On the support of the Grover walk on higher-dimensional lattices
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Abstract. This paper presents the minimum supports of states for stationary measures of the Grover walk on the \(d\)-dimensional lattice by solving the corresponding eigenvalue problem. The numbers of the minimum supports for moving and flip-flop shifts are \(2^d\) \((d \geq 1)\) and \(4\) \((d \geq 2)\), respectively.

1 Introduction

The quantum walk was introduced by Aharonov et al. \cite{aharonov1993} as a generalization of the random walk on graphs. On the one-dimensional lattice \(\mathbb{Z}\), where \(\mathbb{Z}\) is the set of integers, the properties of quantum walks are well studied, see Konno \cite{konno2018}, for example. There are some results on the Grover walk on \(\mathbb{Z}^2\), such as weak limit theorem by Watabe et al. \cite{watabe2013} (moving shift case) and Higuchi et al. \cite{higuchi2015a} (flip-flop shift case), and localization shown by Imiu et al. \cite{imiu2016} (moving shift case) and Higuchi et al. \cite{higuchi2015b} (flip-flop shift case).

In this paper, we present the minimum support of states for the stationary measures of the Grover walk on \(\mathbb{Z}^d\) by solving the corresponding eigenvalue problem. As for the number of the support of the Grover walk on \(\mathbb{Z}^d\) with moving shift, \(2^2 (\mathbb{Z}^2\) case) and \(3^d (\mathbb{Z}^d\) case with \(d \geq 2)\) were given in Stefanak et al. \cite{stefanak2018} and Komatsu and Konno \cite{komatsu2019} by the Fourier analysis, respectively. Compared with the above-mentioned previous results, the number of our minimum support for \(\mathbb{Z}^d\) case with \(d \geq 1)\) is \(2^d\) (Theorem 1). Moreover, concerning the number of the support of the Grover walk on \(\mathbb{Z}^d(d \geq 2)\) with flip-flop shift, 4 was obtained in Higuchi et al. \cite{higuchi2015b} by the spectral mapping theorem, which coincides with our result (Theorem 2). Remark that any finite support does not exist for \(\mathbb{Z}^1\) case.

The rest of the paper is as follows. Section 2 is devoted to the definition of the discrete-time quantum walk on \(\mathbb{Z}^d\). Section 3 deals with the stationary measure of the Grover walk on \(\mathbb{Z}^d\). We give main results on minimum support for the Grover walk on \(\mathbb{Z}^d\) with moving shift (Theorem 1) in Section 4 and flip-flop shift (Theorem 2) in Section 5, respectively. Section 6 summarizes our paper.

2 Discrete-time quantum walks on \(\mathbb{Z}^d\)

In this section, we give the definition of \(2d\)-state discrete-time quantum walks on \(\mathbb{Z}^d\). The quantum walk is defined by using a shift operator and a unitary matrix. Let \(\mathbb{C}\) be the set of complex numbers. For \(i \in \{1, 2, \ldots, d\}\), the shift operator \(\tau_i\) is given by

\[
(\tau_i f)(x) = f(x - e_i) \quad (f : \mathbb{Z}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^{2d}, \ x \in \mathbb{Z}^d),
\]

where \(\{e_1, e_2, \ldots, e_d\}\) denotes the standard basis of \(\mathbb{Z}^d\). Let \(A = (a_{ij}), i,j = 1, 2, \ldots, 2d\) be a \(2d \times 2d\) unitary matrix. We call this unitary matrix the coin matrix. To describe the time evolution of the quantum walk, decompose the unitary matrix \(A\) as

\[
A = \sum_{i=1}^{2d} P_i A,
\]

where \(P_i\) are permutation matrices.

*konno-norio-bt@ynu.ac.jp
†takahashi-sarato-vb@ynu.jp(e-mail of the corresponding author)
Then for $\Psi$ stationary amplitude $\Psi$ is called the We introduce the set of solutions of Eq. (3.2) for $\lambda$

$$U_A = \sum_{i=1}^{d} \left( P_{2i-1}A\tau_i^{-1} + P_{2i}A\tau_i \right).$$  

(2.3)

Let $\mathbb{Z}_d = \{0, 1, 2, \ldots\}$. The state at time $n \in \mathbb{Z}_d$ and location $x \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ can be expressed by a 2d-dimensional vector:

$$\Psi_n(x) = T \left[ \Psi_n^1(x), \Psi_n^2(x), \ldots, \Psi_n^{2d}(x) \right] \in \mathbb{C}^{2d},$$

(2.4)

where $T$ denotes a transposed operator. For $\Psi_n : \mathbb{Z}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^{2d}$ ($n \in \mathbb{Z}_d$), it follows from Eq. (2.3) that

$$\Psi_{n+1}(x) \equiv (U_A\Psi_n)(x) = \sum_{i=1}^{d} \left( P_{2i-1}A\Psi_n(x + e_i) + P_{2i}A\Psi_n(x - e_i) \right).$$

(2.5)

This equation means that the particle moves at each step one unit to the $x_i$-axis direction with matrix $P_{2i}A$ or one unit to the $-x_i$-axis direction with matrix $P_{2i-1}A$. For time $n \in \mathbb{Z}_d$ and location $x \in \mathbb{Z}^d$, we define the measure $\mu_n(x)$ by

$$\mu_n(x) = \| \Psi_n(x) \|_{\mathbb{C}^{2d}},$$

(2.6)

where $\| \cdot \|_{\mathbb{C}^{2d}}$ denotes the standard norm on $\mathbb{C}^{2d}$. Let $\mathbb{R}_d = [0, \infty)$. Here we introduce a map $\phi : (\mathbb{C}^{2d})^{2d} \rightarrow (\mathbb{R}_d)^{2d}$ such that if $\Psi_n : \mathbb{Z}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^{2d}$ and $x \in \mathbb{Z}^d$, thus we get

$$\phi(\Psi_n)(x) = \sum_{j=1}^{2d} |\Psi_n^j(x)|^2 = \mu_n(x),$$

(2.7)

namely this map $\phi$ has a role to transform from amplitudes to measures.

### 3 Stationary measure of the Grover walk on $\mathbb{Z}^d$

In this section, we give the definition of the stationary measure for the quantum walk. We define a set of measures, $\mathcal{M}_s(U_A)$, by

$$\mathcal{M}_s(U_A) = \left\{ \mu \in [0, \infty)^{2d} \setminus \{0\} : \text{there exists } \Psi_0 \in (\mathbb{C}^{2d})^{2d} \text{ such that } \phi(U_A^n\Psi_0) = \mu \ (n \in \mathbb{Z}_d) \right\},$$

(3.1)

where $0$ is the zero vector. Here $U_A$ is the time evolution operator of quantum walk associated with a unitary matrix $A$. We call this measure $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_s(U_A)$ the stationary measure for the quantum walk defined by the unitary operator $U_A$. If $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_s(U_A)$, then $\mu_n = \mu$ for $n \in \mathbb{Z}_d$, where $\mu_n$ is the measure of quantum walk given by $U_A$ at time $n$.

Next we consider the following eigenvalue problem of the quantum walk determined by $U_A$:

$$U_A\Psi = \lambda \Psi \quad (\lambda \in \mathbb{C}, \ |\lambda| = 1).$$

(3.2)

We introduce the set of solutions of Eq. (3.2) for $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$ with $|\lambda| = 1$ as follows.

$$W(\lambda) = \{ \Psi \neq 0 : U_A\Psi = \lambda \Psi \}.$$  

(3.3)

Then for $\Psi \in W(\lambda)$, we see that $\phi(\Psi) \in \mathcal{M}_s(U_A)$. If the function $\Psi$ satisfied with $\lambda = 1$ in Eq. (3.2), then $\Psi$ is called the stationary amplitude. From now on, we focus on the Grover Walk on $\mathbb{Z}^d$ which is defined by the following $2d \times 2d$ coin matrix $U_G = (g_{ij})_{i,j=1,2,\ldots,2d}$ with

$$g_{ij} = \frac{1}{d} - \delta_{ij}.$$  

(3.4)

Remark that Komatsu and Tate [5] showed that the eigenvalue of Eq. (3.2) is only $\lambda = \pm 1$ for the $d$-dimensional Grover walk. Our purpose of this paper is to investigate the support of the $2d$-state Grover walk on $\mathbb{Z}^d$. 

2
4 Grover walk on $\mathbb{Z}^d$ with moving shift

In this section, we present our main results on the support of the Grover walk on $\mathbb{Z}^d$ with moving shift. To do so, we begin with the eigenvalue problem $U_G \Psi = \lambda \Psi$ ($\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$ with $|\lambda| = 1$), which is equivalent to

$$
\begin{cases}
\lambda \Psi^1(x) = \frac{1-d}{d} \Psi^1(x + e_1) + \frac{1}{d} \Psi^2(x + e_1) + \cdots + \frac{1}{d} \Psi^{2d-1}(x + e_1), \\
\lambda \Psi^2(x) = \frac{1}{d} \Psi^1(x - e_1) + \frac{1-d}{d} \Psi^2(x - e_1) + \cdots + \frac{1}{d} \Psi^{2d-1}(x - e_1), \\
\vdots \\
\lambda \Psi^{2d-1}(x) = \frac{1}{d} \Psi^1(x - e_d) + \frac{1-d}{d} \Psi^2(x - e_d) + \cdots + \frac{1}{d} \Psi^{2d-1}(x - e_d), \\
\lambda \Psi^{2d}(x) = \frac{1}{d} \Psi^1(x - e_d) + \frac{1}{d} \Psi^2(x - e_d) + \cdots + \frac{1}{d} \Psi^{2d-1}(x - e_d),
\end{cases}
$$

(4.1)

where $\Psi(x) = T^\dagger [\Psi^1(x), \Psi^2(x), \cdots, \Psi^{2d}(x)]$ ($x \in \mathbb{Z}^d$). Put $\Gamma(x) = \sum_{j=1}^{2d} \Psi^j(x)$ for $x \in \mathbb{Z}^d$. By using $\Gamma(x)$, Eq. (4.1) can be written as

$$
\lambda \Psi^{2k-1}(x - e_k) + \Psi^{2k-1}(x) = \frac{1}{d} \Gamma(x),
$$

(4.2)

$$
\lambda \Psi^{2k}(x + e_k) + \Psi^{2k}(x) = \frac{1}{d} \Gamma(x),
$$

(4.3)

for any $k = 1, 2, \ldots, d$ and $x \in \mathbb{Z}^d$. From Eqs. (4.2) and (4.3), we get immediately

$$
\lambda \Psi^{2k-1}(x - e_k) + \Psi^{2k-1}(x) = \lambda \Psi^{2k}(x + e_k) + \Psi^{2k}(x),
$$

(4.4)

for any $k = 1, 2, \ldots, d$ and $x \in \mathbb{Z}^d$. In order to state the following lemma, we introduce the support of $\Psi : \mathbb{Z}^d \to \mathbb{C}^{2d}$ as follows:

$$
S(\Psi) = \{x \in \mathbb{Z}^d : \Psi(x) \neq 0\}.
$$

(4.5)

Lemma 1  Let $\Psi \in W(\lambda)$ with $\lambda = \pm 1$. Suppose $\#(S(\Psi)) < \infty$, where $\#(A)$ is the cardinality of a set $A$. If there exist $k \in \{1, 2, \cdots, d\}$ and $x \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ such that

$$
\begin{bmatrix}
\Psi^{2k-1}(x-e_k) \\
\Psi^{2k}(x)
\end{bmatrix}
\neq
\begin{bmatrix}
0 \\
0
\end{bmatrix},
$$

(4.6)

then we have

$$
\begin{bmatrix}
\Psi^{2k-1}(x-e_k) \\
\Psi^{2k}(x-e_k)
\end{bmatrix}
\neq
\begin{bmatrix}
0 \\
0
\end{bmatrix}
\quad \text{or} \quad
\begin{bmatrix}
\Psi^{2k-1}(x+e_k) \\
\Psi^{2k}(x+e_k)
\end{bmatrix}
\neq
\begin{bmatrix}
0 \\
0
\end{bmatrix}.
$$

(4.7)

Proof  First we assume that

$$
\begin{bmatrix}
\Psi^{2k-1}(x) \\
\Psi^{2k}(x)
\end{bmatrix}
\neq
\begin{bmatrix}
0 \\
0
\end{bmatrix},
$$

(4.8)

for some $k \in \{1, 2, \cdots, d\}$ and $x \in \mathbb{Z}^d$. Moreover we suppose

$$
\begin{bmatrix}
\Psi^{2k-1}(x-e_k) \\
\Psi^{2k}(x-e_k)
\end{bmatrix}
= \begin{bmatrix}
0 \\
0
\end{bmatrix}
\quad \text{and} \quad
\begin{bmatrix}
\Psi^{2k-1}(x+e_k) \\
\Psi^{2k}(x+e_k)
\end{bmatrix}
= \begin{bmatrix}
0 \\
0
\end{bmatrix},
$$

(4.9)

that is,

$$
\Psi^{2k-1}(x-e_k) = 0,
$$

(4.10)
\[ \Psi^{2k}(x - e_k) = 0, \quad (4.11) \]
\[ \Psi^{2k-1}(x + e_k) = 0, \quad (4.12) \]
\[ \Psi^{2k}(x + e_k) = 0. \quad (4.13) \]
Combining Eq. (4.4) with Eqs. (4.10) and (4.13), we have
\[ \Psi^{2k-1}(x) = \Psi^{2k}(x). \quad (4.14) \]
From the assumption Eqs. (4.8) and (4.14), we put
\[ \Psi^{2k-1}(x) = \Psi^{2k}(x) = \eta, \quad (4.15) \]
where \( \eta \in \mathbb{C} \) with \( \eta \neq 0 \). Furthermore, by Eq. (4.4) for \( x - e_k \), we obtain
\[ \lambda \Psi^{2k-1}(x - 2e_k) + \Psi^{2k-1}(x - e_k) = \lambda \Psi^{2k}(x) + \Psi^{2k}(x - e_k). \quad (4.16) \]
Combining Eq. (4.16) with Eqs. (4.11) and (4.15) implies
\[ \Psi^{2k-1}(x - 2e_k) = \eta, \quad (4.17) \]
since \( \lambda \neq 0 \). In a similar way, Eq. (4.4) for \( x - 2e_k \) becomes
\[ \lambda \Psi^{2k-1}(x - 3e_k) + \Psi^{2k-1}(x - 2e_k) = \lambda \Psi^{2k}(x - e_k) + \Psi^{2k}(x - 2e_k). \quad (4.18) \]
From Eq. (4.17) with Eqs. (4.11) and (4.17), we have
\[ \Psi^{2k-1}(x - 3e_k) = \lambda \{ \Psi^{2k}(x - 2e_k) - \eta \}, \quad (4.19) \]
since \( \lambda = \pm 1 \). Similarly, Eq. (4.4) for \( x - 3e_k \) becomes
\[ \lambda \Psi^{2k-1}(x - 4e_k) + \Psi^{2k-1}(x - 3e_k) = \lambda \Psi^{2k}(x - 2e_k) + \Psi^{2k}(x - 3e_k). \quad (4.20) \]
From Eq. (4.20) with Eq. (4.19), we get
\[ \Psi^{2k-1}(x - 4e_k) = \lambda \Psi^{2k}(x - 3e_k) + \eta. \quad (4.21) \]
Continuing this argument repeatedly, we finally obtain
\[ \Psi^{2k-1}(x - (j + 1)e_k) = \lambda \Psi^{2k}(x - je_k) + (-\lambda)^{j+1} \eta, \quad (4.22) \]
for any \( j = 0, 1, 2, \cdots \). Assumption \#(S(\Psi)) < \infty implies that there exists \( J \) such that
\[ \Psi^{2k-1}(x - Je_k) = \Psi^{2k}(x - Je_k) = 0, \quad (4.23) \]
for any \( j' \geq J \). Combining Eq. (4.22) with Eq. (4.23) gives \( \eta = 0 \) since \( \lambda \neq 0 \). Therefore contradiction occurs, so the proof is complete.

**Lemma 2** Let \( \Psi \in W(\lambda) \) with \( \lambda = \pm 1 \). Suppose \#(S(\Psi)) < \infty. If there exist \( k \in \{1, 2, \cdots, d\} \) and \( x \in \mathbb{Z}^d \) such that
\[ \left[ \begin{array}{c} \Psi^{2k-1}(x) \\ \Psi^{2k}(x) \end{array} \right] \neq \left[ \begin{array}{c} 0 \\ 0 \end{array} \right], \quad (4.24) \]
then there exist \( m^-(\leq 0) \) and \( m^+(\geq 0) \) with \( m^- < m^+ \) and \( \alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{C} \) with \( \alpha \beta \neq 0 \) such that
\[ \left[ \begin{array}{c} \Psi^{2k-1}(x + me_k) \\ \Psi^{2k}(x + me_k) \end{array} \right] = \left\{ \begin{array}{ll} T [0, 0] & (m < m^-) \\ T [\alpha, 0] & (m = m^-) \\ T [0, \beta] & (m = m^+) \\ T [0, 0] & (m > m^+) \end{array} \right. \quad (4.25) \]
Moreover, we have
\[
\begin{bmatrix}
\Psi^{2l-1}(x + m(-)e_k) \\
\Psi^2(x + m(-)e_k)
\end{bmatrix} \neq \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix},
\]
(4.26)
and
\[
\begin{bmatrix}
\Psi^{2l-1}(x + m^+(e_k) \\
\Psi^2(x + m^+(e_k))
\end{bmatrix} \neq \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix},
\]
(4.27)
for any \( l \in \{1, 2, \cdots, d\}\) \( \backslash \{k\} \).

**Proof** From Lemma 1, we get \( \#S(\Psi) \geq 2 \). Therefore we see that there exist \( m^-(\leq 0) \) and \( m^+(\geq 0) \) with \( m^+ < m^- \) and \( \alpha, \beta, \gamma, \delta \in \mathbb{C} \) with \( |\alpha| + |\gamma| > 0 \) and \( |\beta| + |\delta| > 0 \) such that
\[
\begin{bmatrix}
\Psi^{2k-1}(x + m_1 e_k) \\
\Psi^{2k}(x + m_1 e_k)
\end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} T \begin{bmatrix} 0, 0 \end{bmatrix} & (m < m^-) \\
T \begin{bmatrix} \alpha, \gamma \end{bmatrix} & (m = m^-) \\
T \begin{bmatrix} \delta, \beta \end{bmatrix} & (m = m^+) \\
T \begin{bmatrix} 0, 0 \end{bmatrix} & (m > m^+)
\end{bmatrix}.
\]
(4.28)

By Eq. (4.4) for \( x + (m^- - 1)e_k \), we have
\[
\lambda \Psi^{2k-1}(x + (m^- - 2)e_k) + \Psi^{2k-1}(x + (m^- - 1)e_k)
= \lambda \Psi^{2k}(x + (m^- - 1)e_k) + \Psi^{2k}(x + (m^- - 1)e_k).
\]
(4.29)
Combining Eq. (4.28) with Eq. (4.29) gives
\[
\Psi^{2k}(x + m^- e_k) = \gamma = 0,
\]
(4.30)
since \( \lambda \neq 0 \). In a similar fashion, from Eq. (4.4) for \( x + (m^+ + 1)e_k \), we have
\[
\Psi^{2k-1}(x + m^+ e_k) = \delta = 0.
\]
(4.31)
Thus combining Eqs. (4.28), (4.30) and (4.31) implies Eq. (4.25).

By Eq. (4.2) for \( x + m^- e_k \), we have
\[
\lambda \Psi^{2k-1}(x + (m^- - 1)e_k) + \Psi^{2k-1}(x + m^- e_k) = \frac{1}{d} \Gamma(x + m^- e_k).
\]
(4.32)
Then combining Eq. (4.32) with Eq. (4.25) gives
\[
\frac{1}{d} \Gamma(x + m^- e_k) = \alpha.
\]
(4.33)
Similarly, by Eq. (4.3) for \( x + m^+ e_k \) and Eq. (4.25), we get
\[
\frac{1}{d} \Gamma(x + m^+ e_k) = \beta.
\]
(4.34)
From now on, we assume that there exists \( l \in \{1, 2, \cdots, d\}\) \( \backslash \{k\} \) such that
\[
\begin{bmatrix}
\Psi^{2l-1}(x + m^- e_k) \\
\Psi^2(x + m^- e_k)
\end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix},
\]
(4.35)
or
\[
\begin{bmatrix}
\Psi^{2l-1}(x + m^+ e_k) \\
\Psi^2(x + m^+ e_k)
\end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}.
\]
(4.36)
First we consider Eq. (4.35) case. We now use Eq. (4.2) with \( k \to l \) and \( x \to x + m(-)e_k \) to get
\[
\lambda \Psi^{2l-1}(x + m(-)e_k) - e_l + \Psi^{2l-1}(x + m(-)e_k) = \frac{1}{d} \Gamma(x + m(-)e_k).
\] (4.37)

Using the equation just derived and Eq. (4.33), we have
\[
\lambda \Psi^{2l-1}(x + m(-)e_k) - e_l + \Psi^{2l-1}(x + m(-)e_k) = \alpha.
\] (4.38)

By assumption \( \Psi^{2l-1}(x + m(-)e_k) = 0 \) in Eq. (4.35), we see that Eq. (4.38) becomes
\[
\Psi^{2l-1}(x + m(-)e_k) - e_l = \lambda \alpha,
\] (4.39)

since \( \lambda = \pm 1 \). Next we see Eq. (4.4) with \( k \to l \) and \( x \to x + m(-)e_k - e_l \) to get
\[
\lambda \Psi^{2l-1}(x + m(-)e_k) - 2e_l + \Psi^{2l-1}(x + m(-)e_k) - e_l
\]
\[
= \lambda \Psi^2(x + m(-)e_k) + \Psi^2(x + m(-)e_k) - e_l.
\] (4.40)

Combining this equation with Eq. (4.39) and assumption \( \Psi^2(x + m(-)e_k) = 0 \) in Eq. (4.35) gives
\[
\Psi^{2l-1}(x + m(-)e_k) - 2e_l = \lambda \Psi^2(x + m(-)e_k) - e_l - \lambda^2 \alpha.
\] (4.41)

since \( \lambda = \pm 1 \). By the similar argument repeatedly, we obtain,
\[
\Psi^{2l-1}(x + m(-)e_k) - (j + 1)e_l = \lambda \Psi^2(x + m(-)e_k) - je_l - (-\lambda)^j+1 \alpha,
\] (4.42)

for any \( j = 1, 2, \ldots \). Assumption \#(\( S(\Psi) \)) < \( \infty \) implies that there exists \( J \) such that
\[
\Psi^{2l-1}(x + m(-)e_k) - j' e_k = \Psi^2(x + m(-)e_k) - j' e_l = 0,
\] (4.43)

for any \( j' \geq J \). Combining Eq. (4.42) with Eq. (4.43) gives \( \alpha = 0 \) since \( \lambda \neq 0 \). Thus we have a contradiction.

Next we consider Eq. (4.36) case. In a similar fashion, we get \( \beta = 0 \) and have a contradiction. Therefore the proof of Lemma 2 is complete.

**Theorem 1** For the Grover walk on \( \mathbb{Z}^d \) with moving shift, we have
\[
\#(S(\Psi)) \geq 2^d,
\] (4.44)

for any \( \Psi \in W(\lambda) \) with \( \lambda = \pm 1 \). In particular, there exists \( \Psi_\star^\lambda \in W(\lambda) \) such that
\[
\#(S(\Psi_\star^\lambda)) = 2^d,
\] (4.45)

for \( \lambda = \pm 1 \). In fact, we obtain
\[
\Psi_\star^\lambda(x) = \lambda^{x_1 + x_2 + \cdots + x_d} \times \text{ T } [x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_d] \quad (x \in S(\Psi_\star^\lambda)),
\] (4.46)

where
\[
S(\Psi_\star^\lambda) = \{ x = (x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_d) \in \mathbb{Z}^d : x_k \in \{0, 1\} (k = 1, 2, \ldots, d) \}. \quad (4.47)
\]

Here \( |0\rangle = \text{T}[1, 0] \) and \( |1\rangle = \text{T}[0, 1] \).

**Proof.** For \( \Psi \in W(\lambda) \) with \( \lambda = \pm 1 \), there exist \( k \in \{1, 2, \ldots, d\} \) and \( x \in \mathbb{Z}^d \) such that
\[
\begin{bmatrix}
\Psi^{2k-1}(x) \\
\Psi^{2k}(x)
\end{bmatrix} \neq \begin{bmatrix}
0 \\
0
\end{bmatrix}.
\] (4.48)

Thus, we have \( x \in S(\Psi) \).

First we consider \( d = 1 \) case. From Lemma 1, we see that \( x - e_1 \in S(\Psi) \) or \( x + e_1 \in S(\Psi) \), so \( \#(S(\Psi)) \geq 2 \). If fact, we can construct a \( \Psi_\star^\lambda \in W(\lambda) \) with \( \lambda = \pm 1 \) satisfying \( \#(S(\Psi_\star^\lambda)) = 2 \) as follows.
where $m_1 \in \mathbb{Z}$.

Next we deal with $d = 2$ case. Considering the argument for $d = 1$ case, we can assume

$$\begin{bmatrix} \Psi^1(x + m_1 e_1) \\ \Psi^2(x + m_1 e_1) \end{bmatrix} \neq \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad \begin{bmatrix} \Psi^1(x + e_1) \\ \Psi^2(x + e_1) \end{bmatrix} \neq \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}. \quad (4.49)$$

By Lemma 2 with Eq. (4.50), we can also assume $m^{(-)} = 0$ and $m^{(+)} = 1$ to minimize the #$S(\Psi)$, then we have

$$\begin{bmatrix} \Psi^3(x) \\ \Psi^4(x) \end{bmatrix} \neq \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad (4.51)$$

and

$$\begin{bmatrix} \Psi^3(x + e_1) \\ \Psi^4(x + e_1) \end{bmatrix} \neq \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}. \quad (4.52)$$

From Lemma 1 with Eqs. (4.51) and (4.52), we obtain “$x - e_2 \in S(\Psi)$ or $x + e_2 \in S(\Psi)$” and “$x + e_1 - e_2 \in S(\Psi)$ or $x + e_1 + e_2 \in S(\Psi)$” respectively, so #$S(\Psi) \geq 4$. In fact, we can construct a $\Psi^\lambda_x \in W(\lambda)$ with $\lambda = \pm 1$ satisfying #$S(\Psi^\lambda_x) = 4$ as follows.

$$\Psi(x + m_1 e_1 + m_2 e_2) = \begin{cases} \lambda^{m_1+m_2} x^T & (m_1, m_2) = (0, 0) \\ \lambda^{m_1+m_2} x^T & (m_1, m_2) = (1, 0) \\ \lambda^{m_1+m_2} x^T & (m_1, m_2) = (0, 1) \\ \lambda^{m_1+m_2} x^T & (m_1, m_2) = (1, 1) \\ T^{0, 0, 0, 0} & (otherwise) \end{cases} \quad (4.53)$$

for $m_1, m_2 \in \mathbb{Z}$. Remark that Eq. (4.53) has been introduced in Stefanak et al. [7]. Continuing a similar argument for $d = 3, 4, \cdots$, we have the desired conclusion.

From Eq. (4.53), we obtain the following equation as a stationary measure of Grover walk on $\mathbb{Z}^2$ when $\lambda = 1$.

$$\Psi(x, y) = \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \\ 1 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} g(x, y) + \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 1 \\ 1 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} g(x - 1, y) + \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix} g(x - 1, y - 1) + \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 1 \\ 0 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix} g(x - 1, y - 1), \quad (4.54)$$

for $(x, y) \in \mathbb{Z}^2$. Here $g : \mathbb{Z}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$. Let $g(x, y)$ as follows.

$$g(x, y) = \begin{cases} \delta(x, y) & (x, y) \in \{0, -1\} \\ 0 & (otherwise) \end{cases}. \quad (4.55)$$

Then combining Eq. (4.54) with Eq. (4.55), we easily get #$S(\Psi) = 9$ such that

$$\Psi = \begin{bmatrix} 2 & \delta(0, 0) \\ 2 & \delta(0, 1) \\ 2 & \delta(1, 0) \\ 2 & \delta(-1, 0) \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} 0 & \delta(0, 1) \\ 0 & \delta(1, 0) \\ 0 & \delta(-1, 0) \\ 0 & \delta(-1, 0) \end{bmatrix} \cdot \begin{bmatrix} 2 \\ 1 \\ 1 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix} \quad (4.56)$$

Remark that Eq. (4.56) has been introduced in Komatsu and Konno [3].
5 Grover walk on $\mathbb{Z}^d$ with flip-flop shift

In this section, we consider the case of the $d$-dimensional Grover walk with flip-flop shift. The eigenvalue problem $U_G \Psi = \lambda \Psi$ ($\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$ with $|\lambda| = 1$) is equivalent to

$$
\begin{align*}
\lambda \Psi^1(x) &= \frac{1}{d} \Psi^1(x + e_1) + \frac{1}{d} \Psi^2(x + e_1) + \cdots + \frac{1}{d} \Psi^{2d-1}(x + e_1) + \frac{1}{d} \Psi^{2d}(x + e_1), \\
\lambda \Psi^2(x) &= \frac{1}{d} \Psi^1(x - e_1) + \frac{1}{d} \Psi^2(x - e_1) + \cdots + \frac{1}{d} \Psi^{2d-1}(x - e_1) + \frac{1}{d} \Psi^{2d}(x - e_1), \\
&\vdots \\
\lambda \Psi^{2d-1}(x) &= \frac{1}{d} \Psi^1(x + e_d) + \frac{1}{d} \Psi^2(x + e_d) + \cdots + \frac{1}{d} \Psi^{2d-1}(x + e_d) + \frac{1}{d} \Psi^{2d}(x + e_d), \\
\lambda \Psi^{2d}(x) &= \frac{1}{d} \Psi^1(x - e_d) + \frac{1}{d} \Psi^2(x - e_d) + \cdots + \frac{1}{d} \Psi^{2d-1}(x - e_d) + \frac{1}{d} \Psi^{2d}(x - e_d),
\end{align*}
$$

(5.1)

where $\Psi(x) = T[\Psi^1(x), \Psi^2(x), \ldots, \Psi^{2d}(x)]$ ($x \in \mathbb{Z}^d$). Put $\Gamma(x) = \sum_{j=1}^{2d} \Psi^j(x)$ for $x \in \mathbb{Z}^d$. By using $\Gamma(x)$, Eq. (5.1) can be written as

$$
\lambda \Psi^{2k-1}(x - e_k) + \Psi^{2k}(x) = \frac{1}{d} \Gamma(x), \quad (5.2)
$$

$$
\lambda \Psi^{2k}(x + e_k) + \Psi^{2k-1}(x) = \frac{1}{d} \Gamma(x), \quad (5.3)
$$

for any $k = 1, 2, \ldots, d$ and $x \in \mathbb{Z}^d$. From Eqs. (5.2) and (5.3), we get immediately

$$
\lambda \Psi^{2k-1}(x - e_k) + \Psi^{2k}(x) = \lambda \Psi^{2k}(x + e_k) + \Psi^{2k-1}(x), \quad (5.4)
$$

for any $k = 1, 2, \ldots, d$ and $x \in \mathbb{Z}^d$.

**Lemma 3** Let $\Psi \in W(\lambda)$ with $\lambda = \pm 1$. Suppose $\#(S(\Psi)) < \infty$. If there exist $k \in \{1, 2, \ldots, d\}$ and $x \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ such that

$$
\begin{bmatrix}
\Psi^{2k-1}(x - e_k) \\
\Psi^{2k}(x - e_k)
\end{bmatrix} \neq \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix},
$$

(5.5)

then we have

$$
\begin{bmatrix}
\Psi^{2k-1}(x - e_k) \\
\Psi^{2k}(x - e_k)
\end{bmatrix} \neq \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} \quad \text{or} \quad \begin{bmatrix}
\Psi^{2k-1}(x + e_k) \\
\Psi^{2k}(x + e_k)
\end{bmatrix} \neq \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}.
$$

(5.6)

**Proof** First we assume that

$$
\begin{bmatrix}
\Psi^{2k-1}(x) \\
\Psi^{2k}(x)
\end{bmatrix} \neq \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix},
$$

(5.7)

for some $k \in \{1, 2, \ldots, d\}$ and $x \in \mathbb{Z}^d$. Furthermore we suppose

$$
\begin{bmatrix}
\Psi^{2k-1}(x - e_k) \\
\Psi^{2k}(x - e_k)
\end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad \begin{bmatrix}
\Psi^{2k-1}(x + e_k) \\
\Psi^{2k}(x + e_k)
\end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}.
$$

(5.8)

By a similar calculation as in Lemma 1, we get the following equation corresponding to Eq. (5.22).

$$
\Psi^{2k-1}(x - (j + 1)e_k) = -\lambda \Psi^{2k}(x - je_k) + \lambda^{j+1} \eta,
$$

(5.9)

where $\eta = \Psi^{2k-1}(x) = \Psi^{2k}(x)$ for any $j = 0, 1, 2, \ldots$. Assumption $\#(S(\Psi)) < \infty$ implies that there exists $J$ such that

$$
\Psi^{2k-1}(x - j'e_k) = \Psi^{2k}(x - j'e_k) = 0,
$$

(5.10)

for any $j' \geq J$. Combining Eq. (5.9) with Eq. (5.10) gives $\eta = 0$ since $\lambda \neq 0$. Therefore contradiction occurs, so the proof is complete.
Lemma 4  Let $\Psi \in W(\lambda)$ with $\lambda = \pm 1$. Suppose $\#(S(\Psi)) < \infty$. If there exist $k \in \{1, 2, \cdots, d\}$ and \(x \in \mathbb{Z}^d\) such that
\[
\begin{bmatrix}
\Psi^{2k-1}(x) \\
\Psi^{2k}(x)
\end{bmatrix} \neq \begin{bmatrix}
0 \\
0
\end{bmatrix},
\tag{5.11}
\]
then there exist $m^-(\leq 0)$ and $m^+(\geq 0)$ with $m^- < m^+$ and $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{C}$ with $\alpha \beta \neq 0$ such that
\[
\begin{bmatrix}
\Psi^{2k-1}(x + me_k) \\
\Psi^{2k}(x + me_k)
\end{bmatrix} = \begin{cases}
T [0, 0] & (m < m^-) \\
T [\alpha, 0] & (m = m^-) \\
T [0, \beta] & (m = m^+) \\
T [0, 0] & (m > m^+)
\end{cases} \tag{5.12}
\]
Moreover, we have
\[
\Gamma(x + m^-e_k) = 0, \tag{5.13}
\]
and
\[
\Gamma(x + m^+e_k) = 0. \tag{5.14}
\]

Proof  From Lemma 3, we get $\#S(\Psi) \geq 2$. Therefore we see that there exist $m^-(\leq 0)$ and $m^+(\geq 0)$ with $m^- < m^+$ and $\alpha, \beta, \gamma, \delta \in \mathbb{C}$ with $|\alpha| + |\gamma| > 0$ and $|\beta| + |\delta| > 0$ such that
\[
\begin{bmatrix}
\Psi^{2k-1}(x + me_k) \\
\Psi^{2k}(x + me_k)
\end{bmatrix} = \begin{cases}
T [0, 0] & (m < m^-) \\
T [\alpha, \gamma] & (m = m^-) \\
T [\delta, \beta] & (m = m^+) \\
T [0, 0] & (m > m^+)
\end{cases} \tag{5.15}
\]
By Eq. (5.4) for $x + (m^- - 1)e_k$, we have
\[
\lambda \Psi^{2k-1}(x + (m^- - 2)e_k) + \Psi^{2k}(x + (m^- - 1)e_k) = \lambda \Psi^{2k}(x + m^-e_k) + \Psi^{2k-1}(x + (m^- - 1)e_k). \tag{5.16}
\]
Combining Eq. (5.15) with Eq. (5.16) gives
\[
\Psi^{2k}(x + m^-e_k) = \gamma = 0, \tag{5.17}
\]
since $\lambda \neq 0$. In a similar fashion, from Eq. (5.4) for $x + (m^+ + 1)e_k$, we have
\[
\Psi^{2k-1}(x + m^+e_k) = \delta = 0. \tag{5.18}
\]
Thus combining Eqs. (5.15), (5.17) and (5.18) implies Eq. (5.12).

By Eq. (5.2) for $x + m^-e_k$, we have
\[
\lambda \Psi^{2k-1}(x + (m^- - 1)e_k) + \Psi^{2k}(x + m^-e_k) = \frac{1}{d} \Gamma(x + m^-e_k). \tag{5.19}
\]
Then combining Eq. (5.19) with Eq. (5.12) gives
\[
\frac{1}{d} \Gamma(x + m^-e_k) = 0. \tag{5.20}
\]
Similarly, by Eq. (5.3) for $x + m^+e_k$ and Eq. (5.12), we get
\[
\frac{1}{d} \Gamma(x + m^+e_k) = 0. \tag{5.21}
\]
Therefore the proof of Lemma 4 is complete.

**Theorem 2** For the Grover walk on $\mathbb{Z}^d$ with flip-flop shift, we have

$$\begin{cases} 
  \#(S(\Psi)) = 0 & (d = 1) \\
  \#(S(\Psi)) \geq 4 & (d \geq 2)
\end{cases} \tag{5.22}$$

for any $\Psi \in W(\lambda)$ with $\lambda = \pm 1$. In particular, there exists $\Psi^{(\lambda)}_* \in W(\lambda)$ such that

$$\#(S(\Psi)) = 4 \quad (d \geq 2) \tag{5.23}$$

for $\lambda = \pm 1$. In fact, we obtain

$$\Psi^{(\lambda)}_*(x) = \lambda^{x_1+x_2} \times T \left[ (-1)^{x_1+x_2} x_1, \ldots, 0 \right] \quad (x \in S(\Psi^{(\lambda)}_*)), \tag{5.24}$$

where

$$S(\Psi^{(\lambda)}_*) = \{ x = (x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_d) \in \mathbb{Z}^d : x_1, x_2 \in \{0, 1\}, x_3 = x_4 = \cdots = x_d = 0 \}. \tag{5.25}$$

Here $|0\rangle = T[1, 0]$, $|1\rangle = T[0, 1]$ and $0 = T[0, 0]$.  

**Proof** First, we consider $d = 1$ case. For $\Psi \in W(\lambda)$ with $\lambda = \pm 1$, there exists $x \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that

$$\begin{bmatrix} \Psi^1(x) \\ \Psi^2(x) \end{bmatrix} \neq \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}. \tag{5.26}$$

From Lemma 4, we have $m_1^{(-)}(\leq 0)$ and $m_1^{(+)}(\geq 0)$ with $m_1^{(-)} < m_1^{(+)}$ and $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{C}$ with $\alpha \beta \neq 0$ such that

$$\begin{bmatrix} \Psi^1(x + m_1) \\ \Psi^2(x + m_1) \end{bmatrix} = \begin{cases} T[0, 0] & (m_1 < m_1^{(-)}) \\
T[\alpha, 0] & (m_1 = m_1^{(-)}) \\
T[0, \beta] & (m_1 = m_1^{(+)}) \\
T[0, 0] & (m_1 > m_1^{(+)}) \end{cases} \tag{5.27}$$

and

$$\begin{cases} \Gamma(x + m_1^{(-)}) = 0 \\
\Gamma(x + m_1^{(+)}) = 0 \end{cases} \tag{5.28}$$

By definition of $\Gamma$ and Eq. (5.27), we have

$$\begin{cases} \Gamma(x + m_1^{(-)}) = \alpha \\
\Gamma(x + m_1^{(+)}) = \beta \end{cases} \tag{5.29}$$

Combining Eq. (5.28) with Eq. (5.29), we get $\alpha = \beta = 0$. So we see that the finite support for $d=1$ does not exist.

Next we deal with $d = 2$ case. For $\Psi \in W(\lambda)$ with $\lambda = \pm 1$, we assume that there exists $x \in \mathbb{Z}^2$ such that

$$\begin{bmatrix} \Psi^1(x) \\ \Psi^2(x) \end{bmatrix} \neq \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} \tag{5.30}$$

and we put

$$\begin{cases} m^{(-)} = 0 \\
m^{(+)} = 1 \end{cases} \tag{5.31}$$

for Eq. (5.12) on Lemma 4 to minimize $\#(S(\Psi))$. By using (5.12) with Eq. (5.31), we have

$$\begin{bmatrix} \Psi^1(x) \\ \Psi^2(x) \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \alpha \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}. \tag{5.32}$$
By definition of $\Gamma$ with Eqs. (5.13), (5.31) and (5.32), we get
\[
\begin{bmatrix}
\Psi^3(x) \\
\Psi^4(x)
\end{bmatrix} \neq \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\
0 \end{bmatrix}, \tag{5.33}
\]
since $\alpha \neq 0$.
Similarly, from Lemma 3 with Eq. (5.30), we can assume
\[
\begin{bmatrix}
\Psi^1(x + e_1) \\
\Psi^2(x + e_1)
\end{bmatrix} \neq \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\
0 \end{bmatrix}, \tag{5.34}
\]
and we obtain
\[
\begin{bmatrix}
\Psi^3(x + e_1) \\
\Psi^4(x + e_1)
\end{bmatrix} \neq \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\
0 \end{bmatrix}, \tag{5.35}
\]
since $\beta \neq 0$. From Lemma 3 with Eqs. (5.33) and (5.35), we obtain “$x - e_2 \in S(\Psi)$ or $x + e_2 \in S(\Psi)$” and “$x + e_1 - e_2 \in S(\Psi)$ or $x + e_1 + e_2 \in S(\Psi)$” respectively, so $#(S(\Psi)) \geq 4$. In fact, we can construct a $\Psi^{(\lambda)}_* \in W(\lambda)$ with $\lambda = \pm 1$ satisfying $#(S(\Psi^{(\lambda)}_*)) = 4$ as follows.
\[
\Psi(x + m_1e_1 + m_2e_2) = \begin{cases}
T \begin{bmatrix} 1, 0, -1, 0 \end{bmatrix} & (m_1, m_2) = (0, 0) \\
T \begin{bmatrix} 0, -\lambda, \lambda, 0 \end{bmatrix} & (m_1, m_2) = (1, 0) \\
T \begin{bmatrix} -\lambda, 0, 0, \lambda \end{bmatrix} & (m_1, m_2) = (0, 1) \\
T \begin{bmatrix} 0, 1, 0, -1 \end{bmatrix} & (m_1, m_2) = (1, 1) \\
T \begin{bmatrix} 0, 0, 0, 0 \end{bmatrix} & \text{(otherwise)}
\end{cases} \tag{5.36}
\]
for $m_1, m_2 \in \mathbb{Z}$.

Finally, we consider $d \geq 3$ case by continuing the argument on $d = 2$ case. To expand Eq. (5.36) to $d \geq 3$, we focus on the fact that $\Gamma(x + m_1e_1 + m_2e_2) = 0$ for any $x \in \mathbb{Z}^2$ and $m_1, m_2 \in \mathbb{Z}$ in Eq. (5.36). By assuming $\Psi^{2k-1}(x + m_1e_1 + m_2e_2) = \Psi^{2k}(x + m_1e_1 + m_2e_2) = 0$ for any $k \in \{3, 4, \ldots, d\}$, we can construct a $\Psi^{(\lambda)}_* \in W(\lambda)$ with $\lambda = \pm 1$ satisfying $#(S(\Psi^{(\lambda)}_*)) = 4$ as follows.
\[
\Psi(x + m_1e_1 + m_2e_2) = \begin{cases}
T \begin{bmatrix} 1, 0, -1, 0, \ldots, 0 \end{bmatrix} & (m_1, m_2) = (0, 0) \\
T \begin{bmatrix} 0, -\lambda, 0, 0, 0, \ldots, 0 \end{bmatrix} & (m_1, m_2) = (1, 0) \\
T \begin{bmatrix} -\lambda, 0, 0, 0, 0, \ldots, 0 \end{bmatrix} & (m_1, m_2) = (0, 1) \\
T \begin{bmatrix} 0, 1, 0, -1, 0, \ldots, 0 \end{bmatrix} & (m_1, m_2) = (1, 1) \\
T \begin{bmatrix} 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, \ldots, 0 \end{bmatrix} & \text{(otherwise)}
\end{cases} \tag{5.37}
\]

Theorem 2 can be derived from another approach based on the spectral mapping theorem, see Corollary 2 in Higuchi et al. [2].

6 Summary

We presented the minimum supports of states for the Grover walk on $\mathbb{Z}^d$ with moving and flip-flop shifts, respectively, by solving the eigenvalue problem $U_G \Psi = \lambda \Psi$. Results on the moving shift model was obtained by Theorem 1 which coincides with result in Stefának et al. [7] (Z^2 case) and improves result in Komatsu and Konno [4] (Z^d case). Moreover, results on the flip-flop shift model shown by Higuchi et al. [2] was given by Theorem 2. One of the interesting future problems might be to clarify a relationship between the stationary measure and the time-averaged limit measure of the Grover walk on $\mathbb{Z}^d$. 
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