

Protein folding on a 64 qubit trapped-ion hardware via counterdiabatic quantum optimization

Portability dossier - app

agQSL portability pipeline

2026-06-07

Field	Value
Slug	2026-arxiv-2604.26861-ionq-protein-folding
Source	arXiv
Link	https://arxiv.org/abs/2604.26861
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	3
2	Extraction	4
2.1	What the paper does (one paragraph)	4
2.2	Quantum hardware used	4

2.3	Computational primitive	4
2.4	Resource fingerprint	4
2.5	Assumptions and results	5
2.6	Portability flags	6
2.7	Caveats	6
3	Portability matrix	7

1 Source

1.1 Domain classification

Primary: biology. Secondary: optimisation, because the biological task is reduced to a constrained higher-order binary optimisation problem on a tetrahedral lattice.

1.2 Expert persona for Julien

A computational structural biologist or computational chemist who has worked with coarse-grained peptide-folding models, especially lattice encodings and Miyazawa-Jernigan contact potentials. They should also be comfortable with QAOA/DCQO-style quantum optimisation papers, since the extraction depends on separating biological model choices from circuit, sampling, pruning, and post-processing choices. Prior exposure to trapped-ion all-to-all connectivity would help, but the core expertise should be in peptide-folding formulations rather than trapped-ion hardware.

1.3 Related prior work (brief bibliography)

- Perdomo-Ortiz et al., “Finding low-energy conformations of lattice protein models by quantum annealing”, Scientific Reports 2012, DOI: 10.1038/srep00571, <https://doi.org/10.1038/srep00571>.
- Robert et al., “Resource-efficient quantum algorithm for protein folding”, npj Quantum Information 2021, DOI: 10.1038/s41534-021-00368-4, <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41534-021-00368-4>.
- Boulebnane et al., “Peptide conformational sampling using the Quantum Approximate Optimization Algorithm”, npj Quantum Information 2023, DOI: 10.1038/s41534-023-00733-5, <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41534-023-00733-5>.
- Linn et al., “Resource analysis of quantum algorithms for coarse-grained protein folding models”, Physical Review Research 2024, DOI: 10.1103/PhysRevResearch.6.033112, <https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevResearch.6.033112>.
- Romero et al., “Protein folding with an all-to-all trapped-ion quantum computer”, arXiv:2506.07866, <https://arxiv.org/abs/2506.07866>.
- Pamidimukkala et al., “Protein Structure Prediction with High Degrees of Freedom in a Gate-Based Quantum Computer”, Journal of Chemical Theory and Computation 2024, DOI: 10.1021/acs.jctc.4c00848, <https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.jctc.4c00848>.

1.4 Difficulty estimate

medium. The paper is readable locally as HTML and TeX source, with no paywall blocker, but Julien will need to track a dense chain from peptide/lattice encoding through BF-DCQO parameter choices, pruning thresholds, trapped-ion execution details, and consensus post-processing.

2 Extraction

2.1 What the paper does (one paragraph)

The paper maps six short peptide-folding problems onto a coarse-grained tetrahedral lattice model and solves the resulting dense higher-order binary optimisation instances with bias-field digitised counterdiabatic quantum optimisation (BF-DCQO). The encoding separates backbone geometry qubits from residue-contact qubits, so many raw quantum samples violate protein geometry constraints. The authors therefore use classical post-processing to repair or combine sampled information. Their central claim is not a direct fold prediction from raw quantum samples, but that BF-DCQO produces lower-energy, more structured samples than uniform random sampling, especially in the contact sector, and that a consensus post-processing pipeline can preserve this signal.

2.2 Quantum hardware used

- **Vendor / machine:** IonQ / 64-qubit Barium development system similar to the forthcoming IonQ Tempo line (paper Sec. III-B).
- **Qubit count:** 46, 53, or 61 qubits used, depending on the peptide instance; up to 64 Barium qubits available on the development system (paper Sec. II-B, Table I; Sec. III-B).
- **Connectivity:** All-to-all connectivity through collective motional modes; dense Ising coupling maps are implemented directly without SWAP overhead (paper Sec. I; Sec. III-B).
- **Gate set:** The paper reports arbitrary single-qubit rotations and entangling ZZ gates; it does not provide a complete compiled native gate table (paper Sec. III-B).
- **Notable features leveraged:** Long-chain steered-beam trapped-ion architecture, 532 nm laser pulses, acousto-optic-deflector optical control, all-to-all dense coupling, 25-shot-batch measurement debiasing, leakage checks, and classical bias-field feedback between quantum rounds (paper Sec. III-A; Sec. III-B).

2.3 Computational primitive

Other: BF-DCQO, a non-variational digitised counterdiabatic optimisation and sampling primitive with iterative classical bias-field updates.

2.4 Resource fingerprint

Metric	Value	Source (page / equation / SI)
Qubits (logical)	46, 53, or 61 problem qubits; layouts are 21 geometry plus 25 contact, 23 geometry plus 30 contact, or 25 geometry plus 36 contact. These are not error-corrected logical qubits.	Paper Sec. II-B; Table I
Qubits (physical)	46 to 61 Barium trapped-ion qubits used out of up to 64 available	Paper Sec. II-B, Table I; Sec. III-B
Circuit depth	not reported	Paper Sec. III-A reports $n_{\text{steps}} = 1$ and pruning by θ , but not compiled circuit depth
2Q-gate count (total)	not reported	Paper Sec. IV-B says the 61-qubit θ choice kept entangling gates in the range of 1,000, but gives no exact total by instance or pruning level
Measurement shots	5,000 shots per iteration; implied totals are 50,000 shots for 10-round configurations and 40,000 shots for the 8-round MRWQEMGYIFYPRKLR configuration	Paper Sec. III-A; Algorithm 2. Totals are arithmetic from reported R and n_{shots}
Classical loop iter.	10 BF-DCQO rounds, except 8 rounds for MRWQEMGYIFYPRKLR	Paper Sec. III-A
Wall-clock runtime	not reported	No runtime value appears in the main text, local HTML, or TeX source; no SI file is present locally

2.5 Assumptions and results

- The paper claims BF-DCQO shifts raw sampled energy distributions towards lower energies than uniform random sampling, with the clearest learned signal in the contact qubits. With consensus post-processing, BF-DCQO seeds reach the classical reference energy for 4 of 6 sequences, while random seeds reach it for 1 of 6 (paper Sec. IV-B; Table II).

- The paper does not report statistical error bars, confidence intervals, full hardware fidelity numbers, or a quantitative noise model for these runs. It discusses noise qualitatively: most raw samples violate geometry constraints, only $\sim 3.1\%$ of samples are geometrically feasible for the LEPFSGKALCSWSIC example, and a single spin flip can invalidate a backbone geometry (paper Sec. IV-A).
- Classical reference energies are obtained by running a genetic algorithm until convergence. The main sampling baseline is an equal number of uniform random bitstrings, and both quantum and random seeds are passed through the same consensus and per-sample-repair post-processing heuristics (paper Sec. III-A; Sec. III-C; Sec. IV-C).

2.6 Portability flags

- Requires 46 to 61 usable physical qubits for the reported instances, with no error correction or logical encoding overhead described.
- Leans on all-to-all trapped-ion connectivity for dense Ising couplings; the paper explicitly says this avoids SWAP overhead on nearest-neighbour architectures.
- Uses arbitrary single-qubit rotations and entangling ZZ gates as reported hardware operations; other gate sets would need decomposition.
- The problem Hamiltonians are dense higher-order spin-glass instances with long-range interactions involving up to five-body terms, so compilation and pruning strategy matter.
- The 61-qubit runs depend on a pruning threshold chosen to keep entangling gates in the range of 1,000, and the paper says this reduced result quality at that scale.
- Does not require mid-circuit measurement: measurements occur at the end of each circuit execution, and bias updates happen classically between rounds.
- The quantum circuits do not preserve backbone feasibility constraints, so portability of the workflow includes classical feasibility repair and consensus post-processing, not only circuit execution.
- Measurement debiasing and leakage checks are part of the reported experimental protocol.

2.7 Caveats

No paywall blocker: the arXiv HTML rendering and TeX source were available locally. The dossier contains no `paper.pdf`, `paper.url`, or separate Supplementary Information file, and the arXiv source bundle lists only `main.tex`, figures, and bibliography files. I therefore could not cite PDF page numbers or SI-only resource tables; source references above use the paper’s section, equation, algorithm, figure, or table labels from the local arXiv HTML and TeX source.

3 Portability matrix