

# Simulated Quantum Computation of Global Minima

Jing Zhu, Zhen Huang and Sabre Kais\*

*Department of Chemistry and Birck Nanotechnology Center,*

*Purdue University, West Lafayette IN 47907*

## Abstract

Finding the optimal solution to a complex optimization problem is of great importance in practically all fields of science, technology, technical design and econometrics. We demonstrate that a modified Grover's quantum algorithm can be applied to real problems of finding a global minimum using modest numbers of quantum bits. Calculations of the global minimum of simple test functions and Lennard-Jones clusters have been carried out on a quantum computer simulator using a modified Grover's algorithm. The number of function evaluations  $N$  reduced from  $O(N)$  in classical simulation to  $O(\sqrt{N})$  in quantum simulation. We also show how the Grover's quantum algorithm can be combined with the classical Pivot method for global optimization to treat larger systems.

arXiv:0906.2375v1 [quant-ph] 12 Jun 2009

---

\* kais@purdue.edu

Rational drug design, molecular modeling, quantum mechanical calculations and mathematical biological calculations are but a few examples of fields that rely heavily upon the location of a global minimum in a multiple-minima problem[1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6]. Several global optimization methods have been developed over the past decades. However, the large computational cost of finding the global minimum for large number of variables limited the applications of such algorithms[7, 8, 9, 10]. Quantum algorithms on the other hand known to speed up the computation compared to classical ones[11, 12, 13, 14]. For example, the calculation time for the energy of atoms and molecules scales exponentially with system size on a classical computer but polynomially using quantum algorithms[15, 16].

Quantum computation is generally regarded as being more powerful than classical computation. The evidence for this viewpoint begins with Feynman’s pioneering observation [17] that the simulation of a general quantum evolution on a classical computer appears to require an exponential overhead in computational resources compared to the physical resources needed for a direct physical implementation of the quantum process itself. Subsequent work by Deutsch [18], Bernstein and Vazirani [19], Simon [20], Grover [21], Shor and others[22, 23] showed how quantum evolution can be harnessed to carry out some useful computational tasks more rapidly than by any known classical means. For some computational tasks (such as factoring) quantum physics appears to provide an exponential benefit, but for other tasks (such as NP complete problems [24]) the quantum benefits appear to be inherently more restricted, giving at most a polynomial speedup [25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30].

Grover’s quantum algorithm can find an object in a unsorted database containing  $N$  objects in  $O(\sqrt{N})$  quantum mechanical steps instead of  $O(N)$  steps[31, 32]. The steps of Grover’s Algorithm can be shown as following: firstly, the Walsh-Hadamard transformation was performed and the system was initialized to the superposition. Before going any further, let’s introduce some fundamental information of quantum simulation [33]. Quantum computation and quantum information are built upon the concept the *quantum bit*, or *qubit* briefly. It is quite similar to bit in classical computation. Two possible states for a qubit are the states  $|0\rangle$  and  $|1\rangle$ , which is similar to state 0 and 1 for a classical bit. The difference between bits and qubits is that a qubit can be in a state other than  $|0\rangle$  or  $|1\rangle$ . It is also possible to form linear combination of states, called *superpositions*:

$$|\psi\rangle = \alpha|0\rangle + \beta|1\rangle \tag{1}$$

where  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$  are complex numbers and  $|\alpha|^2 + |\beta|^2 = 1$ . Furthermore, one famous qubit gate is *Hadamard gate*, it is defined as:

$$H \equiv \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 1 & -1 \end{pmatrix} \quad (2)$$

This gate is also described as being like a 'square-root of not' gate, in that it turns a  $|0\rangle$  into  $(|0\rangle + |1\rangle)/\sqrt{2}$  (first column of H), 'halfway' between  $|0\rangle$  and  $|1\rangle$ ; and turns  $|1\rangle$  into  $(|0\rangle - |1\rangle)/\sqrt{2}$  (second column of H), which is also 'halfway between  $|0\rangle$  and  $|1\rangle$ '. In our simulation, we performed the Hadamard transform on n qubits initially in the all  $|0\rangle$  state and get an equal superposition of all computational basis states. Mathematically it could be expressed in the following formula:

$$|s\rangle = \bigotimes_{i=1}^n H|0\rangle \quad (3)$$

where  $|s\rangle$  means the initial superposition and n means the number of qubits. Secondly, we generated two different operators called  $P_s$  and  $P_t$ . Their mathematical formations are  $P_t = I - 2|t\rangle\langle t|$  and  $P_s = 2|s\rangle\langle s| - I$ , where  $|s\rangle$  is the initial superposition and  $|t\rangle$  corresponds to the entry matching the search criterion. In practice, there are no direct universal quantum algorithms currently to obtain  $|t\rangle$  besides 'black box function' or 'oracle' [33, 34]. In order to get  $|t\rangle$  here, we first did classical comparison based on search criterion and then translated the result into the quantum state. The detailed procedure is provided in the Appendix. The physical meaning of  $P_t$  is performing the selective phase inversion, and that of  $P_s$  is performing the inversion about average operation, which increases the amplitude of the state which was inverted in the previous step. Finally, we applied the Grover operator,  $G = P_s P_t$ ,  $O(N^{1/2})$  times to the superposition state. After performing the measurement to the obtained vector, the one with the max probability is the marked state [31, 32]. Grover's search algorithm has been implemented by using nuclear magnetic resonance (NMR) techniques for a system with four states[35] and more recently using quantum optical methods[36]. An efficient quantum algorithm for global optimization based on such Grover's search procedure can find applications in a wide range of fields[37].

In this paper, we will demonstrate that a modified Grover's quantum algorithm can be applied to real problems of finding a global minimum using modest numbers of quantum bits. We will simulate the revised quantum search algorithm using a classical computer.

The limitation of computer resource such as the memory and speed of CPU will prohibit a large scale quantum computer algorithm simulation on a classical computer. Thus, first we implement the algorithm for simple test functions and small size Lennard-Jones clusters. The quantum search circuit is shown in Fig. 1. In this figure, we divided the register into three groups, where the Hadamard gates are operated on the initialized registers, then we applied the Grover iteration to rotate the superposition states into target states. The measurement result after the iteration is used to update the threshold value in the Grover iteration steps. Grover oracle is replaced by the adapted threshold to search all the states which  $f(x_1, x_2, \dots) \leq M_{n-1}$ , where  $M_{n-1}$  gives the minimum measurement value. The subscript  $n$  means the steps of measurements and  $M_n$  means the value of the  $n^{\text{th}}$  measurement. The iteration number during each search will be preselected. After each iteration, the result will be measured and compared with the other measured results to setup a new threshold value.

We first applied the adapted quantum search algorithm to test a simple analytical function used in global optimization: the Goldstein-Price function(GP) which is given by[10]

$$f(x_1, x_2) = [1 + (x_1 + x_2 + 1)^2(19 - 14x_1 + 3x_1^2 - 14x_2 + 6x_1x_2 + 3x_2^2)][30 + (2x_1 - 3x_2)^2(18 - 32x_1 + 12x_1^2 + 48x_2 - 36x_1x_2 + 27x_2^2)], \quad (4)$$

where  $-2 \leq x_i \leq 2$ . The GP function is an excellent test function for any global optimization method, which has four local minima in the whole region. One global minima is located at  $(0, -1)$  with the function equals to 3, the other three local minima are  $f(-0.6, -0.4) = 30$ ,  $f(1.8, 0.2) = 84$  and  $f(1.2, 0.8) = 840$ . The potential surface near the global minimum is shown in Fig. 2. It is a kind of difficult to visual minima on a scale of 0 to five million. We added four brown circles to mark all local minima positions, furthermore, the global minima  $f(x_1, x_2) = 3$  is shown by arrow in Fig. 2. We used 10 qubits as the registers (As an example, see the Appendix for detailed calculations using 2 qubits). The registers will be divided into two groups to present the variable  $x_1$  and  $x_2$ . The searching range is  $x_{1,2} \in [-3.2, 3.0]$ , which covers all local and global minima. After applying the Hadamard gate, the registers group will be initialized into the superposition state, each will be used to cover  $2^5$  discrete points in the searching range, namely, each basis function will be mapped to the number within the searching domain. Then, the measurement will be performed to obtain the first threshold value after selected number of Grover iterations was applied. The

number of iterations before each measurement is important to reduce the total iteration number. We chose the sequence: 0, 0, 0, 1, 1, 0, 1, 1, 2, 1, 2, 3, 1, 4, 5, 1, 6, 2, 7, 9, 11, 13, 16, 5..., as the iteration number before each measurement, i.e. for step 1 we measure the state without any Grover iteration, for step 4, we measure the state after one Grover iteration. This sequence has been proposed in Ref. [38] to reduce the Grover iteration numbers for adopted Grover search method. During each iteration, the state function will be rotated towards the threshold value, which is always the best measurement result at previous steps. The new obtained value will be compared with the old threshold value. The threshold value will be reset to the new value if the old threshold value is larger than the new measurement result, otherwise it is unchanged. The iteration will continue until convergence is reached. The quantum search yields the same result (high probability) as the classic method with 16 steps. In Fig. 3, we show the probability distribution of the state function before the iteration steps. The top left panel is the initial state, where the state function is the superposition for every possible state, and the measurement result yields 379605.8306 after step one without any Grover iteration. In Fig.3, panel (b) is the state function after total 2 Grover iterations at step 5, where the measurement result yields 4038.3764. As we can see the probabilities for smaller function values become larger, meanwhile the eigenfunction corresponding to larger function values starts decreasing. In panel (c), the area of high probability reduced a lot compared with panel (b). It means that the search keeps converging at step 10. At step 16 with total 22 Grover iteration, we reach the global minimum value 3 at  $x_1 = 0$  and  $x_2 = -1$  as shown in panel (d) of Fig. 3.

Let us further illustrate this approach by considering a real and practical optimization problem: finding the global minimum of Lennard-Jones clusters, clusters of atoms or molecules that interact with each other through the Lennard-Jones potential. The Lennard-Jones potential (referred to as the L-J potential or 6-12 potential) is a simple mathematical model that describes the long range attractive van der Waals force and the short range Pauli repulsion force. The L-J potential is of the form:

$$V_{LJ}(r) = \epsilon \left[ \left( \frac{2^{1/6}\sigma}{r} \right)^{12} - \left( \frac{2^{1/6}\sigma}{r} \right)^6 \right], \quad (5)$$

where  $\epsilon$  and  $2^{1/6}\sigma$  are the pair equilibrium well depth and separation, respectively.  $r$  is the relative distance between two particles. We will employ reduced units in our simulation and define  $\epsilon = 2^{1/6}\sigma = 1$ . The L-J potential is a relatively good approximation and due to

its simplicity often used to describe the properties of gases, and to model dispersion and overlap interactions in molecular models. It is particularly accurate for noble gas atoms and is a good approximation at long and short distances for neutral atoms, molecules and clusters. Lennard-Jones clusters are excellent for testing the efficiency of global optimization algorithms [39]. Homogeneous Lennard-Jones clusters have well-established minima and regular minimum-energy structures for very large clusters [40]. However, the number of local minima apparently grows rapidly and finding the global minimum in Lennard-Jones clusters is an NP-hard problem [41]. Several global optimization methods have been applied to the energy function of Lennard-Jones clusters. The total energy for a Lennard-Jones cluster of  $M$  particles is:  $E_M = \sum_{i=1}^{M-1} \sum_{j=i+1}^M V_{LJ}(r_{ij})$ , where  $r_{ij}$  is the distance between the  $i$ -th and the  $j$ -th particles and  $V_{LJ}(r)$  is the Lennard-Jones two-body potential. We start simulating the process of searching the global minimum for  $M = 3$  particles. A total of 9 register qubits ( $N=2^9=512$  mesh points) were separated into two groups for presenting three variable  $B_1, B_2$ , and  $A_1$ , where  $B_1$  is the bond length between the atom 0 and 1,  $B_2$  is the bond length between atom 0 and 2, and  $A_1$  is the bond angle of atom 0, 1 and 0, 2 as shown in Fig. 4. Five qubits will be used as the first register to cover the space  $B_1 = B_2$ , and four qubits will be used as the second register for  $A_1$ . The searching range for  $B_{1,2} \in [0.0001, 2]$  and for  $A_1 \in [0.0001, \pi]$ . The quantum search yields the minimum value -2.9094 at  $B_1 = 1.0323$ ,  $B_2 = 1.0323$  and  $A_1 = 1.0473rad = 60^\circ$ . Compared with the classical minimum potential, it is slightly higher. This is due to our mesh can not cover the exact minimum value. Unlike the search method for GP function, where the number of iterations is preselected based upon the proposed sequence, here we increase the number of iterations after every measurement to study the importance of the iteration sequence. The number of iterations increases as 1, 2, 3, 4... In Fig. 4, we show the search results and the total iteration steps. From the histogram of total number of iterations for 100 independent searches, we found that the average number of iteration is about 21. This indicates that the running time of adapted search algorithm (a total of 231 iterations) is still the same as the Grover search algorithm  $O(\sqrt{N})$ , which is about  $10\sqrt{2^9}$  in this example. The configuration corresponding to the minimum for LJ cluster is also shown in Fig. 4.

In order to expand the adapted quantum search algorithm to search the global minimum for larger number of variables and to overcome the limit of using large number of qubits in the computation, we combined the classical pivot search method[9, 10] with the quantum

Grover's search algorithm. The basic scheme is as following: *Step (1)*: Generate  $N$  random probes, where  $N$  equals to  $2^{\text{number of qubits}}$ , then shift it into superposition of the entire state space. *Step (2)*: Use the quantum Grover algorithm mentioned before to do the comparison. Select and keep about the smallest 15% of the original  $N$  random probes as pivot probes. *Step (3)*: Initialize the quantum computer with the state associated with these pivot probes, apply a series of controlled Hadamard gates to produce the superposition state with points near the selected probes.  $x_{R,i} = x_{B,i} + \Delta x_i$ , where  $\Delta x_i$  is a randomly generated vector according to a particular distribution such as Gaussian distribution [9]. *Step (4)*: Redo *Step (2)* and keep going until the criteria of convergence is satisfied. Using this procedure, it is possible to cover the entire searching space by a small number of qubits. Moreover, this small number of qubits is sufficient to cover each subdomain to yield the desired resolution. To illustrate this combined approach, we search the global minimum for the Shubert test function, which is given by[10]:

$$f(x_1, x_2) = \left[ \sum_{i=1}^{i=5} i \cos[(i+1)x_1 + i] \right] \times \left[ \sum_{i=1}^{i=5} i \cos[(i+1)x_2 + i] \right] \quad (6)$$

with  $-10 \leq x_{1,2} \leq 10$ , which has 760 local minima, 18 of which are global with  $f(x_1, x_2) = -186.7309$ . The surface potential of this function is shown in Fig.5. Ten qubits were used to do this simulation, each  $x$  was assigned 5 qubits. Following the same procedure mentioned above, we initially generated  $2^{10}$  random points. Then 15% minimum of these points were picked up by quantum Grover algorithm as pivots. After that, we arranged the pivots based on the weight of the optimized function ( $\exp(-f(x_1, x_2)/kT)$ ), where  $kT$  is just a fixed parameter and equals to 50 in our simulation. We generated the other points according to the Gaussian distribution. We ran this simulation for 98 times, the researched minimum values are between -30.56 and -186.73. Over 80% points are located at -186.73, which is the exact global minimum for this function. It also covers all 18 global minima and the average iteration is 1300. The simulation results are shown in Fig. 5, where the black dots are measurement results on the contour of the surface potential with red dots as global minima. It seems this method only converges to the global minima 80% of times. However, the advantage is that only 10 qubits used, which means  $2^5$  pivot points for each  $x$  axis, with total  $2^{10}$  mesh points. It is a very small mesh based on current computer. If we can use 20 qubits (10 for each axis), the number of mesh points will be much larger. Under this situation, the convergence speed will be much faster.

Furthermore, following the same steps, we also applied this combined method to search optimized structure for LJ cluster. We tried 5 atoms and got the exact same results as the classical method. The detailed procedure for the 3 atoms simulation is as following: we first set 5 qubits for  $B_{1,2}$  and 5 qubits for  $A_1$ . The same previous range, which is  $B_{1,2} \in [0.0001, 2]$  and for  $A_1 \in [0.0001, \pi]$ . We first generated  $2^5$  random  $B_{1,2}$  and  $2^5$  random  $A_1$  in the above range. Then we used the combined classical pivot method and Grover's search algorithm which was mentioned in previous paragraph. After the search, we got the global minimum structure for the 3 atoms cluster (the same structure shown in Fig. 4). The distance between each atom is 0.99889 and the total potential for this structure is -2.9999, which is almost the same as the classical result(-3.0). After that, based on the optimized structure of 3 atoms, we added another atom to form the 4 atoms cluster. We fixed the original 3 atoms and set the forth one free. We used  $X, Y$  and  $Z$  to express the coordinates for the forth atom and used 10 qubits in the simulation, the same number as in the previous simulations. We tried two different ways to perform the simulations: In the first method, we let the forth atom totally free in  $X, Y$  and  $Z$  directions and set 4 qubits for  $X$  axis, 3 qubits for  $Y$  axis and the rest 3 qubits for  $Z$  axis. In order to save simulation steps, the ranges for all coordinates are  $X \in [-0.5, 0.5]$ ,  $Y \in [0.01, 1.01]$  and  $Z \in [0.01, 1.01]$ . Then we followed the same steps as 3 atoms, generated random points and started the search. After a number of simulations, the result converged to -5.0 in average, which is not quite accurate (classical=-6.0). The second method is fixing  $X$  at 0.0 and arranging 5 qubits for  $Y$  and  $Z$  respectively. The ranges for  $Y$  and  $Z$  are the same, between 0.01 and 1.01. The rest of the procedures is the same as for 3 atoms. the simulation results gives the lowest potential for this cluster is -5.9926, which is quite close to the classical result (-6.0). The probability distribution for the whole procedures is shown in Fig. 6, as well as the final structure. We stepped forward to use this method to simulation the most optimized structure for 5 atoms cluster. The simulation procedure is the same as for 4 atoms cluster. We fixed the previous optimized structure and added the 5<sup>th</sup> free atom. We also used the above two methods, results show that the second method gave more accurate results. We obtained the value -9.0952, which is close to the classical simulation value (-9.103852). Although we did not get the exact optimized structures with the current simulations but with more qubits one should cover the exact results.

It is known that the  $\sqrt{N}$  is the optimal running time for quantum search algorithm.

The combined search method does not reduce the total rotation steps, but does reduce the required number of qubits to do the simulation. Due to the limited available qubits in the classical computer, we can only set one atom free with all other atoms fixed. However, in a quantum computer, with enough qubits available, we can perform full optimization for all atoms. For example, for larger LJ clusters, if we had larger qubits, we can incorporate the partial knowledge that we had by starting with the structure of the smaller ( $M - k$ ) clusters and adding  $k$  additional particles at random[9, 42]. In a previous work[9], using the pivot method we have shown that the computational cost (CPU time) scales as  $M^{2.9}$  with the number of L-J particles to be minimized. With various practical improvements, if one reduces the scale to  $M^2$ . If we can assign a certain number of qubits for each particle, then the Grover algorithm will reduce the search steps into the order of  $O(M)$  for this specific case. In any ‘growing’ problem, such as minimum energy configuration of clusters, self-avoiding walks, protein folding, etc., this systematic approach to solving the structure of large clusters can be incorporated. One of the powerful features of this combined algorithm is that information such as this can be built into the initialization of the probes.

We have used an adapted quantum search algorithm to search the global minima for test functions and LJ clusters. Our quantum computer simulations on the classical computer yield the same global minimum values as the classical search method with high probability. We also show how to combine the classical Pivot method with the adapted quantum search algorithm to search for the global minimum in larger domains. Recently, Jordan[43] proposed a fast quantum algorithm for estimating numerical gradients with one query. One can use this method to search the potential gradient with zero value. This will rotate the entire space towards the state function which corresponds to all minima. The measurement will yield one of the minima in stead of any point in the search domain. Combining this with our search method will greatly reduce the number of rotations needed for finding the global minimum. With further improvements in the quantum search algorithms, we expect to see solutions of previously intractable global optimization problems in many different fields.

In summary, the manuscript contains novel results and a proof-of-principle about the use of quantum computers for the simulation of a global minimum. First, the paper provides fundamental insight into the quantum simulation of global optimization problems, and sec-

ond we implemented some simple applications. We also demonstrated for the first time that a modified Grover's quantum algorithm can be applied to real problems of finding a global minimum using a modest number of qubits. If a quantum computer that would allow for these calculations to be carried out were available now, we believe that the development of algorithms for optimization is of great importance in many practical fields and further motivates the construction of these devices.

Experimentally, the Grover's algorithm has been demonstrated by nuclear magnetic resonance (NMR) [44, 45, 46, 47, 48] and quantum optics [36] for small number of qubits. Although it is easy to obtain the Grover's oracle by classic computers, it is very hard to realize this oracle in quantum circuit. There are no efficient universal methods to design this oracle until now. Recently there are a few attempts to solve this problem directly. Ju and coworkers [49] implemented Grover's oracle function by Boolean logic in quantum circuit. However, they used  $N$  ( $2^{\text{number of qubits}}$ ) Boolean logic to represent the oracle, which makes the circuit design not efficient. On the other hand, Xu and coworkers [50] successfully used the adiabatic search algorithm to realize Grover's algorithm without oracle by encoding the database to quantum format and forming the problem Hamiltonian form target value. Further research is still needed to overcome the Grover's oracle.

### **Acknowledgments**

We thank Jonathan Baugh for useful discussions and the Army Research Office (ARO) for funding.

## APPENDIX

This Appendix show how the modified Grover algorithm is used for the simulation of the global minimum of the GP function. In the text, we used a total of 10 qubits for the optimization. Here as an example we provide results for only two qubits. One qubit is used to represent the  $x_1$  axis and the other for the  $x_2$  axis. The search range was  $x_{1,2} \in [-3.2, 3.0]$  and discretized into  $2^1 = 2$  points on each axis.

*Step (1):* Perform the Walsh-Hadamard transformation to place the system into a superposition with equal probabilities for all states. The obtained vector is also our original source  $|s\rangle$ . The formula for this step is  $|s\rangle = \bigotimes_{i=1}^2 H|0\rangle$ . Thus, we obtain the vector  $|s\rangle = (0.5 \ 0.5 \ 0.5 \ 0.5)^T$ .

*Step (2):* Generate the  $P_s$  operator,  $P_s = 2|s\rangle\langle s| - I$ , where  $|s\rangle$  is the vector we obtain in Step 1.  $P_s$  increases the amplitude of the selected state and takes the form

$$P_s = \frac{1}{2} \begin{pmatrix} -1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & -1 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 & -1 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 & 1 & -1 \end{pmatrix} \quad (7)$$

*Step (3):* Obtain the entry matching the search criterion  $|t\rangle$  (can also be called the target source). There is no direct way to obtain the target source from the pure quantum method, so a "black box" type is used in the current simulation. Thus, it was obtained by an indirect mapping. We calculated values of the GP function at all mesh points and picked the lowest one by classical comparison. Then we marked the corresponding part of  $x_{1,2}$  as 1 and the rest as zeros. Followed by applying the Kronecker tensor product to obtain the target source  $|t\rangle$ , which is a similar vector to  $|s\rangle$ . For this example, the point  $(-3.2, -3.2)$  has the lowest value. The corresponding target source is  $|t\rangle = (1 \ 0)^T \otimes (1 \ 0)^T = (1 \ 0 \ 0 \ 0)^T$ .

*Step (4):* Generate the  $P_t$  operator, where  $P_t = I - 2|t\rangle\langle t|$ . This operator reverses the selected state and takes the form

$$P_t = \begin{pmatrix} -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \quad (8)$$

*Step (5):* Apply the Grover operator,  $G = P_s P_t$ ,  $O(\sqrt{N})$  times to the superposition state ( $|s\rangle$ ). The new  $G$  operator has the effect of both  $P_s$  and  $P_t$ , which reverses the selected state first and then increases its amplitude. For this example, it takes the form


$$G|s\rangle = P_s P_t |s\rangle = P_s \begin{pmatrix} -0.5 \\ 0.5 \\ 0.5 \\ 0.5 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} \quad (9)$$

For this simple example, we obtained the correct answer in one step.

- 
- [1] S. Kirkpatrick, C.D. Gelatt Jr. and M. P. Vecchi, *Science*, **220**, 671 (1983).
- [2] J. Barhen, V. Protopopescu, D. Reister, *Science*, **276**, 1094 (1997).
- [3] D. Cvijovis and J. Klinowski, *Science* **267**, 664 (1995).
- [4] D. J. Wales and H.A. Scheraga, *Science*, **285**, 1368 (1999).
- [5] P. Nigra and S. Kais, *Chem. Phys. letters*, **305**, 433 (1999).
- [6] S. Kais and R.D. Levine, *J. Phys. Chem.* **91**, 5462 (1987).
- [7] D.E. Goldberg, *Genetic Algorithms in Search, Optimization and Machine Learning*, (Addison Wesley, Reading, MA 1989).
- [8] D.D. Frantz, D.L. Freeman and J.D. Doll, *J. Chem. Phys.* **93**, 2769 (1990).
- [9] P. Serra, A.F. Stanton and S. Kais, *Phys. Rev. E* **55**, 1162 (1997).
- [10] P. Serra, A.F. Stanton, S. Kais and R.E. Bleil, *J. Chem. Phys.* **106**,7170 (1997).
- [11] S. Lioyd, *Science*, **273**, 1073 (1996).
- [12] D. S. Abrams and S. Lioyd, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **83**, 5162 (1999).
- [13] E. Farhi, J. Golstone, S. Gutmann, J. Iqbal, A. Lundgren and D. Preda, *Science*, **292**, 472 (2001).
- [14] R. Cleve, A. Ekert, C. Macchiavello and M. Mosca, *Proc. R. Soc. Lond. A* **454**, 339 (1998).
- [15] A. Aspuru-Guzik, A.D. Dutoi, P.J. Love and M. Head-Gordon, *Science*, **309**, 1704 (2005).
- [16] H. Wang, S. Kais, A. Aspuru-Guzik and M. R. Hofmann, *Phys. Chem. Chem. Phys.* **10**, 5388 (2008).
- [17] R. Feynman, *Int. Journal of Theor. Phys.*, **21** 467 (1982).
- [18] D. Deutsch, *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London, A* **400**, 97 (1985).
- [19] F. Bernstein, and U. Vazirani, *S. I. A. M. Journal on Computing* **26**, 1411 (1997).
- [20] D. Simon, (1994) *Proc. of 35th Annual Symposium on the Foundations of Computer Science*, (IEEE Computer Society, Los Alamitos), p. 116 (Extended Abstract). Full version of this paper appears in *S. I. A. M. Journal on Computing* **26**, 1474 (1997).
- [21] L. Grover, *Proc. 28th Annual ACM Symposium on the Theory of Computing*, (ACM Press, New York), 212 (1996).
- [22] P.W. Shor, *Algorithms For Quantum Computation: Discrete Logs and Factoring*, Proceedings of the 35th Symposium on the Foundations of Computer Science, 124 (1994).

- [23] P.W. Shor, *SIAM Journal on Computing* **26** **5**, 1484 (1997).
- [24] M. Garey, and D. Johnson, *Computers and Intractability: a Guide to the Theory of NP Completeness*, W. H. Freeman and Co. (1979).
- [25] C. H. Bennett, E. Bernstein, G. Brassard, and U. Vazirani, (1997) *S. I. A. M. Journal on Computing* **26**, 1510-1523 (1997).
- [26] R. Jozsa, Pages 369-379 in *The Geometric Universe* edited by S. Huggett, L. Mason, K. P. Tod, S. T. Tsou and N. Woodhouse, Oxford University Press (1998).
- [27] R. Jozsa, *Proc. Roy. Soc. London Ser A*, **454**, 323 (1998).
- [28] A. Ekert, and R. Jozsa, *Phil. Trans. Roy. Soc. London Ser A* **356**, 1769 (1998).
- [29] F. Remacle and R.D. Levine, *PNAS* **101**, 12091 (2004).
- [30] R. de Vivie-Riedle and U. Troppmann, *Chem. Rev.* **107**, 5082 (2007).
- [31] L. K. Grover, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **79**, 325 (1997).
- [32] L. K. Grover, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **95**, 150501 (2005).
- [33] Michael A. Nielsen and Isaac L. Chuang, *Quantum Computation and Quantum Information* (Cambridge University Press, 2000).
- [34] Mika Hirvensalo, *Quantum Computing* (Springer-Verlag, 2001).
- [35] J.A. Jones, *Science*, **280**, 229 (1998).
- [36] M. O. Scully and M. S. Zubairy, *PNAS* **98**, 9490 (2001).
- [37] A. Perdomo, C. Truncik, I. T. Brohman, G. Rose and A. Aspuru-Guzik, *Phys. Rev. A* **78**, 012320 (2008).
- [38] W.P. Baritompa, D.W. Bulger and G.R. Wood, *SIAM J. OPTIM*, **15**, 1170 (2005).
- [39] D.J. Wales and J.P.K. Doye, *J. Phys. Chem. A* **101**, 5111-5116 (1997)
- [40] R.S. Berry, T.L. Beck, H.L. Davis, and J. Jellinek, in *Advances in Chemical Physics*, edited by I. Prigogine and S.A. Rice (Wiley, New York, 1988), Vol. 70B, p. 75.
- [41] L. T. Wille and J. Vennik, *J. Phys. A* **18**, L419 (1985).
- [42] J.A. Northby, *J. Chem. Phys.* **87**, 6166 (1987).
- [43] S.P. Jordan, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **95**, 050501 (2005).
- [44] L.M.K. Vandersypen, M. Steffen, G. Breyta, C.S. Yannoni, R. Cleve and I.L. Chuang, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **85**, 5452 (2000)
- [45] E. Knill, R. Laflamme, R. Martinez and C.H. Tseng, *Nature(London)* **404**, 368 (2000)
- [46] R.J. Nelson, D.G. Cory and S. Lloyd, *Phys. Rev. A* **2**, 2106 (2000)

- [47] Z.L. Madi, R. Brusweiler and R.R. Ernst, *J. Chem. Phys.* **109**, 10603 (1999)
- [48] R. Das and A. Kumar, *J. Chem. Phys.* **7601**, 121 2004
- [49] Y.L. Ju, I.M. Tsai and S.Y. Kuo, *Ieee Transactions on Circuits and Systems I-Regular Papers* **54**, 2552 (2007)
- [50] N. Xu, J. Zhu, X. Peng, X. Zhou and J. Du *arXiv:0809.0664v1*



1

FIG. 1: Quantum circuit for searching the global minimum. The  $G_{n-1}$  is the oracle to rotate the vector toward the state with  $f(x_1, x_2, \dots) \leq M_{n-1}$ , where  $M_{n-1}$  is the minimum of all measurement results. The registers will be initialize to  $|x_1\rangle = |0000\rangle$  and  $|x_2\rangle = |0000\rangle$  for variable  $x_1$  and  $x_2$ . After using the Hadamard gates to convert the initial state into the superposition state, the adapted Grover operators will be applied to rotate the superposition state to the specific state. The threshold value of Grover operator will be updated based on the measurement result after certain number of rotations.




FIG. 2: The potential surface near the global minimum of the GP function (See the text). It is difficult to tell the four minima points visually on a scale of zero to five million, so I marked them by brown circles.  $f(0, -1) = 3$  is the global minimum which was indicated by the arrow.




FIG. 3: Probability distribution of the state function before the measurement for the GP function. The panel a is the initial state corresponding to the superposition of all possible states, the panels b, c and d are the distributions of step 5, 10 and 16 respectively.




FIG. 4: Final probability distribution of the state function for LJ ( $N=3$ ). The global minimum located at  $B_1 = 1.0323$ ,  $B_2 = 1.0323$  and  $A_1 = 1.0473\text{rad} = 60^\circ$ . The top panel is the distribution of total measure step before reaching the global minimum for 100 search results. The global minimum and corresponding structure are also shown in figure.




FIG. 5: The surface potential of the Shubert function and the final quantum search results. The top panel is the surface potential for the Shubert function with the range  $x_{1,2} \in (-10, 10)$ . The bottom panel is the contour of the function with the quantum search results. The black dots present the measurement results for all search steps.




FIG. 6: Probability distribution of the state function for LJ cluster ( $N=4$ ). The a, b and c are the steps during the searching. The global minimum energy is  $-5.9926$  and the coordinates for the 4th atom are  $(0.0, 0.28444, 0.81344)$ . Although there are many bars, they are quite close to each other. d is the optimized structure for 5 atoms cluster with the energy of  $-9.0952$ . The green atoms are fixed atoms, while the red one is the free atom. The distances between the red and the green ones are  $0.99$ ,  $0.99$  and  $1.00$  separately.