

Quantum Graph Neural Networks for Double-Sided Reconfigurable Intelligent Surface Optimization

Portability dossier - app

agQSL portability pipeline

2026-06-07

Field	Value
Slug	2026-arxiv-2604.10453-ris-optimization-qgcn
Source	arXiv
Link	https://arxiv.org/abs/2604.10453
Category	app
Triaged	2026-05-16 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

Primary: `optimisation`. Secondary: `machine learning`.

The application substrate is wireless communications (a 6G double-sided reconfigurable intelligent surface, or RIS), which is not one of the standard buckets, so flag it as the routing context: this is a telecom/wireless paper. The computational core, however, is a constrained mixed-integer non-convex optimisation, namely a max-min user-rate objective over discrete phase shifts $\phi_n \in [0, 2\pi)$ and binary element activations $a_n \in \{0, 1\}$ subject to minimum-activation and aperture constraints. The authors note NP-hardness by reduction to subset-sum. The solver is the machine-learning angle: a variational “QGCN” (quantum graph convolutional network), a parameterised quantum circuit with a graph-structured ansatz trained by gradient descent. So the work sits at the optimisation/QML boundary, with a wireless-engineering application wrapper.

1.2 Expert persona for Julien

Someone fluent in variational quantum algorithms and quantum machine learning on superconducting NISQ hardware: they should read off circuit depth, qubit count, gate set, shot budget, and gradient cost without prompting, and have calibrated intuition for what a bespoke graph-convolution ansatz (distance-weighted CPhase couplings plus R_y/R_z rotations, parameter-shift gradients) actually costs on an IBM Eagle/Heron device. They need enough wireless/RIS literacy to judge whether the dual-qubit-per-element encoding (one activation qubit, one phase qubit, with subgraph partitioning to ≤ 40 vertices, hence ≤ 80 qubits per block) is a faithful mapping of the beamforming problem, and to separate what was genuinely executed on `ibm_kyiv` from what is PennyLane state-vector or Qiskit Aer noise-model simulation. A QML practitioner who has shipped circuits to IBM Quantum, rather than a pure RF/antenna engineer, is the better fit.

1.3 Related prior work (brief bibliography)

- Verdon et al., “Quantum Graph Neural Networks,” arXiv:1909.12264 (2019). Introduces the QGNN family including QGCNN, the direct lineage of this paper’s “QGCN” primitive. <https://arxiv.org/abs/1909.12264>
- Lim, Ross, Ghosh, Vook, Gradoni, Peng, “Quantum-Assisted Combinatorial Optimization for Reconfigurable Intelligent Surfaces in Smart Electromagnetic Environments,” IEEE Trans. Antennas Propag. 72(1):147-159 (2024), [doi:10.1109/TAP.2023.3298134](https://doi.org/10.1109/TAP.2023.3298134). Same application (RIS phase configuration) via a different quantum primitive (Ising/adiabatic ground state), the natural portability foil. <https://doi.org/10.1109/TAP.2023.3298134>
- “Quantum Optimization in Wireless Communication Systems: Principles and Applications,” arXiv:2512.02468 (2025). Recent survey situating quantum optimisation across wireless workloads. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2512.02468>

- “Beyond-Diagonal Reconfigurable Intelligent Surfaces for 6G Networks: Principles, Challenges, and Quantum Horizons,” arXiv:2512.23400 (2025). Recent RIS architecture review with a quantum-methods outlook. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2512.23400>
- Schuld, Bergholm, Gogolin, Izaac, Killoran, “Evaluating analytic gradients on quantum hardware,” Phys. Rev. A 99, 032331 (2019), arXiv:1811.11184. The parameter-shift rule the paper uses and adapts for its discrete activation qubits. <https://arxiv.org/abs/1811.11184>

1.4 Difficulty estimate

medium. The full arXiv LaTeX source is in the folder (`paper-source/main.tex`, plus `main.bbl` and the result figure), so there is no paywall and the hardware fingerprint is legible: `ibm_kyiv` (127-qubit superconducting), $L = 4$ layers, 2048 shots, dual-qubit encoding, parameter-shift gradients, subgraph partitioning, with a Qiskit Aer noise model calibrated to `ibm_marrakesh` (Heron r2, 156 qubits) for the ablation. What pushes it above **low**: the ansatz is a bespoke graph-convolution construction rather than a textbook VQE/QAOA circuit; the source carries several conflicting commented-out algorithm blocks that must be reconciled against the single live Algorithm 1; and the paper interleaves a genuine hardware run (one panel, the 89%-of-noiseless convergence curve) with state-vector and noise-model simulation for the scalability and rate plots. Julien will need to disentangle executed-on-hardware from simulated before the fingerprint is trustworthy. No SI dependency.

2 Extraction

2.1 What the paper does (one paragraph)

A 6G wireless paper proposes a quantum variational solver for configuring a double-sided reconfigurable intelligent surface (RIS): a panel of N tunable reflecting elements, each switchable on or off by a PIN diode to create “virtual” element spacing, and each carrying a discrete phase shift. The design goal is to maximise the worst user’s data rate (a max-min objective) subject to a minimum-active-element count and a total-aperture constraint, which the authors note is NP-hard by reduction to subset-sum. The solver is a “quantum graph convolutional network” (QGCN): each RIS element is encoded by two qubits (one for the binary activation a_n , one for the phase ϕ_n), the RIS adjacency becomes a graph, and a parameterised circuit of distance-weighted controlled-phase couplings plus R_y/R_z rotations is trained by gradient descent using the parameter-shift rule. Large arrays are split into subgraphs of at most 40 vertices so each circuit fits current hardware. One convergence curve is run on IBM Quantum’s 127-qubit `ibm_kyiv`; the rest is simulation.

2.2 Quantum hardware used

- **Vendor / machine:** IBM Quantum / `ibm_kyiv` (127-qubit superconducting processor; Eagle-generation device). Ablation study uses a Qiskit Aer *noise model* calibrated to `ibm_marrakesh` (IBM Heron r2, 156 qubits), not the real Heron device.
- **Qubit count:** Device has 127 (Table I). The single hardware panel is run at $N = 40$ RIS elements (Fig. 2(a) title), i.e. up to $2N = 80$ qubits for one subgraph block; the paper does not state the executed qubit count explicitly.
- **Connectivity:** Not stated in the paper. `ibm_kyiv` is heavy-hex (fixed-frequency transmons, cross-resonance entangler) per the vendor substrate note; the QGCN’s CPhase couplings instead follow the RIS adjacency graph, which does not match heavy-hex.
- **Gate set:** Algorithm-level gates are CNOT, distance-weighted CPhase($w_{ij}\theta_{ij}$), R_y , R_z , with $|+\rangle$ preparation (Hadamard) and Z -basis measurement (Section IV, Algorithm 1). The paper does **not** report the device native basis or any transpilation. `ibm_kyiv`’s native set is cross-resonance / ECR + $R_z/SX/X$ (vendor note, `superconducting_qubits.tex`); CNOT and CPhase must be decomposed to ECR plus single-qubit gates.
- **Notable features leveraged:** parameter-shift-rule gradient training; per-layer expectation-value feedback $\mu_n = \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}(i)} \langle Z_j^\phi \rangle$ that sets rotation angles within the circuit; measurement of activation qubits to read out discrete decisions; subgraph partitioning ($|V_b| \leq 40$) to bound circuit width. No dynamic-circuit or explicit mid-circuit-measurement primitive is named, though the per-layer $\langle Z_j^\phi \rangle$ feedback would require one on hardware (see Portability flags).

2.3 Computational primitive

VQE-family variational circuit: a **quantum graph convolutional network (QGCN)** trained as an optimiser by parameter-shift gradient descent. One `ibm_kyiv` convergence curve is a hardware run; the rest is simulation. It is **not** QAOA, QPE, Trotterised simulation, amplitude estimation, or analog evolution. The ansatz is bespoke (graph-convolution layers over the RIS adjacency) rather than a textbook variational circuit, and training uses gradient descent with the parameter-shift rule.

2.4 Resource fingerprint

Metric	Value	Source (page / equation / SI)
Qubits (logical)	No error correction; logical = physical. 2 qubits per RIS element.	Section IV (dual-qubit encoding); no QEC mentioned
Qubits (physical)	≤ 80 per subgraph circuit ($2 V_b $, $ V_b \leq 40$); $N = 40$ in the hardware panel. Device has 127. Exact executed count not stated.	Table I (Qubits 127); Fig. 2(a) title ($N = 40$); Section IV ($ V_b \leq 40$, $2 V_b $ qubits/subgraph)
Circuit depth	Not reported as a transpiled number. Asymptotic depth $\mathcal{O}(L E)$ with $L = 4$, $ E = \mathcal{O}(N)$ for the sparse graph.	Section V (line “depth $\mathcal{O}(L E)$ ”); Section IV; Table I ($L = 4$)
2Q-gate count (total)	Not reported. Per subgraph per iteration: $ V_b $ activation-phase CNOTs + $L E_b $ CPhase gates. No total given.	Algorithm 1; Section IV
Measurement shots	2048 ($S = 2048$).	Table III caption; Table II caption
Classical loop iter.	Hardware converges within 30 iterations (to 89% of noiseless); Fig. 2(a) x-axis runs to 50. Ablation convergence epoch 13 ± 9 (full QGCN). Max iterations T not pinned in the live text.	Section V (line on 89%/30 iterations); Table II; Algorithm 1 (loop $t = 1..T$)
Wall-clock runtime	“Opt. time 18.3 ms” listed as a system parameter; not described as measured hardware wall-clock (excludes queue / transpile / shot time).	Table I

For any row marked “not reported” the paper does not state the number; the asymptotic and per-block expressions are the paper’s own and are cited as such.

2.5 Assumptions and results

- **Claims.** The QGCN jointly optimises phase and activation/spacing for a double-sided RIS; on `ibm_kyiv` it reaches 89% of noiseless-simulation performance within 30 iterations, converging faster than classical baselines (Fig. 2(a)). It beats a classical GNN on the identical graph topology by +0.38 bps/Hz at $N = 60$, a gap claimed to widen with array size. Per-iteration cost is $\mathcal{O}(S L |E|)$ with implicit (no explicit $\mathcal{O}(N^2)$) memory, versus $\mathcal{O}(N^2 K)$ time and $\mathcal{O}(N^2)$ memory for the classical GNN (Table III).
- **Error bars / noise assumptions.** Simulated panels use 50 Monte Carlo runs at 95% CI (Table I, Fig. 2(b,c)). The ablation uses 5 Monte Carlo runs at 95% CI (Table II). The hardware curve is reported only as “89% of noiseless” with no stated confidence interval. The ablation’s Aer noise model assumes single-qubit depolarising error 0.1%, two-qubit depolarising error 0.7% (applied to CX and CP gates), and symmetric readout bit-flip 1.5%, calibrated to `ibm_marrakesh` (Heron r2) specifications.
- **Classical baselines.** Gradient descent, genetic algorithm, particle swarm optimisation, block coordinate descent, GNN, and DNN, plus continuous-phase, discrete-phase, random-phase, and fixed-spacing references.

2.6 Portability flags

- **Bespoke graph-convolution ansatz, not a standard primitive.** The circuit is distance-weighted $\text{CPhase}(w_{ij}\theta_{ij})$ over RIS-graph edges, activation-phase CNOTs, and R_y/R_z rotations. There is no QAOA/VQE template to lean on; reproducing it on another stack means re-implementing the ansatz, not swapping a library call.
- **Graph couplings versus device connectivity.** CPhase acts on every RIS adjacency edge $(i, j) \in E_b$, but `ibm_kyiv` is heavy-hex (low degree). The paper reports no routing or SWAP overhead, so the stated $\mathcal{O}(L|E|)$ depth is a logical-circuit figure that will inflate on heavy-hex hardware.
- **CPhase is not native on the anchor device.** `ibm_kyiv` (Eagle) entangles via cross-resonance / ECR, so each CPhase and CNOT decomposes into ECR plus single-qubit gates. The ablation noise model applies a single 0.7% error directly to “CX and CP gates”, which is optimistic for an ECR-decomposed CPhase on Eagle. On Heron (`ibm_marrakesh`) the tunable-coupler CZ is closer to native, so the noise model and the actual hardware (`ibm_kyiv`) are on different substrates.
- **Width ceiling from dual-qubit encoding.** Two qubits per element gives $2N$ qubits globally; the method only fits NISQ via subgraph partitioning to $|V_b| \leq 40$ (≤ 80 qubits/block). Any portability story must carry the partition-and-merge step, which the paper concedes introduces boundary approximation.
- **Per-layer expectation feedback needs mid-circuit access.** Rotation angles use $\mu_n = \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}(i)} \langle Z_j^\phi \rangle$, the neighbours’ phase-qubit expectations, computed *between* layers (Algorithm 1; U_S in Section IV). Reading $\langle Z_j^\phi \rangle$ mid-circuit on hardware requires either mid-circuit measurement (collapsing the phase qubit) or a separate estimation circuit per layer. The paper does not say how this is obtained on `ibm_kyiv`; it reads naturally as a state-vector-simulator construct. This is the most consequential feasibility flag for

the hardware claim.

- **Parameter-shift gradient multiplies the shot budget.** Each of $|\theta| = 3L|V_b|$ parameters needs two circuit evaluations per step ($2|\theta|$ circuits per iteration, Table III). This is hardware-agnostic in principle but scales the 2048-shot cost by $2|\theta|$ per training step.
- **Discrete-activation gradient is non-standard.** The parameter-shift rule is adapted for the binary activation qubits (measure a_n in the forward pass, then a $\pm\pi/2$ finite difference on θ_n^a). This is an approximation, not the exact analytic-gradient rule, and would need validation on any other backend.

2.7 Caveats

- **Access.** Full arXiv LaTeX source is present (`paper-source/main.tex`, `main.bbl`, result figure); no paywall, no SI dependency. The fingerprint is drawn from the source, cross-checked against the rendered result figure.
- **Hardware versus simulation split.** Only Fig. 2(a) (the convergence curve at $N = 40$) is genuine `ibm_kyiv` execution. Fig. 2(b) (UE density) and Fig. 2(c) (scalability over $N = 20$ to 100) are PennyLane state-vector simulation with 50 Monte Carlo runs. Note a labelling conflict: panel (c)’s legend marks its QGCN curve “Adaptive QGCN (Quantum HW)”, and the TeX figure caption’s sub-labels (“(b) Scalability... (c) Minimum user rate...”) do not match the rendered panel titles (“(b) UE Density... (c) Scalability”). The text caption’s “simulated” tag for (b) and (c) is treated as authoritative; the “Quantum HW” legend on (c) should not be read as a hardware run, since N up to 100 would need up to 200 qubits.
- **Live algorithm versus prose.** The executed method is the single live Algorithm 1 (parameter-shift gradients, CPhase edge couplings, a combined $R_z(\gamma)R_y(\alpha + \beta\mu_n)$ rotation). The descriptive equations in Section IV additionally show a graph-state-forming CNOT_{ij}^ϕ over edges and a separate spacing rotation U_S that the live algorithm folds into CPhase and the combined rotation. Several commented-out algorithm variants in the source, including one describing SPSA training over $T = 20$ iterations, are dead code and were not used; the live method trains by parameter shift, not SPSA.
- **Unreported on hardware.** Transpiled depth, total two-qubit gate count, and a measured runtime breakdown are not given. “Opt. time 18.3 ms” (Table I) is a model parameter for the feasibility inequality, not a reported `ibm_kyiv` wall-clock.

3 Portability matrix