

Thermodynamic-limit dispersion relations on trapped-ion quantum hardware

Portability dossier - benchmark

agQSL portability pipeline

2026-06-07

Field	Value
Slug	2026-arxiv-2605.28599-dispersion-aqt-marmot
Source	arXiv
Link	https://arxiv.org/abs/2605.28599
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	4
1.5	Caveats	4

1 Capability note

1.1 Claim

First hardware implementation of the NLCE+QA framework (numerical linked-cluster expansion combined with a quantum algorithm), computing one-quasiparticle dispersion relations of transverse-field Ising models in the thermodynamic limit on 5 to 8 qubits of AQT’s 20-qubit Marmot trapped-ion QPU, with expectation values shown to survive the non-linear (matrix-inverse and matrix-square-root) classical post-processing of a projective cluster-additive transformation (PCAT) in limited regimes far from the quantum-critical point.

1.2 Vendor and machine

- **Vendor / machine:** Alpine Quantum Technologies (AQT), “Marmot” 20-qubit trapped-ion QPU (AQT’s first commercial 19-inch rack-mounted quantum computer).
- **Host / operator:** Leibniz Supercomputing Centre (LRZ), Garching, Germany; resources provided via the Munich Quantum Valley.
- **Software stack:** Qiskit. VQE optimisation performed on classical hardware; only final matrix elements measured on the QPU.
- **Date:** Preprint arXiv:2605.28599, posted May 2026. Data acquisition “spanned several weeks” prior to that; no single experiment date is printed.
- **Authors:** L. Marti, Sumeet, S. Wolf, K. P. Schmidt, M. J. Hartmann (FAU Erlangen-Nürnberg; Quint Computing GmbH).

1.3 Metrics

Metric	Value	Source
QV / linear XEB	not reported (this is not a QV/XEB benchmark)	n/a
1Q gate fidelity	99.96% (nominal)	AQT Marmot product page, cited; not characterised in this work
2Q gate fidelity	98.47% (nominal)	AQT Marmot product page, cited; not characterised in this work

Metric	Value	Source
Qubit count used	5 to 8 of 20 (chains: 4 and 5 qubits; ladder: $3 \times 2 = 6$ and $4 \times 2 = 8$)	Results, Tab. tfimcases
Circuit depth sustained	not reported as a number; ASP circuits $\approx 10\times$ deeper than VQE; ASP sweep used 10 time steps	Sec. results, App. goodsweep
Shots per matrix element	2000 (and as many for the ground state)	Sec. results
Total shot budget	$\approx 5 \times 10^6$ shots, ≈ 430 h of continuous QPU runtime across all runs	Sec. results
Unique circuits per effective H	230 (chain, $N_{\max} = 5$); 303 (TFIM+LF); 574 (ladder)	Sec. on unique circuits
Reference depolarisation rates	$p = 0.003$ (1Q), $p = 0.01$ (2Q), from the AQT emulator, “not finetuned to exactly match the particular device”	Sec. error_analysis

1.4 Context

This is an algorithm-demonstration paper rather than a record-setting hardware benchmark: it reports no quantum-volume, XEB, or new fidelity figure, and the cited gate fidelities are AQT’s published Marmot specifications, not values measured here. Its capability claim is methodological. It shows, for the first time on trapped-ion hardware, that measured expectation values can be accurate enough to pass through the non-linear PCAT post-processing (matrix inversion and a matrix square root) and still yield recognisable dispersion relations in the thermodynamic limit. The authors are explicit that the results stay within classical reach and that ASP would need gate error rates reduced by a factor of 10 to 100 to become viable. Marmot’s nominal 98.47% two-qubit fidelity sits below the best contemporary trapped-ion two-qubit fidelities reported elsewhere, and the two-qubit error is identified as the limiting factor. No theoretical threshold (for example logical break-even, or beyond-classical) is crossed.

1.5 Caveats

- **Preprint, not peer reviewed.** arXiv submission; treat all numbers as author-reported pending review.
- **Fidelities are vendor specs, not measurements.** The 99.96% / 98.47% figures come from AQT’s Marmot product webpage (accessed 2026-02-11), not from device characterisation in this work. The depolarisation rates used in simulation are emulator reference values, explicitly “not finetuned” to the specific device.
- **High run-to-run variability.** Data acquisition ran over several weeks; the authors report large variance between QPU runs (stray magnetic fields, miscalibrations, qubit-laser issues) and explicitly did not average, since too few runs exist to be statistically representative. Individual runs sometimes outperformed and sometimes underperformed the nominal noise model, so single-run agreement with theory is not reproducible on demand.
- **Narrow validity.** Results approach the expected dispersion only for moderate Ising coupling in the polarised phase, sufficiently far from criticality; error grows sharply approaching the critical point and for the ladder geometry.
- **Headline novelty not fully tested.** The genuinely new non-linear part (the full PCAT correction beyond the Schrieffer-Wolff transformation, needed once the \mathbb{Z}_2 symmetry is broken by a longitudinal field) could not be decisively demonstrated: the correction $\Delta_{ij} \approx 4 \times 10^{-4}$ lies below the sampling-noise floor at the available shot budget (it would need about $M = 5 \times 10^6$ shots per element). The viability claim therefore holds, in practice, only for the Schrieffer-Wolff-reducible symmetric regime.
- **Cost projection.** The authors estimate that NLCE+QA on a 10×10 square lattice would need about 3×10^6 unique circuits, on the order of 10^5 hours of QPU time at current speeds, underscoring that algorithmic and sampling-rate improvements are prerequisites for any beyond-classical use.