Quantum Computing Advantage in Materials Science

Prepared by the National Quantum Algorithm Center (NQAC)
at the Illinois Quantum & Microelectronics Park (IQMP)

Introduction

Materials science underpins innovation across batteries, semiconductors, catalysts, renewable energy systems, advanced manufacturing, and emerging quantum technologies. Increasingly, progress in these domains depends on the ability to predict material behavior from first principles rather than relying on slow, costly experimental iteration [1]. As performance demands rise and materials systems grow more complex, a widening gap has emerged between what researchers and engineers seek to model and what classical computational tools can reliably deliver at scale.

Quantum computing offers a fundamentally different approach to simulating quantum-mechanical systems—an underlying challenge shared across many materials applications. Rather than mapping directly onto isolated enterprise workflows, potential quantum advantage in materials science arises from addressing common many-body simulation bottlenecks that appear across diverse technologies. While practical timelines depend on continued hardware and algorithmic progress, quantum computing is plausibly aligned with some of the most computationally intensive challenges in modern materials design.

Certain Problems in Materials Push the Limits of Classical Computing

Many of the most valuable materials problems approach or exceed the capacity of classical computing because they require accurate treatment of interacting quantum particles across extended systems [1]. As system size, realism, and required accuracy increase, classical electronic-structure methods face steep scaling challenges and are forced to rely on approximations that limit predictive power. Several examples illustrate these limits:

- **Strongly correlated materials:** Materials with strong electronic correlations challenge commonly used density functional theory approaches, while higher-accuracy classical methods scale prohibitively as system size grows. These limitations restrict reliable prediction of ground states, phase behavior, magnetic ordering, charge localization, and finite-temperature properties in technologically relevant materials [1][2][3].
- **Electronic structure and excited-state properties:** Accurate modeling of band structures, defects, excitons, and carrier dynamics is central to semiconductor and optoelectronic materials, yet classical techniques scale poorly for realistic system sizes, particularly when excited states and transport phenomena must be treated explicitly [1].
- **Catalysis, interfaces, and reaction pathways:** Many industrially important reactions occur at surfaces and interfaces and involve complex, multi-reference electronic states and thermally activated processes. Classical simulation tools often rely on strong

approximations in these regimes, limiting predictive insight into adsorption energies, reaction barriers, and active site behavior under realistic conditions [1].

- **Materials discovery and multi-objective design workflows:** Designing materials that balance performance, stability, cost, and manufacturability requires navigating high-dimensional, non-convex design spaces. Classical computational approaches increasingly depend on heuristics and surrogate models as these trade-offs grow more complex [1].

  Note: For more information on a related class of challenges and use cases specific to the energy sector, please refer to the accompanying Industry Brief on Quantum Computing Advantage in Energy.

As a result, industrial materials development often relies on heuristics, empirical corrections, and simplified models that slow innovation and increase development cost [1][4].

Quantum Advantage in Materials

The properties of materials emerge from interacting quantum particles, making materials simulation intrinsically aligned with the computational principles underlying quantum computers [5][6][7]. In theory, quantum computing enables direct representation of many-body quantum states that classical methods must approximate, offering a fundamentally different path for modeling complex electronic behavior [5][6][7].

These capabilities position quantum simulation of materials among the most theoretically grounded long-term candidates for quantum advantage, a view broadly shared within the quantum research community when properly scoped [5][6][7][8]. At the same time, translating this theoretical alignment into practical impact depends on hardware quality, error correction, and algorithmic efficiency. As a result, early progress is expected to rely on hybrid quantum–classical workflows, applied to carefully selected subsystems rather than full materials systems [6][8][9].

High-Impact Examples Where Advantage May Emerge

These same classes of materials challenges represent high-impact areas where quantum computing may eventually complement classical approaches, particularly as part of hybrid simulation and design workflows:

- **Strongly correlated materials:** Quantum simulation may enable more faithful treatment of strongly correlated electronic behavior, including ground states, phase transitions, magnetic ordering, and finite-temperature effects that are difficult to capture classically [1][2][3]. Progress in this area could impact next-generation battery materials, superconductors, and quantum materials [2][6][7][10].
- **Electronic structure and excited-state properties:** Accurate modeling of band structures, defects, excitons, and optical response is essential for photovoltaics, semiconductors, and optoelectronic devices, yet remains computationally expensive for realistic systems [1][2]. Quantum algorithms may provide improved treatment of excited states and carrier dynamics as hardware and methods mature [6][7][10].
- **Catalysis, interfaces, and reaction pathways:** Many industrially important reactions occur at interfaces and involve complex, multi-reference electronic states that classical tools approximate only crudely [1][2][6]. Quantum simulation may support deeper insight into adsorption energies, reaction barriers, and active site structure, with implications for energy conversion, storage, and sustainable chemical processes [6][7][10][11].

- **Materials discovery and multi-objective optimization:** Materials design often requires navigating high-dimensional, non-convex trade-offs across performance, stability, cost, and manufacturability [1][4]. Quantum-enhanced optimization and machine learning approaches may eventually complement classical tools in exploring these landscapes, though their role remains exploratory in the near term [8][9][12].

  Note: For more information on a related class of challenges and use cases specific to the energy sector, please refer to the accompanying Industry Brief on Quantum Computing Advantage in Energy.

Across these areas, any early advantages are most likely to arise from hybrid approaches applied to small clusters, fragments, or embedded subsystems, with broader impact emerging as hardware capabilities advance.

A Grand Challenge for Quantum Computing in Materials

As part of this Industry Brief Series, we have identified Grand Challenges relevant for different industries. By articulating these challenges, we hope to set a long-term direction for exploring quantum approaches and a clearer understanding of where future breakthroughs would translate into meaningful impact for various industries.

Accurate Quantum Simulation of Strongly Correlated Materials

Achieving accurate, first-principles quantum simulation of strongly correlated and extended materials systems represents a unifying grand challenge at the heart of quantum computing's potential in materials science. Many technologically critical materials—including battery cathodes, catalysts, superconductors, and solid-state electrolytes—exhibit complex many-body behavior that classical methods struggle to model reliably due to steep scaling, strong electronic correlations, and finite-temperature effects. Solving this challenge would enable quantum-accurate prediction of materials properties before synthesis, unlocking deeper insight into structure–property relationships and accelerating the rational design of next-generation materials. Importantly, while full realization will require continued advances in quantum hardware and algorithms, progress toward this goal could materially reduce development risk, shorten innovation cycles, and concentrate experimental effort on the most promising candidates.

Why Executives Should Act Now

Computational materials design is becoming a competitive differentiator across energy, electronics, mobility, chemicals, aerospace, and advanced manufacturing [4]. As classical tools approach practical limits, organizations that engage early with quantum computing will be better positioned to build internal expertise, shape emerging workflows, and access scarce talent and infrastructure [1][8][9].

Although large-scale materials simulation remains a long-horizon challenge, early engagement enables companies to explore realistic pilot problems, validate emerging algorithms, and prepare for future inflection points. Leading organizations across semiconductors, chemicals, energy storage, and quantum technology are already investing in exploratory quantum simulation efforts, signaling growing strategic interest [4].

How Executives Can Get Started

- Identify high-value materials problems where classical simulation or experimental iteration limits innovation, speed, or accuracy
- Build interdisciplinary teams combining materials science, computational chemistry, high-performance computing, and quantum expertise

- Partner with the Illinois Quantum & Microelectronics Park to connect with quantum hardware providers, algorithm developers, and academic collaborators
- Begin with focused pilot projects targeting small correlated clusters, defects, or embedded subsystems
- Develop a long-term roadmap for integrating quantum-enabled first-principles simulation into materials R&D workflows

Sources

1. Marzari, N., Ferretti, A., & Wolverton, C. (2021). Electronic-structure methods for materials design. Nature Materials, 20(6), 736–749.

2. Pavarini, E. (2021). Solving the strong-correlation problem in materials. Rivista del Nuovo Cimento, 44(10), 597–626.

3. Troyer, M., & Wiese, U.-J. (2005). Computational complexity and fundamental limitations of fermionic quantum Monte Carlo simulations. Physical Review Letters, 94(17), 170201.

4. National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine (2019). Quantum Computing: Progress and Prospects. Washington, DC. The National Academies Press. DOI: 10.17226/25196.

5. Feynman, R. P. (1982). Simulating physics with computers. International Journal of Theoretical Physics, 21(6/7), 467–488.

6. McArdle, S., et al. (2020). Quantum computational chemistry. Reviews of Modern Physics, 92(1), 015003.

7. Georgescu, I. M., Ashhab, S., & Nori, F. (2014). Quantum simulation. Reviews of Modern Physics, 86(1), 153–185.

8. Preskill, J. (2018). Quantum computing in the NISQ era and beyond. Quantum, 2, 79.

9. Bharti, K., et al. (2022). Noisy intermediate-scale quantum (NISQ) algorithms. Reviews of Modern Physics, 94(1), 015004.

10. Aspuru-Guzik, A., et al. (2005). Simulated quantum computation of molecular energies. Science, 309(5741), 1704–1707.

11. Reiher, M., et al. (2017). Elucidating reaction mechanisms on quantum computers. PNAS, 114(29), 7555–7560.

12. Montanaro, A. (2016). Quantum algorithms: an overview. NPJ Quantum Information, 2, 15023.