

Ensemble Fluid Simulations on Quantum Computers

Sauro Succi^{*1}, Wael Itani^{†2}, Katepalli R. Sreenivasan^{‡2,3,4}, and René Steijl^{§5}

¹Fondazione Istituto Italiano di Tecnologia
Center for Life Nano-Neuroscience at la Sapienza
Viale Regina Elena 291, 00161 Roma, Italy

²Tandon School of Engineering, New York University
Brooklyn, New York, NY 11201, United States of America

³Courant Institute of Mathematical Sciences, New York University
New York, NY 10012, United States of America

⁴Department of Physics, New York University
New York, NY 10003, United States of America

⁵James Watt School of Engineering, University of Glasgow
G12 8QQ Glasgow, United Kingdom

April 13, 2023

Abstract

We discuss the viability of ensemble simulations of fluid flows on quantum computers. The basic idea is to formulate a functional Liouville equation for the probability distribution of the flow field configuration and recognize that, due to its linearity, such an equation is in principle more amenable to quantum computing than the equations of fluid motion. After suitable marginalization and associated closure, the Liouville approach is shown to require several hundreds of logical qubits, hence calling for a major thrust in current noise correction and mitigation techniques.

1 Introduction

The extreme complexity of most problems in modern science and society poses a very steep challenge to our best theoretical and computational methods. As an example, even the most powerful supercomputers, reaching up to exascale operations (one billion billions floating point operations per second) pale in front of the task of predicting the weather on the planetary scale based on the direct simulation of the equations of fluid motion [1]. Besides, this and similar problems are typically subject to various sources of uncertainty arising from the initial data and other parameters affecting the solution. As a result, each single case-study requires several realizations in order to accumulate sufficient statistical information (Ensemble Simulations), further reinforcing the quest of computational power.

Given that electronic computers are facing very stringent energy constraints, alternative simulation strategies are constantly sought. Among these, enormous efforts have been devoted in the last decade towards the development of quantum computers, using hardware devices capable of exploiting the ability of quantum systems to occupy a multitude of states at the same time (quantum entanglement). The immediate advantage is that a quantum system can *in principle* perform a multitude of parallel quantum computations, as opposed to classical computers which can only operate on binary states (bits). Lately, not a day goes by without hearing the last quantum computing breakthrough. However, leaving aside the hype [2], the fact remains that turning the immense potential of quantum computing into a concrete tool for scientific

*sauro.succi@gmail.com

†itani@nyu.edu

‡katepalli.sreenivasan@nyu.edu

§rene.steijl@glasgow.ac.uk

purposes remains very challenging. The reasons are many, but, in a nutshell, entanglement is very fragile and tends to crumble pretty quickly under the effects of environmental noise, which is extremely hard to avoid at any reasonable temperature—a problem known as “decoherence”. Notwithstanding these major barriers, it is worth exploring the contributions that quantum computers can possibly make to the prospect of ensemble simulations of fluid flows.

2 Ensemble Simulations

Ensemble simulations have gained popularity in the recent years, thanks to the availability of large supercomputers. The main idea is accumulate statistics over the many sources of uncertainties that are associated, for instance with weather forecasting, by running series of simulations with different initial conditions and/or parametric realizations [3, 1].

To illustrate the idea we consider a set of nonlinear partial differential equations and discretize them on a grid with, say, G grid points. Let $\vec{u}(t)$ be the set of unknowns after discretization, for instance the three-dimensional velocity field of a fluid flow; they obey a set of $O(G)$ first-order ODE’s in (generalized) Langevin form, given by

$$\frac{d\vec{u}}{dt} = f(\vec{u}; \vec{\lambda}), \quad (1)$$

with initial conditions $\vec{u}(0) = \vec{u}_0$. In the above, $\vec{\lambda}$ stands for a set of parameters subject to various sources of uncertainty, thus acting like “noise” on the system. Ensemble simulations correspond to the generation of statistics of solutions upon changing initial conditions and/or perturbing the system parameters. Formally, this amounts to generating a probability distribution function (PDF) for the solutions $\vec{u}(x, t)$, defined by:

$$p(\vec{u}, t) |\delta\vec{u}| = \frac{\delta t}{T}, \quad (2)$$

where δt is the time spent by the set of trajectories, spanning the time interval $[0 \leq t \leq T]$, in a volume of phase-space $|\delta\vec{u}|$. Generating the trajectories is extremely demanding, since by construction each single simulation is set to stress the most advanced computer resources to their limit [3, 4].

Quantum computing could help realizing an exponential speedup on each of these simulations. However, besides all standard concerns affecting quantum computing, two additional issues stand on the way of this program: *quantum mechanics is linear and unitary, while the physics of fluids is neither*. Even when energy is explicitly conserved, the fluid model would not be norm-preserving, thus non-unitary.¹

Several ways around these problems are currently under exploration, based on various strategies, some of which resort to Carleman linearization of the fluid equations [5, 6, 7], while some others leverage nonlinear quantum ODE solvers [9]. In computational fluid dynamics applications of quantum computers, the use of a hybrid quantum/classical formulation is the most widely used approach to deal with the non-linearity of the governing equations of fluid dynamics [9, 10, 12], effectively by accounting for this in the classical part of the algorithm. All of these, however, focus on the solution of the dynamic equations of motion, with no focus on ensemble simulations.

In this brief note, we sketch a potential strategy which offers two major assets at the outset. First, it captures by construction all the statistical information that is sought on the system dynamics (statistical dynamics). Second, it does not resort to any linearization of the dynamic equations, but starts directly from an inherently linear representation of the corresponding probability distribution function (PDF).

The passage from Newtonian dynamics to statistical dynamics is a standard topic in statistical physics, where it is known as Liouville formulation of classical N-body mechanics. This formalism is elegant and conducive to very valuable approximations, mostly at the level of one-body effective kinetic equations, the most outstanding examples of which are the Boltzmann and Fokker-Planck equations.

Unfortunately, at least on classical computers, working with Liouville equations is completely unviable since the N-body distribution function lives in a $O(N)$ -dimensional space, with N of the order of the number of grid points of the dynamic simulation, hence easily in the order of billions or more for current supercomputer simulations.

This looks like a “medicine-is-worse-than-the-disease” scenario, and it is therefore of interest to explore what quantum computing could possibly contribute to easing up the difficulty.

¹We make abstraction of inviscid fluids, which are nonetheless a (useful) idealization

Liouville equation

$$p(x, t_0)\delta x(t_0) = p(x, t)\delta x(t)$$




Figure 1: Geometrical interpretation of the Liouville equation. The cloud of points representing various realisations of the system at $t = t_0$ evolves each along its own trajectory dictated by the dynamic equation $\vec{u} = f(\vec{u})$, with initial conditions $\vec{u}(t_0) = \vec{u}_0$. As time unfolds, the cloud changes its shape but not its volume (if $\nabla \cdot \vec{u} \neq 0$) and consequently the probability distribution $p(\vec{u}, t)$ is invariant along the trajectory $\frac{dp}{dt} = 0$, leading to the Liouville equation.

3 Functional Liouville Equation

By virtue of the Liouville theorem (Fig 1), the N-point PDF associated with the (nonlinear) Langevin equations obeys a linear Liouville Fokker-Planck kinetic equation (LFPE) of the form

$$\partial_t p_N + \sum_{i=1}^N \partial_{u_i} [f(u) p_N - D \partial_{u_i} p_N] = 0, \quad (3)$$

where D is the diffusion coefficient associated with the noise in the (linear) Langevin equation (1).²

Since the Liouville equation is linear by construction, it can operate under the same framework as quantum mechanics and in particular, it can benefit of quantum linear-algebra solvers [11].

3.1 Taming the Dimensional Curse

The Liouville equation is very elegant but operationally unfeasible, since it lives in a ultra-dimensional space with as many dimensions as the number of grid sites where the direct simulations are performed; as already stated, this number is easily in excess of many billions for present-day supercomputers. This is the so called dimensional curse, affecting many problems in modern science and engineering.

The main merit of the Liouville equation, though, is that it opens up lower-dimensional approximations which can often capture the essence of the physical problem at hand. The technical procedure is called *marginalization* and consists of deriving equations for lower-order marginals of the original N-body PDF. Formally, this is obtained by projecting out the unwanted/unnecessary variables by integrating them out, as follows:

$$P_M(u_1 \dots u_M) = \int P_N(u_1 \dots u_N) du_{M+1} \dots du_N, \quad (4)$$

where $1 \leq M \leq N$ defines the order of the marginal distribution. By applying the above definition to the N-body Liouville equation (3), one readily obtains

$$\partial_t p_M + \sum_{i=1}^M \partial_{u_i} [F(u) p_M - D \partial_{u_i} p_M] = 0, \quad (5)$$

where

$$F(u) \equiv F(u_1 \dots u_M) = \int f(u_1 \dots u_N) p_N(u_1 \dots u_N) du_{M+1} \dots du_N \quad (6)$$

²Caveat: Since diffusion results from linearising $f(u; \lambda)$ around a reference value λ_0 , the corresponding diffusion coefficient is generally dependent on the actual flow field, that is, $D = D(u)$.

is the effective M -body force. Here, we have assumed no-flux boundary conditions. From the above relation, it is immediately clear that the explicit expression of $F(u)$ generally depends on the unknown N -body PDF, signaling a much expected closure problem. This is, of course, a key issue for the success of the whole program, but in the following we shall proceed by assuming that a plausible closure can be found. In light of the major advances in statistical mechanics and the theory of coarse-graining this is, after all, a plausible assumption (though its precise realisation has often defined major efforts).

Next, let us consider a generic observable $A(u_1 \dots u_N)$, whose average value is given by

$$\langle A \rangle(t) = \frac{1}{Z(t)} \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} p(u, t) A(u) du, \quad (7)$$

where $Z(t) = \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} p(u, t) du$ and u , as before, is a shorthand for $(u_1 \dots u_N)$.

If the dependence on each of the N independent variables u_j is irreducible, the average of u_j depends on the full N -body PDF $p_N(u_1 \dots u_N)$, with no room for marginalization. But this is rarely the case in classical physics. For instance, if $K = \sum_{j=1}^N u_j^2$ is the total kinetic energy of the fluid, its average depends only on the one-point distribution

$$\langle K \rangle(t) = \sum_{j=1}^N \int u_j^2 p_N(u) du = \sum_{i=1}^N \int u_i^2 p_1(u_i) du_i, \quad (8)$$

where $p_1(u_i)$ results from integrating out all variables u_1 to u_N , but u_i . Likewise, if all we need is the value of the average velocity field at the space slice x_i , the 1-point PDF will suffice

$$\langle u_i \rangle(t) = \int u_i p_1(u_i, t) du_i. \quad (9)$$

By the same token, two-point observables require two-point PDFs, and so on, at all higher orders. That said, we proceed to estimate the computational viability of the marginalization procedure.

The count goes as follows. The N -body PDF associated with a discrete grid with G lattice sites, each hosting F fields discretized over a set of n discrete values, takes on $(GF)^n$ discrete values. The number of qubits to represent the fully N -body discrete PDF is then

$$q = GF \log_2 n. \quad (10)$$

Given that G is in the order of many billions for present-day supercomputer simulations, this requires multi-billions logical bits, a number which appears to be totally unrealistic in any foreseeable future. Fortunately, marginalization presents a much more optimistic picture.

If each field on a discrete grid with G lattices sites is connected to $z \ll G$ neighbours, the lowest order irreducible marginal is of order $M = zF$ and the qubit count now reduces to

$$q = zF \log_2 n. \quad (11)$$

This is still very demanding but vastly simpler than (10) since for the three-dimensional Navier-Stokes equations, the parameter zF is on the order of tens. This shows that marginalization stands good chances to circumvent the dimensional curse on a quantum computer. In the succeeding sections we provide a more quantitative assessment in this direction. A useful reference in this context is [13].

4 Practical Examples

We begin by inspecting the Liouville formulation for the case of the Burgers equation, describing a one-dimensional pressure-free fluid. Since we consider the noiseless Burgers equation (whose noisy version is the famous Kardar-Parisi-Zhang equation), we set the diffusion to zero below.

4.1 The Burgers-Liouville Equation

The Burgers equation describing one-dimensional pressureless fluids, reads as

$$\partial_t u + u \partial_x u = \nu \partial_{xx} u, \quad (12)$$

Liouville-Burgers




Figure 2: Geometrical interpretation of the Liouville-Burgers equation. Each of the three independent variables u_j, u_{j-1}, u_j takes up to $n = 6$ values, hence the discrete Liouville-Burgers equation takes values on a set of three-points paths labeled by three integers n_{j-1}, n_j, n_{j+1} , each varying between 1 and 6. The figure reports the paths $\{413\}$, $\{236\}$ and $\{541\}$.

where ν is the kinematic viscosity.

A simple center-finite difference scheme gives

$$\dot{u}_j = -u_j(u_{j+1} - u_{j-1}) + \nu(u_{j+1} - 2u_j + u_{j-1}) \equiv \sum_{k=-1}^1 B_{j,k}(u_j)u_{j+k} \equiv f_j(u), \quad (13)$$

where the space step is made unity for simplicity and B_{jk} , $j = 1, N$, $k = -1, 0, 1$ is the (nonlinear) ‘‘Burgers’’ matrix. In explicit form, we have:

$$B_{j,j-1} = \nu - \frac{1}{4}u_j, \quad B_{j,j} = -2\nu - \frac{1}{4}u_j, \quad B_{j,j+1} = \nu + \frac{1}{4}u_j. \quad (14)$$

The N-point Burgers-Liouville equation takes the following form:

$$\partial_t p_N + \sum_{j=1}^N \partial_{u_j} \left[\sum_{k=-1}^1 B_{j,k} u_{j+k} \right] p_N. \quad (15)$$

Here $p_N \equiv p(u_1 \dots u_N, t)$ is the N-body PDF associated with the spatial grid of $G = N$ points.

Since \dot{u}_j depends on the triplet (u_{j-1}, u_j, u_{j+1}) , the lowest order irreducible marginal is the three-point PDF p_3 , which is defined by integrating out all independent variables but three, u_{j-1}, u_j, u_{j+1} . This gives:

$$p_3(u_{j-1}, u_j, u_{j+1}) = \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} p(u_1 \dots u_N) du_1 \dots du_{j-2} du_{j+2} \dots du_N. \quad (16)$$

The corresponding 3-point kinetic equation takes the form:

$$\partial_t p_3 + \partial_{u_{j-1}} \left[\sum_{k=-1}^1 B_{j-1,k} U_{j-1+k} \right] p_3 + \partial_{u_j} \left[\sum_{k=-1}^1 B_{j,k} U_{j+k} \right] p_3 + \partial_{u_{j+1}} \left[\sum_{k=-1}^1 B_{j+1,k} U_{j+1+k} \right] p_3 = 0. \quad (17)$$

Here, by periodicity, $j - 2 = j + 1$ and $j + 2 = j - 1$.

In the above we have defined

$$U_j(t) = \int u_j p(u, t) du_1 \dots du_{j-2} du_{j+1} du_N, \quad (18)$$

which is a generally unknown function of u_{j-1}, u_j, u_{j+1} . Hence a suitable expression for U_j versus u_j needs to be worked out, which is the usual closure problem. In the following, we shall proceed on the assumption that such a closure can be worked out.

With reference to the expression (11), we have $z = 3$ and $F = 1$, hence the corresponding qubit count gives

$$q = 3 \log_2 n. \quad (19)$$

Current quantum computers feature up to $q \sim 500$ *nominal* qubits [14], implying that one can reach up to $n \sim 2^{500/3}$, far beyond any practical resolution needed. For a reasonable resolution, say $n \sim 1000 \sim 2^{10}$, we obtain $q \sim 30$, which appears viable once noise and decoherence are tamed.

4.2 Example 2: The Navier-Stokes Liouville Equation

The Navier-Stokes governing the motion of compressible, dissipative fluids read as follows

$$\partial_t \rho + \partial_a (\rho u_a) = 0, \quad (20)$$

$$\partial_t (\rho u_a + \partial_b (\rho u_a u_b + P \delta_{ab} - \sigma_{ab})) = 0, \quad (21)$$

where ρ is the density, u_a , ($a = x, y, z$) the flow velocity, $P = P(\rho)$ the fluid pressure and σ_{ab} the dissipative tensor.

With reference to the expression (11), we now have $F = 4$ (density and three velocity components) and $z = 7$ (each grid site connected to six nearest neighbors), hence the corresponding qubit count gives

$$q = 28 \log_2 n. \quad (22)$$

With $n = 10^3$, we have $q = 280$, much larger than for Burgers, but still within the nominal capabilities of current quantum hardware [14]. Different representations or altogether different formulations, such as lattice Boltzmann [15] methods, may lead to more favourable scalings, this being a topic of interest for future research.

The above considerations reveal the many issues generally associated with quantum computing, particularly noise and decoherence. In the following, we briefly comment on a further issue which is peculiar to quantum simulations in real time, namely time marching.

5 Sketch of the Quantum Algorithm

As mentioned above, a number of different quantum computing strategies have been proposed in the recent past to simulate fluid problems on quantum computers. While all of these methods need to handle the nonlinearity issue, there is no such need in our case, since the problem is linear from scratch; one can proceed by resorting to quantum linear solver algorithm [11], as detailed below.

We start by writing the 3-point Liouville equation in the explicit conservative form

$$\partial_t p + \partial_u (Up) + \partial_v (Vp) + \partial_w (Wp) = 0, \quad (23)$$

where we have set $u \equiv u_{j-1}$, $v \equiv u_j$ and $w \equiv u_{j+1}$ and (U, V, W) are three supposedly known functions of (u, v, w) . Upon discretizing the three-dimensional functional space (u, v, w) , (u_i, v_j, w_k) , $i, j, k = 1, n$, we obtain a set of $G = n^3$ ODE's of the form

$$\dot{p}_{ijk} + U_{ii',jk} p_{i',jk} + V_{i,jj',k} p_{ij',k} + W_{ij,kk'} p_{ij,k'} = 0, \quad (24)$$

where U, V, W are the discrete matrices associated with the three flux terms.

A simple Euler forward time marching delivers

$$p^{t+1} - (1 - Ldt)p^t = 0, \quad (25)$$

with the initial condition $p^0 = p_0$, t labelling discrete time, and p_0 being the initial condition, all spatial indices being suppressed for simplicity and L denotes the sum of the matrices, $L = U + V + W$. The above relations deliver a linear system for the unknown $p = p^{(0)}, p^{(1)} \dots p^{(M)}$, each component being an array of dimension n^3 . In explicit form,

$$p^{(0)} = p_0 \quad (26)$$

$$p^{(m+1)} - (1 - Ldt)p^{(m)} = 0 \quad (27)$$

$$m = 0, \dots, M - 1, \quad (28)$$

where $M = T/dt$ is the number of time slices. This is a linear system $Ap = q$, with a sparse lower-triangular matrix structure and q features just a single entry, p_0 . As a result, it is readily solved as a causal sequence of matrix-vector products. It is still formally a linear system; as such, it can be handled by quantum linear solver algorithms, as shown in [5] for the case of the Burgers equation on the order of $O(10-100)$ grid points.

The computational quantum complexity is given by

$$\mathcal{C}_q \propto s\phi T^2 \text{Polylog}(G, 1/\epsilon), \quad (29)$$

where s is the sparsity of the matrix, ϕ is the fidelity of the initial condition, T the time-span, G the grid size, and ϵ is the error tolerance.

A classical explicit algorithm would scale instead like

$$\mathcal{C}_c \propto sTG, \quad (30)$$

showing that the main advantage is the $\text{polylog}(G)$ factor, partly reabsorbed by the T^2 dependence on the time-span. Since $T \sim G^{1/3}$, a significant quantum speed-up can be expected.

6 Comparison with the Dynamic Approach

In the beginning of this paper, we have cautioned the reader about the practical unviability of the Liouville approach on classical computers, as the problem occupies a space with about thirty dimensions. Hence, on classical computers there is no option but solving repeated realizations of the fluid equations. It is therefore of interest to assess the cost of the dynamic approach on quantum computers. Current approach provide log scaling in the number of grid points and typically a quadratic scaling in time. With such a scaling, running a billion grid points (10^9) over a million time steps, would take about 10^{21} operations, hence that many dynamic degrees of freedom. By running an ensemble of 1000 simulations, say, this comes to 10^{24} , namely about 80 qubits, much less than for the Liouville equation. The problem though is that time-marching on a quantum computers involves the reconstruction of the full quantum state at each time step (by virtue of the no-cloning theorem), an operation which scales exponentially with the number of qubits. For the case of a billion grid points, namely 30 qubits, this adds a dramatic slowdown, which is a major issue in quantum computing [16].

It thus appears that ensemble simulations of fluid flows on quantum computers are best performed via the Liouville approach, provided (i) a sensible closure can be worked out, and (ii) hundreds of reliable logical qubits can be used. Finally, we remark that a similar statement applies to basically any nonlinear field theory.

7 Summary

Summarizing, we have assessed the viability of the functional Liouville formulation for ensemble simulations of fluid flows on quantum computers. The present analysis refers to a blue-sky scenario whereby a quantum algorithm capable of logarithmic scaling with the number of dynamic degrees of freedom is available *and* running on *ideal* quantum computers, with no appreciable decoherence and/or noise problems.

In actual practice, quantum computing ensemble simulations of the Navier-Stokes equations demand hundreds of noiseless *logical* qubits. Given that current quantum computing typically works only up to a few logical qubits, say of the order ten, the target appears to be in the future. This is no invitation to surrender, but just a realistic appraisal to be contrasted with the current (mostly commercial) hype around quantum computing (for a highly informed assessment, see [2]).

8 Acknowledgements

The authors have benefited from valuable discussions with many colleagues, particularly S.S. Bharadwaj, D. Buaria, P. Coveney, N. Defenu, A. Di Meglio, M. Grossi, A. Mezzacapo, S. Ruffo, A. Solfanelli and T. Weaving. S.S. acknowledges financial support from the Italian National Centre for HPC, Big Data and Quantum Computing (CN00000013).

References

- [1] F. Tennie, T.N. Palmer, Quantum Computers for Weather and Climate Prediction: The Good, the Bad and the Noisy, arXiv:2210.17460v1 [quant-ph] 31 Oct 2022
- [2] S. Das Sarma, Quantum computing has a hype problem, MIT Technology Review, March 28, 2022 <https://www.technologyreview.com/2022/03/28/1048355/quantum-computing-has-a-hype-problem/>
- [3] A. Navarra, J. Tribbia and S. Klus, Estimation of Koopman Transfer Operators for the Equatorial Pacific SST, The Journal of Atmospheric Sciences, 1227, 2021, DOI: 10.1175/JAS-D-20-0136.1
- [4] A.P. Bhati, S. Wan, D. Alfe, et al., Pandemic drugs at pandemic speed: infrastructure for accelerating COVID-19 drug discovery with hybrid machine learning-and physics-based simulations on high-performance computers, Interface focus 11 (6), 20210018, 2021
- [5] J.P. Liu, H.O. Kolden, H.K. Krovi, et al., Efficient quantum algorithm for dissipative nonlinear differential equations, PNAS, 118(35) e2026805118 (2021)
- [6] A. Mezzacapo, M. Sanz, L. Lamata, et al., Quantum simulator for transport phenomena in fluid flows, Scientific reports 5 (1), 1-7 (2015)
- [7] W. Itani and S. Succi, Analysis of Carleman Linearization of Lattice Boltzmann, Fluids 7, 24. <https://doi.org/10.3390/fluids 7010024> (2022)
- [8] L. Budinski, Quantum algorithm for the Navier–Stokes equations by using the streamfunction-vorticity formulation and the lattice Boltzmann method arXiv:2103.03804v2[quant-ph] 15 Mar 2022
- [9] F. Gaitan, Finding flows of a Navier-Stokes fluid through quantum computing, Npj Quantum Information, 60 (2020)
- [10] R. Steijl, Quantum algorithms for fluid simulations, <http://dx.doi.org/10.5722/intechopen.86685> (2019)
- [11] A.W. Harrow, A. Hassidim, S. Lloyd, Quantum algorithm for linear systems of equations, Phys. Rev. Lett. 103 (15), 150502 (2009)
- [12] S.S. Bharadwaj and K.R. Sreenivasan, Quantum computing of fluid dynamics, Pramana, Indian Acad. Sci. Conf. Aer. 3, 77-96 (2020)
- [13] G. Xu, A.J. Daley, P. Givi and R.D. Somma, Turbulent mixing simulation via a quantum algorithm, AIAA J., 56 (2), 687-699, (2018)
- [14] <https://www.ibm.com/quantum/roadmap>
- [15] S. Succi, The Lattice Boltzmann Equation for fluid dynamics and beyond, Oxford U.P. 2001, The Lattice Boltzmann Equation for Complex States of Flowing Matter, Oxford U.P. 2018
- [16] M. Lubasch, J. Joo, P. Moinier, M. Kiffner, D. Jaksch, Variational quantum algorithms for nonlinear problems Physical Review A 101 (1), 010301(R) (2021)