

Emulation of Optically Interconnected Quantum Data Centers Topologies for Cost-Fidelity Benchmarking

Portability dossier - benchmark

agQSL portability pipeline

2026-06-07

Field	Value
Slug	2026-arxiv-2605.22267-qdc-topology-emulation
Source	arXiv
Link	https://arxiv.org/abs/2605.22267
Category	benchmark
Triaged	2026-05-28 by port_until_julien_parallel
Bootstrapped	2026-06-07

Contents

1	Capability note	2
1.1	Claim	2
1.2	Vendor and machine	2
1.3	Metrics	2
1.4	Context	3
1.5	Caveats	3

1 Capability note

1.1 Claim

Ring, star, and line optically interconnected Quantum Data Center (QDC) topologies are emulated on IBM’s 133-qubit Torino (Heron r1) processor using GHZ-state benchmarks, finding the star topology gives the best cost-fidelity trade-off under a collisional transduction-plus-fiber noise model.

1.2 Vendor and machine

Field	Value
Vendor / machine	IBM Quantum, Torino backend (133-qubit Heron r1 superconducting processor, with feedforward and mid-circuit measurement)
Software stack	Qiskit (Python)
Access	Premium account via Chalmers Next Labs
Authors / institution	Elyasi, Ahmadian, Lin, Monti; Chalmers University of Technology, Sweden
Date	Preprint arXiv:2605.22267v1, 21 May 2026; a separate experiment date is not reported

The optical interconnect is not physical hardware. Transduction and fibre effects are emulated by an environment qubit coupled to the communication qubits via iterative unitaries \hat{U}_T (transduction) and \hat{U}_F (fibre), generated by $\hat{H} = \kappa(\hat{\sigma}_+\hat{\sigma}_- + \hat{\sigma}_-\hat{\sigma}_+)$, with the environment qubit reset each iteration (Markovian collisional model).

1.3 Metrics

Metric	Value	Source
QV / linear XEB	not reported	this paper reports no QV or XEB figure
1Q gate fidelity	not reported	
2Q (native) gate fidelity	not reported	
Circuit depth sustained	not reported as a number (line topology qualitatively increases depth)	S3.p4

Metric	Value	Source
Qubit count used	not reported as a number (qubit subsets of the 133-qubit device selected per topology; a four-QPU system is emulated)	S3.p1, S3.p2
Monolithic RCNOT fidelity	beyond 80% for both control states $ 0\rangle$ and $ 1\rangle$	Fig. 3(b), S3.p3
Distributed RCNOT, transduction degradation	around 30% fidelity loss (transduction coupling $\kappa = 0.5$)	S3.p3
Distributed RCNOT, fibre contribution after four hops	fluctuates around 50% down to 40% fidelity	S3.p3
Fibre segment modelled	10 m of G.654.E fibre, attenuation 0.0392 km^{-1}	S3.p3
Communication cost (entanglement links)	$E_{\text{star}} = n - 1$, $E_{\text{ring}} = n^2/4$ (even n), $E_{\text{line}} = \frac{n(n-1)}{2}$; for four QPUs, line > ring > star	S3.p2
GHZ-state fidelity ranking	star highest, ring intermediate, line lowest (no numeric values printed in text)	S3.p4, S3.p5

1.4 Context

This is an academic methodology paper, not a vendor capability record: it crosses no QV, XEB, or above-break-even threshold. IBM’s Torino (Heron r1, 133 qubits) is used as a testbed, not as the subject of the claim, and the device’s own benchmark figures are not stated. The headline result (star topology gives the best cost-fidelity trade-off) is the expected consequence of higher pairwise connectivity reducing SWAP and hop count. The repository name (QDC-OFC) and the short cost-fidelity framing suggest an Optical Fiber Communication conference submission. Tomographic validation of the remote CNOT is reported to confirm the noise model, with transduction dominating fidelity loss and fibre contributing little.

1.5 Caveats

- arXiv preprint v1 (21 May 2026); not yet peer reviewed at the time of writing.
- The work is emulation, not distributed quantum computing on real optical links. No transducer or fibre hardware is exercised. The fidelity figures are products of a chosen collisional noise model; the transduction coupling ($\kappa = 0.5$) is set to align with reported

transducer values rather than measured in this experiment.

- The fidelity numbers are approximate and read from figures (“beyond 80%”, “around 30%”, “around 50% to 40%”); no exact-value tables appear in the text, and GHZ fidelities are given only as a ranking.
- The star-best conclusion is demonstrated for a four-QPU GHZ workload; generality to other algorithms and larger systems is asserted, not shown.
- Reproducibility support is good: source code, data, job IDs, and JSON files are stated to be available at the GitHub repository <https://github.com/nelyasi/QDC-OFC>.