Quantum algorithm for calculation of transition amplitudes in hybrid tensor networks
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The hybrid tensor network approach allows us to perform calculations on systems larger than the scale of a quantum computer. However, when calculating transition amplitudes, there is a problem that the number of terms to be measured increases exponentially with that of contracted operators. The problem is caused by the fact that the contracted operators are represented as non-Hermitian operators. In this study, we propose a method for the hybrid tensor network calculation that contracts non-Hermitian operators without the exponential increase of the number of terms. In the proposed method, calculations of transition amplitudes are performed by combining the singular value decomposition of the contracted non-Hermitian operators with the Hadamard test. The method significantly extends the applicability of the hybrid tensor network approach.

I. INTRODUCTION

Quantum computers are expected to be capable of executing classically intractable calculations [1–7]. It has been reported that quantum computers can outperform classical computers in some tasks [5, 9]. However, quantum resource limitations become obstacles for practical applications to quantum computers. Current quantum computers are so-called noisy intermediate-scale quantum (NISQ) devices [10], and we can control only tens to hundreds of noisy qubits on the devices [11–16]. The hardware limitations make it difficult to apply quantum computers to practical tasks that require large numbers of qubits or deep quantum circuits [17–19].

The hybrid tensor network approach has been proposed recently to overcome the obstacles for the limitations [17, 19]. The approach enables the treatment of quantum states larger than actual quantum devices by representing quantum states with a combination of conventional classical tensors and quantum tensors. A quantum tensor has upper and lower indices as, for example, conventional classical tensors and quantum tensors. A quantum state of the system can be represented as a product of quantum and classical tensors constructs a tree graph. While the contraction of general hybrid tensor networks can be costly, hybrid tree-tensor networks can be contracted efficiently to obtain expectation values [17]. In this paper, we mainly discuss a two-layer hybrid tree-tensor network only with quantum tensors, which is called a quantum-quantum tree-tensor network, since it captures the essential properties of hybrid tree-tensor networks and the use of classical tensors restricts the range of representation to classically tractable quantum states such as matrix product states [20]. A quantum-quantum tree-tensor network that expresses k subsystems of n-qubit states is represented as

$$|\psi_{HT}\rangle = \sum_{i_1, i_2, \ldots, i_k} \psi_{i_1, i_2, \ldots, i_k} |\varphi^1\rangle \otimes |\varphi^2\rangle \otimes \cdots \otimes |\varphi^k\rangle,$$

(2)

where $|\psi_{HT}\rangle$ is an unnormalized state, $\psi_{i_1, i_2, \ldots, i_k} = \langle i_1 i_2 \ldots i_k | \psi \rangle$ is a probability amplitude of a k-qubit state $|\psi\rangle$, and $|\varphi^m\rangle (m = 1, 2, \ldots, k)$ is an n-qubit state of the m-th subsystem indexed by a classical bit $i_m$. Figure 1 shows the network diagram of $|\psi_{HT}\rangle$. While the state $|\psi_{HT}\rangle$ represents a kn-qubit state, we can efficiently calculate the expectation value of an observable $O = \bigotimes_{m=1}^k O_m$, where $O_m$ operates on $|\varphi^m\rangle$ via proper tensor contractions, using a quantum computer with $O(\max(k, n))$ qubits. The contraction for evaluating the expectation value $\langle O \rangle = \langle \psi_{HT} | O | \psi_{HT}\rangle$ (without a normalisation) can be implemented as follows. First, we measure $O_m$ and construct operators $M_m^{t_m} = \langle \varphi^m | O_m | \varphi^m \rangle$. Note that each $M_m$ is a $2 \times 2$ Hermitian matrix when $O_m$ is Hermitian. Then, since $M_m$ is Hermitian, we can measure an expectation value of $\bigotimes_{m=1}^k M_m$ for the state $|\psi\rangle$, which is equal to $\langle O \rangle$.

The approach allows for simulations beyond the scale of quantum hardware. For example, the energy and the spin-spin correlation functions of electrons can be calculated with this approach. However, the approach has a serious problem for expanding the range of applications: it can only be applied to the calculation of the expectation value of observables. In other words, there is a problem in the approach when the contracted operator $M_m$ is non-Hermitian. Hereinafter, we denote the Hermitian
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and non-Hermitian contracted operators as \(M_m\) and \(N_m\), respectively. The reason for the problem is that the number of terms to be measured increases exponentially with \(k\) when \(\bigotimes_{m=1}^k N_m\) is calculated naively. Specifically, the non-Hermitian operators are decomposed into the sums of Pauli operators, as in \(\bigotimes_{m=1}^k N_m = \bigotimes_{m=1}^N (h_{m1}I_m + h_{m2}X_m + h_{m3}Z_m)\), where \(I_m\) is an identity operator, \(X_m\) and \(Z_m\) are Pauli operators which act on \(m\)-th qubit, and \(h_{m}\) are corresponding coefficients, with up to \(4^k\) terms appearing. One example where the problem occurs is in the calculation of the transition amplitude related to the Green’s functions and the photon emissions/absorptions. The overlap of two quantum states, which is used as subroutines in many algorithms, is a special case of the transition amplitude. Thus, the difficulty of computing the expectation value of a non-Hermitian operator limits the applicability of the hybrid tensor network approach.

In this study, we propose a method for calculating transition amplitudes by the hybrid tensor network approach. The main point of the method is the treatment of tensor products of non-Hermitian operators. In the naive calculation, the exponential number of terms in \(\bigotimes_{m=1}^k N_m\) will appear. We propose two ways to avoid the problem. One is a Monte-Carlo contraction method and the other is a singular value decomposition (SVD) contraction method, and the second method is the main proposal in this paper. Although the first method can avoid measuring all the terms whose number increases exponentially with \(k\), the second method is exponentially more efficient than the first one in terms of the sampling cost.

In the following, we firstly introduce the overview of a quantum-quantum tree-tensor network [14] for obtaining the expectation values of observables in Sec. III. Then, the method of calculating transition amplitudes and overlaps is shown in Sec. IIII especially we discuss the contraction of quantum tensors in subsystems in Sec. IIIA and the contraction of non-Hermitian matrices in Sec. IIIB. We discuss the future application of the method in Sec. IV.

II. OVERVIEW OF HYBRID TENSOR NETWORK

We present an overview of the hybrid tensor network simulation on the state described by the tensor network in Eq. (2). Letting the observable \(O\) as \(O = \bigotimes_{m=1}^k O_m\) and \(O_m = \bigotimes_{r=1}^n (r = 1, 2, \ldots, n)\), the expectation value of the observable including a normalisation constant can be described as

\[
\langle O \rangle = \frac{1}{A^2} \langle \psi_{HT} | O | \psi_{HT} \rangle = \frac{1}{A^2} \sum_{\tilde{i}} \psi_{\tilde{i}}^* \psi_{\tilde{i}} \prod_{m=1}^k M_m^{i_m}_{m}, \quad (3)
\]

and

\[
A = \sqrt{\langle \psi_{HT} | O | \psi_{HT} \rangle} = \sqrt{\sum_{\tilde{i}} \psi_{\tilde{i}}^* \psi_{\tilde{i}} \prod_{m=1}^k M_m^{i_m}_{m}},
\]

where \(A\) is a normalisation constant, \(\tilde{i} = (i_1, i_2, \ldots, i_k)\) with \(i_m\) taking either 0 or 1, \(M_m^{i_m}_{m}\) is \(= \langle \varphi^{i_m} | O_m | \varphi^{i_m} \rangle\), and \(M_m \times M_m = \langle \varphi^{i_m} | \varphi^{i_m} \rangle\). \(M_m^{i_m}_{m}\) (\(M_m^{i_m}_{m}\)) is the element of the \(2 \times 2\) matrix \(M_m\) (\(M_m\)). When \(O_m\) is assumed to be an observable, i.e., a Hermitian operator, \(M_m\) also becomes a Hermitian operator. \(M_m\) is a Hermitian operator since \(M_m\) is a special case of \(O_m = I_m\) in \(M_m\), where \(I_m\) is the identity operator.

The procedure for constructing \(M_m\) and \(M_m\) depends on how the indices \(i_m\) of the wave function \(\varphi^{i_m}\) are mapped. We assume two cases of the mapping; one case is where the indices \(i_m\) are mapped to unitary gates, i.e., \(\varphi^{i_m} = U_{m1}^{i_m} \ket{0} \otimes_{n-1}^m\), and another case is where the indices \(i_m\) are mapped to initial wave function as \(\varphi^{i_m} = U_{CM}^{i_m} \ket{0} \otimes_{n}^{m-1}\), where \(U_{CM}^{i_m}\) and \(U_{CM}^{i_m}\) are unitary operators with polynomial depth in the \(m\)-th subsystem. The second case can be regarded as a special example in the first case since \(\varphi^{i_m} = U_{CM}^{i_m} \ket{0} \otimes_{n}^{m-1} = U_{CM}(X_1)^{i_m} \ket{0} \otimes_{n}^{m}\) and we can think of \(U_{CM}(X_1)^{i_m}\) as \(U_{CM}\), where \(X_1\) is a Pauli X operator which acts on the first qubit. Note that the first method needs a Hadamard test circuit while \(M_m\) and \(M_m\) can be efficiently constructed via direct measurements in the second case as will be described later.

We first consider the construction of \(M_m\) in the case of \(\varphi^{i_m} = U_{CM}^{i_m} \ket{0} \otimes_{m}\). Since the procedure for measuring the diagonal elements is relatively straightforward, we focus on the measurement of non-diagonal elements. Figure 2a shows a quantum circuit to obtain the matrix element \(M_m^{i_m}_{m}\). The procedure to construct \(M_m\) is as follows. First, we prepare initial states. We use
the Hadamard test to prepare \(|\varphi'^{m}\rangle = U_{Cm}^{\dagger}|0\rangle^{\otimes n}\) and \(|\varphi'^{m}\rangle = U_{Cm}^{\dagger}|0\rangle^{\otimes n}\). The ancilla qubit is initialised to \(|0\rangle + e^{i\alpha}|1\rangle\sqrt{2}\), where \(\alpha\) is the phase. We set \(\alpha = 0 (\alpha = \frac{\pi}{2})\) to obtain real (imaginary) part of \(M^{l,m}_{m}\). Since \(M\) is an Hermitian matrix, only measurements of \(\text{Re}(M^{l,m}_{m})\) and \(\text{Im}(M^{l,m}_{m})\) are required. Then, we measure on a computational basis. We used the fact that \(O_{mr}\) is a Hermitian operator and can have a spectral decomposition as \(O_{mr} = U_{mr}D_{mr}U_{mr}^{\dagger}\), where \(U_{mr}\) is a unitary matrix and \(D_{mr}\) is a diagonal matrix. Also, we assign elements of \(D_{mr}\) as the measured value. More concretely, denoting \(D_{mr} = \text{diag}[\lambda^{(mr)}_{m=0}, \lambda^{(mr)}_{m=1}]\), the measured value is computed as \(\prod_{r=1}^{n} \lambda_{j_{r}}^{(mr)}\) corresponding to the measured outcome \(j = (j_{1}, j_{2}, \ldots, j_{n})\).

We explain how to construct \(M_{Am}\). Figure 2(b) shows the circuit to construct \(M_{Am}\). In the case of \(|\varphi^{m}\rangle = U_{Cm}^{\dagger}|0\rangle^{\otimes n}\), since \(|\varphi^{m}\rangle\) is non-orthogonal to each other, we have \(A \neq 1\). Therefore, calculations of \(M_{Am}\) are required. The circuit in Fig. 2(b) is a modified version of that in Fig. 2(a) except that the system measurements are not necessary; we can construct \(M_{Am}\) using the same construction procedure as \(M\).

Next, we assume the case of \(|\varphi^{m}\rangle = U_{Cm}^{\dagger}|0\rangle^{\otimes n-1}\). In this case, we can obtain all the elements of \(M_{m}\) only from the results of direct measurements. Figure 2(c) shows a quantum circuit to construct \(M_{m}\). The initial states are set to \(|a_{m}\rangle|0\rangle^{\otimes n-1}\), where \(|a_{m}\rangle\) takes four states as \(|0\rangle, |1\rangle, |+\rangle\) and \(+y\rangle\). Then \(M_{m}\) can be obtained using the corresponding measurement results. Refer to Appendix 1 for the detail of the procedure. Also, since \(|\varphi^{m}\rangle\) is orthogonal, \(A = 1\) and the calculation of \(M_{Am}\) is not required.

Finally, we show the procedure to obtain \(\langle \psi |H\rangle |O\rangle\langle O|\psi\rangle\), which can be implemented by contracting \(M_{m}\) and \(M_{Am}\). Now, denoting \(|\psi\rangle = \sum_{i} |\psi_{i}\rangle = \sum_{i_{1}, i_{2}, \ldots, i_{k}} \psi_{i_{1}, i_{2}, \ldots, i_{k}} |i_{1}i_{2} \ldots i_{k}\rangle\), we can rewrite Eq. (3) as

\[
A^{2} \langle O \rangle = \langle \psi | \otimes_{m=1}^{k} M_{m} |\psi\rangle = \langle \psi | \otimes_{m=1}^{k} U_{m}^{\dagger} D_{m} U_{m} |\psi\rangle, \tag{5}
\]

where we used the fact that \(M_{m}\) is a Hermitian operator and can have a spectral decomposition as \(M_{m} = U_{m}^{\dagger} D_{m} U_{m}\). Figure 2(d) shows a quantum circuit to measure \(M_{m}\). Henceforth, we assume \(|\psi\rangle = U_{m} |0\rangle^{\otimes n}\), where \(U_{m}\) is a unitary operator with polynomial depth. We can compute \(A^{2} \langle O \rangle\) by applying \(U_{m}\), measuring in a computational basis, and assigning elements of \(D_{m}\) as the measured value. More concretely, denoting \(D_{m} = \text{diag} [\lambda^{(m)}_{m=0}, \lambda^{(m)}_{m=1}]\), the measured value is computed as \(\prod_{m=1}^{k} \lambda^{(m)}_{i_{m}}\) corresponding to the measured outcome \(i = (i_{1}, i_{2}, \ldots, i_{k})\). In a similar procedure, we can measure \(A^{2}\) by contracting \(M_{Am}\); hence we can obtain \(\langle O \rangle\).

III. CALCULATION OF TRANSITION AMPLITUDES AND OVERLAPS

We describe the measurement of transition amplitudes with the hybrid tensor network approach. The difference from Sec. III is that we need to contract a non-Hermitian operator \(N_{m}\).
FIG. 3. The quantum circuits for obtaining transition amplitudes and overlaps. In all the figures, the topmost line represents an ancilla qubit and the other lines represent system qubits. Real and imaginary components are obtained by setting $\alpha = 0$ and $\alpha = \frac{\pi}{2}$, respectively. (a) A quantum circuit to construct $N_m$ for calculating transition amplitudes in the case of $|\phi^+(0)\rangle = U_C^{(1)} |0\rangle \otimes n$. (b) A quantum circuit to construct $N_m$ for calculating transition amplitudes in the case of $|\phi^+(l)\rangle = U_C^{(l)} |i_m\rangle |0\rangle \otimes n-1$. (c) A quantum circuit to construct $N_m$ for calculating overlaps in the case of $|\phi^+(0)\rangle = U_C^{(1)} |0\rangle \otimes n$. (d) A quantum circuit to construct $N_m$ for calculating overlaps in the case of $|\phi^+(l)\rangle = U_C^{(l)} |i_m\rangle |0\rangle \otimes n-1$. (e) A quantum circuit to measure $N_m$ for calculating transition amplitudes or overlaps.

A. Contraction of quantum tensors in subsystems

Letting two different states represented by quantum-quantum tensor network as $|\psi^{(1)}\rangle$ and $|\psi^{(2)}\rangle$, $N_m$ appears in calculations of $\langle \psi^{(1)}_{HT} | O_{HT} | \psi^{(2)}_{HT} \rangle$ in transition amplitudes or $\langle \psi^{(1)}_{HT} | \psi^{(2)}_{HT} \rangle$ in overlaps.

To begin with, we consider the calculation of the transition amplitude because the overlap is a special case of $O = I$ in the transition amplitude, where $I$ is the identity operator. We comment on the overlap at the end of this section. The transition amplitude $T$ can be defined as

$$T = \frac{1}{A^{(1)} A^{(2)}} \langle \psi^{(1)}_{HT} | O_{HT} | \psi^{(2)}_{HT} \rangle$$

$$= \frac{1}{A^{(1)} A^{(2)}} \sum_{i} \psi^{(1)*}_{i} \psi^{(2)}_{i} \prod_{m=1}^{k} N_{m}^{i,m} \tag{6}$$

$$= \frac{1}{A^{(1)} A^{(2)}} \langle \psi^{(1)} \rangle \bigotimes_{m=1}^{k} N_{m} |\psi^{(2)}\rangle,$$

where $A^{(l)}$ ($l = 1, 2$) is a normalisation constant corresponding to $|\psi^{(l)}_{HT}\rangle$, $i = (i_1, i_2, \ldots, i_k)$, $N_m$ is a $2 \times 2$ matrix with elements of $N_{m}^{i,m} = \langle \phi^{(1)}_{m,i} | O_m | \phi^{(2)}_{m,i} \rangle$, and $|\psi^{(l)}\rangle = \sum_{i} \psi^{(l)}_{i} |i\rangle = \sum_{i_1,i_2,\ldots,i_k} \psi_{i_1,i_2,\ldots,i_k}^{(l)} |i_1 i_2 \ldots i_k\rangle$. 
The notations are the same as in Eqs. (3), (4) and (5), except for the superscript \((l)\), which corresponds to \(|\psi_{HT}^{(l)}\rangle\).

The reason that \(N_m\) is a non-Hermitian matrix comes from the fact that \((N_m^{(i,m)})^* \neq N_m^{(i',m)}\). Since the procedure for calculating \(A^{(l)}\) is the same as the procedure for \(A\) in the previous section, we will not discuss \(A^{(l)}\) in the following.

We first consider the case of \(|\varphi^{(l)}(m)\rangle = U^{(l)}(m) |0\rangle \otimes \eta\). Figure 3(a) shows the quantum circuit for constructing \(N_m\). The flow of constructing \(N_m\) is similar to that of \(M_m\). However, since \(N_m\) is a \(2 \times 2\) non-Hermitian matrix with elements of complex numbers, eight types of measurements are required to construct \(N_m\). Next, we consider the case of \(|\varphi^{(l)}(m)\rangle = U^{(l)}(m) |0\rangle \otimes \eta\). Figure 3(b) shows a quantum circuit to obtain the matrix element \(N_m^{(i,m)}\). Specifically, the wave function is initialized by using one of the four types of unitary gates \(U_{\text{ini}}\) in lower panel of Fig. 3(b) to prepare the initial states \(|i_m\rangle \otimes |0\rangle \otimes \eta\). The subsequent process is the same as the case of \(|\varphi^{(l)}(m)\rangle = U^{(l)}(m) |0\rangle \otimes \eta\).

When calculating the overlap \(S\), i.e., the case of \(O = I\) in Eq. (6), only the circuits to construct \(N_m\) (Fig. 3(a) and (b)) differ from the cases of the transition amplitude. We show the circuits in the cases of \(|\varphi^{(l)}(m)\rangle = U^{(l)}(m) |0\rangle \otimes \eta\) and \(|\varphi^{(l)}(m)\rangle = U^{(l)}(m) |0\rangle \otimes \eta\) in Fig. 3(c) and (d), which are the same quantum circuits as Fig. 3(a) and (b) except that measurements of system qubits are not involved.

B. Contraction of non-Hermitian matrices

The next step is to calculate \(|\psi^{(1)}\rangle \otimes_{m=1}^k N_m |\psi^{(2)}\rangle\) for \(2 \times 2\) non-Hermitian matrices \(N_m\). We describe two methods for contraction: a Monte-Carlo contraction method and an SVD contraction method. In this section, we describe the SVD contraction method because it is more efficient than the Monte-Carlo contraction method in terms of the sampling cost. Refer to Appendix C for details.

We describe how to perform the SVD contraction method. In the method, we perform SVD \(N_m = B_m D_m C_m\) for each \(N_m\), that is, \(\otimes_{m=1}^k N_m = \otimes_{m=1}^k B_m D_m C_m\), where \(B_m\) and \(C_m\) are unitary matrices and \(D_m\) is a diagonal matrix with non-negative elements. \(|\psi^{(1)}\rangle \otimes_{m=1}^k N_m |\psi^{(2)}\rangle\) can be described as

\[
\langle \psi^{(1)} \rangle \otimes_{m=1}^k N_m |\psi^{(2)}\rangle = 2 \left( \prod_{m=1}^k \|N_m\|_{op} \right) \cdot \frac{1}{2} \times \left[ \text{Re} \left( \langle \psi^{(1)} \rangle \otimes_{m=1}^k B_m^t d^{(m)} C_m |\psi^{(2)}\rangle \right) \right] + \text{Im} \left( \langle \psi^{(1)} \rangle \otimes_{m=1}^k B_m^t d^{(m)} C_m |\psi^{(2)}\rangle \right),
\]

where \(|A|_{op}\) is the operator norm of an operator \(A, d^{(m)} = D_m^t / \|N_m\|_{op}\). We can assume \(d^{(m)} = \text{diag}[\chi^{(m)}_{i,m=0}, \ldots, \chi^{(m)}_{i,m=1}] = \text{diag}[1, \chi^{(m)}_{i,m=1}]\), where \(\chi^{(m)}_{i,m=0} \geq \chi^{(m)}_{i,m=1}, \chi^{(m)}_{i,m=0} = 1, \text{and } \chi^{(m)}_{i,m=1}\) takes a value in a range \([0, 1]\), without loss of generality.

Figure 3(e) shows the circuit for measuring \(|\psi^{(1)}\rangle \otimes_{m=1}^k N_m |\psi^{(2)}\rangle\) by the SVD contraction method. We can compute \(|\psi^{(1)}\rangle \otimes_{m=1}^k N_m |\psi^{(2)}\rangle\) as follows. We implement a Hadamard test circuit for \(\otimes_{m=1}^k B_m d^{(m)} C_m\) for obtaining the real or imaginary part of \(|\psi^{(1)}\rangle \otimes_{m=1}^k N_m |\psi^{(2)}\rangle\) with probability 1/2 by changing the phase of the ancilla qubit. We define \(\mu_s = 2\left( \prod_{m=1}^k \|N_m\|_{op} \right) \left( \prod_{m=1}^k \chi^{(m)}_{i,m=0} \right) b_s\) and \(\mu_s = 2i\left( \prod_{m=1}^k \|N_m\|_{op} \right) \left( \prod_{m=1}^k \chi^{(m)}_{i,m=0} \right) b_s\) in the case of measurements of real and imaginary part, respectively, where \(i_s \in \{0, 1\}\) and \(b_s \in \{-1, 1\}\) are the measurement outcomes of the system and ancilla qubits in the \(s\)-th measurement, respectively. Then the sample average of \(\mu_s\) approximates \(|\psi^{(1)}\rangle \otimes_{m=1}^k N_m |\psi^{(2)}\rangle\). Letting \(\bar{x}\) denote the sample average of a random variable \(x, E[\bar{x}]\) denote the expected value of \(x, \text{and } \mu_s\) approximate \(|\psi^{(1)}\rangle \otimes_{m=1}^k N_m |\psi^{(2)}\rangle\). Denoting the number of measurements as \(N_{SVD}\) and assuming \(\forall m \|N_m\|_{op} = \|N_{const}\|_{op}\), we have

\[
E[\bar{\mu}_s - \langle \psi^{(1)} \rangle \otimes_{m=1}^k N_m |\psi^{(2)}\rangle] = O\left( \frac{\|N_{const}\|_{op}^k}{\sqrt{N_{SVD}}} \right).
\]

Thus, we have

\[
N_{SVD} = O\left( \frac{\|N_{const}\|_{op}^2}{\varepsilon^2} \right)
\]

for the required accuracy \(\varepsilon\). We remark that this method is exponentially more efficient than the Monte-Carlo contraction method in terms of the sampling cost. Refer to Appendix C for details.

We mention that \(N_{SVD}\) is expected not to increase exponentially with \(k\) if \(n\) is large enough. Here, we consider the case where the measured observable \(O\) is a product of Pauli operators because in the conventional variational quantum eigensolver (VQE) scenario, we decompose the Hermitian operator of interest into a linear combination of the polynomial number of products of Pauli operators with the system size. We numerically generate four types of \(2^n \times 2^n\) random unitary matrices, \(U^{(0)}(t), U^{(1)}(t), U^{(2)}(t), \text{and } U^{(3)}(t)\), and a product of random Pauli operators, \(O_{\text{rand}}\), create a \(2 \times 2\) matrix \(N_{const}\) consisting of elements \(N_{const}^{(i',i)} = \left( \langle 0^i | \langle 0^{i'} | O_{\text{rand}} U^{(i)}(t) | 0^{i'} \rangle \right)^\otimes_n\), where \(i'\) and \(i\) take 0 or 1. Then, we evaluate average values of \(\|N_{const}\|_{op}\) obtained using 10,000 samples of \(N_{const}\). As a result, we obtained \(\|N_{const}\|_{op} < 1\) including error bars when \(n \geq 3\) (See Appendix C for details). Therefore, if \(n\) is large enough, \(N_{SVD} \leq O(1/\varepsilon^2)\) will be valid.

Besides, we note that in the case of \(|\varphi^{(l)}(m)\rangle = U^{(l)}(m) |0\rangle \otimes \eta\), \(N_{SVD} \leq O(1/\varepsilon^2)\) is strictly satisfied
regardless of \( n \). In this case, since \( N_m \) can be regarded as a submatrix of the unitary matrix \( U^{(1)}_{Cm} O_m U^{(2)}_{Cm} \) as \( N_m \) is a tensor product of non-Hermitian operators by using the SVD contraction method. This study significantly expands the applicability of the hybrid tensor network.

Future work includes the application of our method to algorithms related to hybrid tensor networks. For example, Deep VQE [18, 19], which is a large-scale computational algorithm for NISQ devices based on the divide and conquer method, can be treated in the framework of hybrid tensor networks in theory. By applying the proposed method to such algorithms, we can extend the range of applications to various large-scale quantum algorithms.

### IV. CONCLUSION

In this paper, we proposed a method to calculate transition amplitudes using the hybrid tensor network. When the approach is applied to the calculations of transition amplitudes naively, the contracted operators become exponentially by using the singular value decomposition and the Hadamard test. We remark that our theory can be easily generalized to the cases with a mixture of classical and quantum tensors called quantum-classical and classical-quantum tree-tensor networks, and those with deeper tree structures. We also note that we can easily extend the scenario to the case where the measured operator \( O \) is a tensor product of non-Hermitian operators.
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In this section, we introduce a Monte-Carlo contraction method and discuss the sampling cost. We decompose $\otimes_{m=1}^k N_m = \otimes_{m=1}^k (h_{I_m} I_m + h_{X_m} X_m + h_{Y_m} Y_m + h_{Z_m} Z_m)$, where $I_m$ is an identity operator and $X_m$, $Y_m$ and $Z_m$ are Pauli operators which act on the $m$th qubit, and $h_\alpha, \alpha \in \{I_m, X_m, Y_m, Z_m\}$ are corresponding coefficients. If we expand this term, it has exponentially increasing number of terms with $k$. To circumvent this problem, we consider Monte-Carlo implementation to calculate $\langle \psi^{(1)} \otimes_{m=1}^k N_m | \psi^{(2)} \rangle$. From now on, for notational simplicity, we denote $\sigma^{(m)}_0 = I_m$, $\sigma^{(m)}_1 = X_m$, $\sigma^{(m)}_2 = Y_m$, $\sigma^{(m)}_3 = Z_m$, $h_0^{(m)} = h_{I_m}$, $h_1^{(m)} = h_{X_m}$, $h_2^{(m)} = h_{Y_m}$, and $h_3^{(m)} = h_{Z_m}$. Introducing $\gamma^{(m)} = \sum_{k=0}^3 h_k^{(m)} | p_k^{(m)} \rangle \langle h_k^{(m)} | / \gamma^{(m)}$, $\phi^{(m)}_i \in \mathbb{R}$, and $e^{i \phi^{(m)}_i} = h_i^{(m)}/| h_i^{(m)} |$, we have $\sum_{i} p_i^{(m)} = 1$ and

$$\langle \psi^{(1)} | \otimes_{m=1}^k N_m | \psi^{(2)} \rangle = 2 \sum_{\mathbf{i} = (i_1, i_2, \ldots, i_k)} \sum_{m=1}^k p_i^{(m)} \cdot \frac{1}{2} \times e^{i \sum_{m=1}^k \phi^{(m)}_i} \times \left[ \text{Re} \langle \psi^{(1)} | \otimes_{m=1}^k \sigma^{(m)}_i | \psi^{(2)} \rangle + i \text{Im} \langle \psi^{(1)} | \otimes_{m=1}^k \sigma^{(m)}_i | \psi^{(2)} \rangle \right].$$

(B1)

Therefore, we can compute $\langle \psi^{(1)} | \otimes_{m=1}^k N_m | \psi^{(2)} \rangle$ as follows. We generate $\otimes_{m=1}^k \sigma^{(m)}_i$ with probability $\prod_{m=1}^k p_{i_m}^{(m)}$ and implement a Hadamard test circuit for obtaining the real or imaginary part of

**Appendix A: The construction of $M_m$ in the case where indices $i_m$ are mapped to initial wave functions**

We explain the procedure for the construction of $M_m$ in the case of $| \phi^{i_m} \rangle = U_{CM} | f_m \rangle | 0 \rangle^{\otimes n-1}$ using the circuit in Fig. 2(c). The diagonal elements, $M^{00}_m$ and $M^{11}_m$, can be obtained by measuring the expectation values of $O_m$, $| \phi^{i_m} = 0 \rangle$ and $| \phi^{i_m} = 1 \rangle$, respectively. We can also obtain non-diagonal elements by combining four types of measurement results. By setting $| +^{(m)} \rangle = (| \phi^{i_m = 0} \rangle + i | \phi^{i_m = 1} \rangle)/\sqrt{2}$ and $| +y^{(m)} \rangle = (| \phi^{i_m = 0} \rangle + i | \phi^{i_m = 1} \rangle)/\sqrt{2}$, we have

$$\langle +^{(m)} | O_m | +^{(m)} \rangle = \frac{1}{2}(M^{00}_m + M^{01}_m + M^{10}_m + M^{11}_m)$$

(A1)

and

$$\langle +y^{(m)} | O_m | +y^{(m)} \rangle = \frac{1}{2}(M^{00}_m + iM^{01}_m - iM^{10}_m - M^{11}_m).$$

(A2)

In general, we can then obtain the non-diagonal elements by

$$\begin{align*}
M^{01}_m &= \frac{i}{2}\langle \phi^{i_m = 0}| O_m | \phi^{i_m = 1} \rangle \
M^{10}_m &= -\frac{i}{2}\langle \phi^{i_m = 1}| O_m | \phi^{i_m = 0} \rangle \\
M^{00}_m &= \langle \phi^{i_m = 0}| O_m | \phi^{i_m = 0} \rangle + \langle \phi^{i_m = 1}| O_m | \phi^{i_m = 1} \rangle \\
M^{11}_m &= \langle \phi^{i_m = 1}| O_m | \phi^{i_m = 1} \rangle + \langle \phi^{i_m = 0}| O_m | \phi^{i_m = 0} \rangle.
\end{align*}$$

\[\text{quant-ph}\]
\(|\psi^{(1)}(t)|\otimes_{m=1}^{k} N_{m}|\psi^{(2)}(t)\rangle\) with probability 1/2 by changing the phase of the ancilla qubit. We define \(\mu'_{s} = 2(\prod_{m=1}^{k}\gamma^{(m)})e^{i\sum_{m=1}^{k}\phi_{m}^{(m)}b'_{s}}\) and \(\mu_{s} = 2(\prod_{m=1}^{k}\gamma^{(m)})e^{i\sum_{m=1}^{k}\phi_{m}^{(m)}b_{s}}\) in the case of measurements of the real and imaginary part, respectively, where \(b'_{s} \in \{-1, 1\}\) is the measurement outcomes of the ancilla qubit in the \(s\)-th measurement. Letting \(\bar{x}\) denote the sample average of a random variable \(x\), \(E[x]\) denote the expected value of \(x\), and \(\bar{\mu}'_{s}\) approximate \(|\psi^{(1)}(t)|\otimes_{m=1}^{k} N_{m}|\psi^{(2)}(t)\rangle\). Denoting the number of measurements as \(N_{MC}\) and assuming \(\forall m \gamma^{(m)} = \gamma\), we have

\[
E[|\bar{\mu}'_{s} - |\psi^{(1)}(t)|\otimes_{m=1}^{k} N_{m}|\psi^{(2)}(t)\rangle| = O(\gamma^{k}/\sqrt{N_{MC}}). \tag{B2}
\]

Thus, we need

\[
N_{MC} = O(\gamma^{2k}/\varepsilon^{2}) \tag{B3}
\]

for the required accuracy \(\varepsilon\).

**Appendix C: Comparison of Monte-Carlo contraction method and SVD contraction method**

Here, we compare \(N_{MC}\) with \(N_{SVDD}\). Since \(N_{m} = \sum_{m} h_{m}\sigma_{m}^{(m)}\), we have

\[
||N_{m}\||_{op} \leq \sum_{m} h_{m} ||\sigma_{m}^{(m)}\||_{op} = \gamma^{(m)}, \tag{C1}
\]

where we used \(||\sigma^{(m)}\||_{op} = 1\).

Equations (B3), (B2), and (C1) indicate \(\gamma/||N_{const}\||_{op} \geq 1\) and

\[
\frac{N_{MC}}{N_{SVDD}} = O((\gamma/||N_{const}\||_{op})^{2k}). \tag{C2}
\]

Thus, the SVD contraction method is exponentially more efficient than the Monte-Carlo contraction method in terms of the sampling cost.

We present numerical calculations for \(\gamma/||N_{const}\||_{op}\) in order to check the superiority of the SVD contraction method over the Monte-Carlo contraction method. We obtain 10,000 samples of \(N_{const}\) and \(||N_{const}\||_{op}\) by the procedure in Sec. [11B] and \(\gamma\) from the Pauli decomposition of \(N_{const}\). We show the average of the ratio \(\gamma/||N_{const}\||_{op}\) in Fig. [4](a) and we found that the average value is about 1.4 for any \(n\). Therefore, from the Eq. (C2) and of the result in Fig. [4](a), we can conclude that the SVD contraction method is expected to be \(O((1.4)^{2k})\) times faster on average than the Monte-Carlo contraction method.

We also numerically evaluate the number of measurements for the two methods. The average of \(\gamma\) and \(||N_{const}\||_{op}\) are shown in Fig. [4](b). In \(n \geq 4\) and \(n \geq 3\), \(\gamma\) and \(||N_{const}\||_{op}\) can be considered to be less than 1 including the standard deviation, respectively. Thus, we expect \(N_{MC} \leq O(1/\varepsilon^{2})\) and \(N_{SVDD} \leq O(1/\varepsilon^{2})\), that is, \(N_{MC}\) and \(N_{SVDD}\) are expected not to increase exponentially with \(k\), if \(n\) is large enough.

**FIG. 4.** The average values of \(\gamma / ||N_{const}\||_{op}\), \(\gamma\), and \(||N_{const}\||_{op}\) depending on the number of qubits \(n\) (10,000 samples). Each point and error bar represents the average value and standard deviation of the samples, respectively. (a) The average value of \(\gamma / ||N_{const}\||_{op}\). (b) The average values of \(\gamma\) (circle, red) and \(||N_{const}\||_{op}\) (diamond, blue).