

Ternary Tree Fermion-to-Qubit Mapping with Hamiltonian Aware Optimization

Yuhao Liu
liuyuhao@seas.upenn.edu
University of Pennsylvania
United States

Kevin Yao
keyao@seas.upenn.edu
University of Pennsylvania
United States

Jonathan Hong
johon@seas.upenn.edu
University of Pennsylvania
United States

Julien Froustey
jfroustey@berkeley.edu
University of California, Berkeley
United States

Yunong Shi
shiyunon@amazon.com
AWS Quantum Technologies
United States

Ermal Rrapaj
ermalrrapaj@lbl.gov
Lawrence Berkeley National Lab
United States

Costin Iancu
cciancu@lbl.gov
Lawrence Berkeley National Lab
United States

Gushu Li
gushuli@seas.upenn.edu
University of Pennsylvania
United States

ABSTRACT

This paper introduces the Hamiltonian-Aware Ternary Tree (HATT) framework to compile optimized Fermion-to-qubit mapping for specific Fermionic Hamiltonians. In the simulation of Fermionic quantum systems, efficient Fermion-to-qubit mapping plays a critical role in transforming the Fermionic system into a qubit system. HATT utilizes ternary tree mapping and a bottom-up construction procedure to generate Hamiltonian aware Fermion-to-qubit mapping to reduce the Pauli weight of the qubit Hamiltonian, resulting in lower quantum simulation circuit overhead. Additionally, our optimizations retain the important vacuum state preservation property in our Fermion-to-qubit mapping and reduce the complexity of our algorithm from $O(N^4)$ to $O(N^3)$. Evaluations and simulations of various Fermionic systems demonstrate a significant reduction in both Pauli weight and circuit complexity, alongside excellent scalability to larger systems. Experiments on the Ionq quantum computer also show the advantages of our approach in noise resistance in quantum simulations.

1 INTRODUCTION

Simulating Fermionic systems, composed of particles such as electrons, protons, and neutrons [14], is an essential application area for quantum computing. These systems are integral to various critical physics models, including the electronic structure of molecules in quantum chemistry [24], the Fermi-Hubbard lattice model in condensed matter [1], etc. Fermionic systems are naturally quantum, thus challenging to simulate on classical computers on a large scale due to their exponential and super-exponential complexities. It can take tens of millions of cores in a supercomputer to perform ab initio electronic structure simulation [17], and it is getting harder to scale larger. Quantum computers, on the other hand, can naturally overcome the complexity barrier, simulating these systems with linear resource requirements [13].

To simulate a Fermionic system on a quantum computer requires an essential step, the Fermion-to-qubit mapping. This is because most quantum computers are built with qubits with different statistical properties than Fermions. A Fermion-to-qubit mapping bridges




Figure 1: Overview of simulating Fermionic systems with quantum computers. The mapping on the upper half is better than that in the lower half because it generated a qubit Hamiltonian with fewer Pauli operators, and the circuit implementation cost is lower.

this gap by creating the Fermionic statistics in a qubit system. As depicted in Figure 1, a Fermionic Hamiltonian \mathcal{H}_F (on the left) is usually expressed by the creation and annihilation operators $\{a_i^\dagger, a_i\}$, which do not naturally arise in a qubit system. A Fermion-to-qubit mapping will find Pauli strings to represent the creation and annihilation operators, converting the Fermionic Hamiltonian into a qubit Hamiltonian \mathcal{H}_Q , which is a weighted sum of Pauli strings as shown in the middle of Figure 1. The qubit Hamiltonian can then be compiled into circuits to simulate the original Fermionic system [22, 37]. Note that Fermion-to-qubit mapping is unique, and different mappings will lead to significantly different circuit implementation costs even for the same input Fermionic system, as shown in Figure 1.

It is naturally desired for people to have Fermion-to-qubit mappings that can minimize the simulation circuit implementation cost. However, existing Fermion-to-qubit mappings are not yet satisfying and have significant further optimization potential. These mappings can be classified into two major types. The first type of approach is the constructive method, such as Jordan-Wigner transformation [20], Bravyi-Kitaev transformation [5], and ternary tree mapping [19, 25]. Although some can generate asymptotically optimal mapping, these methods do not consider the input Hamiltonian

and always generate the Fermion-to-qubit mapping using the same operator pattern, leading to suboptimal actual mapping overhead. The second type of approach is the exhaustive search method, such as Fermihedral [23]. Fermihedral formulates the Fermion-to-qubit mapping search into a Boolean satisfiability (SAT) problem and uses an SAT solver to find the optimal mapping with minimal Pauli weight in the final qubit Hamiltonian. Although this approach can find better mappings by encoding the input Hamiltonian in the SAT instance, it has a scalability problem due to the SAT’s intrinsic hardness and fails to accommodate large-size practical cases.

In this paper, we aim to push the boundary of Fermion-to-qubit mapping forward and design a new compilation algorithm that can generate lower-cost mapping results while leveraging the input Hamiltonian information in a scalable manner. Formulating a good input-adaptive Fermion-to-qubit mapping is a complicated constrained optimization problem since valid Fermion-to-qubit mappings must satisfy certain constraints, and the input Hamiltonians can have different patterns across various Fermionic systems. Our key observation is that existing approaches do not fully exploit the potential of mathematical objects in this domain, including the variants in the data structures and the properties of Pauli algebra. In particular, we notice that the flexibility of the ternary tree data structure can be the key to our new algorithm. Indeed, ternary trees with different structures can yield valid but different Fermion-to-qubit mappings. It is possible to alter the ternary tree structure based on the input Fermionic Hamiltonian to yield low-cost Fermion-to-qubit mappings without exhaustive search.

To this end, we propose the Hamiltonian-Aware Ternary Tree (HATT) framework that can compile optimized Fermion-to-qubit mappings tailored to the input Fermionic Hamiltonian. **First**, HATT comes with a new bottom-up ternary tree generation algorithm that can incorporate the input Fermionic Hamiltonian information into the generated tree structure. Starting from the leaf nodes, our algorithm gradually adds parent nodes to construct the tree to maximize the cancellation during Pauli operator multiplication in the input Hamiltonian, thus minimizing the Pauli weight on each qubit. **Second**, we adapt our algorithm with a careful node selection and operator pairing process during tree construction. By traversing down and up the constructed tree, we can ensure that the resulting mapping will map the vacuum state in the Fermionic system to the all-zero state in the qubit mapping. This retains the important *vacuum state preservation* property for a Fermion-to-qubit mapping. **Third**, we further apply a caching strategy to the tree structure during construction to reduce the complexity of traversing up and down during operator pairing from worst $O(N)$ to $O(1)$ when mapping N -mode Fermionic systems. Our optimization decreases the total complexity of the algorithm from $O(N^4)$ to $O(N^3)$.

We evaluate HATT extensively against existing construction and exhaustive search methods on various Fermionic system models. The results show that HATT generates close-to-optimal mappings for small-size cases compared with the optimal mapping from Fermihedral [23] and even outperforms the approximately optimal solutions of Fermihedral. For larger-scale cases where Fermihedral fails, HATT outperforms those constructive methods (Jordan-Wigner [20], Bravyi-Kiteav [5], balanced ternary tree [19]) with $\sim 15\%$ reduction in Pauli weight, $5 \sim 20\%$ reduction in circuit depth, and $10 \sim 30\%$ reduction in $CNOT$ gate in the simulation quantum

circuit. In addition, HATT achieves the lowest bias and variance in the noisy simulation experiments. On the real system study on IonQ Forte 1 quantum computer, HATT achieves the smallest variance and the second best average result (the best average result comes from Fermihedral’s optimal mapping).

The major contributions of this paper can be summarized as follows:

- (1) We propose HATT, a ternary tree-based Fermion-to-qubit mapping compilation framework to construct input-adaptive ternary tree Fermion-to-qubit mappings based on the Fermionic Hamiltonian in polynomial time.
- (2) We further improve our tree construction algorithm and successfully implement the *vacuum state preservation*, a desired property for Fermion-to-qubit mapping without increasing the search complexity or affecting the generated mapping performance.
- (3) By designing a map to cache the structure of the constructed tree, we reduce the overall complexity of our overall algorithm from $O(N^4)$ to $O(N^3)$ (N is system size), achieving significant speed up for large cases.
- (4) Evaluation on several Fermionic systems shows HATT has much better scalability than exhaustive search and can outperform existing constructive methods on system-dependent performance, including circuit depth, gate count, and higher accuracy in noisy simulation and real-system experiments.

2 BACKGROUND

In this section, we introduce the essential background for understanding this paper, including *Fermionic systems*, *Pauli string*, *Fermion-to-qubit mapping*. More fundamental concepts of quantum mechanics and quantum computing can be found in [29, 32].

2.1 Fermionic System

Generally speaking, a Fermionic system contains a set of *Fermionic modes*. Each i^{th} Fermionic mode is captured by a 2D Hilbert space called the *Fock space* \mathcal{F}_i , and a pair of creation and annihilation operators (a_i^\dagger, a_i) .

2.1.1 Fock Space. According to the *Pauli exclusion principle* [31], a Fermionic mode has two exclusive states: unoccupied ($|0\rangle_{\mathcal{F}}$) or occupied by one Fermion ($|1\rangle_{\mathcal{F}}$). Its *Fock space* \mathcal{F} is the 2D Hilbert space $\text{span}\{|0\rangle_{\mathcal{F}}, |1\rangle_{\mathcal{F}}\}$, where $\{|0\rangle_{\mathcal{F}}, |1\rangle_{\mathcal{F}}\}$ is called the *Fock basis*.

The Fock space of a N -mode Fermionic system is a 2^N D Hilbert space generated by the tensor products of the Fock space of all N Fermionic modes. The Fock basis is thus the tensor products of each basis:

$$|e_{N-1}, \dots, e_0\rangle_{\mathcal{F}} = \bigotimes_{i=0}^{N-1} |e_i\rangle_{\mathcal{F}} \quad e_i = 0 \text{ or } 1$$

where $|e_i\rangle_{\mathcal{F}}$ corresponds to the i^{th} Fermionic mode.

2.1.2 Creation and Annihilation Operator. Each Fermionic mode defines a pair of creation and annihilation operators (a_i^\dagger, a_i) . They

act by increasing or decreasing the occupation number:

$$\begin{aligned} a_i^\dagger |0_i\rangle_{\mathcal{F}} &= |1_i\rangle_{\mathcal{F}} & a_i |1_i\rangle_{\mathcal{F}} &= |0_i\rangle_{\mathcal{F}} \\ a_i^\dagger |1_i\rangle_{\mathcal{F}} &= a_i |0_i\rangle_{\mathcal{F}} & &= \mathbf{0} \end{aligned}$$

Notice that any annihilation operator a_i that applies on the vacuum state $|0 \dots 0\rangle_{\mathcal{F}}$ produces $\mathbf{0}$: $a_i |0 \dots 0\rangle_{\mathcal{F}} \equiv \mathbf{0}$.

2.1.3 Fermionic Hamiltonian. Finally, the system's Hamiltonian characterizes the time evolution behavior of a Fermionic system. With creation and annihilation operators, we can second quantize [12] the Hamiltonian of a Fermionic System by expressing it with the weighted sum of operator products. A simple 2-mode Fermionic system can have the following Hamiltonian:

$$\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{F}} = c_0 a_0^\dagger a_0 + c_1 a_1^\dagger a_1 + c_2 a_0^\dagger a_1^\dagger a_0 a_1 \quad (1)$$

2.2 Pauli String

Pauli strings are the most basic concepts to describe a qubit system, as all N -length Pauli strings form an orthogonal basis for N -qubit Hermitians [29]. A Pauli string S of a N -qubit system is defined as the tensor product of N Pauli operators:

$$S = \sigma_{N-1} \otimes \dots \otimes \sigma_0 \quad \text{where } \sigma_i \in \{I, X, Y, Z\}$$

We say it has a length N . Each Pauli operator σ_i operates solely on the qubit q_i . I is the identity operator, and $\{X, Y, Z\}$ are the Pauli matrices:

$$X = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad Y = i \begin{bmatrix} 0 & -1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad Z = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 \end{bmatrix}$$

2.2.1 Format. A Pauli string could be written in two forms:

- *N-length string*: the string lists operators from σ_{N-1} to σ_0 , such as $XYZ = X \otimes Y \otimes I \otimes Z$
- *Compact form*: identity operators (I) are omitted, and each non-identity Pauli operator is subscripted with the qubit it operates, such as $XYZ = X_3 Y_2 Z_0$. Since operators are annotated, their order does not matter.

2.2.2 Time Evolution Operator. The ultimate goal of quantum simulation on a digital quantum computer is to execute the time evolution operator $e^{-i\mathcal{H}_Q t}$ of a given qubit Hamiltonian \mathcal{H}_Q with quantum circuits. It begins with decomposing \mathcal{H}_Q to a unique linear combination of N -length Pauli strings:

$$\mathcal{H}_Q = \sum c_j S_j \quad c_j \in \mathbb{R}$$

The time evolution operator $e^{-i\mathcal{H}_Q t}$ is then approximated by Trotterization and number of time steps n :

$$e^{-i\mathcal{H}_Q t} = e^{-it \sum c_j S_j} \approx \underbrace{\left(\prod_j e^{it c_j S_j / n} \right)^n}_{\textcircled{1}} \underbrace{+ O(t^2/n)}_{\text{residue}}$$

$\textcircled{1}$ easily converts into a sequence of circuit snippets, each implementing a term $\exp(it c_j S_j / n)$ with basic gates. Figure 2 (a)~(e) shows how term $\exp(it c_j XYZ / n)$ is converted: (a) Apply Y gates to qubits that have Y operator in the Pauli string (q_2), and apply H to the ones have X (q_3). (b) Use $CNOT$ gates to entangle all qubits with non-identity Pauli operators (q_3, q_2) to a target qubit (q_0). (c)




Figure 2: Circuit snippet of operator $\exp(itc_jXYZ/n)$. q_0 is selected as the target qubit.

Rotate the target qubit (q_0) with $R_z(2c_j t/n)$. (d)~(e) Apply inverse gates in (b) and (a).

2.2.3 Pauli Weight. The Pauli weight of a Pauli string $w(S)$ is the number of non-identity operators in it. For example, the string XYZ has weight 3. The Pauli weight of a qubit Hamiltonian $\mathcal{H}_Q = \sum c_j S_j$ is defined as the sum of weights of all decomposed Pauli strings: $w(\mathcal{H}_Q) = \sum w(S_j)$. As discussed in Section 2.2.2, the identity operators in a Pauli string do not generate any gates. Thus, the Pauli weight of a qubit Hamiltonian is approximately proportional to the number of gates in the circuit of the time evolution operator $e^{-i\mathcal{H}_Q t}$.

2.3 Fermion-to-Qubit Mapping

To simulate a Fermionic system on a digital quantum computer, we have to bridge the Fermionic Hamiltonian $\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{F}}$ to the qubit Hamiltonian \mathcal{H}_Q . To do this, we use *Fermion-to-qubit mapping* to find a set of Pauli strings to represent the creation and annihilation operators while satisfying the Fermionic anticommutation relationship. The mapping first pairs the N creation and N annihilation operators into $2N$ Majorana operators M_j :

$$a_j^\dagger = \frac{M_{2j} - iM_{2j+1}}{2} \quad a_j = \frac{M_{2j} + iM_{2j+1}}{2} \quad (2)$$

Each Majorana operator M_j maps to a N -length Pauli string S_j , thus mapping the creation/annihilation operators and the Fermionic Hamiltonian to the qubit Hamiltonian.

For example, using the well-known Jordan-Wigner (JW) Fermion-to-qubit mapping [20], the example Hamiltonian in Equation (1) is mapped to:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{F}} \mapsto \mathcal{H}_Q &= \frac{2c_0 + 2c_1 - c_2}{4} II + \frac{c_2 - 2c_0}{4} IZ \\ &+ \frac{c_2 - 2c_1}{4} ZI - \frac{c_2}{4} ZZ \end{aligned}$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} a_0^\dagger &\mapsto 0.5IX - 0.5iIY & a_0 &\mapsto 0.5IX + 0.5iIY \\ a_1^\dagger &\mapsto 0.5XZ - 0.5iYZ & a_1 &\mapsto 0.5XZ + 0.5iYZ \end{aligned}$$

and the Majorana operators are:

$$M_0 = IX \quad M_1 = IY \quad M_2 = XZ \quad M_3 = YZ$$

3 HAMILTONIAN AWARE TERNARY TREE

We aim to design an efficient and scalable compilation framework to generate low-overhead Fermion-to-qubit mappings tailored to




Figure 3: Example of a ternary tree and extracting Fermion-to-qubit mapping

the input Hamiltonians. Our approach exploits the properties of Pauli strings and a unique data structure, the ternary tree, to yield Pauli strings satisfying the constraints of a valid Fermion-to-qubit. The Pauli strings are generated to maximize the Pauli operator cancellation during the multiplication of Majorana operators, leading to low Pauli weight post-mapping qubit Hamiltonians.

3.1 Extracting Majorana Operators from Ternary Tree

We first introduce the ternary tree and how to extract Majorana operators in the Fermion-to-qubit mapping from a ternary tree.

3.1.1 Ternary Tree. Ternary trees are a special type of tree. All nodes that are not leaves are denoted as internal nodes. Each internal node of a ternary tree has *at most* three child nodes. A ternary tree is complete if every internal node has exactly three children. If a complete ternary tree has n internal nodes, it has $2n + 1$ leaves. Each path from the root to a leaf is always unique since a ternary tree does not have cycles. For example, the four red nodes in Figure 3 (a) are the internal nodes of a ternary tree, and Figure 3 (b) shows a complete ternary tree after the leaves (blue nodes) are added to ensure each internal node has three child nodes.

3.1.2 Extract Pauli Strings from Ternary Tree. A ternary tree Fermion-to-qubit mapping for an N -mode Fermionic system can be constructed via $2N$ Pauli strings representing the $2N$ Majorana operators. The $2N$ Pauli strings are extracted from a complete ternary tree with N internal nodes and $2N + 1$ leaves. Each Pauli string is represented by a path from the root node to one leaf node in the ternary tree. This process is illustrated using the example in Figure 3.

We denote each internal node by In_j where $j = 0, \dots, N - 1$. The internal node In_j corresponds to the qubit q_j in the qubit system to be mapped onto. The leaf nodes are denoted by $\{L_i\}$. In this example, the ternary tree has four internal nodes $In_0 \sim In_3$ and nine leaves $L_0 \sim L_8$.

Now, we take a path from the root node to one leaf. At each step in this path, there are three possible branches to select the next node because each internal node in a complete ternary tree has three children. The three branches are labeled by X , Y , and Z . Then, a Pauli string can be determined by following the path. Suppose the Pauli string S_i is constructed by the path from the root to the leaf node L_i , and the path is:

$$Path = In_a(\text{root}) \rightarrow In_b \rightarrow In_c \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow L_i$$




Figure 4: 3-mode ternary tree Fermion-to-qubit examples. (a) Balanced ternary tree. (b) Unbalanced ternary tree.

Each internal node In_j contributes a Pauli operator in the Pauli string S_i . For the Pauli operator on qubit q_j , if $In_j \notin Path$, the operator is I_j . If $In_j \in Path$, based on the branch $In_j \rightarrow In_k$ it takes, the node contributes X_j , Y_j , or Z_j if In_k is the left, middle, or right child of In_j . S_i equals the tensor product of all these operators to which the nodes contribute. For example, the green nodes in Figure 3 (c) represent a path from the root node to one leaf in the complete ternary tree. The path starts from node In_2 to node In_0 via the branch Y , so we have Y_2 in the Pauli string. Then the path goes from node In_0 to node In_1 via the branch Z , so we have Z_0 . Similarly, we have X_1 because of the X branch from In_0 to the leaf, and I_3 because In_3 is not in this path. This Pauli string is $I_3Y_2Z_0X_1$.

As there are $2N + 1$ leaves, paths from the root to these leaves can construct $2N + 1$ distinct Pauli strings. It can be proved that any $2N$ Pauli strings out of the $2N + 1$ strings satisfy all the constraints required for the $2N$ Majorana operators in a valid Fermion-to-qubit mapping [19, 25]. Thus, we can always construct a Fermion-to-qubit mapping for N Fermionic modes through a complete ternary tree with N internal nodes and $2N + 1$ leaves.

3.2 Motivation: Drawback of Balanced Ternary Tree

Since the Pauli strings are determined by the paths from the root to the leaves in a ternary tree, the tree's structure will determine the generated Pauli strings and affect the overhead when simulating the corresponding qubit Hamiltonian. The number of non-identity Pauli operators in one Pauli string is the number of internal nodes in this path. Therefore, to reduce the Pauli weight of the Pauli strings, previous work[19] employs the balanced ternary tree, which has the lowest depth on average. For N Fermionic modes, it generates Pauli strings with an average Pauli weight of $\lceil \log_3(2N + 1) \rceil$, which can be proved to be the theoretically optimal Pauli weight per Pauli string.

However, in this paper, we make a key observation that the minimal Pauli weight in the Pauli strings may not lead to the minimal circuit implementation overhead in the qubit Hamiltonian simulation. An actual Hamiltonian can be a complex expression of the Pauli strings. The Pauli operators may cancel with each other and become the identity during the multiplication of Pauli strings. A motivation example is shown in Figure 4.

Suppose we have a toy model 3-mode Fermionic Hamiltonian (in Majorana operators) $\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{F}} = c_1 M_0 M_5 + c_2 M_1 M_3$. the mapping generated from a balanced ternary tree, as shown in Figure 4 (a), maps it to $\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{Q}} = c_1 (X_0 X_1) (Y_0 Z_2) + c_2 (X_0 Y_1) (Y_0 X_2) = c'_1 Z_0 X_1 Z_2 + c'_2 Z_0 Y_1 X_2$. The Pauli weight is 6. But the unbalanced ternary tree mapping, as shown in Figure 4 (b), can yield a lower Pauli weight. It maps

Algorithm 1 Hamiltonian Aware Ternary Tree Construction

Require: $\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{F}}$: Hamiltonian of the Fermionic system
Ensure: $\{S_i\}$: $2N$ anticommute Pauli strings generated by the ternary tree, used as $2N$ Majorana operators.

```

1:  $\mathcal{H}_Q \leftarrow \text{preprocess}(\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{F}})$ 
2:  $\mathcal{U} \leftarrow \{O_0, \dots, O_{2N}\}$   $\triangleright$  initial node set  $\mathcal{U}$ 
3: for  $i$  from 0 to  $N$  do
4:    $w \leftarrow \infty$ 
5:    $\text{selection} \leftarrow (\text{null}, \text{null}, \text{null})$ 
6:   for  $O_X, O_Y, O_Z \in \text{permutation}(\mathcal{U}, 3)$  do
7:      $w' \leftarrow \text{pauli\_weight}(\mathcal{H}_Q, (O_X, O_Y, O_Z), i)$   $\triangleright$  Pauli weight on qubit  $i$ 
8:     if  $w' < w$  then
9:        $w \leftarrow w'$ 
10:       $\text{selection} \leftarrow (O_X, O_Y, O_Z)$ 
11:     end if
12:   end for
13:    $\mathcal{U}.\text{remove}(O_X); \mathcal{U}.\text{remove}(O_Y); \mathcal{U}.\text{remove}(O_Z)$ 
14:    $\mathcal{U}.\text{add}(O_{2N+1+i})$ 
15:    $O_{2N+1+i}.(X, Y, Z) \leftarrow (O_X, O_Y, O_Z)$ 
16:    $\mathcal{H}_Q \leftarrow \text{reduce}(\mathcal{H}_Q, (O_X, O_Y, O_Z) \mapsto O_{2N+1+i})$   $\triangleright$  reduce Hamiltonian  $\mathcal{H}_Q$ 
17: end for
18:  $O_{\text{root}} \leftarrow \mathcal{U}.\text{pop}()$ 
19:  $\{S_i\} \leftarrow \text{walk\_tree}(O_{\text{root}})$ 
20: return  $\{S_i\}$ 

```

the Hamiltonian to $\mathcal{H}_Q = c_1(X_0)(Y_0Z_1) + c_2(Y_0X_1X_2)(Y_0X_1Z_2) = c_1'Z_0Z_1 + c_2'Y_2$, which has a Pauli weight of 3.

The example above shows that a mapping generated by unbalanced ternary trees can have larger Pauli weights in the Pauli strings and smaller Pauli weights in the final qubit Hamiltonian because of the multiplication of the Pauli operators. This motivates us to construct the ternary tree adaptively based on the input Fermionic Hamiltonian, which can further decrease the Pauli weight in the final qubit Hamiltonian.

3.3 Hamiltonian Aware Ternary Tree Construction

This section introduces our ternary tree construction algorithm that can exploit cancellation between Majorana operators for an input Fermionic Hamiltonian. Suppose we have a N -mode Fermionic Hamiltonian. Our compilation takes a bottom-up approach, starting with all the $2N + 1$ leaves. We gradually append parent nodes to the tree and finally reach the root. These parent nodes are always the internal nodes representing qubits. Our algorithm will search for a tree structure to lower the Pauli weight on each qubit. The pseudo-code is in Algorithm 1, and an algorithm overview is in Figure 5. The algorithm details are explained below.

3.3.1 Setup. The algorithm compiles a complete ternary tree Fermion-to-qubit mapping for an N -mode input Fermionic Hamiltonian with $2N + 1$ leaf nodes and N internal nodes. For simplicity, all the nodes are denoted by O_i in the rest of this paper. The $2N + 1$ leaf nodes are denoted by $O_0 \sim O_{2N}$. The N internal nodes are denoted by $O_{2N+1} \sim O_{3N}$. Leaf node $O_{0 \leq i \leq 2N}$ (previously L_i in the ternary




Figure 5: Algorithm for ternary tree construction

tree example in Figure 3) corresponds to the Pauli string S_i and is used as the Majorana operator M_i in the Fermion-to-qubit mapping. Internal node $O_{2N+1 \leq 2N+1+i \leq 3N}$ (previously In_i in Figure 3) corresponds to qubit q_i . The algorithm starts with $2N + 1$ leaves in the ternary tree as the initial node set $\mathcal{U} = \{O_0, \dots, O_{2N}\}$.

The initial Fermionic Hamiltonian $\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{F}}$ is preprocessed to substitute all creation and annihilation operators with Majorana operators $\{M_i\}$, then $\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{F}}$ is mapped to a qubit Hamiltonian \mathcal{H}_Q by using Pauli strings to represent Majorana operators: $M_i \rightarrow S_i$. The algorithm finds a concrete Pauli string for each S_i . For example, we have a 3-mode Hamiltonian:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{F}} &= a_0^\dagger a_0 + 2a_1^\dagger a_2^\dagger a_1 a_2 \\ &= 0.5i \cdot M_0 M_1 - 0.5i \cdot M_2 M_3 - 0.5i \cdot M_4 M_5 \\ &\quad + 0.5 \cdot M_2 M_3 M_4 M_5 \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

The algorithm begins with $\mathcal{U} = \{O_0, \dots, O_6\}$, each carries S_0, \dots, S_6 . The Hamiltonian is preprocessed to $\mathcal{H}_Q = 0.5i \cdot S_0 S_1 - 0.5i \cdot S_2 S_3 - 0.5i \cdot S_4 S_5 + 0.5 \cdot S_2 S_3 S_4 S_5$.

3.3.2 Iteration. The algorithm takes N iterations, from 0 to $N - 1$. In the i^{th} step, the algorithm picks three nodes from \mathcal{U} and grows a parent O_{2N+1+i} for them. The three nodes are removed from \mathcal{U} , and O_{2N+1+i} is added to \mathcal{U} , which reduces the size of \mathcal{U} by 2. This settles the operator on qubit q_i for all strings. The three nodes are carefully selected to produce a minimum Hamiltonian Pauli weight on q_i . Details are discussed as follows:

- **Node Selection** (line 6 ~ 12 in Algorithm 1): Suppose we select three nodes O_X, O_Y, O_Z as the X, Y, Z child for node O_{2N+1+i} . Based on definition, Pauli strings S_X, S_Y, S_Z correspond to nodes O_X, O_Y, O_Z have X, Y, Z operators on qubit q_i while the rest always have I , as shown in Figure 6. For each possible selection of O_X, O_Y, O_Z , we calculate the Pauli weight for the Hamiltonian on qubit q_i (`pauli_weight` in Algorithm 1 line 7). It can be done by only calculating




Figure 6: Picked nodes O_X, O_Y, O_Z , their parent O_{2N+1+i} and corresponding Pauli operators on qubit q_i

the i^{th} Pauli operator of the Hamiltonian. Based on the Pauli weight and *greedy* strategy, O_X, O_Y, O_Z should give the *minimum Pauli weight* on qubit q_i among all selections. For the example Hamiltonian in Equation (3), we will pick O_0, O_1, O_6 in the first step. Only S_0, S_1, S_6 will have X, Y, Z operator on qubit q_0 while the rest have I . The Pauli weight is:

$$\begin{aligned} S_0 S_1 &\mapsto XY \rightarrow Z(1) \\ S_2 S_3, S_4 S_5 &\mapsto II \rightarrow I(0) \\ S_2 S_3 S_4 S_5 &\mapsto II \rightarrow I(0) \end{aligned}$$

$$\text{Total Pauli weight} = 1 + 0 + 0 + 0 = 1$$

- **Update tree and node set \mathcal{U}** (line 13 ~ 15 in Algorithm 1): Remove O_X, O_Y, O_Z from \mathcal{U} and add O_{2N+1+i} to \mathcal{U} . Connect O_X, O_Y, O_Z to the X, Y, Z child of node O_{2N+1+i} .
- **Reduce Hamiltonian** (reduce in Algorithm 1 line 16): The node O_{2N+1+i} carries a Pauli string S_{2N+1+i} such that:

$$S_{\{X,Y,Z\}} = S_{2N+1+i} \otimes \{X, Y, Z\}_i$$

For the rest of the nodes $\forall O_j \notin \{O_X, O_Y, O_Z\}$, we can also find a Pauli string S'_j such that $S_j = S'_j \otimes I_i$. We update O_j to carry S'_j instead of S_j .

Then, we substitute S_j with S'_j and $\{S_X, S_Y, S_Z\}$ with S_{2N+1+i} in \mathcal{H}_Q . This action removes qubit q_i from the system, which is forever settled for all Pauli strings.

In the example, we will introduce node O_7 representing qubit q_0 that carries S_7 . The tree becomes that in Figure 7, while the Hamiltonian in Equation (3) reduces to:

$$S_0 S_1 \mapsto S_7 S_7 = I \text{ (does not contribute weight)}$$

$$S_2 S_3 \mapsto S'_2 S'_3, S_4 S_5 \mapsto S'_4 S'_5$$

$$S_2 S_3 S_4 S_5 \mapsto S'_2 S'_3 S'_4 S'_5$$

$$\mathcal{H}_Q \text{ reduces to } 0.5iS'_2 S'_3 - 0.5iS'_4 S'_5 + 0.5S'_2 S'_3 S'_4 S'_5$$

In the next iteration step, we have node set $\mathcal{U} = \{O_2, O_3, O_4, O_5, O_7\}$ in our Hamiltonian-aware ternary tree construction because we have already assumed the Pauli string S_j is assigned to the Majorana operator M_j . Reassignment destroys the Pauli operator cancellation created in our algorithm.




Figure 7: Constructed ternary tree for the example in the first step. Note how nodes O_0, O_1, O_6 are replaced by O_7 . Subsequent iterations then construct the tree.

3.3.3 Termination. The algorithm always terminates after N iterations since the initial size of \mathcal{U} is $2N + 1$ and reduces by two in each step. The final only node in \mathcal{U} is the root of the ternary tree.

3.3.4 Complexity. We disregard the complexity of calculating the Pauli weight in each iteration step since it is input-dependent. We estimate its overhead to be a constant determined by the input Hamiltonian. In the algorithm, we compared all possible selections of O_X, O_Y, O_Z , which are $\binom{N}{3} \sim N^3$ choices. Thus, the complexity of each step is $O(N^3)$. For total N steps, the complexity is $O(N^4)$.

4 VACCUUM STATE PRESERVATION AND PERFORMANCE OPTIMIZATION

The algorithm described in Section 3.3 decreases the Hamiltonian Pauli weight but fails to retain one desired property of a Fermion-to-qubit mapping: *vacuum state preservation*. In addition, the computation complexity $O(N^4)$ is still high. In this section, we further optimize our algorithm to a) ensure *vacuum state preservation* in the generated mapping and b) reduce its complexity to $O(N^3)$.

4.1 Vacuum State Preservation

In Fermion-to-qubit mappings, it is desired to map the vacuum state of a Fermionic system $|0, \dots, 0\rangle_{\mathcal{F}}$ to the zero qubit state $|0\rangle^{\otimes N}$ of the qubits. It is called *Vacuum State Preservation*, allowing lower overhead for state preparation in quantum simulation. This property is achieved by ensuring that the annihilation operators always produce $\mathbf{0}$ when applying on the vacuum state:

$$\forall j, a_j |0, \dots, 0\rangle_{\mathcal{F}} = \mathbf{0} \Leftrightarrow \frac{M_{2j} + iM_{2j+1}}{2} |0\rangle^{\otimes N} = \mathbf{0}$$

To satisfy the right-hand-side equation, the corresponding Pauli strings S_{2j}, S_{2j+1} of Majorana operators M_{2j}, M_{2j+1} should have a (X, Y) Pauli operator pair on a qubit, since $((X + iY)/2) |0\rangle \equiv \mathbf{0}$. In the vanilla balance ternary tree [19, 25], this is achieved by reassigning the Pauli strings to Majorana operators.

4.2 Operator Pairing In Tree Construction

However, we cannot re-assign Pauli strings to Majorana operators in our Hamiltonian-aware ternary tree construction because we have already assumed the Pauli string S_j is assigned to the Majorana operator M_j . Reassignment destroys the Pauli operator cancellation created in our algorithm.

Instead of re-assigning Pauli strings, we improve our tree construction algorithm by enforcing *vacuum state preservation* during the node selection. That is, we only freely select O_X and O_Z , and O_Y is determined based on O_X and O_Z . With careful construction leveraging the property of ternary trees, we can guarantee that all the Majorana operator pairs (M_{2j}, M_{2j+1}) have an (X, Y) Pauli operator pair on one qubit and thus ensure vacuum state preservation.

We first define two new concepts in our new algorithm:

- I) *Z-descendant*: The *Z-descendant* of a node O , denoted as $desc_Z(O)$, is defined as the *rightmost leaf* of the subtree with root O . It can be reached by traversing down all the Z branches. If O is a leaf, then $desc_Z(O) = O$.
- II) *Valid Pair*: Two Pauli strings (S_{2j}, S_{2j+1}) forms a *valid pair* if they share a (X, Y) pair on a qubit. If we have (S_{2j}, S_{2j+1}) is a *valid pair* for all $0 \leq j < N$, then *vacuum state preservation* is guaranteed.

Algorithm 2 Optimized HATT**Require:** $\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{F}}$: Hamiltonian of the Fermionic system**Ensure:** $\{S_i\}$: $2N$ Majorana operators generated by the ternary tree

```

1: ...                                     ▷ Algorithm 1, line 1 ~ 2
2: for  $i$  from 0 to  $N$  do
3:   ...                                     ▷ Algorithm 1, line 4 ~ 5
4:   for  $O_X, O_Z \in \text{permutation}(\mathcal{U}, 2)$  do
5:      $O_x \leftarrow \text{desc}_Z(O_X)$ 
6:     if  $x = 2N$  then
7:       continue                               ▷  $O_x$  is the last operator, no pairing
8:     end if
9:     if  $x$  is even then
10:       $O_y \leftarrow O_{x+1}$ 
11:       $O_Y \leftarrow \text{traverse\_up}(O_y, \mathcal{U})$ 
12:    else
13:       $O_y \leftarrow O_{x-1}$ 
14:       $O_Y \leftarrow \text{traverse\_up}(O_y, \mathcal{U})$ 
15:       $\text{swap}(O_X, O_Y)$                                ▷ swap  $Y, X$  to  $X, Y$ 
16:    end if
17:    ...                                     ▷ Algorithm 1, line 7 ~ 11
18:  end for
19:  ...                                     ▷ Algorithm 1, line 13 ~ 16
20: end for
21: ...                                     ▷ Algorithm 1, line 18 ~ 20

1: procedure  $\text{desc}_Z(O)$ 
2:   while  $O$  is not leaf do
3:      $O \leftarrow O.Z$ 
4:   end while
5:   return  $O$ 
6: end procedure

1: procedure  $\text{traverse\_up}(O, \mathcal{U})$ 
2:   while  $O \notin \mathcal{U}$  do
3:      $O \leftarrow O.\text{parent}$ 
4:   end while
5:   return  $O$ 
6: end procedure

```

We now introduce our improved tree construction algorithm 2. The overall structure is similar to Algorithm 1, but node selection is changed. In each step i , as shown in Algorithm 2 instead of selecting all O_X, O_Y, O_Z nodes, we now only select nodes O_X, O_Z as the X, Z children of node O_{2N+1+i} and find an appropriate O_Y to ensure exists l , such that $\text{desc}_Z(O_X)$ corresponds to S_{2l} and $\text{desc}_Z(O_Z)$ corresponds to S_{2l+1} . Thus, (S_{2l}, S_{2l+1}) is valid paired since they have a (X, Y) pair on qubit q_i , as shown in Figure 8.

Suppose O_X and O_Z are selected. We traverse down along the Z child from node O_X until reaching a leaf of the final leaf $O_x = \text{desc}_Z(O_X)$ (where $0 \leq x < 2N + 1$), as shown in Figure 8 ①. Then, we select its nearby leaf $O_y = \text{desc}_Z(O_Y)$ based on O_x to ensure the corresponding Pauli strings S_x, S_y form a valid pair $(S_{x=2l}, S_{y=2l+1})$, as shown in Figure 8 ②:

- If $x = 2N$, then O_x is the rightmost leaf. Discard this selection and pick O_X, O_Z again (S_{2N} is always discarded in the ternary tree mapping and does not pair).
- If x is even ($x = 2l$), let $y = x + 1$ ($y = 2l + 1$).
- If x is odd ($x = 2l + 1$), let $y = x - 1$ ($y = 2l$). We must also exchange O_X with O_Y when we get O_Y (Line 15, Algorithm 2) to ensure (S_x, S_y) has a (X, Y) Pauli operator pair, instead of (Y, X) .

To find O_Y based on $O_y = \text{desc}_Z(O_Y)$, we can traverse up from O_y until we reach a node O_Y in the current node set \mathcal{U} , as shown in Figure 8 ③. O_Y is the ancestor of O_y , as it is the root of the subtree in which O_y is located.




Figure 8: Procedure of finding O_Y based on O_X, O_Z

Finally, O_Y is chosen as the Y child of O_{2N+1+i} to ensure valid string pairing. For each selection of O_X, O_Z in step i , we calculate the Pauli weight similarly to the original algorithm and construct the node based on the selection of O_X, O_Y, O_Z that gives a minimum Pauli weight on qubit q_i , then reduce the Hamiltonian similarly to the original algorithm.

Consider our previous example, where $\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{F}} = a_0^\dagger a_0 + 2a_1^\dagger a_2^\dagger a_1 a_2 = 0.5i \cdot M_0 M_1 - 0.5i \cdot M_2 M_3 - 0.5i \cdot M_4 M_5 + 0.5 \cdot M_2 M_3 M_4 M_5$. We have already selected O_0, O_1, O_6 as the children of O_7 in the first step, and the Hamiltonian is reduced to $\mathcal{H}_Q = 0.5i S_2' S_3' - 0.5i S_4' S_5' + 0.5 S_2' S_3' S_4' S_5'$.

In the second step, we first choose O_7, O_2 as O_X, O_Z , as shown in Figure 9 (a). However, $O_x = \text{desc}_Z(O_7) = O_6$ is the rightmost operator, so we discard this selection and move on. Then, we choose O_2, O_7 as O_X, O_Z , as shown in Figure 9 (b). Here, $O_x = \text{desc}_Z(O_2) = O_2$, thus $O_y = O_{2+1} = O_3$ and traverse back to S gives $O_Y = O_3$. This choice also minimizes the Pauli weight. O_2, O_3, O_7 are the children of O_8 .

We then follow the original procedure and reduce the Hamiltonian:

$$S_2' S_3' \mapsto XY \rightarrow Z(1)$$

$$S_4' S_5' \mapsto II \rightarrow I(0)$$

$$S_2' S_3' S_4' S_5' \mapsto XYII \rightarrow Z(1)$$

$$\text{Total Pauli weight} = 1 + 0 + 1 = 2$$

We can check that Majorana operators are paired validally. $(M_2, M_3) \mapsto (S_2, S_3)$ have a (X, Y) pair on qubit 1, and $(M_0, M_1) \mapsto (S_0, S_1)$ have a (X, Y) pair on qubit q_0 .

4.3 Optimizing Operator Pairing

In the algorithm above, the complexity at the node selection is reduced because we only select two operators O_X, O_Z in each step.




Figure 9: Example of operator pairing in tree construction

The computation complexity is $\binom{N}{2} \sim O(N^2)$. However, it introduces new overhead in traversing down to O_x and up to O_y . In the worst case, the complexity of traversing up and down can be $O(i)$, leading to a total complexity of $O(N^4)$ (there are N steps).

In this section, we further optimize the algorithm by reducing the traversing time from $O(N)$ to $O(1)$. This improvement is made based on the following *statement*:

In step i , the O_y we find and its ancestor $O_Y \in \mathcal{U}$ must always satisfy $O_y = \text{desc}_Z(O_Y)$

Proof: We first prove two lemmas.

Lemma 1: Before step i , a leaf O is not paired with another leaf if and only if it is a Z descendant of a node in \mathcal{U} . In other words, $\exists O' \in \mathcal{U}, O = \text{desc}_Z(O')$.

Proof: We prove it by induction.

- (I) Before step $i = 0$, \mathcal{U} includes all leaves. They are all unpaired and Z descendants of themselves.
- (II) Suppose Lemma 1 is satisfied before step i . We prove it holds after step i (holds before step $i + 1$).

After step i , we find O_X, O_Y , and O_Z as the X, Y, and Z children of node O_{2N+1+i} . Based on the induction hypothesis, all unpaired leaves in the O_X, O_Y , and O_Z subtree are $O_x = \text{desc}_Z(O_X), O_y = \text{desc}_Z(O_Y)$, and $O_z = \text{desc}_Z(O_Z)$. Our algorithm pairs O_x with O_y while leaving O_z unpaired. Since O_Z is the Z child of O_{2N+1+i} , we have $O_z = \text{desc}_Z(O_Z) = \text{desc}_Z(O_{2N+1+i}) \in \mathcal{U}$ and it is the only unpaired leaf in the O_{2N+1+i} subtree.

Now, we can check the lemma. O_x and O_y are paired and no longer Z descendants since their path to O_{2N+1+i} takes X or Y branch. O_z is unpaired and still Z descendant of $O_{2N+1+i} \in \mathcal{U}$. The lemma holds on O_x, O_y , and O_z . All other leaves are untouched, and the lemma holds on them. \square

Lemma 2: O_y is not paired in step i .

Proof: Notice that $\forall 0 \leq l < N$, leaf O_{2l} must be paired with O_{2l+1} . O_x is not paired in step i due to Lemma 1. Then, based on how we find O_y in Section 4.2, O_y must be unpaired. Otherwise, it leads to a contradiction. \square

Based on Lemma 1 and $O_x = \text{desc}_Z(O_X)$, we have O_x must be unpaired. Then, based on Lemma 2, O_y is also unpaired. Again, by Lemma 1, O_y is a Z descendant, indicating $O_y = \text{desc}_Z(O_Y)$.

The observation hints that the traversing up and down procedure (desc_Z and traverse_up in Algorithm 2) only involves the Z

descendants and their ancestors. Thus, we could keep two maps: $O \mapsto \text{desc}_Z(O)$ and $\text{desc}_Z(O) \mapsto O$ to reduce the complexity of traversing from $O(N)$ to $O(1)$. The map updates when constructing a new parent in each step, as shown in Algorithm 3. Overall, this optimization reduced the total complexity from $O(N^4)$ to $O(N^3)$.

Algorithm 3 Optimized Algorithm 2 with $O \mapsto \text{desc}_Z(O)$ and $\text{desc}_Z(O) \mapsto O$ maps

Require: $m_{\text{down}}: O \mapsto \text{desc}_Z(O)$ map
 $m_{\text{up}}: \text{desc}_Z(O) \mapsto O$ map

```

1: for  $i$  from 0 to  $2N$  do                                 $\triangleright$  initialize maps
2:    $m_{\text{down}}[O_i] \leftarrow O_i$ 
3:    $m_{\text{up}}[O_i] \leftarrow O_i$ 
4: end for
5: ...                                                          $\triangleright$  Algorithm 1, line 1 ~ 2
6: for  $i$  from 0 to  $N$  do
7:   ...                                                          $\triangleright$  Algorithm 2, line 3 ~ 19
8:    $O_{2N+1+i}.(X, Y, Z) \leftarrow (O_X, O_Y, O_Z)$ 
9:    $Z_{\text{desc}} \leftarrow m_{\text{down}}[O_Z]$ 
10:   $m_{\text{down}}[O_{2N+1+i}] \leftarrow Z_{\text{desc}}$ 
11:   $m_{\text{up}}[Z_{\text{desc}}] \leftarrow O_{2N+1+i}$ 
12:  ...                                                          $\triangleright$  Algorithm 1, line 16
13: end for
14: ...                                                          $\triangleright$  same as Algorithm 1, line 18 ~ 20

1: procedure  $\text{desc}_Z(O)$                                         $\triangleright O(1)$  time
2:   return  $m_{\text{down}}[O]$ 
3: end procedure

1: procedure  $\text{traverse\_up}(O, \mathcal{U})$                             $\triangleright O(1)$  time
2:   return  $m_{\text{up}}[O]$ 
3: end procedure
    
```

5 EVALUATION

In this section, we evaluate the proposed Hamiltonian-aware Fermion-to-qubit mapping compilation framework HATT against existing Fermion-to-qubit mappings. We also test the scalability of our method and optimization.

5.1 Benchmark Physics Models

We select the following physical models as our benchmark Fermionic Hamiltonians. They come from various application domains of quantum simulation and have different Fermionic mode coupling structures.

- (1) **Electronic structure model** from quantum chemistry [24]. Hamiltonian describes the electrons in a molecule:

$$\mathcal{H}_e = \sum_{p,q} h_{pq} a_p^\dagger a_q + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{p,q,r,s} h_{pqrs} a_p^\dagger a_q^\dagger a_r a_s$$

Geometric data of molecules are from PubChem [21] to determine the coefficients using PySCF [36].

Table 1: Evaluation result of Electronic Structure Model. The best results of each metric are highlighted in bold. ‘-’ indicates the case is too large to solve by Fermihedral (FH). ‘*’ indicates that Fermihedral only finds an approximately optimal solution.

Molecule	Modes	Pauli Weight					CNOT Gate Count					Circuit Depth				
		JW	BK	BTT	FH	HATT	JW	BK	BTT	FH	HATT	JW	BK	BTT	FH	HATT
H_2	4	32	34	36	32	32	21	25	32	22	21	34	25	53	33	34
LiH (freeze)	6	192	221	225	193*	188	134	211	225	189*	147	191	283	305	254*	198
LiH	12	3660	3248	3536	3842*	2926	2377	2373	2298	2985*	1642	3174	3249	3306	3987*	2402
H_2O	14	6332	6567	6658	-	5545	4620	5064	4413	-	3083	5755	6501	6234	-	4344
CH_4	18	42476	42646	41530	-	36983	22798	19051	18645	-	16304	32951	28704	28326	-	25745
O_2	20	16904	16828	15364	-	13076	11653	12126	10382	-	8912	14532	15426	13914	-	11331
NaF	28	247264	218688	207554	-	192064	102689	93376	89260	-	69243	141317	141577	133931	-	110898
CO_2	30	173324	144112	138756	-	133208	85711	70769	62857	-	58208	110321	98726	92334	-	87114

- (2) **Fermi-Hubbard model** in condensed-matter physics [1]. Hamiltonian describes a position lattice model of Fermions:

$$\mathcal{H}_{\text{fh}} = \sum_{i,j} \sum_{\sigma=\uparrow,\downarrow} t_{ij} a_{i,\sigma}^\dagger a_{j,\sigma} + U \sum_i a_{i,\uparrow}^\dagger a_{i,\uparrow} a_{i,\downarrow}^\dagger a_{i,\downarrow}$$

- (3) **Collective neutrino oscillations** from astroparticle physics [3, 7, 30]. The Hamiltonian is formulated on a 1D momentum lattice:

$$H_V = \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_a^3 \sqrt{p_i^2 + m_a^2} \hat{a}_{a,i}^\dagger \hat{a}_{a,i} + \sum_{i_1, i_2, i_3}^N \sum_{a,b}^3 C_{i_1, i_2, i_3} \hat{a}_{a, i_1}^\dagger \hat{a}_{a, i_3} \hat{a}_{b, i_2}^\dagger \hat{a}_{b, i_4}$$

where $p_{*,*}$ and m_a are the momentum and static mass of neutrino and $C_{i_1, i_2, i_3} = \mu [\hat{p}_{i_2, x} - \hat{p}_{i_1, x}] [\hat{p}_{i_3, x} - \hat{p}_{i_1, x}]$ (μ is the two-body coupling strength).

5.2 Experiment Setup

5.2.1 Implementation. We implemented our Hamiltonian-Aware Ternary Tree method (HATT) as described in Section 3 and 4 using Python. We leveraged some Pauli operator processing modules from Qiskit [18] and Qiskit Nature [11].

5.2.2 Baseline Fermion-to-Qubit Mappings. We compared against a) the Jordan-Wigner transformation (JW) [20], and b) the Bravyi-Kitaev transformation (BK) [5] in Qiskit Nature [11], c) the balanced ternary tree mapping [25] (BTT), and Fermihedral [23] (FH) that gives optimal Hamiltonian Pauli weight at small scales using a SAT solver.

5.2.3 Compilation. The time evolution operator is compiled and optimized with the quantum simulation kernel compiler Paulihedral [22] followed by Qiskit L3 optimization. We chose $\{CNOT, U3\}$ as the basis gates for noisy simulation.

5.2.4 Noisy Simulation. We use the Qiskit Aer [18] to simulate circuits with depolarizing noise on single- and two-qubit gates.

5.2.5 Real-System Study. We also executed the compiled circuit on the IonQ Forte 1 quantum computer. It has 36 ion trap qubits with all-to-all connectivity, 99.98% single-qubit gate fidelity, 98.99% double-qubit gate fidelity, and 99.02% readout fidelity. Due to current hardware limitations, only the H_2 molecule simulation is executed.

5.2.6 Metrics. We use the following metrics: 1) Pauli weight of the mapped qubit Hamiltonian, 2) $CNOT$ gate count and depth of the compiled circuit, and 3) the simulated system energy in noisy simulation and real-system study.

5.3 Pauli Weight and Circuit Metrics

We evaluate the Pauli weight of the qubit Hamiltonians generated by different Fermion-to-qubit mapping methods and the circuits to simulate these Hamiltonians.

5.3.1 Electronic Structure Model. Table 1 shows the Pauli weight and circuit metrics of different molecules. For the smallest case where Fermihedral (FH) can find the optimal Pauli weight, HATT achieves similar results. For larger cases where FH can only provide approximate solutions or even fail to solve, HATT consistently shows the best results in all metrics except for the 6-mode LiH (freeze) where Jordan-Wigner transformation (JW) is slightly better. Compared with (JW), HATT, on average, reduces Pauli weight by 14.77%, number of $CNOT$ gates by 25.84%, and circuit depth by 19.33%. Compared with the Bravyi-Kitaev transformation (BK), HATT reduces 13.83% Pauli weight, 24.35% $CNOT$ count and 18.91% circuit depth. Compared against the balanced ternary tree (BTT), HATT reduces 11.77% Pauli weight, 21.37% $CNOT$ count and 20.58% circuit depth.

5.3.2 Fermi-Hubbard Model. Table 2 shows the Pauli weight and two metrics of the compiled circuits for the Fermi-Hubbard model benchmarks. It can be observed that although FH achieved the minimal Pauli weight for up to 18 modes, it cannot solve more significant cases. HATT achieves a lower Pauli weight consistently and a lower circuit complexity most of the time against JW, BK, and BTT as our method is tailored according to a specific Hamiltonian and does capture the optimization opportunities within.

On Fermi-Hubbard models, compared to JW, HATT on average reduces Pauli weight by 20.90%, number of $CNOT$ gates by 22.90%, and circuit depth by 7.88%. Compared to BK, HATT reduces 6.48% Pauli weight, 12.11% $CNOT$ count and 8.16% circuit depth. Against BTT, HATT reduces 4.77% Pauli weight, 16.58% $CNOT$ count and 18.11% circuit depth correspondingly. On small scales (8 ~ 18 modes), HATT shows the results closest to the optimal solution by FH.

5.3.3 Collective Neutrino Oscillation. Table 3 shows the Pauli weight and metrics of compiled circuits of different neutrino oscillation test cases. Fermihedral (FH) is not evaluated since all the cases are

Table 2: Evaluation result of Fermi-Hubbard Model. ‘-’ indicates the case is too large to solve by Fermihedral (FH).

Geometry	Modes	Pauli Weight					CNOT Gate Count					Circuit Depth				
		JW	BK	BTT	FH	HATT	JW	BK	BTT	FH	HATT	JW	BK	BTT	FH	HATT
2×2	8	80	80	86	56	76	51	71	77	37	62	60	99	108	36	73
2×3	12	212	200	199	161	187	159	172	161	123	146	161	223	229	160	196
2×4	16	304	263	260	230	256	228	183	208	195	189	225	239	256	230	249
3×3	18	492	428	408	352	410	378	296	317	266	260	328	391	427	270	356
2×5	20	396	348	356	-	330	287	270	266	-	224	305	275	320	-	283
3×4	24	704	620	580	-	524	528	460	433	-	364	462	529	496	-	401
2×7	28	580	493	502	-	473	405	380	373	-	320	465	374	399	-	333
3×5	30	916	756	706	-	706	661	523	563	-	490	621	550	629	-	582
4×4	32	1152	790	784	-	760	842	531	651	-	483	712	562	749	-	553
3×6	36	1128	932	876	-	806	794	662	668	-	544	780	684	694	-	487
4×5	40	1504	1030	986	-	986	1055	665	782	-	601	941	561	795	-	618

Table 3: Evaluation result of Collective Neutrino Oscillation. Fermihedral (FH) is not included since all the benchmarks in this application are too large for Fermihedral.

Case	Modes	Pauli Weight				CNOT Gate Count				Circuit Depth			
		JW	BK	BTT	HATT	JW	BK	BTT	HATT	JW	BK	BTT	HATT
$3 \times 2F$	12	1424	1568	1556	1290	776	986	1092	850	1137	1421	1554	1229
$4 \times 2F$	16	4048	4011	4244	3720	2115	2742	2657	2203	3003	3763	3788	3110
$3 \times 3F$	18	5550	5770	5548	5153	2912	3667	3391	2703	3927	4911	4801	3949
$5 \times 2F$	20	9240	9800	9016	7852	4630	5285	5685	4487	6261	7476	8021	6414
$4 \times 3F$	24	16216	16462	14806	14267	7996	8952	8243	7141	10530	12098	11786	10440
$6 \times 2F$	24	18280	18594	16992	15047	8868	9168	9612	8382	11571	13338	13693	11986
$7 \times 2F$	28	32704	31088	28876	25074	15440	14733	15358	13322	19281	21278	22148	19400
$5 \times 3F$	30	37690	33776	32154	31418	17872	17460	16957	15204	21958	23708	23872	21697
$6 \times 3F$	36	75540	66262	60576	58229	34697	30193	29361	26298	41198	41702	41995	38502
$7 \times 3F$	42	136486	114833	101717	99334	60414	48846	48155	45045	69117	67548	67600	64686

too large for FH. Among all the cases, HATT always achieves the lower Pauli weight. Although HATT shows slightly higher circuit overhead compared with JW, the trend shows that HATT has more advantage as the problem size increases. Compared to JW, HATT on average reduces Pauli weight by 15.65%, number of CNOT gates by 4.01%. Compared to BK, HATT reduces 14.58% Pauli weight, 17.69% CNOT count and 14.92% circuit depth. Against BTT, HATT reduces 11.95% Pauli weight, 17.30% CNOT count and 17.31% circuit depth correspondingly.

5.4 Noisy Simulation and Real-System Study

We performed the noisy simulation and real-system study of compiled circuits for H_2 and LiH (freeze) cases from the electronic structure model. ‘freeze’ means that the inner layer electrons are fixed.

5.4.1 Noisy Simulation. We simulated the circuit generated by different Fermion-to-qubit mappings under depolarizing errors. The error rate range of single-qubit gates is $10^{-5} \sim 10^{-4}$ and $10^{-4} \sim 10^{-3}$ for double-qubit gates. We simulate each circuit for 1000 shots, and the final system energy is measured and compared against the theoretical results.

Figure 10 shows the simulation results of H_2 (upper half) and LiH (freeze) (lower half) molecules. Bias and variance are calculated against the theoretical values based on 1000 shots. It can be observed that HATT has the lowest deviation and variance (heatmap closer to blue), which outperforms JW, BK, and BTT, achieving similar results with the prior optimal FH.

5.4.2 Real-System Study. Figure 11 shows the results of H_2 ground state energy simulation on the IonQ Forte 1 device. The red horizontal lines indicate the average measured energy of 1000 shots using the corresponding mapping. The associated black vertical lines indicate the variance of the measured energy across all shots. The blue line indicates the theoretical result. HATT achieved the second closest to theory, with the closest being the small-scale optimal FH solution. HATT also has the lowest variance.

5.5 Execution Time and Scalability

To understand the scalability of the proposed tree construction algorithm and the impact of our performance optimization, we compared our unoptimized tree construction algorithm in Section 3.3 (HATT (unopt)), optimized algorithm in Section 4.3 (HATT) and the optimal exhaustive search method Fermihedral [23] (FH) on the




Figure 10: Noisy simulation result of H_2 and LiH (freeze) molecule. Energy is measured for 1000 shots. Bias is calculated against the theoretical results.




Figure 11: H_2 molecule simulation results on IonQ Forte 1 quantum computer

time consumption to produce a Fermion-to-qubit mapping for a simple Hamiltonian: $\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{F}} = \sum_{i=0}^{2N-1} M_i$ at different sizes. As shown in Figure 12, both HATT (unopt) and HATT scales to large cases in polynomial time, but FH show its exponential complexity. Also, HATT has a shorter execution time compared with unoptimized HATT (unopt) as our optimization reduces the algorithm’s complexity from $O(N^4)$ to $O(N^3)$.

6 RELATED WORKS

Fermion-to-Qubit Mappings: Previous Fermion-to-qubit mappings includes the Jordan-Wigner transformation [20], Bravyi-Kitaev transformation [5], parity mapping [4] and ternary tree mapping [19, 25]. The Bravyi-Kitaev transformation and ternary tree mapping generate the theoretical minimum Pauli weight per Majorana operator ($O(\log N)$). However, all of them fail to achieve optimal solutions with a specific Hamiltonian since the pattern of the Fermionic




Figure 12: Scalability of Fermihedral (FH), unoptimized HATT (HATT (unopt)) and HATT with optimization (HATT). Black dotted lines (–) show the regression of complexity orders.

system is disregarded in their construction. Recent superfast encoding [6, 33] captures structures of the Fermionic system to produce optimized mappings. However, it is only restricted to systems with local Fermionic modes and cyclic interaction patterns. Fermihedral [23] solves a given Hamiltonian’s theoretical optimum Pauli weight mapping with an SAT problem. However, SAT is NP-complete, and Fermihedral fails to scale to cases larger than ~ 20 qubits. In contrast, HATT combines the goal of optimizing Pauli weight and Hamiltonian information with the ternary tree construction process. It works on any Fermionic system and scales to larger cases with polynomial complexity $O(N^3)$.

Quantum Simulation Compilers: Some recent works successfully identify the computation pattern in quantum simulation to further optimize quantum circuits, including architectural-aware synthesis [22, 38], reordering Pauli strings for gate cancellation [15, 16], and simultaneous diagonalization [8, 9, 39]. These works happen after Fermion-to-qubit mappings and do not rely on a specific Fermion-to-qubit mapping. HATT is compatible with these works.

Quantum Compilers and Optimizations: Modern quantum compilers, such as Qiskit [18], Cirq [10], Braket [2] and t|ket> [34] apply multiple optimization passes to quantum circuits. These optimizations, including gate cancellations [28] and rewriting [35], qubit routing [26, 27], are applied after the Fermion-to-qubit mapping stage where the Hamiltonian simulation is converted to circuits. Thus, they are compatible with HATT.

7 CONCLUSION

In this work, we presented the Hamiltonian-Aware ternary tree (HATT) compilation framework, a novel optimization for compiling Fermion-to-qubit mapping that leverages the high-level structure of the input Fermionic Hamiltonian. HATT efficiently compiles ternary trees to optimize the mapping process, significantly reducing the Pauli weight and circuit complexity compared to existing methods. Our approach retains the *vacuum state preservation* property and achieves a polynomial ($O(N^3)$) complexity, making it suitable for large-scale simulations that classical and exhaustive methods struggle to handle. Extensive evaluations demonstrated that HATT not only achieves close-to-optimal mappings for small systems but also outperforms current constructive methods in larger-scale applications. These improvements in efficiency and accuracy underscore HATT’s potential as a powerful tool for simulating complex Fermionic systems on quantum computers, paving the way for more practical and scalable quantum simulations.

REFERENCES

- [1] A. Altland, B. Simons, and B. Simons, *Condensed Matter Field Theory*. Cambridge University Press, 2006. [Online]. Available: <https://books.google.com/books?id=0KMkFAMe3JkC>
- [2] Amazon Web Services, “Amazon Braket,” 2020. [Online]. Available: <https://aws.amazon.com/braket/>
- [3] V. Barger, D. Marfatia, and K. Whisnant, *The Physics of Neutrinos*. Princeton University Press, 2012. [Online]. Available: <https://books.google.com/books?id=qso8NEr3XY8C>
- [4] S. Bravyi, J. M. Gambetta, A. Mezzacapo, and K. Temme, “Tapering off qubits to simulate fermionic hamiltonians,” 2017.
- [5] S. B. Bravyi and A. Y. Kitaev, “Fermionic quantum computation,” *Annals of Physics*, vol. 298, no. 1, pp. 210–226, 2002. [Online]. Available: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0003491602962548>
- [6] R. W. Chien, S. Xue, T. S. Hardikar, K. Setia, and J. D. Whitfield, “Analysis of superfast encoding performance for electronic structure simulations,” *Physical Review A*, vol. 100, no. 3, sep 2019. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevA.100.032337>
- [7] V. Cirigliano, S. Sen, and Y. Yamauchi, “Neutrino many-body flavor evolution: the full hamiltonian,” 2024. [Online]. Available: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2404.16690>
- [8] A. Cowtan, S. Dilkes, R. Duncan, W. Simmons, and S. Sivarajah, “Phase gadget synthesis for shallow circuits,” *Electronic Proceedings in Theoretical Computer Science*, vol. 318, pp. 213–228, may 2020. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.4204/2020Fepts.318.13>
- [9] A. Cowtan, W. Simmons, and R. Duncan, “A generic compilation strategy for the unitary coupled cluster ansatz,” 2020. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2007.10515>
- [10] C. Developers, “Cirq,” Jul. 2023. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.8161252>
- [11] T. Q. N. developers and contributors, “Qiskit nature 0.6.0,” Apr. 2023. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.7828768>
- [12] P. A. M. Dirac and N. H. D. Bohr, “The quantum theory of the emission and absorption of radiation,” *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London. Series A, Containing Papers of a Mathematical and Physical Character*, vol. 114, no. 767, pp. 243–265, 1927. [Online]. Available: <https://royalsocietypublishing.org/doi/abs/10.1098/rspa.1927.0039>
- [13] R. P. Feynman, “Simulating physics with computers,” *International Journal of Theoretical Physics*, vol. 21, no. 6, pp. 467–488, Jun 1982. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02650179>
- [14] P. D. Group, R. L. Workman, V. D. Burkert, V. Crede, E. Klempt, U. Thoma, L. Tiator, K. Agashe, G. Aielli, B. C. Allanach, C. Amsler, M. Antonelli, E. C. Aschenauer, D. M. Asner, H. Baer, S. Banerjee, R. M. Barnett, L. Baudis, C. W. Bauer, J. J. Beatty, V. I. Belousov, J. Beringer, A. Bettini, O. Biebel, K. M. Black, E. Blucher, R. Bonventre, V. V. Bryzgalov, O. Buchmuller, M. A. Bychkov, R. N. Cahn, M. Carena, A. Ceccucci, A. Cerri, R. S. Chivukula, G. Cowan, K. Cranmer, O. Cremonesi, G. D’Ambrosio, T. Damour, D. de Florian, A. de Gouvêa, T. DeGrand, P. de Jong, S. Demers, B. A. Dobrescu, M. D’Onofrio, M. Doser, H. K. Dreiner, P. Eerola, U. Egede, S. Eidelman, A. X. El-Khadra, J. Ellis, S. C. Eno, J. Erler, V. V. Ezhela, W. Fetscher, B. D. Fields, A. Freitas, H. Gallagher, Y. Gershtein, T. Gherghetta, M. C. Gonzalez-Garcia, M. Goodman, C. Grab, A. V. Gritsan, C. Grojean, D. E. Groom, M. Grunewald, A. Gurtu, T. Gutsche, H. E. Haber, M. Hamel, C. Hanhart, S. Hashimoto, Y. Hayato, A. Hebecker, S. Heinemeyer, J. J. Hernández-Rey, K. Hikasa, J. Hisano, A. Höcker, J. Holder, L. Hsu, J. Huston, T. Hyodo, A. Ianni, M. Kado, M. Karliner, U. F. Katz, M. Kenzie, V. A. Khoze, S. R. Klein, F. Krauss, M. Kreps, P. Krizan, B. Krusche, Y. Kwon, O. Lahav, J. Laiho, L. P. Lellouch, J. Lesgourgues, A. R. Liddle, Z. Ligeti, C.-J. Lin, C. Lippmann, T. M. Liss, L. Littenberg, C. Lourenço, K. S. Lugovsky, S. B. Lugovsky, A. Lusiani, Y. Makida, F. Maltoni, T. Mannel, A. V. Manohar, W. J. Marciano, A. Masoni, J. Matthews, U.-G. Meißner, I.-A. Melzer-Pellmann, M. Mikhasenko, D. J. Miller, D. Milstead, R. E. Mitchell, K. Mönig, P. Molaro, F. Moortgat, M. Moskvic, K. Nakamura, M. Narain, P. Nason, S. Navas, A. Nelles, M. Neubert, P. Nevski, Y. Nir, K. A. Olive, C. Patrignani, J. A. Peacock, V. A. Petrov, E. Pianori, A. Pich, A. Piepke, F. Pietropaolo, A. Pomarol, S. Pordes, S. Profumo, A. Quadt, K. Rabbertz, J. Rademacker, G. Raffelt, M. Ramsey-Musolf, B. N. Ratcliff, P. Richardson, A. Ringwald, D. J. Robinson, S. Roesler, S. Rolli, A. Romaniouk, L. J. Rosenberg, J. L. Rosner, G. Rybka, M. G. Ryskin, R. A. Ryutin, Y. Sakai, S. Sarkar, F. Sauli, O. Schneider, S. Schöner, K. Scholberg, A. J. Schwartz, J. Schwiening, D. Scott, F. Sefkow, U. Seljak, V. Sharma, S. R. Sharpe, V. Shiltsev, G. Signorelli, M. Silari, F. Simon, T. Sjöstrand, P. Skands, T. Skwarnicki, G. F. Smoot, A. Soffer, M. S. Sozzi, S. Späner, C. Spiering, A. Stahl, S. L. Stone, Y. Sumino, M. J. Syphers, F. Takahashi, M. Tanabashi, J. Tanaka, M. Taševský, K. Terao, K. Terashi, J. Terning, R. S. Thorne, M. Titov, N. P. Tkachenko, D. R. Tovey, K. Trabelsi, P. Urquijo, G. Valencia, R. Van de Water, N. Varelas, G. Venanzoni, L. Verde, I. Vivarelli, P. Vogel, W. Vogelsang, V. Vorobyev, S. P. Wakely, W. Walkowiak, C. W. Walter, D. Wands, D. H. Weinberg, E. J. Weinberg, N. Wermes, M. White, L. R. Wiencke, S. Willocq, C. G. Wohl, C. L. Woody, W.-M. Yao, M. Yokoyama, R. Yoshida, G. Zanderighi, G. P. Zeller, O. V. Zenin, R.-Y. Zhu, S.-L. Zhu, F. Zimmermann, and P. A. Zyla, “Review of Particle Physics,” *Progress of Theoretical and Experimental Physics*, vol. 2022, no. 8, p. 083C01, 08 2022. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1093/ptep/ptac097>
- [15] K. Gui, T. Tomesh, P. Gokhale, Y. Shi, F. T. Chong, M. Martonosi, and M. Suchara, “Term grouping and travelling salesperson for digital quantum simulation,” 2021. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2001.05983>
- [16] M. B. Hastings, D. Wecker, B. Bauer, and M. Troyer, “Improving quantum algorithms for quantum chemistry,” *Quantum Info. Comput.*, vol. 15, no. 1–2, p. 1–21, jan 2015. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.1403.1539>
- [17] W. Hu, H. An, Z. Guo, Q. Jiang, X. Qin, J. Chen, W. Jia, C. Yang, Z. Luo, J. Li, W. Wu, G. Tan, D. Jia, Q. Lu, F. Liu, M. Tian, F. Li, Y. Huang, L. Wang, S. Liu, and J. Yang, “2.5 million-atom ab initio electronic-structure simulation of complex metallic heterostructures with dgdf,” in *SC22: International Conference for High Performance Computing, Networking, Storage and Analysis*, 2022, pp. 1–13.
- [18] A. Javadi-Abhari, M. Treinish, K. Krulic, C. J. Wood, J. Lishman, J. Gacon, S. Martiel, P. D. Nation, L. S. Bishop, A. W. Cross, B. R. Johnson, and J. M. Gambetta, “Quantum computing with Qiskit,” 2024.
- [19] Z. Jiang, A. Kalev, W. Mruczkiewicz, and H. Neven, “Optimal fermion-to-qubit mapping via ternary trees with applications to reduced quantum states learning,” *Quantum*, vol. 4, p. 276, Jun. 2020. [Online]. Available: <http://dx.doi.org/10.22331/q-2020-06-04-276>
- [20] P. Jordan and E. Wigner, “Über das paulische äquivalenzverbot,” *Zeitschrift für Physik*, vol. 47, no. 9, pp. 631–651, Sep 1928. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01331938>
- [21] S. Kim, J. Chen, T. Cheng, A. Gindulyte, J. He, S. He, Q. Li, B. A. Shoemaker, P. A. Thiessen, B. Yu, L. Zaslavsky, J. Zhang, and E. E. Bolton, “PubChem 2023 update,” *Nucleic Acids Research*, vol. 51, no. D1, pp. D1373–D1380, 10 2022. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1093/nar/gkac956>
- [22] G. Li, A. Wu, Y. Shi, A. Javadi-Abhari, Y. Ding, and Y. Xie, “Paulihedral: a generalized block-wise compiler optimization framework for quantum simulation kernels,” in *Proceedings of the 27th ACM International Conference on Architectural Support for Programming Languages and Operating Systems*, ser. ASPLOS ’22. New York, NY, USA: Association for Computing Machinery, 2022, p. 554–569. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1145/3503222.3507715>
- [23] Y. Liu, S. Che, J. Zhou, Y. Shi, and G. Li, “Fermihedral: On the optimal compilation for fermion-to-qubit encoding,” in *Proceedings of the 29th ACM International Conference on Architectural Support for Programming Languages and Operating Systems, Volume 3*, ser. ASPLOS ’24. New York, NY, USA: Association for Computing Machinery, 2024, p. 382–397. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1145/3620666.3651371>
- [24] D. McQuarrie, *Quantum Chemistry*. University Science Books, 2008. [Online]. Available: <https://books.google.com/books?id=zzxLTIjQB4C>
- [25] A. Miller, Z. Zimborás, S. Knecht, S. Maniscalco, and G. García-Pérez, “Bonsai algorithm: Grow your own fermion-to-qubit mappings,” *PRX Quantum*, vol. 4, no. 3, Aug. 2023. [Online]. Available: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1103/PRXQuantum.4.030314>
- [26] A. Molavi, A. Xu, M. Diges, L. Pick, S. Tannu, and A. Albarghouthi, “Qubit Mapping and Routing via MaxSAT,” Aug. 2022, arXiv:2208.13679 [quant-ph]. [Online]. Available: <http://arxiv.org/abs/2208.13679>
- [27] P. Murali, J. M. Baker, A. J. Abhari, F. T. Chong, and M. Martonosi, “Noise-adaptive compiler mappings for noisy intermediate-scale quantum computers,” 2019. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.1901.11054>
- [28] Y. Nam, N. J. Ross, Y. Su, A. M. Childs, and D. Maslov, “Automated optimization of large quantum circuits with continuous parameters,” *npj Quantum Information*, vol. 4, no. 1, may 2018. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1038/2Fs41534-018-0072-4>
- [29] M. A. Nielsen and I. L. Chuang, *Quantum Computation and Quantum Information: 10th Anniversary Edition*. Cambridge University Press, 2010. [Online]. Available: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511976667>
- [30] A. V. Patwardhan, M. J. Cervia, E. Rrapaj, P. Siwach, and A. B. Balantekin, *Many-Body Collective Neutrino Oscillations: Recent Developments*. Singapore: Springer Nature Singapore, 2020, pp. 1–16. [Online]. Available: https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-15-8818-1_126-1
- [31] W. Pauli, “Über den zusammenhang des abschlusses der elektronengruppen im atom mit der komplexstruktur der spektren,” *Zeitschrift für Physik*, vol. 31, no. 1, pp. 765–783, Feb 1925. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02980631>
- [32] J. J. Sakurai and J. Napolitano, *Modern Quantum Mechanics*, 3rd ed. Cambridge University Press, 2020.
- [33] K. Setia, S. Bravyi, A. Mezzacapo, and J. D. Whitfield, “Superfast encodings for fermionic quantum simulation,” *Phys. Rev. Res.*, vol. 1, p. 033033, Oct 2019. [Online]. Available: <https://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevResearch.1.033033>
- [34] S. Sivarajah, S. Dilkes, A. Cowtan, W. Simmons, A. Edgington, and R. Duncan, “[t]ket: a retargetable compiler for nisq devices,” *Quantum Science and Technology*, vol. 6, no. 1, p. 014003, nov 2020. [Online]. Available: <https://dx.doi.org/10.1088/2058-9565/ab8e92>
- [35] M. Soeken and M. K. Thomsen, “White dots do matter: Rewriting reversible logic circuits,” in *Proceedings of the 5th International Conference on Reversible Computation*, ser. RC’13. Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer-Verlag, 2013, p. 196–208.

- [Online]. Available: https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-38986-3_16
- [36] Q. Sun, T. C. Berkelbach, N. S. Blunt, G. H. Booth, S. Guo, Z. Li, J. Liu, J. D. McClain, E. R. Sayfutyarova, S. Sharma, S. Wouters, and G. K.-L. Chan, "Pyscf: the python-based simulations of chemistry framework," *WIREs Computational Molecular Science*, vol. 8, no. 1, p. e1340, 2018. [Online]. Available: <https://wires.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1002/wcms.1340>
- [37] H. F. Trotter, "On the product of semi-groups of operators," *Proceedings of the American Mathematical Society*, vol. 10, no. 4, pp. 545–551, 1959. [Online]. Available: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2033649>
- [38] A. M. van de Griend and R. Duncan, "Architecture-aware synthesis of phase polynomials for nisq devices," 2020. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.4204/EPTCS.394.8>
- [39] E. van den Berg and K. Temme, "Circuit optimization of hamiltonian simulation by simultaneous diagonalization of pauli clusters," *Quantum*, vol. 4, p. 322, sep 2020. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.22331/q-2020-09-12-322>