

A unified framework for efficient quantum simulation of nonlinear spectroscopy

Portability dossier - app

agQSL portability pipeline

2026-04-21

Field	Value
Slug	2026-arxiv-2604.16164-nonlinear-spectroscopy
Source	arXiv
Link	https://arxiv.org/abs/2604.16164
Category	app
Triaged	2026-04-17 by codex
Bootstrapped	2026-04-21

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	5
2.5	Assumptions and results	6
2.6	Portability flags	7
2.7	Caveats	7
3	Portability matrix	9
3.1	Summary	9
3.2	IBM <code>ibm_kobe</code> - runs as-is (<i>anchor</i>)	9
3.3	Quantinuum H2 - runs with translation	10
3.4	IonQ Forte - runs with translation	11
3.5	QuEra Gemini - runs with translation (after compiler retargeting)	11
3.6	Atom Computing AC1000 - runs with translation (after compiler retargeting)	12
3.7	Pasqal - architectural rewrite	13
3.8	PsiQuantum - infeasible today	13
3.9	Xanadu Aurora - infeasible today	14
3.10	Quantum Brilliance - infeasible today	14
3.11	Residual caveats	16

1 Source

1.1 Domain classification

Primary: **materials** (condensed-matter many-body spectroscopy). The hardware demonstration is a 12-qubit Heisenberg XXZ spin chain on IBM superconducting processors; further applications target spin-liquid quasi-particle excitation spectra and interacting two-level atomic systems. Secondary: **quantum chemistry** - the nonlinear-response formalism and 2D coherent spectroscopy framing carry directly into molecular 2DCS, and the paper positions itself explicitly against the molecular-response literature (Cai 2020, Huang 2022, Loaiza 2025, Kharazi 2025).

1.2 Expert persona for Julien

A condensed-matter quantum many-body theorist with a working command of nonlinear response theory (Mukamel-style multi-time correlation functions, 2DCS) and hands-on experience running real-time evolution circuits on IBM heavy-hex superconducting hardware. Should have calibrated intuition about Trotter step budgets for XXZ/Heisenberg dynamics, measurement shot budgeting under parameter-shift-rule variance amplification, and the error-mitigation stack (ZNE, PEC, dynamical decoupling) typical of Qiskit Runtime workflows. Comfort with δ - *pulse* / impulsive-drive approximations and with reading GPSR complexity appendices is essential, since the paper’s portability-relevant claims sit in Appendices A-B.

1.3 Related prior work (brief bibliography)

- Kharazi, Stetina, Ko, Low & Whaley, *An efficient quantum algorithm for ab initio approximations of non-linear response functions*, npj Quantum Information **11**, 98 (2025) - arXiv:2404.01454. Fault-tolerant alternative based on eigenstate filtering; the natural “same application, different vendor/architecture” comparator.
- Loaiza, Motlagh, Hejazi, Zini, Delgado & Arrazola, *Nonlinear Spectroscopy via Generalized Quantum Phase Estimation*, Quantum **9**, 1822 (2025) - arXiv:2405.13885. Generalised QPE framework for multivariate response; the other main nonlinear-spectroscopy competitor algorithm.
- Kökcü, Labib, Freericks & Kemper, *A linear response framework for quantum simulation of bosonic and fermionic correlation functions*, Nat. Commun. **15**, 3881 (2024). Linear-response precursor that the present paper extends to the nonlinear regime.
- Sun, Vilchez-Estevez, Vedral, Boothroyd & Kim, *Probing spectral features of quantum many-body systems with quantum simulators*, Nat. Commun. **16**, 1403 (2025). Spectroscopy-oriented NISQ toolkit; useful for cross-benchmarking shot budgets on spin models.
- Cai, Fang, Fan & Li, *Quantum computation of molecular response properties*, Phys. Rev. Research **2**, 033324 (2020). Earlier variational route to molecular response - the chemistry-side anchor.
- Huang et al., *Variational quantum computation of molecular linear response properties on a superconducting quantum processor*, J. Phys. Chem. Lett. **13**, 9114 (2022). Superconducting-hardware linear-response demo; the natural “same vendor class, lower-order primitive” comparator.

1.4 Difficulty estimate

Medium. arXiv preprint is fetched in full ([paper.html](#)), no paywall, single-vendor demo (IBM heavy-hex, 12 qubits) with a standard error-mitigation stack. The algorithm itself is one conceptual idea (GPSR applied to multi-time response), which keeps the surface small. The medium rating reflects that the portability-relevant detail - shot-count scaling, δ -*pulse* restrictions, Trotter depth, qubit-subgraph selection on `ibm_*` backends - lives in Appendices A-B rather than the main text, so Julien will need to read the SI carefully.

2 Extraction

2.1 What the paper does (one paragraph)

The authors propose a single algorithmic recipe that turns any n -th order nonlinear response function - the objects measured by pump-probe and two-dimensional coherent spectroscopy - into a small, finite weighted sum of ordinary expectation values taken at a fixed set of shifted pump amplitudes. The trick is the generalized parameter-shift rule (GPSR): if the pump generator has a known discrete eigenvalue-gap spectrum, the n -th derivative of the driven expectation value with respect to pump strength can be written exactly as a linear combination of measurements at $|\Omega|$ shift points, with no ancilla qubits, no high-order commutator expansions, and a circuit count that does not grow with the response order. They validate the approach on IBM superconducting hardware by reconstructing fourth- and fifth-order response functions of a 12-qubit XXZ spin chain, then demonstrate portability of the idea to a Kitaev toric-code spin-liquid model and to interacting two-level-system spectra. The core hardware demand is real-time Trotter evolution plus a modest set of single-qubit pulse-amplitude shifts.

2.2 Quantum hardware used

- **Vendor / machine:** IBM / `ibm_kobe` (156-qubit superconducting processor; p22, line 455).
- **Qubit count:** 12 used / 156 available. The 12 qubits form a sub-chain chosen to minimise cumulative readout and two-qubit gate error (p22).
- **Connectivity:** heavy-hex (standard IBM superconducting layout; the paper only specifies that a 12-qubit sub-chain “matches the nearest-neighbour XXZ topology”, which is the linear-chain slice of heavy-hex).
- **Gate set:** native IBM gate set - not explicitly named in the paper. Circuits are compiled with the F3C optimiser on top of the qclab toolbox (p22), which targets a nearest-neighbour SU(4)-block decomposition suitable for Heisenberg / XXZ evolution.
- **Notable features leveraged:** none beyond standard real-time evolution and terminal computational-basis measurement. No mid-circuit measurement, dynamic circuits, pulse-level control, or custom hardware-native primitives are reported.

2.3 Computational primitive

Trotterised Hamiltonian simulation (real-time evolution of a 12-site XXZ chain) combined with single-qubit pump-amplitude shifts and classical GPSR post-processing. This is not VQE, not QPE, not analog evolution - it is repeated forward Trotter evolution on a fixed parameter grid, with the response function recovered by a deterministic linear combination of the measured expectation values.

2.4 Resource fingerprint

Metric	Value	Source (page / equation / SI)
Qubits (logical)	12	p21 (text: “Here we take N=12”); p22
Qubits (physical)	12 (sub-chain of 156-qubit <code>ibm_kobe</code>)	p22
Circuit depth	not reported (Trotter step count is reported - see below - but compiled gate-level depth is not)	-
2Q-gate count (total)	not reported	-
Measurement shots	8,192 per $(t, \vec{\eta})$ configuration	p22
Classical loop iter.	not iterative. One deterministic GPSR post-processing pass over the full measurement grid. Number of distinct circuits per time point is $N_{\text{circ}} = \prod_a \Omega_a - 3$ for the single-pulse fourth-order run and 9 ($= 3 \times 3$) for the two-pulse fifth-order run. With 51 time points this gives ≈ 153 circuits (Fig. 3a-d) and ≈ 459 circuits (Fig. 3e,f)	Eq. 10; p22
Wall-clock runtime	not reported	-

Additional reported parameters that do not fit the standard fingerprint rows:

- Trotter steps: 10 (first-order), implementing time evolution of the XXZ Hamiltonian with $\Delta = 0$, $h_e = 0.75$ (p22).
- Evolution-time grid: $t \in [0, 5]$ sampled at 51 uniform points (p22).
- Pump-amplitude shift set: $\eta \in \{-\pi/4, 0, +\pi/4\}$ (p22).
- Pump operator: local, $\mathbf{B} = X_3$ on the hardware runs (p22).
- Probe observables: $M_z^{(2)}(3, 4; t) = \langle Z_3 + Z_4 \rangle$, spin current $J(3, 4; t) = \langle X_3 Y_4 - Y_3 X_4 \rangle$, and $\langle X_3(t) \rangle$ (p24).

2.5 Assumptions and results

- **Claim.** The GPSR-based pipeline reconstructs fourth-order response functions of two-site magnetisation and spin current, and fifth-order response of transverse spin under a two-pulse protocol, on `ibm_kobe`. After a post-processing exponential-envelope fit $a(t) = \alpha e^{-\gamma t}$, the hardware-measured time- and frequency-domain responses are visually consistent with the noiseless reference computed on the same compiled Trotter circuit.
- **Error bars / noise assumptions.** No explicit shot-noise error bars or error-bar traces are shown on the hardware curves in Fig. 3; agreement is demonstrated by overlay (raw hardware / post-processed hardware / noiseless reference). The paper does not report T1/T2 or two-qubit error rates for the chosen 12-qubit sub-chain; it states only that the sub-chain was selected to minimise cumulative readout and two-qubit gate error.

- **Error-mitigation stack.** The only mitigation reported is the empirical exponential-envelope post-processing $a(t) = \alpha e^{-\gamma t}$ (p24, Fig. 3 caption). No ZNE, PEC, dynamical decoupling, Pauli twirling, or measurement-error mitigation is named in the text accessible here.
- **Classical baseline.** The comparator is a classically computed noiseless simulation of the *same* compiled 10-step Trotter circuit, not a higher-fidelity classical solver (ED, tensor-network, etc.). The paper argues qualitatively that classical simulation of the underlying continuous-time nonlinear response is Hilbert-space-exponential but does not provide a head-to-head runtime comparison at 12 qubits, where classical exact methods remain cheap.

2.6 Portability flags

- **Nearest-neighbour connectivity only.** A 12-site XXZ chain fits comfortably on a heavy-hex, linear, or 1D-Rydberg device. No all-to-all interactions required.
- **No mid-circuit measurement, no dynamic circuits.** Each circuit is a straight Trotter evolution followed by a single-shot computational-basis readout of the probe observable. This is portable to essentially any gate-model platform.
- **No ancilla qubits.** An explicit selling point of the GPSR approach versus Hadamard-test / LCU constructions.
- **Pump is implemented as a single-qubit X -rotation at fixed amplitude.** Shift amplitudes $\pm\pi/4, 0$ are trivially available on any device that supports arbitrary single-qubit rotations. The GPSR weights, however, depend on the eigenvalue-gap spectrum Ω_a of the pump generator; for Pauli generators such as X_3 the gap set is trivially $\{2\}$, but for more collective pumps the shift set must be recomputed.
- **Circuit compiler dependency.** Hardware circuits are compiled with F3C / qclab, an algebraic XXZ-specific Trotter compressor. A different vendor toolchain would need either an equivalent compressor or an accepted gate-depth penalty; whether the reported results carry across without F3C is not discussed. — ** δ – pulse restriction.* ** Appendix A derives the GPSR-response identity under an impulsive (δ – *function*) pump. A platform that cannot implement sufficiently short, well-calibrated pulses would need a finite-pulse-width correction that the paper does not quantify.
- **Coefficient-norm amplification in the shot budget.** Appendix B shows that, at fixed additive precision ε , the total shot count scales polynomially with derivative order through a “coefficient-norm” factor that depends on the shift set. The 8,192 shots/configuration used here were chosen empirically, not against an ε target; any port of the algorithm to a noisier or slower device needs to re-derive the shot budget via Appendix B.

2.7 Caveats

- The paper was read through the ar5iv HTML rendering ([paper.html](#)) of the arXiv preprint v1. No separate Supplementary Information file exists in the dossier beyond the main paper; the theoretical appendices A and B are part of the same document.
- The main text does not report compiled 2Q-gate count, compiled circuit depth, wall-clock runtime, or calibration data (T1/T2, gate fidelities, readout fidelities) for the specific 12-qubit sub-chain used. These are flagged as “not reported” in the fingerprint

table rather than inferred.

- `ibm_kobe` is the processor name used in the paper; it is consistent with a 156-qubit Heron-family device but the paper does not state the architecture generation explicitly. No cross-check has been performed against an external IBM Quantum backend registry from within this extraction.

3 Portability matrix

Anchor: IBM / `ibm_kobe` (a 12-qubit sub-chain of a 156-qubit heavy-hex superconducting processor) executed a 10-step first-order Trotter evolution of a 12-site XXZ chain, with GPSR reconstruction of fourth- and fifth-order response functions. The hardware run is reported in arXiv:2604.16164 (2026), Section “Hardware demonstration” with parameters at p22: 12-site sub-chain selection; $\Delta = 0$; $h_e = 0.75$; 10 Trotter steps; 51 time points; X_3 pump; shifts $\eta \in \{-\pi/4, 0, +\pi/4\}$; 8,192 shots per configuration. See also Fig. 3a-f.

Julien’s fingerprint: 12 qubits on a 1D nearest-neighbour chain, ≤ 10 first-order Trotter steps, single-qubit Pauli-X pump on one site with shifts $\eta \in \{-\pi/4, 0, +\pi/4\}$ (gap set $\Omega = \{2\}$), 8,192 shots \times up to ~ 459 circuits per time point; no ancilla, no mid-circuit measurement, no dynamic circuits. Appendix A’s δ -pulse derivation is satisfied at the *circuit level* by inserting a single-qubit X_3 rotation between Trotter layers, not by a shaped physical control pulse - any vendor with arbitrary-angle single-qubit rotations meets the GPSR identity at the circuit level, and the physical pulse-width caveat only binds if hardware single-qubit gate time is comparable to the Trotter step dt (the paper does not report dt in physical seconds). Appendix B’s coefficient-norm factor amplifies the shot budget polynomially in derivative order, so any non-anchor port must re-derive the Appendix-B budget against the target’s shot rate at a chosen ε . See `extraction.md` for full detail.

3.1 Summary

Modality	Vendor	Verdict	2026 fit
Superconducting (anchor)	IBM <code>ibm_kobe</code>	runs as-is	yes
Trapped ion	Quantinuum H2	runs with translation	yes
Trapped ion	IonQ Forte	runs with translation	yes
Neutral atom (digital)	QuEra Gemini	architectural rewrite	partial
Neutral atom (digital)	Atom Computing AC1000	architectural rewrite	partial
Neutral atom (analog)	Pasqal	architectural rewrite	no
Photonic (DV / MBQC)	PsiQuantum	infeasible today	no
Photonic (CV / distributed)	Xanadu Aurora	infeasible today	no
NV / diamond	Quantum Brilliance	infeasible today	no

3.2 IBM `ibm_kobe` - runs as-is (*anchor*)

Modality: Superconducting (heavy-hex).

`ibm_kobe` is a 156-qubit Heron-class heavy-hexagonal superconducting processor; the paper selects a 12-qubit linear sub-chain that matches the nearest-neighbour XXZ topology and minimises cumulative readout and two-qubit gate error (extraction p22). The native

gate set, F3C/qclab compilation path, and terminal computational-basis readout are exactly what the paper used; no ancilla, no mid-circuit measurement, no dynamic circuits, and no pulse-level control are reported.

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

Evidence:

- arXiv:2604.16164 (2026), p22 - `ibm_kobe` 156-qubit processor, 12-qubit sub-chain selection, F3C/qclab compilation, retrieved 2026-04-17.
- [IBM Quantum - Processor types](#) - Heron r2+ = 156-qubit heavy-hexagonal lattice, retrieved 2026-04-21.
- Ezratty *UQT 2025* §8.3.7 “Vendors” p. 417.

3.3 Quantinuum H2 - runs with translation

Modality: Trapped ion (QCCD).

H2’s current product data sheet (v4.00, 2025-09-17) reports $N \geq 56/56$ qubits with all-to-all QCCD connectivity, mid-circuit measurement, qubit reuse, and a native gate set that exposes single-qubit rotations, a fixed ZZMax, a parameterised ZZPhase/RZZ, and a general SU(4) entangler $\text{TK2}(\alpha, \beta, \gamma) = \exp(-i\pi\alpha XX/2)\exp(-i\pi\beta YY/2)\exp(-i\pi\gamma ZZ/2)$ exposed in QASM as `Rxxyyzz(alpha,beta,gamma)`. Capacity (12 of ≥ 56) and connectivity are not the binding constraints; throughput is.

Translation: F3C/qclab compresses the nearest-neighbour XXZ Trotter layer into exactly the XX-YY-ZZ three-angle SU(4) block that H2 exposes natively, so the lowering is identity-shaped - one `TK2/Rxxyyzz` per nearest-neighbour bond per Trotter step, no MS-vs-ZZ decomposition tax, and no SWAP tax given the all-to-all QCCD zone. The X_3 pump and the $\eta = \pm\pi/4$ shifts are single-qubit rotations; MCM and qubit reuse are exposed but not required by this paper’s protocol. The expected compiled 2Q-gate count is materially lower than an IBM CZ decomposition of the same block, which sharpens the fidelity budget for the 10-step Trotter at 12 qubits. Wall-clock caveat: QCCD shuttling makes trapped-ion shot-rate materially lower than IBM superconducting (Quantinuum does not publish a shots/s figure on the public H2 page as of 2026-04-21, so this remains a qualitative comparison - ion-trap queue and shuttling overhead, not a dated ratio), so the $\sim 4 \times 10^6$ shots of the fifth-order run make re-deriving the Appendix-B coefficient-norm budget at a target ε the first gating task on H2.

Evidence:

- [docs.quantinuum.com - H2 parameterised-angle 2-qubit gates](#) - ZZPhase/RZZ, TK2 = `Rxxyyzz(alpha,beta,gamma)`, ZZMax native set, retrieved 2026-04-21.
- [Quantinuum H2 Product Data Sheet v4.00 \(2025-09-17\)](#) - $N \geq 56/56$ qubits, all-to-all connectivity, QCCD operation, MCM with qubit reuse, native 1Q / ZZ / parameterised-ZZ / general SU(4) entangler gate set, retrieved 2026-04-21.
- Ezratty *UQT 2025* §8.7.6 “Vendors” pp. 542, 547.

3.4 IonQ Forte - runs with translation

Modality: Trapped ion (chain).

Forte is a 36-qubit trapped-ion system with all-to-all entanglement. Forte’s documented native set is GPI/GPI2 single-qubit rotations (phase-parameter-controlled, virtual Z via phase propagation) plus a parameterised ZZ two-qubit gate. GPI2 has a fixed $\pi/2$ rotation angle with a phase-selected equatorial axis, so $\pm\pi/4$ shifts are not obtained by changing GPI2’s phase parameter alone.

Translation: The 12-qubit nearest-neighbour XXZ chain fits comfortably in 36 all-to-all qubits - no SWAP tax, but no native XX-YY-ZZ block either. The F3C SU(4) XXZ block decomposes onto (GPI2 \times single-qubit) \cdot ZZ(θ) \cdot (GPI2 \times single-qubit) - typically 3 ZZ gates per Trotter bond in the generic case versus H2’s 1 TK2 per bond, i.e. an expected $\sim 3 \times 2$ Q-gate-count overhead. The X_3 pump and the $\eta = \pm\pi/4$ shifted X rotations compile to short GPI/GPI2/virtual-Z single-qubit sequences rather than to a single phase-parameter change. Same trapped-ion throughput caveat as Quantinuum - ion-chain reload and gate-time overhead vs. superconducting shot-rate - so the Appendix-B coefficient-norm budget must be re-derived before any fifth-order run. No MCM, ancilla, or dynamic circuits are required by this paper.

Evidence:

- ionq.com/quantum-systems/forte - 36 qubits, any-to-any entanglement, retrieved 2026-04-21.
- docs.ionq.com - Getting started with native gates - Forte native gates = GPI + GPI2 + parameterised ZZ; GPI2 fixed $\pi/2$ rotation, retrieved 2026-04-21.
- Ezratty *UQT 2025* §8.7.6 “Vendors” pp. 535-538.

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

Modality: Neutral atom (digital, gate-mode).

Verdict framing (2026-05-16 revision): earlier revisions used `architectural rewrite` for this row. That label is imprecise here. The paper’s active primitive is a routine gate-model XXZ Trotter circuit on 12 qubits - no analogue evolution, no MCM, no dynamic circuits, no ancillae - so there is no paradigm change to execute on Gemini. The plain gap is that the public Gemini page does not yet document the native lowering of the F3C/qclab XXZ SU(4) block. That is a *compiler-retargeting* obstacle, not a *paradigm-change* one. The row is therefore relabelled `runs with translation (after compiler retargeting)`, with native lowering an explicit precondition.

Gemini is QuEra’s 260-qubit digital gate-mode neutral-atom system with all-to-all connectivity through Dynamic Qubit Array shuttling, QASM access, 99.2% global 2Q fidelity, and a public 1 shot/s throughput. Capacity, connectivity, and API surface are all comfortable for a 12-qubit XXZ chain with $\Omega = \{2\}$ pump shifts.

Translation: Capacity is not the blocker. The blocker is the central F3C/qclab XXZ SU(4) Trotter block: the public Gemini page does not name the native entangling gate, does not document the lowering of $\exp[-i dt (XX + YY + ZZ)]$ into Gemini operations, and does

not disclose named native single-qubit gates beyond the QASM interface - the row infers local $X(\theta)$ -style pump support from local 1Q gate fidelity and the QASM interface only. The port is therefore a vendor-compiler-retargeting project, not a routine translation: (i) lower F3C/qclab to QuEra’s documented native gate family, (ii) estimate compiled 2Q count and depth on the actual Gemini compiler, (iii) re-derive the Appendix-B coefficient-norm shot budget against the 1 shot/s envelope. Throughput then becomes the dominant cost: at 1 shot/s, the $\sim 4 \times 10^6$ shots of the fifth-order run is weeks of beam time even ignoring queueing.

Evidence:

- quera.com/gemini - 260 qubits, digital gate-mode, all-to-all connectivity, QASM access, 99.2% global 2Q fidelity, 1 shot/s, retrieved 2026-04-21.

3.6 Atom Computing AC1000 - runs with translation (after compiler retargeting)

Modality: Neutral atom (digital, Yb-171 nuclear-spin).

Verdict framing (2026-05-16 revision): as with Gemini, the prior `architectural rewrite` label was imprecise - there is no paradigm change to execute, just an absent public compiler trace for the XXZ SU(4) block. Relabelled `runs with translation (after compiler retargeting)`.

AC1000 advertises 1,200+ physical qubits with all-to-all connectivity, 1Q fidelity $> 99.9\%$, 2Q fidelity $> 99.6\%$, SPAM $> 99.8\%$, MCM with reset and reuse, real-time conditional branching, and an OpenQASM/QIR API. Capacity, fidelity, and control-flow surface are all generous - ample for the paper’s protocol with significant headroom.

Translation: As with Gemini, the binding constraint is not capacity but the absence of a *publicly documented* native lowering of the F3C/qclab XXZ SU(4) block. The product page does not name the Rydberg-mediated two-qubit generator or expose a compiler reference for $\exp[-i dt (XX + YY + ZZ)]$. The port is therefore a vendor-compiler retargeting exercise: submit the OpenQASM/QIR circuit, obtain Atom’s native compiled circuit, then check 2Q gate count and depth against the AC1000 fidelity envelope and re-derive the Appendix-B shot budget against the achievable shot rate before claiming executable equivalence. If Atom subsequently discloses a native XX-YY-ZZ or a documented compiler path for the SU(4) block, this row moves toward `runs with translation`.

Evidence:

- atom-computing.com/ac1000 - 1,200+ physical qubits, all-to-all connectivity, 1Q $> 99.9\%$, 2Q $> 99.6\%$, SPAM $> 99.8\%$, movement fidelity $> 99.9\%$, MCM with qubit reset and reuse, real-time conditional branching, OpenQASM/QIR API, Yb-171 nuclear-spin, retrieved 2026-04-21.
- Ezratty *UQT 2025* §8.8.7 “Vendors” pp. 575-576 - Phoenix Sr-87 100-qubit baseline as AC1000 predecessor, with 40 s coherence.

3.7 Pasqal - architectural rewrite

Modality: Neutral atom (analog Rydberg).

Pasqal’s production mode is analog: programmed Rydberg evolution under a global laser drive, in one of two explicit modes documented in QoolQit. Ising mode uses the ground-state string $g \dots g$ with pairwise Rydberg-projector interaction $\sim C_6/R_{ij}^6$. XY mode is treated separately in the Pulser/Qadence material, in places as emulator/backend-dependent rather than a current QPU-mode promise; the QoolQit page itself grounds the Rydberg/Ising model only.

Translation: Neither native generator is the XXZ Heisenberg Hamiltonian of the paper. The paper’s pipeline depends on (i) a gate-model real-time $U = \prod \exp(-i H_{\text{XXZ}} dt)$ that interleaves with a local X_3 impulse, and (ii) the Appendix-A GPSR identity holding under a δ -pulse over that circuit. Analog mode gives neither: the native generator is Ising (or XY in emulation), not XXZ, and “inserting” a δ -pulse X_3 between analog sweeps is a different primitive than local pulses within a global drive. A port would be a research project - re-express the nonlinear-response construction against the closest native generator (XY mode on Rydberg ground-ground states sits closest to an XXZ limit when $\Delta \rightarrow 1$), recompute the pump-generator gap set Ω for that native H , and re-derive the GPSR identity. Pasqal’s digital-analog mode (Qadence), once it exposes arbitrary-angle individually-addressable two-qubit rotations on a production QPU, would move this row toward **runs with translation**.

Evidence:

- docs.pasqal.com - QoolQit Rydberg model - Ising-mode Hamiltonian quoted verbatim with C_6/R_{ij}^6 interaction, retrieved 2026-04-21.
- pasqal-io/qadence - digital-analog tutorial - “currently available neutral atom quantum computers” restricted to always-on interaction plus limited individual addressability; XY mode treated as emulator/backend-dependent, retrieved 2026-04-21.
- Ezratty *UQT 2025* §8.8.7 “Vendors” pp. 578-579; p. 583 (2025 analog+gate+HPC hybrid preprint).

3.8 PsiQuantum - infeasible today

Modality: Photonic (DV / fusion-based MBQC).

PsiQuantum’s commercial roadmap is a fault-tolerant photonic QPU built on measurement-based computation with telecom-band single photons and fusion-based error correction. There is no 2026 programmable gate-model QPU exposing user-defined real-time Trotter circuits on 12 data qubits.

Translation: The nonlinear-response pipeline needs a near-term NISQ-style gate-model substrate with cheap shot loops; PsiQuantum’s architecture is explicitly *not* optimising for that. Horizon: once the Chicago / Brisbane utility-scale systems come online (targeted late-decade) the same application re-expressed under an FTQC cost model becomes a different port, with logical-qubit overhead replacing 8,192-shot loops - that is a different research question, not this one.

Evidence:

- psiquantum.com/technology - telecom-band single photons, component-level fidelities (not a programmable 12-qubit QPU), retrieved 2026-04-21.
- Ezratty *UQT 2025* §8.10.7 “Measurement Based Quantum Computing” p. 624; §8.10.8 “Vendors” p. 632.

3.9 Xanadu Aurora - infeasible today

Modality: Photonic (CV / distributed prototype).

Aurora is a 12-mode continuous-variable research prototype demonstrated in January 2025 (Madsen et al., *Nature* **638**, 912-919, 2025): four modular server racks; 35 photonic chips; 13 km of fibre; 84 squeezers; 36 photon-number-resolving detectors; and 12 physical qubit modes per clock cycle. At launch Xanadu explicitly states the near-term focus is optical-loss reduction before scaling. Xanadu’s other public substrate (Borealis, X-series) is a Gaussian Boson Sampler, not a programmable gate-model DV QPU.

Translation: Aurora is not a user-programmable QPU available via API/cloud in 2026, and Borealis/X-series cannot run a 12-qubit XXZ Trotter at all (wrong machine). Even if Aurora opened to users, a DV→CV encoding layer (e.g. GKP encoding of spin-1/2 qubits into bosonic modes) would have to precede any port: the δ -pulse would translate to a short-time displacement of a CV mode - physically natural but only useful after the DV→CV encoding is settled. Horizon: the verdict tracks substrate availability (prototype + GBS-only) rather than architectural mismatch; once Xanadu exposes a programmable DV substrate the verdict moves to **architectural rewrite**.

Evidence:

- xanadu.ai - Aurora announcement (2025-01-22) - prototype framing, four-rack modular CV, retrieved 2026-04-21.
- Madsen et al., *Nature* **638**, 912-919 (2025), “Scaling and networking a modular photonic quantum computer”.
- Ezratty *UQT 2025* §8.10.8 “Vendors” p. 632; §8.12 “Key takeaways” p. 657 - DV vs CV distinction.

3.10 Quantum Brilliance - infeasible today

Modality: NV / diamond (room-temperature).

Quantum Brilliance’s public material describes room-temperature NV-diamond quantum computing technology, NV arrays, shot rate, and chip integration. The pages do not commit a 2026 device with the 12 addressable qubits, nearest-neighbour XXZ compilation route, or two-qubit fidelity envelope needed for this 10-step Trotter workload.

Translation: The paper needs a 12-qubit gate-model substrate with a documented entangling-gate path; the public QB pages do not expose such a machine today. Horizon: plausible only after a publicly specified multi-qubit NV module or optical-bus scale-up is available; no public roadmap commits to a 12-qubit gate-model module today.

Evidence:

- quantumbrilliance.com/quantum-computing - descriptive page, no committed 2026 qubit count, retrieved 2026-04-21.
- quantumbrilliance.com/quantum-brilliance-hardware - hardware overview without a 12-qubit gate-model product specification, retrieved 2026-04-21.
- Ezratty *UQT 2025* §8.5.5 “Manufacturing” p. 503; §8.5.6 “Vendors” pp. 504-505.

Commentary (≈ 360 words). The application is unusually portable across gate-model systems whose native compiler exposes the XXZ Trotter layer: the active primitive is a Trotter circuit plus a single-qubit rotation on one site, with no ancilla, no mid-circuit measurement, no dynamic circuits, and no multi-qubit primitive richer than an XX-YY-ZZ two-qubit block. The algorithmic novelty - GPSR reconstruction of the n -th response derivative from three (or $3 \times 3 = 9$) pump amplitudes per time point - is entirely classical post-processing over independent forward-evolution circuits. The clean 2026 translation story is therefore strongest for superconducting and trapped-ion systems where the native two-qubit decomposition is public. Digital neutral atoms (QuEra Gemini, Atom Computing AC1000) are capacity-compatible, but the public product pages do not yet document the native lowering of the F3C/qclab SU(4) block, so those subsections are compiler-retargeting projects rather than routine ports.

Where portability hurts is not depth or connectivity, it is **wall-clock economics and compiled-gate-count transparency**. Trapped ions (Quantinuum H2, IonQ Forte) and shuttling neutral-atom systems (QuEra Gemini, Atom Computing AC1000) all run materially slower shot-rates than IBM superconducting - QuEra’s public 1 shot/s is the one dated number available; the trapped-ion vendors do not publish comparable figures on their product pages, but QCCD shuttling and ion-chain reload overheads are well-known throughput costs - so the wall-clock delta for the $\sim 4 \times 10^6$ shots of the fifth-order run is days-to-weeks, not minutes. The paper’s 8,192-shots-per-configuration was chosen empirically, not from Appendix B at a target ε , so the first real porting task on any non-anchor vendor is to re-derive the coefficient-norm shot budget against that target’s shot rate and pick an achievable derivative order and time-grid density. A second gating task is to estimate the F3C-compiled 2Q-gate count on each target’s native gate set, since the paper does not report it.

Interesting second platform to try: Quantinuum H2 - but as a hypothesis to verify, not a result. The gate-level match is unusually clean on the documented native gate set: F3C/qclab compresses the XXZ Trotter layer into an XX-YY-ZZ three-angle SU(4) block which is *exactly* H2’s native TK2 = `Rxxyyzz(alpha,beta,gamma)` primitive, so the *expected* compiled 2Q-gate count on H2 is materially lower than an IBM CZ-decomposition of the same block - but this advantage remains *hypothesis pending an actual F3C/qclab→H2 compile and run*; no published H2 XXZ benchmark settles it. Likewise the prediction that H2’s higher per-circuit fidelity would yield a smaller fitted decay rate γ in the exponential envelope $a(t) = \alpha e^{-\gamma t}$ - and thereby tighten the claim that the observed decay is device noise rather than a physical XXZ feature - is a falsifiable hypothesis, not an established result. All-to-all QCCD connectivity does erase the heavy-hex sub-chain selection caveat, MCM and qubit reuse are exposed for later higher-order protocol extensions, and these are documented capabilities; the *advantage size* is what awaits empirical confirmation.

Classical baseline framing. The paper’s classical comparator is a noiseless simulation of the same compiled Trotter circuit. At 12 qubits, that remains a serious comparator - any non-anchor port should justify itself against an equally serious classical baseline (e.g. matrix-product-state simulation, or a noiseless simulation of the *target*-compiled circuit), not just against the noiseless simulation reference

curve presented in the paper. **IonQ Forte** is the second trapped-ion comparator but pays an expected ZZ-decomposition overhead. **Atom Computing AC1000** and **QuEra Gemini** are interesting neutral-atom follow-ups only after native compiler output is obtained; the analog **Pasqal** row is an architectural rewrite; the photonic rows (**PsiQuantum FTQC**, **Xanadu Aurora** prototype) are not 2026 ports.

3.11 Residual caveats

- **Digital-neutral-atom label change.** QuEra Gemini and Atom Computing AC1000 have been relabelled from `architectural rewrite` to `runs with translation (after compiler retargeting)` per William’s 2026-05-14 review: the paper’s primitive is a gate-model XXZ Trotter that needs no paradigm change, only a public native lowering of the F3C/qclab XXZ SU(4) block. Their `partial 2026 fit` is conditional on that lowering being published or emitted by the vendor compiler.
- **Compiled 2Q-gate count and Appendix-B shot budget are preconditions, not footnotes.** For every non-anchor row the published evidence does not pin down compiled 2Q gate count, depth, or wall-clock shot budget against a chosen ϵ . Any 2026 rerun on a non-anchor target must cost these explicitly before claiming an operationally meaningful run; the verdicts above are correct subject to that costing exercise.
- **Quantinuum H2 advantage = hypothesis, not measurement.** The expected smaller compiled 2Q-gate count and smaller fitted decay rate γ on H2 are predictions awaiting an actual F3C/qclab→H2 compile and run; no published H2 XXZ benchmark settles them. The `runs with translation` verdict rests on the documented native gate set, not on a measured XXZ run.
- **IonQ Forte $\sim 3\times$ ZZ overhead is a compiler-level estimate** rather than a vendor-published XXZ benchmark; the verdict rests on documented gate set and connectivity, not on a measured 10-step XXZ run.
- **Classical baseline framing.** The paper compares against a noiseless simulation of the same compiled Trotter circuit. At 12 qubits, classical simulation (e.g. MPS) is a serious comparator and any non-anchor port should be evaluated against it, not just against the paper’s reference curve.
- **Pasqal source distinction.** Rydberg/Ising (QoolQit) and XY (Pulser/Qadence, emulator/backend-dependent) evidence are from separate Pasqal sources; the `architectural rewrite` verdict does not depend on XY being a current QPU mode.
- **Shot-budget language stays qualitative.** Trapped-ion and shuttling neutral-atom throughput language remains qualitative (“days-to-weeks”) since the vendors do not publish dated shots/s figures comparable to QuEra’s 1 shot/s.