

Quantum-enhanced Large Language Models on Quantum Hardware via Cayley Unitary Adapters

Portability dossier - app

agQSL portability pipeline

2026-06-07

Field	Value
Slug	2026-arxiv-2605.05914-llm-cayley-adapters
Source	arXiv
Link	https://arxiv.org/abs/2605.05914
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	6
2.4	Resource fingerprint	6
2.5	Assumptions and results	7
2.6	Portability flags	8
2.7	Caveats	8
3	Portability matrix	10

1 Source

1.1 Domain classification

Machine learning (quantum machine learning / quantum natural language processing). The work inserts trainable quantum-circuit blocks (Cayley-parameterised block-diagonal unitaries) into the frozen projection layers of pre-trained transformer LLMs and executes them on superconducting hardware. There is no secondary application domain in a different category. The nearest adjacent sub-theme is hardware-efficient circuit synthesis (amplitude encoding plus shallow 2-qubit unitaries on IBM Heron r2), but that is a means to the ML end rather than a domain in its own right.

1.2 Expert persona for Julien

A quantum machine learning researcher with direct, hands-on experience running parameterised circuits on IBM superconducting QPUs through Qiskit Runtime: fluent in amplitude encoding, `UnitaryGate` transpilation to the Heron r2 native set ($\{CZ, SX, R_z, X\}$), circuit packing across a heavy-hex coupling map, and depolarising-plus-readout noise modelling. They should have calibrated intuition for what a depth-19, 2-qubit, 8,192-shot circuit costs in wall-clock and fidelity, and enough transformer-internals literacy (residual stream, per-projection adapters, LoRA-style parameter budgets) to map the block-diagonal unitary onto its insertion site. Familiarity with operator-Schmidt / operator-entanglement analysis is a plus, since the entangling-power argument carries the paper’s scaling claim.

1.3 Related prior work (brief bibliography)

- Aizpurua, Jahromi, Singh & Orús, *Quantum large language models via tensor network disentanglers*, [arXiv:2410.17397](#). The same group’s immediate methodological predecessor; the disentangler lineage the CUA refines.
- Aizpurua, Singh & Orús, *Classical neural networks on quantum devices via tensor network disentanglers*, [arXiv:2509.06653](#). Same lineage, generalising the “run a trained classical layer on a QPU” primitive that this paper instantiates for LLMs.
- Hu et al., *LoRA: Low-Rank Adaptation of Large Language Models*, [arXiv:2106.09685](#). The classical low-rank adapter the CUA is benchmarked against at the same projection site and parameter budget.
- Lezcano-Casado & Martínez-Rubio, *Cheap orthogonal constraints in neural networks*, [arXiv:1901.08428](#). The Cayley / orthogonal-group parameterisation primitive at the core of the adapter.
- Yu et al., *Quantum-enhanced large language model efficient fine tuning*, [arXiv:2503.12790](#). A competing hybrid scheme for injecting quantum parameters into LLM fine-tuning; the nearest same-application comparator.
- Li, Zhao & Wang, *Quantum Self-Attention Neural Networks for Text Classification*, [arXiv:2205.05625](#). Quantum-native NLP via a different architecture (quantum attention rather than unitary adapters on a frozen classical backbone); a useful contrast on the simulator-versus-QPU and classification-versus-generation axes.

1.4 Difficulty estimate

Medium. Arguing for low: the full LaTeX source is in the dossier (`paper-source/quantum_llm_nature_v5.tex`), the backbone is openly readable, and the hardware fingerprint is unusually well specified in the open text. Native-gate counts, circuit depth, shot counts, T_1/T_2 , per-gate error rates, backend names (`ibm_basquecountry`, `ibm_strasbourg`), qubit counts and the packing strategy are all stated across the main text, Methods, and Extended Data Tables 4 to 9, and the executed circuits are simple (2-qubit, depth 19). What pushes it to medium is breadth rather than depth: two backbones (Llama 3.1 8B and SmoLLM2-135M), many adapter configurations, a qubit-count noise sweep, and an operator-entanglement analysis. Julien will need to read carefully to separate what actually ran on the QPU (the 2-qubit BDUs) from what was only simulated or analysed classically (3-plus-qubit exact synthesis, full-dimension unitaries). No paywall blocks the extraction. The paper defers a sign-correction ablation to a “Supplementary Information” that is not in the folder, but this is non-blocking: the Methods reproduce the relevant ablation numbers inline.

2 Extraction

2.1 What the paper does (one paragraph)

The authors insert small trainable quantum-circuit blocks, called Cayley Unitary Adapters (CUAs), into the linear projection layers of two pre-trained transformer language models and run them on a real IBM superconducting quantum processor. Each adapter is a block-diagonal orthogonal matrix whose 4×4 blocks are parameterised by the Cayley transform of a skew-symmetric matrix; every block becomes an independent 2-qubit circuit. The blocks are trained entirely on classical hardware (the model backbone stays frozen), then the fixed unitaries are executed on the QPU via amplitude encoding plus measurement. On Llama 3.1 8B a single 6,144-parameter adapter lowers WikiText perplexity by 1.43%; a systematic study on the much smaller SmolLM2-135M sweeps block size, ablations, a hardware-noise sweep, and an operator-entanglement analysis. The authors are explicit that the executed 2-qubit circuits are classically simulable: this is a hardware-feasibility demonstration, not a claim of quantum advantage.

2.2 Quantum hardware used

- **Vendor / machine:** IBM. Primary device `ibm_basquecountry` (IBM Quantum System Two, Heron r2, 156 qubits) for all Llama 3.1 8B runs and most SmolLM2 runs; cross-validation on `ibm_strasbourg` (127 qubits) for SmolLM2 between February and March 2025 (main text “Primary result”; “Systematic study”; Fig. 2/3 captions).
- **Qubit count:** 2 qubits per executed Cayley block ($n = 2$). Many blocks run in parallel by packing disjoint 2-qubit lanes: up to 64 lanes (128 physical qubits) per packed “wide” circuit for Llama; up to 72 pairs per batch for SmolLM2. 156 qubits available on the device (Methods, “Transpilation and circuit packing”; Fig. 2c).
- **Connectivity:** Heavy-hexagon coupling map (IBM Heron r2). Only nearest-neighbour 2-qubit adjacency is used; a greedy maximum-matching algorithm selects disjoint qubit pairs from the coupling map (Methods; Fig. 2c). Vendor-notes (`superconducting_qubits.tex`) confirm Heron is a heavy-hex, tunable-coupler-CZ architecture.
- **Gate set:** Device native basis listed as $\{\text{CZ}, R_x, R_z, \text{SX}, X\}$ (Methods, “Transpilation and circuit packing”); the transpiled CUA circuit itself uses the subset $\{\text{CZ}, \text{SX}, R_z, X\}$ with R_z virtual (Fig. 2a caption). The R_x entry reflects Heron r2’s fractional-gate basis (corroborated by vendor-notes) and is not exploited by the executed circuit. The trained 4×4 matrix is applied as a single `UnitaryGate(Q†)` and transpiled at optimisation level 3.
- **Notable features leveraged:** Amplitude encoding (Qiskit `initialize`); exact unitary synthesis of a fixed 2-qubit gate; circuit packing of many disjoint 2-qubit lanes into one wide circuit with per-lane `reset`; a single Qiskit Runtime `SamplerV2` Session per generation call to amortise scheduling and preserve calibration. No mid-circuit measurement, no dynamic circuits, no error correction.

2.3 Computational primitive

QML inference (sampling). Amplitude-encode a normalised 4-vector into a 2-qubit state, apply a fixed (pre-trained, frozen) unitary, measure in the computational basis over 8,192 shots, and reconstruct $\hat{y}_k = \sqrt{c_k/N_{\text{shots}}} \cdot \text{sgn}(x_k) \cdot \|\mathbf{x}\|$. There is **no** on-device variational optimisation: it is not VQE or QAOA. The circuit is a fixed unitary executed open-loop; all training happens classically beforehand.

2.4 Resource fingerprint

Metric	Value	Source (page / equation / SI)
Qubits (logical)	No error-correction / no logical encoding; 2 qubits per Cayley block ($n = 2$)	Main text “Cayley unitary adapter”; Methods “Amplitude encoding”
Qubits (physical)	2 per block circuit; up to 128 used simultaneously (64 packed lanes, Llama); up to 144 (72 pairs, SmolLM2); 156 available on device	Methods “Transpilation and circuit packing”; Fig. 2c; Fig. 3b
Circuit depth	19 (single 2-qubit encode–unitary–measure circuit); 23 (packed wide circuit, 64 lanes / 128 qubits, Llama)	Main text “Primary result”; Methods “Transpilation”; Fig. 2a
2Q-gate count (total)	3 CZ per 2-qubit block; 192 CZ per packed Llama circuit (64 lanes); 1,024 blocks/token \Rightarrow 3,072 CZ per Llama token	Main text “Primary result”; Methods “Transpilation”; Fig. 2a
Measurement shots	8,192 per circuit (QPU). Noise sims used $N = 1,024$ (Ext. Data Table 4); sign-correction ablation swept 1,024–16,384	Eq. 4; Methods “Measurement and post-processing”; Ext. Data Table 4; Methods “Sign-correction”
Classical loop iter.	None on device (open-loop). Adapters trained classically offline: SmolLM2 3 epochs, Llama 3.1 8B 1 epoch	Methods “Training procedure”

Metric	Value	Source (page / equation / SI)
Wall-clock runtime	Single 2-qubit circuit ~ 4 s; first Llama token (16 packed circuits, 128 qubits) 3 min 6 s; full Llama sequence 1,328 circuits \$ 264 min (4 h 24 min); SmolLM2 129-token / 387-circuit response < 90 min	Main text “Primary result”; Methods “Qiskit Session management”; Fig. 3c

2.5 Assumptions and results

- **Claimed.** First end-to-end quantum enhancement of a production-scale, pre-trained LLM for autoregressive generation on real gate-based hardware. Llama 3.1 8B WikiText perplexity $8.877 \rightarrow 8.752$ (+1.43%) from a 6,144-parameter 2-qubit BDU adapter on `v_proj` layer 7 (Ext. Data Table 5). SmolLM2 (compressed 24.10 \rightarrow 35.31) recovers to 29.94 with 210-layer sign-constrained input-dimension adapters (48% of the compression gap); LAMBADA recovers 272.18 \rightarrow 46.20 (83% of the gap) (Ext. Data Tables 1, 3).
- **Error bars / noise assumptions.** Noise modelled as a per-gate depolarising channel with rates pulled from `ibm_basquecountry`: SX 2.45×10^{-4} , CZ 1.78×10^{-3} , readout $\sim 6.8 \times 10^{-3}$; $T_1 \approx 252 \mu\text{s}$, $T_2 \approx 182 \mu\text{s}$ (Methods “Impact of (simulated) noise”; Fig. 2c). Plus readout confusion and multinomial shot noise; cross-validated against IBM’s FakeFez (RMSE 0.056, cosine similarity 0.9984 at activation level). A sharp noise–expressivity phase transition: 2-qubit benign ($\lambda = 1.2\%$); 3-qubit collapse ($\lambda = 11.9\%$, 233 native gates, $\sim 35\times$ PPL); 4-qubit random output ($\lambda > 50\%$). CZ gates carry 59% of gate infidelity at 2 qubits while being 17% of gates (main text “Systematic study”; Ext. Data Table 4). Stochastic baselines in the ablation report mean \pm s.d. over 3 seeds (Ext. Data Table 2).
- **Comparison to classical baseline.** At the same Llama `v_proj-7` site, unconstrained (non-unitary linear) matrices reach PPL 8.585 (+3.29%, 16.77M params) as an upper bound; full unitary + sign reaches 8.618 (+2.92%, 8.38M). The 2-qubit BDU attains roughly half the unconstrained improvement at $\sim 2,730\times$ fewer trainable parameters (6,144 vs 16.77M), framed as an implicitly favourable comparison to LoRA at matched parameter budget (main text; Ext. Data Table 5). Ablations confirm the gain is specific to the *learned* Cayley structure: random Gaussian / unitary / permutation matrices all degrade PPL (up to 41.59); identity reproduces the baseline (Ext. Data Table 2). Authors explicitly state the executed 2-qubit circuits are classically simulable and the QPU run is a feasibility demonstration, not a computational-advantage claim (Discussion).

2.6 Portability flags

- **The executed QPU workload is minimal and substrate-agnostic.** It is a large set of *independent* 2-qubit unitaries (one per 4×4 block), embarrassingly parallel, with no inter-block entanglement and no deep circuits. This ports cleanly to any universal gate-based vendor (trapped-ion, digital neutral-atom, other superconducting). The “quantum” content of what actually ran is small and classically simulable (authors’ own statement, Discussion).
- **Exact unitary synthesis is the hard ceiling.** Each block uses Qiskit `initialize` (amplitude encoding) plus an exactly synthesised `UnitaryGate`. Synthesis cost grows exponentially with qubit count; the noise phase transition (Ext. Data Table 4) makes 3-qubit blocks already unusable on Heron r2 and 4-qubit blocks random. Anything beyond 2 qubits requires **approximate compilation**, which the paper proposes but does not execute on hardware.
- **Only 2-qubit connectivity is required.** Heavy-hex is used solely to find many disjoint 2-qubit lanes for packing throughput; the algorithm needs only pairwise adjacency. Linear or all-to-all topologies work equally well, so connectivity is not a portability constraint at the executed scale.
- **Native gate set is not special.** The transpiled circuit uses $\{CZ, SX, R_z, X\}$; `UnitaryGate` must be re-decomposed for any other vendor’s native set, but for a 2-qubit unitary this is trivial on any universal basis (e.g. trapped-ion XX/MS, neutral-atom CZ). Heron’s fractional R_x/R_{ZZ} basis is not exploited.
- **No exotic hardware primitives.** No mid-circuit measurement, no dynamic circuits, no Rydberg blockade, no native $XX(\theta)$ dependence, no error correction. The only non-gate operation is `reset` between packed lanes.
- **Tight classical–quantum interleaving at inference.** The sign-correction scheme ($\mathbf{y} = W(|Q(\mathbf{x})| \odot \text{sgn}(\mathbf{x}))$) requires storing each slice’s norm and signs classically and reconstructing amplitudes from counts per activation 4-vector. Portability depends on the host supporting fast, fine-grained classical post-processing of sampled counts, not on any QPU feature.
- **Throughput, not qubit count, is the bottleneck.** Cost scales as (circuits \times shots): 1,328 circuits / \$ \$264 min for one Llama sequence. The key throughput lever is wide multi-lane packing with `reset` and a single long Runtime Session; a target vendor must support wide circuits and long sessions to be competitive, independent of qubit quality.
- **The quantum-utility argument is future-facing, not demonstrated.** The scaling claim (a depth- D brickwork VQC encodes $\mathcal{O}(nD)$ parameters versus $2^n(2^n - 1)/2$ Cayley parameters) and the entangling-power / operator-Schmidt analysis (BDU rank-saturating 16/16 at the $10 | 2$ cut versus rank 1 for a depth-1 VQC; Ext. Data Table 9) are classical analyses that motivate scaling to 5–10 qubits via approximate compilation. That regime depends on 2-qubit gate fidelity well below current Heron r2 ($\lambda_{2Q} = 1.78 \times 10^{-3}$) and was not run on hardware.

2.7 Caveats

No paywall: the full LaTeX source (`paper-source/quantum_11m_nature_v5.tex`) and all nine Extended Data Tables are present and were read in full. The figures are referenced but their PDF panels were not parsed beyond their captions; all quantitative claims above come from main text, Methods, and the Extended Data Tables, not from figure pixels.

The Supplementary Information (cited for the full sign-correction ablation detail) is **not** in the dossier folder, but the relevant ablation numbers are reproduced inline in the Methods “Sign-correction within CUA” subsection (PPL 42.47 / 41.49 / 35.05 / 35.07 across schemes and shot counts), so this is non-blocking.

Several internal inconsistencies are worth flagging for downstream use; none change the qualitative hardware picture, but they affect specific numbers:

1. **2-qubit noisy perplexity disagrees across the paper.** Ext. Data Table 4 reports PPL 45.50 at 2 qubits ($N_{\text{shots}} = 1,024$), whereas the main text and Methods report PPL 34.92 for the same 2-qubit noise configuration. The likely cause is shot count (Table 4 explicitly uses 1,024 shots with multinomial shot noise; the 34.92 figure presumably uses more shots or excludes shot noise), but the paper does not reconcile them.
2. **Arithmetic typo in the noise claim.** Main text states the 2-qubit case “degrades by only 0.02 points (PPL 34.68 \rightarrow 34.92)”; the stated difference is 0.24, not 0.02.
3. **Single-circuit depth disagreement.** The 2-qubit circuit is depth 19 (24 native gates = 12 SX + 9 RZ + 3 CZ) in the main text, Methods and Fig. 2a, but Fig. 3a (the SmoLLM2 schematic) labels it “24 native gates; depth 5–8”. The gate count is consistent (24); the depth figures conflict. Depth 19 is the value used three times and is the one carried into the fingerprint table.
4. **Minor PPL drift for the compressed SmoLLM2 baseline:** 35.31 (Methods, main text), 35.29 (Ext. Data Table 3), 35.21 (Ext. Data Table 2). Used 35.31 as the headline value.
5. **SmoLLM2 packing count.** Fig. 3b states 72 disjoint pairs and “2 batches suffice for 144 blocks per token”, but Fig. 3c reports 387 circuits for a 129-token response (= 3 circuits per token), not 2.
6. **Gate-set listing.** Methods lists $\{\text{CZ}, R_x, R_z, \text{SX}, X\}$ while Fig. 2a lists $\{\text{CZ}, \text{SX}, R_z, X\}$. These are reconcilable: the former is Heron r2’s available fractional-gate native basis, the latter is the subset the transpiled CUA circuit actually uses. Reported both above rather than treating either as an error.

3 Portability matrix