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Noisy intermediate scale quantum computers are useful for various tasks including quantum state preparation, quantum metrology and variational quantum algorithms. However, the non-euclidean quantum geometry of parameterized quantum circuits is detrimental for these applications. Here, we introduce the natural parameterized quantum circuit (NPQC) with a euclidean quantum geometry. The initial training of variational quantum algorithms is substantially sped up as the gradient is equivalent to the quantum natural gradient. NPQCs can also be used as highly accurate multi-parameter quantum sensors. For a general class of quantum circuits, the NPQC has the minimal quantum Cramér-Rao bound. We provide an efficient sensing protocol that only requires sampling in the computational basis. Finally, we show how to generate tailored superposition states without training. These applications can be realized for any number of qubits with currently available quantum processors.

A growing number of applications for noisy intermediate scale quantum (NISQ) computers have been proposed \cite{1, 2} to make use of quantum computers available now and in the near future. For NISQ computers, variational quantum algorithms (VQAs) have been proposed to solve tasks difficult for classical computers \cite{3–6} such as finding the ground state of Hamiltonians \cite{3} or simulating quantum dynamics \cite{7, 8}. A major obstacle for practical applications is the long training time of VQAs \cite{9–11}. As further application, NISQ devices can serve as highly controllable quantum sensors \cite{12–15}. However, it is unclear what is the best way to design these quantum sensors or how to efficiently sense multiple parameters at the same time \cite{12, 16}.

Parameterized quantum circuits (PQCs) are the basis of most NISQ algorithms. It is challenging to design PQCs that can efficiently run NISQ applications \cite{17–20}. The quantum geometry of PQCs as measured by the quantum Fisher information metric (QFIM) plays a key role in this regard \cite{17, 21, 22}. VQAs can be trained more efficiently by using the QFIM for adaptive learning rates \cite{23} and the quantum natural gradient (QNG) \cite{23–26}. For quantum sensing, the QFIM places a lower bound on the estimation error with the quantum Cramér-Rao bound. These convenient properties make the NPQC a useful basis for many other NISQ applications such as state preparation.

Model—The QFIM $\mathcal{F}(\theta)$ for a PQC $|\psi(\theta)\rangle$ and $M$-dimensional parameter vector $\theta$ is an $M \times M$ dimensional positive semidefinite matrix \cite{21, 28}

\[
\mathcal{F}_{ij}(\theta) = 4\langle \partial_i \psi | \partial_j \psi \rangle - \langle \partial_i \psi | \psi \rangle \langle \psi | \partial_j \psi \rangle ,
\]

where $\partial_i |\psi\rangle$ is the gradient in respect to parameter $\theta_i$. The QFIM $\mathcal{F}(\theta)$ is a metric that relates fidelity of the quantum state with the distance in parameter space $\theta$. When varying the parameter of the quantum state $|\psi(\theta + d\mu)\rangle$ by a small $d\mu$, the fidelity is given by $|\langle \psi(\theta) | \psi(\theta + d\mu) \rangle|^2 = 1 - \frac{1}{4} d\mu^T \mathcal{F}(\theta) d\mu$. The variation of the distance in parameter space has a non-equal influence on the quantum state for generic PQCs with $\mathcal{F}(\theta) \neq cI$, where $I$ is the identity matrix and $c > 0$. This non-euclidean nature of the PQC materializes in the QFIM, which acquires off-diagonal entries and non-equal diagonal entries. When the diagonal entries are non-equal $\mathcal{F}_{ii}(\theta) \neq \mathcal{F}_{jj}(\theta)$, then a variation of $\theta_i$ changes the fidelity of the quantum state $|\psi(\theta)\rangle$ by a different degree compared to $\theta_j$. An off-diagonal entry $\mathcal{F}_{ij}(\theta) \neq 0$ means that a variation of parameter entries $\theta_i$ and $\theta_j$ lead to a change of quantum state $|\psi(\theta)\rangle$ in non-orthogonal directions. A pictorial description of a non-euclidean fidelity landscape is shown in the upper graph of Fig.1a. When the quantum geometry is euclidean with $\mathcal{F}(\theta) = cI$, then all the parameters $\theta_i$, $\theta_j$ are uncorrelated and they change the quantum state into orthogonal directions in the same proportional manner (see lower graph of Fig.1a). We define the NPQC as a PQC with a euclidean quantum geometry for a set of parameters.
FIG. 1. a) The fidelity landscape $K_i(\theta) = \langle |\psi(\theta_i)|\psi(\theta_i')\rangle^2$ as a function of parameter $\theta$ of a parameterized quantum circuit (PQC). For generic PQCs, the landscape is non-euclidean and the parameters are distorted, which is characterized by the quantum Fisher information metric (QFIM) $F(\theta) \neq cI$, where $c > 0$ and $I$ is the identity matrix. Training with gradient ascent (dashed line) is challenging as the gradient does not point into the optimal direction. For a natural PQC (NPQC) the fidelity landscape is euclidean with $\mathcal{F}(\theta) = cI$. Thus, the standard gradient points in the optimal direction, is equivalent to the quantum natural gradient (QNG) and one can use adaptive learning rates to speed up training (Eq. (6)).

b) Hardware efficient implementation of the NPQC composed of single qubit rotations and CPHASE gates with $N$ qubits. The NPQC has a euclidean quantum geometry close to the reference parameters $\theta \approx \theta_r$ (Eq. (2)) with QFIM $\mathcal{F}(\theta_r) = I$. The reference state $|\psi(\theta_r)\rangle$ can be used to represent arbitrary quantum states and the NPQC is a highly expressive PQC. c) Example of an entangling layer $U_{\text{ent}}(\theta)$ of the NPQC, consisting of $\mathcal{Z}$ CPHASE gates and single qubit rotations. d) Multi-parameter quantum metrology to estimate $\Delta \theta$ by measuring NPQC $U(x + \Delta \theta)|0\rangle$ in the computational basis. The estimation error is lower bounded by the quantum Cramér-Rao bound, which is proportional to the inverse of the QFIM $\mathcal{F}^{-1}(\theta_i) = I$. For the NPQC, the quantum Cramér-Rao bound has the minimal value for a general class of PQCs.

A hardware efficient construction of the NPQC is shown in Fig.1b. It consists of $N$ qubits ($N$ even) and $p$ layers of unitaries $U_l(\theta_l)$ with quantum state $U(\theta)|0\rangle = \prod_{t=1}^{l}U_l(\theta_l)|0\rangle \in \mathbb{C}^N$ parameterized by the $M$-dimensional parameter vector $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^M$. The first layer consists of $2N$ single qubit rotations around $y$ and $z$ axis applied on each qubit $n$ with $U_1 = \prod_{n=1}^{N}R_z^{(n)}(\theta_{1,z}^{(n)})R_y^{(n)}(\theta_{1,y}^{(n)})$, where $R_{y,z}^{(n)}(\theta) = \exp(-i \frac{\theta}{2} \sigma_{y,z}^{(n)})$, $\alpha \in \{ x, y, z \}$ and $\sigma_x^n, \sigma_y^n, \sigma_z^n$ are the Pauli matrices applied on qubit $n$. Each further layer $l > 1$ is composed of a product of two qubit entangling gates and parameterized single qubit rotations given by $U_l(a_l) = \prod_{k=1}^{N/2}[R_z^{(2k-1)}(\theta_{1,z}^{(2k-1)})R_y^{(2k-1)}(\theta_{1,y}^{(2k-1)})]^{\sigma_1^{(2k-1)}}U_{\text{ent}}(a_l)$, where $U_{\text{ent}}(a_l) = \prod_{k=1}^{N/2}\text{CPHASE}(2k-1, 2k, 2k+1)$ and CPHASE$(n, m)$ is the controlled $\sigma_z$ gate applied on qubit index $n, m$, where indices larger than $N$ are taken modulo. As an example, the entangling layer $U_l(0)$ is shown in Fig.1c. The shift factor $a_l \in \{0, 1, \ldots, N/2 - 1\}$ as a function of layer $l$ is defined via the following recursive rule. Initialise the set $A = \{0, 1, \ldots, N/2 - 1\}$ and $s = 1$. In each iteration, pick and remove one element $r$ from $A$. Then set $a_s = r$ and $a_{s+q} = a_s$ for $q = 1, \ldots, s - 1$. As the last step, we set $s = 2s$. We repeat this procedure until no elements are left in $A$ or the desired depth $p$ is reached. Our construction has up to $p_{\text{max}} = 2N/2$ layers with in total $M = N(p + 1)$ parameters. The NPQC has a euclidean geometry where the QFIM is the identity for the reference parameter $\theta_r$ given by

$$\mathcal{F}(\theta_r) = I \quad \text{for} \quad \theta_{r,t,l,y}^{(n)} = \pi/2, \quad \theta_{r,t,l,x}^{(n)} = 0.$$  \hspace{1cm} (2)

While the euclidean geometry is exactly valid only for $\theta_r$, we find that it remains nearly euclidean in the vicinity of $\theta \approx \theta_r$. The QFIM $\mathcal{F}(\psi) = \mathcal{F}(\langle \psi | \psi \rangle)$ is invariant under application of arbitrary unitaries $V$ [21]. Thus, the euclidean quantum geometry is preserved even if we apply additional unitaries on the NPQC. We can prepare arbitrary reference states $|\psi_r\rangle = |\psi(\theta_r)\rangle$ with the unitary $V_{\text{ref}} |0\rangle = |\psi(\theta_r)\rangle$ such that $U_{\text{fix}}^l U_l(\theta) = I$. In general the NPQC is intractable for classical computers, however for the particular case $\theta_r$ and $V_{\text{ref}} = I$ the NPQC is Cliffords with an efficient simulation on classical computers [33]. The NPQC substantially improves various important applications of NISQ computers.

Training QVAs—QVAs solve tasks by optimizing the parameters $\theta$ of the PQC in respect to a cost function. As an example, we investigate the QVA for learning the quantum state $|\psi_i\rangle$, an important subroutine in many VQAs [7, 8, 34, 35]. The goal is to learn the target parameters $\theta'_i = \text{argmax}_\theta K_i(\theta)$ by maximizing the fidelity

$$K_i(\theta) = \langle |\psi_i| \psi(\theta) \rangle^2.$$ \hspace{1cm} (4)

The cost function can be optimized by a method such as gradient ascent [3]. Here, the parameters are updated iteratively via $\theta' = \theta + \alpha \nabla K_i(\theta)$, where $\alpha$ is the learning rate and $\nabla K_i(\theta)$ is the gradient, which points in the direction of steepest change of the cost function. The NPQC can aid here by improving the learning rate $\alpha$ and the gradient. In general PQCs, the gradient $\nabla K_i(\theta)$ is not the best choice for optimization as it implicitly assumes that the landscape is euclidean [24, 25, 36]. As an
example, a training trajectory for a generic non-euclidean PQC is shown in the upper graph of Fig.1a. To amend the non-euclidean nature, one can transform the gradient into the QNG \((F^{-1}(\theta) V K_i(\theta))\) by using the inverse of the QFIM \(F^{-1}(\theta)\) \cite{24}. The QNG points in the optimal direction for gradient ascent. However, this transformation requires knowledge about the QFIM which can be difficult to acquire \cite{24, 25, 36}. As the NPQC has a euclidean geometry close to the reference parameter \((F^{-1}(\theta_r) = I)\), Eq. (2) by default, the gradient and QNG are equivalent

\[
\nabla K_i(\theta) = F^{-1}(\theta) V K_i(\theta),
\]

allowing us to train the first training steps in an efficient manner without the QFIM (see lower graph of Fig.1a). To further improve training, we can replace the heuristic learning rate \(\alpha\) with adaptive learning rates that change during the training. It has been shown that the fidelity of hardware efficient PQCs takes an approximate Gaussian form \cite{23}. By combining this result with the euclidean QFIM, we can derive the adaptive learning rate \(\alpha_t(\theta)\). Close to the reference parameter \(\theta \approx \theta_r\), and \(F(\theta) \approx \theta_r\), we find that \(\alpha_t(\theta)\) is given by (see Supplemental materials or [23])

\[
\theta_1 = \theta + \alpha_1 \nabla K_i, \quad \alpha_1 = \frac{2 \sqrt{-\log(K_i(\theta))}}{|\nabla K_i(\theta)|},
\]

\[
\alpha_t(\theta) = \frac{2}{\alpha_1 |\nabla K_i(\theta)|} \log \left( \frac{K_i(\theta_1)}{K_i(\theta)} \right) + \frac{\alpha_1}{2}. \tag{6}
\]

The adaptive learning rates combined with the inherent QNG substantially improves the training of VQAs. We initialise the NPQC with parameter \(\theta_t\) and choose any desired initial state via Eq. (3). Then, we proceed to train the VQA for a few iterations. After a few training iterations, the parameter of the NPQC \(\theta\) may not be close to \(\theta_t\) anymore and the QFIM can acquire substantial off-diagonal entries. At this point, our assumption \(F = I\) breaks down and we switch to a heuristic learning rate. Nonetheless, improving the initial training iterations can already give us a major speed up in training VQAs.

**Metrology** — We further apply the NPQC for quantum metrology of multiple parameters (see Fig.1d). The goal is to determine the a priori unknown \(M\)-dimensional parameter vector \(\Delta \theta\) by performing measurements on the quantum state \(|\psi(\theta_r + \Delta \theta)\rangle\). The accuracy of estimating \(\Delta \theta\) is fundamentally limited by quantum mechanics as measured by the mean squared error \(\text{MSE}(\theta) = \mathbb{E}[(\theta - \theta_0)^2] = \text{Tr}[\text{cov}(\theta)]\). For any quantum metrology protocol with \(n\) measurements and an unbiased estimator \(\hat{\theta}\), the MSE(\(\theta\)) \(\geq \frac{1}{n} F^{-1}(\theta)\) is lower bounded by the inverse of the QFIM, which is called the quantum Cramér-Rao bound \cite{21, 27, 28}. The NPQC with \(\text{Tr}[F^{-1}(\theta)] = M\) has the smallest possible quantum Cramér-Rao bound \(Q_{\min} = M\) for a general class of PQCs constructed from parameterized Pauli rotations and arbitrary unitaries (see Supplemental materials)

\[
\text{MSE}(\theta)|_{\theta = \theta_r} \geq \frac{1}{n} \text{Tr}[F^{-1}(\theta_r)] = \frac{Q_{\min}}{n} = \frac{M}{n}. \tag{7}
\]

This can be intuitively understood as for a euclidean QFIM any variation of the parameters leads to an orthogonal change in the space of quantum states. Thus, each parameter direction is associated with an orthogonal quantum state that can be distinguished with a positive operator-valued measure (POVM). However, a major challenge in multi-parameter metrology is finding practical encodings and measurement settings \cite{21, 28}. While estimating a single parameter is always possible, for multiple parameters the necessary POVMs may not commute, making it difficult to determine all parameters in a single measurement setting. Further, the POVMs may require additional resources that are not suited for NISQ devices. Using the NPQC, we can sense \(M\) parameters by sampling in the computational basis only. The setup is a modified version of the NPQC \(U^*_y(\theta)\), where all the parameterized single-qubit z-rotations are removed. Then, we have the quantum state \(|\psi_y(\theta)| = U^*_y(\theta)|\psi_y(\theta)\rangle\rangle\), where we apply the adjoint \(U^*_y(\theta)|\) with parameters fixed to \(\theta_r\). A small variation \(|\Delta \theta| \ll 1\) yields

\[
|\psi_y(\theta_r + \Delta \theta)\rangle \approx \sqrt{1 - \frac{1}{4} |\Delta \theta|^2} |0\rangle + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^M |\Delta \theta| |v_i\rangle, \tag{8}
\]

where \(|v_i\rangle\) is the computational basis state with the unique number \(v_i\) for the \(i\)-th parameter of the NPQC. The number \(v_i\) can be efficiently determined on a classical computer from the gradients in respect to parameter \(\Delta \theta_i\) for the Clifford state \(|\psi_y(\theta)|\). The form of Eq. (8) follows from the fidelity \(K(\Delta \theta) \approx 1 - \frac{1}{4} |\Delta \theta|^2\) \cite{21}. The absolute value of the \(i\)-th parameter entry \(|\Delta \theta_i|\) can now be estimated by sampling from \(|\psi_y(\theta_r + \Delta \theta)|\) in the computational basis with \(|\Delta \theta_i| = 2\sqrt{F_i}\), where \(P_i = |\langle\psi_y(\theta_r + \Delta \theta)|v_i\rangle|^2\) is the probability of measuring the computational basis state \(|v_i\rangle\). For a NPQC of \(p\) layers, we can determine \(M = \frac{p}{2}(p + 1)\) parameters at the same time.

**Results** — We now demonstrate the proposed application using numerical simulations \cite{37, 38}. In Fig.2a, we show the performance of the VQA for learning a target quantum state \(|\psi\rangle\) using PQCs. We measure the quality of the found target parameter \(\theta_f \) with the infidelity \(\Delta K_i(\theta_f) = 1 - K_i(\theta_f)\). We plot the infidelity after one iteration of gradient ascent \(\Delta K_i(\theta_f)\) using adaptive learning rates for varying initial infidelity \(K_i(\theta_f)\). We compare training starting with random initial parameters of the NPQC \(\theta = \theta_{rand} \in [0, 2\pi]\) \((F(\theta_{rand}) \neq I)\) against the reference parameter \(\theta_f\) with euclidean quantum geometry \((F(\theta_f) = I)\). Training with \(\theta_f\) vastly outperforms the randomly chosen parameters. We numerically find that the data is fitted with
\[
\Delta K_i(\theta'_i) = -c \log^\nu[1 - \Delta K_i(\theta)], \quad \text{with } \nu = 1 \text{ for } \theta_{\text{rand}} \text{ and } \nu = 2 \text{ for } \theta._i. \quad \text{In Fig. 2b for initial parameter } \theta._i, \text{ we observe that the infidelity after one iteration of gradient ascent } \langle \Delta K_i(\theta'_i) \rangle \text{ decreases with increasing qubit number } N, \text{ demonstrating improved performance when scaling up the number of qubits of the quantum computer. In Fig. 2c, we show training with the NPQC using various optimization methods using } \theta._i \text{ as initial parameter. We compare adaptive gradient ascent (A-G) with standard methods such as Adam [39], LBFGS [40] and standard gradient ascent with fixed learning rate (S-G). For adaptive gradient ascent, we use adaptive learning rates with Eq. (6) (assuming QFIM } \mathcal{F} = I \text{ for the first three training iterations, then switch to a heuristic learning rate as the QFIM becomes non-euclidean. We find that adaptive gradient ascent performs superior compared to the others methods as the first training iterations can leverage the euclidean quantum geometry to provide a substantial speed up. In Fig. 2d, we compare training with } \theta_r \text{ as initial parameter against training with random initial parameters } \theta_{\text{rand}} \in [0, 2\pi]. \text{ We find that training starting with random parameters with non-euclidean quantum geometry performs worse for all investigated optimization methods compared to training with the euclidean quantum geometry.}
\]

Now, we demonstrate our quantum metrology protocol. In Fig. 3 we show the relative root mean square error (RMSE) to estimate the M-dimensional parameter vector } \Delta \theta \text{ of the NPQC. We show in Fig. 3a that the error decreases with increasing number of measurement samples } n, \text{ reaching eventually a constant error. The error decreases when the parameter } |\Delta \theta| \text{ to be estimated becomes smaller and we observed that our protocol in the limit of small } |\Delta \theta|. \text{ In Fig. 3b, we show that for finite number of measurements } n \text{ the error decreases to nearly zero with decreasing norm } |\Delta \theta| \text{ of the parameter vector to be estimated. For finite } n, \text{ we observe that for small } |\Delta \theta| \text{ the error increases as the probability of measuring a non-zero state decreases (see Eq. (8)) and there is sweet spot where the relative error is minimal.}

\[
\text{FIG. 2. a) Average infidelity } \langle \Delta K_i(\theta'_i) \rangle \text{ after one iteration of gradient ascent with adaptive learning rates. The initial parameters of the NPQC are random } \theta_{\text{rand}} \in [0, 2\pi]\text{ (} \mathcal{F}(\theta_{\text{rand}}) \neq I\text{, blue curve) or the reference parameter } \theta._i \text{ (} \mathcal{F}(\theta._i) = I\text{, orange and green curves). We show } \langle \Delta K_i(\theta'_i) \rangle \text{ against initial infidelity } \Delta K_i(\theta). \text{ Dashed lines are fits with } \Delta K_i(\theta'_i) = -c \log^\nu[1 - \Delta K_i(\theta)], \text{ with } \nu = 1 \text{ for } \theta_{\text{rand}} \text{ and } \nu = 2 \text{ for } \theta._i. \text{ The scaling factors of the fits are } c = [6 \cdot 10^{-2}, 4.7 \cdot 10^{-3}, 2.7 \cdot 10^{-3}] \text{ and number of qubits } N = 10. \text{ b) Average infidelity after one iteration of gradient ascent } \langle \Delta K_i(\theta'_i) \rangle \text{ plotted against number of qubits } N \text{ for varying infidelity before the step } \Delta K_i(\theta). \text{ Number of layers is } p = 10 \text{ and data averaged over 50 random instances. c) Training NPQC with initial parameter } \theta._i \text{ and initial infidelity } \Delta K_i(\theta._i) = 0.9. \text{ Shaded area is standard deviation of infidelity over 50 random instances of the target state. We compare adaptive gradient ascent (A-G, adaptive learning rates for first 3 iterations, then fixed learning rate } \alpha = 0.5), \text{ Adam, LBFGS and standard gradient ascent (S-G, learning rate } \alpha = 1). \text{ d) Compare training starting with reference parameter } \theta._i \text{ against random parameter } \theta_{\text{rand}} \in [0, 2\pi] \text{ with } \Delta K_i(\theta_{\text{rand}}) = 0.9.
\]

\[
\text{FIG. 3. a) Estimating parameter } \Delta \theta \text{ by sampling from NPQC } |\psi(\theta_r + \Delta \theta)\rangle. \text{ We plot the root mean square error } \text{RMSE}(\Delta \theta) = \sqrt{\langle (\Delta \theta - \Delta \theta)^2 \rangle} \text{ of the estimated parameter } \Delta \theta \text{ normalized by the average parameter } \langle \Delta \theta \rangle \text{ as a function of the number of measurement samples } n. \text{ We compare different numbers of parameters } M \text{ and norms of parameter vector } |\Delta \theta|. \text{ Data is averaged over 10 random instances of parameter } \Delta \theta \text{ for } N = 8. \text{ b) Estimation error as a function of norm of parameter vector } |\Delta \theta| \text{ for different } M \text{ and } n.
\]

\text{Discussion} — We introduced the NPQC which features a euclidean quantum geometry with QFIM } \mathcal{F}(\theta._i) = I \text{ close to the reference parameter } \theta._i. \text{ The reference state } |\psi(\theta._i)\rangle \text{ for parameter } \theta._i \text{ is completely general and can be any arbitrary quantum state while retaining its euclidean quantum geometry. We show a hardware efficient construction of the NPQC for } M \text{ parameters which requires only single qubit rotations and } (M - 2N)/2 \text{ CPHASE gates, which can be immediately implemented on current NISQ hardware.}

\text{For VQAs, the initial training with the NPQC is vastly sped up as the gradient is by default the QNG [24] and we can use adaptive learning rates for free [23]. Train-}
ing with a euclidean geometry follows an improved scaling law compared to training with a non-euclidean geometry. For the first training iteration, the infidelity with the target state decreases for increasing number of qubits. While we were only able to study up to \( N = 24 \) qubits, we expect further improvements for more qubits which could be realized in current NISQ computers \[41\]. The NPQC could also improve the runtime of variational quantum simulation algorithms that require knowledge of the QFIM \[42, 43\]. When using these algorithms to study the short-time dynamics, which is close to the initial state, the QFIM is approximately the identity and we can remove the resource-heavy measurement of the QFIM from the algorithm \[32\].

We showed that NPQCs are accurate and practical multi-parameter quantum sensors. For a general class of circuits, NPQCs have the minimal quantum Cramér-Rao bound, which is the lower bound of the estimation error in quantum metrology \[27\]. In general, it is a major challenge to find practical measurement settings that are able to estimate all parameters at the same time, as the POVMs often do not commute or are not feasible to be implemented \[21, 28\]. We demonstrated a protocol that estimates the absolute values of \( M \) parameter entries \( \Delta \theta \) by sampling in the computational basis. The sampling can be easily done on NISQ devices and trivially commutes, allowing us to estimate all parameters in parallel. Our approach works for any number \( N \) of qubits and an extensive number \( M \) of parameters, where we can estimate \( M = \frac{N}{2}(p+1) \) parameters for \( p \) layers of entangling gates. We derived our protocol by employing a first order approximation of the parameter \( \Delta \theta \). Our protocol becomes more accurate for small \( \Delta \theta \), however one could derive higher order terms to improve the accuracy further. In a NISQ setting, our parameter estimation protocol can be immediately applied in atomic \[44, 45\] or superconducting setups \[41\]. The NPQC could sense an external perturbation that varies in time and space such as a magnetic field. The field induces a change in the parameters of the parameterized single qubit rotations. The parameters \( \theta_{l}^{(t)} \) of layer \( l \) provide a snapshot of the field present at time \( t_{l} \). If the field varies across different qubits, we can read out the spatial variation of the field from the parameters corresponding to each qubit. As further application, one could determine calibration errors in parameterized quantum gates \[46\] or combine the protocol with error correction \[47\].

NPQCs are not limited to improving VQAs and metrology, but could be useful in other applications via its euclidean geometry. For example, one can generate tailored superposition states \( |\psi(\theta_{s})\rangle = \gamma_{s}|\psi(\theta_{s})\rangle + \gamma_{l}|\psi(\theta_{l})\rangle + \gamma_{\perp}|\psi_{\perp}\rangle \) which are composed of reference state \( |\psi(\theta_{s})\rangle \), target state \( |\psi(\theta_{l})\rangle \) and a state \( |\psi_{\perp}\rangle \) which is orthogonal to both. First, one chooses the desired fidelities of the superposition state with the reference state \( K_{s} = |\langle \psi(\theta_{s}) | \psi_{s} \rangle |^{2} \) and target state \( K_{l} = |\langle \psi(\theta_{l}) | \psi_{l} \rangle |^{2} \). Then, one can immediately calculate the parameters for the corresponding superposition state \( \theta_{l} \) (see Supplemental materials). The power to create superposition states could help to prepare basis states for quantum assisted algorithms \[48–51\] or become an ingredient to implement algorithms based on linear combination of unitaries on NISQ quantum computers \[52, 53\].

Python code for the numerical calculations are available at \[54\].
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Fidelity and variance of NPQC

We define the fidelity $K_t(\theta) = |\langle \psi_t|\psi(\theta)\rangle|^2$ of quantum state $|\psi(\theta)\rangle$ in respect to the target state $|\psi(\theta_t)\rangle$. For small enough parameter distances $\Delta \theta = \theta - \theta_t$ the fidelity is approximately described by a Gaussian [23]

$$K(\theta, \theta') = |\langle \psi(\theta)|\psi(\theta')\rangle|^2 \approx \exp[-\frac{1}{4} \frac{\Delta \theta^T M \Delta \theta}{2}].$$

Further, the variance of the gradient is approximated by

$$\text{var}(\Delta \theta) \approx \frac{1}{M \text{Tr}(M)} \frac{2}{K(\theta)} \log \left[ \frac{K_0}{K(\theta)} \right],$$

where the average is taken over distance $\Delta t = \theta - \theta_t$ and then over the gradient indices $k$. We define $K_0 = \max_\theta |\langle \psi(\theta)|\psi_t\rangle|^2$ as the maximal possible fidelity for the NPQC. For parameter $\theta_t$, the QFIM is given by $F(\theta_t) = I$, resulting in simple expressions for fidelity and variance of the gradient respectively.

We now show numerical evidence for the Gaussian form of the fidelity of NPQCs. We show the fidelity as a function of distance between the reference parameter $\theta_r$ and arbitrarily chosen target parameters $\theta_s$, $|\Delta \theta_r,s|^2 = (\theta_r - \theta_s)^2$ in Fig.4a. We observe that the data is fitted well with Eq. (9) for small distances. For larger distances, it becomes constant and reaches the fidelity $\frac{1}{2\pi}$ of Haar random quantum states. The variance of gradient is shown in Fig.4b against $|\Delta \theta_r,s|^2$. We indeed find a good fit with Eq. (10). We find that the accuracy of the formulas improve with increasing number of qubits.

Generating superposition states

The NPQC can generate superposition states of the reference state $|\psi(\theta_t)\rangle$ and a given target state $|\psi(\theta_s)\rangle$ with target parameters $\theta_s$, as shown in Fig.1c. We want to find the parameters $\theta_r$ for the superposition state $|\psi_s\rangle = |\psi(\theta_s)\rangle = \gamma_r |\psi(\theta_t)\rangle + \gamma_t |\psi(\theta_s)\rangle + \gamma_l |\psi(\theta_l)\rangle,$

where $|\psi(\theta_l)\rangle$ orthogonal to both reference and target states. Now, the NPQC can generate superposition states $|\psi_s\rangle$ with tailored fidelities with the reference state $K_{r,s} = |\langle \psi(\theta_s)|\psi(\theta_s)\rangle|^2$ and the target state $K_{t,s} = |\langle \psi(\theta_s)|\psi(\theta_s)\rangle|^2$ to our choosing. We define $\Delta \theta_{r,s} = \theta_s - \theta_r$.
as the difference between the parameters of the superposition state and target state, as well as \( \Delta \theta_{r,t} = \theta_t - \theta_r \) as the difference between the parameters of the target and reference state. We assume that the QFIM \( \mathbf{F} = I \). Using (Eq. Eq. (9), [23]), we calculate the relation between fidelity and parameter distance for the reference and superposition state

\[
|\Delta \theta_{r,s}|^2 = -4 \log(\mathbf{F}_{r,s}). \tag{12}
\]

For the target state and superposition state, we have

\[
K_{t,s} = e^{-\frac{1}{2} \theta_t - \theta_s} = e^{-\frac{1}{2} |\Delta \theta_{r,s} - \theta_r|}^2
= e^{-\frac{1}{2}(|\Delta \theta_{r,s}|^2 + |\theta_r|^2 - 2|\theta_r|\cos(\Delta \theta_{r,s}, \Delta \theta_{r,t}))
= K_{r,s} e^{-\frac{1}{2}(|\theta_r|^2 - 4 - \log(K_{r,s}) |\theta_r| \cos(\Delta \theta_{r,s}, \Delta \theta_{r,t}))},
\]

where \( \angle(\Delta \theta_{r,s}, \Delta \theta_{r,t}) \) is the angle between the two parameter vectors. By rearranging the equation and taking the logarithm, we finally get

\[
\cos[\angle(\Delta \theta_{r,s}, \Delta \theta_{r,t})] = \frac{4 \log(K_{r,s}) + |\Delta \theta_{r,t}|^2}{4 |\Delta \theta_{r,t}| \sqrt{-\log(K_{r,s})}}. \tag{13}
\]

A solution exists when the absolute value of the right hand side of Eq. (13) is less or equal 1. The boundary of the solution space is given by

\[
K_{t,s} = K_{r,s} \exp(\pm |\Delta \theta_{r,t}| \sqrt{-\log(K_{r,s})} - \frac{1}{4} |\Delta \theta_{r,t}|^2), \tag{14}
\]

We define the error between desired and actual superposition state

\[
\Delta C = |K_{r,s} - K'_{r,s}| + |K_{t,s} - K'_{t,s}|, \tag{15}
\]

where \( K'_{r,s} \) and \( K'_{t,s} \) are the actual fidelities measured with reference and target state respectively, and \( \Delta C = 0 \) corresponds to perfect creation of the desired superposition state.

Now, we investigate generating superposition states with the NPQC. The superposition state \( |\psi_\lambda\rangle \) is a linear combination of reference state \( |\psi(\theta_r)\rangle \) and random target state \( |\psi(\theta_t)\rangle \) with infidelity between target and reference state \( \Delta K_1(\theta_t) \). We randomly choose a desired fidelity \( K_{t,s} \) between target and superposition state, and fidelity \( K_{r,s} \) between reference and superposition state. Then, we calculate the parameters \( \theta_s \) of the superposition state using Eq. (13) and generate the state using the NPQC. In Fig. 5a, we plot the error of the superposition states \( \Delta C \) for different \( K_{t,s} \) and \( K_{r,s} \). The dashed line shows the boundary of possible superposition states (see Supplemental materials). In Fig. 5b, we show \( \cos[\angle(\Delta \theta_{r,s}, \Delta \theta_{r,t})] \) as a function of the fidelities \( K_{t,s} \) and \( K_{r,s} \). In Fig. 5c, we find that the error \( \Delta C \) decreases with number of parameters \( M \) of the NPQC and increases with \( \Delta K_1(\theta_t) \).

**Gradient update**

The optimal adaptive learning rates for gradient ascent [23] can be derived by using that the fidelity is approximately Gaussian for PQCs. These adaptive learning rates tremendously speed up the gradient ascent algorithm.

The goal is to optimise \( \theta_t = \arg\max_\theta |\langle\psi(\theta)|\psi_\lambda\rangle|^2 \) for a given target state \( |\psi_\lambda\rangle \). Initially, we assume \( \max_\theta |\langle\psi(\theta)|\psi_\lambda\rangle|^2 = K_0 = 1 \), which means that the PQC is able to represent the state. We relax this condition \( K_0 < 1 \) further below. For an initial parameter \( \theta_t \) we get a fidelity \( K_t(\theta) \). The gradient ascent algorithm has the update rule for the new parameter \( \theta_t \)

\[
\theta_t = \theta_t + \alpha_1 \nabla K_t(\theta_t), \tag{16}
\]

with the learning rate \( \alpha_1 \). As we show in Eq. (9), the fidelity follows a Gaussian kernel. We use this to choose \( \alpha_1 \) such that it is as close as possible to the optimal solution \( \theta_t \approx \theta_t \). We have

\[
K_t(\theta) = e^{-\frac{1}{2} \Delta \theta^T \mathbf{F}(\theta) \Delta \theta}. \tag{17}
\]

where we define the distance between target parameter and initial parameter \( \Delta \theta = \theta_t - \theta_t \). By applying the logarithm we get

\[
-4 \log(K_t(\theta)) = \Delta \theta^T \mathbf{F}(\theta) \Delta \theta. \tag{18}
\]

Reordering Eq. (16) yields

\[
\Delta \theta = \alpha_1 \nabla K_t(\theta_t) \tag{19}
\]

Then, we multiply both sides with \( \mathbf{F}^{\frac{1}{2}}(\theta) \)

\[
\mathbf{F}^{\frac{1}{2}}(\theta) \Delta \theta = \alpha_1 \mathbf{F}^{\frac{1}{2}}(\theta) \nabla K_t(\theta_t), \tag{20}
\]

followed by taking square

\[
\Delta \theta^T \mathbf{F}(\theta) \Delta \theta = \alpha_1^2 \nabla K_t(\theta_t)^T \mathbf{F}(\theta) \nabla K_t(\theta_t). \tag{21}
\]
Here, we used $|\mathcal{F}^T \mu|^2 = \mu^T \mathcal{F} \mu$. We insert Eq. (18) and yield

$$\alpha_1 = \frac{2\sqrt{-\log(K_t(\theta))}}{\sqrt{\nabla K_t(\theta)^T \mathcal{F}(\theta) \nabla K_t(\theta)}},$$

with the initial update rule

$$\theta_1 = \theta + \alpha_1 \nabla K_t(\theta).$$

Note we assumed that the PQC is able to represent the reference and superposition parameters, and reference and target parameters $\cos(\theta, r, s)$.

The target state is defined as

$$|\psi_t\rangle = \sqrt{K_0} |\psi(\theta_t)\rangle + \sqrt{1-K_0} |\psi_o\rangle,$$

where $|\psi_o\rangle$ is a state orthogonal to any other state that can be represented by the PQC, i.e. $|\langle \psi_o | \psi(\theta) \rangle|^2 = 0 \; \forall \theta$ and $K_0$ is the maximal fidelity for the target state possible with the PQC. Then, we find that the initial update rule as defined above is moving in the correct direction, however it overshoots the target parameters. We take this into account via

$$K_t(\theta) = K_0 e^{-\frac{1}{2} \Delta \theta^T \mathcal{F}(\theta) \Delta \theta},$$

where $K_t(\theta)$ is the fidelity after applying the initial update rule. The corrected update rule takes the form

$$\theta_t = \theta + \alpha_t \nabla K_t(\theta),$$

with final learning rate $\alpha_t$. By subtracting our two update rules we yield

$$\theta_1 - \theta_t = (\alpha_1 - \alpha_t) \nabla K_t(\theta).$$

We insert above equations into our fidelities

$$K_t(\theta) = K_0 e^{-\frac{1}{2} \nabla K_t^T \mathcal{F} \nabla K_t},$$

$$K_t(\theta_1) = K_0 e^{-\frac{1}{2} (\theta_1 - \theta_t)^T \mathcal{F}(\theta) (\theta_1 - \theta_t)}.$$
nearly constant level around $p \approx 5$ for any $N$ we investigated. Further increase of $p$ yields either a further relatively smaller increase (for $\Delta K_l(\theta_l) > \xi(N)$) or decrease in $\Delta K_l(\theta_l')$ (for $\Delta K_l(\theta_l) < \xi(N)$), where we numerically find $\xi(10) \approx 0.5$ and $\xi(16) \approx 0.9$.
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**FIG. 6.** a) We show average infidelity after optimization $\langle \Delta K_l(\theta_l) \rangle$ averaged over 50 random instances against number of layers $p$ for $N = 10$ qubits. b) We show infidelity for different initial infidelities $\Delta K_l(\theta_l)$ for $N = 16$ qubits. c) We show infidelity for different number of qubits $N$ for initial infidelity $\Delta K_l(\theta_l) = 0.9$.

**Further training data**

In Fig.7 we show further data on training NPQCs. In Fig.7a, we discuss the infidelity as a function of the learning rate $\lambda$ of gradient ascent. We find that the adaptive learning rate $\alpha_t$ (Eq. (31)) describes the best possible choice of learning rate. In Fig.7b, we show the training starting with $\theta_t$ for a target state with various initial infidelities $\Delta K_l(\theta_l)$.

**Multi-parameter estimation with PQC**

We assume a general class of PQCs composed of arbitrary unitaries and Pauli rotations. We have $|\psi(\theta)\rangle = U(\theta)|0\rangle = \prod_{l=1}^M U_l(\theta_l)|0\rangle$ given by $M$ layers and $M$-dimensional parameter vector $\theta$. The unitary at layer $l$ is given by $U_l(\theta_l) = R_l(\theta_l)W_l$ with a constant $N$-qubit unitary $W_l$ and a parameterized unitary $R_l(\theta_l) = \exp(-i\frac{\theta_l}{2}P_l)$, with parameter $\theta_l$ and Pauli string $P_l = \otimes_{k=1}^N \sigma_k$, where $\sigma \in \{\sigma_x, \sigma_y, \sigma_z, I\}$ is a Pauli matrix or the identity. The NPQC belongs to this class of PQC as well as commonly used hardware efficient PQCs.

The quantum Fisher information metric $\mathcal{F}$ is a $M$ dimensional positive semidefinite matrix given by $\mathcal{F}_{ij}(\theta) = 4\langle \partial_i|\psi(\theta)\rangle\langle \partial_j|\psi(\theta)\rangle - \langle \partial_i|\psi(\theta)\rangle\langle \partial_j|\psi(\theta)\rangle$, where $\partial_j|\psi(\theta)\rangle$ is the gradient in respect to parameter $j$.

The quantum Fisher information metric (via the quantum Cramér-Rao bound) sets a lower bound on the error made when using a quantum system as a sensor [21].

**Theorem 1.** For above defined class of PQCs, the minimal possible mean squared error for the unbiased estimator $\theta$ is given by

$$MSE(\theta) \geq \frac{1}{n} \text{Tr}[\mathcal{F}^{-1}(\theta)] \geq \frac{Q_{\text{min}}}{n} = \frac{M}{n}$$

where $n$ is the number of measurements performed and $Q_{\text{min}} = M$.

The NPQC assumes this lower bound as $\text{Tr}[\mathcal{F}^{-1}(\theta)] = M$, making the NPQC one of the optimal sensors within above defined class of PQCs.

**Proof.** We now proceed to proof Theorem 1. The derivative acting on the unitary in layer $l$ is given by $\partial_l U_l = \delta_l (-i\frac{\theta_l}{2} P_l) U_l$, where $\delta_l$ is the Kronecker delta. We define $U_{[l_1,l_2]} = U_{l_2} \ldots U_{l_1}$, with $l_2 \geq l_1$ and $|\psi_i\rangle = U_{[1]}|0\rangle$.

With this notation, we find $\langle \partial_l |\psi\rangle = U_{[l_1+1:M]}(\partial_l U_l) U_{[l_1-1]}|0\rangle = U_{[l_1+1:M]}(-i\frac{\theta_l}{2} P_l) U_{[l_1-1]}|0\rangle = U_{[l_1+1:M]}(-i\frac{\theta_l}{2} P_l) U_{[l_1]}|0\rangle$.

We can now compute $\langle \partial_l \psi|\partial_l \psi\rangle = \frac{1}{2}$ due to $P_l^2 = I$ and $\langle \psi|\partial_l \psi\rangle = -i\frac{1}{2}\langle \psi|P_l|\psi\rangle$. The diagonal terms of the quantum Fisher information metric are then given by

$$\mathcal{F}_{ii} = \text{Tr}[\partial_l |\psi\rangle\langle \partial_l |\psi\rangle] = |\langle \psi|P_l|\psi\rangle|^2.$$  

Due to the eigenvalues of $P_l$ being $\pm 1$, we have $0 \leq |\langle \psi|P_l|\psi\rangle|^2 \leq 1$. Thus, the diagonal entries $\mathcal{F}_{ii}$ are
within $0 \leq F_{ii} \leq 1$ and the trace of $F$ is upper bounded by

$$\text{Tr}(F) = \sum_{i=1}^{M} F_{ii} \leq M.$$  \hfill (36)

By combining Eq. (36) and Lemma 2, Eq. (34) follows immediately.

**Lemma 2.** Given a positive semidefinite matrix $\mathcal{A}$ with dimension $M \times M$, $M \in \mathbb{N}$, the trace of the inverse matrix $\mathcal{A}^{-1}$ is lower bounded by $\text{Tr}(\mathcal{A}^{-1}) \geq \frac{M^2}{\text{Tr}(\mathcal{A})}$.

**Proof.** For a sequence of numbers $x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_M$ with $x_n \geq 0$, the arithmetic mean is always larger than harmonic mean

$$\frac{1}{M} \sum_{n=1}^{M} x_n \geq \frac{M}{\sum_{n=1}^{M} \frac{1}{x_n}},$$  \hfill (37)

which is known from the relations of the Pythagorean means. A simple calculation shows

$$\sum_{n=1}^{M} \frac{1}{x_n} \geq \frac{M^2}{\sum_{n=1}^{M} x_n}.$$  \hfill (38)

The positive semidefinite matrix $\mathcal{A}$ has only non-negative eigenvalues $\lambda_n \geq 0$. The trace is given by

$$\text{Tr}(\mathcal{A}) = \sum_{n=1}^{M} \lambda_n.$$  \hfill (39)

and accordingly for the inverse

$$\text{Tr}(\mathcal{A}^{-1}) = \sum_{n=1}^{M} \frac{1}{\lambda_n}.$$  \hfill (40)

Using Eq. (38), we can immediately show

$$\text{Tr}(\mathcal{A}^{-1}) \geq \frac{M^2}{\text{Tr}(\mathcal{A})},$$  \hfill (41)

Using Eq. (41) and Eq. (36), we find

$$\text{Tr}(\mathcal{F}^{-1}) \geq \frac{M^2}{\text{Tr}(\mathcal{F})} \geq M,$$  \hfill (42)

which we insert in Eq. (34).

**Note on extending the NPQC**

While our construction of NPQC can generate an exponential number of parameters, it does not cover the full Hilbert space. However, we note that it is possible to get NPQCs with $2^{N+1} - 2$ parameters that exactly cover all possible quantum states, however this requires an implementation with lower efficiency where in each layer there are less than $N$ parameters.