

arXiv:2405.05068

Portability dossier - app

agQSL portability pipeline

2026-06-07

Field	Value
Slug	2026-arxiv-2405.05068-candidate
Source	arXiv
Link	<a href="https://arxiv.org/abs/2405.05068">https://arxiv.org/abs/2405.05068</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 . . . . .	6
2.4	Resource fingerprint . . . . .	6
2.5	Assumptions and results . . . . .	7
2.6	Portability flags . . . . .	7
2.7	Caveats . . . . .	8
<b>3</b>	<b>Portability matrix</b>	<b>9</b>

# 1 Source

Paper identified from the local source: *Chemistry Beyond the Scale of Exact Diagonalization on a Quantum-Centric Supercomputer* (Robledo-Moreno et al.), arXiv:2405.05068. The method is Sample-Based Quantum Diagonalization (SQD): a local unitary cluster Jastrow (LUCJ) state is prepared and sampled on an IBM Heron superconducting processor, and the resulting bitstrings seed a self-consistent configuration-recovery and selected-CI diagonalisation run classically on the Fugaku supercomputer. Demonstrated on the ground-state dissociation of  $N_2$  and on the [2Fe-2S] and [4Fe-4S] iron-sulfur clusters, with circuits up to 77 qubits and 10,570 gates.

## 1.1 Domain classification

**Quantum chemistry** (electronic structure, ground-state energies). This is the primary domain throughout:  $N_2$  dissociation in 6-31G and cc-pVDZ basis sets, and the iron-sulfur clusters in tailored active spaces.

Secondary threads worth flagging for Julien: bio-inorganic chemistry (the iron-sulfur clusters are the redox-active cofactors of nitrogenase, ferredoxins, and respiratory complexes, which is why they are chosen as a hard strong-correlation target) and HPC / quantum-centric supercomputing integration (the classical eigensolver runs at scale on Fugaku). Treat it as a chemistry paper; the supercomputing angle matters only for separating the quantum from the classical resource accounting.

## 1.2 Expert persona for Julien

A computational quantum chemist fluent in active-space methods (CASCI, CASSCF, and the selected-CI family: CIPSI, heat-bath CI) and in post-Hartree-Fock treatment of strong correlation in transition-metal systems. Should have hands-on familiarity with VQE-style state preparation, and specifically with the local unitary cluster Jastrow (LUCJ) circuit and how it maps onto a heavy-hex superconducting topology (IBM Heron, tunable-coupler and fractional gates). Needs calibrated intuition about active-space selection for iron-sulfur clusters, measurement shot budgets, and the configuration-recovery loop, so as to cleanly separate the irreducibly quantum sampling step (run on Heron) from the classical diagonalisation (run on Fugaku) when fingerprinting the hardware requirement.

## 1.3 Related prior work (brief bibliography)

- **LUCJ ansatz, the circuit primitive used here.** M. Motta, K. J. Sung, K. B. Whaley, M. Head-Gordon, J. Shee, *Bridging physical intuition and hardware efficiency for correlated electronic states: the local unitary cluster Jastrow ansatz for electronic structure*, Chem. Sci. (2023). DOI: [10.1039/d3sc02516k](https://doi.org/10.1039/d3sc02516k). Defines the truncated LUCJ circuit and its heavy-hex mapping; required reading to fingerprint the quantum circuit.
- **QSCI, the same primitive from a different group.** K. Kanno et al., *Quantum-Selected Configuration Interaction: classical diagonalization of Hamiltonians in subspaces selected by quantum computers*, arXiv:2302.11320. The “sample bitstrings, build a

CI subspace, diagonalise classically” idea that SQD generalises; useful as an independent (QunaSys) realisation for a portability comparison.

- **ADAPT-QSCI, the adaptive variant.** Y. O. Nakagawa et al., *ADAPT-QSCI: Adaptive Construction of Input State for Quantum-Selected Configuration Interaction*, arXiv:2311.01105. Shows the input-state choice is itself a design axis, relevant when comparing what each vendor’s ansatz buys.
- **Classical benchmark for the same systems.** S. Sharma, K. Sivalingam, F. Neese, G. K.-L. Chan, *Low-energy spectrum of iron-sulfur clusters directly from many-particle quantum mechanics*, Nat. Chem. 6, 927 (2014). arXiv:1408.5080, DOI: 10.1038/nchem.2041. DMRG reference numbers for [2Fe-2S] and [4Fe-4S]; the classical yardstick this work is measured against.
- **Hardware-platform context.** Y. Kim et al., *Evidence for the utility of quantum computing before fault tolerance*, Nature 618, 500 (2023). DOI: 10.1038/s41586-023-06096-3. The IBM heavy-hex superconducting platform and error-rate regime this work builds on, here advanced onto a Heron device.

#### 1.4 Difficulty estimate

**High.** Three distinct chemical systems ( $N_2$  in two basis sets, plus the [2Fe-2S] and [4Fe-4S] active spaces), circuits up to 77 qubits and 10,570 gates, and a two-part workflow whose hardware fingerprint (the LUCJ sampling on Heron) must be separated carefully from a large classical component (configuration recovery and diagonalisation on Fugaku). The paper leans heavily on its supplementary material, with numerous SI figures for orbital occupancies, the S-CORE correction, uniform-versus-hardware sampling, and runtimes. Mitigating factor: the full author source is present in `paper-source/` (`main.tex`, `main.bib`, and all figures) and the work is open (arXiv preprint, no paywall or fetch barrier), so Julien has the LaTeX and the bibliography in hand. Budget a long extraction, not a blocked one.

## 2 Extraction

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

The paper introduces Sample-Based Quantum Diagonalization (SQD), a hybrid workflow that uses a quantum processor for one narrow job and a classical supercomputer for everything else. A shallow, hardware-friendly trial state (the local unitary cluster Jastrow, or LUCJ, circuit) is prepared on an IBM superconducting processor and measured in the computational basis, producing many bitstrings that stand for electronic configurations (Slater determinants). These noisy samples are shipped to the Fugaku supercomputer, where a self-consistent “configuration recovery” step repairs configurations corrupted by noise, and a selected configuration-interaction solver projects and diagonalises the molecular Hamiltonian inside the sampled subspace. The output is a variational (upper-bound) ground-state energy and a sparse wavefunction. The method is demonstrated on  $N_2$  bond breaking and on the [2Fe-2S] and [4Fe-4S] iron-sulfur clusters, with the largest case, (54e,36o), lying far beyond the reach of exact diagonalisation.

### 2.2 Quantum hardware used

- **Vendor / machine:** IBM Quantum. The main text describes the platform as a 133-qubit **Heron** superconducting processor. The Supplementary table (Table S1, `tab:hardware details`) names the specific backends as `ibm_torino` (the 133-qubit Heron, used for the  $N_2$ /cc-pVDZ, [2Fe-2S] and [4Fe-4S] runs) and `ibm_nazca` (used only for the small  $N_2$ /6-31G run). See Caveats on the device-naming point.
- **Qubit count:** Largest experiment uses 77 of 133 qubits (72 Jordan-Wigner data qubits + 5 auxiliary) for [4Fe-4S]. Per-system counts (JW data / total incl. auxiliary):  $N_2$ /6-31G 32/36;  $N_2$ /cc-pVDZ 52/58; [2Fe-2S] 40/45; [4Fe-4S] 72/77 (Table S1).
- **Connectivity:** Heavy-hex. The locality approximation of the LUCJ ansatz is tailored to heavy-hex: same-spin density-density terms act on adjacent qubits of a “zig-zag” chain, opposite-spin terms are routed through auxiliary qubits at orbital indices  $p \bmod 4 = 0$  (Materials and Methods, “Mapping to heavy-hex processors”; vendor-notes confirm IBM’s heavy-hex lattice).
- **Gate set:** The paper compiles every circuit into single-qubit  $U_3(\theta, \phi, \lambda)$  rotations and two-qubit CNOT gates, and reports two-qubit counts as CNOT counts (SI “Compiled circuits”; Table S1 column ( $d$ , CNOT,  $u$ )). The Jastrow primitive is the number-number gate

$$U_{nn}(\varphi) = \exp(i\varphi(1 - Z_0)(1 - Z_1)/4) = \exp(-i\frac{\varphi}{4}(Z_p + Z_q - Z_p Z_q)),$$

a  $ZZ$ -type rotation. (Substrate note, not from the paper: Heron’s native two-qubit entangler is a tunable-coupler CZ with a native  $Z \otimes Z$  interaction and a fractional-gate basis  $R_{ZZ}(\theta)$ ; the  $U_{nn}$  primitive maps naturally onto that native  $R_{ZZ}$ .)

- **Notable features leveraged:** Reset-mitigation post-selection (an extra measurement before the circuit, post-selecting on the  $|00\dots 0\rangle$  initial state,  $\sim 1/3$  retention); twirled readout error mitigation (ROEM); dynamical decoupling (pairs of  $X$  pulses on idle qubits, Ramsey-echo style). No mid-circuit measurement or dynamic circuits are used inside the algorithm itself; the quantum role is single-shot state preparation plus computational-basis sampling.

### 2.3 Computational primitive

**Sampling.** The quantum processor prepares one fixed, non-optimised LUCJ trial state and samples it in the computational basis; the bitstrings seed a classical selected configuration-interaction diagonalisation (the SQD / QSCI primitive). This is explicitly **not** VQE: the circuit parameters are fixed from a classical CCSD calculation and there is no hardware-in-the-loop parameter optimisation (the authors call the experiments “optimization-free”). There is also no Trotterised time evolution and no quantum phase estimation.

### 2.4 Resource fingerprint

Values are given per experiment in the order  $\text{N}_2/6\text{-}31\text{G}$  ;  $\text{N}_2/\text{cc-pVDZ}$  ;  $[2\text{Fe-}2\text{S}]$  ;  $[4\text{Fe-}4\text{S}]$ . There is no quantum error correction, so “logical” below means Jordan-Wigner data qubits (not QEC logical qubits) and “physical” means total physical qubits used including auxiliary qubits.

Metric	Value	Source (page / equation / SI)
Qubits (logical)	32 ; 52 ; 40 ; 72 (JW data qubits)	Table S1 <code>tab:hardware details</code>
Qubits (physical)	36 ; 58 ; 45 ; 77 (incl. auxiliary)	Table S1; main text (77 of 133)
Circuit depth	148 ; 223 ; 173 ; 301	Table S1 (column $d$ )
2Q-gate count (total)	762 ; 1792 ; 1100 ; 3590 CNOT (total gates 2170 ; 5204 ; 3170 ; 10570)	Table S1; SI list (lines: 1100/3170, 1792/5204, 3590/10570)
Measurement shots	$1 \cdot 10^5$ ; $9.8304 \cdot 10^4$ ; $2.4576 \cdot 10^6$ ; $2.4576 \cdot 10^6$ (per dissociation point for $\text{N}_2$ )	Table S1 ( $ \tilde{\mathcal{X}} $ ); Results
Classical loop iter.	converges in 3, max 5 in general; $\text{N}_2/\text{cc-pVDZ}$ used 10; $[4\text{Fe-}4\text{S}]$ used 2 (warm-started from 10 iters at $d = 250\text{K}$ )	Results (Configuration recovery); main text
Wall-clock runtime	quantum \$ <i>45minpersystem(allN_2\$</i> bond points combined); classical $[4\text{Fe-}4\text{S}]$ \$ \$1.5 h per diagonalisation at 64 nodes	Results; “Implementation on a quantum computer”

Additional resource context (not in the table above):

- **Batches  $K$ :**  $K = 10$  for all reported experiments; up to  $K = 100$  for the  $[4\text{Fe-}4\text{S}]$  statistical-convergence study.
- **Subspace dimension  $d$  (classical):**  $d = 16 \cdot 10^6$  for  $\text{N}_2/\text{cc-pVDZ}$ ; up to  $d = 100\text{M}$  for  $[4\text{Fe-}4\text{S}]$ ; a 58M-dimensional subspace in the  $[2\text{Fe-}2\text{S}]$  optimised-circuit comparison; largest HCI reference  $d = 2.3\text{M}$  on 16 nodes (\$ \$16 min).
- **Classical hardware:** Fugaku, 6400 nodes for the largest  $[4\text{Fe-}4\text{S}]$  run (64 nodes per diagonalisation  $\times K = 100$  batches); each Fugaku node has 48 cores, 32 GiB. Solvers: PySCF (Davidson) and DICE (distributed HCI).

- **Device quality (77-qubit subset):** median two-qubit fidelity 99.77%, single-qubit 99.97%, readout 98.37%; median  $T_1 = 180 \mu\text{s}$ ,  $T_2 = 150 \mu\text{s}$  (main text, “Implementation on a quantum computer”).
- **Correct-particle-number sampling efficiency  $p_N^{\text{hw}}$  (95% c.i.):**  $\text{N}_2/6\text{-}31\text{G}$  (0.0069, 0.0071);  $\text{N}_2/\text{cc-pVDZ}$  (0.0016, 0.0017);  $[2\text{Fe-}2\text{S}]$  (0.0044, 0.0045);  $[4\text{Fe-}4\text{S}]$  ( $4.69 \cdot 10^{-5}$ ,  $6.61 \cdot 10^{-5}$ ) (Table S1). For  $[4\text{Fe-}4\text{S}]$ , only roughly 1 in 20000 raw shots already carries the correct particle number before recovery.

## 2.5 Assumptions and results

- **What was claimed.** A quantum-centric supercomputing workflow can compute ground-state energies for active spaces beyond exact diagonalisation. FCI is limited to roughly (22e,22o) to (26e,23o); the largest case here is (54e,36o) for  $[4\text{Fe-}4\text{S}]$ , whose Hilbert-space dimension is  $D = \binom{N_{\text{MO}}}{N/2}^2 \approx 8.86 \cdot 10^{15}$  (Table 1). The authors claim SQD energies agree with the best classical selected-CI (HCI) to within tens of  $mE_{\text{h}}$  for  $\text{N}_2$ , and that the quantum samples for  $[4\text{Fe-}4\text{S}]$  carry a signal clearly distinguishable from uniform random sampling (pure noise) at circuit sizes of  $\$3.5\text{k}$  two-qubit gates.
- **Error bars / noise assumptions.** Hardware fractions  $p_N^{\text{hw}}$  are given with 95% confidence intervals (Table S1). Energies are obtained by energy-variance extrapolation, where  $\delta E$  vanishes linearly with  $\Delta H/E^2$  (Materials and Methods). A noise-robustness study uses a global depolarising model,  $\widetilde{P}_{\Psi_{\text{G}}}(\mathbf{x}) = \alpha P_{\Psi_{\text{G}}}(\mathbf{x}) + (1 - \alpha) 2^{-M}$ , showing that configuration recovery reaches sub-10  $mE_{\text{h}}$  error from only  $\$2\%$  retained signal versus  $\$20\%$  without recovery (Fig. 2). An  $\hat{S}^2$  soft penalty with Lagrange multiplier  $\lambda = 0.2$  enforces approximate spin symmetry.
- **Comparison to classical baseline.**  $\text{N}_2$  is compared against RHF, MP2, CCSD (which fails on static correlation), CASCI/FCI (6-31G) and HCI (the reference). The iron-sulfur clusters are compared against the DMRG reference energies of Li et al. (2017) and against HCI, and  $[4\text{Fe-}4\text{S}]$  against a uniform-sampling baseline because no exact solution exists. SQD does not reach chemical accuracy ( $1.6 mE_{\text{h}}$ ) for these systems; the claim is variational competitiveness with classical selected-CI, not exactness.

## 2.6 Portability flags

Features this paper leans on that matter for the portability analysis:

- **Heavy-hex-tailored ansatz.** The LUCJ locality approximation (which Jastrow terms are kept) is chosen specifically for heavy-hex connectivity. On all-to-all hardware (trapped ions, some neutral-atom schemes) this restriction is unnecessary and the fuller UCJ ansatz with richer distributions becomes available; on a different fixed topology the retained terms and the SWAP network change.
- **Auxiliary-qubit routing for opposite-spin coupling.** Opposite-spin Jastrow terms are mediated by auxiliary qubits bridging the two spin chains. On a 133-qubit heavy-hex device, for  $N_{\text{MO}} > 21$  one cannot couple all  $N_{\text{MO}}/4$  opposite-spin pairs (no more than 6 can be coupled); the authors call this a fundamental layout limit removable only by a different fermion-to-qubit mapping or larger processors. This is a device-size and topology constraint, not a gate constraint.
- **ZZ-type number-number gate.** The Jastrow primitive  $U_{nn}(\varphi)$  is a  $ZZ$  rotation that maps naturally onto Heron’s native  $R_{ZZ}(\theta)$

fractional gate / CZ family. On a platform whose native entangler is XX / Mølmer-Sørensen (trapped ions) or iSWAP, it must be decomposed; the paper itself reports CNOT-compiled counts, so the 2Q-gate budget is gate-set dependent.

- **Sampling efficiency is fidelity- and connectivity-bound.** Only  $\sim 5 \cdot 10^{-5}$  of raw [4Fe-4S] shots carry the correct particle number before recovery. On a noisier or lower-connectivity device this fraction collapses further, raising the shot budget required to seed configuration recovery. The method’s viability hinges on getting enough correct-sector samples, so it is sensitive to two-qubit fidelity at depth \$ 300 and \$3590 CNOTs.
- **Reset-mitigation post-selection.** An extra leading measurement post-selects on  $|00 \dots 0\rangle$  with  $\sim 1/3$  retention, costing roughly  $3\times$  shots. This needs reliable measurement and reset; it is broadly portable but adds overhead.
- **Readout mitigation and dynamical decoupling.** ROEM and X-pulse dynamical decoupling are used. Both rely on pulse-level control that most platforms expose, but they are part of the recipe that makes the signal usable.
- **Portability-friendly counterpoint.** The quantum role is sampling-only and optimisation-free, with no mid-circuit measurement, no dynamic circuits and no hardware feedback loop inside the algorithm. Any sampler able to prepare the LUCJ state and measure in the computational basis can in principle play the quantum role; the binding constraint is two-qubit fidelity and connectivity at the required depth, not exotic hardware primitives.

## 2.7 Caveats

- **Access.** Open-access arXiv preprint with the full author LaTeX source present in `paper-source/` (`main.tex`, `figures`, `.bbl`). No paywall or fetch barrier. The main text and the complete Materials and Methods plus the resource sections of the supplement (circuit table, classical-resource details) were read in full. The numerous SI figures that are plots only (orbital occupancies, S-CORE-vs-no-S-CORE, uniform-vs-hardware comparisons, per-bond-length amplitudes) were not pixel-read; all resource-bearing tables and text were accessible, so no resource number here is blocked or inferred from a figure.
- **Device-naming discrepancy.** The main text uniformly calls the platform “Heron” (a 133-qubit Heron processor; the 77-qubit [4Fe-4S] run is on `ibm_torino`, which is that 133-qubit Heron). The SI table, however, lists `ibm_nazca` for the small  $N_2/6-31G$  run. The paper does not state `ibm_nazca`’s generation; under IBM’s device naming it sits outside the Heron series (Eagle-generation, 127 qubits), so the 6-31G run may have been on a different processor generation than the headline Heron results. Flagged as an internal inconsistency rather than resolved, since the paper does not spell it out. None of the flagship resource claims (77 qubits, 10,570 gates, 3.5k two-qubit gates) depend on the `ibm_nazca` run.
- **Two meanings of  $d$ .** In Table S1,  $d$  denotes circuit depth; elsewhere in the paper  $d$  denotes the classical subspace dimension. The values above keep them separate.
- **Shot-count rounding.** The main text rounds the  $N_2/cc$ -pVDZ shot count to  $100 \cdot 10^3$ ; the SI table gives the precise  $9.8304 \cdot 10^4$ . The precise SI value is used in the fingerprint.

### 3 Portability matrix