

Quantum Annealing for Nurse Scheduling Problem

Portability dossier - app

agQSL portability pipeline

2026-06-07

Field	Value
Slug	2026-arxiv-1904.12139-quantum-annealing-nurse-scheduling-problem
Source	arXiv
Link	https://arxiv.org/abs/1904.12139
Category	app
Triaged	2026-06-07 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	5
2.5	Assumptions and results	6
2.6	Portability flags	7
2.7	Caveats	8
3	Portability matrix	9

1 Source

1.1 Domain classification

optimisation. The paper is squarely combinatorial optimisation / operations research: the Nurse Scheduling Problem (NSP) is an NP-hard rostering problem cast as QUBO and then as a transverse-field Ising model for a quantum annealer. No meaningful secondary domain. The only adjacent flavour is the workforce/logistics application context (it sits under `logistics_scheduling` in `edges.json`), but the computational content is generic constrained binary optimisation.

1.2 Expert persona for Julien

An operations-research-literate quantum annealing specialist who is fluent in QUBO/Ising formulations of constrained combinatorial problems and in D-Wave’s transverse-field Ising hardware. Should have calibrated intuition about minor embedding onto the Chimera topology, chain strength, the logical-to-physical qubit blow-up, dynamic-range/precision limits of analog control, and the practical knobs of forward vs reverse annealing (target s , hold time h_t , annealing time, sample counts). Penalty-weight tuning (λ , γ , the correlation constant a) for soft/hard constraint balancing should be second nature, since that is where most of the device-specific subtlety lives.

1.3 Related prior work (brief bibliography)

- A. Lucas, *Ising formulations of many NP problems*, Front. Phys. **2**, 5 (2014), DOI [10.3389/fphy.2014.00005](https://doi.org/10.3389/fphy.2014.00005). The canonical QUBO/Ising encoding reference underpinning the mapping in this paper.
- D. Venturelli, D. J. J. Marchand, G. Rojo, *Quantum Annealing Implementation of Job-Shop Scheduling*, [arXiv:1506.08479](https://arxiv.org/abs/1506.08479). Closest same-primitive, same-vendor-class comparison: a related scheduling problem on a D-Wave annealer.
- J. Cai, W. G. Macready, A. Roy, *A practical heuristic for finding graph minors*, [arXiv:1406.2741](https://arxiv.org/abs/1406.2741). The randomised minor-embedding algorithm the authors rely on to place the logical Ising graph onto hardware.
- K. Ikeda, Y. Nakamura, T. S. Humble, *Application of Quantum Annealing to Nurse Scheduling Problem*, Sci. Rep. **9**, 12837 (2019), DOI [10.1038/s41598-019-49172-3](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-019-49172-3). The peer-reviewed version of this very arXiv preprint; Julien should prefer it for final figures/parameters.
- Flight-gate assignment via CVaR-VQE on IonQ Aria, [arXiv:2309.09686](https://arxiv.org/abs/2309.09686) (in `edges.json`, `ionq/logistics_scheduling`). Same scheduling application family on a *different* vendor and a *gate-model* primitive; the sharpest portability contrast for Brillant later.
- Capacitated vehicle routing as QUBO on D-Wave Advantage, [arXiv:2206.10042](https://arxiv.org/abs/2206.10042) (in `edges.json`, `dwave/logistics_scheduling`). Same QUBO/Ising primitive, adjacent logistics workload on newer D-Wave hardware (Advantage vs the 2000Q used here).

1.4 Difficulty estimate

low. The preprint is short (about 13 pages including figures), fully open access on arXiv with the LaTeX source and figure files already mirrored into [paper-source/](#), and a peer-reviewed Scientific Reports version exists. There is no separate SI to chase. The primitives are standard (QUBO to transverse-field Ising, minor embedding, forward and reverse annealing on D-Wave 2000Q) and the problem instances are tiny ($N = 3, 4$ nurses, $D = 5$ to 14 days; annealing time 200 μs , 1000 samples per instance). Julien's hardware-fingerprint extraction should be quick and unambiguous.

2 Extraction

2.1 What the paper does (one paragraph)

The paper casts the Nurse Scheduling Problem (NSP), an NP-hard rostering problem, as a quadratic unconstrained binary optimisation (QUBO) and then as a transverse-field Ising model, and solves small instances on a D-Wave 2000Q quantum annealer. A binary variable $q_{n,d} \in \{0, 1\}$ marks whether nurse n works day d ; hard constraints (at least one nurse on duty each day, no nurse working two consecutive days) and a soft even-workload preference are encoded as penalty terms. The authors run forward annealing (1000 samples per instance, 200 μs each) for $N = 3, 4$ nurses over $D = 5$ to 14 days, then test reverse annealing as a refinement pass. They measure how often the returned schedules satisfy all constraints (accuracy) and the Hamming distance of samples to a satisfying schedule. Accuracy decays as N and D grow; reverse annealing sometimes sharpens the solution distribution but does not uniformly improve the success rate.

2.2 Quantum hardware used

- **Vendor / machine:** D-Wave Systems / D-Wave 2000Q (access provided by Oak Ridge National Laboratory; p. 12 acknowledgements). Superconducting flux qubits (p. 2).
- **Qubit count:** Logical problem size is $N \times D$ spins, ranging from 15 ($N = 3, D = 5$) to 56 ($N = 4, D = 14$); see derivation below. The physical qubit count actually consumed on the device after minor embedding is **not reported**. (The 2000Q exposes on the order of 2048 physical qubits on its Chimera fabric per the D-Wave/Ezratty spec, but the paper does not state how many it used.)
- **Connectivity:** Sparse Chimera graph (p. 5, “the sparsity of the chimera layout”). Logical couplings that exceed the native degree are realised by minor embedding with auxiliary spin chains (p. 5). Cross-check: Ezratty 2025, section 8.2.5 (p. 380), gives the 2000Q Chimera as 8-qubit unit cells with 6 couplers per qubit (4 internal, 2 external).
- **Gate set:** None in the digital sense. This is an analog annealer: the controllable resources are the programmable Ising couplers J_{ij} and local fields h_i (Eq. 4), plus the annealing schedules $A(t)$, $B(t)$ that interpolate from the transverse driver $H_0 = -\sum_{i \in V} s_i^x$ (Eq. 3) to the problem Hamiltonian H_1 (Eq. 4). Forward and reverse annealing are selectable schedule modes (p. 6, p. 11).
- **Notable features leveraged:** Reverse annealing (reverse to an intermediate s , pause/hold, anneal forward; p. 11); programmable annealing schedule; minor embedding onto the Chimera topology with auxiliary chains (p. 5).

2.3 Computational primitive

Analog evolution (quantum annealing). Continuous-time evolution under the time-dependent transverse-field Ising Hamiltonian $H(t) = A(t)H_0 + B(t)H_1$ (Eq. 2), with the NSP solution encoded in the ground state of H_1 . Not a gate-model primitive: there is no circuit, no VQE/QAOA variational loop, and no Trotterisation.

2.4 Resource fingerprint

Metric	Value	Source (page / equation / SI)
Qubits (logical)	$N \times D$ spins; 15 (at $N = 3, D = 5$) to 56 (at $N = 4, D = 14$). Derived from the $q_{n,d}$ encoding and the stated instance dimensions; not tabulated by the authors.	Encoding p. 6; dimensions $N = 3, 4$, $D = 5$ to 14, p. 8
Qubits (physical)	not reported (minor-embedding chain length and total physical-qubit usage not given)	p. 5 (embedding discussed, not quantified)
Circuit depth	not applicable (analog annealer; no gate circuit)	Eq. 2 to Eq. 4, p. 4 to p. 5
2Q-gate count (total)	not applicable (analog annealer; couplings are continuous J_{ij} , not 2Q gates)	Eq. 4, p. 5
Measurement shots	1000 samples per problem instance	p. 8 (“collect 1000 samples per problem instance”)
Classical loop iter.	not applicable for forward annealing (single-pass sampling). Reverse annealing adds one further annealing pass per seed solution; no variational/classical optimisation loop.	p. 6 (forward), p. 11 (reverse)
Wall-clock runtime	Per-sample annealing time $200 \mu s$ (forward); reverse-annealing example schedule spans $14 \mu s$ per sample. End-to-end / total QPU wall-clock not reported .	p. 8 ($200 \mu s$); p. 11 (reverse schedule)

For any row marked “not reported” or “not applicable”, the paper gives no usable number; nothing here is inferred beyond the explicit $N \times D$ encoding.

2.5 Assumptions and results

- **Claim.** Quantum annealing on the D-Wave 2000Q recovers fully satisfying NSP schedules for small instances, and the authors judge the heuristic “sufficient for practical use” (abstract). Reverse annealing can refine the forward-annealing distribution (lower mean Hamming distance, tighter spread) but does not uniformly raise the constraint-satisfaction rate (p. 12, p. 13, conclusion p. 13).
- **Fixed parameters.** Annealing time $200 \mu s$, 1000 samples, $\gamma = 0.3$, $\lambda = 1.3$, $h_1(n) = 1$, $h_2(d) = 1$, $E(n) = 1$, $W(d) = 1$, penalty $a = 7/2$; minimum duty days $F(n) \geq \lceil D/N \rceil$ (p. 8). Reverse-annealing study used target $s \in [0.6, 0.8]$ and hold time $h_t \in \{10, 50, 100 \mu s\}$, with the worked example reversing to $s = 0.6$ at $2 \mu s$, holding $h_t = 10 \mu s$, then annealing forward to end at $14 \mu s$ (p. 11). Note: the parameter table at the end of the source (**tab:b**) lists $\lambda = 0.3, \gamma = 1.3$, which contradicts the Results text ($\gamma = 0.3, \lambda = 1.3$); the values used in the main study are the Results-text values. Flagged as an internal inconsistency.
- **Error bars / noise.** Reported as empirical statistics over the 1000-sample distribution: accuracy (percent of samples satisfying

all constraints, Figs. 2, 6, 9) and the mean and standard deviation of the Hamming distance to a satisfying schedule (Figs. 3, 4, 7, 8, etc.). No device-level error model, coherence time, or chain-break statistics are reported. The authors note the 2000Q is “better approximated by a mixed quantum state evolving as an open system” (p. 5), i.e. thermal/open-system effects are acknowledged but not quantified.

- **Failure modes reported.** No completely satisfying solutions observed for $N = 3, D = 13$ and $N = 4, D = 10, 11, 12, 13, 14$ under forward annealing (p. 9); reverse annealing on randomly chosen seeds gave exactly zero accuracy for $N = 4, D = 11, 12, 13, 14$ (p. 12).
- **Classical baseline.** Not a head-to-head benchmark, but the authors report that the classical solver `qbsolv` (a tabu-search variant) found satisfying NSP solutions up to $(N, D) = (4, 160)$ with the same parameters, far beyond the sizes reachable on the annealer (conclusion, p. 13). No runtime comparison is given.

2.6 Portability flags

Features Brilliant should weigh when assessing portability to other vendors and primitives:

- **Analog quantum annealing with no digital-gate equivalent.** The entire computation is continuous-time evolution under a transverse-field Ising Hamiltonian (Eqs. 2 to 4). Porting to a gate-model device means re-expressing the problem as QAOA or digitised adiabatic evolution, which changes the resource profile completely (circuit depth, 2Q-gate count, variational outer loop) and is not a like-for-like map.
- **Reverse annealing is a D-Wave-specific control mode.** The pause-and-reverse refinement (target s , hold time h_t) has no direct gate-model analogue; any port loses this knob or must emulate it with a different mechanism.
- **Minor embedding onto sparse Chimera.** Logical couplings beyond the native 6-per-qubit degree require chains of physical qubits with chain-strength tuning, inflating the physical-qubit count well above the $N \times D$ logical size. The paper does not quantify this overhead, so a like-for-like physical footprint cannot be carried to another topology.
- **The logical Ising graph is not as sparse as the text suggests.** The shift matrix J is sparse (nearest-day couplings), but the equality-penalty terms $\lambda \sum_d (\sum_n E(n) q_{i(n,d)} - W(d))^2$ and $\gamma \sum_n (\sum_d h_1 h_2 q_{i(n,d)} - F(n))^2$ (Eq. 7) expand into cliques coupling all nurses sharing a day and all days for a given nurse. Any target hardware needs either dense connectivity or substantial embedding/SWAP overhead at these clique sizes; an all-to-all ion-trap or neutral-atom device would absorb this more cheaply than a sparse fixed-lattice fabric.
- **Analog control precision / dynamic range.** The penalty weights λ, γ, a and the fields/couplers h_i, J_{ij} must fit the device’s limited analog dynamic range (p. 5). On a different annealer the achievable precision and the consequent constraint-balance behaviour will differ.
- **Tiny instances.** The largest case is $N \times D = 56$ logical spins; nothing here stresses qubit count, so the portability question is about the primitive and the encoding, not raw scale. The classical `qbsolv` reach to $(N, D) = (4, 160)$ underlines that the demonstrated quantum sizes are well within classical range.

2.7 Caveats

- The paper is open access on arXiv (1904.12139v2) with full LaTeX source and figure files mirrored into **paper-source/**; all 13 pages and the appendix were read. No separate Supplementary Information exists to chase. A peer-reviewed version (Ikeda, Nakamura, Humble, *Sci. Rep.* **9**, 12837, 2019) carries the same content and would be the preferred citation for final figures.
- Several device-level resources are simply absent from the paper: physical qubit usage after embedding, chain lengths, chain-break rates, total QPU time, coherence times, and any per-instance success-probability error bars beyond the plotted accuracy/Hamming statistics. These are recorded as “not reported” above rather than estimated.
- The hardware specifications cross-checked against Ezratty 2025 (Chimera unit cell, coupler degree, nominal qubit count) are background context for the 2000Q generation, not numbers used by this paper; the fingerprint above is drawn solely from the paper.

3 Portability matrix