

Benchmarking quantum simulation with neutron-scattering experiments

Portability dossier - app

agQSL portability pipeline

2026-06-07

Field	Value
Slug	2026-arxiv-2603.15608-benchmarking-quantum-simulation-neutron-scattering-experiments
Source	arXiv
Link	https://arxiv.org/abs/2603.15608
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	8
2.7	Caveats	9
3	Portability matrix	10

1 Source

1.1 Domain classification

Primary: **materials** (condensed-matter quantum magnetism). The paper simulates the dynamical structure factor (DSF) of real quasi-1D antiferromagnets, KCuF_3 (a spin-1/2 Heisenberg / isotropic XXZ chain) and the CsCoX_3 family (anisotropic XXZ with ferromagnetic next-nearest-neighbour coupling), and benchmarks the simulated spectra directly against inelastic neutron-scattering data.

Secondary: **other - digital quantum simulation methodology**. The deliverable is a quantum-classical workflow for computing the DSF via the retarded Green's function on superconducting hardware; the materials are the validation target rather than the novelty. Maps to the graph's `chemistry_materials` group and corresponds to existing edge `e078` (IBM, KCuF_3 neutron-scattering benchmark).

1.2 Expert persona for Julien

A condensed-matter / quantum-simulation physicist fluent in digital simulation of 1D spin-1/2 Heisenberg and XXZ chains: dynamical structure factors and their relation to the retarded Green's function, first- and second-order Trotterisation, and the center-site approximation. Crucially, they should have calibrated intuition for the IBM superconducting stack, Heron processors (`ibm_boston`, `ibm_kingston`), heavy-hex connectivity, two-qubit gate error budgets near 10^{-3} , and the error-suppression and mitigation chain used here (XY4 dynamical decoupling, Pauli twirling, TREX readout mitigation, approximate quantum compilation against an MPS reference). They should read MPS/DMRG bond-dimension benchmarking comfortably, since the classical baseline sets the accuracy ceiling. Working familiarity with inelastic neutron scattering (cross-section, magnetic form factor) is helpful but secondary to the hardware fingerprint.

1.3 Related prior work (brief bibliography)

- Baez et al., *Dynamical structure factors of dynamical quantum simulators*, PNAS 117, 26123 (2020). DOI 10.1073/pnas.2006103117. The foundational local-perturbation protocol for extracting DSFs that this work implements.
- Bauer et al., *Progress towards neutron-scattering simulation on an analog quantum processor*, Phys. Rev. A 111, 022442 (2025). DOI 10.1103/PhysRevA.111.022442. Same application (neutron-scattering DSF) on an analog rather than digital platform; the natural cross-paradigm portability comparison.
- Leclerc et al., *One-to-one quantum simulation of the frustrated quantum magnet TmMgGaO_4 with 256 qubits*, arXiv:2603.20372 (2026). Contemporaneous neutral-atom (analog) simulation of a real magnet, the digital-versus-analog counterpoint the authors themselves cite.
- Scheie et al., *Quantum wake dynamics in Heisenberg antiferromagnetic chains*, Nat. Commun. 13, 5796 (2022). DOI 10.1038/s41467-022-33571-8. The experimental and theory DSF reference (quantum wake in KCuF_3) the simulation is validated against.
- Kumaran et al., *Superdiffusion resilience in Heisenberg chains with 2D interactions on a quantum processor*, arXiv:2503.14371 (2025). Sibling IBM digital experiment on the same spin-chain primitive; useful for cross-run hardware comparison.

- Yu, Zhao & Wei, *Simulating large-size quantum spin chains on cloud-based superconducting quantum computers*, Phys. Rev. Research 5, 013183 (2023). DOI 10.1103/PhysRevResearch.5.013183. Source of the variational ground-state-preparation ansatz used here.

1.4 Difficulty estimate

medium. The full arXiv LaTeX source, all main and supplementary figures, and the bibliography are present in `paper-source/` (no paywall, no missing SI). The simulation primitives are standard and clearly documented (Trotter time evolution, DSF via the retarded Green's function, variational state preparation). The cost driver is breadth, not exotic methods: the hardware fingerprint is spread across an extensive supplement (per-backend gate-error distributions, AQC circuit construction, fidelity-versus-layers data, depolarisation error analysis) and spans several model, backend, and circuit configurations, the XX limit, isotropic KCuF_3 , and CsCoX_3 with and without NNN coupling, each with distinct Trotter order, step counts ($\Delta t \approx 0.6$ to 0.8 , 20 to 30 steps), and qubit counts up to 50. Julien will need to read the SI carefully to capture all of this, but everything required is in the folder.

2 Extraction

2.1 What the paper does (one paragraph)

The authors use an IBM superconducting quantum processor to compute the dynamical structure factor (DSF) of real quasi-1D quantum magnets and benchmark the simulated spectra directly against inelastic neutron-scattering (INS) data. The target is the spin-1/2 Heisenberg chain realised by KCuF_3 (the isotropic point of the 1D XXZ model), plus the solvable XX limit and a non-integrable anisotropic XXZ model with ferromagnetic next-nearest-neighbour (NNN) couplings relevant to the CsCoX_3 family. The workflow prepares the ground state variationally, applies a local spin perturbation at the central site, evolves under the spin Hamiltonian with Trotterised time evolution, and measures single-site spin expectation values to reconstruct the retarded Green’s function (RGF). Fourier transforming the RGF gives $S(q, \omega)$, which is compared with experiment using image metrics (MSE, Wasserstein, SSIM) and physics-informed measures (spectral weight, line scans, quantum Fisher information). The headline result: a 50-qubit circuit on the best available processor reaches quantitative agreement with INS once two-qubit error rates approach 10^{-3} .

2.2 Quantum hardware used

- **Vendor / machine:** IBM Quantum. Primary results on `ibm_boston` (Heron r3). Cross-device comparison also run on `ibm_kingston` (Heron r2) and `ibm_pittsburgh` (SI, “Approximated error” and Fig. S9).
- **Qubit count:** 50 used / 156 available (`ibm_boston` comprises 156 fixed-frequency transmon qubits). (SI “Implementation details”; SI “Hardware information”)
- **Connectivity:** heavy-hex. (SI “Implementation details”; SI “Hardware information”)
- **Gate set:** native single-qubit rotations plus one native two-qubit entangler. The paper does **not** explicitly name the native 2Q gate; it quotes two-qubit counts in CNOT terms (e.g. “the XX model’s time-evolution block contains only two CNOT gates”, SI “Approximate quantum compiling”). The Heron r3 device-family native 2Q gate is the tunable-coupler CZ ($Z \otimes Z$) with a fractional-gate $R_{ZZ}(\theta)$ basis (vendor-notes context, not stated in the paper). The Trotter block implements $R_{XX}(\theta_x) R_{YY}(\theta_y) R_{ZZ}(\theta_z)$ rotations (SI “Time evolution circuit”, Fig. S3).
- **Notable features leveraged:** variational ground-state preparation; center-site approximation for the RGF; approximate quantum compilation (AQC, tensor-network based) to cut 2Q depth; XY4 dynamical decoupling; 1000 Pauli-twirled circuits; TREX readout-error mitigation. No mid-circuit measurement and no dynamic circuits are used. (SI “Implementation details”)

2.3 Computational primitive

Trotterised Hamiltonian simulation (real-time evolution of a 1D spin Hamiltonian) used to extract the retarded Green’s function, preceded by classically-optimised **variational ground-state preparation**. Second-order Trotterisation for the XX model and KCuF_3 ; first-order Trotterisation (with SWAP layers) for the NNN CsCoX_3 model. This is not a hardware-in-the-loop variational algorithm: the

ansatz parameters are optimised offline against an MPS/DMRG reference, then the prepared state is evolved in a single forward pass per time step.

2.4 Resource fingerprint

Values differ per model/circuit configuration; the table gives the KCuF₃ baseline with per-model detail in the notes below. “Deepest circuit” figures are the post-AQC values at the longest simulated time.

Metric	Value (KCuF ₃ baseline)	Source (page / equation / SI)
Qubits (logical)	50	SI “Implementation details”; main text Fig. 3 caption
Qubits (physical)	50 of 156 (no error correction; logical = physical)	SI “Hardware information”
Circuit depth	2Q depth 103 (deepest post-AQC); GS circuit depth 31	SI “Approximate quantum compiling”
2Q-gate count (total)	2,574 (deepest post-AQC); 3,700 in original un-compiled circuit; GS circuit 760	SI “Approximate quantum compiling”
Measurement shots	128,000 per circuit (1000 Pauli-twirled circuits × 128 shots)	SI “Implementation details”; SI “Noisy simulation”
Classical loop iter.	not reported as runtime feedback (ground-state ansatz optimised offline vs MPS); Trotter steps: 20 (baseline)	SI “Ground state preparation”; main text Fig. 3 caption
Wall-clock runtime	not reported for KCuF ₃ /XX; \$ 18mineachforCsCoX_3\$ NNN and two-soliton	main text Fig. 4 caption

Per-model circuit resources (all post-AQC “deepest circuit”, SI “Approximate quantum compiling”):

Model	Trotter order	Δt	Trotter steps	GS circuit (2Q gates / 2Q depth)	Deepest circuit (2Q gates / 2Q depth)	Original un-compiled 2Q gates
XX	2nd	≈ 0.6	up to 20 (baseline); AQC to 10 then concatenated	760 / 31	1,888 / 77	3,455

Model	Trotter order	Δt	Trotter steps	GS circuit (2Q gates / 2Q depth)	Deepest circuit (2Q gates / 2Q depth)	Original un-compiled 2Q gates
KCuF ₃	2nd	0.6	20	760 / 31	2,574 / 103	3,700
($\epsilon = 1$)			(baseline)			
Two-soliton	1st	0.8	30	294 / 12	2,424 / 99	4,629
(NN only)						
CsCoX ₃	1st	0.8	30	294 / 12	4,908 / 219	12,153
(NNN)						

Notes on the table:

- Original un-compiled 2Q-gate counts are reconstructed from the stated AQC reductions: XX 1888 + 1567; KCuF₃ 2574 + 1126; two-soliton 2424 + 2205; CsCoX₃ 4908 + 7245. (SI “Approximate quantum compiling”)
- AQC keeps the AQC-block 2Q gates below 50% of the deepest circuit: 50.7% (XX), 42.6% (KCuF₃), 39.4% (two-soliton), 17.8% (CsCoX₃ NNN).
- The 128,000-shot budget is per circuit configuration. The number of distinct circuits scales with the number of time steps and measured Pauli components; the center-site approximation reduces the circuit count by a factor of n (the system size) by perturbing only the central site rather than every site. (SI “Implementation details”, Eq. for U_{j_c})

2.5 Assumptions and results

- **Claim.** A pre-fault-tolerant 50-qubit superconducting processor produces quantitatively meaningful DSF spectra for KCuF₃ that match INS data, and the framework extends to a non-integrable NNN XXZ model for CsCoX₃. Agreement is enabled by two-qubit error rates falling towards 10^{-3} and by the robustness of the Fourier transform to noise-induced damping of the correlation functions. (Abstract; main text “Hardware scaling”)
- **Quantitative agreement.** Spectral weight in the main dispersion: experiment $\approx 48\%$, MPS 58.9%, `ibm_boston` $\sim 50\%$. SSIM of the KCuF₃ spectrum vs the DMRG/MPS reference: 0.845 (`ibm_kingston`), 0.877 (`ibm_pittsburgh`), 0.900 (`ibm_boston`); MPS-GSP+AQC noiseless reference 0.990 (SI Table I). Peak-position uncertainty below 10% of FWHM at $q = \pi$, rising to 20–30% at $q = \pi/2$. Both MPS and quantum results show at least four-partite entanglement via nQFI. (main text “Benchmarking”)
- **Error bars / noise assumptions.** Two-qubit gate error is treated as the dominant noise source; modelled with a global depolarising channel applied only to 2Q gates inside the backward light cone, with $(1 - p) \approx \prod_i (1 - p_i)$ over the in-cone 2Q gates (SI “Noisy

simulation”). A controlled sweep of effective 2Q error from 7.5×10^{-3} to 1×10^{-3} markedly improves all metrics (main text “Hardware scaling”; Fig. 3). Measured median 2Q error on the chosen 50-qubit `ibm_boston` layout: 1.080×10^{-3} (XX/KCuF₃) and 1.342×10^{-3} (two-soliton/CsCoX₃); median T_1/T_2 of $\approx 298/344 \mu\text{s}$ and $\approx 284/329 \mu\text{s}$ for the two layouts (SI Table II). `ibm_kingston` (Heron r2) median 2Q error was 1.877×10^{-3} , above the threshold for quantitative agreement (main text Fig. 3B caption).

- **Classical baselines.** MPS time evolution at bond dimension $\chi = 128$ (converged against $\chi = 256$; residuals 10^{-4} for XX/KCuF₃, 10^{-5} for the NNN models) is the noiseless ceiling; DMRG supplies the reference ground state (SI “Convergence of the bond dimension”). The decisive baseline is the laboratory INS measurement of KCuF₃ (MAPS spectrometer, ISIS; Ref. lake2013multispinon), not a classical computation. Ground-state-*prep* fidelity targets: 80% for KCuF₃ (achieved ~ 83 – 85%), $> 90\%$ for CsCoX₃ (achieved $\sim 95.9\%$); AQC target 90% (KCuF₃ achieved $\sim 89.5\%$). (SI “Implementation details”; “Ground state preparation”)

2.6 Portability flags

- **Heavy-hex connectivity forces SWAP networks for NNN couplings.** The CsCoX₃ NNN model cannot be Trotterised at second order on the device; the authors fall back to first-order Trotterisation and insert SWAP layers to bring next-nearest-neighbour pairs adjacent (SI “Time evolution circuit”, Fig. S3c). This is the single largest gate-cost driver: the un-compiled NNN circuit needs $\sim 12,153$ 2Q gates vs $\sim 3,700$ for nearest-neighbour KCuF₃. On all-to-all hardware (trapped ion) the SWAP overhead vanishes; on any nearest-neighbour-only fabric the same penalty recurs.
- **Native 2Q gate basis matters for the Trotter block.** Each $R_{XX}R_{YY}R_{ZZ}$ interaction is compiled to CNOT/CZ-based primitives (the XX block uses 2 CNOTs; the isotropic block needs 3). Hardware with a native $R_{ZZ}(\theta)$ fractional gate (Heron) or a native $XX(\theta)$ Mølmer-Sørensen interaction (trapped ion) implements these blocks with fewer entangling operations; a fixed CZ/CNOT basis is the costlier case the paper reports.
- **Error-suppression chain is gate-model-specific.** XY4 dynamical decoupling (idle-qubit pulse control), 1000-fold Pauli twirling, and TREX readout twirling are tailored to a digital superconducting stack. An analog/Rydberg platform has no direct equivalent for several of these.
- **AQC depends on classical MPS simulability and is memory-bound.** Approximate quantum compilation reduces 2Q depth substantially but its effectiveness is model-specific (17.8%–50.7% of the deepest circuit) and the optimisation hits 500–850 GB memory ceilings (SI “Approximate quantum compiling”). AQC is hardware-agnostic in principle, but the achievable reduction is tied to the target gate basis and entanglement growth.
- **No mid-circuit measurement, no dynamic circuits.** Favourable for portability: the protocol is a state-*prep* + unitary-evolution + terminal measurement pattern with no conditional logic.
- **Center-site approximation is algorithmic, not hardware-specific.** The factor- n circuit-count reduction transfers to any platform.
- **Variational ground-state preparation requires a classical DMRG/MPS reference** for the fidelity loss function; this is an offline classical dependency rather than a hardware feature, and it sets the accuracy ceiling.

2.7 Caveats

No paywall. The full arXiv LaTeX source (`main.tex`), the bibliography, and all main and supplementary figure PDFs are present in `paper-source/`; the extraction was made from the verbatim TeX rather than a rendered PDF. The supplement is text-complete in `main.tex`, so all quoted resource numbers come from the source text. A few quantities are reported only per-configuration or not at all:

- Wall-clock runtime is given only for the CsCoX₃ NNN and two-soliton runs (*\$ 18mineach*); *noruntimeisreportedfortheXXorKCuF_3* runs.
- The aggregate shot count across all circuits (time steps \times Pauli components \times models) is not totalled; only the per-circuit budget (128,000) is stated.
- The native two-qubit gate of `ibm_boston` is not named in the paper; the CZ / fractional- R_{ZZ} identification is device-family context from the superconducting vendor note, not a paper claim.
- Quantitative per-figure data (gate-error CDFs, fidelity-vs-layers curves, bond-dimension residual curves) live in figure PDFs that were not pixel-read; the numerical values quoted here are those stated in the captions and SI text.

3 Portability matrix