

Arithmetic on a Distributed-Memory Quantum Multicomputer¹

RODNEY VAN METER

Keio University and CREST-JST, Japan

and

W. J. MUNRO

Hewlett-Packard Laboratories, Bristol, United Kingdom

and

KAE NEMOTO

National Institute of Informatics, Tokyo, Japan

and

KOHEI M. ITOH

Keio University and CREST-JST, Japan

We evaluate the performance of quantum arithmetic algorithms run on a distributed quantum computer (a quantum multicomputer). We vary the node capacity and I/O capabilities, and the network topology. The tradeoff of choosing between gates executed remotely, through “teleported gates” on entangled pairs of qubits (telegate), versus exchanging the relevant qubits via quantum teleportation, then executing the algorithm using local gates (teledata), is examined. We show that the teledata approach performs better, and that carry-ripple adders perform well when the teleportation block is decomposed so that the key quantum operations can be parallelized. A node size of only a few logical qubits performs adequately provided that the nodes have two transceiver qubits. A linear network topology performs acceptably for a broad range of system sizes and performance parameters. We therefore recommend pursuing small, high-I/O bandwidth nodes and a simple network. Such a machine will run Shor’s algorithm for factoring large numbers efficiently.

Categories and Subject Descriptors: C.1.m [Processor Architectures]: Miscellaneous; B.m [Hardware – MISCELLANEOUS]:

General Terms: Design

Additional Key Words and Phrases: Quantum computing, quantum computer architecture

1. INTRODUCTION

We are investigating the design of a *quantum multicomputer*, a machine consisting of many small quantum computers connected together to cooperatively solve a single problem [Van

¹A shorter version of this paper appeared as “Distributed Arithmetic on a Quantum Multicomputer” in the Proceedings of the International Symposium on Computer Architecture (ISCA-33), 2006 [Van Meter et al. 2006].

Meter et al. 2006; Van Meter III 2006]. Such a system may overcome the limited capacity of quantum computing technologies expected to be available in the near term, scaling to levels which dramatically outperform classical computers on some problems [Nielsen and Chuang 2000; Shor 1994; Grover 1996; Deutsch and Jozsa 1992].

The main question in considering a multicomputer is whether the system performance will be acceptable *if* the implementation problems can be solved. We focus on distributed implementation of three types of arithmetic circuits derived from known classical adder circuits [Vedral et al. 1996; Cuccaro et al. 2004; Draper et al. 2006; Ercegovac and Lang 2004]. For many algorithms, notably Shor’s algorithm for factoring large numbers, arithmetic is an important component, and integer addition is at its core [Shor 1994; Van Meter and Itoh 2005]. Our evaluation criterion is the latency to complete the addition. The goal is to achieve “reasonable” performance for Shor’s factoring algorithm for numbers up to a thousand bits.

Our distributed quantum computer must create a shared quantum state between the separate nodes of our machine. As we perform our computation, this quantum state evolves and we are dependent on either quantum teleportation of data qubits or teleportation-based remote execution of quantum gates to create that shared state [Bennett et al. 1993; Gottesman and Chuang 1999].

The nodes of the machine may be connected in a variety of topologies, which will influence the efficiency of the algorithm. We concentrate on only three topologies (shared bus, line, and fully connected) and two additional variants (2bus, 2fully), constraining our engineering design space and deferring more complex topology analysis for future work. Our analysis is done attempting to minimize the required number of qubits in a node while retaining reasonable performance; we investigate node sizes of one to five logical qubits per node.

In this research we show that:

- teleportation of data is better than teleportation of gates;
- decomposition of teleportation brings big benefits in performance, making a carry-ripple adder effective even for large problems;
- a linear topology is an adequate network for the foreseeable future; and
- small nodes (only a few logical qubits) perform acceptably, but I/O bandwidth is critical.

A multicomputer built around these principles and based on solid-state qubit technology will perform well on Shor’s algorithm. These results collectively represent a large step in the design and performance analysis of distributed quantum computation.

We begin at the foundations, including related work and definitions of some of the terms we have used in this introduction. Next, we discuss our node and interconnect architectures, followed by mapping the arithmetic algorithms to our system. Performance estimates are progressively refined, including showing how decomposing the teleportation operation makes the performance of the CDKM carry-ripple adder competitive with the carry-lookahead adder. We conclude with specific recommendations for a medium-term goal of a modest-size quantum multicomputer.

2. FOUNDATIONS

A quantum computer is a machine that uses quantum mechanical effects to achieve potentially large reductions in the computational complexity of certain tasks [Nielsen and

[Chuang 2000; Shor 1994; Grover 1996; Deutsch and Jozsa 1992]. Quantum computers exist, but are slow, very small (consisting of only a few quantum bits, or *qubits*) and not reliable. Also, they have very limited scalability [Vandersypen et al. 2001; Gulde et al. 2003]. True architectural research for a large-scale quantum computer can be said to have only just begun [Van Meter and Oskin 2006; Oskin et al. 2003; Copsey et al. 2003; Kielpinski et al. 2002; Steane 2004; Kim et al. 2005; Balensiefer et al. 2005].

Classically, the best known algorithm for factoring large numbers is $O(e^{(nk \log^2 n)^{1/3}})$, where n is the length of the number, in bits, and $k = (\frac{64}{9} + \epsilon) \log 2$, whereas Shor's quantum factoring algorithm is polynomial ($O(n^3)$ or better) [Knuth 1998; Shor 1994; Van Meter and Itoh 2005]. These gains are achieved by taking advantage of *superposition* (a quantum system being in a complex linear combination of states, rather than the single state that is possible classically), *entanglement* (loosely speaking, the state of two quanta not being independent), and *interference* of the quantum wave functions (analogous to interference in classical wave mechanics). Of these, only entanglement of pairs of qubits, as the core of quantum teleportation, is directly relevant to this paper. Otherwise, only a limited familiarity with quantum computing is required to understand this paper, and we introduce the necessary terminology and background in this section. Readers interested in more depth are referred to popular [Williams and Clearwater 1999] and technical [Nielsen and Chuang 2000] texts on the subject.

Teleportation of quantum states (qubits, or quantum data) has been known for more than a decade [Bennett et al. 1993]. It has been demonstrated experimentally [Furusawa et al. 1998; Bouwmeester et al. 1997], and has been suggested as being necessary for moving data long distances within a single quantum computer [Oskin et al. 2003]. Teleportation consumes Einstein-Podolsky-Rosen pairs, or *EPR pairs*. EPR pairs are pairs of particles or qubits which are *entangled* so that actions on one affect the state of the other. EPR pairs can be created in a variety of ways, including reactions that simultaneously emit pairs of photons whose characteristics are related and many quantum gates on two qubits. Entanglement is a continuous, not discrete, phenomenon, and several weakly entangled pairs can be used to make one strongly entangled pair using a process known as *purification* [Cirac et al. 1999].

2.1 Qubus Entanglement Protocol

Our approach to creating EPR pairs contains no direct qubit-qubit interactions and does not require the use of single photons, instead using laser or microwave pulses as a probe beam [Nemoto and Munro 2004; Munro et al. 2005]. Two qubits are entangled indirectly through the interaction of qubits with a common quantum field mode created by the probe beam – a continuous quantum variable – which can be thought of as a communication bus, or “qubus” [Spiller et al. 2006]. We call the qubus-qubit entanglement protocol *QEP*. A block diagram of a qubus link is shown in Figure 1. For our purposes in the quantum multicomputer, the qubits are likely to be separated by centimeters to meters, though the protocol is expected to work at the micron scale (within a chip) [Spiller et al. 2006] and at the WAN scale (kilometers) [van Loock et al. 2006].

For some solid state qubit systems, the interaction with a bus mode takes the effective form of a cross-Kerr nonlinearity, analogous to that for optical systems, described by an interaction Hamiltonian of the form

$$H_{int} = \hbar \chi \sigma_z a^\dagger a. \quad (1)$$




Fig. 1. Qubus link block diagram.

When acting for a time t on a qubit-bus system, this interaction effects a rotation (in phase space) by an angle $\pm\theta$ on a qubus coherent state, where $\theta = \chi t$ and the sign depends on the qubit computational basis amplitude. By interacting the probe beam with the qubit, the probe beam picks up a θ phase shift if it is in one basis state (e.g., $|0\rangle$) and a $-\theta$ phase shift if it is in the other (e.g., $|1\rangle$). If the same probe beam interacts with two qubits, it is straightforward to see that the probe beam acting on the two-qubit states $|0\rangle|1\rangle$ and $|1\rangle|0\rangle$ picks up no net phase shift because the opposite-sign shifts cancel, while the probe beam acting on the states $|0\rangle|0\rangle$ and $|1\rangle|1\rangle$ picks up phase shift $\pm 2\theta$. An appropriate measurement determines whether the probe beam has been phase shifted (in effect taking the absolute value of the shift), projecting the qubits into either an even parity state or an odd parity state. The measurement shows only the parity of the qubits, not the actual values, leaving them in an entangled state. This state can be then used as our EPR pair.

2.2 Teleporting Gates and Teleporting Data

To teleport a qubit, one member of the EPR pair is held locally, and the other by the teleportation receiver. The qubit to be teleported is entangled with the local EPR member, then both of those are *measured*, which will return 0 or 1 for each qubit. The results of this measurement are transmitted to the receiver, which then executes gates locally on its member of the EPR pair, conditional on the measurement results, recreating the (now destroyed) original state at the destination. The circuit for teleportation is shown in figure 2.

Gottesman and Chuang showed that teleportation can be used to construct a control-NOT (CNOT) gate [Gottesman and Chuang 1999]. Their original teleported gate requires two EPR pairs. We use an approach based on parity gates that consumes only one EPR pair, as shown in figure 2 [Munro et al. 2005]. Locally, the parity gates can be implemented with two CNOT gates and a measurement (outlined with dotted lines in the figure). Double lines are classical values that are the output of the measurements; when used as a control line, we decide classically whether or not to execute the quantum gate, based on the measurement value. The last gate involves classical communication of the measurement result between nodes. As shown, this construction is not fault tolerant; it must be built over fault-tolerant gates. Alternatively, the qubus approach can be used as the node-internal interconnect. Its natural gate is the parity gate, and is fault tolerant.

In designing algorithms for our quantum multicomputer, therefore, we have a choice: when two qubits in different nodes of our multicomputer are required to interact, we can either move data (qubits) from one node to another, then perform the shared gate, or we can use a teleported gate directly on the qubits, without moving them. We will call the data-moving approach *teledata* and the teleportation-based gate approach *telegate*.

For some algorithms, we can use a simple, visual approach to counting the number of remote operations necessary to execute the algorithm using either the teledata or telegate




Fig. 2. A teleportation circuit (top) and teleported control-NOT (CNOT) gate (bottom). Time flows left to right, each horizontal line represents a qubit, and each vertical line segment with terminals is a quantum gate. A segment with a $\oplus$ terminal is a control-NOT (CNOT). The “meter” box is measurement of a qubit’s state. The boxes with H, X, and Z in them are various qubit gates. The large box labeled QEP is the qubus EPR pair generator. (See Nielsen and Chuang for more details on the notation.)




Fig. 3. CCNOT (control-control-NOT, or Toffoli) gate constructions for our architectures. The leftmost object is the canonical representation of this three-qubit gate. The rightmost construction we use for the line topology; the middle construction we use for all other topologies. The box with the bar on the right represents the square root of X (NOT), and the box with the bar on the left its adjoint. The last gate in the rightmost construction is a SWAP gate, which exchanges the state of two qubits.

approach (see section 4). For the telegate approach, we assign a cost of three to each two-node Toffoli (control-control-NOT) gate, and each three-node Toffoli gate we count as five. The three-node Toffoli gate should cost more, as in figure 3, but pipelining of operations across multiple nodes hides the additional latency. We assign two-node CNOT gates a cost of one.²

2.3 Distributed Quantum Computation

Early suggestions of distributed quantum computation include Grover [Grover 1997], Cirac et al. [Cirac et al. 1999], and Steane and Lucas [Steane and Lucas 2000]. A recent paper has proposed combining the cluster state model with distributed computation [Lim et al. 2005]. Such a distributed system generally requires the capability of transferring qubit state from one physical representation to another, such as nuclear spin $\leftrightarrow$ electron spin $\leftrightarrow$ photon [Mehring et al. 2003; Jelezko et al. 2004; Childress et al. 2005].

Yepez distinguished between distributed computation using entanglement between nodes, which he called type I, and without inter-node entanglement (i.e., classical communication only), which he called type II [Yepez 2001]. Our quantum multicomputer is a type I quantum computer. Jozsa and Linden showed that Shor’s algorithm requires entanglement across the full set of qubits, so a type II quantum computer cannot achieve exponential speedup [Jozsa and Linden 2003; Love and Boghosian 2006]. Much of the work on our multicomputer involves creation and management of that shared entanglement.

Yimsiriwattana and Lomonaco have discussed a distributed version of Shor’s algorithm [Yimsiriwattana and Lomonaco Jr. 2004], based on one form of the Beckman-Chari-Devabhaktuni-Preskill modular exponentiation algorithm [Beckman et al. 1996]. The form they use depends on complex individual gates, with many control variables, inducing a large performance penalty compared to using only two- and three-qubit gates. Their approach is similar to our telegate (sec. 2.2), which we show to be slower than teledata. They do not consider differences in network topology, and analyze only circuit size, not depth (time performance).

3. NODE AND INTERCONNECT ARCHITECTURE

A multicomputer [Athas and Seitz 1988] is a constrained form of distributed system. All parts of the system are geographically colocated. Short travel distances (up to a few tens of meters) between nodes reduce latency, simplify coordinated control of the system, and increase signal fidelity. We assume a regular network topology, a dedicated network environment, and scalability to thousands of nodes. We concentrate on a homogeneous node technology based on solid-state qubits, with a qubus interconnect, though our results apply to essentially any choice of node and interconnect technologies, such as single photon-based qubit transfer [Wallraff et al. 2004; Matsukevich and Kuzmich 2004].

Future, larger quantum computers will be built on technologies that are inherently limited in the number of qubits that can be incorporated into a single device [Nielsen and Chuang 2000; Spiller et al. 2005; Van Meter and Oskin 2006; ARDA 2004]. The causes of these limitations vary with the specific technology, and in most cases are poorly understood, but may range from the low tens to perhaps thousands; integration of the densities

²There are other possible decompositions of the Toffoli gate, but the differences are less than a factor of two. Which approach is best will depend on the choice of quantum error correction (QEC), as some are more difficult to implement on encoded qubits [DiVincenzo 1998].

we are accustomed to in the classical world is not even being seriously discussed for most technologies. For example, flux Josephson junction qubits, which are built using VLSI chip manufacturing technology, may be 100 microns square; even a large chip would hold only a few thousand physical qubits [Martinis et al. 2002]. The scalable ion trap, built with a PC board fabrication process, requires an even larger area for all of the control structures to manage each trapped atom [Kielpinski et al. 2002]. Quantum error correction (QEC) naturally reduces the number of available logical (application-level) qubits by a large factor [Shor 1996; Calderbank and Shor 1996; Steane 2003]. Two levels of the Steane 7-qubit code, for example, which encodes a single logical qubit in seven lower-layer qubits, would impose a 49:1 encoding and storage penalty. Even aggressive management of the overhead imposed by error correction may still leave an ion trap system with a surface area of a large fraction of a square meter [Thaker et al. 2006]. Such a system would be difficult to fabricate and operate. Therefore, it makes sense to examine the utility of a device that can hold only a few logical qubits, especially if the device can create shared entanglement with another similar device.

We choose a node technology based on solid-state qubits, such as Josephson-junction superconducting qubits [Nakamura et al. 1999; Wallraff et al. 2004; Johansson et al. 2005] or quantum dots [Fujisawa et al. 1998], which will require a microwave qubus. Each node has many qubits which are private to the node, and a few transceiver qubits that can communicate with the outside world. Node size is limited by the number of elements that can practically be built into a single device, including control structures, external signalling, packaging, cooling, and shielding constraints. The primary advantages of these solid-state technologies are their speed, with physical gate times in the low nanoseconds, and their potential physical scalability based on photolithographic techniques.

Hollenberg’s group has recently proposed a multicomputer using small ion traps as the nodes [Oi et al. 2006]. Each node will contain enough physical qubits to hold one logical qubit plus a few ancillae and a transceiver qubit, corresponding to our “baseline” case, discussed below. A single photon-based entanglement scheme will be used. They do not explore algorithms, concentrating on the error correcting parts of the system, and do not discuss the details of the “optical multiplexer” in their system that corresponds to our interconnect. This system has the advantage that it could be implemented using existing technology.

Throughout this paper, qubits and operations on them are understood to be logical. Although the QEP protocol in theory supports EPR pair creation over many kilometers, our design goal is a scalable quantum computer in one location (such as a single lab). We consider a 10nsec classical communication latency, corresponding roughly to 2m distance between nodes. We find that performance is insensitive to this number.

We consider five interconnect networks: shared bus, line of nodes, fully connected, two-transceiver bus (2bus), and two-transceiver fully connected (2fully) as in figure 4. For the shared bus, all nodes are connected to a single bus. Any two nodes may use the bus to communicate, but it supports only a single transaction at a time. For 2bus, each node contains two transceiver qubits and connects to two independent buses, labeled “A” and “B” in the figure, that may operate concurrently. In the line topology, each node uses two transceiver qubits, one to connect to its left-hand neighbor and one to connect to its right-hand neighbor. Each link operates independently, and all links can be utilized at the same time, depending on the algorithm. For the fully-connected network, each node has




Fig. 4. The five physical topologies analyzed in this paper.

a single transceiver qubit which can connect to any other node without penalty via some form of classical circuit-switched network, though of course each transceiver qubit can be involved in only one transaction at a time. Although we have characterized this network as “fully connected”, implying an $n \times n$ crossbar switch, any non-blocking network, such as a Clos network, will do, provided that the signal loss through each stage of the network is not significant [Dally and Towles 2004]. The network can also be optimized to match the particular traffic pattern, though that is unlikely to be necessary. The 2fully topology utilizes two transceiver qubits per node for concurrent transfers on two separate networks, one connecting the transceivers labeled “A” and one connected the transceivers labeled “B”. Many mappings of qubits to nodes and gates to bus timeslots are possible; we do not claim the arrangements presented here are optimal.

The effective topology may be different from the physical topology, depending on the details of a bus transaction. For example, even if the physical topology is a bus, the system may behave as if it is fully connected if the actions *internal* to a node to complete a bus transaction are much longer than the activities on the bus itself, allowing the bus to be reallocated quickly to another transaction. Some technologies may support frequency division multiplexing on the bus, allowing multiple concurrent transactions.

This research is part of an overall effort to design a scalable quantum multicomputer. Elsewhere, we have investigated distributed quantum error correction, determining that two

layers of the Steane $[[7,1,3]]$ quantum error correction code (for a total capacity penalty of 49:1) will protect against error rates up to $\sim 1\%$ in the teleportation process. We have also found that each link in the interconnect may be serial, causing only a small penalty in performance and reliability, while substantially simplifying the hardware [Van Meter et al. 2007; Van Meter III 2006]. Those results help constrain the hardware of the quantum multicomputer; in this paper, we analyze the software and performance.

4. ALGORITHM

The introduction of Shor’s factoring algorithm spurred interest in arithmetic circuits for quantum computers. Several groups almost immediately began investigating the modular exponentiation phase of the algorithm [Vedral et al. 1996; Beckman et al. 1996; Miquel et al. 1996]. All of these early algorithms used various types of carry-ripple adders, which are $O(n)$ in both depth and gate complexity, and composed modular multiplication and exponentiation in the most straightforward fashion. Shortly thereafter, other types of adders and various other optimizations were introduced [Gossett 1998; Draper 2000; Cleve and Watrous 2000; Beauregard 2003; Zalka 1998]. Some of these circuits operate on Fourier-transformed numbers [Beauregard 2003]; while these circuits use fewer qubits than the original Vedral-Barenco-Ekert (VBE) style of carry-ripple adder [Vedral et al. 1996], implementing the small rotations that are necessary for the Fourier transform may be difficult on QEC-encoded qubits. Zalka examined the Schönhage-Strassen FFT-based multiplication algorithm and found it to be faster than the “obvious” approach only for factoring numbers larger than 8 kilobits [Zalka 1998]; our own analysis places the crossover at closer to 32kb. Some of these approaches are evaluated in more detail in our previous work [Van Meter and Itoh 2005]. In this paper, we choose to concentrate on integer addition only, as the fundamental building block of arithmetic.

Recently, several new addition circuits have been introduced, some based on standard classical techniques [Ercegovic and Lang 2004]. The Cuccaro-Draper-Kutin-Moulton (CDKM) carry-ripple adder [Cuccaro et al. 2004] is faster than the original VBE adder and uses fewer qubits. The advantage of the Draper Fourier-based adder was its use of fewer qubits; the development of CDKM makes the Fourier adder less attractive due to its complex implementation. Takahashi and Kunihiro, working from CDKM, have eliminated the need for ancillae, at the expense of a much deeper (but still $O(n)$) circuit [Takahashi and Kunihiro 2005]. The carry-lookahead adder [Draper et al. 2006] is $O(\log n)$ depth and $O(n)$ gate complexity. Our own carry-select and conditional-sum adders [Van Meter and Itoh 2005] are $O(\sqrt{n})$ and $O(\log n)$ circuit depth, respectively, but use more ancillae. The definitions of these algorithms ignore communications costs; in most real systems, distant qubits cannot interact directly, and this impacts performance. The carry-lookahead adder and Takahashi-Kunihiro adder do not present obvious mappings onto architectures with such limitations.

From among these, we have chosen to evaluate three different addition algorithms: VBE [Vedral et al. 1996], the Cuccaro-Draper-Kutin-Moulton (CDKM) carry-ripple adder [Cuccaro et al. 2004], and the carry-lookahead adder [Draper et al. 2006]. In this section we discuss the adders without regard to the network topology; the following section presents numeric values for different topologies and gate timings. None of these circuits has been optimized for a system in which accessing some qubits is very fast and accessing others is very slow, as in our multicomputer; it is certainly possible that faster circuits for our




Fig. 5. Details of a distributed 2-qubit VBE adder. The top circuit is the monolithic form, and the bottom circuit is the distributed form using the teledata method. The solid box (QEP) is the qubus EPR pair generator; the circuits in dashed boxes are standard quantum teleportation circuits. The “meter” box is measurement of a qubit’s state. The boxes with H, X, and Z in them are various single-qubit gates.

proposed system will be found.

4.1 Carry-Ripple Adders

Figure 5 shows a two-qubit VBE carry-ripple adder [Vedral et al. 1996] in its monolithic (top) and distributed (bottom) forms. Each horizontal line represents a qubit; the *ket* notation is omitted for clarity. The QEP block creates an EPR pair. The dashed boxes delineate the teleportation circuit, which is assumed to be perfect. This moves the qubit $|c_0\rangle$ from node A to node B. $|c_0\rangle$ is used in computation at node B, then moved back to node A via a similar teleportation to complete the computation. The two qubits $|t_0\rangle$ and $|t_1\rangle$ are used as transceiver qubits, and are reinitialized as part of the QEP subcircuit.

Figure 6 shows a larger VBE adder circuit and illustrates a visual method for comparing telegate and teledata. For telegate, we can draw a line across the circuit, with the number of gates (vertical line segments) crossed showing our cost. For teledata, the line must *not* cross gates, instead crossing the qubit lines. The number of such crossings is the number of teleportations required. This approach works well for analyzing the VBE and CDKM adders, but care must be taken with the carry-lookahead adder, because it uses long-distance gates that may be between e.g. nodes 1 and 3.

The VBE adder latency to add two numbers on an m -node machine using the teledata method is $2m - 2$ teleportations plus the circuit cost. For the telegate approach, using the five-gate breakdown for CCNOT, as in figure 3, would require three teleported two-qubit gates to form a CCNOT. Therefore, implementing telegate, the latency is $7m - 7$ gate teleportations, or 3.5x the cost.

For the CDKM carry-ripple adder [Cuccaro et al. 2004], which more aggressively reuses




Fig. 6. Visual approach to determining relative cost of teleporting data versus teleporting gates for a VBE adder. The upper, dashed (red) line shows the division between two nodes (A and B) using data teleportation. The circles show where the algorithm will need to teleport data. The lower, dotted line (blue) shows the division using gate teleportation (nodes B and C). The circles show where teleported gates must occur. Note that two of these three are CCNOT gates, which may entail multiple two-qubit gates in actual implementation.

data space, teledata requires a minimum of six movements, whereas telegate requires two CCNOTs and three CNOTs, or a total of nine two-qubit gates, as shown in figure 7. The CDKM adder pipelines extremely well, so the actual latency penalty for more than two nodes is only $2m + 2$ data teleportations, or $6m$ gate teleportations, when there is no contention for the inter-node links, as in our line and fully-connected topologies. The bus topology performance is limited by contention for access to the interconnect.

4.2 Carry-Lookahead

Analyzing the carry-lookahead adder is more complex, as its structure is not regular, but grows more intertwined toward the middle bits. Gate scheduling is also variable, and the required concurrency level is high. The latency is $O(\log n)$, making it one of the fastest forms of adder for large numbers [Draper et al. 2006; Van Meter and Itoh 2005; Ercegovac and Lang 2004].

Let us look at the performance in a monolithic quantum computer, for n a power of two. Based on table 1 from Draper et al. [Draper et al. 2006], for $n = 2^k$, the circuit depth of $4k + 3$ Toffoli gates is 19, 31, and 43 Toffoli gates, for 16, 128, and 1,024 bits, respectively. We assume a straightforward mapping of the circuit to the distributed architecture. We assign most nodes four logical qubits ($|a_i\rangle$, $|b_i\rangle$, $|c_i\rangle$, and one temporary qubit used as part of the carry propagation). In the next section, we see that the transceiver qubits are the bottleneck; we cannot actually achieve this $4k + 3$ latency.




Fig. 7. Visual approach to determining relative cost of teleporting data versus teleporting gates for a CDKM adder. The upper, dashed (red) line shows the division between two nodes using data teleportation. The circles show where the algorithm will need to teleport data. The lower, dotted line (blue) shows the division using gate teleportation. The circles show where teleported gates must occur. Note that two of these five are CCNOT gates, which may entail multiple two-qubit gates in actual implementation.

5. PERFORMANCE

The modular exponentiation to run Shor’s factoring algorithm on a 1,024-bit number requires approximately 2.8 million calls to the integer adder [Van Meter and Itoh 2005]. With a 100 μ sec adder, that will require about five minutes; with a 1 msec adder, it will take under an hour. Even a system two to three orders of magnitude slower than this will have attractive performance, provided that error correction can sustain the system state for that long, and that the system can be built and operated economically. This section presents numerical estimates of adder performance which show that this criterion is easily met by a quantum multicomputer under a variety of assumptions about logical operation times, providing plenty of headroom for quantum error correction.

5.1 Initial Estimate

Our initial results are shown in table I. Units are in number of complete teleportations, treating teleportation and EPR pair generation as a single block, and assuming zero cost for local gates. In the following subsections these assumptions are revisited. We show three approaches (baseline, telegate, and teledata) and three adder algorithms (VBE, CDKM, carry-lookahead) for five networks (bus, 2bus, line, fully, 2fully) and three problem sizes (16, 128, and 1024 bits). In the baseline case, each node contains only a single logical

qubit; gates are therefore executed using the teleport approach. For the teleport and teledata columns, we chose node sizes to suit the algorithms: two, three, and four qubits per node for the CDKM, VBE, and carry-lookahead adders, respectively, when using teleport, and three, four and five qubits when using teledata.

The VBE adder, although larger than CDKM and slower on any monolithic computer when local gate times are considered, is faster in a distributed environment. The VBE adder exhibits a large (3.5x) performance gain by using the teledata method instead of teleport. For teledata, the performance is independent of the network topology, because only a single operation is required at a time, moving a qubit to a neighboring node. The CDKM adder also communicates only with nearest neighbors, but performs more transfers. The single bus configuration is almost 3x slower than the line topology. On a line, in most time slots, three concurrent transfers are conducted (e.g., between nodes $1 \rightarrow 2$, $3 \rightarrow 2$, and $3 \rightarrow 4$).

An unanticipated but intuitive result is that the performance of the carry-lookahead adder is better in the baseline case than the teleport case, for the fully-connected network. This is due to the limitation of having a single transceiver qubit per node. Putting more qubits in a node increases contention for the transceiver qubit, and reduces performance even though the absolute number of gates that must be executed via teleportation has been reduced. The carry-lookahead adder is easily seen to be inappropriate for the line architecture, since the carry-lookahead requires long-distance gates to propagate carry information quickly. Our numbers also show that the carry-lookahead adder is not a good match for a bus architecture, despite the favorable long-distance transport, again because of excessive contention for the bus.

For teleport, performing some adjustments to eliminate intra-node gates, we find $8n - 9k - 8$ total Toffoli gates that need arguments that are originally stored on three separate nodes, plus $n - 2$ two-node CNOTs. For the bus case, which allows no concurrency, this is our final cost. For the fully-connected network, we find a depth of $8k - 10$ three-node CCNOTs, 8 two-node CCNOTs, and 1 CNOT. These must be multiplied by the appropriate CCNOT breakdown. For the teledata fully-connected case, each three-node Toffoli gate requires four teleportations (in and out for each of two variables). For the 2fully network, the latency of the three-node Toffolis is halved, but the two-node Toffolis do not benefit, giving us a final cost of slightly over half the fully-connected network cost.

algo.	size	Baseline			Telegate					Teledata				
		bus	line	fully	bus	2bus	line	fully	2F	bus	2bus	line	fully	2F
VBE	16	360	305	182	105	105	105	105	105	30	30	30	30	30
	128	3048	2545	1526	889	889	889	889	889	254	254	254	254	254
	1024	24552	20465	12278	7161	7161	7161	7161	7161	2046	2046	2046	2046	2046
CDKM	16	232	160	160	138	96	96	97	96	90	60	34	90	34
	128	1912	1280	1280	1146	768	768	768	768	762	508	258	762	258
	1024	15352	10240	10240	9210	6144	6144	6145	6144	6138	4092	2050	6138	2050
Carry-look-ahead	16	644	N/A	99	444	222	N/A	136	135	260	178	N/A	96	56
	128	6557	N/A	159	4901	2451	N/A	256	255	3176	2028	N/A	192	104
	1024	54806	N/A	219	41502	20751	N/A	376	375	27260	17206	N/A	288	152

Table I. Estimate of latency necessary to execute various adder circuits on different topologies of quantum multicomputer, assuming monolithic teleportation blocks (Sec. 5.1). Units are in number of teleportation blocks, including EPR pair creation (bus transaction), local gates and classical communication. Size, length of the numbers to be added, in bits. Lower numbers are faster (better). '2F' denotes 2fully.

5.2 Improved Performance

The analysis in section 5.1 assumed that a teleportation operation is a monolithic unit. However, figure 5 makes it clear that a teleportation actually consists of several phases. The first portion is the creation of the entangled EPR pair. The second portion is local computation and measurement at the sending node, followed by classical communication between nodes, then local operations at the receiving node. The EPR pair creation is not data-dependent; it can be done in advance, as resources (bus time slots, qubits) become available, for both telegate and teledata.

Our initial execution time model treats local gates and classical communication as free, assuming that EPR pair creation is the most expensive portion of the computation. For example, for the teledata VBE adder on a linear topology, all of the EPR pairs needed can be created in two time steps at the beginning of the computation. The execution time would therefore be 2, constant for all n . Table II shows the performance under this assumption. The performance of the carry-lookahead adder does not change, as the bottleneck link is busy full-time creating EPR pairs.

This model gives a misleading picture of performance once EPR pair creation is decoupled from the teleportation sequence. When the cost of the teleportation itself or of local gates exceeds $\sim 1/n$ of the cost of the EPR pair generation, the simplistic model breaks down; in the next subsection, we examine the performance with a more realistic model.

algo.	size	Baseline			Telegate					Teledata				
		bus	line	fully	bus	2bus	line	fully	2F	bus	2bus	line	fully	2F
VBE	16	360	16	16	105	53	7	14	7	30	15	2	4	2
	128	3048	16	16	889	445	7	14	7	254	127	2	4	2
	1024	24552	16	16	7161	3581	7	14	7	2046	1023	2	4	2
CDKM	16	232	21	19	135	68	11	18	9	90	60	6	12	6
	128	1912	21	19	1146	573	11	18	9	762	508	6	12	6
	1024	15352	21	19	9210	4605	11	18	9	6138	4092	6	12	6
Carry-look-ahead	16	644	N/A	99	444	222	N/A	89	45	260	178	N/A	96	56
	128	6557	N/A	159	4901	2451	N/A	149	75	3176	2028	N/A	192	104
	1024	54806	N/A	219	41502	20751	N/A	209	105	27260	17206	N/A	288	152

Table II. Estimated latency to execute various adders on different topologies, for decomposed teleportation blocks (sec. 5.2), assuming classical communication and local gates have zero cost. Units are in EPR pair creation times. '2F' denotes 2fully.

5.3 Detailed Estimate

To create figures 8-10, we make assumptions about the execution time of various operations. Classical communication between nodes is 10nsec. A CCNOT (Toffoli) gate on encoded qubits takes 50nsec, CNOT 10nsec, and NOT 1nsec. These numbers can be considered realistic but optimistic for a technology with physical gate times in the low nanoseconds; for quantum error correction-encoded solid-state systems, the bottleneck is likely to be the time for qubit initialization or reliable single-shot measurement, which is still being designed (see the references in [Van Meter and Oskin 2006]).

We vary the EPR pair creation time from 10nsec to 1280nsec. This creation process is influenced by the choice of parallel or serial bus and the cycle time of an optical homodyne detector. Photodetectors may be inherently fast, but their performance is limited by surrounding electronics [Armen et al. 2002; Stockton et al. 2002]. Final performance may be faster or slower than our model, but the range of values we have analyzed is broad enough to demonstrate clearly the important trends.

Figures 8 and 9 show, top to bottom, the fully, 2fully, and line networks for the telegate and teledata methods. We plot adder time against EPR pair creation time and the length of the numbers to be added. The left hand plot shows the shape of the surfaces, with the z axis being latency to complete the addition. The right hand plot, with the same x and y axes, shows the regions in which each type of adder is the fastest.

By examining the vertical extent of the curves in the figures, we see that the teledata method is faster than telegate for all of the conditions presented, but especially for the carry-lookahead adder. The figures also show that the carry-lookahead adder is very dependent on EPR pair creation time, while neither carry-ripple adder is. In figure 10 we show this in more detail. For fast (10nsec) EPR pair creation, the carry-lookahead adder is faster for all problem sizes. For slow (1280nsec) EPR pair creation time, carry-lookahead is not faster until we reach 512 bits.

Although we do not include graphs, we have also varied the time for classical communication and the other types of gates. The performance of an adder is fairly insensitive to these changes; it is dominated by the relationship between CCNOT and EPR pair creation times.

5.4 Comparison to a Monolithic Machine

Our work shows the possibility of extending the size of problems that can successfully be attacked using a given quantum computing technology, surpassing the limitations of a single, monolithic quantum computer by aggregating many small quantum computers into one large system. Therefore, the common multiprocessing performance analysis approach of determining the speedup achieved by adding nodes to the system is not appropriate. Instead, let us ask what performance penalty we pay by performing the computation on a multicomputer relative to the performance of a monolithic computer, if a large enough one could be built.

Let us examine the case of increasing node sizes connected in a linear network, using a CDKM carry-ripple adder. So far, we have assumed that an n -bit addition is performed on a system of n nodes (or $2n$ for the baseline case). Let us now allow the number of nodes to be m , $m < n$. If t_{QEP} is our EPR pair creation time, t_{CCNOT} is the CCNOT time, and t_{TELE} is our teleportation time, including one measurement, classical communication time between two nodes, and three local single-qubit gates (all for logical qubits), then the total




Fig. 8. (Telegate) Performance of different adders on three different networks, one fully-connected with a single link and one with two links per node (2fully), and one line configuration. In this graph, we vary the latency to create a high-quality EPR pair and the length of the numbers we are adding. Classical communication time is assumed to be 10nsec, Toffoli gate time 50nsec, CNOT gate time 10nsec. The left hand graph of each pair plots adder execution time (vertical axis) against EPR pair creation time and number length. In the right hand graph of each pair, the hatched red area indicates areas where carry-lookahead is the fastest, the diagonally lined green area indicates CDKM carry-ripple, and solid blue indicates VBE carry-ripple. The performance of the carry-lookahead adder is very sensitive to the EPR pair creation time. If EPR pair creation time is low, the carry-lookahead adder is very fast; if creation time is high, the adder is very slow.




Fig. 9. (Teledata) Performance of different adders on three different networks, one fully-connected with a single link and one with two links per node (2fully), and one line configuration. In this graph, we vary the latency to create a high-quality EPR pair and the length of the numbers we are adding. Classical communication time is assumed to be 10nsec, Toffoli gate time 50nsec, CNOT gate time 10nsec. In the right hand graph of each pair, the hatched red area indicates areas where carry-lookahead is the fastest, the diagonally lined green indicates CDKM carry-ripple, and solid blue indicates VBE carry-ripple. The performance of the carry-lookahead adder is very sensitive to the EPR pair creation time. If EPR pair creation time is low, the carry-lookahead adder is very fast; if creation time is high, the adder is very slow.




Fig. 10. (Teledata) Comparison of CDKM on a line network with carry-lookahead on a 2fully network. These are the “front” and “back” cross-sections of figure 9.

execution time on the multicomputer is approximately

$$2t_{\text{QEP}} + (m - 1)t_{\text{TELE}} + (2n - 1)t_{\text{CCNOT}} \quad (2)$$

compared to $(2n - 1)t_{\text{CCNOT}}$ on a monolithic machine. As n grows and as $m \rightarrow n$, the performance penalty goes to $\sim \frac{t_{\text{TELE}} + 2t_{\text{CCNOT}}}{2t_{\text{CCNOT}}}$. For our multicomputer environment, the cost of a logical CCNOT is far higher than the classical communications cost. For small n , the QEP time may dominate, but it quickly becomes an unimportant factor as n grows. Overall, the performance penalty is small, and the capabilities improve, so we conclude that the multicomputer is a desirable architecture.

For the carry-lookahead adder on the fully-connected and 2fully networks, as noted above, the analysis is more difficult because the transceiver qubits are often the bottleneck in the system. We compare only the fixed node size of five logical qubits and the 2fully network to a monolithic machine of approximately $4n$ logical qubits. In this configuration, the performance penalty is significant; $2\times$ for an EPR pair creation time of 10nsec, and $25\times$ for an EPR pair creation time of 1280nsec, almost independent of n , as both the computational circuit depth and the communication overhead scale with $O(\log n)$. Of course, the carry-lookahead adder in general is favorable for very large n , so despite the apparently large performance penalty it may still be the preferred choice in that case.

6. CONCLUSION

A quantum multicomputer is a system composed of multiple nodes, each of which is a small quantum computer capable of creating entanglement shared with other nodes via a qubus. We have evaluated the performance of arithmetic circuits on a quantum multicomputer for different problem sizes, interconnect topologies, and gate timings. Although we have assumed that the interconnect is based on the qubus entanglement protocol creation of EPR pairs, our analysis, especially table I, applies equally well to any two-level structure with low-latency local operations and high-latency long-distance operations. The details of the cost depend on the interconnect topology, number of transceiver qubits, and the chosen breakdown for CCNOT. More important than actual gate times for this analysis is gate time ratios. The time values presented here are reasonable for solid-state qubits under optimistic assumptions about advances in the underlying technology. Applying our results to slower technologies (or the same technology using more layers of quantum error correction) is a simple matter of scaling by the appropriate clock speed and storage requirements.

We find that the teledata method is faster than the telegate method, that separating the actual data teleportation from the necessary EPR pair creation allows a carry-ripple adder to be efficient for large problems, and that a linear network topology is adequate for up to a hundred nodes or more, depending on the cost ratio of EPR pair creation to local gates. For very large systems, switching interconnects, which are well understood in the optical domain [Kim et al. 2003; Marchand et al. 1997; Szymanski and Hinton 1995], may become necessary, though we recommend deferring adding switching due to the complexity and the inherent signal loss; switching time in such systems also must be considered.

Our results show that node size, interconnect topology, distributed gate approach (teledata v. telegate), and choice of adder affect overall performance in sometimes unexpected ways. Increasing the number of logical qubits per node, for example, reduces the total number of interconnect transfers but concentrates them in fewer places, causing contention for access for some algorithms. For the specific recommendation of a linear network and a carry-ripple adder, larger nodes exact no penalty but produce no benefit. Therefore, increasing node size is not, in general, favorable *unless node I/O bandwidth increases proportionally*; we recommend keeping the node size small and fixed for the foreseeable future.

Our data presents a clear path forward. We recommend pursuing a node architecture consisting of only a few logical qubits and initially two transceiver (quantum I/O) qubits. This will allow construction of a linear network, which will perform adequately with a carry-ripple adder up to moderately large systems. Engineering emphasis should be placed on supporting more transceiver qubits in each node, which can be used to parallelize transfers, decrease the network diameter, and provide fault tolerance. Significant effort is warranted on minimizing the key parameter of EPR pair creation time. Only once these avenues have been exhausted should the node size be increased and a switched optical network introduced. This approach should lead to the design of a viable quantum multicomputer.

Acknowledgments

The authors thanks Eisuke Abe for useful discussions, and Thaddeus Ladd for both discussions and writing advice. Professors Hideharu Amano, Nobuyuki Yamasaki and Timothy Pinkston provided advice on multicomputer networks. RDV and KMI acknowledge funding from CREST-JST. KN acknowledges funding from MEXT. WJM acknowledges funding from the European project QAP.

REFERENCES

- ACM 2006. *Computer Architecture News, Proc. 33rd Annual International Symposium on Computer Architecture*. ACM.
- ARDA 2004. *A quantum information science and technology roadmap*, v2.0 ed. ARDA.
- ARMEN, M. A., AU, J. K., STOCKTON, J. K., DOHERTY, A. C., AND MABUCHI, H. 2002. Adaptive homodyne measurement of optical phase. *Physical Review Letters* 89, 133602.
- ATHAS, W. C. AND SEITZ, C. L. 1988. Multicomputers: message-passing concurrent computers. *IEEE Computer* 21, 9–24.
- BALENSIEFER, S., KREGOR-STICKLES, L., AND OSKIN, M. 2005. An evaluation framework and instruction set architecture for ion-trap based quantum micro-architectures. In *Proc. 32nd Annual International Symposium on Computer Architecture*.
- BEAUREGARD, S. 2003. Circuit for Shor’s algorithm using $2n + 3$ qubits. *Quantum Information and Computation* 3, 2, 175–185. <http://arXiv.org/quant-ph/0205095>.

- BECKMAN, D., CHARI, A. N., DEVABHAKTUNI, S., AND PRESKILL, J. 1996. Efficient networks for quantum factoring. *Phys. Rev. A* 54, 1034–1063. <http://arXiv.org/quant-ph/9602016>.
- BENNETT, C. H., BRASSARD, G., CRÉPEAU, C., JOSZA, R., PERES, A., AND WOOTTERS, W. 1993. Teleporting an unknown quantum state via dual classical and EPR channels. *Physical Review Letters* 70, 1895–1899.
- BOUWMEESTER, D., PAN, J.-W., MATTLE, K., EIBL, M., WEINFURTER, H., AND ZEILINGER, A. 1997. Experimental quantum teleportation. *Nature* 390, 575–579.
- CALDERBANK, A. R. AND SHOR, P. W. 1996. Good quantum error-correcting codes exist. *Physical Review A* 54, 1098–1105.
- CHILDRESS, L., TAYLOR, J., SØRENSEN, A., AND LUKIN, M. 2005. Fault-tolerant quantum repeaters with minimal physical resources and implementations based on single-photon emitters. *Physical Review A* 72, 5, 52330.
- CIRAC, J., EKERT, A., HUELGA, S., AND MACCHIAVELLO, C. 1999. Distributed quantum computation over noisy channels. *Physical Review A* 59, 4249.
- CLEVE, R. AND WATROUS, J. 2000. Fast parallel circuits for the quantum Fourier transform. In *Proc. 41st Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science*. ACM, 526–536.
- COPSEY, D., OSKIN, M., METODIEV, T., CHONG, F. T., CHUANG, I., AND KUBIATOWICZ, J. 2003. The effect of communication costs in solid-state quantum computing architectures. In *Proceedings of the fifteenth annual ACM Symposium on Parallel Algorithms and Architectures*. 65–74.
- CUCCARO, S. A., DRAPER, T. G., KUTIN, S. A., AND MOULTON, D. P. 2004. A new quantum ripple-carry addition circuit. <http://arXiv.org/quant-ph/0410184>.
- DALLY, W. J. AND TOWLES, B. 2004. *Principles and Practices of Interconnection Networks*. Elsevier.
- DEUTSCH, D. AND JOZSA, R. 1992. Rapid solution of problems by quantum computation. *Proc. R. Soc. London Ser. A*, 439, 553.
- DIVINCENZO, D. P. 1998. Quantum gates and circuits. *Proc. Royal Soc. London A*.
- DRAPER, T. G. 2000. Addition on a quantum computer. <http://arXiv.org/quant-ph/0008033>. first draft dated Sept. 1998.
- DRAPER, T. G., KUTIN, S. A., RAINS, E. M., AND SVORE, K. M. 2006. A logarithmic-depth quantum carry-lookahead adder. *Quantum Information and Computation* 6, 4&5 (July), 351–369.
- ERCEGOVAC, M. D. AND LANG, T. 2004. *Digital Arithmetic*. Morgan Kaufmann, San Francisco, CA.
- FUJISAWA, T., OOSTERKAMP, T. H., VAN DER WIEL, W. G., BROER, B. W., AGUADO, R., TARUCHA, S., AND KOUWENHOVEN, L. P. 1998. Spontaneous emission spectrum in double quantum dot devices. *Science* 282, 932–935.
- FURUSAWA, A., SØRENSEN, J. L., BRAUNSTEIN, S. L., FUCHS, C. A., KIMBLE, H. J., AND POLZIK, E. S. 1998. Unconditional quantum teleportation. *Science* 282, 5389, 706–709.
- GOSSETT, P. 1998. Quantum carry-save arithmetic. <http://arXiv.org/quant-ph/9808061>.
- GOTTESMAN, D. AND CHUANG, I. L. 1999. Demonstrating the viability of universal quantum computation using teleportation and single-qubit operations. *Nature* 402, 390–393.
- GROVER, L. 1996. A fast quantum-mechanical algorithm for database search. In *Proc. 28th Annual ACM Symposium on the Theory of Computation*. 212–219. <http://arXiv.org/quant-ph/9605043>.
- GROVER, L. K. 1997. Quantum telecomputation. <http://arXiv.org/quant-ph/9704012>.
- GULDE, S., RIEBE, M., LANCASTER, G. P. T., BECHER, C., ESCHNER, J., HAFFNER, H., SCHMIDT-KALER, F., CHUANG, I. L., AND BLATT, R. 2003. Implementation of the Deutsch-Jozsa algorithm on an ion-trap quantum computer. *Nature* 421, 48–50.
- JELEZKO, F., GAEBEL, T., POPA, I., DOMHAN, M., GRUBER, A., AND WRATCHTRUP, J. 2004. Observation of coherence oscillation of a single nuclear spin and realization of a two-qubit conditional quantum gate. *Physical Review Letters* 93, 130501.
- JOHANSSON, J. ET AL. 2005. Vacuum Rabi oscillations in a macroscopic superconducting qubit LC oscillator system. <http://arXiv.org/cond-mat/0510457>.
- JOZSA, R. AND LINDEN, N. 2003. On the role of entanglement in quantum computational speedup. *Proc. Royal Soc. London A* 459, 2011–2032. <http://arXiv.org/quant-ph/0201143>.
- KIELPINSKI, D., MONROE, C., AND WINELAND, D. J. 2002. Architecture for a large-scale ion-trap quantum computer. *Nature* 417, 709–711.

- KIM, J. ET AL. 2003. 1100x1100 port MEMS-based optical crossconnect with 4-dB maximum loss. *IEEE Photonics Technology Letters* 15, 11, 1537–1539.
- KIM, J. ET AL. 2005. System design for large-scale ion trap quantum information processor. *Quantum Information and Computation* 5, 7, 515–537.
- KNUTH, D. E. 1998. *The Art of Computer Programming, volume 2 / Seminumerical Algorithms*, 3rd ed. Addison-Wesley, Reading, MA.
- LIM, Y. L., BARRETT, S. D., BEIGE, A., KOK, P., AND KWEK, L. C. 2005. Repeat-Until-Success quantum computing using stationary and flying qubits. <http://arXiv.org/quant-ph/0508218>.
- LOVE, P. AND BOGHOSIAN, B. 2006. Type II quantum algorithms. *Physica A: Statistical Mechanics and its Applications* 362, 1, 210–214.
- MARCHAND, P. J., KRISHNAMOORTHY, A. V., YAYLA, G. I., ESENER, S. C., AND EFRON, U. 1997. Optically augmented 3-d computer: System technology and architecture. *J. Parallel and Distributed Computing* 41, 1 (Feb.), 20–35.
- MARTINIS, J. M., NAM, S., AUMENTADO, J., AND URBINA, C. 2002. Rabi oscillations in a large Josephson-junction qubit. *Physical Review Letters* 89, 117901.
- MATSUKEVICH, D. N. AND KUZMICH, A. 2004. Quantum state transfer between matter and light. *Science* 306, 5696, 663–666.
- MEHRING, M., MENDE, J., AND SCHERER, W. 2003. Entanglement between an electron and a nuclear spin 1/2. *Physical Review Letters* 90, 153001.
- MIQUEL, C., PAZ, J., AND PERAZZO, R. 1996. Factoring in a dissipative quantum computer. *Physical Review A* 54, 4, 2605–2613.
- MUNRO, W., NEMOTO, K., AND SPILLER, T. 2005. Weak nonlinearities: a new route to optical quantum computation. *New Journal of Physics* 7, 137.
- NAKAMURA, Y., PASHKIN, Y. A., AND TSAI, J. S. 1999. Coherent control of macroscopic quantum states in a single-Cooper-pair box. *Nature* 398, 786–788.
- NEMOTO, K. AND MUNRO, W. J. 2004. Nearly deterministic linear optical controlled-NOT gate. *Physical Review Letters* 93, 250502.
- NIELSEN, M. A. AND CHUANG, I. L. 2000. *Quantum Computation and Quantum Information*. Cambridge University Press.
- OI, D. K. L., DEVITT, S. J., AND HOLLENBERG, L. C. L. 2006. Scalable error correction in distributed ion trap computers. *Physical Review A* 74, 052313.
- OSKIN, M., CHONG, F. T., CHUANG, I. L., AND KUBIATOWICZ, J. 2003. Building quantum wires: The long and short of it. In *Computer Architecture News, Proc. 30th Annual International Symposium on Computer Architecture*. ACM.
- SHOR, P. W. 1994. Algorithms for quantum computation: Discrete logarithms and factoring. In *Proc. 35th Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science*. IEEE Computer Society Press, Los Alamitos, CA, 124–134.
- SHOR, P. W. 1996. Fault-tolerant quantum computation. In *Proc. 37th Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science*. IEEE Computer Society Press, Los Alamitos, CA, 56–65.
- SPILLER, T. P., MUNRO, W. J., BARRETT, S. D., AND KOK, P. 2005. An introduction to quantum information processing: applications and realisations. *Contemporary Physics* 46, 406.
- SPILLER, T. P., NEMOTO, K., BRAUNSTEIN, S. L., MUNRO, W. J., VAN LOOCK, P., AND MILBURN, G. J. 2006. Quantum computation by communication. *New Journal of Physics* 8, 30.
- STEANE, A. M. 2003. Overhead and noise threshold of fault-tolerant quantum error correction. *Physical Review A* 68, 042322.
- STEANE, A. M. 2004. How to build a 300 bit, 1 Gop quantum computer. <http://arxiv.org/abs/quant-ph/0412165>.
- STEANE, A. M. AND LUCAS, D. M. 2000. Quantum computing with trapped ions, atoms, and light. *Fortschritte der Physik*. <http://arXiv.org/quant-ph/0004053>.
- STOCKTON, J., ARMEN, M., AND MABUCHI, H. 2002. Programmable logic devices in experimental quantum optics. *J. Opt. Soc. Am. B* 19, 3019.
- SZYMANSKI, T. AND HINTON, H. 1995. Design of a terabit free-space photonic backplane for parallel computing. In *Proc. Second Workshop on Massively Parallel Processing Using Optical Interconnections*. IEEE.

- TAKAHASHI, Y. AND KUNIHIRO, N. 2005. A linear-size quantum circuit for addition with no ancillary qubits. *Quantum Information and Computation* 5, 6, 440–448.
- THAKER, D. D., METODI, T., CROSS, A., CHUANG, I., AND CHONG, F. T. 2006. CQLA: Matching density to exploitable parallelism in quantum computing. See ACM [2006].
- VAN LOOCK, P., LADD, T. D., SANAKA, K., YAMAGUCHI, F., NEMOTO, K., MUNRO, W. J., AND YAMAMOTO, Y. 2006. Hybrid quantum repeater using bright coherent light. *Physical Review Letters* 96, 240501.
- VAN METER, R. AND ITOH, K. M. 2005. Fast quantum modular exponentiation. *Physical Review A* 71, 5 (May), 052320.
- VAN METER, R., MUNRO, W. J., NEMOTO, K., AND ITOH, K. M. 2006. Distributed arithmetic on a quantum multicomputer. See ACM [2006], 354–365.
- VAN METER, R., NEMOTO, K., AND MUNRO, W. J. 2007. Communication links for distributed quantum computation. <http://arxiv.org/quant-ph/0701043>.
- VAN METER, R. AND OSKIN, M. 2006. Architectural implications of quantum computing technologies. *ACM Journal of Emerging Technologies in Computing Systems* 2, 1 (Jan.), 31–63.
- VAN METER III, R. D. 2006. Architecture of a quantum multicomputer optimized for Shor’s factoring algorithm. Ph.D. thesis, Keio University.
- VANDERSYPEN, L. M. K., STEFFEN, M., BREYTA, G., YANNONI, C. S., SHERWOOD, M. H., AND CHUANG, I. L. 2001. Experimental realization of Shor’s quantum factoring algorithm using nuclear magnetic resonance. *Nature* 414, 883–887.
- VEDRAL, V., BARENCO, A., AND EKERT, A. 1996. Quantum networks for elementary arithmetic operations. *Phys. Rev. A* 54, 147–153. <http://arXiv.org/quant-ph/9511018>.
- WALLRAFF, A., SCHUSTER, D. I., BLAIS, A., FRUNZIO, L., HUANG, R.-S., MAJER, J., KUMAR, S., GIRVIN, S. M., AND SCHOELKOPF, R. J. 2004. Strong coupling of a single photon to a superconducting qubit using circuit quantum electrodynamics. *Nature* 431, 162–167.
- WILLIAMS, C. P. AND CLEARWATER, S. H. 1999. *Ultimate Zero and One: Computing at the Quantum Frontier*. Copernicus Books.
- YEPEZ, J. 2001. Type-II quantum computers. *International Journal of Modern Physics C* 12, 9, 1273–1284.
- YIMSIRIWATTANA, A. AND LOMONACO JR., S. J. 2004. Distributed quantum computing: A distributed Shor algorithm. <http://arxiv.org/quant-ph/0403146>.
- ZALKA, C. 1998. Fast versions of Shor’s quantum factoring algorithm. <http://arXiv.org/quant-ph/9806084>.