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Abstract
Many quantum algorithms can be written as a composition of unitaries, some of which can be exactly synthesized by a universal fault-tolerant gate set like Clifford+T, while others can be approximately synthesized. A quantum compiler synthesizes each approximately synthesizable unitary up to some approximation error, such that the error of the overall unitary remains bounded by a certain amount. In this paper we consider the case when the errors are measured in the global phase invariant distance. Apart from deriving a relation between this distance and the Frobenius norm, we show that this distance composes. If a unitary is written as a composition (product and tensor product) of other unitaries, we derive bounds on the error of the overall unitary as a function of the errors of the composed unitaries. Our bound is better than the sum-of-error bound, derived by Bernstein and Vazirani [BV97], for the operator norm. This builds the intuition that while synthesizing a quantum circuit, if we want to optimize certain resources that are inversely proportional to the error, working with the global phase invariant distance might give us a lower count, compared to the operator norm.

Next we consider the following problem. Suppose we are given a decomposition of a unitary, that is, the unitary is expressed as a composition (multiplication and tensor product) of other unitaries. The task is to distribute the errors in each component such that the resource-count (T-count in our paper) is optimized. We consider the specific case when the unitary can be decomposed such that the single-qubit z-rotation gates are the only component that we synthesize approximately. We prove analytically that for both the operator norm (considered in [HRS18, MSRH20]) and global phase invariant distance, the error should be distributed equally among these components. The optimal number of T-gates obtained by using the global phase invariant distance is less, compared to the case when operator norm is used. We explicitly derive bounds on the number of T-gates for Quantum Fourier Transform (QFT) and approximate QFT and show that working with this distance can give us a smaller number of T-gates. This implies a reduced number of T-gate for other quantum algorithms where QFT is an important part, for example, phase estimation, factoring and so on.

1 Introduction

It was envisioned [Fey82, Den85] that quantum computers can solve certain problems much more efficiently than their classical counterparts. This notion of quantum supremacy [Pre13] became
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a possibility with the design of quantum algorithms for challenging problems like factorization [Sho94, Sho99], unstructured search [Gro96], and others, with applications in areas such as cryptography [BB14], machine learning [HCT+19], material science [MEAG+20] and quantum chemistry [BBS+17, LC19]. At an abstract level, the algorithm usually consists of a number of unitaries, which are composed via tensor product or multiplication. These unitaries are mapped onto some implementation model, in most cases the circuit model. This step is a crucial part of the compilation process, where the unitary is decomposed into a number of gates (each one is a unitary) belonging to a universal set that can be implemented by the underlying technology of the hardware. The improvement claimed by the above-mentioned quantum algorithms usually do not take into account the number of resources like gates, ancilla, special states and so on, required to implement it on a particular hardware platform. The difference in the cost of implementation of these resources can make a significant difference in the practical advantage of these quantum algorithms over their classical counterparts. Thus it is necessary to estimate these resources to assess the practical advantage of quantum algorithms, to determine trade-offs (for example, problem sizes or parameters when quantum algorithms become more efficient), to determine the appropriate applications and to have a mutually reinforcing design of hardware and software.

The Clifford+T set is a widely studied and developed universal fault-tolerant gate set, which we consider in this paper. In this set the non-Clifford T gate is the most expensive to implement fault-tolerantly, as it requires large ancilla factories and additional operations like gate teleportation and state distillation [BK05, GC99, BH12, HH18, CC19, WWS20, OCI17, KT19, PL20, RBTL20, WWS19], which are less accurate procedures and require additional space and time compared to a single physical gate [BH12, CTV17]. Again, not all unitaries have an exact implementation with the gates of this set. The Solovay-Kitaev algorithm [Kit97, DN06] guarantees that given an n-qubit unitary $U$, we can generate a circuit with a universal gate set like Clifford+T, such that the unitary $U'$ implemented by the circuit is at most a certain distance from $U$. A unitary $U$ is exactly implementable by the Clifford+T gates if there exists a circuit with these gates that implement $U$. Otherwise it is approximately implementable i.e. $d(U, U') \leq \epsilon$ for some $\epsilon > 0$. For a distance $d$, the value $d(U, U')$ is also called the approximation error or error. In most synthesis and re-synthesis algorithms [MM20, GMM21, AMM14, dBBW19, KMM15, RS16] it is required to implement a circuit for a unitary that has the minimum number of certain resource like T-gate or T-depth, or which at least reduces these resources compared to the best-known results. Among the many kinds of approximation errors that may occur while implementing a unitary, we focus on the synthesis errors (see [MSRH20] for a nice exposition). These accumulate due to the inability to implement some unitaries exactly by a discrete fault-tolerant gate set like Clifford+T. It has been proved [NC10] that any universal fault-tolerant gate set must be discrete. In this paper our preferred distance measure (for calculating errors) is not the trace distance or operator norm used in [Kit97, DN06, KMM13, Sel15, RS16], but the global phase invariant distance used in [KMM15, Fow11]. This is because the trace distance or operator norm does not ignore global phase, and hence leads to unnecessarily long approximating sequences that achieve a specific global phase. In [KMM15] the authors give an empirical formula relating the T-count of arbitrary single qubit z-rotations with approximation error $\epsilon$, where the latter is measured in the global phase invariant distance. The single-qubit z-rotation gate is defined as follows.

$$R_z(\theta) = \begin{bmatrix} e^{-i\theta/2} & 0 \\ 0 & e^{i\theta/2} \end{bmatrix}$$

In [Sel15, RS16] the authors give bounds on the T-count of $R_z(\theta)$ as a function of $\epsilon$, measured in
the operator norm. This bound is worse than the bound obtained in [KMM15].

Most quantum algorithms like Quantum Fourier Transform (QFT) and phase estimation, which are also fundamental building blocks of other algorithms like factorization [NC10], can be written in a modular form. This implies that the overall unitary $V$ can be written as composition, i.e. multiplication and tensor product, of other unitaries, $V = \prod_{i=1}^{M} \bigotimes_{j=1}^{m_i} V_{ij}$. We call $V_{ij}$ as component unitaries in one decomposition of $V$. There can be more than one way to decompose $V$.

To reduce a particular resource of the overall unitary we would want to minimize the number of these resources in each $V_{ij}$. This can be determined by existing algorithms. For example, if the task is to optimize T-count or T-depth and some $V_{ij}$ is exactly implementable then we can use the T-count and T-depth optimal synthesis algorithms [MM20, GMM21], but their complexity scales exponentially with the number of qubits. If we want a more efficient way to obtain the circuit then we can sacrifice the optimality and use re-synthesis algorithms [AMM14, dBBW19]. If $V_{ij}$ is $R_z(\theta)$ then we can use the optimal-synthesis algorithms like [KMM15, Sel15, RS16]. Any single-qubit unitary can be decomposed into a sequence of $R_z(\theta)$ gates [KSVV02]. Otherwise we can synthesize a circuit using algorithms like [Kit97, DN06] and then apply a re-synthesis algorithm to reduce the T-count/depth.

The number of resources like gate count, depth, T-count and T-depth usually are inversely proportional to the approximation error [DN06, KMM15, RS16]. Given a decomposition, a compiler has to distribute the errors among each approximately-synthesizable component unitary ($V_{ij}$) such that the overall error remains bounded by some quantity. For this we need a composition rule for the distance metric in which these errors are measured. In previous works [HRS18, MSRH20] the authors worked with the operator norm and used the Bernstein-Vazirani bound [BV97] for composing the errors. They also designed an automatic error management framework using simulated annealing algorithm that tried to distribute the errors such that the total number of a particular resource (T-count) reduces. To the best of our knowledge, before our work, no such composition rule existed for the global phase invariant distance.

1.1 Our contributions

Apart from deriving a relation between the Frobenius (and hence operator) norm and global phase invariant distance, such that an upper bound on the former implies an upper bound on the latter (Lemma 2.1 in Section 2.4), our contributions in this paper can be broadly divided into two parts.

1. Composition of global phase invariant distance : First we show how the global phase invariant distance composes under multiplication and tensor product of unitaries. Specifically let $V = \prod_{i=1}^{M} \bigotimes_{j=1}^{m_i} V_{ij}$ be an approximately implementable $n$-qubit unitary. The unitaries $U_{ij}$ are exactly implementable unitaries such that $D_P(U_{ij}, V_{ij}) \leq \epsilon_{ij}$, for each $i, j$, where $D_P(., .)$ is the global phase invariant distance. Then, if $U = \prod_{i=m}^{1} \bigotimes_{j=1}^{m_i} U_{ij}$, in Section 3 we derive the following bound.

$$D_P(U, V) \leq \sqrt{1 - \prod_{i=1}^{M} \prod_{j=1}^{m_i} \left(1 - \epsilon_{ij}^2 \right)} < \sum_{i=1}^{M} \sum_{j=1}^{m_i} \epsilon_{ij}$$

In the operator norm, the Bernstein-Vazirani bound [BV97] has been used in such cases [HRS18, MSRH20]. We prove that our bound is better than this sum-of-distance bound. This indicates that we can get much shorter circuits for the same error, since in most cases the number of resources is
inversely proportional to the error (distance). Apart from that, this result may be of independent interest.

2. Distribution of error while decomposing: Next we deal with the question of how to distribute errors among the component unitaries such that we optimize the number of T-gates, while keeping the overall error bounded by some given quantity. In many popular quantum algorithms like QFT [Sho94] and phase estimation [Kit95] the unitary can be decomposed such that \( R_z(\theta) \) gates are the only approximately synthesizable component unitaries. From [KMM15] we know how the error relates to the T-count of \( R_z(\theta) \). First we formulate an optimization problem for this task. Then we prove analytically that the error should be distributed equally among all the rotation gates. We also derive analytical expressions for the total number of T-gates required to implement the complete unitary.

This is in contrast to the approach taken in [HRS18, MSH20] where the same problem is considered but the authors use simulated annealing to reduce the number of T-gates required, while bounding the errors by Bernstein-Vazirani bound [BV97]. We prove analytically that even in their case the error should be distributed equally in order to achieve the optimum. Also, we show that using global phase invariant distance and our composition rules it is possible to get much lower number of T-gates for the overall unitary.

We consider the specific case of QFT algorithm [NC10] and derive the optimal number of T-gates required for a given approximation error. We then consider the approximate QFT algorithm. We show that the algorithmic error \( \epsilon_{QFT} \) accumulated due to the truncation of rotation gates [Cop02], is less if error is measured according to the global phase invariant distance. Then applying our composition rules and other optimization results we can get shorter circuits in terms of number of T gates. QFT is an important sub-routine in other important quantum algorithms like phase estimation, factoring, order finding and hidden subgroup problem [NC10]. So a reduction in the resource count of QFT implies a resource reduction for all these algorithms.

Our analytic framework will work for any decomposition in which the resource count of each component unitary has a “nice” functional relation with the error. At present, we know such a function exists for T-count of \( R_z(\theta) \).

1.2 Related work

A considerable amount of work has been done to develop programming languages and toolchains for resource estimation, such as Q# [SGT+18], Quipper [GLR+13], Scaffold/ScaffCC [JKP+14], Qiskit [AAB+19], ProjectQ [SHT18] and QuRE [SKF+13]. In the theoretical framework of [HHZ+19] the authors characterize the \((Q, \lambda)\)-diamond norm distance between an ideal quantum program and one which is executed on a noisy quantum hardware. This involves solving a semidefinite program [Wat09] whose complexity scales exponentially with the number of qubits, making it computationally intractable for large systems. Resource estimations have also been done for specific problems such as in [RWS+17, SVM+17], but usually these involve a significant amount of manual work utilizing domain knowledge.

The first designs of an automatic framework for managing approximation errors were due to Haner, Roetteler and Svore [HRS18] and Mueli, Soeken, Roetteler and Haner [MSHR20]. The latter improves on the former by using a fast symbolic method and incorporating two more kinds of approximation errors. Both of them use a simulated annealing program to solve an optimiza-
tion problem and they work with the operator norm, one main reason being the availability of composition rules for the operator norm \[\text{BV97}\].

1.3 Organization

We give some preliminary definitions and results in Section 2. The composition rules for the global phase invariant distance have been derived in Section 3. The optimization programs have been given in Section 4. Bound on the number of T-gates for QFT and other algorithms, has been shown in Section 5. Finally we conclude in Section 6.

2 Preliminaries

We denote the set of \(n\)-qubit unitaries by \(U_n\). The size of an \(n\)-qubit unitary is \(N \times N\) where \(N = 2^n\). The \((i, j)\)th entry of any matrix \(M\) is denoted by \(M_{ij}\) or \(M_{i,j}\) or \(M[i,j]\). We denote the \(n \times n\) identity matrix by \(I_n\) or \(I\) if dimension is clear from the context. \([n] = \{0, 1, \ldots, n-1\}\).

2.1 Clifford+T gate set

The single qubit Pauli matrices are as follows:

\[
X = \sigma_1 = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \quad Y = \sigma_2 = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & -i \\ i & 0 \end{bmatrix} \quad Z = \sigma_3 = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 \end{bmatrix}
\]

The \(n\)-qubit Pauli operators are:

\[
P_n = \{Q_1 \otimes Q_2 \otimes \ldots \otimes Q_n : Q_i \in \{I, X, Y, Z\}\}.
\]

For convenience, we denote an \(n\)-qubit Pauli operator \(\sigma_{a_1} \otimes \sigma_{a_2} \otimes \ldots \otimes \sigma_{a_n}\) by \(\sigma_a\) where \(a = (a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_n) \in [4]^n\). By convention, \(\sigma_0 = I_2\).

The single-qubit Clifford group \(C_1\) is generated by the Hadamard and phase gates i.e \(C_1 = \langle H, S \rangle\), where

\[
H = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 1 & -1 \end{bmatrix} \quad S = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & i \end{bmatrix}
\]

When \(n > 1\) the \(n\)-qubit Clifford group \(C_n\) is generated by these two gates (acting on any of the \(n\) qubits) along with the two-qubit CNOT = \(|0\rangle \langle 0| \otimes I + |1\rangle \langle 1| \otimes X\) gate (acting on any pair of qubits).

The Clifford+T group \(J_n\) is generated by the \(n\)-qubit Clifford group along with the T gate. Thus

\[
J_1 = \langle H, T \rangle \quad \text{and} \quad J_n = \langle H_{(i)}, T_{(i)}, \text{CNOT}_{(i,j)} : i, j \in [n] \rangle
\]

A unitary \(U\) is exactly implementable if there exists a Clifford+T circuit that implements it (up to some global phase), else it is approximately implementable. Specifically, we say \(V\) is \(\epsilon\)-approximately implementable if there exists an exactly implementable unitary \(U\) such that \(d(U, V) \leq \epsilon\). We denote the set of exactly implementable unitaries by \(J_n\). In this paper we use the following distance measure, which has been used in previous works like \[\text{Fow11}\] KMM15.

**Definition 2.1 (Global phase invariant distance).** Given two unitaries \(U, V \in U_n\), we define the global phase invariant distance between them as follows.

\[
D_P(U, V) = \sqrt{1 - \frac{|\text{Tr}(U^\dagger V)|}{N}}
\]
2.2 T-count and T-depth of circuits and unitaries

T-count and T-depth of circuits

The T-count of a circuit is the number of T-gates in it.

Suppose the unitary $U$ implemented by a circuit is written as a product $U = U_m U_{m-1} \ldots U_1$ such that each $U_i$ can be implemented by a circuit in which all the gates can act in parallel or simultaneously. We say $U_i$ has depth 1 and $m$ is the depth of the circuit. The T-depth of a circuit is the number of unitaries $U_i$ where the $T/T^\dagger$ gate is the only non-Clifford gate and all the $T/T^\dagger$ gates can act in parallel.

T-count and T-depth of exactly implementable unitaries

The T-count of an exactly implementable unitary $U \in J_n$, denoted by $T(U)$, is the minimum number of T-gates required to implement it (up to a global phase). A decomposition of $U$ with the minimum number of T-gates is called a T-count-optimal decomposition of $U$.

The min-T-depth of an exactly synthesizable unitary $U \in J_n$, denoted by $T_d(U)$, is the minimum T-depth of a Clifford+T circuit that implements it (up to a global phase). We often simply say, “T-count” instead of “T-count of a unitary” and “T-depth” instead of “T-depth or min-T-depth of a unitary”. It should be clear from the context.

$\epsilon$-T-count and $\epsilon$-T-depth of approximately implementable unitaries

Let $V \in U_n$ be an approximately implementable unitary. The $\epsilon$-T-count of $V$, denoted by $T^\epsilon(V)$, is equal to $T(U)$, the T-count of an exactly implementable unitary $U \in J_n$ such that $d(U,V) \leq \epsilon$ and $T(U) \leq T(U')$ for any $U' \in J_n$ and $d(U',V) \leq \epsilon$.

Similarly, the $\epsilon$-T-depth of $V$, denoted by $T^\epsilon_d(V)$, is equal to $T_d(U)$, the T-depth of an exactly implementable unitary $U \in J_n$ such that $d(U,V) \leq \epsilon$ and $T_d(U) \leq T_d(U')$ for any $U' \in J_n$ and $d(U',V) \leq \epsilon$.

We call a T-count-optimal (or T-depth-optimal) circuit for any such $U$ as the $\epsilon$-T-count-optimal (or $\epsilon$-T-depth-optimal respectively) circuit for $V$.

It is not hard to see that the above definitions are very general and can be applied to any unitary $V \in U_n$, exactly or approximately implementable. If a unitary is exactly implementable then $\epsilon = 0$.

2.3 Matrix norms

Let $F^{m \times n}$ is the vector space of all matrices of size $m \times n$ with entries in the field $F$, which is the field of real or complex numbers.

The operator norm of an $m \times n$ matrix $A$ on the space $F^{m \times n}$ is defined as follows.

$$
\|A\| = \sup \left\{ \|Ax\| : x \in F^n \text{ with } \|x\| = 1 \right\} = \sup \left\{ \frac{\|Ax\|}{\|x\|} : x \in F^n \text{ with } x \neq \vec{0} \right\}
$$

In particular, the $p$-norm is defined as follows.

$$
\|A\|_p = \sup_{x \neq \vec{0}} \frac{\|Ax\|_p}{\|x\|_p}
$$
When \( p = 2 \) then \( \|A\|_2 = \sigma_{\text{max}}(A) \) where the latter is the largest singular value of \( A \). An equivalent definition of \( \|A\|_2 \) is as follows.

\[
\|A\|_2 = \sup \{ x^T Ay : x, y \in \mathbb{F}^n \text{ with } \|x\|_2 = \|y\|_2 = 1 \}
\]

The **Frobenius norm** can be defined as follows.

\[
\|A\|_F = \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^{m} \sum_{j=1}^{n} |a_{ij}|^2} = \sqrt{\text{Tr}(A^\dagger A)} = \sqrt{\min\{m,n\} \sum_{i=1}^{R} \sigma_i^2(A)} = \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^{R} \lambda_i}
\]

where \( \sigma_i(A) \) are the singular values of \( A \). \( R \leq \min\{m, n\} \) is the rank of \( A \) and \( \lambda_i \) is the \( i^{th} \) non-zero eigenvalue of \( A^\dagger A \). We also have

\[
\|A\|_2 \leq \|A\|_F \leq \sqrt{R} \|A\|_2
\]

### 2.4 Relation between Frobenius distance and global phase invariant distance

Let \( U \) and \( V \) be two unitaries. Let \( \text{Tr}(V^\dagger U) = t \), so \( \text{Tr}(U^\dagger V) = \overline{t} \). The global phase invariant distance between the unitaries is:

\[
D_P(U,V) = \sqrt{1 - \frac{|t|}{N}}
\]

The Frobenius distance between these unitaries is:

\[
D_F(U,V) = \|V - U\|_F = \sqrt{\text{Tr}((V - U)^\dagger (V - U))}
\]

**Lemma 2.1.**

\[
D_P(U,V) \leq \frac{D_F(U,V)}{\sqrt{2N}} \quad [N = 2^n].
\]

**Proof.** For simplicity of expressions, we write \( D_P \) and \( D_F \) instead of \( D_P(U,V) \) and \( D_F(U,V) \) respectively.

\[
D_F^2 = \text{Tr}(V^\dagger V) + \text{Tr}(U^\dagger U) - \text{Tr}(V^\dagger U) - \text{Tr}(U^\dagger V) \\
= 2N - t - \overline{t} \quad [\because U^\dagger U = V^\dagger V = I] \\
= 2N - 2t_R \quad [\text{where } t_R = \text{Re}(t)]
\]

and

\[
ND_P^2 = N - |t|
\]

So

\[
D_F^2 - 2ND_P^2 = 2N - 2t_R - 2N + 2|t| = 2(|t| - t_R) \geq 0 \\
D_F^2 = 2ND_P^2 + 2(|t| - t_R) \\
\implies D_F^2 \geq 2ND_P^2 \quad [\text{Equality hold iff } |t| = t_R] \\
\implies D_P \leq \frac{D_F}{\sqrt{2N}} \quad [D_P, D_F \geq 0]
\]

\( \square \)
3 Composition of global phase invariant distance

In this section we show how the global phase invariant distance composes for tensor product and multiplication of unitaries. We prove that the bound we obtain is better than the sum-of-distance bound derived in [BV97] for product of unitaries in the operator norm.

3.1 Multiplication of unitaries

Lemma 3.1. Let $V = \prod_{i=1}^{m} V_i \in \mathcal{U}_n$, where each $V_i \in \mathcal{U}_n$ and for each one of them, there exists an $n$-qubit exactly implementable unitary $U_i \in \mathcal{J}_n$ such that $D_P(U_i, V_i) \leq \epsilon_i$, for some small enough $\epsilon_i \geq 0$ (say $\epsilon_i \leq 0.01$). If $U = \prod_{i=1}^{m} U_i \in \mathcal{J}_n$, then

$$D_P(U, V) \leq \sqrt{1 - \prod_{i=1}^{m} (1 - \epsilon_i^2)}$$

Proof. Since $D_P(V_i, U_i) \leq \epsilon_i$ for each $i$, so from the definition of global phase invariant distance, we have

$$\left| \text{Tr} \left( V_i^\dagger U_i \right) \right| = \left| \text{Tr} \left( U_i^\dagger V_i \right) \right| \geq N \left( 1 - \epsilon_i^2 \right). \quad (1)$$

We prove this result by recursion. First we prove the case when $m = 2$, i.e. $V' = V_2 V_1$ and $U' = U_2 U_1$, where $U_1, U_2 \in \mathcal{J}_n$ and $D_P(V_1, U_1) \leq \epsilon_1, D_P(V_2, U_2) \leq \epsilon_2$. Let $V_2 = U_2 E_2$ and $V_1 = E_1 U_1$. Then using Inequality 1 we have the following.

$$\left| \text{Tr} \left( E_1^\dagger \right) \right| = \left| \text{Tr} \left( E_1 \right) \right| \geq N (1 - \epsilon_1^2) \quad \text{and} \quad \left| \text{Tr} \left( E_2^\dagger \right) \right| = \left| \text{Tr} \left( E_2 \right) \right| \geq N (1 - \epsilon_2^2) \quad (2)$$

Both $E_1, E_2$ are unitaries, so we can expand them in the Pauli basis. Let

$$E_1 = \sum_{a \in \mathcal{P}_n} e_{a_1} \sigma_a \quad \text{and} \quad E_2 = \sum_{a \in \mathcal{P}_n} e_{a_2} \sigma_a.$$

For simplicity of notations, we write $a \in \mathcal{P}_n$, instead of $\sigma_a \in \mathcal{P}_n$. From Inequality 2 we can write

$$|e_{a_1}| \geq (1 - \epsilon_1^2) \quad \text{and} \quad |e_{a_2}| \geq (1 - \epsilon_2^2).$$

Since $E_1 E_1^\dagger = E_2 E_2^\dagger = I$ so we have

$$\sum_{a \neq 1} |e_{a_1}|^2 \leq 1 - (1 - \epsilon_1^2)^2 \leq 2 \epsilon_1^2 - \epsilon_1^4$$

and

$$\sum_{a \neq 1} |e_{a_2}|^2 \leq 1 - (1 - \epsilon_2^2)^2 \leq 2 \epsilon_2^2 - \epsilon_2^4.$$

Now $\text{Tr}(V'^\dagger U') = \text{Tr}(V_2^\dagger V_1^\dagger U_2 U_1) = \text{Tr}((U_1 V_1^\dagger)(V_2^\dagger U_2)) = \text{Tr}(E_1^\dagger E_2^\dagger)$ (where the second equality
follows from the invariance of trace under cyclic permutations), and

\[
E_1 E_2 = \left( \sum_{a \in \mathcal{P}_n} e_{a1} \sigma_a \right) \left( \sum_{a \in \mathcal{P}_n} e_{a2} \sigma_a \right) = \sum_a e_{a1} e_{a2} + \sum_{a \neq b} e_{a1} e_{b2} \sigma_a \sigma_b
\]

Thus \( |\text{Tr}(E_1^4 E_2^4)| = |\text{Tr}(E_1 E_2)| \geq N(1 - \epsilon_1^2)(1 - \epsilon_2^2) - N \sqrt{(2\epsilon_1^2 - \epsilon_1^4)(2\epsilon_2^2 - \epsilon_2^4)} \)

So \( |\text{Tr}(E_1^4 E_2^4)| = |\text{Tr}(E_1 E_2)| \approx N(1 - \epsilon_1^2)(1 - \epsilon_2^2) \) \[ \epsilon_1, \epsilon_2 \text{ is small enough} \]

Thus

\[
D_P(V', U') = \sqrt{1 - \frac{|\text{Tr}(V'^* U')|}{N}} \leq \sqrt{1 - (1 - \epsilon_1^2)^2 - (1 - \epsilon_2^2)^2}
\]

Suppose the result hold when \( m = j - 1 \), i.e. let \( \tilde{V} = \prod_{i=j-1}^1 V_i \) and \( \tilde{U} = \prod_{i=j-1}^1 U_i \), such that for each \( i, U_i \in \mathcal{J}_n \), \( D_P(V_i, U_i) \leq \epsilon_i \) and \( D_P(\tilde{V}, \tilde{U}) \leq \sqrt{1 - \prod_{i=j-1}^1 (1 - \epsilon_i^2)} = \bar{\epsilon} \).

It is sufficient if we prove the result for \( m = j \). Let \( V = \prod_{i=j}^1 V_i = V_j \tilde{V} \) and \( U = \prod_{i=j}^1 U_i = U_j \tilde{U} \) where \( U_j \in \mathcal{J}_n \) and \( D_P(V_j, U_j) \leq \epsilon_j \). From our assumption we know \( D_P(\tilde{V}, \tilde{U}) \leq \bar{\epsilon} \). Then using Inequality 3 we can write

\[
D_P(V, U) \leq \sqrt{1 - (1 - \bar{\epsilon}^2)(1 - \epsilon_j^2)} = \sqrt{1 - \prod_{i=j}^1 (1 - \epsilon_i^2)}
\]

and the result follows.

In the next lemma we show that the bound we obtain is better than the sum of error bound, which was initially derived for the operator norm in [BV97], and has been used in [HRS18, MSR19].

**Lemma 3.2.**

\[
\sum_{i=1}^m \epsilon_i > \sqrt{1 - \prod_{i=1}^m \left(1 - \epsilon_i^2\right)}
\]

when \( \epsilon_i \) are such that \( \sum_{i=1}^m \epsilon_i < 1 \).

**Proof.** It is sufficient to prove \( \Delta = \left( \sum_{i=1}^m \epsilon_i \right)^2 - 1 + \prod_{i=1}^m \left(1 - \epsilon_i^2\right) > 0 \). We have

\[
\left( \sum_{i=1}^m \epsilon_i \right)^2 = \sum_{i=1}^m \epsilon_i^2 + 2 \sum_{i<j} \epsilon_i \epsilon_j
\]

and

\[
\prod_{i=1}^m \left(1 - \epsilon_i^2\right) = 1 - \sum_{i=1}^m \epsilon_i^2 + \sum_{i<j} \epsilon_i^2 \epsilon_j^2 - \sum_{i<j<k} \epsilon_i^2 \epsilon_j^2 \epsilon_k^2 + \cdots (-1)^n \prod_{i=1}^m \epsilon_i^2.
\]
So
\[
\Delta = 2 \sum_{i<j} \epsilon_i \epsilon_j + \sum_{i<j} \epsilon_i^2 \epsilon_j^2 - \sum_{i<j<k} \epsilon_i^2 \epsilon_j^2 \epsilon_k^2 + \cdots (-1)^m \prod_{i=1}^m \epsilon_i^2
\]
\[
= 2 \sum_{i<j} \epsilon_i \epsilon_j + \sum_{i<j} \epsilon_i^2 \epsilon_j^2 (1 - \sum_{k=j+1}^m \epsilon_k^2) + \sum_{i<j<k} \epsilon_i^2 \epsilon_j^2 \epsilon_k^2 (1 - \sum_{a=\ell+1}^m \epsilon_a^2) + \cdots
\]

Since \( \sum_{i=1}^m \epsilon_i < 1 \), so \( \sum_{i=1}^m \epsilon_i^2 < 1 \) and hence \( \sum_{i=b}^m \epsilon_i^2 < 1 \) for any \( b \geq 1 \). So each of the differences in the brackets is positive and we have \( \Delta > 0 \). This proves the lemma.

\( \square \)

Remark 3.1. The assumption about \( \epsilon_i \) in Lemma 3.3 has been made to get a compact expression of the upper bound. Even if we do not make this assumption then also our bound is better than the sum-of-error bound in [BV97]. To see this, it is sufficient to consider the case when \( m = 2 \). Then without the assumption in Inequality [3] we can write
\[
D_P(V', U') \leq \sqrt{1 - (1 - \epsilon_1^2) (1 - \epsilon_2^2) + (2\epsilon_1^2 - \epsilon_1^4)(2\epsilon_2^2 - \epsilon_2^4)} = \epsilon'
\]

Now we prove that \( \epsilon' \leq (\epsilon_1 + \epsilon_2) \).
\[
\epsilon'^2 - (\epsilon_1 + \epsilon_2)^2 = \epsilon_1^2 + \epsilon_2^2 - \epsilon_1^2 \epsilon_2^2 + \sqrt{(2\epsilon_1^2 - \epsilon_1^4)(2\epsilon_2^2 - \epsilon_2^4)} - \epsilon_1^2 - \epsilon_2^2 - 2\epsilon_1 \epsilon_2 \\
\leq -\epsilon_1^2 \epsilon_2^2 + 2\epsilon_1 \epsilon_2 - 2\epsilon_1 \epsilon_2 = -\epsilon_1^2 \epsilon_2^2 \leq 0
\]

The claim that our bound is better, simply follows by recursion.

3.2 Tensor product of unitaries

Lemma 3.3. Let \( V = \bigotimes_{i=1}^m V_i \in U_n \), such that \( V_i \in U_{n_i} \) and \( \sum_{i=1}^m n_i = n \). For each \( i \), there exists \( U_i \in J_{n_i} \) such that \( D_P(U_i, V_i) \leq \epsilon_i \), for some \( \epsilon_i \geq 0 \). If \( U = \bigotimes_{i=1}^m U_i \in J_n \), then
\[
D_P(U, V) \leq \sqrt{1 - \prod_{i=1}^m (1 - \epsilon_i^2)} < \sum_{i=1}^m \epsilon_i
\]

Proof. Let \( N_i = 2^{n_i} \) and \( N = 2^n = 2^{\sum_{i=1}^m n_i} = \prod_i N_i \). Let \( \text{Tr}(V_i^\dagger U_i) = t_i \). Since \( U_i \in J_{n_i} \) is such that \( D_P(U_i, V_i) \leq \epsilon_i \), so we have
\[
D_P(U_i, V_i) = \sqrt{1 - \frac{|\text{Tr}(V_i^\dagger U_i)|}{N_i}} = \sqrt{1 - \frac{|t_i|}{N_i}} \leq \epsilon_i \quad [\forall i = 1, \ldots, m]
\]
\[
\implies |t_i| \geq N_i (1 - \epsilon_i^2).
\]

Now \( |\text{Tr}(V^\dagger U)| = \prod_{i=1}^m |\text{Tr}(V_i^\dagger U_i)| = \prod_{i=1}^m |t_i| \geq \prod_{i=1}^m N_i (1 - \epsilon_i^2) \), and hence
\[
D_P(U, V) = \sqrt{1 - \frac{|\text{Tr}(V^\dagger U)|}{N}} \leq \sqrt{1 - \prod_{i=1}^m (1 - \epsilon_i^2)} < \sum_{i=1}^m \epsilon_i
\]

The second inequality follows from Lemma 3.2.

\( \square \)
3.3 Composition of unitaries as arbitrary tensor product and multiplication

Let \( V = \prod_{i=1}^{m} V_i \) be an approximately implementable \( n\)-qubit unitary which has been decomposed as multiplication of component unitaries. Each such component unitary \( V_i \in U_n \) is further decomposed as:

\[ V_i = \bigotimes_{j=1}^{m_i} V_{ij}. \]

Let there exists exactly implementable unitary \( U_{ij} \) such that \( D_P(V_{ij}, U_{ij}) \leq \epsilon_{ij} \) for each \( i,j \). Let \( U_i = \bigotimes_{j=1}^{m_i} U_{ij} \) and \( U = \prod_{i=1}^{m} U_i \). We want to bound \( D_P(V, U) \) as function of \( \epsilon_{ij} \).

From Lemma 3.3 we know:

\[ D_P(V_i, U_i) \leq \sqrt{1 - \prod_{j=1}^{m_i} (1 - \epsilon_{ij}^2)} = \epsilon_i \quad \forall i = 1, \ldots, m \]

and from Lemma 3.1 we obtain:

\[ D_P(V, U) \leq \sqrt{1 - \prod_{i=1}^{m} \prod_{j=1}^{m_i} (1 - \epsilon_{ij}^2)} < \sum_{i=1}^{m} \sum_{j=1}^{m_i} \epsilon_{ij}. \]

The second inequality follows from Lemma 3.2.

4 Optimization problems

In this section we formulate some optimization problems to find the distribution of approximation errors such that the total resource requirement, in our case the number of T-gates, is minimized.

Let \( C(V, \epsilon) \) is a cost function that captures the quantity we want to minimize like number of T-gates, T-depth, circuit depth and total number of gates in the circuit, for a given bound \( \epsilon \) on the approximation error (in the global phase invariant distance) of the complete circuit. This means that if \( U \) is the unitary implemented by the circuit and \( V \) is a given unitary, then \( D_P(U, V) \leq \epsilon \). Let \( V = \prod_{i=m}^{1} \bigotimes_{j=1}^{m_i} V_{ij} \) is a decomposition of \( V \) into component unitaries. \( U_{ij} \) is an exactly implementable unitary such that \( D_P(U_{ij}, V_{ij}) \leq \epsilon_{ij} \) and it requires the minimum number of resources among all unitaries that \( \epsilon_{ij} \)-approximates \( V_{ij} \). So \( U = \prod_{i=1}^{m} \bigotimes_{j=1}^{m_i} U_{ij} \) is the unitary implemented by the circuit. \( C(U_{ij}) \) is the minimum number of resources required to implement \( U_{ij} \), i.e. \( C(V_{ij}, \epsilon_{ij}) = C(U_{ij}) \). So our optimization program to find the minimum count of any resource is:

\[
\begin{align*}
\min_{\epsilon_{ij}} & \quad C(V, \epsilon) = \sum_{i,j} C(V_{ij}, \epsilon_{ij}) \\
\text{s.t.} & \quad 1 - \prod_{i=1}^{m} \prod_{j=1}^{m_i} (1 - \epsilon_{ij}^2) < \epsilon^2
\end{align*}
\]

and the program to find the minimum depth of any resource is:

\[
\begin{align*}
\min_{\epsilon_{ij}} & \quad C(V, \epsilon) = \sum_{i} \min\{C(V_{ij}, \epsilon_{ij}) : j = 1 \ldots m_i\} \\
\text{s.t.} & \quad 1 - \prod_{i=1}^{m} \prod_{j=1}^{m_i} (1 - \epsilon_{ij}^2) < \epsilon^2
\end{align*}
\]
We have used bold fonts for variables. Since the resource count of only approximately implementable unitaries is a function of the approximation error, so in the optimization programs 4 and 5 we assume, without loss of generality, that each $V_{ij}$ is approximately synthesizable. One problem with such formulation is the number of parameters $\epsilon_{ij}$ that may grow infeasibly large. In fact, the decomposition of $V$ may depend on $\epsilon$ and so the number of $V_{ij}$ (and hence $\epsilon_{ij}$) may vary. A software solution was given in [HRS18, MSRH20], where the authors used simulated annealing to solve the optimization problem.

In this section we consider the setting where $R_z(\theta)$ gates are the only approximately synthesizable unitaries, as done in [HRS18, MSRH20]. We consider the problem of minimizing the number of T gates. Thus we use the empirical relation in [KMM15], by which

$$C(V_{ij}, \epsilon_{ij}) = k \log \left( \frac{1}{\epsilon_{ij}} \right) + k_2$$

where $k = 3.067$ and $k_2 = -4.322$ (6) where the error is measured in the global phase invariant distance. If $N_R$ is the total number of $R_z(\theta)$ gates then the constraint is as follows.

$$\prod_{i=1}^{N_R} (1 - \epsilon_i^2) \geq 1 - \epsilon^2$$

(7)

4.1 Optimal cost of our optimization program

We can use Karush-Kuhn-Tucker (KKT) conditions [Kar39, KT+51, KT14] to solve the above optimization problem with inequality constraint. For simplicity and without loss of much generality we use equality in the constraint and follow the Lagrangian method of optimization.

Our optimization problem is as follows.

$$\min_{\epsilon_i} C(V, \epsilon) = \sum_{i=1}^{N_R} C(V_i, \epsilon_i)$$

s.t. $\epsilon_i^2 = 1 - \prod_{i=1}^{N_R} (1 - \epsilon_i^2)$

Equivalently, $\log (1 - \epsilon^2) = \sum_{i=1}^{N_R} \log (1 - \epsilon_i^2)$

Let $\lambda$ is a Lagrange multiplier. The Lagrange formulations is:

$$\mathcal{L} = \sum_{i=1}^{N_R} C(V_i, \epsilon_i) + \lambda \left( \log (1 - \epsilon^2) - \sum_{i=1}^{N_R} \log (1 - \epsilon_i^2) \right)$$

To optimize, the following derivatives must be zero.

$$\frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial \epsilon_i} = \frac{\partial C(V_i, \epsilon_i)}{\partial \epsilon_i} + \lambda \frac{2 \epsilon_i}{1 - \epsilon_i^2} = 0 \quad \forall i = 1, \ldots, N_R$$

$$\implies 2\lambda = \frac{1 - \epsilon_i^2}{\epsilon_i} \cdot \frac{\partial C(V_i, \epsilon_i)}{\partial \epsilon_i}$$

(8)
Since $C(V_i, \epsilon_i) = k \log \left( \frac{1}{\epsilon_i} \right) + k_2$ (Equation 6) where $k = 3.067$ and $k_2 = -4.322$, we have 

$$\frac{\partial C(V_i, \epsilon_i)}{\partial \epsilon_i} = -\frac{k}{\epsilon_i}$$

and Equation 8 implies

$$\frac{1 - \epsilon_i^2}{\epsilon_i} \cdot \frac{k}{\epsilon_i} = \frac{1 - \epsilon_j^2}{\epsilon_j} \cdot \frac{k}{\epsilon_j} \quad [i \neq j]$$

$$\implies \epsilon_i^2 = \epsilon_j^2$$

Equivalently, $\epsilon_i = \epsilon_j = \epsilon_r$ [Let]

Then

$$(1 - \epsilon_r^2)^{N_R} = 1 - \epsilon^2$$

$$\epsilon_r = \sqrt{1 - (1 - \epsilon^2)^{\frac{1}{N_R}}}$$

And the optimal number of T-gates is

$$C(V, \epsilon)_{\text{min}} = \frac{N_Rk}{2} \log \frac{1}{1 - (1 - \epsilon^2)^{\frac{1}{N_R}}} + N_Rk_2$$

$$= \frac{3.067N_R}{2} \log \frac{1}{1 - (1 - \epsilon^2)^{\frac{1}{N_R}}} - 4.322N_R$$

(9)

**Optimal cost in [HRS18, MSRH20]**

In [HRS18, MSRH20] the authors have worked with the operator norm and used the Bernstein-Vazirani bound [BV97]. So the constraint function is as follows.

$$\sum_{i=1}^{N_R} \epsilon_i \leq \epsilon$$

Strictly speaking, while working with operator norm the available results [RS16] show that the T-count of $R_z(\theta)$ vary as follows.

$$C(V_i, \epsilon_i) \leq 3 \log \left( \frac{1}{\epsilon_i} \right) + O \left( \log \log \left( \frac{1}{\epsilon_i} \right) \right)$$

(10)

There is another bound, due to Selinger [Sel15], that gives the following relation.

$$C(V_i, \epsilon_i) = 4 \log \left( \frac{1}{\epsilon_i} \right) + 10$$

(11)

Clearly, both these bounds are much worse than in Equation 6. Our result in Lemma 2.1 show that an upper bound on operator norm implies an upper bound on global phase invariant distance. We do not know about the relation in the other direction. So the assumption that either of the above relations hold for global phase invariant distance is without rigorous mathematical proof.
In the following we want to argue that even if we use the same bound for both the distances (the best one, Equation 6), working with global phase invariant distance gives us less number of T-gates.

For the operator norm the optimization program is as follows.

\[
\min_{\epsilon_i} \quad C(V, \epsilon) = \sum_{i=1}^{N_R} C(V_i, \epsilon_i)
\]

\[
s.t. \quad \epsilon = \sum_{i=1}^{N_R} \epsilon_i
\]

(12)

The Lagrangian formulation is as follows.

\[
L = \sum_{i=1}^{N_R} C(V_i, \epsilon_i) + \lambda \left( \sum_{i=1}^{N_R} \epsilon_i - \epsilon \right)
\]

To optimize, the following partial derivatives must be zero.

\[
\frac{\partial L}{\partial \epsilon_i} = \frac{\partial C(V_i, \epsilon_i)}{\partial \epsilon_i} + \lambda = 0 \quad \forall i = 1, \ldots, N_R
\]

\[
\lambda = -\frac{\partial C(V_i, \epsilon_i)}{\partial \epsilon_i} = -\frac{k}{\epsilon_i}
\]

Then

\[
\frac{k}{\epsilon_i} = \frac{k}{\epsilon_j} \implies \epsilon_i = \epsilon_j = \epsilon_r \quad [\text{Let}].
\]

So

\[
N_R \epsilon_r = \epsilon \implies \epsilon_r = \frac{\epsilon}{N_R}.
\]

And the optimal number of T gates is

\[
C(V, \epsilon)_{\text{min}} = N_R k \log \left( \frac{N_R}{\epsilon} \right) + N_R k_2 = 3.067 N_R \log \left( \frac{N_R}{\epsilon} \right) - 4.322 N_R.
\]

(13)

**Comparison**

Now we calculate the difference between the optimal costs (Equations 9 and 13).

\[
\Delta = N_R k \left[ \log \frac{N_R}{\epsilon} - \frac{1}{2} \log \frac{1}{1 - (1 - \epsilon^2)^{1/N_R}} \right] = N_R k \left[ \log \sqrt{\frac{N_R^2 (1 - (1 - \epsilon^2)^{1/N_R})}{\epsilon^2}} \right]
\]

Now

\[
(1 - \epsilon^2)^{1/N_R} = 1 - \frac{1}{N_R} \epsilon^2 + \frac{1}{2! N_R^2} \left( \frac{1}{N_R} - 1 \right) \epsilon^4 - \frac{1}{3! N_R^3} \left( \frac{1}{N_R} - 1 \right) \left( \frac{1}{N_R} - 2 \right) \epsilon^6 + \cdots
\]

\[
= 1 - \frac{1}{N_R} \epsilon^2 - \frac{N_R - 1}{2! N_R^2} \epsilon^4 - \frac{(N_R - 1)(N_R - 2)}{3! N_R^3} \epsilon^6 - \cdots
\]

\[
1 - (1 - \epsilon^2)^{1/N_R} = \frac{1}{N_R} \epsilon^2 + \frac{N_R - 1}{2! N_R^2} \epsilon^4 + \frac{(N_R - 1)(N_R - 2)}{3! N_R^3} \epsilon^6 + \cdots
\]

\[
\frac{N_R^2}{\epsilon^2} \left( 1 - (1 - \epsilon^2)^{1/N_R} \right) = N_R + \frac{N_R - 1}{2!} \epsilon^2 + \cdots > N_R \geq 1
\]
Thus $\Delta > 0$ and this proves that the optimal cost i.e. number of T-gates, obtained in our program is less.

5 Number of T-gates for QFT and other quantum programs

In this section we give an upper bound on the number of T-gates required to implement the Quantum Fourier Transform (QFT) and its approximation, when the error is measured in the global phase invariant distance. We show that this is less than the upper bound on the number of T-gates, had we worked in the operator norm.

QFT can be used for important tasks like phase estimation (QPE) and solving the hidden subgroup problem. QPE helps us to approximate the eigenvalues of a unitary operator under certain circumstances. This in turn allows us to solve other interesting problems like factoring [Bea03], order finding problem, counting solutions to a search problem. Thus a bound on the number of resources for QFT plays an important factor in the resource estimate of all these important quantum programs.

The following approach applies to any unitary that can be decomposed such that the $R_z(\theta)$ gate is the only component unitary that cannot be exactly synthesized by the Clifford+T gate set.

5.1 Quantum Fourier Transform

We consider the QFT circuit in [NC10] that requires $N_R = \frac{n(n-1)}{2}$ controlled $R_k$ gates, where

$$R_k = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & e^{2\pi i/2^k} \end{bmatrix}.$$

The subscript $k$ varies from 2, ..., $i$, when the distance between control and target qubit is $i - 1$

![QFT Circuit](image-url)

Figure 1: QFT

i.e. control is at qubit 1 and $R_k$ (target) is at qubit $i$. Further decomposition into $R_z(\theta)$ gates can be obtained by two facts. First, any single qubit unitary can be decomposed in terms of two H gates and $R_z(\theta)$ gates [KSVV02]. Second, controlled $R_z(\theta)$ can be implemented by reducing them to Fredkin and $R_z(\theta)$. Fredkin gates are exactly implementable and their T-count is 7. We focus on reducing the number of T-gates for composition of $R_z(\theta)$ gates. If we want the overall error to be bounded by $\epsilon$ then from the analysis in the previous Section 4 we know that the error per rotation gate should be $\epsilon_r = \sqrt{1 - (1 - \epsilon^2)^{1/N_R}}$. Then the number of T-gates required is at most the following quantity.

$$\frac{3.067n(n-1)}{4} \log \frac{1}{1 - (1 - \epsilon^2)^{n^2/(n-1)}} - 4.322 \frac{n(n-1)}{2}$$
Also, it has been proved (Section 4) that this bound is less than the bound obtained by using operator norm.

### 5.2 Approximate Quantum Fourier Transform

Coppersmith [Cop02] proposed an approximate QFT, by which the number of rotations is reduced by pruning the rotation gates with small angles i.e. bigger values of $k$. This implies replacing the corresponding controlled $R_k$ gates ($cR_k$) with identity ($I$). Then the global phase invariant distance is calculated as follows. Let $\theta_k = 2\pi/2^k$.

\[
\left| \text{Tr} \left( cR_k I^\dagger \right) \right| = \left| 3 + e^{i\theta_k} \right| = \sqrt{(3 + \cos \theta_k)^2 + (\sin \theta_k)^2} = 2\sqrt{1 + 3\cos^2 \frac{\theta_k}{2}}
\]

\[
D_P(cR_k, I) = \sqrt{1 - \frac{\left| \text{Tr} \left( cR_k I^\dagger \right) \right|}{4}} = \sqrt{1 - \frac{\sqrt{1 + 3\cos^2 \frac{\theta_k}{2}}}{2}} = \epsilon'_k \quad \text{[Let]}
\]

Now let $S = \{ k : cR_k \text{ is included} \}$ and $S_0 = \{2, 3, \ldots, n\} \setminus S$. $N_k$ is the number of $cR_k$ gates in the complete circuit. Let $\epsilon_k$ is the variable for the synthesis error of $cR_k$ when $k \in S$. Then the overall error is as follows.

\[
\sqrt{1 - \prod_{k \in S} \left( 1 - \epsilon_k^2 \right)^{N_k} \prod_{k \in S_0} \left( 1 - \epsilon_k^2 \right)^{N_k}}
\]

The algorithmic error due to truncation of rotation gates is $\epsilon_{QFT} = \sqrt{1 - \prod_{k \in S_0} \left( 1 - \epsilon_k^2 \right)^{N_k}}$. If $\epsilon$ is an upper bound then we have the following constraint.

\[
\prod_{k \in S} \left( 1 - \epsilon_k^2 \right)^{N_k} \geq \frac{1 - \epsilon^2}{\prod_{k \in S_0} \left( 1 - \epsilon_k^2 \right)^{N_k}} = \frac{1 - \epsilon^2}{1 - \epsilon_{QFT}^2} = 1 - \epsilon_0^2 \quad \text{[Let]}
\]

From the analysis in the previous section, we know that in order to get the minimum number of T-gates the value of each $\epsilon_k$ must be

\[
\epsilon_k = \sqrt{1 - \left( 1 - \epsilon_0^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{N_R}}} \quad \text{where} \quad N_R = \sum_{k \in S} N_k \in O(n \log n)
\]

and the minimum number of T-gates is as follows

\[
\frac{3.067N_R}{2} \log \frac{1}{1 - \left( 1 - \epsilon_0^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{N_R}}} - 4.322N_R
\]

### Approximate QFT with operator norm

We have

\[
\|cR_k - I\| = 2\sin \frac{\theta_k}{2} = \epsilon'_k \geq \epsilon_k.
\]  

The inequality also follows from Lemma 2.1. By Bernstein-Vazirani bound [BV97], here the algorithmic error due to truncation of rotation gates is $\epsilon_{QFT} \leq \sum_{k \in S_0} \epsilon_k^f$. From Inequality 14 and our results in Section 3.3 we can say that $\epsilon_{QFT} > \epsilon_{QFT}$.  
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From our results in Section 4 we know that to get the optimal results, for both the cases we have to distribute the remaining error equally among the remaining rotation gates. So for operator norm, error per remaining rotation gate is \( \tilde{\epsilon}_k = \frac{\epsilon - \epsilon_{QPE}}{N_R} \). Thus for global phase invariant distance we allocate more error to each rotation gate and hence get shorter circuits in terms of T-gates.

5.3 Quantum phase estimation (QPE)

![Figure 2: QPE. Image taken from the official website of qiskit.org](image)

We have considered one of several implementations of the QPE, shown in Figure 2. The measurement outcomes of the top \( t \) qubits yield a \( t \)-bit approximation to the phase. \( t \) also determines the probability \( p \) of a successful measurement. If \( n \) is the desired accuracy in number of bits, then we have the following relation \([NC10]\).

\[
t = n + \left\lceil \log \left( 2 + \frac{1}{2(1 - p)} \right) \right\rceil
\]

Suppose \( \epsilon_{QPE} \) is the accuracy or phase-approximation error i.e. the absolute difference between the correct phase and its \( t \)-bit approximation. Since this has nothing to do with the difference in the unitaries implemented, so we can assume that this error value is same for both the operator norm as well as the global phase invariant distance. In this case we can assume that we want the overall error to be bounded by \( \epsilon - \epsilon_{QPE} \).

Consider QPE on \( U = R_z(\alpha) \). Using the results in previous sections we can conclude that we use less number of T gates to implement the component unitaries if error is measured in global phase invariant distance, compared to the case where operator norm is used.

6 Conclusion

Most quantum algorithms can be written as a composition (multiplication and tensor product) of unitaries, of which some can be exactly synthesized by a universal fault-tolerant gate set like Clifford+T, while the others can be approximately synthesized. In this paper we have studied the problem of approximation error management while synthesizing each such unitary with the Clifford+T gate set. The errors are measured in the global phase invariant distance, and not the operator or Frobenius norm, as has been done in previous papers like \([HRS18, MSRH20]\). One main reason for considering this distance is the fact that it ignores the global phase and hence does not require unnecessary phase correcting sequences. Also, previous works \([KMM15]\) show that the
T-count of $R_z(\theta)$ gates scale better with the error, when the latter is measured in the global phase invariant distance. We derive a relation between the Frobenius norm and the global phase invariant distance, such that an upper bound on the former implies an upper bound on the latter. We also derive composition rules for the global phase invariant distance and prove that these errors compose better i.e. the bound derived by us is better than the sum-of-distance bound [BV97], which is used in the operator norm. When a unitary is decomposed into component unitaries such that $R_z(\theta)$ gates are the only approximately synthesizable components, then we prove analytically that to get optimal number of T-gates, error should be distributed equally among the $R_z(\theta)$ components, both in the case of operator norm as well as global phase invariant distance. We also prove that the optimal number of T-gates obtained by us is less than the case when the optimization is done with errors measured in the operator norm.

We then derive some upper bound on the number of T-gates of QFT and approximate QFT, which are important components in other popular quantum algorithms like phase estimation, factoring, order finding, hidden subgroup problem. We show that using global phase invariant distance, we have better upper bound on the number of T-gates required. Such analysis on the resource requirements can also be done for other unitaries, for example time-evolution operators, which are widely used in simulating chemistry [RWS+17]. In many cases, the time-evolution operator is approximated by a Trotter-Suzuki decomposition, where the number of Trotter steps is proportional to $\frac{1}{\sqrt{\epsilon_{TE}}}$. Here $\epsilon_{TE}$ is the accuracy error, usually measured in the operator norm. It will be interesting to probe if the global phase invariant distance has some operational meaning here and if so, whether working in this distance gives us any advantage, for example in terms of gate count. Further applications of the results derived in this paper, have been left for future work.
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