

Quantum evolution kernel: Machine learning on graphs with programmable arrays of qubits

Portability dossier - app

agQSL portability pipeline

2026-06-07

Field	Value
Slug	2026-arxiv-2107.03247-quantum-evolution-kernel-machine-learning-graphs
Source	arXiv
Link	https://arxiv.org/abs/2107.03247
Category	app
Triaged	2026-06-07 by port_until_julien_parallel
Bootstrapped	2026-06-07

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	8
2.7	Caveats	8
3	Portability matrix	10

1 Source

1.1 Domain classification

Machine learning (primary). The paper builds a graph kernel for supervised graph classification (SVM) and regression (KRR), benchmarked on standard graph-learning datasets. There is no application-domain secondary: the method is domain-agnostic ML on graphs. Methodologically the encoding shares structure with optimisation ansätze (the alternating free-evolution / mixing-pulse schedule is QAOA-like), so a reader with an optimisation background will recognise the machinery, but the deliverable is a classifier, not an optimiser.

1.2 Expert persona for Julien

A quantum machine learning specialist fluent both in quantum kernels / feature maps (Havlicek-style feature Hilbert spaces, SVM/KRR over a Gram matrix) and in neutral-atom analog Hamiltonians. They should read a Rydberg pulse schedule without friction, knowing that the Ising term comes from van der Waals interaction $\propto 1/r^6$ and the XY term from resonant dipolar exchange $\propto 1/r^3$, and have calibrated intuition for the depth p , pulse durations, global drive amplitude Ω_0 , detuning δ , and the shot/measurement budget needed to reconstruct a probability distribution. Crucially they must flag that the headline results here are classically emulated (**pulser**) with proposed hardware parameters, not measured on a QPU.

1.3 Related prior work (brief bibliography)

- Albrecht, Dalyac, Leclerc et al., “Quantum Feature Maps for Graph Machine Learning on a Neutral Atom Quantum Processor,” Phys. Rev. A 107, 042615 (2023). arXiv:2211.16337. The experimental follow-up that runs this exact QEK construction on real Pasqal hardware; the closest same-primitive, different-substrate (emulation to QPU) comparison, and already a sibling dossier in this batch.
- Havlicek, Corcoles, Temme et al., “Supervised learning with quantum-enhanced feature spaces,” Nature 567, 209 (2019). arXiv:1804.11326. The same quantum-kernel idea on a gate-based superconducting device; the natural cross-vendor contrast for the feature-map primitive.
- Schuld and Killoran, “Quantum machine learning in feature Hilbert spaces,” Phys. Rev. Lett. 122, 040504 (2019). arXiv:1803.07128. Theory grounding for treating a quantum state as a feature map and a kernel as an inner product.
- Kriege, Johansson and Morris, “A survey on graph kernels,” Applied Network Science 5, 6 (2020). arXiv:1903.11835. Reference frame for the classical comparators (graphlet sampling, random walk, Weisfeiler-Lehman).
- Henriët, Beguin, Signoles et al., “Quantum computing with neutral atoms,” Quantum 4, 327 (2020). arXiv:2006.12326. Platform reference for the Rydberg substrate Julien will fingerprint.
- Morris, Kriege, Bause et al., “TUDataset: A collection of benchmark datasets for learning with graphs,” arXiv:2007.08663 (2020). Provenance for the IMDB, PTC, PROTEINS, NCI1 and Fingerprint datasets used in Section V.

1.4 Difficulty estimate

Medium. The paper is open-access on arXiv (no paywall; LaTeX source and figures are mirrored in `paper-source/`), roughly 12 pages plus appendices, and the hardware-relevant parameters are stated explicitly in Section VI (minimum atom spacing $5\ \mu\text{m}$, $\Omega_0 = 15\ \text{rad}/\mu\text{s}$, total pulse time $T < 500\ \text{ns}$, detection-error model $\epsilon = \epsilon' = 0.05$). What raises it above `low`: the primitives are analog Rydberg dynamics rather than a gate circuit, so the fingerprint needs care, and the headline numbers are classically emulated with `pulser` rather than measured on a QPU. Julien should treat this as the proposal-and-emulation paper and read it alongside the sibling experimental dossier (arXiv:2211.16337) to separate proposed parameters from measured hardware behaviour. No supplementary material beyond the in-paper appendices is required.

2 Extraction

2.1 What the paper does (one paragraph)

The paper proposes the Quantum Evolution (QE) kernel, a graph kernel for supervised machine learning on graph-structured data (SVM classification and, in principle, kernel ridge regression). Each input graph is encoded into the interaction Hamiltonian of an array of qubits, so that the graph topology drives the dynamics. The system is then evolved through an alternating schedule of free evolution under the graph Hamiltonian and global mixing pulses (a QAOA-like layered sequence of depth p), an observable is measured, and the resulting probability distribution becomes the graph’s feature representation. The kernel between two graphs is a similarity (a decreasing function of the Jensen-Shannon divergence) between their distributions. The authors derive the construction analytically, show it connects to classical random-walk and graphlet kernels in limiting cases, and benchmark it on standard graph datasets, where it matches or beats classical kernels. They then describe and classically emulate an implementation on a neutral-atom (Rydberg) processor. No result in the paper was measured on quantum hardware.

2.2 Quantum hardware used

- **Vendor / machine:** Pasqal-style neutral-atom (Rydberg) processor. The scheme is proposed for “Rydberg atom processors ... with up to hundreds of qubits” (Introduction, p. 1) and characterised for a “programmable array of qubits made of neutral atoms” (Sec. VI, p. 8). **No QPU was used:** all numbers come from classical emulation with the `pulsar` library (Sec. VI.B, p. 8) and from closed-form analytic formulas. The authors are at Pasqal.
- **Qubit count:** One atom per graph node. Benchmark (Sec. V) restricted to graphs of less than 16 nodes, “Because the simulation of large quantum systems is algorithmically costly” (p. 8); the emulated Fingerprint* implementation (Sec. VI) uses graphs of up to 12 nodes (p. 8). So at most 16 qubits enter the emulated dynamics, at most 12 in the `pulsar` run. The $N = 60$ Erdos-Renyi illustration (Fig. 2) is evaluated from an analytic degree-histogram formula (Eqs. 20-22), not from simulated dynamics. No hardware qubit count.
- **Connectivity:** Analog Rydberg interaction graph set by atom positions in a 2D register. Couplings decay with interatomic distance: van der Waals $\propto 1/r_{ij}^6$ for the Ising case and resonant dipolar exchange $\propto 1/r_{ij}^3$ for the XY case (Sec. VI.A, p. 8-9). The authors state explicitly that “only local graphs can be embedded in this platform” (p. 9), so the connectivity is geometry-programmable but distance-limited, not all-to-all and not a fixed lattice.
- **Gate set:** Analog, not digital. There is no discrete gate set. The primitives are (i) free evolution under the native graph Hamiltonian and (ii) global driving pulses. The Ising graph Hamiltonian is $\hat{H}_G = \sum_{(i,j) \in \mathcal{E}} \hat{\sigma}_i^z \hat{\sigma}_j^z$ and the XY graph Hamiltonian is $\hat{H}_{XY} = \sum_{(i,j) \in \mathcal{E}} (\hat{\sigma}_i^+ \hat{\sigma}_j^- + \text{h.c.})$ (Sec. II.A, p. 3). The global mixing drive is $\hat{H}_\theta = \tau \hat{H}_G + \frac{\Omega_0 \tau}{2} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{V}} \hat{\sigma}_i^x$ in the emulated run (Eq. 33, p. 9). Note this is the *analog* Rydberg interaction Hamiltonian, distinct from the digital Rydberg-blockade CZ that the same substrate offers in gate mode.

- **Notable features leveraged:** Analog Hamiltonian evolution; native van der Waals (Ising) interaction; native resonant dipolar exchange (XY) interaction; position-encoded graph topology; global (uniform) addressing for the mixing pulses; occupation-number-conserving XY dynamics used for the quantum-walk connection (Sec. IV.B). Detuning δ is set to 0 in the emulated run; a position-dependent detuning is mentioned as a way to encode labelled nodes (p. 9) but is not used.

2.3 Computational primitive

Analog evolution in a QAOA-like alternating schedule (free evolution under the graph Hamiltonian interleaved with global mixing pulses), used as a **QML feature map / kernel** with **sampling**-based readout. The depth- p evolution producing the final state is

$$|\psi_f\rangle = \prod_{i=1}^p \left(e^{-i\hat{H}_{\theta_i}} e^{-i\hat{H}_g t_i} \right) e^{-i\hat{H}_{\theta_0}} |\psi_0\rangle$$

(Eq. 9, p. 3). It is QAOA-like in structure but the deliverable is a graph classifier, not an optimiser.

2.4 Resource fingerprint

Metric	Value	Source (page / equation / SI)
Qubits (logical)	1 per graph node; ≤ 16 in benchmark, ≤ 12 in pulser emulation	Sec. V, p. 8 (“less than 16 nodes”); Sec. VI.B, p. 8 (“up to 12 nodes”)
Qubits (physical)	Not reported (no QPU run; 1 atom per node, analog encoding)	Sec. VI, p. 8-9 (emulation only)
Circuit depth	$p = 1, 4, 8$ layers (Ising) and $p = 4$ (XY) in benchmark; $p = 2$ in pulser emulation. Analog, no gate depth.	Table II, p. 9; Sec. VI.B, p. 9
2Q-gate count (total)	Not reported (analog evolution; no discrete two-qubit gates)	Sec. VI.A, p. 8-9

Metric	Value	Source (page / equation / SI)
Measurement shots	10 000 measurements per kernel estimate, $\times 100$ estimates (noise study); benchmark uses exact emulated distributions (no finite-shot sampling reported)	Sec. VI.B, p. 8 (“100 ... sets of 10000 measurements”)
Classical loop iter.	Bayesian optimisation: ~ 20 iterations to plateau, up to 100 shown; $\approx 150/2000/6000$ function evaluations for Ising $p = 1/4/8$; surrogate minimised by sampling 5000 points per step	Fig. 5(a), p. 10; Table II header, p. 9; Sec. V, p. 8
Wall-clock runtime	“of the order of a few hours” per dataset (classical emulation training, GENCI/CINES HPC allocation); no QPU runtime	Sec. V, p. 8; Acknowledgments, p. 11

For any row marked “not reported”, the paper does not state the number; values were not invented.

2.5 Assumptions and results

- **Claim:** A graph kernel built from the time-evolution of a quantum system classifies graphs as well as or better than standard classical graph kernels. “For all datasets, at least one quantum kernel is better than the best classical kernel” (Sec. V, p. 8). Increasing the number of layers generally improves accuracy. Example accuracies (Table II, p. 9, accuracy \pm std over 10-fold cross-validation): IMDB-MULTI 48.1 ± 4.4 (Ising₄) vs GS 40.9 ± 3.5 / RW 45.2 ± 3.4 ; PROTEINS 76.0 ± 5.3 (Ising₈) vs GS/RW 73.3 ± 1.2 ; NCI1 80.1 ± 3.5 (Ising₈) vs 78.1. On the small emulated Fingerprint* set (Table III, p. 10): QE noiseless 64.0 ± 8.7 vs GS 48.2 ± 8.9 and RW 52.0 ± 5.8 .
- **Error bars / noise assumptions:** Standard deviations are from 10-fold cross-validation repetitions, not from quantum hardware noise. A detection (readout) error model with false-positive and false-negative rates $\epsilon = \epsilon' = 0.05$ is applied in emulation, “in accordance to conservative estimates for currently existing devices” (Sec. VI.B, p. 10); it is taken as duration-independent and

assumed to dominate over decoherence for evolutions shorter than a few microseconds. Under this noise the accuracy is “not significantly altered”: $\text{QE}(0.05) = 63.0$ vs $\text{QE}(0) = 64.0$ (Table III), and the relative kernel change exceeds 10% for only $\sim 0.13\%$ of graph pairs (Sec. VI.B, p. 11, Fig. 6).

- **Classical baseline:** Graphlet Subsampling (GS, 1000 graphlet samples) and Random Walk (RW) kernels, computed with the `grakel` library (Sec. V, p. 8). The QE kernel beats both on the reported datasets.

2.6 Portability flags

- **Analog evolution, no gate decomposition given.** The method is specified as continuous Hamiltonian evolution (Eq. 9). Porting to a gate-based device requires Trotterising the Ising or XY graph Hamiltonian, with the associated depth and error overhead; the paper provides no circuit.
- **Requires a native Ising (ZZ) interaction with $1/r^6$ tail.** On neutral atoms this is the free van der Waals interaction $C_6/r_{ij}^6 \hat{n}_i \hat{n}_j$; on gate hardware it must be synthesised from ZZ / CZ gates.
- **XY variant requires native dipolar exchange ($XX + YY$, $1/r^3$).** The term $2C_3/r_{ij}^3 (\hat{\sigma}_i^x \hat{\sigma}_j^x + \hat{\sigma}_i^y \hat{\sigma}_j^y)$ (Sec. VI.A, p. 9) maps to iSWAP-like / XY gates elsewhere and must be decomposed for most gate sets.
- **Graph topology is encoded in atom positions; only local graphs embed.** “As the interaction strength depends on the distance between atoms, only local graphs can be embedded in this platform” (Sec. VI.A, p. 9). Arbitrary (non-geometric) graphs are not faithfully represented unless a position-dependent detuning is added for labelled nodes. This is a substrate-specific embedding constraint that a portability analysis must respect: the $1/r^6$ (or $1/r^3$) coupling does not produce a clean unit-weight adjacency matrix; every non-edge still carries a residual tail interaction.
- **Global-only addressing in the basic scheme.** The mixing pulses are uniform ($\Omega = \Omega_0$, $\delta = 0$); per-qubit control is not required for the unlabelled-graph case (an advantage), but labelled-node graphs would need local detuning.
- **Distribution-reconstruction measurement cost.** The feature vector is a probability distribution rebuilt from measurements. The Fourier / power- spectrum readout (Eq. 11) needs many measurements over a long time window; the more measurement-efficient route is the fixed-pulse histogram (Sec. II.B.2, Sec. V). The emulation budgets 10 000 shots per kernel estimate.
- **Readout-error model is neutral-atom flavoured.** The $\epsilon = \epsilon' = 0.05$ false-positive/negative detection model reflects atom-loss / state-detection errors; a different substrate would carry a different dominant noise channel.

2.7 Caveats

- The paper is open access on arXiv (2107.03247v1, dated 8 July 2021) with full LaTeX source mirrored in `paper-source/`. No section was unreachable; nothing is paywalled.
- **Most important caveat:** no result was measured on a QPU. Every quantum number is either a closed-form analytic value or a classical emulation (`pulser` for the dynamics, `grakel` for the classical comparators). The hardware parameters in Sec. VI (minimum atom spacing $5 \mu\text{m}$, $\Omega_0 = 15 \text{ rad}/\mu\text{s}$, total pulse time $T < 500 \text{ ns}$, per-segment minimum 4 ns , detection error $\epsilon = \epsilon' = 0.05$) are

proposed realistic values, not measured device behaviour. Treat this as the proposal-and- emulation paper and read it alongside the experimental sibling dossier (arXiv:2211.16337), which runs the same QEK construction on real Pasqal hardware, to separate proposed parameters from measured performance.

- The $N = 60$ Erdos-Renyi example (Fig. 2) and the random-walk / quantum-walk connections (Sec. IV) are analytic; they are not evidence of simulated or measured dynamics at that scale.

3 Portability matrix