

On the gate-error robustness of variational quantum algorithms

Daniil Rabinovich,¹ Ernesto Campos,¹ Soumik Adhikary,¹ Ekaterina Pankovets,^{1,2} Dmitry Vinichenko,^{1,3} and Jacob Biamonte⁴

¹*Skolkovo Institute of Science and Technology, Moscow, Russian Federation*

²*Moscow Institute of Physics and Technology, Moscow, Russian Federation*

³*Moscow Engineering Physics Institute, Moscow, Russian Federation*

⁴*Beijing Institute of Mathematical Sciences and Applications, Beijing, China*

Variational quantum algorithms are tailored to perform within the constraints of current quantum devices, yet they are limited by performance-degrading errors. In this study, we consider a noise model that reflects realistic gate errors inherent to variational quantum algorithms. We investigate the decoherence of a variationally prepared quantum state due to this noise model, which causes a deviation from the energy estimation in the variational approach. By performing a perturbative analysis of optimized circuits, we determine the noise threshold at which the criteria set by the stability lemma is met. We assess our findings against the variational quantum approximate optimization algorithm for 3-SAT problem instances and unstructured search with up to 10 qubits and 30 layers. Moreover, we show that certain gate errors have a significantly smaller impact on the coherence of the state, allowing us to reduce the execution time without compromising performance.

I. INTRODUCTION

Noisy Intermediate Scale Quantum (NISQ) computing [1] is constrained by limited coherence times and operation precision [2–5], which restrict the number of qubits and circuit depths that can be implemented with reasonable fidelity. This limits the range of possible experimental demonstrations. The variational model of quantum computation is tailored to operate within these practical limitations [6–8], and has been shown to be computationally universal under idealized conditions [9]. Similar to machine learning, a variational algorithm employs a parameterized quantum circuit, called an ansatz, that is iteratively adjusted to minimize a cost function in a quantum-to-classical feedback loop [10]. The cost function usually takes the form of the expectation of a problem Hamiltonian, where the ground state of the problem Hamiltonian represents the solution to a given problem instance. By minimizing the cost function (energy), a variational algorithm aims to approximate the ground state of the Hamiltonian. However, this approach does not guarantee the quality of the approximate solution, which is typically measured by the overlap between the state prepared by the ansatz and the true ground state. Nonetheless, the overlap can be bounded. Using the stability lemma [9], it has been demonstrated that the bounds can be directly linked to the energy, allowing us to determine the energy threshold (upper bound) required to ensure a minimum (fixed) overlap. We refer to this as the acceptance threshold, and a state with an energy below this threshold is considered accepted by the algorithm.

Variational algorithms are designed to mitigate some of the systematic limitations of NISQ devices [8, 11–13]. However, these algorithms are still susceptible to stochastic noise. While there is some evidence that variational algorithms can benefit from a certain level of stochastic noise [14], in general, noise negatively impacts their

performance by inducing decoherence and impacting solution quality.

In this paper, we investigate how errors in the form of parameter deviations impact the performance of variational algorithms when operated at their noiseless optimal parameters. We analytically demonstrate that the energy shift varies quadratically with the spread of parameter deviation, equivalent to an energy shift linear with respect to the gate error probabilities for various noise models [15]. We validate our findings using the quantum approximate optimization algorithm on two common problems: 3-SAT [16] and unstructured search [17, 18]. We also observe that the performance of the algorithm is more resilient to alterations in certain parameters. Based on these findings, we propose methods to potentially enhance performance and reduce the execution time of variational quantum algorithms.

II. PRELIMINARIES

A. Variational Quantum Approximate Optimization

The quantum approximate optimization algorithm (QAOA) [19], originally designed to approximately solve combinatorial optimization problems [16, 19–30], consists of ansatz circuits expressive enough to (in theory) emulate any quantum circuit [21, 22].

Consider a pseudo-Boolean function $\mathcal{C} : \{0, 1\}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, the objective of the algorithm is to approximate a bit string that minimizes \mathcal{C} . To accomplish this, \mathcal{C} is first encoded as a problem Hamiltonian H , diagonal in the computational basis. The ground state of H encodes the solution to the problem; in other words QAOA searches for a solution $|g\rangle$ such that $\langle g|H|g\rangle = \min H$.

The algorithm begins with an ansatz state $|\psi_p(\gamma, \beta)\rangle$ —

prepared by a circuit of depth p — parameterized as:

$$|\psi_p(\gamma, \beta)\rangle = \prod_{k=1}^p e^{-i\beta_k H_x} e^{-i\gamma_k H} |+\rangle^{\otimes n}, \quad (1)$$

with real parameters $\gamma_k \in [0, 2\pi)$, $\beta_k \in [0, \pi)$. Here $H_x = \sum_{j=1}^n X_j$ is the standard one-body mixer Hamiltonian with Pauli matrix X_j applied to the j -th qubit. The cost function is given by the expectation of the problem Hamiltonian with respect to the ansatz state. The algorithm minimizes this cost function to output:

$$E^* = \min_{\gamma, \beta} \langle \psi_p(\gamma, \beta) | H | \psi_p(\gamma, \beta) \rangle \quad (2)$$

$$\gamma^*, \beta^* \in \arg \min_{\gamma, \beta} \langle \psi_p(\gamma, \beta) | H | \psi_p(\gamma, \beta) \rangle \quad (3)$$

Here, $|\psi_p(\gamma^*, \beta^*)\rangle$ is the approximate ground state of H and hence the approximate solution to \mathcal{C} . Indeed, the quality of the approximation, quantified as the overlap between the true solution and the approximate solution, is not known a priori from (2). Nevertheless one can establish bounds on this quantity using the so called stability lemma.

B. Stability lemma

The stability lemma states that if $|g\rangle$ is the true ground state of H with energy E_g and Δ is the spectral gap (the difference between the ground state energy and the energy of the first excited state) the following relation holds [9, 31]:

$$1 - \frac{E^* - E_g}{\Delta} \leq |\langle \psi_p(\gamma^*, \beta^*) | g \rangle|^2 \leq 1 - \frac{E^* - E_g}{E_m - E_g} \quad (4)$$

where E_m is the maximum eigenvalue of H . Thus to guarantee a non-trivial overlap one must ensure that $E^* \leq E_g + \Delta$. We call the latter the acceptance condition.

III. VARIATIONAL QUANTUM ALGORITHMS IN THE PRESENCE OF REALISTIC GATE ERRORS

Implementation of unitary operations depends significantly on the considered hardware. However, typically the implementation makes use of electromagnetic pulses, such as in superconducting quantum computers [32, 33], neutral atom based quantum computers [34, 35], and trapped ion based quantum computers [8, 36]. Such pulses can change the population of the energy levels that constitute a qubit or introduce phases to the quantum amplitudes, thus controlling the state of the qubits. Consequently, the main contribution to gate errors comes from variation in pulse shaping, meaning that amplitude

and timing of electromagnetic pulse can stochastically vary. In certain experimental setups, such as ground state ion qubits, where entangling operations are performed using the radial phonon modes [37], the variability in pulse shaping is the main source of gate errors.

Angles of rotation in a typical gate operation depend on time averaged intensity $I(t)$ of the electromagnetic pulse; $\theta \propto \int I(t) dt$. Thus, variations in the pulse shaping lead to stochastic deviations of the angles of rotations from the desired values. In other words, if a circuit is composed of the parameterised gates $\{U_k(\theta_k)\}_{k=1}^q$; $\theta_k \in [0, 2\pi)$ and one tries to prepare a state $|\psi(\theta)\rangle = \prod_{k=1}^q U_k(\theta_k) |\psi_0\rangle$, a different state

$$|\psi(\theta + \delta\theta)\rangle = \prod_{k=1}^q U_k(\theta_k + \delta\theta_k) |\psi_0\rangle, \quad (5)$$

is prepared instead due to the presence of errors. Notice here that the perturbation $\delta\theta$ to the parameters is stochastic and is sampled with a certain probability density $p(\delta\theta)$. This implies that the prepared state can be described by an ensemble $\{|\psi(\theta + \delta\theta)\rangle, p(\delta\theta)\}$, which we can equivalently view as a density matrix

$$\rho(\theta) = \int_{\delta\theta \in [-\pi, \pi]^{\times q}} p(\delta\theta) |\psi(\theta + \delta\theta)\rangle \langle \psi(\theta + \delta\theta)| d(\delta\theta). \quad (6)$$

Eq. (6) represents a noise model native to the variational paradigm of quantum computing. For the rest of this paper we systematically study the effect of this noise model on the performance of QAOA for instances of 3-SAT and the unstructured search problem (see appendix A for more details on the considered problems). In particular we study the energy perturbation around E^* in different scenarios subsequently recovering the strength of noise under which the acceptance condition continues to be satisfied.

IV. RESULTS

A. Perturbative analysis in presence of gate errors

Consider a problem Hamiltonian H and a variational ansatz $|\psi(\theta)\rangle = U_1(\theta_1) \dots U_q(\theta_q) |\psi_0\rangle$ used to minimize H . Here the gates $U_k(\theta_k)$ have the form:

$$U_k(\theta_k) = e^{iA_k\theta_k}, A_k^2 = \mathbb{1}, \quad (7)$$

A typical example of such an ansatz is the checkerboard ansatz, with Mølmer-Sørensen (MS) gates as the entangling two qubit gates. Nevertheless, any quantum circuit can admit a decomposition in terms of operations that satisfy (7); this adds generality to this assumption.

In the presence of gate errors the prepared quantum state decoheres as $|\psi(\theta)\rangle \rightarrow \rho(\theta)$ as per (6). To obtain the analytic form of $\rho(\theta)$ we first note that

$$U_k(\theta_k + \delta\theta_k) = U_k(\theta_k)U_k(\delta\theta_k) = \cos \delta\theta_k U_k(\theta_k) + \sin \delta\theta_k U_k\left(\theta_k + \frac{\pi}{2}\right).$$

This follows directly from (7). Therefore we get:

$$|\psi(\boldsymbol{\theta} + \boldsymbol{\delta\theta})\rangle\langle\psi(\boldsymbol{\theta} + \boldsymbol{\delta\theta})| = \sum_{k_1, \dots, k_q, m_1, \dots, m_q=0}^1 (\cos^2 \delta\theta_1 \tan^{k_1+m_1} \delta\theta_1) \dots (\cos^2 \delta\theta_q \tan^{k_q+m_q} \delta\theta_q) |\psi_{k_1 \dots k_q}\rangle\langle\psi_{m_1 \dots m_q}|, \quad (8)$$

where

$$|\psi_{k_1 \dots k_q}\rangle = U_1(\theta_1 + k_1 \frac{\pi}{2}) \dots U_q(\theta_q + k_q \frac{\pi}{2}) |\psi_0\rangle. \quad (9)$$

Here we make three realistic assumptions—(a) perturbations to all the angles are independent, (b) mean perturbation $\langle\delta\theta_k\rangle = 0$ and (c) the distribution $p(\delta\theta_k)$ vanishes quickly outside the range $(-\sigma_k, \sigma_k)$; that is, the error is localized on the scale $\sigma_k \ll 1$. Note that even if assumption (b) does not hold, as long as mean value $\langle\delta\theta_k\rangle$ is independent from the angle θ_k , one can always shift the parameters as $\theta_k \rightarrow \theta_k - \langle\delta\theta_k\rangle$ to avoid non-zero mean. Otherwise, terms linear in $\langle\delta\theta_k\rangle$ could contribute to the energy perturbation [38].

Substituting (8) in (6) we arrive at the expression:

$$\rho(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = |\psi(\boldsymbol{\theta})\rangle\langle\psi(\boldsymbol{\theta})| + \delta\rho, \quad (10)$$

where

$$\delta\rho \approx - \sum_{k=1}^q a_k |\psi(\boldsymbol{\theta})\rangle\langle\psi(\boldsymbol{\theta})| + \sum_{k=1}^q a_k |\psi_k\rangle\langle\psi_k| + o(\sigma_k^2). \quad (11)$$

Here $|\psi_k\rangle = |\psi_{00\dots 1\dots 00}\rangle$ with 1 placed in the k -th position, and

$$a_k \equiv \langle\sin^2 \delta\theta_k\rangle = \int \sin^2 \delta\theta_k p(\delta\theta_k) d(\delta\theta_k) \sim \sigma_k^2. \quad (12)$$

Notice that (11) can be viewed as the action of certain noisy channel, where each of the gates is altered with probability $a_k \sim \sigma_k^2$. In this sense, we call a_k 's gate error probabilities, though this treatment is specific to the interpretation of the noisy channel.

Notice that the derivation above does not require $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ to be a minimum of the noiseless cost function. Let us now assume that $\boldsymbol{\theta}^*$ is a vector of parameters such that $|\psi(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*)\rangle$ approximates the ground state of H . The noise induced energy perturbation around the optimal energy E^* is given as:

$$\begin{aligned} \delta E &= \text{Tr}(\rho(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*)H) - \langle\psi(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*)|H|\psi(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*)\rangle \\ &= \sum_k (\langle\psi_k|H|\psi_k\rangle - E^*) a_k \leq (E_m - E^*) \sum_k a_k, \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

which demonstrates that energy perturbation depends linearly on the gate error probabilities a_k (quadratic in σ_k) [15].

For the simplest case where each parameter is sampled from the same distribution ($\sigma_k = \sigma$) we can roughly estimate:

$$\delta E \leq q\sigma^2(E_m - E^*). \quad (14)$$

Thus, requesting an energy threshold $E \leq E_g + \Delta$, we

conclude that for $\sigma \lesssim \sqrt{\frac{\Delta - (E^* - E_g)}{q(E_m - E^*)}}$ the acceptance condition is still satisfied.

While our perturbative analysis holds for all variational algorithms, we substantiate our findings numerically using QAOA. In particular we solve instances of 3-SAT and unstructured search problems to study the behaviour of energy perturbation around E^* caused by the presence of gate errors.

1. Constant perturbation

We begin with a simplified version of the noise model proposed in (6). We ran QAOA for 100 uniformly generated 3-SAT instances of 6, 8, and 10 variables with 26, 34 and 42 clauses respectively. All the instances were selected to have a unique satisfying assignment. The instances were minimized by QAOA sequences of 15, 25 and 30 layers respectively in order to obtain expected values well below the energy gap. In order to numerically verify the behaviour of the energy perturbation, we vary all optimal parameters by a constant angle δ . Figure 1 illustrates the shift in the energy for the minimized instances, which can be seen to have a quadratic dependence of the perturbed energy δE with respect to the shift δ . This is natural to expect since the parameters deviate from the local minimum, where linear contribution must have vanished (a rigorous expression showing the quadratic behavior is derived in appendix B).

Similar to the case of 3-SAT, for the problem of unstructured search we perturb optimal parameters of the circuit by an angle δ and plot corresponding energy in Fig. 2. Again, as expected, for small values of δ the energy perturbation is quadratic which comes from the fact that the deviation happens around the minimum.




FIG. 1. Energy shift obtained by perturbing the ansatz state as $|\psi_p(\gamma^* + \delta, \beta^* + \delta)\rangle$. The curves illustrate averages over 100 uniformly generated 3-SAT instances of 6, 8 and 10 qubits with clause to variable ratio of 4.2 and unique satisfying assignment. The error bars depict standard error. Polynomial fits of data in range $\delta \in [0, 0.02]$ indicates quadratic behaviour.




FIG. 2. Energy shift for the problem of unstructured search obtained by perturbing of the ansatz state as $|\psi_p(\gamma^* + \delta, \beta^* + \delta)\rangle$. Polynomial fits for data points of 6, 8 and 10 qubits follow quadratic curves in the ranges $\delta \in [0, 0.02]$, $[0, 0.01]$, $[0, 0.008]$ respectively.

2. Stochastic perturbation

We now consider the complete noise model in (6) and verify our analytical prediction as shown in (14). For each 3-SAT instance, we randomly sample perturbations δ to each of the gates from a uniform distribution on the interval $(-\sigma, \sigma)$ and average the obtained energy. Then we average energies over instances of the same number of qubits as depicted in Fig. 3. It is seen that for small values of noise the energy scales as $\delta E \propto \sigma^2$, as per (14), which is equivalent to linear dependence on the gate error probabilities a_k . It is seen, that the value $\sigma \sim 0.075$ could never violate the acceptance criteria, as corresponding energy error never exceeds the gap $\Delta \geq 1$. For smaller number of qubits and gates the threshold value of σ increases.




FIG. 3. Average energy shift of 100 uniformly generated 3-SAT instances of 6, 8 and 10 qubits with clause to variable ratio of 4.2 and unique satisfying assignment. The shifts are obtained by the perturbation of γ^* , β^* by δ uniformly sampled from the range $(-\sigma, \sigma)$. Error bars depict standard error. Polynomial fits of data indicate that in the range $\sigma \in [0, 0.1]$ $\delta E \propto \sigma^2$.




FIG. 4. Average energy for the problem of unstructured search obtained by the perturbation of γ^* , β^* by δ uniformly sampled from the range $(-\sigma, \sigma)$. Error bars depict standard error. Polynomial fits of data points of 6, 8 and 10 qubits in the ranges $\sigma \in [0, 0.1]$, $[0, 0.07]$, $[0, 0.05]$, respectively confirm that $\delta E \propto \sigma^2$.

For unstructured search, we average the energy over δ sampled for each gate from the uniform distribution $(-\sigma, \sigma)$. We again recover that $\delta E \propto \sigma^2$, as depicted in Fig. 4. It is seen that the same threshold $\sigma \sim 0.075$ now increases energy by no more than 0.6, which guaranties 40% overlap with the target state.

B. Perturbation to individual parameters

Here we consider a modified version of (6), where parameters are perturbed one at a time while the rest are kept intact. Effect of this model on the energy is illustrated in Figures 5 and 6 for $n = 10$ qubits. Similar results were also obtained for $n = 6$ and $n = 8$ qubits. The results are numerical and are yet to be explained

analytically. We observe that perturbations to certain angles have a significantly smaller effect on the energy. Thus we can infer that reducing the values of such angles would not have a significant effect on performance but will reduce the execution time of the circuit, that is $t_{exec} = \sum_{k=1}^p \beta_k + \gamma_k$. Alternatively, increasing depth to $p + 1$ while limiting the maximum execution time to that of the original circuit, $t_{exec}^{p+1} \leq t_{max}^{p+1} = t_{exec}^p$, one can potentially improve performance.




FIG. 5. Energy $\langle H \rangle = \langle \psi(\theta^* + \delta\theta) | H | \psi(\theta^* + \delta\theta) \rangle$ obtained for the unstructured search on $n = 10$ qubits with $p = 25$ layers, when only β_k (top) and γ_k (bottom) are perturbed.

Reducing the execution time is important to quantum algorithms, since variational parameters are proportional to the time required to execute the gates experimentally. NISQ era devices suffer from limited coherence, thus reducing execution times can lead to more efficient hardware utilization [39, 40]. We test these ideas in the setting of unstructured search, as depicted in Fig. 7. Here we demonstrate the optimized QAOA energies for 6 qubits at multiple depths with execution time limited to t_{max} . The highlighted green and orange rectangles correspond to the two groups of optimal angles that minimize the energy at each depth, as presented in [17]. Green rectangles also indicate the depth and t_{exec} at which the ansatz will not be able to decrease its energy by either increasing depth or t_{max} . Following the observations of Fig. 5, by slightly reducing t_{max} the optimizer may reduce the parameters to which the energy is less sensitive. This results in a slight energy increase as illustrated in Fig. 7




FIG. 6. Average energy $\langle H \rangle = \langle \psi(\theta^* + \delta\theta) | H | \psi(\theta^* + \delta\theta) \rangle$ of 100 uniformly generated 3-SAT instances solved with $p = 30$ layers, where β_k (top) or γ_k (bottom), from the k -th layer, are perturbed. The instances are of 10 qubits with clause to variable ratio of 4.2 and unique satisfying assignment.

where to the left of the green rectangles we can observe darkening gradients.

By contrast, orange rectangles highlight longer execution times corresponding to different sets of angles that also minimize the energy for a given number of layers. Therefore, if the optimization routine finds the solution corresponding to the orange rectangle, setting t_{max} to be slightly less than the t_{exec} of the orange rectangle will lead the optimizer to find angles corresponding to the green rectangle. This will amount to a considerable reduction in execution time. Alternatively, increasing the number of layers while keeping t_{max} constant may reduce the energy.

In general, for an arbitrary problem Hamiltonian one can not be sure if optimization has returned the ideal set of angles (green ones in our example). For this reason, one might employ several strategies based on Fig. 7 to achieve a minimum threshold energy. These include—to reduce t_{max} until energy starts degrading or increase depth with fixed t_{max} until performance stagnates.




FIG. 7. Expected value for multiple combinations of depth for maximum execution times. Green and orange rectangles depict the two branches of angles that minimize expectation value for a given depth.

V. DISCUSSION

In this study, we considered a noise model where variational gate parameters are stochastically perturbed, and we demonstrated how this perturbation affects the optimised energy E^* . Through a perturbative analysis, we found that the change in energy δE due to the presence of the gate errors behaves quadratically with respect to the spread of parameter deviations, which is equivalent to linear dependence on the gate error probabilities. Using this result, we derived upper bounds on the amount of perturbation that can be tolerated while still satisfying the acceptance condition and achieving a fixed overlap between the target state and the state prepared by the noisy variational circuit.

Our analytical findings are confirmed by numerical simulations of the quantum approximate optimisation algorithm (QAOA) for two common problems - 3-SAT and unstructured search - using different modifications of the considered noise model. Our numerical results further showed that the algorithmic performance is more resilient to perturbations of certain variational parameters. Based on this observation, we proposed a strategy to improve performance and reduce the execution time of variational quantum algorithms. Specifically, we showed that the

performance of QAOA (with execution time t_{exec}) is not affected when limiting the maximum execution time to $t_{max} = t_{exec} - \epsilon$ for $\epsilon \ll t_{exec}$. We also demonstrated that in some cases reducing t_{max} can lead to significant reductions in t_{exec} , while increasing the depth of the algorithm can lead to an energy reduction while fixing t_{exec} .

Whereas our study primarily focused on energy perturbations around the noiseless optimum θ^* , in practice, one has to train the algorithm in the presence of noise, which can change the optimal angles θ^* to $\theta^* + \delta\theta^*$, where the shift $\delta\theta^*$ increases with the strength of the noise. However, using perturbation theory around the noiseless optimum, one can estimate $\delta\theta^* = O(\sigma^2)$ in the regime of weak noise, and the corresponding change in the energy is $\text{Tr}(\rho(\theta^* + \delta\theta^*)H) - \text{Tr}(\rho(\theta^*)H) = O(\sigma^4)$. Therefore, in the regime of weak noise, one can safely use the noiseless optimum θ^* . For detailed calculations, please refer to appendix C.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

D.R., E.C., S.A., E.P., D.V. acknowledge support from the research project, Leading Research Center on Quantum Computing (agreement No. 014/20).

-
- [1] John Preskill. Quantum computing in the nisq era and beyond. *Quantum*, 2:79, 2018.
 - [2] Johannes Weidenfeller, Lucia C Valor, Julien Gacon, Caroline Tornow, Luciano Bello, Stefan Woerner, and Daniel J Egger. Scaling of the quantum approximate optimization algorithm on superconducting qubit based hardware. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2202.03459*, 2022.
 - [3] Alexander K Ratcliffe, Richard L Taylor, Joseph J Hope, and André RR Carvalho. Scaling trapped ion quantum computers using fast gates and microtraps. *Physical Review Letters*, 120(22):220501, 2018.
 - [4] Swathi S Hegde, Jingfu Zhang, and Dieter Suter. Toward the speed limit of high-fidelity two-qubit gates. *Physical Review Letters*, 128(23):230502, 2022.
 - [5] Adam R Mills, Charles R Guinn, Michael J Gullans, Anthony J Sigillito, Mayer M Feldman, Erik Nielsen, and Jason R Petta. Two-qubit silicon quantum processor with operation fidelity exceeding 99%. *Science Advances*, 8(14):eabn5130, 2022.

2022.

- [6] Abhinav Kandala, Antonio Mezzacapo, Kristan Temme, Maika Takita, Markus Brink, Jerry M Chow, and Jay M Gambetta. Hardware-efficient variational quantum eigensolver for small molecules and quantum magnets. *Nature*, 549(7671):242–246, 2017.
- [7] Daniil Rabinovich, Soumik Adhikary, Ernesto Campos, Vishwanathan Akshay, Evgeny Anikin, Richik Sengupta, Olga Lakhmanskaya, Kirill Lakhmanskii, and Jacob Biamonte. Ion-native variational ansatz for quantum approximate optimization. *Phys. Rev. A*, 106:032418, Sep 2022.
- [8] Guido Pagano, Aniruddha Bapat, Patrick Becker, Katherine S Collins, Arinjoy De, Paul W Hess, Harvey B Kaplan, Antonis Kyprianidis, Wen Lin Tan, Christopher Baldwin, et al. Quantum approximate optimization of the long-range ising model with a trapped-ion quantum simulator. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 117(41):25396–25401, 2020.
- [9] Jacob Biamonte. Universal variational quantum computation. *Physical Review A*, 103(3):L030401, 2021.
- [10] Marco Cerezo, Andrew Arrasmith, Ryan Babbush, Simon C Benjamin, Suguru Endo, Keisuke Fujii, Jarrod R McClean, Kosuke Mitarai, Xiao Yuan, Lukasz Cincio, et al. Variational quantum algorithms. *Nature Reviews Physics*, 3(9):625–644, 2021.
- [11] Matthew P Harrigan, Kevin J Sung, Matthew Neeley, Kevin J Satzinger, Frank Arute, Kunal Arya, Juan Atalaya, Joseph C Bardin, Rami Barends, Sergio Boixo, et al. Quantum approximate optimization of non-planar graph problems on a planar superconducting processor. *Nature Physics*, 17(3):332–336, 2021.
- [12] Gian Giacomo Guerreschi and Anne Y Matsuura. Qaoa for max-cut requires hundreds of qubits for quantum speed-up. *Scientific reports*, 9(1):1–7, 2019.
- [13] Anastasiia Butko, George Micheliogiannakis, Samuel Williams, Costin Iancu, David Donofrio, John Shalf, Jonathan Carter, and Irfan Siddiqi. Understanding quantum control processor capabilities and limitations through circuit characterization. In *2020 International Conference on Rebooting Computing (ICRC)*, pages 66–75, 2020.
- [14] E Campos, D Rabinovich, V Akshay, and J Biamonte. Training saturation in layerwise quantum approximate optimisation. *(Letter) Physical Review A*, 104:L030401, 2021.
- [15] Kieran Dalton, Christopher K. Long, Yordan S. Yordanov, Charles G. Smith, Crispin H. W. Barnes, Normann Mertig, and David R. M. Arvidsson-Shukur. Variational quantum chemistry requires gate-error probabilities below the fault-tolerance threshold, 2022.
- [16] V. Akshay, H. Philathong, M. E.S. Morales, and J. D. Biamonte. Reachability Deficits in Quantum Approximate Optimization. *Physical Review Letters*, 124(9):090504, Mar 2020.
- [17] Vishwanathan Akshay, Daniil Rabinovich, Ernesto Campos, and Jacob Biamonte. Parameter concentrations in quantum approximate optimization. *Physical Review A*, 104(1):L010401, 2021.
- [18] Lov K Grover. A fast quantum mechanical algorithm for database search. In *Proceedings of the twenty-eighth annual ACM symposium on Theory of computing*, pages 212–219, 1996.
- [19] Edward Farhi, Jeffrey Goldstone, and Sam Gutmann. A quantum approximate optimization algorithm. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1411.4028*, 2014.
- [20] Murphy Yuezhen Niu, Sirui Lu, and Isaac L Chuang. Optimizing qaoa: Success probability and runtime dependence on circuit depth. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1905.12134*, May 2019.
- [21] Seth Lloyd. Quantum approximate optimization is computationally universal. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1812.11075*, 2018.
- [22] Mauro ES Morales, Jacob D Biamonte, and Zoltán Zimborás. On the universality of the quantum approximate optimization algorithm. *Quantum Information Processing*, 19(9):1–26, 2020.
- [23] Leo Zhou, Sheng-Tao Wang, Soonwon Choi, Hannes Pichler, and Mikhail D. Lukin. Quantum approximate optimization algorithm: Performance, mechanism, and implementation on near-term devices. *Phys. Rev. X*, 10:021067, Jun 2020.
- [24] Zhihui Wang, Nicholas C Rubin, Jason M Dominy, and Eleanor G Rieffel. X y mixers: Analytical and numerical results for the quantum alternating operator ansatz. *Physical Review A*, 101(1):012320, 2020.
- [25] Lucas T. Brady, Christopher L. Baldwin, Aniruddha Bapat, Yaroslav Kharkov, and Alexey V. Gorshkov. Optimal Protocols in Quantum Annealing and Quantum Approximate Optimization Algorithm Problems. *Physical Review Letters*, 126(7):070505, Feb 2021.
- [26] Edward Farhi and Aram W Harrow. Quantum supremacy through the quantum approximate optimization algorithm. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1602.07674*, 2016.
- [27] Edward Farhi, Jeffrey Goldstone, Sam Gutmann, and Leo Zhou. The quantum approximate optimization algorithm and the sherrington-kirkpatrick model at infinite size. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1910.08187*, Oct 2019.
- [28] Matteo M Wauters, Glen Bigan Mbeng, and Giuseppe E Santoro. Polynomial scaling of qaoa for ground-state preparation of the fully-connected p-spin ferromagnet. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2003.07419*, 2020.
- [29] Jahan Claes and Wim van Dam. Instance independence of single layer quantum approximate optimization algorithm on mixed-spin models at infinite size. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2102.12043*, 2021.
- [30] Leo Zhou, Sheng-Tao Wang, Soonwon Choi, Hannes Pichler, and Mikhail D. Lukin. Quantum approximate optimization algorithm: Performance, mechanism, and implementation on near-term devices. *Phys. Rev. X*, 10:021067, Jun 2020.
- [31] Vishwanathan Akshay, H Philathong, E Campos, Daniil Rabinovich, Igor Zacharov, Xiao-Ming Zhang, and J Biamonte. On circuit depth scaling for quantum approximate optimization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2205.01698*, 2022.
- [32] John Clarke and Frank K Wilhelm. Superconducting quantum bits. *Nature*, 453(7198):1031–1042, 2008.
- [33] Jay M Gambetta, Jerry M Chow, and Matthias Steffen. Building logical qubits in a superconducting quantum computing system. *npj quantum information*, 3(1):1–7, 2017.
- [34] L. V. Gerasimov, R. R. Yusupov, A. D. Moiseevsky, I. Vybornyi, K. S. Tikhonov, S. P. Kulik, S. S. Straupe, C. I. Sukenik, and D. V. Kupriyanov. Coupled dynamics of spin qubits in optical dipole microtraps. 2022.

- [35] M. Morgado and S. Whitlock. Quantum simulation and computing with rydberg-interacting qubits. *AVS Quantum Science*, 3(2):023501, 2021.
- [36] J. Zhang, G. Pagano, P. W. Hess, A. Kyprianidis, P. Becker, H. Kaplan, A. V. Gorshkov, Z.-X. Gong, and C. Monroe. Observation of a many-body dynamical phase transition with a 53-qubit quantum simulator. *Nature*, 551(7682):601–604, 2017.
- [37] Laird Nicholas Egan. *Scaling Quantum Computers with Long Chains of Trapped Ions*. PhD thesis, University of Maryland, College Park, 2021.
- [38] Joris Kattemölle and Guido Burkard. Effects of correlated errors on the quantum approximate optimization algorithm, 2022.
- [39] Zhi-Cheng Yang, Armin Rahmani, Alireza Shabani, Hartmut Neven, and Claudio Chamon. Optimizing variational quantum algorithms using pontryagin’s minimum principle. *Physical Review X*, 7(2):021027, 2017.
- [40] Mohammad Ibrahim, Hamed Mohammadbagherpoor, Cynthia Rios, Nicholas T Bronn, and Gregory T Byrd. Pulse-level optimization of parameterized quantum circuits for variational quantum algorithms. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2211.00350*, 2022.

Appendix A: 3-SAT and unstructured search problems

1. 3-SAT

Boolean satisfiability, or SAT, is the problem of determining whether a boolean formula written in conjunctive normal form (CNF) is satisfiable. It is possible to map any SAT instance via Karp reduction into 3-SAT, which are restricted to 3 literals per clause. In order to approximate solutions to SAT we embed the instance into a Hamiltonian as

$$H_{\text{SAT}} = \sum_j P(j), \quad (\text{A1})$$

where j indexes clauses of an instance, and $P(j)$ is the tensor product of projectors that penalizes bit string assignments that do not satisfy the j -th clause.

2. Unstructured search

Consider an unstructured database S indexed by $j \in \{0, 1\}^{\times n}$. Let $f : \{0, 1\}^{\times n} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ be a Boolean function (a.k.a. black box) such that:

$$f(j) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{iff } j = t \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (\text{A2})$$

The task is to find $t \in \{0, 1\}^{\times n}$. The corresponding problem Hamiltonian for QAOA is

$$H_t = \mathbb{1} - |t\rangle\langle t|, \quad (\text{A3})$$

thus the expected value is given by

$$\langle H \rangle = 1 - |\langle t | \psi_p(\gamma, \beta) \rangle|^2. \quad (\text{A4})$$

QAOA performance for unstructured search is not sensitive to the particular target state $|t\rangle$ in the computational basis. For any target state $|t\rangle$ representing a binary

string, there is a $U = U^\dagger$ composed of X and $\mathbb{1}$ operators such that $U|0\rangle^{\otimes n} = |t\rangle$. The overlap of an arbitrary state prepared by a QAOA sequence with $|t\rangle$ is then:

$$\begin{aligned} \langle t | \psi_p(\gamma, \beta) \rangle &= \langle t | \prod_{k=1}^p e^{-i\beta_k \mathcal{H}_x} e^{-i\gamma_k |t\rangle\langle t|} |+\rangle^{\otimes n} \\ &= \langle 0 |^{\otimes n} U \prod_{k=1}^p e^{-i\beta_k \mathcal{H}_x} e^{-i\gamma_k U(|0\rangle\langle 0|)^{\otimes n} U} |+\rangle^{\otimes n} \\ &= \langle 0 |^{\otimes n} U \prod_{k=1}^p e^{-i\beta_k \mathcal{H}_x} U e^{-i\gamma_k (|0\rangle\langle 0|)^{\otimes n}} U |+\rangle^{\otimes n} \\ &= \langle 0 |^{\otimes n} \prod_{k=1}^p e^{-i\beta_k \mathcal{H}_x} e^{-i\gamma_k (|0\rangle\langle 0|)^{\otimes n}} |+\rangle^{\otimes n}, \end{aligned}$$

which is independent on t .

Appendix B: Energy variation in presence of constant perturbations to gate parameters

Using (8) one can calculate perturbation to the energy caused by a shift of the optimal angles by a constant $\delta\theta$ as

$$\begin{aligned} \delta E &= \langle \psi(\theta^* + \delta\theta) | H | \psi(\theta^* + \delta\theta) \rangle - \langle \psi(\theta^*) | H | \psi(\theta^*) \rangle \\ &= - \sum_{k=1}^q \delta\theta_k^2 E^* + \sum_{m \neq k}^q \delta\theta_k \delta\theta_m (\langle \psi(\theta^*) | H | \psi_{km} \rangle + h.c.) \\ &\quad + \sum_{m,k}^q \delta\theta_k \delta\theta_m \langle \psi_m | H | \psi_k \rangle + o(\delta\theta_k \delta\theta_m) \\ &= \frac{1}{2} (\delta\theta)^T \mathbf{H} \delta\theta + o(\delta\theta_k \delta\theta_m), \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B1})$$

where $|\psi_{mk}\rangle = |\psi_{0\dots 1\dots 1\dots 0}\rangle$ with 1 placed only at m -th and k -th positions. \mathbf{H} is the Hessian of the energy at noiseless optimum, $\mathbf{H}_{ij} = \frac{\partial^2}{\partial\theta_i \partial\theta_j} \langle \psi(\theta) | H | \psi(\theta) \rangle |_{\theta=\theta^*}$. Here we use the fact that at the optimal position linear

contribution to the cost function necessarily vanishes. It is seen now that for the constant perturbation $\delta\theta_k = \delta$ the energy changes as $\delta E \propto \delta^2$.

Appendix C: Optimal parameters variation in the presence of noise

Let us use expressions (10) and (11) to estimate change in the energy if one accounts for shift of optimal parameters $\theta^* \rightarrow \theta^* + \delta\theta^*$:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Tr}(\rho(\theta^* + \delta\theta^*)H) = & \\ (1 - \sum_{k=1}^q a_k) \langle \psi(\theta^* + \delta\theta^*) | H | \psi(\theta^* + \delta\theta^*) \rangle & \\ + \sum_{k=1}^q a_k \langle \psi_k(\theta^* + \delta\theta^*) | H | \psi_k(\theta^* + \delta\theta^*) \rangle + o(\sigma_k^2) & \\ (C1) & \end{aligned}$$

We introduce gradients of the noisy terms $\mathbf{B}^k = \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} \langle \psi_k(\theta) | H | \psi_k(\theta) \rangle |_{\theta=\theta^*}$. Notice that gradients of the noiseless function $\langle \psi(\theta) | H | \psi(\theta) \rangle$ vanish at optimum. Then,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Tr}(\rho(\theta^* + \delta\theta^*)H) \approx (1 - \sum_{k=1}^q a_k)E^* + \frac{1}{2}(\delta\theta^*)^T \mathbf{H} \delta\theta^* & \\ + \sum_{k=1}^q a_k [\langle \psi_k(\theta^*) | H | \psi_k(\theta^*) \rangle + (\delta\theta^*)^T \mathbf{B}^k]. & \quad (C2) \end{aligned}$$

Minimizing it with respect to $\delta\theta^*$ one gets $\delta\theta^* = \sum_{k=1}^q a_k \mathbf{H}^{-1} \mathbf{B}^k$. Thus, if we account for the change of optimal parameters in the presence of noise, the energy shifts by

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Tr}(\rho(\theta^* + \delta\theta^*)H) - \text{Tr}(\rho(\theta^*)H) \approx & \\ (\delta\theta^*)^T \mathbf{H} \delta\theta^* + \sum_{k=1}^q a_k (\delta\theta^*)^T \mathbf{B}^k = O(\sigma^4). & \quad (C3) \end{aligned}$$