

Quantum error correction with the toric code

Portability dossier - benchmark

agQSL portability pipeline

2026-06-07

Field	Value
Slug	2026-arxiv-2606.04079-toric-code-qec
Source	arXiv
Link	https://arxiv.org/abs/2606.04079
Category	benchmark
Triaged	2026-06-06 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

Continuous, arbitrarily-repeatable syndrome extraction demonstrated in a twisted toric code on Atom Computing’s ^{171}Yb neutral-atom processor, sustaining up to 90 syndrome-extraction cycles via mid-circuit measurement plus mid-circuit atom reloading from a MOT, with a fitted logical error per cycle of 0.56 to 0.74% and lower logical error rates for the larger ($d_X = 6$) code than the smaller ($d_X = 4$) at fixed cycle counts.

1.2 Vendor and machine

Atom Computing (paper attributed to “Atom Computing and Collaborators”). Zone-based reconfigurable neutral-atom processor with ^{171}Yb nuclear-spin qubits; register zone currently configured for 128 qubits, with separate interaction, measurement, storage and loading zones plus a MOT 30 cm below the array for mid-circuit reloading. Software stack: Stim for detector-error-model construction, PyMatching (minimum-weight perfect matching) for decoding, Gurobi for logical-operator search. arXiv:2606.04079, dated June 2026; exact experiment dates not reported (datasets span ≈ 180 h and ≈ 67 h of collection).

1.3 Metrics

Metric	Value	Source
Codes (subsystem params)	det 8: $[[16, 1, (4, 3)]]$; det 16: $[[32, 1, (6, 4)]]$, distances (d_X, d_Z)	main text
Max syndrome-extraction cycles	90 (det 8), 70 (det 16); 95 cycles for the $d = 7$ repetition code	main text, suppl.
Logical error per cycle, Z (no reload)	$\epsilon_{\text{det } 8}^Z = 0.74 \pm 0.01\%$; $\epsilon_{\text{det } 16}^Z = 0.56 \pm 0.01\%$	Fig. 3(a)
Logical error per cycle, Z (with reload)	$\epsilon_{\text{det } 8}^Z = 0.63 \pm 0.03\%$; $\epsilon_{\text{det } 16}^Z = 0.64 \pm 0.04\%$	Fig. 3(b)
Error suppression factor Λ (4-cycle, no reload)	$\Lambda^Z = 1.9 \pm 0.1$; $\Lambda^X = 1.20 \pm 0.03$; $\Lambda^{\text{Avg}} = 1.30 \pm 0.03$	main text
1Q gate error	CRB error per Clifford $4.6(1.6) \times 10^{-4}$; SX total Pauli per gate $3.45(1.0) \times 10^{-4}$	suppl. Table S1
2Q (CZ) gate error	Total Pauli per gate $4.03(1.8) \times 10^{-3}$; loss per gate $9.6(2.0) \times 10^{-3}$; error post-selected on survival $4.3(1.9) \times 10^{-3}$	suppl. Table S1

Metric	Value	Source
Qubits used	32 (det 8: 16 data + 16 ancilla); 64 (det 16: 32 data + 32 ancilla), plus reservoir atoms	main text
Gate layers per cycle	4 CZ layers; a typical atom sees 8 two-qubit gates per 2 cycles	suppl. Fig. (circuit)
Idle coherence T_2 (Hahn echo)	7.2(0.6) s	suppl.
Physical atom $1/e$ lifetime	10.5(4) s (science zones); 15.6(5) s (register)	main text
Repetition-code logical lifetime τ_L	44(1) s ($d = 3$); 225(33) s ($d = 7$), at $\tau = 0.5$ s idle per cycle	main text
Reload contrast loss	1.6(1)% per refilling cycle; SZ refilled every 10 cycles	main text
Decoder	PyMatching (MWPM) with per-shot loss-aware detector-error-model reweighting	main text

1.4 Context

This is, on the authors’ framing, the first neutral-atom demonstration of repeated syndrome extraction scalable to arbitrary depth, combining mid-circuit measurement, qubit role-swap, ancilla replacement and continuous MOT reloading, and the first continuous syndrome extraction on a non-planar code (the toric code) needing non-local connectivity. It positions against superconducting subthreshold results (Google, restricted to nearest-neighbour surface codes), trapped-ion work (Quantinuum-style, not yet beyond 8 cycles), and the recent Harvard/QuEra neutral-atom surface-code result, which showed distance-5-over-3 suppression but without true mid-circuit measurement. The repetition-code memory holding logical information for 225 s, far beyond the ~ 10 s physical atom lifetime, crosses the milestone of a logical lifetime exceeding the physical-qubit lifetime.

1.5 Caveats

This is an arXiv preprint, not yet peer reviewed; the author block is the placeholder “Atom Computing and Collaborators”, and the source contains unresolved draft markers (a “100K SHOTS” placeholder and commented-out error-budget text). The sub-threshold reading is hedged by the authors themselves: suppression factors are only marginally above unity ($\Lambda^{\text{Avg}} = 1.30 \pm 0.03$), the det 16 data do not follow the fixed-error-per-cycle model, and once reloading is added the per-cycle Z error rates of the two codes are statistically equal (0.63 vs 0.64%, i.e. $\Lambda^Z \approx 1$), so the larger distance no longer suppresses error per cycle. The authors explicitly decline to claim sub-threshold

behaviour, noting unmodelled coherent errors and slow atom heating, and that per-operation error rates may grow with system size given arbitrary connectivity. The $\tau_L = 225$ s lifetime is for a phase-sensitive repetition code (protecting a single error type), not a full toric-code logical qubit, and the $\tau = 0.5$ s idle time is a chosen, non-optimised operating point. Cycle depth is currently limited by compilation overhead rather than physics. The quoted CZ infidelity post-selects on atom survival, so the $\sim 1\%$ per-gate loss channel sits outside that number and dominates the loss budget.