

# Lower Bounds on Number of QAOA Rounds Required for Guaranteed Approximation Ratios

Naphan Benchasattabuse<sup>1,2</sup>, Andreas Bärtzchi<sup>1</sup>, Luis Pedro García-Pintos<sup>3</sup>, John Golden<sup>1</sup>, Nathan Lemons<sup>4</sup>, and Stephan Eidenbenz<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>CCS-3 Information Sciences, Los Alamos National Laboratory, Los Alamos, NM 87545, USA

<sup>2</sup>Graduate School of Media and Governance, Keio University, 5322 Endo, Fujisawa, Kanagawa 252-0882, Japan

<sup>3</sup>T-4 Physics of Condensed Matter & Complex Systems, Los Alamos National Laboratory, Los Alamos, NM 87545, USA

<sup>4</sup>T-5 Applied Mathematics and Plasma Physics, Los Alamos National Laboratory, Los Alamos, NM 87545, USA

The quantum alternating operator ansatz (QAOA) is a heuristic hybrid quantum-classical algorithm for finding high-quality approximate solutions to combinatorial optimization problems, such as Maximum Satisfiability. While QAOA is well-studied, theoretical results as to its runtime or approximation ratio guarantees are still relatively sparse. We provide some of the first lower bounds for the number of rounds (the dominant component of QAOA runtimes) required for QAOA. For our main result, (i) we leverage a connection between quantum annealing times and the angles of QAOA to derive a lower bound on the number of rounds of QAOA with respect to the guaranteed approximation ratio. We apply and calculate this bound with Grover-style mixing unitaries and (ii) show that this type of QAOA requires at least a polynomial number of rounds to guarantee any constant approximation ratios for most problems. We also (iii) show that the bound depends only on the statistical values of the objective functions, and when the problem can be modeled as a  $k$ -local Hamiltonian, can be easily estimated from the coefficients of the Hamiltonians. For the conventional transverse field mixer, (iv) our framework gives a trivial lower

bound to all bounded occurrence local cost problems and all strictly  $k$ -local cost Hamiltonians matching known results that constant approximation ratio is obtainable with constant round QAOA for a few optimization problems from these classes. Using our novel proof framework, (v) we recover the Grover lower bound for unstructured search and – with small modification – show that our bound applies to any QAOA-style search protocol that starts in the ground state of the mixing unitaries.

## 1 Introduction

Solving optimization problems has been a cornerstone computational task, with a wide range of applications across industry, science, and technology. The two leading approaches in tackling optimization problems in quantum computing are the quantum annealing (QA) [1] and the quantum approximate optimization algorithm [2] and its generalization, the quantum alternating operator ansatz algorithm (QAOA) [3]. In order to solve an optimization problem on a quantum computer, it is natural to translate the minima or maxima finding of a given objective function to finding the ground state of a corresponding problem Hamiltonian. Although QAOA does not have any proven theoretical quantum advantage or speedups over classical algorithms, several numerical simulation results hint at potential “practical” speed-ups if and when scalable quantum computers exist [4, 5, 6]. There are, in fact, algorithms for exact optimization with provable polynomial speedups over random guessing (brute

Naphan Benchasattabuse: [whit3z@sfc.wide.ad.jp](mailto:whit3z@sfc.wide.ad.jp)

Andreas Bärtzchi: [baertschi@lanl.gov](mailto:baertschi@lanl.gov)

Luis Pedro García-Pintos: [lpgp@lanl.gov](mailto:lpgp@lanl.gov)

John Golden: [golden@lanl.gov](mailto:golden@lanl.gov)

Nathan Lemons: [nlemons@lanl.gov](mailto:nlemons@lanl.gov)

Stephan Eidenbenz: [eidenben@lanl.gov](mailto:eidenben@lanl.gov)

force) with Grover-style adaptive search [7, 8], but this type of algorithms does not provide near-optimal solutions or any approximation ratio guarantees. In its simplest form, QAOA consists of two parameterized subcircuits, the phase separator that encodes the problem Hamiltonian  $H_1$  and the mixing operator (or the mixer) that represents a Hamiltonian  $H_0$  that does not commute with the phase separator. The two subcircuits are then applied alternately in rounds, the number of which is usually denoted by  $p$ , and the goal is to adjust the parameters to minimize the expectation value to the given problem Hamiltonian  $\langle H_1 \rangle$ .

For the QA protocol, the system is initialized in an easy-to-prepare ground state of a Hamiltonian  $H_0$  that does not commute with the problem Hamiltonian  $H_1$ , similar to the mixer of QAOA. The system is then driven by a time-dependent Hamiltonian,  $H(t) = (1 - g(t))H_0 + g(t)H_1$ , where  $g(t)$  is called the ‘annealing schedule’ where  $g(0) = 0$  and  $g(t_f) = 1$ , and  $t_f$  is the total evolution time or the anneal time. It is known from the adiabatic theorem [9] that if the transition from  $H_0$  to  $H_1$  is slow enough, the state will remain close to the instantaneous ground state at all times and will arrive at the ground state of  $H_1$  at the end of the protocol. It is worth noting that although the adiabatic theorem guarantees that the final state will be the ground state of  $H_1$ , the time scale of the adiabatic anneal time is polynomial in the inverse of the gap between the ground state and the first excited state. This gap is typically exponentially small, leading to an exponential time scale in the number of qubits, and thus also in the problem size. Thus non-adiabatic annealing schedules, such as counterdiabatic driving [10, 11, 12, 13], diabatic annealing [14], or the optimal control approach [12] have been proposed that still fall into the framework of quantum annealing.

It is straightforward to see that in the limit  $p \rightarrow \infty$ , QAOA is the Trotterization of the QA. Since  $p$ , the number of QAOA rounds corresponding to the circuit depth, relates directly to the time complexity, it would be of interest to characterize the asymptotic scaling of  $p$  with the solution quality and the problem size. In the case of finite  $p$ , the intuition is not as clear, as the Trotterization argument would need to take the Trotter error into account. On the other hand,

the QAOA does not need to represent the Trotterization or discretization of any QA annealing schedule and can be thought of purely as an ansatz structure for variational algorithms [15]. In the finite  $p$  regime, it has been proven that certain problems can admit a fixed solution quality [2, 16, 17]. Another aspect that is widely studied for the variational quantum algorithms is the expressibility of the QAOA circuits [18], how much of the solution space can be reached with a given  $p$  rounds of QAOA [19, 20], or the concentration of states [21, 22]. Other connections between QA and QAOA that have been explored are the initial state selection [23, 24, 25, 26] and the counterdiabatic driving in QAOA [27]. In the other direction, QA can also simulate QAOA protocols by realizing that the alternate Hamiltonian applications of QAOA correspond to the bang-bang schedule [28] (i.e., the schedule where only one driving Hamiltonian is turned on at a time). It is also conjectured that the bang-bang schedule is optimal for QA for most problems [29] while some other problems might have the optimal schedule that follows bang-anneal-bang [30].

In this work, we give lower bounds on the number of QAOA rounds needed to achieve a constant target approximation ratio via results from the lower bounds of annealing time derived for QA [31]. The structure of the paper is as follows. We begin by defining QAOA and QA, and how they work in our framework. We outline the combinatorial optimization problems and their objective functions we consider, maximization problems with only non-negative integer values, and briefly recap the lower bound results of QA from [31] (Sec. 2). We then outline the assumptions of our driving Hamiltonians and derive the lower bounds for the number of rounds  $p$  in the QAOA case (Sec. 3). We also show that rescaling of the Hamiltonians has no observable effect on the QAOA, which at first, sounds counterintuitive when compared to QA, and show that the scaling factor can be selected to make the bounds constantly tighter without affecting other assumptions we prior made (Sec. 4). After we have the bounds established, we show that when using the Grover diffusion operator style as the mixer, the bounds depend on statistical values of the objective values (Sec. 5). Later, we look into the most common mixer, the transverse field. We describe that although the lower

bounds for certain families of  $k$ -local Hamiltonians (bounded occurrence or strictly  $k$ -local) evaluate to trivial lower bounds, the results agree with constant depth QAOA literature (Sec. 6). Next, we look into solving search problems with QAOA and how our lower bounds behave in this special case. We later show that a slight modification to our lower bound can recover the oracular unstructured search lower bound for both the Grover- and the transverse field mixer and also generalize to cover continuous-time quantum walk search (Sec. 7). We then end the paper with some outlook on the implications and impact on our derived bounds and how future research directions can be taken from further investigation into other properties of the system such as the coherence and the expectation value changes over the course of the protocol (Sec. 8).

## 2 Background

In this section, we give a brief introduction to combinatorial optimization, QAOA, and QA. We then outline our assumptions and constraints on the optimization problems that we consider leading to constraints on problem Hamiltonians which is used to drive the QAOA. We give a summary of results on lower bounds on annealing time derived for QA that we later use to derive the lower bounds on the number of QAOA rounds. We also elaborate on the connection between QAOA and QA with a bang-bang schedule.

### 2.1 Combinatorial optimization problem

Here, we consider combinatorial optimization problems defined on bitstrings of length  $n$  with an objective function that maps bitstring  $x$  to non-negative integer  $C(x)$ , where one wishes to find the maximum objective value  $C_{max} = \max_z C(z)$ . It is also useful to define the average of the objective values  $C_{avg} = \frac{1}{N} \sum_z C(z)$  and the standard deviation  $\sigma_C = \sqrt{\sum_z \frac{(C(z) - C_{avg})^2}{N}}$ . In this work, we only consider the case where all objective values are non-negative integers ( $C(x) \in \mathbb{N}_0$  for all  $x$ ). We denote  $F \subseteq \{0, 1\}^n$  to refer to the set of all feasible solution strings. We also often refer

to the size of the search space  $N = |F|$ , when the problem is unconstrained, the size of the feasible search space becomes  $N = 2^n$ . When the context of the feasible solution set is clear or not of importance, we will refer to its size simply as  $N$ . From the objective function, we define the cost Hamiltonian

$$H_C = \sum_{z \in F} C(z) |z\rangle \langle z|, \quad (1)$$

thus  $|z\rangle$  is an eigenstate in the computational basis  $Z^{\otimes n}$ . One of the most common ways to evaluate whether a heuristic optimization algorithm is good or bad is to denote its *approximation ratio*. In this work, we define the approximation ratio to be  $\lambda$  where  $\lambda \in [0, 1]$  is defined by

$$\lambda = \frac{\langle H_C \rangle_p}{C_{max}} = \max_{|\psi_p\rangle} \frac{\langle \psi_p | H_C | \psi_p \rangle}{C_{max}}, \quad (2)$$

where  $|\psi_p\rangle$  is the state obtainable from  $p$  rounds of QAOA and  $\langle H_C \rangle_p$  is the largest expectation value that can be obtained from  $p$  rounds of QAOA with respect to the cost Hamiltonian (or the objective function).

Since it is more common to talk about Hamiltonians with zero ground state energies, unless otherwise specified, we define our problem Hamiltonian

$$H_1 = \mathbb{1}C_{max} - H_C. \quad (3)$$

It is worth noting that the solution to our optimization problem is now mapped to the ground state of the problem Hamiltonian  $H_1$ , turning the maximization problem into minimization in the problem Hamiltonian.

### 2.2 QAOA

A QAOA protocol consists of two non-commuting Hamiltonians, the problem encoding Hamiltonian  $H_1$  (eq. (3)) and a mixing Hamiltonian with zero ground state energies  $H_0$ , a hyperparameter  $p$  indicating how many rounds the two Hamiltonians are alternately applied, and the set of angles  $\vec{\gamma}$  and  $\vec{\beta}$  denoting the evolving time of  $H_1$  and  $H_0$  at each round. The state after  $p$  rounds of QAOA can be defined as

$$|\psi(\vec{\beta}, \vec{\gamma})\rangle_p = (e^{-i\beta_p H_0} e^{-i\gamma_p H_1}) (e^{-i\beta_{p-1} H_0} e^{-i\gamma_{p-1} H_1}) \dots (e^{-i\beta_1 H_0} e^{-i\gamma_1 H_1}) |\psi_0\rangle. \quad (4)$$

The goal of QAOA is to prepare a state that minimizes  $\langle \psi(\vec{\beta}, \vec{\gamma}) | H_1 | \psi(\vec{\beta}, \vec{\gamma}) \rangle_p$  which is done by alternating between sampling the states prepared by the QAOA circuit and then on classical computers evaluating the expectation value and adjust the parameter vectors  $\vec{\gamma} = (\gamma_1, \gamma_2, \dots, \gamma_p)$  and  $\vec{\beta} = (\beta_1, \beta_2, \dots, \beta_p)$  so the expectation value moves toward the minima. We will later refer to  $\langle \psi(\vec{\beta}, \vec{\gamma}) | H_1 | \psi(\vec{\beta}, \vec{\gamma}) \rangle_p$  with the shorthand notation  $\langle H_1 \rangle_p$ .

### 2.3 Quantum Annealing

Quantum annealing protocols consist of a set of driving Hamiltonians and an annealing schedule, a function of time  $g(t)$ . The set of driving Hamiltonians usually comprises of two Hamiltonians, the problem Hamiltonian that we want to find its ground state  $H_1$ , and a Hamiltonian where its ground state is known and easy to prepare  $H_0$ . The system is then driven by a time-dependent Hamiltonian given by

$$H(t) = (1 - g(t))H_0 + g(t)H_1, \quad (5)$$

where the function  $g(t)$  is called the ‘annealing schedule’ that satisfies  $g(0) = 0$  and  $g(t_f) = 1$ , and  $t_f$  is the total duration of the process. Here, we consider an annealing schedule to be successful if the probability of finding the ground state of the problem Hamiltonian  $p_{0,t_f} \geq k$  where  $k$  is some constant threshold.

### 2.4 QAOA as a bang-bang QA

When the driving Hamiltonians of QAOA and QA are the same, the QAOA is essentially the bang-bang schedule, the schedule  $g(t)$  only has two distinct values, 0 and 1. The annealing time can be defined as

$$t_{anneal} = \sum_{j=1}^p (|\beta_j| + |\gamma_j|). \quad (6)$$

In this view, any result that applies to general QA can also be applied to QAOA.

### 2.5 Lower bounds on annealing times

It was shown in [31] that a lower bound on anneal time to reach the ground state with high probability can be derived independent of the trajectory of the state through the process.

**Theorem 1** (García-Pintos et al. [31]). *Given two driving Hamiltonians with zero ground state energies  $H_0$  and  $H_1$ . For a quantum annealing protocol that starts in the ground state of  $H_0$  and ends at time  $t_f$ , it holds that*

$$t_f \geq \tau_{anneal} := \frac{\langle H_0 \rangle_{t_f} + \langle H_1 \rangle_0 - \langle H_1 \rangle_{t_f}}{\|[H_1, H_0]\|}. \quad (7)$$

Above,  $\langle H \rangle_t = \langle \psi_t | H | \psi_t \rangle$  is the expectation value of the evolving state  $|\psi_t\rangle$  at time  $t$  with respect to Hamiltonian  $H$  and  $\|\cdot\|$  denotes the spectral norm. This bound only depends on the properties of the problem Hamiltonian and the driving Hamiltonians, with the term  $\langle H_1 \rangle_{t_f}$  capturing the error to the ground state of  $H_1$ .

We note that there are also other variations of the lower bounds that are tighter. For those lower bounds, which take the trajectory of the state during the annealing process, we refer readers to [31].

## 3 Lower bounds on QAOA

Here in this section, we will give the main results, which show the relationship between the approximation ratio  $\lambda$  and the number of rounds  $p$  for QAOA required to reach it. Let  $\langle H \rangle_l$  denote the expectation value after  $l$  rounds of QAOA. (In the context of QA  $l$  refers to the annealing time, while for QAOA  $l$  refers to the state after  $l$  rounds of QAOA.)

### 3.1 Lower bounds on QAOA angles

From the view that QAOA is a QA with a bang-bang schedule (Sec. 2.4), we can derive lower bounds on QAOA given the angles.

**Lemma 1.** *Given a phase separator Hamiltonian  $H_1$  and a mixing Hamiltonian  $H_0$ , where both Hamiltonians have zero ground state energies. For a QAOA protocol with  $p$  rounds driven by  $H_0$  and  $H_1$  with angle parameters  $\vec{\gamma}$  and  $\vec{\beta}$  that starts from the ground state of  $H_0$ , then*

$$\sum_{j=1}^p (|\beta_j| + |\gamma_j|) \geq \frac{\langle H_0 \rangle_p - \langle H_1 \rangle_0 - \langle H_1 \rangle_p}{\|[H_1, H_0]\|}. \quad (8)$$

*Proof.* This is an immediate result from Theorem 1 and eq. (6).  $\square$

It should be noted that the assumption that the driving Hamiltonians  $H_0$  and  $H_1$  having zero ground state energies does not violate the usual construction of QAOA. One can always shift the eigenvalues of a Hamiltonian by a constant. From the perspective of optimization, adding a constant cost to the objective function preserves the solution quality. The unitaries constructed from the modified Hamiltonians would only differ by a global phase.

### 3.2 Lower bounds on QAOA rounds

Before we go on to our main results, we will add one more assumption to the driving Hamiltonians. In addition to having zero ground state energies, we also assume that the driving Hamiltonians are periodic. Formally,

$$e^{iH(t+\theta)} = e^{iHt}, \quad (9)$$

where  $\theta$  is the period of the Hamiltonian  $H$ . For  $H_1$ , the problem Hamiltonian, the periodicity of  $2\pi$  comes naturally since we restrict ourselves to only consider combinatorial optimization with non-negative integer objective values. For  $H_0$ , the mixer, most mixing Hamiltonians used in literature are also periodic, with only a few exceptions like the ring-mixer for some fixed nearby-values [3].

Now, we are ready to give the relationship between the approximation ratio  $\lambda = \langle H_C \rangle_p / C_{max}$  and the lower bound on the number of QAOA rounds required to reach this expectation value.

**Theorem 2.** *Given a classical objective function  $C(x)$  for a maximization task, represented by the Hamiltonian  $H_C$ , encoded into the phase separator Hamiltonian  $H_1 = \mathbb{1}C_{max} - H_C$  and a mixing Hamiltonian  $H_0$ , where all Hamiltonians are  $2\pi$  periodic with zero ground state energies. Let  $C_{max}$  and  $C_{avg}$  denote the global maximum and the average of  $C(x)$ . If a QAOA protocol with  $p$  rounds driven by  $H_0$  and  $H_1$  that starts from the ground state  $|\psi_0\rangle = |+\rangle^{\otimes n}$  of  $H_0$  reaches a state with approximation ratio  $\lambda$ , then*

$$p \geq \frac{\langle H_0 \rangle_p + \lambda C_{max} - C_{avg}}{4\pi \| [H_C, H_0] \|}. \quad (10)$$

*Proof.* From Lemma 1, when imposing the peri-

odicity constraints, we get

$$\sum_{j=1}^p (|\beta_j| + |\gamma_j|) \geq \frac{\langle H_0 \rangle_p - \langle H_1 \rangle_0 - \langle H_1 \rangle_p}{\| [H_1, H_0] \|} \quad (11)$$

$$p(2\pi + 2\pi) \geq \frac{\langle H_0 \rangle_p - \langle H_1 \rangle_0 - \langle H_1 \rangle_p}{\| [H_1, H_0] \|} \quad (12)$$

$$p \geq \frac{\langle H_0 \rangle_p - \langle H_1 \rangle_0 - \langle H_1 \rangle_p}{4\pi \| [H_1, H_0] \|}, \quad (13)$$

where the second line comes from the fact that the two Hamiltonians are  $2\pi$  periodic. Since the phase separator  $H_1$  of QAOA encodes the information of the objective value into the phase, we get

$$\langle H_1 \rangle_0 - \langle H_1 \rangle_p = \lambda C_{max} - C_{avg}. \quad (14)$$

This comes directly from the definitions of the approximation ratio (eq. (2)) and  $H_1$  (eq. (3)). As for the denominator, we know that

$$[A + kI, B] = [A, B] \quad (15)$$

holds for any constant  $k$  and any matrix  $A, B$ . And because  $H_1 = \mathbb{1}C_{max} - H_C$ , thus,  $\| [H_1, H_0] \| = \| [H_C, H_0] \|$ .  $\square$

The above theorem also applies to constrained optimization problems, when the initial state  $|\psi_0\rangle$  is the uniform superposition of all feasible states and is the ground state of a constrained preserving mixing Hamiltonian  $H_0$ .

To our knowledge, this is the first result in QAOA literature that shows the connection between the number of rounds  $p$  and the approximation ratio  $\lambda$  analytically and applies to general QAOA on combinatorial optimization problems independent of the choice of mixer. Although our lower bounds are not applicable to real-valued objective functions or non-periodic mixers, it is a step forward to peek into the inner machinery and interplay between problem Hamiltonians and mixing Hamiltonians.

It should be pointed out that this lower bound also applies to families of QAOA where the problem Hamiltonian  $H_C$  is not in the set of driving Hamiltonians (e.g., the thresholded objective functions [32]), as long as the chosen phase separator commutes with  $H_C$ .

## 4 Rescaling of driving Hamiltonians

Earlier, we made an assumption that the driving Hamiltonians must be periodic and have a

period of  $2\pi$ . One could ask why this normalization of Hamiltonians makes sense. One could also rescale all the driving Hamiltonians to have a similar range of energies, say between zero and one, and this would be more physical like in the case of QA.

#### 4.1 Changes in lower bounds

Rescaling of the Hamiltonians changes their period and the range of expectation values. Therefore, it does impact the lower bound in Theorem 2. Suppose we rescale  $H_0$  by  $\alpha_0$  and  $H_1$  by  $\alpha_1$  where  $\alpha_0, \alpha_1 > 0$ , we get  $H'_0 = \alpha_0 H_0$  and  $H'_1 = \alpha_1 H_1$ , and the new periods become  $2\pi/\alpha_0$  and  $2\pi/\alpha_1$  for  $H'_0$  and  $H'_1$  respectively. The lower bound then becomes

$$p \left( \frac{2\pi}{\alpha_0} + \frac{2\pi}{\alpha_1} \right) \geq \frac{\langle H'_0 \rangle_p + \langle H'_1 \rangle_0 - \langle H'_1 \rangle_p}{\| [H'_1, H'_0] \|} \quad (16)$$

$$p \geq \frac{\alpha_0 \langle H_0 \rangle_p + \alpha_1 (\langle H_1 \rangle_0 - \langle H_1 \rangle_p)}{2\pi(\alpha_0 + \alpha_1) \| [H_1, H_0] \|}. \quad (17)$$

This allows us to analyze each Hamiltonian separately by scaling only one of the Hamiltonians to be so large that it dominates the numerator terms, which we get two inequalities,

$$p \geq \frac{\langle H_0 \rangle_p}{2\pi \| [H_1, H_0] \|} \quad \text{when } \alpha_0 \gg \alpha_1 \quad (18)$$

and

$$p \geq \frac{\langle H_1 \rangle_0 - \langle H_1 \rangle_p}{2\pi \| [H_1, H_0] \|} \quad \text{when } \alpha_0 \ll \alpha_1. \quad (19)$$

One consequence that we can directly observe is that the lower bounds cannot be adjusted to grow arbitrarily large via Hamiltonian rescaling. This is a desirable feature and leads to our next point.

#### 4.2 QAOA is invariant under Hamiltonian rescaling

If the driving Hamiltonians were to be rescaled for QA protocols, with  $\alpha_j > 1$ , one can realize that the time it takes to implement the same annealing schedule  $g(t)$  would decrease. If one were to have the ability to arbitrarily increase the strength with precise controls, then QA can be arbitrarily sped up. We emphasize that this behavior does not apply to QAOA, especially when our computational cost is the number of rounds. Since the effect of rescaling, as shown earlier, changes the

period of the Hamiltonians, the angles  $\beta$  and  $\gamma$  need only be rescaled, and the number of rounds  $p$  is not affected.

This implies that the lower bounds can be made tighter by adjusting  $\alpha_0$  and  $\alpha_1$  of eq. (17) to maximize the expression on the right-hand side. Explicitly, we can write

$$p \geq \max_{\alpha_0, \alpha_1} \frac{\alpha_0 \langle H_0 \rangle_p + \alpha_1 (\langle H_1 \rangle_0 - \langle H_1 \rangle_p)}{2\pi(\alpha_0 + \alpha_1) \| [H_1, H_0] \|}. \quad (20)$$

We note that adjusting the lower bound via rescaling can only improve the constant factor and cannot improve the asymptotes compared to bounds derived from  $2\pi$  period Hamiltonians. These observations confirmed that deriving the lower bounds from the  $2\pi$  period is logically sound even though it might seem counterintuitive at first when compared to the QA case.

Next, we will use this bound that we derived and look at a few specific concrete examples.

## 5 Lower bounds on QAOA rounds with Grover diffusion-style mixer

One of the mixers that has been proposed for constrained optimization problems is the Grover-mixer [33], the parameterized version of the usual diffusion operator in Grover's algorithm and its amplitude amplification [34, 35]. This mixer not only preserves the state space in the space of feasible solutions, but it is also invariant to permutations of the input since all states with the same objective value will always share the same amplitudes if initialized with the same value. This style of phase separator and Grover-mixer QAOA is also looked at from the perspective of amplitude amplification [36, 37, 38, 39, 40] in an attempt to decrease the cost of adaptive Grover's search and to gain more insights into generalization of ground state finding via amplitude amplification techniques. From the QAOA literature, this mixer was shown to provide better scaling for small problem size [18, 32] than the traditional transverse field Hamiltonian due to its ability to mix rapidly [41, 42, 43, 44]. Although this rapid mixing behavior has been empirically shown to be detrimental when the problem size is large when the classical outer loop is optimized via expectation value [4, 5], we still find it interesting to characterize its lower bound since optimal sched-

ule could be difficult to find via optimizing over the expectation value [45].

The Hamiltonian of the Grover-mixer can be defined as

$$H_{Grover} = \mathbb{1} - |\psi_0\rangle\langle\psi_0| \quad (21)$$

$$= \mathbb{1} - \frac{1}{N} \sum_x \sum_y |y\rangle\langle x|, \quad (22)$$

where  $x$  and  $y$  are states in the feasible subspace. Its unitary is the rotation around the uniform superposition state of all feasible states  $|\psi_0\rangle$ .

**Theorem 3.** *Given a classical objective function  $C(x)$  for a maximization task, represented by the Hamiltonian  $H_C$ , encoded into the phase separator Hamiltonian  $H_1 = \mathbb{1}C_{max} - H_C$  and the mixing Hamiltonian  $H_{Grover}$ , where all Hamiltonians are  $2\pi$  periodic with zero ground state energies. Let  $C_{max}$ ,  $C_{avg}$ , and  $\sigma_C$  denote the global maximum, the average, and the standard deviation of  $C(x)$ . If a QAOA protocol with  $p$  rounds driven by  $H_{Grover}$  and  $H_1$  starts from the ground state  $|\psi_0\rangle = |+\rangle^{\otimes n}$  of  $H_{Grover}$  and reaches a state with approximation ratio  $\lambda$ , then*

$$p \geq \frac{1 - |\langle\psi_0|\psi_p\rangle|^2 + \lambda C_{max} - C_{avg}}{4\pi\sigma_C}. \quad (23)$$

*Proof.* The term  $\langle H_{Grover} \rangle_p$  can be evaluated directly from eq. (22). Since  $H_C$  is diagonal in the computational basis and  $H_{Grover}$  is a rank-1 projector, the term  $[H_C, H_{Grover}]$  evaluates to a projector of rank at most 2. There is a closed-form formula for calculating the spectral norm of a matrix of this form given in [46], which gives (refer to Appendix A for the full derivations)

$$\|[H_C, H_{Grover}]\| = \sigma_C. \quad (24)$$

Plugging these values into Theorem 2 gives the lower bound as shown.  $\square$

We can see that the above lower bound depends only on the statistical value of the combinatorial optimization problem that one wishes to solve. (Evaluations with concrete problems are shown for Max-Cut in Sec. 5.2 and for  $k$ -local cost Hamiltonians in the next subsection.) This implies that the time required to solve an

optimization problem using QAOA with Grover-mixer depends only on the distribution of the objective values and not the structure of the problem (i.e., the closeness of good and bad solutions or whether there is a structure to be exploited from the bitstring representations). In other words, given two problem instances with the same distribution of objective values, the Grover-mixer treats the two as equal and indifferent to the hardness of each instance. This can be seen as a general result from the special case of single  $\beta$  and  $\gamma = \pi$  observed in [37, 39] and agrees with observations made from angle selections in the infinite size limit [47].

## 5.1 Lower bounds on QAOA with Grover-mixer on local cost Hamiltonian

So far we have treated both the objective function of our combinatorial optimization problems  $C(x)$  and the corresponding cost Hamiltonian  $H_C$  with minimal assumptions. One natural assumption about most combinatorial optimization problems that can be efficiently implemented on quantum computers is that they need only local interactions between a small number of bits of the entire bitstring [48]. This means that the corresponding  $H_C$  is a classical  $k$ -local Hamiltonian (as examples shown in [3] with constrained search space and in [49] with penalty terms) and can be written as

$$H_C = \mathbb{1}O(m) - \sum_{\nu=1}^m \alpha_\nu H_\nu \quad (25)$$

$$= \mathbb{1}O(m) - \sum_{\nu=1}^m \alpha_\nu Z_{\nu,1} Z_{\nu,2} Z_{\nu,3} \cdots Z_{\nu,t}, \quad (26)$$

where  $m = \text{poly}(n)$ ,  $\alpha_j$  is some real number of order  $\Theta(1)$  and  $t \leq k$  for all  $\nu$  (each term involves at most  $k$  qubits). It should be noted that the locality here refers to the maximum number of qubit interactions for each cost term and not the spatial arrangement of the qubits on the quantum device.

In this form, one can see that the average of objective values  $C_{avg}$  pops up naturally for unconstrained problems. Let  $|s\rangle = |+\rangle^{\otimes n}$  and we have

$$C_{avg} = \langle s|H_C|s\rangle \text{ and } \langle +|Z|+\rangle = 0, \quad (27)$$

implying that the coefficient of the trivial Pauli term of eq. (26) equals the average. We can then

rewrite  $H_C$  as

$$H_C = \mathbb{1}C_{avg} - \sum_{\nu=1}^m \alpha_\nu H_\nu \quad (28)$$

$$= \mathbb{1}C_{avg} - \sum_{\nu=1}^m \alpha_\nu Z_{\nu,1} Z_{\nu,2} Z_{\nu,3} \cdots Z_{\nu,t}. \quad (29)$$

Using the above insights, we can form another theorem.

**Theorem 4.** *Given a classical objective function  $C(x)$  for a maximization task, represented by a  $k$ -local Hamiltonian  $H_C = C_{avg}\mathbb{1} - \sum_{\nu=1}^m \alpha_\nu H_\nu$ , where each  $H_\nu$  is a product of Pauli  $Z$  with at most  $k$  terms, each  $\alpha_\nu$  is a real number denoting the weight of the term, and  $C_{avg}$  and  $C_{max}$  denote the average and the global maximum of  $C(x)$ . If a QAOA protocol with  $p$  rounds driven by the phase separator  $H_1 = C_{max}\mathbb{1} - H_C$  and the mixer  $H_{Grover}$  that starts in the state  $|\psi_0\rangle = |+\rangle^{\otimes n}$  reaches a state  $|\psi_p\rangle$  with approximation ratio  $\lambda$ , then*

$$p \geq \frac{1 - |\langle\psi_0|\psi_p\rangle|^2 + \lambda C_{max} - C_{avg}}{4\pi\sqrt{\sum_{\nu=1}^m \alpha_\nu^2}}. \quad (30)$$

*Proof.* Since we have already established that  $C_{avg}$  is the coefficient of the trivial Pauli term, we now show that the standard deviation  $\sigma_C$  can be easily calculated from the problem Hamiltonian representation as well. Realizing that

$$\sigma_C^2 = \langle s|H_C^2|s\rangle - \langle s|H_C|s\rangle^2 \quad (31)$$

$$= \left( C_{avg}^2 + \sum_{\nu=1}^m \alpha_\nu^2 \right) - C_{avg}^2 \quad (32)$$

$$= \sum_{\nu=1}^m \alpha_\nu^2, \quad (33)$$

where the first term of the second line is due to the fact that only when all the Pauli  $Z$ 's cancel out into identity that we get non-zero contributions to the sum.  $\square$

This formulation of  $k$ -local Hamiltonian not only allows us to calculate the statistical values of the objective functions easily, but it also helps estimate the lower bound. In some cases,  $C_{max}$  can also be known when turning a search problem into an optimization problem for solving with QAOA (e.g., turning SAT into Max-SAT [6]). One can also bound  $C_{max} - C_{avg}$  from above using the sum

of the absolute value of the coefficients of  $H_C$  (i.e.,  $C_{max} - C_{avg} \leq \sum_{\nu} |\alpha_\nu|$ ).

Similar arguments can be made for Hamiltonians of constrained problems, one only needs to adjust the initial state  $|s\rangle$  from a uniform superposition of all bitstrings to those in the feasible subspace. Although the adjusted state will not be a product state nor the expectation value over non-trivial terms will disappear, nevertheless, both the numerator and the denominator will still be polynomials in  $n$ . For example, when the feasible bitstring space is constrained by a fixed Hamming weight of weight  $q$  (e.g.,  $q$ -densest subgraph,  $q$ -vertex cover, etc.), each  $t$ -body term of Pauli  $Z$  can be calculated using sums of binomial coefficients. Both the average and the variance can be calculated efficiently since one only needs to calculate up to  $2k$ -body terms and sum all the weighted coefficients of each term.

**5.2 Achieving constant approximation ratio requires a polynomial number of rounds for certain problems with Grover-mixer**

There is an interesting property that one notices from this lower bound. Unlike the case of QAOA with the transverse field mixer (which we will discuss in Sec. 6), where a constant round QAOA can give a guarantee on the approximation ratio  $\lambda$  independent of the problem size for certain problems (e.g., Max-Cut, E3LIN2) as shown in [2, 16, 17], this behavior does not exist for many classes of problems when solving with QAOA and Grover-mixer.

We can form a corollary for Max-Cut to formally state this insight.

**Corollary 1.** *If a QAOA protocol with  $p$  rounds finds an approximate solution with approximation ratio  $\lambda$  to Max-Cut of a graph with  $|E|$  edges driven by the objective value phase separator  $H_1$  and the Grover-mixer  $H_{Grover}$  that starts in the state  $|\psi_0\rangle = |+\rangle^{\otimes n}$ , then*

$$p \geq \frac{1 - |\langle\psi_0|\psi_p\rangle|^2 + \lambda C_{max} - |E|/2}{2\pi\sqrt{|E|}}. \quad (34)$$

*Proof.* Applying the lower bound of Theorem 3 to an instance of Max-Cut with the number of edges denoted by  $|E|$ . Since there are 4 possible ways to assign a cut partition to an edge, it is easy to see that the expected cut value for each edge is  $1/2$ , and since any pair of edges are independent



of each other, the expected cut values then equals  $|E|/2$ . We can use a similar line of argument to calculate the standard deviation of the cuts of a graph, which evaluates to  $\sqrt{|E|}/2$ . (Refer to Appendix B for full derivations of  $\sigma_C$ .)  $\square$

We know that for any bipartite graph, the maximum number of cut edges will be equal to the number of edges in the graph. Using the above corollary, we get

$$p \geq \frac{1 - |\langle \psi_0 | \psi_p \rangle|^2 + \lambda |E| - |E|/2}{2\pi\sqrt{|E|}} \quad (35)$$

$$\geq \frac{(2\lambda - 1)}{4\pi} \sqrt{|E|}. \quad (36)$$

Since  $|E|$  is at least linear in the number of vertices  $n$  when the graph is connected, this shows that there exist problem instances in the class of Max-Cut that QAOA with Grover-mixer cannot get any approximation ratio guarantee with constant rounds and would require the number of rounds to be at least a polynomial in  $n$  to obtain a constant approximation ratio.

Although we have only shown this formally with the Max-Cut problems, similar calculations can be made for most combinatorial optimization problems.

### 5.3 Tightness of the lower bounds for optimization problems with Grover-mixer

One natural question is whether the lower bounds derived here are tight or not. We argue that the lower bounds on typical optimization problems would evaluate to a polynomial in  $n$  using techniques presented in the previous subsection. This is in contrast to the empirical results shown in [4, 5] requiring an exponential number of rounds in  $n$  and also go against the intuition obtained from the low-depth QAOA regime [50] that each round would only contribute to Grover-like progress at best.

The numerical results in [4, 5] are both obtained by optimizing the QAOA via a round-by-round basis, using the angles found from  $p - 1$  rounds to optimize for round  $p$ . We argue that this method of round-by-round angle-finding might not yield the globally optimal angles for QAOA with  $p$  rounds or another possibility that cannot be ruled out is that optimizing over expectation value might not lead us to the optimal

angles. It is also infeasible to show this numerically since performing a grid search over  $[0, 2\pi)^{2p}$  requires an exponential amount of computational resources for a high value of  $p$ .

As for the intuition given from the low-depth regime [50], it was shown that the behavior from the first round of QAOA with Grover-mixer can change the expectation value at most  $C_{max}/\sqrt{N}$  similar to the progress made by one round of Grover's search algorithm. We point out that behaviors beyond low depth are hard to predict. (This is true even in the case of a fixed angle selection [37, 39].) Since the phase of each computational basis state will not be the same across all states like in the first round.

Since our lower bound does not eliminate the usefulness of QAOA with Grover-mixer and with the above reasoning, the possibility of this type of QAOA to have a significant advantage over Grover adaptive search [7, 8] remains an open question.

## 6 Lower bounds on QAOA rounds with transverse field mixer

The transverse field mixer is the go-to mixer for unconstrained problems and it is the first mixer to be studied in the QAOA literature. It originates from QA due to being the most common and natural in most annealer devices. Not only can the transverse field mixer be implemented with constant depth on gate-based quantum computers, but it has also been shown to significantly outperform other higher-order mixers, including the Grover-mixer in random satisfiability problems [5]. The Hamiltonian of the transverse field mixer can be defined as

$$H_{TF} = \mathbb{1} \frac{n}{2} - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j=1}^n X_j, \quad (37)$$

where  $X_j$  denotes the Pauli  $X$  acting on qubit  $j$ . We can now derive the lower bound on  $p$  for the objective phase separator and transverse field mixer.

**Lemma 2.** *Given a classical objective function  $C(x)$  for a maximization task, represented by the Hamiltonian  $H_C$ , encoded into the phase separator Hamiltonian  $H_1 = \mathbb{1}C_{max} - H_C$  and the mixing Hamiltonian  $H_{TF}$  (transverse field), where all Hamiltonians are  $2\pi$  periodic with zero ground*

state energies. Let  $C_{max}$  and  $C_{avg}$  denote the global maximum and the average of  $C(x)$ . If a QAOA protocol with  $p$  rounds driven by  $H_{TF}$  and  $H_1$  that starts from the ground state  $|\psi_0\rangle = |+\rangle^{\otimes n}$  of  $H_{TF}$  reaches a state with approximation ratio  $\lambda$ , then

$$p \geq \frac{\frac{n}{2} - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j=1}^n \langle \psi_p | X_j | \psi_p \rangle + \lambda C_{max} - C_{avg}}{4\pi \| [H_C, H_{TF}] \|}. \quad (38)$$

*Proof.* This is an immediate consequence of Theorem 2.  $\square$

One immediate observation from this lower bound is the fact that energy from the term  $\langle H_{TF} \rangle_p$  ranges between 0 to  $n$ , this is unlike the Grover-mixer case where the energy from the mixing Hamiltonian does not contribute significantly to the lower bound. In the typical cases of optimization problems, we argue that  $\lambda C_{max} - C_{avg}$  should dominate the numerator term. When the energy with respect to the problem Hamiltonian  $H_1$  is of order smaller than  $n$ , the lower bound will be dominated by the  $\langle H_{TF} \rangle_p$  term. This could come from optimization problems where the global optima does not scale or grow sublinearly with the problem size. We will explore the first case in this section and the latter case will be explored with the search cost function (in Sec. 7).

We know from early results of QAOA literature that constant-depth QAOAs achieve guarantees for approximation ratios  $\lambda$  independent of the problem size for a few combinatorial optimization problems [2, 16, 51]. These combinatorial problems have one property in common, namely the number of interaction terms that each qubit participates in is bounded. Our lower bounds should capture this behavior. Thus, for the bounded occurrence  $k$ -local Hamiltonians that correspond to these optimization problems with proven approximation ratio guarantees, our lower bound from Theorem 2 should evaluate to a trivial lower bound for  $p$  (i.e., less than one) that does not scale with the number of qubits or the number of cost terms. We show in the next subsection a stronger result, namely that our bounds evaluate to a trivial lower bound for all bounded occurrence  $k$ -local Hamiltonian problems, thus leaving open the possibility that QAOA with transverse field mixer might actually achieve constant

approximation ratios for many additional optimization problems, but these guarantees have not yet been formally shown. Or stated differently, our approach does not enable us to prove non-trivial lower bounds for bounded occurrence  $k$ -local Hamiltonians problems.

## 6.1 Bounded local problem Hamiltonians yield trivial lower bounds for QAOA with transverse field mixer

We assume that  $H_C$  is a  $k$ -local Hamiltonian such that  $k = O(1)$  where it can be expressed as a weighted sum of  $m$  distinct products of Pauli  $Z$  with spectral norm  $\Theta(1)$ , and each qubit participates in at most  $l = O(1)$  terms. We also assume that  $C_{max} - C_{avg} = \Omega(n)$  making the contribution from  $\langle H_{TF} \rangle_p$  negligible in the asymptotes.

Recall from eq. (29) where the constant term in the problem Hamiltonian denotes  $C_{avg}$  when the problem is unconstrained, we get

$$C_{max} \leq \|H_C\| = \|\mathbb{1}C_{avg} + H'_C\| \leq C_{avg} + \|H'_C\|, \quad (39)$$

$$C_{max} - C_{avg} \leq \|H'_C\| = O(m), \quad (40)$$

where  $H'_C$  is the non-trivial part of  $H_C$  ( $H_C$  minus multiples of identity operators). Now, if we can characterize the conditions when  $\|[H_C, H_{TF}]\|$  is at least as large as  $\|H'_C\|$ , we will know when the lower bound evaluates to  $p \geq 1$ .

It is clear that the commutator  $[H_C, H_{TF}]$  is also  $k$ -local but the number of terms can increase from  $m$  terms up to  $km$  terms and each qubit can participate up to  $kl$  terms (originally up to  $l$  terms). We can express the commutator term as

$$[H_C, H_{TF}] = -i \sum_{\nu=1}^m \alpha_{\nu} \sum_{l=1}^t Y_{\nu,l} \bigotimes_{j \neq l} Z_{\nu,j}. \quad (41)$$

Using Theorem 1 of Ref. [52] (lower bound of the spectral norm of a traceless  $k$ -local Hamiltonian), we get

$$\|[H_C, H_{TF}]\| = \Omega(km/\sqrt{kl}) = \Omega(m), \quad (42)$$

which holds when both  $k$  and  $l$  are constants independent of the number of qubits. We can then conclude that

$$p \geq \frac{C_{max} - C_{avg}}{4\pi \|[H_C, H_{TF}]\|} = O(1), \quad (43)$$

thus the lower bound becomes a trivial lower bound (i.e., less than one) when the problem Hamiltonian is a bounded occurrence  $k$ -local Hamiltonian.

At first glance, this result may seem trivial, saying that  $p$  needs to be larger than some constant. But recall that when  $l$  is bounded by some constant, there are results as mentioned earlier showing guaranteed approximation ratios independent of problem sizes. Hence, our bounds capture behaviors of QAOA where the optimization problem is encoded into a bounded occurrence  $k$ -local Hamiltonian. The problems that are of this class are Max-Cut of bounded maximum degree, any constant bound regular graph, bounded degree  $k$ -SAT, or variations of odd degree Hamming weight problems (odd  $p$ -spin ferromagnets). The trivial bound is obtained from our lower bounds because it captures easy problem instances of this type.

## 6.2 Strictly $k$ -local problem Hamiltonians yield trivial lower bounds for QAOA with transverse field

In addition to the bounded occurrence local problems, we can also make statements about strictly  $k$ -local Hamiltonians. In order to show that this class of problem Hamiltonians also admit trivial lower bound, we will construct a certain product state in which the expectation value with respect to the commutator is larger than the spectral norm of  $H'_C$ .

Since  $H'_C$  is a classical Hamiltonian (diagonal in the computational basis), we know that there exists an eigenstate product state  $|s\rangle$  which induced the norm and from Rayleigh quotient [53] where

$$\langle s|H'_C|s\rangle^2 = \|H'_C\|^2. \quad (44)$$

Using the bitstring  $s$  of  $|s\rangle$ , we can construct  $|s^*\rangle = \bigotimes_{j=1}^n |s_j^*\rangle$  by

$$|s_j^*\rangle = \begin{cases} \cos(\theta)|0\rangle - i\sin(\theta)|1\rangle; & \text{if } s_j = 0, \\ -i\sin(\theta)|0\rangle + \cos(\theta)|1\rangle; & \text{if } s_j = 1, \end{cases} \quad (45)$$

where  $\theta = -\frac{1}{2} \arctan\left(\sqrt{\frac{1}{k-1}}\right)$ .

With this construction, the following holds for

every  $j$  and  $\nu$ ,

$$\langle s^*|Y_j|s^*\rangle = \sqrt{\frac{1}{k}} \langle s|Z_j|s\rangle, \quad (46)$$

$$\langle s^*|Z_j|s^*\rangle = \sqrt{\frac{k-1}{k}} \langle s|Z_j|s\rangle, \quad (47)$$

$$\langle s^*|[H_\nu, H_{TF}]|s^*\rangle = \langle s|H_\nu|s\rangle \sqrt{k} \left(\sqrt{\frac{k-1}{k}}\right)^{k-1}. \quad (48)$$

This gives

$$\|[H_C, H_{TF}]\| \geq |\langle s^*|[H_C, H_{TF}]|s^*\rangle| \quad (49)$$

$$= \|H'_C\| \sqrt{k} \left(\sqrt{\frac{k-1}{k}}\right)^{k-1} \quad (50)$$

$$\geq \|H'_C\| \quad (\text{for all } k \geq 1), \quad (51)$$

where the first inequality is due to the Rayleigh quotient. Recall from eq. (40), that the numerator term  $C_{max} - C_{avg}$  can only be as large as  $\|H'_C\|$  thus we also get a trivial lower bound where the whole expression always evaluates to some value smaller than 1 from Theorem 2 when the problem Hamiltonian is strictly  $k$ -local.

An example of a problem with strictly 2-local cost Hamiltonian is the Max-Cut problem including the weighted graph variant where weights are integers (to preserve the periodicity condition). The above result suggests that even without the bounded degree constraint (beyond regular graph families), there might be some classes other than the bounded degree of Max-Cut problems that can have a guarantee on the approximation ratio with a constant depth.

It is unclear how the lower bound would look like for general  $k$ -local Hamiltonian problems. But we argue that the  $\|[H_C, H_{TF}]\|$ , in general, should be larger than  $\|H_C\|$ , from the intuition given in [52], stating that the degree or the number of terms a qubit participates in can decrease the norm at most on the order of square root while increasing the number of terms should scales the norm up linearly. With this intuition,  $\|[H_C, H_{TF}]\| \geq \sqrt{k}\|H_C\|$  should hold in the typical case. We note that in order to get a non-trivial lower bound on  $p$  with the transverse field mixer,  $\|[H_C, H_{TF}]\| = o(m)$  needs to hold (small  $o$ -notation). We do not know of any upper bound of this order for optimization problems with local cost terms.

## 7 Lower bound applied to search problems

We now consider search problems. A search problem defined on  $n$  qubits can be described as finding a bitstring  $z$  from a set  $S = \{z | C_{search}(z) = 1\}$  where the objective function is defined as  $C_{search}(x) : \{0, 1\}^n \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ .

Although solving search problems with QAOA is not practical in the hybrid quantum-classical algorithm sense when one needs to vary and find the angles, the minimum number of rounds to prepare a target state with a constant probability of observing a marked state is an important measure. We know from the unstructured search lower bound results [54, 55, 56] that in the black-box oracular model, searching requires  $\Omega(\sqrt{N})$  queries to the oracle. Since we consider only QAOA, the model we consider is more constrained and the question becomes, given two parameterized unitaries (adjustable phase oracle and the mixer), how many rounds one would need to alternately apply the two unitaries to prepare the target states.

Since Grover's algorithm can also be viewed as QAOA (the ansatz) because it alternates between two Hamiltonians albeit with fixed angles, our lower bound should be tight in the case of search with the Grover-mixer. Not only do we know that Grover's algorithm [34] and its amplitude amplification generalization [35] are optimal in the unstructured search model, but a fixed angle selection strategy can also be made optimal (with constant success probability 1/2) for the transverse field mixer as well when there is only a single target state [57].

We have shown in the previous two sections when the lower bound is applied to *optimization problems* with the Grover- and the transverse field mixer. Although a compact expression (Theorem 3) and non-trivial lower bounds can be obtained for some problems for QAOA with Grover-mixer, the tightness of the lower bound is still unclear. On the other hand, we have given two conditions when the lower bound evaluates to a trivial lower bound for the transverse field case with local cost problems. In both conditions, it was assumed that the numerator term of Lemma 2 is dominated by the contributions from the problem Hamiltonian  $H_1$  ( $\lambda C_{max} - C_{avg}$ ), while the case when the contributions from  $H_0$  dominates

have not been discussed. Now, we seek to give a partial answer to the tightness question regarding the Grover-mixer and also address the case when  $\langle H_{TF} \rangle$  dominates the expression in the transverse field case by looking at search problems.

To be more precise, we show in Subsection 7.1 that the lower bound for QAOA with search phase separator and Grover mixer is indeed tight leveraging Theorem 3, i.e., it matches the Grover lower-bound result of finding marked states in unstructured search. We then focus on QAOA for search with the transverse field mixer in Subsection 7.2; we show that for two specific search problems, our lower bound yields two different sublinear and non-constant lower bounds for the same number of marked states, thus showing that our proof approach leads to structure-dependent or problem-specific lower bounds for search problems. Finally, in Subsection 7.3, we change our proof framework to work with state overlap expressions and recover (Subsection 7.4) the Grover lower bound for QAOA with search and both Grover- and transverse field mixer (and in fact a much larger set of mixers).

### 7.1 Lower bound for QAOA with Grover-mixer is tight for search

We now show that the lower bound from Theorem 3 is tight when applied to search problems.

**Corollary 2.** *If a QAOA protocol solves a search problem with  $p$  rounds, finding a marked state from  $m$  marked states, with success probability  $\lambda$  and is driven by the objective value phase separator  $H_1$  (phase oracle with adjustable phase) and the Grover-mixer  $H_{Grover}$  that starts in the state  $|\psi_0\rangle = |+\rangle^{\otimes n}$ , then*

$$p \geq \frac{\lambda}{2\pi} \sqrt{\frac{N-m}{m}} - \frac{1}{2\pi} \sqrt{\lambda(1-\lambda)}. \quad (52)$$

*Proof.* We can see that, by rewriting the states as linear combinations of solution and non-solution states, we get

$$|\langle \psi_0 | \psi_p \rangle|^2 = \frac{1}{N} \left( \sqrt{\lambda m} + \sqrt{(1-\lambda)(N-m)} \right)^2, \quad (53)$$

$$C_{max} = 1, \text{ and } C_{avg} = m/N. \quad (54)$$

The standard deviation for the search cost function is

$$\sigma_C = \frac{\sqrt{m(N-m)}}{N}. \quad (55)$$

Plugging these into the lower bound in Theorem 3 gives this expression, thus completing the proof.  $\square$

We can see that the expression in eq. (52) recovers Grover's search scaling of order  $\sqrt{N/m}$  from the lower bound in Theorem 3 when the objective function is search and  $m \ll N$ . This is consistent with the tight lower bound of oracular unstructured search [35, 54, 56].

## 7.2 Search with transverse field QAOA

We will now take a look at search problems with the transverse field mixer. Since the transverse field mixer is not invariant under input permutation, we calculate the lower bound from Lemma 2 with two constructed problems where the target states are marked differently. (Proofs of the corollaries in this subsection are provided in Appendix C.)

It is helpful to think about mixers as Laplacian of graphs [50], and in this picture, the transverse field mixer represents the  $n$ -dimensional hypercube graph. Realizing this fact, we can think of the search set construction as marking vertices on the hypercube graph.

### 7.2.1 Search on distance-3 independent set of hypercube

First, consider a set  $S_{dist-3}$  of marked states, where the Hamming distance between any two marked states is at least 3. In other words, to get to another solution (if it exists) from a solution, one needs to perform at least 3 bit flips. With this construction, we can derive the lower bound of the QAOA search with  $H_{TF}$ .

**Corollary 3.** *Let  $S_{dist-3}$  be the set of marked states of size  $m$ , where the Hamming distance between any two marked states is at least 3. If a QAOA protocol solves a search problem with  $p$  rounds, where marked states are defined by  $S_{dist-3}$ , with success probability  $\lambda > 1/2$  driven by the objective value phase separator  $H_1$  (phase oracle with adjustable phase) and the transverse*

*field mixer  $H_{TF}$  that starts in the state  $|\psi_0\rangle = |+\rangle^{\otimes n}$ , then*

$$p \geq \frac{n(1 - 2\sqrt{\lambda(1-\lambda)}) + 2\lambda - 2m/N}{4\pi\sqrt{n}}. \quad (56)$$

We can see that the lower bound above evaluates to around  $p \geq \sqrt{n}$  independent of the number of marked states. We defer the discussion of the above lower bound to the end of this subsection (Sec. 7.2.3) to note the differences between the two problems.

### 7.2.2 Search for states with constant Hamming weight

Now we construct another set of marked states,  $S_{Hamming-k}$ , where all the states having Hamming weight equal to  $k$  are marked (or Hamming distance from all 0 bitstring equals to  $k$ ).

**Corollary 4.** *Let  $S_{Hamming-k}$  be the set of marked states of size  $m$ , where all states with Hamming weight  $k$  are marked. If a QAOA protocol solves a search problem with  $p$  rounds, where marked states are defined by  $S_{Hamming-k}$ , with success probability  $\lambda > 1/2$  driven by the objective value phase separator  $H_1$  (phase oracle with adjustable phase) and the transverse field mixer  $H_{TF}$  that starts in the state  $|\psi_0\rangle = |+\rangle^{\otimes n}$ , then*

$$p \geq \frac{n(1 - 2\sqrt{\lambda(1-\lambda)}) + 2\lambda - 2m/N}{4\pi\sqrt{2k(n-k) + n}}. \quad (57)$$

We can see that the above lower bound depends on the choice of  $k$ . For example, when  $k = n/\log^2 n$ , we get approximately  $p \geq \log n$ .

### 7.2.3 Lower bound for search with the transverse field mixer is structure dependent

Now that we have shown two examples of the lower bounds on  $p$  when solving the search problem with the transverse field mixer. For the first problem with  $S_{dist-3}$ , one can choose the number of marked states from a single marked state up to around  $2^n/n^2$  without affecting the lower bound ( $p \geq \sqrt{n}$ ). Since the lower bound holds for any marked states forming a distance-3 independent set on the hypercube graph. The number of marked states in the second problem with

$S_{\text{Hamming-}k}$  is more restricted, but one can still vary  $k$  and the number of marked states for chosen  $k$  is  $\binom{n}{k}$ .

The two problems can be adjusted (e.g., choosing  $k = n/\log^2 n$ ) to have the same number of marked states while the lower bounds evaluate to something of a different order ( $\sqrt{n}$  and  $\log n$ ). Although the lower bounds seem to capture the problem structure without taking the number of marked states into account, this could merely be an artifact from Theorem 1 since we already know that the unstructured search lower bound is of order  $\Omega(\sqrt{N/m})$  independent of the quantum search framework. (We use the term *structure* here loosely, referring to some patterns or some additional information regarding the input labeling and not just the knowledge of the distribution of the objective values. Since it is already well known that for quantum algorithms to gain significant speedup over specialized classical algorithms, it is required that the quantum algorithm must exploit certain structures of the problem [58].) Thus, these two lower bounds are loose when applied to the transverse field mixer case.

### 7.3 Lower bound on change in states overlap

To derive a better bound specific for search, we show that with a small adjustment to the lower bound given in Theorem 1, we can derive another lower bound based on changes in the overlapping of states.

**Lemma 3.** *Given two driving Hamiltonians with zero ground state energies  $H_0$  and  $H_1$ , where  $H_1$  is  $2\pi$  periodic. Let  $P_0$  be a projector that commutes with  $H_0$ . For a QAOA protocol with  $p$  rounds that starts in the ground state of  $H_0$ , it holds that*

$$p \geq \frac{|\langle P_0 \rangle_p - \langle P_0 \rangle_0|}{2\pi \|[P_0, H_1]\|}. \quad (58)$$

*Proof.* Consider dynamics with a Hamiltonian

$$H(t) = (1 - g(t))H_0 + g(t)H_1, \quad (59)$$

where the value of  $g(t) = \{0, 1\}$  in the case of QAOA. If  $P_0$  is a projector that commutes with

$H_0$ , we have that

$$\left| \frac{d}{dt} \langle P_0 \rangle_t \right| = |-i \text{Tr}([H(t), \rho_t] P_0)| \quad (60)$$

$$= |\text{Tr}(\rho_t [P_0, g(t)H_1])| \quad (61)$$

$$\leq |g(t)| \|[P_0, H_1]\|, \quad (62)$$

where the last line arrived from the cyclic property of trace and Rayleigh quotient as done in eq. (44). Integrating over the duration  $t_f$  of the protocol gives

$$|\langle P_0 \rangle_{t_f} - \langle P_0 \rangle_0| = \left| \int_0^{t_f} \frac{d}{dt} \langle P_0 \rangle_t dt \right| \quad (63)$$

$$\leq \|[P_0, H_1]\| \int_0^{t_f} |g(t)| dt \quad (64)$$

$$\leq \|[P_0, H_1]\| \sum_{j=1}^p |\gamma_j| \quad (65)$$

$$\leq \|[P_0, H_1]\| 2\pi p. \quad (66)$$

where we assumed  $|\gamma_j| < 2\pi$  due to the periodicity. Then,

$$p \geq \frac{|\langle P_0 \rangle_p - \langle P_0 \rangle_0|}{2\pi \|[P_0, H_1]\|}, \quad (67)$$

completing the proof.  $\square$

As we can notice from this lower bound derived from the change in states overlap, the numerator is always between 0 and 1, thus this bound would only be useful when the spectral norm of the commutator (the denominator) is small. We will show that in the case of search, this bound would prove to be much stronger and more general than our lower bound from Theorem 1.

### 7.4 Lower bound on search with QAOA

The uniform superposition state  $|\psi_0\rangle = |+\rangle^{\otimes n}$ , the usual initial state for QA and QAOA, is the ground state of the transverse field Hamiltonian  $H_{TF}$ . By choosing  $P_0 = |\psi_0\rangle\langle\psi_0|$  for the above lemma, we can form a theorem for search.

**Theorem 5.** *If a QAOA protocol solves a search problem with  $p$  rounds, finding a marked state from  $m$  marked states, with success probability  $\lambda$  and is driven by the objective value phase separator  $H_1$  (phase oracle with adjustable phase) and a mixing Hamiltonian  $H_0$  that starts in the ground*

state  $|\psi_0\rangle = |+\rangle^{\otimes n}$  of  $H_0$ , then

$$p \geq \frac{\lambda(N - 2m) + m - 2\sqrt{\lambda(1 - \lambda)m(N - m)}}{2\pi\sqrt{m(N - m)}}. \quad (68)$$

*Proof.* Consider the lower bound expression in Lemma 3, when choosing  $P_0 = |\psi_0\rangle\langle\psi_0|$  we see that

$$[P_0, H_1] = -[1 - P_0, H_1] = [H_1, H_{Grover}]. \quad (69)$$

Then using Lemma 3, we get

$$p \geq \frac{|\langle P_0 \rangle_p - \langle P_0 \rangle_0|}{2\pi \| [P_0, H_1] \|} = \frac{1 - |\langle \psi_0 | \psi_p \rangle|^2}{2\pi\sigma_C}. \quad (70)$$

By plugging in the values from eq. (53) and (55) into the above inequality, we get the expression as claimed, thus completing the proof.  $\square$

We note that the above lower bound can be adapted to other initial states, as long as the initial state is the ground state of the Hamiltonian  $H_0$ . This includes all variants of amplitude amplifications with any diffusion operator (mixing Hamiltonian) that starts in the ground state of this operator [34, 35], and with a slight modification to eq. (64), also applies to continuous-time quantum walk search [59, 60] that starts in the stationary distribution.

## 8 Discussion

Although QAOA is a very active topic of research in quantum algorithms and variational quantum algorithms, most results are of empirical nature, relying on numerical results of small problem instances and extrapolation to large instances while analytical results are few and far between. It has been observed empirically that the choice of mixers can have a significant impact on the performance of QAOA, both in terms of the number of rounds and the difficulty in the angle-finding classical loop. In this work, we derived lower bounds in the number of QAOA rounds given a target constant approximation ratio when the driving Hamiltonians are periodic as Theorem 2. We showed that the lower bounds derived also heavily depend on the spectral norm of the commutator of the phase separator and the mixer, strengthening the stance that QAOA research should invest more effort in understanding the relationship

between the problem's structure and the mixer structure beyond the low-depth regime. Despite the fact that our lower bounds can only be saturated by Grover's search algorithm, we consider it a first step toward the theoretical understanding of the QAOA protocols.

We also showed the limitations of our bounds when the problem Hamiltonian is bounded  $k$ -local or strictly  $k$ -local due to the spectral norm of the commutator of the problem and the transverse field mixing Hamiltonians are larger than the numerator given in our bounds resulting in a trivial fact that one needs at least one round. This is because the bounds in [31] were derived from the changes of the energies with respect to the driving Hamiltonians. Since the transverse field can flip the whole bitstring, the energy can undergo a rapid change, thus rendering our lower bounds not so useful in these cases. Possible ways to circumvent this problem are to characterize effective changes in the energy per one round of QAOA (under small angle regime [61]), include more assumptions of angles at each round and utilize a tighter bound of [31], or use other measures in addition to energies.

In the search problems with the transverse field mixer, we saw that the lower bound captures certain structures while disregarding the number of marked states. Although this could merely be an artifact of the lower bound derived from changes in energies, how the structure of the problem affects the bound is still an open problem. We also showed that it is possible to derive problem-specific bounds like in the search case and certain bounds work better for certain problems.

## Acknowledgements

We thank Yiğit Subaşı for helpful discussions. Research presented in this article was supported by the Laboratory Directed Research and Development program of Los Alamos National Laboratory under project number 20230049DR. LPGP acknowledges support from the DOE Office of Science, Office of Advanced Scientific Computing Research, Accelerated Research for Quantum Computing program, Fundamental Algorithmic Research for Quantum Computing (FAR-QC) project, Beyond Moore's Law project of the Advanced Simulation and Computing Program at LANL managed by Triad National Se-

curity, LLC, for the National Nuclear Security Administration of the U.S. DOE under contract 89233218CNA000001.  
Report number: LA-UR-23-29376.

## References

- [1] Tadashi Kadowaki and Hidetoshi Nishimori. “Quantum annealing in the transverse Ising model”. *Physical Review E* **58**, 5355–5363 (1998).
- [2] Edward Farhi, Jeffrey Goldstone, and Sam Gutmann. “A Quantum Approximate Optimization Algorithm” (2014). [arXiv:1411.4028](https://arxiv.org/abs/1411.4028).
- [3] Stuart Hadfield, Zihui Wang, Bryan O’Gorman, Eleanor G. Rieffel, Davide Venturelli, and Rupak Biswas. “From the Quantum Approximate Optimization Algorithm to a Quantum Alternating Operator Ansatz”. *Algorithms* **12**, 34 (2019).
- [4] John Golden, Andreas Bärttschi, Stephan Eidenbenz, and Daniel O’Malley. “Numerical Evidence for Exponential Speed-up of QAOA over Unstructured Search for Approximate Constrained Optimization” (2023). [arXiv:2202.00648](https://arxiv.org/abs/2202.00648).
- [5] John Golden, Andreas Bärttschi, Daniel O’Malley, and Stephan Eidenbenz. “The Quantum Alternating Operator Ansatz for Satisfiability Problems” (2023). [arXiv:2301.11292](https://arxiv.org/abs/2301.11292).
- [6] Sami Boulebnane and Ashley Montanaro. “Solving boolean satisfiability problems with the quantum approximate optimization algorithm” (2022). [arXiv:2208.06909](https://arxiv.org/abs/2208.06909).
- [7] Christoph Durr and Peter Hoyer. “A Quantum Algorithm for Finding the Minimum” (1999). [arXiv:quant-ph/9607014](https://arxiv.org/abs/quant-ph/9607014).
- [8] Austin Gilliam, Stefan Woerner, and Constantin Gondiulea. “Grover Adaptive Search for Constrained Polynomial Binary Optimization”. *Quantum* **5**, 428 (2021).
- [9] M. Born and V. Fock. “Beweis des Adiabatsatzes”. *Zeitschrift für Physik* **51**, 165–180 (1928).
- [10] Mustafa Demirplak and Stuart A. Rice. “Adiabatic Population Transfer with Control Fields”. *The Journal of Physical Chemistry A* **107**, 9937–9945 (2003).
- [11] M V Berry. “Transitionless quantum driving”. *Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and Theoretical* **42**, 365303 (2009).
- [12] D. Guéry-Odelin, A. Ruschhaupt, A. Kiely, E. Torrontegui, S. Martínez-Garaot, and J. G. Muga. “Shortcuts to adiabaticity: Concepts, methods, and applications”. *Reviews of Modern Physics* **91**, 045001 (2019).
- [13] Adolfo del Campo. “Shortcuts to adiabaticity by counterdiabatic driving”. *Physical Review Letters* **111**, 100502 (2013).
- [14] E. J. Crosson and D. A. Lidar. “Prospects for quantum enhancement with diabatic quantum annealing”. *Nature Reviews Physics* **3**, 466–489 (2021).
- [15] M. Cerezo, Andrew Arrasmith, Ryan Babush, Simon C. Benjamin, Suguru Endo, Keisuke Fujii, Jarrod R. McClean, Kosuke Mitarai, Xiao Yuan, Lukasz Cincio, and Patrick J. Coles. “Variational quantum algorithms”. *Nature Reviews Physics* **3**, 625–644 (2021).
- [16] Edward Farhi, Jeffrey Goldstone, and Sam Gutmann. “A Quantum Approximate Optimization Algorithm Applied to a Bounded Occurrence Constraint Problem” (2015). [arXiv:1412.6062](https://arxiv.org/abs/1412.6062).
- [17] Jonathan Wurtz and Peter Love. “Max-Cut quantum approximate optimization algorithm performance guarantees for  $p > 1$ ”. *Physical Review A* **103**, 042612 (2021).
- [18] V. Akshay, H. Philathong, M. E. S. Morales, and J. D. Biamonte. “Reachability Deficits in Quantum Approximate Optimization”. *Physical Review Letters* **124**, 090504 (2020).
- [19] V. Akshay, H. Philathong, E. Campos, D. Rabinovich, I. Zacharov, Xiao-Ming Zhang, and J. D. Biamonte. “Circuit depth scaling for quantum approximate optimization”. *Physical Review A* **106**, 042438 (2022).
- [20] Murphy Yuezhen Niu, Sirui Lu, and Isaac L. Chuang. “Optimizing QAOA: Success Probability and Runtime Dependence on Circuit Depth” (2019). [arXiv:1905.12134](https://arxiv.org/abs/1905.12134).
- [21] Joao Basso, David Gamarnik, Song Mei, and Leo Zhou. “Performance and limitations of the QAOA at constant levels on large sparse hypergraphs and spin glass models”. In 2022 IEEE 63rd Annual Symposium on Founda-



- tions of Computer Science (FOCS). **Pages 335–343**. (2022).
- [22] Anurag Anshu and Tony Metger. “Concentration bounds for quantum states and limitations on the QAOA from polynomial approximations”. **Quantum 7**, 999 (2023).
- [23] Madelyn Cain, Edward Farhi, Sam Gutmann, Daniel Ranard, and Eugene Tang. “The QAOA gets stuck starting from a good classical string” (2022). [arXiv:2207.05089](https://arxiv.org/abs/2207.05089).
- [24] Stefan H. Sack and Maksym Serbyn. “Quantum annealing initialization of the quantum approximate optimization algorithm”. **Quantum 5**, 491 (2021).
- [25] Stefan H. Sack, Raimel A. Medina, Richard Kueng, and Maksym Serbyn. “Recursive greedy initialization of the quantum approximate optimization algorithm with guaranteed improvement”. **Physical Review A 107**, 062404 (2023).
- [26] Zichang He, Ruslan Shaydulin, Shouvanik Chakrabarti, Dylan Herman, Changhao Li, Yue Sun, and Marco Pistoia. “Alignment between Initial State and Mixer Improves QAOA Performance for Constrained Portfolio Optimization” (2023). [arXiv:2305.03857](https://arxiv.org/abs/2305.03857).
- [27] Jonathan Wurtz and Peter J. Love. “Counterdiabaticity and the quantum approximate optimization algorithm”. **Quantum 6**, 635 (2022).
- [28] Luca Innocenti, Gabriele De Chiara, Mauro Paternostro, and Ricardo Puebla. “Ultrafast critical ground state preparation via bang–bang protocols”. **New Journal of Physics 22**, 093050 (2020).
- [29] 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**, 021027 (2017).
- [30] 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**, 070505 (2021).
- [31] Luis Pedro García-Pintos, Lucas T. Brady, Jacob Bringewatt, and Yi-Kai Liu. “Lower Bounds on Quantum Annealing Times”. **Physical Review Letters 130**, 140601 (2023).
- [32] John Golden, Andreas Bärtzchi, Daniel O’Malley, and Stephan Eidenbenz. “Threshold-Based Quantum Optimization”. In 2021 IEEE International Conference on Quantum Computing and Engineering (QCE). **Pages 137–147**. (2021).
- [33] Andreas Bärtzchi and Stephan Eidenbenz. “Grover Mixers for QAOA: Shifting Complexity from Mixer Design to State Preparation”. In 2020 IEEE International Conference on Quantum Computing and Engineering (QCE). **Pages 72–82**. (2020).
- [34] 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**. STOC ’96 New York, NY, USA (1996). Association for Computing Machinery.
- [35] Gilles Brassard, Peter Høyer, Michele Mosca, and Alain Tapp. “Quantum amplitude amplification and estimation”. In Samuel J. Lomonaco and Howard E. Brandt, editors, Contemporary Mathematics. **Volume 305**, pages 53–74. American Mathematical Society, Providence, Rhode Island (2002). [arXiv:quant-ph/0005055](https://arxiv.org/abs/quant-ph/0005055).
- [36] Takahiko Satoh, Yasuhiro Ohkura, and Rodney Van Meter. “Subdivided Phase Oracle for NISQ Search Algorithms”. **IEEE Transactions on Quantum Engineering 1**, 1–15 (2020).
- [37] Naphan Benchasattabuse, Takahiko Satoh, Michal Hajdušek, and Rodney Van Meter. “Amplitude Amplification for Optimization via Subdivided Phase Oracle”. In 2022 IEEE International Conference on Quantum Computing and Engineering (QCE). **Pages 22–30**. (2022).
- [38] Daniel Koch, Massimiliano Cutugno, Samuel Karlson, Saahil Patel, Laura Wessing, and Paul M. Alsing. “Gaussian Amplitude Amplification for Quantum Pathfinding”. **Entropy 24**, 963 (2022).
- [39] Daniel Koch, Massimiliano Cutugno, Saahil Patel, Laura Wessing, and Paul M. Alsing. “Variational Amplitude Amplification for Solving QUBO Problems” (2023). [arXiv:2301.13665](https://arxiv.org/abs/2301.13665).
- [40] Prasanth Shyamsundar. “Non-Boolean Quantum Amplitude Amplification and

- Quantum Mean Estimation” (2021). [arXiv:2102.04975](#).
- [41] Edward Farhi, David Gamarnik, and Sam Gutmann. “The Quantum Approximate Optimization Algorithm Needs to See the Whole Graph: A Typical Case” (2020). [arXiv:2004.09002](#).
- [42] Edward Farhi, David Gamarnik, and Sam Gutmann. “The Quantum Approximate Optimization Algorithm Needs to See the Whole Graph: Worst Case Examples” (2020). [arXiv:2005.08747](#).
- [43] S. Marsh and J. B. Wang. “Combinatorial optimization via highly efficient quantum walks”. *Physical Review Research* **2**, 023302 (2020).
- [44] S. Marsh and J. B. Wang. “A quantum walk-assisted approximate algorithm for bounded NP optimisation problems”. *Quantum Information Processing* **18**, 61 (2019).
- [45] Lennart Bittel, Sevag Gharibian, and Martin Kliesch. “Optimizing the depth of variational quantum algorithms is strongly QCMA-hard to approximate” (2023). [arXiv:2211.12519](#).
- [46] Ahmet İpek. “On eigenvalue singular value and norms of a real skew-symmetric matrix”. *Electronic Journal of Mathematical Analysis and Applications* **11**, 111–115 (2023).
- [47] David Headley and Frank K. Wilhelm. “Problem-size-independent angles for a Grover-driven quantum approximate optimization algorithm”. *Physical Review A* **107**, 012412 (2023).
- [48] Éric D. Taillard. “Design of Heuristic Algorithms for Hard Optimization: With Python Codes for the Travelling Salesman Problem”. *Graduate Texts in Operations Research*. Springer International Publishing, Cham (2023).
- [49] Andrew Lucas. “Ising formulations of many NP problems”. *Frontiers in Physics* **2** (2014).
- [50] Jarrod R. McClean, Matthew P. Harrigan, Masoud Mohseni, Nicholas C. Rubin, Zhang Jiang, Sergio Boixo, Vadim N. Smelyanskiy, Ryan Babbush, and Hartmut Neven. “Low-Depth Mechanisms for Quantum Optimization”. *PRX Quantum* **2**, 030312 (2021).
- [51] Matteo M. Wauters, Glen B. Mbeng, and Giuseppe E. Santoro. “Polynomial scaling of the quantum approximate optimization algorithm for ground-state preparation of the fully connected  $p$ -spin ferromagnet in a transverse field”. *Physical Review A* **102**, 062404 (2020).
- [52] Aram W. Harrow and Ashley Montanaro. “Extremal eigenvalues of local Hamiltonians”. *Quantum* **1**, 6 (2017).
- [53] Roger A. Horn and Charles R. Johnson. “Matrix Analysis”. *Cambridge University Press*. (2012). 2 edition.
- [54] Charles H. Bennett, Ethan Bernstein, Gilles Brassard, and Umesh Vazirani. “Strengths and Weaknesses of Quantum Computing”. *SIAM Journal on Computing* **26**, 1510–1523 (1997).
- [55] Robert Beals, Harry Buhrman, Richard Cleve, Michele Mosca, and Ronald de Wolf. “Quantum lower bounds by polynomials”. *Journal of the ACM* **48**, 778–797 (2001).
- [56] Christof Zalka. “Grover’s quantum searching algorithm is optimal”. *Physical Review A* **60**, 2746–2751 (1999).
- [57] Zhang Jiang, Eleanor G. Rieffel, and Zhihui Wang. “Near-optimal quantum circuit for Grover’s unstructured search using a transverse field”. *Physical Review A* **95**, 062317 (2017).
- [58] Scott Aaronson and Andris Ambainis. “The Need for Structure in Quantum Speedups”. *Theory of Computing* **10**, 133–166 (2014).
- [59] Andrew M. Childs and Jeffrey Goldstone. “Spatial search by quantum walk”. *Physical Review A* **70**, 022314 (2004).
- [60] Simon Apers, Shantanav Chakraborty, Leonardo Novo, and Jérémie Roland. “Quadratic Speedup for Spatial Search by Continuous-Time Quantum Walk”. *Physical Review Letters* **129**, 160502 (2022).
- [61] Stuart Hadfield, Tad Hogg, and Eleanor G Rieffel. “Analytical framework for quantum alternating operator ansätze”. *Quantum Science and Technology* **8**, 015017 (2023).

## A Derivations of Grover-mixer and objective value phase separator lower bound

In the proof of Theorem 3, we gave an outline of how to calculate the spectral norm of the commutator term, which we gave the result  $\|[H_C, H_{Grover}]\| = \sigma_C$ , where  $\sigma_C$  is the standard deviation of the objective values. We will show the derivations here. Let  $|\psi_0\rangle = |+\rangle^{\otimes n}$ , we get

$$[H_C, H_{Grover}] = H_C H_{Grover} - H_{Grover} H_C \quad (71)$$

$$= - (H_C |\psi_0\rangle \langle \psi_0| - |\psi_0\rangle \langle \psi_0| H_C) \quad (72)$$

$$= - \left( (H_C |\psi_0\rangle) \langle \psi_0| - |\psi_0\rangle (H_C^\dagger |\psi_0\rangle)^\dagger \right) \quad (73)$$

$$= - \left( \left( \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \sum_i H_C |i\rangle \right) \langle \psi_0| - |\psi_0\rangle \left( \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \sum_i H_C |i\rangle \right)^\dagger \right) \quad (74)$$

$$= - \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \sum_i C(i) (|i\rangle \langle \psi_0| - |\psi_0\rangle \langle i|) \quad (75)$$

$$= - \frac{1}{N} \sum_i C(i) (\sqrt{N} |i\rangle \langle \psi_0| - \sqrt{N} |\psi_0\rangle \langle i|) \quad (76)$$

$$= - \frac{1}{N} A, \quad (77)$$

where

$$A = (|C\rangle \langle e| - |e\rangle \langle C|), \quad (78)$$

$$|C\rangle = [C(0) \ C(1) \ C(2) \ \dots \ C(N-1)]^T, \quad (79)$$

$$|e\rangle = [1 \ 1 \ 1 \ \dots \ 1]^T = \sqrt{N} |\psi_0\rangle. \quad (80)$$

$$(81)$$

Each entry of matrix  $A$  can be described by

$$A_{ij} = C(i) - C(j). \quad (82)$$

We can see that  $A$  is a skew-symmetric matrix, meaning that its eigenvalues are purely imaginary and come in pairs, and its spectral norm is equal to the absolute value of its largest eigenvalue. Because  $|C\rangle$  and  $|e\rangle$  are not co-linear, it means that the rank of  $A$  is at most 2 and so the magnitude of the two non-zero eigenvalues (if exists) will be equal.

There is a close form for computing the spectral norm of a skew-symmetric matrix of this form [46] given by

$$\|A\| = \sqrt{\beta N - \alpha^2}, \quad (83)$$

where

$$\alpha = \sum_i C(i) = N C_{avg} \text{ and } \beta = \sum_i C(i)^2. \quad (84)$$

Using this formula, we get

$$\|[H_1, H_0]\| = \frac{1}{N} \|A\| \quad (85)$$

$$= \frac{1}{N} \sqrt{N \sum_i C(i)^2 - (N C_{avg})^2} \quad (86)$$

$$= \sqrt{\frac{\sum_i C(i)^2 - N C_{avg}^2}{N}} \quad (87)$$

$$= \sigma_C, \quad (88)$$

where  $\sigma_C$  is the standard deviation of the objective values.

## B Statistical value of Max-Cut

We will show here the derivations regarding statistical values, the mean, and the standard deviation of cut values of Max-Cut problems.

**Lemma 4.** *The average of cut values of a graph is  $|E|/2$ .*

*Proof.* Since there are 4 possible ways to assign a cut partition to an edge, it is easy to see that the expected cut value for each edge is  $1/2$ , and since any pair of edges are independent of each other, the expected cut values then equals  $|E|/2$ .  $\square$

**Lemma 5.** *The standard deviation of cut values of a graph is  $\sqrt{|E|}/2$ .*

*Proof.* We define  $c(U, V) = \{e | e \in E \text{ and } e_u \in U, e_v \in V\}$  where  $e = \{e_u, e_v\}$ . Let  $X$  be a random variable corresponding to the cut values. We have

$$2^n E[X^2] = \sum_{W \subseteq V} (|c(W, V \setminus W)|)^2 \quad (89)$$

$$= \sum_{W \subseteq V} \sum_{e \in c(W, V \setminus W)} \sum_{f \in c(W, V \setminus W)} (1_e \cdot 1_f) \quad (90)$$

$$= \sum_{W \subseteq V} \left( \sum_{\substack{e, f \in c(W, V \setminus W), \\ |e \cap f| = 0}} (1_e \cdot 1_f) + \sum_{\substack{e, f \in c(W, V \setminus W), \\ |e \cap f| = 1}} (1_e \cdot 1_f) + \sum_{\substack{e, f \in c(W, V \setminus W), \\ |e \cap f| = 2}} (1_e \cdot 1_f) \right) \quad (91)$$

$$= \sum_{\substack{e, f \in E, \\ |e \cap f| = 0}} \sum_{\substack{W \subseteq V, \\ e_u \neq e_v, \\ f_u \neq f_v}} 1 + \sum_{\substack{e, f \in E, \\ |e \cap f| = 1}} \sum_{\substack{W \subseteq V, \\ e_u \neq e_v, \\ f_u \neq f_v}} 1 + \sum_{\substack{e, f \in E, \\ |e \cap f| = 2}} \sum_{\substack{W \subseteq V, \\ e_u \neq e_v, \\ f_u \neq f_v}} 1 \quad (92)$$

$$= \sum_{\substack{e, f \in E, \\ |e \cap f| = 0}} 4 \cdot 2^{n-4} + \sum_{\substack{e, f \in E, \\ |e \cap f| = 1}} 2 \cdot 2^{n-3} + \sum_{\substack{e, f \in E, \\ |e \cap f| = 2}} 2 \cdot 2^{n-2} \quad (93)$$

$$= 2^{n-2} \left( \sum_{\substack{e, f \in E, \\ |e \cap f| = 0}} 1 + \sum_{\substack{e, f \in E, \\ |e \cap f| = 1}} 1 + \sum_{\substack{e, f \in E, \\ |e \cap f| = 2}} 1 \right) + \sum_{\substack{e, f \in E, \\ |e \cap f| = 2}} 1 \quad (94)$$

$$= 2^{n-2} (|E|^2 + |E|). \quad (95)$$

Thus we get

$$\text{Var}(X) = E[X^2] - E[X]^2 \quad (96)$$

$$= \frac{(|E|^2 + |E|)}{4} - \left( \frac{|E|}{2} \right)^2 \quad (97)$$

$$= \frac{|E|}{4}, \quad (98)$$

$$\sigma(X) = \frac{\sqrt{|E|}}{2}, \quad (99)$$

This completes the proof.  $\square$

There is an alternate proof, which is far simpler, by writing the objective function of Max-Cut in the  $k$ -local Hamiltonian formalism. One can write the Max-Cut Hamiltonian of an unweighted undirected graph as

$$H_C = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{(u,v) \in E} (\mathbb{1} - Z_u Z_v) = \frac{|E|}{2} \mathbb{1} - \sum_{(u,v) \in E} \frac{1}{2} Z_u Z_v. \quad (100)$$

Using the technique outline in Sec. 5.1, we get

$$\text{Var}(X) = \sum_{e \in E} \left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^2 = \frac{|E|}{4}, \quad (101)$$

which is the same as the calculations above.

## C Derivations of lower bounds on QAOA rounds for search with transverse field

From Lemma 2, we have

$$p \geq \frac{\frac{n}{2} - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j=1}^n \langle \psi_p | X_j | \psi_p \rangle + \lambda C_{max} - C_{avg}}{4\pi \| [H_C, H_{TF}] \|}. \quad (102)$$

In the case of search, we have

$$C_{max} = 1 \text{ and } C_{avg} = \frac{|S|}{N}, \quad (103)$$

where  $S$  is the set of marked states and  $N = 2^n$ .

Let  $H_S$  denotes the Hamiltonian for search problem given the set of marked states by  $S$ ,  $C(x) = \{0, 1\}$  denoting the membership of  $x$  in  $S$ , and  $y \sim x$  to denote that  $y$  is Hamming distance 1 away from  $x$ . Since we are considering searching with the transverse field mixer, the commutator term can be written as

$$[H_S, H_{TF}] = H_S H_{TF} - H_{TF} H_S \quad (104)$$

$$= -H_S \left( \frac{1}{2} \sum_x \sum_{y \sim x} |y\rangle \langle x| \right) + \left( \frac{1}{2} \sum_x \sum_{y \sim x} |y\rangle \langle x| \right) H_S \quad (105)$$

$$= - \left( \frac{1}{2} \sum_x \sum_{y \sim x} C(y) |y\rangle \langle x| \right) + \left( \frac{1}{2} \sum_x \sum_{y \sim x} C(x) |y\rangle \langle x| \right) \quad (106)$$

$$= \frac{1}{2} \sum_x \sum_{y \sim x} (C(x) - C(y)) |y\rangle \langle x|. \quad (107)$$

Ignoring the  $1/2$  prefactor, we can see that the commutator term can be viewed as a directed weighted subgraph of  $n$ -dimensional hypercube with weight  $\pm 1$ . If both vertices are marked or unmarked, there is no edge between them. On the other hand, if they are in different sets, there are two edges between them; one edge from  $x$  to  $y$  and another with the opposite sign from  $y$  to  $x$ .

### C.1 Search set from distance-3 independent set of hypercube

We can now show the derivations for Corollary 3. Since no marked vertices are adjacent to each other nor are they sharing neighbors, the graph representing this commutator  $[H_{S_{dist-3}}, H_{TF}]$  comprises of  $|S_{dist-3}|$  star graphs  $K_{1,n}$ . Since the commutator is traceless and normal, the spectral norm equals the largest eigenvalue in magnitude, and since it also represents a graph, its spectral norm is the spectral

radius of the corresponding graph. The sign in the matrix does not matter in this particular case since all edges pointing from (or to) the center of the star share the same sign. We then get (using Lemma 6)

$$\|[H_{S_{dist-3}}, H_{TF}]\| = \sqrt{n}/2. \quad (108)$$

Next, we will show how to upper bound the numerator term. First, we define a projector onto the subspace spanned by the marked states

$$P_S = \sum_{z \in S} |z\rangle \langle z|. \quad (109)$$

We then rewrite the state  $|\psi_p\rangle$  after  $p$  rounds of QAOA as

$$|\psi_p\rangle = \sqrt{\lambda} |\phi_0\rangle + \alpha |\phi_1\rangle + \beta |\phi_2\rangle, \quad (110)$$

$$|\phi_0\rangle = \frac{P_S |\psi_p\rangle}{\|P_S |\psi_p\rangle\|}, \quad (111)$$

$$|\phi_1\rangle = \frac{(X_j P_S X_j) |\psi_p\rangle}{\|(X_j P_S X_j) |\psi_p\rangle\|}, \quad (112)$$

$$|\phi_2\rangle = \frac{(I - P_S - X_j P_S X_j) |\psi_p\rangle}{\|(I - P_S - X_j P_S X_j) |\psi_p\rangle\|}, \quad (113)$$

where  $|\phi_0\rangle$  denotes the projected state into the subspace spanned by the marked states,  $|\phi_1\rangle$  denotes the projected state into the subspace spanned by the marked state having the  $j^{\text{th}}$  bit flipped, and  $|\phi_2\rangle$  denotes projected state into the subspace orthogonal to the prior two subspaces. We then have

$$\langle \psi_p | X_j | \psi_p \rangle = 2\text{Re}(\sqrt{\lambda}\alpha \langle \phi_0 | X_j | \phi_1 \rangle) + |\beta|^2 \langle \phi_2 | X_j | \phi_2 \rangle \quad (114)$$

$$\leq 2\sqrt{\lambda}|\alpha| |\langle \phi_0 | X_j | \phi_1 \rangle| + |\beta|^2 \langle \phi_2 | X_j | \phi_2 \rangle \quad (115)$$

$$\leq 2\sqrt{\lambda}|\alpha| + |\beta|^2 \quad (116)$$

$$\leq 2\sqrt{\lambda}|\alpha| + 1 - \lambda - |\alpha|^2 \quad (117)$$

$$\leq 1 - (\sqrt{\lambda} - |\alpha|)^2 \quad (118)$$

$$\text{(assuming that } \lambda > 1/2, \text{ we get)} \quad (119)$$

$$\leq 1 - (\sqrt{\lambda} - \sqrt{1 - \lambda})^2 \quad (120)$$

$$\leq 2\sqrt{\lambda(1 - \lambda)}. \quad (121)$$

This inequality holds true for all  $j$ , thus we have

$$n - \sum_{j=1}^n \langle \psi_p | X_j | \psi_p \rangle \geq n \left( 1 - 2\sqrt{\lambda(1 - \lambda)} \right). \quad (122)$$

Substituting everything into Lemma 2, we get

$$p \geq \frac{\frac{n}{2} - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j=1}^n \langle \psi_p | X_j | \psi_p \rangle + \lambda C_{max} - C_{avg}}{4\pi \|[H_C, H_{TF}]\|} \quad (123)$$

$$\geq \frac{\frac{1}{2}n \left( 1 - 2\sqrt{\lambda(1 - \lambda)} \right) + \lambda - m/N}{2\pi\sqrt{n}} \quad (124)$$

$$= \frac{n \left( 1 - 2\sqrt{\lambda(1 - \lambda)} \right) + 2\lambda - 2m/N}{4\pi\sqrt{n}} \quad (125)$$

## C.2 Search set from bitstrings with a fixed Hamming weight

Now, we will derive the proof for Corollary 4. Consider the search set  $S_{Hamming-k}$  where the marked states are selected from bitstrings with Hamming weight equal to  $k$ . The numerator term can be done similarly to that of marked states constructed from distance-3 independent set of hypercube. For the commutator term  $[H_{S_{Hamming-k}}, H_{TF}]$ , using the same picture, we view it as an induced subgraph of a hypercube. Suppose we draw the graph  $Q_n$  in levels, where all vertices in level  $q$  are represented by bitstring with Hamming weight  $q$ , we get that there will only be edges connecting level  $k-1$  and  $k$  and  $k$  and  $k+1$ . Using the spectral radius property of this induced subgraph, we get (using Lemma 7)

$$\|[H_{S_{Hamming-k}}, H_{TF}]\| = \frac{\sqrt{2k(n-k) + n}}{2}. \quad (126)$$

Substituting everything into Lemma 2, we get

$$p \geq \frac{\frac{n}{2} - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j=1}^n \langle \psi_p | X_j | \psi_p \rangle + \lambda C_{max} - C_{avg}}{4\pi \|[H_C, H_{TF}]\|} \quad (127)$$

$$\geq \frac{\frac{1}{2}n \left(1 - 2\sqrt{\lambda(1-\lambda)}\right) + \lambda - m/N}{2\pi \sqrt{2k(n-k) + n}} \quad (128)$$

$$= \frac{n \left(1 - 2\sqrt{\lambda(1-\lambda)}\right) + 2\lambda - 2m/N}{4\pi \sqrt{2k(n-k) + n}} \quad (129)$$

## D Spectral radius calculation of certain graphs

**Lemma 6.** *The spectral radius of a star graph  $K_{1,n}$  is  $\sqrt{n}$ .*

*Proof.* Suppose  $A$  is the adjacency matrix of the star graph  $K_{1,n}$ , we know that  $A^2$  has a constant row sum equal to  $n$  (the number of ways to walk from the center vertex (any of the leaf vertices) to any of the leaf vertices (the center node) and back to center (any of the leaf vertices) in 2 steps, thus  $\|A\| = \sqrt{n}$  (c.f. Perron-Frobenius Theorem [53]).  $\square$

**Lemma 7** (Spectral radius of subgraphs of  $Q_n$  induced by vertices having Hamming weight  $k-1$ ,  $k$ , and  $k+1$ ). *For positive integers  $k, n$  where  $0 < k < n/2$  and a  $n$ -dimensional hypercube graph  $Q_n$ , suppose  $V_{k-1}$ ,  $V_k$  and  $V_{k+1}$  are three subsets of vertices of  $Q_n$ , where  $V_m$  are the vertex set corresponding to vertices whose Hamming weight of the binary representation equals to  $m$ , the spectral radius of the induced subgraph of  $Q_n[V_{k-1} \cup V_k \cup V_{k+1}]$  is  $\sqrt{2k(n-k) + n}$ .*

*Proof.* We know that  $Q_n[V_{k-1} \cup V_k \cup V_{k+1}]$  is a bipartite graph from the definition. Let  $v_m \in V_m$ , we also know that  $deg(v_k) = n$ ,  $deg(v_{k-1}) = n - k + 1$ , and  $deg(v_{k+1}) = k - 1$ . Let  $A$  denotes the adjacency matrix of the induced subgraph  $Q_n[V_{k-1} \cup V_k \cup V_{k+1}]$ , one can order the rows and the columns such that the first  $|V_k|$  rows/columns correspond to  $V_k$ , the next  $|V_{k-1}|$  rows correspond to  $V_{k-1}$  and similarly for  $V_{k+1}$ . We then see that  $A^2$  produces a block matrix where we can separate them into 5 blocks  $A_{k,k}$ ,  $A_{k-1,k-1}$ ,  $A_{k-1,k+1}$ ,  $A_{k+1,k-1}$ , and  $A_{k+1,k+1}$  shown below.

$$A^2 = \left( \begin{array}{c|cc} A_{k,k} & & \\ \hline & A_{k-1,k-1} & A_{k-1,k+1} \\ & A_{k+1,k-1} & A_{k+1,k+1} \end{array} \right). \quad (130)$$

And we know that  $\|A_{k,k}\| = 2nk - 2k^2 + n$  since it has a constant row sum, from the number of ways to walk from a vertex  $u \in V_k$  and ends up at  $v \in V_k$  in two steps. For the other block, since the

Perron-Frobenius Theorem says that the vector which induces the norm is positive, we get

$$\frac{x}{y} = \frac{x(kn + k - k^2) + y(n^2 - 2nk + n - k + k^2)}{x(k^2 + k) + y(kn + n - k - k^2)} \quad (131)$$

$$= \frac{n - (k - 1)}{k + 1}, \quad (132)$$

where  $x$  and  $y$  are elements of an eigenvector of length  $\binom{n}{k-1} + \binom{n}{k+1}$  where the first  $\binom{n}{k-1}$  entries are  $x$  and the rest are  $y$ . Then we get that the spectral norm of this block is

$$\left\| \begin{array}{cc} A_{k-1,k-1} & A_{k-1,k+1} \\ A_{k+1,k-1} & A_{k+1,k+1} \end{array} \right\| = kn + k - k^2 + \frac{y}{x}(n^2 - 2nk + n - k + k^2) \quad (133)$$

$$= kn + k - k^2 + \frac{k+1}{n-k+1}(n^2 - 2nk + n - k + k^2) \quad (134)$$

$$= 2k(n - k) + n. \quad (135)$$

Since the spectral norms of both diagonal block matrices are equal, this means that the spectral radius of the induced subgraph  $Q_n[V_{k-1} \cup V_k \cup V_{k+1}]$  is exactly  $\sqrt{2k(n - k) + n}$ .  $\square$