

Solving non-native combinatorial optimization problems using hybrid quantum-classical algorithms

Portability dossier - app

agQSL portability pipeline

2026-06-07

Field	Value
Slug	2026-arxiv-2403.03153-solving-non-native-combinatorial-optimization-problems
Source	arXiv
Link	https://arxiv.org/abs/2403.03153
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	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

optimisation (primary). The paper is squarely combinatorial optimisation: it works three textbook NP-hard graph problems (MaxCut, Max k -Cut, maximum independent set) end to end. There is a methodological lean towards sampling-based heuristics (the “quantum device as variational sampler” abstraction explicitly admits Boltzmann machines and graph neural networks as drop-in classical replacements), but no application domain other than optimisation is genuinely exercised. No secondary domain worth flagging.

1.2 Expert persona for Julien

A quantum-optimisation specialist who is fluent in both analog neutral-atom Rydberg dynamics (QuEra Aquila) and the classical post-processing toolbox (greedy flip, spectral clustering, cluster-update simulated annealing with parallel tempering). They should have calibrated intuition about analog ansatz controls, quench time t , detuning Δ , Rabi drive Ω , blockade radius R_b versus lattice spacing, and about shot economics on analog hardware (this work runs as few as ~ 10 shots, typically 100, with COBYLA converging in ~ 30 iterations and ~ 3000 total shots). Crucially, they need to separate what is hardware-native here (the Rydberg blockade MIS encoding) from the deliberately non-native parts that are pushed onto the classical co-processor, because the paper’s whole “comparative advantage” framing rests on the classical “no-quantum limit” of each ansatz.

1.3 Related prior work (brief bibliography)

- Ebadi et al., “Quantum optimization of maximum independent set using Rydberg atom arrays”, arXiv:[2202.09372](#), DOI [10.1126/science.abo6587](#). Direct predecessor on the same hardware lineage; this paper retroactively reads it as a type-1 post-processing NNHA and extends it with a type-3 reservoir step.
- Wurtz, Bylinskii et al., “Aquila: QuEra’s 256-qubit neutral-atom quantum computer”, arXiv:[2306.11727](#). Platform whitepaper for the device used in the Max k -Cut and MIS demonstrations; the source for hardware fingerprint numbers Julien will need.
- Pichler et al., “Quantum optimization for maximum independent set using Rydberg atom arrays”, arXiv:[1808.10816](#). Theoretical basis for encoding MIS on unit-disk graphs via Rydberg blockade.
- Farhi, Goldstone, Gutmann, “A Quantum Approximate Optimization Algorithm”, arXiv:[1411.4028](#). The base QAOA ansatz enhanced in the type-1 MaxCut example.
- Marwaha, “Local classical MAX-CUT algorithm outperforms $p = 2$ QAOA on high-girth regular graphs”, arXiv:[2101.05513](#). Classical-baseline result motivating the paper’s “comparative advantage” discipline.
- In-corpus cross-vendor comparison: “Benchmarking Quantum Optimization for the Maximum-Cut Problem on a Superconducting Quantum Computer”, arXiv:[2404.17579](#) (dossier [2026-arxiv-2404.17579-benchmarking-quantum-optimization-maximum-cut-problem](#)). Same MaxCut application on a different hardware substrate and gate-model QAOA; a ready portability contrast point already in the dossier set.

1.4 Difficulty estimate

medium. The paper is fully readable: the LaTeX source (`paper-source/main.tex`), all five figures, and the `.bbl` are already in the folder, and it is an open arXiv preprint with no paywall. The hardware fingerprint numbers Julien needs are stated in the body (lattice spacing $4.8\text{ }\mu\text{m}$, $\Omega = 15\text{ rad}/\mu\text{s}$, $R_b \approx 6.7\text{ }\mu\text{m}$, $t \in [0, 4]\text{ }\mu\text{s}$, $\Delta \in [0, 15]\text{ rad}/\mu\text{s}$ for the clustering quench; $t_{\text{max}} = 3.80\text{ }\mu\text{s}$, $\Delta_{\text{min}} = -13.47$, $\Delta_{\text{max}} = 41.95\text{ rad}/\mu\text{s}$ for the MIS anneal), so no SI excavation is required for the core extraction. What lifts this above **low** is breadth rather than depth: three worked examples, each pairing a different quantum ansatz (fixed-angle QAOA, Rydberg quench, adiabatic state preparation) with a different classical routine and a distinct quantum/classical split. Julien will need to fingerprint each separately and be careful that two of the three demonstrations actually run on Aquila while the MaxCut example is state-vector emulation only. Reproduction notebooks are referenced on GitHub but are not needed to complete the extraction.

2 Extraction

2.1 What the paper does (one paragraph)

The paper proposes “non-native hybrid algorithms” (NNHA): a framework where a quantum device is used as a *variational sampler* rather than a direct solver. Instead of measurement bit strings encoding solutions directly, the bit strings become a *resource* fed to a classical routine that computes the actual answer. The authors classify three flavours by how the classical step uses the samples: type 1 “post-processes” individual bit strings as warm starts, type 2 uses correlation functions as a “quantum hint”, and type 3 uses the whole measurement distribution as a “reservoir”. They demonstrate three textbook NP-hard graph problems: MaxCut (type 1, QAOA + greedy flip, run only in state-vector emulation); Max k -Cut (type 2, Rydberg quench + spectral clustering, run on hardware); and maximum independent set (types 1 and 3, Rydberg adiabatic anneal + cluster-update simulated annealing, run on hardware). The headline metric is “comparative advantage”: does adding the quantum sampler beat the same algorithm’s classically-sampled “no-quantum limit”? Results are mixed and instance-dependent.

2.2 Quantum hardware used

- **Vendor / machine:** QuEra Computing / Aquila, accessed through Amazon Braket. (Two of the three demos run on hardware; the MaxCut demo is emulation only.)
- **Qubit count:** Aquila is a 256-atom device ([arXiv:2306.11727](#)). The two hardware demos use one atom per graph vertex, but the exact atom counts are **not reported** in the main text (see Resource fingerprint and Caveats).
- **Connectivity:** Programmable 2D atom positions; interactions are distance-dependent van der Waals ($\propto 1/r^6$). The effective problem graph is the *unit-disk graph* defined by the blockade radius. The paper restricts both hardware demos to “King’s subgraphs” (2D-geometric unit-disk instances) with 30% random vertex dropout. Non-geometric graphs have no native embedding.
- **Gate set:** No digital gate set. The native control surface is the analog Rydberg Hamiltonian with a **global** Rabi drive $\Omega(t)$ and a **global** detuning $\Delta(t)$ applied to all atoms simultaneously; the problem structure is encoded in atom geometry, not gates.
- **Notable features leveraged:** Rydberg blockade (encodes the MIS independent-set hard constraint physically); programmable atom geometry as the problem-encoding mechanism; nonequilibrium quench dynamics (ballistic / diffusive correlation spread) as the type-2 “quantum hint”; piecewise-linear adiabatic state preparation for the type-3 MIS reservoir.

The standard Aquila analog model (written here from the Aquila whitepaper and the local substrate note; the paper itself reports only endpoint parameters and defers the explicit schedule to its code notebooks) is

$$H(t) = \frac{\Omega(t)}{2} \sum_i \sigma_i^x - \Delta(t) \sum_i \hat{n}_i + \sum_{i < j} V_{ij} \hat{n}_i \hat{n}_j, \quad V_{ij} = \frac{C_6}{|\vec{r}_i - \vec{r}_j|^6}.$$

2.3 Computational primitive

Analog evolution (neutral-atom Rydberg dynamics) is the primitive for both hardware demos: a nonequilibrium *quench* for Max k -Cut and an *adiabatic* / *quantum-annealing* state preparation for MIS. The third, emulation-only demo uses **QAOA** (digital, fixed-angle, state-vector simulated). In all cases the quantum step is deliberately a *variational sampler*, with the actual solving done by classical routines (greedy flip, k -means spectral clustering, cluster-update simulated annealing with Metropolis acceptance).

2.4 Resource fingerprint

Metric	Value	Source (page / equation / SI)
Qubits (logical)	MaxCut: 16 (one per vertex, emulated). Max k -Cut & MIS: one atom per graph vertex, count not reported in text (Fig. 3 / Fig. 4 imply \$ \$100+ and \$ \$150–190 vertices respectively, but the authors do not enumerate).	§III (256 random 3-regular 16-vertex graphs); §IV, §V (King’s subgraphs, count not stated)
Qubits (physical)	Aquila device cap is 256 atoms; exact atoms used in the two hardware demos not reported .	Aquila ref arXiv:2306.11727 ; §IV, §V
Circuit depth	Not applicable; analog evolution. Reported as evolution time instead: quench $t \in [0, 4] \mu s$ (§IV); anneal $t_{\max} = 3.80 \mu s$ (§V). Emulated QAOA uses p layers, swept to $p \gtrsim 6$ (Fig. 2).	§IV, §V, Fig. 2
2Q-gate count (total)	Not applicable (analog, no digital gates). For the emulated QAOA, $2p$ layers of $ E $ ZZ -phase terms, not tabulated by the authors.	§III

Metric	Value	Source (page / equation / SI)
Measurement shots	Typically 100 shots; “as few as ~ 10 ” found to work; ~ 3000 total shots to converge (general methods claim). Max k -Cut: $M = 100$ per ansatz across 3 ansatzes.	§II.C, §IV
Classical loop iter.	~ 30 optimizer iterations (general methods claim, COBYLA). Hardware demos instead used Bayesian optimization (classical λ weights) plus a bounded stochastic search (quantum t, Δ).	§II.C, §IV, §V
Wall-clock runtime	Not reported.	n/a

For any row marked “not reported” / “not applicable”, the paper does not state a number or the metric does not apply to an analog protocol.

2.5 Assumptions and results

- **MaxCut (type 1, emulation):** On an ensemble of 256 random 3-regular 16-vertex graphs, greedy post-processing of fixed-angle QAOA samples is by construction $\geq$ base QAOA, and rises above the classical $p = 0$ limit at $p \sim 4$ (claimed comparative advantage; heuristic, ensemble-averaged). The classical $p = 0$ limit alone already beats base QAOA up to $p \sim 6$ (§III, Fig. 2).
- **Max k -Cut (type 2, Aquila):** For a representative King’s subgraph and $k = 3$, the hybrid (quantum) spectral-clustering pipeline produces more optimal solutions than its no-quantum limit (random feature vectors). Claimed as a clear comparative advantage but explicitly *not* quantum advantage (§IV, Fig. 3). Quantum parameters: lattice spacing $4.8 \mu\text{m}$, $\Omega = 15.0 \text{ rad}/\mu\text{s}$, $R_b \approx 6.7 \mu\text{m}$, $t \in [0, 4] \mu\text{s}$, $\Delta \in [0, 15] \text{ rad}/\mu\text{s}$.
- **MIS, Ebadi22 re-reading (type 1, Aquila):** For the studied instance the hybrid gives mean independent-set size 44.282 vs 45.178 classical (performance ratio 0.9801): the quantum samples *hurt* here; the classical limit finds a size-47 MIS with 1.80% probability that the hybrid never finds (§V.A, Fig. 4).
- **MIS cluster update (type 3, Aquila):** With variationally optimized $t_{\text{max}} = 3.80 \mu\text{s}$, $\Delta_{\text{min}} = -13.47 \text{ rad}/\mu\text{s}$, $\Delta_{\text{max}} = 41.95$

rad/ μ s, the hybrid gives mean size 45.72 vs 45.48 classical (ratio 1.005) and an equal-or-better sample with 83% probability, a slim comparative advantage that converges faster, though the classical limit still occasionally finds the size-47 MIS (§V.B, Fig. 5).

- **Error bars / noise:** No explicit error bars or coherence budget given; distributions are shown as violin / histogram plots over instances and shots. The authors note decoherence, SPAM, and diabatic errors mean the prepared state is not the true ground state, which motivates the classical clean-up.
- **Classical baseline:** The entire framework is built around the “no-quantum limit” baseline (replace the quantum sampler with a trivially-sampleable classical distribution). This *is* the comparison; there is no separate best-in-class classical solver benchmark, and the authors stress these are templates, not competitive solvers.

2.6 Portability flags

- **Problem graph is encoded in physical atom geometry** via van der Waals interactions, so both hardware demos require **2D-geometric unit-disk (King’s-subgraph) instances** (explicit constraint, §IV). Non-geometric or long-range graphs have no native embedding on this substrate.
- **Rydberg blockade provides the MIS independent-set constraint physically**, with no digital-gate equivalent. A gate-model port must impose the hard constraint via penalty terms, 1-hot encodings, or post-selection, all with qubit/depth overhead (the paper cites this overhead as a motivation).
- **Global-only analog control** (single $\Omega(t)$ and $\Delta(t)$ for all atoms; only ~ 2 variational parameters per quench/anneal). This minimal ansatz is why ~ 10 – 100 shots and ~ 30 iterations suffice; the authors explicitly expect a general digital ansatz (hardware-efficient / UCC) to need far more iterations.
- **Type-2 “quantum hint” relies on coherent quench correlation spread** (ballistic/diffusive light-cone of the connected correlation function). A gate-model port would need Trotterised time evolution of the Rydberg Hamiltonian to reproduce the same correlations.
- **The non-native parts are deliberately offloaded to a hardware-agnostic classical co-processor** (greedy flip, k -means spectral clustering, sandpile cluster-update simulated annealing, COBYLA / Bayesian / stochastic outer loop). Porting effort is concentrated in the analog Rydberg kernel; the classical pipeline carries across substrates unchanged.
- **Native interaction is $1/r^6$ van der Waals, not a tunable two-qubit gate.** Any digital substrate must synthesize the analog evolution rather than call a native primitive; the cross-corpus superconducting MaxCut QAOA dossier (2026-arxiv-2404.17579) is the natural contrast point Brillant can use.

2.7 Caveats

- Open arXiv preprint (arXiv:2403.03153), full text and all five figures available locally via the TeX source; no paywall, no SI excavation needed.
- **The MaxCut demonstration (§III) is state-vector emulation, not hardware.** Only the Max k -Cut (§IV) and MIS (§V)

demos ran on Aquila. Do not attribute the 16-qubit / 256-graph MaxCut numbers to hardware.

- **Exact atom counts for the two hardware demos are not stated in the main text.** The figure-implied scale (\$ \$100+ vertices for Max k -Cut from the cut-edge distribution of \$ \$240–260; \$ \$150–190 vertices for MIS from independent-set sizes of 44–47) is my inference from the figures, not a reported value. Treat as order-of-magnitude only.
- The explicit analog Hamiltonian and the full quench/adiabatic schedules are deferred by the authors to their GitHub code notebooks (GitHub24), which were not consulted for this extraction. The paper reports endpoint parameters only; the Hamiltonian above is supplied from the Aquila whitepaper and the local substrate note, not quoted from this paper.
- No wall-clock runtimes and no per-demo total shot counts are given beyond $M = 100$ per ansatz (§IV) and the general ~ 3000 -shot convergence figure (§II.C).

3 Portability matrix