

Quantum Annealing for Prime Factorization

Shuxian Jiang¹, Keith A. Britt², Alexander J. McCaskey², Travis S. Humble^{*2}, and Sabre Kais^{†1,3}

¹Department of Computer Science, Purdue University, West Lafayette, IN 47906

²Quantum Computing Institute, Oak Ridge National Laboratory, Oak Ridge, TN 37831

³Department of Chemistry, Physics and Birck Nanotechnology Center, Purdue University, West Lafayette, IN 47906

Abstract

We have developed a framework to convert an arbitrary integer factorization problem to an executable Ising model by first writing it as an optimization function and then transforming the k -bit coupling ($k \geq 3$) terms to quadratic terms using ancillary variables. Our resource-efficient method uses $\mathcal{O}(\log^2(N))$ binary variables (qubits) for finding the factors of an integer N . We present how to factorize 15, 143, 59989, and 376289 using 4, 12, 59, and 94 logical qubits, respectively. This method was tested using the D-Wave 2000Q for finding an embedding and determining the prime factors for a given composite number. The method is general and could be used to factor larger integers as the number of available qubits increases.

1 Introduction

The integer factorization problem reduces an integer N to its prime factors p and q . This problem is fundamental in number theory with broad implications for cryptographic data storage and communications [29]. While finding factors of an integer is a computational hard problem, it is not believe to belong to the class of NP-hard problems. In a practical sense though, all known classical factoring algorithms which are deterministic and don't have unproved hypotheses require time exponential in $\log N$. Thus, the integer factorization problem is used as the basic hardness assumption for many encryption methods including the widely deployed RSA cryptographic system. The fastest, known classical algorithm for integer factorization is the general number field sieve method [16], which scales exponentially in the number of operations required with respect to the integer N .

Quantum computing theory has shown the potential to reduce the number of operations required for solving certain problems, and many efforts have been undertaken to develop a quantum computer that can solve the integer factorization problem. The quantum methods for solving factorization problem could be regarded as probabilistic methods, compared to the classical deterministic methods. Shor's algorithm is perhaps the most well-known quantum algorithm for integer factorization. To factor an integer N , Shor's algorithm requires a polynomial number of operations [27], thus providing an exponential speedup over the general number sieve. Shor's algorithm works by reducing the factorization problem to the order-finding problem. Many attempts have been made to implement Shor's algorithm on quantum computing hardware. Vandersypen et al. [28] used seven spin-1/2 nuclei in a molecule as qubits to factor $N = 15$, while Lanyon et al. [15], Lu et al. [17], and Politi et al. [25] have implemented compiled versions of Shor's algorithm using photonic systems for factoring $N = 15$. Martín-López et al. [19] factored 21 using qubit recycling, and Lucero et al. [18] used superconducting qubits to factor 15. Geller et al.[10] used a simplified version of Shor's algorithm for factoring products of the Fermat primes 3, 5, 17, 257, and 65537. Shor's algorithm is not only useful for solving integer factorization problem, but can be also used to solve other order-finding problems. Very recently, Grosshans et al.[11] proposed factoring safe semi-primes using the quantum order finding algorithm which reduced the failure probability.

*humblets@ornl.gov

†kais@purdue.edu

Shor's quantum algorithm for order-finding is presented within the circuit model of quantum computation. But another, equally powerful model of quantum computing (up to a polynomial reduction) is the quantum adiabatic computing model [9](QAC), which can also be used to solve the integer factorization problem. Peng et al. [24] have developed methods for factoring 21 using QAC and they implemented this algorithm in a three-qubit NMR quantum processor, while Xu et al. [30] factored 143 using similar NMR technology. A novel approach by Schaller et al. [26] used multiplication tables to produce a set of equations and used those to produce a quadratic cost function. Dridi et al. [8] further optimized this method using Gröbner bases, reducing the number of auxiliary variables and equations required.

In this contribution, we introduce a new procedure for solving the integer factorization problem using a variant of QAC known as quantum annealing. Our approach is based on a direct mathematical transformation of the problem to an Ising Hamiltonian, which can be realized using currently available quantum processors. Next, in order to account for hardware constraints, we introduce a modified multiplication method that reduces the range of the coefficients in the cost function without increasing the number of qubits required. The method is general, resource-efficient, and does not rely on ad-hoc calculations.

Quantum annealing solves optimization problems using quantum fluctuations [13]. Quantum adiabatic computation (QAC), as developed by Farhi et al. [9], approaches the same task given a complex Hamiltonian whose ground state encodes the solution to the optimization problem. This computation begins in the ground state of a simple, well-characterized Hamiltonian, which is then adiabatically evolved to the complex, problem Hamiltonian. According to the adiabatic theorem[21], the system state will also evolve the ground state of the problem Hamiltonian provided the evolution is sufficiently slow to prevent excitations to any higher-lying state. At the end of the annealing process, the measured qubits will encode the optimal solution to the problem within a bounded degree of certainty (due to noise within the closed system).

The time-dependent Hamiltonian of the quantum system is given by combining the initial Hamiltonian and the final Hamiltonian [1]

$$H(t) = \left(1 - \frac{t}{T}\right)H_B + \frac{t}{T}H_P. \quad (1)$$

Here H_B is the initial Hamiltonian with a well-known and easily constructed ground state, which we consider to have the general form

$$H_B = - \sum \sigma_x^{(i)} \quad (2)$$

with Pauli operator σ_x defining the x -basis. The Hamiltonian H_P is the final Hamiltonian whose ground state encodes the solution to a given instance of the optimization problem. Finding the prime factors of an integer will be mapped to the final Ising Hamiltonian of the general form

$$H_P = \sum h_i \sigma_z^{(i)} + \sum J_{ij} \sigma_z^{(i)} \sigma_z^{(j)} \quad (3)$$

where σ_z defines the z -basis and the local fields h_i and the couplings J_{ij} define the factorization problem instance. H_P gives the total energy of the system.

The time-dependent Hamiltonian $H(t)$ of the physical system evolves according to Schrödinger equation

$$i \frac{d}{dt} |\psi(t)\rangle = H(t) |\psi(t)\rangle \quad (4)$$

where $|\psi(t)\rangle$ is the state of the system at any time $t \in [0, T]$. Let $|\phi_i(t)\rangle$ be the i -th instantaneous eigenstate of $H(t)$, that is, $H(t) |\phi_i(t)\rangle = E_i(t) |\phi_i(t)\rangle$ holds through the entire evolution. If the system is initialized in the ground state $|\phi_0(t=0)\rangle$, then the evolution proceeds slow enough to avoid exciting to the higher-lying eigenstates, e.g., $|\phi_1(t)\rangle$. Ultimately, the system will be prepared in the instantaneous ground eigenstate $|\phi_0(t=T)\rangle$.

The direct method to factor $N = pq$, where p and q are prime numbers is to let $l_1 = \lfloor \log_2(p) \rfloor$, $l_2 = \lfloor \log_2(q) \rfloor$ and, without loss of generality, we take $p = (x_{l_1-1}x_{l_1-2}\dots x_1)_2$, $q = (x_{l_1+l_2-2}x_{l_1+l_2-3}\dots x_{l_1})_2$, and $l_1 > l_2$ where x_i are binary numbers. So $p = \sum_{i=1}^{l_1-1} 2^i x_i + 1$ and $q = \sum_{j=l_1}^{l_1+l_2-2} 2^j x_j + 1$. We can define the cost function $f(x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4, \dots, x_{l_1+l_2-2}) = (N-pq)^2$. To reduce the order of the cost function to quadratic, we need $\binom{l_1}{2} + \binom{l_2}{2} = \frac{l_1(l_1-1)}{2} + \frac{l_2(l_2-1)}{2}$ auxiliary variables. If $l_1 = l_2 = l$, the number of auxiliary variables is $l \times (l-1)$. Plus the variables to denote the factors, we used $2 \times (l-1) + l \times (l-1) = (l+2) \times (l-1) = \mathcal{O}(l^2) = \mathcal{O}(\log^2(N))$ binary variables in total. We could also let $p = (1x_{l_1-2}\dots x_1)_2$, $q = (1x_{l_1+l_2-4}\dots x_{l_1-1})_2$ when lengths of p and q are fixed.

we illustrate this direct method through the factorization of $N = 15$. We have $\log_2(p) \leq 2 < n_2 = \log_2(q) < 4$, which means p is at most 2 bits, q is at most 3 bits, then we define $p = (x_1 1)_2 = x_1 \times 2 + 1$, $q = (x_2 x_3 1)_2 = x_2 \times 2^2 + x_3 \times 2 + 1$, $x_i \in \{0, 1\}$, because p and q are prime numbers. The objective function $f(x_1, x_2, x_3) = (N - pq)^2$ to be minimized has the following form:

$$f = 128x_1x_2x_3 - 56x_1x_2 - 48x_1x_3 + 16x_2x_3 - 52x_1 - 52x_2 - 96x_3 + 196.$$

Now, we reduced the 3-local term to 2-local term as follows [2]: for $x, y, z \in \{0, 1\}$, $xy = z$ iff $xy - 2xz - 2yz + 3z = 0$, and $xy \neq z$ iff $xy - 2xz - 2yz + 3z > 0$. It is also easy to check that $x_1x_2x_3 = x_4x_3 + 2(x_1x_2 - 2x_1x_4 - 2x_2x_4 + 3x_4)$ if $x_4 = x_1x_2$, and $x_1x_2x_3 < x_4x_3 + 2(x_1x_2 - 2x_1x_4 - 2x_2x_4 + 3x_4)$ if $x_4 \neq x_1x_2$. Thus, the $x_1x_2x_3$ term could be transformed to quadratic form by replacing x_1x_2 with x_4 , plus a constrained condition as the penalty term:

$$\min(x_1x_2x_3) = \min(x_4x_3 + 2(x_1x_2 - 2x_1x_4 - 2x_2x_4 + 3x_4)) \quad (5)$$

Here we transformed the 3-local term to 2-local by introducing a new variable and replacing the constrained condition with a penalty term into the original function. We obtain (see Appendix A.1 for more details) an Ising function to be optimized with the local fields h^T and couplings J written as

$$\mathbf{h}^T = \begin{pmatrix} \sigma_z^{(1)} & \sigma_z^{(2)} & \sigma_z^{(3)} & \sigma_z^{(4)} \\ 58 & 50 & 12 & -80 \end{pmatrix} \quad \mathbf{J} = \begin{pmatrix} \sigma_z^{(1)} & \sigma_z^{(2)} & \sigma_z^{(3)} & \sigma_z^{(4)} \\ & 25 & -6 & -64 \\ \sigma_z^{(2)} & & 2 & -64 \\ \sigma_z^{(3)} & & & 16 \\ \sigma_z^{(4)} & & & \end{pmatrix}$$

1.1 Results

We use the D-Wave 2000Q quantum annealer to demonstrate the method. In order to solve problems on the D-Wave hardware we need to embed the problem Hamiltonian onto the *chimera* hardware graph while maintaining the energy minimization objective function [12]. This process requires users of the D-Wave system to solve two problems: minor embedding[4, 14] and parameter setting[5].


A *minor embedding* of $G(V, E)$ in $G'(V', E')$ is defined by a mapping $\phi : G \mapsto G'$ such that each vertex $v \in G$ is mapped to a connected subtree T_v of G' and if $(u, v) \in E$ then there exist $i_u, i_v \in G'$ such that $i_u \in T_u, i_v \in T_v$ and $(i_u, i_v) \in E'$. If such a mapping ϕ exists between G and G' , we say G is a *minor* of G' and we use $G \leq_m G'$ to denote such relationship.

In parameter setting, we assign each node and each edge in the minor embedding graph such that: (1) for each node in the tree T_i expanded by the same vertex i , its value h'_{i_k} satisfies $\sum h'_{i_k} = h_i$, (2) for each edge in the tree T_i expanded by the same vertex i , the value $J_{i_k, i_{k'}}$ needs to be large enough to make sure all physical qubits that correspond to the same logical qubit to be of the same value and (3) for each edge in the minor embedding graph which is in the original graph, we could use the same J_{ij} value.


The experimental results of factoring 15 and 21 are shown in Figure 1. These plots show the decoded solutions in order of lowest energy to highest energy (left to right). In some cases, the observed bits were decoded as the correct factors. For example, there are several (3, 7) solutions for $N = 21$. Only the first (leftmost) corresponds to the lowest energy state. The others were always higher energy solutions.

In order to factor larger numbers and perform the quantum annealing on the D-wave machine with reasonable mitigation of control hardware bits of precision, we introduce the modified multiplication table method. The modified multiplication table method allows us to reduce the range of Ising parameter values used as coefficients to the qubits and couplers, thereby reducing the bits of precision required by control hardware to satisfy the final Hamiltonian.

The modified multiplication table method uses local minimizations of the product of individual bits in the bit strings of p and q to reduce the number of variables needed in the global minimization of the final Hamiltonian. In addition to



(a) Factoring 15 with annealing time 200



(b) Factoring 21 with annealing time 2000

Figure 1: Experimental results on D-Wave machine: rates of getting different solutions. For example, the $(3, 5)$ in the x-axis denotes the factorization of 15 is 3 multiplied by 5, the number in y-axis denotes the rate to get this factorization.

reducing the number of logical qubits needed to describe the final Hamiltonian, this method also shrinks the range of coefficient values needed to describe the final Hamiltonian. A detailed analysis of the range of coefficients is shown in Appendix A.5. Of note is that the modified multiplication table method did not eliminate the need for 4-body and 3-body terms to be reduced to quadratic terms, but it did reduce the number of these higher body terms making it possible for us to embed them on the D-Wave hardware. We used approximately $\log(N)$ binary variables to denote the factors and about $\log(N)$ binary variables to denote the carries where N is the number to be factored, plus $\log^2(N)/4$ auxiliary binary variables in this scheme. In total, we need roughly $\log^2(N)/4$ binary variables (qubits).

For an illustrative example, we consider factoring $143 = 11 \times 13$. We have the multiplication table[7]. Instead of

Table 1: Multiplication table for $11 \times 13 = 143$ in binary.

	2^7	2^6	2^5	2^4	2^3	2^2	2^1	2^0
p					1	p_2	p_1	1
q					1	q_2	q_1	1
					1	p_2	p_1	1
				q_1	$p_2 q_1$	$p_1 q_1$	q_1	
			q_2	$p_2 q_2$	$p_1 q_2$	q_2		
		1	p_2	p_1	1			
carries		c_4	c_3	c_2	c_1			
$p \times q = 143$	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	1

using carries in every bits[7] [8],[22], we only use carries twice (let them to be c_1, c_2, c_3, c_4 with $(c_2 c_1)_2 = c_2 \times 2 + c_1$, $(c_4 c_3)_2 = c_4 \times 2 + c_3$, $c_i = 0, 1$) determined by the divided columns. This method skipped the step to calculate the system of equations for each column, thus greatly reduced the burden of computation. To determine how to divide the columns we need to balance the number of unknown variables (carries) and the range of coefficients in the problem Hamiltonian. Instead of making the sum of each column equal to every bits of the number to be factored as in a conventional multiplication table, we make each block of the multiplication table equal to the corresponding block of the number to be factored, thus greatly reducing the number of carry qubits used while keeping their coefficients in a reasonable range (given the hardware platform). The equations for these blocks give the following cost function $f(p_1, p_2, q_1, q_2, c_1, c_2, c_3, c_4)$ to be optimized (more details in Appendix A.2):

$$f = (2p_2 + 2p_1 q_1 + 2q_2 - 8c_2 - 4c_1 + p_1 + q_1 - 3)^2 + (2q_1 + 2p_2 q_2 + 2p_1 + 2c_2 - 8c_4 - 4c_3 + p_2 q_1 + p_1 q_2 + c_1 + 1)^2 + (q_2 + p_2 + c_3 + 2c_4 - 2)^2.$$

This function could be expanded and further simplified using the property $x^2 = x$ for $x = 0, 1$. But there will still be cubic terms like $c_1 p_1 q_1$ and quartic terms like $p_1 p_2 q_1 q_2$. In order to convert it to Ising Hamiltonian, we need to reduce

these high order terms to two order terms as explained in the Appendix A.2. Replacing p_1q_1 with t_1 , p_1q_2 with t_2 , p_2q_2 with t_3 , and p_2q_1 with t_4 , we used $2 \times 2 = 4$ auxiliary variables. After doing a variable conversion from p_1 to s_1 , p_2 to s_2 , q_1 to s_3 , q_2 to s_4 , ..., p_2q_1 to s_{12} as the final step, we transfer the cost function to an Ising type Hamiltonian as shown in Appendix A.2.

Next we embed the problem to D-wave machine using the following method (note: for larger N factoring experiments which can't be embedded directly using this method due to the limitation of the Chimera graph, we relied on a D-Wave provided heuristic embedding algorithm). If n qubits are needed in the Hamiltonian, we divide n into $\lceil \frac{n}{4} \rceil$ groups. For each group, we use 4 copies of the nodes with each $h'_{i_k} = \frac{1}{4}h_i$. We assign each edge in the tree T_i the negative number with largest absolute value to make it a penalty term. This method guarantees the nodes correspond to the same original qubit have the same value. We assign each edge corresponds to the original edge in the problem graph the same J_{ij} value. The embedded graph to D-Wave machine is in Figure 2.




Figure 2: Embedding the factoring instance $N = 143$ to Chimera graph. The nodes with the same color denote the same original qubit, with their connected lines corresponding to strong couplings. The left footnotes refer to which spin the node was embedded.

The results graph are shown in Figure 3. The final state of the system will be $|1 - 1 - 1 1\rangle$ or $|-1 1 1 - 1\rangle$ with high probability, which corresponds to solutions $p = (1p_2p_11) = (1101)_2 = 13$, $q = (1q_2q_11) = (1011)_2 = 11$ or $p = 11, q = 13$.

Next, we factorize larger numbers such as $N = 59989 = pq$, where $p > q$ are prime numbers. We start by fixing the length of the factors by setting the binary representation of the factors to $p = (1p_6p_5p_4p_3p_2p_1)_2, q = (1q_6q_5q_4q_3q_2q_1)_2, p_i, q_i \in \{0, 1\}$. We predefine how to divide the columns and the number of carries given the multiplication table shown in Appendix A.3. Using the method described for factoring 143, we write the equations and the corresponding cost function of the factorization problem then convert this cost function to the Ising Hamiltonian. We need $6 \times 6 = 36$ auxiliary variables, based on the same variable replacement rules stated in the previous section, plus $6 + 6 = 12$ variables to denote the factors and 11 variables to denote the carries. This gives a total number of 59 variables. Sometimes the carries in the multiplication table will overlap, as is the case for factoring $376289 = 659 \times 571$ shown in the multiplication table of Appendix A.4. In such circumstances, we add these carries in the table and then use the same method as before to find the corresponding Ising Hamiltonian. This Hamiltonian has $8 + 8 + 14 + 8 \times 8 = 94$ qubits. As a point of reference, applying this method to the current factoring record for RSA-768 would require approximately 147,456 qubits.




Figure 3: Experimental results on D-wave machine: final ground state of factoring 143. Nodes colored red denote $+1$, nodes colored blue denote -1 . (a) This graph shows $s_1 = 1, s_2 = -1, s_3 = -1, s_4 = 1$ which means $p = 1101, q = 1011$. (b) This graph shows $s_1 = -1, s_2 = 1, s_3 = 1, s_4 = -1$ which means $p = 1011, q = 1101$.

2 Conclusions

In this paper we have presented two general methods for factoring integers using quantum annealing by converting the problem to an Ising Hamiltonian. Both methods use $\mathcal{O}(\log^2(N))$ qubits in total, where N is the number to be factored. The novelty of our demonstration of quantum annealing for prime factorization is based on the reduction in quantum resources required to execute factoring and the experimental verification of the algorithmic accuracy using currently available hardware. As a proof-of-concept, we have demonstrated these methods by factoring integers using the D-Wave 2000Q quantum annealing hardware, but these methods may be used on any other quantum annealing system with a similar number of qubits, qubit degree of connectivity, and hardware parameter precision. Assuming that quantum annealing hardware systems will continue to grow both in the number of qubits and bits of precision capabilities, our methods offer a promising path toward factor much larger numbers in the future.

Finally, we note that while our demonstrations of factoring have made use of currently available quantum annealers, there is an outstanding question regarding the asymptotic complexity for this approach. It is well known that algorithmic complexity within the QAC model depends on the minimum spectral gap between the ground and first-excited states of the underlying time-dependent Hamiltonian. Attempts to classify the complexity of the spectral gap with respect to system size have not yet succeed and, indeed, Cubitt, Perez-Garcia, and Wolf have proven that the problem of claiming a Hamiltonian has a gap is undecidable in general [6]. Nonetheless, there is hope that our resource-efficient algorithms may find use in pre-processing potential factors for noisy factorization algorithms, e.g., as suggested by Patterson et al. within the context of RSA [23].

Methods We calculated the factors p and q of a coprime integer N using a implementation of the algorithms described in Sec. 1.1. The programmed implementation was written in C/C++ or Python using the XACC programming framework [20]. XACC enables integration of the D-Wave solver application programming interface (SAPI) using a directive-based programming model. Pre-processing of the input N generated the Ising parameters for a logical Hamiltonian that was then embedded into the hardware graph structure. For the 2000Q processor, the hardware graph was a complete 16-by-16 Chimera structure over 2048 qubits using the SAPI version 3.0 `sapi.findembedding` method, which is based on the Cai, Macready and Roy randomized algorithm [3]. Access to these methods were managed using the XACC `dwsapi-embedding` plugin [20]. The corresponding biases and couplings for the embedded problem were generated using the logical Ising parameters. The output of the embedding was a program implementation of the physical Ising model that was submitted for execution on the D-Wave processor. Additional parameters for the execution included the number of samples S and the annealing duration T . The default annealing schedule for the 2000Q was used for all executions. The output from each of the S executions was a measured binary string designating ± 1 values for each spin variable. The number of samples was $S = 10,000$. Each returned string was then classified according to the corresponding energy for the physical Ising model and subsequently decoded according to

the algorithm in Sec. 1.1 into the factors p and q . A histogram of all solutions returned for a specific annealing time was recorded.

Acknowledgments Access to the D-Wave 2000Q was provided by the Quantum Computing Institute at Oak Ridge National Laboratory and Google Quantum Artificial Intelligence Lab, USRA-Purdue. This manuscript has been authored by UT-Battelle, LLC under Contract No. DE-AC05-00OR22725 with the U.S. Department of Energy. The United States Government retains and the publisher, by accepting the article for publication, acknowledges that the United States Government retains a non-exclusive, paid-up, irrevocable, worldwide license to publish or reproduce the published form of this manuscript, or allow others to do so, for United States Government purposes. The Department of Energy will provide public access to these results of federally sponsored research in accordance with the DOE Public Access Plan (<http://energy.gov/downloads/doe-public-access-plan>).

References

- [1] Tameem Albash and Daniel A. Lidar. Adiabatic quantum computation. *Rev. Mod. Phys.*, 90:015002, Jan 2018.
- [2] Endre Boros and Peter L. Hammer. Pseudo-boolean optimization. 2001.
- [3] Jun Cai, William G Macready, and Aidan Roy. A practical heuristic for finding graph minors. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1406.2741*, 2014.
- [4] Vicky Choi. Minor-embedding in adiabatic quantum computation: I. the parameter setting problem. *Quantum Information Processing*, 7(5):193–209, 2008.
- [5] Vicky Choi. Minor-embedding in adiabatic quantum computation: II. minor-universal graph design. *Quantum Information Processing*, 10(3):343–353, 2011.
- [6] Toby S Cubitt, David Perez-Garcia, and Michael M Wolf. Undecidability of the spectral gap. *Nature*, 528(7581):207, 2015.
- [7] Nikesh S Dattani and Nathaniel Bryans. Quantum factorization of 56153 with only 4 qubits. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1411.6758*, 2014.
- [8] Raouf Dridi and Hedayat Alghassi. Prime factorization using quantum annealing and computational algebraic geometry. *Scientific Reports*, 7, 2017.
- [9] Edward Farhi, Jeffrey Goldstone, Sam Gutmann, Joshua Lapan, Andrew Lundgren, and Daniel Preda. A quantum adiabatic evolution algorithm applied to random instances of an NP-complete problem. *Science*, 292(5516):472–475, 2001.
- [10] Michael R Geller and Zhongyuan Zhou. Factoring 51 and 85 with 8 qubits. *Scientific reports*, 3, 2013.
- [11] Frédéric Grosshans, Thomas Lawson, François Morain, and Benjamin Smith. Factoring safe semiprimes with a single quantum query. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1511.04385*, 2015.
- [12] Travis S Humble, Alexander J McCaskey, Ryan S Bennink, Jay J Billings, Eduardo F D’Azevedo, Blair D Sullivan, Christine F Klymko, and Hadayat Seddiqi. An integrated programming and development environment for adiabatic quantum optimization. *Computational Science and Discovery*, 7(1):015006, 2014.
- [13] Tadashi Kadowaki and Hidetoshi Nishimori. Quantum annealing in the transverse ising model. *Physical Review E*, 58(5):5355, 1998.
- [14] Christine Klymko, Blair D. Sullivan, and Travis S. Humble. Adiabatic quantum programming: minor embedding with hard faults. *Quantum Information Processing*, 13(3):709–729, 2014.
- [15] BP Lanyon, TJ Weinhold, Nathan K Langford, M Barbieri, DFV James, Alexei Gilchrist, and AG White. Experimental demonstration of a compiled version of shor’s algorithm with quantum entanglement. *Physical Review Letters*, 99(25):250505, 2007.
- [16] Arjen K Lenstra, Hendrik W Lenstra Jr, Mark S Manasse, and John M Pollard. The number field sieve. In *Proceedings of the twenty-second annual ACM symposium on Theory of computing*, pages 564–572. ACM, 1990.
- [17] Chao-Yang Lu, Daniel E Browne, Tao Yang, and Jian-Wei Pan. Demonstration of a compiled version of shor’s quantum factoring algorithm using photonic qubits. *Physical Review Letters*, 99(25):250504, 2007.
- [18] Erik Lucero, Rami Barends, Yu Chen, Julian Kelly, Matteo Mariantoni, Anthony Megrant, Peter O’Malley, Daniel Sank, Amit Vainsencher, James Wenner, et al. Computing prime factors with a josephson phase qubit quantum processor. *Nature Physics*, 8(10):719–723, 2012.
- [19] Enrique Martín-López, Anthony Laing, Thomas Lawson, Roberto Alvarez, Xiao-Qi Zhou, and Jeremy L O’Brien. Experimental realization of shor’s quantum factoring algorithm using qubit recycling. *Nature Photonics*, 6(11):773–776, 2012.

- [20] Alexander J McCaskey, Eugene F Dumitrescu, Dmitry Liakh, Mengsu Chen, Wu-chun Feng, and Travis S Humble. Extreme-scale programming model for quantum acceleration within high performance computing. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1710.01794*, 2017.
- [21] A. Messiah. *Quantum Mechanics: Volume 2*. North-Holland Publishing Company, 1962.
- [22] Soham Pal, Saranyo Moitra, VS Anjusha, Anil Kumar, and TS Mahesh. Hybrid scheme for factorization: Factoring 551 using a 3-qubit nmr quantum adiabatic processor. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1611.00998*, 2016.
- [23] Kenneth G. Paterson, Antigoni Polychroniadou, and Dale L. Sibborn. A coding-theoretic approach to recovering noisy rsa keys. In Xiaoyun Wang and Kazue Sako, editors, *Advances in Cryptology – ASIACRYPT 2012*, pages 386–403, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2012. Springer Berlin Heidelberg.
- [24] Xinhua Peng, Zeyang Liao, Nanyang Xu, Gan Qin, Xianyi Zhou, Dieter Suter, and Jiangfeng Du. Quantum adiabatic algorithm for factorization and its experimental implementation. *Physical Review Letters*, 101(22):220405, 2008.
- [25] Alberto Politi, Jonathan CF Matthews, and Jeremy L O’Brien. Shor’s quantum factoring algorithm on a photonic chip. *Science*, 325(5945):1221–1221, 2009.
- [26] Gernot Schaller and Ralf Schützhold. The role of symmetries in adiabatic quantum algorithms. *arXiv preprint arXiv:0708.1882*, 2007.
- [27] Peter W Shor. Polynomial-time algorithms for prime factorization and discrete logarithms on a quantum computer. *SIAM review*, 41(2):303–332, 1999.
- [28] Lieven MK Vandersypen, Matthias Steffen, Gregory Breyta, Costantino S Yannoni, Mark H Sherwood, and Isaac L Chuang. Experimental realization of shor’s quantum factoring algorithm using nuclear magnetic resonance. *Nature*, 414(6866):883–887, 2001.
- [29] Samuel S Wagstaff. *The Joy of Factoring*, volume 68. American Mathematical Soc., 2013.
- [30] Nanyang Xu, Jing Zhu, Dawei Lu, Xianyi Zhou, Xinhua Peng, and Jiangfeng Du. Quantum factorization of 143 on a dipolar-coupling nuclear magnetic resonance system. *Physical review letters*, 108(13):130501, 2012.

A Appendix

A.1 Factoring $N = 15 = 5 \times 3$

Define $p = (x_1 1)_2 = x_1 * 2 + 1$, $q = (x_2 x_3 1)_2 = x_2 * 2^2 + x_3 * 2 + 1$, $x_i \in \{0, 1\}$, p and q are prime numbers. The cost function is

$$\begin{aligned}
 & f(x_1, x_2, x_3) \\
 &= (N - pq)^2 \\
 &= [15 - (x_1 * 2 + 1)(x_3 * 2^2 + x_2 * 2 + 1)]^2 \\
 &= 128x_1x_2x_3 - 56x_1x_2 - 48x_1x_3 + 16x_2x_3 - 52x_1 - 52x_2 - 96x_3 + 196.
 \end{aligned}$$

Use the replacement in Eq.6, we got

$$\begin{aligned}
 & f'(x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4) \\
 &= 128(x_4x_3 + 2(x_1x_2 - 2x_1x_4 - 2x_2x_4 + 3x_4)) - 56x_1x_2 - 48x_1x_3 + 16x_2x_3 \\
 &\quad - 52x_1 - 52x_2 - 96x_3 + 196 \\
 &= 200x_1x_2 - 48x_1x_3 - 512x_1x_4 + 16x_2x_3 - 512x_2x_4 + 128x_3x_4 \\
 &\quad - 52x_1 - 52x_2 - 96x_3 + 768x_4 + 196.
 \end{aligned}$$

with

$$\min_{x_1x_2=x_4} f(x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4) = \min f'(x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4)$$

because the coefficient of $x_1x_2x_3$ term is positive.

Then we do variable replacement using $x_i = \frac{1-s_i}{2}, i = 1, 2, 3, 4$

$$\begin{aligned}
& f'(x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4) \\
= & 200 \frac{1-s_1}{2} \frac{1-s_2}{2} - 48 \frac{1-s_1}{2} \frac{1-s_3}{2} - 512 \frac{1-s_1}{2} \frac{1-s_4}{2} + 16 \frac{1-s_2}{2} \frac{1-s_3}{2} \\
& - 512 \frac{1-s_2}{2} \frac{1-s_4}{2} + 128 \frac{1-s_3}{2} \frac{1-s_4}{2} - 52 \frac{1-s_1}{2} - 52 \frac{1-s_2}{2} \\
& - 96 \frac{1-s_3}{2} + 768 \frac{1-s_4}{2} + 196 \\
= & 116s_1 + 100s_2 + 24s_3 - 160s_4 + 50s_1s_2 - 12s_1s_3 - 128s_1s_4 + 4s_2s_3 - 128s_2s_4 + 32s_3s_4 + 298 \\
= & 2g(s_1, s_2, s_3, s_4)
\end{aligned}$$

$g(s_1, s_2, s_3, s_4)$ is the energy function of

$$\begin{aligned}
& H_P(\sigma_z^{(1)}, \sigma_z^{(2)}, \sigma_z^{(3)}, \sigma_z^{(4)}) \\
= & 58\sigma_z^{(1)} + 50\sigma_z^{(2)} + 12\sigma_z^{(3)} - 80\sigma_z^{(4)} + 25\sigma_z^{(1)}\sigma_z^{(2)} - 6\sigma_z^{(1)}\sigma_z^{(3)} - 64\sigma_z^{(1)}\sigma_z^{(4)} + 2\sigma_z^{(2)}\sigma_z^{(3)} - 64\sigma_z^{(2)}\sigma_z^{(4)} \\
& + 16\sigma_z^{(3)}\sigma_z^{(4)} + 149I.
\end{aligned}$$

A.2 Factoring $N = 143 = 13 \times 11$

From multiplication table 1, we could get the equations for each blocks

$$\begin{aligned}
(p_2 + p_1q_1 + q_2 - (c_2 \times 4 + c_1 \times 2)) \times 2 + (p_1 + q_1) &= (11)_2 = 3 \\
(q_1 + p_2q_2 + p_1 + c_2 - (c_4 \times 4 + c_3 \times 2)) \times 2 + (1 + p_2q_1 + p_1q_2 + 1 + c_1) &= (01)_2 = 1 \\
(1 + c_4) \times 2 + (q_2 + p_2 + c_3) &= (100)_2 = 4
\end{aligned}$$

They could be further simplified as

$$\begin{aligned}
2p_2 + 2p_1q_1 + 2q_2 - 8c_2 - 4c_1 + p_1 + q_1 - 3 &= 0 \\
2q_1 + 2p_2q_2 + 2p_1 + 2c_2 - 8c_4 - 4c_3 + p_2q_1 + p_1q_2 + c_1 + 1 &= 0 \\
q_2 + p_2 + c_3 + 2c_4 - 2 &= 0
\end{aligned}$$

We define the cost function to be squares of the left of equations. That is

$$\begin{aligned}
& f(p_1, p_2, q_1, q_2, c_1, c_2, c_3, c_4) \\
= & (2p_2 + 2p_1q_1 + 2q_2 - 8c_2 - 4c_1 + p_1 + q_1 - 3)^2 + (2q_1 + 2p_2q_2 + 2p_1 + 2c_2 - 8c_4 - 4c_3 + p_2q_1 + p_1q_2 + c_1 + 1)^2 \\
& + (q_2 + p_2 + c_3 + 2c_4 - 2)^2
\end{aligned}$$

Expand and simplify the function using the property $x^2 = x$ for $x = 0, 1$. Then reduce the higher order terms to two order terms according to the following rule noticing that there will be negative high order terms:

$$\begin{cases} x_1x_2x_3 = x_4x_3 + 2(x_1x_2 - 2x_1x_4 - 2x_2x_4 + 3x_4) & \text{if } x_4 = x_1x_2 \\ x_1x_2x_3 < x_4x_3 + 2(x_1x_2 - 2x_1x_4 - 2x_2x_4 + 3x_4) & \text{if } x_4 \neq x_1x_2 \end{cases}$$

$$\text{and } \begin{cases} -x_1x_2x_3 = -x_4x_3 + 2(x_1x_2 - 2x_1x_4 - 2x_2x_4 + 3x_4) & \text{if } x_4 = x_1x_2 \\ -x_1x_2x_3 < -x_4x_3 + 2(x_1x_2 - 2x_1x_4 - 2x_2x_4 + 3x_4) & \text{if } x_4 \neq x_1x_2 \end{cases}$$

So the negative term $-x_1x_2x_3$ could be transformed to quadratic term in the same way as the positive term $x_1x_2x_3$.

The cost function could be minimized as long as the transformed one is minimized

$$\min(x_1x_2x_3) = \min(x_4x_3 + 2(x_1x_2 - 2x_1x_4 - 2x_2x_4 + 3x_4)) \quad (6)$$

$$\min(-x_1x_2x_3) = \min(-x_4x_3 + 2(x_1x_2 - 2x_1x_4 - 2x_2x_4 + 3x_4)) \quad (7)$$

Replace p_1q_1 with t_1 , p_1q_2 with t_2 , p_2q_2 with t_3 , p_2q_1 with t_4 , using the variable replacement rule if the coefficient of the term is positive or negative respectively. The cost function becomes

$$\begin{aligned}
& f(p_1, p_2, q_1, q_2, c_1, c_2, c_3, c_4, t_1, t_2, t_3, t_4) \\
= & 43c_1 + 120c_2 + 5c_3 + 44c_4 + 3p_1 - 11p_2 + 3q_1 - 11q_2 + 444t_1 + 252t_2 + 372t_3 + 252t_4 + 68c_1c_2 - 8c_1c_3 \\
& - 16c_1c_4 - 16c_2c_3 - 32c_2c_4 + 68c_3c_4 - 4c_1p_1 - 16c_1p_2 - 8c_2p_1 - 32c_2p_2 - 16c_3p_1 + 2c_3p_2 - 32c_4p_1 + 4c_4p_2 \\
& - 4c_1q_1 - 16c_1q_2 - 8c_2q_1 - 32c_2q_2 - 16c_3q_1 + 2c_3q_2 - 32c_4q_1 + 4c_4q_2 - 16c_1t_1 + 2c_1t_2 - 32c_2t_1 + 4c_1t_3 \\
& + 4c_2t_2 + 2c_1t_4 + 8c_2t_3 - 8c_3t_2 + 4c_2t_4 - 16c_3t_3 - 16c_4t_2 - 8c_3t_4 - 32c_4t_3 - 16c_4t_4 + 4p_1p_2 + 158p_1q_1 \\
& + 95p_1q_2 + 95p_2q_1 + 142p_2q_2 + 4q_1q_2 - 296p_1t_1 - 168p_1t_2 + 12p_2t_1 + 12p_2t_2 - 248p_2t_3 - 168p_2t_4 - 296q_1t_1 \\
& + 12q_2t_1 - 168q_2t_2 - 168q_1t_4 - 248q_2t_3 + 12q_2t_4 + 2t_1t_3 + 14
\end{aligned}$$

Then we do a variable transformation to make the variable in the domain $\{-1,1\}$ using $x_i = \frac{1-s_i}{2}$ if we let $x_1 = p_1, x_2 = p_2, \dots, x_{12} = t_4$.

$$\begin{array}{cccccccccccc}
p_1 & p_2 & q_1 & q_2 & c_1 & c_2 & c_3 & c_4 & t_1 & t_2 & t_3 & t_4 \\
\downarrow & \downarrow & \downarrow & \downarrow & \downarrow & \downarrow & \downarrow & \downarrow & \downarrow & \downarrow & \downarrow & \downarrow \\
s_1 & s_2 & s_3 & s_4 & s_5 & s_6 & s_7 & s_8 & s_9 & s_{10} & s_{11} & s_{12}
\end{array}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& f'(p_1, p_2, q_1, q_2, c_1, c_2, c_3, c_4, t_1, t_2, t_3, t_4) \\
= & 2f(p_1, p_2, q_1, q_2, c_1, c_2, c_3, c_4, t_1, t_2, t_3, t_4) \\
= & (261s_1)/2 + (215s_2)/2 + (261s_3)/2 + (215s_4)/2 - 41s_5 - 82s_6 + 3s_7 + 6s_8 - 137s_9 - 81s_{10} - 107s_{11} - 81s_{12} \\
& + 2s_1s_2 + 79s_1s_3 + (95s_1s_4)/2 + (95s_2s_3)/2 - 2s_1s_5 + 71s_2s_4 - 4s_1s_6 - 8s_2s_5 + 2s_3s_4 - 8s_1s_7 - 16s_2s_6 \\
& - 2s_3s_5 - 16s_1s_8 + s_2s_7 - 4s_3s_6 - 8s_4s_5 - 148s_1s_9 + 2s_2s_8 - 8s_3s_7 - 16s_4s_6 - 84s_1s_{10} + 6s_2s_9 - 16s_3s_8 \\
& + s_4s_7 + 34s_5s_6 + 6s_2s_{10} - 148s_3s_9 + 2s_4s_8 - 4s_5s_7 - 124s_2s_{11} + 6s_4s_9 - 8s_5s_8 - 8s_6s_7 - 84s_2s_{12} - 84s_4s_{10} \\
& - 8s_5s_9 - 16s_6s_8 - 84s_3s_{12} - 124s_4s_{11} + s_5s_{10} - 16s_6s_9 + 34s_7s_8 + 6s_4s_{12} + 2s_5s_{11} + 2s_6s_{10} + s_5s_{12} + 4s_6s_{11} \\
& - 4s_7s_{10} + 2s_6s_{12} - 8s_7s_{11} - 8s_8s_{10} - 4s_7s_{12} - 16s_8s_{11} - 8s_8s_{12} + s_9s_{11} + 794
\end{aligned}$$

This corresponds to Ising Hamiltonian with local fields

$$\mathbf{h}^T = \begin{pmatrix} \sigma_z^{(1)} & \sigma_z^{(2)} & \sigma_z^{(3)} & \sigma_z^{(4)} & \sigma_z^{(5)} & \sigma_z^{(6)} & \sigma_z^{(7)} & \sigma_z^{(8)} & \sigma_z^{(9)} & \sigma_z^{(10)} & \sigma_z^{(11)} & \sigma_z^{(12)} \\ 130.5 & 107.5 & 130.5 & 107.5 & -41 & -82 & 3 & 6 & -137 & -81 & -107 & -81 \end{pmatrix}$$

and coupling terms:

$$\mathbf{J} = \begin{pmatrix} \sigma_z^{(1)} & \sigma_z^{(2)} & \sigma_z^{(3)} & \sigma_z^{(4)} & \sigma_z^{(5)} & \sigma_z^{(6)} & \sigma_z^{(7)} & \sigma_z^{(8)} & \sigma_z^{(9)} & \sigma_z^{(10)} & \sigma_z^{(11)} & \sigma_z^{(12)} \\ \sigma_z^{(1)} & & & & & & & & & & & & \\ \sigma_z^{(2)} & 2 & 79 & 47.5 & -2 & -4 & -8 & -16 & -148 & -84 & 0 & 0 \\ \sigma_z^{(3)} & & 47.5 & 71 & -8 & -16 & 1 & 2 & 6 & 6 & -124 & -84 \\ \sigma_z^{(4)} & & & 2 & -2 & -4 & -8 & -16 & -148 & 0 & 0 & -84 \\ \sigma_z^{(5)} & & & & -8 & -16 & 1 & 2 & 6 & -84 & -124 & 6 \\ \sigma_z^{(6)} & & & & & 34 & -4 & -8 & -8 & 1 & 2 & 1 \\ \sigma_z^{(7)} & & & & & & -8 & -16 & -16 & 2 & 4 & 2 \\ \sigma_z^{(8)} & & & & & & & 34 & 0 & -4 & -8 & -4 \\ \sigma_z^{(9)} & & & & & & & & 0 & -8 & -16 & -8 \\ \sigma_z^{(10)} & & & & & & & & & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ \sigma_z^{(11)} & & & & & & & & & & 0 & 0 \\ \sigma_z^{(12)} & & & & & & & & & & & 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

A.3 Factoring $N = 59989 = 251 \times 239$

The following table shows how to divide the columns to blocks. The lengths of each carries ($c_{11}c_{10}c_9$, $c_8c_7c_6$, $c_5c_4c_3$, c_2c_1) are determined by what is the largest carry for the numbers in right next block are (assuming each variable to be 1, then add them up). For example, the maximum carry for the right-most block (except the least significant bit) is 3 which is 11 in binary, so the length of the carry for this block is 2. This carry is represented as c_2c_1 .

Table 2: Multiplication table for $251 \times 239 = 59989$ in binary.

	2^{15}	2^{14}	2^{13}	2^{12}	2^{11}	2^{10}	2^9	2^8	2^7	2^6	2^5	2^4	2^3	2^2	2^1	2^0
p									1	p_6	p_5	p_4	p_3	p_2	p_1	1
q									1	q_6	q_5	q_4	q_3	q_2	q_1	1
									1	p_6	p_5	p_4	p_3	p_2	p_1	1
							q_1	p_6q_1	p_5q_1	p_4q_1	p_3q_1	p_2q_1	p_1q_1	q_1		
							q_2	p_6q_2	p_5q_2	p_4q_2	p_3q_2	p_2q_2	p_1q_2	q_2		
						q_3	p_6q_3	p_5q_3	p_4q_3	p_3q_3	p_2q_3	p_1q_3	q_3			
				q_4	p_6q_4	p_5q_4	p_4q_4	p_3q_4	p_2q_4	p_1q_4	q_4					
			q_5	p_6q_5	p_5q_5	p_4q_5	p_3q_5	p_2q_5	p_1q_5	q_5						
		q_6	p_6q_6	p_5q_6	p_4q_6	p_3q_6	p_2q_6	p_1q_6	q_6							
	1	p_6	p_5	p_4	p_3	p_2	p_1	1								
	c_{11}	c_{10}	c_9	c_8	c_7	c_6	c_5	c_4	c_3		c_2	c_1				
	1	1	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	1

A.4 Factoring $N = 376289 = 659 \times 571$

The following table shows the carries $c_{14}c_{13}$, $c_{12}c_{11}c_{10}$, $c_9c_8c_7c_6$, $c_5c_4c_3$, c_2c_1 for corresponding blocks. There are overlaps in the column 2^{14} .

Table 3: Multiplication table for $659 \times 571 = 376289$ in binary.

	2^{18}	2^{17}	2^{16}	2^{15}	2^{14}	2^{13}	2^{12}	2^{11}	2^{10}	2^9	2^8	2^7	2^6	2^5	2^4	2^3	2^2	2^1	2^0
										1	p_8	p_7	p_6	p_5	p_4	p_3	p_2	p_1	1
										1	q_8	q_7	q_6	q_5	q_4	q_3	q_2	q_1	1
										1	p_8	p_7	p_6	p_5	p_4	p_3	p_2	p_1	1
							q_2	p_8q_2	p_7q_2	p_6q_2	p_5q_2	p_4q_2	p_3q_2	p_2q_2	p_1q_2	q_2			
						q_3	p_8q_3	p_7q_3	p_6q_3	p_5q_3	p_4q_3	p_3q_3	p_2q_3	p_1q_3	q_3				
				q_4	p_8q_4	p_7q_4	p_6q_4	p_5q_4	p_4q_4	p_3q_4	p_2q_4	p_1q_4	q_4						
			q_5	p_8q_5	p_7q_5	p_6q_5	p_5q_5	p_4q_5	p_3q_5	p_2q_5	p_1q_5	q_5							
		q_6	p_8q_6	p_7q_6	p_6q_6	p_5q_6	p_4q_6	p_3q_6	p_2q_6	p_1q_6	q_6								
		q_7	p_8q_7	p_7q_7	p_6q_7	p_5q_7	p_4q_7	p_3q_7	p_2q_7	p_1q_7	q_7								
	q_8	p_8q_8	p_7q_8	p_6q_8	p_5q_8	p_4q_8	p_3q_8	p_2q_8	p_1q_8	q_8									
	1	p_8	p_7	p_6	p_5	p_4	p_3	p_2	p_1	1									
	c_{14}	c_{13}		c_9	c_8	c_7	c_6	c_5	c_4	c_3		c_2	c_1						
	1	0	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0

A.5 Range of Coefficients

Define the lengths of p and q as l_1 and l_2 , respectively. Let $l_1 = \frac{\log(N)}{2} = O(\log(N))$ and $l_2 = \frac{\log(N)}{2} = O(\log(N))$. Suppose each block contains 3 columns as in Table 2 for factoring 59989. Then the sum for one block is not larger than

$(l_2 + 1) + 2(l_2 + 1) + 4(l_2 + 1) = 7l_2 + 7$, assuming all unknown bits in p and q are 1's and all carries from the block on the right hand side are 1's. Thus, the length of the sum for the current block is at most $\log(7l_2 + 7) = O(\log(\log(N)))$. Therefore, the length of the carry from the sum of current block is at most $\log(7l_2 + 7) - 3 = O(\log(\log(N)))$. Because the length of the carry plus the width of the block (which is 3 in this case) determines the range of the coefficients in the cost function, the maximum coefficient in the cost function corresponding to one block is $(2^{O(\log(\log(N)))})^2 = O((\log(N))^2)$. This square comes from transforming the equation for each block to a square that makes the equation hold. (See appendix A.2 for examples of these equations.) There are approximately $\frac{\log(N)}{3}$ blocks in total for this example, such that the coefficient in the combined cost function containing all cost functions for each block is no larger than $\frac{\log(N)}{3} * O((\log(N))^2) = O((\log(N))^3)$. Note that for the majority of cases, this becomes $O((\log(N))^2)$ because most of terms in different blocks are different. Since the variable replacement only effects the scale of the range of the coefficients linearly, the coefficients of the final quadratic cost function are polynomially large with regard to the size of N , the number to be factored.