

# Quantum Assisted Eigensolver

Kishor Bharti<sup>1,\*</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Centre for Quantum Technologies, National University of Singapore 117543, Singapore

We propose a hybrid quantum-classical algorithm for approximating the ground state and ground state energy of a Hamiltonian. Once the Ansatz has been decided, the quantum part of the algorithm involves the calculation of two overlap matrices. The output from the quantum part of the algorithm is utilized as input for the classical computer. The classical part of the algorithm is a quadratically constrained quadratic program with a single quadratic equality constraint. Unlike the variational quantum eigensolver algorithm, our algorithm does not have any classical-quantum feedback loop. Using convex relaxation techniques, we provide an efficiently computable lower bound to the classical optimization program. Furthermore, using results from Bar-On *et al.* (*Journal of Optimization Theory and Applications*, 82(2):379–386, 1994), we provide a sufficient condition for a local minimum to be a global minimum. A solver can use such a condition as a stopping criterion.

*Introduction.*—Most of the available quantum computers have at most 50 – 70 noisy qubits and nobody knows whether it is possible to utilise these noisy intermediate-scale quantum (NISQ) [1] devices to solve any problem of practical relevance. A recent experiment by researchers at Google has, however, indicated the ability of these devices to execute computation beyond the capability of any available powerful classical computer [2]. An important question is how such breakthroughs can be translated into quantum advantages for practical use-cases.

To harness the potential of NISQ era quantum computers, hybrid quantum-classical variational algorithms have been suggested in recent years [3–7]. These algorithms operate via adaptive feedback control of the quantum device with the objective function encoding the solution of the corresponding computational problem. These algorithms are referred to as variational quantum algorithms (VQA). Some of the canonical examples of VQAs are variational quantum eigensolver (VQE) [3–5] and quantum approximate optimization algorithm (QAOA) [6, 7]. The aforementioned algorithms employ classical optimizers to update the parameters in a parametric quantum circuit while utilizing the quantum computer to evaluate the objective function or its gradient efficiently. These algorithms are considered the best hope for a near-term quantum advantage. The training of the parameters of the parametric quantum circuit for these algorithms, in general, can be exceptionally challenging. The appearance of the vanishing gradient problem (also referred to as barren plateau problem) as the quantum hardware noise or circuit depth increases, has led to valid concerns regarding the future of these algorithms [8–12]. Moreover, the training landscape, in general, does not correspond to any well-characterized optimization program, thus making their investigation difficult. Due to the aforementioned reasons, the pursuit of alternatives becomes pertinent.

In this Letter, we propose a hybrid classical-quantum algorithm for estimating the ground state of Hamiltonians. Unlike VQE, our algorithm does not mandate tuning of parameters of a quantum circuit. Moreover, there is no classical-quantum feedback loop. Our algo-

rithm proceeds in three stages, which we discuss informally now. The first step involves the selection of a sufficiently expressible Ansatz. The second step corresponds to the evaluation of specific matrix elements on a quantum computer. We assume that the quantum computer can estimate the aforementioned matrix elements efficiently. After the second step, the job of the quantum computer is over. The result from the second step serves as input to the final step. The third step of our algorithm is a classical optimization, which is a quadratically constrained quadratic program (QCQP) with single quadratic equality constraint.

Using convex relaxation techniques such as Lagrangian relaxation and semidefinite relaxation, we provide efficiently computable lower bounds to the classical optimization program. We also provide a sufficient condition for a local minimum to be a global minimum, which can be used by a solver as a stopping criterion. We refer to our algorithm as quantum assisted eigensolver (QAE). There has been a comprehensive study of QCQPs in the non-convex optimization literature [13–15] and one can hope to utilize many of the existing results from the aforementioned community to prove theoretical guarantees for our algorithm. Our algorithm has connections with Ritz method, which is used to find an approximate solution for boundary value problems. We believe that studying the connections in detail will lead to improvements to our algorithm. Recently, many algorithms based on overlap matrix computation have been suggested in the literature to estimate the ground state of Hamiltonians [16–24]. The second step of our algorithm could be improved based on ideas from the aforementioned references.

*Set-up*—We assume that the Hamiltonian  $H$  is a linear combination of unitaries,

$$H = \sum_{i=1}^n \beta_i U_i, \quad (1)$$

where  $U_i \in SU(2^N)$ ,  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , and  $\beta_i \in \mathbb{C}$  for  $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ . Our goal is to calculate an approximation to the ground state and ground state energy for  $H$ . Let

us consider a set of  $m$  quantum states  $\{|\phi_j\rangle\}_{j=1}^m$  such that  $\langle\phi_j|\phi_k\rangle \neq 1$  for  $j \neq k$  and  $|\phi_j\rangle = V_j|0^{\otimes N}\rangle$ , for some efficiently implementable unitary  $V_j \in SU(2^N)$ . Our Ansatz for approximating the ground state is

$$|\psi(\alpha)\rangle = \sum_{i=1}^m \alpha_i |\phi_i\rangle, \quad (2)$$

for  $\alpha \in \mathbb{C}^m$ . The task remains to find a suitable  $\hat{\alpha} \in \mathbb{C}^m$  which minimises the expectation value of  $H$  for the Ansatz in 2.

*Formulating the Optimization Problem*—The expectation value of the Hamiltonian in 1 for the Ansatz in 2 can be expressed as

$$\langle H(\alpha) \rangle = \sum_{i,j,k} \beta_i \alpha_j \langle \phi_j | U_i | \phi_k \rangle \alpha_k. \quad (3)$$

Using the notation  $D_{j,k} \equiv \sum_i \beta_i \langle \phi_j | U_i | \phi_k \rangle$ , we get

$$\begin{aligned} \langle H(\alpha) \rangle &= \sum_{j,k} \alpha_j D_{j,k} \alpha_k \\ &= \alpha^T D \alpha. \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

The requirement on the Ansatz in 2 to be a valid quantum state implies

$$\sum_{j,k} \alpha_j \langle \phi_j | \phi_k \rangle \alpha_k = 1. \quad (5)$$

Using the notation  $E_{j,k} \equiv \langle \phi_j | \phi_k \rangle$ , we get

$$\sum_{j,k} \alpha_j E_{j,k} \alpha_k = 1. \quad (6)$$

In compact notation, the above constraint can be re-written as

$$\alpha^T E \alpha = 1. \quad (7)$$

Combining 4 and 7, we get the following final optimization program, which we denote by  $P1$ .

$$\begin{aligned} &\text{minimize } \alpha^T D \alpha \\ &\text{subject to } \alpha^T E \alpha = 1 \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

The above program  $P1$  is a quadratic optimization problem with a single quadratic equality constraint. Furthermore, it is straightforward to see that matrix  $E$  is always a positive semidefinite matrix. The matrix  $D$  is positive semidefinite (PSD) whenever the Hamiltonian  $H$  in 1 is guaranteed to be PSD.

*The Hybrid Quantum-Classical Algorithm*—For a given Hamiltonian (of form 1) the QAE algorithm involves three steps:




FIG. 1. The QAE algorithm involves three steps. The first step corresponds to selecting an efficiently preparable Ansatz. The second step concerns the calculation of matrices  $D$  and  $E$ , where the elements of the matrices are of the form  $\langle 0^{\otimes N} | U | 0^{\otimes N} \rangle$  for some unitary  $U \in SU(2^N)$ . After step 2, we do not require the quantum computer. The third step is an optimization program (more precisely a QCQP), which is executed on a classical computer.

1. Selection of an Ansatz,
2. Calculation of the overlap matrices ( $D$  and  $E$ ) on a quantum computer, and
3. Execution of the corresponding QCQP on a classical computer.

Note that step 1 is crucial and heavily determines the success of the QAE algorithm. Our algorithm demands the Ansatz to be a linear combination of quantum states  $\{|\phi_j\rangle\}_{j=1}^m$  such that  $\langle\phi_j|\phi_k\rangle \neq 1$  for  $j \neq k$  and  $|\phi_j\rangle = V_j|0^{\otimes N}\rangle$  for some efficiently implementable unitary  $V_j$ .

Step 2 involves the computation of the overlap matrices ( $D$  and  $E$ ). The computation of matrix elements of the form  $\langle 0^{\otimes N} | U | 0^{\otimes N} \rangle$  (where  $U$  is some unitary matrix) will furnish the overlap matrices. We assume that the quantum computer can efficiently compute the aforementioned matrices for the given Hamiltonian and the choice of Ansatz.

Step 3 corresponds to a QCQP with input matrices of size  $m \times m$ . Note that the matrices  $D$  and  $E$  can be, in general, complex Hermitian. The combination coefficients  $\alpha$  also in general belong to  $\mathbb{C}^m$ . However, one can always map the program  $P1$  with complex variables to a program with real variables, by creating a mapping from  $\mathbb{C}^m$  to  $\mathbb{R}^{2m}$ . We discuss one such mapping in the Appendix. Thus, for the discussion in the main text, without loss of generality, we will assume  $D$  and  $E$  to be real symmetric matrices, and  $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}^m$ . We discuss the details of step 3 in the follow-up paragraphs. See Figure 1 for a visual synopsis of the QAE algorithm. If a given choice of Ansatz does not produce the desired accuracy, one needs to revisit step 1.

*Analysing the Classical Optimization*—The objective function in  $P1$  is convex whenever  $D$  is PSD. The

quadratic equality in the constraint, however, renders the optimization program  $P1$  non-convex. Using the Lagrange multiplier  $\lambda$  for the constraint  $\alpha^T E \alpha = 1$ , we define the following Lagrangian  $\mathcal{L} : \mathbb{R}^m \times \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ ,

$$\mathcal{L}(\alpha, \lambda) = \alpha^T D \alpha + \lambda (\alpha^T E \alpha - 1). \quad (9)$$

The first order condition for the optimality of  $P1$  are

$$\frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial \lambda} = 0 \implies \alpha^T E \alpha = 1, \quad (10)$$

and

$$\frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial \alpha} = 0 \implies (D + \lambda E) \alpha = 0. \quad (11)$$

Using conditions 10 and 11, we get

$$\alpha^T D \alpha + \lambda = 0. \quad (12)$$

Using the tangent plane  $T = \{y : y^T E \alpha = 0\}$  and  $H = D + \lambda E$ , the second order conditions for optimality are given by

$$y^T H y \geq 0 \quad \forall y \in T. \quad (13)$$

**Theorem 1.** *Given a tuple  $(\alpha, \lambda)$  that is local minimum and satisfies  $H \geq 0$  yields the global minimum of the program  $P1$  in 8.*

*Proof.* The proof trivially follows from proposition 1 in [14] and has been deferred to Appendix.  $\square$

The aforementioned theorem provides a sufficient condition for a given local minimum to be global minimum. Such a condition can be used by a solver for  $P1$  to provide a stopping criterion.

*Convex Relaxations*—Lower bounds on the optimal value of the nonconvex optimization program  $P1$  can be provided by convex relaxation techniques for quadratically constrained quadratic programs (QCQP). Minimizing over  $\alpha$  for the Lagrangian in 9, we get the following dual function,

$$\begin{aligned} g(\lambda) &= \inf \mathcal{L}(\alpha, \lambda) \\ &= -\lambda \text{ if } (D + \lambda E) \succcurlyeq 0 \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

and is unbounded otherwise. Using the dual function  $g(\lambda)$ , we can construct the following dual of  $P1$ :

$$\begin{aligned} &\text{maximize } \lambda \\ &\text{subject to } D - \lambda E \succcurlyeq 0, \end{aligned} \quad (15)$$

We will denote the above dual program in 15 as  $D1$ . Note that  $D1$  is a semidefinite program (SDP) and hence can be solved efficiently on a classical computer [13]. Instead

of Lagrangian relaxation (which turns out to be an SDP), one can also have a direct SDP relaxation (see Appendix). The aforementioned convex relaxation methods though provide a lower bound efficiently, the optimal points in the convex relaxed program may not be feasible. However, there exists sampling and convex-restriction based techniques in the optimization theory literature, which provide good feasible points [15].

*A Toy Example*—We explain the implementation of our QAE algorithm by providing a toy example. We consider the task of finding the ground state of the Hydrogen molecule ( $H_2$ ). The Hamiltonian for  $H_2$  can be represented using two qubits as

$$H = a(Z \otimes I + I \otimes Z) + b(X \otimes X), \quad (16)$$

where  $a = 0.4$  and  $b = 0.2$  [25, 26]. The symbols  $X$  and  $Z$  denote Pauli X and Pauli Z matrices. Our first step is to select a set of efficiently preparable quantum states to create the Ansatz (see 2). This step is crucial and will determine the expressibility of the Ansatz. For the sake of explanation, we choose  $|1, 1\rangle, |+, -\rangle$  and  $|-, +\rangle$ . For real coefficients  $\alpha_i$  for  $i \in \{1, 2, 3\}$ , the Ansatz is given by

$$|\psi(\alpha)\rangle = \alpha_1|1, 1\rangle + \alpha_2|+, -\rangle + \alpha_3|-, +\rangle. \quad (17)$$

The expectation value of the Hydrogen molecule Hamiltonian in 16 for the Ansatz in 17 can be written as  $\alpha^T D \alpha$  (see 4). The normalization constraint for the Ansatz can be written as  $\alpha^T E \alpha = 1$  (see 7). For our toy example (with  $a = 0.4$  and  $b = 0.2$ ), we have

$$D = \begin{bmatrix} -0.8 & 0.5 & 0.5 \\ 0.5 & -0.2 & 0 \\ 0.5 & 0 & -0.2 \end{bmatrix} \quad (18)$$

and

$$E = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & -0.5 & -0.5 \\ -0.5 & 1 & 0 \\ -0.5 & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}. \quad (19)$$

Now the task remains to solve the optimization program, which has to be done on a classical computer. Since, in our case, the Ansatz coefficients ( $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}^3$ ) and the input matrices ( $D$  and  $E$ ) are already real, no realification is required. Solving the QCQP gives  $\alpha = [-0.87033111, 0.1221769, 0.1221776]^T$ . The corresponding ground state energy is  $-0.824621$ , which is close to the true ground state energy up to six digits after decimal. Note that the success of the algorithm heavily depends on the Ansatz and a bad Ansatz can give a poor result.

*Discussion and Open Problems*—In this work, we proposed a hybrid quantum-classical algorithm to approximate the ground state and ground state energy of a

Hamiltonian of form 1 via an Ansatz of form 2. Our algorithm proceeds in three steps. The first step involves selecting a set of efficiently preparable quantum states. The choice of Ansatz heavily decides the proximity of the final output to the correct value. Our algorithm requires the Ansatz to be a linear combination of efficiently preparable distinct quantum states. In future, it would be interesting to develop systematic as well as heuristic algorithms to provide sufficiently expressible Ansatz which are compatible with our algorithm. The second step involves the computation of matrix elements of the form  $\langle 0^{\otimes N} | U | 0^{\otimes N} \rangle$  for some unitary  $U$ . Note that the aforementioned matrix elements can have complex values and a straightforward execution of the unitary  $U$  on a circuit initialized in  $|0^{\otimes N}\rangle$ , followed by measurement in the computational basis will kill all the phase information. One popular approach to calculate  $\langle 0^{\otimes N} | U | 0^{\otimes N} \rangle$  is the Hadamard test, which involves controlled-unitaries. Since implementing controlled-unitaries is challenging, one needs to devise alternative methods. Ideas from [27] could be a good starting point to proceed in the aforementioned direction. Once the matrix elements have been computed, the role of the quantum computer in the algorithm is over. Unlike VQEs, there is no feedback loop between the classical and quantum computer. The output from the first step is used to provide input matrices ( $D$  and  $E$ ) for the second step of the algorithm. The third step corresponds to a non-convex optimization program (QCQP) with input matrices of size  $m \times m$ . Using standard techniques in optimization theory, we provided a convex relaxation to the problem, which can be used to efficiently compute a lower bound. Note that the aforementioned lower bound corresponds to the lower bound for the given choice of Ansatz. The optimal points in the convex relaxed program may not be a feasible point. However, one can use sampling and convex-restriction based techniques in the optimization theory literature to find good enough feasible points [15]. Furthermore, we discussed the sufficient condition for a local minimum to be a global minimum. There has been a thorough study of QCQPs in the non-convex optimization literature, and one can hope to use many of the existing results for QCQPs to prove theoretical guarantees for our algorithm. The noise in the quantum system can affect the computation of  $D$  and  $E$  matrices on a quantum computer. In future, it would be interesting to study the effect of noise on our algorithm. To comprehend the potential of our algorithm, it would be interesting to deliver theoretical guarantees using tools from complexity theory. In recent years, a series of results have been supplied in the VQE and QAOA set-up where the key idea has been to map the problem to finding the ground state of a Hamiltonian [6, 28, 29]. It would be interesting to study these problems in our set-up. We hope that such studies can lead to the demonstration of quantum advantage for useful problems on NISQ devices.

*Acknowledgements*—We thank Patrick Rebentrost, Atul Singh Arora, Antonios Varvitsiotis and Tobias Haug for interesting discussions. We are grateful to the National Research Foundation and the Ministry of Education, Singapore for financial support. We thank Mohua Das for support with the pictorial description of the QAE algorithm.

---

\* [kishor.bhartil@gmail.com](mailto:kishor.bhartil@gmail.com)

- [1] J. Preskill, *Quantum* **2**, 79 (2018).
- [2] F. Arute, K. Arya, R. Babbush, D. Bacon, J. C. Bardin, R. Barends, R. Biswas, S. Boixo, F. G. Brandao, D. A. Buell, *et al.*, *Nature* **574**, 505 (2019).
- [3] A. Peruzzo, J. McClean, P. Shadbolt, M.-H. Yung, X.-Q. Zhou, P. J. Love, A. Aspuru-Guzik, and J. L. O'Brien, *Nature communications* **5**, 4213 (2014).
- [4] J. R. McClean, J. Romero, R. Babbush, and A. Aspuru-Guzik, *New Journal of Physics* **18**, 023023 (2016).
- [5] A. Kandala, A. Mezzacapo, K. Temme, M. Takita, M. Brink, J. M. Chow, and J. M. Gambetta, *Nature* **549**, 242 (2017).
- [6] E. Farhi, J. Goldstone, and S. Gutmann, *arXiv preprint arXiv:1411.4028* (2014).
- [7] E. Farhi and A. W. Harrow, *arXiv preprint arXiv:1602.07674* (2016).
- [8] J. R. McClean, S. Boixo, V. N. Smelyanskiy, R. Babbush, and H. Neven, *Nature communications* **9**, 4812 (2018).
- [9] H.-Y. Huang, K. Bharti, and P. Rebentrost, *arXiv preprint arXiv:1909.07344* (2019).
- [10] K. Sharma, M. Cerezo, L. Cincio, and P. J. Coles, *arXiv preprint arXiv:2005.12458* (2020).
- [11] M. Cerezo, A. Sone, T. Volkoff, L. Cincio, and P. J. Coles, *arXiv preprint arXiv:2001.00550* (2020).
- [12] S. Wang, E. Fontana, M. Cerezo, K. Sharma, A. Sone, L. Cincio, and P. J. Coles, *arXiv preprint arXiv:2007.14384* (2020).
- [13] S. Boyd and L. Vandenberghe, *Convex Optimization* (Cambridge University Press, 2004).
- [14] J. Bar-On and K. Grasse, *Journal of Optimization Theory and Applications* **82**, 379 (1994).
- [15] A. dAspremont and S. Boyd, *EE392o Class Notes*, Stanford University **1**, 1 (2003).
- [16] J. R. McClean, M. E. Kimchi-Schwartz, J. Carter, and W. A. De Jong, *Physical Review A* **95**, 042308 (2017).
- [17] O. Kyriienko, *npj Quantum Information* **6**, 1 (2020).
- [18] R. M. Parrish and P. L. McMahan, *arXiv preprint arXiv:1909.08925* (2019).
- [19] T. A. Bespalova and O. Kyriienko, *arXiv preprint arXiv:2009.03351* (2020).
- [20] W. J. Huggins, J. Lee, U. Baek, B. O’Gorman, and K. B. Whaley, *New Journal of Physics* (2020).
- [21] T. Takeshita, N. C. Rubin, Z. Jiang, E. Lee, R. Babbush, and J. R. McClean, *Physical Review X* **10**, 011004 (2020).
- [22] N. H. Stair, R. Huang, and F. A. Evangelista, *Journal of Chemical Theory and Computation* **16**, 2236 (2020).
- [23] M. Motta, C. Sun, A. T. Tan, M. J. O’Rourke, E. Ye, A. J. Minnich, F. G. Brandão, and G. K.-L. Chan, *Nature Physics* **16**, 205 (2020).
- [24] K. Seki and S. Yunoki, *arXiv:2008.03661* (2020).

- [25] S. Bravyi, J. M. Gambetta, A. Mezzacapo, and K. Temme, arXiv preprint arXiv:1701.08213 (2017).
- [26] N. Yamamoto, arXiv preprint arXiv:1909.05074 (2019).
- [27] K. Mitarai and K. Fujii, Physical Review Research **1**, 013006 (2019).
- [28] E. Anschuetz, J. Olson, A. Aspuru-Guzik, and Y. Cao, in *International Workshop on Quantum Technology and Optimization Problems* (Springer, 2019) pp. 74–85.
- [29] A. Garcia-Saez and J. Latorre, arXiv preprint arXiv:1806.02287 (2018).

### Inequality Representation

The equality constraint in P1 can also be rewritten as two inequality constraints. In terms of inequality constraints, the program P1 becomes:

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{minimize } \alpha^T D \alpha \\ & \text{subject to } \alpha^T E \alpha - 1 \leq 0, \\ & \alpha^T (-E) \alpha + 1 \leq 0. \end{aligned} \quad (20)$$

We denote the above QCQP by P2.

### Semidefinite Relaxation

In the main text, we discussed the Lagrangian relaxation of the QCQP in 8 i.e., P1. However, one can also have a direct convex relaxation using SDP. The SDP relaxation of program in 8 can be written as

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{minimize } \text{Tr}(XD) \\ & \text{subject to } \text{Tr}(XE) = 1, \end{aligned} \quad (21)$$

$$\begin{bmatrix} X & x \\ x^T & 1 \end{bmatrix} \succcurlyeq 0,$$

$$X \in \mathbb{S}^{m \times m}, x \in \mathbb{R}^{1 \times m}.$$

Here  $X$  is a symmetric matrix of size  $m \times m$  and  $x$  is a row vector of size  $1 \times m$ .

### Realification

The idea of realification is to create a mapping from  $\mathbb{C}^n$  to  $\mathbb{R}^{2n}$ . The crux of the idea is the following real matrix representation for 1 and  $i$ ,

$$1 \leftrightarrow \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \equiv \mathbb{I} \quad (22)$$

and

$$i \leftrightarrow \begin{bmatrix} 0 & -1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \equiv I. \quad (23)$$

It can be seen that  $I^2 = -\mathbb{I}$ , which mimics  $i^2 = -1$ . Using the mappings in 22 and 23, one can obtain the following representation with a double-sided implication on positivity,

$$M \succcurlyeq 0 \iff \begin{bmatrix} M_R & -M_I \\ M_I & M_R \end{bmatrix} \succcurlyeq 0, \quad (24)$$

where  $M_R$  and  $M_I$  are the real and imaginary part of the Hermitian matrix  $M = M_R + iM_I$ . The representation in 24 works even if the matrix  $M$  is not PSD. For a quantum state  $|\psi\rangle = |\psi_R\rangle + i|\psi_I\rangle$ , with real part  $|\psi_R\rangle$  and imaginary part  $|\psi_I\rangle$ , one can use the following representation,

$$|\psi\rangle \leftrightarrow \begin{bmatrix} |\psi_R\rangle & -|\psi_I\rangle \\ |\psi_I\rangle & |\psi_R\rangle \end{bmatrix}. \quad (25)$$

Using the aforementioned representations for quantum state and Hermitian operator, we obtain the following expression for the expectation values,

$$\langle \psi | M | \psi \rangle = \begin{bmatrix} \langle \psi_R | & \langle \psi_I | \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} M_R & -M_I \\ M_I & M_R \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} |\psi_R\rangle \\ |\psi_I\rangle \end{bmatrix}. \quad (26)$$

Since the matrices  $D$  and  $E$  in 8 are Hermitian, the above realification works.

### Local and Global Optimality

**Theorem 2.** *Given a tuple  $(\alpha, \lambda)$  that is local minimum and satisfies  $H \geq 0$  yields the global minimum of the program P1 in 8.*

*Proof.* Suppose there exists a tuple  $(\tilde{\alpha}, \tilde{\lambda})$  which satisfies the first and second order conditions and results in  $H \geq 0$ , and achieves a lower minimum as compared to  $(\alpha, \lambda)$  i.e.,

$$\alpha^T D \alpha > \tilde{\alpha}^T D \tilde{\alpha}. \quad (27)$$

Since  $(\tilde{\alpha}, \tilde{\lambda})$  satisfies the first order conditions and  $(\alpha, \lambda)$  results in  $H \geq 0$ , we have the following,

$$\begin{aligned} & \tilde{\alpha}^T (D + \lambda E) \tilde{\alpha} \geq 0, \\ & \implies \tilde{\alpha}^T D \tilde{\alpha} \geq -\lambda \tilde{\alpha}^T E \tilde{\alpha} \\ & \implies \tilde{\alpha}^T D \tilde{\alpha} \geq -\lambda \\ & \implies \tilde{\alpha}^T D \tilde{\alpha} \geq \alpha^T D \alpha. \end{aligned} \quad (28)$$

The expression in 28 violates our assumption i.e., expression in 27. To complete the proof, we need to show that for the tuples  $(\alpha_1, \lambda_1)$  and  $(\alpha_2, \lambda_2)$  that satisfy the first and second order conditions and result in  $H \geq 0$ , the associated objective values are same. Since  $D + \lambda_1 E \geq 0$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha_2 (D + \lambda_1 E) \alpha_2 &\geq 0 \\ \implies \alpha_2 D \alpha_2 &\geq -\lambda_1 \\ \implies \alpha_2 D \alpha_2 &\geq \alpha_1 D \alpha_1. \end{aligned} \quad (29)$$

Similarly  $D + \lambda_2 E \geq 0$  implies

$$\alpha_1 D \alpha_1 \geq \alpha_2 D \alpha_2. \quad (30)$$

From 29 and 30, we have

$$\alpha_1 D \alpha_1 = \alpha_2 D \alpha_2.$$

□