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Differential equations are ubiquitous in models of physical phenomena. Applications like steady-state analysis of heat flow and deflection in elastic bars often admit to a second order differential equation. In this paper, we discuss the use of a quantum annealer to solve such differential equations by recasting a finite element model in the form of an Ising Hamiltonian. The discrete variables involved in the Ising model introduce complications when defining differential quantities, for instance, gradients involved in scientific computations of solid and fluid mechanics. To address this issue, a graph coloring based methodology is proposed which searches iteratively for solutions in a subspace of weak solutions defined over a graph, hereafter called the ‘box algorithm.’ The box algorithm is demonstrated by solving a truss mechanics problem on the D-Wave quantum computer.

I. INTRODUCTION

Computational methods are rapidly emerging as an essential tool to understand and solve complex engineering problems complementing the traditional means of experimentation and theory. Richard Feynman’s statement (I) “with a suitable class of quantum machines you could imitate any quantum system, including the physical world” has driven our vision towards a machine that can solve computational problems inaccessible to classical computers. Early versions of such quantum computers have already appeared. Mirroring gate-based classical computers, gate-based quantum computers with a small number of qubits have been demonstrated and promise an eventual path towards universal quantum computation. However, noise limits the number of gate operations that can be enforced before the quantum states decohere. In parallel, quantum annealers have been developed that provide a significant number of qubits for solving a class of combinatorial optimization problems. In these machines, an Ising Hamiltonian is engineered such that the solution to the computational problem is encoded in its ground state. The system evolves adiabatically to the ground state as governed by the Schrodinger equation for the time-dependent Hamiltonian.

The D-wave system is a quantum annealer that currently provides more than 2000 qubits modeling a transverse Ising Hamiltonian whose ground state is NP-complete. The Hamiltonian with $q_i$ describing the state of the $i^{th}$ qubit is given by:

$$E\{q\} = \sum_{i \in \text{sites}} H_i q_i + \sum_{(i,j) \in \text{links}} J_{ij} q_i q_j$$

(1)

The Hamiltonian includes self-interaction ($H_i$ is the on-site energy of qubit $q_i$) and site-site interaction terms ($J_{ij}$ are the interaction energies of two connected qubits $q_i$ and $q_j$), with the qubits connected in a Chimera graph. The system is first initialized in the ground state of a Hamiltonian which is known and easy to prepare. Then, the Hamiltonian is changed such that the system equilibrates to the ground state of the Ising Hamiltonian $E\{q\}$ according to the adiabatic theorem. NP-hard combinatorial optimization problems can be encoded through the field and site interaction strengths. The system particularly holds promise for solving graph coloring problems with large sizes (N) where classical polynomial time algorithms cannot be devised. Many engineering problems in airline scheduling, image segmentation, and pattern recognition have been encoded as graph coloring problems solvable on quantum annealers.

While differential equations are ubiquitous in models of physical phenomena, the use of quantum annealers for scientific computing in solid and fluid mechanics has not yet been explored. Scientific computing mostly involves solving a linear system of equations $Ax = b$ defined on a continuum domain discretized with finite elements. The matrix $A$, generally being sparse, structured and positive definite matrix obtained by assembling element-level stiffness matrices. In the past, gate-based quantum computing algorithms have been devised to solve the system of linear equations using Lloyd’s QLSA algorithm (2) and its modifications (3–6). This algorithm, unlike a classical solver, does not give a direct solution $x$ but rather allows sampling from the solution vector. Nevertheless, this has spawned several works in differential equation modeling on quantum computers (7–15). The sampling task by itself requires solving $Ax = b$. In the classical setting, the complexity typically goes as $O(n^3)$ where $n$ is the number of unknowns. On the other hand, the QLSA has a favorable running time of $O(k^2 s^2 / \epsilon)$ where $k$ is the condition number, $s$ is the sparsity of $A$, and $\epsilon$ is the precision of the solution.

Quantum annealers are especially attractive for scientific computing with the ability to scale up the simulations to a more significant number of qubits. However,
algorithms for the solution of differential equations have not been devised yet on these systems. Hence, graph techniques, in general, are under-utilized in these domains. Here, we note that the solution to $Ax = b$ can be encoded in an equivalent minimization problem $\min \left( \frac{1}{2} x^T Ax - x^T b \right)$ which contains field and interaction terms similar to an Ising model. Thus, in this paper, we explore mapping of this energy to Ising hamiltonian on the D-wave machine recognizing that the graph in the D-wave chip by itself models a finite element mesh-like topology. The element level stiffness and force vectors are then encoded in the Ising hamiltonian as interaction weights and field variables. Dirichlet boundary conditions are enforced by modifying field terms to favor one qubit state over another. An illustration of this procedure is presented in Fig. A discretized version of the differential equation is solved using energy minimization on a graph. The strength parameter of the graph is subsequently updated based on the annealed solution from the previous step. The final solution is estimated as the converging center of a bounded region with shrinking size. In the solution to a differential equation, the qubits must encode a rational number. However, the qubit encoding the Ising lattice point carries two discrete levels (up/down spin) in the ground state. In classical computers, with similar binary (0/1) encoding, anywhere from 32 bits (float) to 80 bits (long double) of memory can be used to encode more than 12 million high precision variables in 1 GB memory. In contrast, currently available quantum annealers have a limited number of physical qubits. This restriction makes the representation of solutions of double precision similar to a classical computer extremely expensive. In \cite{16, 17}, the problem of minimizing $||Ax - b||$ in the least squares sense was posed by encoding physical qubits to represent rational numbers using a radix 2 representation. This format requires a significant number of physical qubits and connections to represent positive rational numbers and an additional qubit to represent the sign of the number \cite{16}. In comparison, the box algorithm searches within a small discrete set of up/down qubit values with each element of the set mapped to a double precision value, thereby eliminating the need for additional qubits to achieve higher precision. This algorithm is demonstrated by solving a truss mechanics problem on the D-Wave quantum computer.

II. MATHEMATICAL PRELIMINARIES

A self-adjoint form of a second order differential equation on an interval $(x_1, x_r)$ is defined as,

$$-(p(x)u'(x))' + q(x)u(x) = f(x) \quad x_1 < x < x_r \quad (2)$$

Dirichlet boundary conditions are considered at both ends i.e. $u(x_1) = u_1$ and $u(x_r) = u_r$. Well-posedness of this problem requires $p(x) > 0$ and $q(x) > 0$. Furthermore, for convenience, it is assumed that $p, q \in C(x_1, x_r)$ and $f \in L^2(x_1, x_r)$. These conditions are sufficient to show the existence of a unique solution to the weak form \cite{15}.

A. Functional minimization

Motivated by the intractability of direct integration of the differential equation \cite{2}, it is often convenient to employ functional minimization techniques. Calculus of variations can be used to observe that the minimization of the functional \cite{3} leads to the strong form described in Eq. \cite{2}.

$$\Pi[u] = \int_{x_1}^{x_r} \left( \frac{1}{2} p u'^2 + \frac{1}{2} q u^2 - f u \right) dx \quad (3)$$

Square integrability of $u$ and its first derivative are required in this definition of $\Pi[u]$. The implication is that the minimizing solution, $u$ lies in the Sobolov space $H^1([x_1, x_r])$. A discrete problem is obtained using a finite basis for the solution defined in Eq. \cite{4}. This approximation reduces the infinite dimensional functional minimization problem to finite dimensions. The approximated functional $\Pi_N$ is entirely determined by the representation of $u$ in the finite basis as shown in Eq \cite{5}. It is worth observing that the choice of $\phi_i(x)$ is such that $\phi_i \in H^1([x_1, x_r])$ i.e. for any $u_N \in V_N = \text{span}{\phi_1, \phi_2, ..., \phi_N} \subset H^1([x_1, x_r])$. Additionally the proper inclusion, $V_i \subset V_{i+1}$, guarantees convergence of the solution with increasing $N$.

$$u_N(x) = \sum_{i=0}^{N} a_i \phi_i(x) \quad (4)$$

$$\Pi_N [a_0, ..., a_r, ..., a_N] = \int_{x_1}^{x_r} \frac{p}{2} \left( \sum_{i=0}^{N} a_i \phi_i' \right)^2 + \frac{q}{2} \left( \sum_{i=0}^{N} a_i \phi_i \right)^2 - f \left( \sum_{i=0}^{N} a_i \phi_i \right) dx \quad (5)$$

B. Finite Element approximation

Finite element basis provides a popular choice of compactly supported shape functions. For the purpose of simplicity, ‘tent/hat functions’ (defined in Eq. \cite{6}) are used in this work. The domain is split into $N$ elements with $N+1$ nodes. The generalization to higher order families of piecewise-continuous basis functions is immediate but is omitted for brevity.

$$\phi_i(x) = \begin{cases} 0, & x < x_{i-1}, \\
(x - x_{i-1})/(x_i - x_{i-1}), & x_{i-1} \leq x < x_i, \\
1 - (x - x_i)/(x_{i+1} - x_i), & x_i \leq x < x_{i+1}, \\
0, & x \geq x_{i+1}. \end{cases} \quad (6)$$
The usage of compact basis further reduces the complexity by reducing the integration over the whole domain to a summation of integration over smaller elements. It is shown in section III that this choice of shape functions lead to a relatively sparse graph. It simplifies the computation by reducing the size of the graph optimization problem. The simplified form of $\Pi$ specialized for the functional as $\Pi$ is presented in Eq (7).

$$\Pi = \int_a^b \prod_{i=1}^N \left[ f_i(x) \right] dx$$

This form of $\Pi$ promotes modularity in computation and allows expressing the functional as $\Pi_N = \sum_{i=1}^N A_i S_i$ where vectors $A_i$ and $S_i$ are defined for each element in $S$. The vector $S_i$ is independent of variables $\{a_i\}$ and is therefore only computed once in the whole procedure.

$$A_i = \begin{bmatrix} a_{i-1}^2, & a_i^2, & a_{i-1}a_i, & a_{i-1}, & a_i \end{bmatrix}^T$$

$$S_i = \begin{bmatrix} \int_{x_{i-1}}^{x_i} \frac{p}{2} \phi_i^2 dx + \frac{q}{2} \phi_{i-1}^2 dx, & \int_{x_{i-1}}^{x_i} \frac{p}{2} \phi_i^2 dx + \frac{q}{2} \phi_{i-1}^2 dx, \\
\int_{x_{i-1}}^{x_i} p \phi_{i-1} \phi_i + q \phi_{i-1} \phi_i dx, & -\int_{x_{i-1}}^{x_i} f \phi_{i-1} dx, \end{bmatrix}^T$$

III. GRAPH COLORING PROBLEM

Representation of a functional in terms of continuous variables is not feasible on quantum architectures. Thus it is imperative to further approximate this functional using discrete variables. In this section, a graph coloring based functional representation is formulated. An Ising hamiltonian is used to encode the functional on discrete points in $V_N$. Quantum annealing methods are tailored to find the lowest energy states in an Ising system defined in Eq (1). The parameters of self-interaction term ($H_i$) and the site-site interaction term ($J_{ij}$) are chosen in a way that the lower energy states correspond to feasible solutions for $u(\{a_i\})$. Additionally, it is required that the Ising hamiltonian of the lower energy states should correspond to $\Pi(\{a_i\})$.

The value of $a_i$ for each node is represented using 3 logical qubits, namely, $\{q_j^i\}$. The variable, $a_i$ takes value from a finite set $\{v_j^i\}$ with cardinality 3. The evaluation of the test function at the $i^{th}$ node is estimated using Eq (9) where $q_j^i$ takes value in $\{+1, -1\}$.

$$a_i = \sum_{j=1}^3 v_j^i q_j^i + \frac{1}{2}$$

Different graphs are required to study the different levels of discretization. Two sub-graphs are introduced to maintain generality, namely, Element graph and Nodal graph. All logical graphs can be generated using a combination of these sub-graphs. The contribution of each element to the functional is encoded in the element graph. The hamiltonian is augmented to enforce the preference of feasible states. This additional energy is provided through the Nodal graph.

A. Nodal Graph

The three qubits assigned to individual nodes are fully connected among themselves. For the purpose
of elucidation, the state of the \(i^{th}\) node can be denoted as a triplet \(\{q_1^i, q_2^i, q_3^i\}\). The states defined in the set \(Q = \{\{1, -1, -1\}, \{-1, 1, -1\}, \{-1, -1, 1\}\} \equiv \{\{Q_1\}, \{Q_2\}, \{Q_3\}\}\) are chosen as allowable states. It is left for the reader to observe that these states result from nine linear equations given in Eq (10). The notation \(Q = \{v_1^i, v_2^i, v_3^i\}\), respectively. The strength of the coupling strength \(J\) for each connection and the field strength \(H\) for each node. A choice of \(\tilde{J}\) and \(\tilde{H}\) that fulfill these conditions is presented in Fig 3.

### B. Element Graph

The connection between the qubits of consecutive nodes is determined using the element graph. This graph is constructed in a manner that for a feasible labelling of nodes (i.e. when state of all nodes are in the set \(Q\), the evaluation of the Ising Hamiltonian equals the evaluation of the Ising Hamiltonian with state \(Q\) of all nodes (i.e. when state of all nodes are in the set \(Q\), the evaluation of the Ising Hamiltonian equals the evaluation of the Ising Hamiltonian with state \(Q\) of all nodes). This requirement is imposed by using the same value of the coupling strength \(J\) for each connection and the field strength \(H\) for each node. A choice of \(\tilde{J}\) and \(\tilde{H}\) that fulfill these conditions is presented in Fig 3.

The site-site interaction for the \(i^{th}\) element can be estimated as a matrix, \(\tilde{J}\), where \((\tilde{J})_{kl}\) represents the coupling energy between qubits \(q_{k-1}^i\) and \(q_k^i\). The contribution of the \(i^{th}\) element towards the functional, based on the choice of a compact basis function, is evaluated as \(A_i\). The elements of the vector, \(A_i\), are polynomials in \(a_{i-1}\) and \(a_i\) which are uniquely defined for a feasible state of nodes. This allows determination the matrix \(\tilde{J}\) by solving the system of nine linear equations given in Eq (10). The notation \(A_i(Q_k, Q_l)\) refers to the evaluation of the vector \(A_i\) when the \(k^{th}\) state is selected for the \(i^{th}\) node and the \(l^{th}\) state is selected for the \(i^{th}\) node.

\[
\begin{align*}
|a_{i-1}| & \longrightarrow |J_{11}^i| & |J_{12}^i| & |J_{13}^i| & \uparrow & \uparrow & \uparrow \\
|a_i| & \longrightarrow |J_{21}^i| & |J_{22}^i| & |J_{23}^i| & \downarrow & \downarrow & \downarrow \\
|a_{i+1}| & \longrightarrow |J_{31}^i| & |J_{32}^i| & |J_{33}^i| & \\
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
|Q_1| & |Q_2| & |Q_3| \\
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
A_i(Q_1, Q_2, Q_3) S_i = A_i(Q_1, Q_2, Q_3) S_i \\
A_i(Q_2, Q_1, Q_3) S_i = A_i(Q_2, Q_1, Q_3) S_i \\
A_i(Q_3, Q_1, Q_2) S_i = A_i(Q_3, Q_1, Q_2) S_i \\
\end{align*}
\]

\[
(10)
\]

### C. Assembly and function approximations

The process of the graphical representation of the discretized functional using the nodal and element graphs is referred to as “Assembly.” Each node and element is endowed with a nodal and element graph, respectively. For a consistent enumeration of nodes, the effective site-site interaction energy is estimated by summing the nodal coupling strength, \(\tilde{J}\), over all nodes, and element coupling strength, \(\tilde{J}\), over all elements. Due to the nature of discretization, \(N\) element graphs and \(N + 1\) nodal graphs are required for representing an \(N\)-element discretization of the domain. The assembled graph, from here on, is referred to as the logical graph. Connectivity of logical graphs for one-element and four-element discretization is presented in Fig 4.

For a particular choice of \(v_j^i\), defined as Eq (11), the possible values of \(a_i\) at the \(i^{th}\) node are specialized to the set \(\{u_i^1 - r, u_i^2, u_i^3 + r\}\). The quantities, \(u_i^c = \{u_1^1, u_2^1, \ldots, u_3^2\}\) and \(r\) are hereafter referred to as box center while the slack variable, respectively. The intention is to approximate functions using the box center while the slack variable provides a bound on this approximation. The precise meaning of this bound is presented later in this section. A linear approximation of \(f(x) = \sqrt{x}\) using ten nodes is presented in Fig 5 for varying box centers and the slack variable (which can be interpreted as the box size). The function, \(f(x)\), is approximated as \(u^c\) at the nodes with linear interpolation in between the nodes. The blue region describes the possible value of the interpolation if the value at any node is perturbed within the range of \(\pm r\). In Fig 5(a), an exact approximation of the function at the nodes is presented with a slack variable of 0.2. In (b) the same approximation with a slack variable of 0.02 is presented. The same approximation is given in the two cases, but the bound on nodal values of (b) is tighter than (a). In part (c), the approximation is not exact, however, it lies within the bounds. In part (d), the approximation is neither exact nor within the bound. In the context of the vectorial representation of \(\{a_i\}\), these bounds are represented as \(3^N - 1\) points on the surface of a box, defined as, \(\|a - u^c\|_\infty \leq r\). An illustration for the vectorial representation of a two nodes element is presented in Fig 6. The solution is sampled from a \(3 \times 3\) grid in the \(a_1 - a_2\) vector space.

\[
v_j^i = u_j^i + r(j - 2)
\]
$\lambda_{\text{max}}$ and $\lambda_{\text{min}}$ are the maximum and the minimum non-zero eigenvalues of $M$, respectively. This suggests that as the box size decreases, the corresponding $u^c$ approaches to the best approximation solution of $u$. This argument is extended to $n$ dimensions with the bound given in Eq (12).

$$||a_{\min} - u^c|| \leq 2 \left( 1 + (n - 1) \frac{\lambda_{\text{max}}}{\lambda_{\text{min}}} \right) \frac{r}{\sqrt{n}} \quad (12)$$

IV. BOX ALGORITHM

In this section, an iterative procedure is developed to minimize the functional, $\Pi_N$, using the graph coloring representation discussed in the previous section. The necessary information required for defining the functional is stored in the vector $S_i$. It is computed once at the beginning of the procedure as the problem definition stage. The procedure is initiated with a guessed solution of the vector, $a$, provided as a box centered at $u^c$. The boundary nodes with Dirichlet boundary conditions are assigned the boundary value as the initial guess. The slack variable is initialized with an arbitrary scalar value. A better initial guess for $r$ is the one which bounds the solution in the box defined by $u^c$. Such initial guesses require fewer iterations in comparison to arbitrary ones; however, starting with a good guess is not a necessary condition for convergence. The Ising parameters, $H$, $\tilde{J}$ and $\hat{J}$ are estimated as discussed in section III. The self-interaction parameter, $H$, is augmented to apply the Dirichlet boundary conditions. $H$ corresponding to $q_2$ of the boundary node is assigned an additional negative value. This contribution allows a lower value of the functional for the boundary node state of $\{-1, +1, -1\}$, which corresponds to the solution $u^c_i$ at the boundary.

In this work, D-Wave’s 2000Q processor is used. This processor has a Chimera-type structure with 2048 qubits and 6016 couplers ([19]). A direct solution of the optimization problem by re-numeration of qubits is not possible as the assembled graph cannot be found in any subgraph of the physical graph, i.e., the processor. Therefore, it is required that the logical graph is mapped onto the physical graph via the process of embedding. This problem in itself is NP-hard and is not discussed here for brevity. The reader is referred to ([20]) for a discussion on this topic. The topology of the logical graph remains unchanged over the interactions. The search for embedding of a map is only conducted once, and in subsequent iterations, the self-interaction and the site-site interaction parameters are updated for the same embedding.

The use of three qubits per node in this paper allows the D-wave system to search for a minimum over a space of $3^N$ solution vectors in a single run. In each iteration, the box center is translated to the minimizing state (say $a_{\min}$). This move is referred to as the translation step. In the case where the minimizing state is found at the center, the box size is reduced, and the search is continued with a smaller bound on error. This move is referred to as the contraction step. The complete procedure is...
FIG. 5. Approximation of $\sqrt{x}$ function using boxed domain: (a) Exact fit with a slack of 0.2 (Loose fit) (b) Exact fit with a slack of 0.02 (tight fit) (c) inexact fit but bounded in a box size of 0.2 (d) inexact fit and unbounded by a slack of 0.2.

FIG. 6. An illustration of a two-node approximation in $a_1 - a_2$ vector space with contours plot of the functional, $\Pi(\{a_1, a_2\})$ and a representative box with center at $u^c$ and a box size of $r$.

Algorithm 1 Box Algorithm

1: Problem definition: Calculate $S_i$
2: Initialize $\{u_i^c\}, r$
3: Estimate $H_i, \hat{J}$ and $\tilde{J}$
4: Find embedding: Logical graph $\leftrightarrow$ Physical graph
5: While $r > r_{\text{min}}$ do
6: Update $\tilde{J}$ for current $(u_i^c, r)$
7: Anneal for $(q_i)$
8: Map to $a_{\text{min}}, (\Pi_N)_{\text{min}}$
9: If $(\Pi_N)_{\text{min}} < \Pi_N(\{u_i^c\})$ then
10: $u_i^c = a_{\text{min}}$ (Translation step)
11: Else
12: $r = \frac{r}{2}$ (Contraction step)
13: End

V. RESULTS

The deformation of a bar under axial loading is modelled using an equation of form [2]. In particular, the deflection ($u$) of a bar is related to the elastic stiffness, $(E)$, cross-sectional area $(A)$, and the applied body force, $(f)$ using Eq (13). The functional (Eq 3) is referred to as the potential energy of the system. The correspond-

presented in Algorithm [1]
ing discretized form of the potential energy for piece-wise linear $E_A$ and $f$ is calculated using Eq. (14) where $E_i, A_i$ and $f_i$ represents the elastic stiffness, area and applied body force, respectively, at the center of the $i^{th}$ element.

$$(EAu')' + f = 0$$  \hspace{1cm} (13)$$

$$\Pi_N[u] = \sum_{i=1}^{N} \frac{1}{2} E_i A_i (a_i - a_{i-1})^2 - \frac{1}{2N} f_i (a_i + a_{i-1})$$  \hspace{1cm} (14)$$

Two test cases are presented in Fig. 7. In test case (a), a bar with a discontinuity in $EA$ is simulated. The body force is not applied in this case. A four-element discretization is used. The initial guesses are taken as $u^e = \{0, 0.25, 0.5, 0.75, 1\}$ and $r = 0.2$. The numerical solution is observed to approach the exact solution in this case. The convergence in the functional is also evident.

In the test case (b), a bar with continuously varying $EA$ is simulated. A linearly varying body-force is supplied. A six-element discretization of the bar is used with $u^e = \{0, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6\}$ and $r = 0.2$. Based on the theory of finite element methods, the exact minimization of the energy in discretized space leads to a stiffer solution in comparison to the exact solution. It is observed that the numerical solution approaches the exact solution at nodes which is characteristic of finite element methods. Energy is also observed to be converging towards the fine element solution $u^{fem}$ in this case. The mismatch of $u$ within the element is expected to decrease with refinement in discretization.

Some implementation details on the D-wave architecture are relevant here. Although the mapping only requires three qubits per node, embedding of this graph into the Chimera graph produced an overhead of 9 qubits per node - constant over a range of discretizations. It is understandable since a complete graph of three qubits used to represent a node is not directly represented on the Chimera graph. In the future, the use of two qubits to represent a node can also be explored. While this assures we still sample a large enough ($2^N$ vectors) solution space in a single run, we lose out on information on the box center energy that is important for this case. It is possible to compute the solution at the box center classically. The overhead of performing classical solutions can be offset by the fact that a two-qubit representation has smaller complete sub-graphs and is easier to embed in the physical graph. Another important task in quantum computing is error suppression. Quantum processors, unlike classical computers, do not have parity correction algorithms due to the no-cloning theorem. A compilation of popular methods for quantum error correction is presented in 21. Energy re-scaling is one of the simpler approaches and is employed in this work. Here, in the estimation of $J^\prime$, the energy was rescaled to ensure that the energy gap between feasible and unfeasible states is increased while maintaining a similar energy landscape. This step is a heuristic remedy for minimizing noise in quantum computation, and has no bearing in the theoretical convergence of the algorithm.

VI. CONCLUSIONS AND FUTURE WORK

Recent developments in quantum annealers warrant further investigation into re-formulation of scientific computation problems as graph coloring problems. The use of quantum computing for solving differential equations has, to date, focused on the use of a gate–computing based QLSA algorithm. This algorithm attempts to sample from the solution space of the linear system of equations $Ax = b$. In the quantum annealer based algorithm described here, we do not solve the system of equations. We instead map the discretized version of the energy function of the differential equation to the Ising hamiltonian. The solution vector, $x$, is directly obtained as the ground state of the qubits. The algorithm has low memory requirements since the global matrix is not stored and the local matrices are encoded in the interaction weights of the Ising model. Further, the box algorithm allows mapping of up/down spin states of qubits in the ground state to rational numbers involved in the solution vector. The algorithm can also take advantage of recent developments on optically based coherent Ising architectures, where coupled spin half particles are used to drive the solution (22–24). Since we primarily solve the Ising model, the cost of computation is tied to the performance of the quantum annealer (25). Within each iteration however, equation Eq (10) is solved for each element, leading to at least $O(n)$ operations.

We have shown that the box algorithm indeed guarantees convergence to the best approximation of the solution in the discretized space as the box size goes to zero. However, some improvements could be made to reduce the number of minimization runs. We could use the statistics of solutions that D-wave system returns from a single minimization run to drive the iteration process in an arbitrary direction. This data can also be used to heuristically develop ‘local’ potential energy maps that can be used to identify larger step sizes for faster convergence. With future scaling up of quantum annealers up to millions of qubits, it will then be possible to solve challenging engineering solid and fluid mechanics problems with quantum annealers.
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FIG. 7. Axial deformation of a bar with (a) a discontinuous cross-section with a tip displacement (b) a continuously varying cross section with a body force and a tip displacement.
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