Quantum Chebyshev’s Inequality and Applications

Yassine Hamoudi and Frédéric Magniez

IRIF, Université Paris Diderot, CNRS, France
{hamoudi,magniez}@irif.fr

Abstract

In this paper we provide new quantum algorithms with polynomial speed-up for a range of problems for which no such results were known, or we improve previous algorithms. First, we consider the approximation of the frequency moments $F_k$ of order $k \geq 3$ in the multi-pass streaming model with updates (turnstile model). We design a $P$-pass quantum streaming algorithm with space memory $M$ satisfying a tradeoff of $P^2M = \tilde{O}(n^{1-2/k})$, whereas the best classical algorithm requires $PM = \Theta(n^{1-2/k})$. Then, we study the problem of estimating the number $m$ of edges and the number $t$ of triangles given query access to an $n$-vertex graph. We describe optimal quantum algorithms that perform $\tilde{O}(\sqrt{n}/m^{1/4})$ and $\tilde{O}(\sqrt{n}/t^{1/6} + m^{3/4}/\sqrt{t})$ queries respectively. This is a quadratic speed-up compared to the classical complexity of these problems.

For this purpose we develop a new quantum paradigm that we call Quantum Chebyshev’s inequality. Namely we demonstrate that one can approximate with relative error the mean of any random variable with a number of quantum samples that is linear in the ratio of the square root of the variance to the mean. Classically the dependency is quadratic. Our result is optimal and subsumes a previous result of Montanaro [47]. This new paradigm is based on a refinement of the Amplitude Estimation algorithm of Brassard et al. [12], and of previous quantum algorithms for the mean estimation problem. For our applications, we also adapt the variable-time amplitude amplification technique of Ambainis [5] into a variable-time amplitude estimation algorithm, improving a recent result of Chakraborty, Gilyén and Jeffery [16].
1 Introduction

Motivations and background Randomization and probabilistic methods are among the most widely used techniques in modern science, with applications ranging from mathematical economics to medicine or particle physics. One of the most successful probabilistic approaches is the Monte Carlo Simulation method for algorithm design, that relies on repeated random sampling and statistical analysis to estimate parameters and functions of interest. From Buffon’s needle experiment, in the eighteenth century, to the simulations of galaxy formation or nuclear processes, this method and its variations have become increasingly popular to tackle problems that are otherwise intractable. The Markov chain Monte Carlo method [35] led for instance to significant advances for approximating parameters whose exact computation is #P-hard [38, 37, 21, 36].

The analysis of Monte Carlo Simulation methods is often based on concentration inequalities that characterize the deviation of a random variable from some parameter. In particular, the Chebyshev inequality is a key element in the design of randomized methods that estimate some target numerical value. Indeed, this inequality guarantees that the arithmetic mean of a random variable from some parameter. In particular, the Chebyshev inequality is a key element in the design of randomized methods that estimate some target numerical value. Indeed, this inequality guarantees that the arithmetic mean of $\Delta^2 / \varepsilon^2$ independent samples, from a random variable with variance $\sigma^2$ and mean $\mu$ satisfying $\Delta \geq \sigma / \mu$, is an approximation of $\mu$ under relative error $\varepsilon$ with high probability. This basic result is at the heart of many computational problems, such as counting with Markov chain Monte Carlo methods [35, 55], estimating graph parameters [18, 27, 30, 23], testing properties of distributions [31, 13, 8, 17, 14], approximating the frequency moments in the data stream model [4, 46, 7].

Various quantum algorithms have been developed to speed-up or generalize classical Monte Carlo methods (e.g. sampling the stationary distributions of Markov-chains [56, 52, 20, 54, 19], estimating graph parameters [35, 55], estimating graph parameters [18, 27, 30, 23], testing properties of distributions [31, 13, 8, 17, 14], approximating the frequency moments in the data stream model [4, 46, 7].

Motivations and background Randomization and probabilistic methods are among the most widely used techniques in modern science, with applications ranging from mathematical economics to medicine or particle physics. One of the most successful probabilistic approaches is the Monte Carlo Simulation method for algorithm design, that relies on repeated random sampling and statistical analysis to estimate parameters and functions of interest. From Buffon’s needle experiment, in the eighteenth century, to the simulations of galaxy formation or nuclear processes, this method and its variations have become increasingly popular to tackle problems that are otherwise intractable. The Markov chain Monte Carlo method [35] led for instance to significant advances for approximating parameters whose exact computation is #P-hard [38, 37, 21, 36].

The analysis of Monte Carlo Simulation methods is often based on concentration inequalities that characterize the deviation of a random variable from some parameter. In particular, the Chebyshev inequality is a key element in the design of randomized methods that estimate some target numerical value. Indeed, this inequality guarantees that the arithmetic mean of $\Delta^2 / \varepsilon^2$ independent samples, from a random variable with variance $\sigma^2$ and mean $\mu$ satisfying $\Delta \geq \sigma / \mu$, is an approximation of $\mu$ under relative error $\varepsilon$ with high probability. This basic result is at the heart of many computational problems, such as counting with Markov chain Monte Carlo methods [35, 55], estimating graph parameters [18, 27, 30, 23], testing properties of distributions [31, 13, 8, 17, 14], approximating the frequency moments in the data stream model [4, 46, 7].

Quantum Chebyshev Inequality Our main contribution (Theorem 3.6) is to show that the mean $\mu$ of any distribution with variance $\sigma^2$ can be approximated with relative error $\varepsilon$ using $\tilde{O}(\Delta / \varepsilon \cdot (\log(H/L) + \Delta / \varepsilon))$ quantum samples, given an upper bound $\Delta$ on $1 + \sigma / \mu$ and two bounds $L, H$ such that $L < \mu < H$. This is an exponential improvement in $H/L$ compared to previous works [47, 42]. Moreover, if $\log(H/L) = \tilde{O}(1)$, this is a quadratic improvement over the number of classical samples needed when using the Chebyshev inequality. If no bound $L$ is known, we also present an algorithm using $\tilde{O}(\Delta / \varepsilon \cdot \log^3(\mu^2 / \mu))$ quantum samples in expectation (Corollary 3.7). A corresponding lower bound is deduced from [51] (Theorem 3.8).

Our approach is based on sequential analysis. Given a threshold $b \geq 0$, we will consider the “truncated” mean $\mu_{\leq b}$ defined by replacing the outcomes larger than $b$ with 0. Using standard techniques, this mean can be encoded in the amplitude of some quantum state $\sqrt{1 - \mu_{\leq b} / b} | \psi \rangle + \sqrt{\mu_{\leq b} / b} | \psi \rangle$ (Corollary 2.4). We then run the Amplitude Estimation algorithm of Brassard et al. [12] on this state for $\Delta$ steps (i.e. with

\[ \text{Algorithm: Amplitude Estimation for } \mu_{\leq b} \text{ with } \Delta \text{ steps.} \]

\[ \text{ERROR: } \frac{1}{b} | \psi \rangle + \frac{\mu_{\leq b}}{b} | \psi \rangle \text{ is encoded in the amplitude.} \]

\[ \text{Output: } \mu_{\leq b} \text{ is estimated with relative error } \varepsilon. \]
\(\Delta\) quantum samples), only to see whether the estimate of \(\mu_{<b}/b\) it returns is nonzero (this is our stopping rule). A property of this algorithm (Corollary 2.4 and Remark 2.7) guarantees that it is zero with high probability if and only if the number of quantum samples is below the inverse \(\sqrt{b/\mu_{<b}}\) of the estimated amplitude. The crucial observation (Lemma 3.2) is that \(\sqrt{b/\mu_{<b}}\) is smaller than \(\Delta\) for large values of \(b\), and it becomes larger than \(\Delta\) when \(b \approx \mu\Delta^2\). Thus, by repeatedly running the amplitude estimation algorithm with \(\Delta\) quantum samples, and doing \(O(\log(H/L))\) steps of a logarithmic search on decreasing values of \(b\), the first non-zero value is obtained when \(b/\Delta^2\) is approximately equal to \(\mu\) (Theorem 3.3). The precision of the result is later improved, by using more precise “truncated” means (Theorems 3.4 and 3.6).

The previous algorithm is extended (Theorem 3.9) to cover the common situation where one knows a non-increasing function \(f\) such that \(f(\mu) \geq 1 + \sigma/\mu\), instead of having explicitly \(\Delta \geq 1 + \sigma/\mu\). For this purpose, we exploit another property (Corollary 2.4 and Remark 2.6) of the amplitude estimation algorithm, namely that it always outputs a number smaller than the estimated value (up to a constant factor) with high probability. This shall be seen as a quantum equivalent of the Markov inequality. Combined with the previous algorithm, it allows us to find a value \(f(\bar{\mu}) \geq 1 + \sigma/\mu\), with a second logarithmic search on \(\bar{\mu}\).

Next, we study the quantum analogue of the following standard fact: \(s\) classical samples, each taking average time \(T_{av}\), to be computed, can be obtained in total average time \(s \cdot T_{av}\). The notion of average time is adapted to the quantum setting, using the framework of variable-time algorithms introduced by Ambainis (Definition 3.10). We develop a variable-time amplitude estimation algorithm (Theorem B.3) that approximates the target value efficiently when some branches of the computation stop earlier than the others. It is used in place of the standard amplitude estimation in our previous results (Theorems 3.11 and 3.12).

**Applications** We describe two kinds of applications that illustrate the use of the previous results. We study first the problem of approximating the frequency moment \(F_k\) of order \(k \geq 3\) in the multi-pass streaming model with updates. Classically, the best \(P\)-pass algorithms with memory \(M\) satisfy \(PM = \Theta(n^{1-2/k})\) \([46, 58]\). We give a quantum algorithm for which \(P^2M = \tilde{O}(n^{1-2/k})\) (Theorem 4.3). This problem was studied before in \([47]\), where the author obtained quantum speed-ups for \(F_0\), \(F_2\) and \(F_{\infty}\), but no significant improvement for \(k \geq 3\). Similar tradeoff results are known for DISJOINTNESS (\(P^2M = \tilde{O}(n)\) in the quantum streaming model \([41]\) vs. \(PM = \Theta(n)\) classically), and DYCK(2) (\(P^5M = \Omega(\sqrt{n})\) \([50]\) vs. \(PM = \Theta(\sqrt{n})\) \([45, 15, 34]\)).

Our construction starts with a classical one-pass linear sketch streaming algorithm \([46, 7]\) with memory \(polylog n\), that samples (approximately) from a distribution with mean \(F_k\) and variance \(O(n^{1-2/k}F_k^2)\). We implement it with a quantum sampler, that needs two passes for one quantum sample. The crucial observation (Appendix C) is that the reverse computation of a linear sketch algorithm can be done efficiently in one pass (whereas usually that would require processing the same stream but in the reverse direction).

In a second time, we study the approximation of graph parameters in the general graph model with neighbor, vertex-pair and degree queries access. To our knowledge, this question has not been addressed in the quantum setting before. We show that the numbers \(m\) of edges and \(t\) of triangles, in an \(n\)-vertex graph, can be approximated with \(\Theta(n^{1/2}/m^{1/4})\) (Theorem 4.4) and \(\Theta((\sqrt{n}/t)^{1/6} + m^{3/4}/\sqrt{t})\) (Theorem 4.6) quantum queries respectively. This is a quadratic improvement over the best classical algorithms \([30, 23]\). We obtain nearly matching lower bounds (Theorems 4.5 and 4.7) by using a property testing to communication complexity reduction method introduced by Blais et al. in \([10]\), and adapted to the graph model in \([26]\).

The number of edges is approximated by translating a classical estimator \([53]\) into a quantum sampler. The triangle counting algorithm is more involved. We need a classical estimator \([23]\) approximating the number \(t_v\) of adjacent triangles to any vertex \(v\). Its average running time being small, we obtain a quadratic speed-up for estimating \(t_v\) (Proposition D.5) using our mean estimation algorithm for variable-time samplers. We diverge then from the classical triangle counting algorithm of \([23]\), that requires to set-up a data structure for sampling edges uniformly in the graph. This technique seems to be an obstacle for a quadratic speed-up. We circumvent this problem by adapting instead a bucketing approach from \([22]\) that partitions the graph’s vertices according to the value of \(t_v\). The size of each bucket is estimated using a second quantum sampler.
2 Preliminaries

2.1 Computational model

In this paper we consider probability distributions \( d \) on some finite sample spaces \( \Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^+ \). We denote by \( d(x) \) the probability to sample \( x \in \Omega \) in the distribution \( d \). We also make the assumption, which is satisfied for most of applications, that each space \( \Omega \) we consider is equipped with an efficient encoding of its elements \( x \in \Omega \). In particular, we can perform quantum computations on the Hilbert space \( \mathcal{H}_\Omega \) defined by the basis \( \{|x\rangle \}_{x \in \Omega} \). Moreover, given any two values \( 0 \leq a < b \), we assume the existence of a unitary \( R_{a,b} \) that can perform the Bernoulli sampling (see below) in time polylogarithmic in \( b \). In the rest of the paper we will neglect this complexity, including the required precision for implementing any of those unitary operators.

**Definition 2.1.** Given a finite space \( \Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^+ \) and two reals \( 0 \leq a < b \), an \((a,b)\)-Bernoulli sampler over \( \Omega \) is a unitary \( R_{a,b} \) acting on \( \mathcal{H}_\Omega \otimes \mathbb{C}^2 \) and satisfying for all \( x \in \Omega \):

\[
R_{a,b}(|x\rangle|0\rangle) = \begin{cases} |x\rangle \left( \sqrt{\frac{1-a}{b}}|0\rangle + \sqrt{\frac{a}{b}}|1\rangle \right) & \text{when } a \leq x < b, \\ |x\rangle|0\rangle & \text{otherwise}. \end{cases}
\]

We say that \( \Omega \) is Bernoulli samplable if any \((a,b)\)-Bernoulli sampler can be implemented in polylogarithmic time in \( b \), when \( a,b \) have polylog-size encodings in \( b \).

A Bernoulli sampler can be implemented using a controlled rotation. The \( R_{a,b} \) transformation is reminiscent to what has been used in related works for mean estimation (e.g. [57, 11, 47]). We now define what it means for a quantum algorithm \( S \) to sample according to a distribution \( d \) on \( \Omega \).

**Definition 2.2.** Given a finite Bernoulli samplable space \( \Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^+ \) and a distribution \( d \) on \( \Omega \), a (quantum) sampler \( S \) for \( d \) is a unitary operator acting on \( \mathcal{H}_g \otimes \mathcal{H}_\Omega \) for some Hilbert space \( \mathcal{H}_g \), such that

\[
S(|0\rangle|0\rangle) = \sum_{x \in \Omega} \alpha_x |\psi_x\rangle |x\rangle
\]

where \( |\psi_x\rangle \) are unit states, and \( d(x) = |\alpha_x|^2 \) for all \( x \in \Omega \).

A quantum sample is one execution of \( S \) or \( S^{-1} \) (including their controlled versions). The output of \( S \) is the random variable \( v(S) \) obtained by measuring the \( x \)-register of \( S(|0\rangle|0\rangle) \). Its mean is denoted by \( \mu_S \), its variance by \( \sigma^2_S \), and its second moment by \( \Phi^2_S = \mathbb{E}[v(S)^2] \).

Given a non-negative random variable \( X \) and two numbers \( 0 \leq a < b \), we define the random variable \( X_{a,b} = \text{id}_{a,b}(X) \) where \( \text{id}_{a,b}(x) = x \) when \( a \leq x < b \) and \( \text{id}_{a,b}(x) = 0 \) otherwise. If \( a = 0 \), we denote \( X_{<b} = X_{0,b} \). Similarly, \( X_{\geq b} = \text{id}_{\geq b}(X) \) where \( \text{id}_{\geq b}(x) = x \) when \( x \geq b \) and \( \text{id}_{\geq b}(x) = 0 \) otherwise.

We motivate the use of a Bernoulli sampler \( R_{a,b} \) by the following observation: for any sampler \( S \) and values \( 0 \leq a < b \), the modified sampler \( \hat{S} = (I_{\mathcal{H}_g} \otimes R_{a,b})(S \otimes I_{\mathbb{C}^2}) \) acting on \( \mathcal{H}_g \otimes \mathcal{H}_\Omega \), where \( \mathcal{H}_g = \mathcal{H}_g \otimes \mathcal{H}_\Omega \) and \( \hat{\Omega} = \{0,1\} \), generates the Bernoulli distribution \( d(0) = 1 - \mu, d(1) = \mu \) of mean \( \mu = \mathbb{E}[v(S)] = b^{-1} \mathbb{E}[v(S)] \). This central result will be used all along this paper.

**Other quantum sampling models** We present three other models that can be encompassed within the framework of Definition 2.2. First, Aharonov and Ta-Shma [2] studied the \( Qsampling \) problem, which is the ability to prepare \( \sum_{x \in X} \sqrt{d(x)} |x\rangle \) given the decraction of a classical circuit with output distribution \( d \). While it is straightforward to prepare the state of Definition 2.2 with such a circuit (using a garbage register \( \psi_g \) and reversible-computation techniques), the \( Qsampling \) problem is open and would imply \( \text{SZK} \subseteq \text{BQP} \) [2]. Bravyi, Harrow and Hassidim [13] considered an oracle-based model, that is provably weaker than \( Qsampling \), where a distribution \( d = (d(1), \ldots, d(N)) \) on \( \Omega = [N] \) is represented by an oracle \( O_d : [S] \to [N] \) (for some \( S \)), such that \( d(x) \) equals the proportion of inputs \( s \in [S] \) with \( O_d(s) = x \). It is extended to the
quantum query framework, with a unitary $O_d$ such that $O_d|s\rangle|0\rangle = |s\rangle|O_d(s)\rangle$. It is not difficult to see that applying $O_d$ on a uniform superposition gives $\sum_{x \in [N]} \sqrt{d(x)} \left( \frac{1}{\sqrt{d(x)}} \sum_{s : O_d(s) = x} |s\rangle \right) |x\rangle$, as required by Definition 2.2 (where $|\psi_x\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{d(x)}} \sum_{s : O_d(s) = x} |s\rangle$). Finally, Montanaro [47] presented a model that is similar to ours, where he replaced the $x$-register of $S(|0\rangle|0\rangle)$ with a $k$-qubit register (for some $k$), and used an “easy-to-compute” mapping $\phi : \{0,1\}^k \rightarrow \Omega$ to obtain the sample $x = \phi(s)$ associated to each $s \in \{0,1\}^k$.

2.2 Amplitude estimation

The essential building block of this paper is the amplitude estimation algorithm [12], combined with ideas from [57, 11, 47], to estimate the modified mean $b^{-1}E[v(S)_{a,b}]$ of a quantum sampler $S$ on which has been applied a Bernoulli sampler $R_{a,b}$. We will need the following result about amplitude estimation.

**Theorem 2.3.** There is a quantum algorithm AmplEst, called Amplitude Estimation, that takes as input a unitary operator $U$, an orthogonal projector $\Pi$, and an integer $t > 2$. The algorithm outputs an estimate $\hat{p} = \text{AmplEst}(U, \Pi, t)$ of $p = \langle \psi | \Pi | \psi \rangle$, where $|\psi\rangle = U|0\rangle$, such that

$$
\begin{align*}
|\hat{p} - p| &\leq 2 \pi \sqrt{\frac{p(1-p)}{t}}, \quad \text{with probability } 8/\pi^2; \\
\hat{p} &= 0, \quad \text{with probability } \frac{\sin^2(t\theta)}{t^2 \sin^2(\theta)},
\end{align*}
$$

and $0 \leq \theta \leq \pi/2$ satisfies $\sin(\theta) = \sqrt{p}$. It uses $O\left(\log^2(t)\right)$ 2-qubit quantum gates (independent of $U$ and $\Pi$) and makes $2t+1$ calls to (the controlled versions of) $U$ and $U^{-1}$, and $t$ calls to the reflection $I - 2\Pi$.

We present now an adaptation of the algorithms from [57, 11, 47], for estimating $b^{-1}E[v(S)_{a,b}]$.

### Algorithm 1: the Basic Estimation Algorithm BasicEst.

**Input:** a sampler $S$, two values $(a,b)$, an integer $t$, a failure parameter $0 < \delta < 1$.

**Output:** an estimate $\tilde{\mu} = \text{BasicEst}(S,(a,b),t,\delta)$ of $\mu = b^{-1}E[v(S)_{a,b}]$.

1. Let $U = (I \otimes R_{a,b})(S \otimes I)$ and $\Pi = I \otimes |1\rangle\langle 1|$.
2. For $i = 1, \ldots, \Theta(\log(1/\delta))$: compute $\tilde{p}_i = \text{AmplEst}(U, \Pi, t)$.
3. Output $\tilde{\mu} = \text{median}\{\tilde{p}_1, \ldots, \tilde{p}_{\Theta(\log(1/\delta))}\}$.

**Corollary 2.4.** Consider a quantum sampler $S$ and two values $0 \leq a < b$. Denote $\mu = b^{-1}E[v(S)_{a,b}]$. Given an integer $t > 2$ and a real $0 < \delta < 1$, BasicEst $(S,(a,b),t,\delta)$ (see Algorithm 1) uses $O\left(t \log(1/\delta)\right)$ quantum samples and outputs $\tilde{\mu}$ satisfying with probability $1 - \delta$:

$$
\begin{align*}
|\tilde{\mu} - \mu| &\leq 2 \pi \frac{\sqrt{\mu}}{t}, \quad \text{and } \tilde{\mu} \leq (1 + 2 \pi)^2 \cdot \mu, \quad \text{for any } t; \\
|\tilde{\mu} - \mu| &\leq \epsilon \cdot \mu, \quad \text{when } t \geq \frac{8}{\sqrt{\mu}} \text{ and } 0 < \epsilon < 1; \\
\tilde{\mu} &= 0, \quad \text{when } t < \frac{1}{\sqrt{\mu}}.
\end{align*}
$$

**Proof.** We show that each $\tilde{p}_i$ satisfies the inequalities stated in the corollary, with probability $8/\pi^2$. Since $\tilde{\mu}$ is the median of $\Theta(\log(1/\delta))$ such values, the probability is increased to $1 - \delta$ using the Chernoff bound.

For each $x \in \Omega$, denote $v_x = \frac{1}{b}$ if $a \leq x < b$, and $v_x = 0$ otherwise. Since $\mu = \sum_{x \in \Omega} v_x |\alpha_x|^2$, observe that

$$
U(|0\rangle|0\rangle) = (I \otimes R_{a,b}) \sum_{x \in \Omega} \alpha_x |\psi_x\rangle |x\rangle |0\rangle = \sum_{x \in \Omega} \alpha_x |\psi_x\rangle |x\rangle \left( \sqrt{1 - v_x} |0\rangle + \sqrt{v_x} |1\rangle \right)
$$

$$
= \sqrt{1 - \mu} \left( \frac{1}{\sqrt{1 - \mu}} \sum_{x \in \Omega} \alpha_x \sqrt{1 - v_x} |\psi_x\rangle |x\rangle \right) |0\rangle + \sqrt{\mu} \left( \frac{1}{\sqrt{\mu}} \sum_{x \in \Omega} \alpha_x \sqrt{v_x} |\psi_x\rangle |x\rangle \right) |1\rangle.
$$

4
Thus, the output \( \tilde{\mu}_i \) of the AmplEst algorithm applied on \( U \) with projector \( \Pi = I \otimes |1\rangle \langle 1| \) is an estimate of \( p = \mu \) satisfying the output conditions of Theorem 2.3. Therefore \( |\tilde{\mu}_i - \mu| \leq 2\pi \sqrt{\frac{\pi}{c}} \) with probability \( 8/\pi^2 \), for any \( t \). By plugging \( t \geq \frac{8}{\sqrt{\pi}\pi} \) into this inequality we have \( |\tilde{\mu}_i - \mu| \leq e \cdot \mu \). By plugging \( t \geq \frac{1}{\sqrt{\pi} \pi} \) we have \( |\tilde{\mu}_i - \mu| \leq (4 \pi + 4 \pi^2) \mu \), and thus \( \tilde{\mu}_i \leq (1 + 2 \pi^2) \mu \). Finally, if \( t < \frac{1}{\sqrt{\pi} \pi} \), denote 0 \( \leq \theta \leq \pi/2 \) such that \( \sin(\theta) = \sqrt{\frac{\pi}{\mu}} \) and observe that \( \theta \leq \frac{\pi}{2} \sqrt{\frac{\pi}{\mu}} \leq \frac{\pi}{2} \) (since \( \frac{2}{\pi} x \leq \sin(x) \leq x \), for \( x \in [0, \pi/2] \)). The probability to obtain \( \tilde{\mu}_i = 0 \) is \( \frac{\sin^2(\theta)}{\pi^2 \sin^2(\theta)} \geq \frac{\sin^2(\pi/(4\pi))}{\pi^2 \sin^2(\pi/(4\pi))} \geq \frac{\sin^2(\pi/(4\pi))}{\pi^2 (\pi/(4\pi))^2} = 8/\pi^2 \), since \( x \mapsto \sin^2(tx)/(t^2 \sin^2(x)) \) is decreasing for \( 0 < x \leq \pi/t \). Moreover, when \( t < \frac{1}{\sqrt{\pi} \pi} \), the first two inequalities are obviously satisfied if \( \tilde{\mu}_i = 0 \).

The four results on \( \tilde{\mu} \) in Corollary 2.4 lie at the heart of this paper. We make a few comments on them.

**Remark 2.5.** Consider a sampler \( S \) over \( \Omega = \{0, 1\} \) for the Bernoulli distribution of parameter \( p \). Using the Chebyshev inequality, we get that \( O \left( (1 - p)/(\varepsilon^2 p) \right) \) classical samples are enough for estimating \( p \) with relative error \( \varepsilon \). The third result of Corollary 2.4 shows that \( t = O \left( 1/(\varepsilon \sqrt{\mu}) \right) \) quantum samples are sufficient. Our main result (Section 3) generalizes this quadratic speed-up to the non-Bernoulli case.

**Remark 2.6.** The result \( \tilde{\mu} \leq (1 + 2\pi^2) \cdot \mu \) shall be seen as an equivalent of the Markov inequality, namely that \( \tilde{\mu} \) does not exceed \( \mu \) by a large factor with good probability. This property is used in the second part of the paper (Section 3.2).

**Remark 2.7.** If \( \mu \neq 0 \), then the third and fourth inequalities imply that, with large probability, \( t < 8/\sqrt{\mu} \) when \( \tilde{\mu} = 0 \), and \( t \geq 1/(2\sqrt{\mu}) \) when \( \tilde{\mu} \neq 0 \). This phenomenon, around the threshold \( t = \Theta(1/\sqrt{\mu}) \), is the central result used in the next section for estimating the mean with constant approximation parameter.

## 3 Quantum Chebyshev’s inequality

### 3.1 Basic setting

We describe our main algorithms for estimating the mean \( \mu_S \) of any quantum sampler \( S \), given an upper bound \( \Delta_S \geq \phi_S/\mu_S \) (we recall that \( \phi_S^2 = \mathbb{E} [v(S)^2] \) and \( \sigma_S/\mu_S \leq \phi_S/\mu_S \leq 1 + \sigma_S/\mu_S \)). We first show how to find \( \tilde{\mu}_S \in [2\mu_S, 2500\mu_S] \) with \( O(\Delta_S \cdot \log(H/L)) \) quantum samples (where \( 0 < L < \mu_S < H \) are known bounds on \( \mu_S \)). We then improve the accuracy to any value \( \varepsilon \), at extra cost \( O(\Delta_S/\varepsilon) \).

The two main tools we use in this section are the BasicEst algorithm of Corollary 2.4, and the following lemma on “truncated” means. We recall that \( X_{<b} \) (resp. \( X_{\geq b} \)) is defined from a non-negative random variable \( X \) by substituting the outcomes greater or equal to \( b \) (resp. less than \( b \)) with 0. In particular, it implies that \( X = X_{<b} + X_{\geq b} \) for all \( b > 0 \).

**Fact 3.1.** For any random variable \( X \) and numbers \( 0 < a \leq b \), we have \( \mathbb{E} [X_{a,b}] \leq \frac{\mathbb{E} [X_{a,b}]}{a} \) and \( \mathbb{E} [X_{a,b}] \leq \frac{\mathbb{E} [X_{a,b}]}{b} \).

**Lemma 3.2.** Let \( X \) be a non-negative random variable and \( \Delta \geq \sqrt{\mathbb{E} [X^2]/\mathbb{E} [X]} \). Then, for all \( c_1, c_2, M > 0 \) such that \( c_1 \cdot \mathbb{E} [X] \leq M \leq c_2 \cdot \mathbb{E} [X] \), we have

\[
\left( 1 - \frac{1}{c_1} \right) \cdot \mathbb{E} [X] \leq \mathbb{E} [X_{<MA^2}] \leq \mathbb{E} [X] \quad \text{and} \quad \sqrt{c_1} \cdot \Delta \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{\mathbb{E} [X_{<MA^2}]/(MA^2)}} \leq \sqrt{c_2} \left( 1 - \frac{1}{c_1} \right) \cdot \Delta
\]

**Proof.** The left hand side term is a consequence of \( \mathbb{E} [X_{<MA^2}] = \mathbb{E} [X] - \mathbb{E} [X_{\geq MA^2}] \) and \( 0 \leq \mathbb{E} [X_{\geq MA^2}] \leq \mathbb{E} [X^2]/(MA^2) \leq \mathbb{E} [X^2]/(MA^2) \leq (1/c_1) \cdot \mathbb{E} [X] \) (using Fact 3.1). The right hand side term is a direct consequence of the left one, and of the hypothesis \( c_1 \cdot \mathbb{E} [X] \leq M \leq c_2 \cdot \mathbb{E} [X] \).

---

\(^3\text{The Markov inequality for a non-negative random variable } X \text{ states that } \mathbb{P}(X \geq k\mathbb{E}[X]) \leq 1/k \text{ for any } k > 0. \text{ Here, although we do not need this result, it is possible to prove that } \mathbb{P}(\tilde{\mu} \geq k\mu) \leq C/\sqrt{\mathbb{E}[X]}, \text{ for some absolute constant } C.\)
Our algorithm for finding \( \tilde{\mu}_S \in [2\mu_S, 2500\mu_S] \) goes via the following steps. Start with a value \( M > 4\mu_S \) and use the BasicEst algorithm with \( 25\Delta_S \) quantum samples to compute an estimate \( \tilde{\mu} \) of the normalized “truncated” mean \( (M\Delta_S^2)^{-1} \cdot E \left[ v(S)_{M\Delta_S^2} \right] \). As long as \( \tilde{\mu} = 0 \), restart with \( M = M/2 \). We show that this algorithm stops for \( M \in [2\mu_S, 2500\mu_S] \) with large probability.

We do not require the input parameter \( L \) to be a lower bound on \( \mu_S \), as the algorithm can detect if it is not the case. In fact, this parameter can be replaced with a logarithmic search on decreasing values of \( L \), as we show in Algorithm 6 and Corollary 3.7.

### Algorithm 2: constant approximation of the mean of a quantum sampler \( S \).

**Input**: a sampler \( S \), an integer \( \Delta_S \), two values \( 0 < L < H/2 \) with \( H > \mu_S \), a failure parameter \( 0 < \delta < 1 \).

**Output**: an estimate \( \tilde{\mu}_S \) of \( \mu_S \), or the statement “\( L > 2\mu_S \)”.

1. Set \( M = 4 \cdot H \).
2. Compute \( \tilde{\mu} = \text{BasicEst} (S,(0,M\Delta_S^2),25\Delta_S,\delta') \) where \( \delta' = \frac{\delta}{3 + \log (H/L)} \).
3. If \( \tilde{\mu} = 0 \) and \( M \geq L \) then set \( M = M/2 \) and go to Step 2.
4. If \( M < L \) then output “\( L > 2\mu_S \)”, else output \( \tilde{\mu}_S = M \).

**Theorem 3.3.** If \( \Delta_S \geq \phi_S/\mu_S \) then, with probability \( 1 - \delta \), either Algorithm 2 outputs an estimate \( \tilde{\mu}_S \) such that \( \tilde{\mu}_S \in [2\mu_S, 2500\mu_S] \); or it correctly declares that \( L > 2\mu_S \). The number of quantum samples of Algorithm 2 is \( O (\Delta_S \cdot \log (H/L) \log (\log (H/L)/\delta)) \).

**Proof.** Denote \( \mu = (M\Delta_S^2)^{-1} \cdot E \left[ v(S)_{M\Delta_S^2} \right] \). By Lemma 3.2, if \( M \geq 2500\mu_S \) then \( 25\Delta_S \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{\mu}} \), and if \( 2\mu_S \leq M \leq 4\mu_S \) then \( 25\Delta_S > \frac{8}{\sqrt{\mu}} \). Therefore, by Corollary 2.4, with probability \( 1 - \delta' \), the value \( \tilde{\mu} \) computed at Step 2 is equal to 0 when \( M \geq 2500\mu_S \), and is different from 0 when \( 2\mu_S \leq M \leq 4\mu_S \). We conclude that the first time Step 2 of Algorithm 2 computes \( \tilde{\mu} \neq 0 \) happens for \( M \in [2\mu_S, 2500\mu_S] \), with probability \( (1 - \delta')^{1 + \log (H/(2\mu_S))} > 1 - \delta \). If \( L > 2\mu_S \), the algorithm may stop earlier and output “\( L > 2\mu_S \)”. \( \square \)

We now describe a simple way to improve the precision of the estimate to any value \( \varepsilon \), at extra cost \( O (\varepsilon^{-3/2}\Delta_S) \). A more involved algorithm, with an \( \varepsilon^{-1} \) dependence but extra log factors, is presented later.

### Algorithm 3: \( \varepsilon \)-approximation of the mean of a quantum sampler \( S \).

**Input**: a sampler \( S \), an integer \( \Delta_S \), two values \( 0 < L < H/2 \) with \( H > \mu_S \), two reals \( 0 < \varepsilon, \delta < 1/2 \).

**Output**: an estimate \( \tilde{\mu}_S \) of \( \mu_S \), or the statement “\( L > 2\mu_S \)”.

1. Run Algorithm 2 on input \( S, \Delta_S, L, H, \delta/2 \).
   (a) Output “\( L > 2\mu_S \)” if it is the result returned by Algorithm 2.
   (b) Else, let \( M \) be the estimate returned.
2. Compute \( \tilde{\mu} = \text{BasicEst} (S,(0,\varepsilon^{-1}M\Delta_S^2),35^2\varepsilon^{-3/2}\Delta_S,\delta/2) \) and output \( \tilde{\mu}_S = (\varepsilon^{-1}M\Delta_S^2) \cdot \tilde{\mu} \).

**Theorem 3.4.** If \( \Delta_S \geq \phi_S/\mu_S \) then, with probability \( 1 - \delta \), either Algorithm 3 outputs an estimate \( \tilde{\mu}_S \) such that \( |\tilde{\mu}_S - \mu_S| \leq \varepsilon \cdot \mu_S \); or it correctly declares that \( L \geq 2\mu_S \). Moreover, without any assumption on \( \Delta_S \), the output value \( \tilde{\mu}_S \) still satisfies \( |\tilde{\mu}_S - \mu_S| \leq (1 + 2\pi) \cdot \mu_S \) with probability \( 1 - \delta \). The number of quantum samples is \( O \left( \Delta_S \cdot \left( \log \left( \log (H/L) \right) + \varepsilon^{-3/2} \log \left( \frac{1}{\delta} \right) \right) \right) \).

**Proof.** According to Theorem 3.3, when \( \Delta_S \geq \phi_S/\mu_S \) the output of Algorithm 2 is correct with probability \( 1 - \delta/2 \). Assume that is is a value \( M \in [2\mu_S, 2500\mu_S] \) and let \( M' = M/\varepsilon \). According to Lemma 3.2 we have \( (1 - \varepsilon/2) \cdot \mu_S \leq \int \left( v(S)_{M\Delta_S^2} \right) \leq \mu_S \) and \( 35^2\varepsilon^{-3/2}\Delta_S \geq \frac{8}{(\varepsilon/2)^2}\mu \), where \( \mu = (M\Delta_S^2)^{-1} \cdot E \left[ v(S)_{M\Delta_S^2} \right] \). Consequently, according to Corollary 2.4, the value \( \tilde{\mu} = \text{BasicEst} (S,(0,M'\Delta_S^2),35^2\varepsilon^{-3/2}\Delta_S,\delta) \) satisfies \( |\tilde{\mu} - \mu| \leq (\varepsilon/2) \mu \) with probability \( 1 - \delta \). Using the triangle inequality, it implies \( |(\varepsilon^{-1}M\Delta_S^2) \cdot \tilde{\mu} - \mu_S| \leq \varepsilon \mu_S \) with probability \( 1 - \delta \). \( \square \)
In order to get the alternative complexity bound $\tilde{O}(\varepsilon^{-1} \Delta S)$, we use the following modified version of an algorithm from [47] (based on an idea from [33]), where we introduced a new parameter $\Gamma$ which simplifies the analysis (the result presented in [47] corresponds to $\Gamma = 1$).

\begin{algorithm}
\textbf{Input:} a sampler $S$, a parameter $\Gamma > 0$, an integer $t > 2$, a failure parameter $0 < \delta < 1$. \\
\textbf{Output:} an estimate $\tilde{\mu}_S$ of $\mu_S$.
\begin{enumerate}
\item Set $k = \lfloor \log t \rfloor - 1$, $t_0 = 3\pi^2 t \sqrt{\log t}$.
\item Compute $\mu_0 = \text{BasicEst}(S, (0, \Gamma), t_0, \delta/(k+1))$.
\item For $\ell = 1, \ldots, k$:
\begin{enumerate}
\item Compute $\mu_\ell = \text{BasicEst}(S, (\ell^{-1} \Gamma, 2\ell^{1/2} \Gamma), t_0, \delta/(k+1))$.
\end{enumerate}
\item Output $\tilde{\mu}_S = \sum_{\ell=0}^k 2^{\ell} \Gamma \cdot \mu_\ell$.
\end{enumerate}
\end{algorithm}

\begin{algorithm}
\textbf{Algorithm 4:} subroutine for approximating the mean of a quantum sampler $S$.

\textbf{Proposition 3.5.} Algorithm 4 outputs an estimate $\tilde{\mu}_S$ such that $|\tilde{\mu}_S - \mu_S| \leq \frac{1}{t} \left( \sqrt{\Gamma} + \frac{\phi_S}{\sqrt{\Gamma}} \right)^2$ and $\tilde{\mu}_S \leq (1 + 2\pi)^2 \cdot \mu_S$ with probability $1 - \delta$. The number of quantum samples is $O\left( (t \log^{3/2}(t) \log(\log(t)/\delta)) \right)$.

\textbf{Proof.} Observe that $\mu_S = \sum_{\ell=0}^k 2^\ell \Gamma \cdot \mu_\ell$ and $\mu_0 = \frac{E[\nu(S)|\mu_\ell]}{t_0}$ and $\mu_\ell = \frac{E[\nu(S)|\mu_\ell]}{t_0}$. Using Corollary 2.4 and a union bound, we can assume $|\mu_\ell - \mu_\ell| \leq \pi^2 \left( \frac{\sqrt{\phi}}{\phi} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{\phi}} \right)$ and $\mu_\ell \leq (1 + 2\pi)^2 \cdot \mu_\ell$ for all $\ell$, with probability $1 - \delta$. It implies $\tilde{\mu}_S \leq (1 + 2\pi)^2 \cdot \mu_S$. On the other hand, using the triangle inequality,

\[
|\tilde{\mu}_S - \mu_S| \leq \pi^2 \left( \frac{\Gamma}{t_0} + \frac{1}{t_0} \sum_{\ell=1}^k \sqrt{2^\ell \Gamma \cdot E[\nu(S)|\mu_\ell]} + \frac{\Gamma}{t_0} \sum_{\ell=0}^k 2^\ell \right) + E[\nu(S)_{\geq 2\Gamma}]
\]

\[
\leq \pi^2 \left( \frac{\Gamma}{t_0} + \frac{1}{t_0} \sqrt{k} \sum_{\ell=1}^k 2^\ell \Gamma \cdot \frac{E[\nu(S)_{\geq 2\ell^{1/2} \Gamma}]}{2^{\ell-1} \Gamma} + \frac{2^{k+1}}{t_0} \Gamma \right) + \frac{\phi_S^2}{2^{k+1}}
\]

\[
\leq \pi^2 \left( \frac{\Gamma}{t_0} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{\phi}} \cdot \phi_S + \frac{2^{k+1}}{t_0} \Gamma \right) + \frac{\phi_S^2}{2^{k+1}} \leq \frac{1}{t} \left( \sqrt{\Gamma} + \frac{\phi_S}{\sqrt{\Gamma}} \right)^2
\]

where we used Fact 3.1 and the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, at the second step. \hfill \Box

If we set $\Gamma = \phi_S$ in the previous inequality, we obtain $|\tilde{\mu}_S - \mu_S| \leq 4\phi_S/t$, and thus $|\tilde{\mu}_S - \mu_S| \leq \varepsilon \mu_S$ when $t = \Omega(\varepsilon^{-1} \Delta S)$. Since $\phi_S$ is unknown, we approximate it by $\phi_S = M \Delta S$ instead, where $M \in [2\mu_S, 2500\mu_S]$ is the value computed with Algorithm 2.

\begin{algorithm}
\textbf{Input:} a sampler $S$, an integer $\Delta S$, two values $0 < L < H/2$ with $H > \mu_S$, two reals $0 < \varepsilon, \delta < 1/2$. \\
\textbf{Output:} an estimate $\bar{\mu}_S$ of $\mu_S$, or the statement “$L > 2\mu_S$”.
\begin{enumerate}
\item Run Algorithm 2 on input $S, \Delta S, L, H, \delta/2$.
\begin{enumerate}
\item Output “$L > 2\mu_S$” if it is the result returned by Algorithm 2.
\item Else, let $M$ be the estimate returned.
\end{enumerate}
\item Run Algorithm 4 on input $S, \Gamma = M \cdot \Delta S, t = 512\varepsilon^{-1} \Delta S, \delta/2$ and output the result as $\bar{\mu}_S$.
\end{enumerate}
\end{algorithm}

\begin{algorithm}
\textbf{Algorithm 5:} $\varepsilon$–approximation of the mean of a quantum sampler $S$.

\textbf{Theorem 3.6.} If $\Delta S \geq \phi_S / \mu_S$ then, with probability $1 - \delta$, either Algorithm 5 outputs an estimate $\bar{\mu}_S$ such that $|\bar{\mu}_S - \mu_S| \leq \varepsilon \cdot \mu_S$; or it correctly declares that $L \geq 2\mu_S$. Moreover, without any assumption on $\Delta S$, the output value $\bar{\mu}_S$ still satisfies $\bar{\mu}_S \leq (1 + 2\pi)^2 \cdot \mu_S$ with probability $1 - \delta$. The number of quantum samples is $O\left( \Delta S \cdot \left( \log \left( \frac{H}{\varepsilon} \right) \log \left( \frac{\log(H/L)}{\delta} \right) + \varepsilon^{-1} \log^{3/2}(\Delta S) \log \left( \frac{\log \Delta S}{\delta} \right) \right) \right)$. 

\end{algorithm}
The next algorithm details how to replace the input parameter $L$ with a logarithmic search on decreasing values of $L$. This causes the factor $\log(H/L)$ in the complexity bounds to become $\log^3(H/\mu_S)$. A similar result can be obtained for all of our previous (and future) algorithms.

**Input:** a sampler $S$, an integer $\Delta S$, a value $H > 2\mu_S$, two reals $0 < \epsilon, \delta < 1/2$.

**Output:** an estimate $\mu_S$ of $\mu_S$.

1. Set $i = 1$.
2. Run Algorithm 5 on input $S, \Delta S, L = H/2^i, H, (\delta/2)^i$.
   (a) If the result is a numerical value, output it as $\mu_S$.
   (b) Else, set $i = i + 1$ and go to Step 2.

**Algorithm 6:** $\epsilon$–approximation of the mean of a quantum sampler $S$.

**Corollary 3.7.** If $\Delta S \geq \phi_S/\mu_S$ then, with probability $1 - \delta$, Algorithm 6 outputs an estimate $\mu_S$ such that $|\mu_S - \mu_S| \leq \epsilon \cdot \mu_S$. The expected number of quantum samples is $O(\Delta_S \cdot \epsilon^{-1} \log^3 (H/\mu_S) \log(1/\delta))$.

**Proof.** According to Theorem 3.6, the success probability of Algorithm 6 is $1 - \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} (\delta/2)^i > 1 - \delta$. Moreover, Step 2 uses $O(\Delta_S \cdot \epsilon^{-1} \log(1/\delta))$ quantum samples for each $i$, and the output of Algorithm 5 is a numerical value with probability $1 - (\delta/2)^i$ when $i \geq \log(H/\mu_S)$. Thus, the expected number of quantum samples is $O\left(\Delta_S \cdot \epsilon^{-1} \log(1/\delta) \cdot \left(\sum_{i=1}^{\log(H/\mu_S)} \frac{1}{i^2} + \sum_{i=\log(H/\mu_S)}^{\infty} \frac{1}{i^2}\right)\right)$.

**Lower bound** Using a result due to Nayak and Wu [51] on approximating counts, we can show a corresponding lower bound to Theorem 3.6 already in the simple case of Bernoulli variables. For this purpose, we define that a quantum algorithm $A$ solves the **Mean Estimation problem for parameters** $\epsilon, \Delta$ if, for any sampler $S$ satisfying $\phi_S/\mu_S \in [\Delta, 2\Delta]$ (the constant 2 is arbitrary), it outputs a value $\mu_S$ satisfying $|\mu_S - \mu_S| \leq \epsilon \cdot \mu_S$ with probability $2/3$.

**Theorem 3.8.** Any algorithm solving the Mean Estimation problem for parameters $0 < \epsilon < 1/6$ and $\Delta > 1$ on the sample space $\{0, 1\}$ must use $\Omega((\Delta - 1)/\epsilon)$ quantum samples.

**Proof.** Consider an algorithm $A$ solving the Mean Estimation problem for parameters $0 < \epsilon < 1/6, \Delta > 1$ using $N$ quantum samples. Take two integers $0 < t < n$ large enough such that $\Delta \leq \sqrt{n}/t \leq \sqrt{2}\Delta$ and $\epsilon t > 1$. For any oracle $O : \{1, \ldots, n\} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$, define the quantum sampler $S_O : \{0\} \rightarrow \{i\} / O(i)$ and let $t_O = |\{i \in [n] : O(i) = 1\}|$. Observe that $\mu_{S_O} = \phi_{S_O}^2 = t_O/n$, and one quantum sample from $S_O$ can be implemented with one quantum query to $O$.

According to [51, Corollary 1.2], any algorithm that can distinguish $t_O = t$ from $t_O = \lfloor (1 - 2\epsilon)/\epsilon \rfloor$ makes $\Omega(\sqrt{n/(\epsilon t)} + \sqrt{1/(n-t)/\epsilon}) = \Omega(\sqrt{n/(\epsilon t - 1/\epsilon)}) = \Omega((\Delta - 1)/\epsilon)$ quantum queries to $O$. However, given the promise that $t_O = t$ or $t_O = \lfloor (1 - 2\epsilon)/\epsilon \rfloor$ we can use $A$ with input $S_O, \epsilon, \Delta$ to distinguish between the two cases using $N$ samples, that is $N$ queries to $O$. Indeed, $\phi_{S_O}/\mu_{S_O} = \sqrt{n/t_O} \in [\Delta, 2\Delta]$ for such samplers. Thus, the algorithm $A$ must use $N = \Omega((\Delta - 1)/\epsilon)$ quantum samples.

3.2 **Approximating the mean for unknown $\Delta S$**

We study the problem of estimating $\mu_S$ under a weaker assumption than in Section 3.1. Instead of having $\Delta S \geq \phi_S/\mu_S$, we are given a non-increasing function $f$ where $f(\mu_S) \geq \phi_S/\mu_S$. Such a situation is very common when approximating graph parameters for instance (see Section 4.2).

Since we do not have an upper bound on $\phi_S/\mu_S$, we cannot use directly the stopping rule “$\mu \neq 0$” of Algorithm 2. Instead, starting with $M \geq \mu_S$, we use Algorithm 5 with input $\Delta S = f(M)$ to obtain some estimate $\mu$. The new stopping rule is “$\mu \geq M/6$”. As long as it is not satisfied we restart with $M = M/2$. Using the inequality “$\mu_S \leq (1 + 2\pi)^2 \cdot \mu_S$” obtained in the previous results, we show that this algorithm stops for $M \in [\mu_S, 6(1 + 2\pi)^2 \cdot \mu_S]$ with large probability. The detailed algorithm and the corresponding theorem are given in Appendix A. Below, we give a weaker statement that is sufficient for our applications.
Theorem 3.9. There is a quantum algorithm that takes as input a quantum sampler $S$, a function $f : x \mapsto A/x^\alpha$ for some reals $A, \alpha > 0$ such that $f(\mu_S) \geq \phi_S/\mu_S$, two values $0 < L < H/2$ with $H > \mu_S$, and two reals $0 < \epsilon, \delta < 1$ with $\delta < 2^{-2\alpha}$. This algorithm either outputs an estimate $\overline{\mu}_S$ such that $|\overline{\mu}_S - \mu_S| \leq \epsilon \cdot \mu_S$ or correctly declares that $L \geq 2\mu_S$, with probability $1 - \delta$. The average (for the $\ell_1$ or $\ell_2$ norms) number of quantum samples is $\tilde{O}(e^{-1}f(\max(L, \mu_S)) \cdot \log(\frac{H}{\epsilon}) \log(\frac{1}{\delta}))$.

3.3 Approximating the mean for variable-time quantum samplers

The time complexity (total number of quantum gates) of all previous algorithms is essentially equal to the number of quantum samples multiplied by the time complexity $T_{\text{max}}(S)$ of the considered sampler. In order to improve this result, we define the notion of average running time $T_{\ell_2}(S)$, using the concept of variable-time algorithm introduced by Ambainis [5, 6].

Definition 3.10 (Variable-time algorithm). Consider two Hilbert spaces $\mathcal{H}_F$ and $\mathcal{H}_C$, where $\mathcal{H}_F$ is equipped with a standard basis $\{|\text{stop}\rangle, |\text{cont}\rangle\}$. We say that a unitary $U$ acting on $\mathcal{H}_F \otimes \mathcal{H}_C$ is a variable-time algorithm with stopping times $t_1 < \cdots < t_m$ (for some integer $m$) if it can be decomposed as a product of unitary operators $U = U_m \cdots U_1$, such that each $U_i$ acts as the identity on $\text{Span}(\{|\text{stop}\rangle\}) \otimes \mathcal{H}_C$ and has time complexity $T_{\text{max}}(U_i) = t_i - t_{i-1}$ (where $t_0 = 0$).

The probability to stop at step $i$ is $p_{\text{stop}} = ||\Pi_{\text{stop}}U_1 \cdots U_i(0)||^2 - ||\Pi_{\text{stop}}U_1 \cdots U_{i-1}(0)||^2$, where $\Pi_{\text{stop}} = |\text{stop}\rangle \langle \text{stop}| \otimes I_{\mathcal{H}_C}$, and the 2-average running time of $U$ is $T_{\ell_2}(U) = (\sum_{i=1}^m p_{\text{stop},i} t_i^2)^{1/2}$.

In order to adapt our main results to the case of variable-time quantum samplers $S = S_m \cdots S_1$, we develop in Appendix B a new amplitude estimation algorithm for variable-time algorithms. By doing so, we lose the $|\bar{\mu} - \mu| \leq 2\pi \frac{2\tau}{T} + \frac{\epsilon}{\mu}$ inequality of Corollary 2.4, which was central in the proof of Proposition 3.5. Instead, we use the algorithm of Theorem 3.4, for which it was sufficient that $|\bar{\mu} - \mu| \leq \epsilon \cdot \mu$ when $t \geq \frac{8}{\epsilon \sqrt{\mu}}$. Each of these two changes adds a factor of $e^{-0.5}$ in the time complexity.

Theorem 3.11. There is a quantum algorithm that takes as input a quantum sampler $S$, an integer $\Delta_S$, two values $0 < L < H/2$ with $H > \mu_S$, a real $T_{\ell_2} \geq 1$, and two reals $0 < \epsilon, \delta < 1$. If $\Delta_S \geq \phi_S/\mu_S$ and $T_{\ell_2} \geq T_{\ell_2}(S)$, this algorithm either outputs an estimate $\bar{\mu}_S$ such that $|\bar{\mu}_S - \mu_S| \leq \epsilon \cdot \mu_S$, or it correctly declares that $L \geq 2\mu_S$, with probability $1 - \delta$. Moreover, without any assumption on $\Delta_S$, the output value $\bar{\mu}_S$ satisfies $\bar{\mu}_S \leq 2 \cdot \mu_S$ with probability $1 - \delta$. The time complexity is $\tilde{O}(\Delta_S \left(e^{-2} + \log\left(\frac{H}{\epsilon}\right)\right) \cdot T_{\ell_2} \cdot \log^4(T_{\text{max}}(S)) \log\left(\frac{1}{\delta}\right))$.

Theorem 3.12. There is a quantum algorithm that takes as input a quantum sampler $S$, a function $f : x \mapsto A/x^\alpha$ for some real $A, \alpha > 0$ such that $f(\mu_S) \geq \phi_S/\mu_S$, two values $0 < L < H/2$ with $H > \mu_S$, a real $T_{\ell_2} \geq 1$, and two reals $0 < \epsilon, \delta < 1$ with $\delta < 2^{-2\alpha}$. If $T_{\ell_2} \geq T_{\ell_2}(S)$, this algorithm either outputs an estimate $\bar{\mu}_S$ such that $|\bar{\mu}_S - \mu_S| \leq \epsilon \cdot \mu_S$, or correctly declares that $L \geq 2\mu_S$, with probability $1 - \delta$. The average (for the $\ell_1$ or $\ell_2$ norms) time complexity is $\tilde{O}(e^{-2}f(\max(L, \mu_S)) \cdot T_{\ell_2} \cdot \log^4(T_{\text{max}}(S)) \log(\frac{H}{\epsilon}))$.

4 Applications

We describe two applications of the quantum Chebyshev inequality. The first one (Section 4.1) concerns the computation of the frequency moment $F_k$ of order $k \geq 3$ in the quantum streaming model. We design a P-pass quantum streaming algorithm with space memory $M$ satisfying a tradeoff of $P^2M = \tilde{O}(n^{1-2/k})$, whereas the best classical algorithm requires $PM = \Theta(n^{1-2/k})$. We study then (Section 4.2) the edge and triangle counting problems in the general graph model with quantum query access. We describe nearly optimal algorithms that approximate these parameters quadratically faster than in the classical query model.

4.1 Frequency moments in the multi-pass streaming model

In the streaming model with update (turnstile model), the input is a vector $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ obtained through a stream $\bar{u} = u_1, u_2, \ldots$ of updates. Initially, $x(0) = (0, \ldots, 0)$, and each $u_i = (i, \lambda) \in [n] \times \mathbb{R}$ modifies the $i$-th coordinate of $x(j)$ by adding $\lambda$ to it. The goal of a streaming algorithm $\mathcal{T}$ is to output, at the end of the stream,
some function of the final vector $x$ while minimizing the number $M \ll n$ of memory cells. In the multi-pass model, the same stream is repeated for a certain number $P$ of passes, before the algorithm outputs its result.

The frequency moment of order $k$ is defined, for the final vector $x = (x_1, \ldots, x_n)$, as $F_k = \sum_{i \in [n]} |x_i|^k$. The problem of approximating $F_k$ when $k \geq 3$ has been addressed first with the AMS algorithm [4], that uses $O\left(n^{1-1/k}\right)$ classical memory cells in the insertion-only model (where $u_j \in [n] \times \mathbb{R}^+$. A series of works in the turnstile model culminated into optimal one-pass algorithms with memory $\Theta\left(n^{1-2/k}\right)$ [44, 28], and nearly optimal $P$-pass algorithms with memory $\tilde{O}\left(n^{1-2/k}/P\right)$ [46, 7, 58]. In the quantum setting, it was only known [48] how to improve the dependency of the AMS algorithm on the approximation parameter $\varepsilon$.

Given $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$, we define the $\ell_k$ distribution $D_{\ell_k, x}$ that returns $i \in [n]$ with probability $\frac{|x_i|^k}{F_k}$. The AMS algorithm [4] essentially samples $i$ from $D_{\ell_k, x}$ and returns $F_1 \cdot |x_i|^{k-1}$. This is an unbiased estimator for $F_k$, with variance $O\left(n^{1-1/k}F_k^2\right)$. Sampling from $D_{\ell_k, x}$ instead, and returning $|x_i|^{k-2}$, reduces the variance to $O\left(n^{1-2/k}F_k^2\right)$. In [46, 7], the authors succeeded to sample in one-pass, and polylog $n$ memory, from an $(\varepsilon, \delta)$-approximator to $D_{\ell_k, x}$ that returns $i \in [n]$ with probability $(1 - \varepsilon)|x_i|^2 - \delta \leq p_i \leq (1 + \varepsilon)|x_i|^2 + \delta$. Moreover, this construction is built from a linear sketch.

Linear sketches (see Definition C.1) are common type of streaming algorithms. They have the particularity to maintain in memory only a linear function of the input $x$, that can be updated in time $T_{\text{upd}}$. The output is reconstructed in time $T_{\text{rec}}$, using the final value $L(x)$ only. We will need these particular properties to implement the following estimator into a quantum sampler.

**Theorem 4.1** ([7]). Fix $0 < \varepsilon < 1/3$. There exists a linear sketch streaming algorithm which, given a stream $\tilde{u}$ with final vector $x$ and a real $\tilde{F}_2$ such that $|\tilde{F}_2 - F_2| \leq (1/2) \cdot F_2$, outputs a value $i \in [n]$ that is distributed according to an $(\varepsilon, n^{-2})$-approximator to $D_{\ell_k, x}$, with probability $1 - \varepsilon|F_2|^2$. The algorithm has memory $M = \tilde{O}\left(\varepsilon^{-2}\log n\right)$, update time $T_{\text{upd}} = \tilde{O}\left(\frac{1}{\varepsilon^2} \log n\right)$ and reconstruction time $T_{\text{rec}} = \tilde{O}\left(\varepsilon^{-1} \log n\right)$.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Input: a stream $\tilde{u}$, an integer $k \geq 3$, a real $\tilde{F}_2$, an approximation parameter $0 &lt; \varepsilon &lt; 1$.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Output: an estimate $\tilde{F}_k$ of the frequency moment of order $k$ of $\tilde{u}$.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Compute $i \in [n]$ using the randomized linear sketch algorithm of Theorem 4.1 with input $\tilde{u}, \tilde{F}_2, \varepsilon/4$.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Compute $x_i$ using a second pass over $\tilde{u}$.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Output $\tilde{F}_2 \cdot</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Estimator 7**: frequency moment $F_k$ of a stream.

**Proposition 4.2** ([46, 7]). If we denote $X$ the output random variable of Estimator 7, then $\mathbb{E}[X] = (1 - \varepsilon/2)F_k$ and $\text{Var}[X] \leq \tilde{O}\left(n^{1-2/k}F_k^2\right)$, when $|\tilde{F}_2 - F_2| \leq (\varepsilon/4) \cdot F_2$.

In order to implement Estimator 7 with a quantum sampler $S$, we need to be careful that the reverse computation $S^{-1}$ can also be done efficiently. Usually, that would require processing the same stream but in the reverse direction. In Appendix C (Proposition C.2), we show that it can be done with one pass in the direct direction for linear sketch streaming algorithms. We combine the quantum sampler that is obtained from this result with our Quantum Chebyshev’s Inequality (Theorem 3.6), to obtain the following tradeoff.

**Theorem 4.3**. There exists a quantum streaming algorithm that, given a stream $\tilde{u}$, two integers $P \geq 1, k \geq 3$ and an approximation parameter $0 < \varepsilon < 1$, outputs an estimate $\tilde{F}_k$ such that $|\tilde{F}_k - F_k| \leq \varepsilon F_k$ with probability $2/3$. The algorithm uses $\tilde{O}\left(n^{1-2/k}/(\varepsilon P)^2\right)$ quantum memory cells, and it makes $\tilde{O}\left(P \cdot (k \log n + \varepsilon^{-1})\right)$ passes over the stream $\tilde{u}$.

**Proof**: We compute first, in one pass, a value $\tilde{F}_2$ such that $|\tilde{F}_2 - F_2| \leq (\varepsilon/2)F_2$ with high probability, using [4, 48] for instance. The complexity is absorbed by the final result. Then, using Estimator 7 together with Proposition C.2, we can design a quantum sampler $S$ using memory $M = \tilde{O}\left(\varepsilon^{-2}\log^3 n\right)$ such that
Theorem 4.4. There exists a quantum algorithm that, given query access to any \( n \)-vertex graph \( G = (V, E) \) and an approximation parameter \( \varepsilon < 1 \), outputs an estimate \( \tilde{m} \) of the number \( m \) of edges of \( G \) such that \( |\tilde{m} - m| \leq \varepsilon m \) with probability 2/3. Its expected number of degree and neighbor queries is \( \tilde{O} \left( \frac{n^{1/2}}{\varepsilon m^{1/2}} \right) \), and, moreover, it performs no vertex-pair query.

Theorem 4.5. Any quantum algorithm that computes an \( \varepsilon \)-approximation of the number \( m \) of edges of any \( n \)-vertex graph, given query access to it, has expected query complexity \( \Omega \left( \frac{n^{1/2}}{(\varepsilon m)^{1/2}} \cdot \log^{-1}(n) \right) \).

The triangle counting problem was studied in the classical general graph model in [23], where it is solved using \( \tilde{O} \left( \frac{n}{t^{1/3}} + \min(m, m^{3/2}/t) \right) \) queries in expectation [22, 23]. This result was generalized to counting the number of \( k \)-cliques in [24]. In the quantum setting, we obtain the following results.

Theorem 4.6. There exists a quantum algorithm that, given query access to any \( n \)-vertex graph \( G \) with \( m \) edges and an approximation parameter \( \varepsilon < 1 \), outputs an estimate \( \tilde{t} \) of the number \( t \) of triangles of \( G \) such that \( |\tilde{t} - t| \leq \varepsilon t \) with probability 2/3. The expected number of queries of the algorithm is \( \tilde{O} \left( \left( \frac{\pi^2}{12} + \frac{m^{1/2}}{\sqrt{\varepsilon t}} \right) \cdot \text{poly}(1/\varepsilon) \right) \).

Theorem 4.7. Any quantum algorithm that computes an \( \varepsilon \)-approximation to the number \( t \) of triangles in any \( n \)-vertex graph with \( m \) vertices, given query access to it, has expected query complexity \( \Omega \left( \left( \frac{\pi^2}{12} + \frac{m^{1/4}}{\sqrt{\varepsilon t}} \right) \cdot \log^{-1}(n) \right) \).
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A Approximating the mean for unknown $\Delta_S$

We show how to approximate the mean $\mu_S$ of a quantum sampler $S$, given a non-increasing function $f$ such that $f(\mu_S) \geq \phi_S / \mu_S$ (instead of having $\Delta_S \geq \phi_S / \mu_S$).

**Input:** a sampler $S$, a non-increasing function $f$ such that $f(\mu_S) \geq \phi_S / \mu_S$, two values $0 < L < H/2$ with $H > \mu_S$, an approximation parameter $\epsilon < 1/2$, a failure parameter $0 < \delta < 1$.

**Output:** an estimate $\tilde{\mu}_S$ of $\mu_S$, or the statement “$L > 2 \mu_S$”.

1. Set $M = H$ and $\Delta_S = f(M)$.
2. Run Algorithm 5 on input $S, \Delta_S, L, H, \epsilon' = 5/6, \delta'$ where $\delta' = \frac{\delta}{2(4 + \log(\frac{1}{\epsilon}))}$.
   (a) If the result is a numerical value, denote it by $\tilde{\mu}$.
   (b) If the result is “$L > 2 \mu_S$”, let $\tilde{\mu} = 0$.
3. If $\tilde{\mu} < M/6$ and $M \geq L/4$ then set $M = M/2, \Delta_S = f(M)$ and go to Step 2.
4. If $M < L/4$ then output “$L > 2 \mu_S$”, else run Algorithm 5 with $S, \Delta_S = f \left( M/(6(1 + 2\pi)^2) \right), L, H, \epsilon, \delta/2$ and output its result as $\tilde{\mu}_S$.

**Algorithm 8:** $\epsilon$–approximation of the mean of a quantum sampler $\tilde{S}$ for unknown $\Delta_S$. 

---
**Theorem A.1.** With probability $1 - \delta$, Algorithm 8 either outputs an estimate $\tilde{\mu}_S$ such that $|\tilde{\mu}_S - \mu_S| \leq \epsilon \cdot \mu_S$, or correctly declares that $L \geq 2 \mu_S$. The number of quantum samples is

$$\tilde{O}\left(f\left(\frac{\max(L/8, 2^{-T} \mu_S)}{6(1 + 2\pi)^2}\right) \epsilon^{-1} \cdot \log \left(\frac{H}{\epsilon L}\right) \log \left(\frac{1}{\delta}\right)\right)$$

for some integer random variable $T$ such that $\mathbb{P}(T = 1) \geq 1 - \delta$ and $\mathbb{P}(T = \ell) \leq \delta^\ell$ for all $\ell > 1$.

**Proof.** Assume first that $L \leq 2 \mu_S$ (so that $M$ satisfies $M \geq L/4$ for values as small as $M = \mu_S/2$). According to Theorem 3.6, the estimate $\bar{\mu}$ computed at Step 2 of Algorithm 8 satisfies $\bar{\mu} \leq (1 + 2\pi)^2 \cdot \mu_S$ with probability $1 - \delta'$. Consequently, when $M > 6(1 + 2\pi)^2 \cdot \mu_S$, we have $\bar{\mu} < M/6$ with probability $1 - \delta'$. On the other hand, when $M \leq \mu_S$, since $\Delta_S = f(M) \geq \phi_S / \mu_S$ the value $\bar{\mu}$ computed at Step 2 satisfies $|\bar{\mu} - \mu_S| \leq (5/6) \cdot \mu_S$ with probability $1 - \delta'$. In particular, it implies $\bar{\mu} \geq \mu_S / 6 \geq M/6$, with probability $1 - \delta'$. Using these two points, we conclude that the first time Step 2 of Algorithm 8 computes $\bar{\mu}$ such that $\bar{\mu} \geq M/6$ happens for $M \in [\mu_S/2, 6(1 + 2\pi)^2 \mu_S]$, with probability $(1 - \delta')^{1 + \log(H/(\mu_S/2))} > 1 - \delta/2$. In this case, the value taken by $\Delta_S$ at Step 4 of the algorithm is larger than $\phi_S / \mu_S$, and the output returned by Algorithm 5 is an $\epsilon$-approximation of $\mu_S$ with probability $1 - \delta/2$ (by Theorem 3.6). The total success probability is $(1 - \delta/2)^2 \geq 1 - \delta$. If $L > 2 \mu_S$, there is a higher chance that $\bar{\mu} < M/6$. This causes Step 4 to either output directly “$L > 2 \mu_S$”, or to run Algorithm 5 with a value for $\Delta_S$ larger than previously (which may only increase the accuracy of the estimate).

We now analyse the number of quantum samples. The value taken by $M$ at Step 4 of the algorithm satisfies $M \geq \mu_S/2$ with probability at least $1 - \delta$, and $2^{-\ell} \mu_S > M \geq 2^{-\ell + 1} \mu_S$ with probability at most $\delta^\ell$ (for any $\ell \geq 1$). Moreover, the total number of quantum samples in Algorithm 8 is dominated (up to polylogarithmic factors) by the number of quantum samples used at Step 4, that is $\tilde{O}\left(f\left(\frac{2^{-\ell} \mu_S}{12(1 + 2\pi)^2}\right) \epsilon^{-1} \cdot \log \left(\frac{H}{\epsilon L}\right) \log \left(\frac{1}{\delta}\right)\right)$ when $M \geq 2^{-\ell} \mu_S$. The smallest possible value for $M$ at Step 4 is $L/8$. Thus, the total number of quantum samples is $\tilde{O}\left(f\left(\frac{\max(L/8, 2^{-\ell} \mu_S)}{12(1 + 2\pi)^2}\right) \epsilon^{-1} \cdot \log \left(\frac{H}{\epsilon L}\right) \log \left(\frac{1}{\delta}\right)\right)$, where $T = 1$ with probability at least $1 - \delta$ and $T = \ell$ with probability at most $\delta^\ell$, for all $\ell \geq 2$.

The average (for the $\ell_1$ norm) number of quantum samples in Algorithm 8 is

$$\tilde{O}\left(\sum_{\ell=0}^{m} \delta^\ell \cdot f\left(\frac{\max(L/8, 2^{-\ell+1} \mu_S)}{6(1 + 2\pi)^2}\right) \epsilon^{-1} \cdot \log \left(\frac{H}{\epsilon L}\right) \log \left(\frac{1}{\delta}\right)\right)$$

In particular, if $f : x \mapsto A/\alpha^x$ for some reals $A, \alpha > 0$, it becomes $\tilde{O}\left(\frac{2^{-\ell+1} A}{\max(L, \mu_S)^\alpha} \cdot \log \left(\frac{H}{\epsilon L}\right) \log \left(\frac{1}{\delta}\right)\right)$ when $\delta < 2^{-\alpha}$. For the $\ell_2$ norm, the same conclusion can be drawn by taking $\delta < 2^{-2\alpha}$.

**B Variable-time amplitude estimation**

The Definition 3.10 of variable-time algorithm expresses the fact that some branches of computation may stop earlier than the others. When the computation of a branch is done, the first register is set to $|\text{stop}\rangle$, and this part of the state cannot be changed afterward. The probability $p_{\text{stop,} \leq i}$ to stop before step $i$ is defined as

$$p_{\text{stop,} \leq i} = \|\Pi_{\text{stop}} U_i \cdots U_1 |0\rangle\|^2$$

where $\Pi_{\text{stop}} = |\text{stop}\rangle \langle \text{stop}| \otimes I_{H_C}$. Similarly, $p_{\text{stop,} > i} = 1 - p_{\text{stop,} \leq i}$ is the probability to stop after step $i$, and $p_{\text{stop,} i} = p_{\text{stop,} \leq i} - p_{\text{stop,} \leq i-1}$ (where $p_{\text{stop,} 0} = 0$) to stop at step $i$. Instead of the expected (or $\ell_1$-average) running time, we will be manipulating the $\ell_2$-average running time of $U$, which is defined as

$$T_{\ell_2}(U) = \left(\sum_{i=1}^{m} p_{\text{stop,} i} t_i^2\right)^{1/2}$$
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Ambainis [5, 6] studied the question of quantum searching and amplitude amplification for variable-time unitaries $U = U_m \cdots U_1$. In Section B.2, we extend this work with a variable-time amplitude estimation algorithm: given $U = U_m \cdots U_1$ and an orthogonal projector $\Pi = \ket{\text{stop}} \bra{\text{stop}} \otimes \Pi_C$ over $H_F \otimes H_C$, we show that estimating $p = \bra{\psi} \Pi \ket{\psi}$ with relative error $\varepsilon$, where $\ket{\psi} = U \ket{0}$, can be done in total time

$$O \left( \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \left( \min \left( T_{\text{max}}(U), \frac{T_{t_2}(U)}{\sqrt{p}} \right) + \frac{T_{t_2}(U)}{\sqrt{p}} \right) \cdot \log^4(T_{\text{max}}(U)) \log \left( \frac{\log(T_{\text{max}}(U))}{\delta} \right) \right)$$

where, in comparison, the standard amplitude estimation algorithm (Theorem 2.3) would require time $O \left( \frac{T_{\text{max}}(U)}{(\varepsilon \sqrt{p})} \right)$. Using this subroutine, we obtain new versions of our main results when $S$ is a variable-time sampler $S = S_m \cdots S_1$ (Theorems 3.11 and 3.12).

**Related work** We have been aware, during the redaction of this paper, of a similar result recently proved in [16], in the context of quantum machine learning. The authors showed that $p = \bra{\psi} \Pi \ket{\psi}$ can be approximated with relative error $\varepsilon$ in time

$$O \left( \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \left( T_{\text{max}}(U) + \frac{T_{t_2}(U)}{\sqrt{p}} \right) \cdot \log^2(T_{\text{max}}(U)) \log \left( \frac{\log(T_{\text{max}}(U))}{\delta} \right) \right)$$

This quantity may be too large when $T_{\text{max}}(U) \gg T_{t_2}(U)$ (as it is the case for the algorithm of Theorem 4.6). Our algorithm is not conceptually different from that of [16], we differ mainly by observing that $U$ can be stopped at time $t_i = O \left( \frac{T_{t_2}(U)}{\sqrt{p}} \right)$ without impacting the quality of the estimate much (as pointed out for variable-time amplitude amplification in [6]). In addition, we also prove new inequalities on the output, similar to that of Corollary 2.4.

**B.1 Preliminaries**

We need the following modified amplitude estimation algorithm, without input time parameter, that still approximates $p$ using $O \left( 1/(\varepsilon \sqrt{p}) \right)$ calls to $U$ with large probability. In the following, we neglect the complexity of implementing the projector $\Pi$.

**Proposition B.1** ([12, Theorem 15]). There is a quantum algorithm, denoted $\text{AmplEst}^*$, that takes as input a unitary operator $U$, an orthogonal projector $\Pi$, and two reals $0 < \varepsilon, \delta < 1$. With probability $1 - \delta$, this algorithm outputs an estimate $\tilde{p} = \text{AmplEst}^*(U, \Pi, \varepsilon, \delta)$ satisfying $|\tilde{p} - p| \leq \varepsilon p$ and runs in time $O \left( \frac{T_{\text{max}}(U)}{(\varepsilon \sqrt{p})} \right)$, where $p = \bra{\psi} \Pi \ket{\psi}$ and $\ket{\psi} = U \ket{0}$.

The second tool we use is the standard amplitude amplification algorithm [12, Section 2], with an improved analysis from [1].

**Proposition B.2** ([1, Lemma 5.2]). Let $\mathcal{H}$ be some Hilbert space. Let $U$ be a unitary operator and $\Pi$ an orthogonal projector on $\mathcal{H}$. Denote $p = \bra{\psi} \Pi \ket{\psi}$ where $\ket{\psi} = \sqrt{p} \ket{\psi_1} + \sqrt{1-p} \ket{\psi_{1\perp}} = U \ket{0}$ and $\ket{\psi_1}, \ket{\psi_{1\perp}}$ are two unit states invariant by $\Pi$ and $\Pi^\perp$ respectively. Given an integer $t$ such that

$$t \leq \frac{\pi}{4 \arcsin \sqrt{p}} - \frac{1}{2}$$

the Amplitude Amplification algorithm [12, Section 2] on input $(U, \Pi, t)$ outputs in time $O \left( t \right)$ the description of a quantum circuit $\text{Amplify}(U, \Pi, t)$ acting on $\mathcal{H}$ such that

$$\text{Amplify}(U, \Pi, t) \ket{0} = \sqrt{p'} \ket{\psi_{1\perp}} + \sqrt{1-p'} \ket{\psi_{1\perp}}$$

where

$$p' \geq \left( 1 - \frac{(2t+1)^2 - p}{3} \right) (2t+1)^2 p$$

Moreover, $\text{Amplify}(U, \Pi, t)$ runs in time $O \left( t \cdot T_{\text{max}}(U) \right)$. 
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B.2 Variable-time amplitude estimation

We describe our new version of the amplitude estimation algorithm, adapted to the case of a variable-time algorithm $U = U_m \cdots U_1$ with stopping times $t_1 < \cdots < t_m$. The algorithm consists in estimating at each intermediate time step $t_i$ a multiplicative portion $\tilde{p}_i$ of $p = \langle \psi | \Pi | \psi \rangle$ (the final estimate $\tilde{p}$ of $p$ being the product of the $\tilde{p}_i$’s). To this end, we apply the regular amplitude estimation algorithm on two particular state generation algorithms originating from the work of Ambainis [5].

**Theorem B.3.** Let $\mathcal{H}_F$ and $\mathcal{H}_C$ be some Hilbert spaces, where $\mathcal{H}_F = \{|\text{stop}\rangle, |\text{cont}\rangle \}$ is two-dimensional. There is a quantum algorithm that takes as input a variable-time algorithm $U = U_m \cdots U_1$ on $\mathcal{H}_F \otimes \mathcal{H}_C$, an orthogonal projector $\Pi = |\text{stop}\rangle \langle \text{stop}| \otimes \Pi_F$ on $\mathcal{H}_F \otimes \mathcal{H}_C$, two reals $t, T > 1$, and two reals $0 < \epsilon, \delta < 1$. If $T_t \geq T_t(U)$, then the algorithm outputs an estimate $\tilde{p}$ of $p = \langle \psi | \Pi | \psi \rangle$, where $|\psi\rangle = U|0\rangle$, such that

$$\begin{align*}
\tilde{p} &\leq 2 \cdot p, & \text{for any } t; \\
|\tilde{p} - p| &\leq \epsilon \cdot p, & \text{when } t \geq \frac{2}{\epsilon^2}p; \\
\tilde{p} &= 0, & \text{when } t < \frac{1}{\epsilon^2}p
\end{align*}$$

with probability $1 - \delta$. The time complexity of this algorithm is

$$O \left( \left( \min(T_{\text{max}}(U), t \cdot T_t \epsilon^{-1/2}) + t \cdot T_t \right) \epsilon^{-1} \cdot \log^4(T_{\text{max}}(U)) \log \left( \frac{\log(T_{\text{max}}(U))}{\delta} \right) \right).$$

The rest of this section is dedicated to the proof of Theorem B.3. For clarity, and without loss of generality, we assume from now that each intermediate state $|\psi_i\rangle = U_i \cdots U_1|0\rangle$ can be written as

$$|\psi_i\rangle = \sqrt{\rho_{\text{acc}, \leq i}} |\text{stop}\rangle |\psi^1_i\rangle |1\rangle + \sqrt{\rho_{\text{rej}, \leq i}} |\text{stop}\rangle |\psi^0_i\rangle |0\rangle + \sqrt{\rho_{\text{stop}, \leq i}} |\text{cont}\rangle |\psi^2_i\rangle |2\rangle,$$

for some unit states $|\psi^1_i\rangle, |\psi^0_i\rangle, |\psi^2_i\rangle, |\psi^0\rangle \in \mathcal{H}_C$ where $\mathcal{H}_C = \mathcal{H}_C \otimes \mathbb{C}^3$, and some probabilities $\rho_{\text{acc}, \leq i}, \rho_{\text{rej}, \leq i}, \rho_{\text{stop}, \leq i}, \rho_{\text{acc}}, \rho_{\text{rej}}$. The last register indicates if the computation is not finished (value 2), if it is finished and corresponds to the accepting part whose amplitude has to be estimated (value 1), or if it is finished and corresponds to the rejecting part (value 0). The proportion $1 - \rho_{\text{stop}, > i}$ of computation that is finished at step $i$ is decomposed as $\rho_{\text{acc}, \leq i}$ for the accepting part and $\rho_{\text{rej}, \leq i}$ for the rejecting part. We assume that all the computations are finished at step $m$ (i.e. $\rho_{\text{stop}, > m} = 0, \rho_{\text{acc}, \leq m} = \rho_{\text{acc}} = p$ and $\rho_{\text{rej}, > m} = \rho_{\text{rej}}$). We also denote $\rho_{\text{rej}, \leq 0} = \rho_{\text{acc}, \leq 0} = 0, \rho_{\text{stop}, > 0} = 1$. Finally, we define the following two projectors on $\mathcal{H}_F \otimes \mathcal{H}_C$:

$$\begin{align*}
\Pi_1 &= I_{\mathcal{H}_F \otimes \mathcal{H}_C} \otimes |1\rangle \langle 1|; \\
\Pi_{1,2} &= I_{\mathcal{H}_F \otimes \mathcal{H}_C} \otimes (|1\rangle \langle 1| + |2\rangle \langle 2|). 
\end{align*}$$

We recall first the state generation algorithms of Ambainis [5], on which is based our variable-time amplitude estimation algorithm. The central idea of these algorithms is to amplify at each intermediate step $i \leq m$ the amplitude of the potentially accepting state

$$|\phi^{1,2}_i\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{1 - \rho_{\text{rej}, \leq i}}} \left( \sqrt{\rho_{\text{acc}, \leq i}} |\text{stop}\rangle |\psi^1_i\rangle |1\rangle + \sqrt{\rho_{\text{stop}, > i}} |\text{cont}\rangle |\psi^2_i\rangle |2\rangle \right)$$

before executing $U_{i+1}$. In practice, two families $(B_i)_i, (A_i)_i$ of algorithms are defined recursively such that

$$B_i|0\rangle = |\psi_{B_i}\rangle = \sqrt{b_i} |\phi^{1,2}_i\rangle + \sqrt{1 - b_i} |\phi^0_i\rangle \quad \text{and} \quad A_i|0\rangle = |\psi_{A_i}\rangle = \sqrt{a_i} |\phi^{1,2}_i\rangle + \sqrt{1 - a_i} |\phi^0_i\rangle$$
where $|\phi_i^{1,2}\rangle$ has been defined above, and $|\phi_i^0\rangle \in \text{Span}(|\text{stop}\rangle) \otimes \mathcal{H}_C \otimes \text{Span}(|0\rangle)$ is some unit state corresponding to the rejected part after $i$ steps. Each $|\psi_{A_i}\rangle$ is obtained from $|\psi_{B_i}\rangle$ by amplifying the squared amplitude of $|\phi_i^{1,2}\rangle$ from $b_i$ to $a_i \geq \max(b_i, \Omega(1/m))$ (see Algorithm 10), and each $|\psi_{B_{i+1}}\rangle$ is equal to $U_{i+1}|\psi_{A_i}\rangle$ (see Algorithm 9). The main observation that stems from the definition of these algorithms below is that,

$$b_i = a_{i-1} \frac{1-p_{\text{rej},i}}{1-p_{\text{rej},i-1}}$$

(1)

where $a_0 = 1$.

**Input:** a variable-time algorithm $U = U_m \cdots U_1$ with stopping times $t_1 < \cdots < t_m$, a step $i \in \{1, \ldots, m\}$, a sequence of estimates $(\tilde{b}_k)_{1 \leq k \leq i-1}$.

**Output:** a state generation algorithm $B_i = \text{Gen}_B \left(U,i, (\tilde{b}_k)_{1 \leq k \leq i-1}\right)$.

1. If $i = 1$, output $B_1 = U_1$.
2. If $i > 1$, output $B_i = U_{i-1}$ where $A_{i-1} = \text{Gen}_A \left(U, i-1, (\tilde{b}_k)_{1 \leq k \leq i-1}\right)$.

**Algorithm 9:** state generation algorithm $\text{Gen}_B$.

**Input:** a variable-time algorithm $U = U_m \cdots U_1$ with stopping times $t_1 < \cdots < t_m$, a step $i \in \{1, \ldots, m\}$, a sequence of estimates $(\tilde{b}_k)_{1 \leq k \leq i}$.

**Output:** a state generation algorithm $A_i = \text{Gen}_A \left(U, i, (\tilde{b}_k)_{1 \leq k \leq i}\right)$.

1. Set $B_i = \text{Gen}_B \left(U, i, (\tilde{b}_k)_{1 \leq k \leq i-1}\right)$.
2. If $\tilde{b}_i > \frac{1}{9m}$, output $A_i = B_i$.
3. If $\tilde{b}_i \leq \frac{1}{9m}$, output $A_i = \text{Amplify} (B_i, \Pi_{1,2}, k)$ for the smallest $k$ satisfying $1/(9m) \leq (2k+1)^2 \tilde{b}_i \leq 1/m$.

**Algorithm 10:** state generation algorithm $\text{Gen}_A$.

The running time of these algorithms is analyzed [5] assuming $|\tilde{b}_j - b_j| \leq b_j/(3m)$ for all $1 \leq j \leq i$. Such estimates $\tilde{b}_j$ will be obtained next, using the $\text{AmplEst}^*$ algorithm on input $B_j$.

**Proposition B.4.** Consider a variable-time algorithm $U = U_m \cdots U_1$ with stopping times $t_1 < \cdots < t_m$, a step $i \in \{1, \ldots, m\}$ and a sequence of estimates $(\tilde{b}_k)_{1 \leq k \leq i}$. For each $1 \leq j \leq i$, denote $B_j = \text{Gen}_B \left(U, j, (\tilde{b}_k)_{1 \leq k \leq j-1}\right)$, $A_j = \text{Gen}_A \left(U, j, (\tilde{b}_k)_{1 \leq k \leq j}\right)$, and let $b_j = \|\Pi_{1,2}(B_j)|0\rangle\|^2$, $a_j = \|\Pi_{1,2}(A_j)|0\rangle\|^2$. If $|\tilde{b}_j - b_j| \leq b_j/(3m)$ for all $1 \leq j \leq i$, then the running time $T_{\text{max}}(A_i)$ of algorithm $A_i$ is

$$T_{\text{max}}(A_i) \leq C \sqrt{m} \left(t_i + \frac{T_{\text{gen}}(U)}{\sqrt{1-p_{\text{rej},i}}} \right)$$

(2)

for some constant $C$, and

$$a_i \geq \left(1 - \frac{1}{3m}\right) \frac{1}{9m}$$

(3)

**Proof.** Assume that $|\tilde{b}_j - b_j| \leq b_j/(3m)$ for all $1 \leq j \leq i$. Observe first that the running time of $B_i$ is $T_{\text{max}}(B_i) = T_{\text{max}}(A_{i-1}) + (t_i - t_{i-1})$. Consequently, if $\tilde{b}_i > 1/(9m)$ then $T_{\text{max}}(A_i) = T_{\text{max}}(A_{i-1}) + (t_i - t_{i-1})$ and $a_i = b_i \geq \left(1 + \frac{1}{3m}\right)^{-1} \frac{1}{9m} \geq \left(1 - \frac{1}{3m}\right) \frac{1}{9m}$. Otherwise, according to Proposition B.2, the running time of $A_i$ is $T_{\text{max}}(A_i) = (2k+1)(T_{\text{max}}(A_{i-1}) + (t_i - t_{i-1}))$, where $1/(9m) \leq (2k+1)^2 \tilde{b}_i \leq 1/m$, and $a_i \geq \left(1 - \frac{(2k+1)^2}{3m} \tilde{b}_i\right) (2k+1)^2 \tilde{b}_i$. In particular, it implies $a_i \geq \left(1 - \frac{1}{3m}\right) \frac{1}{9m}$. Moreover, since $\tilde{b}_i \geq \left(1 - \frac{1}{3m}\right)b_i$, we
also have $a_i \geq (1 - \frac{1}{3m}^2(2k + 1)^2)b_i$. Consequently, $T_{\text{max}}(A_i) \leq (1 + \frac{1}{3m-1})\sqrt{\frac{a_i}{b_i}}(T_{\text{max}}(A_{i-1}) + (t_i - t_{i-1}))$.

Applying this result recursively, we obtain

$$T_{\text{max}}(A_i) \leq \left(1 + \frac{1}{3m-1}\right)^i \sum_{\ell=1}^i \left(\prod_{j=\ell}^{i} \frac{a_j}{b_j}\right)(t_\ell - t_{\ell-1})$$

$$= \left(1 + \frac{1}{3m-1}\right)^i \sum_{\ell=1}^i \frac{1 - p_{\text{ref},\leq \ell-1}}{1 - p_{\text{ref},\leq i}} \cdot (t_\ell - t_{\ell-1}) \quad \text{(by Equation 1)}$$

$$\leq C\sqrt{m} \sum_{\ell=1}^i \sqrt{1 - p_{\text{ref},\leq \ell-1}} \cdot (t_\ell - t_{\ell-1}) \quad \text{(since } 1 - p_{\text{ref},\leq \ell-1} = p_{\text{acc},\leq \ell-1} + p_{\text{stop}, > \ell-1})$$

$$\leq C\sqrt{m} \sum_{\ell=1}^i \sqrt{1 - p_{\text{stop}, > \ell-1}} \cdot (t_\ell - t_{\ell-1}) \quad \text{(by Equation 1)}$$

$$\leq C\sqrt{m} \left(t_i + \frac{1}{\sqrt{1 - p_{\text{ref},\leq i}}} \sum_{\ell=1}^i \sqrt{p_{\text{stop}, > \ell-1} \cdot t_\ell^2} \right) \quad \forall \ell \in \mathbb{R}^+ : \sqrt{1 + x} \leq 1 + \sqrt{x}$$

$$\leq C\sqrt{m} \left(t_i + \frac{T_{\text{stop}}(U)}{\sqrt{1 - p_{\text{ref},\leq i}}} \right) \quad \forall \ell \in [i] : \sqrt{p_{\text{stop}, > \ell-1} \cdot t_\ell^2} \leq T_{\text{stop}}(U))$$

We explain now how the $A_i$ and $B_i$ algorithms can be used to estimate the final probability $p_{\text{acc}}$. According to Equation 1, the probability $p_{\text{acc},\leq i}$ can be decomposed as

$$p_{\text{acc},\leq i} = b_1 \cdot \prod_{j=2}^{i-1} \frac{b_j}{a_j} \cdot \frac{b_{1,i-1}}{a_{1,i-1}} \quad \text{(4)}$$

where $b_{1,i-1} = \|\Pi B_i | 0 \|^2 = a_{1,i-1} \cdot \frac{p_{\text{acc},\leq i}}{1 - p_{\text{ref},\leq i-1}}$. We estimate separately all the probabilities involved in this equation, and multiply them to get an $\varepsilon$-approximation of $p_{\text{acc},\leq i}$. Next, we show that it suffices to choose $t_i = O\left(\frac{T_{\text{stop}}(U)}{\sqrt{p_{\text{acc}}}}\right)$ for $p_{\text{acc},\leq i}$ to be $\varepsilon$-close to $p_{\text{acc}}$.

**Input:** a variable-time algorithm $U = U_m \cdots U_1$, a step $i \in \{1, \ldots, m\}$, two reals $0 < \varepsilon, \delta < 1$.

**Output:** an estimate $\widetilde{p}_{\text{acc},\leq i}$ of $p_{\text{acc},\leq i}$.

1. For $j = 1, \ldots, i - 1$:
   a. Set $B_j = \text{Gen}_B\left(U, j, (\tilde{b}_k)_{1 \leq k \leq j-1}\right)$ and compute $\tilde{b}_j = \text{AmplEst}^*\left(B_j, \Pi_{1,2}, \varepsilon, \frac{\delta}{4m}, \frac{\delta}{2m}\right)$.
   b. Set $A_j = \text{Gen}_A\left(U, j, (\tilde{b}_k)_{1 \leq k \leq j}\right)$ and compute $\tilde{a}_j = \text{AmplEst}^*\left(A_j, \Pi_{1,2}, \varepsilon, \frac{\delta}{4m}, \frac{\delta}{2m}\right)$.
2. Set $B_i = \text{Gen}_B\left(U, i, (\tilde{b}_k)_{1 \leq k \leq j-1}\right)$ and compute $\tilde{b}_{i,1} = \text{AmplEst}^*\left(B_i, \Pi_{1,2}, \varepsilon, \frac{\delta}{4m}, \frac{\delta}{2m}\right)$.
3. Output $\tilde{b}_i = \Pi_{j=1}^{i-1} \frac{\tilde{b}_j}{a_{j-1}} \cdot \frac{\tilde{b}_{1,i-1}}{a_{1,i-1}}$.

**Algorithm 11:** estimation of $p_{\text{acc},\leq i}$.

**Proposition B.5.** With probability $1 - \delta$, Algorithm 11 outputs an estimate $\tilde{p}_{\text{acc},\leq i}$ satisfying $|\tilde{p}_{\text{acc},\leq i} - p_{\text{acc},\leq i}| \leq \varepsilon p_{\text{acc},\leq i}$ and runs in time $O\left(\frac{m^3}{\varepsilon} \sqrt{\frac{1 - p_{\text{ref},\leq i-1}}{p_{\text{acc},\leq i}}} \left(t_i + i \frac{T_{\text{stop}}(U)}{\sqrt{1 - p_{\text{ref},\leq i}}} \right) \log \left(\frac{m}{\delta}\right)\right)$.

**Proof.** Using Proposition B.1, together with a union bound over all the calls to AmplEst* in Algorithm 11, we can assume with probability $1 - \delta$ that (for all $j$) $\tilde{b}_j$ and $\tilde{b}_{i,1}$ are $\frac{\varepsilon}{4m}$-approximations of $b_j$ and $b_{i,1}$
respectively, and $a_j$ is an $\frac{\varepsilon}{6m}$-approximation of $a_j$ (which implies $\left| \frac{1}{a_j} - \frac{1}{a_{i}} \right| \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{4m} \cdot \frac{1}{a_j}$). Consequently,

$$
\tilde{b}_1 \cdot \prod_{j=2}^{n} \frac{b_j}{a_{j-1}} \geq \left( 1 - \frac{\varepsilon}{4m} \right)^{2i} \cdot \tilde{b}_1 \cdot \prod_{j=2}^{n} \frac{b_j}{a_{j-1}} \cdot \tilde{b}_1 \cdot \prod_{j=2}^{n} \frac{b_j}{a_{j-1}} \leq \left( 1 + \frac{4i}{4m} \right) \cdot p_{\text{acc}, \leq i} \leq (1 + \varepsilon) p_{\text{acc}, \leq i}
$$

where we used $1 + x \leq e^x$, and $e^{y} - 1 \leq 2y$ (for $y \in [0, 1]$). On the other hand,

$$
\tilde{b}_1 \cdot \prod_{j=2}^{n} \frac{b_j}{a_{j-1}} \geq \left( 1 - \frac{\varepsilon}{4m} \right)^{2i} \cdot \tilde{b}_1 \cdot \prod_{j=2}^{n} \frac{b_j}{a_{j-1}} \geq \left( 1 - \frac{2i}{4m} \varepsilon \right) \cdot p_{\text{acc}, \leq i} \geq (1 - \varepsilon) p_{\text{acc}, \leq i}
$$

where we used Bernoulli’s inequality. Thus, $|\tilde{p}_{\text{acc}, \leq i} - p_{\text{acc}, \leq i}| \leq \varepsilon |p_{\text{acc}, \leq i}|$.

We now analyse the running time of the algorithm. The same union bound as above gives that with probability $1 - \delta$, for all $j$,

- Step 1(a) runs in time $O\left( \frac{m}{\varepsilon \sqrt{b_j}} (T_{\text{max}}(A_{j-1}) + (t_j - t_{j-1})) \log(m / \delta) \right)$
- Step 1(b) runs in time $O\left( \frac{m}{\varepsilon \sqrt{b_{m}}} T_{\text{max}}(A_j) \log(m / \delta) \right)$
- Step 2 runs in time $O\left( \frac{m}{\varepsilon \sqrt{b_1}} (T_{\text{max}}(A_{j-1}) + (t_i - t_{i-1})) \log(m / \delta) \right)$

We can show $(T_{\text{max}}(A_{j-1}) + (t_j - t_{j-1})) = O\left( \sqrt{\frac{m}{\varepsilon}} \left( t_j + j \cdot \frac{T_{i}(U)}{\sqrt{1 - p_{\text{acc}, \leq i}}} \right) \right)$, by the same arguments as in the proof of Proposition B.4. Since $a_j = \Omega(1/m)$ (by Equation 3), the running time of Step 1, for each $j$, is $O\left( \frac{m^2}{\varepsilon} \sqrt{\frac{b_j}{b_{m}}} \left( t_j + j \cdot \frac{T_{i}(U)}{\sqrt{1 - p_{\text{acc}, \leq i}}} \right) \log \left( \frac{m}{\delta} \right) \right)$. Similarly, for Step 2, since $b_{i-1} = a_{i-1} \frac{p_{\text{acc}, \leq i}}{1 - p_{\text{acc}, \leq i}}$, the running time is $O\left( \frac{m^2}{\varepsilon} \sqrt{\frac{b_{m}}{b_1}} \left( t_i + i \cdot \frac{T_{i}(U)}{\sqrt{1 - p_{\text{acc}, \leq i}}} \right) \log \left( \frac{m}{\delta} \right) \right)$, which dominates the total running time of Step 1 (up to a factor $m^{1/2}$ since Step 1 is repeated $O(m)$ times).

We describe now the algorithm proving Theorem B.3. In the following, we make the technical assumption (also used in [5, 16]) that $U = U_m \cdots U_1$ has stopping times $t_j = 2^j$, for $j = 1, \ldots, m$ and $m = \log(T_{\text{max}}(U))$, and we assume that $U_m$ is the identity (so that $p_{\text{stop}, > m-1} = p_{\text{stop}, > m} = 0$).

**Input:** a variable-time algorithm $U = U_m \cdots U_1$ with stopping times $t_j = 2^j$ ($1 \leq j \leq m$), an integer $t$, a value $T_{i} \geq T_{i}(U)$, two reals $0 < \varepsilon, \delta < 1$.

**Output:** an estimate $\tilde{p}_{\text{acc}}$ of $p_{\text{acc}}$.

1. Set $i = \min \left( (m, 1 + \left\lceil \log(t \varepsilon^{-1/2} \cdot T_{i}(U)) \right\rceil \right)$ and $t' = 8D \frac{m^2}{\varepsilon} \left( t_{i} + i \cdot \frac{T_{i}(U)}{\sqrt{1 - p_{\text{acc}, \leq i}}} \right) \log \left( \frac{m}{\delta} \right)$, where $D$ is the constant hidden in the $O(\cdot)$ notation of Proposition B.5.
2. Run Algorithm 11 with input $U, i, \varepsilon / 2, \delta$ for at most $t'$ computation steps.
   (a) If the computation has not ended after $t'$ steps, stop it and output $\tilde{p}_{\text{acc}} = 0$.
   (b) Else, denote $\tilde{p}_{\text{acc}, \leq i}$ the result of Algorithm 11. If $\tilde{p}_{\text{acc}, \leq i} = 0$ or $t' < 1 / \sqrt{\tilde{p}_{\text{acc}, \leq i}}$ then output $\tilde{p}_{\text{acc}} = \tilde{p}_{\text{acc}, \leq i}$. Otherwise, output $\tilde{p}_{\text{acc}} = \tilde{p}_{\text{acc}, \leq i}$.

**Algorithm 12:** estimation of $p_{\text{acc}}$.

**Proof of Theorem B.3.** We show that Algorithm 12 satisfies the statements of Theorem B.3.

Assume first that $t \geq \frac{2}{\sqrt{p_{\text{acc}}}}$. Since $T_{i} \geq T_{i}(U) \geq \sqrt{p_{\text{stop}, > i} \cdot t_{i}^2}$ and $t_j = 2^j$ (for all $j$), by choosing $i = \min \left( (m, 1 + \left\lceil \log(t \varepsilon^{-1/2} \cdot T_{i}(U)) \right\rceil \right)$ we obtain $t_{i-1} \geq \min \left( \frac{t_{i}(U)}{\sqrt{(\varepsilon/4)_{p_{\text{acc}}}}}, \frac{T_{i}(U)}{2} \right)$ and $p_{\text{stop}, > i} \leq p_{\text{stop}, > i-1} \leq (\varepsilon/4) \cdot p_{\text{acc}}$. Consequently,

$$
1 - p_{\text{rej}, \leq i} \geq p_{\text{acc}} \geq p_{\text{acc}, \leq i} \geq p_{\text{acc}} - p_{\text{stop}, > i} \geq (1 - \varepsilon/4) p_{\text{acc}} \geq p_{\text{acc}} / 2
$$
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and
\[ 1 - p_{\text{rel}, \leq i - 1} \leq p_{\text{acc}} + p_{\text{stop}, > i - 1} \leq 2p_{\text{acc}} \]

It implies \( D_{\varepsilon} = \varepsilon \sqrt{\frac{1 - p_{\text{rel}, \leq i - 1}}{p_{\text{acc}, \leq i}^{\frac{1}{2}}}} \log \left( \frac{m}{\delta} \right) < t' \). Consequently, according to Proposition B.5, with probability \( 1 - \delta \), the computation at Step 2 ends before \( t' \) time steps have been done and the result \( \bar{p}_{\text{acc}, \leq i} \) satisfies \( |\bar{p}_{\text{acc}, \leq i} - p_{\text{acc}, \leq i}| \leq (\varepsilon/2) \cdot p_{\text{acc}, \leq i} \). Since we have also shown \( |p_{\text{acc}} - p_{\text{acc}, \leq i}| \leq (\varepsilon/4) \cdot p_{\text{acc}} \), it implies \( |\bar{p}_{\text{acc}, \leq i} - p_{\text{acc}}| \leq \varepsilon \cdot p_{\text{acc}} \) by a triangle inequality. In this case, we have \( 1/\sqrt{p_{\text{acc}, \leq i}} \leq 2/\sqrt{p_{\text{acc}}} \leq t \), and the algorithm outputs \( \bar{p}_{\text{acc}} = \bar{p}_{\text{acc}, \leq i} \).

Assume now that \( t < \frac{1}{\sqrt{p_{\text{acc}}}} \). According to Proposition B.5, the output \( \bar{p}_{\text{acc}, \leq i} \) of Algorithm 11 satisfies \( \bar{p}_{\text{acc}, \leq i} \leq (1 + \varepsilon/2)p_{\text{acc}, \leq i} \leq 2p_{\text{acc}} \), with probability \( 1 - \delta \). Since the output \( \bar{p}_{\text{acc}} \) of Algorithm 12 is either 0 or \( p_{\text{acc}, \leq i} \), it also satisfies \( \bar{p}_{\text{acc}} \leq 2 \cdot p_{\text{acc}} \), with probability \( 1 - \delta \). In this case, when \( t < \frac{1}{\sqrt{2p_{\text{acc}}}} \) and \( p_{\text{acc}, \leq i} \neq 0 \), we have \( t < \frac{1}{\sqrt{p_{\text{acc}, \leq i}}} \) and the final output is \( \bar{p}_{\text{acc}} = 0 \). \( \square \)

### C Making streaming algorithms reversible

Reversibility is an intrinsic property of quantum computing that we often used in this paper. It is known that any deterministic computation can be made reversible, and therefore implemented by a unitary map with a limited overhead on the time and space complexities [9]. Nonetheless, implementing the reverse computation of a streaming algorithm would require processing the same stream but in the reverse direction, which may not be always possible. This motivates our specific notion of **reversible streaming algorithms**.

We say that a streaming algorithm \( \mathcal{T} \) with memory size \( M \) is **reversible** if there exists a streaming algorithm \( \mathcal{T}^{-1} \) with memory size \( M \) such that each computational steps of \( \mathcal{T} \) and \( \mathcal{T}^{-1} \) are reversible, and in addition each pass of \( \mathcal{T} \) can be undone by one pass of \( \mathcal{T}^{-1} \).

Even if it is not clear how to make any streaming algorithm reversible, it is sufficient for our purpose to show how to achieve this condition when the streaming algorithm is a **linear sketch**.

**Definition C.1.** We say that a (one-pass) streaming algorithm \( \mathcal{T} \) is a linear sketch algorithm with memory \( M \), update time \( T_{\text{upd}} \) and reconstruction time \( T_{\text{rec}} \) if there exists a family \( \{L_{r}\}_{r \in \{0, 1\}^M} \) of linear functions \( L_{r} : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^M \), and two deterministic algorithms \( \mathcal{A}_{\text{upd}} \) and \( \mathcal{A}_{\text{rec}} \) running in time \( T_{\text{upd}} \) and \( T_{\text{rec}} \) (respectively) and space \( M \), such that \( \mathcal{T} \) behaves as follows:

1. Draw \( r \in \{0, 1\}^M \) uniformly at random and store it in memory. Initialize \( L = 0 \).
2. Given \( u_j = (i, \lambda) \), apply \( \mathcal{A}_{\text{upd}} \) on input \( r, u_j \) to compute \( L_r(\lambda e_i) \) and update \( L \leftarrow L + L_r(\lambda e_i) \).
3. At the end of the stream, apply \( \mathcal{A}_{\text{rec}} \) on input \( r, L \) to compute the output of the algorithm

Observe that, by linearity of \( L_r \), the value of \( L \) in Definition C.1 after the \( j \)-th item has been processed is \( L = L_r(x(j)) \). Linear sketch algorithms play an important role in the turnstile model, since they can implement essentially all streaming algorithms [43, 3]. Moreover, they are highly parallelizable, which facilitates their adaptation to the multi-pass model. In addition they can be made reversible as stated below. This property stems from the fact that the content of the memory, at any step of the computation, is unchanged under any permutation of the order of arrival of the updates received so far (because of the linearity of \( L_r \)).

**Proposition C.2.** For any linear sketch algorithm \( \mathcal{T} \) with parameters \( (M, T_{\text{upd}}, T_{\text{rec}}) \), there exists a reversible streaming algorithm \( \mathcal{R}(\mathcal{T}) \) with memory size \( O(M \cdot \log (T_{\text{upd}} \cdot T_{\text{rec}})) \) that computes the same output as \( \mathcal{T} \).

**Proof.** First we observe from [9] that any (non-streaming) classical algorithm \( \mathcal{A} \) can be turned into a reversible one \( \mathcal{R}(\mathcal{A}) \), such that \( \mathcal{R}(\mathcal{A}) \) computes the same output as \( \mathcal{A} \), performs \( T^2 \) computation steps and uses \( O(M \log T) \) memory cells.

We assume that the random seed \( r \in \{0, 1\}^M \) is pre-loaded in memory. Algorithm \( \mathcal{R}(\mathcal{T}) \) is implemented as follows. For each update \( u(j) = (i, \lambda) \), use algorithm \( \mathcal{R}(\mathcal{A}_{\text{upd}}) \) to compute reversibly \( L_r(\lambda e_i) \), copy the
result to \( L \leftarrow L + L_\phi(\lambda e_i) \), and undo the computation of \( L_\phi(\lambda e_i) \) with \( \mathcal{R}(A_{\text{upd}})^{-1} \). The reconstruction part is done using \( \mathcal{R}(A_{\text{rec}})^{-1} \).

The reverse algorithm \( \mathcal{R}(T)^{-1} \) uncomputes first the reconstruction part using \( \mathcal{R}(A_{\text{rec}})^{-1} \). Then, for each update \( u(j) = (i, \lambda) \), it computes \( L_\phi(\lambda e_i) \) with \( \mathcal{R}(A_{\text{upd}}) \), updates \( L \leftarrow L - L_\phi(\lambda e_i) \), and uncomputes \( L_\phi(\lambda e_i) \) using \( \mathcal{R}(A_{\text{upd}})^{-1} \).

\[ \square \]

D Graph parameters in the query model

We fix a few notations that are used in the next two sections.

**Notations D.1.** Let \( G = (V, E) \) be a graph, where \( V = [n] \) for some integer \( n \). For each vertex \( v \in V \), we let \( N_v \) equal the set of neighbor vertices to \( v \), \( E_v \) the set of edges adjacent to \( v \), and \( d_v = |N_v| = |E_v| \) the degree of \( v \). Similarly, \( T_v \) is the set of triangles adjacent to \( v \), and \( t_v = |T_v| \) its cardinality. We define the total order \( \prec \) on \( V = [n] \) where \( u \prec v \) if \( d_u < d_v \), or \( d_u = d_v \) and \( u < v \) (where \( < \) is the natural order on \( [n] \)). We let \( d_v^+ \) equal the number of neighbors \( w \) of \( v \) such that \( d_v < d_w \).

**Fact D.2.** For all vertex \( v \in V \), we have \( d_v^+ \leq \sqrt{2m} \).

**D.1 Approximating the number of edges**

We show how to approximate the number \( m \) of edges with \( \tilde{O}(n^{1/2}/(\epsilon m^{1/4})) \) quantum queries in expectation. We need the following estimator from Seshadhri [53].

\[
\text{Input:} \text{ query access to a graph } G = (V, E). \\
\text{Output:} \text{ an estimate of } m = |E|. \\
1. \text{ Sample } v \in V \text{ uniformly at random. Sample } w \in N_v \text{ uniformly at random.} \\
2. \text{ If } v \prec w, \text{ output } nd_v, \text{ else output } 0.
\]

**Estimator 13:** number \( m \) of edges in a graph \( G = (V, E) \) (from [53]).

**Proposition D.3.** If we denote \( X \) the output random variable of Estimator 13, then \( \mathbb{E}[X] = m \) and \( \mathbb{E}[X^2] \leq 2\sqrt{2nm^{3/2}} \).

**Proof.** On the one hand, \( \mathbb{E}[X] = n^{-1} \sum_v (d_v^+ / d_v) \cdot nd_v = \sum_v d_v^+ = m \). On the other hand, \( \mathbb{E}[X^2] = n \sum_v d_v^+ \cdot d_v \leq 2\sqrt{2nm^{3/2}} \), where we used Fact D.2. \( \square \)

We can now prove Theorem 4.4.

**Proof of Theorem 4.4.** We can implement Estimator 13 with a quantum sampler \( S \) that computes, in constant time,

\[
S(|0\rangle|0\rangle) = \sum_{v \in V} \sum_{w \in N_v} |v\rangle|w\rangle \lambda(v, w)
\]

where \( \lambda(v, w) = nd_v \) if \( v \prec w \), and \( \lambda(v, w) = 0 \) otherwise. According to Proposition D.3, we have \( \mu_S = m \) and \( \phi_S / \mu_S \leq 8^{1/4} n^{1/2} / m^{1/4} \). Consequently, using Theorem 3.9 with \( f : x \mapsto 8^{1/4} n^{1/2} / x^{1/4} \), \( L = 1 \), \( H = n^2 \) and \( \delta = 1/3 \), we can estimate \( m \) with approximation parameter \( \epsilon \), success probability 2/3 and expected number of quantum samples \( \tilde{O}(n^{1/2} / \epsilon m^{1/4}) \). \( \square \)

**Lower bound** We can obtain easily a nearly matching lower bound, by adapting to the quantum setting the classical result for edge counting given in [26, Section 4.1]. The proof is based on the property testing to communication complexity reduction method introduced by Blais et al. in [10] (the communication problem used in [26] is \textsc{Disjointness}). We refer the reader to [49, Section 2.3.3] for details on the quantum equivalent of this method.\(^4\) This argument leads directly to the statement of Theorem 4.5.

\(^4\)In [49], it is pointed out that the quantum equivalent of the Blais et al.’s method has the following drawback: the two players executing the quantum communication protocol have to exchange a superposition state over all the possible queries (whereas in
D.2 Approximating the number of triangles

We show how to approximate the number \( t \) of triangles with \( \tilde{O}\left(\frac{\sqrt{n}}{\varepsilon^{3/4}} + \frac{m^{3/4}}{\varepsilon t} \right) \) quantum queries in expectation. In order to keep this section concise, we describe an algorithm that computes a \((4/5 + \varepsilon)\)-approximation of \( t \), though it is possible to obtain an \( \varepsilon \)-approximation with similar ideas.

Our algorithm uses first as a subroutine an estimator from [23], that approximates the number \( n \) of triangles adjacent to a given vertex \( v \in V \). We implement it with a variable-time quantum sampler and apply Theorem 3.12 to estimate its mean.

\[ \text{Input: query access to a graph } G = (V, E), \text{ a vertex } v \in V. \]
\[ \text{Output: an estimate of } t_v/d_v. \]
1. Sample \( e \in E_v \) uniformly at random. Let \( w \) be the endpoint of \( e \) that is not \( v \). Let \( u \) be the smaller endpoint of \( e \) according to \( \prec \).
2. If \( d_u \leq \sqrt{2m} \), set \( r = 1 \) with probability \( d_u/\sqrt{2m} \); otherwise set \( r = \lfloor d_u/\sqrt{2m} \rfloor \).
3. For \( i = 1, \ldots, r \):
   a. Pick a neighbor \( x \) of \( u \) uniformly at random.
   b. If \( u \) and \( x \) form a triangle and \( w \prec x \), set \( X_i = \max(d_u, \sqrt{2m}) \). Else, set \( X_i = 0 \).
4. Output \( \frac{1}{r} \sum_{i=1}^{r} X_i \).

**Estimator 14:** ratio of the number of adjacent triangles \( t_v \) to the degree \( d_v \) of a vertex \( v \) (from [23]).

**Proposition D.4.** If we denote \( X \) the output random variable of Estimator 14, then \( \mathbb{E}[X] = t_v/d_v \) and \( \mathbb{V}[X] \leq 2\sqrt{2mt_v}/d_v \). Moreover, the \( \ell^2 \)-average running time of Estimator 14 is \( O(1) \).

**Proof.** For each edge \( e = (v, w) \), we denote \( t_{e,v} \) the number of triangles \((v, w, x)\) such that \( w \prec x \). It is clear that \( t_v = \sum_{e \in E_v} t_{e,v} \). Moreover, \( t_{e,v} \leq \sqrt{2m} \). Indeed, either \( d_w \leq \sqrt{2m} \) (and thus \( t_{e,v} \leq d_w \leq \sqrt{2m} \)), or \( d_w > \sqrt{2m} \) and in this case \( w \) cannot have more than \( \sqrt{2m} \) neighbors of degree at least \( \sqrt{2m} \), thus \( t_{e,v} \leq \sqrt{2m} \).

We compute first the mean of \( X \) conditioned on the edge \( e \) chosen at Step 1 and the value taken by \( d_u \).

\[ \mathbb{E}[X|e, du] = (du/\sqrt{2m}) \cdot (t_{e,v}/du) \cdot \sqrt{2m} = t_{e,v} \cdot \sqrt{2m}. \]

Consequently, \( \mathbb{E}[X] = \frac{1}{dt_v} \sum_{e \in E_v} \mathbb{E}[X|e] = t_v/d_v \).

We also have \( \mathbb{V}[X|e, du] \leq \frac{2\sqrt{2m}}{du} \cdot (t_{e,v}/du) \cdot \sqrt{2m} = t_{e,v} \cdot \sqrt{2m} \).

Consequently, \( \mathbb{V}[X] \leq \frac{1}{dt_v} \sum_{e \in E_v} \mathbb{V}[X|e] = \frac{2\sqrt{2m}}{du} \cdot (t_{e,v}/du) \cdot \sqrt{2m} = \frac{2\sqrt{2m}}{du} \cdot t_{e,v} \).

Finally, the \( \ell^2 \)-average running time of Step 3 is \( \frac{1}{dt_v} \sum_{e \in E_v} \frac{\min{(d_u, d_w)}}{\sqrt{2m}} \leq \frac{1}{dt_v} \sum_{e \in E_v} \frac{d_u}{\sqrt{2m}} \leq O(1) \). The other steps of the estimator run in constant time. \( \square \)

**Proposition D.5.** There exists a quantum algorithm that, given query access to any \( n \)-vertex graph \( G \) with \( m \) edges, a vertex \( v \) in \( V \), an integer \( L \), an approximation parameter \( \varepsilon < 1 \) and a failure parameter \( \delta < 2^{-1} \), outputs either an estimate \( t_v \) of the number \( t_v \) of triangles adjacent to \( v \) such that \( |t_v - t_v| \leq \varepsilon t_v \), or correctly declares that \( L \geq 2t_v \), with probability \( 1 - \delta \). The \( \ell^2 \)-average running time of this algorithm, including its number of queries, is \( \tilde{O}\left(\left(1 + \frac{m^{1/4}}{\varepsilon^{3/4}} \right) \cdot \log{(1/\delta)} \right) \).

**Proof.** It is straightforward to implement Estimator 14 with a quantum sampler \( S \), in a similar way as we did in the proof of Theorem 4.4. This sampler satisfies \( \mu_S = t_v/d_v \) and \( \phi_S/\mu_S \leq 1 + (8m)^{1/4} \sqrt{d_v}/t_v \), according to Proposition D.4. Moreover, it has \( \ell^2 \)-average running time \( T_{\ell^2}(S) = O(1) \). Consequently, using Theorem 3.12 with \( f : x \mapsto 1 + (cm)^{1/4} \sqrt{d_v}/x \) (for a small enough constant \( c \), \( L' = L/d_v \) and \( H = n^2 \), we obtain an
algorithm that either computes an \( \varepsilon \)-relative error approximate of \( t \varepsilon /d_v \), or correctly declares that \( t \varepsilon /d_v \geq 2L' \), with probability \( 1 - \delta \) and \( \ell_2 \)-average running time \( \tilde{O}\left( \left( 1 + \frac{m^{3/4} \sqrt{\ell}}{\varepsilon^2 \sqrt{\ell}} \right) \cdot \log(1/\delta) \right) \). \( \square \)

The remaining part of our algorithm diverts from the approach taken in [23], that requires to set-up a data structure for sampling edges uniformly in \( G \). This technique seems to be an obstacle for improving the term \( \mathcal{O}(m^{3/2}/t) \) in the complexity. We circumvent this problem by combining [23] with a bucketing approach from [22], that partitions the graph’s vertices into \( k + 1 = \mathcal{O}(\log n) \) buckets \( B_0, \ldots, B_k \), where

\[
B_i = \{ v \in V : t_v \in [(1 + c)^i - 1, (1 + c)^i] \}
\]

for a small value \( 0 < c < 1 \) to be chosen later. If we estimate the size \( b_i = |B_i| \) of each bucket, then we would obtain an approximation of \( \frac{1}{3} \sum_i |B_i| \cdot (1 + c)^i \in [t, (1 + c)t] \). We show first that the smallest sizes \( |B_i| \) can be discarded, at the cost of a certain factor in the approximation.

**Lemma D.6.** Let us denote \( I^+ \subseteq \{0, \ldots, k\} \) the set of indices \( i \) such that \( |B_i| \geq \frac{(a)^{1/3}}{k+1} \) and \( |B_i| \geq \frac{a}{(k+1)(1+c)^i} \). Then

\[
\frac{1 - 2c}{3} t \leq \frac{1}{3} \sum_{i \in I^+} |B_i| \cdot (1 + c)^i \leq (1 + c) t
\]

**Proof:** Define \( B(v) \) to be the bucket that \( v \in V \) belongs to, and let \( V_{bad,1} = \{ v \in V : |B(v)| < \frac{(a)^{1/3}}{k+1} \} \) and \( V_{bad,2} = \{ v \in V : |B(v)| < \frac{a}{(k+1)(1+c)^i} \} \). There are at most \( (ct)^{1/3} \) vertices in \( V_{bad,1} \). Consequently, at most \( ct \) triangles have their three endpoints in \( V_{bad,1} \). It implies \( \sum_{v \in V_{bad,1}} t_v < 3ct + 2(1-c)t \). On the other hand, we have \( \sum_{v \in V_{bad,2}} t_v \leq \sum_{i \in I^+} |B_i| \cdot (1 + c)^i < ct \). Consequently, \( \frac{1}{3} \sum_{i \in I^+} |B_i| \cdot (1 + c)^i \geq t - \frac{1}{3} \sum_{i \in I^+} |B_i| \cdot (1 + c)^i \geq t - \frac{1}{3} \sum_{v \in V_{bad,1} \cup V_{bad,2}} t_v > \frac{1}{3}(1 - 2c) t \). \( \square \)

We are now ready to state the main result of this section.

**Theorem D.7.** There exists a quantum algorithm that, given query access to any \( n \)-vertex graph \( G \) with \( m \) edges and an approximation parameter \( \varepsilon < 1 \), outputs an estimate \( \tilde{t} \) of the number of triangles of \( G \) such that \( |\tilde{t} - t| \leq (4/5 + \varepsilon) \cdot t \) with probability \( 2/3 \). The expected number of queries of the algorithm is \( \tilde{O}\left( \left( \frac{n \sqrt{m}}{\varepsilon \sqrt{\ell_n}} + \frac{m^{3/4}}{\sqrt{\ell_n}} \right) \cdot \text{poly}(1/\varepsilon) \right) \).

**Sketch of the proof.** We assume that \( I^+ \) is known, although \( t \) is part of its definition. It is not difficult to see that using a rough estimate \( \tilde{t} \) of \( t \) is enough. Moreover, one can observe that the output of the algorithm described below will likely be smaller than \( \tilde{t} \) when \( \tilde{t} > 20t \), and it will likely be larger than \( \tilde{t} \) when \( \tilde{t} < t/20 \). Thus, a sufficiently good definition of \( I^+ \) is obtained by doing a logarithmic search on \( \tilde{t} \) (starting with \( \tilde{t} = n^3 \)).

The general approach of the algorithm is to compute separately an estimate \( \tilde{t}_i \) of the size of each \( B_i \), for \( i \in I^+ \), and then to recombine them into \( \sum_{i \in I^+} \tilde{t}_i \cdot (1 + c)^i \). If we had access to an oracle that returns \( t_v \) for each \( v \in V \), then it would suffice to perform order of \( \sqrt{n/|B_i|} \) quantum queries for estimating \( |B_i| \). Instead, we use the algorithm of Proposition D.5 with threshold \( L = (1 + c)^i - 1 \) to decide if \( v \in B_i \). Since we cannot distinguish efficiently \( v \in B_i \) from \( v \in B_{i+1} \) when \( t_v \) is close to \( (1 + c)^i \), we are estimating a value between \( |B_i| \) and \( |B_{i-1}| + |B_i| + |B_{i+1}| \) instead. This adds a factor of \( (1 + c)^i + 1 + (1 + c)^i \leq 3 + c \) to the final approximation.

In more details, we assign \( v \in V \) to bucket \( B_i \) if the output \( t_v \) of the algorithm of Proposition D.5 with input \( v, L = (1 + c)^i - 1, \varepsilon' = c/2, \delta = \varepsilon / \text{poly}(n) \) satisfies \( t_v \in [(1 + c)^i - 1, (1 + c)^i] \). We apply this algorithm on a superposition over all vertices \( v \in V \) to obtain a quantum sampler \( S_t([0]\langle 0 \rangle) = n^{-1} \sum_{v \in V} |v\rangle |\psi_v\rangle |e_v\rangle \) over \( \Omega = \{ 0, 1 \} \), where |\( \psi_v \rangle \) is some garbage state, and |\( e_v \rangle \) is a one-qubit state that equals |\( 1 \rangle \) to indicate \( v \in B_i \), and |\( 0 \rangle \) otherwise. This sampler implements a Bernoulli distribution of mean \( \mu_S \in \)
[(1 - \varepsilon/8)|B_i|, (1 + \varepsilon/8)(3 + c)|B_i|] (the \varepsilon/8 error comes from the fact that the algorithm of Proposition D.5 has probability \delta = \varepsilon/poly(n) to fail).

According to Proposition D.5, the \ell_2-average running time to compute each \langle \psi_i, e_{\psi_i} \rangle is of the order of
\[ O\left(1 + \frac{m^{3/4}}{\varepsilon^2 \sqrt{(1+c)^{t-1}}} \right) \log \left(\frac{n}{\varepsilon}\right). \]
Thus, the \ell_2-average running time of \mathcal{S}_i is
\[ O\left(1 + \frac{m^{3/4}}{\varepsilon^2 \sqrt{n(1+c)^{t-1}}} \right) \log \left(\frac{n}{\varepsilon}\right). \]

We apply the algorithm of Theorem 3.11 on input \mathcal{S}_i, \Delta_{\mathcal{S}_i} = \sqrt{n/\max\left(\frac{(ct)^{1/3}}{k+1}, \frac{ct}{(k+1)(1+c)^t}\right)}, H = n, L = 1, T_{\ell_2} = O\left(1 + \frac{m^{3/4}}{\varepsilon^2 \sqrt{n(1+c)^{t-1}}} \right) \log \left(\frac{n}{\varepsilon}\right), \epsilon' = \varepsilon/8 \text{ and } \delta = O\left(1/\log(n)\right) \text{ to obtain an estimate}
\[ \tilde{b}_i \in \left[(1 - \varepsilon/8)^2 |B_i|, (1 + \varepsilon/8)^2 (3 + c)|B_i|\right], \]
in time
\[ O\left(1 + \frac{m^{3/4}}{\sqrt{n(1+c)^t}} \right) \cdot poly(1/\varepsilon)\]

Finally, we choose \( c = \varepsilon/4 \) to define the buckets’ width, which implies \( \frac{1}{3} \sum_{i \in I^+} |B_i| \cdot (1 + c)^t \in \left[\frac{1}{3}(1 - \varepsilon/2)t, (1 + \varepsilon/4)t\right] \) according to Lemma D.6, and \( \tilde{b}_i \in \left[(1 - \varepsilon/4)|B_i|, 3(1 + \varepsilon/4)|B_i|\right] \) with large probability. Thus, \( \frac{1}{3} \sum_{i \in I^+} \tilde{b}_i \cdot (1 + c)^t \in \left[\frac{1}{3}(1 - \varepsilon)t, 3(1 + \varepsilon)t\right] \). Consequently, for \( i = \frac{1}{3} \sum_{i \in I^+} \tilde{b}_i \cdot (1 + c)^t \), we have \( |i - t| \leq (4/5 + \varepsilon)t \) with large probability. \( \square \)

The approximation factor can be improved from \( (4/5 + \varepsilon) \) to \( \varepsilon \), by using a refined algorithm that combines techniques from [22] and [23]. The first main idea is to randomly perturbate the buckets’ boundaries (see [22, Section 3.3.1]) to ensure that few vertices are close to them (this removes the previous factor \( 3(1 + c) \) in the approximation). The second main idea is to modified the estimator used in Proposition D.5 to compensate the loss introduced by discarding the buckets outside of \( I^+ \). This leads to Theorem 4.6.

**Lower bound** A nearly matching lower bound is obtained with the same method as in Lemma 4.5, using the constructions given in Sections 4.1 and 4.3 of [26]. This leads to the statement of Theorem 4.7.