

Reply to: Comment on “Quantum Optimization for Combinatorial Searches”

C. A. Trugenberger

InfoCodex SA, av. Louis-Casà 18, CH-1209 Geneva, Switzerland

Theory Division, CERN, CH-1211 Geneva 23, Switzerland

ca.trugenberger@InfoCodex.com

Abstract

This is my reply to Zalka and Brun’s criticism of my recent paper on quantum optimization heuristics. Essentially, this criticism is shown to be utterly irrelevant.

In a recent publication [1] I proposed a quantum optimization heuristic for combinatorial search problems. The basic idea is to generate a quantum superposition of search states such that the corresponding probability distribution for measurement outcomes is strongly peaked on low-cost states, in analogy to a thermal Boltzmann distribution, and to apply then standard thermodynamic reasoning, as in simulated annealing.

This procedure has been criticized by Zalka and Brun [2] on the ground that the probability of measurement of any fixed states I^k is small (last but one paragraph of their Comment [2]).

Unfortunately, these authors have forgotten that, once the desired *thermal* quantum superposition has been generated (which is guaranteed by obtaining a particular outcome from the measurement of an auxiliary register), it is not at all the absolute probabilities that matter but only the relative ones. After all, nobody would discard statistical mechanics on the ground that the canonical partition function, providing the normalization of occupation probabilities, is large for a large number of degrees of freedom. In other

words, even if the absolute probability of measuring one particular state I^k with cost $C(I^k)$ is small, what matters is that the probability of measuring any other state I^j with $C(I^j) > C(I^k)$ is even much smaller, actually infinitely smaller when the effective temperature t approaches zero. As I point out in my paper, the really important question is another one, and namely how low one has to choose the temperature in order to achieve a given accuracy. Since the effective temperature is set by the inverse of the number b of auxiliary qbits, increasing the accuracy requires more computational load. But this trade-off between accuracy and computational load is common to all optimization heuristics, which are, after all, approximation techniques.

So, while Zalka and Brun's comment contains mathematically correct formulas, it is also totally irrelevant to the problem at hand.

References

- [1] C.A. Trugenberger, *Quantum Optimization for Combinatorial Searches*, New Journal of Physics **4** (2002) 26.1-26.7.
- [2] C. Zalka and T. Brun, *Comment on “Quantum Optimization for Combinatorial Searches”*, quant-ph/0206081.