

Non-Hermitian Adiabatic Quantum Optimization

Gennady P. Berman*

Theoretical Division, Los Alamos National Laboratory, Los Alamos, NM 87544, USA

Alexander I. Nesterov†

*Departamento de Física, CUCEI, Universidad de Guadalajara,
Av. Revolución 1500, Guadalajara, CP 44420, Jalisco, México*

(Dated: June 21, 2024)

We propose a novel non-Hermitian adiabatic quantum optimization algorithm. One of the core new ideas is to use a non-Hermitian auxiliary “initial” Hamiltonian that provides an effective level repulsion for the main Hamiltonian. This effect enables us to develop an adiabatic theory in determining the ground state with released gap conditions.

PACS numbers: 03.67.Ac, 03.67.Lx, 75.10.Nr, 64.70.Tg

Keywords: critical points; ground states; quantum theory; adiabatic quantum computation; quantum annealing

Many physical and combinatorial problems associated with complex networks of interacting degrees of freedom can be mapped to equivalent problems of finding the ground (or minimum cost) state of a corresponding quantum Hamiltonian \mathcal{H}_0 [1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9]. One of the approaches to finding the ground state of \mathcal{H}_0 is adiabatic quantum computation (AQC) which can be formulated as follows. Consider the time-dependent Hamiltonian

$$\mathcal{H}(t) = \frac{t}{\tau}\mathcal{H}_0 + \left(1 - \frac{t}{\tau}\right)\mathcal{H}_1, \quad (1)$$

where \mathcal{H}_0 is the Hamiltonian whose ground state is to be found, τ is the given time-interval of AQC, \mathcal{H}_1 is an auxiliary “initial” Hamiltonian and $[\mathcal{H}_0, \mathcal{H}_1] \neq 0$. As time varies from $t = 0$ to $t = \tau$, the Hamiltonian interpolates between \mathcal{H}_1 and \mathcal{H}_0 .

If the system is initially close to the ground state of \mathcal{H}_1 , and if τ is large (slow variation), then the system will remain close to the instantaneous ground state (i.e., that of $\mathcal{H}_\tau(t)$) for all $t \in [0, \tau]$. In particular, at $t = \tau$ it will be close to the ground state of \mathcal{H}_0 , which is the state we seek. In practice, \mathcal{H}_1 is chosen so that its ground state is known, then the dynamics is allowed to evolve and the state of the system evolves into the final state which is the solution to the problem.

Closely related to AQC is quantum annealing (QA), in which one has a Hamiltonian \mathcal{H}_0 to be optimized, and an auxiliary (non-commuting) term \mathcal{H}_1 so that the total Hamiltonian reads $\mathcal{H}_{tot}(t) = \mathcal{H}_0 + \Gamma(t)\mathcal{H}_1$, where $\Gamma(t)$ reduces from very high value to zero during the evolution. The coefficient $\Gamma(t)$ is the control parameter and initially Γ kept very high so that \mathcal{H}_1 dominates over \mathcal{H}_0 . One starts with the ground state of \mathcal{H}_1 as the initial state, and if $\Gamma(t)$ is slowly decreasing, the adiabatic theorem guarantees reaching of the ground state of the main Hamiltonian

\mathcal{H}_0 at the end of computation, assuming that there are no energy level crossings between the ground and excited states.

Quantum optimization algorithms usually require the presence of a gap between the ground state and first excited state, however, in typical cases the minimal gap, g_m , is exponentially small [22]. This increases drastically the total computational time and from a practical point of view, the advantage of the method is lost.

In this Letter, we propose a novel adiabatic non-Hermitian quantum optimization algorithm. We show that coupling the system to a non-Hermitian auxiliary initial Hamiltonian induces an effective level repulsion for the total Hamiltonian. This effect enables us to develop an adiabatic theory without the usual gap condition, and to determine the low lying states of \mathcal{H}_0 , including the ground state.

Adiabatic Quantum Optimization. – A generic adiabatic quantum optimization (AQO) problem may be formulated as follows [3]. Let \mathcal{H}_0 be a Hamiltonian whose ground state is to be found, and \mathcal{H}_1 be the auxiliary “initial” Hamiltonian. Then we consider the following time-dependent Hamiltonian:

$$\mathcal{H}_\tau(t) = f_0(t)\mathcal{H}_0 + f_1(t)\mathcal{H}_1, \quad (2)$$

where $[\mathcal{H}_0, \mathcal{H}_1] \neq 0$. The functions $f_0(t)$ and $f_1(t)$ are monotonic increasing and decreasing, respectively, and satisfy the following conditions: $f_1(\tau) = 0$, $f_0(\tau) = 1$, and $f_1(0) \gg f_0(0)$, if $f_0(0) \neq 0$. The Hamiltonian $\mathcal{H}_\tau(t) \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_0$, while $t \rightarrow \tau$, and we assume that, for any choice of the function $f_0(t)$, $\mathcal{H}_\tau(t)$ is dominated by \mathcal{H}_1 at the initial time $t = 0$.

The evolution of the system is determined by the Schrödinger equation

$$i\frac{\partial}{\partial t}|\psi(t)\rangle = \mathcal{H}_\tau(t)|\psi(t)\rangle. \quad (3)$$

We impose the initial conditions as follows: $\mathcal{H}_1|\psi_g\rangle = E_g|\psi_g\rangle$, where E_g denotes the energy of the ground state

*Electronic address: gpb@tmail.lanl.gov

†Electronic address: nesterov@cencar.udg.mx

$|\psi_g\rangle = |\psi(0)\rangle$, which is assumed to be the ground state of the auxiliary Hamiltonian \mathcal{H}_1 . The adiabatic theorem guarantees that the initial state $|\psi_g\rangle$ evolves into the final state $|\psi_g(\tau)\rangle$, which is the ground state of the Hamiltonian \mathcal{H}_0 as long as the instantaneous ground state of $\mathcal{H}_\tau(t)$ does not become degenerate at any time.

As known, the validity of the adiabatic theorem requires that the following condition be satisfied:

$$\sum_{m \neq n} \left| \frac{\langle \psi_m | \partial \mathcal{H}_\tau / \partial t | \psi_n \rangle}{(E_m - E_n)^2} \right| \ll 1. \quad (4)$$

This restriction is violated near the degeneracies in which the eigenvalues coalesce. In the commonest case of double degeneracy with two linearly independent eigenvectors, the energy surfaces form the sheets of a double cone. The apex of the cones is called a ‘‘diabolic point’’, and since, for a generic Hermitian Hamiltonian, the co-dimension of the diabolic point is three, it can be characterized by three parameters [10, 11]. Moreover, in the vicinity of the degeneracy being either diabolic point or exceptional point, the N -dimensional problem effectively becomes two-dimensional problem [12, 13, 14]. This will be essential in the following argument.

For quantum optimization the commonly used version of the adiabatic theorem takes the form [3, 4, 15]

$$\tau \gg \frac{\max |\langle \psi_e | \dot{\mathcal{H}}_\tau(t) | \psi_g \rangle|}{\min |E_e(t) - E_g(t)|^2}, \quad (5)$$

where $|\psi_g\rangle$ and $|\psi_e\rangle$ are the ground instantaneous state and the first excited state of the total system, and ‘‘dot’’ denotes the derivative with respect to the dimensionless time $s = t/\tau$, $\dot{\mathcal{H}}_\tau = d\mathcal{H}_\tau/ds = \tau d\mathcal{H}_\tau(t)/dt$, etc.

As can be observed, if during the evolution the gap $\Delta E = |E_e - E_g|$ becomes small enough, the amount of time required to pass from the initial state to the final state becomes very large and from the practical point of view the AQO loses its advantage in comparison with the thermal annealing.

Since in the vicinity of the level crossing point only the two-dimensional Jordan block related to the level crossing makes the most considerable contribution to the quantum evolution, the N -dimensional problem can be described by the effective two-dimensional Hamiltonian which can be obtained as follows [16]. Let t_c be a crossover point at which the energy gap between the ground state and the first excited state of the total Hamiltonian $\mathcal{H}_\tau(t)$ achieves its minimum. In the two-dimensional subspace corresponding to $E_g(t_c)$ and $E_e(t_c)$, we choose an orthonormal basis $\{|0\rangle, |1\rangle\}$ and complement it to the complete basis of the N -dimensional Hilbert space by adding the eigenvectors $|\psi_k(t_c)\rangle$ ($k = 2, \dots, N-1$).

Now, an arbitrary state $|\psi(t)\rangle$ can be expanded as $|\psi(t)\rangle = \alpha(t)|0\rangle + \beta(t)|1\rangle + \sum_{k \neq 0,1}^{N-1} c_k(t)|\psi_k(t_c)\rangle$. Inserting this expansion into Eq. (3), we obtain the coefficients α and β as the solution of the two-dimensional Schrödinger

equation

$$i \frac{\partial}{\partial t} |u(t)\rangle = \mathcal{H}_{ef}(t) |u(t)\rangle, \quad (6)$$

where

$$\mathcal{H}_{ef} = \begin{pmatrix} \lambda + Z & X - iY \\ X + iY & \lambda_0 - Z \end{pmatrix} \quad (7)$$

and $|u(t)\rangle = \begin{pmatrix} \alpha \\ \beta \end{pmatrix}$. The matrix elements in Eq. (7) are determined by

$$\lambda(t) = \frac{1}{2} (\langle 0 | \mathcal{H}_\tau | 0 \rangle + \langle 1 | \mathcal{H}_\tau | 1 \rangle), \quad (8)$$

$$X(t) = \frac{1}{2} (\langle 0 | \mathcal{H}_\tau | 1 \rangle + \langle 1 | \mathcal{H}_\tau | 0 \rangle), \quad (9)$$

$$Y(t) = \frac{i}{2} (\langle 0 | \mathcal{H}_\tau | 1 \rangle - \langle 1 | \mathcal{H}_\tau | 0 \rangle), \quad (10)$$

$$Z(t) = \frac{1}{2} (\langle 0 | \mathcal{H}_\tau | 0 \rangle - \langle 1 | \mathcal{H}_\tau | 1 \rangle). \quad (11)$$

Solving the characteristic equation for \mathcal{H}_{ef} , we obtain $E_\pm = \lambda \pm \sqrt{X^2 + Y^2 + Z^2}$. Setting $\mathbf{R} = (X, Y, Z)$, we find the energy gap between the ground state and the first excited state is $\Delta E = 2R$.

Inserting $\mathcal{H}_\tau(t) = f_0(t)\mathcal{H}_0 + f_1(t)\mathcal{H}_1$ into Eqs. (8) – (11), we can write the effective Hamiltonian as

$$\mathcal{H}_{ef}(t) = \lambda(t)\mathbb{1} - f_0(t)\mathbf{R}_0 \cdot \boldsymbol{\sigma} + f_1(t)\mathbf{R}_1 \cdot \boldsymbol{\sigma}, \quad (12)$$

where $\lambda(t) = f_0(t)\lambda_0 + f_1(t)\lambda_1$, $\mathbf{R}_0 = -(X_0, Y_0, Z_0)$ and $\mathbf{R}_1 = (X_1, Y_1, Z_1)$. The parameters λ_0, λ_1 and components of the vectors \mathbf{R}_0 and \mathbf{R}_1 are determined from Eqs. (8) – (11) by substitution of \mathcal{H}_0 and \mathcal{H}_1 instead of \mathcal{H}_τ . Next, setting $J = f_0(t)R_0$ and $g = f_1(t)R_1$, we obtain

$$R = \sqrt{g^2 - 2gJ \cos \alpha + J^2}, \quad (13)$$

where α is the angle between the vectors \mathbf{R}_0 and \mathbf{R}_1 .

At the crossover point we obtain

$$g_c = -J_c \frac{\dot{J}_c - \dot{g}_c \cos \alpha}{\dot{g}_c - \dot{J}_c \cos \alpha}, \quad (14)$$

where we denote $g_c = g(t_c)$, $J_c = J(t_c)$, $\dot{g}_c = \dot{g}(t_c)$ and $\dot{J}_c = \dot{J}(t_c)$. This yields

$$|\Delta E|_{\min} = \frac{\sqrt{\dot{g}_c^2 - 2\dot{g}_c \dot{J}_c \cos \alpha + \dot{J}_c^2}}{|\dot{g}_c - \dot{J}_c \cos \alpha|} 2|J_c| \sin \alpha. \quad (15)$$

In addition, one can show that $\sin \alpha \sim g_m$, where g_m is the minimum gap between the first two energy levels of the total Hamiltonian $\mathcal{H}_\tau(t)$.

One of the typical scenarios of AQO is AQC which is realized assuming $\dot{g}(t) = -\dot{J}(t)$. This implies that the functions $g(t)$ and $J(t)$ can be written as follows: $g(t) = J_*(1 - f(t))$, $J(t) = J_*f(t)$, where $f(t)$ is a monotonic increasing function and $f(0) = 0$, $f(\tau) = 1$.




FIG. 1: AQC: Energy gap $|\Delta E|/J_*$ between the ground state and the first excited state of the effective Hamiltonian as function of the dimensionless time $s = t/\tau$ and the parameter α .

For definiteness we assume further that $J_* > 0$. From Eq. (14) we find $f(t_c) = 1/2$ and Eq. (15) yields $|\Delta E|_{\min} = 2J_* \sin \frac{\alpha}{2}$. As can be observed the energy gap vanishes at the point $\alpha = 0$. (See Fig. 1.)

Another conventional scenario that is a particular case of general AQO, is a proper QA, for which $J(t) = J_* = \text{const}$ and it is assumed $g(0) \gg J_*$. In this case we obtain $g(t_c) = J_* \cos \alpha$ and the minimal gap is found to be $|\Delta E|_{\min} = J_* \sin \alpha$.

Non-Hermitian Adiabatic Quantum Optimization. – Before proceeding we comment on the emerging of the non-Hermiticity of the Hamiltonian. Since the aim is to obtain the ground state of the classical Hamiltonian \mathcal{H}_0 as a result of quantum optimization, there is no physical reason to restrict the class of the tunneling Hamiltonians \mathcal{H}_1 to Hermitian Hamiltonians.

Non-Hermitian quantum optimization can be implemented by the following generalization of the total Hamiltonian (2)

$$\tilde{\mathcal{H}}_\tau(t) = f_0(t)\mathcal{H}_0 + \tilde{f}_1(t)\mathcal{H}_1, \quad (16)$$

where $\tilde{f}_1(t) = f_1(t) - if_2(t)$. The functions $f_0(t)$ and $f_1(t)$ being monotonic decreasing and increasing, respectively, satisfy the following conditions: $f_1(0) \gg f_0(0)$, if $f_0(0) \neq 0$, and $f_1(\tau) = 0$, $f_0(\tau) = 1$. In addition, we assume that the function $f_2(t)$ is monotonic and $f_2(\tau) = 0$.

The evolution of the total system is determined by the Schrödinger equation and its adjoint equation

$$i\frac{\partial}{\partial t}|\psi(t)\rangle = \tilde{\mathcal{H}}_\tau(t)|\psi(t)\rangle, \quad (17)$$

$$-i\frac{\partial}{\partial t}\langle\tilde{\psi}(t)| = \langle\tilde{\psi}(t)|\tilde{\mathcal{H}}_\tau(t). \quad (18)$$

We impose the initial conditions as follows: $\tilde{\mathcal{H}}_1|\psi_g\rangle = E_g|\psi_g\rangle$, E_g being the energy of the ground state of the initial non-Hermitian Hamiltonian $\tilde{\mathcal{H}}_1 = \tilde{f}_1(0)\mathcal{H}_1$.

We denote by $|\psi_n(t)\rangle$ and $\langle\tilde{\psi}_n(t)|$ the right/left instantaneous eigenvectors of the total Hamiltonian:

$\tilde{\mathcal{H}}_\tau(t)|\psi_n(t)\rangle = E_n(t)|\psi_n\rangle$, $\langle\tilde{\psi}_n(t)|\tilde{\mathcal{H}}_\tau(t) = \langle\tilde{\psi}_n(t)|E_n(t)$. We assume that both systems of left and right eigenvectors form a bi-orthonormal basis, $\langle\tilde{\psi}_m|\psi_n\rangle = \delta_{mn}$ [17].

For the Non-Hermitian quantum optimization problem governed by the Hamiltonian (16) the criterion validity of adiabatic approximation is given by

$$\tau \gg \frac{\max |\langle\tilde{\psi}_e|\dot{\tilde{\mathcal{H}}}_\tau(t)|\psi_g\rangle|}{\min |E_e(t) - E_g(t)|^2}. \quad (19)$$

This restriction is violated near the ground state degeneracy where the complex energy levels cross. The point of degeneracy is known as the exceptional point, and it is characterized by a coalescence of eigenvalues and their corresponding eigenvectors, as well. Therefore, studying the behavior of the system in the vicinity of the exceptional point requires a special care [13, 14, 18].

At the crossover point t_c , we introduce the bi-orthonormal basis as follows: In the two-dimensional subspace spanned by the ground state and the first excited state of the total non-Hermitian Hamiltonian \tilde{H}_τ , we choose an orthonormal basis $\{|0\rangle, |1\rangle\}$ and complement it to the complete basis by adding the eigenvectors $|\psi_k(t_c)\rangle$ ($k = 2, \dots, N-1$). Then the set of states $\{|0\rangle, |1\rangle, \langle\tilde{\psi}_k(t_c)|; |0\rangle, |1\rangle, |\psi_k(t_c)\rangle\}$, where k runs from 2 to $N-1$, forms the bi-orthonormal basis of the N -dimensional Hilbert space.

Basically repeating the same procedure as for the Hermitian case, we obtain the effective two-dimensional non-Hermitian Hamiltonian as

$$\tilde{\mathcal{H}}_{ef}(t) = \tilde{\lambda}(t)\mathbb{1} - f_0(t)\mathbf{R}_0 \cdot \boldsymbol{\sigma} + \tilde{f}_1(t)\mathbf{R}_1 \cdot \boldsymbol{\sigma}, \quad (20)$$

where $\tilde{\lambda} = f_0(t)\lambda_0 + \tilde{f}_1(t)\lambda_1$, and \mathbf{R}_0 and \mathbf{R}_1 are defined in the same functional form as in Eq. (12), but in the new basis referred to the crossover point of the total non-Hermitian Hamiltonian $\tilde{\mathcal{H}}_\tau(t)$.

The Hamiltonian $\tilde{\mathcal{H}}_{ef}$ has a complex energy spectrum given by $E_\pm = \lambda_0 \pm \tilde{R}$, where

$$\tilde{R} = \sqrt{\tilde{g}^2 - 2\tilde{g}J \cos \alpha + J^2}, \quad (21)$$

and we set $J = f_0(t)R_0$, $\tilde{g} = g - i\delta = \tilde{f}_1(t)R_1$. From (21) we obtain the energy gap as

$$|\Delta E| = 2|\sqrt{g^2 - 2gJ \cos \alpha + J^2 - \delta^2 - 2i\delta(g - J \cos \alpha)}|. \quad (22)$$

As can be observed, $|\Delta E|$ vanishes at the exceptional point, defined in the parameter space (δ, g) by

$$g^2 + \delta^2 = J^2, \quad g = J \cos \alpha. \quad (23)$$

This yields $\cos \alpha = \sqrt{1 - (\delta/J)^2}$. From here it follows that the complex energy does not become degenerate during the evolution of the system, if $\delta(t) > J(t)$ for any $0 \leq t \leq \tau$. Otherwise, an exceptional point appears for some time $t \leq \tau$.

Of a special interest is the point $\alpha = 0$, in which the ground state of the total Hermitian Hamiltonian $\mathcal{H}_\tau(t)$

becomes degenerate. Inserting $\alpha = 0$ in Eq. (22) we find that for any time $0 \leq t \leq \tau$ the energy gap

$$|\Delta E| \geq |\Delta E|_{\min} = 2 \min(\sqrt{(g-J)^2 + \delta^2}) > 0. \quad (24)$$

Thus, the non-Hermitian adiabatic optimization does not suffer from the “gapless” defect of the Hermitian adiabatic optimization.

A rough estimate of the time required for the non-Hermitian quantum optimization can be obtained applying the criterion of Eq. (19) to the effective Hamiltonian $\tilde{\mathcal{H}}_{ef}$. The computation yields $\tau \gg |\dot{g}_0|/|\delta_c|^2$, where $\delta_c = \delta(\tau_c)$, τ_c being the time at which $|\Delta E|$ of Eq. (24) reaches its minimum.

As illustrative example, we consider the non-Hermitian adiabatic quantum computation (NAQC) realized by the following linear interpolation: $\tilde{g}(s) = g(s) - i\delta(s) = (J_* - i\delta_0)(1-s)$ and $J(s) = J_*s$. In Fig. 2 the energy gap $|\Delta E|/J_*$ between the ground state and the first excited state of the effective Hamiltonian $\tilde{\mathcal{H}}_{ef}(s)$ is depicted as function of the dimensionless time s and the parameter α .




FIG. 2: NAQC: Energy gap $|\Delta E|/J_*$ as function of the dimensionless time $s = t/\tau$ and α ($\delta_0 = 1.25$).

Taking $\alpha = 0$ and substituting $g(s)$ and $J(s)$ into Eq. (24), we find that the energy gap is bounded from below by $|\Delta E| \geq |\Delta E|_{\min} = 2J_*\delta_0/\sqrt{\delta_0^2 + 4J_*^2}$. Thus, at the critical point the complex energy has non vanishing gap controlled by the parameter δ_0 . (See Fig. 3.) Applying the criterion of validity of adiabatic approximation (19), we find that the evolution time τ must satisfy the following condition: $\tau \gg \tau_0 = (\delta_0^2 + 4J_*^2)^{3/2}/4J_*^2\delta_0^2$. The parameter τ_0 considered as the function of δ_0 has the minimum $\tau_{0m} = \sqrt{27}/4J_*$ at the point $\delta_0 = 2\sqrt{2}J_*$, and we obtain $|\Delta E| \geq 2\sqrt{2/3}J_*$.

Similar consideration for the non-Hermitian quantum annealing (NQA) with $\tilde{g}(s) = (g_0 - i\delta_0)(1-s)$ and $J = J_*$ yields $|\Delta E| \geq 2J_*\delta_0/\sqrt{\delta_0^2 + g_0^2}$, and from Eq. (19) we obtain $\tau \gg \tau_0 = (\delta_0^2 + g_0^2)^{3/2}/4J_*^2\delta_0^2$.

One can show that τ_0 reaches its minimum given by $\tau_{0m} = \sqrt{27}g_0/8J_*^2$ at the point $\delta_0 = \sqrt{2}g_0$. This




FIG. 3: NAQC ($\delta_0 \neq 0$): $|\Delta E|/J_*$ as function of the dimensionless time $s = t/\tau$ ($\alpha = 0$). The energy gap does not vanish for any time $0 \leq s \leq 1$ (green line, $\delta_0 = 0.5J_*$; blue line, $\delta_0 = J_*$; cyan line, $\delta_0 = 2J_*$). AQC ($\delta_0 = 0$): The ground state energy degenerates at the time $s = 1/2$ (dashed black line).




FIG. 4: NQA: Energy gap $|\Delta E|/J_*$ versus s ($\alpha = 0$). If $\delta_0 = 0$ the energy gap vanishes at the time $s = 0.8$ (dashed black line). For $\delta_0 \neq 0$ one has avoiding energy levels crossing (red line, $\delta_0 = J_0, g_0 = 5J_*$; green line, $\delta_0 = 2J_0, g_0 = 5J_*$; blue line, $\delta_0 = 5J_0, g_0 = 5J_*$; cyan line $\delta_0 = 10J_0, g_0 = 5J_*$).

yields the same lower bound for the energy gap $|\Delta E| \geq 2\sqrt{2/3}J_*$ as for NAQC.

In conclusion, we have demonstrated that proposed in our paper adiabatic quantum optimization, based on the use of non-Hermitian Hamiltonians, can significantly reduce the time needed for optimization of complex combinatorial problems.

This work was carried out under the auspices of the National Nuclear Security Administration of the U.S. Department of Energy at Los Alamos National Laboratory under Contract No. DE-AC52-06NA25396, and research grant SEP-PROMEP 103.5/04/1911.

-
- [1] E. Farhi, J. Goldstone, S. Gutmann, J. Lapan, A. Lundgren, and D. Preda, *Science* **292**, 472 (2001).
- [2] T. Kadowaki and H. Nishimori, *Phys. Rev. E* **58**, 5355 (1998).
- [3] S. Suzuki and M. Okada, in *Quantum Annealing and Related Optimization Methods*, edited by A. Das and B. K. Chakrabarti (Springer, 2005), vol. 679 of *Lecture Notes in Physics*, pp. 207 – 238.
- [4] A. Das and B. K. Chakrabarti, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **80**, 1061 (2008).
- [5] G. E. Santoro, R. Martonak, E. Tosatti, and R. Car, *Science* **295**, 2427 (2002).
- [6] L. Stella, G. E. Santoro, and E. Tosatti, *Phys. Rev. B* **72**, 014303 (2005).
- [7] T. Caneva, R. Fazio, and G. E. Santoro, *Phys. Rev. B* **76**, 144427 (2007).
- [8] S. Suzuki, H. Nishimori, and M. Suzuki, *Phys. Rev. E* **75**, 051112 (2007).
- [9] M. H. S. Amin, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **100**, 130503 (2008).
- [10] M. V. Berry, *Proc. R. Soc. London A* **392**, 45 (1984).
- [11] M. V. Berry and M. Wilkinson, *Proc. R. Soc. London A* **392**, 15 (1984).
- [12] V. I. Arnold, *Geometric Methods in the Theory of Ordinary Differential Equations* (Springer, New York, 1983).
- [13] O. N. Kirillov, A. A. Mailybaev, and A. P. Seyranian, *J. Phys. A* **38**, 5531 (2005).
- [14] A. P. Seyranian, O. N. Kirillov and A. A. Mailybaev, *J. Phys. A: Math. Gen.* **38**, 1723 (2005).
- [15] J. Roland and N. J. Cerf, *Phys. Rev. A* **65**, 042308 (2002).
- [16] A. I. Nesterov and F. Aceves de la Cruz, *J. Phys. A: Math. Theor.* **41**, 485304 (2008).
- [17] P. M. Morse and H. Feshbach, *Methods of Theoretical Physics* (McGraw-Hill, New York, 1953).
- [18] A. A. Mailybaev, O. N. Kirillov, and A. P. Seyranian, *Doklady Math.* **73**, 129 (2006).
- [19] V. N. Smelyanskiy, U. v Toussaint, and D. A. Timucin, *Dynamics of quantum adiabatic evolution algorithm for Number Partitioning*, arXiv: quant-ph/0202155.
- [20] T. Jörg, F. Krzakala, J. Kurchan, and A. C. Maggs, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **101**, 147204 (2008).
- [21] A. P. Young, S. Knysch, and V. N. Smelyanskiy, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **101**, 170503 (2008).
- [22] For instance, in the commonly used quantum optimization n -qubit models the estimation of the minimal energy gap yields $g_m \approx 2^{-n/2}$ [1, 4, 19, 20, 21].