

Error estimation in IBM Quantum Computers

Unai Aseguinolaza,¹ Nahual Sobrino,^{2,3} Gabriel Sobrino,⁴ Joaquim Jornet-Somoza,⁵ and Juan Borge^{1,*}

¹*Basic Science Department, Faculty of Engineering,
Mondragon Unibertsitatea, 20500 Arrasate, Spain*

²*Donostia International Physics Center, Paseo Manuel de Lardizabal 4, E-20018 San Sebastián, Spain*

³*Nano-Bio Spectroscopy Group and European Theoretical Spectroscopy Facility (ETSF),*

*Departamento de Polímeros y Materiales Avanzados: Física,
Química y Tecnología, Universidad del País Vasco UPV/EHU,
Avenida de Tolosa 72, E-20018 San Sebastián, Spain*

⁴*Quantum Software Engineering*

⁵*Servicios Generales a la Investigación (SGIker), Universidad del País Vasco UPV/EHU,
Avenida de Tolosa 72, E-20018 San Sebastián, Spain*

One of the main important features of the noisy intermediate-scale quantum (NISQ) era is the correct evaluation and consideration of errors. In this paper, we analyze the main sources of errors in current (IBM) quantum computers and we present a useful tool (TED-qc) designed to facilitate the total error probability expected for any quantum circuit. We propose this total error probability as the best way to estimate the fidelity in the NISQ era, mainly because we do not have to compare our quantum calculations with any classical one. In order to contrast the robustness of our tool we compute the total error probability that may occur in three different quantum models: 1) the four-electron Ising model, 2) the Quantum-Phase Estimation (QPE) and 3) the Grover's algorithm. For each model, we compute a statistically significant sample size for both the expectation value of the related observable and the fidelity, comparing them with the value calculated in the simulator as a function of the error probability. The analysis is satisfactory in more than the 99% of the cases. In addition, we study how the error mitigation techniques are able to eliminate the noise induced during the measurement.

INTRODUCTION

Quantum computing, i.e. the possibility to access real quantum states to realize complex calculations, has passed from a possibility to a reality [1]. Feynman's idea [2] of using real quantum systems to simulate quantum mechanics is nowadays not a dream or an idea anymore. In the last 20 years, the capabilities of the state-of-the-art quantum computers have improved a lot. As an example, last year IBM was able to implement the first 100 qubit computer[?] and it has foreseen to present a computer with more than 400 qubits by the end of the year[?]. Ideal quantum computers are supposed to be able to realize calculations not possible for classical computers with great accuracy. To do so, these computers require at least thousands of qubits in order to use many of them for quantum error corrections [3–5]. Unfortunately, we are still far from this situation, and in the noisy intermediate-scale quantum (NISQ) era, the scientific and technological efforts focus on evaluation, control, and reduction of the physical errors [6–22].

The NISQ devices are composed of a couple of tens of qubits, and presumably a couple of hundreds in the near future. One of their most important characteristics is their imperfect nature, as their name indicates they are noisy. Nowadays the best-performing quantum computers are based on transmon qubits [23], however, they suffer from four main limitations. First of all, in these devices, the qubit's state stability is known to be of the order of hundreds of microseconds, so we can not per-

form very long calculations. In second order, the gates acting on the qubits are noisy, so every time we perform any calculation we are losing accuracy. In third place, the measurement process of the qubit state is subject to errors. The last thing to take into account is the limited number of available physical qubits.

Normally, the errors induced by these limitations are analyzed by comparing the noisy quantum calculations with their classical noiseless results. This method is really precise but it cannot be used for calculations that exceed the capacity of classical computers. As quantum supremacy is expected in the NISQ era we propose to use the total error probability as the best way to measure the role of errors in this period. Our main purpose in this paper is to analyze these limitations by considering representative statistical samples in different quantum algorithms as a function of the total probability error. By doing it we will be able to ensure that this total probability error we obtain before any quantum calculation correctly represents upper bound for the error induced in the actual calculation.

To do so, we first produce a tool that connects with IBM's API to calculate the total error probability expected during the run of a given quantum circuit. Then we estimate the effect of the total error probability by studying three different and representative quantum algorithms, the four-electron Ising model, the QPE, and the Grover's algorithm. This will be done through the fidelity which provides a good measure of similarity between the ideal and real quantum states/calculations. In

order to contrast the difference between the ideal result (simulator) and the noisy one (physical quantum computer) we will also calculate the magnetization for the Ising model and phase for the QPE, which are the most important outputs of these models.

We will also evaluate the error mitigation technique developed in Qiskit [24] for all these cases. The error mitigation techniques are post-processing routines that try to minimize the errors occurring in quantum computers [25–32]. The one developed in Qiskit consists in the elimination of the error induced during the measurement process of the physical qubits. Although this technique may succeed in the elimination of measurement errors, it is important to notice that it scales exponentially with the number of qubits, so there might be situations in which its use is computationally really demanding.

The paper is structured as follows, in Sec. we describe the proposed tool to calculate the total error probability. In Sec. we analyze the results of the three quantum circuits for six different IBM computers and for different qubit chains. In Sec. we comment on the error mitigation routine of Qiskit. Finally, the conclusions are exposed in Sec. .

CALCULATING THE TOTAL ERROR PROBABILITY

As we pointed out in the previous Section, the estimation of errors in the NISQ era is essential in the field of quantum computing. These errors come basically from three different sources [7]:

- The error induced by the instability of the qubits. In order to have non-trivial states we have to excite our physical qubits. The probability of finding the qubit in the excited state decays exponentially with time [24, 33], so the larger the quantum circuit the less likely is to find the qubit in the expected state. There are two possible decaying mechanisms, the decay of an excited state to the ground state, i.e. the probability of a state $|1\rangle$ to decay to a $|0\rangle$, and the change of the phase of an excited state, for example passing from the state $1/\sqrt{2}(|0\rangle + |1\rangle)$ to the state $1/\sqrt{2}(|0\rangle - |1\rangle)$.

- Through the gates applied in the quantum circuit. The evaluation of any quantum gate carries an error with it. Single qubit gates usually carry a probability error of the order of 10^{-4} to 10^{-3} while two qubit gates usually carry an error of the order of 10^{-3} to 10^{-2} .

- Quantum measurement induces an error due to the lack of precision in the physical act of measure which carries a probability error of the order of 10^{-2} .

All the errors depend on the physical hardware where the circuit is run. They depend not only on the specific machine but also on the specific qubits and connections that are used. For this reason, we have developed a pre-processing computational tool that facilitates the total

error probability expected for a given quantum circuit on a specific IBM quantum machine.

We have written our quantum circuits in Qiskit making use of more than one set of universal quantum gates. Once the quantum circuit is written on the chosen basis, it has to be sent to a particular quantum computer. This quantum computer transforms the provided gates to the universal set of quantum gates it operates. In Fig (1) we can see how the `ibmq_belem` transforms the QPE operator σ_x for the $|+\rangle$ state circuit described in the qiskit's basis into its own gates.

Through IBM's API, it can be extracted all the information we need to calculate the total probability error. First of all, it gives us each gate error probability, which takes into account which qubits have been used. The same quantum gate has different error probability depending on the qubit that is acting on. It also gives us the error probability committed during the measurement. We will see that this error can be treated and completely reduced using error mitigation technique. Finally, IBM's API also gives us the relaxation (τ_1) and dephasing (τ_2) times of our qubits.

In order to calculate the total error probability we define the success probability, i.e. the possibility of non-committing any error, S_T , as:

$$S_T = \prod_{i=1}^m S_i = \prod_{i=1}^m [1 - P_i], \quad (1)$$

where P_i represents the error probability from any source: single and double qubit gates, measurement, and qubit instabilities, and m is the total number of error sources. The relation between the error probability and success probability is always defined as:

$$P + S = 1. \quad (2)$$

In order to take into account the error produced by the instability of the qubits we first calculate the time it takes for any qubit between the initialization of the circuit and the measurement. To do so we sum the time it takes to our qubit to perform any single gate. The two qubit gates are a little bit trickier because in order to perform a two qubit gate both qubits have to perform all the gates they had to perform before arriving at it. Due to this reason after adding the two qubit gate's time to the total time we have to compare the total time between the two of them and take the maximum of the two as the new qubit time.

Once we have calculated the total circuit time of each qubit j we fit the success probability of finding the qubit in the expected state, with an exponential function of the form:

$$S_{\tau_{1/2},j} = e^{-\frac{t_j}{\tau_{1/2},j}} \quad (3)$$

where 1,2 are the two instability mechanism explained before, t_j is the total circuit time of qubit j and $\tau_{1/2,j}$ are the relaxation and dephasing times of qubit j .




Figure 2. Fidelity of different physical qubit chains in different IBM quantum computers for the $n=4$ Ising model in the large external magnetic field ($\lambda = 2.5$) case. Each point corresponds with a different physical qubit chain and each color with a different IBM quantum computer.

The details of the construction of U are supplied in [34, 35].

We will calculate the ground state in the Hamiltonian bases for the case of large external magnetic field, 2.5 times larger than the antiferromagnetic exchange field ($\lambda = 2.5$), and later on, we will calculate the magnetization for this ground state. The magnetization is just the difference between spin ups and downs, or in this case between zeros and ones.

We have chosen a big external magnetic field in order to have a ground state which induces a magnetization close to the maximum solution, therefore, our ground state will be similar to the state $|1111\rangle$. Due to this reason, any possible type of error in the calculation of the circuit will pop up with a high probability in the calculation of the magnetization. If we would have chosen other values for the external magnetic field closer to the antiferromagnetic exchange field, or even smaller, these would induce magnetization values around 0 and some of the errors could compensate with the others (the $|0\rangle$ states which become $|1\rangle$ may be compensated by the $|1\rangle$ states becoming $|0\rangle$).

In Fig. (2) we can see the values of the fidelity for the Ising model for different physical qubit chains. The purple line represents the success probability, which scales linearly with the error probability, see Eq. 2. There are only two calculations in which the computed fidelity is below the success probability. These 2 points represent less than the 1% of the points (2 out of 276) so we can say that the probability error calculated using the tool works almost perfectly here too. It is important to notice that the data given by the API of IBM is obtained statistically, so it is normal that there may be small deviations.

The results of the ratio between the measured and the simulated magnetizations for different physical qubit




Figure 3. Ratio between the magnetization obtained in the physical qubits in different IBM quantum computers and the simulated one for the $n=4$ Ising model in the large external magnetic field ($\lambda = 2.5$) case. Each point corresponds with a different qubit chain, and each color with a different IBM quantum computer.

chains are presented in Fig. (3). The purple line represents the minimum value of the magnetization if the error provokes the maximum magnetization change due to the total error probability. In this case, it represents the possibility to switch from a 1(down) to a 0(up) for each qubit so the total change can be up to modulus 2. We can see that all points for all different configurations stand above this line, which indicates that the total error induced by the imperfection of the physical qubits is compatible with the one that is induced taking into account the total error probability we have calculated using our tool. These results can be compared with the ones calculated by Cervera in [34] which were calculated in 2018 in the IBM quantum computers. The smallest error that we obtain for the calculation of the magnetization is smaller than 7%, while the ones in [34] for large values of the external magnetic field are in the best scenarios of the 50%. This is an impressive improvement of the performance of the current quantum computers, their error has been reduced more than 7 times in just 4 years.

The quantum phase estimation

The quantum phase estimation is an algorithm that permits to calculate the eigenvalue of any Unitary Matrix [1, 36] given the eigenstate or eigenvector. The eigenvalues of any Unitary matrix U have modulus 1, therefore, its eigenvalue equation can be written as:

$$U|\psi\rangle = e^{2\pi i\theta}|\psi\rangle, \quad (8)$$

where $\theta \in \mathbb{R} : \theta \in [0, 1]$. The QPE algorithm is crucial in quantum computing because all quantum circuits




Figure 4. Results for the fidelity of different qubit chains in different IBM quantum computers for quantum phase estimation σ_x circuit for the $|+\rangle$ state. Each point corresponds with a different qubit chain, and each color with a different IBM quantum computer.




Figure 5. Results of the phase of different qubit chains in different IBM quantum computers for quantum phase estimation σ_x circuit for the $|+\rangle$ state. Each point corresponds with a different qubit chain, and each color with a different IBM quantum computer.

are Unitary matrices. Its role is very important in more complex algorithms like the Shor's algorithm [37].

We will calculate the QPE for the σ_x operator and for the $|+\rangle = (1/\sqrt{2})(|0\rangle + |1\rangle)$ eigenstate, using a total of 4 qubits, one as a register for preparing the eigenstate and other 3 to calculate the phase. Details of the quantum circuit are shown in .

The results for the fidelity and the phase estimation for different qubit chains are shown in Figs. 4 and 5. In this case, the expected result for θ is 0 (the eigenvalue of the $|+\rangle$ state is 1) and the purple line represents the maximum error we can generate as a function of the probability error (the maximum error can be calculated using the procedure of the QPE to estimate the eigenvalue).

In this case, all the points stay below this line which indicates that the calculation of the total error probability matches perfectly with the errors induced by the imperfections of the physical qubits. When we observe the results for the fidelity we can also observe that the totality of the points stays above the purple line, which represents the minimum expected fidelity as a function of the error probability.

The Grover's algorithm

The Grover's algorithm, developed by Lov Grover in 1996, is a quantum search algorithm that can greatly improve the efficiency of searching through a large dataset. In classical algorithms, searching for an element that satisfies a certain property typically requires $O(N)$ searches, where N is the size of the dataset. The Grover's algorithm, on the other hand, can perform this search in $O(N^{1/2})$ iterations, making it exponentially faster than classical algorithms.

The Grover's algorithm can be used to find elements that satisfy a wide range of properties, not just simple ones. It can be applied to search for a specific number in a list of numbers, for example. The algorithm will output the number with high probability if it is present in the list, and low probability if it is not. To determine the algorithm's performance, the fidelity, which is the degree of similarity between the desired output and the actual output, can be used as a measure.

It is also worth noting that the Grover's algorithm can only be used on unstructured databases and it's more efficient than classical algorithms when the number of solutions is smaller than the size of the data set. The algorithm is also known as the quantum search algorithm with quadratic speedup. Details of the quantum circuit are provided in .

We can see in Fig. (6) the results of the fidelity for 2 different sizes of the search list. In the first one, we have $2^n = 4$ elements, and we can see that the error probability is, in general, very small. However, if we increase the size of our search list up to $2^n = 8$ elements the total error probability increases dramatically. We can see that only 2 points up to 293, less than 1%, are below the fidelity line, so we can say that the algorithm has calculated the total error probability properly.

After evaluating the 3 different quantum circuits we are able to conclude that both the information given by the API of IBM and the total probability error estimation tool are fully reliable.

MEASUREMENT ERROR MITIGATION

In this section, we evaluate the effect of the error mitigation techniques in correcting the error induced by the




Figure 6. Fidelity of the Grover’s algorithm. The total element of the list is $2^n = 4$ for the rhombuses and $2^n = 8$ for the circles. Each point corresponds with a different qubit chain and each color with a different IBM quantum computer.

measurement. One way of achieving this is by using the Qiskit measurement error mitigation function, which generates a matrix M consisting of measurements over all the basis states of our system.

It’s worth noting that the size of this basis grows exponentially as 2^n , where n is the total number of qubits. This means that for small circuits, the number of jobs is also small, but as the size of the circuit increases, the number of jobs increases dramatically. For example, for $n = 10$, it has to do 1024 jobs, but for bigger numbers like $n = 20$, the number jumps to a million jobs. Due to this, this technique is only suitable for small circuits and its cost can be quite high.

To test the effectiveness of this error mitigation routine, we repeated previous calculations using this function. The results are presented in Fig. (7), where we compare the raw and mitigated fidelities for the Ising model, the QPE, and the Grover’s algorithm (Fig. (7) a), b), and c), respectively). The raw points have been calculated taking into account the error probability induced by the measurement in Eq. 1, while the mitigated ones have been calculated without taking it into account.

From the figure, it’s clear to see that the mitigation error technique significantly improves the raw results, as all the points remain above the success probability line (purple line). This means that the technique is able to eliminate all the errors induced by measurement. However, there are a few points that fall below the purple line, but since they represent less than 1%, we can still assume that the mitigation error technique is successful in eliminating measurement errors.

Overall, measurement error mitigation is a crucial aspect of quantum computing and the results presented in this section demonstrate the effectiveness of using the Qiskit measurement error mitigation function. However, it is important to keep in mind the limitations of this

technique, especially when it comes to larger circuits and the cost associated with it.

CONCLUSIONS

In this work, we have developed a tool (TED-qc) that enables the calculation the total error probability of any quantum circuit performed in an IBM quantum computer. This is a crucial result in the NISQ era because it permits us to advance the reliability of the result one may obtain in any real quantum computer. The algorithm can be run easily on any personal computer, which may help to reduce unnecessary use of real quantum computers. It is important to remark that it permits us to estimate the error in any quantum calculation without comparing it with the classical one. Hence, the TED-qc provides a general and extensible framework designed to facilitate further progress in the field.

In order to prove the robustness of this tool we have realized a big number of different calculations on three representative quantum circuits, the one dimensional Ising model, the QPE, and the Grover’s algorithm. In this cases, we have compared the results of the physical qubits with the ones obtained in the simulator (which is noiseless) and we have printed them as a function of the total error probability. The results are very satisfactory because more than 99% of the errors were smaller than the maximum that could be predicted through the total error probability. Taking into account the statistical nature of the way this probability error is calculated we can assure that this concept as a measure of the error is both robust and reliable.

We have also studied the effect of the measurement error mitigation routine. This technique eliminates the noise produced during the measurement. In order to do so it has to perform 2^n quantum jobs, being n the number of qubits we use in our quantum circuit. We have proven that this technique may be able to eliminate all the errors induced by the measurement. To do so we have studied the results obtained through the mitigation error as a function of the error probability which does not include the noise induced by the measurement. We have seen that the mitigated results are compatible with a total error probability which excludes the noise that occurs during the measurement. Nevertheless, this technique needs a very high number of evaluations and if the number of qubits we may use is high enough (more than 20) its cost may be too high to be used.

These results have been calculated for the IBM quantum computers and in order to calculate the total error probability we have used the API of the company. Nevertheless, both the tool and the analysis can be easily extended to any other quantum computer following the same lines we have presented here.




Figure 7. Fidelity comparison between the mitigated results (black) and the raw ones (red) for a) Ising model, b) QPE, and c) Grover's algorithm.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

We acknowledge the use of IBM Quantum services for this work. The views expressed are those of the authors,

and do not reflect the official policy or position of IBM or the IBM Quantum team. We thank the support of the Diputación de Bizkaia and Lantik for providing the access to the quantum computers through Bizkaia Quantum Ecosystem.

Appendix: The quantum circuits

Quantum phase estimation

The QPE algorithm calculates the phase of the eigenvalue of a unitary matrix U for a proper eigenstate ψ . The QPE uses two registers. The first one is composed of t qubits, the bigger is t the bigger is the precision of the estimation. The second register contains the ψ state. The circuit is described in Fig. (1) and it consists of applying t Hadamard gates to the t first register qubits and then controlled- U ($U = \sigma_x$ in this case, represented with a + sign in the figure) operations in the way shown in Fig. (1). Being ψ (the eigenstate stored in the second register) an eigenstate of U (σ_x) it will not change during the execution of the quantum circuit as the only gates applied to it are U (σ_x) gates. After the appliance of the H and controlled- U (σ_x) gates the first register will read:

$$\frac{1}{2^{t/2}} \left(|0\rangle + e^{2\pi i 2^{t-1} \theta} |1\rangle \right) \left(|0\rangle + e^{2\pi i 2^{t-2} \theta} |1\rangle \right) \cdots \left(|0\rangle + e^{2\pi i 2^0 \theta} |1\rangle \right). \quad (9)$$

If θ can be expressed exactly by t bits using the binary fraction $\theta = 0.\theta_1 \dots \theta_t = \frac{\theta_1}{2^1} + \cdots + \frac{\theta_t}{2^t} : \theta_1, \dots, \theta_t = 0, 1$, then Eq. 9 may be rewritten:

$$\frac{1}{2^{t/2}} \left(|0\rangle + e^{2\pi i 0.\theta_t} |1\rangle \right) \left(|0\rangle + e^{2\pi i 0.\theta_{t-1}\theta_t} |1\rangle \right) \cdots \left(|0\rangle + e^{2\pi i 0.\theta_1\theta_2 \dots \theta_t} |1\rangle \right). \quad (10)$$

By taking the inverse Fourier transform of Eq. 10 the output is $|\theta_1 \dots \theta_t\rangle$ and, therefore, a measurement in the computational basis will give exactly θ in its binary fraction form. It can be proven [1] that this method provides a good approximation of θ even if it cannot be written as a binary fraction of t bits.

The Grover's algorithm

The Grover algorithm is used to solve search problems. Let's understand a search problem as: Given a set $S = \{0, 1, \dots, 2^{n-1}\}$ of possible solutions, find x belonging to S such that $f(x) = 1$ for a certain function f . In addition, we will assume that the element x that satisfies $f(x) = 1$ is unique in S , and we will denote it as w . Let n be the number of qubits in the circuit.

To solve the search problem, we need to repeatedly apply the Oracle and Amplifier, where the Oracle is a unitary operator U_w that satisfies

$$U_w|x\rangle = (-1)^{f(x)}|x\rangle, \forall x \in S,$$




Figure 8. Oracle (left) and Amplifier (right) implementation in a $n = 3$ qubit register and $w = |3\rangle = |011\rangle$. The Oracle transformation is independent of w .

and the Amplifier is another unitary operator that performs the inversion about the mean of amplitudes. That is, it modifies the amplitude of each state with respect to the mean of all amplitudes.

Therefore, by iterating the Oracle + Amplifier k times, where k is the integer closest to $\frac{\pi}{4} \cdot \sqrt{2^n}$, the probability of not returning the desired element is of $O(1/N)$, being negligible for sufficiently large N , with $N = 2^n$.

The construction of the Oracle depends on the element that we are searching $|w\rangle = |b_{n-1}..b_1b_0\rangle$. First, the Oracle applies an X gate to the i -th qubit if the element $b_i = 0$, for all $i = 0, \dots, n-1$. Then a multi-control-Z gate is applied on all qubits, and finally, an X gate is applied to the i -th qubit if the element $b_i = 0$. See Fig. 8 (left) for the Oracle's implementation in the particular case for $n = 3$ qubits and $w = |3\rangle = |011\rangle$.

The Amplifier is constructed by applying a column of Hadamard gates on all qubits, a column of X gates on all qubits, a multi-control-Z gate on all qubits, and symmetrically a column of X gates followed by a column of Hadamard gates on all qubits, as can be appreciated in Fig. 8 (right) for $n = 3$.

* jborge@mondragon.edu

- [1] Michael A. Nielsen and Isaac L. Chuang. "Quantum computation and quantum information: 10th anniversary edition". Cambridge University Press. USA (2011). 10th edition.
- [2] Richard P Feynman. "Simulating physics with computers". International journal of theoretical physics **21**, 467–488 (1982).
- [3] Daniel A. Lidar and Todd A. Brun. "Quantum error correction". Cambridge University Press. (2013).
- [4] Barbara M. Terhal. "Quantum error correction for quantum memories". Rev. Mod. Phys. **87**, 307–346 (2015).
- [5] G Wendin. "Quantum information processing with superconducting circuits: a review". Reports on Progress in Physics **80**, 106001 (2017).
- [6] Kishor Bharti, Alba Cervera-Lierta, Thi Ha Kyaw, Tobias Haug, Sumner Alperin-Lea, Abhinav Anand, Matthias Degroote, Hermanni Heimonen, Jakob S. Kottmann, Tim Menke, Wai-Keong Mok, Sukin Sim, Leong-Chuan Kwek, and Alán Aspuru-Guzik. "Noisy intermediate-scale quantum algorithms". Rev. Mod. Phys. **94**, 015004 (2022).
- [7] Frank Leymann and Johanna Barzen. "The bitter truth about gate-based quantum algorithms in the nisq era". Quantum Science and Technology **5**, 044007 (2020).
- [8] Max D. Porter and Ilon Joseph. "Observability of fidelity decay at the Lyapunov rate in few-qubit quantum simulations". Quantum **6**, 799 (2022).
- [9] Abhinav Kandala, Antonio Mezzacapo, Kristan Temme, Maika Takita, Markus Brink, Jerry M. Chow, and Jay M. Gambetta. "Hardware-efficient variational quantum eigensolver for small molecules and quantum magnets". Nature **549**, 242–246 (2017).
- [10] Alán Aspuru-Guzik, Anthony D. Dutoi, Peter J. Love, and Martin Head-Gordon. "Simulated quantum computation of molecular energies". Science **309**, 1704–1707 (2005). arXiv:https://www.science.org/doi/pdf/10.1126/science.1113479.
- [11] M. Cerezo, Andrew Arrasmith, Ryan Babbush, Simon C. Benjamin, Suguru Endo, Keisuke Fujii, Jarrod R. McClean, Kosuke Mitarai, Xiao Yuan, Lukasz Cincio, and Patrick J. Coles. "Variational quantum algorithms". Nature Reviews Physics **3**, 625–644 (2021).
- [12] Frank Arute, Kunal Arya, Ryan Babbush, Dave Bacon, Joseph C. Bardin, Rami Barends, Rupak Biswas, Sergio Boixo, Fernando G. S. L. Brandao, David A. Buell, Brian Burkett, Yu Chen, Zijun Chen, Ben Chiaro, Roberto Collins, William Courtney, Andrew Dunsworth, Edward Farhi, Brooks Foxen, Austin Fowler, Craig Gidney, Marissa Giustina, Rob Graff, Keith Guerin, Steve Habegger, Matthew P. Harrigan, Michael J. Hartmann, Alan Ho, Markus Hoffmann, Trent Huang, Travis S. Humble, Sergei V. Isakov, Evan Jeffrey, Zhang Jiang, Dvir Kafri, Kostyantyn Kechedzhi, Julian Kelly, Paul V. Klimov, Sergey Knysh, Alexander Korotkov, Fedor Kostritsa, David Landhuis, Mike Lindmark, Erik Lucero, Dmitry Lyakh, Salvatore Mandrà, Jarrod R. McClean, Matthew McEwen, Anthony Megrant, Xiao Mi, Kristel Michielsen, Masoud Mohseni, Josh Mutus, Ofer Naaman, Matthew Neeley, Charles Neill, Murphy Yuezhen Niu, Eric Ostby, Andre Petukhov, John C. Platt, Chris Quintana, Eleanor G. Rieffel, Pedram Roushan, Nicholas C. Rubin, Daniel Sank, Kevin J. Satzinger, Vadim Smelyanskiy, Kevin J. Sung, Matthew D. Trevithick, Amit Vainsencher, Benjamin Villalonga, Theodore

- White, Z. Jamie Yao, Ping Yeh, Adam Zalcman, Hartmut Neven, and John M. Martinis. “Quantum supremacy using a programmable superconducting processor”. *Nature* **574**, 505–510 (2019).
- [13] John Preskill. “Quantum Computing in the NISQ era and beyond”. *Quantum* **2**, 79 (2018).
- [14] Xiao Xiao, J. K. Freericks, and A. F. Kemper. “Determining quantum phase diagrams of topological Kitaev-inspired models on NISQ quantum hardware”. *Quantum* **5**, 553 (2021).
- [15] Alexander M. Dalzell, Aram W. Harrow, Dax Enshan Koh, and Rolando L. La Placa. “How many qubits are needed for quantum computational supremacy?”. *Quantum* **4**, 264 (2020).
- [16] Konstantinos Georgopoulos, Clive Emary, and Paolo Zuliani. “Modeling and simulating the noisy behavior of near-term quantum computers”. *Physical Review A* **104**, 062432 (2021).
- [17] Tirthak Patel, Abhay Potharaju, Baolin Li, Rohan Basu Roy, and Devesh Tiwari. “Experimental evaluation of nisq quantum computers: error measurement, characterization, and implications”. In *SC20: International Conference for High Performance Computing, Networking, Storage and Analysis*. Pages 1–15. IEEE (2020).
- [18] Paul D Nation, Hwajung Kang, Neereja Sundaresan, and Jay M Gambetta. “Scalable mitigation of measurement errors on quantum computers”. *PRX Quantum* **2**, 040326 (2021).
- [19] Johannes Weidenfeller, Lucia C. Valor, Julien Gacon, Caroline Tornow, Luciano Bello, Stefan Woerner, and Daniel J. Egger. “Scaling of the quantum approximate optimization algorithm on superconducting qubit based hardware”. *Quantum* **6**, 870 (2022).
- [20] F. Setiawan, Peter Groszkowski, Hugo Ribeiro, and Aashish A. Clerk. “Analytic design of accelerated adiabatic gates in realistic qubits: General theory and applications to superconducting circuits”. *PRX Quantum* **2**, 030306 (2021).
- [21] Yulin Wu, Wan-Su Bao, Sirui Cao, Fusheng Chen, Ming-Cheng Chen, Xiawei Chen, Tung-Hsun Chung, Hui Deng, Yajie Du, Daojin Fan, Ming Gong, Cheng Guo, Chu Guo, Shaojun Guo, Lianchen Han, Linyin Hong, He-Liang Huang, Yong-Heng Huo, Liping Li, Na Li, Shaowei Li, Yuan Li, Futian Liang, Chun Lin, Jin Lin, Haoran Qian, Dan Qiao, Hao Rong, Hong Su, Lihua Sun, Liangyuan Wang, Shiyu Wang, Dachao Wu, Yu Xu, Kai Yan, Weifeng Yang, Yang Yang, Yangsen Ye, Jianghan Yin, Chong Ying, Jiale Yu, Chen Zha, Cha Zhang, Haibin Zhang, Kaili Zhang, Yiming Zhang, Han Zhao, Youwei Zhao, Liang Zhou, Qingling Zhu, Chao-Yang Lu, Cheng-Zhi Peng, Xiaobo Zhu, and Jian-Wei Pan. “Strong quantum computational advantage using a superconducting quantum processor”. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **127**, 180501 (2021).
- [22] David Headley, Thorger Müller, Ana Martin, Enrique Solano, Mikel Sanz, and Frank K. Wilhelm. “Approximating the quantum approximate optimization algorithm with digital-analog interactions”. *Phys. Rev. A* **106**, 042446 (2022).
- [23] Jens Koch, Terri M. Yu, Jay Gambetta, A. A. Houck, D. I. Schuster, J. Majer, Alexandre Blais, M. H. Devoret, S. M. Girvin, and R. J. Schoelkopf. “Charge-insensitive qubit design derived from the cooper pair box”. *Phys. Rev. A* **76**, 042319 (2007).
- [24] Héctor Abraham, Ismail Yunus Akhalwaya, Gadi Aleksandrowicz, Thomas Alexander, G Alexandrowics, E Arbel, A Asfaw, C Azaustre, P Barkoutsos, G Barron, et al. “Qiskit: An open-source framework for quantum computing, 2019”. URL <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.2562110> (2019).
- [25] Abhinav Kandala, Kristan Temme, Antonio D. Córcoles, Antonio Mezzacapo, Jerry M. Chow, and Jay M. Gambetta. “Error mitigation extends the computational reach of a noisy quantum processor”. *Nature* **567**, 491–495 (2019).
- [26] Ewout van den Berg, Zlatko K. Mineev, Abhinav Kandala, and Kristan Temme. “Probabilistic error cancellation with sparse pauli-lindblad models on noisy quantum processors” (2022).
- [27] Kristan Temme, Sergey Bravyi, and Jay M. Gambetta. “Error mitigation for short-depth quantum circuits”. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **119**, 180509 (2017).
- [28] Piotr Czarnik, Andrew Arrasmith, Patrick J. Coles, and Lukasz Cincio. “Error mitigation with Clifford quantum-circuit data”. *Quantum* **5**, 592 (2021).
- [29] Zhenyu Cai. “Quantum Error Mitigation using Symmetry Expansion”. *Quantum* **5**, 548 (2021).
- [30] Ryan LaRose, Andrea Mari, Sarah Kaiser, Peter J. Karalekas, Andre A. Alves, Piotr Czarnik, Mohamed El Mandouh, Max H. Gordon, Yousef Hindy, Aaron Robertson, Purva Thakre, Misty Wahl, Danny Samuel, Rahul Mistri, Maxime Tremblay, Nick Gardner, Nathaniel T. Stemen, Nathan Shammah, and William J. Zeng. “Mitiq: A software package for error mitigation on noisy quantum computers”. *Quantum* **6**, 774 (2022).
- [31] Philippe Suchsland, Francesco Tacchino, Mark H. Fischer, Titus Neupert, Panagiotis Kl. Barkoutsos, and Ivano Tavernelli. “Algorithmic Error Mitigation Scheme for Current Quantum Processors”. *Quantum* **5**, 492 (2021).
- [32] Lena Funcke, Tobias Hartung, Karl Jansen, Stefan Kühn, Paolo Stornati, and Xiaoyang Wang. “Measurement error mitigation in quantum computers through classical bit-flip correction”. *Phys. Rev. A* **105**, 062404 (2022).
- [33] David C McKay, Thomas Alexander, Luciano Bello, Michael J Biercuk, Lev Bishop, Jiayin Chen, Jerry M Chow, Antonio D Córcoles, Daniel Egger, Stefan Filipp, et al. “Qiskit backend specifications for openqasm and openpulse experiments” (2018).
- [34] Alba Cervera-Lierta. “Exact Ising model simulation on a quantum computer”. *Quantum* **2**, 114 (2018).
- [35] Frank Verstraete, J. Ignacio Cirac, and José I. Latorre. “Quantum circuits for strongly correlated quantum systems”. *Phys. Rev. A* **79**, 032316 (2009).
- [36] Alicja Dutkiewicz, Barbara M. Terhal, and Thomas E. O’Brien. “Heisenberg-limited quantum phase estimation of multiple eigenvalues with few control qubits”. *Quantum* **6**, 830 (2022).
- [37] Peter W. Shor. “Polynomial-time algorithms for prime factorization and discrete logarithms on a quantum computer”. *SIAM Journal on Computing* **26**, 1484–1509 (1997). [arXiv:https://doi.org/10.1137/S0097539795293172](https://doi.org/10.1137/S0097539795293172).