

# Benchmarking Quantum Annealing for a Greenhouse-Inspired Control QUBO

Portability dossier - app

agQSL portability pipeline

2026-06-07

Field	Value
Slug	2026-arxiv-2605.27670-greenhouse-control-qubo
Source	arXiv
Link	<a href="https://arxiv.org/abs/2605.27670">https://arxiv.org/abs/2605.27670</a>
Category	app
Triaged	2026-05-28 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 . . . . .	6
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.** The scientific core is a quadratic unconstrained binary optimisation (QUBO) benchmark for binary heater scheduling, solved with quantum annealing and annealing-style classical baselines. The greenhouse is a thin application skin over a combinatorial control problem.

Secondary: **other - greenhouse climate control / agriculture** (energy-climate adjacent). The application framing is receding-horizon greenhouse temperature control, but the authors are explicit that this is a structured benchmark, not a deployable controller or a calibrated agronomic model. In the canonical graph, D-Wave already holds `optimization`, `logistics_scheduling`, and `energy_climate` edges; this paper sits squarely at the intersection of the first and last.

## 1.2 Expert persona for Julien

A quantum-optimisation specialist fluent in QUBO/Ising formulations and the D-Wave Ocean stack: minor-embedding and chain strength on the Advantage2 QPU, Leap hybrid BQM solvers, and the classical and simulated-quantum annealing samplers (`SimulatedAnnealingSampler`, `PathIntegralAnnealingSampler`). They should have calibrated intuition about binary slack-variable penalty encodings of inequality constraints, annealing-time and `num_reads` budgets, embedding overhead and chain-break effects, and the gap between raw BQM energy and a decoded application-side objective. Control-theory familiarity (receding-horizon / MPC) is a useful but secondary asset; the hardware fingerprint to extract here is annealer-centric, and the paper states it cleanly (`solver = Advantage2_system1`, anneal time 20  $\mu$ s, `num_reads = 5000`, `auto_scale=True`; main instance  $H = 24$  giving 312 variables and 4596 couplers; direct-QPU runs on reduced horizons  $H = 10$ ,  $H = 12$ ,  $H = 14$ ).

## 1.3 Related prior work (brief bibliography)

A pointer set favouring portability-relevant comparisons (same QUBO primitive on a different paradigm or vendor; same problem class against classical baselines). Most are beyond the paper’s own bibliography.

- Willsch, Willsch, Jin, De Raedt, Michielsen, *Benchmarking the Quantum Approximate Optimization Algorithm*, Quantum Inf. Process. 19, 197 (2020) - arXiv:1907.02359. Gate-based QAOA versus a D-Wave 2000Q annealer on the same QUBO class; the natural cross-paradigm portability comparison for this problem.
- Venturelli, Marchand, Rojo, *Quantum Annealing Implementation of Job-Shop Scheduling* (2015) - arXiv:1506.08479. The canonical scheduling-QUBO-on-D-Wave reference; same time-indexed binary scheduling structure, with embedding and pre-processing strategies directly comparable to this paper’s slack-encoding choices.
- Ebadi et al., *Quantum Optimization of Maximum Independent Set using Rydberg Atom Arrays*, Science 376, 1209 (2022) -

arXiv:2202.09372. Same combinatorial optimisation goal on a wholly different platform (neutral-atom), benchmarked against classical simulated annealing; a strong cross-vendor portability anchor.

- Yarkoni, Raponi, Bäck, Schmitt, *Quantum Annealing for Industry Applications: Introduction and Review*, Rep. Prog. Phys. 85, 104001 (2022) - arXiv:2112.07491. Review of QA on scheduling, production, and mobility problems, with the same benchmark-against-strong-classical-baselines discipline this paper adopts.
- *Comparing Three Generations of D-Wave Quantum Annealers for Minor Embedded Combinatorial Optimization Problems* (2023) - arXiv:2301.03009. Same embedded QUBOs across D-Wave hardware generations; useful context for the Advantage2 embedding and scaling behaviour Julien will fingerprint.

#### 1.4 Difficulty estimate

**Low.** The full LaTeX source, figures, and bibliography are attached locally (`paper-source/`), so there is no paywall or fetch risk and no reliance on external SI. The paper is a moderate-length single-benchmark study using the standard D-Wave Ocean toolchain with no exotic primitives. The hardware-and-software fingerprint is given explicitly in the main text (solver settings table, pinned Ocean component versions, per-instance variable and coupler counts), so Julien's extraction should be quick and well-supported.

## 2 Extraction

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

The authors build a deliberately simplified greenhouse climate-control problem, binary hourly on/off scheduling of a single heater over a horizon  $H$ , and cast it as a quadratic unconstrained binary optimisation (QUBO) problem. Hard air-temperature bounds are enforced with quadratic penalties and binary slack bits. They then run the same QUBO through five workflows: exact enumeration (ground truth), classical simulated annealing (SA), path-integral simulated quantum annealing (PIA, run classically), D-Wave’s Leap Hybrid BQM solver, and direct execution on a D-Wave QPU. Every solver output is decoded back into a heater schedule and re-scored in the original greenhouse simulator under a common physical objective and feasibility test. For the main one-day instance ( $H = 24$ ) the classical baselines reach near-optimal feasible solutions; the hybrid solver does not beat them. Direct-QPU runs on reduced horizons recover the exact optimum at  $H = 10$  and  $H = 12$  but degrade by  $H = 14$ . The paper claims no quantum advantage; it offers a reproducible benchmark.

### 2.2 Quantum hardware used

- **Vendor / machine:** D-Wave. Direct-QPU solver `Advantage2_system1`, accessed through `EmbeddingComposite(DWaveSampler)`. Separately, the Leap Hybrid BQM cloud service `hybrid_binary_quadratic_model_version2p` (a classical/quantum decomposition workflow, not a bare QPU).
- **Qubit count:** Logical variables submitted to the QPU were 130 ( $H = 10$ ), 156 ( $H = 12$ ), and 182 ( $H = 14$ ) (Table, Sec. 5.4 / `tab:qpu_scaling_results`). The number of physical qubits used after minor-embedding is **not reported** (stated explicitly in Sec. 6, Limitations). The device’s total available qubit count is also not reported in the paper. (Context, not from the paper: Advantage2 systems carry qubit counts in the thousands on the Zephyr graph, per `vendor-notes/annealing_flux_qubits.tex`.)
- **Connectivity:** Sparse fixed hardware graph requiring minor-embedding; the paper refers only to “the QPU connectivity graph” and does **not** name the topology. (Context, not from the paper: `Advantage2_system1` uses the Zephyr topology, a higher-degree sparse graph than Advantage’s Pegasus, per `vendor-notes/annealing_flux_qubits.tex`.) The logical problem graph itself is near-dense: the affine state rollout couples every heater variable, giving 4596 couplers over 312 variables at  $H = 24$ .
- **Gate set:** Not applicable. A D-Wave annealer has no digital gates; it implements a single time-dependent analogue control Hamiltonian  $H(s) = A(s)H_{\text{driver}} + B(s)H_{\text{problem}}$  and is programmed by loading the Ising biases  $h_i$  and couplings  $J_{ij}$ . Annealing time was set to 20  $\mu\text{s}$  with `auto_scale=True` (Table, Sec. 4 / `tab:solver_settings`).
- **Notable features leveraged:** Minor-embedding via the default `EmbeddingComposite` (no manual chain-strength tuning); automatic rescaling of  $h/J$  into the hardware range (`auto_scale=True`); the Leap Hybrid BQM service’s internal problem decomposition and solver orchestration. No mid-circuit measurement, dynamic circuits, or coherent/fast-anneal features are used.

## 2.3 Computational primitive

**Analog evolution / quantum annealing.** The QUBO is mapped to an Ising Hamiltonian and minimised by quantum annealing on the D-Wave QPU; the classical and hybrid baselines (SA, PIA, Leap Hybrid BQM) are annealing-style samplers over the same binary quadratic model. This is not a gate-based primitive (no VQE / QAOA / QPE / Trotterisation is run on hardware here).

## 2.4 Resource fingerprint

Metric	Value	Source (page / equation / SI)
Qubits (logical)	Direct QPU: 130 ( $H = 10$ ), 156 ( $H = 12$ ), 182 ( $H = 14$ ). Main hybrid/classical instance: 312 ( $H = 24$ ; 24 heater + 288 slack bits)	Sec. 4 / <code>tab:qpu_scaling_results</code> ; Sec. 4 prose (“312 binary variables ... 4596 quadratic couplers”)
Qubits (physical)	not reported (default <code>EmbeddingComposite</code> ; “physical-qubit counts after embedding ... were not recorded systematically”)	Sec. 6, Limitations
Circuit depth	not applicable (analog anneal); annealing time 20 $\mu$ s per read on direct QPU	Sec. 4 / <code>tab:solver_settings</code>
2Q-gate count (total)	not applicable (annealer). Problem couplers (Ising $J_{ij}$ ): 1005 ( $H = 10$ ), 1362 ( $H = 12$ ), 1771 ( $H = 14$ ), 4596 ( $H = 24$ )	Sec. 4 prose; <code>tab:qpu_scaling_results</code>
Measurement shots	<code>num_reads= 5000</code> (direct QPU, SA, PIA). Hybrid BQM is time-limited, not shot-based	Sec. 4 / <code>tab:solver_settings</code>
Classical loop iter.	No variational loop (annealing). 10 independent repetitions per workflow; SA <code>num_sweeps= 3000</code>	Sec. 4 / <code>tab:solver_settings</code> , Sec. 4 prose

Metric	Value	Source (page / equation / SI)
Wall-clock runtime	Direct-QPU access time: 0.85 s ( $H = 10$ ), 0.88 s ( $H = 12$ ), 0.89 s ( $H = 14$ ). $H = 24$ : exact enumeration 1028.27 s, SA 31.84 s, PIA 3.60 s, Leap Hybrid BQM (30 s requested) 29.99 s	<code>tab:qpu_scaling_results</code> ; <code>tab:main_kpi_comparison</code>

Notes on timing: hybrid figures are *requested* Leap Hybrid BQM time limits (15 / 30 / 60 s), not full end-to-end wall-clock; queuing, network, and notebook overhead are excluded. Direct-QPU figures are QPU access time returned by the D-Wave system (Sec. 4).

## 2.5 Assumptions and results

- **Claim.** The work is presented as a reproducible, physically decoded benchmark, not a deployable controller and not a quantum-advantage claim. For  $H = 24$ , exact enumeration gives the reference optimum  $J_{\text{total}} = -145.14$ ; SA reaches  $-150.11$  (gap  $\approx 4.97$ ) and PIA  $-149.11$  (gap  $\approx 4.03$ ), both feasible in all 10 runs. The Leap Hybrid BQM (30 s) best feasible solution is  $-174.32$  (gap  $\approx 29.18$ ), feasible in only 7/10 runs, and does not outperform the classical baselines under any tested time limit (Sec. 5.1).
- **Direct-QPU scaling.** Exact-optimum hit rate falls 5/10 ( $H = 10$ )  $\rightarrow$  2/10 ( $H = 12$ )  $\rightarrow$  0/10 ( $H = 14$ ). Best decoded QPU objectives stay close to optimal, but means are far below with large spread (e.g.  $H = 14$ : best  $-35.11$  vs mean  $-58.83 \pm 23.38$ , against exact  $-34.61$ ). Degradation appears as loss of optimality reliability, not loss of feasibility (Sec. 5.4).
- **Error bars / noise assumptions.** Standard deviations are over 10 feasible decoded runs per workflow. The authors caution that 10 repetitions are a diagnostic, not a high-confidence estimate of the solver-output distribution, and they avoid statistical claims about time-limit monotonicity or solver superiority. The hybrid time-limit sweep (15/30/60 s) is non-monotonic in feasible-run rate (5/10, 7/10, 2/10) and is presented as diagnostic only (Sec. 5.2). Chain-break fractions and embedding quality were not recorded, so hardware degradation cannot be separated from problem-difficulty growth (Sec. 6).
- **Classical baseline comparison.** Yes, and central to the paper. Exact enumeration is ground truth for  $H \leq 24$ ; SA and PIA are the classical / quantum-inspired baselines. On every tested instance the QPU and hybrid workflows fail to beat SA/PIA in mean decoded objective. Comparison is made on the decoded simulator objective  $J_{\text{total}}$ , not raw BQM energy (Sec. 4, eq. `eq:benchmark_jtotal`).

## 2.6 Portability flags

Features and modelling choices that matter for Brillant’s cross-paradigm / cross-vendor analysis:

- **Pure QUBO / Ising primitive, no exotic hardware features.** The workload is a single Ising-Hamiltonian minimisation. No mid-circuit measurement, dynamic circuits, native non-standard gates, or analog-specific blockade physics are used. This makes the *problem* highly portable across QUBO-capable platforms (other annealers, gate-based QAOA, coherent Ising machines, classical SA/PIA); the binding constraints are embedding density and encoding overhead, not special primitives.
- **Requires minor-embedding onto a sparse QPU graph.** The logical graph is near-dense (4596 couplers at  $H = 24$ ). The full  $H = 24$  instance was never run on the direct QPU; only  $H \leq 14$  (up to 182 variables, 1771 couplers) was embedded. Embedding overhead, not logical problem size, is the hardware-scaling ceiling. Default `EmbeddingComposite` with untuned chain strength was used, so embedding quality is uncontrolled.
- **Slack-bit penalty encoding inflates the variable and coupler count.** At  $H = 24$ , 288 of 312 variables are slack bits ( $M = 6$  bits per bound per step, two one-sided bounds), i.e. 92% of the footprint is auxiliary. This drives the graph density and embedding cost. Any vendor comparison should note that a more compact inequality encoding (flagged as future work) would change the embedding burden materially.
- **auto\_scale=True relies on D-Wave’s automatic  $h/J$  rescaling** into the hardware dynamic range. Porting to another annealer requires an equivalent rescaling step; the penalty weight  $A_{\text{bound}} = 120$  interacts with this scaling and with the energy landscape.
- **The analog anneal schedule does not transfer to gate-model hardware.** Porting to QAOA reuses the cost Hamiltonian (the QUBO/Ising matrix) but not the 20  $\mu\text{s}$  analog sweep; the driver term and schedule must be re-expressed as parameterised gate layers. This is the natural cross-paradigm comparison (cf. Willsch et al. QAOA-vs-D-Wave, in Romain’s bibliography).
- **Solution quality is defined by a post-hoc decode, not by raw BQM energy.** Every solver’s output is re-simulated and re-scored against the physical objective  $J_{\text{total}}$  and the zero-violation feasibility test. Any fair vendor/paradigm comparison must replicate this decode step rather than compare returned energies.

## 2.7 Caveats

- **Full access, no paywall.** The complete arXiv LaTeX source (`paper-source/GreenHouse-Quantum.tex`), figures, and bibliography are attached locally; all sections (main text, solver-settings table, results tables, appendices) were read in full. Equations and resource numbers were taken verbatim from the source.
- **Gaps are in the paper, not in access.** The authors do not report post-embedding physical-qubit counts, chain-break fractions, or embedding-quality statistics for the direct-QPU runs, and do not name the QPU topology. These are acknowledged limitations (Sec. 6), so the corresponding fingerprint rows are “not reported” rather than reconstructed.
- **Topology attribution.** The Zephyr-topology and thousands-of-qubits context for `Advantage2_system1` comes from `vendor-notes/annealing_flux_qubits.tex` (a 2026 substrate reference), not from this paper, and is labelled as such above.
- **Identifier note.** The dossier lists arXiv:2605.27670 (a 2026-dated identifier); the extraction is grounded in the attached source bundle, which is treated as authoritative.

### 3 Portability matrix