

Homology Computation of Large Point Clouds using Quantum Annealing

Raouf Dridi

Hedayat Alghassi

IQB Information Technologies (IQBit)

458 – 550 Burrard Street

Vancouver, British Columbia V6C 2B5, Canada

RAOUF.DRIDI@IQBIT.COM

HEDAYAT.ALGHASSI@IQBIT.COM

Abstract

In this paper we present a quantum annealing algorithm for computation of homology of large point clouds. It is designed to work on resizable cloud computing platforms. The algorithm takes as input a witness complex K approximating the given point cloud. It uses quantum annealing to compute a clique cover of the 1-skeleton of K and then uses this cover to blow up K into a Mayer-Vietoris complex. Finally, it computes the homology of the Mayer-Vietoris complex in parallel. The novelty here is the use of clique covering which, compared to graph partitioning, substantially reduces the computational load assigned to each slave machine in the computing cluster. We describe two different clique covers and their quantum annealing formulation in the form of quadratic unconstrained binary optimization (QUBO).

Keywords: homology, topological data analysis, quantum annealing, quadratic unconstrained binary optimization, big data, resizable cloud computation, Mayer-Vietoris blow-up complex

1. Introduction

Homology is a topological invariant that consists of a sequence of vector spaces measuring the shape of the given space. In topological data analysis (TDA), these measurements usually translate into valuable insights about the data (the space) which are not available by other means; a survey of TDA and its applications can be found in Carlsson (2009) and Zomorodian (2012). Also, we refer to Massey (1991) and Hatcher (2002) for the basic notions of homotopy equivalence, simplicial complexes and their homologies.

For large point clouds, homology computation can be parallelized as follows. First, we approximate a given point cloud X with a *witness complex* K . This combinatorial structure reduces both the dimensionality and size of the data while preserving the topology. We then construct a *Mayer-Vietoris complex* on top of K as in (Lewis and Zomorodian (2014); Lewis and Morozov (2015)). This consists of covering the witness complex K with smaller subcomplexes and then blowing up their overlaps. The blow-up operation is a homotopy equivalence which implies that the two complexes have the same homology. Now, the computation of the homology of the Mayer-Vietoris complex is parallelizable.

In practice, the success of the above parallel computation depends on the step of covering K , which is done in two stages. First, cover the edges of the 1-skeleton of K and then extend this cover to the simplicial complex K . The extension is a relatively inexpensive operation with com-

plexity $O(\text{card}(K))$ and can easily be parallelized (Lewis and Zomorodian (2014)) - See also subsection 4.1. However, covering the 1-skeleton (such that the computation terminates in a reasonable time frame) is a complex problem. This problem has two important parameters: the structure of the covering subgraphs and their number. Here, we investigate the structure rather than the number of subgraphs which is justified by the availability of resizable cloud computing (e.g., AWS EC2¹) where the number of slave machines is not a practical constraint. The problem reduces then to *covering the 1-skeleton with subgraphs whose structure minimizes the computational load* assigned to each slave machine. Solving this problem is NP-hard and is the focus of the present paper.

Contributions and Related Work We investigate this problem using quantum annealing (QA) and D-Wave Systems' D-Wave II quantum processor in particular. We begin by reformulating the work of Lewis and Zomorodian (2014) in the language of quantum annealing, which is quadratic unconstrained binary optimization (QUBO), a special case of quadratic pseudo-boolean optimization (QPBO)—see Boros et al. (2007) and Boros and Hammer (2002) for more on the subject. This does not solve the covering problem as it is stated above but provides a way to cover any simplicial complex, not necessarily a witness complex. We then present two novel approaches that take advantage of the clique-based structure of the witness complex. The first uses vertex clique covering and the second is based on an iterative computation of maximum cliques. Since the scenario involves a resizable computing cluster, the changing number of slave machines is not problematic. We express both methods as a QUBO problem formulations. We then explain that these two covering approaches reduce the computational load assigned to the local machines of the computing cluster.

One can also see our work as a hybrid, quantum-classical pipeline for homology computation of large and high-dimensional point clouds. The pipeline starts with a representation of the given point cloud using witness complexes (see Figure 1). This reduces the dimensionality and size of the data. The quantum processor is then used to cover the 1-skeleton of the represented complex. After we have a valid cover, parallel computation of Betti numbers is carried out.

Our pipeline can be used in real-life applications, including subpopulation detection in cancer genomics, fraud detection in financial transactions (Lum et al. (2013)), brain networks (Lee et al. (2011)), and robot sensor networks (de Silva et al. (2005)), to name a few. It is worth mentioning that there are mathematical constructions for the parallel homology computation other than Mayer-Vietoris complexes, including the spectral sequence algorithm introduced by Edelsbrunner and Harer (2010) and further developed by Bauer et al. (2014).

Software We have implemented all algorithms and constructions as a complete package in Python. We have also tested our algorithms on the D-Wave II quantum processor.

Outline In Section 2, we review the nerve and witness complexes. In Section 3, we discuss Mayer-Vietoris complex and explain how the homology computation can be parallelized. Section 4 contains our quantum annealing-based solutions to the problem stated above. We have included tests using the D-Wave II processor as well as a basic description of how it works.

1. Amazon Web Services Elastic Cloud Computing; <http://aws.amazon.com>




Figure 1: Pipeline for homology computation of large high-dimensional point clouds.

2. Background

We briefly review the notion of witness complex introduced by de Silva and Carlsson (2004). In addition to the nerve complex, also described below, these complexes are important constructions used in TDA to represent a point cloud X as a graph.

Let X be a topological space, and let $\mathcal{U} = \{U_\alpha\}_{\alpha \in A}$ be a covering of X .

Definition 1 *The nerve of the cover \mathcal{U} , denoted by $N\mathcal{U}$, is the simplicial complex with vertex set A , where a family $\{\alpha_0, \dots, \alpha_k\}$ spans a k -simplex if and only if the intersection $U_{\alpha_0} \cap \dots \cap U_{\alpha_k}$ is not empty.*

This definition is important because of the nerve theorem which guarantees that complex $N\mathcal{U}$ is homotopy equivalent to the underlying space X provided the overlaps between the covering sets U_α are contractible.

An instance of the nerve complex is the witness complex. Suppose we are given a finite set $\mathcal{L} \subset X$, called the landmark set, and a parameter $\epsilon > 0$. For every point $x \in X$, we let m_x denote the distance from this point to the set \mathcal{L} , i.e., $m_x = \min_{l \in \mathcal{L}} \{d(x, l)\}$.

Definition 2 *The witness complex attached to (X, \mathcal{L}) is the complex $W(X, \mathcal{L}, \epsilon)$ whose vertex set is \mathcal{L} , and where a collection $\{l_0, \dots, l_k\}$ spans a k -simplex if and only if there is a point $x \in X$ (the witness) such that $d(x, l_i) \leq m_x + \epsilon$ for all i .*

To see that this is just the nerve complex, it suffices to introduce the subset \mathcal{L}_i , of the point cloud X , defined by $\{x \in X \mid d(x, l_i) \leq m_x + \epsilon\}$. It is then clear that the intersection $\cap_{i \in I} \mathcal{L}_i$ is not empty if and only if there exists an x such that $d(x, l_i) \leq m_x + \epsilon$ for all $i \in I$.

One can relax the previous definition by considering the clique complex (or flag complex for algebraic topologists) of the abstract graph defined by the 1-simplices as in Definition 2:

Definition 3 *The lazy witness complex, denoted by $W_{VR}(X, \mathcal{L}, \epsilon)$, is defined as follows: the 1-simplices are as in Definition 2, but a family $\{l_0, \dots, l_k\}$ is declared a k -simplex if and only if all of the pairs (l_i, l_j) are 1-simplices.*

Due to its being a relaxation, $W_{VR}(X, \mathcal{L}, \epsilon)$ is not necessarily homotopy equivalent to X ; however, it works well in many cases with a careful selection of landmarks (an important topic which we will not discuss here; see de Silva and Carlsson (2004) Section 2.3 for practical guidelines).

Figure 2 illustrates two witness complexes of the unit torus $S^1 \times S^1$ and cancer genomic data.

3. Parallelization of Homology Computation

In this section we describe how the homology computation of the simplicial complex K , which approximates a given point cloud X , is made parallel. We recall the key definition of Mayer-Vietoris blow-up complex and then describe the parallelization via a simple example.

Let $\mathcal{C} = \{K^i\}_{i \in I}$ be a cover of K by simplicial subcomplexes $K^i \subseteq K$. For $J \subseteq I$, we define $K^J = \cap_{j \in J} K^j$.




Figure 2: *Left*: 1-skeleton of the lazy witness complex of the unit torus $S^1 \times S^1$ in \mathbb{R}^4 , with 100 landmarks and 100 000 data points. *Right*: 1-skeleton of size 80 of the witness complex of the NKI data set (van de Vijver et al. (2002)) that contains 24 496 gene expressions of 295 female patients diagnosed with breast cancer.

Definition 4 (Zomorodian and Carlsson (2008)) *The Mayer-Vietoris blow-up complex of the simplicial complex K and cover \mathcal{C} is defined by*

$$K^{\mathcal{C}} = \bigcup_{J \subseteq I} \bigcup_{\sigma \in K^J} \sigma \times J.$$

A basis for the k -chains $C_k(K^{\mathcal{C}})$ is $\{\sigma \otimes J \in K^{\mathcal{C}} \mid \dim \sigma + \text{card } J = n\}$. The boundary of a cell $\sigma \otimes J$ is given by: $\partial(\sigma \otimes J) = \partial\sigma \otimes J + (-1)^{\dim \sigma} \sigma \otimes \partial J$.

We will not provide a proof here, but it is a fact that the projection $K^{\mathcal{C}} \rightarrow K$ is a homotopy equivalence and induces an isomorphism $H_*(K^{\mathcal{C}}) \simeq H_*(K)$.

The simplicial complex $K^{\mathcal{C}}$ is the set of “original” simplices in addition to the ones we get by blowing up common simplices. These are of the form $\sigma \otimes J$ in the definition above. In Figure 3, the vertex d common to the two subcomplexes $\{K_1, K_2\}$ is blown up into an edge $v \otimes 12$ and the edge bc is blown up into the triangle-like $bc \otimes 01$. In Figure 4, the vertex a common to three subcomplexes $\{K_0, K_1, K_2\}$ is blown up into the triangle $a \otimes 012$.

The key point is that the boundary map of the simplicial complex $K^{\mathcal{C}}$ (which replaces K by the homotopy equivalence) has a block form suitable for parallel rank computation.

A simple pseudocode of the parallelized computation is described below:

Algorithm 1 rank||

Input: a simplicial complex K , a cover $\mathcal{C} = \{K^j\}_{j \in J}$

Parallel for $j \in J$ and a posint k

 row-reduce the j th block

return the rank and remainders (almost zero rows)

call aggregate

As an example, let us consider again the simplicial complex K depicted in Figure 3. First, the space $C_0(K^{\mathcal{C}})$ is spanned by the vertices

$$a \otimes 0, b \otimes 0, c \otimes 0, b \otimes 1, c \otimes 1, d \otimes 1, d \otimes 2, e \otimes 2.$$




Figure 3: *Top*: The simplicial complex K is the depicted graph. *Middle*: K is covered with K_0 , K_1 , and K_2 . *Bottom*: The blow-up complex of the cover depicted in the middle image. After the blow-up, the edges $b \otimes 01$, $c \otimes 01$, $d \otimes 12$, and the 2-simplex $bc \otimes 01$ appear.




Figure 4: The triangle $a \otimes 012$ appears after blowing up the cover of the middle picture.

Algorithm 2 aggregate

Input: a pair (list(int r), list(array a))
return $\sum r + \text{rank Matrix}(\text{list}(\text{array } a))$

That is, all vertices of K take into account the partition to which they belong. The space of edges $C_1(K^C)$ is spanned by

$$ab \otimes 0, bc \otimes 0, bc \otimes 1, cd \otimes 1, de \otimes 2, b \otimes 01, c \otimes 01, d \otimes 12.$$

That is, first the “original” edges (i.e., those of the form $\sigma \otimes j$, with $j \in J = \{0, 1, 2\}$ and σ being an edge in K) are constructed. Then, the new edges that result from blow-ups (i.e., those of the form $v \otimes ij$, where v is a vertex in $K^i \cap K^j$; if the intersection is empty the value of boundary map is 0), are constructed. The matrix ∂_0 with respect to the given ordering is then:

$$\begin{pmatrix} \begin{array}{ccc|ccc} -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & -1 & 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 \end{array} \\ \hline \begin{array}{ccc|ccc} 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & -1 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \end{array} \\ \hline \begin{array}{ccc|ccc} 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \end{array} \end{pmatrix}$$

We see that one can now row-reduce each coloured block independently. There might be *remainders*, i.e., zero rows except for the intersection part. We collect all such rows in one extra matrix and row-reduce it at the end and aggregate. For the second boundary matrix, we need to determine $C_2(K^C)$. The 2-simplices are of three forms: the original ones (those of the form $\sigma \otimes j$ with $\sigma \in C_2(K)$; in this example there are none); those of the form $\sigma \times \{i, j\}$, with $\sigma \in K^i \cap K^j$; and those of the form $v \otimes \{i, j, k\}$, with $v \in K^i \cap K^j \cap K^k$ (there are none in this example but Figure 5 has one). We get $C_2(K^C) = \langle bc \otimes 01 \rangle$ and thus there is no need for parallel computation.

4. Quantum Blow-ups

This section describes our methods for covering a given witness complex (or a Vietoris-Rips complex) using quantum annealing. The first method is a reformulation of the work of Lewis and Zomorodian (2014) in the language of QUBO. The two other methods benefit from the clique structure of the witness complex to minimize the local rank computation. Our proof-of-concept tests were carried out on the D-Wave II processor. A short description of the processor’s inner workings is given in the Appendix.

Let K be a simplicial complex and G be its 1-skeleton, i.e., the set of all simplices of dimension ≤ 1 .

4.1 Minimum k -cut-based Covering

In Lewis and Zomorodian (2014), the METIS graph partitioning library (Karypis and Kumar (1998)) has been used to cover the 1-skeleton G using heuristics to solve the minimum k -cut. This problem

consists of partitioning the vertex set of G into k non-empty and fixed-sized subsets so that the total weight of edges connecting distinct subsets is minimized. The minimum k -cut partitioning problem is one of the problems known as Karp's 21 NP-complete problems (Karp (1972)). Here we present a new tensorial QUBO problem reformulation of the work of Fan and Pardalos (2010), presented in details in Alghassi (2015).

For each partition P_i in the graph, for $0 \leq i \leq k - 1$, we need k binary decision vectors of size n . The row vector $\mathbf{x}_i = (x_{i1}, x_{i2}, \dots, x_{in})$ is part of the solution that indicates that if the vertex v_j of G belongs to the i th partition, the x_{ij} is equal to 1; otherwise it is 0. The QUBO problem formulation of the k -cut graph partitioning problem is

$$\begin{aligned} \min \mathbf{X}^T (\mathbf{Q} + \alpha \mathbf{Q}_{orth} + \beta \mathbf{Q}_{card}) \mathbf{X}, \\ \mathbf{X} &= (\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2, \dots, \mathbf{x}_k)^T, \\ \mathbf{Q} &= (J_k - I_k) \otimes A, \\ \mathbf{Q}_{orth} &= (J_k - 2I_k) \otimes I_n, \\ \mathbf{Q}_{card} &= I_k \otimes J_n - 2 \begin{pmatrix} s_1 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ 0 & s_2 & \cdots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & \cdots & s_k \end{pmatrix} I_n. \end{aligned}$$

The matrix I_k is the identity matrix, J_k is the $k \times k$ constant matrix with all entries 1, s_i is the size (cardinality) of the i th partition, and α and β are the orthogonality and cardinality constraint balancing factors, respectively.

The k subgraphs P_i , for $0 \leq i \leq k - 1$, in addition to an extra subgraph containing all of the edges between them (now minimized), define a covering for G . The extra subgraph is needed since the goal is to cover the simplicial complex K ; hence the set of all edges should be covered. For the same reason, one needs to complete this graph covering into a cover of K in terms of subcomplexes for which we have $K = \cup_0^k K_i$. The procedure we use here is the same as in Lewis and Zomorodian (2014), which assigns the subcomplex K_i to the simplex $\sigma \in K$ if its vertices belong to the subgraph G_i . Otherwise, the simplex is put in an extra cover K_k . In the covering solutions that follow, and in the context of clique complexes, this completion step is simplified substantially due to the fact that our covering consists mostly of cliques.

4.2 Clique-based Coverings

In this section, the simplicial complex K is assumed to be a witness complex (or a Vietoris-Rips complex). Given the clique-based structure of K , if we use cliques to cover its 1-skeleton G then the rank computation fed to the local machines is substantially reduced. We do this using two methods.

The *first method* computes a vertex clique cover for the 1-skeleton G of K . Since the scenario involves a resizable computing cluster (i.e., it has an arbitrary number of local machines), the changing number of slave machines is not problematic. Now, recall that the vertex clique cover problem consists of covering the vertex set with cliques such that each vertex is assigned to a unique clique. The problem can be translated as a colouring problem where we cover the complement of G with a

given number of colours such that no edge connects two vertices of the same colour. Similar to the minimum k -cut problem, graph colouring is among Karp's 21 NP-complete problems.

Let \bar{A} be the adjacency matrix of the graph \bar{G} , the complement of G . A QUBO problem formulation of the colouring problem is (Alghassi (2015))

$$\min \mathbf{X}^T (\mathbf{Q} + \alpha \mathbf{Q}_{orth}) \mathbf{X},$$

where $\mathbf{Q} = I_k \otimes \bar{A}$, $\mathbf{Q}_{orth} = (J_k - 2I_k) \otimes I_n$, and $k \geq \chi(\bar{G})$ is a natural number greater than or equal to the chromatic number of \bar{G} .

The resulting covering $\mathcal{U} = \{U_i\}_{i=0\dots k}$ consists of k cliques (colours) in addition to an extra set (and possibly more if the size is too big for a single local machine) containing the edges between those cliques. The blow-up boundary matrix of the Mayer-Vietoris complex has the form

$$\begin{pmatrix} \mathcal{A}_0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & \mathcal{B}_0 \\ 0 & \mathcal{A}_1 & \cdots & 0 & \mathcal{B}_1 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \cdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & \cdots & \mathcal{A}_k & \mathcal{B}_k \end{pmatrix},$$

where \mathcal{A}_i is the boundary matrix of the covering subcomplex K_i (the extension of the covering set U_i , which is a clique complex if U_i is a clique). Compared to partitioning-based covering, this time the rank of $k-1$ of the \mathcal{A}_i is known, and the same for the passage matrix \mathcal{P}_i , which makes \mathcal{A}_i upper triangular, i.e., $\mathcal{A}_i \mathcal{P}_i$ is upper triangular. This is because the homology of an m -clique is the homology of the m -dimensional ball B^m , which is always trivial except for the zeroth homology where it is one-dimensional (this gives $\text{rank } \partial_\ell = \sum_{\alpha=0\dots\ell} (-1)^{\ell-\alpha} \binom{m}{\alpha}$). We achieve the same result via brute-force calculation performed offline once, and stored into a file for all future use. Now, the remaining question is to find the remainders (see Section 3). Suppose $r_i = \text{rank } \mathcal{A}_i$ is the precomputed rank of \mathcal{A}_i . The remainder is then given by the product $\mathcal{B}_i[r_i + 1, \text{end}] \mathcal{P}_i$, where $\mathcal{B}_i[r_i + 1, \text{end}]$ is the submatrix of \mathcal{B}_i containing the rows $r_i + 1$ downward. This is the only computation assigned to the machine i for $i \in \{0, \dots, k-1\}$.

The *second method* uses maximum cliques. The algorithm takes as input the graph G and a stopping criterion. The idea is to iteratively find the maximum clique and each time remove the clique edges from the graph of the previous iteration. Each run gives one maximum clique. At step i , we get a new graph G_i with adjacency matrix A_i . We stop when the clique is "small" (stopping criterion 1) or after a certain number of cliques computation (stopping criterion 2).

Algorithm 3 maxCliqueCover

Input: the adjacency matrix A of a 1-skeleton of a simplicial complex, stopping criterion

$i \leftarrow 0$

$A^{(0)} \leftarrow A$

while stopping criteria is not met **do**

 compute $C^{(i)}$, the adjacency of the maximum clique of $A^{(i)}$

$A^{(i+1)} \leftarrow (A^{(i)} - C^{(i)})$

$i \leftarrow i + 1$

return all computed maximum cliques and $A^{(i+1)}$

The QUBO formulation for finding the maximum clique (at iteration i) is

$$\mathbf{x}^T(A^{(i)} - I_n)\mathbf{x},$$

where $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, \dots, x_n)^T$, $A^{(i)}$ is the updated adjacency matrix at step i , and n is the dimension of $A^{(i)}$. The adjacency matrix of the maximum clique is then $C^{(i)} = \mathbf{x}^{(i)}\mathbf{x}^{(i)T} \circ (J_n - I_n)$, where \circ is the Hadamard product and $\mathbf{x}^{(i)}$ is the solution of the QUBO problem at iteration i .

There is an obvious gain in terms of the size of the problems that we can handle. Indeed, the number of variables involved here is n , compared to kn for the previous two coverings. Note also that using stopping criterion 2, we have more control over the number of local machines, although this is not particularly problematic, as explained earlier.

By construction, the covering subcomplexes $\{K_i\}_{i=0\dots k}$ intersect only at vertices; however, a vertex can be blown up into a high-dimensional simplex if it belongs to several covering subgraphs. This translates into a considerable reduction in the size of the matrices \mathcal{B}_i which now involve only simplices of the form $v \otimes J$, where v is a vertex in G and J is the set of all subcomplexes containing the vertex v . In fact, the matrix

$$\mathcal{B} = \begin{pmatrix} \mathcal{B}_0 \\ \vdots \\ \mathcal{B}_k \end{pmatrix}$$

now reduces to the boundary map of $\mathcal{N}\{K_i\}_{i=0\dots k}$, the nerve of the cover $\{K_i\}_{i=0\dots k}$. The matrices \mathcal{A}_i are as in the vertex cover and the same reduced computation can be carried out now with smaller matrices \mathcal{B}_i .

We have tested as a proof of concept our formulation on the D-Wave II machine over a large number of instances. We only report here the statistics for the vertex clique covering method using 30 instances of the witness complex of the two-dimensional unit torus (from randomly generated landmarks). Here, the chromatic number of all instances is equal to 3. Due to embedding size limitation of the D-Wave II processor, some of our instances were not successfully solved (refer to Appendix).

$ G $	solved	average graph density
9	10	0.62
10	9	0.54
11	7	0.53

The ‘‘solved’’ column indicates the number of instances (out of 10) successfully partitioned with D-Wave II for each size. For all of the solved cases, our algorithm successfully calculated the Betti numbers.

5. Conclusion

In this paper, we have presented three promising quantum annealing-based methods for parallel homology computation of large high-dimensional point clouds. The first method is based on the k -cut partitioning problem and is valid for any simplicial complex. This is an adiabatic (QUBO) problem reformulation of the use of partitioning in the work of Lewis and Zomorodian (2014). The other two methods, specifically designed for witness and Vietoris-Rips complexes, rely on our proposed clique covering methods for which we presented two QUBO problem formulations. We

have successfully tested our algorithms on the D-Wave II processor. We have also explained how all of this fits in the framework of resizable cloud computing.

Acknowledgments

We would like to thank M. Elsheikh for constructive discussions about the parallelization, S. S. Rezaei for his careful reading and helpful comments on the paper, P. Ronagh for helpful discussions on the topic, and M. Bucyk for proof reading the manuscript.

Appendix A. Basic Description of the D-Wave Processor

Here we introduce the quantum annealing concept that ultimately solves a general Ising (QUBO) problem, then talk about the important topic of embedding a QUBO problem into the specific quantum annealer (the D-Wave II processor).

A.1 Quantum Annealing

Quantum annealing (QA), along with the D-Wave processor, have been the focus of much research. We refer the interested reader to Johnson et al. (2011); Calude et al. (2015); Boixo et al. (2013, 2014); Lanting et al. (2014). QA is a paradigm designed to find the ground state of systems of interacting spins represented by a time-evolving Hamiltonian:

$$\mathcal{S}(s) = \mathcal{E}(s)\mathcal{H}_P - \frac{1}{2} \sum_i \Delta(s)\sigma_i^x,$$

$$\mathcal{H}_P = - \sum_i h_i \sigma_i^x + \sum_{i<j} J_{ij} \sigma_i^z \sigma_j^z.$$

The parameters h_i and J_{ij} encode the particular QUBO problem P into its Ising formulation. QA is performed by first setting $\Delta \gg \mathcal{E}$, which results in a ground state into which the spins can be easily initialized. Then Δ is *slowly* reduced and \mathcal{E} is increased until $\mathcal{E} \gg \Delta$. At this point the system is dominated by \mathcal{H}_P , which encodes the optimization problem. Thus the ground state represents the solution to the optimization problem.

A.2 Embedding

An embedding is the mapping of the nodes of an input graph to the nodes of the destination graph. The graph representing the problem's QUBO matrix needs to be embedded into the actual physical qubits on the processor in order for it to solve the QUBO problem. The specific existing connectivity pattern of qubits in the D-Wave chip is called the Chimera graph. Embedding an input graph (a QUBO problem graph) into the hardware graph (the Chimera graph) is in general NP-complete (Choi (2008)).

Figure 5 shows a sample embedding into the Chimera graph of the D-Wave II chip, which contains an 8×8 lattice of 4×4 bipartite blocks. The Chimera graph is structured so that the vertical and horizontal couplers in its lattice are connected only to either side of each bipartite block. Each node in this graph represents one qubit and each edge represents a coupling between two qubits. Adjacent nodes in the Chimera graph can be grouped together to form new effective (i.e., logical) nodes, creating nodes of a higher degree. Such a grouping is performed on the processor by setting the coupler between two qubits to a large negative value, forcing two Ising spins to align such that the two qubits end up with the same values. These effective qubits are expected to behave identically and remain in the same binary state at the time of measurement. The act of grouping adjacent qubits (hence forming new effective qubits) is called chain creation or identification.

An embedding strategy consists of two tasks: mapping and identification. Mapping is the assignment of the nodes of the input graph to the single or effective nodes of the destination graph. Solving such problems optimally is in general NP-hard, but one can devise various approximations and enhancement strategies to overcome the difficulties, for example, using statistical search methods like simulated annealing, structure-based methods, or a combination of both. For a better




Figure 5: *Top*: 1-skeleton of the witness complex of the two-dimensional torus point cloud with 1000 points. Colouring represents the clique covering. *Bottom*: The actual embedding of the corresponding clique cover QUBO problem inside the current Chimera graph (with 512 qubits). The QUBO problem has 30 variables and 102 quadratic terms. The coloured nodes are the 228 qubits which have been used, which is approximately 7 times the number of variables in the QUBO problem. The colouring of the nodes (and edges, respectively) represents the h parameter values (the J values) according to the colouring scheme on the interval $[-1, 1]$ represented by a colour interval [blue, red] in the D-Wave II processor API.

understanding of current embedding approaches, we refer the reader to Choi (2008), Bian et al. (2014), Jun et al. (2014), Tomas et al. (2015), Zaribafiyani et al. (2015). In Figure 5 (bottom), the blue lines indicate the identified couplers, the yellow lines indicates the problem couplers (i.e., the edges of the problem graph), and the grey lines indicate empty couplers.

References

- Hedayat Alghassi. The algebraic QUBO design framework. *Preprint*, 2015.
- Ulrich Bauer, Michael Kerber, and Jan Reininghaus. Clear and Compress: Computing Persistent Homology in Chunks. In Peer-Timo Bremer, Ingrid Hotz, Valerio Pascucci, and Ronald Peikert, editors, *Topological Methods in Data Analysis and Visualization III*, Mathematics and Visualization, pages 103–117. Springer International, Cham, 2014.
- Zhengbing Bian, Fabian Chudak, Robert Israel, Brad Lackey, William G Macready, and Aidan Roy. Discrete optimization using quantum annealing on sparse ising models. *Frontiers in Physics*, 2(56), 2014.
- Sergio Boixo, Tameem Albash, Federico M. Spedalieri, Nicholas Chancellor, and Daniel A. Lidar. Experimental signature of programmable quantum annealing. *Nat Commun*, 4, 06 2013.
- Sergio Boixo, Troels F. Ronnow, Sergei V. Isakov, Zhihui Wang, David Wecker, Daniel A. Lidar, John M. Martinis, and Matthias Troyer. Evidence for quantum annealing with more than one hundred qubits. *Nat Phys*, 10(3):218–224, 03 2014.
- Endre Boros and Peter L. Hammer. Pseudo-boolean optimization. *Discrete Applied Mathematics*, 123(13):155 – 225, 2002.
- Endre Boros, PeterL. Hammer, and Gabriel Tavares. Local search heuristics for quadratic unconstrained binary optimization (qubo). *Journal of Heuristics*, 13(2):99–132, 2007.
- Cristian S. Calude, Elena Calude, and Michael J. Dinneen. Guest column: Adiabatic quantum computing challenges. *SIGACT News*, 46(1):40–61, March 2015.
- Gunnar Carlsson. Topology and data. *Bull. Am. Math. Soc., New Ser.*, 46(2):255–308, 2009.
- Vicky Choi. Minor-embedding in adiabatic quantum computation: I. the parameter setting problem. *Quantum Information Processing*, 7(5):193–209, October 2008.
- Vin de Silva and Gunnar Carlsson. Topological estimation using witness complexes. In *Proceedings of the First Eurographics Conference on Point-Based Graphics*, SPBG’04, pages 157–166, Aire-la-Ville, Switzerland, Switzerland, 2004. Eurographics Association.
- Vin de Silva, Robert Ghrist, and Abubakr Muhammad. Blind swarms for coverage in 2-d. In Sebastian Thrun, Gaurav S. Sukhatme, and Stefan Schaal, editors, *Robotics: Science and Systems*, pages 335–342. The MIT Press, 2005.
- Herbert Edelsbrunner and John Harer. *Computational Topology - an Introduction*. American Mathematical Society, 2010.

- Neng Fan and Panos M. Pardalos. Linear and quadratic programming approaches for the general graph partitioning problem. *Journal of Global Optimization*, 48(1):57–71, 2010.
- Allen Hatcher. *Algebraic topology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002.
- M. W. Johnson, M. H. S. Amin, S. Gildert, T. Lanting, F. Hamze, N. Dickson, R. Harris, A. J. Berkley, J. Johansson, P. Bunyk, E. M. Chapple, C. Enderud, J. P. Hilton, K. Karimi, E. Ladizinsky, N. Ladizinsky, T. Oh, I. Perminov, C. Rich, M. C. Thom, E. Tolkacheva, C. J. S. Truncik, S. Uchaikin, J. Wang, B. Wilson, and G. Rose. Quantum annealing with manufactured spins. *Nature*, 473(7346):194–198, 05 2011.
- Cai Jun, G. Macready William, and Roy Aidan. A practical heuristic for finding graph minors. *Preprint arXiv:1406.2741*, 2014.
- Richard M. Karp. Reducibility among combinatorial problems. In *Complexity of Computer Computations*, pages 85–103. ed. R.E. Miller, J.W. Thatcher and J.D. Bohlinger, 1972.
- George Karypis and Vipin Kumar. A fast and high quality multilevel scheme for partitioning irregular graphs. *SIAM J. Sci. Comput.*, 20(1):359–392, December 1998.
- T. Lanting, A. J. Przybysz, A. Yu. Smirnov, F. M. Spedalieri, M. H. Amin, A. J. Berkley, R. Harris, F. Altomare, S. Boixo, P. Bunyk, N. Dickson, C. Enderud, J. P. Hilton, E. Hoskinson, M. W. Johnson, E. Ladizinsky, N. Ladizinsky, R. Neufeld, T. Oh, I. Perminov, C. Rich, M. C. Thom, E. Tolkacheva, S. Uchaikin, A. B. Wilson, and G. Rose. Entanglement in a quantum annealing processor. *Phys. Rev. X*, 4:021041, May 2014.
- Hyekeyoung Lee, M.K. Chung, Hyejin Kang, Bung-Nyun Kim, and Dong Soo Lee. Discriminative persistent homology of brain networks. In *Biomedical Imaging: From Nano to Macro, 2011 IEEE International Symposium on*, pages 841–844, 2011.
- Ryan Lewis and Dmitriy Morozov. Parallel computation of persistent homology using the blowup complex. In *Proceedings of the 27th ACM Symposium on Parallelism in Algorithms and Architectures*, SPAA '15, pages 323–331, New York, NY, USA, 2015. ACM.
- Ryan Lewis and Afra Zomorodian. Multicore homology via mayer vietoris. arxiv.org/abs/1407.2275, 2014.
- P. Y. Lum, G. Singh, A. Lehman, T. Ishkanov, M. Vejdemo-Johansson, M. Alagappan, J. Carlsson, and G. Carlsson. Extracting insights from the shape of complex data using topology. *Scientific Reports*, 3:1236 EP –, 02 2013.
- William S. Massey. *A basic course in algebraic topology*, volume 127 of *Graduate Texts in Mathematics*. Springer-Verlag, New York, 1991.
- Boothby Tomas, D. King Andrew, and Roy Aidan. Fast clique minor generation in chimera qubit connectivity graphs. *Preprint arXiv:1507.04774*, 2015.
- Marc J. van de Vijver, Yudong D. He, Laura J. van 't Veer, Hongyue Dai, Augustinus A.M. Hart, Dorien W. Voskuil, George J. Schreiber, Johannes L. Peterse, Chris Roberts, Matthew J. Marton, Mark Parrish, Douwe Atsma, Anke Witteveen, Annuska Glas, Leonie Delahaye, Tony

van der Velde, Harry Bartelink, Sjoerd Rodenhuis, Emiel T. Rutgers, Stephen H. Friend, and Ren Bernards. A gene-expression signature as a predictor of survival in breast cancer. *New England Journal of Medicine*, 347(25):1999–2009, 2002.

Arman Zaribafiyani, Dominic Marchand, and Seyed Saeed Rezaei. Systematic and deterministic graph-minor embedding of cartesian products of complete graphs. *Preprint*, 2015.

Afra Zomorodian. *Advances in Applied and Computational Topology*. American Mathematical Society, Boston, MA, USA, 2012.

Afra Zomorodian and Gunnar Carlsson. Localized homology. *Computational Geometry*, 41(3):126 – 148, 2008.