

Unifying quantum spatial search, state transfer and uniform sampling on graphs: simple and exact

Qingwen Wang, Ying Jiang, and Lvzhou Li*

School of Computer Science and Engineering, Sun Yat-sen University,
Guangzhou 510006, China

July 4, 2024

Abstract

This article presents a novel and succinct algorithmic framework via alternating quantum walks, unifying quantum spatial search, state transfer and uniform sampling on a large class of graphs. Using the framework, we can achieve exact uniform sampling over all vertices and perfect state transfer between any two vertices, provided that eigenvalues of Laplacian matrix of the graph are all integers. Furthermore, if the graph is vertex-transitive as well, then we can achieve deterministic quantum spatial search that finds a marked vertex with certainty. In contrast, existing quantum search algorithms generally has a certain probability of failure. Even if the graph is not vertex-transitive, such as the complete bipartite graph, we can still adjust the algorithmic framework to obtain deterministic spatial search, which thus shows the flexibility of it. Besides unifying and improving plenty of previous results, our work provides new results on more graphs. The approach is easy to use since it has a succinct formalism that depends only on the depth of the Laplacian eigenvalue set of the graph, and may shed light on the solution of more problems related to graphs.

1 Introduction

Quantum walks have developed into a crucial and useful primitive for quantum algorithm design. Since Aharonov, Davidovich and Zagury [ADZ93] first introduced the term “quantum walks” in 1993, quantum walks have become one of the key components in quantum computation [Kem03, VA12, KGK21]. Quantum walks can be divided into two main types: discrete-time quantum walks (DTQWs) and continuous-time quantum walks (CTQWs). Whereas CTQWs evolve a Hamiltonian H (related to the graph under consideration) for any time t , i.e. simulating e^{iHt} , DTQWs evolve the system for discrete time steps, i.e. applying U_{walk}^t to the initial state for some integer t and unitary operator U_{walk} . DTQWs can be further

*Email: lilvzh@mail.sysu.edu.cn

categorized into many different frameworks. The earliest and simplest model of DTQWs is the coined quantum walk [ABN⁺01, AAKV01]. Subsequently, Szegedy proposed a quantum walk framework [Sze04] from the perspective of Markov chains. In this direction, a series of variant frameworks for spatial search have been developed: the MNRS framework [MNRS07], the interpolated walks [KMOR16], the electric network framework [Bel13, AGJ21] and so on. Quantum walk-based algorithms have provided polynomial and even exponential speedups over classical algorithms. Typical examples include quantum algorithms for the element distinctness problem [Amb07], matrix product verification [BS06], triangle finding [MSS07], group commutativity [MN07], and the welded tree problem [CCD⁺03, JZ23, LLL24]. It is worth mentioning that while it is habitually believed that DTQW-based quantum algorithms can provide only at most a quadratic speedup over classical algorithms, Li, Li and Luo [LLL24] have proposed a succinct quantum algorithm based on the simplest coined quantum walks for the welded tree problem, which not only achieves exponential quantum speedups, but also returns the correct answer deterministically.

1.1 Quantum spatial search

One of the most important classes of quantum walk-based algorithms is used to tackle the spatial search problem of finding unknown marked vertices on a graph. Over the past 20 years, the research on quantum spatial search algorithms can be roughly summarized into two lines. The first line is to search on specific graphs, aiming at designing a quantum algorithm with time $O(\sqrt{N})$ for a given graph with N vertices. It has been investigated on plenty of different graphs such as d -dimensional grids [AKR05], hypercube graphs [CG04, HT09], strongly regular graphs [JMW14], complete bipartite graphs [NCM⁺15, RW19, XZL22], balanced trees [PTB16], Johnson graphs [TSP22a, TSP22b], Hamming graphs [CGTX22], Grassmann graphs [CGTX22], Erdős-Renyi random graphs [CNAO16], and so on. The quantum spatial search algorithms for those graphs can be designed via DTQWs or CTQWs. It is worth noting that discrete and continuous walks have essential differences in the quantum setting, so designing a quantum algorithm in one model does not necessarily lead to a quantum algorithm in the other model. The relationship between DTQWs and CTQWs can be found in the literature [Chi10].

In the above work, the general method for analyzing the quantum algorithm is as follows: (i) reduce the state space to a low-dimensional invariant subspace, (ii) obtain the matrix representations of the walk operators in the invariant subspace, and (iii) derive the spectral decomposition of the matrices and use the eigenvalues and eigenvectors to analyze the success probability and complexity of the algorithm. Each of the above steps is closely related to topological properties of the graph, so it usually needs to analyze the specific graphs case by case and it is generally difficult to generalize the results from one type of graphs to another. Naturally, one might ask: Is it possible to obtain a concise and universal quantum search method?

The second line of research on quantum spatial search is not limited to specific graphs but is based on Markov chains to answer a more general question: Can quantum walks always provide a quadratic speedup over classical walks for the spatial search problem? A breakthrough result on this problem was proved in 2020 [AGJK20]: For any graph, if there exists a classical search algorithm with time $O(T)$, then we can construct a quantum search

algorithm with time $\tilde{O}(\sqrt{T})$. This result was proven based on DTQWs. Subsequently, a similar result based on CTQWs was proven in [ACNR22]. These two results have provided a more comprehensive understanding on the application of quantum walks to spatial search problems. However, it should be noted that the research along the second line cannot replace the one along the first line. The reason is that despite these elegant results [AGJK20, ACNR22], when dealing with specific graphs, the optimal quantum search algorithm remains unknown, and we still need to fully utilize topological properties of the graph to design algorithms.

1.2 Derandomization

Note that in both the first and second lines of research mentioned above, almost all of the quantum search algorithms are not deterministic (exact), that is, there is a certain probability of failure. This leads us to ask the question: Can these quantum search algorithms be improved to be exact in principle, without sacrificing quantum speedups? In order to see the significance of this question, let us have a brief review on the research of derandomization, which is the process of taking a randomized algorithm and turning it into a deterministic algorithm. In the field of classical computing, randomness has long been regarded as an important resource to improve algorithm's efficiency. For instance, randomized algorithms can be significantly efficient in some choice of computational resource for a lot of basic computational problems, such as time for primality testing [Mil76, Rab80, SS77], space for undirected s-t connectivity [AKL+79] and circuit depth for perfect matching [KUW86]. However, since the polynomial-time deterministic algorithm for primality testing [AKS04] was proposed in 2004, the study of derandomization has been attracting continued attention in the field of theoretical computer science, see for instance, Refs. [Imp06, Rei08, ST17, GKSS19, CT21, DT23]. There are also entire books on derandomization [LW06, Vad12, Tel22]. However, the derandomization of quantum algorithms lacks theories and methods, despite some effort (e. g., [BHMT00, Hoy00, Lon01, LL23b, LL23a, LL24a, LLL24]). The significance of derandomizing quantum algorithms lies not only in theoretically proving that quantum algorithms can be improved to be exact in principle, but also in attracting interest from experimental scientists, e.g., [LYW+23, QMW+22, LZ15].

1.3 State transfer

Quantum walks were also applied to the task of state transfer between two vertices of a graph. More specifically, transfer from a vertex u to another vertex v on a graph is to construct a unitary operator U such that $|\langle v|U|u\rangle|$ is as close to 1 as possible, where U is the dynamics of a quantum walk on the graph. If $|\langle v|U|u\rangle| = 1$, then we say the state transfer is perfect. The form of U depends on which quantum walk model used as described in [Por18]. For example, when using CTQW as the walk model, $U = e^{-iHt}$ where H is the adjacency matrix or Laplacian matrix of G . Perfect state transfer (PST) was originally introduced by Bose in [Bos03]. Since it has wide utilization in quantum information processing [CDEL04, CDD+05, BGS08, CLMS09, God12, ASM20], the problem of what graphs permit PST has drawn much attention.

1.4 Uniform sampling

The last problem considered in this work is quantum sampling, which refers to generating a quantum state corresponding to a probability distribution. More generally, quantum state preparation is a fundamental and crucial issue in quantum computing [SBM05, PB11, STY⁺23, YZ23, LL24b]. The uniform superposition state is required in plenty of quantum algorithms. For example, in the CTQW-based quantum spatial search algorithms initiated by Childs and Goldstone [CG04], the uniform state $|s\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{|V|}} \sum_{v \in V} |v\rangle$ over all vertices on a graph $G = (V, E)$ is usually taken as the initial state in the quantum algorithms, without illustrating how to prepare it. There have been some works [KMOR16, CLR20, LS23] considering how to approximate the uniform state as close as possible, that is, generate a state $|s'\rangle$ such that $\| |s'\rangle - |s\rangle \| < \epsilon$, where the algorithm's complexity is proportional to $\frac{1}{\epsilon}$. If $\epsilon = 0$, then the process is called exact uniform sampling. Obviously, the approximate approach does not apply to the exact case.

In this work, we shall present a novel and succinct algorithmic framework unifying quantum spatial search, perfect state transfer, and exact uniform sampling on a large class of graphs. To this end, we need the model of alternating quantum walks below.

1.5 Alternating quantum walks

Recently, an interesting model for spatial search was proposed and applied to a variety of graphs [MW21a, MW21b, QMW⁺22]. In this paper, we called the model as *alternating quantum walks*, where CTQW and the marked-vertex phase shift are alternately performed. More specifically, two Hamiltonians are constructed: One uses the Laplacian matrix or adjacency matrix of the graph and the other uses the information of location of the marked vertex. Then the quantum system evolves alternately under the two Hamiltonians, which is similar to the quantum approximate optimization algorithm (QAOA) [FGG14]. The state evolution of the system is as follows:

$$|\vec{t}, \vec{\theta}\rangle = \prod_{k=1}^p e^{-iHt_k} e^{-i\theta_k |m\rangle\langle m|} |s\rangle, \quad (1)$$

where $|s\rangle$ is the uniform superposition of all vertices on a graph, m is the marked vertex, and H is the Laplacian matrix or adjacency matrix of the graph. Our objective is to choose the parameters $\vec{t}, \vec{\theta}$ so that the success probability $|\langle m | \vec{t}, \vec{\theta} \rangle|^2$ is as close to 1 as possible for as small a p as possible. Note that the generalized oracle $e^{-i\theta_k |m\rangle\langle m|}$ has the following effect:

$$e^{-i\theta_k |m\rangle\langle m|} |v\rangle = \begin{cases} e^{-i\theta_k} |v\rangle, & v = m \\ |v\rangle, & v \neq m. \end{cases} \quad (2)$$

It can be constructed by using the standard oracle two times as shown in [LL23b]. The time of this model is defined to be the total evolution time of the two Hamiltonians:

$$T = \sum_{i=1}^p (t_i + \theta_i). \quad (3)$$

Notably, deterministic quantum search algorithms via alternating quantum walks were designed for the class of complete identity interdependent networks (CIINs) [MW21a] and star graphs [QMW+22]. However, their methods are instance-specific and difficult to generalize to other graphs. Deterministic spatial search algorithms not only mean that we can improve the theoretical success probability to 100% but also imply a kind of perfect state transfer between two vertices on graphs [ZQB+14]. Hence, this drives Ref. [MW21b] to propose the open problem “another compelling direction for future research is making the algorithm deterministic”. Again, how to fully characterize the class of graphs that permit deterministic search was proposed as a topic of future study in [QMW+22].

1.6 Graph

In this article, we only consider simple undirected connected graphs, where “simple” means the graph has no loops and has no multiple edges between any two vertices. Let $G = (V, E)$ be a graph where V is the vertex set and E is the edge set. The Laplacian matrix of G is $L = D - A$, where D is the diagonal matrix with $D_{jj} = \deg(j)$, the degree of vertex j , and A is the adjacency matrix of G . A graph $G = (V, E)$ is said to be *vertex-transitive*, if for any two vertices v_1 and v_2 of G , there is an automorphism mapping $f : V \rightarrow V$ such that $f(v_1) = v_2$. Next we introduce some graphs that will be discussed in this work.

- Let S be a set of n elements and k a positive integer. The vertices of the *Johnson graph* $J(n, k)$ [BH12] are given by the k -subsets of S , with two vertices connected if their intersection has size $k - 1$.
- Let S be a set of n elements and k a positive integer with $n \geq 2k$. The vertices of the *Kneser graph* $K(n, k)$ [BH12] are given by the k -subsets of S , with two vertices connected if they are disjoint.
- Let Q be a set of size q and d a positive integer. The vertices of *Hamming graph* $H(d, q)$ [BH12] are given by the ordered d -tuples of elements of Q . Two vertices in $H(d, q)$ are adjacent if they disagree only in one coordinate.
- Let V be a vector space of dimension n over the field F_q . The vertices of *Grassmann graph* $G_q(n, k)$ [BH12] are given by the set of k -subspaces of V where two k -subspaces A and B are connected if $\dim(A \cap B) = k - 1$.
- The *rook graph* $R(m, n)$ [MW21b] is the graph Cartesian product $K_m \square K_n$ of complete graphs K_m and K_n , having a total of $N = mn$ vertices, where two vertices (u, v) and (u', v') are adjacent if either $u = u'$ and (v, v') is an edge of K_n or $v = v'$ and (u, u') is an edge of K_m .
- The *complete-square graph* [MW21b] is the graph Cartesian product of a complete graph K_n and a square graph where the square graph is a square with four vertices.
- The *complete bipartite graph* $K(N_1, N_2)$ is a graph whose vertex set can be partitioned into two subsets V_1 of size N_1 and V_2 of size N_2 , such that there is an edge from every vertex in V_1 to every vertex in V_2 and there are no other edges.

The eigenvalues of the Laplacian matrix for the above graphs are given in Appendix A and they are all integers. All the above graphs except the complete bipartite graph are vertex-transitive. A complete bipartite graph is not vertex-transitive unless $N_1=N_2$.

1.7 Our contribution

In this article, we shall present a novel and succinct algorithmic framework via alternating quantum walks that unifies quantum spatial search, perfect state transfer, and exact uniform sampling on a large class of graphs including all the graphs defined above. The framework has a succinct formalism that depends only on the depth of the Laplacian eigenvalue set of the graph, and is easy to use. We first present the algorithmic framework in Theorem 1, and then as direct applications, we achieve exact uniform sampling in Corollary 1 and perfect state transfer in Corollary 2. The most important and interesting application is to tackle the spatial search problem in Theorem 2. When applying Corollary 1, Corollary 2 and Theorem 2 to these graphs introduced in Section 1.6, we obtain Theorem 3.

Theorem 1. *Let $G = (V, E)$ be a graph with N vertices whose Laplacian matrix L has only integer eigenvalues and $|s\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \sum_{v \in V} |v\rangle$. Given any $m \in V$, there is an integer $p \in O(2^{d_L} \sqrt{N})$ and real numbers $\gamma, \theta_j, t_j \in [0, 2\pi)$ ($j \in \{1, 2, \dots, p\}$), such that*

$$|s\rangle = e^{-i\gamma} \prod_{j=1}^p e^{-i\theta_j |m\rangle \langle m|} e^{-iLt_j} |m\rangle, \quad (4)$$

where d_L is the depth of the eigenvalue set of L and will be illustrated in Definition 1.

The most direct application of Theorem 1 is exact uniform sampling.

Corollary 1. *Let $G = (V, E)$ be a graph with N vertices whose Laplacian matrix L has only integer eigenvalues. There is a quantum walk algorithm with time $O(2^{d_L} \sqrt{N})$ to generate exactly the uniform superposition state over all vertices on the graph.*

Proof. Following Equation (4), we can generate the uniform superposition state from any given vertex m by performing e^{-iLt} and $e^{-i\theta |m\rangle \langle m|}$ alternately. \square

Moreover, by applying Theorem 1, we can achieve perfect state transfer between any two vertices.

Corollary 2. *Let $G = (V, E)$ be a graph with N vertices whose Laplacian matrix L has only integer eigenvalues. Given any two vertices u and v on G , there is a quantum walk algorithm $A_{u,v}$ with time $O(2^{d_L} \sqrt{N})$ such that $|\langle v | A_{u,v} | u \rangle| = 1$, which consists of three types of unitary operators: e^{-iLt} , $e^{-i\alpha |u\rangle \langle u|}$ and $e^{-i\beta |v\rangle \langle v|}$, where t, α and β are real parameters in $[0, 2\pi)$.*

Proof. By Theorem 1, we can use e^{-iLt} and $e^{-i\alpha |u\rangle \langle u|} (e^{-i\beta |v\rangle \langle v|})$ to construct a quantum algorithm $A_u(A_v)$ such that $A_u |u\rangle = |s\rangle$ ($A_v |v\rangle = |s\rangle$) where $|s\rangle$ is the uniform superposition state. Let $A_{u,v} = A_v^\dagger A_u$. Then we have

$$A_{u,v} |u\rangle = A_v^\dagger A_u |u\rangle = A_v^\dagger |s\rangle = |v\rangle. \quad (5)$$

\square

In Theorem 1, the parameters are related to m , which requires to know the position of m in advance. However, in the spatial search problem m as a marked vertex is not known, which prevents us from applying Theorem 1 to spatial search. Hence, here we propose a new theorem that additionally requires graphs to be vertex transitive. In this new theorem, the parameters are independent of m .

Theorem 2. *Let $G = (V, E)$ be a vertex-transitive graph with N vertices whose Laplacian matrix L has only integer eigenvalues and $|s\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \sum_{v \in V} |v\rangle$. There is an integer $p \in O(2^{d_L} \sqrt{N})$ and real numbers $\gamma, \theta_j, t_j \in [0, 2\pi)$ ($j \in \{1, 2, \dots, p\}$), such that the following equation holds for all $m \in V$:*

$$|s\rangle = e^{-i\gamma} \prod_{j=1}^p e^{-i\theta_j |m\rangle \langle m|} e^{-iL t_j} |m\rangle, \quad (6)$$

where d_L is the depth of the eigenvalue set of L and will be illustrated in Definition 1.

Applying the above results to these specific graphs introduced in Section 1.6, we immediately obtain the following result.

Theorem 3. *Let G be a graph with a marked vertex among N vertices. If it belongs to one of the following types, then there exist quantum walk algorithms for deterministic spatial search, perfect state transfer, and exact uniform sampling on G with time $O(\sqrt{N})$:*

1. Johnson graph $J(n, k)$ for any fixed k ;
2. Hamming graph $H(d, q)$ for any fixed d ;
3. Kneser graph $K(n, k)$ for any fixed k ;
4. Grassmann graph $G_q(n, k)$ for any fixed k ;
5. rook graph;
6. complete-square graph;
7. complete bipartite graph;

The idea behind Theorem 3 is as follows. First note that all the Laplacian matrices of these graphs have only integer eigenvalues. Therefore, by Corollary 1 and Corollary 2, we can get quantum algorithms for exact uniform sampling and perfect state transfer with time $O(2^{d_L} \sqrt{N})$. Next, note that the graphs of type 1 to 6 are all vertex-transitive. Then reversing the state evolution in Equation (6) results in a deterministic quantum search algorithm with time $O(2^{d_L} \sqrt{N})$. In Section 4, we will show that d_L of these graphs is independent of N . Thus, the time of all the quantum algorithms is $O(\sqrt{N})$.

The complete bipartite graph is not vertex-transitive, which means we cannot use Theorem 2 directly, but we can still obtain deterministic quantum search algorithms by subtly adopting the idea of Theorem 2. This will be proven in Theorem 5 which could be worthy of more attention, since this case is significantly different from other graphs and it may shed light on more graphs.

The significance of our results, in our opinion, lies at least in the following aspects:

- (1) Our approach is universal in the sense that it leads to quantum algorithms for exact uniform sampling, perfect state transfer and deterministic spatial search on a large class of graphs. The previous uniform sampling algorithms were usually not exact and their complexity is related to the accuracy ϵ , whereas our uniform sampling algorithm is exact and requires fewer ancilla qubits. For the state transfer problem, our results reveal more graphs that permit perfect state transfer. For the spatial search problem, besides unifying and improving plenty of previous results, our approach provides new results on more graphs.
- (2) Our approach is succinct. Our approach depends only on the depth of the Laplacian eigenvalue set of the graph and then it is easy to use to design quantum algorithms. However, the usual method used in existing work depends on the spectral decomposition of the walk operators in a low-dimensional invariant subspace, and is closely related to topological properties of the graph. Thus, the analysis is generally instance-specific, and it is difficult to generalize from one graph to other graphs.
- (3) We provide an approach to the derandomization of quantum spatial search algorithms. Due to the inherent randomness of quantum mechanics, most quantum algorithms have a certain probability of failure. It seems that everyone has habitually accepted the inevitable failure probability and think that exact quantum algorithms may have a higher complexity (e. g., the complexity of exact quantum algorithms may be on the square or larger power of the complexity of bounded-error quantum algorithms [BCDWZ99, BK19, BBC+01]). From the perspective of computational theory, clarifying whether a problem can be effectively solved with certainty or only with a certain probability of success is an important theoretical issue. Our work may stimulate more discussion on this question.

1.8 Technical overview

Although our algorithmic framework is quite succinct and does not rely on a complicated analysis of evolution operators, there are still some non-trivial steps that involve technical challenges.

The main task in this article is to prove Theorem 1, which mainly depends on the *depth* of the Laplacian eigenvalue set, where the depth is the number of times dividing all elements in the current set by their greatest common divisor and keeping only those elements that yield even results until the current set only contains 0. More specifically, let $G = (V, E)$ be a graph with Laplacian matrix L whose eigenvalues are all integers and m be a vertex in V . Let Λ_0 be the multiset of eigenvalues of L . Then for $k \geq 1$, we iteratively define $\Lambda_k = \{\lambda_i \in \Lambda_{k-1} \mid \frac{\lambda_i}{\gcd(\Lambda_{k-1})} \text{ is even}\}$ until Λ_k contains only 0, where $\gcd(\Lambda_{k-1})$ denotes the greatest common divisor of all nonzero elements in Λ_{k-1} . The depth, denoted by d_L , is the number k such that Λ_k contains only 0. Let $|\eta_i\rangle$ be the eigenvector of λ_i . Each Λ_k corresponds to a subspace $S_k = \text{span}\{|\eta_i\rangle \mid \lambda_i \in \Lambda_k\}$. Note that $|m\rangle \in S_0$ since S_0 is the whole space. Our main idea is to make the current state in S_k evolve into a state in the lower-dimensional subspace S_{k+1} , repeating this step for each $k \leq d_L - 1$.

Let $|w_k\rangle$ ($k \in \{0, 1, \dots, d_L\}$) be the normalized projection component of $|m\rangle$ onto S_k .

Then, our aim is to achieve the following state evolution:

$$|m\rangle = |w_0\rangle \rightarrow |w_1\rangle \rightarrow \cdots \rightarrow |w_{d_L}\rangle = |s\rangle. \quad (7)$$

In order to achieve $|w_k\rangle \rightarrow |w_{k+1}\rangle$ for each k , we perform deterministic quantum search [LL23b] in $\text{span}\{|w_k\rangle, |w_{k+1}\rangle\}$ as described in Lemma 2, where the main points are as follows.

- (1) Choosing an appropriate parameter t such that e^{-iLt} acts as a reflection operator $U = I - 2|w_{k+1}\rangle\langle w_{k+1}|$ in $\text{span}\{|w_k\rangle, |w_{k+1}\rangle\}$.
- (2) Constructing $V(\theta) = I - (1 - e^{-i\theta})|w_k\rangle\langle w_k|$ in $\text{span}\{|w_k\rangle, |w_{k+1}\rangle\}$. When $k = 0$, it is the oracle operator which can be directly used. When $k \geq 1$, we iteratively construct it.
- (3) Calculating $|\langle w_k|w_{k+1}\rangle|$ based on the location of m .

By Lemma 2, there is an integer $p \in O(\frac{1}{|\langle w_k|w_{k+1}\rangle|})$, and real numbers $\gamma, \theta_1, \dots, \theta_p \in [0, 2\pi)$ such that

$$|w_{k+1}\rangle = e^{-i\gamma} \prod_{j=1}^p V(\theta_j)U|w_k\rangle. \quad (8)$$

Finally, we shall prove that $|w_{d_L}\rangle = |s\rangle$ and analyze the complexity.

The idea to prove Theorem 2 is similar. The difference is that when m is unknown, calculating $|\langle w_k|w_{k+1}\rangle|$ in the third step will be difficult. However, we will prove that in vertex-transitive graphs, $|\langle w_k|w_{k+1}\rangle|$ is independent of the location of m . This attribute is proven in Appendix B.

1.9 Related work

Spatial search. There has been much work devoted to the research of quantum spatial search, and in Table 1 we list only these closely related to our work. First, quantum spatial search on Johnson graphs has become a basis for the solution of many problems. For example, quantum algorithms for the element distinctness problem [Amb07], matrix product verification [BS06], triangle finding [MSS07], and the string problem [AJ22] are all based on quantum walk search on Johnson graphs. Quantum spatial search Johnson graphs $J(n, k)$ for any fixed k was investigated in [TSP22a, TSP22b, CGTX22] based on CTQWs or DTQWs. A quantum search algorithm based on alternating quantum walks was proposed for $J(n, 2)$ [MW21b], but it is not clear how to extend it to the general case. Quantum spatial search on hypercube graphs was investigated in [CG04, HT09] based on CTQWs or DTQWs. Note that a hypercube graph is a special case of Hamming graph $H(d, q)$ where $q = 2$. The Hamming graph $H(d, q)$ with constant q and Grassmann graph $G_q(n, k)$ with constants k and q were investigated in [CGTX22] based on CTQWs. The rook graph and complete square graph were considered in [MW21b] via alternating quantum walks. Quantum spatial search on complete bipartite graphs was investigated in [NCM⁺15, RW19, XZL22] based on CTQWs or DTQWs. Deterministic quantum search algorithms were proposed for complete identity interdependent networks (CIINs) [MW21a] and for star graphs [QMW⁺22] based on alternating quantum walks. Note that a CIIN is a special case of rook graph $R(m, n)$ where

$n = 2$, and a star graph is a special case of complete bipartite graph where one partition has only one vertex.

In order to obtain the above results, an instance-specific and complicated analysis is required in the literature, and the approach is difficult to generalize to other graphs. Deterministic quantum algorithms are obtained only for CIINs and star graphs, but it is not clear how to extend them to other graphs. Hence, this drives Ref. [MW21b] to propose the open problem “another compelling direction for future research is making the algorithm deterministic”. How to fully characterize the class of graphs that permit deterministic search was proposed also as a topic of future study in [QMW+22].

In this article, we obtain a quantum spatial search algorithm that deterministically find the marked vertex on all the above mentioned graphs.

Table 1: Some related works on quantum spatial search. All the quantum algorithms can find out a marked vertex from N vertices in $O(\sqrt{N})$ time (or discrete time steps).

Graphs	Walk model	Deterministic?
Johnson graph	CTQW [TSP22a, CGTX22], DTQW [TSP22b]	No
hypercube graph	CTQW [CG04], DTQW [HT09]	No
Hamming graph	CTQW [CGTX22]	No
Grassmann graph	CTQW [CGTX22]	No
rook graph	alternating quantum walks [MW21b]	No
complete-square graph	alternating quantum walks [MW21b]	No
complete bipartite graph	CTQW [NCM+15], DTQW [RW19, XZL22]	No
CIIN	alternating quantum walks [MW21a]	Yes
star graph	alternating quantum walks [QMW+22]	Yes
all the above graphs	alternating quantum walks (this work)	Yes

Uniform sampling. Assuming P is a reversible Markov chain on a graph $G = (V, E)$ with stationary distribution π and $|V| = N$, quantum sampling on P is to prepare a quantum state $|\pi\rangle = \sum_{v \in V} \sqrt{\pi_v} |v\rangle$. When π is uniform, i.e. $|\pi\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \sum_{v \in V} |v\rangle$, we say it’s a uniform sampling.

The quantum sampling algorithm with quadratic speed-up was only found in special cases, e.g., [NV00, AAKV01, ABN+01, Ric07a, Ric07b, DB15]. For sampling from a sequence of slowly evolving Markov chains, the running time of quantum algorithms in [WA08, OBD18] are better than the classical algorithms under certain specific assumptions. For the general case, a quantum sampling algorithm can be designed for any reversible Markov chain by using the approach in [KMOR16]. Let $HT(P, v)$ be the time from stationary distribution to hit vertex v according to P . The time required to prepare a state ϵ close to $|\pi\rangle$ is $O\left(\sqrt{HT \frac{1}{\epsilon}}\right)$, where $HT = \max_v HT(P, v)$. It can be seen that the complexity of the algorithm increases rapidly with $\frac{1}{\epsilon}$. In [CLR20], the complexity was improved to $O\left(\sqrt{HT \log \frac{1}{\epsilon}}\right)$. Later, the result was further improved in [LS23], reducing the number of ancilla qubits. We list the cost of these quantum algorithms when applying to uniform sampling in Table 2. Compared to previous work, our quantum algorithm prepares $\frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \sum_{v \in V} |v\rangle$ exactly and requires no ancilla qubit.

Table 2: Some related works on uniform sampling. $HT = \Omega(N)$ [AF02].

Walk model	Error	Complexity	Ancilla qubit
DTQW [KMOR16]	ϵ	$\Theta\left(\sqrt{HT} \frac{1}{\epsilon}\right)$	$\Theta\left(\log\sqrt{HT} + \log\frac{1}{\epsilon}\right)$
CTQW [CLR20]	ϵ	$\Theta\left(\sqrt{HT}\log\frac{1}{\epsilon}\right)$	$\Theta\left(\log\sqrt{HT}\log\frac{1}{\epsilon}\right)$
DTQW [LS23]	ϵ	$\Theta\left(\sqrt{HT}\log\frac{1}{\epsilon}\right)$	$\Theta\left(\log\sqrt{HT} + \log\log\left(\frac{1}{\epsilon}\right)\right)$
CTQW(this work)	0	$O\left(2^{d_L} \sqrt{N}\right)$	0

Perfect state transfer. Perfect state transfer (PST) from u to v on a graph G is to construct a quantum walk operator U such that $|\langle v|U|u\rangle| = 1$. A crucial problem is to find which graph permits PST. There have been many research results on this problem. The conclusion of PST is not consistent in different quantum walk models.

We first list some related work based on CTQWs. PST was originally introduced by Bose [Bos03] as a tool for quantum communication through quantum spin chains. Then, PST in quantum spin networks was studied in [CDEL04, CDD⁺05], which provided a class of qubit networks that have PST for any two-dimensional quantum state. Cheung and Godsil [CG11] obtained a characterization for cubelike graphs permitting PST. Bašić [Baš13] considered a circulant graph and established a criterion for checking whether or not it permits PST. Moreover, PST was investigated on distance-regular graphs [CGGV15], Hadamard diagonalizable graphs [JKP⁺17] and Johnson schemes [ASM20]. Especially, Cayley graphs have attracted much attention since they possess distinguished algebraic structure and are closely related to group theory. PST on different classes of Cayley graphs was investigated in [HB16, PB17, TFC19, CF21, GLW22, WC24].

In the DTQW model, PST is mainly divided into two cases: the positions of u and v are known or unknown. In the first case, the dynamics of implementing PST can be designed globally, and this approach was analyzed on different graphs such as a line [YG15, ZQB⁺14], a circle [YG15], a 2D lattice [ZQB⁺14], a regular graph [SWLL19], a complete graph [SWLL19] and a complete bipartite graph [HLL⁺23]. In the second case, PST is usually achieved by taking the approach in quantum search, and PST was found on a star graph and a complete graph with loops [ŠS16] and a circulant graph [Zha19].

In this paper, we consider PST in the case that u and v are known in advance and alternating quantum walks are used as the walk model. Our conclusion is that PST can be achieved on a graph G provided that eigenvalues of the Laplacian matrix of G are all integers.

1.10 Paper organization

The article is organized as follows. Some preliminaries are introduced in Section 2. Then, we prove our main theorem and algorithmic framework in Section 3. Next, we show the applications of our algorithmic framework on some graphs in Section 4. Finally, we conclude the article in Section 5.

2 Preliminaries

Below we give some properties of the Laplacian matrix L of a graph.

Lemma 1. *Let L be the Laplacian matrix of a graph $G = (V, E)$, where $|V| = N$. Then, we have the following properties. (i) 0 is a simple¹ eigenvalue of L , and the corresponding eigenvector is $\frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \sum_{v \in V} |v\rangle$. (ii) Given the spectral decomposition $L = \sum_{i=1}^N \lambda_i |\eta_i\rangle\langle\eta_i|$, $\langle v|\eta_i\rangle$ is a real number for each $v \in V$ and each $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, N\}$.*

Proof. The property (i) is a direct conclusion in [GMS90]. Since D and A are both real and symmetric, L is real and symmetric and has N orthogonal real eigenvectors. Thus, property (ii) holds. □

The continuous-time quantum walk (CTQW) on $G = (V, E)$ takes place in the Hilbert space $\mathcal{H} = \text{span}\{|v\rangle : v \in V\}$ and the dynamic of the system is determined by the following Schrödinger equation:

$$i \cdot \frac{d\langle v|\psi(t)\rangle}{dt} = \sum_{u \in V} \langle v|H|u\rangle \langle u|\psi(t)\rangle, \quad (9)$$

where $|\psi(t)\rangle$ denotes the state at time t , H is a Hamiltonian satisfying $\langle v|H|u\rangle = 0$ when v and u are not adjacent in G . This equation means that at time t , the change of the amplitude of each vertex $|v\rangle$ is only related to the amplitudes of its adjacent vertices. From Equation (9), one can see that the continuous-time quantum walk over a graph G at time t can be defined by the unitary transformation $U = e^{-iHt}$. In general, we let $H = \gamma L$ or γA , where γ is a real and positive parameter called jumping rate. In this paper, we choose $H = L$ such that the CTQW operator is e^{-iLt} .

To evolve $|\psi_1\rangle$ into $|\psi_2\rangle$, one frequently-used way is to perform alternately the two unitary operators

$$\begin{aligned} U_1(\alpha) &= I - (1 - e^{-i\alpha})|\psi_2\rangle\langle\psi_2|, \\ U_2(\beta) &= I - (1 - e^{-i\beta})|\psi_1\rangle\langle\psi_1| \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

on the initial state $|\psi_1\rangle$ where α and β are real numbers. Note that when $\alpha = \beta = \pi$, the above two operations recover to the reflection operations in Grover's algorithm [Gro97]. In [RJS22], the authors showed that if α is fixed to π , given $|\langle\psi_1|\psi_2\rangle| \in (0, \frac{1}{2}]$, there exist appropriate values for β to carry out the search deterministically and these values can be numerically calculated. In [LL23b] (Theorem 1 and 2), deterministic quantum search with adjustable parameters was obtained, from which the above result holds for any $|\langle\psi_1|\psi_2\rangle| \in (0, 1)$ as follows.

Lemma 2 ([LL23b]). *Given two unitary operators $U_1(\pi)$, $U_2(\beta)$, and $|\langle\psi_1|\psi_2\rangle| \in (0, 1)$, where $U_1(\pi) = I - 2|\psi_2\rangle\langle\psi_2|$, $U_2(\beta) = I - (1 - e^{-i\beta})|\psi_1\rangle\langle\psi_1|$, there is an integer $p \in O(\frac{1}{|\langle\psi_1|\psi_2\rangle|})$ and real numbers $\gamma, \beta_1, \dots, \beta_p \in [0, 2\pi)$ such that*

$$|\psi_2\rangle = e^{-i\gamma} \prod_{j=1}^p U_2(\beta_j) U_1(\pi) |\psi_1\rangle. \quad (11)$$

¹An eigenvalue is said to be simple if its algebraic multiplicity is 1.

Remark 1. The parameters β_1, \dots, β_p in Lemma 2 alternates between two parameters $\bar{\beta}_1, \bar{\beta}_2$, i.e. $\beta_1 = \bar{\beta}_1, \beta_2 = \bar{\beta}_2, \beta_3 = \bar{\beta}_1, \beta_4 = \bar{\beta}_2, \dots$. The two parameters $\bar{\beta}_1, \bar{\beta}_2$ can be obtained by solving a system of two trigonometric equations numerically, as the equations are too complicated to obtain a closed-form solution.

3 Algorithmic framework

In this section, we present a universal algorithmic framework unifying quantum spatial search, perfect state transfer, and exact uniform sampling on a large class of graphs.

Let S be a finite set of integers. We use $\gcd(S)$ to denote the greatest common divisor of all nonzero elements in S . If there is no nonzero element in S , then let $\gcd(S) = 1$. A crucial definition is as follows.

Definition 1. Let M be an $N \times N$ Hermitian matrix with spectral decomposition $M = \sum_{i=1}^N \lambda_i |\eta_i\rangle\langle\eta_i|$, where $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_N$ are integers, at least one of which is 0.

(i) Define $\Lambda_0 = \{\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_N\}$. For $k \geq 1$, we recursively define Λ_k and $\bar{\Lambda}_k$ until Λ_k contains only 0 as follows:

$$\Lambda_k = \{\lambda \in \Lambda_{k-1} \mid e^{-i\lambda \frac{\pi}{\gcd(\Lambda_{k-1})}} = 1\}, \quad (12)$$

and

$$\bar{\Lambda}_k = \{\lambda \in \Lambda_{k-1} \mid e^{-i\lambda \frac{\pi}{\gcd(\Lambda_{k-1})}} = -1\}. \quad (13)$$

We use d_M to denote the number k such that Λ_k contains only 0, and call it the depth of the eigenvalue set of M .

(ii) Let $|m\rangle = \sum_{i=1}^N \alpha_i |\eta_i\rangle$ be a vector where each α_i is a real number such that

$$\left(\sum_{\lambda_i \in \Lambda_k} \alpha_i^2\right) \left(\sum_{\lambda_i \in \bar{\Lambda}_k} \alpha_i^2\right) \neq 0 \quad (14)$$

for any $k \in \{1, \dots, d_M\}$. Let $|w_0\rangle = |m\rangle$, and for $k \in \{1, \dots, d_M\}$ define

$$|w_k\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\sum_{\lambda_i \in \Lambda_k} \alpha_i^2}} \sum_{\lambda_i \in \Lambda_k} \alpha_i |\eta_i\rangle \quad (15)$$

and

$$|\bar{w}_k\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\sum_{\lambda_i \in \bar{\Lambda}_k} \alpha_i^2}} \sum_{\lambda_i \in \bar{\Lambda}_k} \alpha_i |\eta_i\rangle. \quad (16)$$

Example 1. Given the following 6×6 Hermitian matrix

$$\begin{aligned} M = & 0|\eta_1\rangle\langle\eta_1| + 1|\eta_2\rangle\langle\eta_2| + 3|\eta_3\rangle\langle\eta_3| + 6|\eta_4\rangle\langle\eta_4| \\ & + 64|\eta_5\rangle\langle\eta_5| + 64|\eta_6\rangle\langle\eta_6|, \end{aligned} \quad (17)$$

the process of computing d_M , Λ_0 , $|w_0\rangle$, and Λ_k , $\bar{\Lambda}_k$, $|w_k\rangle$, $|\bar{w}_k\rangle$ for $k \in \{1, 2, \dots, d_M\}$ with $|m\rangle = \sum_{i=1}^6 \alpha_i |\eta_i\rangle$ where $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_6$ are not zero is shown in Fig. 1.




Figure 1: The process of computing d_M , Λ_0 , $|w_0\rangle$ and Λ_k , $\bar{\Lambda}_k$, $|w_k\rangle$, $|\bar{w}_k\rangle$ for $k \in \{1, \dots, d_M\}$.

In the following, we consider the class of graphs whose Laplacian matrices have only integer eigenvalues. Now let $G = (V, E)$ be such a graph with N vertices and Laplacian matrix L . Assume the spectral decomposition of L is $L = \sum_{i=1}^N \lambda_i |\eta_i\rangle \langle \eta_i|$. By Lemma 1, one can see that L satisfies the condition in Definition 1, and thus we can define d_L , Λ_0 , and Λ_k , $\bar{\Lambda}_k$, ($k \in \{1, 2, \dots, d_L\}$) as in (i) of Definition 1. In the space spanned by $\{|v\rangle : v \in V\}$, $|\eta_1\rangle, \dots, |\eta_N\rangle$ constitute a set of orthonormal basis, and for any vertex $m \in V$, $|m\rangle$ can be represented as $|m\rangle = \sum_{i=1}^N \alpha_i |\eta_i\rangle$, where each $\alpha_i = \langle \eta_i | m \rangle$ is a real number. For $|m\rangle = \sum_{i=1}^N \alpha_i |\eta_i\rangle$, we define $|w_0\rangle$, $|w_k\rangle$, $|\bar{w}_k\rangle$ ($k \in \{1, 2, \dots, d_L\}$) as in (ii) of Definition 1.

By Lemma 1, the number 0 is a simple eigenvalue of L , and $|s\rangle$ is the corresponding eigenvector. Assuming α_* is the α_i such that $|\eta_i\rangle = |s\rangle$. Obviously,

$$\alpha_* = \langle s | m \rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}}. \quad (18)$$

We also have

$$\begin{aligned}
 |w_{d_L}\rangle &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{\sum_{\lambda_i \in \Lambda_{d_L}} \alpha_i^2}} \sum_{\lambda_i \in \Lambda_{d_L}} \alpha_i |\eta_i\rangle \\
 &= \frac{\alpha_*}{\sqrt{\alpha_*^2}} |\eta_i\rangle = |s\rangle.
 \end{aligned} \quad (19)$$

We can also see that d_L is not bigger than the number of distinct eigenvalues of L , $\Lambda_k = \Lambda_{k+1} \cup \bar{\Lambda}_{k+1}$, $|\bar{w}_{k+1}\rangle \in \text{span}\{|w_k\rangle, |w_{k+1}\rangle\}$ and $\text{span}\{|w_k\rangle, |w_{k+1}\rangle\} = \text{span}\{|w_{k+1}\rangle, |\bar{w}_{k+1}\rangle\}$ ($k \in \{0, 1, \dots, d_L - 1\}$).

Below we present the fundamental result of this article.

Theorem 4 (Restatement of Theorem 1). *Let $G = (V, E)$ be a graph with N vertices whose Laplacian matrix L has only integer eigenvalues and $|s\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \sum_{v \in V} |v\rangle$. Given any $m \in V$, there is an integer $p \in O(2^{d_L} \sqrt{N})$ and real numbers $\gamma, \theta_j, t_j \in [0, 2\pi)$ ($j \in \{1, 2, \dots, p\}$), such that*

$$|s\rangle = e^{-i\gamma} \prod_{j=1}^p e^{-i\theta_j |m\rangle \langle m|} e^{-iLt_j} |m\rangle. \quad (20)$$

Proof. The idea for the proof is to divide the space $\text{span}\{|v\rangle : v \in V\}$ into a series of subspaces $\text{span}\{|w_k\rangle, |w_{k+1}\rangle\}$ ($k \in \{0, \dots, d_L - 1\}$). In each subspace $\text{span}\{|w_k\rangle, |w_{k+1}\rangle\}$, we use e^{-iLt} and $e^{-i\theta |m\rangle \langle m|}$ to construct $I - 2|w_{k+1}\rangle \langle w_{k+1}|$ and $I - (1 - e^{-i\theta})|w_k\rangle \langle w_k|$, respectively. Then, by Lemma 2, there exists a procedure such that the state $|w_k\rangle$ evolves into $|w_{k+1}\rangle$. By repeating the above process in order, we achieve the following state evolution:

$$|m\rangle = |w_0\rangle \rightarrow |w_1\rangle \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow |w_{d_L}\rangle = |s\rangle. \quad (21)$$

We first consider the continuous-time walk operator e^{-iLt} . Let $t = \frac{\pi}{\text{gcd}(\Lambda_0)}$. Then

$$e^{-iL \frac{\pi}{\text{gcd}(\Lambda_0)}} = \sum_{i=1}^N e^{-i\lambda_i \frac{\pi}{\text{gcd}(\Lambda_0)}} |\eta_i\rangle \langle \eta_i| = \sum_{\lambda_i \in \Lambda_1} |\eta_i\rangle \langle \eta_i| - \sum_{\lambda_i \in \bar{\Lambda}_1} |\eta_i\rangle \langle \eta_i|. \quad (22)$$

Recall that $|w_1\rangle$ ($|\bar{w}_1\rangle$) are linear combinations of eigenvectors $|\eta_1\rangle, \dots, |\eta_N\rangle$ whose corresponding eigenvalues are in Λ_1 ($\bar{\Lambda}_1$). Then it can be seen that

$$\begin{aligned} e^{-iL \frac{\pi}{\text{gcd}(\Lambda_0)}} |w_1\rangle &= |w_1\rangle, \\ e^{-iL \frac{\pi}{\text{gcd}(\Lambda_0)}} |\bar{w}_1\rangle &= -|\bar{w}_1\rangle. \end{aligned} \quad (23)$$

Thus, when restricted to subspace $\text{span}\{|w_1\rangle, |\bar{w}_1\rangle\} = \text{span}\{|w_0\rangle, |w_1\rangle\}$, we have

$$e^{-iL \frac{\pi}{\text{gcd}(\Lambda_0)}} = 2|w_1\rangle \langle w_1| - I = e^{i\pi} (I - 2|w_1\rangle \langle w_1|). \quad (24)$$

In addition, we have

$$e^{-i\theta |m\rangle \langle m|} = I - (1 - e^{-i\theta}) |w_0\rangle \langle w_0|. \quad (25)$$

From Definition 1, for $0 \leq k \leq d_L - 1$, we have

$$\langle w_k | w_{k+1} \rangle = \frac{\sqrt{\sum_{\lambda_i \in \Lambda_{k+1}} \alpha_i^2}}{\sqrt{\sum_{\lambda_i \in \Lambda_k} \alpha_i^2}}. \quad (26)$$

Since each α_i can be calculated based on the position of m , we can get the value of $\langle w_k | w_{k+1} \rangle$. We can see that there is a $\alpha_* = \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}}$ in each Λ_k since $\Lambda_{k+1} \subseteq \Lambda_k$ and $\alpha_* \in \Lambda_{d_L}$. Thus,

we have $\langle w_k | w_{k+1} \rangle > 0$. If $\langle w_k | w_{k+1} \rangle = 1$, then we do nothing. Here we assume that $\langle w_k | w_{k+1} \rangle \in (0, 1)$.

According to Equations (24), (25), (26) and Lemma 2, there are parameters $p \in O(\frac{1}{|\langle w_1 | w_0 \rangle|})$, $t = \frac{\pi}{\gcd(\Lambda_0)}$ and $\gamma, \theta_j \in [0, 2\pi)$ ($j \in \{1, 2, \dots, p\}$) such that

$$|w_1\rangle = e^{-i\gamma} \left(\prod_{j=1}^p e^{-i\theta_j |m\rangle\langle m|} e^{-iLt} \right) |w_0\rangle. \quad (27)$$

Next, we prove the following fact.

Fact 1. *If there is an integer p and $\gamma, \theta_j, t_j \in [0, 2\pi)$ ($j \in \{1, 2, \dots, p\}$) satisfying*

$$|w_k\rangle = e^{-i\gamma} \prod_{j=1}^p e^{-i\theta_j |m\rangle\langle m|} e^{-iLt_j} |w_0\rangle, \quad (28)$$

where $1 \leq k \leq d_L - 1$, then there is an integer $p' \in O(\frac{2p}{|\langle w_k | w_{k+1} \rangle|})$ and $\gamma', \theta'_j, t'_j \in [0, 2\pi)$ ($j \in \{1, 2, \dots, p'\}$) such that

$$|w_{k+1}\rangle = e^{-i\gamma'} \prod_{j=1}^{p'} e^{-i\theta'_j |m\rangle\langle m|} e^{-iLt'_j} |w_0\rangle. \quad (29)$$

Proof of Fact 1. Denote $e^{-i\gamma} \prod_{j=1}^p e^{-i\theta_j |m\rangle\langle m|} e^{-iLt_j}$ in Equation (28) by A_k . Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} A_k e^{-i\theta |m\rangle\langle m|} A_k^\dagger &= A_k (I - (1 - e^{-i\theta}) |w_0\rangle\langle w_0|) A_k^\dagger \\ &= I - (1 - e^{-i\theta}) |w_k\rangle\langle w_k|. \end{aligned} \quad (30)$$

Restricted to subspace $\text{span}\{|w_{k+1}\rangle, |\bar{w}_{k+1}\rangle\}$, we have

$$e^{-iL \frac{\pi}{\gcd(\Lambda_k)}} = 2|w_{k+1}\rangle\langle w_{k+1}| - I = e^{i\pi} (I - 2|w_{k+1}\rangle\langle w_{k+1}|). \quad (31)$$

Recall that $\text{span}\{|w_k\rangle, |w_{k+1}\rangle\} = \text{span}\{|w_{k+1}\rangle, |\bar{w}_{k+1}\rangle\}$ and $|\langle w_k | w_{k+1} \rangle|$ can be calculated from the position of m . Therefore, by Lemma 2 there is an integer $p'' \in O(\frac{1}{|\langle w_k | w_{k+1} \rangle|})$ and $\gamma'', t = \frac{\pi}{\gcd(\Lambda_k)}$, $\theta''_j \in [0, 2\pi)$ ($j \in \{1, 2, \dots, p''\}$) such that

$$\begin{aligned} |w_{k+1}\rangle &= e^{-i\gamma''} \left(\prod_{j=1}^{p''} A_k e^{-i\theta''_j |m\rangle\langle m|} A_k^\dagger e^{-iLt} \right) |w_k\rangle \\ &= e^{-i\gamma''} \left(\prod_{j=1}^{p''} A_k e^{-i\theta''_j |m\rangle\langle m|} A_k^\dagger e^{-iLt} \right) A_k |w_0\rangle. \end{aligned} \quad (32)$$

By replacing A_k with $e^{-i\gamma} \prod_{j=1}^p e^{-i\theta_j |m\rangle\langle m|} e^{-iLt_j}$ in Equation (32), we can get the parameters satisfying Equation (29). This proves the fact. \square

By Equation (27) and using Fact 1 recursively, there is $p \in O(\prod_{k=0}^{d_L-1} \frac{2}{|\langle w_{k+1}|w_k\rangle|})$ and $\gamma, \theta_j, t_j \in [0, 2\pi)$ ($j \in \{1, 2, \dots, p\}$) such that

$$\begin{aligned} |w_{d_L}\rangle &= e^{-i\gamma} \prod_{j=1}^p e^{-i\theta_j|m\rangle\langle m|} e^{-iLt_j} |w_0\rangle \\ &= e^{-i\gamma} \prod_{j=1}^p e^{-i\theta_j|m\rangle\langle m|} e^{-iLt_j} |m\rangle. \end{aligned} \quad (33)$$

The upper bound of p is

$$\begin{aligned} \prod_{k=0}^{d_L-1} \frac{2}{|\langle w_{k+1}|w_k\rangle|} &= \prod_{k=0}^{d_L-1} \frac{2\sqrt{\sum_{\lambda \in \Lambda_k} \alpha_i^2}}{\sqrt{\sum_{\lambda_i \in \Lambda_{k+1}} \alpha_i^2}} \\ &= \frac{2^{d_L} \sqrt{\sum_{\lambda \in \Lambda_0} \alpha_i^2}}{\sqrt{\sum_{\lambda_i \in \Lambda_{d_L}} \alpha_i^2}} \\ &= 2^{d_L} \sqrt{N}, \end{aligned} \quad (34)$$

where the third equation holds since Λ_{d_0} contains all eigenvalues and Λ_{d_L} only contains 0 which is a simple eigenvalue with eigenvector $|s\rangle$ such that $\sum_{\lambda_i \in \Lambda_{d_L}} \alpha_i^2 = \alpha_*^2 = \frac{1}{N}$. Thus, the time complexity of the algorithm is:

$$T = \sum_{i=1}^p (t_i + \theta_i) \leq 4p\pi = O(2^{d_L} \sqrt{N}). \quad (35)$$

This completes the proof of Theorem 4. \square

The proof of Theorem 2 is similar to the proof of Theorem 4. The difference is that we need to additionally prove that $\langle w_k|w_{k+1}\rangle = \frac{\sqrt{|\Lambda_{k+1}|}}{\sqrt{|\Lambda_k|}}$ which is a number independent of $|m\rangle$. More specifically, we will prove that

$$\begin{aligned} \sqrt{\sum_{\lambda_i \in \Lambda_k} \alpha_i^2} &= \sqrt{\frac{|\Lambda_k|}{N}}, \\ \sqrt{\sum_{\lambda_i \in \bar{\Lambda}_k} \alpha_i^2} &= \sqrt{\frac{|\bar{\Lambda}_k|}{N}}, \end{aligned} \quad (36)$$

where $|\Lambda_k|$ ($|\bar{\Lambda}_k|$) denotes the cardinality of Λ_k ($\bar{\Lambda}_k$). The detailed proof is given in Appendix B. The analysis of parameters in our algorithms is detailed explained in Appendix C.

4 Applications to specific graphs

In this section, our aim is to show d_L of graphs of type 1 to 6 in Theorem 3 is independent of N and to address the case of complete bipartite graphs. The eigenvalues of the Laplacian matrix for these graphs are given in Appendix A and they are all integers.

We first take the Johnson graph as an example.

Lemma 3. *Let k be a fixed positive integer. For any Johnson graph $J(n, k)$ with N vertices, d_L is independent of N .*

Proof. The Laplacian matrix L of Johnson graph $J(n, k)$ has $\min(k, n - k) + 1$ distinct eigenvalues that are all integers. Recall that d_L is not bigger than the number of distinct eigenvalues of L and we have $d_L \leq \min(k, n - k) + 1 \leq k + 1$. Since k is fixed, d_L is independent of N . \square

The second example is the Hamming graph.

Lemma 4. *For a Hamming graph $H(d, q)$ with $N = q^d$ vertices, d_L is independent of N when d is fixed or $d_L = O(\log \log N)$ when q is fixed.*

Proof. The distinct eigenvalues of the Laplacian matrix L of the Hamming graph $H(d, q)$ are $0, q, 2q, \dots, dq$. As defined in Definition 1, $d_L = O(\log d)$. If d is fixed, d_L is also fixed and independent of N . If q is fixed, $d = O(\log N)$ and $d_L = O(\log d) = O(\log \log N)$. \square

Similarly, d_L in the following graphs are all independent of N : Kneser graph $K(n, k)$ for any fixed k , Grassmann graph $G_q(n, k)$ for any fixed k , rook graph $R(m, n)$ and complete-square graph.

Next, we consider the complete bipartite graph $K(N_1, N_2)$, which in general is not vertex-transitive. Consequently, Theorem 2 does not apply to this situation directly. However, we can still design a deterministic quantum algorithm by subtly adopting the idea of Theorem 2, which thus shows the flexibility of our algorithmic framework.

The vertex set of a complete bipartite graph $K(N_1, N_2)$ can be partitioned into two subsets V_1 of size N_1 and V_2 of size N_2 , such that there is an edge from every vertex in V_1 to every vertex in V_2 and there are no other edges. A special case of complete bipartite graphs is star graphs, where there is only one vertex in V_1 or V_2 . For star graphs, Ref. [QMW⁺22] proposed a deterministic quantum search algorithm via alternating quantum walks. We will give a generalized algorithm for any complete bipartite graph.

Theorem 5. *Given a complete bipartite graph $K(N_1, N_2)$ with a marked vertex m , there is a quantum search algorithm via alternating quantum walks that deterministically finds the marked vertex using time $O(\sqrt{N_1 + N_2})$.*

Proof. The adjacency matrix A of a complete bipartite graph $K(N_1, N_2)$ has three distinct eigenvalues: $0, \sqrt{N_1 N_2}, -\sqrt{N_1 N_2}$. The algebraic multiplicity of 0 is $N_1 + N_2 - 2$, and both $\sqrt{N_1 N_2}$ and $-\sqrt{N_1 N_2}$ are simple eigenvalues. Moreover, A has the following spectral decomposition

$$A = \sqrt{N_1 N_2} |\eta_+\rangle \langle \eta_+| - \sqrt{N_1 N_2} |\eta_-\rangle \langle \eta_-| + \sum_{i=1}^{N_1+N_2-2} 0 |\eta_i\rangle \langle \eta_i|, \quad (37)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} |\eta_+\rangle &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2N_1 N_2}} \left(\underbrace{\sqrt{N_2}, \dots, \sqrt{N_2}}_{N_1}, \underbrace{\sqrt{N_1}, \dots, \sqrt{N_1}}_{N_2} \right)^T, \\ |\eta_-\rangle &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2N_1 N_2}} \left(\underbrace{\sqrt{N_2}, \dots, \sqrt{N_2}}_{N_1}, \underbrace{-\sqrt{N_1}, \dots, -\sqrt{N_1}}_{N_2} \right)^T. \end{aligned} \quad (38)$$

The marked vertex is represented in this basis as

$$|m\rangle = \sum_{i=1}^{N_1+N_2-2} \alpha_i |\eta_i\rangle + \alpha_+ |\eta_+\rangle + \alpha_- |\eta_-\rangle. \quad (39)$$

If the marked vertex is in V_1 , then

$$\langle \eta_+ | m \rangle = \langle \eta_- | m \rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2N_1}},$$

and

$$|m\rangle = \sum_{i=1}^{N_1+N_2-2} \alpha_i |\eta_i\rangle + \frac{1}{\sqrt{2N_1}} |\eta_+\rangle + \frac{1}{\sqrt{2N_1}} |\eta_-\rangle. \quad (40)$$

Define

$$\begin{aligned} |\eta_0\rangle &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^{N_1+N_2-2} \alpha_i^2}} \sum_{i=1}^{N_1+N_2-2} \alpha_i |\eta_i\rangle, \\ |s\rangle &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} (|\eta_+\rangle + |\eta_-\rangle) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{N_1}} \underbrace{(1, 1, \dots, 1, 0, \dots, 0)}_{N_1}. \end{aligned} \quad (41)$$

We can see in subspace $\text{span}\{|\eta_0\rangle, |s\rangle\} = \text{span}\{|m\rangle, |s\rangle\}$,

$$e^{-iA \frac{\pi}{\sqrt{N_1 N_2}}} = I - 2|s\rangle\langle s|. \quad (42)$$

Obviously, $\langle m | s \rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{N_1}}$. Thus, by Lemma 2 there are parameters $p \in O(\sqrt{N_1})$, $\gamma, \theta_j \in [0, 2\pi)$ ($j \in \{1, 2, \dots, p\}$) such that

$$|s\rangle = e^{-i\gamma} \prod_{j=1}^p e^{-i\theta_j |m\rangle\langle m|} e^{-iA \frac{\pi}{\sqrt{N_1 N_2}}} |m\rangle. \quad (43)$$

Hence, by reversing the above state evolution, we obtain a quantum search algorithm that uses time $O(\sqrt{N_1})$ and finds the marked vertex with certainty from the uniform superposition state over all vertices in V_1 . Similarly, if the marked vertex is in V_2 , we can construct a quantum search with time $O(\sqrt{N_2})$. Thus, by running the two algorithms in order, we have a quantum algorithm that has time $O(\sqrt{N_1} + \sqrt{N_2})$ and finds the marked vertex with certainty. Since $\sqrt{N_1} + \sqrt{N_2} \leq \sqrt{2N_1 + 2N_2}$, the algorithm has time $O(\sqrt{N_1 + N_2})$. \square

5 Conclusion and Discussion

In this article, we have presented an quantum algorithmic framework, (i.e., Theorem 1), that unifies quantum spatial search, state transfer and uniform sampling on a large class of graphs. Using this framework, we can achieve exact uniform sampling over all vertices and perfect state transfer between any two vertices on a graph, provided that the graph's Laplacian matrix has only integer eigenvalues. Furthermore, if the graph is vertex-transitive as well, we can achieve deterministic quantum spatial search that finds a marked vertex with

certainty. Applying these results to several kinds of graphs often studied in the existing work, such as Johnson graphs, Hamming graphs, Kneser graphs, Grassmann graphs, rook graphs, complete-square graphs and complete bipartite graphs, we immediately obtain quantum algorithms of deterministic spatial search, exact uniform sampling, and perfect state transfer on these graphs with time $O(\sqrt{N})$, where N is the number of vertices of the graph.

Compared with existing work, our work not only has provided a succinct and universal method, but also has obtained more optimized results. The method is easy to use since it has a succinct formalism that depends only on the depth of the Laplacian eigenvalue set of the graph. Also, this method can uniformly resolve the three different problems (spatial search, state transfer and uniform sampling), whereas existing works resolve these problem one by one. Our work has improved the previous results. For instance, the previous uniform sampling algorithms were usually not exact and their complexity is related to the accuracy, whereas our uniform sampling algorithm is exact and requires fewer ancilla qubits. For the state transfer problem, our results reveal more graphs that permit perfect state transfer. For the spatial search problem, besides unifying and improving plenty of previous results, our approach provides new results on more graphs.

We have provided an approach to the derandomization of quantum spatial search algorithms. Due to the inherent randomness of quantum mechanics, most quantum algorithms have a certain probability of failure. It seems that everyone has habitually accepted the inevitable probability of failure in quantum algorithms. There is a lack of in-depth thinking about the following question: What problems can quantum algorithms in principle solve efficiently and deterministically? Our work may stimulate more discussion on this question.

Theorem 5 dedicated to the case of complete bipartite graphs is worthy of more attention, since the case is significantly different from the others. Despite this different, we can still deal with the case by subtly adopting the idea of Theorem 2, which thus shows the flexibility of Theorem 2. For future work, we hope to extend our results to more general graphs and more problems.

References

- [AAKV01] Dorit Aharonov, Andris Ambainis, Julia Kempe, and Umesh V. Vazirani. Quantum walks on graphs. In *Proceedings of the 33rd ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing*, pages 50–59, 2001.
- [ABN⁺01] Andris Ambainis, Eric Bach, Ashwin Nayak, Ashvin Vishwanath, and John Watrous. One-dimensional quantum walks. In *Proceedings of the Thirty-Third Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing*, STOC '01, page 37–49, New York, NY, USA, 2001. Association for Computing Machinery.
- [ACNR22] Simon Apers, Shantanav Chakraborty, Leonardo Novo, and Jérémie Roland. Quadratic speedup for spatial search by continuous-time quantum walk. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 129:160502, Oct 2022.
- [ADZ93] Y. Aharonov, L. Davidovich, and N. Zagury. Quantum random walks. *Phys. Rev. A*, 48:1687–1690, Aug 1993.

- [AF02] David Aldous and James Allen Fill. Reversible markov chains and random walks on graphs, 2002. Available at <http://www.stat.berkeley.edu/~aldous/RWG/book.html>.
- [AGJ21] Simon Apers, András Gilyén, and Stacey Jeffery. A Unified Framework of Quantum Walk Search. In Markus Bläser and Benjamin Monmege, editors, *38th International Symposium on Theoretical Aspects of Computer Science (STACS 2021)*, volume 187 of *Leibniz International Proceedings in Informatics (LIPIcs)*, pages 6:1–6:13, 2021.
- [AGJK20] Andris Ambainis, András Gilyén, Stacey Jeffery, and Martins Kokainis. Quadratic speedup for finding marked vertices by quantum walks. In *Proceedings of the 52nd Annual ACM SIGACT Symposium on Theory of Computing*, STOC 2020, page 412–424, New York, NY, USA, 2020. Association for Computing Machinery.
- [AJ22] Shyan Akmal and Ce Jin. Near-optimal quantum algorithms for string problems. In *Proceedings of the 2022 Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms (SODA)*, pages 2791–2832. SIAM, 2022.
- [AKL⁺79] Romas Aleliunas, Richard M. Karp, Richard J. Lipton, Laszlo Lovasz, and Charles Rackoff. Random walks, universal traversal sequences, and the complexity of maze problems. In *20th Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (sfcs 1979)*, pages 218–223, 1979.
- [AKR05] Andris Ambainis, Julia Kempe, and Alexander Rivosh. Coins make quantum walks faster. In *SODA '05: Proceedings of the sixteenth annual ACM-SIAM symposium on Discrete algorithms*, page 1099–1108, 2005.
- [AKS04] Manindra Agrawal, Neeraj Kayal, and Nitin Saxena. Primes is in p. *Annals of Mathematics*, 160(2):781–793, 2004.
- [Amb07] Andris Ambainis. Quantum walk algorithm for element distinctness. *SIAM J. Comput.*, 37(1):210–239, 2007.
- [ASM20] Bahman Ahmadi, M.H. Shirdareh Haghighi, and Ahmad Mokhtar. Perfect quantum state transfer on the johnson scheme. *Linear Algebra and its Applications*, 584:326–342, 2020.
- [Baš13] Milan Bašić. Characterization of quantum circulant networks having perfect state transfer. *Quantum Information Processing*, 12(1):345–364, 2013.
- [BBC⁺01] Robert Beals, Harry Buhrman, Richard Cleve, Michele Mosca, and Ronald de Wolf. Quantum lower bounds by polynomials. *J. ACM*, 48(4):778–797, jul 2001.
- [BCDWZ99] Harry Buhrman, Richard Cleve, Ronald De Wolf, and Christof Zalka. Bounds for small-error and zero-error quantum algorithms. In *40th Annual Symposium*

on *Foundations of Computer Science (Cat. No. 99CB37039)*, pages 358–368. IEEE, 1999.

- [Bel13] Aleksandrs Belovs. Quantum Walks and Electric Networks. *arXiv e-prints*, page arXiv:1302.3143, February 2013.
- [BGS08] Anna Bernasconi, Chris Godsil, and Simone Severini. Quantum networks on cubelike graphs. *Phys. Rev. A*, 78:052320, Nov 2008.
- [BH12] Andries E. Brouwer and Willem H Haemers. *Distance-Regular Graphs*, pages 177–185. Springer New York, New York, NY, 2012.
- [BHMT00] Gilles Brassard, Peter Hoyer, Michele Mosca, and Alain Tapp. Quantum amplitude amplification and estimation. *AMS Contemporary Mathematics Series*, 305, 06 2000.
- [BK19] Shalev Ben-David and Robin Kothari. Quantum distinguishing complexity, zero-error algorithms, and statistical zero knowledge. *arXiv e-prints*, page arXiv:1902.03660, feb 2019.
- [Bos03] Sougato Bose. Quantum communication through an unmodulated spin chain. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 91:207901, Nov 2003.
- [BS06] Harry Buhrman and Robert Spalek. Quantum verification of matrix products. In *Proceedings of the Seventeenth ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms*, pages 880–889, 2006.
- [CCD⁺03] Andrew M. Childs, Richard Cleve, Enrico Deotto, Edward Farhi, Sam Gutmann, and Daniel A. Spielman. Exponential algorithmic speedup by a quantum walk. In *Proceedings of the Thirty-Fifth Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing, STOC '03*, page 59–68, New York, NY, USA, 2003. Association for Computing Machinery.
- [CDD⁺05] Matthias Christandl, Nilanjana Datta, Tony C. Dorlas, Artur Ekert, Alastair Kay, and Andrew J. Landahl. Perfect transfer of arbitrary states in quantum spin networks. *Phys. Rev. A*, 71:032312, Mar 2005.
- [CDEL04] Matthias Christandl, Nilanjana Datta, Artur Ekert, and Andrew J. Landahl. Perfect state transfer in quantum spin networks. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 92:187902, May 2004.
- [CF21] Xiwang Cao and Keqin Feng. Perfect state transfer on cayley graphs over dihedral groups. *Linear and Multilinear Algebra*, 69(2):343–360, 2021.
- [CG04] Andrew M. Childs and Jeffrey Goldstone. Spatial search by quantum walk. *Phys. Rev. A*, 70:022314, Aug 2004.
- [CG11] Wang-Chi Cheung and Chris Godsil. Perfect state transfer in cubelike graphs. *Linear Algebra and its Applications*, 435(10):2468–2474, 2011. Special Issue in Honor of Dragos Cvetkovic.

- [CGGV15] G. Coutinho, C. Godsil, K. Guo, and F. Vanhove. Perfect state transfer on distance-regular graphs and association schemes. *Linear Algebra and its Applications*, 478:108–130, 2015.
- [CGTX22] Ada Chan, Chris D. Godsil, Christino Tamon, and Weichen Xie. Of shadows and gaps in spatial search. *Quantum Inf. Comput.*, 22(13&14):1110–1131, 2022.
- [Chi10] Andrew M. Childs. On the relationship between continuous- and discrete-time quantum walk. *Communications in Mathematical Physics*, 294(2):581–603, October 2010.
- [CLMS09] ANDREA CASACCINO, SETH LLOYD, STEFANO MANCINI, and SIMONE SEVERINI. Quantum state transfer through a qubit network with energy shifts and fluctuations. *International Journal of Quantum Information*, 07(08):1417–1427, 2009.
- [CLR20] Shantanav Chakraborty, Kyle Luh, and J er emie Roland. Analog quantum algorithms for the mixing of markov chains. *Phys. Rev. A*, 102:022423, Aug 2020.
- [CNAO16] Shantanav Chakraborty, Leonardo Novo, Andris Ambainis, and Yasser Omar. Spatial search by quantum walk is optimal for almost all graphs. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 116:100501, Mar 2016.
- [CT21] Lijie Chen and Roei Tell. Simple and fast derandomization from very hard functions: Eliminating randomness at almost no cost. In *Proceedings of the 53rd Annual ACM SIGACT Symposium on Theory of Computing*, STOC 2021, page 283–291, New York, NY, USA, 2021. Association for Computing Machinery.
- [DB15] V Dunjko and H J Briegel. Quantum mixing of markov chains for special distributions. *New Journal of Physics*, 17(7):073004, jul 2015.
- [DT23] Dean Doron and Roei Tell. Derandomization with Minimal Memory Footprint. In Amnon Ta-Shma, editor, *38th Computational Complexity Conference (CCC 2023)*, volume 264 of *Leibniz International Proceedings in Informatics (LIPIcs)*, pages 11:1–11:15, Dagstuhl, Germany, 2023. Schloss Dagstuhl – Leibniz-Zentrum f ur Informatik.
- [FGG14] Edward Farhi, Jeffrey Goldstone, and Sam Gutmann. A quantum approximate optimization algorithm, 2014.
- [GKSS19] Zeyu Guo, Mrinal Kumar, Ramprasad Satharishi, and Noam Solomon. Derandomization from algebraic hardness: Treading the borders. In *2019 IEEE 60th Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS)*, pages 147–157, 2019.
- [GLW22] Dandan Wang Gaojun Luo, Xiwang Cao and Xia Wu. Perfect quantum state transfer on cayley graphs over semi-dihedral groups. *Linear and Multilinear Algebra*, 70(21):6358–6374, 2022.

- [GMS90] Robert Grone, Russell Merris, and V. S. Sunder. The Laplacian Spectrum of a Graph. *SIAM Journal on Matrix Analysis and Applications*, 11(2):218–238, 1990.
- [God12] Chris Godsil. State transfer on graphs. *Discrete Mathematics*, 312(1):129–147, 2012. Algebraic Graph Theory — A Volume Dedicated to Gert Sabidussi on the Occasion of His 80th Birthday.
- [Gro97] Lov K. Grover. Quantum mechanics helps in searching for a needle in a haystack. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 79:325–328, Jul 1997.
- [HB16] Hiranmoy Pal and Bikash Bhattacharjya. A class of gcd-graphs having perfect state transfer. *Electronic Notes in Discrete Mathematics*, 53:319–329, 2016. International Conference on Graph Theory and its Applications.
- [HLL⁺23] Jiani Huang, Dan Li, Panlong Li, Yuqian Zhou, and Yuguang Yang. Perfect state transfer by means of discrete-time quantum walk on the complete bipartite graph. *Physica Scripta*, 99(1):015110, dec 2023.
- [Hoy00] Peter Hoyer. On arbitrary phases in quantum amplitude amplification. *Physical Review A*, 62, 06 2000.
- [HT09] Birgit Hein and Gregor Tanner. Quantum search algorithms on the hypercube. *Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and Theoretical*, 42(8):085303, jan 2009.
- [Imp06] Russell Impagliazzo. Can every randomized algorithm be derandomized? In *Proceedings of the Thirty-Eighth Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing*, STOC '06, page 373–374, New York, NY, USA, 2006. Association for Computing Machinery.
- [JKP⁺17] Nathaniel Johnston, Steve Kirkland, Sarah Plosker, Rebecca Storey, and Xiaohong Zhang. Perfect quantum state transfer using hadamard diagonalizable graphs. *Linear Algebra and its Applications*, 531:375–398, 2017.
- [JMW14] Jonatan Janmark, David A. Meyer, and Thomas G. Wong. Global symmetry is unnecessary for fast quantum search. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 112:210502, May 2014.
- [JZ23] Stacey Jeffery and Sebastian Zur. Multidimensional quantum walks. In *Proceedings of the 55th Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing*, STOC 2023, page 1125–1130, New York, NY, USA, 2023. Association for Computing Machinery.
- [Kem03] J. Kempe. Quantum random walks: An introductory overview. *Contemporary Physics*, 44(4):307–327, 2003.
- [KKGK21] Karuna Kadian, Sunita Garhwal, and Ajay Kumar. Quantum walk and its application domains: A systematic review. *Computer Science Review*, 41:100419, 2021.

- [KMOR16] Hari Krovi, Frédéric Magniez, Maris Ozols, and Jérémie Roland. Quantum walks can find a marked element on any graph. *Algorithmica*, 74(2):851–907, 2016.
- [KUW86] R. M. Karp, E. Upfal, and A. Wigderson. Constructing a perfect matching is in random nc. *Combinatorica*, 6(1):35–48, Mar 1986.
- [LL23a] Guanzhong Li and Lvzhou Li. Derandomization of quantum algorithm for triangle finding. *arXiv:2309.13268*, 2023.
- [LL23b] Guanzhong Li and Lvzhou Li. Deterministic quantum search with adjustable parameters: Implementations and applications. *Information and Computation*, 292:105042, 2023.
- [LL24a] Guanzhong Li and Lvzhou Li. Optimal deterministic quantum algorithm for the promised element distinctness problem. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 999:114551, 2024.
- [LL24b] Jingquan Luo and Lvzhou Li. Circuit complexity of sparse quantum state preparation. *arXiv:2406.16142*, 2024.
- [LLL24] Guanzhong Li, Lvzhou Li, and Jingquan Luo. Recovering the original simplicity: succinct and deterministic quantum algorithm for the welded tree problem. In *Proceedings of the 2024 Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms (SODA)*, pages 2454–2480. SIAM, 2024.
- [Lon01] G. L. Long. Grover algorithm with zero theoretical failure rate. *Phys. Rev. A*, 64:022307, Jul 2001.
- [LS23] Xinying Li and Yun Shang. Faster quantum sampling of markov chains in nonregular graphs with fewer qubits. *Phys. Rev. A*, 107:022432, Feb 2023.
- [LW06] Michael Luby and Avi Wigderson. Pairwise independence and derandomization. *Foundations and Trends in Theoretical Computer Science*, 1(4):237–301, 2006.
- [LYW⁺23] Zhi-Hao Li, Gui-Fang Yu, Ya-Xin Wang, Ze-Yu Xing, Ling-Wen Kong, and Xiao-Qi Zhou. Experimental demonstration of deterministic quantum search algorithms on a programmable silicon photonic chip. *Science China Physics, Mechanics & Astronomy*, 66(9):290311, 2023.
- [LZ15] Yang Liu and FeiHao Zhang. First experimental demonstration of an exact quantum search algorithm in nuclear magnetic resonance system. *Science China Physics, Mechanics & Astronomy*, 58:1–6, 2015.
- [Mil76] Gary L. Miller. Riemann’s hypothesis and tests for primality. *Journal of Computer and System Sciences*, 13(3):300–317, 1976.

- [MN07] Frédéric Magniez and Ashwin Nayak. Quantum complexity of testing group commutativity. *Algorithmica*, 48(3):221–232, 2007.
- [MNRS07] Frederic Magniez, Ashwin Nayak, Jeremie Roland, and Miklos Santha. Search via quantum walk. In *Proceedings of the Thirty-Ninth Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing, STOC '07*, page 575–584. Association for Computing Machinery, 2007.
- [MSS07] Frédéric Magniez, Miklos Santha, and Mario Szegedy. Quantum algorithms for the triangle problem. *SIAM J. Comput.*, 37(2):413–424, 2007.
- [MW21a] S. Marsh and J. B. Wang. Deterministic spatial search using alternating quantum walks. *Phys. Rev. A*, 104:022216, Aug 2021.
- [MW21b] S Marsh and J B Wang. A framework for optimal quantum spatial search using alternating phase-walks. *Quantum Science and Technology*, 6(4):045029, sep 2021.
- [NCM⁺15] Leonardo Novo, Shantanav Chakraborty, Masoud Mohseni, Hartmut Neven, and Yasser Omar. Systematic dimensionality reduction for quantum walks: Optimal spatial search and transport on non-regular graphs. *Scientific Reports*, 5(1):13304, 2015.
- [NV00] Ashwin Nayak and Ashvin Vishwanath. Quantum walk on the line. *arXiv e-prints*, pages quant-ph/0010117, oct 2000.
- [OBD18] Davide Orsucci, Hans J. Briegel, and Vedran Dunjko. Faster quantum mixing for slowly evolving sequences of Markov chains. *Quantum*, 2:105, nov 2018.
- [PB11] Martin Plesch and Časlav Brukner. Quantum-state preparation with universal gate decompositions. *Physical Review A*, 83(3):032302, 2011.
- [PB17] Hiranmoy Pal and Bikash Bhattacharjya. Perfect state transfer on gcd-graphs. *Linear and Multilinear Algebra*, 65(11):2245–2256, 2017.
- [Por18] Renato Portugal. *Coined Quantum Walks on Graphs*, pages 125–158. Springer International Publishing, Cham, 2018.
- [PTB16] Pascal Philipp, Luís Tarrataca, and Stefan Boettcher. Continuous-time quantum search on balanced trees. *Phys. Rev. A*, 93:032305, Mar 2016.
- [QMW⁺22] Dengke Qu, Samuel Marsh, Kunkun Wang, Lei Xiao, Jingbo Wang, and Peng Xue. Deterministic search on star graphs via quantum walks. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 128:050501, Feb 2022.
- [Rab80] Michael O Rabin. Probabilistic algorithm for testing primality. *Journal of Number Theory*, 12(1):128–138, 1980.
- [Rei08] Omer Reingold. Undirected connectivity in log-space. *J. ACM*, 55(4), sep 2008.

- [Ric07a] Peter C Richter. Almost uniform sampling via quantum walks. *New Journal of Physics*, 9(3):72, mar 2007.
- [Ric07b] Peter C. Richter. Quantum speedup of classical mixing processes. *Phys. Rev. A*, 76:042306, Oct 2007.
- [RJS22] Tanay Roy, Liang Jiang, and David I. Schuster. Deterministic Grover search with a restricted oracle. *Phys. Rev. Res.*, 4:L022013, Apr 2022.
- [RW19] Mason L. Rhodes and Thomas G. Wong. Quantum walk search on the complete bipartite graph. *Phys. Rev. A*, 99:032301, Mar 2019.
- [SBM05] Vivek V Shende, Stephen S Bullock, and Igor L Markov. Synthesis of quantum logic circuits. In *Proceedings of the 2005 Asia and South Pacific Design Automation Conference*, pages 272–275, 2005.
- [SS77] R. Solovay and V. Strassen. A fast monte-carlo test for primality. *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 6(1):84–85, 1977.
- [ŠS16] Martin Štefaňák and S Skoupý. Perfect state transfer by means of discrete-time quantum walk search algorithms on highly symmetric graphs. *Phys. Rev. A*, 94:022301, Aug 2016.
- [ST17] Ola Svensson and Jakub Tarnawski. The matching problem in general graphs is in quasi-nc. In *2017 IEEE 58th Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS)*, pages 696–707, 2017.
- [STY+23] Xiaoming Sun, Guojing Tian, Shuai Yang, Pei Yuan, and Shengyu Zhang. Asymptotically optimal circuit depth for quantum state preparation and general unitary synthesis. *IEEE Transactions on Computer-Aided Design of Integrated Circuits and Systems*, 42(10):3301–3314, 2023.
- [SWLL19] Yun Shang, Yu Wang, Meng Li, and Ruqian Lu. Quantum communication protocols by quantum walks with two coins. *Europhysics Letters*, 124(6):60009, jan 2019.
- [Sze04] M. Szegedy. Quantum speed-up of markov chain based algorithms. In *45th Annual IEEE Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science*, pages 32–41, 2004.
- [Tel22] Roei Tell. Quantified derandomization: How to find water in the ocean. *Foundations and Trends in Theoretical Computer Science*, 15(1):1–125, 2022.
- [TFC19] Ying-Ying Tan, Keqin Feng, and Xiwang Cao. Perfect state transfer on abelian cayley graphs. *Linear Algebra and its Applications*, 563:331–352, 2019.
- [TSP22a] Hajime Tanaka, Mohamed Sabri, and Renato Portugal. Spatial search on johnson graphs by continuous-time quantum walk. *Quantum Information Processing*, 21(2):74, 2022.

- [TSP22b] Hajime Tanaka, Mohamed Sabri, and Renato Portugal. Spatial search on johnson graphs by discrete-time quantum walk. *Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and Theoretical*, 55(25):255304, jun 2022.
- [VA12] Salvador Elías Venegas-Andraca. Quantum walks: a comprehensive review. *Quantum Information Processing*, 11(5):1015–1106, 2012.
- [Vad12] Salil P. Vadhan. Pseudorandomness. *Foundations and Trends in Theoretical Computer Science*, 7(1–3):1–336, 2012.
- [WA08] Pawel Wocjan and Anura Abeyesinghe. Speedup via quantum sampling. *Phys. Rev. A*, 78:042336, Oct 2008.
- [WC24] Dandan Wang and Xiwang Cao. Perfect quantum state transfer on cayley graphs over dicyclic groups. *Linear and Multilinear Algebra*, 72(1):76–91, 2024.
- [XZL22] Yongzhen Xu, Delong Zhang, and Lvzhou Li. Robust quantum walk search without knowing the number of marked vertices. *Phys. Rev. A*, 106:052207, Nov 2022.
- [YG15] İskender Yalçınkaya and Zafer Gedik. Qubit state transfer via discrete-time quantum walks. *Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and Theoretical*, 48(22):225302, may 2015.
- [YZ23] Pei Yuan and Shengyu Zhang. Optimal (controlled) quantum state preparation and improved unitary synthesis by quantum circuits with any number of ancillary qubits. *Quantum*, 7:956, 2023.
- [Zha19] Hanmeng Zhan. An infinite family of circulant graphs with perfect state transfer in discrete quantum walks. *Quantum Information Processing*, 18(12):369, 2019.
- [ZQB⁺14] Xiang Zhan, Hao Qin, Zhi-hao Bian, Jian Li, and Peng Xue. Perfect state transfer and efficient quantum routing: A discrete-time quantum-walk approach. *Phys. Rev. A*, 90:012331, Jul 2014.

A Eigenvalues associated with some typical graphs

The Johnson graph $J(n, k)$ has Laplacian eigenvalues $ni + i - i^2$ with multiplicity $\binom{n}{i} - \binom{n}{i-1}$ ² where $i = 0, 1, 2, \dots, \min(k, n - k)$.

The Kneser graph $K(n, k)$ [BH12] has Laplacian eigenvalues $\binom{n-k}{k} - (-1)^i \binom{n-k-i}{k-i}$ with multiplicity $\binom{n}{i} - \binom{n}{i-1}$ where $i = 0, 1, 2, \dots, k$.

The Hamming graph $H(d, q)$ [BH12] has Laplacian eigenvalues qi with multiplicity $\binom{d}{i}(q-i)^i$ where $i = 0, 1, 2, \dots, d$.

² $\binom{n}{-1}$ is defined as 0 for each n .

The Grassmann graph $G_q(n, k)$ [BH12] has Laplacian eigenvalues $q[k]_q[n-k]_q - q^{i+1}[k-i]_q[n-k-i]_q + [i]_q$ where $i = 0, 1, 2, \dots, \min(k, n-k)$ and $[k]_q = \frac{q^k-1}{q-1}$.

The rook graph $R(m, n)$ [MW21b] has Laplacian eigenvalues $0, m, n, m+n$.

The $K_n \square Q_2$ graph [MW21b] that is called complete-square graph has Laplacian eigenvalues $0, 2, 4, n, n+2, n+4$.

The complete bipartite graph $K(N_1, N_2)$ has Laplacian eigenvalues $0, n, m, n+m$. The adjacency matrix A of $K(N_1, N_2)$ has three distinct eigenvalues: $0, \sqrt{N_1 N_2}, -\sqrt{N_1 N_2}$. The algebraic multiplicity of 0 is $N_1 + N_2 - 2$, and both $\sqrt{N_1 N_2}$ and $-\sqrt{N_1 N_2}$ are simple eigenvalues.

B Proof of Equation (36)

Since G is vertex-transitive, given any vertex v in G , there is an automorphism mapping $f: V \rightarrow V$ such that $f(m) = v$. We define $S = \text{span}\{|v_1\rangle, \dots, |v_N\rangle\}$, and a linear mapping $g: S \rightarrow S$ such that $g(|u_1\rangle) = |f(u_1)\rangle$, $g(|u_1\rangle + |u_2\rangle) = g(|u_1\rangle) + g(|u_2\rangle)$, and $g(\beta|u_1\rangle) = \beta g(|u_1\rangle)$ where u_1, u_2 are any two vertices in G and β is any real number. Recall that $|m\rangle = \sum_{i=1}^N \alpha_i |\eta_i\rangle$. We have

$$|v\rangle = |f(m)\rangle = g(|m\rangle) = \sum_{i=1}^N \alpha_i g(|\eta_i\rangle) \quad (44)$$

Next we shall prove that if $L|\eta_i\rangle = \lambda_i |\eta_i\rangle$, then $Lg(|\eta_i\rangle) = \lambda_i g(|\eta_i\rangle)$. Recall that f is an automorphism mapping and we have

$$\langle u_1 | L |u_2\rangle = \langle f(u_1) | L |f(u_2)\rangle = g(|u_1\rangle)^T L g(|u_2\rangle) \quad (45)$$

where u_1, u_2 are any two vertices in G . Assuming that $|\eta_i\rangle = \sum_{k=1}^N \beta_k |v_k\rangle$ where v_k is a vertex in G and the following equation holds for each $j \in \{1, 2, \dots, N\}$.

$$\begin{aligned} g(|v_j\rangle)^T L g(|\eta_i\rangle) &= g(|v_j\rangle)^T L g\left(\sum_{k=1}^N \beta_k |v_k\rangle\right) = \sum_{k=1}^N \beta_k g(|v_j\rangle)^T L g(|v_k\rangle) \\ &= \sum_{k=1}^N \beta_k \langle v_j | L |v_k\rangle = \langle v_j | L \sum_{k=1}^N \beta_k |v_k\rangle = \langle v_j | L |\eta_i\rangle = \langle v_j | \lambda_i |\eta_i\rangle = \lambda_i \beta_j. \end{aligned} \quad (46)$$

From (46), we can obtain that

$$L g(|\eta_i\rangle) = \sum_{j=1}^N \lambda_i \beta_j g(|v_j\rangle) = \lambda_i g\left(\sum_{j=1}^N \beta_j |v_j\rangle\right) = \lambda_i g(|\eta_i\rangle) \quad (47)$$

This equation shows that $g(|\eta_i\rangle)$ and $|\eta_i\rangle$ are the eigenvectors of the same eigenvalue and $g(|\eta_i\rangle)$ are also orthonormal since g is linear and $|\eta_i\rangle$ are orthonormal. Let $\lambda'_1, \lambda'_2, \dots, \lambda'_n$ be the distinct values of $\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_N$. From (44) and (47), and the modulus of the projection vectors of $|v\rangle$ and $|m\rangle$ on the eigenspace of λ'_j are equal for each $j \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ and v in

G. This fact implies that $\sqrt{\sum_{\lambda_i=\lambda'_j} \alpha_i^2}$ is independent from the location of m for each j . The Definition 1 ensures that the equal eigenvalues are in a same set and we have $\sqrt{\sum_{\lambda_i \in \Lambda_k} \alpha_i^2}$ and $\sqrt{\sum_{\lambda_i \in \bar{\Lambda}_k} \alpha_i^2}$ are both independent from the location of m . Next we give the specific values of them. Assuming the algebraic multiplicity of λ'_j is a_j and its orthonormal eigenvectors are $|\eta'_1\rangle, |\eta'_2\rangle, \dots, |\eta'_{a_j}\rangle$. We have

$$\begin{aligned} a_j &= \sum_{k=1}^{a_j} \langle \eta'_k | \eta'_k \rangle = \sum_{k=1}^{a_j} \langle \eta'_k | \sum_{v \in V} |v\rangle \langle v| | \eta'_k \rangle = \sum_{v \in V} \sum_{k=1}^{a_j} \langle \eta'_k | v \rangle \langle v | \eta'_k \rangle \\ &= N \sum_{k=1}^{a_j} \langle \eta'_k | m \rangle \langle m | \eta'_k \rangle = N \sum_{\lambda_i=\lambda'_j} \alpha_i^2, \end{aligned} \quad (48)$$

where the first equation in the second line holds since $\sum_{k=1}^{a_j} \langle \eta'_k | v \rangle \langle v | \eta'_k \rangle$ is the square of module of the projection vectors of $|v\rangle$ on the eigenspace of λ'_j and this is a fixed number for each v . We can see that

$$\sqrt{\sum_{\lambda_i \in \Lambda_k} \alpha_i^2} = \sqrt{\sum_{\lambda'_j \in \Lambda_k} \sum_{\lambda_i=\lambda'_j} \alpha_i^2} = \sqrt{\sum_{\lambda'_j \in \Lambda_k} \frac{a_j}{N}} = \sqrt{\frac{|\Lambda_k|}{N}}. \quad (49)$$

Similarly,

$$\sqrt{\sum_{\lambda_i \in \bar{\Lambda}_k} \alpha_i^2} = \sqrt{\frac{|\bar{\Lambda}_k|}{N}}. \quad (50)$$

C Analysis of parameters in our algorithms

In Theorem 4, we achieve $|m\rangle = |w_0\rangle \rightarrow |w_{d_L}\rangle = |s\rangle$ by achieving $|w_k\rangle \rightarrow |w_{k+1}\rangle$ for each k using Lemma 2. More specifically, in each $\text{span}\{|w_k\rangle, |w_{k+1}\rangle\}$, we constructed two types of unitary operators:

$$\begin{aligned} U_1(\pi) &= I - 2|w_{k+1}\rangle \langle w_{k+1}| \\ U_2(\beta) &= I - (1 - e^{-i\beta}) |w_k\rangle \langle w_k|. \end{aligned} \quad (51)$$

Using Theorem 2, there are parameters p, γ, β_j ($j \in \{1, \dots, p\}$) such that

$$|w_{k+1}\rangle = e^{-i\gamma} \prod_{j=1}^p U_2(\beta_j) U_1(\pi) |w_k\rangle. \quad (52)$$

The global phase γ can be ignored and what we care about are p, β_j ($j \in \{1, \dots, p\}$). The reference [LL23b] of Lemma 2 list the conditions that these parameters need to satisfy. Let

$$\sqrt{\lambda} = |\langle w_k | w_{k+1} \rangle|. \quad (53)$$

The condition that the integer p needs to satisfy is

$$\begin{cases} p \text{ is even,} \\ p > \frac{\pi}{|\arcsin \sqrt{\lambda}|}. \end{cases} \quad (54)$$

For each p satisfies the above condition, there are β_j ($j \in \{1, \dots, p\}$) satisfying Equation (52), where

$$\beta_j = \begin{cases} \beta'_1 & j \text{ is odd} \\ \beta'_2 & j \text{ is even} \end{cases}, \quad (55)$$

and β'_1, β'_2 are solutions to the following equations:

$$\begin{cases} \cos \frac{\psi}{2} = -\cos \left(\frac{\beta'_1 + \beta'_2}{2} \right) - 8\lambda \sin \frac{\beta'_1}{2} \sin \frac{\beta'_2}{2} + 8\lambda^2 \sin \frac{\beta'_1}{2} \sin \frac{\beta'_2}{2}, \\ 0 = \sin \frac{\psi}{2} \cos(p\psi) - 4\lambda(1 - 2\lambda) \sin(p\psi) \sin \frac{\beta'_1}{2} \sin \frac{\beta'_2}{2}, \\ 0 = (4\lambda - 1) \sin \frac{\beta'_1}{2} \cos \frac{\beta'_2}{2} - \cos \frac{\beta'_1}{2} \sin \frac{\beta'_2}{2}. \end{cases} \quad (56)$$

We can see that the equations are too complicated to obtain a closed-form solution. To design parameters in our algorithms more simply, we propose an improvement method which doesn't increase the time complexity and only requires an ancilla qubit. Our main idea is use the following theorem to achieve $|w_k\rangle \rightarrow |w_{k+1}\rangle$.

Theorem 6 ([Lon01]). *Given $U_1(\alpha)$, $U_2(\beta)$ and $|\langle \psi_1 | \psi_2 \rangle| \in (0, 1)$ where $U_1(\alpha) = I - (1 - e^{-i\alpha}) |\psi_2\rangle\langle \psi_2|$, $U_2(\beta) = I - (1 - e^{-i\beta}) |\psi_1\rangle\langle \psi_1|$. There is $p \in O\left(\frac{1}{|\langle \psi_1 | \psi_2 \rangle|}\right)$ and γ , α_j, β_j ($j \in \{1, \dots, p\}$) $\in [0, 2\pi)$ such that*

$$|\psi_2\rangle = e^{-i\gamma} \prod_{j=1}^p U_2(\beta_j) U_1(\alpha) |\psi_1\rangle. \quad (57)$$

If p satisfies that

$$p \geq \frac{\pi - 2 \arcsin(|\langle \psi_1 | \psi_2 \rangle|)}{4 \arcsin(|\langle \psi_1 | \psi_2 \rangle|)}, \quad (58)$$

there are parameters α_j, β_j ($j \in \{1, \dots, p\}$) satisfying Equation (57), where

$$\alpha_j = \beta_j = 2 \arcsin \left(\frac{\sin \left(\frac{\pi}{4p+6} \right)}{|\langle \psi_1 | \psi_2 \rangle|} \right), \quad j \in \{1, \dots, p\}. \quad (59)$$

It's obvious that if we use Theorem 6 to achieve $|w_k\rangle \rightarrow |w_{k+1}\rangle$, parameters in our algorithms will have analytical expressions. According to Theorem 6, to achieve $|w_k\rangle \rightarrow |w_{k+1}\rangle$ in $\text{span}\{|w_k\rangle, |w_{k+1}\rangle\}$, we need these three conditions:

1. Constructing $U_1(\alpha) = I - (1 - e^{-i\alpha}) |w_{k+1}\rangle\langle w_{k+1}|$.
2. Constructing $U_2(\beta) = I - (1 - e^{-i\beta}) |w_k\rangle\langle w_k|$.
3. Knowing the value of $\langle w_k | w_{k+1} \rangle$.

In the proof of Theorem 4, we have proven that the second and third conditions can be satisfied. For the first condition, we construct a special case of $U_1(\alpha)$ where $\alpha = \pi$:

$$U_1(\pi) = I - 2|w_{k+1}\rangle\langle w_{k+1}|. \quad (60)$$

Next we describe that how to use $U_1(\pi)$ to construct $U_1(\alpha)$ for any α .

Theorem 7. Let $|\psi\rangle$ be any quantum state, and U satisfies that $U|\psi\rangle = -|\psi\rangle$ and $U|\psi^\perp\rangle = |\psi^\perp\rangle$, where $|\psi^\perp\rangle$ is orthogonal with $|\psi\rangle$. Given any $\theta \in [0, 2\pi)$, we can construct a operator A , where A calls U twice and satisfies that $A|\psi\rangle = e^{i\theta}|\psi\rangle$ and $A|\psi^\perp\rangle = |\psi^\perp\rangle$.

Proof. The quantum circuit of A can be constructed as shown in Figure 2.




Figure 2: The quantum circuit of A in Theorem 7

In the quantum circuit, the first line represents an ancilla qubit initialized to $|0\rangle$ and the second line represents qubits which U acts on. The gate

$$H = \begin{pmatrix} \sqrt{\frac{1}{2}} & \sqrt{\frac{1}{2}} \\ \sqrt{\frac{1}{2}} & -\sqrt{\frac{1}{2}} \end{pmatrix}, \quad (61)$$

and

$$Z_\theta = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & e^{i\theta} \end{pmatrix}. \quad (62)$$

After simple calculation, it can be obtained that

$$A|0\rangle|\psi\rangle = e^{i\theta}|0\rangle|\psi\rangle, \quad (63)$$

and

$$A|0\rangle|\psi^\perp\rangle = |0\rangle|\psi^\perp\rangle. \quad (64)$$

□

By the above theorem, we can use

$$U_1(\pi) = I - 2|w_{k+1}\rangle\langle w_{k+1}| \quad (65)$$

to construct $A(\alpha)$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} A(\alpha)|w_{k+1}\rangle &= e^{-i\alpha}|w_{k+1}\rangle. \\ A(\alpha)|w_{k+1}^\perp\rangle &= |w_{k+1}^\perp\rangle. \end{aligned} \quad (66)$$

In subspace $\text{span}\{|w_{k+1}\rangle, |\bar{w}_{k+1}\rangle\} = \text{span}\{|w_k\rangle, |w_{k+1}\rangle\}$, the effect of $A(\alpha)$ is equivalent to

$$I - (1 - e^{-i\alpha})|w_{k+1}\rangle\langle w_{k+1}| = U_1(\alpha). \quad (67)$$

Thus, we satisfy all three conditions in Theorem 6 and we can use it to achieve $|w_k\rangle \rightarrow |w_{k+1}\rangle$:
If p satisfies that

$$p \geq \frac{\pi - 2 \arcsin(|\langle w_k | w_{k+1} \rangle|)}{4 \arcsin(|\langle w_k | w_{k+1} \rangle|)}, \quad (68)$$

there are parameters γ and

$$\alpha_j = \beta_j = 2 \arcsin \left(\frac{\sin \left(\frac{\pi}{4p+6} \right)}{|\langle w_k | w_{k+1} \rangle|} \right), \quad j \in \{1, \dots, p\}, \quad (69)$$

such that

$$|w_{k+1}\rangle = e^{-i\gamma} \prod_{j=1}^p U_2(\beta_j) U_1(\alpha_j) |w_k\rangle. \quad (70)$$

In this way, we provide an analytical expression for parameters in our algorithms.