

Constrained Quantum Optimization for Extractive Summarization on a Trapped-ion Quantum Computer

Portability dossier - app

agQSL portability pipeline

2026-06-07

Field	Value
Slug	2026-arxiv-2206.06290-constrained-quantum-optimization-extractive-summarization-trapped
Source	arXiv
Link	https://arxiv.org/abs/2206.06290
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	5
2.4	Resource fingerprint	6
2.5	Assumptions and results	8
2.6	Portability flags	8
2.7	Caveats	9
3	Portability matrix	10

1 Source

1.1 Domain classification

optimisation (primary). The computational core is a constrained combinatorial-optimisation problem: a QUBO with a hard Hamming-weight constraint $\sum_i x_i = M$, solved with QAOA-family circuits on Quantinuum H1-1. Secondary: **machine learning** (the application is extractive summarisation, an NLP task; sentence centralities and similarities come from tf-idf and BERT embeddings). For the hardware fingerprint the secondary domain is incidental: the quantum circuit lives entirely in the optimisation layer, and the NLP front end only supplies the objective coefficients.

1.2 Expert persona for Julien

A quantum-optimisation specialist fluent in the QAOA family, specifically the Quantum Alternating Operator Ansatz with constraint-preserving mixers (the Hamming-weight-preserving XY mixer here) and Dicke-state initial-state preparation. They should have calibrated intuition for two-qubit gate budgets and circuit-depth trade-offs on trapped-ion hardware, and understand the two routes to constraint satisfaction (subspace-restricting mixers versus penalty terms) plus how transpilation to a native gate set on all-to-all connectivity ($t|ket\rangle$, Quantinuum H1-1) shapes the reported counts. Familiarity with the L-VQE hardware-efficient ansatz is useful, since the paper benchmarks XY-QAOA against L-VQE and plain QAOA. Deep NLP knowledge is not required.

1.3 Related prior work (brief bibliography)

- Hadfield et al., “From the Quantum Approximate Optimization Algorithm to a Quantum Alternating Operator Ansatz,” *Algorithms* 12(2):34 (2019). DOI 10.3390/a12020034, arXiv:1709.03489. Origin of the QAO Ansatz and constraint-preserving mixers.
- Wang, Hadfield, Jiang, Rieffel, “XY-mixers: Analytical and numerical results for the quantum alternating operator ansatz,” *Phys. Rev. A* 101, 012320 (2020). DOI 10.1103/PhysRevA.101.012320, arXiv:1904.09314. The XY mixer used in this paper.
- Aktar, Bärtschi, Badawy, Eidenbenz, “A Divide-and-Conquer Approach to Dicke State Preparation,” *IEEE Trans. Quantum Eng.* 3 (2022). DOI 10.1109/TQE.2022.3174547, arXiv:2112.12435. The short-depth Dicke initial-state preparation targeting all-to-all connectivity.
- Liu et al., “Layer VQE: A Variational Approach for Combinatorial Optimization on Noisy Quantum Computers,” *IEEE Trans. Quantum Eng.* 3 (2022). DOI 10.1109/TQE.2021.3140190, arXiv:2102.05566. The L-VQE comparison algorithm.
- Farhi, Goldstone, Gutmann, “A Quantum Approximate Optimization Algorithm,” arXiv:1411.4028 (2014). Baseline QAOA.
- McDonald, “A Study of Global Inference Algorithms in Multi-Document Summarization,” *ECIR 2007*. DOI 10.5555/1763653.1763720. The NP-hard extractive-summarisation formulation mapped to the optimisation problem here.

1.4 Difficulty estimate

medium. The paper is openly available on arXiv (no paywall) and the full LaTeX source, including the `.bbl` and figures, is already in `paper-source/`, so nothing needs to be fetched. The primitives are standard QAOA-family methods rather than exotic constructions. The reasons it is not **low**: the device specifications, hyperparameters, two-qubit gate counts and depths (Table 1), and the extractive-summarisation problem details are spread across appendices A through E, so Julien will need to mine the supplementary material to assemble a complete fingerprint, and the three-algorithm comparison (XY-QAOA, L-VQE, QAOA) plus the Dicke-state preparation step add moving parts to disentangle.

2 Extraction

2.1 What the paper does (one paragraph)

This paper benchmarks constraint-preserving quantum optimisation on a trapped-ion processor, using extractive text summarisation as an industrially flavoured test problem. Summarisation is cast as McDonald’s NP-hard constrained quadratic problem: select exactly M sentences from N to maximise centrality (tf-idf) while minimising pairwise redundancy (BERT cosine similarity), subject to a hard Hamming-weight constraint $\sum_i x_i = M$. Three algorithms run on Quantinuum’s 20-qubit H1-1 device: the Quantum Alternating Operator Ansatz with a Hamming-weight-preserving XY mixer (XY-QAOA), which restricts the evolution to the in-constraint subspace; plain penalty-based QAOA; and the hardware-efficient Layer VQE (L-VQE). The headline result is the largest constraint-preserving quantum-optimisation circuit run to date: 20 qubits, two-qubit-gate depth 159, 765 native two-qubit gates, no error mitigation, reaching a 92.1% approximation ratio and 91.4% in-constraint probability. The authors argue penalty methods force a quality-versus-feasibility trade-off that native constraint encoding avoids.

2.2 Quantum hardware used

- **Vendor / machine:** Quantinuum H1-1 (trapped ion). Authors had preview access to H1-1 upgraded to 20 qubits (Acknowledgements). Results also cross-checked against Quantinuum’s noise emulator of H1-1.
- **Qubit count:** up to 20 used / 20 available. The 20-qubit instances use all 20 qubits; a second set of instances uses 14 qubits. No error correction, so one $^{171}\text{Yb}^+$ ion maps to one algorithmic qubit (logical = physical here).
- **Connectivity:** all-to-all. The QCCD architecture realises all-to-all coupling by physically rearranging the ions between gate zones, which the paper states “introduces a negligible amount of error” (Appendix C, H1-1 details).
- **Gate set:** native gate set **not enumerated in the paper**. Circuits are transpiled and optimised to “H1-1’s native gate set” with Quantinuum’s t|ket> / pytket transpiler (Methods; Table 1 caption). For background only (not from this paper), the H-series native two-qubit gate is an arbitrary-angle Mølmer-Sørensen-type entangler $R_{XX}(\theta)$ with arbitrary-angle single-qubit rotations and virtual Z (vendor-notes, `trapped_ion_qubits.tex`). The reported gate counts are post-transpilation for this arbitrary-angle native basis.
- **Notable features leveraged:** all-to-all connectivity (essential to the shallow Dicke-state preparation and the XY-mixer ring of $XX + YY$ couplings). Five parallel gate zones in a linear QCCD trap; qubits encoded in hyperfine states of twenty $^{171}\text{Yb}^+$ ions (Appendix C). The work does **not** use mid-circuit measurement, qubit reuse, error correction, or any error mitigation.

2.3 Computational primitive

QAOA family. Specifically the **Quantum Alternating Operator Ansatz with a Hamming-weight-preserving XY mixer (XY-QAOA)** at $p = 1$, which is the headline demonstration, benchmarked against penalty-based **QAOA** ($p = 1$) and the hardware-efficient variational **L-VQE** ($p = 1$ for 14 qubits, $p = 2$ for 20 qubits). All three are gate-based variational sampling circuits; the constraint-preserving primitive (subspace-restricting mixer plus Dicke initial state) is the scientific focus.

The XY mixer copied from the source (with the `\xgate`/`\ygate` macros expanded to X/Y):

$$U_M^{XY}(\beta_j) = \prod_{k=1}^N e^{-i\frac{\beta_j}{2}(X_k X_{k+1} + Y_k Y_{k+1})}$$

which commutes with $\sum_k Z_k$ and so confines the state to the Hamming-weight- M subspace. The constrained objective (Eq. 6 in the source):

$$\max_{\vec{x} \in \{0,1\}^N} \sum_{i=0}^{N-1} \mu(i)x_i - \lambda \sum_{i \neq j} \beta(i,j)x_i x_j, \quad \text{s.t.} \quad \sum_{i=0}^{N-1} x_i = M$$

2.4 Resource fingerprint

Headline values are for the largest run (XY-QAOA, 20 qubits, full circuit). The full per-algorithm breakdown follows the table.

Metric	Value	Source (page / equation / SI)
Qubits (logical)	up to 20 ($N = 20$; also $N = 14$ set)	Abstract; Methods (Sec. 3); Table 1
Qubits (physical)	up to 20 $^{171}\text{Yb}^+$ ions (no QEC)	Appendix C (H1-1 details); Methods
Circuit depth	two-qubit-gate depth up to 159 (XY-QAOA, 20q)	Abstract; Table 1; Table 2
2Q-gate count (total)	up to 765 (XY-QAOA, 20q); init-state prep alone 347	Abstract; Table 1
Measurement shots	2000 per circuit on hardware (1000 for QAOA grid-search numerics)	Methods; Appendix B

Metric	Value	Source (page / equation / SI)
Classical loop iter.	none on hardware: parameters pre-optimised in noiseless simulation, then fixed for the hardware run. Simulation optimiser: COBYLA from 10 random starts (XY-QAOA, all sizes); 20 starts (L-VQE 14q); QAOA via grid search	Methods; Appendix B
Wall-clock runtime	not reported (only qualitative “high running time on trapped-ion hardware”)	Sec. 4; Results

Full two-qubit-gate budget (Table 1, pytket-optimised), reproduced verbatim:

Algorithm	# qubits	Init-state 2Q depth	Init-state 2Q count	Full-circuit 2Q depth	Full-circuit 2Q count
L-VQE	14	0	0	4	26
L-VQE	20	0	0	8	76
QAOA	14	0	0	50	182
QAOA	20	0	0	74	380
XY-QAOA	14	68	185	114	393
XY-QAOA	20	95	347	159	765

For XY-QAOA the Dicke initial-state preparation dominates the cost: at 20 qubits it accounts for 347 of 765 two-qubit gates and 95 of 159 in two-qubit-gate depth, before any optimisation layer is applied (Methods; Results; Table 1). QAOA and L-VQE need no two-qubit gates for state preparation.

Reported device error figures (typical, from the H1-1 datasheet, Appendix C): single-qubit-gate infidelity 5×10^{-5} ; two-qubit-gate infidelity 3×10^{-3} ; state-preparation-and-measurement error 3×10^{-3} ; idle (memory) error per qubit at average depth-1 circuit 4×10^{-4} .

2.5 Assumptions and results

- **Claim.** XY-QAOA executes the largest-to-date constraint-preserving quantum-optimisation circuits on gate-based hardware: up to 20 qubits, two-qubit-gate depth 159, 765 native two-qubit gates, with no error mitigation, obtaining approximation ratios up to 92.1% and in-constraint probability up to 91.4% on H1-1 (Abstract; Results). The paper’s broader argument is that unconstrained algorithms (QAOA with a penalty term) face an intrinsic trade-off between in-constraint probability and approximation ratio that makes parameter selection hard, whereas native constraint encoding (XY-QAOA) gives in-constraint probability one in the noiseless limit by construction.
- **Error bars / noise.** No error mitigation is applied to any hardware or noisy-simulation result. Statistics are over 10 problem instances per qubit count, **except** XY-QAOA on H1-1, where only three 14-qubit and three 20-qubit instances were run owing to the high circuit depth and running time (Fig. 1 caption; Results). Box plots report quartiles, median, and min/max whiskers. Noise visibly broadens the Hamming-weight distribution: for the deep XY-QAOA circuits, bitstrings as far as 10 bitflips from the in-constraint subspace appear in the output (Results, Fig. 4 discussion).
- **Comparison to classical baseline.** The quantum baseline is “random” and “random in-constraint” (uniform sampling). All algorithms beat random guess on approximation ratio. However, against the actual application metric (ROUGE against human reference summaries, Appendix D), even noiseless simulations only match random summaries, and optimal extractive summaries are barely better than random. The authors conclude the usefulness of this optimisation framework as a route to summary generation “remains inconclusive” for the dataset, evaluation criteria, and qubit counts considered. The contribution is a hardware-capability demonstration, not a quantum advantage in summarisation.

2.6 Portability flags

- **Relies on all-to-all connectivity at 14-20 qubits.** Both the divide-and-conquer Dicke-state preparation (Aktar et al.) and the XY mixer are compiled for an all-to-all device. The Discussion states explicitly that “the circuit depth would increase significantly if the circuit had to be compiled to a nearest-neighbor architecture.” Porting to a heavy-hex or linear superconducting lattice would add SWAP-routing overhead the reported counts do not include.
- **XY-mixer $XX+YY$ (Givens / iSWAP-family) couplings must be decomposed.** The mixer is a ring of $e^{-i(\beta/2)(X_k X_{k+1} + Y_k Y_{k+1})}$ terms. On the trapped-ion arbitrary-angle Mølmer-Sørensen entangler these map efficiently; on a fixed-angle CZ/CNOT gate set each term needs several two-qubit gates, inflating the budget.
- **Native arbitrary-angle two-qubit rotation assumed.** Table 1 counts are post-transpilation for H1’s arbitrary-angle native basis via $t|ket\rangle$. Hardware restricted to fixed-angle entanglers (CZ, \sqrt{i} SWAP) would not reproduce these counts directly.
- **Dicke-state initial-state preparation is a hard, dominant overhead.** It is the price of native constraint preservation: 347 of 765 two-qubit gates at 20 qubits. Any portability comparison must keep state preparation and the optimisation layer as separate line items, because the prep cost is what distinguishes XY-QAOA from QAOA and L-VQE.
- **Constraint preservation is structural, not penalty-based.** The portability story changes entirely if a target device forces the

penalty formulation (Eqs. 7-8): the Hamming-weight constraint then becomes soft, the in-constraint-probability / approximation-ratio trade-off returns, and the resource profile shifts from “deep prep plus shallow optimisation” to “shallow circuit plus hard classical parameter tuning.”

- **No mid-circuit measurement, qubit reuse, error correction, or error mitigation used.** The demonstration does not lean on H1-specific advanced features beyond all-to-all connectivity, which is favourable for porting in that narrow sense.

2.7 Caveats

- **Full access.** The paper (arXiv:2206.06290) is open access and the complete LaTeX source, including all appendices and Table 1, is present in `paper-source/`. No section was unreachable; nothing was paywalled.
- **Internal inconsistency on the constraint value M for the 20-qubit set.** Methods (Sec. 3) states a required summary length $M = 8$ for both the $N = 20$ and $N = 14$ instance sets. Two other places disagree and agree with each other: Table 2 lists the Hamming-weight constraint (H.W.C.) as 8 for the 14-qubit row and **14** for the 20-qubit row, and Appendix D states summaries of “8 and 14 sentences respectively” for the 14- and 20-sentence articles. The internally consistent reading across two independent statements is $N = 14 \rightarrow M = 8$ and $N = 20 \rightarrow M = 14$; the Methods “ $M = 8$ ” for the 20-qubit set appears to be a typo. Flagged because the constraint value sets the size of the feasible subspace and the Dicke-state target.
- **Apparent typo in optimiser settings.** Appendix B reads “5 for L-VQE with 5 qubits”; given the experiments use 14- and 20-qubit problems, this is most plausibly “20 qubits.” Reported as written.
- **Parameters optimised in simulation, not on hardware.** This is not a full hardware-in-the-loop variational run: the classical optimiser (COBYLA / grid search) runs in noiseless simulation, and only the resulting fixed circuits execute on H1-1. The “classical loop iterations” on hardware are therefore effectively zero, which matters for any runtime or feedback-latency portability claim.
- **Wall-clock runtime not reported.** Only the qualitative statement that XY-QAOA’s depth led to “high running time on trapped-ion hardware,” which limited XY-QAOA to three instances per size.
- **Dossier date prefix is not the paper year.** The slug and dossier are dated 2026 (triage/bootstrap), but arXiv:2206.06290 is a 2022 demonstration; H1-1 was the 20-qubit preview-access machine of that period. Hardware figures of merit quoted here are the 2022 datasheet values, not current H-series specs.

3 Portability matrix