

Multiojective Optimization in a Quantum Adiabatic Computer*

Benjamín Barán[†]

Marcos Villagra[‡]

*Universidad Nacional de Asunción
Núcleo de Investigación y Desarrollo Tecnológico (NIDTEC)*

Abstract

In this work we present a quantum algorithm for multiojective combinatorial optimization. We show how to map a convex combination of objective functions onto a Hamiltonian and then use that Hamiltonian to prove that the quantum adiabatic algorithm of Farhi *et al.* [FGGS00] can find Pareto-optimal solutions in finite time provided certain convex combinations of objectives are used and the underlying multiojective problem meets certain restrictions.

Keywords: quantum computation, multiojective optimization, quantum adiabatic evolution.

1 Introduction

Optimization problems are pervasive in everyday applications like logistics, communication networks, artificial intelligence and many other areas. Consequently, there is a high demand of efficient algorithms for these problems. Many algorithmic and engineering techniques applied to optimization problems are being developed to make an efficient use of computational resources in optimization problems. In fact, several engineering applications are multiojective optimization problems, where several objectives must be optimized at the same time. For a survey on multiojective optimization see for example Refs. [EG00, vLBB14]. In this work, we present what we consider the first algorithm for multiojective optimization using a quantum adiabatic computer.

Quantum computation is a promising paradigm for the design of highly efficient algorithms based on the principles of quantum mechanics. Researchers have studied the computational power of quantum computers by showing the advantages it presents over classical computers in many applications. Two of the most well-known applications are in unstructured search and the factoring of composite numbers. In structured search, Grover's algorithm can find a single marked element among n elements in time $O(\sqrt{n})$, whereas any other classical algorithm requires time at least n [Gro96]. Shor's algorithm can factor composite numbers in polynomial time—any other known classical algorithm can find factors of composite numbers in subexponential time (it is open whether a classical algorithm can find factors in polynomial time) [Sho94].

Initially, before the year 2000, optimization problems were not easy to construct using quantum computers. This was because most studied models of quantum computers were based on quantum circuits which presented difficulties for the design of optimization algorithms. The first paper reporting on solving an optimization problem was in Ref. [DH99]. Their algorithm finds a minimum inside an array of n numbers in time $O(\sqrt{n})$. More recently, Baritompá *et al.* [BBW05] presented an improved algorithm based on Ref. [DH99]; this latter algorithm, however, does not have a proof of convergence in finite time. The algorithms of Refs. [DH99] and [BBW05] are based on Grover's search, and hence, in the quantum circuit model.

Quantum Adiabatic Computing was introduced by Farhi *et al.* [FGGS00] as a new quantum algorithm and computation paradigm more friendly to optimization problems. This new paradigm is based on a natural phenomenon of quantum annealing [DC08]; analogously to classical annealing, optimization problems are mapped onto a natural optimization phenomenon, and thus, optimal solutions are found by just letting this phenomenon to take place.

*An extended abstract of this paper appeared in Ref. [BV16]

[†]Email: bbaran@cba.com.py

[‡]Email: mvillagra@pol.una.py; corresponding author

The algorithms of Refs. [DH99] and [BBW05] are difficult to extend to multiobjective optimization and to prove convergence in finite time. Hence, quantum adiabatic computing presents itself as a more suitable model to achieve the following two goals: (i) to propose a quantum algorithm for multiobjective optimization and (ii) prove convergence in finite time of the algorithm.

In this work, as our main contribution, we show that the quantum adiabatic algorithm of Farhi *et al.* [FGGS00] can be used to find Pareto-optimal solutions in finite time provided certain restrictions are met. In Theorem 4.1, we identify two structural features that any multiobjective optimization problem must have in order to use the abovementioned adiabatic algorithm.

The outline of this paper is the following. In Section 2 we present a brief overview of multiobjective combinatorial optimization and introduce the notation used throughout this work; in particular, several new properties of multiobjective combinatorial optimization are also presented that are of independent interest. In Section 3 we explain the quantum adiabatic theorem, which is the basis of the adiabatic algorithm. In Section 4 we explain the adiabatic algorithm and its application to combinatorial multiobjective optimization. In Section 5 we prove our main result of Theorem 4.1. In Section 6 we show how to use the adiabatic algorithm in a concrete problem. Finally, in Section 7 we present a list of challenging open problems.

2 Multiobjective Combinatorial Optimization

In this section we introduce the notation used throughout this paper and the main concepts of multiobjective optimization. The set of natural numbers (including 0) is denoted \mathbb{N} , the set of integers is \mathbb{Z} , the set of real numbers is denoted \mathbb{R} and the set of positive real numbers is \mathbb{R}^+ . For any $i, j \in \mathbb{N}$, with $i < j$, we let $[i, j]_{\mathbb{Z}}$ denote the discrete interval $\{i, i+1, \dots, j-1, j\}$. The set of binary words of length n is denoted $\{0, 1\}^n$. We also let $\text{poly}(n) = O(n^c)$ be a polynomial in n .

A *multiobjective combinatorial optimization problem* (or MCO) is an optimization problem involving multiple objectives over a finite set of feasible solutions. These objectives typically present trade-offs among solutions and in general there is no single optimal solution. In this work, we follow the definition of Ref. [KLP75]. Furthermore, with no loss of generality, all optimization problems considered in this work are minimization problems.

Let S_1, \dots, S_d be totally ordered sets and let \leq_i be an order on set S_i for each $i \in [1, d]_{\mathbb{Z}}$. We also let n_i be the cardinality of S_i . Define the natural partial order relation \prec over the cartesian product $S_1 \times \dots \times S_d$ in the following way. For any $u = (u_1, \dots, u_d)$ and $v = (v_1, \dots, v_d)$ in $S_1 \times \dots \times S_d$, we write $u \prec v$ if and only if for any $i \in [1, d]_{\mathbb{Z}}$ it holds that $u_i \leq_i v_i$; otherwise we write $u \not\prec v$. An element $u \in S$ is a *minimal element* if there is no $v \in S$ such that $v \prec u$ and $v \neq u$. Moreover, we say that u is *non-comparable* with v if $u \not\prec v$ and $v \not\prec u$ and succinctly write $u \sim v$. In the context of multiobjective optimization, the relation \prec as defined here is often referred to as the *Pareto-order* relation [KLP75].

Definition 2.1 A *multiobjective combinatorial optimization problem* (or shortly, MCO) is defined as a tuple $\Pi = (D, R, d, \mathcal{F}, \prec)$ where D is a finite set called domain, $R \subseteq \mathbb{R}^+$ is a set of values, d is a positive integer, \mathcal{F} is a finite collection of functions $\{f_i\}_{i \in [1, d]_{\mathbb{Z}}}$ where each f_i maps from D to R , and \prec is the Pareto-order relation on R^d (here R^d is the d -fold cartesian product on R). Define a function f that maps D to R^d as $f(x) = (f_1(x), \dots, f_d(x))$ referred as the *objective vector* of Π . If $f(x)$ is a minimal element of R^d we say that x is a *Pareto-optimal solution* of Π . For any two elements $x, y \in D$, if $f(x) \prec f(y)$ we write $x \prec y$; similarly, if $f(x) \sim f(y)$ we write $x \sim y$. For any $x, y \in D$, if $x \prec y$ and $y \prec x$ we say that x and y are *equivalent* and write $x \equiv y$. The set of all Pareto-optimal solutions of Π is denoted $P(\Pi)$.

A canonical example in multiobjective optimization is the Two-Parabolas problem. In this problem we have two objective functions defined by two parabolas that intersect in a single point, see Fig.1. In this work, we will only be concerned with a combinatorial version of the Two-Parabolas problem where each objective function only takes values on a finite set of numbers.

Considering that the set of Pareto-optimal solutions can be very large, we are mostly concerned on finding a subset of the Pareto-optimal solutions. Optimal query algorithms to find all Pareto-optimal solutions for $d = 2, 3$ and almost tight upper and lower bounds for any $d \geq 4$ up to polylogarithmic factors were discovered by [KLP75]; [PY00] showed how to find an approximation to all Pareto-optimal solutions in polynomial time.

For the remaining of this work, \prec will always be the Pareto-order relation and will be omitted from the definition of any MCO. Furthermore, for convenience, we will often write $\Pi_d = (D, R, \mathcal{F})$ as a short-hand for $\Pi = (D, R, d, \mathcal{F})$. In addition, we will assume for this work that each function $f_i \in \mathcal{F}$ is computable in polynomial time and each $f_i(x)$ is bounded by a polynomial in the number of bits of x .




Figure 1: The Two-Parabolas Problem. The first objective function f_1 is represented by the bold line and the second objective function f_2 by the dashed line. For MCOs, each objective function takes values only on the natural numbers. Note that there are no equivalent elements in the domain. In this particular example, all the solutions between 7 and 15 are Pareto-optimal.

Definition 2.2 An MCO Π_d is *well-formed* if for each $f_i \in \mathcal{F}$ there is a unique $x \in D$ such that $f_i(x) = 0$. An MCO Π_d is *normal* if it is well-formed and $f_i(x) = 0$ and $f_j(y) = 0$, for $i \neq j$, implies $x \neq y$.

In a normal MCO, the value of an optimal solution in each f_i is 0, and all optimal solutions are different. In Fig.1, solutions 7 and 15 are optimal solutions of f_1 and f_2 with value 0, respectively; hence, the Two-Parabolas problem of Fig.1 is normal.

Definition 2.3 An MCO Π_d is *collision-free* if given $\lambda = (\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_d)$, with each $\lambda_i \in \mathbb{R}^+$, for any $i \in [1, d]_{\mathbb{Z}}$ and any pair $x, y \in D$ it holds that $|f_i(x) - f_i(y)| > \lambda_i$. If Π_d is collision-free we write succinctly as Π_d^λ .

The Two-Parabolas problem of Fig.1 is not collision-free; for example, for solutions 5 and 9 we have that $f_1(5) = f_1(9)$. In Section 6 we show how to turn the Two-Parabolas problem into a collision-free MCO.

Definition 2.4 A Pareto-optimal solution x is *trivial* if x is an optimal solution of some $f_i \in \mathcal{F}$.

In Fig.1, solutions 7 and 15 are trivial Pareto-optimal solutions, whereas any x between 7 and 15 is non-trivial.

Lemma 2.5 For any normal MCO Π_d , if x and y are trivial Pareto-optimal solutions of Π_d , then x and y are not equivalent.

Proof. Let x, y be two trivial Pareto-optimal solutions of Π_d . There exists i, j such that $f_i(x)$ and $f_j(y) = 0$. Since Π_d is normal we have that $x \neq y$ and $f_i(y) > 0$ and $f_j(x) > 0$, hence, $x \sim y$ and they are not equivalent. ■

Let W_d be a set of normalized vectors in $[0, 1]^d$, the continuous interval between 0 and less than 1, defined as

$$W_d = \left\{ w = (w_1, \dots, w_d) \in [0, 1]^d \mid \sum_{i=1}^d w_i = 1 \right\}. \quad (1)$$

For any $w \in W_d$, define $\langle f(x), w \rangle = \langle w, f(x) \rangle = w_1 f_1(x) + \dots + w_d f_d(x)$.

Lemma 2.6 Given $\Pi_d = (D, R, \mathcal{F})$, any two elements $x, y \in D$ are equivalent if and only if for all $w \in W_d$ it holds that $\langle f(x), w \rangle = \langle f(y), w \rangle$.

Proof. Assume that $x \equiv y$. Hence $f(x) = f(y)$. If we pick any $w \in W_d$ we have that

$$\langle f(x), w \rangle = w_1 f_1(x) + \dots + w_d f_d(x) = w_1 f_1(y) + \dots + w_d f_d(y) = \langle f(y), w \rangle.$$

Now suppose that for all $w \in W_d$ it holds $\langle f(x), w \rangle = \langle f(y), w \rangle$. By contradiction, assume that $x \not\equiv y$. With no loss of generality, assume further that there is exactly one $i \in [1, d]_{\mathbb{Z}}$ such that $f_i(x) \neq f_i(y)$. Hence

$$w_i(f_i(x) - f_i(y)) = \sum_{j \neq i} w_j(f_j(y) - f_j(x)). \quad (2)$$

The right hand of Eq.(2) is 0 because for all $j \neq i$ we have that $f_j(x) = f_j(y)$. The left hand of Eq.(2), however, is not 0 by our assumption, hence, a contradiction. Therefore, it must be that x and y are equivalent. ■

Lemma 2.7 Let $\Pi_d = (D, R, \mathcal{F})$. For any $w \in W_d$ there exists $x \in D$ such that if $\langle f(x), w \rangle = \min_{y \in D} \{\langle f(y), w \rangle\}$, then x is a Pareto-optimal solution of Π_d .

Proof. Fix $w \in W_d$ and let $x \in D$ be such that $\langle f(x), w \rangle$ is minimum among all elements of D . For any $y \in D$, with $y \neq x$, we need to consider two cases: (1) $\langle f(y), w \rangle = \langle f(x), w \rangle$ and (2) $\langle f(y), w \rangle > \langle f(x), w \rangle$.

Case (1). Here we have another two subcases, either $f_i(y) = f_i(x)$ for all i or there exists at least one pair $i, j \in \{1, \dots, d\}$ such that $w_i f_i(x) < w_i f_i(y)$ and $w_j f_j(y) < w_j f_j(x)$. When $f_i(x) = f_i(y)$ for each $i = 1, \dots, d$ we have that x and y are equivalent. On the contrary, if $w_i f_i(x) < w_i f_i(y)$ and $w_j f_j(y) < w_j f_j(x)$, we have that $f_i(x) < f_i(y)$ and $f_j(y) < f_j(x)$, and hence, $x \sim y$.

Case (2). In this case, there exists $i \in \{1, \dots, d\}$ such that $w_i f_i(x) < w_i f_i(y)$, and hence, $f_i(x) < f_i(y)$. Thus, $f(y) \not\leq f(x)$ and $y \not\leq x$ for any $y \neq x$.

We conclude from Case (1) that $x \equiv y$ or $x \sim y$, and from Case (2) that $y \not\leq x$. Therefore, x is Pareto-optimal. ■

In this work, we will concentrate on finding non-trivial Pareto-optimal solutions. Finding trivial elements can be done by letting $w_i = 1$ for some $i \in [1, d]_{\mathbb{Z}}$ and then running an optimization algorithm for f_i ; consequently, in Eq.(1) we do not allow for any w_i to be 1. The process of mapping several objectives to a single-objective optimization problem is sometimes referred as a *linearization* of the MCO [EG00].

From Lemma 2.7, we know that some Pareto-optimal solutions may not be optimal solutions for any linearization $w \in W_d$. We define the set of *non-supported Pareto-optimal solutions* as the set $N(\Pi)$ of all Pareto-optimal solutions x such that $\langle f(x), w \rangle$ is not optimal for any $w \in W_d$. We also define the set $S(\Pi)$ of *supported Pareto-optimal solutions* as the set $S(\Pi) = P(\Pi) \setminus N(\Pi)$ [EG00].

Note that there may be Pareto-optimal solutions x and y that are non-comparable and $\langle f(x), w \rangle = \langle f(y), w \rangle$ for some $w \in W_d$. That is equivalent to say that the objective function obtained from a linearization of an MCO is not injective.

Definition 2.8 Any two elements $x, y \in D$ are *weakly-equivalent* if and only if there exists $w \in W_d$ such that $\langle f(x), w \rangle = \langle f(y), w \rangle$.

By Lemma 2.6, any two equivalent solutions x, y are also weakly-equivalent, ; the other way, however, does not hold in general. For example, consider two objective vectors $f(x) = (1, 2, 3)$ and $f(y) = (1, 3, 2)$. Clearly, x and y are not equivalent; however, if $w = (1/3, 1/3, 1/3)$ we can see that x and y are indeed weakly-equivalent. In Fig.1, points 10 and 12 are weakly-equivalent.

3 Quantum Adiabatic Computation

Starting from this section we assume basic knowledge of quantum computation. For a thorough treatment of quantum information science we refer the reader to the book by Nielsen and Chuang[NC00].

Let \mathcal{H} be a Hilbert space with a finite basis $\{|u_i\rangle\}_i$. For any vector $|v\rangle = \sum_i \alpha_i |u_i\rangle$, the ℓ_2 -norm of $|v\rangle$ is defined as $\|v\| = \sqrt{\sum_i |\alpha_i|^2}$. For any matrix A acting on \mathcal{H} , we define the operator norm of A induced by the ℓ_2 -norm as $\|A\| = \max_{\|v\|=1} \|A|v\rangle\|$.

The Hamiltonian of a quantum system gives a complete description of its time evolution, which is governed by the well-known Schrödinger's equation

$$i\hbar \frac{d}{dt} |\Psi(t)\rangle = H(t) |\Psi(t)\rangle, \quad (3)$$

where H is a Hamiltonian, $|\Psi(t)\rangle$ is the state of the system at time t , Planck's constant is denoted by \hbar and $i = \sqrt{-1}$. For simplicity, we will omit \hbar and i from now on. If H is time-independent, it is easy to see that a solution to Eq.(3) is simply $|\Psi(t)\rangle = U(t) |\Psi(0)\rangle$ where $U(t) = e^{-itH}$ using $|\Psi(0)\rangle$ as a given initial condition. When the Hamiltonian depends on time, however, Eq.(3) is not in general easy to solve and much research is devoted to it; nevertheless, there are a few known special cases.

Say that a closed quantum system is described by a time-dependent Hamiltonian $H(t)$. If $|\Psi(t)\rangle$ is the minimum energy eigenstate of $H(t)$, adiabatic time evolution keeps the system in its lower energy eigenstate as long as the change rate of the Hamiltonian is “slow enough.” This natural phenomenon is formalized in the *Adiabatic Theorem*, first proved in Ref. [BF26]. Different proofs were given along the years, see for example Refs. [Kat50, Mes62, SWL04, Rei04, AR04]. In this work we make use of a version of the theorem presented in Ref. [AR04].

Consider a time-dependent Hamiltonian $H(s)$, for $0 \leq s \leq 1$, where $s = t/T$ so that T controls the rate of change of H for $t \in [0, T]$. We denote by H' and H'' the first and second derivatives of H .

Theorem 3.1 (Adiabatic Theorem [BF26, Kat50, AR04]) *Let $H(s)$ be a nondegenerate Hamiltonian, let $|\psi(s)\rangle$ be one of its eigenvectors and $\gamma(s)$ the corresponding eigenvalue. For any $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}^+$ and $s \in [0, 1]$, assume that for any other eigenvalue $\hat{\gamma}(s)$ it holds that $|\gamma(s) - \hat{\gamma}(s)| > \lambda$. Consider the evolution given by H on initial condition $|\psi(0)\rangle$ for time T and let $|\phi\rangle$ be the state of the system at T . For any nonnegative $\delta \in \mathbb{R}$, if $T \geq \frac{10^5}{\delta^2} \cdot \max\{\frac{\|H'\|^3}{\lambda^4}, \frac{\|H'\| \cdot \|H''\|}{\lambda^3}\}$ then $\|\phi - \psi(1)\| \leq \delta$.*

The Adiabatic Theorem was used in [FGGS00] to construct a quantum algorithm for optimization problems and introduced a new paradigm in quantum computing known as *quantum adiabatic computing*. In the following section, we briefly explain the quantum adiabatic algorithm and use it to solve MCOs.

4 The Quantum Adiabatic Algorithm

Consider a function $f : \{0, 1\}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^+$ whose optimal solution \bar{x} gives $f(\bar{x}) = 0$. Let H_1 be a Hamiltonian defined as

$$H_1 = \sum_x f(x) |x\rangle\langle x|. \quad (4)$$

Notice that $H_1|\bar{x}\rangle = 0$, and hence, $|\bar{x}\rangle$ is an eigenvector. Thus, an optimization problem reduces to finding an eigenstate with minimum eigenvalue [FGGS00]. For any $s \in [0, 1]$, let $H(s) = (1 - s)H_0 + sH_1$, where H_0 is an initial Hamiltonian chosen accordingly. If we initialize the system in the lowest energy eigenstate $|\psi(0)\rangle$, the adiabatic theorem guarantees that T at least $1/\text{poly}(\lambda)$ suffices to obtain a quantum state close to $|\psi(1)\rangle$, and hence, to our desired optimal solution. We call H_1 and H_0 the final and initial Hamiltonians, respectively.

After defining the initial and final Hamiltonians, the adiabatic theorem guarantees that we can find an optimal solution in finite time using the following procedure known as the *Quantum Adiabatic Algorithm*. Let $H(s) = (1 - s)H_0 + sH_1$. Prepare the system in the ground-state $|\psi(0)\rangle$ of H . Then let the system evolve for time t close to T . Finally, after time t , read-out the result by measuring the system in the computational basis. The only requirements, in order to make any use of the adiabatic algorithm, is that H_0 and H_1 must not commute and the total Hamiltonian $H(s)$ must be nondegenerate in its minimum eigenvalue [FGGS00].

In this section we show how to construct the initial and final Hamiltonians for MCOs. Given any normal and collision-free MCO $\Pi_d^\lambda = (D, R, \mathcal{F})$ we will assume with no loss of generality that $D = \{0, 1\}^n$, that is, D is a set of binary words of length n .

For each $i \in [1, d]_{\mathbb{Z}}$ define a Hamiltonian $H_{f_i} = \sum_{x \in \{0, 1\}^n} f_i(x) |x\rangle\langle x|$. The minimum eigenvalue of each H_{f_i} is nondegenerate and 0 because Π_d^λ is normal and collision-free. For any $w \in W_d$, the final Hamiltonian H_w is defined as

$$\begin{aligned} H_w &= w_1 H_{f_1} + \cdots + w_d H_{f_d} \\ &= \sum_{x \in \{0, 1\}^n} (w_1 f_1(x) + \cdots + w_d f_d(x)) |x\rangle\langle x| \\ &= \sum_{x \in \{0, 1\}^n} \langle f(x), w \rangle |x\rangle\langle x|. \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

Following the work of [FGGS00], we choose as initial Hamiltonian one that does not diagonalize in the computational basis. Let $|\hat{0}\rangle = (|0\rangle + |1\rangle)/\sqrt{2}$ and $|\hat{1}\rangle = (|0\rangle - |1\rangle)/\sqrt{2}$. A quantum state $|\hat{x}\rangle$, for any $x \in \{0, 1\}^n$, is obtained by applying the n -fold Walsh-Hadamard operation $F^{\otimes n}$ on $|x\rangle$. The set $\{|\hat{x}\rangle\}_{x \in \{0, 1\}^n}$ is known as the Hadamard basis. The initial Hamiltonian is thus defined over the Hadamard basis as

$$H_0 = \sum_{x \in \{0, 1\}^n} h(x) |\hat{x}\rangle\langle \hat{x}|, \quad (6)$$

where $h(0^n) = 0$ and $h(x) \geq 1$ for all $x \neq 0^n$. It is easy to see that the minimum eigenvalue is nondegenerate* with corresponding eigenstate $|\hat{0}^n\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \sum_{x \in \{0,1\}^n} |x\rangle$.

For any vector w in Euclidian space we define the ℓ_1 -norm of w as $\|w\|_1 = |w_1| + \dots + |w_d|$.

Theorem 4.1 *Let Π_d^λ be any normal and collision-free MCO. If there are no equivalent Pareto-optimal solutions, then for any $w \in W_d$ there exists $w' \in W_d$, satisfying $\|w - w'\|_1 \leq 1/\text{poly}(n)$, such that the quantum adiabatic algorithm, using $H_{w'}$ as final Hamiltonian, can find a Pareto-optimal solution x corresponding to w in finite time.*

Note that if a linearization w gives a nondegenerate Hamiltonian $H(s)$, we can directly use the adiabatic algorithm to find a Pareto-optimal solution. In the case of a degenerate Hamiltonian $H(s)$, Theorem 4.1 tell us that we can still find a Pareto-optimal solution using the adiabatic algorithm, provided we choose a new w' sufficiently close to w .

5 Eigenspectrum of the Final Hamiltonian

In this section we prove Theorem 4.1. Note that if the initial Hamiltonian does not commute with the final Hamiltonian, it suffices to prove that the final Hamiltonian is nondegenerate in its minimum eigenvalue [FGGS00]. For the remaining of this work, we let σ_w and α_w be the smallest and second smallest eigenvalues of H_w corresponding to a normal and collision-free MCO $\Pi_d^\lambda = (D, R, \mathcal{F})$.

Lemma 5.1 *Let x be a non-trivial Pareto-optimal solution of Π_d^λ . For any $w \in W_d$ it holds that $\sigma_w > \langle w, \lambda \rangle$.*

Proof. Let $\sigma_w = w_1 f_1(x) + \dots + w_d f_d(x)$ and let x be a non-trivial Pareto-optimal element. For each $w_i \in N$ we have that

$$\sigma_w = \sum_i w_i f_i(x) > \sum_i w_i \lambda_i = \langle w, \lambda \rangle.$$

■

Lemma 5.2 *For any $w \in W_d$, let H_w be a Hamiltonian with a nondegenerate minimum eigenvalue. The eigenvalue gap between the smallest and second smallest eigenvalues of H_w is at least $\langle \lambda, w \rangle$.*

Proof. Let σ_w be the unique minimum eigenvalue of H_w . We have that $\sigma_w = \langle f(x), w \rangle$ for some $x \in \{0,1\}^n$. Now let $\alpha_w = \langle f(y), w \rangle$ be a second smallest eigenvalue of H_w for some $y \in \{0,1\}^n$ where $y \neq x$. Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha_w - \sigma_w &= \langle f(y), w \rangle - \langle f(x), w \rangle \\ &= w_1 f_1(y) - w_1 f_1(x) + w_2 f_2(y) - w_2 f_2(x) \\ &> w_1 \lambda_1 + w_2 \lambda_2 \\ &= \langle \lambda, w \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

■

Lemma 5.3 *If there are no weakly-equivalent Pareto-optimal solutions in Π_d^λ , then the Hamiltonian H_w is non-degenerate in its minimum eigenvalue.*

Proof. By the contrapositive, suppose H_w is degenerate in its minimum eigenvalue σ_w . Take any two degenerate minimal eigenstates $|x\rangle$ and $|y\rangle$, with $x \neq y$, such that

$$w_1 f_1(x) + \dots + w_d f_d(x) = w_1 f_1(y) + \dots + w_d f_d(y) = \sigma_w.$$

Then it holds that x and y are weakly-equivalent. ■

We further show that even if Π_d^λ has weakly-equivalent Pareto-optimal solutions, we can find a nondegenerate Hamiltonian. Let $m = \max_{x,i} \{f_i(x)\}$.

*In quantum physics, a Hamiltonian is degenerate when one of its eigenvalues has multiplicity greater than one.

Lemma 5.4 For any Π_d^λ , let $x_1, \dots, x_\ell \in D$ be Pareto-optimal solutions that are not pairwise equivalent. If there exists $w \in W_d$ and $\sigma_w \in \mathbb{R}^+$ such that $\langle f(x_1), w \rangle = \dots = \langle f(x_\ell), w \rangle = \sigma_w$ is minimum among all $y \in D$, then there exists $w' \in W_d$ and $i \in [1, \ell]_{\mathbb{Z}}$ such that for all $j \in [1, \ell]_{\mathbb{Z}}$, with $j \neq i$, it holds $\langle f(x_i), w' \rangle < \langle f(x_j), w' \rangle$. Additionally, if the linearization w' satisfies $\|w - w'\|_1 \leq \frac{\langle \lambda, w \rangle}{md}$, then $\langle f(x_i), w' \rangle$ is unique and minimum among all $\langle f(y), w' \rangle$ for $y \in D$.

Proof. We prove the lemma by induction on ℓ . Let $\ell = 2$, then $\langle f(x_1), w \rangle = \langle f(x_2), w \rangle$, and hence,

$$\begin{aligned} w_1 f_1(x_1) + \dots + w_d f_d(x_1) &= \sigma_w \\ w_1 f_1(x_2) + \dots + w_d f_d(x_2) &= \sigma_w. \end{aligned} \tag{7}$$

for some $\sigma_w \in \mathbb{R}^+$. From linear algebra we know that there is an infinite number of elements of W_d that simultaneously satisfy Eq.(7). With no loss of generality, fix w_3, \dots, w_d and set $b_1 = w_3 f_3(x_1) + \dots + w_d f_d(x_1)$ and $b_2 = w_3 f_3(x_2) + \dots + w_d f_d(x_2)$. We have that

$$\begin{aligned} w_1 f_1(x_1) + w_2 f_2(x_1) &= \sigma_w - b_1 \\ w_1 f_1(x_2) + w_2 f_2(x_2) &= \sigma_w - b_2. \end{aligned} \tag{8}$$

Again, by linear algebra, we know that Eq.(8) has a unique solution w_1 and w_2 ; it suffices to note that the determinant of the coefficient matrix of Eq.(8) is not 0.

Choose any $w'_1 \neq w_1$ and $w'_2 \neq w_2$ satisfying $w'_1 + w'_2 + w_3 + \dots + w_d = 1$ and let $w' = (w'_1, w'_2, w_3, \dots, w_d)$. Then we have that $\langle f(x_1), w' \rangle \neq \langle f(x_2), w' \rangle$ because w'_1 and w'_2 are not solutions to Eq.(8). Hence, either $\langle f(x_1), w' \rangle$ or $\langle f(x_2), w' \rangle$ must be smaller than the other.

Suppose that $\langle f(x_1), w' \rangle < \langle f(x_2), w' \rangle$. We now claim that $\langle f(x_1), w' \rangle$ is minimum and unique among all $y \in D$. In addition to the constraint of the preceding paragraph that w' must satisfy, in order for $\langle f(x_1), w' \rangle$ to be minimum, we must choose w' such that $\|w - w'\|_1 \leq \frac{\langle \lambda, w \rangle}{md}$.

Assume for the sake of contradiction the existence of $y \in D$ such that $\langle f(y), w' \rangle \leq \langle f(x_1), w' \rangle$. Hence,

$$\langle f(y), w' \rangle \leq \langle f(x_1), w \rangle < \langle f(y), w \rangle.$$

From Lemma 5.1, we know that $|\langle f(x_1), w \rangle - \langle f(y), w \rangle| > \langle \lambda, w \rangle$, and thus,

$$|\langle f(y), w' \rangle - \langle f(y), w \rangle| > \langle \lambda, w \rangle. \tag{9}$$

Using the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality we have that

$$\begin{aligned} |\langle f(y), w' \rangle - \langle f(y), w \rangle| &= |\langle f(y), w' - w \rangle| \\ &\leq \|f(y)\|_1 \cdot \|w' - w\|_1 \\ &\leq \langle \lambda, w \rangle, \end{aligned}$$

where the last line follows from $\|f(y)\|_1 \leq md$ and $\|w - w'\|_1 \leq \frac{\langle \lambda, w \rangle}{md}$; from Eq.(9), however, we have that $|\langle f(y), w' - w \rangle| > \langle \lambda, w \rangle$, which is a contradiction. Therefore, we conclude that $\langle f(y), w' \rangle > \langle f(x_1), w' \rangle$ for any $y \in D$; the case for $\langle f(x_1), w' \rangle > \langle f(x_2), w' \rangle$ can be proved similarly. The base case of the induction is thus proved.

Now suppose the statement holds for ℓ . Let $x_1, \dots, x_\ell, x_{\ell+1}$ be Pareto-optimal solutions that are not pairwise equivalent. Let $w \in W_d$ be such that $\langle f(x_1), w \rangle = \dots = \langle f(x_{\ell+1}), w \rangle$ holds. By our induction hypothesis, there exists $w' \in W_d$ and $i \in [1, \ell]_{\mathbb{Z}}$ such that $\langle f(x_i), w' \rangle < \langle f(y), w' \rangle$ for any other $y \in D$.

If $\langle f(x_i), w' \rangle \neq \langle f(x_{\ell+1}), w' \rangle$ then we are done, because either one must be smaller. Suppose, however, that $\langle f(x_{\ell+1}), w' \rangle = \langle f(x_i), w' \rangle = \sigma_{w'}$ for some $\sigma_{w'} \in \mathbb{R}^+$. From the base case of the induction we know there exists $w'' \neq w'$ that makes $\langle f(x_i), w'' \rangle < \langle f(x_{\ell+1}), w'' \rangle$, and hence, $\langle f(x_i), w'' \rangle < \langle f(y), w'' \rangle$ for any $y \in D$. ■

The premise in Lemma 5.4, that each x_1, \dots, x_ℓ must be Pareto-optimal solutions, is a sufficient condition because if one solution is not Pareto-optimal, then the statement will contradict Lemma 2.7.

We now apply Lemma 5.4 to find a Hamiltonian with a nondegenerate minimum eigenvalue.

Lemma 5.5 Let Π_d^λ be a MCO with no equivalent Pareto-optimal solutions and let H_w be a degenerate Hamiltonian in its minimum eigenvalue with corresponding minimum eigenstates $|x_1\rangle, \dots, |x_\ell\rangle$. There exists $w' \in W_d$, satisfying $\|w - w'\|_1 \leq \frac{\langle \lambda, w \rangle}{md}$, and $i \in [1, \ell]_{\mathbb{Z}}$ such that $H_{w'}$ is nondegenerate in its smallest eigenvalue with corresponding eigenvector $|x_i\rangle$.

Proof. From Lemma 5.3, we know that if Π_d^λ has no weakly-equivalent Pareto-optimal solutions, then for any w the Hamiltonian H_w is nondegenerate.

We consider now the case when the minimum eigenvalue of H_w is degenerate with ℓ Pareto-optimal solutions that are weakly-equivalent. Let x_1, \dots, x_ℓ be such weakly-equivalent Pareto-optimal solutions that are non-trivial and $x_i \not\equiv x_j$ for all $i \neq j$. By Lemma 5.4 there exists $w' \in W_d$, where $w \neq w'$, such that $\langle f(x_i), w' \rangle$ is minimum among all $y \in D$. ■

If we consider our assumption from Section 2 that $m = \text{poly}(n)$, where n is the maximum number of bits of any element in D , we have that any w' must satisfy $\|w - w'\|_1 \leq 1/\text{poly}(n)$. Then Theorem 4.1 follows immediately from lemmas 2.7 and 5.5.

To see that the adiabatic evolution takes finite-time let $\Delta_{\max} = \max_s \|\frac{d}{ds}H(s)\|$ and $g_{\min} = \min_s g(s)$, where $g(s)$ is the eigenvalue gap of $H(s)$. Letting $T = O(\frac{\Delta_{\max}}{g_{\min}^2})$ suffices to find a supported solution corresponding to w . Since $g_{\min} > 0$ and $\|\frac{d}{ds}H(s)\| = \text{poly}(n)$, we conclude that T is finite.

6 Application of the Adiabatic Algorithm to the Two-Parabolas Problem

To make use of the adiabatic algorithm of Section 4 in the Two-Parabolas problem we need to consider a collision-free version of the problem. Let $TP_2^\lambda = (D, R, \mathcal{F})$ be a normal and collision-free MCO where $\lambda = (\lambda_1, \lambda_2) \in \mathbb{R}^+ \times \mathbb{R}^+$, $D = \{0, 1\}^n$, $R \subseteq \mathbb{R}^+$ and $\mathcal{F} = \{f_1, f_2\}$. Let x_0 and x'_0 be the optimal solutions of f_1 and f_2 , respectively. We will use x_i to indicate the i th solution of f_1 and x'_i for f_2 . Moreover, we assume that $|x_0 - x'_0| > 1$. This latter assumption will ensure that there is at least one non-trivial Pareto-optimal solution.

To make TP_2^λ a Two-Parabolas problem, we impose the following conditions.

1. For each $x \in [0, x_0]$, the functions f_1 and f_2 are decreasing;
2. for each $x \in [x'_0, 2^n - 1]$, the functions f_1 and f_2 are increasing;
3. for each $x \in [x_0 + 1, x'_0 - 1]$, the function f_1 is increasing and the function f_2 is decreasing.

The final and initial Hamiltonians are as in Eq.(5) and Eq.(6), respectively. In particular, in Eq.(6), we define the initial Hamiltonian as

$$\hat{H}_0 = \sum_{x \in \{0,1\}^n \setminus \{0^n\}} |\hat{x}\rangle \langle \hat{x}|. \quad (10)$$

Thus, the Hamiltonian of the entire system for TP_2^λ is

$$H(s) = (1 - s)\hat{H}_0 + sH_w. \quad (11)$$

From the previous section we know that $T = O(\frac{\Delta_{\max}}{g_{\min}^2})$ suffices to find a supported solution corresponding to w [vDMV01]. The quantity Δ_{\max} is usually easy to estimate. The eigenvalue gap g_{\min} is, however, very difficult to compute; indeed, determining for any Hamiltonian if $g_{\min} > 0$ is undecidable [CPGW15].

We present a concrete example of the Two-Parabolas problem on six qubits and numerically estimate the eigenvalue gap. In Fig.2 we show a discretized instance of the Two-Parabolas problem—Table 1 presents a complete specification of all points.

For this particular example we use as initial Hamiltonian $8H_0$, that is, Eq.(10) multiplied by 8. Thus, the minimum eigenvalue of $8H_0$ is 0, whereas any other eigenvalue is 8.

In Fig.3 we present the eigenvalue gap of TP_2^λ for $w = 0.57$ where we let $w_1 = w$ and $w_2 = 1 - w_1$; for this particular value of w the Hamiltonian $H_{F,w}$ has a unique minimum eigenstate which corresponds to Pareto-optimal solution 59. The two smallest eigenvalues never touch, and exactly at $s = 1$ the gap is $|\langle w, f(x_0) \rangle - \langle w, f(x_1) \rangle|$, where $x_0 = 59$ and $x_1 = 60$ are the smallest and second smallest solutions with respect to w , which agrees with lemmas 5.1 and 5.2.

Similar results can be observed for different values of w and a different number of qubits. Therefore, the experimental evidence lead us to conjecture that in the Two-Parabolas problem $g_{\min} \geq |\langle w, f(x) \rangle - \langle w, f(y) \rangle|$, where x and y are the smallest and second smallest solutions with respect to w .




Figure 2: A discrete Two-Parabolas problem on seven qubits. Each objective function f_1 and f_2 is represented by the rounded points and the squared points, respectively. The gap vector $\lambda = (0.2, 0.4)$. The trivial Pareto-optimal points are 40 and 80.

Table 1: Complete definition of the Two-Parabolas example of Fig.2 for seven qubits.

x	$f_1(x)$	$f_2(x)$	x	$f_1(x)$	$f_2(x)$	x	$f_1(x)$	$f_2(x)$	x	$f_1(x)$	$f_2(x)$
1	36.14	214.879	2	34.219	208.038	3	32.375	201.354	4	30.606	194.825
5	28.91	188.449	6	27.285	182.224	7	25.729	176.148	8	24.24	170.219
9	22.816	164.435	10	21.455	158.794	11	20.155	153.294	12	18.914	147.933
13	17.73	142.709	14	16.601	137.62	15	15.525	132.664	16	14.5	127.839
17	13.524	123.143	18	12.595	118.574	19	11.711	114.13	20	10.87	109.809
21	10.07	105.609	22	9.309	101.528	23	8.585	97.564	24	7.896	93.715
25	7.24	89.979	26	6.615	86.354	27	6.019	82.838	28	5.45	79.429
29	4.906	76.125	30	4.385	72.924	31	3.885	69.824	32	3.404	66.823
33	2.94	63.919	34	2.491	61.11	35	2.055	58.394	36	1.63	55.769
37	1.214	53.233	38	0.805	50.784	39	0.401	48.42	40	0	46.139
41	0.801	43.939	42	1.205	41.818	43	1.614	39.774	44	2.03	37.805
45	2.455	35.909	46	2.891	34.084	47	3.34	32.328	48	3.804	30.639
49	4.285	29.015	50	4.785	27.454	51	5.306	25.954	52	5.85	24.513
53	6.419	23.129	54	7.015	21.8	55	7.64	20.524	56	8.296	19.299
57	8.985	18.123	58	9.709	16.994	59	10.47	15.91	60	11.27	14.869
61	12.111	13.869	62	12.995	12.908	63	13.924	11.984	64	14.9	11.095
65	15.925	10.239	66	17.001	9.414	67	18.13	8.618	68	19.314	7.849
69	20.555	7.105	70	21.855	6.384	71	23.216	5.684	72	24.64	5.003
73	26.129	4.339	74	27.685	3.69	75	29.31	3.054	76	31.006	2.429
77	32.775	1.813	78	34.619	1.204	79	36.54	0.6	80	38.54	0
81	40.621	1.2	82	42.785	1.804	83	45.034	2.413	84	47.37	3.029
85	49.795	3.654	86	52.311	4.29	87	54.92	4.939	88	57.624	5.603
89	60.425	6.284	90	63.325	6.984	91	66.326	7.705	92	69.43	8.449
93	72.639	9.218	94	75.955	10.014	95	79.38	10.839	96	82.916	11.695
97	86.565	12.584	98	90.329	13.508	99	94.21	14.469	100	98.21	15.469
101	102.331	16.51	102	106.575	17.594	103	110.944	18.723	104	115.44	19.899
105	120.065	21.124	106	124.821	22.4	107	129.71	23.729	108	134.734	25.113
109	139.895	26.554	110	145.195	28.054	111	150.636	29.615	112	156.22	31.239
113	161.949	32.928	114	167.825	34.684	115	173.85	36.509	116	180.026	38.405
117	186.355	40.374	118	192.839	42.418	119	199.48	44.539	120	206.28	46.739
121	213.241	49.02	122	220.365	51.384	123	227.654	53.833	124	235.11	56.369
125	242.735	58.994	126	250.531	61.71	127	258.5	64.519	128	266.644	67.423




Figure 3: Eigenvalue gap (in gray) of the Two-Parabolas problem of Fig.2 for $w = 0.57$. The eigenvalue gap at $s = 1$ is exactly $|\langle w, f(x) \rangle - \langle w, f(y) \rangle|$, where $x = 59$ and $y = 60$ are the smallest and second smallest solutions with respect to w .

7 Concluding Remarks and Open Problems

In this work we showed that the quantum adiabatic algorithm of [FGGS00] can be used for multiobjective combinatorial optimization problems. In particular, a simple linearization of the objective functions suffices to guarantee convergence to a Pareto-optimal solution provided the linearized single-objective problem has an unique optimal solution. Nevertheless, even if a linearization of objectives does not give an unique optimal solution, then it is always possible to choose an appropriate linearization that does.

We end this paper by listing a few promising and challenging open problems.

1. To make any practical use of Theorem 4.1 we need to choose $w \in W_d$ in such a way that the optimal solution of the linearization of an MCO has an unique solution. It is very difficult, however, to know a priori which w to choose in order to use the adiabatic algorithm. Therefore, more research is necessary to learn how to select these linearizations. One way could be to constraint the domain of an MCO in order to minimize the number of weak-equivalent solutions.
2. Another related issue is learn how to solve multiobjective problems in the presence of equivalent solutions. A technique of mapping an MCO with equivalent solutions to Hamiltonians seems very difficult owing to the fact that the smallest eigenvalue must be unique in order to apply the adiabatic theorem.
3. According to Theorem 4.1, we can only find all supported solutions. Other works showed that the number of non-supported solutions can be much larger than the number of supported solutions [EG00]. Hence, it is interesting to construct a quantum algorithm that could find an approximation to all Pareto-optimal solutions.
4. Prove our conjecture of Section 6 that the eigenvalue gap of the Hamiltonian of Eq.(11), corresponding to the Two-Parabolas problem, is at least the difference between the smallest solution and second smallest solution for any given linearization of the objective functions.

References

- [AR04] Andris Ambainis and Oded Regev. An elementary proof of the quantum adiabatic theorem. arXiv:quant-ph/0411152, 2004.
- [BBW05] W. P. Baritompa, D. W. Bulger, and G. R. Wood. Grover’s quantum algorithm applied to global optimization. *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, 15(4):11701184, 2005.

- [BF26] Max Born and Vladimir Fock. Beweis des adiabatenatzes. *Zeitschrift für Physik*, 51(3–4):165–180, 1926.
- [BV16] Benjamin Barán and Marcos Villagra. Multiobjective optimization in a quantum adiabatic computer. *Electronic Notes in Theoretical Computer Science*, 329:27–38, 2016. arXiv:1605.03152.
- [CPGW15] Toby S. Cubitt, David Perez-Garcia, and Michael M. Wolf. Undecidability of the spectral gap. *Nature*, 528:207–211, 2015.
- [DC08] Arnab Das and Bikas K. Chakrabarti. Quantum annealing and quantum computation. *Reviews of Modern Physics*, 80(1061), 2008.
- [DH99] Christoph Dürr and Peter Høyer. A quantum algorithm for finding the minimum. arXiv:quant-ph/9607014, 1999.
- [EG00] Matthias Ehrgott and Xavier Gandibleux. A survey and annotated bibliography of multiobjective combinatorial optimization. *OR Spektrum*, 22(4):425–460, 2000.
- [FGGS00] Edward Farhi, Jeffrey Goldstone, Sam Gutman, and Michael Sipser. Quantum computation by adiabatic evolution. arXiv:quant-ph/0001106, 2000.
- [Gro96] Lov Grover. A fast quantum mechanical algorithm for database search. In *Proceedings of the 28th Annual ACM Symposium on the Theory of Computing (STOC)*, pages 212–219, 1996.
- [Kat50] Tosio Kato. On the adiabatic theorem of quantum mechanics. *Journal of the Physical Society of Japan*, 5(6):435, 1950.
- [KLP75] H. T. Kung, F. Luccio, and F. P. Preparata. On finding the maxima of a set of vectors. *Journal of the ACM*, 22(4):469–476, 1975.
- [Mes62] Albert Messiah. *Quantum Mechanics, Volume II*. North Holland, 1962.
- [NC00] Michael Nielsen and Isaac Chuang. *Quantum Computation and Quantum Information*. Cambridge University Press, 2000.
- [PY00] Christos Papadimitriou and Mihalis Yannakakis. On the approximability of trade-offs and optimal access of web sources. In *Proceedings of the 41st Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS)*, pages 86–92, 2000.
- [Rei04] Ben Reichardt. The quantum adiabatic optimization algorithm and local minima. In *Proceedings of the 36th Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing (STOC)*, pages 502–510, 2004.
- [Sho94] Peter Shor. Algorithms for quantum computation: discrete logarithms and factoring. In *Proceedings of the 35th Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS)*, pages 124–134, 1994.
- [SWL04] Marcelo Silva Sarandy, Lian-Ao Wu, and Daniel A. Lidar. Consistency of the adiabatic theorem. *Quantum Information Processing*, 3(6):331–349, 2004.
- [vDMV01] Wim van Dam, Michele Mosca, and Umesh Vazirani. How powerful is adiabatic quantum computation? In *Proceedings of the 42nd IEEE Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS)*, pages 279–287. IEEE, 2001.
- [vLBB14] Christian von Lücken, Benjamin Barán, and Carlos Brizuela. A survey on multi-objective evolutionary algorithms for many-objective problems. *Computational Optimization and Applications*, 58(3):707–756, 2014.