

Quantum Signal Processing (QSP) for simulating cold plasma waves

I. Novikau,¹ E. A. Startsev,¹ and I. Y. Dodin^{1,2}

¹*Princeton Plasma Physics Laboratory, Princeton, New Jersey 08543, USA*

²*Department of Astrophysical Sciences, Princeton University, Princeton, New Jersey 08544, USA*

(*Electronic mail: inovikau@pppl.gov)

(Dated: 16 December 2021)

Numerical modeling of radio-frequency waves in plasma with sufficiently high spatial and temporal resolution remains challenging even with modern computers. However, such simulations can be sped up using quantum computers in the future. Here, we propose how to do such modeling for cold plasma waves, in particular, for an X wave propagating in an inhomogeneous one-dimensional plasma. The wave system is represented in the form of a vector Schrödinger equation with a Hermitian Hamiltonian. Block-encoding is used to represent the Hamiltonian through unitary operations that can be implemented on a quantum computer. To perform the modeling, we apply the so-called Quantum Signal Processing algorithm and construct the corresponding circuit. Quantum simulations with this circuit are emulated on a classical computer, and the results show agreement with traditional classical calculations. We also discuss how our quantum circuit scales with the resolution.

I. INTRODUCTION

Radio-frequency (RF) waves are widely used in experiments with magnetically confined fusion plasmas. At low power, these waves can serve as a diagnostic tool¹. At high power, they can help control fusion plasmas through RF heating^{2,3} and also current drive¹, which is mainly done with lower-hybrid⁴ and electron-cyclotron waves⁵ and can also help suppress instabilities^{6,7}. Many of these RF techniques are practiced on existing fusion devices^{8,9}, and current drive in particular is now envisioned to play a large role for achieving steady-state operation and for suppressing instabilities in future devices^{10–13}.

Many RF codes have been developed in the last decades to facilitate these applications. However, precise simulations of certain RF processes, such as the energy deposition of waves at high-order cyclotron resonances¹⁴, mode conversion¹⁵, and even basic electron-cyclotron waves¹⁶ often require significant computational resources that remain beyond the reach of modern computers^{17,18}, especially for three-dimensional simulations. *Quantum Computing* (QC) may be a solution to this problem. In particular, fluid linear RF problems are good candidates for the application of QC as discussed in Ref. 19.

In this work, we consider only the circuit model of quantum computation, where information is stored in a set of n_q quantum bits called *qubits*^{20,21}. Being entangled, the qubits create a configuration space described by a 2^{n_q} -dimensional complex vector, and such an exponential scaling with n_q can be beneficial in large-dimensional problems. A quantum circuit consists of a sequence of so-called *gates*. Some of the gates operate in parallel, and the longest path between the input and output points of the circuit is called *circuit depth*, which is roughly proportional to the runtime²². A gate that acts on m_q qubits can be represented by a $2^{m_q} \times 2^{m_q}$ unitary matrix, while the whole quantum circuit is described by a $2^{n_q} \times 2^{n_q}$ unitary matrix U . This matrix is applied to an initial state $\psi(0)$, generating an output state $\psi(t) = U\psi(0)$, from which classical information is then extracted via a classical measurement. In particular, in this paper we focus on

Quantum Hamiltonian Simulations (QHS) of systems with Hermitian Hamiltonians \mathcal{H} that are independent of time t ; then, $U = \exp(-i\mathcal{H}t)$.

In recent years, there has been a significant development of QC applications to physics problems, including simulations of classical systems. Various methods have been proposed to solve the wave equation²³, Poisson's equation^{24,25}, Maxwell's equations^{26,27}, and first-order linear hyperbolic systems²⁸, the Navier–Stokes equation^{29,30}, the Boltzmann equation³¹, and to simulate advection–diffusion processes³². It was also shown that most of quantum algorithms can be considered as special cases of a more general algorithm called Quantum Singular Value Transform³³. This technique is based on the so-called *Quantum Signal Processing* (QSP) paradigm, which was originally developed for efficient QHS^{34,35}. The essence of the QSP is in encoding polynomials of given matrices into sequences of rotations. In the QHS in particular, the QSP searches for a polynomial to approximate the exponential function of the system Hamiltonian, which is *block-encoded* into an auxiliary unitary. This state-of-the-art quantum method is now extensively studied in the QC community^{36–40} and holds promise as a universal numerical framework applicable to any linear Hamiltonian problem. For instance, it was recently applied to plasma zero-dimensional kinetic simulations⁴¹.

Here, we show that QSP can be constructed efficiently for QHS of cold-plasma waves and present a working algorithm. We implement the QSP using QuEST computing toolkit⁴². Specifically, we model X-wave propagation in a one-dimensional electron plasma with an inhomogeneous static magnetic field and inhomogeneous density. The corresponding quantum simulations are emulated on a classical computer and show agreement with classical simulations of the same problem. We discuss how the resulting QSP quantum circuit scales if one modifies the grid resolution, the precision of the QSP approximation and the simulated time interval.

Our paper is organized as follows. In Sec. II, we discuss cold-wave dynamics within an electron-fluid model and present its Schrödinger form. In Sec. III, we construct the

corresponding one-dimensional model and derive the Hamiltonian that is used later in our QHS. It is also shown in Sec. III how to encode the resulting plasma system into a quantum circuit and how to initialize the circuit. The QSP algorithm is explained in Sec. IV, and the block-encoding of the wave Hamiltonian is constructed in Sec. V. The comparison of the QSP to classical simulations and the scaling of the QSP circuit are presented in Sec. VI. Finally, the advantages and challenges of applying QSP to classical plasma problems are discussed in Sec. VII. A reader not familiar with the quantum computing is encouraged to read a brief introduction into the field presented in Appendix A.

II. COLD-PLASMA WAVES

We assume a cold fluid electron plasma with density $n(\mathbf{r})$ immersed into a background magnetic field $\mathbf{B}_0(\mathbf{r})$. Linear waves in such plasma can be described by the following equations:

$$\partial_t \tilde{\mathbf{v}} = -\tilde{\mathbf{v}} \times \mathbf{B}_0 - \tilde{\mathbf{E}}, \quad (1a)$$

$$\partial_t \tilde{\mathbf{E}} = n\tilde{\mathbf{v}} + \nabla \times \tilde{\mathbf{B}}, \quad (1b)$$

$$\partial_t \tilde{\mathbf{B}} = -\nabla \times \tilde{\mathbf{E}}, \quad (1c)$$

where $\tilde{\mathbf{v}}$ is the electron fluid velocity, and $\tilde{\mathbf{E}}$ and $\tilde{\mathbf{B}}$ are the wave electric and magnetic fields, respectively. Time is measured in units of plasma frequency $\omega_{p,0} = \sqrt{4\pi n_0 e^2 m^{-1}}$, where e is the absolute value of the electron charge, m is the electron mass, and n_0 is the maximum value of $n(\mathbf{r})$. The velocity is normalized to the speed of light c , while the fields are normalized to $c\sqrt{4\pi n_0 m}$, and the space coordinate is normalized to $\kappa_x = c\omega_{p,0}^{-1}$.

As shown in Ref. 19, one can also rewrite Eqs. 1 in a form of a Schrödinger equation

$$\frac{\partial |\psi\rangle}{\partial t} = -i\mathcal{H}|\psi\rangle, \quad (2)$$

where $|\psi\rangle = (\sqrt{n}\tilde{\mathbf{v}}, \tilde{\mathbf{E}}, \tilde{\mathbf{B}})$, and \mathcal{H} serves as a time-independent Hamiltonian, which is Hermitian if the system has suitable boundary conditions (periodic or Dirichlet). The corresponding dynamics is described by

$$|\psi(t)\rangle = e^{-i\mathcal{H}t} |\psi(0)\rangle, \quad (3)$$

where $\exp(-i\mathcal{H}t)$ is a unitary operator.

Equations 1 satisfy the Poynting's theorem $\partial_t \int W dV + \int \mathbf{N} \cdot d\mathbf{S} = 0$, where $W = n|\tilde{\mathbf{v}}|^2 + |\tilde{\mathbf{E}}|^2 + |\tilde{\mathbf{B}}|^2$ is the system energy density, and $\mathbf{N} = \tilde{\mathbf{E}} \times \tilde{\mathbf{B}}$ is the Poynting vector. With appropriate boundary conditions (such as the Dirichlet boundary conditions), the integral over the surface \mathbf{S} disappears so the total energy $\int W dV$ is conserved.

The system 1 supports several waves, which are often identified as the O and X waves⁴³. Below, we focus on propagation of the X wave perpendicular to \mathbf{B}_0 . This wave has elliptic field polarization in the (x, y) plane, where the x -axis goes along the gradients of the background field B_0 and density n , and z is directed along \mathbf{B}_0 . It exhibits the so-called *upper-hybrid* (UH) resonance at frequency

$$\omega_{UH} = \sqrt{B_0^2 + n} \quad (4)$$

and the *L cutoff* at frequency

$$\omega_L = \frac{1}{2} \left(B_0 + \sqrt{B_0^2 + 4n} \right), \quad (5)$$

where all units are normalized as specified above (we do not consider R cutoff here⁴³).

III. ONE-DIMENSIONAL MODEL

A. Field configuration

We reduce the equations 1 to a one-dimensional system of size $2r_0$. The corresponding space grid $x \in [-r_0/\kappa_x, r_0/\kappa_x]$ has N_x points. For convenience, we define also a space grid s via

$$s = x/\max(x) \quad (6)$$

to have $s \in [-1, 1]$. Because we focus on X-wave propagation, it is enough for us to keep only $\tilde{v}_x, \tilde{v}_y, \tilde{E}_x, \tilde{E}_y$, and \tilde{B}_z , and we impose the Dirichlet boundary conditions

$$\tilde{E}_y(-r_0) = \tilde{E}_y(r_0) = 0, \quad (7)$$

$$\tilde{B}_z(-r_0) = \tilde{B}_z(r_0) = 0. \quad (8)$$

To mimic the effect of the antenna that launches the wave, we introduce an auxiliary oscillator Q with initial amplitude Q_0 . Coupled to the magnetic field \tilde{B}_z , the oscillator gradually transfers its energy to the X wave, while the energy of the whole system remains constant.

We seek to demonstrate wave tunneling through the L cutoff and localization of the wave energy at the UH resonance. Therefore, the case where the L cutoff and the UH resonance appear close enough to each other is considered. The *Clemmow-Mullaly-Allis* (CMA) diagram⁴³ (Fig. 1a) shows the corresponding wave trajectory in the parameter space (ω_c, ω_p) , where $\omega_c = B_0$ is the electron frequency and $\omega_p = \sqrt{n}$ is the plasma frequency. The X wave is excited by a source placed at the center of the system, where the background density (represented by the plasma frequency) and magnetic field (represented by the cyclotron frequency) are low. Therefore, its trajectory starts at the bottom left corner of the CMA diagram. The wave propagates in both directions. The horizontal black arrow corresponds to the wave propagation toward the *high-density cutoff-resonance pair* (HCR). The X wave is partly reflected at the cutoff, partly tunnels through the narrow forbidden zone (gray area) beyond the cutoff (blue line), and accumulates at the UH resonance (red line), where its wavenumber ends up growing indefinitely. This configuration is of a particular interest since it allows to model the wave behaviour at the resonance, where high resolution of the spatial and time grids is required.

This demonstration can be impeded by wave reflection from the right boundary. To suppress such reflection, supplemental background profiles (Fig. 1b) are introduced, which ensures X-wave trapping inside an additional UH resonance.




FIG. 1: (a): CMA diagram showing $\omega_L(x)$ (blue solid), $\omega_{UH}(x)$ (red solid), and the X-wave frequency ω_a (black dashed) in the parameter space ($\omega_c^2/\omega_a^2, \omega_p^2/\omega_a^2$). Here, HCR is the high-density cutoff–resonance pair; LCR is the low-density cutoff–resonance pair; UHR is the single (without L cutoff) UH resonance. The gray area corresponds to the forbidden zone between the L cutoff and the UH resonance. The black arrows indicate the wave propagation from $s = 0$ to $s < 0$ (horizontal arrow) and from $s = 0$ to $s > 0$ (vertical arrow). (b): the corresponding background density $n(x)$ (solid blue) and magnetic field $B_0(x)$ (red dashed). The peaks in $B_0(x)$ and $n(x)$ at $s > 0$ are added ad hoc to reduce wave reflection from the right boundary. They guarantee the presence of the LCR pair and the UHR in (a). The parameters of the background profiles are specified in Sec. VI. (c): ω_L (solid blue), ω_{UH} (dashed red), and ω_a (dashed black).

More precisely, the additional profiles give rise to a *cutoff–resonance pair at low density* (LCR) and an *isolated UH resonance* (UHR) as shown on the CMA diagram (Fig. 1a). Due to the low density, the LCR pair does not have a forbidden zone. This allows the X wave to traverse the pair without reflection and reach the UHR. Figure 1c indicates the position of the cutoff–resonance pairs in space.

Classical simulations of this system (Figs. 2a-2b) show that the wave behaves in the manner described above, as desired. Specifically, the left-propagating wave reaches the HCR pair (white dashed line), where a part of its energy is reflected from the L cutoff, while the tunneled energy becomes localized at the corresponding UH resonance of the HCR. The right-propagating wave propagates without reflection towards the UHR (red dashed line). By trapping the X wave, the UHR restrains the wave propagation towards the right boundary.

B. Rescaled variables

In terms of the rescaled velocity $\xi = \tilde{v}\sqrt{n}$, our 1-D model can be written explicitly as

$$i\partial_t \xi_x(x,t) = -iB_0(x)\xi_y(x,t) - i\sqrt{n(x)}\tilde{E}_x(x,t), \quad (9a)$$

$$i\partial_t \xi_y(x,t) = iB_0(x)\xi_x(x,t) - i\sqrt{n(x)}\tilde{E}_y(x,t), \quad (9b)$$

$$i\partial_t \tilde{E}_x(x,t) = i\sqrt{n(x)}\xi_x(x,t), \quad (9c)$$

$$i\partial_t \tilde{E}_y(x,t) = i\sqrt{n(x)}\xi_y(x,t) - i\partial_x \tilde{B}_z(x,t), \quad (9d)$$

$$i\partial_t \tilde{B}_z(x \neq x_q, t) = -i\partial_x \tilde{E}_y(x \neq x_q, t), \quad (9e)$$

$$i\partial_t \tilde{B}_z(x_q, t) = -i\partial_x \tilde{E}_y(x_q, t) - \beta Q(x_q, t), \quad (9f)$$

$$i\partial_t Q(x_q, t) = -\omega_a Q(x_q, t) - \beta \tilde{B}_z(x_q, t), \quad (9g)$$

$$Q(x_{q_1}, 0) = Q(x_{q_2}, 0) = Q_0, \quad (9h)$$

where the source Q with a constant frequency ω_a is coupled to the magnetic field \tilde{B}_z using an ad hoc coupling coefficient β . The 1-D model can be rewritten in the Hamiltonian form (Eq. 2) with

$$\psi = (\xi_x, \xi_y, \tilde{E}_x, \tilde{E}_y, \tilde{B}_z, Q)^\top, \quad (10)$$

where \top denotes transposition. The energy density is represented now as

$$W_{\text{tot}} = \psi \psi^\dagger = W_v + W_{eb} + W_q, \quad (11a)$$

$$W_v = |\xi_x|^2 + |\xi_y|^2, \quad (11b)$$

$$W_{eb} = |\tilde{E}_x|^2 + |\tilde{E}_y|^2 + |\tilde{B}_z|^2, \quad (11c)$$

$$W_q = |Q|^2. \quad (11d)$$

C. Discretization

The x -axis is represented by $N_x = 2^{n_x}$ points with a step h (Fig. 3). Equations 9 are discretized in space using the central differencing scheme. The boundary conditions for the velocity are

$$i\partial_t \xi_{y,0} = iB_{0,0}\xi_{x,0}, \quad (12a)$$

$$i\partial_t \xi_{y,N_x-1} = iB_{0,N_x-1}\xi_{x,N_x-1}, \quad (12b)$$

for the wave electric field they are

$$i\partial_t \tilde{E}_{y,0} = 0, \quad (13a)$$

$$i\partial_t \tilde{E}_{y,1} = i\sqrt{n_1}\xi_{y,1} - \frac{i}{2h}\tilde{B}_{z,2}, \quad (13b)$$

$$i\partial_t \tilde{E}_{y,N_x-2} = i\sqrt{n_{N_x-2}}\xi_{y,N_x-2} + \frac{i}{2h}\tilde{B}_{z,N_x-3}, \quad (13c)$$

$$i\partial_t \tilde{E}_{y,N_x-1} = 0, \quad (13d)$$




FIG. 2: Classical simulation: dynamics of kinetic energy W_v (a) and magnetic energy W_b (b) in space and time. The input parameters are described in Sec. VI. The white line indicates the HCR pair; the red line indicates the UHR; the green line indicates the LCR pair (Fig. 1a). The left-propagating wave reaches the HCR pair, partially reflects from it and partially tunnels to the UH resonance. The right-propagating wave is trapped within the UHR, and only a small part of its energy reaches the right boundary.

and for the magnetic field they are

$$i\partial_t \tilde{B}_{z,0} = 0, \quad (14a)$$

$$i\partial_t \tilde{B}_{z,1} = -\frac{i}{2h} \tilde{E}_{y,2}, \quad (14b)$$

$$i\partial_t \tilde{B}_{z,N_x-2} = \frac{i}{2h} \tilde{E}_{y,N_x-3}, \quad (14c)$$

$$i\partial_t \tilde{B}_{z,N_x-1} = 0. \quad (14d)$$




FIG. 3: One-dimensional space grid $x \in [-r_0/\kappa_x, r_0/\kappa_x]$ has N_x points numerated by index j , starting with $j = 0$. The source Q is placed at points x_{q_1} and x_{q_2} that correspond to the indices j_{q_1} and j_{q_2} .

Since the source Q interacts with the wave magnetic field only at the center of the system (Eqs. 9f-9g, Fig. 3), it does not enter the boundary conditions. The corresponding Hamiltonian can be expressed as

$$\mathcal{H} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -iB_0 & -i\sqrt{n} & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ iB_0 & 0 & 0 & -i\sqrt{n}\varepsilon & 0 & 0 \\ i\sqrt{n} & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & i\sqrt{n}\varepsilon & 0 & 0 & M_h & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & M_h & 0 & M_\beta \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & M_\beta & M_{\omega_a} \end{pmatrix}. \quad (15)$$

Here, $\varepsilon = \text{diag}(0, 1, \dots, 1, 0)$, M_h is the matrix representation of the operator δ_x :

$$M_h = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \dots \\ 0 & 0 & -\frac{i}{2h} & 0 & \dots \\ 0 & \frac{i}{2h} & 0 & -\frac{i}{2h} & \dots \\ \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots \\ \dots & \frac{i}{2h} & 0 & -\frac{i}{2h} & 0 \\ \dots & 0 & \frac{i}{2h} & 0 & 0 \\ \dots & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (16)$$

The matrix M_β describes the source-wave coupling

$$M_\beta = \begin{pmatrix} \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots \\ \dots & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \dots \\ \dots & 0 & -\beta & 0 & 0 & \dots \\ \dots & 0 & 0 & -\beta & 0 & \dots \\ \dots & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \dots \\ \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots \end{pmatrix}, \quad (17)$$

while M_{ω_a} encodes the source frequency:

$$M_{\omega_a} = \begin{pmatrix} \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots \\ \dots & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \dots \\ \dots & 0 & -\omega_a & 0 & 0 & \dots \\ \dots & 0 & 0 & -\omega_a & 0 & \dots \\ \dots & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \dots \\ \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots \end{pmatrix}. \quad (18)$$

Here, B_0 is a diagonal $N_x \times N_x$ matrix with values of the background magnetic field on the diagonal. The matrix that encodes $\sqrt{n(x)}$ has the same form. The coefficients β and ω_a are placed at the diagonal elements (j_{q_1}, j_{q_1}) and (j_{q_2}, j_{q_2}) of the matrices M_β and M_{ω_a} . Finally, the values $i/2h$ are shifted by $+1$ and -1 with respect to the diagonal of the matrix M_h .

D. Quantum encoding of plasma signals

To encode our discretized system into a quantum circuit, we map ψ on two registers: $|d\rangle$ and $|j\rangle$. The register $|j\rangle$ has $n_x = \log_2 N_x$ qubits and stores the space dependence of every variable. That is, $|j\rangle$ contains the binary representation of the spatial-point indices in the x -grid. The register $|d\rangle$ encodes the variable index:

$$d = 0 \longleftrightarrow \xi_x, \quad (19a)$$

$$d = 1 \longleftrightarrow \xi_y, \quad (19b)$$

$$d = 2 \longleftrightarrow \tilde{E}_x \quad (19c)$$




FIG. 4: An example of the quantum-state initialization in a system with $n_x = 4$, where the source Q , which is stored in $|5\rangle_d \equiv |101\rangle_d$, is placed at x points with $j_q = 10$ and 11.

etc. Since we have six independent fields in ψ , the register $|d\rangle$ must have at least three qubits. Then,

$$\psi = A_{d,j} |d\rangle |j\rangle \equiv A_{d,j} |d_2 d_1 d_0\rangle_d |j_{n_x-1} \dots j_2 j_1 j_0\rangle_j, \quad (20)$$

where d_k and j_k take values of 0 or 1; $A_{d,j}$ stores the amplitude of the variable with the index d at x_j . For instance, the value of $\tilde{B}_z(x = x_5)$ is stored in $A_{d=4, j=5}$, which is the amplitude of the quantum state $|100\rangle_d |0\dots 0101\rangle_j$. We assume that the rightmost qubit is the least-significant one (which is responsible for the parity), which is the bottom qubit in the quantum circuit. At the same time, once qubits are represented by a classical column vector, the amplitude of the least-significant qubit is stored in the first two top elements of the column vector as shown in Eq. A2.

E. Initialization

The source Q is initialized at two spatial points with indices j_q and $(j_q + 1)$ such that j_q is even and close to $N_x/2$, i.e., at the center of the system. There, the plasma density is low, so the X-wave wavenumber is $k_x = \omega_a/c$. To guarantee the state normalization $\langle \psi | \psi \rangle = 1.0$, we set $Q_0 = 1/\sqrt{2}$ (Eq. 9h). To prepare this initial state, one sets $|0\rangle_j$ and $|5\rangle_d$. Then, a Hadamard gate (Eq. A9) is placed at the least-significant qubit of the register $|j\rangle$. Apart from that, every qubit that must have a value 1 according to the bit representation of the integer j_q , is inverted by a Pauli X gate (Eq. A7). An example of the initialization circuit for $n_x = 4$ is shown in Fig. 4. The proper initialization is confirmed by the comparison of the source time evolution from classical and QC modeling shown in Figs. 16a and 16c. If one wants to initialize a source with various amplitudes at different spatial points, one can use one or several rotation gates R_y (Eq. 34) instead of the Hadamard gate. The number of gates in the initialization circuit is proportional to n_x .

IV. QUANTUM SIGNAL PROCESSING FRAMEWORK

A. QSP basics

Quantum Signal Processing (QSP)^{34,35,44} is an algorithm for constructing a polynomial $f(A)$ of a given matrix A . In




FIG. 5: General QSP circuit (Eq. 22). The subcircuit for each $\Phi_j(\phi_{2j+1}, \phi_{2j})$ is shown in Fig. 6. The rotation gate R_z is defined in Eq. 23. The ancillae $|a\rangle, |q\rangle, |b\rangle$ are initialized in the zero state, while the register $|s\rangle$ stores the initial conditions. The Hadamard gates H prepare the necessary superposition state $|+\rangle$ (Eq. A9) for the ancillae $|q\rangle$ and $|b\rangle$. If all ancillae are output in the zero state, then the register $|s\rangle$ contains the QSP approximation of $\exp(-i\mathcal{H}t)|\psi(0)\rangle_s$ for the given t and error ϵ_{qsp} .

the case of Hamiltonian simulations, QSP is used for approximating the propagator with a given absolute error, as $f(\mathcal{H}) \approx \exp(-i\mathcal{H}t) + \mathcal{O}(\epsilon_{\text{qsp}})$, and encodes the polynomial into a quantum circuit as

$$U_{\text{qsp}} = \begin{pmatrix} f(\mathcal{H}) & \cdot \\ \cdot & \cdot \\ \cdot & \cdot \end{pmatrix}. \quad (21)$$

Here, the unitary matrix U_{qsp} depends on $(2N_\phi + 1)$ real parameters ϕ_j , henceforth called *phases*, and is represented by a set of rotations^{34,37} (Fig. 5):

$$U_{\text{qsp}} = R_{z,b}(\phi_{2N_\phi}) \Phi_{N_\phi-1}(\phi_{2N_\phi-1}, \phi_{2N_\phi-2}) \dots \Phi_0(\phi_1, \phi_0). \quad (22)$$

Unlike in graphical representations of quantum circuits, the rightmost operator Φ_0 is applied first, and the leftmost operator $R_{z,b}$ is applied last. The latter is the Pauli rotation gate:

$$R_z(\phi) = \begin{pmatrix} \exp(-i\phi/2) & 0 \\ 0 & \exp(i\phi/2) \end{pmatrix}, \quad (23)$$

which acts on the ancilla qubit $|b\rangle$. The operator $\Phi_j(\phi_{2j+1}, \phi_{2j})$ is described in Fig. 6. It consists of alternating rotation gates R_z (Eq. 23) and an operator W (Eq. 31), which encodes the Hamiltonian (Sec. IV C). The copies of W create higher powers of \mathcal{H} , which are used to construct the polynomial $f(\mathcal{H})$, while the rotations R_z generate the appropriate coefficients in $f(\mathcal{H})$ ^{34,35}.

An initial state $\psi(0)$ is stored in the input register $|s\rangle$ (in our case, the combination of registers $|d\rangle$ and $|j\rangle$), and the ancillae $|b\rangle, |q\rangle$ and $|a\rangle$ are initialized in the zero state. Then, QHS is implemented via application of the unitary U_{qsp} to the system state vector. Because the propagator is encoded as the upper-left block of U_{qsp} , the desired state $\exp(-i\mathcal{H}t)\psi(0)$ is yielded as the output in the register $|s\rangle$ when all the ancillae are measured in the zero state.

The phases are chosen depending on the simulation time and error tolerance ϵ_{qsp} , and are calculated on a classical computer using known algorithms. The corresponding details can be found in Refs. 37–39. The codes for the calculation of the phases are presented in Refs. 45 and 46. In our work, we use the code described in Ref. 37 and presented in Ref. 45.




FIG. 6: Quantum circuit of each operator $\Phi_j(\phi_{2j+1}, \phi_{2j})$ that enters Eq. 22.




FIG. 7: Quantum circuit of the operator W (Eq. 31). The controlled unitary U_H (Eq. 24) and its complex-conjugate U_H^\dagger form the extended operator U'_H (Eq. 30). The left Pauli X gate implements the operator S (Eq. 29). The subcircuit within the blue box implements the reflector U_R (Eq. 32).

B. Block-encoding

The operator W (Fig. 7) contains some oracle U_H , which is the mapping of the Hamiltonian \mathcal{H} on a unitary matrix. In this work, circuit representation of any function or mapping is called oracle. Generally, Hamiltonian is a non-unitary matrix, it cannot be directly described by a quantum circuit, which can contain only unitary gates. Therefore, to operate with \mathcal{H} in the QSP circuit, one has to encode \mathcal{H} within a unitary matrix. The corresponding mapping $\mathcal{H} \rightarrow U_H$ is called block-encoding. This transformation can be done by extending Hilbert space such that the matrix \mathcal{H} becomes a sub-block of the unitary U_H :

$$U_H = \begin{pmatrix} \mathcal{H} & \\ \zeta M & \cdot \\ \cdot & \cdot \end{pmatrix} \quad (24)$$

where the original matrix \mathcal{H} must be normalized to its norm

$$M \equiv \|\mathcal{H}\|_{\max} = \max_i \sum_j \sqrt{|\mathcal{H}_{ij}|^2}, \quad (25)$$

and to its sparsity ζ (a maximum number of nonzero elements in every row and column). The extension of the space is achieved by using the ancilla register $|a\rangle$. The block-encoding as shown in Eq. 24 indicates that the normalized Hamiltonian can be extracted from U_H when the ancillae have zero input and output states:

$$\langle k|_s \langle 0|_a U_H |0\rangle_a |j\rangle_s = \frac{\mathcal{H}_{jk}}{\zeta M}. \quad (26)$$

Here, the row index j is encoded as an input in the register $|s\rangle$, and the column index k is an output in the same register after the block-encoding operation. Efficiency of the QSP technique is usually estimated in a number of queries to the oracle U_H . The block-encoding of our wave Hamiltonian (Eq. 15) is discussed in Section V.

C. Qubitization

The purpose of the QSP is to build the desired polynomial $f(\mathcal{H})$. Because U_H is linear in \mathcal{H} , multiple applications of U_H are required, where the block-encoding matrix acts as:

$$U_H |0\rangle_a |\lambda\rangle_s = \lambda |0\rangle_a |\lambda\rangle_s + \sqrt{1 - \lambda^2} |\perp\rangle_{a,s}. \quad (27)$$

Here, $\lambda, |\lambda\rangle$ are the eigenvalue and eigenvector of \mathcal{H} , respectively; the state $|\perp\rangle_{a,s}$ is created by the undefined part of U_H marked with dots in Eq. 24. To build higher powers of \mathcal{H} , we need to stay within the space spanned by $(|0\rangle_a |\lambda\rangle_s, U_H |0\rangle_a |\lambda\rangle_s)$. The problem is that in general, this space is not invariant under the action of U_H . Every next application of U_H adds additional perpendicular vectors that are different from the original $|\perp\rangle_{a,s}$. To overcome this issue, one can decompose (qubitize)³⁵ the entire Hilbert space into two-dimensional orthogonal subspaces, $\bigoplus_\lambda \mathcal{P}_\lambda$, where each subspace \mathcal{P}_λ corresponds to a particular $|\lambda\rangle$ of \mathcal{H} . After that, one replaces U_H by a new operator W that performs rotation in each of these disjoint subspaces. As a result, the operator W block-encodes \mathcal{H} and by acting in an invariant space $\mathcal{P}_\lambda = (|0\rangle_a |\lambda\rangle_s, W |0\rangle_a |\lambda\rangle_s)$ for each $|\lambda\rangle$ can produce necessary moments of \mathcal{H} to construct the polynomial $f(\mathcal{H})$.

According to Lemma 10 from Ref. 35, W can always be constructed using the following procedure. First of all, one extends again Hilbert space with an ancilla $|q\rangle$ initialized in the superposition state $|+\rangle$ (Eq. A9):

$$|0\rangle_a \rightarrow |+\rangle_q |0\rangle_a. \quad (28)$$

Then, one applies an X gate (Eq. A7) to the ancilla $|q\rangle$:

$$S = X_q \otimes I_{a,s} \quad (29)$$

and uses two copies of controlled U_H :

$$U'_H = |0\rangle_q \langle 0|_q \otimes U_H + |1\rangle_q \langle 1|_q \otimes U_H^\dagger, \quad (30)$$

Combining the above operators, one constructs

$$W = (U_R \otimes I_s) S U'_H, \quad (31)$$

where the so-called reflector U_R :

$$U_R = 2|+\rangle_q |0\rangle_a \langle 0|_a \langle +|_q - I_{q,a} \quad (32)$$

keeps unchanged the zero-ancilla state and inverts the sign of the perpendicular state. Here, I_y is the unit operator that acts on an ancilla $|y\rangle$. The corresponding circuit is shown




FIG. 8: General circuit of the oracle O_F . Its components are shown in Fig. 9. According to Table I, the block \tilde{E}_x does not modify ancillae $|a_j\rangle|a_d\rangle$.

in Fig. 7. As it is proven in Lemma 8 and Lemma 10 from Ref. 35, the above construction guarantees that the matrix form of the operator W is represented by the following direct sum:

$$W = \bigoplus_{\lambda} \begin{pmatrix} \lambda & -\sqrt{1-\lambda^2} \\ \sqrt{1-\lambda^2} & \lambda \end{pmatrix}, \quad (33)$$

which ensures the invariance of each subspace \mathcal{P}_{λ} under the action of W .

V. BLOCK-ENCODING OF THE WAVE HAMILTONIAN

A. General algorithm

To encode the wave Hamiltonian (Eq. 15), we apply the state-preparation technique³⁵. The standard procedure is described in Appendix B. In this algorithm, one finds positions of all nonzero elements within \mathcal{H} and then encodes values of these elements into the amplitudes of quantum states. First of all, for each row of \mathcal{H} one stores the column indices of nonzero matrix elements in an ancilla register. Being an integer, each index is encoded as a quantum state represented by a bit-string of qubits. After that, knowing the column and row indices, one finds the values of the corresponding nonzero elements. The values are encoded in the amplitudes of the quantum states. Since any element of the rescaled Hamiltonian $\mathcal{H}/(\zeta M)$ (Eq. 24) is less than (or equal to) unity by the absolute value, it can be represented as $\cos(\theta/2)$ of a certain angle θ . The cosine can be generated by the rotation gate $R_y(\theta)$:

$$R_y(\theta) = \begin{pmatrix} \cos(\theta/2) & -\sin(\theta/2) \\ \sin(\theta/2) & \cos(\theta/2) \end{pmatrix} \quad (34)$$




acting on the zero state:

$$R_y(\theta)|0\rangle = \cos(\theta/2)|0\rangle + \sin(\theta/2)|1\rangle. \quad (35)$$

B. Normalization

To normalize the wave Hamiltonian (Eq. 15), we adopt:

$$\mathcal{H}_{\text{qsp}} = \beta_H \mathcal{H}, \quad t_{\text{qsp}} = t/\beta_H, \quad \beta_H = \frac{1}{d_H^2 M}, \quad (36)$$



$$j \text{ -- } \begin{matrix} 0 & -1 \\ | & | \\ \hline 0 & 1 \end{matrix} \text{ --} = j_{1,n_x-1} \begin{matrix} 0 & -1 \\ | & | \\ \hline 0 & 1 \end{matrix} \text{ --}$$

$$j \text{ -- } \begin{matrix} 1 & -2 \\ | & | \\ \hline 1 & -1 \end{matrix} \text{ --} = j \text{ -- } \begin{matrix} 1 & -2 \\ | & | \\ \hline 1 & -1 \end{matrix} \text{ --} = j_{1,n_x-1} \begin{matrix} 1 & -2 \\ | & | \\ \hline 1 & -1 \end{matrix} \text{ --}$$

FIG. 9: Sub-blocks of the O_F quantum circuit shown in Fig. 8. The circuits are constructed following the Table I. The control block j_Q is illustrated in Fig. 10. The control nodes in the register $|d\rangle$ encode the variable label, while the register $|j\rangle$ encodes the spatial coordinate.

TABLE I: Action of the oracle O_F . An input variable is encoded into the register $|d\rangle$, and its space dependence is taken from the register $|j\rangle$. The operator O_F returns the registers $|a_j\rangle|a_d\rangle$ in the indicated output states, while the states of the registers $|d\rangle|j\rangle$ remain unchanged.

Variable	Input ^a	Output
ξ_x	$ 000\rangle_d j\rangle_j$	$ 00\rangle_{a_j} 001\rangle_{a_d} + 00\rangle_{a_j} 010\rangle_{a_d}$
ξ_y	$ 001\rangle_d 0; N_x - 1\rangle_j$ $ 001\rangle_d [1, N_x - 2]\rangle_j$	$ 00\rangle_{a_j} 000\rangle_{a_d}$ $ 00\rangle_{a_j} 000\rangle_{a_d} + 00\rangle_{a_j} 011\rangle_{a_d}$
\tilde{E}_x	$ 010\rangle_d j\rangle_j$	$ 00\rangle_{a_j} 000\rangle_{a_d}$
\tilde{E}_y	$ 011\rangle_d 0; N_x - 1\rangle_j$ $ 011\rangle_d 1\rangle_j$ $ 011\rangle_d [2, N_x - 3]\rangle_j$ $ 011\rangle_d N_x - 2\rangle_j$	$ 00\rangle_{a_j} 011\rangle_{a_d}$ $ 00\rangle_{a_j} 001\rangle_{a_d} + 10\rangle_{a_j} 100\rangle_{a_d}$ $ 00\rangle_{a_j} 001\rangle_{a_d} + 01\rangle_{a_j} 100\rangle_{a_d} + 10\rangle_{a_j} 100\rangle_{a_d}$ $ 00\rangle_{a_j} 001\rangle_{a_d} + 01\rangle_{a_j} 100\rangle_{a_d}$
\tilde{B}_z	$ 100\rangle_d 0; N_x - 1\rangle_j$ $ 100\rangle_d 1\rangle_j$ $ 100\rangle_d [2, N_x - 3] \neq j_Q\rangle_j$ $ 100\rangle_d j_Q\rangle_j$ $ 100\rangle_d N_x - 2\rangle_j$	$ 00\rangle_{a_j} 100\rangle_{a_d}$ $ 10\rangle_{a_j} 011\rangle_{a_d}$ $ 01\rangle_{a_j} 011\rangle_{a_d} + 10\rangle_{a_j} 011\rangle_{a_d}$ $ 01\rangle_{a_j} 011\rangle_{a_d} + 10\rangle_{a_j} 011\rangle_{a_d} + 00\rangle_{a_j} 101\rangle_{a_d}$ $ 01\rangle_{a_j} 011\rangle_{a_d}$
Q	$ 101\rangle_d j \neq j_Q\rangle_j$ $ 101\rangle_d j_Q\rangle_j$	$ 00\rangle_{a_j} 101\rangle_{a_d}$ $ 00\rangle_{a_j} 100\rangle_{a_d} + 00\rangle_{a_j} 101\rangle_{a_d}$

^a $|0; N_x - 1\rangle_j$ denotes $|0\rangle_j$ or $|N_x - 1\rangle_j$ states; $|[1, N_x - 2]\rangle_j$ denotes all states from $|1\rangle_j$ up to $|N_x - 2\rangle_j$; $|j_Q\rangle_j$ corresponds to the spatial position of the source Q .

TABLE II: Action of the oracle $O_{\sqrt{H}}$. The operator is controlled by the indicated input registers. For various bit arrays encoded in these registers, it returns the indicated output amplitudes on the ancilla a_1 (or a_2) as explained in Eq. 35.

Input	Output amplitude
$ 001\rangle_{a_d} 000\rangle_d$ $ 000\rangle_{a_d} 001\rangle_d$	$\sqrt{\beta_H B_0}$
$ 010\rangle_{a_d} 000\rangle_d$ $ 011\rangle_{a_d} 001\rangle_d$ $ 000\rangle_{a_d} 010\rangle_d$ $ 001\rangle_{a_d} 011\rangle_d$	$\sqrt{\beta_H n_0^{1/2}}$
$ 01\rangle_{a_j}$ $ 10\rangle_{a_j}$	$\sqrt{\beta_H / (2h)}$
$ 101\rangle_{a_d} 100\rangle_d$ $ 100\rangle_{a_d} 101\rangle_d$	$\sqrt{\beta_H \beta}$
$ 101\rangle_{a_d} 101\rangle_d$	$\sqrt{\beta_H \omega_a}$

or more explicitly

$$\beta_H = \frac{1}{d_H^2 \sqrt{\omega_{UH, \max}^2 + \frac{1}{2h^2} + \beta^2 + \omega_a^2}}. \quad (37)$$

Here, \mathcal{H}_{qsp} is the rescaled Hamiltonian, t_{qsp} is the time interval to be simulated by the QSP circuit, $\omega_{UH, \max} = \sqrt{B_{0, \max}^2 + n_{\max}}$, and n_{\max} and $B_{0, \max}$ are the maximum values of the background density and magnetic field, respectively. In our case, $d_H^2 = 4$, which is close to the sparsity $\zeta = 3$ of our wave Hamiltonian (Eq. 15), as it should be according to Eq. 24. By sparsity, we mean the number of nonzero elements in a matrix row maximized over the row

TABLE III: Action of the oracle O_{S, a_1} . For a given indicated state, the operator outputs the corresponding coefficient that is multiplied by the value returned by the oracle $O_{\sqrt{H}, a_1}$.

Input	Output multiplier
$ 000\rangle_{a_d} 001\rangle_d$ $ 000\rangle_{a_d} 010\rangle_d$ $ 001\rangle_{a_d} 011\rangle_d$ $ 01\rangle_{a_j}$	i
$ 001\rangle_{a_d} 000\rangle_d$ $ 010\rangle_{a_d} 000\rangle_d$ $ 011\rangle_{a_d} 001\rangle_d$ $ 10\rangle_{a_j}$	-i
$ 101\rangle_{a_d} 100\rangle_d$ $ 100\rangle_{a_d} 101\rangle_d$ $ 101\rangle_{a_d} 101\rangle_d$	-1




FIG. 10: Circuit of the control block j_Q in a system with $n_x = 4$, where the source Q is placed at spatial points with indices $j_{q,1} = 8$ and $j_{q,2} = 9$.

index. If $\zeta > 1$, then during the block-encoding one needs to encode positions of several nonzero elements knowing only a single row index. This means that a superposition of several quantum states (where the column indices of the nonzero




FIG. 11: Quantum circuit of the oracle $O_{\sqrt{H}, a_1}$. Every box j indicates the conditional dependence on the register $|j\rangle$. Here, the conditional-rotation gate $R(B)$ is used to obtain the profile $\sqrt{\beta_H B_{0,j}}$; $R(n)$ encodes the profile $\sqrt{\beta_H n_j^{1/2}}$; $R(g)$ encodes a constant $\sqrt{\beta_H/(2h)}$ with different superpositions for bulk and boundary x -points. In our model, the conditional-rotation gates are represented by multi-qubit matrices. The circuit is built according to Table II.




FIG. 12: Quantum circuit of the oracle O_{S, a_1} . The circuit is constructed according to Table III. Each colored box multiplies the amplitude stored in $|a_1\rangle$ by the factor specified in the figure (i , $-i$, -1). The rotation gate R_z acts as shown in Eq. 23.




FIG. 13: Quantum circuit of the oracle O_M . The subtractor S and the adder A are shown in Fig. 14. The oracle converts the relative positions stored in the register $|a_j\rangle$ into the corresponding absolute positions and stores them in the register $|j\rangle$. Then, the circuit swaps (Fig. 19) the registers $|d\rangle$ and $|a_d\rangle$.




FIG. 14: Quantum circuits of the adder and of the subtractor by 1 for the case with four qubits.

elements are encoded) has to be created from a single input state (where the row index is encoded). This can be done by applying the Hadamard gate (Eq. A8), and one needs at least $n_H = 2$ Hadamard gates to produce the superposition of $\zeta = 3$ states. However, the amplitude of each state in the resulting superposition has an additional multiplier $1/2^{n_H/2}$. Then, according to Eq. 35 and 42, we encode the square root

of the absolute value of the matrix element v as

$$\sqrt{\frac{|v|}{d_H^2 M}} = \frac{1}{2^{n_H/2}} \cos(\theta/2), \quad (38)$$

where $\cos(\theta/2) = \sqrt{|v|/M} \leq 1$, and therefore, $d_H = 2^{n_H/2}$. Note that larger t_{qsp} requires calculation of a higher number of QSP phases, which can be challenging. Instead of

doing that, we represent the QSP circuit with n_t sequential copies of a shorter circuit constructed for the time interval t_{qsp}/n_t . In this case, performing simulations on a digital emulator, one can also analyse intermediate quantum states.

C. Ancilla registers

To implement the state-preparation method (Appendix B), we introduce several ancilla registers (Fig. 8) to store positions of matrix nonzero elements. The register $|a_d\rangle$ is responsible for the location of sub-blocks such as M_h or M_β in Eq. 15. Given a variable index $|d\rangle$ (Eq. 20), the register $|a_d\rangle$ stores the absolute column indices of all sub-blocks that contain nonzero elements. The maximum number of sub-blocks in a row (including zero sub-blocks) coincides with the number of variables in our plasma system. Thus, the size of $|a_d\rangle$ is the same as that of the register $|d\rangle$.

Then, we describe the location of nonzero elements within each sub-block. The ancilla register $|a_j\rangle$ is introduced for this purpose. To decrease the total number of ancillae, this register stores not an absolute column index but the relative position of a nonzero element with respect to the sub-block diagonal:

$$|00\rangle_{a_j} \rightarrow i_c = i_r, \quad (39)$$

$$|01\rangle_{a_j} \rightarrow i_c = i_r - 1, \quad (40)$$

$$|10\rangle_{a_j} \rightarrow i_c = i_r + 1, \quad (41)$$

where i_r is the row index, which is the index of a given point on x -grid of a variable. The row index is stored in the register $|j\rangle$ (Eq. 20). The integer i_c is the column index of the nonzero value within the sub-block $|a_d\rangle$. For instance, $|00\rangle_{a_j}$ means that a nonzero element lies on the local diagonal of the sub-block. One should note that the size of the register $|a_j\rangle$ does not depend on N_x , which is not the case in the standard technique (Appendix B). This feature allows us to increase N_x without increasing the number of ancillae. The size of $|a_j\rangle$ increases, however, with the discretization order and it may also depend on the boundary conditions.

Finally, two more single-qubit ancilla registers $|a_1\rangle$ and $|a_2\rangle$ are introduced. The rotation gates $R_y(\theta)$ act on these qubits to store the nonzero elements of the Hamiltonian (Eq. 35). A thinner space grid has a smaller difference between neighboring Hamiltonian elements, and as a result, requires that the rotation angle θ be calculated with a higher precision.

D. Block-encoding operator

Now, when we have introduced all necessary ancillae and know how they store the structure of \mathcal{H} , we can represent the block-encoding as a product of several operators:

$$U_H = O_F^\dagger O_{\sqrt{H}, a_2}^\dagger O_M O_{S, a_1} O_{\sqrt{H}, a_1} O_F, \quad (42)$$

where every operator is responsible for a particular part of the block-encoding procedure. The oracle O_F (Table I,

Figs. 8-9 and Fig. 10) defines the location of nonzero elements for a given variable index stored in $|d\rangle$ and for a local row index saved in $|j\rangle$. This oracle writes the column indices of sub-blocks with nonzero elements into the register $|a_d\rangle$ and local relative positions of these nonzero elements into the register $|a_j\rangle$. To construct the quantum circuit of the oracle O_F , we consider it as a sequence of sub-circuits for different variables (Fig. 8). Every sub-circuit corresponds to one block from Table I. If one assumes that multi-controlled gates are physically realizable, then the depth of the O_F circuit does not change with the system size N_x . However, whether it will be possible to efficiently connect non-neighboring qubits in future quantum computers is yet to be seen.

According to Eq. 15, several rows of the Hamiltonian have only zero elements. In this case, to simplify the construction of the oracle O_F , we output the column index equal to the row index, as one can see, for instance, for the input $|101\rangle_d |j \neq j_Q\rangle_j$ (in the block Q) in Table I. The presence of these diagonal elements does not affect the action of the oracles $O_{\sqrt{H}}$ and O_S .

The oracle $O_{\sqrt{H}}$ (Table II, Fig. 11) reads the row and column indices and provides the square root of the absolute value of the corresponding nonzero element. It acts on the ancilla $|a_1\rangle$ or ancilla $|a_2\rangle$. The oracle O_{S, a_1} (Table III, Fig. 12) describes whether an element is imaginary or real, as well as whether it is positive or negative.

To create the $O_{\sqrt{H}}$ quantum circuit, we use gates that perform rotations $R_y(\theta_j)$ conditioned on the register j . Every combination of qubits in $|j\rangle$ corresponds to a particular angle θ_j expressing the space dependence of a given field on x . For instance, to obtain the profile of the background magnetic field, one can use angles $\theta_j = 2 \arccos \sqrt{\beta_H B_{0,j}}$. For convenience, we denote the corresponding conditional gate as $R(B)$ in our quantum circuit (Fig. 11).

The conditional-rotation gates must be expressed via arithmetic functions with a set of additional qubits to store the angles θ_j . In our work, every conditional gate is coded as a multi-qubit gate with inner sub-blocks as in Eq. 34 on the main diagonal. Every sub-block corresponds to one θ_j for a particular j . The circuit depth of $O_{\sqrt{H}}$ may strongly depend on how efficient the implementation of the conditional gates is for given profiles and how they depend on the system size N_x . However, the general tendency is that the depth of quantum arithmetic circuits scales as $\mathcal{O}(\text{poly}(n_x))$ (Refs. 23 and 47).

In the standard state-preparation algorithm, ancilla registers store the absolute column indices (Eqs. B4-B5). As a result, the index exchange between the ancilla and input registers can be implemented by a simple swap operator. In our case, the register $|a_j\rangle$ works with relative indices. Because of that, we need to implement the mapping between the absolute and relative indices during the index exchange. This is provided by the oracle O_M (Fig. 13) by using a subtractor and an adder by 1, which are depicted in Fig. 14. After the application of the oracle O_M , the register $|j\rangle$ encodes the absolute column indices of nonzero elements within a sub-block, and the register $|d\rangle$ contains sub-block column indices. On the other hand, the ancilla register $|a_d\rangle$ encodes now a variable

index, while the register $|a_j\rangle$ remains unchanged. The depth of the circuit O_M is proportional to $\log_2(N_x)$ because of the adder and subtractor.

To sum up, taking the row index as an input in $|d\rangle|j\rangle$ and the ancillae initialized in the zero state, the resulting oracle U_H outputs column indices encoded in $|d\rangle|j\rangle$ as states with amplitudes equal to the corresponding Hamiltonian elements when all ancillae registers are returned in the zero state (Eq. 26).

VI. SIMULATION RESULTS

A. Comparison of classical and quantum simulations

We implement QHS using the circuit described above on a classical emulator of a quantum computer using QuEST toolkit⁴². Unlike in an actual quantum simulation, this gives us access to the whole output space at all moments of time. The results presented below are directly extracted from ψ (Eq. 20) without performing, or emulating, quantum measurements. Then, we compare our results with those of classical simulations, which have been obtained by directly solving Eqs. 9 using the central finite difference scheme for both space and time. As a reminder, the normalized background profiles are shown in Fig. 1b. The size of the system is $r_0[\text{cm}] = 20$ with $N_x = 1024$ ($n_x = 10$) spatial points. The simulation time is $t_f[\omega_p^{-1}] = 300.5$, which is split into $n_t = 1200$ time steps with duration $\tau[\omega_p^{-1}] = 0.2504$. The corresponding Courant number is 0.76. The maximum background density is $n_0[\text{cm}^{-3}] = 2 \times 10^{13}$, while the peak of the fictitious density profile is $n_{0,f}[\text{cm}^{-3}] = 10^{12}$. The background magnetic field at the center is $B_0[\text{G}] = 10^3$, and the auxiliary magnetic peak at $s = 0.4$ has $B_{0,f}[\text{G}] = 7 \times 10^3$. The source-field coupling coefficient is $\beta = 0.1$, and Q oscillates with the frequency $\omega_a[\omega_p] = 0.38$. The corresponding wavenumber is $k_x r_0 = 64.56$.

With these plasma parameters, the normalization of the Hamiltonian (Eq. 37) becomes $\beta_H = 0.102$. Therefore, the QSP time step is $\tau_{\text{qsp}} = \tau/\beta_H = 2.455$ with the resulting time interval $t_{\text{qsp}} = n_t \tau_{\text{qsp}} = 2946$ to simulate. The QSP error is $\epsilon_{\text{qsp}} = 10^{-6}$. As seen from Fig. 15a, such ϵ_{qsp} corresponds to $\sim 10^{-4}$ error in the energy conservation. For this QSP error, the number of QSP angles is equal to 25 for the time interval τ_{qsp} .

According to Ref. 35, the query complexity (number of copies of the oracle U_H) of the QSP circuit is $\mathcal{O}(t_{\text{qsp}} + \log_2(1/\epsilon_{\text{qsp}}))$. The asymptotic dependence is confirmed by our direct computation (Figs. 17a, 17b). There, the total number of queries is calculated as twice the number of the QSP phases, because each phase corresponds to two calls to the block-encoding oracle U_H (Figs. 6 and 7). The number of the phases is found using the code from Ref. 45. We should remark here that in our particular case, where the whole QSP circuit is split into n_t subcircuits, the scaling is $\mathcal{O}(n_t \tau_{\text{qsp}} + n_t \log_2(1/\epsilon_{\text{qsp}}))$.

We compare the time evolution of the energy components (Eqs. 11b-11d) integrated in space. Figure 15b shows that

both the classical and quantum simulations produce the same time histories of various energy components (Eqs. 11b-11d). When the wave reaches the HCR pair (at $t \approx 100$, according to Fig. 2b), the field energy converts partly into the kinetic plasma energy. Figures 16b-16d show that the kinetic (field) energy has a similar spatial distribution in both the simulations, and the X wave accumulates in the UH resonance of the HCR pair. The wave also passes the LCR pair practically without interaction and deposits its energy at the UHR, as anticipated.

B. Oracle scaling

Assuming that multi-qubit controlled gates are realizable, the depths of the oracles O_F (Fig. 8) and O_S (Fig. 12) are independent of $n_x = \log_2 N_x$. However, these depths can change if the discretization order is increased or if the source Q is distributed over multiple grid points. The depth of the oracle O_M increases linearly with n_x due to the adder and subtractor (Fig. 14).

The oracle O_H (Fig. 11) depends on n_x due to the conditional-rotation gates. Similar gates are considered in Ref. 40 (see supplemental materials there), where they are called multiplexed unitaries. These gates can be implemented via arithmetic functions that usually scale as $\mathcal{O}(\text{poly}(n_x))$. For instance, as shown in Ref. 23, the depth of a general adder with one of the summands predefined scales as $\mathcal{O}(n_x)$, and the subtractor depth scales as $\mathcal{O}(n_x) + 2n_x$. In general, there is a trade between the number of ancillae used to store intermediate data and the depth of the resulting circuit. In our case, a conditional-rotation gate must implement a smooth function that depends on the space variable x encoded inside the register $|j\rangle$. As explained in Ref. 47, a polynomial of order D can be evaluated by using the Horner scheme. A given polynomial y_D with coefficients a_i can be obtained by D subsequent iterations:

$$y_1 = a_D x + a_{D-1},$$

$$y_2 = y_1 x + a_{D-2},$$

$$\dots$$

$$y_D = y_{D-1} x + a_0.$$

The total number of gates necessary to implement the whole polynomial scales as $\mathcal{O}(D n_x^2)$.

C. Quantum measurements

In an actual quantum simulation, the output vector cannot be accessed directly. One can measure only the expectation value of a given operator on the output state. How to do this for potentially practical RF simulations is a problem separate from QSP that we discuss here, so it is left to future work. However, here is how at least one of the quantities on interest can be measured, namely, the wave energy within a given spatial volume.

The field components are encoded into the quantum state ψ as shown in Eq. 20. To compute the electric energy, one




FIG. 15: (a): space-integrated total system energy for different values of the QSP error ϵ_{qsp} . (b): comparison of the corresponding energy components (Eqs. 11b-11d) in classical and quantum (with $\epsilon_{\text{qsp}} = 10^{-6}$) simulations. Here, CL stands for classical simulations and QC stands for emulated quantum simulations.




FIG. 16: Comparison of classical (solid blue curves) and emulated quantum (red dashed curves) simulations. Real (a) and imaginary (c) components of the source Q . (b): kinetic energy W_v (Eq. 11b) at time t_f as a function of s . (d): field energy W_{eb} (Eq. 11c) at time t_f as a function of s . The vertical lines show the HCR pair (blue), the LCR pair (green), the UHR (red).

needs to sum the squares of the electric components in a desired spatial interval. As an example, a case with $n_x = 4$ is considered in Fig. 18. The QSP algorithm outputs ψ_{out} that encodes plasma variables if the QSP ancillae $|a_{\text{qsp}}\rangle$ are all in the zero state. In this example, we sum up $W_e = \tilde{E}_x^2 + \tilde{E}_y^2$ over the spatial points with indices $j = [2, \dots, 5]$. The first controlled Pauli X gate entangles the superposition of the amplitudes of both $\tilde{E}_x(j \in [2, 3])$ and $\tilde{E}_y(j \in [2, 3])$ with the

state $|1\rangle_{c_0}$. The second X gate entangles $\tilde{E}_x(j \in [4, 5])$ and $\tilde{E}_y(j \in [4, 5])$ with the state $|1\rangle_{c_1}$. The last controlled X gate finds the conjunction (logical AND) of the above states, and as a result, stores $\sum_{j=2}^5 W_e(x_j)$ as the probability of the state $|1\rangle_m$.

If the qubit m has the state $|1\rangle$ with amplitude a , then it takes at least $\mathcal{O}(|a|^{-2})$ repetitions of the whole QSP operator before the direct measurement returns $|m\rangle = |1\rangle$. How-




FIG. 17: Dependence of the query complexity on the QSP error $\epsilon_{\text{qsp}} \in [10^{-3}, 10^{-4}, \dots, 10^{-10}]$ (a) and on the simulation time t_{qsp} (b).




FIG. 18: Schematic circuit of the measurement of the electric energy density W_e summed over the spatial points with indices $j = [2, \dots, 5]$, for $n_x = 4$. The register $|a_{\text{qsp}}\rangle$ represents all ancillae necessary for the QSP technique. The electric energy components are addressed using the control nodes on $|d\rangle = |2\rangle$ (for \tilde{E}_x) and $|d\rangle = |3\rangle$ (for \tilde{E}_y) (Eqs. 10 and 19). The resulting state is $\Psi_{\text{meas}} = \sum_{k=2}^5 (\tilde{E}_x(x_k) |2\rangle_d + \tilde{E}_y(x_k) |3\rangle_d) |k\rangle_j |1\rangle_m + \dots |0\rangle_m$ (the other registers are omitted), where the desired information is stored in the probability amplitude of the state $|1\rangle_m$. The qubit $|m\rangle$ is measured in the computational basis. The probability of the state $|1\rangle_m$ can be found using AE techniques.

ever, there is a quantum *Amplitude–Amplification* (AA) algorithm^{48–50} that requires only $\mathcal{O}(|a|^{-1})$ iterations of the operator to measure the desired state with probability at least $\max(1 - |a|^2, |a|^2)$. This method is the basis of so-called *Amplitude–Estimation* (AE) techniques^{50–53} that allow to find the state probability with a predefined absolute error δ . The AA is based on the Grover-like^{48,49} rotation R_{AA} in the

quantum space spanned by a state of interest $|G\rangle$ ($|m\rangle = |1\rangle$ in our case) and a “garbage” state $|B\rangle$ ($|m\rangle = |0\rangle$) in such a way that the amplitude of the rotated state $|G\rangle$ becomes a sinusoidal function of the number of applications n_{AA} of R_{AA} : $\sin((2n_{AA} + 1)\theta)$, where $\sin^2 \theta = |a|^2$ and $\theta \in [0, \pi/2]$. In our case, every rotation includes the whole QSP operator and its inverse.

The operator R_{AA} has eigenvalues $\exp(\pm i2\theta)$. Therefore, one can calculate the probability $|a|^2$ from the estimation of the angle θ by constructing a superposition of states rotated with several n_{AA} , and by applying a subsequent *Quantum Fourier Transform* (QFT). That is the essence of the conventional AE algorithm described in Ref. 50. This method estimates the probability $|a|^2$ with an absolute error δ by applying $M = \mathcal{O}(1/\delta)$ queries (in our case, calls to the QSP) and by using $\log_2(M)$ ancilla qubits, while classically one would need $\mathcal{O}(1/\delta^2)$ queries due to the central limit theorem. In our case, the error δ corresponds to the absolute error of the measured space-integrated energy.

There are also state-of-the-art AE techniques^{51–53} with a similar asymptotic scaling but smaller number of ancillae and controlled gates. For instance, the algorithm proposed in Ref. 51 also uses a set of AA operators with a various number of rotations R_{AA} . However, instead of the QFT, it performs statistical post-processing of measurement results by implementing the maximum likelihood estimation of $|a|^2$.

The numerical implementation of the quantum measurements for classical RF systems is left to future work.

VII. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

We have proposed how to apply the Quantum Signal Processing (QSP) technique to simulating cold-plasma waves and explicitly developed a quantum algorithm for modeling one-dimensional X-wave propagation in cold electron

plasma. We have demonstrated how to construct an oracle to encode the wave Hamiltonian into a quantum circuit. The number of the ancillae in this oracle does not depend on the spatial resolution, so one can use a resolution higher than in the case with the standard state-preparation method. Since oracle complexity scales as $\mathcal{O}(\text{poly}(\log_2 N_x))$, the QSP simulation can provide a near-exponential speedup in comparison to classical simulations, which scale as $\mathcal{O}(N_x)$. This approach can be particularly helpful in simulations with high spatial resolution, which is advantageous, for example, for modeling the wave dynamics near resonances.

Our quantum simulations have been performed on a digital emulator of the quantum circuit and have shown agreement with the corresponding classical modeling. For emulation, we used the QuEST numerical toolkit⁴² that operates with a whole 2^{n_q} state vector in a circuit with n_q qubits. For our one-dimensional QSP simulations, the emulator have shown efficient parallelization on GPUs. However, one might need a more advanced emulator for higher-dimensional simulations. One of the promising approaches in this regard is the model proposed in Ref. 54. It uses the fact that a quantum state is mostly sparse, i.e., many elements of the state vector are zero. If only its nonzero elements were stored (e.g. in a form of a hash table), one could significantly reduce memory usage and the simulation runtime. Moreover, one could model oracles with conditional rotations implemented via actual arithmetic functions with a big number of ancillae, since the ancillae act only locally and are zeroed otherwise thus being removed from the memory. Yet, this model needs to be extended with a GPU parallelization and the corresponding implementation of dynamic hash tables⁵⁵.

Based on our results, we can also assess the overall utility of the QSP technique in application to the linear problems. Being a universal algorithm with a clear hierarchical structure, the QSP can be easily coded as a set of subsequent sub-routines where only the block-encoding module needs to be modified for different plasma problems. The QSP provides an optimal dependence of the query complexity (the number of calls to the oracle) on the simulation time and on the error tolerance (as was pointed out in Ref. 35). Also, the QSP requires only two ancillae in addition to the qubits used by the oracle. This reduces the circuit width. That said, the QSP circuits and our oracle in particular have many multi-controlled operators, where one gate is controlled by several nodes. Such a configuration is not directly realizable on existing quantum computers. The decomposition of these operators strongly depend on what gates are available on a chosen quantum computer, and on how the circuit is mapped on a specific quantum processor. Both of these aspects will be hardware-dependent, so the limitations of the QSP will become clearer when practical error-corrected quantum computers with sufficiently many qubits become available.

Taking into account the block-encoding scaling with N_x , the dependence of the QSP circuit on the length of the simulated time interval t , and the number of the QSP queries needed for measurements, the final scaling of our circuit

depth is

$$\mathcal{O}\left(\frac{\text{poly}(\log_2 N_x)}{\delta} (t_{\text{qsp}} + \log_2(1/\delta))\right), \quad (43)$$

where we take the absolute error δ , which appears from measurements, equal to the QSP approximation error ϵ_{qsp} . The numerical coefficient in the scaling is determined by the specific implementation of the conditional rotations and of the measurement algorithm. Studying these subjects is left to future work.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The work was supported by the U.S. DOE through Contract No. DE-AC02-09CH11466. The authors also thank Alexander Engel for valuable discussions.

Appendix A: Basic notation and terminology of quantum computing

The elementary memory cell of a quantum computer is a qubit, whose state can be characterized by a two-dimensional vector. In the computational basis, the basis vectors are

$$|0\rangle = \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad |1\rangle = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (A1)$$

A qubit can also be in a superposition state

$$\alpha |0\rangle + \beta |1\rangle = \begin{pmatrix} \alpha \\ \beta \end{pmatrix}, \quad (A2)$$

where α and β are the complex amplitudes of the states $|0\rangle$ and $|1\rangle$, respectively, such that $|\alpha|^2 + |\beta|^2 = 1$. A quantum computer typically operates with $n > 1$ qubits, so its quantum state is characterized by a tensor product of the qubit states

$$|k_{n-1}\rangle \otimes |k_{n-2}\rangle \otimes \dots \otimes |k_1\rangle \otimes |k_0\rangle, \quad (A3)$$

where $k_i = 0, 1$ in the computational basis. For convenience, one can organize qubits in quantum registers. A combination of n_r qubits in a register $|r\rangle$ can be written either as a bit-string $|k_{n_r-1}k_{n_r-2}\dots k_1k_0\rangle_r$, or as an integer $|k\rangle_r$, where

$$k = \sum_{i=0}^{n_r-1} k_i 2^i. \quad (A4)$$

Several qubits can also form superposition states:

$$|\psi\rangle = \sum_k \alpha_k |k\rangle, \quad (A5)$$

where $|\alpha_k|^2$ is the probability amplitude of the state $|k\rangle$, and $\sum_k |\alpha_k|^2 = 1$.

To modify a quantum state of a circuit, one applies gates, which are unitary operators acting on $n_g \geq 1$ qubits and can be represented by matrices of size $2^{n_g} \times 2^{n_g}$. The gates that are used in this work are mainly the X Pauli, Hadamard H ,




FIG. 19: Top: SWAP gate of two qubits $|k\rangle$ and $|j\rangle$. Bottom: phase gates with an angle θ . If the dot is hollow, then the phase gate acts on the zero state.

Phase P , and SWAP operators. The X gate inverses the qubit value:

$$X = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (\text{A6})$$

$$X(\alpha|0\rangle + \beta|1\rangle) = \beta|0\rangle + \alpha|1\rangle. \quad (\text{A7})$$

The Hadamard gate creates a superposition of states:

$$H = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 1 & -1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (\text{A8})$$

$$H|0\rangle = |+\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|0\rangle + |1\rangle), \quad (\text{A9})$$

$$H|1\rangle = |-\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|0\rangle - |1\rangle). \quad (\text{A10})$$

The Phase gate modifies the phase of the state $|1\rangle$, and keeps the zero state $|0\rangle$ unchanged (Fig. 19):

$$P(\theta) = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & e^{i\theta} \end{pmatrix}, \quad (\text{A11})$$

$$P(\theta)(\alpha|0\rangle + \beta|1\rangle) = \alpha|0\rangle + e^{i\theta}\beta|1\rangle. \quad (\text{A12})$$

The SWAP gate exchanges the qubit values (Fig. 19):

$$\text{SWAP} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (\text{A13})$$

$$\text{SWAP}|kj\rangle = |jk\rangle. \quad (\text{A14})$$

A gate can be controlled by one or several other qubits (control nodes) as shown in Fig. 20. For instance, a 1-controlled H gate can be written as

$$CH = |0\rangle\langle 0|_c \otimes I_t + |1\rangle\langle 1|_c \otimes H_t, \quad (\text{A15})$$

where the Hadamard gate acts on the target qubit t only if the control qubit c is in the state $|1\rangle$.

Also note that a gate can be controlled by a whole register. In this case, the gate is executed only if each qubit in the register is in the $|0\rangle$ or $|1\rangle$ state, as illustrated in Fig. 21.

Appendix B: Block-encoding by state-preparation method

The block-encoding U_H of a Hermitian operator \mathcal{H} can be constructed by applying the state-preparation algorithm³⁵ as a product of two unitary matrices:

$$U_H = T_2^\dagger T_1, \quad (\text{B1})$$




FIG. 20: CNOT gate, or controlled X gate. The 1-controlled gate takes action only if the control qubit is in the state $|1\rangle$: $|out\rangle = \alpha|0\rangle_t|0\rangle_c + \beta|1\rangle_t|1\rangle_c$. A 0-controlled (in this case, the dot is hollow) gate takes action only if the control node is in the state $|0\rangle$. Here, the black dot is called 1-control node. If the dot is hollow, it is called 0-control node.




FIG. 21: Circuit containing a gate G controlled by the register $|r\rangle$. The register has n_r qubits. The gate G modifies the target qubit $|t\rangle$ only if all n_r qubits of the register $|r\rangle$ are in the state $|1\rangle$.

where

$$T_1 = \sum_j |\psi_j\rangle\langle 0|_a \langle j|_s, \quad (\text{B2})$$

$$T_2 = \sum_k |\chi_k\rangle\langle 0|_a \langle k|_s. \quad (\text{B3})$$

Each T_i involves the sum of states $|\psi\rangle$ and $|\chi\rangle$ defined as

$$|\psi_j\rangle = \sum_{p \in F_j} \frac{|p\rangle_{a_3}}{\sqrt{\zeta}} |\mathcal{H}_{jp}\rangle_{a_1} |0\rangle_{a_2} |j\rangle_s, \quad (\text{B4})$$

$$|\chi_k\rangle = \sum_{p \in F_k} \frac{|k\rangle_{a_3}}{\sqrt{\zeta}} |\mathcal{H}_{kp}\rangle_{a_2} |0\rangle_{a_1} |p\rangle_s, \quad (\text{B5})$$

where

$$|\mathcal{H}_{jk}\rangle_a = \sqrt{\frac{|\mathcal{H}_{jk}|}{M}} |0\rangle_a + \sqrt{1 - \frac{|\mathcal{H}_{jk}|}{M}} |1\rangle_a. \quad (\text{B6})$$

Using the oracle O_F (Eq. 42), one finds a set of column indices F_j of all nonzero elements on the row j . The operator T_1 reads the row index j and saves the corresponding column indices to the ancilla register $|a_3\rangle$. After that, it rotates the ancilla qubit $|a_1\rangle$, so the necessary matrix element (its square root) becomes the amplitude of the zero state $|0\rangle_{a_1}$ (Eq. B6). This is implemented by the oracle $O_{\sqrt{H}}$ in Eq. 42. The operator T_2 rotates the ancilla qubit $|a_2\rangle$ in a similar way by taking a row index from the ancilla register $|a_3\rangle$ and column indices from the register $|s\rangle$. Since the encoding of the row and column indices in the registers a_3 and s in $|\chi_k\rangle$ is swapped in comparison with the state $|\psi_j\rangle$, we introduce the oracle O_M , which performs the corresponding index swapping in Eq. 42.

¹N. J. Fisch, “Theory of current drive in plasmas,” *Reviews of Modern Physics* **59**, 175–234 (1987).

²R. I. Pinsker, “Introduction to wave heating and current drive in magnetized plasmas,” *Physics of Plasmas* **8**, 1219–1228 (2001), <https://aip.scitation.org/doi/pdf/10.1063/1.1343512>.

³R. Prater, “Heating and current drive by electron cyclotron waves,” *Physics of Plasmas* **11**, 2349–2376 (2004), <https://doi.org/10.1063/1.1690762>.

- ⁴N. J. Fisch, “Confining a tokamak plasma with RF-driven currents,” *Physical Review Letters* **41**, 873–876 (1978).
- ⁵N. J. Fisch and A. H. Boozer, “Creating an asymmetric plasma resistivity with waves,” *Physical Review Letters* **45**, 720–722 (1980).
- ⁶A. H. Reiman, “Suppression of magnetic islands by RF driven currents,” *The Physics of Fluids* **26**, 1338–1340 (1983), <https://aip.scitation.org/doi/pdf/10.1063/1.864258>.
- ⁷A. H. Reiman and N. J. Fisch, “Suppression of tearing modes by radio frequency current condensation,” *Physical Review Letters* **121**, 225001 (2018).
- ⁸B. J. Ding, P. T. Bonoli, A. Tuccillo, M. Goniche, K. Kirov, M. Li, Y. Li, R. Cesario, Y. Peysson, A. Ekedahl, L. Amicucci, S. Baek, I. Faust, R. Parker, S. Shiraiwa, G. M. Wallace, A. Cardinali, C. Castaldo, S. Ceccuzzi, J. Mailloux, F. Napoli, F. Liu, and B. Wan, “Review of recent experimental and modeling advances in the understanding of lower hybrid current drive in ITER-relevant regimes,” *Nuclear Fusion* **58**, 095003 (2018).
- ⁹T. I. Tsujimura, R. Yanai, Y. Mizuno, K. Tanaka, Y. Yoshimura, T. Tokuzawa, M. Nishiura, R. Sakamoto, G. Motojima, S. Kubo, T. Shimozuma, H. Igami, H. Takahashi, M. Yoshinuma, and S. Ohshima, “Improved performance of electron cyclotron resonance heating by perpendicular injection in the Large Helical Device,” *Nuclear Fusion* **61**, 026012 (2020).
- ¹⁰P. T. Bonoli and M. Porkolab, “Radiofrequency current generation by lower hybrid slow waves in the presence of fusion generated alpha particles in the reactor regime,” *Nuclear Fusion* **27**, 1341–1346 (1987).
- ¹¹R. Cesario, L. Amicucci, A. Cardinali, C. Castaldo, M. Marinucci, L. Panaccione, F. Santini, O. Tudisco, M. L. Apicella, G. Calabrò, C. Cianfarani, D. Frigione, A. Galli, G. Mazzitelli, C. Mazzotta, V. Pericoli, G. Schettini, A. A. Tuccillo, B. Angelini, G. Apruzzese, E. Barbato, G. Belli, W. Bin, L. Boncagni, A. Botrugno, S. Briguglio, A. Bruschi, S. Ceccuzzi, C. Centioli, S. Cirant, F. Crisanti, O. D’Arcangelo, R. De Angelis, L. Di Matteo, C. Di Troia, B. Esposito, G. Fogaccia, V. Fusco, L. Gabellieri, A. Garavaglia, E. Giovannozzi, G. Granucci, G. Grossetti, G. Grosso, F. Iannone, G. Maddaluno, D. Marocco, P. Micozzi, A. Milovanov, F. Mirizzi, G. Monari, A. Moro, S. Novak, F. P. Orsitto, M. Panella, G. Pucella, G. Ravera, E. Sternini, E. Vitale, G. Vlad, V. Zanza, M. Zerbini, F. Zonca, and the FTU Team, “Current drive at plasma densities required for thermonuclear reactors,” *Nature Communications* **1**, 55 (2010).
- ¹²B. N. Wan, Y. Liang, X. Z. Gong, N. Xiang, G. S. Xu, Y. Sun, L. Wang, J. P. Qian, H. Q. Liu, L. Zeng, L. Zhang, X. J. Zhang, B. J. Ding, Q. Zang, B. Lyu, A. M. Garofalo, A. Ekedahl, M. H. Li, F. Ding, S. Y. Ding, H. F. Du, D. F. Kong, Y. Yu, Y. Yang, Z. P. Luo, J. Huang, T. Zhang, Y. Zhang, G. Q. Li, T. Y. Xia, and the EAST team and Collaborators, “Recent advances in EAST physics experiments in support of steady-state operation for ITER and CFETR,” *Nuclear Fusion* **59**, 112003 (2019).
- ¹³G. M. Wallace, B. J. Ding, M. H. Li, J. Chen, S. G. Baek, P. T. Bonoli, S. Shiraiwa, L. Liu, and C. Wu, “Scoping study of lower hybrid current drive for CFETR,” *Nuclear Fusion* **61**, 106009 (2021).
- ¹⁴K. Yanagihara, S. Kubo, I. Y. Dodin, and the LHD Experiment Group, “Quasioptical propagation and absorption of electron cyclotron waves: simulations and experiment,” *Nuclear Fusion* **61**, 106012 (2021).
- ¹⁵I. Y. Dodin, D. E. Ruiz, K. Yanagihara, Y. Zhou, and S. Kubo, “Quasioptical modeling of wave beams with and without mode conversion. I. Basic theory,” *Physics of Plasmas* **26**, 072110 (2019), <https://doi.org/10.1063/1.5095076>.
- ¹⁶T. I. Tsujimura, S. Kubo, H. Takahashi, R. Makino, R. Seki, Y. Yoshimura, H. Igami, T. Shimozuma, K. Ida, C. Suzuki, M. Emoto, M. Yokoyama, T. Kobayashi, C. Moon, K. Nagaoka, M. Osakabe, S. Kobayashi, S. Ito, Y. Mizuno, K. Okada, A. Ejiri, and T. Mutoh, “Development and application of a ray-tracing code integrating with 3d equilibrium mapping in LHD ECH experiments,” *Nuclear Fusion* **55**, 123019 (2015).
- ¹⁷A. Fasoli, S. Brunner, W. A. Cooper, J. P. Graves, P. Ricci, O. Sauter, and L. Villard, “Computational challenges in magnetic-confinement fusion physics,” *Nature Physics* **12**, 411–423 (2016).
- ¹⁸V. A. Svidzinski, J. S. Kim, L. Zhao, S. A. Galkin, and J. A. Spencer, “Hybrid iterative approach for simulation of radio-frequency fields in plasma,” *Physics of Plasmas* **25**, 082509 (2018), <https://doi.org/10.1063/1.5037110>.
- ¹⁹I. Y. Dodin and E. A. Startsev, “On applications of quantum computing to plasma simulations,” *Physics of Plasmas* **28**, 092101 (2021), <https://doi.org/10.1063/5.0056974>.
- ²⁰M. A. Nielsen and I. L. Chuang, *Quantum Computation and Quantum Information* (Cambridge University Press; 10th Anniversary edition, 2010).
- ²¹E. G. Rieffel and W. H. Polak, *Quantum Computing: A Gentle Introduction*, 1st ed. (MIT Press, 2011).
- ²²“Circuit depth explanation,” https://qiskit.org/textbook/ch-labs/Lab01_QuantumCircuits.html#step-3-interpret-the-result (2021), accessed: 10-2021.
- ²³A. Suau, G. Staffelbach, and H. Calandra, “Practical quantum computing,” *ACM Transactions on Quantum Computing* **2**, 1–35 (2021).
- ²⁴Y. Cao, A. Papageorgiou, I. Petras, J. Traub, and S. Kais, “Quantum algorithm and circuit design solving the Poisson equation,” *New Journal of Physics* **15**, 013021 (2013).
- ²⁵S. Wang, Z. Wang, W. Li, L. Fan, Z. Wei, and Y. Gu, “Quantum fast Poisson solver: the algorithm and complete and modular circuit design,” *Quantum Information Processing* **19**, 170 (2020).
- ²⁶S. Sinha and P. Russer, “Quantum computing algorithm for electromagnetic field simulation,” *Quantum Information Processing* **9**, 385–404 (2010).
- ²⁷A. Scherer, B. Valiron, S.-C. Mau, S. Alexander, E. van den Berg, and T. E. Chapuran, “Concrete resource analysis of the quantum linear-system algorithm used to compute the electromagnetic scattering cross section of a 2D target,” *Quantum Information Processing* **16**, 60 (2017).
- ²⁸F. Fillion-Gourdeau and E. Lorin, “Simple digital quantum algorithm for symmetric first-order linear hyperbolic systems,” *Numerical Algorithms* **82**, 1009–1045 (2019).
- ²⁹F. Gaitan, “Finding flows of a Navier–Stokes fluid through quantum computing,” *npj Quantum Information* **6**, 61 (2020).
- ³⁰F. Gaitan, “Finding solutions of the Navier–Stokes equations through quantum computing—recent progress, a generalization, and next steps forward,” *Advanced Quantum Technologies* **4**, 2100055 (2021), <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/pdf/10.1002/qute.202100055>.
- ³¹B. N. Todorova and R. Steijl, “Quantum algorithm for the collisionless Boltzmann equation,” *Journal of Computational Physics* **409**, 109347 (2020).
- ³²L. Budinski, “Quantum algorithm for the advection–diffusion equation simulated with the lattice Boltzmann method,” *Quantum Information Processing* **20**, 57 (2021).
- ³³J. M. Martyn, Z. M. Rossi, A. K. Tan, and I. L. Chuang, “A grand unification of quantum algorithms,” (2021), [arXiv:2105.02859 \[quant-ph\]](https://arxiv.org/abs/2105.02859).
- ³⁴G. H. Low and I. L. Chuang, “Optimal Hamiltonian simulation by quantum signal processing,” *Physical Review Letters* **118**, 010501 (2017).
- ³⁵G. H. Low and I. L. Chuang, “Hamiltonian simulation by qubitization,” *Quantum* **3**, 163 (2019).
- ³⁶A. Gilyén, Y. Su, G. H. Low, and N. Wiebe, “Quantum singular value transformation and beyond: Exponential improvements for quantum matrix arithmetics,” in *Proceedings of the 51st Annual ACM SIGACT Symposium on Theory of Computing, STOC 2019* (Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 2019) p. 193–204.
- ³⁷J. Haah, “Product decomposition of periodic functions in quantum signal processing,” *Quantum* **3**, 190 (2019).
- ³⁸R. Chao, D. Ding, A. Gilyén, C. Huang, and M. Szegedy, “Finding angles for quantum signal processing with machine precision,” (2020), [arXiv:2003.02831 \[quant-ph\]](https://arxiv.org/abs/2003.02831).
- ³⁹Y. Dong, X. Meng, K. B. Whaley, and L. Lin, “Efficient phase-factor evaluation in quantum signal processing,” *Physical Review A* **103**, 042419 (2021).
- ⁴⁰V. von Burg, G. H. Low, T. Häner, D. S. Steiger, M. Reiher, M. Roetteler, and M. Troyer, “Quantum computing enhanced computational catalysis,” *Physical Review Research* **3**, 033055 (2021).
- ⁴¹A. Engel, G. Smith, and S. E. Parker, “Quantum algorithm for the Vlasov equation,” *Physical Review A* **100**, 062315 (2019).
- ⁴²T. Jones, A. Brown, I. Bush, and S. C. Benjamin, “QuEST and high performance simulation of quantum computers,” *Scientific Reports* **9**, 10736 (2019).
- ⁴³T. H. Stix, *Waves in Plasmas* (AIP Press, 1992).
- ⁴⁴G. H. Low, T. J. Yoder, and I. L. Chuang, “Methodology of resonant equiangular composite quantum gates,”

- Physical Review X **6**, 041067 (2016).
- ⁴⁵“Computation of angles for quantum signal processing in F#,” <https://github.com/microsoft/Quantum-NC/tree/main/src/simulation/qsp> (2020), accessed: 04-2021.
- ⁴⁶“Efficient phase-factor evaluation in quantum signal processing: code,” <https://github.com/qspack/QSPACK> (2021), accessed: 09-2021.
- ⁴⁷T. Häner, M. Roetteler, and K. M. Svore, “Optimizing quantum circuits for arithmetic,” (2018), arXiv:1805.12445 [quant-ph].
- ⁴⁸L. K. Grover, “Quantum mechanics helps in searching for a needle in a haystack,” *Physical Review Letters* **79**, 325–328 (1997).
- ⁴⁹L. K. Grover, “Quantum computers can search rapidly by using almost any transformation,” *Physical Review Letters* **80**, 4329–4332 (1998).
- ⁵⁰G. Brassard, P. Høyer, M. Mosca, and A. Tapp, “Quantum amplitude amplification and estimation,” *Quantum Computation and Information* **305**, 53–74 (2002).
- ⁵¹Y. Suzuki, S. Uno, R. Raymond, T. Tanaka, T. Onodera, and N. Yamamoto, “Amplitude estimation without phase estimation,” *Quantum Information Processing* **19** (2020), 10.1007/s11128-019-2565-2.
- ⁵²S. Uno, Y. Suzuki, K. Hisanaga, R. Raymond, T. Tanaka, T. Onodera, and N. Yamamoto, “Modified Grover operator for quantum amplitude estimation,” *New Journal of Physics* **23**, 083031 (2021).
- ⁵³D. Grinko, J. Gacon, C. Zoufal, and S. Woerner, “Iterative quantum amplitude estimation,” *npj Quantum Information* **7** (2021), 10.1038/s41534-021-00379-1.
- ⁵⁴S. Jaques and T. Häner, “Leveraging state sparsity for more efficient quantum simulations,” (2021), arXiv:2105.01533 [quant-ph].
- ⁵⁵Y. Li, Q. Zhu, Z. Lyu, Z. Huang, and J. Sun, “DyCuckoo: Dynamic hash tables on GPUs,” in *2021 IEEE 37th International Conference on Data Engineering (ICDE)* (IEEE Computer Society, Los Alamitos, CA, USA, 2021) pp. 744–755.