

# Accuracy and resource advantages of quantum eigenvalue estimation with non-Hermitian transcorrelated electronic Hamiltonians

Alexey Uvarov and Artur F. Izmaylov\*

*Chemical Physics Theory Group, Department of Chemistry,  
University of Toronto, Toronto, Ontario M5S 3H6, Canada and*

*Department of Physical and Environmental Sciences,  
University of Toronto Scarborough, Toronto, Ontario M1C 1A4, Canada*

(Dated: December 1, 2025)

In electronic structure calculations, the transcorrelated method enables a reduction of the basis set size by incorporating the electron-electron correlations directly into the Hamiltonian. However, the transcorrelated Hamiltonian is non-Hermitian, which makes many common quantum algorithms inapplicable. Recently, a quantum eigenvalue estimation algorithm was proposed for non-Hermitian Hamiltonians with real spectra [FOCS 65, 1051 (2024)]. Here we investigate the cost of this algorithm applied to transcorrelated electronic Hamiltonians of second-row atoms and compare it to the cost of applying standard qubitization to non-transcorrelated Hamiltonians. We find that the ground state energy of the transcorrelated Hamiltonian in the STO-6G basis is more accurate than that of a standard Hamiltonian in the cc-pVQZ basis. The T gate counts of the two methods are comparable, while the qubit count of the transcorrelated method is 2.5 times smaller.

## I. INTRODUCTION

Quantum eigenvalue algorithms for the electronic structure problem can in principle recover the full configuration interaction (CI) energy of the electronic Hamiltonian in a given basis set. The accuracy of the solution is therefore limited by the error of the basis set. For the basis of hydrogenic wavefunctions up to principal quantum number  $N$ , the error of the basis set scales as  $N^{-3}$  [1, 2]. In terms of the total number of basis functions  $M$ , this corresponds to  $\sim 1/M$  scaling. The same behaviour was observed for Gaussian functions [3] and plane waves [4]. The reason for the slow convergence is that the exact eigenfunctions of the electronic Hamiltonian have cusps at the points where two or more particles coalesce [5], which cannot be exactly reproduced by an expansion in terms of Slater determinants.

To improve the convergence, conventional computational chemistry has long been taking advantage of explicitly correlated ansatz states — wavefunctions that explicitly depend on the electron-electron distances  $r_{ij}$  [6, 7]. Another approach, called the transcorrelated method, consists in transforming the Hamiltonian with a mapping that incorporates the dependence on  $r_{ij}$  [8, 9], so that the eigenfunctions of the transformed Hamiltonian no longer have a cusp.

Recent works have proposed adapting quantum eigenvalue estimation algorithms to leverage the convergence benefits offered by the transcorrelated method. There are two main ways to do so. One way consists in applying a similarity transformation generated by an anti-Hermitian operator, constructing what is known as a canonical transcorrelated Hamiltonian [10]. The latter is then treated as usual, e.g., using the variational quantum

eigensolver [11, 12]. However, in this case, the Baker–Campbell–Hausdorff series is infinite, and one has to truncate it manually, obtaining an approximate Hamiltonian. The second way consists in applying a transformation which is guaranteed to have a short Baker–Campbell–Hausdorff series [8]. However, this similarity transformation is non-unitary, and the transformed Hamiltonian is non-Hermitian, which poses a challenge for quantum algorithms.

In the near-term framework, we can no longer use the variational quantum eigensolver [13] or quantum subspace expansion methods [14, 15] since the variational principle does not apply to non-Hermitian Hamiltonians. Instead, a viable alternative is to use non-Hermitian variance as a minimization target [16, 17]. Another option is to use quantum imaginary-time evolution [18, 19].

In the fault-tolerant regime, the state-of-the-art method for finding eigenvalues relies on implementing a qubitized quantum walk operator and finding its spectrum with quantum phase estimation [20]. Again, this method is inapplicable for non-Hermitian operators: it uses the fact that the left and right eigenvectors of a Hermitian matrix are the same, which is not the case for a non-Hermitian one.

The eigenvalues of the transcorrelated Hamiltonian can be found using the recently proposed quantum eigenvalue estimation (QEVE) algorithm [21]. Similarly to qubitization-based algorithms for Hermitian Hamiltonians [20, 22], this algorithm achieves the optimal  $O(1/\varepsilon)$  scaling in the accuracy and linear scaling in the “one-norm” of the Hamiltonian presented as a linear combination of unitaries. However, Ref. [21] only provides asymptotic complexity bounds, so *a priori* it is not clear whether going to the transcorrelated picture and applying QEVE enables reaching the desired accuracy at a lower cost than using standard qubitization.

In this work, we calculate the resources required to estimate the ground state energy of a transcorrelated

\* artur.izmaylov@utoronto.ca

Hamiltonian using QEVE and compare them to the costs of standard qubitization. We also estimate the quality of the basis required in standard qubitization to match the accuracy that could be obtained in QEVE. We find that, for Li and Be, the energy of the transcorrelated Hamiltonian in the minimal basis is more accurate with respect to the experimental values than that of the standard Hamiltonian in the cc-pVQZ basis. However, in these bases, the methods have comparable T gate counts, while the qubit count of the transcorrelated method is much smaller. These findings suggest that using QEVE for transcorrelated chemistry is a promising direction in reducing the cost of electronic structure calculations.

This paper is structured as follows. In Section II A, we introduce the transcorrelated method and the quantum algorithms we consider, namely qubitization and QEVE. In Section III, we show the numerical estimates for the energy errors and gate counts. Section IV contains concluding remarks.

## II. THEORY

### A. Transcorrelated Hamiltonian

We start with the electronic structure problem, which is the problem of finding the eigenstates of the following Hamiltonian:

$$\hat{H}_0 = - \sum_i \frac{\nabla_i^2}{2} + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i \neq j} r_{ij}^{-1} - \sum_{iI} Z_I r_{iI}^{-1} + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{I \neq J} Z_I Z_J r_{IJ}^{-1} \quad (1)$$

Here lowercase indices count the electrons and uppercase indices count the nuclei.  $Z_I$  is the charge of  $I$ 'th nucleus,  $r_{ij}$  is the distance between electrons  $i$  and  $j$ ,  $r_{iI}$  and  $r_{IJ}$  are electron-nucleus and nucleus-nucleus distances, respectively. We only consider the electronic wavefunction and treat the coordinates of the nuclei as parameters of the Hamiltonian. We are interested in solving the time-independent Schrödinger equation:

$$\hat{H}_0 |\Psi\rangle = E |\Psi\rangle \quad (2)$$

The Hamiltonian (1) has singularities at  $r_{ij} = 0$  and  $r_{iI} = 0$ . Because of that, the eigenfunctions of  $\hat{H}_0$  have discontinuous derivatives at these points. More specifically,  $|\Psi\rangle$  satisfies the *cusp conditions* [5, 23]. For two electrons with opposite spins, we have

$$\left. \frac{\partial \Psi}{\partial r_{12}} \right|_{r_{12}=0} = \frac{1}{2} \Psi|_{r_{12}=0} \quad (3)$$

Here the partial derivative is assumed to be averaged over a sphere centered at the coalescence point. For two electrons with identical spins, we have

$$\left. \frac{\partial \Psi_{1m}}{\partial r_{12}} \right|_{r_{12}=0} = \frac{1}{4} \Psi_{1m}|_{r_{12}=0}, \quad (4)$$

where  $\Psi_{1m}$  is the  $r_{12}Y_{1m}$  component of  $\Psi$  and  $Y_{lm}$  is the  $(l, m)$ -th spherical harmonic. Similar conditions arise from the electron-nucleus coalescence.

We can represent the eigenfunction  $|\Psi\rangle$  as a product of a smooth wavefunction and an operator that reproduces the correct behaviour of the wavefunction near the singularities:

$$|\Psi\rangle = e^{\hat{J}} |\Phi\rangle \quad (5)$$

Here  $\hat{J}$  is known as the Jastrow factor. The eigenvalue problem then takes the following form:

$$\hat{H}_0 e^{\hat{J}} |\Phi\rangle = E e^{\hat{J}} |\Phi\rangle \quad (6)$$

Multiplying both sides by  $e^{-\hat{J}}$ , we obtain an eigenvalue problem for the *transcorrelated* (TC) Hamiltonian  $\hat{H}$ :

$$\hat{H} |\Phi\rangle = e^{-\hat{J}} \hat{H}_0 e^{\hat{J}} |\Phi\rangle = E |\Phi\rangle \quad (7)$$

The Jastrow factor generally has the following form:

$$\hat{J} = \sum_{i < j} u(\mathbf{r}_i, \mathbf{r}_j) \equiv \sum_{i < j} u_{ij}, \quad (8)$$

where  $\mathbf{r}_i$  are the electron coordinates, and  $u(\mathbf{r}_i, \mathbf{r}_j) = u_{ij}$  is symmetric with respect to its arguments. In principle,  $u_{ij}$  depends not only on the electron-electron distance  $r_{ij}$ , but also on the electron-nucleus distances  $r_{iI}$ .

The similarity transformation, expanded as Baker-Campbell-Hausdorff series, truncates exactly after two commutator terms:

$$e^{-\hat{J}} \hat{H}_0 e^{\hat{J}} = \hat{H}_0 - [\hat{J}, \hat{H}_0] + \frac{1}{2} [\hat{J}, [\hat{J}, \hat{H}_0]] \quad (9)$$

because of the nilpotency of the Heisenberg algebra generated by the coordinate and momentum operators. Calculating the commutators, we find  $\hat{H}$ :

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{H} &= \hat{H}_0 - \sum_i \left( \frac{\nabla_i^2 \hat{J}}{2} + (\nabla_i \hat{J}, \nabla_i) + \frac{1}{2} (\nabla_i \hat{J})^2 \right) \\ &= \hat{H}_0 - \sum_{i < j} \hat{K}(\mathbf{r}_i, \mathbf{r}_j) - \sum_{i < j < k} \hat{G}(\mathbf{r}_i, \mathbf{r}_j, \mathbf{r}_k) \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{K}(\mathbf{r}_i, \mathbf{r}_j) &= \frac{1}{2} (\nabla_i^2 u_{ij} + \nabla_j^2 u_{ij} + (\nabla_i u_{ij})^2 + (\nabla_j u_{ij})^2) \\ &\quad + (\nabla_i u_{ij}, \nabla_i) + (\nabla_j u_{ij}, \nabla_j) \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{G}(\mathbf{r}_i, \mathbf{r}_j, \mathbf{r}_k) &= (\nabla_i u_{ij}, \nabla_i u_{ik}) \\ &\quad + (\nabla_j u_{ji}, \nabla_j u_{jk}) + (\nabla_k u_{ki}, \nabla_k u_{kj}) \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

After this transformation, we project the Hamiltonian onto a finite basis of Slater determinants to obtain a second-quantized Hamiltonian:

$$\begin{aligned}
H = & \sum_{pq,\sigma} h_{pq} a_{p\sigma}^\dagger a_{q\sigma} \\
& + \sum_{pqrs,\sigma\tau} (V_{pqrs} - K_{pqrs}) a_{p\sigma}^\dagger a_{q\tau}^\dagger a_{s\tau} a_{r\sigma} \\
& + \sum_{pqrsuv,\sigma\tau\kappa} G_{pqrsuv} a_{p\sigma}^\dagger a_{q\tau}^\dagger a_{r\kappa}^\dagger a_{v\kappa} a_{u\tau} a_{s\sigma} \quad (13)
\end{aligned}$$

Here  $h_{pq} = \langle \phi_p | \frac{-\nabla^2}{2} | \phi_q \rangle - \sum_I Z_I r_{1I}^{-1} \langle \phi_p | \phi_q \rangle$ ,  $V_{pqrs} = \langle \phi_p \phi_q | r_{12}^{-1} | \phi_r \phi_s \rangle$ ,  $K_{pqrs} = \langle \phi_p \phi_q | \hat{K} | \phi_r \phi_s \rangle$ ,  $G_{pqrsuv} = \langle \phi_p \phi_q \phi_r | \hat{G} | \phi_s \phi_u \phi_v \rangle$ . The Hamiltonian now has three-body interactions, but more importantly, the two-body term is non-Hermitian, making the standard qubitization algorithm unusable. Instead, one needs to use more sophisticated algorithms. In addition, even though the full space TC Hamiltonian (7) is diagonalizable, the projected Hamiltonian (13) is not guaranteed to retain this property, nor is it guaranteed to have real eigenvalues. However, this was the case for all Hamiltonians we considered in this work.

### B. Ground state energy estimation for Hermitian and non-Hermitian operators

In this section we briefly review the main ideas behind the estimation of the lowest eigenvalue of a Hamiltonian using a quantum computer. The algorithms for both Hermitian and non-Hermitian Hamiltonians assume that we represent the Hamiltonian as a linear combination of unitaries:

$$H = b_0 + \sum_{j=1}^K b_j U_j \quad (14)$$

Here  $b_j$  are real and positive, with the phases being absorbed in the unitaries. The important complexity metrics are the number of terms  $K$  and the one-norm

$$\alpha := \sum_{j=1}^K b_j \quad (15)$$

Here the constant term  $b_0$  is not included in the count as we can perform all quantum operations without it and then add  $b_0$  to the final results.

The Hamiltonian  $H$  is represented in a quantum computer using the PREPARE and SELECT circuits which act on the target register and a  $\lceil \log K \rceil$ -qubit ancilla register as follows:

$$\text{PREP}|0\rangle|\psi\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\alpha}} \sum \sqrt{b_j} |j\rangle |\psi\rangle \quad (16a)$$

$$\text{SEL} |i\rangle |\psi\rangle = |i\rangle U_i |\psi\rangle \quad (16b)$$

Here and in the rest of the paper,  $\log K$  denotes a logarithm with base two. Applying  $\text{PREP}^\dagger \cdot \text{SEL} \cdot \text{PREP}$  to

an input state  $|0\rangle|\psi\rangle$  then yields a state

$$|0\rangle \frac{H}{\alpha} |\psi\rangle + |\perp\rangle, \quad (17)$$

where  $|\perp\rangle$  is orthogonal to any state with zero in the ancilla register.

#### 1. Hermitian operators

We first consider the case when  $H$  is a Hermitian operator with eigenstates  $\{|\lambda_i\rangle\}$  and corresponding eigenvalues  $\{\lambda_i\}$ . The core component of the algorithm for ground state energy estimation is a controlled unitary  $U$  that encodes the eigenvalues of  $H$  in its eigenphases. For a Hermitian  $H$ , there are two common choices of such a unitary:

- *Trotter-based simulation*: construct an approximate propagator

$$U(t) \approx e^{-iHt},$$

so that  $U(t)|\lambda_j\rangle = e^{-i\lambda_j t} |\lambda_j\rangle$  [24].

- *Qubitization*: construct a walk operator  $W$  such that the states  $\text{PREP}|0\rangle|\lambda_i\rangle$  and  $\text{SEL} \cdot \text{PREP}|0\rangle|\lambda_i\rangle$  form a two-dimensional invariant space for  $W$ , and the eigenvalues of  $W$  restricted to this subspace are  $\exp(\pm i \arccos \lambda_i / \alpha)$  [20, 25].

The ground state energy of a Hermitian operator  $H$  is then estimated as follows. Here we show the steps for the Trotter-based algorithm, but for qubitization they are the same up to substitution of the input state by  $\text{PREP}|0\rangle|\psi_0\rangle$  and the eigenstates of  $H$  by the eigenstates of  $W$ .

*Input state preparation.* We start by preparing an input state  $|\psi_0\rangle$  which approximates the ground state  $|\lambda_0\rangle$ . In the eigenbasis,  $|\psi_0\rangle$  has the following decomposition:

$$|\psi_0\rangle = \sum_j c_j |\lambda_j\rangle$$

The success probability of the algorithm is proportional to the overlap  $|c_0|^2 = |\langle \psi | \lambda_0 \rangle|^2$ , so it is desirable to maximize it.

*Controlled applications of the phase unitary.* Introduce an  $M$ -qubit ancilla register in the uniform superposition

$$\frac{1}{2^{M/2}} \sum_{k=0}^{2^M-1} |k\rangle.$$

Apply controlled- $U^k$ , i.e., apply  $U^k$  to the system register when the ancilla is in state  $|k\rangle$ . The joint state becomes

$$\frac{1}{2^{M/2}} \sum_{k=0}^{2^M-1} |k\rangle U^k |\psi_0\rangle.$$

Calculation type	Li, E, Ha	Li error, Ha	Be, E, Ha	Be error, Ha
Experiment [26]	-7.47806	-	-14.66736	-
FCI, cc-pVDZ	-7.43264	0.04542	-14.61741	0.04995
FCI, cc-pVTZ	-7.44607	0.03199	-14.62381	0.04355
FCI, cc-pVQZ	-7.44983	0.02823	-14.64001*	0.02735*
TC-FCI, STO-6G	$-7.471 \pm 0.001$	$0.007 \pm 0.001$	$-14.667 \pm 0.004$	$0 \pm 0.004$

TABLE I. Estimates of the ground state energy for Li and Be atoms. The FCI energy for Be in the cc-pVQZ basis is a DMRG+SCI estimate from the DARPA Quantum Benchmarking dataset. The energies for the TC Hamiltonians are averaged over 5 realizations of the Jastrow factor optimized via variational Monte Carlo, the error intervals denote one standard deviation.

Expansion of  $|\psi_0\rangle$  in the eigenbasis yields

$$\frac{1}{2^{M/2}} \sum_{k=0}^{2^M-1} \sum_j c_j |k\rangle e^{-ik\lambda_j t} |\lambda_j\rangle.$$

*Quantum Fourier transform on the ancilla register.* Finally, we apply the quantum Fourier transform to the ancilla register:

$$|k\rangle \mapsto \frac{1}{2^{M/2}} \sum_{y=0}^{2^M-1} e^{2\pi i k y / 2^M} |y\rangle.$$

After QFT, the ancilla register is approximately peaked around  $y \approx \theta_j 2^M / (2\pi)$ . Measuring the ancilla gives an estimate of  $\theta_j$ , and thus of  $\lambda_j$ , with probability  $|c_j|^2$ . In particular, with probability  $|c_0|^2$  the outcome encodes the ground state energy.

## 2. Non-Hermitian operators

When  $H$  is non-Hermitian, one cannot build the phase-encoding unitary the same way as for the Hermitian case. The evolution operator  $e^{-iHt}$  is no longer unitary, and the walk operator does not have the same two-dimensional invariant subspaces. Instead, the quantum eigenvalue estimation (QEVE) algorithm of Ref. [21] encodes a sum of Chebyshev polynomials in  $H$ . The input state is the same, but instead of controlled Trotter/walk operators, we apply a circuit that prepares the *Chebyshev history state*

$$|\Phi\rangle = \sum_{l=0}^{N-1} |l\rangle T_l\left(\frac{H}{\alpha}\right) |\psi_0\rangle. \quad (18)$$

Here  $T_l(x)$  are the Chebyshev polynomials of the first kind:

$$T_\ell(x) = \cos(\ell \arccos(x)) \quad (19)$$

The maximum degree  $N$  controls the accuracy of eigenvalue estimation. The ancilla qubits required for LCU are not shown, as well as the normalization factor of  $|\Phi\rangle$ . The Chebyshev polynomials of  $H/\alpha$  act on the right eigenstates as follows:

$$T_\ell(H/\alpha) |\lambda_j\rangle = T_\ell(\lambda_j/\alpha) |\lambda_j\rangle.$$

In the (right) eigenstate expansion, the history state is then

$$|\Phi\rangle = \sum_{l=0}^{L-1} \sum_j c_j |l\rangle T_l(\lambda_j/\alpha) |\lambda_j\rangle$$

After preparing  $|\Phi\rangle$ , we apply QFT to the ancilla register and measure it. Since  $T_l(\lambda_j/\alpha) = \cos(l\theta_j)$  with  $\theta_j = \arccos(\lambda_j/\alpha)$ , the Fourier transform produces peaks at  $\theta_j$ . Measuring the ancilla yields an estimate of  $\theta_j$ , and hence of  $\lambda_j$ .

## C. Constructing the Chebyshev history state using a quantum linear system solver

Here we discuss preparation of the history state (18) for non-Hermitian Hamiltonian  $H$ . Using the block encoding of  $H$ , one could in principle prepare the Chebyshev polynomials  $T_\ell(H/\alpha)$  by preparing individual monomials of  $H/\alpha$  and adding the block encodings by treating them as unitaries in another LCU expansion, but since the coefficients of the Chebyshev polynomials scale exponentially with  $\ell$ , so would the cost of this approach. Instead, we take advantage of the fact that we know the generating function of  $T_\ell(x)$ :

$$G(x, y) = \sum_{\ell=0}^{\infty} y^\ell T_\ell(x) = \frac{1 - xy}{1 - 2xy + x^2} \quad (20)$$

With a lower shift operator

$$L := \sum_{\ell=1}^{N-2} |\ell+1\rangle \langle \ell| \quad (21)$$

we can implement the history state by applying the matrix version of the Chebyshev generating function:

$$\begin{aligned} G(H/\alpha, L) &= \sum_{\ell=0}^{\infty} L^\ell \otimes T_\ell\left(\frac{H}{\alpha_A}\right) \\ &= \frac{1 - L \otimes H/\alpha}{1 - 2L \otimes H/\alpha + L^2 \otimes 1} \end{aligned} \quad (22)$$

Here the series truncates at  $N-1$  because  $L^N = 0$ . The nontrivial part then is the application of the denominator

$$C = 1 - 2L \otimes H/\alpha + L^2 \otimes 1 \quad (23)$$

Atom	Li	Be	B	C	N	O	F	Ne
$\kappa_S$	3.1	10.0	7.7	7.1	13.89	4.43	37.8	5.06

TABLE II. Jordan condition numbers of the TC Hamiltonians used for the gate count estimates.

To do this, we construct a block encoding of  $C$  and use a quantum linear system solver algorithm to apply  $C^{-1}$ . The most advanced solver that we are aware of is the adiabatic solver of Ref. [27]; its runtime scales linearly with the condition number of  $C$  and logarithmically with the required precision of the inversion. Internally, this algorithm constructs a Hermitian operator out of  $C$  and  $C^\dagger$ , then implements adiabatic evolution using qubitized quantum walks.

### III. NUMERICAL RESULTS

#### A. Energy error

The TC Hamiltonian is non-Hermitian and includes more terms than its non-TC counterpart in the same basis, so it is natural to expect the energy estimation to be more expensive. However, since the TC Hamiltonian incorporates the Jastrow factor, its ground state energy should in principle approximate the exact one more accurately. In this subsection, we compare the energy errors for simple Hamiltonians to establish what basis in the non-TC picture corresponds to the minimal basis in the TC picture, accuracy-wise.

For this purpose, we compute the FCI energies for Li and Be atoms. For Li, we used PySCF to construct the Hamiltonians and calculate the non-TC FCI energies in the cc-pVXZ bases for  $X = D, T, Q$ .

For the TC case, the Hamiltonians were obtained using CASINO [28] and the TCHInt library. We used the Drummond-Towler-Needs form of the Jastrow factor [29], which was optimized using the variational Monte Carlo algorithm with  $10^7$  samples. We then used exact diagonalization to find the ground state energy. Since the usage of variational Monte Carlo entails randomness in the resulting Jastrow factor and consequently the TC Hamiltonian, we ran 5 independent trials. Over these trials, the standard deviation of the ground state energy was 1 mHa.

We used the same procedure for Be, except that the energy for the cc-pVQZ basis was taken from the DARPA Quantum Benchmarking dataset [30], where it was calculated using the density matrix renormalization group (DMRG) method. For the TC Hamiltonian of Be, the standard deviation of the ground state energy over 5 realizations of variational Monte Carlo was approximately 4 mHa.

The results are shown in Table I. As a reference, we use the experimental energy from Ref. [26]. For these examples, even with the uncertainty coming from the

Jastrow factor optimization, the TC ground state energy for the STO-6G basis is much closer to the reference energy than that of the non-TC Hamiltonian for the cc-pVQZ basis.

#### B. Resource estimates

For the gate resource estimates we compare the qubitization algorithm for non-TC Hamiltonians with the QEVE algorithm for TC Hamiltonians. The Hamiltonians are mapped to linear combinations of Pauli operators using the Jordan-Wigner transformation.

The gate complexity and qubit count depend on the required accuracy of the eigenvalue estimation. For both methods, the error budget of  $\varepsilon = 0.0016$  Hartree can be split between the following sources of error:

1. The error of the phase estimation. This error determines the number of ancilla qubits in QPE and the maximum Chebyshev degree in QEVE. In both cases, it ends up determining the number of calls to the qubitized walk operator.
2. The error of the block encoding. This error depends on the precision to which we store the coefficients of the LCU decomposition. In addition, once we fix this error, we can also discard the terms where  $|b_i|/\alpha < 2^{-\mu}$ , so indirectly the tolerance for block encoding also determines the number of terms.

We split the error budget evenly between these sources. Having done that, we can fix the qubit and T gate costs as functions of  $K$  and  $\alpha$ . The detailed calculations are shown in Appendices A and B.

Tables III and IV show the one-norms  $\alpha$  and the term counts  $K$ , respectively. For comparison, we also show the one-norm and the number of terms for the non-TC Hamiltonian in the STO-6G basis. Both in terms of one-norms and the number of terms, the TC Hamiltonians in the STO-6G basis are much smaller than the non-TC Hamiltonians in the cc-pVXZ bases. Moreover, even though the number of terms in the TC Hamiltonians for the STO-6G basis is several times larger than that in the non-TC, STO-6G Hamiltonians, the one-norms have the same order of magnitude.

Besides  $K$  and  $\alpha$ , the QEVE algorithm depends on the so-called Jordan condition number of  $H$ . That is, if we have a diagonalization

$$H = SDS^{-1}, \quad (24)$$

then by Jordan condition number we mean the condition number of  $S$ :

$$\kappa_S = \|S\| \cdot \|S^{-1}\| \quad (25)$$

The query complexity of QEVE depends linearly on  $\kappa_S$ , but since  $\kappa_S$  also affects the required precision of the coefficients, the T gate count grows as  $O(\kappa_S \log \kappa_S)$ .

	Li	Be	B	C	N	O	F	Ne
STO-6G	8.2	12.0	17.4	26.0	36.2	48.4	62.3	78.2
cc-pVDZ	67.4	112.5	121.7	154.5	202.8	203.6	242.0	293.7
cc-pVTZ	$5.83 \times 10^2$	$8.39 \times 10^2$	$8.91 \times 10^2$	$1.10 \times 10^3$	$1.63 \times 10^3$	$1.53 \times 10^3$	$1.76 \times 10^3$	$2.39 \times 10^3$
cc-pVQZ	$2.80 \times 10^3$	$4.32 \times 10^3$	$4.00 \times 10^3$	$5.20 \times 10^3$	$8.17 \times 10^3$	$7.00 \times 10^3$	$8.06 \times 10^3$	$1.20 \times 10^4$
TC, STO-6G	6.0	12.0	18.1	27.0	49.1	76.3	94.6	106.5

TABLE III. One-norms of second-row atoms in their Pauli decompositions.

	Li	Be	B	C	N	O	F	Ne
STO-6G	154	154	154	154	154	154	154	154
cc-pVDZ	$1.27 \times 10^4$	$2.25 \times 10^4$	$1.10 \times 10^4$	$1.10 \times 10^4$	$2.30 \times 10^4$	$1.10 \times 10^4$	$1.10 \times 10^4$	$2.30 \times 10^4$
cc-pVTZ	$5.02 \times 10^5$	$5.37 \times 10^5$	$2.39 \times 10^5$	$2.39 \times 10^5$	$5.47 \times 10^5$	$2.39 \times 10^5$	$2.39 \times 10^5$	$5.48 \times 10^5$
cc-pVQZ	$6.10 \times 10^6$	$6.23 \times 10^6$	$2.62 \times 10^6$	$2.62 \times 10^6$	$6.39 \times 10^6$	$2.61 \times 10^6$	$2.62 \times 10^6$	$6.39 \times 10^6$
TC, STO-6G	934	958	958	910	958	958	910	910

TABLE IV. Number of terms for second-row atoms in the Pauli decompositions.

		Li	Be	B	C	N	O	F	Ne
cc-pVDZ	QROM	$6.4 \times 10^{11}$	$1.1 \times 10^{12}$	$5.5 \times 10^{11}$	$1.1 \times 10^{12}$	$2.3 \times 10^{12}$	$1.1 \times 10^{12}$	$1.1 \times 10^{12}$	$4.6 \times 10^{12}$
	QROAM	$2.6 \times 10^{11}$	$4.5 \times 10^{11}$	$2.3 \times 10^{11}$	$4.7 \times 10^{11}$	$9.2 \times 10^{11}$	$4.7 \times 10^{11}$	$4.6 \times 10^{11}$	$1.8 \times 10^{12}$
cc-pVTZ	QROM	$2.0 \times 10^{14}$	$2.2 \times 10^{14}$	$9.6 \times 10^{13}$	$1.9 \times 10^{14}$	$4.4 \times 10^{14}$	$1.9 \times 10^{14}$	$1.9 \times 10^{14}$	$8.8 \times 10^{14}$
	QROAM	$7.0 \times 10^{13}$	$7.5 \times 10^{13}$	$3.4 \times 10^{13}$	$6.8 \times 10^{13}$	$1.5 \times 10^{14}$	$6.8 \times 10^{13}$	$6.8 \times 10^{13}$	$3.1 \times 10^{14}$
cc-pVQZ	QROM	$9.8 \times 10^{15}$	$2.0 \times 10^{16}$	$4.2 \times 10^{15}$	$8.4 \times 10^{15}$	<b><math>2.1 \times 10^{16}</math></b>	<b><math>8.4 \times 10^{15}</math></b>	<b><math>8.4 \times 10^{15}</math></b>	$4.1 \times 10^{16}$
	QROAM	$3.3 \times 10^{15}$	$6.8 \times 10^{15}$	<b><math>1.4 \times 10^{15}</math></b>	$2.9 \times 10^{15}$	<b><math>7.0 \times 10^{15}</math></b>	<b><math>2.9 \times 10^{15}</math></b>	<b><math>2.9 \times 10^{15}</math></b>	$1.4 \times 10^{16}$
TC, STO-6g	QROM	<b><math>7.2 \times 10^{14}</math></b>	<b><math>2.4 \times 10^{15}</math></b>	<b><math>3.7 \times 10^{15}</math></b>	<b><math>3.3 \times 10^{15}</math></b>	$1.4 \times 10^{16}$	$8.8 \times 10^{15}$	$7.2 \times 10^{16}$	<b><math>9.6 \times 10^{15}</math></b>
	QROAM	<b><math>4.7 \times 10^{14}</math></b>	<b><math>1.5 \times 10^{15}</math></b>	$2.4 \times 10^{15}$	<b><math>2.2 \times 10^{15}</math></b>	$9.1 \times 10^{15}$	$5.9 \times 10^{15}$	$5.0 \times 10^{16}$	<b><math>6.6 \times 10^{15}</math></b>

TABLE V. T gate complexity estimates for eigenvalue estimation. Here the choice of ancillas in QROAM minimizes the gate count.

Table II shows values of the Jordan condition numbers for the Hamiltonians we used in resource estimation. However, unlike the one-norm, term count, or eigenenergies, the Jordan condition number was much more unstable with respect to random realizations of the Jastrow factor optimization: for Li, the observed values of  $\kappa_S$  ranged from 3.1 to 25.7. For Be, these values ranged from 4.1 to 10.1.

Finally, we note that there is a certain freedom in choosing the implementation of the PREPARE circuit. Using the QROAM subroutine [31], one can decrease the T gate count at the cost of introducing additional ancilla registers.

Table V shows the overall T gate counts for the qubitization and QEVE algorithms. In terms of T gate complexity, the QEVE algorithm for the TC Hamiltonian in the minimal basis is more expensive than the qubitization-based algorithm for the cc-pVDZ and cc-pVTZ bases, but it is comparable with the cost of the qubitization for the cc-pVQZ basis. The qubit count, however, is substantially smaller for the QEVE algorithm (Table VI). Optimizing the QROAM subroutine yields an improvement in T gate count up to about a factor of three, especially for the VQZ basis, but the qubit overhead quickly becomes overwhelming. The reason for this is that QROAM does not affect the cost of the SELECT circuit, so after a certain point it becomes the most expensive part of the quantum walk, and further improvements to PREP become unimportant

compared to the cost of SELECT.

#### IV. CONCLUSIONS

We evaluated the costs of estimating the ground state energy using qubitization (for Hermitian Hamiltonians) and quantum eigenvalue estimation (for non-Hermitian Hamiltonians). We found that the QEVE algorithm yields more accurate energy estimates with competitive T gate counts and fewer qubits.

Estimating the Jordan condition number  $\kappa_S$  remains a key challenge. Even though the similarity transformation in first quantization is generated by a well-behaved operator, there is no guarantee that the projected Hamiltonian can be diagonalized by a similarity transformation with a small condition number. Understanding the behavior of  $\kappa_S$  is critical for determining the success of QEVE and likely of any other quantum algorithm that deals with the spectrum of diagonalizable non-Hermitian matrices.

The Hamiltonians used in the work and the code for resource estimation are available on Github: [https://github.com/aleksey-uvarov/qeve\\_cost](https://github.com/aleksey-uvarov/qeve_cost).

		Li	Be	B	C	N	O	F	Ne
cc-pVDZ	QROM	136	142	137	138	144	139	139	145
	QROAM	1032	1098	1063	1064	1130	1095	1095	1131
cc-pVTZ	QROM	200	205	195	197	207	197	197	208
	QROAM	10099	10358	4977	5105	10614	5105	5105	10615
cc-pVQZ	QROM	274	275	269	270	276	271	271	278
	QROAM	23216	23217	22701	22702	23728	23213	23213	24240
TC, STO-6g	QROM	94	97	98	98	101	101	104	102
	QROAM	242	263	264	264	279	273	294	280

TABLE VI. Logical qubit count.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We thank Nathan Wiebe for helpful discussions. A.U. thanks Pablo López Ríos and Werner Dobrautz for their help in configuring TCHInt. This work was supported by Mitacs through the Mitacs Elevate program. This research was partly enabled by the support of Compute Ontario (computeontario.ca) and the Digital Research Alliance of Canada (alliancecan.ca). Part of the computations were performed on the Niagara and Trillium supercomputers at the SciNet HPC Consortium, and the NARVAL and RORQUAL supercomputers under the Calcul Québec Consortium. SciNet is funded by Innovation, Science, and Economic Development Canada, the Digital Research Alliance of Canada, the Ontario Research Fund: Research Excellence, and the University of Toronto.

## Appendix A: Complexity analysis for qubitization

### a. Query complexity

A key component of qubitization is the controlled walk operator. Its preparation requires one call to SEL, one call to PREP, one call to  $\text{PREP}^\dagger$ , and one call to a multi-controlled Z. The desired precision of calculating the eigenvalues determines the number of times we want to call the controlled W. Finally, we apply the quantum Fourier transform to the ancilla register and measure.

The spectrum of the walk operator

$$Q = (2|0\rangle\langle 0| - 1) \cdot \text{PREP}^\dagger \cdot \text{SEL} \cdot \text{PREP}$$

consists of values of the form  $\exp(\pm i \arccos \frac{\lambda_k}{\alpha})$ . The phase estimation algorithm will extract the phase  $\varphi = \arccos \frac{\lambda_k}{\alpha}$  up to some precision  $\delta\varphi$ . We want this phase error to be such that its contribution to the total energy error is at most  $\varepsilon_{QPE}$ . By considering the derivative of the arccosine, we can estimate the at worst we need  $\delta\varphi \approx \frac{\varepsilon_{QPE}}{\alpha}$ .

To perform phase estimation successfully with probability at least  $(1 - p_{fail})$ , we need

$$n_a = \left\lceil \log \frac{2\pi}{\delta\varphi} \right\rceil + \left\lceil \log \left( 2 + \frac{1}{2p_{fail}} \right) \right\rceil \quad (\text{A1})$$

ancilla qubits [32]. Thus, we will need  $2^{n_a} - 1$  controlled applications of  $Q$ . If we demand  $p_{fail} < 1/2$ , the second term in A1 yields two extra qubits. The number of calls to the walk oracle is then

$$2^{n_a} - 1 = 2^{\lceil \log \frac{2\pi\alpha}{\varepsilon_{QPE}} \rceil + 2} - 1 = 4 \cdot 2^{\lceil \log \frac{2\pi\alpha}{\varepsilon_{QPE}} \rceil} - 1. \quad (\text{A2})$$

### b. The cost of PREP

We follow the realization of PREP given in Ref. [22], where it uses coherent alias sampling. In short, the idea is the following:

1. Prepare a uniform superposition

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{K}} \sum_{i=1}^K |i\rangle \quad (\text{A3})$$

When  $K$  is a power of two, this step consists of  $\log K$  Hadamard gates, but otherwise requires a more complicated circuit. However, as we explain shortly, in this case one can instead prepare a uniform superposition on the first  $\lceil \log K \rceil$  qubits, still requiring no T gates.

2. Prepare a state

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{K}} \sum_{i=0}^{K-1} |i\rangle |\text{alt}_i\rangle |\text{keep}_i\rangle \quad (\text{A4})$$

Here the registers contain  $\lceil \log K \rceil$ ,  $\lceil \log K \rceil$ , and  $\mu$  qubits, respectively. This step is performed using QROAM [31]. We are free to select an integer  $q$  which is a power of two and  $1 \leq q < K$ . This step will then cost

$$\left\lceil \frac{K}{q} \right\rceil + (\mu + \lceil \log K \rceil)(q - 1) \quad (\text{A5})$$

Toffoli gates and  $(\mu + \lceil \log K \rceil)(q - 1) + \lceil \log K/q \rceil$  ancillas. Note that  $q = 1$  corresponds to standard QROM.

3. Prepare a uniform superposition in another  $\mu$ -qubit register  $|\sigma\rangle$ , then swap the index and “alt” register controlled on whether the value of  $\sigma$  is smaller than

keep<sub>i</sub>. This means that we need to perform an addition ( $4\mu$  T gates) and a controlled SWAP. Since a SWAP can be implemented with three CNOTs, a cSWAP can be implemented with three Toffolis. Thus we have  $3\lceil\log K\rceil$  Toffoli gates.

The values of keep<sub>i</sub> and alt<sub>i</sub> can be classically engineered so that in the end we obtain a state proportional to

$$\sum_{i=0}^{K-1} \sqrt{b_i} |i\rangle |\text{garbage}_i\rangle \quad (\text{A6})$$

To avoid having to prepare a uniform distribution on  $K$  states when  $K$  is not a power of two, we can instead prepare a uniform distribution on the first  $2^{\lceil\log K\rceil}$  states (supported at least on half of the register). The desired distribution is then reachable in the same fashion.

Thus, the cost of PREP, assuming 1 Toffoli is equal to 4 T gates, is

$$4 \left\lceil \frac{K}{q} \right\rceil + 4(\mu + \lceil\log K\rceil)(q-1) + 4\mu + 12\lceil\log K\rceil \quad (\text{A7})$$

T gates.

While the inverse of PREP could potentially be made cheaper than PREP, here we assume that the inverse costs the same.

#### c. The cost of SEL

This one cost  $4K - 4$  T gates due to unary iteration plus the cost of all controlled applications of the unitaries themselves. If these are controlled Paulis, then their T-cost is zero.

#### d. The cost of reflection

The reflection operator is an  $\lceil\log K\rceil$ -controlled Z, which is equivalent to an  $\lceil\log K\rceil$ -Toffoli gate up to Clifford gates. This costs  $4(\lceil\log K\rceil - 1)$  T gates [33].

#### e. Total cost of a quantum walk oracle

Putting it all together, one call of a controlled quantum walk oracle costs

$$4K + 8\mu + 8(q-1)(\mu + \lceil\log K\rceil) + 8 \left\lceil \frac{K}{q} \right\rceil + 28\lceil\log K\rceil - 8 \quad (\text{A8})$$

T gates.

#### f. Error budget

Now we need to decide on the size of the keep register  $\mu$  and the phase estimation tolerance  $\varepsilon_{QPE}$ . By approximating the Hamiltonian terms up to  $2^{-\mu}$ , we incur the error in the eigenvalues of at most  $K2^{-\mu}$ , which follows from Weyl's perturbation theorem [34].

The error in determining the eigenvalues then consists of the QPE error  $\varepsilon_{QPE}$  and the preparation error. If we distribute the error budget evenly, we get:

$$\varepsilon_{QPE} = \frac{\varepsilon}{2}; \quad \mu = \log \frac{2\alpha K}{\varepsilon} \quad (\text{A9})$$

Finally, the complexity of a call to the walk oracle can be slightly reduced further by discarding the terms with coefficients below  $\alpha 2^{-\mu}$ .

### Appendix B: Complexity analysis for QEVE

By  $N-1$  we denote the maximum degree of the Chebyshev polynomials, and by  $n = \log N$  the corresponding number of ancilla qubits. We assume that  $\|H/\alpha\| \leq 1/2$ , this is necessary for the QEVE algorithm and can be ensured at no extra cost. We also assume that  $N$  is a power of two (for cost estimations, when we calculate the value of  $N$  needed to reach the required accuracy, we round it up to the nearest power of two).

#### a. Block encoding of the denominator

The QEVE algorithm uses a block encoding of  $C = (1 + L^2 \otimes I - 2L \otimes H/\alpha)$ . This block encoding needs block encodings of  $H/\alpha$  and  $L$ . The block encoding of  $H$  has the same T cost as for the qubitization case, namely the cost of SEL plus twice the cost of PREP:

$$C = 4K + 8\mu + 8(q-1)(\mu + \lceil\log K\rceil) + 8 \left\lceil \frac{K}{q} \right\rceil + 24\lceil\log K\rceil - 4 \quad (\text{B1})$$

The lower shift  $L$  is implemented using the cyclic shift operator

$$X_{2N} = \sum_{j=0}^{2N-1} |j+1 \bmod 2N\rangle \langle j| \quad (\text{B2})$$

together with a *comparator* gate to filter out the unnecessary blocks:

$$CMP_{2N} = \sum_{k \leq N-1} |k\rangle \langle k| \otimes I + \sum_{k > N-1} |k\rangle \langle k| \otimes X \quad (\text{B3})$$

When  $N$  is a power of two, this gate is just a CNOT. The block encoding of  $L$  requires two comparators and one shift.

We can build the shift operator by composing an  $(n-1)$ -Toffoli gate, an  $(n-2)$ -Toffoli,  $(n-3)$ -Toffoli, and



so on (see e.g. Ref. [35], Figure 4). The cost of this implementation is  $4(n-2) + 4(n-3) + \dots + 4 = 2(n-1)(n-2)$  T gates. The controlled implementation of the shift operator means adding one more control to every Toffoli, making the overall cost equal to  $2n(n-1)$  T gates.

We can encode  $C$  using the block encodings of  $L$  and  $H/\alpha$  as LCU components. The one-norm of this LCU is 4, so we get a block encoding of  $C/4$ . The cost is  $\mathcal{C}_{BE(H)} + 6n(n-1)$ . The PREPARE circuit of this LCU doesn't cost any extra T gates: we need two ancilla qubits, and we can rewrite the LCU as  $1 + L^2 - LH - LH$ . This way all coefficients are equal to one up to phase, and the PREPARE circuit is just two Hadamard gates.

The operator norm of  $C/4$  is less or equal than  $3/4$ , which can be shown directly using the properties of the norm (the norm of  $L$  is equal to one:  $LL^\dagger$  is diagonal and has eigenvalues 0 and 1). On the other hand, by directly applying  $C$  to a vector  $|0\rangle|\psi\rangle$ , we can find that  $\|C\| \geq \sqrt{2+4\|H\|^2} \geq \sqrt{2}$ .

#### b. Quantum linear system solver

The core of the QEVE algorithm is the quantum linear systems solver algorithm of Ref. [27] (or any algorithm for solving linear systems). Given  $C$  and  $|b\rangle$  as an input, it prepares a state proportional to  $C^{-1}|b\rangle$ . It consists of two steps: adiabatic evolution and eigenstate filtering. They both scale linearly with the condition number of  $C$ , but the filtering step also carries a logarithmic dependence on the accuracy of preparing the solution. However, compared to the constant factor appearing in the adiabatic evolution step, the filtering step has a negligible cost for any reasonable accuracy requirements.

In the adiabatic evolution step, the algorithm uses a qubitized quantum walk of the Hermitian operator

$$\mathbf{C} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & C^\dagger \\ C & 0 \end{pmatrix} = \sum_i c_i \begin{pmatrix} 0 & U_i^\dagger \\ U_i & 0 \end{pmatrix} \quad (\text{B4})$$

Since the Hamiltonians we consider are real, all Pauli coefficients are either purely real (in which case a Pauli string  $U_i$  contains an even number of  $Y$  Pauli matrices) or purely imaginary (an odd number of  $Y$  Pauli matrices), and by convention that  $c_i$  are real, in this case  $U_i$  is also multiplied by  $i$ . In either case, the summands in (B4) are obtained from  $U_i$  by tensor multiplying them either by  $X$  or by  $Y$ . Therefore, block encoding  $\mathbf{C}$  takes the same amount of T gates as encoding  $C$ . To make a walk operator, we also need a reflection, which, taking all extra ancillas into account, takes  $4(\lceil \log K \rceil + 2 - 1)$  T gates.

Aside from a much looser rigorous bound, Ref. [27] gives the following bound based on numerical experiments:

$$\|U(s) - U_C(s)\| \leq 2305 \frac{\kappa}{T} \quad (\text{B5})$$

Here  $\kappa$  is the condition number of the input matrix. For the algorithm to work, the error of the evolution after this

process has to be such that the overlap with the ground state of the final matrix is no less than  $1/2$ . This implies that  $T$  has to be chosen so that

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \geq 2305 \frac{\kappa}{T} \quad (\text{B6})$$

That is,

$$T \geq 2305 \kappa \sqrt{2} \quad (\text{B7})$$

Since the probability of success in this case is about one half, this means that on average we will need

$$4610 \kappa \sqrt{2} \quad (\text{B8})$$

calls to the block encoding of  $C$ .

The condition number  $\kappa$  is defined as the following product of norms:

$$\kappa = \|C\| \cdot \|C^{-1}\| \quad (\text{B9})$$

For Lemma 1 of Ref. [21] we know an upper bound:

$$\|C^{-1}\| \leq N \alpha_U \quad (\text{B10})$$

Here

$$\alpha_U \geq \max_{0 \leq j \leq n-1} \|U_j(H/\alpha)\| \quad (\text{B11})$$

is an upper bound on the values of Chebyshev polynomials of the second kind. If we assume that  $H$  is diagonalizable (i.e. only contains one-dimensional Jordan blocks; this may or may not be true), we have the following bound:

$$\alpha_U \leq O(\kappa_S) \quad (\text{B12})$$

where  $\kappa_S$  is the Jordan condition number of  $H$ . That is, if we have a diagonalization

$$H = SDS^{-1}, \quad (\text{B13})$$

then by the Jordan condition number we mean the condition number of  $S$ :

$$\kappa_S = \|S\| \cdot \|S^{-1}\| \quad (\text{B14})$$

We can rewrite  $U_j(H)$  as  $SU_j(D)S^{-1}$ .

To turn this “O-large” bound into a concrete bound, we demand that the block encoding of  $H$  is such that  $\|H\|/\alpha \leq 1/2$ . Then we can use a relation connecting the Chebyshev polynomials of first and second kind:

$$T_n^2(x) - (x^2 - 1)U_{n-1}^2(x) = 1 \quad (\text{B15})$$

For  $x \in [-1/2, 1/2]$  we can deduce that  $|U(x)| \leq \sqrt{\frac{8}{3}}$ . This way, we obtain

$$\alpha_U \leq \sqrt{\frac{8}{3}} \kappa_S \quad (\text{B16})$$

Collecting all the terms, we find that we need the following number of queries to the walk operator:

$$18440 \cdot \sqrt{3}N\kappa_S \quad (\text{B17})$$

The required degree of the Chebyshev polynomial depends on the accuracy we need. In QEVE, the energy is estimated as

$$\alpha_A \cos 2\pi\phi \quad (\text{B18})$$

where  $\phi \in [1/6, 1/3]$  is measured in the device (the angle is guaranteed to be in this range by  $\alpha \geq \|H\|/2$ ). The angle is measured up to  $1/N$ . The paper shows that, when the correct angle is not exactly an integer multiple of  $1/N$ , the results of the measurement are spread in such a way that the measured angle is within  $5/N$  of the correct one more than half the time. Using that, if we demand to measure the energy up to  $\epsilon_{QEVE}$ , we can estimate the required Chebyshev degree as

$$N \sim 10\pi\alpha_A/\epsilon_{QEVE} \quad (\text{B19})$$

The call count is then

$$184400 \cdot \sqrt{3}\pi\alpha\kappa_S/\epsilon_{QEVE}$$

### c. Error budget

Once again we will have to distribute the error budget between QEVE and the block encoding. The reasoning doesn't differ from the qubitization case, except that now the error incurred by representing the coefficients to a finite accuracy depends on the Jordan condition number [34]:

**Theorem:** Let  $M = VDV^{-1}$  be a diagonalizable matrix, and  $E$  an arbitrary matrix, then the eigenvalues of  $M$  and  $M + E$  are connected as follows:

$$\max_j \min_{j'} |\lambda_j - \lambda'_{j'}| \leq \|V\| \cdot \|V^{-1}\| \cdot \|E\| \quad (\text{B20})$$

This means that the error in the eigenvalues is upper bounded by  $\alpha 2^{-\mu} \kappa_S K$ . Splitting the error budget equally, we can set

$$\epsilon_{QEVE} = \frac{\epsilon}{2}; \quad \mu = \left\lceil \log \frac{2\alpha K \kappa_S}{\epsilon} \right\rceil \quad (\text{B21})$$

- 
- [1] C. Hättig, W. Klopper, A. Köhn, and D. P. Tew, Explicitly Correlated Electrons in Molecules, *Chemical Reviews* **112**, 4 (2012).
  - [2] T. Helgaker, P. Jørgensen, and J. Olsen, *Molecular Electronic-Structure Theory* (Wiley, Hoboken, 2014).
  - [3] W. Klopper, M. Schütz, H. P. Lüthi, and S. Leutwyler, An *ab initio* derived torsional potential energy surface for (H<sub>2</sub>O)<sub>3</sub>. II. Benchmark studies and interaction energies, *The Journal of Chemical Physics* **103**, 1085 (1995).
  - [4] J. J. Shepherd, A. Grüneis, G. H. Booth, G. Kresse, and A. Alavi, Convergence of many-body wave-function expansions using a plane-wave basis: From homogeneous electron gas to solid state systems, *Physical Review B* **86**, 035111 (2012).
  - [5] T. Kato, On the eigenfunctions of many-particle systems in quantum mechanics, *Communications on Pure and Applied Mathematics* **10**, 151 (1957).
  - [6] E. A. Hylleraas, Neue Berechnung der Energie des Heliums im Grundzustande, sowie des tiefsten Terms von Ortho-Helium, *Zeitschrift für Physik* **54**, 347 (1929).
  - [7] W. Kutzelnigg,  $r_{12}$ -Dependent terms in the wave function as closed sums of partial wave amplitudes for large  $l$ , *Theoretica Chimica Acta* **68**, 445 (1985).
  - [8] Boys and Handy, The determination of energies and wavefunctions with full electronic correlation, *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London. A. Mathematical and Physical Sciences* **310**, 43 (1969).
  - [9] J. O. Hirschfelder, Removal of Electron—Electron Poles from Many-Electron Hamiltonians, *The Journal of Chemical Physics* **39**, 3145 (1963).
  - [10] T. Yanai and T. Shiozaki, Canonical transcorrelated theory with projected Slater-type geminals, *The Journal of Chemical Physics* **136**, 084107 (2012).
  - [11] A. Kumar, A. Asthana, C. Masteran, E. F. Valeev, Y. Zhang, L. Cincio, S. Tretiak, and P. A. Dub, Accurate quantum simulation of molecular ground and excited states with a transcorrelated Hamiltonian 10.48550/arXiv.2201.09852 (2022), arXiv:2201.09852 [physics].
  - [12] M. Motta, T. P. Gujarati, J. E. Rice, A. Kumar, C. Masteran, J. A. Latone, E. Lee, E. F. Valeev, and T. Y. Takeshita, Quantum simulation of electronic structure with a transcorrelated Hamiltonian: Improved accuracy with a smaller footprint on the quantum computer, *Physical Chemistry Chemical Physics* **22**, 24270 (2020).
  - [13] A. Peruzzo, J. McClean, P. Shadbolt, M.-H. Yung, X.-Q. Zhou, P. J. Love, A. Aspuru-Guzik, and J. L. O'Brien, A variational eigenvalue solver on a photonic quantum processor, *Nature Communications* **5**, 4213 (2014).
  - [14] J. I. Colless, V. V. Ramasesh, D. Dahlen, M. S. Blok, M. E. Kimchi-Schwartz, J. R. McClean, J. Carter, W. A. de Jong, and I. Siddiqi, Computation of Molecular Spectra on a Quantum Processor with an Error-Resilient Algorithm, *Physical Review X* **8**, 10.1103/PhysRevX.8.011021 (2018).
  - [15] S. Patel, P. Jayakumar, T. Zeng, and A. F. Izmaylov, Quantum Seniority-based Subspace Expansion: Linear Combinations of Short-Circuit Unitary Transformations for Efficient Quantum Measurements 10.48550/arXiv.2509.01061 (2025), arXiv:2509.01061 [quant-ph].

- [16] X.-D. Xie, Z.-Y. Xue, and D.-B. Zhang, Variational quantum algorithms for scanning the complex spectrum of non-Hermitian systems, *Frontiers of Physics* **19**, 41202 (2024), arXiv:2305.19807 [quant-ph].
- [17] M. Solinas, B. Barton, Y. Zhang, J. Nys, and J. Carrasquilla, Biorthogonal Neural Network Approach to Two-Dimensional Non-Hermitian Systems 10.48550/arXiv.2508.01072 (2025), arXiv:2508.01072 [quant-ph].
- [18] W. Dobrautz, I. O. Sokolov, K. Liao, P. L. Ríos, M. Rahm, A. Alavi, and I. Tavernelli, Ab Initio Transcorrelated Method enabling accurate Quantum Chemistry on near-term Quantum Hardware, arXiv:2303.02007.
- [19] E. Magnusson, A. Fitzpatrick, S. Knecht, M. Rahm, and W. Dobrautz, Towards Efficient Quantum Computing for Quantum Chemistry: Reducing Circuit Complexity with Transcorrelated and Adaptive Ansatz Techniques, *Faraday Discussions*, 10.1039.D4FD00039K (2024), arXiv:2402.16659 [quant-ph].
- [20] J. Lee, D. W. Berry, C. Gidney, W. J. Huggins, J. R. McClean, N. Wiebe, and R. Babbush, Even More Efficient Quantum Computations of Chemistry Through Tensor Hypercontraction, *PRX Quantum* **2**, 030305 (2021).
- [21] G. H. Low and Y. Su, Quantum Eigenvalue Processing, in *2024 IEEE 65th Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS)* (IEEE, Chicago, IL, USA, 2024) pp. 1051–1062.
- [22] R. Babbush, C. Gidney, D. W. Berry, N. Wiebe, J. McClean, A. Paler, A. Fowler, and H. Neven, Encoding Electronic Spectra in Quantum Circuits with Linear T Complexity, *Physical Review X* **8**, 041015 (2018).
- [23] R. T. Pack and W. B. Brown, Cusp Conditions for Molecular Wavefunctions, *The Journal of Chemical Physics* **45**, 556 (1966).
- [24] J. D. Whitfield, J. Biamonte, and A. Aspuru-Guzik, Simulation of electronic structure Hamiltonians using quantum computers, *Molecular Physics* **109**, 735 (2011).
- [25] G. H. Low and I. L. Chuang, Hamiltonian Simulation by Qubitization, *Quantum* **3**, 163 (2019), arXiv:1610.06546 [quant-ph].
- [26] S. J. Chakravorty, S. R. Gwaltney, E. R. Davidson, F. A. Parpia, and C. F. P. Fischer, Ground-state correlation energies for atomic ions with 3 to 18 electrons, *Physical Review A* **47**, 3649 (1993).
- [27] P. C. Costa, D. An, Y. R. Sanders, Y. Su, R. Babbush, and D. W. Berry, Optimal Scaling Quantum Linear-Systems Solver via Discrete Adiabatic Theorem, *PRX Quantum* **3**, 10.1103/prxquantum.3.040303 (2022).
- [28] R. J. Needs, M. D. Towler, N. D. Drummond, P. López Ríos, and J. R. Trail, Variational and diffusion quantum Monte Carlo calculations with the CASINO code, *The Journal of Chemical Physics* **152**, 154106 (2020).
- [29] N. D. Drummond, M. D. Towler, and R. J. Needs, Jastrow correlation factor for atoms, molecules, and solids, *Physical Review B* **70**, 235119 (2004).
- [30] A. Author, B. Coauthor, and C. Collaborator, QB-GSEE-Benchmark, <https://github.com/isi-usc-edu/qb-gsee-benchmark/> (2025), accessed: 2025-10-21.
- [31] D. W. Berry, C. Gidney, M. Motta, J. R. McClean, and R. Babbush, Qubitization of Arbitrary Basis Quantum Chemistry Leveraging Sparsity and Low Rank Factorization, *Quantum* **3**, 208 (2019), arXiv:1902.02134 [physics, physics:quant-ph].
- [32] M. A. Nielsen and I. L. Chuang, *Quantum Computation and Quantum Information* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge; New York, 2010).
- [33] C. Jones, Low-overhead constructions for the fault-tolerant Toffoli gate, *Physical Review A* **87**, 022328 (2013).
- [34] R. Bhatia, *Matrix Analysis*, Graduate Texts in Mathematics No. 169 (Springer, New York Berlin Paris [etc.], 1997).
- [35] X. Li, G. Yang, C. M. Torres, D. Zheng, and K. L. Wang, A class of efficient quantum incrementer gates for quantum circuit synthesis, *International Journal of Modern Physics B* **28**, 1350191 (2014).