# Algorithmic Conversion of Polynomial Optimization Problems of Noncommuting <br> Variables to Semidefinite Programming Relaxations 

Sparsity and Scalability

Peter Wittek<br>University of Borås

December 10, 2013

## Outline

(9) Polynomial Optimization Problems of Noncommuting Variables
(2) SDP Relaxations
(3) The Problem of Translation

4 Sources of Sparsity
(5) Scalability
(6) Limitations
(7) Conclusions

## Problem Statement

We are interested in finding the global minimum $p^{*}$ of a polynomial $p(x)$ :

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathbb{P}_{K} \mapsto p^{*}:=\min _{x \in K} p(x), \tag{1}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $K$ is a not necessarily convex set defined by polynomial inequalities $g_{i}(x) \geq 0, i=1, \ldots, r$.

## Bounding Quantum Correlations

$$
\max _{E, \phi}\left\langle\phi, \sum_{i j} c_{i j} E_{i} E_{j} \phi\right\rangle
$$

subject to

$$
\begin{array}{rlr}
\|\phi\| & =1 \\
E_{i} E_{j} & =\delta_{i j} E_{i} \quad \forall i, j \\
\sum_{i} E_{i} & =1 \\
{\left[E_{i}, E_{j}\right]} & =0 \quad \forall i, j .
\end{array}
$$



Navascués, M.; Pironio, S. \& Acín, A. Bounding the set of quantum correlations. Physical Review Letters, 2007, 98, 1040.

## Ground-state Energy

$$
\begin{gather*}
\min \langle\phi, H \phi\rangle \\
H_{\text {firee }}=\sum_{\langle r s\rangle}\left[c_{r}^{\dagger} c_{s}+c_{s}^{\dagger} c_{r}-\gamma\left(c_{r}^{\dagger} c_{s}^{\dagger}+c_{s} c_{r}\right)\right]-2 \lambda \sum_{r} c_{r}^{\dagger} c_{r}, \tag{2}
\end{gather*}
$$

where $<r s>$ goes through nearest neighbour pairs in the lattice. The fermionic operators are subject to the following constraints:

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \left\{c_{r}, c_{s}^{\dagger}\right\}=\delta_{r s} I_{r} \\
& \left\{c_{r}, c_{s}\right\}=0 .
\end{aligned}
$$

Corboz, P.; Evenbly, G.; Verstraete, F. \& Vidal, G. Simulation of interacting fermions with entanglement renormalization. Physics Review A, 2010, 81, 010303.

## Detection of Multipartite Entanglement

- Partitions: $s=\{A B|C, A C| B, B C \mid A\}$.
- $P(a b c \mid x y z)$ is biseparable iff it equals to
$\sum_{s} \operatorname{tr}\left[M_{a \mid x}^{s} \otimes M_{b \mid y}^{s} \otimes M_{c \mid z}^{s} \rho^{s}\right]$,
- Where measurement operators for an isolated party commute: $\left[M_{c \mid z}^{A B \mid C}, M_{c^{\prime} \mid z^{\prime}}^{A B \mid C}\right]$.
- Bancal, J.-D.; Gisin, N.; Liang, Y.-C. \& Pironio, S. Device-Independent Witnesses of Genuine Multipartite Entanglement. Physics Review Letters, 2011, 106, 250404.


## Mutually Unbiased Bases

Mutually unbiased bases in Hilbert space $\mathbb{C}^{d}$ are two orthonormal bases $\left\{\left|e_{1}\right\rangle, \ldots,\left|e_{d}\right\rangle\right\}$ and $\left\{\left|f_{1}\right\rangle, \ldots,\left|f_{d}\right\rangle\right\}$ such that $\left|\left\langle e_{j} \mid f_{k}\right\rangle\right|^{2}=\frac{1}{d}, \quad \forall j, k \in\{1, \ldots, d\}$.
Translating it to a noncommutative optimization problem:
(1) $\Pi_{i}^{X}=\left(\Pi_{i}^{X}\right)^{*}$;
(3) $\Pi_{i}^{X} \Pi_{j}^{X}=\delta_{i j} \Pi_{i}^{X}$;
(3) $\sum_{i=1}^{d} \Pi_{i}^{x}=\mathbb{I}$;
(1) $\Pi_{i}^{x} \Pi_{j}^{x^{\prime}} \Pi_{i}^{x}=\frac{1}{d} \Pi_{i}^{x}$, for $x \neq x^{\prime}$;
(0) $\left[\Pi_{i}^{X} O_{1} \Pi_{i}^{X}, \Pi_{i}^{X} O_{2} \Pi_{i}^{X}\right]=0$, for any $x, i$, and any pair of monomials $O_{1}$ and $O_{2}$ of $\left\{\Pi_{i}^{x}\right\}$ of length three.

## Words and Involution

- Given $n$ noncommuting variables, words are sequences of letters of $x=\left(x_{1}, x_{2}, \ldots, x_{n}\right)$ and $x^{*}=\left(x_{1}^{*}, x_{2}^{*}, \ldots, x_{n}^{*}\right)$.
- E.g., $w=x_{1} x_{2}^{*}$.
- Involution: similar to a complex conjugation on sequences of letters.
- A polynomial is a linear combination of words $p=\sum_{w} p_{w} w$.
- Hermitian moment matrix.
- Hermitian variables.
- Versus commutative case.


## The Target SDP

We replace the optimization problem (1) by the following SDP:

$$
\begin{array}{cc}
\min _{y} & \sum_{w} p_{w} y_{w}  \tag{3}\\
\text { s.t. } & M(y) \succeq 0, \\
& M\left(g_{i} y\right) \succeq 0, i=1, \ldots, r .
\end{array}
$$

- A truncated Hankel matrix.

Pironio, S.; Navascués, M. \& Acín, A. Convergent relaxations of polynomial optimization problems with noncommuting variables. SIAM Journal on Optimization, SIAM, 2010, 20, 2157-2180.

## The Complexity of Translation

- Generating the moment and localizing matrices is not a trivial task.
- The number of words - the monomial basis - grows exponentially in the order of relaxation.
- The number of elements in the moment matrix is the square of that.


## Commutative Examples

- SparsePOP
- Approximative, up to 1,000 variables in optimal cases.
- Gloptipoly 3.
- Philipp Rostalski's convex algebraic geometry package.


## Supporting Libraries

- Efficient noncommutative symbolic operations
- Undocumented and dying feature in Yalmip (Matlab).
- SymPy and its quantum physics extension.
- SymbolicC++.
- NCAlgebra in Mathematica.
- Singular, GAP, etc.


## The Kinds of SDPs

- Equality constraints
- Solving the equalities is less efficient.
- Structural Sparsity
- Sparsity in the generated SDP


## Reduce the Monomial Basis

- We often encounter equality constraints of the following form:
- $a+b=0$, where $a$ and $b$ are monomials.
- Remove a from the monomial basis, and substitute it with $-b$ when encountered.


## Toy Example: Polynomial Optimization

Consider the following polynomial optimization problem:

$\min 2 x_{1} x_{2}$<br>$x \in \mathbb{R}^{2}$

such that

$$
\begin{gathered}
-x_{2}^{2}+x_{2}+0.5 \geq 0 \\
x_{1}^{2}-x_{1}=0
\end{gathered}
$$

## Toy Example: Corresponding SDP

$$
\min _{y} 2 y_{12}
$$

such that

$$
\begin{gathered}
{\left[\begin{array}{c|cc|ccc}
1 & y_{1} & y_{2} & y_{11} & y_{12} & y_{22} \\
\hline y_{1} & y_{11} & y_{12} & y_{111} & y_{112} & y_{122} \\
y_{2} & y_{12} & y_{22} & y_{112} & y_{122} & y_{222} \\
\hline y_{11} & y_{111} & y_{112} & y_{1111} & y_{1112} & y_{1122} \\
y_{12} & y_{112} & y_{122} & y_{1112} & y_{1122} & y_{1222} \\
y_{22} & y_{122} & y_{222} & y_{1122} & y_{1222} & y_{2222}
\end{array}\right] \succeq 0} \\
{\left[\left.\begin{array}{c}
-y_{22}+y_{2}+0.5 \\
\hline-y_{122}+y_{12}+0.5 y_{1} \\
-y_{222}+y_{22}+0.5 y_{2}
\end{array} \right\rvert\,-y_{1122}+y_{122}+0.5 y_{1}\right.} \\
\hline-y_{112}+0.5 y_{11} \\
-y_{1222}+y_{222}+0.5 y_{2} \\
{\left[\begin{array}{c|ccc}
y_{11}-y_{1} & y_{111}-y_{11} & y_{112}-y_{12} \\
\hline y_{111}-y_{11} & y_{1111}-y_{111} & y_{1112}-y_{112} \\
y_{112}-y_{12} & y_{1112}-y_{112} & y_{1122}-y_{122}
\end{array}\right]=0 .}
\end{gathered}
$$

## Toy Example: Reduced SDP

$\min _{y} 2 y_{12}$
such that
$\left[\begin{array}{c|cc|cc}1 & y_{1} & y_{2} & y_{12} & y_{22} \\ \hline y_{1} & y_{1} & y_{12} & y_{12} & y_{122} \\ y_{2} & y_{12} & y_{22} & y_{122} & y_{222} \\ \hline y_{12} & y_{12} & y_{122} & y_{122} & y_{1222} \\ y_{22} & y_{122} & y_{222} & y_{1222} & y_{2222}\end{array}\right] \succeq 0$

$$
\left[\begin{array}{c|cc}
-y_{22}+y_{2}+0.5 & -y_{122}+y_{12}+0.5 y_{1} & -y_{222}+y_{22}+0.5 y_{2} \\
\hline-y_{122}+y_{12}+0.5 y_{1} & -y_{122}+y_{12}+0.5 y_{1} & -y_{1222}+y_{122}+0.5 y_{12} \\
-y_{222}+y_{22}+0.5 y_{2} & -y_{1222}+y_{122}+0.5 y_{12} & -y_{2222}+y_{222}+0.5 y_{22}
\end{array}\right] \succeq 0 .
$$

## Fast Monomial Substitution

- Noncommutative symbolic libraries come with substitution routines.
- They are prepared for all eventualities.
- We know what monomials look like.
- Substitution routine can be tuned accordingly.


## Ground-state Energy

The constraints are simple:

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \left\{c_{r}, c_{s}^{\dagger}\right\}=\delta_{r s} I_{r} \\
& \left\{c_{r}, c_{s}\right\}=0 .
\end{aligned}
$$

- Most of these are monomial substitutions.
- The number of actual equalities is linear.


## Multipartite Correlations

- $\left[M_{c \mid z}^{A B \mid C}, M_{c^{\prime} \mid Z^{\prime}}^{A B \mid C}\right]=0$.
- Notice the independence of algebras.
- Reduce the size of the moment matrix.



## Mutually Unbiased Bases

- $\left[\Pi_{i}^{x} O_{1} \Pi_{i}^{x}, \Pi_{i}^{x} O_{2} \Pi_{i}^{x}\right]=0$ implies over 34 billion constraints for $D=6, K=4$.
- Constant number of equalities: $\sum_{i=1}^{d} \Pi_{i}^{X}=\mathbb{I}$.
- The rest are all monomial substitutions.


## We Cannot Change the Complexity

- We can make wise decisions in the implementation.
- SDP wrapper libraries will not generate sufficiently sparse SDPs: Yalmip, CvxOpt, PICOS.
- Re-implementation from symbolic manipulations.
- Choose your interpreter wisely: Pypy.


## Memory Use



Figure : Memory use of different implementations (log log scale).

## Running time



Figure : Running time of different implementations (log log scale).

## Parallelization

- Not all programming languages parallelize easily.
- Internal symmetries of the moment matrix imply data dependencies.
- Race conditions exist.
- Only calculating the moment matrix is hard to parallelize.


## Solving the SDPs

- Target solver: SDPA.
- Accepts sparse file format.
- Parallel and distributed.
- Accelerated by GPUs: Fujisawa, K.; Sato, H.; Matsuoka, S.; Endo, T.; Yamashita, M. \& Nakata, M. High-performance general solver for extremely large-scale semidefinite programming problems. Proceedings of SC-12, International Conference on High Performance Computing, Networking, Storage and Analysis, 2012, 93:1-93:11.


## Where the SDPs Go Wrong

- Generating the SPDs is not flawless.
- Toy example works.
- Calculating the ground-state energy of systems of harmonic oscillators works.
- Multipartite entanglement, MUBs, more involved Hamiltonians still have problems.


## Summary

- http://arxiv.org/abs/1308.6029
- GitHub repositories: ncpol2sdpa, multipartite_entanglement, ncpol2sdpa-cpp.
- Problems in this domain imply sparse structures.
- Scalability to real-world problems: hundred noncommuting variables with quadratic numbers of constraints.
- Limitations apply.

