Optimized Low-Depth Quantum Circuits for Molecular Electronic Structure using a Separable Pair Approximation
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We present a classically solvable model that leads to optimized low-depth quantum circuits leveraging separable pair approximations. The obtained circuits are well suited as a baseline circuit for emerging quantum hardware and can, in the long term, provide significantly improved initial states for quantum algorithms. The associated wavefunctions can be represented with linear memory requirement which allows classical optimization of the circuits and naturally defines a minimum benchmark for quantum algorithms. In this work, we employ directly determined pair-natural orbitals within a basis-set-free approach. This leads to accurate representation of the one- and many-body parts for weakly correlated systems and we explicitly illustrate how the model can be integrated into variational and projective quantum algorithms for stronger correlated systems.

The electronic structure problem of quantum chemistry is one of the main anticipated applications for future quantum computers. [1, 2] The core problem is to extract, primarily low-lying, eigenenergies from electronic Hamiltonians as well as preparing the corresponding eigenstates. Projective algorithms, like the quantum phase estimation [3] are promising candidates for application on future quantum computers. Since the first proposals, those algorithms have been improved significantly with regards to their resource requirements and estimated runtimes [4–6], but their expected applicability remains out of reach for near and medium term devices. Variational algorithms have been originally proposed [7, 8] as an applicable class of algorithms for those devices and as a potential bridging technology until scalable fault-tolerant hardware becomes available. As the success probability of phase estimation based algorithms depends on the overlap of the initial state with the targeted eigenstate, variational algorithms might also play a role in the long term by providing improved initial states for projective algorithms.

Variational algorithms, usually aim to prepare wavefunctions directly by a parametrized quantum circuit and measure the associated energies as expectation values. The parameters of the quantum circuit (e.g. the angles of Eq. (1)) are then optimized successively by a classical optimizer via the variational principle. In it’s original form, which is most common in quantum chemical applications, the objective of the optimization is the plain expectation value of the electronic Hamiltonian. Detailed introductions to variational quantum algorithms can be found in recent reviews [9, 10], original articles [8] or in recent works on unitary coupled-cluster with hands-on code examples [11, 12]. The reviews [1, 13, 14] provide a general overview over quantum algorithms for quantum chemistry.

The construction of suitable parametrized circuits for variational algorithms is a vibrant research topic, where physically inspired models like unitary coupled-cluster where part of the initial proposals [8] and remain a source of inspiration for current approaches. Standard unitary coupled-cluster approaches such as UCCSD suffer from high gate and parameter counts that both scale with quartic cost in the number of orbitals. In addition, the corresponding quantum circuits show, once compiled into primitive one- and two-qubit gates, high gate counts and depths even for small systems with a relatively small number of variational parameters. The standard approach defines the whole unitary operation through a single exponential generated by a sum over primitive electronic excitation operators (as defined in Eq. (2)). This unitary operation is then decomposed into primitive excitation unitaries (such as Eq. (1)) employing for example the Trotter decomposition. Most modern approaches abandoned this formulation over a single exponential and instead follow a factorized [15] approach where the quantum circuit is constructed as a product of primitive excitations by various strategies such as adaptive circuit construction [11, 16, 17] as well as Lie-algebraic [18] and empirical [19] techniques. Although significantly reduced, the associated gate counts are still unfeasible on current day hardware platforms. This leads to the paradoxical situation that many-body wavefunctions of chemical systems, which are considered “easy” to describe within the classical algorithmic framework (e.g. using MP2 or CCSD), already require non-local and high-depth quantum circuits. Ideally such wavefunctions should be initializable with low-
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depth and local quantum circuits.
In this work, we will describe how such circuits can
be realized by physical principles and classical pre-
computation resulting in optimized circuits through a
separable pair ansatz (SPA). As an explicit embodi-
ment, we will combine this ansatz with the directly
determined pair-natural orbitals representation of [20]
resulting in reduced gate counts and depths by several
orders of magnitude - e.g. the BeH2(4,14) system from
a circuit with 192 controlled-not gates [20] to a depth-5
circuit with 15 local controlled-not operations shown in
Fig. 2. Apart from low gate counts and depths, such
wavefunctions prepared by the quantum circuits can be
represented efficiently on a classical computer, which
allows classical simulation and parameter optimization
of the corresponding circuits. The classically optimized
quantum circuits could then be used to prepare initial
states for more advanced quantum algorithms like the
quantum phase estimation [3] or variational algorithms
and the generators \(G_{pq}, P^0_{pq}\) can be mapped to qubits
via various transformations.

Table I. Details about the circuits used in Fig. 6 for the
N2(6,12) and BH1(6,12) systems with different levels of opti-
mization: None (0), gate decompositions similar to Ref. [24]
(1), including initialization in the HCB subspace according
to Eq. (12) using SPA as initial part of the circuit (2). Up-
CCGASD and similar circuits employ approximate singles
(similar to “A” gates in [25]) where \(\sigma_z\) terms in the gener-
ators are neglected.

I. METHODOLOGY

Unitary coupled-cluster quantum circuits are formed
from elementary \(n\)-electron excitation gates

\[
U_{pq}(\theta) = e^{-i \frac{1}{2} G_{pq}} \quad (1)
\]

which describe excitations between spin orbitals \(p = \{p_0, p_1, \ldots, p_n\}\) and \(q = \{q_0, q_1, \ldots, q_n\}\) through the
fermionic excitation generator

\[
G_{pq} = i \left( \prod_k a^\dagger_{pk} a_{qk} - h.c. \right). \quad (2)
\]

The gate acts like a rotation on a subspace spanned by
all configurations with spin-orbitals \(p\) occupied and \(q\)
unoccupied and vice versa, while acting trivially (as the
identity) on all other configurations

\[
U_{pq}(\theta) = \cos \left( \frac{\theta}{2} \right) - i \sin \left( \frac{\theta}{2} \right) G_{pq}
+ \left( 1 - \cos \left( \frac{\theta}{2} \right) \right) P^0_{pq}. \quad (3)
\]

Here, \(P^0_{pq}\) is the nullspace projector [11] of the generator

\[
P^0_{pq} = 1 - \prod_k a^\dagger_{pk} a_{pk} a^\dagger_{qk} a_{qk} - \prod_k a^\dagger_{qk} a_{qk} a^\dagger_{pk} a_{pk}. \quad (4)
\]

Within the Jordan-Wigner encoding, each spin-orbital
is mapped directly to a qubit. In terms of spatial or-
bitals this means we need twice as many qubits as spa-
tial orbitals \(N_q = 2N_s\). In this work, we will use the
Jordan-Wigner representation due to its intuitive sim-
pplicity. In future applications, we could imagine local
encodings [21–23] to be advantageous. In order to em-
ploy them within the separable pair ansatz in Eq. (18),
solely the bridging unitary of Eq. (9) that maps from the
paired representation to the Jordan-Wigner represen-
tation needs to be adapted.

A. Paired Coupled-Cluster and the Hard-Core
Boson Model

Paired unitary coupled-cluster models build their wave-
functions from single excitations and double excitations
restricted to paired electrons in the same spatial orbitals
\(p\) and \(q\). The corresponding generator for a primitive
unitary excitation operator is

\[
\tilde{G}_{pq} = i \left( a^\dagger_{p_p} a^\dagger_{q_1} a^\dagger_{p_1} a_{q_2} - h.c. \right). \quad (6)
\]
In the Jordan-Wigner encoding, all $\sigma_z$ operations in these restricted double excitations cancel out, yielding a qubit excitation generator

$$\tilde{G}_{pq}^{\text{Jordan-Wigner}} = i \left( \prod_k \sigma_{pk}^+ \sigma_{kq}^- - h.c. \right). \quad (7)$$

that can be compiled into a unitary circuit with depth 22 and 13 CNOT gates [24] (see Ref. [26] for an alternative construction). If we restrict the ansatz to only paired doubles, e.g. UpCCD, and start from a restricted reference wavefunction, the resulting wavefunction will consist solely of doubly occupied configurations. Instead of representing the spin-up and spin-down part of a spatial orbital individually with two qubits, we can now encode the doubly occupied or non-occupied spatial orbitals by a single qubit. This restriction is commonly referred to as a hard-core Boson (HCB) model of the original fermionic system and has been employed for variational quantum algorithms in reduced qubit representations [27, 28]. Instead of hard-core Boson, the model is often also labelled as seniority-free or simply as a doubly-occupied or paired model. The term seniority-free results from the seniority quantum number of the associated wavefunction which is a quantifier for unpaired electrons in the system. Associated classical algorithms are paired coupled-cluster (pCCD) or doubly-occupied configuration interaction (DOCI). In an $k$-UpCCGSD ansatz the whole wavefunction can be represented in the hard-core Boson representation by encoding the pair-excitation generators of Eq. (6) as

$$\tilde{G}_{pq}^{\text{HCB}} = i \left( \sigma_{p}^+ \sigma_{q}^- - h.c. \right). \quad (8)$$

where qubits $P, Q$ represent electron pairs in spatial orbitals $P, Q$. Thus $N_o$ spatial orbitals are mapped to $N_o$ qubits. This is conceptually the same as in Ref. [27] and the HCB-Hamiltonian can be mapped to qubits using the same principles. Here, we aim to prepare good initial states of the original Hamiltonian, so we need to transfer the hard-core Boson wavefunction into a regular Jordan-Wigner represented qubit wavefunction. This can be achieved throughout a series of controlled-not operations

$$U_{\text{HCB}}^{\text{JW}}(\theta_D) = U_{\text{HCB}}^{\text{JW}}(\theta_D) U_{\text{RHF}}^{\text{HCB}} \quad (10)$$

$$U_{\text{pCCSD}}(\theta_S) = U_{\text{pCCD}}(\theta_S) U_{\text{pCCD}}(\theta_D) \quad (11)$$

representing the pair-double excitations in the hard-core Boson representation and the singles excitations in the standard Jordan-Wigner representation. The restricted Hartree–Fock reference state in the HCB representation is constructed by a product of $\sigma_z$ gates in the unitary $U_{\text{HCB}}^{\text{RHF}}$. This particular construction of pCC(S)D circuits partially fixes the order of the primitive circuits as it requires the singles block to be separated from the doubles block. This high-level ordering is however often empirically preferred [19]. Further integration into the $k$-UpCCGSD [29] hierarchy can be obtained by adding further layers of excitations to the circuit

$$U_{k-\text{UpCCGS}} = \prod_{l=1}^{k-1} U_{\text{GSD}}(\theta_l) U_{\text{UpCCGS}}(\theta_0) \quad (12)$$

and by using generalized singles and paired-doubles blocks (including excitations between all orbitals). As the associated wavefunction will loose it’s pair structure after the first application of an unpaired operation, such as a single electron excitation, the hard-core Boson encoding will only reduce gate counts and depths for the first layer and the primitive excitations of the $U_{\text{GSD}}$ blocks are not restricted to any particular ordering. In Tab. I we give some explicit gate counts and depths; the savings for the first UpCCGSD layer are approximately one order of magnitude. Note, that in principle, the reference does not need to be restricted Hartree–Fock, as long as the state is created solely from doubly occupied orbitals.

So far the result of this section unified ideas from Refs. [27, 28] that investigated paired unitary models with general unitary coupled-cluster approaches, in particular with the $k$-UpCCGSD [29] hierarchy. The combination of those approaches already leads to significantly reduced gate counts and depths. In addition we implemented optimized gate decompositions from Refs. [24] (and similar in Ref. [26]) and [25] for the qubit excitation unitaries that allowed further reduction of the circuits. In the following section we will improve this circuit construction by using system-adapted pair-natural orbitals from Ref. [20] where they have been introduced, in order to construct compact Hamiltonians with significantly reduced qubit resources. Here we will further employ this representation of the Hamiltonian in order to construct low-depth quantum circuits.
tron pairs. E.g. LiH(2,10) and C2 configurations with more spatial orbitals for individual electron pair) with low-depth circuits as well as active space reference state in the hard-core Boson representation (operation on the lower left prepares the two-electron reference state as a product of two-core orbitals. The first layer on the right transfers the wavefunction to a closed-shell initial state. In order to generate the wavefunction \( |\Psi_{SP} \rangle \) in a qubit representation we only require the unitaries \( U_{k} \) that create the pair-functions \( |\psi_{k} \rangle \). One strategy to realize \( U_{k} \) is through one- and two-electron excitation gates as in Eq. (1). Acting on a closed-shell initial state \( |\Psi_{SP} \rangle = \prod_{k=1}^{N_{e}/2} |\psi_{k} \rangle \).

Electron pair states can be written as products of one-electron functions (spin-orbitals) \( |\psi_{k} \rangle = \sum_{m} \phi_{k}^{m} |\phi_{m} \rangle \otimes |\phi_{n} \rangle \).

Note that the PNO-UpCCGSD circuits of Ref. [20] have exactly this product structure and the resulting wavefunctions can be fully simulated classically without facing an exponential memory bottleneck. It is only required to store \( N_{e}^{2} \) individual pair functions that each can be fully described with \( O\left(|\tilde{S}_{k}|^{2}\right) \) coefficients. Solving the model with a variational quantum algorithm brings therefore no evident advantage on it’s own besides potential benchmark applications. An interesting application is however to use the model as initial state for more advanced quantum algorithms. The advantage here is that the model can be solved classically while still being represented by quantum circuits. The classical optimization results directly in optimized parameters of a low-depth quantum circuit that is ready to be used within an extended quantum algorithm. Furthermore, such classically simulable circuits naturally

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Molecule((N_{e},N_{q}))</th>
<th>(N_{\text{param}})</th>
<th>(N_{\text{cnot}})</th>
<th>Depth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(\text{H}_{2}(2,4))</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\text{LiH}(2,10))</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\text{BeH}_{2}(4,8))</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\text{BeH}_{2}(6,14))</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\text{BH}_{2}(6,12))</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\text{N}_{2}(6,12))</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\text{C}<em>{2}\text{H}</em>{4}(12,24))</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\text{H}<em>{2}\text{O}</em>{2}(14,28))</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\text{C}<em>{2}\text{H}</em>{4}(14,28))</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\text{C}<em>{2}\text{H}</em>{6}(2,12))</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\text{C}<em>{2}\text{H}</em>{6}(14,84))</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table II. Resource requirements for SPA circuits according to Eq. (18) used in this work. We show minimal configurations \((N_{q} = 2 \cdot N_{e}\) with two spatial orbital for each electron pair) with low-depth circuits as well as active space configurations with more spatial orbitals for individual electron pairs. E.g. \(\text{LiH}(2,10)\) and \(\text{C}_{2}\text{H}_{6}(12,12)\) with 5 and 6 spatial orbitals for a single electron pair and \(\text{C}_{2}\text{H}_{4}(14,84)\) with 6 spatial orbitals for each active electron pair. The \(\text{BeH}_{2}(6,14)\) circuit with two spatial orbitals for both active electron pairs and a single spatial orbital for the core orbital is shown explicitly in Fig. 2.

Figure 1. Template SPA circuit (left) and required qubit connectivity (right) for a single electron pair represented by 3 spatial orbitals in ladder arrangement. The first NOT operation on the lower left prepares the two-electron reference state in the hard-core Boson representation \((U_{\text{HCB}})^{00} \) in Eq. (18)). The CNOT layer on the right transfers the doubly-occupied wavefunction in the hard-core Boson representation to the Jordan-Wigner representation \((U_{\text{JW}})^{00} \) in Eq. (18)).

B. Separable Pair Ansatz (SPA)

In Ref. [20], system adapted orbitals are constructed from a classical surrogate model that tries to capture the most important physical effects of the molecule at hand, in order to yield an optimized spatial representation. Furthermore the information from the surrogate can be transferred to the design of initial quantum circuits. In Ref. [20] this led to the so-called PNO-UpCCD ansatz. Similar to UpCCD, only pairwise excitations of electrons are allowed and furthermore the excitation structure of the quantum circuit follows the underlying MP2-PNO surrogate. In the following, we will describe this model in a more general framework and combine it with the circuit compilation strategies of the last section to construct a separable pair ansatz (SPA) with significantly reduced gate count.

Assume we have an \(N_{e}\) electron system and we want to create a wavefunction of \(\frac{N_{e}}{2}\) electron pairs. This separable pair (SP) wavefunction can be written as

\[
|\Psi_{SP} \rangle = \prod_{k=1}^{N_{e}/2} |\psi_{k} \rangle
\]

where \(|\psi_{k} \rangle\) are electron pair functions, that can themselves be represented by a linear combination of tensor-products of |\(S_{k}\)| one-electron functions (spin-orbitals)

\[
|\psi_{k} \rangle = \sum_{m} \phi_{k}^{m} |\phi_{m} \rangle \otimes |\phi_{n} \rangle
\]

Each pair-function \(|\psi_{k} \rangle\) is represented by an individual set of orbitals \(\tilde{S}_{k} = \{ |\phi_{k}^{l} \rangle, l = 0, \ldots, |\tilde{S}_{k}| - 1 \}\) and we will furthermore require all orbitals to be orthonormal

\[
\langle \phi_{k}^{l} | \phi_{k'}^{l'} \rangle = \delta_{kk'} \delta_{ll'} \quad \forall k, l, m, n.
\]

In order to generate the wavefunction \(|\Psi_{SP} \rangle\) in a qubit representation we only require the unitaries \(U_{k}\) that create the pair-functions \(|\psi_{k} \rangle\). One strategy to realize \(U_{k}\) is through one- and two-electron excitation gates as in Eq. (1) acting on a closed-shell initial state

\[
|\Psi_{SP} \rangle = \prod_{k}^{N_{e}/2} U_{k} (\theta_{k}) U_{\text{RHF}} |00 \ldots 0 \rangle.
\]
Figure 2. Example: Directly compiled low-depth SPA ladder arrangement for the BeH$_2$ molecule initializing a wavefunction as in Eq. (13). Controlled $R_y$ rotations can be compiled into two controlled-not operations and three single qubit rotations, leading to an overall CNOT count of 15 and a circuit depth of 8. The circuit corresponds to the BeH$_2$(6,14) circuit in Tab. II. Without qubits $\phi^0_0, \phi^0_1$ (representing the core-orbital $\phi^0_0$), the circuit corresponds to BeH$_2$(6,14) in Tab. II. Pink gates represent individually parametrized Pauli-Y rotations $R_y(\theta) = e^{-i \theta \sigma_y}$ and + labels represent (controlled)-not operations.

define a minimum benchmark that variational quantum algorithms need to beat in order to be considered for a potential advantage. Note, that the associated variational algorithm will minimize the expectation value of the parametrized product of pair-functions over the full electronic Hamiltonian

$$E = \min_\theta \langle \Psi_{\text{SP}}(\theta) | H | \Psi_{\text{SP}}(\theta) \rangle.$$  

(17)

In other words, while the wavefunction has a product structure, the individual pair-functions are not independent but coupled through the Hamiltonian. The latter basically defines a mean-field model for pairs, similar to generalized valence bond models (GVB) with strong orthogonality condition [30].

The individual pair-functions can again be restricted to only contain paired electron configurations. As before, we can construct the circuits by arranging double excitations $U_{k,l}$ in the hard-core Boson representation in order to construct the individual $U_k$ pair function unitaries

$$U_{\text{SPA}} = U^{\text{JW}}_{\text{HCB}} \left( \prod_{k}^{N_e/2} \prod_{l \in \tilde{S}_k} U_{k,l}(\theta_k) \right) U^{\text{HCB}}_{\text{RHF}}.$$  

(18)

The $k$ index denotes the reference orbital associated with the current pair function $| \psi_k \rangle$ and $l$ iterates over the associated orbitals $\tilde{S}_k^l$ assigned to this pair. At this point, the memory requirements to represent the associated wavefunction are further reduced to $O(|\tilde{S}_k|)$ for each pair. One particular strategy to arrange the $U_{k,l}$ is a ladder arrangement of double excitations that requires only local connectivity of the associated qubits

$$U_{k,l} = e^{-i \theta \tilde{G}_{(l,l+1)}}$$  

(19)

where $\tilde{G}_{(l,l+1)}$ is a paired double excitation in the form of Eq. (8) that excites an electron pair from spatial orbital $l$ to spatial orbital $l + 1$. Since the unitaries $U_{k,l}$ that prepare the individual pair-functions act on an initial product state prepared by $U^{\text{HCB}}_{\text{RHF}}$, they can be efficiently compiled into controlled-not and controlled rotation gates as

$$U_{k,l} \rightarrow \text{CR}_{y}(\theta, S_k^l, S_k^{l+1}) \cdot \text{CNOT}(S_k^{l+1}, S_k^l)$$  

(20)

where the control on the $\text{CR}_y$ can be dropped for the very first $U_{k,l}$. This circuit construction procedure is schematically depicted in Fig. 1. Alternatively the doubles can be arranged canonically by exciting from the
reference orbital to all other orbitals in $\tilde{S}$ like in an Up-CCD ansatz for the individual pair. 

Both approaches have the same expressibility but differ in their locality and in their behaviour under optimization where the more local ladder arrangement usually requires more iterations in gradient based optimizations starting from an initial point with all angles in zero. An intuitive explanation is, that within the first $m$ iterations, all gradients except for the $U_{k,n}$ with $n \leq m$ iterations of each pair are naturally zero since the corresponding qubits are not occupied yet in the wavefunction as the occupation of the qubits gradually needs to be distributed from the first orbital to the last. Within the canonical arrangement all qubits can be occupied after the first iteration. A more natural starting point for the ladder approximation would be a finite value for all angles. In the specific embodiment of this work, the orbitals that represent the individual pairs are ordered through the classical surrogate model that determines them (see next section). From this property we can already assume that the initial values for the angles in $U_{k,l}$ should decrease in magnitude with growing $l$. The exact behaviour and sophisticated initialization of the correct signs of the angles could be an interesting testing case for currently emerging initialization protocols. [31, 32]

C. Orbital Determination

In the previous section we constructed optimized quantum circuits that follow the excitation pattern of a paired model where each electronic pair function $|\psi_e\rangle$ is represented by individual orbital sets $\tilde{S}_k$. In order to determine these orbitals we will resort to a modified approach of Ref. [20] that takes a classical, basis-set-independent surrogate model, MRA-PNO-MP2 [33], to determine the orbitals. Here the orbitals $\phi \in \tilde{S}_k$ are directly determined by numerically solving an integral equation

$$\phi (r) = -2 \int d^3 r \ G (r - r') \ V (r') \phi (r'), \quad (21)$$

and the surrogate potential $V$ is the MRA-PNO-MP2 potential of Ref. [33] for all orbitals in $\tilde{S}_k$ except the first, which is determined by the Hartree–Fock potential. As in Ref. [20] the surrogate model is represented and optimized in an adaptive multiwavelet framework by a multiresolution analysis (MRA). However, the circuit construction schemes of this work are independent of the numerical representation of the orbitals. We employ the original MRA representation as it offers a computationally fast and reliable framework that allows the model to be formulated independently of static quantum chemical basis sets. This beneficial property is illustrated on some small chemical reactions in Fig. 3. We refer to the original article [33] on the surrogate model for details about the implementation and to Ref. [20] for the integration into the framework of variational quantum algorithms. The computational cost of the MRA-PNO-MP2 model scales formally as $O \left( \left( \frac{N_e}{N_0} \right)^3 R^2 \right)$, where $R$ is the average size of the orbital sets $\tilde{S}_k$, but can in this case be reduced to $O \left( \left( \frac{N_e}{N_0} \right)^2 R^2 \right)$ by neglecting all “off-diagonal” [33] MP2 pairs, since these are not required to construct the orbital sets $\tilde{S}_k$. The square in the computational cost results from the exchange operator that is part of the surrogate potential $V$. It was shown before, that this cost can be mitigated to near-linear behaviour by efficiently exploiting locality in the multiresolution representation [34]. In our current implementation, this technique is however not included yet. Currently the computational bottleneck of the classical pre-computation are the molecular integrals that define the final qubit Hamiltonian and scale $O \left( N_0^3 \right)$ with the total number of orbitals (here $N_0 = \sum_k |\tilde{S}_k|$. Note that this is not a particular property of this approach but intrinsic to second-quantized electronic structure Hamiltonians. Optimization of the SPA circuits requires only the integrals of the hard-core Boson Hamiltonian that has only $N_0^2$ elements.

The strong orthogonality condition that ensures orthogonality between all orbitals is not necessarily fulfilled in all models. This is for example the case in the original MRA-PNO-MP2 [33] model but has been enforced in the construction of the associated qubit Hamiltonians in Ref. [20] through a Cholesky decomposition. For larger systems with degenerate electron pairs (as for example the orbitals corresponding to the six C-H bonds in $C_2H_6$ in Fig. 4), we found that symmetric orthogonalization by diagonalizing of the overlap matrix resulted in more well-behaved Hamiltonians. A formulation with pair-wise non-orthogonal orbitals might be interesting as well. This would increase the flexibility of the surrogate model but on the other hand also the number of terms in the final qubit Hamiltonian. We restrict ourselves here to the fully symmetrically orthogonalized formulation.

In principle, basis-set-dependent approaches could be employed for orbital determination as well. Modified variants of frozen-natural methods [35, 36], that avoid global recanonicalization of the predetermined pair-natural orbitals could be envisioned for this task for example.
Figure 3. Example Reactions: Performance of the SPA model in a system adapted orbital basis determined by MRA-PNOs, for chemical reaction energies compared to standard basis sets. Results are labeled as method/basis/(\(N_e, N_q\)).

Figure 4. Simple Model Systems: Single bond dissociation of LiH(2,12) and \(\text{C}_2\text{H}_6(2,12)\). SPA circuits are constructed as in Eq. (18) and a single layer of generalized orbital rotations is added. The performance of SPA+GS is expected to be equivalent to orbital-optimized SPA with orbital optimization similar to Refs. [37–39]. In addition we show \(\text{C}_2\text{H}_6(14,28)\) with all active electron pairs represented by two spatial orbitals (same representation as in Fig. 3). The associated non-parallelity errors (difference between largest and smallest absolute error) with FCI/MRA(14,28) as reference are: 3 for SPA/MRA(14,28), 18 for FCI/MRA(2,12) and 25 for SPA/MRA(2,12) millihartree.

II. APPLICATIONS

In the following, we will demonstrate explicit use-cases of the SPA and illustrate how it can potentially be used as initial state for variational and projective quantum algorithms. As in [20] we denote molecular representations as “Molecule-Name(\(N_e, N_q\))” with number of electrons \(N_e\) and number of qubits \(N_q = 2N_o\) necessary in a direct mapping of the spin orbitals. In Fig. 4 we compute single bond stretches of the LiH and \(\text{C}_2\text{H}_6\) molecules, similar to Ref. [20]. As expected, the separable pair ansatz performs well at not too far stretched bond distances. The shortcoming can be overcome by including orbital rotations in the form of a generalized singles layer in the circuit. This performance can be expected to be equivalent to an orbital-optimized form of SPA that could be implemented similar to Refs. [38, 39]. We also included a calculation with a larger active space \(\text{C}_2\text{H}_6(14,28)\) to confirm that the performance of the separable pair ansatz stays consistent. Here we observe a consistent energy difference to the FCI energies (non-parallelity error of 3 millihartree) resulting from the missing correlation between the pairs. Although this does not represent a rigorous benchmark, we anticipate that the separable pair ansatz will be an appropriate model for single bond reactions and organic equilibrium structures, especially in an orbital optimized extension.
similar to related classical methods like pCCD [40], its orbital-optimized variants [41–43], and low-order matrix-product states respectively generalized valence bond models [30].

In Fig. 6 we computed double and triple bond dissociation of more challenging systems and compared classical methods with SPA and extensions in the k-UpCCGSD hierarchy. With BeH$_2$(4,8) and N$_2$(6,12) we included 8 and 12 qubit test systems which show variational breakdowns of standard methods (MP2, CCSD and CCSD(T)) from classical quantum chemistry. All quantum models naturally don’t show variational breakdowns. Furthermore we assume that the oscillating behaviour of CCSD is due to convergence problems. The SPA behaves fairly consistent over all three molecules, but, as for the single bond stretches, it shows large energy deviations for far stretched structures. In this case, including orbital rotations does improve, but not fully resolve, these differences. The N$_2$(6,12) molecule remains the most challenging one; here, not even 2-UpCCGSD can reach FCI accuracy in all points. It was however shown before, that more layers of the ansatz systematically converge towards the FCI energy. [29].

In Fig. 5 we performed a small numerical study where we assume to have access to a fault tolerant architecture, that is capable of performing a molecular quantum phase estimation [3]. In this proposed algorithm the physical measurement process of the full electronic Hamiltonian is implemented, and for simplicity we will assume a numerically exact implementation. If a trial state $|\Psi\rangle = \sum_k c_k |E_k\rangle$ is prepared, where $E_k$ denotes the eigenstates and energies of the molecular Hamiltonian, the algorithm results in measurement of $E_k$ (as well as the preparation of $|E_k\rangle$) with probability $|c_k|^2$. So, the success of the procedure will depend on the overlap $c_k$ of the trial function with the targeted state. In Fig. 5 we show absolute values of the variances $\text{Var}(U) = ||\langle H^2\rangle_U - \langle H\rangle_U^2||$ with $U \in \{U_{\text{RHF}}, U_{\text{SPA}}\}$ as a quantifier for closeness to an eigenstate for BeH$_2$(4,8) and N$_2$(6,12). For both systems, SPA gives a significantly improved trial state and requires only depth 3 circuits with 6, respectively 9, controlled-not gates in total (see Tab. II). Note that for stretched geometries of BeH$_2$, the variances of both initialization methods become almost identical as both methods are comparably close to electronic eigenstates. Hartree–Fock initialization would however not result in a clear preference for the ground state, as the trial wavefunction has similar overlap with an excited state (shown in the central plot of Fig. 5). If the expected energy range of the ground state is known, this deficiency could for example be overcome with the Philter algorithm [44]. The associated costs are however significantly larger than simply switching to an improved trial state in the form of $U_{\text{SPA}}$.

In this work we use the basis-set-free approach of Ref. [20] in order to determine the spatial orbitals that form the qubit Hamiltonian in a system-adapted bottom-up approach. Our approach is therefore independent of static basis sets and a first assessment of it’s numerical performance compared to those basis sets would be interesting. In Ref. [20] first comparisons were already performed where the basis-set-free approach allowed significant improvements in numerical accuracy. In Fig. 3 we provide three further examples in the form of small chemical reactions, that are significantly larger systems than in Ref. [20] and further confirm improved accuracy with a directly determined MRA-PNO basis.
In all calculations we observed fast convergence of the optimizations of the SPA circuits that usually took 4-10 BFGS iterations for canonical rearrangement of primitive excitations. In all cases, a single BFGS iteration, required a single energy and gradient evaluation. It was furthermore more to initialize all angles to 0.0 (i.e., using Hartree–Fock as a starting point) without reaching local minima or plateaus [45] in the process. This indicates that the optimization of SPA circuits can be achieved routinely and cheap with gradient based methods. UpCCGSD and 2-UpCCGSD behaved similar at points where it resulted in similar energies as with the SPA but became more difficult for stretched geometries. Here we needed to run several (5-10) optimizations with different starting points in order to achieve good convergence. With this strategy the optimization also took substantially more BFGS iterations (up to 100) which is however still a comparably small number [26, 31, 46].

### III. IMPLEMENTATION

All our circuit construction schemes are implemented in the TEQUILA [12] library that also contains a convenient interface to MADNESS [47] where the orbitals are computed according to Ref. [48, 49] (Hartree–Fock) and Ref. [33] (MRA-PNO-MP2) with the standard (non-regularized) nuclear and electronic potentials. A specific point of the LiH(4,16) molecule of Fig. 4 can for example be computed as

```python
import tequila as tq

mol = tq.Molecule(geometry="Li 0.0 0.0 0.0\n H 0.0 0.0 1.5")
H = mol.make_hamiltonian()
U = mol.make_upccgsd_ansatz(name="SPA")
E = tq.ExpectationValue(H=H, U=U)
result = tq.minimize(E, method="bfgs")
```

Here, \( n_{pno} = \sum_k (|S_k| - 1) \) defines the total number of requested pair-natural orbitals from the surrogate model. This leads to a total number of orbitals \( N_o = N_e/2 + n_{pno} = \sum_k |S_k| \), where \( N_e/2 \) is the number of occupied Hartree–Fock orbitals. The `make_upccgsd_ansatz` automatically compiles circuits according to Eq. (18) and adds the remaining unitary excitations. It accepts and interprets all keywords assembled from name="\{(HCB)-(SPA)-(UpCCGSD)\}" where HCB representation (meaning that \( U^\text{HCB} \) in Eq. (18) will be removed), SPA will restrict all excitations to the surrogates excitation pattern (i.e., excitations are restricted within the \( \hat{S}_k \) orbital sets), \( D \) and \( S \) will include doubles and singles, \( A \) will result in approximated singles as qubit excitations and \( G \) will result in generalized singles and doubles. The additional keyword `direct_compiling="ladder"` will result in the laddered arrangement of the SPA (see Figs. 1 and 2). Invalid combinations, like the combination of HCB and \( S \) will result in exceptions. Note, that the UpCC part is not necessary in the name, but can be included to enhance readability in the code. The standard method is SPA which corresponds to Eq. (18) and is equivalent to SPA-UpCCD. In this sense, SPA-UpCCGSD would result in the SPA circuit complemented with all unaccounted generalized double excitations within the \( \hat{S}_k \) orbital sets. The frozen-core approximation, i.e., no correlation of the \( N_c (5N_e) \) lowest orbitals of molecules with \( N_c \) second (third) row atoms, is enabled by default as well as active-spaces that include only pairs represented by more than one (the Hartree–Fock) orbital. The SPA energies for \( N_2(6,12) \) in Fig. 6 can for example be computed as

```python
import tequila as tq

mol = tq.Molecule(geometry="n2.xyz", n_pno=3)
H = mol.make_hardcore_boson_hamiltonian()
U -= mol.make_upccgsd_ansatz("HCB-SPA-UpCCGD")
E = tq.ExpectationValue(H=H, U=U)
result = tq.minimize(E)
```

where the active space is automatically constructed. Here, we exploited the fact, that PNO occupation numbers in the surrogate model are largest for the three orbitals that correspond to the triple bond, so that with \( n_{pno}=3 \) three PNOs from those pairs are selected automatically. More complicated active-spaces can be specified over the active_orbitals keyword where information about all orbitals from the surrogate can be obtained over `print(mol)`. In the last code snippet we also illustrated how to optimize the separable pair ansatz directly in the hard-core Boson representation that allows simulations with \( N_q = N_o \) qubits. In this work, we used QULACS [50] as quantum simulation backend, SCIPY [51] as optimization backend, and the Jordan-Wigner implementation of OPENFERMON [52]. Gradient compilation for the BFGS optimization is performed by the automatically differentiable framework of Ref. [11] where gradients for the controlled-\( R_y \) operations of the optimized circuits follow the same principle. All of those options correspond to the defaults which do not need to be explicitly specified and we refer to Ref. [12] and [11] for more details on how to use TEQUILA e.g., for the manual construction of circuits that can be combined with the U objects constructed above.

Energies from classical quantum chemistry meth-
Figure 6. Challenging Model Systems: Comparison of standard classical methods (left) and pair-restricted quantum circuits (right) for the bonding electron pairs in BeH$_2$(4,8), BH$_3$(6,12) and N$_2$(6,12). See Tab. I for the required resources.
ods can be computed through TEQUILA interfaces to PSI4 [53] and Pyscf [54] for example via mol.compute_energy("ccsd").

IV. CONCLUSION & OUTLOOK

We formulated a physically motivated recipe to construct low-depth and local quantum circuits that are able to approximate large parts of the electronic correlation in electronic structure problems. If applied to a closed shell reference state, the resulting circuits are equivalent to the PNO-UpCC circuits introduced in Ref. [20]. Note that they are not the same unitaries, but applied to a closed-shell reference they prepare the same wavefunction. In contrast to the PNO-UpCC circuits the SPA circuits are significantly reduced in their depths and CNOT counts from several hundred to low one to two digit figures. Due to their naturally separated form, the associated wavefunctions can be represented with linear memory requirement with respect to the system size which allows to optimize the parameters of the low-depth circuit in a classical pre-computation step. This bypasses challenges in variational quantum eigensolvers like finite-shot sensitive gradients and high measurement cost. Due to the physically inspired construction we furthermore expect this model to be well behaved with gradient based optimization. Within this work we observed fast convergence in a few epochs of the BFGS optimizer throughout all numerical computations without getting trapped in local minima or plateaus. All these properties qualify this model to be a potential minimum benchmark that quantum algorithms have to outperform in order to claim any advantage over classical methods. In this regard, BeH$_2$(4,8) and N$_2$(6,12) could be well suited test systems.

Within quantum algorithms for electronic structure, we see the separable pair ansatz as initial part of larger approaches which we illustrated within two scenarios. The first employs the optimized SPA circuits as initial parts of a larger variational algorithm, here illustrated within the k-UpCCGSD hierarchy. The second uses the SPA as significantly improved initial states for projective algorithms. In this work, we integrated our methodologies into the basis-set-free framework of Ref. [20], which is not a necessity to compile the low-depth circuits, but allows to compute basis-set-independent energies with high numerical accuracy. For weakly correlated reactions, this provides a good balance between the one- and many-body aspects of the electronic wavefunctions which we illustrated on small organic reactions. Our current implementation does not exploit the properties of the SPA wavefunction completely but rather takes advantage of high-performance simulators like QULACS [50] within the TEQUILA [12] framework. It is however well suited for systems treated in this work. In the future, specialized high-performance implementations would be desirable and the combination with basis-set-free approaches could be interesting as a classical algorithm for weakly correlated molecular structures as they for example occur in a wide range of organic reactions. Within this context, too further enhance the overall performance of the model, we expect improvements on the surrogate model that determines the orbital basis. Additionally, one can include orbital optimization, which allows optimized linear-combination within said orbital basis. As the SPA wavefunction is itself efficiently representable classically, it could be envisioned to employ this model, preferably in it’s orbital-optimized form, directly as surrogate. Furthermore, we explored first estimates on potential orbital-optimized algorithms for SPA by simulating the orbital rotations as unitary operation in the form of a generalized singles layer added to the circuit. The techniques of Refs. [37–39] and related classical methods [41, 43] could be employed as a first step towards an orbital-optimized implementation that does not require gate-based implementations of the corresponding unitaries.
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