

Fermionic partial tomography via classical shadows

Andrew Zhao,¹ Nicholas C. Rubin,² and Akimasa Miyake¹

¹*Center for Quantum Information and Control, Department of Physics and Astronomy, University of New Mexico, Albuquerque, New Mexico 87106, USA*

²*Google Research, Mountain View, California, 94043, USA*

(Dated: July 27, 2021)

We propose a tomographic protocol for estimating any k -body reduced density matrix (k -RDM) of an n -mode fermionic state, a ubiquitous step in near-term quantum algorithms for simulating many-body physics, chemistry, and materials. Our approach extends the framework of classical shadows, a randomized approach to learning a collection of quantum-state properties, to the fermionic setting. Our sampling protocol uses randomized measurement settings generated by a discrete group of fermionic Gaussian unitaries, implementable with linear-depth circuits. We prove that estimating all k -RDM elements to additive precision ε requires on the order of $\binom{n}{k} k^{3/2} \log(n)/\varepsilon^2$ repeated state preparations, which is optimal up to the logarithmic factor. Furthermore, numerical calculations show that our protocol offers a substantial improvement in constant overheads for $k \geq 2$, as compared to prior deterministic strategies. We also adapt our method to particle-number symmetry, wherein the additional circuit depth may be halved at the cost of roughly 2–5 times more repetitions.

Introduction.—One of the most promising applications of quantum computation is the study of strongly correlated systems such as interacting fermions. While quantum algorithms such as phase estimation [1, 2] allow for directly computing important quantities like ground-state energies with quantum speedup [3–5], current hardware limitations [6] have directed much attention toward variational methods. Of note is the variational quantum eigensolver (VQE) [7, 8], where short-depth quantum circuits are repeatedly executed in order to estimate observable expectation values.

Initial bounds on the number of these circuit repetitions associated with fermionic two-body Hamiltonians were prohibitively high [9], spurring on much recent work addressing this problem. We roughly classify these strategies into two categories: those which specifically target energy estimates [8, 10–29], referred to as Hamiltonian averaging, and more general techniques which can learn the k -body reduced density matrices (k -RDMs) of a quantum state [30–44]. (Not all works fit neatly into this dichotomy, e.g., Refs. [45–50].) Hamiltonian averaging is ultimately interested in a single observable, allowing for heavy exploitation in its structure. In contrast, reconstructing an RDM requires estimating all the observables which parametrize it.

Though generally more expensive than Hamiltonian averaging, calculating the k -RDM allows one to determine the expectation value of any k -body observable [51]. For example, the electronic energy of chemical systems is a linear functional of the 2-RDM, while in condensed-matter systems, effective models for electrons can require knowledge of the 3-RDM [52, 53]. Beyond the energy, other important physical properties include pair-correlation functions and various order parameters [54, 55]. The 2-RDM is also required for a host of error-mitigation techniques for near-term quantum algorithms [13, 56, 57], which have been experimen-

tally demonstrated to be crucial in obtaining accurate results [58–61]. Additionally, promising extensions to VQE such as adaptive ansatz construction [62–65] and multireference- and excited-state calculations [56, 57, 66–69] can require up to the 4-RDM.

Motivated by these considerations, in this work we focus on partial tomography for fermionic RDMs. While numerous works have demonstrated essentially optimal sample complexity for estimating qubit RDMs [36, 37, 40–42], such approaches necessarily underperform in the fermionic setting. Recognizing this fundamental distinction, Bonet-Monroig *et al.* [37] and Jiang *et al.* [40] developed measurement schemes which achieve optimal scaling for fermions. However, the former construction is not readily generalizable for $k > 2$, while the latter requires a doubling in the number of qubits and a specific choice of fermion-to-qubit mapping.

In this Letter, we propose a *randomized* scheme which is free from these obstacles. It is based on the theory of classical shadows [42]: a protocol of randomly distributed measurements from which one acquires a partial classical representation of an unknown quantum state (its “shadow”). Classical shadows are sufficient for learning a limited collection of observables, making this framework ideal for partial state tomography. Our key results identify efficient choices for the ensemble of random measurements, suitable for the structure of fermionic RDMs.

Fermionic RDMs.—Consider a fixed-particle state ρ represented in second quantization on n fermion modes. The k -RDM of ρ , obtained by tracing out all but k particles, is typically represented as a $2k$ -index tensor,

$${}^k D_{q_1 \dots q_k}^{p_1 \dots p_k} := \text{tr}(a_{p_1}^\dagger \dots a_{p_k}^\dagger a_{q_k} \dots a_{q_1} \rho), \quad (1)$$

where a_p^\dagger, a_p are fermionic creation and annihilation operators, $p \in \{0, \dots, n-1\}$. By linearity, these matrix elements may be equivalently expressed using Majorana

operators, starting with the definitions

$$\gamma_{2p} := a_p + a_p^\dagger, \quad \gamma_{2p+1} := -i(a_p - a_p^\dagger). \quad (2)$$

Then for each $2k$ -combination $\boldsymbol{\mu} \equiv (\mu_1, \dots, \mu_{2k})$, where $0 \leq \mu_1 < \dots < \mu_{2k} \leq 2n - 1$, we define a $2k$ -degree Majorana operator

$$\Gamma_{\boldsymbol{\mu}} := (-i)^k \gamma_{\mu_1} \cdots \gamma_{\mu_{2k}}. \quad (3)$$

All unique $2k$ -degree Majorana operators are indexed by the set of all $2k$ -combinations of $\{0, \dots, 2n - 1\}$, which we shall denote by $\mathcal{C}_{2n, 2k}$. Since Majorana operators possess the same algebraic properties as Pauli operators (Hermitian, self-inverse, and Hilbert–Schmidt orthogonal), any fermion-to-qubit encoding maps between the two in a one-to-one correspondence.

The commutativity structure inherited onto $\mathcal{C}_{2n, 2k}$ constrains the maximum number of mutually commuting (hence simultaneously measurable) operators to be $\mathcal{O}(n^k)$ [37]. As there are $\mathcal{O}(n^{2k})$ independent k -RDM elements, this implies an optimal scaling of $\mathcal{O}(n^k)$ measurement settings to account for all matrix elements.

Classical shadows and randomized measurements.—We briefly review the framework of classical shadows introduced by Huang *et al.* [42], upon which we build our fermionic extension and prove sampling bounds. Let ρ be an n -qubit state and $\{O_1, \dots, O_L\}$ a set of L traceless observables for which we wish to learn $\text{tr}(O_1\rho), \dots, \text{tr}(O_L\rho)$. Classical shadows require a simple measurement primitive: for each preparation of ρ , apply the unitary map $\rho \mapsto U\rho U^\dagger$, where U is randomly drawn from some ensemble \mathcal{U} ; then perform a projective measurement in the computational basis, $\{|z\rangle \mid z \in \{0, 1\}^n\}$.

Suppose we have an efficient classical representation for inverting the unitary map on postmeasurement states, yielding $U^\dagger|z\rangle\langle z|U$. Then the process of repeatedly applying the measurement primitive and classically inverting the unitary may be viewed, in expectation, as the quantum channel

$$\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{U}}(\rho) := \mathbb{E}_{U \sim \mathcal{U}, |z\rangle \sim U\rho U^\dagger} [U^\dagger|z\rangle\langle z|U], \quad (4)$$

where $|z\rangle \sim U\rho U^\dagger$ is defined by the usual probability distribution from Born’s rule, $\Pr[|z\rangle \mid U\rho U^\dagger] = \langle z|U\rho U^\dagger|z\rangle$. Informational completeness of \mathcal{U} ensures that this channel is invertible, which allows us to define the classical shadow

$$\hat{\rho}_{U,z} := \mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{U}}^{-1}(U^\dagger|z\rangle\langle z|U) \quad (5)$$

associated with the particular copy of ρ for which U was applied and $|z\rangle$ was obtained. Classical shadows form an unbiased estimator for ρ , and so they can be used to estimate the expectation value of any observable O :

$$\mathbb{E}_{U \sim \mathcal{U}, |z\rangle \sim U\rho U^\dagger} [\text{tr}(O\hat{\rho}_{U,z})] = \text{tr}(O\rho). \quad (6)$$

The number of repetitions M required to obtain an accurate estimate for each $\text{tr}(O_j\rho)$ is controlled by the estimator’s variance, which may be upper bounded by

$$\max_{\text{states } \sigma} \mathbb{E}_{U \sim \mathcal{U}} \mathbb{E}_{|z\rangle \sim U\sigma U^\dagger} [\langle z|U\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{U}}^{-1}(O_j)U^\dagger|z\rangle^2] =: \|O_j\|_{\mathcal{U}}^2. \quad (7)$$

This quantity is referred to as the (squared) shadow norm. Then by median-of-means estimation, one may show that

$$M = \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{\log L}{\varepsilon^2} \max_{1 \leq j \leq L} \|O_j\|_{\mathcal{U}}^2\right) \quad (8)$$

samples suffice to estimate all expectation values to within additive error ε . To minimize Eq. (8) for a fixed collection of observables, the only available freedom is in \mathcal{U} . One must therefore properly choose the ensemble of unitaries, with respect to the target observables.

Naive application to fermionic observables.—A natural ensemble for near-term considerations is the group of single-qubit Clifford gates, $\text{Cl}(1)^{\otimes n}$ (i.e., Pauli measurements). For an ℓ -local Pauli observable P , Huang *et al.* [42] showed that $\|P\|_{\text{Cl}(1)^{\otimes n}}^2 = 3^\ell$, similar to the results of prior approaches also based on Pauli measurements [36, 37, 40, 41]. While optimal for qubit ℓ -RDMs, such strategies cannot achieve the desired $\mathcal{O}(n^k)$ scaling in the fermionic setting due to the inherent nonlocality of fermion-to-qubit mappings. Indeed, assuming that the n fermion modes are encoded into n qubits, the 1-degree Majorana operators necessarily possess an average qubit locality of at least $\log_3(2n)$ [40]. This implies that, under random Pauli measurements, the squared shadow norm maximized over all $2k$ -degree Majorana operators cannot do better than $3^{2k \log_3(2n)} = 4^k n^{2k}$. In fact, for commonly used mappings such as the Jordan–Wigner [70] or Bravyi–Kitaev [71–74] transformations, the scalings are poorer (3^n and $\sim 9^k n^{3 \cdot 2k}$, respectively).

Randomized measurements with fermionic Gaussian unitaries.—In order to obtain optimal scaling in the shadow norm for fermionic observables, we propose randomizing over a different ensemble: the group of fermionic Gaussian Clifford unitaries. First, the group of fermionic Gaussian unitaries $\text{FGU}(n)$ comprises all unitaries of the form

$$U(e^A) := \exp\left(-\frac{1}{4} \sum_{\mu, \nu=0}^{2n-1} A_{\mu\nu} \gamma_\mu \gamma_\nu\right), \quad (9)$$

where $A = -A^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{2n \times 2n}$. This condition implies that $\text{FGU}(n)$ is fully characterized by the Lie group $\text{SO}(2n)$ [75]. In particular, the adjoint action

$$U(Q)^\dagger \gamma_\mu U(Q) = \sum_{\nu=0}^{2n-1} Q_{\mu\nu} \gamma_\nu \quad \forall Q \in \text{SO}(2n) \quad (10)$$

allows for efficient classical simulation of this group [76–80]. Second, the Clifford group $\text{Cl}(n)$ is the set of all uni-

tary transformations which permute n -qubit Pauli operators among themselves. It also admits an efficient classical representation [81, 82].

Since Majorana operators are equivalent to Pauli operators, we may deduce from Eq. (10) that a unitary which is both Gaussian and Clifford corresponds to Q being a signed permutation matrix. Note that this defines the full group of Majorana swap circuits [37]. As the signs are irrelevant for our purpose, we simply consider the group of $2n \times 2n$ permutation matrices with determinant 1, known as (the faithful matrix representation of) the alternating group, $\text{Alt}(2n)$.

Concretely, we set

$$\mathcal{U}_{\text{FGU}} := \{U(Q) \in \text{FGU}(n) \mid Q \in \text{Alt}(2n)\}. \quad (11)$$

Given the context of fermionic tomography, the motivation for studying $\text{FGU}(n)$ is clear, as it preserves the degree of Majorana operators. On the other hand, the restriction to the discrete Clifford elements is valuable for practical considerations. As we show in Sec. II of the Supplemental Material (SM) [83], the permutational property of Clifford transformations necessarily implies that \mathcal{M}_{FGU} , as a linear map on the algebra of fermionic observables, is diagonal in the Majorana-operator basis,

$$\mathcal{M}_{\text{FGU}}(\Gamma_{\mu}) = \lambda_{\mu} \Gamma_{\mu} \quad \forall \mu \in \mathcal{C}_{2n,2k}, \quad (12)$$

with eigenvalues

$$\lambda_{\mu} = \binom{n}{k} / \binom{2n}{2k} \equiv \lambda_{n,k}. \quad (13)$$

In this diagonal form, the channel is readily invertible. Thus one may obtain closed-form expressions for the classical shadows $\hat{\rho}_{Q,z}$, and, importantly, their corresponding estimators for $\text{tr}(\Gamma_{\mu}\rho)$:

$$\text{tr}(\Gamma_{\mu}\hat{\rho}_{Q,z}) = \lambda_{n,k}^{-1} \sum_{\nu \in \mathcal{C}_{2n,2k}} \langle z | \Gamma_{\nu} | z \rangle \det[Q_{\nu,\mu}]. \quad (14)$$

Here, $Q_{\nu,\mu}$ denotes the submatrix of Q formed from its rows and columns indexed by ν and μ , respectively [98]. Since Q is a permutation matrix, for each μ there is exactly one ν' such that $\det[Q_{\nu',\mu}] \neq 0$. Thus Eq. (14) is nonzero if and only if that $\Gamma_{\nu'}$ is diagonal (i.e., maps to a Pauli- Z operator under a fermion-to-qubit transformation). In other words, the Clifford operation $U(Q)$ sends Γ_{μ} to $\pm\Gamma_{\nu'}$, which can be estimated only if it is diagonal in the computational basis.

From Eq. (7), the eigenvalues $\lambda_{n,k}^{-1}$ of the inverse channel $\mathcal{M}_{\text{FGU}}^{-1}$ determine the shadow norm. The sample complexity of our approach then follows from Eq. (8). We summarize this first key result with the following theorem.

Theorem 1. *Consider all $2k$ -degree Majorana operators Γ_{μ} on n fermionic modes, labeled by $\mu \in \mathcal{C}_{2n,2k}$. Under*

the ensemble \mathcal{U}_{FGU} defined in Eq. (11), the shadow norm satisfies

$$\|\Gamma_{\mu}\|_{\text{FGU}}^2 = \binom{2n}{2k} / \binom{n}{k} \approx \binom{n}{k} \sqrt{\pi k} \quad (15)$$

for all $\mu \in \mathcal{C}_{2n,2k}$. Thus the method of classical shadows estimates the fermionic k -RDM of any state ρ , i.e., $\text{tr}(\Gamma_{\mu}\rho) \forall \mu \in \bigcup_{j=1}^k \mathcal{C}_{2n,2j}$, to additive error ε , given

$$M = \mathcal{O}\left[\binom{n}{k} \frac{k^{3/2} \log n}{\varepsilon^2}\right] \quad (16)$$

copies of ρ . Additionally, there is no subgroup $G \subset \text{FGU}(n) \cap \text{Cl}(n)$ for which $\|\Gamma_{\mu}\|_G < \|\Gamma_{\mu}\|_{\text{FGU}}$.

The proof is presented in the SM, Sec. II [83]. Furthermore, noting from Eq. (14) that $|\text{tr}(\Gamma_{\mu}\hat{\rho}_{Q,z})| \leq \lambda_{n,k}^{-1}$, we also show in the SM that Bernstein's inequality [99] guarantees the above sample complexity via standard sample-mean estimation, rather than requiring the median-of-means technique proposed in the original work on classical shadows [42].

This result has an intuitive conceptual interpretation. In the computational basis, there are precisely $\binom{n}{k}$ diagonal Majorana operators within $\mathcal{C}_{2n,2k}$, corresponding to the unique k -fold products of occupation-number operators (e.g., $\prod_{j=1}^k a_{p_j}^{\dagger} a_{p_j}$) on n modes. As a permutation on $\mathcal{C}_{2n,2k}$, each element of \mathcal{U}_{FGU} defines a different basis in which some other subset of $\binom{n}{k}$ operators are diagonal. Then, one may expect to account for all $|\mathcal{C}_{2n,2k}| = \binom{2n}{2k}$ Majorana operators by randomly selecting on the order of $\binom{2n}{2k} / \binom{n}{k}$ such bases; Theorem 1 makes this claim rigorous.

Fermionic Gaussian circuits have a well-studied compilation scheme based on a Givens-rotation decomposition [100–102]. For a general element of \mathcal{U}_{FGU} , we require a circuit depth of at most $2n$ with respect to this decomposition [102]. Additionally, as pointed out in Ref. [37], Gaussian unitaries commute with the global parity operator $\Gamma_{(0,\dots,2n-1)}$, allowing for error mitigation via symmetry verification [103, 104].

Such compilation schemes make use of a group homomorphism property, $U(Q_1)U(Q_2) = U(Q_1Q_2)$. Therefore, if the circuit preparing ρ itself features fermionic Gaussian operations at the end, then we may further compile the measurement unitary into the state-preparation circuit [57]. In the case of indefinite particle number, this concatenation is essentially free. However, rotations with particle-number symmetry have depth at most n [101, 102], so they must be embedded into the larger Gaussian unitary of depth $2n$. This observation motivates us to explore classical shadows over the number-conserving (NC) subgroup of $\text{FGU}(n)$.

Modification based on particle-number symmetry.—Fermionic Gaussian unitaries which preserve particle

number are naturally parametrized by $U(n)$. We express an element of this NC subgroup as

$$U(e^\kappa) := \exp\left(\sum_{p,q=0}^{n-1} \kappa_{pq} a_p^\dagger a_q\right), \quad (17)$$

where $\kappa = -\kappa^\dagger \in \mathbb{C}^{n \times n}$, hence $e^\kappa \in U(n)$. Since the particle-number symmetry manifests as a global phase factor $e^{\text{tr} \kappa/2} \in U(1)$, without loss of generality we may consider $\text{tr} \kappa = 0$, or equivalently, $e^\kappa \in \text{SU}(n)$. Such unitaries are also called orbital-basis rotations, owing to their adjoint action,

$$U(u)^\dagger a_p U(u) = \sum_{q=0}^{n-1} u_{pq} a_q \quad \forall u \in \text{SU}(n). \quad (18)$$

This action on Majorana operators follows by linear extension.

Taking the intersection with the Clifford group requires that u be an $n \times n$ generalized permutation matrix, with nonzero elements taking values in $\{\pm 1, \pm i\}$. This corresponds to the group of fermionic swap circuits [71, 101]. Again, the phase factors on the matrix elements are irrelevant, so we shall restrict to $u \in \text{Alt}(n)$. By itself, this ensemble is insufficient to perform tomography. To see this, consider an arbitrary reduced density operator $A_{\mathbf{p}}^\dagger A_{\mathbf{q}} := a_{p_1}^\dagger \cdots a_{p_k}^\dagger a_{q_k} \cdots a_{q_1}$, where $\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q} \in \mathcal{C}_{n,k}$. Such operators are diagonal in the computational basis only if $\mathbf{p} = \mathbf{q}$. Informational completeness thus requires that there exists some $U(u)$ which maps $A_{\mathbf{p}}^\dagger A_{\mathbf{q}}$ to $A_{\mathbf{r}}^\dagger A_{\mathbf{r}}$, for some $\mathbf{r} \in \mathcal{C}_{n,k}$. Since $u \in \text{Alt}(n)$, conjugation by $U(u)$ simply permutes \mathbf{p} and \mathbf{q} independently. However, as permutations are bijective, it is not possible to permute both \mathbf{p} and \mathbf{q} to the same \mathbf{r} if $\mathbf{p} \neq \mathbf{q}$.

Therefore, this ensemble will necessarily require operations beyond either the NC or Gaussian constraints. The simplest option for maintaining the low-depth structure of the basis rotations is to append Pauli measurements at the end of the circuit. While the resulting circuit no longer preserves particle number, this addition only incurs a single layer of single-qubit gates. Specifically, we define the ensemble

$$\mathcal{U}_{\text{NC}} := \{V \circ U(u) \mid V \in \text{Cl}(1)^{\otimes n}, u \in \text{Alt}(n)\}. \quad (19)$$

By virtue of introducing the notion of ‘‘single-qubit’’ gates, this method is dependent on the choice of fermion-to-qubit mapping. Let $\text{loc}(\Gamma_\mu)$ denote the qubit locality of Γ_μ under some chosen mapping. While Pauli measurements incur a factor of $3^{\text{loc}(\Gamma_\mu)}$ in the variance, the randomization over fermionic swap circuits effectively averages this quantity over all same-degree Majorana operators (rather than depending solely on the most nonlocal operator). Formally, we find that the shadow norm here is

$$\|\Gamma_\mu\|_{\text{NC}}^2 = \mathbb{E}_{u \sim \text{Alt}(n)} \left[3^{-\text{loc}[U(u)^\dagger \Gamma_\mu U(u)]} \right]^{-1}. \quad (20)$$

Although this expression does not possess a closed form, the following theorem provides a universal upper bound.

Theorem 2. *Under the ensemble \mathcal{U}_{NC} defined in Eq. (19), the shadow norm obeys*

$$\max_{\mu \in \mathcal{C}_{2n,2k}} \|\Gamma_\mu\|_{\text{NC}}^2 \leq 9^k \binom{n}{2k} / \binom{n-k}{k} = \mathcal{O}(n^k) \quad (21)$$

for a fixed integer k and for all fermion-to-qubit mappings. Thus the method of classical shadows with \mathcal{U}_{NC} estimates the k -RDM to additive error ε with sample complexity

$$M = \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{n^k \log n}{\varepsilon^2}\right). \quad (22)$$

We provide derivations for the above results in the SM, Sec. III [83]. Note that we have fixed k as a constant here, so the asymptotic notation may hide potentially large prefactors depending on k . To understand such details, we turn to numerical studies.

Numerical calculations.—Instead of drawing a new circuit for each repetition, here we employ a simplification more amenable to practical implementation. Fixing some integer $r \geq 1$, we generate a random collection $\{U^{(j)} \sim \mathcal{U}\}_{j=1}^{K_r}$ of K_r unitaries such that all target observables are covered at least r times. We say a Majorana operator Γ_μ is covered by the measurement unitary U if $U \Gamma_\mu U^\dagger$ is diagonal in the computational basis. Since the ensembles considered here consist of Gaussian and Clifford unitaries, we can determine all covered operators efficiently. Additionally, for the \mathcal{U}_{NC} calculations, the qubit mappings were automated through OpenFermion [105].

To achieve precision corresponding to $S = \mathcal{O}(1/\varepsilon^2)$ samples per observable, one repeats each circuit $\lceil S/r \rceil$ times. The total number of circuit repetitions for our randomized protocols is then $\lceil S/r \rceil K_r$. For practical purposes, we fix $r = 50$ in this work (see Sec. V of the SM for further details [83]). To compare against prior deterministic strategies, we compute $S \times C$ for each such strategy, where C is the number of sets of commuting observables constructed by a given strategy.

For the comparisons presented in Fig. 1, we focus on the most competitive prior strategies applicable to fermionic RDM tomography. Since the 1-RDM has a relatively simple structure, optimal strategies are known [37, 61], and so randomization underperforms for $k = 1$. However, the advantage of our \mathcal{U}_{FGU} -based method becomes clear for $k \geq 2$. When comparing against the Majorana clique cover, which features asymptotically optimal $\mathcal{O}(n^2)$ scaling for the 2-RDM [37], we find a roughly twofold factor improvement by our approach.

For the \mathcal{U}_{NC} case, we observe a trade-off between circuit size and measurement efficiency. As expected, the choice of fermion-to-qubit mapping matters here; the




FIG. 1. (Left): Summary of the methods compared here, cataloging their required circuit types and scalings in the number of measurement settings. Since graph-based methods [33–35, 38] are resource-intensive, we employ SORTED INSERTION [17] as a more tractable alternative. The Majorana clique cover [37], which employs the same class of fermionic Gaussian Clifford circuits as our classical shadows (FGU) unitaries, possesses optimal asymptotic scaling; however, it exhibits jumps at powers of 2 due to a divide-and-conquer approach. Furthermore, the construction only exists for $k \leq 2$. The measurement strategy using fermionic swap networks is a generalization of the optimal 1-RDM strategy introduced in Ref. [61], which we describe in Sec. IV of the SM [83]. (Right): Numerical performances (log-log scale). Note that SORTED INSERTION and the Majorana clique cover are equivalent for $k = 1$. Since our scheme uses randomization, we include error bars of 1 standard deviation, averaged over 10 instances. However, they are not visible at the scale of the plots, indicating the consistency of our method.

Jordan–Wigner (JW) mapping performs worse than Bravyi–Kitaev (BK), since the former possesses more qubit nonlocality. While more measurement settings are required compared to the \mathcal{U}_{FGU} ensemble (e.g., a factor of ~ 2 –5 under BK, depending on k), each circuit itself requires only half the depth of general fermionic Gaussian circuits. Notably, however, \mathcal{U}_{NC} classical shadows for the 2-RDM under the BK mapping is closely comparable to the Majorana clique cover.

Conclusions.—We have adapted the framework of classical shadows to the efficient tomography of fermionic k -RDMs, applicable for all k . Numerical calculations demonstrate that our approach consistently outperforms prior strategies using measurement circuits of comparable sizes when $k \geq 2$, despite the logarithmic factor in the sample complexity (a consequence of rigorously bounding the worst-case probabilistic instances). The power of randomization here lies in avoiding the NP-hard problem of partitioning observables into commuting cliques [32–35]. Instead, we show that a highly overlapping cover of the observables suffices to perform partial tomography efficiently, since a factor of $\mathcal{O}(1/\varepsilon^2)$ repetitions is already required for this task.

An outlook for further applications is to adapt these ensembles, e.g., for Hamiltonian averaging. As expected, our method is less efficient in this context than those tailored for the task (see Sec. V C of the SM for preliminary

numerical calculations [83]). Possible modifications may include biasing the distribution of unitaries [22, 27–29], or derandomization techniques [25].

We thank Hsin-Yuan (Robert) Huang and Charles Hadfield for helpful discussions. This work was supported partially by the National Science Foundation STAQ project (PHY-1818914), QLCI Q-SENSE award (OMA-2016244), CHE-2037832, and the U.S. Department of Energy, Office of Science, National Quantum Information Science Research Centers, Quantum Systems Accelerator. We acknowledge the use of high-performance computing resources provided by the UNM Center for Advanced Research Computing, supported in part by the National Science Foundation.

-
- [1] M. A. Nielsen and I. Chuang, *Quantum Computation and Quantum Information* (Cambridge University Press, 2010).
 - [2] A. Y. Kitaev, A. Shen, and M. N. Vyalyi, *Classical and Quantum Computation* (American Mathematical Society, 2002).
 - [3] D. S. Abrams and S. Lloyd, Quantum algorithm providing exponential speed increase for finding eigenvalues and eigenvectors, *Physical Review Letters* **83**, 5162 (1999).
 - [4] R. Somma, G. Ortiz, J. E. Gubernatis, E. Knill, and

- R. Laflamme, Simulating physical phenomena by quantum networks, *Physical Review A* **65**, 042323 (2002).
- [5] A. Aspuru-Guzik, A. D. Dutoi, P. J. Love, and M. Head-Gordon, Simulated quantum computation of molecular energies, *Science* **309**, 1704 (2005).
- [6] J. Preskill, Quantum computing in the NISQ era and beyond, *Quantum* **2**, 79 (2018).
- [7] A. Peruzzo, J. McClean, P. Shadbolt, M.-H. Yung, X.-Q. Zhou, P. J. Love, A. Aspuru-Guzik, and J. L. O'Brien, A variational eigenvalue solver on a photonic quantum processor, *Nature Communications* **5**, 4213 (2014).
- [8] J. R. McClean, J. Romero, R. Babbush, and A. Aspuru-Guzik, The theory of variational hybrid quantum-classical algorithms, *New Journal of Physics* **18**, 023023 (2016).
- [9] D. Wecker, M. B. Hastings, and M. Troyer, Progress towards practical quantum variational algorithms, *Physical Review A* **92**, 042303 (2015).
- [10] J. R. McClean, R. Babbush, P. J. Love, and A. Aspuru-Guzik, Exploiting locality in quantum computation for quantum chemistry, *The Journal of Physical Chemistry Letters* **5**, 4368 (2014).
- [11] A. Kandala, A. Mezzacapo, K. Temme, M. Takita, M. Brink, J. M. Chow, and J. M. Gambetta, Hardware-efficient variational quantum eigensolver for small molecules and quantum magnets, *Nature* **549**, 242 (2017).
- [12] R. Babbush, N. Wiebe, J. McClean, J. McClain, H. Neven, and G. K.-L. Chan, Low-depth quantum simulation of materials, *Physical Review X* **8**, 011044 (2018).
- [13] N. C. Rubin, R. Babbush, and J. McClean, Application of fermionic marginal constraints to hybrid quantum algorithms, *New Journal of Physics* **20**, 053020 (2018).
- [14] A. F. Izmaylov, T.-C. Yen, and I. G. Ryabinkin, Revising the measurement process in the variational quantum eigensolver: is it possible to reduce the number of separately measured operators?, *Chemical Science* **10**, 3746 (2019).
- [15] A. F. Izmaylov, T.-C. Yen, R. A. Lang, and V. Verteletskyi, Unitary partitioning approach to the measurement problem in the variational quantum eigensolver method, *Journal of Chemical Theory and Computation* **16**, 190 (2019).
- [16] W. J. Huggins, J. R. McClean, N. C. Rubin, Z. Jiang, N. Wiebe, K. B. Whaley, and R. Babbush, Efficient and noise resilient measurements for quantum chemistry on near-term quantum computers, *npj Quantum Information* **7**, 1 (2021).
- [17] O. Crawford, B. van Straaten, D. Wang, T. Parks, E. Campbell, and S. Brierley, Efficient quantum measurement of Pauli operators in the presence of finite sampling error, *Quantum* **5**, 385 (2021).
- [18] A. Zhao, A. Tranter, W. M. Kirby, S. F. Ung, A. Miyake, and P. J. Love, Measurement reduction in variational quantum algorithms, *Physical Review A* **101**, 062322 (2020).
- [19] G. Torlai, G. Mazzola, G. Carleo, and A. Mezzacapo, Precise measurement of quantum observables with neural-network estimators, *Physical Review Research* **2**, 022060 (2020).
- [20] A. Arrasmith, L. Cincio, R. D. Somma, and P. J. Coles, Operator sampling for shot-frugal optimization in variational algorithms, [arXiv:2004.06252](https://arxiv.org/abs/2004.06252) (2020).
- [21] M. Painsi, A. Kalev, D. Padilha, and B. Ruck, Estimating expectation values using approximate quantum states, *Quantum* **5**, 413 (2021).
- [22] C. Hadfield, S. Bravyi, R. Raymond, and A. Mezzacapo, Measurements of quantum Hamiltonians with locally-biased classical shadows, [arXiv:2006.15788](https://arxiv.org/abs/2006.15788) (2020).
- [23] T.-C. Yen and A. F. Izmaylov, Cartan sub-algebra approach to efficient measurements of quantum observables, [arXiv:2007.01234](https://arxiv.org/abs/2007.01234) (2020).
- [24] J. F. Gonthier, M. D. Radin, C. Buda, E. J. Duskocil, C. M. Abuan, and J. Romero, Identifying challenges towards practical quantum advantage through resource estimation: the measurement roadblock in the variational quantum eigensolver, [arXiv:2012.04001](https://arxiv.org/abs/2012.04001) (2020).
- [25] H.-Y. Huang, R. Kueng, and J. Preskill, Efficient estimation of Pauli observables by derandomization, *Physical Review Letters* **127**, 030503 (2021).
- [26] G. García-Pérez, M. A. Rossi, B. Sokolov, F. Tacchino, P. K. Barkoutsos, G. Mazzola, I. Tavernelli, and S. Maniscalco, Learning to measure: adaptive informationally complete POVMs for near-term quantum algorithms, [arXiv:2104.00569](https://arxiv.org/abs/2104.00569) (2021).
- [27] S. Hillmich, C. Hadfield, R. Raymond, A. Mezzacapo, and R. Wille, Decision diagrams for quantum measurements with shallow circuits, [arXiv:2105.06932](https://arxiv.org/abs/2105.06932) (2021).
- [28] C. Hadfield, Adaptive Pauli shadows for energy estimation, [arXiv:2105.12207](https://arxiv.org/abs/2105.12207) (2021).
- [29] B. Wu, J. Sun, Q. Huang, and X. Yuan, Overlapped grouping measurement: A unified framework for measuring quantum states, [arXiv:2105.13091](https://arxiv.org/abs/2105.13091) (2021).
- [30] S. Aaronson, Shadow tomography of quantum states, *SIAM Journal on Computing* **49**, 368 (2020); S. Aaronson, X. Chen, E. Hazan, S. Kale, and A. Nayak, Online learning of quantum states, in *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* (2018) pp. 8962–8972; S. Aaronson and G. N. Rothblum, Gentle measurement of quantum states and differential privacy, in *Proceedings of the 51st Annual ACM SIGACT Symposium on Theory of Computing* (2019) pp. 322–333.
- [31] N. Yu, Quantum closeness testing: a streaming algorithm and applications, [arXiv:1904.03218](https://arxiv.org/abs/1904.03218) (2019); Sample efficient tomography via Pauli measurements, [arXiv:2009.04610](https://arxiv.org/abs/2009.04610) (2020).
- [32] V. Verteletskyi, T.-C. Yen, and A. F. Izmaylov, Measurement optimization in the variational quantum eigensolver using a minimum clique cover, *The Journal of Chemical Physics* **152**, 124114 (2020).
- [33] A. Jena, S. Genin, and M. Mosca, Pauli partitioning with respect to gate sets, [arXiv:1907.07859](https://arxiv.org/abs/1907.07859) (2019).
- [34] T.-C. Yen, V. Verteletskyi, and A. F. Izmaylov, Measuring all compatible operators in one series of single-qubit measurements using unitary transformations, *Journal of Chemical Theory and Computation* **16**, 2400 (2020).
- [35] P. Gokhale, O. Angiuli, Y. Ding, K. Gui, T. Tomesh, M. Suchara, M. Martonosi, and F. T. Chong, Minimizing state preparations in variational quantum eigensolver by partitioning into commuting families, [arXiv:1907.13623](https://arxiv.org/abs/1907.13623) (2019); $O(N^3)$ measurement cost for variational quantum eigensolver on molecular Hamiltonians, *IEEE Transactions on Quantum Engineering* **1**, 1 (2020).
- [36] J. Cotler and F. Wilczek, Quantum overlapping tomography, *Physical Review Letters* **124**, 100401 (2020).

- [37] X. Bonet-Monroig, R. Babbush, and T. E. O'Brien, Nearly optimal measurement scheduling for partial tomography of quantum states, *Physical Review X* **10**, 031064 (2020).
- [38] I. Hamamura and T. Imamichi, Efficient evaluation of quantum observables using entangled measurements, *npj Quantum Information* **6**, 1 (2020).
- [39] G. García-Pérez, M. A. Rossi, B. Sokolov, E.-M. Borrelli, and S. Maniscalco, Pairwise tomography networks for many-body quantum systems, *Physical Review Research* **2**, 023393 (2020).
- [40] Z. Jiang, A. Kalev, W. Mruzckiewicz, and H. Neven, Optimal fermion-to-qubit mapping via ternary trees with applications to reduced quantum states learning, *Quantum* **4**, 276 (2020).
- [41] T. J. Evans, R. Harper, and S. T. Flammia, Scalable Bayesian Hamiltonian learning, [arXiv:1912.07636](https://arxiv.org/abs/1912.07636) (2019).
- [42] H.-Y. Huang, R. Kueng, and J. Preskill, Predicting many properties of a quantum system from very few measurements, *Nature Physics* **16**, 1050 (2020).
- [43] S. E. Smart and D. A. Mazziotti, Lowering tomography costs in quantum simulation with a symmetry projected operator basis, *Physical Review A* **103**, 012420 (2021).
- [44] J. Tilly, P. Sriluckshmy, A. Patel, E. Fontana, I. Rungger, E. Grant, R. Anderson, J. Tennyson, and G. H. Booth, Reduced density matrix sampling: Self-consistent embedding and multiscale electronic structure on current generation quantum computers, [arXiv:2104.05531](https://arxiv.org/abs/2104.05531) (2021).
- [45] A. W. Harrow and J. C. Napp, Low-depth gradient measurements can improve convergence in variational hybrid quantum-classical algorithms, *Physical Review Letters* **126**, 140502 (2021).
- [46] D. Wang, O. Higgott, and S. Brierley, Accelerated variational quantum eigensolver, *Physical Review Letters* **122**, 140504 (2019).
- [47] J. M. Kübler, A. Arrasmith, L. Cincio, and P. J. Coles, An adaptive optimizer for measurement-frugal variational algorithms, *Quantum* **4**, 263 (2020).
- [48] R. Sweke, F. Wilde, J. J. Meyer, M. Schuld, P. K. Fährmann, B. Meynard-Piganeau, and J. Eisert, Stochastic gradient descent for hybrid quantum-classical optimization, *Quantum* **4**, 314 (2020).
- [49] B. van Straaten and B. Koczor, Measurement cost of metric-aware variational quantum algorithms, [arXiv:2005.05172](https://arxiv.org/abs/2005.05172) (2020).
- [50] G. Wang, D. E. Koh, P. D. Johnson, and Y. Cao, Minimizing estimation runtime on noisy quantum computers, *PRX Quantum* **2**, 010346 (2021).
- [51] A. Coleman and I. Absar, Reduced Hamiltonian orbitals. III. Unitarily invariant decomposition of Hermitian operators, *International Journal of Quantum Chemistry* **18**, 1279 (1980).
- [52] S. Tsuneyuki, Transcorrelated method: another possible way towards electronic structure calculation of solids, *Progress of Theoretical Physics Supplement* **176**, 134 (2008).
- [53] M. R. Peterson and C. Nayak, More realistic Hamiltonians for the fractional quantum Hall regime in GaAs and graphene, *Physical Review B* **87**, 245129 (2013).
- [54] D. A. Mazziotti, Two-electron reduced density matrix as the basic variable in many-electron quantum chemistry and physics, *Chemical Reviews* **112**, 244 (2012).
- [55] F. Jensen, *Introduction to Computational Chemistry* (John Wiley & Sons, 2017).
- [56] J. R. McClean, M. E. Kimchi-Schwartz, J. Carter, and W. A. De Jong, Hybrid quantum-classical hierarchy for mitigation of decoherence and determination of excited states, *Physical Review A* **95**, 042308 (2017).
- [57] T. Takeshita, N. C. Rubin, Z. Jiang, E. Lee, R. Babbush, and J. R. McClean, Increasing the representation accuracy of quantum simulations of chemistry without extra quantum resources, *Physical Review X* **10**, 011004 (2020).
- [58] J. I. Colless, V. V. Ramasesh, D. Dahlen, M. S. Blok, M. Kimchi-Schwartz, J. McClean, J. Carter, W. De Jong, and I. Siddiqi, Computation of molecular spectra on a quantum processor with an error-resilient algorithm, *Physical Review X* **8**, 011021 (2018).
- [59] R. Sagastizabal, X. Bonet-Monroig, M. Singh, M. A. Rol, C. Bultink, X. Fu, C. Price, V. Ostroukh, N. Muthusubramanian, A. Bruno, *et al.*, Experimental error mitigation via symmetry verification in a variational quantum eigensolver, *Physical Review A* **100**, 010302 (2019).
- [60] A. J. McCaskey, Z. P. Parks, J. Jakowski, S. V. Moore, T. D. Morris, T. S. Humble, and R. C. Pooser, Quantum chemistry as a benchmark for near-term quantum computers, *npj Quantum Information* **5**, 1 (2019).
- [61] Google AI Quantum and Collaborators, Hartree-Fock on a superconducting qubit quantum computer, *Science* **369**, 1084 (2020).
- [62] H. R. Grimsley, S. E. Economou, E. Barnes, and N. J. Mayhall, An adaptive variational algorithm for exact molecular simulations on a quantum computer, *Nature Communications* **10**, 1 (2019).
- [63] I. G. Ryabinkin, R. A. Lang, S. N. Genin, and A. F. Izmaylov, Iterative qubit coupled cluster approach with efficient screening of generators, *Journal of Chemical Theory and Computation* **16**, 1055 (2020).
- [64] H. L. Tang, V. Shkolnikov, G. S. Barron, H. R. Grimsley, N. J. Mayhall, E. Barnes, and S. E. Economou, Qubit-ADAPT-VQE: an adaptive algorithm for constructing hardware-efficient ansätze on a quantum processor, *PRX Quantum* **2**, 020310 (2021).
- [65] Q. Wang, M. Li, C. Monroe, and Y. Nam, Resource-optimized fermionic local-hamiltonian simulation on quantum computer for quantum chemistry, [arXiv:2004.04151](https://arxiv.org/abs/2004.04151) (2020).
- [66] R. M. Parrish, E. G. Hohenstein, P. L. McMahon, and T. J. Martínez, Quantum computation of electronic transitions using a variational quantum eigensolver, *Physical Review Letters* **122**, 230401 (2019).
- [67] W. J. Huggins, J. Lee, U. Baek, B. O'Gorman, and K. B. Whaley, A non-orthogonal variational quantum eigensolver, *New Journal of Physics* **22**, 073009 (2020).
- [68] N. H. Stair, R. Huang, and F. A. Evangelista, A multireference quantum Krylov algorithm for strongly correlated electrons, *Journal of Chemical Theory and Computation* **16**, 2236 (2020).
- [69] M. Urbanek, D. Camps, R. Van Beeumen, and W. A. de Jong, Chemistry on quantum computers with virtual quantum subspace expansion, *Journal of Chemical Theory and Computation* **16**, 5425 (2020).
- [70] P. Jordan and E. Wigner, Über das Paulische Äquivalenzverbot, *Z. Phys.* **47**, 631 (1928).
- [71] S. B. Bravyi and A. Y. Kitaev, Fermionic quantum com-

- putation, *Annals of Physics* **298**, 210 (2002).
- [72] J. T. Seeley, M. J. Richard, and P. J. Love, The Bravyi-Kitaev transformation for quantum computation of electronic structure, *The Journal of Chemical Physics* **137**, 224109 (2012).
- [73] A. Tranter, S. Sofia, J. Seeley, M. Kaicher, J. McClean, R. Babbush, P. V. Coveney, F. Mintert, F. Wilhelm, and P. J. Love, The Bravyi–Kitaev transformation: properties and applications, *International Journal of Quantum Chemistry* **115**, 1431 (2015).
- [74] V. Havlíček, M. Troyer, and J. D. Whitfield, Operator locality in the quantum simulation of fermionic models, *Physical Review A* **95**, 032332 (2017).
- [75] D. Sattinger and O. Weaver, *Lie Groups and Algebras with Applications to Physics, Geometry, and Mechanics* (Springer-Verlag New York, 1986).
- [76] E. Knill, Fermionic linear optics and matchgates, [arXiv:quant-ph/0108033](https://arxiv.org/abs/quant-ph/0108033) (2001).
- [77] B. M. Terhal and D. P. DiVincenzo, Classical simulation of noninteracting-fermion quantum circuits, *Physical Review A* **65**, 032325 (2002).
- [78] S. Bravyi, Lagrangian representation for fermionic linear optics, *Quantum Information and Computation* **5**, 216 (2005).
- [79] D. P. DiVincenzo and B. M. Terhal, Fermionic linear optics revisited, *Foundations of Physics* **35**, 1967 (2005).
- [80] R. Jozsa and A. Miyake, Matchgates and classical simulation of quantum circuits, *Proceedings of the Royal Society A: Mathematical, Physical and Engineering Sciences* **464**, 3089 (2008).
- [81] D. Gottesman, The Heisenberg representation of quantum computers, [arXiv:quant-ph/9807006](https://arxiv.org/abs/quant-ph/9807006) (1998).
- [82] S. Aaronson and D. Gottesman, Improved simulation of stabilizer circuits, *Physical Review A* **70**, 052328 (2004).
- [83] See Supplemental Material at [url] for proofs of Theorems 1 and 2, the derivation of the fermionic swap network method, and additional numerical calculations, which includes Refs. [84–97].
- [84] R. F. Streater and A. S. Wightman, *PCT, Spin and Statistics, and All That* (Princeton University Press, 2000).
- [85] M. Steudtner and S. Wehner, Fermion-to-qubit mappings with varying resource requirements for quantum simulation, *New Journal of Physics* **20**, 063010 (2018).
- [86] J. Lawrence, Č. Brukner, and A. Zeilinger, Mutually unbiased binary observable sets on N qubits, *Physical Review A* **65**, 032320 (2002).
- [87] D. Han and D. R. Larson, *Frames, Bases and Group Representations* (American Mathematical Society, 2000).
- [88] S. F. Waldron, *An Introduction to Finite Tight Frames* (Birkhäuser Basel, 2018).
- [89] R. Vale and S. Waldron, Tight frames and their symmetries, *Constructive Approximation* **21**, 83 (2004).
- [90] N. Cotfas and J. P. Gazeau, Finite tight frames and some applications, *Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and Theoretical* **43**, 193001 (2010).
- [91] P. A. Grillet, *Abstract Algebra* (Springer-Verlag New York, 2007).
- [92] W. Fulton and J. Harris, *Representation Theory: A First Course* (Springer-Verlag New York, 2004).
- [93] Google AI Quantum and Collaborators, Quantum supremacy using a programmable superconducting processor, *Nature* **574**, 505 (2019).
- [94] Google AI Quantum and Collaborators, Quantum approximate optimization of non-planar graph problems on a planar superconducting processor, *Nature Physics* **17**, 332 (2021).
- [95] Google AI Quantum and Collaborators, Observation of separated dynamics of charge and spin in the Fermi-Hubbard model, [arXiv:2010.07965](https://arxiv.org/abs/2010.07965) (2020).
- [96] K. J. Sung, J. Yao, M. P. Harrigan, N. C. Rubin, Z. Jiang, L. Lin, R. Babbush, and J. R. McClean, Using models to improve optimizers for variational quantum algorithms, *Quantum Science and Technology* **5**, 044008 (2020).
- [97] R. M. Parrish, L. A. Burns, D. G. Smith, A. C. Simmonett, A. E. DePrince III, E. G. Hohenstein, U. Bozkaya, A. Y. Sokolov, R. Di Remigio, R. M. Richard, *et al.*, Psi4 1.1: An open-source electronic structure program emphasizing automation, advanced libraries, and interoperability, *Journal of Chemical Theory and Computation* **13**, 3185 (2017).
- [98] A. Chapman and A. Miyake, Classical simulation of quantum circuits by dynamical localization: analytic results for Pauli-observable scrambling in time-dependent disorder, *Physical Review A* **98**, 012309 (2018).
- [99] S. Boucheron, G. Lugosi, and P. Massart, *Concentration Inequalities: A Nonasymptotic Theory of Independence* (Oxford University Press, 2013).
- [100] D. Wecker, M. B. Hastings, N. Wiebe, B. K. Clark, C. Nayak, and M. Troyer, Solving strongly correlated electron models on a quantum computer, *Physical Review A* **92**, 062318 (2015).
- [101] I. D. Kivlichan, J. McClean, N. Wiebe, C. Gidney, A. Aspuru-Guzik, G. K.-L. Chan, and R. Babbush, Quantum simulation of electronic structure with linear depth and connectivity, *Physical Review Letters* **120**, 110501 (2018).
- [102] Z. Jiang, K. J. Sung, K. Kechedzhi, V. N. Smelyanskiy, and S. Boixo, Quantum algorithms to simulate many-body physics of correlated fermions, *Physical Review Applied* **9**, 044036 (2018).
- [103] X. Bonet-Monroig, R. Sagastizabal, M. Singh, and T. E. O’Brien, Low-cost error mitigation by symmetry verification, *Physical Review A* **98**, 062339 (2018).
- [104] S. McArdle, X. Yuan, and S. Benjamin, Error-mitigated digital quantum simulation, *Physical Review Letters* **122**, 180501 (2019).
- [105] J. R. McClean, N. C. Rubin, K. J. Sung, I. D. Kivlichan, X. Bonet-Monroig, Y. Cao, C. Dai, E. S. Fried, C. Gidney, B. Gimby, *et al.*, OpenFermion: the electronic structure package for quantum computers, *Quantum Science and Technology* **5**, 034014 (2020).