Quantum algorithm for visual tracking
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Visual tracking (VT) is the process of locating a moving object of interest in a video. It is a fundamental problem in computer vision, with various applications in human-computer interaction, security and surveillance, and so on. In this paper, we address this problem for the first time in the quantum setting, and present a quantum algorithm for VT based on the framework proposed by Henriques et al. [IEEE Trans. Pattern Anal. Mach. Intell., 7, 583 (2015)]. Our algorithm comprises two phases, training and detection. In the training phase, to discriminate the object and background in the training frame, the algorithm trains a ridge regression classifier in the quantum state form where the optimal fitting parameters of ridge regression are encoded in the amplitudes. In the detection phase, the classifier is then employed to generate a quantum state whose amplitudes encode the responses of all the candidate image patches. The algorithm is shown to be polylogarithmic in scaling, when the image data matrices have low condition numbers, and therefore may achieve exponential speedup over its classical counterpart. As examples, we discuss two important applications related to VT, namely object disappearance detection and motion behavior matching. This work demonstrates the power of quantum computing in solving computer vision problems.

PACS numbers: 03.67.Dd, 03.67.Hk

I. INTRODUCTION

Visual tracking (VT) is the task of locating a moving object of interest in a video. It is a fundamental problem in computer vision and has wide application across human-computer interaction, security and surveillance, robot perception, traffic control, and medical imaging. In recent years, a successful approach for VT, which attracts wide attention, has been tracking-by-detection, where discriminative machine learning classifiers are adopted to detect the object. In this approach, every pair of time contiguous frames respectively undergoes two phases, training and detection. For convenience, hereafter we call the frame trained in the training phase the training frame, where the location of the object is determined (given in the initial frame or detected in the following frames), and we call the frame detected in the detection phase the detection frame, where the location of the object remains to be determined. In the training phase, by using discriminative machine learning algorithms, a number of image patches (samples) around the object are selected from the training frame to train a classifier that can discriminate between the object and its background. In the detection phase, the classifier is then performed on several candidate patches selected from the detection frame, to calculate their responses, and the one with maximum response reveals the most probable position of the object. The training-detection procedure is run successively over every frame to track the object in the whole video, during which the detection frame becomes the training frame once the object is detected. The whole process is depicted in Fig. 1. Despite various advanced and fast algorithms [1–5], VT can be time consuming when the processed data size is large.

Quantum computing provides a paradigm that makes use of quantum mechanical principles, such as superposition and entanglement, to perform computing tasks in quantum systems (quantum computers) [6, 7]. The most exciting thing about quantum computing is that it can achieve significant speedup over the classical computing, in solving certain problems, such as simulating quantum systems [8], factoring large numbers [9], unstructured database searching [10, 11], and solving linear systems...

FIG. 1. Schematic of tracking-by-detection for VT. Here the two rectangles with blue border denote two time contiguous frames, the k-th frame and the (k + 1)-th frame, which also represent the training frame and detection frame respectively. The red circles denote the object, and the rectangles with black border in the training frame denote sample image patches for training, and those in the detection frame denote the candidate image patches for detection. The training-detection procedure is run successively over every frame to track the object in the video.
of equations by Harrow et al. (HHL algorithm) [12]. In recent years, the applicability of quantum computing has been expanded to the fields of machine learning and data mining, resulting in a variety of related quantum algorithms [13, 16] for solving various machine learning and data mining problems, such as linear regression [13, 16], support vector machine [17], association rules mining [18], and so on. These algorithms are shown to achieve significant speedup over their classical counterparts. Overviews on the recent progress in this field can be found in the references [20, 21].

Motivated by the progress in VT as well as quantum computing, and especially in machine learning, we explore whether and how quantum computing can be exploited to implement VT more efficiently than classical computing. In particular, we propose a quantum algorithm for VT based on the well-known tracking-by-detection VT framework proposed by Henriques et al. in 2015 (HCMB15 framework) [4]. The earlier version of this framework is given in the reference [3]. In the training phase, HCMB15 framework utilizes a base sample patch to subtly produce a large number of virtual sample patches which can be represented by a circulant data matrix, and use these samples to train a ridge regression classifier. In the detection phase, it uses a candidate image patch to generate a large number of virtual candidate patches which can also be represented by a circulant matrix, performs the classifier on these candidate patches, and obtains their corresponding responses. The most probable location of the object is revealed by the candidate patch with the maximum response. The circulant structure of the data matrix has been subtly exploited in the HCMB15 framework and makes it extremely efficient in both training and detection phases.

Our quantum algorithm also comprises the training phase and the detection phase. In the training phase, our algorithm trains a ridge regression classifier in the quantum state form, where the optimal fitting parameters of ridge regression are encoded in the amplitudes. In the detection phase, the classifier is then utilized to generate a quantum state whose amplitudes encode the responses of all the candidate image patches. The whole algorithm is built on the proposed subroutine of simulating extended circulant Hamiltonians, which allows the estimation of the singular values of generic circulant matrices by phase estimation. Our quantum algorithm can generate both states in time that is polylogarithmic in their dimensionality when the data matrices have low condition numbers, demonstrating its potential to achieve exponential speedup over classical counterpart. Moreover, the output quantum state (in the detection phase) of our algorithm can be fully used to efficiently implement two important computer vision tasks, object disappearance detection and motion behavior matching.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. In Sec. II we review the HCMB15 framework in terms of its basic concepts, notations, and classical algorithmic procedures. Sec. III presents the details of our quantum algorithm, including its two sub algorithms for the training phase and the detection phase, and provides its complexity analysis and extension. Sec. IV gives two important applications of our algorithm. Finally, conclusions are drawn in the last section.

II. HCMB15 FRAMEWORK

In this section, we review the basic idea and algorithms in the HCMB15 framework [4, 5]. For simplicity, we only consider one-dimensional images with single channel. The generalization to two-dimensional multiple-channel images can be seen in [4, 5].

In the problem of VT, we are given a video consisting of a large number of frames. The object of interest is located in some position of every frame, and the task of VT is to estimate the position of the object in each frame. The HCMB15 framework is one of the excellent candidates for implementing this task. In the training phase, it takes a base sample image patch of the training frame (where the object is usually placed at the center) with \( n \) pixels that can be represented by a vector \( \mathbf{x} = \{x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_n\} \), the size of which is larger than that of the object, for example, two times that of the object. \( \mathbf{x} \) can be used to generate \( n \) virtual samples by cyclic shifting \( \mathbf{x} \), corresponding to the circulant matrix

\[
X = \mathcal{C}(\mathbf{x}) = \begin{bmatrix}
1 & x_2 & x_3 & \cdots & x_n \\
x_n & x_1 & x_2 & \cdots & x_{n-1} \\
\vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\
x_2 & x_3 & x_4 & \cdots & x_1 
\end{bmatrix},
\]

where \( \mathcal{C}(\mathbf{x}) : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{n \times n} \) is a function which generates the circulant matrix for a given vector \( \mathbf{x} \). The \( i \)-th row of \( X \) is denoted by \( \mathbf{x}_i \), with \( \mathbf{x}_1 = \mathbf{x} \), and corresponds to the \( i \)-th training sample.

In addition, each sample is assigned a label (or regression target), a positive value ranging from 0 to 1, to quantify the closeness between the sample and the base sample; the value approximates to 1 if the sample is close to the base sample, and decays to 0 as the distance between the sample and the base sample increase. The label of \( \mathbf{x}_i \), denoted by \( y_i \), is derived commonly using a Gaussian function as

\[
y_i = e^{-d_i^2/s^2},
\]

where \( d_i \) is the Euclidean distance of \( i \)-th sample to the base sample in the image, and \( s \) is the bandwidth and is commonly taken as \( s = c \sqrt{n} \) for some constant \( c \).

In the training phase, the goal is to train a linear function \( f(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{w}^T \mathbf{x} \) by ridge regression, which minimizes the squared error over samples \( \mathbf{x}_i \) and \( y_i \),

\[
\min \mathbf{w} \sum_{i=1}^{n} |f(\mathbf{x}_i) - y_i|^2 + \alpha \|\mathbf{w}\|^2,
\]
where $\alpha$ is the regularization parameter that controls overfitting. The solution is given by

$$w = (X^T X + \alpha I)^{-1} X^T y,$$

where $y = (y_1, y_2, \ldots, y_n)^T$ is the vector of the regression targets of all $n$ samples, and $X$ is called data matrix \cite{3}. After the solution $w$ is obtained, one can predict the response of a new image patch $\hat{x}$ by calculating $f(\hat{x}) = w^T \hat{x}$.

The HCMB15 framework takes advantage of the property of circulant matrix $X$ that $X$ can be written as

$$X = F \text{diag}(F(x)) F^\dagger,$$

where $F(x)$ is the discrete Fourier transformation (DFT), and $\text{diag}(z)$ is the diagonal matrix formed by $z$. As a result, the solution (Eq. (4)) can be efficiently obtained with time complexity $O(n \log(n))$ \cite{3}, which is significantly faster than the currently prevalent method by matrix inversion and products that has time complexity $O(n^3)$.

In the detection phase, a base candidate image patch of the detection frame denoted by a $n \times n$ matrix $Z = C(z)$ with the $i$-th row corresponding to the $i$-th candidate patch. Then the responses of these patches are predicted by

$$\hat{y} = Zw,$$

where the $i$-th element of $\hat{y}$ corresponds to the response of $i$-th candidate patch. The index with maximum response in $\hat{y}$ reveals the target image patch that gives the best estimated position of the object and serves as the new base sample for the next training-detection procedure.

### III. QUANTUM ALGORITHM

In this section, we present a quantum algorithm for VT based on the HCMB15 framework with focus on one-dimensional single-channel images. Our algorithm can also be readily adapted for two-dimensional single-channel images as described towards the end of this section. Just as the HCMB15 framework, our algorithm also comprises two phases, training and detection. It first produces the quantum state $|w\rangle$ in the training phase and then, in the detection phase, generates the state $|\hat{y}\rangle$, which are respectively the normalized versions of vectors $w$ and $\hat{y}$.

Let us first discuss how to produce the quantum state $|w\rangle$. To attain a more concise form of $w$ (as well as $|w\rangle$), we write $X$ in the singular value decomposition form

$$X = \sum_{j=1}^{n} \lambda_j |u_j\rangle \langle v_j|,$$

where $\{\lambda_j\}_{j=1}^{n}$ are the singular values, $\{|u_j\rangle\}_{j=1}^{n}$ are the left singular vectors, and $\{|v_j\rangle\}_{j=1}^{n}$ are the right singular vectors of $X$. Since $\{|u_j\rangle\}_{j=1}^{n}$ constitutes an orthonormal basis of the $\mathbb{R}^n$ space, $y$ can be written as a linear combination of these basis vectors, i.e., $y = \sum_{j=1}^{n} \beta_j |y\rangle |u_j\rangle$.

In this case, the solution of $w$ (Eq. (4)) can be rewritten as

$$w = \sum_{j=1}^{n} \beta_j \lambda_j |y\rangle \langle v_j|.$$

This implies that to generate $|w\rangle$ we can estimate the singular values $\{\lambda_j\}_{j=1}^{n}$ by simulating Hamiltonians associated with $X$, then rotate conditioned on $\lambda_j$, and finally perform measurement. This procedure was initially developed in the HHL algorithm \cite{12} and later widely used in various quantum machine learning algorithms \cite{13,15,17,20,21}. It is notable that a good $\alpha$ with which ridge regression can achieve good predictive performance can be chosen efficiently by quantum cross validation \cite{16}.

In the case where $X$ is Hermitian, i.e., $X = X^\dagger$, we can simulate $X$ by using the Hermitian circulant Hamiltonian simulation technique \cite{22}. By observing that the circulant matrix $X$ can be written as a linear combination of $n$ efficient-to-implement unitary operators, namely

$$X = \sum_{j=1}^{n} x_j V_j,$$

where each $V_j = \sum_{l=0}^{n-1} |(l - j + 1) \mod n\rangle \langle l|$ for $j = 1, 2, \ldots, n$, and can be implemented using $O(\log n)$ one- or two-qubit gates, Zhou and Wang \cite{22} proposed an efficient quantum algorithm that can implement $e^{-iXT}$ within spectral-norm error $\epsilon$ in time $O(t \log t/\epsilon^2 \log \log t/\epsilon)$, under the assumptions that the quantum oracle $O_X[0] \otimes [\log n] = \sum_{j=1}^{n} |\sqrt{x_i}| i\rangle$ can be efficiently implemented in time $O(\log \log(n))$, and $\sum_{i=1}^{n} x_i = 1$.

However, in the more general case where $X$ is not Hermitian, we can extend it to a larger Hermitian matrix

$$\tilde{X} = |1\rangle \langle 1| \otimes X + |1\rangle \langle 0| \otimes X^\dagger = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & X \\ X^\dagger & 0 \end{bmatrix},$$

which has $2n$ eigenvalues $\{\pm \lambda_j\}_{j=1}^{n}$ and eigenvectors $\{|w_j\rangle\} = \{|0\rangle |u_j\rangle \pm |1\rangle |v_j\rangle\}/\sqrt{2} = \{\pm \lambda_j\}_{j=1}^{n}$. We call $\tilde{X}$ the extended circulant Hamiltonian of $X$. More importantly, $\tilde{X}$ can also be written as a linear combination of simple unitary operators:

$$\tilde{X} = \sum_{j=1}^{n} x_j (|0\rangle \langle 1| \otimes V_j + |1\rangle \langle 0| \otimes V_j^\dagger)$$

$$= \sum_{j=1}^{n} x_j (\sigma_X \otimes I)(|0\rangle \langle 0| \otimes V_j + |1\rangle \langle 1| \otimes V_j^\dagger),$$

$$= \sum_{j=1}^{n} x_j \tilde{V}_j,$$

where $\sigma_X$ is the Pauli-X gate (or NOT gate). Therefore, following Zhou and Wang \cite{22}, we can also use the
unitary linear decomposition approach \cite{23} to design an efficient quantum algorithm that can implement $e^{-i\hat{X}t}$ within (spectral-norm) error $\epsilon$. We present the result in the following theorem.

**Theorem 1. (Simulation of extended circulant Hamiltonian)** There exists a quantum algorithm that implements $e^{-i\hat{X}t}$ within error $\epsilon$ by taking $O(t \log(t/\epsilon)/\log\log(t/\epsilon))$ calls of controlled-$O_x$ together with $O(t\log(n)\log(t/\epsilon)/\log\log(t/\epsilon))$ one- or two-qubit gates.

**Proof.** This theorem can be readily proved by following the same argument as proving theorem 4.1 in \cite{22}. In the proof of theorem 4.1 in \cite{22}, a quantum algorithm which involves a series of controlled-$O_x$ together with controlled $V_j$ and their inverse was constructed. To prove the above theorem, we can construct a similar quantum algorithm where $\hat{V}_j$ instead of $V_j$ are used. It is notable that from Eq. (9) it is easy to see $\hat{V}_j$ can also be efficiently implemented by taking $O(\log n)$ one- or two-qubit gates just as $V_j$.

Following this theorem, $e^{-i\hat{X}t}$ can be implemented within error $\epsilon$ with time complexity $O(t\log(n)\log(t/\epsilon)/\log\log(t/\epsilon))$ under the assumption that $O_x$ can be implemented in time $O(\text{polylog}(n))$. The ability of efficiently implementing $e^{-i\hat{X}t}$ allows phase estimation of $e^{-i\hat{X}t}$ to reveal the eigenvalues of $\hat{X}$ and train the classifier (Eq. (11)) on a quantum computer as shown below.

A. Training

The goal of the training phase is to generate the quantum state $|\bar{w}\rangle$. Our algorithm achieves this by the following steps and the corresponding quantum circuit is shown in Fig. 2.

1. Prepare three quantum registers in the state $(|0\rangle|y\rangle)(|0\rangle \otimes s_0)|0\rangle$, where

\[ |0\rangle|y\rangle = |0\rangle \left( \sum_{j=1}^{n} \beta_j |u_j\rangle \right) = \sum_{j=1}^{n} \beta_j \left( \frac{|w_j^+\rangle + |w_j^-\rangle}{\sqrt{2}} \right), \]

where $s_0$ denotes the number of qubits used for estimating the eigenvalues in the next step. Consequently, the regression targets $(y_1, y_2, \cdots, y_n)$ of all the samples are encoded in the amplitudes of $|y\rangle$. The details of preparing $|y\rangle$ are shown in Appendix.

2. Performing phase estimation of $e^{-i\hat{X}t_{0\alpha}}$ on the first two registers, we obtain the whole state

\[ \sum_{j=1}^{n} \beta_j \left( \frac{|w_j^+\rangle |\lambda_j\rangle + |w_j^-\rangle |-\lambda_j\rangle}{\sqrt{2}} \right) |0\rangle. \]

3. Performing a rotation operation on the last register (qubit) conditioned on the second register storing eigenvalues, we have

\[ \begin{align*}
\sum_{j=1}^{n} \beta_j \left( \frac{|w_j^+\rangle |\lambda_j\rangle + |w_j^-\rangle |-\lambda_j\rangle}{\sqrt{2}} \right) \\
&= \left( \sum_{j=1}^{n} \beta_j \left( \frac{\sqrt{\lambda_j}}{\sqrt{2}} |\lambda_j\rangle + \sqrt{1-\lambda_j} |\lambda_j\rangle \right) + \left( \sum_{j=1}^{n} \beta_j \left( \frac{\sqrt{1-\lambda_j}}{\sqrt{2}} |\lambda_j\rangle + \sqrt{-\lambda_j} |\lambda_j\rangle \right) \right) |0\rangle.
\end{align*} \]

Here $C = O(\min_j \lambda_j)$.

4. Undoing phase estimation and measuring the last qubit to see the outcome $|1\rangle$, we obtain the state of the first register

\[ |1\rangle \left( \sum_{j=1}^{n} C \beta_j |\lambda_j\rangle |v_j\rangle \right)/\left( \sum_{j=1}^{n} (C \beta_j \lambda_j)^2 \right) = |1\rangle |w\rangle. \]

Discarding $|1\rangle$, we derive the quantum state $|\bar{w}\rangle$ as desired.

FIG. 2. Quantum circuit for training phase. Here the numbers 1, 2, 3 and 4 denote the sequence of four steps, / denotes a bundle of wires, $H$ denotes the Hadamard operation, $FT$ represents the quantum Fourier transformation, and $R_0$ denotes controlled rotation in step 3.

B. Detection

In the detection phase, a base candidate patch $z = (z_1, z_2, \cdots, z_n)$ tailored from the next frame is given. We can also derive its circulant matrix $Z = C(z)$, the rows of which correspond to all the candidate patches, representing all possible shifts (translations) of the object from the current frame to the next frame. According to the HCMB15 framework, this phase entails the vector $\hat{y}$ (Eq. (5)) which encode the responses of all the candidate patches.

In a quantum computer, according to Eq. (6), we perform the operation $Z$ on the quantum state $|\bar{w}\rangle$ to produce the state $|\hat{y}\rangle$ with the vector being the normalized form of $\hat{y}$ rather than $\hat{y}$ itself. We call this state the response state. Let $Z$ be written in the singular value decomposition form, i.e., $Z = \sum_{j=1}^{n} \gamma_j |\mathbf{p}_j\rangle \langle \mathbf{q}_j|$, where $\gamma_j \sum_{j=1}^{n}$ are the singular values, $\{|\mathbf{p}_j\rangle\}_{j=1}^{n}$ are the left singular vectors, and $\{|\mathbf{q}_j\rangle\}_{j=1}^{n}$ are the right singular vectors.
of $Z$. Since $|w\rangle$ obviously lies in the space spanned by the basis $\{|q_j\rangle\}_{j=1}^n$, $|w\rangle$ can be written as a linear combination of them, i.e., $|w\rangle = \sum_{j=1}^n \delta_j |q_j\rangle$. Therefore, $|\hat{y}\rangle$ can be rewritten as $|\hat{y}\rangle = \sum_{j=1}^n \gamma_j \delta_j |p_j\rangle / \sqrt{\sum_{j=1}^n \gamma_j^2} \cdot (\sum_{j=1}^n \gamma_j^2)^{1/2}$.

The above form of $|\hat{y}\rangle$ implies that, to produce $|\hat{y}\rangle$, we need to simulate some Hamiltonian associated with $Z$ to reveal its singular values $\{\gamma_j\}_{j=1}^n$. However, in general, $Z$ is not Hermitian and cannot be directly simulated. But, just as $X$, it can also be extended to a larger Hermitian matrix $\tilde{Z} = |0\rangle \langle 1| \otimes Z + |1\rangle \langle 0| \otimes Z^\dagger$ which has $2n$ eigenvalues $\{\pm \gamma_j\}_{j=1}^n$ and eigenvectors $\{|r_j\rangle = (|0\rangle |p_j\rangle \pm |1\rangle |q_j\rangle) / \sqrt{2}\}_{j=1}^n$. Here we also assume that a quantum oracle $O_x$ is provided which can efficiently implement $|0\rangle \log[n] \mapsto \sum_{i=1}^n \sqrt{z_i} |i\rangle$ in time $O(\text{polylog}(n))$, and that $\sum_{i=1}^n z_i = 1$. Under these assumptions, we can also efficiently simulate the extended Hamiltonian $\tilde{Z}$ according to Theorem 1, and thus can reveal the singular values $\{\gamma_j\}_{j=1}^n$ by phase estimation. Armed with this technique, $|\hat{y}\rangle$ can be obtained by the following procedure, the corresponding quantum circuit of which is shown in Fig. 3.

1. Prepare three quantum registers in the state $(|1\rangle |w\rangle) (|0\rangle \otimes s_1) (|0\rangle)$, where

$$|1\rangle |w\rangle = |1\rangle \left(\sum_{j=1}^n \delta_j |q_j\rangle\right) = \sum_{j=1}^n \delta_j \left(\frac{|r_j^+\rangle + |r_j^-\rangle}{\sqrt{2}}\right),$$

### (14)

and $s_1$ denotes the number of qubits used for estimating the eigenvalues in the next step. Note that $|w\rangle$ has been produced as shown in the training phase.

2. Performing phase estimation of $e^{-i\tilde{Z}t_1}$ on the first two registers, we obtain the state

$$\sum_{j=1}^n \delta_j \left(\frac{|r_j^+\rangle |\gamma_j\rangle - |r_j^-\rangle |-\gamma_j\rangle}{\sqrt{2}}\right) |0\rangle.$$

### (15)

3. Performing a rotation operation on the last qubit conditioned on the second register storing eigenvalues results in the state

$$\sum_{j=1}^n \delta_j \left(\frac{|r_j^+\rangle}{\sqrt{2}} |C' \gamma_j |1\rangle + \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} (-C' \gamma_j) |0\rangle\right)$$

$$= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \left(\frac{|r_j^-\rangle}{\sqrt{2}} |-\gamma_j\rangle - C' \gamma_j |1\rangle + \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} (-C' \gamma_j) |0\rangle\right).$$

### (16)

Here $C' = O(\text{max}_j \gamma_j)^{-1}$.  

4. Undoing phase estimation and measuring the last qubit to see the outcome $|1\rangle$, we obtain the state of the first register,

$$|0\rangle \left(\sum_{j=1}^n C' \delta_j \gamma_j |p_j\rangle\right)$$

$$= |0\rangle |\hat{y}\rangle.$$

### (17)

Discarding $|0\rangle$, we derive the quantum state $|\hat{y}\rangle$ as desired.

![FIG. 3. Quantum circuit for generating $|\hat{y}\rangle$. Here the numbers 1, 2, 3 and 4 also denote the sequence of four steps of this algorithm, and $R_1$ denotes controlled rotation in step 3.](image)

### C. Runtime analysis

In the training phase, the error occurs in the Hamiltonian simulation of $\tilde{X}$ and in the phase estimation in step 2. Since the complexity of Hamiltonian simulation scales sublogarithmically in the inverse of error as shown in Theorem 1 and that of the phase estimation scales linearly [12], the source of error dominantly comes from the phase estimation. The phase estimation induces error $O(1/t_0)$ in estimating $\lambda$ (singular value of $X$), and relative error $O\left(\frac{\lambda^2}{\kappa X \lambda + \alpha}\right) = O(1/t_0 \lambda)$ in estimating $\lambda/(\lambda^2 + \alpha)$. Since $\sum_{i=1}^n x_i = 1$, the spectral norm of $X$ is 1 and thus $1/\kappa_X \leq \lambda \leq 1$, where $\kappa_X$ is the condition number of $X$. So $t_0 = O(\kappa/\epsilon)$ induces final error $\epsilon$ according to the analysis in HHL algorithm [12]. In step 4, the success probability of obtaining $|1\rangle$ is $\sum_j \left(\frac{C_2 \lambda}{\lambda^2 + \alpha}\right)^2 = O(1/\kappa_X^2)$ since $C_\lambda/(\lambda^2 + \alpha) = O(1/\kappa_X)$, which means $O(\kappa_X^2)$ measurements are required to obtain $|1\rangle$ with a high probability and this can be improved to $O(\kappa_X)$ repetitions by amplitude amplification. Here $\alpha$ is taken for convenience to be in the range $[1/\kappa_X^2, 1]$, because from Eq. (11) it is easy to see that when $\alpha$ is too small, ridge regression is reduced to ordinary linear regression, and when $\alpha$ is too large, it is the operation $X$ that is performed in Eq. (4). Therefore, the total time complexity for generating $|w\rangle$ in the training phase is $T_w = \tilde{O}(\text{polylog}(n) \kappa_X^2 / \epsilon)$, where $\tilde{O}$ is used to suppress the more lower growing terms, polylogarithmic factors in simulating Hamiltonian as shown in Theorem 1.

In the detection phase, the source of error for generating $|\hat{y}\rangle$ is also dominated by the phase estimation in step 2. The phase estimation induces relative error $O(1/\gamma)$ in estimating $\gamma$, where $\gamma$ denotes the singular value of $Z$. Since $\sum_i z_i = 1$, the spectral norm of $Z$ is also one and $1/\kappa_Z \leq \gamma \leq 1$, where $\kappa_Z$ is the condition number of $Z$. Thus $t_1 = O(\kappa_Z / \epsilon)$ induces final error $\epsilon$ for generating $|\hat{y}\rangle$. In step 4, the success probability of obtaining the outcome $|1\rangle$ is $\sum_j (C' \delta_j \gamma_j)^2 = \Omega(1/\kappa_Z^2)$, which means $O(\kappa_Z)$ repre-
tions are required to obtain $|1\rangle$, with a high probability, by amplitude amplification. Taking into account the time for generating $|w\rangle$ (in the training phase) in step 1, the total time complexity of our quantum algorithm scales as $\tilde{O} (\kappa_Z (\text{polylog}(n) \kappa_Z / \epsilon + \text{polylog}(n) \kappa_Z^2 / \epsilon)) = \tilde{O} (\text{polylog}(n) \kappa_Z (\kappa_Z + \kappa_Z^2) / \epsilon)$. Comparing to the classical HCMB15 framework which takes $O(n \log(n))$ time to obtain $w$ and $y$, our algorithm takes only exponentially less time for generating their quantum-state versions $|w\rangle$ and $|y\rangle$ when $\kappa_Z, \kappa_Z^2 / \epsilon = O(\text{polylog}(n)).$

According to the HCMB15 framework, detecting target candidate patch entails identifying the index of largest (squared) amplitude in $|y\rangle$. In practice, when the object is clearly visible in the detection frame, the set of elements in $\hat{y}$ will be approximately equal to that in $y$ [28]. So in this case the largest squared amplitude in $|\hat{y}\rangle$ is close to that in $|y\rangle$, that is, $1 / (\sum_{i=1}^n y_i^2) \approx 2/\sqrt{n} = O(1/\sqrt{n})$ according to the result of Appendix A. This means that $O(\sqrt{n})$ copies of $|\hat{y}\rangle$ are required to reveal the largest squared amplitude in $|\hat{y}\rangle$ by sampling the state. As a result, the runtime for detection would be $\Omega(\sqrt{n} \text{polylog}(n) \kappa_Z (\kappa_Z + \kappa_Z^2) / \epsilon)$ by our quantum algorithm, and would only be improved at most quadratically in the dependence on $n$ compared to that by the HCMB15 framework. Hereafter we focus on using $|\hat{y}\rangle$ to implement certain interesting tasks efficiently, as shown in the following section, rather than sampling it exhaustively.

### D. Extension to two-dimensional images

For two-dimensional images, a base sample patch of size $n \times m$ is represented by a $n \times m$ matrix $x$ with $j$th ($1 \leq j \leq m$) row denoted by a $n$-dimensional vector $x_j$. All the samples correspond to cyclic shifts of the base sample in both horizontal and vertical directions, and can be described by a block circulant matrix with circulant transitions are required to obtain $|1\rangle$, with a high probability, by amplitude amplification. Taking into account the time for generating $|w\rangle$ (in the training phase) in step 1, the total time complexity of our quantum algorithm scales as $\tilde{O} (\kappa_Z (\text{polylog}(n) \kappa_Z / \epsilon + \text{polylog}(n) \kappa_Z^2 / \epsilon)) = \tilde{O} (\text{polylog}(n) \kappa_Z (\kappa_Z + \kappa_Z^2) / \epsilon)$. Comparing to the classical HCMB15 framework which takes $O(n \log(n))$ time to obtain $w$ and $y$, our algorithm takes only exponentially less time for generating their quantum-state versions $|w\rangle$ and $|y\rangle$ when $\kappa_Z, \kappa_Z^2 / \epsilon = O(\text{polylog}(n)).$

According to the HCMB15 framework, detecting target candidate patch entails identifying the index of largest (squared) amplitude in $|y\rangle$. In practice, when the object is clearly visible in the detection frame, the set of elements in $\hat{y}$ will be approximately equal to that in $y$ [28]. So in this case the largest squared amplitude in $|\hat{y}\rangle$ is close to that in $|y\rangle$, that is, $1 / (\sum_{i=1}^n y_i^2) \approx 2/\sqrt{n} = O(1/\sqrt{n})$ according to the result of Appendix A. This means that $O(\sqrt{n})$ copies of $|\hat{y}\rangle$ are required to reveal the largest squared amplitude in $|\hat{y}\rangle$ by sampling the state. As a result, the runtime for detection would be $\Omega(\sqrt{n} \text{polylog}(n) \kappa_Z (\kappa_Z + \kappa_Z^2) / \epsilon)$ by our quantum algorithm, and would only be improved at most quadratically in the dependence on $n$ compared to that by the HCMB15 framework. Hereafter we focus on using $|\hat{y}\rangle$ to implement certain interesting tasks efficiently, as shown in the following section, rather than sampling it exhaustively.

### D. Extension to two-dimensional images

For two-dimensional images, a base sample patch of size $n \times m$ is represented by a $n \times m$ matrix $x$ with $j$th ($1 \leq j \leq m$) row denoted by a $n$-dimensional vector $x_j$. All the samples correspond to cyclic shifts of the base sample in both horizontal and vertical directions, and can be described by a block circulant matrix with circulant blocks [3], resulting in the $nm \times nm$ data matrix

$$X = \left[ \begin{array}{cccc} C(x_1) & C(x_2) & C(x_3) & \cdots & C(x_n) \\ C(x_n) & C(x_1) & C(x_2) & \cdots & C(x_{n-1}) \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ C(x_2) & C(x_3) & C(x_4) & \cdots & C(x_1) \end{array} \right],$$

(18)

corresponding to the two-dimensional-image version of Eq. (11). It can be decomposed as

$$X = \sum_{j=1}^n V_j \otimes C(x_j) = \sum_{j=1}^n \sum_{k=1}^m x_{jk} V_j \otimes V_k,$$

(19)

where $V_k = \sum_{l=1}^{m-1} \langle l | (l + k - 1) \mod m \rangle | l \rangle$ and can also be efficiently implemented in time $O(\log(m))$.

Given the quantum oracle $O_\times$ such that $O_\times |0\rangle \otimes |\log nm\rangle = \sum_{|k\rangle} \sum_{j=1}^m \sqrt{x_{jk}} |j\rangle |k\rangle$ and under the assumption that $\sum_{jk} x_{jk} = 1$, the extended circulant Hamiltonian $\hat{X} = |0\rangle \langle 1| \otimes X + |1\rangle \langle 0| \otimes X^\dagger$ can be efficiently simulated as shown in Theorem II by extending the dimension $n$ to $nm$. The ability of simulation of $\hat{X}$ allows training and detection in the quantum computer as shown in the Sec. III but the dimension has been extended from $n$ to $nm$.

### IV. APPLICATIONS

In this section, we show how the output response state $|\hat{y}\rangle$ of our quantum algorithm can be fully used to efficiently implement two important tasks related to VT, object disappearance detection and motion behavior matching.

#### A. Object disappearance detection

The task of object disappearance detection is to detect whether the object has already disappeared or not in the candidate image patch of the detection frame. If not, as discussed in the previous section, the set of elements in $\hat{y}$ (Eq. (5), namely the output in the detection phase of HCMB15 framework, will be approximately equal to that in $y$ [28]. This means that in this case the distribution of the elements in $\hat{y}$ also approximately follow a Gaussian distribution with a peak. However, if yes, the distribution of the elements in $\hat{y}$ becomes much more uniform [28]. This implies that in this case the quantum state $|\hat{y}\rangle$ is closer to the uniform superposition state $|1\rangle := \sum_{j=1}^n |j\rangle / \sqrt{n}$. In order to clearly discriminate these two cases, we estimate the squared absolute value of $|\hat{y}\rangle$ and $|1\rangle$, $P_1 = |\langle y | 1 \rangle|^2$ using swap test [14, 17, 29], to determine and quantify the closeness between these two states. Then we set a threshold $\vartheta_1$, and regard that the object has disappeared if $P_1 \geq \vartheta_1$; otherwise, we regard the object still exists. Since $P_1$ can be obtained to accuracy $\delta$ with $O(1/\delta^2)$ repetitions of swap test [14, 17, 29], this task only takes $O(1/\delta^2)$ copies of the response state $|\hat{y}\rangle$ (as well as $|1\rangle$), as opposed to $O(\sqrt{n})$ copies for sampling described in the last section. This means that, compared with the task of sampling $|\hat{y}\rangle$, the task of object disappearance detection takes exponential less number of $|\hat{y}\rangle$, if $\delta = O(1/\text{polylog } n)$ is acceptable.

To more intuitively show how different the values of $P_1$ are in the above two cases, we conduct an experiment with an illustrative example in Fig. (4). In the experiment, we manually and randomly generate one training frame, and two detection frames in which the above where the two cases occur respectively. In this example, $P_1 = 0.571$ for the case where the object exists and $P_1 = 0.993$ for the case where the object disappears. We then run the experiment for 50 times and 50 values of $P_1$ for each case are calculated and shown in Fig. (4). From the Fig. (4), we can see that $P_1 \leq 0.6$ for the case where the object exists, while $P_1 \geq 0.9$ for the case where the object disappears. Therefore, for this example, $\vartheta_1$ can suitably take the value 0.75.
The task of motion behavior matching is to determine whether the motion behavior of the object in a video matches a given motion behavior template. More specifically, it is to determine whether the object in the video moves along a given path or not. To see this task visually, it is to determine whether the object in the video matches a given motion behavior template. More specifically, it is to determine whether the motion behavior of the object in a video matches the template well, and perform the detection part of our quantum algorithm with the classifier \( |w\rangle \) obtained.)

1. Train the entire initial frame of the video (instead of an image patch according to the standard HCMB15 framework) by using the training part of our quantum algorithm and get the classifier \( |w\rangle \).

2. Select \( K \) positions in the template including the position of the object in the initial frame, generate \( K \) “template” frames by just moving the object in the initial frame to these positions, and perform the detection part of our quantum algorithm (using \( |w\rangle \) obtained) on these template frames, to generate \( K \) response states, \( |\hat{y}_1^0\rangle, |\hat{y}_2^0\rangle, \cdots, |\hat{y}_K^0\rangle \).

3. Select \( K \) “actual” frames appropriately from the video, where the object is supposed to be located at the selective \( K \) positions if the object motion behavior matches the template well, and perform the detection part of our quantum algorithm with the classifier \( |w\rangle \) on these frames, to generate \( K \) response states, \( |\hat{y}_1^1\rangle, |\hat{y}_2^1\rangle, \cdots, |\hat{y}_K^1\rangle \). Here we assume that the information of the object moving speed is known so that these actual frames can be appropriately selected.

4. Evaluate the closeness between \( |\psi_1\rangle \) and \( |\psi_a\rangle \) by estimating the value of \( P_2 = \|\langle\psi_1|\psi_a\rangle\|^2 \) using swap test, where \( |\psi_1\rangle = \otimes_{k=1}^K |\hat{y}_k^0\rangle \) and \( |\psi_a\rangle = \otimes_{k=1}^K |\hat{y}_k^1\rangle \). Setting another threshold \( \vartheta_2 \), if \( P_2 \geq \vartheta_2 \), we regard the motion behavior of the object in the video matches the template well; otherwise, the matching fails.

In the step 4, \( P_2 \) can be obtained to accuracy \( \delta \) with \( O(1/\delta^2) \) copies of \( |\psi_1\rangle \) and \( |\psi_a\rangle \) and each copy takes \( 2K \) response states of same size. Therefore, \( O(K/\delta^2) \) copies of response states \( (|\psi_1\rangle \text{ and } |\psi_a\rangle) \) are taken in total for implementing this task. Moreover, \( O(K/\delta^2) = \)

**FIG. 4.** (a) is the training frame, where the object is placed at the center. The black rectangle denotes the image patch, and the red rectangle is to denote the object. (b) is the detection frame where the object moves for 3 pixels toward the right relative to that in (a) but still exists in the patch. (c) is the detection frame where the object disappears relative to that in (b), and the dashed red rectangle denotes the position where the object should be. All the three frames are one-dimensional grayscale images of 50 pixels. The patch and the object are of 20 pixels and 10 pixels respectively.

**FIG. 5.** Comparison between the 50 values of \( P_1 \) for the case where the object exists and those for the case where the object disappears after running the experiment in Fig. 4 for 50 times.

**FIG. 6.** A simple example for motion behavior matching. Here the rectangle with blue border denotes the frame, the red circles denote the object, the black arrowed lines correspond to the Z-shape motion template, and the numbers 1, 2, \( \cdots \), 7 are to mark seven selected positions in the template. The initial frame of the video contains the object located in position 1. If the object motion behavior in the video matches the template, the object in seven appropriately selected frames of the video should be located at these seven positions.
O(\text{polylog}(n)) if \( K, 1/\delta = O(\text{polylog}(n)) \) is acceptable. In practice, \( K \) can be chosen to be very small relative to the number of frames in the video, if we just want to roughly know the object’s moving motion in the video. The choice for the threshold \( \delta_2 \) depends on how well we require the object’s moving motion to match the template, but practically and reasonably \( \delta_2 \) should be chosen to be close to 1, e.g., \( \delta_2 = 0.9 \). In addition, the accuracy \( \delta \) is generally chosen to be \( O(\delta_2) \), e.g., \( \delta = \delta_2/10 \). Therefore, the scaling \( O(K/\delta^2) \) can be small in practice.

V. CONCLUSIONS

We have presented a quantum algorithm for visual tracking based on the well-known classical HCMB15 framework. Our algorithm firstly trains a quantum-state ridge regression classifier, where the optimal fitting parameters of ridge regression are encoded in the amplitudes. The classifier is then performed on the detection frame to generate a quantum state whose amplitudes encode the responses of all the candidate image patches. Taking full advantage of efficient extended circulant Hamiltonian simulation, each of the two states can be generated in time that is polylogarithmic in its dimensionality when the data matrices have low condition numbers. This demonstrates that our quantum algorithm has the potential to achieve exponential speedup over the classical counterpart. Furthermore, we have also shown how our algorithm can be used to efficiently implement the tasks of object disappearance detection and motion behavior matching.

We expect the techniques used in our algorithm, such as extended circulant Hamiltonian simulation, to be helpful in designing more quantum algorithms requiring manipulating circulant matrices. Also, we anticipate our algorithm can inspire more quantum algorithms for visual tracking as well as other computer vision problems.
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Appendix: Preparing the quantum state \(|\psi\rangle\) in the training phase

According to the definition of \( \psi \) (Eq. 2), for one-dimensional images, it is easy to see that \( \psi_i = e^{-(i-1)^2/s^2} \) for \( i = 1, 2, \ldots, [(n+1)/2] \), and \( \psi_i = e^{-(n+1-i)^2/s^2} \) for \( i = [(n+1)/2] + 1, [(n+1)/2] + 2, \ldots, n \). Since the elements of \( \psi \) are generally not uniformly distributed, it is time consuming to create the quantum state \(|\psi\rangle = \sum_{i=1}^{n} y_i |i\rangle / ||\psi|| \) in the common way: \( y_i \) are loaded into a quantum register in parallel and a controlled rotation and measurement are then conducted on an ancilla qubit so that \( y_i / ||\psi|| \) can be written in the amplitudes. Another efficient way is referred to \([26]\), where \( \sum y_i^2 \) for any two \( i_1 \) and \( i_2 \), with \( 1 \leq i_1 \leq i_2 \leq n \), is required to be efficiently computable to create \(|\psi\rangle \) \([12]\). However, \( y_i \) cannot satisfy this condition because there is no efficient formula for calculating \( \sum_{i=1}^{n} y_i^2 \) for any two \( i_1 \) and \( i_2 \) with \( 1 \leq i_1 \leq i_2 \leq n \). In the following, we present a new approach that combines both of the two ways to efficiently create \(|\psi\rangle\).

Our new approach is based on the observation that for \( i = 2, \ldots, ((n+1)/2) \), \( y_i \) can be approximated by integrating some Gauss function in some appropriate range, that is,

\[ y_i^2 \approx \gamma_i^2 := \int_{-\gamma_i}^{\gamma_i} e^{-t^2} dt, \quad (A.1) \]

but \( \gamma_i^2 \leq \gamma_i^2 \). This is related to the error function \( E(x) = \frac{2}{\sqrt{\pi}} \int_{0}^{x} e^{-t^2} dt \) \((x > 0)\) that can be approximated by some elementary functions. For example, \( E(x) \approx G(x) = 1 - (a_1 t + a_2 t^2 + a_3 t^3) e^{-x^2} \) within error \( 2.5 \times 10^{-5} \) \([27]\), where \( t = \frac{x}{\sqrt{\pi}}, p = 0.47047, a_1 = 0.348024, a_2 = -0.0958798, \) and \( a_3 = 0.7478556 \). Since this error is too small and so it is negligible, we replace \( E(x) \) with \( G(x) \) and have \( \gamma_i^2 = \frac{\sqrt{2 \pi}}{2\gamma_i} s(G(\frac{\sqrt{2\pi}(i-1)}{s}) - G(\frac{\sqrt{2\pi}i)}{s})) \) for \( i = 2, \ldots, ((n+1)/2) \). This means that \( \sum_{i=1}^{n} y_i^2 \) for any two \( 2 \leq i_1 \leq i_2 \leq ((n+1)/2) \) is efficiently computable. Furthermore, for \( i = 2, \ldots, ((n+1)/2) \), since \( y_1 = 1 \) and \( y_i = y_{n+2-i} \), we can set \( \gamma_i^2 = 1 \) and \( \gamma_i^2 = \gamma_{n+2-i}^2 \), thus \( \sum_{i=1}^{n} y_i^2 \) for any two \( 1 \leq i_1 \leq i_2 \leq n \) is also efficiently computable. Consequently, using the approach of \([26]\), we can create the state

\[ |\tilde{\psi}\rangle := \sum_{i=1}^{n} \frac{\tilde{y}_i}{\sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^{n} \tilde{y}_i^2}} |i\rangle \]

efficiently in time \( O(\log n) \) \([26]\).

Armed with the capability of efficiently creating \(|\tilde{\psi}\rangle\), we can create the state \(|\psi\rangle\) efficiently as well, by the following procedure.

1. Add two registers to the register of \(|\tilde{\psi}\rangle\) and load the \( \tilde{y}_i \) and \( y_i \) in parallel to get the state

\[ \sum_{i=1}^{n} \frac{\tilde{y}_i}{\sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^{n} \tilde{y}_i^2}} |i\rangle |y_i\rangle |\tilde{y}_i\rangle. \]

Note that \( \tilde{y}_i \) and \( y_i \) can be computed efficiently.

2. Add another qubit and perform the controlled rotation to have the state

\[ \sum_{i=1}^{n} \frac{\tilde{y}_i}{\sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^{n} \tilde{y}_i^2}} |i\rangle |y_i\rangle |\tilde{y}_i\rangle \left( \frac{y_i}{\tilde{y}_i} |1\rangle + \sqrt{\frac{\tilde{y}_i^2}{y_i^2}} |0\rangle \right). \]
3. Undo the step 1 and get the state
\[ \sum_{i=1}^{n} \frac{\tilde{y}_i}{\sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^{n} \tilde{y}_i}} |1\rangle \left( \frac{y_i}{\tilde{y}_i} |1\rangle + \sqrt{1 - \frac{y_i^2}{\tilde{y}_i^2}} |0\rangle \right). \]

4. Measure the last qubit to see the outcome 1 and the first register will be in the state |y⟩ as desired.

The success probability of post selection in the last step is \( \sum_{i=1}^{n} \tilde{y}_i^2 = \Theta(1) \), because it is easy to see \( \sum_{i=1}^{n} \tilde{y}_i^2 \approx \sum_{i=1}^{n} y_i^2 \) and \( \sum_{i=1}^{n} y_i^2 \approx \frac{n}{2} \) when n is large enough. So a constant number of measurements are sufficient and thus the time complexity for creating |y⟩ also scales as \( O(\log n) \).