

Toward Near-Real-Time Marine Oil Spill Detection in SAR Imagery using Quantum-Assisted SVM

Portability dossier - app

agQSL portability pipeline

2026-06-07

Field	Value
Slug	2026-arxiv-2605.17217-oil-spill-qsvm
Source	arXiv
Link	https://arxiv.org/abs/2605.17217
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	8
2.7	Caveats	8
3	Portability matrix	10

1 Source

1.1 Domain classification

Primary: machine learning. The paper’s quantum-relevant content is a quantum support vector machine (QSVM): an ensemble of weak SVMs whose training is cast as a QUBO and solved on a D-Wave annealer, plus a gate-based quantum-kernel SVM in PennyLane. The application area is environmental remote sensing (Sentinel-1 SAR marine oil-spill segmentation), but that is the data substrate, not the quantum modality. Note the SAR here is classical radar imagery, so this is **not** a quantum-sensing paper despite the word “sensing”.

Secondary: **optimisation** (the per-learner SVM training is a discrete combinatorial subroutine, a QUBO solved by quantum annealing).

1.2 Expert persona for Julien

A quantum machine learning specialist comfortable in two hardware paradigms at once. On the annealing side they should have calibrated intuition for QUBO formulations of SVM training, the binary discretisation (bit-depth encoding) of continuous SVM coefficients, and the practicalities of D-Wave Advantage execution: minor embedding onto the Pegasus topology, chain strength, number of reads, and best-sample retention. On the gate side they should understand quantum-kernel estimation in PennyLane, angle/rotation feature encoding, and the train-time-versus-inference-time placement of the quantum step (annealing puts quantum at training, the kernel method puts it at inference). Remote-sensing/SAR familiarity is a useful secondary, not the main requirement.

1.3 Related prior work (brief bibliography)

- Willsch, Willsch, De Raedt, Michielsen, *Support vector machines on the D-Wave quantum annealer*, Comput. Phys. Commun. 248:107006 (2020). [arXiv:1906.06283](https://arxiv.org/abs/1906.06283) / [DOI:10.1016/j.cpc.2019.107006](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cpc.2019.107006). Foundational QUBO-SVM-on-D-Wave method this paper’s annealing half adapts.
- Cavallaro, Willsch, Willsch, Michielsen, Riedel, *Approaching Remote Sensing Image Classification with Ensembles of Support Vector Machines on the D-Wave Quantum Annealer*, IGARSS 2020, pp. 1973-1976. [DOI:10.1109/IGARSS39084.2020.9323544](https://doi.org/10.1109/IGARSS39084.2020.9323544). Direct predecessor: same primitive (QSVM ensemble on D-Wave) on the same domain (remote-sensing image classification); this work extends it from image-level to pixel-wise segmentation.
- *Benchmarking Quantum Kernel SVMs Against Classical Baselines on Tabular Data*, [arXiv:2604.18837](https://arxiv.org/abs/2604.18837). In-corpus sibling (graph edge e087, IBM): same QSVM primitive on a different vendor and a gate-based kernel, with classical baselines. Useful portability comparison point.
- Havlíček et al., *Supervised learning with quantum-enhanced feature spaces*, Nature 567:209-212 (2019). [DOI:10.1038/s41586-019-0980-2](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-019-0980-2). Foundational gate-based quantum-kernel SVM underpinning the PennyLane half.
- Venkatesh, Macaluso, Nuske, Klusch, Dengel, *Q-Seg: Quantum annealing-based unsupervised image segmentation*, IEEE Comput. Graph. Appl. 44(5):27-39 (2024). [arXiv:2311.12912](https://arxiv.org/abs/2311.12912). Alternative annealing route to segmentation (min-cut on D-Wave); contrasts

with the QSVM-ensemble approach taken here.

- Trujillo-Acatitla, Tuxpan-Vargas, Ovando-Vázquez, Monterrubio-Martínez, *Marine oil spill detection and segmentation in SAR data with two steps Deep Learning framework*, Mar. Pollut. Bull. 204:116549 (2024). DOI:10.1016/j.marpolbul.2024.116549. Source of the Sentinel-1 dataset and the classical deep-learning (U-Net) comparison point.

1.4 Difficulty estimate

low. The paper is short and open (CC BY 4.0), and the full source is already attached locally (`paper-source/main.tex`, `references.bib`, `comparison/Hormuz figure PDFs`), so no paywall or SI dependence. The hardware fingerprint targets are concrete and stated in the main text: D-Wave `Advantage_system4.1` via the Ocean SDK, 1000 reads per QUBO with the best 20 samples retained, 500 weak learners trained on disjoint 40-vector subsets, a 5-dimensional feature vector, and a 5-qubit PennyLane quantum-kernel circuit (one qubit per feature). The one extraction subtlety: the QUBO discretisation scheme (bit-depth encoding of the SVM coefficients) and minor-embedding details (qubits/chain length per QUBO) are not spelled out in the main text and are inherited from Cavallaro [3] / Willsch (arXiv:1906.06283), so Julien should reach for those two references to pin down the encoding rather than expect it in-paper.

2 Extraction

2.1 What the paper does (one paragraph)

The paper builds a pixel-wise oil-spill segmentation pipeline for Sentinel-1 SAR imagery using a bagging ensemble of weak support vector machines, with the quantum step injected in two distinct ways. In the annealing route, each weak SVM’s training is recast as a QUBO (continuous SVM coefficients discretised into binary variables) and solved on a D-Wave Advantage annealer; inference is then fully classical. In the gate route, a 5-qubit PennyLane circuit estimates a quantum kernel that is then handed to a classical SVM, so the quantum cost falls at inference rather than training. Five hand-crafted features per pixel (VV intensity, VH/VV ratio, local entropy, local standard deviation, Sobel gradient magnitude) feed 500 weak learners, each trained on a disjoint 40-vector subset. Across classical, simulated-annealing, hardware-annealing and simulated-gate configurations the segmentation quality is essentially tied (IoU 0.60, balanced accuracy 0.89); the configurations differ mainly in inference latency.

2.2 Quantum hardware used

- **Vendor / machine:** D-Wave / Advantage_system4.1 (rf-SQUID flux-qubit quantum annealer), accessed via the Ocean SDK. The gate-model results are **PennyLane simulation only**; no gate-based quantum hardware was run.
- **Qubit count:** Annealing: per-QUBO embedding size *not reported* (the minor-embedding footprint of each weak-learner QUBO is not stated); available ≈ 5640 physical flux qubits on the Pegasus graph (D-Wave Advantage spec, not stated in the paper). Gate route: 5 qubits (one qubit encodes each input feature; simulated).
- **Connectivity:** Annealing: Pegasus topology, coupler degree 15, a sparse fixed hardware graph that forces minor-embedding for any non-native interaction graph (substrate spec, not stated in the paper; see `vendor-notes/annealing_flux_qubits.tex`). Gate route: not stated (5-qubit simulator, no connectivity constraint imposed).
- **Gate set:** Annealing has **no gate set**: it programs a time-dependent Ising Hamiltonian $H(s) = A(s)H_{\text{driver}} + B(s)H_{\text{problem}}$ with $H_{\text{problem}} = \sum_i h_i \sigma_i^z + \sum_{\langle i,j \rangle} J_{ij} \sigma_i^z \sigma_j^z$, set by per-qubit flux biases h_i and tunable couplers J_{ij} . Gate route: parameterised single-qubit rotation gates for angle encoding (the first sample encoded with positive rotations, the paired sample with negative rotations, so the measured overlap quantifies similarity).
- **Notable features leveraged:** Quantum annealing as a heuristic QUBO sampler (best 20 of 1000 reads retained per problem); minor-embedding onto Pegasus. The gate route leans on quantum-kernel estimation. No mid-circuit measurement, dynamic circuits, or other advanced control primitives are used or claimed.

2.3 Computational primitive

Two distinct primitives are used:

1. **Quantum annealing (QUBO sampling)** for weak-SVM training. This is the only primitive run on physical quantum hardware

(D-Wave Advantage) and is the paper’s headline configuration.

2. **QML inference (quantum-kernel estimation)** for the gate route, evaluated in PennyLane simulation only.

2.4 Resource fingerprint

Values below describe the D-Wave hardware-annealing configuration (the primitive actually executed on quantum hardware), with gate-route figures noted in parentheses where they differ.

Metric	Value	Source (page / equation / SI)
Qubits (logical)	not reported (per-learner QUBO = $40 \times K$ binary variables for K encoding bits per coefficient; bit depth K not stated, encoding inherited from Cavallaro et al. [9323544]). Gate route: 5	Methodology (40-vector subsets); encoding ref [9323544]
Qubits (physical)	not reported (minor-embedding footprint / chain length per QUBO not given)	n/a
Circuit depth	not applicable to annealing (single analog anneal, no circuit). Gate-route depth not reported	n/a
2Q-gate count (total)	not applicable to annealing. Gate-route count not reported	n/a
Measurement shots	1000 reads per QUBO problem, best 20 samples retained (hardware annealing). Gate-route shot count not reported (PennyLane simulation)	Results (annealing workflow paragraph)

Metric	Value	Source (page / equation / SI)
Classical loop iter.	not applicable (non-variational): the ensemble performs 500 independent QUBO solves (each weak learner solved once) with no quantum-classical feedback loop	Methodology (500 base learners)
Wall-clock runtime	hardware annealing: 8.00 s training, 2.61 s inference per image. (Simulated annealing: 113.98 s / 2.62 s; simulated gate: 3.77 s / 23.78 s; classical: 13.24 s / 1.04 s)	Table I

2.5 Assumptions and results

- **Claim.** A quantum-assisted bagging SVM ensemble can match a rigorously controlled classical bagging SVM baseline on pixel-wise SAR oil-spill segmentation. On the 150-image test set all four configurations are effectively tied: IoU 0.60, F1 0.72 to 0.73, balanced accuracy 0.89 (Table I). Among the quantum routes the annealing approach has by far the better inference latency (2.61 s/image versus 23.78 s/image for the gate kernel), because its quantum work sits at training time while inference runs classically. On the out-of-distribution Strait of Hormuz scene (applied with no fine-tuning), the annealing model reaches IoU 0.46 / balanced accuracy 0.75, the gate model IoU 0.45 / 0.74, and the classical baseline IoU 0.44 / 0.73 (Results, Hormuz paragraph).
- **Error bars or noise assumptions.** None quantified. There are no error bars, standard deviations, or repeated-run statistics anywhere in the paper. The emulator-to-hardware gap is discussed qualitatively but not measured; the only concession to annealing stochasticity is the best-20-of-1000-reads retention policy. No chain-break rate, anneal time, chain strength, or QPU access-time breakdown is reported.
- **Comparison to classical baseline.** Direct and central. The classical bagging SVM (same 500-learner architecture) is the control. Critically, the classical baseline ties the quantum routes on every accuracy metric and is the fastest of all at inference (1.04 s/image). No quantum accuracy advantage is demonstrated or claimed; the only quantum-favourable comparison is inference latency *between the two quantum routes*, not against the classical baseline.

2.6 Portability flags

- **Two different quantum placements, two different portability stories.** The annealing route puts quantum at training (one-time, offline, amortised); the gate-kernel route puts quantum at inference (recurring, per pixel). This train-versus-inference placement is the dominant portability axis for Brilliant: the annealing route’s quantum cost does not scale with the number of images segmented, whereas the gate route’s does.
- **Annealing route needs a QUBO/Ising solver, not a gate device.** The weak-SVM training objective is mapped to a QUBO via bit-depth discretisation of the continuous SVM coefficients (formulation inherited from Cavallaro et al. [9323544] / Willsch et al., arXiv:1906.06283; the bit depth is not given in this paper). The same QUBO runs unchanged on simulated annealing (the paper does this), and in principle on any QUBO solver or via QAOA on gate hardware, so the formulation itself is hardware-agnostic. What is D-Wave-specific is the execution: minor-embedding onto the sparse Pegasus graph, with chain strength, embedding qubit count, and anneal schedule all unreported here.
- **Minor-embedding overhead is real but unquantified.** Each QUBO has roughly $40 \times K$ logical variables (40 training vectors, K encoding bits). Any pairwise SVM kernel term couples coefficients densely, so the QUBO interaction graph is far denser than degree-15 Pegasus and must be minor-embedded into multi-qubit chains. The physical-qubit cost per problem is therefore well above the logical-variable count, but neither is reported.
- **Gate route is simulation only.** The 5-qubit angle-encoding kernel was never run on gate hardware, so there is no hardware-portability evidence for it. On real gate hardware the per-pixel kernel evaluation (each test pixel encoded and compared against every support vector, over a 256x256 image) would add shot noise and per-circuit queue latency on top of the already slow 23.78 s/image simulated figure. The 5-qubit width is trivially portable; the inference-time circuit *count* is the portability problem.
- **No exotic primitives required.** Neither route uses mid-circuit measurement, dynamic circuits, all-to-all connectivity, or any native non-standard gate. The gate-route encoding is plain single-qubit rotations, decomposable on any gate set. The annealing route’s only hardware-specific demand is a programmable Ising annealer with enough qubits to embed a $\sim 40K$ -variable dense QUBO.
- **No demonstrated quantum advantage.** Accuracy is tied with classical and the classical baseline is the fastest end to end. Any portability case rests on hypothetical future scaling (low-data, latency-sensitive regimes), not on a measured speed-up here.

2.7 Caveats

- **Access:** Full and open. The paper is short, CC BY, and the complete arXiv TeX source (`paper-source/main.tex`, `references.bib`, `comparison/Hormuz` figure PDFs) is attached locally. No paywall, no SI dependence. No sections were unreachable.
- **Numbers inherited by reference, not reported in-paper.** The QUBO discretisation scheme (bit depth / encoding base of the SVM coefficients) and all minor-embedding details (logical/physical qubit counts per QUBO, chain length, chain strength) are not stated; the methodology cites Cavallaro et al. [9323544], which in turn follows Willsch et al. (arXiv:1906.06283). The QUBO size is therefore structurally known ($\approx 40K$ binary variables) but numerically not pinned down by this paper.

- **No uncertainty quantification.** No error bars, run-to-run variance, or chain-break statistics are given for any configuration. Single point estimates only.
- **Hardware-annealing timing is end-to-end and unbroken-down.** The reported 8.00 s training time for the D-Wave run is notably lower than both the simulated-annealing (113.98 s) and classical (13.24 s) training times; the paper does not separate QPU access time, programming/readout overhead, network queue latency, or embedding time, so this figure should not be read as pure anneal time. Treat it as the reported wall-clock for the training stage and no more.
- **D-Wave device specifications** (Pegasus topology, degree-15 connectivity, ≈ 5640 qubits) are taken from the substrate reference and general D-Wave Advantage documentation (consistent with McGeoch and Farre, [McGeoch2020TheDA]), not from this paper, which names only `Advantage_system4.1`.

3 Portability matrix