

Determination of Optimal Chain Coupling made by Embedding in D-Wave Quantum Annealer

Hayun Park^{1,2, a)} and Hunpyo Lee^{1,2}

¹⁾Department of Liberal Studies, Kangwon National University, Samcheok, 25913, Republic of Korea

²⁾Quantum Sub Inc., Samcheok, 25913, Republic of Korea

(*Electronic mail: hplee@kangwon.ac.kr)

(Dated: 6 June 2024)

The qubits in a D-wave quantum annealer (D-wave QA) are designed on a Pegasus graph that is different from structure of a combinatorial optimization problem. This situation requires embedding with the chains connected by ferromagnetic (FM) coupling J_c between the qubits. Weak and strong J_c values induce chain breaking and enforcement of chain energy, which reduce the accuracy of quantum annealing (QA) measurements, respectively. In addition, we confirmed that even though the D-Wave Ocean package provides a default coupling J_c^{default} , it is not an optimal coupling J_c^{optimal} that maximizes the possible correct rate of QA measurements. In this paper, we present an algorithm how J_c^{optimal} with the maximum probability p for observing the possible lowest energy is determined. Finally, we confirm that the extracted J_c^{optimal} show much better p than J_c^{default} in QA measurements of various parameters of frustrated and fully connected combinatorial optimization problems. The open code is available in <https://github.com/HunpyoLee/OptimizeChainStrength>.

I. INTRODUCTION

The recent progress in quantum technology has led to the emergence of quantum machines. In addition, they are being developed and built more frequently than before¹. In particular, a D-Wave quantum annealer (D-Wave QA) is an example of such a quantum machine². Unlike gate-type quantum machines based on circuits, quantum annealing (QA) is implemented in the parameterized Hamiltonian of a transverse-field Ising model containing binary superconducting qubits³⁻⁵. The primary advantage of this architecture quantum machine is that qubits are added much easier than gate-type quantum computers with maintaining the accuracy of the results, due to short quantum coherence time. Thus, the D-Wave QA with rapid increases of qubit capacity approaches computational speed of classical digit machine. In addition, studying the dynamic behaviors observed in real materials is a very interesting research topic, as it is not easy to study using numerical simulation methods. $\text{Ca}_3\text{Co}_2\text{O}_6$ compound is an example with unconventional dynamics that has remained a puzzle⁶. Recent QA experiment on frustrated spin system reported that it can be used as a programmable quantum simulator for both the dynamic and equilibrium behaviors observed in $\text{Ca}_3\text{Co}_2\text{O}_6$ compound⁷. Consequently, this quantum machine has been not only employed in combinatorial optimization problems requiring annealing process for the possible lowest energy and for the research of Ising model, which exhibits the phase transition between unconventional phases at zero temperature, but also used as programmable quantum simulator for exploring dynamic behaviors shown in real materials⁷⁻¹⁸.

However, the D-Wave QA cannot technically describe the exact couplings between long-distance qubits, and it retains qubits designed on the specific architectures such as Pega-




FIG. 1. (Color online) (a) Unit cell of 2×2 qubits on a two-dimensional (2D) square structure with the nearest-neighbor coupling J_1 and diagonal-neighbor coupling J_2 as a combinatorial optimization problem. (b) Embedding on Pegasus graph for a unit cell of 2×2 qubits on the 2D square structure. The chains with coupling J_c to sustain ferromagnetic order of qubits are marked as dotted lines.

sus and Kimera graphs that depend on D-Wave QA hardware types. These situations require physical embedding that the architecture of the original problem topologically matches that of D-Wave QA^{19,20}. The auxiliary chains with ferromagnetic (FM) coupling J_c between several qubits, represented as one variable in the architecture of the original problem, are required. Weak and strong J_c induce chain breaking and reinforcement of chain energy to sustain FM order of qubits in chains, respectively, lowering the accuracy of the results measured by D-Wave QA. In addition, even though the D-Wave QA Ocean package provides a default coupling J_c^{default} , it is not an optimal coupling J_c^{optimal} . Therefore, determining J_c^{optimal} is highly desirable for accurate QA measurements.

In this study, we first analyze the full energy spectrum on an embedding of a combinatorial optimization problem of small size to estimate J_c^{optimal} , through an exact approach that visits all energy states. We confirm that J_c^{optimal} would be slightly larger than the critical chain coupling J_c^* between chain breaking and unbroken state without any chain breaking. Next, we

^{a)}Department of Liberal Studies, Kangwon National University, Samcheok, 25913, Republic of Korea

explain an algorithm by which J_c^* is extracted. We confirmed that the maximum probability p^{\max} with the possible lowest energy in QA measurements of various combinatorial optimization problems appears at a chain coupling value that is 1.2 times larger than J_c^* .

As examples of the combinatorial optimization problems to demonstrate the usefulness of J_c^{optimal} extracted by our algorithm, we consider a $J_1 - J_2$ Ising system on a two-dimensional (2D) $L \times L$ square lattice and fully connected Ising system with all couplings determined by randomness on N sites. We present p with the possible lowest energy in many QA shots of both the combinatorial optimization problems. Finally, it is confirmed that the extracted J_c^{optimal} showed better p than J_c^{default} in both the combinatorial optimization problems.

The remainder of this paper is organized as follows. Section II describes the Hamiltonian made by embedding with chains of FM order between qubits. In Section III, we analyze the full energy spectrum on the combinatorial optimization problem of the 2D 4×4 qubits via exact approach. 9 qubits are artificially added in the chains. We roughly estimate J_c^{optimal} from analysis of the exact full energy spectrum result. We also account for the method how J_c^{optimal} is extracted. Section IV shows that J_c^{optimal} is better p than J_c^{default} in QA measurements of $J_1 - J_2$ and fully connected combinatorial optimization problems. Finally, conclusions are presented in Section V.

II. HAMILTONIAN IN EMBEDDING

The Hamiltonian of the D-Wave QA is given by

$$H = H_{\text{cop}} + H_{\text{chain}}, \quad (1)$$

where H_{cop} and H_{chain} are the parts of the combinatorial optimization problem and of the chain, respectively. Here, H_{chain} is expressed as follows:

$$H_{\text{chain}} = - \sum_{i_{\text{chain}}} \sum_{\langle k, k' \rangle}^{n_{i_{\text{chain}}}} J_{c, i_{\text{chain}}} \sigma_{i_{\text{chain}}, k}^z \sigma_{i_{\text{chain}}, k'}^z, \quad (2)$$

where $J_{c, i_{\text{chain}}}$ is the coupling of the FM order between k and k' qubits at the chain site i_{chain} , and $n_{i_{\text{chain}}}$ is the number of qubits. The total number of qubits N_{chain} in all chains is given by $N_{\text{chain}} = \sum_{i_{\text{chain}}} n_{i_{\text{chain}}}$.

III. DETERMINATION OF THE OPTIMAL CHAIN COUPLING

A. Hamiltonian

As an example to show an algorithm how J_c^{optimal} is determined, we considered a $J_1 - J_2$ combinatorial optimization problem on a 2D $L \times L$ square lattice. The Hamiltonian H_{cop}




FIG. 2. (Color online) Interval Δ_c/J_1 between the ground and the first excited energies on the 2D 4×4 qubits of the combinatorial optimization problem with 9 qubits in the chains as a function of J_c/J_1 for $J_2/J_1 = 0.42, 0.46$, and 0.48 . Δ_c/J_1 are computed by the exact method with visiting all energy states. Note that if any chain is broken, we set that Δ_c/J_1 is 0.

of the $J_1 - J_2$ combination optimization problem is defined as follows:

$$H_{\text{cop}} = -J_1 \sum_{\langle i, j \rangle} \sigma_i^z \sigma_j^z + J_2 \sum_{\langle\langle i, j' \rangle\rangle} \sigma_i^z \sigma_{j'}^z, \quad (3)$$

where the nearest- and diagonal-neighbors are denoted by $\langle i, j \rangle$ and $\langle\langle i, j' \rangle\rangle$, respectively^{21,22}. J_1 and J_2 mean the nearest-neighbor and diagonal-neighbor couplings respectively, as shown in Fig. 1 (a). Here, the reason we chose this $J_1 - J_2$ combinatorial optimization problem as the example is because the interval Δ between the energies of the ground and of the first-excited states is systematically adjusted by J_2/J_1 value^{21,22}. Δ is an important variable that affects the accuracy of QA measurements, because the plausible local minima close to global minimum in objective function of the combinatorial optimization problem increase with decreasing Δ . In addition, another energy gap Δ_c between the energies of the ground and of the first-excited states in Eq. (1) of an embedded combinatorial optimization problem on Pegasus graph is occurred by chains with J_c . Figs. 1(a) and (b) illustrate the unit cell of 2×2 qubits on the 2D square structure with the nearest-neighbor coupling J_1 and diagonal-neighbor coupling J_2 as a combinatorial optimization problem and its embedding on Pegasus graph, respectively. The chains with the coupling J_c to keep FM order of qubits are marked as dotted lines in Fig. 1(b).

B. Rough estimation of optimal chain coupling by analysis of full energy spectrum

We analyze the full energy spectrum of $J_1 - J_2$ combinatorial optimization problem on a 2D 4×4 square lattice in the embedding, using the exact method with visiting all energy states. 9 qubits are also added in the chains. We find that when all chains are broken in weak J_c/J_1 , a stable state oc-




FIG. 3. (Color online) Chain coupling J_c as a function of Δ/J_1 on the bottom label (and J_2/J_1 on top label) in $J_1 - J_2$ combinatorial optimization problem on a $2D 8 \times 8$ square lattice. Here, Δ/J_1 in the bottom label are approximately estimated by interval between the lowest energy and the second lowest energy in many quantum annealing (QA) shots. The top label is J_2/J_1 , matching Δ/J_1 .

curs. As J_c/J_1 increases, the stable state with all chain breakings changes into a state where chain breaking disappears individually, depending on the chain connecting shape between the qubits of the combinatorial optimization problem and the chain. This implies that the critical coupling for chain breaking at each chain depends on the chain connecting shapes. After J_c^*/J_1 , the state in which any chain is not broken becomes a stable state.

Fig. 2 shows Δ_c/J_1 as a function of J_c/J_1 for $J_2/J_1 = 0.42, 0.46, \text{ and } 0.48$. Here, we assume that when all chains are unbroken, the most stable state occurs to prevent deformation of the combinatorial optimization problem. So, if any chain is broken, we set Δ_c/J_1 to 0. A stable state without any chain breaking appears above the critical chain couplings $J_c^*/J_1 = 1.68, 1.84, \text{ and } 1.92$ for $J_2/J_1 = 4.2, 4.6, \text{ and } 4.8$, respectively. Δ_c/J_1 increases as J_c/J_1 increases from J_c^*/J_1 until kink behavior is observed at $J_c^{**}/J_1 = 2.96, 2.48, \text{ and } 2.24$ for $J_2/J_1 = 4.2, 4.6, \text{ and } 4.8$, respectively. After J_c^{**}/J_1 for all J_2/J_1 , Δ_c/J_1 converges to Δ/J_1 . We believe that the chain breaking and dominant chain energy states that sustain the FM order of the qubits in the chain would appear below J_c^*/J_1 and above J_c^{**}/J_1 , respectively. The range between J_c^* and J_c^{**} decreases with increasing J_2/J_1 (or decreasing Δ/J_1). Finally, we inferred three possibilities from exact result in Fig. 2: (i) J_c^{optimal}/J_1 might be between J_c^*/J_1 and J_c^{**}/J_1 . (ii) When Δ/J_1 is tiny, it may be difficult to determine J_c^{optimal}/J_1 . (iii) The accuracy of QA measurements will be poor with decreasing Δ/J_1 .




FIG. 4. (Color online) Probability p for observing the possible lowest energies measured by 5000 times QA shots with J_c^{default} and J_c^{optimal} on $J_1 - J_2$ combinatorial optimization problem on $2D 8 \times 8$ square lattice.

C. Procedure for extracting the optimal chain coupling J_c value

The D-Wave Ocean package provides the default coupling J_c^{default} given as

$$J_c^{\text{default}} = 1.41 * \left(\frac{1}{M_c} \sum_{\langle i,j \rangle} J_{ij}^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} * \left(\frac{1}{N_c} \sum_{i=1} \text{deg}(i) \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}, \quad (4)$$

where M_c , N_c and $\text{deg}(i)$ are the number of total connectivities between qubits, the number of total qubits and the coordination number at i -chain, respectively. Even though J_c^{default} gives not bad results in accuracy of QA measurements, we confirmed that J_c^{default} is not J_c^{optimal} from estimation of the exact result in Fig. 2 and from various results measured by D-Wave QA.

Here, we design more sophisticated algorithm to obtain J_c^{optimal} that provides better results than J_c^{default} . The procedure of the algorithm is followed as: (i) In the first step, we set to initial chain coupling J_c given as $J_c = 0.1 \times J_c^{\text{default}}$ of weak chain coupling. The stable state at initial J_c is when almost all chains are broken. (ii) In the second step, we increase J_c by 10 percent of J_c^{default} and perform QA measurements. The chain breaking gradually disappears with increasing J_c . (iii) In the third step, we set the critical chain coupling J_c^* , when the chain is no longer broken. (iv) Finally, we set J_c^* multiplied by 1.2 as J_c^{optimal} . The factor 1.2 is obtained empirically from the best results of QA measurements in various combinatorial optimization problems on D-Wave Advantage machine. In open code we set annealing time to 1.0×10^{-3} second in QA measurements, and perform a hundred of annealing shots to find J_c^* and J_c^{optimal} .




FIG. 5. (Color online) J_c as a function of N on bottom label (and N_T on top label) in fully connected combinatorial optimization problem. Here, N on bottom label and N_T on top label are the number of qubits in fully connected combinatorial optimization problem and the number of qubits in embedding, respectively.

IV. RESULTS

A. $J_1 - J_2$ combinatorial optimization problem

In order to demonstrate the superiority of the results in J_c^{optimal} extracted by our algorithm, we first consider $J_1 - J_2$ combinatorial optimization problem on 2D 8×8 square lattice expressed by Hamiltonian of Eq. (3). We compare J_c^{default}/J_1 computed by Eq. (4) to J_c^{optimal}/J_1 determined by our algorithm. Fig. 3 shows J_c^{default} and J_c^{optimal} values as a function of Δ/J_1 in bottom label (and J_2/J_1 in top label). Here, Δ/J_1 values in bottom label are approximately estimated by interval between the lowest energy and the second lowest energy in many QA shots. The top label is J_2/J_1 , matching Δ/J_1 . We observe that J_c^{default}/J_1 values are larger than J_c^{optimal}/J_1 in all Δ/J_1 . J_c^{default}/J_1 increases slowly, while J_c^{optimal}/J_1 increases quickly as Δ/J_1 decreases.

In addition, we plot p for observing the possible lowest energies measured by QA shots of 5000 times with both J_c^{default}/J_1 and J_c^{optimal}/J_1 in Fig. 4. p (or accuracy of QA measurements) decrease with decreasing Δ/J_1 in both J_c^{default}/J_1 and J_c^{optimal}/J_1 , because many plausible local minimum that are similar to the global minimum are created in tiny Δ/J_1 . As a main result, we find that p values measured in J_c^{optimal}/J_1 are higher than those in J_c^{default}/J_1 . We think that J_c^{optimal}/J_1 provides the optimal compromise between chain breaking and chain energy, while J_c^{default}/J_1 lowers the accuracy of QA measurements by the strong chain energy.




FIG. 6. (Color online) J_c as a function of N in fully connected combinatorial optimization problem. p are measured by QA shots of 5000 times with J_c^{default} and J_c^{optimal} .

B. Fully connected combinatorial optimization problem

Finally, in order to confirm a more general case we select a fully connected combinatorial optimization problem, where obtaining accurate results of QA measurements is more difficult than $J_1 - J_2$ combinatorial optimization problem because it produces more plausible local minima than $J_1 - J_2$ combinatorial optimization problem, due to strong degeneracy in energy states. The Hamiltonian H_{cop} is given as

$$H_{\text{cop}} = - \sum_{\langle i,j \rangle}^N J_{\langle i,j \rangle} \sigma_i^z \sigma_j^z, \quad (5)$$

where $\langle i, j \rangle$ and N mean all couplings between qubits and the number of qubits in the combination optimization problem, respectively. $J_{\langle i,j \rangle}$ values are either -1.0 , 0.0 or 1.0 determined by random number generator.

Same as $J_1 - J_2$ combinatorial optimization problem, we plot J_c values and p as a function of N on bottom label in Fig. 5 and Fig. 6, respectively. p are measured by QA shots of 5000 times with J_c^{default} and J_c^{optimal} . J_c^{default} values are always bigger than J_c^{optimal} values in all N of Fig. 5. The number of total qubits N_T on top label in embedding is increasing with N in Fig 5. It is also confirmed that J_c^{optimal} gives more accurate results than J_c^{default} in QA measurements of Fig. 6.

V. CONCLUSION

The D-Wave QA displays significant potential due to the recent rapid increase in qubit capacity. Moreover, the D-Wave QA has been extensively applied to solving combinatorial optimization problems. However, as a limitation, physical embedding with FM chains of several qubits is required to consider the exact long-range coupling between qubits ignored in D-Wave QA. The separation of FM qubits in the chains or the dominant enhancement of the chain energy to sustain FM order of qubits in chains lowers the accuracy of the results

measured by D-Wave QA. In addition, we confirm that even though the D-Wave Ocean package provides the default coupling J_c^{default} , it is not an optimal coupling J_c^{optimal} . Therefore, determining the optimal coupling J_c^{optimal} for maintaining the appropriate FM ordered qubits in the chains is required to improve accuracy.

In this paper, we present the algorithm how J_c^{optimal} is determined. We confirm that the extracted J_c^{optimal} shows much better p than J_c^{default} in various parameters of $J_1 - J_2$ and fully connected combinatorial optimization problems. Finally, We believe that our method provides practical assistance for D-Wave QA users to search for J_c^{optimal} with decreased essential errors. The open code is available in <https://github.com/HunpyoLee/OptimizeChainStrength>.

VI. ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This work was supported by Institute of Information and communications Technology Planning Evaluation (IITP) grant funded by the Korean government (MSIT) (No. RS-2023-0022952422282052750001), Ministry of Science through NRF-2021R1111A2057259 and by the quantum computing technology development program of the National Research Foundation of Korea (NRF) funded by the Korean government (Ministry of Science and ICT(MSIT)) (No. 2020M3H3A1110365).

VII. DATA AVAILABILITY

The data that support the findings of this study are available from the corresponding author upon reasonable request.

VIII. CONFLICT OF INTEREST

The authors have no conflicts to disclose.

- ¹J. Preskill, “Quantum Computing in the NISQ era and beyond,” *Quantum* **2**, 79 (2018).
- ²M. W. Johnson, M. H. S. Amin, S. Gildert, T. Lanting, F. Hamze, N. Dickson, R. Harris, A. J. Berkley, J. Johansson, P. Bunyk, E. M. Chapple, C. Enderud, J. P. Hilton, K. Karimi, E. Ladizinsky, N. Ladizinsky, T. Oh, I. Perminov, C. Rich, M. C. Thom, E. Tolkacheva, C. J. S. Truncik, S. Uchaikin, J. Wang, B. Wilson, and G. Rose, “Quantum annealing with manufactured spins,” *Nature* **473**, 194–198 (2011).
- ³T. Kadowaki and H. Nishimori, “Quantum annealing in the transverse ising model,” *Phys. Rev. E* **58**, 5355–5363 (1998).
- ⁴A. D. King, S. Suzuki, J. Raymond, A. Zucca, T. Lanting, F. Altomare, A. J. Berkley, S. Ejtemaee, E. Hoskinson, S. Huang, E. Ladizinsky, A. J. R. MacDonald, G. Marsden, T. Oh, G. Poulin-Lamarre, M. Reis, C. Rich, Y. Sato,

- J. D. Whittaker, J. Yao, R. Harris, D. A. Lidar, H. Nishimori, and M. H. Amin, “Coherent quantum annealing in a programmable 2,000 qubit ising chain,” *Nature Physics* **18**, 1324–1328 (2022).
- ⁵A. Das and B. K. Chakrabarti, “Colloquium: Quantum annealing and analog quantum computation,” *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **80**, 1061–1081 (2008).
- ⁶I. Nekrashevich, X. Ding, F. Balakirev, H. T. Yi, S.-W. Cheong, L. Civale, Y. Kamiya, and V. S. Zapf, “Reaching the equilibrium state of the frustrated triangular ising magnet $\text{Ca}_3\text{Co}_2\text{O}_6$,” *Phys. Rev. B* **105**, 024426 (2022).
- ⁷A. D. King, C. D. Batista, J. Raymond, T. Lanting, I. Ozfidan, G. Poulin-Lamarre, H. Zhang, and M. H. Amin, “Quantum annealing simulation of out-of-equilibrium magnetization in a spin-chain compound,” *PRX Quantum* **2**, 030317 (2021).
- ⁸M. H. Amin, E. Andriyash, J. Rolfe, B. Kulchytsky, and R. Melko, “Quantum boltzmann machine,” *Phys. Rev. X* **8**, 021050 (2018).
- ⁹S. V. Isakov, G. Mazzola, V. N. Smelyanskiy, Z. Jiang, S. Boixo, H. Neven, and M. Troyer, “Understanding quantum tunneling through quantum monte carlo simulations,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **117**, 180402 (2016).
- ¹⁰G. Mazzola, V. N. Smelyanskiy, and M. Troyer, “Quantum monte carlo tunneling from quantum chemistry to quantum annealing,” *Phys. Rev. B* **96**, 134305 (2017).
- ¹¹D. Inoue, A. Okada, T. Matsumori, K. Aihara, and H. Yoshida, “Traffic signal optimization on a square lattice with quantum annealing,” *Scientific Reports* **11**, 3303 (2021).
- ¹²P. Kairys, A. D. King, I. Ozfidan, K. Boothby, J. Raymond, A. Banerjee, and T. S. Humble, “Simulating the shastry-sutherland ising model using quantum annealing,” *PRX Quantum* **1**, 020320 (2020).
- ¹³A. D. King, J. Raymond, T. Lanting, S. V. Isakov, M. Mohseni, G. Poulin-Lamarre, S. Ejtemaee, W. Bernoudy, I. Ozfidan, A. Y. Smirnov, M. Reis, F. Altomare, M. Babcock, C. Baron, A. J. Berkley, K. Boothby, P. I. Bunyk, H. Christiani, C. Enderud, B. Evert, R. Harris, E. Hoskinson, S. Huang, K. Jooya, A. Khodabandelou, N. Ladizinsky, R. Li, P. A. Lott, A. J. R. MacDonald, D. Marsden, G. Marsden, T. Medina, R. Molavi, R. Neufeld, M. Norouzpour, T. Oh, I. Pavlov, I. Perminov, T. Prescott, C. Rich, Y. Sato, B. Sheldan, G. Sterling, L. J. Swenson, N. Tsai, M. H. Volkman, J. D. Whittaker, W. Wilkinson, J. Yao, H. Neven, J. P. Hilton, E. Ladizinsky, M. W. Johnson, and M. H. Amin, “Scaling advantage over path-integral monte carlo in quantum simulation of geometrically frustrated magnets,” *Nature Communications* **12**, 1113 (2021).
- ¹⁴H. Irie, H. Liang, T. Doi, S. Gongyo, and T. Hatsuda, “Hybrid quantum annealing via molecular dynamics,” *Scientific Reports* **11**, 8426 (2021).
- ¹⁵H. Park and H. Lee, “Frustrated ising model on d-wave quantum annealing machine,” *Journal of the Physical Society of Japan* **91** (2022), <https://doi.org/10.7566/JPSJ.91.074001>.
- ¹⁶T. F. Rønnow, Z. Wang, J. Job, S. Boixo, S. V. Isakov, D. Wecker, J. M. Martinis, D. A. Lidar, and M. Troyer, “Defining and detecting quantum speedup,” *Science* **345**, 420–424 (2014).
- ¹⁷T. Albash and D. A. Lidar, “Demonstration of a scaling advantage for a quantum annealer over simulated annealing,” *Phys. Rev. X* **8**, 031016 (2018).
- ¹⁸S. Boixo, T. F. Rønnow, S. V. Isakov, Z. Wang, D. Wecker, D. A. Lidar, J. M. Martinis, and M. Troyer, “Evidence for quantum annealing with more than one hundred qubits,” *Nature Physics* **10**, 218–224 (2014).
- ¹⁹M. Lanthaler and W. Lechner, “Minimal constraints in the parity formulation of optimization problems,” *New Journal of Physics* **23**, 083039 (2021).
- ²⁰M. S. Konz, W. Lechner, H. G. Katzgraber, and M. Troyer, “Embedding overhead scaling of optimization problems in quantum annealing,” *PRX Quantum* **2**, 040322 (2021).
- ²¹S. Jin, A. Sen, and A. W. Sandvik, “Ashkin-teller criticality and pseudo-first-order behavior in a frustrated ising model on the square lattice,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **108**, 045702 (2012).
- ²²S. Jin, A. Sen, W. Guo, and A. W. Sandvik, “Phase transitions in the frustrated ising model on the square lattice,” *Phys. Rev. B* **87**, 144406 (2013).