

# Quantum Feature Selection with Higher-Order Binary Optimization on Trapped-Ion Hardware

Portability dossier - app

agQSL portability pipeline

2026-06-07

Field	Value
Slug	2026-arxiv-2604.26834-ionq-feature-selection
Source	arXiv
Link	<a href="https://arxiv.org/abs/2604.26834">https://arxiv.org/abs/2604.26834</a>
Category	app
Triaged	2026-05-16 by port_until_julien_parallel
Bootstrapped	2026-06-07

## Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>Source</b>	<b>3</b>
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
<b>2</b>	<b>Extraction</b>	<b>5</b>

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	6
2.6	Portability flags	6
2.7	Caveats	7
<b>3</b>	<b>Portability matrix</b>	<b>8</b>

# 1 Source

## 1.1 Domain classification

machine learning. Secondary: optimisation, because the feature-selection objective is encoded as a HUBO/Ising optimisation problem; the application benchmark is ML preprocessing for tabular classification, not a domain-specific biology workload despite the Gallstone medical dataset.

## 1.2 Expert persona for Julien

A quantum machine-learning researcher with hands-on feature-selection experience, especially mutual-information filters and classifier-level validation on tabular data. They should be comfortable reading HUBO/Ising objectives and DCQO sampling workflows on trapped-ion hardware. The right person can distinguish ML-preprocessing choices, such as feature preselection or thresholding inclusion probabilities, from actual hardware execution details.

## 1.3 Related prior work (brief bibliography)

- Sascha Muecke et al., “Feature selection on quantum computers”, *Quantum Machine Intelligence* 5, 11 (2023). DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s42484-023-00099-z>; arXiv: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2203.13261>. QUBO-style feature selection tested across classical optimisation, gate-model, and annealing routes.
- Maurizio Ferrari Dacrema et al., “Towards Feature Selection for Ranking and Classification Exploiting Quantum Annealers”, SIGIR 2022. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1145/3477495.3531755>; arXiv: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2205.04346>. Annealer-oriented quadratic feature-selection formulation for ranking and classification.
- Gerhard Hellstern, Vanessa Dehn, and Martin Zaeferrer, “Quantum computer based feature selection in machine learning”, *IET Quantum Communication* 5 (2024), 232-252. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1049/qt2.12086>; arXiv: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2306.10591>. QUBO feature-selection comparison using classical optimisers plus QAOA/VQE on IBM hardware.
- Jose J. Orquin-Marques et al., “Analog Quantum Feature Selection with Neutral-Atom Quantum Processors” (2025). arXiv: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2510.20798>. Same broad QFS application, but framed for neutral-atom analogue execution with mutual-information relevance and redundancy.
- Narendra N. Hegade, Xi Chen, and Enrique Solano, “Digitized counterdiabatic quantum optimization”, *Physical Review Research* 4, L042030 (2022). DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevResearch.4.L042030>. Core DCQO method used as the optimisation engine here.
- Sebastian V. Romero et al., “Bias-field digitized counterdiabatic quantum algorithm for higher-order binary optimization”, *Communications Physics* 8, 348 (2025). DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1038/s42005-025-02270-3>; arXiv: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2409.04477>. Direct context for higher-order binary optimisation with the same DCQO family.

#### 1.4 Difficulty estimate

medium. The local HTML/LaTeX source is readable, no paywall blockage was found, and the paper is short. Extraction is still medium because Julien must separate HUBO coefficient construction, DCQO scheduling and sampling, low-energy post-processing, and the 32-feature preprocessing limit; no supplementary PDF appears necessary from the bootstrapped folder.

## 2 Extraction

### 2.1 What the paper does (one paragraph)

The paper turns feature selection for tabular classification into a higher-order binary optimisation problem. Each candidate feature is represented by a spin, and the objective combines mutual-information scores for feature relevance, pairwise redundancy, and three-feature dependencies. The resulting HUBO Hamiltonian is sampled with digitised counterdiabatic quantum optimisation on IonQ Forte-class trapped-ion hardware. Measured bitstrings are ranked by their Hamiltonian energy; low-energy samples are retained, converted into per-feature inclusion probabilities, and thresholded to choose a compact feature subset. The authors test this workflow on Gallstone and Spambase classification datasets and compare the selected subsets with noiseless quantum simulation, all-feature classifiers, PCA, and SelectKBest.

### 2.2 Quantum hardware used

- **Vendor / machine:** IonQ / Forte-class systems. The paper does not name a specific Forte QPU instance.
- **Qubit count:** 32 used / available count not reported. The 32 hardware qubits correspond to the 32 preselected input features.
- **Connectivity:** All-to-all connectivity is claimed for trapped-ion processors such as IonQ Forte; no explicit coupling map is provided.
- **Gate set:** Arbitrary single-qubit rotations and entangling ZZ gates, implemented with two-photon Raman transitions driven by 355 nm laser pulses.
- **Notable features leveraged:** Yb<sup>+</sup> trapped-ion platform, integrated surface linear Paul traps, acousto-optic deflector beam steering for individual-ion addressing, all-to-all connectivity for long-range HUBO interactions, terminal computational-basis measurement, and classical low-energy post-selection. No mid-circuit measurement is reported.

### 2.3 Computational primitive

Sampling: digitised counterdiabatic quantum optimisation (DCQO) used to sample low-energy states of a higher-order Ising/HUBO Hamiltonian.

### 2.4 Resource fingerprint

Metric	Value	Source (page / equation / SI)
Qubits (logical)	32 feature variables / Ising spins	p. 2, Eq. (2); p. 3, Sec. III.B; p. 4, Sec. IV.A
Qubits (physical)	32 used; available hardware qubit count not reported	p. 3, Sec. III.B

Metric	Value	Source (page / equation / SI)
Circuit depth	not reported	Not reported; p. 3, Sec. III.B gives a two-qubit gate count but no depth
2Q-gate count (total)	approximately 1 000 two-qubit gates per final circuit per dataset	p. 3, Sec. III.B
Measurement shots	2 000 shots per circuit	p. 3, Sec. III.B
Classical loop iter.	not reported	p. 3, Sec. III.B notes results after 1 iteration, but does not define a classical optimisation loop or full iteration schedule
Wall-clock runtime	not reported	Not reported in the paper or local source bundle

## 2.5 Assumptions and results

- The paper claims that explicit three-body HUBO terms capture feature structure missed by QUBO feature-selection models, and that DCQO on IonQ Forte can produce low-energy samples useful for feature ranking.
- Error bars are not reported. The paper compares hardware output with noiseless quantum simulation, but does not give a hardware noise model, measured error bars, circuit depth, or per-run uncertainty intervals.
- Classical comparisons use Random Forest evaluation of the selected feature sets against all features, PCA with 95% explained variance, and SelectKBest based on mutual information. On Gallstone, IonQ Forte selects 19 of 32 features at  $\tau = 0.525$  and reports Acc 0.79, F1 0.79, AUC 0.88; PCA reports AUC 0.79 and SelectKBest AUC 0.84 (p. 4, Table I). On Spambase, IonQ Forte selects 23 of 32 features at  $\tau = 0.50$  and reports Acc 0.9475, F1 0.9464, AUC 0.9836; PCA reports AUC 0.9615 and SelectKBest AUC 0.9805 (p. 5, Table II).

## 2.6 Portability flags

1. Requires 32 qubits for the reported runs because each preselected feature maps to one qubit; smaller devices would require stronger classical preselection or a different encoding.
2. The paper leans on all-to-all trapped-ion connectivity to accommodate long-range HUBO interactions without embedding; sparse-connectivity gate-model hardware would need routing or decomposition overhead not quantified here.
3. The reported implementation uses IonQ Forte native-style arbitrary single-qubit rotations plus entangling ZZ gates; other gate sets would need a compilation path for the DCQO circuits and the two-qubit count may change.

4. The HUBO objective includes explicit three-body terms; portability depends on how those higher-order phase interactions are decomposed on the target gate set. The paper does not provide a portable circuit-depth formula.
5. The workflow needs repeated terminal measurement and classical low-energy filtering over 2 000 shots per circuit; it does not rely on mid-circuit measurement or feed-forward.
6. The 32-qubit hardware limit shapes the ML pipeline: both datasets are first reduced to 32 features using  $MI(X_i, y)$  ranking before the quantum run.
7. The paper reports approximately 1 000 two-qubit gates per final circuit, so two-qubit fidelity and compilation overhead are likely material portability constraints, but no cross-device error budget is supplied.

## 2.7 Caveats

The dossier contains local HTML, TeX source, and figure PDFs, but no root `paper.pdf` and no separate Supplementary Information document. I downloaded the arXiv PDF only to map claims to page numbers and cross-checked it against the local source. No paywall or unreachable paper sections were encountered. The paper does not report available qubit count, circuit depth, wall-clock runtime, a full circuit schedule, or error bars.

### 3 Portability matrix