

Impact-Driven Quantum Decomposition for Traffic Zone Partitioning: A Hybrid Gate-Model Framework

Portability dossier - app

agQSL portability pipeline

2026-06-07

Field	Value
Slug	2026-arxiv-2605.01127-traffic-zone-partitioning
Source	arXiv
Link	https://arxiv.org/abs/2605.01127
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	6
2.5	Assumptions and results	6
2.6	Portability flags	7
2.7	Caveats	7
3	Portability matrix	9

1 Source

1.1 Domain classification

optimisation (combinatorial / QUBO). The transportation framing (intelligent transportation systems, traffic analysis zones) is the application wrapper, but the computational core is a generic two-region balanced graph bipartition cast as a Quadratic Unconstrained Binary Optimization problem, $H(x) = x^T Q x + C$, with a workload-balance penalty and a spatial-coherence (graph-cut) term. Secondary domain: transportation / operations research, useful only for judging whether the synthetic $n = 64$ grid instance is representative of real zoning workloads.

1.2 Expert persona for Julien

A quantum optimisation specialist fluent in QUBO/Ising formulations on gate-model NISQ hardware, who can read a hardware fingerprint through a vendor abstraction. Specifically: comfortable with digitized counterdiabatic quantum optimization (DCQO) and its bias-field variant (BF-DCQO) as packaged in Kipu Quantum’s Iskay optimizer, which runs as a Qiskit Function and hides circuit-level detail (counterdiabatic term order, transpiled two-qubit depth, shot budget) behind a managed service. Should have calibrated intuition for IBM superconducting backends (qubit count, heavy-hex connectivity, ECR two-qubit gate error, readout assignment error) and for subQUBO decomposition heuristics of the qbsolv lineage, so they can separate what the device actually did from what the Iskay wrapper reports. Not a transportation expert; the domain wrapper should be treated as a relabelling of a standard balanced-bipartition QUBO.

1.3 Related prior work (brief bibliography)

- Hegade, Chen & Solano, *Digitized-Counterdiabatic Quantum Optimization*, Phys. Rev. Research (2022). arXiv:2201.00790. Foundational DCQO primitive underlying Iskay.
- Romero et al., *Bias-field digitized counterdiabatic quantum optimization (BF-DCQO)*. arXiv:2405.13898. The specific algorithm the Iskay optimizer implements; the closest pointer for reconstructing the circuit-level fingerprint hidden behind the Qiskit Function.
- Chandarana et al., *Bias-Field Digitized Counterdiabatic Quantum Algorithm for Higher-Order Binary Optimization*. arXiv:2409.04477. Same primitive demonstrated on 156 qubits of IBM hardware; anchors “same primitive, larger device” portability.
- Booth, Reinhardt & Roy, *Partitioning Optimization Problems for Hybrid Classical/Quantum Execution* (qbsolv), D-Wave Technical Report 14-1006A-A. PDF. The classical subQUBO-decomposition lineage this paper’s baseline and impact-driven selection descend from, originally targeting a D-Wave annealer.
- Neukart et al., *Traffic Flow Optimization Using a Quantum Annealer*, Frontiers in ICT (2017). arXiv:1708.01625. Same application family (transportation QUBO) on a different vendor (D-Wave annealer); the natural cross-vendor comparison point.
- Azfar et al., *Quantum-Assisted Vehicle Routing: QAOA on a Gate-Based Quantum Computer* (2025). arXiv:2505.01614. Same group, same IBM gate-model family, a different primitive (QAOA vs DCQO) on an adjacent transportation problem; the closest

sibling for “same vendor, different primitive”.

1.4 Difficulty estimate

medium. The paper is short (an IEEE conference submission, roughly seven pages) and fully readable: the LaTeX source, bibliography, and all figures are present in `paper-source/`, so there is no paywall or missing-SI obstacle. The friction is that the hardware fingerprint is thin and partly locked in a figure rather than the prose. The text names only the backend (“IBM Quantum System One” at RPI) and quotes order-of-magnitude error rates ($\sim 10^{-2}$ readout, $\sim 10^{-3}$ entangling/ECR); the actual qubit count, shot budget, subQUBO size q , and per-iteration circuit depth are not stated numerically. Calibration detail lives in `figs/IBM_renselaer.pdf` (Julien should read that figure directly). Because the quantum solve is delegated to the Iskay/BF-DCQO Qiskit Function, Julien will need to cross-reference the BF-DCQO references above to pin down what circuit actually ran. The exotic-primitive plus under-specified-device combination is what lifts this above low.

2 Extraction

2.1 What the paper does (one paragraph)

The paper partitions a transportation network into two balanced, spatially coherent traffic zones. It casts this as a Quadratic Unconstrained Binary Optimization (QUBO) problem $H(x) = x^T Q x + C$ over $n = 64$ binary zone-assignment variables, combining a workload-balance penalty (which couples many zones at once) with a graph-cut spatial-coherence term. Because the full QUBO is too large and dense for reliable execution on current quantum hardware, the authors propose an “impact-driven” hybrid loop: at each iteration they rank variables by their single-flip energy sensitivity ΔH_i , select the q most influential ones into an active subset, freeze the rest, and solve the reduced subQUBO on a gate-model quantum device (via the Isky optimizer) before reintegrating the result classically. On a synthetic 64-zone grid they compare three configurations: direct quantum solve of the full QUBO, classical subQUBO refinement, and the proposed hybrid. The hybrid beats the classical baseline but does not beat the direct quantum solve.

2.2 Quantum hardware used

- **Vendor / machine:** IBM / IBM Quantum System One at Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute. The connectivity figure (Fig. 2, [figs/IBM_renselaer.pdf](#)) shows qubits 0 to 126 in a heavy-hex lattice, i.e. a 127-qubit Eagle r3 processor (backend `ibm_renselaer`; the specific backend name is inferred from the RPI affiliation, the figure topology, and the “IBM-RPI Future of Computing Collaboration” acknowledgment, not stated verbatim).
- **Qubit count:** 127 available (figure). Number actually used is not reported; for the direct full-QUBO solve it is implicitly 64 (one qubit per binary zone variable, $n = 64$), but the paper never states a qubit count. The subQUBO active-set size q is defined only symbolically and never given a number.
- **Connectivity:** heavy-hex (figure). Limited, non-uniform connectivity is cited as a motivation for subQUBO reduction (Sec. V.C).
- **Gate set:** IBM Eagle native set; the paper names the two-qubit gate explicitly as ECR (echoed cross-resonance) when quoting error rates (Sec. V.C). Single-qubit native gates (RZ, SX, X) are not discussed. Transpilation is hidden inside the Isky Qiskit Function.
- **Notable features leveraged:** digitized counterdiabatic driving (the DCQO primitive, Sec. IV.C), delivered through the managed Isky optimizer running as a Qiskit runtime Function (Sec. V.G). No mid-circuit measurement, dynamic circuits, or other exotic device features are claimed; the device is used as a black-box QUBO sampler inside a classical outer loop.

2.3 Computational primitive

Sampling: **digitized counterdiabatic quantum optimization (DCQO)**, named in Sec. IV.C and delivered via the Isky optimizer (Sec. V.G). DCQO is an annealing-inspired primitive compiled to a shallow digital gate-model circuit whose input is the QUBO/Ising Hamiltonian. The Isky optimizer (Kipu Quantum) is externally known to implement the bias-field variant BF-DCQO; the paper itself says only “digitized counterdiabatic quantum optimization” and “Isky optimizer” and provides no citation for either (see Caveats).

2.4 Resource fingerprint

Metric	Value	Source (page / equation / SI)
Qubits (logical)	64 for the direct full-QUBO solve (inferred: $n = 64$ binary variables, one qubit each);	Sec. V.A ($n = 64$); Sec. IV.B (q symbolic only)
Qubits (physical)	subQUBO size q not reported not reported (127 available on the backend; transpiled count hidden by Iskay)	Fig. 2 for the 127-qubit device
Circuit depth	not reported	hidden behind the Iskay Qiskit Function
2Q-gate count (total)	not reported	hidden behind the Iskay Qiskit Function
Measurement shots	not reported	Sec. V.G (no shot budget given)
Classical loop iter.	4 (hybrid converges after four iterations); classical-baseline iteration count shown only in a figure trajectory, not stated numerically	Sec. VI.C (“after four iterations”); Fig. 6 for the classical trajectory
Wall-clock runtime	not reported (the paper states it does not emphasise computational speed)	Sec. V.E

Other reported scalars: best direct quantum objective $H = 151.1$ (Eq. in Sec. VI.A), classical subQUBO baseline $H = 214.0$ (Sec. VI.B), hybrid final $H = 169.5$ (Sec. VI.C); median readout assignment error of order 10^{-2} and median ECR error of order 10^{-3} (Sec. V.C). Penalty weight λ and attribute count m are symbolic only.

2.5 Assumptions and results

- **Claim.** Impact-driven (energy-sensitivity-ranked) subQUBO selection produces better convergence and more spatially coherent two-region partitions than unguided classical subQUBO refinement, while staying within current hardware limits. On the synthetic 64-zone instance the hybrid reaches $H = 169.5$ versus the classical baseline $H = 214.0$ (about a 44-point reduction) but does not match the direct full-QUBO quantum solve at $H = 151.1$. The authors explicitly do not claim quantum advantage.
- **Error bars / noise assumptions.** No statistical error bars, repeat counts, or shot budgets are reported; results are single best-observed objective values. Hardware noise is characterised only by order-of-magnitude median error rates (readout $\sim 10^{-2}$, ECR

$\sim 10^{-3}$, Sec. V.C). The single-flip impact is the exact QUBO sensitivity $\Delta H_i = (1 - 2x_i) (Q_{ii} + 2 \sum_{j \neq i} Q_{ij} x_j)$ (Sec. IV.A); the frozen environment contributes an effective bias $b_S = 2Q_{SF}x_F$ to the reduced problem $H_S(x_S) = x_S^T Q_{SS} x_S + b_S^T x_S + C$ (Sec. IV.B).

- **Classical baseline.** The classical subQUBO refinement ($H = 214.0$, stagnating early) is the in-paper baseline. There is no comparison to a strong classical graph partitioner (e.g. METIS / Kernighan-Lin), although such methods are cited as effective at moderate scale (Sec. I). The synthetic $n = 64$ grid is acknowledged as a controlled stand-in for real zoning data.

2.6 Portability flags

- **Vendor-proprietary managed primitive.** The quantum solve is delegated to the Iskay optimizer, a managed Qiskit runtime Function (Kipu Quantum’s BF-DCQO). Counterdiabatic-term order, transpiled two-qubit depth, and shot budget are hidden. Porting to another vendor means substituting an equivalent QUBO/Ising solver (QAOA, VQE, an annealer, or a classical heuristic), not retargeting a known circuit, because no circuit is exposed.
- **Problem is hardware-agnostic at the QUBO layer.** The deliverable handed to the device is a QUBO matrix Q , not a hardware-specific circuit. This is a portability strength: the same QUBO/subQUBO can in principle be fed to a D-Wave annealer, a trapped-ion QAOA stack, or a classical solver. The hybrid impact-decomposition wrapper is fully classical and vendor-neutral.
- **Dense, near-global coupling.** The balance penalty couples all zones simultaneously (Sec. III.C, III.G), producing a dense J_{ij} that does not match heavy-hex nearest-neighbour connectivity; full execution would require heavy SWAP-network transpilation. The subQUBO decomposition exists precisely to shrink the active set to an embeddable size. On all-to-all hardware (trapped ion) or an annealer with a richer embedding, the dense coupling maps more directly. This dense-coupling-versus-sparse-connectivity tension is the central portability lever.
- **Native ECR two-qubit gate.** Error rates are quoted in terms of ECR; any non-IBM target would decompose the entangling layer to its own native gate, but this is absorbed inside Iskay’s transpilation and not surfaced by the paper.
- **No exotic device features.** No mid-circuit measurement, dynamic circuits, or analog/Rydberg-specific mechanism is used. The hybrid loop is a classical outer loop around repeated independent quantum subQUBO solves, which transfers cleanly across gate-model vendors.

2.7 Caveats

- **Access.** Not paywalled. Full LaTeX source, bibliography (`root.bib`), and all figures are present in `paper-source/`; nothing was unreachable.
- **Thin hardware fingerprint.** The qubits actually used, the subQUBO size q , the shot budget, per-iteration circuit depth, two-qubit gate count, and wall-clock runtime are all absent. The only concrete hardware information is the topology figure (127-qubit heavy-hex) and order-of-magnitude median error rates. The qubit-count entries above marked “inferred” rest on the standard one-binary-variable-per-qubit QUBO mapping, not on a stated number.
- **Uncited primitive.** The paper names “digitized counterdiabatic quantum optimization” and the “Iskay optimizer” but cites

neither; `root.bib` contains no entry for Iskay, Kipu Quantum, DCQO, or BF-DCQO. The identification of Iskay as Kipu Quantum's BF-DCQO implementation, and of the backend as the 127-qubit `ibm_rensseleer` Eagle, comes from external references (the dossier sourcing note and the Ezratty 2025 survey, which records Kipu's BF-DCQO on IBM hardware), not from the paper.

- **Calibration figure.** Fig. 2 (`figs/IBM_rensseleer.pdf`) colour-codes per-qubit error levels but carries no numeric per-qubit labels; only the prose order-of-magnitude rates are usable as numbers.

3 Portability matrix