

# Pauli Correlation Encoding for mRNA Secondary Structure Prediction: Problem-Aware Decoding for Dense-Constraint QUBOs

Portability dossier - app

agQSL portability pipeline

2026-06-07

Field	Value
Slug	2026-arxiv-2605.20163-mrna-structure-pce
Source	arXiv
Link	<a href="https://arxiv.org/abs/2605.20163">https://arxiv.org/abs/2605.20163</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	7
2.7	Caveats	8
<b>3</b>	<b>Portability matrix</b>	<b>9</b>

# 1 Source

## 1.1 Domain classification

Primary: optimisation. Secondary: biology.

The quantum content is a dense-constraint QUBO solved variationally; the mRNA secondary-structure problem only supplies the QUBO instances, and the biology is fully encapsulated in the formulation borrowed from Alevras et al. The fingerprint Julien needs to extract is that of a qubit-efficient variational combinatorial-optimisation solver, so I route this primarily as optimisation, with biology as the application substrate. The Ezratty index files the same territory under section 13.5 (life sciences, drug discovery, protein/RNA structure), which supports the secondary tag but confirms the quantum novelty sits on the optimisation side.

## 1.2 Expert persona for Julien

A variational quantum optimisation specialist fluent in QUBO/Ising formulations and NISQ-era superconducting execution. Should hold calibrated intuition about qubit-efficient encodings (Pauli Correlation Encoding and its capacity relation  $3\binom{n}{2} \geq m$ , here packing up to  $m = 745$  variables onto  $n = 23$  qubits), measurement-setting and shot budgets, transpilation of Molmer-Sorensen entanglers to heavy-hex native CZ gates, error mitigation (XX dynamical decoupling, T-REX), and COBYLA behaviour at the small layerwise parameter counts ( $2p + 1$ ) used here. Deep RNA thermodynamics is not required: the secondary-structure physics is pre-baked into the QUBO coefficients, so the extraction is about the encoding-to-hardware mapping and the decoder, not base-pair free energies.

## 1.3 Related prior work (brief bibliography)

- Sciorilli et al., “Towards large-scale quantum optimization solvers with few qubits”, Nature Communications 16, 553 (2025). DOI: [10.1038/s41467-024-55346-z](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-024-55346-z). Origin of Pauli Correlation Encoding; the primitive and the sign-rounding decoder this paper extends.
- Alevras et al., “mRNA secondary structure prediction using utility-scale quantum computers”, IEEE QCE 2024. [arXiv:2405.20328](https://arxiv.org/abs/2405.20328). Same application solved with one-variable-per-qubit CVaR-VQE on IBM Eagle/Heron; the direct portability contrast (dedicated-qubit versus compressed encoding) and the source of the QUBO formulation reused here.
- Kumar et al., “Towards secondary structure prediction of longer mRNA sequences using a quantum-centric optimization scheme”, arXiv:2505.05782 (2025). [arXiv:2505.05782](https://arxiv.org/abs/2505.05782). Same application scaled to 156 qubits on Heron and 354-qubit tensor-network simulation; the  $L^{2.2}$  qubit-growth baseline this paper aims to beat.
- Soloviev et al., “Large-scale portfolio optimization using Pauli Correlation Encoding”, arXiv:2511.21305 (2025). [arXiv:2511.21305](https://arxiv.org/abs/2511.21305). Same primitive (PCE) on a different domain (250+ asset portfolios); evidence for portability of the encoding across application classes.
- Padin et al., “Pauli Correlation Encoding for Budget-Constrained Optimization”, arXiv:2602.17479 (2026). [arXiv:2602.17479](https://arxiv.org/abs/2602.17479). Closest prior treatment of PCE under explicit constraints (budget-constrained Min-Cut and TSP), adjacent to this paper’s dense-

constraint focus.

- Lorenz et al., “ViennaRNA Package 2.0”, Algorithms for Molecular Biology 6:26 (2011). DOI: [10.1186/1748-7188-6-26](https://doi.org/10.1186/1748-7188-6-26). The canonical classical minimum-free-energy folding toolchain; the non-quantum reference point for the application.

## 1.4 Difficulty estimate

medium.

The source is fully open: the arXiv LaTeX source (`paper-source/main.tex`) and a rendered `paper.html` are both in the dossier folder, there is no paywall, and there is no separate supplementary information to chase. The hardware fingerprint is unusually explicit in the main text: named devices (`ibm_pittsburgh`, `ibm_aachen`, IBM Heron), 23 qubits, a 24-edge native heavy-hex subgraph, 480 native CZ gates at depth 256 transpiled SWAP-free,  $2^{14}$  shots per evaluation across three Pauli measurement settings, COBYLA training, and XX dynamical decoupling plus T-REX mitigation. What lifts this above `low` is the Pauli Correlation Encoding layer: Julien must keep the variable-count versus qubit-count distinction straight (hundreds of QUBO variables compressed onto 23 qubits via  $3\binom{n}{2} \geq m$ ) and may want to skim the origin PCE paper to extract the fingerprint cleanly. No exotic SI, no paywall, and no reliance on external data, so it does not reach `high`. I was able to read the paper end to end, so no triager action is needed before Julien runs.

## 2 Extraction

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

The paper applies Pauli Correlation Encoding (PCE), a qubit-efficient variational optimisation scheme, to the prediction of minimum-free-energy mRNA secondary structure, cast as a densely constrained QUBO. PCE packs  $m$  binary QUBO variables onto only  $n$  physical qubits by mapping each variable to the expectation value of a two-body Pauli correlator, so hundreds of variables ride on a handful of qubits. A shallow parameterised circuit is trained with COBYLA to minimise a QUBO-space sigmoid loss, and the resulting continuous expectation values are turned into a feasible bitstring by a new classical decoder, the Problem-Aware Guided Decoder (PAGD), which combines marginal QUBO energy reduction with the trained prior and prunes constraint conflicts greedily. Simulator benchmarks cover six sequences (50 to 240 variables, 7 to 14 qubits). The headline hardware result runs three roughly 100-nucleotide instances (694 to 745 variables) on 23 qubits of IBM Heron processors, where a single 100-iteration run on one sequence recovers the exact CPLEX optimum.

### 2.2 Quantum hardware used

- **Vendor / machine:** IBM Quantum, Heron processors `ibm_pittsburgh` and `ibm_aachen`.
- **Qubit count:** 23 used (hardware-scale runs); 7 to 14 used across the six simulator benchmarks. Device total not reported in the paper.
- **Connectivity:** Heavy-hex. A 23-qubit, 24-edge native subgraph containing two closed hexagonal cells is extracted per device; all 24 entangling pairs are native, so transpilation inserts zero SWAP gates (Sec. Experimental Setup, Hardware).
- **Gate set:** Single-qubit  $R_y(\theta) = e^{-i\theta Y/2}$  rotations and parameterised Mølmer-Sørensen entanglers  $MS(\theta) = \exp[-i\frac{\theta}{4}(XX + YY)]$ . MS is native to trapped ions, not to IBM superconducting devices, so each MS gate is transpiled into 2 native two-qubit (CZ) gates (Sec. Experimental Setup, Hardware).
- **Notable features leveraged:** Pauli Correlation Encoding (variables encoded as  $X_iX_j, Y_iY_j, Z_iZ_j$  correlators, read out in three measurement settings); hardware-aware pair selection that keeps all entangling pairs on native heavy-hex edges; edge-colouring of the 24 pairs into 3 parallel sublayers of 8 gates; XX dynamical decoupling and Twirled Readout Error eXtinction (T-REX, `resilience_level=1`); Qiskit transpiler optimisation level 3. No mid-circuit measurement, dynamic circuits, or reset are used.

### 2.3 Computational primitive

Variational quantum optimisation (VQE-type expectation-value minimisation) under Pauli Correlation Encoding. The circuit is a layered hardware-efficient ansatz ( $R_y$  rotation layers alternating with MS entangling layers) whose Pauli-correlator expectation values define a relaxed QUBO objective; it is not QAOA (there is no problem-Hamiltonian phase separator) and it carries no error correction. The quantum step produces a continuous expectation-value vector that a classical decoder (PAGD) rounds to a feasible bitstring.

## 2.4 Resource fingerprint

Metric	Value	Source (page / equation / SI)
Qubits (logical)	No error-corrected logical qubits (NISQ). PCE encodes $m = 694$ to $745$ QUBO variables (hardware) and $50$ to $240$ (simulator) onto the physical register via the capacity relation $3\binom{n}{2} \geq m$ .	Abstract; Eq. (3) <code>eq:min-qubits</code> ; Table I <code>tab:benchmarks</code>
Qubits (physical)	$23$ used (hardware-scale runs); $7$ to $14$ used (six simulator benchmarks). Device total not reported.	Abstract; Table I; Sec. Experimental Setup (Hardware)
Circuit depth	$256$ native, transpiled SWAP-free, at $p = 10$ .	Sec. Experimental Setup (Hardware)
2Q-gate count (total)	$480$ native CZ gates ( $24$ MS pairs, each decomposing to $2$ CZ, across $10$ layers).	Sec. Experimental Setup (Hardware)
Measurement shots	$2^{14} = 16,384$ shots per evaluation, across $3$ Pauli measurement settings.	Sec. Experimental Setup (Hardware)
Classical loop iter.	$100$ COBYLA iterations per QPU run (capped). Simulator: $50$ to $160$ (six benchmarks); up to $800$ (hardware-scale simulator).	Sec. Experimental Setup (Simulation, Hardware)
Wall-clock runtime	Approximately $25$ s per COBYLA iteration; approximately $40$ min of QPU time per sequence for the $100$ -iteration run, within a single calibration window.	Sec. Experimental Setup (Hardware)

Additional reported resources: trainable parameters  $2p + 1 = 21$  at  $p = 10$  under the layerwise parameterisation (one shared  $R_y$  angle and one shared MS angle per layer), explicitly stated for both the simulator and QPU hardware pipelines (Sec. Experimental Setup, Hardware). PAGD decoder hyperparameters are fixed throughout at  $\alpha = 8$ ,  $\beta = 1.0$ ,  $\sigma_{\text{noise}} = 0.2$ , with restart counts  $K \in \{1, 10, 100, 200\}$  (Sec. Reproducibility). The no-crossing constraint count  $|QC|$  reaches 172,307 to 192,959 pair constraints on the three hardware instances (Table I).

## 2.5 Assumptions and results

- **What was claimed.** PCE compresses the dense-constraint mRNA QUBO (694 to 745 variables) onto 23 qubits and, paired with the QUBO-space sigmoid loss and the PAGD decoder, recovers near-optimal folds. The headline claim is that a single 100-iteration QPU run on `seq_694` (102 nt, `ibm_aachen`) recovers the CPLEX optimum exactly (0.0 % gap) at  $K = 200$  and reaches 7.4 % gap already at  $K = 10$ ; the other two QPU runs reach 5.9 % (`seq_715`) and 18.0 % (`seq_745`) at  $K = 200$ . In simulation, PAGD- $K_{100}$  achieves 75 to 100 % near-optimal recovery, defined as  $P(\text{gap} < 1\%)$ , for  $m \leq 152$ , versus 0 to 30 % for the Sign+LS baseline.
- **Error bars or noise assumptions.** Simulator figures are means  $\pm 1\sigma$  over 10 seeds (hardware-scale) or proportions over 20 seeds with Wilson 95 % confidence intervals (six benchmarks). The QPU result is a single run per sequence (running-best over 100 iterations), framed as a one-sample falsification test against the simulator distribution, not a reproducibility claim or a hardware-side distribution. Noise handling on hardware is XX dynamical decoupling plus T-REX readout mitigation only; no zero-noise extrapolation or probabilistic error cancellation. From Table II, simulator means at  $K = 200$  are  $15.4 \pm 8.6\%$  (`seq_694`),  $14.4 \pm 4.2\%$  (`seq_715`),  $32.3 \pm 4.2\%$  (`seq_745`); each QPU running-best matches or beats its simulator mean at  $K \geq 100$ .
- **Comparison to classical baseline.** CPLEX integer programming is used as a verification oracle for ground-truth optima, explicitly not as an iso-time competitor. Decoder baselines are sign rounding and Sign + Local Search (Sign+LS); the Bernoulli-sampling decoder offered no measurable advantage and was omitted. The authors state plainly that no iso-time comparison against tuned classical heuristics (simulated annealing, tabu, branch-and-cut) is included and that the hardware-scale results are a feasibility demonstration, not a quantum-advantage claim.

## 2.6 Portability flags

- **Mølmer-Sørensen entangler must be decomposed per platform.** The ansatz uses  $\text{MS}(\theta) = \exp[-i\frac{\theta}{4}(XX + YY)]$ , native to trapped ions but not to IBM superconducting hardware; here it is transpiled to 2 native CZ gates each. A different gate set (for example a CZ-only or cross-resonance basis) needs its own decomposition, changing the depth and two-qubit count.
- **Qubit-efficient encoding is the central portability feature.** PCE packs  $m = 694$  to 745 variables onto 23 qubits via  $3\binom{n}{2} \geq m$ , against the one-variable-per-qubit baseline that needed up to 156 qubits for 60-nt sequences in prior work. Any target platform inherits this large reduction in qubit demand, at the cost of three Pauli measurement settings and heavier classical decoding.
- **Connectivity demand is deliberately low and native.** Hardware-aware pair selection restricts the entangling graph to native heavy-hex edges, yielding zero inserted SWAPs. The method does not require all-to-all connectivity; it asks only for a connected  $n$ -

qubit native subgraph, which is portability-friendly across linear, heavy-hex, and grid topologies. Platforms with richer connectivity (trapped ions, neutral atoms) could in principle use the topology-agnostic Informed- $k$  pairs directly.

- **Requires three-setting Pauli-correlator readout.** Estimating  $X_iX_j$ ,  $Y_iY_j$ ,  $Z_iZ_j$  needs three measurement bases per circuit evaluation; this multiplies the shot budget on any platform.
- **Error mitigation is helpful but not structural.** XX dynamical decoupling and T-REX are IBM-flavoured but have analogues elsewhere; the pipeline does not depend on a mitigation primitive unique to one vendor.
- **Decoder and optimiser are fully classical and platform-agnostic.** PAGD, the QUBO-space sigmoid loss, and COBYLA carry over unchanged; only the expectation-value source is hardware-specific.
- **Shallow, static circuit.** No mid-circuit measurement, dynamic circuits, reset, or long-range gates are required, so the circuit shape ports cleanly to most gate-model platforms.

## 2.7 Caveats

- Access was complete. The arXiv LaTeX source (`paper-source/main.tex`), the rendered `paper.html`, and the auto-generated hardware-versus-simulator table (`paper-source/figures/hw_vs_sim_table.tex`, the source of Table II) were all present. There is no paywall and no separate supplementary information, so the fingerprint is taken directly from the main text and that table. Figures are pre-rendered PDFs and were not pixel-inspected; all numbers above come from the text or the table source.
- Internal inconsistency in the reported parameter count. The optimiser discussion (Sec. Methods) cites “ $\leq 41$  for our largest hardware instance”, consistent with  $2p + 1$  at  $p = 20$ , while the Hardware paragraph states the same 21-parameter scheme ( $2p + 1$  at  $p = 10$ ) drives both pipelines. The hardware runs are explicitly at  $p = 10$ , so 21 trainable parameters is the figure used above; the “ $\leq 41$ ” bound is flagged as an unresolved discrepancy in the text.
- The QUBO-space versus Ising-space loss head-to-head is omitted “for space”; the authors present the QUBO-space loss as a principled default, not an empirically demonstrated winner, and report only that quality was “comparable” on these instances.
- The hardware campaign is a single run per sequence within one calibration window; there is no hardware-side error distribution, and the authors do not claim reproducibility or quantum advantage.
- The device total qubit count for `ibm_pittsburgh` and `ibm_aachen` is not stated in the paper; only the 23-qubit working subgraph is reported.

### 3 Portability matrix