

Fast, accurate, high-resolution simulation of large-scale Fermi-Hubbard models on a digital quantum processor

Portability dossier - app

agQSL portability pipeline

2026-06-06

Field	Value
Slug	2026-arxiv-2605.04025-fermi-hubbard-speedup
Source	arXiv
Link	https://arxiv.org/abs/2605.04025
Category	app
Triaged	2026-05-16 by codex-curation
Bootstrapped	2026-06-06

Contents

1	Source	3
1.1	Domain classification	3
1.2	Expert persona for Julien	3
1.3	Related prior work (brief bibliography)	3
1.4	Difficulty estimate	4
2	Extraction	5

2.1	What the paper does (one paragraph)	5
2.2	Quantum hardware used	5
2.3	Computational primitive	6
2.4	Resource fingerprint	6
2.5	Assumptions and results	7
2.6	Portability flags	7
2.7	Caveats	8
3	Portability matrix	10

1 Source

1.1 Domain classification

Primary: materials (condensed-matter physics, strongly correlated electrons). The paper is a digital quantum simulation of the 1D Fermi-Hubbard model, the canonical model of correlated electrons, used here to probe non-equilibrium quench dynamics (spin-charge separation, ballistic wavefront propagation) rather than ground-state electronic structure. The secondary flavour is **quantum chemistry**, but only in that it borrows the fermion-to-qubit machinery (Jordan-Wigner, fSWAP networks); the physics is many-body condensed matter, not molecular chemistry. The Ezratty 2025 index places this class of work in Chapter 13 applications, section 13.3 materials, adjacent to yet distinct from molecular electronic-structure chemistry.

1.2 Expert persona for Julien

A computational condensed-matter physicist who works on real-time Hamiltonian simulation of fermionic lattice models and is fluent on both the quantum and classical sides. They should carry calibrated intuition for fermion-to-qubit mappings (Jordan-Wigner with interleaved orderings, fSWAP networks), Trotter order and step-size selection, and the realities of IBM Heron heavy-hex superconducting hardware: native fractional-gate set, two-qubit gate counts and layer depth, dynamical decoupling, Pauli twirling, and readout/decay post-processing. They must also be able to read the classical baseline (TDVP/DMRG via ITensor, bond-dimension χ scaling, Pauli path propagation) closely enough to judge whether the quantum/classical crossover and the $3000\times$ runtime claim are like-for-like, since that crossover is the entire portability story.

1.3 Related prior work (brief bibliography)

Pointer set favouring portability-relevant comparisons (same application or primitive on a different vendor or method).

- Arute et al. (Google), *Observation of separated dynamics of charge and spin in the Fermi-Hubbard model*, arXiv:2010.07965. The same spin-charge-separation observable on Google Sycamore; the cleanest cross-vendor comparator for this work.
- Chowdhury, Korepin, Pascuzzi, Yu (2026), Appl. Phys. Rev. **13**, DOI 10.1063/5.0306069. IBM 1D-chain Fermi-Hubbard at $L = 52$; the direct quantitative baseline this paper undercuts on two-qubit gate count and depth (interleaved versus pair-interleaved ordering).
- Alam, Bosse, Čepaitė et al. (2025), arXiv:2510.26845. A 2D 6×6 Fermi-Hubbard simulation on Google hardware; same model, different lattice topology and compilation route.
- Granet, Dreyer et al. (Quantinuum, 2025), arXiv:2511.02125. Fermi-Hubbard on a trapped-ion processor; the same model on a different hardware modality, useful for the cross-platform portability contrast.
- Fishman, White, Stoudenmire, *The ITensor Software Library*, SciPost Phys. Codebases **4** (2022), DOI 10.21468/SciPost-PhysCodeb.4. The TDVP classical baseline whose $\chi = 4096$ runtime anchors the speedup claim.

- Stanišić et al. (2022), *Observing ground-state properties of the Fermi-Hubbard model using a scalable algorithm on a quantum computer*, Nat. Commun., DOI 10.1038/s41467-022-33335-4. Earlier scalable Fermi-Hubbard demonstration (Google), for ground-state versus dynamics context.

1.4 Difficulty estimate

medium. The source is fully open (arXiv preprint, with complete LaTeX source, figures, and bibliography already in the dossier folder, plus the full HTML rendering including the Supplementary Material), so there is no paywall risk and no SI fetch is needed before Julien runs. The hardware fingerprint is also stated unusually plainly in the main text: device `ibm_boston` (156-qubit IBM Heron), up to 120 qubits, 9,057 two-qubit gates across 152 layers for the widest circuit (above 13,800 gates for the deepest), 20,000 shots per circuit, native fractional-gate set, mirrored second-order Trotter. What lifts this above **low** is breadth rather than opacity: Julien will need to work through a substantial Supplementary Material (application-aware compilation, error suppression, TDVP and Pauli-path baselines, multi-stage post-processing, wavefront detection) to capture the full error-suppression and compilation stack, and several primitives are non-standard (pair-interleaved Jordan-Wigner ordering, fSWAP networks, the Fire Opal overhead-free suppression pipeline).

2 Extraction

2.1 What the paper does (one paragraph)

A Q-CTRL team runs a digital (gate-based) quantum simulation of real-time dynamics of the one-dimensional Fermi-Hubbard model, the canonical model of interacting electrons on a lattice, on IBM’s 156-qubit `ibm_boston` Heron superconducting processor. Using a Jordan-Wigner mapping with a custom pair-interleaved ordering plus a fermionic-SWAP (fSWAP) network, they encode up to $L = 60$ sites (120 qubits) and Trotterise the evolution to as many as 90 steps. They observe spin-charge separation from a vacancy defect in an $L = 31$ Neel state, extract charge and spin wavefront velocities that match tensor-network (TDVP) reference calculations, then push to $L = 60$ where exact statevector methods are intractable. With an error-suppression stack that adds no sampling overhead (Q-CTRL Fire Opal, Pauli twirling, readout mitigation, decay recovery), the quantum output agrees with TDVP to about 1% RMSE up to $t \approx 5.2$, and the authors claim up to $3000\times$ faster wall-clock than a CPU TDVP baseline at the edge of agreement.

2.2 Quantum hardware used

- **Vendor / machine:** IBM / `ibm_boston`, a Heron-generation superconducting processor (main text p.3; SI Sec. I.C).
- **Qubit count:** up to 120 used / 156 available. Widest run: 120 qubits ($L = 60$). Deepest run: 62 qubits ($L = 31$). (Abstract; main text p.3; SI Tab. S I.)
- **Connectivity:** heavy-hex lattice. The fermion chain is embedded as a snaking 1D path that the heavy-hex graph natively supports; the device exposes 108,988 distinct 1D-chain layouts at 120 qubits (SI Sec. I.C.4).
- **Gate set:** native fixed-angle CZ, X , \sqrt{X} plus continuously parametrised fractional gates $R_{ZZ}(\theta)$ and $R_X(\theta)$ (SI Sec. I.C). R_Z rotations are realised as virtual (zero-duration) phase shifts. The device does **not** expose an $\text{fSIM}(\theta, \phi)$ gate tailored to fermionic simulation, so the spin-exchange step is built from $\text{fSWAP} = \text{SWAP} \cdot \text{CZ}$ (main text p.3). The circuit-level gates the compiler targets are R_Z , $R_{ZZ}(\theta)$, $R_{XX+YY}(\theta)$, and fSWAP.
- **Notable features leveraged:** fractional (continuous-angle) two-qubit $R_{ZZ}(\theta)$; virtual- Z phase tracking; hardware-optimised dynamical decoupling; Pauli twirling / randomised compiling (pseudo-twirling for R_{ZZ}); per-qubit layout selection that excludes three persistently high-noise qubits. The work explicitly does **not** use mid-circuit measurement or dynamic circuits; readout is a single terminal Z -basis measurement.

Note on the gate set: the main text (p.3) lists the fractional gates as $R_{ZZ}(\theta)$ and $R_Z(\theta)$, whereas the SI (Sec. I.C) lists $R_{ZZ}(\theta)$ and $R_X(\theta)$. The SI version matches IBM’s Heron fractional-gate basis (R_{ZZ} , R_X) recorded in the local substrate note `vendor-notes/superconducting_qubits.tex`; the main-text “ R_Z ” appears to be a typo (and R_Z is free/virtual in any case). I take the SI as authoritative and flag the discrepancy.

2.3 Computational primitive

Trotterised Hamiltonian simulation (digital real-time evolution). First-order Trotter steps are mirrored in pairs to obtain second-order, $\mathcal{O}(\Delta t^3)$, local error. A single Trotter step is

$$U_{\text{step}} = e^{-i\frac{\Delta t}{2}H_{1Q}} e^{-i\Delta t H_S} \mathcal{F} e^{-i\Delta t H_{U,2Q}} e^{-i\Delta t H_S} e^{-i\frac{\Delta t}{2}H_{1Q}}$$

where \mathcal{F} is the fSWAP layer that maps short hops to long hops and back (SI Eqs. S.15-S.18). This is **not** a variational algorithm: there is no classical optimisation loop and no parameter training.

2.4 Resource fingerprint

Two regimes are reported. “Widest” = $L = 60$ (120 qubits), $t = 6, 30$ Trotter steps. “Deepest” = $L = 31$ (62 qubits), $t = 9, 90$ Trotter steps.

Metric	Value	Source (page / equation / SI)
Qubits (logical)	not applicable (pre-fault-tolerant; no error-correcting code, no logical encoding)	whole paper
Qubits (physical)	120 (widest, $L = 60$); 62 (deepest, $L = 31$); 156 available on device	Abstract; main p.3; SI Tab. S I
Circuit depth	2Q-gate depth $D_{2Q} = 152$ (widest); $D_{2Q} = 452$ (deepest). $D_{2Q} = 5n_{\text{step}} + 2$, independent of L	SI Eq. (S depth), Tab. S I; main p.6
2Q-gate count (total)	9,057 (widest, $L = 60, 30$ steps); 13,829 (deepest, $L = 31, 90$ steps). $N_{2Q} = (5L - 2)n_{\text{step}} + 2(L - 1) - 1$	main p.3, p.6; SI Tab. S I
Measurement shots	20,000 per circuit, split as 10 Pauli-twirl variants \times 2,000 shots each; plus 32,768 readout-characterisation shots per experiment for REM (16,384 each for $ 0\rangle/ 1\rangle$)	main p.3; SI Sec. I.D, Sec. IV.A
Classical loop iter.	not applicable (non-variational; no in-the-loop classical feedback). Decay-recovery confidence $c \approx 0.5$ and Δt are calibrated once, out of sample, on small $L = 10$ systems	SI Sec. IV.B, Sec. III.A
Wall-clock runtime	QPU time, all time steps, 20,000 shots: 2m46s (widest, 30 steps) / 8m46s (deepest, 90 steps). Including REM+decay-recovery characterisation overhead: 4m25s / 13m26s. Excludes compilation, cloud data retrieval, and post-processing	main p.6; SI Tab. S I

Additional measured quantities (not in the template rows):

- Trotter step sizes: $\Delta t \in \{0.1, 0.15, 0.2\} t_h^{-1}$ chosen per interaction strength U (smaller Δt for larger U) (main Fig. 2 caption; SI Sec. III.A).
- TDVP baseline: χ up to 4096; time $t = 5.2 t_h^{-1}$ at $\chi = 4096$ exceeds 100 hours; $t = 6 t_h^{-1}$ at $\chi = 4096$ exceeds 160 hours, on a 32 vCPU AWS `c7i.8xlarge` (64 GB) (main p.6; SI Sec. II.A).
- Velocity error bars from 2,000 bootstrap samples (main Fig. 2 caption).

2.5 Assumptions and results

- **Claims.** Digital quantum simulation of the 1D Fermi-Hubbard model is performed at a scale beyond exact statevector simulation and challenging for state-of-the-art tensor networks. Quantum and TDVP outputs agree to RMSE $\lesssim 1\%$ up to $t \approx 5.2 t_h^{-1}$ (rising to about 4% at $t = 6$), and at the edge of agreement the QPU wall-clock is up to $3000\times$ faster than an optimised $\chi = 4096$ TDVP run. Extracted charge/spin wavefront velocity ratios v_c/v_s match TDVP across $U/t_h \in \{0, \dots, 14\}$.
- **Error bars / noise assumptions.** Shot noise from binomial statistics, $\text{Var}(\langle \widehat{P_Z} \rangle) = (1 - \langle \widehat{P_Z} \rangle)^2 / N_{\text{shot}}$ (SI Eq. S, Sec. III). Estimated noise floor RMSE = 0.01 (1%). Beyond $t \approx 5.2 t_h^{-1}$ the authors state that neither the quantum nor the classical method can be asserted correct (“indeterminate” zone). Temporal device-drift study over six weeks shows RMSE fluctuations of about 2.7% ($L = 30$) and 0.8% ($L = 60$). Readout error per qubit ranges roughly 0.06% to 9.7% (median 0.4%) after avoiding qubits reaching about 38%.
- **Comparison to classical baseline.** Primary baseline is two-site TDVP (`ITensorMPS.jl`), cost $\mathcal{O}(L\chi^3)$ per step, validated against exact diagonalisation at $L = 4$. A second baseline, Pauli path propagation (`PauliPropagation.jl` v0.4.1), is found less competitive than TDVP for this problem. The compilation is also benchmarked against the interleaved-ordering IBM result of Chowdhury et al.: at the equivalent of $L = 52$, 10 second-order steps, the pair-interleaved scheme uses 40.5% fewer 2Q gates and 61.2% lower 2Q depth (D_{2Q} : 102 vs 263; N_{2Q} : 5,261 vs 8,844). Versus a Qiskit Nature JW + level-3 transpiler baseline, depth drops by $>80\%$ and 2Q-gate count by $>60\%$.

2.6 Portability flags

Features this result leans on that matter for a portability analysis to other vendors:

1. **Fractional continuous-angle two-qubit gate $R_{ZZ}(\theta)$ (IBM Heron native).** The onsite-interaction layer and the consolidated R_{ZZ} -fSWAP blocks compile directly onto it. On hardware without a parametrised ZZ entangler (most superconducting CZ/iSWAP-only and many platforms) this must be decomposed into fixed entanglers plus single-qubit rotations, raising 2Q count and depth. The “no sampling overhead” depth budget partly depends on this native gate.
2. **Fractional $R_X(\theta)$ single-qubit gate (Heron native, per SI).** Used in the numerically optimised native decompositions; elsewhere replaced by \sqrt{X} /virtual- Z sequences.
3. **Virtual (free) R_Z .** The symmetrised H_{1Q} layers are inserted “for free” because R_Z is a zero-duration phase update on supercon-

ducting hardware. On platforms where Z rotations are physical (some ion and neutral-atom control schemes), this symmetrisation adds real gate cost.

4. **Heavy-hex connectivity with embedded 1D chain + fSWAP routing.** The entire application-aware compilation is tuned so the pair-interleaved ordering needs only a single fSWAP layer per Trotter step on heavy-hex. This is a connectivity-specific optimisation. On an all-to-all machine (trapped ion) the fSWAP network for long-hop routing is unnecessary; on a square grid the block ordering with a folded chain is preferable. So the specific 2Q-gate savings do not transfer unchanged across topologies.
5. **fSWAP built from SWAP · CZ because no fSIM gate.** The authors note Heron lacks the fSIM(θ, ϕ) primitive available elsewhere (e.g. Google). A platform with native fSIM could fuse the hop-plus-swap into fewer native gates, so portability here can be favourable, not just costly.
6. **Q-CTRL Fire Opal error-suppression pipeline (proprietary).** Deterministic error suppression + hardware-optimised dynamical decoupling + Pauli twirling are central to reaching depth $D_{2Q} = 452$ with usable signal at zero sampling overhead. DD requires idle-time pulse insertion (gate-level scheduling control). Pauli twirling needs single-qubit Paulis absorbed into existing rotations; pseudo-twirling for R_{ZZ} restricts to the Pauli subset commuting with ZZ . These are conceptually portable but the tuned pipeline is IBM/Q-CTRL-specific; reproducing the overhead-free property on another vendor is not guaranteed.
7. **Decay-recovery post-processing requires inverse Trotter (echo) circuits.** It runs forward-then-inverse evolution to extract per-step damping factors, so it needs the ability to apply U_{step}^\dagger and a tractable small- L calibration reference; portable in principle but adds characterisation circuits.
8. **Does NOT require mid-circuit measurement or dynamic circuits.** Measurement is a single terminal Z -basis readout. This eases portability to platforms with weak or no MCM support, and should be stated as a non-dependency.
9. **Speedup is QPU wall-clock vs a single 32 vCPU CPU node (no GPU).** The $3000\times$ figure compares about 2 minutes of QPU time against >100 hours of CPU TDVP at $\chi = 4096$. The authors argue symmetry-adapted ($U(1) \times U(1)$) TDVP gains little from more cores or current GPU tensor libraries, but the crossover is against one classical configuration, not a GPU- or algorithm-optimised baseline. Any cross-vendor or quantum-vs-classical portability claim should treat the speedup as configuration-specific rather than absolute.

2.7 Caveats

- **Access.** Full open access. The arXiv preprint, complete LaTeX source (main text `latex/body.tex` and full Supplementary Material `latex/supplement.tex`), all figures, and both bibliographies are present in the dossier. No paywall, no missing sections. Every number above is sourced from the main text or SI as cited.
- **Internal inconsistency flagged.** The fractional single-qubit gate is listed as R_Z in the main text and R_X in the SI; I take R_X (SI) as correct per IBM’s Heron basis and the substrate note. This does not affect the resource counts.
- **Numbers I did not find as explicit single values.** There is no logical-qubit count (no error correction). There is no classical-iteration count (non-variational). The “circuit depth” is reported by the authors as a two-qubit-gate-layer depth (D_{2Q}), not a total (all-gate) depth; I report D_{2Q} and label it as such rather than inventing a total depth.

- **Cross-check sources.** IBM Heron heavy-hex connectivity and the R_{ZZ}/R_X fractional basis were corroborated against `vendor-notes/superconducting_qubits.tex` and the Ezratty 2025 index (section 8-3-7-vendors); these are 2026/2025 substrate references used only to sanity-check the hardware claims, not as a source of the paper's own numbers.

3 Portability matrix