

# A New Hybrid Quantum-Classical Algorithm for Solving the Unit Commitment Problem

Portability dossier - app

agQSL portability pipeline

2026-06-07

---

Field	Value
Slug	2026-arxiv-2505.00145-new-hybrid-quantum-classical-algorithm-solving
Source	arXiv
Link	<a href="https://arxiv.org/abs/2505.00145">https://arxiv.org/abs/2505.00145</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 . . . . .	8
2.7	Caveats . . . . .	8
<b>3</b>	<b>Portability matrix</b>	<b>10</b>

# 1 Source

## 1.1 Domain classification

**optimisation.** The paper attacks the Unit Commitment (UC) problem, a mixed-integer program from power-systems planning: choose which generators to switch on each hour and at what power level to meet the demanded load  $\ell$  at minimum operating cost. The application sector is energy and smart grids (Ezratty 2025 files this under quantum-computing applications, §13.4.1 “Power grid”), but the computational core is combinatorial optimisation, which is the primary axis for portability. No meaningful secondary domain; the binary sieve plus continuous power-level refinement is a discrete-optimisation problem with a convex sub-solve, not chemistry, ML, or finance.

## 1.2 Expert persona for Julien

A quantum-optimisation specialist comfortable with variational / QAOA-style algorithms on NISQ trapped-ion hardware. They should have calibrated intuition about QUBO/Hamiltonian encodings of constrained binary problems, penalty-versus-slack-variable trade-offs (here the constraint  $\mathbf{u}^T \mathbf{p}_{\max} \geq \ell$  is enforced by an erf penalty evaluated lazily, so no ancilla qubits), shot-budget and ansatz-depth choices, and the IonQ Forte stack specifically (algorithmic-qubit count, all-to-all connectivity, error mitigation). Light familiarity with power-systems Bender’s decomposition helps to read the framing, but the hardware fingerprint lives almost entirely in the quantum-sieve stage (ansatz family, layers, qubit count  $N =$  number of generators, classical optimiser COBYLA, shots), not in the classical SLSQP refinement.

## 1.3 Related prior work (brief bibliography)

- **Aboumradi et al., “Quantum Computing for Optimizing Aircraft Loading,” arXiv:2504.01567 (2025):** the same IonQ team’s lazy-QUBO penalty method (no slack ancillas) and VQA workflow on the same Forte stack, applied to a different packing problem. The closest same-vendor, same-primitive comparison. Already a sibling dossier in this corpus.
- **“Qubit-Efficient Quantum Annealing for Stochastic Unit Commitment,” arXiv:2502.15917 (2025):** same application, but solved by quantum annealing rather than gate-based VQA. The canonical cross-paradigm portability contrast for UC.
- **Koretsky et al., “Adapting QAOA for Unit Commitment,” arXiv:2110.12624 (2021), IEEE QCE:** earlier gate-based QAOA baseline for the same problem; useful to gauge how this paper’s sieve-plus-refine decomposition departs from a direct QAOA encoding.
- **Peng & Zhang, “Novel Resolution of Unit Commitment Problems Through Quantum Surrogate Lagrangian Relaxation,” IEEE Trans. Power Syst., DOI:10.1109/TPWRS.2022.3181221 (2023):** same application, different quantum decomposition strategy (Lagrangian relaxation), for method-versus-method portability framing.
- **Morris et al., “Performant Near-Term Quantum Combinatorial Optimization,” arXiv:2404.16135 (2024):** methodological comparison point for the near-term VQA primitive on combinatorial problems. Also a sibling dossier here.

- “A Survey on Applications of Quantum Computing for Unit Commitment,” arXiv:2601.01777 (2026): recent landscape survey of the QC-for-UC literature, for situating this paper among the alternatives.

#### 1.4 Difficulty estimate

medium. In Julien’s favour: the full LaTeX source, the bibliography, and all result figures are already in `paper-source/`, so there is no paywall and no reliance on an external SI; the hardware details (IonQ Forte, “36 algorithmic qubits,” shot counts of 512 / 1,000 / 2,000, COBYLA optimiser, ansatz layer count,  $N$  qubits for  $N$  generators up to 26) are stated inline. What pushes it above `low`: the paper uses two distinct ansatz designs (a brickwork parametrised- $ZY/RY$  circuit for the 10-unit runs, the layered QAOA-style  $U_E/U_M$  ansatz for the 26-unit runs), three problem sizes, and a split between full VQA-training runs and cheaper “inference” sampling runs on hardware; pinning down a single clean hardware fingerprint will require disentangling these. The lazy-QUBO encoding (penalties computed classically without a Pauli decomposition of  $H_Q$ ) is mildly non-standard and worth flagging to whoever reasons about circuit structure downstream.

## 2 Extraction

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

The paper (IonQ and Oak Ridge National Laboratory) gives a hybrid quantum-classical heuristic for the Unit Commitment (UC) problem in power systems: for each hour, decide which generators to switch on and at what power level to meet a demanded load  $\ell$  at minimum operating cost. UC is a mixed-integer program; the authors split each hourly instance with a Bender’s-type decomposition into a binary “which units are on” part and a continuous “at what power level” part. A variational quantum algorithm (VQA) acts as a *sieve*: it prepares a parametrised state encoding a constrained binary optimisation, samples it, and returns a small set  $C^*$  of at most 128 candidate on/off vectors with the lowest minimum operating cost. A classical sequential least-squares routine (SLSQP) then solves the residual quadratic program for each candidate, and the cheapest feasible solution is reported. The method is tested on 3-, 10-, and 26-generator grids over up to 24 hourly periods, in noiseless simulation and on IonQ’s Forte trapped-ion processor, reaching 0% to roughly 3% approximation error against a CPLEX global optimum.

### 2.2 Quantum hardware used

- **Vendor / machine:** IonQ Forte (trapped-ion QPU). The paper states Forte “has demonstrated performance at the level of 36 algorithmic qubits” (Sec. IV-B, citing IonQ material). Simulations used Google’s `qsim` state-vector simulator.
- **Qubit count:** one qubit per generator, so  $N$  qubits for  $N$  generators. Hardware runs used 3, 10, and 26 qubits; 26 is the largest hardware instance. Forte exposes 36 algorithmic qubits. No quantum error correction is used, so the logical and physical qubit counts coincide.
- **Connectivity:** all-to-all. The paper relies on this explicitly: “the all-to-all connectivity of qubits in IonQ systems enables such an implementation for qubits with non-adjacent indices” (Sec. III-A). Corroborated by the trapped-ion vendor note: IonQ runs a static linear  $^{171}\text{Yb}^+$  chain with all-to-all coupling through shared motional modes.
- **Gate set:** parametric single-qubit rotations plus a single native two-qubit entangler. The ansatz uses parametric  $ZY$  gates “because they can be implemented using a single two-qubit gate on IonQ’s processors” (Sec. III-A); the hardware brickwork variants use parametrised  $R_Y$  gates. The vendor note identifies the native two-qubit primitive as a Mølmer–Sørensen  $R_{XX}(\theta)$ .
- **Notable features leveraged:** all-to-all connectivity (Butterfly-ansatz entangling block couples non-adjacent indices); single-native-gate  $ZY$  realisation; warm-start state preparation via single-qubit rotations. No mid-circuit measurement, dynamic circuits, or error-correction primitives are reported.

### 2.3 Computational primitive

VQE / variational quantum algorithm. The engine minimises  $\langle \psi(\theta) | H_Q | \psi(\theta) \rangle$  for a diagonal QUBO cost Hamiltonian  $H_Q$ , using a warm-started, QAOA-style layered “alternating operator” ansatz (entangling block plus mixer). The paper calls it a VQA and refers to the

engine as VQE; the classical outer loop is COBYLA. This is a *sampling-based* variational optimiser: the QPU prepares and samples the state, and the QUBO eigenvalues are evaluated classically (see Portability flags).

## 2.4 Resource fingerprint

Metric	Value	Source (page / equation / SI)
Qubits (logical)	$N$ per instance: 3 / 10 / 26 (= number of generators); 26 max on hardware	Sec. III-A ( $H_Q$ on $N$ qubits); Sec. IV
Qubits (physical)	Same $N$ (no QEC); Forte provides 36 algorithmic qubits	Sec. IV-B
Circuit depth	26-unit hardware ansatz (1 layer): depth 19. Simulator layered ansatz: 10-unit depth 16 to 151 (layers 1 to 10), 26-unit depth 19 to 181. 10-/3-unit hardware brickwork $R_Y$ ansatz depth not reported	Tables III (10-unit) and IV (26-unit); Sec. IV-B
2Q-gate count (total)	Per circuit (TQG column): 26-unit 1 layer = 57; 10-unit layered = 15 per layer (15 to 150 for 1 to 10 layers); 26-unit = 57 per layer (57 to 570). Brickwork hardware ansatz TQG not reported	Tables III and IV
Measurement shots	Simulator training: 512 per COBYLA iteration; simulator final sampling: 5,000. Hardware: 1,000 per iteration (10-unit and 3-unit); 512 per iteration (26-unit); 2,000 per state for 26-unit inference jobs	Sec. IV-A, Sec. IV-B; Figs. 8, 9, 11

Metric	Value	Source (page / equation / SI)
Classical loop iter.	COBYLA to tolerance $10^{-6}$ . Simulator averages: 10-unit 59 to 449; 26-unit 71 to 539 (rising with layer count). Per-run hardware iteration counts shown only in convergence figures, not tabulated	Tables III, IV; Figs. 9, 10
Wall-clock runtime	not reported	not reported

Notes: hardware runs split into two designs. The 10-unit and 3-unit Forte runs used an “earlier” brickwork ansatz (4 and 2 layers of parametrised  $R_Y$  gates respectively, parameters drawn uniformly from  $[-2\pi, 2\pi]$ ), so their gate counts and depths are not in the resource tables. The 26-unit Forte runs used the main layered ansatz with a single layer (parameters initialised to zero). Tables III and IV report simulator figures; the single-layer entries (depth 19, TQG 57 for 26-unit) are the closest tabulated proxy for the 26-unit hardware circuit.

## 2.5 Assumptions and results

- **Claim.** A Bender’s-type quantum sieve plus classical SLSQP refinement solves UC to low approximation error and scales past 20 generators. Reported errors against the CPLEX global optimum: exactly 0% on the 3-unit grid; 0.55% to 1.78% on the 10-unit grid (decreasing with ansatz layers); 2.53% to 2.92% on the 26-unit grid. On the 26-unit inference experiment, the mean error across 24 periods was 3.201% using simulated samples and 3.088% using samples measured on IonQ Forte (Fig. 8). The authors claim this improves on the prior state of the art (Koretsky et al., roughly 8% on the same 10-unit grid).
- **Error bars / noise.** Simulator results averaged over 7 independent trials (10-unit) and 3 trials (26-unit) per period. Quantum simulations are noiseless (`qsim` state vector). Hardware runs include native Forte noise; the paper reports only “qualitative agreement” between simulation and hardware and uses the QPU runs to validate convergence, not to push accuracy. No fidelities, coherence times, or error-mitigation settings are reported.
- **Classical baseline.** CPLEX provides the global optimum used as ground truth. The continuous sub-problems are solved classically with SLSQP; the binary sieve is the only quantum stage.
- **Penalty hyper-parameter.**  $\lambda = 450,000$  (10-unit) and  $\lambda = 700,000$  (26-unit); candidate set capped at  $\text{card}(C^*) \leq 128$ .

Key encodings, copied from the source:

$$P(\mathbf{u}) = \text{erf}((\ell - \mathbf{u}^T \mathbf{p}_{\max})^+)$$

$$Q(\mathbf{u}) = c_{\min}(\mathbf{u}) + \lambda P(\mathbf{u})$$

with  $H_Q|\mathbf{u}\rangle = Q(\mathbf{u})|\mathbf{u}\rangle$  and the VQA minimising  $\langle\psi(\theta)|H_Q|\psi(\theta)\rangle$ .

## 2.6 Portability flags

- **Lazy QUBO evaluation, no Pauli decomposition.**  $H_Q$  is never decomposed into a Pauli sum; its eigenvalues  $Q(\mathbf{u})$  are evaluated classically on each sampled bitstring (method from arXiv:2504.01567). The QPU is used purely as a sampler of a parametrised state. This is portable to any sampler-capable device, but it is *not* a Hamiltonian-expectation measurement; downstream reasoning about “measuring  $H_Q$ ” or term grouping does not apply.
- **No slack ancillas.** The inequality constraint  $\mathbf{u}^T \mathbf{p}_{\max} \geq \ell$  is enforced by the lazy erf penalty rather than slack variables, so the qubit count is exactly  $N$  (one per generator), with no ancilla overhead. Encoding-efficient relative to standard slack-variable QUBOs.
- **Native ZY two-qubit gate.** The entangling block uses parametric ZY gates realised as one native IonQ two-qubit gate. On CNOT/CZ-based gate sets each such gate must decompose into multiple two-qubit gates, inflating the count.
- **All-to-all connectivity at scale.** The Butterfly entangling block couples non-adjacent qubit indices and relies on IonQ all-to-all coupling. On fixed topologies (heavy-hex, linear, grid) this needs SWAP networks, growing both two-qubit-gate count and depth, most acutely at the 26-qubit instance.
- **Warm-start mixer.** The mixer ground state encodes the SDP relaxation of the binary LP and is prepared with a layer of single-qubit rotations (method from Tate et al.). This part is single-qubit only and broadly portable, but it adds a classical SDP pre-solve to the pipeline.
- **Outer-loop dependence.** Convergence needs many COBYLA iterations (tens to hundreds), each a full circuit execution with hundreds to thousands of shots, so the cost is dominated by repeated QPU sampling under a classical optimiser rather than by single-shot circuit complexity.
- **No mid-circuit measurement or dynamic circuits.** None are used, which eases portability to devices lacking those features.

## 2.7 Caveats

- The paper is openly available on arXiv with full LaTeX source in [paper-source/](#); there was no paywall and no external supplementary information. All resource numbers above are taken from the source text and tables.
- Per-run hardware iteration counts and wall-clock runtimes are shown only in convergence figures (Figs. 8 to 11, supplied as images) and are not stated numerically in the text, so the “Classical loop iter.” hardware values and the “Wall-clock runtime” row could not be pinned to exact numbers.

- The 10-unit and 3-unit hardware runs used a different (“earlier”, brickwork  $R_Y$ ) ansatz from the main layered ansatz, so Tables III and IV (which describe the layered ansatz under noiseless simulation) do not directly give the gate count or depth of those specific hardware circuits.
- Device-level details (gate fidelities, coherence times, error mitigation, transpilation) are not reported; the hardware capability is asserted via the cited “36 algorithmic qubits” Forte specification rather than measured in this work.

### 3 Portability matrix