

Accuracy-Cost Trade-offs for Reference VQE Calculations of H₂ on IBM Quantum Hardware

Portability dossier - app

agQSL portability pipeline

2026-06-07

Field	Value
Slug	2026-arxiv-2604.11478-h2-vqe-costs
Source	arXiv
Link	https://arxiv.org/abs/2604.11478
Category	app
Triaged	2026-05-16 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	8
2.7	Caveats	9
3	Portability matrix	10

1 Source

1.1 Domain classification

quantum chemistry. The paper computes the electronic ground-state energy of H_2 in an STO-3G minimal active space (two spatial orbitals, two electrons) with a UCC ansatz and VQE on IBM Quantum hardware. The secondary axis is platforms and tooling: the real contribution is a workflow cost and accuracy benchmark of the out-of-the-box Qiskit Nature plus IBM Runtime stack (shot or precision semantics, resilience levels, session versus single-job billing), with H_2 serving as a fixed, exactly solvable probe rather than the object of study. Julien should treat the chemistry as a control variable and the hardware or runtime configuration space as the payload.

1.2 Expert persona for Julien

A quantum-software practitioner who lives in the Qiskit Nature plus IBM Runtime stack: fluent in UCC ansatz construction over a Hartree-Fock reference, fermion-to-qubit mappings (Jordan-Wigner, parity) and Z2 symmetry tapering, and the EstimatorV2 primitive where sampling is set by a `precision` target rather than an explicit shot count ($\epsilon = 1/\sqrt{N_{\text{shots}}}$). Should have calibrated intuition for how circuit depth and CX count on Heron-class processors translate into energy error, what resilience levels 0, 1 and 2 actually switch on (measurement mitigation, then ZNE plus gate twirling), and the chemical-accuracy yardstick of roughly 1.6 mHa. Needs to be comfortable reading IBM device naming across generations (Eagle r3, Heron r1 to r3, Nighthawk r1) to record a per-backend fingerprint.

1.3 Related prior work (brief bibliography)

- Miháliková et al., *Best-Practice Aspects of Quantum-Computer Calculations: A Case Study of the Hydrogen Molecule*, *Molecules* 27 (2022) 597, [arXiv:2112.01208](https://arxiv.org/abs/2112.01208), [doi:10.3390/molecules27030597](https://doi.org/10.3390/molecules27030597). Closest precedent: same molecule, same best-practice VQE framing (optimisers, circuit architecture, noise) one hardware generation earlier.
- McCaskey et al., *Quantum chemistry as a benchmark for near-term quantum computers*, *npj Quantum Inf.* 5 (2019) 99, [doi:10.1038/s41534-019-0217-y](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41534-019-0217-y). Direct portability anchor: the same chemistry workload benchmarked across IBM and Rigetti devices via a vendor-neutral stack.
- Boutakka et al., *Benchmarking VQE Configurations: Architectures, Initializations, and Optimizers for Silicon Ground State Energy* (2025), [arXiv:2510.23171](https://arxiv.org/abs/2510.23171), [doi:10.48550/arXiv.2510.23171](https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2510.23171). Same computational primitive (configuration sweep over ansatz and optimiser) applied to a heavier system; a useful generalisation check.
- Oliv, Matic, Messerer, Lorenz, *Evaluating the impact of noise on the performance of the Variational Quantum Eigensolver* (2022), [arXiv:2209.12803](https://arxiv.org/abs/2209.12803). Same-group precursor isolating the noise-to-accuracy relationship that this paper measures on hardware.
- Kandala et al., *Hardware-efficient variational quantum eigensolver for small molecules and quantum magnets*, *Nature* 549 (2017) 242, [doi:10.1038/nature23879](https://doi.org/10.1038/nature23879). Foundational IBM-hardware VQE demonstration against which the present default-workflow accuracy is implicitly compared.

- Peruzzo et al., *A variational eigenvalue solver on a photonic quantum processor*, Nat. Commun. 5 (2014) 4213, doi:10.1038/ncomms5213. Origin of the VQE primitive on a different (photonic) substrate; useful as the cross-platform root of the method.

1.4 Difficulty estimate

low. The paper is open-access and present in the folder in full: rendered `paper.html` plus the complete LaTeX source under `paper-source/` (sections, `bibliography.bib`, tables). No paywall and no SI dependency for the fingerprint; the Supporting Information is supportive, not required. The primitives are standard (UCC-VQE, JW or parity mappings, COBYLA or SPSA, IBM Runtime resilience levels), with no exotic hardware techniques to decode, and the hardware fingerprint is unusually explicit: named backends with their chip generations, an ansatz table giving qubits, depth, total ops and CX count per mapping, and a software-version table. The only thing that adds effort is breadth: eight backends spanning Eagle, three Heron revisions and Nighthawk, crossed with four mappings, three resilience levels and two execution modes, so Julien faces a fair amount of tabulation rather than any conceptual difficulty.

2 Extraction

2.1 What the paper does (one paragraph)

The paper builds a hardware-executed reference dataset for variational ground-state energy calculations of the hydrogen molecule H_2 on IBM Quantum processors available in 2026. The chemistry is held fixed and trivial (H_2 in an STO-3G minimal active space, two spatial orbitals and two electrons, with an exactly known reference energy), so it acts as a control probe. The real payload is a systematic sweep of the out-of-the-box Qiskit Nature plus IBM Runtime workflow: the authors vary fermion-to-qubit mapping (four representations from four-qubit Jordan-Wigner down to a one-qubit fully tapered parity circuit), nominal shot count (1 to 8192), resilience/error-mitigation level (0, 1, 2), classical optimizer (COBYLA vs SPSA), execution mode (runtime session vs single-job), and backend (seven IBM devices across Eagle, three Heron revisions, and Nighthawk). For each run they record energy error against exact diagonalisation plus optimizer iterations, quantum time, and billed time. The headline findings: tapered/smaller-circuit mappings give the most consistent accuracy gain, resilience level 1 helps but costs more, and session execution buys no accuracy over single-job mode while billing far more time.

2.2 Quantum hardware used

- **Vendor / machine:** IBM Quantum. Seven physical backends, all superconducting transmon QPUs:
 - Heron r1: `ibm_torino`
 - Heron r2: `ibm_aachen`, `ibm_fez`, `ibm_kingston`
 - Heron r3: `ibm_pittsburgh`
 - Eagle r3: `ibm_brussels`
 - Nighthawk r1: `ibm_miami` (described as still in an exploratory phase)

(Source: §2, “Quantum backends” paragraph. A noisy/noiseless `AerSimulator` with the `FakeNairobiV2` noise model and `NumPyEigensolver` are used as classical/simulator controls, not as quantum hardware.)

- **Qubit count:** 1 to 4 logical qubits used, depending on mapping (PT = 1, PF = 2, JW = 4, P = 4; Table II, §2). Each device provides “over 100 physical qubits” and “each execution effectively occupies the full device”; exact per-backend physical qubit counts are **not reported** in the paper (§3.4).
- **Connectivity: Not explicitly stated in the paper.** Per vendor documentation and `vendor-notes/superconducting_qubits.tex`, IBM Eagle/Heron are heavy-hex lattices and Nighthawk uses a newer (denser) connectivity; this is external context, not a paper claim. The paper only notes that the at-most-four-qubit circuits are mapped onto >100-qubit chips and that the transpiler may pick a different physical-qubit subset on each submission (§2, “Circuit generation and transpilation variability”).
- **Gate set:** Single-qubit native gates listed (with durations) are `rx`, `rz`, `x`, `sx`; `rz` is a virtual (zero-duration) gate on some backends, e.g. `ibm_brussels` and `ibm_miami` (Table III / `tables/gate_exec_time.tex`). The two-qubit native gate is **not named in the paper**; two-qubit cost is reported only at the abstract circuit level as `CX` (CNOT) counts. Externally: Heron’s native entangler is a tunable-coupler CZ, Eagle’s is cross-resonance/ECR (`vendor-notes`, Ezratty 8.3.7).

- **Notable features leveraged:** IBM Runtime EstimatorV2 primitive with `precision`-based sampling (no explicit shot count); resilience levels 0/1/2 (measurement-error mitigation at L1; zero-noise extrapolation plus gate twirling at L2); runtime “session” vs “single-job” execution modes; Z2 symmetry tapering via Qiskit Nature `get_tapered_mapper`. No mid-circuit measurement, dynamic circuits, or other exotic primitives are used.

2.3 Computational primitive

VQE (variational quantum eigensolver). Unitary coupled-cluster (UCC) ansatz over a Hartree-Fock reference, one repetition of excitation operators, real-valued parameters initialised to zero; classical outer loop primarily COBYLA (SPSA shown only for comparison). Energies evaluated via the Qiskit Runtime EstimatorV2 primitive. (§2, “Ansatz generation”, “VQE implementation and optimizers”).

2.4 Resource fingerprint

Circuit-structure rows are per-mapping; values are pre-transpilation, from `ansatz.decompose(reps=2)` (Table II, §2). Where a single representative configuration is needed, the paper’s reference point is PT mapping, COBYLA, 1024 nominal shots, resilience 0.

Metric	Value	Source (page / equation / SI)
Qubits (logical)	1 (PT) / 2 (PF) / 4 (JW) / 4 (P)	Table II (<code>tab:ansatz_properties</code>), §2
Qubits (physical)	>100 available per device; full device effectively occupied; exact per-backend count not reported	§2 (“Quantum backends”), §3.4 (“over 100 physical qubits”)
Circuit depth	JW 96 / P 74 / PF 17 / PT 1 (pre-transpilation)	Table II, §2
2Q-gate count (total)	CX: JW 48 / P 32 / PF 4 / PT 0 (pre-transpilation)	Table II; §2 (“To make the resulting circuits concrete”)
Measurement shots	Nominal 1, 16, 64, then 256-8192 (1024 = main reference); set via Estimator <code>precision</code> $\epsilon = 1/\sqrt{N_{\text{shots}}}$, not a literal shot count. Simulator controls use 16384 shots.	§2 (“Shot definition”, Eq. 1); §3.3; Table I (simulator)

Metric	Value	Source (page / equation / SI)
Classical loop iter.	COBYLA reaches stable energy in <15 iterations; iteration 17 used as the cross-backend comparison point; SPSA spends ~51 calibration evals then converges in ~30. Simulator controls: ~22-24 evals (max 80).	§3.1; §3.2; Table I
Wall-clock runtime	Per VQE run (PT, 1024 shots): ~32 min average (session) / ~44 min average (single-job). Per-evaluation quantum time ~1-2 s for most backends.	§3.6; §3.2 (Fig. 12)

Additional cost numbers (not in the template rows but central to the paper):

- Quantum time vs shots, across backends: gradient $(1.08 \pm 0.19) \times 10^{-2}$ s/shot, intercept 27.0 ± 5.5 s (§3.3). Outlier `ibm_miami`: 0.195 ± 0.002 s/shot, intercept 22.7 ± 3.7 s, attributed to a CLOPS roughly an order of magnitude lower than the other backends (§3.3).
- Billed time, PT/1024/session, resilience 0: mean 1.9-2.9 min across backends; resilience 1: 5.2-6.1 min; resilience 2: 5.8-6.8 min (`tables/03-Resilience-time-session.tex`). Single-job billed time is on the order of seconds, not minutes (§3.6).
- Inter-iteration spacing (latency + classical step + queue): single-job 7 s to 5 m 19 s; session 10 s to 3 m 32 s; overall mean below ~5 m 36 s for all backends (§3.6).
- Reference energy: $E_{\text{ref}} = -1.85727503$ a.u. (geometry 0.735 Å, STO-3G, singlet); errors reported as $E_{\text{err}} = |E_{\text{final}} - E_{\text{ref}}|$, often scaled $\times 10$ in figures/tables (§2, Eq. 2).

2.5 Assumptions and results

- **Claims.** Across the configurations studied, mapper-driven circuit simplification (tapering) is the most consistent accuracy lever; resilience level 1 improves accuracy robustly but at a large time premium and level 2 is variable and more expensive; session execution gives no systematic accuracy advantage over single-job execution despite markedly higher billed time. Crucially, the out-of-the-box default workflow does **not** reach chemical accuracy (≈ 1.6 mHa, i.e. 1 kcal/mol) even for this minimal problem.

- **Error bars / noise assumptions.** Results are aggregated over repeated hardware executions; spread is treated as an inherent property of the device/runtime, not post-processing uncertainty. Repeat counts are uneven and sometimes $n = 1$ (the authors flag this explicitly as a limitation). Representative hardware error magnitudes used in the error-accumulation argument: two-qubit gate error $\approx 7 \times 10^{-3}$, single-qubit gate error $\approx 3 \times 10^{-4}$ (§3.4). Hardware energy errors for PT/res-0 cluster around ~ 13 -35 mHa (e.g. `ibm_aachen` mean $E_{\text{err}} = 0.02406$ a.u.; from `tables/03-Resilience-energy-session.tex`, values quoted there as $E_{\text{err}} \times 10$). With resilience 1, individual runs reach near or below chemical accuracy (e.g. `ibm_kingston` $E_{\text{err}} \approx 0.74$ mHa, `ibm_brussels` ≈ 2.6 mHa, both $n = 1$).
- **Classical baseline.** Exact diagonalisation (`NumPyEigensolver`) supplies E_{ref} . A noisy `AerSimulator` depolarising control (error rates $p_1 = 0.003$, $p_2 = 0.02$) reproduces the mapper ordering (JW and P worst, PF intermediate, PT best) at much smaller absolute error: simulator PT $|E - E_{\text{ref}}| = 2.458 \times 10^{-3}$ a.u. vs JW 5.547×10^{-1} a.u. (Table I, §3.4). The gap between simulator and hardware magnitudes is attributed to real-device noise.

2.6 Portability flags

This is a workflow/cost benchmark of the IBM Runtime stack, so most of what it “leans on” is IBM-specific tooling and billing rather than exotic physics. Items that matter for a portability analysis:

- **IBM Runtime EstimatorV2 precision semantics.** Sampling is specified as a target statistical precision $\epsilon = 1/\sqrt{N_{\text{shots}}}$, not an explicit shot count. Other vendors’ primitives take literal shot counts; the “nominal shot” labelling is an IBM-specific re-interpretation.
- **IBM resilience levels 0/1/2.** The L1 = measurement mitigation, L2 = ZNE + gate twirling hierarchy is an IBM Runtime packaging. The underlying techniques (readout mitigation, zero-noise extrapolation, twirling) are conceptually portable, but the single-knob `resilience_level` abstraction and its defaults are not.
- **Session vs single-job billing model.** The central cost finding (session bills minutes, single-job bills seconds, for equal accuracy) is tied to IBM’s runtime scheduler and billing units (`quantum_seconds`, billed time). It does not transfer directly to vendors with different cost/queue models (e.g. per-shot or per-task pricing).
- **CLOPS-driven throughput.** The `ibm_miami` (Nighthawk) timing outlier is explained by lower CLOPS, an IBM-defined throughput metric; cross-vendor timing comparisons need a different common currency.
- **Native gate set / two-qubit entangler.** Single-qubit basis is `rx/rz/x/sx` (with `rz` virtual on some devices); the abstract circuits are quoted in CX counts. On a trapped-ion (XX/MS) or neutral-atom platform the CX gates would have to be re-decomposed, and the depth/2Q-count figures in Table II would change. But the circuits are tiny (0-48 CX), so this is a minor concern at this problem size.
- **Heavy-hex routing.** The four-qubit JW/P circuits assume the transpiler can route on a sparse heavy-hex lattice; on an all-to-all connected machine (ion trap) routing overhead vanishes. Again low-stakes at 1-4 qubits, but relevant if the same workflow is scaled.
- **Stochastic qubit placement.** Run-to-run variability is partly driven by the default transpiler reassigning physical qubits on each

submission across a >100-qubit chip. Vendors with smaller or fully-connected registers would show a different variability profile.

- **Vendor-neutral pieces.** Z2 symmetry tapering (PT/PF), the UCC ansatz, the Hartree-Fock reference, and COBYLA/SPSA are software-layer and portable; the qualitative “smaller circuit wins on NISQ hardware” conclusion is expected to carry across substrates.

2.7 Caveats

- The paper is open-access and fully available in the dossier: rendered `paper.html` plus the complete LaTeX source (`paper-source/`, including all section partials, tables, and `bibliography.bib`). No paywall and no SI gating; the Supporting Information is supportive, not required for the fingerprint. No sections were unreachable.
- Two-qubit native gate type and exact per-backend physical qubit counts are not stated in the paper; these are marked “not reported” above and any substrate context is flagged as external (vendor notes / Ezratty 2025), not a paper claim.
- Figure-level numeric values (energy/time per backend) are read from the EPS-backed figures and the two reproduced appendix tables; the underlying numeric figure data is not in the source bundle, so figure-derived ranges are approximate where the value is not also tabulated.
- Several configurations (notably resilience 1 and 2 per backend) have very small sample sizes, down to $n = 1$; the authors explicitly caution that the dataset is a broad empirical benchmark, not a balanced factorial study. Treat single-run accuracy values (e.g. the sub-chemical-accuracy resilience-1 results) as indicative, not statistically settled.

3 Portability matrix