

Measuring Accuracy and Energy-to-Solution of Quantum Fine-Tuning of Foundational AI Models

Portability dossier - app

agQSL portability pipeline

2026-06-07

Field	Value
Slug	2026-arxiv-2605.02798-ai-finetuning-energy
Source	arXiv
Link	https://arxiv.org/abs/2605.02798
Category	app
Triaged	2026-05-21 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	7
2.6	Portability flags	7
2.7	Caveats	8
3	Portability matrix	9

1 Source

1.1 Domain classification

machine learning. This is a quantum machine learning (QML) paper: a parameterised quantum circuit serves as the fine-tuning head of a BERT-based sentence transformer, trained for SST2 binary sentiment classification under the SetFit few-shot framework. There is no strong secondary application domain. The cross-cutting thread is quantum energy efficiency benchmarking: the headline contribution is an energy-to-solution (ETS) methodology built on direct power instrumentation of an IonQ Forte Enterprise trapped-ion QPU, compared against GPU statevector simulation and a theoretical matrix-product-state (MPS) baseline. Treat that as methodology rather than a separate domain.

1.2 Expert persona for Julien

A QML practitioner with hands-on experience running variational and data-reuploading circuits on trapped-ion hardware (IonQ-family ideal), fluent in NISQ error mitigation: symmetrisation/debiasing, non-linear histogram filtering, and unsupervised bias correction on $\langle Z \rangle$ logits. Should have calibrated intuition for how angle encoding, re-upload depth, and two-qubit gate count (35 \rightarrow 63 gates over 10 \rightarrow 18 qubits here) jointly drive expressivity, depolarising error, and shot-budget scaling. A useful secondary competence is systems/datacentre literacy to sanity-check the ETS instrumentation (1 Hz power logging, $P_{qpu} \sim 5$ kW, CodeCarbon + PUE on an NVIDIA L4) and the $O(Q \log Q)$ QPU versus $O(Q\chi^3)$ MPS scaling argument.

1.3 Related prior work (brief bibliography)

- Kim et al., *Quantum Large Language Model Fine-Tuning*, arXiv:2504.08732 (2025): the direct predecessor; this paper extends that simulated pipeline onto hardware and adds the energy study. Read first.
- Pérez-Salinas et al., *Data re-uploading for a universal quantum classifier*, Quantum 4, 226 (2020), doi:10.22331/q-2020-02-06-226](https://doi.org/10.22331/q-2020-02-06-226): the encoding/ansatz primitive; portable across gate-based vendors.
- Tunstall et al., *Efficient Few-Shot Learning Without Prompts (SetFit)*, arXiv:2209.11055 (2022): the classical fine-tuning framework whose head is replaced; the SVC/logistic-regression baseline reference point.
- Fu et al., *Achieving energetic superiority through system-level quantum circuit simulation*, arXiv:2407.00769 (2024): classical tensor-network energy counter-argument; directly relevant to the portability/energy comparison.
- Meier & Yamasaki, *Energy-consumption advantage of quantum computation*, PRX Energy 4, 023008 (2025), doi:10.1103/PRXEnergy.4.023008](https://doi.org/10.1103/PRXEnergy.4.023008): theoretical grounding for the energy-to-solution claim.
- Maksymov et al., *Enhancing quantum computer performance via symmetrization*, arXiv:2301.07233 (2023): the symmetrisation/debiasing (DNL) error-mitigation method applied on the trapped-ion device.

1.4 Difficulty estimate

medium. The paper is fully fetchable (arXiv HTML plus complete LaTeX source, including inline appendices, is in the dossier `paper-source/` folder), so there is no paywall or missing-SI blocker. It is a short IEEE conference paper with the hardware parameters tabulated explicitly (qubit ranges, two-qubit gate counts, shot schedules, gate times, power draw). What pushes it above **low**: the fingerprint spans three back-ends (QPU instrumentation, GPU CodeCarbon, MPS theory), the architecture is only fully specified by reading the predecessor (arXiv:2504.08732), and there are several stacked mitigation layers (25-variant debiasing, non-linear filter, bias correction) that Julien must disentangle to characterise the true hardware result versus the calibrated upper bound.

2 Extraction

2.1 What the paper does (one paragraph)

This paper measures the energy cost and accuracy of running a quantum machine-learning model on real trapped-ion hardware. The model is a fine-tuning head for a BERT-based sentence transformer: a parameterised quantum circuit replaces SetFit’s classical classification head for SST2 binary sentiment analysis. The authors run inference circuits on an IonQ Forte Enterprise QPU, directly instrumenting its power draw at 1 Hz, and compare against GPU statevector simulation (NVIDIA L4) and a theoretical matrix-product-state (MPS) baseline. Their headline result is that QPU energy grows roughly linearly with qubit count for shallow circuits, while GPU simulation grows exponentially, giving an energy-to-solution break-even near 34 qubits. With error mitigation (25-variant debiasing plus a non-linear filter and bias correction), the hardware reaches 91.2% accuracy at 18 qubits, close to the 92.1% noiseless ceiling and above classical logistic-regression and support-vector baselines.

2.2 Quantum hardware used

- **Vendor / machine:** IonQ / Forte Enterprise (trapped-ion, $^{171}\text{Yb}^+$ hyperfine qubits; substrate per `vendor-notes/trapped_ion_qubits.tex`).
- **Qubit count:** 36 available (stated as a “36-qubit trapped-ion quantum system”, §III-F “QPU consumption estimates”). Logical qubits used: 10, 12, 14, 16, 18 in the accuracy study (Table II / §IV-C); even values 10 to 28 in the energy study (§III-G “Energy Study Configuration”). Encoding is one qubit per input feature, so logical and physical qubit counts coincide (no error-correction overhead).
- **Connectivity:** All-to-all. The paper leans on this explicitly: Forte Enterprise “features all-to-all connectivity between its qubits, which eliminates the need for SWAP-based routing overhead” (§III-F).
- **Gate set:** The ansatz is written in R_Y single-qubit rotations and CNOT entangling ladders (§III-A). On IonQ hardware these CNOTs are compiler-synthesised from the native Mølmer-Sørensen $R_{XX}(\theta)$ two-qubit gate (substrate fact, `vendor-notes/trapped_ion_qubits.tex` §4); the paper itself does not name the native primitive. Reported gate timings (Table III): single-qubit 1.1×10^{-4} s, two-qubit 9×10^{-4} s.
- **Notable features leveraged:** All-to-all connectivity (no SWAP routing for the skip-ladder entangler); symmetrisation/debiasing over 25 logical-to-physical ion-assignment variants; direct electrical power instrumentation logged at 1 Hz; single terminal Z -basis measurement of one target qubit. No mid-circuit measurement, dynamic circuits, or analog evolution are used.

2.3 Computational primitive

Sampling (QML inference) via a data re-uploading parameterised quantum circuit (angle encoding with trainable R_Y rotations and CNOT entangling layers, read out as a Z -basis expectation value used directly as the classification logit). This is inference only: it samples a fixed, pre-trained circuit. It is not VQE/QAOA and runs no variational optimisation loop on hardware.

2.4 Resource fingerprint

Metric	Value	Source (page / equation / SI)
Qubits (logical)	10, 12, 14, 16, 18 (accuracy); even 10–28 (energy)	§IV-C / Table II; §III-G
Qubits (physical)	36 available; logical = physical (1 qubit/feature, no QEC)	§III-F
Circuit depth	Not reported as an explicit number; bounded/constant depth, $M = 2$ main blocks each with $R = 4$ re-uploads plus entangling layer, then $N = 1$ final layer	§III-A / Table I
2Q-gate count (total)	35, 42, 49, 56, 63 for $Q = 10$, 12, 14, 16, 18 (linear in Q)	§III-A; Table II
Measurement shots	600 fixed (energy study); 500 / 1{,}000 / 2{,}000 / 5{,}000 / 20{,}000 total (accuracy, $Q =$ 10–18), i.e. 20 / 40 / 80 / 200 / 800 per variant across 25 variants	Table I; Table II
Classical loop iter.	Not applicable on hardware: inference only; all training done in simulation, parameters deployed without retraining	§III-E, §IV-A
Wall-clock runtime	Not reported (no measured total). Estimate-formula constants only: per-shot overhead 1.5×10^{-3} s, circuit overhead 10 s, gate times above	Table III

Average QPU power draw is reported as $P_{qpu} \sim 5$ kW (Table III) and is found to be roughly independent of circuit width and depth

(§IV-B “Power Draw Analysis”), so the paper treats execution time as the only size-dependent factor in QPU energy.

2.5 Assumptions and results

- **Claims.** For depth-limited hardware-efficient circuits, QPU energy and execution time grow roughly linearly with qubit count (linear fit $R^2 = 0.981$), whereas GPU statevector simulation grows exponentially (exponential fit $R^2 = 0.994$ overall, 0.999 for $Q \geq 16$); the two cross near 34 qubits (§IV-A, Fig. 1). With debiasing plus the non-linear filter, hardware accuracy reaches 91.2% at 18 qubits, 0.86 percentage points below the 92.06% noiseless ceiling (99.1% of ideal) and above the classical baselines (SVC 89.56%, logistic regression 89.06%) from 14 qubits onward (§IV-C, Table IV). The error reduction of the best quantum model over the best classical baseline is 23.9% (noiseless) and 15.7% (QPU).
- **Error bars / noise assumptions.** Single-accuracy standard error is $\approx 1.8\%$ at $N = 250$ samples; the authors note the per-point advantage over classical baselines is modest in isolation and rests on the consistent 14–18 qubit trend (§IV-C). Training used a gate-noise model emulating Forte Enterprise. Mitigation stack: 25-variant debiasing (symmetrisation, ≥ 500 shots required), a non-linear aggregation filter with grid-searched parameters (p, t) , and an unsupervised bias correction subtracting the global mean logit, $\langle Z \rangle_i^{\text{bc}} = \langle Z \rangle_i - \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N \langle Z \rangle_j$ (§III-B, §III-C). The paper explicitly calls the filtered “+DNL” accuracy a “calibrated upper bound rather than the baseline hardware result” because the filter parameters are tuned on the evaluation set (§III-C). The raw hardware baseline is therefore the debiasing-only “QPU” column: 90.8% at 18 qubits.
- **Classical baselines.** Three comparators: noiseless statevector simulation (theoretical ceiling), noisy gate-noise-model simulation (training distribution), and classical SVC / logistic regression on the same SetFit embeddings. A separate theoretical MPS scaling argument (§V) gives QPU energy $O(Q \log Q)$ versus MPS $O(Q^4)$ for log-depth, locally-trained circuits, conjecturing a QPU-favourable crossover at NISQ scale.

2.6 Portability flags

- **Exploits all-to-all connectivity at 10–28 qubits.** The skip-ladder entangler (CNOT on qubits i and $i+2$, alternating even/odd) executes with no SWAP insertion on the ion chain. On heavy-hex (IBM) or linear nearest-neighbour layouts this pattern needs routing, inflating the 2Q-gate count and depth beyond the reported 35–63. The paper names this advantage directly against superconducting architectures.
- **2Q gate count is a logical CNOT count, not a native-gate count.** On IonQ each CNOT maps to one native Mølmer–Sørensen $R_{XX}(\theta)$ plus single-qubit frame changes; on a CZ-native or $\sqrt{\text{iSWAP}}$ -native device the decomposition and the per-gate fidelity/time differ. Brilliant should not treat the 35–63 figure as substrate-invariant.
- **Debiasing/symmetrisation depends on connectivity.** The 25 “equivalent variants” are logical-to-physical ion permutations that stay valid circuits only because all-to-all connectivity makes any relabelling routing-free, and are useful only because trapped-ion error is position-dependent. On a fixed coupling map, relabelling changes routing, so this mitigation does not port for free. It also requires ≥ 500 shots to be practicable.

- **Energy economics are hardware-specific and do not transfer.** The linear energy scaling, the ~ 5 kW size-independent power draw, and the 34-qubit GPU break-even all hinge on IonQ’s power profile; the authors flag the crossover as specific to their choice of QPU, GPU, circuit, and hyperparameters. Superconducting (dilution-fridge) or neutral-atom substrates have different power and cooling profiles, so neither the break-even nor the $O(Q \log Q)$ -vs- $O(Q^4)$ MPS argument carries over unchanged.
- **Angle encoding is qubit-hungry.** One qubit per input feature (with re-uploading) ties circuit width to feature dimension; the upstream quantum-inspired/linear encoder exists to compress dimension to a NISQ-feasible width. On qubit-constrained devices this caps the usable feature dimension.
- **Portability-friendly on circuit structure.** No mid-circuit measurement, no dynamic circuits, no Rydberg/analog primitives; a single terminal Z -basis readout of one qubit. The circuit primitive itself ports to any gate-based vendor. What does not port is the routing-free entangler and the energy comparison.

2.7 Caveats

- Full access. The arXiv HTML and the complete LaTeX source (including the inline appendices: SST2 dataset and the energy-estimate formulae) are present in [paper-source/](#). No paywall and no missing SI.
- The full architecture is only specified by the predecessor, Kim et al., arXiv:2504.08732 ([kim2025quantum](#)). This paper describes the simplifications it makes relative to that work (dropping the final classical linear layer, replacing the simulated PQC encoder with a linear-layer encoder) but defers the multi-head quantum-inspired encoder and the full differentiable pipeline to the predecessor.
- Circuit depth is never given as an explicit number; it is characterised only as bounded/constant via the block structure (M, R, N) .
- No measured wall-clock runtime is reported. Table III gate-time and overhead values are described as “rough ballpark estimates”, and energy per qubit count is presented only as a semilog figure (Fig. 1), not a numeric table.
- The energy study uses randomised circuit weights with measurement outcomes discarded (energy only, no accuracy) and runs on 25 of the 250 accuracy-study samples, so its circuits are not the trained accuracy-study circuits.
- The headline “+DNL” accuracies are calibrated upper bounds (filter parameters grid-searched on the evaluation set), per the authors’ own framing; the raw hardware baseline is the debiasing-only “QPU” column (90.8% at 18 qubits).

3 Portability matrix