

Large-scale quantum reservoir learning with an analog quantum computer

Portability dossier - app

agQSL portability pipeline

2026-05-25

Field	Value
Slug	2026-arxiv-2407.02553-quera-quantum-reservoir-learning
Source	arXiv
Link	https://arxiv.org/abs/2407.02553
Category	app
Triaged	2026-05-25 by codex
Bootstrapped	2026-05-25

Contents

1	Source	3
1.1	Domain classification	3
1.2	Expert persona for Julien	3
1.3	Related prior work (brief bibliography)	3
1.4	Difficulty estimate	3
2	Extraction	4
2.1	What the paper does (one paragraph)	4
2.2	Quantum hardware used	4

2.3	Computational primitive	4
2.4	Resource fingerprint	4
2.5	Assumptions and results	6
2.6	Portability flags	6
2.7	Caveats	7
3	Portability matrix	8
3.1	Summary	8
3.2	QuEra Aquila — runs as-is (<i>anchor</i>)	9
3.3	Pasqal Orion Alpha / Fresnel — runs with translation	9
3.4	Atom Computing AC1000 / Azure logical offering — architectural rewrite	10
3.5	Quantinuum Helios — architectural rewrite	10
3.6	IBM Heron / Nighthawk — architectural rewrite	11
3.7	D-Wave Advantage2 — infeasible today	11
3.8	Xanadu Borealis — infeasible today	12
3.9	Xanadu Aurora — infeasible today	12
3.10	Residual caveats	13

1 Source

1.1 Domain classification

Primary: machine learning. Secondary: other - neutral-atom analogue quantum simulation and Rydberg-array hardware, since the learning primitive is built from analogue Hamiltonian dynamics rather than a circuit ansatz.

1.2 Expert persona for Julien

A quantum machine learning specialist who has worked with reservoir computing, kernel methods, or analogue Hamiltonian processors. They should be comfortable translating Rydberg-array control schedules into ML embeddings, comparing position, local detuning, and global pulse encodings, and tracking how shot noise and hardware consistency affect SVM/SVR postprocessing. Familiarity with Aquila, Bloqade, or neutral-atom control constraints would save time.

1.3 Related prior work (brief bibliography)

- Bravo et al., “Quantum Reservoir Computing Using Arrays of Rydberg Atoms”, PRX Quantum 3, 030325 (2022). DOI: 10.1103/PRXQuantum.3.030325.
- Huang et al., “Power of data in quantum machine learning”, Nature Communications 12, 2631 (2021). DOI: 10.1038/s41467-021-22539-9.
- Albrecht et al., “Quantum feature maps for graph machine learning on a neutral atom quantum processor”, Physical Review A 107, 042615 (2023). DOI: 10.1103/PhysRevA.107.042615.
- Yasuda et al., “Quantum reservoir computing with repeated measurements on superconducting devices” (2023). arXiv:2310.06706.
- Senanian et al., “Microwave signal processing using an analog quantum reservoir computer”, Nature Communications 15 (2024). DOI: 10.1038/s41467-024-51161-8; arXiv:2312.16166.
- Cimini et al., “Large-scale quantum reservoir computing using a Gaussian Boson Sampler” (2025). arXiv:2505.13695.

1.4 Difficulty estimate

High. The paper and supplementary source are readable locally, with no access blocker, but Julien’s extraction will need the supplementary methods: three data encodings, multiple datasets, several array geometries, shot-count regimes, postselection choices, correlator sets, noise models, and Aquila-specific control constraints.

2 Extraction

2.1 What the paper does (one paragraph)

The paper implements quantum reservoir learning on QuEra’s Aquila neutral-atom analog quantum computer. Classical data are encoded into a Rydberg Hamiltonian through global detuning pulses, atom-position-dependent interactions, or local detuning patterns. The atoms evolve analogously, are measured repeatedly at several probe times, and the resulting one- and two-site Z -correlators become features for simple classical SVM/SVR models. The authors apply the pipeline to Santa Fe laser time-series prediction, MNIST classification, tomato leaf disease classification, and synthetic kernel-geometry tasks. The central claim is practical, gradient-free QML at larger hardware scale, with experiments up to 108 atoms and a comparative quantum-kernel advantage on constructed data.

2.2 Quantum hardware used

- **Vendor / machine:** QuEra / Aquila, described as a publicly accessible neutral-atom analog quantum computer.
- **Qubit count:** Up to 108 qubits used. Specific experiments include 9-qubit MNIST chains and 12-qubit Santa Fe chains. Tomato runs use square 2D arrays from 9 to 81 qubits plus a 9×12 array. Available machine capacity is not reported in the paper.
- **Connectivity:** Programmable 1D chains and 2D arrays with Rydberg van der Waals interactions $V_{jk} = C/\|\mathbf{r}_j - \mathbf{r}_k\|^6$; encodings mostly target nearest-neighbour interactions while weaker longer-range tails remain part of the analog Hamiltonian. Six parallel 1D chains were separated by $15 \mu\text{m}$ to act as effectively isolated copies.
- **Gate set:** Not a gate-model experiment. Native controls are global Rabi drive $\Omega(t)$, global detuning $\Delta_g(t)$, site-dependent local detuning $\alpha_j \Delta_l(t)$, atom positions setting V_{jk} , and final projective measurement.
- **Notable features leveraged:** Analog Rydberg dynamics, blockade-scale interaction tuning, programmable atom positions, local detuning masks, global pulse shaping, repeated fresh preparation/readout at probe times, parallel independent arrays, and postselection of imperfect initial sorts in 1D experiments. No mid-circuit measurement or feedforward is used in the reported experiments.

2.3 Computational primitive

QML inference / sampling: analog quantum reservoir learning. The quantum primitive is sampling local observables after Rydberg Hamiltonian evolution; training is classical and there is no variational quantum loop.

2.4 Resource fingerprint

Metric	Value	Source (page / equation / SI)
Qubits (logical)	not reported as fault-tolerant logical qubits; the algorithmic reservoir size is N_q , with reported experiments up to $N_q = 108$	Main text abstract, Image classification and qubit scaling; SI Experimental and calculational methods
Qubits (physical)	up to 108 neutral-atom qubits used; available Aquila capacity not reported in the paper	Main text abstract and Discussion; SI tomato encoding methods
Circuit depth	not reported; this is analog Hamiltonian evolution. Reported probe schedules are 5 timesteps for MNIST, local/position Santa Fe, and tomato experiments, and 10 timesteps for global-pulse Santa Fe	SI Experimental and calculational methods
2Q-gate count (total)	not reported; entanglement comes from continuous Rydberg interactions rather than discrete two-qubit gates	Main text Rydberg Hamiltonian equation; SI Encoding to Rydberg Hamiltonian dynamics
Measurement shots	task-dependent: $N_s = 220$ for 3/8 MNIST; $N_s \sim 100$ chosen for 10-class MNIST; 110 shots shown for Santa Fe and consistency checks; $N_s = 100$ kept for the largest tomato experiment; performance plateaus typically near $N_s \sim 1000$	Main text Figs. 2-4 and Image classification text; SI System size scaling and sampling, Experimental consistency, Tomato results

Metric	Value	Source (page / equation / SI)
Classical loop iter.	not reported; the paper states there is no quantum-hardware optimisation loop, while classical SVM/SVR grid-search sizes and solver iteration counts are not reported	Main text Co-designed Algorithm; SI Classical models
Wall-clock runtime	not reported	Main text Image classification text; SI notes that six parallel chains reduce hardware runtime but gives no elapsed time

2.5 Assumptions and results

- The paper claims a gradient-free QRC method with improving experimental performance up to 108 qubits, plus comparative quantum kernel advantage on a synthetic 3/8-MNIST task with a QRC-CRC test accuracy difference of $(7.1 \pm 3.1)\%$.
- It reports 3/8-MNIST test accuracy of 0.935 at $N_s = 220$, 0/1-MNIST accuracy above 99% with the caveat that classical methods also reach that level, and tomato performance that improves with system size, exceeds the linear SVM baseline at the two largest sizes, and approaches the 4-layer neural-network benchmark.
- Uncertainties are estimated as means and standard deviations over 25 training/inference instances: 5 shot-resampled embeddings and 5 dataset permutations or training-set resamples. Noise discussion separates finite shot noise, shot-to-shot position fluctuations, decoherence, calibration drift, and systematic inconsistency; the illustrative noise parameters $\Delta r_{fl} = 0.2 \mu\text{m}$ and $\delta\Delta_{fl} = 0.1$ are described as closest to hardware observations, not as a complete hardware noise model.
- Classical comparisons include linear SVM/SVR on the input features, a 4-layer feedforward neural network with two 100-node hidden layers, the classical spin reservoir (CRC), and Gaussian/RBF kernels for some kernel-geometry tests. The authors state that no classical simulations are known to readily simulate the 108-qubit experimental dynamics.

2.6 Portability flags

- Requires analog neutral-atom Rydberg Hamiltonian dynamics with $V_{ij} = C/\|\mathbf{r}_i - \mathbf{r}_j\|^6$; the paper supplies no digital circuit decomposition.
- Data encoding relies on hardware controls: atom-position modulation, site-dependent local detuning, and time-shaped global detuning.

- Position encoding is sensitive to geometric constraints and calibration: atom positions are rounded to two decimal places, and the tomato experiment avoids irregular row positions because of a hardware minimum-row-distance constraint.
- Shot-to-shot atom-position fluctuations affect position encoding; local-detuning inhomogeneity and decoherence affect local and pulse encodings.
- Embeddings require repeated preparation and projective measurement at several probe times. They are not collected as a single run with mid-circuit measurements.
- 1D experiments use six physically parallel, well-separated chains to reduce sampling runtime; large 2D arrays cannot always use this parallelism because of limited accessible physical space.
- 1D experiments discard shots with imperfect initial sorts; the paper says this is below 10% for explored 1D sizes. For 2D QRC, no sample postselection is applied, even though around 60% of shots at the largest sizes would have a sorting defect.
- The observable set is hardware-readout specific: all $\langle Z_i \rangle$ values, all $\langle Z_i Z_j \rangle$ values for proof-of-principle 1D chains, and only nearest-neighbour connected two-point correlators for large 2D arrays.
- Mid-circuit measurement and feedforward appear only as a possible future way to improve global-pulse encoding; they are not part of the demonstrated protocol.

2.7 Caveats

The dossier contains the arXiv TeX source and figures, and the TeX source includes both the main text and Supplementary Information. No local PDF or HTML rendering was present, so source references above use main-text equations, figures, and SI sections rather than PDF page numbers. I did not digitise values that appear only in plotted curves. No paper sections were unreachable from the local source bundle.

3 Portability matrix

Anchor: The anchor is QuEra Aquila, the public neutral-atom analogue Hamiltonian simulator used by Kornjaca et al. for quantum reservoir learning. The executed runs are the Santa Fe time-series, MNIST, tomato disease, and synthetic kernel tasks in the main-text sections **Co-designed Algorithm and Results on quantum hardware**, with Fig. 2 for time-series and Fig. 3 for image classification and qubit scaling; the paper has no hardware-run table, and SI Table **SFlas_perf** is a simulation-only Santa Fe table. The hardware claim to port is therefore the demonstrated analogue reservoir up to $N_q = 108$ atoms, not a digital circuit or large-instance resource table.

Julien’s fingerprint: Julien’s extraction fixes the portability problem as an analogue Rydberg-reservoir workload: up to 108 neutral-atom qubits; programmable 1D chains and 2D arrays; interactions $V_{jk} = C/\|\mathbf{r}_j - \mathbf{r}_k\|^6$; global Rabi drive $\Omega(t)$; global detuning $\Delta_g(t)$; site-dependent local detuning $\alpha_j\Delta_l(t)$; repeated fresh final measurements at several probe times; and no mid-circuit measurement or feedforward. Any positive non-anchor row has to preserve those controls or explicitly replace them with a costed digital or modality-specific rewrite.

3.1 Summary

Modality	Vendor	Verdict	2026 fit
Neutral atom analogue (anchor)	QuEra Aquila	runs as-is	yes: hardware-demonstrated at 108 atoms
Neutral atom analogue	Pasqal Orion Alpha / Fresnel	runs with translation	partial: subscale (100-qubit cloud in 2026), position/global variants only; full 108/local-pulse run conditional on larger target-QPU local-detuning access
Neutral atom gate model	Atom Computing AC1000 / Azure logical offering	architectural rewrite	partial: scale exists; analogue controls and digital resource costing not public
Trapped ion gate model	Quantinuum Helios	architectural rewrite	partial: 98 qubits; 108-atom anchor needs larger target or smaller workload
Superconducting gate model	IBM Heron / Nighthawk	architectural rewrite	partial: qubits fit on Heron; depth, routing, and shot budget un-costed
Quantum annealing	D-Wave Advantage2	infeasible today	no

Modality	Vendor	Verdict	2026 fit
Photonic GBS	Xanadu Borealis	infeasible today	no
Photonic MBQC prototype	Xanadu Aurora	infeasible today	no

3.2 QuEra Aquila — runs as-is (*anchor*)

Modality: Neutral atom analogue (anchor).

Translation: — (anchor row, no translation needed).

Evidence:

- Kornjaca et al., [arXiv:2407.02553](#) (retrieved 2026-05-25), abstract, Co-designed Algorithm, Results on quantum hardware, Figs. 2-3, and SI Table SFlas_perf.
- AWS Braket, [Submit an analog program using QuEra Aquila](#) (retrieved 2026-05-25), native AHS Hamiltonian, programmable 2D atom arrangement, $\Omega(t)$, $\Delta_{\text{global}}(t)$, local detuning, and C_6/d^6 interaction terms.
- QuEra, [Aquila](#) (retrieved 2026-05-25), 256-qubit analogue neutral-atom processor, Amazon Braket access, dynamic layout, and fine-grained analogue programming.

3.3 Pasqal Orion Alpha / Fresnel — runs with translation

Modality: Neutral atom analogue.

Translation: Pasqal is the only non-QuEra row here that preserves the analogue Rydberg-reservoir primitive rather than digitising it. The 2026 runnable scope is position and global-pulse QRC: (i) rewrite the Aquila schedules in Pulser, QoolQit, or Pasqal Cloud so that the source $\Omega(t)$, $\Delta_{\text{g}}(t)$, and C_6/R^6 interaction terms are expressed in Pasqal’s Rydberg analogue model; (ii) re-fit atom coordinates and blockade scale to Pasqal spacing, geometry, pulse-bandwidth, and detuning constraints, especially for Julien’s position encoding $V_{il} = V^{(0)}(1 + \lambda x_i)$; (iii) reproduce the probe-time protocol by running fresh jobs at each measurement time and reconstructing $\langle Z_i \rangle$ and $\langle Z_i Z_j \rangle$ features. No mid-circuit measurement is needed. The local-pulse variant is a preconditioned extension, not a 2026 claim: Pasqal documents detuning-map modulation in Pulser, but the cited public QPU evidence does not by itself pin target-QPU support for the exact local-detuning mask used in Julien’s fingerprint. Since public Pasqal Cloud evidence is a 100-qubit QPU and the anchor includes 108 atoms, the row stays subscale until a 108+ accessible target is booked. Preconditions for promoting beyond partial: target-QPU local-detuning confirmation for $\alpha_j \Delta_1(t)$, target-specific evolution-time/probe schedule, effective shot budget against the source $N_s \sim 100$ to 1000 range, and hardware-consistency calibration for local detuning and position encoding. The 2Q-gate count and circuit-depth preconditions are not applicable because this row remains analogue; the analogue equivalents are evolution time, pulse bandwidth, and number of fresh shots.

Evidence:

- Pasqal, [Pasqal Cloud Services brochure](#) (retrieved 2026-05-25), Orion Alpha 100-qubit cloud QPU and analogue mode available through Pasqal Cloud.
- Pasqal docs, [Local Addressability with DMM](#) (retrieved 2026-05-25), detuning-map modulator and weighted analogue Ising Hamiltonian with site weights.
- Pasqal docs, [Our Canadian QPU is now live on Pasqal Cloud](#) (retrieved 2026-05-25), second public 100-qubit neutral-atom QPU.

3.4 Atom Computing AC1000 / Azure logical offering — architectural rewrite

Modality: Neutral atom gate model.

Translation: Atom Computing has neutral atoms and enough physical-qubit headline scale, but the public product line is gate-based nuclear-spin qubits, not Aquila-style AHS with data-dependent atom geometry and local detuning masks. A port would be a paradigm rewrite: (i) digitise Julien’s Rydberg Hamiltonian terms into ZZ phase networks plus single-qubit X and Z rotations; (ii) replace position and local-detuning encodings with circuit parameters, movement schedules, or classical recompilation per datapoint; (iii) collect final Z_i and $Z_i Z_j$ features at multiple circuit depths in place of analogue probe times. No mid-circuit measurement is required by the source protocol. Preconditions for moving this beyond partial: public AC1000 native two-qubit gate naming, a compiler trace for a 108-site reservoir step, total 2Q gate count and depth at a chosen Trotter error ε , loss/readout-adjusted shot budget matching the source N_s range, and evidence that data-dependent geometry updates do not dominate runtime.

Evidence:

- Atom Computing, [Technology](#) (retrieved 2026-05-25), gate-based optically trapped neutral-atom platform and AC1000 with over 1,200 qubits.
- Microsoft Azure Quantum, [Microsoft and Atom Computing offer a commercial quantum machine](#) (retrieved 2026-05-25), 24 entangled logical qubits, computation on 28 logical qubits, neutral atoms, and all-to-all connectivity claim.

3.5 Quantinuum Helios — architectural rewrite

Modality: Trapped ion gate model.

Translation: Helios is a strong digital Hamiltonian-simulation target, but it is not an analogue Rydberg array. The rewrite would map the source $\Omega(t)$, $\Delta_g(t)$, $\alpha_j \Delta_1(t)$, and V_{jk} terms into Trotterised layers using native $R_{ZZ}(\theta)$ plus single-qubit rotations, then sample final computational-basis bitstrings at the source probe times. All-to-all ion transport helps the dense V_{jk} tail, and mid-circuit measurement/reset is available but unused. The full 108-atom anchor exceeds Helios’s 98 physical-qubit envelope, so only the paper’s smaller 9- and 12-qubit tasks, or a reduced 2D tomato instance, are 2026 candidates. Preconditions for a positive runtime claim: a chosen reservoir

discretisation error ε , compiled 2Q gate count and depth, memory-error budget over all probe depths, and a shot budget showing whether the source $N_s \sim 100$ to 1000 regime survives digital noise.

Evidence:

- Quantinuum, [Helios product page](#) (retrieved 2026-05-25), 98 physical qubits and 50 logical qubits, with cloud/on-premises availability.
- Quantinuum docs, [Helios Operation](#) (retrieved 2026-05-25), all-to-all junction transport, native R_z , R_{xy} , ZZ , and R_{ZZ} gates, MCMR, runtime routing, and shot limits.

3.6 IBM Heron / Nighthawk — architectural rewrite

Modality: Superconducting gate model.

Translation: IBM’s current gate-model processors can cover the anchor qubit count on Heron, but they do not expose the analogue Rydberg geometry, $1/r^6$ coupling, or local-detuning mask that Julien identifies. A port would re-express the reservoir as a routed digital circuit: (i) approximate each probe-time evolution with ZZ -equivalent two-qubit blocks and single-qubit X/Z rotations; (ii) route dense or nearest-neighbour interaction patterns over Heron’s heavy-hex lattice or Nighthawk’s grid; (iii) run separate circuits for each probe time and estimate $\langle Z_i \rangle$ plus selected $\langle Z_i Z_j \rangle$ features. No mid-circuit measurement is needed, and Nighthawk’s current dynamic-circuit limitations are therefore not decisive. Preconditions for promoting this beyond partial: backend-specific instruction lowering, compiled 2Q gate count, routed depth at a chosen ε , error-mitigation plan, and a shot budget that accounts for the source’s finite-sampling plateau near $N_s \sim 1000$.

Evidence:

- IBM Quantum docs, [Processor types](#) (retrieved 2026-05-25), Nighthawk 120-qubit grid topology and Heron 156-qubit heavy-hex revisions.
- IBM Quantum docs, [Nighthawk and the latest Heron are now available](#) (retrieved 2026-05-25), early Nighthawk limitations and `ibm_boston` Heron r3 access/performance note.

3.7 D-Wave Advantage2 — infeasible today

Modality: Quantum annealing.

Translation: Advantage2 offers a transverse-field Ising annealer with user-programmed linear and quadratic coefficients on a Zephyr graph, not coherent Rydberg reservoir evolution with programmable atom positions, global/local detuning schedules, and probe-time bitstring sampling. Recasting this as an annealing-reservoir feature generator would be a different algorithm, not a port of Julien’s

analogue QRC fingerprint. No mid-circuit measurement is relevant. Horizon: not a 2026 portability target on public product evidence; it would require D-Wave to offer a coherent gate-model or analogue-reservoir control stack rather than the current annealing interface.

Evidence:

- D-Wave support, [Advantage2 Quantum Computer Now Generally Available](#) (retrieved 2026-05-25), Advantage2 availability, Zephyr topology, 4,400+ qubits, and 40,000+ couplers.
- D-Wave docs, [Annealing Implementation and Controls](#) (retrieved 2026-05-25), transverse-field Ising Hamiltonian, anneal schedule, and coupler-graph limitation.

3.8 Xanadu Borealis — infeasible today

Modality: Photonic GBS.

Translation: Borealis is a continuous-variable Gaussian boson sampler, historically a 216-qumode special-purpose GBS device, not a universal qubit processor and not a Rydberg Hamiltonian simulator. It cannot express Julien’s atom-position encoding, local detuning mask, or $Z_i/Z_i Z_j$ reservoir observables. A GBS reservoir-learning paper would be a separate application family, not a translation of this Aquila run. No mid-circuit measurement is part of the source protocol, and no Borealis capability closes the modality gap. Horizon: no 2026 route on current AWS device evidence, which no longer lists Xanadu among supported Braket QPUs.

Evidence:

- AWS, [Amazon Braket adds support for Borealis](#) (retrieved 2026-05-25), Borealis as 216-qumode non-universal GBS device.
- AWS docs, [Amazon Braket supported regions and devices](#) (retrieved 2026-05-25), current QPU list includes AQT, IonQ, IQM, QuEra, and Rigetti, with no Xanadu entry.

3.9 Xanadu Aurora — infeasible today

Modality: Photonic MBQC prototype.

Translation: Aurora is a modular photonic prototype for a future universal, fault-tolerant photonic architecture, not a 2026 cloud QPU for running a 108-site reservoir. Porting would require replacing the analogue Rydberg primitive with a measurement-based digital simulation of the same Hamiltonian, then costing cluster-state resources, logical error rates, and shots; none of that is publicly available as a runnable target. The source protocol does not require mid-circuit measurement, while Aurora’s measurement-based model would make measurement the computational substrate rather than a direct match. Horizon: revisit only when Xanadu publishes a user-accessible universal photonic backend with resource estimates for Hamiltonian simulation.

Evidence:

- Xanadu, [Aurora announcement](#) (retrieved 2026-05-25), 12-qubit Aurora prototype with 35 photonic chips and 13 km of fibre.
- Xanadu, [Lighting up the quantum computing horizon with Aurora](#) (retrieved 2026-05-25), Aurora as a complete prototype following a future fault-tolerant photonic design.

Commentary (about 350 words). The clean second platform is Pasqal Orion Alpha / Fresnel, but only in the narrow sense of preserving the analogue neutral-atom primitive. It can express the same kind of Rydberg Hamiltonian and programmable registers, so the position and global-pulse variants are a hardware-retuning exercise rather than a new algorithm. The caveats are scale and local control: the cited public cloud QPU is 100 qubits, while Julien’s largest tomato run uses 108 atoms, and target-QPU support for the exact $\alpha_j \Delta_1(t)$ local-pulse mask needs confirmation rather than inference from software documentation. A curator should ask Pasqal for a 108+ accessible target, pulse limits, local-detuning availability, and a measured embedding-consistency check before treating the row as full-scale.

Atom Computing AC1000 / Azure logical offering is the most interesting neutral-atom wildcard because the qubit headline is large enough, but it is a gate-model path. The missing artefact is not merely a compiler flag; the whole reservoir has to become a digital Hamiltonian simulation or a different gate-model reservoir. That makes it an architectural rewrite even though the substrate is neutral atoms. Quantinuum Helios is similar but cleaner scientifically: native R_{ZZ} gates and all-to-all transport are a good fit for digitising V_{jk} terms, but the 98-qubit envelope misses the 108-atom anchor and the shot/depth budget is not yet costed. IBM Heron / Nighthawk has enough qubits on Heron and broader cloud access, but dense interaction tails and repeated probe-time circuits will pay routing and noise overhead on heavy-hex or grid connectivity.

D-Wave Advantage2 is disqualified by computational model, despite high qubit count. Its annealing Hamiltonian is useful for optimisation, not for coherent Rydberg reservoir snapshots. Xanadu must be split: Borealis is GBS-only and not currently listed by Braket, while Aurora is a non-cloud prototype for a future measurement-based architecture. Neither is a 2026 target for this application. The human follow-up is clear: chase Pasqal for full-scale analogue access first; ask Atom Computing only if they can disclose a native lowering and movement schedule; treat trapped-ion and superconducting ports as research rewrites until someone supplies the 2Q-depth and shot budget.

3.10 Residual caveats

- The **QuEra Aquila** row is hardware-demonstrated at 108 atoms, but the local-detuning capability in public Braket documentation is request-gated experimental access; repeatability outside the reported paper depends on account-level access to that capability.
- The **Pasqal Orion Alpha / Fresnel** row remains subscale for the 108-atom tomato anchor: public evidence supports 100-qubit QPUs, and full local-detuning portability is conditional on target-QPU support for $\alpha_j \Delta_1(t)$.
- The **Atom Computing AC1000 / Azure logical offering** row is a digital Hamiltonian-simulation rewrite, not an analogue port; the matrix does not yet include a public 108-site compiler trace, 2Q-depth estimate, or shot budget.
- The **Quantinuum Helios** row supports an R_{ZZ} -style digital rewrite but remains below the 108-qubit anchor at 98 physical qubits, with runtime, depth, memory-error, and shot budgets still uncoded.
- The **IBM Heron / Nighthawk** row has enough qubits on Heron, but the dense V_{jk} tail and repeated probe-time circuits still need

backend-specific lowering, routed-depth estimates, and shot/noise budgeting.

- The D-Wave Advantage2, Xanadu Borealis, and Xanadu Aurora rows are excluded by computational model rather than qubit count; their public evidence does not establish a direct route to the Rydberg-reservoir controls in Julien's fingerprint.