

Quantum Signal Processing for Linear PDEs: Circuit Design and Experimental Validation

Portability dossier - app

agQSL portability pipeline

2026-06-07

Field	Value
Slug	2026-arxiv-2606.00368-qsp-pde-validation
Source	arXiv
Link	https://arxiv.org/abs/2606.00368
Category	app
Triaged	2026-06-06 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	7
2.7	Caveats	8
3	Portability matrix	9

1 Source

1.1 Domain classification

other (specify): scientific computing / numerical PDE solving (computational physics). The paper is primarily a methods-and-benchmarking contribution: it compiles and runs end-to-end circuits for three generic linear PDEs (advection, wave, Poisson) rather than serving a single application vertical. The Ezratty index places this material in its algorithms chapter (11.2.13 “Linear and differential equations”), not in an application-domain chapter, which matches. Secondary flavour: **materials / semiconductor-process modelling**. The non-homogeneous Dirichlet demonstration solves the Poisson equation for a capacitively coupled plasma (CCP) charge-density profile, a low-temperature discharge relevant to chip fabrication, with source data from a WarpX PIC/MCC simulation.

1.2 Expert persona for Julien

A quantum-algorithms specialist with hands-on NISQ hardware experience, not a plasma physicist (the CCP application is a thin wrapper over a generic Poisson solve). They should be fluent in quantum signal processing and, specifically, the ancilla-based generalised QSP construction used here (block-encoding-free, no QSVT reflections), plus QFT-based spectral methods, Jacobi-Anger / Bessel expansions, and the Hamiltonian-simulation degree scaling $d = \Theta(tNr)$. Critically, they need calibrated intuition about IBM transpilation and two-qubit gate counting, amplitude-encoded state preparation and readout overheads, and QSP post-selection success-probability scaling (here as poor as $\Omega(N^{-4})$ for the Poisson solver), since the hardware fingerprint lives in those numbers rather than in the PDE physics.

1.3 Related prior work (brief bibliography)

- Lubasch et al. (2025), “Quantum circuits for partial differential equations in Fourier space,” *Phys. Rev. Res.*, DOI [10.1103/tbzc-w9x8](https://doi.org/10.1103/tbzc-w9x8). The theory paper this work directly compiles and benchmarks; same primitive, simulation-only.
- Wright et al. (2024), “Noisy intermediate-scale quantum simulation of the one-dimensional wave equation,” *Phys. Rev. Res.* 6, 043169, DOI [10.1103/PhysRevResearch.6.043169](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevResearch.6.043169). Same application (wave equation) on NISQ hardware without QSP; the closest portability comparison point.
- Novikau & Joseph (2025), “Quantum algorithm for the advection-diffusion equation and the Koopman-von Neumann approach to nonlinear dynamical systems,” *Comput. Phys. Commun.*, DOI [10.1016/j.cpc.2025.109498](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cpc.2025.109498). Same application (advection) via a different algorithmic route.
- Motlagh & Wiebe (2024), “Generalized Quantum Signal Processing,” *PRX Quantum* 5, 020368, DOI [10.1103/PRXQuantum.5.020368](https://doi.org/10.1103/PRXQuantum.5.020368). The exact QSP variant compiled here.
- Gilyén, Su, Low, Wiebe (2019), “Quantum singular value transformation and beyond,” *STOC 2019*, DOI [10.1145/3313276.3316366](https://doi.org/10.1145/3313276.3316366). The QSVT foundation that contextualises the authors’ block-encoding-free choice.
- Turner et al. (2013), “Simulation benchmarks for low-pressure plasmas: Capacitive discharges,” *Phys. Plasmas*, DOI [10.1063/1.4775084](https://doi.org/10.1063/1.4775084). The established classical CCP benchmark behind the Dirichlet demonstration; the classical methods

anchor.

Reproducibility artefact: the authors release a `qsp4pde` Python package at github.com/hjkqubit/qsp4pde, which Julien can use to confirm gate counts and circuit structure directly.

1.4 Difficulty estimate

medium. The paper is fully fetchable (arXiv, no paywall) and the dossier already holds the HTML render plus the complete LaTeX source and all ten figure PDFs, so there is no SI or access barrier. The hardware fingerprint is concrete and well tabulated: `ibm_miami`, $n = 4$ system qubits (+1 ancilla for QSP), 1,000 shots per run, with two-qubit gate counts and post-transpilation depths laid out in Table 1, and QSP degrees $d = 0, 2, 4, 6, 8$. That structure pulls difficulty down from high. What keeps it at medium rather than low is the machinery Julien must read correctly: generalised QSP with Laurent-polynomial robust root-finding, the Jacobi-Anger degree scaling, and the post-selection success-probability analysis all need careful reading, and the wave and Poisson sections are simulation-only (no hardware numbers), so the extractable hardware evidence is concentrated in the advection results.

2 Extraction

2.1 What the paper does (one paragraph)

The authors take published “PDE in Fourier space” circuit recipes and turn them into fully compiled, end-to-end quantum circuits, then benchmark them in statevector simulation and on IBM superconducting hardware. They treat three linear PDEs in one dimension: advection and wave (time propagation) and Poisson (a matrix pseudoinverse). The common workflow is: amplitude-encode the initial data, apply an inverse quantum Fourier transform (QFT) to move to frequency space, apply the differential operator there (which is diagonal in the Fourier basis), then QFT back. The frequency-space operator is implemented two ways: a cheap “small-angle approximation” (SAA, a single layer of Z rotations with uncontrollable error) and quantum signal processing (QSP, a Laurent-polynomial transform with one ancilla, deeper circuits, and tunable error). The headline experiment shows that on real hardware QSP can beat SAA in accuracy for the advection equation despite using more gates. They also extend the Poisson solver to non-homogeneous Dirichlet boundaries and verify it numerically on a capacitively coupled plasma charge-density source from a WarpX simulation.

2.2 Quantum hardware used

- **Vendor / machine:** IBM Quantum, `ibm_miami` (superconducting transmon device). The paper does not state the processor generation (Eagle vs Heron), so the native two-qubit gate is not pinned down.
- **Qubit count:** 4 system qubits used (16 grid points) for the hardware advection runs, plus 1 ancilla for the QSP circuits, i.e. 5 qubits total for QSP, 4 for SAA. The total number of qubits available on `ibm_miami` is not reported.
- **Connectivity:** Not stated explicitly in the paper; the text only refers to “transpilation to IBMQ architecture.” IBM superconducting devices use a heavy-hex lattice (grounding: `vendor-notes/superconducting_qubits.tex`; Ezratty 8.3.7), which is why the transpiled two-qubit counts are larger than the logical circuit would suggest.
- **Gate set:** Standard IBM native basis (single-qubit rotations plus one native two-qubit entangler). The paper counts generic “two-qubit gates” after transpilation and does not name the native entangler. On IBM hardware this is cross-resonance / ECR (Falcon, Eagle) or tunable-coupler CZ (Heron) per `vendor-notes/superconducting_qubits.tex`; the paper does not say which.
- **Notable features leveraged:** One ancilla qubit with terminal post-selection on the $|0\rangle$ outcome (the QSP success branch); amplitude-encoded state preparation via `Qiskit StatePreparation`; QFT circuit. No mid-circuit measurement, no dynamic circuits, no hardware-specific analog primitive are used.

2.3 Computational primitive

Sampling: probability-amplitude readout of a fixed, non-variational circuit whose construction sub-routine is a **QFT-based spectral method plus generalized (Laurent-polynomial) quantum signal processing** (QSP is the method, not the axis-A primitive). QSP here realises Hamiltonian simulation for the advection and wave equations (via a Jacobi-Anger Laurent expansion of e^{-iHt} , an alternative to Trotterisation) and a matrix pseudoinversion for the Poisson equation. A non-QSP small-angle approximation (a single

diagonal layer of single-qubit Z rotations) is benchmarked as the shallow baseline. The construction is the block-encoding-free generalized QSP of Motlagh and Wiebe, with robust Laurent-polynomial root-finding for the complementary polynomial Q ; it does not use QSVT block encodings or reflection operators.

2.4 Resource fingerprint

Metric	Value	Source (page / equation / SI)
Qubits (logical)	4 system qubits for hardware advection (16 grid points); +1 ancilla for QSP = 5 total. Simulations use $n = 6$ (advection, wave, periodic Poisson), $n = 8$ (advection Jacobi-Anger convergence; Dirichlet/CCP Poisson, +1 QSP ancilla and +1 odd-extension ancilla).	Sec. “IBM quantum hardware results” and Fig. 5 caption; Figs. 3, 4, 6, 8; Sec. “Numerical example with non-homogeneous Dirichlet data”
Qubits (physical)	Not reported separately. NISQ run with no error correction; the 4 system + 1 ancilla qubits map directly to physical transmons.	Sec. “IBM quantum hardware results”
Circuit depth	Equal to the two-qubit-gate count by the paper’s definition: SAA 15 ($t = 0$) then 36; QSP 15, 86, 114, 142, 170 for $t = 0, 0.125, 0.25, 0.375, 0.5$.	Table 1 and its caption
2Q-gate count (total)	SAA: 15 ($t = 0$), 36 ($t \geq 0.125$). QSP: 15, 86, 114, 142, 170 (degrees $d = 0, 2, 4, 6, 8$).	Table 1
Measurement shots	1,000 shots per run (hardware advection).	Sec. “IBM quantum hardware results”; Fig. 5 caption

Metric	Value	Source (page / equation / SI)
Classical loop iter.	Not applicable: non-variational algorithm, no classical optimisation loop. QSP polynomial degree was swept over $d = 0, 2, 4, 6, 8$ as a parameter, not iterated.	Fig. 5 caption; Sec. “IBM quantum hardware results”
Wall-clock runtime	Not reported.	—

2.5 Assumptions and results

- **Claimed.** End-to-end compiled circuits for the advection, wave, and Poisson equations, benchmarked in simulation and (for advection) on `ibm_miami`. The central experimental claim is the first hardware demonstration that QSP not only solves a PDE but improves accuracy over the shallow SAA baseline under NISQ noise: for the advection equation at $t \geq 0.25$, QSP attains lower RMSE than SAA despite using more two-qubit gates. The Dirichlet-boundary extension is verified numerically (not on hardware) on a capacitively coupled plasma Poisson source from a WarpX PIC/MCC simulation.
- **Error bars / noise assumptions.** Accuracy is quantified as RMSE between the measured $|\psi(x)|^2$ and the classical $|\psi^{\text{classical}}(x)|^2$ (hardware measures probabilities, so the overall sign/phase is lost). Reported hardware RMSE: SAA 0.011 to 0.055; QSP 0.012 to 0.040 (Table 1). No per-point shot-noise confidence intervals are tabulated; runs use 1,000 shots. The paper gives no explicit error-mitigation recipe in the extracted text beyond standard transpilation. For the Poisson solver it states the post-selection success probability is order 10^{-4} , so reaching a 10% signal-to-noise ratio at $p = 10^{-4}$ would need more than 10^6 measurements (before accounting for per-grid-point readout).
- **Comparison to classical baseline.** Yes, throughout. A traditional finite-difference PDE solver is the ground truth in every figure; the advection convergence study confirms the Jacobi-Anger degree must scale as $d = \Theta(tNr)$ (numerically $d^* \approx 0.45N$ at $t = 0.45$, $r = 1$). The CCP demonstration compares the quantum statevector solution against the classically discretised Dirichlet solution built from the same WarpX charge density.

2.6 Portability flags

Hardware-specific or cost-driving features that matter for Brillant’s portability analysis:

- **Ancilla post-selection with potentially catastrophic success probability.** The QSP solution lives in the ancilla- $|0\rangle$ branch. For the Poisson solver the success probability is as poor as $p(n) = \Omega(N^{-4}) = \Omega(2^{-4n})$ in the worst case (plane-wave source at $\tilde{k} = -N/2$), and is order 10^{-4} in the studied cases. This dominates the measurement budget ($> 10^6$ shots for 10% SNR) and is the

main obstacle to scaling on any platform, not IBM-specific. The construction also rescales $P \rightarrow \gamma P$ ($0 < \gamma < 1$), reducing success probability by a further γ^2 .

- **Amplitude-encoded input.** Initial data are loaded with Qiskit `StatePreparation`; state-preparation cost is excluded from the reported gate counts and can be exponential for unstructured data. Any target vendor inherits this cost.
- **QFT cost is connectivity-sensitive.** The shifted QFT uses $\frac{n(n-1)}{2}$ controlled two-qubit rotations. On a low-degree heavy-hex lattice these incur SWAP overhead during transpilation, which inflates the reported two-qubit counts; an all-to-all platform (trapped ion) would transpile the QFT and the controlled- U QSP layers more cheaply.
- **Controlled-unitary QSP structure must be decomposed.** Each QSP layer applies an ancilla $SU(2)$ rotation and a controlled application of $U = e^{i2\pi K/N}$ (and U^\dagger). The diagonal U itself is a product of single-qubit Z rotations and is cheap, but the ancilla-controlled U and U^\dagger blocks require a native or compiled controlled-unitary and will decompose differently across native gate sets (ECR vs CZ vs $XX(\theta)$).
- **Readout loses phase.** Hardware reconstructs $|\langle x_j | \psi \rangle|^2$, discarding the sign; recovering the full real-valued solution and its overall scale needs the tracked QSP normalisation factor plus many measurements per grid point.
- **Depth scales with the simulated parameters.** For the Hamiltonian-simulation cases the QSP degree, and hence two-qubit depth, scales as $d = \Theta(tNr)$, so longer evolution times or finer grids push circuits deeper, independent of vendor.
- **Portability positives.** No mid-circuit measurement, no dynamic circuits, and no analog or Rydberg-specific primitive are required. The algorithm is purely digital and gate-based, so it maps in principle to any universal digital gate-set vendor; only the connectivity-driven QFT overhead and the native two-qubit gate decomposition differ across platforms.

2.7 Caveats

- Access was complete: the dossier holds the full arXiv LaTeX source (`main_SIAM.tex`, `shared_SIAM.tex`), the HTML render, and all ten figure PDFs. No paywall, and there is no separate supplementary file (single-file SIAM article). Numbers above are taken from the source `.tex` and Table 1 verbatim.
- Hardware numbers exist only for the advection equation. The wave equation (SAA only) and both Poisson studies (periodic and the CCP Dirichlet demonstration) are simulation-only, so the extractable hardware fingerprint is concentrated in the advection run.
- The paper does not state the `ibm_miami` processor generation, total qubit count, native two-qubit gate, qubit coherence times, or wall-clock runtime, so those rows are “not reported.” `ibm_miami` is reported as named in the paper; I could not cross-check this specific device name against the Ezratty 2025 snapshot (which predates these 2026 runs), so connectivity and gate-set context above are the IBM-platform defaults from `vendor-notes/`, not paper-stated facts.

3 Portability matrix