

# Quantum Computing for Optimizing Aircraft Loading

Portability dossier - app

agQSL portability pipeline

2026-06-07

---

Field	Value
Slug	2026-arxiv-2504.01567-quantum-computing-optimizing-aircraft-loading
Source	arXiv
Link	<a href="https://arxiv.org/abs/2504.01567">https://arxiv.org/abs/2504.01567</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 . . . . .	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

**optimisation.** This is a constrained combinatorial optimisation paper (an IonQ and Airbus collaboration) on the aircraft cargo loading problem, framed as a knapsack-like assignment problem with side constraints on maximum payload, centre of gravity, and fuselage shear. There is a clear aerospace or logistics application flavour, but the technical content is squarely variational combinatorial optimisation, so optimisation is the primary and only meaningful axis. No secondary domain.

## 1.2 Expert persona for Julien

A quantum optimisation specialist fluent in QAOA and its hardware-efficient variants, with calibrated intuition about ansatz design (here a multi-angle layered VQA using  $R_Y$  mixers and  $R_{ZZ}$  entanglers rather than a Hamiltonian-exponentiating QAOA cost layer), CVaR cost aggregation, and the trade-off between parameter count and classical-optimiser tractability. They should be comfortable reading off trapped-ion fingerprints: Mølmer-Sørensen two-qubit gate counts, all-to-all versus laddered entanglement degree, shot budgets, and symmetrisation-based error mitigation on IonQ Aria and Forte. Familiarity with slack-free constraint handling (penalties applied during classical expectation-value evaluation rather than via extra slack qubits) will help them judge what is and is not encoded in the circuit.

## 1.3 Related prior work (brief bibliography)

- Herrman et al., *Multi-angle quantum approximate optimization algorithm*, Sci. Rep. 12, 6781 (2022). DOI: 10.1038/s41598-022-10555-8 (arXiv:2109.11455). The multi-angle QAOA that MAL-VQA extends.
- Barkoutsos et al., *Improving Variational Quantum Optimization using CVaR*, Quantum 4, 256 (2020). DOI: 10.22331/q-2020-04-20-256. The CVaR cost aggregation used throughout the results.
- Morris, Kaushik, Roetteler, Lotshaw, *Performant near-term quantum combinatorial optimization*, arXiv:2404.16135 (2024). Same IonQ group, prior trapped-ion combinatorial optimisation; the closest same-vendor portability anchor.
- Montañez-Barrera et al., *Unbalanced penalization: a new approach to encode inequality constraints of combinatorial problems for quantum optimization algorithms*, arXiv:2211.13914 (2022). A slack-free inequality-constraint scheme directly comparable to this paper’s classical-penalty approach.
- *IF-QAOA: A Penalty-Free Approach to Accelerating Constrained Quantum Optimization*, arXiv:2504.08663 (2025). Contemporary penalty-free knapsack treatment from a different group; useful method-level comparator.
- Stollenwerk et al., *Image Acquisition Planning for Earth Observation Satellites with a Quantum Annealer*, arXiv:2006.09724 (2020). The same constrained-assignment problem class on a different hardware paradigm (quantum annealing), for cross-vendor framing.

## 1.4 Difficulty estimate

low. The paper is fully open: the arXiv preprint and the complete LaTeX source (`paper-source/main.tex`, `references.bib`, and the `Figs/` set) are already in the dossier folder, with no paywall and no reliance on hidden supplementary material. The hardware fingerprint Julien needs is stated explicitly in the text rather than buried in an SI: qubit counts span 12 to 28 ( $MN$  qubits for  $M$  containers and  $N$  slots), gate counts are given per instance (for example the 12-qubit Aria run uses 60 single-qubit and 24 two-qubit gates; the 28-qubit Forte run uses 56 and 56), shot budgets are 1 000 to 10 000, the optimiser is COBYLA, and the devices are IonQ Aria (25 Yb ions) and Forte (36 Yb ions) with Mølmer-Sørensen gates and symmetrisation error mitigation. The only mild wrinkles are the non-standard ansatz label (MAL-VQA) and the spread of problem instances, so Julien should anchor the fingerprint on the two full hybrid optimisation runs (Aria 12-qubit, Forte 28-qubit) and treat the inference-only runs as supporting data. Two-qubit gate count scales as  $O((NM)^2)$  with the entanglement degree, which is worth noting when characterising scaling.

## 2 Extraction

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

This is an IonQ and Airbus collaboration that solves the aircraft cargo loading problem on trapped-ion hardware. The task is a constrained combinatorial optimisation: choose which containers to load, and into which cargo slots, so as to maximise total payload weight while respecting the aircraft’s maximum payload, centre-of-gravity window, fuselage shear profile, and slot-fitting rules. The authors map the problem to an Ising Hamiltonian ( $MN$  qubits for  $M$  containers and  $N$  slots) and optimise it with a multi-angle, layered variational ansatz they call MAL-VQA: alternating layers of per-gate-parametrised  $R_Y$  rotations and a ladder of  $R_{ZZ}$  entangling gates, which is shallower than canonical QAOA. Inequality constraints are not encoded with slack qubits; instead they are applied as penalties during the classical expectation-value step, using an error-function penalty and CVaR aggregation. The method is run on IonQ Aria and Forte, recovering the optimal solution for every instance studied, from 12 to 28 qubits.

### 2.2 Quantum hardware used

- **Vendor / machine:** IonQ Aria and IonQ Forte (trapped-ion QPUs).
- **Qubit count:** Aria run uses 12 of up to 25 addressable  $^{171}\text{Yb}^+$  ions; Forte run uses 28 of 36 addressable ions. (The 25 and 36 figures are quoted by the paper as both addressable ions and “algorithmic qubits”; see Caveats on the #AQ aggregate.)
- **Connectivity:** all-to-all within the single static ion chain, mediated by shared motional modes. Note that the ansatz actually executed used a nearest-neighbour  $R_{ZZ}$  ladder, not the full all-to-all degree.
- **Gate set:** native arbitrary single-qubit rotations plus a single Mølmer-Sørensen-type two-qubit entangler ( $R_{XX}(\theta)$ ), driven by 355-nm laser pulses on Raman transitions. The ansatz is written in  $R_Y$  and  $R_{ZZ}(\theta)$ ;  $R_{ZZ}$  is realised on this hardware from the native  $R_{XX}$  gate plus single-qubit basis rotations.
- **Notable features leveraged:** error mitigation via symmetrisation (executing circuit variants with distinct qubit-to-ion mappings, then component-wise averaging); CVaR cost aggregation; warm-starting from a partially converged simulator run (Forte). No mid-circuit measurement and no dynamic circuits are used.

### 2.3 Computational primitive

QAOA, specifically a multi-angle, layered hardware-efficient variant the authors name MAL-VQA (Multi-Angle Layered Variational Quantum Algorithm). It is a hybrid variational algorithm. It sits closer to a hardware-efficient VQE ansatz than to canonical QAOA, because each gate carries its own parameter and the entangling block does not exponentiate the problem Hamiltonian.

## 2.4 Resource fingerprint

Anchored on the two full hybrid-optimisation runs (Aria 12-qubit, Forte 28-qubit); inference-only runs are reported as supporting data below the table.

Metric	Value	Source (page / equation / SI)
Qubits (logical)	Not applicable (NISQ, no error correction). Problem size = $MN$ algorithmic qubits, spanning 12 to 28	§Results intro; §Quantum Encoding (Eq. <code>ising_map</code> )
Qubits (physical)	12 ions (Aria, 4 containers / 3 slots); 28 ions (Forte, 7 containers / 4 slots). Devices expose up to 25 (Aria) / 36 (Forte)	§Aria QPU Results; §Forte QPU Results; §Results intro
Circuit depth	Not reported (the number of ansatz layers $p$ used on the QPU is not stated)	§MAL-VQA; §Aria / Forte QPU Results
2Q-gate count (total)	24 (Aria 12-qubit); 56 (Forte 28-qubit)	§Aria QPU Results (Optimization runs); §Forte QPU Results (Inference runs)
Measurement shots	1 000 per iteration (hybrid optimisation runs); 10 000 (inference runs)	§Aria QPU Results; §Forte QPU Results
Classical loop iter.	100 max (Aria 12-qubit, COBYLA); 250 (Forte 28-qubit, warm-started COBYLA)	§Aria QPU Results; §Forte QPU Results (Full Optimization)
Wall-clock runtime	Not reported	(not stated for QPU runs)

Single-qubit gate counts (not a template row, recorded for completeness): 60 (Aria 12-qubit), 144 (Aria 16-qubit inference), 180 (Aria 20-qubit inference), 56 (Forte 28-qubit).

Supporting inference-only runs (pre-optimised parameters from a classical simulator, executed once on hardware with no feedback loop):

- Aria, 4 containers / 4 slots, 16 qubits, max-weight 16 kG: 144 1Q gates, 64 2Q gates, 10 000 shots, optimal-solution probability

$\approx 40\%$ .

- Aria, 5 containers / 4 slots, 20 qubits, max-weight 16 kG: 180 1Q gates, 80 2Q gates, 10 000 shots, optimal-solution probability  $\approx 50\%$ .
- Forte, 7 containers / 4 slots, 28 qubits, max-weight 23 kG: 56 1Q gates, 56 2Q gates, 10 000 shots, optimal-solution probability  $\approx 35\%$ .

## 2.5 Assumptions and results

- **Claim.** The MAL-VQA method recovers the optimal container assignment for every instance studied, from 12 to 28 qubits, on real trapped-ion hardware. For the Aria 12-qubit full hybrid run the optimal solution reaches probability  $\approx 70\%$  and is well separated from the runner-up. The Forte 28-qubit full hybrid run converges to a lower but still clearly distinguishable optimal-solution probability, alongside valid sub-optimal (degenerate) solutions.
- **Error bars / noise assumptions.** No explicit numerical error bars are given. Reduced optimal-solution probabilities are attributed qualitatively to a combination of shot noise and QPU noise. Systematic error is suppressed by symmetrisation, and CVaR is used as the aggregation function throughout. The CVaR tail fraction  $\epsilon$  is defined but its numerical value for the runs is not reported. Gate fidelities are asserted to be high but are cited to IonQ blog and benchmarking references rather than measured in this paper.
- **Comparison to classical baseline.** None head-to-head. The paper motivates the work by the exponential scaling of exact classical knapsack-type solvers but presents no classical solver comparison and explicitly frames the result as a proof-of-principle demonstration, not a claim of quantum advantage.

## 2.6 Portability flags

- **Native entangler is Mølmer-Sørensen  $R_{XX}(\theta)$  with all-to-all connectivity.** The ansatz’s  $R_{ZZ}(\theta)$  maps onto the native gate directly via single-qubit basis rotations, so on IonQ no CNOT decomposition is needed. On hardware whose native two-qubit gate is CZ or CNOT (superconducting heavy-hex, for example) each  $R_{ZZ}(\theta)$  must be decomposed (typically two CNOTs plus an  $R_Z$ ), roughly doubling the entangling-gate count.
- **Entanglement degree governs connectivity demand.** The reported QPU runs used a nearest-neighbour  $R_{ZZ}$  ladder, which ports cleanly to linear or heavy-hex lattices with no SWAP overhead. The method is, however, designed to support higher entanglement degree up to all-to-all, where the 2Q-gate count scales as  $O((NM)^2)$ ; realising that on a fixed limited-connectivity lattice would incur SWAP-routing overhead that the trapped-ion chain avoids.
- **Symmetrisation error mitigation assumes free qubit-to-ion remapping.** This is cheap on an all-to-all ion chain; the equivalent (alternative physical qubit assignments) is more constrained on a fixed lattice.
- **Slack-free constraint handling and CVaR are classical post-processing.** Inequality constraints (max weight, centre of gravity, shear, slot fit) are evaluated on the CPU during expectation-value computation, so they add no qubits and no gates to the circuit. This is fully vendor-agnostic and is a portability advantage rather than a flag.

- **No exotic hardware primitives.** The circuit is a plain parametrised gate circuit: no mid-circuit measurement, no dynamic circuits, no analog or Rydberg-specific evolution. This makes the digital structure broadly portable across gate-model platforms.
- **Device-size figures are  $\#AQ$  aggregates.** The 25 (Aria) and 36 (Forte) numbers are IonQ “algorithmic qubit” figures that fold qubit count, fidelity, and depth performance together. A cross-vendor portability comparison should not equate  $\#AQ$  with a raw physical qubit count.

## 2.7 Caveats

The paper is fully open: the arXiv preprint, the complete LaTeX source (`paper-source/main.tex`, `references.bib`, and the `Figs/` set), and the rendered HTML are all present in the dossier. There is no paywall and no reliance on hidden supplementary material, so access was complete.

Several quantities are genuinely not reported in the paper, and are recorded as “not reported” above rather than inferred:

- The explicit circuit depth and the number of ansatz layers  $p$  used on the QPU runs.
- The numerical CVaR tail fraction  $\epsilon$  used for the hardware runs.
- Wall-clock runtimes for any run.
- Measured gate fidelities and SPAM error rates (asserted as high, cited to external IonQ references).
- Any head-to-head classical solver baseline.

One bookkeeping note: the 28-qubit circuit gate count (56 single-qubit, 56 two-qubit) is stated explicitly only in the Forte “Inference runs” paragraph. The Forte full hybrid-optimisation run uses the same 7-container / 4-slot ansatz, so the same gate count is taken to apply to both, but the paper states it in the inference context.

### 3 Portability matrix