

Molecular Quantum Computations on a Protein

Portability dossier - app

agQSL portability pipeline

2026-06-07

| Field | Value |
|--------------|---|
| Slug | 2026-arxiv-2512.17130-molecular-quantum-computations-protein |
| Source | arXiv |
| Link | https://arxiv.org/abs/2512.17130 |
| Category | app |
| Triaged | 2026-06-07 by port_until_julien_parallel |
| Bootstrapped | 2026-06-07 |

Contents

| | | |
|----------|---|----------|
| 1 | Source | 3 |
| 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 |
| 2 | Extraction | 5 |
| 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 |
| 3 | Portability matrix | 10 |

1 Source

1.1 Domain classification

quantum chemistry (primary). Secondary domain: biology. The target is the 300-atom Trp-cage miniprotein and the scientific motivation is conformer energetics (folded versus unfolded), but the computational object is molecular electronic structure, so the quantum-hardware fingerprint Julien must extract is a quantum-chemistry one.

1.2 Expert persona for Julien

A computational quantum chemist fluent in wave-function-based quantum embedding (DMET and its EWF extension) and in selected-configuration-interaction solvers (QSCI, SQD, ext-SQD). They should know the LUCJ ansatz first hand: its $L = 1$ truncation, the Jordan-Wigner mapping ($2M$ qubits for M spatial orbitals), CCSD-amplitude initialisation through compressed double factorisation, and the locality approximation that fixes its qubit connectivity. Calibrated intuition is needed for active-space and bath-orbital selection, shot budgets, and configuration-recovery convergence, plus the IBM Heron specifics used here (zig-zag layout heuristics, α/β plus ancilla qubit assignment, XY4 dynamic decoupling). Crucially they must separate the genuinely quantum step from the surrounding classical HPC pipeline, since only the larger EWF clusters were sampled on the QPU while the many hydrogen-like fragments were solved classically by FCI.

1.3 Related prior work (brief bibliography)

- Robledo-Moreno, Motta, Mezzacapo et al., “Chemistry beyond the scale of exact diagonalization on a quantum-centric supercomputer,” arXiv:2405.05068. The foundational SQD paper; defines the configuration-recovery primitive reused here.
- Motta et al., “Bridging physical intuition and hardware efficiency for correlated electronic states: the local unitary cluster Jastrow ansatz,” arXiv:2312.00178. Defines the exact LUCJ circuit primitive that is sampled in this work.
- Shajan, Kaliakin, Robledo-Moreno, Motta, Mezzacapo, Merz et al., “Toward quantum-centric simulations of extended molecules: sample-based quantum diagonalization enhanced with density matrix embedding theory,” arXiv:2411.09861 (JCTC 2025, DOI 10.1021/acs.jctc.5c00114). The same group’s direct predecessor (32-qubit DMET-SQD); this paper swaps DMET for EWF and scales the workflow up to a protein.
- “Crossing the 12,000-atom barrier with heterogeneous quantum-classical supercomputing: quantum chemistry of protein-ligand complexes,” arXiv:2605.01138. The scaled-up EWF-TrimSQD follow-on (T4-lysozyme and trypsin, up to 12,635 atoms, `ibm_cleveland` and `ibm_kobe`, up to 94 qubits); the natural “same primitive, larger system, additional backends” portability comparison.
- Nusspickel and Booth, “Systematic improvability in quantum embedding for real materials,” Phys. Rev. X 12, 011046 (2022), DOI 10.1103/PhysRevX.12.011046. The EWF embedding theory this work builds upon.
- Asphalt-additive binding energies via QSCI/SQD on IQM Emerald, arXiv:2605.27640 (in corpus as 2026-arxiv-2605.27640-asphalt-binding-qsci). Cross-vendor pointer: the same SQD/QSCI primitive on a different superconducting vendor, useful input

to Brillant’s later portability read.

1.4 Difficulty estimate

medium. The paper is fully open (arXiv preprint with complete LaTeX source attached under `paper-source/`; no paywall and no missing SI), and the hardware fingerprint is stated explicitly in the Computational Details section: IBM Heron r2 QPUs, 1,000,000 shots per circuit, LUCJ with $L = 1$, EWF clusters spanning 6 to 33 molecular orbitals (so up to $2 \times 33 = 66$ system qubits plus 4 ancillae for the largest), 2-qubit gate counts of roughly 750 at 15 orbitals rising to about 3400 at 32 orbitals, and 2-qubit depth from 90 to 160. What pushes the effort above **low** is the dense method stack Julien must parse to attribute that fingerprint correctly: EWF/DMET fragmentation, the MP2 interacting-bath expansion, LUCJ with compressed-double-factorisation initialisation, SQD plus ext-SQD configuration recovery, and the split between QPU-solved and classically-solved fragments. If reconciling the per-cluster gate-count, circuit-depth, and subspace-dimension figures across all cluster sizes proves fiddly, treat it as tipping toward **high**; the core extraction should otherwise be tractable.

2 Extraction

2.1 What the paper does (one paragraph)

The authors run a fragment-based, quantum-centric electronic-structure workflow on the 300-atom Trp-cage miniprotein and predict the relative energy of its folded and unfolded conformers. A full-system Hartree-Fock calculation (STO-3G, 919 molecular orbitals) is fragmented with the Embedded Wave Function (EWF) method, an extension of density matrix embedding theory (DMET) in which every atom is included in a correlated treatment. Each fragment-plus-bath “EWF cluster” (6 to 33 molecular orbitals) is solved at the configuration-interaction level: small, mostly hydrogen-centred clusters are solved classically by full configuration interaction (FCI), while the larger heavy-atom clusters (15 to 33 orbitals) are solved by sample-based quantum diagonalisation (SQD), in which an IBM Heron-R2 quantum processor samples electron configurations from a LUCJ ansatz and classical HPC performs error mitigation and subspace diagonalisation. EWF-(FCI,SQD) conformer energetics are benchmarked against classical EWF-MP2 and EWF-CCSD.

2.2 Quantum hardware used

- **Vendor / machine:** IBM / Heron R2 QPUs (the paper says “IBM Heron-R2 QPUs”; no specific backend name such as `ibm_torino` or `ibm_kobe` is given).
- **Qubit count:** Jordan-Wigner maps M spatial orbitals to $2M$ qubits. QPU-solved clusters span 15 to 33 orbitals, i.e. 30 to 66 system qubits. The largest (33-orbital) cluster uses 66 system qubits plus 4 ancillae = 70 qubits. The number of qubits physically available on the device is not stated in the paper (Heron R2 is a 156-qubit generation, background only).
- **Connectivity:** IBM heavy-hex lattice. The LUCJ circuit is laid out as two parallel qubit chains holding the α and β spin-orbitals respectively, coupled through ancilla qubits at the junctions; for the 33-orbital cluster four α/β pairs are connected via four ancillary qubits (Fig. 5). The layout is picked from the available “zig-zag” patterns by a heuristic that sums the two-qubit gate errors of the couplers and the readout errors of the qubits in the pattern.
- **Gate set:** Not enumerated in the paper. Circuit cost is reported in terms of “CNOT” / “2-qubit gates”. Background: the Heron generation’s native two-qubit entangler is a tunable-coupler CZ with single-qubit basis $\{X, SX, R_z\}$ (vendor-notes), so the reported 2-qubit gates are transpiled onto CZ. Transpilation used Qiskit v2.1.1 `generate_preset_pass_manager` at `optimization_level=0`, `ffsim PRE_INIT` orbital-rotation passes, and `RemoveIdentityEquivalent`. Fractional gates are not mentioned.
- **Notable features leveraged:** XY4 dynamic-decoupling sequence for decoherence suppression; error-aware qubit-layout selection; CCSD-amplitude initialisation of the LUCJ parameters via compressed double factorisation. No mid-circuit measurement, no dynamic circuits, and no on-hardware variational/feedback loop are used; the device role is shallow state preparation followed by terminal computational-basis measurement.

2.3 Computational primitive

Sampling. The quantum processor samples bitstrings (electron configurations / Slater determinants) from a fixed, classically pre-optimised LUCJ ansatz state, measured in the computational basis. Those samples feed the classical SQD / ext-SQD pipeline (configuration recovery plus projected-Hamiltonian diagonalisation). This is not VQE: the LUCJ parameters are optimised offline against CCSD amplitudes, not through hardware-in-the-loop feedback.

2.4 Resource fingerprint

| Metric | Value | Source (page / equation / SI) |
|-----------------------|---|--|
| Qubits (logical) | 30 to 66 (= $2M$ for $M = 15$ to 33 orbitals on the QPU; no error-corrected logical qubits) | Computational Details, “Quantum circuit design”; Eq. (4) JW mapping ($2M$ qubits) |
| Qubits (physical) | up to 70 for the largest cluster (66 system + 4 ancillae); device size not reported | “Sampling using circuits run on quantum hardware”; Fig. 5 (qubit layout) |
| Circuit depth | 2-qubit depth grows linearly from 90 to 160 over 15 to 32 orbitals | “Quantum resources”; Fig. 6B |
| 2Q-gate count (total) | grows quadratically from ≈ 750 at 15 orbitals to ≈ 3400 at 32 orbitals | “Quantum resources”; Fig. 6A |
| Measurement shots | 1,000,000 per circuit | “Sampling using circuits run on quantum hardware” |
| Classical loop iter. | configuration recovery ≤ 5 iterations (classical; QPU sampled once per circuit), 10 batches of 3000 samples each; LUCJ parameter optimisation single-stage L-BFGS-B (classical, offline) | “Ground State and Energy of the Hamiltonian in SQD”; “Parameter Optimization” |

| Metric | Value | Source (page / equation / SI) |
|--------------------|---|---|
| Wall-clock runtime | QPU runtime: not reported. Classical: HF \approx 4 min/conformer; EWF cluster + MP2 bath expansion \approx 30 min typical | “Mean-field calculations”; “Embedded Wave Function Fragmentation” |

Additional reported parameters (not in the template rows, but relevant): bath natural-orbital threshold $\eta = 1 \cdot 10^{-5}$; configuration recovery convergence thresholds $1 \cdot 10^{-8}$ (energy) and $1 \cdot 10^{-5}$ (orbital occupancy); relevant-configuration threshold $1 \cdot 10^{-4}$; ext-SQD dominant-configuration threshold $1 \cdot 10^{-5}$; SBD diagonalisation uses 48 CPUs per subspace, 480 CPUs across 10 batches per cluster. SQD post-processing memory ranges roughly 200 GB to 1000 GB for 25 to 33-orbital clusters (Fig. 9).

2.5 Assumptions and results

- **Claimed.** This is presented as the largest embedding-based simulation done within the configuration-interaction paradigm (Trp-cage in STO-3G corresponds to 919 molecular orbitals, versus prior DMET/EWF systems of at most 321 and 312 explicitly included orbitals), and the first system of this biochemical size to be treated with quantum sampling inside an embedding workflow. The folded conformer is predicted more stable than the unfolded one. Relative energies ΔE : EWF-MP2 59.61 kcal/mol; EWF-CCSD 47.70 kcal/mol; EWF-(FCI,SQD) 55.43 kcal/mol (Table 1). EWF-(FCI,SQD) differs from EWF-CCSD by -7.7 kcal/mol and from EWF-MP2 by 4.2 kcal/mol.
- **Error bars / noise assumptions.** No statistical error bars are reported on the conformer energies, and no shot-noise or device-calibration uncertainty is quoted. Noise is handled by self-consistent configuration recovery (restores particle-number conservation broken by the noisy distribution $\tilde{p}(\mathbf{x}) \neq |\langle \mathbf{x} | \Psi \rangle|^2$), XY4 dynamic decoupling, and error-aware layout selection. Calculations are gas-phase, closed-shell singlet; the +1 protonation state is neutralised to a zwitterion by deprotonating LYS8, because DMET/EWF has not been demonstrated for charged species.
- **Comparison to classical baseline.** The classical baselines are EWF-MP2 and EWF-CCSD computed under the identical EWF fragmentation scheme, plus FCI for the small clusters. SQD is therefore benchmarked against CCSD-level correlation on the same fragments rather than against an exact full-protein reference (which is intractable).

2.6 Portability flags

- **LUCJ locality approximation is a connectivity compromise, not a physics choice.** The density-density operator \hat{J}_μ would need all-to-all connectivity in dense form; LUCJ zeroes matrix elements between spin-orbitals not mapped to adjacent qubits to fit the hardware. The reference circuit is:

$$|\Psi\rangle = \prod_{\mu=0}^{L-1} e^{\hat{K}_\mu} e^{i\hat{J}_\mu} e^{-\hat{K}_\mu} |\mathbf{x}_{\text{RHF}}\rangle$$

with $L = 1$. On an all-to-all machine (trapped ion) the truncation could be relaxed (denser \hat{J}_μ , no SWAP/ancilla routing); on a different superconducting topology the layout heuristic changes. The accuracy of the sampled subspace is thus coupled to the chosen connectivity.

- **Ancilla-mediated α/β coupling is specific to JW on heavy-hex.** Four ancilla qubits bridge the α and β chains for the largest cluster; a platform with native all-to-all coupling would not need them, and a different lattice degree would need a different ancilla pattern.
- **Native two-qubit gate must be re-decomposed off IBM.** Costs are quoted as CNOT/2-qubit gates and transpiled to Heron’s CZ; up to ≈ 3400 two-qubit gates and depth ≈ 160 for the largest cluster. Re-targeting to a cross-resonance CX, an iSWAP-family gate, or a trapped-ion Mølmer-Sørensen $XX(\theta)$ changes the gate count and the achievable fidelity-limited depth.
- **High shot budget (1,000,000 shots/circuit) is a runtime portability cost.** On low-repetition-rate hardware (trapped ions at roughly Hz to kHz sampling) this shot count would dominate wall-clock; on the superconducting substrate it is tractable. The paper does not report the QPU wall-clock, so the cross-platform runtime cannot be read off directly.
- **XY4 dynamic decoupling and error-aware layout selection assume per-coupler/per-qubit calibration data** and are tuned to superconducting decoherence; on a long-coherence platform the decoupling step may be unnecessary, and the layout heuristic has no meaning on an all-to-all device.
- **The quantum footprint is a minority of the workflow.** Only the 15 to 33-orbital clusters were sampled on the QPU; the large majority of clusters (for example 116 folded / 111 unfolded clusters in the 8-orbital bin alone, almost all hydrogen environments) were solved classically by FCI. Any portability claim applies to that quantum subset, not to the protein-scale result as a whole.
- **Quantum step is structurally portable.** Because the device only prepares a shallow LUCJ state and measures in the computational basis, with no mid-circuit measurement, dynamic circuits, or hardware feedback loop, the algorithmic primitive transfers to any gate-model device; the hardware-specific work is connectivity mapping, gate decomposition, and the shot-rate cost, not the algorithm structure.

2.7 Caveats

- The paper is a fully open arXiv preprint and the complete LaTeX source is attached under `paper-source/`. There is no paywall and no missing supplementary information; all sections were reachable.

- Several quantitative figures are read from plots rather than tables. The 2-qubit gate counts (≈ 750 to ≈ 3400), the depths (90 to 160), and the subspace/memory figures are the authors' own round-number readings of Figs. 6, 8 and 9, quoted as ranges; there is no per-cluster table of gate count, depth, electron number, or subspace dimension to cite individual clusters against.
- The specific Heron R2 backend identifier, the device qubit count, the per-circuit QPU execution time, and any per-conformer total QPU time are not reported.
- Per-fragment electron counts and the exact number of QPU-solved clusters (as opposed to the FCI-solved majority) are not tabulated; the 15 to 33-orbital range and the cluster-count histogram (Fig. 4) are the only quantitative handles given.

3 Portability matrix