Quantum algorithms for linear systems of equations inspired by adiabatic quantum computing
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We present two quantum algorithms based on evolution randomization, a simple variant of adiabatic quantum computing, to prepare a quantum state \( |x\rangle \) that is proportional to the solution of the linear system of equations \( A \vec{x} = \vec{b} \). The time complexities of our algorithms are nearly of order \( \kappa^2 \) and \( \kappa \), respectively, and linear in \( 1/\epsilon \), where \( \kappa \) is the condition number of \( A \) and \( \epsilon \) is the precision. Both algorithms are constructed using families of Hamiltonians that are linear combinations of products of \( A \), the projector onto the initial state \( |b\rangle \), and single-qubit Pauli operators. The first algorithm aims at preparing the ground states of the Hamiltonians while the second algorithm aims at preparing excited states. The algorithms are simple: they are not obtained using equivalences between the gate model and adiabatic quantum computing, they do not use phase estimation, and they do not use variable-time amplitude amplification. We provide numerical simulations and use methods for Hamiltonian simulation to show the optimality of our second algorithm in terms of \( \kappa \). Like previous solutions of this problem, our techniques yield an exponential quantum speedup under some assumptions on \( A \) and \( |b\rangle \). Our results emphasize the role of Hamiltonian-based models of quantum computing for the discovery of important algorithms.

PACS numbers: 03.67.Ac, 03.67.Lx, 03.65.Xp, 89.70.Eg

\textbf{Introduction.} Recently, there has been significant interest in quantum algorithms to solve various linear algebra problems [1-4], as quantum computers can implement certain linear transformations more efficiently than their classical counterparts. Such algorithms may find applications in a wide range of topics, including machine learning [5-7], graph problems [8], solving differential equations [9], and physics problems [10, 11]. A main example is the HHL algorithm of Ref. [1] for the so-called quantum linear systems problem (QLSP), where the goal is to prepare a quantum state \( |x\rangle \) that is proportional to the solution of a linear system of equations \( A \vec{x} = \vec{b} \). If the \( N \times N \) matrix \( A \) and \( N \)-dimensional vector \( \vec{b} \) are sparse, and for constant precision, the complexity of the algorithm in Ref. [1] is polynomial in \( \log N \) and \( \kappa \), where \( \kappa \) is the condition number of \( A \). In contrast, classical algorithms to invert matrices are of complexity polynomial in \( N \), suggesting that quantum computers would be able to solve certain problems related to linear systems of equations exponentially faster than classical computers. Improvements of the HHL algorithm can be found in Refs. [3, 4].

The referenced algorithms are described in the standard gate-based model of quantum computing, where quantum states are prepared by applying a sequence of elementary (e.g., two-qubit) gates to some initial state. However, Hamiltonian-based alternatives to the gate-based model exist; a well-known case being adiabatic quantum computing (AQC) [12]. One advantage of considering these other alternatives is that new and simple quantum algorithms can sometimes be found, even if such algorithms will ultimately be implemented using a different but equivalent model.

In AQC, for example, the computation is performed by smoothly changing the interaction parameters of a Hamiltonian that evolves a quantum system. The adiabatic theorem asserts that if the continuously related eigenstates remain non-degenerate and the Hamiltonians change sufficiently slowly, then the evolved state is sufficiently close to the eigenstate of the final Hamiltonian [13]. Such an eigenstate encodes information about the solution to a problem; in our case the final eigenstate would be \( |x\rangle \) (or \( |\phi\rangle \otimes |x\rangle \) if ancillas are used). AQC is one example of eigenpath traversal [14]. A closely related method to AQC is the randomization method (RM) described in Ref. [15]. In the RM, rather than continuously changing the parameters of the Hamiltonian, the parameters are changed discretely and an evolution with a time-independent Hamiltonian for a random time is implemented at each step. An advantage of the RM with respect to AQC is that better convergence guarantees can sometimes be obtained, as shown in Ref. [16]. The RM is also another example of eigenpath traversal and faster methods based on fixed-point quantum search are described in Ref. [14].

In this paper, we develop two simple quantum algorithms that solve the QLSP using the RM. To this end, we construct families of simple Hamiltonians whose continuously related eigenstates connect \( |b\rangle \), the quantum state proportional to \( \vec{b} \), with \( |x\rangle \). The average evolution times of our algorithms, i.e. the time complexities, are nearly order \( \kappa^2 \) and \( \kappa \), respectively. Here \( \kappa \) is the condi-
tion number of $A$. Additionally, the time complexities of both algorithms are linear in $1/\epsilon$, where $\epsilon$ is a precision parameter. (By construction, the maximum evolution time will be twice the average.)

Our first quantum algorithm aims at performing the evolution from the initial to the final state by preparing the lowest-energy states of the corresponding Hamiltonians. Instead, our second algorithm performs the evolution by preparing energy eigenstates that lie exactly at the middle of the spectrum of the Hamiltonians, i.e., excited states.

Our second algorithm is remarkable in that it is almost optimal, having time complexity almost linear in $\kappa$. We achieve this without using complicated subroutines such as phase estimation or variable-time amplitude amplification. These subroutines were used in previous works for the QLSP. Our results also emphasize the importance of considering models of quantum computing, which go beyond the gate-based model, for discovering algorithms that result in exponential quantum speedups—see Ref. [17] for another example.

Quantum linear systems problem. The QLSP in Refs. [13, 4] is stated as follows. We are given an $N \times N$ Hermitian matrix $A$, and a vector $\vec{b} = (b_1, \ldots, b_N)^T$ with $N = 2^n$. The problem is to prepare an $\epsilon$-approximation of a quantum state

$$|x\rangle := \frac{\sum_{j=1}^N x_j |j\rangle}{\sqrt{\sum_{j=1}^N |x_j|^2}},$$

where $\vec{x} = (x_1, \ldots, x_N)^T$ is the solution to the linear system $A\vec{x} = \vec{b}$ and $0 < \epsilon < 1$ is a precision parameter. We assume that $A$ is invertible, having condition number $\kappa < \infty$, and $\|A\| \leq 1$. Then, we can write

$$|x\rangle = \frac{(1/A)|\vec{b}\rangle}{\|(1/A)|\vec{b}\rangle\|},$$

where $|\vec{b}\rangle \propto \sum_{j=1}^N b_j |j\rangle$. The approximated state $|\tilde{x}\rangle$ satisfies $\| |\tilde{x}\rangle - |x\rangle\| \leq \epsilon$. Here we consider a slightly modified version of this problem where the goal is to prepare a mixed state $\rho_x$, where the trace distance satisfies

$$\frac{1}{2} \text{Tr} |\rho_x - |x\rangle\langle x|| \leq \epsilon.$$  

Note that this modified version is adequate since the ultimate purpose of the QLSP is for obtaining expectation values of observables. Thus, both $|\tilde{x}\rangle$ and $\rho_x$ will provide same-order approximations for such calculations.

To build our quantum algorithms, we assume access to a procedure that allows for the preparation of the initial quantum state $|\tilde{b}\rangle$. We also allow for the implementation of evolutions under Hamiltonians that are linear combinations of products of $A$, $|\tilde{b}\rangle$, and single qubit Pauli operators $X$, $Y$, and $Z$. Ideally, our quantum methods would be designed to prepare $|x\rangle$ from $|\tilde{b}\rangle$ via a sequence of steps that prepare intermediate states. Nevertheless, due to various approximations, an exact algorithm may not be possible and we aim at preparing the state $\rho_x$ instead.

Algorithm inspired by AQC. Motivated by AQC, we first define the family of Hamiltonians

$$H(s) := A^2(s) - A(s)|\tilde{b}\rangle\langle\tilde{b}|A(s),$$

where $A(s) := (1 - s)Z \otimes \mathbb{I} + sX \otimes A$, $|\tilde{b}\rangle := |+, b\rangle$, and $0 \leq s \leq 1$ is a parameter. These Hamiltonians act on a space of dimension $2N$, i.e., the Hilbert space of $n$ qubits plus one ancilla qubit. In the Supp. Mat. we show that $|x(s)\rangle \propto (1/A(s))|\tilde{b}\rangle$ is the unique ground state of $H(s)$ of zero energy and any other excited eigenstate is above an energy gap $\Delta(s) := (1 - s)^2 + (s/\kappa)^2$. As $s$ is increased from 0 to 1, the ground state continuously changes from $|x(0)\rangle = |-, b\rangle$ to $|x(1)\rangle = |+, x\rangle$. Exact preparation of $|x(1)\rangle$ implies exact preparation of the target state $|x\rangle$ by discarding the ancillary qubit. We note that the ancillary qubit was introduced to make $A(s)$ invertible for all $s$. We also define the orthogonal projector $P_{b}^{\perp} = \mathbb{I} - |\tilde{b}\rangle\langle\tilde{b}|$ so that $H(s) = A(s)P_{\tilde{b}}^{\perp}A(s)$.

As suggested in Refs. [14, 15, 22], it is convenient to work in the so-called natural parametrization when using the RM. A natural parametrization $s(v)$ is such that the norm of the rate of change of the eigenstate (defined up to a phase factor that depends on $s$) can be bounded by a constant. In the Supp. Mat. we show that a natural parametrization for this case is

$$s(v) := \frac{e^{v \frac{\sqrt{1 + \kappa^2}}{2\kappa}} + 2\kappa^2 - \kappa^2 e^{-v \frac{\sqrt{1 + \kappa^2}}{2\kappa}}}{2(1 + \kappa^2)}.$$  

Here, $v_a \leq v \leq v_b$, with

$$v_a := \frac{\sqrt{2\kappa}}{\sqrt{1 + \kappa^2}} \log(\kappa \sqrt{1 + \kappa^2} - \kappa^2),$$

$$v_b := \frac{\sqrt{2\kappa}}{\sqrt{1 + \kappa^2}} \log(\sqrt{1 + \kappa^2} + 1).$$  

With a slight abuse of notation, we write $f(v) := f(s(v))$. (It will be clear from the text which parametrization is used.) Then, $\| \partial_v x(v) \| \leq 1$. 


The RM involves several steps; each step evolves with the Hamiltonian for a fixed value of $v$ and for a random time $\tau$. This process effectively simulates an approximate projective measurement of the desired ground state (or any other eigenstate) achieving a version of the quantum Zeno effect. The RM has the benefit that its time complexity can be easily obtained and provides a better bound than those obtained by various adiabatic approximations [13 23 27]. If the ground states (eigenstates) at adjacent steps are sufficiently close and non-degenerate, the method in [15] allows for the preparation of a state, which approximates the final ground state (eigenstate), from the initial one with sufficiently high probability. The worst-case time complexity of the method is $O(L^2/(\epsilon \Delta))$ [22], where $L$ is the so-called path length of the ground state (eigenstate), $\epsilon$ is a precision parameter, and $\Delta$ is the minimum spectral gap of the Hamiltonians ($L$ is described in the Supp. Mat.). Nevertheless, the bound on the time complexity can be slightly improved in the current case because we have information about the spectral properties of the Hamiltonians that is in general not available.

We now obtain the time complexity of the RM. In the natural parametrization, the path is discretized evenly into $q$ points as $v_a < v^1 < v^2 < \ldots < v^q = v_b$. Here, $v^j = v_a + j \delta$ ($j = 1, \ldots, q$) and $\delta$ is determined below. These discretization points correspond to the $q$ steps of the RM and are chosen as to satisfy

$$1 - \left| \langle v^j \rangle |x(v^{j+1})\rangle \right|^2 = O(\epsilon/q).$$

Equation (8) simply implies that a sequence of $q$ perfect projective measurements of $|x(v^j)\rangle$, starting from $|x(v_a)\rangle$, will produce $|x(v_b)\rangle$ with probability $1 - O(\epsilon)$. The RM implements imperfect measurements. However, it was shown in [22] that the coherences of the resulting density matrix are bounded by $\epsilon$ as well. Under these conditions the resulting density matrix can be shown to satisfy the error bound in terms of the trace distance given in Eq. (3).

The left hand side of Eq. (8) can be upper bounded by $\delta^2$. Then, $\delta = O(\sqrt{\epsilon/q})$ and $q \delta = v_b - v_a = O(\log \kappa)$ see the Supp. Mat. The number of steps in the RM is then $q = O((\log^2(\kappa))/\epsilon)$. At each step $j = 1, \ldots, q$ we evolve with the Hamiltonian $H(v^j)$ for a random time $t^j$. The evolution time can be sampled from the uniform distribution $t^j \in [0, 2\pi/\Delta^*(v^j)]$ [15 22] and satisfies $\langle t^j \rangle = \pi/\Delta^*(v^j)$. The time complexity of the RM is $T := \sum_{j=1}^q \langle t^j \rangle$ and in the Supp. Mat. we show

$$T = O(\kappa^2 \log(\kappa)/\epsilon).$$

Our first algorithm then uses the RM to prepare a mixed state $\rho_x$ that satisfies Eq. (3), after discarding the ancilla. The time complexity is almost quadratic in $\kappa$.

**Spectral gap amplification.** One way to improve the time complexity of the RM is by considering other families of Hamiltonians where the relevant spectral gap is larger than that of $H(s)$. This idea was considered in Ref. [28] and resulted in various polynomial quantum speedups for quantum state preparation. The results in Ref. [28] show that a quadratic spectral gap amplification is indeed possible when the Hamiltonians satisfy a so-called frustration free property. Very roughly, a possible Hamiltonian with an amplified gap can be interpreted as the square root of the frustration-free Hamiltonian. A zero eigenvalue remains zero and an eigenvalue $\lambda > 0$ is transformed into eigenvalues $\pm \sqrt{\lambda}$. ($\sqrt{\lambda} \gg \lambda$ if $\lambda \ll 1$.) In order to avoid additional complexity overheads, the Hamiltonians with an amplified gap must satisfy certain constrains related to the difficulty of their simulation. We refer to [28] for details.

Motivated by these results, we now consider another family of Hamiltonians for solving the QLSP using the RM. This family is given by

$$H'(s) := \sigma^+ \otimes A(s) P_b^\perp + \sigma^- \otimes P_b^\perp A(s), \quad (10)$$

where $\sigma^\pm = (X \pm iY)/2$ are single-qubit (raising and lowering) operators, and $s \in [0, 1]$. We note that $H'(s)$ acts on a Hilbert space of dimension $4N$. Then

$$(H'(s))^2 = \begin{pmatrix} H(s) & 0 \\ 0 & P_b^\perp \langle A(s)^2 \rangle P_b^\perp \end{pmatrix}, \quad (11)$$

where each block of the matrix is of dimension $2N \times 2N$. In the Supp. Mat. we show that the eigenvalues of $P_b^\perp \langle A(s)^2 \rangle P_b^\perp$ coincide with those of $H(s)$ and that the eigenvalues of $H'(s)$ are $\{0, 0, \pm \sqrt{\gamma_1(s)}, \ldots, \pm \sqrt{\gamma_{2N-1}(s)}\}$, where $\gamma_j(s) > 0$ are the nonzero eigenvalues of $H(s)$. The subspace of $H'(s)$ of eigenvalue zero is spanned by $\{0 \otimes |s(0)\rangle, |1 \otimes |b\rangle\}$. The relevant spectral gap is now bounded by $\sqrt{\Delta^*(s)}$.

In contrast to the first algorithm that aimed at preparing the ground state of $H(s)$, we now aim at preparing one of the two eigenstates of zero eigenvalue of $H'(s)$ that lie exactly at the middle of the spectrum. Nevertheless, the RM can be used to prepare any eigenstate as long as it is separated by a nonzero spectral gap from the other eigenstates. One may wonder if the double degeneracy is a problem for this case. The answer is negative as the two eigenstates differ by the state of the first qubit being in $|0\rangle$ or $|1\rangle$. If we initialize our quantum computer in $|0\rangle \otimes |x(0)\rangle = |0\rangle \otimes |-, b\rangle$, a sequence of perfect projective measurements of the eigenstates of $H'(s)$ at sufficiently close points will allow us to prepare $|0\rangle \otimes |x(1)\rangle = |0\rangle \otimes |+, x\rangle$ with sufficiently high probability.

The eigenstate $|0\rangle \otimes |x(s)\rangle$ has similar properties as $|x(s)\rangle$: its path length and the rate of change of its norm are the same. Then, the RM for this case can be constructed by using the same discretization points that were used before. At each step, we now need to evolve with the Hamiltonian $H'(v^j)$ for a random time
$t^j$. This time can be sampled from the uniform distribution $t^j \in [0, 2\pi / \sqrt{\Delta_0(v^j)}]$. The time complexity of the RM, $T := \sum_{j=1}^q (t^j)$, is determined in the Supp. Mat. to be

$$T = O(\kappa \log(\kappa)/\epsilon) .$$  

(12)

After discarding the two ancilla qubits, the final state is $\rho_x$ and satisfies Eq. (3). The time complexity of our second algorithm is then almost linear in $\kappa$.

**Simulation results.** We tested the validity of our quantum algorithms by performing numerical simulations. For this purpose, we randomly generated Hermitian matrices $A$ of dimension $N = 16$ that are 4-sparse and $N = 32$ that are 5-sparse, both satisfying $\|A\| = 1$. The generated matrices result in a range of values for the condition number $\kappa$. We post-selected matrices for which $\kappa \approx 10$ and $\kappa \approx 50$ (to within absolute error $10^{-3}$), for $N = 16$ and $N = 32$ respectively. Similarly, we randomly generated 4-sparse and 5-sparse vectors for $b$. The parameters $v^j$ and $t^j$ of the RM were chosen according to the previous discussion and depend on $\kappa$ and $\epsilon$ (or $q$). In each execution of the RM, we prepare a pure quantum state which is not guaranteed to be $\epsilon$-close to the pure eigenstate of the final Hamiltonian. However, the expected error of the prepared pure states from many repeated executions of the RM is indeed bounded by $\epsilon$.

We ran simulations for which the number of repetitions of the RM were $n_{rep} = 50$ and $n_{rep} = 200$, respectively. For each case, we first construct a finite-sampling density matrix $(1/n_{rep}) \sum_{t=1}^{n_{rep}} |\psi_i\rangle\langle\psi_i|$. Here, $|\psi_i\rangle$ is the pure state output at the $i$th repetition of the RM. Tracing out the ancilla qubits, we get a density matrix $\tilde{\rho}_x$ that describes the state of the system only. Note that $\tilde{\rho}_x$ is, in general, slightly different from $\rho_x$ of Eq. (3). However, $\tilde{\rho}_x \rightarrow \rho_x$ in the limit of $n_{rep} \rightarrow \infty$. The error computed in our numerical simulations is then the trace distance between $\tilde{\rho}_x$ and $\rho_x(x)$.

In Fig. 1 we show the dependence of the inverse of the error on the number of steps $q$. While the results are for two particular matrices $A$ with $\kappa \approx 10$ and $\kappa \approx 50$, other matrices show similar results. We observe that the inverse of the error for the two quantum algorithms, denoted by $\epsilon_Q$ and $\epsilon_L$ respectively, scales almost linearly with $q$. The dispersion around the linear fit is smaller for larger $n_{rep}$. The results are then in accordance with our theoretical analysis.

**Gate-based model algorithms.** We now describe how to implement the algorithm based on the Hamiltonian of Eq. (10) using a gate-based quantum computer. [The implementation for the algorithm based on the Hamiltonian of Eq. (4) can be obtained following similar steps.] We will follow some results of Ref. [20]. Given that the matrix $A$ is $d-$sparse, $A(s)$ is $(d+1)-$sparse. As we show in the Supp. Mat., $A(s)$ can be decomposed into a linear combination of unitaries acting on a larger Hilbert space. This uses a version of Szegedy walks [29] that requires additional ancilla qubits. These walks were considered in several other works, including Refs. [4, 30]. We define $\tilde{H}(s) := H(s) \otimes P$, where $P = |0\rangle\langle 0|$ is a projector acting on the ancillary space. The defined Hamiltonian also takes the form $\tilde{H}(s) = d+1 \sum_{t=1}^{d+1} \tilde{H}^t(s)$, where $\tilde{H}^t(s)$ are unitaries. We note that evolving the state $|\psi\rangle$ with $\tilde{H}(s)$ can be done by evolving the state $|\psi\rangle \otimes |0\rangle$ with $H(s)$. The time evolution with $\tilde{H}(s)$, for fixed $s$, can be simulated using the methods developed in Ref. [20]. These methods aim at implementing a linear combination of unitaries resulting from a truncated Taylor series for $e^{-i\tilde{H}(s)t}$. We let $K = O\left(\frac{\log dt/\epsilon}{\log \log (dt/\epsilon)}\right)$ be the truncation order of the series.

We will measure the overall complexity in the gate-based model by distinguishing the query and gate complexities. To this end, we assume that we have access to an oracle $O_A$ for $A$ that outputs the matrix elements of $A$ and the index of any non-zero element in a particular row of $A$. We also assume that we have access to a (controlled) unitary $U_b$ that prepares the state $|b\rangle$ and the (controlled) $U_b^\dagger$. In the Supp. Mat. we prove that each run of the RM can be simulated, within precision of order $\epsilon$, using $O(dTK)$ queries to $O_A$, where $T$ is given in Eq. (12). The number of uses of the (controlled) $U_b$ and $U_b^\dagger$ is also $O(dTK)$. The gate complexity is $O(dTK(n+C_M))$, where $C_M$ is the complexity associated with a reversible computation needed to implement the quantum walks that depends on the matrix elements of $A$. These complexities are almost linear in $\kappa$, $1/\epsilon$, and $d$. The lower bound presented in Ref. [1] for the QLSP
in terms of $\kappa$ implies that our gate-based simulation is almost optimal in the condition number.

**Discussion.** We presented simple quantum algorithms for solving the QLSP that were motivated by AQC and not the standard gate-based model. One of those algorithms has time complexity that is almost linear in $\kappa$ and, due to the equivalence between Hamiltonian-based and gate-based models, that algorithm is almost optimal. A nice feature about AQC and related models, such as the RM or general eigenpath traversal methods \[14\], is that the time complexity is typically dominated by a single quantity, i.e., the inverse of the minimum spectral gap of the Hamiltonians. Then, the root of the quantum speedup is more clear in this case than in the gate-based model, allowing for algorithmic improvements by considering different Hamiltonians with larger spectral gaps. Another nice feature is that some problems are naturally reduced to preparing the eigenstate of a Hamiltonian, and eigenpath traversal methods are useful in that context. We showed that this is the case for the QLSP. It resulted in two quantum algorithms that do not require phase estimation or variable-time amplitude amplification, thereby reducing the number of ancillary qubits required by the gate-based methods of Refs. \[1\] \[3\] \[4\] as well.

The time complexity of our methods depends on $1/\epsilon$, i.e., the inverse of a precision parameter. This complexity can be improved to polylogarithmic in $1/\epsilon$ using the fast methods for eigenpath traversal of Ref. \[14\]. These methods will provide a different way of obtaining an exponential improvement in terms of precision with respect to the HHL algorithm, as in Ref. \[3\], but they nevertheless require the use of phase estimation.

Last, it would be interesting to study if our results can also impact classical methods for solving linear systems of equations or for computing expectation values in $\vec{x}$.
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SUPPLEMENTARY MATERIAL

We consider first the Hamiltonians \( H(s) \) of Eq. (11) and note that

\[
H(s)(1/A(s))|\tilde{b}\rangle = A(s)|\tilde{b}\rangle - A(s)|\tilde{b}\rangle = 0 .
\]

\( A(s) \) is always invertible and its eigenvalues are \( \pm \sqrt{(1-s)^2 + (s/\kappa)^2} \), where \( \lambda \) is an eigenvalue of \( A \). We let \( P_b = |\tilde{b}\rangle\langle\tilde{b}| \) and \( P_b^\perp \) its complementary projector. Then, \( H(s) = A(s)P_b^\perp A(s) \geq 0 \). Also, since \( P_b \) is a one-dimensional projector, \( |x(s)\rangle \) is the unique eigenstate of zero eigenvalue of \( H(s) \) and any other eigenvalue is positive and bounded from above by 1, under the assumptions on \( A \).

The Hamiltonian \( \mathbb{1} - H(s) \) has largest eigenvalue 1 and is the sum of two positive semi-definite operators: \( (\mathbb{1} - A^2(s)) \) and \( A(s)|\tilde{b}\rangle\langle\tilde{b}|A(s) \). Weyl's inequalities [31] imply that the second largest eigenvalue of \( \mathbb{1} - H(s) \) can be upper bounded by the largest eigenvalue of \( (\mathbb{1} - A^2(s)) \) plus the second largest eigenvalue of \( A(s)|\tilde{b}\rangle\langle\tilde{b}|A(s) \), which is 0. It follows that the spectral gap of \( H(s) \) satisfies

\[
\Delta(s) \geq \Delta^*(s) := (1-s)^2 + (s/\kappa)^2 ,
\]

which is a bound on the square of the smallest eigenvalue of \( A(s) \).

Under the assumption \( \langle x(s)|\partial_s x(s)\rangle = 0 \), the rate of change of \( ||\partial_s x(s)|| \) can be obtained as follows. First,

\[
||\partial_s x(s)|| = \frac{1}{A(s)}(Z \otimes \mathbb{1} - X \otimes A)|x(s)\rangle + \beta(s)|x(s)\rangle ,
\]

where \( \beta(s) \in \mathbb{R} \). Since Eq. (15) is orthogonal to \( |x(s)\rangle \), we obtain

\[
||\partial_s x(s)|| = P_x^\perp \frac{1}{A(s)}(-Z \otimes \mathbb{1} + X \otimes A)|x(s)\rangle ,
\]

with \( P_x^\perp = \mathbb{1} - |x(s)\rangle\langle x(s)| \) the orthogonal projector. Using simple norm properties, it follows that

\[
||\partial_s x(s)|| \leq \sqrt{2}||1/A(s)|| \leq \sqrt{2} \sqrt{(1-s)^2 + (s/\kappa)^2} .
\]

The quantity \( ||\partial_s x(s)|| \) is useful to compute the path length of the eigenstate. If the assumption \( \langle x(s)|\partial_s x(s)\rangle = 0 \) is not satisfied, we need to redefine \( |x(s)\rangle \) by introducing a phase factor \( e^{i\phi(s)} \) so that the assumption is satisfied. The calculation of \( ||\partial_s x(s)|| \) has now an extra term that is due to the rate of change of \( \phi(s) \). Nevertheless, the bound of Eq. (17) still applies when this extra phase factor is introduced.

In the following, we abuse the notation slightly so that \( f(v) := f(s(v)) \). The notation will be clear from the context.

**Natural parametrization.** A natural parametrization \( v(s) \) is such that \( ||\partial_s x(v)|| \) is upper bounded by a constant, e.g. 1. This parametrization can be obtained from Eq. (17) if we require

\[
\partial_s v = \sqrt{\frac{(1-s)^2 + (s/\kappa)^2}{2}} .
\]

The solution is

\[
v_a = \frac{\sqrt{2}\kappa}{\sqrt{1 + \kappa^2}} \log(\frac{\kappa\sqrt{1 + \kappa^2} - \kappa^2}{v^b}) ,
\]

\[
v_b = \frac{\sqrt{2}\kappa}{\sqrt{1 + \kappa^2}} \log(\sqrt{1 + \kappa^2} + 1) ,
\]

and note that

\[
s(v_a) = 0 , s(v_b) = 1 ,
\]

so that the boundary constrains are satisfied.

**Path length.** The path length

\[
L := \int_0^1 ds ||\partial_s x(s)||
\]

\[
= \int_{v_a}^{v_b} dv ||\partial_s x(v)||
\]

is a useful quantity for methods based on eigenpath traversal. From the natural parametrization it follows that

\[
L \leq \int_{v_a}^{v_b} dv = v_b - v_a .
\]

Additionally, we can use the fact that \( \kappa + 1/(4\kappa) \leq \sqrt{\kappa^2 + 1} \leq \kappa + 1 \) to show

\[
v_b - v_a = \frac{\sqrt{2}\kappa}{\sqrt{1 + \kappa^2}} \log \left( \frac{\sqrt{1 + \kappa^2} + 1}{\kappa\sqrt{1 + \kappa^2} - \kappa^2} \right)
\]

\[
\leq \sqrt{2} \log \left( \frac{\kappa + 2}{1/4} \right)
\]

\[
\leq \sqrt{2} \log(12\kappa) .
\]

Then the path length depends logarithmically on the condition number.

**Time complexity using \( H(s) \).** The time complexity of the RM is

\[
T = \pi \sum_{j=1}^q 1/\Delta^*(v^j) .
\]
We can multiply and divide by $\delta$. As $\kappa$ gets larger $\delta$ gets smaller and we should be able to approximate $T$ by $(\pi/\delta) \int_{v_a}^{v_b} dv \left(1/\Delta^*(v)\right)$. More precisely, the function $1/\Delta^*(v)$ reaches its maximum value of $\kappa^2 + 1$ at $v = v_M$, and $v_a \leq v_M \leq v_b$. We let $r$ be the integer in $\{1, \ldots, q\}$ such that $v^r \leq v_M \leq v^{r+1}$. It is then possible to show
\[
\delta \sum_{j=1}^{r} \frac{1}{\Delta^*(v^j)} \leq \int_{v_a}^{v^r-\delta} dv \frac{1}{\Delta^*(v + \delta)} + \frac{1}{\Delta^*(v^r)} \quad . \tag{27}
\]
\[
\delta \sum_{j=r+1}^{q} \frac{1}{\Delta^*(v^j)} \leq \frac{1}{\Delta^*(v^{r+1})} + \int_{v^{r+1}}^{v_b} dv \frac{1}{\Delta^*(v)} \quad . \tag{28}
\]
Then,
\[
\sum_{j=1}^{q} \frac{1}{\Delta^*(v^j)} \leq \frac{1}{\delta} \int_{v_a}^{v_b} dv \frac{1}{\Delta^*(v)} + \frac{2}{\Delta^*(v_M)} \quad . \tag{29}
\]

The second term on the right hand side is $2(\kappa^2 + 1)$. To obtain the first term on the right hand side, we evaluate the integral:
\[
\int_{v_a}^{v_b} dv \frac{1}{\Delta^*(v)} = \int_{0}^{1} ds \frac{\sqrt{2}}{[(1-s)^2 + (s/\kappa)^2]^{3/2}} = \sqrt{2}\kappa(1 + \kappa) \quad . \tag{30}
\]
These bounds imply
\[
T \leq \pi \left[ \frac{\sqrt{2}\kappa(1 + \kappa)}{\delta} + 2(\kappa^2 + 1) \right] \quad . \tag{31}
\]
Finally, recalling $\delta = O(\epsilon/\log \kappa)$ we obtain $T = O(\kappa^2 \log(12\kappa)/\epsilon)$.

**Spectral gap amplification.** Consider the Hamiltonian $H(s) := P_b^\dagger(\kappa^2)P_b$ that appears in one of the diagonal blocks of Eq. \([11]\). If we define $B(s) := A(s)P_b^\dagger$ then $H(s) = B(s)B^\dagger(s)$ and $I(s) = B^\dagger(s)B(s)$. Then, if $|\gamma(s)\rangle$ is an eigenstate of $H(s)$ of eigenvalue $\gamma(s) > 0$, $B^\dagger(s) |\gamma(s)\rangle \neq 0$ is an eigenstate of $I(s)$ with the same eigenvalue. The eigenstate of eigenvalue zero of $I(s)$ is $|\tilde{0}\rangle$.

Equation \([11]\) implies that the eigenvalues of $H'(s)$ are $0, +\sqrt{\gamma(s)}$, and $-\sqrt{\gamma(s)}$. Moreover, $(Z \otimes \mathbb{I})H'(s)(Z \otimes \mathbb{I}) = -H'(s)$, so if $+\sqrt{\gamma(s)}$ is an eigenvalue of $H'(s)$ then $-\sqrt{\gamma(s)}$ is also an eigenvalue. In summary, $H'(s)$ has a zero eigenvalue of degeneracy two and the other eigenvalues are $\pm \sqrt{\gamma(s)}$ for each eigenvalue $\gamma(s)$ of $H(s)$.

**Time complexity using $H'(s)$.** As described in the paper, the time complexity of the RM when using $H'(s)$ is
\[
T = \pi \sum_{j=1}^{q} \frac{1}{(\Delta^*(v^j))^{1/2}} \quad (32)
\]
Following Eq. \([29]\) for this case, we obtain
\[
\sum_{j=1}^{q} \left( \frac{1}{\Delta^*(v^j)} \right)^{1/2} \leq \frac{1}{\delta} \int_{v_a}^{v_b} dv \frac{1}{\Delta^*(v)} + \frac{2}{\Delta^*(v_M)} \quad . \tag{33}
\]

The second term on the right hand side is $2\sqrt{\kappa^2 + 1}$. To obtain the first term on the right hand side, we evaluate the integral:
\[
\int_{v_a}^{v_b} dv \frac{1}{\sqrt{\Delta^*(v)}} = \int_{0}^{1} ds \frac{\sqrt{2}}{(1-s)^2 + (s/\kappa)^2} = \pi\kappa/\sqrt{2} \quad .
\]
These bounds imply
\[
T \leq \pi \left[ \frac{\pi\kappa}{\sqrt{2}\delta} + 2\sqrt{\kappa^2 + 1} \right] \quad (34)
\]
and then $T = O(\kappa \log(12\kappa)/\epsilon)$.

**Gate-based model algorithms.** $A(s)$ can be written as a linear combination of units using a version of Szegedy walks that applies to Hermitian matrices [29][30]. $A$ is of dimension $N$, $n = \log_2 N$, and $A(s)$ is of dimension $2N$. We define unitary operations $U_x$, $U_y$, and $S$ that act as follows:

\[
U_x |j\rangle |0\rangle |0\rangle |0\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{d+1}} \sum_{i \in F_j} |j\rangle |i\rangle |0\rangle \left( \sqrt{A(s)_{ji}} |0\rangle + \sqrt{1 - |A(s)_{ji}|^2} |1\rangle \right) \quad , \tag{35}
\]
\[
U_y |0\rangle |j'\rangle |0\rangle |0\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{d+1}} \sum_{i \in F_{j'}} |i'\rangle |j'\rangle \left( \sqrt{A(s)_{i'j'}} |0\rangle + \sqrt{1 - |A(s)_{i'j'}|^2} |1\rangle \right) \quad , \tag{36}
\]
\[
S |j\rangle |j'\rangle |\cdot\rangle |\cdot\rangle = |j'\rangle |j\rangle |\cdot\rangle |\cdot\rangle \quad . \tag{37}
\]

Here, the first two registers have $n+1$ qubits each, and the last two registers have a single qubit each. It is straightforward to show that
\[
A(s) \otimes |\tilde{0}\rangle |\tilde{0}\rangle = (d+1) |\tilde{0}\rangle |\tilde{0}\rangle U_x^\dagger U_y S |\tilde{0}\rangle |\tilde{0}\rangle \\
= \frac{d+1}{4} (\mathbb{I} - e^{i\pi P}) U_x^\dagger U_y S (\mathbb{I} - e^{i\pi P}) \quad . \tag{39}
\]
where we defined $\tilde{0} := |0\rangle |0\rangle |0\rangle$ for the state of the last three registers and $P = |0\rangle \langle 0|$.

We assume access to an oracle for $A$ that allows us to perform the maps

$$|j\rangle |i\rangle |z\rangle \rightarrow |j\rangle |i\rangle |z \oplus A_{ji}\rangle , \quad (40)$$

$$|j\rangle |l\rangle \rightarrow |j\rangle |f(j,l)\rangle . \quad (41)$$

Here, $j$ and $i$ label the row and column of $A$, respectively, so that $j, i \in [N]$. $f(j,l)$ is the column index of the $l$-th nonzero element of $A$ in row $j$. We refer to this oracle as $O_A$. From the oracle $O_A$ it is straightforward to implement an oracle for $O_{A(s)}$, which is similarly defined for the $(d + 1)$-sparse matrix $A(s)$. Our oracle is the same as that used in previous works; see Ref. [30] for an example.

$U_x$ can then be implemented in a sequence of five steps as follows:

$$|j\rangle |0\rangle |0\rangle |0\rangle \xrightarrow{\text{Hadamards}} \frac{1}{\sqrt{d + 1}} \sum_{l=0}^d |j\rangle |l\rangle |0\rangle |0\rangle$$

$$\xrightarrow{O_{A(s)}} \frac{1}{\sqrt{d + 1}} \sum_{i \in F_j} |j\rangle |i\rangle |0\rangle |0\rangle$$

$$\xrightarrow{O_{A(s)}} \frac{1}{\sqrt{d + 1}} \sum_{i \in F_j} |j\rangle |i\rangle |A(s)_{ji}\rangle |0\rangle$$

$$\xrightarrow{M} \frac{1}{\sqrt{d + 1}} \sum_{i \in F_j} |j\rangle |i\rangle |A(s)_{ji}\rangle |0\rangle \left( \sqrt{A(s)_{ji}^*} |0\rangle + \sqrt{1 - |A(s)_{ji}|} |1\rangle \right)$$

$$\xrightarrow{O_{A(s)}} \frac{1}{\sqrt{d + 1}} \sum_{i \in F_j} |j\rangle |i\rangle |0\rangle \left( \sqrt{A(s)_{ji}^*} |0\rangle + \sqrt{1 - |A(s)_{ji}|} |1\rangle \right). \quad (42)$$

The third register above is used to temporarily store the matrix elements of $A(s)$ and is discarded at the end. $F_j$ is the set of indices $i$ for which $A(s)_{ji}$ is nonzero. $U_x$ can then be implemented with $O(1)$ queries to $O_A$. The complexity of the third step, where the operation $M$ is implemented, is defined to be $C_M$. This complexity and the size of the third register depend on the precision with which the matrix elements of $A$ are given. A similar procedure can be followed to implement $U_y$. Using Eq. [39] we can write

$$\tilde{H}'(s) = H'(s) \otimes P = \frac{d + 1}{16} X (I - Z) \otimes (I - e^{i\pi P}) U_x^\dagger U_y S (I - e^{i\pi P}) \left( I + U_b e^{i\pi P} U_b^\dagger \right)$$

$$+ \frac{d + 1}{16} X (I + Z) \otimes (I - e^{i\pi P}) U_x^\dagger U_y S (I - e^{i\pi P}) \quad (43)$$

where $U_b = H \otimes U_b$ is the unitary that prepares the state $|\tilde{b}\rangle$ and $H$ is the Hadamard operation. This Hamiltonian is a linear combination of 32 unitaries with equal weights of $(d + 1)/16$.

We will follow the results of Ref. [20] to simulate the evolution under $\tilde{H}'(s)$, for fixed $s$, and evolution time $t$. Reference [20] describes a simulation method based on an implementation of a truncated Taylor series for the evolution operator. An evolution for time $t$ is split into $r$ shorter time evolutions (segments) for time $t/r$ each. Each of these segments is executed by using an algorithm that implements a linear combination of unitary operations and by using a technique described as oblivious amplitude amplification.

To determine the complexity of the simulation method, we let $K$ be the truncation order of the Taylor series approximation of the evolution associated with each segment. In Ref. [20], it is determined that $K = O(\log(dt/\epsilon) / \log(\log(dt/\epsilon)))$, since the sum of the weights of the linear combination in Eq. (43) is $O(d)$. Following Ref. [20], the number of segments for this case is $r = O(dt)$. Since $U_x$ and $U_y$ require $O(1)$ queries to $A$
each, it follows that the total number of queries $O_A$ to simulate the evolution for time $t$ is $O(dtK)$. The number of (controlled) $U_b$ and $U_b^\dagger$ operations is also $O(dtK)$: $\tilde{H}'(s)$ uses a constant number of these operations. The main gate complexity comes from the implementation of the operations $U_x$ and $U_y$, which is $C_M$, and the unitaries $e^{ip}$, which is $O(\log N) = O(n)$. Thus, the gate complexity of the overall simulation is $O(dtK(n + C_M))$. Replacing $t$ by the evolution time of the RM provides the desired results.