

Noise-Induced Landscape Distortion in QAOA for Constrained Binary Optimization: Empirical Characterization on IBM Quantum Hardware

Portability dossier - app

agQSL portability pipeline

2026-06-07

Field	Value
Slug	2026-arxiv-2604.19426-qaoa-portfolio-noise
Source	arXiv
Link	https://arxiv.org/abs/2604.19426
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	5
2.4	Resource fingerprint	6
2.5	Assumptions and results	7
2.6	Portability flags	8
2.7	Caveats	8
3	Portability matrix	9

1 Source

1.1 Domain classification

Primary: **optimisation**. The contribution is a device-level noise characterisation metric (Landscape Span Compression) for $p=1$ QAOA on constrained QUBO problems. Secondary: **finance**. The three benchmark instances are mean-variance portfolio selections with a cardinality constraint, but the paper is explicit that portfolio selection is only a representative constrained QUBO; the metrics and methodology are pitched at any QUBO-encoded combinatorial problem (scheduling, routing, max- k -cut). Treat finance as illustrative, not the subject.

1.2 Expert persona for Julien

A NISQ variational-algorithms practitioner with hands-on `qiskit-ibm-runtime` experience on IBM superconducting hardware. Should have calibrated intuition about compiling shallow QAOA to the Heron native gate set $\{CZ, R_Z, SX, X\}$, about what `AerSimulator.from_backend()` does and does not model (per-gate depolarising plus T_1/T_2 thermal relaxation plus asymmetric readout bit-flips, but no correlated SPAM or always-on ZZ crosstalk), and about the cost and caveats of the mitigation stack (Richardson ZNE at fold factors $\{1, 3, 5\}$, M3 readout mitigation). Familiarity with QUBO/Ising penalty encodings of cardinality constraints is useful but secondary; the hardware fingerprint here is the device (`ibm_fez`, Heron r2, 156 qubits), the primitive (one-layer QAOA grid scan), shot budgets ($\leq 57,344$ per grid point), and the error-mitigation choices, not the application maths.

1.3 Related prior work (brief bibliography)

- Harrigan et al., *Quantum approximate optimization of non-planar graph problems on a planar superconducting processor*, arXiv:2004.04197 (Nat. Phys. 17, 332, 2021). Canonical same-primitive, different-vendor baseline: QAOA AR degradation on Google Sycamore superconducting hardware.
- Pelofske, Bärtschi, Eidenbenz, *Quantum Annealing vs. QAOA: 127 Qubit Higher-Order Ising Problems on NISQ Computers*, arXiv:2301.00520. Direct cross-platform comparison of QAOA on IBM `ibm_washington` against D-Wave annealing; the closest cross-vendor portability reference for the same Ising primitive.
- Brandhofer et al., *Benchmarking the performance of portfolio optimization with QAOA*, arXiv:2207.10555 (Quantum Inf. Process. 2022). Same application (constrained portfolio QUBO) under finite-shot, gate, and readout noise; the nearest same-application comparison point.
- Shaydulin & Wild, *Classical symmetries and QAOA*, arXiv:2012.04713 (Quantum 7, 1040, 2023). Theoretical basis for the OPS = 0 parameter-transfer claim that classically optimised (γ^*, β^*) carry to hardware.
- Nation, Kang, Sundaresan, Gambetta, *Scalable mitigation of measurement errors on quantum computers (M3)*, arXiv:2108.12518 (PRX Quantum 2, 040326, 2021). The post-hoc readout mitigation the paper proposes (but does not run) to isolate the readout contribution to LSC.

- *Quantum Portfolio Optimization: An Extensive Benchmark*, arXiv:2509.17876 (2025). Recent broad benchmark of quantum portfolio solvers, useful for situating LSC against the wider portfolio-QAOA literature.

1.4 Difficulty estimate

low. Short IEEE QCE 2026 EXAP-track conference paper, single device, single QAOA depth ($p=1$), no supplementary material, no paywall. The hardware fingerprint is stated explicitly in the Experimental Setup section (device, qubit count, native gate set, `Qiskit` 2.3.1 / `qiskit-ibm-runtime` 0.46.1 versions, optimisation level 3, shots per grid point, ZNE fold factors), and the full LaTeX source plus all six figures are already vendored under `paper-source/`. The primitives are standard; no exotic encodings. Extraction should be quick.

2 Extraction

2.1 What the paper does (one paragraph)

This experience-and-application (EXAP) study introduces Landscape Span Compression (LSC), a scale-free metric for how hardware noise flattens the QAOA energy landscape: $LSC \rightarrow 1$ as the landscape collapses toward a barren plateau. The author runs depth-1 ($p=1$) QAOA on IBM’s *ibm_fez* (Heron r2) for three small constrained portfolio-selection QUBOs (6 and 8 binary variables, cardinality constraint $k = \lfloor n/2 \rfloor$), scanning the two-parameter (γ, β) plane on a 13×13 grid. Comparing ideal-simulator, calibration-noise-simulator, and hardware landscapes, it finds noise compresses the landscape span by 24–30% without moving the optimum (so classically optimised parameters transfer directly), that IBM’s calibration noise model reproduces landscape *shape* (Pearson $r = 0.959$) but underestimates *amplitude* suppression, and that zero-noise extrapolation gives mixed gains with large uncertainty inflation. The paper is a noise-characterisation methodology piece; portfolio selection is only an illustrative constrained QUBO.

2.2 Quantum hardware used

- **Vendor / machine:** IBM Quantum / *ibm_fez* (Heron r2 generation).
- **Qubit count:** 6 or 8 used (one qubit per binary variable; $n \in \{6, 8\}$) of 156 available. (§Experimental Setup; Table II instances.)
- **Connectivity:** Heavy-hex with tunable couplers. The paper states only “156 superconducting qubits with tunable couplers” (§Hardware and Simulation); heavy-hex is the standard Heron r2 topology (cross-checked against the Ezratty 2025 index, Fig. 354 “Heron heavy-hex connectivity”) and is not given as a verbatim phrase in the paper.
- **Gate set:** native $\{CZ, R_Z, SX, X\}$, transpiled at optimisation level 3 (§Hardware and Simulation). *CZ* is the native two-qubit gate.
- **Notable features leveraged:** Zero-Noise Extrapolation (Richardson extrapolation at noise-amplification fold factors $\{1, 3, 5\}$) via the `EstimatorV2` primitive; calibration-based noise modelling via `AerSimulator.from_backend()`. No mid-circuit measurement, no dynamic circuits, no exotic primitives. M3 readout mitigation is *proposed but not run*.

2.3 Computational primitive

QAOA ($p=1$, single layer). Implemented as a fixed 13×13 grid scan over the (γ, β) parameter plane rather than a hardware-in-the-loop variational optimisation. Parameters (γ^*, β^*) are pre-optimised classically (multi-start COBYLA on a noiseless simulator) and frozen for all hardware runs.

The cost Hamiltonian, cost unitary, and mixer (copied from `paper-source/`, macros expanded):

$$H_C = \sum_{ij} Q_{ij} Z_i Z_j + \sum_i Q_{ii} Z_i$$

$$U_C(\gamma) = e^{-i\gamma H_C}, \quad U_B(\beta) = e^{-i\beta H_B}, \quad H_B = \sum_i X_i$$

starting from $|+\rangle^{\otimes n}$. The QUBO objective is mean-variance $f(\mathbf{x}) = -\mu^\top \mathbf{x} + \lambda \mathbf{x}^\top \Sigma \mathbf{x}$ with a squared cardinality penalty $P(\sum_{i=1}^n x_i - k)^2$, $P = \|\mu\|_1 + \lambda \|\sigma\|_1$ (Eq. (1), §Problem Formulation).

2.4 Resource fingerprint

Metric	Value	Source (page / equation / SI)
Qubits (logical)	not reported (NISQ; no error correction). Variables $n \in \{6, 8\}$ map 1:1 to physical qubits.	§Experimental Setup; Table II
Qubits (physical)	6 (6-var instance) / 8 (8-var instances) of 156 available	Abstract; §Hardware and Simulation; Table II
Circuit depth	not reported (stated only as $p=1$ QAOA at transpiler optimisation level 3)	§QAOA Circuit; §Hardware and Simulation
2Q-gate count (total)	not reported	not applicable
Measurement shots	57,344 per grid point; $13 \times 13 = 169$ points per landscape (so $\approx 9.69 \times 10^6$ shots per hardware landscape, derived)	Abstract; Table II; Eq. (2)
Classical loop iter.	not reported (multi-start COBYLA on noiseless simulator; count unstated). No hardware-in-the-loop iteration; hardware uses a fixed 169-point grid scan.	§QAOA Circuit; Eq. (2)

Metric	Value	Source (page / equation / SI)
Wall-clock runtime	not reported per run. Total hardware allocation: 180-minute IBM Quantum Open Plan promotion.	§Acknowledgment

Landscape span and LSC definitions (verbatim from `paper-source/`, macros expanded), Eqs. (3)–(4):

$$\text{LS}(L) = \max_{\theta \in \mathcal{P}} L(\theta) - \min_{\theta \in \mathcal{P}} L(\theta)$$

$$\text{LSC}(\varepsilon) = 1 - \frac{\text{LS}(L_\varepsilon)}{\text{LS}(L_0)}$$

2.5 Assumptions and results

- **Claimed.** Hardware noise compresses the QAOA landscape span by 24–30% ($\text{LSC}_{\text{hw}} \in [0.24, 0.30]$) without displacing the global minimum (OPS = 0 for all instances), supporting classical-to-hardware parameter transfer. The IBM calibration noise model gives Pearson $r = 0.959$ structural agreement but explains only $\approx 42\%$ of approximation-ratio degradation and 44–59% of hardware LSC, with crosstalk and coherent errors named as the leading unexplained contributors. LSC is argued to be a more sensitive noise discriminator than AR, Pearson r , FF, or OPS (Table I: 6-var hardware values AR = 0.914, $r = 0.959$, FF = 0.515, OPS = 0, LSC = 0.288).
- **Error bars / noise assumptions.** Consistent noise cost of 0.032 ± 0.001 AR units (ideal \rightarrow hardware) across all instances. ZNE inflates standard deviation by 3.1–5.1 \times . The calibration noise model (`AerSimulator.from_backend()`) comprises per-gate depolarising channels (strength = reported error rate), thermal relaxation (T_1, T_2 , gate time), and asymmetric readout bit-flips. It explicitly omits correlated SPAM, measurement crosstalk, always-on ZZ parasitic coupling ($\xi_{ij} \sim 10\text{--}100$ kHz between neighbours), coherent over/under-rotation in R_Z/SX , and calibration drift (§Noise Model Gap Analysis). OPS = 0 is resolution-limited: the grid spacing $0.8/12 \approx 0.067$ rad sets the floor; sub-cell drift is not resolved (§5.1).
- **Comparison to classical baseline.** Classical brute force, simulated annealing, and random search all achieve AR = 1.000; all feasible QAOA solutions lie within 0.63% (8-var) and 1.71% (6-var) of the true optimum, so AR is an insensitive discriminator and classical solvers trivially dominate at this size (§Approximation Ratio; acknowledged in §Limitations). Hardware feasibility fraction stays 1.5–1.7 \times above the random-sampling baseline (31.25% for $n=6$, 27.34% for $n=8$): 6-var FF degrades 63.9% \rightarrow 59.0% \rightarrow 51.5% (ideal \rightarrow noisy \rightarrow hardware); 8-var reaches $\approx 42\%$.

- **ZNE outcome.** Energy improvements of +7.1% and +9.3% for two instances but −3.5% degradation for the third, attributed to non-monotone noise dependence at high fold factors.

2.6 Portability flags

- **Native CZ two-qubit gate (Heron r2).** The $p=1$ cost layer is a set of $R_{ZZ}(\gamma)$ rotations realised from native $CZ + R_Z + SX$. Platforms whose native two-qubit gate is not CZ (e.g. trapped-ion Mølmer-Sørensen / native $XX(\theta)$, or older IBM Eagle’s ECR) must re-decompose each R_{ZZ} ; this is a routine basis change with low portability cost, but the gate count and depth would differ.
- **Heavy-hex connectivity vs dense QUBO coupling.** The mean-variance objective plus cardinality penalty produces a *fully connected* QUBO (every Q_{ij} generally nonzero), whereas Heron is heavy-hex (degree 2–3). Realising non-neighbour $Z_i Z_j$ terms requires SWAP routing; mild at $n = 6, 8$ but it grows with problem size. An all-to-all platform (trapped ions) would remove this SWAP overhead and is the natural portability contrast for the same Ising primitive.
- **The QAOA circuit itself is highly portable.** Standard $p=1$ structure (R_{ZZ} cost layer + R_X mixer, computational-basis readout), no mid-circuit measurement, no dynamic circuits, no device-exclusive primitive. The hard-to-port content is the *noise characterisation*, which is device-specific by design.
- **IBM-runtime-specific mitigation tooling.** ZNE uses Richardson extrapolation at folds $\{1, 3, 5\}$ through `EstimatorV2`; the gate-folding idea is vendor-agnostic but the implementation is `qiskit-ibm-runtime 0.46.1 / Qiskit 2.3.1` specific. `AerSimulator.from_backend()` calibration modelling and the proposed (unrun) M3 readout mitigation are IBM-ecosystem tools; the noise-gap conclusions do not transfer to other vendors’ calibration formats.
- **Noise-model fidelity claims are not portable.** The Pearson $r = 0.959$ / “44–59% of LSC explained” findings characterise `ibm_fez` under its calibration snapshot; they are not predictions for any other device or substrate.

2.7 Caveats

Full open access: arXiv abstract page, full HTML rendering, and the complete arXiv LaTeX source (`paper-source/LSC-QAOA-ibm_fez-arxiv.tex`, plus all six figure PDFs) are vendored. No paywall and no supplementary information exists (short IEEE QCE 2026 EXAP-track conference paper, single author). Nothing was unreachable.

Resource rows marked “not reported” reflect genuine absences in the paper: the author gives shots-per-point, grid size, device, gate set, software versions, and fold factors, but does **not** report transpiled circuit depth, two-qubit-gate counts, COBYLA iteration counts, or per-run wall-clock time. The 180-minute figure in the Acknowledgment is the total hardware *access grant* (IBM Quantum Open Plan promotion), not a measured run time. The $\approx 9.69 \times 10^6$ shots-per-landscape figure is derived ($57,344$ shots/point $\times 169$ grid points), not stated verbatim. Heavy-hex connectivity is inferred from the Heron r2 device identity and an external survey, not from an explicit statement in the paper.

3 Portability matrix