

Sombbrero adiabatic quantum computation: A heuristic strategy for quantum adiabatic evolution

Alejandro Perdomo,¹ Salvador E. Venegas-Andraca,^{2,1} and Alán Aspuru-Guzik¹

¹Department of Chemistry and Chemical Biology,

Harvard University, 12 Oxford Street, 02138, Cambridge, MA

²Quantum Information Processing Group. Tecnológico de Monterrey

Campus Estado de México. Carretera Lago Gpe. Km 3.5,

Atizapán de Zaragoza, Edo. México, México

Abstract

In the adiabatic quantum computation (AQC) approach, the ground state of a quantum system is evolved by a time-dependent Hamiltonian toward a final ground state that encodes the answer to a computational problem. AQC initial Hamiltonians conventionally have a uniform superposition as ground state. We diverge from this practice by introducing a new strategy, in which the adiabatic evolution starts with an initial guess chosen at random or by following prior knowledge or intuition about the problem, followed by a “sombbrero-like” perturbation, hence the name sombrero AQC (SAQC). We provide a scheme to build initial Hamiltonians which encode initial guesses in their ground states, and we describe a proof-of-concept simulations of the SAQC protocol by performing an exhaustive numerical study on hard-to-satisfy instances of the satisfiability problem (3-SAT). Our results show that about 35% of the initial 7 variable guesses have a significantly larger minimum gap compared to the minimum gap expected for conventional AQC (CAQC), possibly allowing for more efficient quantum algorithms. Finally, we propose serial and parallel versions of a quantum adiabatic algorithm based on SAQC.

PACS numbers: 03.67.Lx, 03.67.Ac, 03.65.-w

I. INTRODUCTION

Adiabatic quantum computation (AQC) [1] is a promising paradigm of quantum computation because of its robustness [2, 3], its encouraging results in the study of NP-complete problems [1, 4, 5, 6], and its implementation for the study of statistical mechanical complex problems such as protein folding [7]. We explore the effects on computational efficiency of starting the adiabatic evolution with a random or an educated guess to the problem instead of giving equal weight to all possible solutions as is usually done in AQC. This conventional initialization, i.e., superposition of all states in the computational basis, seems to be reasonable not just because of its convenient preparation but also because of its non-zero overlap with the solution; the targeted solution is already part of the initial superposition state but by construction it has exponentially small amplitude, $1/\sqrt{2^N}$, in the number N of variables. In the algorithmic design we propose, the initial “guess” state could have a zero overlap with the solution to the computational problem, which can be either a classical problem or a quantum mechanical one [8, 9, 10]. In this paper, we focus in the case of classical computational problems, and we have chosen an NP-complete problem, 3-satisfiability problem (3-SAT) [11, 12], to study the viability and performance of this new proposal.

For classical problems, the simplest guess for the initial state is that of choosing one of the possible assignments from the solution space. Since both the initial guess and the final solution will be states of the computational basis, the overlap between them is zero unless one has guessed the right solution. Regardless of this counterintuitive choice, we show that it can be of advantage; even in the case of choosing the initial state by random guessing there is potential for this new algorithmic strategy to outperform the conventional way of doing adiabatic quantum computation.

Physical intuition as well as constraints within the problem can be used to make an educated guess. For example, in a lattice model for protein folding [7], a possible educated guess for the initial state of the proposed adiabatic evolution, would be to chose a bit string which encodes an initial position for the amino acids in the spatial lattice such that no two amino acids are on top of each other and that they are connected according to the sequence defining the protein to be fold. Conversely, the conventional approach of quantum computation would have as an initial state a quantum superposition of all possible states of the computational basis; namely, since the bit strings encode positions of amino acids in

the lattice, it will include in the initial state, absurd configurations like all amino acids on top of each other, or assignments referring to configuration of amino acids which are fully disconnected or not properly linked according to the sequence in the protein. We conjecture here that the presence of these “non-sensical” states might increase the time required for the adiabatic evolution, since they can act as trap states. In other fields of computer science, physics and chemistry, one might also use classical methods or a mean field approach to find approximate solutions to be used as educated guesses. For example, in the context of quantum simulation, a Hartree-Fock solution may be used as the initial state for an adiabatic preparation of an exact molecular wave function [13, 14, 15, 16].

The rest of this paper is divided as follows: in Section II, we review the conventional way of doing quantum computation via adiabatic evolution, hereinafter called Conventional Adiabatic Quantum Computation (CAQC). Section III introduces the basic elements of the new implementation which we called Sombrero Adiabatic Quantum Computation (SAQC). Finally, in Section IV, we present numerical calculations comparing the performance of both the CAQC and the SAQC algorithms based on the minimum gap, g_{min} , of their respective time-dependent Hamiltonians driving their corresponding time evolutions.

II. CONVENTIONAL ADIABATIC QUANTUM COMPUTATION (CAQC)

The goal of AQC algorithms is that of transforming an initial ground state $|\psi(0)\rangle$ into a final ground state $|\psi(\tau)\rangle$, which encodes the answer to the problem. This is achieved by evolving the corresponding physical system according to the Schrödinger equation with a time-dependent Hamiltonian $\hat{H}(t)$. The AQC algorithm relies on the quantum adiabatic theorem [17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27], which states that the time propagation of the quantum state will remain very close to the instantaneous ground state $|\psi_g(t)\rangle$ for all $t \in [0, \tau]$, whenever $\hat{H}(t)$ varies slowly throughout the propagation time $t \in [0, \tau]$ and assuming the ground state manifold does not cross the energy levels which lead to excited states of the final Hamiltonian. Here, we denote by ground state manifold the first m curves associated with the lowest eigenvalue of the time-dependent Hamiltonian for $t \in [0, \tau]$, where m is the degeneracy of the final Hamiltonian ground state. An example of $m = 2$, is shown in Fig. 5 of Ref. [7].

Conventionally the adiabatic evolution path is the linear sweep of $s \in [0, 1]$, where $s = t/\tau$:

$$H(s) = (1 - s)H_{transverse} + sH_f. \quad (1)$$

$\hat{H}_{transverse}$ is usually chosen such that its ground state is a uniform superposition of all possible 2^n computational basis vectors (see Eq. 7 below). Here, we choose the spin states $\{|q_i = 0\rangle, |q_i = 1\rangle\}$, which are the eigenvectors of $\hat{\sigma}_i^z$ with eigenvalues $+1$ and -1 , respectively, as the basis vectors. Then the initial ground state is $|\psi_g(0)\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2^n}} \sum_{q_i \in \{0,1\}} |q_n\rangle |q_{n-1}\rangle \cdots |q_2\rangle |q_1\rangle$. Such an initial ground state is usually assumed to be easy to prepare and it results in a quantum state with equal probability of all possible solutions.

III. SOMBRERO ADIABATIC QUANTUM COMPUTATION (SAQC)

For SAQC, the time-dependent Hamiltonian can be written as:

$$\hat{H}_{sombbrero} = (1 - s)\hat{H}_i + \text{hat}(s)\hat{H}_{driving} + s\hat{H}_f. \quad (2)$$

The non-degenerate ground state of the initial Hamiltonian \hat{H}_i encodes a guess to the solution, and the $\hat{H}_{driving}$ term couples the states in the computational basis. The function $\text{hat}(s)$ satisfies $\text{hat}(0) = \text{hat}(1) = 0$, because $\hat{H}_{driving}$ acts only in the range $s \in (0, 1)$ in a ‘‘sombbrero-like’’ time dependence (see Fig. 1).

A. Design of the initial Hamiltonian for the guess state

As preparing an arbitrary initial non-degenerate ground state for adiabatic evolution is not a trivial task, we focus on easy to prepare initial guesses that consist of one of the states in the computational basis. The strategy proposed builds initial Hamiltonians such that the initial guess corresponds to non-degenerate ground states, as it is required by the adiabatic theorem.

Let us denote the states of the computational basis of an N qubit system as $|q_N\rangle |q_{N-1}\rangle \cdots |q_1\rangle \equiv |q_N \cdots q_1\rangle$ where $q_n \in \{0, 1\}$. The proposed initial Hamiltonian, whose ground state corresponds to an arbitrary initial guess state of the form $|x_N \cdots x_1\rangle$, can be written as




FIG. 1: (Color online) Left: In conventional adiabatic quantum computation, CAQC, the initial Hamiltonian, denoted as $\hat{H}_{transverse}$, is chosen in such a way that its initial ground state is a superposition of all the states in the computational basis. This $\hat{H}_{transverse}$ plays the role of coupling the quantum states towards the solution if the quantum evolution is adiabatic and it is slowly turned off while the final Hamiltonian, whose ground state encodes the solution to the computational problem, is fully turned on. One possibility for this process is shown in the left panel, where a simple linear ramp shows the turning off of this transverse field. Right: In sombrero adiabatic quantum computation, SAQC, one has the freedom of selecting an initial state which might be close to the solution of the problem. In the simplest scenario, this initial state is randomly selected from the computational basis set. The initial Hamiltonian is going to depend on the initial state chosen and its simple construction (see Sec. III A) results in a diagonal Hamiltonian with respect to the computational basis. The final Hamiltonian for the case of classical problems is diagonal as well. A simple linear ramp between the initial and final Hamiltonian (both diagonal) will not take the initial state to the solution, and then a Hamiltonian with off-diagonal coupling needs to be turned on to achieve the computation. This Hamiltonian denoted as $\hat{H}_{driving}$ in the right panel was chosen to be the same as $\hat{H}_{transverse}$ for comparison reasons. Since one wants the initial and final Hamiltonians to be the only ones turned on at the beginning and at the end of the quantum evolution, respectively, the amplitude of the $\hat{H}_{transverse}$ needs to be zero at the beginning, $s = 0$, and at the end, $s = 1$, of the quantum evolution, giving the sombrero-like time dependence profile. Two examples of functions with this functional form are presented in the right panel of the figure, where $\text{hat}_1(s) = \sin^2(\pi s)$ and $\text{hat}_2(s) = s(1 - s)$.

$$\hat{H}_i = \sum_{n=1}^N \left(x_n \hat{I} + \hat{q}_n (1 - 2x_n) \right) = \sum_{n=1}^N \hat{h}_{x_n}, \quad (3)$$

where each x_n is a boolean variable, $x_n \in \{0, 1\}$, while $\hat{q} \equiv \frac{1}{2}(\hat{I} - \hat{\sigma}^z)$ is a quantum operator acting on the n -th qubit of the multipartite Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}_N \otimes \mathcal{H}_{N-1} \otimes \cdots \otimes \mathcal{H}_n \otimes \cdots \otimes \mathcal{H}_1$. The operator \hat{q}_n is given by

$$\hat{q}_n = \hat{I}_N \otimes \hat{I}_{N-1} \otimes \cdots \otimes (\hat{q})_n \otimes \cdots \otimes \hat{I}_1, \quad (4)$$

where \hat{q} is placed in the n th position and the identity operators act on the rest of the Hilbert space.

The states constituting the computational basis, $|0\rangle$ and $|1\rangle$, are eigenvectors of $\hat{\sigma}_z$ with eigenvalues $+1$ and -1 , and therefore they are also eigenstates of the operator \hat{q} with eigenvalues 0 and 1 respectively. The logic behind the initial Hamiltonian in Eq. 3 then is clear: if $x_n = 0$, then $\hat{h}_{x_n=0} = \hat{q}_n$ but in the case of $x_n = 1$, then $\hat{h}_{x_n=1} = \hat{I} - \hat{q}_n$.

As an example, suppose one has you have a four qubit system, and one wishes to initialize the adiabatic computation with the state $|x_4 = 1, x_3 = 0, x_2 = 1, x_1 = 0\rangle \equiv |1010\rangle$ which one either picked randomly or as an educated guess to the solution. According to Eq. 3, the initial Hamiltonian for the $|1010\rangle$ guess state should be constructed as

$$\hat{H}_i = \hat{h}_{q_4} + \hat{h}_{q_3} + \hat{h}_{q_2} + \hat{h}_{q_1} = (\hat{I} - \hat{q}_4) + \hat{q}_3 + (\hat{I} - \hat{q}_2) + \hat{q}_1, \quad (5)$$

and, clearly

$$\hat{H}_i |1010\rangle = \left((\hat{I} - \hat{q}_4) + \hat{q}_3 + (\hat{I} - \hat{q}_2) + \hat{q}_1 \right) |1010\rangle = 0 |1010\rangle. \quad (6)$$

In general, the 2^N states of the computational basis are all eigenstates of \hat{H}_i , and it can be easily verified that the spectrum of \hat{H}_i are energies contained in $\{0, \dots, N\}$. As required, the ground state is also nondegenerate. The other states will have an eigenenergy which equals their Hamming distance to the ground state of the initial Hamiltonian.

B. Driving Hamiltonian

The encoding of an educated or a random guess into \hat{H}_i (Eq. 3) makes both \hat{H}_i and \hat{H}_f (Eq. 2) diagonal in the computational basis. Therefore, connecting \hat{H}_i and \hat{H}_f with a

linear ramp (as in Eq. 1), namely, omitting the operator $\hat{H}_{driving}$ in the quantum evolution, would yield zero probability of obtaining the state that encodes the unknown solution to the problem starting from the initial guess state. To avoid such a situation, $\hat{H}_{driving}$ must introduce non-diagonal terms in $\hat{H}_{sombbrero}$ (see Eq. 2) that allows the initial state to transform from any arbitrary guess into the solution.

In order to make a fair comparison between CAQC and SAQC, we set

$$\hat{H}_{driving} = \hat{H}_{transverse} = \delta \sum_{n=1}^N \hat{q}_n^x, \quad (7)$$

in Eq. 2, where \hat{q}_n^x stands for the quantum operator \hat{q}^x acting on the n th qubit of the multipartite Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}_N \otimes \mathcal{H}_{N-1} \otimes \cdots \otimes \mathcal{H}_n \otimes \cdots \otimes \mathcal{H}_1$. The operator \hat{q}_n^x is given by $\hat{I}_N \otimes \hat{I}_{N-1} \otimes \cdots \otimes (\hat{q}^x)_n \otimes \cdots \otimes \hat{I}_1$, where the operator $\hat{q}^x \equiv \frac{1}{2}(\hat{I} - \hat{\sigma}^x)$ has been placed in the n th position, and the \hat{I}_i 's are identity operators. From a physical point of view, the Hamiltonians $\hat{H}_{driving}$ and $\hat{H}_{transverse}$ can be related to a transverse magnetic field. The intensity of these Hamiltonians is tuned by varying the δ parameter. If we set δ to be the same for both adiabatic algorithms, all the dependence of the transverse field intensity lies on functions $(1-s)$ in Eq. 1 and $\text{hat}(s)$ in Eq. 2. A reasonable requirement for a fair comparison between CAQC and SAQC is that they both provide the same average intensity of the transverse magnetic field in $s \in [0, 1]$. A choice of $\text{hat}(s)$ with the same average $\int_0^1 \text{hat}(s) ds = \int_0^1 (1-s) ds = 1/2$, is $\text{hat}(s) = 3s(1-s)$.

Even though nonlinear evolutions have been proposed in previous articles [28, 29, 30], our $\text{hat}(s)$ function can be as simple or as complicated as desired, as long as $\text{hat}(0) = \text{hat}(1) = 0$ is fulfilled. There is plenty of room to optimize the performance by choosing a more convenient $\text{hat}(s)$ for the adiabatic evolution with the additional advantage of having control of choosing an initial guess state from the computational basis. In the next section we present some results obtained based on one of the simple nonlinear function $\text{hat}(s) = 3s(1-s)$ and discuss the performance of both CAQC and SAQC for random 3-SAT instances.

IV. HAMILTONIANS FOR 3-SAT, NUMERICAL CALCULATIONS AND DISCUSSION

In order to provide a proof of concept for SAQC and to test the potential usefulness of both random and educated guesses in adiabatic evolution, we performed a numerical study

on hard-to-satisfy 6- and 7-variable instances of the 3-SAT problem and compared our results with the CAQC approach. Let us now provide a succinct introduction to the 3-SAT problem as well as to briefly discuss its relevance in the fields of theoretical and applied computer science.

A. Construction of final Hamiltonians for satisfiability problems and design of numerical calculations

The K-SAT Problem. Let $A = \{e_1, e_2, \dots, e_n, \bar{e}_1, \bar{e}_2, \dots, \bar{e}_n\}$ be a set of Boolean variables $E = \{e_i\}$ and their negations $\bar{E} = \{\bar{e}_i\}$. Let us now construct a logical proposition P , defined as $P = \bigwedge_i [(\bigvee_{j=1}^k a_j)] = \bigwedge_i C_i$, where $a_j \in A$, i.e. P is a conjunction of clauses C_i over the set A , where each clause consists of the disjunction of k literals. Proposition P is a K-SAT instance and the solution of the K-SAT problem, for instance P , consists of finding a set of values for those binary variables upon which P has been built (i.e. a bitstring), so that replacement of such binary variables for their corresponding binary values makes $P = 1$, namely, proposition P is satisfied. 3-SAT is a particular case of K-SAT for $K=3$.

For example, let us examine the following instance of the 3-SAT problem. Let $E = \{x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4, x_5, x_6\}$ be a set of binary variables, and therefore the set of literals is $A = E \cup \bar{E} = \{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_6, \bar{x}_1, \bar{x}_2, \dots, \bar{x}_6\}$. Consider a 3-SAT instance specified by the proposition,

$$\begin{aligned}
P = & (\bar{x}_1 \vee \bar{x}_4 \vee \bar{x}_5) \wedge (\bar{x}_2 \vee \bar{x}_3 \vee \bar{x}_4) \wedge (x_1 \vee x_2 \vee \bar{x}_5) \wedge (x_3 \vee x_4 \vee x_5) \wedge \\
& (x_4 \vee x_5 \vee \bar{x}_6) \wedge (\bar{x}_1 \vee \bar{x}_3 \vee \bar{x}_5) \wedge (x_1 \vee \bar{x}_2 \vee \bar{x}_5) \wedge (x_2 \vee \bar{x}_3 \vee \bar{x}_6) \wedge \\
& (\bar{x}_1 \vee \bar{x}_2 \vee \bar{x}_6) \wedge (x_3 \vee \bar{x}_5 \vee \bar{x}_6) \wedge (\bar{x}_1 \vee \bar{x}_2 \vee \bar{x}_4) \wedge (x_2 \vee x_3 \vee \bar{x}_4) \wedge \\
& (x_2 \vee x_5 \vee \bar{x}_6) \wedge (x_2 \vee \bar{x}_3 \vee \bar{x}_5) \wedge (\bar{x}_2 \vee \bar{x}_3 \vee \bar{x}_4) \wedge (x_2 \vee x_3 \vee x_6) \wedge \\
& (\bar{x}_1 \vee \bar{x}_2 \vee \bar{x}_3) \wedge (\bar{x}_1 \vee \bar{x}_4 \vee \bar{x}_5) \wedge (\bar{x}_3 \vee \bar{x}_4 \vee \bar{x}_6) \wedge (\bar{x}_4 \vee \bar{x}_5 \vee x_6) \wedge \\
& (\bar{x}_2 \vee x_3 \vee \bar{x}_6) \wedge (x_2 \vee x_5 \vee x_6) \wedge (x_3 \vee x_5 \vee \bar{x}_6) \wedge (\bar{x}_1 \vee x_3 \vee \bar{x}_6) \wedge \\
& (x_3 \vee \bar{x}_5 \vee x_6) \wedge (x_4 \vee x_5 \vee x_6) \wedge (x_1 \vee x_2 \vee \bar{x}_3)
\end{aligned}$$

As this example suggests, finding solutions of even a modest 3-SAT instance can become difficult quite easily (in this case, P has only one solution: $x_1 = 1, x_2 = 1, x_3 = 0, x_4 = 1, x_5 = 0, x_6 = 0$.)

3-SAT is an NP-complete problem [11, 12], as opposed to 2-SAT which can be efficiently solved using a classical computer. Consequently, studying the properties of 3-SAT is an

important area of research, not only because a polynomial-time solution to 3-SAT would imply $\mathbf{P} = \mathbf{NP}$, but also because 3-SAT (due to its polynomial equivalence with K-SAT) may be used to model problems and procedures in theoretical computer science [31] as well as in several areas of applied computer science and engineering like artificial intelligence [32, 33].

For the purpose of simplifying our discussion, and without loss of generality, we randomly generated 3-SAT instances have a unique satisfying assignment (USA) and their number of clauses to number of variables ratio is $\alpha \approx 4.26$. This value of α corresponds to the phase transition region where hard-to-satisfy instances are expected to be found [34, 35]. For completeness and to avoid any kind of bias in selecting this pool of instances, we selected 2^n different instances for every n variable case studied. The instances were selected in such a way that their solutions had not only a USA, but also that there was no two instances with the same solution.

To exhaustively study the impact of different initial guesses with respect to unique solutions in the behavior of SAQC, we considered all 64 possible initial Hamiltonians \hat{H}_i (using Eq. 3) for each one of the 64 randomly generated 6-variable USA instances. Similarly, we built 128 initial Hamiltonians for each 7-variable instance, one per possible initial guess (see Fig. 2).

Final Hamiltonians \hat{H}_f are instance-dependent, i.e. the structure of each final Hamiltonian depends on the particular structure (conjunction of clauses) of each 3-SAT USA instance. Our final Hamiltonians \hat{H}_f comply with the property that it must encode, in its ground state, the solution to the particular 3-SAT USA instance it was designed for [1, 36]. The design of the final Hamiltonian involves an intermediate step, where a classical cost or energy function is constructed for the particular instance of interest. Once this energy function is expressed in terms of binary variables, it can be easily transformed into a quantum Hamiltonian by performing the mapping indicated in Eq. 4. The energy function, H_f , associated with the final Hamiltonian, \hat{H}_f , can be constructed as a sum of other energy functions, h_{C_i} which involve only variables associated with one clause at a time,

$$H_f = \sum_i h_{C_i} \quad (8)$$

Each h_{C_i} is designed such that it is equal to 1 if clause C_i is unsatisfied and 0 if the clause is satisfied. Notice that the functions h_{C_i} contribute to the count of unsatisfied clauses which

defines the spectrum of possible values for H_f , with $H_f = 0$ when all clauses are satisfied.

Formally, suppose $A = \{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n, \bar{x}_1, \bar{x}_2, \dots, \bar{x}_n\}$ is a set of n binary variables and their corresponding negations, P is a 3-SAT USA instance given by $P = \bigwedge_i C_i$, and each C_i is a disjunction of three elements of A , i.e. $C_i = a_\alpha \vee a_\beta \vee a_\gamma$ with $a_\alpha, a_\beta, a_\gamma \in A$ and indices α, β, γ are natural numbers, not necessarily consecutive. Finally, let $B = z_1 z_2 \dots z_n$ be a set of n bits to be substituted in instance P . Then, h_{C_i} is given by

$$h_{C_i} = \begin{cases} 0, & \text{if substitution of } B = z_1 z_2 \dots z_n \text{ in } a_\alpha \vee a_\beta \vee a_\gamma \text{ makes } C_i = 1 \\ 1, & \text{if substitution of } B = z_1 z_2 \dots z_n \text{ in } a_\alpha \vee a_\beta \vee a_\gamma \text{ makes } C_i = 0. \end{cases}$$

To construct such a function for any arbitrary clause $C_i = a_\alpha \vee a_\beta \vee a_\gamma$, it is useful to note that the only assignment for which $C_i = 0$ is when $a_\alpha = 0$, $a_\beta = 0$, and $a_\gamma = 0$. Therefore, the function h_{C_i} by construction, should be 1 when $a_\alpha = 0$, $a_\beta = 0$, and $a_\gamma = 0$, and 0 otherwise. It can be easily checked that

$$h_{C_i} = (1 - a_\alpha)(1 - a_\beta)(1 - a_\gamma), \quad (9)$$

equals 1 when $a_\alpha = 0$, $a_\beta = 0$, and $a_\gamma = 0$ and 0 otherwise. Recall that each a_β represents a literal and therefore it could be representing the negation of a variable. One can always use the identity $\bar{x}_i = 1 - x_i$ to eliminate any \bar{x}_i , and obtain both h_{C_i} and H_f in terms of the x_i .

Consider for example the construction of the energy function h_C required for clause $C = \bar{x}_\alpha \vee \bar{x}_\beta \vee \bar{x}_\gamma$, i.e. C is a conjunction of three negated binary variables. In this case, C is satisfied by all possible 3-bit bitstrings except for 111 and, according to Eq. 9 the energy function assumes the form $h_{C_i} = (1 - \bar{x}_\alpha)(1 - \bar{x}_\beta)(1 - \bar{x}_\gamma) = x_\alpha x_\beta x_\gamma$.

As a last example consider a clause of the form $C = x_\alpha \vee x_\beta \vee x_\gamma$, where C is a conjunction of three non-negated binary variables taken from set A . It is clear that C will be satisfied by all possible 3-bit bitstrings except for 000. According to Eq. 9, the energy function for this clause C is given by $h_C = (1 - x_\alpha)(1 - x_\beta)(1 - x_\gamma) = 1 - x_\alpha - x_\beta - x_\gamma + x_\alpha x_\beta + x_\beta x_\gamma + x_\alpha x_\gamma - x_\alpha x_\beta x_\gamma$. From the first equality of the previous equation, one can easily check that $h_C = 0$ for all possible 3-bit combinations except for $h_C(000) = 1$, as expected.

Once we have the final expression for the final classical energy function of Eq. 8, the final Hamiltonians \hat{H}_f can be obtained using the mapping of Eq. 4, which relates the classical binary variables with quantum operators. Since we selected only USA instances for our study, each \hat{H}_f has a non-degenerate ground state encoding the unique solution of one of our 3-SAT

instances with corresponding ground eigenvalue equal to zero. The final Hamiltonians are the same for both strategies, CAQC and SAQC.

The numerical results on the dependence of the minimum-gap value, g_{min} , as a function of δ are shown in Fig. 3. Curves were computed by taking the median of all bit strings that fulfilled the criteria specified in the legend boxes; namely either to produce i unsatisfied clauses (UC= i) when substituting the initial guess bit string in its corresponding instance, or to be j bit flips away from the solution (BF= j). BF represents the well known Hamming distance between the solution and the initial guess state. We focused on UC and BF because, in principle, the notion of closeness of an initial guess to the actual solution may be defined with either parameter. Data corresponding to a fixed value of δ is a statistical representation (median) of typical g_{min} values that would be expected for hard 3-SAT instances if the guess state belonged to a definite number of UCs or BFs under an experimental setup using SAQC. Such curves are compared with the minimum gap expected for CAQC.

B. Effects of the variation in the transverse field intensity on the minimum energy gap

The dependence of g_{min} values as a function of the transverse field intensity δ leaves open some important questions regarding the efficiency of adiabatic quantum algorithms, whether CAQC or SAQC. For example, what is the optimum value of δ which minimizes the running time of an adiabatic algorithm? How transferable is this optimum δ value among computational problems? Although we do not intend to do a thorough study of this question in this paper, we would like to give some insight into this question and provide a qualitative discussion of what kind of results might be expected.

Following closely the notation from Farhi *et al* [1], consider $H(t) = \tilde{H}(t/\tau) = \tilde{H}(s)$, with instantaneous values of $\tilde{H}(s)$ defined by

$$\tilde{H}(s) |E_l(s)\rangle = E_l(s) |E_l(s)\rangle \quad (10)$$

with

$$E_0(s) \leq E_1(s) \leq \dots \leq E_{2^N-1}(s) \quad (11)$$

where 2^N is the dimension of the Hilbert space, and N the number of qubits or equivalently the number of binary variables in the SAT instance. According to the adiabatic theorem, if




FIG. 2: Scheme for 6 binary variables SAQC calculations. We generated 2^6 3-SAT unique satisfying assignment (USA) instances (first branching), each having as its only solution one of the 2^6 possible assignments. All 2^6 instances have a different state as solution, i.e. there is no chance for repeated instances. For each instance, we computed minimum-gap values associated with all possible settings of SAQC (Eq. 2) of all possible guesses (second branching), using 20 different values of $\delta \in \{0.5, 1.0, \dots, 10.0\}$ (third branching). The same scheme was applied to 7 binary variable 3-SAT USA instances (not shown) for a total of $(128\text{USA}) \times (128\text{guesses}) \times (20\text{values of } \delta) = 327,680$ SAQC settings.




FIG. 3: (Color online) Summary of the 327,680 calculations for 7 variable 3-SAT instances of minimum-gap median values as a function of the transverse field intensity within groups sorted by (a) number of bit flips, BF, representing the Hamming distance between the initial guess and the solution and (b) number of unsatisfied clauses (UC). Plots include the CAQC (see Eq. 1) results for the same 128 different unique-satisfying assignment 3-SAT instances randomly generated for the case of 7 variables. Values in parentheses correspond to numbers of data points which contributed to the value of the median plotted in each curve. Results for 6 variable instances (not shown) are similar to the ones shown for 7 variable instances.

the gap between the two lowest levels, $E_1(s) - E_0(s)$, is greater than zero for all $0 \leq s \leq 1$, and taking,

$$\tau \gg \frac{\mathcal{E}}{g_{min}^2} \quad (12)$$

with the minimum gap, g_{min} , defined by,

$$g_{min} = \min_{0 \leq s \leq 1} (E_1(s) - E_0(s)), \quad (13)$$

and \mathcal{E} given by,

$$\mathcal{E} = \max_{0 \leq s \leq 1} |\langle E_1(s) | \frac{d\tilde{H}}{ds} | E_0(s) \rangle|, \quad (14)$$

then we can make the normed overlap

$$|\langle E_0(s=1) | \psi(\tau) \rangle| \quad (15)$$

arbitrarily close to 1. In other words, the existence of a nonzero gap guarantees that $|\psi(t)\rangle$ remains very close to the ground state of $H(t)$ for all $0 \leq t \leq \tau$, if τ is sufficiently large.

Even though we are aware of the new and more stringent conditions for adiabaticity [18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27] and that Eq. 12 is just one of the inequalities to guarantee adiabatic evolution (though there is still lack of a sufficient and necessary condition according to Ref. [37]), we will base our discussion on Eq. 12 to illustrate that there is nothing anomalous in inserting the additional Hamiltonian term in the full time-dependent Hamiltonian for SAQC. As well as in CAQC, the algorithmic complexity relies again in avoiding an exponentially narrowing of g_{min} . Along the way we find an important observation about the scaling of the running time as a function of the parameter δ .

Let us first determine an upper bound for \mathcal{E}_{SAQC} in Eq. 12. Consider the Hamiltonian in Eq. 2 with $\text{hat}(s) = 3s(1 - s)$ since this was the functional form used for our numerical calculations. We already discussed, at the end of Sec. III A, that the spectrum of H_i is contained in $\{0, 1, \dots, N\}$ and, similarly, it can be easily shown that the spectrum of $\hat{H}_{driving}$ (see Eq. 7) is contained in $\{0, 1, \dots, \delta N\}$. On the other hand, the spectrum of the final Hamiltonian, \hat{H}_f , is instance dependent, but its construction guarantees that the maximum eigenvalue would be M which denotes the total number of clauses. This eigenvalue M would only appear in case we had an assignment which violates all of the clauses. Using these spectra upper bounds, we can establish an upper bound for \mathcal{E}_{SAQC} in Eq. 12, i.e,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{E}_{SAQC} &= \max_{0 \leq s \leq 1} \left| \langle E_1(s) | \frac{d\tilde{H}}{ds} | E_0(s) \rangle \right| \\
&= \max_{0 \leq s \leq 1} \left| \langle E_1(s) | \hat{H}_f - \hat{H}_i + 3\delta \hat{H}_{driving} - 6\delta s \hat{H}_{driving} | E_0(s) \rangle \right| \\
&\leq \max \left(|\langle E_1(s) | \hat{H}_f | E_0(s) \rangle| + |\langle E_1(s) | \hat{H}_i | E_0(s) \rangle| \right) \\
&\quad + 3|\delta \langle E_1(s) | \hat{H}_{driving} | E_0(s) \rangle| + 6|\delta \langle E_1(s) | \hat{H}_{driving} | E_0(s) \rangle| \\
&\leq M + N + 3|\delta|N + 6|\delta|N = N(\alpha + 1 + 9|\delta|)
\end{aligned} \tag{16}$$

Where we have used the triangle and Schwartz inequality and also the fact that $M = \alpha N$, with α close to 4.26 in this particular study. We can see that in the worst case scenario, \mathcal{E}_{SAQC} scales linearly with the number of variables N , and linearly with the intensity of the magnetic field, $\mathcal{E}_{SAQC} = O(|\delta|N)$. A similar analysis gives also that $\mathcal{E}_{CAQC} = O(|\delta|N)$, and therefore, we showed that for SAQC, not surprisingly, the algorithmic complexity also relies on the scaling of g_{min} .

An interesting observation arise by analyzing the linear scaling of \mathcal{E} with δ and using the numerical results for the dependence of the typical minimum gap values as a function of δ . There seem to be at least two distinguishable regimes for the dependence of g_{min} on δ for both CAQC and SAQC (Fig. 3). For relatively small values of $\delta \in [0.5, 1.5]$, g_{min} scales approximately linearly with δ and therefore $g_{min}^2 \sim \delta^2$. Since the running time is given by Eq. 12, and $\mathcal{E} \sim \delta$, the running time τ decays inversely proportional to δ within this linear regime. However, for large values of δ , in the ‘stationary’ regime where g_{min} is almost constant, increasing field intensity through δ would make both algorithms less efficient as running time τ would increase roughly linearly with δ .

Both CAQC and SAQC would benefit from an increase in the transverse field for small values of δ , but notice that g_{min} values for SAQC are more sensitive to δ , and soon become better on average than those for CAQC (Fig. 3). According to the previous discussion about running time as a function of δ , it would be ideal to choose δ near the end of the linear regime; in our calculations, δ somewhere in the interval (1,2). Further studies concerning the optimum value of δ as a function of the number of binary variables are needed, but we chose $\delta = 1.5$ for our analysis of the performance in SAQC and CAQC described in the following section.

C. Performance comparison between SAQC and CAQC

The data sorted with respect to BFs and UCs shows an increase of the minimum gap, g_{min} , as the Hamming distance from the initial guess to the solution decreases; the trend for UC is less apparent (see Fig. 3). Computing the number of UCs produced by a given initial guess can be done in polynomial time on a classical computer. Unfortunately there is no way to determine *a priori* how many bit flips the guess is from the solution, as that requires knowledge of the solution itself. Additionally, Fig. 4(a) shows that the SAQC implementation, using $\hat{H}_{driving}$ as defined in Eq. 7, does not necessarily favor states with low values of UC, but rather gives a homogenously distributed success probability between 25-45%, for $\delta = 1.5$. This is in accordance to the observation that solving 3-SAT hard instances is not necessarily guided by minimizing the number of UCs [38]. Given the above scenario, we analyzed the likelihood of better performance by choosing initial guesses at random.

In the following discussion, we use the term *significantly better* initial guess to mean an initial condition that leads a SAQC algorithm to be at least twice as fast as CAQC, i.e. running times for CAQC, τ_{CAQC} , and SAQC, τ_{SAQC} , are such that $\tau_{CAQC} \geq 2\tau_{SAQC}$ or, equivalently, $g_{min}^{SAQC} \geq \sqrt{2}g_{min}^{CAQC}$, assuming $\mathcal{E}_{CAQC} = \mathcal{E}_{SAQC}$.

For $\delta = 1.5$, choosing an initial state at random yields a probability greater than 50% of having $g_{min}^{SAQC} \geq g_{min}^{CAQC}$ (squares) as shown in Fig. 4(b). Moreover, the probability of *significantly better* performance, i.e. $\tau_{CAQC} \geq 2\tau_{SAQC}$ is $\approx 35\%$ (triangles). With the intention of predicting the performance of the SAQC protocol in the limit of large n , the third curve (circles) was produced using the following rationale: for USA instances, the number of bit configurations with a given value of $BF = m$ follows a binomial distribution $\binom{n}{m}$. In the limit of large n , the likelihood of choosing a state in the central region of the binomial distribution is the highest. This observation led us to concentrate on the performance of the most populated instance subsets, those that correspond to $BF = 3, 4$ for 7 variables. Here, the probability of significantly better performance is close to 40%.

Finally, we propose an algorithm based on SAQC. An initial guess is chosen either at random or by applying expert-domain knowledge and then encoded into the initial ground state of \hat{H}_i (Eq. 3). An adiabatic passage based on SAQC is then performed either in serial or in parallel, depending on the availability of quantum hardware resources (see Fig. 5.). As an example of the potential usefulness of our algorithm, recall from Fig. 4 that the probability




FIG. 4: (Color online) (a) $P(g_{min}^{SAQC} \geq \sqrt{2}g_{min}^{CAQC} | UC = n)$ is the conditional probability of choosing a state with $UC = n$ and a SAQC minimum-gap large enough so that the performance of the SAQC is *significantly better* (at least twice faster) than the CAQC. The results were obtained for $\delta = 1.5$. Panel (a) shows that there is no correlation between the number of violated clauses and the g_{min} of the SAQC algorithm, for the hard-to-satisfy instances randomly chosen for this numerical study. Panel (b) shows the probability of choosing an initial state at random and satisfying the condition specified in the legend, for different values of the transverse field intensity, $0.5 \leq \delta \leq 10$. The conditional probability $P(g_{min}^{SAQC} \geq \sqrt{2}g_{min}^{CAQC} | BF = 3, 4)$ (triangles) aims to predict the performance of the SAQC algorithm in the case of large number n of qubits. In this limit, a initial state chosen at random will have with high probability a Hamming distance $BF \sim n/2$, given that they are binomially distributed, i.e., the number of n bit strings with $BF = m$ is equal to $\binom{n}{m}$

of *significantly better* performance using SAQC is 39% for $\delta = 1.5$.

One way to employ the probabilities we obtained from our numerical simulations in a more concrete scenario is: suppose one is assigned the task of using an adiabatic quantum computer and assume one uses Eq. 12 or any of the more stringent conditions for adiabaticity [18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27] to estimate for how long one may need to run an algorithm under the CAQC paradigm. Moreover, suppose that this estimated running time required to remain in the ground state with a high success probability is $\tau_{CAQC} = 2$ days. Using the numerical results presented in this paper, one can opt for performing the same task using SAQC as follows: suppose we have absolutely no information about the problem as it was in the case of this numerical study with random 3-SAT USA instances. Instead of running the CAQC algorithm for 2 days, pick a guess state at random from all the possible assignments and then use it as initial state for SAQC and run the algorithm with $\tau_{SAQC} = 1$ -day. According to Fig. 4, the probability of having picked a state whose performance is as good as CAQC is 39%, for $\delta = 1.5$. If after measurement at the end of the first day the result is not a solution, we still can pick another state at random and let it run for one more day. By now the probability of having picked a state with the same performance as the CAQC in the two trials equals 63%. Note that in this simple probability calculations we are not taking into account the fact that even in the case where the state selected for the first run was not one of the ‘ideal’ ones (states corresponding to the 39 % of guesses for the results presented in Fig. 4), we still have a very good chance that the ‘non-ideal’ state still delivers a right answer after the first measurement. This probability will depend of course of how close is the chosen state from the set of ‘ideal’ ones.

Consequently, the execution of two SAQC algorithms in serial would take at most as much time as the execution of only one CAQC algorithm. By allowing us to choose two guesses to run in the same time as one case in CAQC, the probability of choosing a significantly better initial guess in these two SAQC executions increases from 39% to 63%. Furthermore, even when no significantly better initial guess is chosen and the process is not guaranteed to be fully adiabatic, there is still some probability that we measure the correct solution at the end of both executions.




FIG. 5: (Color online) Implementation of an SAQC algorithm either in parallel or in serial. The algorithm begins by choosing a state of the computational basis. For each chosen initial state, an initial Hamiltonian is prepared according to Sec. III A. Next, choose an ideal time assuming a CAQC protocol will be run, and use that as a reference to run the SAQC protocol twice as fast. If only one AQC computer is available, one can still use the probabilistic speed up obtained in SAQC to run for example two adiabatic protocols instead of one, in serial mode. Once the first SAQC calculation is finished, one can efficiently check whether or not the result is a solution. In case that it is not a solution, one can submit an additional calculation. In the case of having several adiabatic quantum computers at hand, one can do the same initial procedure of selecting guesses, but now submitting a different guess to a different node and running on each node twice as fast.

V. CONCLUSIONS

In summary, our results show that there may be much to be gained by choosing an initial guess in SAQC, even if such a guess is chosen at random. We also present the possibility of doing parallel adiabatic quantum computation with SAQC. Suppose we have available a few adiabatic quantum computers or quantum adiabatic processors. Then, the only type of parallelization to date with CAQC in order to possibly have faster-than-usual algorithm execution is to use all available quantum adiabatic hardware simultaneously, under the rationale that several runs may increase success probability; one may also propose different functional time dependence connecting the initial and final Hamiltonian in each quantum computer. Under SAQC paradigm, we can do all of these modifications as well as to have the advantage of trying different initial states, freedom that is not accessible in the original CAQC proposal, since the initial ground state is fixed to be a uniform superposition of states. We have shown in this paper that starting the adiabatic evolution with a state which has zero-overlap with the solution is not a big concern. On the contrary, we have shown that even in the worst case scenario when there is no way to make an educated guess or applying heuristics, selecting the initial state at random is a reasonable alternative, since there is approximately 40% of states which might allow running the quantum algorithm at least twice as fast when compared to CAQC. This possibility of running the algorithm for shorter times but with several trials brings also additional advantages of getting the right answer in any intermediate measure. Moreover, these shorter runs will be less affected by decoherence effects.

In particular, our method opens up the possibility of using an educated guess based on physical intuition for structured problems. For example, in the case of our recent AQC algorithm proposed for protein folding [7], there is plenty of room for selecting reasonable configurations as well as excluding nonviable folding instances, such as the ones that spatially overlap amino acids. The results in this paper show that SAQC is a new strategy for quantum adiabatic algorithm development that offers the flexibility of using physical intuition and parallel implementation of quantum adiabatic algorithms to decrease computational time. SAQC is also suitable to study quantum problems [8, 9, 10, 39, 40]. Further alternatives of $\hat{H}_{driving}$, as those found in [28], can also be explored in the context of SAQC. The connections between SAQC, quantum phase transitions [41], and the effect of local minima [42] remain

to be explored.

The numerical study performed in this paper is a proof-of-principle to aid in the presentation of the method. For this reason, we explored the space of initial guesses in an exhaustive manner for the case of 6-variable and 7-variable SAT instances, running 81,920 plus 327,680 for 6- and 7- variables respectively (see Fig. 2). Now that the method seems promising, we suggest the exploration of numerical experiments which are not meant to be exhaustive but still test the performance of both CAQC and SAQC. These further numerical studies could involve larger size instances, and different problems other than SAT, in particular, it is desirable to try structured problems as the ones found in specific situations, such as protein folding. Regarding the criteria for comparing both methods, the more rigorous criteria for adiabatic conditions [18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27] may be needed. Numerical propagation of the time-dependent Schrödinger equation, instead of inspection of the minimum gap after the Hamiltonian diagonalization, could provide a more realistic simulation of the quantum computation process.

Acknowledgments

All authors thank E. Farhi and S. Gutmann for useful discussions the led to Fig. 4 and related analysis. S.V.A. gratefully acknowledges P. Grasa and R. Rueda for their support, and Tecnológico de Monterrey Campus Estado de México for funding. A.P. and A.A.G gratefully acknowledge funding from D-Wave Systems and Harvard's Institute for Quantum Science and Engineering. A.A.G. thanks the Army Research Office under contract W911NF-07-0304.

-
- [1] E. FARHI, J. GOLDSTONE, S. GUTMANN, and M. SIPSER, *quant-ph/0001106* (2000).
 - [2] A. M. CHILDS, E. FARHI, and J. PRESKILL, *Physical Review A* **65**, 012322.
 - [3] D. A. LIDAR, *Physical Review Letters* **100**, 160506 (2008).
 - [4] E. FARHI, J. GOLDSTONE, S. GUTMANN, J. LAPAN, A. LUNDGREN, and D. PREDA, *Science* **292**, 472 (2001).
 - [5] T. HOGG, *Physical Review A* **67**, 022314 (2003).

- [6] A. P. YOUNG, S. KNYSH, and V. N. SMELYANSKIY, *Physical Review Letters* **101**, 170503 (2008).
- [7] A. PERDOMO, C. TRUNCIK, I. TUBERT-BROHMAN, G. ROSE, and A. ASPURU-GUZI, *Physical Review A* **78**, 012320 (2008).
- [8] J. KEMPE, A. KITAEV, and O. REGEV, *SIAM Journal on Computing* **35**, 10701097 (2006).
- [9] S. BRAVYI, *quant-ph/0602108* (2006).
- [10] R. OLIVEIRA and B. M. TERHAL, *Quantum Information and Computation* **8**, 0900 (2008).
- [11] M. GAREY and D. JOHNSON, *Computers and Intractability. A Guide to the Theory of NP-Completeness*, W.H. Freeman and Co., NY, 1979.
- [12] M. SIPSER, *Introduction to the Theory of Computation*, PWS Publishing Co., 2005.
- [13] A. ASPURU-GUZI, A. D. DUTOI, P. J. LOVE, and M. HEAD-GORDON, *Science* **309**, 1704 (2005).
- [14] N. J. WARD, I. KASSAL, and A. ASPURU-GUZI, *The Journal of Chemical Physics* **130**, 194105 (2009).
- [15] H. WANG, S. KAIS, A. ASPURU-GUZI, and M. R. HOFFMANN, *Physical Chemistry Chemical Physics* **10**, 5388 (2008).
- [16] H. WANG, S. ASHHAB, and F. NORI, *Physical Review A* **79**, 042335 (2009).
- [17] A. MESSIAH, *Quantum Mechanics (Physics)*, Dover Publications, 1999.
- [18] K. MARZLIN and B. C. SANDERS, *Physical Review Letters* **93**, 160408 (2004).
- [19] D. M. TONG, K. SINGH, L. C. KWEK, and C. H. OH, *Physical Review Letters* **98**, 150402 (2007).
- [20] Z. WEI and M. YING, *Physical Review A* **76**, 024304 (2007).
- [21] Y. ZHAO, *Physical Review A* **77**, 032109 (2008).
- [22] M. H. S. AMIN, *0810.4335* (2008).
- [23] R. MACKENZIE, A. MORIN-DUCHESNE, H. PAQUETTE, and J. PINEL, *Physical Review A* **76**, 044102 (2007).
- [24] A. AMBAINIS and O. REGEV, *quant-ph/0411152* (2004).
- [25] S. JANSEN, M. RUSKAI, and R. SEILER, *Journal of Mathematical Physics* **48**, 102111 (2007).
- [26] J. DA WU, M. SHENG ZHAO, J. LAN CHEN, and Y. DE ZHANG, *0706.0264* (2007).
- [27] J.-L. CHEN, M. SHENG ZHAO, J. DA WU, and Y. DE ZHANG, *0706.0299* (2007).
- [28] E. FARHI, J. GOLDSTONE, and S. GUTMANN, *quant-ph/0208135* (2002).

- [29] M. ANDRECUT and M. K. ALI, *International Journal of Theoretical Physics* **43**, 925931 (2004).
- [30] M. S. SIU, *Physical Review A* **75**, 0623375 (2007).
- [31] S. ACHARYYA, *Journal on Satisfiability, Boolean Modeling and Computation* **4**, 33 (2007).
- [32] I. GENT and T. WALSH, *Internal report, department of computer science, University of Strathclyde* (1999).
- [33] M. MEZARD, G. PARISI, and R. ZECCHINA, *Science* **297**, 812 (2002).
- [34] D. ACHLIOPTAS, A. NAOR, and Y. PERES, *Nature* **435**, 759 (2005).
- [35] M. MEZARD, T. MORA, and R. ZECCHINA, *Physical Review Letters* **94**, 197205 (2005).
- [36] M. ŽNIDARIC, *Physical Review A* **71**, 062305.
- [37] J. DU, L. HU, Y. WANG, J. WU, M. ZHAO, and D. SUTER, *Physical Review Letters* **101**, 060403 (2008).
- [38] H. KAUTZ and B. SELMAN, *Discrete Applied Mathematics* **155**, 1514 (2007).
- [39] D. AHARONOV and A. TA-SHMA, *SIAM Journal on Computing* **37**, 47 (2007).
- [40] A. MIZEL, D. A. LIDAR, and M. MITCHELL, *Physical Review Letters* **99**, 070502 (2007).
- [41] R. SCHUTZHOLD and G. SCHALLER, *Physical Review A* **74**, 060304 (2006).
- [42] M. H. S. AMIN, *Physical Review Letters* **100**, 1305034 (2008).