

# Setting angles in quantum approximate optimization at utility-scale

Portability dossier - app

agQSL portability pipeline

2026-06-07

Field	Value
Slug	2026-arxiv-2606.05311-qaoa-angle-setting
Source	arXiv
Link	<a href="https://arxiv.org/abs/2606.05311">https://arxiv.org/abs/2606.05311</a>
Category	app
Triaged	2026-06-06 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 . . . . .	5
2.5	Assumptions and results . . . . .	8
2.6	Portability flags . . . . .	8
2.7	Caveats . . . . .	9
<b>3</b>	<b>Portability matrix</b>	<b>10</b>

# 1 Source

## 1.1 Domain classification

**optimisation.** The paper is a utility-scale benchmark of QAOA angle setting on combinatorial optimisation problems (weighted Max-Cut, Maximum Independent Set, and the higher-order Low Autocorrelation Binary Sequence problem). There is no strong secondary application domain: the angle-setting taxonomy includes a **machine learning** sub-class (neural-network angle predictors), but that is a method family, not the application. Several co-authors sit in finance (HSBC), yet the evaluated problem classes are graph and sequence problems, not portfolio instances, so I would not tag this as finance.

## 1.2 Expert persona for Julien

A QAOA / variational combinatorial-optimisation specialist who has executed utility-scale ( $\geq 100$  qubit) circuits on IBM superconducting heavy-hex (Heron-class) hardware. Should have calibrated intuition about SWAP-network compilation when the cost-Hamiltonian topology does not match physical qubit connectivity, shallow circuits at depth  $p \leq 10$  carrying  $\sim 2000$  two-qubit ( $C_Z$ ) gates, and shot budgets (the paper uses  $Q = 4096$  shots for final sampling and 1000 shots per landscape point). Crucially, they must read the classical energy evaluators fluently: MPS bond-dimension tradeoffs (max bond dimension 40 here, with Quimb and Qiskit-Aer back ends), Pauli-propagation truncation weight (max weight 6), and exact statevector. They should understand the distinction the paper draws between the simulator-side estimated approximation ratio and the on-hardware approximation ratio, and that error mitigation changes the expectation values used in training but not the final sampling.

## 1.3 Related prior work (brief bibliography)

- Farhi, Goldstone, Gutmann, *A Quantum Approximate Optimization Algorithm* (2014). The primitive itself. arXiv:1411.4028.
- Wurtz, Love, *MaxCut QAOA performance guarantees for  $p > 1$*  (2021). The fixed-angle conjecture that supplies the transferable angles benchmarked here. DOI:10.1103/PhysRevA.103.042612.
- Sack, Serbyn, *Quantum annealing initialization of the quantum approximate optimization algorithm* (2021). The Trotterised-quantum-annealing (TQA) physics-inspired schedule, one of the benchmarked methods. DOI:10.22331/q-2021-07-01-491.
- Montañez-Barrera, Michielsen, *Toward a linear-ramp QAOA protocol* (2025). The linear-ramp angle method that the paper finds robust for rugged higher-order landscapes. DOI:10.1038/s41534-025-01082-1.
- Egger, Mareček, Woerner, *Warm-starting quantum optimization* (2021). The relaxation-biased initial state that sidesteps the symmetry and locality obstructions discussed in the complexity section. DOI:10.22331/q-2021-06-17-479.
- Koch, Bernal Neira, *et al.*, *Quantum Optimization Benchmark Library: The Intractable Decathlon* (2025). The benchmark harness this work positions itself against, useful as a portability comparison baseline. arXiv:2504.03832.

## 1.4 Difficulty estimate

high. Driving factors: the paper is long (roughly 165 kB of LaTeX, around 25 figures, several wide tables, and eight appendices), and most of the hardware fingerprint lives in the appendices (`app:example_hw` utility-scale hardware runs, `app:problem_models`, `app:graphs`, `app:tn` tensor networks). The extraction must disentangle two QPUs (`ibm_boston` for 144-node heavy-hex validation at  $p = 5$  and  $p = 10$ , `ibm_fez` for the energy landscape), four energy evaluators, and three problem classes, while separating which numbers come from hardware versus classical approximation. One mitigating factor lowers the friction: the full LaTeX source, figures, and tables are present in `paper-source/`, so there is no paywall and no separate supplementary PDF for Julien to chase.

## 2 Extraction

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

The paper compares ways to choose QAOA angles for utility-scale combinatorial optimisation, mainly MaxCut, with additional MIS and LABS studies. Instead of doing every variational update on a quantum processor, it tests classical angle-setting routes such as fixed angles, parameter transfer, linear ramps, TQA, interpolation, Fourier methods, MPS energy estimation, and Pauli propagation. The authors then validate selected utility-scale MaxCut circuits on IBM superconducting hardware, including 144-qubit heavy-hex instances at QAOA depths up to  $p = 10$ . The main practical question is whether classically chosen angles still rank well once the final samples are drawn from noisy quantum hardware.

### 2.2 Quantum hardware used

- **Vendor / machine:** IBM Quantum / `ibm_boston` and `ibm_fez`.
- **Qubit count:** Main validation uses 144 qubits; other hardware examples use 100 qubits. Device total available qubits are not reported in the paper.
- **Connectivity:** Heavy-hexagonal QPU coupling topology. Hardware-native heavy-hex problem graphs require no SWAPs; line-based, random-regular, and Erdos-Renyi graphs are routed with predetermined line SWAP networks and SAT mapping.
- **Gate set:** Native gate set described as controlled- $Z$  rotations and single-qubit gates. Quadratic MaxCut cost evolution is decomposed into commuting  $R_{ZZ}(\theta, i, j) = e^{-i\theta Z_i Z_j / 2}$  gates, with SWAPs inserted when a problem edge is not a physical coupling.
- **Notable features leveraged:** Heavy-hex topology matching, commuting  $ZZ$  cost terms, line SWAP networks, SAT initial mapping, high-throughput final sampling, and CVaR-style top-5% sample post-processing in the hardware-training example. No mid-circuit measurement or dynamic circuits are reported.

### 2.3 Computational primitive

QAOA for combinatorial optimisation, with final hardware sampling of bitstrings after classically or approximately trained angle selection.

### 2.4 Resource fingerprint

Metric	Value	Source (page / equation / SI)
Qubits (logical)	144 maximum for the main heavy-hex MaxCut hardware validation; 100 for the depth-four hardware-training example, the depth-one <code>ibm_fez</code> validation, and the line-based validation.	p. 14, Sec. V.B.2; p. 31, App. G.3; p. 32, App. G.5
Qubits (physical)	144 used for the main heavy-hex validation and 100 used for the other hardware examples; total physical qubits available on <code>ibm_boston</code> or <code>ibm_fez</code> are not reported.	p. 14, Sec. V.B.2; p. 30, App. G.1; p. 31, App. G.3
Circuit depth	Compiled circuit depth is not reported. Reported QAOA depths include $p = 4$ for the 100-node training example, $p = 5$ and $p = 10$ for 144-node heavy-hex validation, $p = 1$ for the 100-node three-regular validation, and $p = 2$ and $p = 6$ for 100-node line-based validation. The $p = 4$ training circuit has 40 two-qubit-gate layers.	p. 7, Sec. III.B.1; p. 14, Sec. V.B.2; p. 15, Fig. 9; p. 31, App. G.3; p. 32, App. G.5

Metric	Value	Source (page / equation / SI)
2Q-gate count (total)	$N_{CZ} = 1980$ for the 100-node, depth-four hardware-training circuit; 4926 two-qubit gates for the 100-node, depth-one three-regular validation circuit. Not reported for the 144-node $p = 5/p = 10$ heavy-hex validation or the 100-node line-based $p = 2/p = 6$ validation.	p. 7, Sec. III.B.1; p. 31, App. G.2 and App. G.3
Measurement shots	20 000 samples per COBYLA iteration in the hardware-training example; 1000 shots per landscape datapoint for the 144-qubit <code>ibm_fez</code> landscape; 4096 samples per circuit for the 144-node <code>ibm_boston</code> heavy-hex validation; 65 536 samples per angle set for the 100-node <code>ibm_fez</code> depth-one validation.	p. 31, App. G.2; p. 13 and p. 15, Fig. 8; p. 14 and p. 15, Sec. V.B.2; p. 31, App. G.3
Classical loop iter.	Not reported for the hardware runs. The paper states that COBYLA is used and denotes the iteration count by $K$ in the resource-cost model, but does not give a numeric $K$ for the hardware validation runs.	p. 7, Fig. 2; p. 15, Sec. V.C

Metric	Value	Source (page / equation / SI)
Wall-clock runtime	<p>Hardware-training example: 11.4 minutes end-to-end including classical processing; 20 000 samples generated at about 2.47 kHz; per-iteration user wall-clock sampling time <math>8.2 \pm 0.9</math> s and backend completion time <math>5.8 \pm 0.5</math> s. The 144-qubit <code>ibm_fez</code> landscape used 1000 shots at each of 625 datapoints and took about 3 minutes total. Runtime for the 4096-shot final heavy-hex validation circuits is not reported.</p>	p. 7, Sec. III.B.1; p. 31, App. G.2; p. 13 and p. 15, Fig. 8

## 2.5 Assumptions and results

- The claimed workflow is to train or select QAOA angles away from the QPU when possible, then bind those angles into hardware circuits and sample candidate bitstrings. The largest reported hardware case is depth-ten QAOA on 144 qubits (p. 17, Sec. VII).
- Hardware approximation ratios are lower than estimated ratios because of noise. For 144-node heavy-hex validation, PP correlates better with hardware than MPS: all-shot correlations are 0.93 and 0.89 for  $p = 5$  and  $p = 10$ , while MPS gives 0.66 and 0.61 (p. 15, Fig. 9). On top-5% shots, PP gives 0.90 and 0.90, while MPS gives 0.69 and 0.67 (p. 32, Fig. 23).
- The paper uses exact CPLEX solutions to normalise hardware approximation ratios for the MaxCut instances (p. 14, Sec. V.B.2). It also compares against Goemans-Williamson rounding: for the studied graph families, 10, 100, 1000, and 10 000 rounding rounds often match the CPLEX optimum; reported runtimes are under 0.01 s for 10-node graphs, 0.1-0.5 s for 100-node graphs, and up to 25.45 s for 144-node heavy-hex graphs on an Apple MacBook Pro with an M3 processor (p. 25, App. F.1).

## 2.6 Portability flags

- Requires compilation to IBM superconducting heavy-hex hardware with controlled- $Z$  rotations and single-qubit gates as described by the paper.

- Heavy-hex problem graphs are intentionally chosen because they match the QPU connectivity and avoid SWAP routing; this is central to the 144-qubit hardware validation.
- Non-native graph families require explicit SWAP routing. The paper uses line SWAP networks and SAT mapping, with full line-based connectivity reached after  $n - 2$  SWAP layers (p. 30, App. G.1).
- The hardware-training example depends on repeated high-shot sampling and CVaR-style use of only the lowest-energy 5% of 20 000 samples per iteration (p. 31, App. G.2).
- The final sampled bitstrings are not error-mitigated expectation values. The paper states that error mitigation improves expectation values but not final sampling, and instead discusses drawing more samples and post-selecting good samples (p. 7, Sec. III.B.1).
- The study deliberately avoids running dense or high-order LABS circuits on hardware: the authors state that LABS has many four-local interactions, high connectivity, and gate-depth challenges, so LABS results rely on statevector simulation (p. 29, App. F.3).
- No mid-circuit measurement, active feed-forward, or dynamic circuits are reported. The hardware role is final computational-basis sampling of QAOA circuits.
- At 144 qubits and  $p = 10$ , the circuits are close enough to the QPU noise limits that many of the best angle-setting methods become statistically indistinguishable on hardware (p. 14, Sec. V.B.2).

## 2.7 Caveats

No paywall or partial-access problem was encountered: the local dossier includes the PDF and the arXiv TeX source. I did not find a separate Supplementary Information PDF; the supplement-like material is in the paper appendices, especially Appendix G for utility-scale hardware runs. Backend total qubit counts, full compiled depths for the main 144-qubit validation circuits, and complete per-circuit two-qubit-gate counts are not reported.

### 3 Portability matrix