

DETC2014-34634

GLOBAL OPTIMIZATION WITH QUANTUM WALK ENHANCED GROVER SEARCH

Yan Wang

Woodruff School of Mechanical Engineering
Georgia Institute of Technology, Atlanta, GA 30332
yan.wang@me.gatech.edu

ABSTRACT

One of the significant breakthroughs in quantum computation is Grover's algorithm for unsorted database search. Recently, the applications of Grover's algorithm to solve global optimization problems have been demonstrated, where unknown optimum solutions are found by iteratively improving the threshold value for the selective phase shift operator in Grover rotation. In this paper, a hybrid approach that combines continuous-time quantum walks with Grover search is proposed. By taking advantage of quantum tunneling effect, local barriers are overcome and better threshold values can be found at the early stage of search process. The new algorithm based on the formalism is demonstrated with benchmark examples of global optimization. The results between the new algorithm and the Grover search method are also compared.

1 Introduction

Efficient global optimization methods are important for solving complex design problems. Algorithms such as particle swarm optimization [1, 2], genetic algorithm [3, 4], and simulated annealing [5,6] have been applied to solve multidisciplinary design optimization problems. In this paper, a new global optimization scheme is developed based on an emerging quantum computation paradigm. Quantum computing could exponentially speed up some of the most difficult problems in searching and quantum simulation. Different from the traditional digital computer, quantum computers are based on the quantum mechanical phenomena of superposition and entanglement. The potential of quantum computation to solve scientific and engineering

problems has been recognized in the past decade. The power of quantum computers is in both time and space efficiency. The major exciting breakthroughs include the discovery of Shor's algorithm [7] that factors integers in polynomial times which is exponentially faster than any of the previously known classical ones, and Grover's algorithm [8] for unsorted database search which has the quadratic speedup.

Rather than a bit, either 0 or 1 deterministically, used in the classical digital computer, a quantum computer has a different way to represent data. In quantum mechanics, the spin state of an electron can be represented by a wave function $|\psi\rangle$ which can be further represented in terms of the linear combination of two basic states, spin-down $|\downarrow\rangle$ or $|0\rangle$, and spin-up $|\uparrow\rangle$ or $|1\rangle$, written as $|\psi\rangle = a|0\rangle + b|1\rangle$. Such a wave function is defined as a quantum bit or *qubit*. Here, a and b are complex-valued coefficients or amplitudes under the normalization condition $|a|^2 + |b|^2 = 1$. The state of a quantum system, as the value of qubit, is not as "sharp" as classical bit (either 0 or 1). That is, a qubit has the continuum (instead of binary) state as any of the possible linear combinations of $|0\rangle$ and $|1\rangle$. This is the phenomenon of so-called superposition. Superposition enables a quantum particle to "have" two states simultaneously.

To represent a quantum state of N qubits, we entangle N wave functions as $|\Psi\rangle = |\psi_1\rangle \otimes \cdots \otimes |\psi_N\rangle$. The new wave function can also be presented in terms of basis states as $|\Psi\rangle = a_0|00\dots 00\rangle + \cdots + a_{2^N-1}|11\dots 11\rangle$ with $\sum_{k=0}^{2^N-1} |a_k|^2 = 1$. As a result, a system of N qubits can simultaneously represent a total of 2^N possible states, which the classical computer cannot do. The power of a quantum computer is its massive parallel computation because it acts on the superposition of all states simultane-

ously.

The computation in quantum computer is done through applying unitary operations on quantum registers formed by entangled qubits. At the end of operations, the result is obtained by measuring the state of the quantum system. Since the outcome of measurement is not deterministic, the algorithms performed by a quantum computer are probabilistic. A quantum algorithm actually generates a probability distribution of possible outputs. Yet, techniques such as amplitude amplification have been developed to increase the probability of obtaining the desirable output to near one during measurement.

Grover's search algorithm uses the amplitude amplification approach to find one or more solutions out of all possible ones x^* that meet some criterion such as $f(x^*) = 0$. Starting from a general state with all possible solutions are equally likely, a selective phase shift operation first performs a reflection and inverts the phase of the solution. Then a Grover operator is applied to invert all amplitudes around the mean value of all. This two-step Grover rotation is repeatedly applied for some iterations such that the amplitude corresponding to the solution is maximized. In locating one out of N items, Grover's search algorithm requires only $O(\sqrt{N})$ iterations of Grover rotations. In general, to locate one of m solutions out of a total of N possible items if m is known, the upper bound for the number of Grover rotations is $\lceil (\pi/4)\sqrt{N/m} \rceil$.

Recently, Grover's algorithm was applied to solve global optimization problems. The problem is formulated as to find solutions of $f(x) \leq c$ for minimization ($f(x) \geq c$ for maximization) where c is a threshold value and is improved iteratively during search. The challenge is that the threshold value needs to be decided at run time. Therefore, the number of solutions m is unknown, therefore the optimum number of Grover rotations is unknown either. Several approaches have been proposed to decide the number of Grover rotations for each iteration. In this paper, a new Grover search algorithm for global optimization is proposed, where a continuous-time quantum walk is applied as the preprocessing step. Quantum walk introduces tunneling so that a better guess of the threshold value at the initial steps of search could be found. This extra step helps accelerate the Grover search for global optima by increasing the sampling probabilities of the global optimum states through quantum accelerated diffusion.

In the remainder of the paper, the applications of Grover's algorithm for global optimization is reviewed and quantum walk is introduced in Section 2. The continuous-time quantum walk formulation is described in Section 3. The new global optimization algorithm that combines quantum walk and Grover search will be presented in Section 4. The computational study that simulates the quantum algorithm on the conventional computer will be described in Section 5.

2 Background

2.1 Grover's Algorithm for Optimization

Here, the Grover's algorithm is briefly introduced. Suppose there are m different solutions to problem $f(x) = 0$. We are interested in finding any of the solutions, assuming the value of m is known. Define normalized states $|\alpha\rangle = (1/\sqrt{N-m})\sum_{x:f(x)\neq 0}|x\rangle$ and $|\beta\rangle = (1/\sqrt{m})\sum_{x:f(x)=0}|x\rangle$. The initial state $|\psi\rangle$ with uniform distribution of amplitude is $|\psi\rangle = \sqrt{(N-m)/N}|\alpha\rangle + \sqrt{m/N}|\beta\rangle$, which is in the space spanned by $|\alpha\rangle$ and $|\beta\rangle$. Grover rotation operator, denoted as G , consists of two steps. After the first step, the selective phase shift operator S results in $S|\psi\rangle = \sqrt{(N-m)/N}|\alpha\rangle - \sqrt{m/N}|\beta\rangle$. For the second step, the Grover operation uses a unitary operator $(2|\psi\rangle\langle\psi| - I)$ to perform a reflection. Let $\cos(\theta/2) = \sqrt{(N-m)/N}$. Then $|\psi\rangle = \cos(\theta/2)|\alpha\rangle + \sin(\theta/2)|\beta\rangle$. After k iterations of Grover rotation, $G^k|\psi\rangle = \cos((2k+1)\theta/2)|\alpha\rangle + \sin((2k+1)\theta/2)|\beta\rangle$. If a k is found so that the amplitude value $\sin((2k+1)\theta/2)$ associated with $|\beta\rangle$ is maximized (as close to 1 as possible), then a measurement of the quantum state will most likely results in a $|\beta\rangle$, which is one of the m solutions.

Dürr and Høyer [9] first applied Grover's algorithm in optimization by randomly selecting a possible solution, using its functional evaluation as the threshold in the selective phase shift operator, and applying a certain number of Grover rotations for each optimum search iteration. The number of Grover rotations is increased gradually based on the upper bound of Grover search with unknown number of solutions [10]. Bulger et al. [11] took an adaptive search strategy to change the number of Grover rotations per iteration dynamically, where the number of Grover rotations is also randomly sampled between zero and the incremental limit. Baritompa et al. [12] developed a further improved adaptive algorithm where the number of Grover rotations for each iteration is determined by a strategy of maximizing the benefit-cost ratio as the expected value gain to the number of rotations. A static sequence of rotation numbers was also generated to heuristically implement the strategy. Bulger [13] combined Grover's search algorithm with local search techniques where Grover's algorithm is only used to locate the basin that possibly contains the global optimum solution. Liu and Koehler [14] provided a different strategy where Bayesian update is applied to determine the benefit-cost ratio, where the static sequence of rotation numbers can be calculated more efficiently. The static sequence has been extended to include 43 iterations. The static sequence of rotations, as the state of the art of Grover optimization, performs fairly well in the searching process. Liu and Koehler [15] also further improved the computational efficiency by taking only one Grover rotation at the early stage of search when the threshold is far from the global optimum and at least one fourth of all possible solutions have better functional evaluations than the threshold, in which case the selective phase shift operator takes $\cos^{-1}(1/9)$ instead of π as in the classical Grover search.

The new search algorithm proposed in this paper combines Grover search with quantum walks and takes the advantage of quantum tunneling to quickly improve the threshold functional value in Grover's algorithm at the early stage of search with only few Grover rotations. The existing Grover methods for global optimization only considered the improvement of computational efficiency by optimizing the number of Grover rotations. There is yet another aspect of the search efficiency, which is the threshold functional value. The threshold is important in convergence speed because it determines the number of solutions m out of a total of N possibilities in the discretized solution space. That is, there are m solutions of which the functional evaluations are better than the threshold value. If m is large, the magnitude of amplitude and thus the probability of finding the optimum will not be 'sharp', and the sampling of threshold is not effective in finding the actual optimum. The goal of our approach is to introduce a quantum walk mechanism so as to increase the 'sharpness' of probability distribution at the early stage of search with only a few Grover rotations. Here we use the heuristic static sequence of rotations as the basis for comparison.

2.2 Quantum Walks

In the proposed approach, quantum walks are applied whenever there is no improvement on the optimum solution during the iterative searching process. The goal is to take advantage of the tunneling effect to escape local minima for possible better thresholds. Quantum walk can be considered as a quantum version of the classical random walk, where a stochastic system is modeled in terms of probability amplitudes instead of probabilities. In random walk, the system's state \mathbf{x} at time t is described by a probability distribution $p(\mathbf{x}, t)$. The system evolves by transitions. The state distribution after a time period of τ is $p(\mathbf{x}, t + \tau) = T(\tau)p(\mathbf{x}, t)$ where $T(\tau)$ is the transition operator. In quantum walk, the system's state is described by the complex-valued amplitude $\psi(\mathbf{x}, t)$. Its relationship with the probability is $\psi^*\psi = |\psi|^2 = p$. The system evolution then is modeled by the quantum walk $\psi(\mathbf{x}, t + \tau) = U(\tau)\psi(\mathbf{x}, t)$ with U being a unitary and reversible operator. In quantum walks, probability is replaced by amplitude and Markovian dynamics is replaced by unitary dynamics.

Similar to random walks, there are discrete-time quantum walks and continuous-time quantum walks. The study of discrete-time quantum walks started from 1990s [16, 17] in the context of quantum algorithm and computation [18–20]. Although the term, continuous-time quantum walk, was introduced more recently [21], the research of the topic can be traced back much earlier in studying the dynamics of quantum systems, particularly in the path integral formulation of quantum mechanics generalized by Feynman [22] in 1940's. The relationship between the discrete- and continuous-time quantum walks was also studied. The two models have similar speed performance and in-

trinsic relationships. The convergence of discrete-time quantum walks toward continuous-time quantum walks has been demonstrated [23, 24].

3 Continuous-time quantum walk

The dynamics of quantum systems is described by Schrödinger's equation

$$i \frac{d}{dt} \Psi(\mathbf{x}, t) = H(t) \Psi(\mathbf{x}, t) \quad (1)$$

where $H(t)$ is the Hamiltonian and $i = \sqrt{-1}$. Continuous-time quantum walks in one-dimensional (1-D) space can be formulated to model the quantum drift-diffusion process, described by

$$i \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \Psi(x, t) = -\frac{b}{2} \frac{\partial^2}{\partial x^2} \Psi(x, t) - iV(x, t) \Psi(x, t) \quad (2)$$

where b is the diffusion coefficient and $V(x, t)$ is the potential function. Assuming that a minimization problem $\min_x f(x)$ is to be solved, we then have $V(x) = f(x)$.

Path integral is a classical approach to solve the quantum dynamics problem. To construct the unitary operator U that describes quantum state transitions, a general *functional integral* [25]

$$F_{jk} := \int dq_{jk} e^{-i \int_{t_0}^{t_0+\tau} W_{q(s)} ds} \prod_{l \rightarrow m} e^{i\theta_{ml}} \quad (3)$$

for a path from state x_k to state x_j is applied. Here, dq_{jk} is the probabilistic measure on the path from x_k to x_j , which is analogous to continuous-time Markov chain model. A *path* $q(s)$ is defined as a functional mapping from time s to the state space. For instance, $q(t_0) = x_k$ and $q(t_0 + \tau) = x_j$ represent the transitional path from state x_k to state x_j during a time period of τ . $\int_{t_0}^{t_0+\tau} W_{q(s)} ds$ gives the overall probability of all possible paths from x_k at time t_0 to x_j at time $t_0 + \tau$. $e^{-i \int_{t_0}^{t_0+\tau} W_{q(s)} ds}$ can be regarded as the *weight* of transition from x_k to x_j . $\prod_{l \rightarrow m} e^{i\theta_{ml}}$ is the *total phase shift factor* for all jumps in transition from x_k to x_j , where each of $e^{i\theta_{ml}}$ corresponds to the phase shift for one of the jumps during the transition.

Similar to the classical Chapman-Kolmogorov equation of state transitions, a transition rate from state x_k to state x_j at time t in terms of probability amplitude is

$$\rho_{jk} e^{i\theta_{jk}} := -i \langle x_j | H(t) | x_k \rangle \quad (4)$$

where ρ_{jk} is the magnitude of transition rate and θ_{jk} is the phase. Then the magnitude of leaving state x_k is

$$\rho_k := \sum_{k \neq j} \rho_{jk} \quad (5)$$

and the overall transition rate for state x_k is determined by

$$W_k := \langle x_k | H(t) | x_k \rangle + i\rho_k \quad (6)$$

The elements of the Hamiltonian matrix \hat{H} for 1-D lattice space that has integer indices and the spacing Δ are given by

$$\langle j|\hat{H}|k\rangle = -\frac{b}{2\Delta^2}\delta_{j,k-1} + \left(\frac{b}{\Delta^2} - iV_k\right)\delta_{j,k} - \frac{b}{2\Delta^2}\delta_{j,k+1} \quad (7)$$

where $\delta_{j,k}$ is the Kronecker delta, and the states are simply denoted by integers as $x = \dots, -2, -1, 0, 1, 2, \dots$

For a transitional path with $k \neq j$,

$$\rho_{jk} = \frac{b}{2\Delta^2}[\delta_{j,k-1} + \delta_{j,k+1}]$$

$$e^{i\theta_{jk}} = i$$

$$\rho_k = \rho_{k-1,k} + \rho_{k+1,k} = \frac{b}{\Delta^2}$$

$$W_k = \frac{b}{\Delta^2} - iV_k + i\frac{b}{\Delta^2}$$

3.1 Functional integral

Consider that the 1-D transitions are memoryless and the transition rate is $b/(2\Delta^2)$ per unit time. The numbers of transitions to the left or right direction within a time period follows a Poisson distribution. That is, the probability that there are l transitions to the left for time τ is $e^{-b\tau/(2\Delta^2)}(b\tau/(2\Delta^2))^l/l!$. Similarly it is $e^{-b\tau/(2\Delta^2)}(b\tau/(2\Delta^2))^r/r!$ for r transitions to the right. Assuming the final state is at n steps away and on the right to the initial state, $r - l = n$. The probabilistic measure dq_{jk} in Eq.(3) for one path from state 0 to $n\Delta$ that has l left jumps is

$$dq_{n,0}^{(l)} = \frac{e^{-b\tau/(2\Delta^2)}(b\tau/(2\Delta^2))^l}{l!} \frac{e^{-b\tau/(2\Delta^2)}(b\tau/(2\Delta^2))^{n+l}}{(n+l)!} \quad (8)$$

For a transition with n steps away from the initial state for a total period τ , the weight in the functional integral can be calculated as

$$e^{-i\sum_l W_l \tau_l} = e^{-i\sum_l [\frac{b}{\Delta^2} + i(\frac{b}{\Delta^2} - V_l)]\tau_l} \approx e^{(1-i)\frac{b}{\Delta^2}\tau - V_n\tau}$$

where V_n denotes the potential at the final state and $\sum_l \tau_l = \tau$. With the probabilistic measure as in Eq.(8), the functional integral for quantum drift-diffusion processes in Eq.(3) becomes

$$F_{n,0} = \sum_{l=0}^{\infty} [dq_{n,0}^{(l)} e^{-i\tau(1+i)b/\Delta^2 - V_n\tau} (-1)^l i^n]$$

$$= \sum_{l=0}^{\infty} e^{-b\tau/\Delta^2} \frac{(b\tau/(2\Delta^2))^{2l+n}}{l!(n+l)!} e^{-i\tau(1+i)b/\Delta^2 - V_n\tau} (-1)^l i^n \quad (9)$$

$$= i^n e^{-ib\tau/\Delta^2 - V_n\tau} \sum_{l=0}^{\infty} \frac{(-1)^l (b\tau/(2\Delta^2))^{2l+n}}{l!(n+l)!}$$

$$= i^n e^{-ib\tau/\Delta^2 - V_n\tau} J_n\left(\frac{b\tau}{\Delta^2}\right)$$

where $J_n(y)$ is the *Bessel function of first kind* with integer order n and input y ($y \geq 0$). Additionally, $J_{-n}(y) = (-1)^n J_n(y)$.

Based on Eq.(9), the elements of the unitary quantum walk operator $U = (u_{jk})_{N \times N}$ are updated as $u_{jk} = F_{(j-k),0}$ for the given space resolution Δ and time resolution τ .

3.2 Choice of time step τ

Compared to random walk, the power of quantum walk lies in its capability of capturing the long-range spatial correlation and thus the tunneling effect. This is largely due to the Bessel function. Given the amplitudes $\Psi(t)$ associated with all states at time t , one step of quantum walk will yield $\Psi(t + \tau)$ with the j^{th} element ($j = 1, \dots, N$) updated by

$$\Psi_j(t + \tau) = \sum_k F_{(j-k),0} \Psi_k(t)$$

Consider that the system starts at state K with $\Psi_K(t) = 1.0$ and $\Psi_{k \neq K}(t) = 0.0$, where K is any index between 1 and N . The j^{th} element is then updated to

$$\Psi_j(t + \tau) = F_{(j-K),0} = i^{(j-K)} e^{-ib\tau/\Delta^2 - V_j\tau} J_{(j-K)}\left(\frac{b\tau}{\Delta^2}\right)$$

The corresponding updated probability that state j is observed is

$$\Pr(x = j) = \Psi_j^*(t + \tau) \Psi_j(t + \tau) = C_0 e^{-2V_j\tau} J_{(j-K)}^2\left(\frac{b\tau}{\Delta^2}\right) \quad (10)$$

where C_0 is a normalization factor to ensure that $\sum_{j=1}^N \Pr(x = j) = 1$. With Eq.(10), the probability of arriving certain state can be adjusted by selecting appropriate time step τ and diffusion coefficient b . Given that the Bessel functions of the first kind J_n 's are continuous and oscillatory with values between -1 and 1 , $\Pr(x = j)$ in Eq.(10) has the local maximum values where τ satisfies $\partial J_{(j-K)}/\partial \tau = 0$ with fixed b and Δ .

The first derivatives of Bessel function $J_n(z)$'s with respect to z can be derived and calculated recursively. From the recurrence forms of Bessel function

$$\frac{d}{dz} [z^n J_n(z)] = z^n J_{n-1}(z)$$

and

$$\frac{d}{dz} [z^{-n} J_n(z)] = -z^{-n} J_{n+1}(z)$$

we can further receive

$$nz^{-1} J_n(z) + J'_n(z) = J_{n-1}(z) \quad (11)$$

and

$$-nz^{-1} J_n(z) + J'_n(z) = -J_{n+1}(z) \quad (12)$$

respectively. The summation of Eqs.(11) and (12) yields

$$J'_n(z) = \frac{1}{2} [J_{n-1}(z) - J_{n+1}(z)] \quad (13)$$

Additionally, from Eq.(12)

$$J'_0(z) = -J_1(z)$$

The zeros of $J'_n(z)$'s determine where the local maximum probabilities in Eq.(10) are obtained with the oscillatory pattern. Some example solutions of $J'_n(z) = 0$ are listed in Table 1. Notice that the coefficient $e^{-2V_j\tau}$ in Eq.(10) adds the modulation effect

Table 1. Example solutions of $J'_n(z) = 0$

n=0	3.83170597	7.01558667	10.17346814	13.32369194
n=1	1.84118378	5.33144277	8.53631637	11.7060049
n=2	3.05423693	6.70613319	9.96946782	13.17037086
n=3	4.20118894	8.0152366	11.34592431	14.58584829

of the potential or objective function onto the probability distribution. As a result, the states with lower energy levels tend to have higher probability values. In addition, the zeros of $J_n(z)$'s determine where the probabilities become zeros and no samples will be drawn from those states.

The choice of time step τ affects the probability value in Eq.(10). The temptation is to choose τ to be as large as possible such that the quantum walk can span over the major portion of state space. However, a balanced approach should be taken, because $\sum_n J_n(z) = 1$ regardless z . That is, the overall oscillatory amplitudes are reduced if large z 's are taken, and the advantage of introducing quantum walk over the uniform initial sampling in other Grover approaches [12, 14, 15] may diminish. If the global optimum solution has been known within some particular regions in the solution space, the time step size can be tailored so that the quantum walk do not under or over shoot so that the regions are fully covered and without overestimation.

Eq.(13) also indicates that the maximum probability for a spatial walking step size n is achieved at the time step where the probabilities for the spatial step size $n - 1$ and $n + 1$ are the same, if the effect of potential is not considered. This gives a unique pattern of spatial-temporal relationship for quantum walks. It is seen in Eq.(10) that the PDF is quadratically more sensitive to spatial resolution than to temporal resolution because of $J_n(b\tau/\Delta^2)$. That is, the amplitude is proportional to $1/\Delta^2$ and τ respectively. A variation in Δ results in a more prominent change of PDF than a variation in τ .

To solve $\min f(x)$ by the optimization methods based on Grover search, if there are m solutions out of a total of N possible ones such that f is less than a threshold value c , then the probability of finding a better functional evaluation after r Grover rotations is $\Pr(f_r(x) < c) = \sin^2[(2r + 1) \arcsin \sqrt{m/N}]$ [10]. The sampling efficiency of quantum walk with a chosen τ is stated as follows.

Theorem 1. If there is a $J_{(L)}(b\tau/\Delta^2)$ such that $J_{(L)}^2(b\tau/\Delta^2) \leq J_{(j)}^2(b\tau/\Delta^2) (\forall j \in \{j | V_j < c\})$ with diffusion coefficient b , spatial resolution Δ , and time step τ , and $\sqrt{C_0 m} e^{-c\tau} |J_{(L)}(b\tau/\Delta^2)| > \sin[(2r + 1) \arcsin \sqrt{m/N}]$, quantum walk search is more efficient than the Grover search with the probability of finding m solutions out of N possible ones with the threshold value c based on r rotations.

Proof. From Eq.(10), the probability of finding a better evaluation than c after one iteration of quantum walk is

$C_0 \sum_{V_j < c} e^{-2V_j \tau} J_{(j)}^2(b\tau/\Delta^2)$. In order to ensure that quantum walk can locate a better threshold value, we need $C_0 \sum_{V_j < c} e^{-2V_j \tau} J_{(j)}^2(b\tau/\Delta^2) > \sin^2[(2r + 1) \arcsin \sqrt{m/N}]$. Given that $\sum_{V_j < c} e^{-2V_j \tau} \geq m e^{-2c\tau}$ and if we can find a $J_{(L)}(b\tau/\Delta^2)$ such that $J_{(L)}^2(b\tau/\Delta^2) \leq J_{(j)}^2(b\tau/\Delta^2)$ for all j such that $V_j < c$, then

$$\sqrt{C_0 \sum_{V_j < c} e^{-2V_j \tau} J_{(j)}^2(b\tau/\Delta^2)} \geq \sqrt{C_0 m} e^{-c\tau} |J_{(L)}(b\tau/\Delta^2)|$$

4 The new global optimization algorithm

The proposed algorithm starts with one step of continuous-time quantum walk so that the probabilities of states are distributed according to the objective function, where the minimum solutions have higher sampling probabilities during quantum measurement. The functional evaluation of the sampled solution is used as the threshold to decide the selective phase shift operation in the Grover rotation. The heuristic Grover optimization algorithm [12, 14] is used as the basis for comparison. The sequence is $Rc = (0, 0, 0, 0, 1, 1, 0, 1, 1, 2, 1, 2, 3, 1, 4, 5, 1, 6, 2, 7, 9, 11, 13, 16, 5, 20, 24, 28, 34, 2, 41, 49, 4, 60, 72, 9, 88, 105, 125, 3, 149, 22, 183, 219)$. At the beginning of search, the number of rotations is very small. Therefore, the measurements at the early process are dependent on almost uniform samplings. Our algorithm replaces these small number of Grover rotations with one step of quantum walk. That is, based on a predetermined threshold rotation value R_0 , if the rotation number is not greater than R_0 , we use one step of quantum walk instead of Grover rotation. After a number of Grover rotations, a new sample is drawn from the resulted amplitude. If the functional evaluation has improved, then the new value will be used as the updated threshold for the next iteration of Grover search. The iteration continues until certain stop criteria are met. The new algorithm is listed in Table 2.

As shown in Table 2, the position of the initial state x_0 can be either randomly or deterministically selected with its amplitude as one. As the search starts, one step of quantum walk is performed. The first measurement is obtained by sampling from the resulted distribution and the value is set to be the threshold c . If the static number of rotations is less than a predetermined rotation threshold R_0 , then one step of quantum walk is applied instead of Grover rotations. Notice that one quantum walk requires one evaluation of objective function, whereas R Grover rotations requires R evaluations.

Lemma 1. In solving $\min_{x \in \Omega} f(x)$, the solution sampled based on the amplitude $\Psi_{QW}(x)$ resulted from quantum walk operator has better expected value than the one based on the amplitude $\Psi_H(x)$ resulted from Hadamard operator, i.e. $\mathbb{E}_{\Psi_{QW}^2}[f] < \mathbb{E}_{\Psi_H^2}[f]$.

Proof. Suppose $|\Omega| = N$ in a discretized space. From Eq.(10),

Table 2. The quantum walk enhanced Grover search algorithm for minimization problems

QW_Grover_Minimization_Search()
Input: objective function $V(x)$, diffusion coefficient $b(t)$, time step τ , iterations $ITER$
Output: optimum solution x^* , optimum value c

```

iter = 0;
count = 0;
initialize  $\psi(x)$  as  $\psi(x_0) = 1.0$  at a selected position  $x_0$ ;
compute unitary operator  $U = F(\tau, \Delta, b(t), V)$  by Eq.(9);
 $|\psi\rangle = U|\psi\rangle$ ;
randomly sample an  $x^*$  based on distribution  $\psi^2(x)$ ;
initialize threshold value  $c = V(x^*)$ ;
BBW_sequence = [0, 0, 0, 0, 1, 1, 0, 1, 1, 2, 1, 2, 3, 1, 4, 5, 1, 6, 2, 7, 9, 11, 13, 16, 5, 20, 24, 28, 34, 2, 41, 49, 4, 60, 72, 9, 88, 105, 125, 3, 149, 22, 183, 219];
%main iterations of search%
WHILE iter < ITER and stop criteria not met
    R = BBW_sequence[iter];
    IF R ≤ R0 %perform one random walk %
        initialize  $\psi(x)$  as  $\psi(x_0) = 1.0$ ;
         $|\psi\rangle = U|\psi\rangle$ ;
        randomly sample an  $x_1$  based on distribution  $\psi^2(x)$ ;
        IF  $V(x_1) < V(x^*)$  %update the threshold %
            c = V(x1);
            x* = x1;
        END IF
    ELSE %perform R Grover rotations %
        initialize  $\psi(x)$  as a uniform distribution;
        FOR r = 1 to R
            apply Grover rotation operator to  $\psi(x)$ ;
        END FOR
        randomly sample an  $x_1$  based on distribution  $\psi^2(x)$ ;
        IF  $V(x_1) < V(x^*)$  %update the threshold %
            c = V(x1);
            x* = x1;
        END IF
    END IF
    iter = iter + 1;
END WHILE

```

the expected value after one iteration of quantum walk is

$$\mathbb{E}_{\psi_{QW}^2}[f] = \sum_{j=1}^N f(j) e^{-2f(j)\tau} J_{(j-K)}^2\left(\frac{b\tau}{\Delta^2}\right) / \sum_{j=1}^N e^{-2f(j)\tau} J_{(j-K)}^2\left(\frac{b\tau}{\Delta^2}\right)$$

for a N -qubit system. With $e^{-2f(j)\tau}$ in the probability density, solutions with smaller $f(x)$'s correspond to higher probabilities. Therefore, the expected value $\mathbb{E}_{\psi_{QW}^2}[f]$ is smaller than

$\mathbb{E}_{\psi_H^2}[f] = \sum_{j=1}^N f(j)/N$ based on the amplitude $\psi_H(x) = 1/\sqrt{N}$ after Hadamard operation.

Lemma 2. In solving $\min_{x \in \Omega} f(x)$, the solution sampled based on the amplitude $\psi_{QW}(x)$ resulted from quantum walk operator has a smaller variance than the one based on the amplitude $\psi_H(x)$ resulted from Hadamard operator, i.e. $\mathbb{E}_{\psi_{QW}^2}[(f - \mathbb{E}_{\psi_{QW}^2}[f])^2] < \mathbb{E}_{\psi_H^2}[(f - \mathbb{E}_{\psi_H^2}[f])^2]$.

Proof. From Lemma 1, we know $\mathbb{E}_{\psi_{QW}^2}[f] < \mathbb{E}_{\psi_H^2}[f]$. The state or solution space is divided into the following four subspaces: $\Omega_1 = \{x | f \leq \mathbb{E}_{\psi_{QW}^2}[f]\}$, $\Omega_2 = \{x | \mathbb{E}_{\psi_{QW}^2}[f] < f \leq \mathbb{E}_{\psi_H^2}[f], |f - \mathbb{E}_{\psi_{QW}^2}[f]| \leq |f - \mathbb{E}_{\psi_H^2}[f]|\}$, $\Omega_3 = \{x | \mathbb{E}_{\psi_{QW}^2}[f] < f \leq \mathbb{E}_{\psi_H^2}[f], |f - \mathbb{E}_{\psi_{QW}^2}[f]| > |f - \mathbb{E}_{\psi_H^2}[f]|\}$, and $\Omega_4 = \{x | f > \mathbb{E}_{\psi_H^2}[f]\}$. For subspaces Ω_1 and Ω_2 , $(f - \mathbb{E}_{\psi_{QW}^2}[f])^2 \leq (f - \mathbb{E}_{\psi_H^2}[f])^2$. If we use $\mathbb{E}_{\psi_{QW}^2}^{(k)}[f]$ to denote the expected value for the k -th subspace where the probability values are the same as the original ones within the subspace and are zeros outside the subspace, then $\mathbb{E}_{\psi_{QW}^2}^{(1 \cup 2)}[(f - \mathbb{E}_{\psi_{QW}^2}[f])^2] < \mathbb{E}_{\psi_H^2}^{(1 \cup 2)}[(f - \mathbb{E}_{\psi_{QW}^2}[f])^2] \leq \mathbb{E}_{\psi_H^2}^{(1 \cup 2)}[(f - \mathbb{E}_{\psi_H^2}[f])^2]$. For subspaces Ω_3 and Ω_4 , $(f - \mathbb{E}_{\psi_{QW}^2}[f])^2 > (f - \mathbb{E}_{\psi_H^2}[f])^2$. Then $\mathbb{E}_{\psi_{QW}^2}^{(3 \cup 4)}[(f - \mathbb{E}_{\psi_{QW}^2}[f])^2] > \mathbb{E}_{\psi_{QW}^2}^{(3 \cup 4)}[(f - \mathbb{E}_{\psi_H^2}[f])^2] \geq \mathbb{E}_{\psi_H^2}^{(3 \cup 4)}[(f - \mathbb{E}_{\psi_H^2}[f])^2]$. The original expectations are $\mathbb{E}_{\psi_H^2} = \mathbb{E}_{\psi_H^2}^{(1 \cup 2)} + \mathbb{E}_{\psi_H^2}^{(3 \cup 4)}$ and $\mathbb{E}_{\psi_{QW}^2} = \mathbb{E}_{\psi_{QW}^2}^{(1 \cup 2)} + \mathbb{E}_{\psi_{QW}^2}^{(3 \cup 4)}$. Therefore, $\mathbb{E}_{\psi_{QW}^2}[(f - \mathbb{E}_{\psi_{QW}^2}[f])^2] < \mathbb{E}_{\psi_H^2}[(f - \mathbb{E}_{\psi_H^2}[f])^2]$.

Theorem 2. In searching the global optimum in the solution space Ω , sampling based on $\psi_{QW}^2(x)$ after one iteration of quantum walk provides a better solution than the one based on $\psi_H^2(x)$ after Hadamard operation.

Proof. For minimization problems, Lemma 1 shows that the expected value from samplings based on $\psi_{QW}^2(x)$ is less than the one based on $\psi_H^2(x)$. Lemma 2 shows that the variance of samples based on $\psi_{QW}^2(x)$ is also less than the one based on $\psi_H^2(x)$. The similar proof can be obtained for maximization problems.

Theorem 3. In searching the global optimum in the solution space Ω , sampling based on $\psi_{QW}^2(x)$ after one iteration of quantum walk results in a threshold value that is better than the one based on $\psi_G^2(x)$ after one iteration of Grover operation, if the quantum walk successfully locates the basin of global optimum.

Proof. It is well known that one iteration of Grover operation can locate one of m solutions with the probability of one if $m = N/4$ where N is the size of discrete solution space [10]. In this case, for the minimization problem $\min_{x \in \Omega} f(x)$, $|\{x | f(x) \leq c\}| = |\Omega|/4$. One iteration of Grover operation results in $\psi_G^2(x) =$




Figure 1. Test functions: Rastrigin, Ackley, Schwefel

$4/|\Omega|$ for subspace $\{x|f(x) \leq c\}$ and $\psi_G^2(x) = 0$ for subspace $\{x|f(x) > c\}$.

5 Implementation and numerical experiments

Both the new algorithm denoted by BBW-QW and the BBW algorithm [12, 14] are implemented in a quantum computer emulator written in python. Experiments are conducted by several test functions, including Rastrigin $f(x) = 10 + x^2 - 10\cos(2\pi x)$, Schwefel $f(x) = -4.189829 + 30x\sin(\sqrt{|30x|})$, and Ackley $f(x) = -20\exp(-0.2|4x|) - \exp(\cos(2\pi x))$. All of the functions are challenging for local search because of the multiple steep wells of local optimums, as shown in Figure 1, and have been widely used as benchmarks in global optimization.


For our experiments, 9 qubits are taken to represent the discrete solution space. The corresponding spatial resolution is $\Delta = (x_U - x_L)/2^9$ given the lower bound x_L and upper bound x_U of the considered solution range. We also implemented the BBW algorithm with both dynamic and static rotation strategies. In the dynamic strategy, the numbers of rotations are calculated at run time to maximize the benefit-cost ratio for each iteration, whereas in the static strategy, the numbers of rotations are fixed as a sequence of values. Our experiments showed that the static rotation strategy actually performs more robust with higher probabilities of success for these benchmark functions used in this paper. Therefore the static strategy is used to compared with the proposed quantum walk based method.

As shown in Figure 2, the average PDF's over 20 runs of search are compared between the proposed quantum walk grover search algorithm and the BBW algorithm, where the rotation threshold R_0 is 2. The typical PDF's for only one run of search by the two algorithms are compared in Figure 3. It is seen that the PDF's are flat and close to the uniform distribution for few rotations in the BBW algorithm. In the proposed BBW-QW algorithm, they are replaced by a sharper distribution after one step


of quantum walk. The efficiency of the two algorithms is compared in Figure 4, where the probabilities of successful samplings with respect to (w.r.t.) the number of iterations and the number of functional evaluations are compared with different values of rotation threshold R_0 . At the initial stage of search with few iterations, quantum walk provides higher probabilities of success. It is seen that when $R_0 = 2$, the difference between the BBW-QW and BBW algorithms is the most significant. The benefit of quantum walk is also seen at the later stage of the search. The number of functional evaluations is a better criterion to evaluate the efficiency. Figure 4-(b) illustrates the difference between the BBW and BBW-QW algorithms. Figure 4-(c) compares the efficiencies of BBW and BBW-QW algorithm when the domain size is increased from $x \in [-5, 5]$ to $x \in [-15, 15]$. The efficiency of the BBW algorithms slightly decreases at the early search stage as the domain size increases, whereas it does not change much for the BBW-QW algorithm. It is also seen that with about 50 evaluations, both BBW and BBW-QW algorithms increase the probability of success to about 90%. The difference between the two starts to emerge when more iterations are taken.

To provide an overall picture of how the quantum search algorithms are compared with traditional global optimization methods, the probabilities of successful search w.r.t. the number of functional evaluations in the BBW, BBW-QW, simulated annealing, and genetic algorithms (GA) for Rastrigin function are compared in Figure 5. The results from the genetic algorithms with different population sizes (5, 25, and 50) and simulated annealing with different initial temperature (100 and 1000) are shown. The optimum solution is known at $x = 0$. When the distance between a located solution and the known optimum solution is less than a threshold value of 1.0×10^{-4} , the search is regarded as a success. The threshold is chosen to be compatible with the resolution used in the quantum algorithms as a result of the number of available qubits. The number of iterations affect the probability of success. Among the three population sizes, the population size of 25 is the best. Yet it is still much less efficient than the quantum search algorithms. Similarly, simulated annealing is not as efficient as the quantum search algorithms.


The results of the BBW and BBW-QW algorithms in searching for Schwefel function are compared in Figure 6 where $R_0 = 0$. The efficiencies of the BBW and BBW-QW algorithms with different R_0 values are also compared in Figure 7. It is seen that the quantum search algorithms work more efficiently for Schwefel function than for Rastrigin function. The optimum solution can be found with the probability of one with only few iterations. As a result, the difference between the two algorithms is relatively small. Figure 8 compares the efficiencies of the BBW and BBW-QW algorithms for Ackley function. Similar to Rastrigin function, $R_0 = 2$ provides an obvious improvement for Schwefel and Ackley functions. It should be noted that the rotational threshold R_0 plays a key role of efficiency for the BBW-QW compared to BBW. If R_0 is too large, more quantum walks (with




(a) average PDF by BBW-QW algorithm ($R_0 = 2$)



(a) typical PDF by BBW-QW algorithm ($R_0 = 2$)



(b) average PDF by BBW algorithm



(b) typical PDF by BBW algorithm

Figure 2. Comparison between average PDF's for Rastrigin function

Figure 3. Comparison between typical PDF's for Rastrigin function


additional functional evaluations) are applied during the search, which will decrease the efficiency of the search algorithm. The test results show that a threshold value of $R_0 < 2$ is good for the test functions. In general, the selection of the value of R_0 depends on the complexity of the objective function. If the function has more local optima or wells in the search domain, more quantum walks are necessary, therefore a larger value of R_0 needs to be chosen.

6 Concluding remarks


In this paper, a hybrid approach that combines quantum walks with Grover search to solve global optimization problems is proposed. By taking advantages of quantum tunneling effect, quantum walks can enhance the traditional Grover search algorithm and improve the efficiency of search. The acceleration is achieved by quickly improving the threshold value at the early stage of search so that the solution space can be reduced faster

during the Grover search.


Different from existing Grover search algorithms that focus on optimizing the number of Grover rotations only, the new algorithm tries to improve the search efficiency by accelerating the convergence of threshold value toward the optimum. Nevertheless, as the threshold approaches the optimum value, the number of Grover rotations also increases. Therefore, a balance between the number of rotations and the number of iterations is needed for particular problems or applications. In an actual quantum computation environment, each sampling or measurement after performing a number of Grover rotations will actually destroy the quantum coherence. The amplitudes of the system will turn into one for the measured solution and zeros for all others. For each iteration, the Grover rotation always starts from the uniform distribution. Therefore, there is an overhead when the quantum register is initialized by Hadamard operation for each iteration. Reducing the number of iterations thus can improve the efficiency of computation in general.



(a) probability of success w.r.t. iterations



(b) probability of success w.r.t. functional evaluations



(c) the effect of domain size w.r.t. functional evaluations

Figure 4. Comparison the efficiency of the BBW and proposed BBW-QW algorithms






Figure 5. Comparison the efficiency of the BBW, GA, and simulated annealing algorithms for Rastrigin function




(a) average PDF by BBW-QW algorithm ($R_0 = 0$)




(b) average PDF by BBW algorithm

Figure 6. Comparison between average PDF's for Schwefel function



(a) probability of success w.r.t. iterations



(b) probability of success w.r.t. functional evaluations

Figure 7. Comparison the efficiency of the BBW and proposed BBW-QW algorithms for Schwefel function




Figure 8. Comparison the efficiency of the BBW and proposed BBW-QW algorithms for Ackley function

REFERENCES

- [1] Venter, G., and Sobieszczanski-Sobieski, J., 2004. "Multidisciplinary optimization of a transport aircraft wing using particle swarm optimization". *Structural and Multidisciplinary Optimization*, **26**(1-2), pp. 121–131.
- [2] Venter, G., and Haftka, R., 2010. "Constrained particle swarm optimization using a bi-objective formulation". *Structural and Multidisciplinary Optimization*, **40**(1-6), pp. 65–76.
- [3] Lee, J., and Hajela, P., 1996. "Parallel genetic algorithm implementation in multidisciplinary rotor blade design". *Journal of Aircraft*, **33**(5), pp. 962–969.
- [4] Obayashi, S., 1998. "Multidisciplinary design optimization of aircraft wing planform based on evolutionary algorithms". In *IEEE International Conference on Systems Man and Cybernetics*, Vol. 4, INSTITUTE OF ELECTRICAL ENGINEERS INC (IEEE), pp. 3148–3153.
- [5] Tekinalp, O., and Bingol, M., 2004. "Simulated annealing for missile optimization: Developing method and formulation techniques". *Journal of guidance, control, and dynamics*, **27**(4), pp. 616–626.
- [6] Jilla, C. D., and Miller, D. W., 2004. "Multi-objective, multidisciplinary design optimization methodology for distributed satellite systems". *Journal of Spacecraft and Rockets*, **41**(1), pp. 39–50.
- [7] Shor, P. W., 1994. "Algorithms for quantum computation: discrete logarithms and factoring". In *Foundations of Computer Science, 1994 Proceedings., 35th Annual Symposium on*, IEEE, pp. 124–134.
- [8] Grover, L. K., 1996. "A fast quantum mechanical algorithm for database search". In *Proceedings of the twenty-eighth annual ACM symposium on Theory of computing*, ACM, pp. 212–219.
- [9] Dürr, C., and Høyer, P., 1996. "A quantum algorithm for finding the minimum". *arXiv preprint quant-ph/9607014*.
- [10] Boyer, M., Brassard, G., Høyer, P., and Tapp, A., 1998. "Tight bounds on quantum searching". *Fortschritte der Physik*, **46**(4-5), pp. 493–505.
- [11] Bulger, D., Baritompa, W. P., and Wood, G. R., 2003. "Implementing pure adaptive search with grover's quantum algorithm". *Journal of optimization theory and applications*, **116**(3), pp. 517–529.
- [12] Baritompa, W. P., Bulger, D. W., and Wood, G. R., 2005. "Grover's quantum algorithm applied to global optimization". *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, **15**(4), pp. 1170–1184.
- [13] Bulger, D. W., 2007. "Combining a local search and grovers algorithm in black-box global optimization". *Journal of optimization theory and applications*, **133**(3), pp. 289–301.
- [14] Liu, Y., and Koehler, G. J., 2010. "Using modifications to grovers search algorithm for quantum global optimization". *European Journal of Operational Research*, **207**(2),

pp. 620–632.

- [15] Liu, Y., and Koehler, G. J., 2012. “A hybrid method for quantum global optimization”. *Journal of Global Optimization*, **52**(3), pp. 607–626.
- [16] Meyer, D., 1996. “From quantum cellular automata to quantum lattice gases”. *Journal of Statistical Physics*, **85**(5-6), pp. 551–574.
- [17] Ambainis, A., Bach, E., Nayak, A., Vishwanath, A., and Watrous, J., 2001. “One-dimensional quantum walks”. In Proceedings of the thirty-third annual ACM symposium on Theory of computing, STOC '01, ACM, pp. 37–49.
- [18] Kempe, J., 2003. “Quantum random walks: An introductory overview”. *Contemporary Physics*, **44**(4), pp. 307–327.
- [19] Kendon, V., 2007. “Decoherence in quantum walks – a review”. *Mathematical Structures in Computer Science*, **17**(6), Dec, pp. 1169–1220.
- [20] Konno, N., 2008. “Quantum walks”. In *Quantum Potential Theory*, Vol. 1954 of *Lecture Notes in Mathematics*. Springer, Berlin / Heidelberg, pp. 309–452.
- [21] Farhi, E., and Gutmann, S., 1998. “Quantum computation and decision trees”. *Phys. Rev. A*, **58**, Aug, pp. 915–928.
- [22] Feynman, R. P., 1948. “Space-time approach to non-relativistic quantum mechanics”. *Reviews of Modern Physics*, **20**, Apr, pp. 367–387.
- [23] Strauch, F. W., 2006. “Connecting the discrete- and continuous-time quantum walks”. *Phys. Rev. A*, **74**, Sep, p. 030301.
- [24] Childs, A. M., 2010. “On the relationship between continuous-and discrete-time quantum walk”. *Communications In Mathematical Physics*, **294**, pp. 581–603.
- [25] Farhi, E., and Gutmann, S., 1992. “The functional integral constructed directly from the hamiltonian”. *Annals of Physics*, **213**(1), pp. 182–203.