

Performance Upper Bound of the Grover-Mixer Quantum Alternating Operator Ansatz

Ningyi Xie^{*1}, Jiahua Xu¹, Tiejin Chen², Yoshiyuki Saito³, Nobuyoshi Asai⁴, and Dongsheng Cai⁵

¹Graduate School of Science and Technology, University of Tsukuba

²School of Computing and Augmented Intelligence, Arizona State University

³Graduate School of Computer Science and Engineering, University of Aizu

⁴School of Computer Science and Engineering, University of Aizu, University of Aizu

⁵Faculty of Engineering, Information and Systems, University of Tsukuba

Abstract

The Quantum Alternating Operator Ansatz (QAOA) represents a branch of quantum algorithms designed for solving combinatorial optimization problems. A specific variant, the Grover-Mixer Quantum Alternating Operator Ansatz (GM-QAOA), ensures uniform amplitude across states that share equivalent objective values. This property makes the algorithm independent of the problem structure, focusing instead on the distribution of objective values within the problem. In this work, we prove the probability upper bound for measuring a computational basis state from a GM-QAOA circuit with a given depth, which is a critical factor in QAOA cost. From this, we derive the upper bounds for the probability of sampling an optimal solution and for the approximation ratio of maximum optimization problems, based on the objective value distribution. Using numerical analysis, we link the distribution to the problem size and build the regression models that relate the problem size, QAOA depth, and performance upper bound. Our results suggest that the GM-QAOA provides a quadratic enhancement in sampling probability and requires circuit depth that scales exponentially with problem size to maintain consistent performance.

1 Introduction

Combinatorial optimization problems are continuously studied by both industry and academia due to their broad applicability and inherent complexity. Since the number of possible solutions grows exponentially with the problem size, the computational cost of finding the exact optimal solution skyrockets. This challenge motivates the development of heuristic methods to find approximate solutions in a reasonable time [15, 16]. In recent years, this area of research has also been activated in the context of quantum computing [4, 11, 17, 19].

A popular family of quantum algorithms for addressing combinatorial optimization problems is the Quantum Alternating Operator Ansatz (QAOA) [2, 5, 11, 12, 20]. Inspired by the principles of adiabatic quantum computing [6], QAOA algorithms prepare a parameterized quantum state through an alternating sequence of operations repeated for a pre-defined number of rounds p , known as the circuit depth. Many works have theoretically and numerically analyzed the effect of circuit depth on the quality of solutions obtained from QAOAs [1, 14, 18, 22], including Grover-Mixer Quantum Alternating Operator Ansatz (GM-QAOA) [2, 3, 8].

The GM-QAOA [2] initializes the quantum circuit in a uniform amplitude superposition of states encoding all possible solutions in the search space, and the search space is maintained by the Grover mixer. This allows GM-QAOA to inherently preserve feasibility for constrained problems like the traveling salesman problem and the capacitated vehicle routing problem, given efficient preparation

^{*}E-mail: nyxie@cavelab.cs.tsukuba.ac.jp

of the feasible state superposition [2, 21]. Additionally, GM-QAOA assigns equal amplitudes to states corresponding to the same objective value, causing the algorithm's performance to be determined solely by the distribution of objectives. [3] analyzes the least circuit depth p required by GM-QAOA to achieve a targeted performance, establishing theoretical bounds by extending the theorem on quantum annealing time [7]. However, this depth scaling may not be tight, as numerical experiments in [8] suggest conflicting behaviors, showing the exponential growth of the required GM-QAOA depth as the problem size increases.

In this work, we derive upper bounds on the performance of GM-QAOA in terms of two key metrics: the probability of sampling the optimal solution and the approximation ratio. These bounds, which are dependent on the objective value distribution, emerge from our proof of an upper limit on the probability of measuring a computational basis state from the GM-QAOA circuit. To evaluate the scalability of the GM-QAOA, we apply numerical analysis to the objective value distributions of several widely studied combinatorial optimization problems of varying sizes, where the problem definitions and instance sets are detailed in Section 5.3. Additionally, we propose predictive models for these bounds and validate them through comparisons with GM-QAOA simulation results. Our findings provide further evidence of the exponential resource requirements of GM-QAOA for solving combinatorial optimization problems as the instance size increases.

2 Background of the GM-QAOA

A combinatorial optimization problem is defined by (F, C) , where search space F represents the finite set of possible solutions, and $C : F \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is the objective function that assigns a numerical value to each solution in F . The goal is to find an optimal solution that maximizes or minimizes the objective function, mathematically formulated as,

$$\operatorname{argopt}_{f \in F} C(f). \quad (1)$$

For a given problem (C, F) , QAOA approaches yield solutions by performing measurements in the computational basis of parameterized quantum circuits, $|\psi(\boldsymbol{\theta})\rangle$. Here, the parameter $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ is typically tuned by optimizing the expected value $E(\boldsymbol{\theta})$,

$$E(\boldsymbol{\theta}) := \langle \psi(\boldsymbol{\theta}) | H_C | \psi(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \rangle, \quad (2)$$

where the problem Hamiltonian, H_C , satisfies $\langle f | H_C | f \rangle = C(f)$, $\forall f \in F$. Specifically, $|f\rangle$ represents the computational basis state encoding the solution f .

The GM-QAOA [2] prepares a parameterized state $|\psi_{p,C,F}(\boldsymbol{\gamma}, \boldsymbol{\beta})\rangle$ from a uniform amplitude superposition, denoted as $|F\rangle$,

$$|F\rangle := \frac{1}{\sqrt{|F|}} \sum_{f \in F} |f\rangle. \quad (3)$$

Then, the state evolves through p repetitions of two distinctive types of operation, $U_C^{(P)}$ and $U_F^{(M)}$, which is given by

$$|\psi_{p,C,F}(\boldsymbol{\gamma}, \boldsymbol{\beta})\rangle := U_F^{(M)}(\beta_p) U_C^{(P)}(\gamma_p) \cdots U_F^{(M)}(\beta_2) U_C^{(P)}(\gamma_2) U_F^{(M)}(\beta_1) U_C^{(P)}(\gamma_1) |F\rangle, \quad (4)$$

where p denotes the pre-defined QAOA depth and $\boldsymbol{\gamma} = [\gamma_1, \gamma_2, \dots, \gamma_p]^T$, $\boldsymbol{\beta} = [\beta_1, \beta_2, \dots, \beta_p]^T$ are tunable circuit parameters. The phase separation operation, $U_C^{(P)}$, functions as,

$$U_C^{(P)}(\gamma) |f\rangle = e^{-i\gamma C(f)} |f\rangle. \quad (5)$$

Here, we name $\mathcal{C} : F \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ as the ‘‘phase function’’. Generally, it is pre-defined as $\mathcal{C}(f) := C(f)$, and $U_C^{(P)} := e^{-i\gamma H_C}$. [9] introduces a threshold-based strategy,

$$\mathcal{C}(f) = \begin{cases} 1 & C(f) \leq th \\ 0 & otherwise \end{cases} \quad (6)$$

where threshold, th , is an additional tunable parameter. The mixing operation $U_F^{(M)}$ in the GM-QAOA is defined as,

$$\begin{aligned} U_F^{(M)}(\beta) &:= e^{-i\beta|F\rangle\langle F|} \\ &= I - (1 - e^{-i\beta})|F\rangle\langle F|, \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

which has a Grover-like form [10].

We adopt two metrics to evaluate the effectiveness of states prepared by the GM-QAOA:

Definition 1 (Probability of sampling the optimal solution). *Given a problem (F, C) , let F^* denote the set of optimal solutions, where $F^* := \{f^* | f^* = \text{argopt}_{f \in F} C(f)\}$. Let $|\psi(\boldsymbol{\theta})\rangle$ be the prepared quantum state (i.e., $|\psi_{p,C,F}(\boldsymbol{\gamma}, \boldsymbol{\beta})\rangle$ in the GM-QAOA), then the probability of sampling the optimal solution denoted λ , is defined as,*

$$\lambda := \sum_{f^* \in F^*} |\langle f^* | \psi(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \rangle|^2; \quad (8)$$

Definition 2 (Approximation ratio). *Given a maximum optimization problem (F, C) , let H_C denote the problem Hamiltonian. the approximation ratio of a prepared quantum state, $|\psi(\boldsymbol{\theta})\rangle$ (i.e., $|\psi_{p,C,F}(\boldsymbol{\gamma}, \boldsymbol{\beta})\rangle$ in the GM-QAOA), denoted α , is defined as,*

$$\alpha := \frac{\langle \psi(\boldsymbol{\theta}) | H_C | \psi(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \rangle}{\max_{f \in F} C(f)}. \quad (9)$$

The probability of sampling an optimal solution, λ , directly influences the QAOA time-to-solution (TTS), which is defined as $\frac{1}{\lambda}$ [18]. This represents the expected number of measurements required to sample an optimal solution from the QAOA state. Additionally, the approximation ratio, α , is widely adopted in the research for evaluating approximation algorithms. It provides a measure of how close the solution given by QAOA is to the optimal solution. This work establishes upper bounds for both metrics of the constant depth GM-QAOA circuits.

3 Results

3.1 Performance Upper Bound

In this section, we introduce theoretical upper limits on the probability of measuring a computational basis state from GM-QAOA circuits. Building on this foundational result, we further derive upper bounds for the probability of sampling the optimal solution and the approximation ratio achieved by GM-QAOA. Both bounds are established following definitions of statistical metrics that assess the distribution of objective function values.

Theorem 1. *Given a problem defined with the search space F , using any phase function $\mathcal{C} : F \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, the probability of sampling a computational basis state $|f\rangle$ from a depth- p GM-QAOA circuit has an upper bound that,*

$$|\langle f | \psi_{p,C,F}(\boldsymbol{\gamma}, \boldsymbol{\beta}) \rangle|^2 < \frac{(2p+1)^2}{|F|}. \quad (10)$$

Proof. See Section 5.1 for details and the proof sketch is as follows. The proof begins by expanding the probability $|\langle f | \psi_{p,C,F}(\boldsymbol{\gamma}, \boldsymbol{\beta}) \rangle|^2$ and introducing a relaxation function G by including new variables, allowing the same or greater range. The search for the maximum is then narrowed to the set of points where the partial derivatives of G are zero. This set is further reduced by identifying subsets yielding identical G outputs. Finally, the maximum value of G is found within this restricted search space, thereby establishing the upper bound of the probability $|\langle f | \psi_{p,C,F}(\boldsymbol{\gamma}, \boldsymbol{\beta}) \rangle|^2$. \square

Definition 3 (Optimality density). *Given a problem (F, C) , and let F^* denote the set of optimal solutions, where $F^* := \{f^* | f^* = \text{argopt}_{f \in F} C(f)\}$. Then, the optimality density, denoted ρ , is defined as,*

$$\rho := \frac{|F^*|}{|F|}. \quad (11)$$

Definition 4 (Top- r -percentage mean-max ratio). *Given a problem (F, C) , sort the solutions as $f^{(1)}, f^{(2)}, \dots, f^{(|F|)}$, based on their objective function values, such that*

$$C(f^{(1)}) \geq C(f^{(2)}) \geq \dots \geq C(f^{(|F|)}). \quad (12)$$

The top- r -percentage mean-max ratio, μ_r , measures the mean value of top r percentage objective values over the maximum value, defined as,

$$\mu_r := \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{\lceil r|F| \rceil} C(f^{(i)})}{r|F|C(f^{(1)})}. \quad (13)$$

Theorem 2. *Given a problem (C, F) , where the optimality density of the distribution of objective values is ρ . Then, the probability of sampling the optimal solution from a depth- p GM-QAOA circuit is bounded as,*

$$\lambda < (2p + 1)^2 \rho. \quad (14)$$

Proof. By applying the probability upper bound from Theorem 1 to each optimal solution and summing over, then, we get the upper bound for probability of sampling the optimal solution. \square

Theorem 3. *Given a problem (C, F) , where the top- r -percentage mean-max ratio is considered as μ_r . Then, a depth- p GM-QAOA circuit can achieve an approximation ratio, α , with an upper bound given by,*

$$\alpha \leq \mu \frac{1}{(2p+1)^2}. \quad (15)$$

Proof. See Section 5.2. \square

3.2 Optimal Solution Sampling Probability Scaling

In this section, we examine the optimality density (ρ) of the objective value distribution for increasing problem sizes across three specific problems, where the search space can be limited to feasible sets when using GM-QAOA: traveling salesman problem, max- k -colorable-subgraph, and max- k -vertex-cover [2, 20]. Then, from Theorem 2, we can assess the upper bound of the probability that GM-QAOA samples the optimal solution (λ).

The solutions of the TSP are encoded on permutation matrices, using $(n - 1)^2$ bits, where n represents the number of locations [13]. where the distances between locations vary, there are only 2 optimal solutions. Thus, the optimality density is given

$$\rho = \frac{2}{(n - 1)!}, \quad (16)$$

and for a depth- p GM-QAOA circuit, the upper bound on the probability of sampling the optimal solution is

$$\lambda < \frac{2(2p + 1)^2}{(n - 1)!}. \quad (17)$$

For the max- k -colorable-subgraph and max- k -vertex-cover problems, we set the k as 3 and $\frac{n}{2}$, respectively, where n is the graph vertices number. As illustrated in Figure 1, the optimality density (ρ) for both problems shows an exponential decrease as the problem size (n) increases. Using linear regression on $\log(\rho)$ against n , we develop a predictive model for the upper bound of λ as,

$$\hat{\lambda}_{\theta}(n, p) := \min \left((2p + 1)^2 e^{\theta_1 n + \theta_2}, 1 \right) \quad (18)$$

where $\theta = [\theta_1, \theta_2]$ is the regression coefficient.

Figure 2 further validates the tightness of these upper bounds by comparing them with λ sampled from optimized GM-QAOA circuits across depths ranging from 1 to 9. In this analysis, the circuit parameters are tuned to maximize λ , directly. The (fitted) upper bounds exhibit a consistent downward trend to the sampled λ , as the problem size increases. Meanwhile, the benefits of increasing the circuit depth progressively diminish in the logarithm, indicating the depth-quadratic enhancement of λ provided by GM-QAOA cannot offset the exponential decrease in the optimality density.




Figure 1: Optimality density (ρ) sampling from max- k -colorable problems (a) and max- k -vertex problems (b), across various problem sizes (i.e., number of graph vertices, n), with 48 instances for each size. Blue points represent the sampled data, with error bars indicating the 0.95 confidence interval for the mean. Red lines show the linear regression results, illustrating an exponential decrease in optimality density.




Figure 2: Probability of sampling the optimal solution (λ) and its upper bound for GM-QAOA circuits in solving the traveling salesman problem (a), max- k -colorable-subgraph problems (b), and max- k -vertex-cover problems (c), across various problem sizes n , with 48 instances for each size. The upper bounds for the traveling salesman problems are derived from Equation (17), while those for the other two problem types are obtained from Equation (18).

3.3 Approximation Ratio Scaling

This section extends the investigation to the pattern of the top- r -percentage mean-max ratio, μ_r . We sample distributions of objective values from three maximizing problems: max- k -colorable-subgraph, max-cut, and max- k -vertex-cover. Figure 3 visualizes how μ_r varies with the changes in the problem size n , and $\log(\frac{1}{r})$, where data points with similar μ_r values are connected by lines. The plot shows that for a constant μ_r , $\log(\frac{1}{r})$ exhibits an approximately linear behavior with respect to problem size n . We further assume that $\log(\frac{1}{r})$ has a quadratic relationship with μ_r , then the fitting model for μ_r can be built as,

$$\hat{\mu}_{\theta}(n, r) := \sqrt{\frac{-\log(r)}{\theta_1 n + \theta_1}} + \frac{\theta_3}{1 + e^{-\theta_4(n - \theta_5)}}, \quad (19)$$

where $\theta = [\theta_1, \theta_2, \dots, \theta_5]$ is the regression parameter. For the max- k -colorable-subgraph problems, since the sampled distribution exhibits the same value for μ_1 , we adjust the model as,

$$\hat{\mu}_{\theta}(n, r) := \sqrt{\frac{-\log(r)}{\theta_1 n + \theta_1}} + \theta_3, \quad (20)$$




Figure 3: Top- r -percentage mean-max ratio (μ_r) of max- k -colorable-subgraph, max-cut and max- k -vertex-cover problem. Each data point is composed of $(n, \log(\frac{1}{r}), \bar{\mu}_r)$, where n is the problem size, and $\bar{\mu}_r$ is the averaged value of μ_r over 48 different instances of the respective problems. The lines connect data points with the similar $\bar{\mu}_r$ value. The color bar maps the colors of lines and data points to the corresponding $\bar{\mu}_r$ value.




Figure 4: Regression results for the top- r -percentage mean-max ratio (μ_r). The averaged values of sampled μ_r are visualized using pink wireframes. The fitted values, $\hat{\mu}_\theta(n, r)$, where r is set to $\frac{1}{(2p+1)^2}$, are depicted using lines colored with the Viridis palette. The color bar maps these colors to their corresponding p values.

where θ_3 is specifically set to equal μ_1 . The fitting results are presented in Table 1 and visualized in Figure 4.

Using the fitting results, we can predict the upper bound for the approximation ratio achieved by depth- p GM-QAOA as,


$$\hat{\alpha}_\theta(n, p) := \min \left(\hat{\mu}_\theta\left(\frac{1}{(2p+1)^2}, n\right), 1 \right). \quad (21)$$

Figure 5 presents a comparative analysis between $\hat{\alpha}$ and the empirically obtained approximation ratios α from optimized GM-QAOA circuits across depths ranging from 1 to 9. The results show that most of the predicted upper bounds are higher than the true values of α . Furthermore, the data points are generally close to the line of equality, which implies the gap between the predicted upper bound and the true value is controlled, making these upper-bound predictions reliable. Hence, according to the definition of the fitting model, we conjecture as follows.

Conjecture 1. *Given a family of problems with a certain objective function structure. As the problem size increases, achieving a target approximation ratio greater than a certain value requires the depth of GM-QAOA to grow exponentially with respect to the problem size.*

Table 1: Regression results for top- r -percentage mean-max ratio μ_r

	parameters of regression model				
	θ_1	θ_2	θ_3	θ_4	θ_5
max- k -colorable-subgraph	$7.68e + 0$	$-1.12e + 1$	$6.67e - 1$	—	—
max-cut	$1.38e + 1$	$-1.20e + 2$	$8.09e - 1$	$7.19e - 2$	$-1.10e + 1$
max- k -vertex-cover	$5.21e + 1$	$-5.98e + 2$	$8.90e - 1$	$1.20e - 1$	$-6.21e + 0$


 Figure 5: Comparison of Approximation ratio (α) and predicted upper bound ($\hat{\alpha}$). The dashed gray line represents the line of equality.

4 Conclusion

In this work, we prove an upper bound of $\frac{(2p+1)^2}{|F|}$ on the probability of measuring a computational basis state from a depth- p GM-QAOA state, where $|F|$ denotes the number of solutions within the search space. Based on this result, we derive upper bounds on two performance metrics for the GM-QAOA: the probability of sampling the optimal solution (λ), and the approximation ratio (α). These upper bounds are formulated in terms of the statistical metrics we defined for objective value distribution, namely the optimality density (ρ) and the top- r -percentage mean-max ratio (μ_r), respectively. Through regression analysis on ρ and μ_r , we developed predictive models that enable us to estimate the upper bounds of λ and α for problem instances according to the problem size. The tightness of these predicted upper bounds is validated by comparing them against the λ and α values obtained from optimized GM-QAOA circuits. As the enhancement in measurement probability offered by increasing the depth of GM-QAOA is at best quadratic, thus, from the definition of the predictive model, we conjecture that as the problem size scales up, GM-QAOA would necessitate an exponential increase in circuit resources to maintain a consistent level of performance.

5 Methods

5.1 Proof of Theorem 1

In this section, we present the derivation of our main result, Theorem 1, which provides the upper bound on the probability of measuring a computational basis state from a GM-QAOA state with a given depth. We begin by introducing two key notations and deriving two essential lemmas.

Notation 1. Define $\binom{[p]}{k}$ as the set of all possible combinations of choosing k elements from $[p] := \{1, 2, \dots, p\}$, where each combination $\mathbf{s} \in \binom{[p]}{k}$ is a vector whose entries are in ascending order.

Notation 2. Let S be a set of vectors, where each $\mathbf{s} = [s_1, s_2, \dots, s_{|\mathbf{s}|}]$. Define the operations $\triangleleft_n S$

and $S \triangleright_n$ as follows,

$$\begin{aligned}\triangleleft_n S &:= \{[n, s_1, s_2, \dots, s_{|s|}] \mid s \in S\}, \quad (s_0 := n, \forall s \in \triangleleft_n S), \\ S \triangleright_n &:= \{[s_1, s_2, \dots, s_{|s|}, n] \mid s \in S\},\end{aligned}\tag{22}$$

where $\triangleleft_n S$ prepends and $S \triangleright_n$ appends the number n to every vector in the set S , respectively, resulting in new sets of vectors.

Lemma 1. Consider a depth- p GM-QAOA circuit with parameters $\beta \in S_m, S_m := \bigcup_{s \in \binom{[p]}{m}} \{\beta \mid \beta_i = 2k_i\pi, k_i \in \mathbb{Z}, \forall i \in s; \beta_j \in \mathbb{R}, \forall j \notin s\}$, containing m elements as integral multiples of 2π , while the remaining $p-m$ parameters are any real number, then, this depth- p circuit reduces to a depth- $(p-m)$ circuit.

Proof. From Equation 7, for any search space F , operation $U_F^{(M)}(2k\pi) = I, \forall k \in \mathbb{Z}$, resulting in no alteration to the circuit's behavior.

When $\beta_p = 2k\pi, k \in \mathbb{Z}$, the circuit,

$$|\psi_{p,C,F}(\gamma, \beta)\rangle = U_C^{(P)}(\gamma_p)U_F^{(M)}(\beta_{p-1})U_C^{(P)}(\gamma_{p-1}) \cdots U_F^{(M)}(\beta_1)U_C^{(P)}(\gamma_1)|F\rangle.\tag{23}$$

According to Equation 5, the last operation, $U_C^{(P)}(\gamma_p)$ merely shifts the phase of each computational basis state without altering the measurement probabilities. Consequently, operation $U_F^{(M)}(\beta_p)U_C^{(P)}(\gamma_p)$ can be considered canceled.

When $\beta_j = 2k\pi, k \in \mathbb{Z}, j \neq p$, the circuit,

$$|\psi_{p,C,F}(\gamma, \beta)\rangle = \cdots U_F^{(M)}(\beta_{j+1})U_C^{(P)}(\gamma_{j+1})U_C^{(P)}(\gamma_j) \cdots |F\rangle.\tag{24}$$

From Equation 5, we can derive,

$$\begin{aligned}U_C^{(P)}(\gamma_{j+1})U_C^{(P)}(\gamma_j)|f\rangle &= e^{-i(\gamma_{j+1}+\gamma_j)\mathcal{C}(f)}|f\rangle \\ &= U_C^{(P)}(\gamma_{j+1} + \gamma_j)|f\rangle, \quad f \in F.\end{aligned}\tag{25}$$

Hence, let $\gamma_{j+1} \leftarrow \gamma_{j+1} + \gamma_j$, the operation $U_F^{(M)}(\beta_j)U_C^{(P)}(\gamma_j)$ is equivalent to being canceled. \square

Lemma 2. Given a problem defined with the search space F . Consider a depth- p GM-QAOA circuit using a phase function \mathcal{C} , with parameters $\gamma \in S_m, S_m := \bigcup_{s \in \binom{[p]}{m}} \{\gamma \mid \gamma_i \mathcal{C}(f) = 2k_{i,f}\pi, k_{i,f} \in \mathbb{Z}, \forall i \in s, \forall f \in F; \gamma_j \in \mathbb{R}, \forall j \notin s\}$, then, this depth- p circuit reduces to a depth- $(p-m)$ circuit.

Proof. From Equation 5, if $\gamma \mathcal{C}(f) = 2k_f\pi, k_f \in \mathbb{Z}, \forall f \in F$, then $U_C^{(P)}(\gamma)|f\rangle = |f\rangle, \forall f \in F$, resulting in no alteration to the circuit's behavior.

When $\gamma_1 \mathcal{C}(f) = 2k_f\pi, k_f \in \mathbb{Z}, \forall f \in F$, the circuit,

$$\begin{aligned}|\psi_{p,C,F}(\gamma, \beta)\rangle &= U_F^{(M)}(\beta_p)U_C^{(P)}(\gamma_p)U_F^{(M)}(\beta_{p-1}) \cdots U_F^{(M)}(\beta_2)U_C^{(P)}(\gamma_2)U_F^{(M)}(\beta_1)|F\rangle \\ &= e^{-i\beta_1}U_F^{(M)}(\beta_p)U_C^{(P)}(\gamma_p)U_F^{(M)}(\beta_{p-1}) \cdots U_F^{(M)}(\beta_2)U_C^{(P)}(\gamma_2)|F\rangle.\end{aligned}\tag{26}$$

As global phase $e^{-i\beta_1}$ is not observable when measuring, the operation $U_F^{(M)}(\beta_1)U_C^{(P)}(\gamma_1)$ can be regarded as canceled.

When $\gamma_j \mathcal{C}(f) = 2k_f\pi, k_f \in \mathbb{Z}, \forall f \in F$ and $j \neq 1$, the circuit,

$$|\psi_{p,C,F}(\gamma, \beta)\rangle = \cdots U_F^{(M)}(\beta_j)U_F^{(M)}(\beta_{j-1})U_C^{(P)}(\gamma_{j-1}) \cdots |F\rangle.\tag{27}$$

From Equation 7, we can derive,

$$\begin{aligned}U_F^{(M)}(\beta_j)U_F^{(M)}(\beta_{j-1}) &= I - (1 - e^{-i(\beta_j+\beta_{j-1})})|F\rangle\langle F| \\ &= U_F^{(M)}(\beta_j + \beta_{j-1}).\end{aligned}\tag{28}$$

Hence, let $\beta_{j-1} \leftarrow \beta_j + \beta_{j-1}$, the operation $U_F^{(M)}(\beta_j)U_C^{(P)}(\gamma_j)$ is equivalent to being canceled. \square

Proof of Theorem 1. Expand the prepared states of the GM-QAOA, we get,

$$\begin{aligned}
& |\psi_{p,C,F}(\gamma, \beta)\rangle \\
&= U_F^{(M)}(\beta_p) U_C^{(P)}(\gamma_p) \cdots U_F^{(M)}(\beta_2) U_C^{(P)}(\gamma_2) U_F^{(M)}(\beta_1) U_C^{(P)}(\gamma_1) |F\rangle \\
&= \left(U_C^{(P)}(\gamma_p) - (1 - e^{-i\beta_p}) |F\rangle \langle F| U_C^{(P)}(\gamma_p) \right) \cdots \left(U_C^{(P)}(\gamma_1) - (1 - e^{-i\beta_1}) |F\rangle \langle F| U_C^{(P)}(\gamma_1) \right) |F\rangle \\
&= \sum_{\substack{\mathbf{s} \in \binom{[p]}{k}, \\ k \in \{0,1,\dots,p\}}} \left(\prod_{j=1}^k (e^{-i\beta_{s_j}} - 1) \right) U_C^{(P)} \left(\sum_{j=s_k+1}^p \gamma_j \right) |F\rangle \langle F| U_C^{(P)} \left(\sum_{j=s_{k-1}+1}^{s_k} \gamma_j \right) \cdots |F\rangle \langle F| U_C^{(P)} \left(\sum_{j=1}^{s_1} \gamma_j \right) |F\rangle \\
&= \sum_{\substack{\mathbf{s} \in \binom{[p]}{k}, \\ k \in \{0,1,\dots,p\}}} \left(\prod_{j=1}^k (e^{-i\beta_{s_j}} - 1) \right) \left(U_C^{(P)} \left(\sum_{j=s_k+1}^p \gamma_j \right) |F\rangle \right) \frac{\sum_{f \in F} e^{-i \sum_{j=s_{k-1}+1}^{s_k} \gamma_j \mathcal{C}(f)}}{|F|} \cdots \frac{\sum_{f \in F} e^{-i \sum_{j=1}^{s_1} \gamma_j \mathcal{C}(f)}}{|F|} \\
&= \frac{1}{\sqrt{|F|}} \sum_{f \in F} \sum_{\substack{\mathbf{s} \in \triangleleft_0 \binom{[p]}{k}, \\ k \in \{0,1,\dots,p\}}} \left(\prod_{j=1}^k (e^{-i\beta_{s_j}} - 1) \right) \left(\prod_{j=1}^k \frac{\sum_{f' \in F} e^{-i \sum_{l=s_{j-1}+1}^{s_j} \gamma_l \mathcal{C}(f')}}{|F|} \right) e^{-i \sum_{j=s_k+1}^p \gamma_j \mathcal{C}(f)} |f\rangle \quad (29)
\end{aligned}$$

Then, the probability of measuring a computational basis state $|f\rangle$, $f \in F$, is given as,

$$\begin{aligned}
& |\langle f | \psi_{p,C,F}(\gamma, \beta) \rangle|^2 \\
&= \frac{1}{|F|} \left| \sum_{\substack{\mathbf{s} \in \triangleleft_0 \binom{[p]}{k}, \\ k \in \{0,1,\dots,p\}}} e^{-i \sum_{j=s_k+1}^p \gamma_j \mathcal{C}(f)} \prod_{j=1}^k (e^{-i\beta_{s_j}} - 1) \prod_{j=1}^k \frac{\sum_{f' \in F} e^{-i \sum_{l=s_{j-1}+1}^{s_j} \gamma_l \mathcal{C}(f')}}{|F|} \right|^2. \quad (30)
\end{aligned}$$

Here, we assume a tunable phase function \mathcal{C} , and introduce a vector parameter $\mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{R}^{|F|}$, where each component represents $\mathcal{C}(f')$, $f' \in F$. Additionally, we define another parameter $z \in \mathbb{R}$, independent of \mathbf{v} , to specifically replace $\mathcal{C}(f)$ outside the product of sums. Then, we have a new function,

$$G_p(\gamma, \beta, \mathbf{v}, z) := \frac{1}{|F|} |g_p(\gamma, \beta, \mathbf{v}, z)|^2, \quad (31)$$

where

$$g_p(\gamma, \beta, \mathbf{v}, z) := \sum_{\substack{\mathbf{s} \in \triangleleft_0 \binom{[p]}{k}, \\ k \in \{0,1,\dots,p\}}} e^{-i \sum_{j=s_k+1}^p \gamma_j z} \prod_{j=1}^k (e^{-i\beta_{s_j}} - 1) \prod_{j=1}^k \frac{\sum_{m=1}^{|F|} e^{-i \sum_{l=s_{j-1}+1}^{s_j} \gamma_l v_m}}{|F|}. \quad (32)$$

We can find the upper bound of $|\langle f | \psi_{p,C,F}(\gamma, \beta) \rangle|^2$ by maximizing G_p , as naturally,

$$\max_{\gamma \in \mathbb{R}^p, \beta \in \mathbb{R}^p, \mathbf{C}} |\langle f | \psi_{p,C,F}(\gamma, \beta) \rangle|^2 \leq \max_{\gamma \in \mathbb{R}^p, \beta \in \mathbb{R}^p, \mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{R}^{|F|}, z \in \mathbb{R}} G_p(\gamma, \beta, \mathbf{v}, z). \quad (33)$$

The partial derivative of $G_p(\gamma, \beta, \mathbf{v}, z)$ with respect to v_m , $m \in \{1, 2, \dots, |F|\}$, is given by,

$$\frac{\partial G_p(\gamma, \beta, \mathbf{v}, z)}{\partial v_m} = \frac{2}{|F|} \text{Re} \left(\frac{\partial g_p(\gamma, \beta, \mathbf{v}, z)}{\partial v_m} \bar{g}_p(\gamma, \beta, \mathbf{v}, z) \right), \quad (34)$$

where $\text{Re}(\cdot)$ returns the real part of the given number, and,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{\partial g_p(\gamma, \beta, \mathbf{v}, z)}{\partial v_m} \overline{g_p}(\gamma, \beta, \mathbf{v}, z) = \\
& = \sum_{\substack{\mathbf{s} \in \triangleleft_0 \binom{[p]}{k}, \\ k \in \{1, 2, \dots, p\}}} \left[e^{-i \sum_{j=s_k+1}^p \gamma_j z} \left(\prod_{j=1}^k (e^{-i\beta_{s_j}} - 1) \right) \times \right. \\
& \quad \left. \sum_{j=1}^k \frac{-i \left(\sum_{l=s_{j-1}+1}^{s_j} \gamma_l \right) e^{-i \sum_{l=s_{j-1}+1}^{s_j} \gamma_l v_m}}{|F|} \prod_{\substack{j'=1, \\ j' \neq j}}^k \frac{\sum_{m'=1}^{|F|} e^{-i \sum_{l=s_{j'-1}+1}^{s_{j'}} \gamma_l v_{m'}}}{|F|} \right] \times \\
& \quad \sum_{\substack{\mathbf{s} \in \triangleleft_0 \binom{[p]}{k}, \\ k \in \{0, 1, \dots, p\}}} e^{i \sum_{j=s_k+1}^p \gamma_j z} \prod_{j=1}^k (e^{i\beta_{s_j}} - 1) \prod_{j=1}^k \frac{\sum_{m'=1}^{|F|} e^{i \sum_{l=s_{j-1}+1}^{s_j} \gamma_l v_{m'}}}{|F|} \\
& = -i \sum_{\substack{\mathbf{s} \in \triangleleft_0 \binom{[p]}{k}, \\ \mathbf{s}' \in \triangleleft_0 \binom{[p]}{k'}, \\ k \in \{1, 2, \dots, p\}, \\ k' \in \{0, 1, \dots, p\}}} \left[\prod_{j=1}^k (e^{-i\beta_{s_j}} - 1) \prod_{j=1}^{k'} (e^{i\beta_{s'_j}} - 1) \left(\sum_{t \in [|F|]^{k'}} \frac{e^{i \left(\sum_{j=1}^{k'} \sum_{l=s_{j-1}+1}^{s_j} \gamma_l v_{t_j} + \sum_{j=s'_k+1}^p \gamma_l z \right)}}{|F|^{k'}} \right) \right. \\
& \quad \left. -i \left(\sum_{j'=1}^{j-1} \sum_{l=s_{j'-1}+1}^{s_{j'}} \gamma_l v_{t_{j'}} + \sum_{l=s_{j-1}+1}^{s_j} \gamma_l v_m \right) \right. \\
& \quad \left. \sum_{j=1}^k \sum_{t \in [|F|]^{j-1}} \sum_{t' \in [|F|]^{k-j}} \frac{(\sum_{l=s_{j-1}+1}^{s_j} \gamma_l) e^{\left(\sum_{j'=j+1}^k \sum_{l=s_{j'-1}+1}^{s_{j'}} \gamma_l v_{t'_{j'-j}} + \sum_{l=s_k+1}^p \gamma_l z \right)}}{|F|^k} \right] . \tag{35}
\end{aligned}$$

When $\beta \in \{\beta \mid \beta_i = 2k_i\pi, k_i \in \mathbb{Z}, \forall i \in [p]\}$, the partial derivative, $\frac{\partial G_p(\gamma, \beta, \mathbf{v}, z)}{\partial v_m} = 0$. From Lemma 1, all phase separation and mixing operations cancel out, leaving the circuit in the initial state $|F\rangle$, where the measurement probability of each computational basis state that encoded a possible solution is $\frac{1}{|F|}$, which is not the maximum. Alternatively, when $(\gamma, \beta, \mathbf{v}, z) \in T_p^{(1)}$, where

$$T_p^{(1)} := \left\{ \gamma, \beta, \mathbf{v}, z \left| \begin{aligned} & (\beta_i = a_i\pi) \wedge (\gamma_i v_j + d_i = b_{i,j}\pi) \wedge (\gamma_i z + d_i = c_i\pi) \wedge \\ & (a_i \in \mathbb{Z}, b_{i,j} \in \mathbb{Z}, c_i \in \mathbb{Z}, d_i \in \mathbb{R}), \forall i \in [p], \forall j \in [|F|] \end{aligned} \right. \right\}, \tag{36}$$

$\frac{\partial g_p(\gamma, \beta, \mathbf{v}, z)}{\partial v_m} \overline{g_p}(\gamma, \beta, \mathbf{v}, z)$ retains only the imaginary part that $\frac{\partial G_p(\gamma, \beta, \mathbf{v}, z)}{\partial v_m} = 0, \forall m \in [|F|]$. The points where G_p attains its maximum value are certainly among $T_p^{(1)}$ as,

$$\max_{\gamma \in \mathbb{R}^p, \beta \in \mathbb{R}^p, \mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{R}^{|F|}, z \in \mathbb{R}} G_p(\gamma, \beta, \mathbf{v}, z) = \max_{(\gamma, \beta, \mathbf{v}, z) \in T_p^{(1)}} G_p(\gamma, \beta, \mathbf{v}, z). \tag{37}$$

Let $(\gamma, \beta, \mathbf{v}, z) \in T_p^{(1)}$, then, we get

$$G_p(\gamma, \beta, \mathbf{v}, z) = \frac{1}{|F|} \left| \sum_{\substack{\mathbf{s} \in \triangleleft_0 \binom{[p]}{k}, \\ k \in \{0, 1, \dots, p\}}} e^{-i \sum_{j=s_k+1}^p (c_l \pi - d_l)} \prod_{j=1}^k (e^{-i a_{s_j} \pi} - 1) \prod_{j=1}^k \frac{\sum_{m=1}^{|F|} e^{-i \sum_{l=s_{j-1}+1}^{s_j} (b_{l,m} \pi - d_l)}}{|F|} \right|^2$$

$$= \frac{1}{|F|} \left| \sum_{\substack{\mathbf{s} \in \triangleleft_0 \binom{[p]}{k}, \\ k \in \{0, 1, \dots, p\}}} e^{-i \sum_{j=s_k+1}^p c_l \pi} \prod_{j=1}^k (e^{-i a_{s_j} \pi} - 1) \prod_{j=1}^k \frac{\sum_{m=1}^{|F|} e^{-i \sum_{l=s_{j-1}+1}^{s_j} b_{l,m} \pi}}{|F|} \right|^2, \quad (38)$$

where $a_i \in \mathbb{Z}, b_{i,j} \in \mathbb{Z}, c_i \in \mathbb{Z}, d_i \in \mathbb{R}, \forall i \in [p], \forall j \in [|F|]$. Following this, we can further narrow the search space for finding the maximum of the G_p to the set, $T_p^{(2)}$,

$$T_p^{(2)} := \left\{ \gamma, \beta, \mathbf{v}, z \mid \gamma \in \{0, \pi\}^p, \beta \in \{0, \pi\}^p, \mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{Z}^{|F|}, z \in \mathbb{Z} \right\}, \quad (39)$$

such that,

$$\max_{(\gamma, \beta, \mathbf{v}, z) \in T_p^{(1)}} G_p(\gamma, \beta, \mathbf{v}, z) = \max_{(\gamma, \beta, \mathbf{v}, z) \in T_p^{(2)}} G_p(\gamma, \beta, \mathbf{v}, z). \quad (40)$$

We first consider the case that $\gamma = \pi \mathbf{1}_p, \beta = \pi \mathbf{1}_p$, where $\pi \mathbf{1}_p$ represents a length- p vector with all elements π , we get,

$$G_p(\gamma = \pi \mathbf{1}_p, \beta = \pi \mathbf{1}_p, \mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{Z}^{|F|}, z \in \mathbb{Z})$$

$$= \frac{1}{|F|} \left(\cos(p\pi z) + \sum_{k=1}^p \cos((p-k)\pi z) \sum_{j=0}^{k-1} \sum_{\mathbf{s} \in \triangleleft_0 \binom{[k-1]}{j} \triangleright_k} (-2)^{j+1} \prod_{i=1}^{j+1} \frac{\sum_{m=1}^{|F|} \cos((s_i - s_{i-1})\pi v_m)}{|F|} \right)^2. \quad (41)$$

Assume there are n odd numbers and m even numbers in \mathbf{v} , and let $r := \frac{-n+m}{|F|}$, then, we can define

$$H_k(r) = \sum_{j=0}^{k-1} \sum_{\mathbf{s} \in \triangleleft_0 \binom{[k-1]}{j} \triangleright_k} (-2)^{j+1} \prod_{i=1}^{j+1} h(s_j, s_{j-1}, r), \quad (42)$$

where

$$h(s_j, s_{j-1}, r) := \frac{\sum_{m=1}^{|F|} \cos((s_j - s_{j-1})\pi v_m)}{|F|} = \begin{cases} 1 & s_j - s_{j-1} \text{ is even,} \\ r & s_j - s_{j-1} \text{ is odd.} \end{cases} \quad (43)$$

Expand $H_{k+1}(r)$, we get,

$$H_{k+1}(r) = \sum_{j=0}^k \sum_{\mathbf{s} \in \triangleleft_0 \binom{[k]}{j} \triangleright_{k+1}} (-2)^{j+1} \prod_{i=1}^{j+1} h(s_j, s_{j-1}, r)$$

$$= \sum_{\substack{\mathbf{s} \in \triangleleft_0 \binom{[k-1]}{j} \triangleright_k \triangleright_{k+1}, \\ j \in \{0, 1, \dots, k-1\}}} (-2)^{j+2} \prod_{i=1}^{j+2} h(s_j, s_{j-1}, r) + \sum_{\substack{\mathbf{s} \in \triangleleft_0 \binom{[k-2]}{j} \triangleright_{k-1} \triangleright_{k+1}, \\ j \in \{0, 1, \dots, k-2\}}} (-2)^{j+2} \prod_{i=1}^{j+2} h(s_j, s_{j-1}, r) + \sum_{\substack{\mathbf{s} \in \triangleleft_0 \binom{[k-2]}{j} \triangleright_{k+1}, \\ j \in \{0, 1, \dots, k-2\}}} (-2)^{j+1} \prod_{i=1}^{j+1} h(s_j, s_{j-1}, r)$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= -2h(k+1, k, r) \sum_{j=0}^{k-1} \sum_{\mathbf{s} \in \triangleleft_0 \binom{[k-1]}{j} \triangleright_k \triangleright_{k+1}} (-2)^{j+1} \prod_{i=1}^{j+1} h(s_j, s_{j-1}, r) \\
&\quad - 2h(k+1, k-1, r) \sum_{j=0}^{k-2} \sum_{\mathbf{s} \in \triangleleft_0 \binom{[k-2]}{j} \triangleright_{k-1} \triangleright_{k+1}} (-2)^{j+1} \prod_{i=1}^{j+1} h(s_j, s_{j-1}, r) \\
&\quad + \sum_{j=0}^{k-2} \sum_{\mathbf{s} \in \triangleleft_0 \binom{[k-2]}{j} \triangleright_{k+1}} (-2)^{j+1} \prod_{i=1}^{j+1} h(s_j, s_{j-1}, r) \\
&= -2rH_k(r) - 2H_{k-1}(r) + H_{k-1}(r) = -2rH_k(r) - H_{k-1}(r).
\end{aligned} \tag{44}$$

Consider $z \in \mathbb{Z}$ as a constant number, we define a function of r as,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{G}_{p,z}(r) &= \frac{1}{|F|} \left(\cos(p\pi z) + \sum_{k=1}^p \cos((p-k)\pi z) H_k(r) \right)^2, \\
H_{k+1}(r) &= -2rH_k(r) - H_{k-1}(r), \quad H_1(r) = -2r, \quad H_2(r) = 4r^2 - 2.
\end{aligned} \tag{45}$$

Then, we can find the maximal points of $G_p(\boldsymbol{\gamma} = \pi \mathbf{1}_p, \boldsymbol{\beta} = \pi \mathbf{1}_p, \mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{Z}^{|F|}, z \in \mathbb{Z})$, by solving the problem:

$$\max_r \mathcal{G}_{p,z}(r), \quad s.t. \quad r^2 - 1 \leq 0. \tag{46}$$

Using the method of Lagrange multiplier, we have the Lagrange function as,

$$\mathcal{L}(r, \nu) = -\mathcal{G}_{p,z}(r) + \nu(r^2 - 1), \tag{47}$$

where ν is the Lagrange multiplier. Then, the problem is transformed as,

$$\begin{cases} \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}(r, \nu)}{\partial r} = -\frac{2}{|F|} \left(\cos(p\pi z) + \sum_{k=1}^p \cos((p-k)\pi z) H_k(r) \right) \left(\sum_{k=1}^p \cos((p-k)\pi z) \frac{\partial H_k(r)}{\partial r} \right) + 2\nu r = 0 \\ r^2 - 1 \leq 0, \\ \nu \geq 0, \\ \nu(r^2 - 1) = 0. \end{cases} \tag{48}$$

In the case of where z is even. We find that if $r = -1$,

$$\begin{aligned}
H_k(-1) &= 2, \quad \left. \frac{\partial H_k(r)}{\partial r} \right|_{r=-1} = -2k^2, \quad \forall k \in [p], \\
\mathcal{G}_{p,z}(-1) &= \frac{(2p+1)^2}{|F|}, \\
\nu &= \frac{p(p+1)(2p+1)^2}{3|F|} > 0.
\end{aligned} \tag{49}$$

In the case of where z is odd. We find that if $r = 1$,

$$\begin{aligned}
H_k(1) &= 2(-1)^k, \quad \left. \frac{\partial H_k(r)}{\partial r} \right|_{r=1} = 2(-1)^k k^2, \quad \forall k \in [p], \\
\mathcal{G}_{p,z}(1) &= \frac{(2p+1)^2}{|F|}, \\
\nu &= \frac{p(p+1)(2p+1)}{|F|} > 0.
\end{aligned} \tag{50}$$

Hence, when z is even, $r = -1$, or when z is odd, $r = 1$, $\mathcal{G}_{p,z}(r)$ attains its maximum $\frac{(2p+1)^2}{|F|}$. Following this, we get,

$$\begin{aligned} \max_{\mathbf{v}, z} G_p(\gamma = \pi \mathbf{1}_p, \beta = \pi \mathbf{1}_p, \mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{Z}^{|F|}, z \in \mathbb{Z}) &= \frac{(2p+1)^2}{|F|}, \\ \operatorname{argmax}_{\mathbf{v}, z} G_p(\gamma = \pi \mathbf{1}_p, \beta = \pi \mathbf{1}_p, \mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{Z}^{|F|}, z \in \mathbb{Z}) &\in T_p^{(3)}, \end{aligned} \quad (51)$$

where

$$T_p^{(3)} := \left\{ \mathbf{v}, z \left| \begin{aligned} &(v_i = 2a_i + 1 \wedge z = 2b, a_i \in \mathbb{Z}, b \in \mathbb{Z}, \forall i \in [|F|]) \vee \\ &(v_i = 2a_i \wedge z = 2b + 1, a_i \in \mathbb{Z}, b \in \mathbb{Z}, \forall i \in [|F|]) \end{aligned} \right. \right\}. \quad (52)$$

For the case that the parameters $(\gamma, \beta) \in S_m$, $S_m := \bigcup_{\mathbf{s} \in \binom{[p]}{m}} \{\gamma, \beta \mid \beta_i = 0 \vee \gamma_i = 0, \forall i \in \mathbf{s}; \beta_j = \pi \wedge \gamma_j = \pi, \forall j \notin \mathbf{s}\}$, we consider back to the Lemma 1, and Lemma 2, the depth reduces to $p - m$. Then, since

$$\max_{\mathbf{v}, z} G_{p-m}(\gamma = \pi \mathbf{1}_{p-m}, \beta = \pi \mathbf{1}_{p-m}, \mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{Z}^{|F|}, z \in \mathbb{Z}) = \frac{(2(p-m)+1)^2}{|F|} < \frac{(2p+1)^2}{|F|}, \quad \forall m \in [p], \quad (53)$$

Thus,

$$\max_{\gamma \in \mathbb{R}^p, \beta \in \mathbb{R}^p, \mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{R}^{|F|}, z \in \mathbb{R}} G_p(\gamma, \beta, \mathbf{v}, z) = \max_{(\gamma, \beta, \mathbf{v}, z) \in T_p^{(2)}} G_p(\gamma, \beta, \mathbf{v}, z) = \frac{(2p+1)^2}{|F|}. \quad (54)$$

According to Equation (38), we get,

$$\operatorname{argmax}_{\gamma, \beta, \mathbf{v}, z} G_p(\gamma \in \mathbb{R}^p, \beta \in \mathbb{R}^p, \mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{R}^{|F|}, z \in \mathbb{R}) \in T_p, \quad (55)$$

where

$$T_p := \left\{ \gamma, \beta, \mathbf{v}, z \left| \begin{aligned} &(\beta_i = (2a_i + 1)\pi, a_i \in \mathbb{Z}, \forall i \in [p]) \wedge \\ &\left((\gamma_i v_j + d_i = 2b_{i,j}\pi \wedge \gamma_i z + d_i = (2c_i + 1)\pi, b_{i,j}, c_i, d_i \in \mathbb{Z}, \forall i \in [p], \forall j \in [|F|]) \vee \right. \\ &\left. (\gamma_i v_j + d_i = (2b_{i,j} + 1)\pi \wedge \gamma_i z + d_i = 2c_i\pi, b_{i,j}, c_i, d_i \in \mathbb{Z}, \forall i \in [p], \forall j \in [|F|]) \right) \end{aligned} \right\}. \quad (56)$$

Finally, according to Equation 56, when G_p attains its maximum, $z \neq v_i, \forall i \in [|F|]$, we arrive at the conclusion that the probability of sampling a computational basis state $|f\rangle$ from a depth- p GM-QAOA circuit satisfies as,

$$|\langle f | \psi_{p,C,F}(\gamma, \beta) \rangle|^2 < \max_{\gamma \in \mathbb{R}^p, \beta \in \mathbb{R}^p, \mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{R}^{|F|}, z \in \mathbb{R}} G_p(\gamma, \beta, \mathbf{v}, z) = \frac{(2p+1)^2}{|F|}. \quad (57)$$

□

5.2 Proof of Theorem 3

Proof of Theorem 3. From Definition 2 and Definition 4, we get,

$$\begin{aligned} &\mu_{\frac{1}{(2p+1)^2}} - \alpha \\ &= \frac{(2p+1)^2 \sum_{i=1}^{\lceil \frac{|F|}{(2p+1)^2} \rceil} C(f^{(i)})}{|F| C(f^{(1)})} - \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{|F|} |\langle f^{(i)} | \psi_{p,C,F}(\gamma, \beta) \rangle|^2 C(f^{(i)})}{C(f^{(1)})} \\ &= \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{\lceil \frac{|F|}{(2p+1)^2} \rceil} \left(\frac{(2p+1)^2}{|F|} - |\langle f^{(i)} | \psi_{p,C,F}(\gamma, \beta) \rangle|^2 \right) C(f^{(i)})}{C(f^{(1)})} - \frac{\sum_{i=\lceil \frac{|F|}{(2p+1)^2} \rceil + 1}^{|F|} |\langle f^{(i)} | \psi_{p,C,F}(\gamma, \beta) \rangle|^2 C(f^{(i)})}{C(f^{(1)})}. \end{aligned} \quad (58)$$

From equation 12,

$$\begin{aligned}
(58) &\geq \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{\lceil \frac{|F|}{(2p+1)^2} \rceil} \left(\frac{(2p+1)^2}{|F|} - |\langle f^{(i)} | \psi_{p,C,F}(\gamma, \beta) \rangle|^2 \right) C(f^{(i)})}{C(f^{(1)})} \\
&\quad - \frac{C(f^{(\lceil \frac{|F|}{(2p+1)^2} \rceil + 1)}) \sum_{i=\lceil \frac{|F|}{(2p+1)^2} \rceil + 1}^{|F|} |\langle f^{(i)} | \psi_{p,C,F}(\gamma, \beta) \rangle|^2}{C(f^{(1)})} \\
&= \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{\lceil \frac{|F|}{(2p+1)^2} \rceil} \left(\frac{(2p+1)^2}{|F|} - |\langle f^{(i)} | \psi_{p,C,F}(\gamma, \beta) \rangle|^2 \right) C(f^{(i)})}{C(f^{(1)})} \\
&\quad - \frac{C(f^{(\lceil \frac{|F|}{(2p+1)^2} \rceil + 1)}) \left(1 - \sum_{i=1}^{\lceil \frac{|F|}{(2p+1)^2} \rceil} |\langle f^{(i)} | \psi_{p,C,F}(\gamma, \beta) \rangle|^2 \right)}{C(f^{(1)})}.
\end{aligned} \tag{59}$$

As $\sum_{i=1}^{\lceil \frac{|F|}{(2p+1)^2} \rceil} \frac{(2p+1)^2}{|F|} \geq 1$,

$$\begin{aligned}
(58) &\geq \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{\lceil \frac{|F|}{(2p+1)^2} \rceil} \left(\frac{(2p+1)^2}{|F|} - |\langle f^{(i)} | \psi_{p,C,F}(\gamma, \beta) \rangle|^2 \right) C(f^{(i)})}{C(f^{(1)})} \\
&\quad - \frac{C(f^{(\lceil \frac{|F|}{(2p+1)^2} \rceil + 1)}) \sum_{i=1}^{\lceil \frac{|F|}{(2p+1)^2} \rceil} \left(\frac{(2p+1)^2}{|F|} - |\langle f^{(i)} | \psi_{p,C,F}(\gamma, \beta) \rangle|^2 \right)}{C(f^{(1)})} \\
&= \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{\lceil \frac{|F|}{(2p+1)^2} \rceil} \left(\frac{(2p+1)^2}{|F|} - |\langle f^{(i)} | \psi_{p,C,F}(\gamma, \beta) \rangle|^2 \right) \left(C(f^{(i)}) - C(f^{(\lceil \frac{|F|}{(2p+1)^2} \rceil + 1)}) \right)}{C(f^{(1)})}
\end{aligned} \tag{60}$$

From Theorem 1 that $\frac{(2p+1)^2}{|F|} > |\langle f^{(i)} | \psi_{p,C,F}(\gamma, \beta) \rangle|^2$, we finally get,

$$(58) \geq 0. \tag{61}$$

□

5.3 Problem Definition and Instance Sets

5.3.1 Traveling Salesman Problem

The traveling salesman problem seeks to find the shortest possible route that visits each city once and returns to the original city. Here, following [13], we fix the first city, and formulate an n -city traveling salesman problem instance (C, F) as follows,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\min_{\mathbf{x} \in F} C(\mathbf{x}); \\
C(\mathbf{x}) &= \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} w_{0,i} x_{1,i} + \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} w_{i,0} x_{n-1,i} + \sum_{t=2}^{n-1} \sum_{\substack{i,j=1, \\ i \neq j}}^{n-1} w_{i,j} x_{t-1,i} x_{t,j}; \\
F &= \left\{ \mathbf{x} \mid \mathbf{x} \in \{0, 1\}^{(n-1)^2}; \forall t \in [n-1], \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} x_{t,i} = 1; \forall i \in [n-1], \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} x_{t,i} = 1 \right\},
\end{aligned} \tag{62}$$

where $w_{i,j} \in \mathbb{R}$ represents the distance between city i and city j .

Our instance sets include problems ranging from 7-city to 13-city, and 48 instances for each size. The coordinates of the cities are sampled from a uniform distribution within interval $[0, 1]$.

5.3.2 Max- k -Colorable-Subgraph Problem

The max- k -colorable-subgraph problem seeks to find a subgraph with the maximum number of edges that can be properly colored using at most k colors, such that no two adjacent vertices share the same color. Here, we use the definition in [20], given an n -vertex undirected graph with the edge set E , the max- k -colorable-subgraph problem instance (C, F) is formulated as follows,

$$\begin{aligned} & \max_{\mathbf{x} \in F} C(\mathbf{x}); \\ C(\mathbf{x}) &= |E| - \sum_{v=1}^k \sum_{(i,j) \in E} x_{i,v} x_{j,v}; \\ F &= \left\{ \mathbf{x} \mid \mathbf{x} \in \{0, 1\}^{n \times k}; \forall i \in [n], \sum_{v=1}^k x_{i,v} = 1 \right\}. \end{aligned} \tag{63}$$

Our instance sets include problems ranging from graphs with 11 to 17 vertices, and the color number k is set to 3. We generate 48 instances for each vertex number. The graphs are generated randomly, but we specifically select graphs where the solution is the given graph itself, which increases the difficulty of the problem.

5.3.3 Max-Cut Problem

The max-cut problem is equivalent to the max- k -colorable-subgraph problem with $k = 2$. Since there are only two colors, we can encode the color using a single bit. Given an n -vertex undirected graph with the edge set E , the max-cut problem instance (C, F) is formulated as follows,

$$\begin{aligned} & \max_{\mathbf{x} \in F} C(\mathbf{x}); \\ C(\mathbf{x}) &= \sum_{(i,j) \in E} (x_i - x_j)^2; \\ F &= \{0, 1\}^n. \end{aligned} \tag{64}$$

It is worth noting that whether using this formulation or the max- k -colorable-subgraph formulation (i.e., Equation 63) with $k = 2$, the resulting objective value distribution remains the same.

Our instance sets include problems with 3-regular graphs having 16, 18, 20, 22, 24, 26, and 28 vertices. We randomly generate 48 instances for each vertex number.

5.3.4 Max- k -Vertex-Cover Problem

The max- k -vertex-cover problem aims to find a subset of vertices with a size of k in an undirected graph, such that the number of edges incident to the vertices in the subset is maximized. Here, we use the definition in [2], given an n -vertex undirected graph with the edge set E , the max- k -vertex-cover problem instance (C, F) is formulated as follows,

$$\begin{aligned} & \max_{\mathbf{x} \in F} C(\mathbf{x}); \\ C(\mathbf{x}) &= |E| - \sum_{(i,j) \in E} (1 - x_i)(1 - x_j); \\ F &= \left\{ \mathbf{x} \mid \mathbf{x} \in \{0, 1\}^n; \sum_{i=1}^n x_i = k \right\}. \end{aligned} \tag{65}$$

Our instance sets include problems ranging from graphs with vertex number, $n \in \{18, 20, \dots, 30\}$, and k is set to $\frac{n}{2}$. We generate 48 instances for n . The graphs are generated using the Erdős-Rényi model with an edge probability of 0.5.

References

- [1] V. Akshay, H. Philathong, E. Campos, D. Rabinovich, I. Zacharov, Xiao-Ming Zhang, and J. D. Biamonte. Circuit depth scaling for quantum approximate optimization. *Physical Review A*, 106(4), October 2022.
- [2] Andreas Bartschi and Stephan Eidenbenz. Grover mixers for qaoa: Shifting complexity from mixer design to state preparation. In *2020 IEEE International Conference on Quantum Computing and Engineering (QCE)*. IEEE, October 2020.
- [3] Naphan Benchasattabuse, Andreas Bartschi, Luis Pedro García-Pintos, John Golden, Nathan Lemons, and Stephan Eidenbenz. Lower bounds on number of qaoa rounds required for guaranteed approximation ratios. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.15442*, 2023.
- [4] Marco Cerezo, Andrew Arrasmith, Ryan Babbush, Simon C Benjamin, Suguru Endo, Keisuke Fujii, Jarrod R McClean, Kosuke Mitarai, Xiao Yuan, Lukasz Cincio, et al. Variational quantum algorithms. *Nature Reviews Physics*, 3(9):625–644, 2021.
- [5] Edward Farhi, Jeffrey Goldstone, and Sam Gutmann. A quantum approximate optimization algorithm. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1411.4028*, 2014.
- [6] Edward Farhi, Jeffrey Goldstone, Sam Gutmann, and Michael Sipser. Quantum computation by adiabatic evolution. *arXiv preprint quant-ph/0001106*, 2000.
- [7] Luis Pedro García-Pintos, Lucas T. Brady, Jacob Bringewatt, and Yi-Kai Liu. Lower bounds on quantum annealing times. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 130:140601, Apr 2023.
- [8] John Golden, Andreas Bartschi, Daniel O’Malley, and Stephan Eidenbenz. Numerical evidence for exponential speed-up of qaoa over unstructured search for approximate constrained optimization. In *2023 IEEE International Conference on Quantum Computing and Engineering (QCE)*, volume 1, pages 496–505. IEEE, 2023.
- [9] John Golden, Andreas Bartschi, Daniel O’Malley, and Stephan Eidenbenz. Threshold-based quantum optimization. In *2021 IEEE International Conference on Quantum Computing and Engineering (QCE)*, pages 137–147. IEEE, 2021.
- [10] Lov K Grover. A fast quantum mechanical algorithm for database search. In *Proceedings of the twenty-eighth annual ACM symposium on Theory of computing*, pages 212–219, 1996.
- [11] Stuart Hadfield, Zhihui Wang, Bryan O’gorman, Eleanor G Rieffel, Davide Venturelli, and Rupak Biswas. From the quantum approximate optimization algorithm to a quantum alternating operator ansatz. *Algorithms*, 12(2):34, 2019.
- [12] Rebekah Herrman, Phillip C Lotshaw, James Ostrowski, Travis S Humble, and George Siopsis. Multi-angle quantum approximate optimization algorithm. *Scientific Reports*, 12(1):6781, 2022.
- [13] Andrew Lucas. Ising formulations of many np problems. *Frontiers in physics*, 2:74887, 2014.
- [14] Jarrod R McClean, Matthew P Harrigan, Masoud Mohseni, Nicholas C Rubin, Zhang Jiang, Sergio Boixo, Vadim N Smelyanskiy, Ryan Babbush, and Hartmut Neven. Low-depth mechanisms for quantum optimization. *PRX Quantum*, 2(3):030312, 2021.
- [15] Christos H Papadimitriou and Kenneth Steiglitz. *Combinatorial optimization: algorithms and complexity*. Courier Corporation, 1998.
- [16] Judea Pearl. *Heuristics: intelligent search strategies for computer problem solving*. Addison-Wesley Longman Publishing Co., Inc., 1984.
- [17] Atanu Rajak, Sei Suzuki, Amit Dutta, and Bikas K Chakrabarti. Quantum annealing: An overview. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society A*, 381(2241):20210417, 2023.

- [18] Ruslan Shaydulin, Changhao Li, Shouvanik Chakrabarti, Matthew DeCross, Dylan Herman, Niraj Kumar, Jeffrey Larson, Danylo Lykov, Pierre Minssen, Yue Sun, Yuri Alexeev, Joan M. Dreiling, John P. Gaebler, Thomas M. Gatterman, Justin A. Gerber, Kevin Gilmore, Dan Gresh, Nathan Hewitt, Chandler V. Horst, Shaohan Hu, Jacob Johansen, Mitchell Matheny, Tanner Mengle, Michael Mills, Steven A. Moses, Brian Neyenhuis, Peter Siegfried, Romina Yalovetzky, and Marco Pistoia. Evidence of scaling advantage for the quantum approximate optimization algorithm on a classically intractable problem, 2023.
- [19] Andrea Skolik, Michele Cattelan, Sheir Yarkoni, Thomas Bäck, and Vedran Dunjko. Equivariant quantum circuits for learning on weighted graphs. *npj Quantum Information*, 9(1):47, 2023.
- [20] Zhihui Wang, Nicholas C Rubin, Jason M Dominy, and Eleanor G Rieffel. X y mixers: Analytical and numerical results for the quantum alternating operator ansatz. *Physical Review A*, 101(1):012320, 2020.
- [21] Ningyi Xie, Xinwei Lee, Dongsheng Cai, Yoshiyuki Saito, Nobuyoshi Asai, and Hoong Chuin Lau. A feasibility-preserved quantum approximate solver for the capacitated vehicle routing problem, 2024.
- [22] Leo Zhou, Sheng-Tao Wang, Soonwon Choi, Hannes Pichler, and Mikhail D Lukin. Quantum approximate optimization algorithm: Performance, mechanism, and implementation on near-term devices. *Physical Review X*, 10(2):021067, 2020.