

Quantum Simulations of Fundamental Physics

Martin J. Savage^{a,*}

^a*InQubator for Quantum Simulation (IQUS), Department of Physics, University of Washington, Seattle, WA 98195, USA.*

E-mail: mjs5@uw.edu

Simulating the dynamics of non-equilibrium matter under extreme conditions lies beyond the capabilities of classical computation alone. Remarkable advances in quantum information science and technology are profoundly changing how we understand and explore fundamental quantum many-body systems, and have brought us to the point of simulating essential aspects of these systems using quantum computers. I discuss highlights, opportunities and the challenges that lie ahead.

The 11th International Workshop on Chiral Dynamics (CD2024)
26-30 August 2024
Ruhr University Bochum, Germany

*Speaker

1. Introduction

Many of the important challenges facing researchers in fundamental science are related to the dynamics of systems far from equilibrium. Precision studies lie beyond the capabilities of HPC alone [1–4], limited by “sign problems” in known classical methods, arising from the interference of complex amplitudes. Feynman and others [5–8] emphasized the potential of quantum computers for simulating fundamentally quantum systems, in particular, how they would be able to simulate aspects of such systems that are beyond the capabilities of HPC [9]. With corresponding efforts in developing theoretical frameworks, effective descriptions and models, classical techniques and simulations, quantum algorithms, codes, workflows, and physics-aware optimizations, quantum computers provide a potential path forward for robust simulations of the dynamics of matter initially far from equilibrium or subject to extreme conditions, providing that the relevant initial states can be prepared with sufficient fidelity. New understandings of quantum many-body systems (QMBSs) and quantum field theories (QFTs) acquired in these pursuits also accelerate advances in quantum information science, technology and engineering (QISET) and other science domains.

The first digital quantum computers became available to researchers in high-energy physics (HEP) and nuclear physics (NP) via cloud access in 2017 [10], enabling small quantum circuits to be run on (noisy) 5-superconducting qubit quantum processing units (QPUs), e.g., Refs. [11, 12]. In contrast, present day quantum computers range from superconducting-qubit (more than 100 qubits), trapped-ion (more than 50 qubits), cold-atom (more than 1000 atoms), and more, with some platforms also supporting qudits. Creative algorithms, workflows and implementations are enabling simulations of utility using Noisy Intermediate Scale Quantum (NISQ) computers [13]. A dramatic illustration of the progress in quantum simulations is shown in Fig. 1. One sees that




Figure 1: The number of utilized qubits in jobs run on IBMs quantum computers from 2016 forward [14]. Also shown are the classical computers corresponding to the Hilbert-space dimensionality (dashed lines).

a number of communities have advanced to the point where they are able to perform large-scale quantum simulations, i.e., utilizing more than 100 qubits This happened, in large part, through encouragement from technology companies, particularly IBM, to “think big”. The projects shown in Fig. 1 include the preparation of the vacuum in the Schwinger model [15] and time-evolution of

wavepackets [16], accomplished by an IQUS team. Logical qubits have been demonstrated, including from IBM using superconducting qubits and Low-Density Parity-Check (LDPC) [17], from the Quantinuum-Microsoft collaboration using trapped-ions [18], from Atom Computing-Microsoft using cold-atoms [19], from Google-AI using superconducting qubits and surface codes [20], and from Amazon (AWS) with bosonic cat-codes [21], indicating that quantum computers with some degree of fault tolerance (FT) will become available in the near future. Mid-circuit measurements that are now possible using some quantum computers offer the potential to (significantly) reduce the depth of quantum circuits.

We are in the enviable situation of knowing the underlying interactions and particle content that we wish to simulate, provided by the Standard Model. While we have made great progress since the 1970's in determining masses, energies and low-energy scattering processes using lattice QCD with HPC, higher energy dynamics and dense systems of fermions suffer from well-known sign problems. Future simulations using quantum computers, with operations that extend beyond the classical gate set, provide a path forward for addressing key aspects of such systems using the Hamiltonian framework. Even before fault-tolerant/error-correcting quantum computers become available to provide high-fidelity results, much progress can be made along the way from present-day NISQ-era devices. Asymptotically, we expect to be able to perform end-to-end simulations of complex dynamics, but well before then, constraints on dynamical aspects of problems, such as, for example, fragmentation functions or in-medium energy-loss, will become accessible, and used to refine HPC simulations.

In simulating quantum field theories using quantum computers, pioneering work by Jordan, Lee and Preskill [22–24] developed a complete protocol for simulating scattering in $\lambda\phi^4$ scalar field theory, starting from preparing initial state wavepackets in the interacting theory, through time-evolution through the scattering process, and then through to particle detection. Further, they showed this to be BQP-complete, so that any systems that can be efficiently simulated using a quantum computer can be mapped with polynomial-scaling quantum resources to $\lambda\phi^4$ with external classical sources.

Simulating non-Abelian gauge theories is more complicated than $\lambda\phi^4$ for a number of obvious reasons. From a practical standpoint, preparing the initial state “beam” of hadrons is significantly more challenging, however, that has been essentially achieved in 1+1D using a technique that can be translated to Yang-Mills in 3+1D [15, 16]. The scattering process requires evolving a theory with quark and gluon degrees of freedom forward in time, while maintaining color neutrality despite recent observations that naive Trotterization induces color-violating amplitudes [25]. The digitization of the gauge space is not unique, and current strategies, such as the Kogut-Susskind (KS) Hamiltonian require a substantial Hilbert space per gauge link that grows toward the continuum limit. An added complication is that applications of the plaquette operator require operations within four gauge spaces of six links (that have to be re-coupled in 3+1D). Recent suggestions of using honeycomb [26, 27] in 2+1D and triamond [28] or hyper-honeycomb [29] in 3+1D somewhat mitigate that complexity.

The last few years has witnessed a growing diversity in quantum computing architectures, from trapped-ions with all-to-all connectivity, cold-atom systems with increasing connectivity, to superconducting systems with nearest-neighbor connectivity. The atomic systems are characteristically “slow” with measurement rates in the Hertz range, while superconducting systems are many orders

of magnitude faster. Internationally, there are major efforts toward simulating multiple systems of interest on all available devices. At this stage, there are no “clear winners” with regard to quantum architectures that will furnish first quantum advantages.

Low-dimensional models with features in common with 3+1D Standard Model systems of interest have been the focus of quantum algorithm and simulation development until now, with only modest efforts to extend to 2+1D and 3+1D. One of the models that has proven remarkably fruitful is the Schwinger model, which is quantum electrodynamics in 1+1D. This model confines charges, exhibits a fermion vacuum condensate, and two- and three-body bound states, making it an ideal “sandbox” for developing quantum algorithms and intuition for future simulation efforts in quantum chromodynamics (QCD). Lattice symmetries and confinement led to scalable quantum circuits for preparing the quantum vacuum and wavepackets [15, 16]. This work built utilized the ADAPT-VQE algorithm [30] by working with a pool of scalable operators. Error mitigation is essential for successful simulations utilizing large quantum volumes [31]. Figure 2 shows the results of vacuum preparation obtained from IBM’s quantum computers using scalable operators tuned with small-scale classical simulations and well-known asymptotic behaviors. Also shown is the dynamical evolution of a wavepacket into pulses of hadrons moving back-to-back. There




Figure 2: The vacuum of the Schwinger model prepared using IBM’s quantum computers, `ibm_cusco` (upper panel), and the time evolution of a wavepacket, producing hadrons propagating within the light cone (lower panel). The left side of the lower panel shows the exact result computed using HPC, while the right side shows the results obtained using IBM’s quantum computers, `ibm_torino` [15, 16].

have been a number of important algorithm developmental works using classical computing for simulating 1+1D theories using quantum computers, these include kink-kink scattering in “Ising plus” spin system to study energy and entanglement evolution [32, 33], studies of hadronization and string breaking [34–36], and detailed explorations of algorithm performance for state preparation and evolution in fermion systems, e.g., Refs. [37, 38].

1+1D simulations of SU(2) and SU(3) theories including quarks and anti-quarks, with the gluon field constrained by Gauss’s law, have been performed using quantum computers [25, 39–43]. A single spatial lattice site requires $2n_f n_c$ qubits using the Jordan-Wigner mapping. These works have included preparing the ground state for a small number of spatial sites using IBMs and Quantum quantum computers, examining the time evolution following quenches, and the probing the structure of exotic hadrons. Some of the new quantum architectures support qudits,

e.g., Ref. [44–46]. For example, each of the trapped ions in some new systems can support not just two quantum states, but multiple. We suggested that embedding the quarks at each site into $d = 8$ qudits [47], or qu8its, will reduce the depth of quantum circuits due to the capabilities of these devices for parallel gate application. These advances are stimulating the community to consider the advantages and disadvantages of simulating fundamental systems using qubits vs qudits. First simulations of a highly truncated quantum field theory using a quantum computer have been recently performed [44].

Dynamical quantum phases transitions (DQPTs) can be explored using quantum computers, opening up new possibilities for understanding fundamental systems. Interestingly, in the Schwinger model, there is a DQPT arising in the dynamics following a θ -quench, depending on the magnitude of $\Delta\theta$ [48]. Examining the phase of the Fourier components of the two-point function as a function of time reveals a DQPT at $\theta = \pi/2$, above which vortices are generated at critical values of momentum. This manifests itself as a zero in the Loschmidt echo and non-analytic structure in the associated rate function, which is smoothed to some degree in finite systems. Quantum simulations were performed using IonQ’s trapped-ion system, recovering expectations within uncertainties [49].

Classical simulations of the QCD phase diagram have been modeled using the Nambu-Jona-Lasinio model with a chemical potential [50]. The resources of obtaining observables using the Hamiltonian framework were found to scale reasonably, in contrast to computations in Euclidean space of the same quantities that exhibit sign problems. A new method for evaluating thermal expectation values was developed, working with operations on pure states (called Physical Thermal Pure Quantum (PTPQ)), and studied classically in the context of Z_2 lattice gauge theory [51].

While significant progress has been made in simulating 1+1D gauge theories, the corresponding developments for 2+1D and 3+1D simulations are less advanced [39, 52–57]. Formal progress is being made to identify good and hopefully optimal mappings of these theories to qubit and qudit systems with particular architectures, e.g., Refs. [58–67]. For Yang-Mills gauge theories, most of the efforts have been toward implementing the KS Hamiltonian, involving chromo-electric and chromo-magnetic field operators, acting on fabrics of links, each link supporting $SU(N)$ representations. At each vertex, links are combined to form a gauge-invariant state. Byrnes and Yamamoto and others have shown how to map Yang-Mills to quantum registers [68–71]. So far, only simulations involving highly-truncated gauge spaces and spatial volumes have been attempted. An exception to this is in recent work by Bauer and Ciavarella who demonstrated significant simplifications by working in the large- N_c limit [57]. Abelian theories have proven less complicated to implement, as expected, and a number of new formulations have appeared, typically making explicit use of $U(1)$ gauge invariance and novel choices of gauge fixing [72]. Small plaquette systems have been prepared in the ground state, and also quenched from the trivial vacuum, time evolved with the Trotterized KS Hamiltonian. One “sociologically-important” simulation was recently performed to demonstrate the potential for determining transport properties of non-equilibrium matter, in this case the viscosity of finite-temperature $SU(2)$ Yang-Mills gauge theory. Turro, Ciavarella and Yao [27, 73] simulated the real-time correlation function of the stress-energy tensor for a truncated $SU(2)$ gauge theory mapped to a honeycomb lattice [26]. While this simulation does not provide a quantification of uncertainties, it demonstrates that viscosity is expected to be determined efficiently from quantum simulations, and obtained a result that is consistent with that found in heavy-ion collisions.

Neutrinos play a key role in the evolution of supernova and hence the production of heavy

elements in our universe. Their weak interactions with matter and among themselves combined with an extreme range of energy scales, means that classical computing and analytic results alone are limited in their scope of predictive capabilities. Near the supernova core, the extreme density of neutrinos overcomes the weakness of the interactions among them, rendering $\nu\nu$ interactions the driver for coherent flavor evolution. Quantum computers are currently enabling studies of the evolution of initial quantum states of neutrinos in model systems, both in the spectrum and in dimensional reductions. Early simulations using superconducting-qubit and trapped-ion systems examined the quantum properties of systems of less than ten or so neutrinos in simplified models [74–77]. The Hamiltonian describing coherent flavor evolution is derived robustly from the Standard Model, which maps to a spin-system (where the spin resides in neutrino flavor space) with interactions among all of the neutrinos. Interesting properties in the evolution of entanglement was found, including the presence of multi-partite entanglement (beyond Bell pairs) [76, 78]. These simulations have recently been extended to qutrits, a natural embedding for three flavors of neutrinos [79, 80]. Given the complexity of supernova evolution, there is a long road ahead of development before directly impacting full-scale supernova simulations.

Imagine starting in some initial state, an eigenstate of a given Hamiltonian, and then the system is quenched and evolved using a different Hamiltonian. Scar states are distributed throughout the evolving system. They are only weakly coupled under the evolution and form a “cold subspace”, delaying thermalization of the system, and have low bipartite entanglement entropy. It was thought until recently that scar states existed only in confining theories, for obvious physical reasons. However, work by Lewenstein and collaborators [81], using a Z_2 Kitaev model showed that scar states exist in the deconfined phase of this model, and not in the confined phase. There have been recent works that examine in detail the entanglement and evolution of entanglement, along with scar states and thermalization in modest-sized, truncated gauge theories. In particular, Z_2 theories mapped to a range of lattice geometries have been examined [82]. The theory on the dual-rail ring (or plaquette chain with periodic boundary conditions (PBC)) can be further mapped to a dual theory of single spins per plaquette. These dual systems are easily amenable to partitioning and detailed studies of entanglement. Part of this study involved using classical shadows to estimate the reduced density matrix of a sub-partition, and determining eigenvalues of the entanglement Hamiltonian. Level statistics were determined, and the gap-ratio distribution was seen to evolve from Poissonian at early times to Gaussian Unitary Ensemble (GUE) at late times, indicative of system thermalization, see Fig. 3. Studies of systems closer to physical systems are underway. There are many studies of thermalization that have been made possible by progress in quantum computers and algorithms, e.g., Refs. [83, 84]. Simulations using cold-atom systems have been performed in which a selection of different pure states that have the same average energy density are prepared, and evolved forward in time. Expectation values of local operators are found to approach the same values at late times, despite following a different evolution path.

One of the very recently emerging areas at the interface of QIS and fundamental physics is “quantum magic”. While this has been a key concept of quantum error correction and communication, it had not penetrated the HEP or NP communities until recently (during an IQUS workshop). It is built upon the stabilizer formalism and all of the associated techniques, at the heart of it lies the classical gate set and the universal quantum gate set, and foundational works by Gottesman, Knill and Aaronson [85, 86]. Imagine an n -qubit quantum system initially prepared in the $|0\rangle^{\otimes n}$




Figure 3: Real-time evolution of the gap-ratio distribution of the entanglement Hamiltonian for a Z_2 lattice gauge theory on a dual-rail ring, using 10 plaquettes and 6 randomly selected initial states [82].

tensor-product (classical) pure state. Acting on this state with an arbitrary selection of gates from the classical gate set, comprised of the Hadamard gate, the phase gate and the CNOT gate, produces a stabilizer state. This is a state that can be prepared efficiently using classical computation (by definition). Clearly not all quantum states can be accessed using the classical gate set, which however can be accomplished using a universal quantum gate set - comprised of the classical gates with the addition of the T-gate (as one particular partitioning of gates). The magic of a many-body system vanishes for a stabilizer state, by construction, and is a measure of the non-stabilizerness. The recent introduction of Stabilizer Renyi Entropies (SREs) provide measures that can be used to quantify magic in many-body wavefunctions [87–90], \mathcal{M}_α , or in the magic-power of a unitary operator, such as the S-matrix. It has been shown through simulation of random quantum circuits, doped with T-gates and single qubit measurements, that the transition in sub-system scaling (from volume law to area law) of the entanglement and magic occur in different regions of doping [91]. This reinforces the notion that entanglement and magic must be considered as independent measures of the complexity of quantum many-body systems. This is what follows directly from Gottesman, Knill and Aaronson – large-scale multi-partite entanglement can be established efficiently with classical computing resources within a given stabilizer state, and thus does not dictate a need for quantum computing resources alone. Similarly, tensor-product states with large-scale magic can also be prepared efficiently with classical computers using single-qubit rotations. It is systems with large-scale entanglement and large-scale magic that require quantum computers at scale or for high-precision simulation. Recent work quantifying multi-partite entanglement and system-wide magic have been undertaken for p-shell and sd-shell nuclei [92, 93], and in qubit and qutrit embeddings of neutrinos [94] with interesting results. For example, the shape-complexity of nuclei, from classical deformation through shape co-existence, through to instability is found to be reflected in measures of magic.

One important area of application in the area of low-energy nuclear physics is nuclear reactions, many of which are difficult to predict with accuracy. While it is a few-body problem, the nature of the nuclear force is such that the structure of nuclei, resonating sub-spaces evolving in real-time are beyond the capabilities of classical computing for an array of nuclear reactions, including those

involving short-lived nuclei involved in secondary reactions. A co-design team led by Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory is building its own hardware to address these problems [95, 96]. Non-relativistic systems have the nice feature that spin and space decouple and reside in distinct Hilbert spaces, and as such, the position of nucleons can be “handled” using classical computing, while the spin degrees of freedom, which are intrinsically quantum mechanical, can be “handled” using quantum computing, in a hybrid approach [96]. Using RF signals design using classical computing to optimally execute requisite quantum operations on their SRF cavity system, this team has successfully simulated the dynamics of two scattering nucleons using this hybrid technique. Their pulse-control optimizations and hardware designs have enabled simulations of impressive fidelity over relatively long time intervals.

Some of our works have focused on simulating the low-energy dynamics in effective models of nucleons, such as the Lipkin-Meshkov-Glick (LMG) model [97, 98] and the Agassi model (LMG with pairing) [99]. The LMG allows for explorations of important aspects of many-body systems, including the structure of entanglement [98], Hamiltonian learning [97], global optimization for optimal effective model spaces, properties near phase transitions, and more. With the inclusion of pairing, the Agassi model exhibits super-fluid phases, and its intrinsic $SO(5)$ symmetry naturally maps to $d = 5$ qudits (qu5its) [99]. Such a mapping leads to reductions in quantum resource requires for simulations. There remains much to be understood about the role of entanglement in nuclei, e.g., Refs. [92, 93, 100–103]

2. Summary and Outlook

Quantum information science and quantum computers are changing how we think about quantum many-body systems and field theories describing fundamental physics. Not only are they changing how we view them, they are changing our objectives for future simulations. Significant progress is being made toward quantum computing providing predictive capabilities for the dynamics and properties of matter in extreme conditions beyond what is possible with classical computing and formal techniques alone. We have already seen encouraging small-scale simulations of dynamical properties of systems inaccessible to classical simulations at scale, but without a complete quantification of uncertainties.

The near future will be a remarkable period in the history of computation as we will see an evolution from the NISQ-era to robust fault-tolerant/error-corrected quantum computers. Research efforts in NP and HEP, techniques and simulation protocols will need to evolve accordingly, requiring continued engagement among scientists, engineers and developers at universities, technology companies and national laboratories. We have spent the last eight or so years pursuing and learning from simulations using NISQ-era digital quantum computers, where reliably controlling entanglement through the application of CNOT gates is the major challenge. This work has led to conceptual paths forward for establishing quantum advantages in some key systems. As we evolve into the fault-tolerant/error corrected era, optimizing the hybrid classical-quantum processing becomes increasingly important. This involves physics-awareness and organizing simulations in terms of quantum complexity.

I would like to thank IQuS, my collaborators and the community. I would also like to thank the organizers of this stimulating and lively meeting.

References

- [1] N. Klco, A. Roggero and M.J. Savage, *Standard model physics and the digital quantum revolution: thoughts about the interface*, *Rept. Prog. Phys.* **85** (2022) 064301 [2107.04769].
- [2] C.W. Bauer et al., *Quantum Simulation for High-Energy Physics*, *PRX Quantum* **4** (2023) 027001 [2204.03381].
- [3] C.W. Bauer, Z. Davoudi, N. Klco and M.J. Savage, *Quantum simulation of fundamental particles and forces*, *Nature Rev. Phys.* **5** (2023) 420 [2404.06298].
- [4] D. Beck et al., *Quantum Information Science and Technology for Nuclear Physics. Input into U.S. Long-Range Planning, 2023*, 2, 2023 [2303.00113].
- [5] R.P. Feynman, *Simulating physics with computers*, *Int. J. Theor. Phys.* **21** (1982) 467.
- [6] R. Landauer, *Irreversibility and heat generation in the computing process*, *IBM J. Res. Dev.* **5** (1961) 183.
- [7] Y. Manin, *Computable and Uncomputable*, *Sov. Radio* **128** (1980) .
- [8] P. Benioff, *The computer as a physical system: A microscopic quantum mechanical hamiltonian model of computers as represented by turing machines*, *Journal of Statistical Physics* **22** (1980) 563.
- [9] S. Lloyd, *Universal quantum simulators*, *Science* **273** (1996) 1073.
- [10] “IBM Quantum.” <https://quantum-computing.ibm.com/>, 2022.
- [11] E.F. Dumitrescu, A.J. McCaskey, G. Hagen, G.R. Jansen, T.D. Morris, T. Papenbrock et al., *Cloud Quantum Computing of an Atomic Nucleus*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **120** (2018) 210501 [1801.03897].
- [12] N. Klco, E.F. Dumitrescu, A.J. McCaskey, T.D. Morris, R.C. Pooser, M. Sanz et al., *Quantum-classical computation of schwinger model dynamics using quantum computers*, *Phys. Rev. A* **98** (2018) 032331 [1803.03326].
- [13] J. Preskill, *Quantum computing in the nisq era and beyond*, *Quantum* **2** (2018) 79 [1801.00862].
- [14] J. Gambetta@jaygambetta, *Tweet posted 2:24 pm · oct 31, 2023*, 2023 [online].
- [15] R.C. Farrell, M. Illa, A.N. Ciavarella and M.J. Savage, *Scalable Circuits for Preparing Ground States on Digital Quantum Computers: The Schwinger Model Vacuum on 100 Qubits*, *PRX Quantum* **5** (2024) 020315 [2308.04481].
- [16] R.C. Farrell, M. Illa, A.N. Ciavarella and M.J. Savage, *Quantum simulations of hadron dynamics in the Schwinger model using 112 qubits*, *Phys. Rev. D* **109** (2024) 114510 [2401.08044].

- [17] S. Bravyi, A.W. Cross, J.M. Gambetta, D. Maslov, P. Rall and T.J. Yoder, *High-threshold and low-overhead fault-tolerant quantum memory*, *Nature* **627** (2024) 778–782.
- [18] A. Paetznick, M.P. da Silva, C. Ryan-Anderson, J.M. Bello-Rivas, J.P.C.I. au2, A. Chernoguzov et al., *Demonstration of logical qubits and repeated error correction with better-than-physical error rates*, 2024.
- [19] J.A. Muniz, M. Stone, D.T. Stack, M. Jaffe, J.M. Kindem, L. Wadleigh et al., *High-fidelity universal gates in the ^{171}Yb ground state nuclear spin qubit*, 2024.
- [20] R. Acharya, L. Aghababaie-Beni, I. Aleiner, T.I. Andersen, M. Ansmann, F. Arute et al., *Quantum error correction below the surface code threshold*, 2024.
- [21] H. Putterman, K. Noh, C.T. Hann, G.S. MacCabe, S. Aghaeimeibodi, R.N. Patel et al., *Hardware-efficient quantum error correction using concatenated bosonic qubits*, 2024.
- [22] S.P. Jordan, K.S.M. Lee and J. Preskill, *Quantum algorithms for quantum field theories*, *Science* **336** (2012) 1130.
- [23] S.P. Jordan, K.S.M. Lee and J. Preskill, *Quantum computation of scattering in scalar quantum field theories*, *Quantum Inf. Comput.* **14** (2014) 1014.
- [24] S.P. Jordan, H. Krovi, K.S.M. Lee and J. Preskill, *BQP-completeness of scattering in scalar quantum field theory*, *Quantum* **2** (2018) 44 [1703.00454].
- [25] R.C. Farrell, I.A. Chernyshev, S.J.M. Powell, N.A. Zemlevskiy, M. Illa and M.J. Savage, *Preparations for quantum simulations of quantum chromodynamics in 1+1 dimensions. I. Axial gauge*, *Phys. Rev. D* **107** (2023) 054512 [2207.01731].
- [26] B. Müller and X. Yao, *Simple Hamiltonian for quantum simulation of strongly coupled (2+1)D $SU(2)$ lattice gauge theory on a honeycomb lattice*, *Phys. Rev. D* **108** (2023) 094505 [2307.00045].
- [27] F. Turro, A. Ciavarella and X. Yao, *Classical and quantum computing of shear viscosity for (2+1)D $SU(2)$ gauge theory*, *Phys. Rev. D* **109** (2024) 114511 [2402.04221].
- [28] A.H.Z. Kavaki and R. Lewis, *From square plaquettes to triamond lattices for $SU(2)$ gauge theory*, *Commun. Phys.* **7** (2024) 208 [2401.14570].
- [29] M. Illa, M.J. Savage and X. Yao, *Improved Honeycomb and Hyper-Honeycomb Lattice Hamiltonians for Quantum Simulations of Non-Abelian Gauge Theories*, 2503.09688.
- [30] H.R. Grimsley, S.E. Economou, E. Barnes and N.J. Mayhall, *An adaptive variational algorithm for exact molecular simulations on a quantum computer*, *Nat. Commun.* **10** (2019) 3007 [1812.11173].
- [31] Y. Kim, A. Eddins, S. Anand, K.X. Wei, E. van den Berg, S. Rosenblatt et al., *Evidence for the utility of quantum computing before fault tolerance*, *Nature* **618** (2023) 500.

- [32] A. Milsted, J. Liu, J. Preskill and G. Vidal, *Collisions of False-Vacuum Bubble Walls in a Quantum Spin Chain*, *PRX Quantum* **3** (2022) 020316 [2012.07243].
- [33] R.G. Jha, A. Milsted, D. Neuenfeld, J. Preskill and P. Vieira, *Real-Time Scattering in Ising Field Theory using Matrix Product States*, 2411.13645.
- [34] J.a. Barata, W. Gong and R. Venugopalan, *Realtime dynamics of hyperon spin correlations from string fragmentation in a deformed four-flavor Schwinger model*, *Phys. Rev. D* **109** (2024) 116003 [2308.13596].
- [35] A. Florio, D. Frenklakh, K. Ikeda, D.E. Kharzeev, V. Korepin, S. Shi et al., *Quantum real-time evolution of entanglement and hadronization in jet production: Lessons from the massive Schwinger model*, *Phys. Rev. D* **110** (2024) 094029 [2404.00087].
- [36] R.C. Farrell, M. Illa and M.J. Savage, *Steps toward quantum simulations of hadronization and energy loss in dense matter*, *Phys. Rev. C* **111** (2025) 015202 [2405.06620].
- [37] Y. Chai, A. Crippa, K. Jansen, S. Kühn, V.R. Pascuzzi, F. Tacchino et al., *Fermionic wave packet scattering: a quantum computing approach*, *Quantum* **9** (2025) 1638 [2312.02272].
- [38] Z. Davoudi, C.-C. Hsieh and S.V. Kadam, *Scattering wave packets of hadrons in gauge theories: Preparation on a quantum computer*, *Quantum* **8** (2024) 1520 [2402.00840].
- [39] N. Klco, J.R. Stryker and M.J. Savage, *$SU(2)$ non-Abelian gauge field theory in one dimension on digital quantum computers*, *Phys. Rev. D* **101** (2020) 074512 [1908.06935].
- [40] A. Ciavarella, N. Klco and M.J. Savage, *Trailhead for quantum simulation of $SU(3)$ Yang-Mills lattice gauge theory in the local multiplet basis*, *Phys. Rev. D* **103** (2021) 094501 [2101.10227].
- [41] Y.Y. Atas, J. Zhang, R. Lewis, A. Jahanpour, J.F. Haase and C.A. Muschik, *$SU(2)$ hadrons on a quantum computer via a variational approach*, *Nat Commun* **12** (2021) 6499 [2102.08920].
- [42] R.C. Farrell, I.A. Chernyshev, S.J.M. Powell, N.A. Zemlevskiy, M. Illa and M.J. Savage, *Preparations for quantum simulations of quantum chromodynamics in 1+1 dimensions. II. Single-baryon β -decay in real time*, *Phys. Rev. D* **107** (2023) 054513 [2209.10781].
- [43] Y.Y. Atas, J.F. Haase, J. Zhang, V. Wei, S.M.L. Pfaendler, R. Lewis et al., *Simulating one-dimensional quantum chromodynamics on a quantum computer: Real-time evolutions of tetra- and pentaquarks*, *Phys. Rev. Res.* **5** (2023) 033184 [2207.03473].
- [44] M. Meth et al., *Simulating 2D lattice gauge theories on a qudit quantum computer*, 2310.12110.
- [45] L.B. Nguyen, N. Goss, K. Siva, Y. Kim, E. Younis, B. Qing et al., *Empowering a qudit-based quantum processor by traversing the dual bosonic ladder*, *Nature Commun.* **15** (2024) 7117 [2312.17741].

- [46] E. Champion, Z. Wang, R. Parker and M. Blok, *Multi-frequency control and measurement of a spin-7/2 system encoded in a transmon qudit*, [2405.15857](#).
- [47] M. Illa, C.E.P. Robin and M.J. Savage, *Qubits for quantum simulations of lattice quantum chromodynamics*, *Phys. Rev. D* **110** (2024) 014507 [[2403.14537](#)].
- [48] T.V. Zache, N. Mueller, J.T. Schneider, F. Jendrzejewski, J. Berges and P. Hauke, *Dynamical Topological Transitions in the Massive Schwinger Model with a θ Term*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **122** (2019) 050403 [[1808.07885](#)].
- [49] N. Mueller, J.A. Carolan, A. Connelly, Z. Davoudi, E.F. Dumitrescu and K. Yeter-Aydeniz, *Quantum Computation of Dynamical Quantum Phase Transitions and Entanglement Tomography in a Lattice Gauge Theory*, *PRX Quantum* **4** (2023) 030323 [[2210.03089](#)].
- [50] A.M. Czajka, Z.-B. Kang, H. Ma and F. Zhao, *Quantum simulation of chiral phase transitions*, *JHEP* **08** (2022) 209 [[2112.03944](#)].
- [51] Z. Davoudi, N. Mueller and C. Powers, *Toward Exploring Phase Diagrams of Gauge Theories on Quantum Computers with Thermal Pure Quantum States*, *PoS LATTICE2022* (2023) 029 [[2212.11388](#)].
- [52] A. Ciavarella, N. Klco and M.J. Savage, *Trailhead for quantum simulation of $SU(3)$ Yang-Mills lattice gauge theory in the local multiplet basis*, *Phys. Rev. D* **103** (2021) 094501 [[2101.10227](#)].
- [53] A.N. Ciavarella and I.A. Chernyshev, *Preparation of the $SU(3)$ lattice Yang-Mills vacuum with variational quantum methods*, *Phys. Rev. D* **105** (2022) 074504 [[2112.09083](#)].
- [54] S. A Rahman, R. Lewis, E. Mendicelli and S. Powell, *$SU(2)$ lattice gauge theory on a quantum annealer*, *Phys. Rev. D* **104** (2021) 034501 [[2103.08661](#)].
- [55] M. Illa and M.J. Savage, *Basic elements for simulations of standard-model physics with quantum annealers: Multigrid and clock states*, *Phys. Rev. A* **106** (2022) 052605 [[2202.12340](#)].
- [56] S. A Rahman, R. Lewis, E. Mendicelli and S. Powell, *Self-mitigating Trotter circuits for $SU(2)$ lattice gauge theory on a quantum computer*, *Phys. Rev. D* **106** (2022) 074502 [[2205.09247](#)].
- [57] A.N. Ciavarella and C.W. Bauer, *Quantum Simulation of $SU(3)$ Lattice Yang-Mills Theory at Leading Order in Large- N_c Expansion*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **133** (2024) 111901 [[2402.10265](#)].
- [58] Z. Davoudi, I. Raychowdhury and A. Shaw, *Search for efficient formulations for Hamiltonian simulation of non-Abelian lattice gauge theories*, *Phys. Rev. D* **104** (2021) 074505 [[2009.11802](#)].

- [59] C.W. Bauer and D.M. Grabowska, *Efficient representation for simulating $U(1)$ gauge theories on digital quantum computers at all values of the coupling*, *Phys. Rev. D* **107** (2023) L031503 [2111.08015].
- [60] T. Hartung, T. Jakobs, K. Jansen, J. Ostmeier and C. Urbach, *Digitising $SU(2)$ gauge fields and the freezing transition*, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **82** (2022) 237 [2201.09625].
- [61] D.M. Grabowska, C. Kane, B. Nachman and C.W. Bauer, *Overcoming exponential scaling with system size in Trotter-Suzuki implementations of constrained Hamiltonians: 2+1 $U(1)$ lattice gauge theories*, 8, 2022.
- [62] I. D'Andrea, C.W. Bauer, D.M. Grabowska and M. Freytsis, *New basis for Hamiltonian $SU(2)$ simulations*, *Phys. Rev. D* **109** (2024) 074501 [2307.11829].
- [63] A. Alexandru, P.F. Bedaque, A. Carosso, M.J. Cervia, E.M. Murrari and A. Sheng, *Fuzzy gauge theory for quantum computers*, *Phys. Rev. D* **109** (2024) 094502 [2308.05253].
- [64] E.J. Gustafson, H. Lamm and F. Lovelace, *Primitive quantum gates for an $SU(2)$ discrete subgroup: Binary octahedral*, *Phys. Rev. D* **109** (2024) 054503 [2312.10285].
- [65] D.M. Grabowska, C.F. Kane and C.W. Bauer, *A Fully Gauge-Fixed $SU(2)$ Hamiltonian for Quantum Simulations*, 9, 2024.
- [66] E.J. Gustafson, Y. Ji, H. Lamm, E.M. Murrari, S.O. Perez and S. Zhu, *Primitive quantum gates for an $SU(3)$ discrete subgroup: $\Sigma(36\times 3)$* , *Phys. Rev. D* **110** (2024) 034515 [2405.05973].
- [67] J.C. Halimeh, M. Hanada, S. Matsuura, F. Nori, E. Rinaldi and A. Schäfer, *A universal framework for the quantum simulation of Yang-Mills theory*, 11, 2024.
- [68] T. Byrnes and Y. Yamamoto, *Simulating lattice gauge theories on a quantum computer*, *Phys. Rev. A* **73** (2006) 022328 [quant-ph/0510027].
- [69] E. Zohar, J.I. Cirac and B. Reznik, *Cold-Atom Quantum Simulator for $SU(2)$ Yang-Mills Lattice Gauge Theory*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **110** (2013) 125304 [1211.2241].
- [70] D. Banerjee, M. Bögli, M. Dalmonte, E. Rico, P. Stebler, U.J. Wiese et al., *Atomic Quantum Simulation of $U(N)$ and $SU(N)$ Non-Abelian Lattice Gauge Theories*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **110** (2013) 125303 [1211.2242].
- [71] L. Tagliacozzo, A. Celi, P. Orland and M. Lewenstein, *Simulations of non-Abelian gauge theories with optical lattices*, *Nat Commun* **4** (2013) 2615 [1211.2704].
- [72] J.F. Haase, L. Dellantonio, A. Celi, D. Paulson, A. Kan, K. Jansen et al., *A resource efficient approach for quantum and classical simulations of gauge theories in particle physics*, *Quantum* **5** (2021) 393 [2006.14160].
- [73] F. Turro and X. Yao, *Emergent Hydrodynamic Mode on $SU(2)$ Plaquette Chains and Quantum Simulation*, 2, 2025.

- [74] K. Yeter-Aydeniz, S. Bangar, G. Siopsis and R.C. Pooser, *Collective neutrino oscillations on a quantum computer*, *Quant. Inf. Proc.* **21** (2022) 84 [2104.03273].
- [75] V. Amitrano, A. Roggero, P. Luchi, F. Turro, L. Vespucci and F. Pederiva, *Trapped-ion quantum simulation of collective neutrino oscillations*, *Phys. Rev. D* **107** (2023) 023007.
- [76] M. Illa and M.J. Savage, *Multi-neutrino entanglement and correlations in dense neutrino systems*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **130** (2023) 221003.
- [77] M. Illa and M.J. Savage, *Basic elements for simulations of standard-model physics with quantum annealers: Multigrid and clock states*, *Physical Review A* **106** (2022) 052605.
- [78] I.A. Chernyshev, *Three-flavor Collective Neutrino Oscillations on D-Wave's Advantage Quantum Annealer*, 2405.20436.
- [79] F. Turro, I.A. Chernyshev, R. Bhaskar and M. Illa, *Qutrit and Qubit Circuits for Three-Flavor Collective Neutrino Oscillations*, 2407.13914.
- [80] L. Spagnoli et al., *Collective Neutrino Oscillations in Three Flavors on Qubit and Qutrit Processors*, 2503.00607.
- [81] A.S. Aramthottil, U. Bhattacharya, D. González-Cuadra, M. Lewenstein, L. Barbiero and J. Zakrzewski, *Scar states in deconfined z_2 lattice gauge theories*, *Physical Review B* **106** (2022) .
- [82] N. Mueller, T. Wang, O. Katz, Z. Davoudi and M. Cetina, *Quantum Computing Universal Thermalization Dynamics in a (2+1)D Lattice Gauge Theory*, 2408.00069.
- [83] A.M. Kaufman, M.E. Tai, A. Lukin, M. Rispoli, R. Schittko, P.M. Preiss et al., *Quantum thermalization through entanglement in an isolated many-body system*, *Science* **353** (2016) aaf6725.
- [84] Z.-Y. Zhou, G.-X. Su, J.C. Halimeh, R. Ott, H. Sun, P. Hauke et al., *Thermalization dynamics of a gauge theory on a quantum simulator*, *Science* **377** (2022) abl6277 [2107.13563].
- [85] D. Gottesman, *The Heisenberg representation of quantum computers*, in *22nd International Colloquium on Group Theoretical Methods in Physics*, 7, 1998 [quant-ph/9807006].
- [86] S. Aaronson and D. Gottesman, *Improved simulation of stabilizer circuits*, *Physical Review A* **70** (2004) .
- [87] L. Leone, S.F. Oliviero and A. Hamma, *Stabilizer rényi entropy*, *Physical Review Letters* **128** (2022) .
- [88] T. Haug and L. Piroli, *Stabilizer entropies and nonstabilizerness monotones*, *Quantum* **7** (2023) 1092 [2303.10152].

- [89] L. Leone, S.F.E. Oliviero and A. Hamma, *Nonstabilizerness determining the hardness of direct fidelity estimation*, *Phys. Rev. A* **107** (2023) 022429 [2204.02995].
- [90] S.F.E. Oliviero, L. Leone, A. Hamma and S. Lloyd, *Measuring magic on a quantum processor*, *npj Quantum Information* **8** (2022) .
- [91] G.E. Fux, E. Tirrito, M. Dalmonte and R. Fazio, *Entanglement-magic separation in hybrid quantum circuits*, 2312.02039.
- [92] F. Brokemeier, S.M. Hengstenberg, J.W.T. Keeble, C.E.P. Robin, F. Rocco and M.J. Savage, *Quantum Magic and Multi-Partite Entanglement in the Structure of Nuclei*, 2409.12064.
- [93] C.E.P. Robin and M.J. Savage, *The Magic in Nuclear and Hypernuclear Forces*, 2405.10268.
- [94] I. Chernyshev, C.E.P. Robin and M.J. Savage, *Quantum Magic and Computational Complexity in the Neutrino Sector*, 2411.04203.
- [95] F. Turro, A. Roggero, V. Amitrano, P. Luchi, K.A. Wendt, J.L. DuBois et al., *Imaginary-time propagation on a quantum chip*, *Phys. Rev. A* **105** (2022) 022440 [2102.12260].
- [96] F. Turro et al., *Demonstration of a quantum-classical coprocessing protocol for simulating nuclear reactions*, *Phys. Rev. A* **108** (2023) 032417 [2302.06734].
- [97] C.E.P. Robin and M.J. Savage, *Quantum simulations in effective model spaces: Hamiltonian-learning variational quantum eigensolver using digital quantum computers and application to the Lipkin-Meshkov-Glick model*, *Phys. Rev. C* **108** (2023) 024313 [2301.05976].
- [98] S.M. Hengstenberg, C.E.P. Robin and M.J. Savage, *Multi-body entanglement and information rearrangement in nuclear many-body systems: a study of the Lipkin–Meshkov–Glick model*, *Eur. Phys. J. A* **59** (2023) 231 [2306.16535].
- [99] M. Illa, C.E.P. Robin and M.J. Savage, *Quantum simulations of $SO(5)$ many-fermion systems using qudits*, *Phys. Rev. C* **108** (2023) 064306 [2305.11941].
- [100] O.C. Gorton, *Efficient modeling of nuclei through coupling of proton and neutron wavefunctions*, 2018.
- [101] C. Robin, M.J. Savage and N. Pillet, *Entanglement Rearrangement in Self-Consistent Nuclear Structure Calculations*, *Phys. Rev. C* **103** (2021) 034325 [2007.09157].
- [102] C.W. Johnson and O.C. Gorton, *Proton-neutron entanglement in the nuclear shell model*, *J. Phys. G* **50** (2023) 045110 [2210.14338].
- [103] C. Gu, Z.H. Sun, G. Hagen and T. Papenbrock, *Entanglement entropy of nuclear systems*, *Phys. Rev. C* **108** (2023) 054309 [2303.04799].