

# Problem Set 1: The Block-Encoding

July 24, 2023

**Problem 1** (Block-encodings: tensor products). Let  $U$  and  $V$  be  $Q$ -block encodings of  $A$  and  $B$ , respectively. Show how to get a  $Q$ -block-encoding of  $A \otimes B$ .

*Solution.*  $U \otimes V$  is a block-encoding of  $A \otimes B$ . □

**Problem 2** (Extensibility properties). Prove Corollary 1.8 of the lecture notes. Specifically, show that the two extensibility properties allow us to convert a  $Q$ -block encoding of  $A$  to a  $dQ$ -block encoding of  $p^{(\text{SV})}(A)$ .

*Solution.* We can construct a  $kQ$ -block encoding of  $m_k^{(\text{SV})}(A)$ , for  $m_k(x) = x^k$ . The problem here is that the naïve approach – producing  $x^d$  and then adding with  $x^{d-1}$  – would require  $\mathcal{O}(d^2Q)$  complexity.

Instead, via Horner’s rule, we may rewrite the polynomial in the following form:

$$a_0 + x(a_1 + x(a_2 + \dots + x(a_{n-1} + xa_n))) \tag{1}$$

Precisely the sum of products of polynomials. It can be shown that the coefficients can be structured carefully so that they never exceed 1. □

*Solution.* [Angus Lowe’s solution] Consider the following preparation unitaries:

$$\text{PREP } |0\rangle = \sum_k \sqrt{\lambda_k} |k\rangle \tag{2}$$

$$\text{SELECT} = \sum_{k=0}^d |k\rangle \langle k| \otimes A^k \tag{3}$$

Then, the application of  $\text{PREP}^\dagger \cdot \text{SELECT} \cdot \text{PREP}$  precisely implements a desired block encoding with  $\lambda_k$  chosen appropriately. This is a version of linear combinations of unitaries seen in [Bab+18]. SELECT can be implemented efficiently via using a binary encoding in the ancilla and using  $\log_2 d$  controlled- $A^{2^j}$  gates. □

**Problem 3** (Extensibility properties do not suffice). Let  $p(x) = \sum_{k=0}^d a_k x^k$  be a polynomial whose coefficients satisfy  $\sum |a_k| \leq 1$ . Show that  $p(x)$  cannot approximate  $\sin(100x)$  for any choice of  $d$ . That is, show that there is some  $x \in [-1, 1]$  such that

$$|p(x) - \sin(100x)| \geq 0.01.$$

*Solution.* The key idea is straightforward: we want to show that any polynomial  $p(x)$  has derivative  $p'(x)$  that differs significantly from  $\frac{d}{dx} \sin(100x)$  and use this to produce a contradiction.

First, consider  $x = -\frac{\pi}{200}, x = \frac{\pi}{200}$ . Then,  $\sin(100x) = \pm 1$  at those points. Thus, by the Mean Value Theorem,  $p$  must at some point attain a derivative exceeding the following value:

$$\frac{0.99 - -0.99}{\frac{\pi}{200} - -\frac{\pi}{200}} = \frac{200 \cdot 0.99}{\pi} \geq 50 \quad (4)$$

Now, consider the maximum derivative attainable by the polynomial. Set  $p(x) = \sum_{k=0}^d a_k x^k$  with  $\sum |a_k| = 1$ . Then,

$$|p'(x)| \leq \left| \sum_{k=1}^d a_k \cdot kx^{k-1} \right| \quad (5)$$

$$\leq \sum_{k=1}^d |a_k| k |x|^{k-1} \quad (6)$$

$$\leq \sum_{k=1}^d k |x|^{k-1} \quad (7)$$

Numerics can show that this function lies far below 50 for  $x \in [\pm \frac{\pi}{200}]$ .

Thus, for the polynomial to observe our requirements, it must attain a derivative of at least 50 at some point. However, on this interval, it has derivative far less. Thus, we have obtained a contradiction and  $p$  does not exist.  $\square$

*Solution.* [Zach's] Suppose we have a polynomial  $p(x) = a_0 + \sum_{k=1}^d a_k x^k$ . Then, because  $|p(0)| \leq \frac{1}{100}$  by our constraint, we need  $|a_0| \leq \frac{1}{100}$ . Then, observe that, on  $x \in [0, 1/2]$ :

$$p(x) \leq |a_0| + \sum_{k=1}^d |a_k| |x|^k \quad (8)$$

$$\leq \frac{1}{100} + \frac{1}{2} \quad (9)$$

Thus, the maximum attainable value of  $p(x)$  is  $\frac{51}{100}$ . However,  $x = \frac{\pi}{200}$  would mean  $\sin(100x) = 1$ , so  $p(x)$  and  $\sin(100x)$  differ from a quantity much greater than 0.01, a contradiction.  $\square$

**Problem 4** (Oblivious amplitude amplification). QSVT is a unifying technique which includes many major quantum algorithms, including amplitude amplification [MRTC21]. In this problem, we show that Oblivious Amplitude Amplification (OAA), as described in [BCCKS17, Lemma 3.6], can be written in our block-encoding framework.

Identify the block-encoding within the aforementioned unitary. What polynomial would effect the same transformation as described in [BCCKS17, Lemma 3.6]?

*Solution.* The state preparation unitary mentioned in [BCCKS17] performs the following transformation:

$$U |0\rangle^\mu |\psi\rangle = \sin \theta |0\rangle^\mu V |\psi\rangle + |\Phi^\perp\rangle \quad (10)$$

Where  $|\Phi^\perp\rangle$  is an orthogonal component such that  $\langle 0|^\mu \otimes I |\Phi^\perp\rangle = 0$ . Then,  $U$  is a block-encoding of  $\sin \theta V$ , i.e.:

$$U = \begin{bmatrix} \sin \theta V & \cdot \\ \cdot & \cdot \end{bmatrix} \quad (11)$$

In fact, the net unitary we would like to implement is the following:

$$S^\ell U = \begin{bmatrix} \sin(2\ell + 1)\theta V & \cdot \\ \cdot & \cdot \end{bmatrix} \quad (12)$$

Thus, we see that  $S^\ell U$  actually implements a polynomial (Chebyshev polynomial) taking  $\sin \theta$  to  $\sin(2\ell + 1)\theta$ . However, we need not use Chebyshev polynomials if we may tolerate a different construction. In particular,  $\sin \theta$  will typically be known, so implementing any polynomial taking the specific value of  $\sin \theta$  to  $\sin(2\ell + 1)\theta$  will suffice.  $\square$

*Remark 1.1.* See [Ral20] for more information on how to get block-encodings of density matrices and observables, and how to use this to estimate physical quantities like expectations of Gibbs states. See [BCKKS17] for further discussion of Hamiltonian simulation, placing it in the context of the more general problem of understanding the “fractional query model”, “discrete query model”, and “continuous query model”. See [LC19] (the original paper) or [GSLW19] for a more thorough explanation of the Hamiltonian simulation algorithm.

## References

- [Bab+18] Ryan Babbush, Craig Gidney, Dominic W Berry, Nathan Wiebe, Jarrod McClean, Alexandru Paler, Austin Fowler, and Hartmut Neven. “Encoding electronic spectra in quantum circuits with linear T complexity”. In: *Physical Review X* 8.4 (2018), p. 041015 (page 1).
- [BCKKS17] Dominic W. Berry, Andrew M. Childs, Richard Cleve, Robin Kothari, and Rolando D. Somma. “Exponential improvement in precision for simulating sparse hamiltonians”. In: *Forum of Mathematics, Sigma* 5 (2017), e8. DOI: [10.1017/fms.2017.2](https://doi.org/10.1017/fms.2017.2). arXiv: [1312.1414](https://arxiv.org/abs/1312.1414) [quant-ph] (pages 2, 3).
- [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 51<sup>st</sup> ACM Symposium on the Theory of Computing (STOC)*. ACM, June 2019, pp. 193–204. DOI: [10.1145/3313276.3316366](https://doi.org/10.1145/3313276.3316366). arXiv: [1806.01838](https://arxiv.org/abs/1806.01838) (page 3).
- [LC19] Guang Hao Low and Isaac L. Chuang. “Hamiltonian simulation by qubitization”. In: *Quantum* 3 (July 2019), p. 163. DOI: [10.22331/q-2019-07-12-163](https://doi.org/10.22331/q-2019-07-12-163) (page 3).
- [MRTC21] John M. Martyn, Zane M. Rossi, Andrew K. Tan, and Isaac L. Chuang. “Grand unification of quantum algorithms”. In: *PRX Quantum* 2 (4 Dec. 2021), p. 040203. DOI: [10.1103/PRXQuantum.2.040203](https://doi.org/10.1103/PRXQuantum.2.040203) (page 2).
- [Ral20] Patrick Rall. “Quantum algorithms for estimating physical quantities using block encodings”. In: *Physical Review A* 102.2 (Aug. 2020), p. 022408. DOI: [10.1103/physreva.102.022408](https://doi.org/10.1103/physreva.102.022408). arXiv: [2004.06832](https://arxiv.org/abs/2004.06832) [quant-ph] (page 3).