

# Benchmarking Quantum Optimization for the Maximum-Cut Problem on a Superconducting Quantum Computer

Portability dossier - app

agQSL portability pipeline

2026-06-07

---

Field	Value
Slug	2026-arxiv-2404.17579-benchmarking-quantum-optimization-maximum-cut-problem
Source	arXiv
Link	<a href="https://arxiv.org/abs/2404.17579">https://arxiv.org/abs/2404.17579</a>
Category	app
Triaged	2026-06-07 by port_until_julien_parallel
Bootstrapped	2026-06-07

---

## Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>Source</b>	<b>3</b>
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
<b>2</b>	<b>Extraction</b>	<b>5</b>

2.1	What the paper does (one paragraph)	5
2.2	Quantum hardware used	5
2.3	Computational primitive	5
2.4	Resource fingerprint	5
2.5	Assumptions and results	7
2.6	Portability flags	8
2.7	Caveats	8
<b>3</b>	<b>Portability matrix</b>	<b>10</b>

# 1 Source

## 1.1 Domain classification

**optimisation.** The paper is squarely combinatorial optimisation: maximum-cut on unit-weight 3-regular graphs, solved with a hybrid quantum-classical relax-and-round pipeline and benchmarked against classical heuristics. There is no meaningful secondary domain; the hardware and error-mitigation content supports the optimisation claim rather than standing as a separate application.

## 1.2 Expert persona for Julien

A quantum-optimisation specialist comfortable with QAOA on superconducting hardware and with semidefinite-programming-style relax-and-round (Goemans-Williamson) hybrids. Should have calibrated intuition about the sampling budget needed to estimate a correlation matrix from bitstrings, about swap-network compilation onto a short linear qubit chain, and about the noise-mitigation stack used here (randomized compilation plus readout-error mitigation). The key judgement is disentangling how much of the headline  $\approx 99\%$  approximation ratio comes from the quantum circuit itself versus the classical greedy local search and the light-cone subgraph decomposition that lets a 7-qubit chain stand in for problems of thousands of variables.

## 1.3 Related prior work (brief bibliography)

- Farhi, Goldstone, Gutmann, *A Quantum Approximate Optimization Algorithm*, arXiv:1411.4028. The QAOA primitive underlying the quantum solver.
- Goemans & Williamson, *Improved approximation algorithms for maximum cut and satisfiability problems using semidefinite programming*, J. ACM 42, 1115 (1995), DOI 10.1145/227683.227684. The classical SDP relax-and-round baseline the quantum method is designed to mirror and beat.
- Dupont & Sundar, *Extending relax-and-round combinatorial optimization solvers with quantum correlations*, Phys. Rev. A 109, 012429 (2024), arXiv:2307.05821. The method paper for the quantum relax-and-round solver this work scales up and benchmarks.
- Dupont et al., *Quantum-Enhanced Greedy Combinatorial Optimization Solver*, Sci. Adv. 9, eadi0487 (2023), arXiv:2303.05509. Same group’s earlier superconducting demonstration (SK spin glasses, up to 72 qubits); useful for calibrating what counts as enhancement on Rigetti hardware.
- Ebadi et al., *Quantum optimization of maximum independent set using Rydberg atom arrays*, Science 376, 1209 (2022), arXiv:2202.09372. Same optimisation ambition on a different vendor (neutral atoms); the headline scaling-advantage comparison the paper positions itself against.
- King et al. (D-Wave), *Scaling Advantage in Approximate Optimization with Quantum Annealing*, Phys. Rev. Lett. 134, 160601 (2025), arXiv:2401.07184. The quantum-annealer route to the same optimisation goal; a third vendor modality for portability framing.

## 1.4 Difficulty estimate

medium. The full text is available locally as `paper.html` plus LaTeX source (`paper-source/main.tex`) with no paywall, so fetchability is not a concern. However the appendix is heavy (sections A through E, roughly two dozen figures) and packs many primitives: QAOA, quantum relax-and-round, Goemans-Williamson, Burer-Monteiro, simulated annealing, parallel tempering, plus a light-cone subgraph decomposition, swap-network compilation, and randomized compilation. The actual hardware fingerprint is concentrated and clean (84-qubit Rigetti Ankaa-2, square lattice with tunable couplers, but only a continuous 7-qubit linear chain used, with per-qubit gate fidelities and durations tabulated in Appendix A.1). Julien's effort is mainly in separating what ran on the QPU from what was classically emulated, and in reading the  $N$ -to-7-qubit light-cone trick correctly, rather than in hunting for missing detail.

## 2 Extraction

### 2.1 What the paper does (one paragraph)

The authors (Rigetti and collaborators) benchmark a hybrid quantum-classical solver for the maximum-cut problem on unit-weight random 3-regular graphs, ranging from  $N = 32$  up to  $N = 4,096$  variables. The quantum part is a QAOA at  $p = 1$  with fixed, pre-tabulated variational angles. Rather than sampling solution bitstrings, they read out two-body correlations  $\langle \hat{Z}_i \hat{Z}_j \rangle$  and feed them to a relax-and-round post-processing step (the QRR algorithm) plus a classical greedy local search (QRR\*). A light-cone argument plus graph isomorphism means that, at  $p = 1$  on 3-regular graphs, every correlation comes from one of only 44 distinct subgraphs, each needing at most 7 qubits, so a continuous 7-qubit chain on the 84-qubit Ankaa-2 device stands in for problems of thousands of variables. They report a 99% average approximation ratio and benchmark projected run-time against Gurobi, simulated annealing and the Burer-Monteiro heuristic, concluding the method is competitive with Gurobi but short of the others in the low-depth regime.

### 2.2 Quantum hardware used

- **Vendor / machine:** Rigetti Computing / Ankaa-2 superconducting QPU, accessed via Rigetti Quantum Cloud Services (QCS), pyQuil API.
- **Qubit count:** 7 used (a continuous linear chain, device labels 28 to 34) / 84 available.
- **Connectivity:** Square-lattice topology with tunable couplers; only a linear (nearest-neighbour) chain of 7 qubits was used. Non-adjacent logical interactions were realised through a swap network.
- **Gate set:** Native gates are  $\text{Rx}(\phi) = \exp(-i\hat{X}\phi/2)$  with  $\phi = \pm\pi/2$ , virtual  $\text{Rz}(\theta) = \exp(-i\hat{Z}\theta/2)$  (error-free), and the two-qubit  $\text{ISWAP} = \exp[i\pi(\hat{X} \otimes \hat{X} + \hat{Y} \otimes \hat{Y})/4]$ . Algorithmic  $\text{Rx}(\phi)$  for arbitrary  $\phi$ , the Hadamard,  $\text{Rzz}(\phi)$  and  $\text{Rzz}(\phi) \times \text{SWAP}$  are compiled from these (App. on compilation).
- **Notable features leveraged:** tunable-coupler  $\text{ISWAP}$ ; randomized compilation (Pauli twirling, 50 randomizations, TrueQ); readout-error mitigation (Iterative Bayesian Unfolding on marginal distributions); active reset (3x read-and-reset, used in the projected run-time model). Light-cone subgraph decomposition and a linear-chain swap network are the compilation tricks that keep the hardware footprint at 7 qubits.

### 2.3 Computational primitive

QAOA (at  $p = 1$ , with fixed non-optimised angles) used as a two-body correlation-sampling subroutine inside a classical relax-and-round solver. There is no variational optimisation loop on the device. In the taxonomy list this is closest to **QAOA / sampling**; the headline solver is a hybrid where the quantum step only supplies the correlation matrix  $\mathbf{Z}_{ij} = (\delta_{ij} - 1) \langle \hat{Z}_i \hat{Z}_j \rangle_p$ .

### 2.4 Resource fingerprint

Metric	Value	Source (page / equation / SI)
Qubits (logical)	7 per $p = 1$ subcircuit; problem variables $N$ up to 4,096 addressed via light-cone decomposition	§“Quantum Optimization” (1 qubit problem-variable mapping); Fig. 1a; App. A.1
Qubits (physical)	7 used / 84 available on Ankaa-2	App. A.1, Tab. of qubit characteristics (“continuous linear chain of seven qubits”; “84-qubit ... chip”)
Circuit depth	Not reported as a single number. Run circuits are $p = 1$ QAOA on $\leq 7$ qubits compiled with a worst-case linear-chain swap network, giving $O(Np)$ two-qubit-gate layers	App. “Executing Quantum Circuits” / swap-network and run-time sections
2Q-gate count (total)	Not reported as a single total. A default swap network for an $N$ -node $p = 1$ phase separator needs $3N(N - 1)/2$ ISWAP gates (so 63 for $N = 7$ ); an efficient finder reduces this by $\approx 52\%$ at $p = 1$	App. swap-network section ( $3N(N - 1)/2$ ; 52%/73%/85% reductions at $p = 1/2/3$ )
Measurement shots	$10^4$ bit strings per circuit (experiment); $n \gtrsim 5 \times 10^3$ gives best performance; run-time analysis assumes $n = 5 \times 10^4$ (Fig. 2) and a $p$ -dependent count (Fig. 3)	§“Quantum Optimization” (“ $n = 10^4$ ”); Fig. 2/3 captions
Classical loop iter.	No variational quantum-classical loop (fixed tabulated $\gamma_\ell, \beta_\ell$ ). Classical greedy local search uses 10 steps	§“Quantum Speedup” (fixed parameters); Tab. of QRR* run-time caption (“10 local greedy steps”)

Metric	Value	Source (page / equation / SI)
Wall-clock runtime	Modelled / projected, not measured end-to-end. e.g. $N = 4,096$ , $p = 1$ : $\approx 59.5$ s on $M = 100$ qubits; $\approx 7.0$ s on $M = 1,000$ qubits; $\approx 5.75$ s with literature-best gate times. Prose says “tens of seconds” (intro) and “tenths of seconds” (conclusion)	Tab. of QRR* run-time ( $t_Q + t_C$ entries); §Introduction; §Conclusions

For the rows marked “not reported as a single number/total”, the paper gives the scaling formulae and per-subcircuit costs but no aggregate depth or two-qubit-gate count for the experimental campaign; I have not inferred one.

## 2.5 Assumptions and results

- **Claim.** An average approximation ratio of 99% ( $1 - \alpha \simeq 1\%$ ) over thousands of random 3-regular maximum-cut instances from  $N = 32$  to  $N = 4,096$ , using QRR\* with  $p = 1$ , with all device work done on a 7-qubit chain via the light-cone decomposition. Projected quantum-plus-classical run-time is competitive with Gurobi but short of simulated annealing and Burer-Monteiro in the low- $p$  regime, on a hypothetical 100-qubit machine.
- **Decomposing the headline number.** The paper is explicit that the quantum circuit is not doing the heavy lifting at  $p = 1$ : the QAOA alone yields only  $1 - \alpha \simeq 30\%$ ; the relax-and-round step brings this to  $\simeq 3\%$ ; the classical greedy local search brings it to  $\simeq 1\%$ . The authors also prove that at  $p = 1$  the QRR is approximately equivalent to a purely classical relax-and-round on the graph adjacency matrix  $W$  (same leading eigenvectors, same cut), so the  $p = 1$  “quantum” result carries no advantage over a classical spectral method. Genuine separation requires  $p \geq 2$ , which was obtained from classical state-vector emulation, not from the QPU.
- **Error bars and noise.** Plots show one standard deviation. The Pearson correlation between experimental and emulated two-body expectation values is  $r > 0.95$  across all four mitigation scenarios (raw, REM, RC, RC+REM). The device expectation magnitudes are reduced by noise, understood through a depolarizing channel  $\hat{\rho}_{p,F} = F |\Psi\rangle\langle\Psi|_p + (1 - F)\hat{1}/2^N$ , which rescales correlations by the fidelity  $F$  but leaves the eigenvectors of the correlation matrix unchanged. That invariance is why a low-fidelity  $p = 1$  circuit still yields a usable rounding direction. Measured qubit characteristics (7-qubit chain): average  $T_1 = 11.6 \mu\text{s}$ , Rx fidelity 99.2% (error 0.8%, duration 40 ns), ISWAP fidelity 98.1% (error 1.9%, duration 122 ns), readout fidelity 94.5%.
- **Classical baselines.** Gurobi 11.0.0 (600 s limit, single thread, AMD EPYC 7643), simulated annealing, parallel tempering, and

the MQLib/Burer2002 Burer-Monteiro heuristic (the strongest for 3-regular maximum-cut). Classical run-times were measured on a 64 GB Apple M1 Max MacBook Pro.

## 2.6 Portability flags

- **Native ISWAP entangler.** The algorithm is compiled to ISWAP; on a CZ/CNOT-native platform the phase-separator-plus-swap primitive ( $\text{Rzz}(\phi) \times \text{SWAP}$ , costing 3 ISWAP here) must be re-decomposed. No physics blocks this; it is a compilation cost.
- **Linear-chain connectivity is sufficient.** Only nearest-neighbour coupling on a 7-qubit chain is used; the swap network handles non-adjacent logical edges within each  $\leq 7$ -qubit subgraph. This is a portability strength: the method does not need all-to-all hardware. Required subgraph size grows as  $1 + 6(2^p - 1)$  (7 at  $p = 1$ , 19 at  $p = 2$ , 43 at  $p = 3$ ), independent of  $N$ .
- **Light-cone decomposition depends on sparse problem structure, not on hardware.** Trading one  $N$ -qubit circuit for  $O(N)$  small subcircuits relies on 3-regular sparsity and on working with expectation values rather than full bitstrings. It does not port to dense problems, where the light cone covers the whole graph. This is the single feature that lets 7 qubits stand in for thousands of variables, so any portability comparison must keep it in scope.
- **Error mitigation is software-level and vendor-agnostic.** Randomized compilation (Pauli twirling) and Iterative Bayesian Unfolding readout mitigation are not tied to Rigetti hardware and port to any gate-based platform.
- **Depolarizing-noise robustness ports.** Because uniform depolarizing noise only rescales the correlation matrix and preserves its eigenvectors, the rounding step tolerates low circuit fidelity on any platform whose noise is approximately depolarizing after twirling.
- **No mid-circuit measurement or dynamic branching in the algorithm.** Active reset (measure-and-conditionally-flip between shots) appears only in the projected run-time model for inter-shot reset, not as algorithmic mid-circuit measurement; the measured QCS run used the default passive reset (200  $\mu\text{s}$ ). A platform without fast active reset pays a per-shot reset penalty but can still run the algorithm.
- **No variational closed loop.** Fixed tabulated angles remove the latency-sensitive classical optimiser from the loop, so the method does not depend on fast quantum-classical round-trips. Portable.

## 2.7 Caveats

- **Access was complete, not paywalled.** Full text was available locally as `paper.html` and the arXiv LaTeX source (`paper-source/main.tex`, plus all figure PDFs). Equations and hardware numbers were taken from the TeX source. No section was unreachable.
- **What actually ran on the QPU is narrow.** Hardware execution was limited to the 44 distinct  $p = 1$  QAOA subcircuits ( $\leq 7$  qubits each,  $10^4$  shots) needed to estimate the 44 unique two-body correlations. Everything at scale (all  $N > 7$  results, the thousands of instances, the 99% figure) is classical post-processing of those 44 measured correlations via graph isomorphism, and the  $p = 2$  results in Fig. 1d come from noiseless state-vector emulation rather than the device. The paper is clear about this,

but the headline framing (“up to several thousand variables on a superconducting quantum computer”) should be read with that decomposition in mind.

- **Wall-clock run-times are modelled, not measured end-to-end.** The quoted seconds come from the run-time model of Eq. for  $\tilde{t}_{\text{ex}}$  and the QRR\* run-time table, assuming idealised active reset, hypothetical  $M = 100$  or  $M = 1,000$  qubit machines, and in some columns literature-best gate speeds ( $t_{\text{Rx}} = 20$  ns,  $t_{\text{ISWAP}} = 50$  ns). The measured QCS run-time is about  $3\times$  slower than this model.
- **Internal prose inconsistency on run-time.** The introduction says “tens of seconds” for several thousand variables while the conclusion says “tenths of seconds”; the run-time table is the authoritative source and gives, for example, 59.5 s at  $N = 4,096$  on  $M = 100$  qubits ( $p = 1$ ) down to a few seconds on  $M = 1,000$  qubits. I report the table values and flag the discrepancy rather than resolve it.

### 3 Portability matrix