Journal of Multiscale Materials Informatics

Vol. 02, No. 02, October 2025
https://publikasi.dinus.ac.id/index.php/jimat/ ISSN 3047-5724
DOI: 10.62411/jimat.v2i2.14935

Variational Quantum Circuits Design Principles, Applications, and Challenges Toward Practical: A Review

Dian Arif Rachman[1], Muhamad Akrom[2]*

[1] Institut Teknologi dan Sains Nahdlatul Ulama Pekalongan, Pekalongan, Indonesia
[2] Research Group for Quantum Computing and Materials Informatics, Faculty of Computer Science, Universitas Dian Nuswantoro, Semarang 50131, Indonesia

Article Info
Received : October 16, 2025
Revised : November 12, 2025
Accepted : November 19, 2025

Keywords:
Variational Quantum Circuit,
Quantum Machine Learning,
Variational Quantum Eigensolver,
Barren Plateau,
Quantum Kernel,
Quantum Optimization.

ABSTRACT
Variational Quantum Circuits (VQCs) have emerged as a cornerstone of hybrid quantum–classical algorithms designed to harness the computational potential of near-term quantum devices. By combining parameterized quantum gates with classical optimization, VQCs provide a flexible framework for tackling machine learning, chemistry, and optimization problems intractable for classical methods. This review comprehensively overviews VQC design principles, ansatz structures, optimization strategies, and real-world applications. Furthermore, we discuss fundamental challenges such as barren plateaus, the expressibility–trainability trade-off, and current noisy intermediate-scale quantum (NISQ) hardware limitations. Finally, we highlight emerging directions that could enable scalable, noise-resilient, and physically interpretable variational quantum models for future quantum computing applications.

Corresponding Author:
email: m.akrom@dsn.dinus.ac.id

1. INTRODUCTION

Quantum computing has emerged as one of the most transformative paradigms in modern computational science. Unlike classical computers, which manipulate bits that exist in definite states of 0 or 1, quantum computers leverage the principles of superposition, entanglement, and quantum interference to process information in fundamentally new ways. This capability enables quantum devices to explore exponentially large solution spaces intractable for classical algorithms. However, the practical implementation of large-scale fault-tolerant quantum computing remains limited by hardware constraints, noise, and decoherence [1].

In this context, Variational Quantum Circuits (VQCs)—also known as Parameterized Quantum Circuits (PQCs)—have emerged as one of the most promising frameworks for harnessing quantum computational power in the Noisy Intermediate-Scale Quantum (NISQ) era. VQCs provide a hybrid quantum–classical architecture, combining quantum circuits parameterized by tunable gates with classical optimization algorithms. The quantum circuit generates a parameter-dependent quantum state, while the classical optimizer iteratively updates parameters to minimize a given cost or loss function. This feedback loop forms the backbone of variational quantum algorithms (VQAs) [2].

The earliest examples of variational algorithms, such as the Variational Quantum Eigensolver (VQE) and the Quantum Approximate Optimization Algorithm (QAOA), demonstrated that shallow quantum circuits could produce beneficial computational outcomes despite device imperfections. VQE was initially designed to compute molecular ground-state energies in quantum chemistry, while QAOA focused on

combinatorial optimization problems. These two seminal works laid the foundation for various VQC-based methods in quantum machine learning, quantum simulation, and materials discovery [3].

A VQC functions as a parametric model similar to a neural network at the conceptual level. Each quantum gate is associated with a tunable parameter, analogous to a weight in a classical network. The quantum state evolution encodes complex correlations through entanglement, while measurement outcomes correspond to classical outputs. Hence, a VQC can be trained to approximate nonlinear functions, perform classification, or even simulate physical systems. This conceptual similarity to neural networks has led to the rise of Quantum Neural Networks (QNNs)—a special subclass of VQCs designed for learning from data [4].

The motivation for adopting VQCs stems from their adaptability and scalability to current quantum hardware. They require relatively shallow circuits, making them resilient against decoherence compared to deep quantum algorithms. Moreover, because the optimization process is offloaded to classical processors, VQCs allow for practical training on limited qubit systems while maintaining the potential for quantum advantage [5].

Despite their promise, VQCs face several critical challenges that hinder their scalability and practical utility [6]. These include:

- The barren plateau problem, where gradients vanish as circuit depth or system size increases, preventing efficient training.
- The expressibility–trainability trade-off, where highly expressive circuits suffer from optimization difficulties.
- Noise sensitivity in NISQ devices, which degrades measurement fidelity.
- Dependence on classical optimizers that may get trapped in local minima or exhibit unstable convergence.

The purpose of this review is therefore threefold:

- To provide a comprehensive understanding of the design and mathematical formulation of VQCs, including their ansatz architectures and optimization mechanisms.
- To survey key applications of VQCs in diverse scientific and engineering domains such as quantum machine learning, chemistry, and optimization.
- To identify open challenges and future directions that could lead to scalable, interpretable, and hardware-efficient quantum models.

This paper's structure is as follows: Section 2 discusses the fundamental principles and architecture of VQCs, including various ansatz designs and optimization techniques. Section 3 highlights applications of VQCs in machine learning, quantum chemistry, and optimization. Section 4 elaborates on challenges such as barren plateaus, expressibility issues, and noise mitigation strategies. Section 5 outlines emerging research directions that enhance VQC performance and scalability. Finally, Section 6 concludes the review by summarizing insights and projecting future developments in this rapidly evolving field.

2. THEORETICAL BACKGROUND

2.1 Fundamentals of Variational Quantum Circuits

Variational Quantum Circuits (VQCs) represent a class of parameterized quantum models that bridge quantum mechanics and classical optimization. The core idea is to design a quantum circuit whose gates depend on a set of trainable parameters ($\theta = \theta_1, \theta_2, \ldots, \theta_m$). A classical algorithm iteratively optimizes these parameters to minimize a task-specific loss function derived from circuit measurements. This hybrid framework enables quantum algorithms to run effectively on noisy intermediate-scale quantum (NISQ) devices, leveraging their quantum features while mitigating hardware limitations [7].

2.2 Architecture and Mathematical Formulation

A general VQC consists of three essential components:

- State Preparation Layer — encodes input data (classical or quantum) into a quantum state ($|\psi(x)\rangle$).
- Parameterized Quantum Circuit (Ansatz) — applies a sequence of unitary transformations ($U(\theta)$) parameterized by tunable gates.
- Measurement and Cost Evaluation — measures expectation values of observables to compute a scalar cost or loss function ($L(\theta)$).

The overall process can be expressed as:

$$|\psi_{\text{out}}(\boldsymbol{\theta})\rangle = U(\boldsymbol{\theta})|\psi(x)\rangle$$

and the expected value of an observable (H) (Hamiltonian or measurement operator) is:

$$C(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = \langle \psi_{\text{out}}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) | H | \psi_{\text{out}}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \rangle$$

The classical optimizer minimizes this expectation value (or any loss derived from it):

$$\min_{\boldsymbol{\theta}} \mathcal{L}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = f(C(\boldsymbol{\theta}))$$

The optimization proceeds iteratively:

$$\boldsymbol{\theta}^{(t+1)} = \boldsymbol{\theta}^{(t)} - \eta \nabla_{\boldsymbol{\theta}} \mathcal{L}(\boldsymbol{\theta}^{(t)})$$

where η is the learning rate, in many implementations, the gradient $\nabla_\theta L$ is computed via quantum-specific methods such as the parameter-shift rule (Section 2.4).

This closed-loop interaction between quantum and classical subsystems forms the heart of variational quantum algorithms (VQAs), encompassing models like VQE, QAOA, and Quantum Neural Networks (QNNs) [8].

2.3 Quantum Ansatz Design

The ansatz defines the structure and expressive capacity of the VQC. An ansatz is a unitary transformation parameterized as:

$$U(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = \prod_{l=1}^{L} U_l(\theta_l)$$

where (L) is the number of layers, and each $U_l(\theta_l)$ typically consists of a set of parameterized rotation and entangling gates. Different ansatz types are designed based on trade-offs between hardware efficiency, representational power, and trainability [9]:

(a) Hardware-Efficient Ansatz

Designed to match the native gate set and connectivity of available hardware (e.g., IBM Q or Rigetti systems). It typically alternates layers of single-qubit rotations (Ry(θ), Rz(θ) with entangling gates such as CNOT. Advantages: minimal circuit depth and faster execution. Drawback: prone to barren plateaus due to unstructured parameter spaces.

(b) Problem-Inspired Ansatz

Tailored for a specific physical problem, such as a molecular Hamiltonian or optimization cost function. Examples include Unitary Coupled Cluster (UCC) ansatz in VQE and the alternating application of problem and mixing Hamiltonians in QAOA. These circuits exhibit better interpretability and reduced search space dimensionality.

(c) Tensor-Network and Data-Driven Ansatz

Inspired by classical tensor networks (MPS, TTN), these architectures reduce entanglement complexity by limiting qubit interactions. Recently, data-driven ansatzes have been proposed, where circuit structure adapts dynamically to training data through reinforcement or differentiable design methods.

(d) Quantum Convolutional and Recurrent Circuits

Analogous to CNNs and RNNs, these circuits exploit data's translational symmetry or temporal correlations. They have been successfully applied in quantum image recognition and quantum time-series analysis.

2.4 Data Encoding and Feature Mapping

One of the most crucial steps in VQC-based machine learning is encoding classical data into quantum states. This process determines how information is represented and processed in Hilbert space. Typical encoding schemes include [10]:

- Basis Encoding: Represents data as computational basis states |x⟩. Efficient for discrete data but requires many qubits.
- Amplitude Encoding: Encodes data into amplitudes of a quantum state:

$$|x\rangle = \sum_{i=0}^{2^n-1} x_i |i\rangle$$

This provides exponential data compression but is challenging to prepare experimentally.

- Angle Encoding (Rotation Encoding): Encodes data values as rotation angles in single-qubit gates:

$$R_y(x_i)|0\rangle = \cos\frac{x_i}{2}|0\rangle + \sin\frac{x_i}{2}|1\rangle$$

It is hardware-friendly and widely used in quantum feature maps.

Feature maps allow data to be projected into high-dimensional quantum Hilbert spaces, where linear separability can be achieved more easily than in classical space—a key advantage for quantum machine learning.

2.5 Gradient Estimation: The Parameter-Shift Rule

Unlike classical neural networks, computing gradients in VQCs requires quantum-specific techniques since direct differentiation is impossible for quantum measurements. The parameter-shift rule provides an exact method for gradient evaluation when Pauli operators generate gates [11]. For a gate $U(\theta) = e^{-i\theta P/2}$ with P being a Pauli operator, the derivative of an expectation value ($C(\theta)$) can be written as:

$$\frac{\partial C(\theta)}{\partial \theta} = \frac{1}{2}\left[C(\theta + \frac{\pi}{2}) - C(\theta - \frac{\pi}{2})\right]$$

This formulation allows gradient computation by evaluating the quantum circuit twice—once at shifted parameter values—making it efficient and hardware-compatible.

Alternative gradient-free methods, such as Simultaneous Perturbation Stochastic Approximation (SPSA) or Bayesian Optimization, are employed when noise or hardware limitations make gradient estimation unreliable [12].

2.6 Cost Function Construction

The cost function in a VQC depends on the task:

- Quantum Chemistry: Expectation value of a Hamiltonian, $\langle\psi(\theta)|H|\psi(\theta)\rangle$.
- Classification: Cross-entropy or mean-squared error between measured probabilities and target labels.
- Optimization: Expectation of problem Hamiltonian as objective energy.

For multi-output tasks, cost functions may involve multiple observables:

$$\mathcal{L}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = \sum_k w_k \langle\psi(\boldsymbol{\theta})|H_k|\psi(\boldsymbol{\theta})\rangle$$

where w_k are task-specific weighting coefficients. Careful selection of cost functions is crucial since they directly affect gradient smoothness, convergence rate, and susceptibility to barren plateaus [13].

2.7 Classical Optimization Strategies

VQC optimization relies on classical algorithms to update parameters. Optimizers can be grouped as follows:

- Gradient-Based Methods: Stochastic Gradient Descent (SGD), Adam, and L-BFGS-B. These methods benefit from the parameter-shift rule but may be sensitive to noise.
- Gradient-free methods: COBYLA (Constrained Optimization By Linear Approximation), Nelder–Mead Simplex, and SPSA (Simultaneous Perturbation Stochastic Approximation). These methods are robust to noise and low measurement precision, making them practical for NISQ devices.

Recent advances explore meta-learning and reinforcement learning to adapt optimizer hyperparameters dynamically, improving convergence stability [14].

2.8 Summary of VQC Workflow

The complete VQC workflow integrates all the above steps into an iterative hybrid loop:

- Encode input data x into a quantum state $|\psi(x)\rangle$.
- Apply parameterized circuit $U(\theta)$.
- Measure observable(s) and compute cost $\mathcal{L}(\boldsymbol{\theta})$.
- Send cost value to the classical optimizer.
- Update parameters θ and repeat until convergence.

This quantum–classical feedback loop underpins nearly all variational algorithms and is the foundation for modern quantum machine learning architectures.

3. Applications of Variational Quantum Circuits (Expanded Version)

The flexibility of Variational Quantum Circuits (VQCs) makes them a universal tool for a wide range of quantum and hybrid computational tasks. Their ability to approximate nonlinear mappings, simulate quantum systems, and optimize high-dimensional functions has led to applications in three major domains: Quantum Machine Learning (QML), Quantum Chemistry and Material Science, and Quantum Optimization. Each domain leverages the same fundamental architecture—parameterized quantum gates combined with classical feedback—yet tailors the cost function, ansatz design, and measurement strategy to domain-specific objectives [15].

3.1 VQCs for Quantum Machine Learning

3.1.1 The Role of VQCs in QML

Quantum Machine Learning (QML) aims to enhance classical learning models by exploiting the high-dimensional feature space of quantum Hilbert spaces. Variational Quantum Circuits are the core learning model in many QML architectures, functioning analogously to classical neural networks. The parameterized gates act as trainable weights, while measurement outcomes yield features or predictions. This approach leads to Quantum Neural Networks (QNNs) and Variational Quantum Classifiers (VQCs). The general workflow for VQC-based learning includes:

- Data Encoding: Transforming classical data x into a quantum state $|\psi(x)\rangle$.
- Parameterized Circuit Evolution: Applying $U(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ to introduce trainable transformations.
- Measurement: Extracting probabilities or expectation values that correspond to class predictions.
- Loss Evaluation and Optimization: Updating parameters via classical gradient-based or gradient-free optimization.

This process allows the quantum system to represent nonlinear decision boundaries that can, in theory, outperform classical models on specific datasets with quantum feature advantages [16].

3.1.2 Quantum Feature Mapping and Kernel Learning

One of the most profound applications of VQCs in QML is quantum kernel estimation. Here, a feature map U(x) embeds classical data into a quantum Hilbert space such that:

$$K(x_i, x_j) = |\langle 0|U^{\dagger}(x_i)U(x_j)|0\rangle|^2$$

This kernel quantifies similarity between data points based on quantum state overlaps, offering exponential feature space representations that are impossible to compute classically. Such mappings are used in Quantum Support Vector Machines (QSVMs) and Quantum Kernel Ridge Regression (QKRR), where VQCs act as the kernel generators [17].

3.1.3 Hybrid Quantum–Classical Deep Learning

VQCs can seamlessly integrate with classical deep networks, forming hybrid quantum–classical models. For instance:

- A classical convolutional network extracts local features, while a VQC layer performs a nonlinear transformation in quantum space.
- Alternatively, a quantum feature extractor based on VQC can feed its output into a classical fully connected layer for final classification.

This integration has been demonstrated in applications like:

- Quantum image recognition (MNIST, Fashion-MNIST datasets).
- Molecular property prediction.
- Speech and signal classification under low-data regimes.

3.1.4 Example Implementations

- VQC Classifier: Uses rotation encoding and a layered ansatz to learn decision boundaries.
- Quantum Convolutional Neural Network (QCNN): Employs local entangling gates and pooling layers to compress information hierarchically.
- Quantum Autoencoders: Use VQCs to compress quantum data representations, optimizing reconstruction fidelity.

These implementations demonstrate that VQCs are not only conceptually analogous to classical neural networks but can also exhibit novel representational properties due to entanglement and superposition [18].

3.2 VQCs in Quantum Chemistry and Material Informatics

3.2.1 Variational Quantum Eigensolver (VQE)

The Variational Quantum Eigensolver (VQE) is the most established application of VQCs in computational physics and chemistry. It aims to estimate the ground-state energy of a molecular Hamiltonian (H) by solving:

$$E_0 = \min_{\boldsymbol{\theta}} \langle \psi(\boldsymbol{\theta}) | H | \psi(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \rangle$$

The ansatz U(θ) is often inspired by the Unitary Coupled Cluster (UCC) method, providing a physically meaningful parametrization that captures electron correlations. This algorithm has been successfully applied to small molecules such as H_2, LiH, and BeH_2, showing that even shallow circuits can reproduce near-exact energies when combined with classical post-processing [19].

3.2.2 Quantum Simulation of Material Properties

Beyond molecules, VQCs are increasingly used in material informatics to predict band structures, magnetic interactions, and electron density distributions. The quantum circuit represents correlated many-body states that are hard to simulate classically [20]. Examples include:

- Modeling quantum phase transitions in condensed matter systems.
- Computing electronic band gaps of complex materials using hybrid DFT–VQE methods.
- Designing ionic liquids and catalysts using VQC-based regression on quantum-mechanically derived descriptors.

3.2.3 Quantum Generative Models for Materials

VQCs are also adapted into quantum generative adversarial networks (QGANs), where the generator circuit learns to produce quantum states that mimic target distributions. This approach is promising for sampling molecular configurations or designing new materials with desired properties, such as corrosion inhibitors or battery electrolytes [21].

3.2.4 Advantages and Limitations

Advantages include:

- Exponential state-space representation of many-body systems.
- Energy estimation accuracy surpasses classical mean-field methods.
- Compatibility with NISQ hardware due to shallow circuit depth.

However, limitations remain in scalability, error accumulation, and the need for domain-specific ansatz designs that preserve physical symmetries.

3.3 VQCs in Quantum Optimization

3.3.1 Quantum Approximate Optimization Algorithm (QAOA)

The Quantum Approximate Optimization Algorithm (QAOA) is another cornerstone application of VQCs [22]. It solves discrete optimization problems formulated as:

$$\min_{z \in \{0,1\}^n} C(z)$$

by mapping them to a cost Hamiltonian H_C and evolving the system with alternating unitaries:

$$U(\boldsymbol{\gamma}, \boldsymbol{\beta}) = e^{-i\beta_p H_M} e^{-i\gamma_p H_C} \cdots e^{-i\beta_1 H_M} e^{-i\gamma_1 H_C}$$

where H_M is the mixing Hamiltonian and (γ,β) are variational parameters. The resulting circuit is optimized to minimize the expected energy ⟨HC⟩. Applications include:

- Combinatorial optimization problems (e.g., MaxCut, Traveling Salesman Problem).
- Portfolio optimization in finance.
- Scheduling and logistics optimization in industry.

3.3.2 Variational Quantum Boltzmann Machines

VQCs can simulate Boltzmann distributions using variational methods. These circuits learn to represent probability distributions that minimize a system's free energy. They have been explored for solving Ising models, spin-glass systems, and quantum annealing approximations [23].

3.3.3 Real-World Implementations

Industrial use cases have demonstrated small-scale VQC optimization prototypes on actual quantum hardware [24], including:

- Traffic flow optimization using D-Wave and IBM Q systems.
- Energy-efficient power grid management.
- Molecular configuration optimization in drug discovery.

Although these implementations are small in scale, they demonstrate the feasibility and potential impact of VQCs for complex decision-making tasks.

3.4 Summary of Applications

In summary, Variational Quantum Circuits represent a unifying computational framework that can be adapted to:

- Learn data-driven mappings (Quantum Machine Learning).
- Model physical systems (Quantum Chemistry and Materials).
- Solve combinatorial problems (Quantum Optimization).

Their success across these domains arises from the shared ability to parameterize quantum states and optimize them classically, offering a flexible, noise-resilient strategy for extracting useful information from quantum devices. Despite current hardware constraints, continuous advancements in circuit design, hybrid architectures, and quantum error mitigation are rapidly pushing VQC-based applications toward real-world relevance.

4. Challenges and Open Issues

Although Variational Quantum Circuits (VQCs) represent one of the most promising frameworks for near-term quantum computing, they face several fundamental and practical challenges that limit their scalability and generalization. These issues arise from the interplay between quantum hardware constraints, circuit design, and optimization landscapes. Understanding these challenges is crucial for developing next-generation algorithms and architectures that can effectively harness quantum advantages.

4.1 The Barren Plateau Problem

4.1.1 Definition and Origin

The barren plateau phenomenon refers to the exponential vanishing of cost-function gradients as the number of qubits or circuit depth increases. Optimization becomes nearly impossible in such landscapes because parameter updates yield no meaningful direction for improvement [25]. Formally, for a cost function $C(\theta) = \langle\psi(\theta)|H|\psi(\theta)\rangle$, the variance of its gradient scales as:

$$\mathrm{Var}\left(\frac{\partial C}{\partial \theta_i}\right) \propto \frac{1}{2^n}$$

where n is the number of qubits, as n grows, the gradients rapidly vanish, leading to flat optimization landscapes.

4.1.2 Causes

- Random Initialization: Randomly chosen parameters can generate states that approximate unitary 2-designs, effectively producing uniformly distributed states over Hilbert space, causing the cost to saturate.
- Deep Circuits: Excessive depth induces global entanglement, which increases gradient cancellation across layers.
- Global Cost Functions: Using cost functions that depend on the entire system (global observables) amplifies the plateau effect.

4.1.3 Mitigation Strategies

Several strategies have been proposed to overcome barren plateaus:

- Layer-wise Training: Optimizing one circuit layer simultaneously reduces parameter correlations.
- Local Cost Functions: Designing loss functions based on local observables (e.g., nearest-neighbor interactions) retains gradient variance.
- Structured Ansatz: Using problem-inspired or sparse connectivity ansatz avoids randomization effects.
- Parameter Initialization Heuristics: Choosing parameter distributions that preserve gradient variance.
- Residual and Skip-Connection Circuits: Borrowing ideas from deep learning (e.g., ResNets) to stabilize gradient flow.

Barren plateaus remain a key bottleneck in scaling VQCs to high-dimensional quantum systems despite these advances.

4.2 Expressibility–Trainability Trade-off

4.2.1 Expressibility

Expressibility measures how well a VQC can represent arbitrary quantum states in Hilbert space. Highly expressive circuits have greater representational capacity but may exhibit chaotic loss landscapes [26]. Expressibility can be quantified using the Haar measure fidelity:

$$\mathcal{E} = 1 - \mathrm{D}_{\mathrm{KL}}(p_{\mathrm{VQC}}(U) \parallel p_{\mathrm{Haar}}(U))$$

4.2.2 Trainability

Trainability refers to how efficiently an optimizer can find parameters minimizing the cost function. While increasing expressibility expands the hypothesis space, it also introduces high curvature and noise sensitivity, making optimization unstable. The trade-off can thus be summarized as: Highly expressive circuits are more complex to train, while easily trainable circuits may lack representational power [27].

4.2.3 Balancing Strategies

- Using problem-tailored ansatz to limit expressibility to relevant subspaces.
- Implementing adaptive ansatz growth (e.g., ADAPT-VQE), where circuit depth increases only when necessary.
- Applying regularization techniques in the cost function to penalize overparameterization.
- Employing quantum dropout or layer pruning to maintain trainability.

This trade-off is central to designing scalable and robust VQC architectures.

4.3 Noise, Decoherence, and Error Mitigation

4.3.1 Impact of Noise

Current NISQ devices are highly susceptible to noise sources, including:

- Gate errors (imperfect gate implementation).
- Decoherence (loss of quantum information due to environment interaction).
- Readout noise (imprecise measurement outcomes).

Noise accumulation leads to inaccurate cost-function estimates, reducing gradient reliability and ultimately derailing optimization [28].

4.3.2 Error Mitigation Techniques

Since full quantum error correction is not yet feasible on NISQ devices, various error mitigation strategies have been developed:

- Zero-Noise Extrapolation (ZNE): Runs the circuit at different noise levels and extrapolates to zero noise.
- Probabilistic Error Cancellation: Characterizes noise channels and statistically counteracts their effects.
- Measurement Error Mitigation: Calibrates and corrects measurement distributions post hoc.
- Subspace Expansion: Small corrections from nearby quantum states are included to refine the estimated expectation value.

Combined with classical post-processing, these techniques substantially improve result fidelity without requiring additional qubits [29].

4.3.3 Hardware-Aware Circuit Design

Hardware-efficient ansatz and shallow entanglement layers can further reduce noise sensitivity. Compiling circuits using device-specific gate sets and connectivity maps ensures better execution fidelity on actual quantum processors.

4.4 Optimization Challenges

4.4.1 Non-Convex Landscapes

The loss landscapes of VQCs are typically highly non-convex and rugged, containing numerous local minima and saddle points. This makes convergence dependent on initialization, optimizer choice, and stochastic measurement noise [30].

4.4.2 Classical Optimizer Limitations

Standard classical optimizers such as Adam, COBYLA, and SPSA exhibit the following limitations:

- Sensitivity to learning rates and hyperparameters.
- Slow convergence in high-dimensional parameter spaces.
- Vulnerability to stochastic noise in expectation values.

4.4.3 Emerging Optimization Approaches

To overcome these limitations, researchers have explored:

- Natural Gradient Descent: Incorporating quantum geometric information via the Fubini–Study metric tensor.
- Bayesian Optimization: Modeling the cost landscape probabilistically to guide exploration.
- Reinforcement Learning: Adapting optimizer policies based on circuit feedback.
- Quantum-Aware Momentum Methods: Combining adaptive step sizes with noise tolerance.

Hybrid approaches that mix multiple strategies often yield the best convergence on noisy hardware [31].

4.5 Data Encoding and Generalization Issues

Encoding classical data into quantum states presents unique challenges:

- Resource Cost: Amplitude encoding offers exponential data compression but requires deep circuits for state preparation.
- Information Loss: Angle and basis encoding may not fully capture data correlations.
- Generalization Gap: Overfitting can occur when circuits memorize training data rather than learn generalizable features.

Potential solutions include data re-uploading strategies, where input features are encoded at multiple circuit layers, and regularized cost functions inspired by classical machine learning [32].

4.6 Scalability and Hardware Limitations

As qubits increase, circuit depth and entanglement requirements grow exponentially, while coherence time remains limited. Current quantum processors typically operate with 50–200 noisy qubits—insufficient for large-scale tasks. Scalability challenges involve:

- Connectivity Constraints: Limited qubit coupling restricts entanglement topologies.
- Compilation Overhead: Translating abstract circuits into hardware-native gates introduces additional depth.
- Measurement Bottlenecks: Statistical sampling noise increases exponentially with circuit size.

Efforts to address these issues include error-robust ansatz design, circuit compression techniques, and hardware–software co-design, where quantum algorithm design and hardware development evolve jointly [33].

4.7 Interpretability and Explainability

In analogy with classical deep learning, VQCs often act as black boxes—their internal transformations and learned representations remain opaque. This lack of interpretability limits scientific insight and trustworthiness in applications like quantum chemistry and material design [34]. Emerging approaches to improve interpretability include:

- Quantum Feature Attribution: Quantifying qubit or gate contribution to output variance.
- Quantum Circuit Visualization Tools: Mapping learned entanglement and gate correlations.
- Physics-Informed Constraints: Embedding known symmetries or conservation laws to enforce interpretability.

4.8 Summary of Challenges

Challenge	Cause	Potential Solutions
Barren Plateaus	Deep circuits, random initialization	Layer-wise training, local costs, structured ansatz
Expressibility–Trainability Trade-off	High expressibility leading to chaotic landscapes	Adaptive ansatz, regularization, residual connections
Noise and Decoherence	Hardware imperfections	Error mitigation, hardware-efficient circuits
Non-Convex Optimization	Complex loss landscapes	Natural gradient, Bayesian optimization
Data Encoding	Limited state preparation resources	Data re-uploading, hybrid encodings
Scalability	Limited qubit connectivity, short coherence time	Circuit compression, hardware co-design
Interpretability	Lack of physical insight	Physics-informed models, visualization tools

4.9 Outlook

Addressing these challenges requires cross-disciplinary innovation at the intersection of quantum physics, optimization theory, and machine learning. The next generation of VQCs will likely integrate physics-informed priors, noise-adaptive architectures, and quantum–classical co-learning frameworks. As

algorithms and hardware evolve, these advances will pave the way toward truly scalable and explainable quantum learning systems capable of outperforming classical models in real-world tasks.

5. Future Research Directions

As Variational Quantum Circuits (VQCs) continue to serve as the foundation for most near-term quantum algorithms, a new wave of research is emerging to enhance their scalability, interpretability, and resilience against hardware limitations. The evolution of VQC research is increasingly multidisciplinary—integrating insights from quantum physics, optimization theory, and machine learning. This section outlines the key emerging directions expected to define the next phase of progress in variational quantum algorithms and their applications [35].

5.1 Physics-Informed and Constraint-Based VQCs

A promising direction is the development of Physics-Informed Variational Quantum Circuits (PiVQCs), which directly incorporate domain knowledge and physical constraints into the circuit design or loss function. Instead of optimizing purely data-driven objectives, PiVQCs enforce conservation laws, symmetries, or energy constraints—ensuring that the learned quantum states remain physically meaningful. For example:

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{total}} = \mathcal{L}_{\text{data}} + \lambda \mathcal{L}_{\text{physics}}$$

where λ controls the influence of the physical regularizer, this approach mirrors classical Physics-Informed Neural Networks (PINNs) but operates in the quantum domain, improving model interpretability and generalization. Applications include quantum material design, quantum fluid simulation, and quantum chemistry, where physical consistency is critical [36].

5.2 Quantum Kernel and Feature-Based Learning

While current VQCs often rely on direct circuit parameter optimization, a parallel line of research focuses on quantum kernels and feature embeddings as implicit learning mechanisms. In these methods, quantum circuits define high-dimensional K(xi,xj) that can be integrated with classical kernel-based algorithms (e.g., Support Vector Machines, Gaussian Processes). Future work will likely explore:

- Adaptive kernel design, where circuit parameters evolve based on data distribution.
- Multi-layer quantum feature hierarchies, analogous to deep kernels in classical deep learning.
- Quantum kernel combination frameworks, blending multiple circuits for task-specific feature construction.

These directions may allow hybrid learning systems that combine the generalization power of classical models with the representational richness of quantum feature spaces [37].

5.3 Hybrid Tensor–Quantum Architectures

As quantum devices scale, seamlessly integrating them with classical tensor-based models offers a practical pathway toward hybrid intelligence. Quantum Tensor Networks (QTNs) and quantum-classical neural architectures are emerging as powerful paradigms. For instance:

- Tensor-network compression techniques can reduce VQC parameter count without significant loss of accuracy.
- Variational circuits can serve as quantum nodes within a tensor network, encoding non-classical correlations between components.

Such architectures bridge the gap between quantum expressibility and classical scalability, allowing complex systems—such as molecular simulations or graph learning—to leverage the strengths of both computational paradigms [38].

5.4 Fault-Tolerant and Noise-Resilient VQCs

With the advent of larger quantum processors, fault tolerance becomes a central requirement. Research is increasingly focused on designing noise-resilient variational architectures capable of maintaining stability under imperfect conditions. Promising directions include:

- Error-resilient ansatz structures, where gate sequences are arranged to self-correct phase or amplitude errors.

- Noise-adaptive optimization, dynamically adjusting learning rates or cost functions based on estimated noise variance.
- Integration of Quantum Error Correction (QEC) and Error Mitigation Layers (EMLs) directly into circuit training.

Furthermore, hybrid quantum–classical co-optimization frameworks are being developed to adaptively tune both ansatz structure and error models during training, paving the way for robust VQCs deployable on early fault-tolerant hardware [39].

5.5 Automatic and Differentiable Quantum Circuit Design

Manual design of VQC architectures is often heuristic and problem-dependent. Future research moves toward automated quantum architecture search (AutoQAS), where circuit structures are optimized alongside parameters. This field combines techniques from reinforcement learning, evolutionary computation, and differentiable programming to discover efficient circuit layouts autonomously. Key emerging methods include:

- Differentiable Quantum Architecture Search (DQAS): enabling gradient-based updates of gate sequences and connectivity.
- Neural-guided circuit synthesis: using neural surrogates to predict optimal ansatz designs.
- Evolutionary strategies: optimizing circuit depth, entanglement topology, and cost fidelity via population-based search.

These developments could dramatically reduce the manual trial-and-error process, enabling automated discovery of VQC architectures optimized for specific hardware and datasets.

5.6 Quantum Federated and Distributed Learning

As quantum computing resources remain limited and geographically distributed, Quantum Federated Learning (QFL) is gaining traction. In QFL, multiple quantum nodes train local VQCs on different datasets, sharing parameter updates rather than raw data. This approach preserves privacy while exploiting collective learning benefits. Future challenges include:

- Synchronizing updates across noisy and heterogeneous quantum devices.
- Defining communication-efficient quantum parameter aggregation schemes.
- Combining classical and quantum federated layers for hybrid learning networks.

Such frameworks could enable collaborative quantum learning ecosystems, particularly for global-scale scientific simulations or cryptographic analysis.

5.7 Explainability and Quantum Interpretability

Interpretability will become increasingly vital as VQCs are applied to sensitive domains such as material discovery and quantum finance. Emerging research focuses on making VQCs more explainable and transparent, addressing current architectures' "black-box" nature. Potential developments include:

- Quantum saliency mapping: identifying which qubits or gates contribute most to prediction outcomes.
- Entanglement visualization tools: revealing how correlations evolve during training.
- Explainable quantum kernels: decomposing learned representations into interpretable physical features.

These efforts aim to make VQCs influential, trustworthy, and scientifically interpretable.

5.8 Integration with Quantum Hardware Co-Design

A crucial long-term direction is the co-design of quantum algorithms and hardware. Instead of treating quantum circuits as abstract constructs, researchers are increasingly designing VQCs that exploit the specific strengths of hardware platforms—such as trapped ions, superconducting qubits, or photonic processors [40]. Examples include:

- Topology-aware ansatz designs that map efficiently to hardware connectivity graphs.
- Pulse-level VQCs, where variational parameters control analog quantum pulses directly.
- Dynamic resource allocation, optimizing circuit placement, depth, and real-time gate timing.

Co-design strategies will enable quantum systems to reach peak performance by aligning algorithmic and physical constraints.

5.9 Toward Quantum Advantage in Real Applications

Ultimately, future VQC research aims to achieve quantum advantage, at which variational algorithms outperform classical counterparts in speed, accuracy, or energy efficiency. Promising target areas include:

- Quantum-enhanced materials and catalyst discovery.
- Real-time optimization for logistics and finance.
- Drug design and protein folding simulations.
- Secure post-quantum cryptographic learning models.

Research must converge across algorithmic, hardware, and theoretical fronts to demonstrate verifiable performance advantages in realistic scenarios to achieve this goal.

The future of Variational Quantum Circuits lies in the synergy between physics, machine learning, and quantum engineering. From physics-informed formulations and hybrid tensor models to automated design and federated quantum learning, the field is evolving toward adaptive, interpretable, and hardware-aware systems. While significant challenges remain—particularly in scalability and noise resilience—the rapid pace of interdisciplinary innovation strongly suggests that VQCs will form the computational backbone of early quantum applications and may eventually enable large-scale, fault-tolerant quantum intelligence systems.

6. CONCLUSION

Variational Quantum Circuits (VQCs) have become the cornerstone of hybrid quantum–classical computing in the NISQ era. By combining parameterized quantum gates with classical optimization, VQCs enable practical quantum algorithms that bridge the gap between theory and hardware limitations. This review has outlined their foundational architecture, optimization principles, and diverse applications in quantum machine learning, chemistry, and optimization. Despite significant progress, key challenges that limit scalability and reliability persist—such as barren plateaus, expressibility, trainability trade-offs, and noise-induced errors. Future research must focus on developing physics-informed circuits, noise-resilient architectures, and automated, interpretable designs that align with evolving hardware capabilities. With continued advances in algorithm–hardware co-design, VQCs are poised to play a central role in realizing practical quantum advantage and shaping the next generation of intelligent quantum technologies.

REFERENCES

[1] A. Zulehner, R. Wille, Simulation and design of quantum circuits, in I. Ulidowski, I. Lanese, U.P. Schultz, C. Ferreira (Eds.), Reversible Computation: Extending Horizons of Computing: Selected Results of the COST Action IC1405, Springer International Publishing, Cham, 60–82 (2020), http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-47361-7_3.

[2] M. Benedetti, E. Lloyd, S. Sack, M. Fiorentini, Parameterized quantum circuits as machine learning models, Quantum Sci. Technol., 4(4), (2019), http://dx.doi.org/10.1088/2058-9565/ab4eb5, arXiv:1906.07682.

[3] J. Biamonte, P. Wittek, N. Pancotti, P. Rebentrost, N. Wiebe, and S. Lloyd. Quantum Machine Learning. Nature, 549(7671), 195-202 (2017).

[4] S. Budi, M. Akrom, G.A. Trisnapradika, T. Sutojo, W.A.E. Prabowo, Optimization of Polynomial Functions on the NuSVR Algorithm Based on Machine Learning: Case Studies on Regression Datasets, *Scientific Journal of Informatics*, 10(2), (2023), https://doi.org/10.15294/sji.v10i2.43929.

[5] M. Benedetti, J. Realpe-Gómez, and R. Biswas, Quantum-Assisted Learning of Hardware-Embedded Probabilistic Graphical Models. Physical Review A, 99(4), 042306 (2019).

[6] S. Lloyd, M. Mohseni, and P. Rebentrost, Quantum algorithms for supervised and unsupervised machine learning. arXiv preprint arXiv:1307.0411.

[7] M. Schuld, I. Sinayskiy, and F. Petruccione, The quest for a quantum support vector machine. Quantum Information Processing, 13(11), 2567-2586 (2014).

[8] V. Havlíček, A.D. Córcoles, K. Temme, A.W. Harrow, A. Kandala, J.M. Chow, and J.M. Gambetta. Supervised learning with quantum-enhanced feature spaces. Nature, 567(7747), 209-212 (2019).

[9] M. Akrom, S. Rustad, H.K. Dipojono, A machine learning approach to predict the efficiency of corrosion inhibition by natural product-based organic inhibitors, *Phys Scr*, 99(3), 036006 (2024), https://doi.org/10.1088/1402-4896/ad28a9.

[10] M. Akrom, Investigation of natural extracts as green corrosion inhibitors in steel using density functional theory, *Jurnal Teori dan Aplikasi Fisika*, 10(1), 89-102 (2022), https://doi.org/10.23960%2Fjtaf.v10i1.2927.
[11] Nielsen, M. A., & Chuang, I. L. (2010). "Quantum Computation and Quantum Information: 10th Anniversary Edition." Cambridge University Press.
[12] Preskill, J. (1998). "Quantum Computing: Prologue." arXiv preprint quant-ph/9712048.
[13] Mermin, N. D. (2007). "Quantum Computer Science: An Introduction." Cambridge University Press.
[14] Ladd, T. D., Jelezko, F., Laflamme, R., Nakamura, Y., Monroe, C., & O'Brien, J. L. (2010). "Quantum computers." Nature, 464(7285), 45-53.
[15] Aaronson, S., & Arkhipov, A. (2011). "The Computational Complexity of Linear Optics." Proceedings of the ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing (STOC).
[16] Wang, D., Guo, F., & Guo, Y. (2016). "A novel solution to multi-class classification problem using support vector machine." *Journal of Ambient Intelligence and Humanized Computing, 7*(4), 563-571.
[17] Chang, H., Liu, Y., & Bai, Y. (2017). "A new multi-category support vector machine algorithm." *Soft Computing, 21*(6), 1377-1389.
[18] M.-Z. Ai, Y. Ding, Y. Ban, J.D. Martín-Guerrero, J. Casanova, J.-M. Cui, Y.-F. Huang, X. Chen, C.-F. Li, G.-C. Guo, Experimentally realizing efficient quantum control with reinforcement learning, 2021, arXiv:2101.09020.
[19] M. Akrom, S. Rustad, H.K. Dipojono. Development of quantum machine learning to evaluate the corrosion inhibition capability of pyrimidine compounds. Materials Today Communications, 39, 108758 (2024), https://doi.org/10.1016/j.mtcomm.2024.108758.
[20] D. Alaminos, M.B. Salas, M.A. Fernández-Gámez, Quantum computing and deep learning methods for GDP growth forecasting, Comput. Econ. (2021) http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10614-021-10110-z.
[21] F.J. García-Peñalvo, Desarrollo de estados de la cuestión robustos: Revisiones sistemáticas de literatura, Educ. Knowl. Soc. (EKS) 23 (2022) http://dx.doi.org/10.14201/eks.28600, URL http://repositorio.grial.eu/handle/grial/2568.
[22] W. O'Quinn, S. Mao, Quantum machine learning: Recent advances and outlook, IEEE Wirel. Commun. 27 (3) (2020) 126–131, http://dx.doi.org/10.1109/MWC.001.1900341.
[23] D. Moher, A. Liberati, J. Tetzlaff, D.G. Altman, Preferred reporting items for systematic reviews and meta-analyses: The PRISMA statement, Int. J. Surg. 8 (5) (2010) 336–341, http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.ijsu.2010.02.007.
[24] M. Petticrew, H. Roberts, Systematic Reviews in the Social Sciences: A Practical Guide, vol. 11, 2006, http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/9780470754887.
[25] Y. Huang, H. Lei, X. Li, Q. Zhu, W. Ren, X. Liu, Quantum generative model with variable-depth circuit, Comput. Mater. Contin. 65 (1) (2020) 445–458, http://dx.doi.org/10.32604/cmc.2020.010390.
[26] M. Srikumar, C.D. Hill, L.C.L. Hollenberg, Clustering and enhanced classification using a hybrid quantum autoencoder, Quantum Sci. Technol. 7 (1) (2021) 015020, http://dx.doi.org/10.1088/2058-9565/ac3c53.
[27] D. Konar, S. Bhattacharyya, B.K. Panigrahi, E.C. Behrman, Qutrit-inspired fully self-supervised shallow quantum learning network for brain tumor segmentation, IEEE Trans. Neural Netw. Learn. Syst. (2021) 1–15, http://dx.doi.org/10. 1109/tnnls.2021.3077188, arXiv:2009.06767.
[28] M. Lukac, K. Abdiyeva, M. Kameyama, CNOT-measure quantum neural networks, in: Proceedings of the International Symposium on Multiple-Valued Logic, Vol. 2018-May, IEEE Computer Society, 2018, pp. 186–191, http://dx.doi.org/10.1109/ISMVL.2018.00040.
[29] Y. Li, R.G. Zhou, R. Xu, J. Luo, W. Hu, A quantum deep convolutional neural network for image recognition, Quantum Sci. Technol. 5 (4) (2020) http://dx.doi.org/10.1088/2058-9565/ab9f93.
[30] M. Akrom, DFT Investigation of Syzygium Aromaticum and Nicotiana Tabacum Extracts as Corrosion Inhibitor, Science Tech: Jurnal Ilmu Pengetahuan dan Teknologi, 8(1), 42-48 (2022). http://dx.doi.org/10.30738/st.vol8.no1.a11775.
[31] H. Wang, J. Zhao, B. Wang, L. Tong, A quantum approximate optimization algorithm with metalearning for maxcut problem and its simulation via tensorflow quantum, Math. Probl. Eng. 2021 (2021) http://dx.doi.org/10.1155/2021/6655455.
[32] A. Ceschini, A. Rosato, M. Panella, Design of an LSTM cell on a quantum hardware, IEEE Trans. Circuits Syst. II 69 (3) (2022) 1822–1826, http://dx.doi.org/10.1109/TCSII.2021.3126204.

[33] Y.-Y. Hong, C.J.E. Arce, T.-W. Huang, A robust hybrid classical and quantum model for short-term wind speed forecasting, IEEE Access 11 (2023) 90811–90824, http://dx.doi.org/10.1109/ACCESS.2023.3308053.

[34] S.Y.-C. Chen, Asynchronous training of quantum reinforcement learning, Procedia Comput. Sci. 222 (2023) 321–330, http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.procs.2023.08.171, International Neural Network Society Workshop on Deep Learning Innovations and Applications (INNS DLIA 2023).

[35] J. Preskill, Quantum Computing in the NISQ era and beyond, Quantum 2 (2018) 79, http://dx.doi.org/10.22331/q-2018-08-06-79.

[36] M. Akrom, S. Rustad, H.K. Dipojono. Variational quantum circuit-based quantum machine learning approach for predicting corrosion inhibition efficiency of pyridine-quinoline compounds. Materials Today Quantum, 2, 100007 (2024), https://doi.org/10.1016/j.mtquan.2024.100007.

[37] M. Akrom, Quantum machine learning for corrosion resistance in stainless steel, Materials Today Quantum, 3, 100013 (2024), https://doi.org/10.1016/j.mtquan.2024.100013.

[38] R. Sharma, B. Kaushik, N.K. Gondhi, M. Tahir, M.K.I. Rahmani, Quantum particle swarm optimization based convolutional neural network for handwritten script recognition, Comput. Mater. Contin. 71 (3) (2022) 5855–5873, http://dx.doi.org/10.32604/cmc.2022.024232.

[39] M. Akrom, T. Sutojo, A. Pertiwi, S. Rustad, H.K. Dipojono, Investigation of Best QSPR-Based Machine Learning Model to Predict Corrosion Inhibition Performance of Pyridine-Quinoline Compounds, *J Phys Conf Ser*, 2673(1), 012014 (2023), https://doi.org/10.1088/1742-6596/2673/1/012014.

[40] M. Akrom, A comprehensive approach utilizing quantum machine learning in the study of corrosion inhibition on quinoxaline compounds, Artificial Intelligence Chemistry, 2(2), 100073 (2024), https://doi.org/10.1016/j.aichem.2024.100073.