

---

# TWO-STEP QUANTUM SEARCH ALGORITHM FOR SOLVING TRAVELING SALESMAN PROBLEMS

---

A PREPRINT

Rei Sato<sup>1,2</sup>, Cui Gordon<sup>3</sup>, Kazuhiro Saito<sup>1</sup>, Hideyuki Kawashima<sup>3</sup>, Tetsuro Nikuni<sup>2</sup>, Shohei Watabe<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> KDDI Research, Inc., Fujimino, Ohara 2-1-15, Saitama, 356-8502, Japan

<sup>2</sup>Department of Physics, Tokyo University of Science, Shinjuku, Tokyo, 162-8601, Japan

<sup>3</sup>Faculty of Environment and Information Studies, Keio University, Fujisawa, Kanagawa, 252-0882, Japan

<sup>4</sup>Faculty of Engineering, Computer Science and Engineering, Shibaura Institute of Technology, Toyosu, Tokyo, 135-8548, Japan

October 8, 2024

## ABSTRACT

Quantum search algorithms, such as Grover’s algorithm, are anticipated to efficiently solve constrained combinatorial optimization problems. However, applying these algorithms to the traveling salesman problem (TSP) on a quantum circuit presents a significant challenge. Existing quantum search algorithms for the TSP typically assume that an initial state—an equal superposition of all feasible solutions satisfying the problem’s constraints—is pre-prepared. The query complexity of preparing this state using brute-force methods scales exponentially with the factorial growth of feasible solutions, creating a significant hurdle in designing quantum circuits for large-scale TSPs. To address this issue, we propose a two-step quantum search (TSQS) algorithm that employs two sets of operators. In the first step, all the feasible solutions are amplified into their equal superposition state. In the second step, the optimal solution state is amplified from this superposition state. The TSQS algorithm demonstrates greater efficiency compared to conventional search algorithms that employ a single oracle operator for finding a solution within the encoded space. Encoded in the higher-order unconstrained binary optimization (HOBO) representation, our approach significantly reduces the qubit requirements. This enables efficient initial state preparation through a unified circuit design, offering a quadratic speedup in solving the TSP without prior knowledge of feasible solutions.

**Keywords** First keyword · Second keyword · More

## 1 Introduction

The traveling salesman problem (TSP) [1], which is recognized as NP-hard, stands as a fundamental optimization problem encountered across various engineering fields. Quantum algorithms are anticipated to serve as potent tools and have been extensively studied for optimization problems. This is owing to their capacity to explore all candidate solutions simultaneously through quantum superposition. Leveraging quantum algorithms as solvers for combinatorial optimization dilemmas is expected to yield advantages across a wide range of industries, including portfolio optimization [2], traffic optimization [3], and vehicle routing optimization [4].

Various quantum algorithms have been studied to solve the TSP, offering potential speedups over classical heuristic approaches. These can be broadly categorized into quantum annealing [5], variational methods including variational quantum eigensolvers (VQE) [6] and quantum approximate optimization algorithms (QAOA) [7, 8, 9, 10], phase estimation methods [11, 12], quantum walk-based methods [13] and quantum search algorithms [14, 15, 16, 12] including Grover’s algorithm [17]. Among these approaches, quantum search algorithms stand out as promising for solving the TSP, offering a quadratic speedup over classical methods [14, 15, 16]. Given this potential, we focus on the quantum search algorithm for solving the TSP in this study.

Quantum search algorithms begin by preparing a uniform superposition of all, or a chosen subset of, basis states, subsequently applying followed by the application of a Grover operator [18]. The Grover operator comprises oracle operators and the Grover diffusion operator. When solving the TSP with quantum search algorithms, the initial state is typically an equal superposition of all feasible solutions, and the oracle operator serves as the cost oracle [14, 15, 19]. The cost oracle adjusts the phase of the quantum state based on the TSP tour costs, enabling a quadratic speedup in finding the optimal solution under certain conditions [14, 15].

Although many innovative quantum search algorithms have been explored theoretically [14, 15, 12], practical challenges arise when constructing circuits for these algorithms to solve the TSP. One such challenge is preparing the initial state [20], defined as

$$|\psi_0\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{n!}} \sum_i |T_i\rangle, \quad (1)$$

where  $|T_i\rangle$  represents the feasible solutions to the TSP and  $n$  the number of cities. These quantum search algorithms operate by searching within the solution space, and implementing them on a quantum circuit requires preparing all  $n!$  states. If a brute-force approach is used for state preparation, the maximum query complexity becomes  $\mathcal{O}(n!)$ . Although the quantum search algorithm offers a quadratic speedup in exploring the solution space, the overall query complexity including state preparation remains at most  $\mathcal{O}(n!)$ . This presents a significant obstacle when solving large-scale TSPs. Therefore, efficient preparation of the initial state in Eq. (1) is crucial.

In this study, we propose a two-step quantum search algorithm (TSQS) that enables efficient initial state preparation through a unified circuit design, offering a quadratic speedup in solving TSP instances without prior knowledge of feasible solutions. The proposed circuit architecture incorporates two distinct quantum search processes.

The first step involves performing a quantum search to identify all feasible solutions and generate an equal superposition of these solutions using Grover’s algorithm. The query complexity of preparing the initial state depends on the encoding scheme used for the TSP. Quantum algorithms for the TSP typically utilize one of two encoding methods: Higher-Order Unconstrained Binary Optimization (HOBO) or Quadratic Unconstrained Binary Optimization (QUBO). HOBO employs binary encoding, while QUBO uses one-hot encoding. A key advantage of HOBO is its ability to reduce qubit requirements compared to QUBO, lowering the query complexity from  $\mathcal{O}(\sqrt{2^{n^2}/n!})$  to  $\mathcal{O}(\sqrt{2^{n \log_2 n}/n!})$ . This reduction brings the query complexity for preparing the equal superposition state below  $\mathcal{O}(n!)$ . To the best of our knowledge, a detailed quantum circuit design for Grover’s algorithm to prepare all feasible solutions for HOBO-encoded TSP has yet to be explored, particularly given that HOBO encoding is more complex than QUBO encoding.

The second step involves a quantum search to amplify the optimal solution state from the state prepared in the first step. In this step, we leverage the quantum circuit used in the first step, which facilitates the construction of a generalized Grover diffusion operator for solving the TSP. Under certain conditions, the query complexity of solving the TSP can be achieved at  $\mathcal{O}(\sqrt{n!})$  [14].

Therefore, the overall query complexity of our algorithm in the HOBO encoding is  $\mathcal{O}(\sqrt{n!})$ , which is significantly less than the brute-force method with  $\mathcal{O}(n!)$ . Our novel framework, based on the proposed two-step circuits, effectively solves the TSP without requiring prior knowledge of the constraints.

The structure of this paper is as follows: In Sec. 2, we briefly review previous studies related to the TSP and quantum search algorithms. In Sec. 3, we describe and formulate the TSP, followed by the introduction of a quantum search algorithm for solving the TSP. Section 4 explains problem settings. In Sec. 5, we present our proposed method. Section 6 assesses the performance of our proposed circuits. Section 8 discusses our results and outlines future research directions. Finally, Sec. 9 summarizes our conclusions.

## 2 Related work

Quantum algorithms to solving the TSP include a dynamic programming-based algorithm that operates in  $\mathcal{O}(1.728^n)$  time [21], a hybrid quantum algorithm for identifying minimum values in unsorted lists [22], and a Grover-based heuristic algorithm that demonstrates quadratic speedup for Gaussian-distributed tour costs [14].

Simulation studies have investigated novel oracle operators and qudit states to enhance success probabilities [15], as well as the Grover adaptive search (GAS) algorithm [23]. Additionally, efforts have been made to design efficient circuits requiring fewer qubits [16, 24].

Other gate-based approaches incorporate phase estimation techniques [11, 12] and Grover Mixers for Quantum Approximate Optimization Algorithm (GM-QAOA)[19]. The GM-QAOA employs Grover-like selective phase shift




Figure 1: (a) One of feasible solutions  $x$  of TSP with  $n = 3$ . (b) List of all feasible solutions  $|T\rangle$ , and their tour costs of TSP for  $n = 3$ . Visualization of a feasible solution of  $n = 3$  TSP encoded by (a) QUBO and (b) HOBO. The gray and white tiles are equal to 1 and 0, respectively

mixing operators, enabling effective searches within the feasible solution space. Additionally, a divide-and-conquer quantum search algorithm[20] has been proposed to enhance the efficiency of initial state preparation.

While these methods have advanced the resolution of the TSP within the quantum information domain, challenges related to initial state preparation and qubit requirements remain. To address these issues, our TSQS algorithm utilizes HOBO encoding, thereby providing a unified circuit design that facilitates both initial state preparation and TSP solving. This approach offers the potential for a more efficient solution tailored for near-term quantum devices.

### 3 Preliminaries

#### 3.1 General encoding of TSP

The TSP is an optimization problem that seeks to determine the tour with minimal cost, where a salesman visits each city exactly once while incurring the least total travel expense. We begin by introducing the general binary encoding of the TSP for  $n$  cities. Let  $x_{t_s, i}$  be a binary variable defined such that  $x_{t_s, i} = 1$  if the  $i$ -th city is visited at time  $t_s$ , and  $x_{t_s, i} = 0$  otherwise. This encoding method is referred to as the QUBO representation. We denote the tour cost from city  $i$  to city  $j$  as  $\phi_{ij}$ . In our formulation, we consider the asymmetric TSP, where the tour costs are not symmetric; that is, we assume  $\phi_{i,j} \neq \phi_{j,i}$  for two cities  $i$  and  $j$ , as illustrated in Fig. 1. Furthermore, we assume that all tour costs are positive, such that  $\phi_{j,k} > 0$ .

The objective function is expressed as follows:

$$H_c(x) = \sum_{i,j=1, i \neq j}^n \phi_{ij} \sum_{t_s=1}^n x_{t_s, i} x_{t_s+1, j}. \quad (2)$$

The TSP is subject to two constraints: precisely one city must be visited at each time step, which can be represented as

$$H_1(x) = \sum_{t_s=1}^n \left( 1 - \sum_{i=1}^n x_{t_s, i} \right)^2 = 0, \quad (3)$$

and

$$H_2(x) = \sum_{i=1}^n \left( 1 - \sum_{t_s=1}^n x_{t_s, i} \right)^2 = 0. \quad (4)$$

We denote the set of all possible tours that satisfy Eqs. (3) and (4) as  $\mathcal{T} = \{T_1, T_2, \dots, T_{n!}\}$ , and similarly define the set of all possible tour costs as  $\mathcal{W} = \{W(T_1), W(T_2), \dots, W(T_{n!})\}$ , where  $W(T)$  represents the cost of a tour  $T$ . Our goal is to identify  $T_{\min}$  such that  $W(T_{\min}) = \min(\mathcal{W})$ , where  $T_{\min}$  is the tour with the minimum cost.




Figure 2: A quantum circuit for the quantum search algorithm used to solve the TSP.

### 3.2 Quantum search for solving TSP

The time evolution of a quantum state in the quantum search algorithm is described by

$$|\psi(t)\rangle = [\hat{D}\hat{R}]^t |\psi(0)\rangle, \quad (5)$$

where  $|\psi(0)\rangle$  is the initial state given by

$$|\psi(0)\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{n!}} \sum_{i=1}^{n!} |T_i\rangle. \quad (6)$$

Here,  $\hat{R}$  is the cost oracle operator, which provides the tour cost such that

$$\hat{R}|T_i\rangle = e^{iW(T_i)} |T_i\rangle, \quad (7)$$

where each cost phase is defined as  $W(T_i) \in \{0, 2\pi\}$ , scaled according to the tour costs. The state  $|T_i\rangle$  represents the  $i$ -th tour state and is defined as

$$|T_i\rangle = |x_1\rangle \otimes |x_2\rangle \otimes \cdots \otimes |x_n\rangle, \quad (8)$$

where  $|x_{t_s}\rangle$  corresponds to the  $t_s$ -th visited city.

The operator  $\hat{D}$  is the Grover diffusion operator, expressed as

$$\hat{D} = 2|\psi(0)\rangle\langle\psi(0)| - \hat{I}. \quad (9)$$

The success probability  $P$  of finding the minimum cost tour state  $|T_{\min}\rangle$  is given by

$$P = |\langle T_{\min}|\psi(t_2)\rangle|^2. \quad (10)$$

If the tour costs follow the Gaussian distribution, the optimal query complexity  $t_2$  is given by

$$t_2 = \frac{\pi}{4} \sqrt{\frac{n!}{m}}, \quad (11)$$

where  $m$  represents the number of solutions. This algorithm amplifies the states of both the minimum and maximum cost tours, resulting in  $m = 2$  in this case (see Appendix 9).

## 4 Research problem

Figure 2 illustrates a quantum circuit corresponding to Eq. (5). Designing this circuit presents several challenges. Specifically, it must generate the state described in Eq. (6). For the TSP with  $n!$  solutions for  $n$  cities, a circuit capable of producing a superposition of these  $n!$  feasible solutions is essential, with a query complexity lower than that of the brute-force method, which is  $\mathcal{O}(n!)$ .

Moreover, efficient circuit design for Eq. (9) is also challenging, as the Grover diffusion operator depends on the initial state given in Eq. (6). Therefore, the efficient preparation of the Grover diffusion operator  $\hat{D}$  is crucial.

To address these issues, the GM-QAOA algorithm was proposed in Ref. [19], which generates all feasible solutions for the TSP and solves the problem. This approach utilizes the QUBO formulation for the TSP, requiring at least  $n^2$  qubits for  $n$  cities. In contrast, our approach employs a HOBQ formulation and solves the TSP using a two-step Grover algorithm, thereby reducing the number of qubits and the circuit depth.

## 5 Proposed Method

Here we propose circuit designs for our TSQS algorithm that overcome the problem of exponentially large query complexity in implementing the initial state [14].




Figure 3: Circuit design of the TSQS algorithm, which prepares the initial state and solves the TSP.

### 5.1 HOBO formulation for TSP

We implement the TSQS algorithm for the TSP using the HOBO formulation described in Ref. [10]. The HOBO encoding method represents feasible solutions, such as  $|T_i\rangle$ , in a binary system, as illustrated in Fig. 1(c)(d). This approach requires  $K = \lceil \log_2 n \rceil$  qubits for each city, resulting in a total of  $nK$  qubits for encoding HOBO-TSP. In contrast, QUBO encoding necessitates  $n^2$  qubits due to its one-hot encoding scheme.

For example, Fig. 1(d) illustrates the encoding of a feasible solution where 2 qubits are needed to encode the cities, such as  $x_1 = 2 = |01\rangle$ ,  $x_2 = 1 = |00\rangle$ , and  $x_3 = 3 = |10\rangle$ . When  $2^K \neq n$ , the state  $|11\rangle$  is penalized and not utilized. In the case of  $n = 4$ ,  $2^K = n$  holds, meaning all qubits are employed without penalty.

We define the city encoding as

$$|x_{t_s}\rangle = |x_{t_s,0}, x_{t_s,1}, \dots, x_{t_s,k}, \dots, x_{t_s,K-1}\rangle, \quad (12)$$

where  $x_{t_s,k}$  is the  $k$ -th individual qubit associated with encoding city  $x_{t_s}$ . Further mathematical details can be found in Ref. [10]. A feasible solution state, such as  $|T_i\rangle = |01\rangle|00\rangle|10\rangle$ , represents all possible tours using permutations of  $x_{t_s}$  (see Appendix 9). The HOBO formulation helps in reducing the query complexity of preparing the equal superposition state of feasible solutions.

### 5.2 TSQS algorithm

The time evolution of the TSQS algorithm is given by

$$|\psi(t_2, t_1)\rangle = \hat{G}_2^{t_2} \hat{G}_1^{t_1} |\psi(0)\rangle, \quad (13)$$

where  $|\psi(0)\rangle = \hat{H}^{nK} |0\rangle^{nK}$ , and  $\hat{H}$  is the Hadamard gate. The parameters  $t_1$  and  $t_2$  represent the optimal times for the first and second step operations, respectively. The operator  $\hat{G}_1$  is the first step quantum search operator, which prepares an equal superposition state of all feasible solution states for the TSP. The second step quantum search operator,  $\hat{G}_2$ , finds the optimal solution from all the feasible solutions amplified in the first step (see Fig. 3 (a)).

The quantum search operator  $\hat{G}_1$  is a conventional Grover operator, consisting of two unitary operators:

$$\hat{G}_1 = \hat{D}_1 \hat{R}_1, \quad (14)$$

where  $\hat{R}_1$  is the oracle operator that distinguishes between feasible and non-feasible solution states by marking the solution states with a phase flip:

$$\hat{R}_1 |x\rangle = \begin{cases} -|x\rangle & \text{if } x = T_i, \\ |x\rangle & \text{if } x \neq T_i, \end{cases} \quad (15)$$

where  $x$  is an arbitrary binary vector of length  $nK$ .

The operator  $\hat{D}_1$  is the Grover diffusion operator, defined as:

$$\hat{D}_1 = 2|\psi(0)\rangle\langle\psi(0)| - \hat{I}^{nK}, \quad (16)$$

where  $\hat{I}$  is the identity operator. The Grover diffusion operator facilitates an inversion about the mean (see Fig. 3 (b)).

The optimal query complexity  $t_1$  for the first step is given by:

$$t_1 = \frac{\pi}{4} \sqrt{\frac{2^{nK}}{M}}, \quad (17)$$

where  $M$  is the total number of feasible solutions, i.e.,  $M = n!$  for  $n$  cities in the TSP. In particular, the QUBO encoding requires the optimal query complexity  $t_1$  as  $\mathcal{O}(\sqrt{2^{n^2}/n!})$ , and the HOBQ encoding  $\mathcal{O}(\sqrt{2^{n \log_2 n}/n!})$ .

The second quantum search operator,  $\hat{G}_2$ , is used to amplify the optimal solutions for solving the TSP and is given by

$$\hat{G}_2 = \hat{D}_2 \hat{R}_2, \quad (18)$$

where  $\hat{R}_2$  is the cost oracle operator, which acts on the state  $|T_i\rangle$  as

$$\hat{R}_2 |T_i\rangle = e^{iW(T_i)} |T_i\rangle. \quad (19)$$

Here, the overall cost for a feasible solution  $T_i$  is encoded in the cost phase  $W(T_i) \in \{0, 2\pi\}$ , which scales with the tour costs.  $\hat{D}_2$  is the Grover diffusion operator, given by

$$\hat{D}_2 = 2\hat{G}_1^{t_1} |\psi(0)\rangle \langle \psi(0)| \hat{G}_1^{t_1\dagger} - \hat{I}, \quad (20)$$

where  $\hat{G}_1^{t_1} |\psi(0)\rangle$  provides the equal superposition of all feasible solution states from Eq. (6) generated by the first quantum search step, acting on  $|0\rangle^{nK}$  as

$$\hat{G}_1^{t_1} |\psi(0)\rangle \simeq \frac{1}{\sqrt{n!}} \sum_i |T_i\rangle. \quad (21)$$

We design the Grover diffusion operator  $\hat{D}_2$  based on the first quantum search operator. Figure 3 (c) provides a detailed circuit for  $\hat{D}_2$ , which acts only on the basis states corresponding to all the feasible solutions prepared during the first quantum search step. The success probability for finding the minimum-cost tour state  $|T_{\min}\rangle$  is given by

$$P(T_{\min}, t_1, t_2) = |\langle T_{\min} | \psi(t_2, t_1) \rangle|^2, \quad (22)$$

where  $|\psi(t_2, t_1)\rangle$  is given by Eq. (13).

If the cost oracle  $\hat{R}_2$  follows a Gaussian distribution, the optimal time  $t_2$  can be estimated as

$$t_2 = \frac{\pi}{4} \sqrt{\frac{n!}{2}}. \quad (23)$$

This value of  $t_2$  matches Eq. (11) for  $m = 2$ , where the present algorithm amplifies the states of both the minimum and maximum cost tours. The total query complexity of the TSQS algorithm is thus  $t = t_1 + t_2$ .

## 6 Circuit design

We address the specific circuit structures of the TSQS algorithm by extending the approach presented in Ref. [14]. As examples, we examine TSP problems, as discussed in Sec. 3.2. The minimum and maximum cost tour states correspond to the minimum and maximum route costs of  $\pi/2$  and  $3\pi/2$ , respectively, while the intermediate states are randomly generated according to a Gaussian distribution, as described in Sec. 3.2. Because of the computational capability, we conducted the TSP analysis for  $n = 3$  and  $n = 4$  cities. Additionally, we compare our circuit design with that of the GM-QAOA approach [19].

### 6.1 Circuit design of the first-step quantum search

We require two sub-oracles: one for validity checking and the other for ensuring uniqueness in the encoding of the HOBQ-TSP, as described in subsection 5.1.

The validity check addresses a potential issue in the quantum encoding of cities, which arises in the sub-oracle. Specifically, when qubits are used to binary encode each city, and the number of cities  $n$  is not equal to  $2^K$  in the HOBQ formulation, non-existent cities may be erroneously encoded. For example, with  $n = 3$  cities, using two qubits for the city representation results in the undesired state  $|11\rangle$ , which corresponds to a non-existent city. In contrast, this issue does not arise for  $n = 4$  cities, where  $n = 2^K$ . This problem occurs only when the number of possible states represented by the qubits,  $2^K$ , exceeds the actual number of cities,  $n$ , in the TSP.

To resolve this issue, we employ MCX gates to filter out invalid binary representations. In the case of  $n = 3$  cities, we prevent the state  $|11\rangle$  by using the circuit shown in Fig. 4(a). In Fig. 4(b), there is no invalid state, as  $n = 2^K$ , and thus, the validity check oracle is not required.




Figure 4: The circuits of TSQS algorithm. (a) Grover operator circuit of the first quantum search  $G_1$  in the TSP for  $n = 3$ . (b) The circuit of the TSQS algorithm for solving the TSP for  $n = 4$ . (c) One of the cost oracles constructed by multi-phase gate  $W(T_1) = \pi/2$  for the tour  $|00011011|$ .

The uniqueness check ensures that each city in the tour is visited exactly once. This is achieved by implementing a function that compares pairs of cities and outputs 0 if they are the same and 1 if they are different. The function is applied to all city pairs, and the state is marked as a valid solution only if all the pairs return 1. The oracle function is defined as:

$$f(x_{t_s}, x_{t'_s}) = \begin{cases} 0, & \text{if } x_{t_s} = x_{t'_s}, \\ 1, & \text{if } x_{t_s} \neq x_{t'_s}. \end{cases} \quad (24)$$

The sub-oracle ensures  $x_{t_s} \neq x_{t'_s}$  by verifying that for all index  $k$ , there exists at least one  $k$  value such that  $(x_{t_s, k} \neq x_{t'_s, k})$ . This is achieved using CX (control-not) gates and X (not) gates. For each city pair, we apply a CNOT gate with  $x_{t_s, k}$  as the control bit and  $x_{t'_s, k}$  as the target bit. We then check whether at least one of the target bits is 1 using an OR gate constructed from CX and X gates. If the OR gate returns  $f = 0$ , it indicates that  $x_{t_s} = x_{t'_s}$ ; if it returns  $f = 1$ , then  $x_{t_s} \neq x_{t'_s}$ . To restore the city qubit to its original state for future use, we apply the CNOT operations again. For example, Fig. 4(a)(b) illustrates the circuit pattern, showing a CNOT applied to  $x_{1,0}$  and  $x_{2,0}$ , and another CNOT applied to  $x_{1,1}$  and  $x_{2,1}$ . We implement this checking pattern for all city pairs and utilize an MCT (multi-controlled Toffoli) gate to flip the phase of the state only if all OR gates return a value of 1, ensuring the oracle condition is met.

The total number of qubits required for the circuit is:

$$nK + a_{\text{valid}} + a_{\text{unique}} + 1, \quad (25)$$

where  $nK$  represents the qubits used for TSP encoding. The ancilla qubits for the validity check are  $a_{\text{valid}} = (2^K - n)n$ , and for the uniqueness check  $a_{\text{unique}} = \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} i$ . The final “+1” represents the ancilla qubit used to mark the solution state.

## 6.2 Circuit design of the second-step quantum search

Figure 4(b) depicts an actual circuit design based on Fig. 3, illustrating the TSQS algorithm for the TSP with  $n = 4$ . First, we apply Hadamard gates to the  $nK$  qubits. Next, we implement the first quantum search operator  $G_1$  for the optimal time, effectively eliminating the states of infeasible solutions and generating a superposition state of feasible solutions as indicated by Eq. (6). Subsequently, we employ the cost oracle as described in Eq. (7) to the state, following Ref [14]. For instance, Fig. 4(c) illustrates one of the cost oracles constructed using multi-phase gates and the X-gate for the TSP tour  $|00011011|$ , the cost of which is  $W(00011011) = \pi/2$ . We construct the cost oracle for all feasible solution states.

After constructing the cost oracle, we apply the Grover diffusion operator  $D_2$ , which acts solely on the solution space of feasible solutions, as shown in Fig. 3(c). The operator  $D_2$  can be represented using the first Grover operator  $G_1$ , as




Figure 5: (The simulation results of TSQS algorithm. (a) The histogram of the success probability for  $n = 3$  TSP. (b) The histogram of the success probability for  $n = 4$  TSP. The insets show the success probability of the TSQS (dots) with the numerical simulation (solid lines). The success probability includes the probability of minimum and maximum cost tours.

indicated in Eq. (20). The optimal number of operations for  $G_1$  and  $G_2$  are determined based on the query complexity outlined in Eqs. (17) and (23), respectively. Detailed information about each parameter is presented in Table I for the TSP with  $n = 3$  and  $n = 4$ .

## 7 Simulation result

Table 1: The circuit evaluation between TSQS and GM-QAOA for solving TSP with  $n = 3, 4$  cities. The numbers in parentheses represent the total success probability of the min/max cost tours.

	$n = 3$					$n = 4$				
	TSQS	GM-QAOA	GM-QAOA	$G_1^{t_1}$	$U_s$	TSQS	GM-QAOA	GM-QAOA	$G_1^{t_1}$	$U_s$
$p$	–	1	2	–	–	–	1	2	–	–
iteration	–	10 – 15	10 – 20	–	–	–	10 – 15	10 – 20	–	–
$t_1$	2	–	–	2	–	2	–	–	2	–
$t_2$	1	–	–	–	–	2	–	–	–	–
width	13	9	9	13	9	15	16	16	15	16
depth	4636	3116	5581	1182	599	43211	167890	337937	2288	2039
$P$	0.42..(0.97..)	0.49..	0.82..	0.99..	0.99..	0.14..(0.31..)	0.16..	0.33..	0.99..	0.99..

We evaluate the accuracy of the TSQS algorithm and perform benchmarks on circuit width, depth, and the query complexity of preparing the initial state and solving the TSP. The evaluations were conducted using the Qiskit simulator [25] within an IBM quantum system. We compare the query complexity of the brute-force method,  $\mathcal{O}(n!)$ , Grover's algorithm, and our proposed algorithm.



The software versions of Qiskit employed in our experiments are: qiskit-terra:0.21.1, qiskit-aer:0.10.4, qiskit-ignis:0.7.1, qiskit-ibmq-provider:0.19.2, and qiskit:0.37.1. For the numerical environment, we fix the seed number as `seed_simulator = 42` and `seed_transpiler = 42`, and the shot number for measuring as `shots = 1024`.

## 7.1 Performance evaluation

Figure 5 illustrates the results of the TSP for  $n = 3$  and  $n = 4$  using our TSQS algorithm. To verify the circuit operation, we plot the time-dependent success probabilities based on numerical calculations performed in the Julia programming language for matrix computations (solid lines in the inset) and values simulated by the circuit (red dots in the inset). For both  $n = 3$  and  $n = 4$  cities, the numerical results from the matrix computations and the circuit simulations are nearly identical, thus confirming the correct operation of the proposed circuit.

However, in the case of circuit simulations, we observe negligibly small probabilities for non-constrained solutions such as 101110 and 011101 for  $n = 3$ , and 11101000, 10110011, 10111111, etc., for  $n = 4$ , as shown in Figs. 5 (a) and (b). These occurrences are attributed to minor errors in the Grover search during the first step. While the Grover search certainly amplifies feasible solutions, non-feasible solutions may also be observed due to noise. Consequently, in the second step of the quantum search, non-feasible solutions are incorporated into the Grover diffusion operator with negligibly small weights. The proportion of non-feasible solutions is significantly smaller compared to the success probability of feasible solutions, ensuring that the circuit operates effectively without a substantial loss of success probability over time, as shown in the insets of Figs. 5(a) and (b).

## 7.2 Circuit evaluation

Table 1 presents a circuit evaluation for the TSQS and GM-QAOA approaches [19]. An example of the simulation results for GM-QAOA is provided in Appendix 9.

### 7.2.1 Gate complexity

We estimate that the gate complexity of the oracle operator  $\hat{R}_1$  used to prepare the initial state can be implemented with  $\mathcal{O}(n^2 \log^2 n)$  gates. For the validity check, the total number of gates required is  $(2^K - n)n + n$  for  $n$  cities, where the first term represents the number of MCX gates and the second term accounts for the number of X gates. For the uniqueness check, we have  $\{K^2 + (2K + 1) + 1\} \times \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} i$ , where  $K^2$ ,  $(2K + 1)$ , and 1 represent the number of CX gates, X gates, and MCX gates, respectively. Thus, the total number of gates can be expressed as  $\{(2^K - n)n + n\} + \{K^2 + (2K + 1) + 1\} \times \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} i = \mathcal{O}(n^2) + \mathcal{O}(\log^2 n) \times \mathcal{O}(n^2) \sim \mathcal{O}(n^2 \log^2 n)$ . Although the gate complexity of  $\hat{R}_1$  is larger than the  $\mathcal{O}(n^2)$  of  $U_s$  in GM-QAOA [19], the total depth of the TSQS circuit is shallower than that of GM-QAOA, since the MCX gate in the Grover mixer operator scales with larger  $n$ .

### 7.2.2 query complexity

Earlier TSP algorithms utilizing quantum search [14] achieved a query complexity of  $\mathcal{O}(\sqrt{n!})$  under the assumption that an equal superposition of all feasible solutions had already been prepared. However, the method for preparing such a state was not explicitly established in [14]. If a brute-force approach is employed to construct this superposition, the query complexity becomes  $\mathcal{O}(n!)$ , which nullifies the quadratic speedup gained by the quantum search. In contrast, our TSQS algorithm is significantly faster since it can optimally prepare the superposition of feasible solutions (see Table 2). For example, for TSP instances with  $n = 3$  and  $n = 4$ , the superposition can be prepared with  $t_1 = 2$  and  $t_2 = 1, 2$ , respectively—remarkably smaller than  $n!$ . Indeed, in the TSQS algorithm, the first step constructs an equal superposition state of all feasible solutions for the TSP in the encoding space of size  $2^{nK}$ , where  $n$  represents the number of cities and  $K$  is the encoding size per city. The optimal query complexity of the first quantum search step is  $t_1 = \mathcal{O}(\sqrt{2^{nK}/n!})$ . The second step then amplifies the minimum-cost tour from the set of feasible solutions, which has a size of  $n!$ . The optimal query complexity for this second quantum search step is  $t_2 = \mathcal{O}(\sqrt{n!})$ . In the case of QUBO encoding, where  $K = n$ , the overall query complexity of the TSQS algorithm,  $t_{\text{TSQS}} = t_1 + t_2$ , is dominated by the first step, leading to a total complexity of  $t_{\text{TSQS}} = \mathcal{O}(\sqrt{2^{n^2}/n!})$ . On the other hand, for the HOBQ encoding, where  $K = \lceil \log_2 n \rceil$ , the second step dominates the query complexity, yielding  $t_{\text{TSQS}} = \mathcal{O}(\sqrt{n!})$ . Therefore, the QUBO encoding's requirement to prepare the equal superposition of all feasible solutions leads to a less efficient query complexity compared to the HOBQ encoding. Alternatively, the single-step quantum search (SSQS) algorithm evolves the system as  $|\psi(t)\rangle = (\hat{D}\hat{R})^t |\psi(0)\rangle$ , where  $\hat{R}$  is the oracle operator marking the minimum-cost tour state  $|T_{\min}\rangle$ , and  $\hat{D}$  is the diffusion operator acting on an encoding space of dimension  $2^{nK}$ . In this case, the optimal query complexity is  $t_{\text{SSQS}} = \mathcal{O}(\sqrt{2^{nK}})$ . Consequently, the SSQS algorithm exhibits a longer query complexity compared to the TSQS

Table 2: query complexity of SSQS and TSQS algorithms for QUBO and HOBO encodings. TSQS with brute-force preparation is also shown.

	SSQS (QUBO)	SSQS (HOBO)	TSQS (Brute-force)	TSQS (QUBO)	TSQS (HOBO)
1 <sup>st</sup> -step (prepare feasible solutions)	-	-	$\mathcal{O}(n!)$	$\mathcal{O}(\sqrt{2^{n^2}/n!})$	$\mathcal{O}(\sqrt{2^{n \log_2 n}/n!})$
2 <sup>nd</sup> -step (find min.-cost tour)	-	-	$\mathcal{O}(\sqrt{n!})$	$\mathcal{O}(\sqrt{n!})$	$\mathcal{O}(\sqrt{n!})$
total	$\mathcal{O}(\sqrt{2^{n^2}})$	$\mathcal{O}(\sqrt{2^{n \log_2 n}})$	$\mathcal{O}(n!)$	$\mathcal{O}(\sqrt{2^{n^2}/n!})$	$\mathcal{O}(\sqrt{n!})$

algorithm, both for the QUBO encoding ( $t_{\text{TSQS}} = \mathcal{O}(\sqrt{2^{n^2}/n!})$ ) and the HOBO encoding ( $t_{\text{TSQS}} = \mathcal{O}(\sqrt{n!})$ ). This advantage is due to the fact that SSQS searches for the minimum-cost tour across the entire encoding space, whereas TSQS restricts the search to the smaller space of feasible solutions, which is extracted from the encoding space. Furthermore, the TSQS algorithm outperforms the GM-QAOA algorithm in terms of query complexity for solving the TSP. This is because GM-QAOA requires multiple iterations of classical optimization, typically ranging from 10 to 20 iterations for TSPs with  $n = 3$  and  $n = 4$  cities, respectively. Notably, the number of classical iterations in GM-QAOA grows as the number of QAOA layers,  $p$ , increases. Furthermore, the TSQS algorithm outperforms the GM-QAOA algorithm in terms of query complexity for solving the TSP. This is because GM-QAOA requires multiple iterations of classical optimization, typically ranging from 10 to 20 iterations for TSPs with  $n = 3$  and  $n = 4$  cities, respectively. Notably, the number of classical iterations in GM-QAOA grows as the number of QAOA layers,  $p$ , increases. However, compared to the TSQS algorithm, the advantages of GM-QAOA are that, aside from the computational cost of the optimization process, the success probability of finding the minimum cost tour increases as  $p$  increases, and it can solve a variety of cost tour distributions, not limited to Gaussian distributions.

## 8 Discussion

By utilizing the TSQS algorithm, we can prepare an equal superposition of all feasible solutions with a query complexity lower than  $\mathcal{O}(n!)$ . Furthermore, we can construct a circuit that amplifies the tour states corresponding to minimum and maximum tour costs, achieving a quadratic speedup, particularly when the tour costs follow a Gaussian distribution.

TSQS presents several advantages over GM-QAOA. First, the present TSQS utilizes HOBO encoding, which significantly reduces the qubit requirements compared to GM-QAOA’s QUBO encoding. This reduction in qubits results in shallower circuits, making TSQS potentially more suitable for near-term quantum devices.

Second, the TSQS approach facilitates the efficient preparation of the initial state of feasible solutions, addressing a common challenge in many quantum TSP algorithms. TSQS demonstrates higher success probabilities for identifying minimum tour states compared to GM-QAOA, particularly when the tour costs adhere to a Gaussian distribution. This efficacy is likely attributed to its quantum search-based approach, which is particularly well-suited for such distributions.

Finally, while GM-QAOA necessitates iterative classical optimization to fine-tune its parameters, thereby potentially increasing its total query complexity, TSQS is executed with fixed parameters, offering a more straightforward implementation. However, it is important to note that GM-QAOA may offer advantages in managing constraints and in solving problems where the cost distribution deviates from Gaussian. Future work could explore the integration of elements from both approaches to leverage their respective strengths.

TSQS presents several new challenges alongside GM-QAOA. As illustrated in Table 1, the circuit depth increases significantly with the number of cities, complicating the implementation of large-scale TSPs with current qubit systems. Consequently, advancements aimed at creating shallower circuits are essential. For instance, integrating methods discussed in Refs. [26, 27] may be beneficial. Notably, the construction of the cost oracle circuit required in the second step necessitates  $n!$  multi-controlled phase gates. To facilitate circuit implementations with fewer than  $n!$  embedding computations, it may be advantageous to decompose the cost oracle into sub-oracles that can be reused through a divide-and-conquer approach, enabling their repeated application.

Finally, it remains to be determined whether our proposed method is suitable for execution on near-term intermediate-scale quantum (NISQ) devices with short-term noise. In noisy quantum devices, the first step of the quantum search could be replaced with variational quantum methods to create an equal superposition state of all feasible solutions. However, exploring the feasible solution space in the second step quantum search using these variational gate sets poses challenges due to the quality of gate sets to generate the equal superposition state and the quality of the generated state. Several extended quantum search algorithms have been proposed that may be advantageous in the post-NISQ era, such as divide-and-conquer quantum search, which can be implemented in shallow circuits [28, 29, 30].

## 9 Conclusions

We proposed and verified a Two-Step Quantum Search (TSQS) algorithm, along with its circuit construction, which is capable of preparing an equal superposition of all feasible solutions and solving the Traveling Salesman Problem (TSP) on a unified quantum circuit. The TSQS prepares the initial state with a query complexity that is less than that of the brute-force method,  $\mathcal{O}(n!)$ , and amplifies the tour state corresponding to the minimum cost of the TSP. We tested the proposed method for TSP instances with  $n = 3$  and  $n = 4$  cities. Our approach successfully reduces the query complexity for solving the TSP to less than  $\mathcal{O}(n!)$ ; however, it presents challenges related to circuit depth. Developing methods to implement our circuit with shallower architectures remains a future challenge.

## Appendix

### A: dataset and Numerical simulation of quantum search

Table 3: dataset of tour cost for  $n = 3, 4$  TSPs.

$\phi_{i,j}$	$n = 3$	$n = 4$
$\phi_{0,1}$	1.066..	0.523..
$\phi_{1,0}$	2.818..	1.047..
$\phi_{0,2}$	0.866..	1.047..
$\phi_{2,0}$	2.434..	2.094..
$\phi_{1,2}$	0.503..	0.523..
$\phi_{2,1}$	1.893..	1.047..
$\phi_{1,3}$		1.047..
$\phi_{3,1}$		1.047..
$\phi_{2,3}$		0.523..
$\phi_{3,2}$		1.396..

The tour costs are assumed to be generated from the Gaussian distribution given by

$$f(x) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}\sigma} \exp\left[-\frac{(x-\mu)^2}{2\sigma^2}\right], \quad (26)$$

where  $\mu$  and  $\sigma$  represent the mean and standard deviation, respectively. In this study, we fix the minimum and maximum tour costs at  $\pi/2$  and  $3\pi/2$ , respectively, generating other tour costs from the Gaussian distribution with  $\mu = \pi$  and  $\sigma = 0.5$ , as shown in Table 3.

Figure 6(a-c) illustrates the validation of the algorithm through numerical simulations of the quantum search among the total of  $5! = 120$  feasible solutions for the 5-TSP problem. In this scenario, the non-solution states are concentrated near  $\pi$ , while the solution states are distributed around the tails of the Gaussian distribution. Consequently, the phase difference is approximately  $\pi$ , enabling the periodic evolution of success probability over time, as shown in Figure 6(b). This behavior is similar to that of Grover's algorithm, leading to a quadratic speedup.

Figure 6(c) presents the probability distribution at  $t = t_2 \sim 7$ , with indices 1 and 120 corresponding to the solutions of the minimum and maximum costs, respectively. Since the quantum search amplifies both the minimum and maximum cost tours simultaneously, post-processing is required to extract the minimum cost tour [14]. Given that the computational complexity of this post-processing is  $\mathcal{O}(1)$ , the overall computational complexity remains  $\mathcal{O}(\sqrt{n!})$ .

### B: Numerical simulation of GM-QAOA

The time evolution of quantum states by GM-QAOA [19] is given by

$$|\psi(\beta, \gamma)\rangle = \prod_{i=1}^p U_M(\beta_i) U_P(\gamma_i) |\psi(0)\rangle. \quad (27)$$

Here,  $U_P(\gamma_i) = e^{-i\gamma_i H_c}$  is the phase separator unitary which is diagonal in the computational basis.  $H_c$  is cost Hamiltonian of TSP given by Eq. (2). We translate the classical cost function  $H_c$  into a quantum system by using Pauli-Z operators. The relation between binary variable  $x$  and Pauli-Z operators is given by

$$x_{i,j} = \frac{1 - \sigma_{t_s,i}^z}{2}, \quad (28)$$




Figure 6: (a)-(c) Numerical simulation of the quantum search for  $n = 5$  TSP which cost follows Gaussian distribution where  $\mu = \pi$  and  $\sigma = 0.5$ . (d)(e) The simulation results of GM-QAOA algorithm for  $n = 3$  cities. (a) The Gaussian distribution. (b) Time-dependence success probability  $P(t)$ . min/max are minimum/maximum cost tours. (c) The histogram of success probability of all feasible solutions, i.e.,  $5! = 120$  for optimal query complexity  $t_2$ . (d) Optimization expectation value  $\langle \psi(\beta, \gamma) | H_c | \psi(\beta, \gamma) \rangle$  for classical iteration. (e) The histogram of success probability for  $n = 3$  TSP with optimized parameters  $\beta, \gamma$  and  $p = 2$ .

where  $\sigma_{t_s, i}^z \in \{-1, 1\}$  is the Pauli-Z operator acting on the qubit corresponding to city  $i$  at step  $t_s$ . The Hamiltonian  $H_c$  is updated as

$$H_c = \sum_{i,j=1, i \neq j}^n \phi_{i,j} \sum_{t_s=1}^{n-1} \left( \frac{1 - \sigma_{t_s, i}^z}{2} \right) \left( \frac{1 - \sigma_{t_s+1, i}^z}{2} \right) \quad (29)$$

$$= \sum_{i,j=1, i \neq j}^n \sum_{t_s=1}^{n-1} \frac{\sigma_{ij}}{4} (1 - \sigma_{t_s, i}^z - \sigma_{t_s+1, j}^z + \sigma_{t_s, i}^z \sigma_{t_s+1, j}^z). \quad (30)$$

Then we remove the first term and we obtain the unitary operator  $U_P(\gamma)$  as

$$U_P(\gamma) = \prod_{t_s=1}^{n-1} \prod_{i,j=1, i \neq j}^n e^{i\gamma \frac{\phi_{ij}}{4} (\sigma_{t_s, i}^z + \sigma_{t_s+1, j}^z)} e^{-i\gamma \frac{\phi_{ij}}{4} \sigma_{t_s, i}^z \sigma_{t_s+1, j}^z}. \quad (31)$$

We can express the operator  $U_P$  with  $R_Z, R_{ZZ}$  gates, such as  $e^{i\gamma \frac{\phi_{ij}}{4} (\sigma_{t_s, i}^z + \sigma_{t_s+1, j}^z)} = R_Z^{(t_s, i)} \left( -\frac{\gamma \phi_{ij}}{2} \right)$  and  $e^{-i\gamma \frac{\phi_{ij}}{4} \sigma_{t_s, i}^z \sigma_{t_s+1, j}^z} = R_{ZZ}^{(t_s, i), (t_s+1, j)} \left( \frac{\gamma \phi_{ij}}{2} \right)$ .  $R_{ZZ}^{(t_s, i), (t_s+1, j)}$  is a two-qubit gate applied between qubit  $(t_s, i)$  and qubit  $(t_s + 1, j)$ .

$U_M(\beta_i) = e^{-i\beta |F\rangle \langle F|}$  is the mixing unitary.  $|\psi(0)\rangle$  is an equal superposition of all feasible solutions in  $F$ :

$$|F\rangle = U_s |0\rangle = \frac{1}{|F|} \sum_{x \in F} |x\rangle. \quad (32)$$

Fig. 6(d)(e) shows the result of GM-QAOA for  $n = 4$  cities. We performed 500 shots to calculate the expectation value  $\langle \psi(\beta, \gamma) | H_c | \psi(\beta, \gamma) \rangle$ , and used the COBYLA optimizer provided by Qiskit for parameter optimization.

## Acknowledgment

For part of this work, S.W. was supported by JST, PRESTO and JPMJPR211A. S.W. thanks Shigeru Yamashita for his helpful comments.

## References

- [1] George Dantzig, Ray Fulkerson, and Selmer Johnson. Solution of a large-scale traveling-salesman problem. *Journal of the operations research society of America*, 2(4):393–410, 1954.
- [2] Nicholas Slate, Edric Matwiejew, Samuel Marsh, and JB Wang. Quantum walk-based portfolio optimisation. *Quantum*, 5:513, 2021.
- [3] Florian Neukart, Gabriele Compostella, Christian Seidel, David Von Dollen, Sheir Yarkoni, and Bob Parney. Traffic flow optimization using a quantum annealer. *Frontiers in ICT*, 4:29, 2017.
- [4] George B Dantzig and John H Ramser. The truck dispatching problem. *Management science*, 6(1):80–91, 1959.
- [5] Roman Martoňák, Giuseppe E. Santoro, and Erio Tosatti. Quantum annealing of the traveling-salesman problem. *Phys. Rev. E*, 70:057701, Nov 2004.
- [6] Atsushi Matsuo, Yudai Suzuki, Ikko Hamamura, and Shigeru Yamashita. Enhancing vqe convergence for optimization problems with problem-specific parameterized quantum circuits. *IEICE TRANSACTIONS on Information and Systems*, 106(11):1772–1782, 2023.
- [7] Yue Ruan, Samuel Marsh, Xilin Xue, Zhihao Liu, Jingbo Wang, et al. The quantum approximate algorithm for solving traveling salesman problem. *Computers, Materials and Continua*, 63(3):1237–1247, 2020.
- [8] Özlem Salehi, Adam Glos, and Jarosław Adam Miszczak. Unconstrained binary models of the travelling salesman problem variants for quantum optimization. *Quantum Information Processing*, 21(2):67, 2022.
- [9] Wenyang Qian, Robert AM Basili, Mary Mehrnoosh Eshaghian-Wilner, Ashfaq Khokhar, Glenn Luecke, and James P Vary. Comparative study of variations in quantum approximate optimization algorithms for the traveling salesman problem. *Entropy*, 25(8):1238, 2023.
- [10] Adam Glos, Aleksandra Krawiec, and Zoltán Zimborás. Space-efficient binary optimization for variational quantum computing. *npj Quantum Information*, 8(1):39, 2022.
- [11] Karthik Srinivasan, Saipriya Satyajit, Bikash K Behera, and Prasanta K Panigrahi. Efficient quantum algorithm for solving travelling salesman problem: An ibm quantum experience. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1805.10928*, 2018.
- [12] Ch Tszynsi and II Beterov. A quantum algorithm for solving the travelling salesman problem by quantum phase estimation and quantum search. *Journal of Experimental and Theoretical Physics*, 137(2):210–215, 2023.
- [13] S. Marsh and J. B. Wang. Combinatorial optimization via highly efficient quantum walks. *Phys. Rev. Res.*, 2:023302, Jun 2020.
- [14] Jeongho Bang, Junghee Ryu, Changhyoup Lee, Seokwon Yoo, James Lim, and Jinhyoung Lee. A quantum heuristic algorithm for the traveling salesman problem. *Journal of the Korean Physical Society*, 61:1944–1949, 2012.
- [15] Daniel Koch, Massimiliano Cutugno, Samuel Karlson, Saahil Patel, Laura Wessing, and Paul M Alsing. Gaussian amplitude amplification for quantum pathfinding. *Entropy*, 24(7):963, 2022.
- [16] Jieao Zhu, Yihuai Gao, Hansen Wang, Tiefu Li, and Hao Wu. A realizable gas-based quantum algorithm for traveling salesman problem. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2212.02735*, 2022.
- [17] Lov K Grover. A fast quantum mechanical algorithm for database search. In *Proceedings of the twenty-eighth annual ACM symposium on Theory of computing*, pages 212–219, 1996.
- [18] Amit Saha, Ritajit Majumdar, Debasri Saha, Amlan Chakrabarti, and Susmita Sur-Kolay. Asymptotically improved circuit for a  $d$ -ary grover’s algorithm with advanced decomposition of the  $n$ -qudit toffoli gate. *Phys. Rev. A*, 105:062453, Jun 2022.
- [19] Andreas Bärttschi and Stephan Eidenbenz. Grover mixers for qaoa: Shifting complexity from mixer design to state preparation. In *2020 IEEE International Conference on Quantum Computing and Engineering (QCE)*, pages 72–82. IEEE, 2020.
- [20] Rei Sato, Kazuhiro Saito, Tetsuro Nikuni, and Shohei Watabe. Embedding all feasible solutions of traveling salesman problem by divide-and-conquer quantum search. In *2023 IEEE International Conference on Quantum Computing and Engineering (QCE)*, volume 02, pages 270–271, 2023.

- 
- [21] Andris Ambainis, Kaspars Balodis, Jānis Iraids, Martins Kokainis, Krišjānis Prūsis, and Jevgēnijs Vihrovs. Quantum speedups for exponential-time dynamic programming algorithms. In *Proceedings of the Thirtieth Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms*, pages 1783–1793. SIAM, 2019.
  - [22] Christoph Durr and Peter Hoyer. A quantum algorithm for finding the minimum. *arXiv preprint quant-ph/9607014*, 1996.
  - [23] Austin Gilliam, Stefan Woerner, and Constantin Gondiulea. Grover Adaptive Search for Constrained Polynomial Binary Optimization. *Quantum*, 5:428, April 2021.
  - [24] Yuki Sano, Kosuke Mitarai, Naoki Yamamoto, and Naoki Ishikawa. Accelerating grover adaptive search: Qubit and gate count reduction strategies with higher-order formulations. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.01572*, 2023.
  - [25] Qiskit contributors. Qiskit: An open-source framework for quantum computing, 2023.
  - [26] Xi Wu, Qingyi Li, Zhiqiang Li, Donghan Yang, Hui Yang, Wenjie Pan, Marek Perkowski, and Xiaoyu Song. Circuit optimization of grover quantum search algorithm. *Quantum Information Processing*, 22(1):69, 2023.
  - [27] Takahiko Satoh, Yasuhiro Ohkura, and Rodney Van Meter. Subdivided phase oracle for nisq search algorithms. *IEEE Transactions on Quantum Engineering*, 1:1–15, 2020.
  - [28] Kun Zhang and Vladimir E Korepin. Depth optimization of quantum search algorithms beyond grover’s algorithm. *Physical Review A*, 101(3):032346, 2020.
  - [29] Kun Zhang, Pooja Rao, Kwangmin Yu, Hyunkyung Lim, and Vladimir Korepin. Implementation of efficient quantum search algorithms on nisq computers. *Quantum Information Processing*, 20:1–27, 2021.
  - [30] Gilchan Park, Kun Zhang, Kwangmin Yu, and Vladimir Korepin. Quantum multi-programming for grover’s search. *Quantum Information Processing*, 22(1):54, 2023.