

QAOA with random and subgraph phase operators

Anthony Wilkie,¹ Igor Gaidai,¹ James Ostrowski,¹ and Rebekah Herrman^{1,*}

¹*Department of Industrial and Systems Engineering
University of Tennessee at Knoxville
Knoxville, TN 37996*

The quantum approximate optimization algorithm (QAOA) is a promising quantum algorithm that can be used to approximately solve combinatorial optimization problems. The usual QAOA ansatz consists of an alternating application of the cost and mixer Hamiltonians. In this work, we study how using Hamiltonians other than the usual cost Hamiltonian, dubbed custom phase operators, can affect the performance of QAOA. We derive an expected value formula for QAOA with custom phase operators at $p = 1$ and show numerically that some of these custom phase operators can achieve higher approximation ratio than the original algorithm implementation. Out of all the graphs tested, 0.036% of the random custom phase operators, 75.9% of the subgraph custom phase operators, 95.1% of the triangle-removed custom phase operators, and 93.9% of the maximal degree edge-removed custom phase operators have a higher approximation ratio than the original QAOA implementation. This finding opens up the question of whether better phase operators can be designed to further improve the performance of QAOA.

I. INTRODUCTION

The quantum approximate optimization algorithm (QAOA) is an algorithm consisting of a parameterized quantum circuit that is well-suited to approximate solutions to combinatorial optimization (CO) problems [1]. The algorithm evolves a given input state under the alternating action of cost and mixing Hamiltonians for variable amounts of time that are selected to optimize the expectation of the cost Hamiltonian. QAOA can be used to find an approximate solution to any CO problem that can be formulated as an Ising problem [2], among which the most studied is the MaxCut problem [3–7]. The goal of MaxCut is to partition the vertices of a given graph $G = (V, E)$ into two sets to maximize the number of edges between the sets.

QAOA can be implemented on noisy intermediate scale quantum (NISQ) devices for some small-scale problems [8–10], but it is challenging to extend it to larger problems due to the depth limitations of the current generation of NISQ devices. Several variations of QAOA have been developed that attempt to reduce the required hardware resources, such as multi-angle QAOA and XQAOA [11–14], but hardware implementation remains challenging. As a result, the performance of QAOA is often studied through the classical simulations of the algorithm. In particular, closed-form equations for the expected value of the MaxCut cost Hamiltonian C have been derived for the special case when only one layer of QAOA is applied [7, 11]. Furthermore, more general closed-form equations for all combinatorial optimization problems that have an Ising formulation have also been derived by Ozaeta et. al [2]. Closer inspection of these equations reveals that the expectation value of the cost Hamiltonian may be negatively affected by the presence of triangles in the graph or may be impacted by the maximum degree of the graph. As such, removing one of the terms that correspond to an edge in a triangle or an edge incident to a maximal degree vertex of the graph might improve the performance of QAOA. Furthermore, one can consider other modifications of the QAOA circuit, detailed below, and their effect on the performance of QAOA. One such modification is to use a subgraph of the original graph to generate the circuit. Using subgraphs for QAOA has been explored in [15–17] in order to solve large instances of the MaxCut problem using fewer quantum resources.

Generally, the state vector prepared by the QAOA circuit can be written as

$$|\vec{\gamma}, \vec{\beta}\rangle = U(B, \beta_p)U(C, \gamma_p) \cdots U(B, \beta_1)U(C, \gamma_1)|s\rangle$$

where $U(B, \beta)$ and $U(C, \gamma)$ are the unitary evolution operators under the action of the corresponding Hamiltonians B and C , and $|s\rangle$ is a maximum (or minimum) energy eigenstate of B . The mixer Hamiltonian B is usually defined as a sum of Pauli-X operators on each qubit

$$B = \sum X_i,$$

* corresponding author; rherrma2@utk.edu

although other mixers have been considered [18, 19]. The *phase operator* Hamiltonian C is usually taken to be equal to the *cost* (or phase) Hamiltonian C' , i.e. the Hamiltonian whose expectation needs to be minimized by QAOA

$$\min \langle \vec{\gamma}, \vec{\beta} | C' | \vec{\gamma}, \vec{\beta} \rangle.$$

However, the ideas described above make the phase operator different from the cost Hamiltonian ($C \neq C'$), which may potentially improve the performance of QAOA for some choices of the phase operators.

One similar development has been considered in Ref. [20], where the authors used a Hamiltonian based on hardware connectivity graph as a phase operator, and concluded that a worse, but still non-trivial performance can be achieved with such phase operator. However, they did not try to search for other phase operators that could potentially achieve better performance than the usual cost Hamiltonian.

Other works have tried using different phase operators. In particular, the authors of Ref. [21] suggested removing the terms of the phase operator corresponding to the edges that are not likely to be in the MaxCut and found that this indeed may improve the performance of QAOA, while also reducing the number of gates in its circuit implementation. Another independent work [22] considered a different set of strategies to choose the terms to remove and arrived at similar conclusions for the case of not-all-equal 3-SAT problems. However, both of these works rely on starting from a classical solution, which results in a poor performance if such solution is far from optimal.

In this work, we focus instead on strategies that are based directly on graph structure and do not require classical solutions. Another important contribution of this work is the analytical formula for the expected value of MaxCut for arbitrary subgraph phase operators in the $p = 1$ case, which we derive in Section II.

In Section III, we start by comparing the standard ($C = C'$) formulation to a “random” phase operator formulation, where each term in the cost Hamiltonian is selected randomly. Note that one can imagine a phase operator with $Z_i Z_j$ interactions as a graph with edges $Z_i Z_j$, hence we may also talk about phase operator graphs occasionally throughout the text. We also consider the case where some fraction of the terms in the cost C' Hamiltonian are used to generate the phase operator C_{sub}^α , where α represents the fraction of terms selected from the original Hamiltonian C' . If G is quite dense and α is small, the number of terms and, correspondingly, gates in the circuit can be significantly reduced, therefore lowering the error in the circuit. Lastly, there is evidence that triangles in problem graphs affect the QAOA MaxCut approximation ratio [3, 4, 23, 24]. Thus, we consider a special case of the phase operator that corresponds to the original graph G with a subset of triangles removed. The resulting graph is then used to generate the phase operator.

Finally, we discuss this work and future research directions in Section IV.

II. DERIVATION OF ANALYTICAL MAXCUT EXPECTED VALUE WITH CUSTOM PHASE OPERATORS

For the MaxCut problem, the cost Hamiltonian is defined as:

$$C' = \sum_{uv \in E} C'_{uv} = \sum_{uv \in E} \frac{1}{2} (\mathbb{I} - Z_u Z_v) \quad (1)$$

Using the Pauli-solver algorithm detailed in [25], the expected value of $\langle C'_{uv} \rangle$ from Eq. (1) after 1 layer of QAOA with a random Hamiltonian is:

$$\langle s | e^{i\gamma C_{\text{rand}}} e^{i\beta B} C_{uv} e^{-i\beta B} e^{-i\gamma C_{\text{rand}}} | s \rangle = \frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{2} \langle s | e^{i\gamma C_{\text{rand}}} e^{i\beta B} Z_u Z_v e^{-i\beta B} e^{-i\gamma C_{\text{rand}}} | s \rangle. \quad (2)$$

Most terms of the mixer commute to leave

$$e^{i\beta B} Z_u Z_v e^{-i\beta B} = \cos^2(2\beta) Z_u Z_v + \sin(2\beta) \cos(2\beta) (Y_u Z_v + Z_u Y_v) + \sin^2(2\beta) Y_u Y_v. \quad (3)$$

The first term of this sum commutes with $e^{-i\gamma C_{\text{rand}}}$ and does not contribute to the expected value of the sum, i.e.

$$\langle s | e^{i\gamma C_{\text{rand}}} Z_u Z_v e^{-i\gamma C_{\text{rand}}} | s \rangle = 0$$

Let us look at the effect of conjugation on the second term of Eq. (3)

$$\langle s | e^{i\gamma C_{\text{rand}}} Y_u Z_v e^{-i\gamma C_{\text{rand}}} | s \rangle.$$

C_{rand} has terms of the form $\frac{1}{2}(\mathbb{I} - Z_a Z_b)$, however all terms that do not have the form $Z_u Z_c$ for some c commute and cancel, so

$$\langle s | e^{i\gamma C_{\text{rand}}} Y_u Z_v e^{-i\gamma C_{\text{rand}}} | s \rangle = \langle s | e^{-i\gamma \sum_c (Z_u Z_c)} Y_u Z_v | s \rangle.$$

If $Z_u Z_v$ is not a term of C_{rand} , then there is no contribution to the expected value and

$$\langle s | e^{-i\gamma \sum_c (Z_u Z_c)} Y_u Z_v | s \rangle = 0$$

Otherwise,

$$\begin{aligned} \langle s | e^{-i\gamma \sum_c (Z_u Z_c)} Y_u Z_v | s \rangle &= \langle s | e^{-i\gamma Z_u Z_v} e^{-i\gamma \sum_{c \neq v} (Z_u Z_c)} Y_u Z_v | s \rangle \\ &= \langle s | (\cos(\gamma)\mathbb{I} - i \sin(\gamma) Z_u Z_v) \prod_{i=1}^d (\cos(\gamma)\mathbb{I} - i \sin(\gamma) Z_u Z_{c_i}) Y_u Z_v | s \rangle \end{aligned}$$

where d is the number of terms of the form $Z_u Z_c$ in C_{rand} , with $c \neq v$. The only term that contributes to the expected value is $-i \sin(\gamma) Z_u Z_v \cos^d(\gamma) Y_u Z_v = -\sin(\gamma) \cos^d(\gamma) X_u$, which implies

$$\langle s | e^{i\gamma C_{\text{rand}}} Y_u Z_v e^{-i\gamma C_{\text{rand}}} | s \rangle = \langle s | -\sin(\gamma) \cos^d(\gamma) X_u | s \rangle = -\sin(\gamma) \cos^d(\gamma).$$

By symmetry, the third term of Eq. (3) is also 0 if $Z_u Z_v$ is not a term of C_{rand} , otherwise:

$$\langle s | e^{i\gamma C_{\text{rand}}} Z_u Y_v e^{-i\gamma C_{\text{rand}}} | s \rangle = \langle s | -\sin(\gamma) \cos^e(\gamma) X_v | s \rangle = -\sin(\gamma) \cos^e(\gamma).$$

where e is the number of terms of the form $Z_h Z_v$ in C_{rand} , where $h \neq u$.

Hence, we have

$$\langle s | e^{i\gamma C_{\text{rand}}} (Y_u Z_v + Z_u Y_v) e^{-i\gamma C_{\text{rand}}} | s \rangle = -\chi_{uv} \sin(\gamma) (\cos^d(\gamma) + \cos^e(\gamma)),$$

where $\chi_{uv} = 1$ if $Z_u Z_v$ is a term in C_{rand} and 0 otherwise.

Let us look at the effect of conjugation on the last term of Eq. (3)

$$\begin{aligned} \langle s | e^{i\gamma C_{\text{rand}}} Y_u Y_v e^{-i\gamma C_{\text{rand}}} | s \rangle &= \langle s | e^{i\gamma \sum_{b \neq v} Z_u Z_b} e^{i\gamma \sum_{a \neq u} Z_a Z_v} Y_u Y_v | s \rangle \\ &= \langle s | \prod_{i=1}^d (\cos(\gamma)\mathbb{I} - i \sin(\gamma) Z_u Z_{b_i}) \prod_{j=1}^e (\cos(\gamma)\mathbb{I} - i \sin(\gamma) Z_{a_j} Z_v) Y_u Y_v | s \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

By approaches similar to those in [25], the expected value contribution from this term is $\frac{1}{2} \cos^{d+e-2f}(\gamma) (1 - \cos^f(2\gamma))$, where f is the number of pairs of terms that satisfy the triangle condition for edge (u, v) . We say two terms $Z_u Z_w$ and $Z_w Z_v$ for $w \neq u, v$ in the phase operator C_{rand} satisfy the *triangle condition* if (u, v) is an edge in the graph of interest.

Combining the above terms yields

$$\langle C'_{uv} \rangle = \frac{1}{2} + \frac{\chi_{uv}}{4} \sin(4\beta) \sin(\gamma) (\cos^d(\gamma) + \cos^e(\gamma)) - \frac{1}{4} \sin^2(\beta) \cos^{d+e-2f}(\gamma) (1 - \cos^f(2\gamma)). \quad (4)$$

Example: An eight-vertex graph where a subgraph phase operator achieves an approximation ratio of 1

Fig. 1 shows a graph G where there exists a subgraph G' consisting of only the dashed edges such that using the corresponding phase operator yields a higher approximation ratio compared to the usual QAOA phase operator. The approximation ratio for this graph using the original QAOA phase operator is 0.934, as found with the code from [26].

The phase operator in this case is given by:

$$C = Z_0 Z_7 + Z_1 Z_4 + Z_2 Z_5 + Z_3 Z_6.$$

From Eq. (4), one can see that the cost expectation of edges in G that are not in G' is 0.5. The edges that are in G' do not form triangles, therefore it is easy to see that their cost expectation becomes equal to 1 for $\gamma = \pi/2$ and $\beta = \pi/8$. There are 6 edges that are in G but not in G' and 4 edges in G' , therefore the total cost expectation, 7, in this case coincides with the maximum cut for this graph.




FIG. 1: An eight-vertex graph where a subgraph phase operator achieves an approximation ratio of 1. The subset of edges included in the subgraph phase operator is marked by red color. The diamond and round vertices mark the two subsets that achieve the maximum cut. Note that the red edges form a perfect matching.




FIG. 2: The star graph, which consists of vertices and the solid edges. The dashed red edges are the terms included in the phase operator. This choice of phase operator yields an approximation ratio of 0.5.

Example: A family of graphs and circuits with an approximation ratio of 0.5

The star graph on n vertices is a connected n -vertex graph that has exactly one vertex of degree $n - 1$ and $n - 1$ vertices of degree one. An example of a star graph is depicted in Fig. 2.

Consider a star graph with 3 or more leaves. Label the center vertex of the star $n - 1$ and the other vertices 0 to $n - 2$ in clockwise order, starting at some arbitrary leaf. Now consider the phase operator with the terms of the form $Z_i Z_{i+1}$ modulo $n - 2$, which has $n - 1$ terms, the same as the cost Hamiltonian. With this choice of the phase operator, the last term of Eq. (4) for all edges of the graph is 0, since none of them satisfy the triangle condition. Furthermore, the second term in Eq. (4) is also zero since none of edges are chosen as a term in the phase operator. Therefore, all edges in the graph have the cost expectation of 0.5, and the overall cost expectation for a star graph with this phase operator is $\frac{|E|}{2}$. In general, if the edges of the graph do not correspond to the terms of the phase operator and do not satisfy the triangle condition, the approximation ratio will always be 0.5. Note if the star has two leaves, this phase operator construction contains a multi-edge, and thus requires additional parameter optimization considerations.

III. RESULTS

In this work, we considered QAOA with random phase operators, subgraph phase operators, a special case of subgraph phase operators in which a subset of triangles are removed (abbreviated TR-phase operator for triangle-removed), and a subcase of random subgraph where edges that are incident to maximal degree vertices are removed

Phase Operator type	Max AR	Min AR	Average AR	% Graphs Better
Random	0.946	0.5	0.710	0.036%
Subgraph	1.0	0.563	0.771	75.9%
TR-Most	0.972	0.686	0.813	90.5%
TR-2 Most	0.972	0.711	0.820	89.2%
TR-All	0.973	0.686	0.817	83.0%
TR-Random	0.972	0.670	0.807	29.3%
MDER-1	0.972	0.657	0.805	90.7%
MDER-2	0.971	0.651	0.802	81.6%
MDER-All	0.959	0.5	0.777	0.711%
Cost (regular QAOA)	0.973	0.662	0.806	—

TABLE I: Comparison of the maximum, minimum, and average AR achieved by the random, subgraph, triangle-removed, max degree edge removed, and cost phase operators as well as the percentage of graphs that had at least one phase operator that performed better than the cost phase operator.

(abbreviated MDER-phase operator for maximum degree edge removal) for solving the MaxCut problem on a collection of all non-isomorphic eight vertex graphs. The simulations were performed by maximizing the expected value formula in Eq. (4) over the parameters γ and β . In each simulation, the optimization is done using the code provided at [27]. The optimizer used was the L-BFGS algorithm with 100 random parameter initialization seeds.

A. Random phase operators

First, we consider random phase operators and analyze the effect of phase operator structure on the approximation ratio. In order to create the phase operator graphs, we randomly selected m of the $\binom{8}{2}$ possible edges of the complete graph on eight vertices, where m is the number of edges in the original graph. Mathematically, this is given by

$$C_{\text{rand}} = \sum_{ab} \frac{1}{2} (\mathbb{I} - Z_a Z_b),$$

where the indices (a, b) are random. For each graph, up to 10 non-isomorphic random phase operators were considered. Note that in some cases, such as the complete graph K_8 , we cannot select 10 non-isomorphic phase operators, since we keep the same number of edges in the phase operator graph. However, when possible, we generated 10 non-isomorphic random phase operators and evaluated the approximation ratio for each.

Out of all the random phase operators tested, 0.036% of the graphs had at least one random phase operator that gave a higher approximation ratio than the cost phase operator. The random graphs are not guaranteed to have any structure with respect to the original graph, so it is not surprising that the random phase operators typically perform worse. Furthermore, there are far more than 10 non-isomorphic phase operators that can be generated in most cases, so it is of course possible that the remaining graphs have better phase operators. Table I shows the maximum, minimum, and average AR that was achieved by using random phase operators as opposed to the cost phase operator. On average, the random phase operators resulted in significantly lower approximation ratios.

B. Subgraph phase operators

The subgraph phase operators differ from the purely random ones in that we choose a random subgraph of the original graph G and add to the phase operator $Z_i Z_j$ only the terms corresponding to edges of this subgraph. In other words, only a subset of terms from the cost Hamiltonian can be considered for the phase operator.

In this experiment, we select random phase operator subgraphs that contain $\lceil \alpha |E(G)| \rceil$ edges of G for $\alpha \in \{\frac{1}{4}, \frac{1}{3}, \frac{1}{2}, \frac{2}{3}, \frac{3}{4}\}$. Similar to before, we choose up to 10 non-isomorphic subgraphs for each α and use 100 parameter initialization seeds.

Compared to the purely random phase operators, the subgraph phase operators yielded higher approximation ratios. Out of all the subgraph phase operators tested, 75.9% of the considered graphs had at least one subgraph phase operator with a higher approximation ratio. Since only 10 non-isomorphic subgraph phase operators were tested, it is possible that there exist phase operators that have even better performance. Table I shows the maximum, minimum, and average AR that was achieved by using subgraph phase operators as opposed to the cost Hamiltonian for MaxCut.

One interesting note is that there were 10 phase operator subgraphs that achieved an AR of 1, meaning that the optimal MaxCut value was found. The structure of these subgraphs all have the same form, where the subgraph is a perfect matching as in Fig. 1. A perfect matching $M \subset E$ is a subset of graph edges such that every vertex in G is incident to exactly one edge in M . While interesting to note, this condition is not necessary or sufficient to define subgraph phase operators that achieve an approximation ratio of 1. However, if the MaxCut value is $\frac{|V|}{4} + \frac{|E|}{2}$, then a perfect matching phase operator, if it exists, does yield an approximation ratio of 1. In general, this information is not known a priori.

C. TR-phase operators

The TR-phase operators are a special case of the subgraph phase operators in which one or more triangles is removed from the original graph. All edges that are not in triangles remain in the phase operator. The importance of this case is to reduce the number of triangles so that the last term of Eq. (4) is 0 for a larger number of edges in the graph, with the hope is that this increases the overall expected value. This experiment examines four types of TR-phase operators. The first type, named “most”, removes a single edge that is contained in the most triangles in the graph. The second type, named “2 most”, implements the same “most” rule, but applied consecutively 2 times. The third type, named “all”, iteratively removes edges until there are no more triangles left in the graph. The final type, named “random”, just chooses a single random edge included in a random triangle and removes it.

Out of all the TR-phase operators tested, 95.1% of the considered graphs had at least one TR-phase operator that yielded a higher approximation ratio. Table I depicts the maximum, minimum, and average AR that was achieved by TR-phase operators as opposed to the cost phase operators. These results indicate that removing triangles from the cost phase operator can improve the approximation ratio, while also using fewer gates in the circuit. However, comparing the performance of “all” and “2 most” types, one can see that removing all the triangles in the graph does not always give a higher approximation ratio. This may be due to the fact that removing all triangles may result in new structure, such as an increase in the diameter of the graph, that may be difficult for QAOA to see. Additionally, the expectation of the removed edges tends to decrease, which offsets the gain from the remaining edges. Among the considered cases, removing the two edges that form the most triangles yields the highest approximation ratio.

D. MDER-phase operators

The MDER-phase operators are subcases of the subgraph phase operator in which at least one edge that is incident to maximum degree vertices are removed from the original graph. We examine this type of phase operator because the exponents of the trigonometric functions in the expected value equation depend on degree of the vertex incident to each edge. Removing edge with high degree drives down the degree of a subset of the trigonometric functions in Eq. (4). This may slightly increase the expected value of all edges that share a common vertex with the removed edge at the cost of setting the expected value of the removed edge to 0.5 plus possibly the triangle term in the expected value. Thus, edges incident to high degree vertices are removed. This experiment considers 3 types of MDER-phase operators: MDER-1-phase operator where we find the maximal degree vertex and remove a random edge incident to it, MDER-2-phase operator, which consecutively applies the previous strategy 2 times, and MDER-all-phase operator where we find the maximal degree vertex and remove all the edges incident to it.

Out of all the MDER-phase operators tested, 93.9% of the considered graphs had at least one MDER-phase operator that yielded a higher approximation ratio. Table I depicts the maximum, minimum, and average AR that was achieved by MDER-phase operators as opposed to the cost phase operators. We can also see the percentages of graphs that had at least one phase operator that performed better than the cost phase operator. These results indicate that removing edges incident to maximum degree vertices can improve the approximation ratio, while also using fewer gates in the circuit. However, removing all the edges incident to the maximum degree vertex can lead to worse performance.

IV. DISCUSSION

In this work, we examined the impact of QAOA phase operator design on the approximation ratio. In general, removing a subset of triangles from the phase operator tends to yield a higher average approximation ratio. Furthermore, using a random phase operator tends to result in a lower approximation ratio than the approximation ratio yielded by the cost phase operator.

The main implication of this work is that, on average, fewer gates can be used in the QAOA circuit and a comparable approximation ratio can be attained. This can provide a modest noise reduction when implementing the algorithm on

NISQ devices. Future work may include multiple directions. First, one can examine how the subgraph phase operators affect the optimization landscape, as there could be a risk that modifying the phase operator results in more barren plateaus. Second, it is important to consider the scalability of the custom phase operators with respect to the number of layers of QAOA. Another direction includes characterizing of when removing gates will improve the approximation ratio. We will also consider using MA-QAOA with the subgraph phase operators to see if the approximation ratio of a given problem can be increased even further. Since the subgraph phase operators have fewer gates, there would be fewer angles to optimize. Thus, the parameter optimization of these multi-angle circuits should be easier, which overcomes one of the challenges of MA-QAOA implementation[28].

One possible application of this work is in the area of privacy. In [29], the authors explore creating multiple circuits with various gates removed from the QAOA cost Hamiltonian in order to protect the privacy of the problem at hand at the cost of having to run multiple circuits on different third party hardware and recombining the results. Our work shows that we can remove certain gates from the cost Hamiltonian, thus increasing the privacy of the original problem, and have comparable results without relying on multiple circuits.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

J.O. acknowledges DARPA ONISQ program under award W911NF-20-2-0051. R. H., J. O., and A. W. acknowledge NSF CCF 2210063.

-
- [1] E. Farhi, J. Goldstone, and S. Gutmann, “A quantum approximate optimization algorithm,” 2014. [Online]. Available: <https://arxiv.org/abs/1411.4028>
 - [2] A. Ozaeta, W. van Dam, and P. L. McMahon, “Expectation values from the single-layer quantum approximate optimization algorithm on ising problems,” *Quantum Science and Technology*, vol. 7, no. 4, p. 045036, sep 2022. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1088%2F2058-9565%2Fac9013>
 - [3] R. Herrman, L. Treffert, J. Ostrowski, P. C. Lotshaw, T. S. Humble, and G. Siopsis, “Impact of graph structures for qaoa on maxcut,” *Quantum Information Processing*, vol. 20, no. 9, pp. 1–21, 2021.
 - [4] E. Farhi, D. Gamarnik, and S. Gutmann, “The quantum approximate optimization algorithm needs to see the whole graph: Worst case examples,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2005.08747*, 2020.
 - [5] J. Wurtz and D. Lykov, “The fixed angle conjecture for qaoa on regular maxcut graphs,” 2021. [Online]. Available: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2107.00677>
 - [6] G. G. Guerreschi and A. Y. Matsuura, “QAOA for max-cut requires hundreds of qubits for quantum speed-up,” *Scientific Reports*, vol. 9, no. 1, may 2019. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1038%2F41598-019-43176-9>
 - [7] Z. Wang, S. Hadfield, Z. Jiang, and E. G. Rieffel, “Quantum approximate optimization algorithm for maxcut: A fermionic view,” *Physical Review A*, vol. 97, no. 2, p. 022304, 2018.
 - [8] L. Zhou, S.-T. Wang, S. Choi, H. Pichler, and M. D. Lukin, “Quantum approximate optimization algorithm: Performance, mechanism, and implementation on near-term devices,” *Physical Review X*, vol. 10, no. 2, p. 021067, 2020.
 - [9] M. P. Harrigan, K. J. Sung, M. Neeley, K. J. Satzinger, F. Arute, K. Arya, J. Atalaya, J. C. Bardin, R. Barends, S. Boixo *et al.*, “Quantum approximate optimization of non-planar graph problems on a planar superconducting processor,” *Nature Physics*, vol. 17, no. 3, pp. 332–336, 2021.
 - [10] N. Earnest, C. Tornow, and D. J. Egger, “Pulse-efficient circuit transpilation for quantum applications on cross-resonance-based hardware,” *Physical Review Research*, vol. 3, no. 4, p. 043088, 2021.
 - [11] R. Herrman, P. C. Lotshaw, J. Ostrowski, T. S. Humble, and G. Siopsis, “Multi-angle quantum approximate optimization algorithm,” *Scientific Reports*, vol. 12, no. 1, pp. 1–10, 2022.
 - [12] J. Wurtz and P. J. Love, “Classically optimal variational quantum algorithms,” *IEEE Transactions on Quantum Engineering*, vol. 2, pp. 1–7, 2021.
 - [13] V. Vijendran, A. Das, D. E. Koh, S. M. Assad, and P. K. Lam, “An expressive ansatz for low-depth quantum optimisation,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.04479*, 2023.
 - [14] K. Shi, R. Herrman, R. Shaydulin, S. Chakrabarti, M. Pistoia, and J. Larson, “Multiangle qaoa does not always need all its angles,” in *2022 IEEE/ACM 7th Symposium on Edge Computing (SEC)*. IEEE, 2022, pp. 414–419.
 - [15] Z. Zhou, Y. Du, X. Tian, and D. Tao, “Qaoa-in-qaoa: solving large-scale maxcut problems on small quantum machines,” *Physical Review Applied*, vol. 19, no. 2, p. 024027, 2023.
 - [16] J. Li, M. Alam, and S. Ghosh, “Large-scale quantum approximate optimization via divide-and-conquer,” *IEEE Transactions on Computer-Aided Design of Integrated Circuits and Systems*, 2022.
 - [17] M. Ponce, R. Herrman, P. C. Lotshaw, S. Powers, G. Siopsis, T. Humble, and J. Ostrowski, “Graph decomposition techniques for solving combinatorial optimization problems with variational quantum algorithms,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.00494*, 2023.

- [18] Z. Wang, N. C. Rubin, J. M. Dominy, and E. G. Rieffel, “X y mixers: Analytical and numerical results for the quantum alternating operator ansatz,” *Physical Review A*, vol. 101, no. 1, p. 012320, 2020.
- [19] A. Bärttschi and S. Eidenbenz, “Grover mixers for qaoa: Shifting complexity from mixer design to state preparation,” in *2020 IEEE International Conference on Quantum Computing and Engineering (QCE)*. IEEE, 2020, pp. 72–82.
- [20] E. Farhi, J. Goldstone, S. Gutmann, and H. Neven, “Quantum algorithms for fixed qubit architectures,” 2017.
- [21] X. Liu, R. Shaydulin, and I. Safro, “Quantum approximate optimization algorithm with sparsified phase operator,” in *2022 IEEE International Conference on Quantum Computing and Engineering (QCE)*. IEEE, 2022, pp. 133–141.
- [22] Z. Wang, P.-L. Zheng, B. Wu, Y. Zhang *et al.*, “Quantum dropout: On and over the hardness of quantum approximate optimization algorithm,” *Physical Review Research*, vol. 5, no. 2, p. 023171, 2023.
- [23] E. Farhi, D. Gamarnik, and S. Gutmann, “The quantum approximate optimization algorithm needs to see the whole graph: A typical case,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2004.09002*, 2020.
- [24] J. Wurtz and P. Love, “Maxcut quantum approximate optimization algorithm performance guarantees for $p > 1$,” *Physical Review A*, vol. 103, no. 4, p. 042612, 2021.
- [25] S. Hadfield, “Quantum algorithms for scientific computing and approximate optimization,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:1805.03265*, 2018.
- [26] <https://github.com/GaidaiIgor/MA-QAOA>.
- [27] A. Wilkie, “Random circuit qaoa,” 2024. [Online]. Available: <https://github.com/Vilcius/Random-Driver-QAOA>
- [28] I. Gaidai and R. Herrman, “Performance analysis of multi-angle qaoa for $p > 1$,” *arXiv e-prints*, pp. arXiv–2312, 2023.
- [29] S. Upadhyay and S. Ghosh, “Obfuscating quantum hybrid-classical algorithms for security and privacy,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.02379*, 2023.