

# Quantum Mini-Apps: A Framework for Developing and Benchmarking Quantum-HPC Applications

Nishant Saurabh   
n.saurabh@uu.nl  
Utrecht University  
Utrecht, NL

Pradeep Mantha   
pradeepm66@gmail.com  
Ludwig Maximilian University  
Munich, Germany

Florian J. Kiwit   
f.kiwit@campus.lmu.de  
BMW Group, Ludwig Maximilian  
University  
Munich, Germany

Shantenu Jha   
shantenu.jha@rutgers.edu  
Rutgers University  
New Brunswick, New Jersey, USA

Andre Luckow   
andre.luckow@ifl.lmu.de  
BMW Group, Ludwig Maximilian  
University  
Munich, Germany

## ABSTRACT

With the increasing maturity and scale of quantum hardware and its integration into HPC systems, there is a need to develop robust techniques for developing, characterizing, and benchmarking quantum-HPC applications and middleware systems. This requires a better understanding of interaction, coupling, and common execution patterns between quantum and classical workload tasks and components. This paper identifies six quantum-HPC execution motifs—recurring execution patterns characterized by distinct coupling and interaction modes. These motifs provide the basis for a suite of quantum mini-apps – simplified application prototypes that encapsulate essential characteristics of production systems. To support these developments, we introduce a mini-app framework that offers the necessary abstractions for creating and executing mini-apps across heterogeneous quantum-HPC infrastructure, making it a valuable tool for performance characterizations and middleware development.

## CCS CONCEPTS

• **Computer systems organization** → **Quantum computing**; • **Hardware** → **Quantum computation**; • **Software and its engineering** → **Application specific development environments**.

## KEYWORDS

Quantum computing, HPC, mini-app

### ACM Reference Format:

Nishant Saurabh , Pradeep Mantha , Florian J. Kiwit , Shantenu Jha , and Andre Luckow . 2024. Quantum Mini-Apps: A Framework for Developing and Benchmarking Quantum-HPC Applications. In *Workshop on High Performance and Quantum Computing Integration (HPQCI '24)*, June 3–4, HPQCI '24, June 3–4, 2024, Pisa, Italy

Permission to make digital or hard copies of all or part of this work for personal or classroom use is granted without fee provided that copies are not made or distributed for profit or commercial advantage and that copies bear this notice and the full citation on the first page. Copyrights for components of this work owned by others than the author(s) must be honored. Abstracting with credit is permitted. To copy otherwise, or republish, to post on servers or to redistribute to lists, requires prior specific permission and/or a fee. Request permissions from [permissions@acm.org](mailto:permissions@acm.org).

HPQCI '24, June 3–4, 2024, Pisa, Italy

© 2024 Copyright held by the owner/author(s). Publication rights licensed to ACM.  
ACM ISBN 979-8-4007-0643-1/24/06  
<https://doi.org/10.1145/3659996.3660036>

2024, Pisa, Italy. ACM, New York, NY, USA, 9 pages. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3659996.3660036>


## 1 INTRODUCTION

Quantum algorithms might outperform classical algorithms in the future for certain tasks by requiring fewer computational steps [19]. Quantum algorithms are particularly relevant for high-performance computing (HPC) applications across various scientific and industrial domains [2, 5]. For example, in materials science, quantum computing offers novel ways to explore molecular interactions and properties at the atomic level [2].

However, current quantum computers are limited in their capabilities. Noisy Intermediate Scale Quantum Computers (NISQ) [52] are particularly limited regarding qubit quality, number, and gate depth. Thus, increasingly, efforts have shifted from NISQ to Fault-tolerant Quantum Computers (FTQC) [47]. NISQ and FTQC require developing hybrid systems that merge quantum and classical computing capabilities. For example, NISQ variational algorithms and FTQC's quantum error correction routines combine quantum with classical computation. Specifically, quantum processing units (QPUs) must be effectively integrated at the hardware and software level into HPC systems, forming effective *quantum-HPC systems* [2, 24].

As quantum-HPC systems and applications grow in complexity and scale, there is a need to design robust techniques for their benchmarking, characterization, and development. However, specific characteristics of quantum algorithms, e.g., the interactions of quantum and classical components, the integration of algorithms in workflows, and execution, are poorly understood. Further, diverse quantum hardware systems, e.g., superconducting, ion-trap, and neutral atom-based systems, make it challenging to optimize applications and workflows. For example, these different qubit modalities have inherently different connectivity, noise, error, and decoherence properties. On the software level, a significant challenge lies in integrating quantum primitives into algorithms that combine quantum and classical components. Such algorithms eventually form part of larger workflows, including data conversion, encoding, pre-, and post-processing.

Given the complex nature of quantum systems, a quantum-HPC middleware system will be crucial for the efficient development of quantum-HPC applications. The software stack for quantum-HPC is



**Figure 1: Quantum-HPC integration types, execution motifs, and mini-app conceptual stages**

and will remain fragmented, specializing in specific hardware, algorithms, and applications. Many crucial questions must be addressed when developing such systems: What are common application scenarios? How are quantum and classical components coupled? How can the diverse software and hardware stack be better integrated, enabling higher abstractions while achieving optimal performance? What are common execution patterns? How can these components be mapped to classical and quantum processing elements, including quantum simulations? How can the scalability and performance of quantum applications be characterized and optimized? How can quantum applications be conceptualized and prototyped efficiently?

To address the aforementioned challenges effectively, we propose the *quantum mini-app* framework to conceptualize quantum solutions. Mini-apps [42] are simplified versions of complex computational applications replicating these systems’ key components and performance characteristics. Existing mini-apps [13, 35] typically focus on classical systems and do not fully encompass the unique properties of quantum-HPC applications and middleware systems. The design of our quantum mini-apps is based on a comprehensive analysis of current algorithms and applications, from which we systematically extract and categorize recurring execution patterns into so-called execution motifs. These execution motifs capture essential properties of quantum-HPC applications, e. g., the interaction and coupling between classical and quantum components. Further, we design and develop a mini-app framework that simplifies the creation of mini-apps and their integration into existing quantum HPC, cloud systems, and simulators.

This paper’s main contributions and structure are as follows. We survey different application scenarios and execution patterns to develop six motifs in section 2.1. The *quantum mini-app* framework allows the rapid iteration of application prototypes and motifs and is presented in Section 3. We demonstrate the framework using an example mini-app for circuit execution in Section 4. Section 5 discusses the related works on mini-apps and quantum benchmarks. Section 6 summarizes the paper and discusses possible future work.

## 2 QUANTUM-HPC INTEGRATION TYPES AND EXECUTION MOTIFS

This section lays the foundation for the design of the quantum mini-apps. After describing the mini-app development stages and the main quantum-HPC integration types, we introduce the concept of an execution motif, i.e., re-occurring patterns in integrating classical and quantum components.

### 2.1 Stages of Developing Quantum Mini-Apps

Figure 2 shows the conceptual stages of a quantum mini-app. It involves three stages as follows:

(i) The first stage aims to understand the interaction between classical HPC and quantum components and identify their *integration and coupling patterns* [58]. Identifying quantum-HPC integration strategies can help estimate communication frequency and time-sensitivity between diverse task components and benchmark their orchestrated resource usage, i.e., the proportion of time utilized by computations on HPC and quantum hardware and simulators.

(ii) The second stage involves *generating execution motifs*, which are fine-grained execution patterns, i. e., a unique workflow configuration that combines different modes of coupling between quantum and classical components and captures a particular relevant pattern (adapted from [33]). Execution motifs can help benchmark and optimize task mapping and distribution across *processing elements* (PEs), where a PE is a CPU core, a GPU, or other computational units within specialized processors or accelerators capable of executing computing tasks.

(iii) The third stage focuses on *creating quantum mini-app* that encapsulates one or more high-level execution motifs emulating unique quantum-HPC workload patterns based on their interaction types within and outside QPU coherence time. Developed mini-apps can further utilize one or more quantum benchmarks [37, 40] to characterize the orchestrated execution patterns and further evaluate and *refine* the mini-app. Integrating quantum mini-apps to such benchmarks is part of our future work. Next, we discuss three integration types and six execution motifs for quantum-HPC systems.

### 2.2 Quantum-HPC Integration Types

Understanding how the various application components interact is crucial to developing representative mini-apps and their performance characterization. Quantum and classical coupling are the interactions between application components within and outside the quantum system. In [58], we identified three integration patterns.

(i) *HPC-for-Quantum*: This pattern emphasizes using classical HPC techniques to enhance quantum computing. It includes optimizing low-level system operations such as input/output, dynamic circuits [15], error mitigation [23], and effectively utilizing quantum processing units (QPUs). This approach is crucial for real-time interactions between HPC and quantum tasks, focusing on low-level circuit developers and leveraging HPC techniques like parallelization and high-performance networking.

(ii) *Quantum-in-HPC*: This pattern integrates a medium-coupled quantum component with a classical HPC component. Unlike the HPC-for-Quantum pattern, classical and quantum computation integration does not occur in real-time. This pattern typically encompasses scenarios where quantum tasks are orchestrated by a classical HPC system, with the quantum component providing acceleration for specific types of tasks. Examples of Quantum-in-HPC [58] pattern involves accelerating ground state energy estimation in a molecular system or linear equation solving [9, 11].

(iii) *Quantum-about-HPC*: A quantum-enhanced kernel is integrated into a broader quantum-classical workflow in this integration

pattern. The quantum component is added without significantly modifying the HPC application structure. This approach involves looser coupling than other patterns [58], and the main application control typically resides in the classical system. The quantum component acts as a specialized tool within the workflow, often requiring additional input or output processing to be effective [1, 30].

## 2.3 Execution Motifs

We adapt the concept of execution motifs [10] to the quantum-HPC domain, describing recurring patterns of interaction and coupling between classical and quantum components. Specifically, we propose six representative motifs covering three integration types: HPC-for-Quantum, Quantum-in-HPC, and Quantum-about-HPC. We describe quantum-HPC execution motifs focusing primarily on interaction and coupling characteristics:

(i) *Interaction*: describe how quantum and HPC components interact. These include the movement and management of data, the control and coordination of processes, and the capacity for real-time interactions between quantum and HPC elements. Quantum and classical tasks can be run concurrently in full or partial concurrent or sequential modes.

(ii) *Coupling* refers to the characteristics of the employed execution strategies, e.g., simultaneous operations (concurrency), the diversity of components (heterogeneity), and the variability in how the workflow is structured (dynamism). The type of coupling between quantum and classical tasks is essential for quantum-HPC applications, e.g., within or outside the coherence time [2]. This work considers three types of coupling between quantum and classical tasks. Tasks with strict time-sensitive interactions within QPU coherence time fall into the tightly-coupled category, while time-sensitive interactions of tasks outside the QPU coherence time are medium-coupled. The third coupling type, i. e., loosely-coupled, refers to tasks with infrequent interactions and involves seamless integration of interdependent classical and quantum task components.

Table 1 provides a detailed mapping of interaction and coupling patterns for each motif below and their benefits in designing and refining quantum-HPC systems. Further, we investigate the middleware capabilities required to support these.

(i) *Circuit execution*: This motif can be found in the HPC-for-Quantum integration type. Utilizing loosely and medium-coupled task parallelism is important when optimizing the execution of quantum circuits using parallelism and multiple processing elements (PEs) (both classical and quantum), e.g., for sampling and computing estimation value. Another example is parameterized circuits, which require executing the same circuit using different parameters. Different PEs can be used to improve the estimation, e.g., of expectation values. Another form of parallelism is the partition of different terms of a Hamiltonian across multiple PEs. Abstraction and tools for supporting this parallelism exist on different levels, e.g., Qiskit Aer provides a multi-processing and Dask executor on the backend device level [53], Qiskit Serverless on the middleware level.

(ii) *Distributed state vector simulation* is another motif found in the HPC-for-Quantum category. It utilizes multiple processing elements, i. e., cores, nodes, and GPU, to benchmark the computational

and memory needs of quantum simulations by partitioning and distributing the state vector, i. e., the state of a quantum system. In this motif, coupling is tight and occurs between classical tasks. Updates to the state vector are done by multiplying a unitary matrix. This computation is conducted concurrently. Depending on the type of operation, only local or non-local qubits, i. e., qubits placed on different processing elements, can be affected. Operations on local qubits can be performed without data exchange, while non-local or global qubits may require significant data movement. Thus, MPI is commonly used to facilitate the communication between tasks. Examples of distributed state vectors include QULAC (CPU/GPU) [32] and cuQuantum’s cuStateVec (GPU) [26]. Further, different programming frameworks utilize cuQuantum to provide a distributed state vector simulation, e. g., PennyLane [7] and Qiskit [14].

(iii) *Circuit cutting* emerged as a technique to mitigate the availability of a limited number of qubits on current QPUs by partitioning circuits onto multiple QPUs [6, 50]. For example, Tomesh et al. [62] utilize circuit cutting for implementing a distributed optimization algorithm for the maximum independent set problem. Different cutting techniques have been proposed. Coupling between tasks can occur via a classical network (or in the future via a quantum network). Depending on the type of circuit cutting, the workload tasks can be distributed across QPU, and classical resources (e.g., simulated QPUs on CPU/GPU). For example, Clifford-based cutting [60] partitions circuits into efficiently simulatable Clifford circuits that can be run on classical resources, and the remaining non-Clifford circuits run on QPUs.

(iv) *Error Mitigation*: This motif could simulate error mitigation techniques in quantum computing, providing insights into the effectiveness of various error mitigation strategies on different quantum hardware. Many strategies rely on executing circuit ensembles on both multiple QPUs and simulators. For example, Ravi et al. [56] utilize classically simulated Clifford canaries to improve the fidelity of the quantum circuit execution.

(v) *Variational Quantum Algorithms (VQA)*, such as the Variational Quantum Eigensolver (VQE) [51] and the Quantum Approximate Optimization Algorithm (QAOA) [27], interleave (and potentially concurrently execute) quantum and classical components to solve optimization, machine learning, linear algebra, factoring or chemistry problems [11].

Depending on the algorithm, the amount of classical/quantum computing and interleaving between both can vary significantly. For example, in vanilla VQE and QAOA, classical computing primarily concerns data preparation, post-processing, and optimization. More advanced algorithms, e. g., VQE with information sharing [59] and quantum machine learning (QML), utilize more complex or multiple cost functions requiring more classical computing. QGANs, e. g., utilize a complex GAN cost function and can benefit from gradient-based optimizers, thus leading to increased classical computational requirements [57]. Accelerators, e. g., GPUs, for parallel gradient computation and backpropagation, can significantly enhance performance [36]. In these cases, sharing resources for ML and quantum computation, such as the GPU memory for quantum simulation and ML back-propagation tasks, is often necessary.

Usually, these stages of variational algorithms, i. e., state preparation, quantum circuit execution, measurement, expectation value computation, and classical optimization, are executed sequentially.

**Table 1: Mapping quantum-HPC execution motifs based on the interaction and coupling patterns between quantum and classical tasks and components. Further, it investigates the middleware capabilities required to support this motif.**

Motif	Interaction	Coupling	Example	Middleware Capabilities
<i>Circuit Execution</i>	Concurrent computation for different parameters	Loosely coupled, homogeneous tasks	Qiskit Estimator/Sampler, Qiskit Aer with Dask [53]	Workload management across heterogeneous resources
<i>Distributed State Vector Simulation</i>	Concurrent computation of state vector updates & its synchronization across all tasks	Tightly coupled static and homogeneous tasks	Large-scale quantum simulations, e. g., cuQuantum [26]	Integration with HPC technologies, e. g., MPI, cuQuantum, ROCm
<i>Circuit Cutting</i>	Concurrent execution & reconstruction of tasks across QPUs.	Medium-to-tight coupling within/outside coherence time, task heterogeneity depends on circuit cutting algorithm	Qiskit Circuit Knitting Toolbox [6], PennyLane Circuit Cutting [66]	Optimal partitioning & placements of tasks/cuts on available (simulated) QPUs for balanced workload.
<i>Error Mitigation</i>	Loosely coupled execution of multiple circuit variants on PEs & results aggregation	Loosely coupled	Qiskit Runtime Error Mitigation [54]	Dynamic allocation & adaptation to right mix of classical & quantum resources
<i>Variational Quantum Algorithms (VQA)</i>	Concurrent execution of classical and quantum resources & Quantum components	Coupling outside coherence window for heterogeneous tasks, e. g., interleaved ML & QC parts sharing GPU	QAOA [27], VQE [51], VQE IS [59], QGAN [57], QuGen [55]	Collocate & balance quantum and classical resources
<i>Multistage Pipelines</i>	Encapsulated stages & its contained transitions with control & data flow	Heterogeneous & varying resource demands between stages	QML workflow MD workflows [16]	Optimized resource estimation for pipeline/individual stages, e. g., for dynamic resource pooling

Execution motifs, such as the circuit execution and distributed state vector motif, can be applied to individual stages, e. g., for optimizing circuit execution for parallel sampling and expectation value computation. Further, classical and quantum algorithms can be interleaved and executed concurrently in advanced scenarios. For example, recursive QAOA algorithms like QIRO [29] could be adapted to run variational algorithms concurrently with a classical optimization algorithm concurrently exchanging information between both frequently. The described VQE with information sharing [59] solves multiple related variational circuits in parallels and utilizes multiple Bayesian optimizers that incorporate the measurement results from these problems.

(vi) *Multistage pipeline* motif comprises multiple stages, e. g., data preparation, training, and inference. The pipeline pattern is typically used with other motifs, e. g., state vector simulation or variational algorithms. An example is chemistry applications requiring multiple stages, e. g., reading molecular data as input, setting up the molecular system, running algorithms for molecular energy level calculations, and conducting post-processing steps. Another example is a machine learning pipeline, requiring multiple stages, e. g., data compression, training, and inference [34]. Cranganorea et al.'s [16] molecular dynamic workflow comprising multiple stages that can be enhanced with quantum algorithms, e. g., it proposes the utilization of the CSWAP algorithm for distance calculation computation and VQE for computation of the eigenvalues.

In the future, we expect more complex, generalized workflows beyond simple pipelines. In such workflows, directed acyclic graphs (DAG) will play a crucial role in modeling and representing the structure of a quantum workflow by describing sequences of tasks (nodes) and their dependencies (edges). New integration patterns between classical and quantum machine learning are emerging, e. g.,


the transformer-based quantum eigensolver (GPT-QE) [46]. GPT-QE utilizes a transformer architecture based on GPT-2 to generate sequences of indices for unitary operations from a predefined operator set, effectively combining classical computational resources (CPUs and GPUs) with quantum processors (QPUs). The application encompasses multiple stages: dataset creation, pre-training, training, and generation.

## 2.4 Discussion

Quantum-HPC applications feature increasingly complex task topology that progressively utilize more advanced HPC capabilities, including GPU acceleration and diverse parallelization strategies (e. g., data and task parallelism). Figure 2 visualizes the interaction between quantum and classical components and couplings for four key execution motifs discussed in section 2.3, i. e., the circuit execution, distributed state vector simulation, variational algorithms (in two variants), and the pipeline motif.

For quantum simulations, both loosely-coupled ensemble and tightly-coupled MPI-based parallelism are critical. Loosely-coupled parallelism can be exploited when sampling circuits or computing expectation values. Tightly coupled distributed state vector simulations that require multi-node systems are necessary for large qubit counts. GPU-accelerated infrastructure can enhance the simulation's complexity, quality, and runtime for these scenarios.

As quantum algorithms and applications mature, more sophisticated algorithms emerge. For example, we highlight two variants of the variational algorithm motif. The first variant demonstrates a sequential approach, commonly found in proof-of-principle implementations, focusing on the iterative optimization process between quantum circuit evaluation and classical optimization. In contrast, the *optimized* variant utilizes various types of parallelism.



**Figure 2: Quantum-HPC core motifs: circuit execution, distributed state vector, variational algorithms (standard and optimized), and the pipeline motif: quantum-HPC applications can exhibit complex task structures and increasingly integrate optimized HPC capabilities, e. g., GPU acceleration and other forms of parallelization.**

For example, quantum and classical tasks can run concurrently, e. g., recursive QAOA algorithms like QIRO [29] could continuously run a classical optimization model that is steered using the results of the quantum circuits. Further, QML applications can leverage GPUs for faster gradient computation and updates.

The pipeline motif represents multi-stage workflows where quantum and classical tasks are interlinked to process and analyze data. Each stage might utilize specialized parallelism, e. g., data-parallelism is important for data preparation and encoding.

The middleware required to support various quantum-HPC execution motifs must facilitate seamless integration, workload management, and resource allocation across heterogeneous computing infrastructures. Essential capabilities include handling classical and quantum tasks, optimizing task partitioning and placement to balance the resource mix, dynamically managing resource demands, and integrating error correction and mitigation routines.

### 3 QUANTUM MINI-APPS

This section discusses quantum mini-app design objectives and proposes three mini-app examples. Next, we briefly discuss our quantum mini-app framework architecture which is still in the early stages of development, and demonstrate it using a circuit execution motif. The quantum mini-app framework is developed in Python, and the source code is available on Github [44].

#### 3.1 Design Objectives

Quantum applications and systems are still in their infancy. With the increasing availability of quantum hardware, there is a need to develop benchmarks for evaluating the performance of quantum-HPC systems. It involves creating scalable and production-ready quantum software, robust performance characterization and benchmarking tools, and methodologies. We postulate that quantum mini-apps can be an efficient tool for researchers and developers

to design, evaluate, refine, and understand the interaction between quantum hardware and software. Additionally, it will enable the definition of concrete application requirements and the drawing of broader conclusions on the design of abstraction and capabilities of quantum-HPC systems. We identify three distinct design objectives of quantum mini-apps as follows.


(i) *Bridging Quantum Hardware and Software:* Mini-apps can provide a better understanding of mitigating the limitations of current quantum hardware, such as coherence time, gate fidelity, and qubit count. By characterizing these constraints using relevant application workloads, developers can effectively manage classical resources for qubit control and error correction, directly impacting the performance of end-to-end quantum applications.

(ii) *Heterogeneous Computing:* As quantum computing evolves towards integrating multiple quantum processors (QPU) with classical accelerators like FPGA and GPUs, quantum mini-apps can help estimate common workload and resource patterns. This is crucial for evaluating quantum software systems that can handle the increased complexity and heterogeneity of high-performance computing (HPC) environments and their integration with QPUs.

(iii) *Scalability:* Quantum mini-apps can help design and evaluate quantum software with a holistic, end-to-end perspective focused on the scalability of every stack layer. This approach is essential as it ensures that the software can grow alongside the evolving quantum hardware landscape without requiring complete redesigns for each technological advancement.

#### 3.2 Mini-App Framework

Figure 3 shows the architecture of the quantum mini-app framework. The framework serves as a basis for creating, implementing, running, and analyzing high-level motifs of a mini-app across distributed resources. It is designed to be flexible and scalable, enabling



**Figure 3: Quantum Mini-App Framework Architecture: The framework facilitates the creation, execution, and management of quantum mini-apps. It comprises a mini-app executor and cluster manager abstracting different computing environments, including HPC, cloud, and quantum resources.**

the creation and integration of new quantum mini-apps encompassing one or motifs. Mini-apps can be designed to be highly configurable and customizable, e. g., qubit count, circuit depth, and supported backends.

The mini-app framework comprises the *mini-app executor* and the *cluster manager*. The *mini-app executor* orchestrates the execution of a mini-app across distributed computing resources. It manages allocating tasks to the available resources, ensuring efficient utilization of the computational power, and aggregates the results obtained from executing these tasks.

The *cluster manager* provides an interface to interact with clusters and is extensible to provision clusters for managing quantum/classical tasks across local, HPC, and cloud-based CPUs, GPUs, and QPUs. Currently, the mini-app executor supports the *Dask* engine [20]. Still, its modular architecture allows seamless integration with other engines, such as *Ray*, to benchmark the specific requirements of different quantum computing applications. For example, *Ray* supports the inherent mapping of tasks to GPUs, while *Dask* doesn't.

### 3.3 Mini-App Examples

We propose three mini-apps involving one or more motifs that isolate specific aspects of larger quantum-HPC applications.

**3.3.1 Quantum Simulation.** The Quantum Simulation mini-app implements the *circuit execution* motif utilizing the Qiskit library [14] for generating random quantum circuits and executes these using different Aer simulator backends, e. g., with and without GPU support. We utilize a *Dask* distributed cluster environment managed via the mini-app framework to manage tasks across multiple nodes.

The distributed state vector motif implementation is based on the PennyLane lightning simulator [4]. The lightning simulator utilizes different HPC techniques, e. g., MPI, cuQuantum, and Kokkos provide a scalable, to provide a scalable distributed state vector simulation. It can simulate larger qubit counts and circuit depths. As the number of qubits to simulate increases, the growth of memory requirements and the need for scaling the simulation across multiple GPUs and nodes increases significantly.

**3.3.2 Variational Quantum Algorithms.** Variational algorithms represent, as described, an important class of NISQ algorithms that leverage the interplay between quantum and classical tasks [12]. Typically, VQA comprises three key components: a parameterized quantum circuit, a classical optimizer, and a cost function. Variational circuits are trained iteratively within a classic optimization loop, which involves adjusting the parameters to approximate the ground state with a minimized cost function. The cost function typically depends upon the type of algorithm (i. e., VQE, QAOA, GAN). The arrangement of these components can vary, e. g., the quantum and classical components can be concurrently executed. Further, quantum components could be executed on multiple QPUs (including simulated QPUs).

**3.3.3 QML Pipeline.** The QML mini-app provides a concrete example for the *multistage pipeline* motif. We represent the QML pipelines mini-app into two stages. The first stage provides a standardized quantum representation of classical data. In contrast, the second stage subsequently assesses the performance of quantum and classical classifiers on the standardized datasets (e. g., MNIST [22] and ImageNet [21]). In the first stage, the QML pipeline mini-app can find the approximate quantum representation of classical data mapped to a quantum state using techniques such as matrix product states (MPS) [49]. After fitting the MPS to classical data points, it can be translated to its quantum circuit representation. Since fitting the quantum circuits to the individual data points is independent, the optimizations can be run in parallel. After encoding the whole dataset, the QML pipeline mini-app can be utilized to assess the performance of classical and quantum classifiers in the second stage.


As a proof-of-concept, we provide an implementation of the quantum simulation mini-app as part of the current framework. In the following, we investigate the performance of this mini-app.

## 4 EXPERIMENTAL RESULTS

In this section, we demonstrate the framework using an implementation of quantum simulation example mini-app focusing on the circuit execution motif with 1024 randomly generated quantum circuits, *qubits* size of 25 and a circuit *depth* of 1. We utilized Qiskit's *random\_circuit module* to generate the circuits and observables to run state vector simulation using Qiskit's Aer simulator with cuQuantum-support. We performed our experiments on the Perlmutter machine at NERSC<sup>1</sup>. Perlmutter comprises 3072 CPU-only and 1792 GPU-accelerated nodes. Each CPU-only node has two CPUs with 64 cores each, i. e., a total of 128 cores. Each GPU node has a single CPU with 64 cores and four A100 GPUs with 40 GB of GPU memory. We utilize up to 16 nodes, comparing CPU and GPU performance.

As the number of GPUs and cores increases, there is a clear decreasing trend for both CPU and GPU scenarios. Increasing the number of GPUs from 4 to 64 resulted in an 85% reduction in runtime. In contrast, CPU runtimes start significantly higher at 890 *sec* seconds for 1 node with 128 cores decreasing to 255 *sec* for 2048 cores, a 71% enhancement. The experimental data clearly

<sup>1</sup>[www.docs.nersc.gov/systems/perlmutter](http://www.docs.nersc.gov/systems/perlmutter)



**Figure 4: Circuit execution motif characterization on Perlmutter: compute time for 1024 randomized circuit tasks for 25 qubits. Executed 1024 circuit execution tasks on up to 16 Perlmutter GPU & CPU nodes, where each GPU node has 4 A100 GPUs and CPU node has 128 cores. We scale from 1 node (4/128 GPUs/Cores) to 16 nodes (64/2048 GPUs/Cores).**

illustrates the superior efficiency of GPUs. Across all experiments, GPU runs are approximately 95 times faster.

The quantum simulation mini-app facilitates benchmarking of important application circuits across diverse quantum-HPC infrastructures, enabling comparisons across various configurations. Although the current focus is on classically simulating quantum circuits, the mini-app framework can be easily extended to physical QPUs. Mini-apps like this are pivotal in advancing quantum applications, algorithms, and infrastructure. Insights from these experiments can contribute to the development and refinement of both software and hardware infrastructure, such as improving simulation capabilities and enhancing middleware functionalities.

## 5 RELATED WORK

Mini-apps can be used as proxies for real applications and workflows to enhance analysis and improve performance. Mini-apps isolate specific aspects of larger applications, allowing efficient exploration of hardware and software configurations. The concept is broadly used for testing, characterizing, and benchmarking application performance in various computing environments, e. g., data analytics [61], streaming [13], and workflows [35].

Several mini-apps frameworks, such as ECP proxy apps [3], ECP CANDLE Benchmarks [65], ExaMiniMD [18], and miniVite [31], exist in the HPC domain, which are more application-specific. Extending upon such works, NERSC-10 Benchmark Suite [48] provides application-agnostic micro-benchmarks for evaluating the performance of different tasks within one or more application workflows. Other initiatives such as Neural mini-apps [63], and Neuromapp [25] also emerged to understand the performance of emerging computing paradigms such as neuromorphic computing and improvement of neural simulators, respectively.

Recently, many researchers have focused on developing quantum benchmarks. System-level performance benchmarks such as

QV [17] and VB [8] measure quantum circuit execution quality and scale (i. e., using qubit number and gate fidelity). At the same time, CLOPS [64] characterizes runtime performance and execution time using quantum volume circuit sequence execution. Application-oriented quantum computing benchmarks, such as QPack [38], QED-C [39–41] and Q-Score [45] enable characterizing the performance of individual circuit execution (i. e. execution quality, runtime, gate count, etc.) for quantum applications of a specific type across diverse quantum hardware and simulators. While the above benchmarks are application-specific, the QUARK framework [28, 36, 37] orchestrates different application-oriented quantum benchmarks in a well-defined, standardized, reproducible, and verifiable way. It also incorporates workloads from the domains of optimization and quantum machine learning. As a future work, we aim to integrate and utilize a QUARK-like framework with quantum mini-apps to generalize benchmarking of high-level execution motifs composed within diverse mini-apps.

## 6 CONCLUSION

Quantum-HPC execution motifs presented in this paper provide a conceptual understanding of the quantum-classical applications and workloads. These motifs provide the conceptual underpinning for *quantum mini-app*. The framework and quantum simulation mini-app are open source and available on Github [44]. Further, the mini-app framework serves as the basis for implementing application kernels that represent these motifs, offering a structured approach for exploring the scalability and performance of quantum applications. Further, it provides the basis for developing advanced middleware systems.

In future work, we aim to develop and implement additional quantum mini-apps, e. g. for variational algorithms and QML pipelines, to represent the six identified motifs comprehensively. These mini-apps will be critical tools for systematically exploring and refining the interactions between quantum hardware and middleware. Furthermore, we aim to develop a middleware system named *pilot-quantum* based on the pilot abstraction [43]. This system will simplify resource and workload management for quantum-HPC systems by abstracting the allocation, management, and optimization of heterogeneous resources and tasks.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENT

This work received support from NERSC (Project ERCAP0029512), ORNL (Project CSC595), and the Bavarian State Ministry of Economic Affairs (BenchQC project, Grant DIK-0425/03). The authors generated parts of this text using OpenAI’s language-generation models. Upon generation, the authors reviewed, edited, and revised the language.

## REFERENCES

- [1] Javier Alcazar, Mohammad Ghazi Vakili, Can B. Kalayci, and Alejandro Perdomo-Ortiz. 2021. GEO: Enhancing Combinatorial Optimization with Classical and Quantum Generative Models. <https://doi.org/10.48550/ARXIV.2101.06250>
- [2] Yuri Alexeev, Maximilian Amsler, Paul Baity, Marco Antonio Barroca, Sanzio Bassini, Torey Battelle, Daan Camps, David Casanova, Young jai Choi, Frederic T. Chong, Charles Chung, Chris Codella, Antonio D. Corcoles, James Cruise, Alberto Di Meglio, Jonathan Dubois, Ivan Duran, Thomas Eckl, Sophia Economou, Stephan Eidenbenz, Bruce Elmegreen, Clyde Fare, Ismael Faro, Cristina Sanz Fernández, Rodrigo Neumann Barros Ferreira, Keisuke Fuji, Bryce Fuller, Laura Gagliardi, Giulia Galli, Jennifer R. Glick, Isacco Gobbi, Pranav Gokhale, Salvador

- de la Puente Gonzalez, Johannes Greiner, Bill Gropp, Michele Grossi, Emmanuel Gull, Burns Healy, Benchen Huang, Travis S. Humble, Nobuyasu Ito, Artur F. Izmaylov, Ali Javadi-Abhari, Douglas Jennewein, Shantenu Jha, Liang Jiang, Barbara Jones, Wibe Albert de Jong, Petar Jurcevic, William Kirby, Stefan Kister, Masahiro Kitagawa, Joel Klassen, Katherine Klymko, Kwangwon Koh, Masaaki Kondo, Doga Murat Kurkcuoglu, Krzysztof Kurowski, Teodoro Laino, Ryan Landfield, Matt Leininger, Vicente Leyton-Ortega, Ang Li, Meifeng Lin, Junyu Liu, Nicolas Lorente, Andre Luckow, Simon Martiel, Francisco Martin-Fernandez, Margaret Martonosi, Claire Marvinye, Arcesio Castaneda Medina, Dirk Mentez, Antonio Mezzacapo, Kristel Michielsen, Abhishek Mitra, Tushar Mittal, Kyung-sun Moon, Joel Moore, Mario Motta, Young-Hye Na, Yunseong Nam, Prineha Narang, Yu ya Ohnishi, Daniele Ottaviani, Matthew Otten, Scott Pakin, Vincent R. Pascuzzi, Ed Penault, Tomasz Piontek, Jed Pitera, Patrick Rall, Gokul Subramanian Ravi, Niall Robertson, Matteo Rossi, Piotr Rydlichowski, Hoon Ryu, George Samsonidze, Mitsuhsa Sato, Nishant Saurabh, Vidushi Sharma, Kunal Sharma, Soyung Shin, George Slessman, Mathias Steiner, Iskandar Sitdikov, In-Saeng Suh, Eric Switzer, Wei Tang, Joel Thompson, Syngye Todo, Minh Tran, Dimitar Trenev, Christian Trott, Huan-Hsin Tseng, Esin Tureci, David Garcia Valinas, Sofia Vallecorsa, Christopher Wever, Konrad Wojciechowski, Xiaodi Wu, Shinjae Yoo, Nobuyuki Yoshioka, Victor Wen zhe Yu, Seiji Yunoki, Sergiy Zhuk, and Dmitry Zubarev. 2023. Quantum-centric Supercomputing for Materials Science: A Perspective on Challenges and Future Directions. arXiv:2312.09733 [quant-ph]
- [3] Jim Ang, Christine Sweeney, Michael Wolf, John Austin Ellis, Sayan Ghosh, Ai Kagawa, Yunzhi Huang, Sivasankaran Rajamanickam, Vinay Ramakrishnaiah, Malachi Schram, et al. 2020. *ECP report: Update on proxy applications and vendor interactions*. Technical Report. Sandia National Lab.(SNL-NM), Albuquerque, NM (United States).
- [4] Ali Asadi, Amintor Dusko, Chae-Yeun Park, Vincent Michaud-Rioux, Isidor Schoch, Shuli Shu, Trevor Vincent, and Lee James O’Riordan. 2024. Hybrid quantum programming with PennyLane Lightning on HPC platforms. arXiv:2403.02512 [quant-ph]
- [5] Andreas Bayerstadler, Guillaume Becquin, Julia Binder, Thierry Botter, Hans Ehm, Thomas Ehmer, Marvin Erdmann, Norbert Gaus, Philipp Harbach, Maximilian Hess, et al. 2021. Industry quantum computing applications. *EPJ Quantum Technology* 8, 1 (2021), 25.
- [6] Luciano Bello, Agata M. Brańczyk, Sergey Bravyi, Almudena Carrera Vazquez, Andrew Eddins, Daniel J. Egger, Bryce Fuller, Julien Gacon, James R. Garrison, Jennifer R. Glick, Tanvi P. Gujjarati, Ikko Hamamura, Areeq I. Hasan, Takashi Imamichi, Caleb Johnson, Leva Liepuoniute, Owen Lockwood, Mario Motta, C. D. Pemmaraju, Pedro Rivero, Max Rossmannek, Travis L. Scholten, Seetharami Seelam, Iskandar Sitdikov, Dharmashankar Subramanian, Wei Tang, and Stefan Woerner. 2023. Circuit Knitting Toolbox. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.7987997>
- [7] Ville Bergholm, Josh Izaac, Maria Schuld, Christian Gogolin, M Sohaib Alam, Shah Nawaz Ahmed, Juan Miguel Arrazola, Carsten Blank, Alain Delgado, Soran Jahangiri, et al. 2018. PennyLane: Automatic differentiation of hybrid quantum-classical computations. arXiv:1811.04968 (2018).
- [8] Robin Blume-Kohout and Kevin C. Young. 2020. A volumetric framework for quantum computer benchmarks. *Quantum* 4 (2020), 362.
- [9] Carlos Bravo-Prieto, Ryan LaRose, M. Cerezo, Yigit Subasi, Lukasz Cincio, and Patrick J. Coles. 2019. Variational Quantum Linear Solver. <https://doi.org/10.48550/ARXIV.1909.05820>
- [10] Wesley Brewer, Ana Gainaru, Frédéric Suter, Feiyi Wang, Murali Emani, and Shantenu Jha. 2024. AI-coupled HPC Workflow Applications, Middleware and Performance. (2024). Under review.
- [11] M. Cerezo, Andrew Arrasmith, Ryan Babbush, Simon C. Benjamin, Suguru Endo, Keisuke Fujii, Jarrod R. McClean, Kosuke Mitarai, Xiao Yuan, Lukasz Cincio, and Patrick J. Coles. 2021. Variational quantum algorithms. *Nature Reviews Physics* 3, 9 (2021), 625–644. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s42254-021-00348-9>
- [12] M. Cerezo, Andrew Arrasmith, Ryan Babbush, Simon C. Benjamin, Suguru Endo, Keisuke Fujii, Jarrod R. McClean, Kosuke Mitarai, Xiao Yuan, Lukasz Cincio, and Patrick J. Coles. 2021. Variational quantum algorithms. *Nature Reviews Physics* 3, 9 (Aug. 2021), 625–644. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s42254-021-00348-9>
- [13] Georgios Chantzialexiou, Andre Luckow, and Shantenu Jha. 2018. Pilot-Streaming: A Stream Processing Framework for High-Performance Computing. In *2018 IEEE 14th International Conference on e-Science (e-Science)*. 177–188. <https://doi.org/10.1109/eScience.2018.00033>
- [14] Qiskit Community. 2024. Qiskit: An Open-source Framework for Quantum Computing. <https://github.com/Qiskit/qiskit>.
- [15] A. D. Córcoles, Maika Takita, Ken Inoue, Scott Lekuch, Zlatko K. Mineev, Jerry M. Chow, and Jay M. Gambetta. 2021. Exploiting Dynamic Quantum Circuits in a Quantum Algorithm with Superconducting Qubits. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 127 (Aug 2021), 100501. Issue 10. <https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.127.100501>
- [16] Sandeep Suresh Cranganore, Vincenzo De Maio, Ivona Brandic, and Ewa Deelman. 2024. Paving the Way to Hybrid Quantum-Classical Scientific Workflows. arXiv:2404.10389 [cs.ET]
- [17] Andrew W Cross, Lev S Bishop, Sarah Sheldon, Paul D Nation, and Jay M Gambetta. 2019. Validating quantum computers using randomized model circuits. *Physical Review A* 100, 3 (2019), 032328.
- [18] Paul Stewart Crozier, Heidi K Thornquist, Robert W Numrich, Alan B Williams, Harold Carter Edwards, Eric Richard Keiter, Mahesh Rajan, James M Willenbring, Douglas W Doerfler, and Michael Allen Heroux. 2009. *Improving performance via mini-applications*. Technical Report. Sandia National Laboratories (SNL), Albuquerque, NM, and Livermore, CA. ....
- [19] Alexander M. Dalzell, Sam McArdle, Mario Berta, Przemyslaw Bienias, Chi-Fang Chen, András Gilyén, Connor T. Hann, Michael J. Kastoryano, Emil T. Khabiboulline, Aleksander Kubica, Grant Salton, Samson Wang, and Fernando G. S. L. Brandão. 2023. Quantum algorithms: A survey of applications and end-to-end complexities. arXiv:2310.03011 [quant-ph]
- [20] Dask Development Team. 2024. Dask: Scale the Python tools you love. <https://www.dask.org>. Accessed: Apr. 21, 2024.
- [21] Jia Deng, Wei Dong, Richard Socher, Li-Jia Li, Kai Li, and Li Fei-Fei. 2009. Imagenet: A large-scale hierarchical image database. In *2009 IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*. Ieee, 248–255.
- [22] Li Deng. 2012. The mnist database of handwritten digit images for machine learning research. *IEEE Signal Processing Magazine* 29, 6 (2012), 141–142.
- [23] Lior Ella, Lorenzo Leandro, Oded Wertheim, Yoav Romach, Ramon Szmuk, Yoel Knol, Nissim Ofek, Itamar Sivan, and Yonatan Cohen. 2023. Quantum-classical processing and benchmarking at the pulse-level. arXiv:2309.03816 [quant-ph]
- [24] Amr Elsharkawy, Xiao-Ting Michelle To, Philipp Seitz, Yanbin Chen, Yannick Stade, Manuel Geiger, Qunsheng Huang, Xiaorang Guo, Muhammad Arslan Ansari, Christian B. Mendl, Dieter Kranzlmüller, and Martin Schulz. 2023. Integration of Quantum Accelerators with High Performance Computing – A Review of Quantum Programming Tools. arXiv:2309.06167 [cs.ET]
- [25] Timothée Ewart, Judit Planas, Francesco Cremonesi, Kai Langen, Felix Schürmann, and Fabien Delalandre. 2017. Neuromapp: a mini-application framework to improve neural simulators. In *High Performance Computing: 32nd International Conference, ISC High Performance 2017, Frankfurt, Germany, June 18–22, 2017, Proceedings 32*. Springer, 181–198.
- [26] Leo Fang, abehn nv, hbbayraktar, and sam stanwyck. 2023. *NVIDIA/cuQuantum: cuQuantum Python v22.11.0.1*. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.7523366>
- [27] Edward Farhi, Jeffrey Goldstone, and Sam Gutmann. 2014. A quantum approximate optimization algorithm. arXiv preprint arXiv:1411.4028 (2014).
- [28] Jernej Rudi Finzgar, Philipp Ross, Leonhard Holscher, Johannes Klepsch, and Andre Luckow. 2022. QUARK: A Framework for Quantum Computing Application Benchmarking. In *2022 IEEE International Conference on Quantum Computing and Engineering (QCE)*. IEEE. <https://doi.org/10.1109/qce53715.2022.00042>
- [29] Jernej Rudi Finzgar, Aron Kerschbaumer, Martin J. A. Schuetz, Christian B. Mendl, and Helmut G. Katzgraber. 2024. Quantum-Informed Recursive Optimization Algorithms. arXiv:2308.13607 [quant-ph]
- [30] Niklas W. A. Gebauer, Michael Gastegger, Stefaan S. P. Hessmann, Klaus-Robert Müller, and Kristof T. Schütt. 2022. Inverse design of 3d molecular structures with conditional generative neural networks. *Nature Communications* 13, 1 (2022), 973. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-022-28526-y>
- [31] Sayan Ghosh, Mahantesh Halappanavar, Antonino Tumeo, Ananth Kalyanaraman, and Assefaw H Gebremedhin. 2018. miniVite: A graph analytics benchmarking tool for massively parallel systems. In *2018 IEEE/ACM Performance Modeling, Benchmarking and Simulation of High Performance Computer Systems (PMBS)*. IEEE, 51–56.
- [32] Satoshi Imamura, Masafumi Yamazaki, Takumi Honda, Akihiko Kasagi, Akihiro Tabuchi, Hiroshi Nakao, Naoto Fukumoto, and Kohta Nakashima. 2022. mpiQulacs: A Distributed Quantum Computer Simulator for A64FX-based Cluster Systems. arXiv:2203.16044 [cs.DC]
- [33] Shantenu Jha, Wesley Brewer, Ana Gainaru, Frédéric Suter, Feiyi Wang, and Murali Emani. 2024. Perspectives Paper: AI-HPC Workflow Applications, Middleware and Performance. (2024).
- [34] Bernhard Jobst, Kevin Shen, Carlos A. Riofrio, Elvira Shishenina, and Frank Pollmann. 2023. Efficient MPS representations and quantum circuits from the Fourier modes of classical image data. arXiv:2311.07666 [quant-ph]
- [35] Ozgur Ozan Kilic, Tianle Wang, Matteo Turilli, Mikhail Titov, Andre Merzky, Line Pouchard, and Shantenu Jha. 2024. Workflow Mini-Apps: Portable, Scalable, Tunable & Faithful Representations of Scientific Workflows. arXiv:2403.18073 [cs.DC]
- [36] Florian J Kiwit, Marwa Marso, Philipp Ross, Carlos A Riofrio, Johannes Klepsch, and Andre Luckow. 2023. Application-Oriented Benchmarking of Quantum Generative Learning Using QUARK. In *2023 IEEE International Conference on Quantum Computing and Engineering (QCE)*, Vol. 1. IEEE, 475–484.
- [37] Florian J. Kiwit, Maximilian A. Wolf, Marwa Marso, Philipp Ross, Jeanette M. Lorenz, Carlos A. Riofrio, and Andre Luckow. 2024. Benchmarking Quantum Generative Learning: A Study on Scalability and Noise Resilience using QUARK. arXiv:2403.18662 [quant-ph]
- [38] Matthias Möller Koen Mesman, Zaid Al-Ars. 2022. QPack: Quantum Approximate Optimization Algorithms as universal benchmark for quantum computers. arXiv (2022). <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2103.17193>
- [39] Thomas Lubinski, Carleton Coffrin, Catherine McGeoch, Pratik Sathe, Joshua Apanavicius, and David E. Bernal Neira. 2023. Optimization Applications as Quantum Performance Benchmarks. arXiv:2302.02278 [quant-ph]

- [40] Thomas Lubinski, Joshua J. Goings, Karl Mayer, Sonika Johri, Nithin Reddy, Aman Mehta, Niranjana Bhatia, Sonny Rappaport, Daniel Mills, Charles H. Baldwin, Luning Zhao, Aaron Barbosa, Smarak Maity, and Pranav S. Mundada. 2024. Quantum Algorithm Exploration using Application-Oriented Performance Benchmarks. arXiv:2402.08985 [quant-ph]
- [41] Thomas Lubinski, Sonika Johri, Paul Varosy, Jeremiah Coleman, Luning Zhao, Jason Necaise, Charles H. Baldwin, Karl Mayer, and Timothy Proctor. 2023. Application-Oriented Performance Benchmarks for Quantum Computing. arXiv:2110.03137 [quant-ph]
- [42] Andre Luckow and Shantenu Jha. 2019. Performance Characterization and Modeling of Serverless and HPC Streaming Applications. In *2019 IEEE International Conference on Big Data (Big Data)*. 5688–5696. <https://doi.org/10.1109/BigData47090.2019.9006530>
- [43] Andre Luckow, Mark Santcroos, Andre Merzky, Ole Weidner, Pradeep Mantha, and Shantenu Jha. 2012. P\*: A model of pilot-abstractions. In *2012 IEEE 8th International Conference on E-Science*. 1–10. <https://doi.org/10.1109/eScience.2012.6404423>
- [44] Pradeep Mantha. 2024. Quantum Mini-App framework implementation. <https://github.com/radical-cybertools/quantum-mini-apps>. Accessed: 2024-03-31.
- [45] Simon Martiel, Thomas Ayrat, and Cyril Allouche. 2021. Benchmarking Quantum Coprocessors in an Application-Centric, Hardware-Agnostic, and Scalable Way. *IEEE Transactions on Quantum Engineering* 2 (2021), 1–11. <https://doi.org/10.1109/tqe.2021.3090207>
- [46] Kouhei Nakaji, Lasse Bjørn Kristensen, Jorge A. Campos-Gonzalez-Angulo, Mohammad Ghazi Vakili, Haozhe Huang, Mohsen Bagherimehrab, Christoph Gorgulla, FuTe Wong, Alex McCaskey, Jin-Sung Kim, Thien Nguyen, Pooja Rao, and Alan Aspuru-Guzik. 2024. The generative quantum eigensolver (GQE) and its application for ground state search. arXiv:2401.09253 [quant-ph]
- [47] National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine. 2023. *Advancing Chemistry and Quantum Information Science: An Assessment of Research Opportunities at the Interface of Chemistry and Quantum Information Science in the United States*. The National Academies Press, Washington, DC. <https://doi.org/10.17226/26850>
- [48] National Energy Research Scientific Computing Center (NERSC). 2024. NERSC-10 Benchmark Suite — nersc.gov. <https://www.nersc.gov/systems/nersc-10/benchmarks/>. [Accessed 24-03-2024].
- [49] Román Orús. 2014. A practical introduction to tensor networks: Matrix product states and projected entangled pair states. *Annals of Physics* 349 (Oct. 2014), 117–158. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.aop.2014.06.013>
- [50] Tianyi Peng, Aram W. Harrow, Maris Ozols, and Xiaodi Wu. 2020. Simulating Large Quantum Circuits on a Small Quantum Computer. *Physical Review Letters* 125, 15 (Oct. 2020). <https://doi.org/10.1103/physrevlett.125.150504>
- [51] Alberto Peruzzo, Jarrod McClean, Peter Shadbolt, Man-Hong Yung, Xiao-Qi Zhou, Peter J. Love, Alan Aspuru-Guzik, and Jeremy L. O’Brien. 2014. A variational eigenvalue solver on a photonic quantum processor. *Nature Communications* 5, 1 (2014), 4213. <https://doi.org/10.1038/ncomms5213>
- [52] John Preskill. 2018. Quantum Computing in the NISQ era and beyond. *Quantum* 2 (Aug. 2018), 79. <https://doi.org/10.22331/q-2018-08-06-79>
- [53] Qiskit Development Team. 2023. Running with Threadpool and DASK - Qiskit Aer 0.13.1. <https://qiskit.org/ecosystem/aer/howtos/parallel.html>. Accessed: 2024-02-18.
- [54] IBM Quantum. 2024. Configure error mitigation for Qiskit Runtime. <https://docs.quantum.ibm.com/run/configure-error-mitigation>. Accessed: 2024-02-18.
- [55] Quantum Technology and Application Consortium (QUTAC). 2024. qugen: Quantum Circuit Generator. <https://github.com/QtacQuantum/qugen>. Accessed: 2024-04-18.
- [56] Gokul Subramanian Ravi, Jonathan M. Baker, Kaitlin N. Smith, Nathan Earnest, Ali Javadi-Abhari, and Frederic Chong. 2022. Boosting Quantum Fidelity with an Ordered Diverse Ensemble of Clifford Canary Circuits. arXiv:2209.13732 [quant-ph]
- [57] Carlos A Riofrío, Oliver Mitevski, Caitlin Jones, Florian Krellner, Aleksandar Vučković, Joseph Doetsch, Johannes Klepsch, Thomas Ehmer, and Andre Luckow. 2023. A performance characterization of quantum generative models. *arXiv e-prints* (2023), arXiv-2301.
- [58] Nishant Saurabh, Shantenu Jha, and Andre Luckow. 2023. A Conceptual Architecture for a Quantum-HPC Middleware. In *Proceedings of the IEEE Conference on Quantum Software*. IEEE.
- [59] Chris N. Self, Kiran E. Khosla, Alistair W. R. Smith, Frédéric Sauvage, Peter D. Haynes, Johannes Knolle, Florian Mintert, and M. S. Kim. 2021. Variational quantum algorithm with information sharing. *npj Quantum Information* 7, 1 (2021), 116. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41534-021-00452-9>
- [60] Kaitlin N. Smith, Michael A. Perlin, Pranav Gokhale, Paige Frederick, David Owusu-Antwi, Richard Rines, Victory Omole, and Frederic Chong. 2023. Clifford-based Circuit Cutting for Quantum Simulation. In *Proceedings of the 50th Annual International Symposium on Computer Architecture (Orlando, FL, USA) (ISCA '23)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, Article 84, 13 pages. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3579371.3589352>
- [61] S. R. Sukumar, M. A. Matheson, R. Kannan, and S.-H. Lim. 2016. Mini-apps for High Performance Data Analysis. In *2016 IEEE International Conference on Big Data (Big Data)*. IEEE, 1483–1492.
- [62] Teague Tomesh, Zain H. Saleem, Michael A. Perlin, Pranav Gokhale, Martin Suchara, and Margaret Martonosi. 2023. Divide and Conquer for Combinatorial Optimization and Distributed Quantum Computation. In *2023 IEEE International Conference on Quantum Computing and Engineering (QCE)*, Vol. 01. 1–12. <https://doi.org/10.1109/QCE57702.2023.00009>
- [63] Craig Vineyard, Suma Cardwell, Frances Chance, Srideep Musuvathy, Fred Rothganger, William Severa, John Smith, Corinne Teeter, Felix Wang, and James Aimone. 2022. Neural Mini-Apps as a Tool for Neuromorphic Computing Insight. In *Proceedings of the 2022 Annual Neuro-Inspired Computational Elements Conference*. 40–49.
- [64] Andrew Wack, Hanhee Paik, Ali Javadi-Abhari, Petar Jurcevic, Ismael Faro, Jay M. Gambetta, and Blake R. Johnson. 2021. Quality, Speed, and Scale: three key attributes to measure the performance of near-term quantum computers. arXiv:2110.14108 [quant-ph]
- [65] Xingfu Wu, Valerie Taylor, Justin M Wozniak, Rick Stevens, Thomas Brettin, and Fangfang Xia. 2019. Performance, energy, and scalability analysis and improvement of parallel cancer deep learning candle benchmarks. In *Proceedings of the 48th International Conference on Parallel Processing*. 1–11.
- [66] Xanadu. 2023. qml.qcut — PennyLane Documentation. [https://docs.pennylane.ai/en/stable/code/qml\\_qcut.html](https://docs.pennylane.ai/en/stable/code/qml_qcut.html). Accessed: 2024-02-18.