Solving the BCS Hamiltonian gap in Near-Term Quantum Computers
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Currently, the use of quantum computers for simulation of physical systems is restricted because of errors induced by noise and low qubit connectivity in the devices. In order to surpass these restrictions we use a variational quantum algorithm called Variational Quantum Deflation to find the gap of a BCS Hamiltonian, which could lead to interesting implications for superconductivity. In this work we compare two optimizers, Constrained Optimization BY Linear Approximations (COBYLA) and Simultaneous Perturbation Stochastic Approximation (SPSA), and study the effect of decoherence caused by noise using simulations in real devices. We show how to approximate the gap, with high precision, even with the presence of noise.

I. INTRODUCTION

At the current time, we may consider that we are in the Noisy Intermediate-Scale Quantum (NISQ) era of Quantum Computing which refers to devices with 50-100 qubits, without Quantum Error Correction. In other words, we are still far from devices with perfect qubits and quantum operations. Thus, in order to attain an acceptable performance, we need to use algorithms that are suited for those limitations. A very valuable class of algorithms appropriate to deal with such limitations, and that may be useful for many applications in physics and many other fields, e.g. machine learning, are the so-called Variational Quantum Algorithms (VQA).

Variational Quantum Algorithms is a class of hybrid classical-quantum algorithms that shows noise resilience due to the use of parametric quantum circuits [2], thus being able to be implemented in NISQ devices. Variational Quantum Algorithms are universal [3] and have been proposed for various problems, such as Combinatorial Optimization [4], Quantum Chemistry [5], factoring [6], Machine Learning [7] and compilation [8].

One problem that can be dealt with by the use of such techniques and has the potential to lead to interesting outcomes is superconductivity. This is fairly well modeled using a pairing Hamiltonian.

BCS superconductivity is an appealing framework for testing VQA. Experimentally, the simulation of pairing hamiltonians have been shown using a Nuclear Magnetic Resonance (NMR) setup [9]. However, due to intrinsic NMR experimental characteristics there are several limitations for scalability which can be handled using VQAs.

In order to simulate Fermionic Hamiltonians it is needed to map fermions to qubits. There are many mapping techniques used for quantum chemistry, for instance Jordan-Wigner [10], and Bravyi-Kitaev Mapping [11]. One of such qubit mappings proposed by Wu et al. [12] has been only applied for NMR quantum computers, although it can be used for circuit-based quantum computers and more specifically NISQ devices using Variational Quantum Algorithms. This paper aims to use this mapping to solve the BCS Hamiltonian.

In order to show that this mapping is suitable for circuit-based quantum computers, we will apply the Fermion-to-Qubit mapping made by Wu et al. [12] to solve the BCS problem with \( N = 2 \) cooper pairs. This also extends the result of [9] in a setting where it is not needed to use any simplification of the parameters of the Hamiltonian leading to a path into solving this problem with an arbitrary number of cooper pairs.

In order to demonstrate this, our goal is to find the energy spectra using a Variational Quantum Algorithm called Variational Quantum Deflation [13] which leads to restrictions of the topology of quantum computers. Fortunately, those restrictions are met by real devices which could be used to solve the BCS Hamiltonian.

The paper is organized as follows: Section II presents the BCS Hamiltonian, the qubit mapping used and explains all steps in the construction of the Variational Quantum Deflation algorithm including ansatz, classical optimizers used and an explanation of the swap test. Section III shows the numerical simulation results for an ideal quantum computer and a noisy quantum computer assuming a Thermal Relaxation Error noise model. Lastly, Section IV we conclude the paper and present possible future works.

II. METHODS

First we need to define the Fermionic Hamiltonian that we want to solve. The general Bardeen–Cooper–Schrieffer (BCS) Hamiltonian is given by:

\[
H_{BCS} = \sum_{m=1}^{N} \frac{\epsilon_m}{2} (n_m + n_{-m}) + \sum_{m,k=1}^{N} V^{+}_{mk} c^+_m c^+_k c_{-k} c_{-m}
\]

where \( n_{\pm m} = c_{\pm m}^\dagger c_{\pm m} \) is the number operator, and the matrix elements \( V_{mk}^{\pm} = \langle m, -m| V| l, -l \rangle \) are real and can...
be calculated efficiently for any given problem. For simplicity V can be treated as a constant which yields a good approximation to many superconductors [13].

An important property that can be obtained from the Hamiltonian is the energy gap, which is defined as $2\Delta_n \equiv E_{n,1} - E_{n,0}$. For instance, for the gap between the first excited state and the ground state, we name it $n = 0$. In the present work, we will focus on the $n = 1$ gap, since it is a harder problem than the $n = 0$ gap.

In order to solve this problem in a quantum computer one needs to map the BCS Hamiltonian into a qubit Hamiltonian with a one-to-one mapping. In this paper we will use one of the mappings presented in Wu et al. [12] which maps Fermions to qubits, given by the following representation:

$$H_Q = \sum_{m=1}^{N} \frac{\epsilon_m}{2} |\sigma_m^z| + V \sum_{l>m=1}^{N} (\sigma_m^x \sigma_l^x + \sigma_m^y \sigma_l^y)$$

One can find the gap by finding the energy spectra of the qubit Hamiltonian (Eq.2) since the mapping assures that the qubit Hamiltonian has the same energy spectra of the BCS Hamiltonian. The goal of this paper is to find the energy spectra using a variational quantum algorithm called Variational Quantum Deflation [13].

The Variational Quantum Deflation (VQD) algorithm is an extension of the Variational Quantum Eigensolver (VQE) [5] algorithm allowing us to approximate excited states of a desired Hamiltonian, thus giving us access to their energy values.

The original VQE algorithm only finds the ground energy of a given Hamiltonian by using the decomposition of such Hamiltonian into Pauli strings and minimizing the expected value of the Hamiltonian:

$$E(\theta) = \langle \psi(\theta) | H | \psi(\theta) \rangle = \sum_{i} c_i \langle \psi(\theta) | P_i | \psi(\theta) \rangle$$

Where $P_i$ are Pauli strings that are of polynomial size. In order to measure this expectation value one needs to change from the computational basis into the $X$ and $Y$ basis, thus this approach has low depth and is suited for NISQ devices. By minimizing the cost function (Eq.3) it is possible to approximate the ground state of a Hamiltonian with high precision.

In order to get the energy of excited states the cost function of the VQE needs to be modified by taking into account that all eigenstates of the Hamiltonian are orthogonal to each other. This is done by minimizing the overlap between all eigenstates discovered using the algorithm. Thus, to calculate the k-th excited state of a given Hamiltonian, $H$, the parameters $\lambda_k$ must be optimized for a parametrized state $|\psi(\lambda_k)\rangle$ for a given cost function. The cost function that needs to be minimized for the VQD is given by:

$$F(\lambda_k) = \langle \psi(\lambda_k) | H | \psi(\lambda_k) \rangle + \sum_{i=0}^{k-1} \beta_i |\langle \psi(\lambda_k) | \psi(\lambda_i) \rangle|^2$$

The first term is the expected value of the energy which can be obtained measuring the Pauli decomposition of the Hamiltonian $H$ just like the VQE cost function. On the other hand, the second term is not as trivial, one needs to calculate the overlapping term between all eigenstates until the desired k-th eigenstate, this term ensures that all eigenstates are orthogonal to each other.

It is possible to measure the overlap between two quantum states using a SWAP test, this procedure will be explained in more detail in Section II C.

One of the downsides of the VQD algorithm is that the hyperparameter $\beta_i$ has to be chosen, but, according to [13], it suffices to choose $\beta_i > E_k - E_l$, where $E_k$ is the desired energy state and $E_l$ all energy states below the desired state, since this paper aims to find the energy spectra of the Hamiltonian, we choose $\beta_i > E_{\text{max}} - E_{\text{min}}$, where $E_{\text{max}}$ is the highest value of the energy and $E_{\text{min}}$ the minimum value of the energy.

In order to implement this algorithm we need to take three factors into account which will be explained in subsections: In II A we will describe different kinds of variational ansatz and our choice of a Hardware-Efficient Ansatz in more detail. In section II B we will further explain the classical optimizers used. In section II C we will clarify both kinds of SWAP tests in detail.

### A. Variational Ansatz

In order to build a variational ansatz for the Variational Quantum Algorithm two conflicting goals should be met: The ansatz must be as general as possible in order to create states that would approximate all eigenstates of the Hamiltonian, but also needs to have a polynomial number of parameters in order to express our ansatz efficiently on a quantum computer.

In the literature there are two distinct paths for constructing the variational ansatz: 1) You can create an ansatz based on the problem’s knowledge, in this case we can see as an example the UCCSD ansatz [16]; 2) Since the main goal is to run the Variational Quantum Algorithm in real hardware one needs to take into account hardware restrictions on connectivity and the gate set and construct an ansatz that is suited for the Hardware that the algorithm will run on, this is commonly called Hardware Efficient Ansatz introduced by Kandala et al. [17].

Our choice of ansatz for this paper is the hardware efficient ansatz. This kind of ansatz is depicted in FIGURE 1 and is composed by blocks of two kind of unitary transformations. The first block is made of one or more hardware-native parametrized one qubit gates ($R_i(\theta_i)$) and depicted on the figure as $U(\theta)$.
The second block is constructed using two qubit gates that can generate entanglement, which is generally called entangling gates. The common entangling gate is the CNOT, however there are other entangling gates such as iSWAP used on the Sycamore chip made by Google [18]. Since entangling gates are the gates which have lower coherence it is imperative to use them according to the hardware’s connection graph in order to avoid using swap gates which are costly for NISQ devices and can lead to non-local errors.

Thus, the ansatz can be written as following:

\[
|\psi(\theta)\rangle = U_{\text{ENT}} U(\theta) \ldots U_{\text{ENT}} U(\theta) |0\rangle \tag{5}
\]

Depth, \(d\), is defined as the number of both the single qubit rotations block and the entangling block. The dependency on the number of parameters regarding the depth is given by \(2Nd\), where \(N\) is the number of qubits, yielding a polynomial number of parameters, which ensures that we are working with an efficient ansatz construction.

![FIG. 1. Hardware Efficient ansatz where the unitary \(U_{\text{ENT}}\) is constructed using the connection graph of the Quantum Hardware, and the unitary \(U(\theta)\) is made of hardware-native parametrized rotations, in our case it is the combination of \(R_y\) and \(R_z\) rotations.](image)

**B. Classical Optimizer**

There are plenty of optimization algorithms that are used on Variational Quantum Algorithms. In this paper, we will focus on two algorithms for optimization: The Simultaneous Perturbation Stochastic Approximation (SPSA) and Constrained Optimization BY Linear Approximations (COBYLA).

The problem of barren plateaus [19] is present in gradient-based optimizers, which means that the loss function gradient becomes exponentially smaller making it harder to minimize the cost function. The barren plateaus problem can be induced by various factors such as high ansatz expressiveness [20] or even presence of noise [21].

Initially, the presence of barren plateaus was found only on gradient-based optimizers, but recently there is evidence that that affects gradient-free optimizers as well [22].

Therefore, in order to see the performance of classical optimizers it is fair to compare gradient-free and gradient based optimizers. We thus choose COBYLA as the gradient-free optimizer and SPSA as the gradient-base optimizer.

1. **SPSA**

The Simultaneous Perturbation Stochastic Approximation (SPSA) [23] is an algorithm that is robust with respect to stochastic perturbations of the function that it will be minimized and has been widely used in variational quantum algorithms that deal with NISQ devices [17].

The SPSA algorithm works with only two evaluations using a symmetrical Bernoulli distribution \(\Delta_i\), and two zero converging sequences, \(c_i\) and \(a_i\). Since we want to minimize the cost function of the VQD algorithm (eq. (4)) we must take the gradient \(g(\lambda_k)\) this will be done by sampling the cost function \(F(\lambda_k)\), since we only take the sample of the gradient and do not calculate it analytically we name it \(\hat{g}(\lambda_k)\) and we obtain it using the formula:

\[
\hat{g}(\lambda_k^{(i)}) = \frac{F(\lambda_k^{(i)} + c_i \Delta_i) - F(\lambda_k^{(i)} - c_i \Delta_i)}{2c_i} \tag{6}
\]

where \(\lambda_k^{(i)}\) is the \(\lambda_k\) parameter in the \(i\)th iteration of the optimization algorithm.

After evaluating the gradient the algorithm updates the parameters using the following rule:

\[
\lambda_k^{(i+1)} = \lambda_k^{(i)} - a_i \hat{g}(\lambda_k^{(i)}) \tag{7}
\]

It has been proven [23] that this algorithm can converge assuming stochastic fluctuations in the cost function evaluation. The sequences \(a_i\) and \(c_i\) are chosen as:

\[
c_i = \frac{c}{r^c} \\
a_i = \frac{n}{r^n} \tag{8}
\]

where the values are optimally chosen [23] as \(\{\alpha, \gamma\} = \{0.602, 0.101\}\). The value \(a\) controls how large is the update of the parameters and \(c\) controls the gradient update, thus if there are large statistical fluctuations on the cost function we must choose a large \(c\) in order to the gradient evaluation to be accurate, according to experiments explained in section III we chose \(c = 0.7\).

In addition to that we use a calibration method as in [17] in order to adjust the \(a\) parameter, which starts at \(a = 2\pi/10\), choosing different directions of \(\Delta_i\), the inverse formula used to calibrate \(a\) is:

\[
a = \frac{2\pi}{5} \frac{c}{\langle F(\lambda_k^{(i)} + c_i \Delta_i) - F(\lambda_k^{(i)} - c_i \Delta_i) \rangle_{\Delta_i}} \tag{9}
\]

Finally, in order to get the optimized \(\lambda_k\) values, we follow [17] and average over the last 25 iterations in order to suppress statistical fluctuations on parameter values.

2. **COBYLA**

Based on a direct search algorithm that models the objective and constraint functions by linear interpolation [24] COBYLA...
is a classical gradient-free optimizer \cite{27}. It is based on an algorithm that is iterative, in which each iteration produces, by interpolation at the vertices of a simplex, a linear approximation of the objective and constraint functions. The iterative change of values is restricted by a trust region, $\rho$, to assure that the problem has a finite solution.

It is expected that this kind of optimizer works well when stochastic perturbations are minimal, because it supposes that function evaluation is exact. This could, anyhow, lead to problems when working with real quantum computers that are subject to low decoherence times. However, there is no proof in the literature that this algorithm will not converge with stochastic perturbations, thus we aim to test this case to see if it converges with the presence of noise.

For the trust region the user needs to choose an initial ($\rho_{\text{init}}$) value that represents the exploration on the objective function landscape which decreases by half after each iteration in order to find the minimum of the objective function subjected to the given constraints. For our optimization procedure we choose $\rho_{\text{init}} = 1$.

\section{SWAP Test}

SWAP test is an algorithm that gives as a result the state overlap between two quantum states $\rho$ and $\sigma$.

There are two proposals for a SWAP test in the literature which are equivalent to each other. The original SWAP test \cite{28} that uses a controlled-SWAP operation and an auxiliary qubit to measure the overlap, and the Destructive SWAP test \cite{29} which only uses first neighbor connectivity, CNOT and 1 qubit gates to measure the overlap.

The SWAP test is depicted on FIGURE 2 and consists of the application of Hadamard and Controlled-SWAP gates, and it is measured using the auxiliary qubit. The probability on measuring the $|0\rangle$ state encodes the overlap between $\rho$ and $\sigma$

\begin{equation}
|\langle \rho | \sigma \rangle|^2 = 2 \left( P(0) - \frac{1}{2} \right)
\end{equation}

where $P(0)$ is the probability of the outcome on the auxiliary qubit being 0.

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=0.5\textwidth]{fig2.png}
\caption{Circuit representation of the SWAP test for states $\rho$ and $\sigma$, this is done using controlled-SWAP gate and 1 qubit gates.}
\end{figure}

The Destructive SWAP test is represented on FIGURE 3 which consists of CNOT and Hadamard Gates and no auxiliary qubit. This algorithm has depth $O(1)$ which makes it suited for NISQ devices and has demonstrated its superiority against the original SWAP Test \cite{29}.

In order to obtain the state overlap one ought to do measurements in the Bell basis for the corresponding qubit in each state. Those measurements can be achieved with a classical post-processing step that scales linearly with qubit size. This post-processing can be interpreted as the expectation value of a controlled-Z observable.

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=0.5\textwidth]{fig3.png}
\caption{Destructive SWAP test for states $\rho$ and $\sigma$, after the measurement on the Bell basis it is needed to do a post-processing classically.}
\end{figure}

It is important to analyze the topology needed for these algorithms to be used in real quantum hardware that are available through the cloud. In order to implement the SWAP test \cite{28} in real hardware, even though the cost of a swap gate is high depending on the hardware topology, we could implement it without making various re-routing of qubits. This topology is supported by the IonQ device provided by Amazon Braket \cite{30}.

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=0.5\textwidth]{fig4.png}
\caption{Hardware topology needed for the SWAP Test.}
\end{figure}

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=0.5\textwidth]{fig5.png}
\caption{Hardware topology needed for the Destructive SWAP Test.}
\end{figure}

In order to implement the Destructive SWAP test in real hardware, it is necessary to have a specific hardware topology that is represented in FIGURE 5. Where the first row of the graph encodes one quantum state and the second encodes the second quantum state and near-neighbor connection between them is used for the Destructive SWAP test. There are actual devices that support this kind of topology, for instance there is the Melbourne chip from IBMQ \cite{31} and the IonQ device provided by Amazon Braket \cite{30}.
III. RESULTS

In order to demonstrate our proposed method, we choose to simulate it both on ideal and noisy quantum computers for the case of $N = 2$ cooper pairs, because the system is solvable using direct diagonalization, and we can compare results between the result of direct diagonalization and the result using a quantum computer.

The two-qubit Hamiltonian that we aim to solve is given by:

\[ H_Q = \frac{1}{2} \left[ \epsilon_1 \sigma_1^z + \epsilon_2 \sigma_2^z + V (\sigma_1^x \sigma_2^x + \sigma_1^y \sigma_2^y) \right] \] (11)

This leads to a spectrum with ground-state given by $E^\pm_0 = \pm (\epsilon_0 + \epsilon_1)/2$ and excited states $E^\pm_1 = \pm \sqrt{\epsilon^2 + 4V^2}/2$, where $\epsilon^2 = (\epsilon_0 - \epsilon_1)^2$.

In the computational basis, $\{ |00\rangle, |01\rangle, |10\rangle, |11\rangle \}$, each $1$ value for the qubit represents a cooper pair, thus we have states with $n = 0, 1, 1, 2$ cooper pairs respectively. An interesting parameter that we can obtain for this Hamiltonian, as mentioned before, is the $n = 1$ gap: $2\Delta_1 = E^+_1 - E^-_1$.

This section will be divided in two subsections in which different parameters of the simulation will be considered. The first section III A will be the simulation performed by a perfect quantum computer, and the second III B will be the simulation subject to a noise model.

A. Ideal Quantum Computer

We will consider a perfect Quantum computer without any noise for the first experiment. The purpose of this experiment is two-fold: firstly to show that the algorithm works in an ideal setting. Secondly, it will be fair comparison when we analyze the case with noise, which is of main importance for running Variational Quantum Algorithms in NISQ devices.

In order to estimate the depth needed to simulate the Hamiltonian from equation (11) we run the algorithm changing the depth of the ansatz and estimate the gap, this is shown on FIGURE 6.

According to the figure, we see that a depth of 3 is needed to find a reasonable solution for both optimizers to solve the BCS problem, because it is within 1 standard deviation of the statistical sample.

However, it is observed that for the SPSA optimizer the increase in depth can also lead to higher variance on the samples, this is expected since increasing the depth of the ansatz also leads to a linear increment in the number of parameters, this shows that for this instance the gradient-free optimizer works better for this kind of problem.

FIG. 6. A plot analyzing the depth needed to solve the problem using a Hardware Efficient Ansatz where we took the statistics of 50 runs of the algorithm with random initialization and comparing between COBYLA and SPSA optimizers. Analysis of the Optimizer performance, where we used $c = 0.7$ and took the average of the last 25 $\lambda_k$ for the final $\lambda_k$ value on the SPSA. As the depth of the circuit increases, the algorithm converges to the solution that is obtained through direct diagonalization.

After defining the depth needed to solve the problem, we benchmark the problem of finding the $n = 1$ gap by changing the coupling parameter $V$, with parameters $\epsilon = \epsilon_1 = \epsilon_2 = 3$. This is done by calculating the first and second excited states of the Hamiltonian. Both optimizers are able to solve the gap problem within 1 standard deviation, which is demonstrated on FIGURE 7.

However, only the COBYLA optimizer is able to show the expected trend on the mean value. This is due to the need to tune the hyperparameters for each case of the SPSA optimizer.

B. Noisy Quantum Computer

In this work we choose the Thermal Relaxation Error \[32\] as our noise model which represents the thermalization of the
qubit towards the equilibrium state at the temperature of the environment. This is an irreversible process that is governed by the gate time $T_2$, relaxation times $T_1$, $T_2$, and device temperature $T$ which all can be obtained during the device calibration.

Since the device is kept at a temperature very close to the absolute zero, it is safe to assume that $T \approx 0$. This assumption implies that there is no excited state population, which is given by the equation:

$$p_e = \left(1 + \exp\left(\frac{2\hbar f}{k_B T}\right)\right)^{-1}$$  \hspace{1cm} (12)

Where $T$ is the device’s temperature, $f$ is the qubit frequency, $k_B$ is Boltzmann’s constant, and $\hbar$ is Planck’s constant. Under this assumption we have two sources of noise, dephasing and reset to $|0\rangle$.

The relaxation error rates are defined as $\epsilon_{T_1} = e^{-T_1/T}$ and $\epsilon_{T_2} = e^{-T_2/T}$ and the reset probability is defined as $p_{\text{reset}} = 1 - \epsilon_{T_2}$.

There are two behaviors for this kind of noise: $T_2 \leq T_1$, and $T_2 > T_1$.

For the case $T_2 \leq T_1$ we can represent the Thermal Relaxation Error as a probabilistic mixture of reset operations and unitary errors.

The probability of a dephasing happening is given by $p_Z = 1 - p_{\text{reset}} = 1 - \epsilon_{T_2}$. The probability of a reset to $|0\rangle$ operation occurring is given by $p_{\text{reset}} = (1 - p_e)p_{\text{reset}}$. The probability of no noise occurring is given by $P_0 = 1 - p_Z - p_{\text{reset}}$.

Under these conditions, the error model has a Kraus representation as:

$$K_i = \sqrt{p_i} I$$
$$K_Z = \sqrt{p_Z} Z$$
$$K_{\text{reset}} = \sqrt{p_{\text{reset}}} |i\rangle \langle 0|$$

(13)

The relaxation noise is represented as the following channel:

$$\rho \mapsto \mathcal{N}(\rho) = \sum_j K_j \rho K_j^\dagger$$

(14)

For the case $T_2 > T_1$, the error can be represented by a Choi-Matrix representation. Considering $T \approx 0$, the Choi-Matrix of the Thermal relaxation noise is given by [33]:

$$
\begin{pmatrix}
1 & 0 & 0 & \epsilon_{T_1} \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & p_{\text{reset}} & 0 \\
\epsilon_{T_2} & 0 & 0 & 1 - p_{\text{reset}}
\end{pmatrix}
$$

(15)

Using the Choi-Matrix representation it is possible to find the Kraus operators and consequently find the channel for the noise.

It is important to evaluate if the Variational Quantum Algorithm that we are using is resilient to noise in order to run in NISQ devices. Thus, we apply the same methodology as the Ideal Quantum Computer section [11A] under the presence of noise.

We first vary the ansatz depth in order to find the number of layers on the ansatz, and we see a similar trend when comparing the analysis with and without noise, however the SPSA optimizer seems to behave not as well as the COBYLA optimizer which shows convergence when the depth increases.

This shows that just as without noise we have a good convergence when the depth of the ansatz is equal to 3, just like the case without noise.

FIG. 8. A plot analyzing the depth needed to solve the problem using a Hardware Efficient Ansatz where we took the statistics of 10 runs of the algorithm with random initialization and compare between COBYLA and SPSA optimizers. Analysis of the Optimizer performance, where we used $c = 0.7$ and took the average of the last 25 $\lambda_k$ for the final $\lambda_k$ value on the SPSA.

After defining the depth, we apply for the same case varying $V$ on the Hamiltonian and using $\epsilon = \epsilon_1 = \epsilon_2 = 3$. We observe that for this case, both COBYLA and SPSA optimizers have demonstrated a linear trend which is expected when the coupling parameter $V$ is changed.

Even though we used $\epsilon = \epsilon_1 = \epsilon_2$, we could choose $\epsilon_1 \neq \epsilon_2$ without any loss to our algorithm, these values were chosen because it would demonstrate a linear trend on the BCS gap, other conditions would lead to non-linear relation when varying the coupling parameter.

FIG. 9. Analysis of the Optimizer performance, where we used $c = 0.7$ and took the average of the last 25 $\lambda_k$ for the final $\lambda_k$ value on the SPSA.

IV. CONCLUSION

In this paper we have explored solving the BCS Hamiltonian through the Wu et al. [12] mapping using Near-Term
Quantum Computers through a Variational Quantum Algorithm.

The algorithm that was used is called Variational Quantum Deflation (VQD) and we were able to obtain the $n = 1$ gap of a two qubit BCS Hamiltonian within 1 standard deviation considering random initialization, showing that the algorithm works and is not highly dependent of the initialization of the random parameters.

We also analyzed both gradient and gradient-free optimizers in order to search for variational parameters that solve our task. For the gradient-based optimizer we chose Simultaneous Perturbation Stochastic Approximation (SPSA) and for the gradient-free we chose constraint functions by linear interpolation (COBYLA). Showing that even in the presence of Thermal Relaxation noise the COBYLA optimizer have a good convergence for solving the BCS gap problem, even though it is assumed to be a bad optimizer when the cost function has stochastic noise.

This work shows promising ways to solve the BCS Hamiltonian in near-term quantum computers, which could be extended for an arbitrary number of cooper pairs. For future works, we aim to explore an ansatz that is tailor-made for the Hamiltonian in order to avoid the Barren Plateaus problem and have a better optimization convergence. Another direction is to analyze in more depth the objective function landscape of the VQD algorithm and see if the barren plateau problem is present in this Variational Quantum Algorithm.
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