

Quantum computation of molecular geometry via many-body nuclear spin echoes

Portability dossier - app

agQSL portability pipeline

2026-06-07

Field	Value
Slug	2026-arxiv-2510.19550-quantum-computation-molecular-geometry-many-body
Source	arXiv
Link	https://arxiv.org/abs/2510.19550
Category	app
Triaged	2026-06-07 by codex
Bootstrapped	2026-06-07

Contents

1	Source	3
1.1	Domain classification	3
1.2	Expert persona for Julien	3
1.3	Related prior work (brief bibliography)	3
1.4	Difficulty estimate	4
2	Extraction	5
2.1	What the paper does (one paragraph)	5
2.2	Quantum hardware used	5

2.3	Computational primitive	6
2.4	Resource fingerprint	6
2.5	Assumptions and results	7
2.6	Portability flags	8
2.7	Caveats	9
3	Portability matrix	10

1 Source

1.1 Domain classification

Primary: **quantum chemistry**. The deliverable is molecular geometry, specifically the mean ortho-meta H-H distance z_{om} of toluene and the inter-ring dihedral angle distribution of 3',5'-dimethylbiphenyl (DMBP), i.e. structure determination.

Secondary: many-body / spin-dynamics **simulation** (`simulation_physics` in `edges.json` terms). The quantum-hardware role here is not an electronic-structure energy estimate but a digital, Trotterised simulation of an all-to-all dipolar spin Hamiltonian, with an out-of-time-ordered correlator (OTOC) as the observable. The motivating downstream targets are biological (amyloid fibrils and SARS-CoV-2 are cited as structure-determination prizes), but no biology computation is performed in this paper. Net read: a chemistry-structure application delivered through a many-body spin-simulation primitive on a superconducting device.

1.2 Expert persona for Julien

A physical chemist or NMR spectroscopist who is also fluent in digital quantum simulation. They need calibrated intuition for solid- and liquid-crystal-state dipolar spin dynamics on one side (double-quantum Hamiltonians, multiple-quantum coherence, Magnus / average-Hamiltonian theory, RF inhomogeneity, the bespoke TARDIS pulse scheme) and for superconducting-qubit compilation on the other (Trotterisation of all-to-all couplings, swap networks, arbitrary-angle fSim gate calibration, and Pauli-path / zero-noise error mitigation). The portability-relevant fingerprint sits at the seam between the NMR pulse sequence and the Willow circuit that emulates it, so a single-discipline reader will miss half the resource story. Comfort reading a long, methods-heavy SI is essential.

1.3 Related prior work (brief bibliography)

- O'Brien et al., "Quantum computation of molecular structure using data from challenging-to-classically-simulate nuclear magnetic resonance experiments," PRX Quantum 3, 030345 (2022). DOI: [10.1103/PRXQuantum.3.030345](https://doi.org/10.1103/PRXQuantum.3.030345). The direct proposal this paper experimentally realises (same application, overlapping author lineage).
- Google Quantum AI and Collaborators, "Constructive interference at the edge of quantum ergodic dynamics," [arXiv:2506.10191](https://arxiv.org/abs/2506.10191) (2025). The Willow OTOC quantum-advantage experiment that supplies the Pauli-path picture and error-mitigation backbone reused here (same vendor, same primitive).
- Mi et al., "Information scrambling in computationally complex quantum circuits," Science 374, 1479 (2021). [arXiv:2101.08870](https://arxiv.org/abs/2101.08870). Earlier Google (Sycamore) OTOC measurement; a portability pointer across device generations of the same primitive.
- Schuster et al., "Learning quantum systems via out-of-time-order correlators," Phys. Rev. Research 5, 043284 (2023). [arXiv:2208.02254](https://arxiv.org/abs/2208.02254). Theoretical basis for OTOC-based structure and Hamiltonian learning.
- Seetharam et al., "Digital quantum simulation of NMR experiments," Sci. Adv. 9, eadh2594 (2023). DOI: [10.1126/sciadv.adh2594](https://doi.org/10.1126/sciadv.adh2594). The closest application twin (NMR dynamics on a quantum computer), a comparison point for the digital-simulation half.

- Novikov et al., “AlphaEvolve: a coding agent for scientific and algorithmic discovery,” [arXiv:2506.13131](https://arxiv.org/abs/2506.13131) (2025). The classical agent used to generate the product-formula circuits run on the device; a vendor-coupled compilation dependency worth flagging.

Note for Brilliant: every hardware OTOC demonstration in this lineage is Google superconducting. There is no published cross-vendor OTOC molecular ruler to compare against yet.

1.4 Difficulty estimate

high. The paper is long (a PRA-format main text plus a very large SI split into separate NMR, Trotter-scaling, superconducting-experiment, molecular-dynamics, AlphaEvolve, and classical-scaling sections), and the quantum-hardware fingerprint is genuinely spread across that SI rather than concentrated in the main text. Exotic primitives stack up: TARDIS double-quantum pulse engineering, OTOC and Loschmidt echoes, the Magnus expansion, swap-network fSim compilation, AlphaEvolve-optimised circuits, and a custom Pauli-path zero-noise extrapolation. No paywall obstacle: the full arXiv source (LaTeX plus bibliography, gate-level SI included) is already present in [paper-source/](#), so Julien has everything without an extra preprint or SI attachment.

2 Extraction

2.1 What the paper does (one paragraph)

The authors determine molecular geometry by combining a nuclear magnetic resonance (NMR) experiment with a digital quantum simulation. In the spectrometer they measure out-of-time-ordered correlators (OTOCs) on two ^{13}C -labelled organic molecules, toluene and 3',5'-dimethylbiphenyl (DMBP), dissolved in a nematic liquid crystal, using a bespoke pulse sequence (TARDIS) that engineers an effective double-quantum dipolar Hamiltonian and then time-reverses it. The OTOC is a many-body echo: local polarisation on a ^{13}C "measurement" spin spreads through the proton network and is refocused, and its sensitivity to a perturbation on distant "butterfly" spins encodes long-range distance information that conventional NMR (limited by $1/r^3$ couplings) cannot reach. Because classically simulating these OTOCs costs exponential effort, the same OTOC curves are reproduced on a Google Willow superconducting processor using AlphaEvolve-optimised Trotter circuits, arbitrary-angle fermionic-simulation (fSim) gates, and a new Pauli-path zero-noise extrapolation. The quantum runs recover the toluene ortho-meta H-H distance and the DMBP inter-ring dihedral angle to roughly the precision of independent spectroscopy.

2.2 Quantum hardware used

- **Vendor / machine:** Google Quantum AI / Willow superconducting processor (same device lineage as Ref. google25constructive, arXiv:2506.10191, and the below-threshold QEC paper).
- **Qubit count:** 9 used (toluene) and 15 used (DMBP), each a linear chain selected from the 105-qubit Willow grid (main text, "Details of superconducting qubit devices"; SI Sec. The Superconducting Quantum Simulator).
- **Connectivity:** 2D grid of flux-tunable transmon qubits with flux-tunable couplers between nearest neighbours. For these experiments the qubits are operated as a 1D line with the single measurement qubit at one end; all-to-all spin coupling is synthesised by a SWAP network (Ref. kivlichan2018quantum), not by native long-range coupling.
- **Gate set:**
 - Toluene (9 qubits): arbitrary-angle two-qubit fSim(θ, ϕ), realised as a two-pulse composite (a population-swap pulse plus a conditional-phase pulse) with single-qubit Z phase-matching. Swap angle θ spans the full range $[0, \pi]$. 80 unique fSim gates were calibrated. Native benchmarked two-qubit gates are CZ and \sqrt{i} SWAP.
 - DMBP (15 qubits): CZ plus arbitrary single-qubit microwave gates; AlphaEvolve generated the circuits directly in a CZ decomposition, so the composite fSim construction was not needed.
- **Notable features leveraged:** arbitrary-angle fSim via two-pulse Floquet calibration (target tolerance 20 mrad, shot-to-shot precision < 5 mrad); SWAP networks for all-to-all coupling on nearest-neighbour hardware; dynamical decoupling; Clifford (and sub-Clifford) twirling; real-time randomised readout error mitigation (TRESX); double-sided light-cone filtering; a bespoke Pauli-path zero-noise extrapolation. No mid-circuit measurement and no dynamic circuits are used: the OTOC is read from a single terminal measurement of the ^{13}C qubit.

2.3 Computational primitive

Trotterised Hamiltonian simulation (digital), with an out-of-time-ordered correlator as the measured observable. The circuit Trotterises the lowest-order Magnus expansion of the double-quantum dipolar Hamiltonian $\hat{H} = \sum d_{ij}^{XY} (X_i X_j - Y_i Y_j) + \sum d_{ij}^{ZZ} Z_i Z_j$ (first order for the 9-qubit toluene run; an AlphaEvolve-evolved product-formula generator for the 15-qubit DMBP run). It is not VQE, QPE, QAOA, or analog evolution.

2.4 Resource fingerprint

Metric	Value	Source (page / equation / SI)
Qubits (logical)	Not applicable: NISQ run, no error correction or logical encoding	Main text, “Details of superconducting qubit devices”; SI Sec. The Superconducting Quantum Simulator
Qubits (physical)	9 (toluene) and 15 (DMBP), selected from a 105-qubit chip	Main text, “Details of superconducting qubit devices”; SI Sec. The Superconducting Quantum Simulator
Circuit depth	Deepest 9-spin circuit: 326 circuit moments. Deepest 15-spin circuit: 484 moments (light-cone-pruned)	Main text, “Error mitigation pipeline”
2Q-gate count (total)	Deepest 9-spin circuit: 540 composite fSim gates (quoted as “up to 1080 2-qubit pulses” for the first six toluene time steps, 2 pulses per composite gate). Deepest 15-spin circuit: 792 CZ gates (“no more than 792 CZ gates”). Counts are within the double light cone	Main text, Results and “Error mitigation pipeline”; main text DMBP paragraph
Measurement shots	Not reported (per-circuit shot count for the quantum device is not stated)	–

Metric	Value	Source (page / equation / SI)
Classical loop iter.	No on-hardware variational/feedback loop. Structure learning is a parameter scan: 9 candidate potential-of-mean-force (PMF) curves for DMBP; a swept z_{om} range with 9 trajectories for toluene. AlphaEvolve circuit-generator optimisation iteration count (number of LLM samples) is not reported as a single figure	Main text, Results; SI Sec. AlphaEvolve circuit simulation
Wall-clock runtime	Full OTOC-NMR learning data taking “took several days”. Readout statistics averaged over about six hours. fSim calibration of the 80 unique gates (28 calibration moments) took about 5 hours; each batch of compatible gates converged in about 10 minutes over 3 rounds	Main text, “Details of superconducting qubit devices”; SI Sec. The Superconducting Quantum Simulator

Supporting device benchmarks (SI Sec. The Superconducting Quantum Simulator): mean qubit frequency ~ 6.2 GHz, anharmonicity ~ 210 MHz, $T_1 = 114 \mu\text{s}$, $T_{2E} = 130 \mu\text{s}$ (Hahn echo). Single-qubit RB error 0.00020 (purity-limit 0.00015). Cycle XEB Pauli error 0.0015 (CZ) and 0.0014 ($\sqrt{i\text{SWAP}}$). Median cycle Pauli infidelity of the phase-matched composite fSim gate 0.0026 (max 0.0045). Measurement-qubit readout error 0.00985.

2.5 Assumptions and results

- **Claim.** Quantum-simulated OTOCs reproduce the NMR many-body echo well enough to learn geometry. Toluene ortho-meta H-H distance from the quantum device: $z_{\text{om,q}} = 2.44 \pm 0.04 \text{ \AA}$, agreeing within error with the literature reference $z_{\text{om,r}} = 2.46 \pm 0.01 \text{ \AA}$

and with the classical estimate $z_{\text{om,c}} = 2.47 \pm 0.01 \text{ \AA}$. DMBP dihedral angle from the quantum device: $\phi_{\text{QC}} = 40^\circ \pm 3^\circ$, against the RF-inhomogeneity-corrected classical simulation $\phi_{\text{sim}} = 41.5^\circ \pm 0.2^\circ$, and validated by an independent multiple-quantum-coherence (MQC) measurement on a methyl-deuterated DMBP sample.

- **Error bars / noise.** Quantum-vs-exact root-mean-square error of 0.05 across all circuits in both molecules. For toluene the quantum-vs-classical RMSE is $\epsilon_{\text{tot}} = 0.058$, split into algorithmic (Trotter) error $\epsilon_{\text{alg}} = 0.035$ and residual post-mitigation experimental bias $\epsilon_{\text{exp}} = 0.050$. Error mitigation recovers signals where the noisy OTOC damping is as small as 0.15 and the smallest raw signal is 0.055 ± 0.003 (Extended Data Fig. 1). The Pauli-path ZNE assumes the noisy expectation value is a Laplace transform of the Pauli-path Hamming-weight distribution, modelled as a Gaussian with ratio parameter $\beta = \sigma_c / \bar{H}_c$, typically $\beta < 0.5$. AlphaEvolv improved the DMBP product formula from a 10.4% to a 0.82% mean OTOC error against exact reference, evaluating each candidate by averaging the OTOC over 250 randomly sampled initial states and checking against the full 2^{15} -state computation; the deployed DMBP circuits reach a mean error of 0.0084 to the exact OTOC within the gate budget.
- **Classical baseline.** The classical comparator is an exact state-vector/density-matrix simulation of the same TARDIS dynamics (toluene modelled as a rigid ring plus freely rotating methyl in the Saupe tensor formalism; DMBP couplings from molecular dynamics). The paper’s motivation is that this classical simulation scales exponentially, so the quantum device is positioned as the scalable replacement. A separate first-order-Trotter scaling study estimates that naive OTOC simulation of 50 to 60 spins would need $\sim 10^5$ to 10^6 two-qubit gates (2.2×10^5 CZ at $N = 50$, 3.2×10^5 at $N = 60$, with about $K \approx 30$ Trotter steps), and an early-fault-tolerant FLASQ resource estimate for the 15-qubit circuits is reported as “feasible” without specific gate or qubit numbers extracted here.

2.6 Portability flags

Hardware-specific features that will matter for Brilliant’s cross-vendor analysis:

- **Arbitrary-angle fSim(θ, ϕ) over the full swap-angle range $[0, \pi]$.** The 9-qubit toluene run depends on a calibration-intensive two-pulse composite gate unique to tunable-coupler superconducting hardware. This is not a standard primitive on most gate sets and would have to be decomposed elsewhere. The paper itself shows the alternative: the 15-qubit DMBP run instead used CZ plus single-qubit gates, so the algorithm does port to a fixed two-qubit gate at the cost of more gates per interaction.
- **SWAP network for all-to-all coupling.** All-to-all dipolar coupling is emulated on nearest-neighbour hardware via a SWAP network costing $N(N - 1)$ interactions per Trotter step. On hardware with native all-to-all coupling (for example trapped ions) the SWAP overhead vanishes, though one two-qubit interaction per spin pair is still required; the authors note the gate count is connectivity-optimal and would not drop with richer connectivity.
- **Stringent two-qubit angle precision.** The simulation needs both fSim angles set to within 20 mrad (typical < 5 mrad). This places heavy demands on calibration that platforms with less flexible two-qubit control may not meet.
- **Architecture-tuned error mitigation.** Results depend on a stacked mitigation pipeline (Pauli-path ZNE derived from this device’s noise model, TREX real-time readout mitigation, dynamical decoupling, Clifford/ sub-Clifford twirling, double-sided light-

cone filtering). These are tied to the superconducting noise profile and would need re-derivation on another substrate.

- **Single terminal readout, no mid-circuit measurement.** The OTOC is obtained from one measurement of the ^{13}C qubit after a forward-then-backward echo. No mid-circuit measurement, reset, or dynamic circuit is required, which improves portability to platforms lacking those features, but a low-error measurement qubit is assumed (readout error ~ 0.01).
- **Vendor-coupled compilation toolchain.** The DMBP circuits were produced by AlphaEvolve (Google DeepMind), evolving a Trotter-formula generator against a classically pre-computed OTOC dataset. This is a software dependency rather than a hardware feature, but the optimisation as performed relies on exact classical reference data and so is not directly scalable beyond classically simulable sizes.

2.7 Caveats

- No paywall obstacle: the full arXiv TeX source (main text plus the NMR, Trotter-scaling, AlphaEvolve, classical-scaling, superconducting-experiment and noise-modelling SI sections, and the bibliography) was available in `paper-source/`, so the hardware fingerprint above is drawn directly from the source.
- Per-circuit measurement shot counts for the quantum device are not stated in the available text; “Measurement shots” is therefore recorded as not reported rather than estimated. NMR-side acquisition counts (for example 6 scans per increment, 2500 t_1 increments in an HMQC reference experiment; each OTOC datapoint an average of 10 measurements) are reported but are spectrometer scans, not quantum-processor shots.
- The 2-qubit gate counts and circuit depths quoted are the light-cone-pruned values the authors actually executed (gates outside the double light cone of the measurement and butterfly operators were removed); pre-pruning counts are not given.
- The FLASQ early-fault-tolerant resource estimate (SI Sec. Trotter scaling estimates) is presented graphically; specific physical-qubit and runtime numbers were not extracted because the figure encodes them as heatmaps rather than tabulated values.

3 Portability matrix