

Quantum IsoRank: Efficient Alignment of Multiple PPI Networks

Anmer Daskin*

Department of Computer Engineering, Istanbul Medeniyet University, Uskudar, Istanbul, Turkey

Comparative analyses of protein-protein interaction networks play important roles in the understanding of biological processes. The growing enormity of available data on the networks becomes a computational challenge for the conventional alignment algorithms. Quantum algorithms generally provide efficiency over their classical counterparts in solving various problems. One of such algorithms is the quantum phase estimation algorithm which generates the principal eigenvector of a stochastic matrix with probability one. Using this property, in this article, we describe a quantum computing approach for the alignment of protein-protein interaction networks by following the classical algorithm IsoRank which uses the principal eigenvector of the stochastic matrix representing the Kronecker product of the normalized adjacency matrices of networks for the pairwise alignment. We also present a measurement scheme to efficiently procure the alignment from the output state of the phase estimation algorithm where the eigenvector is encoded as the amplitudes of this state. Furthermore, since the stochastic matrices are generally not Hermitian, we discuss how to approximate such matrices and generate quantum circuits. Finally we discuss the complexity of the quantum approach and show that it is exponentially more efficient.

I. INTRODUCTION

Comparative analyses of protein-protein interaction (PPI) networks play important roles in the understanding of biological processes. Alignments of PPI networks drawn from different species provide invaluable information to catalogue conserved network regions and identify functional similarities across species. Using different formulations, many network alignment algorithms have been proposed such as the ones in ref. [1–5] and others [6]. However, the growing enormity

* email:anmerdaskin@yahoo.com

of available data on the networks raises computational challenges for implementations of these algorithms. In analogous to ranking algorithms, e.g. PageRank [7], one of the global alignment algorithms, IsoRank [8], uses the intuition that the score of aligning two nodes should depend on the alignment of their neighbours in the global alignment of two PPI networks. It formulates the network alignment as an eigenvector problem where coefficients of the principal eigenvector of a stochastic matrix, the stationary state, represent the functional similarity scores between pairs of the nodes. Using a greedy algorithm, it then generates the network alignment from the eigenvector. In the case of multiple networks, IsoRank is applied to every pair of the networks and a global alignment is retrieved from the pairwise network alignment results [9]. While IsoRank is one of the successful algorithms and fast enough to handle the alignment of large sparse graphs [10], the exponential scaling of its running time with the number of networks still impedes applications of the algorithm to multiple networks (the running time of the algorithm is $O(E^m)$ where E is the number of edges in a network and m is the number of networks) [11].

In ref.[12], it has been discussed that aligning networks on quantum computers may provide efficiency. In particular, it is shown that the quantum phase estimation algorithm can be used for stochastic matrices to find their principal eigenvector with the success probability one. However, it has not been shown how to procure a solution from the quantum state representing the principal eigenvector. It is also not shown how to simulate ranking matrices which are not Hermitian in most of the cases in the phase estimation algorithm. Here, we first show explicitly how the eigenvector of a stochastic matrix can be obtained by using the phase estimation algorithm. To construct the alignment from the final quantum state, we then give an efficient greedy quantum algorithm based on a quantum measurement scheme. In addition, we present an approximate simulation approach for non Hermitian ranking matrices and present simple examples with numerical results which can be experimented on quantum computers (The capacities of the current quantum computers are very limited. Thus, they can only run for small sized problems.). In the end, the complexity analysis shows that the multiple network alignment by this quantum approach requires $O\left(m \times \text{poly}(\log(|V|))\right)$ computational running time for sparse matrices while $O(m|V|^2)$ for dense matrices. This provides an exponential efficiency over the classical running time.

II. CLASSICAL ISORANK

A PPI network is generally represented as an undirected graph, $G(V, E)$ where the set of nodes V represents the set of proteins and the set of edges $(v_i, v_j) \in E$ describes interactions between proteins v_i and v_j . To observe conserved similarities across species, PPI networks for different species are comparatively analysed by maximizing an objective function to indicate correspondences between the nodes. Singh et al.[8] have presented a global alignment algorithm, viz. IsoRank, by using the intuition that the score of aligning two nodes should depend on the alignment of their neighbours. This intuition is formulated as follows:

$$R_{ij} = \sum_{u \in N(i)} \sum_{v \in N(j)} \frac{1}{|N(u)||N(v)|} R_{uv}, \quad (1)$$

where, $N(a)$ is the set of neighbours of the node a ; $|N(a)|$ is the size of this set; V_1 and V_2 are the set of the nodes for the networks G_1 and G_2 ; and $i \in V_1$ and $j \in V_2$. R defines the functional similarity matrix whose stationary state is used to find the solution for the alignment problem. Eq.(1) can be rewritten also in matrix form as:

$$R = AR, \quad (2)$$

$$A[i, j][u, v] = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{|N(u)||N(v)|} & \text{if } (i, u) \in E_1 \text{ and } (j, v) \in E_2, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

In the above equation, A is a $|V_1||V_2| \times |V_1||V_2|$ stochastic matrix and can be defined from the Kronecker product of the normalized adjacency matrices of the input graphs: $A = A_1 \otimes A_2$, where A_i is the normalized adjacency matrix for the graph G_i and also a stochastic matrix. Eq.(2) describes an eigenvalue problem where the principal eigenvector corresponding to the eigenvalue one of the matrix A is the stationary distribution of the random walk on the Kronecker product graph. On classical computers, this equation can be solved by using different iterative methods such as the power iteration.

III. QUANTUM PHASE ESTIMATION ALGORITHM FOR NETWORK ALIGNMENT

In this section, we briefly explain the main intuition of the quantum phase estimation algorithm after giving a very small introduction to quantum computing. For a comprehensive introduction

on quantum computing, we strongly recommend the reader to go through the first chapters of ref.[13].

A. Quantum Computing

Quantum computers use $|0\rangle$ and $|1\rangle$ vectors in Dirac notation to represent information. These two vectors are associated with two distinguishable states of a quantum system, a *qubit*, and defines a basis set. In general, the state of the system, $|\psi\rangle$, can be in *superposition* of these states with normalized complex amplitudes (coefficients) α_0 and α_1 :

$$|\psi\rangle = \alpha_0 |0\rangle + \alpha_1 |1\rangle. \quad (3)$$

$|\psi\rangle$ describes one bit information. In order to know the information carried on the qubit, we apply a measurement to the system in the basis $|0\rangle$ and $|1\rangle$. In quantum mechanics, it is known that this measurement outcomes either 0 or 1 with probabilities $|\alpha_0|^2$ and $|\alpha_1|^2$, respectively. The number of states grows exponentially with the number of qubits involved in the system. Thus, if two qubits are considered, then there are four distinguishable states of the system, viz. $|00\rangle$, $|01\rangle$, $|10\rangle$, and $|11\rangle$, which is again used as a basis set to describe the state of the system in superposition:

$$|\psi\rangle = \alpha_0 |00\rangle + \alpha_1 |01\rangle + \alpha_2 |10\rangle + \alpha_3 |11\rangle, \quad (4)$$

where $|\alpha_i|^2$ is the probability to see the system in $|\mathbf{i}\rangle$ state after a measurement. To change the state of the system, different quantum operations can be applied. If the amplitudes are represented in vector form, then all of these operations can be described as a matrix-vector transformation:

$$U \begin{pmatrix} \alpha_0 \\ \alpha_1 \\ \alpha_2 \\ \alpha_3 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \tilde{\alpha}_0 \\ \tilde{\alpha}_1 \\ \tilde{\alpha}_2 \\ \tilde{\alpha}_3 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (5)$$

where U is a 4x4 unitary matrix describing a quantum operation. Engineering the matrix elements of U and benefiting from the quantum superposition and other phenomena, many efficient quantum algorithms are proposed such as the Shor's integer factoring algorithm [14], Grover's search algorithm [15] and the quantum phase estimation algorithm [16] which is of interest in this paper and described in more detail in the following section.

B. Quantum Phase Estimation Algorithm

For a given approximate eigenvector encoded as the amplitudes of the quantum state $|\mu_j\rangle$ and the eigenvalue equation $U|\mu_j\rangle = e^{i2\pi\phi_j}|\mu_j\rangle$; the phase estimation algorithm (PEA) tries to find the phase ϕ_j in this equation. PEA mainly requires two quantum registers, $|reg_1\rangle$ and $|reg_2\rangle$, consisting of sufficient number of qubits to hold the eigenvector and the phase, respectively. In the initial setting, $|reg_1\rangle$ is set to zero state and $|reg_2\rangle$ is assigned to hold a vector which is the best known approximation of $|\mu_j\rangle$. With the help of quantum Fourier transform (please see Appendix A for the description of the quantum Fourier transform) and the sequential controlled unitary operations, $|reg_1\rangle$ becomes holding the Fourier transform of the phase. Then, the application of the inverse quantum Fourier transform turns $|reg_1\rangle$ into the binary value of the phase: $|reg_1\rangle = |\phi_j\rangle$. Consequently, the value of the phase is obtained by measuring $|reg_1\rangle$ in the standard basis. Here, if the unitary operator U is the time evolution operator of a Hermitian matrix H , $U = e^{i2\pi H}$, then one also obtains the eigenvalue of H .

C. Application to Stochastic Matrices

The success of the phase estimation algorithm is directly related to the closeness of the input vector to the actual eigenvector. This can be defined by the dot product. The dot product of an equal superposition state and a vector is the normalized sum of the vector elements. On the other hand, the eigenvectors of a stochastic matrix has the property that the sum of the vector elements is one for the principal eigenvector and zero for the rest of the eigenvectors. In ref.[12], it has been showed that when PEA is given an equal superposition input state, it then finds the principal eigenvector of U and so the principal eigenvector of the stochastic matrix H with the success probability equal to one.

In our case, we find the principal eigenvector of the matrix A which is the Kronecker product of the normalized adjacency matrices for the input networks: i.e., $A = A_1 \otimes A_2 \otimes \dots \otimes A_m$. Because of the Kronecker product, A defines a separable system and so quantum circuits for each A_i can be constructed separately. This eases the difficulty of finding quantum circuits for the simulation. However, in general, quantum computing is based on unitary gates associated with time evolution operators of Hermitian quantum systems. This dictates the stochastic matrix used in the algorithm to be Hermitian, in which case the principal eigenvector is already known to be a vector of all ones.

In the following subsection, we shall describe how to approach non-Hermitian matrices.

D. Simulation of Non-Hermitian Operators

A matrix A is called positive if the matrix elements $A_{ij} > 0$ and non-negative if $A_{ij} \geq 0$. It is normal if $A^\dagger A - AA^\dagger = 0$, where A^\dagger describes the conjugate transpose of A . Any matrix A can be decomposed into a Hermitian and a skew-Hermitian matrices:

$$A = H + S = \frac{1}{2}(A + A^\dagger) + \frac{1}{2}(A - A^\dagger), \quad (6)$$

where $H = \frac{1}{2}(A + A^\dagger)$ and $S = \frac{1}{2}(A - A^\dagger)$ define the nearest Hermitian and skew-Hermitian matrices to A , respectively [17]. The eigenvalues of H are all real and the eigenvalues of S have only imaginary parts. Moreover, when A is a normal matrix, there are a few additional useful properties:

- H and S commute: $[H, S] = HS - SH = 0$.
- Since $AA^\dagger = A^\dagger A$, H and S have the same eigenvectors.
- The imaginary part of the eigenvalues of A are equal to the eigenvalues of S , and the real parts are equal to the eigenvalues of H .

Because of the last property, one can simulate normal matrices and their corresponding non-Hermitian operators on quantum computers by using two separate registers to obtain the imaginary and the real parts of the eigenvalue individually. In that case, one uses two unitary operators $U_1 = e^{iH}$ and $U_2 = e^S$ for the simulation. (Note that U_2 is a unitary matrix because the exponential of a skew symmetric matrix is a unitary matrix.). However, if a stochastic matrix is normal, it turns out that it is also doubly stochastic: i.e., its left and right principal eigenvectors are known to be a vector of all ones with the eigenvalue one. Therefore, instead of an approximate normal matrix, we shall use the closest Hermitian matrix $H = \frac{1}{2}(A + A^\dagger)$ in our simulations.

E. Incorporation of Other Information

As done in IsoRank [8], one can include further information, e.g. BLAST scores, into the quantum model as well in the following form:

$$\tilde{A} = H + B, \quad (7)$$

where B and H are to be assumed to commute: $BH - HB = 0$. Therefore, the time evolution can be written as:

$$e^{i\tilde{A}} = e^{iH+B} = e^{iH} e^{iB} \quad (8)$$

Note that the above equation does not change the sparsity of the matrix A ; hence, it is still sparse and the evolution operator and the corresponding quantum circuit require polynomial time for the implementation [18] (see Sec.VI for the complexity analysis).

IV. EXTRACTING NODE MAPPINGS FROM A QUANTUM STATE

A. Matching for a Pair of Networks

Generating a discrete solution from the final quantum state is known to be just solving a maximum weight matching problem. However, since fully obtaining a quantum state requires exponential time complexity [13], we cannot apply classical matching algorithms directly. Hence, engineering the order of the quantum registers in the measurement, we describe the following greedy strategy for the alignment: Consider the eigenvector consists of two registers as $|\mathbf{x}\rangle|\mathbf{y}\rangle$, where each register represents a network:

1. Apply a conditional measurement: when the first register is x_i , measure the second register. For each measured x_i , this generates a y_j ; therefore, x_i s are matched to y_j s. Note that the measurement outcome is determined by the conditional probability: the probability of measuring y_j in the second register while the first register is x_i .
2. If there are duplicities and still unmatched nodes; then apply a second type of conditional measurement: if the second register y_j , measure the first register. This time for each y_j an x_i is obtained.

This step is only useful when additional information is incorporated ($A+B$ is used) because the system is otherwise separable as $A = A_1 \otimes A_2$ and the conditional measurement outcome will be the same as the outcome obtained in the first step.

3. We combine these two different measurement outcomes obtained in the first and the second steps and begin matching from nodes whose scores are the highest.

4. If there are still unmatched nodes, statistical information about the other possibilities obtained during the measurement is used to match the remaining nodes.

Since the main intuition of the algorithm gives a higher similarity score to the nodes whose neighbours have high scores; in the matching, the neighbours of the first matched nodes are given priority so as to generate a solution which is also connected. In the end, we choose the largest connected component as the best solution to the alignment.

B. Matching for Multiple Networks

In the case of multiple networks, as done in ref.[9] an obvious approach is to align each possible pair of networks and derive a common solution for the multiple networks from these pairwise alignments. However, the complexity of this approach grows exponentially with the number of networks. Here, we shall follow a different approach which can be generalized easily to any number of networks: Assume we have three networks G_1 , G_2 , and G_3 with nodes $\{a_1 \dots a_{m_1}\}$, $\{b_1 \dots b_{m_2}\}$ and $\{c_1 \dots c_{m_3}\}$, respectively. Let also $|reg_{G_1}\rangle$, $|reg_{G_2}\rangle$, and $|reg_{G_3}\rangle$ represent the networks G_1 , G_2 , and G_3 , respectively:

- Measuring $|reg_{G_1}\rangle$ alone and $|reg_{G_2}\rangle$ and $|reg_{G_3}\rangle$ together, we draw the conditional probabilities to see one of the nodes, a_i , in $|reg_{G_1}\rangle$ and $b_j c_k$ in $|reg_{G_1}\rangle|reg_{G_3}\rangle$. In other words, when $|reg_{G_1}\rangle$ is a_i , the probability to see $b_j c_k$ in $|reg_{G_1}\rangle|reg_{G_3}\rangle$ is obtained. This results in a matching of $a_i - b_j c_k$. Note that in the real implementation on a quantum computer, one just assigns the nodes as a result of the measurement outcome.
 - We match nodes initiating from the largest probability, or the most commonly seen measurement outcome.
 - As done in the case of two networks, the priority given to the neighbours of the first matched nodes.
- If the measurement is no longer provide valuable information to match further nodes, then we measure $|reg_{G_2}\rangle$ alone and $|reg_{G_1}\rangle$ and $|reg_{G_3}\rangle$ together. This gives the probabilities to see one of the nodes, b_j , in $|reg_{G_2}\rangle$ and $a_i c_k$ in $|reg_{G_1}\rangle|reg_{G_3}\rangle$. Then we combine this measurement result with the previous measurement result to match the unmatched nodes.

One can also go further and draw probabilities for $c_k - a_i b_j$ and combine them with the previous results. However, while different measurement settings increase the statistical confidence in the measurement results, it increases the complexity of the algorithm. As noted before, if $|reg_2\rangle$ is separable at the beginning: i.e., $|reg_2\rangle = |reg_{G_1}\rangle \otimes |reg_{G_2}\rangle \otimes \dots \otimes |reg_{G_m}\rangle$, then the other measurements also produce the same result as the first measurement setting, $G_{1i} - G_{2j} \dots G_{mk}$. Thus, only the first measurement setting is used to conclude the matching of the nodes.




FIG. 1. Example Networks

V. NUMERICAL EXAMPLES

Because of the computational difficulty in simulating quantum computers on classical computers (The complexity grows exponentially with the number of qubits involved in the simulation. PEA requires also sufficient number of qubits on the first register to hold eigenvalue.), here we only aim to show the capability of the algorithm when a fully functional quantum computer is available. Therefore, we shall use merely trivial examples given in Fig.1 for which one can see optimal solutions easily. For the large non-trivial networks, since both IsoRank and the quantum approach are based on the principal eigenvector; we expect the success of the algorithm to be similar to IsoRank even though the matching algorithm defined here is different than the one in IsoRank.

A. Example-1: Alignment of Network Pairs

In the case of the alignment of two networks G_1-G_2 , the possible probability outcomes are shown in Fig.2(a); where it is first assumed that $|reg_{G_1}\rangle = a_i$, then probabilities in the collapsed state are found for for each b_j . Note that since the collapsed state is not normalized, it represents conditional probabilities: e.g., the probability of $|reg_{G_2}\rangle = b_2$ when $|reg_{G_1}\rangle = a_1$. The same approach is also

applied to G_2 - G_3 and the probabilities are shown in Fig.2(c). The matching algorithm applied to the outcomes in Fig.2(a) and Fig.2(c) procures the exact alignments for the both pairs of the networks.

Fig.2(b) and Fig.2(d) also show the probability outcomes for the alignment of the same networks: G_1 - G_2 and G_2 - G_3 ; however, in these figures, instead of A , approximate Hermitian matrices found by $A = 1/2(A + A^\dagger)$ are used. While the probabilities slightly differ in comparison to Fig.2(a) and Fig.2(c), they still conclude with the same alignments.

B. Example-2: Alignment of Multiple Networks


As an example for the multiple network alignment, we use G_1 , G_2 and G_3 shown in Fig.1 and follow a similar method to the alignment of two networks: First, we assume $|reg_{G_1}\rangle = a_i$, then find the probability of seeing $|reg_{G_2}reg_{G_2}\rangle = b_jc_k$ in the unnormalized collapsed state which represents the conditional probabilities. The probabilities are shown in Fig.3(a), where the exact matrix is used. Fig.3(a) represents the probabilities when the Hermitian matrix $A = 1/2(A + A^\dagger)$ is used. Giving the priority to the neighbors of the first matched nodes as explained in Sec.IV B, the exact same matching can be obtained from both of the figures.

VI. THE OVERALL COMPLEXITY


It is proven that the efficient (polynomial time) simulation of a sparse operator on quantum computers is possible when the number of entries is bounded polynomially by the number of qubits and the norm of the matrix is less than or equal to the degree of this polynomial [19]. There have been also algorithms presented to simulate such sparse operators in polynomial time [18, 20]. As a result, since the adjacency matrices of the PPI networks sparse, they can be simulated efficiently on quantum computers.

In the implementation of the operator A , quantum circuits for each graph can be generated separately since it is the Kronecker product of the normalized adjacency matrices: $A = A_1 \otimes A_2 \otimes \dots \otimes A_m$, where m represents the number of networks. Therefore the total complexity of implementing A can be defined as:


$$O\left(\text{poly}(\log(|V_1|)) + \text{poly}(\log(|V_2|)) \dots \text{poly}(\log(|V_m|))\right), \quad (9)$$




(a) Probabilities for matching of the nodes of G_2 and G_3



(b) Probabilities for matching of the nodes of G_2 and G_3 when the approximate Hermitian matrix is used.



(c) Probabilities for matching of the nodes of G_1 and G_2



(d) Probabilities for matching of the nodes of G_1 and G_2 when the approximate Hermitian matrix is used.

FIG. 2. Expected probability outcome for the alignment of pairs of the networks

or more concisely:

$$O\left(m \times \text{poly}(\log(|V_{max}|))\right), \quad (10)$$

where $|V_{max}|$ is to define the maximum number of nodes in a graph. Thus, this gives an exponentially faster implementation in comparison to the implementation on classical computers. Note that if the adjacency matrices are not sparse, then the complexity for this part becomes $O(m|V_{max}|^2)$ which is still exponentially fast in comparison to $O(|E|^m)$ classical complexity. Moreover, in the case of the incorporation of additional data: i.e., using $A + B$ instead of A ; the above complexity arguments hold by assuming A and B commute and B is efficiently simulatable.

The complexity of the matching part of the algorithm is related to the number of measurements applied to the system. If only one kind of measurement setting (measure a register alone and the rest together to draw the conditional probabilities) is used, then this part requires polynomial time (polynomial by the number of qubits) because it is related to the number of qubits. On the other hand, if one also uses different combinations of the registers in the measurements and consider

them together to match the nodes (This can be only useful when additional data is incorporated.), then the complexity to store the statistical results of the measurement outcomes and find matching from these outcomes may grow exponentially with the number of networks. However, as mentioned in Sec.IV B, if there is no additional data is used, then the system is separable and all possible measurement settings produce the same output. Therefore, only one measurement setting can be used.

VII. CONCLUSION

In this paper, we have presented a quantum approach for the alignment of multiple networks by adapting quantum phase estimation algorithm. In particular, we have showed that the principal eigenvector of a stochastic matrix used in IsoRank algorithm for the alignment can be found exponentially more efficiently on quantum phase estimation algorithm. Since the final quantum state representing the eigenvector in the phase estimation algorithm is not classically available, adapting a conditional measurement scheme, we have also showed a matching algorithm to obtain the alignment result from this state. In addition, since the stochastic matrices are generally not Hermitian, we have also discussed how to approximate them for the simulation on quantum computers. Finally, we have used three simple networks and showed the numerical alignment results for them. While the approach discussed here follows mainly IsoRank algorithm, we believe it shall also pave the way for the applications of other spectral alignment methods on quantum computers.

Appendix A: Quantum Fourier Transform

The quantum Fourier transform (QFT) [13] is the same as the classical discrete Fourier transform (DFT) applied to the amplitudes of a quantum state. The quantum Fourier transform on an orthonormal basis $|0\rangle, \dots, |N-1\rangle$ maps the quantum states as:


$$|j\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \sum_{k=0}^{N-1} 2^{\frac{2\pi i}{N}jk} |k\rangle. \quad (\text{A1})$$

The quantum Fourier transform can be computed by using $O(\log^2 N)$ elementary operations,


which is exponentially faster than the classical discrete Fourier transform.

- [1] G. Klau, *BMC Bioinformatics* **10**, S59 (2009).
- [2] B. P. Kelley, B. Yuan, F. Lewitter, R. Sharan, B. R. Stockwell, and T. Ideker, *Nucleic Acids Research* **32**, W83 (2004).
- [3] M. Koyutürk, Y. Kim, U. Topkara, S. Subramaniam, W. Szpankowski, and A. Grama, *Journal of Computational Biology* **13**, 182 (2006).
- [4] Z. Li, S. Zhang, Y. Wang, X.-S. Zhang, and L. Chen, *Bioinformatics* **23**, 1631 (2007).
- [5] M. Zaslavskiy, F. Bach, and J.-P. Vert, *Bioinformatics* **25**, i259 (2009).
- [6] C. Clark and J. Kalita, *Bioinformatics* **30**, 2351 (2014).
- [7] L. Page, S. Brin, R. Motwani, and T. Winograd, *The PageRank Citation Ranking: Bringing Order to the Web.*, Technical Report 1999-66 (Stanford InfoLab, 1999) previous number = SIDL-WP-1999-0120.
- [8] R. Singh, J. Xu, and B. Berger, in *Research in Computational Molecular Biology*, Lecture Notes in Computer Science, Vol. 4453, edited by T. Speed and H. Huang (Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2007) pp. 16–31.
- [9] C.-S. Liao, K. Lu, M. Baym, R. S. 0001, and B. Berger, *Bioinformatics* **25** (2009).
- [10] M. Bayati, M. Gerritsen, D. Gleich, A. Saberi, and Y. Wang, in *Data Mining, 2009. ICDM '09. Ninth IEEE International Conference on* (2009) pp. 705–710.
- [11] Y. Nir, S. Roded, and N. William Stafford, *Bioinformatics* **24**, i200 (2008).
- [12] A. Daskin, A. Grama, and S. Kais, *Quantum Information Processing* **13**, 2653 (2014).
- [13] M. A. Nielsen and I. L. Chuang, *Quantum computation and quantum information* (Cambridge university press, 2010).
- [14] P. W. Shor, in *Foundations of Computer Science, 1994 Proceedings., 35th Annual Symposium on* (IEEE, 1994) pp. 124–134.
- [15] L. K. Grover, in *Proceedings of the twenty-eighth annual ACM symposium on Theory of computing* (ACM, 1996) pp. 212–219.
- [16] A. Kitaev, arXiv:quant-ph/9511026 (1995).
- [17] J. B. Keller, *Mathematics Magazine* **48**, pp. 192 (1975).
- [18] D. Berry, G. Ahokas, R. Cleve, and B. Sanders, *Communications in Mathematical Physics* **270**, 359 (2007).

- [19] D. Aharonov and A. Ta-Shma, in *Proceedings of the thirty-fifth annual ACM symposium on Theory of computing* STOC '03 (ACM, New York, NY, USA, 2003) pp. 20–29.
- [20] A. M. Childs and R. Kothari, in *Theory of Quantum Computation, Communication, and Cryptography* (Springer, 2011) pp. 94–103.



(a) Probabilities for matching of the nodes of G_1 and G_2



(b) Probabilities for matching of the nodes of G_1 and G_2 when the approximate Hermitian matrix is used.

FIG. 3. Matching Matrix for the networks G_1 , G_2 , and G_3 . While the x-axis represents the nodes, $a_i b_j c_k$; the y-axis is the unnormalized conditional probabilities: if $|reg_{G_1}\rangle$ is in a_i state, then the probability to measure $|reg_{G_2}\rangle |reg_{G_3}\rangle$ in $b_j c_k$ state in the collapsed quantum state is shown.