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One of the major challenges for erroneous quantum computers is undoubtedly the control over the effect of noise. Considering the rapid growth of available quantum resources that are not fully fault-tolerant, it is crucial to develop practical hardware-friendly quantum error mitigation (QEM) techniques to suppress unwanted errors. Here, we propose a novel generalized quantum subspace expansion method which can handle stochastic, coherent, and algorithmic errors in quantum computers. By fully exploiting the substantially extended subspace, we can efficiently mitigate the noise present in the spectra of a given Hamiltonian, without relying on any information of noise. The performance of our method is discussed under two highly practical setups: the quantum subspaces are mainly spanned by powers of the noisy state \( \rho^n \) and a set of error-boosted states, respectively. We numerically demonstrate in both situations that we can suppress errors by orders of magnitude, and show that our protocol inherits the advantages of previous error-agnostic QEM techniques as well as overcoming their drawbacks.

Introduction.— Control over computational errors is one of the central problems for the implementation of practical quantum computing algorithms using quantum devices subject to imperfections [1, 2]. Towards the goal of achieving fully fault-tolerant computation based on logical operations, the number of required qubits was reduced, and their error rates were improved drastically in the recent years, although the realization of ultimate digital quantum computing is years ahead [3]. Therefore, it is important to ask whether we can establish information processing techniques which exploit the increasing quantum resource without performing fully-functional error correction.

The quantum error mitigation (QEM) techniques perform post-processing on measurement data (usually expectation values) to eliminate unwanted bias from computation results, in exchange for additional measurement costs [4–15]. One of the most prominent examples is the quasi-probability method [5, 7]. Once the error profile of gate operations is given, stochastic operations are inserted to construct the inverse operations of each error map so that we can retrieve the computation result for the intended quantum operation. However, the characterization of the noise model, e.g., via the gate set tomography, is quite costly and easily deteriorated by noise drift.

Meanwhile, error-agnostic QEM methods which do not rely on prior knowledge on the error have been proposed: the quantum subspace expansion (QSE) method [16–19] and the virtual distillation (VD) method, which is also called exponential error suppression (EES) method [20–23]. In the QSE method, we classically realize a variational subspace spanned by a set of quantum states \( \{ |\psi_i\rangle \} \) as \( |\psi\rangle = \sum_i c_i |\psi_i\rangle \), which can be effectively generated via additional measurements and post-processing. While the QSE method was initially proposed to compute excited states from a ground state realized on a quantum device, it also contributes to the mitigation of errors. By construction, the QSE method is well-suited for mitigating coherent errors which may come from insufficient variational optimization, lack of quantum circuit representability, and etc. However, it cannot suppress stochastic errors efficiently, since in general we need a linear combination of exponentially many Pauli operators to construct a projector to the error-free subspace [4, 16]. The VD/EES method, on the other hand, is complementary in this sense. By applying entangling operations between \( M \) identical copies of noisy quantum states \( \rho \), we can obtain the error-mitigated expectation value of an observable \( O \) as \( \langle O \rangle_{VD} = \text{Tr}[\rho \rho^{MV}] \) with \( \rho^{MV} = \rho^M / \text{Tr}[\rho^M] \), whose fidelity with a dominant eigenvector of \( \rho \) exponentially approaches unity. Although this method can significantly compensate for stochastic errors, it is entirely vulnerable to coherent errors which distorts the dominant eigenvector.

In this work, we propose a unified framework of error-agnostic QEM techniques which we refer to as the generalized quantum subspace expansion (GSE) method. The central idea is to extend the notion of quantum subspaces to include general operators that are related to the target noisy quantum state, which allows us to distill the state into an error-mitigated eigenstate of the target Hamiltonian. We show that the GSE method, which provides a substantial generalization of the QSE method, inherits the advantages of previous error-agnostic QEM techniques as well as overcoming their drawbacks. This

\[ \langle O \rangle_{GSE} = \text{Tr}[\rho \rho^{GM}] \]

with \( \rho^{GM} = \frac{\rho^M}{\text{Tr}[\rho^M]} \), whose fidelity with a dominant eigenvector of \( \rho \) exponentially approaches unity. Although this method can significantly compensate for stochastic errors, it is entirely vulnerable to coherent errors which distorts the dominant eigenvector.

In this work, we propose a unified framework of error-agnostic QEM techniques which we refer to as the generalized quantum subspace expansion (GSE) method. The central idea is to extend the notion of quantum subspaces to include general operators that are related to the target noisy quantum state, which allows us to distill the state into an error-mitigated eigenstate of the target Hamiltonian. We show that the GSE method, which provides a substantial generalization of the QSE method, inherits the advantages of previous error-agnostic QEM techniques as well as overcoming their drawbacks. This
is demonstrated under two practical choices of the subspace. In the first example, the subspace consisting of powers of a noisy quantum state \( \rho^m \) achieves not only the exponential suppression of stochastic errors which is even more efficient than the VD/EES method, but also efficiently mitigates coherent errors. In the second example, we span the subspace by non-equivalent quantum states corresponding to different noise levels. Unlike the commonly used error-extrapolation method, the GSE method with the subspace of error-controlled states is quite robust even when the control over noise level is imprecise, and hence highly beneficial to practical applications.

**Framework of generalized subspace expansion.**— Suppose we obtain a noisy approximation \( \rho \) of some desired state, e.g. the ground state of a given Hamiltonian \( H \) using the variational quantum eigensolver (VQE) [24–33]. The generalized subspace expansion method uses the following ansatz in the extended subspace to represent an eigenstate:

\[
\rho_{EM} = \frac{P^\dagger AP}{\text{Tr}[P^\dagger AP]}, \tag{1}
\]

where \( P = \sum_i \alpha_i \sigma_i \) (\( \alpha_i \in \mathbb{C} \)) is a general operator, \( \sigma_i \) is generally a non-Hermite operator, and \( A \) is a positive-semidefinite Hermite operator. In this paper, we refer to \( \sigma_i \) as a base of subspace. It is easy to check that \( \rho_{EM} \) is a positive-semidefinite Hermite operator whose trace is unity, which ensures that \( \rho_{EM} \) corresponds to a physical quantum state. Note that \( \sigma_i \) and \( A \) can be related to the noisy state \( \rho \). For example, we can choose \( \sigma_i = \rho \) and \( A = \rho \); this highlights the crucial difference of the novel GSE method from the conventional QSE that it also includes general operators related to quantum states in the expanded subspace. To span the most general subspace, we can take the base as follows,

\[
\sigma_i = \sum_k \beta_k^{(i)} \prod_{l=1}^{L_k} U_{lk}^{(i)} \rho_{lk}^{(i)} V_{lk}^{(i)}, \tag{2}
\]

where \( \beta_k^{(i)} \in \mathbb{C} \), \( \rho_{lk}^{(i)} \) is a quantum state, \( U_{lk}^{(i)} \) and \( V_{lk}^{(i)} \) are operators that allow for an efficient measurements on quantum computers (e.g. local Pauli operators or unitary operators), and \( L_k \) denotes the number of quantum state. See Supplementary Materials (SM) for more details [34].

To obtain the error-mitigated spectra of the Hamiltonian, we need

\[
\min_{\hat{\alpha}} \text{Tr}[\rho_{EM} H] \text{ such that } \text{Tr}[\rho_{EM}] = 1. \tag{3}
\]

Here we denote \( \hat{\alpha} = (\alpha_0, \alpha_1, \ldots) \). The solution can be obtained by solving the following generalized eigenvalue problem:

\[
\mathcal{H} \hat{\alpha} = ES \hat{\alpha} \tag{4}
\]

where \( \mathcal{H}_{ij} = \text{Tr}[\sigma_i^1 A \sigma_j H] \) and \( S_{ij} = \text{Tr}[\sigma_i^1 A \sigma_j] \) with \( E \) being the error-mitigated eigenenergy. The coefficients are normalized as \( \hat{\alpha}^\dagger S \hat{\alpha} = 1 \) to satisfy \( \text{Tr}[\rho_{EM}] = 1 \). Note that \( \mathcal{H}_{ij} \) and \( S_{ij} \) need to be efficiently computed on quantum computers. Once we find \( \hat{\alpha} \) which satisfies Eq. (3), we can compute the error-mitigated expectation value of any observable \( O \) as \( \langle O \rangle = \sum_{ij} \alpha_i^* \alpha_j \text{Tr}[\sigma_i^1 A \sigma_j O] \).

By implementing the generalized quantum subspaces spanned by Eq. (2), we can efficiently perform error-agnostic QEM. To illustrate the significance of our scheme, we will describe slightly more specific but highly practical two subclasses. Due to their features explained thereafter, we refer to the employed subspaces as the
FIG. 2. Relationship of the expected number of errors $N_{\text{tot}}$ and the ground-state energy deviation $\Delta E$. Blue filled circles, red filled circles, and purple crosses denote the data from the VD/EES, GSE+, and ordinary QSE methods, respectively. Note that $\text{GSE}^{+}$ denotes the GSE method with additional term $\rho H$ included in the bases of subspace $\{\sigma_i\}$. Also, the result without the error mitigation is shown by the black line, and the noiseless outcome from the quantum circuit optimized by the VQE algorithm is shown by the green line. While the accuracy by the VD/EES result is bounded by the insufficient expressibility of the variational quantum circuit, the GSE method can reach beyond this limit by further exploring the subspace. The simulation is done for the ground state of one-dimensional transverse-field Ising Hamiltonian for $N = 8$ qubits, and we have considered $M = 2$ copies of identical noisy quantum states.

### Power subspace and fault subspace, respectively.

**Power subspace.**—Let us first restrict the bases of subspace to powers of noisy quantum states as $\sigma_i = \rho^i$ ($i = 0, 1, ..., m$) and set $A = I$:

$$\rho_{EM} = \sum_{i+j=0}^{m} \alpha_i^* \alpha_j \rho^{i+j}, \quad (5)$$

This shows that the error-mitigated state $\rho_{EM}$ is represented as the series expansion of the state $\rho$ as $\rho_{EM} = \sum_{n=0}^{2m} f_n \rho^n$ where $f_n = \sum_{i+j=n} \alpha_i^* \alpha_j$. Setting $m = 1$, for instance, leads to $\rho_{EM} = f_0 I + f_1 \rho + f_2 \rho^2$, which clarifies that $\rho_{EM}$ is represented as a polynomial of $\rho$. Note that we may alternatively take $A = \rho$ to obtain $\rho_{EM} = f_1 \rho + f_2 \rho^2 + f_3 \rho^3$ for $m = 1$.

It has been pointed out that higher order states themselves are extremely useful [20, 21, 35]. By effectively computing the expectation value of an observable corresponding to the state $\rho_{VD}^{(M)} = \rho^M / \text{Tr}[\rho^M]$ $(M = 2, 3, ...)$, we can exponentially suppress the contribution from the non-dominant eigenstates of $\rho$ (See SM for details [34]).

Our key insight is that the non-dominant states will be suppressed even more efficiently by interfering them with each other. In fact, it is straightforward to see that the power subspace for $A = I$ completely includes $\rho_{VD}^{(2m)}$, and therefore we can always surpass the performance of the VD/EES method when the dominant vector gives good approximation of the ground state [34].

To illustrate the expected gain by our approach, we numerically demonstrate our algorithm. Figure 1 shows the result for the ground state energy of the one-dimensional transverse-field Ising model, whose Hamiltonian is given as $H = -\sum_{r} Z_r Z_{r+1} + h \sum_{r} X_r$ where $X_r$ and $Z_r$ denote the $x$-and $z$-components of the Pauli matrix acting on the $r$-th site and $h$ is the amplitude of the transverse magnetic field. We set $h = 1$ in the following. It is clear from Fig. 1(a) that both the VD/EES method and our GSE method yields exponential suppression of error with respect to the number of copies $M$. Moreover, the interference with non-dominant states in $\rho$ yields quicker convergence of the expectation value $\text{Tr}[\rho_{EM} H]$ towards the ground state energy; this is further boosted by including additional operators such as $\rho^m H$ to the subspace, which is discriminated as $\text{GSE}^{+}$ method in the figures. The trade-off relationship between the accuracy and variance shown in Fig. 1(b) tells us that, even under the restriction of quantum resources (e.g. qubit counts and measurement shots), we benefit from the GSE method using the power subspace.

Now, let us further analyze the effect of the crucial obstacle for the previous exponential error suppression techniques—the coherent errors. It has been pointed out in Refs. [20, 21, 36] that the stochastic gate errors themselves may cause a deviation of the dominant vector, which is called the coherent mismatch. In addition, there are numerous other sources that give rise to the coherent errors, e.g., restrictions on the variational ansatz structure of quantum states due to experimental limitations. In this regard, we interestingly find that our method provides a significant improvement over previous methods, since the expressibility of quantum states can be enhanced effectively by the subspace.

Figure 2 shows the result for numerical simulations to support our findings. Here, we plot the energy deviation from the exact ground state energy at various noise levels where we add a term of $\rho H$ to bases of the subspace $\{\sigma_i\}$ in the GSE method to suppress the coherent mismatch. We assume that the error rate $p$ for the each gate is homogeneously given, such that the expected number of total error satisfies $N_{\text{tot}} = N_{\text{gate}} p$ where $N_{\text{gate}}$ is the number of gates. While the accuracy of the raw noisy state and the conventional QSE method scales only linearly with respect to $N_{\text{tot}}$, both the VD/EES and GSE methods using two copies of $\rho$ provide quadratic suppression in the noisy regime. However, the difference of two methods is highlighted in the low-error regime, in which the accuracy of the VD/EES method is bounded by the performance of the original VQE simulation. Namely, when the ideal quantum circuit is not powerful enough and involves algorithmic error, we cannot remedy the shortage by merely restoring the dominant vector. In sharp contrast, our method is capable of eliminating such unwanted errors.

It is important to remark that the required number of
measurements for the GSE method scales quadratically with respect to the desired accuracy, just as in the usual quantum measurements (See SM for details [34]). When the dominant vector of $\rho$ gives a good approximation of the ground state, this is mainly accounted for by the sampling cost rooting from higher powers $\rho^M$.

Fault subspace.— Now we proceed to another practical subclass of the GSE framework that employs non-identical quantum states to span the quantum subspace. Here, the error-agnostic QEM is realized by utilizing quantum states from different noise levels, and hence refer to the subspace as the fault subspace; we take $\sigma_i = \rho(\lambda_i \epsilon)$ where $\epsilon$ is the unit of the controlled error (e.g., infidelity per gate) and $\lambda_i \geq 1$ determines the actual error level. For instance, we consider an error-mitigated state as follows:

$$\rho_{EM} = \sum_{i,j} \alpha_i^* \alpha_j \rho(\lambda_i \epsilon) \rho(\lambda_j \epsilon), \quad (6)$$

where we have set $A = I$ and $\sigma_j = \rho(\lambda_j \epsilon)$. We may extend the fault subspace to include high orders $\rho^m(\lambda_i \epsilon)$ ($m \geq 2$) or operators $U_l^{(1)}$ and $V_l^{(1)}$.

The concept of the fault subspace is closely related to the celebrated error-extrapolation method [5, 6]. In the error-extrapolation method, one estimates the zero-noise limit of the expectation value of a given observable $O$ based on results at $n + 1$ noise levels $\langle O(\lambda_i \epsilon) \rangle = \text{Tr}[\rho(\lambda_i \epsilon) O]$. The estimated computation result is given as $O^* = \sum_{i=0}^n \beta_i \langle O(\lambda_i \epsilon) \rangle + \mathcal{O}(\epsilon^{n+1})$ where $\beta_i \in \mathbb{R}$, $\sum_{i=0}^n \beta_i = 1$ and $\sum_{i=0}^n \beta_i \lambda_i^k = 0$ for $k = 1, 2, ..., n$ (See SM for details [34]). This implies that the error-extrapolation method constructs an effective density matrix as $\rho_{ex} = \sum_{i=0}^n \beta_i \rho(\lambda_i \epsilon)$.

Due to its simplicity and practicality, the extrapolation method has been investigated widely both theoretically and experimentally. However, the extrapolation is based on a highly nontrivial assumption that the noise level can be accurately controlled (e.g. by extending the gate execution duration). Moreover, since the extrapolation is a purely mathematical operation that does not take any physical constraint into account, it may produce unphysical results even if the measurement is done perfectly, e.g. $\rho_{ex}$ can be a unphysical state whose eigenvalues can be negative.

The GSE method using the fault subspace can solve the above problems. First, the results obtained from the GSE method corresponds to a physical density matrix. Second, the GSE method using the fault subspace does not rely on the accurate knowledge of noise levels. This is because the GSE method simply aims to construct a truncated Hilbert space so that the lowest eigenstate is included. It suffices to employ bases that are not identical to each other, while the choice of error levels may affect the practical efficiency.

As a demonstration, we perform a numerical simulation assuming that the control over the noise level is imperfect. Here, we consider three noise levels $\rho_i = \rho(\lambda_i \epsilon)$ where $\lambda_i = \lambda_i + \mathcal{N}(0, \lambda_i \sigma^2)$ for $\lambda_i \in \{2, 3\}$ and $\sigma = 0.1$. We employ the transverse-field Ising model with $h = 1$ for $N = 8$ qubits, and assume that each Pauli term is estimated without any shot-noise.
space [17, 35] will also improve the computational accuracy. Second, our method is not restricted to near-term quantum computing, but may help improve computational accuracy even in the fault-tolerant quantum computing regimes, when problems of interest involves calculation of eigenspectra. Namely, we may apply the proposed method to mitigate the effect of errors due to decoding of logical qubits or insufficient number of T-gates without any characterization. This is in contrast with the previous works based on the quasi-probability method [37–40]. Third, although we focused on obtaining error-mitigated ground state or a specific eigenstate of a Hamiltonian, the solution of Eq. (4) includes the excitation spectra if the subspace is properly chosen. The study of suitable subspace in our GSE framework is also important in future works.
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 Supplementary Materials for: Generalized quantum subspace expansion

I. REVIEW OF VIRTUAL DISTILLATION OR EXPONENTIAL ERROR SUPPRESSION

In this section, we review the virtual distillation (VD) method or exponential error suppression (EES) method proposed in Refs. [20, 21]. We consider a noisy state $\rho$, which can be written in terms of the spectral decomposition:

$$\rho = p_0 |\psi_0\rangle \langle \psi_0| + \sum_{k=1} \rho_k |\psi_k\rangle \langle \psi_k|,$$  \hspace{1cm} (S1)

where we define $\langle \psi_i|\psi_j\rangle = \delta_{i,j}$ and $p_0 > p_1 \geq p_2 \geq \cdots \geq 0$, and we refer $|\psi_0\rangle$ as a dominant vector. In that method, we can effectively compute the expectation value of an observable from that dominant vector $|\psi_0\rangle$ with exponentially small error:

$$E_{VD}^{(M)} = \frac{\text{Tr}[\rho^M H]}{\text{Tr}[\rho^M]} = \frac{p_0^M \langle \psi_0| H |\psi_0\rangle + \sum_{k=1} (p_k)^M \langle \psi_k| H |\psi_k\rangle}{p_0^M + \sum_{k=1} (p_k)^M}$$  \hspace{1cm} (S2)

$$= \langle \psi_0| H |\psi_0\rangle \left[ 1 + \frac{\sum_{k=1} (p_k/p_0)^M (\langle \psi_k| H |\psi_k\rangle / \langle \psi_0| H |\psi_0\rangle - 1)}{1 + \sum_{k=1} (p_k/p_0)^M} \right]$$  \hspace{1cm} (S3)

$$= E_{dom} \left[ 1 + O \left( \frac{p_1}{p_0} \right)^M \right],$$  \hspace{1cm} (S4)

by measuring the numerator $\text{Tr}[\rho^M H]$ and the denominator $\text{Tr}[\rho^M]$, respectively. These quantities can be measured by unitary diagonalization [20] or indirect (or non-destructive) measurement [20–22]. Fig. S1 shows a controlled derangement quantum circuit for the case of $M = 3$ to calculate the numerator $\text{Tr}[\rho^M H]$. We emphasize that when increasing the number of copies $M$, the virtual state $\rho_{VD}^{(M)} = \rho^M / \text{Tr}[\rho^M]$ exponentially gets closer to the dominant vector $|\psi_0\rangle$.

The VD/EES methods have the best performance when there are only stochastic (or orthogonal) errors that change an ideal state $|\psi_{id}\rangle$ into its orthogonal states. In this case, we have $|\psi_0\rangle = |\psi_{id}\rangle$ with sufficiently small error rates. However, this is not always the case. Some type of error causes a change in a state from $|\psi_{id}\rangle$ to non-orthogonal states, and this leads to $|\psi_0\rangle \neq |\psi_{id}\rangle$. The infidelity of these states is called the coherent mismatch $1 - |\langle \psi_0| \psi_{id}\rangle|^2$ [36], and the VD/EES method cannot eliminate such coherent errors in general, although the effect of the coherent errors was investigated through numerical results [20, 21] and analytic results [36].

![FIG. S1. A derangement quantum circuit for evaluating $\text{Tr}[\rho^M H] = \sum_a f_a \text{Tr}[\rho^M P_a]$, where we set $M = 3$ and the Hamiltonian is decomposed into a linear combination of products of Pauli operators $P_a$ as $H = \sum_a f_a P_a$.](image)

We also remark that even if the state is unphysical, i.e., the state has negative eigenvalues, as long as $|p_0| > |p_k| (k = 1, 2, ...)$, the contribution of $|p_k|/|p_0|$ exponentially vanishes as $M$ increases, which implies virtual distillation still works. This ensures that VD/EES method can be applied to error-mitigated unphysical states to further improve the computation accuracy.

II. IMPLEMENTATION OF GENERAL SUBSPACE

The most general subspace can be implemented using the bases given as follows,

$$\sigma_i = \sum_k \beta_k^{(i)} \prod_{l=1}^{L_k} U_{ik}^{(l)} \rho_{ik} \gamma_{lk}^{(i)},$$  \hspace{1cm} (S5)
where $\beta^{(i)}_k \in \mathbb{C}$, $U^{(i)}_{lk}$ and $V^{(i)}_{lk}$ are general operators, $L_k$ denotes the number of quantum state, and $\rho^{(i)}_{lk}$ is a quantum state. Suppose that the Hamiltonian $H$ can be decomposed into a linear combination of products of Pauli operators as $H = \sum_a f_a P_a$. The elements $\mathcal{H}_{ij} := \text{Tr}[\sigma_i^a A \sigma_j^b H]$ and $\mathcal{S}_{ij} := \text{Tr}[\sigma_i^a A \sigma_j^a]$ (which we call a Hamiltonian in the expanded subspace and an overlap matrix, respectively) in the Eq. (4) can be described as:

$$
\mathcal{H}_{ij} = \sum_{kk'} (\beta^{(i)}_k)^* \beta^{(j)}_{k'} \gamma^{(ij)}_{kk'},
$$

$$
\gamma^{(ij)}_{kk'} = \sum_a f_a \text{Tr} \left( \left( \prod_{l=1}^{L_k} (V^{(i)}_{lk})^\dagger \rho^{(i)}_{lk} (U^{(i)}_{lk})^\dagger \right) A \left( \prod_{p=1}^{L_{k'}} U^{(j)}_{lp} \rho^{(j)}_{lp} V^{(j)}_{lp} \right) P_a \right),
$$

$$
\mathcal{S}_{ij} = \sum_{kk'} (\beta^{(i)}_k)^* \beta^{(j)}_{k'} \zeta^{(ij)}_{kk'},
$$

$$
\zeta^{(ij)}_{kk'} = \text{Tr} \left[ \left( \prod_{l=1}^{L_k} (V^{(i)}_{lk})^\dagger \rho^{(i)}_{lk} (U^{(i)}_{lk})^\dagger \right) A \left( \prod_{l'=1}^{L_{k'}} U^{(j)}_{lp} \rho^{(j)}_{lp} V^{(j)}_{lp} \right) \right],
$$

and these can be calculated on quantum computers by using a modified controlled derangement operator. Let us show an example when $A = \rho$ and $L_1 = 1$, assuming a single subspace given as $\sigma_i = U_1 \rho_1 V_1$. If both $U_1$ and $V_1$ are local Pauli operators, then the calculation of $\mathcal{H}_{ij}$ can be performed by the quantum circuit shown in Fig. S2(a). Alternatively, if $U_1$ and $V_1$ are unitary operators, then we can obtain the expectation value from the circuit shown in Fig. S2(b).

![Quantum Circuit](image)

**Fig. S2.** The quantum circuits for computing $\gamma^{(ij)}_{kk'}$ when $U_1$ and $V_1$ are (a) local Pauli operators or (b) unitary operators. Since $\gamma^{(ij)}_{kk'}$ is a complex number, we need to calculate the real and imaginary parts by measuring Pauli-X and -Y operators of the ancilla qubit, respectively. $\zeta^{(ij)}_{kk'}$ can be similarly evaluated by excluding the operator $P_a$ from the circuit.

### III. Power Subspace Includes the Virtual Distillation Among the Subspace

We compare the performance of the VD/EES method, $E_{VD}^{(M)} = \frac{\text{Tr}[\rho H]}{\text{Tr}[\rho^M]}$, with that of the GSE method using power subspace, $E_{GSE}^{(M)} = \min_x \text{Tr}[\rho \lim_{M \rightarrow \infty} H]$. Since $E_{VD}^{(M)}$ is not a monotonically decreasing function of $M$ in general, we compare $\min_{1 \leq k \leq M} E_{VD}^{(k)}$ with $E_{GSE}^{(M)}$. Actually, we can show $\min_{1 \leq k \leq M} E_{VD}^{(k)} \geq E_{GSE}^{(M)}$. For this purpose, we can choose $\tilde{a} = \tilde{a}_k$. 


(1 \leq k \leq m) such that

\[
\text{Tr}[\rho_{EM}H] \mid \vec{\alpha} = \vec{a}_k = \begin{cases} 
E_{VD}^{(2k)} (A = I) \\
E_{VD}^{(2k+1)} (A = \rho)
\end{cases}
\]  

(S6)

where we define a vector \( \vec{\alpha}_k \):

\[
\vec{\alpha}_k = \begin{cases}
(0,0, \ldots, 0, (\text{Tr}[\rho^{2k}])^{-1/2}, 0, \ldots, 0) & (A = I) \\
(0,0, \ldots, 0, (\text{Tr}[\rho^{2k+1}])^{-1/2}, 0, \ldots, 0) & (A = \rho).
\end{cases}
\]  

(S7)

Note that the \((k+1)\)-th component of \( \vec{\alpha}_k \) is a non-zero value and all the others are zero. Eq. (S6) means that the power subspace expansion includes the expectation values obtained by the VD/EES methods. From the above result, we obtain

\[
\min_{1 \leq k \leq M} E_{VD}^{(k)} = \min_{1 \leq k \leq M} \text{Tr}[\rho_{EM}H] \mid \vec{\alpha} = \vec{a}_k \geq \min_{1 \leq k \leq M} \text{Tr}[\rho_{EM}H] = E_{GSE}^{(M)}.
\]  

(S8)

This implies that the convergence of the power subspace expansion is equal or greater than that of the VD/EES methods.

### IV. EFFECT OF SHOT NOISE ON THE GENERALIZED SUBSPACE EXPANSION

Here, we provide analytical results for the effect of shot noise to the solution of the generalized eigenvalue problem [44]. First we introduce noise-free matrices that describe the quantum subspace; let us denote the Hamiltonian in the expanded subspace and the overlap matrix denote as \( H_0 \) and \( S_0 \), respectively. Note that \( S_0 \geq 0 \). The generalized eigenvalue problem without shot noise can be described as \( H_0 \vec{\alpha}_0 = E_0 S_0 \vec{\alpha}_0 \), where \( \vec{\alpha}_0 \) is the error-free ideal solution. In the following discussion, we assume the ideal eigenvalues are not degenerated. Denoting the effects of shot noise as \( \delta H \) and \( \delta S \), we represent \( H = H_0 + \delta H \) and \( S = S_0 + \delta S \). Now, we have

\[
H\vec{\alpha}_n = E_n S \vec{\alpha}_n.
\]  

(S9)

Here, \( \vec{\alpha}_n = \vec{\alpha}_{on} + \delta \vec{\alpha}_n \) and \( E_n = E_{0n} + \delta E_n \) with \( E_{0n} \) and \( \vec{\alpha}_{0n} \) representing the ideal \( n \)-th eigenvalue and solution of the generalized eigenvalue problem, respectively. Focusing on the first order of the deviation, we get

\[
H_0 \delta \vec{\alpha}_n + \delta H \vec{\alpha}_{0n} = E_{0n} S_0 \delta \vec{\alpha}_n + E_{0n} \delta S \vec{\alpha}_{0n} + \delta E_n S_0 \vec{\alpha}_{0n}.
\]  

(S10)

Now, by expanding \( \delta \vec{\alpha}_n = \sum_m \epsilon_{nm} \vec{\alpha}_{0m} \), we have

\[
\sum_m \epsilon_{nm} E_{0m} S_0 \vec{\alpha}_{0m} + \delta H \vec{\alpha}_{0n} = E_{0n} S_0 \sum_m \epsilon_{nm} \vec{\alpha}_{0m} + E_{0n} \delta S \vec{\alpha}_{0n} + \delta E_n S_0 \vec{\alpha}_{0n}.
\]  

(S11)

By multiplying \( \vec{\alpha}^\dagger_{0n} \) from the left in Eq. (S11), we obtain

\[
\delta E_n = \vec{\alpha}^\dagger_{0n} (\delta H - E_{0n} \delta S) \vec{\alpha}_{0n},
\]  

(S12)

where we used

\[
\vec{\alpha}^\dagger_{0m} S_0 \vec{\alpha}_{0n} = \delta_{nm}.
\]  

(S13)

Multiplying \( \vec{\alpha}^\dagger_{0l} (l \neq n) \) from the left in Eq. (S11) leads to

\[
\epsilon_{nl} = \frac{\vec{\alpha}^\dagger_{0l} (\delta H - E_{0n} \delta S) \vec{\alpha}_{0n}}{E_{0n} - E_{0l}}.
\]  

(S14)

We also note that from the normalization condition \( \vec{\alpha}^\dagger_{0n} S \vec{\alpha}_n = 1 \), we can derive \( \epsilon_{nn} = -\frac{1}{2} \vec{\alpha}_{0n} \delta S \vec{\alpha}_{0n} \). To summarize, we obtain

\[
E_n = E_{0n} + \vec{\alpha}^\dagger_{0n} (\delta H - E_{0n} \delta S) \vec{\alpha}_{0n} \]

\[
\vec{\alpha}_n = (1 - \frac{1}{2} \vec{\alpha}_{0n} \delta S \vec{\alpha}_{0n}) \vec{\alpha}_{0n} + \sum_{m \neq n} \frac{\vec{\alpha}^\dagger_{0m} (\delta H - E_{0n} \delta S) \vec{\alpha}_{0n}}{E_{0n} - E_{0m}} \vec{\alpha}_{0m}.
\]  

(S15)
Let us denote the total number of measurements and the dimension of the subspace as $N_s$ and $D$. Since each element of $\delta H$ and $\delta S$ is in the order of $O(DN_s^{-1/2})$, we have $\delta E_n = O(DN_s^{-1/2})$ and $\delta \bar{\alpha}_n = O(DN_s^{-1/2})$. We can see $\{S_0^{1/2} \bar{\alpha}_n\}_n$ are mutually orthogonal and normalized due to Eq. (S13). Thus, for an arbitrary $D \times D$ matrix $B$, we have

$$\| \alpha^i_{\alpha n} B \alpha_{\alpha n} \| = |\sigma^i_{\alpha n} S_0^{1/2} S_0^{-1/2} B S_0^{-1/2} S_0^{1/2} \alpha^i_{\alpha n}| \leq \| S_0^{-1/2} B S_0^{-1/2} \|_{op}, \quad (S16)$$

where $\| \cdot \|_{op}$ denotes an operator norm. Substituting $B = \delta H - E_{0n} \delta S$ to Eq. (S16) results in

$$|\delta E_n| \leq \| S_0^{-1/2} (\delta H - E_{0n} \delta S) S_0^{-1/2} \|_{op} \leq \| S_0^{-1} \|_{op} (\| \delta H \|_{op} + |E_{0n}| \| \delta S \|_{op}) \leq 2D|S_0^{-1}|_{op} (\| H \|_F + |E_{0n}| \| S \|_F), \quad (S17)$$

where $\| \cdot \|_F$ is the Frobenius norm and we used $\| C \|_{op} \leq \| C \|_F$ for an arbitrary matrix $C$, and $\| \delta H \|_F \leq \| H \|_F / \sqrt{N_s D - 2/2}$ and $\| \delta S \|_F \leq \| S \|_F / \sqrt{N_s D - 2/2}$. Also, we assigned the same number of samples to the measurement of $H$ and $S$. Here, we assumed $A = \rho$ or $A = I/d$ with $d$ being the system dimension. Note that rescaling the $A$ matrix does not affect the overall accuracy.

When we decompose the Hamiltonian into the linear combination of Pauli operators as $H = \sum_a h_a P_a$, we get $|\delta H_{ij}| \leq \gamma$ with $\gamma = \sum_a |h_a|$. Thus, we obtain

$$|\delta E_n| \leq \frac{4\gamma D^2 |S_0^{-1}|_{op}}{\sqrt{N_s}}, \quad (S18)$$

where we used $E_{0n} \leq \| H \|_{op} \leq \gamma$, and also assumed $S_{ij} \leq 1$, which is satisfied in highly practical cases such as the power subspace (without additional bases) and fault subspace. Thus, we can achieve the required accuracy $\varepsilon$ when $N_s \geq 16\gamma^2 D^4 |S_0^{-1}|_{op}^2 / \varepsilon^2$. We further discuss $|S_0^{-1}|_{op}$ for the power subspace in the case of $D = 2$ and $D = 3$, which is highly practical for near-term devices. For $D = 2$, when we set $A = \rho$ for the ansatz given in Eq. (1), we have

$$S_0 = \left( \begin{array}{cc} 1 & \text{Tr}[\rho^2] \\ \text{Tr}[\rho^3] & \text{Tr}[\rho^3] \end{array} \right), \quad (S19)$$

and we obtain $|S_0^{-1}|_{op} \approx (\text{Tr}[\rho^3] - (\text{Tr}[\rho^2])^2)^{-1}$ under the assumption of $(\text{Tr}[\rho^2])^2 \ll 1$. Similarly, we have $|S_0^{-1}|_{op} \approx (\text{Tr}[\rho^2])^{-1}$ for $A = I/d$. In the case of $D = 3$, we obtain $|S_0^{-1}|_{op} \approx (\text{Tr}[\rho^3] - (\text{Tr}[\rho^2])^2 / \text{Tr}[\rho^3])^{-1}$ ($A = \rho$) and $|S_0^{-1}|_{op} \approx (\text{Tr}[\rho^2] - (\text{Tr}[\rho^3])^2 / \text{Tr}[\rho^3])^{-1}$ ($A = I/d$), respectively.

V. EFFECT OF SHOT NOISE ON OBSERVABLE ESTIMATION

As is discussed in the previous section, the values of physical observable necessarily deviates from the ideal ones unless we take infinite number of measurements. Such fluctuations are often called the shot noise. For instance, results provided in Fig. 1 in the main text take the effect of shot noise into account. Each matrix element $H_{ij}$ (or $S_{ij}$) is given as $H_{ij} = H_{ij}^{(0)} + \delta H_{ij}$, where $H_{ij}^{(0)}$ is the expectation value and $\delta H_{ij}$ is a Gaussian noise whose amplitude is determined from the variance that arise from projective measurements. In the following, we discuss the variance of estimators for physical observables such as $H_{ij}$ and $S_{ij}$, which are computed by letting multiple quantum states interfere with each other.

A. Power subspace

It is instructive to start from a case where we have $M$ identical copies to compute the expectation value of an operator $O$. As was proposed in Ref. [20, 21], let us employ the cyclic shift operator $S^{(M)}$ which act on $M$ systems as follows,

$$S^{(M)} |\psi_1 \rangle \otimes |\psi_2 \rangle \otimes \cdots \otimes |\psi_M \rangle = |\psi_2 \rangle \otimes |\psi_3 \rangle \otimes \cdots \otimes |\psi_M \rangle \otimes |\psi_1 \rangle, \quad (S20)$$

where $|\psi_m \rangle$ denotes an arbitrary quantum state of $m$-th system. Practically, $S^{(M)}$ can be regarded as a product of shift operators between two systems as $S^{(M)} = \prod_m S^{(2)}_{m,m+1}$ that can be constructed as a tensor product of swap...
operators acting on all corresponding qubits where \( S_{m,m+1}^{(2)} |\psi_m\rangle \otimes |\psi_{m+1}\rangle = |\psi_{m+1}\rangle \otimes |\psi_m\rangle \). After some computation, we can show that the expectation value for the power of quantum state \( \rho^M \) can be expressed as

\[
\langle O \rangle = \frac{\text{Tr}[\rho^M O]}{\text{Tr}[\rho^M]} = \frac{\text{Tr}[ S(M)^{O(M)} \otimes_{m=1}^M \rho] }{\text{Tr}[ S(M)^{\otimes_{m=1}^M \rho} ]},
\]

where we take \( O^{(M)} = O \otimes I \otimes \cdots \otimes I \) to provide a unified view over various choice of \( M \) [20]. The variance for the single-shot estimation of the numerator can be given as

\[
\text{Var}(S^{(M)}O^{(M)}) = \langle \langle (S^{(M)}O^{(M)})^2 \rangle \rangle - \langle \langle S^{(M)}O^{(M)} \rangle \rangle^2
\]

\[
= \langle \langle (I \otimes O \otimes I \otimes \cdots \otimes I)(O \otimes I \otimes \cdots \otimes I) \rangle \rangle - \text{Tr}[\rho^M O]^2
\]

\[
= \text{Tr}[\rho O]^2 - \text{Tr}[\rho^M O]^2,
\]

where \( \langle \langle \cdot \rangle \rangle := \text{Tr}[\cdot \otimes_{m=1}^M \rho] \) is introduced to denote the expectation value computed in the extended Hilbert space, which consists of \( M \) systems. It is beneficial to remark on a case when the observable is a linear combination of Pauli operators; we decompose as \( O = \sum_{k=1}^{N_O} c_k P_k \) where \( P_k \) is a product of Pauli operators and \( N_O \) denotes the number of terms. Then, the variance is given as

\[
\text{Var}(S^{(M)}O^{(M)}) = \sum_k |c_k|^2 \text{Var}(S^{(M)}(P_k^{(M)})).
\]

Here, we assume that we measure \( \text{Tr}[\rho^M P_1], \text{Tr}[\rho^M P_2], \ldots, \text{Tr}[\rho^M P_{N_O}] \) in separate experiments, and therefore the total variance \( S23 \) is estimated as a sum of each term. The variance for the single-shot estimation of the denominator can be obtained from a parallel argument as

\[
\text{Var}(S^{(M)}) = \langle \langle (S^{(M)})^2 \rangle \rangle - \langle \langle S^{(M)} \rangle \rangle^2
\]

\[
= 1 - \text{Tr}[\rho^M]^2.
\]

Finally, we can calculate the variance of the estimator of the observable itself by substituting the above expressions into the standard formula. If we take \( n_s \) measurement shots for every term, the overall variance can be calculated as

\[
\frac{\text{Var}(O)}{n_s} \approx \frac{\langle O \rangle^2}{n_s} \left( \frac{\text{Var}(S^{(M)}O^{(M)})}{\langle \langle S^{(M)}O^{(M)} \rangle \rangle^2} + \frac{\text{Var}(S^{(M)})}{\langle \langle S^{(M)} \rangle \rangle^2} - 2 \text{Covar}(S^{(M)}O^{(M)}, S^{(M)}) / \langle \langle S^{(M)}O^{(M)} \rangle \rangle \langle \langle S^{(M)} \rangle \rangle \right),
\]

where the covariance between \( S^{(M)}O^{(M)} \) and \( S^{(M)} \) is set to zero in our numerical simulation. This is because we have chosen \( O^{(M)} \) to be \( [S^{(M)}O^{(M)}, S^{(M)}] \neq 0 \). In this case, the denominator and numerator of Eq. (S21) cannot be measured simultaneously, and hence we can ignore the covariance by measuring them separately. Let us also remark that overall variance can be improved, e.g., by weighing the number of measurements according to the coefficient \( c_k \).

We have used Eq. (S25) to estimate the variance of the matrix elements \( H_{ij} \) and \( S_{ij} \) for the power subspace. Note that bases of subspaces \( \{ \sigma_i \} \), including the additional terms \( \rho^m H \), are chosen so that all elements are given as \( \text{Tr}[\rho^m H] \) \((k \in \mathbb{Z}^+)\). We later discuss the case when we must compute, e.g., \( \text{Tr}[\rho H \rho H] \).

B. Fault subspace

Next, we discuss the case when the error-mitigated quantum state is expressed by non-identical quantum states. It is practical to first set \( M = 2 \) so that we can describe the case for the fault subspace. Given a quantum state \( \rho_{EM} = \sum_{i,j=0}^m \alpha_i^* \alpha_j \rho_i \rho_j \) with \( \rho_i = \rho(\lambda_i \epsilon) \) and \( M = 2m \), the expectation value of a physical observable \( O \) is expressed as

\[
\langle O \rangle = \frac{\text{Tr}[\rho_{EM} O]}{\text{Tr}[\rho_{EM}]} = \frac{\sum_{ij} \alpha_i^* \alpha_j \text{Tr}[\rho_i \rho_j O]}{\sum_{ij} \alpha_i^* \alpha_j \text{Tr}[\rho_i \rho_j]} = \frac{\sum_{ij} \alpha_i^* \alpha_j \text{Tr}[S^{(2)} O^{(2)} (\rho_i \otimes \rho_j)]}{\sum_{ij} \alpha_i^* \alpha_j \text{Tr}[S^{(2)} (\rho_i \otimes \rho_j)]} = \frac{\sum_{ij} \alpha_i^* O_{ij} \alpha_j}{\sum_{ij} \alpha_i^* S_{ij} \alpha_j},
\]

where we have defined \( O_{ij} = \text{Tr}[\rho_i \rho_j O] \). Based on the discussion of Eq. (S22), we obtain the variance for the single-shot estimation of an element \( O_{ij} \) as

\[
\text{Var}(S^{(2)} O^{(2)})_{ij} \equiv \langle \langle (S^{(2)} O^{(2)})^2 \rangle \rangle_{ij} - \langle \langle S^{(2)} O^{(2)} \rangle \rangle_{ij}^2
\]

\[
= \langle \langle (I \otimes O)(O \otimes I) \rangle \rangle_{ij} - \text{Tr}[\rho_i \rho_j O]^2
\]

\[
= \text{Tr}[\rho_i O] \text{Tr}[\rho_j O] - \text{Tr}[\rho_i \rho_j O]^2,
\]
where we have defined $\langle\langle \cdot \rangle\rangle_{ij} = \text{Tr}[\cdot (\rho_i \otimes \rho_j)]$. Also, in a similar way to Eq. (S24), the variance for single-shot estimation of $S_{ij}$ is given as

$$\text{Var}(S^{(2)})_{ij} \equiv \langle \langle (S^{(2)})^2 \rangle \rangle_{ij} - \langle \langle S^{(2)} \rangle \rangle_{ij}^2 = 1 - \text{Tr}[\rho_{ij}^{\text{EM}}]^2.$$  \hspace{1cm} (S28)

Using the above expressions, we find that the variance under $n_s$ measurement shots for each term can be formally given as

$$\frac{\text{Var}(O)}{n_s} = \frac{\langle O \rangle^2}{n_s} \left( \frac{\sum_{ij} (\alpha_i^*)^2 (\alpha_j)^2 \text{Var}(S^{(2)}O^{(2)})_{ij}}{\text{Tr}[\rho_{EM}O]^2} + \frac{\sum_{ij} (\alpha_i^*)^2 (\alpha_j)^2 \text{Var}(S^{(2)})_{ij}}{\text{Tr}[\rho_{EM}^{\text{S}}]^2} \right).$$  \hspace{1cm} (S29)

In the main text, we calculate the variance of the physical observable (in particular the energy $\langle H \rangle$) in a stochastic way rather than calculating from Eq. (S29). This procedure can be summarized as follows: (1) add a Gaussian noise to $H_{ij}$ and $S_{ij}$ whose variance is determined from Eqs. (S27) and (S28), (2) regularize $S$ to omit small/negative eigenvalues, (3) solve the generalized linear equation, and (4) repeat (1)-(3) until the variance can be estimated with sufficient accuracy.

C. General case

Here, we briefly comment on the variance using the most general subspace. For simplicity, we focus on the variance of estimating $\langle O \rangle_Q := \text{Tr}[O(Q_1 \rho_1 Q_2 \rho_2 \cdots Q_M \rho_M)]$, where $Q_m$ ($m = 1, \ldots, M$) is taken as a local Pauli operator. This can be measured using the cyclic shift operator $S^{(M)}$ and $O^{(M)} := O \otimes I \otimes \cdots \otimes I$

$$\langle O \rangle_Q = \text{Tr}[S^{(M)}O^{(M)}(Q_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes Q_M)(\rho_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes \rho_M)],$$  \hspace{1cm} (S30)

and hence the variance of the estimator can be given as follows,

$$\text{Var}(O)_Q = \langle \langle (S^{(M)}O^{(M)}(\bigotimes_{m=1}^M Q_m))^2 \rangle \rangle - \left( \langle \langle S^{(M)}O^{(M)}(\bigotimes_{m=1}^M Q_m) \rangle \rangle \right)^2$$

$$= \langle \langle (OQ_1 \otimes Q_2 \otimes \cdots \otimes Q_M)(Q_2 \otimes Q_3 \otimes \cdots \otimes Q_M \otimes OQ_1) \rangle \rangle - \langle \langle O \rangle \rangle_Q^2$$

$$= \text{Tr}[\rho_1 OQ_1 Q_2 \text{Tr}[\rho_2 Q_2 Q_3] \cdots \text{Tr}[\rho_M Q_M OQ_1] - \langle \langle O \rangle \rangle_Q^2,$$  \hspace{1cm} (S31)

where here we have denoted $\langle \langle \cdot \rangle \rangle := \text{Tr}[\cdot \bigotimes_{m=1}^M \rho_m]$.

VI. DETAILS REGARDING THE STRUCTURE OF VARIATIONAL QUANTUM CIRCUITS

In the main text, we have simulated the ground state of the one-dimensional transverse-field Ising model $H = -\sum_r Z_r Z_{r+1} + h \sum_r X_r$ where $X_r$ and $Z_r$ denote the $x$- and $z$-component of the Pauli matrices acting on the $r$-th site under open boundary condition. Throughout this paper, we have employed the hardware-efficient ansatz structure as shown in Fig. S3, where the repetition number of units has been taken as $d = 12$ for results in Figs. 1 and 3, and $d = 6$ for that in Fig. 2. Noisy quantum states are generated by adding local depolarizing noise after each quantum gate.

VII. ERROR-EXTRAPOLATION METHOD

Here, we briefly review the error-extrapolation method used for the quantum error mitigation [5]. Let us assume that a quantum state can be characterized by an error-control parameters as $\rho(\lambda \epsilon)$, where $\epsilon$ is a fixed value which can be considered as the minimum achievable noise level and $\lambda \geq 1$ is the stretch factor. The expectation value of any observable $O$ will be expressed as a power series around its noise-free value $O^*$ as

$$\langle O(\lambda \epsilon) \rangle = O^* + \sum_{k=1}^n a_k \lambda^k + \mathcal{O}(\lambda^{n+1}).$$  \hspace{1cm} (S32)
The noise-free value $O^*$ can be calculated from $n + 1$ results corresponding to stretch factors $\{\lambda_i\}_{i=0}^n$ as

$$O^* = \sum_{i=0}^{n} \beta_i \langle O(\lambda_i \epsilon) \rangle + \mathcal{O}(\epsilon^{n+1}), \quad (S33)$$

where $\beta_i = \prod_{j \neq i} \lambda_j (\lambda_j - \lambda_i)^{-1}$ are solutions of linear equation

$$\sum_i \beta_i = 1, \sum_i \beta_i \lambda_i^k = 0. \quad (S34)$$

Since $\{\beta_i\}$ is common among any physical observable, this is equivalent to estimate the zero-noise density matrix as $\rho_{ex} = \sum_i \beta_i \rho(\lambda_i \epsilon)$. We remark that Eq. (S33) can be used as long as $\langle O(\lambda\epsilon) \rangle$ is controlled by $\lambda$. Namely, the error-extrapolation method can be applied not only for the calculation of the raw expectation value but also for the calculation with the VD/EES method such that $\text{Tr}[\rho^M(\lambda_i \epsilon)H]/\text{Tr}[\rho^M(\lambda_i \epsilon)]$.

While the error-extrapolation technique is highly practical, it is crucial to perform perfect control over the stretch factor $\lambda$. This is demanding for the actual experimental setup, and therefore it is highly possible that $\lambda$ deviates from the actual target value. Figure S4 shows that the effect of such an unwanted fluctuation can be somewhat suppressed by employing data points calculated from the VD/EES method. However, it is evident from Fig. S5(a) that the GSE method can estimate the error-free observable much more efficiently because such an effect barely affects the construction of the quantum subspace. This can be confirmed to be true for various error levels, especially when we take a sufficient number of measurement shots $n_s$ so that the effect of shot-noise is negligible (See Fig. 3 in the main text for a case with $n_s \to \infty$). When $n_s$ is finite, the result by the GSE method may not necessarily satisfy $E_{\text{GSE}} \geq E_{\text{GS}}$ where $E_{\text{GS}}$ is the exact ground-state energy (See Fig. S5(b)). However, we numerically confirm that the fluctuation is much smaller and hence is more reliable.

It must be noted that the GSE method using the fault subspace can outperform the conventional error-extrapolation method even when the stretch factor $\lambda_i$ is precisely known. Let us consider distilling the error-extrapolated density
FIG. S5. (a) Zero-noise energy estimation using the GSE method via fault subspace and the extrapolation of VD/EES method using \( M = 2 \) copies. The unit of controlled noise parameter is taken as \( \epsilon = 1 \). (b) Comparing the effect of fluctuation in the stretch factor \( \lambda \) under various \( \epsilon \). The only difference from the calculation done for Fig. 3 in the main text is the effect of the shot-noise. In all calculations, we consider the one-dimensional transverse-field Hamiltonian with \( N = 8 \) qubits with \( h = 1 \), and we estimate each Pauli terms using \( 10^7 \) measurement shots.

matrix \( \rho_{ex} \) using \( M = 2 \) copies as \( \rho_{ex}^2 / \text{Tr}[\rho_{ex}^2] \). We can see that this state is included in the variational ansatz employed in the GSE method, i.e., \( \rho_{EM} = \sum_{ij} \alpha_i^* \alpha_j \rho(\lambda_i \epsilon) \rho(\lambda_j \epsilon) \). When \( \rho_{ex} \) is a physical state, this also holds for higher orders since we can always construct a variational ansatz that includes \( \rho_{ex}^M / \text{Tr}[\rho_{ex}^M] \). For instance, we can simply take \( \sigma_i = \rho(\lambda_i \epsilon) \) and \( A = \rho_{ex}^{M-2} \) which yields \( \rho_{EM} = \sum_{ij} \alpha_i^* \alpha_j \rho(\lambda_i \epsilon) \rho_{ex}^{M-2} \rho(\lambda_j \epsilon) \).