

Continuous-time quantum-walk centrality for protein residue interaction networks

Portability dossier - app

agQSL portability pipeline

2026-06-07

Field	Value
Slug	2026-arxiv-2604.17486-protein-residue-walks
Source	arXiv
Link	https://arxiv.org/abs/2604.17486
Category	app
Triaged	2026-05-21 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	5
2.4	Resource fingerprint	6
2.5	Assumptions and results	6
2.6	Portability flags	7
2.7	Caveats	8
3	Portability matrix	9

1 Source

1.1 Domain classification

biology (structural biology). The paper identifies functionally important residues in proteins by running a continuous-time quantum walk (CTQW) on residue interaction networks (RINs) built from experimentally resolved PDB structures. The application target is biomolecular structure and function (folding, stability, allosteric signalling, ligand binding), validated against experimentally established sites in protein kinase A and oxytocin.

Secondary: the computational primitive is domain-agnostic, a continuous-time quantum walk / Hamiltonian simulation on a weighted graph, and the same group previously cast the identical residue-centrality problem as a QUBO for quantum annealers (RinQ). The work therefore sits on the boundary between biology and graph-based network analytics (node centrality), with an optimisation-flavoured sibling line of work. Primary classification is biology; note the methodological overlap with machine-learning-style graph analysis.

1.2 Expert persona for Julien

A quantum-algorithms specialist fluent in continuous-time quantum walks and Hamiltonian simulation on gate-based superconducting hardware. They should have calibrated intuition about amplitude-encoding state preparation (the Möttönen routine used here scales poorly with register size) and about the gap between the proof-of-principle compilation actually executed (a dense `QubitUnitary` built from the matrix exponential $e^{-iA_p t}$) and the asymptotic sparse-Hamiltonian -simulation costs the paper invokes (qubitization, Trotter-Suzuki). The “only $q = \lceil \log_2 n \rceil$ qubits” framing deserves scepticism, since dense-unitary synthesis and state preparation, not qubit count, dominate the real circuit cost. Light structural-biology literacy (residue interaction networks, 8 Å C_α contact graphs, PDB residue numbering) helps with context but is secondary to the hardware fingerprint.

1.3 Related prior work (brief bibliography)

- **RinQ (same application, different paradigm and vendor)**. S. I. Mohtashim, *RinQ: Towards predicting central sites in proteins on current quantum computers*, Mater. Today Quant. 7, 100053 (2025). DOI [10.1016/j.mtquan.2025.100053](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.mtquan.2025.100053). The authors’ own QUBO formulation of the identical problem solved on D-Wave annealing; the cleanest cross-paradigm portability anchor.
- **CTQW centrality on weighted graphs (same primitive, classical benchmark)**. Y. Wang, S. Xue, J. Wu, P. Xu, *Continuous-time quantum walk based centrality testing on weighted graphs*, Sci. Rep. 12, 6001 (2022). DOI [10.1038/s41598-022-09915-1](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-022-09915-1). Establishes the CTQW-versus-eigenvector-centrality comparison on weighted graphs that this paper applies to proteins.
- **Experimental CTQW centrality on photonic hardware (same primitive, different vendor)**. T. Wu, J. A. Izaac, et al., *Experimental Parity-Time Symmetric Quantum Walks for Centrality Ranking on Directed Graphs*, Phys. Rev. Lett. 125, 240501 (2020). DOI [10.1103/PhysRevLett.125.240501](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.125.240501). A quantum-walk centrality measure realised on a non-superconducting platform; direct cross-vendor comparison material for Brillant.

- **Classical baseline / application origin.** C. F. A. Negre et al., *Eigenvector centrality for characterization of protein allosteric pathways*, PNAS 115, E12201 (2018). DOI [10.1073/pnas.1810452115](https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1810452115). The classical method the paper benchmarks against.
- **Quantum-walk centrality lineage.** G. D. Paparo, M. A. Martin-Delgado, *Google in a Quantum Network*, Sci. Rep. 2, 444 (2012), DOI [10.1038/srep00444](https://doi.org/10.1038/srep00444); and T. Loke et al., *Comparing classical and quantum PageRanks*, Quantum Inf. Process. 16, 25 (2016), DOI [10.1007/s11128-016-1456-z](https://doi.org/10.1007/s11128-016-1456-z).
- **Sparse Hamiltonian-simulation primitive.** D. W. Berry, A. M. Childs, R. Cleve, R. Kothari, R. D. Somma, *Simulating Hamiltonian Dynamics with a Truncated Taylor Series*, Phys. Rev. Lett. 114, 090502 (2015). DOI [10.1103/PhysRevLett.114.090502](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.114.090502). The basis for the paper’s claimed asymptotic-advantage route; relevant if Julien weighs the scaling argument.

1.4 Difficulty estimate

low. The paper is fully accessible: the dossier holds the complete arXiv LaTeX source plus figures, and the code is public (https://github.com/IshmamShah/CTQW_RIN). No paywall. The hardware fingerprint is concentrated in two short sections (“Quantum circuit implementation” and “Proof-of-principle hardware demonstration”), and the device run is small and self-contained: one nine-residue protein (oxytocin, PDB 1XY1), $q = 4$ qubits, 1024 shots on `ibm_kingston` (an IBM Heron-class superconducting processor) via the Qiskit Runtime interface through PennyLane, using `MottonenStatePreparation` followed by a dense `QubitUnitary`. The Supporting Information adds only the protein list, so there is no SI dependence for the fingerprint. The one point requiring care is separating what was actually executed on hardware (dense unitary, four-qubit register) from the asymptotic sparse-simulation claims that were not run; that is interpretive work for Julien, not a barrier to extraction.

2 Extraction

2.1 What the paper does (one paragraph)

The paper ranks the structurally important residues of a protein by running a continuous-time quantum walk (CTQW) on its residue interaction network (RIN). A protein structure from the PDB is turned into a weighted graph: each amino acid is a node (its C_α atom), and two residues are joined if their C_α atoms lie within 8 Å, with edge weight $w_{ij} = 1/d_{ij}^2$. The weighted adjacency matrix A is treated as a Hamiltonian; a walker started in a uniform superposition evolves under e^{-iAt} , and a residue’s “centrality” is its long-time-averaged occupation probability. The authors derive a closed-form steady state from the spectral decomposition, benchmark CTQW rankings against classical eigenvector centrality on ~150 proteins (consistently high rank/overlap correlation), show the quantum dephased transition map has a larger spectral gap, recover known functional residues in protein kinase A and oxytocin, and run a small proof-of-principle on IBM superconducting hardware.

2.2 Quantum hardware used

- **Vendor / machine:** IBM / `ibm_kingston` superconducting processor, accessed via the Qiskit Runtime interface integrated with PennyLane. (The paper says only “IBM superconducting quantum hardware”; `ibm_kingston` is a Heron r2 device in IBM’s fleet, but the chip family, qubit total and calibration are **not stated in the paper**.)
- **Qubit count:** 4 used (oxytocin, $n = 9$ residues $\rightarrow q = \lceil \log_2 9 \rceil = 4$). Device total not reported in the paper.
- **Connectivity:** Not specified in the paper. IBM superconducting devices of this generation use heavy-hex connectivity (substrate reference, not the paper). The compiled circuit is a *dense* q -qubit unitary, so it requires effectively arbitrary two-qubit interactions and must be transpiled with SWAP networks onto whatever the device topology is.
- **Gate set:** Not reported. The circuit is specified at the abstract level as `MottonenStatePreparation` (amplitude encoding) followed by a single dense `QubitUnitary`; the native basis it transpiled to is not given. (IBM Heron native set is RZ/SX/X plus the CZ two-qubit gate, per substrate reference.)
- **Notable features leveraged:** None exotic. No mid-circuit measurement, no dynamic circuits, no hardware-native analog evolution. A vanilla state-preparation \rightarrow dense-unitary \rightarrow computational-basis measurement circuit. The only device-specific reality the paper invokes is “two-qubit gate infidelities” as the source of ranking deviations.

2.3 Computational primitive

Hamiltonian simulation (a continuous-time quantum walk, e^{-iAt}), but as *executed* it is **exact dense-unitary synthesis**, not Trotterised: $U(t)$ is built by classically forming $\text{expm}(-iA_p t)$ and loading it as one `QubitUnitary`. The output is read out by **sampling** in the computational basis. The asymptotic advantage the paper *invokes* (sparse-Hamiltonian simulation via qubitization / truncated Taylor series) is **not implemented**; it is cited as future work.

2.4 Resource fingerprint

Metric	Value	Source (page / equation / SI)
Qubits (logical)	4 (for oxytocin, $n = 9$); $q = \lceil \log_2 n \rceil$ in general	“Qubit Scaling with Residue Number”, arXiv.tex L477–480; circuit Fig. caption L503–510
Qubits (physical)	not reported (4 logical qubits mapped onto <code>ibm_kingston</code> ; transpiled physical qubit indices / ancilla overhead not given)	§“Proof-of-principle hardware demonstration”, L982–985
Circuit depth	not reported	(no transpilation metrics given)
2Q-gate count (total)	not reported (only qualitative “two-qubit gate infidelities”)	§“Proof-of-principle...”, L1014
Measurement shots	1024 per circuit	§“Proof-of-principle...”, L984
Classical loop iter.	Not applicable; method is parameter-free / non-variational. Default protocol samples $L = 40$ evolution times on a grid up to 20π (one circuit per time point); number of distinct circuits actually run on hardware not stated explicitly	time grid: “Time averaging and truncation”, L521–524
Wall-clock runtime	not reported	not reported

For every “not reported” row, the paper genuinely omits the number; none were inferred.

2.5 Assumptions and results

- **Claim.** CTQW long-time-averaged occupation probability is a viable, parameter-free residue-centrality measure. Across ~ 150 proteins it agrees strongly with classical eigenvector centrality (e.g. for oxytocin 1XY1: Spearman $\rho = 0.976$, Kendall $\tau = 0.929$, Overlap 1.000, Jaccard 1.000, $t^* = 448.394$; arXiv.tex L843). The dephased quantum transition map has a systematically larger spectral gap than the classical random walk ($\Delta_Q - \Delta_{cl}$ positive for all proteins, peaked at 0.6–0.75; quantum gaps mostly 0.6–0.85 vs $\Delta_{cl} \ll 1$; L929, L938, L943), implying faster mixing. Biologically, CTQW recovers known functional residues: for protein kinase

A the key score is 16.75% (vs 15.21% eigenvector, $\sim 8\%$ random baseline; L1041–1042), identifying 8/26 benchmark residues in the top 26 (L1051); for oxytocin it flags Tyr², Ile³, Asn⁵, Cys⁶ as most central, matching receptor-binding / Zn²⁺-coordination evidence (L1060).

- **Error bars / noise assumptions.** No quantitative error bars on the hardware run. Deviations attributed qualitatively to “finite-shot sampling and two-qubit gate infidelities in the compiled dense-unitary representation” (L1014). The hardware ranking is compared to classical and noiseless-simulator rankings in a 9-row table (L998–1009): top two residues (6, 5) are identical across all three; the device reproduces the simulator profile with minor permutations among ranks 3–6.
- **Classical baseline.** Classical eigenvector centrality (NetworkX power method, tol 10^{-6} , $\leq 10^3$ iterations; L172) is the headline baseline, plus the Kornev et al. PKA key-score comparison against degree / betweenness / closeness / eigenvector centralities. The paper notes the only consistently stronger classical method is betweenness centrality on LSP-based networks (25–30% key score; L1048).

2.6 Portability flags

These are the hardware/algorithmic features Brilliant’s portability analysis should weigh. Note the dominant theme: the “only $q = \lceil \log_2 n \rceil$ qubits” headline hides where the real cost sits.

- **Dense-unitary synthesis, not sparse simulation.** What ran on hardware is a single `QubitUnitary` built from the classically pre-computed matrix exponential $e^{-iA_p t}$. Generic q -qubit unitary synthesis costs $\mathcal{O}(4^q) = \mathcal{O}(N^2) \approx \mathcal{O}(n^2)$ two-qubit gates, *per time point*. The qubit count is logarithmic but the gate count is polynomial in the residue number, and the dense compilation exploits no sparsity. The paper states this explicitly (L544–546). The asymptotically efficient route (sparse-Hamiltonian simulation, qubitization, Trotter–Suzuki) is invoked but **not implemented or benchmarked**: porting the *claimed* scaling to any vendor requires building those oracles, which is the real engineering cost.
- **Amplitude-encoded state preparation (Möttönen routine).** The uniform superposition over n residues is loaded with `MottonenStatePreparation` (L490, L497). Generic amplitude encoding scales as $\mathcal{O}(2^q)$ gates and is a known near-term bottleneck; it adds depth before any evolution and is itself substrate-agnostic but expensive. Any portability story must cost state prep separately from the evolution.
- **Requires effectively all-to-all interaction at the logical level.** A dense unitary touches all qubit pairs, so on heavy-hex (IBM) or any limited-connectivity device it transpiles to SWAP-heavy circuits. No native connectivity is exploited; this is connectivity-agnostic but connectivity cost is paid in transpilation, and that cost is not reported.
- **No exotic hardware primitive required (portability positive).** The circuit uses no mid-circuit measurement, no dynamic circuits, no Rydberg blockade, no native analog evolution, no custom two-qubit gate. It is a universal gate-model circuit (prep \rightarrow unitary \rightarrow measure) and is in principle runnable on any universal gate-based platform (trapped-ion, neutral-atom digital, photonic dual-rail) without algorithmic redesign, only re-transpilation.
- **Embarrassingly parallel time sampling.** The time average is classical post-processing over independent single-shot-batch circuit

runs (one per evolution time, default $L = 40$). There is no measurement feedback, no classical optimisation loop, and no inter-circuit dependence, so the workload parallelises trivially across devices or shots.

- **Cross-paradigm anchor exists.** The same authors solved the identical residue-centrality problem as a QUBO on D-Wave annealing (RinQ, Mater. Today Quant. 2025; cited as [?]). That gives Brillant a direct gate-model-vs-annealer portability comparison for the same application target.

2.7 Caveats

No access limitation. The dossier contains the complete arXiv LaTeX source (`paper-source/arXiv.tex`, 1126 lines) plus all figures, and the code is public (`github.com/IshmamShah/CTQW_RIN`). The paper is not paywalled. The Supplementary Information adds only the protein list (PDB IDs and residue counts), so it carries no part of the hardware fingerprint; the SI was not separately needed. The single interpretive judgement, flagged above, is the gap between what was *executed* (a four-qubit dense-unitary circuit on `ibm_kingston`) and the sparse-simulation scaling the paper *invokes but does not run*; all hardware resource numbers above come from the executed run, and the device's chip family, connectivity, native gate set, depth, two-qubit-gate count and runtime are simply not reported in the paper.

3 Portability matrix