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Summary
Recent advances in high-throughput genomic technologies coupled with exponential increases in computer processing and memory have allowed us to interrogate the complex aberrant molecular underpinnings of human disease from a genome-wide perspective. While the deluge of genomic information is expected to increase, a bottleneck in conventional high-performance computing is rapidly approaching. Inspired in part by recent advances in physical quantum processors, we evaluated several unconventional machine learning (ML) strategies on actual human tumor data. Here we show for the first time the efficacy of multiple annealing-based ML algorithms for classification of high-dimensional, multi-omics human cancer data from the Cancer Genome Atlas. To assess algorithm performance, we compared these classifiers to a variety of standard ML methods. Our results indicate the feasibility of using annealing-based ML to provide competitive classification of human cancer types and associated molecular subtypes and superior performance with smaller training datasets, thus providing compelling empirical evidence for the potential future application of unconventional computing architectures in the biomedical sciences.

Introduction
With the rapid expansion of high-throughput genomic technologies there exists a multitude of ‘omics’ data, which allows researchers to now investigate the casual molecular drivers of complex human disease in a more relevant systems biology manner. Over the past two decades, numerous studies have shown the utility of statistical ML strategies to classify human malignancies, hypothesize unknown clinical subtypes, and make prognostic predictions based on omics datasets\textsuperscript{1,2}. Moreover, integrated ‘multi-omics’ approaches have proved effective in deriving meaningful biological insights into the etiological and prognostic complexity of human cancers\textsuperscript{3-6}. While these studies highlight the potential of omics-based analytics to drive innovative new therapies based on unique molecular signatures, a number of well-documented statistical computing limitations, including large-scale statistical optimization still remain for the analysis of high-dimensional complex biological datasets.

As a rapidly emerging technology, quantum computing promises to enhance performance of certain classes of statistical computing and ML tasks, such as classification, regression, generation, and resampling. In this nascent discipline, proposals for several quantum ML algorithms have been developed, including quantum principal component analysis\textsuperscript{7} and quantum support vector machines\textsuperscript{8} and Boltzmann machines\textsuperscript{9}. These proposals have generated interest in the scientific community and in the general public for their potential to address computationally intractable tasks and to model more complicated data distributions. These quantum approaches to statistical ML broadly fall into one of two categories: approaches based on the circuit model of quantum computing\textsuperscript{10} and those based on quantum annealing\textsuperscript{11}. More is known about the computational power of circuit-model algorithms, and a theory of fault-tolerant quantum error correction has been established\textsuperscript{12}, yet current physical realizations of circuit model quantum computers are limited in size to tens of qubits. On the other hand, while the theory of quantum annealing is significantly less developed, physical devices, namely those produced by D-Wave\textsuperscript{13-15}, feature more than 2000 qubits and are approaching capacities that can be used to solve real-world problems\textsuperscript{16}, perform quantum simulation\textsuperscript{17}, and compete with classical optimization algorithms\textsuperscript{18}.
In this work, we primarily examined quantum machine learning (qML) algorithms via quantum annealing, applying them to high-dimensional, multi-omics human cancer data from the Cancer Genome Atlas (TCGA). Our aim was two-fold: first, to assess the applicability of current quantum hardware and qML algorithms for real biological data; and second, to understand under what circumstances, if any, qML performs better than conventional ML. To do so, we compared the quantum algorithms to a variety of standard ML algorithms and quantum annealing analogues for both binomial and multiclass experimental designs. Our analysis is the first of integrated, genome-wide multi-omics human cancer data. In the course of our study we found that the annealing-based approaches all perform similarly. Our results show that in most cases when using relatively large amounts of high-dimensional multi-omics training data, the annealing-based methods, including the quantum algorithms are comparable to conventional ML approaches. However, for certain smaller training datasets of equivalent dimensionality, annealing-based ML statistically outperform established classification strategies. We also assessed the weights returned by our quantum algorithms and found reasonable interpretability of biological information. Overall our results demonstrate the current utility as well as highlight current limitations of quantum computing and associated qML for the analysis of high-dimensional omics data.

Results
We assessed the performance of annealing-based ML algorithms on several TCGA datasets in an effort to identify comparative advantages for annealing approaches, and also to understand the readiness of applying current quantum hardware for cancer classification. In this comprehensive machine learning survey, we compared qML performance to the following commonly used conventional ML algorithms: Least Absolute Shrinkage and Selection Operator (LAŠSO)\textsuperscript{19}, Ridge regression (Ridge)\textsuperscript{20,21}, Random Forest (RF)\textsuperscript{22,23}, Naïve Bayes (NB)\textsuperscript{24,25}, and a Support Vector Machine (SVM)\textsuperscript{26,27}. TCGA data, including exome DNA variation, RNA-seq, DNA methylation, miRNA, and CNVs, were retrieved, pre-processed, and normalized, resulting in an average of 70,504 gene features for five binomial and one multiclass six-cancer TCGA dataset comparisons. We performed dimensionality reduction with principal component analysis (see Supplemental Methods), retaining the top 44 principal components for the binomial datasets and 13 principal components for the six-cancer dataset. The number of principal components was chosen based on the largest number of features that could be accommodated on existing quantum annealing hardware. An overview of our data analysis strategy is presented in Figure 1.

Binomial and Multinomial Classification
In this section, we present classification results for five binomial TCGA cancer dataset comparisons: kidney renal clear cell carcinoma (KIRC) vs. kidney renal papillary cell carcinoma (KIRP); lung adenocarcinoma (LUAD) vs. lung squamous cell carcinoma (LUSC); breast invasive carcinoma (BRCA) vs. matched normal breast tissue (normal); estrogen receptor positive (ERpos) vs. estrogen receptor negative (ERneg) breast cancers; and luminal A (LumA) vs. luminal B (LumB) breast cancers. We also present findings relative to a six-cancer multiclass classification strategy for human brain, breast, kidney, lung, liver, and colorectal cancer types (see Supplemental Spreadsheet 1-S1 for the sample sizes of each dataset). We assessed the relative classification performance of the five standard ML models (LASSO, Ridge, RF, NB, and SVM), one quantum algorithm (D-Wave), and three annealing-based algorithms (simulated annealing (SA), Random, and Field) for all binomial and multiclass TCGA comparisons.
Quantum annealing was implemented on D-Wave physical quantum processors (see Supplemental Methods). Briefly, D-Wave only admits problems formulated as a quadratic unconstrained binary optimization (QUBO) problem, or equivalently, an Ising Hamiltonian, generically written as $H(\mathbf{w}) = \mathbf{w}^T \mathbf{h} + \mathbf{w}^T J \mathbf{w}$. Where $\mathbf{w}$ is a vector of weights, and $\mathbf{h}$ and $J$ represent a vector and matrix, respectively. In this case, $J$ is the couplings of the interactions, and $\mathbf{h}$ is the local fields. The goal of the learning procedure is to find an optimal set of weights that minimizes the energy of the Ising Hamiltonian; i.e., $\mathbf{w}^* = \text{argmin}_\mathbf{w} H(\mathbf{w})$. The global optimum of the Ising problem is in general difficult to determine\(^28\). Classification by using quantum annealing to solve Ising problems has been formulated before\(^29\). In the present work, we developed a novel approach that can be used to solve classification problems directly. Our strategy stems from multinomial regression, which reduces to logistic regression when there are two classes (see Supplemental Methods for the mapping to an Ising problem). We compared performance to several classical approaches that use the same objective function as D-Wave; i.e., problems formulated as an Ising Hamiltonian: simulated annealing (SA), Random, and Field. Simulated annealing\(^30\) is a well-known heuristic optimization algorithm that uses Metropolis updates and a (fictitious) temperature schedule to optimize a target objective function. For Random, we randomly generating candidate weights, sorted them by their Ising energy and selected the best performing weights. For Field, we disregarded $J$, the coupling terms, and performed an optimization only over $\mathbf{h}$, the local fields (See Supplemental Methods for more details of all classical, quantum and quantum-inspired algorithms). Both Random and Field were introduced and used as simple benchmarks against which we tested the SA and QA approaches.

Figure 2 presents comparisons of all nine classifiers for the five binomial datasets. As with the data presented Figure 4a and Supplemental Figure S1, we used four statistical metrics to assess classification performance: accuracy, balanced accuracy, ROC area under the curve (AUC), and F1 score. The four metrics were independently averaged over 100 unique training and test sets for each classifier (see Supplemental Methods). Mean ± SEM for each metric are presented on the y-axis of each figure inset. Relative classification performance was determined by mean balanced accuracy and presented in ranked order on the x-axis of each figure inset. Nonparametric Wilcoxon signed-rank tests were used to assess statistical significance among the nine classifiers relative to the four performance metrics. Bonferroni correction was used to adjust for multiple testing error. For each comparison, we found a conventional ML approach outperformed both quantum and classical annealing across all four metrics of performance. However, for several comparisons, D-Wave and at least one of the classical annealing algorithms performed nearly as well as the best classical method. For example, while RF statistically outperformed (0.99 ± 0.002) all other methods for the BRCA vs. Normal comparison, Random, SVM, SA, and LASSO showed no statistical differences in performance (0.98 ± 0.002; 0.98 ± 0.002; 0.98 ± 0.003; 0.98 ± 0.002). Similarly, for the LumA vs. LumB comparison, we found LASSO performed best (0.76 ± 0.006); however, Random, D-Wave, SA, Ridge, and Field are nearly identical in terms of balanced accuracy (0.75 ± 0.006; 0.75 ± 0.006; 0.74 ± 0.006; 0.74 ± 0.006; 0.74 ± 0.006). For the three other comparisons (ERpos vs. ERneg; KIRC vs. KIRP; LUAD vs. LUSC), the quantum and classical annealing algorithms statistically underperformed the best conventional ML algorithm in each comparison. While D-Wave performed similarly to RF and NB in the KIRC vs. KIRP comparison (0.94 ± 0.002 vs. 0.94 ± 0.002; 0.94 ± 0.002; corrected p-value = 1), it was statistically inferior to SVM (0.94 ± 0.002 vs. 0.98 ± 0.001; corrected p-value = 5.96 x 10\(^{-24}\)). Overall Field was one of the poorest performing methods.
relative to the four metrics assessed; however, it performed relatively well on the LumA vs. LumB dataset (0.74 ± 0.006). The quantum and classical annealing classification results indicate the utility of framing an overall classification strategy as an Ising problem.

Though our quantum and classical annealing algorithms generally underperformed the conventional ML methods assessed in this study, the annealing-type classifiers performed well on the LumA vs. LumB comparison. Moreover, as with all conventional ML methods, the most informative feature for the D-Wave solutions is the first principal component, indicating D-Wave also assigned the greatest weight to the most biologically relevant information. This is consistent with previous results where D-Wave was able to extract a motif for protein-DNA binding that agreed with classical results31.

Finally, to determine the utility of annealing-based methods on a larger, multinomial experimental design, we evaluated classification performance of the conventional, quantum and classical annealing ML algorithms on a six-cancer, multiclass TCGA dataset. The six TCGA cancer types included brain, breast, kidney, lung, liver, and colorectal cancers (see Supplementary Spreadsheet 1-S1 for the sample size of this six-cancer dataset). With the exception of multiclass AUC (0.99 ± 0.0), performance metrics for conventional ML approaches were superior to the quantum and classical annealing algorithms for this larger, multinomial dataset (see also Supplemental Figure S1). We, therefore, focused our efforts on further evaluating the efficacy of annealing-based methods on the five binomial comparisons described above.

**Performance Dependence on Training Set Size**

Based on previous work indicating quantum and classical annealing approaches are superior to conventional ML classifiers on small training set sizes31-33, we systematically reduced the training set data for the LumA vs. LumB human breast cancer comparison into 16 separate partition sizes to evaluate classifier performance (see Supplemental Methods). We first divided the entire LumA vs. LumB breast cancer dataset (311 breast tumor samples) into a training set representing 80% of the initial dataset (250 breast tumor samples) and a testing set equal to 20% of the initial dataset (61 breast tumor samples). From this, we randomly selected incrementally smaller, class-balanced data partitions from 95% to 20% of the original training set data. Due to the complexity and computational expense of this experimental design, we trained each of the nine classifiers described above over only 50 unique training sets, randomly drawn from the 250 breast tumor samples of the initial training data, for each individual training set partition. We then validated performance of each classifier on the original, held-out test set of 61 breast tumor samples. As above, nonparametric Wilcoxon signed-rank tests were used to assess statistical significance among the nine classifiers relative to the four performance metrics, and Bonferroni correction was used to adjust for multiple testing error. Results in Figure 3 are presented as mean ± SEM for averaged balanced accuracies across the entire training set size spectrum.

At 25-40% of the original training data (63 to 100 breast tumor samples), the mean balanced accuracies of the four annealing-based algorithms (D-Wave, SA, Random, and Field) were statistically superior to the mean balanced accuracies of the five conventional ML algorithms (LASSO, NB, RF, Ridge, SVM). For example, at 25% of the initial training data D-Wave statistically outperformed SVM, the top conventional ML method (0.73 ± 0.008 vs. 0.69 ± 0.008; corrected p-value = 0.013). Interestingly, classification performance for all conventional ML
methods (SVM, LASSO, NB, RF, Ridge) steadily decreased after a reduction to 50% of the original training data (125 breast tumor samples), whereas we found no statistical loss in mean balanced accuracies for the four quantum and classical annealing algorithms across the entire training set size spectrum. Specifically, D-Wave showed no statistical reduction in performance at 95% vs. 20% of original training data (0.75 ± 0.004 vs. 0.73 ± 0.007; corrected p-value = 0.069). However, we found a significant reduction in classification performance for LASSO (0.75 ± 0.002 vs. 0.61 ± 0.001; corrected p-value = 1.58 x 10^{-12}) relative to the same comparison. Moreover, all five conventional ML methods associate with a significantly higher degree of overfitting than the annealing-based classification approaches. Supplemental Figure S2 indicates significantly less statistical shrinkage relative to test data for annealing-based algorithms across all fractions of training data for the LumA vs. LumB comparison.

To assess the generality of this finding that annealing-based methods perform better than conventional machine learning approaches with a small amount of training data, we performed the same analysis on the ERpos vs. ERneg breast cancer and the six-cancer, multiclass datasets. As both datasets were significantly larger than the LumA vs. LumB comparison, we reduced each to a much smaller percentage of initial training set size. Supplemental Figure S3a presents mean balanced accuracies from 95% to 10% of the original training data (730 to 77 breast tumor samples) for the ERpos vs. ERneg comparison. We found the same result in classification performance for all nine classifiers. Like the LumA vs. LumB comparison, D-Wave showed no statistical loss in performance from 95% vs. 10% of original training data (0.82 ± 0.005 vs. 0.82 ± 0.007; corrected p-value = 1); whereas LASSO dropped from 0.88 ± 0.022 to 0.75 ± 0.013 (corrected p-value = 4.82 x 10^{-15}).

Analysis of the six-cancer, multiclass dataset further confirmed the LumA vs. LumB and ERpos vs. ERneg findings. While Supplemental Figure S3b shows that the conventional ML methods significantly outperformed the annealing-based methods, here again we found no statistical reduction in D-Wave performance (0.90 ± 0.001 vs. 0.91 ± 0.002; corrected p-value = 0.20) from 95% (3035 tumor samples) to 2% (64 tumor samples) of initial training set size. Comparatively, we again found a significant reduction in classification performance for LASSO (0.995 ± 0.000 vs. 0.97 ± 0.002; corrected p-value = 4.72 x 10^{-17}) on this multiclass cancer dataset. In addition, SA also exhibits a significant performance drop relative to D-Wave at the low end of training data fraction, however this feature is temperature dependent: by modifying SA’s final temperature it can be made to perform as well as D-Wave, in agreement with previous, binomial qML studies^{29,30}.

In summary, all methods (with the exception of NB) converged to roughly the same balanced accuracy at high training data fraction, but at low fraction the annealing-based methods performed better. These findings go beyond previous work^{29,30} and further bolster the case for the utility of framing an overall classification strategy as an Ising problem. Moreover, robust classification of small, high-dimensional omics datasets with annealing based methods provides a potential new avenue to evaluate patient response in early-phase clinical drug trials or in other genome-wide datasets with relatively small numbers of patients or animal models.

*Gene-level Classification*
To assess qML performance at the gene level, we used the 44 most informative genes, by principal component analysis (PCA) loading of the first principal component (PC1), from the original training set described in the previous sections for the LumA vs. LumB breast cancer dataset. Results are presented in Figure 4a. The four metrics were independently averaged over 100 unique training and test sets for each of the nine classifiers. Nonparametric Wilcoxon signed-rank tests were again used to assess statistical significance for the four metrics relative to the nine classifiers. As above, Bonferroni correction was used to adjust for multiple testing error. Here we found a significant increase in mean balanced accuracies for all nine classifiers at the gene level compared to PCA feature-based classification. For example, RF performed significantly better at the gene level as compared to PC level (0.83 ± 0.005 vs. 0.65 ± 0.004; corrected p-value = 1.73 x 10^{-32}). We also found that Random (0.81 ± 0.005), SA (0.80 ± 0.005), and D-Wave (0.80 ± 0.006) slightly outperformed three of the five conventional ML approaches: SVM (0.79 ± 0.005), NB (0.79 ± 0.006), and LASSO (0.77 ± 0.005).

Close inspection of the top 44 PCA genes used as molecular features to train the nine classifiers indicated RACGAPI yielded the highest averaged information ranking for the LumA vs. LumB comparison (see Supplemental Spreadsheet 1-S2). This finding was further supported via an independent edgeR34 analysis, which showed RACGAPI was the strongest differentially expressed gene (FDR = 2.57x10^{-36}; logFC = -1.11) of the top 41 mRNA genes. Supplemental Figure S4 presents a rank-ordered heatmap of the averaged state for each of the 44 genes (41 mRNA and 3 methylated genes) across the 100 unique training sets for the LumA vs. LumB comparison. Conversely, RACGAPI was ranked only 22 of 44 by PC1 loading. These findings indicate the importance of combined dimensionality reduction/feature learning and classification of high-throughput biological data. From a biological perspective, RACGAPI is a putative oncogene, which promotes growth of triple negative/basal-like breast cancers. Experimental depletion of this gene inhibits cancer cell proliferation by the combined effects of cytokinesis failure, CDKN1A/p21-mediated RB1 inhibition, and the onset of senescence35. Given the significant increased expression of RACGAPI in Luminal B tumors, the more aggressive breast cancer subtype, our gene-level classification results also support our previous findings indicating D-Wave robustly assigns the greatest weight to the most biologically relevant information in a given model. Figure 4b shows hierarchical clustering of the 44 most informative genes for the LumA vs. LumB breast cancer comparison and indicates significant discrimination between LumA vs. LumB based on these 44 genes.

Finally, we used GOseq analysis36 and a PubMed Central (PMC) comprehensive semantic search engine to determine known biological relevance of the top 44 genes in the LumA vs. LumB breast cancer comparison. Our GOseq analysis produced 244 functionally enriched gene ontology (GO) terms (see Supplemental Spreadsheet 1-S3). Of these, Figure 4c presents nine statistically significant (Wallenius approximation; FDR ≤ 0.05) GO terms related to cancer: metabolic process; cell cycle; heterocycle metabolic process; regulation of the cell cycle; glucose 6-phosphate metabolic process; DNA integrity checkpoint; telomere organization; and morphogenesis of a branching epithelium. We then used a semantic search engine to query full-text records available in PMC database for published relationships between these 44 genes and the query terms, cancer and breast cancer (see Supplemental Methods). Briefly, we used the entrez search function of the entrez R package, which provides an NCBI EUtils application programming interface (API)37, to retrieve results for each of the 44 genes from the PMC.
database. Search terms were defined by combining each gene symbol with either cancer or breast cancer fields, along with all related MeSH terms using boolean operators AND/OR.

We found that all but C12orf73 have been previously indicated in breast cancer (Figure 4d). Of the remaining 43 genes, PRR15L and MAGI2-AS3 are the only genes with no current functional annotation; however, both PRR15L and MAGI2-AS3 associate with a high averaged information ranking for the LumA vs. LumB comparison (see Supplemental Spreadsheet 1-S2). At the time of our semantic search of the PMC database, Hepatocyte Growth Factor (HGF) and Retinoblastoma-Associated Protein 1 (E2F1) were implicated in the greatest number of published breast cancer papers (6,356 and 5,925, respectively) among all of the 44 genes queried (see Supplemental Spreadsheet 1-S4). E2F1 yielded higher PC1 loading (4 vs.15) and averaged information (8.6 vs. 33) rankings than HGF. E2F1 is a well-studied transcription factor involved in cell proliferation, differentiation, and apoptosis. It is a member of the E2F protein family, which has been implicated in cell cycle control and regulation of tumor suppressor proteins. Low E2F1 gene expression is predictive of metastasis-free survival in breast cancer patients. As with our RACGAP1 finding, we determined significantly higher differential mRNA expression of EF2F1 in LumB vs. LumA breast cancers via edgeR analysis (FDR = 2.59 \times 10^{-27}; \logFC = -1.34). Taken together our gene-level classification results strongly support known breast cancer etiology. Moreover, unlike the five conventional ML methods assessed in this study, our quantum and classical annealing strategies would have robustly uncovered these findings by training on as few as 50 breast cancer patient samples.

Discussion
We have presented the first successful demonstration of annealing-based algorithms applied to integrated genome-wide, multi-omics human cancer data. We have shown that classification with quantum and classical annealing algorithms is comparable to conventional ML strategies on several human cancer datasets. However, it is important to note that the benefit of using quantum annealing cannot be attributed solely to inherent quantum behavior, as simulated annealing and our random control classifier performed similarly if not better than quantum annealing as implemented by a D-Wave device on two of the three fractional training dataset comparisons. By randomly generating bit strings and sorting them by their Ising energy, we achieved classification accuracies nearly equal to conventional ML and, in some cases, better than both quantum and simulated annealing. The comparable performance of our random control strategy to D-Wave and SA is due to a distinction between the objective function for the annealing-based approaches, which is an approximation for the negative log-likelihood, and the performance metrics presented (accuracy, balanced accuracy, F1 score, AUC). While we describe this discrepancy in more detail in the Supplemental Methods and in Supplemental Figure S5, we found the overall classification performance of the random classifier a direct indication of the utility of formulating a classification problem as an Ising Hamiltonian. In this current study, the advantage of using an Ising problem became even more apparent by training classifiers on a relatively smaller amount of training data, as we witnessed with the LumA vs. LumB and ERpos vs. ERneg breast cancer comparisons. For example, Field, which is an almost trivial algorithm after formulating the Ising problem, performed extremely well from 95% to 20% of original training data for this breast cancer comparison.
Nevertheless, the annealing-based approaches generally outperformed conventional ML approaches when trained with relatively small amounts of data. This relative advantage may be attributed to the discrete weights returned for the annealing-based methods. On the one hand, discrete weights rendered with annealing-based methods appear to control for statistical shrinkage better than statistical optimization parameters of conventional ML approaches, as the standard methods assessed did not generalize as well to test data. On the other hand, binary weights limit the informativeness of the unconventional classifiers; with larger amounts of training data, the annealing-based methods slightly underperformed the conventional ML approaches. These findings point to the potential application of a new class of algorithms as simple heuristic models with discrete weights may perform better in situations of limited training data, which is often the case in clinical trials and drug efficacy studies.

Inherent to all useful biological classifiers, we showed both quantum and classical annealing algorithms identified relevant molecular features in each cancer comparison. Like the conventional ML approaches, these algorithms determined PC1 as the most informative feature for each dataset, allowing us to then perform gene-level classification. Classification of the top 44 genes of PC1 for the LumA vs. LumB comparison determined RACGAPI, a putative oncogene in breast cancer, associated with the highest averaged information ranking. This finding was supported via independent differential gene expression analysis, indicating Luminal B tumors, a more aggressive molecular subtype of breast cancer, associated with statistically significant, higher mRNA levels of RACGAPI than Luminal A tumors. Moreover, our semantic search of full-text records available in PMC database found that 43 of these top 44 genes have been previously implicated in breast cancer.

While we achieved comparable classification performance on all binomial comparisons assessed in this study, it is important to note our annealing approaches did not perform as well as conventional ML on a large multiclass, six-cancer dataset. This observation is most likely related to the relatively larger training data used for this multiclass comparison, as the six-cancer dataset comprised approximately 12 times the amount of data relative to the LumA vs. LumB dataset. As we showed by reducing the amount of training data for the LumA vs. LumB, ERpos vs. ERneg, and the six-cancer multiclass comparisons, the quantum and classical annealing approaches performed well with relatively smaller amounts of data but did not statistically improve with incremental increases. Another explanation for the decreased performance of the annealing approaches may be related to the fact that the number of approximations used to formulate the classification problem as an Ising Hamiltonian depends on the number of classes (see Supplemental Methods Eq. (15)). The approximation may be valid for binomial comparisons but could break down with multiclass experimental designs.

Though practical quantum computing architectures are still in development, the demonstration of comparable classification performance to conventional ML methods on these high-dimensional, multi-omics human cancer datasets is encouraging. In the process of assessing the efficacy of qML, we discovered a class of algorithms that perform better than standard methods on a limited data: annealing-based methods with discrete weights. As technology improves and new algorithms are introduced, we are cautiously optimistic that quantum and/or quantum-inspired algorithms will afford new biological insights and drive the discovery of novel approaches for solving complex biological problems.
Methods

Dataset and dimensionality reduction

Genomic data from The Cancer Genome Atlas (TCGA) was retrieved, pre-processed, and normalized. An overview of our data pipeline is depicted in Fig. 1. Briefly, we retrieved whole exome sequencing, RNA-Seq, miRNA-Seq, DNA methylation array, and genotyping array data for five human cancer binomial classifications (breast cancer vs. normal, estrogen receptor positive vs. estrogen receptor negative breast cancers, luminal A vs. luminal B breast cancers, kidney renal clear cell vs. papillary cell carcinoma, and lung adenocarcinoma vs. squamous cell carcinoma) as well as a six-cancer multiclass classification, which included breast, colorectal, lung, kidney, brain, and liver cancer types). Data were retrieved from either the Genome Data Commons (GDC) data portal (https://portal.gdc.cancer.gov/ - data release 4.0) or cBioportal (http://www.cbioportal.org/)\textsuperscript{39,40}. All five data types (mRNA, miRNA, CNV, DNA methylation, and somatic tumor variants) were concatenated into a single data matrix. Each feature was standardized to zero mean and unit variance (z-score).

We derived classification performance via 100 random, class balanced partitions of training (80%) and test/validation (20%) data. Furthermore, given that the data comprised more than 79,000 molecular features, dimensionality reduction was conducted in order to make comparisons with existing quantum hardware and simulators. As such, we performed PCA on each random, balance partition of the feature data, retaining the top 44 principal components for the binomial datasets and 13 principal components for the six-cancer dataset. The number of principal components was chosen based on the largest number of features that could be accommodated on existing quantum annealing hardware (see the Section below on formulating the classification problem as an Ising model).

Quantum annealing

We explored the use of quantum annealing with processors made by D-Wave Systems Inc\textsuperscript{13,14} (see the Supplemental Methods for a brief review of quantum annealing). Results for the binomial datasets were obtained by running the D-Wave 2X (DW2X) processor installed at the Information Sciences Institute (ISI) of the University of Southern California, and results for the six-cancer dataset were run on the DW2000Q located in Burnaby, Canada. The problem Hamiltonians that are used for D-Wave (DW) can be described as Ising spin models with tunable parameters\textsuperscript{13}. The Ising model assumes a graph $G = (V, E)$ composed of a set of vertices, $V$, and edges, $E$. Each of the $N$ spins is a binary variable located at a unique vertex. The spins are represented by superconducting flux qubits, and $G$ is the so-called Chimera graph (see Supplemental Figure S6). For the DW2X, $N = 1098$ and for the DW2000Q, $N = 2038$. The problem (or Ising) Hamiltonian for this system can be written as

$$H_P = \sum_{i \in V} h_i \sigma_i^z + \sum_{(i,j) \in E} J_{ij} \sigma_i^z \sigma_j^z,$$  \hspace{1cm} (1)
where the local fields \( \{ h_i \} \) and couplings \( \{ J_{ij} \} \) define a problem instance and are programmable on the DW2X to within a few percent Gaussian distributed error. The \( \{ \sigma_i^z \} \) represent both binary variables taking on values \( \pm 1 \), and the Pauli \( z \)-matrices. Given a spin configuration \( \{ \sigma_i^z \} \), \( H_p \) is the total energy of the system. Problems submitted to DW are automatically scaled so that all \( h_i \) and \( J_{ij} \) values lie between \(-1\) and \(1\). The initial Hamiltonian is a transverse magnetic field: 
\[
H_B = -\sum_i \sigma_i^x,
\]
where \( \sigma_i^x \) is the Pauli \( x \)-matrix acting on qubit \( i \). During an anneal, the magnitude of \( H_B \) is gradually reduced to zero, while the magnitude of \( H_p \) is slowly increased from zero. After each anneal DW returns a set of spin values \( \{ \sigma_i^z = \pm 1 \} \) that attempts to minimize the energy given by Eq. (1) (a lower energy indicates better optimization). Note, however, that for our purposes we are not strictly using DW as an optimizer. In the Supplemental Methods, we describe our procedure to make use of the fact that higher-energy solutions may still contain some meaningful information and use them to improve performance.

For the results in the main text, we set the annealing time at 5\( \mu s \) and repeated the anneal 1000 times, which returns 1000 spin configurations. We selected the 20 spin configurations with the lowest Ising energy and ran some quick classical post-processing to average the lowest Ising energy spin configurations if they improved the objective function on the training data. See the Supplemental Methods for a more detailed description of other hyper-parameters and Supplemental Figures S7-S9 for the effect of using a larger number of spin configurations.

**Simulating Annealing**

Similar to quantum annealing, simulated annealing (SA) accepts problems formulated as an Ising problem, as defined in Eq. (1) and returns binary variables. For this work we used the implementation of Isakov et al.\(^ {41} \). There are several important parameters that affect SA’s overall performance: the number of sweeps, the type of schedule (linear or exponential in the inverse temperature), and the initial and final temperatures. For our purposes, we fixed the number of sweeps (which is analogous to the annealing time of quantum annealing) to 1000 and selected a linear schedule with an inverse initial temperature of 0.01. We treated the final inverse temperature as a tunable hyper-parameter with values in the set \( \{ 0.03, 0.1, 0.3, 1, 3 \} \) and repeated the anneal 1000 times. Results in the main text are given for the final inverse temperature that yielded the best performance during cross-validation. We used the same classical post-processing procedure that was used with D-Wave to combine 20 spin configurations with the lowest energy, not just the one that returned the lowest Ising energy.

**Field**

As an another approach to explore the usefulness of the formulating the classification task as an Ising problem, and to check the role played by the couplings (the \( J \)’s) we implemented a very simple algorithm that only takes into account the values of the local fields (the \( h \)’s) in Eq. (1). Once \( h \) has been determined based on the training data, we choose the weights to be the opposite sign of the fields; i.e., \( \sigma_i^{\text{field}} = -h_i \). This amounts to a (trivial) analytical solution of the optimization of Eq. (1) without any \( J \)’s.

**Random**

As a sanity check, we generated random solutions to Eq. (1). For each spin we picked a random number uniformly distributed in the interval \([0,1)\). Values below 0.5 were set to -1 and those above 0.5 were set to 1, thereby generating spin configurations the same as those returned by
DW and SA. We then sorted the spin configurations according to their Ising energy, given by Eq. (1). As with DW and SA, we generated 1000 such random spin configurations and used the same classical post-processing procedure to combine the 20 spin configurations with the lowest energy to a final set of weights.

**Formulating a multi-class classification problem on a quantum annealer**

We show how to arrive at a simple Ising formulation to model a multi-class classification problem with $K$ unique class labels. Assume we have a dataset of $N$ training examples: $D = \{(x_i, y_i)\}_{i=1}^{N}$, where $x_i$ is the $i$th data vector of $M$ features and $y_i$ is the corresponding class of the $i$th data vector (i.e., $y_i$ can take one of the $K$ class labels). A simple way to arrive at probabilities for a multi-class classification problem is to use the softmax function. We can define the probability of each class as

$$Pr(y_i = k) = \frac{\exp w_k^T x_i}{\sum_{k=1}^{K} \exp w_k^T x_i},$$  

where $w_k$ are the weights corresponding to the $k$th class that we would like to learn (in other words, we define a set of weights for each class). However, since we are generating a probability of each class, we can reduce the set of weights we have to train from $K$ to $K - 1$ and define the first $K - 1$ probabilities as:

$$Pr(y_i = k) = \frac{\exp w_k^T x_i}{1 + \sum_{k=1}^{K-1} \exp w_k^T x_i},$$  

with the probability of the $K$th class as:

$$Pr(y_i = K) = \frac{1}{1 + \sum_{k=1}^{K-1} \exp w_k^T x_i}. \tag{4}$$

The goal of training is to maximize the probability given the classes in the dataset, or equivalently to minimize the negative log-likelihood. We can express the negative log-likelihood as follows:

$$\mathcal{L} = - \log \prod_i Pr(y_i) \tag{5}$$

$$= - \sum_i \log Pr(y_i) \tag{6}$$

where the probability selected corresponds to the actual class of the label. If the actual class has the highest predicted probability for all data samples, the negative log-likelihood will be minimized. In other words, the farther away from 1 the predicted probability of the real class is, the greater the contribution to the negative log-likelihood; if the algorithm were able to correctly assign a class to each training example with probability 1, the negative log-likelihood would be 0.
Taking a second-order Taylor approximation around the argument of the exponential equal to 0, we eventually arrive at the following expression for the negative log-likelihood (see Supplemental Methods for a more complete derivation and additional technical concerns):

$$
\mathcal{L} \approx \sum_{k=1}^{K-1} \mathbf{w}_k^T (\mathbf{b}_k + \mathbf{h}') + \sum_{k=1}^{K-1} \mathbf{w}_k^T \mathbf{J}' \mathbf{w}_k - \sum_{k=1}^{K-1} \sum_{j \neq k} \mathbf{w}_j^T \mathbf{J}'' \mathbf{w}_k,
$$

where

$$
\mathbf{b}_k = \sum_{i : y_i = k} -\mathbf{x}_i,
$$

$$
\mathbf{h} = \frac{1}{K} \sum_i \mathbf{x}_i,
$$

$$
\mathbf{J}' = \frac{K - 1}{2K^2} \sum_i \mathbf{x}_i \mathbf{x}_i^T,
$$

$$
\mathbf{J}'' = \frac{1}{2K^2} \sum_i \mathbf{x}_i \mathbf{x}_i^T.
$$

In general, this formulation requires arbitrary inter-weight couplings (i.e., $\mathbf{J}''$ -- couplings between $\mathbf{w}_k$ and $\mathbf{w}_j$, where $k$ and $j$ represent the weights for different classes) and intra-weight couplings ($\mathbf{J}'$ -- couplings between $\mathbf{w}_{k,n}$ and $\mathbf{w}_{k,m}$, where $n$ and $m$ are the indices of the weights assigned to the $n$th and $m$th features for the $k$th class). This imposes constraints on the number of classes and number of features that can be run on a particular hardware graph. For a dataset with $M$ features and $K$ classes, this approach requires $M \times (K - 1)$ logical variables. On the D-Wave 2000Q, the largest complete graph that can be embedded consists of 66 logical variables; i.e., $M \times (K - 1)$ must be at most 66. For our purposes, we chose $K = 6$ cancer types, which limits the number of features we can use to 13. The largest complete graph that can be embedded onto the DW2X processor at ISI consists of 45 logical variables, so for the binomial datasets we chose a total of 44 features.
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Figure 1: (a) Overview of classification strategy. (i) Whole exome sequencing, RNA-Seq, miRNA-Seq, DNA methylation array, and genotyping array data (for CNVs) were retrieved from The Cancer Genome Atlas (TCGA) for human cancer type and molecular subtype classification. Data were concatenated and transformed into a single scaled ‘omics’ data matrix. The matrix was then repeatedly split into 100 unique training and independent test sets representing 80% and 20% of total data, respectively. (ii) Principal Component Analysis (PCA) was performed separately on each individual training set, and a subsequent matched test set was projected using training set specific PCA loadings. (iii) Several standard classical machine learning algorithms were compared to quantum annealing and several classical analogues of quantum annealing. The standard classical machine learning methods assessed included: Least Absolute Shrinkage and Selection Operator (LASSO), Ridge regression (Ridge), Random Forest (RF), Naïve Bayes (NB), and support vector machine (SVM). Quantum annealing (D-Wave) was performed on D-Wave hardware by formulating the classification problem as an Ising problem (see Methods). Classical analogues to quantum annealing included: simulated annealing (SA), candidate solutions randomly generated and sorted according to the Ising energy (Random), and an approach that considers only local fields of the Ising problem (Field). (iv) After training, classification performance was validated with each corresponding test set for a variety of statistical metrics, including balanced accuracy, area under the ROC curve (AUC), and F1 score. Classification performance metrics were averaged for the 100 unique test sets for each model. (b) Presents the six human cancer types used for the multi-class classification models. Patient sample sizes are indicated in parentheses.
Figure 2: Comparison of classification algorithms for five TCGA cancer datasets. Human cancer datasets assessed: Kidney Renal Clear Cell Carcinoma (KIRC) vs. Kidney Renal Papillary Cell Carcinoma (KIRP); Lung Adenocarcinoma (LUAD) vs. Lung Squamous Cell Carcinoma (LUSC); Breast Invasive Carcinoma (BRCA) vs. matched normal tissue (normal); estrogen receptor positive (ERpos) vs. estrogen receptor negative (ERneg) breast cancers; and luminal A (LumA) vs. luminal B (LumB) breast cancers. To address class imbalance for each comparison, algorithm performance is ranked by mean balanced accuracy on the x-axis. By and large the other metrics indicate the same performance ranking. Classification performance metrics were averaged for the 100 unique training and test sets for each model (see Methods). Performance metrics: Accuracy (red), AUC (green), Balanced Accuracy (blue), F1 score (purple). Data are presented as mean ± SEM.
Figure 3: Test set balanced accuracy for LumA vs. LumB binomial classification with incremental decreases from 95% to 20% of original training set. Algorithms evaluated are indicated in the legend. Averaged balanced accuracies were calculated for 50 independent training sets at each designated fraction of original training data. Data are presented as mean ± SEM.
Figure 4: Classification, hierarchical clustering, functional enrichment, and natural language processing of the top 44 genes of PC1 for Luminal A vs. Luminal B binomial comparison. (a) Gene-level classification of Luminal A vs. Luminal B human breast cancers based on the top 44 genes of PC1. Data presented as mean ± SEM. (b) classical HCL algorithm (see Methods). Note: genes are presented in rows and samples in columns. (c) GOseq functional enrichment analysis of top 44 genes for PC1 shows enriched GO terms ordered by p-values. (d) Circos plot representing semantic search of full-text articles within the PubMed Central Database identifying published associations of the top 44 genes for PC1 to the query terms, Cancer and Breast Cancer. The red and blue outer bands represent ‘mRNA’ and ‘methylation’ datatypes, respectively. The inner blue band represents genes with known functional annotation. The intensity of the inner purple-colored ring indicates the total number of publications in cancer and breast cancer of the top 44 genes of PC1. This banned colored with 6 bins where white is the lowest and dark purple the highest number of publications at the time of analysis. The thickness and color of the circus plot ribbons indicate number of published gene-to-query term associations: green represents cancer and yellow designates breast cancer.
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Supplemental Methods
In this section we provide more details for the methods used in the main text.

The Cancer Genome Atlas (TCGA) Data
Whole Exome Sequencing, RNA-Seq, miRNA-Seq, DNA Methylation Array, and Genotyping Array data were retrieved from the Genome Data Commons (GDC) data portal (https://portal.gdc.cancer.gov/) - Data Release 4.0 or cBioportal (http://www.cbioportal.org/). Cancer types with samples having all five data types (messenger-RNA, micro-RNA, copy number variation, single nucleotide polymorphism, and DNA methylation) were chosen for further analysis (Figure 5 and Supplemental Spreadsheet 1 - S1). The cancer types for the five binomial comparisons were kidney renal clear cell carcinoma (KIRC) vs. kidney renal papillary cell carcinoma (KIRP); lung adenocarcinoma (LUAD) vs. lung squamous cell carcinoma (LUSC); breast invasive carcinoma (BRCA) vs. matched normal breast tissue (normal); estrogen receptor positive (ERpos) vs. estrogen receptor negative (ERneg) breast cancers; and luminal A (LumA) vs. luminal B (LumB) breast cancers. We used human brain, breast, kidney, lung, liver, and colorectal cancer types for the six-cancer multiclass classification. The cancer types which were merged into a single cancer type due to their similarity are colon adenocarcinoma (COAD) and rectum adenocarcinoma (READ); kidney renal clear cell carcinoma (KIRC) and kidney renal papillary cell carcinoma (KIRP); lung adenocarcinoma (LUAD) and lung squamous cell carcinoma (LUSC).

Whole Exome Sequencing (STV)
We retrieved GDC harmonized level 2 Variant Call Format (VCF) files annotated by VarScan2 and MuTect GDC somatic annotation workflows (with the Variant Effect Predictor (VEP) v84. VCF files were converted to Genomically Ordered Relational (GOR) database file format. DeepCODE scores (described below) were calculated for all variants. Variants were initially filtered by VCF ‘Filter’ equal to ‘Pass’, VarScan2 p-value less than or equal to 0.05, and ‘Somatic’ status and subsequently filtered by VEP annotation ‘impact’ and deepCODE score and kept if the following conditions were met: (1) 'HIGH' VEP impact, (2) a deepCODE score greater than 0.51 and a 'MODERATE' VEP impact, or (3) 'MODERATE' VEP impact in the absence of a deepCODE score. Call copies for each variant was mapped to its given gene and the counts of all variants ascribed to a given gene were added together into a single count value (referred to as a somatic tumor variant, STV, herein). Variants for the matched breast cancer tumor and normal samples were detected from aligned reads of GDC harmonized level 1 BAM files using the Genome Analysis Toolkit (GATK) Haplotypecaller. Joint genotyping was performed on gVCF files using GATK GenotypeGVCFs and hg38 as reference. VEP v85 annotations were obtained by mapping to chromosome position. Variant filtering and call-copy collapsing methods were carried out in the same manner as described above.

RNA-Seq (mRNA)
We retrieved GDC harmonized level 3 mRNA quantification data as un-normalized raw read counts from HT-Seq. Raw mapping counts were combined into a count matrix with genes as rows and samples as columns and normalized using the trimmed mean of M-values (TMM) method from the edgeR R package. Lowly expressed genes were filtered out by requiring read counts to be greater than 1 per million reads for more than 10% of samples. We assessed possible batch effects in the normalized count data using batch information extracted from TCGA.
barcodes (i.e. the sample plate number) with the ComBat\textsuperscript{12} function from the sva\textsuperscript{13} R package. There were no detectible batch effects as assessed by Multi-Dimensional Scaling (MDS) either before or after batch correction.

**miRNA-Seq (miRNA)**
We retrieved GDC harmonized level 3 miRNA quantification data as raw read counts from the BCGSC miRNA profiling pipeline. We filtered miRNAs by retaining only experimentally validated gene targets from the miRBase reference (http://www.mirbase.org/). Raw mapping counts were combined into a count matrix with genes as rows and samples as columns and normalized using the trimmed mean of M-values TMM\textsuperscript{10} method from the edgeR\textsuperscript{11} R package. Lowly expressed genes were filtered out by requiring read counts to be greater than 1 per million reads for more than 1\% of samples.

**Genotyping Arrays (CNV)**
We retrieved GIStIC2 processed copy number variation (CNV) data from cBioportal\textsuperscript{1,14,15}. GIStIC2 assigns an integer value for each gene ranging from -2 to +2, representing a deep loss, shallow loss, diploid, low-level gain, and high-level amplification accordingly. CNV data was compiled into a matrix with samples as rows and genes as columns and all NA values were removed. For the matched breast cancer tumor and normal samples, we retrieved GDC harmonized level-3 copy number data from Affymetrix SNP 6.0 arrays. The segment means were converted to linear copy numbers using Eq. 1 and mapped to gene symbols using ENSEMBL GRCh38 as reference\textsuperscript{16}.

\[
\text{LinearCopyNumber} = 2 \times (2^{\text{SegmentMean}})
\]  
(1)

CNV segments with less than 5 probes and probe sets with frequent germline copy-number variation (using SNP6 array probe set file as reference) were discarded.

**DNA Methylation Arrays (Methylation)**
We retrieved GDC harmonized level 3 beta values derived from Illumina Infinium Human Methylation27 (HM27) and HumanMethylation450 (HM450) arrays. Probes were filtered based on the following criteria: (1) was present on both platforms, (2) was mapped to genes or their promoters, (3) was not present on chromosome X, Y, or MT, and (4) did not contain all NA values. We replaced remaining NA and zero beta values with the minimum beta value across all probes and all samples in each batch (defined by the samples TCGA plate barcode) as described in the REMP R package\textsuperscript{17}. Beta values of 1 were replaced with the maximum beta value less than 1 across all probes and all samples in each batch. We converted beta values into M values using Eq. 2.

\[
M(\beta) = \log_2 \left( \frac{\beta}{1-\beta} \right)
\]  
(2)

We corrected for batch effects within each cancer type using batch information extracted from TCGA barcodes (i.e. the sample plate number) with the ComBat\textsuperscript{12} function from the sva\textsuperscript{13} R package. We collapsed multiple probes mapped to the same gene by selecting the probe with the maximum standard deviation across all samples.
**Genomic Data Integration**

We concatenated the processed data from each of five genomic data types (mRNA, miRNA, STV, CNV, and Methylation) into a single data matrix, with samples represented in rows and genes (tagged by data type) as columns. For each comparison, samples were randomly split into 100 cuts of training (80%) and testing (20%) datasets stratified by cancer type and/or molecular subtype.

**Normalization**

For every cut of training dataset, each feature was scaled to zero mean and unit variance (z-score) and the mean and variance from the training datasets were used to standardize the test datasets.

**Dimensionality Reduction**

**Principal Component Analysis (PCA)**

Dimensionality reduction was performed using principal component analysis on each cut of the training data retaining the top 44 principle components as features for the binomial comparisons, and 13 principal components as features for the six-cancer multinomial comparison. Each cut of the PC-level data was normalized as mentioned above. These 100 data matrices at the PC level were used for downstream modeling (Figure 1).

**Machine Learning**

We used five machine learning approaches as classical classification models.

**Least Absolute Shrinkage and Selection Operator (LASSO), and Ridge Regression**

LASSO\(^\text{18}\) is an L\(_1\)-penalized linear regression model defined as:

\[
\hat{\beta}(\lambda) = \min_{\beta} \left[ -\log [L(y; \beta)] + \lambda \| \beta \|_1 \right]
\]

Ridge\(^\text{19,20}\) is an L\(_2\)-penalized linear regression model defined as:

\[
\hat{\beta}(\lambda) = \min_{\beta} \left[ -\log[L(y; \beta)] + \lambda \| \beta \|_2^2 \right]
\]

where

\[
L = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{t=1}^{N} (y_t - \beta_0 - x_t \cdot \beta)^2
\]

In both cases \(\lambda > 0\) is the regularization parameter that controls model complexity, \(\beta\) are the regression coefficients, \(\beta_0\) is the intercept term, \(y\) are the class labels, \(x_t\) is the \(t\)th training sample, and the goal of the training procedure is to determine \(\hat{\beta}\), the optimal regression coefficients that minimize the quantities defined in Eqs. (3) and (4). The predicted label is given by \(\hat{y} = \beta_0 + x_t \cdot \beta\), with some threshold introduced to binarize the label for classification problems. In LASSO, the constraint placed on the norm of \(\beta\) (the strength of which is given by \(\lambda\)) causes coefficients of uninformative features to shrink to zero. This leads to a simpler model that contains only a few non-zero \(\beta\) coefficients. We used the ‘glmnet’ function from the caret\(^\text{21}\) R package to train all LASSO and Ridge models. For Ridge, \(\lambda\) plays a similar role in determining...
model complexity, except that coefficients for uninformative features do not necessarily shrink to zero.
For both LASSO and Ridge, we chose to implement the function over a custom tuning grid of 1000 values ranging from λ=0 to λ=100. λ was chosen via 10-fold cross-validation as the value that gave the minimum mean cross-validated error.

**Support Vector Machines (SVMs)**
Support vector machines (SVMs)\(^{22,23}\) are a set of supervised learning models used for classification and regression analysis. The primal form of the optimization problem is:

\[
\min_{w,b,a} L_p = \frac{1}{2} ||w||^2 - \sum_{i=1}^{N} a_i y_i (x_i \cdot w + b) + \sum_{i=1}^{N} a_i
\]

where \(L_p\) is the loss function in its primal form (\(p\) for primal), \(w\) are the weights to be determined in the optimization, \(x_i\) is the \(i\)th training sample, \(y_i\) is the label of the \(i\)th training sample, \(a_i \geq 0\) are Lagrange multipliers, \(N\) is the number of training points, and \(b\) is the intercept term. Labels are predicted by thresholding \(x_i \cdot w + b\).

The optimization problem in its dual form is defined as:

\[
\max_a L_d(a_i) = \sum_{i=1}^{N} a_i - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^{N} a_i a_j y_i y_j K(x_i, x_j)
\]

where \(L_d\) is the Lagrangian dual of the primal problem, \(a_i\) are the Lagrange multipliers, and \(y_i\) and \(x_i\) are the \(i\)th the label and training sample, respectively, \(K(\cdot, \cdot)\) is the kernel function and \(\sum_{i=1}^{N} a_i y_i = 0\) and \(\forall i, a_i \geq C \geq 0\). Here \(C\) is a hyper-parameter that controls the degree of misclassification of the model for nonlinear classifiers. The optimal value of \(w\) and \(b\) can found in terms of the \(a_i\)’s, and the label of a new data point \(x\) can be found by thresholding the output \(\sum_i a_i y_i K(x_i, x_j) + b\). In most cases, many of the \(a_i\)’s are zero, and evaluating predictions can be faster using the dual form. We used the support vector machines with linear kernel (‘svmLinear2’) (i.e., \(K(x_i, x_j) = x_i \cdot x_j\), the inner product of \(x_i\) and \(x_j\) function from the caret\(^{21}\) R package to train all SVM models. A 10-fold cross-validation was used to tune parameters resulting in best cross-validation accuracy for training the model.

**Random Forest**
Random Forest\(^{24,25}\) is an ensemble learning method for classification and regression which builds a set (or forest) of decision trees. In random forest, \(n\) samples are chosen (typically two-thirds of all the training data) with replacement from the training data \(m\) times, giving \(m\) different decision trees. Each tree is grown by considering ‘mtry’ of the total features, and the tree is split depending on which features gives the smallest Gini impurity. In the event of multiple training samples in a terminal node of a particular tree, the predicted label is given by the mode of all the training samples in a terminal node. The final prediction for a new sample \(x'\) is determined by taking the majority vote over all the trees in the forest. We used the ‘rf’ function from the caret\(^{21}\) R package to train all Random Forest models. A 10-fold cross-validation was used to tune parameters for training the model. A tune grid with 44 values from 1 to 44 for ‘mtry’, the number of random variables considered for a split each iteration during the construction of each tree, was used for the tuning model.
**Naïve Bayes**

Naïve Bayes\(^{26,27}\) is a conditional probabilistic classifier based on applying Bayes' theorem which relies on strong independence assumptions, as defined by Eqs. 7 and 8:

\[
p(y_i|x_i) = \frac{p(y_i)p(x_i|y_i)}{p(x_i)} \quad (7)
\]

\[
p(y_i|x_{i,1}, \ldots, x_{i,m}) = p(y_i) \prod_{k=1}^{m} p(x_{i,k}|y_i) \quad (8)
\]

where \(x_{i,k}\) is the \(k\)th feature of the \(i\)th training sample \(x_i\), and \(y_i\) is the given class label, and \(m\) is the number of features. We used the ‘nb’ function from the caret\(^{21}\) R package to train all Naïve Bayes models.

**Differential Gene Expression Analysis**

We performed differential expression analysis for 41 mRNA genes from the top 44 most informative genes in Luminal A vs. Luminal B breast cancer comparison. The edgeR\(^{11}\) package was used to determine differentially expressed mRNAs. The Benjamini-Hochberg was used to control for false discovery of 5%. Of the 41 mRNA genes, we found 40 genes were significantly differentially expressed with an FDR ± 0.05. We found 30 genes had higher expression in Luminal B and 11 genes had higher expression in Luminal A samples based on edgeR analysis. Moreover, there were a total 7,871/18,059 (44%) differently expressed mRNA genes for the Luminal A vs. Luminal B breast cancer comparison. Of these 7,871 genes, 4,345 (55%) were up regulated in Luminal B compared to 3,526 (45%) in Luminal A.

**Functional Enrichment Analysis (GOseq)**

Functional enrichment analysis of the top 44 most informative genes by PC loading of PC1 from the training set of luminal A (LumA) vs. luminal B (LumB) breast cancers comparison was carried out with GOseq\(^{28}\) analysis in an unrestricted manner. Briefly, GOseq analysis was performed on the top 44 gene list to identify enriched gene ontology (GO) terms allowing unannotated genes in the analysis. Select GOseq terms ordered by p-value are shown in Figure 4d. A complete list of functionally enriched GO terms is presented in Supplemental Spreadsheet 1–S3.

**Semantic Search Engine**

The ‘entrez search’ function from the R package ‘rentrez’\(^{29}\) was used to query the number of full-text publications for each of the top 44 most informative genes in Luminal A vs. Luminal B breast cancer comparison from the PubMed Central (PMC) database. Briefly, the R package ‘rentrez’ provides an interface to the NCBI’s ‘EUtils’ API to search databases like GenBank [https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/genbank/] and PubMed [https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/] for relationships between genes of interest and query terms, and to process the results from the retrieved hits. The search term was defined by combining the gene symbol and “cancer” or “breast cancer” fields, along with the Medical Subject Headings (MeSH) vocabulary terms as synonyms to expand each NLP search using boolean operators AND/OR (see Supplemental Spreadsheet 1–S4). Network diagrams were constructed using Circos scripts (http://circos.ca/). The red and blue outer bands represent ‘mRNA’ and ‘methylation’ datatypes, respectively. The inner blue band are genes with known functional annotation at the time of analysis. The purple
colored ring indicates the total number of publications where each gene and cancer are both mentioned. This band is colored with five bins where white is the lowest and dark purple the highest. For example, there are many publications that mentions both “E2F1” and “cancer”, and very few with “C12orf73” and “cancer”. The thickness and color of the circos plot ribbons indicate number of published full-text articles linking each gene to the cancer or breast cancer.

**Computational Frameworks and Resources**
Data pre-processing and machine learning models were carried out using R (>= 3.4.4) or Python (3.6.8). Plots were generated using ggplot2 in R.

**Hierarchical Clustering**
We applied a “custom ward” linkage criteria in the hierarchical cluster analysis of top 44 most informative genes, by PC loading, of PC1 from the training set of the luminal A (LumA) vs. luminal B (LumB) breast cancers comparison (Figure 4b). The genes are represented as rows, and samples as columns. The algorithm used an exact minimization procedure.

**Quantum Annealing**
Quantum annealing may be considered a special case of adiabatic quantum computation. The adiabatic theorem of quantum mechanics, which underlies quantum annealing, implies that a physical system will remain in the ground state if a given perturbation acts slowly enough and if there is a gap between the ground state and the rest of the system’s energy spectrum. To use the adiabatic theorem to solve optimization problems, we specify an initial Hamiltonian, $H_B$, whose ground state is easy to find (typically a transverse field), and a problem Hamiltonian, $H_p$, that does not commute with $H_B$ and whose ground state encodes the solution to the problem we are seeking to optimize. We then interpolate from $H_B$ to $H_p$ by defining the total Hamiltonian $H(s) = A(s)H_B + B(s)H_p$, where $s$ is the parameterized time ($0 \leq s = t/t_f \leq 1$, $t$ is time, and $t_f$ is the total annealing time). $A(s)$ and $B(s)$ are, respectively, decreasing and increasing smoothly and monotonically. The adiabatic theorem ensures that the ground state of the system at $s = 1$ will give the desired solution to the problem, provided the interpolation is sufficiently slow, i.e., $t_f$ is large compared to the timescale set by the inverse of the smallest ground state gap of $H(s)$ and by $\frac{dH(s)}{ds}$.

In quantum annealing, rather than run the computation a single time slowly enough such that the adiabatic theorem is obeyed, we allow the possibility of running the computation multiple times at a shorter annealing time, such that the overall computational time is minimized. In addition, when quantum annealing is implemented in a physical device, temperature and other noise effects play an important role; thermal excitation and relaxation cannot be neglected and affect performance.

**Additional technical details regarding the D-Wave quantum annealers**
D-Wave processors currently employ a “Chimera” architecture with a limited graph connectivity (for a typical representation of a hardware graph, see Supplemental Figure S6). For nearly all problems of practical interest, the connectivity of the “logical problem” will differ from the Chimera architecture of D-Wave. This introduces the need to find a **minor embedding** of the hardware graph. A minor embedding maps a logical problem qubit to a set of physical qubits such that for every coupling between pairs of logical qubits in the logical problem there exists at least one physical coupling between the corresponding sets of physical qubits. A minor
embedding is found by performing a series of edge contractions, which effectively join vertices together, thereby allowing for a graph with fewer vertices but a higher degree of connectivity to be obtained. For the results in this study, we used the “minorminer” package available on D-Wave’s github [https://github.com/dwavesystems/minorminer].

In order to ensure that physical qubits are aligned and act as a single logical qubit (or “chain”), a strong coupling bias is introduced between physical qubits that comprise a logical qubit. Then, for a fixed embedding, the way the values of the couplings and local fields for a logical qubit are distributed among the physical qubits is known as “parameter setting”. A built-in function provided by D-Wave has been used for parameter setting. By the embedding procedure and parameter setting, logical problems may be transformed into physical problems. Note that for one logical problem there may be many physical problems, depending both on the embedding and the parameter setting.

Ideally, once the strength of the coupling between logical qubits is determined, all solutions returned by D-Wave would correspond to valid logical solutions, i.e., all the physical qubits within a logical qubit would have the same spin (there would be no “broken chains”). However, due to the probabilistic nature of quantum annealing, as well as noise from different sources, there is often some percentage of solutions that have broken chains. To deal with broken chains D-Wave offers three options for “decoding” the solutions. The first is to discard all solutions with broken chains and collect an additional set of solutions (“discard”). Another option is to do a majority vote on the physical qubits that comprise a logical qubit, breaking ties with a random assignment (“majority vote decoding”). The last option is to go through the broken chains one by one and select the value for the spin that greedily minimizes the energy of the Hamiltonian of the logical problem (“energy minimization decoding”); i.e., it selects the spin that result in the greatest decrease in the energy of the Hamiltonian based on the current spin configuration. The likelihood of a solution having broken chains can be roughly adjusted by controlling a parameter $J_c$, the value of the strong coupling bias between physical qubits within a logical qubit; the larger the magnitude of $J_c$, the more likely will it be for the physical qubits within a logical qubit to have the same spin. The disadvantage of increasing the coupling bias too much is that it can wash out the details of the problem instances; thus, there is a tradeoff between getting solutions with many broken chains (which occurs when $|J_c|$ is too small) and getting solutions which may have lost the details of the original problem we are trying to solve (which occurs when $|J_c|$ is too large).

Based on these considerations, our strategy for collecting solutions was the following. First, we generated 20 embeddings based on the procedure mentioned above. The one with the smallest average number of physical qubits per logical qubit was used to obtain weights for all the training instances. Then, for each training instance we queried the D-Wave chip for 1000 times with 10 spin-reversal transformations (or, gauges) to mitigate parameter misspecifications from the machine. We then treated $J_c$ as a hyper-parameter with values in the set $\{-0.5, -1, -3, -8, -16, -32\}$. All the parameters sent to the machine (both the ferromagnetic coupling $J_c$ and the physical problem parameters $h_i$ and $J_{ij}$) are normalized to fall between $-1$ and $1$, per specifications of the machine. Finally, classical post-processing optionally may be performed on the broken chains; energy-minimization and majority-vote decoding are quick and speed up collection of solutions; however, we treated all three decoding procedures as a hyper-parameter to be tuned. All D-Wave
anneals were run with an annealing time of 5µs. Note that we did not optimize the annealing time; doing so would introduce another hyperparameter and could improve results for D-Wave.

**Derivation of the Ising Hamiltonian**

Recall that we have written the probabilities for the first \( K - 1 \) classes as:

\[
Pr(y_i = k) = \frac{\exp w_k^Tx_i}{1 + \sum_{k=1}^{K-1} \exp w_k^Tx_i},
\]

with the probability of the \( K \)th class as:

\[
Pr(y_i = K) = \frac{1}{1 + \sum_{k=1}^{K-1} \exp w_k^Tx_i}.
\]

By defining the probabilities of our classes in this way, we can reduce the number of sets of weights we have to train from \( K \) to \( K - 1 \). The goal of training is to maximize the probability given the classes in the dataset, or equivalently to minimize the negative log-likelihood. We can express the negative log-likelihood as follows:

\[
\mathcal{L} = -\log \prod_i Pr(y_i) = -\sum_i \log Pr(y_i)
\]

(12)

For simplicity, we define \( z_i^{(k)} = w_k^Tx_i \), i.e., the inner product between the weights corresponding to the \( c \)th and the \( i \)th feature-vector. To continue, we consider splitting the above sum into terms over the first \( K - 1 \) classes and the \( K \)th class:

\[
\mathcal{L} = -\sum_i \log Pr(y_i)
\]

\[
= - \sum_{i : y_i \in 1...K-1} \log Pr(y_i) - \sum_{i : y_i = K} \log Pr(y_i = K)
\]

(13)

\[
= - \sum_{i : y_i \in 1...K-1} \left[ z_i^{(y_i)} - \log \left( 1 + \sum_{k=1}^{K-1} \exp z_i^{(k)} \right) \right] + \sum_{i : y_i = K} \log \left( 1 + \sum_{k=1}^{K-1} \exp z_i^{(k)} \right)
\]

(14)

\[
= - \sum_{i : y_i \in 1...K-1} z_i^{(y_i)} + \sum_i \log \left( 1 + \sum_{k=1}^{K-1} \exp z_i^{(k)} \right),
\]

(15)

We can now take the second-order Taylor approximation around 0 for the second summation, expanding in \( z_i^{(k)} \) gives us the following:
In examining the derivation, one may ask whether it is reasonable to take an expansion to second-order near $z_i^{(k)}$. We offer two brief arguments in support of this. The first is that a second-order approximation has been used to great success in other algorithms, such as XGBoost, a gradient-boosted algorithm that has seen much success recently in a variety of machine learning tasks. To speed up calculations, XGBoost uses a second-order approximation to calculate the objective function in a general setting. It is important to note, however, that for XGBoost (and other gradient-based methods) the weights are updated iteratively, whereas here we are presumably using a quantum annealer to directly evaluate the loss function. A second argument is that we are looking for a set of self-consistent solutions. We take the second-order approximation around 0, and if the optimization works properly, we will get results for which the approximation is valid.

Perhaps a more serious concern is that this expansion is not formally within the radius of convergence of the natural logarithm. Given this concern, care should be given to make sure that the difference in the approximation does not differ too greatly. One simple way to check this is to see whether there is a clear correlation between the energies (the approximation) and the original function we are trying to optimize (the log-likelihood). As long as there is good correlation, the approximation is reasonable. The correlation between the negative log-likelihood and the energy for the five binomial datasets is shown in Supplemental Figure S5 (more on this in the subsection titled “Performance metrics versus energy”, below). For binary classification, the negative log-likelihood is equivalent to the logistic loss, $l = \ln(1 + \exp(-y_i w^T x_i))$, if we use the label convention $y_i \in \{-1, 1\}$ or the binary cross-entropy loss, $l_{(CE)} = -y_i \ln \sigma(w^T x_i) - (1 - y_i) \ln(1 - \sigma(w^T x_i))$, where $\sigma(z) = 1/(1 + \exp(-z)$, if we use the convention $y_i \in \{0, 1\}$. We sometimes refer to the negative log-likelihood as the logistic loss.
Post-processing Spin Configurations

In this section we describe our classical post-processing procedure to make use of all the spin configurations returned by D-Wave, SA and Random. We used all three methods to generate $S$ different spin configurations (which we refer to as “weights”) and sorted them by their Ising energy. Weights were then averaged together and the averaged weights that gave the best performance for some training metric was selected. More formally, let $\{w_i\}_{i=1...S}$ be the set of $S$ weights returned by the various methods. We define $w_{tmp}^k = \frac{1}{k} \sum_{i=1}^k w_i$ as the trial weight, and $\bar{f}_k = \frac{1}{|D_{\text{train}}|} \sum_{j \in D_{\text{train}}} f(y_j, \hat{y}_j^k)$, where $f$ is the performance metric, $D_{\text{train}}$ is the training data set, and $\hat{y}_j^k$ is the predicted output of the $k$th trial weights on the $j$th training sample. The metrics of training performance include AUC, the logistic loss, and the accuracy. For the AUC and logistic loss we can directly use the predicted output (for binary classification, the predicted probability of the $j$th sample to be of class 1 is $\hat{y}_j = \sigma(w^T x_j)$). For the accuracy, we assign labels based on whether the predicted output is greater than 0.5. Applying this averaging procedure for a small set of weights allows us to increase the performance without sacrificing some of the robustness associated with discrete weights. Unless otherwise specified, for all Figures in the Main text and here, we used $S = 20$ and set $f = \text{AUC}$ as the performance metric.

Decreasing the Amount of Training Data

Based on previous results that showed a benefit for annealing approaches over classical machine learning approaches with smaller amounts of data$^{43-45}$, we incrementally decreased the amount of training data for the luminal A (LumA) vs. luminal B (LumB) breast cancers dataset. To do this, we selected one of the original training cuts that consisted of 80% of the entire dataset. From this one cut, we selected fractions of the data in increments of 5%, making sure that we had at least as many samples as PCs. Since the luminal A (LumA) vs. luminal B (LumB) breast cancers dataset had 250 samples and 44 PCs, we selected fractions of data in increments of 5% starting with 20% of the data (20% of 250 samples is 50 samples, which is greater than the number of PCs) up to 95% of the original training cut. In order to collect statistics, for percentage $p$ of the training data we sampled $p\%$ of the original training data with all the gene-level features 50 times. For each of these cuts, we reperformed PCA to identify the top 44 PCs of the reduced sub-training set. We trained all classical and Ising models on the same sub-training sets and evaluated performance on the original test set consisting of 20% of the data. The results are presented in Figure 3. Formally, let the original training data set on the gene-level data before PCA be denoted by $D_{1\text{Train}}$ which is 80% of the entire dataset (in the main text we repeated this step 100 times, i.e., we had a set of training instances $\{D_{i\text{Train}}\}, i = 1 ... 100$), and let the corresponding test data set be noted by $D_{1\text{Test}}$. Here, we selected one of the training cuts and generated 50 “sub”-training data sets for each $p$, which we denote by $\overline{D}_{p,j\text{Train}}$, where $p \in \{20, 25 ... , 95\}$ and $j \in \{1 ... 50\}$. Each $\overline{D}_{p,j\text{Train}}$ is obtained by performing PCA on a randomly selected $p\%$ of the 250 samples in $D_{1\text{Train}}$.

Supplemental Results

In this Section we present some additional details about the relative performance of the various annealing-type methods; i.e., those that optimize the Ising energy. The main purpose of the results in this section is to understand the excellent performance of the random approach with a small number of solutions. We first show that for the datasets we examined, the Ising energy is a
reasonable approximation for the negative log-likelihood. We also explore the effect of changing the number of solutions, both the total number of solutions and the number of solutions in the post-processing approach described above.

**Performance metrics versus energy**

As a way to gain some insight into the machine learning performance with respect to Ising energy, we considered the effect of using higher-energy excited-state solutions; i.e., the solutions that have a higher energy according to the Ising Hamiltonian defined in Eq. (19). To do so, we first generated 1000 sets of weights for each method (D-Wave, SA, and Random). The weights were then sorted according to their Ising energy. Next, we used a sliding window of energies; i.e., we applied our post-processing averaging procedure to 20 solutions at a time starting from the 20 set of weights with the lowest Ising energy, then applying the averaging procedure to the 20 set of weights with the next lowest Ising energy and so on. This procedure was repeated for all 100 cuts of the data for each dataset, and the results for the balanced accuracy and negative log-likelihood are presented in Supplemental Figure S5.

The top row of the Supplemental Figure S5 shows a maximum in the balanced accuracy versus the Ising energy for most of the datasets. This maximum indicates the presence of a mismatch between the optimized objective function (the Ising energy) and the performance metric (the balanced accuracy); i.e., some solutions that perform worse in terms of the Ising energy perform better in terms of the balanced accuracy. This is in part due to the nature of the logistic loss, which is somewhat sensitive to outliers. To calculate the balanced accuracy, we must first threshold the predicted probabilities, assigning classes based on whether the probability for that class is greater than 0.5. Further, we note that by tuning the final temperature of SA, we are able to control the weights found to lie within a particular energy range; higher final temperature (smaller b1) shift the energies to the right. Note that while it is possible to bring SA to find higher energy solutions by increasing the final temperature, there is no single parameter we can use to decrease the temperature of the weights found by the random method, other than increasing the number of weights we randomly generate (for D-Wave we can essentially control the temperature by scaling the h’s and J’s). It seems reasonable to expect that with a growing number of features, Random will become less and less likely to find solutions low enough in energy to be useful; i.e., we may expect the solutions to lie to the right of the maximum. D-Wave and SA are generally to the left of the maximum and we can effectively “raise the temperature” such that they find solutions that are near the maximum.

The bottom row of Supplemental Figure S5 shows the averaged negative log-likelihood across the 100 cuts of the data versus the average Ising energy. Though not always linear, there is a clear correlation between the Ising energy and the log-loss. This indicates that the approximations we used to generate the Ising problem from the log-loss, though perhaps not perfect, are good enough that we see excellent correlations between the two. Had the approximation not been valid, we would expect to see very poor correlation, or no correlation at all between the two.

**Varying the number of solutions**

Because D-Wave, SA, and Random are all probabilistic, returning a distribution of solutions, finding weights with low Ising energy is somewhat dependent on the total number of solutions
that are found. We note that the ability of the respective methods in finding low energy solutions differs; as seen in Supplemental Figure S5, with a 1000 solutions, Random does not find solutions that are as low in energy as D-Wave and SA; we might expect the need to randomly generate on the order of $2^{44}$ (recall that we used 44 PCs for the binomial datasets) solutions in order for Random to find the solutions that match the Ising energy of the solutions returned by D-Wave and SA.

In addition to the total number of solutions, performance is also dependent on the number of solutions we include in our post-processing procedure. Our post-processing procedure is designed to monotonically improve performance on the training datasets, and thus we might expect including more solutions to improve performance. We did not consider using all solutions for several reasons: first, doing so increases the amount of time needed to generate final candidate solutions; second, by including many of the solutions, we begin to somewhat lose the discrete nature of the weights and therefore some of the robustness associated with them; finally, monotonically improving performance on the training dataset may lead to overfitting, and therefore using a smaller number of solutions is somewhat analogous to an early-stopping regularization scheme.

In the main text and in Supplemental Figure S5, we selected 20 best performing solutions to include in our post-processing procedure. The choice of 1000 and 20 are somewhat arbitrary, so to systematically determine the effect of this number of solutions, we vary the total number of solutions from 1 to 1000 and the number of best performing solutions from 1 to 1000 for each of the five binomial datasets. As before, we used the same 100 cuts of the data described in the main text for each of the datasets. The average test balanced accuracy, average test logistic loss, and the average training negative Ising energy are shown in Supplemental Figures S7, S8, and S9, respectively. For each performance metric (i.e., balanced accuracy, logistic loss, and Ising energy), we chose the final inverse temperature for SA and the $J_c$ for D-Wave (see Section on additional technical details of D-Wave) that gave the best performance of that measure.

Supplemental Figures S7-S9 all show that when using a very small number of total solutions, Random does worse than D-Wave and SA on all metrics. However, with as few as 50 total solutions and 5 best performing solutions, Random performs nearly the same as D-Wave and SA in terms of the balanced accuracy. Further increasing the total number of solutions and the number of solutions used in the post-processing procedure improves the balanced accuracy for D-Wave, SA, and Random. For estrogen receptor positive (ERpos) vs. estrogen receptor negative (ERneg) and lung adenocarcinoma (LUAD) vs. lung squamous cell carcinoma (LUSC), using all 1000 out of 1000 solutions gives the best performance, however for the other datasets, using a smaller number (around 20 or 50) of the total solutions gives nearly equal performance as using all 1000. For Random, using all 1000 solutions for the luminal A (LumA) vs. luminal B (LumB) breast cancers dataset is worse than using 50 solutions, indicating that for this dataset early stopping may help improve performance in terms of the balanced accuracy. Supplemental Figures S8 and S9 show that Random does not find solutions that are as low in Ising energy or with as low of a logistic loss as D-Wave and SA, confirming what was shown in Supplemental Figure S5.
These additional results show that even by exploring only a small subset of the total search space (1000 out of $2^{44}$ possible solutions), Random is able to give very good machine learning performance. Because the logistic loss is somewhat sensitive to outliers, finding “good” solutions with low (but not the lowest) Ising energy seem to give the best machine learning performance in terms of the balanced accuracy.
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Supplemental Figures and Tables

**Supplemental Figure S1**: Assessment of algorithm performance for multi-class classification of six TCGA human cancer types: breast, colorectal, lung, kidney, brain, and liver. Classification performance metrics were averaged for the 100 unique test sets for each model (see methods). Performance metrics: Accuracy (red), AUC (green), Balanced Accuracy (blue), F1 score (purple). Data are presented as mean ± SEM.
Supplemental Figure S2: Train and test balanced accuracies for the LumA vs. LumB binomial classification dataset. Order of the panels (left to right, top to bottom) is based on the average difference between performance on the train and the test across the range of data fractions shown for all nine classifiers assessed.
Supplemental Figure S3: (a) Test set balanced accuracy for ERpos vs. ERneg binomial classification with incremental decreases from 95% to 10% of original training set. (b) Test set balanced accuracy for the six-cancer classification with incremental decreases from 95% to 2% of original training set. The six TCGA human cancer types assessed: breast, colorectal, lung, kidney, brain, and liver. Averaged balanced accuracies were calculated for 50 independent training sets at each designated fraction of original training data. Data are presented as mean ± SEM.
Supplemental Figure S4: Rank-ordered heatmap of the averaged state for each of the top 44 genes for the LumA vs. LumB comparison.
Supplemental Figure S5: Evaluation of the performance of D-Wave, SA at various final inverse temperatures (b1 in the Legend), and Random, when using a sliding window of energies. Average balanced accuracy (top) and the average log loss (bottom) across the 100 cuts on the test dataset versus the average Ising energy of the post-processed weights. The shaded region represents 2 standard deviations.
Supplemental Figure S6: Schematic representation of the “Chimera” hardware graph of the DW2X housed at the Information Sciences Institute at USC, used in this work. Green circles represent active qubits, inactive qubits are omitted, lines represent couplings between qubits. Each qubit can be coupled to a maximum of six other qubits.
Supplemental Figure S7: Heatmaps showing the effect of changing the total number of solutions (y-axis) and the number of solutions used in the post-processing procedure (x-axis) on the average balanced accuracy on the test datasets for the five binomial datasets. SA was run with a final inverse temperature of $b_1 = 0.03$ and D-Wave was run with a $J_I$ of 8.0. A higher balanced accuracy indicates better performance.
Supplemental Figure S8: Heatmaps showing the effect of changing the total number of solutions (y-axis) and the number of solutions used in the post-processing procedure (x-axis) on the average logistic loss on the test datasets for the five binomial datasets. SA was run with a final inverse temperature of $b_1 = 3$ and D-Wave was run with a $J_z$ of 1.0. A lower logistic loss indicates better performance.
Supplemental Figure S9: Heatmaps showing the effect of changing the total number of solutions (y-axis) and the number of solutions used in the post-processing procedure (x-axis) on the average negative Ising energy on the training datasets for the five binomial datasets. SA was run with a final inverse temperature of $\beta_1 = 3$ and D-Wave was run with a $J_z$ of 1.0. A lower Ising energy (higher negative Ising energy) indicates better performance.