

Finding low-energy conformations of lattice protein models by quantum annealing

Portability dossier - app

agQSL portability pipeline

2026-06-08

Field	Value
Slug	2026-arxiv-1204.5485-lattice-protein-folding-annealing
Source	arXiv
Link	https://arxiv.org/abs/1204.5485
Category	app
Triaged	2026-06-08 by re-source-correction
Bootstrapped	2026-06-08

Contents

1	Source	3
1.1	Domain classification	3
1.2	Expert persona for Julien	3
1.3	Related prior work (brief bibliography)	3
1.4	Difficulty estimate	4
2	Extraction	5
2.1	What the paper does (one paragraph)	5
2.2	Quantum hardware used	5

2.3	Computational primitive	6
2.4	Resource fingerprint	6
2.5	Assumptions and results	7
2.6	Portability flags	7
2.7	Caveats	7
3	Portability matrix	8
3.1	Summary	8
3.2	D-Wave Advantage2 - runs as-is (<i>anchor</i>)	8
3.3	QuEra Aquila / Pasqal Orion - runs with translation	9
3.4	IBM Heron / IonQ Forte - architectural rewrite	9
3.5	PsiQuantum Omega - infeasible today	10

1 Source

1.1 Domain classification

Primary: optimisation. The scientific core is a QUBO / Ising minimisation: lattice protein folding is mapped, via a pseudo-Boolean “turn” encoding of the self-avoiding walk, to a programmable transverse-field Ising problem and minimised by quantum annealing. The protein-folding / life-sciences framing is a thin application skin over a combinatorial optimisation problem.

Secondary: **drug_pharma / life sciences (protein structure prediction).** This dossier anchors the `dwave/drug_pharma` edge (e067). In the canonical graph D-Wave already holds `optimization` and `logistics_scheduling` edges; this paper sits at the optimisation / life-sciences intersection. It is a proof-of-principle, not a deployable structure-prediction tool: the authors state every instance is classically solvable by exhaustive enumeration (the six-amino-acid problem has 40 valid configurations).

1.2 Expert persona for Julien

A quantum-annealing specialist fluent in QUBO / Ising formulations of combinatorial problems, minor-embedding onto sparse D-Wave hardware graphs, and the transverse-field-Ising annealing model $H(\tau) = A(\tau)H_b + B(\tau)H_p$. Should know lattice protein models (Hydrophobic-Polar and Miyazawa-Jernigan), pseudo-Boolean “turn” encodings of self-avoiding walks, and how the encoding’s qubit count scales (the exponential turn mapping used here versus the polynomial mapping of Perdomo et al. 2008). Should recognise the D-Wave One unit-cell (“Rainier”) generation device from the cited characterisation, and read the proof-of-principle framing without mistaking the 2^{81} search-space phrasing for a hardness or advantage claim.

1.3 Related prior work (brief bibliography)

- Perdomo, Truncik, Tubert-Brohman, Rose, Aspuru-Guzik, “Construction of model Hamiltonians for adiabatic quantum computation and its application to finding low-energy conformations of lattice protein models”, *Phys. Rev. A* 78, 012320 (2008), [arXiv:0801.3625](#) - the polynomial qubit mapping the authors contrast against the exponential turn encoding here.
- Lau and Dill, “A lattice statistical mechanics model of the conformational and sequence spaces of proteins”, *Macromolecules* 22, 3986 (1989) - the HP lattice model.
- Miyazawa and Jernigan, “Residue-residue potentials with a favorable contact pair term”, *J. Mol. Biol.* 256, 623 (1996) - the MJ interaction model folded here.
- Johnson et al., “Quantum annealing with manufactured spins”, *Nature* 473, 194 (2011) – the programmable superconducting flux-qubit device (D-Wave One unit-cell generation) used for the experiments.
- Babbush, Perdomo-Ortiz, O’Gorman, Macready, Aspuru-Guzik, “Construction of energy functions for lattice heteropolymer models”, [arXiv:1211.3422](#) - follow-on encoding work from the same group.
- Robert, Barkoutsos, Woerner, Tavernelli, “Resource-efficient quantum algorithm for protein folding”, *npj QI* 7, 38 (2021),

[arXiv:1908.02163](https://arxiv.org/abs/1908.02163) - the gate-model (CVaR / VQE) alternative on superconducting hardware; the contrast point for the gate-model rewrite rows below.

1.4 Difficulty estimate

low-to-medium. The arXiv LaTeX source and figures are attached and the paper is self-contained and well known. The fingerprint is a clean annealing anchor (programmable Ising, transverse-field schedule, computational-basis readout). The only care points for Julien are keeping the turn-encoding and divide-and-conquer mapping (problem preparation) separate from the axis-A primitive (analog annealing), and not over-reading the 81-qubit / 2^{81} framing as a hardness result given the authors state the instances are classically enumerable.

2 Extraction

2.1 What the paper does (one paragraph)

Perdomo-Ortiz, Dickson, Drew-Brook, Rose, and Aspuru-Guzik (Harvard and D-Wave Systems, 2012) report the first implementation of lattice protein folding on a quantum device. They fold a six-amino-acid sequence (Proline-Serine-Valine- Lysine-Methionine-Alanine, PSVKMA) on a two-dimensional lattice under the Miyazawa-Jernigan (MJ) interaction model, plus two smaller tetrapeptide instances that reduce to Hydrophobic-Polar (HP) interactions. A protein fold is written as a self-avoiding walk and encoded with a “turn” representation (two bits per bond direction in 2D, with rotational-symmetry fixing reducing the count to $\ell = 2N - 5$ binary variables); the lattice-folding energy is mapped to a classical Ising / QUBO Hamiltonian whose ground state is the lowest-energy fold. That Hamiltonian is minimised by quantum annealing on a D-Wave programmable superconducting flux-qubit processor across six experiments using up to 81 qubits. The work is an explicit proof-of-principle: every instance is small enough to solve classically by exhaustive enumeration (the six-amino-acid MJ problem has only 40 valid configurations), and the turn mapping used here scales exponentially and is not intended for large proteins.

2.2 Quantum hardware used

- **Vendor / machine:** D-Wave Systems. A programmable superconducting flux-qubit processor built from 16 units of an eight-qubit unit cell (a 128-qubit array), of which only 115 qubits were reliably usable after post-fabrication characterisation. The paper does not print a commercial device name. (Context, not from the paper: the eight-qubit-unit-cell architecture and the cited characterisation (Johnson et al. 2011, Harris et al. 2010) are the D-Wave One / “Rainier” generation, the Chimera-precursor unit-cell design described in `vendor-notes/annealing_flux_qubits.tex`.)
- **Qubit count:** Up to 81 qubits in the largest experiment (the device anneals over a 2^{81} computational search space); the smallest instance used for a direct theory comparison is an 8-qubit tetrapeptide. Six different problem Hamiltonians in total. The full array is 128 qubits with 115 usable; Scheme 1 of the six-amino-acid problem would have exceeded the 115 available qubits, so Schemes 2 and 3 use a divide-and-conquer partition.
- **Connectivity:** Sparse fixed hardware graph of coupled flux qubits (the eight-qubit unit cell tiled 16 times), requiring the problem Ising graph to be embedded. The paper refers to the hardware-array figure rather than naming a topology. (Context, not from the paper: this is the pre-Chimera unit-cell graph, per `vendor-notes/annealing_flux_qubits.tex`.)
- **Gate set:** None. This is an analog annealer, not a gate-model device. The device implements the time-dependent transverse-field Ising Hamiltonian $H(\tau) = A(\tau)H_b + B(\tau)H_p$ with $H_b = -\sum_i \sigma_i^x$ (the driver / tunnelling term) and $H_p = \sum_i h_i \sigma_i^z + \sum_{i<j} J_{ij} \sigma_i^z \sigma_j^z$ (the programmable Ising problem term), with $|h_i| \leq 1$, $|J_{ij}| \leq 1$.
- **Notable features leveraged:** programmable local fields h_i and couplings J_{ij} ; quantum-annealing (adiabatic) evolution from the driver ground state to the problem ground state; computational-basis readout of the final spin configuration as the candidate fold. The authors stress that nothing quantum-mechanical is implied about the protein itself: quantum tunnelling is used only as an

optimisation tool over classical conformations.

2.3 Computational primitive

Analog evolution / quantum annealing. The lattice-folding energy is mapped to a programmable Ising / QUBO Hamiltonian and minimised by quantum annealing (adiabatic evolution under $H(\tau) = A(\tau)H_b + B(\tau)H_p$) on the D-Wave superconducting flux-qubit device; the final computational-basis spin string is read out as a candidate low-energy fold. This is not a gate-based primitive: no VQE, QAOA, QPE, or Trotterised simulation is run on the hardware. The turn encoding and the divide-and-conquer partition are problem-mapping steps, not the axis-A primitive.

2.4 Resource fingerprint

Metric	Value	Source
Qubits (logical)	No error correction; logical = physical. Up to 81 problem qubits; smallest comparison instance 8 qubits.	Abstract; Intro (“ground state of a search space of 2^{81} ”); mapping section
Qubits (physical)	128-qubit array, 115 reliably usable after characterisation. Six experiments up to 81 qubits.	Hardware overview (“16 units of an eight-qubit unit cell ... 115 qubits”)
Encoding	Turn encoding: 2 bits per bond direction (2D), reduced to $\ell = 2N - 5$ binary variables per N -bead fold; mapped to the Ising Hamiltonian H_p .	Eqs. for q and H_p
Problem instance	2D Miyazawa-Jernigan model, six-amino-acid sequence PSVKMA, solved via Schemes 2 and 3 (divide-and-conquer); two tetrapeptide HP instances in the SI.	Mapping section
Annealing schedule	Time-dependent $A(\tau)$, $B(\tau)$ with $A(0) \gg B(0)$ and $A(1) \ll B(1)$; schedule plotted in the encoding figure. Read / gauge counts not extracted here.	Eq. $H(\tau)$; encoding figure
Search space	2^{81} for the largest experiment; the six-amino-acid MJ problem has 40 valid configurations.	Intro

2.5 Assumptions and results

- **Claims.** First lattice protein folding on a quantum device under the MJ model; the device anneals to the ground state of a 2^{81} search space. Numerical simulation of the open-system annealing dynamics (with no adjustable parameters, all extracted from the device) reproduces the 8-qubit experimental results well.
- **Limitations (stated by the authors).** Every instance presented is classically solvable by exhaustive enumeration, so this is a proof-of-principle rather than a demonstration of quantum advantage. The turn mapping used here scales exponentially with problem size and is “not intended for large instances”; a separate polynomial mapping (Perdomo et al. 2008) plus more advanced devices would be needed for larger proteins. The device runs at finite temperature, making the process less coherent than ideal zero-temperature adiabatic quantum computation.

2.6 Portability flags

- **Annealer-native primitive.** The workload is a QUBO / Ising minimisation, native to quantum annealers. It ports as-is to later D-Wave Advantage / Advantage2 systems (larger qubit counts, denser Pegasus / Zephyr graphs) and to annealing-style samplers (simulated annealing, classical Ising solvers) over the same binary quadratic model.
- **Gate-model reuse needs a rewrite.** Running this on a gate-model device (IBM, IonQ, Quantinuum, Rigetti) means recasting the Ising minimisation as QAOA or a VQE-family variational loop, a genuine architectural rewrite rather than a library swap.
- **Embedding overhead.** The Ising problem graph must be minor-embedded onto the sparse hardware graph; the embedding cost (physical qubits per logical variable) is not reported and grows with problem connectivity.
- **Exponential mapping ceiling.** The turn encoding used here is exponential in problem size; any scale-up must adopt the polynomial mapping, which changes the qubit accounting.

2.7 Caveats

- **Access.** Full arXiv LaTeX source is present (`paper-source/ms_arxiv_v1.tex`) with the figures; the fingerprint is drawn from the source.
- **Provenance correction.** This dossier re-sources the `dwave/drug_pharma` protein-folding edge (`e067`). The earlier citation, `arXiv:2203.11045`, was a mis-identified cosmology paper (cosmic voids and the Lyman-alpha forest) with no quantum content; it is replaced by this paper (Perdomo-Ortiz et al. 2012), the canonical first D-Wave lattice protein-folding demonstration.
- **Device name.** The paper does not print a commercial device name; the D-Wave One / Rainier-generation identification is contextual, from the cited unit-cell characterisation, and is not asserted by the authors.

3 Portability matrix

Anchor: D-Wave programmable superconducting flux-qubit annealer (16 eight-qubit unit cells, a 128-qubit array with 115 usable; D-Wave One unit-cell / “Rainier” generation) executed the lattice-folding QUBO / Ising for a 2D Miyazawa-Jernigan six-amino-acid sequence (PSVKMA) plus two tetrapeptide HP instances, across six experiments using up to 81 qubits (2^{81} search space), reported in arXiv:1204.5485. The device anneals from the transverse-field driver to the programmable problem Hamiltonian and reads out the computational-basis spin string as the candidate fold. Proof-of-principle: every instance is classically enumerable.

Julien’s fingerprint: programmable Ising $H_p = \sum_i h_i \sigma_i^z + \sum_{i<j} J_{ij} \sigma_i^z \sigma_j^z$ with $|h_i|, |J_{ij}| \leq 1$; transverse-field driver $H_b = -\sum_i \sigma_i^x$; annealing schedule $A(\tau), B(\tau)$; turn encoding $\ell = 2N - 5$ binary variables per fold; up to 81 problem qubits, smallest instance 8 qubits; sparse unit-cell hardware graph requiring minor-embedding; no error correction (logical = physical). See `extraction.md` for full detail.

3.1 Summary

Modality	Vendor	Verdict	2026 fit
Superconducting flux (annealing) (anchor)	D-Wave Advantage2	runs as-is	yes
Neutral atom (analog Rydberg)	QuEra Aquila	runs with translation	partial
Neutral atom (analog Rydberg)	Pasqal Orion	runs with translation	partial
Superconducting (gate)	IBM Heron	architectural rewrite	yes
Trapped ion (gate)	IonQ Forte	architectural rewrite	yes
Photonic	PsiQuantum Omega	infeasible today	no

3.2 D-Wave Advantage2 - runs as-is (*anchor*)

Modality: Superconducting flux (quantum annealing).

The workload is a QUBO / Ising minimisation, native to D-Wave annealers. The 2012 demonstration ran on the 128-qubit unit-cell device, where the 115-qubit ceiling forced the divide-and-conquer Schemes 2 and 3. On current Advantage2 hardware (Zephyr topology, qubit counts in the thousands per `vendor-notes/annealing_flux_qubits.tex`) the same Ising problem ports as-is through the standard minor-embedding workflow with substantial headroom; larger proteins are gated by the encoding (the exponential turn mapping, or the polynomial Perdomo 2008 mapping) and by embedding overhead, not by the primitive.

Translation: none (anchor row).

Evidence:

- arXiv:1204.5485 - the hardware experiments (Sec. on the lattice mapping; abstract: “six different experiments up to 81 superconducting quantum bits”).
- D-Wave protein-folding application page (e067 communication, [dwavequantum.com](https://www.dwavequantum.com)) - vendor evidence that lattice protein folding is a supported annealing workload.
- `vendor-notes/annealing_flux_qubits.tex` - the flux-qubit annealing substrate and the Advantage / Advantage2 topology lineage.

3.3 QuEra Aquila / Pasqal Orion - runs with translation

Modality: Neutral atom (analog Rydberg).

Neutral-atom analog machines implement a programmable Ising-type Hamiltonian through the Rydberg blockade, $H = \sum_i \frac{\Omega}{2} \sigma_i^x - \sum_i \Delta \hat{n}_i + \sum_{ij} V_{ij} \hat{n}_i \hat{n}_j$, which is the same problem class as the transverse-field Ising annealing run here. The QUBO / Ising minimisation therefore transfers in spirit to analog Rydberg evolution.

Translation: this is a translation, not a transpilation. The Rydberg interaction $V_{ij} \sim 1/r^6$ is positive (antiferromagnetic) and set by atom positions, so a general signed- J_{ij} protein QUBO must be recast onto the fixed unit-disk Rydberg graph through a unit-disk or auxiliary-spin embedding, and the turn-encoding constraints folded into the local detunings Δ_i . The readout is sampling of low-energy configurations, as on the annealer. 2026 fit is **partial**: the primitive class matches, but embedding an arbitrary protein QUBO onto the analog connectivity is non-trivial and the result is a sampled distribution rather than a guaranteed ground state.

Evidence:

- `vendor-notes/neutral_atom_qubits.tex`, `vendor-notes/cold_atom_global_rotations.tex`
 - the Rydberg-blockade Ising Hamiltonian and analog-evolution control model for QuEra and Pasqal.
- arXiv:1204.5485 - the programmable Ising fingerprint that defines the target problem class.

3.4 IBM Heron / IonQ Forte - architectural rewrite

Modality: Superconducting (gate) / trapped ion (gate).

Gate-model devices do not anneal. Running this workload on a gate-model processor means recasting the Ising minimisation as a variational gate-model algorithm, either QAOA over the same QUBO or a VQE / CVaR loop in the style of Robert et al. 2021’s gate-model protein folding. That is an architectural rewrite of the primitive (analog annealing to digital variational), with its own ansatz, depth, and classical optimisation loop, not a port of the annealing run.

Translation: the QUBO problem statement is hardware-agnostic and ports trivially; the annealing primitive does not. Gate vendors (IBM Heron, IonQ Forte, Quantinuum H2, Rigetti, IQM) readily run QAOA on a QUBO, so 2026 fit is **yes** as a QAOA or VQE

demonstration, but a small-instance run is a re-derivation on a different algorithm rather than a reproduction of the annealing result, and the depth / convergence trade-offs are entirely new.

Evidence:

- `vendor-notes/superconducting_qubits.tex`, `vendor-notes/trapped_ion_qubits.tex`
 - the gate-model substrates and native two-qubit families.
- Robert et al., [arXiv:1908.02163](https://arxiv.org/abs/1908.02163) - the gate-model (CVaR / VQE) protein-folding construction that the rewrite would follow.

3.5 PsiQuantum Omega - infeasible today

Modality: Photonic.

No commercial photonic device exposes a universal gate-model QUBO solver or an Ising annealer in 2026. Gaussian-boson-sampling machines (for example Xanadu Borealis) are sampling-only and non-universal, and fusion-based fault-tolerant photonic hardware (PsiQuantum Omega) is not on a commercial cloud. There is no annealing or QAOA target for this workload on photonic hardware today.

Translation: none available. The verdict would change only once a programmable gate-model or annealing-capable photonic device reaches a commercial cloud.

Evidence:

- `vendor-notes/photonic_modes.tex` - the photonic modalities (GBS, fusion-based) and their non-universality / access status.

Commentary (\approx 160 words). Portability of this workload is governed by modality, not by the protein application. The QUBO / Ising problem statement is hardware-agnostic and ports anywhere; the annealing primitive ports cleanly only to other annealers. D-Wave Advantage2 runs it as-is, with vast headroom over the 115-qubit ceiling that constrained the 2012 device, so the real scale limits are the turn encoding and embedding overhead rather than the hardware. Neutral-atom analog Rydberg machines (QuEra Aquila, Pasqal Orion) are the genuine cross-modality target: their Rydberg-blockade Hamiltonian is the same problem class, but the fixed unit-disk connectivity and positive couplings force an embedding of the signed protein QUBO, so the verdict is a real translation, not a transpilation. Gate-model vendors can solve the same QUBO only by switching primitive to QAOA or VQE / CVaR, which is an architectural rewrite rather than a reproduction of the annealing result. Photonic platforms have no 2026 target. Classical Ising machines (Fujitsu Digital Annealer, Toshiba SBM) solve the same QUBO but sit outside a quantum-portability matrix.