



Quantum computing: pro and con

BY JOHN PRESKILL

*Charles C. Lauritsen Laboratory of High Energy Physics,
California Institute of Technology, Pasadena, CA 91125, USA*

I assess the potential of quantum computation. Broad and important applications must be found to justify construction of a quantum computer; I review some of the known quantum algorithms and consider the prospects for finding new ones. Quantum computers are notoriously susceptible to making errors; I discuss recently developed fault-tolerant procedures that enable a quantum computer with noisy gates to perform reliably. Quantum computing hardware is still in its infancy; I comment on the specifications that should be met by future hardware. Over the past few years, work on quantum computation has erected a new classification of computational complexity, has generated profound insights into the nature of decoherence, and has stimulated the formulation of new techniques in high-precision experimental physics. A broad interdisciplinary effort will be needed if quantum computers are to fulfil their destiny as the world's fastest computing devices.

This paper is an expanded version of remarks that were prepared for a panel discussion at the ITP Conference on Quantum Coherence and Decoherence, 17 December 1996.

Keywords: quantum computing; error correction; complexity theory

1. Introduction

The purpose of this panel discussion is to explore the future prospects for quantum computation. It seems to me that there are three main questions about quantum computers that we should try to address here.

(1) Do we *want* to build one? What will a quantum computer be good for? There is no doubt that constructing a working quantum computer will be a great technical challenge; we will be persuaded to try to meet that challenge only if the potential pay-off is correspondingly great. To assess the future viability of quantum computers, we should thus try to imagine how they will be used in the future. Our imaginations are limited, so we are bound to miss the most interesting applications; still, we should try.

(2) *Can* we build one? No one doubts that building a useful quantum computer (one capable of addressing challenging computational problems) is difficult, but is it actually *impossible*? Do fundamental physical principles pose a truly serious obstacle? The most obvious concern is the problem of errors. As for an analogue classical computer, the errors made by a quantum computer form a continuum, and so the accumulation of small errors threatens to destabilize the device. Furthermore, quantum computers rely on quantum entanglement (non-classical correlations involving many degrees of freedom) for their special capabilities, and entanglement is particularly vulnerable to the effects of decoherence due to uncontrollable interactions with

the environment. Can these difficulties be overcome even in principle (and if so, also in practice)?

(3) *How* will we build one? What kind of hardware will the quantum computers of the future use? Can this hardware be constructed via incremental improvements of existing technologies, or will truly new ideas be needed?

I do not know the answers to these questions, but I will express a few thoughts.

2. Do we want to build one?

How will quantum computers be used?

I have enormous admiration for Peter Shor's factoring algorithm (Shor 1994). With Shor's algorithm, it is possible to find the prime factors of an N -digit number in a time of order N^3 , while it is widely believed (though it has never been proved) that any factoring algorithm that runs on a classical computer would require a time that increases with N faster than any power. This stunning result, and the ingenuity of the algorithm, aroused much interest in quantum computation†. The desire for a powerful factoring engine (with cryptographic applications) is now widely regarded as one of the primary motivations for building a quantum computer. But in the long run, I do not expect factoring to be one of the most important applications of quantum computing. In fact, it seems to me that it is largely a historical accident that the factoring problem is regarded as especially important today.

If not factoring, what then? I am actually quite sympathetic with Feynman's original vision (Feynman 1982)—that a quantum computer will be used to simulate the behaviour of quantum systems‡. What Feynman emphasized is that a quantum device can store quantum information far more efficiently than any classical device; since N qubits live in a Hilbert space of dimension 2^N , a classical device would record $2^N - 1$ complex numbers to describe a typical quantum state of the N qubits. So it is plausible that quantum simulation is an example of a task that requires exponential resources for a classical computer, but not for a quantum computer¶. (Exponential memory space is not really necessary, but presumably the simulation requires exponential time.) Furthermore, quantum simulation is a rich subject, with many potential applications to, say, materials science and chemistry. I think it is important to flesh out in more detail how quantum computers would be used as quantum simulators, so that we can better assess the advantages that quantum computers will enjoy over future classical computers (Lloyd 1996; Zalka 1996a; Wiesner 1996; Meyer 1996; Lidar & Biham 1996; Abrams & Lloyd 1997; Boghosian & Taylor 1997). In principle, a question about a quantum system becomes exceptionally difficult only when the answer depends delicately on the details of entanglement involving many degrees of freedom, and it is not clear for what physically interesting questions massive entanglement plays an essential role. For example, few-body correlations in the ground state can usually be computed in polynomial time on a classical computer.

† Daniel Simon (1994) actually paved the way for Shor's factoring algorithm, by exhibiting the first example of a quantum algorithm that efficiently solves an interesting hard problem.

‡ However, my view that quantum simulation is more important than factoring was dismissed by some participants at the conference as the bias of a narrow-minded physicist—one who thinks that the only important problems are the ones that he works on!

¶ But it was David Deutsch (1985), not Feynman, who emphasized that quantum computers can best realize their computational potential by exploiting massive quantum parallelism. That a quantum system can perform computation was first explicitly pointed out by Benioff (1982).

Classical simulations of the real-time evolution of a quantum system seem to be more challenging, but perhaps, with sufficient ingenuity, new approximations can be developed that will vastly improve the efficiency of such simulations. Using a quantum computer is more of a brute force strategy; yet sometimes we save much effort by invoking the brute force method rather than the one that requires exceptional cleverness.

Since Shor exhibited the factoring algorithm, perhaps the most important new development in quantum complexity has been Grover's very clever method for searching an unsorted database (Grover 1996). In a database containing N items, the one item that meets a specified criterion can be found with a quantum computer in a time of order \sqrt{N} . On a classical computer, the database search would take a time of order N , so Grover's algorithm is a case where we *know* that the quantum computer can perform a computationally important task faster than any classical computer. (This hasn't been proved for factoring, though it is likely to be true in that case, too.) The speed-up is achieved by exploiting both quantum parallelism and the property that a probability in quantum theory is the square of an amplitude—Grover's algorithm acts on an initial state in which all of N classical strings are each represented with an amplitude $1/\sqrt{N}$, and rotates the initial state in of order \sqrt{N} steps to a state in which the string being sought is represented with an amplitude of order one.

The speed-up relative to classical methods achieved by Grover's algorithm is not nearly so spectacular as the exponential speed-up achieved by Shor's algorithm. But even a non-exponential speed-up can be very useful. The database search is surely an important problem with many applications; for example, it could be used to solve any NP problem (a problem whose solution, though perhaps hard to find, is easy to verify). If quantum computers are being used 100 years from now, I would guess that they will be used to run Grover's algorithm or something like it. Furthermore, it seems likely that there is much more to say about algorithms, like Grover's, that provide a non-exponential speed-up. In the case of the database search, a computation that requires time T on a classical computer can be performed in a time of order \sqrt{T} on a quantum computer. It would be quite interesting to find a general way to characterize the classical algorithms that will admit this kind of \sqrt{T} quantum speed-up. In particular, classical computers usually address NP-complete problems not by doing a blind search for the desired solution, but by doing a search that is considerably more clever and more efficient, and that still succeeds reasonably well. To what extent can these more efficient algorithms be improved by means of quantum computation?

Speculation about the prospects for quantum computing often centres on the issue of NP-complete problems, and especially the dream that quantum computation will allow an exponential speed-up of the solution to problems in this class. In this connection, an important result was obtained by Bennett *et al.* (1997a), who showed that Grover's algorithm for the database search problem is actually optimal; no quantum algorithm can solve the problem faster than time of order \sqrt{N} . This result suggests that quantum computers may not prove capable of solving NP-complete problems in polynomial time. At the very least it indicates that no such polynomial-time quantum algorithm will exist that relies on sheer 'quantum magic'; rather, penetrating insights into the structure of the problems in the NP-complete class may well be required.

Perhaps, though, NP-complete problems are not the best context for exploiting the power of quantum computation. It may be that quantum computers are capable

of solving some hard problems that are *outside* NP, and that quantum simulation is an example. Even were an oracle at our command that could solve NP-complete problems, quantum simulation might still require exponential resources on a classical computer; that is, a classical computer would still be unable to simulate a quantum computer efficiently[†]. Quantum computing is likely to have the most dramatic payoff in algorithms that best exploit the ability of a quantum storage register to store an exponentially complex quantum state using polynomial quantum resources. (And for these algorithms, it is bound to be crucial that the quantum computer can generate highly entangled quantum states.)

Assuming the correctness of the central conjecture of classical complexity theory ($P \neq NP$), there exists a class of problems (the class NPI) of intermediate difficulty; these problems are not as hard as the NP-complete problems, yet still cannot be solved by a Turing machine in polynomially bounded time. The factoring problem is regarded as a likely candidate for membership in this class (Garey & Johnson 1979), and so it is natural to wonder whether efficient quantum algorithms can be devised for other problems that are suspected to be in NPI. One particularly promising example is the graph isomorphism problem (to determine whether two specified graphs are equivalent after a suitable relabelling of the vertices). It is important to investigate whether good quantum algorithms can be devised for the graph isomorphism problem and other related problems.

I feel that a deep understanding of *why* quantum algorithms work is still lacking. Surely the power of quantum computers has something to do with entanglement, quantum parallelism and the vastness of Hilbert space, but I think that it should be possible to pinpoint more precisely the true essence of the matter. One form of the question is: how does Planck's constant \hbar enter into quantum computation, and what is the nature of the 'classical' limit $\hbar \rightarrow 0$? I suspect that a better understanding of this sort of issue would help to point us toward new types of quantum algorithms.

In another talk at this conference (Preskill 1997), I estimated the resources that would be needed to solve an interesting factoring problem on a quantum computer. The estimate was surely daunting. Perhaps an interesting quantum simulation problem could be effectively addressed with more modest resources. But it is also natural to ask what could be done with a small quantum computer, one that can store, say, tens of qubits and can implement hundreds of gates. If we could build such a device reasonably soon, would it be useful? Would it have commercial potential?

One possible application of a quantum computer of modest size would be quantum cryptography (Bennett & Brassard 1984). Of course, in the absence of quantum factoring engines, conventional public key cryptography may be secure, but I assume there will always be some users who will insist on the ultimate in privacy, and so will prefer quantum key distribution. (For one thing, the user might fear that his message could be stored and deciphered some time in the future, when more powerful factoring techniques become available.) Though quantum key distribution may be secure in principle, it has a serious limitation: the signal becomes attenuated in the communication channel (such as an optical fibre), and *it cannot be amplified*, because of the no-cloning theorem (Wootters & Zurek 1982). So either we must be satisfied with communication that is limited to distances of the order of the attenuation length in the fibre (perhaps tens of kilometres), or we must be willing to enlist trusted

[†] In fact, a weakened version of this statement ('relative to an oracle') was demonstrated by Bernstein & Vazirani (1993).

intermediaries, which would clearly entail a serious security risk. But quantum error correction may provide an alternative: if we could prepare, send and receive *entangled* multi-photon states, then in principle we could use quantum error-correcting codes to extend the range of quantum communication. ‘Repeaters’ would be placed along the communication line; these repeaters would not read the quantum information that is being transmitted; rather they would diagnose and correct the errors that occur during transmission. We could send, say, blocks of five photons that encode one logical qubit (Bennett *et al.* 1996; Laflamme *et al.* 1996) chosen at random to be in one of two non-orthogonal states, and place the repeating stations close enough together that the probability of error during transmission between successive stations will be small. Our quantum computers would need to be capable of carrying out (fault-tolerant) syndrome measurement and error correction for the five-qubit code with a small probability of error (Shor 1996; DiVincenzo & Shor 1996), and we would need to be able to quickly refresh the ancilla bits that are used to compute the syndrome in order to achieve a reasonable transmission rate. Of course, with more powerful quantum computers, we could use better codes and improve the performance of the network.

Perhaps the best clocks of the reasonably near future will have quantum computers inside. Some atomic clocks are limited by the spontaneous decay lifetimes of the excited atomic states. If error-correcting codes could be used to inhibit spontaneous decay, then in principle longer interrogation times could be achieved and a more precise frequency standard could be established. The NIST group (Bollinger *et al.* 1996) has suggested another way that quantum entanglement could be invoked to improve the precision of a clock or an interferometer. If the phase oscillations of the state $(1/\sqrt{2})(|0\rangle + |1\rangle)$ of a two-level system are used to define a frequency standard, then the ‘cat state’ $(1/\sqrt{2})(|000\dots 0\rangle + |111\dots 1\rangle)$ constructed from N such systems would oscillate N times as fast, and so could in principle be used to establish a more precise standard[†].

Even if the commercial potential of a low-performance quantum computer might be modest, it could well become an essential tool in the laboratory of the experimental physicist. The ability to prepare, maintain, manipulate and monitor highly entangled states will make it possible to perform a wide variety of ingenious new measurements.

But suppose I could buy a truly powerful quantum computer off the shelf today—what would I do with it? I don’t know, but it appears that I will have plenty of time to think about it! My gut feeling is that if powerful quantum computers were available, we would somehow think of many clever ways to use them.

3. *Can we build one?*

Manny Knill and I talked at this meeting about the remarkable recent progress in the theory of fault-tolerant quantum computation. Even before the recent developments, one might have been hopeful that error-correction methods could be invoked to resist decoherence and to control the accumulation and propagation of error in a quantum computer, but this view could have been dismissed as wishful thinking. Now the case is considerably stronger that, in principle, there is no fundamental

[†] However, the improvement in precision that can be attained by using entangled states will be severely limited by decoherence effects—while entangled states oscillate faster than unentangled states, they also decohere more rapidly (Huelga *et al.* 1997).

obstacle to building a functioning quantum computer that is capable of performing computationally interesting tasks.

Serge Haroche and Rolf Landauer have argued eloquently that this point of view is much too sanguine, and perhaps it is. Haroche argues that the optimists grossly underestimate the pervasiveness of decoherence and the difficulty of resisting it (Haroche, this volume; Haroche & Ramond 1996). Haroche notes that a highly entangled state of many qubits is exceptionally vulnerable to the effects of decoherence—a single error affecting just one of the qubits can destroy the coherence of the whole state. Indeed, this is so; in a functional quantum computer, quantum-error correction must work so effectively that hardly a single logical (encoded) qubit fails during the course of the computation. He also emphasizes that error-correcting codes entail an enormous overhead in a quantum computation, both in terms of the number of qubits required (to provide the necessary redundancy to recover from errors) and the number of quantum gates needed (to process the redundantly encoded data, and to diagnose and reverse the errors); this increase in the number of qubits and the number of gates increases the likelihood of error. Indeed this is so, as I have discussed in my other talk at this conference (Preskill 1997). But it has now been shown that if the error probability per gate is less than a certain critical value (the ‘accuracy threshold’), then error correction can still work effectively, even for a computation that is arbitrarily long (Knill & Laflamme 1996; Knill *et al.* 1996, 1997; Aharonov & Ben-Or 1996a; Kitaev 1996b; Gottesman *et al.* 1996; Zalka 1996b; Preskill 1997).

If fault-tolerant methods are invoked to improve the reliability of a quantum computer, then a price must be paid in both storage requirements and processing speed. However, this price may be quite acceptable. Given hardware with a fixed rate of error per elementary gate, to do a longer computation with acceptable accuracy, we will need to increase the block size of the code. But the scaling of the block size needed with the length of the computation to be performed is reasonably favourable:

$$\text{block size} \sim [\log(\text{length of computation})]^{\text{power}}. \quad (3.1)$$

(In the scheme described in Preskill (1997), the power is $\log_2 7 \simeq 2.8$.) To process the information encoded in these larger blocks also requires more elementary gates (with the number scaling roughly linearly with block size). However, in principle, many of these gates could be performed *in parallel*. If we assume that the quantum hardware is highly parallelizable, then the processing time is only weakly dependent on the block size.

It has been suggested that fault-tolerant procedures will not deal effectively with errors in which qubits ‘leak’ out of the Hilbert space on which the quantum computer acts (Plenio & Knight 1996). For example, in an ion trap one of the ions might make an unwanted transition to a long-lived inert state that is not acted on by the quantum gates of the machine. Such errors will inevitably occur, but they need not pose a serious obstacle. One possible strategy is to systematically pump the levels that are prime candidates for leakage. But furthermore, leakage errors can easily be detected in principle with a simple quantum gate array (Preskill 1997). An ion identified as faulty can be eliminated from the code block and replaced by a standard ion in the ground state. After the replacement, a leakage error becomes an error in a known location that can easily be dealt with using standard error-correction procedures (Grassl *et al.* 1996).

Haroche also questions whether it will be possible to achieve error rates per gate that are small enough for quantum computers to work accurately. The fundamental

difficulty is that qubits must interact strongly if we are to fashion a quantum gate; but establishing this strong interaction may also induce the qubits to interact with other degrees of freedom (the environment), which will lead to decoherence. For example, to improve the performance of an ion-trap computer, we would increase the laser intensity to speed up the gates. But as the intensity increases, it becomes more likely that the ion is excited to a different level than was intended. The competition between these two effects imposes an intrinsic limit on the accuracy of the gate that is insensitive to the choice of the ion used (Plenio & Knight 1996). Under fairly general assumptions, one concludes that the probability of error per gate is at least of order 10^{-6} . This limit might be evaded through suitably heroic efforts—for example by placing ions in small cavities that are carefully engineered to suppress the unwanted transitions. Nevertheless, arguments of this sort are unquestionably useful, and it would be of great interest to formulate general limits that would constrain other types of transitions or other conceivable hardware implementations†.

Even if it proves difficult to improve on an error rate of order 10^{-6} per gate, hardware that approaches this level of accuracy may already be suitable for reliable large-scale quantum computation. Indeed, in my talk on fault-tolerant quantum computation at this conference (Preskill 1997), I suggested that an error rate of 10^{-6} per gate is a reasonable target to aim for—this error rate is likely to be sufficiently below the accuracy threshold that very interesting quantum computations will be feasible with reasonable resources‡. But I don't want to give the impression that this accuracy requirement is etched in stone; it may be too conservative for a number of reasons. First of all, this estimate was obtained under the assumption that phase and amplitude errors in the qubits are equally likely. With a more realistic error model better representing the error probabilities in an actual device, the error correction scheme could be better tailored to the error model, and a higher error rate could be tolerated. Furthermore, even under the assumptions stated, the fault-tolerant scheme has not been definitively analysed; with a more refined analysis, one can expect to find a somewhat higher accuracy threshold, perhaps considerably higher. Substantial improvements might also be attained by modifying the fault-tolerant scheme, either by finding a more efficient way to implement a universal set of fault-tolerant gates, or by finding a more efficient means of carrying out the measurement of the error syndrome. With various improvements, I would not be surprised to find that a quantum computer could work effectively with a probability of error per gate, say, of order 10^{-4} . (That is, 10^{-4} may be comfortably *below* the accuracy threshold. In fact, estimates of the accuracy threshold that are more optimistic than mine have been put forward by Zalka (1996*b*). See also Steane (1997).) Another point that should perhaps be emphasized is that as the error rates improve, it becomes possible to make more efficient use of storage space, by using codes that encode many logical qubits in

† A very weak general limitation on the performance of quantum hardware due to the vacuum fluctuations of the electromagnetic field was pointed out by Braginsky *et al.* (1995). In the context of an ion trap, their limit arises because the phonon in the trap can in principle decay by emission of a *photon*. (See also Garg (1996).)

‡ Any statement about acceptable error rates is meaningless unless a model for the errors is carefully specified. In Preskill (1997), uncorrelated stochastic errors are assumed. Under this assumption, all errors are due to decoherence, phase errors and bit flip errors are equally likely, and errors affecting distinct qubits are independent. The 'gate error probability' $\epsilon \sim 10^{-6}$ may be interpreted as a quantum fidelity—that is, if the computer would have been in the state $|\psi\rangle$ had the gate been implemented perfectly, and if its actual state after the gate is applied is ρ , then $F \equiv \langle \psi | \rho | \psi \rangle = 1 - \epsilon$.

a single block. Gottesman (1997) has recently shown how to carry out fault-tolerant computation using such codes, though at a cost in processing time.

Rolf Landauer has played a valuable role, in his remarks at this meeting and in his previous writings (Landauer 1995, 1996, 1997), by reminding us that proposed new technologies rarely realize the rosy projections put forth by their proponents. And he has repeatedly stressed the crucial issue of error control (see also Unruh 1995). Landauer correctly points out that digital devices can achieve remarkable reliability because a digital signal can be easily restandardized—that is, if it wanders slightly from its intended value, it can be shoved back where it belongs. This restandardization, which prevents small errors from accumulating and eventually becoming large errors, is necessarily a *dissipative* process. Ease of restandardization is the central advantage that digital devices enjoy over analogue devices. Quantum computation (or more generally reversible computation) may seem from this point of view to be an ill-devised return to analogue computation, with all the attendant problems.

It has been a truly stunning discovery that, using quantum error correction, it is actually possible to restandardize a coherent quantum signal (Shor 1995; Steane 1996*a, b*; Calderbank & Shor 1996). Of course, like any error-correction technique, quantum error correction is a dissipative process and so produces waste heat that must escape from the device. In a quantum error-correction scheme, information about the errors that have occurred accumulates in a set of ancilla qubits. If these ancilla bits are to be re-used, they must first be cleared, which means that the entropy associated with the accumulated errors must be released to the environment. This need for cooling to remove the entropy associated with the errors may be an important engineering constraint on the quantum computers of the future.

Landauer acknowledges that significant progress has been made on the problem of error control, but he also raises some vexing questions. A question he has raised insistently at this meeting is: how can coding prevent our quantum gates from making small errors, if the code and the device have no way of knowing what gate we are trying to implement? If we make a small mistake while performing a gate that acts on encoded qubits, the final state of the qubits *might* still reside in the code subspace, but take a value that differs slightly from what we intended. This kind of error is undetectable and uncorrectable. Would such small errors not inevitably accumulate over time and result in large errors? (The concern being raised has little to do with decoherence; even if the evolution of the state of the computer is unitary, there is no *a priori* guarantee that the unitary evolution is as desired.)

We can assess this objection for the case of the trivial gate, where the unitary transformation that we intend to apply is the identity[†]. Imagine that transformations that differ slightly from the identity are applied to each of the elementary qubits in the block, so that if the qubits are subsequently measured, the probability of a phase or bit-flip error in each qubit is of order $\epsilon \ll 1$. We may ask about the probability of an undetectable error—with what likelihood does the block still lie in the code subspace, but with the encoded qubit pointing in the wrong direction? For a code that is capable of recovering from a single one-qubit error at an arbitrary position in the block, this probability is actually of order ϵ^3 ; three independent phase or bit-flip errors are required for the *block*, when measured, to take a value in the code subspace that differs by a phase or bit flip error from its original value[‡].

[†] The reasoning can easily be adapted to the case of a non-trivial gate.

[‡] It is actually more likely, occurring with probability of order ϵ^2 , that upon performing fault-tolerant error correction we misdiagnose the error in the block and reset the qubit to an incorrect value.

Regarding non-trivial gates, it is important to note that the fault-tolerant operations that can be performed on (say) a single encoded qubit do not form a continuum; instead, only a discrete set of transformations can be safely implemented. Thus, small errors in the gate implementation, rather than changing the intended gate to a different gate in the fault-tolerant set, will be much more likely to cause detectable errors that can be corrected. Of course, even though the set of fault-tolerant gates is discrete, it may still be *universal*; if we have a universal set of fault-tolerant gates, we can surely use them to construct a transformation that comes arbitrarily close to a single-qubit rotation with any desired angle, but we will need to use some of our multi-qubit gates in that construction.

Landauer also reminds us that the efficacy of error correction will be reduced if the errors have a systematic component. Errors with random phases accumulate like a random walk, so that the *probability* of error accumulates roughly linearly with the number of gates applied. But if the errors have systematic phases, then the error *amplitude* can increase linearly with the number of gates, and the probability of error might become appreciable much sooner. Hence, for our quantum computer to perform well, the rate of systematic errors must meet a more stringent requirement than the rate for random errors. Crudely speaking, *if* we assume that the systematic phases always conspire to add constructively, and if the accuracy threshold is ϵ in the case of random errors, then the accuracy threshold will be approximately ϵ^2 in the case of systematic errors; of the order of 10^{-10} , say, instead of order 10^{-5} . While systematic errors may thus pose a challenge to the quantum engineers of the future, they ought not to pose an insuperable obstacle. First, systematic phases will tend to cancel out over the course of a long computation, so that higher error rates could be tolerated in practice (Obenland & Despain 1996, 1997; Miquel *et al.* 1997). And furthermore, if errors really are systematic, we can in principle understand their origin and eliminate them. It is always the random errors that place the intrinsic limitations on performance.

There is another important respect in which the error models that have been used in theoretical studies of fault-tolerant quantum computing may be unrealistic—it is typically assumed that the errors afflicting distinct qubits are *uncorrelated* or only weakly correlated. In fact, this is a very strong assumption, and an essential one, because quantum error-correcting codes are not equipped to deal with strongly correlated errors involving many qubits. When we say that the probability of error is of order $\epsilon \sim 10^{-6}$ per gate, we actually mean that the probability of two errors occurring in a single block is of order $\epsilon^2 \sim 10^{-12}$. It will ultimately be an experimental question whether different qubits in the same block can really be decoupled to this degree. We should note, though, that there is no reason why two qubits belonging to the same code block need to be near each other in the machine. Thus, we have the opportunity to enhance the validity of our error model through a suitable choice of machine architecture.

Now that we are convinced that quantum-error correction is possible, we should search for new ways to implement it. It is important in particular to analyse in greater detail how error correction methods can be adapted to some of the proposed realizations of quantum hardware, in particular to ion-trap and cavity-QED computers (Pellizzari *et al.* 1996; Mabuchi & Zoller 1996; Van Enk *et al.* 1997). Furthermore, while most of the work on quantum error correction schemes has focused on the quantum circuit model—suitable circuits are designed to diagnose and correct the errors—a broader viewpoint might be highly productive. One alternative procedure

would be to devise a ‘designer Hamiltonian’ which has the protected code subspace as its (highly degenerate) ground state†. Then an error would typically occur only when the system makes a transition to an excited state, and this error would be automatically corrected when the system relaxed to the ground state. Schemes of this sort have been suggested by Kitaev (1996*a*). Kitaev (1997) has also made the ingenious suggestion that fault-tolerant quantum gates might be realized in a suitable medium by exchanging quasiparticles that obey an exotic version of two-dimensional quantum statistics. The essential idea is that, because the long-range Aharonov–Bohm interactions among the quasiparticles would be *topological*, the gate would not have to be implemented with high precision in order to act in the prescribed way on the quantum numbers of the quasiparticles.

Landauer urges us to consider that, even if a quantum computer can be constructed, and even if it is capable of performing highly valuable tasks, the technology will have little impact if it is absurdly expensive. Again, this is a serious objection. Surely, the technology has far to go before we can even begin to seriously assess the economics of quantum computation. The more important point, though, is that to be economically viable, a quantum computer would have to have broad applications. Searching for (and finding) new and useful quantum algorithms may be the most effective way of bringing quantum computing closer to fruition as a commercial enterprise.

Some of the commonly expressed reasons for scepticism about quantum computing are listed in table 1, along with some countervailing views.

4. *How will we build one?*

Quantum computing hardware is clearly in its infancy. Though what has already been achieved using ion traps (Monroe *et al.* 1995), cavity QED (Turchette *et al.* 1995), and NMR techniques (Cory *et al.* 1996; Gershenfeld & Chuang 1997) is intriguing and impressive, all of these technologies have serious intrinsic limitations. The quantum computing hardware of the future is bound to be substantially different than the hardware of the present.

For example, the speed of an ion-trap computer operated according to the Cirac–Zoller (1995) scheme is limited by the frequencies of the vibrational modes in the trap. In the original NIST experiment (Monroe *et al.* 1995), this frequency was about 10 MHz, but it is likely to be orders of magnitude smaller in a trap that contains multiple ions. NMR devices suffer from an exponential attenuation of signal to noise as the number of qubits in the machine increases. Of the ‘current’ quantum computing technologies, those based on cavity QED probably have the best long-term potential (Cirac *et al.* 1996).

Future hardware will have to be fast, scalable and highly parallelizable. Indeed, parallel operations will be crucial to error correction. In addition to errors introduced by the quantum gates themselves, we will also need to worry about *storage* errors, those affecting the ‘resting’ qubits that are not acted on by the gates. To control storage errors, it will be necessary to perform error correction continually on the resting qubits, which will be infeasible in a large device unless many code blocks can be corrected simultaneously. Even apart from the issue of storage errors (and with

† One might hope that the designer Hamiltonian could be realizable in a suitable mesoscopic implementation of quantum computation.

Table 1. *Some possible objections to quantum computation, and some responses*

objection	response
Quantum computers are analogue devices, and hence cannot be restandardized.	Using quantum error-correcting codes and fault-tolerant error correction, we <i>can</i> restandardize encoded quantum information.
A quantum error-correcting code cannot detect or correct an error if the quantum state remains inside the protected code subspace.	If good codes are used, such uncorrectable errors are quite unlikely.
A high-performance quantum computer must prepare and maintain highly entangled quantum states, and these states are very vulnerable to decoherence.	Fault-tolerant error correction protects highly entangled encoded states from decoherence.
Error correction itself requires a complex computation, and so is bound to introduce more errors than it removes!	If the error probability per gate is below the <i>accuracy threshold</i> , then an arbitrarily long computation can in principle be performed with negligible probability of error.
Quantum error correction will slow down the computer.	With highly parallelized operation, the slowdown need not be serious.
To successfully incorporate quantum error correction, a much larger quantum computer will be needed.	The number of qubits needed increases only polylogarithmically with the size of the computation to be performed.
Any quantum computer will suffer from leakage—the quantum information will diffuse out of the Hilbert space on which the computer acts.	With suitable coding, leakage errors can be detected and corrected.
Systematic errors will accumulate over time; error-correcting codes do not deal with systematic errors as effectively as with random errors.	In principle, systematic errors can be understood and eliminated.
Coding does not protect against highly correlated errors.	Correlated errors can be suppressed with suitable machine architecture.
There are intrinsic limitations on the accuracy of quantum gates. Error correction will not work for gates of feasible accuracy.	Within the known limits, gates exceeding the accuracy threshold are possible. With suitable hardware, even these limits might be evaded.
Current quantum computing technology is inaccurate, slow, not scalable, and not easily parallelizable.	Faster gates and new ways to distribute entanglement can surely be developed. New ideas for quantum hardware would be most welcome!
In the near term, experiments with quantum computers will be mere demonstrations. They will not teach us anything.	We will learn about correlated decoherence. The performance of devices with just a few tens of qubits cannot be easily simulated or predicted.
Quantum computers will be too expensive.	But they will be worth the price if suitably broad applications are found.
The known applications of quantum computers are quite limited.	Let's think of new ones! The known quantum database search algorithm may prove to be very useful.

appropriate hardware design, they may not be a serious limitation), parallel operation is highly desirable to improve processing speed. This is especially so because quantum error correction will slow down a computation substantially unless it is possible to operate simultaneously on many qubits in the same code block.

Thus it will be essential for our machine to be able to distribute the parts of a highly entangled state to various processors, and to act on the parts independently. In an ion-trap machine, for example, there would be many traps, each containing multiple qubits, and the machine would have to be able to shunt ions from one trap to another without disturbing the internal atomic states. In the case of a cavity QED device, a promising suggestion for distributing entanglement was made by Cirac *et al.* (1997); in their scheme, atoms are trapped in many cavities, and entanglement is established among atoms in distinct cavities by exchanging photons between the cavities.

Scalability obviously is going to be a crucial issue if we ultimately hope to build machines that are capable of storing and manipulating millions of individually addressable qubits. In the long term, it may be some sort of solid state or micro-fabricated device that will have the most promise of offering the needed scalability. We should also be prepared to adapt our paradigm for quantum computing to new technological opportunities. For example, as Lloyd (1993) has advocated, a molecular machine is likely to operate more like a quantum cellular automaton than like the quantum gate circuits that most theorists usually envision.

Even more broadly, since no quantum system that is well protected from decoherence can be efficiently simulated on a classical computer, any such system has the potential to perform difficult computational tasks. Aharonov & Ben-Or (1996b) have observed that a phase transition can be expected as the decoherence rate is varied[†]. A very noisy quantum system behaves classically, and so can be efficiently simulated with a classical Turing machine, but if the decoherence rate is low enough, highly entangled quantum states can be established and no efficient classical simulation is possible. In this sense, any quantum system with a low decoherence rate is performing a hard ‘computation’. For a theorist familiar with critical phenomena, it is natural to wonder about the universal characteristics of this phase transition—for example, it would be interesting to compute the critical exponents that govern the scaling properties of the transition, as these would not depend on the particular microscopic Hamiltonian of the system being considered. Insight into this question might suggest new physical implementations of quantum computation.

The gap between current quantum computing technology and what will be needed in the future is so vast that one can easily be discouraged. But we should not accept the (justified) criticism of the existing technology as a damning assessment of the ultimate prospects. Rather, mindful of the potential power of the quantum computer, we should be energized by the challenge to fabricate the hardware that will make it work.

5. Quantum computing at the fin de siècle

Quantum computing may be the technology of the day *after* tomorrow. But most of us are not so patient. What can we and should we be doing tomorrow? Or today?

[†] This is related, at least morally, to the sort of phase transition in dissipative quantum systems discussed some time ago by Leggett *et al.* (1987)

It now seems likely that the first experiments to perform a computation involving several quantum gates will be carried out using the NMR method (Cory *et al.* 1996; Gershenfeld & Chuang 1997), and will soon be followed by experiments with ion trap computers (Cirac & Zoller 1995). Although NMR quantum devices, as currently conceived, will probably be limited by signal-to-noise considerations to a storage capacity of order 10 qubits, these pioneering experiments may still prove illuminating. But to fulfil their potential, both the NMR experiments and the ion-trap experiments should progress beyond the stage of mere demonstrations. A suitable goal for the NMR program would be to probe in unprecedented detail (via quantum tomography) the mechanisms of decoherence for the nuclear spins, with particular emphasis on quantifying the multi-spin correlations. It would be exciting if this program were to evolve into a new tool for studying molecular structure.

Actually, NMR quantum computing is not really a new phenomenon—for some years, quantum circuits have been routinely implemented in multipulse NMR routines. But the quantum computing paradigm provides a powerful and systematic new perspective on NMR techniques, and can be expected to lead to the design of new pulse sequences for a variety of purposes.

More broadly, the emerging paradigm of quantum computing will continue to influence experimental physics by suggesting new kinds of measurements and experiments. This trend is already apparent in the studies of decoherence of entangled states reported at this meeting by Haroche (Haroche, this volume; Brune *et al.* 1996) and Wineland (Wineland *et al.* 1997; Meekhof *et al.* 1996). Thinking in terms of a quantum gate array broadens our perspective on how quantum states can be manipulated and monitored (D'Helon & Milburn 1997). Long before quantum computers emerge as commercially viable computing devices, they will be important tools in the physics laboratory. I anticipate that as the technology of quantum computation progresses, it will be used for high precision studies of decoherence in quantum systems, and the insights gleaned from these studies will in turn be incorporated into more sophisticated error correction schemes that can enhance our ability to resist and combat decoherence. This program will forge an alliance between experimenters and theorists that is bound to be highly productive, irrespective of the long term commercial potential of quantum computation.

Those who analyse the results of forthcoming experiments on multiqubit decoherence will face an interesting dilemma—decoherence is *complex*. A general superoperator (trace-preserving, completely positive linear map of density matrices to density matrices) describing the evolution of k qubits has $4^k(4^k - 1)$ real parameters; this is already 240 parameters for just two qubits! New ideas will be needed on how to organize the data so that it can be given a useful and meaningful interpretation.

The advance of the frontier of experimental quantum computation should be accompanied by a parallel advance in numerical simulation (on classical computers) of quantum systems (Despain & Obenland 1996, 1997; Miquel *et al.* 1996, 1997; Barenco *et al.* 1996). A quantum circuit is a strongly coupled system, and its scaling properties are not obvious. Currently, precise simulations of quantum circuits are limited to a modest number of qubits and gates, and because of the unfavourable scaling of the resources needed to perform quantum simulation, these limitations will not be easily overcome. To proceed to larger computers and longer computations, simulators will need to adopt simplified models of the operation of the device. These simplified models will need to be validated by checking that they yield acceptable results for smaller systems, where they can be compared with more exact simula-

tions. It is partly because of the difficulty of the simulations that experiments with a few tens of qubits have the potential to yield surprises†.

On the theoretical front, it is important to emphasize that the work of the past few years has already established an enduring intellectual legacy. A new classification of complexity has been erected, a classification better founded on the fundamental laws of physics than traditional complexity theory. And the work on quantum error correction has generated profound new insights into the nature of decoherence and how it can be controlled. My own view is that the development of the theory of quantum error correction may in the long run have broader and deeper implications than the development of quantum complexity theory.

There are many ways that theorists working in the near term could advance the state of the art. Here is a brief list of some interesting open issues touched on earlier in this paper‡:

- (1) explore and characterize the generalizations of Grover's database search algorithm (what classical algorithms will admit a $\sqrt{\text{time}}$ quantum speed-up?);
- (2) sharpen the proposal to use quantum computers for quantum simulation;
- (3) seek quantum algorithms for problems that are suspected to lie in the NPI class (such as the graph isomorphism problem);
- (4) explore the applications of quantum computers to problems outside the NP class;
- (5) understand more deeply what makes quantum algorithms work (this insight may illuminate the path to new algorithms);
- (6) identify universal features of the 'phase transition' between quantum and classical devices;
- (7) characterize the general intrinsic limits on the accuracy and speed of quantum gates;
- (8) adapt the methods of fault-tolerant computing to more general error models, and to realistic devices;
- (9) seek more efficient ways to implement error recovery and fault-tolerant quantum gates (which would weaken the accuracy requirements for reliable computation);
- (10) find broader realizations of quantum error correction (beyond the abstract quantum circuit model);
- (11) conceive new ways to use quantum computation to measure interesting observables that are otherwise inaccessible;
- (12) conceive new (commercial?) applications of small-scale quantum computers;
- (13) extend simulations of quantum computers to larger devices and longer computations by adopting (validated) simplified models;
- (14) formulate a concrete program applying NMR and ion-trap computing to the study of multi-qubit decoherence;
- (15) find new ways to organize and interpret experimental data pertaining to multi-qubit decoherence;

† One particularly interesting challenge for both simulation and experiment will be the behaviour of qubits in close proximity, for example trapped ions with a separation comparable to the wavelength of visible light. Little is currently known about how such systems will behave.

‡ There are a number of appealing theoretical problems concerning quantum information that are not included on the list because they appear to be of tangential relevance to quantum *computation*. Particularly notable is the problem of understanding the capacity of noisy quantum channels for sending either quantum or classical information (Lloyd 1996; Bennett *et al.* 1996, 1997b; Shor & Smolin 1996; Schumacher & Nielsen 1996; Barnum *et al.* 1997; Holevo 1996; Fuchs 1997).

(16) think of good questions that are not on this list.

Surveying this list of challenges reminds us that the development of quantum computation will require the efforts of people with expertise in a wide variety of disciplines, including mathematics, computer science and information theory, theoretical and experimental physics, chemistry and engineering. This interdisciplinary character is one of the most exhilarating and appealing aspects of quantum computation.

Serge Haroche, while a leader at the frontier of experimental quantum computing, continues to deride the vision of practical quantum computers as an impossible dream that can come to fruition only in the wake of some as yet unglimped revolution in physics (Haroche, this volume). As everyone at this meeting knows well, building a quantum computer will be an enormous technical challenge, and perhaps the naysayers will be vindicated in the end. Surely, their scepticism is reasonable. But to me, quantum computing is not an impossible dream; it is a possible dream. It is a dream that can be held without flouting the laws of physics as currently understood. It is a dream that can stimulate an enormously productive collaboration of experimenters and theorists seeking deep insights into the nature of decoherence. It is a dream that can be pursued by responsible scientists determined to explore, without prejudice, the potential of a fascinating and powerful new idea. It is a dream that could change the world. So let us dream.

This work has been supported in part by the Department of Energy under Grant no. DE-FG03-92-ER40701, and by DARPA under Grant no. DAAH04-96-1-0386 administered by the Army Research Office. I thank David DiVincenzo and Wojciech Zurek for organizing this stimulating meeting, and for giving me this opportunity to express my views. My thinking about quantum computing has been influenced by discussions with many people, including Dave Beckman, Al Despain, Eddie Farhi, Jeff Kimble, Alesha Kitaev, Manny Knill, Raymond Laflamme, Seth Lloyd and Peter Shor. I am particularly grateful to Gilles Brassard, Ike Chuang, David DiVincenzo, Chris Fuchs, Rolf Landauer, Hideo Mabuchi, Martin Plenio, Dave Wineland, and Christof Zalka for helpful comments on the manuscript. I especially thank Michael Nielsen for many detailed suggestions, and Daniel Gottesman for countless discussions of all aspects of quantum computation.

References

- Abrams, D. S. & Lloyd, S. 1997 Simulation of many-body fermi systems on a universal quantum computer. Online preprint quant-ph/9703054.
- Aharonov, D. & Ben-Or, M. 1996a Fault tolerant quantum computation with constant error. Online preprint quant-ph/9611025.
- Aharonov, D. & Ben-Or, M. 1996b Polynomial simulations of decohered quantum computers. Online preprint quant-ph/9611029.
- Barenco, A., Brun, T. A., Schack, R. & Spiller, T. 1996 Effects of noise on quantum error correction algorithms. Online preprint quant-ph/9612047.
- Barnum, H., Nielsen, M. A. & Schumacher, B. 1997 Information transmission through a noisy quantum channel. Online preprint quant-ph/9702049.
- Benioff, P. 1982 Quantum mechanical models of Turing machines that dissipate no energy. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **48**, 1581.
- Bennett, C. H. & Brassard, G. 1984. In *Proc. IEEE Int. Conf. on Computers, Systems, and Signal Processing, Bangalore, India*, p. 175. New York: IEEE.
- Bennett, C., DiVincenzo, D., Smolin, J. & Wootters, W. 1996 Mixed state entanglement and quantum error correction. *Phys. Rev. A* **54**, 3824.
- Bennett, C. B., Bernstein, E., Brassard, G. & Vazirani, U. 1997a Strengths and weaknesses of quantum computing. Online preprint quant-ph/9701001.

- Bennett, C. H., DiVincenzo, D. P. & Smolin, J. A. 1997b Capacities of quantum erasure channels. Online preprint quant-ph/9701015.
- Bernstein, E. & Vazirani, U. 1993 Quantum complexity theory. In *Proc. 25th ACM Symp. on the Theory of Computation*, pp. 11–20. New York: ACM.
- Boghosian, B. M. & Taylor, W. 1997 Simulating quantum mechanics on a quantum computer. Online preprint quant-ph/9701019.
- Bollinger, J. J., Itano, W. M., Wineland, D. J. & Heinzen, D. J. 1997 Optical frequency measurements with maximally correlated states. *Phys. Rev. A* **54**, R4649.
- Braginsky, V. B., Khalili, F. Ya. & Sazhin, M. V. 1995 Decoherence in e.m. vacuum. *Phys. Lett. A* **208**, 177.
- Bruno, M., Hagle, E., Dreyer, J., Maitre, X., Maali, A., Wunerlich, C., Raimond, J. M. & Haroche, S. 1996 Observing the progressive decoherence of the meter in a quantum measurement. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **77**, 4887.
- Calderbank, A. R. & Shor, P. W. 1996 Good quantum error-correcting codes exist. *Phys. Rev. A* **54**, 1098.
- Cirac, J. I. & Zoller, P. 1995 Quantum computations with cold trapped ions. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **74**, 4091.
- Cirac, J. I., Pellizzari, T. & Zoller, P. 1996 Enforcing coherent evolution in dissipative quantum dynamics. *Science* **273**, 1207.
- Cirac, J. I., Zoller, P., Kimble, H. J. & Mabuchi, H. 1997 Quantum state transfer and entanglement distribution among distant nodes in a quantum network. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **78**, 3221.
- Cory, D. G., Fahmy, A. F. & Havel, T. F. 1996 Nuclear magnetic resonance spectroscopy: an experimentally accessible paradigm for quantum computing. In *Proc. 4th Workshop on Physics and Computation*. Boston: New England Complex Systems Institute.
- Deutsch, D. 1985 Quantum theory, the Church–Turing principle and the universal quantum computer. *Proc. R. Soc. Lond. A* **400**, 96.
- D’Helon, C. & Milburn, G. J. 1997 Quantum measurements with a quantum computer. Online preprint quant-ph/9705014.
- DiVincenzo, D. & Shor, P. 1996 Fault-tolerant error correction with efficient quantum codes. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **77**, 3260.
- Feynman, R. P. 1982 Simulating physics with computers. *Int. J. Theor. Phys.* **21**, 467.
- Fuchs, C. 1997 Nonorthogonal quantum states maximize classical information capacity. Online preprint quant-ph/9703043.
- Garey, M. R. & Johnson, D. S. 1979 *Computers and intractability: a guide to the theory of NP-completeness*. New York: W. H. Freeman & Co.
- Garg, A. 1996 Decoherence in ion-trap quantum computers. *Czech. J. Phys.* **46**, 2375.
- Gershenfeld, N. & Chuang, I. 1997 Bulk spin resonance quantum computation. *Science* **275**, 350.
- Gottesman, D. 1997 A theory of fault-tolerant quantum computation. Online preprint quant-ph/9702029.
- Gottesman, D., Evslin, J., Kakade, S. & Preskill, J. 1997 (In the press.)
- Grassl, M., Beth, Th. & Pellizzari, T. 1996 Codes for the quantum erasure channel. Online preprint quant-ph/9610042.
- Grover, L. K. 1996 A fast quantum mechanical algorithm for database search. *Proc. 28th ACM Symp. on Theory of Computation*, p. 212.
- Haroche, S. & Raimond, J. M. 1996 Quantum computing: dream or nightmare? *Phys. Today* **49**, 51.
- Holevo, A. S. 1996 The capacity of quantum channel with general signal states. Online preprint quant-ph/9611023.
- Huelga, S. F., Macchiavello, C., Pellizzari, T., Ekert, A. K., Plenio, M. B. & Cirac, J. I. 1997 On the improvement of frequency standards with quantum entanglement. Online preprint quant-ph/9707014.
- Kitaev, A. Yu. 1996a Quantum error correction with imperfect gates. Preprint. *Proc. R. Soc. Lond. A* (1998)

- Kitaev, A. Yu. 1996b Quantum computing: algorithms and error correction. Preprint. (In Russian.)
- Kitaev, A. Yu. 1997 Fault-tolerant quantum computation by anyons. Online preprint quant-ph/9707021.
- Knill, E. & Laflamme, R. 1996 Concatenated quantum codes. Online preprint quant-ph/9608012.
- Knill, E., Laflamme, R. & Zurek, W. 1996 Accuracy threshold for quantum computation. Online preprint quant-ph/9610011.
- Knill, E., Laflamme, R. & Zurek, W. 1997 Resilient quantum computation: error models and thresholds. Online preprint quant-ph/9702058.
- Laflamme, R., Miquel, C., Paz, J. P. & Zurek, W. 1996 Perfect quantum error correction code. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **77**, 198.
- Landauer, R. 1995 Is quantum mechanics useful? *Phil. Trans. R. Soc. Lond.* **353**, 367.
- Landauer, R. 1996 The physical nature of information. *Phys. Lett. A* **217**, 188.
- Landauer, R. 1997 Is quantum mechanically coherent computation useful? In *Proc. Drexel-4 Symposium on Quantum Nonintegrability-Quantum-Classical Correspondence, Philadelphia, PA, 8 September 1994* (ed. D. H. Feng & B.-L. Hu). Boston: International.
- Leggett, A. J., Chakravarty, S., Dorsey, A. T., Fisher, M. P. A., Garg, A. & Zwerger, W. 1987 Dynamics of the dissipative two-state system. *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **59**, 1.
- Lidar, D. A. & Biham, O. 1996 Simulating Ising spin glasses on a quantum computer. Online preprint quant-ph/9611038.
- Lloyd, S. 1993 A potentially realizable quantum computer. *Science* **261**, 1569.
- Lloyd, S. 1996 Universal quantum simulators. *Science* **273**, 1073.
- Lloyd, S. 1997 The capacity of a noisy quantum channel. *Phys. Rev. A* **55**, 1613.
- Mabuchi, H. & Zoller, P. 1996 Inversion of quantum jumps in quantum-optical systems under continuous observation. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **76**, 3108.
- Meekhof, D. M., Monroe, C., King, B. E., Itano, W. M. & Wineland, D. J. 1996 Generation of nonclassical motional states of a trapped atom. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **76**, 1796.
- Meyer, D. A. 1996 Quantum mechanics of lattice gas automata I: one particle plane waves and potentials. Online preprint quant-ph/9611005.
- Miquel, C., Paz, J. P. & Peruzzo, R. 1996 Factoring in a dissipative quantum computer. *Phys. Rev. A* **54**, 2605.
- Miquel, C., Paz, J. P. & Zurek, W. H. 1997 Quantum computation with phase drift errors. Online preprint quant-ph/9704003.
- Monroe, C., Meekhof, D. M., King, B. E., Itano, W. M. & Wineland, D. J. 1995 Demonstration of a fundamental quantum logic gate. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **75**, 4714.
- Obenland, K. & Despain, A. M. 1996a Simulation of factoring on a quantum computer architecture. In *Proc. 4th Workshop on Physics and Computation, Boston, November 22-24, 1996*. Boston: New England Complex Systems Institute.
- Obenland, K. & Despain, A. M. 1996b Impact of errors on a quantum computer architecture. Online preprint http://www.isi.eu/acal/quantum/quantum_op_errors.ps.
- Pellizzari, T., Gardiner, S. A., Cirac, J. I. & Zoller, P. 1995 Decoherence, continuous observation, and quantum computing: a cavity QED model. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **75**, 3788.
- Plenio, M. B. & Knight, P. L. 1996 Decoherence limits to quantum computation using trapped ions. Online preprint quant-ph/9610015.
- Preskill, J. 1997 Reliable quantum computers. Online preprint quant-ph/9705031.
- Schumacher, B. & Nielsen, M. A. 1996 Quantum data processing and error correction. *Phys. Rev. A* **54**, 2629.
- Shor, P. 1994 Algorithms for quantum computation: discrete logarithms and factoring. In *Proc. 35th Ann. Symp. on Fundamentals of Computer Science*, pp. 124-134. Los Alamitos, CA: IEEE Press.
- Shor, P. 1995 Scheme for reducing decoherence in quantum memory. *Phys. Rev. A* **52**, 2493.
- Shor, P. 1996 Fault-tolerant quantum computation. In *Proceedings of the Symposium on the Foundations of Computer Science*. Los Alamitos, CA: IEEE Press. Online preprint quant-ph/9605011.

- Shor, P. & Smolin, J. 1996 Quantum error-correcting codes need not completely reveal the error syndrome. Online preprint quant-ph/9604006.
- Simon, D. R. 1994 On the power of quantum computation. In *Proc. 35th Ann. Symp. on Fundamentals of Computer Science*, pp. 116–123. Los Alamitos, CA: IEEE Press.
- Steane, A. M. 1996a Error correcting codes in quantum theory. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **77**, 793.
- Steane, A. M. 1996b Multiple particle interference and quantum error correction. *Proc. R. Soc. Lond. A* **452**, 2551.
- Steane, A. M. 1997 Active stabilization, quantum computation and quantum state synthesis. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **78**, 2252.
- Turchette, Q. A., Hood, C. J., Lange, W., Mabuchi, H. & Kimble, H. J. 1995 Measurement of conditional phase shifts for quantum logic. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **75**, 4710.
- Unruh, W. G. 1995 Maintaining coherence in quantum computers. *Phys. Rev. A* **51**, 992.
- Van Enk, S. J., Cirac, J. I. & Zoller, P. 1997 Quantum communication over noisy channels: a quantum optical implementation. Online preprint quant-ph/9702036.
- Wiesner, S. 1996 Simulations of many-body quantum systems by a quantum computer. Online preprint quant-ph/9603028.
- Wineland, D. J., Monroe, C., Meekhof, D. M., King, B. E., Liebfried, D., Itano, W. M., Bergquist, J. C., Berkeland, D., Bollinger, J. J. & Miller, J. 1997 Quantum state manipulation of trapped atomic ions. Online preprint quant-ph/9705022.
- Wootters, W. K. & Zurek, W. H. 1982 A single quantum cannot be cloned. *Nature* **299**, 802.
- Zalka, C. 1996a Efficient simulation of quantum systems by quantum computers. Online preprint quant-ph/9603026.
- Zalka, C. 1996b Threshold estimate for fault tolerant quantum computing. Online preprint quant-ph/9612028.