Diabatic quantum annealing (DQA) is an alternative algorithm to adiabatic quantum annealing (AQA) that can be used to circumvent the exponential slowdown caused by small minima in the annealing energy spectrum. We present the locally suppressed transverse-field (LSTF) protocol, a heuristic method for making stoquastic optimization problems compatible with DQA. We show that, provided an optimization problem intrinsically has magnetic frustration due to inhomogeneous local fields, a target qubit in the problem can always be manipulated to create a double minimum in the energy gap between the ground and first excited states during the evolution of the algorithm. Such a double energy minimum can be exploited to induce diabatic transitions to the first excited state and back to the ground state. In addition to its relevance to classical and quantum algorithmic speed-ups, the LSTF protocol enables DQA proof-of-principle and physics experiments to be performed on existing hardware, provided independent controls exist for the transverse qubit magnetization fields. We discuss the implications on the coherence requirements of the quantum annealing hardware when using the LSTF protocol, considering specifically the cases of relaxation and dephasing. We show that the relaxation rate of a large system can be made to depend only on the target qubit presenting new opportunities for the characterization of the decohering environment in a quantum annealing processor.

I. INTRODUCTION

Quantum annealing is widely regarded as a promising technique for solving difficult optimization problems. Since its inception, adiabatic quantum annealing (AQA) is anticipated to yield a computational speedup via quantum tunneling processes, whereby the physical algorithm can overcome tall and narrow energy barriers. Although much progress has been made in understanding and characterizing the role that quantum tunneling plays in AQA, it remains a hotly contested topic. Particularly with regard to anticipated computational speed-ups, only specific instances are known where an advantage is observed using AQA algorithms while many classical algorithms, particularly quantum Monte Carlo (QMC) methods, outperform AQA.

The main bottleneck encountered in AQA is the occurrence of small local minima in the energy spectrum at some point during an anneal. To avoid a transition to an excited state via a local minimum, the annealing schedule can only be run as fast as allowed by the adiabatic theorem, which can be expressed approximately, in the case of traditional transverse-field AQA, as \( t_f \propto \Delta^{-2} \) where \( t_f \) is the anneal run time, and \( \Delta \) is the global minimum of the energy gap. This inverse squared scaling of the anneal run time with the size of the minimum gap severely impacts the performance of AQA when applied to so-called small-gap problems, which thereby have a reputation for being ‘difficult to solve’ in this context. This limitation is at odds with the statement that AQA can benefit from quantum tunneling in general, since tall and wide energetic barriers necessarily lead to the formation of a very small energy gap, and hence a high error rate for the AQA algorithm in those cases. Many studies using exact and approximate techniques for systems in the thermodynamic limit have argued that such tall and wide energetic barriers are a common feature of annealing problems involving a first-order transition.

An alternative to AQA that is attracting much attention recently involves the use of local minima in the energy spectrum to diabatically induce transitions between states. In perhaps the most promising technique currently, diabatic quantum annealing (DQA), a diabatic cascade of Landau-Zener (LZ) transitions is utilized such that the system can be initialized in the ground state and finalized in the ground state via a shortcut through the excited state spectrum, leading to prospects of quantum-enabled computational speedups. Although this technique poses new experimental challenges and hardware requirements, there are notable benefits over AQA besides circumventing the small-gap bottleneck, the most attractive being universality and relative simplicity compared to gate-model implementations. There are already known problems that are suitable for large-scale DQA in the transverse-field Ising model, such as particular instances of perturbed Hamming weight oracle problems, where a diabatic cascade can be formed. In these cases however a classical algorithm can effectively recover the speedup since no quantum tunneling...
occurs in those examples. Only a single example is
known where stoquastic DQA is expected to outperform
QMC (and any classical algorithm): the oracular glued-
tree problem studied by Childs et al and Somma et al
reveals a limitation on the ability of classical algorithms
to simulate quantum processes.

DQA imposes a new set of challenges with regard to
the necessity of anti-crossings in the energy spectrum,
which, similarly to the case of AQA, requires insight into
their formation. Suitable anti-crossings are required
in DQA, and thus for the protocol to be universally applicable, a method of guaranteeing they exis-
t for arbitrary problems is required, among other re-
quirements such as a large spectral separation between
the first and second excited states. Furthermore, con-
sidering that QMC algorithms generally fail due to so-
called sign problems, which are intricately related to
the notion of non-stoquasticity of the Hamiltonian being
sampled, it is believed that using DQA on problems of a non-stoquastic nature could lead to demon-
strable quantum-enabled speedups.

Furthermore, it has recently been argued that non-stoquasticity is an essential requirement of an annealing Hamiltonian for
demonstrating such speedups. As of yet, there is little work on the experimental implementation of hardware
that provides non-stoquastic terms, and further, the hardware required to implement tuneable non-stoquastic
two-local interaction terms is currently under develop-
ment and is not expected to be available for some time.

As such, little is known about how a quantum annealing
processor will perform with a diabatic protocol, and it is
expected that the environment will play a greater role in
determining the feasibility of the method.

As a means to address this using near-term novel quan-
tum annealing hardware, we propose a heuristic method for programming a stoquastic quantum annealer
in the diabatic mode of operation, which we call the
locally suppressed transverse-field (LSTF) protocol for
DQA. We show that in addition to its relevance to classi-
fical and quantum optimization, this method can be used
to study the role of the environment in DQA. To this end,
we first introduce a simple model of magnetic frustra-
tion, involving two qubits in the transverse-field model of quantum annealing,

\[ \hat{H}(s) = (1-s) \sum_{i \in \{1,2\}} h_i^x \hat{\sigma}_i^x + s \left[ \sum_{i \in \{1,2\}} h_i^z \hat{\sigma}_i^z + J^{zz} \hat{\sigma}_1^z \hat{\sigma}_2^z \right] \]

where \( s = t / t_{an} \) for \( s \in [0,1] \) is the dimensionless an-
nealing parameter and we are explicitly using linear in-

\[ \Delta E_f(s) = \frac{1}{2} \left[ h_i^x \hat{\sigma}_i^x - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i \in \{1,2\}} h_i^z \hat{\sigma}_i^z + J^{zz} \hat{\sigma}_1^z \hat{\sigma}_2^z \right] \]

\[ m_z(s) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i \in \{1,2\}} h_i^z \hat{\sigma}_i^z + J^{zz} \hat{\sigma}_1^z \hat{\sigma}_2^z \]

FIG. 1. The energy gap between the ground and first excited
state of Eq. 1 as a function of \( s \) is shown in (a), focused around
the point \( s^* \) for selected values of \( h_2^z = 1, 10 \) and 100 MHz,
and where \( R = 1 \) GHz, \( f = 0.8 \), \( J^{zz} = R \) and \( h_1^z = R \) as
in Eq. (2). The \( Z \) magnetization expectation value \( m_z^* \) is
shown in (b) for the same parameter values, and the point \( s^* \)
is denoted as the vertical dotted line. Note that \( s^* \) converges
towards \( s_+ \) as \( h_2^z \) is decreased.
terpolation schedules for simplicity. The Pauli operators \( \hat{\sigma}^\alpha \) for \( \alpha = \{x, z\} \) are defined with respect to the computational basis states \( | \downarrow \rangle = |0\rangle \) and \( | \uparrow \rangle = |1\rangle \), i.e. \( \hat{\sigma}^z = | \downarrow \rangle \langle \downarrow | - | \uparrow \rangle \langle \uparrow | \) and \( \hat{\sigma}^x = | \downarrow \rangle \langle \uparrow | + | \uparrow \rangle \langle \downarrow | \). This Hamiltonian is necessarily stoquastic, as there is always a basis in which all off-diagonal elements are non-positive.

Here we can simply choose a \( \pi \) rotation in the XY plane such that the values of \( h_1^z \) are all negative to satisfy this condition. Frustration is introduced in a trivial way by choosing \( J^{zz} \) to be either positive or negative, and then choosing the values of \( h_1^z \) such that one of the spins is biased in an unfavorable way. Using an energy scale set by \( R \), and biasing qubit 2 as \( 0 < h_2^z < R \), we have:

\[
h_1^z = \begin{cases} 
R & \text{if } J^{zz} > 0 \\
-R & \text{if } J^{zz} < 0
\end{cases}
\]

(2)

for qubit 1, which creates an unfavorable condition for qubit 2 to align with its local external field, i.e. in the ground state of this problem qubit 2 will be polarized against its local field. Expressing the local field of qubit 2 as \( h_2^z = Rf \) where the dimensionless quantity \( f \) parametrizes the frustration between low \( (f \rightarrow 0) \) and high \( (f \rightarrow 1) \), the ground and first excited states are respectively,

\[
E_{i\uparrow} = R(f - 2) \\
E_{i\downarrow} = -Rf
\]

(3)

for the case \( J^{zz} > 0 \), where the gap at \( s = 1 \) will be \( \Delta E(s = 1) = E_{i\downarrow} - E_{i\uparrow} = 2R(1 - f) \). When the energy scales of the transverse and longitudinal parts are matched (i.e. \( h_{1,2}^z = R \)), there will always be values of \( s \) where the energy gap between the ground and first excited states is less than \( \Delta E(s = 1) \) for any \( 0 < f < 1 \). We denote the location of the minimum in the energy spectrum as \( s_* \). For a frustrated system, the energy gap at \( s = s_* \) will become very small as \( f \rightarrow 1 \). Such behavior is indicative of suppressed quantum tunneling as \( f \) is increased\[^{39}\][41]. In all our simulations we use \( J^{zz} = R \) unless stated otherwise.

To illustrate this point, we may further control the suppression of quantum tunneling by decreasing the transverse field of qubit 2, which we call the target qubit. Figure 1(a) shows the energy gap between the ground and first excited state in the vicinity of \( s_* \) where \( \Delta E_1(s) \equiv E_1(s) - E_0(s) \), solved in the same range of \( f \) using numerical diagonalization Eq. \[^{41}\] for a selection of values \( h_2^z \ll R \) and where \( R = 1 \) GHz \( h_1^z = R \) and \( f = 0.8 \). We see from this that it is possible to create a very small avoided crossing by controlling the value of the transverse field applied to a single qubit, independently of the other qubit, significantly increasing the computational complexity for the adiabatic algorithm. To illustrate this further, we consider the expectation value of the Z magnetization of the target qubit in the instantaneous ground state, \( m_2^z(s) = \langle E_0(s) | \hat{\sigma}_2^z | E_0(s) \rangle \). Figure 1(b) shows the target qubit magnetization \( m_2^z(s) \) solved in the same range of \( s \) values, where the magnetization value crosses zero with increasing sharpness as \( h_2^z \) is decreased. The point at which \( m_2^z(s) = 0 \) is denoted as \( s_* \), and is shown in the figure. At the point \( s_* \), the target qubit is in a superposition state, indicating that the ground state of the system must be delocalized. This suggests that there are two local minima that are competing to become the global ground state. It follows from this that decreasing the \( h_2^z \) term increases localization or in other words, reduces the interaction between specific minima in the potential energy, in turn increasing computational complexity for the adiabatic algorithm. It is worth pointing out that in general \( s_* \neq s_* \), and that \( s_* \) and \( s_* \) converge as \( h_2^z \rightarrow 0 \), an observation that we discuss briefly in the supplementary material\[^{41}\].

To shed some light on this, we consider the semiclassical potential in the spin-coherent path-integral formalism for spin-1/2 particles\[^{22}\]. We express an arbitrary state associated with the annealing Hamiltonian Eq. \[^{1}\] as a tensor product of coherent states \( | \theta_1, \theta_2 \rangle = | \theta_1 \rangle \otimes | \theta_2 \rangle \),

\[
| \theta_{1,2} \rangle = \cos \left( \frac{\theta_{1,2}}{2} \right) | 0 \rangle + \sin \left( \frac{\theta_{1,2}}{2} \right) | 1 \rangle
\]

(4)

where \( \theta_{1,2} \) represent the magnetization angles with respect to the down state in the XZ plane for qubits 1 and 2 respectively. We then look at the expectation value of the energy as a function of both \( \theta_1 \) and \( \theta_2 \) with respect to the spin coherent state, which represents the semiclassical potential energy

\[
V(s, \theta_1, \theta_2) = \langle \theta_1, \theta_2 | \hat{H}(s) | \theta_1, \theta_2 \rangle.
\]

(5)

Using Eq. \[^{5}\], we can find global and local potential minima which are associated with specific magnetization angles of both qubits. As a measure of fidelity of the semiclassical approximation, and to identify the presence of a delocalized state, we look at the trace norm distance as a function of \( \theta_1 \) and \( \theta_2 \), \[^{9}\]

\[
D(s, \theta_1, \theta_2) = \sqrt{1 - |\langle \theta_1, \theta_2 | E_0(s) \rangle|^2}
\]

(6)

where \( |E_0(s)\rangle \) is the instantaneous ground state of Eq. \[^{4}\] obtained from numerical diagonalization. A delocalized state at some value of \( s \) can be identified when the position in the \( \{ \theta_1, \theta_2 \} \) space of the global minimum of the trace norm distance does not coincide with that of the global minimum of the semiclassical potential, and when its value is finite, indicating that the state is non-classical.

We solve Eqs. \[^{3}\] and \[^{6}\] on a fine grid covering all angle combinations \( \theta_{1,2} \) using \( R = 1 \) GHz, \( f = 0.8 \) and \( h_2^z = 10 \) MHz. We then find the local minima of the semiclassical potential numerically. Details of this analysis are provided in Appendix A. Figure 2(a) shows the energy of the two local minima as a function of \( s \). Early in the anneal, for \( s < 0.41 \), there is a single minimum in the potential, denoted min 1, which is expected as the transverse part of the Hamiltonian dominates. A new
The state is non-classical. We share plots of the full potential landscape and computed values of $\theta$ in Appendix A.

We can see from both Figs 2(a) and 2(b) that the change in global potential minimum occurs discontinuously in $s$, i.e. there is no classical path for a particle to move from $m_1$ to $m_2$ during the evolution of the algorithm. In the absence of a thermal bath, this indicates that a tunneling event must occur near $s_+$, characterized by a flip in the $Z$ component of the magnetization expectation value. The value of $h_z^2$ controls the width and height of the potential barrier, and therefore the interaction between local minima in the potential. This is also indicated by the width of the $s$ interval in which the $Z$ component of the qubit magnetization expectation value flips. This width becomes smaller as $h_z^2$ decreases, as seen in Fig. II(b), indicating that the target qubit is increasingly localized in either the up ($m_z^2 = +1$) or down ($m_z^2 = -1$) state before and after $s_+$, respectively. In the limit $h_z^2 \rightarrow 0$, the interaction between the local minima is switched off, which leads to an energy crossing. We expect that in large-scale problems, magnetic frustration caused by unfavorable local $Z$ fields lead to multiple competing local minima, which in turn can be individually controlled using local transverse fields. An explicit example of this is discussed in the context of the Strong-Weak cluster problem, where it is shown that a diagonal catalyst can remove competing local minima and thereby soften the exponentially closing energy gap of the problem. Finally we note that commercial annealers do not yet offer the ability to control the transverse fields of the qubits independently. The need for increased flexibility of the annealing schedules, including independent control of the transverse fields, has been widely recognized (see [33] and references therein), putting such capabilities on the roadmap for future devices.

minimum, denoted min 2, then appears at a high energy and subsequently approaches the global minimum as $s$ is increased. At the point $s_+$, the two local minima become degenerate, where $m_z^2(s)$ is zero. For $s > s_+$, min 2 becomes lower in energy than min 1, and it therefore becomes the new global minimum. Figure 2(b) shows the potential energy along the line $\theta$ (see Appendix A and Fig. II(a)) as a function of $\theta_2$, at the point $s = s_+$ for $h_z^2 = 10$ MHz. The black dotted line shows the value of $D$ along the same path, which shows that the best description of the state lies in between the two minima. The global minimum of the tracenorm distance $D$ (Eq. (9)) is indicated by the red dot, and the values of the angle $\theta_2$ are indicated at min 1 and min 2.

**III. LOCALLY SUPPRESSED TRANSVERSE-FIELD DQA**

We now describe how the controlled suppression of quantum tunneling in a frustrated qubit can be exploited for creating DQA protocols. In this section we will focus on the computational application of this effect, where it is used heuristically. We have seen so far in a simple example that the expectation of the $Z$ magnetization of a frustrated qubit will cross zero as $s$ increases from 0 to 1. This situation corresponds to the existence of a delocalized state at $s = s_+$ due to quantum tunneling, which can be effectively suppressed by reducing the $X$ field associated with that qubit, in turn creating a very small avoided crossing. However a way of reliably creating a second avoided crossing is required to realize the simplest case DQA protocol, that is where a shortcut to the final ground state via the first excited state exists due to the existence of two avoided crossings at different values of $s$.

Consider a quantum annealer that provides individ-
ual control over the X local fields of each qubit. For an arbitrary problem graph $G$, we express the driver Hamiltonian as

$$\hat{H}_D(s) = \sum_{i \in V(G)} a_i(s) \hat{h}_i^z \hat{\sigma}_i^z$$ \hspace{1cm} (7)$$

where the functions $a_i(s)$ are the driver schedules, now unique to each qubit. $V(G)$ is the set of vertices of $G$. We express the problem Hamiltonian as

$$\hat{H}_P(s) = \sum_{i \in V(G)} b_i(s) \hat{h}_i^z \hat{\sigma}_i^z + \sum_{ij \in E(G)} b_{ij}(s) J_{ij}^{zz} \hat{\sigma}_i^z \hat{\sigma}_j^z$$ \hspace{1cm} (8)$$

where the functions $b_i(s)$ and $b_{ij}(s)$ are the problem schedules, and $E(G)$ is the set of edges of $G$ associated with each 2-local coupling term. In the following we will assume that $\hat{h}_i^z = R$ $\forall i \in V(G)$ unless stated otherwise.

We can trivially make an additional avoided crossing by creating a quasi-degeneracy in the energy spectrum of the driver Hamiltonian Eq. (7). We define our schedules as follows, including a new parameter $s_k$ such that $0 \leq s_k \leq 1$ which defines the value of $s$ at which the additional avoided crossing occurs. We select one qubit $k$ from $V(G)$, which we refer to as the target qubit. The driver schedules as then defined as

$$a_{i \neq k}(s) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } s < s_k \\ 1 - \frac{s-s_k}{1-s_k} & \text{if } s_k \leq s \leq 1 \end{cases}$$ \hspace{1cm} (9)$$

and

$$a_{i=k}(s) = \begin{cases} c_x & \text{if } s < s_k \\ c_x + (c_1 - c_x) \frac{s-s_k}{1-s_k} & \text{if } s_k \leq s \leq 1 \end{cases}$$ \hspace{1cm} (10)$$

where $c_x$ and $c_1$ are parameters that control the amplitude of the X field of the target qubit $k$. Figure 3(a) shows these schedules as a function of $s$ and the effect of their parameters. We see that in the case $i \neq k$ (Eq. (9)) the schedules are the same as the usual linear function, excepting that the interpolation starts at $s_k$. The schedule of Eq. (10) is a new feature, where the parameter $c_x$ scales down the value of $\hat{h}_i^z$. $c_1$ determines the value of $\hat{h}_k^z$ at $s = 1$. The parameters $c_x$ and $c_1$ control the size of the energy minima. These are envisaged to be particularly useful for implementing multi-qubit interference experiments [19, 17], which could serve as a sensitive probe of coherence, a point we will revisit in future work. For the remainder of this work, we assume $c_x = c_1 = 0$.

The problem schedules are defined as

$$b_{i \neq k}(s) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } s < s_k \\ \frac{s-s_k}{1-s_k} & \text{if } s_k \leq s \leq 1 \end{cases}$$ \hspace{1cm} (11)$$

and

$$b_{i=k}(s) = \begin{cases} \frac{s-s_k}{1-s_k} & \text{if } 0 \leq s \leq 1 \end{cases}$$ \hspace{1cm} (12)$$

where again we see that for $i \neq k$ the schedules are the same linear function with a delayed start to the interpolation, as shown in Fig. 3(b). The schedule of Eq. (12) takes the same form as those in Eq. (11), where the only difference is that the former is not restricted to a constant in the range $s < s_k$. This results in a zero crossing of this function at $s = s_k$, hence changing the sign of $\hat{h}_k^z$ at that point. The result of these schedules is to create an avoided crossing at $s = s_k$ with a gap of size $2c_x R$ for $c_x \ll 1$. It is trivial to see that this creates a true avoided crossing at $s = s_k$.

FIG. 3. The DQA schedules as a function of $s$ for the transverse part of the Hamiltonian are shown in (a), corresponding to Eqs. (9) and (10). Arbitrary values of $c_x$ and $c_1$ are shown for illustration. The DQA schedules for the longitudinal part of the Hamiltonian are shown in (b), corresponding to Eqs. (11) and (12).

FIG. 4. The selected 7 qubit graph randomly generated using the Python package networkx Erdos-Renyi algorithm implementation. A probability of 0.5 is used for edge creation. See Appendix B.4 for the values of $h_i^z$ and $J_{ij}^{zz}$ used.
FIG. 5. The magnetization expectation values of each qubit using (a) the AQA algorithm with linear schedules, and (b) LSTF-DQA applied to qubit 1 \((k = 1)\) of the graph shown in Fig. 4.

crossing, as the value of \(b_k(s)h^z_k\) changes sign about \(s_x\), inducing a zero crossing in the expectation of \(\hat{\sigma}^z_k\), or in other words, the creation of a delocalized state at \(s = s_x\). Now for our target qubit \(k\), if the point \(s = s_+\) exists, i.e., if qubit \(k\) participates in the delocalized character of the ground state at that point, then we will now have two very small gaps between the ground and first excited states, at \(s = s_x\) and \(s = s_+\). Note that the schedules \(b_{ij}(s)\) in the last term of Eq. (8) take the same form as Eq. (11).

To illustrate the application of the locally suppressed transverse-field (LSTF) DQA technique, we consider a 7-qubit problem instance, the graph of which is shown in Fig. 4, where values of \(h^z_i\) and \(J^{zz}_{ij}\) are drawn from identical Gaussian distributions with a variance of 1. All the transverse fields \(h^x_i\) were set to 1 GHz. See Appendix B 1 for the values of \(h^z_i\) and \(J^{zz}_{ij}\) used in this instance. Figure 5 shows the expectation values of \(\hat{\sigma}^z_i\) during a normal linear annealing process (a), and using LSTF-DQA in (b), where we have selected \(k = 1\) for the target qubit, with \(s_x = 0.2\) and \(c_x = 0\). In Fig. 5(a) we can see that a number of qubits have a \(Z\) expectation that crosses zero at various points in \(s\), indicating that we have multiple choices for \(k\). In Fig. 5(b) we show the effect of applying the schedules described in Eqs. (9)–(12) on the magnetization expectations of each qubit \(m^z_i\). We can see that \(m^z_1\) undergoes two sharp transitions at the points \(s_x\) and \(s_+\), as expected, which leads to energy crossings between the ground and first excited state. The original AQA energy spectrum, represented as energy gaps \(\Delta E_n(s) \equiv E_n(s) - E_0(s)\), is shown in Fig. 6(a). The LSTF-DQA spectrum is shown in Fig. 6(b) where the double energy crossings can clearly be identified. In this particular problem instance there are several interesting features. Firstly, one of the qubit \(Z\) magnetization expectation values undergoes two zero crossings, in which case it is possible to generate two double minima by only reducing its associated \(X\) field. We discuss this in more detail in Appendix B 2. Secondly, from Fig. 6(b) we can see that the gap between the first and second excited state has been drastically increased, preventing unwanted transitions to higher states in a diabatic cascade.

So far we have only considered trivial problems that are easily solved classically and that do not display the features of problems that would be considered ‘hard’ for AQA. It is also useful to emphasize at this point that LSTF-DQA can not be applied to qubits that have no local \(Z\) field in the problem Hamiltonian. Consider an annealing problem where there exists a phase transition, characterized by a sudden change in \(Z\) magnetization of a subset of qubits. With this transition is associated a small gap that scales exponentially with system size, in the case of a first-order transition, and polynomially in the case of a second or higher-order transition. We can use LSTF-DQA to make this gap even smaller, or close it entirely, if the target qubit participates in the transition. The more qubits participate in a transition, the more probable it is to choose a target qubit that...
can be manipulated into a DQA protocol. On the other hand, in an annealing problem where few qubits are involved in a transition, we might not expect the gap to be very small, in which case it is suitable for a conventional adiabatic algorithm. This is a point we will revisit in future work, using scalable models that exhibit first order phase transitions.

We propose the following heuristic algorithm for finding a low-energy eigenstate, given an arbitrary large-scale problem. We assume no prior knowledge of the structure of the problem, and that the system is coherent in the DQA regime.

1. Apply conventional AQA to the problem.
2. Determine the state with lowest energy obtained.
3. For each qubit \( k \) such that \( h_z^k \neq 0 \):
   (a) Apply schedules in Eqs. (9)-(12).
   (b) Update the state with lowest energy if it exists.

In step 1, the AQA algorithm is used as a reference. If the considered problem has a very small gap compared to the annealing times used, one or more occurrences of excited states will be obtained in step 2. In step 3 the LSTF-DQA method is applied to each qubit in turn, using a value of \( c_x = 0 \) such that the probability of a transition at \( s = s_* \) is 1. A number of possible outcomes are envisaged in step 3. In the case that the problem does not present a small gap, then the LSTF-DQA method should never yield an eigenstate with lower energy. In the case that the problem has a single small gap, i.e. the separation with higher energy eigenstates is large, then the LSTF-DQA method should consistently yield an eigenstate with lower energy. If the separation with higher energy eigenstates is small, and a minimum occurs some time after the lowest energy minimum gap, i.e. argmin[\( \Delta E_2(s) \)] > \( s_* \), then the DQA protocol has better chances of yielding lower energy eigenstates. If argmin[\( \Delta E_2(s) \)] < \( s_* \), then it is possible that the DQA protocol performs as badly or worse than the AQA protocol, due to transitions to higher eigenstates. Although this algorithm is entirely heuristic and has no guarantee of providing better results than in the adiabatic case, the \( O(N) \) scaling of step 3 makes it attractive to use as an alternative to see if a lower energy eigenstate can be obtained. It could also be used to elucidate the structure of a black-box problem, an application which we wish to investigate in further work.

Finally, owing to recent work on the accurate mapping of superconducting circuit Hamiltonians to Ising Hamiltonians\cite{32}, and efficient methods for finding physical annealing schedules that accurately reproduce the desired scheduling of the Ising terms\cite{33}, we anticipate that the schedules proposed in Eqs. (9)-(12), or similar variants, can be readily implemented provided the qubit design is suitable (e.g. it allows a near-zero transverse field).

IV. DYNAMICS SIMULATIONS

We anticipate that the annealing processor environment will play an equal if not more critical role in determining DQA performance compared to AQA. To assess this in the context of LSTF-DQA, we revisit our model of magnetic frustration, using the 2-qubit Hamiltonian as defined in Eq. (1) and perform dynamics simulations in a closed- and open-system setting. We use the Hamiltonian Open Quantum System Toolkit (HOQST) set of Julia codes for solving all master equations\cite{50}. In our simulations we set the energy scale \( R = 1 \) GHz and frustration \( f = 0.8 \) which yields the minimum gap \( \Delta E_1(s_*) \approx 0.4 \) GHz and \( s_* \approx 0.85 \) in the AQA case. Figure 7(a) shows all the energy gaps associated with both the AQA and LSTF-DQA instances of this Hamiltonian using these parameters.

We first present closed-system dynamics simulations comparing both the AQA and LSTF-DQA implementations of the schedules defined in Eqs. (9)-(12). We solve numerically the von-Neumann equation for a range of
annealing times \( t_{an} \),
\[
\hbar \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \hat{\rho}(t) = -i \left[ \hat{H}(t), \hat{\rho}(t) \right]
\]  
(13)
where \( \hat{\rho}(t) \) is the density matrix and \( \hat{H}(t) = \hat{H}_D(t) + \hat{H}_P(t) \). Recall that \( s = t/t_{an} \) so that \( t \) runs from \( t = 0 \) to \( t = t_{an} \). The initial state is the pure ground state of the system at \( s = 0 \), \( \hat{\rho}(0) = |E_0(0)\rangle \langle E_0(0)| \). The final state of the system in this case will also be a pure state. The probability of obtaining the ground state is simply \( p_0(t_{an}) = \langle E_1(t_{an})|\hat{\rho}(t_{an})|E_1(t_{an})\rangle \). Figure 7(b) shows the result of solving Eq. (13) to find the probability of obtaining the ground state at the end of the anneal \( t = t_{an} \). In the case of AQA, a high ground state probability is obtained when the heuristic adiabatic theorem \( \Theta_s > 1/\Delta_1(s_a)^2 \). The equivalent problem in the LSTF-DQA protocol is solved using anneal durations an order of magnitude lower.

The inset of Fig. 7(b) shows the \( t_{an} \) dependence of the time-to-solution (TTS) for a single run, calculated using Eq. (1) in Ref. [51], and where we use a success criterion \( p_d = 0.99 \). Notice in Fig. 7(a) that the separation between the ground and second excited states for \( s < s_a \) and \( s > s_+ \) and the separation between first and second excited states for \( s_x < s < s_a \) in the DQA protocol is larger than the separation between the ground and first excited in the AQA protocol. This, combined with the fact that the transition to the first excited state at \( s_x \) and back to the ground state at \( s_+ \) occurs at any timescale due to our choice of \( c_x = 0 \), shows that the adiabatic theorem is satisfied at shorter timescales than with the AQA protocol.

We now turn to open-system dynamics to assess the impact of the environment. As the parameter space for open-systems is very large, we restrict ourselves to the simplest cases, saving more detailed studies for future work. The first simplification we apply is to use \( c_x = 0 \) throughout our simulations. As we have shown, in this limit there is no interaction between local minima in the semiclassical potential, and thus energy-level crossings are created between the ground and first excited states. This allows us to focus on the use of an adiabatic master equation (AME) for open-system dynamics since there is in principle no diabatic transition between the ground and first excited state. As a second simplification, we focus on two limiting cases of uncorrelated system-bath couplings for a given bath. We only consider the cases where an Ohmic bath is coupled equally to either the X or Z degrees of freedom of Eq. (11), which amounts to considering the effects of relaxation and dephasing respectively.

To this end, we first introduce a bosonic Ohmic bath that is commonly used for dynamics simulations in quantum annealing and we solve the AME numerically. We assume both qubits are coupled equally to the same independent baths, for which we specify the spectral density as
\[
\gamma(\omega) = 2\pi \eta \omega^2 \exp\left( -\frac{\omega}{\omega_c} \right)
\]  
(14)
where \( \beta = 1/k_B T \) is the inverse temperature, \( \omega_c \) is the cutoff frequency and \( \eta g^2 \) is the dimensionless coupling strength. In this work we restrict ourselves to values of these parameters similar to those used in theoretical studies of the DWave machine [35, 36], and refer to Refs. [50] and [35] for the full details of the AME, since we only solve it numerically here. For the bath parameters we use \( T = 16 \) mK, \( \omega_c = 4 \times 2\pi \) GHz and \( \eta g^2 = 10^{-4} \). The time-dependent Lindblad operators in the AME are defined as
\[
L_{\alpha, \omega a}(t) = \langle E_b(t)| \hat{A}_\alpha |E_a(t)\rangle \langle E_a(t)| \langle E_b(t)|
\]  
(15)
where \( \hat{A}_\alpha \) is an operator of the system Hamiltonian, in this case Eq. (1), and where \( \omega a b = E_b(t) - E_a(t) \) is the energy gap between instantaneous energy levels \( a \) and \( b \) at time \( t \). An important feature of these operators is that they describe stochastic transitions in the energy eigenbasis of the system. This occurs in the weak coupling limit. In our simulations we use the operators \( A_{1,2} = \hat{a}_{1,2}^* \) to describe relaxation, as their effect is to flip the qubit Z.
expectation. Separately we use $\hat{A}_{1,2} = \hat{\sigma}_z^{(1,2)}$ to describe dephasing, as their effect is to change the phase of the qubit in the XY plane. Due to our choice of energy scale $R = 1$ GHz, we might expect all 16 Lindblad operators associated with $\hat{A}_{1,2}$ to play a role, owing to the fact that all transitions $\omega_{ba}$ have an energy in the region of $\omega_c$. However this isn’t necessarily the case.

We first compare the probabilities of obtaining the ground state, for the given system-bath interaction, over a range of annealing times and with an initial state $\hat{\rho}(0) = |E_0(0)\rangle \langle E_0(0)|$. Figure 8(a) shows the ground state probability obtained in the AQA case, including the closed-system result for reference. We see that both relaxation (labeled X) and dephasing (labeled Z) play a significant role at long time scales, reducing the ground state probability before the dynamics are suitably adiabatic due to depopulation of the ground state. Figure 8(b) shows the overlap of the density matrix with the instantaneous eigenstates of the system and the location of the minimum gap $s_x$. As we would expect, the system begins to noticebly thermalize near $s = s_x$, as transitions are most likely there.

In the DQA case, the ground state probabilities are shown in Fig. 9(a), where the inset shows a closeup of the effect of a purely dephasing bath. We see here a stark contrast with the AQA case, where significant relaxation (X curve) occurs at a much smaller anneal duration, and where at longer durations $t_{an} > 40$ ns repopulation of the ground state occurs, increasing the ground state probability again. In the case of dephasing (Z curve), the effect is surprisingly less significant compared to the AQA case. However, intuitively, the pronounced effect of relaxation in the DQA protocol is not unexpected, as the energy gap between the ground and first excited state is on average much smaller than in the AQA case, and thus we would expect a higher rate of depopulation/repopulation of the ground state. Indeed, this can be seen in Fig. 9(b), where depopulation of the ground state into the first excited state occurs at $t = 0$. However, in the case of dephasing it is less obvious why there is an apparent insensitivity.

To better understand this, we consider the structure of the instantaneous eigenstates for the DQA protocol involving two qubits and analyze their effect on the Lindblad operators. We will restrict our analysis to consider only transitions between the ground and first excited states in the case $c_x = 0$, justified by the fact that depopulation into the second excited state ($i = 2$) is negligible as evidenced by Fig. 9(b). Under these conditions, the two lowest eigenstates of the Hamiltonian can be written in the form

$$|E_0(s)\rangle = |q_0(s)\rangle \otimes |↓\rangle$$ (16a)

and

$$|E_1(s)\rangle = |q_0(s)\rangle \otimes |↑\rangle$$ (16b)

respectively, where $|q_0(s)\rangle$ denotes the lowest energy eigenstate of qubit 1. During the evolution, qubit 2 will instantaneously flip twice, owing to the absence of a transverse local field, once at $s_x$ and once at $s_+$. This means that, given our notation above, for $s < s_x$ and $s > s_+$, $|E_0(s)\rangle$ is the ground state, and for $s_x < s < s_+$, $|E_1(s)\rangle$ is the ground state. Using this notation, Eq. (15) can be written as either

$$\hat{L}_{\alpha,\omega_{ba}}(t) = \langle q_0(t)|\hat{A}_\alpha|q_0(t)\rangle \langle b|\tilde{I}|a\rangle|q_0(t)a\rangle\langle q_0(t)b|$$ (17a)

in the case that $\hat{A}_\alpha$ is an operator of qubit 1, and

$$\hat{L}_{\alpha,\omega_{ba}}(t) = \langle q_0(t)|\tilde{I}|q_0(t)\rangle \langle b|\hat{A}_\alpha|q_0(t)a\rangle|q_0(t)a\rangle\langle q_0(t)b|$$ (17b)

in the case that $\hat{A}_\alpha$ is an operator of qubit 2. Here $|q_0(t)a\rangle\langle q_0(t)b| = |q_0(t)\rangle\otimes |a\rangle\langle b|$, $\tilde{I}$ is the $2 \times 2$ identity matrix and $a$ and $b$ now distinguish the states based on the Z spin of qubit 2, i.e. $a,b \in \{|↓\rangle, |\uparrow\rangle\}$. We can see immediately that in the first case, Eq. (17a) is zero if $a \neq b$ due to the orthogonality of $|↓\rangle$ and $|\uparrow\rangle$. This already rules out the possibility that any transition can be driven by a bath coupled to any degree of freedom.
To see why dephasing is strongly suppressed in this example, we must look at the behavior of the term $\langle q_0(t)|\hat{A}_{\alpha}|q_0(t)\rangle$. The case of no dephasing corresponds to the case where $|q_0(t)\rangle$ is an eigenstate of $\hat{\sigma}^x$, since in this case, $\langle \pm|\hat{\sigma}^x|\pm\rangle = 0$, where $|\pm\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|0\rangle \pm |1\rangle)$. In fact, in our example, it can be verified numerically that for most of the evolution, $|q_0(t)\rangle$ is almost an eigenstate of $\hat{\sigma}^x$, until near the end of the anneal. In other words, qubit 1 is strongly polarized along the $X$ magnetization axis until near the end of the anneal, which explains the result seen in Fig. [10a][11]. Unlike the relaxation result however, this result is not readily generalized, as the structure of $|q_0(t)\rangle$ is non-trivial. Therefore we would not expect this dephasing insensitivity to apply to all problems.

Another important property of the LSTF-DQA protocol when applied in an environment that drives relaxation is that the impact of relaxation can be mitigated if the time interval spent in the first excited state is reduced. Figure [10a][10] shows that decreasing the frustration $f$ in the system decreases the time interval $t_{an}(s_+ - s_x)$ for fixed $s_x$, as the point $s_+$ occurs earlier in the anneal. Figure [10b] shows the overlap of the problem ground state with the density matrix at the end of the anneal, obtained by solving the AME as a function of $t_{an}$. We see that the effect of decreasing frustration is to reduce the impact of relaxation. Reducing the frustration has the effect of both reducing the time interval $t_{an}(s_+ - s_x)$, but also reduces the average energy gap between the ground and first excited states. The latter property has a less pronounced impact on relaxation according to our results, and thus we do not discuss it further here. Some data is however presented in the supplementary material[41]. It is worth noting that changing the energy scale could be beneficial for investigating resonance effects with the bath[25] experimentally. A particularly interesting application of the LSTF-DQA protocol is to perform multi-qubit interferometry experiments[19, 47], which could serve as a very sensitive probe of coherence in a quantum annealing processor. By adjusting the values of $c_x$ and $c_1$ in Eq. (10), it is possible to tune the size of the energy minima at $s_x$ and $s_+$ to induce oscillations in the ground state probability. This is also an application which we will focus on in future work.

V. CONCLUSION

We have shown that for specific types of optimization problems, i.e. those with frustration caused by inhomogeneous local Z fields, a DQA protocol can be formulated that exploits the suppression of quantum tunneling of frustrated spins to create arbitrarily small energy gaps in the annealing energy spectrum. This we call the locally-suppressed transverse-field (LSTF) DQA protocol. We first demonstrated, using a semiclassical approximation, how a frustrated qubit leads to the formation of a double-well potential when its transverse field is reduced, leading
to a delocalized state at some point in $s$. In particular we showed that an arbitrarily small avoided crossing can be created, and that the gap can be closed entirely in the limit of a vanishing transverse field. We then presented a sketch for an $O(N)$ heuristic algorithm that could be used to find lower energy eigenstates of black-box problems under certain conditions. We argued that it is particularly suited to problems in which phase transitions exist. We have also shown that the LSTF-DQA method is expected to be more sensitive to thermal relaxation than the AQA method for a given problem, through an analysis of the structure of the DQA eigenstates, and their role in forming the Lindblad operators of the AME. A single qubit dominates this effect even for larger systems under certain conditions, notably that only transitions between the ground and first excited states are important. The effect of dephasing in our DQA protocol was shown to be minimal for our two-qubit example. However no simple generalization to greater numbers of qubits was found. We therefore believe that this protocol will be of more use to determining the coherent evolution performance of near-term quantum annealing hardware, than for optimization applications. Despite this, we expect that there is some merit to applying this technique to both classical and quantum optimization in the near-term, particularly because it is inherently simplistic, has $O(N)$ performance, and can be used on existing novel quantum annealing hardware and in classical algorithms that simulate quantum annealing. Furthermore we believe it can be used to assess the structure of a black-box problem, for example testing for the presence of small energy minima.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We gratefully acknowledge Vicky Choi, Gioele Consani, Huo Chen, and Robert Banks for useful comments and insightful discussion. The research is based upon work (partially) supported by the Office of the Director of National Intelligence (ODNI), Intelligence Advanced Research Projects Activity (IARPA), and the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency (DARPA), via the U.S. Army Research Office Contract No. W911NF-17-C-0050. The views and conclusions contained herein are those of the authors and should not be interpreted as necessarily representing the official policies or endorsements, either expressed or implied, of the ODNI, IARPA, DARPA, or the U.S. Government. The U.S. Government is authorized to reproduce and distribute reprints for Governmental purposes notwithstanding any copyright annotation thereon.

Appendix A: Semiclassical Potential

We describe here how the results shown in Fig. 2(a) and (b) were obtained. Consider Figs. 11(a) and 11(b) which show the values obtained for Eqs. 5 and 6 respectively, as a function of $\theta_1$ and $\theta_2$ at $s = s_+$. We are interested in the local (including the global) minima of the semiclassical potential. We find these by first computing the lowest energy path through the potential, shown as the red line in the figure, and then taking the first numerical derivative of the energy with respect to $\theta_2$. The location of the zero crossings at which this derivative is increasing correspond to the location of the local minima, shown as the white dots in the figure. We repeat this process for different values of $s$ to trace the energy of the local minima as a function of $s$, which gives us the data required for Fig. 2(a). To obtain the data shown in Fig. 2(b), we define the straight line $\theta(s, \theta_1, \theta_2)$ that intersects the location of both local minima. We denote the coordinates of the first local minimum as $\theta_{1,a}, \theta_{2,a}$ and at the second minimum as $\theta_{1,b}, \theta_{2,b}$. We can express the line $\theta$ as a function of either $\theta_1$ or $\theta_2$. Therefore we can express the line as $\theta(s, \theta_1, \theta_2) \equiv \theta'_2(s, \theta_1)$ where

$$\theta'_2(s, \theta_1) = \frac{\theta_{2,a}(s) - \theta_{2,b}(s)}{\theta_{1,a}(s) - \theta_{1,b}(s)} \left( \theta_1 - \theta_{1,a}(s) \right) + \theta_{2,a}(s) \quad (A1)$$

where we have made explicit the dependence on $s$, and $\theta'_2$ is the value of $\theta_2$ when $\theta_1$ is on the line $\theta$. We then solve Eq. 5 along $\theta$ and express it as a function of $\theta'_2$ to obtain the semiclassical tunneling potential seen as the green line in Fig. 2(b). We also solve Eq. 6 along $\theta$ to obtain the tracenorm distance seen as the black dotted line in Fig. 2(b). Notice that the global minimum of the tracenorm distance, shown as the white cross in Figs. 11(a) and 11(b), lies on the line $\theta$.

Appendix B: 7-Qubit Example

1. Instance Parameters

The values of $h^i_j$ and $J^{zz}_{ij}$ used for the random problem example are

$$h^1_1 = 0.44943486 \text{ GHz},$$
$$h^1_2 = 0.31289415 \text{ GHz},$$
$$h^1_3 = -2.74644764 \text{ GHz},$$
$$h^2_1 = 0.83604628 \text{ GHz},$$
$$h^2_2 = -1.50996812 \text{ GHz},$$
$$h^2_3 = -0.22601622 \text{ GHz},$$
$$h^3_1 = 0.61277371 \text{ GHz},$$
$$J^{xx}_{14} = 0.60380648 \text{ GHz},$$
$$J^{zz}_{25} = -2.25299311 \text{ GHz},$$
$$J^{xx}_{34} = -0.27227428 \text{ GHz},$$
$$J^{zz}_{35} = 0.65045779 \text{ GHz},$$
$$J^{zz}_{37} = 0.86185789 \text{ GHz},$$
$$J^{zz}_{45} = -0.4736094 \text{ GHz},$$
$$J^{zz}_{57} = -1.8493871 \text{ GHz},$$
$$J^{zz}_{67} = 0.28658828 \text{ GHz}.$$
2. Observed Features

We discuss here the observed features of this random instance not discussed in the main text, focusing on the data shown in Fig. 5(a). Figure 12(a) shows the same data but magnified about the y axis. We can now clearly see the double crossing of the Z magnetization of qubit 2 of the graph in Fig. 4. In this case, application of LSTF-DQA to qubit 2 \((k = 2)\) results in a triple flip of qubit 2, as seen in Fig. 12(b). Note also that the other qubits must clearly participate in the tunneling in some way, since they are all influenced by the flip events of qubit 2. This also occurs to a lesser extent when qubit 1 is the target qubit, as seen in Fig. 5(b). We can see this also in the context of the 2-qubit example when the transverse field of qubit 2 is suppressed. Considering Fig. 11(a), we see that a sudden rotation of qubit 1 from the X to the Z axis accompanies the full Z expectation flip of qubit 2. These correlated events are not at all obvious unless the transverse field of the target qubit is suppressed. It is striking that the suppression of a single transverse field can reveal these otherwise hidden correlations.

Finally, consider Fig. 13 which shows the energy gap resulting from the choice \(k = 2\) in the LSTF-DQA protocol. We see in this case that a triple level crossing occurs, the first occurring at \(s = s_x\), the second at \(s = s_+\) and a third at a point we denote \(s = s'_+\). This suggests it is not always necessary to create an additional crossing at
setting the crossing at $s = s_x$, and also suggests that the way in which local minima in the potential compete can be highly non-trivial. From a computational perspective, we expect that omitting the crossing at $s = s_x$ and simply suppressing a selected transverse field will not be very effective, since such a double crossing of the Z magnetization in the AQA spectrum is expected to be a rare occurrence. However, it could perhaps aid in the characterization of a black-box problem.
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