

Hybrid VQE-CVQE algorithm using diabatic state preparation

John P. T. Stenger,¹ C. Stephen Hellberg,¹ and Daniel Gunlycke¹

¹U.S. Naval Research Laboratory, Washington, DC 20375, United States

(Dated: December 5, 2025)

We propose a hybrid variational quantum algorithm that has variational parameters used by both the quantum circuit and the subsequent classical optimization. Similar to the Variational Quantum Eigensolver (VQE), this algorithm applies a parameterized unitary operator to the qubit register. We generate this operator using diabatic state preparation. The quantum measurement results then inform the classical optimization procedure used by the Cascaded Variational Quantum Eigensolver (CVQE). We demonstrate the algorithm on a system of interacting electrons and show how it can be used on long-term error-corrected as well as short-term intermediate-scale quantum computers. Our simulations performed on IBM Brisbane produced energies well within chemical accuracy.

I. INTRODUCTION

Quantum algorithms that simulate quantum systems can be designed for Noisy Intermediate-Scale Quantum (NISQ) and Fault-Tolerant Quantum (FTQ) computers. Algorithms that require a large number of quantum logic gates must use FTQ computers. Conversely, algorithms that require relatively few quantum logic gates, can be used on NISQ computers but are not designed for FTQ computers. These two classes of algorithms often function very differently, which may pose a challenge when transitioning from near-term to long-term quantum computing.

Algorithms designed for FTQ computing include quantum phase estimation [1] and adiabatic state preparation [2–4]. Both algorithms require precise implementations of the quantum evolution operator. Implementing such an operator requires FTQ computers, which are presently not available. Therefore, much effort has been made to find near-term algorithms that can run on NISQ computers. There are three groups of NISQ algorithms that optimize: (1) during the quantum computing process, including the Variation Quantum Eigensolver (VQE) [5–14] algorithms; (2) after the quantum computing process, including Krylov Eigensolvers [15–23] and the Cascaded Variational Quantum Eigensolver (CVQE) [24–26]; and (3) both during and after, including Subspace Expansion methods [27–34], multi-state contraction [35, 36] and configuration recovery [37].

We focus on VQE and CVQE. Both VQE and CVQE utilize a variational ansatz. Many ansatzes for both VQE and CVQE have been proposed, including the unitary coupled cluster ansatz [5, 31, 38–49], the quantum alternating operator ansatz [50–54], the hardware-efficient ansatz [8, 55–63], the Jastrow–Gutzwiller ansatz [64–69], and the Variational Hamiltonian ansatz [70–72]. Many of these ansatzes will struggle to scale as the problem sizes increase [73]. However, some of these, like the Hamiltonian ansatz, can limit onto adiabatic state preparation.

In this paper, we propose a hybrid VQE-CVQE algorithm that uses the guiding-sampling ansatz [26], which explicitly approximates adiabatic state preparation. The cascaded optimization is performed by diagonalizing an




Figure 1. The basic process for our method. Diabatic state preparation is performed on the quantum computer to generate a guiding state. A collection of state states are measured. These state states form a subspace and this subspace can be optimized classically.

effective operator in a subspace defined by the quantum measurements. We show how this algorithm can be used during different phases of quantum computer development. The algorithm is general enough to be useful with error-correcting quantum computers, quantum computers that have high coherence but not error corrected, near-term quantum computers, and the quantum computers available today.

II. METHOD

Our goal is to calculate the ground-state energy of a fermionic quantum system described by the Hamiltonian \hat{H} on the Fock space \mathcal{F} . To achieve this objective we: (1) apply a parameterized unitary operator to the quantum register to generate a guiding state $|\Psi_0\rangle$, (2) measure $|\Psi_0\rangle$ and use those measurement results to form a collection of basis states \mathcal{B} , and (3) search for the ground state of \hat{H} on the Hilbert subspace \mathcal{V} spanned by \mathcal{B} . This method is depicted in Fig. 1.

An algorithmic implementation of this method is listed in Table I. To construct $|\Psi_0\rangle$, we first introduce a model system described by a Hamiltonian \hat{H}_0 with a known ground state $|\Phi_0\rangle$ that we prepare on the qubit register. Next we apply the diabatic state evolution operator

$$\hat{U}(N_\tau, \Delta\tau) = \mathcal{T} \prod_{\tau_i=1}^{N_\tau} e^{-i\hat{H}(\tau_i\Delta\tau)\Delta\tau}, \quad (1)$$

with a number of time steps N_τ , a time-step duration

Table I. CVQE-VQE hybrid algorithm using diabatic state preparation.

-
-
- 0: Select initial values for N_τ and $\Delta\tau$.
 - 1: Initialize the quantum register to $|\Phi_0\rangle$.
 - 2: Apply $\hat{U}(N_\tau, \Delta\tau)$ to the quantum computer.
 - 3: Measure $\hat{U}(N_\tau, \Delta\tau) |\Phi_0\rangle$ and collect the set of measured states \mathcal{B}_0 .
 - 4: Apply \hat{H} to each state in \mathcal{B}_0 , collect the set of coupled basis states \mathcal{B}_1 , and form the union $\mathcal{B} = \mathcal{B}_0 \cup \mathcal{B}_1$.
 - 5: Let $\hat{H}_\mathcal{B}$ be the projection of \hat{H} onto the subspace $\mathcal{V} = \text{span}(\mathcal{B})$.
 - 6: Find the lowest eigenvalue $E_\mathcal{B}$ of $\hat{H}_\mathcal{B}$.
 - 7: If $E_\mathcal{B}$ has not converged, update N_τ and $\Delta\tau$ and return to step 1.
 - 8: Return $E_\mathcal{B}$.
-
-

$\Delta\tau$, a time ordering operator \mathcal{T} , and a parameterized Hamiltonian

$$\hat{H}(\tau) = \left(1 - \frac{\tau}{N_\tau \Delta\tau}\right) \hat{H}_0 + \frac{\tau}{N_\tau \Delta\tau} \hat{H}. \quad (2)$$

This yields the guiding state $|\Psi_0\rangle = \hat{U}(N_\tau, \Delta\tau) |\Phi_0\rangle$.

In the limit $N_\tau \rightarrow \infty$ for a constant $T = N_\tau \Delta\tau$, the operator $\hat{U}(N_\tau, \Delta\tau)$ prepares the true ground state of \hat{H} . Although this limit is intractable on current quantum computers, a good guiding state can still be reached using highly discretized evolution [i.e. $\Delta\tau \gg 0$, $N_\tau = \mathcal{O}(1)$]. For more information, see Appendix A for arguments as to why highly discretized evolution could produce good guiding states and Appendix B for a method to decompose $U(N_\tau, \Delta\tau)$ into quantum gates.

Once the guiding state is prepared, we perform a set of measurements of the guiding state on the quantum register. The measurement outcomes $|n_0\rangle$ are basis states of the quantum register and they form the set \mathcal{B}_0 . Next we use the Hamiltonian to produce a second set \mathcal{B}_1 formed by all the states $|n_1\rangle$ for which there exists a state $|n_0\rangle \in \mathcal{B}_0$ such that $\langle n_1 | \hat{H} | n_0 \rangle \neq 0$. Lastly we combine these two sets to form the set $\mathcal{B} = \mathcal{B}_0 \cup \mathcal{B}_1$. See appendix C for a comparison with the standard VQE measurement approach [5].

The set \mathcal{B} is used to form the subspace $\mathcal{V} = \text{span}(\mathcal{B})$. We expect that the ground state of \hat{H} is well approximated within this subspace. To generate this approximation we define the effective Hamiltonian

$$\hat{H}_\mathcal{B} = \sum_{|n\rangle \in \mathcal{B}} \sum_{|m\rangle \in \mathcal{B}} h_{nm} |n\rangle \langle m|, \quad (3)$$

where $h_{nm} = \langle n | \hat{H} | m \rangle$. Because the dimension of \mathcal{V} increases polynomially with systems size, we can obtain the ground-state energy $E_\mathcal{B}$ of $\hat{H}_\mathcal{B}$ using a classical computer.

Each given pair $(N_\tau, \Delta\tau)$ specifies a unique guiding state $|\Psi_0\rangle$ in the CVQE guided sampling ansatz [26].

This guiding state can be optimized over $(N_\tau, \Delta\tau)$ to improve the solution, lowering $E_\mathcal{B}$. When $(N_\tau, \Delta\tau)$ is varied, our method can be understood as a hybrid VQE-CVQE method. The optimization technique for updating $(N_\tau, \Delta\tau)$ can be chosen by the user. Herein, we scan over certain cuts of the $(N_\tau, \Delta\tau)$ parameters space. See appendix D for a discussion on the relationship between our method and CVQE.

III. DEMONSTRATION

A. Model

We demonstrate the algorithm for a spinless electronic toy model with orbitals that are equally spaced in energy and with 1-electron excitations and 2-electron interactions restricted to nearest-energy orbitals. The Hamiltonian for this model is

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{H} = & \Delta\mu \sum_{q=0}^{Q-1} q \hat{n}_q - t \sum_{q=0}^{Q-2} (c_q^\dagger c_{q+1} + c_{q+1}^\dagger c_q) \\ & + V \sum_{q=0}^{Q-2} \hat{n}_q \hat{n}_{q+1}, \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

where c_q^\dagger and c_q are creation and destruction operators acting on orbital q , $\hat{n}_q = c_q^\dagger c_q$ is the number operator, $\Delta\mu$ is the energy-level spacing, t is the excitation parameter, and V is the electron-electron interaction strength. In order to build the guiding state we define the initial Hamiltonian

$$\hat{H}_0 = \Delta\mu \sum_{q=0}^{Q-1} q \hat{n}_q. \quad (5)$$

The eigenstates of H_0 can be conceptualized as electrons filling the energy levels $E_{0q} = q\Delta\mu$. We initialize the quantum register to the eigenstate of \hat{H}_0 that has N_e electrons filling the lowest N_e energy levels.

We use the Jordan-Wigner transformation [74] to map the electronic operators to Pauli operators [75]. We use standard methods to generate quantum gates from the Pauli operators. Information regarding gate generation can be found in Appendix B. From these gates we obtain the quantum circuits that generate the guiding states.

B. Simulation of an 8-orbital system

Figure 2 shows results from classical simulations of a system with $Q = 8$ orbitals and $N_e = 4$ electrons. The guiding state is generated using the diabatic state preparation in Eq. (1). The energy expectation value of the guiding state is shown as the black dashed line in Fig. 2a. The solid curves show the effective ground state energy $E_\mathcal{B}$ for various subspace dimensions. We consider three




Figure 2. Energy optimization for a $Q = 8$ orbital system with $N_e = 4$ electrons. (a) energy as a function of the number of time steps with a duration of $\Delta\tau = 1/15 \tau_0$ where $\tau_0 = 1/t$ is the characteristic time scale. (b) energy as a function of the time step duration at $N_\tau = 100$. (c) the total subspace after application of the Hamiltonian as a function of the number of time steps with a duration of $\Delta\tau = 1/15 \tau_0$. The parameters are set to $\Delta\mu = 0.75 t$, $V = t$. While t is a model parameter that sets the energy scale, a reasonable value to set our model to the molecular scale is $t = 1/15$ Ha. The dashed black lines represents the energy expectation value of the guiding state. The thick blue lines represents subspace extraction using the 14 most probable states, the medium orange line represents using the 8 most probable states, and the thin green line represents using the 2 most probable states. The dotted line in (c) marks the total size of the particle conserving state space.

N_τ regimes: a small, medium, and large regime. In the small regime ($0 < N_\tau \lesssim 350$ in Fig. 2a), the guiding state is far from the ground state. However, E_B can still be a good approximation for certain variational parameters ($N_\tau, \Delta\tau$), and therefore, the hybrid VQE-CVQE algorithm can be advantageous in this regime. In the medium regime ($350 \lesssim N_\tau \lesssim 2000$ in Fig. 2a), the guiding state remains a relatively poor approximation of the ground state but with the energy E_B nearly independent of the variational parameters. The guiding state has a probability distribution that generates a subspace that yields a good ground-state approximation. Thus, in this regime, CVQE can find a good approximation of the ground state without having to optimize ($N_\tau, \Delta\tau$). In the large regime ($2000 \lesssim N_\tau$ in Fig. 2a), the guiding state is a good approximation of the ground state as adiabatic state preparation has been achieved. This is indicated by the low energy of the dashed curve.

Because the number of CNOT gates is proportional




Figure 3. The difference between the energy calculated on the quantum computer and the exact ground-state energy. The data is represented by the circles. The lines are drawn to guide the eye. For this data, $Q = 50$, $N_e = 25$, $V = 0$, $N_\tau = 1$, and $\Delta\tau = 1/15 \tau_0$ where $\tau_0 = 1/t$. The inset is a magnification of the low-error data.

to the value N_τ , these regimes determine what type of quantum computer is needed. Because of quantum decoherence, NISQ computers are likely only going to be able to access the small and medium regimes. By contrast, FTQ computers can access all regimes.

The boundaries between these regimes depend on the chosen system and the step size $\Delta\tau$. Figure 2b shows the energy as a function of $\Delta\tau$ for $N_\tau = 100$. Notice that the shape of the curves appear similar in Fig. 2a for small N_τ and Fig. 2b for small $\Delta\tau$. That is because the unitary operator is effectively a function of the overall time $T = N_\tau \Delta\tau$ in the small $\Delta\tau$ limit where Trotter-Suzuki error are small. As the optimal value of $\Delta\tau$ is both hardware and problem specific, it is useful to let $\Delta\tau$ as well as N_τ be variational.

Fig. 2c shows the dimension of each subspace. Because the total number of states required to cover the full 4-electron 8-orbital space is $\binom{8}{4} = 70$, the subspace dimensions are not greatly reduced. This is an typical for small quantum systems because the number of measurements needed to obtain good statistical averages produces a subspace in our method with a dimension that approaches that of the complete basis.

C. Quantum computation for 50 energy levels

Next, consider a $Q = 50$ and $N_e = 25$ system. The size of the complete electron-preserving Fock subspace for this system is $\binom{50}{25} \approx 1.3 \times 10^{14}$. Assuming 64-bit floating-point numbers, it requires approximately two petabytes of information to store a single state vector. Diagonalizing a general Hamiltonian is cubic in the size of the statespace and is, thus, well beyond the reach of modern classical computers. Instead, we run our algorithm on the IBM Brisbane quantum computer. We set $V = 0$ so that we can compare the final energy from our algorithm to known values. The subspace dimension $|\mathcal{B}|$ in our method ranges from 2,000 – 2,500, which is tiny compared to the

dimension of the electron-preserving Fock subspace.

Figure 3 shows the energy difference ΔE between E_B and the ground-state energy as a function of the energy spacing $\Delta\mu$. The error is small for all $\Delta\mu$ except for the limit $\Delta\mu \ll t$ where initializing the system to the lowest-energy state of H_0 is no longer justified. The small error values are significant considering the error per layered gate (EPLG) for IBM Brisbane is 1.9%. The error tolerance inherent in our method is due to the fact that our method is resilient to small fluctuations in the probability distribution obtained from the quantum computer. Fluctuations in the probability distribution do not influence the final energy unless the fluctuations are large enough to add or remove a basis state to the set \mathcal{B}_0 .

Figure 4 shows the error in energy as a function of the number of time steps and the duration of the time steps. We find the optimized solution $(N_\tau, \Delta\tau) = (1, 1/15\tau_0)$. We also find that the value of $\Delta\tau$ is much less relevant than the value of N_τ . Notice that the scale on the y-axis of Fig. 4a is about an order of magnitude larger than that on Fig. 4b. The hardware noise from the quantum computer plays a significant roll in these results. Notice that at $\Delta\tau = 0$, we still find an accurate energy. From Fig. 2b and Ref. [26], one would expect a significant increase in the error as $\Delta\tau \rightarrow 0$. However, those are noise-free simulations. In practice, the noise effectively applies small non-zero angles of rotation to the quantum gates even if the input instruction is zero. Additionally, the fact that $N_\tau = 1$ is the optimal value is almost certainly due to the quantum noise at the hardware level. The increased accuracy that one would expect by increasing N_τ is not observed, suggesting that the increase in error due to the larger gate count overcomes any improvement in accuracy.

In Sec. III B, we described three N_τ regimes in which the optimal implementation of our algorithm is different. These findings using present-day quantum computers highlights a special case in which the quantum error is too high to access any $N_\tau > 1$. In this case varying $(N_\tau, \Delta\tau)$ is likely not necessary [26].

IV. CONCLUSION

We have presented a hybrid VQE-CVQE algorithm that use diabatic state preparation to generate the quantum variational guiding state. The quantum register is measured and the measurements are processed to form a collection of basis states, which are then used to form a subspace on which we represent the system Hamiltonian. The lowest eigenvalue of this Hamiltonian is then calculated using a classical computer.

We find that this hybrid algorithm performs better for NISQ computers than either VQE or CVQE on their own. We have described three regimes for which the optimal implementation of the algorithm changes. Although we demonstrate the presence of these regimes only for our toy model, we expect that these regimes are present for




Figure 4. Error in energy as a function of (a) the number of time steps with $\Delta\tau = 1/15 \tau_0$ where $\tau_0 = 1/t$ and (b) the duration of the time step with $N_\tau = 1$. In both plots, $Q = 50$, $N_e = 25$, $\Delta\mu = 0.2t$, and $V = 0$.

many physically relevant models. For the quantum computers that are currently available, minimizing circuit is the most critical consideration, thus $N_\tau = 1$ gives the best results for large systems. In this case, there is no need to update the variational parameters.

In the near term, allowing the variational parameters to update could help optimize the energy. In the medium term, the energy can be optimized using CVQE without changing the variational parameters. Eventually, when we have FTQ computers, we can do adiabatic state preparation directly without the need for any additional optimization. Our generalized method is effective in all of these regimes.

V. ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

This work has been supported by the Office of Naval Research (ONR) through the U.S. Naval Research Laboratory (NRL). We acknowledge QC resources from IBM through a collaboration with the Air Force Research Laboratory (AFRL).

Appendix A: Diabatic State Preparation

We need a \hat{U} that evolves the state of the quantum register towards the ground state of \hat{H} so that \mathcal{B} contains the necessary states to build a good approximation of the ground state. If we had access to an error-free quantum




Figure 5. Eigenstates for an example H_0 . The spheres represent electrons. The lines represent energy levels. On the left, the lowest energy levels are filled with electrons. In the second from left, one excitation has occurred. The two right most graphs show two excitations.

computer, we could perform adiabatic state preparation

$$\hat{U}_A(\tau) = \mathcal{T} e^{-i \int_0^\tau d\tau_1 \hat{H}(\tau_1)}. \quad (\text{A1})$$

where

$$\hat{H}(\tau) = \left(1 - \frac{\tau}{T}\right) \hat{H}_0 + \frac{\tau}{T} \hat{H}, \quad (\text{A2})$$

where H_0 is trivial to diagonalize and $T \gg 1/|\hat{H}|$ is a long time range.

To apply this operator on a quantum computer we have to discretize time as in Eq. (1) of the main text where $T = \Delta\tau N_\tau$. In the limit $N_\tau \rightarrow \infty$ and $\tau = T$ we recapture the evolution operator $\hat{U}(N_\tau \rightarrow \infty, \Delta\tau = T/N_\tau) = \hat{U}_A(T)$. By initializing the quantum computer to an eigenstate of \hat{H}_0 and applying $\hat{U}_A(T)$, we are guaranteed to prepare the exact ground state of \hat{H} when $T \rightarrow \infty$, assuming the spectrum of $\hat{H}(\tau)$ is gaped throughout. However, fast error rates prevent us from approaching the $N_\tau \rightarrow \infty$ limit.

Fortunately, for our purposes, we only need to reach an approximation of the correct subspace, not of the correct eigenstate itself. Figure 5 shows energy levels filled with four electrons in different excitation configurations. We expect that the ground state should be a linear combination of the lower-order excitations. These lowest order excitations are well captured by diabatic state preparation. Let us compare a single time step $N_\tau = 1$ to the full adiabatic evolution

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{U}(1, T) &= e^{-i\hat{H}_0 T} + \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} (-iT)^n \Pi_{n-m, m}(\hat{H}_0, \hat{H}_1), \\ \hat{U}_A(T) &= e^{-i\hat{H}_0 T} + \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} (-iT)^n \tilde{\Pi}_{n-m, m}(\hat{H}_0, \hat{H}_1), \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A3})$$

where $\hat{H}_1 = \hat{H} - \hat{H}_0$ is the non-trivial part of \hat{H} and both $\Pi_{n, m}(\hat{H}_0, \hat{H}_1)$ and $\tilde{\Pi}_{n, m}(\hat{H}_0, \hat{H}_1)$ are sums over all permutations of operator strings with a number of \hat{H}_0 operators equal to n and a number of \hat{H}_1 operators equal to m but with different weights. For $\Pi_{n, m}(\hat{H}_0, \hat{H}_1)$, all

operators have the weight $w = 1/(n + m)!$. For example

$$\Pi_{2,1}(\hat{H}_0, \hat{H}_1) = \frac{1}{3!} (\hat{H}_0 \hat{H}_0 \hat{H}_1 + \hat{H}_0 \hat{H}_1 \hat{H}_0 + \hat{H}_1 \hat{H}_0 \hat{H}_0). \quad (\text{A4})$$

For $\tilde{\Pi}_{n, m}(\hat{H}_0, \hat{H}_1)$, the weights depend on the position of the \hat{H}_1 operators in the operator string. In general, the weight is

$$\bar{w} = \frac{1}{\gamma_1(\gamma_1 + \gamma_2)(\gamma_1 + \gamma_2 + \gamma_3) \dots}, \quad (\text{A5})$$

where $\gamma_j = 2$ if the operator j positions from the left is \hat{H}_1 and $\gamma_j = 1$ otherwise (a derivation for this expression is found below in A1). For example,

$$\tilde{\Pi}_{2,1}(\hat{H}_0, \hat{H}_1) = \frac{1}{24} \hat{H}_0 \hat{H}_0 \hat{H}_1 + \frac{1}{12} \hat{H}_0 \hat{H}_1 \hat{H}_0 + \frac{1}{8} \hat{H}_1 \hat{H}_0 \hat{H}_0. \quad (\text{A6})$$

We see that both $\hat{U}(1, T)$ and $\hat{U}_A(T)$ contain the exact same operators with the general rule that the longer the operator string, the smaller the weight. The difference is that $\hat{U}_A(T)$ turns on \hat{H}_1 slowly and so the operator strings with \hat{H}_1 towards the beginning (towards the right) are less relevant.

We are only interested in the subspace that contains the ground state and not on the specific weights of each state. Therefore, we expect that $\hat{U}(1, T)$ is often sufficient for our purposes as it produces the same excitations as $\hat{U}_A(T)$ with a similar ordering of the weights.

1. Weights in the evolution operator

The full-adiabatic evolution operator can be written as a sum over integrals

$$\hat{U}_A(T) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} (-i)^n \hat{I}_n(T), \quad (\text{A7})$$

where each integral is

$$\hat{I}_n(\tau) = \int_0^\tau d\tau_1 \hat{H}(\tau_1) \hat{I}_{n-1}(\tau_1), \quad (\text{A8})$$

with $\hat{I}_0(\tau) = \mathbf{1}$. Let us perform the first few integrals and then the pattern for the weights becomes clear

$$\begin{aligned}
\hat{I}_1(\tau) &= \frac{1}{1} \hat{H}_0 \tau + \frac{1}{2} \hat{H}_1 \frac{\tau^2}{T}, \\
\hat{I}_2(\tau) &= \frac{1}{2 \cdot 1} \hat{H}_0 \hat{H}_0 \tau^2 + \frac{1}{3 \cdot 2} \hat{H}_0 \hat{H}_1 \frac{\tau^3}{T}, \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{3 \cdot 1} \hat{H}_1 \hat{H}_0 \frac{\tau^3}{T} + \frac{1}{4 \cdot 2} \hat{H}_1 \hat{H}_1 \frac{\tau^4}{T^2}, \\
\hat{I}_3(\tau) &= \frac{1}{3 \cdot 2 \cdot 1} \hat{H}_0 \hat{H}_0 \hat{H}_0 \tau^3 + \frac{1}{4 \cdot 3 \cdot 2} \hat{H}_0 \hat{H}_0 \hat{H}_1 \frac{\tau^4}{T}, \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{4 \cdot 3 \cdot 1} \hat{H}_0 \hat{H}_1 \hat{H}_0 \frac{\tau^4}{T} + \frac{1}{5 \cdot 4 \cdot 2} \hat{H}_0 \hat{H}_1 \hat{H}_1 \frac{\tau^5}{T^2}, \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{4 \cdot 2 \cdot 1} \hat{H}_1 \hat{H}_0 \hat{H}_0 \frac{\tau^4}{T} + \frac{1}{5 \cdot 3 \cdot 2} \hat{H}_1 \hat{H}_0 \hat{H}_1 \frac{\tau^5}{T^2}, \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{5 \cdot 3 \cdot 1} \hat{H}_1 \hat{H}_1 \hat{H}_0 \frac{\tau^5}{T^2} + \frac{1}{6 \cdot 4 \cdot 2} \hat{H}_1 \hat{H}_1 \hat{H}_1 \frac{\tau^6}{T^3}.
\end{aligned} \tag{A9}$$

We see that the weights are coming from integration over τ . Each integration increases the power of τ by one but also each \hat{H}_1 increases the power of τ by one. Therefore, we arrive at the expression for the weight in Eq. (A5).

Appendix B: Quantum Gates To Build The Diabatic State Preparation Unitary

The unitary operator $\hat{U}(N\tau, \Delta\tau)$ can be decomposed into quantum gates. First, we use the JW transformation and the Trotter–Suzuki decomposition to write the operator as a product of exponentials of Pauli strings. Let σ_q^a be the Pauli- a operator acting on qubit q and let $R_q^a(\phi)$ be the rotation around the a -axis of the Bloch sphere for qubit q . A general exponential of Pauli strings can be decomposed into quantum gates in the following way:

- On the last qubit with a non-identity Pauli string, insert an $R_q^z(\phi)$ gate with an angle equal to the weight of the Pauli string.
- Sandwich the $R_q^z(\phi)$ gate between two chains of CNOT gates that connect all of the qubits with non-identity Pauli operators.
- For each qubit with a σ_q^x Pauli operator, sandwich the circuit with an $R_q^y(-\pi/2)$ to the left and an $R_q^y(\pi/2)$ to the right.
- For each qubit with a σ_q^y Pauli operator, sandwich the circuit with an $R_q^x(\pi/2)$ to the left and an $R_q^x(-\pi/2)$ to the right.

Figure 6 shows an example of a circuit to create the exponential of the Pauli string $\sigma_0^x \sigma_1^z \sigma_3^y$.




Figure 6. Example quantum circuit to implement the unitary operator $e^{i\phi\sigma_0^x\sigma_1^z\sigma_3^y}$.

Appendix C: Collecting Shots

We describe two methods for collecting the shots from the quantum computer and, subsequently, using those shots to create a subspace. In the first method we divide the Hamiltonian into a sum of Pauli strings and then collect shots in the diagonalized basis of each Pauli string. This first method is the standard for calculating the expectation values of Hamiltonians on a quantum computer. In the second method, we collect the shots only in the original basis of the quantum computer. We use the second method in the main text of the manuscript. We show that the two methods are equivalent for k -local Hamiltonians.

For the first method, we partition the Hamiltonian into a sum of L Pauli strings

$$\hat{H} = \sum_{l=1}^L \hat{P}_l, \tag{C1}$$

where each \hat{P}_l is a Pauli string. Each \hat{P}_l has an associated rotation operator \hat{R}_l , which diagonalizes \hat{P}_l

$$\hat{R}_l \hat{P}_l \hat{R}_l^\dagger = \sum_n E_{nl} |n\rangle\langle n|, \tag{C2}$$

where E_{nl} are the eigenvalues of \hat{P}_l .

Let the quantum computer be in a state $|\Psi_0\rangle$. In this first method, we apply each rotation to the quantum state before measurement. After a rotation \hat{R}_l the amplitude of the basis state $|n\rangle$ is

$$\tilde{A}_{nl} = \langle n | \hat{R}_l | \Psi_0 \rangle. \tag{C3}$$

We refer to $\{n_l\} = \{\hat{R}_l | n\rangle\}$ as a rotated basis set and $\{|n\rangle\}$ as the unrotated basis. Let us imagine that we find a shot in state $|n_l\rangle$ if $|\tilde{A}_{nl}| > \epsilon$ for some cutoff threshold ϵ . Then the set of states that we obtain from the quantum computer are

$$\tilde{\mathcal{B}}_{0l} = \{|n_l\rangle : |\tilde{A}_{nl}| > \epsilon\}. \tag{C4}$$

However, we need to form a single basis using all of the collected measurement. Thus, we form the set of all unrotated basis states that might have contributed to each

measured rotated basis state

$$\tilde{\mathcal{B}}_l = \{|m\rangle : r_{mn}^l \neq 0 \text{ and } |\tilde{A}_{nl}| > \epsilon\}, \quad (\text{C5})$$

where $r_{mn}^l = \langle m | \hat{R}_l^\dagger | n_l \rangle$. The total set of states is the union of all $\tilde{\mathcal{B}}_l$

$$\tilde{\mathcal{B}} = \bigcup_l \tilde{\mathcal{B}}_l. \quad (\text{C6})$$

Note that if we are simply calculating expectation values as in VQE then we do not have to form $\tilde{\mathcal{B}}$. However, $\tilde{\mathcal{B}}$ is necessary to perform the CVQE step. Note also that the lowest eigenvalue in this basis $E_{\tilde{\mathcal{B}}}$ is less than or equal to the energy expectation value calculated from the rotated measurement basis. Therefore, hybrid VQE-CVQE finds energies that are at least as accurate as VQE on its own. This completes our description of the first method.

In the second method we do not perform any rotations before the measurement. Therefore, the amplitude of the basis state $|n\rangle$ is simply

$$A_n = \langle n | \Psi \rangle. \quad (\text{C7})$$

We form the initial set of states from this amplitude

$$\mathcal{B}_0 = \{|n\rangle : |A_n| > \epsilon\}, \quad (\text{C8})$$

where we have again assumed that we collect shots in all states with amplitudes bigger than ϵ . Using this initial set alone, we are likely to miss important properties of the Hamiltonian. Therefore, we find the full set of states by hitting the initial set with the Hamiltonian

$$\mathcal{B} = \{|m\rangle : h_{mn} \neq 0 \text{ and } |A_n| > \epsilon\}, \quad (\text{C9})$$

where $h_{nm} = \langle n | \hat{H} | m \rangle$ and \hat{H} is defined such that $h_{nn} \neq 0$ for all n . This completes our description of the second method. Next, we compare the two methods.

It is difficult to compare the two sets \mathcal{B} and $\tilde{\mathcal{B}}$ as they are written. To help make the comparison, let us define the total amplitudes \tilde{A}_n and A_n such that if $\tilde{A}_n \neq 0$ then $|n\rangle \in \tilde{\mathcal{B}}$ and if $A_n \neq 0$ then $|n\rangle \in \mathcal{B}$. For the first method we have

$$\tilde{A}_n = \sum_l \sum_m r_{mn}^l (\tilde{A}_{ml})|_{>\epsilon}, \quad (\text{C10})$$

for the second method we have

$$A_n = \sum_m h_{nm} (A_m)|_{>\epsilon}, \quad (\text{C11})$$

where we use the notation

$$(B)|_{>\epsilon} = \begin{cases} B & \text{if } B > \epsilon \\ 0 & \text{if } B < \epsilon \end{cases}. \quad (\text{C12})$$

We can better compare these two expressions if we use the identities

$$\tilde{A}_{al} = \sum_m (r_{ma}^l)^* \langle m | \Psi \rangle, \quad (\text{C13})$$

and

$$h_{nm} = \sum_l \sum_a r_{na}^l (r_{ma}^l)^* E_{al}. \quad (\text{C14})$$

Plugging in these two identities, we have

$$\tilde{A}_n = \sum_l \sum_a r_{na}^l \left[\sum_m (r_{ma}^l)^* \langle m | \Psi \rangle \right] \Big|_{>\epsilon}, \quad (\text{C15})$$

and

$$A_n = \sum_l \sum_a E_{al} r_{na}^l \sum_m (r_{ma}^l)^* (\langle m | \Psi \rangle)|_{>\epsilon}. \quad (\text{C16})$$

The value of E_{al} is insignificant as we are only concerned with whether or not the probabilities are non-zero. The important difference is the evaluation of the cutoff. In the first method, the cutoff is evaluated after the summation over m . In the second method, the cutoff is evaluated before the summation over m . The effect of the cutoff, therefore, depends on how many non-zero values r_{ma}^l there are for a given l and a . For a Pauli string that contains χ_l Pauli-X and Pauli-Y operators, there are $N_r = 2^{\chi_l}$ non-zero r_{ma}^l terms.

We can think of the second method as effectively increasing the cutoff (i.e. $\epsilon \rightarrow N_r \epsilon$). This can be compensated for by increasing the number of shots. If we take N_s times the number of measurements then $\epsilon \rightarrow \epsilon/N_s$. For fermionic Hamiltonians $\chi_l \leq 4$. Thus, $N_r \leq 16$. Therefore, we need only take sixteen times the number of shots for the second method to achieve the same accuracy as the first method. Furthermore, the first method requires L times as many circuits to achieve this increased accuracy. Even for simple molecules, we can have $L \approx 1000$. So it is often much more efficient to use the second method. We use the second method throughout the main text.

Appendix D: Overview of CVQE

In the CVQE algorithm, one uses an ansatz of the form

$$|\bar{\Psi}(\theta)\rangle = e^{i\hat{\lambda}(\theta)} \hat{U} |\Phi_0\rangle, \quad (\text{D1})$$

where $\hat{\lambda}$ is an operator, θ is a collection of parameters, \hat{U} is a unitary operator, and $|\Phi_0\rangle$ is some initialization state. The state

$$|\Psi_0\rangle = \hat{U} |\Phi_0\rangle, \quad (\text{D2})$$

is simulated on a quantum computer. We calculate the energy expectation value

$$E = \frac{\Upsilon(\theta)}{\Lambda(\theta)}, \quad (\text{D3})$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \Upsilon(\theta) &= \langle \Psi_0 | e^{-i\hat{\lambda}^*(\theta)} \hat{H} e^{i\hat{\lambda}(\theta)} | \Psi_0 \rangle, \\ \Lambda(\theta) &= \langle \Psi_0 | e^{-i\hat{\lambda}^*(\theta)} e^{i\hat{\lambda}(\theta)} | \Psi_0 \rangle, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{D4})$$

in terms of the measured probability distributions

$$|\tilde{A}_{nl}|^2 = |\langle \Psi | \hat{R}_l^\dagger | n \rangle|^2, \quad (\text{D5})$$

for various rotations \hat{R}_l . An important insight of CVQE is that the number of required \hat{R}_l to calculate $\Upsilon(\theta)$ and $\Lambda(\theta)$ is the same as the number required to measure an expectation value of \hat{H} , as long as $\hat{\lambda}(\theta)$ is diagonal in the $|n\rangle$ basis.

1. Comparison between CVQE and our method

The state created on the quantum computer in CVQE $|\Psi_0\rangle$ acts as our guiding state for particular values of N_τ and $\Delta\tau$. Instead of calculating Υ and Λ from the probability distributions (D5), we project the Hamiltonian onto a subspace. However, the final ansatz is the same in both CVQE and our method. Let $u_{n0} = \langle n | \hat{U} | 0 \rangle$, then the guiding state is

$$|\Psi\rangle = \sum_{n \in \mathcal{N}} u_{n0} |n\rangle. \quad (\text{D6})$$

Applying the second piece of the CVQE ansatz gives

$$|\bar{\Psi}(\theta)\rangle = \sum_{n \in \mathcal{N}} e^{i\hat{\lambda}(\theta)} u_{n0} |n\rangle. \quad (\text{D7})$$

If we choose $\hat{\lambda}(\theta)$ such that $\hat{\lambda}(\theta)$ is diagonal and $\langle n | e^{i\hat{\lambda}(\theta)} | n \rangle = 0$ if $|n\rangle \notin \mathcal{B}$ and we redefine our variational parameter as $\phi_n = \langle n | e^{i\hat{\lambda}(\theta)} | n \rangle u_{n0}$ then the state is

$$|\bar{\Psi}(\phi)\rangle = \sum_{n \in \mathcal{B}} \phi_n |n\rangle, \quad (\text{D8})$$

which covers the state subspace \mathcal{V} . Thus, for a set values $(N_\tau, \Delta\tau)$, our method is CVQE with the specific ansatz. However, if either N_τ or τ are allowed to vary then our method can be thought of as a hybrid VQE-CVQE method.

2. Effective Hamiltonian

We can optimize $|\bar{\Psi}(\phi)\rangle$ variationally, however, we can find the exact minimum from diagonalizing an effective Hamiltonian instead. Let us define an effective Hamiltonian on the subspace as in Eq. (3) of the main text. As the size of the basis \mathcal{B} is subexponential with the number of qubits, we can use a classical computer to diagonalize the effective Hamiltonian

$$\hat{H}_{\mathcal{B}} |E_{\mathcal{B}n}\rangle = E_{\mathcal{B}n} |E_{\mathcal{B}n}\rangle, \quad (\text{D9})$$

where $|E_{\mathcal{B}n}\rangle$ are the eigenstates and $E_{\mathcal{B}n}$ are the eigenvalues of $\hat{H}_{\mathcal{B}}$.

We can show that the ground state $E_{\mathcal{B}} \equiv E_{\mathcal{B}0}$ is the minimum possible expectation value of \hat{H} with $|\bar{\Psi}(\phi)\rangle$. We know that $|E_{\mathcal{B}n}\rangle$ forms a complete basis of the subspace $\mathcal{V} = \text{span}(\mathcal{B})$, therefore, we can write the state as

$$|\bar{\Psi}(\phi)\rangle = \sum_n \bar{\psi}_n(\phi) |E_{\mathcal{B}n}\rangle, \quad (\text{D10})$$

where $\bar{\psi}_n(\phi) = \langle E_{\mathcal{B}n} | \bar{\Psi}(\phi) \rangle$ are complex coefficients. Thus, the variational principle applies

$$\langle \bar{\Psi}(\phi) | \hat{H}_{\mathcal{B}} | \bar{\Psi}(\phi) \rangle = \sum_n |\bar{\psi}_n(\phi)|^2 \bar{E}_n \geq \bar{E}_0. \quad (\text{D11})$$

Furthermore, the expectation value of \hat{H} with $|\bar{\Psi}(\phi)\rangle$ is the same as that of $\hat{H}_{\mathcal{B}}$

$$\begin{aligned} E_0 &\leq \langle \bar{\Psi}(\phi) | \hat{H}_{\mathcal{B}} | \bar{\Psi}(\phi) \rangle \\ &= \sum_{nm \in \mathcal{B}} \phi_n^* \phi_m \langle n | \left(\sum_{pq \in \mathcal{B}} \langle p | \hat{H} | q \rangle |p\rangle \langle q| \right) | m \rangle \\ &= \sum_{nm \in \mathcal{B}} \phi_n^* \phi_m \langle n | \hat{H} | m \rangle \\ &= \langle \bar{\Psi}(\phi) | \hat{H} | \bar{\Psi}(\phi) \rangle. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{D12})$$

Appendix E: Approximating an expectation value using a subspace

Anytime we use a quantum computer to calculate the expectation value of an operator, we are using the subspace defined by the shots retrieved from the quantum computer. Therefore, any issues involving approximating the expectation value from a subspace is an inherent issue with quantum computing and not a fault of our method. However, the question still remains, is it appropriate to calculate an expectation value from a subspace?

The answer depends on the state in question. We show that if the state is an eigenstate of the operator then the subspace defined by the basis states with the highest weights gives a good approximation of the expectation value. Because the variational principle guarantees that the minimum expectation value corresponds to an eigenstate, and because we are searching for the minimum expectation value, we can be confident that our final result is a good approximation of the true expectation value. However, it should be noted that the expectation values of other states may not be good approximations.

To show that expectation values of eigenstates are well approximated using a subspace, let us define some helpful expressions. Let P_l be terms in the Hamiltonian as in Eq (C1). We write the eigenstates of each term of the Hamiltonian as Ψ_{nl}

$$\hat{P}_l |\Psi_{nl}\rangle = E_{nl} |\Psi_{nl}\rangle, \quad (\text{E1})$$

where E_{nl} is an eigenvalue of \hat{P}_l . We can expand a general ansatz state in terms of any one of these sets of bases

states

$$|\Psi(\phi)\rangle = \sum_{n \in \mathcal{N}} \phi_{nl} |\Psi_{nl}\rangle, \quad (\text{E2})$$

for any l , where ϕ_{nl} is a complex coefficient. We can then define the energy expectation value in terms of E_{nl} and ϕ_{nl}

$$E(\phi) = \sum_l \sum_{n \in \mathcal{N}} E_{nl} |\phi_{nl}|^2. \quad (\text{E3})$$

When we calculate the energy expectation value from the quantum computer we have to use the shots

$$\bar{E}(\phi) = \sum_l \sum_{n \in \bar{B}_l} E_{nl} |\bar{\phi}_{nl}|^2, \quad (\text{E4})$$

where $|\bar{\phi}_{nl}|^2$ is the normalized number of shots measured in $|n_l\rangle$ given that \hat{R}_l is applied to the quantum state before measurement.

While we are guaranteed that $|\bar{\phi}_{nl}|^2 \approx |\phi_{nl}|^2$, there can be situations where $\bar{E}(\phi) \not\approx E(\phi)$. Take for example, the case where E_{00} is the only non-zero eigenvalue but ϕ_{nl} is evenly spread. In this case, the energy expectation value from the quantum computer most likely returns 0 while the true expectation value is $E_{00}|\phi_{00}|^2$. Thus, not all energy expectation values are well approximated using a quantum computer. However, if $|\Psi(\phi^*)\rangle$ is an eigenstate of \hat{H} then there is a relationship between E_{nl} and ϕ_{nl} . We show that this relationship protects the expectation value of eigenstates.

The intuition is that the more a state contributes to the total energy expectation value, the greater its weight in the eigenstate. Thus, we calculate the contributions $\langle \Psi_{nl} | \hat{H} | \Psi(\phi^*) \rangle$ in two ways. Firstly, we break the Hamiltonian up into its terms

$$\langle \Psi_{nl} | \hat{H} | \Psi(\phi^*) \rangle = \sum_{n'l'} E_{n'l'} \phi_{n'l'} \zeta_{n'l'}^{nl}, \quad (\text{E5})$$

where $\zeta_{n'l'}^{nl} = \langle \Psi_{nl} | \Psi_{n'l'} \rangle$. We have that $\zeta_{n'l}^{nl} = \delta_{nn'}$, however, the basis states for different l are not necessarily orthogonal. Secondly, we use the fact that $|\Psi(\phi)\rangle$ is an eigenstate

$$\langle \Psi_{nl} | \hat{H} | \Psi(\phi^*) \rangle = E(\phi^*) \phi_{nl}. \quad (\text{E6})$$

setting Eq. (E5) and Eq. (E6) equal we have

$$\phi_{nl} = \frac{\sum_{n'l' \neq nl} E_{n'l'} \phi_{n'l'} \zeta_{n'l'}^{nl}}{E(\phi) - E_{nl}}. \quad (\text{E7})$$

Thus, the number of shots that are measured in a state $|n_l\rangle$ during the measurement of $\hat{R}_l | \Psi(\phi^*) \rangle$ is proportional to

$$|\phi_{nl}|^2 \propto \frac{1}{|E(\phi^*) - E_{nl}|^2}. \quad (\text{E8})$$

This means that we only drop states with energies that are far from the true expectation value and, therefore, we get a good approximation of the true expectation value.

To be more explicit, for Eq. (E4) to fail, there are two conditions. Firstly, the absolute value of the weight ϕ_{nl} must be small enough that we do not find it in any shot

$$|\phi_{nl}| \ll 1. \quad (\text{E9})$$

Second, the value of E_{nl} must be large enough that its contribution to the sum is substantial

$$|E_{nl}|\phi_{nl}|^2 \sim |E(\phi^*)|, \quad (\text{E10})$$

or equivalently

$$|E_{nl}|\phi_{nl}|^2 \gtrsim \left| \sum_{n'l' \neq nl} E_{n'l'} |\phi_{n'l'}|^2 \right|. \quad (\text{E11})$$

For both Eq. (E9) and Eq. (E10) to hold we must have that $|E_{nl}| \gg |E(\phi^*)|$. Using $|E_{nl}| \gg |E(\phi^*)|$ and Eq. (E7), we can rewrite Eq. (E11) as

$$|\phi_{nl}| \left| \sum_{n'l' \neq nl} E_{n'l'} \phi_{n'l'} \zeta_{n'l'}^{nl} \right| \gtrsim \left| \sum_{n'l' \neq nl} E_{n'l'} |\phi_{n'l'}|^2 \right|. \quad (\text{E12})$$

Using Eq. (E9) and the fact that $|\zeta_{n'l'}^{nl}| \leq 1$

$$\left| \sum_{n'l' \neq nl} E_{n'l'} \phi_{n'l'} \right| \gg \left| \sum_{n'l' \neq nl} E_{n'l'} |\phi_{n'l'}|^2 \right|. \quad (\text{E13})$$

For Eq. (E13) to hold, each of the $\phi_{n'l' \neq nl} \ll 1$. If any $\phi_{n'l' \neq nl} \sim 1$ then those terms dominate both sides of the inequality and the inequality no longer holds. However, normalization enforces

$$\sum_n |\phi_{nl}|^2 = 1, \quad (\text{E14})$$

for all l . Thus, if $\phi_{n'l' \neq nl} \ll 1$ then $|\phi_{nl}| \sim 1$ and Eq. E9 does not hold. Therefore, if $|\Psi(\phi)\rangle$ is an eigenstate then Eq. E4 is a good approximation of the energy expectation value.

Appendix F: Device Specification

In Tables II, III, and IV we show the device specifications for IBMQ Brisbane on which the quantum computation was performed. Out of the 125 qubits, we use the first 50. The native gates are Pauli-Z rotations, \sqrt{X} gates, and Echoed Cross Resonance (ECR) gates. In the tables, the ECR gates are labeled by an arrow. The arrow indicates the orientation of the neighboring target qubit. The arrow \leftarrow (\rightarrow) indicate that the target qubit is one index lower (higher) than the control qubit. The arrow \uparrow (\downarrow) indicate that the target qubit is directly above (below) the control qubit.

- [1] A. Yu. Kitaev, “Quantum measurements and the abelian stabilizer problem,” (1995), [arXiv:quant-ph/9511026 \[quant-ph\]](#).
- [2] Edward Farhi, Jeffrey Goldstone, Sam Gutmann, Joshua Lapan, Andrew Lundgren, and Daniel Preda, “A quantum adiabatic evolution algorithm applied to random instances of an np-complete problem,” *Science* **292**, 472–475 (2001).
- [3] V. N. Smelyanskiy, U. V. Toussaint, and D. A. Timucin, “Simulations of the adiabatic quantum optimization for the set partition problem,” (2002), [arXiv:quant-ph/0112143 \[quant-ph\]](#).
- [4] Ben W. Reichardt, “The quantum adiabatic optimization algorithm and local minima,” in *Proceedings of the Thirty-Sixth Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing*, STOC ’04 (Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 2004) p. 502–510.
- [5] Alberto Peruzzo, Jarrod R. McClean, Peter Shadbolt, Man-Hong Hong Yung, Xiao-Qi Qi Zhou, Peter J. Love, Alán Aspuru-Guzik, and Jeremy L. O’Brien, “A variational eigenvalue solver on a photonic quantum processor,” *Nature Communications* **5**, 4213 (2014).
- [6] Jarrod R McClean, Jonathan Romero, Ryan Babbush, and Alán Aspuru-Guzik, “The theory of variational hybrid quantum-classical algorithms,” *New Journal of Physics* **18**, 023023 (2016).
- [7] P. J. J. O’Malley, R. Babbush, I. D. Kivlichan, J. Romero, J. R. McClean, R. Barends, J. Kelly, P. Roushan, A. Tranter, N. Ding, B. Campbell, Y. Chen, Z. Chen, B. Chiaro, A. Dunsworth, A. G. Fowler, E. Jeffrey, E. Lucero, A. Megrant, J. Y. Mutus, M. Neeley, C. Neill, C. Quintana, D. Sank, A. Vainsencher, J. Wenner, T. C. White, P. V. Coveney, P. J. Love, H. Neven, A. Aspuru-Guzik, and J. M. Martinis, “Scalable quantum simulation of molecular energies,” *Phys. Rev. X* **6**, 031007 (2016).
- [8] Abhinav Kandala, Antonio Mezzacapo, Kristan Temme, Maika Takita, Markus Brink, Jerry M. Chow, and Jay M. Gambetta, “Hardware-efficient variational quantum eigensolver for small molecules and quantum magnets,” *Nature* **549**, 242–246 (2017).
- [9] Daochen Wang, Oscar Higgott, and Stephen Brierley, “Accelerated variational quantum eigensolver,” *Physical Review Letters* **122** (2019), [10.1103/physrevlett.122.140504](#).
- [10] Sam McArdle, Suguru Endo, Alán Aspuru-Guzik, Simon C. Benjamin, and Xiao Yuan, “Quantum computational chemistry,” *Reviews of Modern Physics* **92** (2020), [10.1103/revmodphys.92.015003](#).
- [11] Frank Arute, Kunal Arya, Ryan Babbush, Dave Bacon, Joseph C. Bardin, Rami Barends, Sergio Boixo, Michael Broughton, Bob B. Buckley, David A. Buell, Brian Burkett, Nicholas Bushnell, Yu Chen, Zijun Chen, Benjamin Chiaro, Roberto Collins, William Courtney, Sean Demura, Andrew Dunsworth, Edward Farhi, Austin Fowler, Brooks Foxen, Craig Gidney, Marissa Giustina, Rob Graff, Steve Habegger, Matthew P. Harrigan, Alan Ho, Sabrina Hong, Trent Huang, William J. Huggins, Lev Ioffe, Sergei V. Isakov, Evan Jeffrey, Zhang Jiang, Cody Jones, Dvir Kafri, Kostyantyn Kechedzhi, Julian Kelly, Seon Kim, Paul V. Klimov, Alexander Korotkov, Fedor Kostritsa, David Landhuis, Pavel Laptev, Mike Lindmark, Erik Lucero, Orion Martin, John M. Martinis, Jarrod R. McClean, Matt McEwen, Anthony Megrant, Xiao Mi, Masoud Mohseni, Wojciech Mruczkiewicz, Josh Mutus, Ofer Naaman, Matthew Neeley, Charles Neill, Hartmut Neven, Murphy Yuezhen Niu, Thomas E. O’Brien, Eric Ostby, Andre Petukhov, Harald Putterman, Chris Quintana, Pedram Roushan, Nicholas C. Rubin, Daniel Sank, Kevin J. Satzinger, Vadim Smelyanskiy, Doug Strain, Kevin J. Sung, Marco Szalay, Tyler Y. Takeshita, Amit Vainsencher, Theodore White, Nathan Wiebe, Z. Jamie Yao, Ping Yeh, and Adam Zalcman, “Hartreefock on a superconducting qubit quantum computer,” *Science* **369**, 1084–1089 (2020).
- [12] Jérôme F. Gonthier, Maxwell D. Radin, Corneliu Buda, Eric J. Daskocil, Clena M. Abuan, and Jhonathan Romero, “Measurements as a roadblock to near-term practical quantum advantage in chemistry: Resource analysis,” *Physical Review Research* **4** (2022), [10.1103/physrevresearch.4.033154](#).
- [13] Kade Head-Marsden, Johannes Flick, Christopher J. Ciccarino, and Prineha Narang, “Quantum information and algorithms for correlated quantum matter,” *Chemical Reviews* **121**, 3061–3120 (2021).
- [14] 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**, 625–644 (2021).
- [15] Robert M. Parrish and Peter L. McMahon, “Quantum filter diagonalization: Quantum eigendecomposition without full quantum phase estimation,” (2019), [arXiv:1909.08925 \[quant-ph\]](#).
- [16] Nicholas H. Stair, Renke Huang, and Francesco A. Evangelista, “A multireference quantum krylov algorithm for strongly correlated electrons,” *Journal of Chemical Theory and Computation* **16**, 2236–2245 (2020).
- [17] Thomas E. Baker, “Lanczos recursion on a quantum computer for the green’s function and ground state,” *Phys. Rev. A* **103**, 032404 (2021).
- [18] Francois Jamet, Abhishek Agarwal, Carla Lupo, Dan E. Browne, Cedric Weber, and Ivan Rungger, “Krylov variational quantum algorithm for first principles materials simulations,” (2021), [arXiv:2105.13298 \[quant-ph\]](#).
- [19] Kishor Bharti and Tobias Haug, “Iterative quantum-assisted eigensolver,” *Phys. Rev. A* **104**, L050401 (2021).
- [20] Jeffrey Cohn, Mario Motta, and Robert M. Parrish, “Quantum filter diagonalization with compressed double-factorized hamiltonians,” *PRX Quantum* **2**, 040352 (2021).
- [21] Francois Jamet, Abhishek Agarwal, and Ivan Rungger, “Quantum subspace expansion algorithm for green’s functions,” (2022), [arXiv:2205.00094 \[quant-ph\]](#).
- [22] Thomas E. Baker, “Block lanczos method for excited states on a quantum computer,” *Phys. Rev. A* **110**, 012420 (2024).
- [23] Nobuyuki Yoshioka, Mirko Amico, William Kirby, Petar Jurcevic, Arkopal Dutt, Bryce Fuller, Shelly Garion, Holger Haas, Ikko Hamamura, Alexander Ivrii, Ritajit Majumdar, Zlatko Mineev, Mario Motta, Bibek Pokharel, Pedro Rivero, Kunal Sharma, Christopher J. Wood,

- Ali Javadi-Abhari, and Antonio Mezzacapo, “Krylov diagonalization of large many-body hamiltonians on a quantum processor,” *Nature Communications* **16**, 5014 (2025).
- [24] Daniel Gunlycke, C. Stephen Hellberg, and John P. T. Stenger, “Cascaded variational quantum eigensolver algorithm,” *Phys. Rev. Res.* **6**, 013238 (2024).
- [25] John P. T. Stenger, C. Stephen Hellberg, and Daniel Gunlycke, “Demonstration of the effectiveness of the cascaded variational quantum eigensolver using the jastrow ansatz for molecular calculations,” *ACS Omega* **9**, 21353–21364 (2024).
- [26] Daniel Gunlycke, John P. T. Stenger, Andrii Maksymov, Ananth Kaushik, Martin Roetteler, and C. Stephen Hellberg, “Guided sampling ansatzes for variational quantum computing,” (2025), [arXiv:2508.13926 \[quant-ph\]](https://arxiv.org/abs/2508.13926).
- [27] Jarrod R. McClean, Mollie E. Kimchi-Schwartz, Jonathan Carter, and Wibe A. de Jong, “Hybrid quantum-classical hierarchy for mitigation of decoherence and determination of excited states,” *Phys. Rev. A* **95**, 042308 (2017).
- [28] 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,” *Phys. Rev. X* **8**, 011021 (2018).
- [29] Miroslav Urbanek, Daan Camps, Roel Van Beeumen, and Wibe A. de Jong, “Chemistry on quantum computers with virtual quantum subspace expansion,” *Journal of Chemical Theory and Computation* **16**, 5425–5431 (2020).
- [30] Suguru Endo, Zhenyu Cai, Simon C. Benjamin, and Xiao Yuan, “Hybrid quantum-classical algorithms and quantum error mitigation,” *Journal of the Physical Society of Japan* **90**, 032001 (2021).
- [31] Mario Motta, Erika Ye, Jarrod R. McClean, Zhendong Li, Austin J. Minnich, Ryan Babbush, and Garnet Kin-Lic Chan, “Low rank representations for quantum simulation of electronic structure,” *npj Quantum Information* **7** (2021), [10.1038/s41534-021-00416-z](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41534-021-00416-z).
- [32] Ethan N. Epperly, Lin Lin, and Yuji Nakatsukasa, “A theory of quantum subspace diagonalization,” *SIAM Journal on Matrix Analysis and Applications* **43**, 1263–1290 (2022).
- [33] Mario Motta, William Kirby, Ieva Liepuoniute, Kevin J. Sung, Jeffrey Cohn, Antonio Mezzacapo, Katherine Klymko, Nam Nguyen, Nobuyuki Yoshioka, and Julia E. Rice, “Subspace methods for electronic structure simulations on quantum computers,” *Electronic Structure* **6**, 013001 (2024).
- [34] Chukwudubem Umeano, François Jamet, Lachlan P. Lindoy, Ivan Rungger, and Oleksandr Kyriienko, “Quantum subspace expansion approach for simulating dynamical response functions of kitaev spin liquids,” *Phys. Rev. Mater.* **9**, 034401 (2025).
- [35] Robert M. Parrish, Edward G. Hohenstein, Peter L. McMahon, and Todd J. Martínez, “Quantum computation of electronic transitions using a variational quantum eigensolver,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **122**, 230401 (2019).
- [36] William J. Huggins, Joonho Lee, Unpil Baek, Bryan O’Gorman, and K. Birgitta Whaley, “A non-orthogonal variational quantum eigensolver,” *New Journal of Physics* **22**, 073009 (2020).
- [37] Javier Robledo-Moreno, Mario Motta, Holger Haas, Ali Javadi-Abhari, Petar Jurcevic, William Kirby, Simon Martiel, Kunal Sharma, Sandeep Sharma, Tomonori Shirakawa, Iskandar Sitdikov, Rong-Yang Sun, Kevin J. Sung, Maika Takita, Minh C. Tran, Seiji Yunoki, and Antonio Mezzacapo, “Chemistry beyond the scale of exact diagonalization on a quantum-centric supercomputer,” *Science Advances* **11**, 9991 (2025).
- [38] Gaurav Harsha, Toru Shiozaki, and Gustavo E. Scuseria, “On the difference between variational and unitary coupled cluster theories,” *The Journal of Chemical Physics* **148**, 044107 (2018).
- [39] Ian D. Kivlichan, Jarrod McClean, Nathan Wiebe, Craig Gidney, Alán Aspuru-Guzik, Garnet Kin-Lic Chan, and Ryan Babbush, “Quantum simulation of electronic structure with linear depth and connectivity,” *Physical Review Letters* **120** (2018), [10.1103/physrevlett.120.110501](https://doi.org/10.1103/physrevlett.120.110501).
- [40] Cornelius Hempel, Christine Maier, Jonathan Romero, Jarrod McClean, Thomas Monz, Heng Shen, Petar Jurcevic, Ben P. Lanyon, Peter Love, Ryan Babbush, Alán Aspuru-Guzik, Rainer Blatt, and Christian F. Roos, “Quantum chemistry calculations on a trapped-ion quantum simulator,” *Phys. Rev. X* **8**, 031022 (2018).
- [41] Jonathan Romero, Ryan Babbush, Jarrod R. McClean, Cornelius Hempel, Peter J. Love, and Alán Aspuru-Guzik, “Strategies for quantum computing molecular energies using the unitary coupled cluster ansatz,” *Quantum Science and Technology* **4**, 014008 (2018).
- [42] Pierre-Luc Dallaire-Demers, Jonathan Romero, Libor Veis, Sukin Sim, and Alán Aspuru-Guzik, “Low-depth circuit ansatz for preparing correlated fermionic states on a quantum computer,” *Quantum Science and Technology* **4**, 045005 (2019).
- [43] Kanav Setia, Sergey Bravyi, Antonio Mezzacapo, and James D. Whitfield, “Superfast encodings for fermionic quantum simulation,” *Physical Review Research* **1** (2019), [10.1103/physrevresearch.1.033033](https://doi.org/10.1103/physrevresearch.1.033033).
- [44] Joonho Lee, William J. Huggins, Martin Head-Gordon, and K. Birgitta Whaley, “Generalized unitary coupled cluster wave functions for quantum computation,” *Journal of Chemical Theory and Computation* **15**, 311–324 (2019).
- [45] Yuta Matsuzawa and Yuki Kurashige, “Jastrow-type decomposition in quantum chemistry for low-depth quantum circuits,” *Journal of Chemical Theory and Computation* **16**, 944–952 (2020).
- [46] Igor O. Sokolov, Panagiotis K. Barkoutsos, Pauline J. Ollitrault, Donny Greenberg, Julia Rice, Marco Pistoia, and Ivano Tavernelli, “Quantum orbital-optimized unitary coupled cluster methods in the strongly correlated regime: Can quantum algorithms outperform their classical equivalents?” *The Journal of Chemical Physics* **152**, 124107 (2020).
- [47] Yunseong Nam, Jwo-Sy Chen, Neal C. Pienti, Kenneth Wright, Conor Delaney, Dmitri Maslov, Kenneth R. Brown, Stewart Allen, Jason M. Amini, Joel Apisdorf, Kristin M. Beck, Aleksey Blinov, Vandiver Chaplin, Mika Chmielewski, Coleman Collins, Shantanu Debnath, Kai M. Hudek, Andrew M. Ducore, Matthew Keesan, Sarah M. Kreikemeier, Jonathan Mizrahi, Phil Solomon, Mike Williams, Jaime David Wong-Campos, David Moehring, Christopher Monroe, and Jungsang Kim, “Ground-state energy estimation of the water molecule on a trapped-ion quantum computer,” *npj quantum in-*

- formation **6**, 33 (2020).
- [48] Nicholas P. Bauman, Jaroslav Chládek, Libor Veis, Jiří Pittner, and Karol Kowalski, “Variational quantum eigensolver for approximate diagonalization of down-folded hamiltonians using generalized unitary coupled cluster ansatz,” (2020), [arXiv:2011.01985 \[quant-ph\]](#).
 - [49] Harper R. Grimsley, Daniel Claudino, Sophia E. Economou, Edwin Barnes, and Nicholas J. Mayhall, “Is the trotterized uccsd ansatz chemically well-defined?” *Journal of Chemical Theory and Computation* **16**, 1–6 (2020), pMID: 31841333.
 - [50] Edward Farhi, Jeffrey Goldstone, and Sam Gutmann, “A quantum approximate optimization algorithm,” (2014), [arXiv:1411.4028 \[quant-ph\]](#).
 - [51] Seth Lloyd, “Quantum approximate optimization is computationally universal,” (2018), [arXiv:1812.11075 \[quant-ph\]](#).
 - [52] Stuart Hadfield, Zhihui Wang, Bryan O’Gorman, Eleanor Rieffel, Davide Venturelli, and Rupak Biswas, “From the quantum approximate optimization algorithm to a quantum alternating operator ansatz,” *Algorithms* **12**, 34 (2019).
 - [53] Zhihui Wang, Nicholas C. Rubin, Jason M. Dominy, and Eleanor G. Rieffel, “XY mixers: Analytical and numerical results for the quantum alternating operator ansatz,” *Physical Review A* **101** (2020), [10.1103/physreva.101.012320](#).
 - [54] M. E. S. Morales, J. D. Biamonte, and Z. Zimborás, “On the universality of the quantum approximate optimization algorithm,” *Quantum Information Processing* **19** (2020), [10.1007/s11128-020-02748-9](#).
 - [55] Panagiotis Kl. Barkoutsos, Jerome F. Gonthier, Igor Sokolov, Nikolaj Moll, Gian Salis, Andreas Fuhrer, Marc Ganzhorn, Daniel J. Egger, Matthias Troyer, Antonio Mezzacapo, Stefan Filipp, and Ivano Tavernelli, “Quantum algorithms for electronic structure calculations: Particle-hole hamiltonian and optimized wave-function expansions,” *Phys. Rev. A* **98**, 022322 (2018).
 - [56] Abhinav Kandala, Kristan Temme, Antonio D. Córcoles, Antonio Mezzacapo, Jerry M. Chow, and Jay M. Gambetta, “Error mitigation extends the computational reach of a noisy quantum processor,” *Nature* **567**, 491–495 (2019).
 - [57] C. Kokail, C. Maier, R. van Bijnen, T. Brydges, M. K. Joshi, P. Jurcevic, C. A. Muschik, P. Silvi, R. Blatt, C. F. Roos, and P. Zoller, “Self-verifying variational quantum simulation of lattice models,” *Nature* **569**, 355–360 (2019).
 - [58] M. Ganzhorn, D.J. Egger, P. Barkoutsos, P. Ollitrault, G. Salis, N. Moll, M. Roth, A. Fuhrer, P. Mueller, S. Woerner, I. Tavernelli, and S. Filipp, “Gate-efficient simulation of molecular eigenstates on a quantum computer,” *Phys. Rev. Applied* **11**, 044092 (2019).
 - [59] Matthew Otten, Cristian L. Cortes, and Stephen K. Gray, “Noise-resilient quantum dynamics using symmetry-preserving ansatzes,” (2019), [arXiv:1910.06284 \[quant-ph\]](#).
 - [60] Bryan T. Gard, Linghua Zhu, George S. Barron, Nicholas J. Mayhall, Sophia E. Economou, and Edwin Barnes, “Efficient symmetry-preserving state preparation circuits for the variational quantum eigensolver algorithm,” *npj Quantum Information* **6** (2020), [10.1038/s41534-019-0240-1](#).
 - [61] Carlos Bravo-Prieto, Josep Lumbrales-Zarapico, Luca Tagliacozzo, and José I. Latorre, “Scaling of variational quantum circuit depth for condensed matter systems,” *Quantum* **4**, 272 (2020).
 - [62] Nikolay V. Tkachenko, James Sud, Yu Zhang, Sergei Tretiak, Petr M. Anisimov, Andrew T. Arrasmith, Patrick J. Coles, Lukasz Cincio, and Pavel A. Dub, “Correlation-informed permutation of qubits for reducing ansatz depth in the variational quantum eigensolver,” *PRX Quantum* **2** (2021), [10.1103/prxquantum.2.020337](#).
 - [63] Hugh G. A. Burton, “Accurate and gate-efficient quantum ansätze for electronic states without adaptive optimization,” *Phys. Rev. Res.* **6**, 023300 (2024).
 - [64] Guglielmo Mazzola, Pauline J. Ollitrault, Panagiotis Kl. Barkoutsos, and Ivano Tavernelli, “Nonunitary operations for ground-state calculations in near-term quantum computers,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **123**, 130501 (2019).
 - [65] Yongxin Yao, Feng Zhang, Cai-Zhuang Wang, Kai-Ming Ho, and Peter P. Orth, “Gutzwiller hybrid quantum-classical computing approach for correlated materials,” *Phys. Rev. Research* **3**, 013184 (2021).
 - [66] Bruno Murta and J. Fernández-Rossier, “Gutzwiller wave function on a digital quantum computer,” *Phys. Rev. B* **103**, L241113 (2021).
 - [67] Shi-Xin Zhang, Zhou-Quan Wan, Chee-Kong Lee, Chang-Yu Hsieh, Shengyu Zhang, and Hong Yao, “Variational quantum-neural hybrid eigensolver,” *Physical Review Letters* **128** (2022), [10.1103/physrevlett.128.120502](#).
 - [68] Kazuhiro Seki, Yuichi Otsuka, and Seiji Yunoki, “Gutzwiller wave function on a quantum computer using a discrete hubbard-stratonovich transformation,” *Physical Review B* **105** (2022), [10.1103/physrevb.105.155119](#).
 - [69] John P. T. Stenger, C. Stephen Hellberg, and Daniel Gunlycke, “Implementing jastrow-gutzwiller operators on a quantum computer using the cascaded variational quantum eigensolver algorithm,” *Physical Review A* **107** (2023), [10.1103/physreva.107.062606](#).
 - [70] Dave Wecker, Matthew B. Hastings, Nathan Wiebe, Bryan K. Clark, Chetan Nayak, and Matthias Troyer, “Solving strongly correlated electron models on a quantum computer,” *Phys. Rev. A* **92**, 062318 (2015).
 - [71] Wen Wei Ho and Timothy H. Hsieh, “Efficient variational simulation of non-trivial quantum states,” *SciPost Physics* **6** (2019), [10.21468/scipostphys.6.3.029](#).
 - [72] Roeland Wiersema, Cunlu Zhou, Yvette de Sereville, Juan Felipe Carrasquilla, Yong Baek Kim, and Henry Yuen, “Exploring entanglement and optimization within the hamiltonian variational ansatz,” *PRX Quantum* **1** (2020), [10.1103/prxquantum.1.020319](#).
 - [73] Martín Larocca, Supanut Thanasilp, Samson Wang, Kunal Sharma, Jacob Biamonte, Patrick J. Coles, Lukasz Cincio, Jarrod R. McClean, Zoë Holmes, and M. Cerezo, “Barren plateaus in variational quantum computing,” *Nature Reviews Physics* **7**, 174–189 (2025).
 - [74] P. Jordan and E. Wigner, “Über das paulische äquivalenzverbot,” *Zeitschrift für Physik* **47**, 631–651 (1928).
 - [75] C. D. Batista and G. Ortiz, “Generalized jordan-wigner transformations,” *Physical Review Letters* **86**, 1082–1085 (2001).

Table II. Specifications of IBMQ Brisbane.

qubit	Frequency (GHz)	T1 (μ s)	T2 (μ s)	Readout Error (%)	$\sqrt{\langle X \rangle}$ (%)	ECR \uparrow (%)	ECR \downarrow (%)	ECR \leftarrow (%)	ECR \rightarrow (%)
q_0	4.72	291.7	80.1	2.37	0.01				
q_1	4.82	364.7	289.5	2.25	0.01			0.44	
q_2	4.61	206.0	94.5	0.97	0.06			1.61	
q_3	4.88	340.8	302.9	2.8	0.02			0.94	
q_4	4.82	325.6	268.0	1.81	0.02		0.87	0.48	0.41
q_5	4.73	215.7	232.0	0.75	0.01				
q_6	4.88	413.7	58.1	0.92	0.02			0.64	0.77
q_7	4.97	365.6	306.4	2.63	0.04				0.71
q_8	4.9	304.7	223.0	0.9	0.02				0.72
q_9	4.99	338.1	175.7	0.79	0.02				
q_{10}	4.83	338.7	268.3	1.93	0.01			0.64	0.61
q_{11}	4.97	344.9	285.1	13.05	0.01				0.68
q_{12}	4.94	286.7	194.8	1.24	0.02		0.45		
q_{13}	5.01	282.5	108.9	1.23	0.03			0.58	
q_{14}	4.9	306.1	114.5	1.56	0.02	0.45	0.47		
q_{15}	4.95	263.3	51.8	1.12	0.03		0.95		
q_{16}	4.96	138.4	14.1	1.48	0.03	0.48	3.57		
q_{17}	4.82	358.7	386.7	1.38	0.02		0.86		
q_{18}	4.79	279.6	100.6	9.17	0.02				0.51
q_{19}	4.75	324.4	88.1	8.96	0.07				
q_{20}	4.86	162.8	104.2	1.32	0.07		3.34	2.03	
q_{21}	4.97	194.5	123.2	0.73	0.02			0.51	1.68
q_{22}	5.04	231.1	187.9	1.46	0.06				1.28
q_{23}	4.84	211.2	240.3	1.24	0.05				
q_{24}	5.1	233.0	178.1	20.19	0.02		0.74	1.29	
q_{25}	4.95	269.0	253.3	1.53	0.02			0.51	
q_{26}	4.85	180.3	2.8	0.82	0.07			1.2	
q_{27}	4.75	165.7	164.2	5.85	0.02			3.31	
q_{28}	4.99	140.3	89.9	3.51	0.03		0.91	1.3	1.26
q_{29}	4.63	350.3	330.4	1.96	0.02				
q_{30}	4.73	216.2	60.5	0.66	0.02			0.7	0.57
q_{31}	4.8	237.4	83.4	0.7	0.02				0.53
q_{32}	4.91	250.5	230.6	0.84	0.02		0.54		
q_{33}	4.97	195.3	121.1	0.9	0.02		0.8		
q_{34}	4.68	308.5	146.3	2.93	0.01		1.5		
q_{35}	4.91	194.8	119.1	1.29	0.02		0.92		
q_{36}	4.81	158.5	245.4	1.49	0.01		0.5		
q_{37}	4.84	263.2	89.4	0.97	0.12				0.86
q_{38}	4.78	283.1	154.6	1.82	0.03				
q_{39}	4.92	222.6	95.6	2.52	0.03			1.59	
q_{40}	4.87	224.4	24.4	3.96	0.02			1.14	1.07
q_{41}	4.94	200.8	286.6	4.71	0.02		0.57		
q_{42}	5.06	161.2	113.1	0.98	0.02			0.41	1.21
q_{43}	4.83	150.2	86.5	3.2	0.26				3.02
q_{44}	4.95	319.1	23.8	2.27	0.03				0.8
q_{45}	5.0	307.4	27.0	4.0	0.14				
q_{46}	4.85	196.1	153.3	1.22	0.04			1.55	3.05
q_{47}	4.77	156.0	168.8	0.63	0.02				
q_{48}	4.84	276.5	70.4	1.54	0.02			0.95	1.45
q_{49}	4.7	264.3	53.8	0.79	0.03				
q_{50}	4.78	337.6	44.0	1.32	0.04			1.69	1.07

Table III. Specifications of IBMQ Brisbane.

qubit	Frequency (GHz)	T1 (μ s)	T2 (μ s)	Readout Error (%)	$\sqrt{\langle X \rangle}$ (%)	ECR \uparrow (%)	ECR \downarrow (%)	ECR \leftarrow (%)	ECR \rightarrow (%)
q51	4.93	206.0	310.2	1.29	0.01				
q52	4.92	202.1	191.2	1.0	0.05	6.84	0.6		
q53	5.0	271.8	275.8	1.51	0.03		0.55		
q54	4.97	196.4	125.0	2.02	0.03	1.24	0.92		
q55	4.84	306.0	100.3	1.06	0.02	1.75	1.12		
q56	4.81	205.0	161.2	1.1	0.02				0.61
q57	4.93	209.9	178.2	1.06	0.02				0.5
q58	4.89	161.8	65.6	21.25	0.02		0.57		1.06
q59	4.97	222.7	52.1	3.79	0.03				0.65
q60	4.77	285.4	127.5	3.39	0.05				1.28
q61	4.79	301.9	157.9	22.3	0.05				
q62	4.94	132.7	163.2	1.63	0.02		0.86	1.41	1.11
q63	5.04	272.2	190.7	1.44	0.02				0.54
q64	4.82	284.2	151.9	0.85	0.02				
q65	4.96	229.0	112.5	1.16	0.02			0.59	0.6
q66	4.89	192.5	140.7	0.97	0.02				
q67	5.11	224.1	154.9	4.91	0.02			0.93	0.96
q68	4.74	224.8	31.6	2.99	0.03				
q69	5.12	152.2	154.0	1.05	0.03			0.69	0.59
q70	4.9	345.3	161.9	7.07	0.02				
q71	4.79	234.3	285.7	2.05	0.01				
q72	5.06	202.8	96.8	4.17	0.03				
q73	4.98	165.9	257.7	1.23	0.02	0.58			
q74	5.03	256.6	110.1	1.07	0.04	1.09	1.18		
q75	5.01	219.0	69.3	0.74	0.02		0.98		
q76	4.84	300.1	65.3	1.13	0.01			0.62	
q77	5.04	250.3	80.0	5.82	0.05	0.82		0.62	3.72
q78	4.64	167.6	262.2	1.21	0.02				
q79	4.86	180.0	52.9	0.98	0.01			1.15	0.56
q80	5.03	192.1	55.2	5.48	2.51				0.6
q81	4.93	307.8	249.2	4.06	0.03	0.75			0.93
q82	4.89	84.3	115.7	1.54	0.1				1.14
q83	4.79	118.8	80.9	1.06	0.02		0.46		
q84	4.68	249.4	142.5	0.86	0.01			0.61	
q85	5.1	250.8	223.4	1.08	0.02	0.44		0.63	0.57
q86	4.9	139.7	84.6	4.14	0.04				1.64
q87	4.99	119.3	131.6	10.61	1.59				3.0
q88	5.1	135.8	85.7	0.61	0.03				0.86
q89	4.96	216.8	161.3	1.02	0.04				
q90	4.91	230.0	84.0	1.07	0.05				
q91	4.91	146.2	178.7	3.05	0.04	0.55			
q92	4.91	120.1	137.4	0.55	0.02		0.57		
q93	4.96	112.6	68.1	3.67	0.31	1.6	10.41		
q94	4.98	146.3	151.7	1.1	0.02	1.14			0.61
q95	4.84	225.3	119.0	1.1	0.03				0.69
q96	4.75	300.2	78.6	4.91	0.03				
q97	4.82	210.4	134.7	0.81	0.02			0.59	0.75
q98	4.94	115.5	25.1	1.83	0.11	1.28			
q99	5.06	179.4	182.1	0.67	0.03			0.6	
q100	4.91	149.5	225.3	0.92	0.02		0.86	3.38	

Table IV. Specifications of IBMQ Brisbane.

qubit	Frequency (GHz)	T1 (μ s)	T2 (μ s)	Readout Error (%)	$\sqrt{\langle X \rangle}$ (%)	ECR \uparrow (%)	ECR \downarrow (%)	ECR \leftarrow (%)	ECR \rightarrow (%)
q_{101}	5.07	181.4	224.5	2.55	0.02			1.07	0.63
q_{102}	4.81	213.7	160.3	4.16	0.02				0.87
q_{103}	4.93	144.8	86.4	0.72	0.03				
q_{104}	4.77	196.3	176.0	1.29	0.02			0.71	
q_{105}	4.98	172.6	98.8	0.76	0.03			0.56	0.69
q_{106}	4.88	219.4	186.2	1.68	0.03				
q_{107}	4.92	181.6	119.6	2.12	0.02			0.62	
q_{108}	5.06	163.6	160.9	2.15	0.03		0.73	0.68	
q_{109}	4.98	184.1	227.2	2.53	0.03	0.81			
q_{110}	4.83	202.2	276.2	1.19	0.03		0.86		
q_{111}	4.85	259.1	294.9	1.22	0.02	0.52			
q_{112}	5.0	176.1	67.2	0.47	0.02		0.79		
q_{113}	5.03	206.6	209.3	0.83	0.02				1.09
q_{114}	4.82	185.2	61.0	13.86	0.02	0.61			0.98
q_{115}	5.03	176.0	92.6	0.84	0.02				
q_{116}	4.91	205.8	191.0	0.77	0.01			0.57	0.56
q_{117}	4.83	247.6	213.9	1.56	0.03				0.58
q_{118}	4.73	241.4	116.4	0.76	0.02				0.99
q_{119}	4.8	196.0	122.4	32.95	0.07				
q_{120}	4.84	184.5	154.6	17.81	0.03			1.58	
q_{121}	4.97	234.4	143.5	1.84	0.05			2.23	
q_{122}	4.94	224.1	130.2	2.21	0.05	0.75		1.36	0.84
q_{123}	5.03	145.8	126.9	1.64	0.02				
q_{124}	4.95	214.2	194.8	0.82	0.03			0.59	
q_{125}	4.86	258.3	223.5	1.05	0.01			0.59	0.58