

Experimental Workflows for Combinatorial Optimization: Towards Quantum Advantage

Portability dossier - app

agQSL portability pipeline

2026-06-07

Field	Value
Slug	2026-arxiv-2604.25162-combinatorial-optimisation-workflows
Source	arXiv
Link	https://arxiv.org/abs/2604.25162
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	5
2.5	Assumptions and results	7
2.6	Portability flags	7
2.7	Caveats	8
3	Portability matrix	9

1 Source

1.1 Domain classification

optimisation. The paper is squarely combinatorial optimisation: it solves Minimum Vertex Cover, Maximum Independent Set, and Maximum Clique via QAOA on gate-based superconducting hardware, using the SCOOP Maximum Profit Cover ($\mathfrak{p}_{\text{PC}}(V') = |E(V')| - |V'|$) reformulation as a penalty-free unconstrained twin.

Secondary flavour: the real-world instances are drawn from biology and social/collaboration networks (protein-interaction graphs such as `bio-celegans`, `bio-yeast`, `bio-diseasome`; collaboration graphs such as `ca-netscience`; social graphs such as `karate`, `football`, `aves-sparrow-social`). These are instance sources, not the computational domain, so they do not change the primary classification. In the canonical graph this maps to the `optimization` app group on an `ibm` (superconducting) substrate.

1.2 Expert persona for Julien

A quantum-optimisation specialist fluent in QAOA on IBM gate-based superconducting hardware. They should know the Heron r2 heavy-hexagonal topology and its connectivity trade-offs, the transpilation and error-suppression knobs in play here (fractional-gate decomposition, native $RZZ(\theta)/RX(\theta)$, dynamical-decoupling sequence selection, measurement twirling, optimisation level 3), and layer-wise sequential QAOA training across QTensor, an MPS simulator, and hardware. Crucially, they must separate the genuine quantum-hardware fingerprint from the thick classical wrapper: parameterized-complexity reduction rules (singleton, pendant, degree-2, high-degree, LP-relaxation) plus the SCOOP MaxPC reformulation and greedy post-processing all sit around the QAOA core and should not be mistaken for hardware behaviour. Calibrated intuition about two-qubit gate budgets and circuit depth on heavy-hex lattices is needed to read the reported circuit statistics (up to 128 qubits, 13,555 two-qubit gates, $p = 1$ on hardware versus up to $p = 8$ in simulation).

1.3 Related prior work (brief bibliography)

- **SCOOP framework (foundational method, same group):** P. P. Angara, E. Martins, U. Stege, H. Müller, “SCOOP: A Quantum-Computing Framework for Constrained Combinatorial Optimization”, IEEE QCE 2025, vol. 1, pp. 65-75. The penalty-free constrained-to-unconstrained reformulation this pipeline deploys.
- **Penalty-free QAOA companion (same primitive, more algorithmic detail):** P. P. Angara et al., “The Art of Avoiding Constraints: A Penalty-free Approach to Constrained Combinatorial Optimization with QAOA”, [arXiv:2503.10077](https://arxiv.org/abs/2503.10077) (2025).
- **Cross-vendor benchmark substrate:** T. Koch et al., “Quantum Optimization Benchmarking Library - The Intractable Decathlon” (QOBLIB), [arXiv:2504.03832](https://arxiv.org/abs/2504.03832) (2025). Source of the MaxIS benchmark instances and the model-independent comparison protocol.
- **Same application, different vendor (the key portability comparison):** E. Pelofske, G. Hahn, H. N. Djidjev, “Solving Larger Maximum Clique Problems Using Parallel Quantum Annealing”, [arXiv:2205.12165](https://arxiv.org/abs/2205.12165); Quantum Information Processing 22:219

- (2023), doi:10.1007/s11128-023-03962-x. Max-clique / vertex-cover on a D-Wave annealer with classical graph decomposition as pre-processing, directly comparable to this paper’s reduction-rule pre-processing plus gate-based QAOA.
- **Original QAOA:** E. Farhi, J. Goldstone, S. Gutmann, “A Quantum Approximate Optimization Algorithm”, [arXiv:1411.4028](https://arxiv.org/abs/1411.4028) (2014).
 - **Penalty-based baseline this work avoids:** A. Lucas, “Ising formulations of many NP problems”, *Frontiers in Physics* 2:5 (2014), [arXiv:1302.5843](https://arxiv.org/abs/1302.5843).

1.4 Difficulty estimate

medium. The full LaTeX source is present in `paper-source/` (no paywall; `paper.html` is also bundled), the quantum execution sits on a single well-documented device (`ibm_quebec`, 156-qubit Heron r2), and the primitive is mainstream gate-based QAOA, all of which pull toward low. It is not low because the hardware fingerprint is spread across the Experimental Setup section and two results tables (Tables `qoblib` and `end_to_end_new`), and is wrapped in a substantial classical layer (SCOOP MaxPC reformulation, parameterized-complexity reduction rules, greedy post-processing) plus a moderately detailed error-suppression stack (fractional gates, dynamical-decoupling sequence selection via mirror-circuit calibration, measurement twirling, sequential layerwise training across QTensor and an MPS simulator). Julien will need to read carefully to isolate the genuine quantum-hardware fingerprint from that wrapper, but no SI material is required and nothing exotic is involved.

2 Extraction

2.1 What the paper does (one paragraph)

The paper presents a three-stage hybrid classical-quantum pipeline (a “sandbox platform”) for three mutually reducible NP-complete graph problems: Minimum Vertex Cover, Maximum Independent Set, and Maximum Clique. Classical pre-processing applies parameterized-complexity reduction rules to shrink the input graph; the reduced graph is encoded as the penalty-free Maximum Profit Cover (MaxPC) twin from the authors’ SCOOP framework and solved with QAOA on IBM gate-based superconducting hardware; classical post-processing (more reduction rules plus a greedy repair step) maps the quantum bitstring back to a feasible solution for the original problem. Feasibility is never encoded into the circuit, so QAOA optimises an unconstrained objective with no penalty hyperparameter. The authors run synthetic graphs (4 to 100 vertices), QOBLIB MaxIS benchmark instances, and real-world Network Repository graphs (up to 4,941 vertices, reduced before quantum execution), with hardware circuits using up to 128 qubits and 13,555 two-qubit gates.

2.2 Quantum hardware used

- **Vendor / machine:** IBM Quantum System One at PINQ² (Bromont, Quebec), device `ibm_quebec`, Heron r2 processor.
- **Qubit count:** up to 128 used / 156 available. One logical qubit per vertex of the reduced graph; the 156-qubit device capacity sets the 156-vertex cap on admitted instances (methodology, sec. III).
- **Connectivity:** heavy-hexagonal lattice; each qubit couples to two or three nearest neighbours (methodology, sec. III).
- **Gate set:** native fractional gates $R_{ZZ}(\theta)$ and $R_x(\theta)$ enabled at transpile time; the underlying two-qubit entangler is CZ (the paper counts two-qubit gates as “CNOT or CZ”). Transpiled with `Qiskit optimization level 3` and fractional-gate decomposition (methodology, sec. III).
- **Notable features leveraged:** fractional-gate native basis; dynamical decoupling (sequences such as `dd_XpXm`); measurement twirling; best error-suppression combination selected per circuit via a mirror-circuit calibration (circuit composed with its inverse, single- Z observables driven toward the ideal value of 1); fresh device characterization run immediately before each transpile (methodology, sec. III).

2.3 Computational primitive

QAOA (Quantum Approximate Optimization Algorithm). Hardware executions run a single layer ($p = 1$); simulator studies reach $p = 8$. Circuit parameters (γ, β) are pre-trained offline on classical simulators and then fixed before sampling on hardware, so the hardware step is a fixed-parameter sampling job rather than a closed-loop variational optimisation.

2.4 Resource fingerprint

Metric	Value	Source (page / equation / SI)
Qubits (logical)	up to 128 (1 per reduced-graph vertex); instances at 125, 128, 128 vertices	Table I (qoblib): C125-9, sloane_1dc_128, sloane_1zc_128; abstract
Qubits (physical)	156-qubit device; transpiled physical-qubit / SWAP-ancilla overhead not separately reported	methodology sec. III (“156-qubit capacity”); no transpiled physical count given
Circuit depth	two-qubit depth 89 to 3,168 (max 3,168 for insecta-ant-colony1-day38; 2,556 for the largest 128-qubit instance sloane_1dc_128)	Table I (qoblib), “2Q depth” column
2Q-gate count (total)	174 to 13,555 (max 13,555 for sloane_1dc_128)	Table I (qoblib), “2Q gates” column; abstract
Measurement shots	not reported (main text; only a commented-out draft mentions 100,000 samples). <code>SamplerV2</code> from <code>qiskit-ibm-runtime v0.43.1</code> used	methodology sec. III; Table I has no shots column
Classical loop iter.	not reported as an iteration count; QAOA angles trained sequentially layer-by-layer offline (QTensor / MPS), then fixed; hardware runs $p = 1$ with no on-device optimisation loop	methodology sec. III (“Sequential Training”)
Wall-clock runtime	sampling t_{samp} 268 to 606 s on <code>ibm_quebec</code> ; classical training t_{train} 72.2 to 25,033.8 s on QTensor	Table I (qoblib), “Time (s)” columns

2.5 Assumptions and results

- **Claim.** An end-to-end pipeline that exhausts cheap exact classical reductions first and offloads only the residual reduced graph to QAOA on the MaxPC unconstrained twin yields feasible, high-quality solutions for MinVC / MaxIS / MaxCl. Reported solutions are competitive with, and in a few cases exceed, the best Network Repository community results (e.g. MaxCl on `ia-infect-dublin` 16 vs 9, `insecta-ant-colony1-day38` 24 vs 22, `mammalia-kangaroo-interactions` 10 vs 9; end-to-end Table II).
- **Cost Hamiltonian (verbatim from source, Eq. 1).** With $\Delta_{\text{PC}} = \frac{|V|}{2} - \frac{3|E|}{4}$,

$$\hat{H}_{\text{PC}} = \frac{1}{4} \sum_{uv \in E} (Z_u Z_v + Z_u + Z_v) - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{v \in V} Z_v + \Delta_{\text{PC}}.$$

Equivalent QUBO (verbatim, Eq. 2):

$$\hat{H}_{\text{PC}}(\vec{x}) = \sum_{uv \in E} (x_u + x_v - x_u x_v) - \sum_v x_v.$$

Profit objective: $\mathfrak{p}_{\text{PC}}(V') = |E(V')| - |V'|$.

- **Error bars / noise.** No statistical error bars on hardware numbers. Aggregate synthetic-graph plots report mean and variance of probability mass on optimal and near-optimal ($\geq 90\%$, $\geq 80\%$) bitstrings across p (Fig. 1c); exact values are in figures, not tables.
- **Quantum-versus-random baseline.** The hardware benefit is measured as $p = 1$ QAOA profit over random sampling ($p = 0$). The gain is described as “modest” (e.g. `sloane_1dc_128`: 1,139 random vs 1,204 at $p = 1$; Table I). Best-sampled MaxIS approximation ratios α_{best} range 0.75 to 1.0 (Table I).
- **Classical baseline.** Solution sizes are compared against QOBLIB optima and Network Repository / literature reference values (Tables I and II). No wall-clock comparison against a classical solver is given; several real-world instances are solved entirely by classical pre-processing with the quantum step bypassed (Table II, “Solved” / “Bypassed” rows).

2.6 Portability flags

- **Native fractional $R_{ZZ}(\theta)$ is leaned on hard.** The QAOA cost layer is one $R_{ZZ}(\theta)$ rotation per graph edge, implemented directly via IBM’s fractional-gate basis. The reported two-qubit-gate counts (up to 13,555) assume this native angle-parametrised entangler. Most gate sets have no native continuously-parametrised two-qubit rotation and must decompose each $R_{ZZ}(\theta)$ into CNOT, $R_z(\theta)$, CNOT, which would roughly double the two-qubit-gate budget and depth.
- **Heavy-hex routing overhead is baked into the depth/gate numbers.** The cost Hamiltonian has a ZZ term per edge, but each qubit on the heavy-hex lattice touches only two or three neighbours. Dense problem graphs (e.g. `insecta-ant-colony1-day38`: 56 vertices, 1,134 edges, 2Q depth 3,168) demand heavy SWAP routing. An all-to-all substrate (trapped ion) would need far fewer SWAPs for the same edge set, so the two-qubit depth and gate counts here are topology-specific, not intrinsic to the algorithm.
- **Shallow hardware depth ($p = 1$) is a hardware-imposed limit.** Deeper QAOA (p up to 8) is only demonstrated in simulation; the hardware fingerprint is a single layer. Any portability comparison should compare like-for-like at $p = 1$.

- **Offline parameter training decouples the hardware step.** Angles are pre-trained on QTensor / MPS simulators and fixed before sampling, so the on-device workload is a parameterised sampling circuit, not a variational feedback loop. This makes the quantum step portable to any sampler but means the heavy classical training time (t_{train} up to 25,033.8 s) belongs to a simulator, not the quantum device.
- **IBM-specific error-suppression tooling.** Dynamical-decoupling sequence selection, measurement twirling, mirror-circuit calibration, SamplerV2, and qiskit-ibm-runtime v0.43.1 are IBM / Qiskit-specific. The concepts port, but the specific knobs and the fractional-gate / twirling incompatibility (gate twirling is disabled because fractional gates are on) do not.
- **Natural cross-substrate comparison is quantum annealing.** The MaxPC twin is an unconstrained Ising / QUBO, and the surrounding classical graph reduction mirrors the decomposition pre-processing used for D-Wave annealers on the same MaxCl / MinVC problems (see Pelofske et al. in the sourcing note). That is the most direct alternative-vendor route for this workload.

2.7 Caveats

- No paywall: full LaTeX source is present in `paper-source/`, and `paper.html` is bundled. All numbers above come from the TeX source (sections and the two results tables `tables/qoblib.tex` and `tables/end_to_end_new.tex`).
- **Measurement shots are not reported** in the main text. A draft comment mentions “100000 samples”, but this is commented out and is not a reported value, so it is recorded as “not reported”.
- **Physical-qubit overhead is not reported.** The paper gives the logical mapping (one qubit per vertex, up to 128) and the device capacity (156), but not the transpiled physical-qubit count, SWAP count, or qubit-routing layout.
- **Classical optimiser iteration counts are not reported.** Sequential layerwise training is described qualitatively; the number of optimiser evaluations per layer is not given.
- Figure-only quantities (per-instance profit curves, aggregate probability-mass means and variances across p) live in PNG plots (`figures/plots/`) that were not read numerically; the table-backed numbers above are unaffected.

3 Portability matrix