

# A Hybrid Classical-Quantum Annealing Algorithm for the TSP

Portability dossier - app

agQSL portability pipeline

2026-06-07

Field	Value
Slug	2026-arxiv-2605.09616-tsp-dwave-annealing
Source	arXiv
Link	<a href="https://arxiv.org/abs/2605.09616">https://arxiv.org/abs/2605.09616</a>
Category	app
Triaged	2026-05-21 by port_until_julien_parallel
Bootstrapped	2026-06-07

## Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>Source</b>	<b>3</b>
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
<b>2</b>	<b>Extraction</b>	<b>5</b>
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 . . . . .	8
2.7	Caveats . . . . .	9
<b>3</b>	<b>Portability matrix</b>	<b>10</b>

# 1 Source

## 1.1 Domain classification

optimisation (primary). This is a textbook combinatorial-optimisation paper: the Travelling Salesperson Problem cast as a QUBO and solved by quantum annealing. No meaningful secondary domain. The only methodological wrinkle worth flagging for Julien is that most of the paper lives in classical Path-Integral Monte Carlo (PIMC) simulation of annealing, with the genuine D-Wave QPU run confined to one short subsection.

## 1.2 Expert persona for Julien

A quantum-annealing practitioner fluent in QUBO/Ising formulations and D-Wave’s Ocean stack. Should have calibrated intuition about minor-embedding onto the Pegasus topology, clique embedding via `DWaveCliqueSampler`, chain-length and chain-strength effects, and how dense, fully-connected TSP graphs exhaust QPU connectivity past roughly 15 cities. Needs enough fluency in annealing-schedule knobs (annealing time, number of reads, Lagrange-multiplier tuning) to read the hardware fingerprint, and enough combinatorial-optimisation background (2-opt moves, pool-based edge-frequency contraction, subQUBO extraction, Trotter discretisation) to cleanly separate the classical pre-processing from the part that actually touches the quantum device.

## 1.3 Related prior work (brief bibliography)

- Martoňák, Santoro, Tosatti (2004), “Quantum annealing of the traveling-salesman problem,” *Phys. Rev. E* 70, 057701. DOI [10.1103/PhysRevE.70.057701](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevE.70.057701). The seminal PIMC quantum-annealing scheme this paper reimplements (same primitive, classical simulation).
- Atobe, Tawada, Togawa (2022), “Hybrid Annealing Method Based on subQUBO Model Extraction With Multiple Solution Instances,” *IEEE Trans. Computers* 71(10):2606–2619. DOI [10.1109/TC.2021.3138629](https://doi.org/10.1109/TC.2021.3138629). The subQUBO extraction loop the authors graft onto the contraction step.
- Jain (2021), “Solving the Traveling Salesman Problem on the D-Wave Quantum Computer,” *Frontiers in Physics* 9:760783. DOI [10.3389/fphy.2021.760783](https://doi.org/10.3389/fphy.2021.760783). Same application, same vendor, with a classical-solver baseline; a direct portability anchor (and the source of the “8 nodes or fewer” ceiling claim).
- Bentellis, Poggel, Lorenz (2025), “Application-Driven Benchmarking of the Traveling Salesperson Problem: a Quantum Hardware Deep-Dive,” *IEEE QCE 2025*, pp. 1894–1904. DOI [10.1109/QCE65121.2025.00207](https://doi.org/10.1109/QCE65121.2025.00207). TSP across superconducting, ion-trap, and neutral-atom hardware; the cross-architecture comparison Brillant will want.
- Padmasola, Li, Chatterjee, Dyk (2025), “Solving the Traveling Salesman Problem via Different Quantum Computing Architectures,” [arXiv:2502.17725](https://arxiv.org/abs/2502.17725). Same application mapped onto multiple vendor architectures (annealing vs gate-based).
- McGeoch, Chern, Farré, King (2024), “A comment on comparing optimization on D-Wave and IBM quantum processors,” [arXiv:2406.19351](https://arxiv.org/abs/2406.19351). Cross-vendor methodology for benchmarking optimisation across annealer and gate-based platforms; useful for

sanity-checking any portability claim.

## 1.4 Difficulty estimate

low. The full LaTeX source ships in `paper-source/` (no paywall, no SI dependency), the code is openly published on GitHub, and the paper is a short GECCO Companion workshop contribution. The hardware fingerprint is stated explicitly in the “D-Wave Hardware Results” subsection and Table 5: D-Wave Advantage\_system 4.1, Pegasus topology, clique minor-embedding via `DWaveCliqueSampler`, annealing time 20  $\mu$ s, 25 reads, Lagrange multipliers  $\lambda_1, \lambda_2 = 0.8 \times \text{max\_dist}$ , and contracted sub-instances of roughly 4 to 5 nodes. No exotic primitives. The one trap for Julien: the headline benchmark tables (TSPLIB instances up to 11,849 cities) are classical PIMC, not QPU runs, so the genuine hardware evidence is limited to the three small instances (`burma14`, `ulysses16`, `ulysses22`) in Table 5.

## 2 Extraction

### 2.1 What the paper does (one paragraph)

The paper proposes a hybrid classical-quantum method for the Travelling Salesperson Problem (TSP). The central idea is graph contraction: a pool of cheaply generated tours is built classically (Fisher-Yates random permutations refined by simulated annealing with 2-opt moves), edge frequencies across a sampled subset are computed, and edges that recur above a confidence threshold  $\tau$  are fixed and merged into “super-nodes”. This contracts an  $N$ -city instance to a much smaller sub-TSP of size  $N_{sub}$ , which is solved by a quantum-annealing step inside an iterative loop that runs until  $K$  consecutive non-improving iterations. Most of the paper evaluates this loop with the quantum step run as a classical Path-Integral Monte Carlo (PIMC) simulation of quantum annealing on TSPLIB instances up to 11,849 cities. One subsection (§6.4, Table 5) replaces PIMC with a genuine D-Wave quantum annealer on three small instances (`burma14`, `ulysses16`, `ulysses22`), casting each contracted sub-TSP as a QUBO and minor-embedding it onto the QPU.

### 2.2 Quantum hardware used

- **Vendor / machine:** D-Wave / Advantage\_system 4.1 QPU (accessed via CINECA, Italy). A D-Wave BQM hybrid solver is also used, as a comparison baseline only.
- **Qubit count:** Not reported. The QPU solves contracted sub-instances of average  $N_{sub} \approx 4$  to 5 nodes (Table 5); the refined QUBO of Eq. 1 for an  $N_{sub}$ -node sub-TSP has  $(N_{sub} - 1)^2$  binary variables, i.e. roughly 9 to 16 logical variables per QPU call. The paper states neither the device qubit count nor the physical-qubit footprint of the embedding. (Cross-check: the D-Wave substrate note records Advantage-line qubit counts “in the thousands”; this is background, not a paper number.)
- **Connectivity:** Pegasus topology (sparse, fixed hardware graph). The dense, fully connected TSP QUBO must be minor-embedded; the authors use clique embedding. (Background: Pegasus has a coupler degree of 15 per general D-Wave documentation; the paper does not state a degree.)
- **Gate set:** None. This is an analog quantum annealer that evolves a programmable transverse-field Ising / QUBO Hamiltonian. There is no digital gate set.
- **Notable features leveraged:** Clique minor-embedding via `DWaveCliqueSampler`; programmable annealing time (20  $\mu$ s); programmable number of reads (25); penalty-based (Lagrange-multiplier) QUBO encoding of the TSP constraints.

### 2.3 Computational primitive

**Analog evolution** (quantum annealing). The genuine QPU step is D-Wave quantum annealing of a QUBO. The bulk of the paper instead emulates this same primitive classically via PIMC (Trotterised path-integral Monte Carlo of a transverse-field Ising model), which is a classical simulation, not a quantum computation.

## 2.4 Resource fingerprint

(QPU figures are for the genuine D-Wave runs in §6.4 / Table 5: averages over 10 independent runs across `burma14`, `ulysses16`, `ulysses22`.)

Metric	Value	Source (page / equation / SI)
Qubits (logical)	Not reported. Sub-instances of avg. $N_{sub} \approx 4$ to 5 nodes; the QUBO of Eq. 1 has $(N_{sub} - 1)^2$ binary variables (roughly 9 to 16), not stated explicitly	§6.4; Table 5 (Avg. $N_{sub}$ 4.02 / 3.94 / 5.05); Eq. 1 (Background §3.1)
Qubits (physical)	Not reported (clique minor-embedding via <code>DWaveCliqueSampler</code> onto Pegasus; no chain length or physical-qubit count given)	§6.4
Circuit depth	Not applicable (analog anneal). Annealing time set to 20 $\mu$ s	§6.4
2Q-gate count (total)	Not applicable (analog annealer, no gates)	§6.4
Measurement shots	25 reads per QPU call	§6.4
Classical loop iter.	Not reported for the QPU runs (hybrid loop runs until $K$ consecutive non-improving iterations; $K = 3$ in the simulation experiments; pool-refinement step deliberately omitted for the QPU runs)	§6.4; Algorithm 1; Tables 1 to 3 captions

Metric	Value	Source (page / equation / SI)
Wall-clock runtime	Total per instance: 11,549.90 ± 2867.69 ms ( <b>burma14</b> ), 12,924.75 ± 5278.47 ms ( <b>ulysses16</b> ), 15,067.80 ± 4872.35 ms ( <b>ulysses22</b> ). Of which QPU time: 97.62 / 92.75 / 130.59 ms; classical time: 55.80 / 59.36 / 137.80 ms. The remainder is minor-embedding, network latency, and QPU queue wait	Table 5

Additional QPU settings (§6.4): Lagrange multipliers  $\lambda_1 = \lambda_2 = 0.8 \times \text{max\_dist}$  (maximum pairwise distance in the instance); pool size  $N_I = 100$ , sample size  $N_S = 50$ , local-search steps  $\gamma = 1$ ; threshold  $\tau = 0.4$  for **burma14** and **ulysses16**,  $\tau = 0.3$  for **ulysses22**. The D-Wave BQM hybrid solver baseline used a 3-second time limit.

The QUBO solved on the QPU is the position-indexed formulation (Eq. 1 in the paper, copied verbatim from the source), where  $x_{i,j} = 1$  if city  $i$  is visited at step  $j$ , with city 0 fixed at time 0:

$$\begin{aligned}
Q' = & \sum_{j=1}^{N-2} \sum_{i=1}^{N-1} \sum_{k=1}^{N-1} d_{i,k} x_{i,j} x_{k,j+1} + \sum_{i=1}^{N-1} (d_{0,i} x_{i,1} + d_{i,0} x_{i,N-1}) \\
& + \lambda_1 \sum_{i=1}^{N-1} \left( \sum_{j=1}^{N-1} x_{i,j} - 1 \right)^2 + \lambda_2 \sum_{j=1}^{N-1} \left( \sum_{i=1}^{N-1} x_{i,j} - 1 \right)^2
\end{aligned}$$

Here  $N$  is the size of the contracted sub-TSP ( $N_{sub}$ ), not the original instance.

## 2.5 Assumptions and results

- **Claim.** Graph contraction by edge frequency shrinks a TSP instance to a sub-TSP small enough to fit a current annealer, while preserving solution quality. On the three QPU instances the hybrid method beats D-Wave’s own BQM hybrid solver on average optimality gap: 1.75% vs 2.26% (**burma14**), 1.20% vs 5.02% (**ulysses16**), 2.57% vs 16.88% (**ulysses22**), solving sub-instances of

about 4 to 5 nodes (Table 5). On the PIMC track it reaches the exact optimum on small instances and stays below roughly 4% gap up to `pr2392`, beating Google OR-Tools at matched time budgets (Table 4).

- **Error bars / noise.** Results are averaged over 10 runs (QPU, Table 5) or 100 runs (most PIMC tables; 10 runs for `r111849`), reported as mean  $\pm$  standard deviation. No qubit-level noise model, chain-break statistics, or annealing-schedule error analysis is given. The penalty weights are tuned heuristically ( $0.8 \times \text{max\_dist}$ ); the authors note the multipliers must be large enough to enforce feasibility but not so large as to flatten the energy gaps between good tours.
- **Classical baselines.** Two: Google OR-Tools (Vehicle Routing module, Path Cheapest Arc + Guided Local Search) at matched time limits for the PIMC track, and the D-Wave BQM hybrid solver (3-second limit) for the QPU track. The dominant cost on the PIMC track is the PIMC step itself; on the very large `r111849` the classical pool stages instead dominate (about 70% of runtime).

## 2.6 Portability flags

Features that matter for Brillant’s portability analysis:

- **Requires a quantum annealer, not a gate-based device.** The QPU step is analog quantum annealing of a QUBO/Ising Hamiltonian. There is no circuit, no gate set, and no depth. Porting the quantum step to a gate-based platform (IBM, IonQ, Quantinuum) means re-casting each sub-QUBO as QAOA or VQE, which changes the resource profile entirely (gate count, depth, variational loop) and is not a drop-in substitution.
- **Requires clique minor-embedding of a dense QUBO onto a sparse graph.** The TSP QUBO is fully connected, so it must be minor-embedded onto Pegasus via `DWaveCliqueSampler`. Embedding overhead grows quickly with sub-instance size; the entire contraction method exists to keep  $N_{sub}$  small (about 4 to 5 nodes, i.e. roughly 9 to 16 logical variables) so the clique still embeds. The Related Work notes that direct TSP embeddings struggle past about 15 cities. This sparse-connectivity tax is the central hardware constraint.
- **Vendor-locked software stack.** Uses D-Wave Ocean components: `DWaveCliqueSampler` for embedding and the BQM hybrid solver as a baseline. These are D-Wave-specific.
- **Annealer-specific tuning knobs.** Annealing time (20  $\mu$ s) and number of reads (25) have no gate-model equivalent. Lagrange penalty weights ( $0.8 \times \text{max\_dist}$ ) are tuned to this encoding and would need re-tuning for any other QUBO/Ising backend.
- **Portability positive: the quantum step is loosely coupled.** The contraction front-end is purely classical and the quantum step is a black-box sub-TSP solver. The paper itself runs that step two ways (classical PIMC and D-Wave QPU), so the contracted sub-QUBO could in principle be handed to any annealer (or, with a different solver wrapper, a gate-based QUBO solver). The interface is the sub-QUBO, not a D-Wave-specific primitive, which lowers the porting barrier for the quantum step relative to a circuit hard-wired to one device.

## 2.7 Caveats

- **Open access, full source.** No paywall. The complete arXiv LaTeX source ships in `paper-source/`; equations were copied from it. The code is publicly released on GitHub (cited as `\cite{source}`).
- **Genuine QPU evidence is narrow.** Only §6.4 / Table 5 reports real D-Wave runs, on three small instances (`burma14` 14 cities, `ulysses16` 16, `ulysses22` 22). Every other table (Tables 1 to 4, up to 11,849 cities) is classical PIMC simulation of annealing, not QPU execution. Treat the large-instance results as classical, not as quantum hardware evidence.
- **Hardware numbers the paper does not report.** Device qubit count, physical-qubit footprint of the embedding, chain lengths, chain strength, chain-break rates, and the number of QPU calls (hybrid-loop iterations) per run are all absent. The number of reads (25), annealing time (20  $\mu$ s), and average  $N_{sub}$  are the only direct QPU resource figures stated.

### 3 Portability matrix