

Quantum Hermitian conjugate and encoding unnormalized matrices

Alexander I. Zenchuk,^{1,*} Wentao Qi,^{2,†} and Junde Wu^{3,‡}

¹*Federal Research Center of Problems of Chemical Physics and Medicinal Chemistry RAS, Chernogolovka, Moscow reg., 142432, Russia*

²*Institute of Quantum Computing and Computer Theory,*

School of Computer Science and Engineering, Sun Yat-sen University, Guangzhou 510006, China

³*School of Mathematical Sciences, Zhejiang University, Hangzhou 310027, China*

We further develop the family of matrix-manipulation algorithms based on the encoding the matrix elements into the probability amplitudes of the pure superposition state of a certain quantum system. We introduce two extensions to these algorithms which allow (i) to perform Hermitian conjugation of matrices under consideration and (ii) to weaken the restriction to the absolute values of matrix elements unavoidably imposed by the normalization condition for a pure quantum state. Both these extensions are applied to the matrix multiplication algorithm. Controlled measurement of ancilla state is implemented to avoid the problem of small success probability in the measurement process.

arXiv:2504.00015v2 [quant-ph] 2 Apr 2025

* zenchuk@itp.ac.ru

† qiwt5@mail2.sysu.edu.cn

‡ wjd@zju.edu.cn

I. INTRODUCTION

Quantum algorithm is a rapidly developing area of quantum informatics whose progress is stimulated by prospective enormous advantages of quantum algorithms over their classical counterparts. We have to acknowledge such famous algorithms as the Deutsch algorithm [1] demonstrating effect of quantum parallelism in operation with Boolean functions, Shor's factoring algorithm [2, 3] utilising the quantum Fourier transform [4–6], Grover's search algorithm [7], phase-estimation algorithm for the Hermitian [6] and non-Hermitian [8] matrices .

We consider a particular application area of quantum algorithms which covers matrix algebraic operations, such as multiplication, addition, determinant calculation, matrix inversion and its application to linear system solver. During recent years, there are many quantum algorithms solving various aspects of linear algebra. Among them are HHL-algorithm for solving systems of linear equations [9] which was applied, in particular, to Gaussian process regression [10], algorithm for solving linear differential equations [11], algorithm for evaluation of matrix functions [12].

A possible approach to quantum algorithms for matrix manipulations is proposed in [13]. This approach refers to matrices as operators to be applied to some vector. Therefore, it is essentially in that approach that arbitrary nonunitary and non-Hermitian matrix must be transferred to the unitary one. Thus, first one has to replace a given matrix A (rectangular in general) with the Hermitian one and then transfer it to the unitary operator by exponentiating which can be approximated via Trotterization [14–17] and Baker-Champbell-Hausdorff method [18]. To implement such matrix transformations effectively, the set of special matrices is proposed to be prepared in advance. The phase estimation subroutine [6] is included into that algorithm.

A special block-encoding model [19] is another approach for implementing matrix algebra. Different type of block-encoding was used in the algorithm in Ref.[20] to embed the inverse of the matrix into the unitary transformation. In [21], matrix multiplication was performed through the binary encoding of matrix elements into the pure states of quantum systems with subsequent binary multiplication via Toffoli gates. Matrix multiplication over some rings, in particular, multiplication of Boolean matrices, was studied in [22].

Some algorithms for matrix inversion have been also developed. As the first one we call the mentioned above HHL algorithm [9] where the inversion was used for solving a linear system. However, the problem of inversion of matrix eigenvalues has not been resolved in frames of quantum algorithm therein. The matrix inversion algorithm based on the singular value decomposition is presented in [23, 24]. In both paper the authors apply the function evaluation problem [19] to approximate the inverse of singular values by odd-polynomial. This approach requires introducing a special scale parameter depending on the interval where all nonzero singular values are distributed.

Recently the alternative matrix-manipulation algorithms based on the matrix encoding into the complex probability amplitudes of a pure superposition state of a certain subsystem have been developed [25–27]. The principal difference of such approach is that a matrix is considered as a part of the quantum state of a system rather than a unitary operator applied to this system. Therefore the elements of the resulting matrix (obtained after addition or multiplication of other matrices, or after matrix inversion) can be measured up to some constant factor. Although those algorithms deal with complex matrices in general, some operations (including Hermitian conjugation) can not be realized in frames of those settings and therefore certain constraints are to be imposed on the variety of matrix manipulations. To remove this disadvantage and construct more flexible algorithms for matrix algebra we propose to separate the real and imaginary parts of a matrix by encoding them in different probability amplitudes of a pure state. This separation can be done by involving additional one-qubit subsystem whose state serves to label the real and imaginary parts of a matrix elements. As a consequence, all probability amplitudes are real in such representation.

Another issue addressed in this paper is weakening the normalization constraint for the elements of the considered matrices. We recall that such constraint is imposed by the normalization condition for a pure quantum state. For that purpose we introduce an additional probability amplitude into the superposition state encoding considered matrix. This can be done involving one more auxiliary one-qubit subsystem.

Of course, both above extensions require modifications of the algorithms proposed in [26, 27]. Below we present the detailed analysis of the appropriate modifications introduced into the multiplication algorithm (see appendix in [27]) and demonstrate manipulations with the input matrices involving Hermitian conjugation. Similar modifications caused by the above extensions can be implemented in other algorithms such as addition, determinant calculation, matrix inversion, linear system solving. Such modifications will be considered in a different paper.

The paper is organized as follows. In Sec.II we introduced two pointed above extensions to the algorithms based on the matrix encoding into a pure state. In Sec.III, we implement these extensions into the matrix multiplication algorithm, demonstrate possibility of manipulating input matrices using subroutine of Hermitian conjugation and show how to measure the output normalization constant that is loosed because of the controlled measurement [28] of the ancilla state at the last stage of the algorithm. Conclusions are given in Sec.IV.

II. EXTENSIONS OF MATRIX ENCODING TECHNIQUE

The matrix encoding implemented in the algorithms for matrix manipulations proposed in Ref.[26] (see also appendix in ([27])) uses two quantum subsystems R and C whose basis states label the rows and columns associated with each element a_{jk} (complex in general) of the $N \times N$ matrix $A = \{a_{jk} : j, k = 0, \dots, N-1\}$. Thus, the matrix A is encoded as follows:

$$|\Psi_A\rangle = \sum_{j=0}^{N-1} \sum_{k=0}^{N-1} a_{jk} |j\rangle_R |k\rangle_C \quad (1)$$

with the following normalization condition for the pure state of a quantum system:

$$\sum_{j=0}^{N-1} \sum_{k=0}^{N-1} |a_{jk}|^2 = 1. \quad (2)$$

We introduce two extensions to the algorithms of matrix manipulations developed in [26]. First of them is aimed on effective operations with complex matrices, Sec.II A. The second one allows to reduce the constraint (2) imposed on the matrix elements, Sec.II B. We deal with the square $N \times N$ matrices for convenience. If the original matrix is rectangular we turn it to the square matrix by adding the appropriate number of either zero rows or zero columns. We also require $N = 2^n$, n is a positive integer.

A. Hermitian conjugate

The complex elements of the $N \times N$ matrix $A = \{a_{jk} : j, k = 0, \dots, N-1\}$ can be written as

$$a_{jk} = a_{jk0} + ia_{jk1}. \quad (3)$$

We again involve two mentioned above n -qubit subsystems R and C and add the third one-qubit subsystem M whose state is $|0\rangle_M$ for the real part of a_{jk} and $|1\rangle_M$ for the imaginary part. Then the elements a_{jk} of the matrix A can be encoded into the superposition state of three subsystems R , C and M as follows:

$$|\Psi_A\rangle = \sum_{j=0}^{N-1} \sum_{k=0}^{N-1} \sum_{m=0}^1 a_{jkm} |j\rangle_R |k\rangle_C |m\rangle_M. \quad (4)$$

With such pure state, the Hermitian conjugation of A can be realized by the following operator:

$$W = SWAP_{RC} \sigma_M^{(z)}, \quad (5)$$

where $SWAP_{RC}$ exchanges states of the subsystems R and C (in other words, it performs transposition of A), and $\sigma_M^{(z)}$ is the $\sigma^{(z)}$ -operator which is applied to M and thus performs complex conjugation of A . Thus the matrix encoded into the state $W|\Psi_A\rangle$ is the Hermitian conjugate of A ,

$$|\tilde{\Psi}_A\rangle = W|\Psi_A\rangle = \sum_{j=0}^{N-1} \sum_{k=0}^{N-1} \sum_{m=0}^1 a_{jkm} (-1)^m |j\rangle_R |k\rangle_C |m\rangle_M. \quad (6)$$

The Hermitian conjugation algorithm can be used as a subroutine in other algorithms, as shown in Sec.III A. The circuit for Hermitian conjugation is presented in Fig.1.

We shall notice that using the new encoding of the complex matrix in the superposition state of the triple system $R \cup C \cup M$ requires appropriate modifications for the algorithms in Refs.[26, 27]. In addition, since algorithms of determinant calculation and matrix inversion [27] use the row-wise matrix encoding, each row requires its own additional one-qubit subsystem to label the real and imaginary parts of its matrix elements, i.e., N one-qubit subsystems M_i , $i = 0, \dots, N-1$, are required. In Sec.III, we consider modification of multiplication algorithm.

B. Weakened normalization constraint for matrix encoding

Equality (2) represents a constraint imposed on the absolute values of matrix elements. However, we can weaken this constraint reducing it to the inequality

$$\sum_{j=0}^{N-1} \sum_{k=0}^{N-1} |a_{jk}|^2 < 1. \quad (7)$$




FIG. 1: The circuit for Hermitian conjugation, $Z \equiv \sigma^{(z)}$.

To satisfy inequality (7), the matrix A has to be properly prepared. Namely, instead of the matrix A we encode the matrix $\tilde{A} = \{\tilde{a}_{ij} : i, j = 0, \dots, N-1\}$,

$$\tilde{A} = \frac{1}{\sum_{j=0}^{N-1} \sum_{k=0}^{N-1} |a_{jk}|^2 + c} A, \quad c > 0, \quad (8)$$

where the positive parameter c is conventional, it is required to guarantee that condition (7) for the matrix \tilde{A} is a strict inequality. To encode the prepared matrix \tilde{A} , we introduce, along with the subsystems R and C enumerating rows and columns of \tilde{A} , the one-qubit subsystem K and replace the initial state (1) with the following one:

$$|\Psi_A\rangle = b|0\rangle_R|0\rangle_C|0\rangle_K + \sum_{j=0}^{N-1} \sum_{k=0}^{N-1} \tilde{a}_{jk}|j\rangle_R|k\rangle_C|1\rangle_K \quad (9)$$

with the normalization

$$|b|^2 + \sum_{j=0}^{N-1} \sum_{k=0}^{N-1} |\tilde{a}_{jk}|^2 = 1, \quad (10)$$

where b serves to satisfy the constraint (10) and can be determined as

$$|b|^2 = 1 - \sum_{j=0}^{N-1} \sum_{k=0}^{N-1} |\tilde{a}_{jk}|^2. \quad (11)$$

C. Circuit for new encoding of initial state

Now we combine the modifications of the state encoding presented in Eqs.(4) and (9) and encode the elements \tilde{a}_{ij} decomposed into the real and imaginary parts (3) as follows:

$$|\Psi_A\rangle = (b_0^{(i)}|0\rangle_M + b_1^{(i)}|1\rangle_M)|0\rangle_R|0\rangle_C|0\rangle_K + \sum_{j=0}^{N-1} \sum_{k=0}^{N-1} (\tilde{a}_{jk0}|0\rangle_M + \tilde{a}_{jk1}|1\rangle_M)|j\rangle_R|k\rangle_C|1\rangle_K, \quad (12)$$

$$|b|^2 + \sum_{j=0}^{N-1} \sum_{k=0}^{N-1} |\tilde{a}_{jk}|^2 = 1, \quad (13)$$

Replacing matrix representation (1) with representation (12) is shown in Fig.2. Below we omit tilde over the elements of the encoded matrix for the brevity, i.e., write a_{jk} instead of \tilde{a}_{jk} assuming that elements a_{jk} satisfy inequality (7).

III. MATRIX MULTIPLICATION

We modify algorithm for matrix multiplication proposed in [26] and improved in [27]. Modification is based on passing from encoding (1) (used in [26]) to encoding (12) for the square $N \times N$ matrices $A^{(1)}$ and $A^{(2)}$ ($A^{(i)} = \{a_{jk}^{(i)} : j, k = 0, \dots, N-1\}$,




FIG. 2: Replacement of matrix encoding (1) with encoding (12) for organizing effective manipulations with complex matrices and weakening the constraints on the matrix elements.

$i = 1, 2$) according to Sec.II. We assume that the both matrices $A^{(1)}$ and $A^{(2)}$ are prepared in accordance with formula (8) and therefore their elements satisfy inequality (7).

We first introduce four n -qubit registers $R^{(i)}$ and $C^{(i)}$, $i = 1, 2$, enumerating, respectively, the rows and columns of the matrices $A^{(i)}$, $i = 1, 2$. Then, we introduce four one-qubit subsystems $M^{(i)}$ and $K^{(i)}$, $i = 1, 2$. The subsystems $M^{(i)}$, $i = 1, 2$, are used to label the real and imaginary parts of the matrix elements of the i th matrix ($a_{jk}^{(i)} = a_{jk0}^{(i)} + ia_{jk1}^{(i)}$), and also to label the real and imaginary parts of the parameters $b^{(i)}$ ($b^{(i)} = b_0^{(i)} + ib_1^{(i)}$). The subsystems $K^{(i)}$, $i = 1, 2$, are needed to weaken the constraints imposed on the elements $a_{jk}^{(i)}$. Thus, the pure states encoding the elements of matrices $A^{(i)}$, $i = 1, 2$, are in form (12) with normalization (13):

$$|\Psi^{(i)}\rangle = (b_0^{(i)}|0\rangle_{M^{(i)}} + b_1^{(i)}|1\rangle_{M^{(i)}})|0\rangle_{R^{(i)}}|0\rangle_{C^{(i)}}|0\rangle_{K^{(i)}} + \quad (14)$$

$$\sum_{j,k=0}^{N-1} (a_{jk0}^{(i)}|0\rangle_{M^{(i)}} + a_{jk1}^{(i)}|1\rangle_{M^{(i)}})|j\rangle_{R^{(i)}}|k\rangle_{C^{(i)}}|1\rangle_{K^{(i)}}, \quad (15)$$

$$|b^{(i)}|^2 + \sum_{j,k} |a_{jk}^{(i)}|^2 = 1,$$

where the constant parameters $b^{(i)}$ are introduced in accordance with Sec.II B. The initial state of the whole system reads

$$|\Phi_0\rangle = |\Psi_2\rangle \otimes |\Psi_1\rangle = \quad (16)$$

$$\sum_{m_1, m_2=0}^1 b_{m_1}^{(1)} b_{m_2}^{(2)} |m_1\rangle_{M^{(1)}} |m_2\rangle_{M^{(2)}} |0\rangle_{R^{(1)}} |0\rangle_{C^{(1)}} |0\rangle_{R^{(2)}} |0\rangle_{C^{(2)}} |0\rangle_{K^{(1)}} |0\rangle_{K^{(2)}} +$$

$$\sum_{\substack{j_1, k_1, \\ j_2, k_2=0}}^{N-1} \sum_{m_1, m_2=0}^1 \left(a_{j_1 k_1 m_1}^{(1)} a_{j_2 k_2 m_2}^{(2)} |m_1\rangle_{M^{(1)}} |m_2\rangle_{M^{(2)}} \right)$$

$$\times |j_1\rangle_{R^{(1)}} |k_1\rangle_{C^{(1)}} |j_2\rangle_{R^{(2)}} |k_2\rangle_{C^{(2)}} |1\rangle_{K^{(1)}} |1\rangle_{K^{(2)}} + |g_0\rangle,$$

where we select the terms with the states $|j\rangle_{K^{(1)}} |j\rangle_{K^{(2)}}$, $j = 0, 1$, which are needed below, while the terms with the states $|j\rangle_{K^{(1)}} |k\rangle_{K^{(2)}}$, $j \neq k$, are collected in the garbage $|g_0\rangle$.

From the superposition state $|\Phi_0\rangle$, we have to select the terms with the states $|k\rangle_{C^{(1)}} |k\rangle_{R^{(2)}}$, $k = 0, \dots, N-1$, i.e., $k_1 = j_2$ in the second part in the rhs of formula (16). For that purpose we apply the CNOTs W_j to the j th qubits of $C^{(1)}$ and $R^{(2)}$,

$$W_j = |1\rangle_{C_j^{(1)}} \langle 1|_{C_j^{(1)}} \otimes \sigma_{R_j^{(2)}}^{(x)} + |0\rangle_{C_j^{(1)}} \langle 0|_{C_j^{(1)}} \otimes I_{R_j^{(2)}}, \quad j = 1, \dots, n. \quad (17)$$

where $\sigma_{R_j^{(2)}}^{(x)}$ and $I_{R_j^{(2)}}$ are, respectively, the $\sigma^{(x)}$ -operator and identity operator applied to the j th qubit of the subsystem $R^{(2)}$.

We have chosen the qubits of $C^{(1)}$ as control ones. All operators W_j , $j = 1, \dots, n$, commute with each other. Applying the operator $W_{C^{(1)} R^{(2)}}^{(0)}$,

$$W_{C^{(1)} R^{(2)}}^{(0)} = \prod_{j=1}^n W_j, \quad (18)$$

to $|\Phi_0\rangle$ we obtain:

$$\begin{aligned}
|\Phi_1\rangle &= W_{C^{(1)}R^{(2)}}^{(0)}|\Phi_0\rangle = \\
&\sum_{m_1, m_2=0}^1 b_{m_1}^{(1)} b_{m_2}^{(2)} |m_1\rangle_{M^{(1)}} |m_2\rangle_{M^{(2)}} |0\rangle_{R^{(1)}} |0\rangle_{C^{(1)}} |0\rangle_{R^{(2)}} |0\rangle_{C^{(2)}} |0\rangle_{K^{(1)}} |0\rangle_{K^{(2)}} + \\
&\sum_{\substack{j_1, j_2 \\ k_2=0}}^{N-1} \sum_{m_1, m_2=0}^1 \left(a_{j_1 j m_1}^{(1)} a_{j k_2 m_2}^{(2)} |m_1\rangle_{M^{(1)}} |m_2\rangle_{M^{(2)}} \right) \\
&\times |j_1\rangle_{R^{(1)}} |j\rangle_{C^{(1)}} |0\rangle_{R^{(2)}} |k_2\rangle_{C^{(2)}} |1\rangle_{K^{(1)}} |1\rangle_{K^{(2)}} + |g_1\rangle.
\end{aligned} \tag{19}$$

The second part in the rhs of (19) collects the terms with the state $|0\rangle_{R_2}$ (the other terms are garbage by definition; their are collected in $|g_1\rangle$ above). We note that the first part in the rhs of (19) remains unchanged after applying the operator $W_{C^{(1)}R^{(2)}}^{(0)}$.

Next, we apply the Hadamard transformations

$$W_{C^{(1)}}^{(1)} = H^{\otimes n} \tag{20}$$

to the qubits of $C^{(1)}$ and select the terms with $|0\rangle_{C^{(1)}} |0\rangle_{R^{(2)}}$ putting others to the garbage $|g_2\rangle$:

$$\begin{aligned}
|\Phi_2\rangle &= W_{C^{(1)}}^{(1)}|\Phi_1\rangle = \\
&\frac{1}{2^{n/2}} \sum_{m_1, m_2=0}^1 b_{m_1}^{(1)} b_{m_2}^{(2)} |m_1\rangle_{M^{(1)}} |m_2\rangle_{M^{(2)}} |0\rangle_{R^{(1)}} |0\rangle_{C^{(1)}} |0\rangle_{R^{(2)}} |0\rangle_{C^{(2)}} |0\rangle_{K^{(1)}} |0\rangle_{K^{(2)}} \\
&+ \frac{1}{2^{n/2}} \sum_{j_1, k_2=0}^{N-1} \sum_{j=0}^{N-1} \sum_{m_1, m_2=0}^1 \left(a_{j_1 j m_1}^{(1)} a_{j k_2 m_2}^{(2)} |m_1\rangle_{M^{(1)}} |m_2\rangle_{M^{(2)}} \right) \\
&\times |j_1\rangle_{R^{(1)}} |0\rangle_{C^{(1)}} |0\rangle_{R^{(2)}} |k_2\rangle_{C^{(2)}} |1\rangle_{K^{(1)}} |1\rangle_{K^{(2)}} + |g_2\rangle.
\end{aligned} \tag{21}$$

We note that the operator $W_{C^{(1)}}^{(1)}$ transforms $|g_1\rangle$ as well. However, we don't need details of that transformation. The similar statement can be referred to the operators $W_{M^{(1)}M^{(2)}K^{(1)}K^{(2)}}^{(2)}$ and $W_{C^{(1)}R^{(2)}M^{(2)}K^{(2)}B\bar{B}}$ below.

Now, to complete multiplication, we have to organize proper combinations of products of real and imaginary parts of matrices $A^{(i)}$, $i = 1, 2$, to form the real and imaginary parts of the result. To this end we introduce the following control operator:

$$W_{M^{(1)}M^{(2)}} = |1\rangle_{M^{(2)}} \langle 1| \otimes \sigma_{M^{(1)}}^{(x)} \sigma_{M^{(1)}}^{(z)} + |0\rangle_{M^{(2)}} \langle 0| \otimes I_{M^{(1)}}. \tag{22}$$

We also introduce the controlled operator

$$W_{K^{(1)}K^{(2)}} = |1\rangle_{K^{(1)}} \langle 1| \otimes \sigma_{K^{(2)}}^{(x)} + |0\rangle_{K^{(1)}} \langle 0| \otimes I_{K^{(2)}} \tag{23}$$

which labels all needed terms by the state $|0\rangle_{K^{(2)}}$. We include the operators $W_{M^{(1)}M^{(2)}}$ and $W_{K^{(1)}K^{(2)}}$ into the operator

$$W_{M^{(1)}M^{(2)}K^{(1)}K^{(2)}}^{(2)} = W_{K^{(1)}K^{(2)}} H_{M^{(2)}} W_{M^{(1)}M^{(2)}}, \tag{24}$$

where $H_{M^{(2)}}$ is the set of the Hadamard operators applied to single qubit of $M^{(2)}$, and apply $W_{M^{(1)}M^{(2)}K^{(1)}K^{(2)}}^{(2)}$ to $|\Phi_2\rangle$, thus obtaining

$$\begin{aligned}
|\Phi_3\rangle &= W_{M^{(1)}M^{(2)}K^{(1)}K^{(2)}}^{(2)}|\Phi_2\rangle = \\
&\frac{1}{2^{(n+1)/2}} \left((b_0^{(1)} b_0^{(2)} - b_1^{(1)} b_1^{(2)}) |0\rangle_{M^{(1)}} + (b_0^{(1)} b_1^{(2)} + b_1^{(1)} b_0^{(2)}) |1\rangle_{M^{(1)}} \right) \\
&\times |0\rangle_{M^{(2)}} |0\rangle_{R^{(1)}} |0\rangle_{C^{(1)}} |0\rangle_{R^{(2)}} |0\rangle_{C^{(2)}} |0\rangle_{K^{(1)}} |0\rangle_{K^{(2)}} \\
&+ \frac{1}{2^{(n+1)/2}} \sum_{j_1, k_2=0}^{N-1} \sum_{j=0}^{N-1} \left((a_{j_1 j 0}^{(1)} a_{j k_2 0}^{(2)} - a_{j_1 j 1}^{(1)} a_{j k_2 1}^{(2)}) |0\rangle_{M^{(1)}} \right. \\
&\left. + (a_{j_1 j 0}^{(1)} a_{j k_2 1}^{(2)} + a_{j_1 j 1}^{(1)} a_{j k_2 0}^{(2)}) |1\rangle_{M^{(1)}} \right) \\
&\times |0\rangle_{M^{(2)}} |j_1\rangle_{R^{(1)}} |0\rangle_{C^{(1)}} |0\rangle_{R^{(2)}} |k_2\rangle_{C^{(2)}} |1\rangle_{K^{(1)}} |0\rangle_{K^{(2)}} + |g_3\rangle.
\end{aligned} \tag{25}$$

Here the second term contains the desired matrix product and all extra terms are collected in the garbage $|g_3\rangle$. We emphasize that the operator $W_{M^{(1)}M^{(2)}K^{(1)}K^{(2)}}^{(2)}$ is a novelty in comparison with multiplication algorithm in [27].

Next, to label and remove the garbage, we prepare two one-qubit ancillae B and \tilde{B} in the ground state $|0\rangle_B|0\rangle_{\tilde{B}}$, introduce the projector

$$P_{C^{(1)}R^{(2)}M^{(2)}K^{(2)}} = |0\rangle_{C^{(1)}}|0\rangle_{R^{(2)}}|0\rangle_{M^{(2)}}|0\rangle_{K^{(2)}} \langle 0|_{C^{(1)}}\langle 0|_{R^{(2)}}\langle 0|_{M^{(2)}}\langle 0|_{K^{(2)}} \quad (26)$$

and the controlled operator $W_{C^{(1)}R^{(2)}M^{(2)}K^{(2)}B\tilde{B}}^{(3)}$,

$$\begin{aligned} W_{C^{(1)}R^{(2)}M^{(2)}K^{(2)}B\tilde{B}}^{(3)} &= P_{C^{(1)}R^{(2)}M^{(2)}K^{(2)}} \otimes \sigma_B^{(x)} \sigma_{\tilde{B}}^{(x)} \\ &+ (I_{C^{(1)}R^{(2)}M^{(2)}K^{(2)}} - P_{C^{(1)}R^{(2)}M^{(2)}K^{(2)}}) \otimes I_{B\tilde{B}}, \end{aligned} \quad (27)$$

of the depth $O(n)$ with $2(n+1)$ -qubit control register. Applying this operator to $|\Phi_3\rangle|0\rangle_B|0\rangle_{\tilde{B}}$ we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} |\Phi_4\rangle &= W_{C^{(1)}R^{(2)}M^{(2)}K^{(2)}B\tilde{B}}^{(3)} |\Phi_3\rangle|0\rangle_B|0\rangle_{\tilde{B}} = \\ &\frac{1}{2^{(n+1)/2}} \left((b_0^{(1)}b_0^{(2)} - b_1^{(1)}b_1^{(2)})|0\rangle_{M^{(1)}} + (b_0^{(1)}b_1^{(2)} + b_1^{(1)}b_0^{(2)})|1\rangle_{M^{(1)}} \right) \\ &\times |0\rangle_{M^{(2)}}|0\rangle_{R^{(1)}}|0\rangle_{C^{(1)}}|0\rangle_{R^{(2)}}|0\rangle_{C^{(2)}}|0\rangle_{K^{(1)}}|0\rangle_{K^{(2)}}|1\rangle_B|1\rangle_{\tilde{B}} + \\ &\frac{1}{2^{(n+1)/2}} \sum_{\substack{j_1, k_2 \\ j=0}}^{N-1} \left((a_{j_1 j_0}^{(1)} a_{j k_2 0}^{(2)} - a_{j_1 j_1}^{(1)} a_{j k_2 1}^{(2)})|0\rangle_{M^{(1)}} + (a_{j_1 j_0}^{(1)} a_{j k_2 1}^{(2)} + a_{j_1 j_1}^{(1)} a_{j k_2 0}^{(2)})|1\rangle_{M^{(1)}} \right) \\ &\times |0\rangle_{M^{(2)}}|j_1\rangle_{R^{(1)}}|0\rangle_{C^{(1)}}|0\rangle_{R^{(2)}}|k_2\rangle_{C^{(2)}}|1\rangle_{K^{(1)}}|0\rangle_{K^{(2)}}|1\rangle_B|1\rangle_{\tilde{B}} + |g_3\rangle|0\rangle_B|0\rangle_{\tilde{B}}. \end{aligned} \quad (28)$$

Now we perform the conditional measurement [28]

$$W_{B\tilde{B}}^{(4)} = |1\rangle_B \langle 1|_{\tilde{B}} \otimes M_{\tilde{B}} + |0\rangle_B \langle 0|_{\tilde{B}} \otimes I_{\tilde{B}}, \quad (29)$$

where $M_{\tilde{B}}$ is the measurement operator applied to \tilde{B} . Then,

$$\begin{aligned} |\Phi_5\rangle &= W_{B\tilde{B}}^{(4)} |\Phi_4\rangle = |\Psi_{out}\rangle |0\rangle_{M_2} |0\rangle_{C_1} |0\rangle_{R_2} |0\rangle_{K_2} |1\rangle_B, \\ |\Psi_{out}\rangle &= G^{-1} \left((b_0^{(1)}b_0^{(2)} - b_1^{(1)}b_1^{(2)})|0\rangle_{M^{(1)}} + (b_0^{(1)}b_1^{(2)} + b_1^{(1)}b_0^{(2)})|1\rangle_{M^{(1)}} \right) \\ &\times |0\rangle_{R^{(1)}}|0\rangle_{C^{(2)}}|0\rangle_{K_1} + \\ &\sum_{\substack{j_1, k_2 \\ j=0}}^{N-1} \left((a_{j_1 j_0}^{(1)} a_{j k_2 0}^{(2)} - a_{j_1 j_1}^{(1)} a_{j k_2 1}^{(2)})|0\rangle_{M^{(1)}} + (a_{j_1 j_0}^{(1)} a_{j k_2 1}^{(2)} + a_{j_1 j_1}^{(1)} a_{j k_2 0}^{(2)})|1\rangle_{M^{(1)}} \right) \\ &\times |j_1\rangle_{R^{(1)}}|k_2\rangle_{C^{(2)}}|1\rangle_{K^{(1)}} = \\ &G^{-1} \left((\hat{b}_0|0\rangle_{M^{(1)}} + \hat{b}_1|1\rangle_{M^{(1)}})|0\rangle_{R^{(1)}}|0\rangle_{C^{(2)}}|0\rangle_{K^{(1)}} \right. \\ &\left. + \sum_{j,k=0}^{N-1} (\hat{a}_{jk0}|0\rangle_{M^{(1)}} + \hat{a}_{jk1}|1\rangle_{M^{(1)}})|j\rangle_{R^{(1)}}|k\rangle_{C^{(2)}}|1\rangle_{K^{(1)}} \right), \end{aligned} \quad (30)$$

where $G = \left(|b^{(1)}b^{(2)}|^2 + \sum_{j,k=0}^{N-1} \left| \sum_{l=0}^{N-1} a_{jl}^{(1)} a_{lk}^{(2)} \right|^2 \right)^{1/2}$ is the normalization factor,

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{b}_0 &= b_0^{(1)}b_0^{(2)} - b_1^{(1)}b_1^{(2)}, \\ \hat{b}_1 &= b_0^{(1)}b_1^{(2)} + b_1^{(1)}b_0^{(2)}, \\ \hat{a}_{jk0} &= \sum_{l=0}^{N-1} (a_{jl0}^{(1)} a_{lk0}^{(2)} - a_{jl1}^{(1)} a_{lk1}^{(2)}), \\ \hat{a}_{jk1} &= \sum_{l=0}^{N-1} (a_{jl0}^{(1)} a_{lk1}^{(2)} + a_{jl1}^{(1)} a_{lk0}^{(2)}), \end{aligned} \quad (31)$$




FIG. 3: (a) The circuit for the matrix multiplication algorithm; $|\Phi_{out}\rangle$ is formed by subsystems R_1 , C_2 , K_1 and M_1 ; $X \equiv \sigma^{(x)}$, $Z \equiv \sigma^{(z)}$; we omit subscripts in notations $W^{(j)}$ for the brevity; operator $W^{(2)}$ is a novelty in comparison with earlier algorithm in [27]; (b) Notation for multi-qubit CNOT.

so that $\hat{A} = A^{(1)}A^{(2)} = \{\hat{a}_{jk} : j, k = 0, \dots, N-1\}$, $\hat{a}_{jk} = \hat{a}_{jk0} + i\hat{a}_{jk1}$, $\hat{b} = \hat{b}_0 + i\hat{b}_1$, where \hat{a}_{jkm} , \hat{b}_m , $m = 0, 1$, are real numbers. We note that the first term in the final expression for $|\Phi_5\rangle$ plays the same role as the first term in the expression for $|\Phi_0\rangle$ in (16). It weakens the constraint on the normalization of the elements of the resulting matrix \hat{A} .

A. Manipulations with input matrices

In this section we consider several manipulations with the input matrices $A^{(1)}$ and $A^{(2)}$. Instead of multiplication $A^{(1)}A^{(2)}$ we can perform multiplications $(A^{(1)})^\dagger A^{(2)}$, $A^{(1)}(A^{(2)})^\dagger$, $(A^{(1)})^\dagger(A^{(2)})^\dagger$, $(A^{(1)}A^{(2)})^\dagger = (A^{(2)})^\dagger(A^{(1)})^\dagger$ and change order of the multiplier. With this purpose we introduce the following operators.

To organize the Hermitian conjugate of $A^{(i)}$, $i = 1, 2$, we use operator (5) introduced in Sec. II A:

$$Q_{R^{(i)}C^{(i)}M^{(i)}}^{(i)} = SWAP_{R^{(i)}C^{(i)}}\sigma_{M^{(i)}}^{(z)}, \quad i = 1, 2. \quad (32)$$

To change position of matrices we apply the operator

$$Q_{R^{(1)}C^{(1)}R^{(2)}C^{(2)}M^{(1)}M^{(2)}}^{(3)} = SWAP_{R^{(1)}C^{(1)}}SWAP_{R^{(2)}C^{(2)}}SWAP_{M^{(1)}M^{(2)}}. \quad (33)$$

The circuit implementing these operators is shown in Fig. 4. For instance, to calculate the product $A^{(1)}(A^{(2)})^\dagger$ we apply the operator $Q_{R^{(2)}C^{(2)}M^{(2)}}^{(2)}$ to the state $|\Phi_0\rangle$. To calculate $(A^{(1)}A^{(2)})^\dagger$ we apply the operators $Q_{R^{(1)}C^{(1)}R^{(2)}C^{(2)}M^{(1)}M^{(2)}}^{(3)}$, $Q_{R^{(2)}C^{(2)}M^{(2)}}^{(2)}$,

$Q_{R^{(1)}C^{(1)}M^{(1)}}^{(1)}$ to the state $|\Phi_0\rangle$. Application of operators $Q^{(i)}$, $i = 1, 2, 3$, can be controlled by additional qubits $q^{(i)}$, i.e., by the following controlled operators:

$$\hat{Q}_{S^{(i)}}^{(i)} = |1\rangle_{q^{(i)}} \langle 1| \otimes Q_{S^{(i)}}^{(i)} + |0\rangle_{q^{(i)}} \langle 0| \otimes I_{S^{(i)}}, \quad (34)$$

where $S^{(i)} = R^{(i)}C^{(i)}M^{(i)}$, $i = 1, 2$, $S^{(3)} = R^{(1)}C^{(1)}R^{(2)}C^{(2)}M^{(1)}M^{(2)}$ and $I_{S^{(i)}}$ is the identity operator applied to $S^{(i)}$. The state $|\varphi\rangle_q = |n_1\rangle_{q^{(1)}}|n_2\rangle_{q^{(2)}}|n_3\rangle_{q^{(3)}}$, $n_i = 0, 1$ ($i = 1, 2, 3$) of the controlling qubits is not changed after running the algorithm.

Of cause calculating $(A^{(1)}A^{(2)})^\dagger$ can be done by performing Hermitian conjugation after multiplication $A^{(1)}A^{(2)}$, this is another option.




FIG. 4: Controlled manipulations with input matrices $A^{(1)}$ and $A^{(2)}$.

B. Measuring normalization G and discussion

Although the controlled measurement allows to resolve the problem of exponential decrease of the success probability with the number of qubits encoding considered matrices we lose the information about normalization G . However, this information might required in obtaining the final result. Below we explore the method of indirect measuring the normalization G .

Let $S_1 = |b^{(1)}b^{(2)}|^2$, this value is known due to the matrix preparation, see eq.(11). If, along with S_1 , we know $S_1/G^2 = \tilde{S}_1$, then $G = \sqrt{S_1/\tilde{S}_1}$. To find \tilde{S}_1 , we refer to the state $|\Phi_5\rangle$ (30) and measure the state of the subsystem K_1 with the output 0. It is easy to understand that the probability of this output equals \tilde{S}_1 . and can be found in result of multiple runs of the algorithm.

It is important that both introduced extensions do not decline the parameters of the multiplication circuit such as depth and space. Fig.3 shows that the depth is determined by the operator $W_{C^{(1)}R^{(2)}M^{(2)}K^{(2)}B\bar{B}}^{(3)}$, while manipulations in Sec.III A, see Fig.4, increase this depth only by insignificant constant factor. Thus, the estimation of the depth remains $O(\log N)$ similar to the estimation in [27]. Regarding the space, the circuit in Fig.3 includes only five additional one-qubit subsystems ($K^{(i)}$, $M^{(i)}$, $i = 1, 2$, and \bar{B}) in comparison with the circuit in [27] with one of them (the ancilla \bar{B}) is needed for organization of controlled measurement. Therefore, the space estimation remains $O(\log N)$ as well.

We have to note that the above measurement destroys the part of superposition quantum state in which the result of matrix multiplication is stored. Therefore, to get the full information, i.e., normalization G and matrix product, we have to use the set of runs to probabilistically determine G and then run the algorithm one more time to end up with the state $|\Phi_6\rangle$ encoding the product $A^{(1)}A^{(2)}$. However, if we don't need G , then the single run is enough.

IV. CONCLUSION

In this paper we continue studying matrix-manipulation algorithms that are proposed in [26, 27] and based on the encoding the matrix elements into the pure superposition state of a quantum system. Although those algorithms work with complex numbers in general, the complex conjugation (in particular, Hermitian conjugation) can not be realized in frames of those settings. This disadvantage is removed by the first our extension which consists in separating the real and imaginary parts of the complex matrix under consideration by encoding these two parts into different probability amplitudes of a pure superposition state. Such extension allows constructing effective subroutine for operations typical for complex numbers, which are complex and Hermitian conjugations. However, this separation of real and imaginary parts requires proper modifications of the quantum algorithms for matrix addition, multiplication, determinant calculation, matrix inversion and solving linear systems that are described in [26, 27]. In our paper, we present such modification for the multiplication algorithm and demonstrate manipulation with the input matrices using Hermitian conjugation subroutine.

Another disadvantage of the algorithms in Refs.[26, 27] is normalization constraint which is generated by the normalization condition for the superposition pure quantum state. This requirement is weakened by the second our extension which adds an additional term in the superposition state encoding a particular matrix. This additional term leads to replacing the normalization equality (2) with inequality (7) that imposes only the upper boundary on the sum of the squared absolute values of the matrix elements.

Of course, each of these modifications requires involving an extra qubit. Therefore, along with two subsystems $R^{(i)}$ and $C^{(i)}$, $i = 1, 2$, enumerating rows and columns of the matrices $A^{(i)}$, $i = 1, 2$, the i th matrix is associated with the one-qubit subsystem $M^{(i)}$, responsible for separate encoding of the real and imaginary parts of complex matrix elements, and the one-qubit subsystem $K^{(i)}$ allowing to introduce an extra term into the superposition state encoding the matrix $A^{(i)}$, namely the presence of this extra term weakens the normalization constraint. Thus, only four additional qubits appear in the modified multiplication algorithm. We note that the second one-qubit ancilla \tilde{B} is needed for organization the controlled measurement which removes the problem of small success probability that appears in the case of direct uncontrolled measurement of the ancilla stat.

We emphasize that both extensions do not significantly decline the depth and space of the multiplication algorithm. Estimations for both of them remain $O(\log N)$, which is similar to the appropriate characteristics of the multiplication algorithm in [27].

Similar modifications can be included in other matrix-manipulation algorithms considered in Refs.[26, 27] which is postponed for future study.

Acknowledgments. This project is supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China (Grants No. 12031004, No. 12271474 and No. 61877054). The work was also partially funded by a state task of Russian Fundamental Investigations (State Registration No. 124013000760-0).

-
- [1] D. Deutsch, Quantum theory, the Church-Turing principle and the universal quantum computer, *Proc. R. Soc. Lond. A* **400**, 97 (1985).
 - [2] P. W. Shor, Algorithms for quantum computation: discrete logarithms and factoring, In Proceedings, 35th Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science. IEEE Press, Los Alamitos, CA. (1994).
 - [3] P. W. Shor, Polynomial-Time Algorithms for Prime Factorization and Discrete Logarithms on a Quantum Computer, *SIAM J. Comput.* **26**, 5 (1997).
 - [4] D. Coppersmith, An approximate Fourier transform useful in quantum factoring, Technical Report RC 19642, IBM (1994).
 - [5] Y. S. Weinstein, M. A. Pravia, E. M. Fortunato, S. Lloyd, and D. G. Cory, Implementation of the Quantum Fourier Transform, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **86**, 1889 (2001).
 - [6] M. A. Nielsen and I. L. Chuang, Quantum Computation and Quantum Information, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, England (2000).
 - [7] L. Grover, A fast quantum mechanical algorithm for database search, In Proceedings, 28th Annual ACM Symposium on the Theory of Computation, ACM Press, New York (1996).
 - [8] H. Wang, L. Wu, Y. Liu, and F. Nori, Measurement-based quantum phase estimation algorithm for finding eigenvalues of non-unitary matrices, *Phys. Rev. A* **82**, 062303 (2010).
 - [9] A. W. Harrow, A. Hassidim, and S. Lloyd, Quantum algorithm for linear systems of equations, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **103**, 150502 (2009).
 - [10] Z. Zhao, J. K. Fitzsimons, and J. F. Fitzsimons, Quantum-assisted Gaussian process regression, *Phys. Rev. A* **99**, 052331 (2019).
 - [11] D. W. Berry, A. M. Childs, A. Ostrander, and G. M. Wang, Quantum Algorithm for Linear Differential Equations with Exponentially Improved Dependence on Precision, *Commun. Math. Phys.* **356**, 1057 (2017).

- [12] S. Takahira, A. Ohashi, T. Sogabe, and T. S. Usuda, Quantum algorithm for matrix functions by Cauchy's integral formula, *Quantum Inf. Comput.* **20** (1 & 2), 14 (2020).
- [13] L. Zhao, Z. Zhao, P. Rebentrost, and J. Fitzsimons, Compiling basic linear algebra subroutines for quantum computers, *Quantum Mach. Intell.* **3**, 21 (2021).
- [14] H.F. Trotter, On the Product of Semi-Groups of Operators, *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* **10** 545 (1959)
- [15] M. Suzuki, Generalized Trotter's formula and systematic approximants of exponential operators and inner derivations with applications to many-body problems, *Commun. Math. Phys.* **51** 183 (1976)
- [16] A. T.-Shma, *Inverting well conditioned matrices in quantum logspace*, in Proceedings of the Forty-fifth Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing, STOC '13, pages 881-890, New York, USA (2013).
- [17] D. Aharonov and A. T.-Shma, *Adiabatic quantum state generation*, *SIAM Journal on Computing* **37**(1), 47 (2007).
- [18] S. Blanes and F. Casas, On the convergence and optimization of the Baker-Campbell-Hausdorff formula, *Linear algebra and its applications*, **378**, 135 (2004)
- [19] A. Gilyén, Y. Su, G. H. Low, and N. Wiebe, *Quantum singular value transformation and beyond: exponential improvements for quantum matrix arithmetics*, *STOC 2019: Proceedings of the 51st Annual ACM SIGACT Symposium on Theory of Computing*, 193-204 (2019).
- [20] S. I. Doronin, E. B. Fel'dman, and A. I. Zenchuk, *Solving systems of linear algebraic equations via unitary transformations on quantum processor of IBM Quantum Experience*, *Quantum Inf. Process* **19**, 68 (2020).
- [21] H. Li, N. Jiang, Z. Wang, J. Wang, and R. Zhou, *Quantum Matrix Multiplier*, *Int. J. Theor. Phys.* **60**, 2037-2048 (2021).
- [22] R. Kothari and A. Nayak, *Quantum Algorithms for Matrix Multiplication and Product Verification*, In: M.-Y. Kao (eds), *Encyclopedia of Algorithms*, Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg (2015).
- [23] J.M. Martyn, Z. M. Rossi, A.K. Tan, I.L. Chuang, A Grand Unification of Quantum Algorithms, *PRX Quantum* **2**, 040203 (2021)
- [24] I. Novikau, I. Joseph Estimating QSVT angles for matrix inversion with large condition numbers, arXiv:2408.15453v2 [quant-ph] (2024)
- [25] W. Qi, A. I. Zenchuk, A. Kumar, J. Wu, *Quantum algorithms for matrix operations and linear systems of equations*, *Commun. Theor. Phys.* **76**, 035103 (2024).
- [26] A. I. Zenchuk, W. Qi, A. Kumar, and J. Wu, Matrix manipulations via unitary transformations and ancilla-state measurements, *Quantum Information and Computation*, **24**(13-14) (2024) 1099
- [27] A.I. Zenchuk, G. A. Bochkin, W. Qi, A. Kumar, J. Wu, Purely quantum algorithms for calculating determinant and inverse of matrix and solving linear algebraic systems, arXiv:2401.16619 [quant-ph]
- [28] E. B. Fel'dman, A. I. Zenchuk, W. Qi, and J. Wu, Remarks on controlled measurement and quantum algorithm for calculating Hermitian conjugate, arXiv:2501.16028v1 (2025).

This figure "HC.png" is available in "png" format from:

<http://arxiv.org/ps/2504.00015v2>

This figure "Multiplication_newNorm.png" is available in "png" format from:

<http://arxiv.org/ps/2504.00015v2>

This figure "Multiplication_newNormHermitian.png" is available in "png" format from

<http://arxiv.org/ps/2504.00015v2>

This figure "NewStateEncoding.png" is available in "png" format from:

<http://arxiv.org/ps/2504.00015v2>

This figure "Notation1_new.png" is available in "png" format from:

<http://arxiv.org/ps/2504.00015v2>