

Strengthened quantum Hamming bound

Sixia Yu^{1,2}, C.H. Lai¹ and C.H. Oh¹

¹*Centre for quantum technologies, National University of Singapore, 3 Science Drive 2, Singapore 117543*

²*Hefei National Laboratory for Physical Sciences at Microscale and Department of Modern Physics, University of Science and Technology of China, Hefei, Anhui 230026, China*

We report two analytical bounds for quantum error-correcting codes that do not have preexisting classical counterparts. Firstly the quantum Hamming and Singleton bounds are combined into a single tighter bound, and then the combined bound is further strengthened via the well-known Lloyd's theorem in classical coding theory, which claims that perfect codes, codes attaining the Hamming bound, do not exist if the Lloyd's polynomial has some non-integer zeros. Our bound characterizes quantitatively the improvement over the Hamming bound via the non-integerness of the zeros of the Lloyd's polynomial. In the case of 1-error correcting codes our bound holds true for impure codes as well, which we conjecture to be always true, and for stabilizer codes there is a 1-logical-qudit improvement for an infinite family of lengths.

Introduction — During all kinds quantum informational processes there are uncontrollable noises due to inevitable interactions with ubiquitous environments. The theory of quantum error correction [1–4] provides us a powerful tool to protect our precious quantum data from various noises by encoding them into some special subspaces, called the quantum error-correcting codes (QECCs), which correct certain type of errors. Stabilizer formalism [5–9] is one major method to find such kinds of subspaces, called stabilizer (additive) codes. There exist also some nonadditive codes [10, 11] with better parameters for whose constructions a graphical approach [12, 13] as well as an equivalent codeword stabilizer codes approach [14] has been developed recently.

One of the fundamental tasks in the theory of QECCs is to find the optimal codes with as large as possible coding subspaces while correcting as many as possible errors and consuming as less as possible resources. Obviously the optimality of the quantum codes, additive or nonadditive, is subjected to the tradeoffs among those parameters imposed by the principles of quantum mechanics. The strongest bound so far is the quantum linear programming (qLP) bound [15, 16] which is unfortunately not analytical. So far all the analytic bounds for quantum codes have preexisting classical counterparts [17], for examples the quantum versions of Johnson bound [18], Griesmer bound [19], and most importantly, the Singleton bound (qSB) [4] and the Hamming bound (qHB) [5].

The qHB the qSB are two independent bounds and comparatively the qHB is stronger for long codes and weaker for short codes than the qSB. For single error correcting codes the qHB is quite tight and can be attained [5, 6]. For instance in the case of qubits, i.e., two-level systems, all the optimal stabilizer codes saturating the qHB are constructed except a few families of lengths [20, 21]. Recently a family of nonadditive codes attaining asymptotically the qHB has been reported [22]. For some families of lengths however the qHB admits strengthening [20, 21, 23], which helps to identify some non-additive codes that outperform the optimal stabilizer codes.

Here we will establish two analytical bounds without pre-existing classical counterparts for pure quantum codes. They are two strengthenings of the qHB with one arising from an interpolation with the qSB and the other one from a necessary

condition for perfect codes attaining the Hamming bound. In the case of 1-error-correcting codes we prove that the strengthened qHB holds true for impure codes as well, which is conjectured to be true for all distances. Though demonstrated in the case of pure quantum codes, both bounds apply to corresponding classical codes straightforwardly.

Quantum Hamming-Singleton bound — In what follows our physical systems are qudits, p -level systems with p being finite. In the Hilbert space of n qudits an K -dimensional subspace, whose projection is denoted by P , corrects a set of errors $\{\mathcal{E}_\omega\}$ if and only if [4] (in an equivalent form)

$$P\mathcal{E}_\omega\mathcal{E}_\alpha^\dagger P = \frac{1}{K}\text{Tr}(P\mathcal{E}_\omega\mathcal{E}_\alpha^\dagger)P. \quad (1)$$

If a set of errors is correctable then their linear combinations are also correctable so that we need only to consider an operator basis, e.g., qudit Pauli errors $\{\mathcal{E}_\omega\}$ [7]. By a t -error we mean a Pauli error \mathcal{E}_ω acting nontrivially on $\leq |\omega| = t$ qudits. As usual $((n, K, d))_p$ denotes a quantum code of length n (the number of the physical systems) of size K (the dimension of the coding subspace) and of distance d meaning that t -errors can be corrected, where $t = \lfloor (d-1)/2 \rfloor$.

The quantum code is said to be *pure* or *non-degenerate* if $\text{Tr}(P\mathcal{E}_\omega\mathcal{E}_\alpha^\dagger) = 0$ whenever $\mathcal{E}_\omega \neq \mathcal{E}_\alpha$, meaning that different errors send the original coding subspace into different orthogonal subspaces. The existence of impure codes, where there are errors that we do not need to worry about, e.g., those errors that stabilize the coding subspace, makes an essential difference between the classical and quantum codes.

The quantum Hamming bound states that if a pure quantum code $((n, K, d))_p$ exists then $(d = 2t + 1 + \sigma$ and $\sigma = 0, 1)$

$$KH_{t,\sigma}^n \leq p^n, \quad H_{t,\sigma}^n = p^{2\sigma} \sum_{s=0}^t (p^2 - 1)^s \binom{n-\sigma}{s}. \quad (2)$$

For odd distances ($\sigma = 0$) the qHB can be established by a standard counting argument: there are $H_{t,0}^n$ different t -errors and each one of such errors should take the coding subspace to a different orthogonal subspace. Though the above counting argument fails for impure codes, there are many positive evidences [5, 9, 17, 19, 24] that the qHB holds true for impure codes as well.

For even distances $d = 2(t + 1)$ the qHB is usually taken as the same as that for $d = 2t + 1$. However a stronger bound as given in Eq.(2) in the case of $\sigma = 1$ can be read off readily from the classical coding theory, for which there exists also a simple counting argument. Consider the set of $(t, 1)$ -errors that includes all the t -errors and all the $(t + 1)$ -errors that act nontrivially on a fixed qudit. It is easy to count that there are $H_{t,1}^n$ of $(t, 1)$ -errors and the product of any two $(t, 1)$ -errors is a $(2t + 1)$ -error. Thanks to the error correction condition for pure codes each one $(t, 1)$ -error should bring the coding subspace to a different orthogonal subspace so that the qHB for even distance follows immediately.

In contrast the quantum Singleton bound holds true both for pure and impure codes and it states that if a quantum code $((n, K, d))_p$ exists then

$$K \leq p^{n-2(d-1)}. \quad (3)$$

Though several proofs are known, including the original Knill-Laflamme argument [4] and the quantum LP bound [6, 9], we provide here a simple argument which leads in what follows to a strengthening to qHB. Let us divide n qubits into 3 subsystems A, B , and C containing $d - 1$, $d - 1$, and $c = n - 2(d - 1)$ qudits respectively. By introducing three reduced projections $P_A = \text{Tr}_{BC} P$, $P_{BC} = \text{Tr}_A P$, and $P_B = \text{Tr}_{AC} P$ with P being the projection of the coding subspace, we compute

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Tr} P_A^2 &= \sum_{\alpha \subseteq A} \frac{|\text{Tr}(\mathcal{E}_\alpha P)|^2}{p^{d-1}} = \sum_{\alpha \subseteq A} \frac{\text{Tr}(\mathcal{E}_\alpha P \mathcal{E}_\alpha^\dagger P)}{p^{d-1}} \\ &= K \text{Tr} P_{BC}^2 \geq \frac{K}{p^c} \text{Tr} P_B^2, \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

in which the first equality follows due to the expansion $P_A \propto \sum_{\alpha \subseteq A} \text{Tr}(P \mathcal{E}_\alpha) \mathcal{E}_\alpha^\dagger$ since $\{\mathcal{E}_\alpha\}_{\alpha \subseteq A}$ is a basis for subsystem A , the second equality is due to the error-correction condition Eq.(1), and the inequality is due to the fact $\text{Tr}(P_{BC} - P_B/p^c)^2 \geq 0$. After interchanging subsystems A and B the above inequality must also hold so that the qSB follows.

The first strengthening of the qHB comes from an interpolation of the qSB and qHB for pure codes. Let $0 \leq e \leq t$ be an arbitrary integer and we divide n physical qudits into two subsystems A and B containing $a = 2e$ and $b = n - 2e$ qudits respectively. Denote

$$P_e = \sum_{\omega \subseteq B, |\omega| \leq t-e+\sigma} \mathcal{E}_\omega P \mathcal{E}_\omega^\dagger \quad (5)$$

where the summation is taken over all $(t - e)$ -errors if $\sigma = 0$ while over all the $(t - e, 1)$ -errors if $\sigma = 1$. From the counting arguments for the qHB it follows that $\text{Tr} P_e = K H_{t-e,\sigma}^{n-2e}$. On one hand we have

$$\text{Tr}(\text{Tr}_A P_e)^2 = \frac{1}{p^a} \sum_{\alpha \subseteq A} \text{Tr}(\mathcal{E}_\alpha P_e \mathcal{E}_\alpha^\dagger P_e) = \frac{K H_{t-e,\sigma}^{n-2e}}{p^{2e}} \quad (6)$$

by noting that $\mathcal{E}_\omega^\dagger \mathcal{E}_\alpha$ is a $(d - 1)$ -error and the error correction condition Eq.(1) for pure codes applies. On the other hand $\text{Tr}(\text{Tr}_A P_e)^2 \geq p^{-b} (\text{Tr} P_e)^2$ so that we have

Theorem 1 If a pure quantum code $((n, K, d))_p$ exists with $d = 2t + 1 + \sigma$ and $\sigma = 0, 1$ then for all integers $0 \leq e \leq t$

$$K H_{t,\sigma}^{n,e} \leq p^n, \quad H_{t,\sigma}^{n,e} = p^{4e} H_{t-e,\sigma}^{n-2e}. \quad (7)$$

Some remarks are in order. i) When $e = t$ or $e = 0$ the bound above coincides with the qSB or the qHB respectively so that our new bound provides a kind of interpolation and is called here as the *quantum Hamming-Singleton bound* (qHSB). ii) For a given length n the integer e can be chosen optimally according to

$$e = t + 1 - \left\lceil \frac{n - d}{p^2 - 2} \right\rceil, \quad (8)$$

with $e = 0$ if $n > tq^2 + 1 + \sigma$, i.e., it coincides with the qHB. As a result qHSB improves the qHB for short codes and in fact when $t(p^2 - 2) > n - d > p^2 - 2$ the qHSB is strictly stronger than both the qSB and qHB. We notice that $n \geq 4(d - 1)$ so that there is no strengthening for qubits, i.e., $p = 2$. iii) Recalling that the codes attaining the qSB and qHB are called as maximum distance separable (MDS) codes and perfect codes respectively, the qHSB claims that there is no MDS code [9] if $n > p^2 + d - 2$ and no (pure) perfect code if $n < d + t(p^2 - 2)$. In the next section the qHSB as well as the qHB is further strengthened via a necessary condition for the perfect codes to exist.

Strengthened quantum Hamming bound — In the classical coding theory a crucial property of the perfect codes, codes attaining the Hamming bound, is described by the well-known Lloyd theorem [25] which states that perfect codes of length n and distance $d = 2t + 1 + \sigma$ with $\sigma = 0, 1$ do not exist if the Lloyd polynomial $L_{t,\sigma}^n(x) = K_t^{n-\sigma-1}(x - 1)$ has some non-integer zeros, where

$$K_t^n(x) = \sum_{j=0}^t (p^2 - 1)^{t-j} (-1)^j \binom{x}{j} \binom{n-x}{t-j} \quad (9)$$

is the Krawtchouk polynomial of degree t . In what follows we shall demonstrate a quantitative version of the Lloyd theorem: how the nonintegrerness of the zeros of the Lloyd polynomial gives rise to an improvement over the Hamming bound.

Take an arbitrary integer $0 \leq e < t$ and let x_j be the j -th root ($j = 1, 2, \dots, t - e$) of the Lloyd's polynomial $L_{t-e,\sigma}^{n-2e}(x)$ of degree $t - e$. According to Ref. [26] these roots are real and distinct with $0 < x_j < n$ with their integer parts $\lfloor x_j \rfloor$ being different integers. We introduce the following polynomial

$$\Delta_{t,\sigma}^{n,e}(x) = \prod_{j=1}^{t-e} \left(1 - \frac{x}{\lfloor x_j \rfloor}\right) \left(1 - \frac{x}{\lfloor x_j \rfloor + 1}\right) \quad (10)$$

of degree $2(t - e)$. It is obvious that $\Delta_{t,\sigma}^{n,e}(k) \geq 0$ for integer k since the roots the polynomial $\Delta_{t,\sigma}^{n,e}(x)$ are pairwise consecutive integers. On the other hand $\Delta_{t,\sigma}^{n,e}(x_j) \leq 0$ for all $1 \leq j \leq t - e$ and the equality happens for all j only when all the zeros x_j are integers.

Theorem 2 i) If a pure QECC $((n, K, d))_p$ exists with $d = 2t + 1 + \sigma$ where $\sigma = 0, 1$ then $S_{t,\sigma}^{n,e} K \leq p^n$ for all integers $0 \leq e < t$ where

$$\frac{1}{S_{t,\sigma}^{n,e}} = \frac{1}{H_{t,\sigma}^{n,e}} - \frac{(p^2 - 1)(n - 2e - \sigma)}{p^{2(2e+1+\sigma)}} \sum_{j=1}^{t-e} \frac{|\Delta_{t,\sigma}^{n,e}(x_j)|}{x_j T_{t,\sigma}^e(x_j)} \quad (11)$$

with $H_{t,\sigma}^{n,e}$ being the qHSB as defined in Eq.(7), x_j 's being the zeros of Lloyd's polynomial $L_{t-e,\sigma}^{n-2e}(x)$, and

$$T_{t,\sigma}^e(x) = \sum_{s=1}^{t-e} \frac{[K_{s-1}^{n-2e-\sigma-1}(x-1)]^2}{(p^2 - 1)^{s-1} \binom{n-2e-\sigma-1}{s-1}} \quad (12)$$

being strictly positive. ii) The above strengthened qHSB is valid for impure codes as well for $d = 3, 4$.

Proof We shall postpone the proof of the first part to the Appendix since it is essentially classical and prove here the second part which is quantum mechanical since it involves impure codes. In the case of $d = 3, 4$, i.e., $t = 1$ and $\sigma = 0, 1$ we have $e = 0$ and for simplicity we denote $S_{1,\sigma}^n = S_{1,\sigma}^{n,0}$ and $\Delta_{t,\sigma}^n(x) = \Delta_{1,\sigma}^{n,0}(x)$. The Lloyd polynomial is linear and its single zero is determined by $p^2 z_\sigma = (p^2 - 1)(n - \sigma) + 1$. For convenience we denote $\delta_\sigma = z_\sigma - \lfloor z_\sigma \rfloor$, $\bar{\delta}_\sigma = 1 - \delta_\sigma$ and obviously $\delta_\sigma, \bar{\delta}_\sigma \geq 0$. The strengthened qHSB is given by

$$\frac{1}{S_{1,\sigma}^n} = \frac{1}{H_{1,\sigma}^n} \left(1 - \frac{(p^2 - 1)(n - \sigma)\bar{\delta}_\sigma\delta_\sigma}{\lfloor z_\sigma \rfloor (\lfloor z_\sigma \rfloor + 1)} \right). \quad (13)$$

According to the qLP bound if a code $((n, K, d))_p$ exists then there is a probability distribution $\{K A_s / p^n\}_{s=0}^n$ such that $\langle K_s^n(x) \rangle = A_s$ for $0 \leq s \leq 2 + \sigma$, where we have denoted $\langle g(x) \rangle = \frac{K}{p^n} \sum_{s=0}^n g(s) A_s$ for arbitrary $g(x)$. Since $\{K_s^n(x)\}_{s \leq t}$ provides a basis for the polynomial of degrees $\leq t$ we can expand the polynomial $\tilde{\Delta}_\sigma^n(x) = (n - x)^\sigma \Delta_\sigma^n(x)$ of degree $2 + \sigma$ by $\{K_s^n(x)\}_{s \leq 3}$ and, when averaged with respect to the above probability distribution, we obtain

$$\langle \tilde{\Delta}_\sigma^n(x) \rangle = \frac{a_{0\sigma} + a_{1\sigma} A_1 + a_{2\sigma} A_2 + a_{3\sigma} A_3}{p^{2(1+\sigma)} \lfloor z_\sigma \rfloor (\lfloor z_\sigma \rfloor + 1)} \quad (14)$$

in which the coefficients are given by

$$\begin{aligned} a_{0\sigma} &= n^\sigma (\lfloor z_\sigma \rfloor + \bar{\delta}_\sigma - p^2 \delta_\sigma \bar{\delta}_\sigma), \\ a_{1\sigma} &= 2(n - 1)^\sigma \bar{\delta}_\sigma + \sigma (\lfloor z_\sigma \rfloor + \bar{\delta}_\sigma - p^2 \delta_\sigma \bar{\delta}_\sigma), \\ a_{2\sigma} &= 2(n - 2)^\sigma / p^2 + 4\sigma \bar{\delta}_\sigma, \quad a_{3\sigma} = 6\sigma / p^2. \end{aligned} \quad (15)$$

If we are able to show that $a_{0\sigma} \tilde{\Delta}_\sigma^n(i) \geq a_{i\sigma} \tilde{\Delta}_\sigma^n(0) (= n^\sigma a_{i\sigma})$ for all $\sigma = 0, 1$ and $0 \leq i \leq 2 + \sigma$ then the bound $S_{1,\sigma}^n K \leq p^n$ follows immediately from the inequalities

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \tilde{\Delta}_\sigma^n(x) \rangle &\geq \frac{K}{p^n} \sum_{i=0}^3 \tilde{\Delta}_\sigma^n(i) A_i \geq \frac{K n^\sigma}{p^n a_{0\sigma}} \sum_{i=0}^3 a_{i\sigma} A_i \\ &= \frac{K n^\sigma p^{2(1+\sigma)} \lfloor z_\sigma \rfloor (\lfloor z_\sigma \rfloor + 1)}{p^n a_{0\sigma}} \langle \tilde{\Delta}_\sigma^n(x) \rangle. \end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

Suppose at first $n \geq p^2 + 2 + \sigma$. In this case we have $\lfloor z_\sigma \rfloor \geq p^2$ and, since $4\delta_\sigma \bar{\delta}_\sigma \leq 1$ and $\delta_\sigma, \bar{\delta}_\sigma \geq 0$, $\lfloor z_\sigma \rfloor \geq p^2 \delta_\sigma \bar{\delta}_\sigma +$

$3p^2 \bar{\delta}_\sigma / 4$ so that $a_{0\sigma} \geq 3n^\sigma$ and $a_{0\sigma} \geq 4n^\sigma \bar{\delta}_\sigma$. Furthermore it is easy to see that $\Delta_\sigma^n(i)$ with fixed $1 \leq i \leq 2 + \sigma$ as a function of $\lfloor z_\sigma \rfloor$ is increasing in the range $\lfloor z_\sigma \rfloor \geq 4 + \sigma$. By excluding a single case where $p = 2$, $n = 7$, and $d = 4$ for which the bound is clear we can assume $\lfloor z_\sigma \rfloor \geq 4 + \sigma$ so that $\Delta_\sigma^n(1) \geq (3 + \sigma)/(5 + \sigma)$, $\Delta_\sigma^n(2) \geq (3 + \sigma)/10$, and $\Delta_\sigma^n(3) \geq 1/5$. If $\sigma = 0$ it is now easy to check $a_{00} \tilde{\Delta}_0^n(i) \geq a_{i0}$ for $i = 1, 2$. In the case of $\sigma = 1$ it follows from $4n \bar{\delta}_1 (\tilde{\Delta}_1^n(1) - 1) \geq 2(n - 1) \bar{\delta}_1 = a_{11} n - a_{01}$ (since $n \geq 7$) that $a_{01} \tilde{\Delta}_1^n(1) \geq n a_{11}$. In the mean time from $a_{01} \geq n(6/p^2 + 2\bar{\delta}_1)$, $6\tilde{\Delta}_1^n(2) > 2(n - 2)$, and $2\bar{\delta}_1 \tilde{\Delta}_1^n(2) \geq 4\bar{\delta}_1$ as long as $n \geq 7$ it follows that $a_{01} \tilde{\Delta}_1^n(2) > n a_{21}$. Finally from $a_{01} \geq 3n$ and $n - 3 \geq 4$ it follows that $a_{01} \tilde{\Delta}_1^n(3) \geq 12n/5 > 6n/p^2 = n a_{31}$.

Suppose now $4 + 2\sigma \leq n \leq p^2 + 1 + \sigma$. In this case we have $\lfloor z_\sigma \rfloor = p^2 \bar{\delta}_\sigma = n - \sigma - 1$. As a result the coefficients can be evaluated as $p^2 a_{0\sigma} = n^\sigma (n - \sigma) \lfloor z_\sigma \rfloor$, $p^2 a_{1\sigma} = (2 + \sigma)(n - 1)(n - 2)^\sigma$, and $p^2 a_{2\sigma} = (2 + 4\sigma)(n - 2)^\sigma$. It is easy to check $a_{0\sigma} \tilde{\Delta}_\sigma^n(i) \geq n^\sigma a_{i\sigma}$ for $i = 1, 2, 3$. In this case since $p^2 a_{0\sigma} = n^\sigma \lfloor z_\sigma \rfloor (\lfloor z_\sigma \rfloor + 1)$ so that $S_{1,\sigma}^n = p^{2(2+\sigma)}$ meaning that our strengthened bound coincides with the qSB $K \leq q^{n-2(d-1)}$ in the case of $d - 1 = 2 + \sigma$. Q.E.D.

Some remarks are now in order. i) To obtain the corresponding strengthened Hamming bound for classical codes we have only to replace K by K/p^n and then identify p^2 with the number of the alphabet. ii) If the Lloyd's polynomial has at least one noninteger zero then $|\Delta_{t,\sigma}^{n,e}(x_j)| > 0$ so that $S_{t,\sigma}^n := S_{t,\sigma}^{n,0} > H_{t,\sigma}^n$ which yields the Lloyd theorem immediately. iii) When $t = 2$ and $n = p^4 m ((p^2 - 1)m + 1) + 2 + \sigma$ with $m \geq 0$ all the zeros of the Lloyd's polynomial are integers and there is no improvement. In the case of $t \geq 3$ (and since $p^2 \geq 4$) [27] there always exist non-integer zeros for Lloyd's polynomial so that we have always $S_{t,\sigma}^n > H_{t,\sigma}^n$. iv) Numerical evidences show that the optimal value of the integer e can be chosen as follows. Let $\{x_j\}_{j=1}^t$ be the zeros (in an increasing order) of $L_{t,\sigma}^n(x)$ and let $e = t - j$ with j being the greatest integer such that $\lfloor x_j \rfloor < n - d + 2j$.

Let us now consider specially the stabilizer code whose size is $K = p^k$ for some integer k , which is the number of the logical qudits. The qHB and the strengthened qHB ($e = 0$) for pure stabilizer codes then read $n - k \geq s_p(n, d) \geq h_p(n, d)$ where

$$h_p(n, d) := \lceil \log_p H_{t,\sigma}^n \rceil, \quad s_p(n, d) := \lceil \log_p S_{t,\sigma}^n \rceil. \quad (17)$$

As long as $S_{t,\sigma}^n > p^{h_p(n, d)}$ we have $s_p(n, d) \geq h_p(n, d) + 1$ since $n, k, h_p(n, d)$ are integers. In this case we say that the strengthened qHB has a 1-logical-qudit (1-l.q.) improvement over the qHB. Since $p^2 S_{t,0}^n = S_{t,1}^{n+1}$ and $p^2 H_{t,0}^n = H_{t,1}^{n+1}$ a 1-l.q. improvement for the codes of length n and distance $2t + 1$ is equivalent to a 1-l.q. improvement for the codes of length $n + 1$ and distance $2t + 2$. In general for a given d and n satisfying $h_p(n + 1, d) = h_p(n, d) + 1$ we may expect a 1-l.q. improvement unless all the zeros of the Lloyd polynomial are integers.

Corollary $s_p(N_{m,\sigma}^r, 3 + \sigma) = 2(m + 1 + \sigma)$ while the qHB

d	$n_{s_2(n,d)}$									
5	21 ₁₂	30 ₁₃	42 ₁₄	60 ₁₅	85 ₁₆					120 ₁₇
7	25 ₁₇	31 ₁₈	39 ₁₉	49 ₂₀	61 ₂₁	62 ₂₁	78 ₂₂	98 ₂₃	123 ₂₄	
9	34 ₂₃	40 ₂₄	48 ₂₅	57 ₂₆	67 ₂₇	80 ₂₈	95 ₂₉			113 ₃₀
11	43 ₂₉	50 ₃₀	57 ₃₁	65 ₃₂	75 ₃₃	85 ₃₄	98 ₃₅			112 ₃₆
13	47 ₃₄	52 ₃₅	59 ₃₆	66 ₃₇	73 ₃₈	82 ₃₉	92 ₄₀			103 ₄₁
15	61 ₄₁	67 ₄₂	82 ₄₄	90 ₄₅	99 ₄₆					120 ₄₈
17	70 ₄₇	83 ₄₉	90 ₅₀	98 ₅₁			107 ₅₂	116 ₅₃	127 ₅₄	
19	79 ₅₃	85 ₅₄	99 ₅₆				106 ₅₇	115 ₅₈	124 ₅₉	
21	88 ₅₉	94 ₆₀				100 ₆₁	107 ₆₂	115 ₆₃	123 ₆₄	
23						103 ₆₆	109 ₆₇	116 ₆₈	123 ₆₉	
25								118 ₇₃	124 ₇₄	

TABLE I: Strengthened qHB $s_2(n, d)$ for binary pure stabilizer codes of length $n \leq 128$ that has a 1-logical-qudit improvement over the qHBs and meanwhile coincides with the qLP bound.

for the same stabilizer code is $2(m + \sigma) + 1$ where

$$N_{m,\sigma}^r = \frac{p^{2m+1} - p}{p^2 - 1} - r + \sigma \quad (m \geq 2) \quad (18)$$

with r being an integer satisfying

$$0 \leq r \leq \frac{1}{2} \left(\sqrt{1 - 4p^3 + 4p^4} - p^2 - (p - 1)^2 \right). \quad (19)$$

In the case of $d = 4$ and $p = 2$ the strengthened qHBs for lengths $N_{m,1}^0$ ($m = 2, 3, \dots$) coincide with the qLP bounds as far as linear programming can be carried out. Notably there is an infinite family binary stabilizer codes of lengths $n_a = (4^a - 1)/3$ with $a \geq 3$ for which we have $s_2(n_a, 5) > h_2(n_a, 5)$. And as far as numerical calculation is possible, these bounds also coincide with the qLP bounds. For larger distances the numerical results show that the strengthened qHB for pure stabilizer codes also has a 1-l.q. improvement over the qHB as tabulated in Table I. There we have recorded all the strengthened qHBs for the codes of lengths ≤ 128 and odd distances that have a 1-l.q. improvement over the qHBs and in the same time coincide with the qLP bounds. It seems that for relative long codes the strengthened qHBs with a 1-l.q. improvement will coincide with the qLP bounds.

Conclusion and discussion— We have established two analytic bounds for the quantum error-correcting codes that do not have preexisting classical counterparts. Both bounds strengthen the quantum Hamming bound for pure codes and in the case of 1-error-correcting codes they are valid also for impure codes as well. For stabilizer codes of a family of lengths the strengthened qHB has a one-logical-qudit improvement over the qHB. Nonadditive codes that outperform the stabilizer codes for these lengths may be expected and it is also interesting to find codes that attains the qHSB. Numerical evidences show that for relative large lengths the strengthened qHB for stabilizer codes with a one-logical-qudit improvement coincides with the qLP bound no matter how large the distance is. Furthermore the asymptotic behavior of the

strengthened qHB deserves investigating. Finally we conclude with a conjecture:

Conjecture The strengthened qHSB $K S_{t,\sigma}^{n,e} \leq p^n$ with integer $0 \leq e \leq t$ holds true for impure codes as well for arbitrary

Acknowledgement — The financial support from CQT project WBS: R-710-000-008-271 is grateful acknowledged.

-
- [1] P.W. Shor, Phys. Rev. A, **52**, R2493 (1995).
 - [2] A.M. Steane, Phys. Rev. Lett. **77**, 793 (1996).
 - [3] C.H. Bennett, D.P. DiVincenzo, J.A. Smolin, and W.K. Wootters, Phys. Rev. A **54**, 3824 (1996).
 - [4] E. Knill and R. Laflamme, Phys. Rev. A **55**, 900 (1997).
 - [5] D. Gottesman, Phys. Rev. A **54** 1862 (1996); D. Gottesman, arXiv: quant-ph/9705052.
 - [6] A.R. Calderbank, E.M. Rains, P.W. Shor, and N.J.A. Sloane, Phys. Rev. Lett. **78**, 405 (1997); IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory, **44**, 1369 (1998).
 - [7] E. Kill, arXiv:quant-ph/9608048.
 - [8] E.M. Rains, IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory, **45**, 1827 (1999).
 - [9] A. Ketkar, A. Klappenecker, S. Kumar, and P.K. Sarvepalli. IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory **52**, 4892 (2006).
 - [10] E.M. Rains, R.H. Hardin, P.W. Shor, and N.J.A. Sloane, Phys. Rev. Lett. **79**, 953 (1997).
 - [11] S. Yu, Q. Chen, C.H. Lai, and C.H. Oh, Phys. Rev. Lett. **101**, 090501 (2008).
 - [12] S. Yu, Q. Chen, and C.H. Oh, arXiv: 0709.1780v1 [quant-ph]; D. Hu, et.al., Phys. Rev. A **78**, 012306 (2008).
 - [13] S. Looi, L. Yu, V. Gheorghiu, and R.B. Griffiths, Phys. Rev. A **78**, 042303 (2008).
 - [14] A. Cross, G. Smith, J. Smolin, and B. Zeng, IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory **55**, 433 (2009).
 - [15] E.M. Rains, IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory, **45**, 2361 (1990).
 - [16] P.W. Shor and R. Laflamme, Phys. Rev. Lett. **78**, 1600 (1997).
 - [17] A. Ashikhmin and S. Litsyn, IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory **45**, 1206 (1999); A. Ashikhmin, arXiv:quant-ph/9705037v1.
 - [18] Z. Li and L.-J. Xing, Phys. Rev. A **79**, 032342 (2009).
 - [19] P.K. Sarvepalli and A. Klappenecker, Phys. Rev. A **81**, 032318 (2010).
 - [20] S. Yu, Y. Dong, Q. Chen, and C.H. Oh, arXiv: 0901.1968 [quant-ph].
 - [21] J. Bierbrauer, G. Faina, M. Giulietti, S. Marcugini, and F. Pambianco, Innovations in Incidence Geometry **6**, 289 (2007); J. Bierbrauer, (unpublished 2009).
 - [22] M. Grassl, P.W. Shor, G. Smith, J. Smolin, and B. Zeng, Phys. Rev. A **79** 0306 (2009).
 - [23] S. Yu, Q. Chen, and C.H. Oh, arXiv: 0901.1935 [quant-ph].
 - [24] S.A. Aly, arXiv: 0711.4603 [quant-ph]; Z. Li and L.-J. Xing, arXiv: 0907.3802 [quant-ph].
 - [25] S.P. Lloyd, Bell System Tech. J. **36**, 517; P. Delsarte, Philips Res. Rep. **27**, 272 (1972).
 - [26] V.I. Levenshtein, IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory **41**, 1303 (1995).
 - [27] Y. Hong, Graphs and Combinatorics **2**, 145 (1986).

Appendix: proof of Theorem 2 part i) — According to the quantum LP bound if a pure code $((n, K, d))_p$ exists then there exists a probability distribution $\{K A_s / p^n\}_{s=0}^n$ such that $A_0 = 1$ and $\langle K_s^n(x) \rangle = 0$ for $1 \leq s < d$ where we have denoted $\langle g(x) \rangle = \frac{K}{p^n} \sum_{s=0}^n g(s) A_s$ for an arbitrary $g(x)$.

Any polynomial $g(x)$ of degree $d - 1$ has an expansion $g(x) = \sum_{i=0}^{d-1} g_i K_i^n(x)$ with the first coefficient given by

$$g_0 = \langle g(x) \rangle_\rho := \frac{1}{p^{2n}} \sum_{s=0}^n g(s) (p^2 - 1)^s \binom{n}{s}. \quad (20)$$

Due to the qLP bound we have $\langle K_s^n(x) \rangle = 0$ for $1 \leq s < d$ from which it follows that $\langle g(x) \rangle = \langle g(x) \rangle_\rho$ as long as $g(x)$ is a polynomial of degree $d - 1$.

Take an arbitrary integer $0 \leq e < t$ and denote $r = 2e + \sigma$ for simplicity. We observe that $\binom{n-x}{r} \Delta_{t,\sigma}^{n,e}(x)$ is a polynomial of degree $d - 1 = 2t + \sigma$ and thus we have

$$\langle \binom{n-x}{r} \Delta_{t,\sigma}^{n,e}(x) \rangle_\rho = \langle \binom{n-x}{r} \Delta_{t,\sigma}^{n,e}(x) \rangle \geq \frac{K}{p^n} \binom{n}{r}, \quad (21)$$

where the inequality is due to $\Delta_{t,\sigma}^{n,e}(x) \geq 0$ for integer x . In order to evaluate the ρ -average on the left hand side of above equation we shall recall some properties of the Krawtchouk polynomials.

First of all we have the Christoffel-Darboux formula [26]

$$K_t^m(y) K_{t-1}^m(x) - K_t^m(x) K_{t-1}^m(y) = p^2 (p^2 - 1)^t \binom{m}{t} \frac{x - y}{t + 1} \sum_{s=0}^{t-1} \frac{K_s^m(x) K_s^m(y)}{(p^2 - 1)^s \binom{n}{s}}. \quad (22)$$

Let x_j be the zeros of the Lloyd' polynomial $L_{t-e,\sigma}^{n-2e}(x)$ and $x_i \neq x_j$ if $i \neq j$. As a direct result of Eq.(22) we have

$$\sum_{s=1}^{t-e} \frac{L_{s-1,\sigma}^{n-2e}(x_i) L_{s-1,\sigma}^{n-2e}(x_j)}{(p^2 - 1)^{s-1} \binom{n-r-1}{s-1}} = 0 \quad (23)$$

Consequently the following polynomial of degree $2(t - e)$

$$f(x) = \Delta_{t,\sigma}^{n,e}(x) - \frac{L_{t-e,\sigma}^{n-2e}(x)}{H_{t-e,0}^{n-r}} - \sum_{j=1}^{t-e} \frac{x \Delta_{t,\sigma}^{n,e}(x_j)}{x_j T_\sigma^t(x_j)} \sum_{s=1}^{t-e} \frac{L_{s-1,\sigma}^{n-2e}(x) L_{s-1,\sigma}^{n-2e}(x_j)}{(p^2 - 1)^{s-1} \binom{n-2e-\sigma-1}{s-1}} \quad (24)$$

has $x = 0$ and $x = x_j$ with $j = 1, 2, \dots, t - e$ as zeros so that we can write $f(x) = x \varphi(x) L_{t-e,\sigma}^{n-2e}(x)$ with $\varphi(x)$ being some polynomial of degree $t - e - 1$. As it turns out, by denoting $\rho_i^n = (p^2 - 1)^i \binom{n}{i}$ for convenience,

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \binom{n-x}{r} \Delta_{t,\sigma}^{n,e}(x) \rangle_\rho &= \frac{1}{H_{t-e,0}^{n-r}} \langle \binom{n-x}{r} L_{t-e,\sigma}^{n-2e}(x) \rangle_\rho + \sum_{j=1}^{t-e} \frac{\Delta_{t,\sigma}^{n,e}(x_j) L_{s-1,\sigma}^{n-2e}(x_j)}{x_j T_\sigma^t(x_j) \rho_{s-1}^{n-r-1}} \langle x \binom{n-x}{r} L_{s-1,\sigma}^{n-2e}(x) \rangle_\rho \\ &= \frac{\binom{n}{r}}{p^{2r} H_{t-e,0}^{n-r}} + \frac{(p^2 - 1)(n - r) \binom{n}{r}}{p^{2(r+1)}} \sum_{j=1}^{t-e} \frac{\Delta_{t,\sigma}^{n,e}(x_j)}{x_j T_\sigma^t(x_j)}. \end{aligned} \quad (25)$$

Because of $\Delta_{t,\sigma}^{n,e}(x_j) \leq 0$ for all $j = 1, 2, \dots, t$ and inequality Eq.(21) the strengthened qHSB Eq.(11) follows immediately. To carry out the calculations in Eq.(25) we have used: i) The following two identities

$$\left\langle \binom{n-x}{r} \frac{p^2 x}{(p^2 - 1)(n - r)} \frac{K_{s-1}^{n-r-1}(x-1)}{\rho_{s-1}^{n-r-1}} \right\rangle_\rho = \left\langle \binom{n-x}{r} \left(\frac{K_{s-1}^{n-r}(x)}{\rho_{s-1}^{n-r}} - \frac{K_s^{n-r}(x)}{\rho_s^{n-r}} \right) \right\rangle_\rho = \frac{\binom{n}{r}}{p^{2r}} \delta_{s1} \quad (26)$$

for $s \geq 1$ and

$$\langle \binom{n-x}{r} L_{t-e,\sigma}^{n-2e}(x) \rangle_\rho = \sum_{s=0}^{t-e} \langle \binom{n-x}{r} K_s^{n-r}(x) \rangle_\rho = \frac{\binom{n}{r}}{p^{2r}}, \quad (27)$$

which follow from two recurrence relations

$$\frac{p^2 x}{(p^2 - 1)n} \frac{K_t^{n-1}(x-1)}{\rho_t^{n-1}} = \frac{K_t^n(x)}{\rho_t^n} - \frac{K_{t+1}^n(x)}{\rho_{t+1}^n}, \quad (28)$$

$$p^{2r} \binom{n-x}{r} K_s^{n-r}(x) = \sum_{i=0}^r \binom{s+i}{i} \binom{n-s-i}{r-i} K_{s+i}^n(x), \quad (29)$$

with the second recurrence relation obtained by computing the

coefficients of $u^s v^r$ in $(1 - u)^x (1 + v + (p^2 - 1)u)^{n-x}$ in two different ways, and an identity

$$K_t^{n-1}(x - 1) = \sum_{s=0}^t K_s^n(x). \quad (30)$$

ii) Due to the recurrence relations Eq.(28) and Eq.(29) the polynomial $x \binom{n-x}{r} L_{t-e,\sigma}^{n-2e}(x)$ of degree d can be expanded by $\{K_s^n(x) \mid s \geq t - e\}$. Since the polynomial $\varphi(x)$ of degree $\leq t - e - 1$ can be expanded by $\{K_s^n(x) \mid s \leq t - e - 1\}$, the orthogonal relations $\langle K_i^n(x) K_j^n(x) \rangle_\rho \propto \delta_{ij}$ lead to $\langle \binom{n-x}{r} f(x) \rangle_\rho = 0$.