

Large Scale Modular Quantum Computer Architecture with Atomic Memory and Photonic Interconnects

C. Monroe¹, R. Raussendorf², A. Ruthven², K. R. Brown³, P. Maunz⁴, L.-M. Duan⁵, and J. Kim^{4*}

¹ *Joint Quantum Institute, University of Maryland Department of Physics
and National Institute of Standards and Technology, College Park, MD 20742*

² *Department of Physics and Astronomy, University of British Columbia, Vancouver, BC V6T1Z1*

³ *Schools of Chemistry and Biochemistry; Computational Science and
Engineering; and Physics, Georgia Institute of Technology, Atlanta, GA 30332*

⁴ *Fitzpatrick Institute for Photonics, Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering, Duke University, Durham, NC 27708*

⁵ *Department of Physics and MCTP, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor,
MI 48109 and Center for Quantum Information, Tsinghua University, Beijing 100084, China*

The practical construction of scalable quantum computer hardware capable of executing non-trivial quantum algorithms will require the juxtaposition of different types of quantum systems. We propose a modular quantum computer architecture with a hierarchy of interactions that can scale to very large numbers of qubits. Local entangling quantum gates between qubit memories within a single register are accomplished using natural interactions between the qubits, and entanglement between separate registers is completed via a probabilistic photonic interface between qubits in different registers, even over large distances. This architecture compares to the “multicore” classical information processor, and is suitable for the implementation of complex quantum circuits utilizing the flexible connectivity provided by a reconfigurable photonic interconnect network. We further show that this architecture can be made fault-tolerant, a prerequisite for scalability. All of the rudiments of this architecture have been demonstrated in small-scale trapped ion systems, and we speculate on the technological hurdles ahead in order to realize such a system.

PACS numbers: 03.67.-a, 42.50.Ex, 89.20.Ff

Introduction

A quantum computer is composed of at least two quantum systems that serve critical functions: a reliable quantum memory for hosting and manipulating coherent quantum superpositions, and a quantum bus for the conveyance of quantum information between memories. Quantum memories are typically formed out of matter such as individual atoms, spins localized at quantum dots or impurities in solids, or superconducting junctions [1]. On the other hand, the quantum bus typically involves propagating quantum degrees of freedom such as electromagnetic fields (photons) or lattice vibrations (phonons). A suitable and controllable interaction between the memory and the bus is necessary to efficiently execute a prescribed quantum algorithm via propagation of entanglement. The current challenge in any quantum computer architecture is to scale the system to very large sizes, where errors are typically caused by speed limitations and decoherence of the quantum bus or its interaction with the memory. The most advanced quantum bit (qubit) networks have thus been established only in very small systems, such as individual atomic ions bussed by the local Coulomb interaction [2] or superconducting Josephson junctions coupled capacitively or through microwave striplines [3, 4]. In this paper, we propose a hierarchy of quantum bus levels in a new modular quantum computer architecture that may allow the scaling of high performance quantum memories to useful sizes. Unlike previous related proposals [5–9], we show this architecture is fault-tolerant, reconfigurable, and based on technology that is currently available.

We specialize to the use of atomic ion qubit memories, al-

though the general architecture presented here can also be adapted to other optically active quantum systems such as quantum dots, neutral atoms, or NV-diamond [1]. Qubits stored in ions enjoy a level of coherence that is unmatched in any other physical system, underlying the reason such states are also used as high performance atomic clocks. Moreover, atomic ions can be initialized and detected with nearly perfect accuracy using conventional optical pumping and state-dependent fluorescence techniques. There have been many successful demonstrations of controlled entanglement of several-ion quantum registers in the past decade involving the use of qubit state-dependent forces supplied by laser beams [2, 10]. These experiments exploit the collective motion of a small number of trapped ion qubits, but with more than 10 – 100 ions, such operations are more susceptible to external noise, decoherence, or speed limitations.

One promising approach to scaling trapped ion qubits is the quantum charge-coupled device (QCCD), which involves the sequential entanglement of small numbers of ions through their collective motion, and the classical shuttling of individual ions between different trapping zones to propagate the entanglement [11, 12]. This approach involves advanced ion trap structures, perhaps with many times more discrete electrodes as trapped ion qubits, and therefore motivates the use of micrometer-scale surface traps [13–15] and novel fabrication techniques [16–18]. The shuttling solution also requires exquisite control of the atomic ion positions during shuttling, may require multiple atomic species to act as “refrigerator” ions to quench the excess motion from shuttling operations [19], will likely involve methods to mitigate the effect of ion heating from the nearby electrodes [20–22], and cannot eas-




Figure 1: Hierarchical modular quantum computer architecture hosting $N = N_{ELU}N_q$ qubits. (a) The elementary logic units (ELU) consists of a register of N_q trapped atomic ion qubits, whereby entangling quantum logic gates are mediated through the local Coulomb interaction between qubits. (b) One or more atomic qubits within each of the N_{ELU} registers are coupled to photonic quantum channels, and through a reconfigurable optical multiplexing switch (center), fiber beamsplitters and position sensitive imager (right), qubits between different registers can be entangled.

ily be extended over large distances for quantum communications applications. The QCCD approach will push current state-of-the-art quantum information processing experiments to territories where elementary quantum error correction and simple quantum algorithms can be implemented, but further scaling may be challenging due to the complexity of interconnects, diffraction of optical beams, and the extensive hardware required for qubit control.

Here we propose a modular universal scalable ion trap quantum computer (MUSIQC) architecture that may enable construction of quantum processors with up to 10^6 qubits utilizing component technologies that have already been demonstrated. This architecture features two elements: stable trapped ion multi-qubit registers that can further be connected with ion shuttling, and scalable photonic interconnects that can connect these registers in a flexible configuration over large distances. We articulate substantial architectural advantages in this approach that allows significant speedup and resource reductions of quantum circuit execution over other hardware architectures, enabled by the ability to operate quantum gates between qubits throughout the entire processor regardless of their relative location. Finally, we prove how such a quantum network can support fault-tolerant error correction even in the face of probabilistic interconnects, and discuss the technological developments necessary for its realization. While we focus our discussions on quantum registers composed of trapped atomic ions, this architecture can be extended to other quantum platforms with strong optical transitions.

The Modular Elementary Logic Unit (ELU)

The base unit of MUSIQC is a collection of N_q qubit memories with local interactions, called the Elementary Logic Unit (ELU). Quantum logic operations within the ELU are ideally fast and deterministic, with error rates sufficiently small that fault-tolerant error correction within an ELU is possible [23]. Here, we represent the ELU with a crystal of $N_q \gg 1$ trapped atomic ions as shown in Fig. 2, with each qubit comprised of internal energy levels of each ion, labeled as $|\uparrow\rangle$ and $|\downarrow\rangle$, separated by frequency ω_0 . We assume the qubit levels are coupled through an atomic dipole operator $\hat{\mu} = \mu(|\uparrow\rangle\langle\downarrow| + |\downarrow\rangle\langle\uparrow|)$. The ions interact through their external collective modes of quantum harmonic motion. Such phonons can be used to mediate entangling gates through application of qubit-state-dependent optical or microwave dipole forces [24–26]. There are many known protocols for phonon-based gates between ions, and here we summarize the main points relevant to the size of the ELU and the larger architecture.

An externally applied near-resonant running wave field with amplitude $E(\hat{x}) = E_0 e^{ik\hat{x}}$ and wavenumber k couples to the atomic dipole through the interaction Hamiltonian $\hat{H} = -\hat{\mu}E(\hat{x})$, and by suitably tuning the field near sidebands induced by the harmonic motion of the ions [12] a qubit state dependent force results. In this way, qubits can be mapped onto phonon states [12, 24] and then onto other qubits for entangling operations with characteristic speed $R_{gate} = \eta\Omega$, where $\eta = \sqrt{\hbar k^2/(2m_0N_q\omega)}$ is the Lamb Dicke parameter, m_0 is the mass of each ion, ω the frequency of harmonic oscillation of the collective phonon mode, and $\Omega = \mu E_0/2\hbar$ is the Rabi frequency of the atomic dipole independent of motion. For optical Raman transitions between qubit states (e.g., atomic hyperfine ground states) [12], two fields are each detuned by Δ from an excited state of linewidth $\gamma \ll \Delta$, and when their difference frequency is near resonant with the qubit frequency splitting ω_0 , we use instead $\Omega = (\mu E_0)^2/(2\hbar^2\Delta)$.

The typical gate speed within an ELU therefore slows down with the number of qubits N_q as $R \sim N_q^{-1/2}$. For large crystals, there will be crosstalk between the many modes of collective motion. However, through the use of pulse-shaping techniques [27], the crosstalk errors need not be debilitating, although the effective speed of a gate will again slow down with size N_q . Background errors such as the decoherence (heating) of the motional modes [20] or fluctuating fields that add random phases to the qubits will become important at longer times, thus there will be practical limits on the size of the ELU for the performance of faithful quantum gates. In particular, very large chains may require periodic “refrigerator” ions perhaps of a different isotope or species that can quench heating [28]. We estimate that ELUs ranging from $N_q = 10 - 100$ should be possible. More than one ELU chain can be integrated into a single chip by employing ion shuttling through more complex ion trap structures [11]. Such extended ELUs (EELUs) consisting of N_E ELU chains can contain a total of $N_q N_E = 20 - 1,000$ physical qubits. For simplicity, we fo-




Figure 2: Elementary Logic Unit (ELU) composed of a single crystal of N_q trapped atomic ion qubits coupled through their collective motion. (a) Classical laser fields impart qubit state-dependent forces on one or more ions, affecting entangling quantum gates between the memory qubits. (b) One or more of the ions (rightmost in the figure) are coupled to a photonic interface, where a classical laser pulse maps the state of these communication qubits onto the state of a single photon (e.g., polarization or frequency), which then propagates along an optical fiber to be interfaced with other ELUs.

cus the remainder of the article on systems with one ELU per chip ($N_E = 1$).

Probabilistic Linking of ELUs

A pair of qubit registers (ELUs or EELUs) can be entangled with each other using propagating photons emitted by ions from each qubit register, designated to be “communication qubits.” In this scheme, the communication qubit is driven to an excited state with fast laser pulses whose duration $\tau_e \ll 1/\gamma$, so that at most one photon emerges from each qubit following appropriate radiative selection rules. When photon(s) from two separate communication qubits are mode-matched and interfere on a 50/50 beamsplitter, detectors on the output modes of the beamsplitter can herald the creation of entanglement between the memory qubits [29–32].

We consider two types of photonic connections, characterized by the number of total photons used in the entanglement protocol between two separate memory qubits [6]. For type I connections (shown in Fig. 3a), each memory with an index i (or j) is weakly excited with probability $p_e \ll 1$ and the state of the memory+photonic qubit is written $|\downarrow\rangle_i |0\rangle_i + e^{ikx_i} \sqrt{p_e} |\uparrow\rangle_i |1\rangle_i$, where $|n\rangle_i$ denotes the state of n photons radiating from the memory into an optical mode i , x_i is the path length from the emitter i to a beamsplitter, and k the optical wavenumber [29]. When two memories i and j are excited in this way and the photons interfere at the beam splitter, the detection of a single photon in either detector placed at the two output ports of the beamsplitter heralds the creation of the state $e^{ikx_j} |\downarrow\rangle_i |\uparrow\rangle_j \pm e^{ikx_i} |\uparrow\rangle_i |\downarrow\rangle_j$ with probability $p = p_e F \eta_D$, where F is the fractional solid angle of emission collected, η_D is the detector efficiency in-




Figure 3: (a) Type I interference from photons emitted from two quantum memories. Each memory is weakly excited so that single photon emission has a very small probability yet is correlated with the final qubit state. The output photonic channels are mode-matched with a 50/50 beamsplitter and subsequent detection of a photon from either output port heralds the entanglement of the qubit memories. The probability of two photons present in the system is much smaller than that of detecting a single photon. (b) Type II interference involves the emission of one photon from each memory, where the internal state of the photon (e.g. its color) is correlated with the qubit state. After two photon interference at the beamsplitter, coincidence detection of photons at the two detectors heralds the entanglement of the qubit memories.

cluding any losses between emitter and detector, and the sign in this state is determined by which one of the two detectors fires. Following the heralding of a single photon, the (small) probability of errors from double excitation and detector dark counts are given respectively by p_e^2 and R_{dark}/γ where R_{dark} is the rate of detector dark counts. For type I connections to be useful, the relative optical path length $x_i - x_j$ must be stable to much better than the optical wavelength $1/k$.

For type II connections (shown in Fig. 3b), each memory is excited with near unit probability $p_e \sim 1$ and the single photon carries its qubit through two distinguishable internal photonic states (e.g., polarization or optical frequency). For example, the state of the system containing both memory and photonic qubits is written as $e^{ik_{\downarrow}x_i} |\downarrow\rangle_i |\nu_{\downarrow}\rangle_i + e^{ik_{\uparrow}x_i} |\uparrow\rangle_i |\nu_{\uparrow}\rangle_i$, where $|\nu_{\downarrow}\rangle_i$ and $|\nu_{\uparrow}\rangle_i$ denote the frequency qubit states of a single-photon emitted by the i -th memory with respective wavenumbers $k_{\downarrow}$ and $k_{\uparrow}$ associated with optical frequencies $\nu_{\uparrow}$ and $\nu_{\downarrow}$, with $|\nu_{\uparrow} - \nu_{\downarrow}| = \omega_0 \gg \gamma$ so that these two frequencies are distinguishable. When

two memories i and j are excited in this way, we herald the connection of the memories by the joint (coincidence) detection of photons at output detectors, creating the state $e^{i(k_{\downarrow}x_i + k_{\uparrow}x_j)} |\downarrow\rangle_i |\uparrow\rangle_j - e^{i(k_{\uparrow}x_i + k_{\downarrow}x_j)} |\uparrow\rangle_j |\downarrow\rangle_i$ with probability $p = (p_e F \eta_D)^2 / 2$ [30, 31].

The success probability of the 2-photon type II connection may be lower than that of the type I connection for small light collection fractions, but type II connections are much less sensitive to optical path length fluctuations, with the relative path length $x_i - x_j$ required to be stable only at the level of the wavelength associated with the difference frequency $2\pi c/\omega_0$ of the photonic frequency qubit which is typically at the centimeter scale for hyperfine-encoded memory qubits. In either case, the mean connection time is given by $\tau_E = 1/(Rp)$ where R is the repetition rate of the initialization/excitation process. For atomic transitions, $R \sim 0.1(\gamma/2\pi)$, and for typical free-space light collection ($F \sim 10^{-3}$) and taking $\eta_D \sim 0.2$, we find for a type I connection $\tau_E \sim 4$ msec and for a type II connection $\tau_E \sim 4$ sec where we have assumed $\gamma/2\pi = 20$ MHz. Type II connections eventually outperform that of type I with more efficient light collection, which can be accomplished by integrating optical elements with the ion trap structure without any fundamental loss in fidelity [33].

In practice, steps must be taken to isolate the communication qubit from the memory qubits so that scattered light from the excitation laser does not disturb the spectator memories and also the emitted photons do not themselves affect the memories. It may be necessary to physically separate or shuttle the communication qubit away from the others, invoking some of the techniques from the QCCD approach. However, this crosstalk can also be eliminated by utilizing a different atomic species for the communication qubit [34], so that the excitation and emitted light is sufficiently far from the memory qubit optical resonance to not cause decoherence. The communication qubits need not have excellent quantum memory characteristics, because once the entanglement is established between the photonic qubits in different ELUs, they can immediately be swapped with neighboring memory qubits in each chain.

The MUSIQC architecture allows a large number N_{ELU} of ELUs (or EELUs) to be connected with each other using such photonic channels, as shown in Fig. 1. The connection is made through an optical crossconnect (OXC) switch with N_{ELU} input and output ports. The photon emitted from the communication qubit in each ELU is collected into a single-mode fiber and directed to a corresponding input port of the OXC switch. Up to $N_{ELU}/2$ Bell state detectors, each comprised of two fibers interfering on a beam splitter and two detectors, are connected to the output ports of the OXC switch. The OXC switch is capable of providing an optical path between any input fiber to any output fiber that is not already connected to another input fiber. An ideal OXC switch achieves full non-blocking connectivity with uniform optical path lengths. This optical network provides fully reconfigurable interconnect network for the photonic qubits, allowing entanglement generation between any pair of ELUs in

the processor with up to $N_{ELU}/2$ such operations running in parallel. OXC switches that support 200 – 1,100 ports utilizing micro-electromechanical systems (MEMS) technology have been constructed and are readily available [35, 36]. In practice, the photon detection can be accomplished in parallel with a conventional charge-coupled-device (CCD) imager, with pairs of regions on the CCD associated with particular pairs of output ports from the fiber beamsplitters, as shown in Fig. 1.

Quantum Computing in a Modular Architecture

In the circuit model of quantum computation, execution of two-qubit gates creates the entanglement necessary to exploit the power of quantum physics in computation [23]. In the alternate model of measurement-based cluster-state quantum computation, all of the entanglement is generated at the beginning of the computation, followed by conditional measurements of the qubits [37]. The MUSIQC architecture presented here follows the circuit model of computation within each ELU, but the probabilistic connection between ELUs is carried out by generation of entangled Bell pairs similar to the cluster-state computation model. In this sense, MUSIQC realizes a hybrid model of quantum computation, driven by the generation rate and burn rate of entanglement. In the event the generation rate of entangled Bell pairs between ELUs is lower than the burn rate, each ELU would require the capacity to store enough initial entanglement that the rate at which the entanglement is burned and produced is sufficient to reach the end of the computation. The hybrid nature of MUSIQC provides a unique hardware platform with three distinct advantages: naturally parallel operation of each ELU, constant timescale to perform operations between distant qubits, and moderate ELU size adequate for practical implementation. One can further reduce the entanglement generation time by time-division multiplexing (TDM) the communication ports at the expense of added qubits. Moreover, the temporal mismatch between the remote entanglement generation and local gates is reduced as the requirement of error correction increases the logical gate time.

For complex quantum algorithm involving n bits, logical operations between spatially distant qubit pairs are necessary. In a hardware architecture where only local gate operations are allowed (*e.g.*, nearest neighbor gates), performing gate operations between two (logical) qubits separated by long distances could lead to communication times polynomial in the distance between qubits, $O(n^k)$. When a large number of parallel operations is available, one can employ a nested entanglement swapping protocol to efficiently distribute entanglement with communication times scaling only logarithmically as a function of communication distance. The procedure requires extra qubits used to construct quantum buses for long-distance entanglement distribution, and was referred to as the Quantum Logic Array (QLA) [38]. Despite the slow entanglement generation times, the performance of MUSIQC archi-




Figure 4: Performance comparisons of quantum ripple-carry adder (QRCA) on a nearest-neighbor architecture, and quantum carry-lookahead adder (QLA) on QLA and MUSIQC architectures.

texture is comparable with QLA (and its variations [39]), with substantial advantage in required resources and feasibility for implementation. Figure 4 shows the comparison of execution times and resource requirements for executing a n -bit adder with one level of quantum error correction in various architectures (the assumptions and outline of performance estimation is given in Appendix III). When only local interactions are available without dedicated buses for entanglement distribution, a quantum ripple-carry adder is the adequate adder of choice [40], for which the execution time goes as $O(n)$. For QLA and MUSIQC architectures, one can implement quantum carry-lookahead adder that is capable of completing the addition in logarithmic times [41]. Since quantum adder circuits form the basis of modular exponentiation circuit that dominates the execution time of Shor algorithm, the speed advantage in adder circuits translate directly to faster execution of Shor algorithm.

In the example provided, the MUSIQC architecture takes 50% longer to carry out the quantum adder circuit compared to the QLA architecture due to slow entanglement generation times, but uses only about 15% of physical resources (in total number of physical qubits and parallel operations necessary). This is because of the overhead qubits necessary to construct the quantum buses. Furthermore, the total size of the single ELU necessary to implement the QLA architecture grows very quickly (over 10^6 physical qubits for a 1024-bit adder), while the ELU size in MUSIQC architecture is fixed at moderate numbers ($\approx 1,500$ ELUs with about 100 qubits per ELU). Therefore, MUSIQC architecture substantially lowers the practical technological barrier in integration levels necessary for a large-scale quantum computer.

Fault Tolerance of Probabilistic Photonic Gates

Naïvely, it would appear that the average entanglement creation time τ_E must be much smaller than the decoherence time scale τ_D for fault tolerance, but as shown in the Appendix II, scalable fault-tolerant quantum computation is possible for *any* ratio τ_E/τ_D , even in the presence of additional gate errors. While large values of τ_E/τ_D would lead to impractical levels of overhead in qubits and time (similar to the case




Figure 5: Three steps of creating a three-dimensional cluster state in the MUSIQC architecture, for fast entangling gates. Step 1: Creation of Bell pairs between different ELUs, all in parallel. Step 2: CNOT gates (head of arrow: target qubit, tail of arrow: control qubit). Step 3: Measuring of 3 out of 4 qubits per ELU. If the ELU represents a face (edge) qubit in the underlying lattice, the measurements are in the σ_z - (σ_x -) basis. The resulting state is a 3D cluster state, up to Hadamard gates on the edge-qubits.

of conventional quantum fault tolerance near threshold error levels [42]), this result is still remarkable and indicates that fault tolerance is always possible in this architecture. Here we mainly consider the case where $\tau_E/\tau_D \ll 1$, where fault tolerant coding is more practical.

When each ELU is large enough to accommodate logical qubits encoded with a conventional error correcting code, one can implement full fault-tolerant procedure within an ELU as in the example presented in the previous section. When the ELUs are too small to fit the logical qubits, fault-tolerance can be achieved by mapping to three-dimensional cluster states, a known approach for supporting fault-tolerant universal quantum computation [43]. This type of encoding is well-matched to the MUSIQC architecture, because the small degree of their interaction graph leads to small ELUs.

For $\tau_E \ll \tau_D$, the 3D cluster state with qubits on the faces and edges of a three-dimensional lattice can be created using the procedure displayed in Fig. 5 and described in more detail in the Appendix II. The procedure consists of three basic steps, as shown in Fig. 5: Creation of Bell states between different ELUs via the photonic link; CNOT-gates within Each ELU and local measurement of 3 out of 4 qubits in each ELU. As can be easily shown using standard stabilizer arguments, the resulting state is a 3D cluster state, up to local Hadamard gates on the edge qubits. A refined scheduling of operations, where no qubit is ever acted on by more than one (even commuting) gate at a time and qubits are never idle, is described in the Appendix.

Fault-tolerance threshold. We assume the following error model. (1) Every gate operation, i.e. preparation and measurement of individual qubits, gates within an ELU, and Bell pair creation between different ELUs, can all be achieved within a clock cycle of duration T . An erroneous one-qubit (two-qubit) gate is modeled by the perfect gate followed by a par-

tially depolarizing one-qubit (two qubit) channel. In the one-qubit channel, X , Y , and Z errors each occur with probability $\epsilon/3$. In the two-qubit channel, each of the 15 possible errors $X_1, X_2, X_1X_2, \dots, Z_1Z_2$ occurs with a probability of $\epsilon/15$. All gates have the same error ϵ . (2) In addition, the effect of decoherence per time step T is described by local probabilistic Pauli errors X , Y , Z , each happening with a probability $T/3\tau_D$. Under these assumptions, the known error threshold for fault-tolerant quantum computation with 3D-cluster states translates into the condition

$$\epsilon + \frac{55}{32} \frac{T}{\tau_D} < 2.9 \times 10^{-3}. \quad (1)$$

as derived in Appendix I.

Overhead. The operational cost of creating a 3D cluster state and then locally measuring it for the purpose of computation is 24 gates per elementary cell in the standard setting, and 54 gates per elementary cell in MUSIQ. The overhead of the MUSIQ architecture over fault-tolerant cluster state computation is thus constant. The operational overhead for fault-tolerance in the latter is poly-logarithmic [43]. For a discussion of operational cost in absolute terms, see [44].

The above construction fails for $\tau_E/\tau_D \geq 1$, where decoherence occurs while waiting for Bell-pair entanglement. However, scalable fault-tolerant computing can still be achieved in the MUSIQ architecture for *any* ratio τ_E/τ_D , even for ELUs of only 3 qubits. This result is based on an alternative construction described in Appendix II. It makes use of a defining feature of the MUSIQ architecture, that the average time to create entanglement is independent of distance. Compared to the case of $\tau_E \ll \tau_D$, the operational cost of fault-tolerance is increased by a factor that depends strongly on τ_E/τ_D but is *independent* of the size of the computation. Thus, while quantum computation becomes more costly when $\tau_E \geq \tau_D$, it remains scalable. This surprising result shows that there is no hard threshold for the ratio τ_E/τ_D , and opens up the possibility for efficient fault tolerance constructions with slow entangling gates.

Outlook

The success of silicon-based information processors in the past five decades hinged upon the scalability of integrated circuits (IC) technology characterized by Moore's law [45]. IC technology integrated all the components necessary to construct a functional circuit, using the same conceptual approach over many orders of magnitude in integration levels. The hierarchical modular ion trap quantum computer architecture discussed here promises scalability, not only in the number of physical systems (trapped ions) that represent the qubits, but also in the entire control structure to manipulate each qubit at such integration levels.

The technology necessary to realize each and every component of the MUSIQ architecture is either already available

or within reach. The recognition that ion traps can be mapped onto a two dimensional surface that can be fabricated using standard silicon microfabrication technologies [13, 16] has led to a rapid development in complex surface trap technology [17, 18]. Present-day trap development exploits extensive electromagnetic simulation codes to design optimized trap structures and control voltages, allowing sufficient control and stability of ion positioning. Integration of optical components into such microfabricated traps will enable stronger interaction between the ions and photons for better photon collection and qubit detection [46] through the use of high numerical aperture optics or integration of an optical cavity with the ion trap [33]. Moreover, electro-optic and MEMS-based beam steering systems allows the addressing of individual atoms in a chain with tightly focused laser beams [47, 48] and an optical interconnect network can be constructed using large-scale all-optical crossconnect switches [35]. While technical challenges such as the operation of narrowband (typically ultraviolet) lasers or the presence of residual heating of ion motion [21] still remain, they do not appear to be fundamental roadblocks to scalability. Within the MUSIQ architecture we have access to a full suite of technologies to realize the ELU in a scalable manner, where the detailed parameters of the architecture such as the number of ions per ELU, the number of ELUs, or the number of photonic interfaces per ELU can be adapted to optimize performance of the quantum computer.

Acknowledgments

We thank D. Bacon, M. Biercuk, B. Blinov, S. Flammia, D. L. Moehring, R. E. Slusher, for helpful discussions, and the Las Vegas cafe for hospitality. This work was supported by the Office of the Director of National Intelligence and Intelligence Advanced Research Projects Activity through the Army Research Office. LMD acknowledges in addition support by the NBRPC (973 Program) 2011CBA00300.

APPENDIX I: ANALYSIS OF FAULT-TOLERANCE FOR FAST ENTANGLING GATES

Scheduling. The operations can be scheduled such that (a) qubits are never idle, and (b) no qubit is acted upon by multiple gates (even commuting ones) at the same time. The latter is required in some proposals for realizing quantum gates with ion qubits. To this end, the schedule [43] for 3D cluster state generation is adapted to the MUSIQ architecture, and the three-step sequence shown in Fig. 5 of the main text is expanded into the five-step sequence shown here in Fig. 6. Through steps 1 - 3 the Bell pairs across the ELUs are created. Through steps 2 - 4 the CNOTs within each ELU are performed, and through steps 3 - 5 three qubits in each ELU are measured. The sequence of operations is such that each of the three ancilla qubits in every ELU lives for only three time

steps: initialization (to half of a Bell pair), CNOT, measurement. No qubit is ever idle in this protocol.

What remains to complete the computation is the local measurement of the 3D cluster state [43]. All remaining measurements are performed in Step 5 of the above procedure. This works trivially for cluster qubits intended for topological error correction or the implementation of topologically protected encoded Clifford gates [44], since these measurements require no adjustment of the measurement basis. To avoid delay in the measurement of qubits for the implementation of non-Clifford gates, it is necessary to break the 3D cluster states into overlapping slabs of bounded thickness [43].




Figure 6: Schedule for the creation of a 3D cluster state in the MUSIQC architecture. Upper line: Schedule for Bell pair production between ELUs representing face and edge qubits. Lower line: Schedule for the CNOT gates within the ELUs corresponding to the front faces of the lattice cell. Schedules for the ELUs on other faces and on edges are similar.

Threshold analysis. A criterion for the error threshold of measurement-based quantum computation with cluster states that has been established numerically for a variety of error models is

$$\langle K_{\partial q} \rangle (\{\text{error parameters}\}) = 0.70. \quad (2)$$

Therein, $K_{\partial q}$ is a cluster state stabilizer operator associated with the boundary of a single volume q , consisting of six faces. Be f a face of the three-dimensional cluster, and $K_f = \sigma_x^{(f)} \otimes_{e \in \partial f} \sigma_z^{(e)}$; See Fig. 8a. Then, $K_{\partial q} = \prod_{f \in \partial q} K_f = \otimes_{f \in \partial q} \sigma_x^{(f)}$. Furthermore, for the above criterion to apply, all errors—for preparation of local states, local and entangling unitaries, and measurement—are propagated forward or backward in time, to solely affect the 3D cluster state.

The above criterion applies for a phenomenological error-model with local memory error and measurement error (the threshold error probability per memory step and measurement is 2.9% [49]), for a gate-based error model (the threshold error probability per gate is 0.67% [43]), and further error models with only low-order correlated error. Specifically, the criterion (2) has numerically been tested for cluster state creation procedures with varying relative strength of local vs 2-local gate

error [43], with excellent agreement. In all cases, the error-correction was performed using Edmonds’ perfect matching algorithm.

The latter case covers the present situation. We have local errors with strength T/τ_D and ϵ , and 2-local errors with strength ϵ . The expectation value of the stabilizer operator $K_{\partial q}$ in Eq. (2) is

$$\langle K_{\partial q} \rangle = \prod_{E \in \text{error sources}} 1 - 2p_-(E). \quad (3)$$

Therein, $p_-(E)$ is the total probability of those Pauli errors in the error source E which, after (forward) propagation to the endpoint of the cluster state creation procedure, anti-commute with the stabilizer operator $K_{\partial q}$. The r.h.s. of Eq. (3) is simply a product because the statistical independence of the individual error sources. Since the cluster state creation procedure is of bounded temporal depth and built of local and nearest-neighbor gates only, errors can only propagate a finite distance. Therefore, only a finite number of error sources contribute in Eq. (3). To linear order in ϵ and T/τ_D , the result is

$$\langle K_{\partial q} \rangle = 1 - \frac{512}{5}\epsilon - 176\frac{T}{\tau_D}. \quad (4)$$

In combination with Criterion (2), this yields the threshold condition Eq. (1) from the main text.

Details of counting the error sources. Here we derive Eq. (4). To simplify the bookkeeping, we make the following observations. (a) A Bell state preparation, 2 CNOT gates (one on either side), and two local measurements on the qubits of the former Bell pair (one in the Z - and one in the X -basis) amount to a CNOT gate between remaining participating qubits. Therein, the qubit on the edge of the underlying lattice is the target, the qubit on the face is the control. We call this teleported CNOT a link. (b) Errors can only propagate once from face qubit to an edge qubit or vice versa, but never farther than that. To see this, consider e.g. a face qubit. There, an X - or Y -error can get propagated (face = control of CNOTs). In either case it causes an X -error on a neighboring edge qubit. But X -errors are not propagated from edge-qubits (edge = target of all CNOTs). (c) The stabilizer $K_{\partial q}$ has only support on face qubits, and is not affected by X -errors.

Based on these observations, we subdivide the error sources affecting $\langle K_{\partial q} \rangle$ into three categories, namely Type 1: First Bell pair created on each face (according to the 5-step schedule); Type 2: The CNOT links, consuming the remaining Bell pairs; and Type 3: The final measurements of the cluster qubits (1 per ELU).

Type-2 contributions: For every CNOT link we only need to count Z -errors (and $Y \cong Z$) on both the control (= face) and target (= edge), because on the face qubit the Z -errors are the ones that matter [with (c)], and on the edge qubit, such errors may still propagate to a neighboring face qubit [with (b)] and matter there. With these simplifications, the effective error of each CNOT link between two neighboring ELUs is described by the probabilities p_{ZI} for a Z -error on the face

qubit, p_{IZ} for a Z -error on the edge qubit, and p_{ZZ} for the combined error; and

$$p_{ZI} = 2\epsilon + \frac{10}{3} \frac{T}{\tau_D}, \quad p_{IZ} = p_{ZZ} = \frac{4}{15}\epsilon + \frac{2}{3} \frac{T}{\tau_D}. \quad (5)$$

Herein, we have only kept contributions up to linear order in $\epsilon, T/\tau_D$. The contributions to the error come from 1. the Bell pair, 2. a first round of memory error on all qubits, 3. the CNOT gates, 4. a second round of memory error on all qubits, and 5. the two local measurements per link.

Now we need to discuss the effect of each of the above gates on $\langle K_{\partial q} \rangle$, taking into account propagation effects. For example, consider the link established between the face qubit of a front face f with its left neighboring edge qubit. (The Bell pair for this link is created in Step 1, the required CNOTs are performed in Step 2, and the local measurements in Step 3.) The Z -error on f does not propagate further. The Z -error on e is propagated in later steps to a neighboring face, c.f. Fig. 6. Thus, the errors Z_f and Z_e of this gate affect $\langle K_{\partial q} \rangle$, and $Z_e Z_f$ doesn't. With Eq. (3), the gate in question reduces $\langle K_{\partial q} \rangle$ by a factor of $1 - 68/15\epsilon - 8T/\tau_D$.

The following links contribute: three for every face in ∂q from within the cell, and three more per face of ∂q from the neighboring cells (links ending in an edge belonging to the cell q can affect $\langle K_{\partial q} \rangle$ by propagation). (i) Contributions from within the cell. If a Z_e -error of the link propagates to an even (odd) number of neighboring faces in q , the total error probability affecting $\langle K_{\partial q} \rangle$ is $p_{ZZ} + p_{ZI}$ ($p_{IZ} + p_{ZI}$). But since $p_{IZ} = p_{ZZ}$, all 18 contribution from within the cell q are the same, irrespective of propagation. (ii) Contributions from neighboring cells. Each of the 18 links in question contributes an effective error probability $p_{IZ} + p_{ZZ}$ if an error on the edge qubit of the link propagates to an odd number of face qubits in ∂q . By inspection of Fig. 6, this happens for 6 links. With Eq. (5), all the type-2 errors reduce $\langle K_{\partial q} \rangle$ by a factor of

$$1 - 160 \frac{T}{\tau_D} - 88\epsilon. \quad (6)$$

Type-1 contributions: Each of the initial Bell pair creations carries a two-qubit gate error of strength ϵ , and memory error of strength T/τ_D on either qubit. Similar to the above case, we can group the 15 possible Pauli errors into the equivalence classes I, Z_f ($Z_e Z_f \equiv I$ and $Z_e \equiv Z_f$ for Bell states). The single remaining error probability, for Z_f , is

$$p_{ZI} = \frac{8}{15}\epsilon + \frac{4}{3} \frac{T}{\tau_D}. \quad (7)$$

For each face of ∂q , there is one Bell pair within the face that reduces $\langle K_{\partial q} \rangle$ by a factor of $1 - 2p_{ZI}$. Bell pairs from neighboring cells do not contribute an error here. Thus, all the type-1 errors reduce $\langle K_{\partial q} \rangle$ by a factor of

$$1 - 8 \frac{T}{\tau_D} - \frac{16}{5}\epsilon. \quad (8)$$

Again, only the contributions to linear order in $\epsilon, T/\tau_D$ were kept.

Type-3 contributions: The only remaining error source is in the measurement of the one qubit per ELU which is part of the 3D cluster state. The strength of the effective error on each face qubit is $p_Z = 2/3\epsilon$. Each of the six faces in ∂q is affected by this error. Thus, all the type-3 errors reduce $\langle K_{\partial q} \rangle$ by a factor of

$$1 - 8\epsilon. \quad (9)$$

Combining the contributions Eq. (6), (8), (9) of error types 1 - 3 yields Eq. (4) for the expectation value $\langle K_{\partial q} \rangle$.

APPENDIX II: ANALYSIS OF FAULT-TOLERANCE FOR SLOW ENTANGLING GATES

Here we show that scalable quantum computation can be achieved for arbitrarily slow entangling gates. There is no threshold for the ratio τ_E/τ_D that needs to be reached.

To this end, the main idea is to construct a ‘‘hypercell’’ out of several ELUs. A hypercell has the same storage capacity for quantum information as a single ELU, but with the ability to become (close to) deterministically entangled with four other hypercells. Fault-tolerant universal quantum computation can then be achieved by mapping to a 4-valent, three-dimensional cluster state [43]. First, we show that arbitrarily large ratios τ_E/τ_D can be tolerated in the limiting case where the gate error rate $\epsilon = 0$ (construction I). Then, we show how to tolerate arbitrarily large ratios τ_E/τ_D with finite gate errors $\epsilon > 0$ (construction II).

Hypercell construction I is based on the snowflake design [50],[51]; see Fig. 7a. The difference is that in the present case, each node in the connectivity tree represents an entire ELU, not a single qubit as in [50, 51]. At the root of the tree is an ELU that contains the qubit used in the computation, while multiple layers of bifurcating branches lead to a large ‘‘surface area’’ with many ports from which to attempt entanglement generation between two trees. If two neighboring surface areas are large enough, the probability of creating a Bell pair between them via a probabilistic photonic link approaches unity. Once a Bell pair is created, it can be converted to a Bell pair between the root qubits A and B via teleportation; see Fig. 7b.

The links (each representing a Bell pair) within a snowflake structure are created probabilistically, each with a probability p of heralded success. The success probability for the entire structure is thus very small, but it is constant in the size of the computation. Correspondingly, the operational cost of creating a hypercell is large; but it is independent of the size of the computation. The hypercell offers a qubit which can be near-deterministically entangled with a constant number of other qubits *on demand*. A quantum computer made up of such hypercells can create a four-valent, 3D cluster state with few missing qubits, and is thus fault-tolerant [43], [52], [61]. Hypercells can readily be implemented in the modular ion trap quantum computer since the probability of entanglement gen-




Figure 7: Hypercell construction I. (a) Snowflake design of [50, 51]. (b) Two hypercells connecting. If the surface area is large, with high probability one or more Bell pairs are created between the surface areas via the photonic link. By Bell measurements within individual ELUs (indicated by ovals) one such Bell pair is teleported to the roots A, B . (c) Boundary of the fault-tolerance region for gate error ϵ and ratio τ_E/τ_D , for various ELU sizes. The threshold for the gate error ϵ depends only weakly on τ_E/τ_D .

eration does not depend on the physical distance between the ELUs.

We call the part of the hypercell needed to connect to a neighboring hypercell a “tree”. For ELUs of coordination number 3, the number m of ports that are available to connect two hypercells is twice the number of ELUs in the top layer of the tree. The probability for all m attempts to generate entanglement between two trees to fail is $P_{\text{fail}} = (1 - p)^m \approx \exp(-mp)$. (In practice, we will allow a constant probability of failure which is tolerable in 3D cluster states [52].) In addition, the number of ELUs in the top layer is $2^{\# \text{ layers}}$, and the path length l (number of Bell pairs between the roots) is $l = 2 \log_2 m + 1$. Combining the above, we find that $l = 2 \log_2 \frac{c}{p} + 1$, for $c = -\ln P_{\text{fail}}$. For simplification we assume that the time t for attempting entanglement generation is the same when creating the trees and when connecting the trees. Then, $p = t/\tau_E$ in both cases. From the beginning of the creation of the trees to completion of entangling two trees, a time $2t$ has passed. The Bell pairs within the trees have been around, on average, for a time $3t/2$, and the Bell pairs

between the two trees for an average time of $t/2$. If overall error probabilities remain small, the total probability of error for creating a Bell pair is proportional to l . The memory error alone is

$$\epsilon_{\text{mem}} = \frac{t}{\tau_D} \left[3 \log_2 \left(c \frac{\tau_E}{t} \right) + \frac{1}{2} \right]. \quad (10)$$

This function is monotonically increasing with t , and $\epsilon_{\text{mem}}(t = 0) = 0$. The task now is to suppress the memory error rate ϵ_{mem} below the error threshold ϵ_{crit} that applies to fault-tolerant quantum computation with 3D cluster states. From Eq. (2) we know that $\epsilon_{\text{crit}} > 0$.

From Eq. (10) we find that, for any ratio τ_E/τ_D , we can make t small enough such that $\epsilon_{\text{mem}} < \epsilon_{\text{crit}}$. The operational cost for creating a hypercell with sufficiently many ports is $O(\text{hypercell}) \sim \left(\frac{1}{p} \right)^{\frac{9/2c}{p}}$. This cost is high for small $p = t/\tau_E$, but independent of the size of the computation. Thus, whenever decoherence on waiting qubits is the only source of error, scalable fault-tolerant QC is possible for arbitrarily slow entangling gates.

We now discuss how the above hypercell construction I fares in the presence of additional gate error ϵ . We model every noisy one-(two)-qubit operation by the perfect operation followed by a $SU(2)$ - ($SU(4)$ -) invariant partial depolarizing channel with strength ϵ . Specifically, in the one-qubit channel, Pauli errors $\sigma_x, \sigma_y, \sigma_z$ each occur independently with a probability $\epsilon/3$. For the two-qubit channel, each of the 15 possible Pauli errors $\sigma_x^{(1)}, \sigma_x^{(2)}, \sigma_x^{(1)}\sigma_x^{(2)}, \dots, \sigma_z^{(1)}\sigma_z^{(2)}$ occurs with a probability of $\epsilon/15$.

If $\epsilon > 0$ then every entanglement swap adds error to the computation. We must swap entanglement in every ELU on the path between the roots A and B , and because there are $2 \log_2 m$ of them ($m \geq 2$), for $\epsilon \ll 1$ the total error is

$$\epsilon_{\text{total}} = \frac{t}{\tau_D} \left[3 \log_2 \left(c \frac{\tau_E}{t} \right) + \frac{1}{2} \right] + 2\epsilon \log_2 \left(c \frac{\tau_E}{t} \right). \quad (11)$$

Now it is no longer true that for any choice of τ_E/τ_D we can realize $\epsilon_{\text{crit}} > \epsilon_{\text{total}}$. A non-vanishing gate error sets an upper limit to the tree depth, because the accumulated gate error is proportional to the tree depth; see Fig. 7b. This implies an upper bound on the size of the top layer of the tree. This implies a lower bound on the time t needed to attempt entangling the two trees, cf. Eq. (12). This implies a lower bound on the memory error caused by decoherence during the time interval t . The accumulated memory error alone may be above or below the error threshold, depending on the ratio τ_E/τ_D .

In more detail, suppose that $\epsilon_{\text{crit}} > \epsilon_{\text{total}}$ holds. Considering only gate errors, $\epsilon_{\text{crit}} > 2\epsilon \log_2 \left(c \frac{\tau_E}{t} \right)$, and hence,

$$t > c\tau_E 2^{-\frac{\epsilon_{\text{crit}}}{2\epsilon}}. \quad (12)$$

Now, recalling that $c \frac{\tau_E}{t} = m \geq 2$, with Eq. (11) we find that $\epsilon_{\text{crit}} > 3t/\tau_D + 2\epsilon$, or

$$t < \frac{1}{3}(\epsilon_{\text{crit}} - 2\epsilon)\tau_D. \quad (13)$$




Figure 8: Hypercell construction II. (a) Lattice cell of a three-dimensional four-valent cluster state. The dashed lines represent the edges of the elementary cell and the full lines represent the edges of the connectivity graph. (b) Creating probabilistic links between several 3D cluster states. (c) Reduction of a 3D cluster state to a 5-qubit graph state, via Pauli measurements. The shaded regions represent measurements of Z , the blank regions represent measurements of X . The qubits represented as black dots remain unmeasured. For details, see [43]. (d) Linking graph states by Bell measurements in the remaining ELUs. Four-valent, 3D cluster states of arbitrary size can be created.

The two conditions Eq. (12) and (13) can be simultaneously obeyed only if

$$\frac{\tau_E}{\tau_D} < \frac{\epsilon_{\text{crit}} - 2\epsilon}{3c} 2^{\frac{\epsilon_{\text{crit}}}{2\epsilon}} \quad (14)$$

We see that there is now an upper bound to the ratio τ_E/τ_D . Eq. (14) is a necessary but not sufficient condition for fault-tolerant quantum computation using the hypercells of Fig. 7c.

We have numerically simulated the process of constructing the hypercells of type I, for various values of the decoherence parameters ϵ and τ_E/τ_D . The boundary of the fault-tolerance region in the $\tau_E/\tau_D, \epsilon$ -plane is shown in Fig. 7c. In the above, for simplicity, we have considered hypercells in which all constituent ELUs are entangled in a single timestep t . However, there are various possible refinements. (1) The computational overhead can be significantly decreased by creating the hypercell in stages, starting with the leaves of the trees and iteratively combining them to create the next layers [50]. (2) Using numerical simulations it was found that if each of the 4 trees making up a hypercell has coordination number 4 or 5 rather than 3 (i.e., a ternary tree instead of a binary tree), the overhead can be further reduced. These optimizations were used to produce Figure 7c.

Hypercell construction II allows fault-tolerance for finite gate errors $\epsilon > 0$. In construction I, the accumulated error for

creating a Bell pair between the roots A and B is linear in the path length l between A and B . This limits the path length l , and thereby the surface area of the hypercell. This limitation can be overcome by invoking three-dimensional (3D) cluster states already at the level of creating the hypercell. 3D cluster states have an intrinsic capability for fault-tolerance [43] related to quantum error correction with surface codes [53, 54]. For the hypercell of type II we employ a 3D cluster state nested within another 3D cluster state. Therein, the “outer” cluster state is created near-deterministically from the hypercells. Its purpose is to ensure fault-tolerance of the construction. The “inner” 3D cluster state is created probabilistically. Its purpose is to provide a means to connect distant qubits in such a way that the error of the operation does not grow with distance. Specifically, if the local error level is below the threshold for error-correction with 3D cluster states, the error of (quasi-) deterministically creating a Bell pair between two root qubits A and B in distinct 3D cluster states is independent of the path length between A and B .

The construction is as follows. We start from a three-dimensional grid with ELUs on the edges and on the faces. Each ELU contains four qubits and can be linked to four neighboring ELUs. Such a grid of ELUs (of suitable size) is used to probabilistically create a 4-valent cluster state by probabilistic generation of Bell pairs between the ELUs, post-selection and local operations within the ELUs.

After such cluster states have been successfully created, in each ELU three qubits are freed up, and can now be used for near-deterministic links between different 3D cluster states. See Fig. 8b. After 4 probabilistic links to other clusters have succeeded (the size of the cluster states is chosen such that this is a likely event), the cluster state is transformed into a star-shaped graph state via X and Z measurements; see Fig. 8c. This graph state contains 5 qubits, shared between the 4 ELUs at which the successful links start, and an additional ELU. Due to the topological error-correction capability of 3D cluster states, the conversion from the 3D cluster state to the star-shaped graph state is fault-tolerant [43]. By further measurement in the ELUs, the graph states created in different hypercells can now be linked, e.g. to form again a 4-valent 3D cluster state which is a resource for fault-tolerant quantum computation [43]; see Fig. 8d. This final linking step is prone to error. However, the error level is independent of the size of the hypercell, which was not the case for hypercell construction I.

The only error sources remaining after error-correction in the 3D cluster stem from (i) the (two) ports per link, and (ii) the two root qubits A and B , which are not protected topologically. The total error ϵ_{total} of a Bell pair created between A and B in this case is given by $\epsilon_{\text{total}} = c_1 t/\tau_D + c_2 \epsilon$, where t is the time spent attempting Bell pair generation, and c_1 and c_2 are algebraic constants which do not depend on the time scales τ_E and τ_D , and not on the distance between the root qubits A and B . Then, if the threshold error rate ϵ_{crit} for fault-tolerance of the outer 3D cluster state is larger than $c_2 \epsilon$, we can reach an overall error ϵ_{total} below the threshold value ϵ_{crit}

by making t sufficiently small. Smaller t requires larger inner 3D cluster states, but does not limit the success probability for linking type II hypercells. Thus, fault-tolerance is possible for all ratios τ_E/τ_D , even in the presence of small gate errors.

APPENDIX III: ARCHITECTURE MODELS FOR QUANTUM CIRCUITS

We have constructed simple models for quantum computer architectures to estimate the execution time of useful algorithms. In our simplified model, we consider (1) hardware capable of implementing a Steane $[[7,1,3]]$ quantum error correction code to one level of concatenation, (2) where all gate operations are performed following fault-tolerant procedures. This simplified model is designed to estimate the execution time of the circuits in such architecture, and not intended to provide the complete fault-tolerant analysis of the quantum circuit. For this analysis, we therefore require that the physical error levels are sufficiently low to produce the correct answer with order-unity probability using only one level of concatenation of Steane code. The hardware is based on trapped ion quantum computing with the assumptions for the timescales for quantum operation primitives summarized in Table I.

Universal Fault-Tolerant QC using Steane Code

We utilize the basic operational primitives of universal quantum computation using Steane $[[7,1,3]]$ code [55] fully outlined in Ref. [23], summarized below.

1. The preparation of logical qubit $|0\rangle_L$ is performed by measuring the six stabilizers of the code using four-qubit cat state $|cat\rangle_4 \equiv (|0000\rangle + |1111\rangle)/\sqrt{2}$, using the procedure that minimizes the use of ancilla qubits as outlined in Ref. [56]. The stabilizer measurement is performed up to three times to ensure that the error arising from the measurement process itself can be corrected. We perform a sequential measurement of the six stabilizers re-using the four ancilla qubits for each logical qubit, which reduces the number of physical qubits and parallel operations necessary for the state preparation at the expense of the execution time. Once all the stabilizers are measured, a three-qubit cat state is used to measure the logical Z_L operator to finalize qubit initialization process. This procedure requires eleven physical qubits to complete preparation of logical qubit $|0\rangle_L$.
2. In this code, all operations in the Pauli group $\{X_L, Y_L, Z_L\}$ and the Clifford group $\{H_L, S_L, CNOT_L\}$ can be performed transversally (i.e., in a bit-wise fashion). We assume seven parallel operations are available, so that these logical operations can be executed in one time step corresponding to the single- or two-qubit operation. The transversal

$CNOT_L$ considered here is between two qubits that are close by, so the operation can be performed locally without further need for qubit communication.

3. In order to construct effective arithmetic circuits, we need Toffoli gate (a.k.a. $CCNOT_L$) which is not in the Clifford group. Since a transversal implementation of this gate is not possible in Steane code, fault-tolerant implementation requires preparation of a special three (logical) qubit state

$$|\phi_+\rangle_L = \frac{1}{2}(|000\rangle_L + |010\rangle_L + |100\rangle_L + |111\rangle_L), \quad (15)$$

and “teleport” the gate into this state [57]. This state can be prepared by measuring its stabilizer operator using a 7-qubit cat state on three logical qubits $|0\rangle_L$, as shown in Fig. 9a. Successful preparation of this state requires a bitwise Toffoli gate (at the physical level), which we assume can only be performed locally among qubits that are close to one another. Once this state is prepared, the three qubits $|x\rangle_L$, $|y\rangle_L$ and $|z\rangle_L$ participating in the Toffoli gate can be teleported to execute the gate, as shown in Fig. 9b. Therefore, a successful Toffoli gate operation requires 3 logical qubits (which in turn require extra ancilla qubits to initialize) and 7 physical qubits as ancillary qubits, on top of the three logical qubits on which the gate operates on.

4. When a $CNOT$ gate is necessary between two qubits that are separated by large distances, we take the approach where the two qubits of a maximally-entangled




Figure 9: Circuit diagram for realizing fault-tolerant Toffoli gate using Steane code. (a) The initial state $|\phi_+\rangle_L$ is prepared by measuring the X_1 and $CNOT_{12}$ of three qubit state $|0\rangle_1(|0\rangle_2 + |1\rangle_2)|0\rangle_3/\sqrt{2}$. Note that the Toffoli gate shown here is a bitwise Toffoli between the 7-qubit cat state and the two logical qubit states. (b) Using the state prepared in (a), Toffoli gate can be realized using only measurement, Clifford group gates and classical communication, all of which can be implemented fault-tolerantly in the Steane code.

Table I: Assumptions on the timescales of quantum operation primitives used in the model.

Quantum Primitive	Single-Qubit Gate	Two-Qubit Gate	Toffoli Gate	Qubit Measurement	Remote Entanglement Generation
Operation Time (μ s)	1	10	10	100	10000

state is each distributed to the vicinity of the two qubits, and then the gate is teleported using the protocol proposed in Ref. [58]. Efficient distribution of the entangled states makes this approach much more effective than where the qubits themselves are transported directly.

Construction of Efficient Arithmetic Circuits

The example quantum circuit we analyze is an adder circuit that computes the sum of two n -bit numbers. Simple adder circuits form the basis of more complex arithmetic circuits, such as the modular exponentiation circuit at the heart of Shor’s factoring algorithm [59]. Quantum adder circuits can be constructed using X , $CNOT$ and Toffoli gates. Quantum ripple-carry adders (QRCA) require minimal hardware resources but features runtime of $O(n)$, and was optimized by Cuccaro et al. [40]. More advanced adder circuits are available, that requires additional hardware (qubits and parallel operations) but dramatically reduces the runtime to $O(\log n)$ [60]. Here, we analyze the case of a quantum carry lookahead adder (QCLA) summarized by Draper et al. [41], which dramatically outperforms the ripple-carry adders for n above ~ 100 in terms of execution time.

Practical implementation of large-scale QCLAs are hindered by the requirement of executing Toffoli gates among qubits that are separated by long distances within the quantum computer. MUSIQC architecture flattens the communication cost between qubits in different ELUs, providing a suitable platform for implementing QCLAs. Alternatively, nested entanglement swapping protocol proposed for quantum teleportation can be used to efficiently distribute maximally-entangled states in a hardware where only local gates are available, as long as a dedicated communication bus is provided. Such quantum logic array (QLA) architecture can also effectively execute QCLAs [38].

MUSIQC Implementation

In order to implement the QCLA circuit in MUSIQC architecture, each ELU should be large enough to accommodate the generation of the $|\phi_+\rangle_L$ state shown in Fig. 9a. This requires a minimum of 3 logical qubits and a 7-qubit cat state, and sufficient ancilla qubits to support the state preparation. We balance the qubit resource requirements with computation time by requiring four ancilla qubits per logical qubit, so that the 4-qubit cat states necessary for the stabilizer measurement

can be created in parallel. Implementation of each Toffoli gate is realized by allocating a fresh ELU and preparing the $|\phi_+\rangle_L$ state, then teleporting the three qubits from other ELUs into this state. Once the gate is performed, the original logical qubits from the other ELUs are freed up and become available for another Toffoli gate. We find that $6n/4 = 1.5n$ logical qubits placed on $6n/4 = 1.5n$ ELUs is sufficient to compute the sum of two n -bit integers using the QCLA circuit.

Teleportation of qubits into the ELU containing the prepared $|\phi_+\rangle_L$ state requires generation of entangled states via photon exchange. In order to minimize the entanglement generation time, one should provide at least three optical ports to connect to these ELUs in parallel. In order to successfully teleport the gate, we need to create seven entangled pairs to each ELU holding the input qubits. The entanglement generation time can be reduced by running multiple optical ports to other ELUs in parallel (we call this the *port multiplexity* m_p). In a typical entanglement generation procedure, the ion is prepared in an initial state, and then excited using a short pulse laser (~ 1 ps). The ion emits a photon over a spontaneous emission lifetime (~ 10 ns), and the photon detection process will determine whether the entanglement generation from a pair of such ions is successful. If the entanglement generation is successful, the pair is ready for use in the computation. If not, the ions will be re-initialized ($\sim 1\mu$ s) and the process is repeated. Since the initialization time of the ion is ~ 100 times longer than the time a photon is propagating in the optical port, one can utilize multiple ions per optical port and “pipeline” the photon emission process. In this time-division-multiplex (TDM) scheme, another ion is brought into the optical port to make another entanglement generation attempt through the optical port while the initialization process is proceeding for the unsuccessful ion. This process can be repeated m_T times using as many extra ions, before the first ion can be brought back (we call m_T the *TDM multiplexity*). Using the port and TDM multiplexity, we can reduce the entanglement generation time by a factor of $m_p m_T$.

In our example, we assume multiplexities $m_p = 2$ and $m_T = 10$ that require 100 qubits ($= 3 \times 7 + 3 \times 4 + 3 \times 2 \times 10$) and 12 parallel operations per ELU as shown in Fig. ??a. This choice adequately speeds up the communication time between ELUs to balance out other operation times in the hardware. Multiple ELUs are connected by an optical switch to complete the MUSIQC hardware (Fig. 1b). With these resources, an efficient implementation of QCLA circuit can realized by executing all necessary logic gates in parallel. Under these circumstances, the depth of the n -bit in-place adder circuit is given by [41]




Figure 10: Example of the QLA hardware considered. (a) Each logic unit is made up of 49 physical qubits hosting four logical qubits and necessary ancilla qubits. (b) A logic block is six such logic units embedded in communication units. Communication units are square arrangements of 7×7 qubits, and eight such units fully surround the logic unit.

$$\lfloor \log_2 n \rfloor + \lfloor \log_2(n-1) \rfloor + \lfloor \log_2 \frac{n}{3} \rfloor + \lfloor \log_2 \frac{n-1}{3} \rfloor + 14, \quad (16)$$

for sufficiently large n ($n > 6$) where $\lfloor x \rfloor$ denotes the largest integer not greater than x . Out of these, two time steps contain X gates, four contain $CNOT$ gates, and the rest contain Toffoli gates which dominate the execution time of the circuit. We assume an error correction step is performed on all qubits after each time step, by measuring all stabilizers of the Steane code and making necessary corrections based on the measurement outcome.

QLA Implementation

QLA and its variations utilize dedicated communication qubits to connect remote qubits in logarithmic time as a function of their separation. Even in the case of qubit arrays where only nearest neighbor qubit gates are allowed, this strategy can be adopted to effectively implement QCLA adder circuits in sub-polynomial time [38]. In this section, we consider a concrete layout of a QLA device optimized for n -bit adder with one level of Steane [[7,1,3]] encoding.

In order to implement the fault-tolerant Toffoli gate described in Fig. 9, one should assemble four logical qubits into a single tight unit, as we did for the ELUs in the MUSIQC ar-

chitecture. In the QLA implementation, a “Logic Unit (LU)” consists of a square of 49 ($= 7 \times 7$) qubits, where a block of 12 ($= 3 \times 4$) qubits form a logical qubit with 7 physical qubits and 5 ancilla qubits (Fig. 10a). Just like in the MUSIQC example, $6n$ logical qubits placed on $1.5n$ LUs are necessary for adding two n bit numbers. Therefore, we organize six LUs into a logical block (LB), capable of adding two 4 bit numbers. Each LU in the LB is surrounded by eight blocks of 7×7 communication units dedicated for distributing entanglement using the quantum repeater protocol (Fig. 10b). We assume that the communication of the qubits within each LU is “free”, and do not consider the time it takes for such communication. This simplified assumption is justified as the communication time between LUs utilizing the qubits in the communication units dominate the computation time, and therefore does not change the qualitative conclusion of this estimate.

Similar to the MUSIQC hardware example, a Toffoli gate execution involves the preparation of the state $|\phi_+\rangle_L$ state in an “empty” LU, then teleporting three qubits onto this LU to complete the gate operation. The execution time of the Toffoli gate therefore is comprised of the time it takes to prepare the $|\phi_+\rangle_L$ state, the time it takes to distribute entanglement between adequate pairs of LUs, and then utilizing the distributed entanglement to teleport the gate operation. Among these, the distribution time for the entanglement is a function of the distance between the two LUs involved, while the other two are independent of the distance.

QCLA circuit involves various stages of Toffoli gates, where the “distance” between qubits goes as 2^t , where $1 \leq t \leq \lfloor \log_2 n \rfloor$ [41]. In a 2D layout as considered in Fig. 10, the linear distance between these two qubits goes as $\sqrt{2^t}$, in units of the number of communication units that the entanglement must be generated over. A slightly more careful analysis shows that the linear distance is approximately given by $d(t) = 3 \cdot 2^{t/2} + 1$ when t is even, and $d(t) = 2^{(t+1)/2} + 1$ when t is odd. Since each communication unit has 7 qubits along a length, the actual teleportation distance is $L(t) = 7d(t)$ in units of the length of ion chain. The nested entanglement swapping protocol can create entanglement between the two end ions in $\lfloor \log_2 L(t) \rfloor$ time steps, where each time step consists of one $CNOT$ gate, two single qubit gates, and one qubit measurement process. Using the expression for $d(t)$, we approximate $\log_2 L(t) \approx t/2 + 4$ for both even and odd t , without loss of much accuracy. Unlike in the case of MUSIQC, the entanglement generation time is now dependent on the distance between the qubits (although only in a logarithmic way), and the resulting time steps needed for entanglement distribution within the QCLA is (approximately) given by

$$\lfloor \log_2 n \rfloor (\lfloor \log_2 n \rfloor + 17)/4 + \lfloor \log_2(n-1) \rfloor (\lfloor \log_2(n-1) \rfloor + 17)/4 + \lfloor \log_2 \frac{n}{3} \rfloor (\lfloor \log_2 \frac{n}{3} \rfloor + 17)/4 + \lfloor \log_2 \frac{n-1}{3} \rfloor (\lfloor \log_2 \frac{n-1}{3} \rfloor + 17)/4. \quad (17)$$

Table II: Summary of the resource estimation and execution times of various adders in MUSIQC and QLA architecture.

Performance Metrics	QCLA on MUSIQC	QCLA on QLA	QRCA on NN
Physical Qubits	$150n$	$1,176n$	$20(n+1)$
# Parallel Operations	$18n$	$110n$	$8n + 43$
Logical Toffoli Time	7,520	4,357 ^a	3,909
128-bit addition	0.35 s	0.24 s	1.0 s
1,024-bit addition	0.47 s	0.34 s	8.1 s
16,384-bit addition	0.64 s	0.47 s	130 s

^aDoes not include entanglement distribution time

It should be noted that in order to achieve this logarithmic time, one has to have the ability to perform two qubit gate between every pair of qubits in the entire communication units in parallel. The addition of two n qubit numbers require $n/4$ LBs. Since each LB has 18 communication units, there are a total of $7 \times 7 \times 18 = 882$ communication qubits in a LB. The number of parallel operations necessary is therefore 441 simultaneous *CNOT* operations per LB, or $441n/4 \approx 110n$ parallel operations for n bit QCLA. The number of *X*, *CNOT* and Toffoli gates that have to be performed remains identical to the MUSIQC case since we are executing identical circuit. We assume that the error correction is performed after every logic gate, but the entanglement distribution process has high enough fidelity so that no further distillation process is necessary.

Comparison

Table II summarizes the resource requirements and performance of the QCLA circuit on MUSIQC and QLA architecture, as well as QRCA circuit on a nearest neighbor (NN) quantum hardware, where multi-qubit gates can only operate on qubits sitting right next to one another. Although the QLA architecture considered in this example is also a NN hardware, presence of the dedicated communication units (quantum bus) allows remote gate operation with the execution time that depends only logarithmically on the distance between qubits, enabling fast execution of the QCLA. The cost in resources, however, is significant: realization of efficient communication channel requires ~ 3 times as many physical qubits as used for storing and manipulating the qubits, and requires a large number of parallel operations and the necessary control hardware to run them. The execution time is fast compared to the MUSIQC architecture, due to the probabilistic nature of the photonic network in establishing the entanglement. We have dedicated substantial resources in MUSIQC to speed up the entanglement generation time. Although MUSIQC architecture will take $\sim 50\%$ more time to execute the adder circuit, the resources it requires to operate the same task is only about 15% of that required in the QLA architecture. In both cases, we note the importance of moving qubits between different

parts of a large quantum computer.

Due to the large number of resources necessary to connect different parts of the quantum computer together, the complexity of the QLA hardware grows very quickly. It is difficult to envision how to realize all the qubits and their control hardware as the number of ions that have to intimately interact increases. MUSIQC architecture provides a more technologically tractable approach to realizing a scalable quantum computer, as the computer is broken up into smaller chunks (in our example, ~ 100 qubits) more amenable for practical realization.

* Electronic address: monroe@umd.edu

- [1] T. D. Ladd, F. Jelezko, R. Laflamme, Y. Nakamura, C. Monroe, and J. L. O'Brien, *Nature* **464**, 45 (2010).
- [2] D. Wineland and R. Blatt, *Nature* **453**, 1008 (2008).
- [3] M. Neeley, R. C. Bialczak, M. Lenander, E. Lucero, M. Mariantoni, A. D. O'Connell, D. Sank, H. Wang, M. Weides, J. Wenner, et al., *Nature* **467**, 570 (2010).
- [4] L. DiCarlo, M. D. Reed, L. Sun, B. R. Johnson, J. M. Chow, J. M. Gambetta, L. Frunzio, S. M. Girvin, M. H. Devoret, and R. J. Schoelkopf, *Nature* **467**, 574 (2010).
- [5] D. D. Thaker, T. S. Metodi, and F. T. Chong, in *High Performance Computing - HiPC 2006, 13th International Conference, Bangalore, India, December 18-21, 2006, Proceedings* (2006), pp. 111–122.
- [6] D. L. Moehring, M. J. Madsen, K. C. Younge, J. R. N. Kohn, P. Maunz, L.-M. Duan, C. Monroe, and B. B. Blinov, *J. Opt. Soc. Am. B* **24**, 300 (2007).
- [7] F. Helmer, M. Mariantoni, A. G. Fowler, J. von Delft, E. Solano, and F. Marquardt, *Europhys. Lett.* **85**, 50007 (2009).
- [8] N. Y. Yao, L. Jiang, A. V. Gorshkov, P. C. Maurer, G. Giedke, J. Cirac, and M. D. Lukin, *Nature Communications* **3**, 800 (2012).
- [9] K. Fujii, T. Yamamoto, M. Koashi, and N. Imoto, arXiv:quant-ph/1202.6588 (2012).
- [10] H. Häffner, C. Roos, and R. Blatt, *Phys. Rep.* **469**, 155 (2008).
- [11] D. Kielpinski, C. Monroe, and D. Wineland, *Nature* **417**, 709 (2002).
- [12] D. J. Wineland, C. Monroe, W. M. Itano, D. Leibfried, B. E. King, and D. M. Meekhof, *J. Res. Nat. Inst. Stand. Tech.* **103**, 259 (1998).
- [13] J. Chiaverini, R. B. Blakestad, J. Britton, J. D. Jost, C. Langer, D. Leibfried, R. Ozeri, and D. Wineland, *Quant. Inf. Comp.* **5**, 419 (2005).
- [14] S. Seidelin, J. Chiaverini, R. Reichle, J. J. Bollinger, D. Leibfried, J. Britton, J. H. Wesenberg, R. B. Blakestad, R. J. Epstein, D. B. Hume, et al., *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **96**, 253003 (2006).
- [15] S. X. Wang, J. Labaziewicz, Y. Ge, R. Shewmon, and I. L. Chuang, *Phys. Rev. A* **81**, 062332 (2010).
- [16] J. Kim, S. Pau, Z. Ma, H. McLellan, J. Gages, A. Kornblit, and R. Slusher, *Quant. Inf. Comp.* **5**, 515 (2005).
- [17] D. L. Moehring, C. Highstrete, D. Stick, K. M. Fortier, R. Haltli, C. Tigges, and M. G. Blain, *New J. Phys.* **13**, 075018 (2011).
- [18] J. T. Merrill, C. Volin, D. Landgren, J. M. Amini, K. Wright, S. C. Doret, C.-S. Pai, H. Hayden, T. Killian, D. Faircloth, et al., *New J. Phys.* **13**, 103005 (2011).
- [19] M. D. Barrett, B. DeMarco, T. Schaetz, V. Meyer, D. Leibfried,

- J. Britton, J. Chiaverini, W. M. Itano, B. Jelenkovi, J. D. Jost, et al., Phys. Rev. A **68**, 042302 (2003).
- [20] Q. A. Turchette, D. Kielpinski, B. E. King, D. Leibfried, D. M. Meekhof, C. J. Myatt, M. A. Rowe, C. A. Sackett, C. S. Wood, W. M. Itano, et al., Phys. Rev. A **61**, 063418 (2000).
- [21] L. Deslauriers, S. Olmschenk, D. Stick, W. K. Hensinger, J. Sterk, and C. Monroe, Phys. Rev. Lett. **97**, 103007 (2006).
- [22] J. Labaziewicz, Y. Ge, D. R. Leibbrandt, S. X. Wang, R. Shewmon, and I. L. Chuang, Phys. Rev. Lett. **101**, 180602 (2008).
- [23] M. A. Nielsen and I. L. Chuang, *Quantum Computation and Quantum Information* (Cambridge University Press, 2000).
- [24] J. I. Cirac and P. Zoller, Phys. Rev. Lett. **74**, 4091 (1995).
- [25] A. Sørensen and K. Mølmer, Phys. Rev. Lett. **82**, 1971 (1999).
- [26] C. Ospelkaus, C. E. Langer, J. M. Amini, K. R. Brown, D. Leibfried, and D. J. Wineland, Phys. Rev. Lett. **101**, 090502 (2008).
- [27] S.-L. Zhu, C. Monroe, and L.-M. Duan, Europhys. Lett. **73**, 485 (2006).
- [28] G.-D. Lin and L.-M. Duan, New Journal of Physics **13**, 075015 (2011).
- [29] C. Cabrillo, J. I. Cirac, P. Garcia-Fernandez, and P. Zoller, Phys. Rev. A **59**, 1025 (1999).
- [30] L.-M. Duan and J. Kimble, Phys. Rev. Lett. **90**, 253601 (2003).
- [31] C. Simon and W. T. M. Irvine, Phys. Rev. Lett. **91**, 110405 (2003).
- [32] D. L. Moehring, P. Maunz, S. Olmschenk, K. C. Younge, D. N. Matsukevich, L.-M. Duan, and C. Monroe, Nature **449**, 68 (2007).
- [33] T. Kim, P. Maunz, and J. Kim, Phys. Rev. A **84**, 063423 (2011).
- [34] P. O. Schmidt, T. Rosenband, C. Langer, W. M. Itano, J. C. Bergquist, and D. J. Wineland, Science **309**, 749 (2005).
- [35] J. Kim, C. Nuzman, B. Kumar, D. Lieuwen, J. Kraus, A. Weiss, C. Lichtenwalner, A. Papazian, R. Frahm, N. Basavanhally, et al., IEEE Photon. Technol. Lett. **15**, 1537 (2003).
- [36] D. Neilson, R. Frahm, P. Kolodner, C. Bolle, R. Ryf, J. Kim, A. Papazian, C. Nuzman, A. Gasparyan, N. Basavanhally, et al., J. Lightwave Technol. **22**, 1499 (2004).
- [37] R. Raussendorf and H. J. Briegel, Phys. Rev. Lett. **86**, 5188 (2001).
- [38] T. S. Metodi, D. D. Thaker, A. W. Cross, F. T. Chong, and I. L. Chuang, Proc. 38th Annual IEEE/ACM Int. Symp. on Microarchitecture (MICRO'05) p. 12 (2005).
- [39] T. S. Metodi, D. D. Thaker, A. W. Cross, I. L. Chuang, and F. T. Chong, ACM Journal on Emerging Technologies in Computing Systems (JETC) **4** (2008).
- [40] S. A. Cuccaro, T. G. Draper, S. A. Kutin, and D. P. Moulton, arXiv:quant-ph/0410184v1 (2004).
- [41] T. G. Draper, S. A. Kutin, E. M. Rains, and K. M. Svore, Quant. Inf. Comput. **6**, 351 (2006).
- [42] E. Knill, Nature **434**, 39 (2005).
- [43] R. Raussendorf, J. Harrington, and K. Goyal, Ann. Phys. **321**, 2242 (2006).
- [44] R. Raussendorf, J. Harrington, and K. Goyal, New Journal of Physics **9**, 199 (2007).
- [45] G. E. Moore, Electronics **38** (1965).
- [46] J. Kim and C. Kim, Quant. Inf. Comput. **9**, 181 (2009).
- [47] F. Schmidt-Kaler, H. Häffner, M. Riebe, S. Gulde, G. P. T. Lancaster, T. Deuschle, C. Becher, C. F. Roos, J. Eschner, and R. Blatt, Nature **422**, 408 (2003).
- [48] C. Knoernschild, X. L. Zhang, L. Isenhowe, A. T. Gill, F. P. Lu, M. Saffman, and J. Kim, Applied Physics Letters **97**, 134101 (2010).
- [49] C. Wang, J. Harrington, and J. Preskill, Ann. Phys. **303**, 31 (2003).
- [50] Y. Li, S. D. Barrett, T. M. Stace, and S. C. Benjamin, Phys. Rev. Lett. **105**, 250502 (2010).
- [51] K. Fujii and Y. Tokunaga, Phys. Rev. Lett. **105**, 250503 (2010).
- [52] S. D. Barrett and T. M. Stace, Phys. Rev. Lett. **105**, 200502 (2010).
- [53] A. Kitaev, Ann. Phys. **303** (2003).
- [54] E. Dennis and *et al.*, J. Math. Phys. **43**, 4452 (2002).
- [55] A. M. Steane, Phys. Rev. Lett. **77**, 793 (1996).
- [56] D. P. DiVincenzo and P. Aliferis, Phys. Rev. Lett. **98**, 020501 (2007).
- [57] X. Zhou, D. W. Leung, and I. L. Chuang, Phys. Rev. A **62**, 052316 (2000).
- [58] D. Gottesman and I. L. Chuang, Nature **402**, 390 (1999).
- [59] V. Vedral, A. Barenco, and A. Ekert, Phys. Rev. A **54**, 147 (1996).
- [60] R. Van Meter and K. M. Itoh, Phys. Rev. A **71**, 052320 (2005).
- [61] If ELUs of size $N_q = 3$ are used, resulting in hypercells of valency three, then two such hypercells can be combined into one of valency 4.