

Generative modeling using evolved quantum Boltzmann machines

Mark M. Wilde

*School of Electrical and Computer Engineering, Cornell University,
Ithaca, New York 14850, USA*

December 3, 2025

Abstract

Born-rule generative modeling, a central task in quantum machine learning, seeks to learn probability distributions that can be efficiently sampled by measuring complex quantum states. One hope is for quantum models to efficiently capture probability distributions that are difficult to learn and simulate by classical means alone. Quantum Boltzmann machines were proposed about one decade ago for this purpose, yet efficient training methods have remained elusive. In this paper, I overcome this obstacle by proposing a practical solution that trains quantum Boltzmann machines for Born-rule generative modeling. Two key ingredients in the proposal are the Donsker–Varadhan variational representation of the classical relative entropy and the quantum Boltzmann gradient estimator of [Patel *et al.*, arXiv:2410.12935]. I present the main result for a more general ansatz known as an evolved quantum Boltzmann machine [Minervini *et al.*, arXiv:2501.03367], which combines parameterized real- and imaginary-time evolution. I also show how to extend the findings to other distinguishability measures beyond relative entropy. Finally, I present four different hybrid quantum–classical algorithms for the minimax optimization underlying training, and I discuss their theoretical convergence guarantees.

Contents

1	Introduction	2
1.1	Background and motivation	2
1.2	Summary of main contribution	4
1.3	Paper organization	7

2	Review of evolved quantum Boltzmann gradient estimator	8
3	Nonconvexity of Born-rule generative modeling with evolved quantum Boltzmann machines	10
4	Gradient and Hessian of Donsker–Varadhan objective function	12
4.1	Analytical expressions for gradient and Hessian and quantum algorithms for estimating them	12
4.2	Bounds on gradient and Hessian norms	14
5	Hybrid quantum–classical algorithms for Born-rule generative modeling	17
5.1	Extragradient	18
5.2	Two-timescale gradient descent-ascent	19
5.3	Follow-the-ridge	19
5.4	HessianFR	20
6	Maintaining concavity via a linear model in feature space	21
7	Alternative distinguishability measures	23
8	Conclusion	24

1 Introduction

1.1 Background and motivation

By now, quantum machine learning is a well established field of study, wherein one of the goals is to determine distinctions between quantum and classical computers for learning tasks [BWP⁺17, CC25]. There is a rich body of theoretical work including topics as diverse as quantum learning theory [AA23, CGR⁺24], variational quantum algorithms for learning [CAB⁺21], quantum algorithms for machine learning applications [WL24, LLL⁺24], etc. We also see ideas from the more traditional area of quantum information theory influencing and having an impact [CHY16, HKP21, CGR⁺24].

A key task in quantum machine learning is known as Born-rule generative modeling [BRGBPO17, KW17, POBRGB18, AAR⁺18, CMDK20, SSHE21, GAW⁺22, RLT⁺24], in which the goal is to simulate samples from a probability distribution p by means of a parameterized probability distribution q_γ that results from measuring a parameterized quantum state ρ_γ . In more

detail, suppose that p is a probability distribution over a finite alphabet \mathcal{Z} . We assume that sample access to p is available, and the model probability distribution q_γ is of the following form:

$$q_\gamma(z) := \text{Tr}[\Lambda_z \rho_\gamma], \quad (1.1)$$

where $(\Lambda_z)_{z \in \mathcal{Z}}$ is a positive operator-valued measure (POVM), which satisfies $\Lambda_z \geq 0$ for all $z \in \mathcal{Z}$ and $\sum_{z \in \mathcal{Z}} \Lambda_z = I$. Additionally, ρ_γ is a state (density operator) parameterized by $\gamma \in \Gamma \subseteq \mathbb{R}^M$, where $M \in \mathbb{N}$. By receiving samples from p and tuning the values in the parameter vector γ , the aim is to minimize an information-theoretically meaningful distinguishability measure between p and q_γ , such as the relative entropy [KL51]:

$$D(p \| q_\gamma) := \sum_{z \in \mathcal{Z}} p(z) \ln \left(\frac{p(z)}{q_\gamma(z)} \right). \quad (1.2)$$

That is, the goal is to determine a minimizing parameter vector γ in the following minimization task:

$$\inf_{\gamma \in \Gamma} D(p \| q_\gamma), \quad (1.3)$$

by observing samples from p , generating samples from q_γ , and tuning γ . Once a suitable γ has been determined, one can then generate samples from q_γ at will by preparing the state ρ_γ on a quantum computer and measuring it according to the POVM $(\Lambda_z)_{z \in \mathcal{Z}}$. The relative entropy is a sensible distinguishability measure, being well grounded in information theory with an operational meaning in asymptotic hypothesis testing as the optimal type II error exponent in Stein's lemma [Ste51, Che56, CT06]. Furthermore, via the Pinsker inequality, it is an upper bound on the total variational distance between p and q_γ , the latter having information-theoretic meaning in the single-shot setting of hypothesis testing [LR05, Theorem 13.1.1].

Several quantum models have been proposed for Born-rule generative modeling, including quantum circuit Born machines [LW18, BGPP⁺19], quantum Boltzmann machines [AAR⁺18, BRGBPO17, KW17], and a generalization of the latter known as evolved quantum Boltzmann machines [MPW25]. However, for the last two models, it has been unclear since the original proposals how to train them efficiently for Born-rule generative modeling, and there has been wide speculation in the quantum machine learning literature that this would not be possible [AAR⁺18, WW19, AC19, Kap20, KW17, ZLW21]. Most recently, a proposal for training quantum Boltzmann

machines for Born-rule generative modeling was made in [PKPW24], but the assumptions made in doing so seem too restrictive to be widely applicable.

Before proceeding, let us recall that a quantum Boltzmann machine is a variational ansatz of the following form [AAR⁺18, BRGBPO17, KW17]:

$$\rho_\theta := \frac{e^{-G(\theta)}}{Z(\theta)}, \quad (1.4)$$

$$G(\theta) := \sum_{j=1}^J \theta_j G_j, \quad (1.5)$$

$$Z(\theta) := \text{Tr}[e^{-G(\theta)}], \quad (1.6)$$

where $\theta_j \in \mathbb{R}$ and each G_j is a Hamiltonian for all $j \in [J] := \{1, \dots, J\}$. Thus, ρ_θ is a parameterized thermal state of the Hamiltonian $G(\theta)$. Generalizing this ansatz is an evolved quantum Boltzmann machine [MPW25], having the following form:

$$\omega_{\theta,\phi} := e^{-iH(\phi)} \rho_\theta e^{iH(\phi)}, \quad (1.7)$$

$$H(\phi) := \sum_{k=1}^K \phi_k H_k, \quad (1.8)$$

where $\phi_k \in \mathbb{R}$ and each H_k is a Hamiltonian for all $k \in [K]$. An evolved quantum Boltzmann machine incorporates parameterized time evolution in addition to a parameterized thermal state.

1.2 Summary of main contribution

By combining two key ingredients, I propose a practical solution to the problem of training evolved quantum Boltzmann machines for Born-rule generative modeling.

The first ingredient is one of the main contributions of [PKPW24, MPW25], known as the evolved quantum Boltzmann gradient estimator. Given an observable O , the gradient of the function

$$\gamma := (\theta, \phi) \mapsto \text{Tr}[O\omega_{\theta,\phi}] \quad (1.9)$$

is specified by the following partial derivatives [MPW25, Eqs. (13)–(14)]:

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial \theta_j} \text{Tr}[O\omega_{\theta,\phi}] = -\frac{1}{2} \left\langle \left\{ e^{iH(\phi)} O e^{-iH(\phi)}, \Phi_\theta(G_j) \right\} \right\rangle_{\rho_\theta} + \langle O \rangle_{\omega_{\theta,\phi}} \langle G_j \rangle_{\rho_\theta}, \quad (1.10)$$




Figure 1: (a) Quantum circuit for estimating the first term $-\frac{1}{2} \langle \{O, \Phi_\theta(G_j)\} \rangle_{\rho_\theta}$ in (1.10). For each execution of this circuit, a value $t \in \mathbb{R}$ is chosen randomly from the high-peak probability density $p(t)$ in (1.14). (b) Quantum circuit for estimating the quantity $-\frac{i}{2} \langle [O, \Psi_\phi(H_k)] \rangle_{\omega_{\theta,\phi}}$ in (1.11). For each execution of this circuit, a value $t \in \mathbb{R}$ is chosen uniformly at random from the unit interval $[0, 1]$. The symbol “Had” denotes the Hadamard gate, and the symbol S denotes the phase gate $S := \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & i \end{bmatrix}$.

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial \phi_k} \text{Tr}[O \omega_{\theta,\phi}] = -i \langle [O, \Psi_\phi(H_k)] \rangle_{\omega_{\theta,\phi}}, \quad (1.11)$$

where $\langle A \rangle_{\rho_\theta} \equiv \text{Tr}[A \rho_\theta]$, $\{A, B\} \equiv AB + BA$, $[A, B] \equiv AB - BA$, Φ_θ and Ψ_ϕ are the following quantum channels:

$$\Phi_\theta(X) := \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dt \, p(t) e^{-iG(\theta)t} X e^{iG(\theta)t}, \quad (1.12)$$

$$\Psi_\phi(X) := \int_0^1 dt \, e^{-iH(\phi)t} X e^{iH(\phi)t}, \quad (1.13)$$

$$p(t) := \frac{2}{\pi} \ln \left| \coth \left(\frac{\pi t}{2} \right) \right|, \quad (1.14)$$

and $p(t)$ is a probability density function known as the high-peak tent probability density [PKPW24]. The quantum Boltzmann gradient estimator is a quantum algorithm that estimates the expression in (1.10) for each $j \in [J]$. An assumption of these gradient estimation algorithms is that one can efficiently prepare the states $\omega_{\theta,\phi}$ and ρ_θ , which is justified by efficient quantum algorithms for Hamiltonian simulation [Llo96, CMN⁺18] and thermal state preparation [CKBG25, RFA24, DZPL25]. The second term in (1.10) is easy

to estimate by repeatedly preparing the state $\omega_{\theta,\phi} \otimes \rho_\theta$ and measuring the observable $O \otimes G_j$, while the first term can be estimated by the quantum circuit depicted in Figure 1(a). The quantum circuit depicted in Figure 1(b) estimates the partial derivative in (1.11). Altogether, the scheme for estimating all partial derivatives in (1.10)–(1.11) is known as the evolved quantum Boltzmann gradient estimator. As given in this form, both algorithms assume that G_j and H_k are unitary in addition to being Hermitian; however, as stated in [PKPW24, MPW25], this assumption can be removed if block-encodings [LC19, GSLW19] of G_j and H_k are available. Henceforth, for simplicity, I make the assumption that G_j and H_k are both Hermitian and unitary.

The second key ingredient is a theoretical device known as the Donsker–Varadhan (DV) variational formula [DV75, Lemma 2.1], which has been widely used and studied in the classical generative modeling literature [NWJ10, NCT16, BBR⁺18, SG22]. In short, the DV formula provides the following variational representations for the relative entropy in (1.2):

$$D(p||q_\gamma) = \sup_{T \in \mathcal{T}} \left\{ \mathbb{E}_p[T(Z)] - \ln \mathbb{E}_{q_\gamma} \left[e^{T(Z)} \right] \right\} \quad (1.15)$$

$$= \sup_{T \in \mathcal{T}} \left\{ \mathbb{E}_p[T(Z)] + 1 - \mathbb{E}_{q_\gamma} \left[e^{T(Z)} \right] \right\}, \quad (1.16)$$

where \mathcal{T} consists of all functions from \mathcal{Z} to \mathbb{R} (i.e., $T: \mathcal{Z} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$). Thus, the desired optimization task in (1.3) can be reformulated as the following minimax optimization problem:

$$\inf_{\gamma \in \Gamma} D(p||q_\gamma) = \inf_{\gamma \in \Gamma} \sup_{T \in \mathcal{T}} \left\{ \mathbb{E}_p[T(Z)] + 1 - \mathbb{E}_{q_\gamma} \left[e^{T(Z)} \right] \right\}. \quad (1.17)$$

The main advantage of the formula in (1.17) is that it rewrites the non-linear objective function in (1.2) in terms of the linear objective function in (1.17), at the cost of an additional optimization. However, the payoff of this rewriting is notable and useful: due to the objective function being linear in p and q_γ , terms like $\mathbb{E}_p[T(Z)]$ and $\mathbb{E}_{q_\gamma} \left[e^{T(Z)} \right]$ can be estimated in an unbiased way by sampling from the probability distributions p and q_γ . Furthermore, the objective function in (1.17) is concave in T , which is beneficial when considering schemes for performing the minimax optimization in (1.17).

Following earlier works [NWJ10, NCT16, BBR⁺18, SG22], instead of optimizing over every possible function $T \in \mathcal{T}$, we can instead adopt a neural network parameterization of such functions in terms of a parameter vector $w \in \mathcal{W} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^L$, where $L \in \mathbb{N}$, leading to the following lower bound on

$$\inf_{\gamma \in \Gamma} D(p \| q_\gamma):$$

$$\inf_{\gamma \in \Gamma} D(p \| q_\gamma) \geq \inf_{\gamma \in \Gamma} \sup_{w \in \mathcal{W}} f(\gamma, w), \quad (1.18)$$

$$\text{where} \quad f(\gamma, w) := \mathbb{E}_p[T_w(Z)] + 1 - \mathbb{E}_{q_\gamma} \left[e^{T_w(Z)} \right]. \quad (1.19)$$

The idea from here is to optimize the objective function in (1.19) in terms of γ and w by using various minimax optimization algorithms [Kor76, WZB20, LJJ20, GLG22, GLNZ22, LJJ25], for which, in some cases, there are guarantees on their convergence to a local minimax point [JNJ20] of $f(\gamma, w)$. The optimization task involves a minimization of $f(\gamma, w)$ with respect to γ and a maximization with respect to w . The minimax optimization algorithms also require access to the gradient of $f(\gamma, w)$ and some of them to its Hessian, and one key insight of the present paper is that the required gradient and Hessian elements can be estimated by means of the evolved quantum Boltzmann gradient estimator, using the quantum circuits depicted in Figure 1.

Thus, the solution proposed here is a practical approach to training evolved quantum Boltzmann machines for Born-rule generative modeling. The key aspect of it is that the objective function $f(\gamma, w)$, its gradient, and its Hessian can be efficiently estimated by means of quantum algorithms, and the related minimax optimization can be carried out as a hybrid quantum–classical algorithm. Other distinguishability measures beyond the relative entropy, including the Rényi relative quasi-entropy, the chi-square divergence, the Hellinger distance, etc. have variational representations similar to that in (1.16), so that a similar approach can be applied to them. I show this explicitly in Section 7 for the Rényi relative quasi-entropy.

1.3 Paper organization

The rest of this paper is organized as follows:

- Section 2 reviews the evolved quantum Boltzmann gradient estimator in more detail, specifically indicating the number of quantum circuit executions that are needed for reliable estimation of the gradient components in (1.10) and (1.11).
- Section 3 proves that the optimization problem in (1.3) is not convex in the parameter vector γ , implying that finding a local minimum is the best we can generally attempt to accomplish for this problem.
- Section 4 presents the core technical contribution of this paper: analytical expressions for the gradient and Hessian of the objective function

$f(\gamma, w)$ in (1.19) and the observation that they can be estimated by means of the evolved quantum Boltzmann gradient estimator depicted in Figure 1. Section 4 also presents simple bounds on the norm of the gradients and the spectral norm of the Hessians, which can be useful for determining the number of steps required for minimax optimization.

- Section 5 appeals directly to existing algorithms for minimax optimization in order to formulate four different hybrid quantum–classical algorithms for optimizing (1.18) (Algorithms 5–8). The existing algorithms for minimax optimization include extragradient [Kor76, GLG22], two-timescale gradient descent-ascent [LJJ20, LJJ25], follow-the-ridge [WZB20], and HessianFR [GLNZ22].
- Section 6 specializes the development from a general neural network to a linear model in feature space, with the main advantage of doing so being that concavity of (1.19) in w holds for this model, so that stronger guarantees on convergence to a local minimax point can be made for this model.
- Section 7 extends the whole development to other distinguishability measures beyond relative entropy, which includes the Rényi relative quasi-entropies. The variational representation of the Rényi relative quasi-entropies is somewhat similar to the DV formula in (1.16), so that the extension is straightforward.
- Section 8 concludes with a brief summary of the findings reported here, as well as suggestions for future directions.

2 Review of evolved quantum Boltzmann gradient estimator

In this section, I review the evolved quantum Boltzmann gradient estimator of [PKPW24, MPW25]. In particular, I recall how the quantum circuits depicted in Figure 1 can be used to estimate the first term of (1.10) and the expression in (1.11).

Suppose that O is an observable of the following form:

$$O = \sum_{z \in \mathcal{Z}} g(z) \Lambda_z, \quad (2.1)$$

where $g: \mathcal{Z} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and $(\Lambda_z)_{z \in \mathcal{Z}}$ is a POVM. It follows that

$$\|O\| \leq \|g\| := \max_{z \in \mathcal{Z}} |g(z)|, \quad (2.2)$$

where $\|O\| := \sup_{|\psi\rangle \neq 0} \frac{\|O|\psi\rangle\|}{\| |\psi\rangle \|}$ is the spectral norm, because

$$-\|g\| I = -\|g\| \sum_{z \in \mathcal{Z}} \Lambda_z \leq \sum_{z \in \mathcal{Z}} g(z) \Lambda_z = O \leq \|g\| \sum_{z \in \mathcal{Z}} \Lambda_z = \|g\| I, \quad (2.3)$$

which is helpful for determining the number of samples sufficient for accurate gradient estimation.

The first algorithm estimates the first term of (1.10):

Algorithm 1. *The algorithm for estimating*

$$\mu \equiv -\frac{1}{2} \left\langle \left\{ e^{iH(\phi)} O e^{-iH(\phi)}, \Phi_\theta(G_j) \right\} \right\rangle_{\rho_\theta} \quad (2.4)$$

proceeds according to the following steps:

1. Fix the desired accuracy $\varepsilon > 0$ and error probability $\delta \in (0, 1)$. Set $n \in \mathbb{N}$ to satisfy $n \geq \frac{\|g\|^2}{2\varepsilon^2} \ln\left(\frac{2}{\delta}\right)$.
2. For $i = 1, \dots, n$, execute the quantum circuit depicted in Figure 1(a). Set $X_i \leftarrow (-1)^{r_i} g(z_i)$, where $r_i \in \{0, 1\}$ is the outcome of the σ_Z measurement on the control register and z_i is the outcome of the measurement $(\Lambda_z)_{z \in \mathcal{Z}}$ on the data register.
3. Output $\bar{X} \equiv \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n X_i$ as an estimate of μ .

The second algorithm estimates the expression in (1.11).

Algorithm 2. *The algorithm for estimating*

$$\nu \equiv -\frac{i}{2} \langle [O, \Psi_\phi(H_k)] \rangle_{\omega_{\theta, \phi}} \quad (2.5)$$

proceeds according to the following steps:

1. Fix the desired accuracy $\varepsilon > 0$ and error probability $\delta \in (0, 1)$. Set $n \in \mathbb{N}$ to satisfy $n \geq \frac{2\|g\|^2}{\varepsilon^2} \ln\left(\frac{2}{\delta}\right)$.
2. For $i = 1, \dots, n$, execute the quantum circuit depicted in Figure 1(b). Set $Y_i \leftarrow 2(-1)^{s_i} g(z'_i)$, where $s_i \in \{0, 1\}$ is the outcome of the σ_Z measurement on the control register and z'_i is the outcome of the measurement $(\Lambda_z)_{z \in \mathcal{Z}}$ on the data register.
3. Output $\bar{Y} \equiv \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n Y_i$ as an estimate of ν .

The analysis in [MPW25, App. B & C] demonstrates that \bar{X} and \bar{Y} are unbiased estimators of μ and ν because the following equalities hold for all i :

$$\mathbb{E}\left[(-1)^{R_i} g(Z_i)\right] = \mu, \quad (2.6)$$

$$\mathbb{E}\left[2(-1)^{S_i} g(Z'_i)\right] = \nu. \quad (2.7)$$

According to the Hoeffding inequality [Hoe63] (see also, e.g., [RASW23, Lemma 18]), the following inequalities hold:

$$\Pr\left[|\bar{X} - \mu| \leq \varepsilon\right] \geq 1 - \delta, \quad (2.8)$$

$$\Pr\left[|\bar{Y} - \nu| \leq \varepsilon\right] \geq 1 - \delta, \quad (2.9)$$

indicating that Algorithms 1 and 2 provide accurate estimations of μ and ν with sufficiently many quantum circuit executions.

3 Nonconvexity of Born-rule generative modeling with evolved quantum Boltzmann machines

In this section, I point out that the optimization problem in (1.3) is not convex in the parameter vector γ when the underlying ansatz is an evolved quantum Boltzmann machine, as in (1.7). In fact, we can arrive at this conclusion simply by considering a quantum Boltzmann machine consisting of a single qubit. As a consequence of this finding, the best we can hope for, in general, when attempting to perform the optimization in (1.3) is to find a local minimum. Thus, this finding stands in distinction to the quantum state learning problem from [CB24], where it was proven that the optimization problem considered there is convex.

The counterexample to convexity is as follows. Let $G(\theta) = \theta_X \sigma_X + \theta_Z \sigma_Z$, where σ_X and σ_Z are the standard Pauli matrices and $\theta = (\theta_X, \theta_Z) \in \mathbb{R}$. The parameterized thermal state ρ_θ is then defined as in (1.4). In this case, the thermal state has a closed form as follows (see, e.g., [MCK⁺25, Corollary 17]):

$$\rho_\theta = \frac{1}{2} (I + r_X \sigma_X + r_Z \sigma_Z), \quad (3.1)$$

where

$$r_X := -\frac{\tanh(r)}{r} \theta_X, \quad r_Z := -\frac{\tanh(r)}{r} \theta_Z, \quad r := \sqrt{\theta_X^2 + \theta_Z^2}. \quad (3.2)$$




Figure 2: Plot of the function in (3.5), demonstrating that it is not convex in μ .

Measuring this state in the standard basis $\{|0\rangle, |1\rangle\}$ then leads to the following model probability distribution:

$$q_\theta(0) = \langle 0 | \rho_\theta | 0 \rangle = \frac{1}{2} \left(1 - \frac{\tanh(r)}{r} \theta_Z \right), \quad q_\theta(1) = 1 - q_\theta(0). \quad (3.3)$$

We can take the probability distribution p to be $p(0) = 1$ and $p(1) = 0$. The relative entropy then evaluates to

$$D(p \| q_\theta) = -\ln q_\theta(0) = -\ln \left[\frac{1}{2} \left(1 - \frac{\tanh(r)}{r} \theta_Z \right) \right]. \quad (3.4)$$

Now let us set $\theta_X = \mu$ and $\theta_Z = 1$, so that the relative entropy reduces to

$$-\ln \left[\frac{1}{2} \left(1 - \frac{\tanh(\sqrt{\mu^2 + 1})}{\sqrt{\mu^2 + 1}} \right) \right]. \quad (3.5)$$

Figure 2 plots this function, demonstrating that it is not convex in μ .

4 Gradient and Hessian of Donsker–Varadhan objective function

In order to perform the optimization in (1.18) (i.e., minimax optimization of the Donsker–Varadhan objective function), it is helpful to determine the gradient and Hessian of the objective function $f(\gamma, w)$ in (1.19). Indeed, all of the hybrid quantum–classical algorithms delineated in Section 5 make use of the gradient, and some of them also make use of the Hessian.

4.1 Analytical expressions for gradient and Hessian and quantum algorithms for estimating them

To this end, in this subsection, I derive analytical expressions for the gradient and Hessian of $f(\gamma, w)$, and I also outline how some of their elements can be estimated by means of Algorithms 1 and 2.

To begin with, let us first rewrite $f(\gamma, w)$ in (1.19) as follows:

$$f(\gamma, w) = \sum_{z \in \mathcal{Z}} p(z) T_w(z) + 1 - \langle O_w \rangle_{\omega_{\theta, \phi}}, \quad (4.1)$$

where $\gamma = (\theta, \phi)$, the observable O_w is defined as

$$O_w := \sum_{z \in \mathcal{Z}} e^{T_w(z)} \Lambda_z, \quad (4.2)$$

and we used that

$$\mathbb{E}_p[T_w(Z)] = \sum_{z \in \mathcal{Z}} p(z) T_w(z), \quad (4.3)$$

$$\mathbb{E}_{q_\gamma} \left[e^{T_w(Z)} \right] = \sum_{z \in \mathcal{Z}} q_\gamma(z) e^{T_w(z)} \quad (4.4)$$

$$= \sum_{z \in \mathcal{Z}} \text{Tr}[\Lambda_z \omega_{\theta, \phi}] e^{T_w(z)} \quad (4.5)$$

$$= \text{Tr}[O_w \omega_{\theta, \phi}] \quad (4.6)$$

$$= \langle O_w \rangle_{\omega_{\theta, \phi}}. \quad (4.7)$$

With (4.1) in hand, it follows as a direct consequence of (1.10)–(1.11) that the gradient $\nabla_\gamma f(\gamma, w)$ with respect to $\gamma = (\theta, \phi)$ has the following components:

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial \theta_j} f(\gamma, w) = \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta_j} \left(- \langle O_w \rangle_{\omega_{\theta, \phi}} \right) \quad (4.8)$$

$$= \frac{1}{2} \left\langle \left\{ e^{iH(\phi)} O_w e^{-iH(\phi)}, \Phi_\theta(G_j) \right\} \right\rangle_{\rho_\theta} - \langle O_w \rangle_{\omega_{\theta, \phi}} \langle G_j \rangle_{\rho_\theta} \quad (4.9)$$

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial \phi_k} f(\gamma, w) = \frac{\partial}{\partial \phi_k} \left(- \langle O_w \rangle_{\omega_{\theta, \phi}} \right) \quad (4.10)$$

$$= i \langle [O_w, \Psi_\phi(H_k)] \rangle_{\omega_{\theta, \phi}}. \quad (4.11)$$

Thus, it is possible to estimate the gradient $\nabla_\gamma f(\gamma, w)$ by means of Algorithms 1 and 2, with O therein replaced by O_w . In addition, the number of samples sufficient for obtaining ε -accurate estimates with error probability $\leq \delta$ is given by $\mathcal{O}\left(\frac{\|e^{T_w}\|^2}{\varepsilon^2} \ln\left(\frac{1}{\delta}\right)\right)$.

The gradient of $f(\gamma, w)$ with respect to the neural-network parameter vector $w \in \mathcal{W}$ is as follows:

$$\nabla_w f(\gamma, w) = \mathbb{E}_p[\nabla_w T_w(Z)] - \mathbb{E}_{q_\gamma} \left[e^{T_w(Z)} \nabla_w T_w(Z) \right], \quad (4.12)$$

and the Hessian is given by

$$H_{ww} := \nabla_w^2 f(\gamma, w) \quad (4.13)$$

$$= \mathbb{E}_p[\nabla_w^2 T_w(Z)] - \mathbb{E}_{q_\gamma} \left[e^{T_w(Z)} \left(\nabla_w^2 T_w(Z) + \nabla_w T_w(Z) (\nabla_w T_w(Z))^T \right) \right] \quad (4.14)$$

Both the gradient in (4.12) and the Hessian in (4.14) can be estimated by sampling from p and q_γ and applying the standard backpropagation algorithm.

By following a development similar to that in (4.4)–(4.7), we can rewrite the components of the gradient $\nabla_w f(\gamma, w)$ in (4.12) as follows:

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial w_\ell} f(\gamma, w) = \mathbb{E}_p \left[\frac{\partial}{\partial w_\ell} T_w(Z) \right] - \langle P_{w_\ell} \rangle_{\omega_{\theta, \phi}}, \quad (4.15)$$

where the observable P_{w_ℓ} is defined as

$$P_{w_\ell} := \sum_{z \in \mathcal{Z}} e^{T_w(z)} \frac{\partial}{\partial w_\ell} T_w(z) \Lambda_z. \quad (4.16)$$

It then follows as a direct consequence of (1.10)–(1.11) that the Hessian elements of $f(\gamma, w)$ with respect to $\gamma = (\theta, \phi)$ and w , denoted collectively by $H_{w\gamma}$, are as follows:

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial \theta_j} \frac{\partial}{\partial w_\ell} f(\gamma, w) = \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta_j} \left(- \langle P_{w_\ell} \rangle_{\omega_{\theta, \phi}} \right) \quad (4.17)$$

$$= \frac{1}{2} \left\langle \left\{ e^{iH(\phi)} P_{w_\ell} e^{-iH(\phi)}, \Phi_\theta(G_j) \right\} \right\rangle_{\rho_\theta} - \langle P_{w_\ell} \rangle_{\omega_{\theta,\phi}} \langle G_j \rangle_{\rho_\theta}, \quad (4.18)$$

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial \phi_k} \frac{\partial}{\partial w_\ell} f(\gamma, w) = \frac{\partial}{\partial \phi_k} \left(- \langle P_{w_\ell} \rangle_{\omega_{\theta,\phi}} \right) \quad (4.19)$$

$$= i \langle [P_{w_\ell}, \Psi_\phi(H_k)] \rangle_{\omega_{\theta,\phi}}, \quad (4.20)$$

Thus, each of the terms in (4.15), (4.18), and (4.20) can again be estimated by means of Algorithms 1 and 2, with O therein replaced by P_{w_ℓ} . In addition, the number of samples sufficient for obtaining ε -accurate estimates with error probability $\leq \delta$ is given by $\mathcal{O}\left(\frac{\|h_\ell\|^2}{\varepsilon^2} \ln\left(\frac{1}{\delta}\right)\right)$, where $h_\ell(z) \equiv e^{T_w(z)} \frac{\partial}{\partial w_\ell} T_w(z)$.

4.2 Bounds on gradient and Hessian norms

In this subsection, I delineate bounds on the norms of the gradient and Hessian elements, which are helpful for establishing smoothness properties of the optimization problem and give a sense of how many iterations of gradient-based algorithms are required when using estimates of these quantities.

Proposition 3 (Gradient bounds). *The following inequalities hold:*

$$\|\nabla_\gamma f(\gamma, w)\|^2 \leq 4 \|e^{T_w}\|^2 \left(\sum_{j \in [J]} \|G_j\|^2 + \sum_{k \in [K]} \|H_k\|^2 \right), \quad (4.21)$$

$$\|\nabla_w f(\gamma, w)\|^2 \leq (\|e^{T_w}\| + 1)^2 \sum_{\ell \in [L]} \left\| \frac{\partial}{\partial w_\ell} T_w \right\|^2. \quad (4.22)$$

Proof. Consider that

$$\left| \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta_j} f(\gamma, w) \right| = \left| \frac{1}{2} \left\langle \left\{ e^{iH(\phi)} O_w e^{-iH(\phi)}, \Phi_\theta(G_j) \right\} \right\rangle_{\rho_\theta} - \langle O_w \rangle_{\omega_{\theta,\phi}} \langle G_j \rangle_{\rho_\theta} \right| \quad (4.23)$$

$$\leq \frac{1}{2} \left| \left\langle \left\{ e^{iH(\phi)} O_w e^{-iH(\phi)}, \Phi_\theta(G_j) \right\} \right\rangle_{\rho_\theta} \right| + \left| \langle O_w \rangle_{\omega_{\theta,\phi}} \langle G_j \rangle_{\rho_\theta} \right| \quad (4.24)$$

$$\leq \left\| e^{iH(\phi)} O_w e^{-iH(\phi)} \right\| \|\Phi_\theta(G_j)\| + \|O_w\| \|G_j\| \quad (4.25)$$

$$\leq 2 \|O_w\| \|G_j\| \quad (4.26)$$

$$\leq 2 \|e^{T_w}\| \|G_j\|, \quad (4.27)$$

where the second inequality follows from the Hölder inequality (specifically, $|\text{Tr}[AB]| \leq \|A\| \|B\|_1$), the third inequality follows from convexity and unitary invariance of the spectral norm, and the last inequality follows from (2.2). Similarly, consider that

$$\left| \frac{\partial}{\partial \phi_k} f(\gamma, w) \right| = \left| i \langle [O_w, \Psi_\phi(H_k)] \rangle_{\omega_{\theta, \phi}} \right| \quad (4.28)$$

$$\leq 2 \|O_w\| \|\Psi_\phi(H_k)\| \quad (4.29)$$

$$\leq 2 \|e^{T_w}\| \|H_k\|. \quad (4.30)$$

The proof of (4.21) is concluded by combining the bounds above and noting that the components of $\nabla_\gamma f(\gamma, w)$ are given by $\frac{\partial}{\partial \theta_j} f(\gamma, w)$ for all $j \in [J]$ and $\frac{\partial}{\partial \phi_k} f(\gamma, w)$ for all $k \in [K]$.

Now consider that

$$\left| \frac{\partial}{\partial w_\ell} f(\gamma, w) \right| = \left| \mathbb{E}_p \left[\frac{\partial}{\partial w_\ell} T_w(Z) \right] - \left\langle \sum_{z \in \mathcal{Z}} e^{T_w(z)} \frac{\partial}{\partial w_\ell} T_w(z) \Lambda_z \right\rangle_{\omega_{\theta, \phi}} \right| \quad (4.31)$$

$$\leq \left| \mathbb{E}_p \left[\frac{\partial}{\partial w_\ell} T_w(Z) \right] \right| + \left| \left\langle \sum_{z \in \mathcal{Z}} e^{T_w(z)} \frac{\partial}{\partial w_\ell} T_w(z) \Lambda_z \right\rangle_{\omega_{\theta, \phi}} \right| \quad (4.32)$$

$$\leq \left\| \frac{\partial}{\partial w_\ell} T_w \right\| + \left\| \sum_{z \in \mathcal{Z}} e^{T_w(z)} \frac{\partial}{\partial w_\ell} T_w(z) \Lambda_z \right\| \quad (4.33)$$

$$\leq \left\| \frac{\partial}{\partial w_\ell} T_w \right\| + \left\| e^{T_w} \frac{\partial}{\partial w_\ell} T_w \right\| \quad (4.34)$$

$$\leq \left\| \frac{\partial}{\partial w_\ell} T_w \right\| (\|e^{T_w}\| + 1), \quad (4.35)$$

where the last inequality follows from submultiplicativity of the function norm defined in (2.2) (i.e., $\|f \cdot g\| \leq \|f\| \|g\|$). \square

Proposition 4 (Hessian bounds). *The following inequalities hold:*

$$\|H_{ww}\|^2 \leq \sum_{\ell, m \in [L]} \left(\left\| \frac{\partial^2}{\partial w_\ell \partial w_m} T_w \right\| (1 + \|e^{T_w}\|) + \|e^{T_w}\| \left\| \frac{\partial}{\partial w_\ell} T_w \right\| \left\| \frac{\partial}{\partial w_m} T_w \right\| \right)^2, \quad (4.36)$$

$$\|H_{w\gamma}\|^2 \leq 4 \left(\sum_{\ell \in [L]} \left\| e^{T_w} \frac{\partial}{\partial w_\ell} T_w \right\|^2 \right) \left(\sum_{j \in [J]} \|G_j\|^2 + \sum_{k \in [K]} \|H_k\|^2 \right). \quad (4.37)$$

Proof. Consider from (4.14) that

$$|H_{w_\ell, w_m}| = \left| \begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}_p \left[\frac{\partial^2}{\partial w_\ell \partial w_m} T_w(Z) \right] \\ & - \mathbb{E}_{q_\gamma} \left[e^{T_w(Z)} \left(\frac{\partial^2}{\partial w_\ell \partial w_m} T_w(Z) + \frac{\partial}{\partial w_\ell} T_w(Z) \frac{\partial}{\partial w_m} T_w(Z) \right) \right] \end{aligned} \right| \quad (4.38)$$

$$\leq \left| \mathbb{E}_p \left[\frac{\partial^2}{\partial w_\ell \partial w_m} T_w(Z) \right] \right| + \left| \mathbb{E}_{q_\gamma} \left[e^{T_w(Z)} \left(\frac{\partial^2}{\partial w_\ell \partial w_m} T_w(Z) + \frac{\partial}{\partial w_\ell} T_w(Z) \frac{\partial}{\partial w_m} T_w(Z) \right) \right] \right| \quad (4.39)$$

$$\leq \left\| \frac{\partial^2}{\partial w_\ell \partial w_m} T_w \right\| + \left\| e^{T_w} \left(\frac{\partial^2}{\partial w_\ell \partial w_m} T_w + \frac{\partial}{\partial w_\ell} T_w \frac{\partial}{\partial w_m} T_w \right) \right\| \quad (4.40)$$

$$\leq \left\| \frac{\partial^2}{\partial w_\ell \partial w_m} T_w \right\| (1 + \|e^{T_w}\|) + \|e^{T_w}\| \left\| \frac{\partial}{\partial w_\ell} T_w \right\| \left\| \frac{\partial}{\partial w_m} T_w \right\|. \quad (4.41)$$

The first bound in (4.36) thus follows because the spectral norm does not exceed the Schatten two-norm (i.e., Frobenius norm). That is, $\|A\|^2 \leq \|A\|_2^2 := \sum_{i,j} |A_{i,j}|^2$.

Defining $P_{w_\ell} := \sum_{z \in \mathcal{Z}} e^{T_w(z)} \frac{\partial}{\partial w_\ell} T_w(z) \Lambda_z$, consider that

$$\left| \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta_j} \frac{\partial}{\partial w_\ell} f(\gamma, w) \right| = \left| \frac{1}{2} \left\langle \left\{ e^{iH(\phi)} P_{w_\ell} e^{-iH(\phi)}, \Phi_\theta(G_j) \right\}_{\rho_\theta} \right\rangle - \langle P_{w_\ell} \rangle_{\omega_{\theta, \phi}} \langle G_j \rangle_{\rho_\theta} \right| \quad (4.42)$$

$$\leq \frac{1}{2} \left| \left\langle \left\{ e^{iH(\phi)} P_{w_\ell} e^{-iH(\phi)}, \Phi_\theta(G_j) \right\}_{\rho_\theta} \right\rangle \right| + \left| \langle P_{w_\ell} \rangle_{\omega_{\theta, \phi}} \langle G_j \rangle_{\rho_\theta} \right| \quad (4.43)$$

$$\leq \left\| e^{iH(\phi)} P_{w_\ell} e^{-iH(\phi)} \right\| \|\Phi_\theta(G_j)\| + \|P_{w_\ell}\| \|G_j\| \quad (4.44)$$

$$\leq 2 \|P_{w_\ell}\| \|G_j\| \quad (4.45)$$

$$\leq 2 \left\| e^{T_w} \frac{\partial}{\partial w_\ell} T_w \right\| \|G_j\|. \quad (4.46)$$

Similarly, consider that

$$\left| \frac{\partial}{\partial \phi_k} \frac{\partial}{\partial w_\ell} f(\gamma, w) \right| = \left| i \langle [P_w, \Psi_\phi(H_k)] \rangle_{\omega_{\theta, \phi}} \right| \quad (4.47)$$

$$\leq 2 \|P_{w_\ell}\| \|\Psi_\phi(H_k)\| \quad (4.48)$$

$$\leq 2 \left\| e^{T_w} \frac{\partial}{\partial w_\ell} T_w \right\| \|H_k\|. \quad (4.49)$$

Combining these bounds and noting that the spectral norm is bounded from above by the Schatten two-norm (i.e., Frobenius norm), we conclude the bound in (4.37). \square

5 Hybrid quantum–classical algorithms for Born-rule generative modeling

In this section, I delineate several hybrid quantum–classical algorithms that can be used for minimax optimization of the objective function $f(\gamma, w)$ in (1.19). These are directly based on extragradient [Kor76, GLG22], two-timescale gradient descent-ascent [LJJ20, LJJ25], follow-the-ridge [WZB20], and HessianFR [GLNZ22]. Extragradient and two-timescale gradient descent-ascent are purely first-order methods, relying only on gradients. Follow-the-ridge and HessianFR are second-order, leveraging Hessian information in addition to gradients in order to navigate the local minimax geometry.

An important goal for any such minimax optimization algorithm is to converge to a local minimax point [JNJ20, Definition 14] of the objective function in (1.19). On the one hand, the first two algorithms (extragradient and two-timescale gradient descent-ascent) lack formal convergence guarantees to local minimax points in general non-convex–non-concave settings, even though they may perform well empirically. The latter two algorithms (follow-the-ridge and HessianFR) do provide theoretical guarantees for convergence to local minimax points (see [WZB20, Theorem 1] and [GLNZ22, Theorem 3.2]). On the other hand, the first two algorithms require first-order information only (gradients), while the latter two algorithms require both first- and second-order information (gradients and Hessians) and thus are more computationally expensive.

As just mentioned, the goal of minimax optimization algorithms is to converge to a local minimax point [JNJ20, Definition 14] of (1.19). Recall that a point (γ^*, w^*) is a local minimax point if (i) both partial gradients vanish at that point; (ii) w^* is a strict local maximizer of $f(\gamma^*, \cdot)$; and (iii) γ^* is a local minimizer of the (local) value function $\max_w f(\gamma, w)$ obtained by maximizing $f(\gamma, w)$ over w in a small neighborhood of w^* . In terms of curvature, when f is twice differentiable, condition (ii) is equivalent to the ww -block of the Hessian being negative definite, $H_{ww}(\gamma^*, w^*) < 0$, and condition (iii) is equivalent to positive semi-definiteness of the associated Schur complement:

$$H_{\gamma\gamma}(\gamma^*, w^*) - H_{\gamma w}(\gamma^*, w^*) H_{ww}(\gamma^*, w^*)^{-1} H_{w\gamma}(\gamma^*, w^*) \geq 0. \quad (5.1)$$

These geometric conditions motivate why some algorithms below explicitly incorporate Hessian information and why they are able to guarantee convergence to local minimax points. More explicitly, these curvature conditions explain why methods such as follow-the-ridge and HessianFR explicitly incorporate the matrix product $H_{ww}^{-1}H_{w\gamma}$: they exploit the local concavity in w and the induced curvature in the γ -direction encoded by the Schur complement.

All hybrid quantum–classical algorithms discussed below require estimating gradients, and some also require estimating Hessian blocks, using a quantum device. These estimated quantities are then supplied to classical routines that perform the update steps. In particular, for second-order methods such as follow-the-ridge and HessianFR, the classical computer assembles the quantum-estimated Hessian blocks and computes matrix inverses such as H_{ww}^{-1} numerically. As a result, the stability of these updates depends both on the accuracy of the quantum estimates and on the conditioning of H_{ww} ; in practice, regularization (e.g., $H_{ww} + \lambda I$) may be used to ensure robust classical inversion. The choice of algorithm involves a trade-off between quantum sampling cost and classical computational overhead: first-order methods require fewer quantum resources, while second-order methods demand more quantum circuit executions and matrix inversions but can achieve guaranteed convergence.

In what follows, I assume that sufficiently many samples have been taken when estimating both the gradients and Hessian elements, so that the stochastic updates closely approximate the corresponding deterministic updates. The bounds from Section 4.1 give a sense of the sample overhead needed to get good estimates of the gradient and Hessian, and the bounds from Propositions 3 and 4 give a sense of the number of iterations needed to ensure convergence of the algorithms (see, e.g., [GLNZ22, Theorem 3.8]).

In the remainder of this section, I describe how each of these four algorithms can be instantiated in the hybrid quantum–classical setting, highlighting their computational requirements and the form of the updates.

5.1 Extragradient

One of the simplest methods for minimax optimization is the extragradient method [Kor76, GLG22]. Going beyond the standard gradient descent-ascent approach to minimax optimization, it involves a predictor and corrector step.

Algorithm 5. *Extragradient proceeds according to the following steps:*

1. *Inputs: learning rates $\eta_\gamma, \eta_w > 0$ and number of iterations N :*

2. For $m = 1, \dots, N$

- (a) $\tilde{\gamma}_m \leftarrow \gamma_m - \eta_\gamma \nabla_\gamma f(\gamma_m, w_m)$, where $\nabla_\gamma f$ is given in (4.9) and (4.11).
- (b) $\tilde{w}_m \leftarrow w_m + \eta_w \nabla_w f(\gamma_m, w_m)$, where $\nabla_w f$ is given in (4.12).
- (c) $\gamma_{m+1} \leftarrow \gamma_m - \eta_\gamma \nabla_\gamma f(\tilde{\gamma}_m, \tilde{w}_m)$, where $\nabla_\gamma f$ is given in (4.9) and (4.11).
- (d) $w_{m+1} \leftarrow w_m + \eta_w \nabla_w f(\tilde{\gamma}_m, \tilde{w}_m)$, where $\nabla_w f$ is given in (4.12).

5.2 Two-timescale gradient descent-ascent

Another method for minimax optimization, for which the goal is to converge to a local minimax point, is two-timescale gradient descent-ascent [LJJ20, LJJ25]. The main idea of this approach is to choose the step sizes for the descent update and ascent update to change on different timescales, so that the ascent updates are much larger / faster than the descent updates (i.e., $\eta_\gamma \ll \eta_w$). See [LJJ25] for formal guarantees and specific methods for choosing the step sizes η_γ and η_w .

Algorithm 6. *Two-timescale gradient descent-ascent proceeds according to the following steps:*

- 1. Inputs: learning rates $\eta_\gamma, \eta_w > 0$, where $\eta_\gamma \ll \eta_w$ and number of iterations N :
- 2. For $m = 1, \dots, N$
 - (a) $\gamma_m \leftarrow \gamma_m - \eta_\gamma \nabla_\gamma f(\gamma_m, w_m)$, where $\nabla_\gamma f$ is given in (4.9) and (4.11).
 - (b) $w_m \leftarrow w_m + \eta_w \nabla_w f(\gamma_m, w_m)$, where $\nabla_w f$ is given in (4.12).

5.3 Follow-the-ridge

Follow-the-ridge is a second-order algorithm for minimax optimization [WZB20], which provably converges to a local minimax point [JNJ20] of the objective function in (1.19) (see [WZB20, Theorem 1]). Thus, we can use it for optimizing (1.19). See [WZB20, Appendix A] for conditions on the learning rates needed to guarantee local convergence. See also [WZB20, Section 4.1] for variants of the basic algorithm that improve convergence, involving preconditioning and momentum.

Algorithm 7. *Follow-the-ridge proceeds according to the following steps:*

1. Inputs: learning rates $\eta_\gamma, \eta_w > 0$ and number of iterations N :
2. For $m = 1, \dots, N$
 - (a) $\gamma_{m+1} \leftarrow \gamma_m - \eta_\gamma \nabla_\gamma f(\gamma_m, w_m)$, where $\nabla_\gamma f$ is given in (4.9) and (4.11).
 - (b) $w_{m+1} \leftarrow w_m + \eta_w \nabla_w f(\gamma_m, w_m) + \eta_\gamma H_{ww}^{-1} H_{w\gamma} \nabla_\gamma f(\gamma_m, w_m)$, where $\nabla_w f$ is given in (4.12), H_{ww} in (4.14), and $H_{w\gamma}$ in (4.18) and (4.20).

Follow-the-ridge incorporates the term $H_{ww}^{-1} H_{w\gamma} \nabla_\gamma f$, which corrects the gradient update along the ascent variable direction, ensuring that the updates remain aligned with the local ridge structure of the minimax landscape.

5.4 HessianFR

The final algorithm that I consider is HessianFR [GLNZ22], which extends follow-the-ridge with additional Newton-like corrections designed to accelerate convergence and improve local stability. As shown in [GLNZ22, Theorem 3.2], it provably converges to a local minimax point.

Algorithm 8. *HessianFR proceeds according to the following steps:*

1. Inputs: learning rates $\eta_\gamma, \eta_{w1}, \eta_{w2} > 0$ and number of iterations N :
2. For $m = 1, \dots, N$
 - (a) $\gamma_{m+1} \leftarrow \gamma_m - \eta_\gamma \nabla_\gamma f(\gamma_m, w_m)$, where $\nabla_\gamma f$ is given in (4.9) and (4.11).
 - (b) $w_{m+1} \leftarrow w_m + u_m$, where

$$u_m \equiv \eta_{w1} \nabla_w f(\gamma_m, w_m) - \eta_{w2} H_{ww}^{-1} \nabla_w f(\gamma_m, w_m) + \eta_\gamma H_{ww}^{-1} H_{w\gamma} \nabla_\gamma f(\gamma_m, w_m), \quad (5.2)$$

$\nabla_w f$ is given in (4.12), H_{ww} in (4.14), and $H_{w\gamma}$ in (4.18) and (4.20).

Taken together, all four hybrid quantum–classical approaches presented in this section span a spectrum from purely first-order updates to fully second-order corrections, providing a flexible toolkit for optimizing (1.19) under different quantum resource and accuracy constraints.

6 Maintaining concavity via a linear model in feature space

A key advantage of the DV objective function in (1.16) is that it is concave in T . This is a desirable feature for optimization, so that optimizing (1.17) directly is a non-convex–concave optimization problem, for which there are many more guarantees than a non-convex–non-concave optimization problem (see [LJJ25] and references therein). As such, it could be desirable to maintain concavity when parameterizing the maximization problem, and one way to do so is to employ a linear model in feature space [SB14], rather than a general neural network. The trade-off when employing a linear model in feature space is that it may not be as expressive as a general neural network.

In this section, I derive analytical expressions for the gradient and Hessian when using a linear model in feature space. These expressions can be estimated on a quantum computer using Algorithms 1 and 2, and the estimates can be plugged directly into Algorithms 5–8 for minimax optimization. In particular, let us pick

$$T_w(z) := w^T \zeta(z), \quad (6.1)$$

where $w \in \mathbb{R}^L$ and $\zeta: \mathcal{Z} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^L$ is a feature map and can be nonlinear. The function in (6.1) is known as a linear model in feature space because it is linear in the parameter vector w . With this choice, the objective function $f(\gamma, w)$ in (1.19) becomes as follows:

$$f(\gamma, w) = \mathbb{E}_p[w^T \zeta(Z)] + 1 - \mathbb{E}_{q_\gamma}[e^{w^T \zeta(Z)}]. \quad (6.2)$$

As such, it is concave in w because the first term $\mathbb{E}_p[w^T \zeta(Z)]$ is linear in w and the last term $\mathbb{E}_{q_\gamma}[e^{w^T \zeta(Z)}]$ is convex in w , due to the exponential function being convex, so that $-\mathbb{E}_{q_\gamma}[e^{w^T \zeta(Z)}]$ is concave in w . With this choice, the optimization problem in (1.18) is indeed a non-convex–concave optimization problem.

We can modify the objective function just slightly, by means of a quadratic regularization, as follows:

$$\tilde{f}(\gamma, w) := \mathbb{E}_p[w^T \zeta(Z)] + 1 - \mathbb{E}_{q_\gamma}[e^{w^T \zeta(Z)}] - \frac{\lambda}{2} \|w\|^2, \quad (6.3)$$

where $\lambda > 0$ is a regularization parameter. Doing so just slightly changes the optimization problem while providing stronger numerical stability guarantees for it. Indeed, the modified objective function $\tilde{f}(\gamma, w)$ is strongly concave in

w , given that $f(\gamma, w)$ is concave in w [GG24, Lemma 2.12]. The modified optimization problem is as follows:

$$\inf_{\gamma \in \Gamma} \sup_{w \in \mathcal{W}} \tilde{f}(\gamma, w), \quad (6.4)$$

and the following inequalities clearly hold:

$$\inf_{\gamma \in \Gamma} D(p \| q_\gamma) \geq \inf_{\gamma \in \Gamma} \sup_{w \in \mathcal{W}} f(\gamma, w) \geq \inf_{\gamma \in \Gamma} \sup_{w \in \mathcal{W}} \tilde{f}(\gamma, w). \quad (6.5)$$

One recovers the original minimax optimization $\inf_{\gamma \in \Gamma} \sup_{w \in \mathcal{W}} f(\gamma, w)$ simply by setting $\lambda = 0$.

The gradient of $\tilde{f}(\gamma, w)$ with respect to $\gamma = (\theta, \phi)$ is the same as given in (4.9) and (4.11), with O_w therein set to $O_w = \sum_{z \in \mathcal{Z}} e^{w^T \zeta(z)} \Lambda_z$. In addition, the number of samples sufficient for obtaining ε -accurate estimates with error probability $\leq \delta$ is given by $\mathcal{O}\left(\frac{\|h\|^2}{\varepsilon^2} \ln\left(\frac{1}{\delta}\right)\right)$, where $h(z) := e^{w^T \zeta(z)}$.

The gradient of $\tilde{f}(\gamma, w)$ with respect to w is as follows:

$$\nabla_w \tilde{f}(\gamma, w) = \mathbb{E}_p[\zeta(Z)] - \mathbb{E}_{q_\gamma} \left[e^{w^T \zeta(Z)} \zeta(Z) \right] - \lambda w, \quad (6.6)$$

and the Hessian is given by

$$H_{ww} := \nabla_{w,w} \tilde{f}(\gamma, w) = -\mathbb{E}_{q_\gamma} \left[e^{w^T \zeta(Z)} \zeta(Z) \zeta(Z)^T \right] - \lambda I. \quad (6.7)$$

Given that the matrix $\mathbb{E}_{q_\gamma} \left[e^{w^T \zeta(Z)} \zeta(Z) \zeta(Z)^T \right]$ is positive semi-definite, the extra term λI with $\lambda > 0$ guarantees that H_{ww} is a negative definite matrix. Both the gradient in (6.6) and the Hessian in (6.7) can be estimated by sampling from p and q_γ .

By following a development similar to that in (4.4)–(4.7), we can rewrite the components of the gradient $\nabla_w \tilde{f}(\gamma, w)$ in (6.6) as follows:

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial w_\ell} \tilde{f}(\gamma, w) = \mathbb{E}_p[\zeta_\ell(Z)] - \langle P_{w_\ell} \rangle_{\omega_{\theta, \phi}} - \lambda w_\ell, \quad (6.8)$$

where the observable P_{w_ℓ} is defined as

$$P_{w_\ell} := \sum_{z \in \mathcal{Z}} e^{w^T \zeta(z)} \zeta_\ell(z) \Lambda_z, \quad (6.9)$$

with $\zeta_\ell(z)$ the ℓ th output of $\zeta(z)$. It then follows as a direct consequence of (1.10)–(1.11) that the Hessian elements of $\tilde{f}(\gamma, w)$ with respect to $\gamma = (\theta, \phi)$ and w , denoted collectively by $H_{\gamma w}$, are as follows:

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial \theta_j} \frac{\partial}{\partial w_\ell} \tilde{f}(\gamma, w) = \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta_j} \left(-\langle P_{w_\ell} \rangle_{\omega_{\theta, \phi}} \right) \quad (6.10)$$

$$= \frac{1}{2} \left\langle \left\{ e^{iH(\phi)} P_{w_\ell} e^{-iH(\phi)}, \Phi_\theta(G_j) \right\} \right\rangle_{\rho_\theta} - \langle P_{w_\ell} \rangle_{\omega_{\theta,\phi}} \langle G_j \rangle_{\rho_\theta}, \quad (6.11)$$

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial \phi_k} \frac{\partial}{\partial w_\ell} \tilde{f}(\gamma, w) = \frac{\partial}{\partial \phi_k} \left(- \langle P_{w_\ell} \rangle_{\omega_{\theta,\phi}} \right) \quad (6.12)$$

$$= i \langle [P_{w_\ell}, \Psi_\phi(H_k)] \rangle_{\omega_{\theta,\phi}}. \quad (6.13)$$

Thus, each of the terms in (6.8), (6.11), and (6.13) can again be estimated by means of Algorithms 1 and 2, with O therein replaced by P_{w_ℓ} . In addition, the number of samples sufficient for obtaining ε -accurate estimates with error probability $\leq \delta$ is given by $\mathcal{O}\left(\frac{\|p_\ell\|^2}{\varepsilon^2} \ln\left(\frac{1}{\delta}\right)\right)$, where $p_\ell(z) := e^{w^T \zeta(z)} \zeta_\ell(z)$.

7 Alternative distinguishability measures

In this section, I note that the main method outlined in this paper applies to other distinguishability measures. This holds because these other distinguishability measures have variational representations analogous to the Donsker–Varadhan formula in (1.16). As such, one can extend the whole development to these other distinguishability measures. See, e.g, [SG22, Section 2.2] for variational representations of other distinguishability measures like chi-square divergence, squared Hellinger distance, and total variation distance.

As a key example, let us consider the Rényi relative quasi-entropy, defined for probability distributions p and q_γ and $\alpha \in (0, 1) \cup (1, \infty)$ as

$$Q_\alpha(p \| q_\gamma) := \sum_{z \in \mathcal{Z}} p(z)^\alpha q_\gamma(z)^{1-\alpha}. \quad (7.1)$$

It is known to have the following variational representations [BFT17]:

$$\inf_{T \in \mathcal{T}} \left\{ \alpha \mathbb{E}_p \left[e^{\frac{\alpha-1}{\alpha} T(Z)} \right] + (1-\alpha) \mathbb{E}_{q_\gamma} \left[e^{T(Z)} \right] \right\} \quad \text{for } \alpha \in (0, 1), \quad (7.2)$$

$$\sup_{T \in \mathcal{T}} \left\{ \alpha \mathbb{E}_p \left[e^{\frac{\alpha-1}{\alpha} T(Z)} \right] + (1-\alpha) \mathbb{E}_{q_\gamma} \left[e^{T(Z)} \right] \right\} \quad \text{for } \alpha \in (1, \infty), \quad (7.3)$$

which results from simplifying the expressions in [BFT17, Lemma 3] to the classical case. Thus, for $\alpha \in (0, 1)$, the parameterized maximin optimization problem for Born-rule generative modeling becomes

$$\sup_{\gamma \in \Gamma} Q_\alpha(p \| q_\gamma) \leq \sup_{\gamma \in \Gamma} \inf_{w \in \mathcal{W}} f_\alpha(\gamma, w), \quad (7.4)$$

and for $\alpha > 1$, it is as follows:

$$\inf_{\gamma \in \Gamma} Q_\alpha(p \| q_\gamma) \geq \inf_{\gamma \in \Gamma} \sup_{w \in \mathcal{W}} f_\alpha(\gamma, w), \quad (7.5)$$

where

$$f_\alpha(\gamma, w) := \alpha \mathbb{E}_p \left[e^{\frac{\alpha-1}{\alpha} T_w(Z)} \right] + (1 - \alpha) \mathbb{E}_{q_\gamma} \left[e^{T_w(Z)} \right]. \quad (7.6)$$

Let us note that the optimizations in (7.4) are flipped when compared to (1.18) because Q_α is a similarity measure for $\alpha \in (0, 1)$, taking values in $[0, 1]$ with its largest value equal to one if and only if $p = q_\gamma$. When $\alpha > 1$, the quantity Q_α is a distinguishability measure, taking values ≥ 1 with its minimum occurring at one, if and only if $p = q_\gamma$.

The gradient $\nabla_\gamma f_\alpha(\gamma, w)$ with respect to $\gamma = (\theta, \phi)$ is precisely the same as in (4.9) and (4.11), with the exception that it should be multiplied by the prefactor $1 - \alpha$. The gradient $\nabla_w f_\alpha(\gamma, w)$ and Hessian $\nabla_w^2 f_\alpha(\gamma, w)$ have the following expressions:

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla_w f_\alpha(\gamma, w) = \\ (\alpha - 1) \left(\mathbb{E}_p \left[e^{\frac{\alpha-1}{\alpha} T_w(Z)} \nabla_w T_w(Z) \right] - \mathbb{E}_{q_\gamma} \left[e^{T_w(Z)} \nabla_w T_w(Z) \right] \right), \end{aligned} \quad (7.7)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla_w^2 f_\alpha(\gamma, w) = \\ (\alpha - 1) \mathbb{E}_p \left[e^{\frac{\alpha-1}{\alpha} T_w(Z)} \left(\nabla_w^2 T_w(Z) + \left(\frac{\alpha-1}{\alpha} \right) \nabla_w T_w(Z) [\nabla_w T_w(Z)]^T \right) \right] \\ + (1 - \alpha) \mathbb{E}_{q_\gamma} \left[e^{T_w(Z)} \left(\nabla_w^2 T_w(Z) + \nabla_w T_w(Z) [\nabla_w T_w(Z)]^T \right) \right], \end{aligned} \quad (7.8)$$

and thus can be estimated by sampling from p and q_γ and performing the standard backpropagation algorithm. Finally, the components of the Hessian $H_{w\gamma}$ are precisely the same as in (4.18) and (4.20), with the exception that they should be multiplied by the prefactor $1 - \alpha$.

These expressions can be directly plugged into Algorithms 5–8 for conducting the minimax optimization for (7.5), while noting that the signs of the updates should be flipped when conducting the maximin optimization for (7.4).

8 Conclusion

In summary, I delineated a practical solution to the problem of training evolved quantum Boltzmann machines for Born-rule generative modeling.

The solution combines the evolved quantum Boltzmann gradient estimator of [PKPW24, MPW25] and the Donsker–Vardhan variational formula for the relative entropy, leading to four different hybrid quantum–classical algorithms for training evolved quantum Boltzmann machines. As a special case, this provides a practical solution to the open problem, dating back to [AAR⁺18], of training quantum Boltzmann machines for Born-rule generative modeling. I also showed how the method extends to other distinguishability measures like the Rényi relative quasi-entropy.

Going forward from here, there are a number of open directions to pursue. First, following [SG22], one could aim to provide formal guarantees for the convergence of the relative entropy estimator. This would involve separating the total error into three components: (i) an approximation error, reflecting how well the neural network approximates the optimal value in the Donsker–Varadhan formula, (ii) an estimation error, quantifying how quickly the estimator converges to its expected value, and (iii) an optimization error, measuring the convergence of the minimax optimization to a local minimax point. Second, it would be worthwhile to perform numerical simulations to assess practical performance. Here, one could employ classical simulators of quantum computers, or one could execute the algorithms on real hardware. Finally, it would be interesting to investigate whether these hybrid quantum–classical algorithms achieve improved convergence when combined with the natural gradient method of [PW25].

Acknowledgements—I acknowledge insightful discussions with Dhruvil Patel and Michele Minervini during the development of [PKPW24, MPW25], and additional insightful discussions with Ziv Goldfeld and Sreejith Sreekumar during the development of [SGW25]. I also acknowledge support from the National Science Foundation under grant no. 2329662 and from the Cornell School of Electrical and Computer Engineering.

References

- [AA23] Anurag Anshu and Srinivasan Arunachalam. A survey on the complexity of learning quantum states. *Nature Reviews Physics*, 6(1):59–69, 2023. arXiv:2305.20069. doi:10.1038/s42254-023-00662-4.
- [AAR⁺18] Mohammad H. Amin, Evgeny Andriyash, Jason Rolfe, Bohdan Kulchyt-sky, and Roger Melko. Quantum Boltzmann machine. *Physical Review X*, 8:021050, May 2018. URL: <https://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevX.8.021050>, doi:10.1103/PhysRevX.8.021050.
- [AC19] Eric R. Anschuetz and Yudong Cao. Realizing quantum Boltzmann machines through eigenstate thermalization, 2019. URL: <https://arxiv.org/abs/1903.01359>, arXiv:1903.01359.

- [BBR⁺18] Mohamed Ishmael Belghazi, Aristide Baratin, Sai Rajeshwar, Sherjil Ozair, Yoshua Bengio, Aaron Courville, and Devon Hjelm. Mutual information neural estimation. In Jennifer Dy and Andreas Krause, editors, *Proceedings of the 35th International Conference on Machine Learning*, volume 80 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 531–540. PMLR, July 2018. URL: <https://proceedings.mlr.press/v80/belghazi18a.html>.
- [BFT17] Mario Berta, Omar Fawzi, and Marco Tomamichel. On variational expressions for quantum relative entropies. *Letters in Mathematical Physics*, 107(12):2239–2265, September 2017. URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s11005-017-0990-7>, [arXiv:1512.02615v2](https://arxiv.org/abs/1512.02615v2), doi:10.1007/s11005-017-0990-7.
- [BGPP⁺19] Marcello Benedetti, Delfina Garcia-Pintos, Oscar Perdomo, Vicente Leyton-Ortega, Yunseong Nam, and Alejandro Perdomo-Ortiz. A generative modeling approach for benchmarking and training shallow quantum circuits. *npj Quantum Information*, 5(1):45, 2019. doi:10.1038/s41534-019-0157-8.
- [BRGBPO17] Marcello Benedetti, John Realpe-Gómez, Rupak Biswas, and Alejandro Perdomo-Ortiz. Quantum-assisted learning of hardware-embedded probabilistic graphical models. *Physical Review X*, 7(4):041052, November 2017. URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevX.7.041052>, doi:10.1103/physrevx.7.041052.
- [BWP⁺17] Jacob Biamonte, Peter Wittek, Nicola Pancotti, Patrick Rebentrost, Nathan Wiebe, and Seth Lloyd. Quantum machine learning. *Nature*, 549:195–202, 2017. doi:10.1038/nature23474.
- [CAB⁺21] M. Cerezo, Andrew Arrasmith, Ryan Babbush, Simon C. Benjamin, Suguru Endo, Keisuke Fujii, Jarrod R. McClean, Kosuke Mitarai, Xiao Yuan, Lukasz Cincio, and Patrick J. Coles. Variational quantum algorithms. *Nature Reviews Physics*, 3(9):625–644, August 2021. URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/s42254-021-00348-9>, doi:10.1038/s42254-021-00348-9.
- [CB24] Luuk Coopmans and Marcello Benedetti. On the sample complexity of quantum Boltzmann machine learning. *Communications Physics*, 7(1):274, 2024. doi:10.1038/s42005-024-01763-x.
- [CC25] Su Yeon Chang and M. Cerezo. A primer on quantum machine learning, 2025. URL: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2511.15969>, [arXiv:2511.15969](https://arxiv.org/abs/2511.15969).
- [CGR⁺24] Matthias C. Caro, Tom Gur, Cambyse Rouzé, Daniel Stilck França, and Sathyawageeswar Subramanian. Information-theoretic generalization bounds for learning from quantum data. In Shipra Agrawal and Aaron Roth, editors, *Proceedings of Thirty Seventh Conference on Learning Theory*, volume 247 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 775–839. PMLR, 30 June–3 July 2024. URL: <https://proceedings.mlr.press/v247/caro24a.html>.
- [Che56] Herman Chernoff. Large-sample theory: Parametric case. *Annals of Mathematical Statistics*, 27(1):1–22, 1956. doi:10.1214/aoms/1177728347.
- [CHY16] Hao-Chung Cheng, Min-Hsiu Hsieh, and Ping-Cheng Yeh. The learnability of unknown quantum measurements. *Quantum Information and Computation*, 16(7&8):615–656, 2016. doi:10.26421/QIC16.7-8-4.

- [CKBG25] Chi-Fang Chen, Michael Kastoryano, Fernando G. S. L. Brandão, and András Gilyén. Efficient quantum thermal simulation. *Nature*, 646(8085):561–566, 2025. doi:[10.1038/s41586-025-09583-x](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-025-09583-x).
- [CMDK20] Brian Coyle, Daniel Mills, Vincent Danos, and Elham Kashefi. The Born supremacy: quantum advantage and training of an Ising Born machine. *npj Quantum Information*, 6:60, 2020. doi:[10.1038/s41534-020-00288-9](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41534-020-00288-9).
- [CMN⁺18] Andrew M. Childs, Dmitri Maslov, Yunseong Nam, Neil J. Ross, and Yuan Su. Toward the first quantum simulation with quantum speedup. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 115(38):9456–9461, 2018. doi:[10.1073/pnas.1801723115](https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1801723115).
- [CT06] Thomas M. Cover and Joy A. Thomas. *Elements of Information Theory*. Wiley, 2nd edition, 2006. doi:[10.1002/047174882X](https://doi.org/10.1002/047174882X).
- [DV75] Monroe D. Donsker and S. R. Srinivasa Varadhan. Asymptotic evaluation of certain Markov process expectations for large time, I. *Communications on Pure and Applied Mathematics*, 28(1):1–47, 1975. doi:[10.1002/cpa.3160280102](https://doi.org/10.1002/cpa.3160280102).
- [DZPL25] Zhiyan Ding, Yongtao Zhan, John Preskill, and Lin Lin. End-to-end efficient quantum thermal and ground state preparation made simple, 2025. URL: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2508.05703>, arXiv:2508.05703.
- [GAW⁺22] Xun Gao, Eric R. Anschuetz, Sheng-Tao Wang, J. Ignacio Cirac, and Mikhail D. Lukin. Enhancing generative models via quantum correlations. *Physical Review X*, 12:021037, 2022. doi:[10.1103/PhysRevX.12.021037](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevX.12.021037).
- [GG24] Guillaume Garrigos and Robert M. Gower. Handbook of convergence theorems for (stochastic) gradient methods, 2024. URL: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2301.11235>, arXiv:2301.11235.
- [GLG22] Eduard Gorbunov, Nicolas Loizou, and Gauthier Gidel. Extragradients method: $O(1/K)$ last-iterate convergence for monotone variational inequalities and connections with cocoercivity. In Gustau Camps-Valls, Francisco J. R. Ruiz, and Isabel Valera, editors, *Proceedings of the 25th International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics (AISTATS)*, volume 151 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 366–402. PMLR, 28–30 Mar 2022. URL: <https://proceedings.mlr.press/v151/gorbunov22a.html>.
- [GLNZ22] Yihang Gao, Huafeng Liu, Michael K. Ng, and Mingjie Zhou. HessianFR: An efficient Hessian-based follow-the-ridge algorithm for minimax optimization, 2022. URL: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2205.11030>, arXiv:2205.11030.
- [GSLW19] András Gilyén, Yuan Su, Guang Hao Low, and Nathan 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*, pages 193–204, New York, NY, USA, 2019. Association for Computing Machinery. doi:[10.1145/3313276.3316366](https://doi.org/10.1145/3313276.3316366).
- [HKP21] Hsin-Yuan Huang, Richard Kueng, and John Preskill. Information-theoretic bounds on quantum advantage in machine learning. *Physical Review Letters*, 126(19):190505, 2021. arXiv:2101.02464, doi:[10.1103/PhysRevLett.126.190505](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.126.190505).

- [Hoe63] Wassily Hoeffding. Probability inequalities for sums of bounded random variables. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 58(301):13–30, March 1963. doi:10.2307/2282952.
- [JNJ20] Chi Jin, Praneeth Netrapalli, and Michael I. Jordan. What is local optimality in nonconvex-nonconcave minimax optimization? In *Proceedings of the 37th International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML 2020)*, volume 119 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 4880–4889. PMLR, 2020. URL: <https://proceedings.mlr.press/v119/jin20e.html>, arXiv:1902.00618.
- [Kap20] H. J. Kappen. Learning quantum models from quantum or classical data. *Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and Theoretical*, 53(21):214001, May 2020. URL: <https://dx.doi.org/10.1088/1751-8121/ab7df6>, doi:10.1088/1751-8121/ab7df6.
- [KL51] Solomon Kullback and R. A. Leibler. On information and sufficiency. *The Annals of Mathematical Statistics*, 22(1):79–86, 1951. doi:10.1214/aoms/1177729694.
- [Kor76] G. M. Korpelevich. The extragradient method for finding saddle points and other problems. *Ekonomika i Matematicheskie Metody (Matecon)*, 12(4):747–756, 1976. Translated version: *Matecon*, 13(4):35–49 (1977). URL: <https://cs.uwaterloo.ca/~y328yu/classics/extragrad.pdf>.
- [KW17] Maria Kieferova and Nathan Wiebe. Tomography and generative data modeling via quantum Boltzmann training. *Physical Review A*, 96(6):062327, December 2017. arXiv:1612.05204, doi:10.1103/PhysRevA.96.062327.
- [LC19] Guang Hao Low and Isaac L. Chuang. Hamiltonian simulation by qubitization. *Quantum*, 3:163, July 2019. doi:10.22331/q-2019-07-12-163.
- [LJJ20] Tianyi Lin, Chi Jin, and Michael I. Jordan. On gradient descent ascent for nonconvex-concave minimax problems. In *Proceedings of the 37th International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML)*, volume 119 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 6083–6093. PMLR, 2020. URL: <https://proceedings.mlr.press/v119/lin20a.html>.
- [LJJ25] Tianyi Lin, Chi Jin, and Michael I. Jordan. Two-timescale gradient descent ascent algorithms for nonconvex minimax optimization. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 26(11):1–45, 2025. URL: <https://www.jmlr.org/papers/volume26/22-0863/22-0863.pdf>.
- [LLL⁺24] Junyu Liu, Minzhao Liu, Jin-Peng Liu, Ziyu Ye, Yunfei Wang, Yuri Alexeev, Jens Eisert, and Liang Jiang. Towards provably efficient quantum algorithms for large-scale machine-learning models. *Nature Communications*, 15(1):434, 2024. doi:10.1038/s41467-023-43957-x.
- [Llo96] Seth Lloyd. Universal quantum simulators. *Science*, 273(5278):1073–1078, 1996. doi:10.1126/science.273.5278.1073.
- [LR05] Erich L. Lehmann and Joseph P. Romano. *Testing Statistical Hypotheses*. Springer Texts in Statistics. Springer, 3rd edition, 2005. doi:10.1007/0-387-27605-X.
- [LW18] Jin-Guo Liu and Lei Wang. Differentiable learning of quantum circuit Born machines. *Physical Review A*, 98(6):062324, 2018. doi:10.1103/PhysRevA.98.062324.

- [MCK⁺25] Michele Minervini, Madison Chin, Jacob Kupperman, Nana Liu, Ivy Luo, Meghan Ly, Soorya Rethinasamy, Kathie Wang, and Mark M. Wilde. Constrained free energy minimization for the design of thermal states and stabilizer thermodynamic systems, 2025. URL: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2508.09103v2>, [arXiv:2508.09103v2](#).
- [MPW25] Michele Minervini, Dhruvil Patel, and Mark M. Wilde. Evolved quantum Boltzmann machines, 2025. URL: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2501.03367>, [arXiv:2501.03367](#).
- [NCT16] Sebastian Nowozin, Botond Cseke, and Ryota Tomioka. f-GAN: Training generative neural samplers using variational divergence minimization. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 29 (NeurIPS 2016)*, pages 271–279, 2016. URL: https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper_files/paper/2016/file/cedebb6e872f539bef8c3f919874e9d7-Paper.pdf, [arXiv:1606.00709](#).
- [NWJ10] XuanLong Nguyen, Martin J. Wainwright, and Michael I. Jordan. Estimating divergence functionals and the likelihood ratio by convex risk minimization. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 56(11):5847–5861, 2010. doi:10.1109/TIT.2010.2068870.
- [PKPW24] Dhruvil Patel, Daniel Koch, Saahil Patel, and Mark M. Wilde. Quantum Boltzmann machine learning of ground-state energies, 2024. URL: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2410.12935>, [arXiv:2410.12935](#).
- [POBRGB18] Alejandro Perdomo-Ortiz, Marcello Benedetti, John Realpe-Gómez, and Rupak Biswas. Opportunities and challenges for quantum-assisted machine learning in near-term quantum computers. *Quantum Science and Technology*, 3(3):030502, 2018. doi:10.1088/2058-9565/aab859.
- [PW25] Dhruvil Patel and Mark M. Wilde. Natural gradient and parameter estimation for quantum Boltzmann machines. *Physical Review A*, 112:052421, November 2025. URL: <https://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/j8nb-by41>, doi:10.1103/j8nb-by41.
- [RASW23] Soorya Rethinasamy, Rochisha Agarwal, Kunal Sharma, and Mark M. Wilde. Estimating distinguishability measures on quantum computers. *Physical Review A*, 108:012409, July 2023. URL: <https://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevA.108.012409>, doi:10.1103/PhysRevA.108.012409.
- [RFA24] Cambyse Rouzé, Daniel Stilck Franca, and Álvaro M. Alhambra. Optimal quantum algorithm for Gibbs state preparation, 2024. URL: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2411.04885>, [arXiv:2411.04885](#).
- [RLT⁺24] Manuel S. Rudolph, Sacha Lerch, Supanut Thanasilp, Oriel Kiss, Sofia Vallecorsa, Michele Grossi, and Zoë Holmes. Trainability barriers and opportunities in quantum generative modeling. *npj Quantum Information*, 10:116, 2024. arXiv:2305.02881. doi:10.1038/s41534-024-00902-0.
- [SB14] Shai Shalev-Shwartz and Shai Ben-David. Kernel methods. In *Understanding Machine Learning: From Theory to Algorithms*, pages 179–189. Cambridge University Press, 2014. doi:10.1017/CB09781107298019.017.

- [SG22] Sreejith Sreekumar and Ziv Goldfeld. Neural estimation of statistical divergences. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 23(126):1–75, 2022. URL: <https://www.jmlr.org/papers/volume23/21-1212/21-1212.pdf>.
- [SGW25] Sreejith Sreekumar, Ziv Goldfeld, and Mark M. Wilde. Performance guarantees for quantum neural estimation of entropies, 2025. URL: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2511.19289>, [arXiv:2511.19289](https://arxiv.org/abs/2511.19289).
- [SSHE21] Ryan Sweke, Jean-Pierre Seifert, Dominik Hangleiter, and Jens Eisert. On the quantum versus classical learnability of discrete distributions. *Quantum*, 5:417, 2021. doi:10.22331/q-2021-03-23-417.
- [Ste51] Charles Stein. Information and comparison of experiments. Charles Stein papers (SC1224). Box 12, Folder 7, Department of Special Collections and University Archives, Stanford University Libraries, unpublished., 1951. URL: <https://x.com/markwilde/status/1587028028521156608>.
- [WL24] Yunfei Wang and Junyu Liu. A comprehensive review of quantum machine learning: from NISQ to fault tolerance. *Reports on Progress in Physics*, 87(11):116402, 2024. arXiv:2401.11351. doi:10.1088/1361-6633/ad7f69.
- [WW19] Nathan Wiebe and Leonard Wossnig. Generative training of quantum Boltzmann machines with hidden units, 2019. URL: <https://arxiv.org/abs/1905.09902>, [arXiv:1905.09902](https://arxiv.org/abs/1905.09902).
- [WZB20] Yuanhao Wang, Guodong Zhang, and Jimmy Ba. On solving minimax optimization locally: A follow-the-ridge approach. In *ICLR 2020 Workshop*, 2020. URL: https://iclr.cc/virtual_2020/poster_Hkx7_1rKwS.html, [arXiv:1910.07512](https://arxiv.org/abs/1910.07512).
- [ZLW21] Christa Zoufal, Aurélien Lucchi, and Stefan Woerner. Variational quantum Boltzmann machines. *Quantum Machine Intelligence*, 3(1):7, 2021. doi:10.1007/s42484-020-00033-7.