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1. Abstract

This project focuses on comparing and evaluating the capabilities of two leading quantum computing platforms: IBM Quantum, which uses superconducting qubits, and Xanadu’s photonic quantum systems, accessed through the Pennylane programming framework (a Python library) [1]. The primary goal is to investigate their performance across a range of algorithms, focusing on factors such as computational efficiency, accuracy, and error rates.

The study emphasises the contrasting approaches of photonic and superconducting qubit technologies, analysing their effectiveness in terms of scalability, hardware robustness, and algorithmic precision [2]. Additionally, it examines how tools like Pennylane enable seamless programming and simulation, bridging the gap between theoretical quantum concepts and real-world implementation. Through a detailed comparison of outcomes, this work aims to shed light on the current state of quantum computing platforms and their future potential in advancing scientific and industrial applications [3].
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1. Introduction

Over the past decade, quantum computing—a field intersecting physics, computer science, mathematics, and engineering—has seen remarkable progress [4]. Diverse quantum technologies lie at the heart of this evolution, each presenting novel solutions to complex computational challenges that classical systems struggle to address. Superconducting qubits and photonic quantum computing stand out as two leading paradigms. IBM Quantum is at the forefront with superconducting qubits, while Xanadu leads in photonic quantum computing. These cutting-edge platforms are expanding the frontiers of computational capability and scalability [2], allowing researchers to delve into previously inaccessible quantum algorithms and applications.

IBM Quantum is notable for its durable superconducting qubit architecture, characterised by high coherence times, accurate gate operations, and an extensive suite of quantum programming tools provided through the Qiskit platform [5]. The IBM Quantum cloud provides access to a wide array of quantum processors, facilitating detailed testing of quantum circuits and enabling users to benchmark performance and investigate novel algorithms [6]. In contrast, Xanadu's photonic quantum systems, available through their Pennylane framework, offer a different approach by leveraging continuous-variable quantum computing [7]. This photonic platform is particularly well-suited for tasks like Gaussian Boson Sampling, which has notable applications in graph theory and machine learning [8].

Our research investigates and compares the performance of IBM Quantum and Xanadu Quantum Technologies’s photonic quantum systems through practical programming and execution of quantum algorithms. By utilising Qiskit for IBM Quantum and Pennylane for Xanadu, we explore their respective strengths and limitations in terms of computational efficiency, scalability, and accuracy. This comparative study highlights the distinct hardware architectures, programming paradigms, and error-correction strategies of each system while assessing their practical applications in solving quantum problems.

This work also delves into the growing utility of software frameworks like Pennylane, which bridge theoretical quantum computing concepts with real-world implementations [9]. Pennylane supports hybrid quantum-classical workflows, enabling the smooth execution of quantum algorithms on both photonic and qubit-based systems, thus making it an essential tool for this research. Likewise, Qiskit’s advanced simulator and hardware interfaces provide rigorous testing of quantum programs before deploying them on physical qubits [10].

Ultimately, this study aims to shed light on the current capabilities of IBM Quantum and Xanadu Quantum Technologies, providing a detailed analysis of their respective advantages and challenges. By comparing their performance across a range of computational tasks, we aim to contribute to the broader understanding of quantum computing technologies, offering insights into their potential roles in scientific and industrial applications.

1. Theory and Computational Approach

**Solving the QUBO Problem with Quantum Computing**

The Quadratic Unconstrained Binary Optimi**s**ation (QUBO) problem is a type of optimi**s**ation problem**.** It involves finding the optimal solution to a quadratic function where the variables are binary, meaning they can only take the values 0 or 1. The goal is to minimise (or maximise) this function without any additional constraints on the variables. QUBO problems are particularly notable because they can represent a wide variety of combinatorial optimisation issues, making them highly versatile and applicable to numerous real-world scenarios. Their importance has surged with the advent of quantum computing, which promises more efficient solutions to these complex problems [11] .

Mathematical Formulation of QUBO

Mathematically, the QUBO problem is expressed as follows:

Minimize f(x) = ∑i ai xi + ∑i < j bij xi xj

Where:

* xi are the binary variables, i,e., xi ∈ {0,1}
* ai are the coefficients for the linear terms
* bij are the coefficients for the quadratic terms

Matrix Representation

The QUBO problem can also be formulated in matrix notation. Let Q be a symmetric matrix where Qii = ai and Qij = bij for i ≠ j. The function then becomes:

f(x) = xTQx

Where:

* x is a vector of binary variables
* Q is a symmetric matrix containing the coefficients [12]

Example of QUBO function:

Consider a simple QUBO problem with three binary variables x1, x2, and x3:

f(x1, x2, x3) = - x1 – x2 – x3 + 2x1x2 + 2x1x3 + 2x2x3

This can be represented in the Matrix form as:

The objective function is:

f(x) = (x1 x2 x3)

**Solving the QUBO Problem with Quantum Computing**

**Xanadu Quantum Technologies**

**Solving the QUBO Problem with a simulation of a Quantum Computer via PennyLane:** The QUBO Problem was solved using, the “default.qubit” device on PennyLane which is simulator for testing and development purposes. It doesn't directly connect to any specific Xanadu quantum hardware. For actual Xanadu hardware to be used, specifying a device such as "X8" or "Borealis”. These devices are part of Xanadu's photonic quantum computing systems. The QUBO problem was solved via this method, and the code was broken down into various sections each representing a different part of the QUBO function.

The code broken down into it’s various steps:

1) The Hamiltonian

H = 0.5 \* qml.Identity(1) + \

0.5 \* qml.PauliZ(1) @ qml.PauliZ(4) + \

0.5 \* qml.PauliZ(2) @ qml.PauliZ(3) + \

0.5 \* qml.PauliZ(3) @ qml.PauliZ(5) + \

0.5 \* qml.PauliZ(4) @ qml.PauliZ(4)

print(H)

The Hamiltonian (H), is defined as a combination of the tensor products of the Pauli – Z operators and the identity operator:

Here:

* I is the identity operator
* Zi represents the Pauli – Z operator acting on the qubit i
* ZiZj represnts a coupling term between the qubits i and j

This Hamiltonian encodes the QUBO problem. The coefficients of ZiZj represent the interaction weights, and the terms correspond to local biases. These interactions determine the energy landscape of the system, with the goal being to find the configuration of qubits that minimises H, which corresponds to solving the QUBO problem. The eigenvalues of H represent possible energies of the system, and the ground state (lowest energy eigenvalue) corresponds to the optimal solution of the QUBO problem [13].

2) Device Setup

dev = qml.device("default.qubit", wires=H.wires)

The device default.qubit simulates a quantum computer using qubits. The number of qubits is determined by the number of wires in the Hamiltonian H.

3) Defining the Circuit

@qml.qnode(dev)

def circuit(params):

for param, wire in zip(params, H.wires):

qml.RY(param, wires=wire)

return qml.expval(H)

Mathematical Intepretation:

The quantum circuit applies a series of parameterised rotations on each qubit:

Where the following equation is the rotation operator around the Y axis of the Bloch sphere:

After the applying the rotations, the expectation value of H is measured:

The rotations prepare a quantum state that depends on the parameters θ. The expectation value corresponds to the energy of the system for the given parameters. The goal is to minimise by optimising the parameters.

For the first equation, ∣ψ⟩ is the quantum state after the circuit has applied transformations, ⨂i is the tensor product applied across all qubits and it signifies that is applied independently to each qubit, is the rotation operator for the i-th qubit which performs a rotation by the angle θi around the Y – axis of the Bloch sphere, ∣0⟩ is the initial state of the qubit, which is the "ground state" in quantum computing. For the second equation RY (θ) is the rotation operator that rotates a qubit by angle θ around the Y – axis [14].

4) Optimisation Loop

params = np.random.rand(len(H.wires))

opt = qml.AdamOptimizer(stepsize=0.5)

epochs = 200

for epoch in range(epochs):

params = opt.step(circuit, params)

The optimisation process adjusts the parameters {} to minimise the expectation value of H:

The Adam oprimiser updates the prameters using gradient based optimisation:

=

Where η is the learning rate (stepsize).

5) Sampling from an Optimised Circuit

dev = qml.device("default.qubit", wires=H.wires, shots=1)

@qml.qnode(dev)

def circuit(params):

for param, wire in zip(params, H.wires):

qml.RY(param, wires=wire)

return qml.sample()

Here, the circuit is modified to sample from the quantum state prepared by the optimised parameters {}. Each sample corresponds to a bitstring that represents a potential solution to the QUBO problem. The sampling process corresponds to a measurement in the computational basis. The probabilities of obtaining each bitstring are determined by the squared amplitudes of the quantum state:

In the context of quantum mechanics, this represents a projective measurement. The sampled bitstring with the lowest energy (as evaluated by H) corresponds to the optimal or near-optimal solution to the QUBO problem.
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