

# Benchmarking Quantum Computers and the Impact of Quantum Noise

Salonik Resch                      Ulya R. Karpuzcu  
resc0059@umn.edu                ukarpuzc@umn.edu

University of Minnesota  
November 2019

## Abstract

Benchmarking is how the performance of a computing system is determined. Surprisingly, even for classical computers this is not a straightforward process. One must choose the appropriate benchmark and metrics to extract meaningful results. Different benchmarks test the system in different ways and each individual metric may or may not be of interest. Choosing the appropriate approach is tricky. The situation is even more open ended for quantum computers, where there is a wider range of hardware, fewer established guidelines, and additional complicating factors. Notably, quantum noise significantly impacts performance and is difficult to model accurately. Here, we discuss benchmarking of quantum computers from a computer architecture perspective and provide numerical simulations highlighting challenges which suggest caution.

## 1 Introduction

There are many ways to measure the performance of a computer<sup>1</sup>. Common ways have been measuring *operations per second* (OPS) or *floating-point operations per second* (FLOPS). These are intuitive and easy to understand, however, they are generally poor metrics. The problem is that hardware could be designed to have a very high OPS/FLOPS but could perform poorly on real world applications, which do not consist of monolithic blocks of arithmetic operations. A way to improve upon this is to measure the progress of a program rather than the number of operations it performs. For example, the HINT benchmark measures quality improvements per second (QUIPS), which measures the numerical accuracy improvement of the output in a given time [1]. While this can be insightful, again the main concern is that this does not accurately represent the real-world programs that will be run on the hardware.

Generally, the best metric is the wall-time required to complete a program [2], if the program is representative of real-world applications. This concept has led to the creation of benchmarks which are samples of larger, industrially useful applications. SpecCPU [3] and Parsec [4] are popular suites in this vein. While this is a clear improvement, it is not without its issues. For one, the reduced size of the programs introduces estimation error on the performance. There are other, less obvious complications. For example, academic work commonly reports performance on Parsec for system evaluation. Now, the human made choices of which benchmarks to include in Parsec determine what the academic community considers to be important. This makes these choices critical, because if the selection is not representative these results can be misleading. Even further, having established benchmarks would allow for a hardware designer to “cheat” by making a system particularly good on only the specific applications.

---

<sup>1</sup>For clarification, we note benchmarks are operations that the system is asked to perform (programs) and metrics are measurable characteristics of the system when performing the benchmark.

The takeaway from the previous paragraph is that benchmarking is possible and useful, yet is tricky and can be misleading. It is difficult to create useful benchmarks, and it may be impossible to create universal ones. This same construct applies to quantum computing, except it is much more intricate. There are a number of complicating factors:

- 1) Quantum hardware is more diverse than classical hardware;
- 2) Quantum hardware is less developed, most systems have only a few qubits and cannot perform useful applications;
- 3) Quantum algorithms are still being developed and it is unknown what applications will be the most useful;
- 4) Quantum noise is not well understood and difficult to simulate, making characterization particularly challenging.

The dissimilarity of quantum hardware makes it hard to compare them to each other. This is not as much of an issue for classical hardware. While there has been a trend towards more diversified and specialized hardware in recent years, such as application specific integrated circuits (ASIC), there is a general framework and almost all hardware is silicon CMOS based. This makes metrics, benchmarks, and general intuition portable across different devices. Currently, there are many different hardware approaches competing in quantum computing. Each is based on a different physical system with entirely different dynamics. For example, quantum computing can be performed in superconducting circuits, ions isolated in a vacuum, or in atoms embedded in silicon. These systems look very different from each other and each have unique advantages and deficiencies. Is it fair to compare them directly?

As quantum computing is early on in its development, there are only small-to-medium sized quantum computers in existence. Most systems are not capable of performing useful programs. This makes it difficult to create benchmarks for these systems that are representative of future real-world applications. Scaling to larger sizes is particularly difficult for quantum computers, hence benchmarks that can be run on these smaller systems are less likely to accurately represent the performance of scaled-up versions. This is where one would normally turn to simulation. Unfortunately, as the states in quantum computers are highly complex, they are not able to be efficiently simulated by classical computers. Hence, benchmarks must be tied to a physical experiment.

On a more fundamental level, it is even unsure what quantum applications will be useful. As the field of quantum computing is largely unexplored, and not well understood, it is believed that many of its advantages and potential are currently unknown. Exploration of quantum potential is not well captured by benchmarking [5].

Quantum computing faces many hardware challenges. Information is easily lost due to quantum noise, which causes decoherence of quantum states. The physical devices need near absolute isolation from the environment, making the systems large and difficult to scale. Due to this fragility, benchmarking begins much lower in the system stack. Benchmarks even for 1-bit operations have been developed [6, 7, 8]. Even at this level, performance has been difficult to quantify. Accurately modelling quantum noise and determining the robustness of quantum operations has become the subject of much research [9, 10, 6, 11]. Noise can affect quantum programs differently, depending on their length and structure. Hence, noise is a significant complicating factor.

Thus, quantum computing inherits all the benchmarking complexity of classical computing, but introduces many additional complications. This makes it quite unclear what is the best way to evaluate a quantum system. In fact, the authors of [5] argue that it is too early to develop a standard approach. They warn that quantum research is currently exploratory in nature and that benchmarks are inappropriate for this kind of work. In fact, it could even be detrimental due to the possibility of misguiding research efforts.

In this paper we provide a quantitative compare and contrast for different quantum strategies from a benchmarking perspective, in the presence of quantum noise, to pinpoint pitfalls and fallacies. We start with basics in Section 2. We discuss quantum noise and noise models in Section 3. Benchmarking for single- and two-qubit systems is covered in Section 4 and for larger computing systems in Section 5. Sections 6 and 7 detail the experimental results. Finally, we conclude the paper in Section 8.

## 2 Quantum Primer

In this section we introduce background and context for quantum computing. Necessarily brief, this clearly cannot do it justice. Quantum mechanics is highly complex and defies intuition. To quote Richard Feynman, “If you think you understand quantum mechanics, you don’t understand quantum mechanics.” This seems even more applicable if one views quantum mechanics from the perspective of computer architecture [12]. But in an attempt to “understand quantum mechanics”, we will attempt to cover key concepts. We recommend [13] as an introduction to quantum mechanics and [14] as an introduction to quantum computing.

Quantum mechanics describes the nature of the physical world. Warm temperatures and large sizes causes quantum mechanics to become less noticeable, and classical physics acts as a good approximation. But when one creates a system that is very small or very cold, only quantum mechanics can accurately describe the system and how it evolves in time. Under these conditions, states are noticeably quantized (take on discrete values), for example the discrete possible energy levels of electrons around the nucleus of atoms. We can assign logical values to these distinct states, which are then called *qudits*. Transitions between these states correspond to quantum logical operations. Qudits can have many possible values, for example there are many possible non-degenerate energy levels for an electron. However, it is often convenient to use only two of the possible states, such as the ground and first excited states, as these become analogous to classical bits and are less susceptible to noise [15]. These two-level qudits are called *qubits*. Qubits can be in both of their states simultaneously (superposition) and multiple qubits can have their states intertwined (entanglement). Hence, there is not only information in each qubit, but *between* each qubit. As a direct consequence, quantum states can store an amount of information that is exponential in the number of qubits. This enables extreme compute capabilities if one is able to create a complex quantum state and reliably transform it in a meaningful way. Unfortunately, this is a difficult task. The quantum states are extremely fragile and need near perfect isolation from the environment to exist. At the same time, we need to be able to interact with the quantum state in order to transform it.

Large scale quantum computing, despite the fragility of quantum states, remains a possibility due to quantum error correction (QEC). By encoding quantum information for a single qubit using multiple qubits, the quantum state can be restored if only a subset of the qubits become corrupted. Encoded qubits are called *logical* qubits, which are composed of multiple *physical* qubits. QEC is a rich field [16], and there is much work devoted to studying how QEC works under different error models [17, 18, 19, 20, 21]. However, modern quantum computers do not yet have sufficient numbers of qubits or required qubit quality to practically implement QEC. Hence, modern quantum applications operate on physical qubits and try to make use of limited resources. Hence, it is of interest not only to how quantum error affects QEC, but how it affects algorithms running without it.

### 2.1 Terminology

If a quantum state is completely isolated, it is called a *pure state*. Quantum pure states can be represented by *kets*, which are column vectors of complex numbers. The elements of the kets are called the *amplitudes*. For example, a single qubit can be represented by a ket of length 2

$$\alpha |0\rangle + \beta |1\rangle = \begin{bmatrix} \alpha \\ \beta \end{bmatrix} \quad (1)$$

where  $\alpha$  is the amplitude associated with state  $|0\rangle$  and  $\beta$  with state  $|1\rangle$ . The amplitudes determine probabilities when performing measurements. For example,  $|\alpha|^2$  is the probability of measuring this single qubit in the state  $|0\rangle$ . The probabilities must sum to 1 for pure states. A single qubit can be visualized as a vector from the origin to a point on the Bloch Sphere, shown in Figure 1. A pair of angles,  $\theta$  and  $\phi$ , can also be used to specify the state of the qubit, related to the amplitudes by the equations




Figure 1: Bloch Sphere representation of a single qubit.

$$\alpha = \cos(\theta/2) \quad (2)$$

$$\beta = e^{i\phi} \sin(\theta/2) \quad (3)$$

Operations on qubits are called *gates*, which are represented by matrices. Common gates are the Pauli **I** (identity), **X** (NOT), **Z** phase-flip, and **Y** (NOT and phase flip) gates. Performing a gate is logically equivalent to multiplying the ket column vector by the matrix the of the gate. For example the **X** gate,

$$\mathbf{X} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \quad (4)$$

flips the amplitudes for the  $|0\rangle$  and  $|1\rangle$  states. The **X**, **Y**, and **Z** gates correspond to rotations around the respective axes on the bloch sphere. Other common gates include the Hadamard (H) and phase gates S and T. Two-qubit gates involve a control qubit and a target qubit. In this case, a gate is performed on the target qubit if the control qubit is in the  $|1\rangle$  state. For example, the CNOT gate is a controlled-**X** gate.

Quantum gates must be *unitary*. This means they must be linear, reversible, and preserve the magnitude of the column vector. The **X** gate is its own inverse, and if two **X** gates are applied sequentially, the qubit returns to the original state. In other words, unitary operations coherently transform the quantum state. Conversely, measurements are non-unitary and irreversible. If a qubit in a superposition of  $|0\rangle$  and  $|1\rangle$  is measured and found to be  $|0\rangle$ , it is then entirely in the state  $|0\rangle$ . This is an incoherent process, as the quantum state has effectively been destroyed, containing only classical information. Whether operations are unitary or not is important not only for quantum gates and measurements, but also the noise that affects the quantum state.

Quantum states that are not pure are called *mixed states*. These states are combinations of pure states, each with an associated classical probability. Mixed states occur as the result of imperfect isolation and manipulation of the quantum state, which applies to all physically realizable quantum states. *Density matrices* are the equivalent of kets for mixed states. Density matrices can represent all pure and mixed states. A ket representation can be converted to a density matrix by taking the outer product of the ket with its transposed conjugate (adjoint)

$$\begin{bmatrix} \alpha \\ \beta \end{bmatrix} \longrightarrow \begin{bmatrix} \alpha\alpha^* & \alpha\beta^* \\ \beta\alpha^* & \beta\beta^* \end{bmatrix} \quad (5)$$

\* denotes the complex-conjugate. If we have desired, “correct” quantum state, represented by the density matrix  $\rho$ , and an actual state, represented by  $\sigma$ , we can define the fidelity [22] of the actual state as

$$TR[\rho\sigma] \tag{6}$$

which is the trace (diagonal sum) of the matrices multiplied. This gives us a metric to quantify the “quality” of quantum state. Simulating with density matrices allows one to keep track of classical probabilities and possible errors, in addition to the quantum transformations. This can be convenient in many cases [23], however the computational resources required increase significantly [24].

### 3 Quantum Noise

Noise is present in all computing systems. However, it is quite a force to be reckoned with for quantum systems. In fact, noise is so pervasive it is impossible to have a meaningful discussion about practical quantum computing without an in-depth consideration of its effects. Clearly, no benchmarking approach can succeed without considering noise and the resulting impact on measured or simulated results. This has been unfortunate, as quantum noise is difficult to characterize and, in many cases, its effects not well understood. Here, we provide a brief overview of quantum noise and the models used to represent it.

#### 3.1 Physical Sources of Noise

Quantum noise can come from a variety of sources. Possible sources are unwanted interaction with the environment (both distinct events and inevitable decay of quantum states), imperfect control operations, and interaction between qubits. Each of these will introduce error with significantly different characteristics, and there are different models for each kind of noise. Here, we go over different common sources and discuss their physical impact.

##### 3.1.1 Interaction with Environment

Qubits need to be perfectly isolated from the environment to maintain their state. If such a system could be constructed, there would be no quantum noise. But no real system can be perfect, hence there is inevitably some interaction. This can be seen as a “measurement” of the system [25], as information is leaving the quantum state. As measurements are non-unitary, this kind of noise is also non-unitary. The expected amount of time a system can remain unperturbed is called the coherence time. Commonly reported are the  $T_1$  and  $T_2$  times.  $T_1$  measures the expected loss of energy from the system; if a qubit is put into an excited  $|1\rangle$  state,  $T_1$  is a measure of how long it takes to collapse to the  $|0\rangle$  state.  $T_2$  measures the dephasing time; if a qubit is placed in the superposition state  $|0\rangle + |1\rangle$ ,  $T_2$  determines how long it takes to polarize either to  $|0\rangle$  or  $|1\rangle$ . Risk of interaction with environment is increased when performing operations on the qubits, as the driving force of the operation comes from an external input. This is an unfortunate situation as two critical requirements have conflicting needs. The quantum state needs near perfect isolation to maintain intact, yet also must interact with control mechanisms in order to perform useful computation. This is referred to as the coherence-controllability trade-off [26].

Interaction with the environment can also produce unitary errors, such as global external fields which act on the qubits [20, 27, 28, 29, 30].

##### 3.1.2 Interaction with Other Qubits

As previously mentioned, qubits can become entangled with each other. This means their states become related. While this is a frequently used tool in quantum computation, it needs to occur only when desired. If qubits interact accidentally,

	Environment	Other Qubits
Unitary	External Fields Imperfect Control [25]	Cross-talk [32, 31]
Non-Unitary	Unintentional Measurements [25]	

Table 1: Categorization of physical noise into its sources and whether it is unitary or not.

this can lead to a mixture of their quantum states or decoherence [31, 32]. This is referred to as cross-talk. This type of error has been particular difficult to characterize.

If left in perfect isolation, cross-talk between qubits would lead to a unitary evolution of the state. Hence, all the information is still contained in the quantum state. However, the quantum state would be different than the one desired, which destroys the ability to manipulate it in a meaningful way. For example, we may wish to have two qubits that are far apart that are highly entangled, in order to perform quantum teleportation <sup>2</sup> However, if they interact with other, nearby qubits, this will disperse and decay the entanglement [32]. If not in perfect isolation, cross-talk can cause increased degradation of the quantum state. Say one is performing error correction, which involves interacting extra (ancilla) qubits with the qubits that store the data, and then measuring the ancilla to extract error information (syndromes). If there is cross-talk, the ancilla qubit may have unintentionally interacted with a data qubit it wasn't supposed to. Hence, some of the quantum information in this data qubit was transferred into the ancilla. When the ancilla is measured, the computer unknowingly extracts information from the data qubit, corrupting its state.

### 3.1.3 Imperfect Operations

Imperfect application of quantum gates can generate incorrect quantum states. Often, these are slight over- or under-rotations which are the result of imperfect calibration [19]. These kinds of errors do not destroy the quantum state but coherently evolves it into an undesired state [25].

### 3.1.4 Leakage

Many quantum systems that are used as qubits actually have more than two possible states. In this case, two of the possible states are selected to represent the  $|0\rangle$  and  $|1\rangle$  states. It is assumed that the systems remain in these two states (though other states may be used temporarily, such as in the implementation of two-qubit gates [33]). If a qubit unintentionally enters one of these other states, it is referred to as leakage, and it can be particularly destructive [34].

## 3.2 Noise Models

If one is working slightly higher in the system stack, it may not be of interest where the source of noise is. However, it is critical to know how it will affect your quantum operations. In this section, we transfer focus from physical sources of noise to the process of modelling them. The goal is to learn how noise disrupts the correctness of quantum algorithms during operation. As most research labs do not have their own physical quantum computer, and publicly available machines have low qubit counts, accurate and efficient noise models are greatly desired to facilitate simulation. Quantum noise is notoriously difficult to model accurately [9]. There are variations of quantum noise and it is possible it may even be

<sup>2</sup>Quantum teleportation is the transfer of quantum information between qubits by means of quantum entanglement in combination with a classical channel. It can be used to transfer information between non-adjacent qubits in a quantum computer or over long distances via a quantum network.

non-Markovian. Knowing what specific nature of noise is present and how it affects a particular system is difficult to determine without extensive, physical experiments. However, there are a number of possible methods to estimate noise, with varying degrees of accuracy and computational efficiency. Realistic noise models are often intractable to simulate at scale, so simplifying assumptions are made to reduce complexity [35]. It is important to know when these assumptions are appropriate to make in order to produce realistic results. Some models are only appropriate under certain conditions. Here, we give a brief, high-level overview of different noise models and discuss their implications.

### 3.2.1 Stochastic Pauli Noise

Stochastic Pauli Noise is the simplest and most intuitive noise model. Additionally, according to the well-known Gottesman-Knill theorem [36, 37], it is easy to simulate using classical computers [19] and is easy to correct using standard error correction procedures [9]. Hence, it has become popular [38, 39, 40]. It is most applicable for modelling unwanted interactions with the environment, which is effectively unintentional “measurements” of the quantum state [25]. It can be implemented by inserting an X, Y, or Z gate into a circuit at random with some specified probability. The effect on the overall fidelity can be estimated with monte carlo simulation [38]. Alternatively, representing the quantum state as a density matrix,  $\rho$ , the noise can be modelled as

$$N_i(\rho) = (1 - \epsilon)\rho + \epsilon_x \mathbf{X}\rho\mathbf{X} + \epsilon_y \mathbf{Y}\rho\mathbf{Y} + \epsilon_z \mathbf{Z}\rho\mathbf{Z} \quad (7)$$

where  $\epsilon$  is the total error rate and  $\epsilon_x$ ,  $\epsilon_y$ , and  $\epsilon_z$  are the rates for each type of error, corresponding to the probabilities of inserting each gate. [19].  $\mathbf{X}$ ,  $\mathbf{Y}$ , and  $\mathbf{Z}$  are operators performing the respective gate on every qubit. While  $\mathbf{X}$ ,  $\mathbf{Y}$ , and  $\mathbf{Z}$  gates are unitary operations (causing a coherent transformation of the quantum state), inserting them in a probabilistic manner does not represent a coherent process. Additionally, the linear combination of unitary operations, as in Eq 7, can represent a non-unitary operation. Hence, stochastic Pauli noise is an incoherent source [19].

A common strategy is to inject error only after each gate. However, this is not realistic as qubits can acquire error even when remaining idle [41]. Hence, Pauli noise should be injected in every cycle. Numerous studies have found that stochastic Pauli noise models often lead to inaccurate and overly optimistic results [42, 19, 20, 17, 18, 25], but can provide reasonable approximations in some conditions. These include errors at the logical level under QEC [19, 20, 17, 24].

There are some natural extensions to this model which can result in more accurate simulations. Significant improvements can be made, while remaining efficiently simulable, by augmenting a Pauli channel with Clifford group operators and Pauli measurements [18]. This involves the same process of inserting gates at random, but with a larger gate set. This larger gate set has, in addition to the Pauli gates ( $\mathbf{I}, \mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Y}, \mathbf{X}$ ), Hadamard (H), phase (S), and CNOT gates [21].

A fundamental problem with stochastic Pauli noise is that it is “not quantum enough” [19]. While the inserted Pauli gates are quantum operations, the choice of whether to insert them is classical probability. While a classical noise model is familiar and intuitive from a computer architecture perspective, it is not a true depiction of the real errors occurring at the physical level.

### 3.2.2 Coherent Noise

Coherent noise models attempt to capture evolution of the quantum state that, while not destructive, is still undesired. One could see this as coherently performing a quantum program, just one that is different than intended. Physical coherent noise can be caused by imprecise classical control of the quantum operations [19], external fields, and cross-talk [20]. Modelling coherent noise can be difficult as some of the relevant sources of noise are not well understood. Hence, simplifying assumptions are made. While not exact, the goal is for the model to affect the quantum state similar to realistic sources. Examples include static Z-rotations [19], X-rotations in combination with Pauli-X errors [20], rotations about a non-Pauli axis [18]. Coherent noise is not efficiently simulable, meaning the classical resources required to simulate grow exponentially with the system size. Hence, these simulations are limited to relatively small systems [43, 44, 25, 45].

Coherent noise is typically much more destructive, with a much higher worst case error rate [9, 19]. Additionally, many quantum algorithms consist of periodic circuits, where the same sequences of gates are repeated many times. Coherent noise is particularly destructive in this case, where its effects get amplified with each iteration [46, 47]. From this, it would appear that coherent noise is a more important consideration, and should be assumed unless known to be otherwise. However, this may not be true for all circumstances. The effects of coherent noise on quantum error correction were studied for repetition codes [20] and surface codes [19]. Both found that the coherence of the error is reduced at the logical level, and is further decreased with a higher code distance. This means that it may be sufficient to assume stochastic Pauli noise at the logical level, even if the physical noise is coherent. However, it was noted at the same time that stochastic Pauli model still significantly under estimated the error rate.

Unfortunately, as modern quantum computers are not capable of QEC, they cannot make use of this resilience to coherent error. Randomized compiling [9] is a novel approach which may help in this domain. The basic idea is to perform randomizing Pauli gates during the run of a quantum circuit, which are interleaved with the gates of the program. At each location that randomization is introduced, the previous randomization is undone to return the quantum state to the desired state. These randomizing operations disrupt the coherent noise and tailor it effectively into stochastic Pauli noise. Prior to execution, these additional randomizing gates can be fused with (compiled "into") the actual gates in the circuit. Depending on the gate set available in the system, Randomized Compiling may be able to be performed with no overhead.

Simulable?	Efficient	Not Efficient
Unitary	NA	Coherent Rotations Pulse-Area Error [25]
Non-Unitary	Stochastic Pauli Pauli Twirling [48] Clifford Channels [17, 18]	Amplitude Damping[44]

Table 2: Categorization of noise models into whether they are unitary and whether they are efficiently simulable or not.

### 3.2.3 Amplitude/Phase Damping

Amplitude Damping (AD) is a non-coherent error model which captures energy loss from the quantum state into the environment, such as spontaneous emission of photon [44]. This noise model is relevant to any quantum system with multiple energy levels, where there is an excited state and ground state, with a tendency for the excited state to decay to the ground state, such as ion-trap quantum computers which use the excitation levels of electrons. Additionally, the loss of energy must be to some environment. Even if the energy loss is a spontaneous emission of a photon, there must be an environment for the photon to escape into. Hence, if the quantum system was *perfectly* isolated, AD would not occur.

AD is a realistic noise model but is also not efficiently simulable. However, models have been designed to approximate the effect of AD, but which remain simulable [18], such as Pauli Twirling [49, 50, 51, 44].

Takeaway: The lesson is that the nature of quantum noise greatly affects the quantum state, and by direct result, the performance of any potential quantum computer. Hence, even at higher levels in the system stack, one must give serious attention to the expected noise present in the system be sure it is adequately accounted for. This impact of quantum noise is often overlooked or given secondary consideration. In many cases stochastic Pauli noise may be an overly simplified model. If so, it will produce incorrectly optimistic results, especially for modern systems.

Physical Noise Source	Noise Models
Interaction with Environment	Stochastic Pauli Noise Amplitude Damping Pauli Measurements
Imperfect Control	Coherent Over/Under Rotations

Table 3: Physical noise vs. noise models

## 4 Qubit Benchmarking

Before talking about benchmarking a quantum computer, we have to talk about “benchmarking” a single (or two) qubit system. If one is constructing a quantum computer, it is clearly of great interest how reliable the quantum operations (gates) are. The previously mentioned error sources and models apply, but experimentally characterizing behavior is not straightforward. A commonly used metric is the *fidelity*, or conversely the *infidelity*, the average gate infidelity to the identity [24]. The fidelity will determine how many gates can be applied before the quantum state gets corrupted. Additionally, quantum error correcting codes only work if the error is below a certain threshold [52]. On top of this, the overhead required for the error correction strongly depends on the fidelity [53]. Quantum gates suffer from high error rates. Errors in classical switches could be less than 1 in  $10^{15}$ , whereas quantum error rates are frequently above 1%. Unfortunately, determining the fidelity can be difficult due to errors not only in the operations but in the state preparation and the measurements and it is particularly difficult to experimentally prove very low error rates [6].

A brute force approach would be that of quantum state tomography [54]. This involves measuring a complete set of observables (physical properties that can be measured) which determines the quantum state. This is rather inefficient as it requires a number of measurements which is exponential in the system size, it is difficult to distinguish states with low probability from those with zero, and the computation to convert measured results into an estimate of the quantum state is intractable [55].

A strategy which has been utilized frequently in recent years is *Randomized Benchmarking* [6, 7, 8]. There are variations on the specific implementation [56] but the general approach is the same. Randomized Benchmarking attempts to go beyond process tomography by determining error probability per gate in computational contexts. In the simplest sense, the process involves applying sequences of randomly selected gates of different lengths, each of which has a known output. By determining the error of the output, which should increase with increasing length, the error per gate can be extracted. Additionally, the process can detect systematic errors. If there are systematic errors, there will be noticeable differences between the error rates of different gate sequences. There have been numerous extensions [35, 30, 57, 58, 59] and modifications [11] to this process.

It is clearly important to be able to perform quantum gates with high fidelity. It is also clearly important to be able to accurately characterize the fidelity. However, as we will see in later sections, focusing too much the fidelity of single- or two-qubit gates can be misleading. Hence, these can be surprisingly poor metrics for large-scale quantum computers.

## 5 (Quantum) Computer Benchmarking

This kind of benchmarking is more similar to classical benchmarking. The idea is to determine the compute capability of a quantum system running a program. It shares a number of considerations with classical computing, such as latency and available parallelism. However, these metrics are not as informative for quantum computers. As to be expected, there are a number of additional considerations. When discussing benchmarking for full quantum computers, it is important

to reconsider the role of quantum error and, if applicable, quantum error correction. As previously mentioned, quantum noise is not equivalent to classical noise, and these differences get more pronounced the larger the system is.

In classical computing it would be feasible to obtain an error rate per gate and stitch these error rates together to generate an error model for a larger circuit. The quantum equivalent would be finding a fidelity for each gate, and then assuming this error rate for each gate on each qubits in the system throughout the entire program. This is *not* accurate for quantum circuits as quantum noise is context dependent [41]. Even if good estimates of gate fidelity can be obtained, using this information to model larger systems with more qubits is not straightforward. A gate performed on one qubit may induce error in another, via quantum entanglement or physical proximity. Hence, qubits must be considered as a monolithic system and their error rates cannot be considered independently [10]. This is problematic as it makes it difficult to understand how noise affects large quantum computers. The whole point of creating large quantum computers is to create states that cannot be efficiently classically simulated. Unfortunately, that also means the noise becomes impossible to simulate. Hence, accurately characterizing the noise, and its significant effects on the reliability and performance, is not straightforward.

This has a few key impacts on benchmarking quantum computers. One is that it intensifies the error that is introduced when using a reduced program size as a bench mark. The error rates per qubit or per operation may be higher on a larger system. Some experimental evidence has shown that this may be overly pessimistic [10], but increased system sizes will no doubt increase susceptibility to noise due to complexity [60]. Hence, the rate of success of a program on a small system may significantly different from that of a larger system, and extrapolating results is not straightforward.

## 5.1 Program Benchmarks

An intuitive approach is establishing a set of programs and measuring the performance of a computing system performing each one. As previously mentioned, this is common practice for classical computers. Replicating this for quantum computing would be collecting a set of quantum programs which are representative of the algorithms we would like to run on them. Common examples may be Shor's [61] for prime factorization or Grover's [62] for unstructured search. There are intuitive advantages to this approach, particularly in making the system perform a "real world" task. IonQ, a quantum start up which has an 11-qubit ion-trap quantum computer appears to favor this approach. They tested their computer on the Bernstein-Vazirani [63] and Hidden Shift [64, 65] algorithms, and their metric for performance was the likelihood of measuring the correct output [66]. They claim that these algorithms are excellent benchmarks and the results proved their system was the best as of early 2019. On the other hand, Google focused on the problem of quantum sampling and achieved results they claim demonstrated quantum supremacy in the summer of 2019 [67]. While the chosen application was not particularly useful, it did a good job at demonstrating the computing power of the system. So, which benchmarks are more insightful? This question raises many more and highlights the difficulty of creating quantum program benchmarks.

Who gets to decide which programs are meaningful? Clearly different systems are superior at different programs, and this introduces the issue of invested interests [2]. While impressive, these modern computers are very small compared to the computers we hope to build in the coming years. Hence, these benchmarks are also very small compared to truly useful programs. While running smaller versions of real world applications introduces error, and is accepted in classical benchmarking, this is exacerbated for quantum computers. Entirely new issues may be introduced when scaling up and it is difficult to say whether measurements taken today are good indicators of future performance. For example, IonQs computer [66] has all 11 qubits fully-connected. This configuration is possible at this scale, but will this be true for a system with hundred or a thousand qubits? Such a system will likely require multiple fully-connected groups of qubits and communication will need to be orchestrated between them [60]. This introduces additional complexity which is not found in these small scale benchmarks. This is analogous to the classical benchmarking of machine learning inference accelerators. An accelerator which performs well on MNIST [68] digit recognition will not necessarily perform well on 1000-class ImageNet [69] classification. While the problem and computation is similar, ImageNet requires much more

data, and memory management becomes the bottleneck.

The difference between competing quantum technologies poses another challenge. Different technologies have different topologies and thus have unique strengths and weaknesses. This was clearly demonstrated in a comparison between a superconducting computer and ion trap computer [70]. It was found that the connectivity of the ion-trap provided a large advantage on some benchmarks.

A more fundamental question is what quantum programs will be useful in the future. Famous algorithms such as Shor's [61], Grover's [62], and quantum chemistry [71, 72, 73] are obvious examples. However, for the most part, these algorithms will remain well out of reach for some time. It is important to remember that quantum algorithm design is still an emerging field, and what actually is the best use of quantum computers is still unknown. This presents a moving target, which suggests quantum research should not too heavily invest in any one direction [5]. Currently, classical-quantum hybrid algorithms [74, 75, 76, 77] are popular due to their ability to make use of the limited resources of modern quantum computers.

## 5.2 Quantifying Capability

Considering the current limitations of quantum computers, it may be more insightful to focus on how much work a quantum computer is capable of, in contrast to performance results on specific algorithms. This is because quantum technology is not mature, and creating larger, more functional computers is of great interest, regardless of the applications they are capable of. The key question is then how can one quantify capability? An influential proposal is that of quantum volume from IBM [78, 79]. According to the authors, there are 4 factors to consider:

1. The number of physical qubits
2. The number of gates that can be applied before errors make the machine behave essentially classically
3. The connectivity of the machine
4. The number of operations that can be run in parallel

Quantum volume targets modern, noisy quantum computers. Hence, factor 2) is referring to running a quantum algorithm without error correction and it is assumed there is an upper limit on the number of gates possible. In the future, it will be of more interest to determine whether the error rate is low enough to enable efficient error correction, or how often error correction needs to be applied. Hence, quantum volume will need to be adapted or superseded in the future [79].

Quantum volume attempts to abstract out all considerations and generate a single number which quantifies the capability of a quantum computer. The idea is to measure something which can be improved by each of the 4 considerations, meaning systems that are superior in each consideration will generally achieve a higher quantum volume. The score is determined by the largest random quantum circuit a quantum computer is able to complete successfully. By classical simulation, the probabilities of each output are known. The quantum computer is considered to be successful at running the circuit if it generates one of the likely output more than  $2/3$  of the time.

Quantum volume has some limitations. A number of which were addressed in [46], which proposes a framework called Volumetric Benchmarks. The idea is to make quantum volume more general, by allowing different shapes of circuits, kinds of circuits (random, periodic, subroutines of algorithms), and different criteria for success. As noted by the authors of [46], errors will affect different kinds of circuits differently, such as coherent errors getting magnified by periodic circuits but getting smeared out by random circuits. This provides evidence that universal benchmarks should be avoided. While quantum volume is a novel and useful concept, it uses exclusively random circuits. As we show in our experiments, random circuits have a similar affect to applying randomized compiling [9].

Another significant approach is that of Cycle Benchmarking [10]. This is similar to the process of randomized benchmarking, but applied to a register of qubits simultaneously. The core idea is to break a quantum program into sets

of operations on all the qubits (cycles) and then individually characterize the fidelity of each cycle. This allows one to quantify how well the computer can do specific operations. Additionally, arbitrary programs can be broken into a finite set of cycles [41]. This prevents the number of required characterizations from growing exponentially with the number of qubits. Using cycle benchmarking, the “benchmarks” would be individual cycles and the metric is the process fidelity.

## 6 Experiments

To illustrate the impact of the different types of quantum noise in different computational contexts, and the resulting difficulty of choosing representative benchmarks, we run representative key quantum algorithms at sizes that are likely to be experimentally possible in the near future. We use a Quantum Adder [80], the Quantum Fourier Transform (QFT) [61], the Quantum Approximation Optimization Algorithm (QAOA) [76], and a machine learning algorithm the Circuit-centric Quantum Classifier [74]. In addition, we use an idle circuit (no computational gates) and a random circuit (random X, Y, Z, H, and CNOT gates), for reference. Note that this is not the same randomized circuit as used in Quantum Volume [79], which generates a set of arbitrary random unitary operations, which need to be decomposed into a universal gate set. For our random circuit, we want to view the effects of performing our gate set in random fashion, without introducing the complexity of gate compilation (which is needed for our other algorithms). Unless otherwise stated, our metric is the process fidelity [22], explained below.

The Quantum Adder performs binary addition using a sequence of quantum full-adders on two input integers which are basis state encoded (1 qubit for each bit). If performing  $n$ -bit addition, the quantum adder requires  $3n - 1$  qubits. We perform 1-bit and 2-bit additions. The adder only uses gates in the Clifford+T set and hence does not require gate decomposition. It does use the Toffoli (doubly controlled X gate), which we implement with a sequence of CNOT, H, and T gates.

The QFT effectively performs the Discrete-time Fourier Transform (DFT) on the amplitudes of the input quantum state. The width and depth of the circuit are determined by the number of input qubits. We use 2 and 4 input qubits. The circuit contains Hadamard gates and controlled-Z rotations. We compile these gates into the Clifford+T gate set, explained below.

The Quantum Classifier is variational algorithm. Variational algorithms make use of short quantum circuits which are performed repeatedly, and after each iteration classical parameters (which determine the quantum operations) are updated to produce a better output. In this case, they are learned by gradient descent. The classifier takes input which is amplitude-encoded, meaning the classical input data is mapped to the amplitudes of the quantum state, rather than to individual qubits. For simplicity we do not consider overhead for state preparation, which can have considerable overhead [74]. The output of the classifier is the probability of measuring a 1 on the first qubit. The circuit is run multiple times to get an approximation of this probability. A classical, trained bias is added to this probability. If the result is greater than 0.5, the final output of the network is 1, and 0 otherwise. Intuition suggests this application would be relatively error resistant, as there are only two possible outputs. We run the Quantum-Classifier on the IRIS [81] and ADULT data sets. IRIS has 4 attributes, allowing the use of only 2 qubits to hold the state. The attributes are petal and sepal measurements of flowers. There are 3 possible classes, a separate classifier is trained to identify each class against the other 3. The logical circuit has a depth of 7, and consists of 5 single gates and 4 controlled 2-qubit gates. For the classifier, our metric is the accuracy. We take the average the accuracy of the three different classifiers, as done in [74]. The quantum gates of the classifiers must also be decomposed, as explained below.

For the target quantum computer we remain as general as possible. We assume an all-to-all connectivity and full parallelism. This means 2-qubit gates can be performed without overhead for movement, and multiple gates can be performed simultaneously, given they do not operate on the same qubits. The QFT, QOAA, and the Quantum Classifier all contain gates which are precise rotations. These must be broken into more realistic gates which can perform the operation approximately. For single qubit gates, we use the gridsynth decomposition method from [82]

Benchmark	# Qubits	Logical Depth	Physical Depth	Gate Set
IDLE	4	2-70	2-70	I
RANDOM	4	2-70	2-70	I,X,Y,Z,H,CNOT
Adder (1,2)	4,7	26,52	26,52	H, T, CNOT
QFT (2,4)	3, 5	3, 10	9, 930	X, H, T, S, CNOT
Quantum Classifier (0,1,2)	3	7	525 (0), 537 (1), 430 (2)	X, H, T, S, CNOT
QAOA	4	1201	1201	Arbitrary

Table 4: Benchmarks used in experiments. Qubits is the number of qubits required for each size. Logical depth is the depth of the quantum circuit (number of sequential gates) required before compilation into Clifford+T set. Physical depth is the depth after compilation. The Adder and QFT have two different input sizes. The Quantum-Classifer had three different configurations (identifying output classes 0, 1, and 2. For QAOA, we do not perform gate decomposition.

which finds an approximation using the Clifford+T set, which includes the Hadamard (H),  $T = |0\rangle\langle 0| + e^{i\pi/4}|1\rangle\langle 1|$ , and  $S = |0\rangle\langle 0| + i|1\rangle\langle 1|$  gates. An additional complication exists in that controlled versions of these gates cannot be implemented directly [83]. To extend these to 2-qubit controlled gates, we take circuits directly from [84], which provides quantum circuits for controlled versions of each, given the use of an additional ancilla (scratch) qubit. Hence, all our decomposed circuits have 1 additional qubit. In order to perform randomized compiling, we need to divide the gate set into “easy” and “hard” gates. Easy and hard can generally be thought of as the difficulty in implementing the gate, such as the expected error rate, but the essential requirement is that the physical noise on the easy gates be independent of which easy gate is performed. We follow [9] and set easy gates as the Pauli gates and the phase gate S; where the hard gates are H, T, and all 2-qubit gates. However, instead of controlled-Z, we use CNOT. As nearly all gates in the decomposed circuits are “hard” gates, randomized compiling effectively doubles the circuit length for each algorithm.

QAOA takes input a set of clauses and increases the probability of quantum states that satisfy the clauses. The circuit is determined by  $p$ , the number of repetitions of the circuit;  $\gamma$ , which determines the rotations of single qubits around the z-axis; and  $\beta$ , which determines rotations around the x-axis. Multi-qubit controlled NOT gates, determined by the input clauses, are performed between these two rotations. As QAOA can have multiple “reasonably correct” outputs we do not believe process fidelity accurately captures the effects of noise. Rather, we look at the output probabilities of desired states. As quantum computers are not yet large enough for QAOA to solve useful problems, we designed a custom set of input clauses to generate pronounced and recognizable output. Specifically, we chose clauses which favored the  $|1\rangle$  state, with higher priority on qubits which represented the less significant bits of the input. We found optimal  $p$ ,  $\beta$ , and  $\gamma$  under noiseless simulation and qualitatively compare the “correct” output to those under noise. As QAOA uses small rotations, it would also be necessary to decompose into a realistic gate set. However, for this algorithm only, we chose to forego gate decomposition and perform only a qualitative analysis.

We use four representative noise models which fall each of the different categories discussed in Section 3. The first is a standard Pauli noise, where the probability of X, Y, and Z errors are all equally likely. While the most commonly used noise model, it generally provides the worst (and overly optimistic) estimates or error correcting threshold error rates [17]. Pauli noise is a non-unitary and incoherent model. To model purely coherent and unitary noise, we follow the same approach as in [19]. It assumes constant Z-rotations for each qubit,  $(e^{i\theta Z})^{\otimes n}$ , for various values of  $\theta$ . This is a simplified model, which comes with some drawbacks we will discuss, but is representative. The third is a combination of Pauli and coherent noise, we follow the model in [20]. This includes static X rotations and X Pauli errors. The fourth

Error Level	Pauli	Coherent	Pauli+Coherent	Amplitude Damping
0	0	$0\pi$	0 , $0\pi$	0
1	0.01	$\pi/30$	0.01 , $\pi/30$	0.01
2	0.02	$\pi/15$	0.02 , $\pi/15$	0.02
3	0.03	$\pi/10$	0.03 , $\pi/10$	0.03

Table 5: Noise levels tested for each noise type. Noise is inserted on every qubit on every cycle, regardless if it is being operated on. Pauli noise rate refers to probability of inserting and X, Y, or Z gate. Coherent noise is the rotation angle applied. For Pauli+Coherent, only X Pauli gates and X rotations are applied to align with the model in [20]. Amplitude Damping error rate refers to the parameter  $\gamma$  [44], which is the probability of collapse.

error model is Amplitude Damping, which is a commonly used and realistic noise model. It models loss of energy from the system to the environment and is a non-unitary process. We sweep the noise over a range of values which are similar to experimental error rates and are expected in near term computers, listed in Table 5. Each noise type is injected on every qubit on every cycle, regardless if the qubit is operated on or not. We assume the same noise rates for single and two-qubit gates. While two-qubit gates will typically have a higher rate of noise in a physical experiment, our values are swept over ranges typically seen for both single- and two-qubit gates. Unless otherwise stated, our metric of choice is the process fidelity of the noisy operation,  $\tilde{G}$ , to the noiseless operation,  $G$ , [10, 22]

$$PF = Tr \left[ G(\rho)\tilde{G}(\rho) \right] \quad (8)$$

where  $\rho$  is the density matrix representing input quantum state.  $Tr$  is the trace, which is the sum along the diagonal of the matrix. At a high level, process fidelity measures “how similar” the noisy output quantum state is to the intended target. If the noisy operation  $\tilde{G}$  is free of error, the process fidelity will be 1. We repeat experiments with different input pure states. We generate the input states at random in the same manner as [25], by selecting random polar coordinates on the Bloch sphere for each qubit. The reported process fidelity is the average.

Numerous quantum simulators exist, [85, 86, 87, 88, 89], many of which would be suitable to run our experiments. However, as we are implementing algorithms and incorporating noise models from a variety of sources, and did not want to unintentionally bias our experiments by relying on any specific software, we chose to run our simulations with the statistical programming language R [90]. This allows us to fully and independently define our experiments. Additionally, R is highly optimized to perform matrix multiplication, which is the essential component for density matrix simulation. We have made our code available at [91], which contains our implementations of all algorithms, Randomized Compiling, and the gate decomposition. To perform the gate decomposition, we rely on the implementation from [92].

Performing simulation with density matrices allows us to avoid much Monte-Carlo simulation. However, Monte-Carlo simulation is still needed due to randomness introduced by our random input states, randomized compiling, and the random circuits for the random circuit benchmark.

## 7 Results

For the Idle, Random, Addition, and QFT circuits we sweep the noise rate over the values listed in Table 5 and plot the effect on the fidelity for circuits of different lengths and sizes. As the Quantum Classifiers have a constant size, we sweep the 4 error models over a wide range and plot the accuracy of the output versus the error rate.




Figure 2: Idle circuit with 4 qubits under various noise models.




Figure 3: Random circuit with 4 qubits under various noise models.

Results for the Idle circuit are shown in Figure 2 and results for the Random circuit are shown in Figure 3. Both circuits are performed from 2 to 70 cycles. Cycles here means the length of a single gate. Note that error level 0 shows a process fidelity of 1, meaning there is no corruption of the quantum state. It is highly noticeable how coherent noise affects the Idle and Random circuits differently. For the Idle circuit, coherent noise has an immediate drastic impact on the fidelity. We must note the strange behavior of the Idle circuit under coherent noise. Due to our simplified coherent noise model, the fidelity returns with a periodicity determined by the constant angle of rotation. This is unlikely to be a physically realistic phenomenon, and even if it was, *it would not be possible to exploit this fact unless one was completely aware of the exact effects of the physical noise*. As physical noise is difficult to model and predict, it is highly unlikely one would have such knowledge. Note that randomized compiling removes this periodic effect.

The true finding from our simulation of coherent noise on the Idle circuit is the immediate destructive nature of even a slight coherent noise source. Interestingly, this same coherent noise is not highly destructive on a Random circuit. In fact, even without Randomized Compiling, the error decays exponentially just as it does under stochastic Pauli noise. This finding is consistent with [46], which says that coherent noise will affect randomized circuits much differently than idle or




Figure 4: Addition circuit performing 1- and 2-bit addition under various noise models.




Figure 5: QFT circuit with 2- and 4-input qubits under various noise models.

cyclic circuits. The coherent noise gets “smeared out” by the randomization inherent in a random circuit. Additionally, this suggests that the randomized benchmark circuits in Quantum Volume [79] will not be representative for many quantum circuits. Noteworthy is that Randomized Compiling does not provide a benefit if the circuit already contains a high degree of randomness. However, the vast majority of useful quantum algorithms do not have such structure.

**Takeaway:** The chosen quantum noise model has a drastic impact on the performance of quantum algorithms. Additionally, the effect of the quantum noise is largely determined by the nature of the quantum algorithm being performed. Hence, one must be cautious when choosing quantum algorithms for benchmarks.

Results for the addition circuit are shown in Figure 4 and results for the QFT are shown in Figure 5. The lightly shaded bars represent randomly compiled versions of the same circuit. Randomized compiling produces a significant increase in fidelity when coherent noise is present.

Note that when the noise is Pauli or Amplitude Damping, Randomized Compiling results are worse. There are two reasons for this. The first is that Randomized compiling does not mitigate the effects of these types of noises. For Pauli noise, it is already entirely random, and hence, is unmodified by the random compilation. For Amplitude Damping, this




Figure 6: Quantum-Classifier Accuracy on Iris data set under different noises and noise rates.




Figure 7: Probability of output quantum states QAOA with different noise models, with and without RC. Also shown is the output with no error.

is intuitive as it models energy loss of the system. Performing randomized gates generally would have no effect on the loss of energy of the system. It may help in some specific circumstances, such as when a qubit is held in the excited  $|1\rangle$  for an extended period of time. As Amplitude Damping models the collapse from  $|1\rangle$  to  $|0\rangle$ , the  $|1\rangle$  state is more vulnerable. As noted by the authors of [93], Amplitude Damping is more destructive if the quantum data in a program contains more qubits in the  $|1\rangle$  state. Randomized Compiling could make the state oscillate, reducing the amount of

time the qubit will spend in the excited, more vulnerable state. However, this condition is not present in either of these benchmarks.

The second reason Randomized Compiling does not help (or is harmful) is that the circuits are longer when randomly compiled. This increases the amount of total amount of Pauli error experienced by the quantum state during the run of the program and requires the qubits to remain coherent for longer, increasing the chance they collapse due to Amplitude Damping. While it is possible in theory to randomly compile without any additional cycles [9], with the circuits we tested all cycles were “hard” cycles, requiring them to be divided by idle “easy” cycles where randomizing Pauli gates can be inserted. This effectively doubles the circuit length. While this does represent the worst case (highest cost for Randomized Compiling), any quantum computer with a limited gate set will pay a similar price. Noteworthy, commonly used methods for gate compilation [92, 83] produce large amounts of H and T gates, which generally fall into the “hard” set. This makes it very clear how helpful randomized compiling actually is for coherent errors. Despite being twice as long, the randomly compiled circuits show fidelity improvements.

Takeaway: Randomized compiling is effective only against specific types of noise. The effect of Randomized Compiling is also determined by the algorithm being performed.

Noticeably, the Quantum-Classifer suffers significantly from all forms of noise. Before performing gate decomposition, the classifier proved to be quite robust, as intuition suggested. Unfortunately, the precise rotations required by the classifier resulted in long sequences of gates for approximation, which significantly increases vulnerability to noise. The gridsynth [92] algorithm allows for a wide range of precision in the approximation. We achieved the best results when significantly reducing the approximation precision in order to achieve a shorter circuit. Due to this approximation, the classifier suffers an accuracy loss even when no noise is present. This demonstrates a trade-off between precision and robustness to noise. Consistent with previous experiments, Randomized Compiling helps only when coherent noise is present. At sufficiently high noise, the classification of the Quantum Classifier can become effectively a random guess. The accuracy of IRIS converges to 1/3 as there are 3 equally likely classes.

As mentioned in Section 2, quantum states can be represented by complex column vectors, where the absolute value squared of each element is the probability of finding the system in the respective state. Plotting the probabilities enables a visual inspection of the state. Fig. 7 shows probabilities of the output quantum state of QAOA under each noise model with and without Randomized Compiling, and the ideal case which has no error. A qualitative inspection provides a number of insights. The clauses provided to QAOA favor the  $|1\rangle$  state, and moreso for the “less significant” qubits. Hence, the ideal output has probabilities that increase in a staircase like manner. Each of the noise types affect this probability distribution differently. Pauli noise decimates the state but some of the original structure intact. Coherent noise causes nearly every state to be equally likely, completely removing all useful information. Pauli noise in combination with coherent noise actually causes more of the structure to remain. Amplitude damping causes a collapse to  $|0\rangle$  for each qubit, hence the state  $|000\rangle$  has high probability. Randomized Compiling made Pauli noise worse, by further spreading out the probabilities (due to the longer circuit). It was however able to maintain much of the structure for coherent noise, and a fair amount for Amplitude Damping.

## 8 Conclusion

Computer architecture uses layers of abstraction to manage complex problems. This approach has already been applied to quantum computing. Unfortunately, quantum systems are notorious at defying abstraction and simplifying assumptions. It is easy to make invalid assumptions and generate inaccurate results. Here, we showed that quantum noise is more complex and difficult to model than is often assumed. This has profound effects everywhere, and can be felt significantly even at higher levels of the system stack. This complicates the task of benchmarking, which is already challenging and full of subtlety for classical computers. The noise model, the target application, and the performance metric all need to be carefully considered.

## References

- [1] John L Gustafson and Quinn O Snell. Hint: A new way to measure computer performance. In *Proceedings of the Twenty-Eighth Annual Hawaii International Conference on System Sciences*, volume 2, pages 392–401. IEEE, 1995.
- [2] David J Lilja. *Measuring computer performance: a practitioner's guide*. Cambridge university press, 2005.
- [3] Cloyce D Spradling. Spec cpu2006 benchmark tools. *ACM SIGARCH Computer Architecture News*, 35(1):130–134, 2007.
- [4] Christian Bienia, Sanjeev Kumar, Jaswinder Pal Singh, and Kai Li. The parsec benchmark suite: Characterization and architectural implications. In *Proceedings of the 17th international conference on Parallel architectures and compilation techniques*, pages 72–81. ACM, 2008.
- [5] Robin J Blume-Kohout and Kevin Young. Metrics and benchmarks for quantum processors: State of play. Technical report, Sandia National Lab.(SNL-NM), Albuquerque, NM (United States); Sandia , 2019.
- [6] Emanuel Knill, Dietrich Leibfried, Rolf Reichle, Joe Britton, R Brad Blakestad, John D Jost, Chris Langer, Roee Ozeri, Signe Seidelin, and David J Wineland. Randomized benchmarking of quantum gates. *Physical Review A*, 77(1):012307, 2008.
- [7] Christoph Dankert, Richard Cleve, Joseph Emerson, and Etera Livine. Exact and approximate unitary 2-designs and their application to fidelity estimation. *Physical Review A*, 80(1):012304, 2009.
- [8] Joseph Emerson, Robert Alicki, and Karol Życzkowski. Scalable noise estimation with random unitary operators. *Journal of Optics B: Quantum and Semiclassical Optics*, 7(10):S347, 2005.
- [9] Joel J Wallman and Joseph Emerson. Noise tailoring for scalable quantum computation via randomized compiling. *Physical Review A*, 94(5):052325, 2016.
- [10] Alexander Erhard, Joel James Wallman, Lukas Postler, Michael Meth, Roman Stricker, Esteban Adrian Martinez, Philipp Schindler, Thomas Monz, Joseph Emerson, and Rainer Blatt. Characterizing large-scale quantum computers via cycle benchmarking. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1902.08543*, 2019.
- [11] Timothy Proctor, Kenneth Rudinger, Kevin Young, Mohan Sarovar, and Robin Blume-Kohout. What randomized benchmarking actually measures. *Physical review letters*, 119(13):130502, 2017.
- [12] John L Hennessy and David A Patterson. *Computer architecture: a quantitative approach*. Elsevier, 2011.
- [13] Robert B Griffiths. *Consistent quantum theory*. Cambridge University Press, 2003.
- [14] Michael Loceff. A course in quantum computing (for the community college). *Foothill College*, 2015.
- [15] Michael A Nielsen and Isaac Chuang. *Quantum computation and quantum information*, 2002.
- [16] Daniel Gottesman. An introduction to quantum error correction and fault-tolerant quantum computation. In *Quantum information science and its contributions to mathematics, Proceedings of Symposia in Applied Mathematics*, volume 68, pages 13–58, 2010.
- [17] Mauricio Gutiérrez and Kenneth R Brown. Comparison of a quantum error-correction threshold for exact and approximate errors. *Physical Review A*, 91(2):022335, 2015.

- [18] Mauricio Gutiérrez, Lukas Svec, Alexander Vargo, and Kenneth R Brown. Approximation of realistic errors by clifford channels and pauli measurements. *Physical Review A*, 87(3):030302, 2013.
- [19] Sergey Bravyi, Matthias Englbrecht, Robert König, and Nolan Peard. Correcting coherent errors with surface codes. *npj Quantum Information*, 4(1):55, 2018.
- [20] Daniel Greenbaum and Zachary Dutton. Modeling coherent errors in quantum error correction. *Quantum Science and Technology*, 3(1):015007, 2017.
- [21] Easwar Magesan, Daniel Puzzuoli, Christopher E Granade, and David G Cory. Modeling quantum noise for efficient testing of fault-tolerant circuits. *Physical Review A*, 87(1):012324, 2013.
- [22] Steven T Flammia and Yi-Kai Liu. Direct fidelity estimation from few pauli measurements. *Physical review letters*, 106(23):230501, 2011.
- [23] Mauricio Gutiérrez, Conor Smith, Livia Lulushi, Smitha Janardan, and Kenneth R Brown. Errors and pseudothresholds for incoherent and coherent noise. *Physical Review A*, 94(4):042338, 2016.
- [24] Stefanie J Beale, Joel J Wallman, Mauricio Gutiérrez, Kenneth R Brown, and Raymond Laflamme. Quantum error correction decoheres noise. *Physical review letters*, 121(19):190501, 2018.
- [25] Jeff P Barnes, Colin J Trout, Dennis Lucarelli, and BD Clader. Quantum error-correction failure distributions: Comparison of coherent and stochastic error models. *Physical Review A*, 95(6):062338, 2017.
- [26] Jun Yoneda, Kenta Takeda, Tomohiro Otsuka, Takashi Nakajima, Matthieu R Delbecq, Giles Allison, Takumu Honda, Tetsuo Koderu, Shunri Oda, Yusuke Hoshi, et al. A quantum-dot spin qubit with coherence limited by charge noise and fidelity higher than 99.9%. *Nature nanotechnology*, 13(2):102, 2018.
- [27] Harrison Ball, Thomas M Stace, Steven T Flammia, and Michael J Biercuk. Effect of noise correlations on randomized benchmarking. *Physical Review A*, 93(2):022303, 2016.
- [28] Richard Kueng, David M Long, Andrew C Doherty, and Steven T Flammia. Comparing experiments to the fault-tolerance threshold. *Physical review letters*, 117(17):170502, 2016.
- [29] Joel J Wallman. Bounding experimental quantum error rates relative to fault-tolerant thresholds. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1511.00727*, 2015.
- [30] Joel Wallman, Chris Granade, Robin Harper, and Steven T Flammia. Estimating the coherence of noise. *New Journal of Physics*, 17(11):113020, 2015.
- [31] Teresa Brecht, Wolfgang Pfaff, Chen Wang, Yiwen Chu, Luigi Frunzio, Michel H Devoret, and Robert J Schoelkopf. Multilayer microwave integrated quantum circuits for scalable quantum computing. *npj Quantum Information*, 2:16002, 2016.
- [32] JS Pratt and JH Eberly. Qubit cross talk and entanglement decay. *Physical Review B*, 64(19):195314, 2001.
- [33] Colin D Bruzewicz, John Chiaverini, Robert McConnell, and Jeremy M Sage. Trapped-ion quantum computing: Progress and challenges. *Applied Physics Reviews*, 6(2):021314, 2019.
- [34] Austin G Fowler. Coping with qubit leakage in topological codes. *Physical Review A*, 88(4):042308, 2013.

- [35] Easwar Magesan, Jay M Gambetta, Blake R Johnson, Colm A Ryan, Jerry M Chow, Seth T Merkel, Marcus P Da Silva, George A Keefe, Mary B Rothwell, Thomas A Ohki, et al. Efficient measurement of quantum gate error by interleaved randomized benchmarking. *Physical review letters*, 109(8):080505, 2012.
- [36] Daniel Gottesman. The heisenberg representation of quantum computers. *arXiv preprint quant-ph/9807006*, 1998.
- [37] Scott Aaronson and Daniel Gottesman. Improved simulation of stabilizer circuits. *Physical Review A*, 70(5):052328, 2004.
- [38] Gushu Li, Yufei Ding, and Yuan Xie. Sanq: A simulation framework for architecting noisy intermediate-scale quantum computing system. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1904.11590*, 2019.
- [39] Héctor Abraham, Ismail Yunus Akhalwaya, Gadi Aleksandrowicz, Thomas Alexander, Gadi Alexandrowics, Eli Arbel, Abraham Asfaw, Carlos Azaustre, Panagiotis Barkoutsos, George Barron, Luciano Bello, Yael Ben-Haim, Lev S. Bishop, Samuel Bosch, David Bucher, CZ, Fran Cabrera, Padraic Calpin, Lauren Capelluto, Jorge Carballo, Chun-Fu Chen, Adrian Chen, Richard Chen, Jerry M. Chow, Christian Claus, Andrew W. Cross, Abigail J. Cross, Juan Cruz-Benito, Cryoris, Chris Culver, Antonio D. Córcoles-Gonzales, Sean Dague, Matthieu Dartiailh, Abdón Rodríguez Davila, Delton Ding, Eugene Dumitrescu, Karel Dumon, Ivan Duran, Pieter Eendebak, Daniel Egger, Mark Everitt, Paco Martín Fernández, Albert Frisch, Andreas Fuhrer, Julien Gacon, Gadi, Borja Godoy Gago, Jay M. Gambetta, Luis Garcia, Shelly Garion, Gawel-Kus, Leron Gil, Juan Gomez-Mosquera, Salvador de la Puente González, Donny Greenberg, John A. Gunnels, Isabel Haide, Ikko Hamamura, Vojtech Havlicek, Joe Hellmers, Łukasz Herok, Hiroshi Horii, Connor Howington, Wei Hu, Shaohan Hu, Haruki Imai, Takashi Imamichi, Raban Iten, Toshinari Itoko, Ali Javadi-Abhari, Jessica, Kiran Johns, Naoki Kanazawa, Anton Karazeev, Paul Kassebaum, Vivek Krishnan, Kevin Krsulich, Gawel Kus, Ryan LaRose, Raphaël Lambert, Joe Latone, Scott Lawrence, Peng Liu, Panagiotis Barkoutsos ZRL Mac, Yunho Maeng, Aleksei Malyshev, Jakub Marecek, Manoel Marques, Dolph Mathews, Atsushi Matsuo, Douglas T. McClure, Cameron McGarry, David McKay, Srujan Meesala, Antonio Mezzacapo, Rohit Midha, Zlatko Minev, Renier Morales, Prakash Murali, Jan Müggenburg, David Nadlinger, Giacomo Nannicini, Paul Nation, Yehuda Naveh, Nick-Singstock, Pradeep Niroula, Hassi Norlen, Lee James O’Riordan, Pauline Ollitrault, Steven Oud, Dan Padilha, Hanhee Paik, Simone Perriello, Anna Phan, Marco Pistoia, Alejandro Pozas-iKerstjens, Viktor Prutyantov, Jesús Pérez, Quintiii, Rudy Raymond, Rafael Martín-Cuevas Redondo, Max Reuter, Diego M. Rodríguez, Mingi Ryu, Martin Sandberg, Ninad Sathaye, Bruno Schmitt, Chris Schnabel, Travis L. Scholten, Eddie Schoute, Ismael Faro Sertage, Yunong Shi, Adenilton Silva, Yukio Siraichi, Seyon Sivarajah, John A. Smolin, Mathias Soeken, Dominik Steenzen, Matt Stypulkoski, Hitomi Takahashi, Charles Taylor, Pete Taylour, Soolu Thomas, Mathieu Tillet, Maddy Tod, Enrique de la Torre, Kenso Trabing, Matthew Treinish, TrishaPe, Wes Turner, Yotam Vaknin, Carmen Recio Valcarce, Francois Varchon, Desiree Vogt-Lee, Christophe Vuillot, James Weaver, Rafal Wieczorek, Jonathan A. Wildstrom, Robert Wille, Erick Winston, Jack J. Woehr, Stefan Woerner, Ryan Woo, Christopher J. Wood, Ryan Wood, Stephen Wood, James Wootton, Daniyar Yeralin, Jessie Yu, Laura Zdanski, Zoufal, anedumla, azulehner, bcamorrison, drholmie, fanizzamarco, kanejess, klinvill, merav aharoni, ordmoj, tigerjack, yang.luh, and yotamvakninibm. Qiskit: An open-source framework for quantum computing, 2019.
- [40] Nader Khammassi, Imran Ashraf, Xiang Fu, Carmen G Almudever, and Koen Bertels. Qx: A high-performance quantum computer simulation platform. In *Design, Automation & Test in Europe Conference & Exhibition (DATE), 2017*, pages 464–469. IEEE, 2017.
- [41] Joel Wallman and Joseph Emerson.
- [42] Naomi H Nickerson and Benjamin J Brown. Analysing correlated noise on the surface code using adaptive decoding algorithms. *Quantum*, 3:131, 2019.

- [43] Muyuan Li, Mauricio Gutiérrez, Stanley E David, Alonzo Hernandez, and Kenneth R Brown. Fault tolerance with bare ancillary qubits for a  $[[7, 1, 3]]$  code. *Physical Review A*, 96(3):032341, 2017.
- [44] Yu Tomita and Krysta M Svore. Low-distance surface codes under realistic quantum noise. *Physical Review A*, 90(6):062320, 2014.
- [45] Christopher Chamberland, Joel Wallman, Stefanie Beale, and Raymond Laflamme. Hard decoding algorithm for optimizing thresholds under general markovian noise. *Physical Review A*, 95(4):042332, 2017.
- [46] Robin Blume-Kohout and Kevin C Young. A volumetric framework for quantum computer benchmarks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1904.05546*, 2019.
- [47] Robin Blume-Kohout, John King Gamble, Erik Nielsen, Kenneth Rudinger, Jonathan Mizrahi, Kevin Fortier, and Peter Maunz. Demonstration of qubit operations below a rigorous fault tolerance threshold with gate set tomography. *Nature communications*, 8:14485, 2017.
- [48] Michael R Geller and Zhongyuan Zhou. Efficient error models for fault-tolerant architectures and the pauli twirling approximation. *Physical Review A*, 88(1):012314, 2013.
- [49] Marcus Silva, Easwar Magesan, David W Kribs, and Joseph Emerson. Scalable protocol for identification of correctable codes. *Physical Review A*, 78(1):012347, 2008.
- [50] Joydip Ghosh, Austin G Fowler, and Michael R Geller. Surface code with decoherence: An analysis of three superconducting architectures. *Physical Review A*, 86(6):062318, 2012.
- [51] Pradeep Kiran Sarvepalli, Andreas Klappenecker, and Martin Rötteler. Asymmetric quantum codes: constructions, bounds and performance. *Proceedings of the Royal Society A: Mathematical, Physical and Engineering Sciences*, 465(2105):1645–1672, 2009.
- [52] Emanuel Knill, Raymond Laflamme, and Wojciech H Zurek. Resilient quantum computation: error models and thresholds. *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London. Series A: Mathematical, Physical and Engineering Sciences*, 454(1969):365–384, 1998.
- [53] Mark Oskin, Frederic T Chong, and Isaac L Chuang. A practical architecture for reliable quantum computers. *Computer*, (1):79–87, 2002.
- [54] K Vogel and H Risken. Determination of quasiprobability distributions in terms of probability distributions for the rotated quadrature phase. *Physical Review A*, 40(5):2847, 1989.
- [55] Marcus Cramer, Martin B Plenio, Steven T Flammia, Rolando Somma, David Gross, Stephen D Bartlett, Olivier Landon-Cardinal, David Poulin, and Yi-Kai Liu. Efficient quantum state tomography. *Nature communications*, 1:149, 2010.
- [56] Kristine Boone, Arnaud Carignan-Dugas, Joel J Wallman, and Joseph Emerson. Randomized benchmarking under different gate sets. *Physical Review A*, 99(3):032329, 2019.
- [57] Shelby Kimmel, Marcus P da Silva, Colm A Ryan, Blake R Johnson, and Thomas Ohki. Robust extraction of tomographic information via randomized benchmarking. *Physical Review X*, 4(1):011050, 2014.
- [58] Jay M Gambetta, AD Córcoles, Seth T Merkel, Blake R Johnson, John A Smolin, Jerry M Chow, Colm A Ryan, Chad Rigetti, S Poletto, Thomas A Ohki, et al. Characterization of addressability by simultaneous randomized benchmarking. *Physical review letters*, 109(24):240504, 2012.

- [59] Rafael N Alexander, Peter S Turner, and Stephen D Bartlett. Randomized benchmarking in measurement-based quantum computing. *Physical Review A*, 94(3):032303, 2016.
- [60] Margaret Martonosi and Martin Roetteler. Next steps in quantum computing: Computer science’s role. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1903.10541*, 2019.
- [61] Peter W Shor. Polynomial-time algorithms for prime factorization and discrete logarithms on a quantum computer. *SIAM review*, 41(2):303–332, 1999.
- [62] Lov K Grover. A fast quantum mechanical algorithm for database search. In *Proceedings of the twenty-eighth annual ACM symposium on Theory of computing*, pages 212–219. ACM, 1996.
- [63] Ethan Bernstein and Umesh Vazirani. Quantum complexity theory. *SIAM Journal on computing*, 26(5):1411–1473, 1997.
- [64] Wim Van Dam, Sean Hallgren, and Lawrence Ip. Quantum algorithms for some hidden shift problems. *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 36(3):763–778, 2006.
- [65] Martin Rötteler. Quantum algorithms for highly non-linear boolean functions. In *Proceedings of the twenty-first annual ACM-SIAM symposium on Discrete algorithms*, pages 448–457. Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics, 2010.
- [66] K Wright, KM Beck, S Debnath, JM Amini, Y Nam, N Grzesiak, J-S Chen, NC Pistenti, M Chmielewski, C Collins, et al. Benchmarking an 11-qubit quantum computer. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1903.08181*, 2019.
- [67] Frank Arute, Kunal Arya, Ryan Babbush, Dave Bacon, Joseph C Bardin, Rami Barends, Rupak Biswas, Sergio Boixo, Fernando GSL Brandao, David A Buell, et al. Quantum supremacy using a programmable superconducting processor. *Nature*, 574(7779):505–510, 2019.
- [68] Yann LeCun, Léon Bottou, Yoshua Bengio, Patrick Haffner, et al. Gradient-based learning applied to document recognition. *Proceedings of the IEEE*, 86(11):2278–2324, 1998.
- [69] J. Deng, W. Dong, R. Socher, L.-J. Li, K. Li, and L. Fei-Fei. ImageNet: A Large-Scale Hierarchical Image Database. In *CVPR09*, 2009.
- [70] Norbert M Linke, Dmitri Maslov, Martin Roetteler, Shantanu Debnath, Caroline Figgatt, Kevin A Landsman, Kenneth Wright, and Christopher Monroe. Experimental comparison of two quantum computing architectures. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 114(13):3305–3310, 2017.
- [71] Jonathan Olson, Yudong Cao, Jonathan Romero, Peter Johnson, Pierre-Luc Dallaire-Demers, Nicolas Sawaya, Prineha Narang, Ian Kivlichan, Michael Wasielewski, and Alán Aspuru-Guzik. Quantum information and computation for chemistry. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1706.05413*, 2017.
- [72] Sam McArdle, Suguru Endo, Alan Aspuru-Guzik, Simon Benjamin, and Xiao Yuan. Quantum computational chemistry. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1808.10402*, 2018.
- [73] Yudong Cao, Jonathan Romero, Jonathan P Olson, Matthias Degroote, Peter D Johnson, Mária Kieferová, Ian D Kivlichan, Tim Menke, Borja Peropadre, Nicolas PD Sawaya, et al. Quantum chemistry in the age of quantum computing. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1812.09976*, 2018.
- [74] Maria Schuld, Alex Bocharov, Krysta Svore, and Nathan Wiebe. Circuit-centric quantum classifiers. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1804.00633*, 2018.

- [75] Dave Wecker, Matthew B Hastings, and Matthias Troyer. Progress towards practical quantum variational algorithms. *Physical Review A*, 92(4):042303, 2015.
- [76] Edward Farhi, Jeffrey Goldstone, and Sam Gutmann. A quantum approximate optimization algorithm. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1411.4028*, 2014.
- [77] Alberto Peruzzo, Jarrod McClean, Peter Shadbolt, Man-Hong Yung, Xiao-Qi Zhou, Peter J Love, Alán Aspuru-Guzik, and Jeremy L O'Brien. A variational eigenvalue solver on a photonic quantum processor. *Nature communications*, 5:4213, 2014.
- [78] Lev S Bishop, Sergey Bravyi, Andrew Cross, Jay M Gambetta, and John Smolin. Quantum volume. *Quantum Volume. Technical Report*, 2017.
- [79] Andrew W Cross, Lev S Bishop, Sarah Sheldon, Paul D Nation, and Jay M Gambetta. Validating quantum computers using randomized model circuits. *Physical Review A*, 100(3):032328, 2019.
- [80] Kai-Wen Cheng and Chien-Cheng Tseng. Quantum full adder and subtractor. *Electronics Letters*, 38(22):1343–1344, 2002.
- [81] Ronald A Fisher. The use of multiple measurements in taxonomic problems. *Annals of eugenics*, 7(2):179–188, 1936.
- [82] Peter Selinger. Efficient clifford+ t approximation of single-qubit operators. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1212.6253*, 2012.
- [83] Vadym Kliuchnikov, Dmitri Maslov, and Michele Mosca. Fast and efficient exact synthesis of single qubit unitaries generated by clifford and t gates. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1206.5236*, 2012.
- [84] Matthew Amy, Dmitri Maslov, Michele Mosca, and Martin Roetteler. A meet-in-the-middle algorithm for fast synthesis of depth-optimal quantum circuits. *IEEE Transactions on Computer-Aided Design of Integrated Circuits and Systems*, 32(6):818–830, 2013.
- [85] Thomas Häner, Damian S Steiger, Mikhail Smelyanskiy, and Matthias Troyer. High performance emulation of quantum circuits. In *SC'16: Proceedings of the International Conference for High Performance Computing, Networking, Storage and Analysis*, pages 866–874. IEEE, 2016.
- [86] Damian S Steiger, Thomas Häner, and Matthias Troyer. Projectq: an open source software framework for quantum computing. *Quantum*, 2(49):10–22331, 2018.
- [87] Krysta M Svore, Alan Geller, Matthias Troyer, John Azariah, Christopher Granade, Bettina Heim, Vadym Kliuchnikov, Mariia Mykhailova, Andres Paz, and Martin Roetteler. Q#: Enabling scalable quantum computing and development with a high-level domain-specific language. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1803.00652*, 2018.
- [88] Ali JavadiAbhari, Shruti Patil, Daniel Kudrow, Jeff Heckey, Alexey Lvov, Frederic T Chong, and Margaret Martonosi. Scaffcc: a framework for compilation and analysis of quantum computing programs. In *Proceedings of the 11th ACM Conference on Computing Frontiers*, page 1. ACM, 2014.
- [89] Martin Roetteler, Krysta M Svore, Dave Wecker, and Nathan Wiebe. Design automation for quantum architectures. In *Design, Automation & Test in Europe Conference & Exhibition (DATE), 2017*, pages 1312–1317. IEEE, 2017.
- [90] R Core Team. *R: A Language and Environment for Statistical Computing*. R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria, 2016.

- [91] <https://gofile.io/?c=pnCj8l>.
- [92] Peter Selinger. Newsynth: exact and approximate synthesis of quantum circuits. <http://www.mathstat.dal.ca/~selinger/newsynth/>.
- [93] Abdullah Ash Saki, Mahabubul Alam, and Swaroop Ghosh. Study of decoherence in quantum computers: A circuit-design perspective. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1904.04323*, 2019.