

The Impact of Qubit Connectivity on Quantum Advantage in Noisy IQP Circuits

Portability dossier - app

agQSL portability pipeline

2026-05-16

Field	Value
Slug	2026-arxiv-2604.12635-iqp-connectivity
Source	arXiv
Link	https://arxiv.org/abs/2604.12635
Category	app
Triaged	2026-05-16 by vd1
Bootstrapped	2026-05-16

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	8
2.6	Portability flags	8
2.7	Caveats	9
3	Portability matrix	10
3.1	Summary	10
3.2	Quantinuum Helios - runs as-is (<i>anchor</i>)	11
3.3	IonQ Forte - runs with translation	12
3.4	IBM Heron - runs with translation	12
3.5	Google Willow - runs with translation	13
3.6	Rigetti Ankaa-3 - runs with translation (after compiler retargeting)	14
3.7	IQM Radiance (20-qubit configuration) - runs with translation (after compiler retargeting)	14
3.8	IQM Radiance (54-qubit configuration) - runs with translation (after compiler retargeting)	15
3.9	Atom Computing - runs with translation (after compiler retargeting)	15
3.10	QuEra Gemini - runs with translation (after compiler retargeting)	16
3.11	Pasqal analogue (Fresnel & Orion Beta) - architectural rewrite	17
3.12	Xanadu Borealis - architectural rewrite	18
3.13	D-Wave Advantage - architectural rewrite	19
3.14	Alice & Bob (Helium) - infeasible today	19
3.15	Pasqal digital (post-Orion) - infeasible today	20
3.16	PsiQuantum Omega - infeasible today	20
3.17	Residual caveats	22

1 Source

1.1 Domain classification

`other - quantum-advantage / circuit-sampling benchmark`. The paper sits in the complexity-theoretic “near-term quantum advantage” lane (IQP sampling under noise), not in any vertical application domain. Secondary thread: NISQ compilation and qubit-routing methodology, since the empirical contribution is a `pytket` compilation sweep across seven hardware-grounded topology models (Quantinuum Helios, IonQ Forte, Google Willow/Sycamore, IBM heavy-hex, Rigetti Ankaa-3, plus a sparse-planar proxy).

1.2 Expert persona for Julien

A near-term-quantum-advantage / circuit-compilation specialist - comfortable with IQP and commuting-circuit complexity (X -diagonal structure, k -local Pauli sums, polynomial-hierarchy hardness arguments) and with the recent noisy-IQP simulatability line of work (Bremner-Montanaro-Shepherd, Fujii-Tamate, Rajakumar et al.). Should have hands-on calibration of what `pytket/qiskit` routing actually costs on heavy-hex vs. all-to-all topologies, and a sober view of how published two-qubit gate-error figures map (or fail to map) onto an abstract interleaved-Pauli noise parameter p . Critically: this paper has no real hardware run - the “fingerprint” Julien extracts will be about *modelled* device topologies, native gatesets, and proxy error rates, not about a wall-clock execution. Someone who has built or audited a connectivity-aware compilation benchmark will save significant time.

1.3 Related prior work (brief bibliography)

- M. J. Bremner, A. Montanaro, D. J. Shepherd, *Achieving Quantum Supremacy with Sparse and Noisy Commuting Quantum Computations*, Quantum 1, 8 (2017). doi:10.22331/q-2017-04-25-8. The original sparse-and-noisy IQP picture; this paper is in direct dialogue with it.
- K. Fujii, S. Tamate, *Computational quantum-classical boundary of noisy commuting quantum circuits*, Sci. Rep. 6, 25598 (2016). doi:10.1038/srep25598. Establishes the noisy-IQP “boundary” framing reused here.
- D. Rajakumar et al., *Polynomial-time classical simulation of noisy IQP circuits with constant depth*, 2025 - the simulatability theorem (Eq. $d_* \lesssim p^{-1} \log(k/p)$) on which the paper’s whole “margin” construction rests. arXiv:2503.10460.
- J. Napp, R. La Placa, A. Dalzell, F. Brandão, A. Harrow, *Efficient Classical Simulation of Random Shallow 2D Quantum Circuits*, Phys. Rev. X 12, 021021 (2022). doi:10.1103/PhysRevX.12.021021. Same flavour of “shallow + geometry-limited \Rightarrow classically easy” argument on a different circuit family.
- A. Cowtan, S. Dilkes, R. Duncan, A. Krajenbrink, W. Simmons, S. Sivarajah, *On the qubit routing problem*, arXiv:1902.08091 (2019). The `pytket` routing primitive used in the experiments.
- M. DeCross et al., *Computational power of random quantum circuits in arbitrary geometries*, Phys. Rev. X (2025). arXiv:2406.02501. Trapped-ion-side counterpart on how connectivity / geometry sets the simulability frontier for random circuits.

1.4 Difficulty estimate

medium. The paper is short (IEEE conference format, ≈ 10 pages), the TeX source and `refs.bib` are already in `paper-source/`, and the experimental setup (four interaction patterns \times seven topology models, $k = 2$, `pytket` compilation, depth + proxy p_{eff}) is laid out explicitly in Sec. III. Two things push it above low: (i) there is no actual hardware execution, so Julien will need to be careful about what counts as a “fingerprint” - the artefact is a *compilation benchmark on modelled devices* rather than a shot-budget on a real machine; and (ii) the analytic depth bounds (Eqs. 5-10) mix percolation/fragmentation arguments with $O(\sqrt{n})$ routing scaling, which require some care to summarise faithfully without overclaiming. No paywall - full LaTeX and HTML are local.

2 Extraction

2.1 What the paper does (one paragraph)

The paper asks how qubit connectivity changes whether a noisy Instantaneous Quantum Polynomial-time (IQP) sampling experiment still lies in the conjecturally hard regime - or whether routing overhead pushes the compiled circuit into the recently identified “easy phase” where noisy IQP circuits become classically simulatable in polynomial time. The authors take the simulatability theorem of Rajakumar et al. (2025), which gives a critical depth $d_* \lesssim p^{-1} \log(k/p)$ above which noisy k -local IQP becomes efficiently simulatable, and combine it with `pytket` compilation experiments across seven hardware-grounded device models (two fully-connected trapped-ion-like and five sparse-connectivity superconducting layouts). For four interaction patterns (dense, sparse, local, RHG-lattice) at $k = 2$ they report the compiled depth D_H , the connectivity-induced overhead $\Delta D(H) = D_H - D_{FC}$, and the resulting simulatability margin $m(H) = D_*(p_{\text{eff}}(H), k) - D_H$. **No quantum hardware is run** - the entire study is classical simulation of compilation onto modelled topologies, with per-device two-qubit error rates used as a proxy effective-noise parameter.

2.2 Quantum hardware used

No hardware execution. The paper compiles abstract IQP circuits onto seven *modelled* device topologies and inspects the compiled depth. There is no shot count, no calibration run, no measured output distribution. The seven device models (Sec. III.B, p. 5; Fig. 2) are:

Model	Qubits	Connectivity	Native gateset (pytket)	p_{eff} proxy (2Q error)
FC_1	98	All-to-all (Quantinuum Helios trapped-ion)	$\{R_z, \text{PhasedX}, \text{ZZPhase}\}$	7.9×10^{-4}
FC_2	36	All-to-all (IonQ Forte trapped-ion)	$\{\text{GPI}, \text{GPI2}, \text{ZZPhase}\}$	4.0×10^{-3}
SC_1	105	Tapered triangular lattice (Google Willow)	$\{R_z, \text{PhasedX-type}, \text{CZ}, \text{SYC}\}$	3.3×10^{-3}
SC_2	53	Staggered nearest-neighbour (Google Sycamore)	$\{R_z, \text{PhasedX-type}, \text{CZ}, \text{SYC}\}$	6.0×10^{-3}
SC_3	127	Heavy-hex (IBM fake_washington)	$\{R_z, \text{SX}, X, \text{CX}\}$	1.146×10^{-2}

Model	Qubits	Connectivity	Native gateset (pytket)	p_{eff} proxy (2Q error)
SC_4	82	Defected rectangular grid (Rigetti Ankaa-3)	$\{R_z, \text{RX}, \text{ISWAP}\}$	1.94×10^{-2}
SC_5	32	Sparse near-planar proxy (no public coupling map identified)	$\{R_z, \text{SX}, \text{ECR}\}$	4.6×10^{-2}

- **Vendor / machine:** seven modelled targets spanning Quantinuum, IonQ, Google, IBM, Rigetti, plus a sparse-planar proxy. None are actually executed on.
- **Qubit count:** as listed; up to $n = 127$ used (for RHG on SC_3). Phase-diagram study uses $n = 16$ for dense/sparse/local and $n = 90$ or 127 for RHG.
- **Connectivity:** spans all-to-all, triangular, staggered nearest-neighbour, heavy-hex, rectangular grid, sparse near-planar.
- **Gate set:** device-native, as tabulated; circuits are rebased into each target’s native set before depth is measured.
- **Notable features leveraged:** none. The benchmark deliberately ignores mid-circuit measurement, dynamic circuits, pulse-level control, Rydberg blockade, etc. - it is a pure routing + rebasing study.

2.3 Computational primitive

Sampling - specifically, noisy IQP-circuit sampling (commuting X -diagonal circuits, Eq. 1, p. 2). The relevant operational quantity is the compiled two-qubit-layer depth of the IQP block, not an expectation value or eigenvalue estimate. No VQE / QAOA / QPE / amplitude-estimation loop is involved.

2.4 Resource fingerprint

The “resources” reported by this paper are *modelled* compiled depths, not on-device numbers. Shots, wall-clock runtime, and classical-optimiser iterations do not apply because nothing is executed.

Metric	Value	Source (page / equation / SI)
Qubits (logical)	$n = 16$ for dense/sparse/local; $n \in \{18, 44, 90, 127\}$ for RHG; depth-scaling sweep over $n \in$ $\{4, 6, 8, 10, 12, 14, 16, 18, 20, 24, 28, 32\}$	Sec. III.B, p. 5; Sec. III.C, p. 7
Qubits (physical)	per device model: 98 (FC_1); 36 (FC_2); 105 (SC_1); 53 (SC_2); 127 (SC_3); 82 (SC_4); 32 (SC_5)	Fig. 2 caption, p. 5
Circuit depth	D_H at $n = 16$, dense: FC_1=34, FC_2=47, SC_1=674, SC_2=887, SC_3=199, SC_4=279, SC_5=824. RHG at $n = 90$: FC_1=19, SC_1=614, SC_3=550. RHG at $n = 127$: SC_3=1128 ($D_{FC} = 54, 20.9 \times$ overhead).	Table I, p. 6; Sec. III.B “RHG lattice”, p. 6
2Q-gate count (total)	not reported (paper reports depth only, not gate counts)	-
Measurement shots	not applicable (no execution); 0 on-device shots	-
Classical loop iter.	not applicable (sampling task, not variational); 20 random IQP-instance samples per phase-diagram point, 10 per depth-scaling point	Sec. III.B, p. 6; Sec. III.C, p. 7
Wall-clock runtime	not applicable (no on-hardware execution); pytket compilation wall-clock not reported	-

Additional reported quantities:

- Compilation efficiency $\eta_H := D_{\text{FC}}/D_H$ at $n = 32$, dense: ≈ 0.27 (SC_1), 0.15 (SC_2), 0.42 (SC_3), 0.20 (SC_4), 0.14 (SC_5); FC_1 = FC_2 = 1 (Sec. III.C “Results”, p. 7).
- RHG η_H at $n = 127$: SC_3 ≈ 0.048 (Sec. III.C “Results”, p. 7).
- Effective-noise proxy $p_{\text{eff}}(H)$: values in the device table above (Sec. III.B “Compilation Setup”, p. 6, with per-device citations).

2.5 Assumptions and results

- **Claim.** For a fixed abstract k -local IQP family, sparse-connectivity hardware compiles to depths D_H that are 2-20 \times larger than the fully-connected baseline D_{FC} , and consequently demands a proportionally lower effective noise rate to remain on the conjecturally-hard side of the simulatability boundary $d_* \lesssim p^{-1} \log(k/p)$. Of the seven device models, FC_1 (Quantinuum Helios proxy, $p_{\text{eff}} = 7.9 \times 10^{-4}$) is the only one comfortably outside the simulatable regime in the tested instances; FC_2 sits near the boundary; all five superconducting models lie *inside* the simulatable regime even in the local pattern where routing overhead vanishes.
- **Error bars / noise assumptions.** Depths are sample means over twenty random IQP instances per pattern; standard deviations are shown in the phase-diagram plots (Fig. 4) but the table reports means only. The noise model is the interleaved single-qubit Pauli channel of Rajakumar et al. (2025) with scalar parameter $p = p_Z + \min(p_X, p_Y)$ (Eq. 2). The authors explicitly disclaim that the per-device two-qubit gate error rate is *not* a calibrated estimate of the abstract Pauli-noise parameter - it is only a comparative architecture-level proxy (Sec. III.B “Compilation Setup”, p. 6; Sec. IV.D “Noise Model Limitations”, p. 8).
- **Classical baseline.** The whole point of the paper is that the relevant classical baseline is the polynomial-time simulation algorithm of Rajakumar et al. (2025), which applies once $D_H > D_*(p_{\text{eff}}(H), k)$. No empirical classical-vs-quantum sampling comparison is performed.

2.6 Portability flags

These are the features the methodology leans on. Because no quantum execution is involved, the “portability” question is mostly about the *modelling* and the *target architectures* being meaningful for downstream re-use.

- **No on-hardware run.** Anyone replicating must accept the entire experiment as a compilation simulation; no quantum-hardware-specific port is required to *reproduce* the paper, but conversely no real-machine numbers are produced.
- **Native gateset assumptions.** The compiled depth depends on the chosen native set per target (table above). Changes in `pytket` rebase passes or gateset updates (e.g. Heron r2 supplanting heavy-hex, native fractional gates on IBM, parametric two-qubit gates on Rigetti) will shift D_H - the numbers are tied to the `pytket` version used (not stated explicitly; Sec. III.B, p. 6).
- **Routing heuristic dependence.** The default `pytket` placement / routing strategy (Cowtan et al. 2019) is used. The authors flag that “alternative mapping strategies may yield different variance profiles” (Sec. III.B “Phase Diagram Results”, p. 6). Any portability claim is conditioned on this heuristic; analytic SAT/MILP routers or device-aware ansatz embedding would change the picture.

- **No mid-circuit measurement, no dynamic circuits, no reset.** The IQP block is a single commuting unitary plus a terminal computational-basis measurement. Architectures that gain mileage from MCM (e.g. IBM Heron dynamic circuits) get no credit in this benchmark.
- **No native multi-qubit primitives.** The $k = 2$ choice means native $XX(\theta)$ / Mølmer-Sørensen / ZZPhase gates can be used directly on FC_1/FC_2 (and indeed are part of their native sets), while CX-only superconducting targets must synthesise. The benchmark would shift further in favour of trapped-ion-like models at $k \geq 3$, which the paper does not explore.
- **SC_5 is a proxy, not a real device.** It is a 32-qubit sparse near-planar layout standing in for an unnamed processor whose coupling map the authors could not find (Sec. III.B “Compilation Setup”, p. 6). Treat any SC_5 number as illustrative, not vendor-specific.
- **Effective-noise proxy uses 2Q error only.** SPAM, idle/ T_1 / T_2 decoherence, crosstalk, and 1Q errors are explicitly excluded from $p_{\text{eff}}(H)$ (Sec. IV.D, p. 8). For architectures where coherence-limited idle errors dominate routing-induced exposure (sparse SC at large n), the real margin penalty is *worse* than reported.

2.7 Caveats

- Paper is open-access (arXiv 2604.12635) and the full IEEEtran LaTeX source plus `refs.bib` are available under `paper-source/`. There is no separate Supplementary Information - the conference-format paper is self-contained at ~10 pages.
- No section was unreachable. The only material not directly inspected is the cited prior work (Rajakumar 2025 simulatability theorem, Cowtan 2019 routing primitive, vendor calibration sheets); I have taken the paper’s summaries of these at face value.
- One thing the paper notably does *not* publish: the underlying compiled-circuit depth tables for the n -sweep in Fig. 5 are shown only as η_H ratios; absolute D_{FC} values for the scaling sweep are not tabulated.
- The arXiv identifier 2604.12635 in the dossier YAML is anomalous (the current arXiv numbering scheme would normally put a 2026 May paper at 2605.xxxxx); the metadata is taken as-given. The TeX source and citation list are internally consistent with a 2026 submission.

3 Portability matrix

Anchor: The paper does **not** execute on hardware; the “anchor” is the only modelled device that stays comfortably outside the noisy-IQP simulatability boundary across the tested instances. That is **FC_1** - a Quantinuum Helios proxy, 98-qubit all-to-all trapped-ion with native $\{R_z, \text{PhasedX}, \text{ZZPhase}\}$ and a two-qubit error rate of 7.9×10^{-4} used as the effective-noise proxy p_{eff} (extraction.md “Quantum hardware used”; conference paper Sec. III.B, Fig. 2, p. 5; Sec. III.C “Results”, p. 7). **FC_2** (IonQ Forte proxy, $p_{\text{eff}} = 4.0 \times 10^{-3}$) sits at the boundary; the five superconducting models (**SC_1-SC_5**) all sit *inside* the simulatable regime, even in the local interaction pattern where routing overhead vanishes (extraction.md “Assumptions and results”). Portability questions therefore reduce to: *which vendors can host the same abstract $k = 2$ IQP-sampling circuit, and where do they sit relative to the boundary $d_* \lesssim O(p^{-1} \log(kp^{-1}))$?*

Julien’s fingerprint: $k = 2$ commuting X -diagonal sampling circuits on $n = 16$ (dense / sparse / local) up to $n = 127$ (RHG); compiled depth D_H via `pytket` rebase + Cowtan-2019 routing, depth-only metric (no 2Q-gate-count table); routing overhead $\Delta D(H) = D_H - D_{\text{FC}}^H$ reported per-target with D_{FC}^H defined as the depth on an all-to-all topology *with the same target native gate set* (so the per-target ratios isolate connectivity overhead from gate-set rebase tax); interleaved single-qubit Pauli noise with scalar $p := p_Z + \min(p_X, p_Y)$ proxied by per-device 2Q gate error; no mid-circuit measurement, no dynamic circuits, no reset, no native multi-qubit ($k \geq 3$) primitives, no pulse-level control; SPAM / T_1 / T_2 / 1Q errors / crosstalk excluded from p_{eff} ; **SC_5** is a sparse-planar proxy with no public coupling map. Every row below must answer the connectivity question (all-to-all vs sparse, per-target ΔD overhead), the native-gate question (whether the vendor’s native two-qubit primitive absorbs the IQP $e^{i\theta Z_i Z_j}$ block without CX-synthesis), and the 2Q-error question (whether p_{eff} keeps the compiled circuit above d_*).

3.1 Summary

Modality	Vendor	Verdict	2026 fit
Trapped ion / QCCD (anchor)	Quantinuum Helios	runs as-is	yes ($n \leq 98$)
Trapped ion / linear chain	IonQ Forte	runs with translation	partial: at boundary per paper
Superconducting / heavy-hex	IBM Heron	runs with translation	partial: inside simulatable regime per paper’s SC_3 proxy
Superconducting / tapered triangular	Google Willow	runs with translation	partial: no public access; inside simulatable regime per paper
Superconducting / defected grid	Rigetti Ankaa-3	runs with translation (after compiler retargeting)	partial: inside simulatable regime per paper
Superconducting / square lattice	IQM Radiance (20-qubit configuration)	runs with translation (after compiler retargeting)	partial: SC peer; same regime expected

Modality	Vendor	Verdict	2026 fit
Superconducting / square lattice	IQM Radiance (54-qubit configuration)	runs with translation (after compiler retargeting)	partial: SC peer; same regime expected
Neutral atom / digital gate-model	Atom Computing	runs with translation (after compiler retargeting)	partial (pending native lowering)
Neutral atom / digital gate-model	QuEra Gemini	runs with translation (after compiler retargeting)	partial (pending native lowering)
Neutral atom / analogue Rydberg	Pasqal analogue (Fresnel & Orion Beta)	architectural rewrite	no
Photonic / Gaussian boson sampling	Xanadu Borealis	architectural rewrite	no
Quantum annealer	D-Wave Advantage	architectural rewrite	no
Cat qubit / digital	Alice & Bob (Helium)	infeasible today	no
Neutral atom / digital FTQC (roadmap)	Pasqal digital (post-Orion)	infeasible today	no
Photonic / FBQC future substrate	PsiQuantum Omega	infeasible today	no

3.2 Quantinuum Helios - runs as-is (*anchor*)

Modality: Trapped ion / QCCD (*anchor*).

Helios is the 98-qubit all-to-all QCCD successor to H2-1, and is the device the paper models as FC_1. Native gate set $\{R_z, \text{PhasedX}, \text{ZZPhase}\}$ absorbs the IQP block $e^{i\theta Z_i Z_j}$ directly into a single ZZPhase(θ) - no CX synthesis, no SWAP routing, per-target $\Delta D(H) = 0$ by construction. With $p_{\text{eff}} \approx 7.9 \times 10^{-4}$ this is the only paper-modelled device that comfortably keeps the compiled depth D_H below the simulatability threshold $d_* \lesssim O(p^{-1} \log(k p^{-1}))$ across the FC_1-accommodated instances tested in the paper: $n = 16$ (dense / sparse / local) and $n = 90$ (RHG). FC_1 is a 98-qubit model, so the $n = 127$ RHG paragraph in Table I belongs to SC_3, not FC_1 - Helios cannot host the $n = 127$ instance and no positive verdict is claimed for it here. The mid-circuit-measurement and dynamic-circuit features that Helios advertises are not exercised in this benchmark (Julien: “no MCM, no dynamic circuits, no reset”).

Translation: - (*anchor* row, no translation needed).

Evidence:

- Paper Sec. III.B, Fig. 2 caption, p. 5; Table I, p. 6 (FC_1 depths and gate set).

- Quantinuum Helios announcement and spec (retrieved 2026-05-16): <https://www.quantinuum.com/products-solutions/quantinuum-systems>.
- Ezratty §8.3.7 “Vendors” pp.417, 547 - Quantinuum H-series + Helios connectivity narrative.

3.3 IonQ Forte - runs with translation

Modality: Trapped ion / linear chain.

Forte is 36 ions, all-to-all, native {GPI, GPI2, ZZPhase} (paper FC_2). All-to-all connectivity means per-target routing overhead is $1.0\times$ - the paper’s $D_H = 47$ at dense $n = 16$ equals its own $D_{FC}^{FC^2}$, all from the GPI/GPI2-vs-PhasedX single-qubit rebase tax around each ZZPhase rather than from routing. The higher reported 2Q error ($p_{\text{eff}} = 4.0 \times 10^{-3}$) puts the device *at* the simulatability boundary in the paper’s evaluation rather than safely outside it. MCM not exercised; $k = 2$ keeps native ZZPhase in play.

Translation: (i) rebase the IQP block from the abstract gate set to {GPI, GPI2, ZZPhase} via `pytket-ionq` - each $e^{i\theta Z_i Z_j}$ block lowers to one ZZPhase(θ) as on Helios, only the single-qubit basis change differs; (ii) no routing pass needed thanks to the all-to-all envelope, so the only depth movement vs Helios is the gate-set tax; (iii) **precondition for promoting off partial:** re-run the paper’s d_* inequality with Forte Enterprise’s 2026 calibrated 2Q error rather than the cited 4.0×10^{-3} - if the calibrated value has improved, Forte may cross safely outside the boundary.

Evidence:

- Paper Sec. III.B, Table I, p. 6 (FC_2 entries).
- IonQ Forte Enterprise spec page (retrieved 2026-05-16): <https://ionq.com/quantum-systems/forte-enterprise>.
- Ezratty §8.3.7 “Vendors” p.430 (IonQ Forte / Tempo line).

3.4 IBM Heron - runs with translation

Modality: Superconducting / heavy-hex.

The paper’s SC_3 model is `fake_washington`, an Eagle-era 127-qubit heavy-hex device with native $\{R_z, SX, X, CX\}$ and $p_{\text{eff}} = 1.146 \times 10^{-2}$. Heron r2 supersedes this in 2026 with tunable couplers and supports a fractional-gate option including $R_{ZZ}(\theta)$ as a native entangling primitive, **subject to documented angle constraints** - IBM’s fractional-gates guide restricts the calibrated angle range and notes that fractional-gate error is not separately reported (the device error model lumps it into the aggregate 2Q error). With angle folding for $|\theta|$ outside the calibrated band, the IQP $e^{i\theta Z_i Z_j}$ block lowers to one or a small number of R_{ZZ} pulses on each native edge rather than the 2-CX + R_z sandwich used in the paper, but only inside the documented envelope. Routing-only overhead at dense $n = 16$ for the SC_3 proxy is $2.1\times$ in Table I (per-target $D_H/D_{FC}^{SC^3}$ with a common CX-native gate set on both endpoints), and the RHG-on-heavy-hex pattern at $n = 127$ blows up to $20.9\times$ overhead (paper Sec. III.B “RHG lattice”, p. 6). At the SC_3 proxy’s $p_{\text{eff}} = 1.146 \times 10^{-2}$ both

compiled circuits sit **inside** the simulatable regime per Rajakumar’s d_* bound; whether a real Heron r2 calibration plus the native R_{ZZ} lowering - within its angle envelope and aggregate-error reporting - moves the margin is the open empirical question.

Translation: (i) rebase the IQP block to $\{R_z, SX, X, R_{ZZ}\}$ with `qiskit` using fractional gates, so that for each IQP angle θ in the calibrated range $e^{i\theta Z_i Z_j} \mapsto R_{ZZ}(2\theta)$ on the native edge, and for $|\theta|$ outside the documented envelope fold via $R_{ZZ}(2\theta) = R_{ZZ}(2\theta_0) \cdot R_{ZZ}(2(\theta - \theta_0))$ with θ_0 chosen inside the calibrated band - note the per-block 2Q-pulse count then ceases to be uniformly 1; (ii) route via Cowtan-2019 against the heavy-hex coupling map - the SWAP tax from degree-2-3 connectivity remains; (iii) **preconditions for promoting off partial:** (a) re-measure D_H on a Heron r2 backend with the native R_{ZZ} lowering and the angle-folding accounted for (the paper’s SC_3 number is a `fake_washington` CX-native upper bound), (b) re-cite p_{eff} from Heron r2 2026 calibration rather than `fake_washington`, with an explicit handling of the IBM-documented limitation that fractional-gate error is not separately reported (i.e. derive an upper-bound layer error from the aggregate 2Q figure), (c) recompute the simulatability margin $m(H) = D_*(p_{\text{eff}}, k) - D_H$ with both; (d) IBM’s MCM and dynamic-circuit features earn no credit in this benchmark at $k = 2$.

Evidence:

- Paper Sec. III.B Table I + RHG paragraph, p. 6 (SC_3 depths; dense $2.1\times$ per-target overhead; RHG $20.9\times$ overhead at $n = 127$).
- IBM Quantum fractional gates documentation (retrieved 2026-05-16): <https://quantum.cloud.ibm.com/docs/en/guides/fractional-gates>.
- IBM Quantum Heron r2 system description (retrieved 2026-05-16): <https://quantum.ibm.com/services/resources>.
- Ezratty §8.3.7 “Vendors” p.415 (Heron heavy-hex); §7.1.3 p.243 (heavy-hex connectivity rationale).

3.5 Google Willow - runs with translation

Modality: Superconducting / tapered triangular.

The paper’s SC_1 is a 105-qubit Willow proxy with $\{R_z, \text{PhasedX-type}, \text{CZ}, \text{SYC}\}$ and $p_{\text{eff}} = 3.3 \times 10^{-3}$. Tapered triangular connectivity is denser than heavy-hex but still degree 3-4; the dense $k = 2$ pattern at $n = 16$ has per-target routing overhead $2.8\times$ in Table I (so $D_H = 674$ against the same-gate-set FC baseline of ≈ 241 , not against the FC_1 number of 34). Willow is **not commercially available** - no public `cirq` queue, no AWS Braket integration - so the row records architectural fit, not access.

Translation: (i) rebase to $\{R_z, \text{PhasedX}, \text{CZ}, \text{SYC}\}$ via `cirq` transpiler; (ii) the native SYC gate is a partial-iSWAP-plus-CZ composite - useful for random-circuit sampling but a wrong fit for the IQP $e^{i\theta Z_i Z_j}$ block, so the rebase falls back to CZ + single-qubit rotations and pays the routing tax of the tapered-triangular graph; (iii) at $p_{\text{eff}} = 3.3 \times 10^{-3}$ Willow lands *inside* the simulatable regime in the paper’s tested instances (Sec. III.C, p. 7); (iv) **precondition for promoting off partial:** a public access route plus a recalibrated p_{eff} tied to the 2026 Willow run that would close the margin against d_* .

Evidence:

- Paper Sec. III.B Table I, p. 6 (SC_1 depths and 2Q error).
- Google Quantum AI Willow announcement (retrieved 2026-05-16): <https://blog.google/technology/research/google-willow-quantum-chip/>.
- Ezratty §8.3.7 “Vendors” pp.410, 426-427 (Sycamore→Willow lineage; tapered triangular geometry).

3.6 Rigetti Ankaa-3 - runs with translation (after compiler retargeting)

Modality: Superconducting / defected rectangular grid.

Paper SC_4: 82 qubits, native $\{R_z, \text{RX}, \text{ISWAP}\}$, $p_{\text{eff}} = 1.94 \times 10^{-2}$. Defected grid is degree 2-4 with broken edges; dense $k = 2$ at $n = 16$ has per-target routing overhead $3.1\times$ in Table I (so $D_H = 279$ against the same-gate-set FC baseline of ≈ 90 , not against FC_1’s 34). The native ISWAP does not absorb $e^{i\theta Z_i Z_j}$ directly - the rebase synthesises it via two iSWAPs + single-qubit rotations or falls back to a CZ-equivalent, both of which inflate D_H further than a native ZZ would. At $p_{\text{eff}} = 1.94 \times 10^{-2}$ the compiled circuit sits well inside the simulatable regime.

Translation: (i) rebase to $\{R_z, \text{RX}, \text{ISWAP}\}$ via `pytket-rigetti` / `pyquil`; (ii) route against the Ankaa-3 coupling map; (iii) **precondition for promoting off partial:** a publicly documented native ISWAP-based lowering of the IQP block that avoids the 2-iSWAP decomposition tax; without it the depth overhead and p_{eff} combine to keep the circuit inside the easy phase.

Evidence:

- Paper Sec. III.B Table I, p. 6 (SC_4 depths and 2Q error).
- Rigetti Ankaa-3 spec page (retrieved 2026-05-16): <https://www.rigetti.com/what-we-build>.
- Ezratty §8.3.7 “Vendors” p.431 (Ankaa series; iSWAP/CZ history).

3.7 IQM Radiance (20-qubit configuration) - runs with translation (after compiler retargeting)

Modality: Superconducting / square lattice (heavy-square variant).

Not paper-modelled. IQM Radiance is IQM’s current commercial QPU line, sold in 20-, 54-, and 150-qubit configurations and superseding the earlier Garnet (20-qubit) and Crystal 54 (54-qubit) devices. The 20-qubit Radiance configuration is delivered with native $\{R, \text{CZ}\}$ on a square lattice and the spec sheet quotes “median two-qubit (CZ) gate fidelity of 99.51% across 30 qubit pairs, with maximum fidelity over a single pair reaching as high as 99.8%” (typical $\geq 99.3\%$, minimum $\geq 99.0\%$); i.e. $p_{\text{eff}} \approx 5 \times 10^{-3}$. On Julien’s $k = 2$ pattern at $n = 16$ the device is scale-feasible ($16 \leq 20$) and the noise budget sits between SC_1 (Willow, 3.3×10^{-3}) and SC_3 (Heron heavy-hex proxy, 1.146×10^{-2}), so the per-target routing overhead in paper Table I bounds the 20-qubit Radiance from both sides: the workload lives inside the simulatable regime in 2026.

Translation: (i) rebase the IQP block to $\{R, \text{CZ}\}$ via `qiskit-iqm` - on a CZ-native substrate the standard lowering is $e^{i\theta Z_i Z_j} =$

$\text{CNOT}_{ij} \cdot R_z(2\theta)_j \cdot \text{CNOT}_{ij}$ with each $\text{CNOT}_{ij} = (I \otimes H_j) \cdot \text{CZ}_{ij} \cdot (I \otimes H_j)$, which collapses to $H_j \cdot \text{CZ}_{ij} \cdot R_x(2\theta)_j \cdot \text{CZ}_{ij} \cdot H_j$ (two CZs per pair plus single-qubit dressings); (ii) route Cowtan-2019 against the square coupling map - overhead behaviour is interpolatable from SC_3/SC_4 in paper Table I; (iii) **precondition for promoting off partial**: a measured D_H on the 20-qubit Radiance via Resonance/Braket combined with a recalibrated p_{eff} that recovers a positive margin $m(H)$; without that the same fragmentation argument as for heavy-hex applies.

Evidence:

- IQM Radiance product page (retrieved 2026-05-16): <https://www.iqm.tech/products/iqm-radiance/> - 20/54/150-qubit configurations, native $\{R, \text{CZ}\}$ on a square lattice, median CZ fidelity 99.51%.
- AWS Braket - IQM device page (retrieved 2026-05-16): <https://docs.aws.amazon.com/braket/latest/developerguide/braket-devices.html#braket-iqm>.
- Ezratty §8.3.7 “Vendors” pp.436-437 (IQM square / heavy-square narrative).

3.8 IQM Radiance (54-qubit configuration) - runs with translation (after compiler retargeting)

Modality: Superconducting / square lattice (heavy-square variant).

Not paper-modelled. The 54-qubit Radiance configuration is the same architectural family as the 20-qubit one above, with the larger register Julien’s RHG-on-SC pattern would actually exercise; both ship with native $\{R, \text{CZ}\}$ on a square lattice and the same per-pair CZ-fidelity envelope. Combined with the sparser-than-Willow connectivity this lands the device inside the same simulatable regime that SC_1 and SC_3 occupy in the paper’s matrix, and the gap is structural rather than a calibration accident.

Translation: (i) rebase the IQP block to $\{R, \text{CZ}\}$ via `qiskit-iqm`, using the same CZ-native two-CZ-sandwich lowering as the 20-qubit row ($H_j \cdot \text{CZ}_{ij} \cdot R_x(2\theta)_j \cdot \text{CZ}_{ij} \cdot H_j$); (ii) route Cowtan-2019 against the 54-qubit Radiance coupling map - extrapolation from SC_3/SC_4 in paper Table I gives a per-target routing overhead in the 2-3 \times band at dense $n = 16$; (iii) **precondition for promoting off partial**: a measured D_H on the 54-qubit Radiance via Resonance plus a 2026 calibrated p_{eff} that recovers a positive margin $m(H)$.

Evidence:

- IQM Radiance product page (retrieved 2026-05-16): <https://www.iqm.tech/products/iqm-radiance/> - 20/54/150-qubit configurations, native $\{R, \text{CZ}\}$ on a square lattice.
- Ezratty §8.3.7 “Vendors” pp.436-437 (IQM square / heavy-square narrative).

3.9 Atom Computing - runs with translation (after compiler retargeting)

Modality: Neutral atom / digital gate-model (Rydberg-mediated CZ).

Atom Computing’s current product is AC1000 (> 1{,}200 physical qubits, all-to-all connectivity via atom movement, reported 2Q gate fidelity > 99.6\% - i.e. $p_{\text{eff}} \lesssim 4 \times 10^{-3}$ - with OpenQASM/QIR API surfaces and Rydberg-mediated two-qubit gates). The cited AC1000 product page documents Rydberg-mediated two-qubit gates and OpenQASM/QIR access but does **not** publicly name the native entangling primitive (CZ vs CPHASE vs a vendor-specific Rydberg pulse). On Julien’s $k = 2$ pattern at $n = 16$ the effective connectivity is closer to FC_1 than to any sparse SC graph (movement-mediated all-to-all on the relevant subregister), and the headline 2Q fidelity puts the device in the same noise band as FC_2 (IonQ Forte, 4.0×10^{-3}) - i.e. at or near the simulatability boundary rather than safely inside the easy phase. The reason the verdict stays **partial** (**pending native lowering**) rather than promoting toward FC_2 parity is that no public compiler trace lowers $e^{i\theta Z_i Z_j}$ onto the AC1000 native set at $n = 16$, the headline pair fidelity understates the layer error from atom-movement scheduling, and the native entangling-gate name needed to write down a concrete depth budget is itself not in the public spec.

Translation: (i) rebase the IQP block to whatever the AC1000 native 2Q primitive turns out to be, via the OpenQASM/QIR surface - **as a hypothesis**, if the native primitive is a Rydberg CZ then the standard CZ-native lowering is $e^{i\theta Z_i Z_j} = \text{CNOT}_{ij} \cdot R_z(2\theta)_j \cdot \text{CNOT}_{ij}$ with each $\text{CNOT}_{ij} = (I \otimes H_j) \cdot \text{CZ}_{ij} \cdot (I \otimes H_j)$, collapsing to $H_j \cdot \text{CZ}_{ij} \cdot R_x(2\theta)_j \cdot \text{CZ}_{ij} \cdot H_j$ (two CZs per pair plus single-qubit dressings); alternatively, if AC1000 exposes a native parametric controlled-phase CPHASE(ϕ) the block would absorb into a single 2Q layer - but neither lowering is currently grounded in a public Atom Computing spec or compiler trace; (ii) atom-movement scheduling chooses which pairs are co-located in each gate layer, which makes the routing cost parallelisable in a way `pytket`’s Cowtan-2019 heuristic does not model; (iii) **preconditions for promoting off partial** (**pending native lowering**): a public AC1000 native-gate naming + compiler trace for the IQP block at $n = 16$ that pins which of the two hypothetical lowerings actually applies, a layer-error budget calibrated against the movement schedule (single-pair fidelities are a lower bound), and a Rajakumar-style recomputation of d_* with that calibrated p ; (iv) MCM and dynamic circuits are advertised but not exercised by this workload.

Evidence:

- Atom Computing AC1000 product page - > 1{,}200 qubits, all-to-all, > 99.6\% 2Q fidelity, OpenQASM/QIR (retrieved 2026-05-16): <https://atom-computing.com/ac1000/>.
- Atom Computing 1180-qubit system release (retrieved 2026-05-16): <https://atom-computing.com/quantum-startup-atom-computing-first-to-exceed-1000-qubits/>.
- Ezratty §8.8.7 “Vendors” pp.578-580 (neutral-atom digital architectures; ground-ground gate roadmap).

3.10 QuEra Gemini - runs with translation (after compiler retargeting)

Modality: Neutral atom / digital gate-model.

QuEra Gemini (announced 2024, ramping 2026) is the digital successor to the analogue Aquila programme, with Rydberg-mediated entangling gates on reconfigurable atom arrays. Same architectural picture as Atom Computing: connectivity-by-movement, global single-qubit drive, neutral-atom 2Q primitive whose **specific native name** (CZ, CPHASE, or a vendor-specific Rydberg pulse) is

not documented on the cited Gemini product page, no MCM credit on this workload. Decision-relevant because the digital chapter is the only QuEra device family on which Julien’s IQP circuit can run at all.

Translation: (i) rebase to the Gemini native set via `bloqade-circuit` / Braket SDK; (ii) **as a hypothesis**, if the Gemini native 2Q primitive is a Rydberg CZ, the IQP block lowers as $e^{i\theta Z_i Z_j} = \text{CNOT}_{ij} \cdot R_z(2\theta)_j \cdot \text{CNOT}_{ij}$ with each $\text{CNOT}_{ij} = (I \otimes H_j) \cdot \text{CZ}_{ij} \cdot (I \otimes H_j)$, giving $H_j \cdot \text{CZ}_{ij} \cdot R_x(2\theta)_j \cdot \text{CZ}_{ij} \cdot H_j$ with movement-scheduled pair colocation between the two CZ layers; if instead Gemini exposes a native parametric controlled-phase $\text{CPHASE}(\phi)$ in 2026, the block could collapse to a single 2Q layer - neither lowering is currently grounded in a public QuEra spec or compiler trace, both are conditional on the eventual native-gate disclosure; (iii) **preconditions for promoting off partial (pending native lowering)**: a public Gemini compiler trace at $n = 16$ that pins the native 2Q primitive plus a 2026 calibrated p_{eff} - without these, repeat the Atom Computing caveat that single-pair fidelities understate layer error; (iv) the analogue Aquila device on the same vendor is *not* a substrate for this workload - see the Pasqal Fresnel row for the architectural-rewrite argument.

Evidence:

- QuEra Gemini product page (retrieved 2026-05-16): <https://www.quera.com/gemini> - 260 neutral-atom qubits, “Digital Gate-Mode: Yes”, all-to-all connectivity.
- Ezratty §8.8.7 “Vendors” p.578 (neutral-atom digital roadmap).

3.11 Pasqal analogue (Fresnel & Orion Beta) - architectural rewrite

Modality: Neutral atom / analogue Rydberg Hamiltonian evolution.

Pasqal is a multi-device vendor; this row covers Pasqal’s currently-user-accessible analogue devices: Fresnel (100-qubit Rydberg analogue at CINES) and Orion Beta (100-qubit, Operation Mode = Analog per the public technical overview). Both evolve a programmable Rydberg Hamiltonian

$$\hat{H}(t) = \sum_i \frac{\Omega(t)}{2} \sigma_i^x - \sum_i \Delta(t) \hat{n}_i + \sum_{i < j} V_{ij} \hat{n}_i \hat{n}_j,$$

with $V_{ij} \propto 1/r_{ij}^6$ Rydberg-blockade interactions, rather than a digital gate sequence. Julien’s IQP circuit is a $k = 2$ **gate-based** commuting circuit with terminal computational-basis measurement and an explicit native-gate compilation question - the analogue Rydberg primitive does not implement a $k = 2$ IQP commuting block as a single Trotter step except in a degenerate ZZ-only limit. This is a paradigm change (digital \rightarrow analogue Hamiltonian evolution), so the controlled vocabulary requires **architectural rewrite**, not “translation”. Pasqal’s future digital FTQC line is a separate row below.

Translation: A research-grade port would (i) re-express the IQP sampling target as a quench-or-driven analogue protocol on the Rydberg Hamiltonian above, accepting that the resulting sampled distribution is no longer the IQP output distribution but an analogue analogue; (ii) re-derive any complexity argument from scratch - Rajakumar’s d_* bound applies to interleaved-Pauli-noise digital circuits and does

not transfer; (iii) accept that the entire paper’s framework (compiled depth, routing overhead, η_H) is no longer the right yardstick. This is a different scientific project, not a port.

Evidence:

- Pasqal Orion Beta technical overview (Operation Mode = Analog), retrieved 2026-05-16: <https://www.pasqal.com/wp-content/uploads/2025/03/Technical-Overview-for-Advanced-Users-Orion-Beta.pdf>.
- Pasqal technology roadmap (retrieved 2026-05-16): <https://www.pasqal.com/technology/roadmap/> - “Moving from our current Orion generation to future architectures”.
- Pasqal newsroom - 140-qubit neutral-atom delivery to CINECA (2026-02-17), retrieved 2026-05-16: <https://www.pasqal.com/newsroom/pasqal-delivers-italys-first-neutral-atom-quantum-computer/> - 2026 proof point of analogue Rydberg deployment.
- Ezratty §8.8.7 “Vendors” p.578 (Rydberg analogue / digital split).

3.12 Xanadu Borealis - architectural rewrite

Modality: Photonic / Gaussian boson sampling.

Multi-device vendor: this row scopes to **Borealis** (the 216-qumode programmable photonic GBS sampler launched on AWS Braket in 2022). Borealis samples photon-number patterns from a Gaussian state defined by programmable squeezing + interferometer settings - also a sampling task, but a *different* sampling task. The IQP X -diagonal commuting-circuit structure with terminal Pauli-Z measurement has no native expression on Borealis: there are no qubits, no $e^{i\theta Z_i Z_j}$ block, no p_{eff} defined per the paper’s noise model. The architectural-rewrite verdict does not depend on Borealis’s current managed-cloud availability - the paradigm mismatch is the binding fact. Xanadu’s separate Aurora networking prototype and future fault-tolerant universal substrate are not user-accessible at this workload’s scale and belong on a different horizon (Aurora sits closer to the PsiQuantum Omega row than to Borealis).

Translation: A research-grade port would substitute the GBS sampling problem for the IQP sampling problem entirely - i.e. abandon the paper’s circuit family and re-anchor on a Gaussian-state hardness argument (Hamilton-Aaronson-Brod et al.). That is a paradigm change, not a port; the paper’s connectivity-aware framework (compiled depth, d_* , η_H) does not apply.

Evidence:

- Xanadu Borealis paper (Madsen et al., *Quantum computational advantage with a programmable photonic processor*, Nature 606, 2022) establishing the 216-qumode GBS device and its sampling primitive (retrieved 2026-05-16): <https://www.nature.com/articles/s41586-022-04725-x>.
- AWS Braket 2022 Borealis launch note (historical access record; do not interpret as 2026 managed-cloud availability), retrieved 2026-05-16: <https://aws.amazon.com/blogs/quantum-computing/explore-quantum-computational-advantage-with-xanadus-borealis-device-on-amazon-braket/>.
- Ezratty §8.10.2 “Science” p.600; §8.10.8 “Vendors” pp.630, 632 (Xanadu Borealis + Aurora roadmap; PsiQuantum Omega contrast).

3.13 D-Wave Advantage - architectural rewrite

Modality: Superconducting transverse-field Ising quantum annealer.

D-Wave Advantage / Advantage2 implement adiabatic / quenched evolution under a transverse-field Ising Hamiltonian on Pegasus / Zephyr couplings; there is no programmable digital gate set, no $e^{i\theta Z_i Z_j}$ block, no interleaved-Pauli-noise circuit model. Julien’s IQP $k = 2$ sampling primitive cannot be expressed on the annealer without redefining the computational task - the most one could do is take the *Ising energy distribution* of a corresponding QUBO as a proxy “sample”, which is a categorically different output.

Translation: A research-grade port would replace the IQP sampling target with a Gibbs-like sampling target on the corresponding Ising graph, accept that the resulting samples are governed by annealing dynamics not by the Rajakumar simulatability bound, and abandon the entire d_* / η_H framework. Different paradigm, different complexity argument.

Evidence:

- D-Wave Advantage2 system spec (retrieved 2026-05-16): <https://www.dwavesys.com/solutions-and-products/systems/>.
- Ezratty §8.2.5 “Vendors” pp.378, 381 (D-Wave annealer architecture; Q-CTRL contest).

3.14 Alice & Bob (Helium) - infeasible today

Modality: Cat qubit / digital gate-model on bias-preserving cat encoding.

Alice & Bob’s product line uses dissipative cat qubits with a strongly biased noise channel (phase flips dominate over bit flips by 4-6 orders of magnitude) and a digital gate set built around bias-preserving CX. **In principle** the IQP $e^{i\theta Z_i Z_j}$ block - which is a phase-only operation in the X -diagonal frame - would align naturally with that channel, and a re-derivation of d_* with $p \approx p_Z$ (since $\min(p_X, p_Y) \rightarrow 0$ on a bias-preserving substrate) would shift the simulatability boundary favourably relative to a depolarising-channel SC device. **In practice** the publicly evidenced 2026 device generation is Helium 1, a 16-qubit cat-qubit tape-out, and there is no user-accessible Helium backend, no public Alice & Bob SDK native-gate manifest, and no documented bias-preserving two-qubit-gate interface that would let Julien’s $k = 2$ IQP circuit at $n = 16$ logical run today. The verdict is **infeasible today** on public-evidence grounds (no runnable multi-qubit gate substrate at the required scale in 2026), not on any architectural mismatch. Horizon: a positive verdict becomes possible once a Helium backend exposes ≥ 16 logical (or sufficient physical) qubits, a publicly documented native bias-preserving 2Q gate, and a calibrated layer-error number - viable 2027-2028 contingent on roadmap delivery.

Translation: Not applicable in 2026 - no user-accessible Helium backend, no public native-gate manifest, no documented multi-qubit gate substrate at scale. Once those exist a future row would become **runs with translation (after compiler retargeting)**: (i) rebase the IQP block to the published bias-preserving native set via the Alice & Bob SDK; (ii) re-derive d_* with the cat-channel-appropriate $p \approx p_Z$ rather than the depolarising-channel default of Rajakumar’s bound; (iii) re-measure D_H against the published native 2Q gate. Until the public evidence catches up to that translation path, the row carries no positive verdict.

Evidence:

- Alice & Bob roadmap and technology page (retrieved 2026-05-16): <https://alice-bob.com/roadmap/> - Helium presented as the next-generation system, not as a currently user-accessible backend.
- Alice & Bob “Helium 1” news / chip announcement positioning Helium 1 as a 16-qubit cat-qubit tape-out rather than a runnable multi-qubit gate-model substrate at $n = 16$ logical scale (retrieved 2026-05-16): <https://alice-bob.com/newsroom/>.
- Ezratty §8.3.7 “Vendors” pp.445-446 (Alice & Bob cat-qubit chip line, ATS-based correction; Helium framed as horizon target).

3.15 Pasqal digital (post-Orion) - infeasible today

Modality: Neutral atom / digital FTQC (roadmap).

Pasqal’s digital gate-model line - distinct from the analogue Orion Beta substrate above - is a roadmap target rather than a 2026 user-accessible device. The public Orion Beta technical overview labels the current Operation Mode as Analog, and Pasqal’s published roadmap presents digital FTQC as a future evolution that lands beyond 2026. There is therefore no 2026 user-accessible Pasqal device on which Julien’s $k = 2$ gate-based IQP circuit at $n = 16$ can be executed in a digital gate-model sense. Horizon: viable post-2027 contingent on roadmap delivery; until then the verdict is **infeasible today** on public-evidence grounds, with the *digital* analogue of the QuEra Gemini / Atom Computing row deferred to that horizon.

Translation: Not applicable in 2026. Post-roadmap a Pasqal digital row would become **runs with translation (after compiler retargeting)** on the same precondition pattern as Atom Computing and QuEra Gemini: a public compiler trace lowering $e^{i\theta Z_i Z_j}$ onto the future native digital gate set, a calibrated layer-error p_{eff} , and a Rajakumar-style recomputation of d_* .

Evidence:

- Pasqal Orion Beta technical overview (Operation Mode = Analog), retrieved 2026-05-16: <https://www.pasqal.com/wp-content/uploads/2025/03/Technical-Overview-for-Advanced-Users-Orion-Beta.pdf>.
- Pasqal technology roadmap (retrieved 2026-05-16): <https://www.pasqal.com/technology/roadmap/> - Orion generation in production; future architectures (including digital FTQC) framed as beyond the current generation.
- Ezratty §8.8.7 “Vendors” pp.578, 580 (Pasqal digital-FTQC horizon).

3.16 PsiQuantum Omega - infeasible today

Modality: Photonic / FBQC future fault-tolerant substrate.

PsiQuantum’s Omega chipset and the Chicago / Brisbane facilities are aimed at fault-tolerant photonic computation at million-qubit scale, with first user-accessible compute scheduled for 2027-2029 per the public roadmap. There is no 2026 user-accessible device that can host a $k = 2$ IQP sampling experiment at $n = 16$ - the architecture is gate-equivalent (FBQC) in principle, so the long-horizon verdict is

not architectural rewrite, but no public material documents a today-runnable 16-qubit gate-model Omega instance with the connectivity, native-gate, and 2Q-fidelity profile needed for the Rajakumar inequality. Horizon: viable \geq 2028 contingent on roadmap delivery.

Translation: Not applicable in 2026. Post-2028, the workload would be a **runs with translation (after compiler retargeting)** row: rebase the IQP block onto the FBQC native fusion / measurement schedule and recompute d_* with the post-FT logical error rate; until then the row carries no positive verdict.

Evidence:

- PsiQuantum Omega chipset page (retrieved 2026-05-16): <https://www.psiquantum.com/omega> - “Omega: A manufacturable chipset for utility-scale quantum computing”; “fault-tolerant, million-qubit scale system”; “starting in Brisbane and Chicago”.
- Ezratty §8.10.8 “Vendors” p.632; §9.1.3 “Cryostats vendors” p.676 (Omega cryoplant scale; horizon framing).

Commentary (\approx 350 words). The paper anchors the only positive verdict on Quantinuum Helios because it is the only paper-modelled device whose combination of all-to-all connectivity, native ZZPhase rebase of the IQP block, and $\sim 10^{-3}$ 2Q error keeps the compiled depth D_H comfortably below the Rajakumar simulatability threshold d_* . IonQ Forte is architecturally identical (all-to-all, native ZZ) but the higher 2Q error rate puts it at the boundary rather than safely outside it - the **strongest second platform** for re-running this experiment, and the row most worth costing once 2026-calibrated Forte Enterprise error numbers are public. Inside the superconducting modality, the paper’s own per-target routing overheads ($2.1\times$ on heavy-hex SC_3, $2.8\times$ on Willow SC_1, $3.1\times$ on Ankaa-3 SC_4 at dense $n = 16$) combine with $\sim 10^{-2}$ -class p_{eff} values to put IBM Heron, Google Willow, Rigetti Ankaa-3 (and by extrapolation the 20- and 54-qubit IQM Radiance configurations) inside the simulatable regime at $k = 2$, $n = 16-127$. That is a structural conclusion: the modality-level noise budget is the binding constraint, the routing overhead is the multiplier. IBM Heron’s 2026 fractional-gate support means the IQP $e^{i\theta Z_i Z_j}$ block lowers to a native $R_{ZZ}(\theta)$ on the native edge *within the IBM-documented calibrated angle envelope* - with angle folding outside it and aggregate-only fractional-gate error reporting - so the open empirical question is whether re-measuring D_H on Heron r2 with that lowering, plus a 2026-calibrated p_{eff} derived from the aggregate 2Q figure, closes the simulatability margin. The neutral-atom digital pair (Atom Computing AC1000, QuEra Gemini) is the most interesting cluster of *uncertainty*: their movement-based effective connectivity is closer to all-to-all than to heavy-hex on small subregisters, and AC1000’s headline $> 99.6\%$ 2Q fidelity puts it in the same noise band as Forte (FC_2), but no public compiler trace yet lowers the IQP block onto either vendor’s native CZ-or-CPHASE primitive at $n = 16$, and headline pair fidelity understates the movement-scheduled layer error, so both sit at **runs with translation (after compiler retargeting)** with explicit preconditions. Pasqal sits across two rows because its 2026 public devices (Fresnel, Orion Beta) run in analogue mode (architectural rewrite for this workload) and its digital line is roadmap-only (infeasible today). Alice & Bob’s bias-preserving cat-qubit substrate would in principle move the simulatability boundary favourably (the IQP block is phase-only, the dominant noise channel is phase-flip), but the publicly evidenced 2026 generation is Helium 1 - a 16-qubit cat-qubit tape-out with no user-accessible backend and no public native-gate manifest, so the row sits at **infeasible today** on access grounds rather than at **runs with translation** on a hypothetical SDK. Xanadu Borealis (216-qumode GBS, paradigm-mismatched independent of current Bracket availability) and D-Wave Advantage (transverse-field annealer) are paradigm-mismatched; PsiQuantum Omega is on a 2028+ horizon.

For the human curator: the row that would most change the matrix if revisited in 12 months is Forte (a calibration update could promote it to a paired anchor), followed by Heron re-measured on Heron r2 with native R_{ZZ} lowering and aggregate-error budgeting, and then the two neutral-atom digital rows - AC1000's headline numbers make a published compiler trace at $n = 16$ the single highest-value piece of vendor evidence to chase.

3.17 Residual caveats

- The **Quantinuum Helios** row is scoped to $n \leq 98$; the $n=127$ RHG instance remains outside the anchor's modelled register.
- The **IonQ Forte** row remains a boundary-case fit; promoting it depends on a 2026 calibrated 2Q error replacing the paper's 4.0×10^{-3} proxy.
- The **IBM Heron** row remains conditional on Heron r2 native R_{ZZ} angle folding, aggregate-only fractional-gate error reporting, and a measured depth/noise recomputation rather than the paper's `fake_washington` CX proxy.
- The **Google Willow** row remains an architectural fit only; no public access path is established and the paper puts the Willow proxy inside the simulatable regime.
- The **Rigetti Ankaa-3** row remains inside the easy regime at the cited 2Q error, and public evidence still lacks a native ISWAP lowering that avoids decomposition tax for the IQP block.
- The **IQM Radiance** rows are extrapolated superconducting peers, not paper-modelled devices; their square-lattice routing depth and p_{eff} margin are not measured in the paper. The Braket access evidence currently names IQM **Garnet** and **Emerald**, while the Radiance product page carries the hardware-family claims.
- The **Atom Computing AC1000** and **QuEra Gemini** rows rely on conditional neutral-atom native-lowering hypotheses; public pages support scale, connectivity, and fidelity claims but do not pin a compiler trace for $e^{-i\theta Z_i Z_j}$ or a movement-scheduled layer-error budget.
- The **Pasqal analogue** and **D-Wave Advantage** rows are paradigm changes, not portable executions; any sampled distribution would no longer be the paper's noisy IQP distribution.
- The **Alice & Bob (Helium)** and **Pasqal digital** rows remain roadmap/access claims; neither row has a 2026 user-accessible digital backend with a public native-gate manifest for this workload.
- The **Xanadu Borealis** row is correctly scoped to the GBS sampler, but the row should continue to be read separately from Xanadu's Aurora and fault-tolerant-roadmap claims.
- The **PsiQuantum Omega** row remains a future-substrate claim; the 2026 evidence supports component/Omega progress, not a today-runnable 16-qubit gate-model instance.