

Quantum Cognitive Modeling: New Applications and Systems Research Directions

Raghavendra Pradyumna Pothukuchi¹, Leon Lufkin^{1†}, Yu Jun Shen^{1*†}, Alejandro Simon^{1†},
Rome Thorstenson^{1†}, Bernardo Eilert Trevisan^{1*†}, Michael Tu^{1†}, Mudi Yang^{1†}, Ben Foxman^{1‡},
Viswanatha Srinivas Pothukuchi^{2‡}, Gunnar Epping⁴, Bryant J Jongkees⁵,
Thi Ha Kyaw³, Jerome R Busemeyer⁴, Jonathan D Cohen⁶, Abhishek Bhattacharjee¹

¹Yale University ²Independent ³LG Electronics Toronto AI Lab ⁴Indiana University ⁵Leiden University ⁶Princeton University

Abstract

Expanding the benefits of quantum computing to new domains remains a challenging task. Quantum applications are concentrated in only a few domains, and driven by these few, the quantum stack is limited in supporting the development or execution demands of new applications. In this work, we address this problem by identifying both a new application domain, and new directions to shape the quantum stack. We introduce computational cognitive models as a new class of quantum applications. Such models have been crucial in understanding and replicating human intelligence, and our work connects them with quantum computing for the first time. Next, we analyze these applications to make the case for re-designing the quantum stack for programmability and better performance. Among the research opportunities we uncover, we study two simple ideas of quantum cloud scheduling using data from gate-based and annealing-based quantum computers. On the respective systems, these ideas can enable parallel execution, and improve throughput. Our work is a contribution towards realizing versatile quantum systems that can broaden the impact of quantum computing on science and society.

1. Introduction

Quantum computing platforms are now real and readily accessible through cloud services [1, 2, 3, 4, 5] thanks to numerous advances in various aspects of quantum information processing. Inspired by this progress, an increasing number of users are seeking to benefit from this novel paradigm [6].

Unfortunately, expanding the scope of quantum computing remains difficult. Quantum applications are localized to a few fields such as physics, chemistry, finance and machine learning (ML), and it has been challenging to find other domains of impact [7]. At the same time, the existing quantum stack is limited in capabilities, making it difficult for new users to incorporate it into their applications and workflows. The two problems feed each other in that a lack of applications results in a specialized quantum stack, which in turn, makes it even harder for new domains to use it. Solving these challenges is crucial to continue the momentum of progress [7].

Our work addresses this need through two joint contributions. First, we present cognitive modeling as a new quantum application domain. Cognitive scientists have been keen on using quantum computing to run the complex models they have been developing. Yet, these models have never been mapped to real quantum machines. Our work fills this gap. Second, we use cognitive models to motivate progress needed to improve the programmability and performance of the quantum cloud.

We select cognitive modeling because it is computationally hard, and high-impact. Cognitive models describe how humans process information and make decisions. They have been instrumental in advancing not only the brain and behavioral sciences, but also artificial intelligence (AI) and ML, since their inception. They augment AI by offering brain-like intelligence not captured by deep learning [8, 9]. More broadly, advancing the brain sciences helps improve our understanding of brain function and disorders, and identify new treatments.

Cognitive models are computationally hard because they include tasks such as relational reasoning [10] and planning [11]. More recently, these models have been developed using the framework of quantum probability theory [12, 13, 14]. Such quantum cognitive models are fast gaining prominence since they fit human behavioral data better, and have native mechanisms to represent decision-making features like uncertainty, sequential-effects, and more [12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18]. Due to their computational demands, cognitive models are attracting the attention of computer systems practitioners [19], making them a natural candidate for quantum systems research. Quantum computing can offer a novel path for these models to scale and shed new light to understand human intelligence, and replicate it. As a vital step towards this goal, we demonstrate how these models can be mapped to real quantum hardware, which is our first contribution in this work.

We identify representative classical and quantum cognitive models, and map them to existing quantum computers. We target full cognitive applications, unlike prior work that focused on quantum kernels (e.g., [20]) or circuit components [21].

Porting cognitive models to quantum computers has also resulted in algorithmic innovation. This is because the models have constructs that haven't been studied in computer architecture. One example is a quantum walk cognitive model that uses subspace projections. Implementing these resources efficiently is not trivial. We designed a new low-cost state-detection cir-

*Worked as Yale University undergraduate.

†Equal contribution. Listed in alphabetical order of last name.

‡Equal contribution. Listed in alphabetical order of last name.

cuit in our work. But, state detection and subspace projections are used in many applications, including quantum program assertions [22, 23], which can benefit from our design.

Furthermore, our efforts have revealed that the existing quantum stack is severely limited in supporting new applications like ours. Existing research is heavily focused on features and devices close to hardware such as error mitigation [24, 25, 26] and reliability [27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32], circuit synthesis [33, 34], and microarchitecture [35]. There is a lack of research targeting usability and higher-level organization, which is restricting the potential of these systems.

We use our applications to spur new quantum research directions. Examples include hardware support for partial projections, programming languages and compiler support for broader computation styles, abstracting control interfaces, and a reorganization of the quantum cloud.

Among the research directions we identify, we evaluate the potential impact of parallelism-aware cloud scheduling using data from real quantum systems. Our proposal offers the ability to execute parallel quantum applications, exposing a new axis of speedup. It also improves system throughput. These ideas are rooted in principles of classical cloud design, but which, have not been explored for quantum clouds. These optimizations are broadly useful beyond our applications.

Overall, our work expands quantum computing into a new high-impact application domain and sets the stage for building versatile quantum systems that are easier and faster to use. Our specific contributions are:

1. Introducing cognitive modeling as a new quantum application domain. This work describes the first mapping of full-fledged cognitive models to quantum computers, and is a contribution to cognitive science and computer systems.
2. Algorithmic/circuit innovation for subspace projections that is broadly useful.
3. Identifying new research avenues for programmability and performance. To our knowledge, this is the first work focusing on higher-level quantum computer architecture.
4. Proposing and analyzing new quantum cloud organization using data from real quantum computers.

2. Motivation

Advances in computing applications and systems design have inspired each other historically. However, realizing such mutual innovation has been difficult in quantum computing. Quantum applications are concentrated in a few areas like physics [36, 37], chemistry [38, 39], and more recently, finance [40, 41], machine learning [42], and optimization [43]. New applications have been challenging to find [7, 44], risking the stagnation and specialization of the quantum stack.

The issues of a lack of applications and overspecialized systems reinforce each other because architecture design is heavily driven by target applications. A narrow set of applications inadvertently results in specialized architectures and limited abstractions (e.g., with co-design [45, 46, 47, 48]),

which in turn makes it even harder to run new applications. This is undesirable for both quantum computer architects and users. We argue for simultaneously exploring new applications and broadening quantum systems research.

We identify that the domain of cognitive modeling is particularly suitable as a target for quantum computing. Cognitive neuroscience models describe how the neural mechanisms underlying mental processes act on inputs (e.g., natural stimuli) to generate decisions and behavior [49, 50, 51]. Insights from cognitive neuroscience modeling have been crucial in advancing AI and ML since the origin of artificial neural networks [52, 53]. Today, they are being used to explore complementary abilities not captured by existing deep learning architectures, to realize aspects of natural intelligence [8, 9].

Cognitive neuroscience models have grown progressively in complexity, to address computationally demanding tasks, such as relational reasoning and problem-solving, that involve graph isomorphism [10], and planning [11]. In the recent past, researchers have also begun using quantum probability theory to develop models of cognition [12, 54]. These methods have been progressing rapidly [12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 55, 56]. Critically, uncertainty is an intrinsic property of quantum models, that does not require additional assumptions or fitting, as required by classical models, to account for the ubiquitous observation of stochasticity in mental function [12, 18, 54, 57]. Additionally, quantum models make unique qualitative predictions (e.g., measurement of an individual’s preference for a decision altering subsequent dynamics), which have begun to receive empirical support [56, 58].

The challenge, however, has been to scale these new models to the larger parameter and data sizes necessary to describe human cognitive function. Currently, the models are all run classically, even those with quantum probabilistic methods. We propose exploring the use of quantum systems to run them.

This paper presents the results of such an exploration. We select representative classical and quantum cognitive models and describe implementations that can be run on existing quantum computers. We develop implementations for full models, rather than circuit components or kernels [21].

Demonstrating the mapping of cognitive models to real quantum hardware has multiple benefits. Foremost, it lets cognitive scientists access a new computational platform for advancing their research. Additionally, it enables co-designing the models and implementations. This can not only provide acceleration but can also offer new modeling insights. Finally, the implementations also present systems researchers with new applications to design for and validate known methods. This is especially important now, when the quantum stack is still nascent. Indeed, mapping entire models and studying their overall execution on the quantum cloud, has helped us identify new limitations and research directions for the quantum stack.

3. Background: Review of Quantum Techniques

We summarize the quantum methods and algorithms used in cognitive models and the suite of implementations we develop.

We use the Dirac or bra-ket notation [59] (with $\hbar = 1$), where $|x\rangle$ denotes a column vector x ; used to represent states, $\langle x|$ is a row vector, and block letters (e.g., H) are operators.

A quantum system is described by its Hamiltonian. If the system's initial state was $|\psi_{init}\rangle$, then its state after time t is, $|\psi_{new}\rangle = U|\psi_{init}\rangle$, where $U = e^{-iHt}$ is the evolution operator.

Quantum walks: They describe the evolution of a particle over a set of states [60, 61]. Cognitive models use them to describe decision-making [54, 56], which is a core aspect of cognition and behavior. A quantum walk captures how an individual processes inputs (stimuli) to navigate their internal preferences (states) under uncertainty, and makes decisions.

Quantum walks are typically implemented on gate-based computers, also called digital quantum computers, by compiling U into quantum gates (e.g., [33, 62]), and initializing the system to $|\psi_{init}\rangle$. In computing, U is often directly specified such as with coin-walks on graphs [61]. In cognitive models, however, the walk is given by H [54, 56], and running it on gate-based systems requires exponentiation to get U .

Variational algorithms: They use both classical and quantum computation for optimization, and are especially relevant in the near-term. We use them to find the eigenstates needed by our cognitive models. Variational quantum eigensolvers (VQE) [63, 64] and the Quantum Approximate Optimization Algorithm (QAOA) [65] are prominent examples of this type. They minimize a cost function, finding its lowest eigenstate (ground state). This cost function can be the expectation of the Hamiltonian (in VQE) or custom designed (in QAOA).

SSVQE (Subspace VQE) is a recently proposed technique to identify eigenstates higher than the groundstate [66]. These higher states are required by the cognitive models we study [12, 18], unlike most applications which only need the ground state.

SSVQE uses a parameterized quantum circuit as a template (or ansatz) to generate candidate solutions for the optimization. Then, a classical optimizer evaluates the cost function for these states, and changes the circuit parameters to explore better states. This eventually finds the minimal-cost state.

There are two SSVQE methods relevant for our work [66, 67], which offer different implementation tradeoffs. One algorithm (SSVQE B) finds the k^{th} excited state using a weighted cost function. If $\{|\psi_j\rangle\}_{j=0}^k$ are k orthogonal vectors (e.g., k vectors whose elements are all zeros except for a 1 in a different position each), and $\{|\phi_j\rangle\}_{j=0}^k$ are the corresponding output states of the ansatz, then the cost function is, $C = w\langle\phi_k|H|\phi_k\rangle + \sum_{j=0}^{k-1} \langle\phi_j|H|\phi_j\rangle$. The term $\langle\phi_k|H|\phi_k\rangle$ is the expected value of the Hamiltonian for state $|\phi_k\rangle$, and w is a weight between 0 and 1. The optimization is repeated k times to get the first k eigenstates. As we describe later, this method inspires a new quantum cloud architecture.

The other method (SSVQE C) also uses a weighted cost

function but finds all eigenstates up to the k^{th} state simultaneously. The cost function is $C = \sum_{j=0}^k w_j \langle\phi_j|H|\phi_j\rangle$, where the weights w_j decrease in value i.e., $w_j < w_{j-1}$. Here, only one optimization is sufficient to extract all the k eigenstates.

Identifying a good ansatz, and an optimizer to efficiently run variational algorithms is non-trivial [68].

Quantum imaginary time evolution (QITE): This technique identifies eigenvalues without variational methods [69]. We use it in our implementation because it avoids the difficult step of selecting an ansatz or the optimizer. Furthermore, QITE belongs to the class of non-unitary quantum algorithms, which need additional steps to run on quantum computers [70, 71, 72], and have not been studied in prior systems research.

In QITE, the system is evolved with time $t = -i\tau$, so that its state becomes $e^{-H\tau}|\psi_{init}\rangle$. This is decay, and if τ is long, the state decays into the ground state. Excited states are given by Quantum Lanczos which uses states evolved with QITE [69].

Quantum annealing: This is an optimization method designed particularly for Ising interactions [73], whose variants are commonly found in cognitive models [50, 74].

In quantum annealing, the system begins in the ground state of a simple Hamiltonian, which is slowly changed to the Hamiltonian whose ground state is to be found. If the rate of change is slow enough, the system ends up in the ground state of the target Hamiltonian, giving the solution we seek [73, 75, 76, 77, 78, 79].

While the quantum advantage of annealers is still unresolved [80, 81], we study the use of annealing because of two reasons. One, annealers represent analog quantum computers. Unlike digital quantum computers programmed using the evolution operator, analog systems are programmed directly with the Hamiltonian [3, 73, 82, 83]. This is a less-studied paradigm in quantum computer architecture. Two, annealers are publicly accessible [3] and have the most mature programming support among other analog quantum systems [73].

Present quantum annealers take as input Ising Hamiltonians, which are of the form $H = \sum_{i,j} a_{ij} \sigma_z^i \sigma_z^j + \sum_i b_i \sigma_z^i$, where σ_z^i is the Pauli Z spin operator [73] whose values can be +1 or -1, and a_{ij}, b_i are scalars and i, j refer to the qubits.

General Hamiltonians, including those of the cognitive models we study, contain Pauli X (σ_x), Pauli Y (σ_y) operators apart from the Pauli Z terms that annealers can operate with. Annealing such Hamiltonians requires manual reformulation [84].

4. Quantum Cognitive Application Suite

Table 1 lists the cognitive models for which we develop quantum implementations that can be run on existing quantum machines. Our choices are guided by three factors: (i) the significance of a model for cognitive neuroscientists, (ii) the generalizability of our implementations to other models in the field, and (iii) the algorithmic and hardware features they use.

In this section, we present the suite of implementations we develop. Section 6 shows their evaluation, and Section 7

Table 1: Selecting cognitive models for quantum implementation.

Model	Significance	Quantum methods we apply
Quantum Walk [54, 56]	Decision-making (two-alternative)	Quantum walk simulation (gate-based, annealing)
Multi-Particle Multi-Well (MPMW) [12, 18]	Decision making (multi-alternative)	Eigensolution: SSVQE, and QITE (both gate-based)
Predator-Prey [85]	Cognitive control	Restricted Boltzmann Machine (RBM; annealing)
Leaky Competing Accumulator (LCA) [50, 86]	Decision-making and control	Dynamic state evolution (annealing)




Figure 1: Cognitive model prototypes for which we develop quantum implementations.

presents the research directions we uncover using them.

4.1. Quantum Walk

Decision-making is the core focus of cognitive modeling. It can be represented by a biased random walk on states representing different preference levels for the available choices [87, 88]. Figure 1a shows this *Quantum Walk* model for a two-alternative decision task (e.g., yes-or-no questions). It has a 1-dimensional lattice of states ordered by preference level, and is described by the Hamiltonian H .

This model uses two styles of walks [54]. One uses reflecting boundaries where the walk evolves over all states including the boundary/decision states, for a fixed number of steps. This represents a scenario where an individual must respond only after a prompt, even if they’ve made a decision earlier. The other uses absorbing boundaries where the walk evolves until the state of the system is observed to be in one of the boundary states, at which point the walk terminates. This captures the first time an individual arrives at a decision. We develop the following implementations for these walks.

Reflecting boundaries (gate-based): If M is the measurement operator for a given decision (e.g., $M = |0\dots 0\rangle\langle 0\dots 0|$), the probability of this decision after T steps is given by the 2-norm $\|MU^T |\psi_{init}\rangle\|_2^2$ [54], using the notation from Section 3. This is easily realized on a quantum computer as shown in Figure 2a, for a 3-qubit (8-state lattice) system. U is synthesized into hardware gates using existing tools [62].

Absorbing boundaries (gate-based): This walk must be projected onto the non-boundary states after every step so that it evolves only in those states until measurement. The decision probability in this walk is given by $\|MU(PU)^{T-1} |\psi_{init}\rangle\|_2^2$, where P is the projector for the non-boundary states.




Figure 2: Realizing an 8-state Quantum Walk on gate-based systems.

Realizing this walk on existing hardware is not straightforward because they do not support partial projections. The only approach is post-selection, i.e., running the system many times and discarding the trials where the system was found in the boundaries. This requires a non-disruptive, runtime mechanism to identify when the system touches the boundaries.

Unfortunately, prior state-detection/checking circuits [22, 23, 89] are ill-suited for our purpose. We cannot use projection-based methods [89] since they change the state. Among alternatives, one approach [22] detects only certain states, such as those with an even number of ones. In our case, a boundary state can have any number of ones. The other, swap-based assertions [23], can check for approximate state membership but needs several ancilla qubits to swap and restore the state.

To overcome these problems, we developed a new circuit to detect the boundary states with only one ancilla qubit. Figure 2b shows the circuit with our proposed state detector for an 8-state quantum walk. The ancilla qubit is shown at the bottom. For any input state $\sum_{i=0}^7 a_i |i\rangle \otimes |0\rangle$, the detector’s output is $(a_0 |0\rangle + a_7 |7\rangle) \otimes |0\rangle + (\sum_{i=1}^6 a_i |i\rangle) \otimes |1\rangle$ i.e., the ancilla is in $|1\rangle$ if and only if the main qubits are not in the boundary states. Therefore, post-selecting on this condition is sufficient to measure the correct probabilities. The detector is easily extended to larger systems and other states by varying the CNOT and Toffoli gates. This is the first generic absorbing

boundary walk design on existing quantum computers.

Annealing walk: A disadvantage of gate-based implementations is that they are programmed with the operator U , which requires exponentiating the Hamiltonian. Therefore, we consider implementing the walk on systems that can be directly programmed with the Hamiltonian, like quantum annealers [3]. However, a difficulty is that existing annealers accept only Ising Hamiltonians [3], which have only diagonal elements and can be decomposed into at most pairwise Pauli-Z terms (σ_z). The *Quantum Walk* Hamiltonian is not diagonal, resulting in additional Pauli-X (σ_x) and Pauli-Y (σ_y) terms, and can have more than two Pauli operator interactions.

We circumvent this difficulty using a multi-step approach shown in Figure 3. We begin by decomposing the N-qubit Quantum Walk Hamiltonian into a sum of Pauli interactions. Next, we create a larger rN-qubit system and map the original Pauli interactions to the larger system using new operators that only use Pauli-Z operations [84]. This mapping allows recovering the original system’s groundstate from that of the rN-qubit system. Finally, we convert the Pauli-Z operations in the new system to binary variables, and quadratize them i.e., expand the Hamiltonian to M ($\geq rN$) qubits such that each term has at most two variables [90]. The resulting Hamiltonian, H_B , can be annealed with existing machines, and the original groundstate can be recovered from the annealer’s result. Increasing the value of r results in more accurate estimates.

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 \begin{array}{l} H = \sigma_x^1 \sigma_x^2 \\ + \sigma_z^1 \\ + \dots \end{array} & \xrightarrow{\text{Transform}} & \hat{H} = \sum_{j,k=1}^r x_1^{j,k} x_2^{j,k} + z_1^{j,k} z_2^{j,k} + \dots \\
 \text{N-qubit} & & \text{rN-qubit} \\
 & & \xrightarrow{\text{Quadratize}} \begin{array}{l} H_B = \alpha b_1 b_2 \\ + \beta b_2 b_3 \\ + \dots \end{array} \\
 & & \text{M-qubit}
 \end{array}$$

Figure 3: Realizing an 8-state Quantum Walk on gate-based systems.

Even though the annealing version of Quantum walk only gives the groundstate instead of the full dynamics, it is still useful for cognitive scientists. The process also highlights the challenges in using present Hamiltonian-based systems.

4.2. Multi-Particle Multi-Well (MPMW)

The *MPMW* is another decision-making model [12, 18]. It has a 1-dimensional landscape of potential wells, one for each choice. The well’s parameters like its height, width, and separation from neighbors, correspond to the cognitive parameters of attention, internal representation and concept similarity, respectively, which are not captured by *Quantum Walk*.

Figure 1b shows the simplest *MPMW* model with one infinite height well [18]. It works by serially admitting particles with different energies into the landscape. Each particle’s position is measured, and if it falls within a well, the information towards that choice is incremented by one bit. Then, the particle is cleared. This process repeats until a choice is made.

The key computational step in *MPMW* is finding the landscape’s ground and excited eigenstates because they determine the distribution of the particle’s position [12, 18]. We identify

two different approaches to obtain these values: SSVQE [66], which is variational, and QITE/Quantum Lanczos [69], which is not. We select these methods because they demand different design and execution support on quantum hardware.

SSVQE: In this approach, we select two algorithms, SSVQE B and SSVQE C (Section 3) that present different implementation tradeoffs. SSVQE B computes the k^{th} eigenstate for a given k , while SSVQE C can compute all the states *up to* k in one optimization. Hence, the latter offers algorithmic multitasking that is lacking in the other. However, SSVQE B runs faster since it solves a simpler optimization, and different instances of it can be run independently—offering an embarrassingly parallel method to find all k eigenstates. Prior work has been focusing only on parallelizing the expectation calculation of Pauli operators within a variational step [91, 92], or parallelizing runs for averaging [93]. We present a new, complementary axis of parallelism which changes the realized performance of algorithms, and impacts systems design.

QITE/Quantum Lanczos: A major difficulty with variational algorithms like SSVQE is finding a suitable ansatz and optimizer [68]. This selection depends on the eigenstates and the function being optimized, but this information is usually unknown. Hence, we pick an alternative non-variational algorithm, QITE [69], for eigensolving. However, QITE is non-unitary and unsupported on quantum computers. Therefore, we follow prior work [69] to determine unitary operators that result in the same state evolution as with the non-unitary QITE. At each step, these operators are obtained by solving a linear system of equations containing Pauli-operator expectations, which in turn, are measured from a quantum computer.

To find the excited states, we use the Quantum Lanczos algorithm base on QITE [69]. It obtains different state vectors evolved with QITE to construct a vector subspace. Then, it runs a classical Lanczos iteration on this subspace to orthogonalize the states into excited eigenstates.

QITE is in the class of non-unitary quantum algorithms [67, 71, 72], which haven’t been studied in systems design.

4.3. Predator-Prey

Predator-Prey is used to model cognitive control [85], which refers to the mechanisms in the brain that govern other mental processes including decision-making. The model describes a player (e.g., a non-human primate) playing a game shown in Figure 1c. The game has a screen grid with three entities: an agent, which is the player’s screen icon, a prey, and a predator. The player must move the agent to capture the prey and avoid being caught by the predator. The model captures how the player allocates attention to the screen icons to discern their position and uses those perceived positions to make a move.

We model this task using a quantum restricted Boltzmann machine (RBM) [74], shown in Figure 4. The RBM has a visible layer with nodes for: the true position of the on-screen entities, attention, perceived positions, and the direction of

movement. The nodes can take binary values, but their biases and the weights for the edges can have real values.




Figure 4: Quantum RBM network for Predator-Prey.

We use one-hot encoding to represent the horizontal and vertical positions on the screen and allow the agent to move one step in any of the 8 possible directions (cardinal and ordinal) from its current position. The total attention that the player has is fixed and is divided into N units that can be allotted to the entities. More details are given in Section 5.

We choose this task and implementation for several reasons. Cognitive control is an important aspect of cognition, that is at play in all tasks we perform. Second, we choose RBMs because they map closely to the simultaneous interactions between the neural mechanisms determining attention and direction in the brain. Finally, RBMs are generative neural networks developed using insights from cognitive science [94]. They, along with Hopfield networks that are similar, have been extensively used in modeling cognition, and in ML [95].

4.4. Leaky Competing Accumulator (LCA)

The *LCA* is a biologically inspired model for decision-making [50, 86] among multiple alternatives, and cognitive control. Figure 1d shows the *LCA* for two choices. Each choice has an accumulator $x(t)$, which integrates the values of the input $i(t)$ corresponding to that choice at each time step. The accumulator loses or leaks its value (with a factor λ), and is inhibited by the output of the other choice (with a factor β). For example, $x_1(t) = i_1(t) + (1 - \lambda)x_1(t - 1) - \beta f_2(t)$. $f(\cdot)$ is a nonlinear function such as a sigmoid that acts on the accumulator to produce the output for the choice.

We select the *LCA* because it is widely used, and its mathematical behavior has been well-characterized [86]. Moreover, the *LCA* is a simultaneous constraint satisfaction model like Ising models, with the additional complexity of stateful dynamics or memory—occurring due to the accumulator, and nonlinearity—due to the activation function. These aspects have been crucial in its utility as a model, but they also create challenges in running it on existing machines.

We map the *LCA* to quantum annealers since they can solve Ising problems. We first linearize $f(\cdot)$ into the format $ax + b$ using its Taylor expansion. Next, to obtain the value of $f(\cdot)$ for a given value of x , we use the annealing cost function, $(f_x - (ax + b))^2$, following prior work that used annealing for prime factorization [96]. Minimizing this cost function would yield f_x to be $\approx f(x)$. Then, we replace x with its previous value $(x(t - 1))$, and the input. This gives a cost function with f_x , $x(t - 1)$, and the inputs $i(t)$. Next, we expand each variable with multiple qubits to represent floating point numbers. Finally, we quadratize the cost function before annealing.

We have explored different alternatives to solve for the *LCA* outputs over multiple timesteps. One approach is to anneal for a single timestep each, where the outputs from the previous timestep are used as inputs for the next anneal. Since existing annealers do not offer initializing variables, we use additional terms in our cost function to realize it. This method has the overhead of reading and re-initializing qubits at each step.

Another approach is to unroll the *LCA* dynamics for K steps, so that one anneal would return the output for all K steps. This amortizes the classical overhead but results in a much larger Hamiltonian than what is reliably annealed on current systems. The last approach uses the technique of Feynman’s clock, where a new problem is formulated that includes a timestep register along with the *LCA* variables [97]. This method introduces complex variables that are unsupported presently. As a balance, we anneal for K steps at once.

5. Experimental Setup

We design our experiments based on the goals of (i) demonstrating the running of cognitive models on existing hardware, and (ii) identifying the limitations of the existing stack.

Platforms: We choose hardware platforms that are publicly available (open-access or for-pay), and which have a mature development and scheduling stack. The latter is important to realize the complex methods required to implement the cognitive models. For our gate-based implementations, we use IBM quantum machines (IBM Perth/Quito, which have 5 superconducting transmon qubits), and for our annealing implementations we use D-Wave’s Advantage_system4.1 solver, which has 5,627 qubits connected in a Pegasus graph [98].

Selecting model parameters: Table 2 shows the model and implementation parameters we evaluate. We choose them so that the models can be run on existing machines reliably. We repeat all experiments and report averages.

Quantum Walk needs 3 qubits for the 8-state reflecting boundaries, and 4 qubits for the 8-state absorbing boundaries on gate-based systems. For the annealing implementation, we only use a 4-state walk, since the actual number of qubits needed is much higher ($\geq rN$; Section 4). We use pausing for anneals [99] to mitigate thermalization and noisy outputs.

Table 2: Selecting cognitive models for quantum implementation.

Model	Parameters	Implementation parameters
Quantum Walk	8 states 4 states	Gate-based (3 or 4 qubit) Annealing ($r=2-9$)
MPMW	2 positions 3 eigenstates	SSVQE (COBYLA/SPSA) QITE (step size = 0.2, steps = 135)
Predator-Prey	6×6 grid, 12 levels	100 train, 100 test
LCA	2 alternatives	5-step unroll, 6-bit floats

In *MPMW*, we obtain the Hamiltonian operator from the Schrödinger equation of a particle in an infinite-height potential well. We discretize the position inside the well, and use the finite difference method to calculate the derivative. Then,




Figure 5: Reflecting boundary Quantum Walk with statevector simulation.




Figure 6: Reflecting boundary Quantum Walk on IBM Perth.

we find the first 3 eigenstates. For SSVQE, we find the ansatz by evaluating many choices [68] with a simpler VQE, and selecting the best. We use this ansatz for the excited states. We use the SPSA optimizer [62] for quantum simulations and the COBYLA optimizer [62] on actual hardware, since it requires fewer circuit evaluations. For the QITE implementation, we set the step size of imaginary time evolution [69] to be 0.1.

For *Predator-Prey*, we use a 6×6 grid, with the agent being able to move in 8 directions from its current position. The player has $N = 12$ attention levels that can be allocated to the three screen icons. Our RBM for this model has 56 visible and 56 hidden nodes. Since we do not need the perceived positions explicitly, we use a single set of nodes for the true and perceived positions, encoded with one-hot vectors.

We consider three different methods to anneal the RBM for this task. The first method (RBM) performs a separate anneal to obtain the hidden layer values from the visible nodes and vice versa. This results in 2 anneals for inference, and 3 anneals in training (1 extra to modify the hidden nodes). We develop another method (RBM_{eff}) that combines updates to both hidden and visible layers to be resource efficient. This method requires only 1 anneal for inference, and 2 for training, but has more complexity. Finally, we develop a data-parallel method (RBM_{parK}), where we anneal for K different samples simultaneously. This is similar to asynchronous training algorithms in ML [100], where the network weights are updated once after K samples, instead of K sequential updates. Since existing systems do not support parallel execution, we realize this design using 0-strength couplers between parallel layers.

The RBM is trained with contrastive divergence [101]. We obtain training data by identifying the best attention allocation

and movement from an exhaustive search, without lookahead. We train on 100 randomly chosen positions of all icons over 30 epochs, and use another 100 positions as test. While this data is a small fraction of the possible combinations, evaluating it has consumed hours of anneals and thousands of dollars.

For *LCA*, we use 2 choices, and solve for $K = 5$ time steps in one anneal (Section 4). We use 6 qubits to represent float values. We quantify accuracy using the mean local relative error, which is the average error of a method \bar{f} relative to exact *LCA* (f), when they run on the same inputs i and previous values (\bar{x}_{-1}) from the method. It is given by, $avg(|\frac{f(i, \bar{x}_{-1}) - \bar{f}(i, \bar{x}_{-1})}{f(i, \bar{x}_{-1})}|)$.

6. Evaluation

6.1. Quantum Walk

Gate-based implementation: Figures 5 and 6 show the probabilities of the states at various timesteps in the reflecting boundary *Quantum Walk* using statevector simulations, and as measured from quantum hardware (IBM Perth), respectively. The simulations align closely with our analytical calculations, but the results from quantum hardware deviate significantly, especially from timestep 2. This is worse for the absorbing boundaries walk. Figures 7 and 8 show the simulated and measured probabilities of the absorbing boundaries walk, where much of the probability distribution is lost even by timestep 2.

We attribute the poor performance of quantum hardware to noise that occurs from running large circuits. Figures 9a and 9b show the gate counts of our applications, and the total time to run them with 1024 shots each. Our models require hundreds of gates, compared to a few tens used in state-of-




Figure 7: Absorbing boundary Quantum Walk with statevector simulation (Total probability < 1 due to projection).




Figure 8: Absorbing boundary Quantum Walk on IBM Perth (Total probability < 1 due to projection).

the-art benchmarks (e.g., [20]). At such large gate counts, noise/error effects are significant. *Mitigating noise effects is vital for quantum machines to be useful for real applications.*




Figure 9: Gate count and performance of Quantum Walk.

Annealing implementation: Figure 10 shows the results for finding the groundstate of a 4-state *Quantum Walk* using annealing. We show the results for both simulated annealing (SA) and quantum annealing with pausing (QA-P). Figure 10a shows the absolute error of the measured eigenvalue (the exact value is -7.22). We expect the error to decrease as the qubit repetition (r) is increased, and we find this to be true for SA. With QA-P, however, the error increases after an initial decrease. This is because bigger r values result in more qubits (Figure 10b) and complex interaction, worsening noise.

Figure 10c shows the execution time of SA and QA-P. SA’s execution time grows linearly with r while QA-P is relatively flat. Even though the error for QA-P is higher at large r , the trend for small r (where its accuracy is comparable to SA) suggests that QA’s execution time can scale better. *It would be fruitful to explore this accuracy-time tradeoff in annealers.*




Figure 10: Annealing for the groundstate of a 4-state Quantum Walk.

6.2. MPMW

SSVQE: To identify an ansatz, we simulate 24 choices from prior work [64, 68, 102]. Figure 11 shows the performance of the ansätze for *MPMW*’s groundstate using standard VQE. The best choice is “Circuit 14” from [68], which uses R_Y and controlled R_X gates. We also used circuit search methods from quantum ML [103], but they did not perform competitively.




Figure 11: Ansatz selection with VQE (the exact value is shown).

For optimizers, we evaluated both SPSA and COBYLA in our simulations, and found SPSA to be better. However, SPSA required $2\text{--}10\times$ more circuit evaluations, which we could not run on real hardware in reasonable time for convergence. So,

we only used COBYLA for quantum hardware.

We run the SSVQE B and SSVQE C algorithms to find the 0th, 1st and 2nd eigenstates of *MPMW*, with exact values as 1.72, 6.21, and 11.78, respectively. Figure 12 shows the progression of SSVQE B2, which only finds the 2nd eigenstate. The measured value (10.1) is reasonably accurate, but has a steady state error. Other runs (SSVQE B0/B1/C) are similar.




Figure 12: Simulated and measured SSVQE B2 for *MPMW*.

The SSVQE algorithms, require many circuit evaluations. For our model, finding the k^{th} state requires $15 \times k$ evaluations per iteration, causing long execution times. Figure 13 shows the execution time of SSVQE in simulations (Figures 13a and 13b) and on actual hardware (Figure 13c). In simulations, SPSA had the highest accuracy of the obtained eigenvalues. The results show that individually, each SSVQE B algorithm takes lesser time to obtain the target eigenvalue, than SSVQE C that finds them all at once. *This can enable faster task execution by running different SSVQE B executions in parallel.* We revisit this observation on parallelism in Section 7.




Figure 13: Execution time of the SSVQE algorithm for *MPMW*

QITE/Quantum Lanczos: Figure 14 shows the performance of QITE and Quantum Lanczos to find the eigenvalues in *MPMW*. We use 27 seconds in imaginary time with a step size of 0.2 s. We show results from both simulations, and measurements on IBM Quito. Figure 14a shows the progression of QITE to obtain the groundstate. The noise in the measured data is clearly seen. Figure 14b shows the error in the calculated eigenvalues. The error in the groundstate value is low, and is better than what SSVQE can achieve. For the excited states, there is a steady state error due to our unitary approximation, but the accuracy is comparable to that of SSVQE.

For execution time, QITE took only 164.8 s in simulations (compared to 12,000 s for SSVQE C with SPSA). Even though




Figure 14: QITE and Quantum Lanczos for *MPMW*.

QITE uses Pauli expectations, it is faster because it needs only one set of these to get all k states (vs k for SSVQE). Moreover, it does not tune any ansatz at each step. Therefore, execution is faster. On IBM Quito, QITE ran for 11,190 s, which is longer than SSVQE C with COBYLA on the same machine (8,394 s). But, QITE has a lower error. *This shows that non-unitary algorithms are competitive to standard variational algorithms in the near term. Unfortunately, the software abstractions to deploy them easily are lacking.*

6.3. Predator-Prey

Figure 15 shows a few sequences of moves generated by our RBM with three different annealing strategies (RBM, RBM_{eff}, and RBM_{par2}), and the corresponding movements from the predator and prey. At each step, we show the deviation of the RBM’s move from a no-lookahead exhaustive search.




Figure 15: *Predator-Prey* screen with different RBM strategies.

Figure 16a shows the execution time of the three RBM implementations. Compared to RBM, RBM_{eff} takes nearly $100 \times$ longer. This is because RBM_{eff} packs 2 passes into one anneal, which results in significantly complex interactions. The number of physical qubits to realize this network goes up by $100 \times$. On the other hand, RBM_{par2} is $\approx 2 \times$ faster relative to RBM, even though it packs 2 samples into one anneal. This is because the samples are processed independently and do not complicate qubit interactions. Thus, it only needs $2 \times$ qubits.

Figure 16b shows the accuracy of the methods with simulated (SA) and quantum annealing (QA). RBM_{eff} has lower accuracy than RBM due to its complex interactions. This is more pronounced with QA, which is sensitive to noise. Importantly, however, RBM_{par2} has comparable accuracy to RBM. *This shows that parallelizing data is preferable over paralleliz-*

ing compute in present annealers. We revisit this in Section 7.




Figure 16: *Predator-Prey* performance.

6.4. LCA

Figure 17 shows the two outputs of LCA (f_1 , and f_2) for 10 timesteps, computed by our model with different annealing methods: SA, QA-P, and QA-NP (QA without pausing). We compute 5 timesteps in one anneal, which requires 60 logical qubits and 252 physical qubits.

LCA with SA is close to the exact values, with a mean local error (Section 5) of (0.58%, 0.49%) for the two LCA outputs. Among the QA methods, QA-NP has larger deviations due to noise, with an error of (5.75%, 7.54%). QA-P has a better fit with an error of (5.18%, 5.82%). Note that our error metric does not consider the conditioning of the problem i.e., for ill-conditioned calculations, errors are amplified over time.




Figure 17: Quantum annealing for the LCA.

For execution time, SA took 84.26 ms for one anneal with 100 reads and 1000 sweeps. For the best fidelity, the QA methods required a total of 175 ms QPU (quantum processing unit) time for a $50 \mu\text{s}$ anneal with 3500 reads. *These results show that existing annealers are noisy, require many reads and mitigation methods like pausing for higher quality outputs.*

7. How can the Quantum Stack be Improved?

Our applications have been unconventional, and helped us identify many ways in which the quantum stack can improve.

Cloud organization and scheduling: Scheduling has been a persistent challenge in our evaluations. Figure 18a shows the current scheduling design for the quantum clouds we use [3, 104]. Users schedule each job directly into device-specific queues, which cannot be migrated to other queues. This includes iterative jobs such as SSVQE that spawn multiple quantum circuits—all are run on the same device.




Figure 18: Reorganizing quantum cloud scheduling.

The present approach is inefficient for several reasons. First, users are unaware of the overall system and user behavior, and must select devices ad hoc using queuing estimates. Second, jobs in a queue are selected for execution using many heuristics [105], and can suffer hours of waiting—but they cannot be migrated. Third, this design does not support parallelism or multitasking. Parallelism can be found in many applications like VQE, and as we identify, in computing excited states with SSVQE. Finally, variational/iterative jobs suffer a long latency network trip between the cloud, and their local environment.

We propose a new design for throughput, shown in Figure 18b. We split queues into an application-specific front-end, and a device-specific backend. Users submit jobs to the front-end that separately handles standalone, and batched jobs (iterative or parallel). These jobs are later scheduled into device-specific queues based on availability or user-preference. Next, we propose scheduling entire jobs including its classical computation. Finally, we propose adding cloudlets [106] with classical compute (CPUs/GPUs) to support the Map-Reduce style parallelism [107] in VQE or QITE. The cloudlets can add jobs locally, instead of a long-latency network trip.

We use our applications to estimate the impact of parallel execution that a new cloud organization would permit. Consider *MPMW*. To find the the three excited states, we can run one SSVQE C job (algorithmic multitasking), or three SSVQE B jobs in serial, or in parallel (execution multitasking). Figure 19a shows the execution time of these methods normalized to a serial baseline. Both forms of parallelism offer significant speedup ($\geq 2\times$). Importantly, execution multitasking provides a 20% additional speedup over algorithmic multitasking. The speedups will be much higher if other forms of parallelism like circuit evaluations, are also realized.

Next, consider the *Predator-Prey* model. We found that a data-parallel RBM design enables faster execution without loss of accuracy (Section 6.3). Figure 19b shows the training and testing time for the network with many RBM layers run in parallel, each processing one sample. Figure 19c shows the corresponding test accuracy. In Figure 19c, we include a new design that is trained in serial, but tested in parallel (T_{mixed}). The RBM’s accuracy remains relatively unchanged up to 10-parallel evaluations during training, and this takes only a tenth of the serial execution time. Furthermore, testing can always run in parallel without loss of performance (T_{mixed}). No quantum clouds currently support such parallelism.




Figure 19: Impact of a parallelism-aware quantum cloud.

Software support: Present quantum software frameworks are heavily domain-specific (e.g., [108, 109, 110, 111]). We explored them initially for our implementation, but it has been a challenge since the abstractions mismatch.

Present toolchains are also heavily focused on specific computation-styles (e.g., unitary or Ising Hamiltonians), devices (gate-based or annealers) and algorithms (e.g., variational). There are other methods and machines that are capable and physically realizable such as Hamiltonian-based systems which lack meaningful software support (e.g., [82, 83]). Using these systems, or, developing applications that map natively to such systems like the *Quantum Walk*, is difficult. We have also found that alternative algorithms like QITE perform well, but architects have not considered designing systems for them.

Hardware-Software interfaces: Existing hardware exposes device control parameters such as the pulse information required to implement gates [112], or the annealing schedules for annealers. On the one hand, this enables cross-layer co-design (e.g., [113]) while on the other, it creates an additional programming burden to identify the correct settings. Consider the *LCA*. A direct implementation resulted in noisy outcomes (Section 6), and we had to manually implement pausing [99].

Striking a balance, we propose that device control mechanisms be abstracted from the user in intermediate compilation stages. For example, pausing can be automated by using recent work [114] that can quickly estimate the energy gap between the lowest eigenstates of a Hamiltonian.

Furthermore, the hardware-software interface has few primitives to simplify programmability. In the *LCA*, re-initializing the qubits at the beginning of each anneal required manually composing Hamiltonians, which could be automated.

Hardware: We argue for research increasing device usability, complementing the present focus on improving noise resilience and qubit counts. Consider the absorbing boundaries *Quantum Walk*. Current systems do not have native primitives to implement the subspace projections used in the model, even though the underlying capabilities exist [115]. Consequently, users must design custom circuits and pre-/post-selection methods. This is not only tedious, but also error-prone since quantum programming is not intuitive [116], and inefficient since it wastes qubits and execution time.

Broadly, conditionals have little support. While this is not an issue in certain domains e.g., quantum simulations, many

applications use them. Certain vendors claim support for conditional reset [117], but the actual machines with this feature are few, and the process is long, resulting in more noise. The alternative is to increase the ancillae or circuit complexity, wasting resources. For example, an N -step Quantum Walk based on Figure 2b would require N ancillae or a more complex state detector if the qubits cannot be reset mid-circuit.

Since hardware development takes long, these features could at least be managed by software to simplify programming in the near term.

8. Related Work

Quantum applications: Numerous advances [118, 119, 120, 121, 122, 123] have helped make quantum computing a reality. However, even though there is great interest in adopting quantum computing for new domains (e.g., [21, 124]), realizing new applications has been a challenge [7, 44]. Applications are focused in only a few areas [36, 38, 41, 42, 43]. We identify cognitive modeling as a new domain that can benefit from quantum computing, and present a suite of new applications. Our work differs from quantum benchmarks [20, 125, 126], which typically use kernels for performance or proof-of-concept analysis [21]. We develop a suite of real-world, full quantum cognitive modeling applications. Our work also spans analog and digital quantum computing styles, which is rare.

Quantum computer architecture: Significant strides have been made in quantum programming and compilation [33], circuit synthesis [127, 128], noise mitigation and reliability [27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32], and microarchitecture design [35]. Recent work [129] on exploring improving fidelity of partial measurements, and improving variational algorithms for near-term machines [130, 131] can help the models we study.

One limitation of prior research is that it is heavily device- and hardware-centric, with only a few analyses at the system level [6, 132, 133]. Our analysis on higher level organization complements existing research, which is focused on hardware-centric aspects [27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35].

Furthermore, existing systems research and frameworks are almost entirely focused on gate-based systems, which are only one type of quantum computers. There are many applications like some of ours, which are more naturally suited to Hamiltonian-based computers (e.g., QuEra [3, 82]). Unfortunately, the stack for these types of systems is limited.

Ravi et al. [6, 132] first highlighted the issue of growing application demands in the cloud, and proposed fidelity- and queuing-aware scheduling in the cloud. In our analysis, we consider other aspects such as the nature of applications (standalone vs batched), and simplifying usability.

Multitasking and Parallelism: Prior work explored microarchitecture and circuit-level parallelism on gate-based computers [134, 135, 136, 137, 138], while mitigating reliability issues. Similar studies have also been performed for annealers [133, 139]. In our analysis of cognitive models, we focused on a complementary form of parallelism found in the appli-

cation. Capturing all these forms of parallelism could enable near-term machines to be competitive for real applications.

9. Conclusion

Quantum computing can benefit many domains, but it has been a challenge to identify new applications, and stimulate architecture-application co-design. This work presented cognitive modeling as a new application area for quantum computing. We developed a suite of implementations for representative real-world cognitive models that can be run on existing hardware. We used these applications to identify new research opportunities in the quantum stack, and evaluated some of their impact with real data. Our work simultaneously advances the cognitive sciences, and quantum computer architecture.

References

- [1] “Amazon Braket.” [Online]. Available: <https://aws.amazon.com/braket/>
- [2] “Azure Quantum cloud service.” [Online]. Available: <https://azure.microsoft.com/en-us/products/quantum>
- [3] “D-Wave Leap.” [Online]. Available: <https://www.dwavesys.com/solutions-and-products/cloud-platform/>
- [4] “IBM Quantum.” [Online]. Available: <https://quantum-computing.ibm.com/>
- [5] “Xanadu Cloud.” [Online]. Available: <https://platform.xanadu.ai/>
- [6] G. S. Ravi, K. N. Smith, P. Murali, and F. T. Chong, “Adaptive job and resource management for the growing quantum cloud,” in *2021 IEEE International Conference on Quantum Computing and Engineering (QCE)*. IEEE, 2021, pp. 301–312.
- [7] Y. Alexeev, D. Bacon, K. R. Brown, R. Calderbank, L. D. Carr, F. T. Chong, B. DeMarco, D. Englund, E. Farhi, B. Fefferman, A. V. Gorshkov, A. Houck, J. Kim, S. Kimmel, M. Lange, S. Lloyd, M. D. Lukin, D. Maslov, P. Maunz, C. Monroe, J. Preskill, M. Roetteler, M. J. Savage, and J. Thompson, “Quantum computer systems for scientific discovery,” *PRX Quantum*, vol. 2, p. 017001, Feb 2021. [Online]. Available: <https://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PRXQuantum.2.017001>
- [8] T. W. Webb, I. Sinha, and J. Cohen, “Emergent symbols through binding in external memory,” in *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2020.
- [9] B. M. Lake, T. D. Ullman, J. B. Tenenbaum, and S. J. Gershman, “Building machines that learn and think like people,” *Behavioral and brain sciences*, vol. 40, p. e253, 2017.
- [10] K. J. Holyoak, “Analogy and relational reasoning,” in *The Oxford handbook of thinking and reasoning*, K. J. Holyoak and R. G. Morrison, Eds. Oxford University Press, 2012, pp. 234–259.
- [11] M. K. Ho, D. Abel, J. D. Cohen, M. L. Littman, and T. L. Griffiths, “The efficiency of human cognition reflects planned information processing,” in *AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, Apr. 2020.
- [12] L. Rosendahl, A. S. Bizyaeva, and J. Cohen, “A novel quantum approach to the dynamics of decision making,” in *CogSci*, 2020.
- [13] J. R. Busemeyer and P. D. Bruza, *Quantum models of cognition and decision*. Cambridge University Press, 2012.
- [14] E. M. Pothos and J. R. Busemeyer, “Quantum cognition,” *Annual review of psychology*, vol. 73, pp. 749–778, 2022.
- [15] ———, “Quantum principles in psychology: The debate, the evidence, and the future,” *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, vol. 36, no. 3, pp. 310–327, 2013.
- [16] P. D. Bruza, Z. Wang, and J. R. Busemeyer, “Quantum cognition: a new theoretical approach to psychology,” *Trends in cognitive sciences*, vol. 19, no. 7, pp. 383–393, 2015.
- [17] G. P. Epping and J. R. Busemeyer, “Using diverging predictions from classical and quantum models to dissociate between categorization systems,” *Journal of Mathematical Psychology*, vol. 112, p. 102738, 2023.
- [18] M. L. Rosendahl, “The multi-particle multi-well (mpmw) framework: A quantum framework incorporating attentional capture, representational generality, and arousal to perceptual choice problems,” Ph.D. dissertation, Princeton University, 2022.
- [19] J. Veselý, R. P. Pothukuchi, K. Joshi, S. Gupta, J. D. Cohen, and A. Bhattacharjee, “Distill: Domain-specific compilation for cognitive models,” in *IEEE/ACM International Symposium on Code Generation and Optimization (CGO)*, 2022, pp. 301–312.
- [20] T. Tomesh, P. Gokhale, V. Omole, G. S. Ravi, K. N. Smith, J. Vizlai, X.-C. Wu, N. Hardavellas, M. R. Martonosi, and F. T. Chong, “Supermarq: A scalable quantum benchmark suite,” in *2022 IEEE International Symposium on High-Performance Computer Architecture (HPCA)*. IEEE, 2022, pp. 587–603.
- [21] D. Widdows, J. Rani, and E. M. Pothos, “Quantum circuit components for cognitive decision-making,” *Entropy*, vol. 25, no. 4, 2023. [Online]. Available: <https://www.mdpi.com/1099-4300/25/4/548>
- [22] J. Liu, G. T. Byrd, and H. Zhou, “Quantum circuits for dynamic runtime assertions in quantum computation,” in *Proceedings of the Twenty-Fifth International Conference on Architectural Support for Programming Languages and Operating Systems*, ser. ASPLOS ’20. New York, NY, USA: Association for Computing Machinery, 2020, p. 1017–1030. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1145/3373376.3378488>
- [23] J. Liu and H. Zhou, “Systematic approaches for precise and approximate quantum state runtime assertion,” in *2021 IEEE International Symposium on High-Performance Computer Architecture (HPCA)*, 2021, pp. 179–193.
- [24] K. Temme, S. Bravyi, and J. M. Gambetta, “Error Mitigation for Short-Depth Quantum Circuits,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, vol. 119, no. 18, p. 180509, Nov. 2017.
- [25] S. Endo, S. C. Benjamin, and Y. Li, “Practical Quantum Error Mitigation for Near-Future Applications,” *Phys. Rev. X*, vol. 8, no. 3, p. 031027, Jul. 2018.
- [26] Z. Cai, R. Babbush, S. C. Benjamin, S. Endo, W. J. Huggins, Y. Li, J. R. McClean, and T. E. O’Brien, “Quantum Error Mitigation,” *arXiv*, Oct. 2022.
- [27] T. Patel and D. Tiwari, “Veritas: Accurately estimating the correct output on noisy intermediate-scale quantum computers,” in *SC20: International Conference for High Performance Computing, Networking, Storage and Analysis*, 2020, pp. 1–16.
- [28] ———, “Qraft: Reverse your quantum circuit and know the correct program output,” in *Proceedings of the 26th ACM International Conference on Architectural Support for Programming Languages and Operating Systems*, ser. ASPLOS ’21. New York, NY, USA: Association for Computing Machinery, 2021, p. 443–455. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1145/3445814.3446743>
- [29] S. S. Tannu and M. K. Qureshi, “Mitigating measurement errors in quantum computers by exploiting state-dependent bias,” in *Proceedings of the 52nd Annual IEEE/ACM International Symposium on Microarchitecture*, ser. MICRO ’52. New York, NY, USA: Association for Computing Machinery, 2019, p. 279–290. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1145/3352460.3358265>
- [30] P. Murali, D. C. McKay, M. Martonosi, and A. Javadi-Abhari, “Software mitigation of crosstalk on noisy intermediate-scale quantum computers,” in *Proceedings of the Twenty-Fifth International Conference on Architectural Support for Programming Languages and Operating Systems*, ser. ASPLOS ’20. New York, NY, USA: Association for Computing Machinery, 2020, p. 1001–1016. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1145/3373376.3378477>
- [31] P. Das, C. A. Pattison, S. Manne, D. M. Carmean, K. M. Svore, M. Qureshi, and N. Delfosse, “Afs: Accurate, fast, and scalable error-decoding for fault-tolerant quantum computers,” in *2022 IEEE International Symposium on High-Performance Computer Architecture (HPCA)*, 2022, pp. 259–273.
- [32] Y. Suzuki, T. Sugiyama, T. Arai, W. Liao, K. Inoue, and T. Tanimoto, “Q3de: A fault-tolerant quantum computer architecture for multi-bit burst errors by cosmic rays,” in *2022 55th IEEE/ACM International Symposium on Microarchitecture (MICRO)*, 2022, pp. 1110–1125.
- [33] A. JavadiAbhari, S. Patil, D. Kudrow, J. Heckey, A. Lvov, F. T. Chong, and M. Martonosi, “Scaffcc: A framework for compilation and analysis of quantum computing programs,” in *Proceedings of the 11th ACM Conference on Computing Frontiers*, ser. CF ’14. New York, NY, USA: Association for Computing Machinery, 2014. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1145/2597917.2597939>
- [34] W. Tang, T. Tomesh, M. Suchara, J. Larson, and M. Martonosi, “Cutq: using small quantum computers for large quantum circuit evaluations,” in *Proceedings of the 26th ACM International conference on architectural support for programming languages and operating systems*, 2021, pp. 473–486.

- [35] P. Murali, N. M. Linke, M. Martonosi, A. J. Abhari, N. H. Nguyen, and C. H. Alderete, "Full-stack, real-system quantum computer studies: Architectural comparisons and design insights," in *Proceedings of the 46th International Symposium on Computer Architecture*, ser. ISCA '19. New York, NY, USA: Association for Computing Machinery, 2019, p. 527–540. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1145/3307650.3322273>
- [36] R. P. Feynman, "Simulating physics with computers," *International Journal of Theoretical Physics*, vol. 21, no. 6/7, 1982.
- [37] I. M. Georgescu, S. Ashhab, and F. Nori, "Quantum simulation," *Rev. Mod. Phys.*, vol. 86, no. 1, pp. 153–185, Mar. 2014.
- [38] A. Aspuru-Guzik, A. D. Dutoi, P. J. Love, and M. Head-Gordon, "Simulated Quantum Computation of Molecular Energies," *Science*, vol. 309, no. 5741, pp. 1704–1707, Sep. 2005.
- [39] Y. Cao, J. Romero, J. P. Olson, M. Degroote, P. D. Johnson, M. Kieferová, I. D. Kivlichan, T. Menke, B. Peropadre, N. P. D. Sawaya *et al.*, "Quantum Chemistry in the Age of Quantum Computing," *Chem. Rev.*, vol. 119, no. 19, pp. 10856–10915, Oct. 2019.
- [40] R. Orús, S. Mugel, and E. Lizaso, "Quantum computing for finance: Overview and prospects," *Rev. Phys.*, vol. 4, p. 100028, Nov. 2019.
- [41] P. Rebentrost, B. Gupt, and T. R. Bromley, "Quantum computational finance: Monte carlo pricing of financial derivatives," *Physical Review A*, vol. 98, no. 2, p. 022321, 2018.
- [42] J. Biamonte, P. Wittek, N. Pancotti, P. Rebentrost, N. Wiebe, and S. Lloyd, "Quantum machine learning," *Nature*, vol. 549, no. 7671, pp. 195–202, 2017.
- [43] N. Moll, P. Barkoutsos, L. S. Bishop, J. M. Chow, A. Cross, D. J. Egger, S. Filipp, A. Fuhrer, J. M. Gambetta, M. Ganzhorn *et al.*, "Quantum optimization using variational algorithms on near-term quantum devices," *Quantum Science and Technology*, vol. 3, no. 3, p. 030503, 2018.
- [44] "Quantum computing: Progress and prospects," *National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine*, 2019, National Academies Press.
- [45] M. G. Algaba, M. Ponce-Martinez, C. Munuera-Javaloy, V. Pina-Canelles, M. J. Thapa, B. G. Taketani, M. Leib, I. de Vega, J. Casanova, and H. Heimonen, "Co-Design quantum simulation of nanoscale NMR," *Phys. Rev. Res.*, vol. 4, no. 4, p. 043089, Nov. 2022.
- [46] G. Li, Y. Shi, and A. Javadi-Abhari, "Software-hardware co-optimization for computational chemistry on superconducting quantum processors," in *2021 ACM/IEEE 48th Annual International Symposium on Computer Architecture (ISCA)*. IEEE, 2021, pp. 832–845.
- [47] G. Li, A. Wu, Y. Shi, A. Javadi-Abhari, Y. Ding, and Y. Xie, "On the co-design of quantum software and hardware," in *Proceedings of the Eight Annual ACM International Conference on Nanoscale Computing and Communication*, ser. NANOCOM '21. New York, NY, USA: Association for Computing Machinery, 2021. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1145/3477206.3477464>
- [48] P. Gokhale, A. Javadi-Abhari, N. Earnest, Y. Shi, and F. T. Chong, "Optimized quantum compilation for near-term algorithms with openpulse," in *2020 53rd Annual IEEE/ACM International Symposium on Microarchitecture (MICRO)*. IEEE, 2020, pp. 186–200.
- [49] R. Ratcliff, "A theory of memory retrieval," *Psychological Review*, vol. 85, no. 2, pp. 59–108, 1978.
- [50] M. Usher and J. L. McClelland, "The time course of perceptual choice: the leaky, competing accumulator model," *Psychological review*, vol. 108, no. 3, p. 550, 2001.
- [51] S. Musslick and J. D. Cohen, "Rationalizing constraints on the capacity for cognitive control," *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, vol. 25, no. 9, pp. 757–775, 2021.
- [52] A. Graves, G. Wayne, and I. Danihelka, "Neural turing machines," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1410.5401*, 2014.
- [53] D. Rolnick, A. Ahuja, J. Schwarz, T. Lillicrap, and G. Wayne, "Experience replay for continual learning," *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, vol. 32, 2019.
- [54] J. R. Busemeyer, Z. Wang, and J. T. Townsend, "Quantum dynamics of human decision-making," *Journal of Mathematical Psychology*, vol. 50, no. 3, pp. 220–241, 2006.
- [55] E. M. Pothos and J. R. Busemeyer, "Can quantum probability provide a new direction for cognitive modeling?" *Behavioral and brain sciences*, vol. 36, no. 3, pp. 255–274, 2013.
- [56] P. D. Kvam, T. J. Pleskac, S. Yu, and J. R. Busemeyer, "Interference effects of choice on confidence: Quantum characteristics of evidence accumulation," *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, vol. 112, no. 34, pp. 10645–10650, 2015.
- [57] J. R. Busemeyer, P. D. Kvam, and T. J. Pleskac, "Comparison of markov versus quantum dynamical models of human decision making," *Wiley Interdisciplinary Reviews: Cognitive Science*, vol. 11, no. 4, p. e1526, 2020.
- [58] P. D. Kvam, J. R. Busemeyer, and T. J. Pleskac, "Temporal oscillations in preference strength provide evidence for an open system model of constructed preference," *Scientific reports*, vol. 11, no. 1, p. 8169, 2021.
- [59] A. Matuschak and M. A. Nielsen, "Quantum Computing for the Very Curious," 2019. [Online]. Available: <https://quantum.country/qcvc>
- [60] E. Farhi and S. Gutmann, "Quantum computation and decision trees," *Physical Review A*, vol. 58, no. 2, p. 915, 1998.
- [61] S. E. Venegas-Andraca, "Quantum walks: a comprehensive review," *Quantum Information Processing*, vol. 11, no. 5, pp. 1015–1106, 2012.
- [62] R. Wille, R. Van Meter, and Y. Naveh, "Ibm's qiskit tool chain: Working with and developing for real quantum computers," in *2019 Design, Automation & Test in Europe Conference & Exhibition (DATE)*. IEEE, 2019, pp. 1234–1240.
- [63] A. Peruzzo, J. McClean, P. Shadbolt, M.-H. Yung, X.-Q. Zhou, P. J. Love, A. Aspuru-Guzik, and J. L. O'Brien, "A variational eigenvalue solver on a photonic quantum processor," *Nat. Commun.*, vol. 5, no. 4213, pp. 1–7, Jul. 2014.
- [64] J. R. McClean, J. Romero, R. Babbush, and A. Aspuru-Guzik, "The theory of variational hybrid quantum-classical algorithms," *New Journal of Physics*, vol. 18, no. 2, p. 023023, 2016.
- [65] E. Farhi, J. Goldstone, and S. Gutmann, "A quantum approximate optimization algorithm," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1411.4028*, 2014.
- [66] K. M. Nakanishi, K. Mitarai, and K. Fujii, "Subspace-search variational quantum eigensolver for excited states," *Physical Review Research*, vol. 1, no. 3, p. 033062, 2019.
- [67] J. R. McClean, M. E. Kimchi-Schwartz, J. Carter, and W. A. de Jong, "Hybrid quantum-classical hierarchy for mitigation of decoherence and determination of excited states," *Phys. Rev. A*, vol. 95, no. 4, p. 042308, Apr. 2017.
- [68] S. Sim, P. D. Johnson, and A. Aspuru-Guzik, "Expressibility and entangling capability of parameterized quantum circuits for hybrid quantum-classical algorithms," *Advanced Quantum Technologies*, vol. 2, no. 12, p. 1900070, 2019.
- [69] M. Motta, C. Sun, A. T. Tan, M. J. O'Rourke, E. Ye, A. J. Minnich, F. G. Brandao, and G. K.-L. Chan, "Determining eigenstates and thermal states on a quantum computer using quantum imaginary time evolution," *Nature Physics*, vol. 16, no. 2, pp. 205–210, 2020.
- [70] S. McArdle, T. Jones, S. Endo, Y. Li, S. C. Benjamin, and X. Yuan, "Variational ansatz-based quantum simulation of imaginary time evolution," *npj Quantum Inf.*, vol. 5, no. 75, pp. 1–6, Sep. 2019.
- [71] T. H. Kyaw, M. B. Soley, B. Allen, P. Bergold, C. Sun, V. S. Batista, and A. Aspuru-Guzik, "Variational quantum iterative power algorithms for global optimization," *arXiv*, Aug. 2022.
- [72] G. Saxena, A. Shalabi, and T. H. Kyaw, "Practical limitations of quantum data propagation on noisy quantum processors," *arXiv*, Jun. 2023.
- [73] P. Hauke, H. G. Katzgraber, W. Lechner, H. Nishimori, and W. D. Oliver, "Perspectives of quantum annealing: Methods and implementations," *Reports on Progress in Physics*, vol. 83, no. 5, p. 054401, 2020.
- [74] K. Kurowski, M. Slysz, M. Subocz, and R. Różycki, "Applying a quantum annealing based restricted boltzmann machine for mnist handwritten digit classification," *Computational Methods in Science & Technology*, vol. 27, no. 3, 2021.
- [75] E. Farhi, J. Goldstone, S. Gutmann, and M. Sipser, "Quantum computation by adiabatic evolution," *arXiv preprint quant-ph/0001106*, 2000.
- [76] T. H. Kyaw, Y. Li, and L.-C. Kwek, "Measurement-Based Quantum Computation on Two-Body Interacting Qubits with Adiabatic Evolution," *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, vol. 113, no. 18, p. 180501, Oct. 2014.
- [77] T. H. Kyaw and L.-C. Kwek, "Cluster state generation in one-dimensional Kitaev honeycomb model via shortcut to adiabaticity," *New J. Phys.*, vol. 20, no. 4, p. 045007, Apr. 2018.
- [78] T. H. Kyaw, S. Allende, L.-C. Kwek, and G. Romero, "Parity-preserving light-matter system mediates effective two-body interactions," *Quantum Sci. Technol.*, vol. 2, no. 2, p. 025007, May 2017.
- [79] W. van Dam, M. Mosca, and U. Vazirani, "How powerful is adiabatic quantum computation?" in *Proceedings 42nd IEEE Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science*. IEEE, Oct. 2001, pp. 279–287.

- [80] B. Tasseff, T. Albash, Z. Morrell, M. Vuffray, A. Y. Lohkov, S. Misra, and C. Coffrin, "On the emerging potential of quantum annealing hardware for combinatorial optimization," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2210.04291*, 2022.
- [81] A. Lucas, "Ising formulations of many np problems," *Frontiers in physics*, vol. 2, p. 5, 2014.
- [82] "QuEra." [Online]. Available: <https://www.quera.com/>
- [83] Y. Peng, J. Young, P. Liu, and X. Wu, "Simuq: A domain-specific language for quantum simulation with analog compilation," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.02775*, 2023.
- [84] R. Xia, T. Bian, and S. Kais, "Electronic structure calculations and the ising hamiltonian," *The Journal of Physical Chemistry B*, vol. 122, no. 13, pp. 3384–3395, 2017.
- [85] T. L. Willke, S. B. M. Yoo, M. Capotà, S. Musslick, B. Y. Hayden, and J. D. Cohen, "A comparison of non-human primate and deep reinforcement learning agent performance in a virtual pursuit-avoidance task," in *Reinforcement Learning and Decision Making Conference*, 2019.
- [86] R. Bogacz, M. Usher, J. Zhang, and J. L. McClelland, "Extending a biologically inspired model of choice: multi-alternatives, nonlinearity and value-based multidimensional choice," *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, vol. 362, no. 1485, pp. 1655–1670, 2007.
- [87] R. Ratcliff, P. L. Smith, S. D. Brown, and G. McKoon, "Diffusion decision model: Current issues and history," *Trends in cognitive sciences*, vol. 20, no. 4, pp. 260–281, 2016.
- [88] J. R. Busemeyer, S. Gluth, J. Rieskamp, and B. M. Turner, "Cognitive and neural bases of multi-alternative, multi-alternative, value-based decisions," *Trends in cognitive sciences*, vol. 23, no. 3, pp. 251–263, 2019.
- [89] G. Li, L. Zhou, N. Yu, Y. Ding, M. Ying, and Y. Xie, "Projection-based runtime assertions for testing and debugging quantum programs," *Proceedings of the ACM on Programming Languages*, vol. 4, no. OOPSLA, pp. 1–29, 2020.
- [90] E. Boros and P. L. Hammer, "Pseudo-boolean optimization," *Discrete applied mathematics*, vol. 123, no. 1-3, pp. 155–225, 2002.
- [91] P. Gokhale, O. Angiuli, Y. Ding, K. Gui, T. Tomesh, M. Suchara, M. Martonosi, and F. T. Chong, "Optimization of simultaneous measurement for variational quantum eigensolver applications," in *2020 IEEE International Conference on Quantum Computing and Engineering (QCE)*, 2020, pp. 379–390.
- [92] J. M. Clary, E. B. Jones, D. Vigil-Fowler, C. Chang, and P. Graf, "Exploring the scaling limitations of the variational quantum eigensolver with the bond dissociation of hydride diatomic molecules," *International Journal of Quantum Chemistry*, p. e27097, 2023.
- [93] L. Mineh and A. Montanaro, "Accelerating the variational quantum eigensolver using parallelism," *Quantum Science and Technology*, vol. 8, no. 3, p. 035012, 2023.
- [94] P. Smolensky *et al.*, "Information processing in dynamical systems: Foundations of harmony theory," 1986.
- [95] G. E. Hinton, "Learning multiple layers of representation," *Trends in cognitive sciences*, vol. 11, no. 10, pp. 428–434, 2007.
- [96] S. Jiang, K. A. Britt, A. J. McCaskey, T. S. Humble, and S. Kais, "Quantum annealing for prime factorization," *Scientific reports*, vol. 8, no. 1, p. 17667, 2018.
- [97] S. A. Rahman, R. Lewis, E. Mendicelli, and S. Powell, "Su (2) lattice gauge theory on a quantum annealer," *Physical Review D*, vol. 104, no. 3, p. 034501, 2021.
- [98] "QPU-Specific Characteristics." [Online]. Available: https://docs.dwavesys.com/docs/latest/_downloads/114d18bfla9d2fd6fea1a16c89c30799/09-1262A-C_QPU_Properties_Advantage_system4_1.pdf
- [99] J. Marshall, D. Venturelli, I. Hen, and E. G. Rieffel, "Power of pausing: Advancing understanding of thermalization in experimental quantum annealers," *Phys. Rev. Appl.*, vol. 11, p. 044083, Apr 2019. [Online]. Available: <https://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevApplied.11.044083>
- [100] B. Recht, C. Re, S. Wright, and F. Niu, "Hogwild!: A lock-free approach to parallelizing stochastic gradient descent," *Advances in neural information processing systems*, vol. 24, 2011.
- [101] M. A. Carreira-Perpinan and G. Hinton, "On contrastive divergence learning," in *International workshop on artificial intelligence and statistics*. PMLR, 2005, pp. 33–40.
- [102] A. Kandala, A. Mezzacapo, K. Temme, M. Takita, M. Brink, J. M. Chow, and J. M. Gambetta, "Hardware-efficient variational quantum eigensolver for small molecules and quantum magnets," *nature*, vol. 549, no. 7671, pp. 242–246, 2017.
- [103] H. Wang, Y. Ding, J. Gu, Y. Lin, D. Z. Pan, F. T. Chong, and S. Han, "Quantumnas: Noise-adaptive search for robust quantum circuits," in *2022 IEEE International Symposium on High-Performance Computer Architecture (HPCA)*. IEEE, 2022, pp. 692–708.
- [104] "IBM Quantum." [Online]. Available: <https://quantum-computing.ibm.com/lab/docs/iql/manage/systems/queue>
- [105] "IBM Quantum." [Online]. Available: <https://qiskit.org/ecosystem/ibm-runtime/sessions.html>
- [106] M. Satyanarayanan, P. Bahl, R. Caceres, and N. Davies, "The case for vm-based cloudlets in mobile computing," *IEEE pervasive computing*, vol. 8, no. 4, pp. 14–23, 2009.
- [107] J. Dean and S. Ghemawat, "Mapreduce: simplified data processing on large clusters," *Communications of the ACM*, vol. 51, no. 1, pp. 107–113, 2008.
- [108] N. H. Stair and F. A. Evangelista, "Qforte: an efficient state simulator and quantum algorithms library for molecular electronic structure," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2108.04413*, 2021.
- [109] J. R. McClean, N. C. Rubin, K. J. Sung, I. D. Kivlichan, X. Bonnet-Monroig, Y. Cao, C. Dai, E. S. Fried, C. Gidney, B. Gimby *et al.*, "Openfermion: the electronic structure package for quantum computers," *Quantum Science and Technology*, vol. 5, no. 3, p. 034014, 2020.
- [110] J. S. Kottmann, S. Alperin-Lea, T. Tamayo-Mendoza, A. Cervera-Lierta, C. Lavigne, T.-C. Yen, V. Verteletskyi, P. Schleich, A. Anand, M. Degroote, S. Chaney, M. Kesibi, N. G. Curnow, B. Solo, G. Tsilimigkounakis, C. Zendejas-Morales, A. F. Izmaylov, and A. Aspuru-Guzik, "TEQUILA: a platform for rapid development of quantum algorithms," *Quantum Sci. Technol.*, vol. 6, no. 2, p. 024009, Mar. 2021.
- [111] X.-Z. Luo, J.-G. Liu, P. Zhang, and L. Wang, "Yao.jl: Extensible, Efficient Framework for Quantum Algorithm Design," *Quantum*, vol. 4, p. 341, Oct. 2020.
- [112] T. Alexander, N. Kanazawa, D. J. Egger, L. Capelluto, C. J. Wood, A. Javadi-Abhari, and D. C. McKay, "Qiskit pulse: programming quantum computers through the cloud with pulses," *Quantum Science and Technology*, vol. 5, no. 4, p. 044006, 2020.
- [113] P. Gokhale, A. Javadi-Abhari, N. Earnest, Y. Shi, and F. T. Chong, "Optimized quantum compilation for near-term algorithms with openpulse," in *2020 53rd Annual IEEE/ACM International Symposium on Microarchitecture (MICRO)*. IEEE, 2020, pp. 186–200.
- [114] T. Imoto, Y. Seki, Y. Matsuzaki, and S. Kawabata, "Guaranteed-accuracy quantum annealing," *Physical Review A*, vol. 106, no. 4, p. 042615, 2022.
- [115] J. T. Monroe, "Partial measurements of quantum systems," Ph.D. dissertation, Washington University in St. Louis, 2021.
- [116] T. Kopyciuk, M. Lewandowski, and P. Kurzyński, "Pre-and post-selection paradoxes in quantum walks," *New Journal of Physics*, vol. 21, no. 10, p. 103054, 2019.
- [117] "IBM Quantum." [Online]. Available: https://quantum-computing.ibm.com/lab/docs/iql/manage/systems/reset/backend_reset
- [118] F. Arute, K. Arya, R. Babbush, D. Bacon, J. C. Bardin, R.arends, R. Biswas, S. Boixo, F. G. S. L. Brandao, D. A. Buell *et al.*, "Quantum supremacy using a programmable superconducting processor," *Nature*, vol. 574, no. 7779, pp. 505–510, Oct. 2019.
- [119] H.-S. Zhong, H. Wang, Y.-H. Deng, M.-C. Chen, L.-C. Peng, Y.-H. Luo, J. Qin, D. Wu, X. Ding, Y. Hu *et al.*, "Quantum computational advantage using photons," *Science*, vol. 370, no. 6523, pp. 1460–1463, Dec. 2020.
- [120] Y. Wu, W.-S. Bao, S. Cao, F. Chen, M.-C. Chen, X. Chen, T.-H. Chung, H. Deng, Y. Du, D. Fan *et al.*, "Strong Quantum Computational Advantage Using a Superconducting Quantum Processor," *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, vol. 127, no. 18, p. 180501, Oct. 2021.
- [121] L. S. Madsen, F. Laudenbach, M. Falamarzi, Askarani, F. Rortais, T. Vincent, J. F. F. Bulmer, F. M. Miatto, L. Neuhaus, L. G. Helt, M. J. Collins *et al.*, "Quantum computational advantage with a programmable photonic processor," *Nature*, vol. 606, no. 7912, pp. 75–81, Jun. 2022.
- [122] K. Bharti, A. Cervera-Lierta, T. H. Kyaw, T. Haug, S. Alperin-Lea, A. Anand, M. Degroote, H. Heimonen, J. S. Kottmann, T. Menke *et al.*, "Noisy intermediate-scale quantum algorithms," *Rev. Mod. Phys.*, vol. 94, no. 1, p. 015004, Feb. 2022.
- [123] J. Zhang, T. H. Kyaw, S. Filippl, L.-C. Kwek, E. Sjöqvist, and D. Tong, "Geometric and holonomic quantum computation," *Phys. Rep.*, vol. 1027, pp. 1–53, Jul. 2023.
- [124] A. Fedorov and M. Gelfand, "Towards practical applications in quantum computational biology," *Nature Computational Science*, vol. 1, no. 2, pp. 114–119, 2021.

- [125] T. Lubinski, S. Johri, P. Varosy, J. Coleman, L. Zhao, J. Necaise, C. H. Baldwin, K. Mayer, and T. Proctor, "Application-oriented performance benchmarks for quantum computing," *IEEE Transactions on Quantum Engineering*, 2023.
- [126] J. R. Finžgar, P. Ross, L. Hölscher, J. Klepsch, and A. Luckow, "Quark: A framework for quantum computing application benchmarking," in *2022 IEEE International Conference on Quantum Computing and Engineering (QCE)*. IEEE, 2022, pp. 226–237.
- [127] V. Shende, S. Bullock, and I. Markov, "Synthesis of quantum-logic circuits," *IEEE Transactions on Computer-Aided Design of Integrated Circuits and Systems*, vol. 25, no. 6, pp. 1000–1010, 2006.
- [128] M. Amy, D. Maslov, M. Mosca, and M. Roetteler, "A meet-in-the-middle algorithm for fast synthesis of depth-optimal quantum circuits," *IEEE Transactions on Computer-Aided Design of Integrated Circuits and Systems*, vol. 32, no. 6, pp. 818–830, 2013.
- [129] P. Das, S. Tannu, and M. Qureshi, "Jigsaw: Boosting fidelity of nisq programs via measurement subsetting," in *MICRO-54: 54th Annual IEEE/ACM International Symposium on Microarchitecture*, 2021, pp. 937–949.
- [130] G. S. Ravi, P. Gokhale, Y. Ding, W. Kirby, K. Smith, J. M. Baker, P. J. Love, H. Hoffmann, K. R. Brown, and F. T. Chong, "Cafqa: A classical simulation bootstrap for variational quantum algorithms," in *Proceedings of the 28th ACM International Conference on Architectural Support for Programming Languages and Operating Systems, Volume 1*, 2022, pp. 15–29.
- [131] G. S. Ravi, K. Smith, J. M. Baker, T. Kannan, N. Earnest, A. Javadi-Abhari, H. Hoffmann, and F. T. Chong, "Navigating the dynamic noise landscape of variational quantum algorithms with qismet," in *Proceedings of the 28th ACM International Conference on Architectural Support for Programming Languages and Operating Systems, Volume 2*, 2023, pp. 515–529.
- [132] G. S. Ravi, K. N. Smith, P. Gokhale, and F. T. Chong, "Quantum computing in the cloud: Analyzing job and machine characteristics," in *2021 IEEE International Symposium on Workload Characterization (IISWC)*. IEEE, 2021, pp. 39–50.
- [133] J. Yao, J. Wang, F. Yue, J. Xu, and Z. Shan, "Mtmc: A scheduling framework of multi-tasking mapping on multi-chips," 2022. [Online]. Available: <https://www.researchsquare.com/article/rs-1857463/latest.pdf>
- [134] M. Zhang, L. Xie, Z. Zhang, Q. Yu, G. Xi, H. Zhang, F. Liu, Y. Zheng, Y. Zheng, and S. Zhang, "Exploiting different levels of parallelism in the quantum control microarchitecture for superconducting qubits," in *MICRO-54: 54th Annual IEEE/ACM International Symposium on Microarchitecture*, 2021, pp. 898–911.
- [135] S. Niu and A. Todri-Sanial, "How parallel circuit execution can be useful for nisq computing?," in *2022 Design, Automation & Test in Europe Conference & Exhibition (DATE)*. IEEE, 2022, pp. 1065–1070.
- [136] Y. Ohkura, T. Satoh, and R. Van Meter, "Simultaneous execution of quantum circuits on current and near-future nisq systems," *IEEE Transactions on Quantum Engineering*, vol. 3, pp. 1–10, 2022.
- [137] P. Das, S. S. Tannu, P. J. Nair, and M. Qureshi, "A case for multi-programming quantum computers," in *Proceedings of the 52nd Annual IEEE/ACM International Symposium on Microarchitecture*, 2019, pp. 291–303.
- [138] L. Liu and X. Dou, "Qucloud: A new qubit mapping mechanism for multi-programming quantum computing in cloud environment," in *2021 IEEE International symposium on high-performance computer architecture (HPCA)*. IEEE, 2021, pp. 167–178.
- [139] T. Huang, Y. Zhu, R. S. M. Goh, and T. Luo, "When quantum annealing meets multitasking: Potentials, challenges and opportunities," *Array*, p. 100282, 2023.