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Abstract

We propose a Fermionic swap network scheme for efficient quantum computing of \( n \)-dimensional Hubbard-model Hamiltonians, assuming linear qubit connectivity. We establish new lower bounds on swap depth for such networks. These rely on isoperimetric inequalities from the combinatorics literature and are closely connected to graph bandwidth. We show that the scheme is swap-depth optimal for both spin and spinless two-dimensional Hubbard model Hamiltonians. In the first case it is also optimal in the number of Hamiltonian interaction layers, and is one from optimal in the second case.

1 Introduction

Near-term quantum computing on limited and noisy hardware requires computations of small circuit depth, using few qubits. Circuit-depth problems are often NP-complete and must be tackled heuristically, with the most efficient solutions for problems of practical size identified, at best, only up to complexity class. Precisely optimal solutions are to be expected only when the problem is small enough to support brute-force circuit construction methods, or when it admits symmetries that allow mathematical intuitions and methods to be applied. A further consideration is that quantum computing hardware often has limited qubit-connectivity which can affect the performance of algorithms; quantum circuits must be designed around these limitations or converted to work within them at the cost of extra circuit depth.

2 Background

The problem of Hamiltonian simulation was the first proposed quantum computing application [4]. Hamiltonians for Fermionic systems, in particular, have important applications in quantum chemistry and materials science. Hamiltonians for Fermionic systems require special computational treatment, because in both first and second quantized formulations extra resources are required to produce computations which respect Fermionic symmetries.

The second-quantized formulation has received more attention in the literature, and is preferred when the number of Fermions is large relative to the number of occupancy sites. In this formulation, each Fermion occupancy site corresponds to a tensor factor in the state space; spin \( \frac{1}{2} \) Fermions can be represented locally in qubit-space as single qubits. Fermionic statistics are preserved by mapping the Fermionic algebra operators to operators in qubit-space via the Jordan-Wigner transform. This fixes an ordering of the occupancy sites and destroys locality; a Fermionic operator on sites \( p \) and \( q \) becomes a qubit-space operator on qubits \( p \) through \( q \).

Many second-quantized Hamiltonian evolution methods employ the Trotter-Suzuki decomposition in a process colloquially known as Trotterization. In this setting, one has a local \( k \)-body Hamiltonian, i.e. a Hamiltonian which is expressible as a sum of polynomially many local summands, each of which evolves at most \( k \) particles via creation and annihilation operators among at most \( 2k \) sites. The evolution of this
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Hamiltonian is approximated, on a short time scale, as a product of short-time evolutions of the local summands. One body Hamiltonians, for example, are of the form:

\[ H = \sum_i H_i + \sum_{i,j} H_{i,j}, \]

\[ H_i = k_i a_i^\dagger a_i, \]

\[ H_{i,j} = k_{i,j} a_i^\dagger a_j, \]

where the \( k \)'s are constants and the \( a_i \) are Fermionic annihilation operators. A Trotter step for such a Hamiltonian is of the form:

\[ e^{-iH\Delta t} \approx \prod_j e^{-iH_j\Delta t} \times \prod_{j,k} e^{-iH_{j,k}\Delta t}. \]

Efficient Trotter steps require efficient circuits for the \( H_i \) and the \( H_{i,j} \).

In the first published algorithm for Fermionic Hamiltonian simulation, due to Abrams and Lloyd \[1\], such an operator required linear circuit-depth for a Trotter step, due to the cost of implementing Fermionic operators, assuming arbitrary pairwise qubit connectivity. The Bravyi-Kitaev method \[2\] reduces the asymptotic circuit-depth to logarithmic by introducing linearly-many ancilla qubits to track the Fermionic operator sign sums over contiguous ranges of qubits, and is more efficient in practice \[7\]. The cost analysis states no connectivity restrictions, and in practice requires constant-time two-qubit (bosonic) operations over a binary tree on the ancilla qubits. If the graph of pairwise qubit interactions is of bounded degree, the superfast Bravyi-Kitaev method \[2\] obtains constant Fermionic operator cost, the constant being a function of the degree, again assuming arbitrary pairwise connectivity.

The above connectivity requirements are quite strong and may be difficult to scale in quantum hardware. Extensions of the Jordan-Wigner transform to more modest qubit connectivities (such as lattice connectivity) include the Verstraete-Cirac transform \[9\] and Auxilliary Qubit Mappings \[8\].

The Fermionic swap method \[6\] reduces the cost of Fermionic operators by efficiently transposing qubits adjacent in the Jordan-Wigner ordering so that each interacting pair (or more generally, tuple) of qubits is brought to adjacency. The interaction may then be performed in constant time. The Fermionic swap operators are swap operators modified to preserve Fermi exchange statistics; once brought to adjacency the local Fermionic operators become local qubit operators. Fermionic swap operators are computationally cheap to implement, do not require auxilliary qubits, and require only linear qubit connectivity.

For one-body Hamiltonians which are dense (i.e. all \( k_{i,j} \neq 0 \)), with \( n \) the number of occupancy sites, the required \( n(n-1) \) pairwise interactions (among \( \frac{n(n-1)}{2} \) interaction pairs) are accomplished with \( n-2 \) layers of swaps and \( n \) interaction layers.\[8\] The authors conjecture that no other method can perform a Trotter step for such Hamiltonians using fewer entangling gates.

For completeness, the following are the Fermionic swap method’s optimality properties with respect to the number of swap layers (swap depth) and Hamiltonian interaction layers (Hamiltonian interaction depth) for the Fermionic swap method for dense one-body Hamiltonians:

**Lemma 1.** For dense Hamiltonians, the swapping scheme of \[6\] has optimal swap depth for dense one-body Hamiltonians. For \( n \) odd, it has optimal interaction depth. For \( n \) even, \( n > 2 \), the interaction depth is one greater than optimal; swap-depth and interaction-depth optimality may not both be achieved simultaneously.

**Proof.** In any swap network for a dense one-body Hamiltonian, the least qubit, in the initial ordering, is lower-ordered than every other qubit at the time it first becomes adjacent to it. Thus the swap depth is at least \( n - 2 \), and \[6\] has optimal swap depth.

\[1\] As presented in \[6\], each qubit is swapped with every other qubit, using \( n \) swap layers. However, qubits need only be made adjacent; inspection shows that the \( n \)-th swap layer is unnecessary, as the \( n-1 \) st since the interactions in the final layer are available prior to the start of swapping. We treat these trivial optimizations as part of the original method.
The interaction depth is bounded below by the degree of the Hamiltonian interaction graph, which in this case is \( n - 1 \). To attain this bound, each qubit must interact with another in each of the interaction layers. If \( n \) is odd this is impossible. If \( n \) is even, by a simple counting argument, each layer contains \( \frac{n}{2} \) interactions. Thus each pairs of qubits \((2k, 2k + 1)\) interact within each interaction layer. Swap-depth optimality then requires that each pair of successive interaction layers be separated by a single swap layer which places new qubit pairs in each of the \((2k, 2k + 1)\) slots. Such a layer must swap the pair \((1, 2)\). A sequence of such layers can only pair 0 with 1 and 2. Thus, if \( n > 2 \) and even, no interaction-depth optimal network can be swap-depth optimal.

Attaining interaction depth \( n - 1 \) for \( n \) even amounts to constructing an \( n - 1 \)-color edge-coloring on the complete graph on \( n \) vertices, which is possible by Barányai’s theorem.

3 Optimal swap networks for Hubbard models

By the term (rectangular) grid graph, we mean a finite product \( G_1 \times \ldots \times G_k \) of path graphs \( G_i \). In particular, for \( M \) and \( N \) positive integers, \( M \leq N \), the \( M \times N \) rectangular grid graph \( G = (V, E) \) with vertices \( V \) and edges \( E \) is defined as follows:

\[
\begin{align*}
V &= \{(m,n)|0 \leq m < M, 0 \leq n < N\}, \\
E_h &= \{((m,n),(m+1,n))|0 \leq m < M-1, 0 \leq n < N\}, \\
E_v &= \{((m,n),(m,n+1))|0 \leq m < M, 0 \leq n < N-1\}, \\
E &= E_h \cup E_v.
\end{align*}
\]  \( (1) \)

In the spinless \( M \times N \) Hubbard model, there is one occupancy state for each element of \( V \), and the Hamiltonian is given by:

\[
H = U \sum_{p \in V} n_p - t \sum_{(p,q) \in E} (a_p^\dagger a_q + a_q^\dagger a_p).
\]

Here, \( a_p \) and \( a_p^\dagger \) are the \( p \)th Fermionic operator algebra raising and lowering operator, respectively, \( n_p \) is the \( p \)th number operator, \(-t\) is the kinetic energy, and \( U \) is the Coulomb repulsion.

For the version with spin, each element of \( V \) is assigned two possible occupancy states, one for each electron spin. The Hamiltonian is then

\[
H_s = U \sum_{p \in V} n_{p,+} n_{p,-} - t \sum_{(p,q) \in E, \sigma \in \pm} (a_{p,\sigma}^\dagger a_{q,\sigma} + a_{q,\sigma}^\dagger a_{p,\sigma}).
\]

The graph of two-occupancy-state interactions for this Hamiltonian is the \( 2 \times M \times N \) rectangular grid graph.

The swap network is concerned with the sites which must be brought to adjacency in order to compute the Hamiltonian interaction terms. The form of those terms determines the structure of the Hamiltonian interaction layers.

Swap networks for two-dimensional Hubbard Hamiltonians were considered in [6]; the method therein requires \( 3(M-1) \) swap layers to process a single Trotter step in the spinless case, and \( 3(2M-1) \) layers in the case with spin. The networks in [6] contain \( O(M) \) Hamiltonian interaction layers.

The degree of a graph is a lower bound on the number of Hamiltonian interaction layers in a swap network. This gives lower interaction-depth bounds of 4 and 5 for two-dimensional spinless and spin Hubbard models respectively.

3.1 Optimal swap depths

Given a set \( V \), let \( R(V) \) denote the set of all orders of \( V \), that is the set of bijective functions \( V \to \{0, \ldots, |V|-1\} \). Given an order \( r \) of \( V \), let \( r_k = r^{-1}(\{0, \ldots, k-1\}) \), the \( k \)-th initial segment of \( r \).
Given a graph \( G = (V, E) \), let \( d_{\text{swap}}(G) \) be the minimum swap depth over all linear-connectivity swap networks for \( G \), and define the graph bandwidth \( b(G) \) of \( G \) as

\[
b(G) = \min_{r \in R(V)} \max_{(v, w) \in E} |r(v) - r(w)|.
\]

Graph bandwidth determines a simple lower bound on swap depth:

\[
d_{\text{swap}}(G) \geq \left\lceil \frac{b(G) - 1}{2} \right\rceil,
\]

since for any \( r \in R(V) \), \( G \) has an edge requiring at least \( \left\lceil \frac{b(G) - 1}{2} \right\rceil \) overlapping swaps (and thus, swap layers) to bring the vertices to adjacency.

In general, computing graph bandwidth is an NP-hard problem. For \( G \) an \( M \times N \) grid graph, with \( M \leq N \), it is shown in [1] that \( b(G) = M \), giving \( d_{\text{swap}}(G) \geq r\left\lceil \frac{M-1}{2} \right\rceil \). For \( G \) an \( 2 \times M \times N \) grid graph, with \( 2 \leq M \leq N \), it follows from [10] that \( b(G) = 2M - 1 \), giving \( d_{\text{swap}}(G) \geq M - 1 \).

The graph bandwidth can also be expressed as

\[
b(G) = \min_{r \in R(V)} \max_{e \in E} b_r(e),
\]

where for any \( W \subset V \), the order bandwidth \( b_r(W) \) of \( W \) under \( r \) is given by

\[
b_r(W) = \max_{w \in W} r(w) - \min_{w \in W} r(w)
\]

We generalize this slightly; let \( L_2(G) \) be the collection of all subgraphs \( S = (V_S, E_S) \) of \( G \) which are length-two line graphs. Define the graph 2-bandwidth \( b^2(G) \) as follows:

\[
b^2(G) = \min_{r \in R(V)} \max_{S \in L_2(G)} b_r(V_S).
\]

**Lemma 2.**

\[
d_{\text{swap}}(G) \geq \left\lceil \frac{b^2(G) - 2}{2} \right\rceil.
\]

**Proof.** Given an order \( r \) of \( V \), and a length-two line-subgraph \( S \) with vertices \( v_1, v_2, v_3 \), \( r(\{v_1, v_2, v_3\}) = \{p_1, p_2, p_3\} \) for some nonnegative integers \( p_1 < p_2 < p_3 \). Then \( b_r(S) = p_3 - p_1 \). The swap depth cost to bring both edges of \( S \) to adjacency (not necessarily simultaneously) is at least \( \left\lceil \frac{p_3 - p_1 - 2}{2} \right\rceil \), as if \( r(v_2) = p_2 \) it cannot be brought nearer to both \( v_1 \) and \( v_3 \) by a single swap, and otherwise it requires \( \left\lceil \frac{p_3 - p_1 - 1}{2} \right\rceil \) swaps to bring the vertices at \( p_1 \) and \( p_3 \) to adjacency. For at least one such \( S \), \( p_3 - p_1 \geq b^2(G) \).

As we shall explain, for many parameterized graph families for which exact bandwidth results are known, the bandwidth is provably realized by a vertex order with special boundary-optimality properties.

Given a graph \( G = (V, E) \) and \( W \subset V \), the vertex boundary \( B_G(W) \) of \( W \) in \( G \) is the set of vertices in \( V - W \) which are adjacent to vertices in \( W \). The vertex boundary closure \( C_G(W) \) is \( W \cup B_G(W) \).

For any \( r \in R(V) \) and any initial segment \( r_k \), the highest-ordered element of \( B_r(r_k) \) shares an edge with some element of \( r_k \). Thus

\[
\max_{k' \leq |V|, r^{-1}(k' - 1) \in B_G(r_k)} k' \geq k + |B_G(r_k)|
\]

and therefore

\[
b(G) \geq \min_{r \in R(V)} \max_{k \leq |V|} |B_G(r_k)|.
\]

**Lemma 2.**

\[
d_{\text{swap}}(G) \geq \left\lceil \frac{b^2(G) - 2}{2} \right\rceil.
\]

**Proof.** Given an order \( r \) of \( V \), and a length-two line-subgraph \( S \) with vertices \( v_1, v_2, v_3 \), \( r(\{v_1, v_2, v_3\}) = \{p_1, p_2, p_3\} \) for some nonnegative integers \( p_1 < p_2 < p_3 \). Then \( b_r(S) = p_3 - p_1 \). The swap depth cost to bring both edges of \( S \) to adjacency (not necessarily simultaneously) is at least \( \left\lceil \frac{p_3 - p_1 - 2}{2} \right\rceil \), as if \( r(v_2) = p_2 \) it cannot be brought nearer to both \( v_1 \) and \( v_3 \) by a single swap, and otherwise it requires \( \left\lceil \frac{p_3 - p_1 - 1}{2} \right\rceil \) swaps to bring the vertices at \( p_1 \) and \( p_3 \) to adjacency. For at least one such \( S \), \( p_3 - p_1 \geq b^2(G) \).

As we shall explain, for many parameterized graph families for which exact bandwidth results are known, the bandwidth is provably realized by a vertex order with special boundary-optimality properties.

Given a graph \( G = (V, E) \) and \( W \subset V \), the vertex boundary \( B_G(W) \) of \( W \) in \( G \) is the set of vertices in \( V - W \) which are adjacent to vertices in \( W \). The vertex boundary closure \( C_G(W) \) is \( W \cup B_G(W) \).

For any \( r \in R(V) \) and any initial segment \( r_k \), the highest-ordered element of \( B_r(r_k) \) shares an edge with some element of \( r_k \). Thus

\[
\max_{k' \leq |V|, r^{-1}(k' - 1) \in B_G(r_k)} k' \geq k + |B_G(r_k)|
\]

and therefore

\[
b(G) \geq \min_{r \in R(V)} \max_{k \leq |V|} |B_G(r_k)|.
\]

Let \( G = (V, E) \) be a graph, \( r \in R(V) \). We say \( r \) is an isoperimetric order on \( V \) for \( G \) if for any other order \( r' \) of \( V \) and \( 0 \leq k \leq |V| \), the \( k \)-th initial segments \( r_k \) and \( r'_k \) of \( r \) and \( r' \) satisfy \( |B_G(r_k)| \leq |B_G(r'_k)| \).

It is often possible to construct an isoperimetric order \( r \) with the property of initial-segment closure: for any initial segment \( r_k \), \( C_G(r_k) \) is also initial segment.
Lemma 3. In Inequality 3, if \( r \) has initial-segment closure, equality holds.

Proof. For any \( 0 \leq k \leq |V| \), let \( k' = k + |B_G(r_k)| \). Then \( C_G(r_k) = r_{k'} \), and if \( k > 0 \), any element of \( B_G(r_k) \) adjacent to \( r^{-1}(k-1) \) is equal to \( r^{-1}(k'') \) for some \( k'' \leq (k-1) + |B_G(r_k)| \). Thus the order bandwidth of every edge is bounded above by some \( |B_G(r_{k'})| \). Given any other order \( r' \), \( |B_G(r'_{k''})| \geq |B_G(r_{k'})| \) and thus equality holds.

Similar arguments show that in general

\[
b^2(G) \geq \min_{r \in \mathcal{R}(V)} \max_{k \leq v} |B_G(r_k) \cup B_G(C_G(r_k))|.
\]

(4)

Lemma 4. In Inequality 2, if \( r \) has initial-segment closure, equality holds.

Proof. The proof is similar to that of Lemma 3, the only additional complexity is that the lowest-ordered vertex \( v \) is the middle vertex for some line subgraphs, however, setting \( k = r(v) + 1 \) the other two vertices lie in \( r_{k+|B_G(r_k)|} \) and thus in \( r_{k+|B_G(r_k)|} + B_G(C_G(r_k)) \).

Proposition 5 \((10)\). Let \( 0 \leq M_1 \leq \ldots \leq M_n \), with each \( M_i \) an integer. Let \( G \) be the \( M_1 \times \ldots \times M_n \) grid graph. Let \( r^* \) be the order given by

\[(x_1, \ldots, x_n) < (y_1, \ldots, y_n)\]

if either

\[\sum x_i < \sum y_i\]

or

\[\sum x_i = \sum y_i \text{ and } (x_1, \ldots, x_n) \succ_L (y_1, \ldots, y_n),\]

where \( L \) is the lexicographic order. Then \( r^* \) is an isoperimetric order on \( G \).

In addition, it is easily verified that \( r^* \) has initial-segment closure. Many other graphs are known to admit isoperimetric orderings; see [5] for an overview of what is known.

For any connected graph \( G = (V, E) \) with order \( r \) on \( V \) we can partition \( V \) into sets \( V_i \) as follows:

\[
V_0 = r^{-1}(\{0\}), \\
V_i = B_G(V_0 \cup \ldots \cup V_{i-1})
\]

If \( G \) is bipartite, no edge in \( E \) can have both endpoints in the same \( V_i \) (or else there would be two paths from \( 0 \) of opposite parity), and conversely, if no \( V_i \) contains the endpoints of an edge in \( E \), the even and odd \( V_i \) form a bipartite partition of \( V \).

For a grid graph, every vertex \( v \) except the first and the last under \( r^* \) has edges with vertices both smaller than greater than it. The length-two path \( P \) through \( v \) which maximizes order bandwidth \( b_r(P) \) is that from the least neighbor of \( v \) to the greatest.

For the case that \( G \) is an \( M \times N \) grid graph, \( M \leq N \), inspection reveals that \( |B_G(r^*_k)| = 2 \) when \( k = 1 \), increases by one as the first element \( (i, 0) \) in each \( V_i \) is reached, for \( i \leq M - 2 \), at which the point at \( (M-2, 0) \) the maximum is attained. \( |B_G(r^*_k)| \) then remains constant until the last element of \( V_{M-1} \), \( (0, N-1) \) is filled, at which point it decreases by one upon completion of each \( V_i \). Since \( M \leq N \), \( |B_G(r^*_k)| \) remains maximal for at least \( 2M - 1 \) steps. Applying Lemma 2 we obtain the following:

\[
b^2(G) = 2M, \\
d_{\text{swap}}(G) \geq M - 1.
\]

For higher-dimensional grid graph cases, these quantities can be computed using the structure of the \( V_i \). The set of points

\[\{(x_1, \ldots, x_n) : x_i \in \mathbb{N}, \sum x_i = k\}\]
forms a \((n-1)\)-simplicial grid of size \(k\) (when \(k = 1\) it is just the standard \((n-1)\)-simplex). Such coordinates might not all be valid on our grid graph; for each \(M_i\) one must remove the \((n-1)\)-simplicial grid of size \(x_i - M_i\), with the convention that grids of negative size are empty, consisting of points not lying on the grid graph because \(x_i\) is too large.

In the \(2 \times M \times N\) case, \(r^\ast\) partitions \(V\) into the \(V_i\), with the spin-coordinate-one vertices in each \(V_i\) prior to all of the the spin-coordinate-zero vertices. It is easy to see that \(|B_G(r^\ast)|\) increases monotonically until reaching a maximum of \(2M\), upon reaching \((1, M - 2, 0)\) in \(V_{M-1}\). This maximum is maintained until reaching \((0, 0, N - 1)\), in \(2M - 1\) more steps if \(M = N\), greater than \(2M\) steps otherwise, at which point \(|B_G(r^\ast)|\) decreases by one and remains stable for at least \(M - 1\) steps.

Applying Lemma \[2\] we obtain the following:

\[
\begin{align*}
V^2(G) &= \begin{cases} 
4M & \text{if } M < N, \\
4M - 1 & \text{if } M = N.
\end{cases} \\
d_{\text{swap}}(G) &\geq 2M - 1.
\end{align*}
\]

### 3.2 Hubbard model networks

Our strategy for swap networks on grid graphs is as follows. Suppose \((G, E)\) is a grid graph of dimension \(n\). Each \(V_i\) consists of a concatenated sequence of sequences, which we shall call \(\sigma\)-rows, each of the form:

\[
\sigma^i_{(x_1, ..., x_{n-2})} = (k, 0, x_1, \ldots, x_{n-2}), (k - 1, 1, x_1, \ldots, x_{n-2}), \ldots, (0, k, x_1, \ldots, x_{n-2}).
\]

For each \(\sigma\)-row \(\sigma^i_{(x_1, x_2, ..., x_{n-2})}\), the \(k\)-th element must interact with the \(k\)-th element of each of the following sequences for \(j \in \pm 1\), provided it exists:

\[
\sigma^{i+j}_{(x_1+j, x_2, ..., x_{n-2})}, \sigma^{i+j}_{(x_1, x_2+j, ..., x_{n-2})}, \ldots, \sigma^{i+j}_{(x_1, x_2, ..., x_{n-2}+j)},
\]

Additionally, for \(j \in \pm 1\), \(\sigma^i_{(x_1, x_2, ..., x_{n-2})}\) must interact with the \(k\)-th and \(k+j\)-th elements of each \(\sigma^{i+j}_{(x_1, x_2, ..., x_{n-2})}\), whenever one exists.

The difference in length between the original \(\sigma\)-row and any of of its neighbor rows is at most one.

Let \(r^o\) be the order on the bipartite partition \(\bigcup V_{2i+1}\) which places the \(V_{2i+1}\) in ascending order, each ordered as a sequence of \(\sigma\)-rows, in reverse lexicographical order by index. Define \(r^e\) similarly on \(\bigcup V_{2i}\).

Interlace the two orders \(r^o\) and \(r^e\) so that the elements of \(r^o\) have the rightmost possible placements such that elements of \(r^e\) maintain relative order and each element of \(\sigma^{2i+1}_{(x_1, ..., x_{n-2})}\) is adjacent to its (up to) two neighbors in \(\sigma^{2i}_{(x_1, ..., x_{n-2})}\) if it exists. An interaction layer is performed. The \(\sigma^{2i+1}_{(x_1, ..., x_{n-2})}\) are then shifted upward in \(2n - 1\) stages to be brought adjacent to each of the remaining neighbor \(\sigma\)-rows, performing an interaction layer at each stage.

We do not expect to obtain our lower bounds on swap depth for arbitrary grid graphs. In general, not every vertex in \(r^o\) can be shifted relative to \(r^e\) at each time step. When elements of \(r^o\) are adjacent to each other they must queue up to swap with the next element of \(r^e\), increasing the transit time for a given \(v \in r^o\). Additionally, the required number of swaps for a vertex is not clearly related to \(B(G)\). It might be argued that as dimension bounds get large, the number of queue steps grows with polynomial degree lower than the number of swaps, and that for large graphs the number of swaps is asymptotically close to \(\frac{B(G)}{2}\). The orders \(r^o\) and \(r^e\), which are not (reverse) lexicographic, are chosen to minimize the queueing. Here we only show that for two-dimensional spin and spinless Hubbard models, (the models most likely to be implemented on NISQ hardware), the lower bounds on swap depth are attained.

**Theorem 6.** For the spinless and spin \(M \times N\) Hubbard model Hamiltonians, the above swap-depth bounds are realizable by the above swap network scheme. In the spinless case, interaction-depth optimality is simultaneously achievable. In the spin case, one extra interaction layer is required.

**Proof.** For the spinless case, each \(V_i\) contains a single \(\sigma\)-row. It requires at most \(M - 1\) swaps on each vertex to shift each of the \(V_{2i+1}\) from its initial to its final position. There may at most one extra stage due to
queueing between the rows if $|V_{2i+3}| > |V_{2i+2}|$, however in this case the number of swaps is smaller than $M - 1$. Thus the required swap depth is $M - 1$. By Equation 5, the network is swap-depth optimal. See Figure 1 for an example.

For the Hamiltonian with spin, each $V_i$ consists of $\sigma$-rows of length at most two. All but possibly the first and last rows have length exactly two, so gaps can form only at the beginning and end of each $V_i$. Each $\sigma$-row interacts with two others, which are adjacent to each other in their bipartite ordering. As a result, to perform the stages, the $V_i$ are just shifted as rows without any queueing within the $V_i$ (see Figure 2 for an illustration). Such a shift requires at most $2M - 1$ swaps, with a single queue step occurring only when fewer than $2M - 1$ swaps occurred. Thus the required swap depth is $2M - 1$. By Equation 6, the network is swap-depth optimal. The network minimizes three-dimensional grid interaction depth, which is six, but since the grid has $M_1 = 2$, the degree of each vertex is only five.

References


Figure 2: The arrangement of layers in a spin-Hubbard model. The $V_i$ are horizontal slices. In the isoperimetric ordering, the points $(1, x, y)$ are first. For the swap network, the order is right-to-left in the figure; each vertex $(1, x, y)$ forms a $\sigma$-row with the element $(0, x + 1, y)$ to its right, if it exists.