Quantum computers as universal quantum simulators: state-of-art and perspectives
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The past few years have witnessed the concrete and fast spreading of quantum technologies for practical computation and simulation. In particular, quantum computing platforms based on either trapped ions or superconducting qubits have become available for simulations and benchmarking, with up to few tens of qubits that can be reliably initialized, controlled, and measured. The present review aims at giving a comprehensive outlook on the state of art capabilities offered from these near-term noisy devices as universal quantum simulators, i.e. programmable quantum computers potentially able to digitally simulate the time evolution of many physical models. First, we give a broad overview on the basic theoretical background pertaining digital quantum simulations, with a focus on the hardware-dependent mapping of spin-type Hamiltonians into the corresponding quantum circuit model. Then, we review the main experimental achievements obtained in the last decade, mostly employing the two leading technological platforms. We compare their performances and outline future challenges, also in terms of prospective hybrid technologies, towards the ultimate goal of reaching the long sought quantum advantage from the simulation of complex manybody models in the physical sciences.

I. INTRODUCTION

When trying to accurately describe the dynamical behavior of physical systems made of several interacting fundamental constituents, and from these explain the complexity of natural aggregates following a bottom up approach, the well established classical laws of physics fail to give an accurate picture of reality, as it is now accepted and understood. In fact, quantum mechanics is arguably the most complete and successful theory we currently have to effectively describe the dynamics of the elementary constituents of our universe. A great deal of methods and simulation tools have been developed in the last century, such as quantum Monte Carlo,1 molecular dynamics,2 and tensor networks3 to name a few examples, which allow solving some of the theoretical models formulated in quantum mechanical terms and correctly describe a large variety of quantum phenomena. The very concept of “simulation” has a broadly understood meaning in Science Technology Engineering and Mathematics (STEM) applications. In fact, simulating any natural phenomenon is equivalent to artificially reproduce its properties and its dynamical evolution in time. This is primarily carried out through an accurate mathematical modeling, i.e. a mapping of the information we know about a system of interest onto a certain set of variables and equations, followed by an analytic or numerical solution. The resulting set of mathematical identities (or the computer with its numerical program aimed at solving them) can then be named a simulator. Such a simulator is used to study the behavior of the real system under fairly general conditions, to make predictions and to test new hypotheses, the only limitations being the validity of the initial modeling and the available computational power. It is generally accepted that most of the models we currently deal with cannot be solved exactly with classical computing machines, such as modern supercomputers obeying the laws of classical physics. The main reason lies in the exponential scaling of time and memory resources needed to correctly capture the dynamics of the relevant physical variables with increasing system size. This is especially true when strong correlations between the system parties play a dominant role, which is the case in most interesting situations. In such cases, even the most elaborate but inevitably approximate classical simulation approaches so far developed fail in giving the correct answers.

Hence, quantum simulators have long been proposed as a possible solution, building on the general idea that since Nature ultimately behaves quantum mechanically, only a computing machine obeying quantum mechanical laws would be able to accurately simulate it.4 Many quantum simulators are quantum computing machines not restricted to be solved with classical computing machines that are unable to accurately simulate quantum mechanical systems. A quantum simulator is a system under high control of the experimenter, which is able to mimic or fully simulate the dynamical behavior of a given physical model, irrespective of the degree of internal correlations or entanglement between the model’s degrees of freedom. Following this route, a plethora of analog quantum simulators have been proposed and developed, in which the physical properties of a targeted model are reproduced on a physical set-up under conditions fully controlled by the experimenter. On the other hand, digital quantum simulators are programmable and general purpose quantum devices, which promise a larger flexibility on the models to be solved. In this respect, digital quantum simulators are quantum computing machines not restricted to emulate the dynamics of targeted models, but satisfying DiVincenzo criteria for quantum computation. Here we will consider such digital quantum computers as
universal quantum simulators (UQS) \cite{31}, meaning that they are able, in principle, to perform simulations on the dynamics of any Hamiltonian model that can be suitably mapped onto the given quantum register and translated into a sequence of gate operations, as schematically illustrated in Fig. 1. The time evolution of the physical model is mapped onto an effective model defined on the quantum hardware degrees of freedom, in which the time evolution can be programmed in digital steps through a sequence of unitary operations defined by a quantum circuit \cite{48}. This mapping will be the focus of the present review.

On a more refined level, it is worth mentioning that hybrid digital-analog quantum simulators have also been proposed, aimed at combining the easier scalability of analog approaches with the intrinsic universality of digital quantum simulations \cite{49}. Here, analog blocks allow for the direct simulation of the time dynamics on a large number of variables, thus reducing the number of digital operations and error, while digital blocks are included to introduce a variety of possible interaction models. This paradigm is hailed as a promising route leading to universal digital-analog quantum computation.

Several excellent reviews have been published in the last few years, giving a broad account of quantum simulators, either general purpose \cite{50,53} or more focused on specific categories and/or quantum hardware \cite{54,59}. Here we focus the present overview on a more specific description of near term digital quantum computers as devices able to perform universal quantum simulations. This goes in line with the recent pace of advancement in different quantum computing technologies that have made programmable devices available, thus attracting widespread interest worldwide. In fact, current quantum processors already promise to shortly overcome the intrinsic limitations of simulating complex many-body physics with classical computing machines. The goal is to reach the long-sought “quantum advantage”, i.e., a certified gain in either memory or temporal efficiency obtained for the solution of a quantum many-body problem with respect to the equivalent simulation being performed on a classical supercomputer. We will not enter into the subtleties related to a more rigorous definition of quantum advantage here, but we just assume that a quantum computer with fully operational \(N = 50\) qubits is able to store something like \(8 \times 2^N \sim 9 \cdot 10^{15}\) bytes of information (i.e., 9 Pb, assuming 8 bytes to store a complex number in single-precision), which roughly corresponds to the random access memory of state-of-art supercomputers \cite{60,61}. This threshold is largely believed to be within reach already in the current Noisy Intermediate Scale Quantum devices (NISQ) era \cite{53}, and it is thus accepted to be the quantum advantage turning point. Far-reaching consequences may then be expected if fully fault tolerant and scalable quantum hardware will effectively become available \cite{62,65}, in which \(N > 100\) logical qubits are complemented with a much larger number of auxiliary quantum bits aimed at correcting noise induced errors, although it is more difficult to foresee a timescale for the realization of this paradigm at time of writing.

Our aim is to give an overview of the field that could be useful to the beginning researcher or student, trying to keep a pedagogic approach over the elementary theoretical background throughout the manuscript, and summarizing the main experimental achievements and prospective developments at the end. Since most Hamiltonian models can be mapped onto spin-type ones, being able to efficiently simulate spin models on actual quantum computing devices is crucial, not only because they possess interesting many-body dynamics themselves but also to open the door to the universal quantum simulation of a large class of many-body quantum models (typically interacting fermionic particles) that are known to be intractable by classical computation means \cite{66}. Paradigmatic examples are the Hubbard model in condensed matter \cite{37,64}, or the Schwinger model in lattice gauge field theory \cite{41,67}. In particular, we emphasize the role of specific quantities that are known to be difficult to compute but extremely important in the description of the dynamical properties of many-body systems, such as quantum correlations.

In terms of actual quantum hardware, we will focus on reviewing the main experimental achievements obtained in the last decade, specifically dealing with the simulation accuracy of a few spin Hamiltonians in the different quantum platforms. While several alternatives are currently
being pursued to realize actual non-error corrected quantum processors \cite{68}, from photonic integrated circuits \cite{50} to spins in semiconductors \cite{69}, we concentrate upon the two leading architectures that have been dominating the scene: trapped ions optically manipulated through external laser fields \cite{70} \cite{71}, and superconducting circuits working at microwave frequencies \cite{72} \cite{74}. We find that interesting results might already be within reach in NISQ processors, despite the relatively small number of useful operations and non-error corrected qubits currently available on such devices. On a parallel sight, while the main object is restricted to quantum simulations of physical models and STEM applications in general, actual quantum processors might eventually turn to solve complex problems in other fields as well. As examples, classification and scheduling tasks, stock market pricing \cite{75} \cite{76} and machine learning \cite{77} might benefit from speedup advantages over classical computers. The basics of quantum circuit programming reported in this review may be a useful starting point. Last but not least, these topic settles within the quantum technologies roadmap promoted at the European level through the recently funded Quantum Flagship \cite{78}.

II. THEORY OF DIGITAL QUANTUM SIMULATIONS

When the main object of a physical theory is to determine the evolution in time of a system, most problems are formulated in terms of a set of differential equations. Their solution is at the heart of most simulation protocols nowadays, from molecular dynamics to aircraft design. A very common situation is, for example, a linear set of equations such as

\[ \frac{d\vec{x}}{dt} = M \vec{x} \]  

where \( M \) is a matrix and \( \vec{x} \) represents a vector of dynamical variables. Once an initial condition \( \vec{x}(0) \) is given, the formal solution to the above equation is simply

\[ \vec{x}(t) = e^{Mt} \vec{x}(0) \]

Implementing such a solution on a computer routine gives a useful tool to fully solve the system dynamics, provided that the size of the numerical problem is within reach of the available computational resources. In quantum mechanics, the paradigmatic example is the Schrödinger equation (here and in the following, we take \( \hbar = 1 \))

\[ \frac{d|\Psi\rangle}{dt} = -i\mathcal{H} |\Psi\rangle \]

where \( \mathcal{H} \) is known as the Hamiltonian operator. This complex-valued differential equation is solved by computing the unitary time-evolution operator \( U(t) = e^{-i\mathcal{H}t} \). Indeed, once the latter is known, any initial condition can be evolved linearly as

\[ |\Psi(t)\rangle = U(t) |\Psi(0)\rangle \]

Matrix exponentiation is a very common numerical task arising in many interesting simulation scenarios, and crucially in the field of quantum mechanical systems. On classical computers, this task turns out to be provably difficult in terms of the matrix size, most notably for quantum mechanical simulations, where the exponential increase of the size of the Hilbert space of a composite system with the number of sub-systems leads to an exponential demand of time and memory resources.

In 1982, Richard Feynman conjectured that using a controllable quantum mechanical system as a computing resource, instead of a classical object, would provide significant advantages in the simulation of quantum systems \cite{6}. Indeed, just about fifteen years later, in 1996, Seth Lloyd proved that idea to be essentially correct \cite{31}, with the sole limitation that the systems to be simulated only carry local interactions between their constituent subsystems. In these review, we will thus concentrate on system Hamiltonians of the form

\[ \mathcal{H} = \sum_{l=1}^{L} \mathcal{H}_l \]

where \( \mathcal{H}_l \) acts locally only on a portion of the total system.

A. The quantum computer as a universal quantum simulator

Given a certain Hamiltonian that models the physical system under investigation, \( \mathcal{H} \), the problem of computing the corresponding time evolution operator \( U(t) = \exp(-i\mathcal{H}t) \) is equivalent to the task of implementing a well defined unitary matrix. A quantum computer endowed with a universal set of quantum gates is in principle able to perform any arbitrary unitary transformation, albeit not necessarily in an efficient number of elementary operations \cite{48}. What Lloyd actually proved is that universal quantum computers can calculate \( U(t) \) efficiently (i.e. with polynomial time and memory resources in the size of the target system) when \( \mathcal{H} \) is a sum of local terms. The proof is based on two fundamental facts: first, in the circuit model for universal quantum computation we can implement general unitary transformations by successively performing elementary unitary operations (quantum gates), and appending one unitary \( U_A \) after another \( U_B \) in the circuit results in a total unitary which mathematically is the product \( U_A U_B \) being applied to the state of the qubit register. Second, any unitary operation \( U \) acting on \( N \) qubits can be implemented with \( O(2^{2N}) \) elementary operations (remember that the dimension of the Hilbert space of \( N \) qubits is \( d = 2^N \) \cite{48} \cite{79}). Suppose now that we are given a Hamiltonian which is a sum of local terms, as in Eq. \cite{6}, with \( L = p \cdot N/2 \), where \( p \) measures some degree of locality (it can be, for example, the number of nearest neighbors in a lattice, which is the reason for the factor 2
that can therefore be obtained on a universal quantum computer by juxtaposing the circuit implementations of the single $U_l(t)$ unitaries and takes at most $O(L_m^2)$ elementary operations, where $m_{\text{max}} = \max_i m_i$. The final step of the reasoning lies in the following mathematical identity, which is known as the Suzuki-Trotter (ST) decomposition:

$$e^{-i \sum_l H_l t} = \lim_{n \to \infty} \left( \prod_l e^{-i H_l t/n} \right)^n$$

Unless all the $H_l$ operators commute, in which case the ST identity is exact already for $n = 1$, the product of local unitaries will not be exactly equal to the total target unitary $U(t) = \exp(-iHt)$. However, it can be shown that

$$U(t) = e^{-i \sum_l H_l t} = \left( \prod_l e^{-i H_l t/n} \right)^n + O \left( \frac{t^2}{n} \right)$$

which means that we can approximate arbitrarily well the desired unitary operator by repeating $n$ times the sequence of gates corresponding to the product of local terms for time slices $t/n$. All in all, we were able to break our original problem into smaller pieces, $e^{-i H_l t/n}$, which can now be implemented using only a limited set of elementary gates and give the correct answer up to an arbitrarily small digital error $O(t^2/n)$. Indeed, for any $\epsilon > 0$ and $t$, there exists a $n_\epsilon$ such that $U(t)$ can be computed within an approximation $\epsilon$ in at most $n_\epsilon L_m^2$ operations. This is polynomial in $N$ whenever $L = \text{poly}(N)$, as for example in the case of nearest-neighbor interactions.

**B. Quantum simulations cookbook**

First, define a model Hamiltonian of interest $H$. This should contain all the dynamical information necessary to describe and characterize the physical quantum system under investigation. The most appropriate set of variables and operators will appear in the mathematical structure of $H$.

Second, map the target Hamiltonian $H$ onto its representation on the qubit Pauli algebra

$$H \rightarrow H(\{\sigma_\alpha\})$$

In simpler terms, this means finding a suitable encoding of the degrees of freedom of the target system into a number $N$ of qubits. The resulting mapped Hamiltonian $\tilde{H}$ will then be written in terms of Pauli matrices. Notice that this mapping is straightforward for physical systems consisting of collections of spin-1/2 objects, as they also obey Pauli algebra, but it is possible in principle for a large class of physical system (e.g. fermions can be mapped onto qubits with the well known Jordan-Wigner transformation [33, 36, 50]). The quantum simulation will be efficient whenever such $H$ is the sum of local terms. Notice that this is usually not a limitation in many practical cases, as most physical processes are inherently local in nature.

Third, assuming the target Hamiltonian is mapped onto a sum of local contributions

$$H = \sum_l H_l$$

check whether $[H_l, H_{l'}] = 0 \forall l, l'$. If that is the case, then

$$e^{-i H t} = \prod_l e^{-i H_l t}$$

with no digital error. Otherwise, choose the number of ST steps (sometimes referred to as Trotter steps), $n$, that is appropriate for the required degree of precision, in such a way that

$$e^{-i H t} \approx \left( \prod_l e^{-i H_l t/n} \right)^n$$

This application of the ST formula is sometimes called *trotterization* in quantum simulations jargon.

Fourth, translate each local unitary $e^{-iH_l t}$ (or $e^{-iH_l t/n}$) into a sequence of quantum gates. This is always possible in at most $O(m_i^2)$ operations and with any universal set of single- and two-qubits operations available on a general purpose quantum computer [48]. The total quantum circuit encoding the time evolution will be the juxtaposition of all the sequences corresponding to the factors in the ST decomposition, repeated $n$ times.

Finally, add initial state preparation at the beginning of the circuit and an appropriate set of measurements at the end to recover expectation values of the relevant observable quantities on the evolved quantum state.

The points above represent a quite general set of instructions towards the design of a quantum simulation...
algorithm. In the following, we will give some explicit examples to show how this is done in practical cases. Of course, such techniques are not limited to actual simulations of real physical systems, but can become a tool for a larger class of computational tasks whenever the problem of interest can be encoded in a Hamiltonian quantum dynamics.

III. QUANTUM CIRCUITS

Among the steps that must be undertaken in order to practically design and realize a digital quantum simulation, the translation of unitary operators into elementary quantum gates is the one that is most typically hardware-dependent. It is also critical in terms of results and performance, particularly in the present era of noisy and intermediate-scale prototypes of quantum processors, where the interplay between hardware properties and target features is stronger.

Several universal sets of single- and two-qubit gates are known [58], all in principle equally valid as a primitive set to realize any quantum simulation. However, every real hardware platform usually comes with a native set of operations that, due to the physical characteristics of the device, are readily implemented in practice. The platform is in itself capable of implementing universal quantum computation, and is thus a potential UQS, if and only if the native set is a universal set in the usual quantum computing sense. If that is the case, any target unitary evolution can be translated in a combination of the native operations without unnecessary overhead. Processors based on different technological platforms may also exhibit distinct topological properties, i.e. different qubit-qubit inter-connectivity and limitations in gate directionality. While these do not pose hard limitations to the computational power of the platform, since they can always be compensated via, e.g., SWAP operations, they may result in some overhead in the total length of the simulations. Hence, in this NISQ era some platforms are more suitable for the simulation of certain physical models (e.g. trapped ions, featuring built-in all-to-all connectivity, can more easily simulate long-range interactions), thus making a fair comparison of performances less straightforward [51]. Of course, it should be reminded that, as a general rule, only systems described by local interaction terms are somehow guaranteed to be efficiently mapped on a quantum computing register.

A. Pauli algebra and spin Hamiltonians

The mathematical properties of qubits are those of spin-1/2 systems, thus obeying the algebraic properties of Pauli matrices. The latter can be written in the computational basis representation as

$$\sigma_x = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \sigma_y = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -i \\ i & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \sigma_z = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix}$$ (13)

and satisfy the following commutation and anticommutation rules

$$[\sigma_\alpha, \sigma_\beta] = 2i\epsilon_{\alpha\beta\gamma} \sigma_\gamma, \quad \{\sigma_\alpha, \sigma_\beta\} = 2\delta_{\alpha\beta}I$$ (14)

where $\alpha, \beta, \gamma \in \{x, y, z\}$, $\epsilon_{\alpha\beta\gamma}$ is the Levi-Civita tensor, $\delta_{\alpha\beta}$ is the Kronecker delta, and $I$ is the identity matrix.

In order to be simulated on a qubit-based architecture, any target Hamiltonian, $H$, has to be mapped into an equivalent Hamiltonian, $\mathcal{H}$, of interacting spin-1/2 operators. As already mentioned, this step is straightforward for paradigmatic spin-1/2 Hamiltonians (e.g., implementing Heisenberg or Ising models), but effective mappings are known for a large variety of cases, ranging from spin $S > 1/2$ [36, 13, 52] to fermionic and fermionic-bosonic systems [32, 86, 38, 33, 41, 46, 93, 83, 53], including lattice models related to gauge theories [67, 53]. The generator of time evolution in a N-qubit digital quantum simulation therefore takes the general form

$$H = \sum_{\alpha=x,y,z} \sum_{i=1}^N h_{i,\alpha}^{(1)} \sigma_\alpha^{(i)} + \sum_{\alpha,\beta=x,y,z} \sum_{i,j=1}^N h_{\alpha,\beta}^{(2)} \sigma_\alpha^{(i)} \sigma_\beta^{(j)}$$ (15)

containing in general both single- and two-spin terms, to which any other manybody term time evolution can, in principle, be reduced (see Sec. III D). Whenever the overall structure of $H$ retains a local nature, as it is the case for many physically relevant examples, its translation into elementary gate operations can be done efficiently. In the following, we will provide a dictionary of useful decomposition rules in terms of different universal sets of gates. Most of them are derived from real use-case scenarios and can therefore be straightforwardly applied to well known physical models.

B. Single-qubit rotations

Once the target Hamiltonian $\mathcal{H}$ is reduced to its counterpart $H$ on $N$ spin-1/2 systems, a register of $N$ qubits can be used to encode and carry out the quantum simulation via the identification of each qubit with a single spin-1/2 element. All currently proposed and realized quantum computing platforms allow addressing single qubits with tailored control pulses to perform single qubit gates. The most general single qubit SU(2) operation has the form

$$U(\theta, \phi, \lambda) = \begin{pmatrix} \cos(\theta/2) & -e^{i\lambda} \sin(\theta/2) \\ e^{i\phi} \sin(\theta/2) & e^{i(\lambda+\phi)} \cos(\theta/2) \end{pmatrix}$$ (16)

and can be obtained, for example, by combining well known single qubit quantum gates such as the Hadamard gate

$$H = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 1 & -1 \end{pmatrix}$$ (17)
and the phase gate
\[ \Phi(\delta) = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & e^{i\delta} \end{pmatrix} \]  

Indeed, the following identity holds:
\[ U(\theta, \phi, \lambda) = e^{-i\theta/2\Phi} \left( \frac{\pi}{2} + \phi \right) H\Phi(\theta)H\Phi \left( -\frac{\pi}{2} + \lambda \right) \]

Rotations around the coordinate axes
\[ R_\alpha(\theta) = \exp \left( -i\frac{\theta}{2} \sigma_\alpha \right) \quad \alpha = x, y, z \]

can be implemented, up to global phase factors, by choosing particular parameters in \( U(\theta, \phi, \lambda) \). For example, \( R_z(\lambda) = e^{-i\lambda/2\Phi(\lambda)} = U(0, 0, \lambda) \), \( R_x(\theta) = U(\theta, -\pi/2, \pi/2) \) and \( R_y(\theta) = U(\theta, 0, 0) \). Vice-versa, any platform capable of implementing single-qubit rotations around the coordinate axes can in principle realize an arbitrary \( U(\theta, \phi, \lambda) \) via the following identity
\[ U(\theta, \phi, \lambda) = R_z(\phi)R_x(\theta)R_z(\lambda) \]

(21)

In Eq. (15), any single-spin term
\[ H_1^{(i)} = \sum_{\alpha=x,y,z} h_{\alpha,i}^{(1)} \sigma_\alpha^{(i)} \]

(22)

essentially represents a magnetic field applied to the \( i \)-th qubit along the direction identified by the vector \( \vec{h} = (h_x^{(1)}, h_y^{(1)}, h_z^{(1)}) \). The induced time evolution
\[ U_1^{(i)}(t) = e^{-iH_1^{(i)}t} \]

(23)

is a precession around the \( \vec{h} \) axis, with the corresponding action on a qubit being a rotation of the Bloch vector. This can always be expressed in the \( U(\theta, \phi, \lambda) \) form, and therefore as a combination of rotations around the coordinate axes or of Hadamard and phase gates. Other decompositions of general SU(2) transformations, as well as approximate results employing only a finite set of fixed-phase single qubit operations instead of continuous-valued ones, are also known. [48, 87]

C. Two-qubits gates

Two-spin interactions appearing in the general Pauli Hamiltonian, Eq. (15), are usually implemented in digital quantum simulation protocols as combinations of single- and two-qubits gates. The typical evolution operator has the form
\[ U^{(i,j)}(t) = e^{-iH_2^{(i,j)}t} = e^{-i\delta \sigma_x^{(i)} \otimes \sigma_x^{(j)}} \]

(24)

where \( \delta \) is a dimensionless phase factor. These terms arise naturally in the simulation of many renowned spin models such as the Heisenberg model
\[ H = \sum_{\langle i,j \rangle} \left( \sigma_x^{(i)} \sigma_x^{(j)} + \sigma_y^{(i)} \sigma_y^{(j)} + \sigma_z^{(i)} \sigma_z^{(j)} \right), \]

(25)

the XYZ model
\[ H = \sum_{\langle i,j \rangle} \left( J_{xx} \sigma_x^{(i)} \sigma_x^{(j)} + J_{yy} \sigma_y^{(i)} \sigma_y^{(j)} + J_{zz} \sigma_z^{(i)} \sigma_z^{(j)} \right), \]

(26)

which reduces to the so called XY model if \( J_{zz} = 0 \), or the Transverse Field Ising model (TIM)
\[ H = \sum_i h_i \sigma_z^{(i)} + \sum_{\langle i,j \rangle} J_{zz} \sigma_z^{(i)} \sigma_z^{(j)} \]

(27)

Here \( \langle i,j \rangle \) denote nearest neighbors spin pairs.

The exact and most effective decomposition of \( U^{(i,j)}(t) \) terms into elementary quantum gates varies from platform to platform, depending on the available set of native operations. One common situation, typical of, e.g., superconducting qubit technology with cross-resonance interactions [88–90], is a native universal set
\[ \mathcal{S}_1 = \{ R_x(\theta), \text{CNOT} \} \]

(28)

containing single qubit rotations and the two-qubit CNOT entangling gate
\[ \text{CNOT} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \]

(29)

Let \( \text{ZZ}(\delta) \) be the unitary operation
\[ \text{ZZ}(\delta) = e^{-i\delta \sigma_x \otimes \sigma_x} \]

(30)

This can be realized using the elementary quantum gates belonging to \( \mathcal{S}_1 \) with the following quantum circuit:
\[ e^{-i\delta \sigma_x \otimes \sigma_x} = \]

(31)

Other terms generated by \( \sigma_\alpha \otimes \sigma_\beta \) can be obtained from the construction above by suitable changes of reference frames, implemented with single qubit rotations. Indeed, remembering the following identities
\[ R_y \left( -\frac{\pi}{2} \right) \sigma_x R_y \left( \frac{\pi}{2} \right) = \sigma_x \]
\[ R_x \left( -\frac{\pi}{2} \right) \sigma_y R_x \left( \frac{\pi}{2} \right) = -\sigma_y \]

(32)

it is straightforward to verify that
\[ e^{-i\delta \sigma_x \otimes \sigma_x} = \]

(33)

and
\[ e^{-i\delta \sigma_y \otimes \sigma_y} = \]

(34)
These gate sequences can be combined to simulate all of the paradigmatic spin models mentioned above. For example, it is straightforward to prove by direct inspection that for the two-qubit Heisenberg model we have
\[
e^{-i\delta(\sigma_z^{(1)} \sigma_z^{(2)} + \sigma_y^{(1)} \sigma_y^{(2)} + \sigma_z^{(1)} \sigma_z^{(2)})} = XX(\delta)YY(\delta)ZZ(\delta)
\] (35)
where \( AB(\delta) = e^{-i\delta \sigma_x \sigma_x} \). More detailed examples will be given in Sec. [IV.C].

Another universal set, defined \( S_2 \), that often arises in superconducting realizations and proposals of quantum simulators replaces the CNOT gate with a parametric XX + YY interaction \([42, 82, 91, 92]\). In this case, we can take as the fundamental building block \( XX(\delta) = e^{-i\delta(\sigma_x \sigma_x + \sigma_y \sigma_y)} \)
(36)
In the latter, we can call the fundamental building block \( XX(\delta) = e^{-i\delta \sigma_x \sigma_x} \), to which all other unitary evolution terms generated by \( \sigma_\alpha \otimes \sigma_\beta \) can be reduced with single-qubit changes of reference frame. The \( XX(\delta) \) gate is realized in \( S_2 \) as
\[
XX(\delta) = \begin{pmatrix}
U_{xy}(\delta/2) & R_x(\pi) & U_{xy}(\delta/2) \\
R_x(-\pi) & U_{xy}(\delta/2) & R_x(\pi)
\end{pmatrix}
\] (37)

Finally, let us call \( S_3 = \{ R_\alpha(\theta), C\Phi(\delta) \} \) the universal set of quantum gates containing all single qubit rotations and the controlled phase gate
\[
C\Phi(\delta) = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 1 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & e^{i\delta} \end{pmatrix}
\] (38)
The latter is natively implemented on superconducting platforms with state dependent frequency shifts \([64, 83, 93, 95]\), and is closely related to the Ising interaction generated by \( H_{\text{Ising}} \propto \sigma_z \otimes \sigma_z \). In view of the latter property, it is not surprising that the ZZ(\( \delta \)) building block can be obtained directly from a single C\Phi(\( \delta \)) just with single qubit corrections and apart from an overall phase:
\[
e^{i(\delta/4)ZZ(\delta/4)} = \begin{pmatrix}
\Phi(-\delta/2) & \Phi(\delta) & \Phi(-\delta/2) \\
\Phi(\delta) & \Phi(-\delta/2) & \Phi(\delta)
\end{pmatrix}
\] (39)
An equivalent construction with two C\Phi(\( \delta \)) is the following
\[
e^{i\delta/2ZZ(\delta/2)} = \begin{pmatrix}
R_x(\pi) & R_x(\pi) \\
\Phi(\delta) & R_x(\pi) & \Phi(\delta)
\end{pmatrix}
\] (40)
where rotations around \( \alpha = x, y \) enable the range of negative and small angles in those real experimental setups where the achievable phases \( \delta \) in a single C\Phi(\( \delta \)) gate might be limited due to hardware constraints \([83]\).

In quantum simulators based on trapped ions technology \([71, 97, 98]\), the fundamental set of operations, which we will call \( S_4 \), typically includes individual single qubit \( z \) rotations
\[
T^{(j)}_1(\theta) = e^{-i\theta \sigma_z^{(j)}},
\] (41)
collective non-entangling operations
\[
T_2(\theta) = e^{-i\theta \sum_j \sigma_z^{(j)}}, \quad T_3(\theta, \phi) = e^{-i\theta \sum_j \sigma_x^{(j)} \sigma_y^{(j)}}
\] (42)
where \( \sigma_\phi = \cos \phi \sigma_x + \sin \phi \sigma_y \), and Mølmer-Sørensen collective entangling gates \([99]\)
\[
T_4(\theta, \phi) = e^{-i\theta \sum_i c_i \sigma_x^{(i)} \sigma_y^{(i)}}
\] (43)
Any subset of qubits can in principle be addressed with the collective gates, while leaving the others untouched. On a 2-qubit quantum register, \( T_4(\delta, 0) \) can for example be used to obtain \( XX(\delta) \). Of course, the naturally collective character of trapped ions quantum gates is best exploited for the quantum simulation of long range and multiple-body interactions.

It is worth pointing out that while the elementary decomposition of typical two-qubits interaction terms reported here can be used to perform the digital quantum simulation of generic spin Hamiltonians, this is not necessarily the optimal strategy in general. Indeed, further optimization of, e.g., combined two qubit operations can lead to an overall reduction of the total number of gates for particular target Hamiltonian models \([12, 86, 100, 101]\). Examples of these techniques applied to the Heisenberg model simulated with \( S_1 \) and \( S_2 \) universal sets are discussed in Sec. [III.C] below.

D. Multiple-qubit interactions

The generalization of \( T^{(i,j)}_{\alpha \beta}(\delta) \) building blocks to \( N \)-qubit interactions leads to unitary evolution terms of the form
\[
U_{\alpha_1...\alpha_N}(\delta) = e^{-i\delta \sum_i \sigma_x^{(i)}}
\] (44)
These can be in principle always decomposed into single- and two-qubit operations. An example within the \( S_1 \) universal set is the following:
\[
e^{-i\delta(\sigma_x \otimes \sigma_y \otimes \sigma_z)} = \begin{pmatrix} R_x(\delta) \end{pmatrix}
\] (45)
The pattern can be generalized to any \( N > 3 \), and changes of reference frames can be applied to individual qubits as done for the \( N = 2 \) case.
FIG. 2. Fidelity of the digital evolution for $|\psi_0\rangle = |00\rangle$, $O_1 = -i(\sigma_x^{(1)} + \sigma_z^{(2)})$ and $O_2 = -i\sigma_z^{(1)}\sigma_x^{(2)}$. The solid black line shows the fixed $n = 5$ approach, which fails after a very short phase evolution. The dotted red line shows the case in which $n$ increases linearly with $\delta$ according to $n = \delta/2\epsilon$, while the solid green line shows the case in which the increase in $n = \delta^2/2\epsilon$ keeps the digital error fully under control. In the plot, $\epsilon = 0.1$ and $n$ goes up to $n \approx 10^4$ when the scaling is quadratic with the phase.

In trapped ions processors, whose universal set $\mathcal{S}_d$ natively contains many-body interactions, the decomposition of $N$-body terms can usually be done very efficiently using Mølmer-Sørensen gates [102] and the limits on $N$ are in principle dictated only by the scalability of the hardware set-up itself.

E. Trotter-Suzuki decomposition and digital error

When designing a quantum simulation which requires the non-trivial application of Suzuki-Trotter approximation formula, Eq. [7], the degree of acceptable digital error must be carefully assessed. This is critical for intermediate-scale non error-corrected quantum processors, where the increase in the number of gates which comes with the increase in the number $n$ of Trotter steps cannot proceed indefinitely without affecting the quality of the results. In practical cases, it is usually sufficient for the digital error to be just smaller than the hardware noise. If $O_1$ and $O_2$ are two operators such that $[O_1, O_2] \neq 0$, the so called first-order Suzuki-Trotter formula gives

$$e^{(O_1 + O_2)\delta} \approx \left(e^{O_1 \frac{\delta}{n}} e^{O_2 \frac{\delta}{n}}\right)^n - \frac{\delta^2}{2n} [O_1, O_2]$$  (46)

A better scaling of the digital error can be obtained at the cost of an additional factor per iteration using the second-order formula

$$e^{(O_1 + O_2)\delta} = \left(e^{O_2 \frac{\delta}{n}} e^{O_1 \frac{\delta}{n}} e^{O_2 \frac{\delta}{n}}\right)^n + \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{\delta^3}{n^2}\right)$$  (47)

In both cases, a ratio $r_\epsilon = \delta^2/n^\alpha$ controls the digital error as a function of the target evolution phase and the number of Trotter steps. Two different strategies can therefore be envisioned.

On one hand, one could aim at a fixed digital precision $\epsilon$ over the whole range of the dynamical simulation. This requires to increase the number of Trotter steps, and consequently the total length of the quantum circuit to be computed, keeping the ratio $r_\epsilon$ fixed. As an example, for the first-order formula in Eq. (46) we get

$$n_\epsilon(\delta) \propto \frac{\delta^2}{2\epsilon}$$  (48)

Notice that while the number of digital steps increases, the phase evolution $\delta_n = \delta/n$ required in each step decreases as $1/n$, thus keeping the overall computation time on the physical hardware linear in the total phase provided that each digital step can be implemented with a coherent operation of duration $t \propto 1/\delta_n$ [31].

On the other hand, when the maximum length of quantum circuits that can be faithfully realized is de facto limited, such as in state-of-the-art noisy quantum processors, it might be convenient to follow a different approach, namely to keep fixed the length of the quantum circuit (i.e. the number of steps $n$). This produces a phase-dependent digital error scaling e.g. with $\delta^2$ in the first-order case. The fixed computational complexity, and consequently the uniform effect of hardware noise over the whole simulation, comes at the cost of a limited range of phases (and therefore of physical times) in which the results of the simulation agree with the target model. Hybrid solutions are also possible, e.g. by selecting reasonable number of steps $n$ in different intervals of phases $\delta$, always with the primary goal of balancing the total error arising both from the hardware noise and software-level approximations. In Fig. 2 we compare the two different approaches (fixed $\epsilon$ or fixed $n$) by showing how the fidelity $\langle|\psi_\epsilon|\psi_n(\delta)\rangle$ of the digitally evolved state $|\psi_n(\delta)\rangle = (\exp(O_1 \frac{\delta}{n}) \exp(O_2 \frac{\delta}{n}))^n |\psi_0\rangle$ with respect to the exact evolution $\langle\psi_{ex}\rangle = \exp((O_1 + O_2) \delta) |\psi_0\rangle$ decreases at long evolution times $t \propto \delta$ when $n$ is fixed or increases only linearly with the phase. In this simple 2-qubit case, we choose $O_1 = -i(\sigma_x^{(1)} + \sigma_z^{(2)})$ and $O_2 = -i\sigma_z^{(1)}\sigma_x^{(2)}$, corresponding to a TIM-like interaction.

F. Extracting physical observables

At the end of a quantum simulation, the final state $|\psi(t)\rangle$ of the quantum register is measured to retrieve information about the physical properties of the system under study. With an appropriate mapping of the generic observable of interest, $\mathcal{O}$, onto a combination spin-1/2 operators, the expectation value $\langle\mathcal{O}(t)\rangle = \langle\psi(t)|\mathcal{O}|\psi(t)\rangle$ can be reconstructed by a readout procedure combining, e.g., appropriate unitary operations $U_{\text{meas}}$ and measurements.
in the computational basis. The reason why $U_{\text{meas}}$ might be needed is that the eigenstates of $Q$ are, in general, different from the computational basis states: for example, if $Q = \sigma_x$ for a single qubit, the readout of $\langle \sigma_x(t) \rangle$ can be done by performing a Hadamard gate (i.e., mapping $\sigma_x \mapsto \sigma_z$) followed by a standard measurement in the computational basis. Joint qubit measurements are also possible, in general, as a way of characterizing the output quantum state.

More refined strategies allow the extraction of complex physical quantities and to optimize the efficiency of the measurement process. Here we will review in particular ancilla-assisted observation of dynamical correlation functions and of the spectrum of an Hermitian operator. This topic is discussed in detail in Ref. [33].

Given a $N$-qubit state $|\psi\rangle$, a Hamiltonian $H$ generating time evolution and two unitary operators $V$ and $W$, we define the dynamical correlation $C_{VW}(t)$ function as the quantity

$$C_{VW}(t) = \langle V^\dagger(t)W \rangle = \langle \psi | e^{-iHt} V^\dagger e^{-iHt} W | \psi \rangle$$

The quantum circuit in Fig. 3 describes how to compute $C_{VW}(t)$ using a quantum register and an ancilla qubit $a$. Here we assume that the quantum register is already prepared in the desired state $|\psi\rangle$, e.g. the ground state of the target physical system, and that the ancilla starts in the quantum superposition $\sqrt{2}|+\rangle = |0\rangle + |1\rangle$. The joint initial state of the quantum register $R$ and the ancilla is therefore $|\phi\rangle_{aR} = |+\rangle_a |\psi\rangle_R$. The first step is a $W$ unitary performed on $R$ and controlled by the ancilla:

$$|\phi\rangle_{aR} \rightarrow \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} (|0\rangle_a |\psi\rangle_R + |1\rangle_a W |\psi\rangle_R)$$

A quantum circuit implementing the digital simulation of the time evolution $U(t) = e^{-iHt}$ is then applied to the quantum register to evolve the state $|\psi\rangle$, thus leading to

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} (|0\rangle_a U(t) |\psi\rangle_R + |1\rangle_a U(t) W |\psi\rangle_R)$$

Finally, a $V$ unitary is applied to $R$, controlled by the state $|0\rangle$ of the ancilla (this can be obtained by adding $X \equiv \sigma_x$ quantum gates on $a$ before and after the standard controlled operation). The output state is:

$$|\phi_{\text{out}}\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} (|0\rangle_a U(t) |\psi\rangle_R + |1\rangle_a U(t) W |\psi\rangle_R)$$

A measure of the observable $\sigma_x$ on the ancilla gives

$$\langle \sigma_x^{(a)} \rangle = \text{Tr} \left( \sigma_x^{(a)} \otimes I \right) |\phi_{\text{out}}\rangle \langle \phi_{\text{out}}|$$

In a similar way, Im $[C_{VW}(t)]$ can be obtained by measuring $\langle \sigma_y^{(a)} \rangle$, in a second run of the algorithm. In total

$$\langle 2\sigma_x^{(a)} \rangle = C_{VW}(t)$$

where $2\sigma_x = \sigma_x + i\sigma_y$. The same scheme can be applied to equal-time correlations by removing the unitary evolution or by moving it at the beginning of the circuit to evolve some initial state. It is worth noting explicitly that the useful information at the end of the proposed procedure is accessible through the ancilla alone, while the larger quantum register $R$ needs not to be measured at the end. The algorithm can also be generalized efficiently to the extraction of $n$-point time-correlation functions and of the expectation value of any operator which can be expressed as $Q = \sum_j c_j V_j W_j$ where $V_j, W_j$ are unitary operators.

With the addition of a classical Fast Fourier Transform (FFT), the strategy described above for time correlation functions can be used to extract the spectrum of a Hermitian operator $Q$. The most relevant example in physical problems is certainly $Q = H$, for some Hamiltonian of interest $H$. The hybrid quantum-classical approach, first proposed in Ref. [33] and then further developed and applied (see e.g. Ref. [101]), requires the quantum register $R$ to be initialized in a state $|\psi\rangle$ with some overlap with the eigenstates $|Q_i\rangle$ of $Q$

$$|\psi\rangle = \sum_l \lambda_l |Q_l\rangle$$

Since by hypothesis the target operator is Hermitian, its exponential $U_Q(\theta) = e^{-iQ\theta}$ is a unitary operator. This can be realized on the quantum register in exactly the same way as any standard time-evolution operator $U_H(\theta) = e^{-iH\theta}$. We can then compute the expectation value $\langle \psi | U_Q(\theta) |\psi\rangle$ with the ancilla-based protocol described in the previous paragraph, setting e.g. $|\psi_R\rangle = |\psi\rangle$, $t = 0$ (i.e. removing the time evolution $U(t)$ part in Fig. 3), $W = U_Q(\theta)$ and $V = I$. In general, the result will be of the form

$$\langle U_Q(\theta) \rangle = \sum_l |\lambda_l|^2 e^{-iq_l\theta}$$

where $q_l$ are the eigenvalues of $Q$. Applying FFT to the variable $\theta$ then yields

$$\text{FFT}(\langle U_Q(\theta) \rangle) = \sum_l 2\pi |\lambda_l|^2 \delta(q - q_l)$$
The Hamiltonian for a 2-qubit isotropic Heisenberg model is
\[ H_{\text{Heis},2} = J \left( \sigma_x^{(1)} \sigma_x^{(2)} + \sigma_y^{(1)} \sigma_y^{(2)} + \sigma_z^{(1)} \sigma_z^{(2)} \right) \]  
(58)

The induced time evolution then reads
\[ U_{\text{Heis},2}(\delta) = e^{-i\delta \left( \sigma_x^{(1)} \sigma_x^{(2)} + \sigma_y^{(1)} \sigma_y^{(2)} + \sigma_z^{(1)} \sigma_z^{(2)} \right)} \]
\[ = e^{-i\delta \sigma_x^{(1)} \sigma_x^{(2)}} e^{-i\delta \sigma_y^{(1)} \sigma_y^{(2)}} e^{-i\delta \sigma_z^{(1)} \sigma_z^{(2)}} \]  
(59)

where \( \delta = Jt \) and the second equality, which is essentially the ST formula for \( n = 1 \), follows from \( \sigma_\alpha^{(1)} \sigma_\alpha^{(2)} , \sigma_\beta^{(1)} \sigma_\beta^{(2)} \big| 0 \rangle \). Recalling Eq. (55) and the results in Sec. III C, a 6-CNOT decomposition for arbitrary \( \delta \) can be given using the universal set \( S_4 \), as shown in Fig. 4a. An equivalent and more efficient circuit in terms of number of two-qubit operations can be designed, according to the results discussed in Ref. [100], if we consider the time evolution operator globally as a single two-qubit transformation, see Fig. 4b. Within \( S_3 \), besides juxtaposing gate sequences of the form shown in Eq. (37), an optimal decomposition, using again only three 2-qubit gates instead of six, is reported in Fig. 4c, based on the identity [42] [103]

\[ H_{\text{Heis},2} = \frac{J}{2} (H_{xxyy} + H_{xxzz} + H_{zxyy}) \]  
(60)

where \( H_{\alpha\beta\gamma} = \sigma_\alpha^{(1)} \sigma_\alpha^{(2)} + \sigma_\beta^{(1)} \sigma_\beta^{(2)} \). In \( S_3 \) a decomposition with three CΦ(\( \delta \)) follows immediately from Eq. (39) and single qubit changes of reference frame. Finally, in \( S_4 \) a possible realization of the Heisenberg interaction can be obtained for some digital resolution \( \delta \) as

\[ U_{\text{Heis},2}(\delta) = ABCAC^\dagger \]  
(61)

where \( A = T_3(\delta,0) \), \( B = T_4(\delta,\pi/2) \) and \( C = T_3(\pi/4, \pi/2) \). With any of the above elementary decomposition in quantum gates, the digital quantum simulation of the 2-qubits Heisenberg model can be performed and physical information can be extracted by using the methods discussed in Sec. III C. In a numerical example reported in Fig. 5a we show the digital quantum simulation of the individual magnetization of the two spins, which can be extracted by measuring the observable \( \sigma_x^{(i)} \) and using the definition \( \langle s_x^{(i)} \rangle = (1/2) \langle \sigma_x^{(i)} \rangle \). No digital error is present in this case.

The decomposition of the 2-spin Heisenberg model into elementary quantum gates presented above can be used as a building block, in combination with single qubit rotations, to perform more complex digital quantum simulations. A 3-spin Heisenberg chain with open ends and \( N_1 = 2 \) bonds, put in an external field, has a Hamiltonian of the form

\[ H_{\text{Heis},3} = H_B + H_{\text{Heis},2}^1 + H_{\text{Heis},2}^2 \]  
(62)

where

\[ H_B = \frac{B g}{2} \left( \sigma_x^{(1)} + \sigma_x^{(2)} + \sigma_x^{(3)} \right) \]  
(63)

describes a magnetic field oriented along the z-direction and each of the spin-spin bonds corresponds to a term

\[ H_{\text{Heis},2}^i = J_{1i} \left( \sigma_x^{(i)} \sigma_x^{(1)} + \sigma_y^{(i)} \sigma_y^{(1)} + \sigma_z^{(i)} \sigma_z^{(1)} \right) \]  
(64)

In general, the two bonds can be nonequivalent, i.e. \( J_{12} \neq J_{23} \). Since \( [H_{\text{Heis},2}^1, H_{\text{Heis},2}^2] \neq 0 \) (independently from the coupling constants \( J_{ij} \)), the quantum simulation must be carried out using the ST digital procedure, alternating the application of the results presented for the 2-spin case on the two bonds

\[ U_{\text{Heis},3}(\delta) = (U_{\text{Heis},2}^1(\delta_{12}/n) U_{\text{Heis},2}^1(\delta_{23}/n))^n e^{-iH_B t} \]  
(65)

where \( \delta_{ij} = J_{ij} t \). The part describing the magnetic field on equivalent spins (we set the gyromagnetic ratio \( g_1 = g_2 = g_3 = g \)) corresponds to single qubit rotations around the z axis. Since this part commutes with the rest, it can be performed at the beginning of the circuit without any phase discretization. In Fig. 5b we show how these results can be used to compute the time evolution of the occupation probability of an initial state \( |\psi_0\rangle = |100\rangle \).
As a third example, we recall that the Hamiltonian of the Transverse Field Ising model (TIM), introduced in Eq. (27), in the two-qubit case can be written as

$$H_{\text{TIM},2} = H_{B,x} + H_{zz} \quad (66)$$

where

$$H_{B,x} = \frac{B g}{2} \left( \sigma_x^{(1)} + \sigma_x^{(2)} \right) \quad H_{zz} = J_{zz} \sigma_z^{(1)} \sigma_z^{(2)} \quad (67)$$

The quantum simulation of the TIM corresponds to the following digital process

$$U_{\text{TIM},2}(t) = \left( ZZ(\sigma_z^{(1)} + \sigma_z^{(2)}) \frac{2 \pi t}{\delta \sigma} \right)^n \quad (68)$$

Apart from straightforward single qubit rotations around the $x$ axis, the required quantum circuit contains only $ZZ$ operations, which can easily be translated into elementary quantum gates as shown in Sec. III C. The time evolution of the total magnetization of the spin dimer along $z$ can then be extracted by measuring the expectation values of $\sigma_z^{(i)}$, see Fig. 5.

Finally, we also report the example of a 3-spin open Heisenberg chain with an application of the ancilla-based algorithm discussed in Sec. III F to the extraction of spin-spin dynamical correlations $C_{ij}^{(ij)}(t) = \langle s_i^{(i)} (t) s_j^{(j)} \rangle = (1/4) \langle \sigma_z^{(i)} (t) \sigma_z^{(j)} \rangle$ on the system ground state. The latter, for the model under study and for a sufficiently strong external field, $B$, is well approximated by $|\psi\rangle = |\downarrow\downarrow\rangle$, which is then assumed as the initial state on the quantum register. The structure of the required quantum circuit is shown in Fig. 6 for the case of next-to-nearest neighbors cross correlations. Autocorrelations and nearest neighbors correlations can be computed in a similar way by changing the target qubit involved in the operations controlled by the ancilla. Numerical results based on $S_1$ decompositions are presented in Fig. 7.

Despite the relatively small size of the systems presented in the previous examples, all the elements introduced in this section can be used as basic modules to extend the quantum simulation to an arbitrary number of spins with pairwise interactions. When scaling up any spin chain to larger numbers of interacting elements, with $N_i > 2$ and possibly to different inter-qubits connectivity, one should also take into account that all the edges with no common ends generate locally independent terms...
FIG. 7. Digital quantum simulation of dynamical correlation functions for the three spin Heisenberg model, computed using the circuit in Fig. 6. The digital quantum simulation is shown for \( n = 5 \) Trotter steps, with the dotted line representing the expected result for continuous phase and the data points showing the result of the corresponding quantum circuit for a selection of phase values. Here the quantum register is initialized in the quantum state corresponding to \( |\psi\rangle = |\downarrow\downarrow\downarrow\rangle \) and we set \( J_{12} = J_{23} = J \) and \( Bg = 20J \). (a) Autocorrelation \( \langle s_\alpha^i(t)s_\alpha^j(t) \rangle \). (b) Nearest neighbors \( \langle s_\alpha^i(t)s_\alpha^j(t) \rangle \) cross correlation. (c) Next-to-nearest neighbors \( \langle s_\alpha^i(t)s_\alpha^j(t) \rangle \) cross correlation.

commuting with each other. These can then be simulated in parallel, thus reducing the overall complexity of the quantum simulation. It is also worth mentioning that, concerning the simulation of dynamical correlation functions, in any \( N \)-spin system there are \( \mathcal{O}(N^2) \) two-body sigma correlations of the form \( \langle s_\alpha^i(t)s_\beta^j(t) \rangle \). These quantities, which are often of great physical interest \[101\], are then in principle extractable efficiently with the ancilla-based methods discussed in Sec. IIIF e.g. by repeating a polynomial number of times the calculation with slightly modified circuits for each spin pair.

IV. EXPERIMENTAL ACHIEVEMENTS AND PROSPECTIVE TECHNOLOGIES

The last few years have represented a timeline of intense development of quantum technologies to realize quantum computing architectures. Among the plethora of possible platforms, two leading technologies are currently pursued for practical digital quantum simulations: trapped ions and superconducting quantum circuits. Here we give a brief overview of the main achievements reported to date in these two experimental set-ups. While the attention and interest on quantum computing is now spreading in different and interdisciplinary fields, we will present an inevitable selection of results on the digital quantum simulation of dynamic populations and correlations in small spin lattices, as a preliminary and necessary step towards universal quantum simulations of generic manybody models.

In Fig. 8 we try to give a quantitative summary of the main experimental achievements reported in the recent literature. While it is difficult to directly compare experiments performed on different platforms, under different initial conditions, and reporting slightly different figures of merit, the graph gives a visual idea of the scenario on digital quantum simulation of spin Hamiltonians up to date. Evidently, there is still a considerable correlation between the number of digital steps included in the simulation and the fidelity of the final state obtained. Overall, trapped ions quantum simulators allow performing deeper quantum circuits with better performance, i.e. a larger number of Trotter steps is possible. This is in line with recent studies comparing the two platforms when challenged with similar quantum algorithms on 5 qubits processors \[105\]. One may notice that 5 Trotter steps are currently a limiting value for superconducting circuit quantum simulators, where the fidelity drops to values slightly above 60%, meaning that there is still room for improvement in terms of quantum hardware. Finally, in terms of size of the simulated model we see that digital quantum simulations for spin-models with up to 6 spins have been performed on trapped ions processors \[98\], while up to 4 spins on superconducting ones \[101\]. We will now give a more detailed description of each of these two experimental platforms and the corresponding key results.
thus satisfying all of the DiVincenzo criteria. Among the applications, read-out, and tailoring multi-qubit interactions, selective initialization, manipulation (i.e., single-qubit rotations), and initial state, while those from Ref. 98 are process fidelities given as estimated bounds), two-spin Heisenberg model (Heis), and 2- to 4-mode Fermi Hubbard model (FH, with $z = 2, 3, 4$). Although more digital steps than the ones reported here were actually performed in some of the experiments, data points are shown only when some measure of accuracy was provided in the original reference. Fidelities from Ref. 91 are given with respect to the ideal evolution for a fixed phase value and initial state, while those from Ref. 98 are process fidelities given with respect to the expected digitized evolution. Finally, data from Ref. 83 are extrapolated linear trends of fidelity with respect to the ideal digital outcome.

A. UQS with ion traps

Digital quantum processors made of atomic ions in a linear Paul trap have been representing the most promising route towards realizing fully operational and scalable quantum processors since late nineties. \cite{107, 108, 54, 70} This type of hardware requires ultra-high vacuum and laser cooling, but not necessarily cryogenic apparatus to be operated. The trapping potential is created through radio frequency oscillating electric fields, which generate a stable linear potential well for the charged atoms, which are then spatially separated by a few microns due to the mutual Coulomb repulsion. To date, in the order of 50 and more ions can be stably aligned within the same trap in analog quantum simulators \cite{27, 29}, and qubits can be encoded into their internal degrees of freedom. The qubits can be optically manipulated through external laser fields or microwave signals, allowing for a selective initialization, manipulation (i.e., single-qubit rotations), read-out, and tailoring multi-qubit interactions, thus satisfying all of the DiVincenzo criteria. Among the different possibilities, particularly advanced appear the technologies based on $^{40}$Ca$^+$ and $^{171}$Yb$^+$ ions, respectively. \cite{107, 108}, although several other atomic species with a single outer electron can be successfully trapped. \cite{70} Apart from technical differences, such as the internal levels on which the qubit is defined and the operational frequencies of the external fields used to manipulate them (i.e., ground state qubits in the microwave range \cite{108}, or optical qubits in the near-infrared or optical range \cite{71}), these platforms have shown essentially equivalent performances and capabilities, so far. One of the key figures of merit is represented by the read out fidelity on each qubit, which can be as high as 99.1% \cite{105}. Gate operations can be realized with fidelities in excess of 99.1% for single-qubit rotations and 97% for two-qubit gates \cite{105}, and gate operations have duration in the range between 20 $\mu$s (single-qubit rotations) and 250 $\mu$s (two-qubits gates), against spin dephasing time that can reach the second time scale, which makes these platforms extremely advanced for quantum simulation purposes.

Briefly, single-qubit operations can be performed through control Raman lasers acting on individual ions, while two-qubits gates are efficiently implemented by off-resonantly shining pairs of ions and letting them interact through the transverse normal vibrational modes of the ion string. In some implementations, two-qubits interactions are well described by an effective XX model in a dominant transverse field \cite{108}, which then becomes the native two-qubits gate implemented in such quantum hardware, while more generally one can have Mølmer-Sørensen type gates \cite{71, 109, 110}, briefly outlined in the previous section. Independently of the specific implementation, an unequivocal advantage of this quantum hardware over alternative technologies is that each qubit can be connected to any other qubit in the chain (see schematic representation in the upper part of Fig. 9), thus realizing all-to-all connected quantum processors with up to few tens of qubits. In fact, while the largest number of trapped ions can reach 50 or more particles in analog simulators, as mentioned above, digital quantum simulators with individual qubit control are limited to about 20 qubits, to date \cite{107}. In fact, increasing the number of ions in the chain ultimately limits the two-qubits gate fidelity, and this implies that a reasonable compromise has to be found between the hardware capacity and its performance.

As a paradigmatic example, we chose to report in Fig. 9 one of the first universal quantum simulation, which was performed back in 2011 by Layon et al. \cite{98}. This is a seminal work, reporting for the first time that the same quantum hardware could be experimentally reprogrammed to simulate different spin models and interaction terms even if not directly implemented on the simulator. Each spin-1/2 was directly mapped onto a single ionic qubit, and unitary operations ($C$, $D$, $E$, and $F$) were defined in terms of the universal set of gates in Eqs. 41-43, which is native on this hardware (see original reference for details). The time evolution is quantified...
FIG. 9. Schematic view of a trapped ions chain, in which each qubit can be individually addressed through external laser fields, and mutual interactions between any qubits pair \((i,j)\) can be induced by vibrational modes of the whole chain. Experimental quantum simulation of two-spin models of increasing complexity is shown in the bottom panels: the digital resolution was kept fixed as \(\theta/n = \pi/16\), i.e. up to \(n = 12\) Trotter steps for the data shown in the figure, and each panel displays the corresponding sequence of unitary operations in each digital step; the lines correspond to the exact evolution, the empty symbols correspond to the ideal digitized evolution, and filled symbols are the quantum simulator results for the evolution of the different eigenstates (reprinted with permission from Ref. 98). Copyright 2011, American Association for the Advancement of Science.

by a dimensionless phase \(\theta = Et/\hbar\), which is reported in the abscissas. The initial state was chosen as an eigenstate of \(\sum_i \sigma_x^{(i)}\), and the population in each of the eigenstates was monitored as a function of \(\theta\). Remarkably, the same work reported digital quantum simulation of up to 6 spins and multi-spin interaction terms, allowing to envision the huge potentialities of digital quantum simulators for fundamental physics studies. Hence, the work from Lanyon et al. set a reference standard for all the following demonstrations of digital quantum simulations on NISQ processors.

More recent developments on this type of quantum hardware have led to the quantum simulation of the real time dynamics underlying particle-antiparticle pair creation in lattice gauge field theories, performed on a few trapped ions quantum processor [67]. The digital quantum simulation is obtained after mapping the fermionic degrees of freedom into Pauli spin operators, as outlined before. Given the size of the quantum register, a toy model successfully simulating the electron-positron spontaneous creation from vacuum fluctuations and the persistence of their entanglement was reported, which creates a bridge between digital quantum simulators and elementary particle physics. As mentioned above, a 20 qubits register has been shown to reliably allow for the creation of multi-qubits entangled states [107], thus opening the door to quantum simulations of larger spin systems. The same quantum hardware has been used to show a hybrid quantum-classical approach to the simulation of the Schwinger model, remarkably using up to 20 qubits [111]. Conceptually similar approaches have recently been applied to the quantum simulation of effective field theories in nuclear physics, such as calculating the deuteron nucleus binding energy with percent accuracy and record deep quantum circuit on a ion trap quantum processor [112].

B. UQS with superconducting circuits

Superconducting quantum circuits have lately emerged as a practical quantum computing technology after a fast and continuous improvement in the last decade [64, 113–121]. In fact, it is quite remarkable how this platform could reach the level of reliability typical of trapped ions quantum processors in only few years of continuous improvement [108]. It is worth mentioning that some of the worldwide leading high-tech companies that are currently investing in the quantum computing paradigm are concentrating their efforts on this technology. These devices work with cryogenic set-up in a \(^3\)He/\(^4\)He dilution refrigerator with 10-15 mK base temperature, in which qubits can be efficiently encoded into the anharmonic energy spectrum of the lowest collective charge/current excitations in a micro-LC resonator, with a nanostructured Josephson junction playing the role of a nonlinear inducting element. The evolution of such elementary device, called the \textit{transmon} [115], has allowed to reach coherence times in the 100 µs range [120]. Qubits are interconnected through superconducting transmission line resonators, and they can be individually addressed through other transmission lines wired at the edges of the chip board. The latter allow to perform single-qubit initialization, manipulation, and read out, while resonators allow to perform two-qubit quantum gates, depending on the connectivity of the chip, through microwave pulses. For details about the exact implementation of the native gates and the figures of merit of state-of-art chips we refer to Ref. [55]. As a summary, we notice that current superconducting quantum circuits allow for unprecedented single-qubit gate fidelities of 99.7% and two-qubit gates average fidelity of 96%, together with single-qubit read
FIG. 10. Experimental quantum simulation of the Ising model in a transverse homogeneous field for two spins with increasing number of Trotter steps, performed on a superconducting quantum processor with 4 Niobium qubits interconnected through Aluminum transmission line resonators (shown in the picture, with false color images, input and output ports and singlet qubit flux bias lines are also highlighted). Dependence of final state fidelity on the number of digital steps used in the quantum simulation is also shown, for different phase angles (color bars), as compared to ideal unitary evolution for the given Trotter step (reprinted under Creative Commons Attribution 3.0 License from Ref. [91], published by the American Physical Society).

out accuracy of $> 96\%$ [122]. Typical gating times are in the order of 10-100 ns for single-qubit rotations and 100-300 ns for two-qubit operations [89], which means that in the order of a hundred gate operations can be sequentially performed within the typical qubits coherence times (50 µs on average devices). In other implementations, both gating and coherence times might be reduced to values in the order of 30-40 ns and 20-40 µs, respectively, leaving roughly unaltered the quantum processor capabilities (see, e.g., Ref. [64]).

The first digital quantum simulations of spin models were experimentally reported on superconducting quantum hardware in 2015 [91]. Here, the evolution of the spin magnetization in Heisenberg and Ising models was systematically studied for 2-spin type Hamiltonians on a 4-qubits quantum processor, as a function of the number of ST steps. Superconducting processors with tunable frequency qubits (through external flux bias lines) naturally implement a XY-type interacting spin Hamiltonian, which can be used as the basis to digitally program a full Heisenberg or Ising type evolution through a circuit model, as outlined in the previous section and explained in detail in the original references [42, 91]. An example is reported in Fig. 10, where the digital evolution is explicitly shown for the two spins projections along the magnetic field direction, $z$, with up to 3 digital time steps, for an initial state prepared in $|\uparrow\rangle \otimes (|\uparrow\rangle - i |\downarrow\rangle) / \sqrt{2}$ that evolves non trivially in time. A summary of the fidelity obtained from these quantum simulations on the same quantum hardware with up to 5 Trotter steps is also reported from the original reference [91]. While the ideal fidelity of the simulated quantum state with respect to the exact evolution increases against the number of Trotter steps, the experimental one starts to decrease after about 2 or 3 digitized steps, depending on the phase. It is quite evident that 5 digitized steps in the simulated time evolution still presented limited fidelities, due to the short coherence times and systematic circuit errors. Nevertheless, such results have set a milestone as a proof of concept demonstration of universal quantum simulations in superconducting quantum circuits.

Correlation functions represent some of the most useful and informative quantities to be calculated in quantum manybody physics. A first attempt at simulating the digital time evolution of two-point correlations was already reported in [91]. More recently, dynamical correlation functions have been experimentally simulated on the superconducting circuits-based quantum processors made freely available by IBM, through their IBM Quantum Experience (see quantumexperience.ng.bluemix.net/qx/experience). These results are encouraging and very promising in view of scalability: dynamical correlations were digitally simulated for various basic spin models, ranging from Ising to isotropic and anisotropic Heisenberg Hamiltonians, both for spin dimers and trimers [101]. The largest number of ST steps
that could be reliably simulated on the IBM quantum processor was \( n = 4 \) for spin dimers, and \( n = 2 \) for trimers (due to the larger depth of the corresponding quantum circuit). An example of the digital quantum simulation of time-dependent two-body correlation functions, as defined in the previous section, is reported in Fig. 11 for a three spin-1/2 Heisenberg model in external magnetic field along \( z \) for an initial state \( |\downarrow\downarrow\downarrow\rangle \), as compared to the ideal digitized evolution with \( n = 2 \) ST steps, showing truly remarkable agreement. A sketch of the available 5-qubit quantum hardware is also shown, with an outline of chip connectivity. Notice that the programming tools currently made available for programming the IBM quantum chips on cloud employ the CNOT as a fundamental entangling gate (see qiskit.org). Thus, the quantum circuit models outlined in the previous Section, in particular the ones allowing to obtain complex expectation values for the correlation functions, are straightforwardly applied to this superconducting quantum hardware. In Ref. 102, the largest quantum simulation reported on the actual IBM quantum hardware actually employed 5 qubits (4 encoding the target system, plus 1 ancilla for correlations readout), showing good agreement with the expected behavior despite the noisy nature of the quantum processors (after systematic error corrections). Remarkably, fitting of such digitally simulated correlations allows one to extract four-dimensional inelastic neutron scattering spectra, a crucial experimental tool to characterize magnetic molecules. The speedup of a quantum processor in simulating the dynamical correlations needed to compute the inelastic neutron cross-section could allow for an efficient and real time interpretation of experiments on complex molecules, a task which is nowadays infeasible with classical computer simulations.

The potential usefulness of the superconducting circuit quantum hardware as a UQS has been further proved by the experimental digital simulation of 3 and 4 modes Fermi-Hubbard model \[ N > 1 \] 129, a notoriously difficult model to be addressed with classical algorithms. Recent results in hybrid quantum-classical approaches have given a boost to the field of quantum chemistry \[ 84 \] 111, in which the ground state energy of multi-atomic molecules is calculated through a variational procedure accompanied by a quantum computer evolution, defined Variational Quantum Eigensolver (VQE). Using an evolution of the VQE algorithm, nuclear physics quantum simulations have also been reported in superconducting circuits quantum hardware, with the cloud computing of the deuteron binding energy \[ 85 \]. Along the same lines of trapped ions quantum simulators \[ 86 \] 111, a quantum classical algorithm has been used to solve for the Schwinger model dynamics on a superconducting quantum hardware \[ 86 \]. Interesting comparisons between trapped ions and superconducting quantum processors in applying such hybrid quantum-classical approaches have been reported, in which the same algorithm was simulated in different platforms, showing a substantial equivalence of the two leading architectures when the same number of qubits could be used, but trapped ions processors allowing for a larger system size to be simulated \[ 112 \]. Considerable work is currently focusing on understanding the main sources of error, and consequently developing error mitigation techniques that help strongly improving the overall quantum simulation fidelities \[ 101 \] 127 129. In the ongoing effort to develop a fault tolerant quantum computing architecture, these results are crucial to allow reaching the quantum advantage already within the so-called NISQ time frame.

C. Prospective technologies for UQS

While the two leading technologies outlined above are currently the mainstream in practical quantum computing, it is still unclear which will be overtaking in the future, especially in terms of scalability to a large number \( (N > 100) \) of logical qubits and a significantly larger amount of error correcting ones. In this respect, recent advances in semiconductor-based technologies could play a significant role. After the huge success of semiconductors in microelectronics applications, they have been a little behind the scene in the quest for practical quantum computing devices, despite the early proposals \[ 130 \]. Semiconductor based quantum dots have long been considered as potential spin qubits. Single-spin read-out and manipulation has been shown quite early \[ 131 \] 132, but scalability has been hindered so far, mostly due to coherence time being limited by nuclear spin dephasing and spin-orbit coupling \[ 133 \]. However, recent advances in silicon-based quantum dots have renewed interest in the actual possibilities of these technologies: CNOT gates between two quantum dots have been shown with about 78% fidelity \[ 134 \], with room for improvement, and two-qubit gates with large fidelities in the order of 80% and more have also been reported, with single qubit rotation precision of \( \sim 99\% \) \[ 135 \] 138. Gating times are below 100 ns, and dephasing times about 200 ns \[ 136 \]. These results are extremely promising and set a stepping stone on the development of a fully semiconductor-based quantum technology, evidently interesting for a number of reasons, from chip costs to the potential for mass scale manufacturing.

In parallel to research on quantum dots, controlled impurities and defects in silicon have been lately considered for a potentially low-cost quantum technologies \[ 69 \]. After the demonstration of single-spin read-out and manipulation of localized donor impurities in silicon \[ 139 \] 140, two-qubits quantum gates have been recently proposed for this prospective platform \[ 141 \] 142. These results hold promise that further development might be seen in the near future, if challenges related to scalability will be overcome.

While electronic states in engineered potentials or in impurity states are naturally emerging as potential candidates for a qubit-based architecture, it is less obvious
that photons, in particular photonic integrated circuits, could play a significant role as UQS. Photonic circuits have been largely explored as analog quantum simulators [150]. The main limitation to exploit photonic states for quantum computing is in their weak interactions, due to intrinsically small material nonlinearities. While it can be argued that suitable electromagnetic confinement in nonlinear materials might lead to single-photon sensitivity [143, 144], no such effect has been measured at time of writing. Mixed radiation-matter excitations in semiconductors, also called exciton-polaritons, have been shown to be sensitive at the single quantum level [145, 146], which is very interesting in view of studying analog simulators of strongly interacting photonic lattices [147, 148], but their effective use as qubits is still immature. On the other hand, a few companies are investing in a photonic-based quantum computer, which could then be used as a UQS employing continuous variable cluster states [149], but we are not aware of any proof-of-principle demonstration at the moment.

Magnetic molecules manipulated through electromagnetic pulses have also been proposed as a potential platform for quantum information processing [56], thanks to their long coherence times and high degree of chemical tunability. This allows to engineer suitable structures of electronic [149] or nuclear [150] spin qubits in which the qubit-phonon interaction is effectively switched on and off by electromagnetic pulses. Furthermore, the richness of the molecular Hilbert space can be exploited to directly encode logical qubits with embedded quantum error correction in single molecules [151].

Together with existing technologies that are moving their first steps into actual quantum computing applications, it is worth concluding this brief overview by mentioning a few potentially promising hybrid technologies, which are usually aimed at merging the best characteristics of two or more existing approaches [152, 153]. The philosophy behind these proposals is simple: it is quite likely that a hybrid technology will be in the best position to simultaneously meet all the requirements in terms of scalability (possibly in multi-dimensional arrays), chip-scale integration, and high operational reliability (i.e., long qubits coherence and short gating times). A number of proposals for prospective quantum technologies have been reported, which we will hereby summarize briefly and refer to the original references for further details.

For instance, spin ensembles coherently coupled to superconducting microwave resonators have been proposed as a backbone of a novel hybrid quantum technology [93, 94, 154]. This hybrid architecture would exploit the long coherence times of spin ensembles and the easy manipulation of photons in tunable resonators. A full digital quantum computing architecture has been devised [43, 155], for which we report an example in Fig. 12(a), where the TIM of 3 spins (see Hamiltonian model in the inset) is theoretically shown to be simulated with a large overall fidelity (∼95% on average) when realistic dissipation parameters are assumed [43]. This kind of architecture could be even built with single magnetic molecules strongly coupled to the quantized resonator field [156, 157].

Along similar lines, hybrid architectures based on Nitrogen Vacancy (NV) centers coupled to Carbon nanotubes have also been proposed [158]. Mechanical degrees of freedom have also been considered to be part of hybrid platforms, due to their intrinsically low dephasing rates. In particular, quantum information processing has been theoretically shown in optical devices in which qubits are encoded in the lowest lying mechanical levels [159], as well as in NV centers coupled to mechanical resonators and superconducting waveguides [160]. Recently, mechanical qubits encoding has been considered in a hybrid setup coupling vibrating nanoresonators to superconducting circuits [122]. An example of such an electromechanical quantum computing architecture is reported in Fig. 12(b), with theoretical simulations of the digitized evolution of the TIM of 2 spins (see Hamiltonian model in the inset) performed on such hypothetical platform, with very interesting fidelities in the order of 99.9% for the overall quantum simulation if the EMR dephasing is neglected, which reduces to about 99% for realistic pure dephasing rates. These numbers are extremely promising, and could motivate further experimental efforts towards realization of the required building blocks.
V. OUTLOOK AND PERSPECTIVES

We have given a brief summary of the current status on quantum simulators, restricting our overview to the use of quantum computers as general purpose machines that can be programmed to solve for the exact time evolution of an arbitrary Hamiltonian model with arbitrary precision. The only prescription for such a universal quantum simulator is that the physical model under analysis be mapped onto an effective Hamiltonian obeying the algebra of Pauli matrices, which is then encoded directly in a qubit-based quantum computer through a quantum circuit model. A number of observables, such as spectra and correlation functions, can be accessed upon measurement in the computational basis. After giving a pedagogic introduction to the theoretical background allowing to translate the digitized unitary evolution in discrete time steps into the corresponding quantum algorithm made of a sequence of one- and two-qubits gates, we have reviewed recent experimental results on the two leading quantum technology platforms. Finally, we have outlined a few existing technologies that might develop into quantum computing hardware, and hence be useful for quantum simulation, as well as prospective hybrid approaches that might eventually be tested.

Since most Hamiltonian models of physical interest can be expressed in terms of locally interacting spin terms, we have focused this review on the most widespread spin-type models, such as the Heisenberg and Ising models in an external magnetic field. Getting acquainted and applying the basic techniques for such models allows to quickly grasp the quantum simulation of more general quantum many-body systems that are typically intractable with classical simulations due to exponential scaling of the required resources with the system size, such as the Fermi-Hubbard model. The road to quantum advantage is an exciting targeted goal to be fulfilled in the coming years, following the availability of NISQ digital quantum simulators, at least for some targeted applications or models.

In the meantime, a great deal of work is ongoing to devise new potential use cases and algorithms to be run on these machines, for which learning techniques of quantum circuit programming might turn being useful. A brief, non-exhaustive list, with a bit of personal taste, is given in the following. Restricting to problems of academic interest, the dynamical localization of quantum Hamiltonians that have a classical chaotic behavior [163,164], requiring simulation of the quantum Fourier transform, could be run on a universal quantum computer. More recently, universal quantum computers have been receiving attention from machine learning applications, in particular to develop quantum neural networks, with the aim of processing an exponentially large amount of data with polynomial resources [77]. The first attempts in this direction have been reported [165,167], promising exciting developments in the near term. Universal quantum simulators might also help solving problems in open quantum system dynamics, for which novel numerical approaches had to be developed [168,169]. Simulating the digitized non-unitary evolution of an open quantum system on a quantum computer is a topic of current interest [97,102,170,174]. Finally, the huge body of knowledge accumulated in the past half a century to classically simulate the manybody dynamics of quantum systems of increasing complexity, such as quantum Montecarlo, molecular dynamics, and density matrix renormalization group could be integrated into quantum algorithms to be run on digital quantum computers, with far-reaching and still unknown consequences.
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