

Quantum reservoir computing maps data onto the Krylov space

Saud Čindrak,* Kathy Lüdge, and Lina Jaurigue
Technische Universität Ilmenau, Institute of Physics, Ilmenau, Germany
(Dated: February 19, 2025)

We demonstrate that time-evolved operators can construct a Krylov space to compute Operator complexity and introduce Krylov observability as a measure of phase space dimension in quantum systems. We test Krylov observability in the framework of quantum reservoir computing and show that it closely mirrors information processing capacity, a data-driven expressivity metric, while achieving computation times that are orders of magnitude faster. Our results validate Operator complexity and give the interpretation that data in a quantum reservoir is mapped onto the Krylov space.

Introduction. — The significance of physics in machine learning, and vice versa, is unmistakable, as evidenced by the awarding of the Nobel Prize to John Hopfield and Geoffrey Hinton. An example of the intersection of physics and machine learning is quantum computing, a technology that seeks to harness quantum effects for computation. Key research questions in quantum computation are the extent to which machine learning algorithms can be implemented on quantum systems, how they might function, and what advantages this could yield. Therefore, understanding quantum machine learning networks is of utmost importance. In classical machine learning, understanding is achieved through methods of expressivity and explainability. In quantum mechanics, quantum information measures are used to gain deeper insights. This raises the question of how advancements in quantum information can be leveraged to enhance our understanding of quantum machine learning.

A promising information measure in this context is Krylov complexity, which quantifies how much the evolved operators or states spread within the Krylov basis [1, 2]. It has been shown that Operator complexity measures provide insights into quantum chaos[3], spin chains, SYK models[2, 4, 5], 2D CFT [6], closed systems, driven systems [7], and open quantum systems [8], among many others [2, 9–40].

Operator complexity can be interpreted as the expectation value of the associated Krylov operator. We believe that a measure on the Krylov phase space can offer further insights and propose *Krylov observability*. Unlike Operator complexity, Krylov observability accommodates multiple operators, respects an upper bound defined by the phase space dimension, and integrates multiple measurements, which are all necessities for quantum machine learning. The defined spaces can also be extended to define a Operator complexity measure, which effectively consider multiple operators.

We test this measure in the context of quantum reservoir computing. Unlike variational quantum machine learning, quantum reservoir computing utilizes a physical system in which only the readout layer is trained [41–45].

Extensive research has been conducted to optimize quantum reservoir computing, ranging from leveraging noise and decoherence, improving task performance and developing various methods to address the time-complexity problem [45–64]. An established measure of expressivity in reservoir computing is the information processing capacity (IPC) [65], which quantifies the reservoir’s ability to map and retain data both linearly and non-linearly.

In this work we demonstrate that time-evolved operators can construct a Krylov space to compute Operator complexity and introduce Krylov observability as a measure of the phase space dimension. We then compute Krylov observability for various systems and observables, and compare the behavior with the information processing capacity. We demonstrate that Krylov observability and information processing capacity exhibit correlation factors as high as 0.97. Our results show that quantum reservoirs map data onto the Krylov space and that sampling this space can be indicative of task performance. Our findings demonstrate the utility of Krylov observability as a measure of the computational capacity of quantum systems which is both upper bounded and computationally inexpensive (calculating the information processing capacity for the results in Figure 1 took 150 hours per reservoir, whereas Krylov observability was computed in just 30 seconds per reservoir).

Spread complexity was first discussed in [66] in relation to quantum reservoir computing, where the authors show that spread complexity can be used to explain task performance. In [40], we perform a thorough study of various Krylov-based measures in relation to understanding task performance in QRC. We discuss Krylov observability, which is introduced in this work, as well as fidelity, spread complexity, Krylov expressivity (introduced in [40]), and the information processing capacity in the context as expressivity measures for quantum reservoir computers. There, we show that more expressive quantum systems can exhibit worse task performance if the considered observables commute with a larger subspace of the system.

Krylov spaces — The evolution of an operator O with a Hamiltonian H is given by $\partial_t O(t) = i[H, O(t)]$. The

* saud.cindrak@tu-ilmenau.de

solution to this equation is

$$O(t) = e^{iHt} O e^{-iHt} = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{(it)^k}{k!} \mathcal{L}^k(O),$$

where $\mathcal{L}(O) = HO - OH$ represents the Liouvillian. This implies that $O(t) \in \text{Span}\{\mathcal{L}^0(O), \mathcal{L}^1(O), \dots\}$. The authors in [1] used the Krylov space property and the linearity of $\mathcal{L}(O)$ to show that there exists an $M \in \mathbb{N}$ such that

$$O(t) \in \text{Span}\{\mathcal{L}^0(O), \mathcal{L}^1(O), \dots, \mathcal{L}^{M-1}(O)\} = \mathcal{L}_M$$

holds true. Orthonormalizing \mathcal{L}_M results in the basis $\{\mathcal{W}_i\}_i$, such that the space can be rewritten as $\mathcal{L}_M = \text{Span}\{\mathcal{W}_0, \mathcal{W}_1, \dots, \mathcal{W}_{M-1}\}$. With the representation of the time-evolved operator $O(t)$ in the Krylov basis, the Operator complexity $\mathcal{C}_O(t)$ is defined as follows [1]:

$$\begin{aligned} O(t) &= \sum_{n=0}^{M-1} i^n \beta_n(t) \mathcal{W}_n, \\ \mathcal{C}_O(t) &= \sum_{n=0}^{M-1} (n+1) |\beta_n(t)|^2. \end{aligned} \quad (1)$$

Krylov Observability— In this work, we will prove that time-evolved observables can be used to construct a space that is equivalent to the space \mathcal{L}_M . Building upon these results, we will define an observability measure to predict task performance and further our understanding of quantum reservoir computing.

Theorem 1. *Let $O \in \mathbb{C}^{N,N}$ be a Hermitian observable, i.e., $O = O^\dagger$. Let $O(t) = e^{iHt} O e^{-iHt}$, where H is the Hamiltonian, and let M be the Krylov grade, such that $O(t) \in \mathcal{L}_M$. Let $0 = t_0 < t_1 < t_2 < \dots < t_Q$ and define the approximate evolved operator as*

$$\tilde{O}(t_a) = \sum_{k=0}^Q \frac{(it_a)^k}{k!} \mathcal{L}^k(O).$$

Then, it holds that $\mathcal{L}_Q = \tilde{\mathcal{F}}_Q$, for all $Q \in \mathbb{N}$, where $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_Q$ is given by

$$\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_Q = \text{Span}\{\tilde{O}(t_0), \tilde{O}(t_1), \dots, \tilde{O}(t_Q)\}.$$

In the limit as $Q \rightarrow \infty$, it follows that $\mathcal{L}_M = \mathcal{F}_M$, where \mathcal{F}_Q is given by

$$\mathcal{F}_Q = \text{Span}\{O(t_0), O(t_1), \dots, O(t_{M-1})\}.$$

Proof. $\tilde{O}(t_a)$ can be represented as

$$\tilde{O}(t_a) = (i^0 \mathcal{L}^0(O), i^1 \mathcal{L}^1(O), \dots, i^Q \mathcal{L}^Q(O)) \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ t_a \\ \vdots \\ \frac{t_a^Q}{Q!} \end{pmatrix}$$

Representing $Q+1$ time-evolved $\tilde{O}(t_a)$ with pairwise distinct times $t_0 < t_1 < \dots < t_Q$ leads to

$$\begin{aligned} (\tilde{O}(t_0), \dots, \tilde{O}(t_Q)) &= (i^0 \mathcal{L}^0(O), \dots, i^Q \mathcal{L}^Q(O)) \Theta, \\ \text{with } \Theta &= \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 & \dots & 1 \\ t_0/1! & t_1/1! & t_2/1! & \dots & t_Q/1! \\ t_0^2/2! & t_1^2/2! & t_2^2/2! & \dots & t_Q^2/2! \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ t_0^Q/Q! & t_1^Q/Q! & t_2^Q/Q! & \dots & t_Q^Q/Q! \end{pmatrix}. \end{aligned}$$

The pairwise distinct times t_a imply the linear independence of each column and the invertibility of Θ , resulting in

$$(\tilde{O}(t_0), \dots, \tilde{O}(t_Q)) \Theta^{-1} = (i^0 \mathcal{L}^0(O), \dots, i^Q \mathcal{L}^Q(O)).$$

Since all vectors of \mathcal{L}_Q can be represented through vectors in $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_Q$, it follows that $\mathcal{L}_Q = \tilde{\mathcal{F}}_Q$ holds for all Q . In the limit as Q approaches infinity, $\tilde{O}(t_a) \rightarrow O(t_a)$ holds, such that the space $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_Q$ can be expressed as:

$$\mathcal{L}_Q = \tilde{\mathcal{F}}_Q = \text{Span}(O(t_0), O(t_1), \dots, O(t_Q)) = \mathcal{F}_Q. \quad (2)$$

For $Q > M$, \mathcal{L}_Q has only M linearly independent vectors, implying that \mathcal{F}_Q has only M linearly independent vectors, thus resulting in $\mathcal{L}_M = \mathcal{F}_M$. ■

In quantum reservoir computing, the expectation values of K observables O_1, O_2, \dots, O_K are sampled at discrete times $\langle O_i(t_j) \rangle$. From Theorem 1

$$O_i(t) \in \mathcal{F}_i = \text{Span}(O_i(t_0), O_i(t_1), \dots, O_i(t_{M_i-1})) \quad (3)$$

follows. M_i is the dimension of the space, and $t_{M_i-1} = T_O$ is equal for all observables O_i . For any $O_i \in \{O_1, O_2, \dots, O_K\}$, it holds that

$$O_i(t) \in \bigcup_{i=1}^K \mathcal{F}_i =: \mathcal{F}(O_1, O_2, \dots, O_K), \quad \forall O_i. \quad (4)$$

In the following, \mathcal{F} always denotes the full space, i.e., $\mathcal{F} := \mathcal{F}(O_1, O_2, \dots, O_K)$. Constructing the spaces in this way does not consider the linear independence of the spaces \mathcal{F}_k and does not provide information about how much each \mathcal{F}_k contributes to \mathcal{F} . Algorithm 1 constructs spaces where both factors are considered. Let \mathcal{F}^B and \mathcal{F}_i^B be the bases of the spaces \mathcal{F} and \mathcal{F}_i , i.e., $\mathcal{F} = \text{Span}(\mathcal{F}^B)$ and $\mathcal{F}_i = \text{Span}(\mathcal{F}_i^B)$.

Algorithm 1 Construction of Observability Spaces

```

1:  $\mathcal{I}_O = \{1, 2, \dots, K\}$ 
2:  $\mathcal{T} = \{t_1, t_2, \dots, t_R\}$ 
3:  $\mathcal{F}^{(B)} = \emptyset$ 
4:  $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_1^{(B)}, \tilde{\mathcal{F}}_2^{(B)}, \dots, \tilde{\mathcal{F}}_K^{(B)} = \emptyset, \emptyset, \dots, \emptyset$ 
5: while  $t_j \in \mathcal{T}$  do
6:   for  $k \in \mathcal{I}_O$  do
7:     if  $O_k(t_j) \notin \mathcal{F}$  then
8:        $\mathcal{F}^{(B)} = \mathcal{F}^{(B)} \cup O_k(t_j)$ 
9:        $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_k^{(B)} = \tilde{\mathcal{F}}_k^{(B)} \cup O_k(t_j)$ 
10:    end if
11:  end for
12: end while
13:  $\mathcal{F}^{(B)} \leftarrow \text{orthonormalize}(\mathcal{F}^{(B)})$ 

```

In the first two lines, the index set \mathcal{I}_O for the observables and the set of all times \mathcal{T} are initialized, where $R > M$ should hold, and in our case, $R = \dim(H)$. Lines 3 and 4 initialize all bases to the empty set, and line 5 iterates through all times t_j . The second while loop in line 6 iterates through all observables O_k . If the k -th time-evolved observable $O_k(t_j)$ is not in the space $\mathcal{F} = \text{Span}(\mathcal{F}^{(B)})$, then the time-evolved observable is added to the bases $\mathcal{F}^{(B)}$ and $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_k^{(B)}$ in lines 8 and 9. This can be verified by computing the rank of the basis and checking whether it changes. If the rank does not change, i.e., $\text{rank}(\mathcal{F}^{(B)}) = \text{rank}(\mathcal{F}^{(B)} \cup O_k(t_j))$, then it follows that $O_k(t_i) \in \mathcal{F}$ holds as well. In line 13, the basis $\mathcal{F}^{(B)}$ is orthonormalized, such that spaces with the following properties are returned:

$$\mathcal{F} = \bigcup_{k=1}^K \mathcal{F}_k = \bigcup_{k=1}^K \tilde{\mathcal{F}}_k, \quad \dim \left(\bigcup_{j=1}^l \tilde{\mathcal{F}}_j \right) = \sum_{j=1}^l \dim(\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_j)$$

This results in the spaces \mathcal{F}_k being linearly independent and ensures that each observable O_k is mapped onto a space \mathcal{F}_k . In the next step, we use these spaces to define Krylov observability, a measure to capture the phase space dimension of various operators.

Proposition 1 (Krylov Observability). *Assume K observables O_1, \dots, O_K . For each observable O_k , the spaces \mathcal{F}_k are computed with $\dim(\mathcal{F}_k) = M_k$ and let $T > 0$. With $R_k = \min(V, M_k)$ and $\tau_k = T/R_k$, define*

$$\mathcal{G}_k = \{O_k(\tau_1), O_k(\tau_2), \dots, O_k(\tau_{M_k})\}$$

where V is the number of measurements for each observable. Upper bounding the number of times R_k by M_k ensures that \mathcal{G}_k always consists of the smallest number of linearly independent basis states. The observability of the k -th observable O_k is defined as

$$p_k(T) = 1 + \sum_{j=1}^{R_k-1} (1 - f(O_k(\tau_j), O_k(\tau_{j+1}))), \quad (5)$$

where f is a function with $f(A, B) = 1$ if $A = B$. In this

study, we set

$$f(A, B) := F(A, B) = \left| \text{Tr} \left(\frac{A^\dagger B}{\|A\| \|B\|} \right) \right| \quad (6)$$

F is the normalized fidelity between the two time-evolved operators. The **Krylov Observability** $\mathcal{O}_K(T)$ of V multiplexed observables O_1, \dots, O_K is defined as

$$\mathcal{O}_K(T) = \sum_{k=1}^K p_k(T). \quad (7)$$

Quantum Reservoir Computing— We demonstrate the utility of Krylov Observability using the widely researched Ising Hamiltonian

$$H_I = \sum_{i=1, j>i}^{N_S} J_{ij} X_i X_j + \sum_{i=1}^{N_S} h Z_i. \quad (8)$$

as a quantum reservoir. X_i and Z_i represent the Pauli- x and Pauli- z operators acting on the i -th site, and N_S is the number of sites. The constant h is set to $h = 0.5$, and $J_{i,j}$ is sampled from a uniform distribution on the interval $[0.25, 0.75]$ [45]. The system evolution under the von Neumann equation is given by

$$\partial_t \rho = -i[H, \rho]. \quad (9)$$

In the quantum reservoir scheme, the n -th input of a time series $\mathbf{u} = (u_1, u_2, \dots, u_{N_U})$ is encoded into one site as $|\Psi_n\rangle = \sqrt{\frac{1-u_n}{2}} |0\rangle + \sqrt{\frac{1+u_n}{2}} |1\rangle$. Then, the full density matrix is constructed as $\rho_n = |\Psi_n\rangle \langle \Psi_n| \otimes \text{Tr}_1(\rho_{n-1}(T))$, where T , also called the clock cycle, is the evolution time before the next input is introduced. The system evolution for any time t is described by $\rho_n(t) = e^{-iHt} \rho_n e^{iHt}$. The output is constructed by computing the expectation values $\langle O_{n,i}(\tau_j) \rangle = \text{Tr}(O_i \rho_n(\tau_j))$ of K observables O_1, O_2, \dots, O_K at discrete times $\tau_i = iT/V$. This results in $N_R = VK$ outputs for each input. Writing the expectation values for each input in a row forms the state matrix $\mathbf{S} \in \mathbb{R}^{N_U, N_R}$. Gaussian noise \mathcal{N} is added to account for shot noise and serves as regularization, i.e., $\mathbf{S} \leftarrow \mathbf{S} + \eta \mathcal{N}$. The output of the reservoir \mathbf{Y} is given by $\mathbf{Y} = \mathbf{S} \mathbf{W}$, where \mathbf{W} are weights computed on a training set \mathbf{u}_{Tr} with $\mathbf{W} = (\mathbf{S}_{\text{Tr}}^T \mathbf{S}_{\text{Tr}})^{-1} \mathbf{S}_{\text{Tr}}^T \hat{\mathbf{Y}}_{\text{Tr}}$.

Reservoir computing research often makes use of the **information processing capacity** (IPC) as an expressivity measure. The IPC evaluates how well prior inputs and combinations of prior inputs can be reconstructed non-linearly [65]. The first-order IPC₁, also called memory capacity, measures how well the system can reconstruct prior data [67]. The definition for computing the IPC is given in [61, 65, 68–70]. The sum over all IPCs is called the total IPC, or simply IPC, i.e., $\text{IPC} = \sum_i \text{IPC}_i$. [71, 72] provides analytical evidence of the influence of eigenvalues on the IPC. Furthermore, it has been shown that IPC can help predict task performance in reservoir




FIG. 1: Observability \mathcal{O}_K and IPC in dependence on multiplexing V and clock cycle T .

computing [73, 74], and there is a typically observed non-linearity-memory trade-off, which was observed in quantum reservoirs as well [61].

Results—To analyze the ability of our Krylov observability measure \mathcal{O}_K to quantify the computational capabilities of a quantum system, we compare it with the IPC. We consider ten different Ising Hamiltonians, each with four sites and uniformly distributed coupling constants $J_{i,j}$ on the interval $[0.25, 0.75]$. For each Hamiltonian, we consider a quantum reservoir where the first site (Z_1), the first two sites ($Z_{1,2}$), and all four sites ($Z_{1,2,3,4}$) are measured in the Pauli- z direction. We compute the information processing capacity IPC and the Krylov observability \mathcal{O}_K for various clock cycle lengths T and for various time-multiplexing measurements V . Figure 1 shows the results for the averaged IPC (left column) and the averaged \mathcal{O}_K (right column). In each plot, the y -axis represents the number of measurements for the corresponding measurement scheme and the x -axis represents the clock cycle T . The first row shows results when only the first site is measured Z_1 .

As the clock cycle T and the number of measurements V increase, so does the phase space dimension, i.e., the Krylov observability \mathcal{O}_K , onto which the data is mapped. At $T_{\text{sat}}(Z_1) \approx 36$ and $V_{\text{sat}}(Z_1) \approx 110$, the full Krylov space is explored, as indicated by the saturation of \mathcal{O}_K . Further increases in the number of measurements and clock cycles result only in measurements that are linearly dependent on all previous ones, thus not further increasing the expressivity of the reservoir. This is observed in the almost identical behavior




FIG. 2: Observability \mathcal{O}_K and IPC in dependence on multiplexing V and clock cycle T .

of IPC and \mathcal{O}_K . To better quantify the behavior of the Krylov observability \mathcal{O}_K and information processing capacity IPC, we compute the Pearson correlation factor between them. In the case where only one observable is measured, a Pearson correlation factor of $P_C = 0.97$ is reached. Measuring the first two sites yields results in the second row, where both measures show similar behavior with slightly smaller values for \mathcal{O}_K . The number of virtual nodes at which IPC and \mathcal{O}_K saturate reduces to $T_{\text{sat}}(Z_{1,2}) \approx 30$ and $V_{\text{sat}}(Z_{1,2}) \approx 95$ with $P_C = 0.97$. Measuring all four sites moves the saturation to smaller values, $V_{\text{sat}}(Z_{1,2,3,4}) \approx 75$ and $T_{\text{sat}}(Z_{1,2}) \approx 18$. The earlier saturation when measuring multiple observables is due to the higher number of measurements N_R as the total number of measurements is given by $N_R = VK$. Additionally, the space dimension of $\mathcal{F}(Z_1)$ is smaller than that of $\mathcal{F}(Z_1, Z_2)$ and $\mathcal{F}(Z_1, Z_2, Z_3, Z_4)$. One interesting observation, particularly for \mathcal{O}_K in the third row, is oscillations over time, arising from the observability measure construction, where the fidelity of time-evolved observables is computed. To better understand this behavior, Fig. 2 shows the IPC (blue) and \mathcal{O}_K (red) as functions of the clock cycle T for a fixed number of measurements $V = 30$ (left), and as functions of V for a fixed clock cycle $T = 20$ (right). In the left plot, \mathcal{O}_K increases slightly later but reaches a maximum with oscillations, while the IPC reaches a maximum around $T \approx 20$ and remains stable. The standard deviation is shown as a fill in the corresponding color and is small for both systems. The oscillation is due to the small number of qubits, as quasiperiodic behavior is more apparent [40]. The right plot shows the dependence on the number of measurements V for constant $T = 20$. The behavior of \mathcal{O}_K and IPC is, except for an offset, almost identical.

Conclusion and Discussion— This work showed that instead of computing different powers of the Liouvillian, time-evolved operators can be used to construct an equivalent space in Theorem 1. Building upon this, we have shown how observability spaces can be constructed that consider the possible dependence of both spaces, and an algorithm for such a computation is provided. This en-

abled our work to propose Krylov observability as a measure to capture the phase space dimension of evolved observables, see Proposition 1. Krylov observability was then tested in the framework of quantum reservoir computing. We showed that the information processing capacity, consisting of thousands of quantum reservoir tasks, and the Krylov observability exhibit almost identical behavior, with correlation factors of $P_C = 0.97$. The high correlation between the information processing capacity and Krylov observability suggests that quantum reservoir computing can be interpreted as a map of classical data onto the Krylov spaces discussed in this work. Second, the field of Krylov complexity is validated as an effective method for understanding quantum systems through Krylov observability, which can predict how well macroscopic information (i.e., encoded input series) can be reconstructed and non-linearly transformed in a quantum system. This study further demonstrates that infor-

mation processing capacity, or macroscopic information, might be an interesting technique to describe the physics of quantum systems. Therefore, quantum reservoir computing might become a tool to further the understanding of quantum systems. Lastly, we show that Krylov observability serves as an expressivity measure that is fast to compute, with a simulation time for one Hamiltonian of 30 seconds, while the corresponding computation of the information processing capacity can take over 150 hours. Programming information processing capacity also requires careful consideration of combinatorics and suitable cutoffs, whereas programming Krylov observability is straightforward. Lastly, Krylov observability can easily adapt as an expressivity measure for variational quantum machine learning and quantum extreme learning.

-
- [1] D. E. Parker, X. Cao, A. Avdoshkin, T. Scaffidi, and E. Altman, A universal operator growth hypothesis, *Phys. Rev. X* **9**, 041017 (2019).
- [2] V. Balasubramanian, P. Caputa, J. M. Magan, and Q. Wu, Quantum chaos and the complexity of spread of states, *Phys. Rev. D* **106**, 046007 (2022).
- [3] V. Balasubramanian, J. M. Magan, and Q. Wu, Quantum chaos, integrability, and late times in the Krylov basis, arXiv 10.48550/arxiv.2312.03848 (2023), arXiv:2312.03848 [cond-mat, physics:hep-th, physics:nlin, physics:quant-ph].
- [4] B. Bhattacharjee, P. Nandy, and T. Pathak, Operator dynamics in Lindbladian SYK: a Krylov complexity perspective, *J. High Energy Phys.* **2024** (1), 94, arXiv:2311.00753 [cond-mat, physics:hep-th, physics:quant-ph].
- [5] S. Jian, B. Swingle, and Z. Xian, Complexity growth of operators in the SYK model and in JT gravity, *J. High Energy Phys.* **2021** (3), 14.
- [6] P. Caputa and S. Datta, Operator growth in 2d CFT, *J. High Energy Phys.* **2021** (12), 188, arXiv:2110.10519 [cond-mat, physics:hep-th, physics:quant-ph].
- [7] A. A. Nizami and A. W. Shrestha, Krylov construction and complexity for driven quantum systems, *Phys. Rev. E* **108**, 054222 (2023), publisher: American Physical Society.
- [8] C. Liu, H. Tang, and H. Zhai, Krylov complexity in open quantum systems, *Phys. Rev. Res.* **5**, 033085 (2023).
- [9] S. E. Aguilar-Gutierrez and A. Rolph, Krylov complexity is not a measure of distance between states or operators, arXiv (2024), arXiv:2311.04093 [hep-th, physics:quant-ph].
- [10] M. Alishahiha and S. Banerjee, A universal approach to Krylov state and operator complexities, *SciPost Phys.* **15**, 080 (2023).
- [11] T. Anegawa, N. Iizuka, and M. Nishida, Krylov complexity as an order parameter for deconfinement phase transitions at large N , *J. High Energy Phys.* **2024** (4), 119.
- [12] J. L. F. Barbón, E. Rabinovici, R. Shir, and R. Sinha, On the evolution of operator complexity beyond scrambling, *J. High Energy Phys.* **2019** (10), 264.
- [13] H. A. Camargo, V. Jahnke, K. Kim, and M. Nishida, Krylov complexity in free and interacting scalar field theories with bounded power spectrum, *J. High Energy Phys.* **2023** (5), 226.
- [14] P. Caputa, H. Jeong, S. Yi, J. F. Pedraza, and L. Qu, Krylov complexity of density matrix operators, *J. High Energy Phys.* **2024** (5), 337.
- [15] X. Cao, A statistical mechanism for operator growth, *J. Phys. A Math. Theor.* **54**, 144001 (2021), publisher: IOP Publishing.
- [16] A. Chattopadhyay, A. Mitra, and H. J. R. Van Zyl, Spread complexity as classical dilaton solutions, *Phys. Rev. D* **108**, 025013 (2023).
- [17] B. Craps, O. Evnin, and G. Pascuzzi, A relation between Krylov and Nielsen complexity, arXiv (2023), arXiv:2311.18401 [hep-th, physics:quant-ph].
- [18] A. Dymarsky and M. Smolkin, Krylov complexity in conformal field theory, *Phys. Rev. D* **104**, L081702 (2021).
- [19] J. Erdmenger, S. Jian, and Z. Xian, Universal chaotic dynamics from Krylov space, *J. High Energy Phys.* **2023** (8), 176.
- [20] Z. Fan, Universal relation for operator complexity, *Phys. Rev. A* **105**, 062210 (2022), arXiv:2202.07220 [hep-th, physics:quant-ph].
- [21] M. Gautam, K. Pal, K. Pal, A. Gill, N. Jaiswal, and T. Sarkar, Spread complexity evolution in quenched interacting quantum systems, arXiv (2023), arXiv:2308.00636 [cond-mat, physics:hep-th, physics:quant-ph].
- [22] W. Gilpin, Model scale versus domain knowledge in statistical forecasting of chaotic systems, *Phys. Rev. Res.* **5**, 043252 (2023).
- [23] S. Guo, Operator growth in SU(2) Yang-Mills theory, arXiv (2022), arXiv:2208.13362 [hep-th].
- [24] K. Hashimoto, K. Murata, N. Tanahashi, and R. Watanabe, Krylov complexity and chaos in quantum mechanics, *J. High Energy Phys.* **2023** (11), 40.
- [25] S. He, P. H. C. Lau, Z. Xian, and L. Zhao, Quan-

- tum chaos, scrambling and operator growth in \mathbb{T} -deformed SYK models, *J. High Energy Phys.* **2022** (12), 70.
- [26] R. Heveling, J. Wang, and J. Gemmer, Numerically Probing the Universal Operator Growth Hypothesis, *Phys. Rev. E* **106**, 014152 (2022), arXiv:2203.00533 [cond-mat, physics:quant-ph].
- [27] K. Huh, H. Jeong, and J. F. Pedraza, Spread complexity in saddle-dominated scrambling, *J. High Energy Phys.* **2024** (5), 137.
- [28] N. Iizuka and M. Nishida, Krylov complexity in the IP matrix model, *arXiv* (2023), arXiv:2306.04805 [hep-th, physics:quant-ph].
- [29] J. Kim, J. Murugan, J. Olle, and D. Rosa, Operator delocalization in quantum networks, *Phys. Rev. A* **105**, L010201 (2022), publisher: American Physical Society.
- [30] X. Li, Q. Zhu, C. Zhao, X. Duan, B. Zhao, X. Zhang, H. Ma, J. Sun, and W. Lin, Higher-order granger reservoir computing: simultaneously achieving scalable complex structures inference and accurate dynamics prediction, *Nat. Commun.* **15**, 2506 (2024).
- [31] H. W. Lin, The bulk Hilbert space of double scaled SYK, *J. High Energy Phys.* **2022** (11), 60.
- [32] J. M. Magan and J. Simón, On operator growth and emergent Poincaré symmetries, *J. High Energy Phys.* **2020** (5), 71.
- [33] W. Mück and Y. Yang, Krylov complexity and orthogonal polynomials, *Nucl. Phys. B.* **984**, 115948 (2022).
- [34] S. Nandy, B. Mukherjee, A. Bhattacharyya, and A. Banerjee, Quantum state complexity meets many-body scars, *J. Phys. Condens. Matter* **36**, 155601 (2024).
- [35] M. A. Nielsen, M. R. Dowling, M. Gu, and A. C. Doherty, Quantum Computation as Geometry, *Science* **311**, 1133 (2006).
- [36] K. Pal, A. Gill, and T. Sarkar, Time evolution of spread complexity and statistics of work done in quantum quenches, *Phys. Rev. B* **108**, 104311 (2023).
- [37] D. Patramanis, Probing the entanglement of operator growth, *Prog. Theor. Phys.* **2022**, 063A01 (2022).
- [38] E. Rabinovici, A. Sánchez-Garrido, R. Shir, and J. Sonner, A bulk manifestation of Krylov complexity, *J. High Energy Phys.* **2023** (8), 213.
- [39] M. J. Vasli, K. B. Velni, M. R. M. Mozaffar, A. Molabashi, and M. Alishahiha, Krylov complexity in Lifshitz-type scalar field theories, *EOJ C* **84**, 235 (2024).
- [40] S. Čindrak, A. Paschke, L. C. Jaurigue, and K. Lüdge, Measurable Krylov Spaces and Eigenenergy Count in Quantum State Dynamics, *J. High Energ. Phys.* **2024**, 83.
- [41] H. Jaeger, *The “echo state” approach to analysing and training recurrent neural networks*, GMD Report 148 (GMD - German National Research Institute for Computer Science, 2001).
- [42] W. Maass, T. Natschläger, and H. Markram, Real-time computing without stable states: A new framework for neural computation based on perturbations, *Neural Comput.* **14**, 2531 (2002).
- [43] D. Verstraeten, B. Schrauwen, M. D’Haene, and D. Stroobandt, An experimental unification of reservoir computing methods, *Neural Networks* **20**, 391 (2007), echo State Networks and Liquid State Machines.
- [44] L. Appeltant, M. C. Soriano, G. Van der Sande, J. Danckaert, S. Massar, J. Dambre, B. Schrauwen, C. R. Mirasso, and I. Fischer, Information processing using a single dynamical node as complex system, *Nat. Commun.* **2**, 468 (2011).
- [45] K. Fujii and K. Nakajima, Harnessing Disordered-Ensemble Quantum Dynamics for Machine Learning, *Phys. Rev. Applied* **8**, 024030 (2017), publisher: American Physical Society.
- [46] K. Nakajima, K. Fujii, M. Negoro, K. Mitarai, and M. Kitagawa, Boosting Computational Power through Spatial Multiplexing in Quantum Reservoir Computing, *Phys. Rev. Applied* **11**, 034021 (2019), publisher: American Physical Society.
- [47] A. Kutvonen, K. Fujii, and T. Sagawa, Optimizing a quantum reservoir computer for time series prediction, *Sci. Rep.* **10**, 14687 (2020).
- [48] R. Martínez-Peña, G. L. Giorgi, J. Nokkala, M. C. Soriano, and R. Zambrini, Dynamical Phase Transitions in Quantum Reservoir Computing, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **127**, 100502 (2021).
- [49] W. Xia, J. Zou, X. Qiu, and X. Li, The reservoir learning power across quantum many-body localization transition, *Front. Phys.* **17**, 33506 (2022).
- [50] N. Götting, F. Lohof, and C. Gies, Exploring quantumness in quantum reservoir computing, *Phys. Rev. A* **108**, 052427 (2023).
- [51] J. Chen, H. I. Nurdin, and N. Yamamoto, Temporal information processing on noisy quantum computers, *Phys. Rev. Applied* **14**, 024065 (2020).
- [52] Y. Suzuki, Q. Gao, K. C. Pradel, K. Yasuoka, and N. Yamamoto, Natural quantum reservoir computing for temporal information processing, *Sci. Rep.* **12**, 1353 (2022), publisher: Nature Publishing Group.
- [53] P. Pfeffer, F. Heyder, and J. Schumacher, Hybrid quantum-classical reservoir computing of thermal convection flow, *Phys. Rev. Research* **4**, 033176 (2022).
- [54] T. Yasuda, Y. Suzuki, T. Kubota, K. Nakajima, Q. Gao, W. Zhang, S. Shimono, H. I. Nurdin, and N. Yamamoto, Quantum reservoir computing with repeated measurements on superconducting devices, *arxiv* (2023).
- [55] J. Nokkala, G. L. Giorgi, and R. Zambrini, Retrieving past quantum features with deep hybrid classical-quantum reservoir computing, *ArXiv* **2401.16961**, <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2401.16961> (2024), arXiv:2401.16961 [quant-ph].
- [56] A. H. Abbas, H. Abdel-Ghani, and I. S. Maksymov, Classical and Quantum Physical Reservoir Computing for Onboard Artificial Intelligence Systems: A Perspective, *Preprints* **10.20944/preprints202406.1128.v1** (2024).
- [57] A. Sannia, R. Martínez-Peña, M. C. Soriano, G. L. Giorgi, and R. Zambrini, Dissipation as a resource for Quantum Reservoir Computing, *Quantum* **8**, 1291 (2024).
- [58] D. Fry, A. Deshmukh, S. Y. Chen, V. Rastunkov, and V. Markov, Optimizing quantum noise-induced reservoir computing for nonlinear and chaotic time series prediction, *Sci. Rep.* **13**, 19326 (2023).
- [59] L. Domingo, G. Carlo, and F. Borondo, Taking advantage of noise in quantum reservoir computing, *Sci. Rep.* **13**, 8790 (2023).
- [60] P. Mujal, R. Martínez-Peña, G. L. Giorgi, M. C. Soriano, and R. Zambrini, Time-series quantum reservoir computing with weak and projective measurements, *npj Quantum Inf.* **9**, 16 (2023).
- [61] S. Čindrak, B. Donvil, K. Lüdge, and L. C. Jaurigue, Enhancing the performance of quantum reservoir comput-

- ing and solving the time-complexity problem by artificial memory restriction, *Phys. Rev. Res.* **6**, 013051 (2024), arXiv 2306.12876.
- [62] O. Ahmed, F. Tennie, and L. Magri, Prediction of chaotic dynamics and extreme events: A recurrence-free quantum reservoir computing approach, *Phys. Rev. Research* **6**, 043082 (2024).
- [63] K. Kobayashi, K. Fujii, and N. Yamamoto, Feedback-Driven Quantum Reservoir Computing for Time-Series Analysis, *PRX Quantum* **5**, 040325 (2024).
- [64] C. Zhu, P. J. Ehlers, H. I. Nurdin, and D. Soh, Practical and scalable quantum reservoir computing, *ArXiv* **2405.04799** (2024), arXiv:2405.04799 [quant-ph].
- [65] J. Dambre, D. Verstraeten, B. Schrauwen, and S. Massar, Information processing capacity of dynamical systems, *Sci. Rep.* **2**, 514 (2012).
- [66] L. Domingo, F. Borondo, G. Scialchi, A. J. Roncaglia, G. G. Carlo, and D. A. Wisniacki, Quantum reservoir complexity by the Krylov evolution approach, *Phys. Rev. A* **110**, 022446 (2024).
- [67] H. Jaeger, *Short term memory in echo state networks*, GMD Report 152 (GMD - Forschungszentrum Informationstechnik GmbH, 2002).
- [68] M. Goldmann, F. Köster, K. Lüdge, and S. Yanchuk, Deep time-delay reservoir computing: Dynamics and memory capacity, *Chaos*, **30**, 093124 (2020).
- [69] F. Köster, D. Ehlert, and K. Lüdge, Limitations of the recall capabilities in delay based reservoir computing systems, *Cogn. Comput.* **15**, 1419 (2020), springer, ISSN 1866-9956.
- [70] I. Bauwens, G. Van der Sande, P. Bienstman, and G. Verschaffel, Using photonic reservoirs as preprocessors for deep neural networks, *Front. Phys.* **10**, 10.3389/fphy.2022.1051941 (2022).
- [71] F. Köster, S. Yanchuk, and K. Lüdge, Insight into delay based reservoir computing via eigenvalue analysis, *J. Phys. Photonics* **3**, 024011 (2021).
- [72] F. Köster, S. Yanchuk, and K. Lüdge, Master memory function for delay-based reservoir computers with single-variable dynamics, *IEEE Trans. Neural Netw. Learn. Syst.* **35**, 7712 (2024).
- [73] T. Hülser, F. Köster, L. C. Jaurigue, and K. Lüdge, Role of delay-times in delay-based photonic reservoir computing, *Opt. Mater. Express* **12**, 1214 (2022).
- [74] T. Hülser, F. Köster, K. Lüdge, and L. C. Jaurigue, Deriving task specific performance from the information processing capacity of a reservoir computer, *Nanophotonics* **12**, 937 (2023).