

When Noisy Quantum Order Finding Remains Recoverable for Shor's Algorithm

Portability dossier - app

agQSL portability pipeline

2026-06-07

Field	Value
Slug	2026-arxiv-2605.16074-noisy-order-finding
Source	arXiv
Link	https://arxiv.org/abs/2605.16074
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	7
2.7	Caveats	8
3	Portability matrix	9

1 Source

1.1 Domain classification

Primary: **cryptography**. The object of study is Shor’s factoring algorithm, specifically the quantum order-finding subroutine and whether classical continued-fraction post-processing still recovers the true multiplicative order r from a noisy phase-estimation register. This is cryptanalysis tooling, not generic optimisation or chemistry.

Secondary: **machine learning**. The analysis layer is interpretable statistical modelling (single-feature AUROC, random-forest permutation importance, a decision tree) over four hand-built distribution features. The ML is descriptive of recoverability, not part of the quantum algorithm itself, so it is the secondary tag.

1.2 Expert persona for Julien

A quantum-algorithms person who knows Shor order-finding circuit anatomy end to end: modular-exponentiation block, the inverse QFT and its approximate-QFT (AQFT) truncation, the t -qubit precision register, and continued-fraction plus modular-verification post-processing. They should have working intuition for NISQ superconducting hardware (IBM Eagle/Heron-class backends, Qiskit transpilation at a given optimisation level, two-qubit depth and count as noise proxies, readout error, 4 000-shot statistics). Useful but not essential: enough applied-ML literacy to sanity-check the random-forest and decision-tree claims. The quantum-hardware fingerprint here is the deliverable, and most of it is already tabulated (see Difficulty), so the persona is more about reading the circuit family correctly than about deep domain modelling.

1.3 Related prior work (brief bibliography)

Tight pointer set, weighted toward same-primitive-different-vendor comparisons for portability framing:

- **Shor’s order-finding primitive (foundational)**. P. W. Shor, *Polynomial-Time Algorithms for Prime Factorization and Discrete Logarithms on a Quantum Computer*, SIAM J. Comput. 26(5), 1997. DOI: [10.1137/S0097539795293172](https://doi.org/10.1137/S0097539795293172).
- **Same primitive, trapped-ion vendor**. T. Monz et al., *Realization of a Scalable Shor Algorithm*, Science 351(6277), 2016. DOI: [10.1126/science.aad9480](https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aad9480). Direct cross-vendor comparison for the order-finding circuit run on a different modality.
- **Same application, photonic modality**. E. Martín-López et al., *Experimental Realization of Shor’s Quantum Factoring Algorithm Using Qubit Recycling*, Nature Photonics 6, 2012. DOI: [10.1038/nphoton.2012.259](https://doi.org/10.1038/nphoton.2012.259).
- **Same application, neutral-atom adiabatic paradigm (in-corporis cross-reference)**. Pasqal, *Testing cryptographic codes with an analog quantum device* (factoring 6, 15, 35 via MIS on Rydberg arrays): pasqal.com/blog/testing-cryptographic-codes-with-an-analog-quantum-device. Already a node in `edges.json`; the natural portability foil to this gate-model phase-estimation route.

- **Classical post-processing baseline for order finding.** M. Ekerå, *On the Success Probability of Quantum Order Finding*, ACM ToQC 5(2), 2024. arXiv:2201.07791, DOI: [10.1145/3655026](https://doi.org/10.1145/3655026). The recoverability criterion in this paper sits on top of exactly this continued-fraction machinery.
- **Fault-tolerant resource end of the spectrum.** C. Gidney and M. Ekerå, *How to factor 2048 bit RSA integers in 8 hours using 20 million noisy qubits*, Quantum 5, 2021. DOI: [10.22331/q-2021-04-15-433](https://doi.org/10.22331/q-2021-04-15-433). Contextualises why NISQ recoverability of toy instances is a stepping stone, not the destination.

1.4 Difficulty estimate

low. The paper is a short ACM workshop paper (ICS Workshops '26), CC-BY and open on arXiv, with full LaTeX source plus figures already in `paper-source/`. There is no paywall and no SI dependency. The quantum-hardware fingerprint is unusually clean to extract: Table 1 (`tab:dataset_summary`) gives backends and per-backend run counts (`ibm_kingston`, `ibm_boston`, `ibm_torino`, `ibm_pittsburgh`, `ibm_miami`), instance set $N \in \{3, 7, 15, 31, 63, 127\}$, bases $a \in \{2, 4, 8, 16\}$, precision sizes $t \in \{8, 10\}$, AQFT degree $\{0, 1, 2\}$, 4 000 shots, Qiskit optimisation level 1, and two-qubit depth/count ranges. The circuit family is restricted to the Mersenne / powers-of-two case $N = 2^n - 1$, $a = 2^s \bmod N$, where modular multiplication collapses to a cyclic rotation, which Julien should call out explicitly because it makes these instances easier than general Shor. The only mild friction: per-run backend-to-instance mapping is not broken out, so Julien should record the fingerprint at the dataset level rather than per run.

2 Extraction

2.1 What the paper does (one paragraph)

This is a measurement-and-statistics study of Shor’s order-finding subroutine run on real IBM superconducting hardware. The authors execute a restricted family of order-finding circuits, read out the t -qubit precision register, and ask a single question: given a noisy measured distribution, does the standard classical post-processing (continued-fraction expansion of y/Q plus modular verification $a^{r_0} \equiv 1 \pmod{N}$) still return the true multiplicative order r ? They label each of 680 collected distributions as *recoverable* or not, then describe each distribution with four order-agnostic features: autocorrelation peak strength A_{peak} , normalised entropy H_{norm} , dominant verified mass fraction $M_{1,\text{frac}}$, and verified margin fraction $\Delta_{\text{ver,frac}}$. Using single-feature AUROC, a random forest with permutation importance, and an interpretable decision tree, they find that recoverability is driven most directly by how strongly the verified probability mass concentrates on one candidate denominator, not by how visually clean the histogram looks. The quantum part is a textbook phase-estimation circuit; the contribution is the interpretable noise/recoverability analysis on top of it.

2.2 Quantum hardware used

- **Vendor / machine:** IBM Quantum, five backends (superconducting). Run counts per backend (Table 1, `tab:dataset_summary`): `ibm_kingston` (390), `ibm_boston` (170), `ibm_torino` (80), `ibm_pittsburgh` (30), `ibm_miami` (10).
- **Qubit count:** Algorithmic register is 7 work qubits + t precision qubits, i.e. **15 qubits used at $t = 8$ and 17 qubits at $t = 10$** (work-register size from Methods §“Dataset Collection”; precision sizes from Table 1). Per-backend processor generation and device qubit counts are **not reported in the paper**. (Context, not from paper: these are IBM Heron-class superconducting devices; `ibm_torino` is publicly a Heron r1 part. The paper does not state this and the fingerprint does not depend on it.)
- **Connectivity: Not stated in the paper.** IBM’s superconducting architecture is a fixed-frequency-transmon **heavy-hex** lattice (substrate reference: `vendor-notes/superconducting_qubits.tex`); transpilation onto that nearest-neighbour graph is what produces the reported two-qubit depth/count figures.
- **Gate set: Not named in the paper.** IBM’s native basis is $\{X, SX, R_z\}$ plus one native two-qubit entangler (CZ via tunable coupler on Heron; ECR / cross-resonance on Eagle). The paper only reports generic “2Q-gate” depth and count, and uses Qiskit transpilation at optimisation level 1.
- **Notable features leveraged:** Approximate QFT (AQFT) truncation as a depth knob, degrees $\{0, 1, 2\}$ (Table 1); the Mersenne / powers-of-two instance family $N = 2^n - 1$, $a = 2^s \pmod{N}$, which collapses modular multiplication to a cyclic rotation of the work register (Methods, Discussion). No mid-circuit measurement, dynamic circuits, or qubit recycling are used: this is the register-based (non-iterative) phase-estimation form.

2.3 Computational primitive

QPE: quantum phase estimation, in the Shor order-finding form. Modular-exponentiation block (here reduced to cyclic rotations) followed by an exact or approximate inverse QFT on a t -qubit precision register, then classical continued-fraction post-processing. It is a single-circuit, non-variational primitive, not VQE, QAOA, or Trotterised simulation, and not iterative/semiclassical QPE.

2.4 Resource fingerprint

Metric	Value	Source (page / equation / SI)
Qubits (logical)	n/a (NISQ, no error correction). Algorithmic register = 7 work + t precision = 15 ($t = 8$) / 17 ($t = 10$)	Methods §“Dataset Collection”; Table 1 (precision sizes)
Qubits (physical)	Same as algorithmic register (no QEC encoding); per-backend device qubit counts not reported	Methods; Table 1
Circuit depth	Two-qubit-gate depth: min 96, median 1279, max 1997 (dataset-level range)	Table 1 (<code>tab:dataset_summary</code>)
2Q-gate count (total)	min 118, median 1654, max 2681 (dataset-level range)	Table 1
Measurement shots	4,000 per run	Table 1; Methods §“Dataset Collection”
Classical loop iter.	n/a; single quantum execution per run + classical continued-fraction / modular-verification post-processing (not a variational loop)	Preliminaries; Methods
Wall-clock runtime	not reported	not reported

Notes: resource figures are reported only at the dataset level (min / median / max across all 680 runs); the paper does not give a per-instance or per-backend circuit breakdown. Other dataset axes: instances $N \in \{3, 7, 15, 31, 63, 127\}$, bases $a \in \{2, 4, 8, 16\}$, precision sizes

$t = 8$ (595 runs) and $t = 10$ (85 runs), AQFT degree 0 (80), 1 (85), 2 (515). Total runs 680: 310 recoverable (45.6%), 370 non-recoverable (54.4%) (Table 1).

2.5 Assumptions and results

- **Claimed.** Recoverability of noisy order finding is governed primarily by how the *post-processing* redistributes probability mass across verified candidate denominators, not by the visual cleanliness of the histogram. The dominant verified mass fraction $M_{1,\text{frac}}$ is the single strongest predictor (AUROC 0.981; the other three features score 0.946, 0.946, 0.937, per Table 4 `tab:auroc_ranking`), and it is also the root split of the decision tree ($M_{1,\text{frac}} \leq 0.415$ branches mostly non-recoverable, $M_{1,\text{frac}} > 0.659$ is a pure recoverable leaf). The four features together give a cross-validated random-forest AUROC of 0.997 ± 0.002 . The key recoverability quantity is the verified mass on a candidate denominator r_0 ,

$$m(r_0) = \sum_{\substack{y: r_0(y)=r_0 \\ a^{r_0} \equiv 1 \pmod{N}}} p(y),$$

with the inferred order $r_{\text{calc}} \in \arg \max_{r_0} m(r_0)$ and a run called recoverable iff $r_{\text{calc}} = r$.

- **Error bars / noise assumptions.** Random-forest importance uses 5-fold stratified cross-validation; permutation-importance error bars are the standard deviation across folds (Fig. `fig:perm_importance`). The authors offer a two-stage application-level noise model,

$$p(y) \approx (1 - \varepsilon) [p_s * K_{\sigma_0}](y) + \varepsilon \sum_{h \in \mathcal{H} \setminus \{s\}} \nu_h [p_h * K_{\sigma_h}](y), \quad \sum_{h \in \mathcal{H} \setminus \{s\}} \nu_h = 1,$$

reading the measured distribution as a broadened intended comb family plus noise-induced competing comb families. This is an interpretive model, not a fitted per-run noise characterisation; ε , ν_h , and the kernels are not estimated numerically in the paper.

- **Classical baseline.** There is no quantum-vs-classical speedup claim. The “baseline” is the standard classical post-processing (continued fractions + modular verification) itself; the study measures when that classical decoder succeeds on noisy quantum output. No comparison to classical factoring of these (tiny) integers is made or intended.

2.6 Portability flags

Features Brilliant should weigh when reasoning about other vendors:

- **Gate-model phase-estimation route, no analog primitive.** The whole pipeline is universal gate-model QPE; nothing depends on Rydberg blockade, analog evolution, or a substrate-unique interaction. In principle it transposes to any universal gate-model vendor (IBM, Google, IQM, Rigetti, OQC, and trapped-ion Quantinuum/IonQ). This is the natural digital foil to the in-corporate Pasqal analog/MIS factoring route, which solves factoring by a completely different (non-phase-estimation) mechanism.

- **Restricted instance family, not general Shor.** The circuits are the Mersenne / powers-of-two case $N = 2^n - 1$, $a = 2^s \bmod N$, where modular multiplication degenerates to a cyclic rotation of the work register. These instances are dramatically easier than general modular exponentiation, and the authors say so (Discussion: for general modexp the “sector” picture and the shallow-circuit advantage break down). Any cross-vendor resource or recoverability comparison must hold this restriction fixed; the figures do **not** generalise to arbitrary N, a .
- **Resource numbers are heavy-hex-conditioned.** The 2Q depth (up to 1997) and 2Q count (up to 2681) come from Qiskit opt-level-1 transpilation onto IBM’s nearest-neighbour heavy-hex lattice, including SWAP routing. On an all-to-all-connected platform (trapped ions) the SWAP overhead would shrink and these counts would drop; on a different lattice or optimisation level they change. The fingerprint’s depth/count rows are architecture- and compiler-specific, not intrinsic to the algorithm.
- **Native two-qubit gate substitution.** Counts assume IBM’s CZ/ECR native entangler. A vendor with a native $XX(\theta)$ / Mølmer-Sørensen (ion) or iSWAP-family gate would re-transpile, changing the gate budget; the reported numbers are not directly comparable across native gate sets.
- **Qubit-hungry but MCM-free.** This is the register-based inverse-QFT form (full t -qubit precision register, $t \in \{8, 10\}$), not the iterative/semiclassical phase-estimation route. It needs more qubits but does **not** require mid-circuit measurement, feed-forward, or qubit recycling, which is relevant when porting to hardware with weak or absent MCM. AQFT degree (0/1/2) is a portable depth/accuracy knob that trades inverse-QFT two-qubit gates for precision.
- **Noise-profile specificity of the finding.** The recoverability statistics and the decision-tree thresholds are tied to the IBM Heron-class noise profile in this dataset. The authors explicitly flag (Discussion, future work) that whether the same recoverability indicators hold across other backends, noise profiles, problem sizes, and approximation levels is open. Portability of the *result* (which features predict recoverability) to other vendors is unverified.

2.7 Caveats

- **Access:** Full access. Open-access CC-BY arXiv paper (ICS Workshops ’26) with complete LaTeX source and all figures in `paper-source/`. No paywall, no supplementary-information dependency. Nothing was unreachable.
- **What the paper does not report:** per-backend processor generation and device qubit counts; per-run mapping from backend to instance (N, a, t , AQFT degree); per-instance circuit resource breakdown (only dataset-level min/median/max are given); the native two-qubit gate name per backend; and wall-clock runtime. These are recorded as “not reported” above rather than inferred.
- **Architecture context vs. paper evidence:** statements about heavy-hex connectivity, the $\{X, SX, R_z\} + CZ/ECR$ native basis, and Heron-class device identity come from the IBM substrate reference (`vendor-notes/superconducting_qubits.tex`) and general knowledge, not from the paper itself; they are labelled as such and the resource fingerprint does not rely on them.

3 Portability matrix