

Feynman’s “Simulating Physics with Computers”

Paul M. Alsing¹, Carlo Cafaro^{1,2}, Stefano Mancini^{3,4}

¹University at Albany-SUNY, Albany, NY 12222, USA

²SUNY Polytechnic Institute, Utica, NY 13502, USA

³University of Camerino, I-62032 Camerino, Italy and

⁴INFN, Sezione di Perugia, 06123 Perugia, Italy

This invited essay belongs to a series considering highly influential articles published by the *International Journal of Theoretical Physics*.

In this paper, we highlight the physical content and the profound consequences of Richard Feynman’s 1982 paper on “*Simulating Physics with Computers*”.

PACS numbers: Quantum Computation (03.67.Lx), Quantum Information (03.67.Ac).

Feynman delivered his seminal lecture “Simulating physics with computers” at the Physics of Computation Conference at the MIT Endicott House in May of 1981. The content of his lecture was later published by the *International Journal of Theoretical Physics* in 1982 [1]. Nowadays, Feynman’s 1982 paper is properly regarded as one of the most influential pieces of work that helped laying out the foundations of quantum computing as a research discipline in its own right.

In Ref. [1], Feynman starts from the observation that natural phenomena are quantum rather than classical in their essence. Therefore, he focuses on the simulation of quantum systems. He employs counting arguments to preliminarily deduce that probabilistic simulations of quantum systems by means of classical digital computers with local connections are not efficient since they use resources that do not scale well with the size of the system. He then further supports his deduction by focusing on the quantum mechanics of a two-photon correlation experiment. This experiment can be described as follows. Consider a source (an atom, for instance) that emits two maximally entangled photons in opposite directions (one going to the right and the other to the left, for instance) toward detector-1 and detector-2 [1, 2]. An analyzer is placed before each detector so that a photon polarized along the x -axis (horizontal polarization) goes through detector-1, while a photon polarized along the y -axis (vertical polarization) is blocked. Analogously, a photon polarized along the y -axis goes through detector-2, while a photon polarized along the x -direction is blocked. Each analyzer is assumed to be rotated independently of the other. For example, when the transmission axis of analyzer-1 is rotated by the angle $\phi_1 \geq 0$, analyzer-2 is set to $\phi_2 \geq 0$. Choosing $\phi_2 - \phi_1 = 30^\circ$, Feynman states that quantum mechanical predictions agree with experimental results. Specifically, the probability of agreement between the two detector outputs (i.e., both collect a photon or neither does) calculated with standard quantum mechanics techniques equals $\cos^2(\phi_2 - \phi_1) = 3/4 = 75\%$. Subsequently, Feynman also shows essentially that quantum theory is not compatible with a local hidden-variable theory of classical type since imposing this compatibility leads to theoretical predictions that are in disagreement with experimental observations. Indeed, admitting a realistic local hidden variable description of quantum mechanics, Feynman makes use of clever counting arguments to show that the probability of agreement between the two detector outputs is necessarily less than $2/3 \approx 67\% < 75\%$. The value $2/3$ emerges from the fact that when $\phi_2 - \phi_1 = 30^\circ$, the probability of agreement is given by the fraction of experiments in which the readings of the two detectors agree and equals the ratio between the number of successful experiments (i.e., 8 in the best possible scenario) and the number of possible experiments (i.e., 12) [3]. Remarkably, without ever mentioning Bell [4], Feynman offers in Ref. [1] an alternative demonstration of Bell’s Theorem [5]. In a sense, this comes as no surprise today given that Feynman’s approach to quantum theory is well-known for being simple and extremely powerful [6]. In view of this discrepancy between experiments and local hidden-variable theories of classical type, Feynman concludes that in order to efficiently simulate large quantum systems specified by highly entangled states, one needs a computer itself built of quantum mechanical elements that are governed by quantum mechanical rules. With this conclusion, Feynman envisions the concept of a quantum computer. For this reason, Ref. [1] can be justly regarded as one of the most influential written pieces of work that set in motion the hunt for a physical realization of a quantum computer [7].

Despite the relevance of Feynman’s insights, the content of the work in Ref. [1] does not offer specific technical details on how a quantum mechanical computer was presumed to run or how a simulation itself would come to a physical realization [8]. Of course, Feynman arrived at his work in Ref. [1] after quite some deep thinking with a sound knowledge of the existing models of computation [9] together with their most relevant thermodynamical aspects [10]. Furthermore, among other things, he was rather mindful of the fact that the physical realization of such a quantum computing machine would have been rather challenging. In Ref. [11], for instance, he points out the significance of deepening our understanding about how to manipulate and control the arrangements of things (for instance, spins) on an atomic scale. Specifically, he argues that the meaningfulness of efficiently performing these tasks

permits to get access to an enormously greater range of possible chemical and physical properties that materials and substances can exhibit. In Ref. [12], Feynman presented a new work on the relation between physics and computation where he tried to describe with more technical details (compared with the more abstract and general content of the work in Ref. [1]) the functioning of an ideal quantum computer along with the design of quantum algorithms to be run on it. Despite the assumed ideality of the quantum machine analyzed, Feynman warns (yet again) his readers that this quantum computer seems to be rather delicate, and the presence of imperfections may cause considerable damage in practical scenarios. Indeed, in actual scenarios, the quantum computer is expected to interact with the external world, both for putting data in and for taking data out. Focusing on the register for holding the data, for instance, there may be issues of cross-talk, interactions between one atom and another in the register, or interactions of atoms in the register directly with computer components that are responsible for what is occurring along the program line, that one did not exactly factor in. In other words, Feynman states that one needs to be mindful of the fact that there may be small terms in the actual Hamiltonian besides the ones defining the ideal Hamiltonian of the quantum-mechanical machine. To combat some of these imperfections and noisy sources of errors causing loss of coherence (i.e., decoherence) in quantum systems, Feynman points out that error correcting codes developed for “normal” computers might help mitigating the number of errors that can happen during the run of an algorithm on a quantum machine [12].

Finally, Feynman also kept thinking about the meaning of negative probabilities in science [13], an issue that he mentioned in Ref. [1] while discussing the incompatibility of quantum theory with a local hidden-variable theory of classical type. Originally, this concept of negative probability captured Feynman’s attention while attempting to quantize electrodynamics with cutoffs (a work on quantum electrodynamics that jointly gave Feynman, Julian Schwinger, and Sin-Itiro Tomonaga the Nobel prize in physics in 1965, seventeen years before his 1982 IJTP paper). In Ref. [13], Feynman argues that while the final probability of an observable physical event must be positive, a final negative probability simply means that scenario is not attainable or not experimentally verifiable. Most interestingly, during a calculation of probabilities of physical events or states, conditional probabilities and probabilities of imagined intermediary events or states may be negative. Most compellingly for our specific discussion on quantum simulations, as we shall discuss later, the degree of negativity of (quasi) probabilities happens to play a key role in determining the upper bounds on the experimental conditions for which classical simulations of sufficiently noisy quantum systems can be efficiently performed [14].

What happened during the last forty years? From Feynman’s 1982 proposal [1], the amount of research and progress made by a number of experts in a range of areas towards the physical realization of a fully functioning quantum computer has been impressive. However, during these years, there has been a persistent bouncing from excitement to dismay. We passed from the level of “conjecture” to the level of “proof” for the universality of quantum simulators [15]. Indeed, Lloyd described in Ref. [15] how to perform an operation on a quantum computer by providing an approximate decomposition of the time evolution operator for a quantum system of interacting particles by means of a short sequence of elementary gates. The first two historical “textbook quantum algorithms” of practical importance in which a quantum computer exhibited a substantial speedup over the best-known classical approaches were invented by Shor (superpolynomial speedup in factoring large integer numbers [16]) and Grover (quadratic speedup in an unstructured database search [17]). Moreover, the first quantum codes for combatting the loss of coherence caused by noisy errors in quantum computational tasks in a quantum computer were constructed by Shor [18, 19], Calderbank [19], and Steane [20].

In Ref. [1], Feynman mentioned the potential difficulties with simulating a quantum system of interacting fermions. Feynman was probably referring to the “sign problem” that happens in the numerical simulation of fermionic or frustrated models by means of Monte Carlo simulations [21]. The origin of the problem resides in the fact that when one maps the quantum system to an equivalent classical system, this mapping can give rise to configurations with negative Boltzmann weights (ultimately, a consequence of the Pauli uncertainty principle). This situation, in turn, results in an exponential growth of the simulation time with the number of fermionic particles (a consequence, this, of the exponential growth of the statistical error during the numerical simulations). This sign problem was shown to be NP-hard in Ref. [22]. Fortunately, a quantum version of the Metropolis algorithm was proposed in [23]. This quantum algorithm allows to avoid the sign problem that occurs in classical simulations thanks to the direct sampling from the eigenstates of the Hamiltonian of the quantum system whose equilibrium and static properties one wishes to simulate. In Ref. [1], Feynman estimated that one needs generally an exponentially large number of steps to simulate a quantum process on a classical computer.

In his argumentation, Feynman also discusses the properties of the phase-space quasiprobability distribution (i.e., the Wigner distribution). This quasiprobability distribution is almost a classical probability distribution since, unlike

classical probabilities, it can assume negative values that underline the quantum-mechanical nature of the physical system being considered. Interestingly, it was reported in Ref. [14] that for sufficiently large loss and noise in the system (i.e., photons) where the quantum process (i.e., boson sampling) occurs, the Wigner function can become positive. Then, thanks to this achieved positivity, an ordinary classical simulation of the quantum process can be performed efficiently without the need of an exponentially large number of computational steps. The findings of Ref. [14] are significant since, without suppressing Feynman’s 1982 suggestion about the necessity for quantum simulation, they specify upper bounds on the experimental conditions for which an ordinary classical computer can work efficiently (with, ideally, a runtime that scales polynomially with the size of the physical system) as a simulator of certain classes of quantum systems and quantum processes [24]. Note that while the Wigner distribution is a valid positive probability distribution on Gaussian states (for example, the ground state of the harmonic oscillator and coherent states) and plays a fundamental role in quantum information and metrology [25], for the purposes of quantum simulation and computation, non-Gaussian states are desired.

So, when is a quantum-mechanical simulation envisioned in Feynman’s 1982 IJTP paper strictly necessary? When does it show a clear advantage over the best classical simulations? There are important questions that, unfortunately, need much more work to be addressed in a meaningful manner [26]. Part of the problem resides in the fact that two major challenges with quantum computers are the identification of good a quantum computer technology and the selection of a suitable set of scientific applications for quantum simulations [27]. Current technologies for the physical implementation of quantum simulations include trapped ions, electronic spins (quantum dots), superconducting circuits, photons (linear optics), and nuclear spins (NMR-nuclear magnetic resonance). Each technology has its own strengths and weaknesses, as observed from actual experimental realizations [8]. Two of the most important performance measures are controllability (i.e., the ability of controlling and measuring each individual qubit) and scalability (i.e., controlling an array of at least a few tens of qubits). The healthy competition between these different technological platforms for quantum simulations is not a “winner takes all” scenario. Each platform has its own advantages and limitations, and different approaches often address complementary features of quantum simulation.

By a quantum computer, one usually implies a (universal) quantum machine able of performing full blown quantum computational tasks, including running general algorithms, classical data on quantum devices, or quantum data on quantum devices. The most prominent model of universal quantum computation is the gate-based quantum computing model [28]. The process of applying these gates is commonly considered to be controlled by an algorithm that runs on a digital computer [29]. A fact that is reflected into the emergence of quantum programming languages. Indeed, in recent years, there has been the making of several open source quantum computing program languages such as Google’s Cirq, IBM’s QisKit, Microsoft’s Quantum Development Kit, and Rigetti’s Quil [27]. However, tasks like compiling quantum algorithms to gate-circuits, or compiling quantum gate-circuit emulation functions, should be analyzed in terms of a rigorous mathematical theory of computability [30]. This, in turn, might hide serious difficulties and hinder the possibility for quantum information processing hardware to become relevant in practice. Returning to the concept of quantum simulations, we remark that it is essentially possible to identify three types of simulation [8]: i) digital simulation; ii) analog quantum simulation (including, for instance, quantum annealing [31]); iii) quantum-information inspired algorithms for the classical simulation of quantum systems. It is clear that within this classification of types, a (universal) quantum computer can function as a quantum simulator. However, one can also use as a quantum simulator an alternative device built specifically for the simulation, for instance a quantum annealer. Then, a digital simulation is intended to run on a (universal) quantum computer, while the analog quantum simulation is performed on an application-specific device. Finally, a quantum information inspired simulation generally runs on (universal) a classical computer. In general, during a quantum simulation, a quantum simulator is a controllable quantum system used to simulate other quantum-mechanical systems (for instance: time evolution, ground state, energy levels, thermal energy, heat capacity, correlation functions, and other static and dynamic observable properties). A successful digital quantum simulation, for instance, happens when the initial-state preparation, the implementation of the time evolution, and the measurement are realized employing solely polynomial resources [8]. In Ref. [1], Feynman requires that for an exact simulation to happen, the quantum-mechanical computer should do exactly as Nature. This statement is reminiscent of what today is known as analog quantum simulation. In this type of simulation, the Hamiltonian H_{sys} of the system is directly mapped onto the (controllable) Hamiltonian H_{sim} of the simulator, $H_{sys} \leftrightarrow H_{sim}$. The third type of simulation, instead, is characterized by the use of methods of quantum information theory into classical numerical algorithms for the simulation of quantum many-body systems. Interestingly, the above-mentioned sign problem insinuated by Feynman in Ref. [1] was addressed in the context of this type of quantum simulation in Ref. [23].

In theory, it seems that a clear quantum advantage is expected to occur in the simulation of the quantum dynamics (i.e., solving the time-dependent Schrödinger equation) of highly entangled systems of many particles, especially

chaotic quantum systems characterized by a significant temporal rate of change of entanglement [32]. Indeed, when the Hamiltonian is local, simulating the temporal evolution with a quantum computer scales polynomially with the number n of qubits in the system. The best classical algorithms, instead, are specified by a runtime that scales exponentially with the number of qubits n . As a matter of fact, the unitary evolution matrix $U(t)$ is exponentially large, since its size scales like $2^n \times 2^n = e^{n \ln(4)} \sim e^n$. Specific applications of quantum simulations are expected to occur in several fields of science, including condensed matter, high-energy physics, cosmology, atomic physics, nuclear physics, and quantum chemistry [8], as well as in the information sciences such as machine learning [33]. Hubbard models, spin systems, quantum phase transitions, spin glasses, superconductivity, and topological order are excellent condensed matter phenomena for which quantum simulations are expected to be of great usefulness [8]. For example, an exact simulation of a one-dimensional transverse Ising spin chain on Rigetti’s and IBM’s quantum processors was performed in Ref. [34]. Specifically, the expected value of the transverse magnetization of the ground state of a $n = 4$ Ising chain as a function of the transverse field strength was simulated with Rigetti’s 19-qubit processor (processor Acorn with quantum software pyQuil) and the two IBM 5-qubit and 16-qubit processors (ibmq \times 4 and ibmq \times 5, respectively, with software QisKit). Furthermore, using these same three quantum processors, the time evolution simulation of the transverse magnetization for the state $|\uparrow\uparrow\uparrow\rangle$ of a $n = 4$ Ising chain was executed. In this second set of simulations, in particular, the magnetization turns out to be smaller than expected in intensity. However, the simulation does reproduce the expected oscillatory pattern [34].

It is worthwhile pointing out that classical simulations are one of the possible techniques to benchmark quantum computers, even though these simulations are exponentially demanding due to the exponential scaling of the Hilbert space in which the quantum state is defined, as a function of the system size. Nonetheless, people are often interested in particular states that belong to peculiar subspaces of the full Hilbert space. Then several techniques were introduced over the years to represent and evolve such states, culminating with Tensor Network Methods [35–37]. Tensor network methods allow to approximate a quantum state by efficiently compressing its information, introducing a controllable error, and can be used for the simulation of quantum computers behavior. It is still unclear where which approach exhibits an advantageous behavior. For instance, a recent experiment on IBM’s superconducting quantum processor with 127 qubits claiming a quantum advantage [38] was outperformed by tensor network methods shortly after [39] in terms of accuracy and precision in simulating a kicked Ising quantum system.

Moreover, an excellent proving ground for studying the power of quantum simulations is high energy physics because of its very rich quantum-mechanical content [40]. In particular, the theory of strong interactions mediated by gluons (i.e., QCD-quantum chromodynamics) has several challenging simulation problems, given the enormous dimension of the Hilbert space together with the intense coupling strength between the interacting components of the larger composite quantum systems. Indeed, QCD theory necessitates of a larger number of qubits per site since it is specified by six flavors of quarks- each one with four Dirac degrees of freedom and three colors [27]. The application of quantum simulators to cosmology is especially useful because, in general, cosmological phenomena are not experimentally accessible. In this context, fascinating applications include the quantum simulation of the Unruh effect [41] and the quantum simulation of the Hawking black-hole radiation [42, 43]. In Ref. [41], the observation of a thermal flux of particles in vacuum by an accelerating observer was suggested to be emulated in terms of phonon excitation of trapped ions. In Ref. [42], a flowing fluid of ultracold atoms divided into two connected regions is considered. In one region, the fluid moves at a supersonic speed. In the other one, it moves at subsonic speed. Then, the black hole event horizon is simulated by the boundary between these two regions. Furthermore, when a pair of sound waves is produced in the vicinity of this boundary (in analogy to a pair of particles created from vacuum of space near a black hole event horizon), one of the waves is absorbed into the supersonic region, and the other one is radiated away from the region (in analogy to the Hawking radiation). Quite remarkably, recent promising applications of quantum computing and simulation have been proposed in the field of drug discovery [44] and finance [45] as well.

Current focus in the field of quantum simulation and computation emphasizes the search algorithms that demonstrate a *quantum advantage* over comparable classical computation, vs. *quantum supremacy*, where the latter demonstrates the execution of a quantum algorithm (not necessarily “practical”) that is computationally difficult or near impossible to perform on a classical computing resource. In Ref. [46], Google’s 53-qubit Weber quantum processor with programmable superconducting qubits based on the Sycamore architecture was used for sampling the output of a pseudo-random quantum circuit acting on 53 working qubits arranged in a two-dimensional array such that entangling two-qubit quantum gates can be performed on neighboring qubits in the array. Comparing with the state-of-the-art classical supercomputers, the authors arrived at the conclusion that, despite the artificial nature of the analyzed quantum task, a significant quantum advantage (quantum supremacy) was achieved [46]. However, the very same Google’s 53-qubit Weber quantum processor was used in Ref. [47] in simulations of properties of actual correlated molecules in quantum chemistry and, its performance was not equally successful. The processor was used for two

types of simulations. In the first task, the objective was to simulate the energy states of an 8-atom cluster of iron (Fe) and sulfur (S) found in the catalytic core of the enzyme nitrogenase. In the second task, the aim was to study the collective behavior (for instance, thermal energy and heat capacity) of magnetic spins in the crystalline material alpha-ruthenium trichloride (α -RuCl₃). Despite the fact that the largest simulations for α -RuCl₃ performed with 11 qubits, 310 two-qubit gates, and 782 single-qubit gates were not successful, simulations with a smaller number of two-qubit gates performed much better (most likely attributed to less overall system noise/decoherence issues associated with smaller circuit depth, in the absence of any currently reliable quantum error correction implementations). Specifically, simplifying the Hamiltonians into effective low-energy spin models and exploiting significant processing of data from exact classical simulations of similar tractable problems, the quantum simulations with up to 100 two-qubit gates lead to qualitatively correct properties of the spin structure, the spectrum of the excited-state, and the heat capacity of the materials [47].

We do not claim of having discussed in this paper the state of the art of quantum computers. Indeed, this was not our goal. However, in an attempt to get closer to such a state of the art, we point out that there exist nowadays hardware platforms with an order of thousands qubits. Furthermore, digital quantum simulations with more than 100 qubits are performed for the study of hadron dynamics in the Schwinger model [48] or, alternatively, up to 64 qubits for equivariant quantum neural networks investigations [49]. For additional reviews on quantum computing applications in high energy physics, we refer to Refs.[50–52]. In particular, the state of the art of quantum computing examples, algorithm methods, and hardware challenges are discussed in Ref. [50]. As a curious historical side remark, we point out that Feynman’s 1982 IJTP paper was not cited much shortly after publication in the high energy physics community. Indeed, a very rapid increase of citations took place only starting approximately twelve years ago. For additional interesting reviews on algorithms and methods used in quantum computing for high energy physics as well, including the Quantum Approximate Optimization Algorithm (QAOA) and the Variational Quantum Eigensolver (VQE), we refer to Refs. [53] and [54], respectively.

In summary, Feynman’s 1982 IJTP paper has paved the way towards the current state of quantum computing which is commonly referred to as the noisy intermediate-scale quantum (NISQ) era [32]. The intermediate-scale is specified by the modest number of qubits and gate fidelity. Within NISQ, quantum processors can contain more than thousands qubits. However, these NISQ quantum processors are neither advanced enough yet for fault-tolerance nor large enough to achieve quantum advantage. Moreover, NISQ quantum processors cannot yet perform continuous quantum correction to mitigate the detrimental effects of quantum decoherence that emerge from their interaction with the external environment. These effects, as Feynman warned in 1982, must be taken into account for physically meaningful quantum simulations to occur. As progress is made towards these important goals, it seems to be peacefully agreed upon that incorporating relevant aspects of the physical problem being investigated into the design of quantum algorithms (in analogy, to a certain extent, to the design of approximate quantum error correcting codes [55]) can significantly enhance the performance the quantum simulators and, consequently, accelerate the progress towards (a physically meaningful) quantum advantage [56].

As scientists, our responsibility is to keep progressing, keep solving wonderful mysteries, use our scientific imagination, do what we can, think freely, welcome doubts, and accept constructive criticisms [57]. Good things happen with hard work. With some luck, even in the absence of a new physical theory to be tested, unforeseen discoveries might arrive while experimenting with quantum-mechanical simulators of next quantum computing generations.

Acknowledgments

S.M. acknowledges support from Italian Ministry of Universities and Research under “PNRR MUR project PE000023-NQSTI”. The authors thank an anonymous referee for useful comments leading to an improved version of this manuscript. Any opinions, findings and conclusions or recommendations expressed in this material are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the views of their home Institutions.

-
- [1] R. P. Feynman, *Simulating physics with computers*, Int. J. Theor. Phys. **21**, 467 (1982).
 - [2] A. Peres, *Quantum Theory: Concepts and Methods*, Kluwer Academic Publishers (1995).
 - [3] M. Mansuripur, *Spin-1 photons, spin-1/2 electrons, Bell’s inequalities, and Feynman’s special perspective on quantum mechanics*, Proceedings of SPIE 12205, Spintronics XV; 12205OB (2022).

- [4] A. Whitaker, *Richard Feynman and Bell's Theorem*, Am. J. Phys. **84**, 493 (2016).
- [5] J. S. Bell, *On the Einstein Podolsky Rosen paradox*, Physics **1**, 195 (1964).
- [6] P. Goyal, *Derivation of quantum theory from Feynman's rules*, Phys. Rev. **A89**, 032120 (2014).
- [7] J. Preskill, *Quantum Computing 40 Years Later*. In *Feynman Lectures on Computation*, Chapter 7, pag.193, Tony Hey (Editor), CRC Press (2023).
- [8] I. M. Georgescu, S. Ashhab, and F. Nori, *Quantum simulation*, Rev. Mod. Phys. **86**, 153 (2014).
- [9] E. Fredkin and T. Toffoli, *Conservative logic*, Int. J. Theor. Phys. **21**, 219 (1982).
- [10] C. H. Bennett, *The thermodynamics of computation- a review*, Int. J. Theor. Phys. **21**, 905 (1982).
- [11] R. P. Feynman, *There's plenty of room at the bottom*. Transcript of a talk given by Feynman on December 29, 1959 at the annual meeting of the American Physical Society at Caltech. Available at <http://calteches.library.caltech.edu/47/2/1960Bottom.pdf>.
- [12] R. P. Feynman, *Quantum mechanical computers*, Found. Phys. **16**, 507 (1986).
- [13] R. P. Feynman, *Negative probability*, in *Quantum Implications: Essays in Honour of David Bohm*, eds. F. David Peat and Basil Hiley, Routledge & Kegan Paul Ltd, London, 1987, pp. 235–248.
- [14] S. Rahimi-Keshari, T. C. Ralph, and C. M. Caves, *Sufficient conditions for efficient classical simulation of quantum optics*, Phys. Rev. **X6**, 021039 (2016).
- [15] S. Lloyd, *Universal quantum simulators*, Science **273**, 1073 (1996).
- [16] P. W. Shor, *Polynomial-time algorithms for prime factorization and discrete logarithms on a quantum computer*, SIAM J. Comput. **26**, 1484 (1997).
- [17] L. K. Grover, *Quantum mechanics helps in searching for a needle in a haystack*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **79**, 325 (1997).
- [18] P. W. Shor, *Scheme for reducing decoherence in quantum computer memory*, Phys. Rev. **A52**, R2493 (1995).
- [19] A. R. Calderbank and P. W. Shor, *Good quantum error correcting codes exist*, Phys. Rev. **A54**, 1098 (1996).
- [20] A. M. Steane, *Multiple-particle interference and quantum error correction*, Proc. R. Soc. Lond. **A452**, 2551 (1996).
- [21] E. Y. Loh Jr., J. E. Gubernatis, R. T. Scalettar, S. R. White, D. J. Scalapino, and R. L. Sugar, *Sign problem in the numerical simulation of many-electron systems*, Phys. Rev. **B41**, 9301 (1990).
- [22] M. Troyer and U.-J. Wiese, *Computational complexity and fundamental limitations to fermionic quantum Monte Carlo simulations*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **94**, 170201 (2005).
- [23] K. Temme, T. J. Osborne, K. G. Vollbrecht, D. Poulin, and F. Verstrate, *Quantum Metropolis sampling*, Nature **471**, 87 (2011).
- [24] J. Franson, *Classical simulation of quantum systems?*, Physics **9**, 66 (2016).
- [25] X.-B. Wang, T. Hiroshima, A. Tomita, and M. Hayashi, *Quantum information with Gaussian states*, Physics Reports **448**, 1 (2007).
- [26] P. Ball, *Simulations using a quantum computer show the technology's current limits*, Physics **15**, 175 (2022).
- [27] Y. Alexeev et al., *Quantum computer systems for scientific discovery*, PRX Quantum **2**, 017001 (2021).
- [28] E. G. Rieffel and W. H. Polak, *Quantum Computing: A Gentle Introduction*, MIT Press (2014).
- [29] M. A. Nielsen and I. L. Chuang, *Quantum Computation and Quantum Information*, Cambridge University Press (2000).
- [30] M. B. Pour-El and J. I. Richards, *Computability in Analysis and Physics*, Cambridge University Press (2016).
- [31] A. Das and B. K. Chakrabarti, *Quantum annealing and analog quantum computation*, Rev. Mod. Phys. **80**, 1061 (2008).
- [32] J. Preskill, *Quantum computing in the NISQ era and beyond*, Quantum **2**, 79 (2018).
- [33] J. Biamonte et al., *Quantum Machine Learning*, Nature **549**, 195 (2017).
- [34] A. Cervera-Lierta, *Exact Ising model simulation on a quantum computer*, Quantum **2**, 114 (2018).
- [35] R. Orus, *A practical introduction to tensor networks: Matrix product states and projected entangled pair states*, Annals of Physics **349**, 117 (2014).
- [36] M. C. Banuls and K. Cichy, *Review on novel methods for lattice gauge theories*, Rep. Prog. Phys. **83**, 024401 (2020).
- [37] J. I. Cirac, D. Perez-Garcia, N. Schuch, and F. Verstraete, *Matrix product states and projected entangled pair states: Concepts, symmetries, theorems*, Rev. Mod. Phys. **93**, 045003 (2021).
- [38] Y. Kim et al., *Evidence for the utility of quantum computing before fault tolerance*, Nature **618**, 500 (2023).
- [39] J. Tindall, M. Fishman, E. M. Stoudenmire, and D. Sels, *Efficient tensor network simulation of IBM's Eagle kicked Ising experiment*, PRX Quantum **5**, 010308 (2024).
- [40] C. W. Bauer et al., *Quantum simulation for high-energy physics*, PRX Quantum **4**, 027001 (2023).
- [41] P. M. Alsing, J. P. Dowling, and G. J. Milburn, *Ion trap simulations of quantum fields in an expanding Universe*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **94**, 220401 (2005).
- [42] J. R. M. de Nova, K. Golubkov, V. I. Kolobov, and J. Steinhauer, *Observation of thermal Hawking radiation and its temperature in an analogue black hole*, Nature **569**, 688 (2019).
- [43] S. Weinfurter, *Quantum simulation of black-hole radiation*, Nature **569**, 634 (2019).
- [44] Y. Cao et al., *Potential of quantum computing for drug discovery*, IBM Journal of Research and Development **62**, 1 (2018).
- [45] D. Herman et al., *Quantum computing for finance*, Nature Reviews Physics **5**, 450 (2023).
- [46] F. Arute et al., *Quantum supremacy using a programmable superconducting processor*, Nature **574**, 505 (2019).
- [47] R. N. Tazhigulov et al., *Simulating models of challenging correlated molecules and materials on a Sycamore quantum processor*, PRX Quantum **3**, 040318 (2022).
- [48] R. C. Farrell, M. Illa, A. N. Ciavarella, and M. J. Savage, *Quantum simulations of hadron dynamics in the Schwinger model using 112 qubits*, arXiv:quant-ph/2401.08044 (2024).
- [49] C. Tuysuz, S. Y. Chang, M. Demidik, K. Jansen, S. Vallecorsa, and M. Grossi, *Symmetry breaking in geometric quantum*

- machine learning in the presence of noise*, arXiv:quant-ph/2401.10293 (2024).
- [50] A. Di Meglio et al., *Quantum computing for high-energy physics: State of the art and challenges. Summary of the QC4HEP Working Group*, arXiv:quant-ph/2307.03236 (2023).
 - [51] M. C. Banuls et al., *Simulating lattice gauge theories within quantum technologies*, Eur. Phys. J. **D74**, 165 (2020).
 - [52] L. Funcke, T. Hartung, K. Jansen, and S. Kuhn, *Review on quantum computing for lattice field theory*, Proceedings of Science 430, *The 39th International Symposium on Lattice Field Theory (LATTICE2022)*, 228 (2023).
 - [53] K. Blekos, D. Brand, A. Ceschini, C.-H. Chou, R.-H. Li, K. Pandya, and A. Summer, *A review on quantum approximate optimization algorithm and its variants*, Phys. Rep. **1068**, 1 (2024).
 - [54] J. Tilly et al., *The variational quantum eigensolver: A review of methods and best practices*, Phys. Rep. **986**, 1 (2022).
 - [55] C. Cafaro and P. van Loock, *Approximate quantum error correction for generalized amplitude-damping errors*, Phys. Rev. **A89**, 022316 (2014).
 - [56] L. Clinton et al., *Towards near-term quantum simulation of materials*, Nature Communications **15**, 211 (2024).
 - [57] R. P. Feynman, *The value of science*, Engineering and Science **19**, 13 (1955).