

# Measurement-Based Quantum Clustering Algorithms

Srushti Patil,<sup>1,\*</sup> Shreya Banerjee,<sup>2,3,†</sup> and Prasanta K. Panigrahi<sup>3,‡</sup>

<sup>1</sup>*Indian Institute of Science Education and Research Tirupati*

<sup>2</sup>*Institut quantique de l'Université de Sherbrooke, Canada*

<sup>3</sup>*Department of Physical Sciences, Indian Institute of Science Education and Research Kolkata, Mohanpur-741246, West Bengal, India*

In this paper, two novel measurement-based clustering algorithms are proposed based on quantum parallelism and entanglement. The Euclidean distance metric is used as a measure of ‘similarity’ between the data points. The first algorithm follows a divisive approach and the bound for each cluster is determined based on the number of ancillae used to label the clusters. The second algorithm is based on unsharp measurements where we construct the set of effect operators with a gaussian probability distribution to cluster similar data points. We specifically implemented the algorithm on a concentric circle data set for which the classical clustering approach fails. It is found that the presented clustering algorithms perform better than the classical divisive one; both in terms of clustering and time complexity which is found to be  $O(kN\log N)$  for the first and  $O(N^2)$  for the second one. Along with that we also implemented the algorithm on the Churrtiz data set of cities and the Wisconsin breast cancer dataset where we found an accuracy of approximately 97.43% which for the later case is achieved by the appropriate choice of the variance of the gaussian window.

## I. INTRODUCTION

In a recent development, quantum supremacy is a topical subject of investigation, where demonstrating quantum advantage is particularly challenging. The performance of certain classical algorithms can be improved with the help of quantum computers. In order to achieve speedup, quantum algorithms are being developed; inspired by the fundamental quantum laws like entanglement and the superposition principle which also leads to quantum parallelism. The potential of quantum computation was first realized by Feynman in 1982, where he postulated the need for quantum computers to simulate complex quantum systems such as many body interactions [1]. The most well-known quantum algorithms showing a quantum advantage over classical ones are Deutsch-Jozsa [2, 3], Bernstein-Vazirani [4], Shor’s [5], Grover’s [6], Lloyd’s algorithm for solving system of linear equations [7].

In the present time, there is an exponential growth of data, generally referred to as big data. Data analysis or more generally data science has emerged as an area of active research aiming to unravel patterns and structures. A fundamental problem that arises with big data in various fields like pattern recognition [8, 9], image processing [10], and machine learning [11] is the clustering problem. Detailed analysis of which can be found in Everitt [12], and Kaufman [13]. Many classical clustering algorithms have been proposed like K-means clustering [14], Density-based spatial clustering of applications with noise (DBSCAN) [15], etc. The task of classifying the data properly can possibly be accomplished with Machine Learning (ML) algorithms. They are trained

by three methods such as unsupervised, supervised, and reinforcement learning. In unsupervised learning algorithms, the data is unlabeled, which gives an advantage of extracting the hidden structures from the data set. These are mainly used in *data mining* [16] where the size of the input is large such as astronomical data.

Quantum laws can be used to speed up unsupervised learning algorithms. The first quantum clustering algorithm was developed by *Durr et al.* [17] where the quantum query complexity of graph problems has been studied and showed that the query complexity of the minimum spanning tree is of the order  $O(N^{3/2})$  in the matrix model and  $O(\sqrt{MN})$  for the array model in which  $N$  and  $M$  represent the number of vertices and edges respectively in the graph. After computing the minimal spanning tree of a graph, the data points can be grouped into  $k$  clusters by removing  $k - 1$  longest edges of the given graph. The classical query complexity for the matrix model is known to be of the order of  $O(N^2)$ . *Durr et al.* have proved that their clustering algorithm based on a minimal spanning tree is close to optimal, i.e. no other algorithm, classical or quantum can do better than  $O(N^{3/2})$ . More generally, a quantum-game-based clustering algorithm was developed by *Li et al.* [18] along with another quantum algorithm using quantum walks [19]. *Yu et al.* [20] proposed another quantum clustering-based algorithm for multivariable nonlinear problem. Several other algorithms have been developed by the quantization of the standard clustering algorithms present in the literature [21]. All three subroutines that they have proposed are not necessarily realistic as it requires the availability of a quantum black box. In all the above-mentioned algorithms, the quantization is done by using variations of Grover’s algorithm. In the quantized versions of clustering via minimum spanning tree, divisive clustering, and  $k$ -medians, it turns out that they are faster than their classical analogues [22]. For the Quantum K-medians algorithm, the runtime was found

\* srushtitikarampatil@students.iisertirupati.ac.in

† shreya93ban@gmail.com

‡ pprasanta@iiserkol.ac.in

to be  $O(\frac{1}{\sqrt{kN^{3/2}}})$  for one iteration, which is  $\sqrt{N/k}$  times faster than the classical approach. Divisive clustering has a runtime of  $O(N\log N)$ . In the construction of the  $c$ -neighbourhood graph, the time complexity is  $O(dN\log N)$  where  $d$  is the dimensionality of the space in which the data points live and  $n$  is the number of data points.

In this paper, we propose two measurement-based clustering algorithms that effectively reduce the time complexity up to the order of polynomial time. The first algorithm follows a divisive approach, we call it Quantum Hierarchical Clustering Algorithm (QHCA). The number of clusters is determined by the ancillae used whereas; in the second algorithm, clustering of the dataset is achieved by measuring the data point unsharply and with the appropriate choice of the variance of the gaussian window. For both the algorithms, the time complexity was found to be of the order of  $O(N^2)$  which is better than the classical divisive algorithm which is of the order of  $O(2^N)$  where  $N$  is the number of data points. We specifically implemented both algorithms on a concentric circle data set for which the classical divisive clustering approach fails. It is found that the presented clustering algorithms perform better than the classical divisive one; both in terms of clustering and time complexity. We also implemented it on the Churriz data set of cities and the Wisconsin breast cancer dataset where we found an accuracy of approximately 97.43%.

The paper is organized as follows. In section II, we give an overview of Hierarchical clustering and measurements in quantum mechanics. In section III, the workflow of both algorithms is described. Section IV is dedicated to the implementation of our algorithms on various benchmarking datasets. Finally, we conclude in section V.

## II. PREREQUISITES

In this section, we briefly review the standard divisive clustering approach and the basics of unsharp measurements.

### A. Hierarchical Clustering

Clustering refers to the grouping of objects/data points having the most similar characteristics with two groups having the least similarities. There are a few clustering algorithms that are widely used like k-means, DB-SCAN, Mean shift clustering, and Hierarchical Clustering. How the data points are clustered differs in each algorithm. We will mainly focus on hierarchical clustering. It is a method of cluster analysis that allows to build us a tree structure from data similarities. The trees are called dendrograms as shown in [Fig.(1)]. It uses an approach of agglomerative and divisive clustering. When hierarchical clustering follows a bottom-up approach, it is called agglomerative clustering where all the data points

are treated as a single cluster which is further partitioned into two least similar clusters. The process is repeated until a complete single cluster is formed. Another way to cluster the data through hierarchical clustering is through a divisive approach. It follows top to bottom approach. All the data points belong to one cluster and the clusters are formed as we move down the hierarchy. Clustering continues until small groups of similar clusters are formed.




FIG. 1. Hierarchical clustering dendrogram

Divisive clustering is done by recursively splitting a larger data set  $C$  into two smaller sub-datasets until the required number of clusters is obtained. Such a method is good at the identification of large clusters and it is common in the field of data mining, image segmentation, decision-making, etc. Clusters obtained by this approach are presented as a hierarchical binary tree which makes it attractive in many problems such as indexing problems. Divisive clustering splits the data set into smaller ones until all the clusters contain only a single element. So the hierarchy in the data set of  $N$  objects is built in  $N - 1$  steps. In the agglomerative method, clustering of two data points together leads to  $N(N - 1)/2$  possible combinations. Based on the same approach, if divisive clustering is considered, there are  $2^{N-1} - 1$  possibilities to split the data into two clusters which are quite larger [23]. Agglomerative clustering algorithms have the time complexity of  $O(N^3)$  as we have to scan the  $N \times N$  distance matrix to get the lowest distance in each  $N - 1$  iteration. This can be reduced to  $O(N^2\log N)$  by using priority queues. By some optimizations, it can be brought down up to the order of  $O(N^2)$  [24]. Divisive clustering with an exhaustive search has a time complexity of  $O(2^N)$  In order to combine(in agglomerative) or divide(in divisive) the data sets, the measure of dissimilarity between the data points should be formulated. For any two data points  $x \in C$  and  $y \in C$ , it is given by a non-negative real-valued distance matrix  $D_{xy} = d(x, y)$  where each datapoint  $x \in C$  has  $k$  attributes given by the tuple  $x = (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_k)$ . The *minkowski* metrics

are the family of matrices that quantify the measure of such dissimilarity. For a fixed  $p \geq 1$  and for any two data points  $x$  and  $y$ , it is given by,

$$L_p(x, y) = \left( \sum_{i=1}^k |x_i - y_i|^p \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \quad (1)$$

for  $p = 1$ , it becomes *Manhattan* metric and for  $p = 2$ , it becomes *Euclidean* metric. As  $p \rightarrow \infty$ , it becomes *Chebyshev* metric. We will mainly use the Euclidean metric as a dissimilarity measure between two data points.

## B. Projective Measurements

Quantum mechanics is inherently probabilistic in nature. The measurement postulate plays an essential role in quantum mechanics. The rigorous description of ‘the act of measurement’ was first given by an American mathematician John von Neumann [25]. The measurement of a physical system  $\mathcal{S}$  is associated with a Hilbert space  $\mathcal{H}$  is represented by an operator  $A$  belonging to the family of self-adjoint operators  $\mathcal{L}_s(\mathcal{H})$  defined on the Hilbert space and the physical attributes of the system are extracted by measuring the corresponding observable.

**Proposition 1.** Let  $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H})$  be the family of operators defined on  $\mathcal{H}$ .

An operator  $A \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H})$  is self adjoint if and only if  $\langle \psi | A | \psi \rangle$  is a real number for every  $|\psi\rangle \in \mathcal{H}$  [26]

The observable upon measurement represents the physical quantities such as position, momentum, energy, etc. The eigenvectors of an observable form an orthonormal basis set for the Hilbert space and the outcome of the measurement corresponds to one of the basis states. These measurements are called projective or projection valued(PV) measurements in the sense that the initial state of the system  $|\psi\rangle$  is projected onto one of the eigenstates  $|A_i\rangle$  of an observable  $A$  that is being measured with the corresponding eigenvalue representing the measurement outcome. Withholding the orthonormality condition i.e.,  $\langle A_i | A_j \rangle = \delta_{ij}$ . These measurements are very accurate and we call them ideal or sharp as the system completely collapses to one of the eigenstates of the observable and thus disturbing the initial state. Such sharp quantum events are described by an orthogonal projection operator  $P$  on Hilbert space  $\mathcal{H}$ . They are defined as  $\{P_i, i \in M\}$  where  $M$  is a set of all possible outcomes of the measurement.  $P_i$  projects the initial state  $|\psi\rangle$  of the system to the state  $|A_i\rangle$ . These operators have the following properties.  $P_i$  is Hermitian, i.e.  $P_i = P_i^\dagger$ .  $P_i$  is a positive semi-definite matrix, i.e the eigenvalues of  $P_i$  are non-negative.  $P_i$  is idempotent,  $P_i^2 = P_i$ .  $P_i$  is pairwise orthogonal, i.e.  $P_i P_j = \delta_{ij}$ . Projection operators obey the completeness relation  $\sum P_i = I$ .

## C. Unsharp Measurements and Quantum Effects

The sharpness of measurement is intrinsically present in the mathematical structure of an observable. But in practice, no accurate measurement of a system is possible. For a classical system, we can predict the outcome, and hence the measurement is sharp but when dealing with real systems, quantum events are fuzzy and measurements are not accurate. They are often called unsharp. Hence we have to work in a more general framework called quantum unsharp measurements. To tackle this issue of measurement being unsharp, the notion of effect algebras was first formulated by Ludwig [27]. After that, in 1989, a comprehensive structure to study the unsharp properties was developed by Giuntini and Greuling [28].

The unsharp measurements are represented by effects. One can vaguely define any quantum unsharp event as a weighted average of quantum sharp events. Ludwig proposed that the quantum event or the ‘measurement’ need not be the projection but can be a self-adjoint operator having an eigenspectrum between 0 to 1. In the extended framework, we define a positive operator valued measure (POVM) which consists of certain positive operators that are self-adjoint i.e. they belong to the  $L_s(\mathcal{H})$  with eigenspectrum lying in the interval  $[0,1]$ .

**Definition II.1** (Positive Operator). An operator  $E \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H})$  is positive if  $\langle \psi | T | \psi \rangle \geq 0$  for every  $|\psi\rangle \in \mathcal{H}$ . We define the operator  $E$  as a positive operator if  $E \geq O$ .  $O$  and  $I$  are defined as:  $O|\psi\rangle = 0$  and  $I|\psi\rangle = |\psi\rangle$

This led to the definition of the effect or a quantum effect as a self-adjoint operator  $E \in L_s(\mathcal{H})$  having eigenspectrum lying between 0 and 1 [29]. The effects are represented by positive bounded self-adjoint operators such that  $0 \leq E \leq I$ . In the standard Hilbert space, the measurements are restricted to those bearing extreme effects [30]. i.e. they belong to the set of projection operators.

$$\text{Ex}(E) = P(\mathcal{H}). \quad (2)$$

The POVMs consisting of  $n$  elements are defined as a set of  $n$  positive valued operators satisfying the following conditions:

$$\sum_{i=1}^n E_i = I \quad (3)$$

Where  $E_i = M_i^\dagger M_i$  and  $M_i$ 's are the measurement operators corresponding to the outcome  $i$ . To give an example, For an infinite dimensional Hilbert space with continuous basis set  $\{|x\rangle\}$  with orthogonality condition  $\langle x | x' \rangle = \Delta(x - x')$  we define an effect,

$$E_y = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dx \frac{1}{(\sqrt{2\pi}\delta^2)} e^{-\frac{(y-x)^2}{(2\Delta^2)}} |x\rangle \langle x| \quad (4)$$

Where  $\Delta$  is the standard deviation of the distribution. It describes an imprecise measurement of position  $y$ . All the effect operators obey the completeness relation.

The operator  $E_y$  represents the unsharp measurement of the position at point  $y$ . These operators indeed create a set of effect operators because they follow completeness relations and are positive operators.

$$\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dy E_y = I \quad (5)$$

### III. QUANTUM CLUSTERING ALGORITHMS

In this section, we present our measurement-based clustering algorithms. In the first algorithm, we make use of Quantum Entanglement and Quantum Parallelism for clustering. In the second Quantum-inspired algorithm, the notion of unsharp measurements is used.

#### A. Quantum Hierarchical Clustering Algorithm (QHCA)

The similarity measure is a key factor in constructing clustering algorithms. A measure of distance is defined over the features of data points to perceive how similar the two data points are. We consider a dataset consisting of  $N$  elements with each element having  $d$  attributes. The measure of dissimilarity between any two data points is given by Euclidean distance metric as in Eq.(1) with  $p = 2$ . Data points having similar distance measures are clustered together. We now present our algorithm for clustering the data points based on the distances between them.




FIG. 2. Circuit representation of QHCA

- We first run a classical sorting algorithm on the entries of the dataset  $C$  and choose the two data points  $k_1$  and  $k_2$  that are farthest from each other, i.e., the distance between  $k_1$  and  $k_2$ ,  $D_{max}$  is the maximum distance between any two pairs of points. The best time complexity known is  $O(N)$

with the space complexity of  $O(1)$

- We choose  $k_1$  as the origin and redefine the distances of the  $N$  entries from  $k_1$  in terms of the binary equivalent of their closest integer. This gives a way to represent the distances as  $n$ -qubit quantum states, where  $n = \lceil \log_2 D_{max} \rceil$ . As an example, if the distance between point  $k_1$  and any other point  $i$  is given by  $C_{k_1 i}$ , we represent it as  $|D_{k_1 i}\rangle$ , where  $D_{k_1 i}$  is the binary equivalent of the decimal number  $\lfloor C_{k_1 i} \rfloor$ , i.e., the closest integer to  $C_{k_1 i}$ . The best time complexity known is  $O(\log N)$  with the space complexity of  $O(\log N)$
- We now take an  $n = \lceil \log_2 D_{max} \rceil$  qubit quantum register and represent the distances on this register as an equal superposition of all quantum states representing the distances  $|D_{k_1 i}\rangle$ . The quantum state representing the superposition of distances is designed in a way that when the most significant qubit (MSqB) in its register, qubit  $n$  is in state  $|1\rangle$ , it represents the distances of cities farthest from the origin  $k_1$ . Approximately these distances are  $\geq \frac{D_{max}}{2}$ . On the contrary, when qubit  $n$  is in state  $|0\rangle$ , it represents the distances of from  $k_1$  that are approximately  $\leq \frac{D_{max}}{2}$ . Similarly, it can be easily seen that when qubit  $n-j$  is at state  $|0\rangle$  and at  $|1\rangle$ , it approximately represents the distances  $\leq \frac{D_{min}}{2^j}$  and  $\geq \frac{D_{min}}{2^j}$  respectively.
- We need to prepare the clusters such that they are within a pre-fixed distance  $D_{min}$  from their individual centers. We take  $m = \lceil \log_2 \frac{D_{max}}{D_{min}} \rceil$  ancilla qubits, and apply the operation  $U$  on the register  $n+m$ , given as,

$$U = \prod_{i_n=0, i_m=0}^{m, m} C^{m-i_n} X_{i_m},$$

where  $i_n$  is the  $n-i_n$ th MSqB in the distance register, and  $i_m$  is the  $i_m$ th MSqB in the ancilla register. The time complexity of this part depends upon the number of clusters we are making. For  $k$  clusters, the computational time is linear  $O(k)$

- As shown in [Fig.(2)], upon measuring both the registers together, one can easily select the states of the ancilla register and find the clusters associated with it. This procedure is repeated until we get the desired number of clusters, say  $k$  clusters. The overall time complexity of the QHCA is  $O(kN \log N)$

---

**Algorithm 1** Quantum Hierarchical Clustering Algorithm (QHCA)
 

---

**Input:**  $\{D_{k_1 i}\}$ ,  $n$ ,  $m$ 
**Output:**  $k$  clusters

initialization

 Construct the state  $\frac{1}{\sqrt{2^N}} \sum_{i=0}^N |D_{k_1 i}\rangle$ 
**for**  $num\_clusters \neq k$  **do**

 apply  $U$  on  $n + m$  register **if**  $num\_clusters = k$  **then**  
   **Return:** Output

**else**

 further split the clusters by applying  $U$  or merge until  
    $num\_clusters = k$ 
**end**
**end**


---

## 1. Deciding the boundaries


We have  $n$  number of qubits to encode the distances and we need to make  $m$  number of clusters, then the ancillae we require for the task are roughly  $(\log_2 m) + 1$ . The boundary of each cluster is determined by the inputs  $n$  and  $m$ . If the clusters formed are  $m$ , then the upper and lower limit of each cluster  $t$  is given in the following way. The  $t^{th}$  cluster is represented by its binary equivalent number  $\{t_{m-1} \dots t_1 t_0\}$  and the bitstring that encodes the distance  $d$  is represented as  $\{d_{n-1} \dots d_1 d_0\}$  where  $t_i, d_k \in \{0, 1\}$  and  $m-1 \leq i \leq 0$ ,  $n-1 \leq k \leq 0$ . The upper limit for cluster  $t$  is given by

$$d_{max}^t = \sum_{j=0}^{m-1} 2^{j+m} \cdot t_j + \sum_{j=0}^{m-1} 2^j \quad (6)$$

and the lower limit is given by

$$d_{min}^t = \sum_{j=0}^{m-1} 2^{j+m} \cdot t_j. \quad (7)$$

The schematic of the algorithm is shown in [Fig.(3)].


 FIG. 3. Flowchart of QHCA to prepare  $m$  clusters

**B. Unsharp measurement-based clustering algorithm**

For a finite-dimensional Hilbert space, on a computational basis, we represent each distance of a datapoint from some fixed origin  $k_1$  as a quantum state encoded by the binary equivalent of the corresponding closest integer. We create an equal superposition of all the states. As described in section II, A set of effect operators can be constructed corresponding to each state/distance. The creation of the effect operator is such that, if one measures the prepared quantum state unsharply, It clusters

the data points which are nearer to that particular state being measured depending upon some proposed parameter.

In computational basis, the number of qubits required to represent all the distances is proportional to the  $n = \log_2(D_{max})$  where  $D_{max}$  is the maximum distance of all. Once we represent the distances as quantum states, each state representing one distance measure, we take an equal

superposition of all the states represented by

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{2^N}} \sum_{D_{k_1 i} \in \{0\dots00\}^{\{1\dots11\}}} d_{k_1 i} |D_{k_1 i}\rangle \quad (8)$$

Where  $D_{k_1 i}$  is a bit string of length  $N$ ,  $0 \leq i \leq N$  and  $d_{k_1 i}$  is a binary function:

$$d_{k_1 i} = \begin{cases} 1 & D_{k_1 i} \in D \\ 0 & D_{k_1 i} \notin D \end{cases} \quad (9)$$

Where  $D$  is the set of all distances from the origin  $k_1$ . Once we have an equally superposed state, we unsharply measure one of the distances. The extended Hilbert space of POVMs for this particular case consists of a set of effects  $E_i$  defined as follows

$$E_i = \sum_{D_{k_1 j} \in \{0\dots00\}^{\{1\dots11\}}} \frac{1}{\sqrt{(2\pi\Delta^2)}} e^{-\frac{(i-j)^2}{2\Delta^2}} \quad (10)$$

where  $i$  is the distance encoded by a quantum state being measured and  $j$  corresponds to all the other distances from  $k_1$ .

---

### Algorithm 2 Unsharp measurement-based Algorithm

---

**Input:**  $\{D_{k_1 i}\}, n$

**Output:**  $k$  clusters

initialization

Construct the **state** given by Eq.(8).

**for** *cluster around point i do*

    measure **state** unsharply around  $i$  **if** *num\_clusters = k*

**then**

**Return:** Output

**else**

            re-center the next distance  $j$  at  $i$  and measure until

*num\_clusters = k*

**end**

**end**

---

- Similar to the previous algorithm, we run a classical sorting algorithm for finding the points which are farthest apart
- We have a dataset consisting of  $N$  data points and the corresponding attributes of each data point can be displayed as Euclidean distance measure. Say, each of the data points  $i$  has  $k$  attributes given by  $i \in \{i_1, i_2, \dots, i_k\}$  features, then the Euclidean

### B. Implementation of QHCA on the concentric circle dataset

We generate a dataset of 400 samples lying on two concentric circles with origin at  $(0, 0)$  using `sklearn` package

distance is given by from some fixed origin  $k_1 = (0, 0)$

$$D_{k_1 i} = \sqrt{x_1^2 + x_2^2 + \dots + x_k^2} \quad (11)$$

- The effect operators described by Eq.(10) correspond to the unsharp measurement around the distance  $i$ . Once the similarity measure is calculated, We construct the set of effect operators as follows: We choose the number of qubits as  $n = \log(d_{max})$  There can be  $2^n$  effect operators corresponding to the given system, each corresponding to the measurement of a single distance measure. However, we only need one effect operator for clustering.
- We encode all the distances as the binary equivalent of their closest integer and prepare an equal superposition state of all the distances.
- Then we measure the state unsharply around the specified center. The clusters are made according to the corresponding amplitudes of the state after the measurement. By default, the width of clusters made depends on the standard deviation of the distribution.

## IV. ALGORITHM IMPLEMENTATION

In this section, we demonstrate the implementation of both algorithms on some standard datasets. First, we implement the quantum clustering algorithm on the Churriz dataset of the cities and the concentric circle dataset.

### A. Implementation of QHCA Churriz dataset

We use the benchmark data set of 130 cities by Churriz and implement our algorithm. The data can be found here [31]. First, a  $130 \times 130$  matrix containing Euclidean distances between city  $i$  and the city  $j$  is calculated. The maximum distance  $D_{max}$  between two cities is calculated to be 938.842 km. We take one of the cities as the origin and cluster all the other cities accordingly, we formed 4 clusters, and the boundaries of each cluster are given by Eq.(6) and Eq.(7). To reduce the number of qubits encoding distances,  $D_{max}$  is scaled down by the appropriate factor. The dataset in the Euclidean  $x - y$  plane is shown below in [Fig.(4)] (left). The clustering of nearby cities is shown in [Fig.(4)] (right). The implementation is carried out on the state vector simulator of IBM.

as shown in the figure. We implement our algorithm on this dataset. The data lies in the two-dimensional Euclidean plane. We first compute the maximum distance




FIG. 4. (Color online) Churriz dataset consisting of 130 cities with  $D_{max} = 938.842$  kms. Each point represents the position of the city in the Euclidean plane. (left) and Clusters of nearby cities after the implementation of QHCA (right).

$D_{max}$  from the origin to the farthest data point. The number of qubits required to encode all the distances in an equal superposed state  $n = \log_2(D_{max})$ . Once the distances are encoded in the state, depending upon the number of clusters that we want and the width of the cluster  $D_{min}$ , the ancillary register is chosen. Here we take  $m = \log_2 \frac{D_{max}}{D_{min}}$  number of ancillas. For scaling purposes, we scale up the distances by the factor of 10. So totally we use a quantum register of  $n = 4$  qubits to encode the state representing distances and  $m = 2$  ancillae for making clusters. To show the advantage of the quantum clustering algorithm over the classical counterpart,

we cluster the same data using a classical hierarchical clustering algorithm. The results are shown in [Fig.(5)]. The classical algorithm fails to cluster the data correctly while the quantum algorithm does accurate clustering showing a quantum advantage. Divisive clustering with an exhaustive search has a time complexity of  $O(2^N)$  and agglomerative clustering algorithms have a time complexity of  $O(N^3)$  as we have to scan the  $N \times N$  distance matrix to get the lowest distance in each  $N - 1$  iteration. The proposed quantum clustering algorithm has a time complexity of the order of  $O(N^2)$  which is better than the classical counterpart.




FIG. 5. (Color online) a) Dataset of 400 points generated using `sklearn` with noise ratio of 0.1 with  $D_{max} = 12.48$  units. b) Classification of the dataset using the traditional classical divisive clustering algorithm. c) Classification of the dataset using the QHCA. Different colors represent different clusters.

### C. Implementation of QHCA and unsharp measurement-based algorithm on a Wisconsin cancer dataset

#### 1. The dataset

The Wisconsin Breast Cancer dataset consists of 699 entries with 9 different attributes such as clump thick-

ness, cell size, cell shape, etc. The dataset can be found here [32]. [Fig.(6)] shows the original classification of the data. In order to cluster the dataset into malignant or benign, and for better visualization, we do a principle component analysis (PCA) to reduce to features to 2 di-

mensions. The accuracy of the model is calculated by using true positive (TP), true negative (TN), false negative (FN), and false positive (FP) to classify the data instance as benign (positive class) and malignant (negative class). We implemented both algorithms on this dataset. The accuracy was found to be 97.48% for the first algorithm as well as the second algorithm. While implementing the second algorithm, the choice of  $\Delta$  is case specific and varies for different datasets. The results are shown in [Fig.(7)].




FIG. 6. Original classification of Wisconsin Breast Cancer Dataset after feature reduction upto  $n = 2$  with PCA




FIG. 7. (Color online) Implementation of QHCA (left) and unsharp measurement-based clustering algorithm (right) to classify the breast cancer dataset.

## V. CONCLUSION

In this work, we presented two algorithms for unsupervised data clustering. The QHCA has a time complexity of  $O(kN \log N)$  which is better than the classical hierarchical clustering algorithms which are  $O(2^N)$  for divisive and  $O(N^3)$  for agglomerative. It also provides better results than the classical divisive approach on the linearly non-separable dataset. The costly part of the algorithm is finding the points which are at the farthest distance in a given dataset of  $N$  points. The quantum divisive clustering algorithm present in the literature assumes that by using the subroutine proposed in [21] we can substantially reduce this cost. But the subroutine proposed makes use of a quantum black box which is not physically realizable. In addition to that, they do not provide any runtime calculation for the black box, hence the algorithm itself

is not implementable on real datasets. Hence, QHCA performs better than the quantum divisive clustering algorithm both in terms of implementation and time complexity. The second algorithm is a quantum-inspired algorithm that makes use of unsharp measurements to cluster similar data points together. This algorithm has a time complexity of the order of  $O(N^2)$ . The comparison between different quantum clustering algorithms is shown in Table I. Both algorithms have limitations in classifying the anomalies for breast cancer classification due to their distance-based approach. The algorithms are mainly useful in unsupervised machine learning. The unsharp measurement-based quantum algorithm can be realized on a gate-based quantum computer which is beyond the scope of this paper. However, we look forward to it in the future.



TABLE. I. The comparison of proposed and existing quantum clustering algorithms.

Algorithm	Time complexity
Minimal spanning tree clustering	$O(N^{3/2})$
Quantum $K$ -medians algorithm	$O(\frac{1}{\sqrt{kN^{3/2}}})$
Quantum Divisive Clustering Algorithm	$O(N\log N)$
QHCA	$O(kN\log N)$
Unsharp-measurement-based quantum clustering algorithm	$O(N^2)$

## VI. ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The authors are thankful to IBM for providing access to their simulators.

- [1] R. P. Feynman, Simulating physics with computers, in *Feynman and computation* (CRC Press, 2018) pp. 133–153.
- [2] D. Deutsch and R. Jozsa, Rapid solution of problems by quantum computation, *Proc. Math. Phys. Eng. Sci.* **439**, 553 (1992).
- [3] D. Collins, K. Kim, and W. Holton, Deutsch-jozsa algorithm as a test of quantum computation, *Phys. Rev. A* **58**, R1633 (1998).
- [4] E. Bernstein and U. Vazirani, Quantum complexity theory, in *Proc. Annu. ACM Symp. Theory Comput.*, STOC '93 (Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 1993) p. 11–20.
- [5] P. W. Shor, Polynomial-time algorithms for prime factorization and discrete logarithms on a quantum computer, *SIAM J. Comput.* **26**, 1484–1509 (1997).
- [6] L. K. Grover, A fast quantum mechanical algorithm for database search, in *Proc. Annu. ACM Symp. Theory Comput.*, STOC '96 (Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 1996) p. 212–219.
- [7] A. W. Harrow, A. Hassidim, and S. Lloyd, Quantum algorithm for linear systems of equations, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **103**, 150502 (2009).
- [8] D. Horn and A. Gottlieb, Algorithm for data clustering in pattern recognition problems based on quantum mechanics, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **88**, 018702 (2001).
- [9] E. Diday and J. C. Simon, Clustering analysis, in *Digital Pattern Recognition*, edited by K. S. Fu (Springer Berlin Heidelberg, Berlin, Heidelberg, 1976) pp. 47–94.
- [10] A. Mandal, S. Banerjee, and P. K. Panigrahi, Quantum image representation on clusters, in *2021 IEEE International Conference on Quantum Computing and Engineering (QCE)* (2021) pp. 89–99.
- [11] R. Ahuja, A. Chug, S. Gupta, P. Ahuja, and S. Kohli, Classification and clustering algorithms of machine learning with their applications, in *Nature-Inspired Computation in Data Mining and Machine Learning*, edited by X.-S. Yang and X.-S. He (Springer International Publishing, Cham, 2020) pp. 225–248.
- [12] B. S. Everitt, S. Landau, M. Leese, and D. Stahl, Cluster analysis: Wiley series in probability and statistics, *Southern Gate, Chichester, West Sussex United Kingdom: John Wiley & Sons* (2011).
- [13] L. Kaufman and P. J. Rousseeuw, *Finding groups in data: an introduction to cluster analysis* (John Wiley & Sons, 2009).
- [14] J. A. Hartigan and M. A. Wong, Algorithm AS 136: A K-Means clustering algorithm, *App. Stat.* **28**, 100 (1979).
- [15] M. Ester, H.-P. Kriegel, J. Sander, and X. Xu, A density-based algorithm for discovering clusters in large spatial databases with noise, in *Proceedings of the Second International Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining*, KDD'96 (AAAI Press, 1996) p. 226–231.
- [16] I. H. Witten and E. Frank, Data mining: Practical machine learning tools and techniques with java implementations, *SIGMOD Rec.* **31**, 76–77 (2002).
- [17] C. Dürr, M. Heiligman, P. Hoyer, and M. Mhalla, Quantum query complexity of some graph problems, *SIAM Journal on Computing* **35**, 1310 (2006).
- [18] Q. Li, Y. He, and J.-p. Jiang, A novel clustering algorithm based on quantum games, *J. Phys. A: Math. and Theor.* **42**, 445303 (2009).
- [19] Q. Li, Y. He, and J.-p. Jiang, A hybrid classical-quantum clustering algorithm based on quantum walks, *Quantum Inf. Process.* **10**, 13 (2011).
- [20] Y. Yu, F. Qian, and H. Liu, Quantum clustering-based weighted linear programming support vector regression for multivariable nonlinear problem, *Soft Comput.* **14**, 921 (2010).
- [21] E. Aïmeur, G. Brassard, and S. Gambs, Quantum clustering algorithms, in *Proceedings of the 24th International Conference on Machine Learning*, ICML '07 (Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 2007) p. 1–8.
- [22] E. Aïmeur, G. Brassard, and S. Gambs, Quantum speed-up for unsupervised learning, *Mach. Learn.* **90**, 261 (2013).
- [23] A. W. F. Edwards and L. L. Cavalli-Sforza, A method for cluster analysis, *Biom.* **21**, 362 (1965).
- [24] W. H. Day and H. Edelsbrunner, Efficient algorithms for agglomerative hierarchical clustering methods, *J. Classif.* **1**, 7 (1984).
- [25] J. von Neumann, *Mathematical Foundations of Quantum Mechanics*, edited by N. A. Wheeler (Princeton Univer-

- sity Press, Princeton, 2018).
- [26] T. Heinosaari and M. Ziman, Guide to mathematical concepts of quantum theory, [arXiv preprint arXiv:0810.3536](https://arxiv.org/abs/0810.3536) (2008).
  - [27] G. Ludwig, Ensembles and effects, in *Foundations of Quantum Mechanics I* (Springer, 1983) pp. 41–82.
  - [28] R. Giuntini and H. Greuling, Toward a formal language for unsharp properties, *Found. Phys.* **19**, 931 (1989).
  - [29] D. J. Foulis and M. K. Bennett, Effect algebras and unsharp quantum logics, *Found. Phys.* **24**, 1331 (1994).
  - [30] P. Busch, Unsharp reality and joint measurements for spin observables, *Phys. Rev. D* **33**, 2253 (1986).
  - [31] G. Reinelt, {TSPLIB}: a library of sample instances for the tsp (and related problems) from various sources and of various types, <http://comopt.ifi.uni-heidelberg.de/software/TSPLIB95/> (2014).
  - [32] D. Dua and C. Graff, [UCI machine learning repository](https://archive.uci.edu/ml/) (2017).