

Simulation of additive binding energies in asphalt using quantum-selected configuration interaction (QSCI)

Portability dossier - app

agQSL portability pipeline

2026-06-06

Field	Value
Slug	2026-arxiv-2605.27640-asphalt-binding-qsci
Source	arXiv
Link	https://arxiv.org/abs/2605.27640
Category	app
Triaged	2026-05-28 by codex-curation
Bootstrapped	2026-06-06

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	6
2.6	Portability flags	7
2.7	Caveats	7
3	Portability matrix	9

1 Source

1.1 Domain classification

quantum chemistry (primary). The computational object is an electronic-structure binding-energy calculation on a 24-atom pyridine-phenol hydrogen-bonded complex, run as a (10e, 10o) active-space QSCI/SQD problem with CASCI, CCSD(T) and DFT cross-checks. Secondary: materials, via the asphalt-binder ageing and binder-aggregate adhesion framing that motivates the molecular model. The Ezratty index places this work in chapter 13 (quantum-computing applications, chemistry), alongside the Kaliakin sample-based-diagonalisation chemistry line.

1.2 Expert persona for Julien

A quantum or computational chemist fluent in active-space electronic structure (CASCI/CASSCF, frozen-core and valence active-space selection) and in sample-based quantum diagonalisation (QSCI/SQD) as implemented in the Qiskit SQD addon. They should have calibrated intuition about active-space sizing versus dynamic correlation, measurement shot budgets and batching, the LUCJ/UCJ ansatz built from CCSD t_1/t_2 amplitudes, and self-consistent configuration recovery on number-symmetry-broken bitstrings. They should also read non-covalent benchmarking fluently (counterpoise correction, CCSD(T) and focal-point estimates, the role of dispersion), so that the active-space underbinding against the CCSD(T) gold standard is attributed to method scope rather than to the hardware. Familiarity with how superconducting-device noise broadens SQD sampling, here on IQM, is a bonus.

1.3 Related prior work (brief bibliography)

- Kanno et al., *Quantum-Selected Configuration Interaction*, arXiv:2302.11320. Origin of the QSCI primitive this paper applies.
- Robledo-Moreno et al., *Chemistry beyond the scale of exact diagonalization on a quantum-centric supercomputer*, Sci. Adv. 11, eadu9991 (2025), arXiv:2405.05068, doi:10.1126/sciadv.adu9991. Same SQD primitive at scale on IBM superconducting hardware; the quantum-centric-supercomputing reference point.
- Anurag et al., *Towards Chemically Accurate and Scalable Quantum Simulations on IQM Quantum Hardware*, arXiv:2604.01983. Same primitive on the same vendor (IQM); the closest hardware-portability sibling.
- Kaliakin et al., *Accurate quantum-centric simulations of supramolecular interactions*, arXiv:2410.09209. SQD for non-covalent/supramolecular binding benchmarked against CCSD(T); same primitive, same application class.
- Ghasemi et al., *Hybrid Quantum Algorithms for Computational Chemistry: Application to the Pyridine-Li ion Complex*, arXiv:2601.10002. Nearest application twin, a pyridine complex treated by hybrid quantum chemistry.
- Reinholdt et al., *Critical Limitations in Quantum-Selected Configuration Interaction Methods*, J. Chem. Theory Comput. 21, 6811 (2025), doi:10.1021/acs.jctc.5c00375. Calibration counterpoint on QSCI sampling efficiency and where the method breaks down.

1.4 Difficulty estimate

low. The full LaTeX source sits in the folder (CC BY 4.0, no paywall), the paper is a short IEEE-format conference write-up, and it uses a single well-documented primitive on a small active space (10e, 10o, 20 qubits). The hardware fingerprint Julien needs is already tabulated in the main text: the IQM Emerald 54-qubit superconducting processor, 20 qubits used, per-molecule transpiled gate counts (1-qubit *r* and 2-qubit *cz*), a calibration-aware zig-zag spin-chain layout, 5000 shots at 500 per batch, a LUCJ/UCJ ansatz, no zero-noise extrapolation, self-consistent configuration recovery, and the 6-31G active-space basis with def2-SVP and def2-TZVP classical references. No supplementary material is required and the workflow code is openly published on GitHub, so the extraction should be quick.

2 Extraction

2.1 What the paper does (one paragraph)

QuantumPave is a hybrid quantum-classical workflow for computing molecular binding energies relevant to the oxidative ageing of asphalt binder. The authors model the binder chemistry with a 24-atom pyridine-phenol hydrogen-bonded complex ($C_{11}H_{11}NO$). The geometry is relaxed with a machine-learning interatomic potential (ORB v3); the electronic-structure binding energy is then computed with quantum-selected configuration interaction (QSCI), also called sample-based quantum diagonalisation (SQD), in a (10 electron, 10 orbital) active space. A 54-qubit IQM Emerald superconducting processor samples the dominant electronic configurations onto 20 qubits, and a classical computer diagonalises within that sampled subspace. On hardware, SQD reproduces the classical active-space CASCI reference exactly, giving a binding energy of -3.52 kcal/mol. The authors show this compact active space underbinds a counterpoise-corrected CCSD(T) benchmark (-8.5 to -9.5 kcal/mol), attributing the gap to active-space size rather than to hardware noise.

2.2 Quantum hardware used

- **Vendor / machine:** IQM / Emerald (54-qubit superconducting processor). Cross-check: IQM Emerald is a “Crystal”-family tunable-coupler transmon device with a square-grid topology (vendor-notes `superconducting_qubits.tex` §IQM; Ezzratty 2025 §8.3.7 confirms a 54-qubit IQM chip with CZ entangling gates).
- **Qubit count:** 20 used / 54 available (method.tex: “10 active electrons in 10 active orbitals (20 qubits)”); result.tex / abstract: “54-qubit IQM Emerald processor”).
- **Connectivity:** Superconducting square-grid (IQM Crystal family; cross-checked from the vendor reference, not stated as such in the paper). The run maps the (10o, 10e) active space onto a “calibration-aware zig-zag spin-chain layout (separate α and β spin chains plus connecting qubits)” (result.tex, Quantum-Inspired Advantages). The paper does **not** require or claim all-to-all connectivity; the LUCJ ansatz is built for limited connectivity.
- **Gate set:** Native 1-qubit **r** (phased-RX rotation) and 2-qubit **cz**: these are the columns of the transpiled-resource table (result.tex, Table II “1-qubit gates (r)”, “2-qubit gates (cz)”). Consistent with IQM’s PRX + CZ native set (vendor-notes; Ezzratty §8.3.7).
- **Notable features leveraged:** Calibration-aware qubit placement (candidate placements “scored against the live two-qubit-gate and readout error rates”); self-consistent configuration recovery to repair particle-number-violating bitstrings; reliance on device noise to broaden the sampled distribution so the retained subspace spans the active space (no zero-noise extrapolation). No mid-circuit measurement or dynamic circuits are used.

2.3 Computational primitive

QSCI / SQD (sample-based quantum diagonalisation): in the taxonomy this sits under **sampling**: the quantum processor only samples electronic configurations from a prepared state (a LUCJ/UCJ ansatz built from CCSD t_1 and t_2 amplitudes), and the eigenvalue problem is diagonalised classically within the sampled subspace (method.tex, Quantum-Selected Configuration Interaction).

2.4 Resource fingerprint

Metric	Value	Source (page / equation / SI)
Qubits (logical)	Not applicable (no QEC encoding); the (10e, 10o) active space maps to 20 spin-orbital qubits	method.tex, Quantum-Selected Configuration Interaction
Qubits (physical)	20 used / 54 available	method.tex; abstract.tex; result.tex (Table II)
Circuit depth	not reported	not reported
2Q-gate count (total)	Per molecule (cz, single transpiled circuit): pyridine 290, phenol 308, complex 328	result.tex, Table II
Measurement shots	5000 shots, 500 samples per batch	method.tex; result.tex (Technical Implementation)
Classical loop iter.	not reported (self-consistent configuration recovery is iterative; iteration count not given. Energy tolerance 10^{-6} Ha)	method.tex
Wall-clock runtime	not reported (only a qualitative “QSCI requires the longest computation time”)	result.tex (Computational Efficiency Analysis)

Additional reported quantities (not template rows): - 1-qubit gate count (r, per molecule): pyridine 591, phenol 627, complex 659 (result.tex, Table II). - Active-space dimension: $\binom{10}{5}^2 = 63\,504$ configurations, tractable for classical diagonalisation (method.tex). - Basis set: 6-31G for the active-space electronic structure (method.tex). Classical references use def2-SVP / def2-TZVP (CCSD(T)) and 6-31+G(d) (B3LYP).

2.5 Assumptions and results

- **Claim:** On the IQM Emerald processor, SQD reproduces the classical active-space CASCI reference exactly, giving a binding energy of -3.52 kcal/mol (-0.153 eV) for the pyridine-phenol complex (abstract; result.tex, Table I). The headline message is that a physically meaningful hydrogen-bond energy is obtainable on real hardware without zero-noise extrapolation.
- **Error bars / noise assumptions:** SQD and CASCI agree to within 6×10^{-8} Ha for the complex and both fragments (result.tex). No zero-noise extrapolation is applied; the authors argue the variational principle makes the energy insensitive to statistical and hardware errors because the quantum device only samples while the diagonalisation is classical. Device noise is claimed to *help*, broadening the distribution so the noisy samples “spanned essentially the full active-space configuration space” (result.tex). Convergence tolerance 10^{-6} Ha (method.tex). No explicit statistical error bar on the -3.52 kcal/mol value is reported.
- **Comparison to classical baseline:** The active-space SQD/CASCI value (-3.52 kcal/mol) underbinds the counterpoise-corrected CCSD(T) gold standard: -8.53 kcal/mol (def2-SVP) and -9.51 kcal/mol (focal-point def2-TZVP) on the LUMI supercomputer;

a supermolecular B3LYP/6-31+G(d) cross-check gives -9.08 kcal/mol; the calorimetric enthalpy in CCl_4 is -6.2 to -6.3 kcal/mol (result.tex, Table I). The CCSD(T) ladder is well behaved (HF -6.78, MP2 -9.19, CCSD -8.07, CCSD(T) -8.53 kcal/mol in def2-SVP). The authors attribute the underbinding to active-space size, not to hardware or sampling, citing SQD reproducing CCSD(T) for related non-covalent dimers with an adequate active space.

2.6 Portability flags

Hardware-specific features that will matter for Brillant’s portability analysis:

- **Native gate set assumed is IQM’s r (phased-RX) + cz.** Only this native set is transpiled and reported. cz is widely available across superconducting and several other vendors, but the arbitrary-axis single-qubit r rotation must be decomposed for gate sets that expose a different single-qubit basis. Gate-count comparisons (290–328 cz per molecule) are specific to this native set.
- **LUCJ/UCJ ansatz is connectivity-aware, not all-to-all.** The “local” UCJ ansatz and the zig-zag spin-chain layout (separate α/β chains plus connecting qubits) are explicitly designed for limited planar connectivity. This is portability-*friendly* in that it does not demand all-to-all coupling, but the specific two-parallel-chains-plus-connectors layout maps most naturally onto a square grid; on heavy-hex (IBM) or linear-only hardware the connecting/spanning qubits would route differently and likely incur extra SWAPs.
- **Calibration-aware placement tuned to IQM Emerald’s live error map.** Candidate placements are scored against live two-qubit-gate and readout error rates. Reproducing the result on another device requires equivalent per-device calibration data and a re-optimised layout; the reported layout is specific to IQM Emerald.
- **Relies on device noise to span the active space, with no ZNE.** The exact-recovery result depends on the device’s noise broadening the sampled distribution enough that the retained subspace spans the small (20-qubit, 63 504-configuration) active space. This is a noise-character-dependent property: on a substantially cleaner device, or one with a different noise structure, the spanning may not occur and explicit configuration enrichment, more shots, or error mitigation could be needed. The “noise helps” behaviour should not be assumed to transfer unchanged to other hardware.
- **Requires full-register sampling and particle-number postselection, but no mid-circuit measurement or dynamic circuits.** Self-consistent configuration recovery repairs particle-number-violating bitstrings classically between diagonalisations; it needs terminal measurement of all qubits, not MCM. The absence of MCM/dynamic-circuit requirements is portability-*friendly*.
- **Hardware burden is modest; the classical diagonalisation is the scaling bottleneck.** Only 20 qubits, shallow-ish circuits (≤ 328 cz), and 5000 shots are needed, so the portability question is mainly whether another vendor can prepare the LUCJ state and sample it; the 63 504-configuration classical diagonalisation is independent of the quantum backend.

2.7 Caveats

- The paper is open access (CC BY 4.0, arXiv:2605.27640) and the full LaTeX source was available; there was no paywall and no access limitation. The extraction is based on the complete main text (abstract, introduction, methodology, results) and Table I/Table II. There is no supplementary information file in the bundle, and the paper references none, so no SI was unreachable.

- The figure PDFs (`pyridine_phenol_complex.pdf`, `supercell.pdf`, `qsci_workflow.pdf`) were not rendered; all numeric values above come from the text and tables, not from figures. The ORB v3 optimised-geometry details (complex energy -148.936 eV, 103 optimisation steps, molecular dimensions $5.5 \times 6.3 \times 4.1$ Å) are read from a figure caption (`method.tex`, Fig. 2 caption).
- Circuit depth, the number of configuration-recovery iterations, and wall-clock runtime are genuinely absent from the paper and are recorded as “not reported” rather than estimated. The 290/308/328 cz figures are per-molecule single-circuit counts; the paper does not aggregate them into a single “total”, and the binding energy requires three separate runs (complex, pyridine, phenol).
- A workflow code repository is cited (`github.com/MarcMaussner/2026_iqm_handsOn`) but was not consulted for this extraction; the fingerprint is taken solely from the paper, per the discipline of not sourcing resource numbers from outside the paper.

3 Portability matrix