

Formulating Subgroup Discovery as a Quantum Optimization Problem for Network Security

Portability dossier - app

agQSL portability pipeline

2026-06-07

Field	Value
Slug	2026-arxiv-2604.27153-network-security-subgroups
Source	arXiv
Link	https://arxiv.org/abs/2604.27153
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

other - cybersecurity / network intrusion detection. Secondary: optimisation, because the paper maps subgroup discovery and feature subset selection to a QUBO solved with QAOA.

1.2 Expert persona for Julien

A cybersecurity data-mining researcher familiar with intrusion detection datasets, subgroup discovery, feature selection, and explainable rule mining. They should also be comfortable with QUBO and QAOA papers, enough to separate the WRAcc surrogate, cardinality penalty, beam-search baseline, and IBM hardware execution details. The right reviewer will notice where the extraction depends on figures or tables rather than prose, especially for $p = 1$ scaling and simulator versus `ibm_pittsburgh` runs.

1.3 Related prior work (brief bibliography)

- Tavallae et al., “A detailed analysis of the KDD CUP 99 data set”, 2009. DOI: 10.1109/CISDA.2009.5356528.
- Atzmueller, Sylvester, and Kanawati, “Exploratory and Explanation-Aware Network Intrusion Profiling using Subgroup Discovery and Complex Network Analysis”, EICC 2023. DOI: 10.1145/3590777.3590803.
- Farhi, Goldstone, and Gutmann, “A Quantum Approximate Optimization Algorithm”, 2014. arXiv:1411.4028.
- Yu, “Experimental Implementation of Quantum Algorithm for Association Rules Mining”, IEEE JETCAS 2022. DOI: 10.1109/JET-CAS.2022.3201097; arXiv:2204.13634.
- Kukliansky et al., “Network Anomaly Detection Using Quantum Neural Networks on Noisy Quantum Computers”, IEEE TQE 2024. DOI: 10.1109/TQE.2024.3359574.
- Cirillo, Esposito, and Seo, “Benchmarking quantum machine learning methods for intrusion detection on noisy quantum computers”, Quantum Machine Intelligence 2026. DOI: 10.1007/s42484-026-00379-4.

1.4 Difficulty estimate

medium. The PDF is readable locally and is only 12 pages, with no obvious SI dependency, but Julien will need to track a custom WRAcc-to-QUBO surrogate, cardinality penalties, QAOA depth settings, classical baselines, and hardware scaling tables before the extraction is reliable.

2 Extraction

2.1 What the paper does (one paragraph)

The paper turns subgroup discovery for network intrusion data into a QUBO and solves it with QAOA. It uses NSL-KDD records, binarises and ranks candidate network features, fits a quadratic surrogate to the WRAcc subgroup-quality landscape, adds a cardinality penalty, maps the QUBO to an Ising Hamiltonian, and samples feature subsets from QAOA circuits. The goal is not black-box classification, but interpretable conjunction rules such as combinations of service, count, and host-behaviour features associated with attack traffic. Results are compared with exhaustive enumeration where tractable, beam search, and a hybrid XGBoost evaluation. Hardware tests use IBM Quantum’s `ibm_pittsburgh` backend from 10 to 30 qubits, mainly to measure where noisy QAOA ceases to recover useful subgroup-quality ratios.

2.2 Quantum hardware used

- **Vendor / machine:** IBM Quantum / `ibm_pittsburgh`, described as superconducting hardware (abstract, p. 1; Table I, p. 8; conclusion, p. 10).
- **Qubit count:** 10, 15, 20, 25, and 30 qubits used in hardware runs; total qubits available on `ibm_pittsburgh` are not reported (Table I, p. 8).
- **Connectivity:** The exact `ibm_pittsburgh` connectivity graph is not reported. The paper says simulator transpilation used a linear coupling map and hardware transpilation used the target backend’s native topology (p. 6).
- **Gate set:** Native gate set is not reported. The paper maps QUBO terms to single-qubit Z and two-qubit ZZ Hamiltonian terms, then says post-transpilation two-qubit gate counts include CX/ECR/CZ categories (pp. 2, 5-6).
- **Notable features leveraged:** Qiskit QAOAAnsatz; IBM Quantum EstimatorV2 during COBYLA optimisation; final SamplerV2 sampling; hardware-native topology during transpilation; dynamical decoupling with the XY4 sequence; Pauli gate twirling with `num_randomizations = 'auto'`; final measurement only, with no mid-circuit measurement reported (p. 6).

2.3 Computational primitive

QAOA for QUBO optimisation, followed by sampling of optimised bitstrings for subgroup discovery.

2.4 Resource fingerprint

Metric	Value	Source (page / equation / SI)
Qubits (logical)	10, 15, 20, 25, and 30 feature-selection variables in hardware runs; one binary feature-selection variable maps to one qubit	QUBO variables $x \in \{0, 1\}^n$, p. 5; QAOA starts on n qubits, p. 6; Table I, p. 8
Qubits (physical)	10, 15, 20, 25, and 30 IBM hardware qubits used; available qubits on the backend not reported	Abstract, p. 1; Table I, p. 8
Circuit depth	not reported; hardware rows use QAOA layer count $p = 1$	Circuit-construction paragraph says depth is post-transpilation but gives no numeric depths, p. 6; Table I reports $p = 1$, p. 8
2Q-gate count (total)	not reported	Circuit-construction paragraph says CX/ECR/CZ counts are reported after transpilation, but no numeric counts are given, p. 6
Measurement shots	100,000 final SamplerV2 shots by default; EstimatorV2 shot count not reported	Sampling paragraph, p. 6
Classical loop iter.	not reported	COBYLA/EstimatorV2 loop described, including one independent job per iteration, but iteration count is absent, p. 6
Wall-clock runtime	not reported	Limitations discussion gives only a qualitative range, “minutes to hours including cloud queue times”, p. 10

2.5 Assumptions and results

- The paper claims the first QUBO formulation of subgroup discovery, using a least-squares fit to the WRAcc landscape with $R^2 = 0.989$ and Spearman $|\rho| = 0.899$ for the R2L-filtered 10-qubit configuration (Fig. 3, p. 8). It also claims QAOA-unique R2L subgroups that beam search misses, including one six-feature rule with 91.6% R2L attack rate in training and 99.6% precision on the test set (p. 9).
- Hardware scaling at $p = 1$ reports WRAcc ratios of 0.983 at 10 qubits, 0.971 and 0.874 for two 15-qubit R2L runs, 0.855 at 20 qubits, 0.624 at 25 qubits, and 0.039 at 30 qubits (Table I, p. 8). The paper attributes the collapse at 30 qubits primarily to noise accumulation in the transpiled circuit and shows a predicted circuit-fidelity comparison using $EPLG = 2.42 \times 10^{-3}$ (Fig. 6, p. 9).

- No statistical error bars are reported for the hardware ratios. Noise handling consists of XY4 dynamical decoupling and Pauli twirling on hardware (p. 6). The authors explicitly do not claim quantum advantage: at the reported sizes, exhaustive search or beam search is faster, while QAOA takes minutes to hours including queue time (discussion, p. 10).
- Classical comparison uses exhaustive enumeration when feasible, beam search as the primary heuristic, additional `pysubgroup` baselines, and a hybrid XGBoost IDS evaluation (pp. 5, 9). In the R2L hybrid test, baseline XGBoost has DR = 9.04% and F1 = 0.166, the classical hybrid has DR = 9.32% and F1 = 0.170, and the quantum hybrid has DR = 12.61% and F1 = 0.222 (p. 9).

2.6 Portability flags

- Dense QUBO structure: the LS-regression formulation produces non-uniform off-diagonal terms and therefore many ZZ interactions, so the circuit depends heavily on two-qubit compilation and routing (p. 5).
- Hardware topology matters: the paper does not state the `ibm_pittsburgh` graph, but hardware transpilation explicitly targets the backend’s native topology (p. 6).
- Native gate basis is underspecified: the paper reports only CX/ECR/CZ as post-transpilation two-qubit gate categories, not the backend-native gate set (p. 6).
- Error mitigation is part of the reported hardware workflow: XY4 dynamical decoupling and Pauli gate twirling should be treated as required run settings for reproducing the hardware fingerprint (p. 6).
- IBM Runtime primitives are embedded in the workflow: EstimatorV2 is used during COBYLA iterations and SamplerV2 for final bitstring sampling (p. 6).
- High-shot terminal sampling: final sampling uses 100,000 shots by default, which affects queue time and cost (p. 6).
- No dynamic-circuit dependency is reported: measurements are appended at the end of the QAOA circuit, and the paper reports no mid-circuit measurement or conditional branching (p. 6).
- Scaling is fidelity-limited: the useful boundary is reported near 20-25 qubits for dense QUBO instances at $p = 1$, with degradation to $r_W = 0.039$ at 30 qubits (pp. 8-10).

2.7 Caveats

The dossier contains the metadata file and a 12-page PDF only. No Supplementary Information, HTML rendering, arXiv source bundle, or supporting refs were present locally. The PDF was readable and not paywalled, but several hardware details needed for a full portability model are absent from the paper: backend total qubit count, exact connectivity graph, native gate basis, transpiled circuit depths, two-qubit gate totals, EstimatorV2 shot counts, COBYLA iteration counts, optimiser restart count, calibration snapshot, and measured wall-clock runtime.

3 Portability matrix