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Abstract

We propose a universal quantum circuit design that can estimate any arbitrary one-dimensional periodic functions based on the corresponding Fourier expansion. The quantum circuit contains \( N \)-qubits to store the information on the different \( N \)-Fourier components and \( M + 2 \) auxiliary qubits with \( M = \lceil \log_2 N \rceil \) for control operations. The desired output will be measured in the last qubit \( q_N \) with a time complexity of the computation of \( O(N^2 \lceil \log_2 N \rceil^2) \). We illustrate the approach by constructing the quantum circuit for the square wave function with accurate results obtained by direct simulations using the IBM-QASM simulator. The approach is general and can be applied to any arbitrary periodic function.

Introduction

The field of quantum information and quantum computing advances in both software and hardware in the past few years. The achievement of 72-qubit quantum chip, Sycamore, with programmable superconducting processor[1] heralded a remarkable triumph towards quantum supremacy experiment [2]. On the other hand, the photonic quantum computer, Jiuzhang[3], demonstrated quantum computational advantages with Boson sampling using photons. The blooming of hardware development by IBM, Google, IonQ and many others provokes tremendous enthusiasm developing quantum algorithms utilizing near term quantum devices and pursuit of application in various fields of science and engineering. Recently there arises a growing body of research focusing on quantum optimization[4, 5], solving linear system of equations[6, 7, 8], electronic structure calculations [9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15], quantum encryption[16, 17], variational quantum eigensolver (VQE)[18, 19] for various problems[20, 21, 22] and open quantum dynamics[23, 24]. Recently, quantum machine learning further explored and implemented quantum software that could show advantages compared with the corresponding classical ones[25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32].

However, difficulties arise inevitably when attempting to include nonlinear functions into quantum circuits. For example, the very existence of nonpolynomial activation functions guarantees that multilayer feedforward networks can approximate any functions[33]. Even though, the nonlinear activation functions do not immediately correspond to the mathematical framework of quantum theory, which describes system evolution with linear operations and probabilistic observation. Conventionally, it is found extremely difficult generating these nonlinearities with a simple quantum circuit. The alternative approach is to make a compromise, imitating the nonlinear functions with repeated measurements[34, 35, 36], or with assistance of the Quantum Fourier Transformation[37] (QFT[38, 39]). How to simulate an arbitrary function, especially nonlinear functions from a quantum circuit is an important issue to be addressed.

In this paper, we proposed a universal design of quantum circuit, which is able to generate arbitrary finite continuous periodic 1-D functions, even nonlinear ones such as the square wave function, with the
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given Fourier expansion. The output information is all stored in the last qubit, which could be measured for the function estimation, or used as an intermediate state for following computation, as the case of estimating the nonlinear activation function between layers in quantum machine learning methods. We presented the details of the quantum circuit design in the first section followed by numerical simulation of the circuit imitating the square wave function on IBM-QASM. The final section contains complexity analysis and further applications.

1 Design of the quantum circuit

Consider a periodic 1-D function $F_N(x)$ that can be expanded as Fourier series with $N$ nontrivial components,

$$F_N(x) = \sum_{n=1}^{N} a_n \cos(\frac{2\pi}{T}nx + b_n)$$

where $T$ is the period, and for simplicity we set $T = \pi$. To construct the quantum circuit that estimates the output function $F_N(x)$, we need $N$-qubits to store the input information, all of which are initially prepared at the state $|\psi(x)\rangle = \cos x|0\rangle + \sin x|1\rangle$. Additionally, there are $M + 2$ auxiliary qubits, with $M = \lceil \log_2 N \rceil$ qubits assigned $q'_1, \cdots, q'_M$ and the other two are $q''_1, q''_2$. All the auxiliary qubits are initially set as $|0\rangle$ states. Thus, the input state can be written as

$$|\Psi_{in}(x)\rangle = |0\rangle^{\otimes M} \otimes |0\rangle^{\otimes 2} \otimes |\psi(x)\rangle^{\otimes N}$$

where subscripts indicate the group of the three different registers. Fig.(1a) illustrates the structure of the quantum circuit design for the output function $F_N(x)$, while the detailed evolution is demonstrated in fig.(1b). There are two main modules in the quantum circuit: The first one contains $U_{pre}$ acting on the auxiliary qubits $q'$, converting them from $|0\rangle$ to state $|\psi'_f\rangle$, and Hadamard gates acting on $q''$, converting them to states $|+\rangle = 1/\sqrt{2}[|0\rangle + |1\rangle]$. The intermediate state $|\psi'_f\rangle$ can be described as

$$|\psi'_f(\gamma)\rangle = \sum_{n=0}^{2^M-1} \sqrt{\gamma_n}|n\rangle$$

where $\sum_{n=0}^{2^M-1} \gamma_n = 1$ and $\gamma_n \geq 0$. Details about the design of $U_{pre}$ and $\gamma_n$ can be found in the supplementary materials. The succeeding module is formed by $N$ controlled unitary operations, where $q'$ are the control qubits for the target qubits $q''$ and $q$. Denote the unitary operations as $U_n$, with a general structure shown in fig.(1c). Initially, the Hadamard gates are applied on $q''$, and a rotation $Y$ gate is applied on the first qubit $q_1$. All these three qubits then acts as control qubits, while $q_2$ is the target in following operation. Next, qubit $q_2, q_3, \cdots, q_n$ are connected as a chain with simple control rotation $Y$ gates. Finally a swap gate between $q_n$ and $q_N$ is included, ensuring that all the necessary information are stored in the last qubit $q_N$.

For simplicity, in the operation $U_n$, we define $w_{0,1}^k$ and $v_{0,1}^k$ as

$$R_y(\theta_k)^\dagger|0\rangle = \cos(w_k^0)|0\rangle + \sin(w_k^0)|1\rangle$$

$$R_y(\theta_k)^\dagger|1\rangle = \cos(w_k^1)|0\rangle + \sin(w_k^1)|1\rangle$$

$$R_y(\theta'_k)^\dagger|0\rangle = \cos(v_k^0)|0\rangle + \sin(v_k^0)|1\rangle$$

$$R_y(\theta'_k)^\dagger|1\rangle = \cos(v_k^1)|0\rangle + \sin(v_k^1)|1\rangle$$

and $\alpha, \beta$ as

$$\alpha = \frac{1}{2} \cos(2x - 2w_1^1) \prod_{k=2}^{n} |\sin(v_k^1 - w_k^1)|$$

$$\beta_k = \arctan(2(\sin(2v_{k+1}^1) - \sin(2w_{k+1}^1), \cos(2v_{k+1}^1) - \cos(2w_{k+1}^1))$$
To estimate $F_N(x)$, we need to ensure that

$$C \sum_{n=1}^{N} a_n \cos(2nx + b_n) + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{m=1}^{N} \gamma_m \alpha^m \prod_{k=1}^{m} \cos(2x - \beta^m_k) + \frac{1}{2} = \sum_{m=1}^{N} \gamma_m \alpha^m \prod_{k=1}^{m} \cos(2x - \beta^m_k) + \frac{1}{2}$$  \hspace{1cm} (7)

where $C$ is a nonzero constant ensuring that $|CF_N(x)| \leq \frac{1}{2}$, and the superscript $m$ of $\alpha^m$, $\beta^m_k$ indicating that they belong to the operation $U_m$. The right hand side of eq.(7) is the probability to get the outcome result $|1\rangle$ when measuring $q_N$ itself after running the whole quantum circuit (More details can be found in the supplementary materials).
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**Figure 1:** Sketch of the quantum circuit estimating $F_N(x)$. Structure of the whole circuit is shown in fig.(1a). There are two main modules. The first one contains $U_{pre}$ acting on the auxiliary qubits $q'$, and Hadamard gates acting on $q''$. The succeeding module is formed by $N$ controlled unitary operations denoted as $U_n$. The corresponding evolution is demonstrated in fig.(1b), where $q'$ (blue color) are control qubits. $q'$ are converted to state $|\phi_f(\gamma)\rangle$ under the operation $U_{pre}$. The detailed sketch of $U_n$ is shown in fig.(1c). Initially, Hadamard gates are applied on $q''$, and a rotation $Y$ gate is applied on the first qubit $q_1$. All these three qubits then acts as control qubits, while $q_2$ is the target in following operation. Next, qubits $q_2, q_3, \cdots, q_N$ are connected as a chain with simple control rotation $Y$ gates. Finally a swap gate between $q_n$ and $q_N$ is included, ensuring that all the necessary information are stored in the last qubit $q_N$.

Thus, subsequent to the whole operation, the output state will be

$$|\Psi_{out}(x)\rangle = \sqrt{-CF_N(x) + \frac{1}{2} |\phi_0\rangle_{q',q'',q_1,\cdots,q_{N-1}} \otimes |0\rangle_{q_N} + \sqrt{CF_N(x) + \frac{1}{2} |\phi_1\rangle_{q',q'',q_1,\cdots,q_{N-1}} \otimes |1\rangle_{q_N}} \hspace{1cm} (8)$$

where $|\phi_0,1\rangle$ describing output state of all qubits and auxiliary qubits except the last one $q_N$. Hence, information stored in $q_N$ is essential and sufficient. After measuring $q_N$, the probability of getting $|1\rangle$ is an estimation of $F_N(x)$. Whereas, it is also appropriate to apply succeeding operations on $q_N$, regarding
it as an intermediate state for further computation. The same quantum circuit structure works when the input is in a superposition states, namely $|\Psi_{in}^{s}(x)\rangle$ describing a vector $x$ that contains $L$ components,

$$|\Psi_{in}^{s}(x)\rangle = \sum_{l=1}^{L} c_l |\psi_{in}(x_l)\rangle_{q',q'',q} \otimes |\Phi_l\rangle_Q$$

(9)

where $q', q'', q$ are entangled with some other qubits, namely in $Q$. The superscript $s$ represents superposition, subscripts $q', q'', q$ and $Q$ indicate the group of different qubits in different registers, and $\sum_{l=1}^{L} |c_l|^2 = 1$. $|\Phi_l\rangle$ is a complete orthogonal set of the subspace expanded by $Q$, ensuring that $\langle \Phi_l | \Phi_l \rangle = \delta_{l,l}$. After the whole operation, the output state is given by

$$|\Psi_{out}^{s}(x)\rangle = \sum_{l=1}^{L} c_l |\psi_{out}(x_l)\rangle_{q',q'',q} \otimes |\Phi_l\rangle_Q$$

If we only focus on the subspace expanded by $q_N$ and $Q$,

$$|\Psi_{out}^{s}(x)\rangle_{q_N,Q} = \sum_{l=1}^{L} c_l \left[ \sqrt{-CF_N(x_l) + \frac{1}{2}} |0\rangle_{q_N} + \sqrt{CF_N(x_l) + \frac{1}{2}} |1\rangle_{q_N} \right] \otimes |\Phi_l\rangle_Q$$

(10)

Then if $q_N$ is measured, probability to get result $|1\rangle$ will be $\frac{1}{2} + C \sum_{l=0}^{L} |c_l|^2 F_N(x_l) \frac{1}{2}$. This property leads to potential applications in quantum algorithm development, for example, the design of nonlinear activation between layers in quantum machine learning.

2 Implementation: Simulation for the square wave function

In this section we will demonstrate the quantum circuit design with a trivial example: Simulation of the square wave function. Consider the following Fourier expansion for the square wave function $f(x) = \text{sign}(\sin 2x)$, the sum of the first 7 terms is given by,

$$F(x) = \sum_{n=1}^{7} \frac{1}{n} \cos \left( n \cdot 2x - \frac{\pi}{2} \right)$$

(11)

where $F(x)$ is an odd function with $a_{2,4,6} = 0$. $q_1, \ldots, 7$ are required carrying out the input information, all of which will be initially prepared in the state $|\psi(x)\rangle$. Additionally, we need 5 auxiliary qubits, denoting them as $q'_{1,2}, q''_{1,2,3}$, and $a'_n, b'_n$ satisfy

$$C \sum_{n=1}^{j} a'_n \cos(2nx + b'_n) = \sum_{n=1}^{N} a_n \cos(2nx + b_n) - \sum_{m=j+1}^{N} \gamma_n \alpha^m \prod_{k=1}^{m} \cos(2x - \beta_k^m) \quad 1 \leq j < N$$

(12)

Then for $n > 1$ we set

$$\begin{align*}
\gamma_n &= 2^{n-1} \cos \frac{\pi}{2}, \\
\beta_k^m &= \frac{\pi}{2} \delta_{1,0} - \frac{\pi}{2(n-1)}, \quad b'_n \neq 0, \\
b'_n &= 0
\end{align*}$$

(13)

Eq.(13) ensures that $\gamma_{2,4,6}$ are all zero, so that we do not need to construct $U_{2,4,6}$ in the circuit. We need to stress the fact that the above setting is not optimal, especially when one prefer a greater value of $|C|$ instead of a shallow circuit. Fig.(2a) is a scheme of the whole operation. Operations in the blue block is $U_{pre}$, which converts $q'$ into state $|\psi'(\gamma)\rangle$ in eq.(3). Due to the fact that $\gamma_{2,4,6}$ are all zero, then there is no need to construct $U_{2,4,6}$ in the quantum circuit. As shown in the green block, $U_1$ is a single rotation $Y$ gate acts on the last qubit $q_7$ directly. The other $U_n$ acts on $q'_{1,2}, q_{1,2,\ldots,j}$ and $q_7$. For illustration, we only plot details of $U_3$, as shown in the yellow block. Based on eq.(7), eq.(11) can be rewritten as

$$F(x) = -0.8211 \cdot \cos(2x - 4.8812) + 18.9339 \cdot \cos^3(2x - 0.2384) - 15.6030 \cdot \cos^5(2x - 0.0046) - 9.1429 \cdot \cos^7(2x - 0.6732)$$
Contributions of each single operation $U_j$ alone is shown in fig.(2b). The sum of all their contributions are shown in fig.(2c), which is the output result. $P_1$ is probability to get the outcome result $|1\rangle$ when measuring the last qubit $q_7$ after the whole operation. Fig.(2d) is a sketch of the connectivity structure. Each node represents a single qubit. If two qubits are connected via a blue curve, then there is at least one 2-qubit gate acting on them. All auxiliary qubits $q'$ and $q''$ are connected with each other. Meanwhile, all qubits $q$ are connected to all of the other auxiliary qubits. For any $1 \leq n < N$, there is also a connection between $q_n$ and its neighbor $q_{n+1}$. The last qubit $q_N$ is connected to all other qubits.

Figure 2: The quantum circuit estimating 1-D square wave function. Fig.(2a) is a sketch of the quantum circuit estimating square wave function. Operations in the blue block is $U_{pre}$, which converts $q'$ into state $|\psi_f(\gamma)\rangle$ in eq.(3). Due to the fact that $\gamma_{2,4,6}$ are all zero, $U_{2,4,6}$ disappears in the circuit. As shown in the green block, $U_1$ is a single rotation $Y$ gate acts on the last qubit $q_7$ directly. The other $U_n$ acts on $q'_1,2,\ldots,j$ and $q_7$. Attributable to the space, here we only plot details of $U_3$, as shown in the yellow block. Numerical simulation results are included in fig.(2b,2c). $P_1$ is probability to get result $|1\rangle$ when measuring the last qubit $q_7$ after the whole operation. $x$ is the variable in the input state $|\psi(x)\rangle$. Contributions of each single operation $U_j$ alone is shown in fig.(2b). Amplitudes are not included when plotting fig.(2b). The sum of all their contributions are shown in fig.(2c), which is as well the output result. Fig.(2d) is a sketch of the connectivity structure. Each node represents a single qubit. If two qubits are connected via a blue curve, then there is at least one 2-qubit gate acting on them.

Further, we also implemented $U_{3,5,7}$ independently based on IBM QASM simulator, as shown in fig.(3), where for each single dot we collect data from 8192 iterative measurements. Results from IBM QASM simulator fit well with the theoretical prediction corresponding to $U_3$ and $U_5$, as shown in fig.(3b) and fig.(3c). More details of the simulations can be found in the supplementary materials.
Figure 3: Implementation on IBM QASM simulator.
Fig.(3a) is numerical simulation results of $U_3$, contributing component $\cos^3(2x - 0.2384)$, while fig.(3b) and fig.(3c) corresponds to $U_5$ and $U_7$, calculating components $\cos^3(2x - 0.0046)$ and $\cos^3(2x - 0.6732)$. Red lines represent the theoretical prediction, and blue dots (or diamonds, triangles) represent the results on IBM QASM simulator. $P$ is the probability to get state $|0\rangle$ or $|1\rangle$ when measuring the last qubit. (Generally, we prefer to get state $|1\rangle$ when calculating a positive component in the expansion, and $|0\rangle$ when calculating a negative one.) For each single dot we collect data from 8192 iterative measurements.

3 Time complexity

We will compare the time complexity for three various situations: In the first situation we consider classical inputs, while for others we consider some unknown quantum states as inputs. One can either estimate $x$ from the input and calculate $F_N(x)$ classically, or apply the method presented in this article to estimate the outputs.

**Situation I.** Estimate $F_N(x)$ with a classical input $x$:

To estimate a periodic function $F_N(x)$ within error $\epsilon$, $O\left(\frac{1}{\epsilon}\right)$ times of measurement are required[40]. Initially $N$ $R_y$ rotation gates are required for mapping $x$ into quantum state $|\psi(x)\rangle^{\otimes N}$. Moreover, we need $M + 2$ auxiliary qubits, where $M = \lceil \log_2 N \rceil$ for control qubits. $U_{\text{pre}}$ contains $O(\exp(M))$ multi control gates, and in each of them there are at most $M - 1$ control qubits. The time scaling of $n$-control gates is $O(n^2)$[41], thus the time complexity of $U_{\text{pre}}$ is $O(N\lceil \log_2 N \rceil^2)$.

Consider the basic unit $U_n$. When $n > 2$, there are 4 Control-Control rotation gates, $4n - 8$ control-rotation gates and one optional 2-qubit swap gate. Thus, it takes time $O((n\lceil \log_2 n \rceil)^2)$ to implement the operation $|n\rangle\langle n| \otimes U_n$. After taking the $M$ auxiliary qubits into account, $M$ control qubits are added to all gates in $U_n$. Therefore, it takes time $O(n)$ to achieve a single $U_n$. Notice that there are $N$ similar $U_n$, where $n = 1, 2, \cdots, N$, time complexity to finish all $\sum_{n=1}^{N} |n\rangle\langle n| \otimes U_n$ is $O(N^2\lceil \log_2 N \rceil^2)$.

Totally, to derive the estimation $C F_N(x)$ within error $\epsilon$, the time complexity is of order $O(N^2\lceil \log_2 N \rceil^2/\epsilon)$, which is still polynomial. On the other hand, time complexity to estimate $F_N(x)$ for a single $x$ based on Taylor expansion is also polynomial to $N$. Hence under this situation there is no speedup comparing with the classical calculation.

**Situation II.** Estimate $F_N(x)$ with input quantum state $|\psi(x)\rangle^{\otimes N}$, where the value of $x$ is still unknown:

The only difference from the previous situation is that the mapping process now can be skipped. Still, time consuming is of order $O(N^2\lceil \log_2 N \rceil^2/\epsilon)$. By contrast, to calculate $F_N(x)$ from $|\psi(x)\rangle^{\otimes N}$ classically, the first step is to derive $x$ from the input states. It requires $O\left(\frac{1}{\epsilon}\right)$ measurements to get $x$ within error $\epsilon$, and then the time complexity to estimate $F_N(x)$ is polynomial to $N$. Still, under this situation there is no speedup comparing with the classical calculation.

**Situation III.** Estimate $\sum_{l=0}^{L} |c_l|^2 F_N(x_l)$ with input quantum state $|\Psi_\text{in}(x)\rangle$, as described in eq.(9):

Here we denote $N'$ as the number of qubits that form state $|\Phi\rangle$, and $L = 2^{N'} - 1$. Even though more variables are introduced into the input, we do not need to change anything in the quantum circuit. To get an estimation of $C \sum_{l=0}^{L} |c_l|^2 F_N(x_l)$, time consuming is still of order $O(N^2\lceil \log_2 N \rceil^2/\epsilon)$. On the other hand, as $c_j$ are not known initially, one must estimate them before estimating $\sum_{l=0}^{L} |c_l|^2 F_N(x_l)$ classically. Time complexity of quantum tomography is exponential to $N'$, or at least polynomial to $N'$.
with shadow quantum tomography\cite{42}. Thus, when $N' \gg N$, the quantum method will be efficient.

4 Conclusion

Here, we propose a universal quantum circuit design for any arbitrary one-dimensional periodic function. The inputs are sufficient qubits prepared at the same state, while the last one will represent the output outcome. One can either estimate the exact value from repeating measurements on the last qubit, or regard it as an intermediate state prepared for succeeding operations. Superposition in the input leads to similarly superposition in the output, which leads to speedup under some certain circumstances, especially when dealing with unknown quantum inputs. As an simple example we illustrate the quantum circuit design for the square wave function. Both exact simulations and implementation on IBM-QASM gave very accurate result and illustrate the power of this proposed general design. This general approach might be used to construct an appropriate quantum circuit for the electronic wave function in periodic solids and materials, moreover in quantum machine learning particularly simulating the non-linear function used in the network.
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S1 Preparations

Consider a 1-D continuous bounded function \( f(x) \) defined on \( x \in [x_1, x_2] \), where \( x_2 > x_1 \), one can always expand \( f(x) \) into a periodic function \( F(x) \) in the whole 1-D space, where the cycle of \( F(x) \) is \( T = 2(x_2 - x_1) \)

\[
F(x) = \begin{cases} 
  f(x), & x \in [x_1 + kT, x_2 + (k + 1/2)T) \\
  f(x_2 - x), & x \in [x_1 + (k + 1/2)T, x_2 + kT) 
\end{cases} \quad k \in \mathbb{Z} \tag{S1}
\]

As a continuous periodic function, \( F(x) \) can be expanded with Fourier series

\[
F(x) = \frac{1}{2}a_0 + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} a_n \cos\left(\frac{2\pi}{T}nx + b_n\right) \tag{S2}
\]

where \( a_n \) and \( b_n \) are defined as

\[
 a_n = \left\{ \left[ \int_T dx F(x) \sin\left(\frac{2\pi}{T}nx\right) \right]^2 + \left[ \int_T dx F(x) \cos\left(\frac{2\pi}{T}nx\right) \right]^2 \right\}^{\frac{1}{2}} \tag{S3}
\]

\[
 b_n = -\arctan\frac{\int_T dx F(x) \sin\left(\frac{2\pi}{T}nx\right)}{\int_T dx F(x) \cos\left(\frac{2\pi}{T}nx\right)} \tag{S4}
\]

The first \( N \) nontrivial components in Fourier expansion are given by

\[
F_N(x) = \sum_{n=1}^{N} a_n \cos\left(\frac{2\pi}{T}nx + b_n\right) \tag{S5}
\]

For simplicity, in the main article and following discussion we assume that \( T = \pi \). Hence, we have

\[
F_N(x) = \sum_{n=1}^{N} a_n \cos(n \cdot 2x + b_n) \tag{S6}
\]

Given a certain \( F_N \) as eq.(S6), our goal is to design a quantum circuit that can estimate \( F_N(x) \) with \( N \) copies of the input state \( |\psi(x)\rangle \), where

\[
|\psi(x)\rangle = \cos x|0\rangle + \sin x|1\rangle \tag{S7}
\]
\[ A_n(x) = \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2} \cos(2x - 2w_1^n) \]
\[ B_n(x) = \frac{1}{2} \left[ \cos(2x - 2v_1^{n+1}) - \cos(2x - 2w_1^{n+1}) \right] \]  

(S11)

Notice that \( P_0^n = A_0(x) \), we have

\[ P_1^n = \sum_{j=1}^{n} \left[ A_j(x) \prod_{k=j+1}^{n} B_k(x) \right] \]  

(S12)

\( B_n(x) \) can be rewritten as

\[ B_n(x) = \frac{1}{2} \left[ \cos(2x - 2v_1^{n+1}) - \cos(2x - 2w_1^{n+1}) \right] \\
= \frac{1}{2} \left[ \cos 2x \cos 2v_1^{n+1} + \sin 2x \sin 2v_1^{n+1} - \cos 2x \cos 2w_1^{n+1} - \sin 2x \sin 2w_1^{n+1} \right] \\
= \frac{1}{2} \left[ \cos 2x(\cos 2v_1^{n+1} - \cos 2w_1^{n+1}) + \sin 2x(\sin 2v_1^{n+1} - \sin 2w_1^{n+1}) \right] \]  

(S13)

\[ = \frac{1}{2} \sqrt{(\cos 2v_1^{n+1} - \cos 2w_1^{n+1})^2 + (\sin 2v_1^{n+1} - \sin 2w_1^{n+1})^2} \cdot \cos(2x - \text{arctan}(2\sin 2v_1^{n+1} - \sin 2w_1^{n+1}, \cos 2v_1^{n+1} - \cos 2w_1^{n+1})) \]  

where we denote \( \beta_n = \text{arctan}(2\sin 2v_1^{n+1} - \sin 2w_1^{n+1}, \cos 2v_1^{n+1} - \cos 2w_1^{n+1}) \). Substitute eq.(S13) into eq.(S12),

\[ P_1^n = \sum_{j=1}^{n} \left\{ \left[ \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2} \cos(2x - 2w_1^n) \right] \prod_{k=j+1}^{n} |\sin(v_1^k - w_1^k)| \cdot \cos(2x - \beta_k) \right\} \\
= \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2} \cos(2x - 2w_1^n) \prod_{k=2}^{n} |\sin(v_1^k - w_1^k)| \cdot \cos(2x - \beta_k) \\
+ \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j=1}^{n} \left\{ |\sin(v_1^{j+1} - w_1^{j+1})| \cos(2x - \beta_{j+1}) + \cos(2x - 2w_1^{j+1}) \right\} \\
\cdot \prod_{k=j+2}^{n} |\sin(v_1^k - w_1^k)| \cdot \cos(2x - \beta_k) \]  

(S14)

Notice that

\[ |\sin(v_1^{j+1} - w_1^{j+1})| \cos(2x - \beta_{j+1}) + \cos(2x - 2w_1^{j+1}) \\
= \cos 2x \cdot \left( |\sin(v_1^{j+1} - w_1^{j+1})| \cos \beta_{j+1} + \cos 2w_1^{j+1} \right) \\
+ \sin 2x \cdot \left( |\sin(v_1^{j+1} - w_1^{j+1})| \sin \beta_{j+1} + \sin 2w_1^{j+1} \right) \]  

(S15)

\[ = \eta_n \cos(2x - \zeta_n) \]  

where for simplicity, we denote

\[ \eta_n = \sqrt{1 + \sin^2(v_1^{j+1} - w_1^{j+1}) + |\sin(v_1^{j+1} - w_1^{j+1})| \cos(2w_1^{j+1} - \beta_{j+1})} \]  

(S16)

\[ \zeta_n = \text{arctan}2(|\sin(v_1^{j+1} - w_1^{j+1})| \sin \beta_{j+1} + \sin 2w_1^{j+1}, |\sin(v_1^{j+1} - w_1^{j+1})| \cos \beta_{j+1} + \cos 2w_1^{j+1}) \]  

(S17)

Then we can rewrite \( P_1^n \) as

\[ P_1^n = \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2} \cos(2x - 2w_1^n) \prod_{k=2}^{n} |\sin(v_1^k - w_1^k)| \cdot \cos(2x - \beta_k) \\
+ \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j=1}^{n} \left\{ \eta_n \cos(2x - \zeta_n) \cdot \prod_{k=j+2}^{n} |\sin(v_1^k - w_1^k)| \cdot \cos(2x - \beta_k) \right\} \]  

(S18)
In the main article we denote the circuit shown in fig.(S2) as $U_n(\Theta_n)$. $U_n(\Theta_n)$ is the basic modulus of the whole circuit that can estimate outputs with given function $F_N$. $\Theta_n$ contains all parameters $\theta, \theta'$ or $v, w$ of the control rotation gates. $U_n(\Theta_n)$ can generate components of Fourier series no greater than the $n$-th order. Different from the simple qubit chain shown in fig.(S1), there are two auxiliary qubits $q''_1$ and $q''_2$ in quantum circuit $U_n(\Theta_n)$. $q''_1$ and $q''_2$ are initially prepared at state $|0\rangle$, and will acts as control gates after the Hadamard (H) gate. Mathematically, it can generates output as described in eq.(S20). In the main article, there is additionally a swap gate in $U_n$, which ensures all $U_n$ share the same qubit carrying outputs.

Further, if we replace the initial state of $q_1$ with $|+\rangle$, discard $U^1$, and keep all the rest the same, then the probability to get $|1\rangle$ when measuring $q_N$ will be

$$P_n^{1'} = \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j=1}^{n} \eta_n \cos(2x - \zeta_n) \cdot \prod_{k=j+2}^{n} \left| \sin(v_1^k - w_1^k) \right| \cdot \cos(2x - \beta_k)$$  \hspace{1cm} (S19)

Hence, for the circuit shown in fig.(S2), if we apply Z measurement on $q_N$ after the whole operation, the probability to get $|1\rangle$ will be

$$\frac{1}{2} (P_n^1 + 1 - P_n^{1'}) = \frac{1}{2} \cos(2x - 2w_1^1) \prod_{k=2}^{n} \left| \sin(v_1^k - w_1^k) \right| \cdot \cos(2x - \beta_k) + \frac{1}{2}$$  \hspace{1cm} (S20)

In the main article we denote the circuit shown in fig.(S2) as $U_n(\Theta_n)$, where there are totally $n$ qubits. We use $\Theta_n$ to represent parameters $\theta$ and $\theta'$ of the rotation gates. Thus, at most $N$ operations are required to rebuild $F_N(x)$, denote them as $U_n$, $n = 1, 2, \cdots, N$. $U_n|\psi(x)\rangle^{\otimes N}$ can generate Fourier series no greater than the $n$-th order. $U_n$ contains a control operation chain that acts on $q''_1, q''_2, q_{N-n+1}, q_{N-n+2}, \cdots, q_n$, where $q''_1, q''_2$ are still auxiliary qubits and now the control operation chain starts from qubit $q_{N-n+1}$. Generally in each operation $U_n$, there are several free variable sharing the similar notation, like $v, w, \beta$. To avoid misleading notations, we introduce superscript to indicate the operation $U_n$, and define

$$\alpha = \frac{1}{2} \cos(2x - 2w_1^1) \prod_{k=2}^{n} \left| \sin(v_1^k - w_1^k) \right|$$  \hspace{1cm} (S21)

Thus, if we apply $U_n$ on $N$ input qubits all prepared at state $|\psi(x)\rangle$, the probability to get $|1\rangle$ when measuring the final qubit $q_N$ will be

$$\sum_{j=1}^{2^{N-1}} \left| \left[ \mathbb{I}_{\otimes \{ q_1, q_2, \cdots, q_{N-1} \}} \otimes |1\rangle \right]^{\dagger} U_n |\psi(x)\rangle^{\otimes N} \right|^2 = \alpha^n \prod_{k=2}^{j} \cos(2x - \beta_k^n) + \frac{1}{2}$$  \hspace{1cm} (S22)
Figure S3: A sketch of $U_{\text{pre}}$ that acts on three qubits.

To convert the three qubits $q'_1, q'_2, q'_3$ into $|\psi_j'(\gamma)\rangle$, the iterative process is repeated for three times. In the first iterative 'loop', we only need to apply a single rotation gate on $q'_1$. In the second loop, $q'_1$ performs as a control qubit. Two different rotation gates are applied on $q'_2$ corresponding to the two eigenstates of $q'_1$. Similarly, in the third loop, $q'_1$ and $q'_2$ together play the role of control qubits, and there are four rotation gates acting on $q'_3$. Totally, three are one rotation $y$ gate acting on $q'_1$, two control rotation gates and four control control rotation gates.

**S3 Design of $U_{\text{pre}}$**

$U_{\text{pre}}$ is introduced to convert the auxiliary qubits $q'_1, q'_2, \cdots, q'_M$ into $|\psi_j'\rangle$

$$|\psi_j'\rangle = \sum_{n=0}^{2^M-1} \sqrt{\gamma_n} |n\rangle$$ \hspace{1cm} (S23)

where $\gamma = (\gamma_0, \gamma_1, \cdots, \gamma_{2^M-1})$, $\gamma_n \geq 0$ and $\sum_{n=0}^{2^M-1} \gamma_n = 1$. Here we provide a universal but not optimal design of $U_{\text{pre}}$. Denote operation $U_{\text{pre}}(\gamma)$ that satisfies

$$U_{\text{pre}}(\gamma)|0\rangle = |\psi_j'\rangle$$ \hspace{1cm} (S24)

There is an iterative method to design $U_{\text{pre}}(\gamma)$, when there are more than 2 components ($M > 1$) in $\gamma$,

$$U_{\text{pre}}(\gamma) = R_y(2\omega) \otimes |0\rangle \langle 0| \otimes U_{\text{pre}}(\gamma_{\text{A}}) + |1\rangle \langle 1| U_{\text{pre}}(\gamma_{\text{B}})$$ \hspace{1cm} (S25)

Otherwise if $\gamma$ only contains 2 terms ($M = 1$),

$$U_{\text{pre}}(\gamma) = R_y(2\omega)$$ \hspace{1cm} (S26)

where $\omega = \arctan 2(\sum_{n=2^M-1}^{2^M-1} \gamma_n, \sum_{n=0}^{2^M-1-1} \gamma_n)$, and as long as $0 < \sum_{n=2^M-1}^{2^M-1-1} \gamma_n < 1$, we define

$$\gamma_{\text{A}} = \frac{1}{\sum_{n=0}^{2^M-1-1} \gamma_n} (\gamma_0, \gamma_1, \cdots, \gamma_{2^M-1-1})$$ \hspace{1cm} (S27)

$$\gamma_{\text{B}} = \frac{1}{\sum_{n=2^M-1}^{2^M-1} \gamma_n} (\gamma_{2^M-1}, \gamma_{2^M-1+1}, \cdots, \gamma_{2^M-1})$$ \hspace{1cm} (S28)

As for the exception, if $\sum_{n=2^M-1}^{2^M-1-1} \gamma_n = 0$, we can set all components in $\gamma_{\text{B}}$ as 0, and same to the situation when $\sum_{n=0}^{2^M-1} \gamma_n = 1$. As a simple but not trivial example, fig.(S3) is a design of $U_{\text{pre}}$ that acts on three qubits $q'_1, q'_2, q'_3$, which totally contains one rotation $y$ gate acting on $q'_1$, two control rotation gates and four control control rotation gates.

Then consider constraints of $\gamma$. If we measure the last qubit $q_N$ after the whole operation, probability
to get $|1\rangle$ is
\[
\sum_{m=1}^{2M} \sum_{n=1}^{2N-1} \left| [m]_{q'_1\cdots q'_M} \otimes [n]_{q_1\cdots q_{N-1}} \otimes |1\rangle_{q_N} \right|^2 \left| \sum_{j=0}^{2M-1} (j) U_j(\Theta) \right|^2 \left| \phi_f \otimes |\psi(x)\rangle \right|^2
\]
\[
\sum_{m=1}^{2M} \sum_{n=1}^{2N-1} \left| \sum_{j=0}^{2M-1} (m)_{q'_1\cdots q'_M} \left[ [m]_{q_1\cdots q_{N-1}} \otimes |1\rangle_{q_N} \right] \right|^2 \left| \sum_{j=0}^{2M-1} (j) U_j(\Theta) \right|^2 \left| \phi_f \otimes |\psi(x)\rangle \right|^2
\]
\[
\sum_{m=1}^{2M} \sum_{n=1}^{2N-1} \left| \delta_{m} \left[ [n]_{q_1\cdots q_{N-1}} \otimes |1\rangle_{q_N} \right] \right|^2 \left| \sum_{j=0}^{2M-1} (m)_{q'_1\cdots q'_M} \left[ [m]_{q_1\cdots q_{N-1}} \otimes |1\rangle_{q_N} \right] \right|^2 \left| \sum_{j=0}^{2M-1} (j) U_j(\Theta) \right|^2 \left| \phi_f \otimes |\psi(x)\rangle \right|^2
\]
\[
\sum_{m=1}^{2M} \sum_{n=1}^{2N-1} \left| \gamma_m \sum_{k=1}^{m} \cos(2x - \beta_k^m) + \frac{1}{2} \right|^2 \left| \gamma_m \sum_{k=1}^{m} \cos(2x - \beta_k^m) + \frac{1}{2} \right|^2
\]
\[
|\Psi_{\text{out}}\rangle = \sqrt{-CF_N(x_j) + \frac{1}{2} |\phi_0\rangle_{q'_1\cdots q'_M} |0\rangle_{q_N} + \sqrt{CF_N(x_j) + \frac{1}{2} |\phi_1\rangle_{q'_1\cdots q'_M} |0\rangle_{q_N}}}
\]
where $|\phi_{0,1}\rangle$ describing output state of all qubits except the last one $q_N$, and $C$ is a constant ensuring $\frac{1}{2} \pm CF_N(x_j) \geq 0$. Hence, information stored in $q_N$ is essential and sufficient. After measuring $q_N$, the frequency getting $|0\rangle$ is an estimation of $F_N(x)$. Whereas, it is also appropriate to apply succeeding operations on $q_N$, regarding it as an intermediate.

To estimate $F_N(x)$, we need to ensure that
\[
C \sum_{n=1}^{N} a_n \cos(2nx + b_n) + \frac{1}{2} = \sum_{m=1}^{N} \gamma_m \alpha^m \prod_{k=1}^{m} \cos(2x - \beta_k^m) + \frac{1}{2}
\]
where $\gamma$ gives $|\psi'_f\rangle$.

Theoretically, any design that satisfies eq.(S32) can be used to estimate $F_N(x)$. Here we only give one solution set that we used in our simulation. Denote $a'_n, b'_n$ as

$$
C \sum_{n=1}^{j} a'_n \cos(2nx + b'_n) = \sum_{n=1}^{N} a_n \cos(2nx + b_n) - \sum_{m=j+1}^{N} \gamma_m \alpha^m \prod_{k=1}^{m} \cos(2x - \beta_k), \quad 1 \leq j < N \tag{S33}
$$

Then for $n > 1$ we can set

$$
\begin{aligned}
\gamma_n &= \frac{2^n-1}{C} a'_n \\
\beta_k^n &= -\frac{\theta^n}{\pi}, \\
\beta_k^n &= \frac{\pi}{3} \delta_{10} - \frac{\pi}{4(n-1)}, \quad b'_n = 0 
\end{aligned} \tag{S34}
$$

**S4 Implementation on IBM QASM simulator**

In the main article, we implemented $U_{3,5,7}$ independently on IBM QASM simulator. Fig.(S4) is a sketch of the implementation of $U_5$, where there are two auxiliary qubits $q_{0,1}$ and five qubits $q_2, \cdots, q_6$ carrying the input information $x$. The control-control-RY gates are decomposed into two CNOT gates and three control-RY gates. $U_5$ is designed to generate the component $\cos^5(2x - 0.0046)$. Notice that the corresponding $\gamma_5$ is negative, we set,

$$
\begin{aligned}
\theta_n &= 0 \quad , n > 1 \\
\theta'_n &= -\left\lfloor (\beta_n - \pi/2) \mod \pi \right\rfloor \quad , n > 1 \\
\theta_0' &= -\beta_0
\end{aligned} \tag{S35}
$$

where $\beta_n = 0.0046$. Measure the last qubit $q_6$ after the whole operation, probability to get state 0, namely $P_0$, will be proportional to $\cos^5(2x - 0.0046)$. In other words, by this design we generate the component $-\cos^5(2x - 0.0046)$ in the final output, as $P_1$ is used for the estimation of $F_N(x)$. To implement $U_n$, totally $O(n)$ CNOT gates and control-RY gates and NOT gates are required. On the other hand, these setting can also be used for a positive term together with a final NOT gate applying on the last qubit.

Figure S4: A sketch of $U_5$ implemented on IBM QASM simulator.

There are two auxiliary qubits $q_{0,1}$ and five qubits $q_2, \cdots, q_6$ carrying the input information $x$. For simplicity, other qubits are not included. The control-control-RY gates are decomposed into two CNOT gates and three control-RY gates.

We need to stress that the above setting is not optimal, especially when one prefer a greater value of $|C|$ instead of a shallow circuit. In this example, the special choice of $\theta$ and $\theta'$ ensure that half of them are zero, so that we can further reduce around half gates. Even though in fig.(S4), we plot all these operations as $R_y(0)$, which is just identical gates and can be removed safely.