

# Calculating the energy profile of an enzymatic reaction on a quantum computer

Portability dossier - app

agQSL portability pipeline

2026-06-07

Field	Value
Slug	2026-arxiv-2408.11091-calculating-energy-profile-enzymatic-reaction-quantum
Source	arXiv
Link	<a href="https://arxiv.org/abs/2408.11091">https://arxiv.org/abs/2408.11091</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 . . . . .	3
<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

## 1.1 Domain classification

quantum chemistry (primary). Secondary: biology / computational enzymology. The quantum-hardware payload is a correlated electronic-structure calculation (an active-space VQE energy) embedded in a multi-scale QM/MM model of a real enzyme, carbonic anhydrase, catalysing CO<sub>2</sub> hydration. The application framing is biological, but the primitive Julien must fingerprint is squarely quantum chemistry.

## 1.2 Expert persona for Julien

A computational quantum chemist fluent in the VQE family of adaptive ansatz methods (ADAPT-VQE and its FAST-VQE variant) and in multi-layer embedding (QM/MM, wf@DFT projective embedding, DMET). They should have calibrated intuition for how a CAS(6,6) active space maps to 12 spin-orbitals and hence 12 qubits under Jordan-Wigner, how MP2 natural-orbital (FNO) selection picks that space, and above all how the number of adaptive iterations trades against circuit depth and a device’s gate budget. Ideally they also track how trapped-ion versus superconducting gate sets and error rates cap the achievable iteration count, and are aware of SAT-based gate reduction as a compilation lever, since both shape the numbers reported here.

## 1.3 Related prior work (brief bibliography)

- FAST-VQE method paper (the exact algorithm run on hardware here): Majland, Ettenhuber, Zinner, *Phys. Rev. A* **108**, 052422 (2023), [10.1103/PhysRevA.108.052422](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevA.108.052422); arXiv:2303.07417. Also a sibling dossier in this corpus.
- Parent adaptive-ansatz method, ADAPT-VQE: Grimsley et al., *Nat. Commun.* **10**, 3007 (2019), [10.1038/s41467-019-10988-2](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-019-10988-2).
- Qubit-excitation-based ADAPT-VQE (alternative hardware-friendly pool, a depth comparator): Yordanov et al., *Commun. Phys.* **4**, 228 (2021), [10.1038/s42005-021-00730-0](https://doi.org/10.1038/s42005-021-00730-0).
- Same multilayer-embedding-for-near-term-chemistry primitive from a different group: Izsák et al., “Quantum computing in pharma”, *J. Comput. Chem.* (2023), [10.1002/jcc.26958](https://doi.org/10.1002/jcc.26958).
- Embedding-on-QPU comparator: Rossmannek et al., “Quantum Embedding Method for the Simulation of Strongly Correlated Systems on Quantum Computers”, *J. Phys. Chem. Lett.* (2023), [10.1021/acs.jpcclett.3c00330](https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.jpcclett.3c00330).
- Alternative primitive for the same active-space chemistry on hardware (a portability contrast against VQE): Nakagawa et al., “ADAPT-QSCI”, arXiv:2311.01105 (2023).

## 1.4 Difficulty estimate

medium (leaning high). The good news for Julien: the actual quantum-hardware fingerprint is stated plainly in the main text, 12 qubits from a CAS(6,6) space, two named devices (IonQ Aria-1/Aria-2 trapped-ion via Amazon Braket, and Rigetti Aspen-M-3 superconducting), explicit gate counts (circuits reduced from 1016 to 660 single-qubit and 540 to 533 two-qubit gates, against the 950 single-qubit-gate Braket

ceiling that capped Aria-1 at 40 iterations), and iteration counts up to 60. The friction is the surrounding stack: NEB path optimisation at GFN2-xTB/GFN-FF, [wf@DFT](#) projective embedding, MP2-FNO active-space construction, and a SAT-based gate-reduction step, with convergence detail pushed into the Supplementary Material. Julien will need to disentangle which layer ran on the QPU from the classical scaffolding around it. Source is open access on arXiv with full LaTeX present in [paper-source/](#), so there is no paywall risk; the cost is breadth, not access.

## 2 Extraction

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

The authors compute the energy profile of the rate-determining step (a proton transfer between a water molecule and Histidine 64, mediated by three further waters and a coordinated zinc) of  $\text{CO}_2$  hydration catalysed by the enzyme carbonic anhydrase. They build a fully automated multi-scale model: the whole protein is treated by an ONIOM scheme with a GFN-FF force field outside and GFN2-xTB inside, a nudged-elastic-band (NEB) calculation fixes a 10-point reaction path, and the chemically active core is treated by wave-function-in-DFT (`wf@DFT`) projective embedding. Within that core, a small correlated wave function over a CAS(6,6) active space (6 electrons in 6 spatial orbitals, 12 spin-orbitals, 12 qubits under Jordan-Wigner) is optimised with the authors’ FAST-VQE adaptive algorithm. The wave-function sampling step of FAST-VQE runs on real quantum hardware (IonQ Aria trapped-ion and Rigetti Aspen-M-3 superconducting devices, via Amazon Braket). They report this as the first use of quantum hardware to simulate an enzymatic reaction, and show FAST-VQE recovers the classical CAS(6,6) benchmark to near or below chemical accuracy.

### 2.2 Quantum hardware used

- **Vendor / machine:** IonQ Aria-1 (trapped ion, accessed via Amazon Braket Hybrid Jobs) for the main 10-point reaction-path study; Rigetti Aspen-M-3 (superconducting) for three selected points (structures 0, 5, 8). *Naming caveat:* the body text says “Aria 1” throughout, but the Fig. 6 caption labels the hardware curve “IonQ’s Aria 2” (see Caveats).
- **Qubit count:** 12 used. Device totals are not reported in the paper (IonQ Aria and Rigetti Aspen-M-3 both expose more than 12; not stated here).
- **Connectivity:** Not stated explicitly in the paper. IonQ Aria is trapped-ion (all-to-all) and Rigetti Aspen-M-3 is superconducting (limited, fixed-lattice) by substrate; the paper alludes to this in the Conclusions (“This problem is exacerbated when qubits are not all-to-all connected”). The all-to-all vs limited distinction is substrate knowledge, not a paper-reported figure.
- **Gate set:** The ansatz is built from adjusted qubit-excitation-based (QEB) operators (Yordanov et al.) under a Jordan-Wigner mapping. The compiled circuits are reported in terms of single-qubit gates and two-qubit (CNOT) gates; the singles/doubles circuits in the appendix use  $R_Z$ ,  $R_X$ ,  $R_Y$ ,  $H$ ,  $X$ ,  $P$  and CNOT. The devices’ native gate sets (e.g. IonQ GPI/GPI2/MS, Rigetti  $R_X/R_Z/CZ/XY$ ) are not reported in the paper.
- **Notable features leveraged:** None of mid-circuit measurement, dynamic circuits, or analog/native two-qubit primitives are used. The on-device operation is computational-basis sampling of the prepared ansatz state (used to evaluate FAST-VQE’s heuristic gradient); the parameter optimisation itself runs on a classical state-vector simulator. A SAT-based optimal-CNOT synthesis (Shaik et al.) plus TKET Clifford simplification are used as a compilation lever to fit the gate budget.

### 2.3 Computational primitive

VQE, specifically FAST-VQE (Fermionic Adaptive Sampling Theory VQE), an adaptive-ansatz variant in the ADAPT-VQE family. The quantum device performs the wave-function **sampling** step; the variational parameter optimisation is run on a state-vector simulator, not on the QPU.

### 2.4 Resource fingerprint

Metric	Value	Source (page / equation / SI)
Qubits (logical)	12 (algorithmic; = 12 spin-orbitals from CAS(6, 6); no error-correction encoding)	“Computational details”; Appendix B “MP2 based FNO construction”; Results (“namely 12 that corresponds to 12 spin-orbitals”)
Qubits (physical)	12 used (1:1 with algorithmic qubits; device totals not reported)	“Computational details”; Results
Circuit depth	not reported (gate counts given instead)	n/a
2Q-gate count (total)	540 (naive) reduced to 533 (optimised) at 55 FAST iterations on Aria-1	Results, circuit-optimisation paragraph
Measurement shots	1024 (on both Aria-1 and Aspen-M-3)	“Computational details”
Classical loop iter.	40 FAST iterations (Aria-1, standard compilation); up to 55 (Aria-1, with CNOT/Clifford reduction); 60 (Aspen-M-3, no gate limit). One operator added per iteration	“Computational details”; Results; “Circuit optimization”
Wall-clock runtime	not reported	n/a

Additional reported gate figures: single-qubit gate count reduced from 1016 to 660 at 55 iterations on Aria-1 (Results); IonQ Aria on Amazon Braket has a 950-single-qubit-gate ceiling that capped FAST at 40 iterations under standard compilation (Results; “Circuit optimization”).

## 2.5 Assumptions and results

- **Claim.** First application of quantum hardware to an enzymatic-reaction simulation. FAST-VQE on hardware reproduces the classically exact CAS(6,6) benchmark potential energy surface; with 60 iterations (on Aspen-M-3) the deviation from the benchmark reaches close to or below chemical accuracy (1 kcal/mol) along the whole reaction coordinate. The NEB reaction path gives a barrier of  $\approx 15.5$  kcal/mol (vs 10.5 kcal/mol free-energy barrier from Fu et al., which includes entropic terms).
- **Error bars / noise assumptions.** All hardware runs used 1024 shots; no explicit per-point error bars are quoted on the hardware energies. The variational ordering  $\text{CAS}(6,6) \leq \text{FAST} \leq \text{HF}$  is used as an internal consistency check. At 40 iterations on Aria-1 the last three PES points show a larger error than the rest. Crucially, the VQE parameter optimisation was performed on a state-vector simulator (the authors flag the VQE measurement overhead as the remaining bottleneck), so the hardware figures isolate the sampling step, not a full on-device optimisation.
- **Comparison to classical baseline.** Yes, the CAS(6,6) CASCI result (classically exact within the active space) is the benchmark, computed with PySCF; Hartree-Fock provides the starting point. FAST-VQE converges towards the CASCI curve. The authors are explicit that the calculation is still within reach of brute-force classical computation and does not claim quantum advantage/utility.

## 2.6 Portability flags

- **All-to-all connectivity assumed for the primary device.** The main study runs on trapped-ion Aria, whose all-to-all connectivity lets the QEB CNOT-heavy ansatz map without SWAP overhead. The authors explicitly note that on limited-connectivity hardware the depth grows (“exacerbated when qubits are not all-to-all connected”). Porting to fixed-lattice superconducting or other limited-connectivity devices inflates the two-qubit gate count.
- **Hard gate-count ceiling drives the science.** A platform-imposed limit (the Braket 950-single-qubit-gate ceiling on Aria) capped the achievable FAST iterations at 40 and therefore the accuracy. Any portability assessment must treat the per-circuit gate budget of the target device as the binding constraint on iteration count, not qubit number.
- **QEB operator ansatz must be decomposed per target gate set.** Circuits are built from QEB singles/doubles (CNOT plus  $R_X/R_Y/R_Z/H/X/P$ ); these are standard digital gates with no analog/native-primitive dependence, so they are portable in principle but must be recompiled to each device’s native two-qubit gate (IonQ MS vs Rigetti CZ/XY), changing the gate count.
- **Compilation lever is part of the result.** Reaching 55 iterations on Aria depended on SAT-based optimal-CNOT synthesis plus TKET Clifford simplification. The reduction achieved (e.g. 1016 to 660 single-qubit gates) is gate-set and topology dependent, so the same compiler pass will yield different savings on other hardware.
- **Jordan-Wigner mapping chosen for QEB compatibility.** A different mapping (e.g. Bravyi-Kitaev, parity) would change locality and two-qubit structure; the choice here is tied to the QEB operator implementation.
- **No mid-circuit measurement, no dynamic circuits, no error correction.** The on-device step is plain computational-basis sampling, which lowers the hardware-feature bar for porting; but the VQE parameter loop currently needs a classical state-vector simulator, which is the real scalability bottleneck the authors call out and which does not port to larger active spaces.

## 2.7 Caveats

- **Open access, full source available.** The paper is on arXiv (2408.11091) with full LaTeX source in `paper-source/`; there is no paywall. The fingerprint above is drawn from the main-text `main.tex`.
- **Device-name inconsistency.** The Materials and Methods / Computational details / Circuit optimization / Results body text consistently names “IonQ’s Aria 1”, but the Fig. 6 caption labels the hardware PES curve “IonQ’s Aria 2”. Romain’s sourcing note likewise references “Aria-1/Aria-2”. This is most likely a caption typo, but it is not resolved in the text; I record the primary device as Aria-1 and flag the ambiguity rather than inventing a resolution.
- **Supplementary Material not separately read.** Full per-point convergence plots for the entire PES, the active-site structures, and the reaction animation are described as living in the Supplementary Material; only the main-text figures (structures 0, 5, 8 convergence) are discussed in the body I extracted from. The SI files themselves are not present in this dossier.
- **Circuit depth, wall-clock runtime, and device qubit totals are not reported** in the paper; these rows are “not reported” rather than inferred.

### 3 Portability matrix