

An end-to-end quantum algorithm for nonlinear fluid dynamics with bounded quantum advantage

Portability dossier - app

agQSL portability pipeline

2026-06-07

Field	Value
Slug	2026-arxiv-2512.03758-end-end-quantum-algorithm-nonlinear-fluid
Source	arXiv
Link	https://arxiv.org/abs/2512.03758
Category	app
Triaged	2026-06-07 by port_until_julien_parallel
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	5
2.4	Resource fingerprint	6
2.5	Assumptions and results	7
2.6	Portability flags	7
2.7	Caveats	8
3	Portability matrix	9

1 Source

1.1 Domain classification

other (computational fluid dynamics / nonlinear fluid dynamics). The paper is a fault-tolerant, end-to-end resource analysis for the incompressible lattice Boltzmann equation (a kinetic model whose moments recover the Navier-Stokes equations). There is no clean secondary application domain, but the cross-cutting computational primitive is quantum linear-systems solving for differential equations via Carleman linearization, so it sits alongside the quantum-ODE/PDE literature rather than any vertical (chemistry, finance, etc.). Ezratty treats this area under §11.3.5 “Computational Fluid Mechanics (CFD)”, inside the quantum-algorithms chapter rather than the applications chapter, which matches: this is an algorithm-and-resource paper, not an industrial case study. CFD, fluid, Boltzmann, PsiQuantum, and Airbus already appear in `vendor-app/edges.json`, so the area is in scope for the graph.

1.2 Expert persona for Julien

A fault-tolerant quantum-algorithms specialist for differential equations, fluent in quantum linear-system solvers (the HHL lineage through to the discrete-adiabatic and Jennings-style optimal solvers), block-encoding, and LCU/QSP. Should have calibrated intuition about Carleman linearization, in particular its convergence radius and condition-number pathologies, plus working knowledge of the lattice Boltzmann method for incompressible flow (BGK collision, D1Q3/D2Q9, the $Ma \rightarrow 0$ incompressible limit). The real value-add is judgement on logical resource estimation: reading T -gate counts, data/ancilla qubit counts, condition-number scaling κ_A , and the read-in (state preparation) and read-out (observable extraction, here the drag force with its $q_M = O(\text{Re}^{3/8})$ overhead) bottlenecks that decide whether an end-to-end advantage survives. This is not a NISQ-hardware paper: no qubit modality, no error-correction code, and costs are quoted in abstract logical T -gates, so a substrate-agnostic FTQC reviewer is the right fit.

1.3 Related prior work (brief bibliography)

- Itani, Sreenivasan & Succi (2024), “Quantum algorithm for lattice Boltzmann (QALB) simulation of incompressible fluids”, *Phys. Fluids* 36, 017112, DOI [10.1063/5.0176569](https://doi.org/10.1063/5.0176569). The canonical Carleman-LBE quantum approach this paper critiques and tries to supersede.
- Sanavio & Succi (2024), “Lattice Boltzmann-Carleman quantum algorithm and circuit for fluid flows at moderate Reynolds number”, *AVS Quantum Sci.* 6, 023802, DOI [10.1116/5.0195549](https://doi.org/10.1116/5.0195549). Same primitive, with explicit circuit construction at moderate Re .
- Penuel et al. (2024), “Feasibility of accelerating incompressible CFD simulations with fault-tolerant quantum computers”, [arXiv:2406.06323](https://arxiv.org/abs/2406.06323). A directly comparable end-to-end fault-tolerant CFD resource estimate (PsiQuantum-adjacent), useful for calibrating gate/qubit fingerprints.
- Li et al. (2025), “Potential quantum advantage for simulation of fluid dynamics”, *Phys. Rev. Research* 7, 013036, [arXiv:2303.16550](https://arxiv.org/abs/2303.16550), DOI [10.1103/PhysRevResearch.7.013036](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevResearch.7.013036). Same application, an independent end-to-end quantum-advantage analysis.

- Liu, Kolden, Krovi, Loureiro, Trivisa & Childs (2021), “Efficient quantum algorithm for dissipative nonlinear differential equations”, *PNAS* 118, e2026805118, DOI [10.1073/pnas.2026805118](https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.2026805118). The foundational Carleman-based quantum nonlinear-ODE primitive underneath all of the above.
- Jennings, Lostaglio, Lowrie, Pallister & Sornborger (2023), “Efficient quantum linear solver algorithm with detailed running costs”, [arXiv:2305.11352](https://arxiv.org/abs/2305.11352). The quantum linear solver actually invoked here (and shared lead author), where the query-cost bookkeeping originates.

1.4 Difficulty estimate

high. The paper is long (about 56 pages of main text plus appendices A through I running past page 64) and dense with fault-tolerant resource analysis. It uses several exotic primitives that Julien must decode to extract the fingerprint: discrete Carleman embedding, block-encoding prefactor analysis, a QSP/LCU-based quantum linear solver, and a Lanczos-based numerical study of the condition number κ_A . The hardware-relevant numbers are spread across Sec. 4.5 (T -gate counts, Eq. 4.123), Sec. 5 (qubit counts, Eqs. 5.1-5.2), and Appendices F (simulation parameters) and I (gate compilation), so a full extraction needs the appendices, not just the body. No paywall risk: the arXiv preprint plus the complete LaTeX source (`paper-source/LBE_theory.tex` and figures) are already in the dossier folder, so Julien can run without any additional attachment.

2 Extraction

2.1 What the paper does (one paragraph)

This is a fault-tolerant resource-estimation study (PsiQuantum and Airbus), not a hardware experiment. It first dismantles existing Carleman-based quantum proposals for computational fluid dynamics (CFD), identifying four bottlenecks that negate claimed advantages: non-convergence of the Carleman linearization, prohibitive time-stepping, unfavourable condition-number scaling, and inefficient data extraction. It then builds a new end-to-end algorithm for the incompressible lattice Boltzmann equation (LBE): a “shifted incompressible LBE” that keeps the solution-state norm at $O(1)$, a discrete Carleman embedding that leaves time discretisation classical, and a quantum linear solver applied to the resulting linear system A . The authors derive query complexity, logical qubit counts, and T -gate counts, validated by classical numerics (direct LBE and Carleman simulation; Lanczos condition-number estimates on matrices up to dimension $\sim 10^8$). Conclusion: only a modest, bounded quantum advantage survives, restricted to low Carleman order (hence low Reynolds number or high error tolerance).

2.2 Quantum hardware used

- **Vendor / machine:** None. No quantum processor was run. The work is a purely theoretical fault-tolerant (FTQC) logical-resource analysis. Authors are PsiQuantum (a photonic FTQC company) and Airbus, but the paper commits to no qubit modality, no device, and no error-correcting code; all costs are quoted in abstract logical T -gates and logical qubits.
- **Qubit count:** Logical only, given as formulae. Data register $n_D = \log(T^* + 1) + W + \log N_C + N_C(\log N + 2D)$; worked example 722 data qubits for $D = 3$, $\text{Re} = 10^8$, $\beta = 3/4$, $W = 10$, $N_C = 10$ (Sec. 3.1). No physical qubit count (no code chosen).
- **Connectivity:** Not specified. Standard logical-resource convention of abstract qubits with arbitrary connectivity; routing/locality overhead is not costed.
- **Gate set:** Abstract Clifford + T . Compilation assumes: single-qubit rotation synthesis $G[R_n^\epsilon(\theta)] \approx 3 \log(1/\epsilon)$ (Ross-Selinger), Toffoli = $7T$, $c^k X = 8k - 12$, quantum adder $\approx 4nT$ (Gidney). No native two-qubit hardware gate is assumed.
- **Notable features leveraged:** Block-encoding of non-unitary matrices; quantum linear solver via QSP/LCU (the Dalzell et al. 2024 “shortcut” solver); quantum amplitude estimation for readout; a benign repeat-till-success measurement on the time/waiting registers. These are standard FTQC algorithmic primitives, not hardware-specific physics.

2.3 Computational primitive

Other: quantum linear-systems solving (QLS) for a linearised differential equation. The nonlinear LBE is Carleman-linearised into one large sparse linear system $AY = b$, block-encoded, and solved with a QSP/LCU-based quantum linear solver; the drag-force observable is then read out by quantum amplitude estimation. It is **not** VQE, QAOA, Trotterised Hamiltonian simulation, QPE, or analog evolution.

2.4 Resource fingerprint

Metric	Value	Source (page / equation / SI)
Qubits (logical)	Data register $n_D = \log(T^* + 1) + W + \log N_C + N_C(\log N + 2D);$ $= \beta[D(N_C + \frac{1}{2}) + 1] \log \text{Re} + 2DN_C + \log N_C + W.$ Example: 722 for $D = 3, \text{Re} = 10^8,$ $\beta = 3/4, W = 10, N_C = 10.$ Plus ancillas n_A (Eq. for n_A); total $n_D + n_A = O(N_C \log \text{Re}).$	Sec. 3.1, Eqs. for n_D (the data-qubits equation, lines 953-960); Sec. 3.2.4 Eq. for n_A (line 1463); Sec. 5 line 2531
Qubits (physical)	not reported (no error-correcting code specified)	n/a
Circuit depth	not reported as a depth count. Proxy = query complexity q_Q : lower bound $O(\text{Re}^{\beta(D/2+1)});$ upper bound $q_Q \lesssim 85.0 c \exp(N_C/4) \text{Re}^x$	Sec. 4.4, Eqs. for q_Q lower/upper bounds (lines 1978, 1998)
2Q-gate count (total)	Paper costs T -gates, not 2Q gates. Per-query T -cost $G[U_{A_F}]: \approx 10^6$ ($D = 1$), $\approx 10^8$ ($D = 2$), $\approx 10^{10}$ ($D = 3$, extrapolated) for $N_C \leq 5,$ $\epsilon = 10^{-6}$. Total T -cost $= q_Q \cdot G[U_{A_F}].$ Closed forms in Eq. for $G[U_{A_F}^\epsilon]$	Sec. 4.5, Eq. for $G[U_{A_F}^\epsilon]$ (lines 2492-2503) and text line 2514
Measurement shots	not reported as shot counts; readout uses amplitude estimation with multiplicative overhead $q_M = O(\text{Re}^{\beta/2}) = O(\text{Re}^{3/8})$ for the drag force at $\beta = 3/4$	Sec. 3.4.2, Eq. for q_M (line 1631); abstract

Metric	Value	Source (page / equation / SI)
Classical loop iter.	not applicable (non-variational; single coherent linear-system solve). The T^* LBE time steps are folded into A , not iterated classically; $T^* = \lceil \text{Re}^{\frac{3}{4}(D/2+1)} \rceil$	Sec. 4.1.1, Eq. for T^* (line 1680)
Wall-clock runtime	not reported (no hardware execution)	n/a

For any row where the paper does not report the number, the value above states “not reported” or “not applicable”. No resource numbers were invented.

2.5 Assumptions and results

- **Claim.** With the shifted incompressible LBE plus discrete Carleman embedding and a QLS, a modest end-to-end quantum advantage survives for selected observables in the high-error-tolerance regime. The scaling improvement over classical CFD is upper-bounded by $O(\text{Re}^{3D/8})$; lattice-velocity-norm control keeps $\| \cdot \| = O(1)$ so data extraction is not norm-killed; memory advantage is exponential ($O(N_C \log \text{Re})$ qubits vs $O(\text{Re}^{\beta D})$ bits).
- **Error bars / noise assumptions.** No device-noise model (no hardware). Algorithmic errors are tracked: gate-synthesis error ϵ (example 10^{-6}), Carleman truncation error ϵ_C , and QLS error ϵ_Q . Carleman convergence holds only below a threshold Re_T ($\sim 10^2$ for $D = 1$; an order of magnitude or more higher for $D = 2$). Condition number $\kappa_{A_H} \approx c \text{Re}^\chi$ with χ rising with both D and N_C (e.g. $\chi = 1.936$ for $D = 2, N_C = 2$), fitted from Lanczos numerics on systems up to $\dim \sim 10^8$.
- **Comparison to classical baseline.** Classical LBE cost $q_c = O(\text{Re}^{\beta(D+1)})$ (the familiar $O(\text{Re}^3)$ at $D = 3, \beta = 3/4$). Best-case state-preparation advantage $q_c/q_Q = O(\text{Re}^{\beta D/2})$ ($\text{Re}^{9/8}$ at $D = 3$, i.e. $O(\text{Re}^{1.875})$ quantum). Using numerically-fitted χ , the advantage exponent λ is positive only for $D = 1, N_C = 1$ (0.333) and $D = 2, N_C \in \{1, 2\}$ (0.662, 0.314); negative otherwise. After the drag-force readout overhead q_M , advantage vanishes except $D = 2, N_C = 1$ (a factor $\text{Re}^{0.320}$). Hence “bounded” advantage: confined to low N_C , i.e. low Reynolds number or coarse error tolerance.

2.6 Portability flags

This is a substrate-agnostic FTQC algorithm, so it is in principle portable across any universal fault-tolerant gate-based platform; the flags below concern what an implementation must supply rather than a fixed-hardware dependency.

- **Requires fault tolerance, not NISQ.** Per-query T -counts of 10^6 to 10^{10} , multiplied by q_Q queries, far exceed any NISQ coherence budget; the algorithm is meaningless without quantum error correction. No NISQ variant is offered.
- **Requires a quantum linear solver (block-encoding + QSP/LCU).** Portable across gate-based FTQC, but the costing leans on arbitrary single-qubit rotations synthesised to T gates (Ross-Selinger $3 \log(1/\epsilon)$), multi-controlled gates, and quantum adders. Any target gate set must provide cheap rotation synthesis and Toffoli/multi-control.
- **Requires quantum amplitude estimation for readout.** The drag force is a boundary observable read via amplitude estimation with a $q_M = O(\text{Re}^{3/8})$ overhead; bulk observables might avoid this, but the demonstrated end-to-end pipeline needs coherent amplitude estimation.
- **Assumes arbitrary (abstract) connectivity.** No connectivity graph is modelled; lattice locality and routing overhead are uncosted. A real device (heavy-hex, linear-chain ion trap, etc.) would add SWAP/teleportation overhead not in these numbers.
- **Mid-circuit measurement is used but mild.** A repeat-till-success measurement on the time and waiting registers, plus measurement of the Carleman block register; success probability $\approx 1/2$ to $1/N_C$. No exotic mid-circuit feedforward is required.
- **No analog / Rydberg / native-entangling-gate dependence.** Nothing in the algorithm exploits Rydberg blockade, native $XX(\theta)$ /Mølmer-Sørensen gates, photonic measurement-based primitives, or spin-echo; there is no analog-evolution step to digitise. This makes it broadly portable but also means none of the hardware-specific accelerations some vendors offer apply directly.
- **Coherent structured state preparation assumed negligible.** Initial-state ($|\psi_{\text{ini}}\rangle$) and boundary-state ($|\mathcal{W}_k\rangle$) preparation costs are assumed subleading for smooth/analytic fields; for unstructured geometries or complex boundaries this assumption breaks and would add portability-relevant cost.

2.7 Caveats

No paywall: the full arXiv preprint ([paper.pdf](#)) and complete LaTeX source ([paper-source/LBE_theory.tex](#), 262 KB) were available and read directly, including the resource-bearing sections (Sec. 3.1 qubit counts, Sec. 4.4 query complexity, Sec. 4.5 gate complexity) and Appendices F (simulation parameters) and I (gate compilation, read via the gate-cost subsections). The main interpretive caveat is intrinsic to the paper, not to access: this is a resource estimate, so every “hardware” number is a logical projection, not a measured device result, and the authors themselves flag the per-query T -counts as crude (no compilation optimisation; “a few orders of magnitude better” is plausible). The numerically-fitted condition-number exponents χ and advantage exponents λ are extrapolations from $D \in \{1, 2\}$ at modest Re (Lanczos limit $\sim 10^8$); $D = 3$ and industrial Re are not directly simulated. The Ezratty index returned no PsiQuantum vendor section for cross-check, but the paper’s substrate-agnostic stance makes a vendor fingerprint inapplicable in any case.

3 Portability matrix