

Quantum supremacy and random circuits

Ramis Movassagh *

October 26, 2021

Abstract

As Moore’s law reaches its limits, quantum computers are emerging with the promise of dramatically outperforming classical computers. We have witnessed the advent of quantum processors with over 50 quantum bits (qubits), which are expected to be beyond the reach of classical simulation [AAB⁺19, HCC⁺20, DHKLP18]. Quantum supremacy is the event at which the old Extended Church-Turing Thesis is overturned: A quantum computer performs a task that is practically impossible for any classical (super)computer. The demonstration requires both a solid theoretical guarantee and an experimental realization. The lead candidate is Random Circuit Sampling (RCS), which is the task of sampling from the output distribution of random quantum circuits. Google recently announced a 53–qubit experimental demonstration of RCS [AAB⁺19]. Soon after, classical algorithms appeared that challenge the supremacy of random circuits by estimating their outputs [NLPD⁺20, GK20, HZN⁺20]. How hard is it to classically simulate the output of random quantum circuits?

We prove that estimating the output probabilities of random quantum circuits is formidably hard ($\#P$ -Hard) for any classical computer. This makes RCS the strongest candidate for demonstrating quantum supremacy relative to all other proposals. The robustness to the estimation error that we prove may serve as a new hardness criterion for the performance of classical algorithms. To achieve this, we introduce the Cayley path interpolation between any two gates of a quantum computation and convolve recent advances in quantum complexity and information with probability and random matrices. Furthermore, we apply algebraic geometry to generalize the well-known Berlekamp-Welch algorithm that is widely used in coding theory and cryptography. Our results imply that there is an exponential hardness barrier for the classical simulation of most quantum circuits.

1 Introduction

Quantum computation is the only model of computation that might solve certain computational tasks exponentially faster than any standard supercomputer. The excitement is compounded by the fact that the Moore’s law is reaching its limits and quantum phenomena are relevant if the chips are to be made smaller. First proposed by Richard Feynman for the

*IBM Research, Cambridge, MA 02142, U.S.A., Email: ramis@us.ibm.com

efficient simulation of (quantum) matter, quantum computing since has rapidly advanced with novel quantum algorithms and tantalizing prospects. Examples include exponential speed-ups for integer factorization [Sho99], solution of linear systems [HHL09], and algorithms based on quantum walks [Chi09]. From a theoretical standpoint, the exponential separation in the computational power of quantum computers would refute the Extended Church-Turing Thesis (ECTT), which asserts that a probabilistic Turing machine can efficiently simulate any realistic model of computation.

Given the state of affairs, we cannot unconditionally prove that quantum mechanics is hard to classically simulate without making plausible complexity theoretical assumptions (e.g., $P \neq NP$ or non-collapse of the polynomial hierarchy). These assumptions pre-date quantum computing and are believed to be valid foundational bases in computer science.

The algorithms such as factoring seem to require fault-tolerant quantum computation, which despite the current vigorous efforts is still a distant goal. However, “Noisy Intermediate Scale Quantum (NISQ)” [Pre18] computers have arrived with about 54 high fidelity quantum bits (qubits) [AAB⁺19, HCC⁺20]. Currently there is a large global interest with an unprecedented academic and industrial push (e.g., from IBM and Google) for developing these computers to scale up while keeping quantum coherence. Ultimately one hopes to have enough good qubits to reify quantum error correcting codes and perform fault-tolerant quantum computation. In the meantime, the central question in quantum computing is: In the absence of fault tolerance what can the quantum computers do? Recent progress shows a mild separation between classical and NISQ computers [BGK18, BGKT20] yet other work point out obstacles in variational algorithms designed for NISQ computers [BGM19, BKKT19]. A milestone is to prove a large separation between the power of NISQ computers and classical ones with minimal number of complexity theoretical assumptions. This event has been termed quantum supremacy [Pre18]: An event when a NISQ computer efficiently performs a computational task which would take a formidably long time (e.g., exponential in n) to perform on any classical computer. Although the task may not be of practical use, if demonstrated successfully, it would show that quantum computers indeed have awesome computational powers and, more fundamentally, that quantum mechanics is hard to simulate classically—whereby refuting ECTT.

The modern quantum supremacy proposals are based on sampling problems, which have the advantage that they need little extra assumptions and can now be performed experimentally on NISQ computers [AAB⁺19]. Aaronson showed that refutation of ECTT for sampling also refutes ECTT for search problems [Aar14]. The sampling task aims to show that outputting samples from a distribution that mimics the distribution of the quantum process (e.g., circuit) is classically very hard. Moreover, the hardness of sampling relies on complexity theoretical assumptions that pre-date quantum computing and do not appeal to quantum mechanics for their justification (see [HM17, LBR17] for reviews). The main assumption is the non-collapse of the polynomial hierarchy, which is stronger than $P \neq NP$ but is as plausible. This assumption is far less restrictive than those needed for justifying that, say integer factoring, is hard. The latter needs to assume that integer factoring is hard classically, which is not known. Indeed, because of these reasons Google focused on random circuit sampling (RCS) to experimentally demonstrate quantum supremacy [AAB⁺19].

But why random circuits? Complexity theoretical statements are *worst-case* statements. For example, if one says that a problem is NP –Hard it means that it is NP –Hard in

general, yet most instances may be easy. From an experimental perspective, such hardness statements imply that there exists circuits that are hard to simulate on a classical computer (unless $P = NP$), but how can one make experimental progress on this claim? What circuit to pick and how to verify hardness? What is needed is that the problem is not just hard for some instance rather it possesses *average-case hardness*. Average-case hardness is implied if most circuits are hard, which in turn implies that a random circuit is hard with high probability. Hence, if a random choice of the quantum circuit is implemented in the lab, then certified average-case hardness provides provable guarantees that the task is likely hard classically. And a (large) family of experiments can be performed that are hard to simulate classically. The caveat is that the average-case hardness is much stronger than worst-case; therefore till now it was only conjectured to be true in all quantum supremacy proposals.

The average-case hardness has been a long standing open conjecture. In this paper we prove that computing the output probabilities of most quantum circuits is $\#P$ -Hard¹, which implies average-case hardness of computing the probability amplitudes on a classical computer unless the polynomial hierarchy collapses. This indeed makes RCS the strongest candidate for the demonstration of quantum supremacy in the near-term quantum computing era as it provides strong complexity theoretical evidence for the hardness of sampling. We then prove that even approximating the probabilities to small additive errors is hard; this is referred to as robustness. The robustness we prove is fully quantifiable and can be benchmarked against the experiments and the performance of classical algorithms. These bounds on noise resilience for a grid of $\sqrt{n} \times \sqrt{n}$ qubits leads to hardness of computing probabilities to within the additive error of $2^{-O(n^3)}$ for circuit of depth \sqrt{n} , and $2^{-O(n^2)}$ for constant depth circuits. It is noteworthy that the very recent numerical algorithms for simulating general constant depth quantum circuits [NLPD⁺20, BGM19] take exponential time if the approximation error falls within our bounds. In particular, Napp *et al* numerically simulate random instances of a universal family of constant depth circuits to $2^{-O(n)}$ additive error [NLPD⁺20]. A recent paper from AliBaba group makes a similar claim for larger depth circuits such as those used in the Google experiment [HZN⁺20]. This challenges the quantum supremacy experiments as classical simulation of a random quantum circuit of depth \sqrt{n} to within $2^{-O(n)}$ additive error is supposed to imply hardness of sampling. Therefore, our result may serve as a new and provable quantum supremacy criterion, albeit a stringent one, for classical algorithms that simulate the output of a quantum circuit.

To accomplish this we provide an explicit and efficient construction of one-parameter family of unitary matrices (i.e., quantum gates) that interpolate between any two fixed unitaries by varying an interpolation parameter, θ , between zero and one. The path is based on the Cayley transformation which maps between hermitian and unitary matrices. Using random matrix and probability theories we prove that the distribution of each scrambled gate is arbitrarily close to the Haar measure with a total variation distance that vanishes with increasing n . One says that a quantum circuit is an instance of an average case circuit if its (local) computational gates enact random Haar unitaries. Therefore, our interpolation scheme may enable the study of transitions into quantum chaos or area-to-volume law en-

¹ $\#P$ is a generalization of NP that extends the decision problems to counting problems. Informally an NP-complete problem asks: Does a 3-SAT instance have a solution? The answer is no (i.e., zero solution) or yes (at least one solution). Whereas, $\#P$ asks: How many solutions does a 3-SAT instance have?

Supremacy proposals	Experimental Feasibility	Universal Computation	Anti-concentration	Worst-case Hardness	Exact Average-case Hardness	Near-exact Average-case hardness	Approximate Average-case hardness
BosonSampling				Yes	Yes	Yes	
IQP Circuit			Yes	Yes			
Random Circuits (RCS)	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes (this work)	Yes (this work)	

Table 1: Main supremacy proposals, where by “near-exact” vs. “approximate” we mean to within additive errors of $2^{-poly(n)}$ vs. $2^{-O(n)}/poly(n)$ respectively. See the main Theorem.

tanglement entropies in the study of black holes [HP07], and holographic models of quantum gravity [Tak18]. Lastly, we prove an extension of Berlekamp-Welch (BW) [WB86] algorithm that can efficiently interpolate rational functions (Alg. 1). The discovery of BW algorithm was originally motivated by classical error correction schemes such as the Reed-Solomon codes [RS60]. In these codes, the messages are encoded in the coefficients of polynomials over finite fields. BW is remarkable in that it exactly recovers such polynomials even if the evaluation of the polynomial at some number of points is erroneous. Our Alg. 1 extends the possibility of message encodings to more general classes of functions.

1.1 Previous work

The sampling-based quantum supremacy proposals originate from the seminal work of Aaronson and Arkhipov [AA11]. There are three main candidates for demonstrating quantum supremacy in the near term. These are BosonSampling [AA11], instantaneous model of quantum computation (known as IQP circuits) [BJS11, BMS16], and RCS [AAB⁺19, BIS⁺18, BFN⁺19]. RCS is the encompassing candidate because it relies on minimum number of complexity theoretical assumptions, it is amenable to experimental tests of larger size that outstretch the limit of classical simulations, and is the only one of the three that implements universal quantum computation. For example, in BosonSampling experiments, it is very hard to scale the number of the photons anywhere close to what is needed to demonstrate supremacy [NSC⁺17]. From a foundational vista, BosonSampling needs to make two complexity theoretical assumptions: 1. Multiplicative estimation of permanents of Gaussian random matrices is $\#P$ -Hard. 2. Anti-concentration conjecture holds, which assumes that the permanent of random gaussian matrices is not too concentrated near zero. The latter is crucial for arguing that the additive estimation of the permanent is equivalent to the multiplicative approximation. The IQP circuits have the added advantage that they can be implemented on quantum circuit hardware and require one main extra assumption, which is the average-case hardness. This assumes that the complexity of random IQP coincides with the most contrived (i.e., the worst-case hard instances) and is analogous to the first assumption in BosonSampling. As discussed above, assumption of average-case hardness is quite strong and requires a proof for its justification. Further, IQP circuits are restrictive models of computation because their gates are chosen from a small discrete set of possible gates. In fact, the circuits are essentially classical (diagonal in z -basis) except at the first and last layer of computation. This makes IQP circuits non-universal for quantum computation yet very interesting from a quantum complexity perspective.

RCS is based on random operations, which makes the underlying circuit universal and the most general instantiation of average-case computation. The average-case instances are minimally constrained and the local gates can enact any realization of $SU(2)$ or $SU(4)$. Moreover, rigorous anti-concentration bounds have been proved for RCS [HM18], which show that the output distribution is close to the uniform. This in turn implies that the signal to noise ratio of probabilities is relatively higher. We summarize the known key results for the main supremacy proposals in Table 1.

The only other theoretical result applicable to the hardness of RCS is the nice work of Bouland *et al* [BFNV19], which proves a hardness result of computing exact amplitudes of a *non-unitary* approximation of the actual circuit (see Subsection 4.3 and also Appendix A in [NLPD⁺20]). This requires a new complexity theoretical assumption, which is the existence of a classical algorithm that takes as inputs non-unitary “circuits” and efficiently produces the probability amplitudes. As shown in Subsection 4.3, the non-unitary oracles will not yield a realistic robustness on actual quantum circuits and hardware. The latter point was furthered emphasized in the work that followed ours [NLPD⁺20]. Moreover, due to the non-unitary approximation, the closeness to random unitary circuits was not proved.

This work gives an entirely new construction and proof of average-case hardness that is free of the previous limitations. It also proves quantifiable robustness bounds which can be compared with experiments and new classical algorithms that have challenged the claim. Because of this work, RCS now has the fewest assumptions and is the strongest candidate for demonstration of quantum supremacy. Our proof simply asserts that estimating the probability amplitudes, even on average (random quantum circuits), is $\#P$ -Hard for any classical supercomputer. For ECTT to be refuted (a watershed event), our stringent estimation bound needs to be weakened to $2^{-O(n)}$. However, the aforementioned recent numerical algorithms cast doubt on the possibility of this historical upset.

1.2 Cayley path and quantum supremacy

An n -qubit quantum computation initializes each of the qubits to the state $|0\rangle$, which makes the initial joint quantum state of the circuit $|0^n\rangle \equiv (1, 0, \dots, 0)^T$. The initial state is simply the 2^n dimensional standard basis vector. A quantum computation is simply the application of a unitary matrix to $|0^n\rangle$ (i.e., a rotation in the Hilbert space). The details of the unitary matrix are fixed by the quantum algorithm being implemented. This unitary is instantiated in the lab by a circuit C with some architecture \mathcal{A} (Fig. 1). The final state of the quantum computation is the vector $|\psi\rangle = C|0^n\rangle$, where for simplicity of notation C also denotes the 2^n dimensional unitary matrix that the circuit instantiates. The square of the absolute value of any entry of ψ is the probability of occurrence of that particular outcome upon measurement. Good quantum algorithms output the answers to the desired computational tasks with high probability and are more efficient than classical computers. The architecture \mathcal{A} serves as a blue-print that specifies the connectivity and interaction of the qubits in the course of the computation but is otherwise agnostic to the details of the computation. Constrained by the difficulties in the experiment, \mathcal{A} almost always allows for 1- or 2-qubit operations (depicted in Fig. 1). For details and proofs of what follows see Supplementary Material (SM).

Suppose $C = \mathcal{C}_m \mathcal{C}_{m-1} \cdots \mathcal{C}_1$ is a quantum circuit with an architecture \mathcal{A} acting on n qubits with m local unitary gates. Further, $\mathcal{C}_k \equiv C_k \otimes I$, which means that C_k enacts a




Figure 1: Left: The architecture \mathcal{A} is the blue print. Right: Circuit C with architecture \mathcal{A}

non-trivial 1- or 2-qubit operation and acts trivially on the rest of the qubits as dictated by the architecture \mathcal{A} (Fig. 1). By a random circuit we shall mean that each local unitary is drawn independently and uniformly at random from the set of all possible unitaries of the appropriate size (i.e., Haar measure). Once the m gates are picked at random one can sample from the output distribution of the circuit by running the circuit and measuring the outputs to obtain a string $x \in \{0, 1\}^n$ with the probability $p_x = |\langle x|C|0^n \rangle|^2$. This task is efficiently for a quantum computer as one simply runs the device and measures the output. Quantum supremacy claims that to draw strings from a distribution that mimics the probability distribution induced by the random circuit is computationally hard for any classical algorithm that takes as input the classical description of the gates.

If sampling from the output of the quantum computer were efficient then via a well-known algorithm due to Stockmeyer for approximate counting, one could efficiently estimate the probability amplitudes $p_x = |\langle x|C|0^n \rangle|^2$ to within a small relative error [Sto85]. That is calculate a quantity \tilde{p}_x such that $e^{-\epsilon} p_x \leq \tilde{p}_x \leq e^{\epsilon} p_x$ for small $\epsilon = O(1/\text{poly}(n))$. However, a more natural measure in sampling problems is estimations with respect to additive errors; that is $p_x \pm \epsilon$ [BG16, HM17]. An attractive feature of RCS is that the output “anti-concentrates” for circuits of depth $O(\sqrt{n})$ [HM18], which makes the two types of errors equivalent in the sense that $O(1/\text{poly}(n))$ relative error estimation implies an additive error estimation of $p_x \pm 2^{-n}/\text{poly}(n)$. Therefore, to refute ECTT it is sufficient to prove that estimating p_x for random circuits to $2^{-n}/\text{poly}(n)$ additive error is hard for any classical algorithm. Moreover, because of a property known as “hiding” [AA11] it is sufficient to prove the average-case $\#P$ -Hardness of

$$p_0 \equiv |\langle 0^n | C | 0^n \rangle|^2, \quad (1)$$

to inverse polynomial relative error.

It is known that there exists *worst* case quantum circuits with a specific architecture \mathcal{A} for which sampling is $\#P$ -Hard. In seminal works Terhal and DiVincenzo [TD04] proved the existence of such circuits for constant depth (four) circuits and Bremner *et al* proved it for IQP circuits with depth of \sqrt{n} [BMS16]. We also know that these worst-case instances are hard to within a constant relative error [DGGJ04]. The distribution over the circuits with




Figure 2: Schematics of the Cayley path on the unitary group induced by $C_k(\theta) \equiv C_k f(\theta h_k)$.

the same architecture and Haar local unitaries is denoted by \mathcal{H}_A . Can we mathematically make the $\#P$ -Hardness of the worst-case to average-case circuits with the same architecture equivalent? Suppose C_1, \dots, C_m are the gates of the worst case circuit with the architecture \mathcal{A} , and H_1, \dots, H_m are corresponding Haar random gates, where instead of each C_k in Fig. 1, one puts H_k . The latter is an average-case instance of \mathcal{H}_A . We propose a continuous path, that we call the Cayley path, which connects any two circuits of the same architecture. The Cayley function is defined by $f(x) = (1 + ix)/(1 - ix)$ where $i = \sqrt{-1}$, where one defines $f(-\infty) = -1$. This function maps any real x to a unique point on a unit circle in the complex plane (SM). Given a local gate H_k we can always write it as $H_k = f(h_k)$ where h_k is a Hermitian matrix and the Cayley function maps the real eigenvalues of h_k to the complex eigenvalues of the unitary matrix H_k ; the eigenvectors remain the same. We define a path parametrized by a real valued θ that interpolates between C_k and H_k and is a unitary for any θ (Fig. 2)

$$C_k(\theta) = C_k f(\theta h_k) \quad , \quad (2)$$

where we recall that each C_k, H_k is an $N \times N$ unitary matrix with $N \in \{2, 4\}$. Note that $C_k(0) = C_k$ is the gate of the worst-case instance and by the translation invariance of Haar measure $C(1) = C_k H_k$ is a random Haar unitary (i.e., an average-case instance). The entries of $C_k(\theta)$ are rational functions of degree (N, N) , i.e., the numerator and denominator are polynomials of degree N because of the algebraic form of the Cayley function (SM). Under the Cayley path the whole circuit which enacts a $2^n \times 2^n$ matrix transforms gate-by-gate as

$$C(\theta) = C_m(\theta) C_{m-1}(\theta) \cdots C_1(\theta) \quad ;$$

consequently each entries of $C(\theta)$ is a rational function of degree (mN, mN) . In Lemma (2) of SM we show that under Cayley path parametrization (Eq. (2)) the distribution over the circuits $C(\theta)$ for $|\theta - 1| \leq \Delta \ll 1$ is arbitrarily close to \mathcal{H}_A in total variation distance. This implies that the circuits are indeed generic instances of the average-case for $\theta \rightarrow 1$.




Figure 3: The worst- to average-case hardness reduction for a circuit with architecture \mathcal{A}

Since $\langle 0^n | C(\theta) | 0^n \rangle$ is the $(1, 1)$ entry of the matrix $C(\theta)$, the quantity of interest in Eq. (1) is a rational function of degree $(2mN, 2mN)$ in θ

$$p_0(\theta) \equiv |\langle 0^n | C(\theta) | 0^n \rangle|^2, \quad (3)$$

and our task is to prove under plausible complexity theoretical assumptions that approximating this quantity to small additive errors is #P-Hard for *any* classical algorithm.

We prove this by showing that if this task were efficient on a classical computer then it would violate the widely believed assumption of the non-collapse of the polynomial hierarchy (Fig. 3). Our main theorem is (see Theorems (1) and (2) in SM):

Theorem: Suppose there exists an architecture \mathcal{A} for which it is #P-Hard to compute arbitrary output probabilities to within a small multiplicative error, then it is #P-Hard to calculate the probability amplitudes for most random circuits with the same architecture \mathcal{A} to within $\epsilon = 2^{-\Omega(m^2)}$ additive error, where m is the number of gates.

The theorem states that it is hard to calculate the amplitudes for *most* circuits. Indeed a random circuit may accidentally coincide with the ‘worst-case’ circuit and such a scenario has to be excluded. More practically, the requirement that the algorithm is hard for most instances leads to beautiful connections with coding theory and algebraic geometry. In order to prove this statement, one first assumes that there exists a classical algorithm that efficiently computes $p_0(\theta)$ for $\theta \approx 1$ (i.e., average-case circuits), then by calling the algorithm on $\text{poly}(n)$ number of points θ_i , one can explicitly solve for the rational function that defines $p_0(\theta)$ for all θ . This would be easy to argue if the classical algorithm succeeded in outputting $p(\theta_i)$ on any input $\theta_i \approx 1$. But we can only assume that it succeeds on some inputs. A remarkable algorithm due to Berlekamp and Welch succeeds in explicitly specifying a polynomial if the rate of error (number of inputs on which the algorithm fails) is low enough [WB86]. The intuition behind the algorithm is that two polynomials with sufficient number of intersections must be the same polynomial. This is also true for more general algebraic curves as implied by Bezout’s theorem in algebraic geometry; we generalize BW

algorithm to rational functions and prove the following Algorithm (Alg. (2) in SM):

Algorithm 1. *Given $(\theta_1, f_1), (\theta_2, f_2), \dots, (\theta_n, f_n)$, output the rational function $F(\theta)$ of degree (k_1, k_2) by evaluating it at $n > k_1 + k_2 + 2t$ points despite t errors in the evaluation points.*

The standard BW algorithm is used for encoding messages in the coefficients of polynomials and allows for reliable transmission despite errors. Our algorithm generalizes this possibility to rational functions.

The second part of the theorem proves that not only p_0 is hard for classical computers but that the hardness is robust and even computing the approximation $p_0 \pm \epsilon$ is $\#P$ -Hard. Suppose the circuit has n qubits and has a two dimensional architecture on a $\sqrt{n} \times \sqrt{n}$ grid, which is the common current architecture with superconducting qubits (e.g., at IBM and Google). If the depth is a constant then the number of local gates is $m = O(n)$ and if the depth is $d = O(\sqrt{n})$ then $m = O(n^{3/2})$. For these we prove robustness with respect to additive errors of $\epsilon = 2^{-O(n^2)}$ for constant depth circuits, and $\epsilon = 2^{-O(n^3)}$ for Google's experiment whose depth is \sqrt{n} (SM).

As stated in the introduction, for constant depth circuits, classical numerical algorithms seem to exhibit a hardness phase transition with respect to the additive error. For example, it is seen that the classical algorithm finds it hard to provide an additive error approximations that we prove, yet seems to be able to efficiently simulate universal circuits for $\epsilon = 2^{-n}/\text{poly}(n)$ [NLPD⁺20]. For circuits with depth \sqrt{n} we proved hardness of estimating probabilities with respect to $2^{-O(n^3)}$ additive error, whereas AliBaba challenges the original supremacy proposal by claiming to simulate these circuits up to the error of $2^{-O(n)}$ [HZN⁺20]. Since in the near-term the number of qubits is approximately $n \sim 100$, the exact quantification might prove helpful in practice. If it does happen that deeper circuits are hard with respect to $2^{-n}/\text{poly}(n)$ additive error, then any theoretical guarantee would most likely need to use proof techniques that are not based on extrapolations of low degree algebraic functions. More research in this direction is needed to better chart the topography of the computation power of near-term quantum computers.

In this work we provided the strongest rigorous hardness results for quantum supremacy proposals to date applicable to the recent experimental breakthroughs [AAB⁺19]. In doing so we offer new tools for interpolating between circuits that may help elucidate the computational power of quantum circuits as a function of their architecture. Further, we provide an algorithm for rational function extrapolation that may be useful in fresh new contexts such as coding theory. Future work may include investigation of the optimality of our robustness bounds especially that the numerical algorithms seem to reach $2^{-O(n)}$ additive error. It would be interesting to (numerically) investigate the phase transition with respect to the additive error for deeper circuits (e.g., depth \sqrt{n}). Lastly, we envision the utility of Cayley path scrambling of the quantum circuits in the study of models of quantum gravity and other contexts such as in cryptography, circuit hiding, blind quantum computation, quantum computation by (extra)interpolation, and quantification of the power of quantum circuits as a function of their architecture.

We thank Sergey Bravyi, John Napp, Alex Dalzell, Sergio Boixo, and Jeffrey Schenker for discussions. We also thank Adam Bouland, Bill Fefferman, Yunchao Liu, and Karol Zyczkowski. I am grateful for the support of the Frontiers Foundation and the MIT-IBM collaborative grant.

References

- [AA11] Scott Aaronson and Alex Arkhipov. The computational complexity of linear optics. In *Proceedings of the forty-third annual ACM symposium on Theory of computing*, pages 333–342. ACM, 2011.
- [AAB⁺19] Frank Arute, Kunal Arya, Ryan Babbush, Dave Bacon, Joseph C Bardin, Rami Barends, Rupak Biswas, Sergio Boixo, Fernando GSL Brandao, David A Buell, et al. Quantum supremacy using a programmable superconducting processor. *Nature*, 574(7779):505–510, 2019.
- [Aar14] Scott Aaronson. The equivalence of sampling and searching. *Theory of Computing Systems*, 55(2):281–298, 2014.
- [BFNV19] Adam Bouland, Bill Fefferman, Chinmay Nirkhe, and Umesh Vazirani. On the complexity and verification of quantum random circuit sampling. *Nature Physics*, 15(2):159, 2019.
- [BG16] Sergey Bravyi and David Gosset. Improved classical simulation of quantum circuits dominated by clifford gates. *Physical review letters*, 116(25):250501, 2016.
- [BGK18] Sergey Bravyi, David Gosset, and Robert König. Quantum advantage with shallow circuits. *Science*, 362(6412):308–311, 2018.
- [BGKT20] Sergey Bravyi, David Gosset, Robert Koenig, and Marco Tomamichel. Quantum advantage with noisy shallow circuits. *Nature Physics*, pages 1–6, 2020.
- [BGM19] Sergey Bravyi, David Gosset, and Ramis Movassagh. Classical algorithms for quantum mean values. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1909.11485*, 2019.
- [BIS⁺18] Sergio Boixo, Sergei V Isakov, Vadim N Smelyanskiy, Ryan Babbush, Nan Ding, Zhang Jiang, Michael J Bremner, John M Martinis, and Hartmut Neven. Characterizing quantum supremacy in near-term devices. *Nature Physics*, 14(6):595, 2018.
- [BJS11] Michael J Bremner, Richard Jozsa, and Dan J Shepherd. Classical simulation of commuting quantum computations implies collapse of the polynomial hierarchy. In *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London A: Mathematical, Physical and Engineering Sciences*, volume 467, pages 459–472. The Royal Society, 2011.
- [BKKT19] Sergey Bravyi, Alexander Kliesch, Robert Koenig, and Eugene Tang. Obstacles to state preparation and variational optimization from symmetry protection. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1910.08980*, 2019.
- [BMS16] Michael J Bremner, Ashley Montanaro, and Dan J Shepherd. Achieving quantum supremacy with sparse and noisy commuting quantum computations. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1610.01808*, 2016.

- [Chi09] Andrew M Childs. Universal computation by quantum walk. *Physical review letters*, 102(18):180501, 2009.
- [CPS99] Jin-Yi Cai, Aduri Pavan, and D Sivakumar. On the hardness of permanent. In *Annual Symposium on Theoretical Aspects of Computer Science*, pages 90–99. Springer, 1999.
- [DGGJ04] Martin Dyer, Leslie Ann Goldberg, Catherine Greenhill, and Mark Jerrum. The relative complexity of approximate counting problems. *Algorithmica*, 38(3):471–500, 2004.
- [DHKLP18] Alexander M Dalzell, Aram W Harrow, Dax Enshan Koh, and Rolando L La Placa. How many qubits are needed for quantum computational supremacy? *arXiv preprint arXiv:1805.05224*, 2018.
- [GK20] Johnnie Gray and Stefanos Kourtis. Hyper-optimized tensor network contraction. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2002.01935*, 2020.
- [GS92] Peter Gemmell and Madhu Sudan. Highly resilient correctors for polynomials. *Information processing letters*, 43(4):169–174, 1992.
- [Haa33] Alfred Haar. Der massbegriff in der theorie der kontinuierlichen gruppen. *Annals of mathematics*, pages 147–169, 1933.
- [HCC⁺20] Wei-Jia Huang, Wei-Chen Chien, Chien-Hung Cho, Che-Chun Huang, Tsung-Wei Huang, and Ching-Ray Chang. Mermin’s inequalities of multiple qubits with orthogonal measurements on ibm q 53-qubit system. *Quantum Engineering*, page e45, 2020.
- [HHL09] Aram W Harrow, Avinatan Hassidim, and Seth Lloyd. Quantum algorithm for linear systems of equations. *Physical review letters*, 103(15):150502, 2009.
- [HM17] Aram W Harrow and Ashley Montanaro. Quantum computational supremacy. *Nature*, 549(7671):203, 2017.
- [HM18] Aram Harrow and Saeed Mehraban. Approximate unitary t -designs by short random quantum circuits using nearest-neighbor and long-range gates. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1809.06957*, 2018.
- [HP07] Patrick Hayden and John Preskill. Black holes as mirrors: quantum information in random subsystems. *Journal of High Energy Physics*, 2007(09):120, 2007.
- [HZN⁺20] Cupjin Huang, Fang Zhang, Michael Newman, Junjie Cai, Xun Gao, Zhengxiong Tian, Junyin Wu, Haihong Xu, Huanjun Yu, Bo Yuan, et al. Classical simulation of quantum supremacy circuits. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2005.06787*, 2020.
- [LBR17] AP Lund, Michael J Bremner, and TC Ralph. Quantum sampling problems, bosonsampling and quantum supremacy. *npj Quantum Information*, 3(1):15, 2017.

- [Mov18] Ramis Movassagh. Efficient unitary paths and quantum computational supremacy: A proof of average-case hardness of random circuit sampling. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1810.04681*, 2018.
- [NLPD⁺20] John Napp, Rolando L La Placa, Alexander M Dalzell, Fernando GSL Brandao, and Aram W Harrow. Efficient classical simulation of random shallow 2d quantum circuits. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2001.00021*, 2020.
- [NSC⁺17] Alex Neville, Chris Sparrow, Raphaël Clifford, Eric Johnston, Patrick M Birchall, Ashley Montanaro, and Anthony Laing. Classical boson sampling algorithms with superior performance to near-term experiments. *Nature Physics*, 13(12):1153–1157, 2017.
- [Pat92] Ramamohan Paturi. On the degree of polynomials that approximate symmetric boolean functions (preliminary version). In *Proceedings of the twenty-fourth annual ACM symposium on Theory of computing*, pages 468–474. ACM, 1992.
- [Pre18] John Preskill. Quantum computing in the nisq era and beyond. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1801.00862*, 2018.
- [Rak07] Evgenii A Rakhmanov. Bounds for polynomials with a unit discrete norm. *Annals of mathematics*, pages 55–88, 2007.
- [RS60] Irving S Reed and Gustave Solomon. Polynomial codes over certain finite fields. *Journal of the society for industrial and applied mathematics*, 8(2):300–304, 1960.
- [Sho99] Peter W Shor. Polynomial-time algorithms for prime factorization and discrete logarithms on a quantum computer. *SIAM review*, 41(2):303–332, 1999.
- [Sto85] Larry Stockmeyer. On approximation algorithms for # p. *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 14(4):849–861, 1985.
- [Tak18] Tadashi Takayanagi. Holographic spacetimes as quantum circuits of path-integrations. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1808.09072*, 2018.
- [TD04] Barbara M Terhal and David P DiVincenzo. Adaptive quantum computation, constant depth quantum circuits and arthur-merlin games. *Quant. Inf. Comp.*, 4(2):134–145, 2004.
- [WB86] Lloyd R Welch and Elwyn R Berlekamp. Error correction for algebraic block codes, December 30 1986. US Patent 4 633 470.
- [Wey64] Hermann Weyl. *Symétrie et mathématique moderne*. 1964.




Figure 4: Plot of the Cayley function in the complex plane (Eq. (4)). The arrow shows how the function fills the unit circle as x increases from $x = -\infty$. The non-uniform spacing is due to the finite step size in x and aggregation of points at infinity.

2 Algebraic unitary path

2.1 Cayley path

Let $\mathbb{U}(N)$ be the set of $N \times N$ unitary matrices and suppose $U_0 \in \mathbb{U}(N)$ and $U_1 \in \mathbb{U}(N)$. How can one build a parametrized path $U(\theta)$ between them such that $U(\theta) \in \mathbb{U}(N)$ for all $\theta \in [0, 1]$ and $U(0) = U_0$ and $U(1) = U_1$?

Previously we gave various paths between U_0 and U_1 that were everywhere contained in the unitary group [Mov18]. In particular, we gave a new rational function-valued path based on the QR-factorization [Mov18].

Here we consider a new extrapolation based on the Cayley transformation. Suppose $U_0, U_1 \in \mathbb{U}(N)$ are unitary matrices and define the unitary matrix $H \equiv U_0^\dagger U_1$. Let $x \in \mathbb{R}$ and $f(x)$ be the *Cayley function*

$$f(x) = \frac{1 + ix}{1 - ix} \quad (4)$$

where we define $f(-\infty) = -1$ (Fig. 4). Since $f(x)$ is a bijection between the real line and the unit circle, H has the unique representation

$$H = f(h), \quad h = h^\dagger \quad (5)$$

and it is easy to verify that $H^\dagger = f(-h)$.

We want an interpolation $U(\theta)$ such that $U(0) = U_0$ and $U(1) = U_1$ and entries of $U(\theta)$ are simple functions of θ that can be efficiently computed. Since h is Hermitian, we have

$$h = \sum_{\alpha=1}^N h_\alpha |\psi_\alpha\rangle \langle \psi_\alpha|,$$

where (h_α, ψ_α) are the eigenpairs of h . Since h is a normal matrix (in fact Hermitian) we can easily express the spectral decomposition of H as $H \equiv f(h) = \sum_{\alpha=1}^N f(h_\alpha) |\psi_\alpha\rangle \langle \psi_\alpha|$.

The proposed path is

$$U(\theta) = U_0 f(\theta h) = \sum_{\alpha=1}^N f(\theta h_\alpha) U_0 |\psi_\alpha\rangle\langle\psi_\alpha|. \quad (6)$$

$U(\theta)$ is a unitary matrix as it is a product of two unitary matrices. Note that $U(0) = U_0 f(0) = U_0$ and $U(1) = U_0 U_0^\dagger U_1 = U_1$ as desired. We now derive the algebraic dependence of the entries of $U(\theta)$ on θ .

Using the definition of the Cayley function and foregoing equation we write

$$U(\theta) = \frac{1}{q(\theta)} \sum_{\alpha=1}^N p_\alpha(\theta) (U_0 |\psi_\alpha\rangle\langle\psi_\alpha|), \quad (7)$$

where $U_0 |\psi_\alpha\rangle\langle\psi_\alpha|$ are matrices, and $q(\theta)$ and $p_\alpha(\theta)$ are the polynomials of degree N in θ :

$$q(\theta) = \prod_{\alpha=1}^N (1 - i\theta h_\alpha) \quad \text{and} \quad p_\alpha(\theta) = (1 + i\theta h_\alpha) \prod_{\beta \in [N] \setminus \alpha} (1 - i\theta h_\beta). \quad (8)$$

So far we took the end-points to be entirely general.

For the purposes of the proofs pertaining to quantum supremacy we adapt the above and define the Cayley path on each gate. Let C_k be a fixed gate of the worst-case circuit that enacts $N \times N$ unitary and let H_k be a random Haar gate of the same size. By the translation-invariance of the Haar measure $C_k H_k$ is also a random Haar gate. We define the Cayley path for each of the gate of the quantum computation by (see Eq. (2) in manuscript)

$$C_k(\theta) = C_k f(\theta h_k) \quad (9)$$

where $H_k = f(h_k)$ and $h_k^\dagger = h_k$. Note that $C_k(0) = C_k$ and $C_k(1) = C_k H_k$ is a random gate.

In the above equation we make the dependence on k explicit and denote $p_\alpha(\theta) \mapsto p_{k,\alpha}(\theta)$ and $q(\theta) \mapsto q_k(\theta)$. Using the spectral decomposition we write $h_k = \sum_{\alpha=1}^N h_{k,\alpha} |\psi_{k,\alpha}\rangle\langle\psi_{k,\alpha}|$ where $h_{k,\alpha}$ and $|\psi_{k,\alpha}\rangle$ are the eigenvalues and eigenvectors of h_k . We can now express Eq. (9) (Eq. (2) of the manuscript) as $C_k(\theta) = q_k^{-1}(\theta) \sum_{\alpha=1}^N p_{k,\alpha}(\theta) C_k |\psi_{k,\alpha}\rangle\langle\psi_{k,\alpha}|$ where $q_k(\theta) = \prod_{\alpha=1}^N (1 - i\theta h_{k,\alpha})$ and $p_{k,\alpha}(\theta) = (1 + i\theta h_{k,\alpha}) \prod_{\beta \in [N] \setminus \alpha} (1 - i\theta h_{k,\beta})$.

These are simply polynomials of degree N that only depend on θ and H .

Remark 1. In Section 4, we think of N as the size of a local gate, which is $N = 2$ or $N = 4$. The entries of $C_k(\theta)$ are rational functions of degree (N, N) . However, for a given θ and H , the normalization $q_k(\theta)$ is easy to classically compute. It amounts to a diagonalization of an $N \times N$ matrix H and an N -fold product of the complex numbers $(1 - i\theta h_\beta)$. Since $N \leq 4$, this is done in $O(1)$ time. For a general circuit made up of m gates, the classical computational complexity of calculating all $q_k(\theta)$'s is therefore $O(m)$. By precomputing them all and multiplying through, Eq. (1) is effectively polynomial-valued and can be treated formally as such. This will be made precise below and $\prod_k q_k(\theta)$ will be bounded to guarantee non-divergence of the rational functions.

We now turn to the issue of uniquely determining a rational function by efficient sampling.

2.2 Berlekamp-Welch for rational functions

Lemma 1. *Any rational function of degree (k_1, k_2) in one variable θ has the general form*

$$F(\theta) = \frac{a_{k_1}\theta^{k_1} + a_{k_1-1}\theta^{k_1-1} + \dots + a_0}{b_{k_2}\theta^{k_2} + b_{k_2-1}\theta^{k_2-1} + \dots + b_0}$$

and is uniquely determined by $k_1 + k_2 + 1$ points provided that $F(\theta_i) = f_i < \infty$ for $i \in [k_1 + k_2 + 1]$ are independent conditions.

Proof. Since a rational function is determined up to a constant multiple of numerator and denominator, we can factor out a_{k_1}/b_{k_2} , whereby the number of unknown coefficients are $k_1 + k_2 + 1$. By multiplying both sides by the denominator and then evaluating $F(\theta)$ at $k_1 + k_2 + 1$ points $F(\theta_i) = f_i$, the coefficients become the solution of the linear system of equations in $(k_1 + k_2 + 1)$ variables. Given that the f_i are independent, the coefficients are uniquely determined (unique point of intersection of hyperplanes). Lastly, $f_i < \infty$ is to emphasize that we discard any θ_i that is a root of the denominator; such θ 's are of measure zero anyway. \square

In coding theory, and especially in Reed-Solomon codes [RS60], the messages a_0, \dots, a_k may be encoded into a polynomial $a_0 + a_1\theta + \dots + a_k\theta^k$, which then is evaluated at $n > k + t + 1$ points. Then, the decoding procedure recovers the polynomial and hence the message exactly despite t errors. The decoding procedure relies on BW algorithm for polynomial interpolation [WB86, GS92]. BW can be extended to interpolate rational functions. The proof follows Sudan's and is a generalization of it from polynomial to rational functions [GS92].

Definition 1. (*Error polynomial*) Suppose $f = (f_1, \dots, f_n)$ is a vector. Let $F(\theta)$ be a rational function of degree (k_1, k_2) . We define the error polynomial $E(\theta)$ as one that satisfies

$$E(\theta_i) = 0 \quad \text{if} \quad F(\theta_i) \neq f_i, \quad \deg(E(\theta)) \leq t.$$

Algorithm 2. (*Berlekamp-Welch for Rational Functions*) Given $(\theta_1, f_1), (\theta_2, f_2), \dots, (\theta_n, f_n)$, find a rational function $F(\theta)$ of degree (k_1, k_2) exactly by evaluating it at $n > k_1 + k_2 + 2t$ points despite t errors in the evaluation points:

$$|\{i \in [n] \mid F(\theta_i) \neq f_i\}| \leq t.$$

Proof. The error polynomial by Definition 1 satisfies

$$E(\theta_i)F(\theta_i) = E(\theta_i)f_i. \tag{10}$$

Let $W(\theta_i) \equiv E(\theta_i)f_i$, which implies that $f_i = W(\theta_i)/E(\theta_i)$. Since $W(\theta) = E(\theta)F(\theta)$ is a $(k_1 + t, k_2)$ rational function, by Eq. (10), f_i is a $(k_1 + t, k_2 + t)$ rational function of θ . By Lemma 1, the linear system defined by Eq. (10), has a solution as long as $n > k_1 + k_2 + 2t$. If $W(\theta)/E(\theta)$ results in a rational function of degree (k_1, k_2) we are done and we simply output it as $F(\theta)$, otherwise we decide that there were too many errors.

Can the algorithm find distinct $(E_1(\theta), W_1(\theta))$ and $(E_2(\theta), W_2(\theta))$? We now show that $W_1(\theta)/E_1(\theta)$ and $W_2(\theta)/E_2(\theta)$ are equal, which means that $F(\theta)$ is learned uniquely even if there are multiple solutions. We have

$$\frac{W_1(\theta)}{E_1(\theta)} = \frac{W_2(\theta)}{E_2(\theta)} \iff E_1(\theta)W_2(\theta) = E_2(\theta)W_1(\theta).$$

Recall that both sides are bounded degree rational functions (of degree $(k_1 + 2t, k_2)$). So by evaluating them at enough points we can determine them uniquely (Lemma 1). Since at every θ_i

$$E_1(\theta_i)f_i = W_1(\theta_i), \quad E_2(\theta_i)f_i = W_2(\theta_i),$$

solving for f_i , we have $E_1(\theta_i)W_2(\theta_i)f_i = f_iE_2(\theta_i)W_1(\theta_i)$ at every θ_i . If $f_i = 0$, then by Eq. (10) $W(\theta_i) = 0$, otherwise we just cancel the f_i . This proves the claim that $F(\theta) = E_1(\theta)/W_1(\theta) = E_2(\theta)/W_2(\theta)$. Since $n > k_1 + k_2 + 2t$, we are guaranteed to have enough points. \square

Remark 2. Here we gave an algorithm in which the number of errors $t < (n - k_1 - k_2)/2$. As in standard BW algorithm, it is entirely possible to find algorithms that can handle more errors. The above is sufficient for our purposes so we leave such refinements for future work.

3 Total variation distance from the Haar measure

In this section, after introducing the Haar measure, in Lemma 2 we will prove that if $H = f(h)$ is a finite dimensional matrix drawn from the Haar measure, then $Cf(\theta h)$ is Δ -close in total variational distance (TVD) to the Haar measure for $|1 - \theta| \leq \Delta \ll 1$. This lemma then will directly apply to each gate $C_k(\theta)$ and will be shown to prove $O(m\Delta)$ TVD of the full circuit $C(\theta)$ from \mathcal{H}_A .

Recall that $\mathbb{O}(N)$, and $\mathbb{U}(N)$ denote the set of orthogonal and unitary matrices respectively [Mov18]. The entries of these matrices are real ($\beta = 1$), and complex ($\beta = 2$) respectively. In the special case that the determinant is equal to one, these are denoted by $\mathbb{SO}(N)$ and $\mathbb{SU}(N)$. If G is any one of the matrix groups, then a *uniform random element* of G is a matrix $V \in G$ whose distribution is *translation invariant*, which is called the Haar measure. This means that for any fixed $M \in G$,

$$VM \stackrel{d}{=} MV \stackrel{d}{=} V,$$

where $\stackrel{d}{=}$ is equality in the distribution sense. We have the well-known theorem of Haar:

Theorem. (Haar [Haa33]) Let G be any of $\mathbb{O}(N)$, $\mathbb{SO}(N)$, $\mathbb{U}(N)$ or $\mathbb{SU}(N)$. Then there is a unique translation-invariant probability measure on G .

Since H_k is independent of C_k , this Theorem implies that $C_k H_k$ is also Haar if H_k is. So below we can focus on the distribution of $f(\theta h)$ as compared with Haar. Recall that the Cayley function and its inverse are

$$f(x) = \frac{1 + ix}{1 - ix} \quad ; \quad f^{-1}(x) = i \frac{1 - x}{1 + x} \quad ,$$

where $f(-\infty) = -1$. We wish to calculate the TVD between the Haar distribution induced by the unitary matrix $f(h)$ where as before we have that $h = h^\dagger$, and the distribution induced by $f(\theta h)$ with $\theta \ll 1$. In practice θ is taken to be smaller than any constant $\theta = o(1)$.

We proceed by spectral decomposition of the unitary matrix H ,

$$H = f(h) = \sum_{\alpha=1}^N e^{ir_\alpha} |\psi_\alpha\rangle\langle\psi_\alpha| \quad ,$$

where we identified the eigenvalues $f(h_\alpha)$ on the unit circle with the phases e^{ir_α} with $r_\alpha \in [-\pi, \pi)$. Solving $h_\alpha = f^{-1}(e^{ir_\alpha})$ we find that $h_\alpha = \tan(r_\alpha/2)$; as expected the eigenvalues h_α that tend towards infinity in magnitude correspond to phases r_α near $\pm\pi$.

Similarly, define the eigenvalues of $f(\theta h)$ to be the phases $e^{i\nu_\alpha}$, and we have

$$f(\theta h) = \sum_{\alpha=1}^N f(\theta h_\alpha) |\psi_\alpha\rangle\langle\psi_\alpha| \equiv \sum_{\alpha=1}^N e^{i\nu_\alpha} |\psi_\alpha\rangle\langle\psi_\alpha| \quad .$$

We solve $\theta h_\alpha = f^{-1}(e^{i\nu_\alpha}) = \tan(\nu_\alpha/2)$ for ν_α to find

$$\nu_\alpha(r_\alpha) = 2 \arctan(\theta \tan(r_\alpha/2)) \quad . \quad (11)$$

Comment: At $\theta = 0$ all $e^{i\nu_\alpha} = 1$, which corresponds to $Cf(0) = CI = C$, and at $\theta = 1$ we have $e^{i\nu_\alpha} = e^{ir_\alpha}$, which corresponds to $Cf(h) = CH$ which is Haar distributed by the above Theorem.

Total variation distance (TVD) between the continuous probability distributions μ and ρ is

$$\|\mu - \nu\|_{\text{TVD}} \equiv \frac{1}{2} \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} dx_1 \cdots \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} dx_N |\mu(\mathbf{x}) - \rho(\mathbf{x})| \quad , \quad (12)$$

The key lemma is:

Lemma 2. *If $H = f(h)$ is a unitary matrix distributed according to the Haar measure, then the distribution over unitaries $f(\theta h)$ for $|1 - \theta| \leq \Delta \ll 1$ is $O(\Delta)$ -close to Haar in total variation distance.*

Proof. Denoting by $\mathbf{r} = (r_1, \dots, r_N)$, the distribution over the eigenvalues of $H = f(h)$ is given by Weyl's seminar work [Wey64],

$$d\mu(\mathbf{r}) = \frac{(N!)^{-1}}{(2\pi)^N} \prod_{\alpha < \beta} |e^{ir_\alpha} - e^{ir_\beta}|^2 dr_1 dr_2 \cdots dr_N \quad (13)$$

The distribution induced by $f(\theta h)$ is obtained by the change of variables $r_\alpha \mapsto \nu_\alpha$ (see Eq. (11)). The corresponding distribution over $\boldsymbol{\nu}$ is denoted by $\rho(\boldsymbol{\nu})$, whose density is

$$d\rho(\boldsymbol{\nu}) = \frac{(N!)^{-1}}{(2\pi)^N} \prod_{\alpha < \beta} |e^{ir_\alpha(\nu_\alpha)} - e^{ir_\beta(\nu_\beta)}|^2 |\det J(\boldsymbol{\nu})| d\nu_1 d\nu_2 \cdots d\nu_N \quad (14)$$

where $J(\boldsymbol{\nu})$ is the Jacobian of the matrix of transformation. Since the change of variables $\nu_\alpha = 2 \arctan(\theta \tan(r_\alpha/2))$ results in a diagonal Jacobian matrix $J = \text{diag}(J_1, \dots, J_N)$, we have

$$|\det J(\boldsymbol{\nu})| = \prod_{\alpha=1}^N \left| \frac{\partial r_\alpha(\nu_\alpha)}{\partial \nu_\alpha} \right| = \prod_{\alpha=1}^N \frac{1 + \theta^2 + \cos(r_\alpha)(1 - \theta^2)}{2\theta}$$

Jacobian is a local property and for $\theta \approx 1$ it is very well-behaved. Let $\Delta \ll 1$ and the condition $|1 - \theta| \leq \Delta$ means $1 - \Delta \leq \theta \leq 1 + \Delta$. The upper-bound on the Jacobian of transformation is (since N is a constant)

$$|\det J(\boldsymbol{\nu})| \leq \prod_{\alpha \in [N]} \frac{1 + \Delta(1 + \cos(r_\alpha))}{1 - \Delta} = 1 + O(\Delta).$$

Near $\theta = 1$ we can let $\theta = 1 + \delta$ where $|\delta| \leq \Delta$ and we have $\nu_\alpha(r_\alpha) = 2 \arctan(\theta \tan(r_\alpha/2)) = r_\alpha + \delta \sin(r_\alpha) + O(\delta^2)$. Therefore,

$$|e^{ir_\alpha(\nu_\alpha)} - e^{ir_\beta(\nu_\beta)}|^2 \approx |e^{ir_\alpha} - e^{ir_\beta}|^2 + O(\Delta).$$

This along with the bound on Jacobian proves the claim $\|\mu - \nu\|_{\text{TVD}} = O(\Delta)$. \square

4 Average-case hardness of Random Circuit Sampling

We now turn our attention to the quantum complexity theory and the application of the above for proving the hardness of sampling from the output distribution of generic quantum circuits. Theorems 1 and 2 together will prove the main theorem in the manuscript.

One can make formal the definition of a circuit architecture \mathcal{A} (e.g., [NLPD⁺20]), however, it simply means the location and layout of the circuit before specifying the actual local unitaries (Fig. 1). The architecture specifies on which qubit(s) each C_k applies and specifies the temporal order of the application of the gates. The quantum circuit is then denoted by $C_{\mathcal{A}}$, which for notational simplicity we denote by C .

One says that the circuit C is *generic* with respect to the architecture \mathcal{A} if the local unitaries C_k are drawn independently from the Haar measure.

4.1 Formal results for the exact average-case hardness

For any circuit C , one can insert a complete set of basis between each C_k and C_{k+1} and represent the circuit in what is at times called ‘‘Feynman path integral’’ form. The amplitude corresponding to the initial state $|y_0\rangle$ and final state $|y_m\rangle$ is

$$\langle y_m | C | y_0 \rangle = \sum_{y_1, y_2, \dots, y_{m-1} \in \{0,1\}^n} \langle y_m | \mathcal{C}_m | y_{m-1} \rangle \langle y_{m-1} | \mathcal{C}_{m-1} | y_{m-2} \rangle \cdots \langle y_1 | \mathcal{C}_1 | y_0 \rangle. \quad (15)$$

Definition 2. (*Haar random circuit distribution*) Let \mathcal{A} be an architecture over circuits and let $\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{A}}$ be the distribution over circuits in \mathcal{A} whose local gates, denoted by H_k , are independently drawn from the Haar measure.

The random circuit sampling is then the following task:

Definition 3. (*Random Circuit Sampling (RCS)*) Given an architecture \mathcal{A} , the description of a circuit $C \in \mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{A}}$, and parameters $\epsilon > 0$ and $\delta > 0$, sample from the output probability distribution induced by C with probability $1 - \delta$ over the choice of C . That is draw $y \in \{0, 1\}^n$ with probability $\Pr(y) = |\langle y|C|0 \rangle|^2$ up to a total variation distance ϵ in time $\text{poly}(n, 1/\epsilon)$.

In RCS one seeks estimations of $|\langle y|C|0^n \rangle|^2$ but any bit string $|y\rangle$ is obtained by applying Pauli X matrices to positions in $|0^n\rangle$ that correspond to 1's. By the so called 'hiding property' [AA11], which guarantees an equality of probabilities, it is *sufficient* to prove the hardness of computing

$$p_0(C) \equiv |\langle 0^n|C|0^n \rangle|^2. \quad (16)$$

As stated in the manuscript, there exist local quantum circuits with n qubits whose probability amplitudes are $\#P$ -Hard to estimate to within $1/\text{poly}(n)$ multiplicative error [BJS11, BJS11, TD04]. The specification of the worst-case circuits is not relevant for our purposes, we make use of their existence only. The task is to extend this hardness to generic circuits with the same architecture.

Informally, the quantum supremacy conjecture in the context of RCS states: Approximating most amplitudes to $O(2^{-n}/\text{poly}(n))$ additive error is a $\#P$ -Hard problem for most quantum circuits. Formally, it reads

Conjecture 1. (*Quantum Supremacy Conjecture [AA11]*) There is no classical randomized algorithm that performs RCS in time $\text{poly}(n, \epsilon^{-1})$ where ϵ is the total variation distance error.

The informal and the formal definition are related via a celebrated algorithm of Stockmeyer for approximate counting. Suppose sampling was efficient on a classical computer, then we could use Stockmeyer's algorithm to approximate the amplitudes to $1/\text{poly}(n)$ multiplicative error. This would collapse the polynomial hierarchy to the third level. This is a contradiction if we assume that the PH does not collapse. Since the probability amplitudes anti-concentrate for random circuits, the expectation value of an amplitude is 2^{-n} and the $1/\text{poly}(n)$ multiplicative error is equivalent to $2^{-n}/\text{poly}(n)$ additive error. The contrapositive to this logic is that: Assuming polynomial Hierarchy does not collapse to the third level, then proving hardness (indeed $\#P$ -Hardness) of approximating the probability amplitudes of the random circuits to $2^{-n}/\text{poly}(n)$ additive error implies that sampling is inefficient (i.e., hard) for any classical computer.

Definition 4. (*θ -deformed Haar towards C*) Let \mathcal{A} be the architecture of the worst case circuit $C = C_m C_{m-1} \cdots C_2 C_1$. Let $\theta \in [0, 1]$ and define by $C(\theta) = C_m(\theta) C_{m-1}(\theta) \cdots C_2(\theta) C_1(\theta)$, where by Eq. (2) we have $C_k(\theta) = C_k(\theta) \otimes \mathbb{I}$ and $C_k(\theta) \equiv C_k f(\theta h_k)$. This path is unitary for all θ as depicted in Fig. 4. Further, each $f(h_k) = H_k$ is a (local) unitary drawn independently from the Haar measure and C_k is the local unitary of the worst case circuit (i.e., $C_k = C_k \otimes \mathbb{I}$). We define by $\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{A}, C, \theta}$ the distribution over $C(\theta)$.

By the translation invariance property of the Haar measure (Section 3), $C_k(1)$ implements a local unitary from the Haar measure. Therefore, the distribution over $C(1)$ coincides with $\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{A}}$, and $C_k(0) = C_k = C_k \otimes \mathbb{I}$, which is the fixed k^{th} gate of the worst-case circuit C . In summary, $C(\theta) \in \mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{A}, C, \theta}$ with extremes (See Fig. 5):




Figure 5: Schematics of Definition 4: The scrambling of the circuit C to $C(\theta)$.

$$\begin{aligned} \theta = 0 & : C_k(0) \quad \forall k \implies C(0) = C \quad \text{worst case circuit.} \\ \theta = 1 & : C_k(1) \quad \forall k \implies C(1) \in \mathcal{H}_A \end{aligned} \quad (17)$$

This naturally defines the deformation of Eq. (16) via Eq. 3, which we recall is

$$p_0(\theta) \equiv |\langle 0^n | C(\theta) | 0^n \rangle|^2, \quad (18)$$

which at $\theta = 1$ is the RCS problem and at $\theta = 0$, we have the $\#P$ -Hard worst-case instance: $p_0(0) = p_0 \equiv |\langle 0^n | C | 0^n \rangle|^2$.

Lemma 3. *The total variation distance of \mathcal{H}_A and $\mathcal{H}_{A,C,\theta}$ is $O(m\Delta)$ for $|1 - \theta| \in \Delta \ll 1$.*

Proof. By the translational invariance of Haar measure (Subsection 3), if H_k is distributed according to the Haar measure then so is $C_k H_k$ for any fixed C_k . Moreover the ℓ_1 norm that defines total variation distance is invariant under unitary multiplication. So it suffices to compare the measures over $\mathcal{H}_{A,C,\theta}$ and \mathcal{H}_A , which by Lemma 2 have TVD of $O(\Delta)$ over a single local gate. By the additivity of TVD, the distribution induced by $C(\theta)$ which is denoted by $\mathcal{H}_{A,C,\theta}$ has a TVD from \mathcal{H}_A that is $O(m\Delta)$ for any θ satisfying $|1 - \theta| \in \Delta \ll 1$. \square

Remark 3. *In an n -qubit circuit, $m = \Omega(\text{poly}(n))$; therefore, if we take $|1 - \theta| \leq \Delta$ with $\Delta = O(1/\text{poly}(n))$ such that $\Delta = o(m^{-1})$, then we are guaranteed that the TVD between \mathcal{H}_A and $\mathcal{H}_{A,C,\theta}$ vanishes with n . For example, in Google's experiment there are n qubits on a grid of size $\sqrt{n} \times \sqrt{n}$ and depth \sqrt{n} resulting in $m = n^{3/2}$. Now if we take $\Delta = O(\frac{1}{n^{3/2} \log n})$, the total variational distance to \mathcal{H}_A becomes $O(m\Delta) \leq O(\log^{-1} n)$*

From Eqs. (7) and (8) we have that $C_k(\theta) = C_k(\theta) \otimes \mathbb{I}$. Therefore, $\langle 0^n | C(\theta) | 0^n \rangle$ is equal

to

$$\langle 0^n | C(\theta) | 0^n \rangle = \langle 0^n | \prod_{k=1}^m \mathcal{C}_k(\theta) | 0^n \rangle \equiv \frac{\langle 0^n | P(\theta) | 0^n \rangle}{Q(\theta)}, \quad \text{where} \quad (19)$$

$$P(\theta) \equiv \sum_{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_m=1}^N \prod_{k=1}^m p_{k, \alpha_k}(\theta) (C_k | \psi_{k, \alpha_k} \rangle \langle \psi_{k, \alpha_k} | \otimes \mathbb{I}_{\hat{k}}) \quad (20)$$

$$Q(\theta) \equiv \prod_{k=1}^m q_k(\theta) = \prod_{k=1}^m \prod_{\alpha_k=1}^N (1 - i\theta h_{k, \alpha_k}) \quad (21)$$

$$p_{k, \alpha_k}(\theta) \equiv (1 + i\theta h_{k, \alpha_k}) \prod_{\beta_k \in [N]/\alpha_k} (1 - i\theta h_{k, \beta_k}),$$

where as before h_{k, α_k} and $|\psi_{k, \alpha_k}\rangle$ are the eigenpairs of the Hermitian matrix h_k , and $\mathbb{I}_{\hat{k}}$ denotes the trivial action of C_k on all other qubits. $Q(\theta)$ is a polynomial of degree at most Nm (recall that $N \in \{2, 4\}$ for local quantum circuits).

Since $\langle 0^n | C(\theta) | 0^n \rangle$ is a rational function of degree at most $(4m, 4m)$, we have that $p_0(\theta)$ as defined by Eq. (18) is a rational function of degree at most $(8m, 8m)$. Moreover, from Eq. (20), we have

$$p_0(P(\theta)) \equiv \langle 0^n | P(\theta) | 0^n \rangle = Q(\theta) \langle 0^n | C(\theta) | 0^n \rangle, \quad (22)$$

where $P(\theta)$ is a matrix whose entries are polynomials in θ . More importantly, $p_0(P(\theta)) \equiv \langle 0^n | P(\theta) | 0^n \rangle$ is a polynomial of degree Nm in θ .

Remark 4. *The procedure is that we are given a fixed worst case circuit C with the architecture \mathcal{A} and whose m local gates (i.e., C_k 's) are published. We then draw a corresponding set of m local gates independently from the Haar measure (i.e., H_k 's) and treat them as fixed. The latter is a realization of an average-case circuit with architecture \mathcal{A} . Generating H_1, \dots, H_m takes $O(m)$ time as each can be generated from the QR decomposition of a complex random gaussian matrix of size at most $N = 4$ [Mov18]. Therefore, the description of the quantum circuit is classically efficient. We then choose a set of θ_i such that $|1 - \theta_i| \in [0, \Delta]$.*

Theorem 1. *Let \mathcal{A} be an architecture such that computing $p_0 = |\langle 0^n | C | 0^n \rangle|^2$ is $\#P$ -Hard in the worst case. Then, it is $\#P$ -Hard to output $|\langle 0^n | H | 0^n \rangle|^2$ with the probability $\alpha = 3/4 + 1/\text{poly}(n)$ over the choice of circuits $H \in \mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{A}}$.*

Proof. Let C be an arbitrary circuit with architecture \mathcal{A} and suppose we have at our disposal a classically efficient algorithm (an oracle) \mathcal{O} such that

$$\Pr_{H \sim \mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{A}}} [\mathcal{O}(H) = |\langle 0^n | H | 0^n \rangle|^2] \geq \alpha.$$

Recall that under the Cayley path parametrization $p_0(\theta) = |\langle 0^n | C(\theta) | 0^n \rangle|^2$ is a rational function of degree at most $(8m, 8m)$ such that $p_0(0) = |\langle 0^n | C | 0^n \rangle|^2$ and $p_0(1) = |\langle 0^n | H | 0^n \rangle|^2$ for some $H \in \mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{A}}$. Divide the interval $I \equiv [1 - \Delta, 1 + \Delta]$ into L pieces and for each $\theta_i \in I$ call the oracle \mathcal{O} on $C(\theta_i)$. Then using the generalized Berlekamp-Welch (Alg. 2) construct a $p'(\theta)$ such that

$$p'(\theta_i) = \mathcal{O}(C(\theta_i)) \quad ; \quad |1 - \theta_i| \leq \Delta$$

for α fraction of the $\theta_i \in I$. If the rational function $p'_0(\theta)$ is not found output fail, otherwise output $p'_0(0)$ as the proposed value of $p_0(0) = |\langle 0^n | C | 0^n \rangle|^2$.

We now show that the above algorithm succeeds with sufficiently high probability over the choice of H and we can then repeat the algorithm a small number of times (at most $\text{poly}(n)$) on different H 's and output the majority result for $p_0(0)$.

Since in Lemma 3 we proved that the total variation distance between $\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{A},\theta}$ and $\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{A}}$ is $O(m\Delta)$ for $\theta \in I$ we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr[\mathcal{O}(C(\theta_i)) = p_0(\theta_i) \mid \theta_i \in I] &\geq \alpha - \|\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{A}} - \mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{A},\theta,C}\|_{TV} \\ &= \alpha - O(m\Delta) \quad . \end{aligned}$$

where we wish to make $\alpha - O(m\Delta) \geq 3/4 + \delta/2$. We accomplish this by taking $\alpha > 3/4$, and $\Delta < O(m^{-1})$ as in Lemma 3. For Berlekamp-Welch to succeed, L needs to be bounded. Since in Alg. 2 $L > k_1 + k_2 + 2t = 8m + 2t$ and from the above we have the error rate $t = (\frac{1}{2} - \delta)L$, we conclude that $L > 4m/\delta = \text{poly}(n)$. Let Θ be the set of all $\theta_i \in I$ such that $\mathcal{O}(C(\theta_i)) \neq p_0(\theta_i)$; then $L - |\Theta|$ is the number of erroneous points. By Markov's inequality

$$\Pr \left[|\Theta| \geq (1 + \delta) \frac{L}{2} \right] = 1 - \Pr \left[(L - |\Theta|) \geq (1 - \delta) \frac{L}{2} \right] \geq 1 - \frac{\frac{1}{2} - \frac{\delta}{2}}{\frac{1}{2} - \frac{\delta}{2}} \geq (1 + \delta)/2$$

We take $|\Theta| = (1 + \delta)L/2$ in Berlekamp-Welch (Alg. 2), which will succeed and outputs the rational function $p_0(\theta)$. We are done because by repeating the call to the algorithm $O(\delta^{-2}) = \text{poly}(n)$ times on different random circuits $C(\theta_i)$, we can diminish the error and take the majority to output $p_0(0)$. \square

We conclude that a polynomial time (efficient) classical computation of probability amplitudes implies $BPP = \#P$, which is believed to be highly unlikely.

Remark 5. *As remarked in the original BosonSampling paper [AA11], it is entirely possible that the above theorem for RCS may be strengthened to allow for an oracle with the success probability $\alpha \geq 1/\text{poly}(n)$ using the results in [CPS99].*

4.2 Proof of robustness

The algebraic reduction goes as follows. For any given $\epsilon > 0$, suppose we can efficiently evaluate the tuples to within some additive error for the random instances of the quantum circuit with high enough probability. That is given a θ_i near $\theta = 1$ we assume that we have the estimate $p_0(\theta_i) + \epsilon_i$, where ϵ_i is the additive error. We want to maximize the additive error tolerance and still be able to extrapolate to the worst-case instance at $\theta = 0$. That is, we wish to obtain the largest $\epsilon = \max_i |\epsilon_i|$ tolerance we can, with an eye on the fact that $\epsilon = 2^{-n}/\text{poly}(n)$ proves the quantum supremacy conjecture!

In order to do so, we need to control the poles of the rational function $p_0(\theta)$. It will be useful to transform the coordinate to $\theta = 1 + z$ to make the problem symmetric. We write

$$C_k(\theta = 1 + z) = \sum_{\alpha=1}^N \frac{1 + i(1 + z)h_{\alpha}}{1 - i(1 + z)h_{\alpha}} C_k |\psi_{k,\alpha}\rangle \langle \psi_{k,\alpha}| \quad ,$$

where ultimately $|z| \leq \Delta = o(1)$. We will proceed to interpolate between $z : |z| \leq \Delta$ which corresponds to unitary matrices with a TVD of at most $O(\Delta)$ from the Haar measure, and the point $z = -1$ which coincides with the worst-case. The poles of the rational function are the zeros of $Q(z)$, which can easily be seen from Eq. 21 to be at $\theta = -i/h_{k,\alpha}$, which in turn correspond to the roots $z = -1 - i/h_{k,\alpha}$.

We have $1 \pm i\theta h_{k,\alpha} = 1 \pm i(1+z)h_{k,\alpha}$. Let $1 \pm ih_{k,\alpha} = r_{k,\alpha}e^{\pm iu_{k,\alpha}}$ (parametrizes a line with the real part one) where $r_{k,\alpha} = \sqrt{1 + h_{k,\alpha}^2}$, and $u_{k,\alpha} = \arctan(h_{k,\alpha})$. Therefore

$$1 \pm i\theta h_{k,\alpha} = r_{k,\alpha} \left[e^{\pm iu_{k,\alpha}} \pm iz \frac{h_{k,\alpha}}{r_{k,\alpha}} \right].$$

We rewrite $C_k(\theta)$ in Eq. (9) and cancel out the magnitudes $r_{k,\alpha}$ to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} C_k(z) &= \frac{\sum_{\alpha=1}^N r_{k,\alpha} \left[e^{iu_{k,\alpha}} + iz \frac{h_{k,\alpha}}{r_{k,\alpha}} \right] \prod_{\beta \in [N] \setminus \alpha} r_{k,\beta} \left[e^{-iu_{k,\beta}} - iz \frac{h_{k,\beta}}{r_{k,\beta}} \right] C_k |\psi_{k,\alpha}\rangle \langle \psi_{k,\alpha}|}{\prod_{\alpha=1}^N r_{k,\alpha} e^{-iu_{k,\alpha}} \left[1 - iz \frac{h_{k,\alpha}}{r_{k,\alpha}} e^{iu_{k,\alpha}} \right]} \\ &= \frac{\sum_{\alpha=1}^N \left[e^{iu_{k,\alpha}} + iz \frac{h_{k,\alpha}}{r_{k,\alpha}} \right] \prod_{\beta \in [N] \setminus \alpha} \left[e^{-iu_{k,\beta}} - iz \frac{h_{k,\beta}}{r_{k,\beta}} \right] C_k |\psi_{k,\alpha}\rangle \langle \psi_{k,\alpha}|}{\prod_{\alpha=1}^N e^{-iu_{k,\alpha}} \left[1 - iz \frac{h_{k,\alpha}}{r_{k,\alpha}} e^{iu_{k,\alpha}} \right]} \end{aligned}$$

Now the Eqs. (19)-(22) write under $\theta = 1 + z$

$$|\langle 0^n | C(z) | 0^n \rangle|^2 = |\langle 0^n | \prod_{k=1}^m C_k(z) | 0^n \rangle|^2 \equiv \frac{|\langle 0^n | P(z) | 0^n \rangle|^2}{|Q(z)|^2}, \quad \text{where} \quad (23)$$

$$P(z) \equiv \sum_{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_m=1}^N \prod_{k=1}^m p_{k,\alpha_k}(z) [(C_k |\psi_{k,\alpha_k}\rangle \langle \psi_{k,\alpha_k}|) \otimes \mathbb{I}_k] \quad (24)$$

$$\begin{aligned} |Q(z)|^2 &\equiv \prod_{k=1}^m q_k(z) = \prod_{k=1}^m \prod_{\alpha_k=1}^N \left| 1 - iz \frac{h_{k,\alpha_k}}{r_{k,\alpha_k}} e^{iu_{k,\alpha_k}} \right|^2. \quad (25) \\ p_{k,\alpha_k}(z) &\equiv \left[e^{iu_{k,\alpha_k}} + iz \frac{h_{k,\alpha_k}}{r_{k,\alpha_k}} \right] \prod_{\beta_k \in [N] \setminus \alpha_k} \left[e^{-iu_{k,\beta_k}} - iz \frac{h_{k,\beta_k}}{r_{k,\beta_k}} \right], \end{aligned}$$

It is important to note that, Since $\frac{h_{k,\alpha_k}}{r_{k,\alpha_k}} < 1$ and $z \in \Delta = o(m^{-1})$, the factors in $|Q(z)|^2$ are close to one

$$\left| 1 - iz \frac{h_{k,\alpha_k}}{r_{k,\alpha_k}} e^{iu_{k,\alpha_k}} \right|^2 = 1 + (2z + z^2) \frac{h_{k,\alpha_k}^2}{1 + h_{k,\alpha_k}^2} \leq 1 + O(\Delta),$$

which results in

$$|Q(z)|^2 \leq \prod_{k=1}^m \prod_{\alpha_k=1}^N \leq 1 + O(Nm\Delta).$$

Therefore, so long that we obey the bound $\Delta = o(m^{-1})$ obtained in the TVD calculation above, we have $|Q(z)|^2 \approx 1$.

In the manuscript we mentioned that the worst-case hardness is to within a constant multiplicative error [DGGJ04]. So the reduction provides a robustness with respect to additive errors, so long as ϵ_i are small enough for the extrapolation to $z = -1$ to be within the hardness interval that hugs $p_0(z = -1)$. How do errors near $z = 0$ amplify when extrapolated to $z = -1$? To address this we first state Paturi's lemma:

Lemma. (Paturi [Pat92]) *Let $p(z)$ be a polynomial of degree d , and suppose $|p(z)| \leq \epsilon$ for $|z| \leq \Delta$. Then $p(-1) \leq \epsilon \exp[2d(1 + \Delta^{-1})]$.*

Comment: Traditionally Paturi's lemma takes $|x| \leq \Delta$ and bounds $p(+1)$. Let $z = -x$ and the above version is recovered.

Assume we have a classical algorithm \mathcal{O}_2 that to within additive error $\epsilon = \max_i |\epsilon_i|$ has the property:

$$\Pr[|\mathcal{O}_2(C(z_i)) - p_0(z_i)| \leq \epsilon] = 1 - 1/\text{poly}(n), \quad |z_i| \leq \Delta$$

Namely, we are guaranteed to have a set of $(z_i, |\langle 0^n | P(z_i) | 0^n \rangle|^2 + \epsilon_i |Q(z_i)|^2)$ with high probability. Now since degree of $|\langle 0^n | P(z) | 0^n \rangle|^2$ is at most $16m$, using Paturi's lemma, Rakhmanov's result, and the above bound on $|Q(z)|^2$ we have

$$||\langle 0^n | P_{\text{exact}}(-1) | 0^n \rangle|^2 - |\langle 0^n | P_{\text{noisy}}(-1) | 0^n \rangle|^2| \leq \epsilon(1 + o(1)) e^{32m(1+\Delta^{-1})}. \quad (26)$$

For example, taking the parameters in Google's experiment, we have $m = n^{3/2}$, we choose $\Delta = O(n^{-3/2} \log^{-2}(n))$ to ensure closeness in TVD as before (see Remark 3).

Remark 6. *In practice, we call the classical oracle some $\text{poly}(n)$ number of times to obtain $(\theta_i, p_0(\theta_i))$, which combined with BW algorithm enables us to construct the rational function if the rate of errors in evaluation is not too high. In using Paturi's lemma there is a subtle question: Can the difference of the exact and sampled polynomials be drastically different in $|1 - \theta| \in [0, \Delta]$ despite agreeing well at the sampled points $(\theta_i, p(\theta_i))$ (i.e., difference upper-bounded by $\max_i \epsilon_i |Q(\theta_i)|^2$)? This is not hard to remedy. If one samples θ_i uniformly in the interval of length Δ near $\theta = 1$, then by a theorem due to Rakhmanov we are also guaranteed that the two polynomials are close to one another everywhere in that interval [Rak07].*

Theorem 2. *Assuming access to an oracle \mathcal{O}_2 as described above, it is $\#P$ -Hard to compute $p_0(C(\theta))$ over \mathcal{H}_A to within $\epsilon = 2^{-\Omega(m^2)}$ additive error.*

Proof. The proof follows from Eq. (26). From Dyer et al's result [DGGJ04] we have hardness guarantees to within constant multiplicative errors. We take $\epsilon = 2^{-\Omega(n)} \exp(-O(m\Delta^{-1}))$ to ensure that the extrapolation to $z = -1$ lies to within $2^{-\Omega(n)}$ additive error of the $\#P$ -Hard instance. The requirement of TVD implies that $\exp(-O(m\Delta^{-1})) = 2^{-\Omega(m^2)}$. \square

Our scheme is resilient to noise $\epsilon = \exp(-\Omega(n^3))$ for parameters being used in the experimental setting of Google in which the circuit is $\sqrt{n} \times \sqrt{n} \times \sqrt{n}$ [AAB⁺19]. And this scheme is resilient to noise of $\epsilon = \exp(-\Omega(n^2))$ for constant-depth proposals in which the geometry is $\sqrt{n} \times \sqrt{n} \times O(1)$ and therefore $m = O(n)$; these are classically hard to simulate in the worst case [TD04] and recent numerical advances seems to indicate that they are hard

to simulate on average for error thresholds similar to what we obtain and not those required by the quantum supremacy conjecture (i.e., $\exp(-n)/\text{poly}(n)$) [NLPD⁺20].

Note that the oracles \mathcal{O} and \mathcal{O}_2 above do *not* need to succeed with probabilities $1/2 + 1/\text{poly}(n)$ and $1 - 1/\text{poly}(n)$ respectively over *all* circuits with the given architecture. For example, although \mathcal{O}_2 succeeds with probability close to one, it is required to do so over circuits distributed close to \mathcal{H}_A .

In Lemmas such as Paturi’s, the source of error ϵ is abstracted away. It may be the sampling imprecisions, finite precision in the inferred polynomial coefficients or what not.

4.3 Inadequacy of Taylor series truncation

A proof of the average-case hardness of a non-unitary approximation of RCS based on the truncation of the Taylor series expansion was given by Bouland et al [BFNV19]. In this section and in what follows we adapt the setup and notation of Bouland et al [BFNV19]. Their reduction is fundamentally different from ours. For example, among others, they follow the convention (e.g., in BosonSampling paper [AA11]) and place the worst-case instances at $\theta = 1$ and average-case instances at $\theta \approx 0$. We do the opposite, which gives a path that is simpler and involves the product of only two unitaries and not three; this also leads to better TVD of the circuits from \mathcal{H}_A .

In [BFNV19] for each local gate C_j of the worst case circuit one picks a corresponding Haar matrix H_j and forms the interpolating local gate $C_j(\theta) \equiv C_j H_j e^{-ih_j \theta}$, where $\exp(-ih_j) = H_j^\dagger$. The full unitary circuit is $C(\theta) = C_m(\theta) C_{m-1}(\theta) \cdots C_1(\theta)$ and $C(0) \in \mathcal{H}_A$, and $C(1) = C$ is the worst case circuit. However, the interpolation is only useful if it leads to a low degree polynomial function, where the previous arsenal developed for permanents in BosonSampling could be used [AA11]. To meet this requirement, they truncate the Taylor series expansion of $\exp(-ih_j \theta)$ at the K^{th} order [BFNV19]. Since the exponential function has an infinite power series, in order to obtain a polynomial, they truncate the Taylor series expansion of $\exp(-ih_j \theta)$ at the K^{th} order

$$\widetilde{C}_j(\theta) = C_j H_j \left\{ \sum_{k=0}^K \frac{(-ih_j \theta)^k}{k!} \right\}. \quad (27)$$

Note that the truncation leads to non-unitary local gates, and consequently a non-unitary circuit. Therefore, to make the reduction of the worst-case hardness to average work using Lipton’s reduction (which is based on polynomial reduction), they assume there exists a classical algorithm O that takes as input the non-unitary truncated description of the circuit (compare with O in Fig. 3). They then succeed in proving the hardness based on this new complexity theoretical assumption (see [NLPD⁺20] for more discussion). In summary, they need to *assume an oracle with respect to a non-unitary circuit*. Also a robustness of $\mathcal{O}(\exp(-\text{poly}(n)))$ with respect to additive error was claimed, which presupposes the use of the, not so natural, non-unitary oracle access [BFNV19].

In order to reduce the complexity of the $\#P$ -Hard problem to average case, one needs to assume that there is an oracle that exactly computes $p_0(C(0))$ where the local gates are Haar distributed. The first issue with a non-unitary circuit is that this oracle cannot be called. So they assume a different oracle that exactly computes $p_0(\widetilde{C}(0))$. Then the claim




Figure 6: Schematics of the deviation from the geodesic and unitarity that results from the truncation of the Taylor series (Eq. (27)). Note that the path leaves the unitary group as θ tends towards $\theta = 1$.

is that the extrapolations (i.e., $p_0(\tilde{C}(0))$) is sufficiently close to $p_0(C)$. This easily leads to the bound (as shown in [BFNV19]),

$$|p_0(\tilde{C}(1)) - p_0(C)| \leq \frac{2^{O(mn)}}{K!} \approx e^{O(mn - K \ln K)}. \quad (28)$$

They use the above construction and to obtain a robustness with respect to noise of $O(\exp(-\text{poly}(n)))$. Their robustness proof relies on Paturi's lemma [Pat92] and Rakhmanov's bounds [Rak07]. Let the polynomial $p(\theta) = p_0(\tilde{C}(\theta)) - p_0(C(\theta))$, then Paturi's lemma says

Lemma. (*Paturi*) *Let $p(\theta)$ be a polynomial of degree d , and suppose $|p(\theta)| \leq \epsilon$ for $|x| \leq \Delta$. Then $p(1) \leq \epsilon \exp[2d(1 + \Delta^{-1})]$.*

In general, the *robustness* claims correspond to the supremum of ϵ .

The robustness claims would be fine for the truncated circuits if they also applied to an actual (i.e., unitary) circuit. This means that if we call a standard oracle O that takes in the exact unitary gates as an input, then it would also give rise to additive errors of $O(\exp(-\text{poly}(n)))$. Let us take the error to be only due to truncation (Eq. (28)) and ignore all other imperfections such as errors resulting from noisy polynomial sampling, numerical round offs, or experimental limitations etc. Indeed one can treat K as a free variable and make it a sufficiently large polynomial to compensate for mn in the exponent of Eq. (28). This would lead to exponentially small errors in computing Eq. (28) as stated in [BFNV19]. Then, in order to sample from distributions near the Haar measure, in Paturi's lemma they take $\Delta = 1/\text{poly}(n)$ as an *independent* free variable.

However, the non-unitary approximation of the circuit is $\tilde{C}(\theta) = \tilde{C}_m(\theta)\tilde{C}_{m-1}(\theta) \cdots \tilde{C}_1(\theta)$, which has m gates each truncated at K^{th} order. Since the degree of the products of polynomials is the sum of their degrees, the entries of $C(\theta)$ become polynomials of degree mK ;




Figure 7: This work vs. the previous work [BFNV19] that assumes an access to a non-unitary oracle. Moreover, in this section we showed that the non-unitary oracle does not provide robustness if the input to it is the standard description of the (unitary) circuit.

consequently $|\langle 0^n | \tilde{C}(\theta) | 0^n \rangle|^2$ is a polynomial of degree $2mK$. Therefore, the degree in Paturi’s lemma is $d = 2mK$ and we have (by Eq. (28) and Paturi’s lemma)

$$p(1) \leq \exp[O(mn - K \ln K)] \exp[4mK(1 + \Delta^{-1})]. \quad (29)$$

This is the fundamental observation: we see that K and d are *dependent*. For the errors not to blow up, one needs to take $K \geq O(\exp(4m(1 + \Delta^{-1}))) = O(\exp(\text{poly}(n)))$ for the right-hand side of Eq. (29) not to blow up— the polynomial would need to have an *exponentially large degree in n* , rendering a unitary oracle based scheme inefficient. This contradicts the assumption of the existence of an efficient classical algorithm in the reduction (c.f. Fig. 3)

Ref. [BFNV19] therefore, proceeds by assuming a *non-unitary* oracle, which for $\theta \ll 1$ outputs $p_0(\tilde{C}(\theta))$ exactly and with high probability. This is somewhat unnatural as the oracle would take as inputs a classical description of a non-unitary “circuit” because of the truncation of the Taylor series to the K^{th} order (see Eq. (27)). Under this new complexity theoretical assumption, they succeed in proving that approximating $p_0(\tilde{C}(1)) = |\langle 0^n | \tilde{C}(1) | 0^n \rangle|^2$ to within $\exp(-\text{poly}(n))$ additive error is hard.

Boulund et al proved that the TVD of the geodesic path, denoted by $\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{A},\theta}$ is $O(m\theta)$ from $\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{A}}$. [BFNV19]. The truncated path however is not a unitary and therefore has eigenvalues that do not lie on the unit circle and Weyl’s formula [Wey64] does not apply. Therefore, the analysis in [BFNV19] does not readily extend in proving a small TVD between the distribution over the non-unitary approximation of circuits obtained from truncation of the Taylor series and $\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{A}}$. But we like to emphasize that in operator norm sense the truncation error obtained from non-unitary approximation is indeed exponentially small.

In summary their nice work makes an extra complexity theoretical assumption that presupposes a non-unitarity oracle access. We summarize this in comparison to our findings in Fig. 7. We also note that any point p in the interval $[p_0 - 2^{-n}/\text{poly}(n), p_0 + 2^{-n}/\text{poly}(n)]$ that satisfies exact $\#P$ -Hardness can be used to prove the supremacy conjecture if one can prove a hardness for an interval encapsulating p that is large enough to encompass the supremacy interval. In this section we proved that \tilde{p}_0 , obtained from Taylor series truncation, will not do. The reason is that the $\#P$ -Hardness cannot be claimed with a unitary oracle access.