

# Perceval: A Software Platform for Discrete Variable Photonic Quantum Computing

Portability dossier - benchmark

agQSL portability pipeline

2026-06-07

Field	Value
Slug	2026-arxiv-2204.00602-perceval-software-platform-discrete-variable-photonic
Source	arXiv
Link	<a href="https://arxiv.org/abs/2204.00602">https://arxiv.org/abs/2204.00602</a>
Category	benchmark
Triaged	2026-06-07 by port_until_julien_parallel
Bootstrapped	2026-06-07

## Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>Capability note</b>	<b>2</b>
1.1	Claim	2
1.2	Vendor and machine	2
1.3	Metrics	2
1.4	Context	4
1.5	Caveats	4

# 1 Capability note

## 1.1 Claim

Quandela introduces Perceval (v0.7.3), an open-source Python platform for simulating and interfacing with discrete-variable (DV) photonic quantum computers; the headline demonstrated capability is classical simulation, exemplified by a noiseless Boson Sampling simulation of  $n = 14$  single photons across  $m = 60$  modes, producing  $1.5 \times 10^9$  samples from an output space of  $\binom{73}{14} \approx 10^{14}$  states.

## 1.2 Vendor and machine

- **Vendor:** Quandela (Massy, France), with academic collaborators (C2N/CNRS, Universite Paris-Saclay, ENS-PSL, CentraleSupélec/Inria/LMF).
- **Machine:** No hardware QPU is benchmarked in this paper. The artefact is the Perceval software platform itself (v0.7.3). Since v0.7, Perceval can dispatch samples to real Quandela photonic chips via the Quandela Cloud, but this paper prints no hardware-run metrics.
- **Software stack:** Python front-end with C back-ends using SIMD vectorisation. Four back-ends: `CliffordClifford2017` (sampling), `Naive` (permanent-based single-output probability), `SLOS` (strong simulation, full distribution), `Stepper` (component-wise, supports loss/noise). Performance benchmarks were run on a 32-core, 3.1 GHz Intel Haswell.
- **Date:** arXiv v1 April 2022; accepted in the journal *Quantum* on 2023-02-07.

## 1.3 Metrics

Metric	Value	Source
QV / linear XEB / etc.	not reported (software platform, not a hardware benchmark)	n/a
1Q gate fidelity	not reported (no hardware run)	n/a

Metric	Value	Source
2Q gate fidelity	not reported; simulated post-selected Ralph CNOT reports ideal fidelity 100% with success probability ("performance") 1/9, an ideal noiseless simulation rather than a device measurement	§§§3.4 (Step-by-Step Example), Fig. ralph_cnot_simul_result
Circuit depth sustained	not reported	n/a
Qubit count used	simulation demonstrations only: Grover $N = 4$ (2 qubits, spatial + polarisation), Shor $N = 15$ , $a = 2$ (5-qubit circuit reduced to 4 used), QML function approximator with up to 6 input photons	§§§4.4, §§§4.5, §§§4.6
Boson Sampling simulation scale	$n = 14$ photons, $m = 60$ modes; 300 Haar-random $60 \times 60$ unitaries, $5 \times 10^6$ runs each, $1.5 \times 10^9$ samples total; output space $\binom{73}{14} \approx 10^{14}$	§§§4.3

Metric	Value	Source
SLOS back-end practical limit	$\approx 20$ photons on a personal computer, $\approx 24$ photons on a supercomputer (memory bound, $\mathcal{O}(n^{\binom{m+n-1}{n}})$ )	§§3.3.3   <i>Back – endpracticallimits</i> ( $<16$ GB, runtime of a few seconds)
Permanent-computation benchmark	timed against Xanadu’s <i>The Walrus</i> v0.19 on $n \times n$ Haar-random matrices; exact times appear only in a figure and are not printed numerically in the text	Fig. performance-permanent

## 1.4 Context

This is a tooling and simulation white paper, not a quantum-hardware capability claim. Its quantitative results situate Perceval against other classical photonic simulators (Xanadu’s *The Walrus* for permanents; QOptCraft for linear-optics tooling) and against published photonic experiments that it reproduces in software: the Hong-Ou-Mandel results of Santori et al. (2002) and Giesz et al. (2015), the two-qubit Grover demonstration of Kwiat et al. (2000), the Shor  $N = 15$  factoring of Politi et al. (2009), and the 60-mode, up-to-14-photon Boson Sampling regime of Wang et al. (2019). The largest figure, a  $1.5 \times 10^9$ -sample Boson Sampling simulation at  $n = 14$ ,  $m = 60$ , is a classical reproduction of that experimental regime, not a hardware advantage demonstration. The complementary platform for the continuous-variable model is Xanadu’s *Strawberry Fields*.

## 1.5 Caveats

- **Category mismatch.** The dossier was auto-triaged as **benchmark**, but the paper is a software-platform paper. Every quantitative result is either classical-simulation performance or a software reproduction of a prior published experiment. There is no new hardware capability claim (no QV, no XEB, no measured gate fidelities or device shot counts).
- **Peer review.** This is not a blog post; it was peer-reviewed and accepted in *Quantum* (2023-02-07), so the absence-of-peer-review flag does not apply. It is, however, vendor-authored (Quandela), and the headline simulation numbers are validated only via

efficiently computable partial certificates (the marginal  $P(K)$  that all photons land in the first  $K$  output modes), not by brute-force verification of the full  $\approx 10^{14}$ -dimensional distribution.

- **Simulation, not measurement.** The CNOT “fidelity 100%” is an ideal noiseless simulation and the  $1/9$  “performance” is the theoretical post-selection success probability; neither is a measured hardware result.
- **Reproducibility.** The platform is open-source (GitHub) and the examples are documented as notebooks, so the simulation claims are reproducible from open code. The Quandela Cloud hardware path is mentioned as a feature but is not exercised with reported numbers in this paper.