Quantum Approximate Optimization Algorithm with Adaptive Bias Fields
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The quantum approximate optimization algorithm (QAOA) transforms a simple many-qubit wavefunction into one which encodes the solution to a difficult classical optimization problem. It does this by optimizing the schedule according to which two unitary operators are alternately applied to the qubits. In this paper, this procedure is modified by updating the operators themselves to include local fields, using information from the measured wavefunction at the end of one iteration step to improve the operators at later steps. It is shown by numerical simulation on MAXCUT problems that this decreases the runtime of QAOA very substantially. This improvement appears to increase with the problem size. Our method requires essentially the same number of quantum gates per optimization step as the standard QAOA. Application of this modified algorithm should bring closer the time to quantum advantage for optimization problems.

We are in the era of Noisy Intermediate-Scale Quantum (NISQ) devices [1]. This motivates the development of variational hybrid quantum-classical algorithms (VHQCA) that use a sequence of relatively short quantum circuits with parameters that are iteratively updated by a classical optimizer [2, 3]. VHQCAs have been designed for a wide range of problems, such as ground state and excited state preparation [4–7], quantum state diagonalization [8, 9], quantum data compression [10–12], quantum fidelity estimation [13, 14], and quantum compiling [15].

The Quantum Approximate Optimization Algorithm (QAOA) is the leading example of a VHQCA for combinatorial optimization [16]. The repeated quantum evolution depends on classical input parameters that are adjusted iteratively p times, where p is the level. The final result is a calculated value for the cost function and a corresponding quantum state that encodes an approximate solution to a classical optimization problem. The QAOA is considered to be a good candidate for an algorithm that will be superior to classical algorithms reasonably soon [17], so many studies have focused on the experimental demonstrations for the QAOA in different physical systems [18–24]. However, it is generally thought that the standard QAOA will not be competitive with established classical methods until a time when quantum machines are considerably larger than they are today [25, 26]. Thus there is intense activity to improve the QAOA [27–33], which would bring this time closer. That is also the goal of the present work.

Simulations on classical computers have shown some impressive results for the QAOA as applied to MaxCut [34, 35]. The authors of Ref. [35] produced an efficient iterative scheme that runs in time $O(\text{poly } p)$ and that approached the known solutions with high accuracy. They demonstrated the superiority of QAOA over quantum annealing - the classical optimization effectively isolates the small gap events that plague annealers and the Quantum Adiabatic Algorithm and substantially neutralizes them. The QAOA starts the quantum computer in the ground state of the mixing Hamiltonian $H_M$ and then alternately applies the unitary operators $\exp(-i\gamma_j H_C)$ and $\exp(-i\beta_j H_M)$, where $H_C$ is the problem Hamiltonian whose ground state is sought. At level $p$ the $\beta_j$ and $\gamma_j$ are components of $p$-dimensional real vector $\vec{\beta}$ and $\vec{\gamma}$ whose values determine the schedule of the evolution. $\vec{\beta}$ and $\vec{\gamma}$ are improved by measuring $\langle H_C \rangle$ at each step of the iterative procedure.

Varying the mixing Hamiltonian has been proposed [28] and we follow this idea here. However, the protocols in the literature do not use all the information available at the end of a step: the qubits can also be measured in the computational basis and this can help to guide the way to the solution. In this work, we propose to use this additional information in the classical optimization. Local fields $\{\vec{h}\}$ are introduced as was done previously in quantum annealing [36]. The starting state is also modified at each iteration. This increases the set of variational parameters, but this is more than made up for by a greatly increased convergence rate to the solution of the problem.

The accuracy $r$ of a solution is defined as

$$r = \frac{\langle H_C \rangle(\psi)}{\langle H_C \rangle(\psi_{\text{max}})},$$

where $\langle H_C \rangle(\psi)$ is the expectation value of the problem Hamiltonian $H$ in the state $\psi$ produced by the algorithm and $\langle H_C \rangle(\psi_{\text{max}})$ is the value in the optimum state $\psi_{\text{max}}$. 

Classically, finding a solution where \( r > 16/17 \approx 0.9412 \) is NP-hard [37, 38], but there is a polynomial time classical algorithm that provably finds answers with \( r = 0.8785 [39] \). We focus on MaxCut for 3-regular graphs with \( n \) vertices.

The performance of a heuristic algorithm must be judged against competitors. In what follows we compare the proposed algorithm, called the adaptive bias QAOA (ab-QAOA), against the standard QAOA (henceforth referred to simply as QAOA) described above. The QAOA has already been compared to classical algorithms [34], so this way of proceeding indirectly benchmarks the QAOA against classical competitors as well. Our primary figure of merit uses the time taken to reach a given \( r \), say \( r^* \), as the performance metric. The choice of the \( r^* \) is to some extent arbitrary. We will take \( r^* = 0.99 \) as a value that is attainable in numerical simulations at moderate system sizes for the ab-QAOA, and for the QAOA with reasonable extrapolations. This value of \( r^* \) also sets a goal that may be practical for future quantum computers in the medium term and it exceeds the NP-hard threshold quoted above. The ratio of computation times for the QAOA and the ab-QAOA to reach the accuracy \( r^* \) is then our measurement of the improvement in the algorithm. More specifically, let \( p \) be the level of the iteration and take \( p^* \) as the value of \( p \) at which \( r^* \) is achieved. The computation time is proportional to \( p^2 \). (See the Supplementary Material for discussion of this point.) The additional overhead in the ab-QAOA is very small. Hence the speedup is best defined as \( S = (p_{QAOA}^{ab}/p_{QAOA})^2 \). We will also use the infidelity \( 1 - F = 1 - \langle \psi |\psi_{\text{max}}| \rangle^2 \) to compare the two methods, since that can give some additional physical insight.

The overall philosophy of the ab-QAOA is to make a marriage between mean field theory and an iterative variational procedure. Thus we include mean fields in the mixing Hamiltonian, updating these at each level of the iteration based on information provided by the final wavefunction of the previous iteration level.

This key technique is somewhat similar to that in Ref. [36], who noted that bias fields could improve accuracy, but in that case the procedure was not adaptive. In the ab-QAOA the fields are changed at each iteration, which steers the state to an improved configuration. The fields improve the value of \( r \) and the overlap between the computed final state and the actual ground state.

The problem Hamiltonian for \( n \) qubits is

\[
H_C = \sum_{i,j \in E} \frac{\omega_{ij}}{2} (1 - Z_i Z_j).
\]

\( E \) is the edge set of the 3-regular graph. We consider weighted graphs with \( \omega_{ij} \) chosen uniformly at random in \([0,1]\) (w3r graphs), and unweighted graphs with \( \omega_{ij} = 1 \) (u3r graphs). (The proven bounds for MaxCut mentioned above relate to the unweighted version.) The precise choice of the graphs is the same as in Ref. [35].

The quantum part of the QAOA is the repeated computation of a quantity \( |\psi_f^\beta| \) according to

\[
|\psi_f^\beta\rangle = \prod_{j=p}^1 e^{-i\beta_j H_M} e^{-i\gamma_j H_C} |\psi_0\rangle,
\]

with \( H_M = \sum_j X_j \). The classical part is the iterative optimization of \( \beta, \gamma \). The ab-QAOA generalizes this to

\[
|\psi_f^{ab}\rangle = \prod_{j=p}^1 e^{-i\beta_j H_M(\vec{h})} e^{-i\gamma_j H_C} |\psi_0\rangle,
\]

where \( H_M^{ab}(\vec{h}) = \sum_j (X_j - h_j Z_j) \) and the \( n \)-dimensional vector \( \vec{h} \) is optimized in addition to \( \vec{\beta}, \vec{\gamma} \). It was noted in Ref. [35] that because \( \vec{\beta}, \vec{\gamma} \) evolve smoothly during the course of the optimization, it is more efficient to optimize over their discrete Fourier transforms, denoted by \( \vec{v}, \vec{u} \). The precise definition is given in the Supplementary Material.

In detail, the ab-QAOA algorithm to find the approximate ground state of \( H_C \) at level \( p \) is as follows.

- **Initialization**
  1. Initialize 2 \( p \)-dimensional vectors \( \vec{u} \) and \( \vec{v} \) that are used to update \( \vec{\gamma} \) and \( \vec{\beta} \).
  2. Initialize the \( n \)-dimensional local field vector \( \vec{h} \).
  3. Set a learning rate \( l \), a global parameter defined in Step 6 in optimization procedure. Further details of the initialization are given in the Supplementary Material.

- **Optimization**
  1. Set \( \vec{\gamma} \) and \( \vec{\beta} \) according to the discrete Fourier transforms of \( \vec{u} \) and \( \vec{v} \).
  2. Construct the mixing Hamiltonian with bias fields:

\[
H_M^b(\vec{h}) = \sum_{j=1}^n (X_j - h_j Z_j).
\]

3. Prepare the ground state (i.e., \( |\psi_0\rangle \)) of \( H_M^b \), which is a product state:

\[
|\psi_0\rangle = \bigotimes_{j=1}^n |\psi_0^j\rangle.
\]

4. Implement \( 2p \) operators as in Eq. (4) and obtain the final state:

\[
|\psi_f^{ab}\rangle = \prod_{j=p}^1 e^{-i\beta_j H_M(\vec{h})} e^{-i\gamma_j H_C} |\psi_0\rangle.
\]
5. Through projective measurements, obtain the gradients of $\vec{u}$, $\vec{v}$:

$$
\nabla \vec{u} = \frac{\partial \langle \psi_f^{ab} | H_C | \psi_f^{ab} \rangle}{\partial \vec{u}},
$$

(8)

$$
\nabla \vec{v} = \frac{\partial \langle \psi_f^{ab} | H_C | \psi_f^{ab} \rangle}{\partial \vec{v}},
$$

and the gradients of $\vec{h}$:

$$
\nabla h_j = h_j - \langle \psi_f^{ab} | Z_j | \psi_f^{ab} \rangle.
$$

(9)

6. Update $\vec{u}$, $\vec{v}$ using the Adam gradient-based stochastic optimization algorithm [40]. Update $\vec{h}$ with learning rate $l$ according to $\vec{h} \rightarrow \vec{h} - l \nabla \vec{h}$.

7. Measure the expectation value of the energy/cost function $E(\vec{u}, \vec{v}, \vec{h}) = \langle \psi_f^{ab} | H_C | \psi_f^{ab} \rangle$.

8. Repeat steps 1-7 until convergence with a fixed tolerance. Output the optimized energy $E(\vec{u}, \vec{v}, \vec{h})$, and a measurement of $|\psi_f^{ab}\rangle$ in the computational basis.

The results of this algorithm for w3r graphs are shown in log-linear plots in Figs. 1(a),1(b) for $1 - r$ and $1 - F$ respectively. The convergence to the solution is much better in the ab-QAOA overall, and the improvement at small $p$ is particularly striking. This is important, since only rather small values of $p$ are likely to be accessible in near-term quantum machines [18–24].

In order to calculate the speedup, we need $p^*$. However, for the QAOA, we can not get it from the existing data and some extrapolation is required. We fit the curves, choosing the forms of the fitting functions empirically. For w3r graphs, the fitting functions for the QAOA are:

$$
1 - r = \exp(-\sqrt{p/p_0 + c}),
$$

$$
1 - F = \exp(-p/p_0 + c).
$$

(10)

For w3r graphs and the ab-QAOA, it’s still of interest to fit the results, though the significance, if any, of the functional forms is not yet clear. The functions are:

$$
1 - r = \exp(-\sqrt{p/p_0 + c}),
$$

$$
1 - F = \exp(-\sqrt{p/p_0 + c}).
$$

(11)

The fitting parameters $p_0$ and $c$ are tabulated in the Supplementary Material.

For the w3r results, the fitting functions work very well, as can be seen in Fig. 1. The upward curvature in the ab-QAOA fits is due to the fact that at higher $p$ we are close to converging to the actual solution. It is notable that for the ab-QAOA the curvature does not increase very rapidly with $p$, indicating that even when the ab-QAOA is quite close to the actual result, improvement still continues. The results for the relative infidelity of the QAOA and the ab-QAOA are nearly as impressive as those for the accuracy; the gap between the two methods is still clearly evident. In the ab-QAOA, $1 - r$ is nearly independent of $n$, while $1 - F$ changes noticeably. This is an indication that for the weighted graphs the ground state is likely to be nearly degenerate with the low-lying excited states.

Figure 1. (a) Comparison of the accuracy of QAOA (solid lines) to the accuracy of ab-QAOA (dashed lines) for $n = 8, 10, 12, 14, 16, 18$ for w3r graphs. The horizontal dashed line represents $r^* = 0.99$. Each point is an average over 40 randomly chosen graphs. The accuracy is plotted as a function of the level $p$. Even for moderate values of $p$, the accuracy of ab-QAOA is an order of magnitude better than that of QAOA. (b) Comparison of the infidelity in QAOA (solid lines) and ab-QAOA (dashed lines) as a function of $p$. Again, the improvement is nearly an order of magnitude at moderate $p$. The fits are described in the text.

The results for the u3r graphs are shown in Fig. 2. Again, the gap between the QAOA and the ab-QAOA is clearly evident. The initial convergence at small $p$ is very fast for the ab-QAOA. Indeed, if the figure of merit for the algorithms is taken as the accuracy at some fixed small $p$, the difference in performance for u3r graphs
would exceed that for w3r graphs.

![Figure 2](image-url)

**Figure 2.** (a) Accuracy of QAOA (solid lines) and ab-QAOA (dashed lines) for \( n = 8, 10, 12, 14, 16, 18 \) for u3r graphs. The number of realizations is 40 for graphs with 10 or more vertices. For \( n = 8 \), there are only 5 different non-isomorphic u3r graphs, and we average over them. The horizontal dashed line again represents \( r^* = 0.99 \). By comparing with Fig. 1 we find that the accuracy for both algorithms is slightly better when applied to unweighted graphs. The improvement of ab-QAOA over QAOA is very marked at even smaller \( p \). (b) Infidelity for QAOA (solid lines) and ab-QAOA (dashed lines) as a function of \( p \), now for unweighted graphs. Again, the improvement is clear at quite small \( p \) and it continues to improve for all \( p \). The fits are described in the text.

For u3r graphs the fitting functions for QAOA are straight lines on the log-linear plots in Figs. 2(a), 2(b):

\[
1 - r = \exp(-p/p_0 + c), \\
1 - F = \exp(-p/p_0 + c),
\]

while for ab-QAOA, they are the same as those in w3r graphs, as shown in (11). Again, \( p_0 \) and \( c \) are fitting parameters that are given in the Supplementary Material.

Interestingly, the convergence rate of the infidelity of the ab-QAOA for u3r wavefunctions is considerably faster than that for the w3r case, and \( 1 - F \) does not depend so strongly on \( n \). This is the main difference in our results for the w3r and u3r graphs. We believe that this is due to the fact that the ground state is fairly well-separated in energy from the low-lying excited states, at least by comparison to the w3r graphs.

The basic figure of merit for the ab-QAOA is \( S(n) \), the speedup as a function of the number of vertices. This is plotted in Fig. 3. We see first of all that all the improvement offered by the ab-QAOA is certainly not limited to very small graphs. If \( S(n) = O(n^a) \), where \( a > 0 \), then the ab-QAOA gives a polynomial speedup over QAOA. If \( a = 0 \) then we can only hope for a constant speedup (which might still be of practical importance, of course). The curve in Fig. 3 shows no sign of saturating up to \( n = 18 \). Of course these are still relatively small systems, but the numerical results give some evidence for a non-trivial speedup of this kind of classical-quantum optimization algorithm.

The ab-QAOA uses information from the updated wavefunction to speed up convergence of the QAOA. This information goes into the mixing Hamiltonian. This additional adaptivity in the algorithm gives a very substantial speedup. In the short and medium term (NISQ era), the results presented in Figs. 1 and 2 are the most important ones, since, for example, about \( p = 5 \) and 20 qubits may be attainable on this time scale [18]. Thus our results give hope for accelerating the demonstration of what we might call quantum optimization advantage. In the longer term we are more interested in how the performance of the ab-QAOA scales with \( n \). Fig. 3 suggests that the ab-QAOA may still be the algorithm of choice beyond the NISQ era.
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This work was supported by the Theory of Quantum Matter Unit, Okinawa Institute of Science and Technology Graduate University (OIST). This research was performed using the computing resources and assistance of the UW-Madison Center For High Throughput Computing. We thank M.G. Vavilov and B. Özyürek for useful discussions.

S-I. COMPUTATIONAL DETAILS

For the current problem, the change in the $\vec{\beta}, \vec{\gamma}$ parameters is relatively smooth as the level increases. This suggests that optimization of the Fourier components of these vectors may more efficient than optimization of $\vec{\beta}, \vec{\gamma}$ themselves [35]. We verified that this was true and followed Ref. [35] in defining $\vec{u}, \vec{v}$ by:

$$
\gamma_j = \sum_{k=1}^{p} u_k \sin \left[ \left( k - \frac{1}{2} \right) \left( j - \frac{1}{2} \right) \frac{\pi}{p} \right],
$$

$$
\beta_j = \sum_{k=1}^{p} v_k \cos \left[ \left( k - \frac{1}{2} \right) \left( j - \frac{1}{2} \right) \frac{\pi}{p} \right].
$$

(S1)

Together with the $n$-dimensional vector $\vec{h}$, this gives us all the quantities that need to be adaptively updated in the course of the algorithm. The update procedure follows.

**Update Procedure**

1. In level 1, we generate $R$ initial "0" points $(\vec{u}_1^0, \vec{v}_1^0, \vec{h}_1^0)$, where the components of $\vec{u}_1^0$ and $\vec{v}_1^0$ are random numbers drawn from a uniform distribution and all components of $\vec{h}_1^0$ are initialized to be 1. The subscripts refer to the level of the iteration procedure, the $s$ superscript ranges from 0 to $R - 1$ representing the different initial points. Using the algorithm in the main text we get the optimal "B" point $(\vec{u}_1^B, \vec{v}_1^B, \vec{h}_1^B)$ with the lowest optimal energy $E_1^B$ from $R$ points for this level.

2. In level $k$ greater than 1, we use $\vec{u}_{k-1}^B, \vec{v}_{k-1}^B, \vec{h}_{k-1}^B$ in level $k - 1$ to construct $R$ initial points $(\vec{u}_k^0, \vec{v}_k^0, \vec{h}_k^0)$. The $s$ superscript refers to the elements of the following random selection procedure. In our calculations, the sampling parameter $R$ was set equal to 10.

$$
\vec{u}_k^0 = \begin{cases} 
(\vec{u}_{k-1}^B, 0), & s = 0 \\
(\vec{u}_{k-1}^B + \alpha \text{Ran}^s[\vec{u}_{k-1}^B], 0), & 1 \leq s \leq R - 1 
\end{cases}
$$

$$
\vec{v}_k^0 = \begin{cases} 
(\vec{v}_{k-1}^B, 0), & s = 0 \\
(\vec{v}_{k-1}^B + \alpha \text{Ran}^s[\vec{v}_{k-1}^B], 0), & 1 \leq s \leq R - 1 
\end{cases}
$$

$$
\vec{h}_k^0 = \vec{h}_{k-1}^B + \alpha \text{Ran}^s[\vec{h}_{k-1}^B], & 0 \leq s \leq R - 1
$$

(S2)

$v_k^0$ or $u_k^0$ is a $k$-dimensional vector padded with an additional zero. The $i$th component of $\text{Ran}^s[\vec{v}_{k-1}^B]$ is the $s$-th selection from a normal distribution with average 0 and variance $[\vec{v}_{k-1}^B]^2$, i.e., $\text{Ran}^s[\vec{v}_{k-1}^B] = \text{Norm}(0, [\vec{v}_{k-1}^B]^2)$. We optimize these $R$ initial points to find the best point $(\vec{u}_k^B, \vec{v}_k^B, \vec{h}_k^B)$ with the lowest energy $E_k^B$. $\alpha$ is an update parameter. We used $\alpha = 0.6$.

3. Repeat step 2 until $k$ reaches the target level $p$.

4. Output all energies $E_k^B$ from level 1 to $p$.

S-II. COMPUTATION TIME/QUANTUM GATES

Here we give the analysis that leads to the conclusion in the main text that the total computation time is $O(p^2)$. We assume that the quantum part of the algorithm dominates the time. This will be true for the foreseeable future. The problem Hamiltonian is defined on an $n$-vertex $R$-regular graph, and a $p$-level QAOA and ab-QAOA is implemented with optimization to find its ground state $|\psi_{\text{ground}}\rangle$. In our calculations $R = 3$. 

Since the iteration in the optimization mainly depends on the choice of the initial points and not the level of the QAOA, we assume it is independent of \( p \) and denote it by \( N_{\text{ite}} \).

In each iteration of the optimization in our calculation, we need to calculate the expectation of the problem Hamiltonian \( \langle H_C \rangle \) \( 2p + 1 \) times to get gradients of the input parameters. In both of these two QAOA the gradient of \( E_{\text{fit}} \), the energy in one iteration for the \( p \) level QAOA, with respect to the \( u_j \) is

\[
\frac{\partial E_{\text{fit}}(\vec{u}, \vec{v}, \vec{h})}{\partial u_j} = \epsilon_g \frac{E_{\text{fit}}(\vec{u}^', \vec{v}, \vec{h}) - E_{\text{fit}}(\vec{u}, \vec{v}, \vec{h})}{\epsilon_g},
\]

where \( \epsilon_g \) is a small quantity. There are \( p \) \( u_j \), so \( p \) \( E_{\text{fit}}(\vec{u}^', \vec{v}, \vec{h}) \) and one \( E_{\text{fit}}(\vec{u}, \vec{v}, \vec{h}) \) are needed. As a result, \( 2p + 1 \) calculations of \( \langle H_C \rangle \) are needed.

In a single calculation of \( \langle H_C \rangle \), one needs to measure \( nR/2 \) different ZZ terms of \( H_C \). \( |\psi_f\rangle \) (either \( |\psi_f^s\rangle \) or \( |\psi_f^a\rangle \) in the main text) is prepared \( M_{ZZ} \) times to get an accurate expectation value for the ZZ term.

In the ab-QAOA, unlike the QAOA, knowledge of the \( Z \) term is also needed to guide \( \vec{h} \) in the flowing iteration. However, this does not require an additional measurement, since if we have the value of \( \langle ZZ \rangle \), we automatically also know \( \langle Z \rangle \), as we now show. Consider a single ZZ term, \( Z_jZ_k \). It has a spectral decomposition

\[
Z_jZ_k = |0_j\rangle\langle 0_j| \otimes |0_k\rangle\langle 0_k| - |0_j\rangle\langle 0_j| \otimes |1_k\rangle\langle 1_k| - |1_j\rangle\langle 1_j| \otimes |0_k\rangle\langle 0_k| + |1_j\rangle\langle 1_j| \otimes |1_k\rangle\langle 1_k|,
\]

where \( |0_j\rangle \otimes |0_k\rangle \langle 0_j| \) is short for \( |0\rangle \otimes \cdots \otimes |0\rangle \langle 0| \otimes |1\rangle \otimes \cdots \otimes |1\rangle \), which is denoted as \( T_{00}^{jk} \), so as for \( T_{10}^{jk} \), \( T_{01}^{jk} \) and \( T_{11}^{jk} \). Once these four \( T \) operators are measured then \( \langle Z \rangle \) can be obtained:

\[
\langle Z \rangle = \langle T_{00}^{jk} \rangle + \langle T_{01}^{jk} \rangle - \langle T_{10}^{jk} \rangle - \langle T_{11}^{jk} \rangle,
\]

\[
\langle Z \rangle = \langle T_{00}^{jk} \rangle + \langle T_{10}^{jk} \rangle - \langle T_{01}^{jk} \rangle - \langle T_{11}^{jk} \rangle.
\]

As a result, there are no additional measurements needed in the ab-QAOA compared to the QAOA.

In one preparation of \( |\psi_f\rangle \), \( \exp(-i\gamma_jH_C) \) is applied \( p \) times and \( \exp(-i\beta_jH_M) \) or \( \exp(-i\beta_jH_M^p) \) is applied \( p \) times. \( \exp(-i\gamma_jH_C) \) can be decomposed into 3 quantum gates while \( \exp(-i\beta_jH_M^p) \) can be represented by one, as shown in Fig. S1, so \( p(3nR/2 + n) \) quantum gates are needed.

![Figure S1. Quantum circuit for 1-level ab-QAOA on 2-regular graphs with 4 vertices. \( \xi_{mn} \) is the real coefficient of \( Z_mZ_n \) appearing in \( \exp(-i\gamma_jH_C) \). \( R_z \) is the rotation operator around the \( Z \) axis while \( R_x(\beta) \) is the rotation operator about the \( X \) axis. There are \( 3 \times 4 + 4 = 16 \) gates in the circuit. In conclusion, there are \( \left( \frac{3nR}{2} + n \right) \) quantum gates for a \( p \)-level QAOA with full optimization. \( N_{\text{ite}} \) is also independent of \( n \) and \( M_{ZZ} \), so \( N_{\text{gate}} \sim O(p^2n^2R^2) \). Of course this analysis assumes that there is no error correction. It also assumes that 2-qubit gates can be applied to any pair of qubits, thus avoiding the necessity of SWAP gates. These considerations apply equally to QAOA and ab-QAOA, so they should not affect the speedup that is defined in the main text since it is a relative speedup. Similarly, \( R \) and \( n \) are the same for the two algorithms and the same reasoning may be applied. For a given accuracy and problem size, only \( p \) is different.](https://example.com/figureS1.png)

**S-III. FITTING PARAMETERS**

Here we list the fitting parameters defined in the main text.
### Table S1. Fitting parameters of standard QAOA for the accuracy in w3r graphs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>n</th>
<th>( p_0 )</th>
<th>( c )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.42800977</td>
<td>0.10739954</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.62230354</td>
<td>-0.12764388</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.73323484</td>
<td>-0.23251733</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.80231316</td>
<td>-0.26348911</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>0.90685782</td>
<td>-0.39672828</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>0.9443149</td>
<td>-0.35855954</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table S2. Fitting parameters of ab-QAOA for the accuracy in w3r graphs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>n</th>
<th>( p_0 )</th>
<th>( c )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.7527266</td>
<td>0.17327266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.7580396</td>
<td>0.17580396</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>1.7957186</td>
<td>0.17704141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>1.8424291</td>
<td>0.17957186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>1.9068578</td>
<td>0.18424291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>1.9443149</td>
<td>0.23922264</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table S3. Fitting parameters of standard QAOA for the infidelity in w3r graphs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>n</th>
<th>( p_0 )</th>
<th>( c )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.50210827</td>
<td>-0.10739954</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.61290557</td>
<td>-0.12764388</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.75486606</td>
<td>-0.23251733</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.80539136</td>
<td>-0.26348911</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>0.85761581</td>
<td>-0.39672828</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>0.9068578</td>
<td>-0.35855954</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table S4. Fitting parameters of ab-QAOA for the infidelity in w3r graphs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>n</th>
<th>( p_0 )</th>
<th>( c )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.30228564</td>
<td>-0.55076766</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.07538215</td>
<td>-1.01553842</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>2.46574535</td>
<td>-1.01553842</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>2.7788049</td>
<td>-1.01553842</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>3.03328213</td>
<td>-1.2615441</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>3.15617106</td>
<td>-1.2615441</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table S5. Fitting parameters of standard QAOA for the accuracy in u3r graphs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>n</th>
<th>( p_0 )</th>
<th>( c )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.0481013</td>
<td>0.41506594</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.04482199</td>
<td>0.55354739</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.05410145</td>
<td>1.19381813</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.05651275</td>
<td>1.89565872</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>0.05735311</td>
<td>2.39503391</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>0.04743622</td>
<td>2.3967199</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table S6. Fitting parameters of ab-QAOA for the accuracy in u3r graphs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>n</th>
<th>( p_0 )</th>
<th>( c )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.12530574</td>
<td>1.18876273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.247189574</td>
<td>0.55371133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.33176173</td>
<td>0.42748629</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.49348061</td>
<td>0.28974544</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>5.8239181</td>
<td>0.27341578</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>6.96389395</td>
<td>0.24360132</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table S7. Fitting parameters of standard QAOA for the infidelity in u3r graphs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>n</th>
<th>( p_0 )</th>
<th>( c )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.04960161</td>
<td>4.14004776</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.04422032</td>
<td>4.58598679</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.0519072</td>
<td>4.17168606</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.05735311</td>
<td>4.08843585</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>0.04898178</td>
<td>4.6724513</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>0.0498607</td>
<td>1.70423705</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table S8. Fitting parameters of ab-QAOA for the infidelity in u3r graphs

Using these fitting parameters and redefining the vertical axes of Figs. 1 and 2 of the main text, we can collapse the graphs for the accuracy and infidelity onto straight lines, as shown in Fig. S2.
Figure S2. Fitting for ab-QAOA. The dashed lines in the four subplots represent $p = p_0[\exp(c - \ln(1 - r))]^2$ or $p = p_0[\exp(c - \ln(1 - F))]^2$, which is equivalent to the fitting functions in the main text.

S-IV. $p^*$ IN SPEEDUP

Here we list $p^*$ for the calculation of the speedup $S(n)$ shown in Fig. 3 in the main text. For the QAOA, $p^*$ is obtained from the fitting function, and all $p^*$ are rounded to an integer. For the ab-QAOA, $p^*$ is obtained directly from the numerical simulation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>$n = 8$</th>
<th>$n = 10$</th>
<th>$n = 12$</th>
<th>$n = 14$</th>
<th>$n = 16$</th>
<th>$n = 18$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>standard QAOA</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ab-QAOA</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table S9. $p^*$ for w3r graphs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>$n = 8$</th>
<th>$n = 10$</th>
<th>$n = 12$</th>
<th>$n = 14$</th>
<th>$n = 16$</th>
<th>$n = 18$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>standard QAOA</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ab-QAOA</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table S10. $p^*$ for u3r graphs