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Motivation

We are currently in the **NISQ** era:
- Small Scale Quantum Computers.
- Noisy Quantum Circuits.
- Limited Connectivity.

Hybrid Quantum/Classical Algorithms (VQE/QAOA):
- Small Quantum Computer with fixed Architecture.
- Postprocessing of measurements in a classical computer.

Can this framework offer any *practical quantum advantage*?
Variational Quantum Algorithms

- **Step 1.** Problem at hand $\rightarrow H$ where $H$ is an interacting qubit Hamiltonian.
  \[ H = \sum_{l=1}^{L} c_l P_l \]  
  (1)
  
  where $c_l \in \mathbb{R}$, $P_l$ a Pauli string, $L = \mathcal{O}(\text{poly}(n))$ and $n$ is the system size.

- **Step 2.** Choose ansatz family $U(\theta) = V(\theta_M) \ldots V(\theta_1)$ where $M = \mathcal{O}(\text{poly}(n))$ and initial parameters $\theta_0$.

- **Step 3.** Execute the quantum circuit and measure the parameterized state $|\psi(\theta)\rangle = U(\theta) |0\rangle \otimes^n$.

- **Step 4.** Choose an *objective function* whose global minimum will correspond to the solution of the problem (usually the expectation value $E(\theta) = \langle \psi(\theta) | H | \psi(\theta) \rangle$).
Variational Quantum Algorithms

Step 5. Choose a classical optimization algorithm and update the parameters following the direction that minimizes the objective function. For example:

$$\theta_{t+1} = \theta_t - \eta \nabla E(\theta_t)$$ (2)

Step 6. When convergence occurs at $\theta^* = \arg \min_{\theta} E(\theta)$ return the ground state approximation $|\psi(\theta^*)\rangle$. 
Bottlenecks

Biggest obstacles in VQAs:
- Local minima.
- Performance is sensitive to initial parameters.
- Barren Plateaux.
- No complexity-theoretic arguments about their scaling.
Classical Optimization problems have diagonal Hamiltonians.

- Prepare $|\psi(\theta)\rangle \rightarrow$ Measure $\rightarrow$ Sort energy samples.
- Keep only $\alpha$ percentage of lowest energies and minimize it $\rightarrow CVaR_\alpha$

Motivation.

- Choice of $\alpha$ is random.
- We need $1/\alpha$ measurements to achieve the same accuracy.
- We will not achieve the largest overlap with the optimal solution.
- $CVaR_\alpha$ with different $\alpha$ agree on the ground state but the rest of the landscape is different!

We can allow $\alpha$ to vary slowly! Significant improvement in performance in MaxCut, Number Partitioning, and Portfolio Optimization.
Adiabatic Quantum Computing

Conventional algorithms with proven theoretical guarantees *implies* Adiabatic Quantum Computing (AQC).

- Initialize system in an easy-to-prepare ground state of a Hamiltonian $H_0$.
- Allow the system of qubits to interact under the Hamiltonian:

$$H(t) = \left(1 - \frac{t}{t_f}\right) H_0 + \frac{t}{t_f} H_1, \quad t \in [0, t_f]$$ (3)

- If certain conditions are met, the system will find itself in the ground state of $H_1$ at $t = t_f$.

To ensure **adiabaticity**:

- The system must be evolved sufficiently slowly so that it never jumps to the instantaneous excited state at any time throughout the evolution.
- The total time $t_f$ is inversely correlated to the *spectral gap*, i.e. the energy difference between the ground state and the first excited state.
Bottlenecks:

- Some problems have exponentially (to the system size) small spectral gaps.
- In order to approximate adiabatic evolution in the quantum circuit model large quantum circuits are needed. \( \implies \) Inapplicable for NISQ devices.
Parameterized Perturbation Theory

Consider a Hamiltonian $H_0$, an ansatz family $U(\theta)$ and initial angles $\theta^*$ that produce the ground state of $H_0$, i.e.,

$$\theta^* = \arg \min_\theta \langle \psi(\theta) | H_0 | \psi(\theta) \rangle$$  \hspace{1cm} (4)

**Question 1.** Suppose that we perturb the Hamiltonian $H_0$ by a small amount $\lambda H_2$ with $\lambda \ll 1$. What is the shift vector $\epsilon$ that will translate the system from the ground state $|\psi(\theta^*)\rangle$ of $H_0$ at the ground state $|\psi(\theta^* + \epsilon)\rangle$ of $H_0 + \lambda H_2$?
Parameterized Perturbation Theory

**Theorem 1 (Informal).** Consider a family of parameterized quantum states $|\psi(\theta)\rangle$ and initial angles $\theta^*$ that minimize a Hamiltonian $H_0$, i.e., $\theta^* = \arg\min_\theta \langle \psi(\theta) | H_0 | \psi(\theta) \rangle$. If we perturb the Hamiltonian $H_0$ by a small amount $\lambda H_2$ with $\lambda \ll 1$, then the shift parameters $\epsilon$ that will translate the system onto the perturbed ground state $|\psi(\theta^* + \epsilon)\rangle$ (at the point $\theta^* + \epsilon$) of $H_\lambda = H_0 + \lambda H_2$ can be found by solving the following mathematical problem:

$$\begin{align*}
\min & \; ||\epsilon|| \\
\text{s.t.} & \; A\epsilon + Q = 0 \\
& \; H^\lambda_{\theta^* + \epsilon} \succeq 0
\end{align*}$$

(5)

The matrix elements $A_{ij}$, $Q_j$, and the Hessian, correspond to observables that are calculated at the ground state of $H_0$!
Parameterized Perturbation Theory

The matrix elements $A_{ij}$, $Q_i$ are given by:

$$Q_i = \lambda \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta_i} \left( \langle \psi(\theta) | H_2 | \psi(\theta) \rangle \right) \bigg|_{\theta^*}$$

$$A_{ij} = \frac{\partial^2}{\partial \theta_i \partial \theta_j} \left( \langle \psi(\theta) | H_\lambda | \psi(\theta) \rangle \right) \bigg|_{\theta^*}.$$

The derivatives and the Hessian can be calculated easily using parameter-shift rules.
Algorithm (AQC-PQC). If the perturbation is chosen to be $\lambda(H_1 - H_0)$, the total perturbed Hamiltonian is:

$$H_\lambda = (1 - \lambda)H_0 + \lambda H_1 \Rightarrow \text{Adiabatic Quantum Computing Hamiltonian}$$

We can iteratively add perturbation of the form $\lambda(H_1 - H_0)$, with $\lambda \equiv \frac{1}{K}$, where $K$ is the choice of discretization steps.

After $K$ steps we will have approximated the ground state of the target Hamiltonian $H_1$. 
Adiabatic Quantum Computing with parameterized quantum circuits

Adiabatic Quantum Computing with PQCs

Input
Ansatz Family $U(\theta) = V(\theta_M) \cdots V(\theta_1)$
Initial Hamiltonian $H_0$, Target Hamiltonian $H_1$
Initial Parameters $\theta^* = \arg \min_\theta \langle \psi(\theta) | H_0 | \psi(\theta) \rangle$
$H_\lambda = (1 - \lambda)H_0 + \lambda H_1$

Output
Optimal Parameters $\theta^* = \arg \min_\theta \langle \psi(\theta) | H_1 | \psi(\theta) \rangle$
Ground State Approximation $|\psi(\theta^*)\rangle$

Quantum Circuit

$|0\rangle^\otimes n \rightarrow V(\theta^*_1) \rightarrow V(\theta^*_2) \rightarrow \cdots \rightarrow V(\theta^*_M) \rightarrow$ Classical Solver

$H_\lambda = H_\lambda + \lambda (H_1 - H_0)$
$\theta^* = \theta^* + \epsilon$
$A\epsilon + Q = 0$
s.t. $H^{\lambda}|_{\theta^* + \epsilon} \succeq 0$
Adiabatic Quantum Computing with parameterized quantum circuits

**Question 2.** How many steps $K$ do we need so that we reach the ground state with certainty, provided that the ansatz family can reach all intermediate ground states?

**Theorem 2.** Consider a time-dependent Hamiltonian
\[ H(\tau) = (1 - \tau)H_0 + \tau H_1, \tau \equiv \frac{t}{t_f} \in [0, 1]. \]
Let $\Delta(\tau) \equiv E_1(\tau) - E_0(\tau)$ be the instantaneous spectral gap and $\delta_\tau(\lambda) \equiv E_0(\tau + \lambda) - E_0(\tau)$ be the energy difference between the ground states at time $\tau + \lambda$ and $\tau$ respectively. Moreover, assume that the parameterized family of states contains the ground state for each $\tau \in [0, 1]$ and $|\delta_\tau(\lambda)| \ll \Delta(\tau + \lambda)$. Then AQC-PQC will always return the ground state of the target Hamiltonian $H_1$ as long as we discretize the time-dependent Hamiltonian into $K > K_0$ where:

\[ K_0 \in \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{\text{poly}(n)}{\min_{\tau} \Delta(\tau)}\right) \]
Adiabatic Quantum Computing with parameterized quantum circuits

Advantages over VQAs

- Insensitive to initialization parameters which may lead to bad convergence.
- Requires no energy minimization.
- No Barren Plateaux.
- Only $K$ quantum states preparations (although $K$ may scale exponentially).
- Accuracy of the result depending on the choice of discretization steps.
- $O(KM^3)$ expectation value calculations.
Simulated Experiments

**MaxCut.** Consider a graph $G(V, E)$ where $V$ is the set of vertices, $E$ is the set of edges and let $W$ be a weight matrix describing the weights of the graph.

**Goal.** Our target is to find a partition of the vertices into two disjoint sets that “cuts” the maximum number of edges. The MaxCut can be mapped to an Ising Hamiltonian:

$$H_{MC} = - \sum_{\langle i, j \rangle \in E} \frac{W_{ij}}{2} (1 - \sigma_i^z \sigma_j^z).$$  \hfill (9)
Number Partitioning. Consider a list of integers \( \{n_1, n_2, \ldots, n_N\} \).

Goal. Our target is to decide whether there exists a partition of the set into two disjoint subsets \( S, \bar{S} \) so that the sums of the elements on each subset are equal. The Number Partitioning problem can be mapped to an Ising Hamiltonian:

\[
H_{\text{NP}} = \sum_{i \neq j} (n_i n_j) \sigma_i \sigma_j + \sum_{i=1}^{N} n_i^2
\]  

(10)
Simulated Experiments

Transverse-Field Ising Chain. The Hamiltonian describing the TFI chain model (with periodic boundary conditions) is:

\[ H_{\text{TFI}} = - \sum_{k=1}^{n} J_k \sigma_k^z \sigma_{k+1}^z - h \sum_{k=1}^{n} \sigma_k^x \]  

where \((J_k, h)\) are coupling coefficients.
Technical Details

**Initial Hamiltonian** for all problems examined: $H_0 = - \sum_{i=1}^{n} \sigma_i^x$ with ground state $|+\rangle \otimes^n$.

**Ansatz family** used for experiments:

All simulations were performed using **QuEST** and **Qiskit** allowing exact noiseless calculations of expectation values.
Choice of discretization steps.

**Figure:** MaxCut performance.

**Figure:** TFI performance.

Accuracy improves with the increase of discretization steps!
AQC-PQC vs VQE

Classical Optimization Problems:

MaxCut

Number Partitioning

$|E - E_{\text{opt}}|$ vs Number of Qubits
## Classical Optimization Problems:

### MaxCut

|        | 7 Qubits | 8 Qubits | 9 Qubits | 10 Qubits | 11 Qubits | 12 Qubits |
|--------|----------|----------|----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| AQC-PQC| 82.7     | 74.3     | 93.1     | 50        | 28.1      | 56.6      |
| VQE    | 62.3     | 54.7     | 60.8     | 39.2      | 22.1      | 11.1      |

### Number Partitioning

|        | 7 Qubits | 8 Qubits | 9 Qubits | 10 Qubits | 11 Qubits | 12 Qubits |
|--------|----------|----------|----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| AQC-PQC| 37.5     | 21.9     | 24.7     | 12.6      | 5         | 4.6       |
| VQE    | 28.5     | 6.2      | 6.4      | 1.2       | 0.8       | 0.4       |
AQC-PQC vs VQE

Transverse-Field Ising Chain:

![Graph showing comparison between AQC-PQC and VQE (Gradient Descent) and VQE (2-SPSA) for different numbers of qubits. The graph plots the absolute difference between the energy and the optimal energy ($|E - E_{opt}|$) against the number of qubits. The x-axis represents the number of qubits ranging from 8 to 12, and the y-axis represents the energy difference ranging from 0.2 to 0.7.]
Ansatz Expressiveness

\[ H_k = \left(1 - \frac{k}{30}\right) H_0 + \frac{k}{30} H_{MC}, \quad k \in [30] \] (12)
Discussion and Future work.

- Optimal algorithm for solving the classical problem:

\[
\begin{align*}
\min & \ |\epsilon| \\
\text{s.t.} & \ A\epsilon + Q = 0 \\
& \ H_{\theta^*+\epsilon}^\lambda \not\succ 0
\end{align*}
\]

- Test performance and compare with VQE on larger instances.
- Limitations?
- Bounds on performance if ansatz cannot reach intermediate ground states?
- Bounds on performance if the quantum device has given accuracy on angles?
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