

Towards High Performance Quantum Computing (HPQ): Parallelisation of the Hamiltonian Auto Decomposition Optimisation Framework (HADOF)

Portability dossier - app

agQSL portability pipeline

2026-06-07

Field	Value
Slug	2026-arxiv-2604.27836-hadof-genome-assembly
Source	arXiv
Link	https://arxiv.org/abs/2604.27836
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	5
2.4	Resource fingerprint	5
2.5	Assumptions and results	6
2.6	Portability flags	6
2.7	Caveats	7
3	Portability matrix	8

1 Source

1.1 Domain classification

optimisation. Secondary: biology, because genome assembly is the application case, but the paper’s main contribution is parallel HADOF for QUBO/QAOA-style optimisation on IBM hardware.

1.2 Expert persona for Julien

A quantum optimisation practitioner with bioinformatics fluency: someone comfortable with QUBO encodings of graph traversal, QAOA or annealing-style solvers, and decomposition frameworks such as HADOF. They should understand de novo assembly enough to recognise when overlap-graph, Hamiltonian-path, and TSP assumptions are modelling choices rather than sequencing-pipeline facts. For the hardware fingerprint, they need practical Qiskit and IBM Runtime experience, especially multi-backend job submission, shot budgets, transpilation, and queue versus usage-time accounting.

1.3 Related prior work (brief bibliography)

- Sankar, Miliotis, and Caton, “Scalable Quantum Optimisation using HADOF: Hamiltonian Auto-Decomposition Optimisation Framework”, CEUR-WS Vol. 4153, 2025. URL: <https://ceur-ws.org/Vol-4153/paper9.pdf> and arXiv:2510.02926.
- Boev et al., “Genome assembly using quantum and quantum-inspired annealing”, Scientific Reports 11, 13183, 2021. DOI: 10.1038/s41598-021-88321-5 and arXiv:2004.06719.
- Sarkar, Al-Ars, Almudever, and Bertels, “QuASeR: Quantum Accelerated de novo DNA sequence reconstruction”, PLoS ONE 16(4), 2021. DOI: 10.1371/journal.pone.0249850 and arXiv:2004.05078.
- Cudby and Strelchuk, “Nonvariational quantum optimisation approaches to pangenome-guided sequence assembly”, 2026. arXiv:2604.06106.
- Kim et al., “Distributed Quantum Approximate Optimization Algorithm on a Quantum-Centric Supercomputing Architecture”, 2025. arXiv:2407.20212.
- Li et al., “MEGAHIT: an ultra-fast single-node solution for large and complex metagenomics assembly via succinct de Bruijn graph”, Bioinformatics 31(10), 2015. DOI: 10.1093/bioinformatics/btv033.

1.4 Difficulty estimate

medium. The source is open and locally readable as `paper.html` plus LaTeX source, with the key backend details in the Methods and Results sections. Julien will still need to track a decomposed QAOA/HADOF loop, sequential versus single-QPU versus multi-QPU runs, and the genome-assembly QUBO example. No SI dependency spotted in the local dossier.

2 Extraction

2.1 What the paper does (one paragraph)

HADOF solves large Quadratic Unconstrained Binary Optimisation (QUBO) problems by decomposing the global cost Hamiltonian into many small fixed-size sub-Hamiltonians, solving each with a shallow trotterised QAOA circuit, and recombining the per-qubit expectation values into a global solution over several iterations. The contribution here is engineering rather than algorithmic: the authors run HADOF on real IBM quantum hardware for the first time and parallelise the decomposed subproblems three ways, sequential, concurrent jobs on a single QPU, and jobs split across four QPUs. They benchmark random QUBOs ($n = 100$ to 500 variables) and a real genome-assembly instance (ϕ X 174 bacteriophage, encoded as a 248-variable QUBO), comparing wall-clock time (makespan), QPU usage time, and solution accuracy against classical simulated annealing and against monolithic full-circuit QAOA. Parallel execution gives roughly $3\times$ (single-QPU) to $3\text{--}4\times$ (multi-QPU) wall-clock speed-up while keeping best-solution accuracy competitive.

2.2 Quantum hardware used

- **Vendor / machine:** IBM. Single-QPU and sequential runs on `ibm_kingston` (Heron r2). Multi-QPU runs across `ibm_kingston` (Heron r2), `ibm_pittsburgh` (Heron r3), `ibm_fez` (Heron r2), and `ibm_marrakesh` (Heron r2). Devices used in April 2026. (methods.tex, final paragraph.)
- **Qubit count:** 5 qubits used per subcircuit ($k = 5$); device size 156 qubits each (methods.tex, final paragraph; results §“HADOF against standard QAOA”). On real hardware the global problem scaled to 300 variables (random QUBO) and 248 variables (genome assembly) using only these 5-qubit circuits.
- **Connectivity:** heavy-hex lattice on all four devices (methods.tex, final paragraph). The paper notes that on a 156-qubit heavy-hex device, dense monolithic QUBO embeddings are practically limited to roughly 50 variables because of connectivity and routing overhead (results §“HADOF against standard QAOA”).
- **Gate set:** not reported. The authors state circuits are built in Qiskit and that the IBM Runtime scheduler “automatically transpiles” the queued jobs (methods.tex, final paragraph); no native gate set, basis-gate list, or custom primitive is specified. (External cross-check, not from this paper: IBM Heron’s native two-qubit gate is CZ via tunable couplers; Ezratty 2025 §8.3.7 confirms Heron heavy-hex connectivity.)
- **Notable features leveraged:** no mid-circuit measurement, dynamic circuits, or analog evolution. The only hardware-systems feature relied on is the IBM Qiskit Runtime job scheduler, which runs queued jobs concurrently on a single device “where possible” (intra-QPU concurrency) and accepts independent job submissions across multiple devices (inter-QPU parallelism). (intro.tex; methods.tex, final paragraph.)

2.3 Computational primitive

QAOA, specifically a digitised / trotterised Quantum Annealing schedule (the “Annealing Parametrisation”), run on 5-qubit sub-Hamiltonians inside the HADOF decomposition loop. The fixed schedule $\beta_m = 1 - (m/5)$, $\gamma_m = m/5$ removes the usual variational classical optimisation of β and γ (methods.tex, Implementation and Parametric Details).

2.4 Resource fingerprint

Values below are anchored to the flagship real-hardware run, the 248-variable ϕX 174 genome-assembly QUBO on `ibm_kingston` (Table `tab:assembly`), with the per-subcircuit parameters that apply to every run.

Metric	Value	Source (page / equation / SI)
Qubits (logical)	5 per subcircuit ($k = 5$); global problem 248 binary variables (genome assembly), up to 300 on hardware / 500 in simulation for random QUBOs	methods.tex Parametric Details; results §Genome Assembly, §HADOF vs QAOA
Qubits (physical)	5-qubit circuits transpiled onto 156-qubit heavy-hex Heron devices; physical footprint per transpiled circuit not reported	methods.tex final paragraph
Circuit depth	not reported (subcircuits use up to 5 QAOA layers, $p = 5$; explicit gate depth not given)	methods.tex Parametric Details
2Q-gate count (total)	not reported	absent from paper
Measurement shots	500 shots per qubit for expectation-value update; 5000 shots per circuit for final sampling; 5000 global solutions assembled	methods.tex Parametric Details
Classical loop iter.	5 HADOF iterations (one QAOA layer added per iteration, $p = 5$); no inner variational β/γ optimisation loop	methods.tex Parametric Details, Fig. <code>fig:HADOF</code>

Metric	Value	Source (page / equation / SI)
Wall-clock runtime	Genome assembly on Kingston: 2344.76 s sequential, 956.48 s single-QPU parallel, 889.04 s multi-QPU; QPU usage time 750 s in all three	Table <code>tab:assembly</code>

Supporting QPU-usage model: each 5-qubit circuit takes 3 seconds on the device, $n/5$ circuits per iteration over 5 iterations, so QPU usage $\approx 3n$ seconds for an n -variable problem, independent of sequential vs parallel mode (results §Speed). For the random-QUBO benchmark (Table `tab:table`), Kingston HADOF wall-clock ranges from 85.3 s ($n = 10$) to 417.32 s ($n = 50$), with QPU usage 30 s to 150 s respectively.

2.5 Assumptions and results

- **Claim.** Parallelising the decomposed subproblems gives up to $3\times$ (single-QPU concurrency) and $3\text{--}4\times$ (four QPUs) wall-clock speed-up over sequential HADOF on real hardware, and over $5\times$ in noisy simulation, while best-solution accuracy stays competitive with classical simulated annealing (abstract; intro.tex; results §Speed). HADOF also beats monolithic full-circuit QAOA on accuracy under noise, e.g. average accuracy 0.53 vs 0.02 at $n = 50$ on Kingston (Table `tab:table`).
- **Error bars / noise assumptions.** Simulation experiments were repeated 5 times and averaged; real-device runs were performed once each because of QPU cost and budget (results, opening paragraph). Noisy simulation used the `Fake Torino` 133-qubit noise model; ideal simulation used Qiskit Aer (methods.tex). Accuracy is normalised so simulated annealing scores 1. On real hardware the best-sampled-solution accuracy stays above 0.80 (genome assembly: 0.88–0.91), but the average accuracy across the sampled distribution falls to 0.45–0.51 and zero exact optimal solutions were sampled (Table `tab:assembly`, results §Accuracy and §Genome Assembly). With GFAtools post-processing, over 52% of the sampled distribution still recovered the correct contiguous sequence.
- **Classical baseline.** D-Wave Ocean simulated annealing is the reference. On the genome instance it achieves best accuracy 1.0, 213 optimal solutions, average 0.99 in 2.3 s, well ahead of all quantum runs on the M3 wall-clock and accuracy; the quantum value claimed is scalability and robustness of the best-found solution rather than raw speed (Table `tab:assembly`, results §Genome Assembly).

2.6 Portability flags

- **Highly portable at the physics layer.** The primitive is a fixed-schedule 5-qubit trotterised QAOA with terminal computational-basis sampling. No mid-circuit measurement, no dynamic circuits, no analog/Rydberg evolution, no all-to-all connectivity require-

ment. The deliberate use of tiny 5-qubit subcircuits means the heavy-hex topology and limited connectivity are not a constraint, so the quantum kernel maps onto essentially any gate-based device.

- **No native-gate dependence stated.** The paper leans entirely on Qiskit transpilation; it names no native or custom gate primitive, so there is nothing gate-set-specific to decompose. (Heron’s native CZ is external context, not a feature the paper exploits.)
- **The speed-up is a vendor-systems feature, not a physics feature.** The wall-clock advantage depends on the IBM Qiskit Runtime scheduler running queued jobs concurrently on one device and on the ability to submit independent jobs to several QPUs. Reproducing the parallel makespan on another vendor requires an equivalent concurrent / multi-backend job-orchestration layer; the algorithm itself is agnostic.
- **QPU-usage model assumes a flat 3 s per circuit.** The “3 s per 5-qubit circuit” and $3n$ QPU-usage figures are IBM-device-specific timing, not transferable constants; another substrate (e.g. trapped-ion or neutral-atom) would have different per-circuit execution and load times.
- **No inner variational loop.** The annealing parametrisation fixes β_m, γ_m , so no classical optimiser round-trips are needed; this removes a common portability pain point (optimiser–hardware latency) entirely.

2.7 Caveats

- Full access. The extraction is from the arXiv LaTeX source bundle (`arxiv.tex` plus `sections/` and `table/` partials); no paywall and no separate Supplementary Information.
- The tabulated numbers cover the genome-assembly instance (Table `tab:assembly`) and the small-size HADOF-vs-QAOA comparison at $n = 10$ to 50 (Table `tab:table`). The headline random-QUBO benchmark at $n = 100, 200, 300$ on real hardware (and up to 500 in simulation) is presented only as plots (Figs. `ttsclassical`, `ttsquantum`, `acca`, `accb`); exact per-size wall-clock and accuracy values for those runs are not given in numeric form in the source, so they are read from figures rather than tables.
- Circuit depth and two-qubit gate counts are nowhere reported; only the layer count ($p = 5$) and subcircuit width ($k = 5$) are stated. These are listed as “not reported” above rather than inferred.
- The arXiv identifier (2604.27836, dated April 2026) and device generations (`pittsburgh` as Heron r3) are taken from the paper as written and not independently verified against IBM’s public backend list.

3 Portability matrix