
ACCELERATING SPECTRAL CLUSTERING ON QUANTUM AND ANALOG PLATFORMS

Xingzi Xu *

Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering
Duke University
Durham, NC, USA
xingzi.xu@duke.edu

Tuhin Sahai

SRI International
Menlo Park, CA, USA
tuhin.sahai@sri.com

ABSTRACT

We introduce a novel hybrid quantum-analog algorithm to perform graph clustering that exploits connections between the evolution of dynamical systems on graphs and the underlying graph spectra. This approach constitutes a new class of algorithms that combine emerging quantum and analog platforms to accelerate computations. Our hybrid algorithm is equivalent to spectral clustering and has a computational complexity of $O(N)$, where N is the number of nodes in the graph, compared to $O(N^3)$ scaling on classical computing platforms. The proposed method employs the dynamic mode decomposition (DMD) framework on the data generated by Schrödinger dynamics that evolves on the manifold induced by the graph Laplacian. In particular, we prove and demonstrate that one can extract the eigenvalues and scaled eigenvectors of the normalized graph Laplacian by evolving Schrödinger dynamics on quantum computers followed by DMD computations on analog devices.

1 Introduction

Graph clustering is a popular technique to identify and group densely connected subgraphs within a larger graph. It is a powerful decomposition approach that enables the analysis of interconnected systems for a variety of applications in a wide range of fields, such as social networks [1, 2, 3], fraud detection [4, 5], bioinformatics [6], uncertainty analysis in networked systems [7], decomposition for scientific computation [8], and transport networks [9]. Consequently, the versatility of graph clustering makes it an invaluable tool in areas ranging from scientific discovery to industrial applications. Spectral clustering, a prevalent graph decomposition approach, is particularly advantageous in high-dimensional spaces where the geometric characteristics of the data are not readily apparent [10]. Unlike traditional clustering methods, spectral clustering uses the properties of the eigenvalues and eigenvectors of the Laplacian of the underlying graph (or data) to find the optimal partitioning. This aspect enables spectral clustering to cluster points based on their interconnectedness rather than their raw distances from each other, typically resulting in better performance when dealing with data where the clusters are irregular, intertwined, or lie on a complex surface.

In this work, we propose a highly scalable quantum-analog hybrid algorithm based on the evolution of Schrödinger dynamics and dynamic mode decomposition (DMD) to rapidly and accurately retrieve spectral clustering information. We evolve the underlying Schrödinger dynamics on quantum devices [11], and perform the subsequent spectrum computations on analog machines. The approach has a scaling of $O(N)$, where N is the number of nodes in the graph. Since existing state-of-the-art classical methods scale as $O(N^3)$, our approach provides a polynomial speed-up over traditional computing platforms. To our best knowledge, this is the first-of-a-kind algorithm that exploits the combination of quantum and analog computing platforms to extract a scaling superior to algorithms that run on a single computing platform.

In quantum computing, qubits, the fundamental elements of quantum information, evolve according to the time-dependent Schrödinger's equation. Qubits differ from classical bits in that they can exist in a superposition of states, meaning that a qubit can be in states representing the traditional bits (0, 1) or a superposition of both. Quantum algorithms provide substantial reductions in computational complexity for specific problems such as integer factorization [12],

*Work performed as an intern in the Applied Sciences Lab at SRI International.

database search [13], solving linear systems [14], simulating dynamical systems [15], and matrix multiplication [16] to name a few. On the other hand, analog computing with resistive memory has a fast response speed and embeds parallelism, significantly accelerating matrix computation [17], a core step in a wide variety of numerical techniques. Analog computing has garnered attention due to its potential to reduce the data movement bottleneck in traditional computing architectures. The essence of analog computing is performing computational operations directly at the data’s location rather than moving data between memory and the central processing unit (CPU). Integrating crosspoint arrays with negative feedback amplifiers allows for addressing linear algebra challenges like solving linear systems and computing eigenvectors in a single step. Analog computing improves the exponential solving of linear systems and has a computational complexity of $\mathcal{O}(1)$ for matrix-vector multiplication [17, 18].

Despite the advantages of spectral clustering, it typically scales as $\mathcal{O}(N^3)$ (where N is the number of nodes in the graph), limiting its applications in large graphs [19]. We show that spectral clustering has an $\mathcal{O}(N)$ complexity on a hybrid quantum-analog platform.

We organize the paper as follows: Section 3.1 provides a brief overview of classical spectral clustering. Section 3.2 delves into the classical decentralized algorithm for spectral clustering that leverages the wave equation and Dynamic Mode Decomposition (DMD). In sections 3.3 and 3.4, we discuss our novel approach that uses quantum evolution of wave dynamics and singular value- and eigen- decompositions on analog computers. We also provide details on efficiently solving the linear system of equations for computing eigenvectors on quantum or analog computers in section 3.5. We present experimental results in section 4 and wrap up with conclusions in section 5.

2 Analog matrix computing circuits

Conventional computers have significantly improved in speed and efficiency over the past decades, as captured by Moore’s law, stating that the number of transistors in an integrated circuit doubles about every two years[20]. However, the industry is approaching a limit where it is increasingly difficult to continue with appreciable reductions in the size of transistors [21]. Additionally, due to the high computational complexity of matrix-vector multiplication required for the training and inference of artificial intelligence models on digital platforms, there is an urgent need to develop alternative computing devices with more attractive scaling properties for these computations. Due to the inherent architectural parallelism for matrix operations, analog matrix computing (AMC) circuits based on crosspoint resistive memory arrays or photonics provide a desirable alternative [17].




Figure 1: Schematic of AMC circuits for matrix-vector multiplication between matrix \mathbf{A} and vector \mathbf{x} , where $\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{A}_+ - \mathbf{A}_-$ [17]. $\mathbf{A} \in \mathcal{R}^{M \times N}$, $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{R}^{N \times 1}$, $\mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{R}^{M \times 1}$.

For example, the multiplication between an $M \times N$ matrix and an $N \times 1$ vector, has the computational complexity of $\mathcal{O}(MN)$ on digital computers and $\mathcal{O}(1)$ on AMC circuits [17] or photonic devices [22]. Figure 1 shows the schematic of a prototypical AMC circuit for computing the matrix-vector multiplication (MVM) between a matrix \mathbf{A} and a vector \mathbf{x} . The conductance in the circuits captures the entries of \mathbf{A} , and the applied voltages encode the values of \mathbf{x} . The output currents provide the result of $\mathbf{y} = \mathbf{A}\mathbf{x}$, due to Ohm’s law [23]. Since conductance can only take positive values, matrices with negative entries can be split as $\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{A}_+ - \mathbf{A}_-$, where \mathbf{A}_+ and \mathbf{A}_- are both positive. The results are then calculated as $\mathbf{A}\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{A}_+\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{A}_-\mathbf{x}$. Unlike digital computers, analog computers compute the MVM results for all entries in parallel after the setting of conductances and application of voltages. To quantify the error and computational time of MVM on analog computers, we prove the following theorem using circuit dynamics.

Theorem 1. Let the minimum time for convergence up to an error ϵ (where ϵ is the difference between the computed and ground truth solutions) of matrix-vector multiplication between an $N \times N$ matrix \mathbf{A} and an $N \times 1$ vector \mathbf{x} on circuit-based analog computers be T . Then T is given by,

$$T = \max_j \frac{1}{\beta_j} \ln\left(\frac{\mathbf{x}_0\beta - \alpha_j}{\epsilon}\right), \quad (1)$$

where \mathbf{x}_0 is the initial condition, $\alpha_j = \vartheta\omega \frac{\sum_i \mathbf{A}_{ji}\mathbf{y}_i}{1+\sum_i \mathbf{A}_{ji}}$, $\beta_j = \frac{\vartheta\omega}{1+\sum_i \mathbf{A}_{ji}}$, and j is the index that takes values $\{1, 2, \dots, N\}$.

Proof. Given the evolution dynamics of analog circuits is given by [24],

$$\frac{d\mathbf{x}(t)}{dt} = \vartheta\omega\mathcal{U}(\mathbf{A}\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{x}(t)), \quad (2)$$

where ϑ is the DC loop gain, ω is the 3-dB bandwidth, \mathbf{y} is an input vector, \mathbf{A} is the conductance matrix, and

$$\mathcal{U} = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{1}{1+\sum_i \mathbf{A}_{1i}} & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ 0 & \frac{1}{1+\sum_i \mathbf{A}_{2i}} & \cdots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & \cdots & \frac{1}{1+\sum_i \mathbf{A}_{ni}} \end{pmatrix}. \quad (3)$$

By expanding the above equations, it is easy to show that the j -th equation is given by,

$$\frac{d\mathbf{x}_j(t)}{dt} = \alpha_j - \beta_j\mathbf{x}_j(t), \quad (4)$$

where α_j and β_j are constants given by,

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha_j &= \vartheta\omega \frac{\sum_i \mathbf{A}_{ji}\mathbf{y}_i}{1+\sum_i \mathbf{A}_{ji}}, \\ \beta_j &= \frac{\vartheta\omega}{1+\sum_i \mathbf{A}_{ji}}. \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

Note that Eqns. 4 are all decoupled and their solution at time t is given by,

$$\mathbf{x}(t) = \frac{(\mathbf{x}(0)\beta_j - \alpha_j)e^{-\beta_j t} + \alpha_j}{\beta_j}. \quad (6)$$

Now, let the solution as $t \rightarrow \infty$ be $\mathbf{x}_f = \frac{\alpha_j}{\beta_j}$. If we consider a time T_j such that the error $\|\mathbf{x}(t) - \mathbf{x}_f\|$ is less than equal to our threshold ϵ we get,

$$\frac{(\mathbf{x}(0)\beta_j - \alpha_j)e^{-\beta_j t}}{\beta_j} \leq \epsilon, \quad (7)$$

or,

$$T_j \geq \frac{1}{\beta_j} \ln\left(\frac{\mathbf{x}_0\beta - \alpha_j}{\epsilon}\right). \quad (8)$$

It now follows that the minimum time for convergence of the system (as indicated by the error reducing below a threshold of ϵ) is given by maximum over all $j \in \{1, 2, \dots, N\}$,

$$T = \max_j \frac{1}{\beta_j} \ln\left(\frac{\mathbf{x}_0\beta - \alpha_j}{\epsilon}\right). \quad (9)$$

□

The above derivation not only provides performance bounds on the time to convergence, but also enables the design of efficient analog circuits.

3 Quantum-Analog Hybrid computation of spectral clustering

3.1 Spectral clustering

Consider a graph denoted by $\mathcal{G} = (V, E)$ that consists of a node set $V = 1, \dots, N$ and an edge set $E \subseteq V \times V$. Each edge $(i, j) \in E$ in this graph is associated with a weight $\mathbf{W}_{ij} > 0$, and \mathbf{W} represents the $N \times N$ weighted adjacency matrix of \mathcal{G} . In this context, $\mathbf{W}_{ij} = 0$ only if $(i, j) \notin E$. The normalized graph Laplacian, represented by \mathbf{L} , is defined as follows:

$$\mathbf{L}_{ij} = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } i = j, \\ -\mathbf{W}_{ij} / \sum_{l=1}^N \mathbf{W}_{il}, & \text{if } (i, j) \in E, \\ 0, & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \quad (10)$$

An equivalent representation of the normalized graph Laplacian is $\mathbf{L} = \mathbf{I} - \mathbf{D}^{-1}\mathbf{W}$, where \mathbf{D} is a diagonal matrix that consists of the sums of the rows of \mathbf{W} . We focus solely on undirected graphs, for which the Laplacian is symmetric, and the eigenvalues are real numbers. The eigenvalues of \mathbf{L} can be arranged in ascending order as $0 = \lambda_1 \leq \lambda_2 \leq \dots \leq \lambda_N$. Each eigenvalue corresponds to an eigenvector, denoted as $\mathbf{v}^{(1)}, \mathbf{v}^{(2)}, \dots, \mathbf{v}^{(N)}$, where $\mathbf{v}^{(1)} = \mathbf{1} = [1, 1, \dots, 1]^T$ [10]. For our study, we assume $\lambda_1 < \lambda_2$, which means that the graph does not contain disconnected clusters. Spectral clustering partitions the graph \mathcal{G} into two clusters by employing the signs of the entries of the second eigenvector $\mathbf{v}^{(2)}$. k -means clustering on the signs of entries of higher eigenvectors enables one to partition graphs into more than two clusters [10]. The spectral gap in the eigenvalues of the graph Laplacians typically determines the number of clusters.

3.2 Wave equation based clustering method

As in [25, 26], we consider the wave equation given by,

$$\frac{\partial^2 \mathbf{u}}{\partial t^2} = c^2 \Delta \mathbf{u}. \quad (11)$$

The discrete form of the wave equation on a graph is given by,

$$\mathbf{u}_i(t) = 2\mathbf{u}_i(t-1) - \mathbf{u}_i(t-2) - c^2 \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}(i)} \mathbf{L}_{ij} \mathbf{u}_j(t-1), \quad (12)$$

where $\mathcal{N}(i)$ is the set of neighbors of node i including the node i itself [27]. To update \mathbf{u}_i , one only needs the previous value of \mathbf{u}_j at the neighboring nodes and the connecting edge weights.

Given the initial condition $\frac{d\mathbf{u}}{dt}|_{t=0} = 0$ and $0 < c < \sqrt{2}$, the solution of the wave equation 12 can be written as

$$\mathbf{u}(t) = \sum_{j=1}^N \mathbf{u}(0)^T \mathbf{v}^{(j)} (p_j e^{it\zeta_j} + q_j e^{-it\zeta_j}) \mathbf{v}^{(j)}, \quad (13)$$

where $p_j = (1 + i \tan(\zeta_j/2))/2$, $q_j = (1 - i \tan(\zeta_j/2))/2$ [26]. Consequently, computing the eigenvectors of \mathbf{L} is transformed into the computation of the coefficients of the frequencies of the wave dynamics in equation 13.

To extract the above coefficients, we use Dynamic Mode Decomposition (DMD), a powerful tool for analyzing the dynamics of nonlinear systems. We interpret DMD as an approximation of Koopman modes [28]. We apply DMD to one-dimensional time series data with time-delay embedding by constructing the matrix \mathbf{X} and \mathbf{Y} for the exact DMD matrix $\mathcal{A} = \mathbf{Y}\mathbf{X}^+$ (where $^+$ denotes the pseudoinverse) [29]. When DMD with time delay embedding is implemented on one-dimensional signals of the form,

$$u(t) = \sum_{j=1}^J a_j e^{i\zeta_j t}, \quad (14)$$

where $\zeta_j \in (-\pi, \pi)$, $j = 1, 2, \dots, J$ are unique frequencies, it can successfully extract the coefficients a_j [26, 29].

We form the following matrices with the one-dimensional signal $u(t)$,

$$\mathbf{X} := \begin{bmatrix} u(0) & u(1) & \dots & u(M-1) \\ u(1) & u(2) & \dots & u(M) \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ u(K-1) & u(K) & \dots & u(K+M-2) \end{bmatrix}, \quad (15)$$

$$= [\mathbf{x}^l(0) \quad \mathbf{x}^l(1) \quad \dots \quad \mathbf{x}^l(M-1)], \quad (16)$$

$$\mathbf{Y} := [\mathbf{x}^l(1) \quad \dots \quad \mathbf{x}^l(M-1) \quad \mathbf{x}^l(M)], \quad (17)$$

where $\mathbf{x}(t) := [u(t), u(t+1), \dots, u(t+(M-1))]^T$. Let $H > 1$, also define

$$\Phi_H := \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 & \dots & 1 \\ e^{i\zeta_1} & e^{i\zeta_2} & \dots & e^{i\zeta_N} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ e^{i(H-1)\zeta_1} & e^{i(H-1)\zeta_2} & \dots & e^{i(H-1)\zeta_N} \end{bmatrix}, \quad (18)$$

$$= [\phi_1, \phi_2, \dots, \phi_N], \quad (19)$$

where $\phi_j = [1, e^{i\zeta_j}, \dots, e^{i(H-1)\zeta_j}]^T$. [26] proved the following two lemmas to connect the above matrices and the associated DMD computations to the spectra of the graph Laplacian.

Lemma 1. *For one-dimensional signal $u(t)$ defined by equation (14), if $K \geq J$ and $M \geq J$ of the matrices \mathbf{X} and \mathbf{Y} defined by (15) and (17) respectively, the eigenvalues of $\mathcal{A} = \mathbf{Y}\mathbf{X}^+$ are $\{e^{i\zeta_j}\}_{j=1}^J$ and the columns of Φ_K defined by (18) are the corresponding eigenvectors [26].*

Lemma 2. *At any node l , the DMD computations on matrices $\mathbf{X}(u_l)$, $\mathbf{Y}(u_l)$ using local snapshots $\mathbf{u}_l(0), \mathbf{u}_l(1), \dots, \mathbf{u}_l(4N-1)$ defined by Eqn. 13 with $K = M = 2N$ yields exact eigenvalues of the Laplacian and the corresponding eigenvectors (scaled) [26].*

Based on lemma 2, [26] developed a DMD-based algorithm for distributed spectral clustering, given in algorithms 1, 2.

Algorithm 1 DMD(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Y}): For computing eigenvalues and eigenvector components at node i [26].

- 1: Compute reduced SVD of \mathbf{X} , i.e., $\mathbf{X} = \mathbf{U}\mathbf{\Sigma}\mathbf{V}^*$.
 - 2: Define the matrix $\tilde{\mathcal{A}} \equiv \mathbf{U}^*\mathbf{Y}\mathbf{V}\mathbf{\Sigma}^{-1}$
 - 3: Compute eigenvalues μ and eigenvectors ξ of $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}$, i.e., $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}\xi = \mu\xi$. Each nonzero eigenvalue μ is a DMD eigenvalue.
 - 4: The DMD mode corresponding to μ is then given by $\hat{\phi} \equiv \frac{1}{\mu}\mathbf{Y}\mathbf{V}\mathbf{\Sigma}^{-1}\xi$.
 - 5: Compute $\hat{\mathbf{a}}$ by solving the linear system $\hat{\mathbf{\Phi}}\hat{\mathbf{a}} = \mathbf{x}(0)$, where the columns of $\hat{\mathbf{\Phi}}$ are the eigenvectors sorted in decreasing order based on the real part of the eigenvalues.
 - 6: $a_i^{(j)} = \hat{\phi}_{j,1}\hat{a}_j, j = 1, 2, \dots, k$.
-

Algorithm 2 Wave equation based graph clustering [26].

- 1: $\mathbf{u}_i \leftarrow \text{Random}([0, 1])$
 - 2: $\mathbf{u}_i(-1) \leftarrow \mathbf{u}_i(0)$
 - 3: $t \leftarrow 1$
 - 4: **while do** $t < T_{\max}$
 - 5: $\mathbf{u}_i(t) \leftarrow 2\mathbf{u}_i(t-1) - \mathbf{u}_i(t-2) - c^2 \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}(i)} \mathbf{L}_{ij}\mathbf{u}_j(t-1)$
 - 6: $t \leftarrow t+1$
 - 7: **end while**
 - 8: Create the matrices $\mathbf{X}_i, \mathbf{Y}_i \in \mathbb{R}^{K \times M}$ defined by Eqns. 15 and 17 at node i ,
 - 9: using $\mathbf{u}_i(0), \mathbf{u}_i(1), \dots, \mathbf{u}_i(T_{\max}-1)$, where $K+M = T_{\max}$.
 - 10: $\mathbf{v}_i \leftarrow a_i$ from DMD($\mathbf{X}_i, \mathbf{Y}_i$) by algorithm 1
 - 11: **for** $j \in \{1, \dots, k\}$ **do**
 - 12: **if** $\mathbf{v}_i^{(j)} > 0$ **then**
 - 13: $\Gamma_j \leftarrow 1$
 - 14: **else**
 - 15: $\Gamma_j \leftarrow 0$
 - 16: **end if**
 - 17: **end for**
 - 18: Cluster number $\leftarrow \sum_{j=1}^k \Gamma_j 2^{j-1}$
-

3.3 Simulation of wave dynamics

Conventional computers suffer from various computational challenges and inherent truncation errors in the simulation process when performing dynamics simulations. In particular, matrix multiplication, central to these computations, has a computational complexity of $\mathcal{O}(N^{2.371866})$ on digital computers [30]. The algorithm with this complexity also

has reduced numerical stability, compared to the naïve $\mathcal{O}(N^3)$ algorithm [30]. On the contrary, quantum and analog computers demonstrate inherent prowess in this domain, providing an exponential advantage for simulating dynamical systems compared to their digital counterparts [31, 32, 15]. For the specific case of wave dynamics, we can choose to simulate the equations in their continuous form on a quantum computer or after discretization on an analog device. However, continuous simulations on quantum computers avoid the truncation errors met in discrete simulations on analog or digital computers.

The wave equation on a graph [33] is similar to equation 11, given as,

$$\frac{d^2 \mathbf{u}}{dt^2} = -c^2 \mathbf{L} \mathbf{u} \quad (20)$$

where \mathbf{L} is the graph Laplacian [27]. In its discrete form, the wave equation on a graph is as follows,

$$\mathbf{u}_i(t) = 2\mathbf{u}_i(t-1) - \mathbf{u}_i(t-2) - c^2 \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}(i)} \mathbf{L}_{ij} \mathbf{u}_j(t-1), \quad (21)$$

where \mathbf{u}_i is the i -th element of \mathbf{u} . In [26], the authors simulated wave dynamics with $dt = 1$ on a digital computer. As this simulation only involves matrix-vector multiplication, we can replace this $\mathcal{O}(N^2)$ operation on digital computers with $\mathcal{O}(1)$ operation on analog computers or $\mathcal{O}(N)$ on quantum platforms [34, 17].

Using the above approach, simulating the wave equation on a graph, has a time complexity of $\mathcal{O}(D^{5/2}l/\Delta l + TD^2/\Delta l)$, where T is the terminal time of simulation, D is the dimension of the wave, l is the diameter of the region, and Δl is the step size [35]. Consequently, for the setting of graphs, the dimension D is 2 (time and space), the diameter of the region l is the number of nodes N , and the step size a is 1, so the complexity is $\mathcal{O}(N + T)$. In practice, we simulate the wave dynamics for around $2N$ steps, leading to an $\mathcal{O}(N)$ computational complexity. Since $T = 2N$ leads to long simulation times for large graphs, the approximation (round-off) errors accumulate for the discrete system of equations. Therefore, an exact continuous simulation is favorable over their discretized counterparts.

To implement continuous simulations of the wave dynamics that avoid truncation errors, [35] suggests using quantum computers by exploiting native Hamiltonian simulations or the quantum linear system algorithm (QLSA). In our work, we evolve the following Hamiltonian system on quantum platforms,

$$\frac{d\mathbf{u}}{dt} = -i\mathbf{H}\mathbf{u}(t), \quad (22)$$

for a predetermined period before measurements collapse the wavefunction. In the above equation, \mathbf{H} is the Hermitian static Hamiltonian [31]. Consider the case where \mathbf{L}_{sym} is the symmetric normalized graph Laplacian [10] defined as,

$$\mathbf{L}_{\text{sym}} = \mathbf{I} - \mathbf{D}^{-1/2} \mathbf{W} \mathbf{D}^{1/2}, \quad (23)$$

where the degree matrix $\mathbf{D} = \text{diag}(\sum_{j=1}^n \mathbf{W}_{1j}, \sum_{j=1}^n \mathbf{W}_{2j}, \dots, \sum_{j=1}^n \mathbf{W}_{nj})$.

Now one can define the symmetric Laplacian using the normalized signed incidence matrix of the graph (denoted by \mathbf{B}) as follows, $\mathbf{L}_{\text{sym}} = \mathbf{B} \mathbf{B}^T$. To define \mathbf{B} consider a graph with N nodes and M edges, then the $N \times M$ incidence matrix $\boldsymbol{\iota}$ has rows indexed by nodes v and columns indexed by edges e . Specifically, the incidence matrix $\boldsymbol{\iota}$ is defined as,

$$\boldsymbol{\iota}_{ij} = \begin{cases} -1 & \text{if edge } e_j \text{ leaves node } v_i, \\ 1 & \text{if edge } e_j \text{ enters node } v_i, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Now, the normalized incidence matrix \mathbf{B} is defined as,

$$\mathbf{B} = \mathbf{D}^{-\frac{1}{2}} \boldsymbol{\iota}. \quad (24)$$

Since we restrain to undirected graphs, for any given edge e_j , we randomly pick one node as the source node and the other as the sink node.

Using the formulation in [35], if we now define a Hermitian Hamiltonian in the following block form,

$$\mathbf{H} = c \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{B} \\ \mathbf{B} & \mathbf{0} \end{bmatrix}, \quad (25)$$

the Schrödinger Hamiltonian system takes the form,

$$\frac{d}{dt} \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{u}_1 \\ \mathbf{u}_2 \end{bmatrix} = -ic \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{B} \\ \mathbf{B} & \mathbf{0} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{u}_1 \\ \mathbf{u}_2 \end{bmatrix}, \quad (26)$$

which implies,

$$\frac{d^2}{dt^2} \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{u}_1 \\ \mathbf{u}_2 \end{bmatrix} = -c^2 \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{B} \\ \mathbf{B} & \mathbf{0} \end{bmatrix}^2 \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{u}_1 \\ \mathbf{u}_2 \end{bmatrix} = -c^2 \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{B}\mathbf{B}^T & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{B}^T\mathbf{B} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{u}_1 \\ \mathbf{u}_2 \end{bmatrix} = -c^2 \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{L}_{\text{sym}} & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{B}^T\mathbf{B} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{u}_1 \\ \mathbf{u}_2 \end{bmatrix}. \quad (27)$$

When simulating dynamics of the Schrödinger system using Eqn. 27, the first N terms correspond to the desired wave dynamics. When \mathbf{u} has a non-zero initial derivative condition, the resulting solution tends to increase over time, leading to instability [36]. Given that:

$$\frac{d}{dt} \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{u}_1 \\ \mathbf{u}_2 \end{bmatrix} = -ic \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{B} \\ \mathbf{B} & \mathbf{0} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{u}_1 \\ \mathbf{u}_2 \end{bmatrix} = -ic \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{B}\mathbf{u}_2 \\ \mathbf{B}\mathbf{u}_1 \end{bmatrix}, \quad (28)$$

the stability criteria $\frac{d\mathbf{u}_1}{dt}|_{t=0} = \mathbf{0}$ translates to the initial condition $\mathbf{u}_2(0) = \mathbf{0}$. Therefore, all non-zero initial values for \mathbf{u}_2 lead to unstable dynamics.

Since the graph Laplacian form used in [25, 26] is the random-walk variant of the graph Laplacian \mathbf{L}_{rw} , it does not have a Hermitian form. Consequently, the wave dynamics based on \mathbf{L}_{rw} cannot be simulated using quantum platforms. For quantum devices, one is restricted to the symmetric graph Laplacian \mathbf{L}_{sym} form defined in Eqn. 23. Since the simulation is Hamiltonian, it is guaranteed to remain stable on quantum platforms.

3.4 Computations on analog computers

When working with the discrete form of the equation, one can exploit the favorable scaling of analog platforms for matrix-vector multiplication. Moreover, in the following lemma, we prove that the wave dynamics with \mathbf{L}_{sym} is stable under the same conditions that were derived in [25] for \mathbf{L}_{rw} , thereby increasing the number of options for practical implementation.

Lemma 3. *The wave equation iteration given by Eqn. 28 is stable on any graph as long as the numerical value of the wave speed c satisfies $0 < c < \sqrt{2}$ and the iterations have initial conditions that satisfy $\mathbf{u}_1(-1) = \mathbf{u}_1(0)$.*

Proof. For the \mathbf{L}_{sym} case, the dynamics of $\mathbf{z}(t) = [\mathbf{u}(t); \mathbf{u}(t-1)]$ evolves as,

$$\mathbf{z}(t) = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{u}(t) \\ \mathbf{u}(t-1) \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 2\mathbf{I} - c^2\mathbf{L}_{\text{sym}} & -\mathbf{I} \\ \mathbf{I} & \mathbf{0} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{u}(t-1) \\ \mathbf{u}(t-2) \end{bmatrix} = \mathbf{M}\mathbf{z}(t-1) = \mathbf{M}^t\mathbf{z}(0).$$

Let matrix \mathbf{M} have eigenvector $\mathbf{m}_j = (\mathbf{m}_j^{(1)}, \mathbf{m}_j^{(2)})^T$, where j denotes the node number and the superscript splits the compound vector into two equal parts. Now, let the corresponding eigenvalue be ρ_j , it then follows that,

$$\mathbf{M} \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{m}_j^{(1)} \\ \mathbf{m}_j^{(2)} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 2\mathbf{I} - c^2\mathbf{L}_{\text{sym}} & -\mathbf{I} \\ \mathbf{I} & \mathbf{0} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{m}_j^{(1)} \\ \mathbf{m}_j^{(2)} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 2\mathbf{m}_j^{(1)} - c^2\mathbf{L}_{\text{sym}}\mathbf{m}_j^{(1)} - \mathbf{m}_j^{(2)} \\ \mathbf{m}_j^{(1)} \end{bmatrix}, \text{ and } \mathbf{M} \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{m}_j^{(1)} \\ \mathbf{m}_j^{(2)} \end{bmatrix} = \rho_j \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{m}_j^{(1)} \\ \mathbf{m}_j^{(2)} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \rho_j\mathbf{m}_j^{(1)} \\ \rho_j\mathbf{m}_j^{(2)} \end{bmatrix}.$$

If we let $\mathbf{m}_j^{(2)} = \mathbf{v}_j$ (where \mathbf{v}_j is the eigenvector of \mathbf{L}_{sym}), the above equation implies that $\mathbf{m}_j^{(1)} = \rho_j\mathbf{m}_j^{(2)} = \rho_j\mathbf{v}_j$. Therefore, the eigenvector \mathbf{m}_j of \mathbf{M} is $\mathbf{m}_j = (\rho_j\mathbf{v}_j, \mathbf{v}_j)^T$.

Using the definition of eigenvalues and pulling everything to the left hand side of the equation,

$$\mathbf{M} \begin{bmatrix} \rho_j\mathbf{v}_j \\ \mathbf{v}_j \end{bmatrix} = \rho_j \begin{bmatrix} \rho_j\mathbf{v}_j \\ \mathbf{v}_j \end{bmatrix} \Rightarrow \begin{bmatrix} (\rho_j(2 - \rho_j)\mathbf{I} - \rho_j c^2\mathbf{L}_{\text{sym}} - \mathbf{I})\mathbf{v}_j \\ \mathbf{0} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} \end{bmatrix}.$$

If we now denote the eigenvalue of \mathbf{L}_{sym} as λ_j , we get,

$$\rho_j(2 - \rho_j)\mathbf{v}_j - c^2\rho_j\mathbf{L}_{\text{sym}}\mathbf{v}_j - \mathbf{v}_j = \mathbf{0} \Rightarrow \rho_j^2 + (c^2\lambda_j - 2)\rho_j + 1 = 0,$$

so we have

$$\rho_j = \frac{-(c^2\lambda_j - 2) \pm \sqrt{(c^2\lambda_j - 2)^2 - 4}}{2} = \frac{2 - c^2\lambda_j}{2} \pm \frac{c}{2}\sqrt{c^2\lambda_j^2 - 4\lambda_j}$$

Therefore, to generate stable dynamics with \mathbf{M} , we need \mathbf{L}_{sym} 's eigenvalues λ_j 's to satisfy $c^2\lambda_j^2 - 4\lambda_j < 0$. If we now use that the fact that $0 \leq \lambda_j \leq 2$ (see [10] for more details), we get $0 \leq c < \sqrt{2}$. Thus, as long as the above conditions are true, the update equations remain stable on analog devices. \square

Once the wave equation finished evolving on an analog or quantum platform, one has to calculate the eigenvalues and eigenvector components for node l using the DMD approach outlined previously. We begin with a reduced SVD in matrix \mathbf{X} . Despite the superiority of existing quantum SVD methods (polylog complexity), they only work on low-rank matrices, which is not the case here [37]. We instead focus on efficient methods for SVD that exploit matrix-vector multiplication and are, therefore, tailored for analog computers. It's important to note that the eigenvalues of $\mathbf{X}^T \mathbf{X}$, represented as $\sqrt{\gamma_i}$, correspond to the squared singular values of \mathbf{X} [38]. Since $\mathbf{X}^T \mathbf{X}$ is symmetric, it has distinct real eigenvalues, which can be determined using the power method.

The power method approximates dominant eigenvalues (and their corresponding eigenvectors) of matrices. Especially powerful for large-scale matrices, this method iteratively refines estimates of the dominant eigenvector, capitalizing on the property that repeated multiplication accentuates the contribution of the dominant eigenvalue. The following recurrence relation describes the power method:

$$\mathbf{b}_{k+1} = \frac{\mathbf{X}^T \mathbf{X} \mathbf{b}_k}{\|\mathbf{X}^T \mathbf{X} \mathbf{b}_k\|}. \quad (29)$$

Using the eigenvector \mathbf{b}_k , the estimation for the dominant eigenvalue is the Rayleigh quotient

$$\gamma_k = \frac{\mathbf{b}_k^T \mathbf{X}^T \mathbf{X} \mathbf{b}_k}{\mathbf{b}_k^T \mathbf{b}_k} [38]. \quad (30)$$

To calculate other eigenvalues and eigenvectors using the power method, we need to remove the dominant eigenvalue while preserving the spectrum. Deflation methods such as Wielandt's and Hotelling's deflation provide such tools [39, 40]. In particular, Hotelling's deflation states that

Lemma 4. *If $\psi_1 \geq \psi_2 \geq \dots \geq \psi_N$ are the eigenvalues of matrix \mathcal{B} , and $\boldsymbol{\nu}^{(1)}, \boldsymbol{\nu}^{(2)}, \dots, \boldsymbol{\nu}^{(N)}$ are the corresponding eigenvectors, define $\hat{\mathcal{B}} = \mathcal{B} - \boldsymbol{\nu}^{(j)} \boldsymbol{\nu}^{(j)T} \mathcal{B} \boldsymbol{\nu}^{(j)} \boldsymbol{\nu}^{(j)T}$ for some $j \in \{1, 2, \dots, N\}$. Then $\hat{\mathcal{B}}$ has eigenvectors $\boldsymbol{\nu}^{(1)}, \boldsymbol{\nu}^{(2)}, \dots, \boldsymbol{\nu}^{(N)}$ with corresponding eigenvalues $\psi_1, \dots, \psi_{j-1}, 0, \psi_{j+1}, \dots, \psi_N$ [40].*

Hotelling's deflation maintains the full spectrum of a matrix, nullifying a chosen eigenvalue while keeping the rest intact. Implementation of Hotelling's deflation is straightforward with just matrix-vector multiplications. Due to the approximation error inherent in the power method, Hotelling's deflation does not *exactly* eliminate the eigenvalues, causing numerical instabilities for large matrices. Schur's deflation method mitigates these challenges and remains stable despite the numerical errors in the eliminated eigenvalues. When the elimination is exact, Schur's deflation reduces to Hotelling's deflation [40]. The power method struggles to determine smaller eigenvalues due to numerical issues. Since we exploit the reduced SVD (where we disregard exceedingly small singular values), these numerical issues do not affect the efficiency of our algorithm [38].

Let us define the SVD of \mathbf{X} as $\mathbf{X} = \mathbf{U} \boldsymbol{\Sigma} \mathbf{V}^T$. The eigendecomposition with the power method and Hotelling's deflation provides us the singular values of \mathbf{X} (given by the diagonal of $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}$) as well as the eigenvectors of $\mathbf{X}^T \mathbf{X}$ (given by the columns of \mathbf{V}). When performing a reduced SVD, we keep only $M \ll N$ singular values and columns of \mathbf{V} . We can calculate the reduced \mathbf{U} using the pseudoinverse of $\mathbf{V}_{\text{red}}^T$, given by

$$\mathbf{U}_{\text{red}} \approx \mathbf{X} \mathbf{V}_{\text{red}}^{T+} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{\text{red}}^{-1}, \quad (31)$$

where $\mathbf{V}_{\text{red}}^{T+}$ is the pseudoinverse of $\mathbf{V}_{\text{red}}^T$. Both quantum and analog computers provide efficient methods for computing the pseudoinverse [41, 17] and in our approach either can be used.

The subsequent step within DMD involves calculating the eigenvalues of $\tilde{\mathbf{A}} = \mathbf{U}^* \mathbf{Y} \mathbf{V} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1}$. The power method is inapplicable in the setting of general unsymmetric matrices such as $\tilde{\mathbf{A}}$. However, given that $\tilde{\mathbf{A}}$ is of dimensions $\mathbb{R}^{M \times M}$ and $M \ll N$, eigendecomposition techniques are not impacted by large N values. Eigendecomposition on analog computers has a scaling of $\mathcal{O}(M \log M)$ [42, 43, 17]. Although quantum algorithms provide the same scaling, existing quantum algorithms are restricted to matrices with specific properties, such as a Hermitian structure and diagonalizability [44, 45, 46]. Consequently, in our approach, we exploit analog platforms for these computations due to their flexibility. As quantum algorithms develop further, it is possible that future variants of this algorithm will rely on quantum devices.

3.5 Solving linear systems with quantum computers

As mentioned previously, the final step within the step of DMD computations is to solve a system of linear equations of the form $\hat{\Phi} \hat{\mathbf{a}} = \mathbf{x}(0)$. Here, $\hat{\mathbf{a}}$ provides the coefficients whose signs are used to assign the nodes to corresponding

clusters. Quantum computers excel at this task, with time complexity of $\mathcal{O}(\text{poly}(\log N, \kappa))$, where N and κ are the dimension and condition number of $\hat{\Phi}$. In contrast, classical algorithms have a scaling of $\mathcal{O}(N\sqrt{\kappa})$ (we refer the reader to [14] for further details).

	Digital	Analog	Quantum
Simulate Wave Dynamics	$\mathcal{O}(N^2 N_t)$	$\mathcal{O}(N_t)$	$\mathcal{O}(N)$
Reduced SVD	$\mathcal{O}(M^2 N + M^3)$	$\mathcal{O}(KM)$	$\mathcal{O}(\text{poly log } N)$
Eigendecomposition	$\mathcal{O}(M^3)$	$\mathcal{O}(M \log M)$	$\mathcal{O}(M \log M)^*$
Matrix-vector multiplication	$\mathcal{O}(N^2)$	$\mathcal{O}(1)$	$\mathcal{O}(N)$
Solving linear system	$\mathcal{O}(N^3)$	$\mathcal{O}(\log N)$	$\mathcal{O}(\log N)$

Table 1: A summary of the computational complexities of various components of the clustering algorithm. H is the Hermitian static Hamiltonian, N is the number of nodes, N_t is the number of time steps, K is the number of iterations taken for the power method, M is the number of components left in reduced SVD, T is terminal time [47, 17, 14]. The complexity of quantum matrix-vector multiplication listed above is adapted from quantum matrix multiplication algorithms, which have a complexity of $\mathcal{O}(N^2)$ [48].




Figure 2: The estimated and the ground truth eigenvector of the adjacency matrix of the Karate club network. Eigenvector (Node index)

4 Results

We implemented our proposed algorithm using the IBM Qiskit package and performed numerical experiments to verify that its results match those of classical algorithms. Our computations are performed on quantum emulators since the current generation of quantum computers do not have enough qubits to handle meaningful examples.

First, as shown in Figure 2, we experiment with a benchmark called Zachary’s karate club graph [49]. Zachary’s Karate Club graph is a widely studied social network representing the relationships amongst a karate club’s 34 members at a US university in the 1970s. In the graph, each node represents a member of the karate club, and each edge indicates a tie between two members outside of the club activities. The network is undirected and unweighted, reflecting the mutual nature of social relationships. We simulated the wave dynamics using Qiskit for the time interval $t = [0, 99]$, measuring the dynamics at integer times [50]. As expected, the eigenvector estimated by the proposed method is a constant factor of the ground truth (see Fig. 2). Since the ground truth and computed eigenvectors share consistent signs for assigning nodes to clusters, the estimated clusters exactly match.

Second, we test the performance of our method on the Twitter interaction network for the US Congress, which represents the Twitter interaction network of both the House of Representatives and Senate that formed the 117th the United States Congress [51, 52]. As shown in Figure 4, our method correctly classifies 467 out of 475 nodes, thereby achieving

an accuracy of 98.32%. This discrepancy arises due to the numerical error of simulating quantum dynamics using the Qiskit dynamics package. We expect 100% accuracy of cluster assignments on an error-corrected (fault tolerant) quantum platform. We note that the error of computing the eigenvector components (from the Schrödinger dynamics data) was below the threshold required to perform accurate cluster assignments and did not contribute to the 1.68% error rate.

To numerically verify the stability of the wave equation simulated with the L_{sym} (proved in lemma 3), we plot the wave dynamics used for clustering on the Twitter dataset in Fig. 3. Here, it is easy to see that the dynamics at the second node remains bounded for all time, as should be expected in the evolution of Hamiltonian systems. Similar evolution plots can be generated at all nodes in the graph. Note that the Qiskit dynamics are not expected to match the discrete equation evolution since the governing equations for both the cases are different.





Figure 3: The wave dynamics of the second node on the Twitter dataset simulated with Qiskit dynamics verify the stability of quantum-simulated dynamics.



(a) The clusters calculated according to the eigenvector estimated with the proposed method. (b) Ground Truth cluster calculated with spectral clustering.

Figure 4: Clusters of the Twitter interaction network for the US Congress, comparing the ground truth and the proposed method’s results.

Lastly, we test the proposed method on a synthetic network with eighty nodes and four clusters. The network is generated such that it contains four clusters of nodes, where the nodes within each cluster are closely connected, and the four clusters themselves have weak interaction. In this case, as can be seen in figure 5, our method perfectly estimates the clusters with 100% accuracy.




Figure 5: Estimated clusters of the synthetic network and the comparison of the estimated and ground truth eigenvector.

5 Conclusion

We propose a first-of-a-kind quantum-analog hybrid algorithm to cluster large-scale graphs. The algorithm contains two components that are sequentially applied. In the first component, we simulate wave dynamics on a graph using analog (discretized dynamics) or quantum (continuous dynamics) computers. Both analog and quantum platforms accelerate the computations by a polynomial factor. However, we expect fault-tolerant quantum computers to provide a significant advantage over analog computers for the task of simulating wave dynamics due to their inherent lack of discretization error, which provides a key advantage of robustness for large graphs. In the second component, we analyze the data from the wave dynamics step using dynamic mode decomposition on analog platforms. In this step, we achieve polynomial speedups over digital computers, arising from the $\mathcal{O}(1)$ complexity of matrix-vector multiplication on analog computers. Overall, we accelerate the existing $\mathcal{O}(N^3)$ complexity on digital computers to $\mathcal{O}(N)$ by using the combination of quantum and analog platforms. We demonstrate our proposed algorithm on diverse benchmark datasets, including the Zachary Karate club example, Twitter interaction networks, and random graphs. As both of the computing paradigms mature, we expect our method to become increasingly attractive for practical applications. Currently, quantum computers are limited in the number and fidelity of qubits. Similarly, analog devices are still under development and exist only as experimental prototypes. Consequently, we have used classical emulators for both platforms to perform the above experiments.

In the broader picture, this work demonstrates that embeddings of discrete problems in continuous spaces enable the construction of efficient algorithms on emerging computing devices. Moreover, we expect that novel combinations of digital, analog, and quantum platforms will provide a unique opportunity for developing novel and efficient algorithms that exploit the inherent strength of each platform. As these computing platforms mature, we expect an increase in the development of such algorithms that exploit the dynamic nature of these problems and devices. These embeddings also provide deep insights into the fundamental limitations of algorithm construction and related complexity classes [53]. The use of these embeddings for computational complexity analysis of problem classes on emerging computing platforms remains an underexplored area of research.

References

- [1] Nina Mishra, Robert Schreiber, Isabelle Stanton, and Robert E Tarjan. Clustering social networks. In *International Workshop on Algorithms and Models for the Web-Graph*, pages 56–67, New York, NY, 2007. Springer.
- [2] Ruifang Liu, Shan Feng, Ruisheng Shi, and Wenbin Guo. Weighted graph clustering for community detection of large social networks. *Procedia Computer Science*, 31:85–94, 2014.
- [3] Zhan Bu, Jie Cao, Hui-Jia Li, Guangliang Gao, and Haicheng Tao. Gleam: A graph clustering framework based on potential game optimization for large-scale social networks. *Knowledge and Information Systems*, 55:741–770,

- 2018.
- [4] Andrei Sorin Sabau. Survey of clustering based financial fraud detection research. *Informatica Economica*, 16(1):110, 2012.
 - [5] Tahereh Pourhabibi, Kok-Leong Ong, Boo H Kam, and Yee Ling Boo. Fraud detection: A systematic literature review of graph-based anomaly detection approaches. *Decision Support Systems*, 133:113303, 2020.
 - [6] Desmond J Higham, Gabriela Kalna, and Milla Kibble. Spectral clustering and its use in bioinformatics. *Journal of computational and applied mathematics*, 204(1):25–37, 2007.
 - [7] Amit Surana, Tuhin Sahai, and Andrzej Banaszuk. Iterative methods for scalable uncertainty quantification in complex networks. *International Journal for Uncertainty Quantification*, 2(4):413–439, 2012.
 - [8] Stefan Klus, Tuhin Sahai, Cong Liu, and Michael Dellnitz. An efficient algorithm for the parallel solution of high-dimensional differential equations. *Journal of computational and applied mathematics*, 235(9):3053–3062, 2011.
 - [9] Shabbir Ahmed and Salil S Kanhere. Cluster-based forwarding in delay tolerant public transport networks. In *32nd IEEE Conference on Local Computer Networks (LCN 2007)*, pages 625–634, Piscataway, NJ, 2007. IEEE.
 - [10] Ulrike Von Luxburg. A tutorial on spectral clustering. *Statistics and computing*, 17:395–416, 2007.
 - [11] Tuhin Sahai and Hari Kiran Krovi. Spectral clustering of graphs on fault tolerant and noisy quantum devices, December 21 2023. US Patent App. 17/843,801.
 - [12] Peter W Shor. Polynomial-time algorithms for prime factorization and discrete logarithms on a quantum computer. *SIAM review*, 41(2):303–332, 1999.
 - [13] Lov K Grover. A fast quantum mechanical algorithm for database search. In *Proceedings of the twenty-eighth annual ACM symposium on Theory of computing*, pages 212–219, 1601 Broadway, 10th Floor, New York, NY, 1996. ACM.
 - [14] Aram W. Harrow, Avinandan Hassidim, and Seth Lloyd. Quantum algorithm for linear systems of equations. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 103:150502, Oct 2009.
 - [15] Amit Surana, Abeynaya Gnanasekaran, and Tuhin Sahai. An efficient quantum algorithm for simulating polynomial dynamical systems. *Quantum Information Processing*, 23(3):105, 2024.
 - [16] Hong Li, Nan Jiang, Zichen Wang, Jian Wang, and Rigui Zhou. Quantum matrix multiplier. *International Journal of Theoretical Physics*, 60:2037–2048, 2021.
 - [17] Zhong Sun and Daniele Ielmini. Invited tutorial: Analog matrix computing with crosspoint resistive memory arrays. *IEEE Transactions on Circuits and Systems II: Express Briefs*, 69(7):3024–3029, 2022.
 - [18] Zhong Sun, Giacomo Pedretti, Piergiulio Mannocci, Elia Ambrosi, Alessandro Bricalli, and Daniele Ielmini. Time complexity of in-memory solution of linear systems. *IEEE Transactions on Electron Devices*, 67(7):2945–2951, 2020.
 - [19] Scott White and Padhraic Smyth. *A Spectral Clustering Approach To Finding Communities in Graphs*, pages 274–285. Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics, Department of Computer Science Donald Bren School of Information and Computer Sciences University of California, Irvine 3019 Donald Bren Hall Irvine, CA 92697-3435, 2005.
 - [20] R.R. Schaller. Moore’s law: past, present and future. *IEEE Spectrum*, 34(6):52–59, 1997.
 - [21] James R. Powell. The quantum limit to moore’s law. *Proceedings of the IEEE*, 96(8):1247–1248, 2008.
 - [22] Shaofu Xu, Jing Wang, Sicheng Yi, and Weiwen Zou. High-order tensor flow processing using integrated photonic circuits. *Nature communications*, 13(1):7970, 2022.
 - [23] Edward T. Gilbert-Kawai and Marc D. Wittenberg. *Ohm’s law, voltage, current and resistance*. Cambridge University Press, 1 Liberty Plaza New York, NY 10006, 2014.
 - [24] Zhong Sun and Ru Huang. Time complexity of in-memory matrix-vector multiplication. *IEEE Transactions on Circuits and Systems II: Express Briefs*, 68(8):2785–2789, 2021.
 - [25] Tuhin Sahai, Alberto Speranzon, and Andrzej Banaszuk. Hearing the clusters of a graph: A distributed algorithm. *Automatica*, 48(1):15–24, 2012.
 - [26] Hongyu Zhu, Stefan Klus, and Tuhin Sahai. A dynamic mode decomposition approach for decentralized spectral clustering of graphs. In *2022 IEEE Conference on Control Technology and Applications (CCTA)*, pages 1202–1207, IEEE Operations Center, 445 Hoes Lane, Piscataway, NJ 08854, 2022. IEEE, IEEE Conference on Control Technology and Applications.

- [27] Joel Friedman and Jean-Pierre Tillich. Wave equations for graphs and the edge-based laplacian. *Pacific Journal of Mathematics*, 216:229–266, 2004.
- [28] Jonathan Tu, Clarence Rowley, Dirk Luchtenburg, Steven Brunton, and Nathan Kutz. On dynamic mode decomposition: Theory and applications. *ACM Journal of Computer Documentation*, 1:391–421, 2013.
- [29] Daniel Dylewsky, Eurika Kaiser, Steven L. Brunton, and J. Nathan Kutz. Principal component trajectories for modeling spectrally-continuous dynamics as forced linear systems, 2022.
- [30] Virginia Vassilevska Williams, Yinzhan Xu, Zixuan Xu, and Renfei Zhou. New bounds for matrix multiplication: from alpha to omega. *ArXiv*, abs/2307.07970, 2023.
- [31] Luca Tagliacozzo. Optimal simulation of quantum dynamics. *Nature Physics*, 18(9):970–971, 2022.
- [32] Abeynaya Gnanasekaran, Amit Surana, and Tuhin Sahai. Efficient quantum algorithms for nonlinear stochastic dynamical systems. In *2023 IEEE International Conference on Quantum Computing and Engineering (QCE)*, volume 2, pages 66–75, Bellevue, WA, USA, 2023. IEEE, 2023 IEEE International Conference on Quantum Computing and Engineering.
- [33] Mikhail Belkin and Partha Niyogi. Laplacian eigenmaps and spectral techniques for embedding and clustering. In T. Dietterich, S. Becker, and Z. Ghahramani, editors, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 14, Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada, 2001. MIT Press.
- [34] Xin-Ding Zhang, Xiao-Ming Zhang, and Zheng-Yuan Xue. Quantum hyperparallel algorithm for matrix multiplication. *Scientific Reports*, 6:24910, 2016.
- [35] Pedro C. S. Costa, Stephen Jordan, and Aaron Ostrander. Quantum algorithm for simulating the wave equation. *Phys. Rev. A*, 99:012323, Jan 2019.
- [36] Lawrence C Evans. *Partial differential equations*, volume 19. American Mathematical Society, Ann Arbor, Michigan, 2022.
- [37] Patrick Rebentrost, Adrian Steffens, Iman Marvian, and Seth Lloyd. Quantum singular-value decomposition of nonsparse low-rank matrices. *Phys. Rev. A*, 97:012327, Jan 2018.
- [38] Martin Anthony and Michele Harvey. *Advanced linear algebra*. Springer, Hanover, Pennsylvania, 2006.
- [39] Yousef Saad. *Numerical Methods for Large Eigenvalue Problems: Revised Edition*. SIAM, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, 2011.
- [40] Lester Mackey. Deflation methods for sparse pca. In D. Koller, D. Schuurmans, Y. Bengio, and L. Bottou, editors, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 21, Vancouver, British Columbia, 2008. Curran Associates, Inc.
- [41] Nathan Wiebe, Daniel Braun, and Seth Lloyd. Quantum algorithm for data fitting. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 109:050505, Aug 2012.
- [42] Zhong Sun, Giacomo Pedretti, and Daniele Ielmini. Fast solution of linear systems with analog resistive switching memory (rram). In *2019 IEEE International Conference on Rebooting Computing (ICRC)*, pages 1–5, San Mateo, CA, USA, 2019. IEEE.
- [43] Lunshuai Pan, Pushen Zuo, Yubiao Luo, Zhong Sun, and Ru Huang. Blockamc: Scalable in-memory analog matrix computing for solving linear systems, 2024.
- [44] Nhat A. Nghiem and Tzu-Chieh Wei. Quantum algorithm for estimating largest eigenvalues. *Physics Letters A*, 488:129138, November 2023.
- [45] Changpeng Shao. Computing eigenvalues of diagonalizable matrices on a quantum computer. *ACM Transactions on Quantum Computing*, 3(4), jul 2022.
- [46] Seth Lloyd, Masoud Mohseni, and Patrick Rebentrost. Quantum principal component analysis. *Nature Physics*, 10(9):631–633, 2014.
- [47] Xiaocan Li, Shuo Wang, and Yinghao Cai. Tutorial: Complexity analysis of singular value decomposition and its variants, 2019.
- [48] Changpeng Shao. Quantum algorithms to matrix multiplication, 2018.
- [49] M. Girvan and M. E. J. Newman. Community structure in social and biological networks. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 99(12):7821–7826, June 2002.
- [50] Daniel Puzzuoli, Christopher J. Wood, Daniel J. Egger, Benjamin Rosand, and Kento Ueda. Qiskit Dynamics: A Python package for simulating the time dynamics of quantum systems. *Journal of Open Source Software*, 8(90):5853, 2023.

- [51] Christian G Fink, Nathan Omodt, Sydney Zinnecker, and Gina Sprint. A congressional twitter network dataset quantifying pairwise probability of influence. *Data in Brief*, 50:109521, 2023.
- [52] Christian G Fink, Kelly Fullin, Guillermo Gutierrez, Nathan Omodt, Sydney Zinnecker, Gina Sprint, and Sean McCulloch. A centrality measure for quantifying spread on weighted, directed networks. *Physica A*, 626:129083, 2023.
- [53] Tuhin Sahai and Abeynaya Gnanasekaran. On the emergence of ergodic dynamics in unique games, 2024.