

Scalable On-Hardware Training of Quantum Neural Networks and Application to Clinical Data Imputation

Portability dossier - app

agQSL portability pipeline

2026-06-07

Field	Value
Slug	2026-arxiv-2606.03517-clinical-imputation-qnn
Source	arXiv
Link	https://arxiv.org/abs/2606.03517
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	6
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

machine learning (quantum machine learning: on-hardware training of quantum neural networks).

Secondary: clinical / healthcare informatics, which maps to the **biology** taxonomy bucket. The application is missing-value imputation on MIMIC-III ICU records, evaluated through downstream patient-survival prediction (AUC). But the paper’s contribution is squarely a QML training-methods result; the clinical task is the testbed, not the science. Route as machine learning first.

1.2 Expert persona for Julien

A QML methods specialist comfortable with subspace-preserving and orthogonal variational circuits: specifically RBS-gate (Hamming-weight-preserving) ansätze, the Butterfly / pyramid layout, and fermionic-linear-optics circuits with non-Gaussian magic-state initialisation. They should have calibrated intuition about parameter-shift gradient estimation and how the parallelised commuting-layer variant changes circuit-execution counts ($O(n^2) \rightarrow O(\log n)$ per step), about layer-wise training and circuit composition, and about MPS / tensor-network simulation at intermediate scales. Working familiarity with trapped-ion execution on IonQ Forte Enterprise (all-to-all connectivity, qubit budget, the training-versus-inference split) and with hybrid plumbing where a QNN sits as a hidden block inside a classical MLP is needed. A practising clinician is not required: the medical task reduces to tabular regression scored by AUC.

1.3 Related prior work (brief bibliography)

1. Kazdaghli, Kerenidis, Kieckbusch, Teare, *Improved clinical data imputation via classical and quantum determinantal point processes*, eLife 12:RP89947 (2024), arXiv:2303.17893. Direct predecessor: same MIMIC-III imputation task and the same group, but a different quantum primitive (quantum determinantal point process sampling rather than a trainable QNN). The closest baseline and portability comparison.
2. Cherrat, Kerenidis, Mathur, Landman, Strahm, Li, *Quantum vision transformers*, Quantum 8, 1265 (2024), arXiv:2209.08167. Source of the Butterfly / compound RBS architecture used here; same computational primitive on a different application and hardware lineage.
3. Landman, Mathur, Li, Strahm, Kazdaghli, Prakash, Kerenidis, *Quantum methods for neural networks and application to medical image classification*, Quantum 6, 881 (2022), arXiv:2212.07389. Architectural ancestor: excitation-preserving and orthogonal QNNs run on hardware for a medical task. Useful for tracking the RBS-circuit fingerprint across vendors.
4. Oszmaniec, Dangniam, Morales, Zimborás, *Fermion sampling: a robust quantum computational advantage scheme using fermionic linear optics and magic input states*, PRX Quantum 3, 020328 (2022). Origin of the non-Gaussian magic-state loader; explains why Gaussian-input FLO is classically simulable and what the magic state buys.

5. Schuld, Bergholm, Gogolin, Izaac, Killoran, *Evaluating analytic gradients on quantum hardware*, Phys. Rev. A 99, 032331 (2019), arXiv:1811.11184. The parameter-shift rule whose $O(n^2)$ per-step cost this paper attacks; baseline for the parallelised variant.
6. Johnson et al., *MIMIC-III, a freely accessible critical care database*, Scientific Data 3, 160035 (2016), DOI 10.1038/sdata.2016.35. The dataset and survival-prediction substrate.

1.4 Difficulty estimate

medium.

The full arXiv LaTeX source, bibliography, and figures are already in the folder (`paper-source/`), so there is no paywall or fetch problem and no separate SI PDF to chase. What lifts this above `low` is the co-designed, multi-primitive stack Julien must disentangle: a non-Gaussian FLO magic-state loader, an R_Y angle-encoding data loader, an RBS Butterfly ansatz, a layer-wise composition protocol, and a parallel parameter-shift rule, plus three execution modes that must not be conflated (16-qubit on-hardware *training*; ideal and noisy simulation; 32-qubit MPS-trained circuits with *inference only* on hardware). The platform is named with key specs (IonQ Forte Enterprise, up to 36 all-to-all trapped-ion qubits, on-hardware training capped at 16), but explicit shot budgets and two-qubit gate fidelities are not stated in the main text and may need to be sourced from IonQ Forte Enterprise spec material for a complete fingerprint.

2 Extraction

2.1 What the paper does (one paragraph)

This paper tackles a practical bottleneck in training quantum neural networks (QNNs) on real hardware: standard parameter-shift gradient estimation needs a number of circuit runs that grows quadratically with the parameter count. The authors combine three co-designed pieces: a logarithmic-depth, subspace-preserving Butterfly circuit of RBS gates ($O(n \log n)$ parameters); a layer-wise training scheme that optimises only one small layer at a time; and a parallel parameter-shift rule that extracts every gradient within a layer from a constant number of circuit runs. Together these cut distinct circuit evaluations per optimisation step from $O(n^2)$ to $O(\log n)$. They demonstrate the method on MIMIC-III clinical missing-value imputation, scored through downstream ICU-survival prediction (AUC). A 16-qubit hybrid model is trained directly on IonQ Forte Enterprise; a 32-qubit model is trained by tensor-network simulation and run for inference on the same hardware.

2.2 Quantum hardware used

- **Vendor / machine:** IonQ / Forte Enterprise (trapped-ion). (Sec. Results, “Quantum Hardware Platform”; Sec. “Feasibility and Qubit Constraints”).
- **Qubit count:** 16 used for on-hardware *training*; 32 used for on-hardware *inference*; two 8-qubit subcircuits trained in classical simulation as warm-start. Up to 36 fully connected qubits available on the device. (Sec. “Feasibility and Qubit Constraints”: “supports up to 36 fully connected trapped-ion qubits ... we restrict on-hardware training to circuits of up to 16 qubits”).
- **Connectivity:** all-to-all. The device is a single static $^{171}\text{Yb}^+$ linear chain with all-to-all coupling delivered through shared collective motional modes (paper states “all-to-all qubit connectivity”; cross-checked against `vendor-notes/trapped_ion_qubits.tex`).
- **Gate set:** the circuit is written in three primitives: (i) a magic-state loader built from H, CNOT and X gates; (ii) single-qubit $R_Y(2\pi x_i)$ data-loading rotations; (iii) two-qubit RBS (Reconfigurable Beam Splitter / Givens) gates, $\text{RBS}_{i,j}(\theta) = e^{-i\frac{\theta}{2}(Y_i \otimes X_j - X_i \otimes Y_j)}$. The paper claims native long-range interactions allow “direct implementation of the RBS gates without compilation overhead”. Note: the device’s *native* two-qubit entangler is the Mølmer-Sørensen $R_{XX}(\theta)$ (per `vendor-notes/trapped_ion_qubits.tex`); the paper’s “no compilation overhead” claim refers to the absence of SWAP/routing overhead under all-to-all connectivity, not to RBS being a single hardware pulse.
- **Notable features leveraged:** all-to-all connectivity (removes SWAP routing for the Butterfly’s long-range pairings); commuting-block structure of each Butterfly layer (enables the parallel parameter-shift rule); non-Gaussian magic-state initialisation (makes the FLO circuit classically hard); layer-wise hybrid training (only the final coupling layer is optimised on hardware). Long coherence and “high-fidelity two-qubit gates” are asserted qualitatively.

2.3 Computational primitive

VQE-family variational quantum neural network with QML inference - on-hardware gradient-based *training* plus *inference*. The QNN is a parametrised quantum circuit acting as a learnable hidden block inside a classical MLP; gradients are obtained by a parallelised parameter-shift rule. This is not VQE/QAOA (no Hamiltonian ground-state target); the cost function is a downstream supervised regression loss.

2.4 Resource fingerprint

Metric	Value	Source (page / equation / SI)
Qubits (logical)	not applicable (NISQ, no error correction)	Whole paper; device described as NISQ trapped-ion
Qubits (physical)	16 (on-hardware training); 32 (on-hardware inference); up to 36 available; 8-qubit subcircuits in simulation	Sec. “Feasibility and Qubit Constraints”; Sec. “Training on Quantum Hardware”; Sec. “Scaling to 32 Qubits”
Circuit depth	$O(\log n)$ Butterfly layers (e.g. $\log_2 16 = 4$ RBS sub-layers at $n = 16$), plus magic-state loader and one R_Y data layer; explicit compiled gate-depth not reported	Sec. “Parametrised Circuit: Butterfly Architecture”; Fig. 1
2Q-gate count (total)	Butterfly RBS gates = $\frac{1}{2}n \log_2 n$: 12 ($n=8$), 32 ($n=16$), 80 ($n=32$); total including magic-state-loader CNOTs and native-gate decomposition not reported	Table I caption (“Butterfly circuit with $\frac{1}{2}n \log n$ gates”)
Measurement shots	not reported (see Caveats)	Main text gives only qualitative “finite shot budgets” / “finite sampling budgets”
Classical loop iter.	not reported (loss curves plot “training iterations” but no count / epoch number is stated)	Figs. “Loss”, “SimVsHard”

Metric	Value	Source (page / equation / SI)
Wall-clock runtime	not reported (see Caveats)	Not stated for hardware training or inference

Headline resource result (circuit evaluations to compute a full gradient, Table I, `tab:CircuitScaling`): naive Butterfly + parameter-shift (PS) vs Butterfly + parallel parameter-shift (PPS):

Qubits	Butterfly + PS	Butterfly + PPS
8	48	12
16	128	16
32	320	20
64	768	24
128	1792	28

2.5 Assumptions and results

- **Claim.** Co-designing the Butterfly ansatz, layer-wise training and a parallel parameter-shift rule reduces distinct circuit evaluations per optimisation step from $O(n^2)$ to $O(\log n)$, which makes direct on-hardware QNN training tractable at 16 qubits and 32-qubit inference feasible. The resulting hybrid imputers match strong classical neural baselines on MIMIC-III ICU-survival AUC, with lower across-run variance.
- **Key numbers (Table II, `tab:ClassicalMethods`; 30% MCAR missingness, one-feature protocol, downstream survival AUC, mean \pm std over seeds):**
 - Actual / no missingness (upper bound): 0.7606 ± 0.0016
 - Deep MICE (best classical): 0.7176 ± 0.0041
 - 16-qubit Hybrid (hardware-trained): 0.7147 ± 0.0108
 - MICE (linear): 0.7143 ± 0.0006
 - 32-qubit Hybrid (MPS-trained, hardware inference): 0.7132 ± 0.0161
 - MissForest: 0.7127 ± 0.0018 ; KNN 0.7091; Mean 0.7020; Zero 0.6998.
- **Error bars / noise assumptions.** Variability is reported as std across multiple random seeds (initialisation, masking, classifier training). The hardware-trained 16-qubit model is reported as +1% median AUC and -1.6% in std relative to a classical 16×16 network. The paper states “no statistically significant degradation” moving across ideal simulation, noisy simulation and hardware (Fig. “SimVsHard”), but reports no explicit noise model parameters, gate fidelities or significance test statistics. 32-qubit training used MPS with bond dimension 32.

- **Classical baseline.** Yes, extensive: zero, mean, KNN, MICE (linear), MissForest, Deep MICE. The hybrid models are positioned as competitive with (not exceeding) the best classical neural baseline (Deep MICE) at accessible qubit counts; the reference classical capacity is a 128-wide hidden layer ($d \rightarrow 128 \rightarrow 128 \rightarrow 128 \rightarrow 128 \rightarrow 1$), with the hybrid replacing the two central layers by an n -qubit QNN ($n \in \{8, 16, 32\}$).

2.6 Portability flags

Features Brilliant must weigh for cross-vendor portability:

- **Leans on all-to-all connectivity.** The Butterfly pattern couples distant qubit pairs (e.g. qubit i with qubit $i + n/2$) across its $\log_2 n$ layers. On the trapped-ion chain this needs no routing. On limited-connectivity hardware (e.g. superconducting heavy-hex), these long-range pairings require SWAP networks, inflating two-qubit count and breaking the advertised $O(\log n)$ depth. The paper itself ties the “no compilation overhead” claim to long-range native interactions.
- **RBS is not a universal hardware-native gate.** $RBS(\theta) = e^{-i\frac{\theta}{2}(YX-XY)}$ is a number-preserving Givens rotation. IonQ’s native entangler is $R_{XX}(\theta)$ (Mølmer-Sørensen). RBS realises as a small fixed-count combination of R_{XX}/R_{YY} -type interactions plus single-qubit rotations on trapped ions, and as roughly 2 CNOT/CZ + single-qubit rotations on most digital gate sets. Any vendor lacking an excitation-preserving native gate must decompose every RBS.
- **Requires non-Gaussian magic-state initialisation.** Gaussian-input fermionic-linear-optics (FLO) circuits are classically simulable; the $|\phi\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|0011\rangle + |1100\rangle)$ loader (applied per four-qubit block) is what places the model in a classically hard regime. The loader uses only H/CNOT/X, so it is portable to any universal gate set, but it is conceptually mandatory: drop it and the quantum layer is classically reproducible.
- **Parallel parameter-shift assumes a global $Z^{\otimes n}$ observable.** The $O(\log n)$ scaling depends on measuring an observable that commutes (or anticommutes) with the disjoint-pair RBS generators, then diagonalising the commuting gradient observables. This is hardware-agnostic methodology, but it presupposes accurate expectation-value estimation, hence a real (unstated) shot budget.
- **On-hardware footprint is one layer only.** Layer-wise training confines hardware optimisation to the final $n/2$ -gate coupling layer; earlier layers are trained classically or in simulation. Portability of the *training* claim is therefore narrower than the full circuit: the device only ever optimises a single shallow layer.
- **32-qubit “result” is inference-only on hardware.** The 32-qubit circuit was trained by MPS simulation (bond dimension 32); only inference ran on IonQ. This is not a 32-qubit on-hardware training demonstration and should not be read as one.

2.7 Caveats

- The paper is openly available as full arXiv LaTeX source (`paper-source/apssamp.tex`); no paywall, no separate SI. All sections were reachable.
- **Shot budgets and gate fidelities are absent from the published main text.** The only quantitative shot figures appear

in a *commented-out* draft table in the TeX source (training shots 100/500/1000, inference shots 500/1000, MPS bond distances 8/16/32/128) that did not make the final paper; per extraction discipline these are recorded as “not reported” in the fingerprint and flagged here only for transparency, not used as evidence.

- **Wall-clock runtime is not reported.** A commented-out draft passage states MPS “simulations complete within a few hours”; this is not in the published text and is not treated as a reported value.
- Three execution regimes must not be conflated: (1) 16-qubit on-hardware *training* of the final coupling layer (8-qubit subcircuits pre-trained in simulation); (2) 16-qubit ideal and noisy *simulation* for the train-condition comparison; (3) 32-qubit MPS-trained circuits with *inference only* on hardware. For the 16-qubit comparison figures, inference was run on a classical simulator in all cases (figure captions).
- The Ezratty 2025 index confirms IonQ’s trapped-ion, all-to-all, algorithmic-qubit framing but predates Forte Enterprise specifics; it was used only for context, not for the paper’s numbers.

3 Portability matrix