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#### Abstract

This paper introduces a novel general-purpose algorithm for Pauli decomposition that employs matrix slicing and addition rather than expensive matrix multiplication, significantly accelerating the decomposition of multi-qubit matrices. In a detailed complexity analysis, we show that the algorithm admits the best known worst-case scaling and more favorable runtimes for many practical examples. Numerical experiments are provided to validate the asymptotic speed-up already for small instance sizes, underscoring the algorithm's potential significance in the realm of quantum computing and quantum chemistry simulations.


## I. INTRODUCTION

Pauli matrices are ubiquitous in the realm of quantum physics and hold a fundamental importance in many other fields like quantum information and quantum computing. Along with the $2 \times 2$ identity matrix Pauli matrices form a complete basis, spanning the space of all $2 \times 2$ matrices. The Pauli group generated by $\sigma^{\{0,1,2,3\}}:=\{I, X, Y, Z\}$ constitutes the elements of the Clifford group, which define the fundamental gate operations in the circuit model of quantum computers ${ }^{1}$ and are also of utmost importance in the context of measurementbased quantum computing ${ }^{2}$. They also play a crucial role in quantum error correction due to their pivotal importance in the theory of stabilizer codes. Pauli matrices and their tensorized products - the Pauli strings - are used for describing errors in quantum computers and for generating stabilizer codes to detect and correct errors ${ }^{3}$. They are essential in Hamiltonian simulation too as they are used in description of Hamiltonians of many physical systems that can be mapped onto spin models in quantum many body physics ${ }^{4}$. They are also widely used in quantum chemistry for description of electronic or molecular Hamiltonians ${ }^{5}$. In principle, any Hamiltonian - as it can be expressed as a linear combination of tensor product of Pauli matrices - can be simulated using a quantum simulator ${ }^{6}$, leading also to many quantum annealing protocols ${ }^{7}$ that rely on the prior decomposition of the evolutionary Hamiltonian into Pauli strings.

This operation of Pauli decomposition, however, often comes at a significant computational cost, particularly when dealing with multi-qubit operators. In the quest to accelerate this task, this paper introduces an innovative approach - the Tensorized Pauli Decomposition (TPD) algorithm. The TPD algorithm takes a novel path by sidestepping the resource-intensive matrix multiplication typically used for Pauli decomposition. Instead, it leverages matrix slicing techniques to determine the Pauli weights in a recursive and iterative manner, promising a remarkable boost in the efficiency of multi-qubit matrix decomposition.

[^0]The rest of the article is organized as follows: In Section II, we first introduce the formulation of Pauli decomposition and review the existing algorithms that tackle this task together with their worst-case complexities. In Section III, we give an in-depth formulation of three variants of the TPD algorithm. In Section IV, we deduce the worst-case and several special-case runtimes depending of number of qubits for the TPD. Moreover, we present our results from benchmark tests we perform to gauge practical performance of the TPD algorithm compared to existing algorithms. Finally in Section V, we summarize our theoretical and numerical findings that, together, draw a very promising picture of the TPD's capabilities. We also discuss approaches to further enhance the performance of our algorithm.

## II. PRELIMINARIES

## A. Problem formulation

We briefly collect all the relevant basic properties of the Pauli matrices. Throughout this paper, we denote with $\operatorname{Mat}(d)$ the set of all complex $d \times d$ matrices. The Pauli matrices $\sigma^{\{0,1,2,3\}}:=\{I, X, Y, Z\}$ are a set of hermitian, involutory, and unitary $2 \times 2$ matrices. Tensorizing Pauli matrices with each other leads to Pauli strings. In order to shorten notation, we set $\mathrm{Q}:=\{0,1,2,3\}$ and define a Pauli string of length $n$ via a corresponding quaternary string $\mathbf{t} \in \mathrm{Q}^{n}$ as

$$
\begin{equation*}
\sigma^{\mathrm{t}}:=\sigma^{\mathrm{t}_{1}} \otimes \sigma^{\mathrm{t}_{2}} \otimes \cdots \otimes \sigma^{\mathrm{t}_{n}} \tag{1}
\end{equation*}
$$

The set of Pauli strings $\left\{\sigma^{\mathbf{t}}: \mathbf{t} \in \mathrm{Q}^{n}\right\}$ again constitutes hermitian, involutory, and unitary matrices which form an orthonormal basis of $\operatorname{Mat}\left(2^{n}\right)$ with respect to the Frobenius inner product $\langle A, B\rangle:=\frac{1}{2^{n}} \operatorname{tr}\left(A^{*} B\right)$.

We address the objective of computing the Pauli decomposition of a given matrix $A \in \operatorname{Mat}\left(2^{n}\right)$, that is

$$
\begin{equation*}
A=\sum_{\mathbf{t} \in \mathrm{Q}^{n}} \omega_{\mathbf{t}} \sigma^{\mathbf{t}}, \quad \omega_{\mathbf{t}}:=\frac{1}{2^{n}} \operatorname{tr}\left(\sigma^{\mathbf{t}} A\right) \tag{2}
\end{equation*}
$$

In the worst case, all $\left|\mathrm{Q}^{n}\right|=4^{n}$ terms contribute which clearly dictates the worst-case scaling for every Pauli decomposition algorithm. Moreover, the direct calculation of $\omega_{\mathbf{t}}$ involves multiplying together two $2^{n} \times 2^{n}$ matrices.

```
    Algorithm 1: Recursive \(\operatorname{TPD}(A, L, \mathbf{s}=" ")\)
if \(\operatorname{dim}(A)=1 \times 1\) then
    append \(\left(\mathbf{s}, A=\omega_{\mathbf{s}}\right)\) to \(L\);
    else
    for \(t \in Q\) do
        compute \(\Omega_{* t}\) according to (4);
        if \(\Omega_{* t} \neq 0\) then
                        call Recursive \(\operatorname{TPD}\left(\Omega_{* \mathrm{t}}, L\right.\), ts \()\);
        end
    end
    end
```

```
```

    Algorithm 2: Iterative \(\operatorname{TPD}(A)\)
    ```
```

    Algorithm 2: Iterative \(\operatorname{TPD}(A)\)
    ```
```

    Algorithm 2: Iterative \(\operatorname{TPD}(A)\)
    $S^{1}:=\{*\} ;$
$S^{1}:=\{*\} ;$
$S^{1}:=\{*\} ;$
for $i=1, \ldots, n-1$ do
for $i=1, \ldots, n-1$ do
for $i=1, \ldots, n-1$ do
$S^{i+1}:=\{ \} ;$
$S^{i+1}:=\{ \} ;$
$S^{i+1}:=\{ \} ;$
for $\mathbf{r} \in S^{i}$ and $\mathrm{s} \in \mathrm{Q}$ do
for $\mathbf{r} \in S^{i}$ and $\mathrm{s} \in \mathrm{Q}$ do
for $\mathbf{r} \in S^{i}$ and $\mathrm{s} \in \mathrm{Q}$ do
$\tilde{\mathbf{r}}:=\mathrm{r}_{1} \cdots \mathrm{r}_{n-i} \mathrm{Sr}_{n-i+2} \cdots \mathrm{r}_{n} ;$
$\tilde{\mathbf{r}}:=\mathrm{r}_{1} \cdots \mathrm{r}_{n-i} \mathrm{Sr}_{n-i+2} \cdots \mathrm{r}_{n} ;$
$\tilde{\mathbf{r}}:=\mathrm{r}_{1} \cdots \mathrm{r}_{n-i} \mathrm{Sr}_{n-i+2} \cdots \mathrm{r}_{n} ;$
compute $\Omega_{\tilde{\mathbf{r}}}$ according to (4);
compute $\Omega_{\tilde{\mathbf{r}}}$ according to (4);
compute $\Omega_{\tilde{\mathbf{r}}}$ according to (4);
if $\Omega_{\tilde{\mathbf{r}}} \neq 0$ then
if $\Omega_{\tilde{\mathbf{r}}} \neq 0$ then
if $\Omega_{\tilde{\mathbf{r}}} \neq 0$ then
add $\tilde{\mathbf{r}}$ to $S^{i+1}$;
add $\tilde{\mathbf{r}}$ to $S^{i+1}$;
add $\tilde{\mathbf{r}}$ to $S^{i+1}$;
end
end
end
end
end
end
end
end
end
return $\left\{\left(\mathbf{t}, \Omega_{\mathbf{t}}=\omega_{\mathbf{t}}\right): \mathbf{t} \in S^{n}\right\} ;$

```
return \(\left\{\left(\mathbf{t}, \Omega_{\mathbf{t}}=\omega_{\mathbf{t}}\right): \mathbf{t} \in S^{n}\right\} ;\)
```

return $\left\{\left(\mathbf{t}, \Omega_{\mathbf{t}}=\omega_{\mathbf{t}}\right): \mathbf{t} \in S^{n}\right\} ;$

```
```

            -
    ```
```

            -
    ```
```

            -
    ```
ــ

FIG. 1. Two variants of TPD. The recursive version inputs a matrix \(A\), a list \(L\) for storing the quaternary strings and associated weights, and a current (possibly incompletely expanded) quaternary string s. If \(A\) already is a scalar it entails, by constructing, the weight \(\omega_{\mathbf{s}}\) for the current string \(\mathbf{s}\) which is therefore appended to \(L\). Otherwise the CMWs are computed via matrix slicing, and \(\operatorname{TPD}\left(\Omega_{* \mathrm{t}}, L, \operatorname{ts}\right)\) for each nonzero CMW \(\Omega_{* t}\). In the iterative version an initial set of strings \(S^{1}\) exclusively contains the wildcard string \(*\). In the following we iterate over all qubit positions \(i\) except the last one. For each such \(i\) we initialize an empty set \(S^{i+1}\), expand the \(i_{n-(i+1)}\) position of every string \(\mathbf{r}\) in the predecessor \(S^{i}\) with a concrete \(\mathrm{s} \in \mathrm{Q}\), calculate the respective CMW, and finally add the altered string \(\tilde{\mathbf{r}}\) to \(S^{i+1}\) if the corresponding CMW \(\Omega_{\tilde{\mathbf{r}}}\) is nonzero. The returned final set \(S^{n}\) therefore includes all entirely expanded quaternary strings \(\mathbf{t}\) which contribute nonzero weights \(\omega_{\mathrm{t}}\).

\section*{B. Existing algorithms}

Due to the ubiquity of Pauli decomposition, numerous algorithms addressing this task already exist. We provide a brief summary of those algorithms, all of which are subjected to numerical testing in Section IV, and highlight their worst-case complexities

The H2ZIXY \({ }^{8}\) algorithm straightforwardly calculates all \(4^{n}\) Pauli strings in advance and then formulates a system of \(4^{n}\) linear equations, one for each matrix element, to be solved. \({ }^{9}\) It yields a worst-case runtime of \(\mathcal{O}\left(64^{n}\right)\) as it constructs a linear system of \(4^{n}\) equations which is subsequently solved using numpy.linalg.solve which, in turn, uses LAPACK's _gesv routine. As the latter operates cubically in the input dimension, i.e. \(\left(4^{n}\right)^{3}=64^{n}\), we obtain said complexity.

In contrast, SparsePauliOp.from_operator, the previous internal Pauli decomposing method of Qiskit \({ }^{10}\) (versions \(\leq 0.46 .1\) ), directly calculated the \(4^{n}\) Frobenius inner products of the input matrix with each Pauli string, involving the multiplication of \(2^{n} \times 2^{n}\) matrices. \({ }^{11}\) The underlying algorithm for matrix multiplication may differ between architectures and custom settings, but, in order to be as general as possible, it is fair to assume the standard cubic implementation. This yields a total worst-case runtime of \(\mathcal{O}\left(32^{n}\right)\).

The Pauli Composer \({ }^{12}\) algorithm offers a substantial speed-up generating the Pauli strings. This method relies on the insight that Pauli strings have exactly one non-zero entry per row and column, making it possible to construct them more efficiently in a well-suited sparse format. By replacing the standard Kronecker product with the Pauli Composer method and harnessing the enhanced efficiency of sparse matrix multiplication, it be-
comes possible to markedly expedite the computation of Frobenius inner products, improving the worst-case scaling to \(\mathcal{O}\left(8^{n}\right)\) for the resulting Pauli Decomposer (PD).

In contrast, PennyLane's \({ }^{13}\) internal Pauli decomposition routine follows an entirely distinct, quantuminspired approach: The weights \(\omega_{\mathbf{t}}\) are inferred via Bell measurements on the pure Choi matrix of the superoperator \(\rho \mapsto A \rho A^{*}\). This approach is also elaborated on in more detail by Hamaguchi et al. \({ }^{14}\), including a derivation of its \(\mathcal{O}\left(n 4^{n}\right)\) worst-case scaling.

Finally, a very recent approach by Jones \({ }^{15}\) leverages the diagonal/anti-diagonal structure of Pauli matrices as well as Gray codes to find another favorable way of computing the weights \(\omega_{\mathbf{t}}\), also admitting a worst-case runtime of \(\mathcal{O}\left(8^{n}\right)\).

\section*{III. METHODS}

Our approach is centered around expanding the decomposition (2) in its tensor factors and calculating their weights via matrix partitioning rather than multiplication. Namely, by equally partitioning a given input matrix \(A \in \operatorname{Mat}\left(2^{n}\right)\) into four blocks of dimension \(2^{n-1} \times 2^{n-1}\), we obtain the essential relation
\[
A=\left[\begin{array}{ll}
A_{11} & A_{12}  \tag{3}\\
A_{21} & A_{22}
\end{array}\right]=\sum_{\mathrm{t} \in \mathrm{Q}} \Omega_{* \mathrm{t}} \otimes \sigma^{\mathrm{t}}
\]
with the cumulative matrix weights (CMW)
\[
\begin{align*}
\Omega_{* 0} & =\frac{1}{2}\left(A_{11}+A_{22}\right), \Omega_{* 1}=\frac{1}{2}\left(A_{21}+A_{12}\right)  \tag{4}\\
\Omega_{* 2} & =\frac{i}{2}\left(A_{21}-A_{12}\right), \Omega_{* 3}=\frac{1}{2}\left(A_{11}-A_{22}\right)
\end{align*}
\]
    Algorithm 3: Partial \(\operatorname{TPD}(A, L, T, \mathbf{s}=" ")\)
    Algorithm 3: Partial \(\operatorname{TPD}(A, L, T, \mathbf{s}=" ")\)
if \(\operatorname{dim}(A)=1 \times 1\) then
if \(\operatorname{dim}(A)=1 \times 1\) then
    append ( \(\mathbf{s}, A=\omega_{\mathbf{s}}\) ) to \(L\);
    append ( \(\mathbf{s}, A=\omega_{\mathbf{s}}\) ) to \(L\);
else
else
    for children t of \(\operatorname{root}(T)\) do
    for children t of \(\operatorname{root}(T)\) do
        compute \(\Omega_{* t}\) according to (4);
        compute \(\Omega_{* t}\) according to (4);
        if \(\Omega_{* t} \neq 0\) then
        if \(\Omega_{* t} \neq 0\) then
                        call Partial \(\operatorname{TPD}\left(\Omega_{* t}, L\right.\), subtree(t), ts \()\);
                        call Partial \(\operatorname{TPD}\left(\Omega_{* t}, L\right.\), subtree(t), ts \()\);
        end
        end
    end
    end
end
end


FIG. 2. Algorithm variation with adaptation for partial Pauli decomposition. The additional quaternary tree structure \(T\) dictates which CMWs have to be calculated. After calculating the relevant CMWs for all children of the current tree's root, the Partial TPD is called again with the subtree emerging at the respective children passed as new tree structure. The right picture depicts an exemplary subtree containing only one path that corresponds to the \(\Omega_{12}=\omega_{12}\) weight.

The calculation of \(\Omega_{* t}\) does not involve any matrix multiplication, is therefore comparatively cheap, and entails, by construction, the weighted sum of all Pauli strings having \(\sigma^{\mathrm{t}}\) in their last tensor factor, i.e.,
\[
\begin{equation*}
\Omega_{* \mathrm{t}}=\sum_{\mathbf{s} \in \mathrm{Q}^{n-1}} \omega_{\mathbf{s} \mathbf{t}} \sigma^{\mathbf{s}} \tag{5}
\end{equation*}
\]

Most importantly, if \(\Omega_{* \mathrm{t}}=0\), the multi-linearity of the tensor product yields that \(\omega_{\mathbf{t}^{\prime}}=0\) for all \(\mathbf{t}^{\prime} \in \mathrm{Q}^{n}\) with \(\mathrm{t}_{n}^{\prime}=\mathrm{t}\). Hence, in this case we would have already determined the values of \(\left|\mathrm{Q}^{n-1} \times\{\mathrm{t}\}\right|=4^{n-1}\) weights. This also means that additional input structures like diagonality or symmetry which rule out a large subset of Pauli strings are detected early.

In an iterative manner, we now equally partition each nonzero CMW into four blocks as well, yielding analogues of (3) and (4) with new CMWs
\[
\begin{equation*}
\Omega_{* s t}=\sum_{\mathbf{r} \in \mathrm{Q}^{n-2}} \omega_{\mathbf{r s t}} \sigma^{\mathbf{r}} \tag{6}
\end{equation*}
\]
which can be further partitioned to yield new CMWs and so on. The scheme continues until the remainder strings * are entirely expanded into concrete strings \(\mathbf{t} \in \mathrm{Q}^{n}\), respectively. Correspondingly, in the last iteration step, the CMWs become scalar-valued and yield the remaining individual weights \(\omega_{\mathbf{t}}\). An iterative and a recursive version of this Tensorized Pauli Decomposition (TPD) are summarized as pseudocode in Figure 1.

In practice, one is often given a guarantee on which Pauli strings could contribute in a decomposition, or, algorithmically equivalently, one may only be interested in certain weights \(\omega_{\mathbf{t}}\) in the first place. This additional requirement can be represented as a collection of paths within a complete quaternary tree with \(n\) layers; each path corresponds to exactly one Pauli string of interest. The recursive variant of TPD is especially suited for this adaptation: We further input a quaternary subtree \(T\) entailing the collection of paths/Pauli strings in question. For each children of the root node, we calculate the associated CMW, register its corresponding index \(t \in \mathrm{Q}\), and
call the routine with the obtained CMW and the subtree emerging at the picked child node. The entire algorithmic procedure is summarized as pseudocode in Figure 2.

\section*{IV. RESULTS}

As already mentioned in Section II, the worst case constitutes \(4^{n}\) contributing terms which all have to be calculated; this factor can, in full generality, never be eliminated. However, additional factors vary drastically among different algorithms. The TPD - whether iterative or recursive - matches the best existing worst-case scaling: In each iteration \(i, 4^{i}\) CMWs are calculated which each involve taking the sum/difference of two \(2^{n-i} \times 2^{n-i}\) matrices respectively and the subsequent element-wise division by two, hence \(\mathcal{O}\left(4^{n}\right)\) operations per iteration. Executing all \(n\) iterations, this yields a worst-case runtime of \(\mathcal{O}\left(n 4^{n}\right)\).

A more detailed analysis yields runtimes for some special cases. For a given input, let \(m\) be the number of non-zero matrix entries and \(p\) be the number of contributing Pauli strings. Then the maximum width of the quaternary subtree explored by the TPD - and thus the maximum number of CMWs that have to be computed in the same iteration - is upper bounded by \(p\). Furthermore, the number of nonzero entries in any CMW cannot be higher than the number of nonzero entries in its parent matrix. Therefore, via an inductive argument, the number of additions performed to calculate any CMW is upper bounded by \(m\). In summary, in each iteration, \(m p\) operations have to be performed, yielding, in total, a scaling of \(\mathcal{O}(m n p)\).

If we only prescribe the number of qubits \(n\) and the number of contributing Pauli strings \(p\), we can use the fact that every Pauli string constitutes at most \(2^{n}\) nonzero matrix elements \({ }^{12}\) to get an estimate of \(m \sim p 2^{n}\) for the initial number of nonzero matrix elements. This argument can be repeated for every iteration \(i\), where we decompose an \((n-i)\)-qubit matrix, yielding at most \(p 2^{n-i}\)
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|}
\hline algorithm & worst-case & TFIM \\
\hline TPD, Qiskit (version \(\geq 1.0)\) & \(\mathcal{O}\left(n 4^{n}\right)\) & \(\mathcal{O}\left(n 2^{n}\right)\) \\
PennyLane, Hamaguchi et al. & \(\mathcal{O}\left(n 4^{n}\right)\) & \(\mathcal{O}\left(n 4^{n}\right)\) \\
Pauli Decomposer, Jones & \(\mathcal{O}\left(8^{n}\right)\) & \(\mathcal{O}\left(8^{n}\right)\) \\
Qiskit (version \(\leq 0.46 .1)\) & \(\mathcal{O}\left(32^{n}\right)\) & \(\mathcal{O}\left(32^{n}\right)\) \\
H2ZIXY & \(\mathcal{O}\left(64^{n}\right)\) & \(\mathcal{O}\left(64^{n}\right)\) \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

TABLE I. Asymptotic performances for the TPD and other existing decomposition routines in the worst-case and for the \(n\) qubit TFIM Hamiltonian. The TPD and PennyLane's method share the same worst-case runtime; the other algorithms perform asymptotically worse in descending order. The TPD manages to significantly reduce the runtime for the TFIM use-case. In contrast, for all other algorithms, the TFIM decomposition is asymptotically as costly as the general worst case.
nonzero matrix elements per CMW in the \(i\)-th iteration. For the first \(\left\lceil\log _{4} p\right\rceil\) iterations \(i\), we can additionally upper bound the number of simultaneous calculations of CMWs by \(4^{i}\), respectively. Therefore, their total costs amount to
\[
\sum_{i=1}^{\left\lceil\log _{4} p\right\rceil} 4^{i} 2^{n-i+1} p=2^{n+2} p\left(p^{1 / 2}-1\right) \in \mathcal{O}\left(2^{n} p^{3 / 2}\right)
\]

For the remaining \(n-\left\lceil\log _{4} p\right\rceil\) iterations, the number of simultaneously considered CMWs is trivially upper bounded by \(p\). Therefore, we incur additional costs of
\[
\sum_{i=\left\lceil\log _{4} p\right\rceil}^{n} p^{2} 2^{n-i+1}=2^{n+2} p^{2}\left(p^{-1 / 2}-1\right) \in \mathcal{O}\left(2^{n} p^{3 / 2}\right),
\]
yielding, in total, a scaling of \(\mathcal{O}\left(2^{n} p^{3 / 2}\right)\).
Conversely, the fact that every Pauli string contributes \(\mathcal{O}\left(2^{n}\right)\) nonzero matrix elements implies that only \(\mathcal{O}\left(2^{n}\right)\) Pauli strings can contribute to the same matrix entry - if more would contribute there would not be enough Pauli strings left for the remaining matrix elements - yielding an estimate \(p \sim m 2^{n}\) in case only \(m\) and \(n\) are prescribed.

To further validate the effectiveness of our algorithm, we assess our algorithm's performance in decomposing Hamiltonians into the Pauli basis. Specifically, we apply our algorithm to the symmetric one-dimensional Transverse Field Ising Model (TFIM)
\[
\begin{equation*}
H_{n}=-J\left(\sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \sigma_{i}^{3} \sigma_{i+1}^{3}+g \sum_{j=1}^{n} \sigma_{j}^{1}\right) \tag{7}
\end{equation*}
\]
a significant benchmark commonly used in quantum computing. \({ }^{16}\) Obviously, (7) already entails the entire decomposition into \(2 n-1\) Pauli strings, so one may ask what is the gist of calculating the TPD's runtime on that specific example. Nonetheless, we believe that the performance of the algorithm on control instances provides important insights into the algorithm's practicability for
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|}
\hline case & TPD scaling \\
\hline worst-case & \(\mathcal{O}\left(n 4^{n}\right)\) \\
TFIM Hamiltonian & \(\mathcal{O}\left(n 2^{n}\right)\) \\
single Pauli string & \(\mathcal{O}\left(2^{n}\right)\) \\
\(p\) Pauli strings, \(m\) matrix entries & \(\mathcal{O}(m n p)\) \\
\(p\) Pauli strings & \(\mathcal{O}\left(2^{n} p^{3 / 2}\right)\) \\
\(m\) matrix entries & \(\mathcal{O}\left(m^{2} n 2^{n}\right)\) \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

TABLE II. Asymptotic TPD performances for several cases: worst-case, TFIM Hamiltonian, single Pauli string, prescribed number of Pauli strings and/or nonzero matrix elements. The runtimes for known number of nonzero matrix elements \(m\) are especially relevant for applications where this quantity is easy to determine, while the complexities in terms of Pauli strings \(p\) are both relevant for initial guarantees on the contributing Pauli strings and for the partial Pauli decomposition.
real-world use cases. Thus, for examples with rich structure - such as the TFIM Hamiltonian - we hope for a most favorable runtime.

As a prerequisite, we consider the case of a single Pauli string first. Starting from \(m=2^{n}\) nonzero matrix elements, each iteration halves the number of nonzero matrix elements in the current CMW, meaning that in iteration \(i\) there are \(2^{n-i}\) additions to be performed. Adding up all operations over the course of \(n\) iterations thus yields a scaling of \(\mathcal{O}\left(2^{n}\right)\). Moving to \(H_{n}\), the following decomposition yields valuable insights into the runtime:
\[
\begin{equation*}
H_{n}=H_{n-1} \otimes \sigma^{0}-J \sigma_{n}^{3}-J g \sigma_{n}^{1} . \tag{8}
\end{equation*}
\]

Since \(H_{n}\) has linearly many contributing Pauli strings, there are \(\mathcal{O}\left(n 2^{n}\right)\) nonzero matrix elements, dictating the cost of the first iteration. Now, (8) shows that the remaining iterations accumulate to the cost of decomposing \(H_{n-1}\) as well as two single Pauli strings, the later is \(\mathcal{O}\left(2^{n}\right)\). Let \(\mathcal{O}\left(H_{n}\right)\) denote the decomposition scaling for \(H_{n}\), then we obtain the recursion relation
\[
\begin{equation*}
\mathcal{O}\left(H_{n}\right)=\mathcal{O}\left(H_{n-1}\right)+\mathcal{O}\left(n 2^{n}\right) . \tag{9}
\end{equation*}
\]

Successively expanding the \(\mathcal{O}\left(H_{i}\right)\) terms for all \(i<n\) eventually yields an overall scaling of \(\mathcal{O}\left(n 2^{n}\right)\).

We emphasize that the speed-up \(\mathcal{O}\left(n 4^{n}\right) \rightarrow \mathcal{O}\left(n 2^{n}\right)\) for the TFIM Hamiltonian is a unique property of the TPD in comparison to the other methods. The only promise that can be made is that \(H_{n}\) is real-symmetric; of the existing algorithms mentioned, only the H2ZIXY algorithm and the Pauli Composer are sensible for that kind of additional input information. They are then able to omit taking into account all Pauli string with an odd number of \(\sigma^{2}\)-operators. However, as this reduced the number of relevant Pauli strings from \(4^{n}\) to \(2^{n-1}\left(2^{n+1}\right)\), the asymptotic scaling stays the same. An overview over the general worst-case complexity as well as for the special case of the TFIM Hamiltonian is provided in Table I, showcasing the TPD's favorable scaling in comparison to the other methods. Furthermore, the calculated TPD complexities for all other special cases are collected in Table II.



\begin{tabular}{ll} 
Algorithm/Variant \\
\hline & H2ZIXY \(^{8}\) \\
& Pauli Decomposer \\
\\
& PennyLane pauli_decompose \\
\hline & Qiskit SparsePauliOp.from_operator \\
\hline & TPD algorithm \\
& TPD: sparse version
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{ll} 
Package & Version \\
\hline python & 3.10 .4 \\
numpy & 1.25 .2 \\
scipy & 1.11 .1 \\
qiskit & 0.25 .0 \\
pennylane & 0.31 .1
\end{tabular}


FIG. 3. Measured execution times of the various Pauli decompositions of different matrix types. In each plot, the execution times are drawn for one matrix type, showing qubit number and the execution times on a logarithmic axis. Both, Qiskit's and PennyLane's decomposition methods yield the same moderate runtime for all input examples, showcasing their insensibility to any special structure of the input. With the exception of the unit matrix and diagonal matrices, the H2ZIXY algorithm performs the poorest; in these two specific cases, it is able to outperform all other methods except the two TPD variants. The Pauli Decomposer is, in each case, compatible with the best performing method besides TPD, especially yielding favorable runtimes for when the input is highly structured. Lastly, both TPD versions perform equally well and outperform all other algorithms on every single benchmark set. They also show favorable runtimes for highly structured input.

Finally, we address the TPD's space complexity. In each iteration \(i\), up to \(4^{i}\) matrices of dimension \(2^{n-i} \times 2^{n-i}\) are created which would introduce \(\mathcal{O}\left(4^{n}\right)\) additional memory per iteration, i.e. \(\mathcal{O}\left(n 4^{n}\right)\) additional memory in total. However, since information is only passed between directly consecutive iterations, the parent matrices' memory can be reused after finishing each iteration, yielding a milder memory overhead of \(\mathcal{O}\left(4^{n}\right)\). This is in alignment with the space complexity of PennyLane's method as detailed by \({ }^{14}\). In contrast, the Pauli Decomposer works with a spatial overhead of \(\mathcal{O}\left(2^{n}\right)\) which is remarkably improved by \({ }^{15}\) to a constant overhead.

Algorithms with asymptotically better worst-case complexities do not necessarily perform well in practice; numerical studies remain essential. In order to also cover this issue, we further investigate numerically the performance of TPD against the H2ZIXY, Qiskit's implementation, the Pauli Decomposer method, and PennyLane's implementation on instances from 2 to 10 qubits. The
results are depicted in Figure 3 and include input matrices of specific types: symmetric, diagonal, random, sparse, and hermitian matrices as well as the unit matrix and the Transverse Field Ising Model Hamiltonian \((\text { TFIM })^{17}\), respectively. The TPD is implemented once for sparse matrices and for matrices stored as numpy arrays. All matrices except the TFIM Hamiltonian as well as the unit matrix are created using matrix elements drawn uniformly at random from the interval \([0,1]\). Symmetric and Hermitian matrices are manipulated accordingly to guarantee their properties.

In a comprehensive set of numerical experiments, with the exception of diagonal and unit matrices, the H2ZIXY algorithm exhibits the poorest performance. The implementations in PennyLane and Qiskit consistently exhibit identical behavior across all scenarios, showcasing the methods' insensitivity to predefined characteristics of the input data. Conversely, the Pauli Decomposer exhibits runtime performance comparable to the aforementioned
algorithms but significantly surpasses them in the case of diagonal and unit matrices.

Lastly, both variants of the TPD consistently outperform all their competitors, with a substantial performance advantage becoming evident as the number of qubits increases. Except for the sparse matrices and the unit matrices, both TPD variants perform about equally well. Small differences are most likely due to transforming between sparse and nonsparse formats.

\section*{V. CONCLUSION AND OUTLOOK}

The task of computing the Pauli decomposition of multi-qubit operators is at the core of many applications from quantum computing, including Hamiltonian simulation and quantum error correction. In this article we have proposed a simple, yet powerful method for accelerating this ubiquitous task. Our method, the Tensorized Pauli Decomposition (TPD) algorithm actively avoids expensive matrix multiplication and, instead, calculates the Pauli weights in an recursive/iterative manner via matrix slicing.

Our detailed complexity analysis revealed an optimal worst-case scaling of the TPD among existing methods. For several special cases, we concluded the TPD's drastically improved scaling, unmatched by the other methods. Furthermore, we have tested the TPD against the most popular alternatives on various instances from 2-10 qubits and observed a decreased runtime in favor of the TPD in all cases. Based on the observed trend in our numerical experiments as well as the asymptotically favorable scaling, we anticipate improved algorithmic efficiency for most instances across domains. By detecting the input's structure early on, TPD achieves speed ups even in cases where its competitors receive additional flags, lowering their worst-case runtime. However, empirical verification remains essential.

Additionally, it is important to note that, as of the current implementation, we have not explored parallelization of our algorithm. Nevertheless, given that the evaluation of the intermediate CMWs (4) relies on the analysis of disjoint blocks within our initial matrix, we are optimistic that any potential communication overhead incurred when employing multiple processors will be manageable. Future investigations into parallelization strategies may further enhance the scalability of our approach.
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