Flag fault-tolerant error correction, measurement, and quantum computation for cyclic CSS codes
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Flag qubits have recently been proposed in syndrome extraction circuits to detect high-weight errors arising from fewer faults. The use of flag qubits allows the construction of fault-tolerant protocols with the fewest number of ancillas known to-date. In this work, we prove some critical properties of CSS codes constructed from classical cyclic codes that enable the construction of a flag fault-tolerant error correction scheme. We then develop fault-tolerant protocols as well as a family of circuits for flag fault-tolerant error correction and operator measurement, requiring only four ancilla qubits and applicable to distance-three CSS codes constructed from classical cyclic codes. The measurement protocol can be further used for logical Clifford gate implementation via quantum gate teleportation. We also provide examples of cyclic CSS codes with large encoding rates.

PACS numbers: 03.67.Pp

I. INTRODUCTION

Fault-tolerant quantum computation will be an essential component in building a large scale quantum computer. It ensures that even though the operations used to perform error correction can be noisy, logical error rates can still be made arbitrarily small as long as the noise strength is below a threshold value [1–4]. The value of the threshold depends on several factors, including the quantum error correcting code being used, the fault-tolerant error correction protocol, how fast measurements can be performed (including the classical processing of the error syndromes obtained from error correction) and the underlying physical noise.

Currently, the surface code appears to be a strong candidate for fault-tolerant quantum computation given its high threshold value as well as the geometric locality of the gates used in the syndrome extraction circuits [5–8]. Unfortunately, achieving low enough logical failure rates in order to perform large quantum computations, such as Shor’s factoring algorithm [9], requires a large qubit and gate overhead [10–12].

In recent work by Chao and Reichardt, it was shown that fault-tolerant error correction (FTEC) as well as fault-tolerant quantum computation can be achieved using only two extra ancilla qubits [13, 14] for perfect distance-three codes and perfect distance-three CSS codes. The idea is to use flag qubits to detect the event of a high weight error arising from a single fault. In [15], flag qubits were used to develop a FTEC protocol applicable to arbitrary distance stabilizer codes. It was shown that for several code families, the proposed FTEC scheme can be performed using very few qubits. For instance, color codes with a hexagonal lattice can be used in the FTEC scheme requiring only four ancilla qubits regardless of the distance of the code. The protocol in [15], along with LDPC codes (low density parity check codes), can be used as an alternative to Shor error correction [1] in order to achieve constant overhead [16–18]. Recently, flag qubits were used to fault-tolerantly prepare magic states with very low overhead compared to previous distillation schemes when Clifford gates are noisy [19].

In this paper we build on the previous flag-FTEC schemes and obtain a new flag-FTEC scheme applicable to CSS codes constructed from classical cyclic codes. We provide a circuit construction for measuring the error syndromes using flag qubits which require only four ancilla qubits (see Fig. 2). The circuit uses a particular ordering of the CNOT gates which is independent of the underlying stabilizer code. Our work further expands the code families where flag-FTEC schemes can be used with very few ancilla qubits. Further, the number of ancilla qubits are independent of the weights of the stabilizers being measured. Lastly, we provide a flag fault-tolerant (flag-FT) operator measurement protocol for cyclic CSS codes, which can be further used for Clifford gate implementation and other applications.

The paper is organized as follows. In Section II we review the basic properties of flag error correction and CSS codes. Key definitions are introduced which are used in several parts of the paper. We define the notion of distinguishable errors and consecutive error sets which are key components of our flag-FTEC scheme. We conclude the section by stating Lemma 1 (which is proved in Appendix A), an important building block for constructing our flag-FTEC scheme. In Section III we review basic properties of classical cyclic codes. We then state Lemmas 2 and 3 (proved in Appendix A). Using the lem-
mas, we state and prove Theorem 2 which is the final ingredient required to construct our flag-FTEC scheme for CSS codes constructed from classical cyclic codes. In Section IV we describe the syndrome extraction circuit used in our flag-FTEC protocol and proceed by describing the protocol in detail as well as explaining how it satisfies the fault-tolerance criteria. In Section V we provide a flag-FT measurement protocol for Pauli operators, and its possible applications are discussed in Section VI. Examples of distance-3 cyclic CSS codes are given in Section VII. Lastly, we discuss our results and directions for future work in Section VIII.

II. FLAG ERROR CORRECTION WITH CSS CODES

The idea of using flag qubits to perform FTEC was first introduced by Chao and Reichardt in [13]. They provided some circuit constructions to fault-tolerantly extract syndromes for various distance-3 perfect stabilizer codes, using only two ancilla qubits. In [15], a FTEC protocol using flag qubits and applicable to arbitrary distance stabilizer codes was developed. To show that a code along with appropriate syndrome extraction circuits satisfy the general conditions for flag-FTEC can be quite challenging. In [15], a sufficient condition, which if verified guarantees that the general flag-FTEC conditions are satisfied, was provided. The sufficient condition can be much easier to verify and several code families were shown to satisfy the general flag-FTEC conditions. However, not all CSS codes satisfy the sufficient condition.

As was shown in [13], for codes which don’t satisfy the sufficient condition, the permutation of CNOT gates used in the syndrome extraction circuits as well as the choice of stabilizer generators matter. With an appropriate permutation of the CNOT gates of the syndrome extraction circuits, Chao and Reichardt proved that the family of $[2^r-1, 2^r-1-2r, 3]$ quantum Hamming codes satisfied the general flag-FTEC conditions. In this section, we will analyze errors caused by a single fault in the syndrome extraction circuits of CSS codes. We will use the specific form of such errors to give inspiration to our flag-FTEC protocol for cyclic CSS codes, described later in this work.

We begin by stating the FTEC definitions adapted from [20] which we will use throughout this paper and then briefly review some properties of CSS codes.

Definition 1. Fault-tolerant error correction

For $t = \left\lfloor (d - 1)/2 \right\rfloor$, an error correction protocol using a distance-$d$ stabilizer code $C$ is $t$-fault-tolerant if the following two conditions are satisfied:

1. For an input codeword with error of weight $s_1$, if $s_2$ faults occur during the protocol with $s_1 + s_2 \leq t$, ideally decoding the output state gives the same codeword as ideally decoding the input state.

2. For $s$ faults during the protocol with $s \leq t$, no matter how many errors are present in the input state, the output state differs from a codeword by an error of at most weight $s$.

In the above, ideally decoding is equivalent to performing fault-free error correction. Both conditions are required in order to ensure that errors don’t spread in a bad way as well as to prevent errors from accumulating between different error correction rounds.

Next we briefly review the basic properties of CSS codes.

Definition 2. CSS code

A $[n, k, d]$ stabilizer code is a CSS code if there exists a choice of generators such that their binary symplectic representation is of the form

$$
\begin{pmatrix}
A & 0 \\
0 & B
\end{pmatrix},
$$

where $A$ is a $r_x \times n$ matrix and $B$ is a $r_z \times n$ matrix for some $r_x$ and $r_z$ with $r_x + r_z = n - k$. $A$ and $B$ are called $X$ and $Z$ stabilizer matrices [21, 22].

Theorem 1. CSS code construction

Let $C_x$ be an $[n, k_x, d_x]$ classical linear code with parity check matrix $H_x$ and $C_z$ be an $[n, k_z, d_z]$ classical linear code with parity check matrix $H_z$. Suppose that $C_x^\perp \subseteq C_z$. Let $C$ be the CSS code with stabilizer generators

$$
\begin{pmatrix}
H_x & 0 \\
0 & H_z
\end{pmatrix}.
$$

Then $C$ is an $[n, k, d]$ quantum code with $k = k_x + k_z - n$ and $d \geq \min\{d_x, d_z\}$ [23].

In an EC protocol, the syndrome measurement corresponds to the measurement of all stabilizer generators. Consider an $[n, k, d]$ CSS code which can correct errors of maximum weight $t = \left\lfloor (d - 1)/2 \right\rfloor$. Each generator is either an $X$ stabilizer or $Z$ stabilizer, and it has support on $m$ qubits where $m \in \{1, \cdots, n\}$. We can assume that, up to qubit permutations, the stabilizer being measured is of the form $I^\otimes m \otimes X^\otimes m$ or $I^\otimes m \otimes Z^\otimes m$. The ideal circuits for measuring weight-$m$ $X$ stabilizers and weight-$m$ $Z$ stabilizers are shown in Fig. 1a. However, the EC protocol involving the aforementioned circuit is not fault tolerant. For instance, $v$-faults can lead to an error of weight greater than $v$ for any $v \leq t$ (unless $v$ is equal to the weight of the stabilizer being measured) causing the EC protocol to fail. In Fig. 1c, a flag qubit is introduced to detect a fault that can lead to data error of weight $> 1$. If any pair of higher-weight errors detected by the flag qubit are either equivalent or have different syndromes, it is possible to construct a flag-FTEC protocol which will allow higher weight errors (that arise from a single fault) to be corrected using information from the flag qubit and subsequent stabilizer measurements.
Definition 3. **t-flag circuit**

A circuit $C(P)$ which, when fault-free, implements a projective measurement of a weight-$m$ Pauli $P$ without flagging is a $t$-flag circuit if the following holds: For any set of $v$ faults at up to $t$ locations in $C(P)$ resulting in an error $E$ with $\min(wt(E), wt(EP)) > v$, the circuit flags.

In this paper, we will use certain properties of cyclic CSS codes to develop a flag-FTEC protocol. In particular, cyclic CSS codes will allow us to distinguish consecutive errors. In order to proceed, a few definitions are necessary:

- **Definition 4. Distinguishable errors**

Let $C$ be an $[n,k,d]$ stabilizer code and let $E_1$ and $E_2$ be $n$-qubit Pauli errors with syndromes $s(E_1)$ and $s(E_2)$. We say that $E_1$ and $E_2$ are distinguishable by $C$ if $s(E_1) \neq s(E_2)$. Otherwise we say that they are indistinguishable. In addition, if any pair of errors from an error set $E$ are distinguishable by $C$, we say that $E$ is distinguishable by $C$.

The circuit in Fig. 1c is a 1-flag circuit since it will flag if there is a single fault causing data error of weight $> 1$. Our goal is to distinguish all possible higher-weight errors by subsequent stabilizer measurements. Note that the set of higher-weight errors depend on the choice of generators and the permutation of CNOT gates, and only some choices and permutations will lead to a distinguishable error set. Some CSS codes that satisfy the sufficient condition in [15] can be used in a flag-FTEC protocol.

Observe that permuting CNOT gates is equivalent to permuting columns of the stabilizer matrices. In order to find CSS code families such that flag-FTEC techniques can be used, we will consider fixing the CNOT gates of syndrome extraction circuits in the normal permutation, (i.e., applying CNOT gates from top to bottom as in Fig. 1c)\(^2\). Subsequently, we will find conditions that need to be satisfied by the $X$ and $Z$ stabilizer matrices.

Assume that a faulty CNOT gate can cause a 2-qubit error of the form $P_1 \otimes P_2$ where $P_1, P_2 \in \{I, X, Y, Z\}$ are Pauli errors on control and target qubits, respectively. Consider a circuit for measuring stabilizers of the form $I \otimes P_1 \otimes P_2 \otimes Z^{\otimes m}$ with the normal permutation of CNOT gates as in Fig. 1c where $m \in \{1, \cdots, n\}$. A single fault at a CNOT location can result in the following types of errors:

- (a) If an error from a faulty CNOT gate is of the form $P_1 \otimes P_2$ where $P_1 \in \{I, X, Y, Z\}$ and $P_2 \in \{I, X\}$, then the data error is of weight $\leq 1$ and the flag outcome is $+1$.

- (b) If an error from a faulty CNOT gate is $P_1 \otimes P_2$ where $P_1 = I$ and $P_2 \in \{Y, Z\}$, the data error is of the form $I^{\otimes n-m-c} \otimes Z^{\otimes m-c}$ where $c \in \{1, \cdots, m\}$. In the cases where the data error has weight $> 1$, the flag outcome is $-1$.

- (c) If an error from a faulty CNOT gate is $P_1 \otimes P_2$ where $P_1 \in \{X, Y, Z\}$ and $P_2 \in \{Y, Z\}$, the data error is of the form $I^{\otimes n-m-c-1} \otimes P_1 \otimes Z^{\otimes m-c}$ where $c \in \{1, \cdots, m\}$. In the cases where the data error has weight $> 1$, the flag outcome is $-1$.

---

\(^1\) Note that for such codes, the order of the CNOT gates in a $t$-flag circuit is not important.

\(^2\) Note that for some specific codes, it is certainly possible to find circuits with fewer ancilla qubits by choosing an appropriate permutation of the CNOT gates.
Data errors of the form (b) or (c) arise due to the propagation of Z errors from the target to control qubit of CNOT gates. In addition, if a faulty CNOT gate causes the error $Z \otimes Z$, this can be viewed as an error $I \otimes Z$ caused by the preceding CNOT gate. Let $E_0$ and $E_z$ be sets of errors corresponding to the flag outcome $+1$ and $-1$, respectively. Consider an $[n, k, d]$ CSS code $C$ constructed from two classical codes $C_x$ and $C_z$ as in Theorem 1. It is obvious that $E_z$ is distinguishable by $C$ if $d \geq 3$. The distinguishability of errors of the form (b) in $E_z$ depend on the classical code $C_x$. Also, any error of the form (c) in $E_z$ can be considered as a product of an error of the form (b) and a weight-1 $X$-type error. Therefore, if the distance of $C_z$ is $d_z \geq 3$ and the code $C_x$ can distinguish all errors in the form (b), then $E_z$ is distinguishable by $C$. The same argument can also be applied to circuits for measuring $X$ stabilizers.

We can see that the ability of the code to distinguish errors of the form (b) is crucial in a flag-FTEC protocol. In order to develop a flag-FTEC protocol for cyclic CSS codes, the following definitions will be very useful:

**Definition 5.** Left cyclic-shift
Let $P = P_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes P_n$ be an $n$-qubit Pauli operator and $l \in \{0, 1, \ldots, n-1\}$ be an integer. The $l$-qubit left cyclic-shift of the operator $P$, denoted by $L(P, l)$, is defined as
\[
L(P, 0) = P, \quad (3) \\
L(P, l) = P_{l+1} \otimes \cdots \otimes P_n \otimes P_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes P_l \quad \text{for} \ l \neq 0. \quad (4)
\]

**Definition 6.** Consecutive error set
Let $n$ be the number of qubits, and $l \in \{0, 1, \ldots, n-1\}$ be an integer. A consecutive-$X$ error set $E_{l,n}^x$ and a consecutive-$Z$ error set $E_{l,n}^z$ are sets of the form
\[
E_{l,n}^x = \{L(I^{\otimes n-p} \otimes X^{\otimes p}, l) : p \in \{0, 1, \ldots, n-1\}\}, \quad (5) \\
E_{l,n}^z = \{L(I^{\otimes n-p} \otimes Z^{\otimes p}, l) : p \in \{0, 1, \ldots, n-1\}\}. \quad (6)
\]
A consecutive error product set $E_{l,n}^p$ is defined as
\[
E_{l,n}^p = \{E_x \cdot E_z : E_x \in E_{l,n}^x, E_z \in E_{l,n}^z\}. \quad (7)
\]

In order to distinguish all errors in the consecutive error set, $X$ and $Z$ stabilizer matrices must satisfy the conditions in the following lemma:

**Lemma 1.** Let $C$ be a CSS code constructed from the classical cyclic codes $C_x$ and $C_z$ following Theorem 1 with parity check matrices $H_x$ and $H_z$ of the form
\[
H_x = \begin{pmatrix} 
1 \cdots 1 & \cdots & 1 \\
2 \cdots 2 & \cdots & 2 \\
\cdots & \cdots & \cdots \\
\end{pmatrix}, \quad (8)
\]
\[
H_z = \begin{pmatrix} 
z_1,1 & z_1,2 & \cdots & z_1,n \\
z_2,1 & z_2,2 & \cdots & z_2,n \\
\cdots & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots \\
z_{r_z,1} & z_{r_z,2} & \cdots & z_{r_z,n} \\
\end{pmatrix}, \quad (9)
\]
and let $E_{l,n}^x$, $E_{l,n}^z$, and $E_{l,n}^p$ be consecutive-$X$ error set, consecutive-$Z$ error set, and consecutive error product set, respectively. Then,

1. $E_{0,n}^x$ is distinguishable by $C$ iff for all $p, q \in \{0, \ldots, n-1\}$ such that $p < q$, there exists $i \in \{1, \ldots, r_x\}$ such that $x_i, n-p+1 \otimes \cdots \otimes x_i, n-q = 1$. 
2. $E_{0,n}^z$ is distinguishable by $C$ iff for all $p, q \in \{0, \ldots, n-1\}$ such that $p < q$, there exists $i \in \{1, \ldots, r_z\}$ such that $z_i, n-p+1 \otimes \cdots \otimes z_i, n-q = 1$. 
3. $E_{0,n}^p$ is distinguishable by $C$ iff both $E_{0,n}^x$ and $E_{0,n}^z$ are distinguishable by $C$.

A proof of Lemma 1 is given in Appendix A.

Note that consecutive error sets in Lemma 1 are defined on $n$ qubits. In particular, consecutive error sets defined on $m$ qubits are distinguishable iff the submatrices of $H_x$ and $H_z$ corresponding to measurements on $m$ qubits satisfy similar conditions. In the next section, we will show that the cyclic symmetry of cyclic CSS codes can simplify the conditions in Lemma 1.

**III. CYCLIC CSS CODES AND ERROR DISTINGUISHABILITY**

In this section, we begin by stating the definition of classical cyclic codes and outlining some of their properties.

**Definition 7.** Classical cyclic code
Let $C$ be a classical binary linear code of length $n$. $C$ is cyclic if any cyclic shift of a codeword is also a codeword, i.e., if $(c_0, c_1, \ldots, c_n)$ is in a codeword, then so is $(c_n, c_0, \ldots, c_{n-1})$. [24]

Let $C$ be a classical cyclic code of length $n$. There exists a unique generator polynomial $g(x) = \sum_{i=1}^{\alpha} g_i x^i$ which is also a unique monic polynomial of minimal degree in $C$ such that $C$ is generated by the generator matrix
\[
\begin{pmatrix}
g_0 & g_1 & g_2 & \cdots & g_{\alpha} & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\
0 & g_0 & g_1 & \cdots & g_{\alpha-1} & g_{\alpha} & \cdots & 0 \\
\cdots & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots \\
0 & 0 & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & g_{\alpha}
\end{pmatrix}. \quad (10)
\]

The polynomial $h(x) = (x^n - 1)/g(x) = \sum_{i=1}^{\beta} h_i x^i$ is called the check polynomial of $C$. The parity check matrix of $C$ is
\[
\begin{pmatrix}
h_\beta & h_{\beta-1} & h_1 & h_0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\
0 & h_\beta & h_2 & h_1 & h_0 & \cdots & 0 \\
\cdots & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots \\
0 & 0 & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & h_0
\end{pmatrix}. \quad (11)
\]
It is known that any classical Hamming code can be made cyclic \cite{24}. Thus, a cyclic CSS code can be constructed from permuting columns of a quantum Hamming code’s stabilizer matrices. In \cite{25}, it was shown how to construct a cyclic CSS code from two classical cyclic codes.

By the symmetries of a cyclic code, we can show in the following lemma that the left cyclic-shift of operators in the generating set also generates the same code.

**Lemma 2.** Let \( C \) be a CSS code constructed from the classical cyclic codes \( C_x \) and \( C_z \) following Theorem 1 with parity check matrices \( H_z \) and \( H_z \). Suppose that \( C \) can be generated by \( \{ g_{1}^x, . . . , g_{r_z}^x, g_{1}^z, . . . , g_{r_z}^z \} \), where \( g_{i}^x \) and \( g_{j}^z \) are generators corresponding to the \( i \)-th row of \( H_x \) and \( H_z \), respectively. Then \( C \) can also be generated by \( \{ L(g_{1}^x, l), . . . , L(g_{r_z}^x, l), L(g_{1}^z, l), . . . , L(g_{r_z}^z, l) \} \) for any \( l \in \{ 0, 1, . . . , n - 1 \} \).

The proof of Lemma 2 is given in Appendix A.

In the previous section, Lemma 1 gives sufficient and necessary conditions of a CSS code to be able to distinguish all errors in the consecutive error set. Those conditions can be simplified by using the symmetries of cyclic code as follows:

**Lemma 3.** Let \( C \) be a CSS code constructed from the classical cyclic codes \( C_x \) and \( C_z \) following Theorem 1 with parity check matrices \( H_x \) and \( H_z \) of the form

\[
H_x = \begin{pmatrix} x_{1,1} & x_{1,2} & \cdots & x_{1,n} \\ x_{2,1} & x_{2,2} & \cdots & x_{2,n} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ x_{r_x,1} & x_{r_x,2} & \cdots & x_{r_x,n} \end{pmatrix}, \tag{12}
\]

\[
H_z = \begin{pmatrix} z_{1,1} & z_{1,2} & \cdots & z_{1,n} \\ z_{2,1} & z_{2,2} & \cdots & z_{2,n} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ z_{r_z,1} & z_{r_z,2} & \cdots & z_{r_z,n} \end{pmatrix}, \tag{13}
\]

where \( x_{i+1, (j+1) \bmod n} = x_{i,j} \) for all \( i \in \{ 1, 2, . . . , r_x - 1 \} \) and \( z_{i+1, (j+1) \bmod n} = z_{i,j} \) for all \( i \in \{ 1, 2, . . . , r_z - 1 \} \), \( j \in \{ 1, . . . , n \} \). Let \( l \in \{ 0, 1, . . . , n - 1 \} \) be an integer, and let \( E_{0,n}^x, E_{0,n}^z, \) and \( E_{0,n}^z \) be consecutive-\( X \) error set, consecutive-\( Z \) error set, and consecutive error product set, respectively. Then,

1. \( E_{i,n}^x \) is distinguishable by \( C \) iff for all \( u_x \in \{ 2, . . . , n \} \), there exists \( i \in \{ 1, . . . , r_x \} \) such that \( x_{i,u_x} \oplus \cdots \oplus x_{i,n} = 1 \).
2. \( E_{i,n}^z \) is distinguishable by \( C \) iff for all \( u_z \in \{ 2, . . . , n \} \), there exists \( i \in \{ 1, . . . , r_z \} \) such that \( z_{i,u_z} \oplus \cdots \oplus z_{i,n} = 1 \).
3. \( E_{i,n}^z \) is distinguishable by \( C \) iff both \( E_{i,n}^x \) and \( E_{i,n}^z \) are distinguishable by \( C \).

A proof of Lemma 3 is given in Appendix A.

Now we are ready to prove a main theorem in this work.

**Theorem 2.** Let \( C \) be an \( [n, k, d] \) CSS code constructed from the \( [n, k_x, d_x] \) classical cyclic code \( C_x \) and the \( [n, k_z, d_z] \) classical cyclic code \( C_z \), \( l \in \{ 0, 1, . . . , n - 1 \} \) be an integer, and \( E_{i,n}^z \) be a consecutive error product set.

If both \( d_x, d_z \geq 3 \), then \( E_{i,n}^z \) is distinguishable by \( C \).

**Proof.** Let the parity check matrix \( H_x \) of the code \( C_x \) and \( H_z \) of the code \( C_z \) be in the form

\[
H_x = \begin{pmatrix} x_{1,1} & x_{1,2} & \cdots & x_{1,n} \\ x_{2,1} & x_{2,2} & \cdots & x_{2,n} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ x_{r_x,1} & x_{r_x,2} & \cdots & x_{r_x,n} \end{pmatrix}, \tag{14}
\]

\[
H_z = \begin{pmatrix} z_{1,1} & z_{1,2} & \cdots & z_{1,n} \\ z_{2,1} & z_{2,2} & \cdots & z_{2,n} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ z_{r_z,1} & z_{r_z,2} & \cdots & z_{r_z,n} \end{pmatrix}, \tag{15}
\]

where \( x_{i+1, (j+1) \bmod n} = x_{i,j} \) for all \( i \in \{ 1, . . . , r_x - 1 \} \) and \( z_{i+1, (j+1) \bmod n} = z_{i,j} \) for all \( i \in \{ 1, . . . , r_z - 1 \} \), \( j \in \{ 1, . . . , n \} \) since \( C_x \) and \( C_z \) are cyclic codes. By Statement 1 of Lemma 3, we know that \( E_{i,n}^z \) is distinguishable by \( C \) iff for all \( u_x \in \{ 2, 3, . . . , n \} \), there exists \( i \in \{ 1, . . . , r_x \} \) such that \( x_{i,u_x} \oplus \cdots \oplus x_{i,n} = 1 \). Suppose by contradiction that there exists a \( u_z \in \{ 2, . . . , n \} \) such that \( x_{i,u_z} \oplus \cdots \oplus x_{i,n} = 0 \) for all \( i \in \{ 1, . . . , r_x \} \), that is, \( E_{i,n}^z \) is not distinguishable by \( C \). Now, let \( E_{p_z} = I \otimes e_{p_z} \otimes Z \otimes e_{p_z} \), \( E_{q_z} = I \otimes e_{q_z} \otimes Z \otimes e_{q_z} \) with \( u_z = n - (p - q) + 1 \). Further, let \( M_i^z = L(g_{1}^z, q) = (x_{i,q+1}, . . . , z_{i,n-(p-q)+1}, . . . , z_{i,n}, x_{i,1}, . . . , x_{i,q}) \) be a left cyclic-shift of \( g_{1}^z \) for all \( i \in \{ 1, . . . , r_x \} \). By assumption, errors \( E_{p_z} \) and \( E_{q_z} \) cannot be distinguished by the operator \( M_i^z \) for all \( i \in \{ 1, . . . , r_x \} \) (see the proof of Lemma 3 in Appendix A). Observe that \( \{ M_1^z, . . . , M_{r_x}^z \} = \{ L(g_{1}^z, q), . . . , L(g_{r_z}^z, q) \} \) is also a generating set for the \( X \)-stabilizers (see the proof of Lemma 2 in Appendix A). Thus, \( E_{p_z} \) and \( E_{q_z} \) are indistinguishable. The indistinguishability of \( E_{p_z} \) and \( E_{q_z} \) by \( M_i^z \) gives

\[
x_{1,u_x} \oplus \cdots \oplus x_{1,n} = 0. \tag{16}
\]

From the cyclic property, any cyclic shift of \( M_i^z \) cannot distinguish between \( E_{p_z} \) and \( E_{q_z} \) as well. This gives the following conditions:

\[
x_{1,u_x+1} \oplus \cdots \oplus x_{1,n} \oplus x_{1,1} = 0
\]

\[
x_{1,u_x+2} \oplus \cdots \oplus x_{1,n} \oplus x_{1,1} \oplus x_{1,2} = 0
\]

\[
\vdots
\]

\[
x_{1,u_x-1} \oplus x_{1,1} \oplus \cdots \oplus x_{1,n-1} = 0 \tag{17}
\]

From Eqs. (16) and (17), we have \( x_{1,j} = x_{1,(u_x-1+j) \bmod n} \) for all \( j \in \{ 1, . . . , n \} \). Let \( t_x = \text{GCD}(u_x - 1, n) \), the greatest common divisor of \( u_x - 1 \) and \( n \). The conditions become

\[
x_{1,j} = x_{1,j+t_x} = x_{1,j+2t_x} = \cdots = x_{1,j+n-t_x}. \tag{18}
\]
for all \( j \in \{1, \ldots, t_e\} \). Repeating the above steps for all \( M^z \in \{M^z_1, \ldots, M^z_r\} \), we obtain
\[
x_{i,j} = x_{i,j+t_z} = x_{i,j+2t_z} = \ldots = x_{i,j+n-t_z},
\]
(19)
for all \( i \in \{1, \ldots, r_x\}, j \in \{1, \ldots, t_z\} \).

From the above, we see that any error of the form \( Z_{l_x} Z_{l_x+t_z} \) commutes with all stabilizer generators. Now let us consider two cases:

- **Case 1:** At least one operator of the form \( Z_{l_x} Z_{l_x+t_z} \) is in the stabilizer.
  In this case \( C \) has distance at most two. This contradicts our assumption that \( \min\{d_x, d_z\} \geq 3 \).

- **Case 2:** All operators of the form \( Z_{l_x} Z_{l_x+t_z} \) are in the stabilizer.
  In this case, there exists a set of coefficients \( a_1, \ldots, a_{r_z} \in \{0, 1\} \) such that \( \prod_i (g^z_i)^{a_i} = Z_{l_x} Z_{l_x+t_z} \), where \( g^z_i \) is the \( i \)th row of \( H_z \) in binary symplectic form. Since \( H_z \) generates \( C^z_x \), and \( C^z_x \subseteq C_x \) by construction of CSS codes. Thus we have that \( Z_{l_x} Z_{l_x+t_z} \subseteq C_x \). Now since the distance of classical codes is given by the minimum weight codeword, we have that \( d_z \leq 2 \) which contradicts our assumption that \( d_z \geq 3 \).

Similarly, assume by contradiction that there exists a \( u_z \in \{2, \ldots, n\} \) such that \( z_{i,u_z} \oplus \cdots \oplus z_{i,n} = 0 \) for all \( i \in \{1, \ldots, r_z\} \) (i.e., \( E^z_{l,n} \) is not distinguishable by \( C \)), we will have that \( C \) has \( d_z \leq 2 \) or \( d_z = 2 \). Thus, if both \( d_x, d_z \geq 3, E^{z}_{l,n}, E^{z}_{l,n} \) are distinguishable by \( C \). By Statement 3 of Lemma 3, we find that \( E^z_{l,n} \) is distinguishable by \( C \) if both \( d_x, d_z \geq 3 \).

Although consecutive error product set \( E^z_{l,n} \) is distinguishable by any cyclic CSS code satisfying Theorem 2, we cannot construct an FTEC protocol using the circuit in Fig. 1c directly since the possible errors might not be in the consecutive form without qubit permutation. Moreover, permuting qubits will break the cyclic symmetry and \( E_{l,n}^z \) might be no longer distinguishable. In the next section we will use Theorem 2 to find a 1-flag circuit for distance-three cyclic CSS codes that can be used in a fault-tolerant protocol satisfying Definition 1. We point out that since \( p, q \) in Lemma 1 was chosen to be in the set \( \{0, \ldots, n-1\} \), if a cyclic CSS code has odd-weight stabilizers and can correct errors of weight \( \leq t \), then the flag circuits should be designed such that if there are \( \leq t \) faults during the FTEC protocol, an error of weight \( n \) cannot occur.

### IV. FAULT- TOLERANT ERROR CORRECTION PROTOCOL FOR DISTANCE-3 CYCLIC CSS CODES

In this section we provide a 1-flag circuit (see Definition 3 for the definition of a t-flag circuit) for distance-

three CSS codes constructed from classical cyclic codes\(^3\). An illustration of the circuit is given in Fig. 2. Here we adapted the idea of localizing circuit faults from [13]. Additionally, we develop a flag-FTEC protocol for distance-three cyclic CSS codes.

Suppose that the stabilizer generator being measured is of the form
\[
P = Z^{\otimes a_1} \otimes I^{\otimes b_1} \otimes Z^{\otimes a_2} \otimes I^{\otimes b_2} \otimes \cdots \otimes Z^{\otimes a_m} \otimes I^{\otimes b_m},
\]
(20)

The \( i \)-th sub-block contains \( a_i \) qubits, which are from the \( \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} (a_j + b_j) + 1 \)-th qubit to the \( \sum_{j=1}^{i} (a_j + b_j) + a_i \)-th qubit.

Notice that the blue, green and orange CNOT gates in the circuit of Fig. 2 always come in pairs. This is to ensure that when fault-free, the circuit implements a projective measurement of the stabilizer without flagging. In what follows, we will refer to the first blue, green or orange CNOT of a pair as an open CNOT and the second blue, green or orange CNOT as a closed CNOT. Given these definitions, we have the following claim:

**Claim 1.** During the measurement of \( Z^{\otimes a_1} \otimes I^{\otimes b_1} \otimes Z^{\otimes a_2} \otimes I^{\otimes b_2} \otimes \cdots \otimes Z^{\otimes a_m} \otimes I^{\otimes b_m} \) using the circuit in Fig. 2, the following can occur:

1. If there are no faults, none of the \( f_i \) ancilla qubits will flag.
2. A fault at a CNOT location resulting in a ZZ error is equivalent to the prior CNOT failing resulting in an IZ error (here Z acts on the target qubit).
3. Suppose that a fault occurs on one of the red CNOT’s and causes a Z error on the ancilla \( m_0 \). If the fault occurs on sub-block \( a_i \) where \( i \geq 1 \), only the ancillas \( f_0 \) and \( f_i \) will flag.
4. Suppose that a fault occurs on a blue or green CNOT. Let the control qubit be the ancilla \( f_1 \). If it is the open CNOT and causes a Z error on ancilla \( m_0 \), the ancillas \( f_0 \), \( f_1 \), and \( f_{i-1} \) will flag. However, if it is the closed CNOT and causes a Z error on the ancilla \( m_0 \), the ancillas \( f_0 \) and \( f_{i+1} \) will flag. However if the fault occurs on a blue or green CNOT's at the boundary \(^4\), if the open CNOT of \( f_1 \) is faulty, \( f_0 \) and \( f_1 \) will flag, and if the closed CNOT of \( f_m \) is faulty, only \( f_0 \) will flag.
5. A fault occurring at an orange CNOT gate will not cause a data qubit error (since a Z spreading to

---

\(^3\) Note that our protocol and circuit can also be applied to higher distance codes if we only consider correcting errors introduced by at most one fault.

\(^4\) By boundary we are referring to either the first blue CNOT after the sub-block 1 or the last green CNOT after the sub-block \( m \).
FIG. 2: Illustration of a 1-flag circuit applicable to distance-three cyclic CSS codes. The circuit measures stabilizers of the form $Z \otimes a_1 \otimes I \otimes b_1 \otimes Z \otimes a_2 \otimes I \otimes b_2 \otimes \cdots \otimes Z \otimes a_m \otimes I \otimes b_m$. The flag qubits are represented by the labels $f_1, \cdots, f_m$. Information from the flag outcomes along with the protocol given in Section IV enable the construction of a flag-FTEC protocol which satisfies Definition 1.

all qubits is equivalent to the stabilizer being measured). Further, only the ancilla $f_0$ can flag in this case (depending on whether the error was of the form $IZ$ or $ZZ$ and also if it occurred on the open or closed orange CNOT).

From the above claim, one can verify that a single fault resulting in a data qubit error $E$ with $\min(\text{wt}(E), \text{wt}(EP)) > 1$ (where $P$ is given by Eq. (20)) will always cause at least one flag qubit to flag. Thus the circuit in Fig. 2 is a 1-flag circuit. Note that an analogous claim can be made for $X$-type stabilizers.

Before describing the FTEC protocol, we require one more definition:

Definition 8. Minimum weight correction

Given the syndrome $s = s(E)$ of an error $E$, we let $E_{\min}(s)$ be the minimal weight correction of $E$.

Using Theorem 2, Claim 1, and Definition 8, we now describe a FTEC protocol that satisfies Definition 1 for distance-three cyclic CSS codes using a procedure adapted from [15]. In what follows, we define $s_i$ to be the syndrome obtained during round $i$ (either using flag or non-flag circuits). We also define $s_x$ and $s_z$ to be the syndrome obtained from $X$-type and $Z$-type stabilizers, respectively.

FTEC Protocol:

Let $C$ be an $[n, k, d]$ cyclic CSS code satisfying Theorem 2 with stabilizer group $S = \langle g_1, \cdots, g_r \rangle$. Let $C(g_i)$ be the 1-flag circuit of Fig. 2 for stabilizer $g_i$. Repeat the syndrome measurement (measurement of all stabilizer generators) using the 1-flag circuits until one of the following is satisfied:

1. If the syndrome is repeated twice in a row and there are no flags, apply $E_{\min}(s_1)$.
2. If there are no flags and the syndromes $s_1$ and $s_2$ differ, repeat the syndrome measurement using non-flagged circuits. Apply the correction $E_{\text{min}}(s_3)$.

3. If $f_0$ doesn’t flag but $f_i$ flags (with $i \geq 1$) during round one, stop. Repeat the syndrome measurement using non-flagged circuits and apply $E_{\text{min}}(s_2)$. If there are no flags in the first round but in round two $f_i$ flags and $f_0$ doesn’t flag, stop. Apply $E_{\text{min}}(s_1)$.

4. If at anytime during the protocol $f_0$ flags, stop and do one of the following:

   (a) Suppose $f_i = 0$ for all $i \geq 1$. Repeat the syndrome measurement using non-flag circuits. Apply $E_{\text{min}}(s)$.

   (b) If there is only one $i$ such that $f_i = 1$ (with $i \geq 1$), apply $I^{\otimes k} \otimes Z^{\otimes a_{i+1}} \otimes I^{\otimes b_{i+1}} \otimes \cdots \otimes Z^{\otimes a_m} \otimes I^{\otimes b_m}$ to the data if the stabilizer being measured is a $Z$ stabilizer or $I^{\otimes k} \otimes X^{\otimes a_{i+1}} \otimes I^{\otimes b_{i+1}} \otimes \cdots \otimes X^{\otimes a_m} \otimes I^{\otimes b_m}$ if it is a $X$ stabilizer (where $k = \sum_{j=1}^{i} (a_i + b_i)$). Repeat the syndrome measurement using non-flag circuits yielding syndrome $s = (s_x | s_z)$. If the stabilizer being measured is a $Z$ stabilizer (or an $X$ stabilizer) and there is an element $E_x$ in $E_{l,n}^x$ or $E_x$ in $E_{l,n}^x$ where $I = n - k + b_i$ that satisfies $s(E_x) = s_x$ (or $s(E_x) = s_z$), apply $E_x$ followed by $E_{\text{min}}(s_z)$ (or $E_{\text{min}}(s_z)$). Otherwise, apply $E_{\text{min}}(s)$.

   (c) Suppose there is an $i$ such that $f_i = 1$ and $f_{i+1} = 1$. Apply $I^{\otimes k} \otimes Z^{\otimes a_{i+1}} \otimes I^{\otimes b_{i+1}} \otimes \cdots \otimes Z^{\otimes a_m} \otimes I^{\otimes b_m}$ to the data if the stabilizer being measured is a $Z$ stabilizer or $I^{\otimes k} \otimes X^{\otimes a_{i+1}} \otimes I^{\otimes b_{i+1}} \otimes \cdots \otimes X^{\otimes a_m} \otimes I^{\otimes b_m}$ if it is a $X$ stabilizer (where $k = \sum_{j=1}^{i} (a_i + b_i)$). Repeat the syndrome measurement using non-flag circuits yielding syndrome $s = (s_x | s_z)$. If the stabilizer being measured is a $Z$ stabilizer (or an $X$ stabilizer) and there is an element $E_z$ in $E_{l,n}^z$ or $E_z$ in $E_{l,n}^z$ where $I = n - k + b_i$ that satisfies $s(E_z) = s_x$ (or $s(E_z) = s_z$), apply $E_z$ followed by $E_{\text{min}}(s_z)$ (or $E_{\text{min}}(s_z)$). Otherwise, apply $E_{\text{min}}(s)$.

To see that the above protocol satisfies Definition 1, we will assume that there is at most one fault during the protocol. If a fault in any of the CNOT gates introduces a $Z$ error on ancilla $m_0$, then $f_0$ and at least one $f_i$ (with $i \geq 1$) will flag (unless the first orange CNOT introduces an error of the form $ZZ$ or the last orange CNOT introduces an error of the form $IZ$ which in both cases, there will be no data qubit error). If there is only one flag, either $f_0$ or $f_i$, then the fault could either have been caused by a measurement error, idle qubit error on the ancilla $f_0$ or $f_i$, or an error on the control qubit of the CNOT gate interacting with $f_0$ or $f_i$. However in all three cases, the error could not have spread to the data. By repeating the syndrome measurement and applying $E_{\text{min}}(s)$, both criteria of Definition 1 will be satisfied. Note that if $f_i$ flags during round two, then the syndrome obtained during round one corresponds to the data qubit error (since there could not have been a measurement error giving the wrong syndrome during the first round), so correcting using $s_1$ will again satisfy Definition 1.

Next, let us consider the case where none of the $f_i$ ancillas flag. By the circuit construction, a single fault can introduce an error $E$ with $\text{wt}(E) \leq 1$. If the same syndrome is repeated twice in a row, then applying $E_{\text{min}}(s)$ can result in a data error of weight at most one. If $s_1 \neq s_2$, then a fault occurred in either the first or second round. Thus repeating the syndrome measurement a third time and applying $E_{\text{min}}(s_1)$ will remove the data errors or project the code back to the codespace.

Next we consider the case where a fault happens on a red CNOT introducing a $Z$ error on the ancilla $m_0$ and a $P$ error on the data qubit where $P \in \{I, X, Y, Z\}$. If the fault occurs on the $i^{th}$ sub-block, then $f_0$ will flag and there will be only one $i \geq 1$ such that $f_i$ flags. Applying $I^{\otimes k} \otimes Z^{\otimes a_{i+1}} \otimes I^{\otimes b_{i+1}} \otimes \cdots \otimes Z^{\otimes a_m} \otimes I^{\otimes b_m}$ where $k = \sum_{j=1}^{i} (a_i + b_i)$ to the data if the stabilizer being measured is a $Z$ stabilizer (or $I^{\otimes k} \otimes X^{\otimes a_{i+1}} \otimes I^{\otimes b_{i+1}} \otimes \cdots \otimes X^{\otimes a_m} \otimes I^{\otimes b_m}$ if it is an $X$ stabilizer) guarantees that the resulting error is a product of $Z$-type error from $E_{l,n}^x$ and an $X$-type error of weight at most 1 (or a product of $X$-type error from $E_{l,n}^x$ and a $Z$-type error of weight at most 1). By Theorem 2, errors in the set $E_{l,n}^x$ (or $E_{l,n}^x$) can be distinguished. Thus applying the correction in 4 b) of the protocol will remove the error if there are no input errors. However, if there is an input error, then applying $E_{\text{min}}(s)$ will project the code back to the codespace.

Lastly, if a fault occurs on a blue or green CNOT, then from Claim 1 either the case in 4 b) or 4 c) will be satisfied. However in both cases, the $Z$ error will spread to the data in the same way. Hence the correction proposed in 4 c) will satisfy the fault-tolerance criteria of Definition 1.

V. FAULT-TOLERANT MEASUREMENT PROTOCOL FOR DISTANCE-3 CYCLIC CSS CODES

In this section, we provide a flag-FT measurement protocol for distance-3 cyclic CSS codes. The idea of consecutive error correction used in the flag-FTEC protocol in Section IV is developed so that it is applicable to a measurement of any Pauli operator. The measurement protocol plays an important role in fault-tolerant quantum computation and other techniques, described later in Section VI.

We begin by introducing the definition of fault-tolerant non-destructive measurement adapted from [20] as follows:
Definition 9. Fault-tolerant non-destructive measurement
For \( t = \lfloor (d - 1)/2 \rfloor \), a non-destructive measurement protocol using a distance-\( d \) stabilizer code \( C \) is \( t \)-fault-tolerant if the following two conditions are satisfied:

1. For an input codeword with error of weight \( s_1 \), if \( s_2 \) faults occur during the protocol with \( s_1 + s_2 \leq t \), ideally decoding the output state gives the same codeword as ideally decoding the input state, and the result obtained from measuring the input codeword is the same as the result from the measuring the codeword after ideally decoding the input state.

2. For an input codeword with error of weight \( s_1 \), if \( s_2 \) faults occur during the protocol with \( s_1 + s_2 \leq t \), the output state differs from a codeword by an error of at most weight \( s_1 + s_2 \).

Suppose that the operator being measured is of the form

\[
P = P_1^{\otimes a_1} \otimes I^{\otimes b_1} \otimes P_2^{\otimes a_2} \otimes I^{\otimes b_2} \otimes \cdots \otimes P_m^{\otimes a_m} \otimes I^{\otimes b_m},
\]

where \( P_i \in \{X, Y, Z\} \). The \( i \)th sub-block contains \( a_i \) qubits, which are from the \( \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} (a_j + b_j) + 1 \)th qubit to the \( \sum_{j=1}^{i} (a_j + b_j) + a_i \)th qubit. A 1-flag circuit for operator measurement is similar to the circuit given in Fig. 2, while the measurements of \( X, Y, \) and \( Z \) operators correspond to CNOT gates, the gates shown in Fig. 1b, and the gates shown in Fig. 3. One can verify that Claim 1 is also applicable in this setting.

Using Theorem 2 and Claim 1, we now describe a flag-FT measurement protocol that satisfies Definition 9 for distance-three cyclic CSS codes. Here we define \( m_i \) to be the measurement result obtained from operator measurement (using either flag or non-flag circuits) during round \( i \), and define \( s_j \) to be the syndrome obtained from syndrome measurement (using either flag or non-flag circuits) during round \( j \) of error correction. The protocol is as follows:

Flag-FT Operator Measurement Protocol:
Let \( C \) be an \([n, k, d]\) cyclic CSS code satisfying Theorem 2. Let \( C(P) \) be the 1-flag circuit of Fig. 2 for measuring a Pauli operator \( P \) of the form

\[
P = P_1^{\otimes a_1} \otimes I^{\otimes b_1} \otimes P_2^{\otimes a_2} \otimes I^{\otimes b_2} \otimes \cdots \otimes P_m^{\otimes a_m} \otimes I^{\otimes b_m}.
\]

Repeat the measurement using the 1-flag circuits until one of the following is satisfied:

1. If the measurement result is repeated twice in a row and there are no flags, perform the syndrome measurement twice using 1-flag circuits for flag-FTEC.
   
   (a) If \( s_1 = s_2 = 0 \) and there are no flags during both syndrome measurement rounds, output \( m_1 \).
   
   (b) If \( s_1 \neq s_2 \) or at least one flag qubit flags during the syndrome measurement, apply the correction described by the flag-FTEC protocol of Section IV, then output \( m_1 \).
   
   (c) If \( s_1 = s_2 \neq 0 \) and there are no flags during syndrome measurement, apply the correction \( E_{\text{min}}(s_1) \). Repeat the operator measurement using a non-flag circuit, then output \( m_3 \).

2. If \( m_1 \neq m_2 \) and there are no flags, perform one syndrome measurement round using non-flag circuits for error correction and apply \( E_{\text{min}}(s_1) \). Repeat the operator measurement using a non-flag circuit, then output \( m_3 \).

3. If \( f_0 \) doesn’t flag but \( f_i \) flags (with \( i \geq 1 \)) during round one, stop. Repeat the operator measurement using a non-flag circuit then output \( m_2 \). If there are no flags during round one but \( f_i \) flags and \( f_0 \) doesn’t flag during round two, output \( m_1 \).

4. If at anytime during protocol \( f_0 \) flags, stop and do one of the followings:
   
   (a) If \( f_i = 0 \) for all \( i \geq 1 \), repeat the operator measurement using a non-flag circuit and output \( m \).
   
   (b) If there is only one \( i \) such that \( f_i = 1 \) (with \( i \geq 1 \)), apply \( I^{\otimes k} \otimes P_i^{\otimes a_{i+1}} \otimes I^{\otimes b_{i+1}} \otimes \cdots \otimes P_m^{\otimes a_m} \otimes I^{\otimes b_m} \) to the data, where \( k = \sum_{j=1}^{i} a_j + b_j \). Perform the syndrome measurement using non-flag circuits for error correction yielding syndrome \( s = (s_2 | s_3) \).
      
      i. If \( P_i = Z \), apply \( E_x \in E_{\text{min}}^x \) that satisfies \( s(E_x) = s_2 \) where \( l = n - k + b_i \), followed by \( E_{\text{min}}(s_2) \).
      
      ii. If \( P_i = X \), apply \( E_x \in E_{\text{min}}^x \) that satisfies \( s(E_x) = s_2 \) where \( l = n - k + b_i \), followed by \( E_{\text{min}}(s_2) \).
      
      iii. If \( P_i = Y \), apply \( E \in E_{\text{min}}^x \) that satisfies \( s(E) = s \) where \( l = n - k + b_i \).
      
      Afterwards, repeat the operator measurement using a non-flag circuit, then output \( m \).
   
   (c) If there is an \( i \) such that \( f_i = 1 \) and \( f_{i+1} = 1 \), apply \( I^{\otimes k} \otimes P_i^{\otimes a_{i+1}} \otimes I^{\otimes b_{i+1}} \otimes \cdots \otimes P_m^{\otimes a_m} \otimes I^{\otimes b_m} \) to the data, where \( k = \sum_{j=1}^{i} a_j + b_j \). Perform syndrome measurement using non-flag circuits for error correction yielding syndrome \( s = (s_2 | s_3) \).
i. If $P_i = Z$, apply $E_z \in \mathcal{E}_{t,n}$ that satisfies $s(E_z) = s_z$ where $l = n - k + b_i$, followed by $E_{\text{min}}(s_z)$.

ii. If $P_i = X$, apply $E_x \in \mathcal{E}_{t,n}$ that satisfies $s(E_x) = s_x$ where $l = n - k + b_i$, followed by $E_{\text{min}}(s_x)$.

iii. If $P_i = Y$, apply $E \in \mathcal{E}_{t,n}'$ that satisfies $s(E) = s$ where $l = n - k + b_i$.

Afterwards, repeat the operator measurement using a non-flag circuit, then output $m$.

To see that Definition 9 is satisfied, we will assume that the number of faults during the protocol is at most one. Similar to the FT-EC protocol, $f_0$ and at least one $f_i$ (with $i \geq 1$) will flag whenever a fault in any CNOT gate causes $Z$ error on $m_0$. If there is no flags, a single fault can introduce error of weight at most one. If the measurement result is repeated twice, then there is no fault in the circuits. However, the measurement result might be incorrect due to the input error. By perform full syndrome measurement twice with flag circuits, we can determine from $s_1$ and $s_2$ whether these is no input error, there is a fault during syndrome measurement, or there is an input error of weight 1. The procedure in 1 a), 1 b), and 1 c) can correct possible errors and output the right operator measurement result with corresponding codeword after projection.

Now let us consider the case that there is no flags but $m_1 \neq m_2$. This is the case where a fault occurred in either the first or second round. Therefore, performing error correction and repeating the operator measurement can give the correct result.

Next, consider the case that there is only one flag, either $f_0$ or $f_i$ with $i \geq 1$. The fault could be a measurement error, idle qubit error on the ancilla $f_0$ or $f_i$, or an error on the control qubit of the CNOT gate interacting with $f_0$ or $f_i$. Repeating the operator measurement can give the right result. Note that if $f_i$ flags during round two, then the result obtained during round one corresponds to the right outcome.

Now let us consider the case where a fault happens on a red CNOT introducing a $Z$ error on the ancilla $m_0$ and a $P$ error on the data qubit where $P \in \{I, X, Y, Z\}$. If the fault occurs on the $i$th sub-block, then $f_0$ and only one $f_i$ with $i \geq 1$ will flag. Applying $F^0_k \otimes P_i^{\otimes a_{i+1}} \otimes I^{\otimes k-b_i} \otimes I^{\otimes n-k}$ to the data guarantees that the resulting error is in the form $F^0_k \otimes P_i^{\otimes a_{i+1}} \otimes I^{\otimes k-b_i} \otimes I^{\otimes n-k}$ (where $k = \sum_{j=1}^n a_j + b_j$).

If $P_i = Z$ (or $P_i = X$), the resulting error is a product of two logical operators in $\mathcal{E}_{t,n}'$ (or $\mathcal{E}_{t,n}''$) and $X$-type error (or $Z$-type error) of weight one, where $l = n - k + b_i$. If $P_i = Y$, the resulting error is a consecutive error in $\mathcal{E}_{t,n}'$. By Theorem 2, errors in $\mathcal{E}_{t,n}', \mathcal{E}_{t,n}''$, and $\mathcal{E}_{t,n}^P$ are distinguishable. Therefore, performing a full syndrome measurement followed by appropriate error correction as in 4 b) will remove the error, and repeating the operator measurement gives the correct output. The result for the case that a fault occurs on a blue or green CNOT is similar, and the procedure for this case is described in 4 c).

The flag-FT measurement protocol described above is for a measurement of an operator acting in one code block. Surprisingly, the protocol also works for an operator acting on two or more code blocks. The measurement of such operator can be done by treating parts of the operator acting on different code blocks as operators from different sub-blocks. For example, let $C_p$ and $C_q$ be cyclic CSS codes of distance three satisfying Theorem 2, and let $P$ and $Q$ be Pauli operators acting on $C_p$ and $C_q$, respectively. The measurement of $P \otimes Q$ on the code $C_p \otimes C_q$ can be done by using a 1-flag circuit given in Fig. 2, where $P$ and $Q$ are treated as operators from the different sub-blocks. Observe that if $f_0$ flags and at least one $f_i$ flags (the 4 b) or 4 c) case), the resulting error after appropriate operation will become a consecutive error in either first or second code blocks. Since $C_p$ and $C_q$ are both cyclic, we can determine the error by performing subsequent syndrome measurement on only $C_p$ or $C_q$, depending on the sub-block in which the fault occurs. After that, the correct measurement result can be obtained by a subsequent operator measurement.

VI. APPLICATIONS OF FAULT-TOLERANT OPERATOR MEASUREMENT PROTOCOL

An operator measurement is a main ingredient in numerous techniques. Since the fault-tolerant measurement protocol described in Section V is applicable on two or more code blocks, information processing between code blocks is possible. In this section we briefly describe some important techniques which make fault-tolerant computation on cyclic CSS codes possible, including logical EPR state preparation, teleportation, and quantum computation on logical qubits.

Let us consider an EPR state $|00\rangle + |11\rangle$. This is a +1 eigenstate of operators $X \otimes X$ and $Z \otimes Z$. Let $C_p$ and $C_q$ be $[n_1, k_1, d_1]$ and $[n_2, k_2, d_2]$ cyclic CSS codes satisfying Theorem 2 with stabilizer generating sets $\{g^p_{i,1}\}$ and $\{g^q_{j,1}\}$, respectively. Suppose that we want to prepare a state

$$\frac{|0\rangle_p |0\rangle_q + |1\rangle_p |1\rangle_q}{\sqrt{2}}$$

(23)

which is an EPR state between the $i$th logical qubit of $C_p$ and the $j$th logical qubit of $C_q$. This can be done by measuring a totally mixed state with stabilizer generators $\{g^p_{i,1} \otimes I \otimes g^q_{j,1}\}$ and operators $X_{p,i} \otimes X_{q,j}$ and $Z_{p,i} \otimes Z_{q,j}$, where $X_{p,i}$ and $X_{q,j}$ (or $Z_{p,i}$ and $Z_{q,j}$) are logical $X$ (or logical $Z$) operators on $i$th logical qubit of $C_p$ and $j$th logical qubit of $C_q$, respectively. Since the measurement protocol described in Section V is a fault-tolerant protocol, the state in Eq. (23) can be prepared fault-tolerantly.

In conventional quantum teleportation, an EPR state
and Bell measurement are required. Here we will examine a process to fault-tolerantly perform quantum teleportation between two code blocks. The scheme for logical qubit teleportation is shown in Fig. 4a. Suppose that we would like to teleport the $i$th logical qubit of $C_p$ to the $j$th logical qubit of $C_q$, first an EPR state $|0\rangle_3|0\rangle_3+|1\rangle_3|1\rangle_3\over\sqrt{2}$ prepared on $C_q \otimes C_q$ is required. The logical qubit teleportation can be done by performing a Bell measurement with respect to $X_{p,i} \otimes X_{q,j}$ and $Z_{p,i} \otimes Z_{q,j}$ between $C_p$ and the first block of $C_q$. The teleported logical qubit can be obtained in the second block of $C_q$ by operating an appropriate logical Pauli operator $P_{r,j}$ depending on the Bell measurement result. Note that the Bell measurement can be done fault-tolerantly using the measurement protocol in Section V, and logical Pauli operators are transversal. Thus, fault-tolerant teleportation between two code blocks can be achieved.

Now let us consider fault-tolerant computation on cyclic CSS codes. It is known that for any error-correcting code, by the Eastin-Knill theorem, at least one logical gate in a universal gate set cannot be implemented transversely. For such gates, other fault-tolerant techniques must be performed which can require a significant amount of resources. Fortunately, fault-tolerant implementations of logical Cliffords gates on distance-three cyclic CSS codes can be achieved via quantum gate teleportation [26]. For example, suppose that we would like to perform a logical Hadamard gate $H_i$ on the code $P_{C_p}$. This can be achieved by preparing a codeword which is an eigenstate of $X_i \otimes Z_i$ and $Z_i \otimes X_i$ on $C_p \otimes C_p$, performing logical qubit teleportation, and operating a logical Pauli operator $H_{p,i}P_{p,i}H_{p,i}$ depending on the result from the Bell measurement in qubit teleportation as illustrated in Fig. 4b. Also, logical $S = \text{diag}(1,i)$ and logical CNOT gates on any logical qubits can be performed in the similar way. However, performing logical non-Clifford gates will require different techniques such as the ones presented in [19].

VII. EXAMPLES OF CYCLIC CSS CODES

In this section, some examples of cyclic CSS codes satisfying Theorem 2 are given. A first example is the [7,1,3] quantum Hamming code. This code is constructed from a classical [7,4,3] Hamming code (with $C_x = C_z$). A check polynomial of the [7,4,3] Hamming code in cyclic form is

$$h(x) = 1 + x^2 + x^3 + x^4$$

(24)

In fact, any classical Hamming code can be made cyclic [24]. Thus, any CSS code constructed from a classical $[2^r-1, 2^r-1-r, 3]$ Hamming code with $C_x = C_z$ satisfies Theorem 2, and can be used in the flag-FTEC protocol and the flag-FT measurement protocol described in this work.

Another example of cyclic CSS codes satisfying Theorem 2 is the [30,14,3] code constructed from a classical [30,22,3] cyclic code with a check polynomial

$$h(x) = 1 + x^2 + x^4 + x^6 + x^{10} + x^{14} + x^{16} + x^{22}$$

(25)

The [30,22,3] code and other classical codes satisfying $C^+ \subseteq C$ are given Table 1 of [25]. (A method of finding the check polynomial of a classical cyclic code is discussed in [24].) One possible choice of logical operators for the [30,14,3] code is given in Table 1. The advantages of the [30,14,3] code are that its encoding rate is high $(k/n = 14/30)$, and the logical operators of the first ten logical qubits have a simple form, which make them easily accessible.

VIII. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

In this work we used the symmetries of CSS codes constructed from classical cyclic codes in order to prove that errors written in consecutive form (as in Definition 6) can be distinguished. From these properties, we were able to obtain a 1-flag circuit along with a flag-FTEC protocol which satisfies the fault-tolerance criteria of Definition 1 when there is at most one fault. The 1-flag circuit requires only four ancilla qubits. This number does not grow as the block length gets larger, making our protocol advantageous in the implementation where resources are limited. We note that not all cyclic CSS codes are Hamming codes and therefore the methods in [13] (which apply to perfect codes) cannot be directly applied, thus providing further motivation for our work.
In general, cyclic CSS codes do not satisfy the sufficient condition required for flag fault-tolerance presented in [15] (one example is the family of Hamming codes which can be made cyclic). Nevertheless, using the techniques presented in this paper, a flag-FTEC protocol can still be achieved.

Further, we have shown how logical Pauli operators of cyclic CSS codes can be fault-tolerantly measured using the flag techniques discussed in Section V. The flag-FT operator measurement protocol satisfies the fault-tolerance criteria of Definition 9 when there is at most one fault. We then showed in Section VI how one can fault-tolerantly perform gate teleportation to implement logical Clifford operators on any given logical qubit for codes which encode multiple logical qubits. Examples of cyclic CSS codes with large encoding rates are provided in Section VII.

Note that for all CSS codes, the stabilizer generators being measured are of the form $I^\otimes n-m \otimes X^\otimes m$ or $I^\otimes n-m \otimes Z^\otimes m$ up to qubit permutations. Thus data qubit errors arising from faulty CNOT gates will be expressed in consecutive form. The errors of this form are distinguishable iff the sub-matrices of the $X$ and $Z$ stabilizers satisfy Lemma 1. In our work, we use the symmetry of the cyclic codes to simplify Lemma 1 into Lemma 3. We believe that Lemma 1 can be simplified by using symmetries found in other families of quantum codes. With appropriate t-flag circuits and operations dependent on the flag measurement outcome, this may lead to new flag fault-tolerant protocols.

Another interesting avenue is finding non-cyclic quantum codes for which a version of Theorem 2 can be applied. We note that for such codes, the same 1-flag circuit as in Fig. 2 along with the flag-FTEC protocol of Section IV and the flag-FT measurement protocol of Section V can be used. The reason is that the key property used by these schemes is based on the distinguishability of consecutive errors.

Note that there are quantum cyclic codes which are not CSS codes for which flag fault-tolerant schemes are still possible. For instance, a flag-FTEC protocol for the $[[5,1,3]]$ code was devised in [13]. We believe it could be interesting to generalize the ideas presented in this work to non-CSS cyclic quantum codes. However, we leave this problem for future work.

The flag fault-tolerant protocols for cyclic CSS codes presented in this work are based on the assumption that the qubit measurement and state preparation must be fast since we reuse some flag qubits in the protocols (as we can see in Fig. 2). If we do not reuse flag qubits, however, the number of required ancillas will be $m + n$ for an operator being measured of the form $P = P_1^a \otimes I^\otimes b_1 \otimes P_2^a \otimes I^\otimes b_2 \otimes \ldots \otimes P_m^a \otimes I^\otimes b_m$ instead of 4.

One important feature of flag fault-tolerant protocols is that the number of required ancillas is very small compared to other fault-tolerant schemes. We believe that if fewer ancillas are required, the accuracy threshold will increase since the number of locations will decrease in total. However, we should point out that subsequent syndrome measurements are also required in a flag fault-tolerant protocol and may increase the total number of locations in the protocol. The answer of whether the accuracy threshold for a flag fault-tolerant protocol is greater or smaller compared to other fault-tolerant schemes is still unknown.

Lastly, we point out that cyclic CSS codes which satisfy the condition in Theorem 2 are not limited to distance-three codes. Therefore, interesting future work would be to use the methods of [15] to obtain flag fault-tolerant schemes for higher distance codes. In particular, the main challenge stems from finding t-flag circuits as in Fig. 2 for $t > 1$.

| $\bar{X}_1$ | $X_1X_{11}X_{21}$ | $\bar{Z}_1$ | $Z_1Z_{11}Z_{21}$ |
| $X_2$ | $X_2X_{12}X_{22}$ | $\bar{Z}_2$ | $Z_2Z_{12}Z_{22}$ |
| $X_3$ | $X_3X_{13}X_{23}$ | $\bar{Z}_3$ | $Z_3Z_{13}Z_{23}$ |
| $X_4$ | $X_4X_{14}X_{24}$ | $\bar{Z}_4$ | $Z_4Z_{14}Z_{24}$ |
| $X_5$ | $X_5X_{15}X_{25}$ | $\bar{Z}_5$ | $Z_5Z_{15}Z_{25}$ |
| $X_6$ | $X_6X_{16}X_{26}$ | $\bar{Z}_6$ | $Z_6Z_{16}Z_{26}$ |
| $X_7$ | $X_7X_{17}X_{27}$ | $\bar{Z}_7$ | $Z_7Z_{17}Z_{27}$ |
| $X_8$ | $X_8X_{18}X_{28}$ | $\bar{Z}_8$ | $Z_8Z_{18}Z_{28}$ |
| $X_9$ | $X_9X_{19}X_{29}$ | $\bar{Z}_9$ | $Z_9Z_{19}Z_{29}$ |
| $X_{10}$ | $X_{10}X_{20}X_{30}$ | $\bar{Z}_{10}$ | $Z_{10}Z_{20}Z_{30}$ |
| $X_{11}$ | $X_{11}X_{17}X_{18}X_{19}$ | $\bar{Z}_{11}$ | $Z_{11}Z_{17}Z_{18}Z_{19}Z_{27}Z_{29}$ |
| $X_{12}$ | $X_{2}X_{8}X_{10}X_{12}X_{18}X_{20}$ | $\bar{Z}_{12}$ | $Z_{12}Z_{18}Z_{20}Z_{22}Z_{28}Z_{30}$ |
| $X_{13}$ | $X_{11}X_{17}X_{19}X_{21}X_{27}X_{29}$ | $\bar{Z}_{13}$ | $Z_{13}Z_{17}Z_{19}Z_{21}Z_{27}Z_{29}$ |
| $X_{14}$ | $X_{12}X_{18}X_{20}X_{22}X_{28}X_{30}$ | $\bar{Z}_{14}$ | $Z_{12}Z_{18}Z_{20}Z_{22}Z_{28}Z_{30}$ |
| $X_{1}$ | $X_{1}X_{11}X_{21}$ | $Z_{1}$ | $Z_{1}Z_{11}Z_{21}$ |
| $X_{2}$ | $X_{2}X_{12}X_{22}$ | $Z_{2}$ | $Z_{2}Z_{12}Z_{22}$ |
| $X_{3}$ | $X_{3}X_{13}X_{23}$ | $Z_{3}$ | $Z_{3}Z_{13}Z_{23}$ |
| $X_{4}$ | $X_{4}X_{14}X_{24}$ | $Z_{4}$ | $Z_{4}Z_{14}Z_{24}$ |
| $X_{5}$ | $X_{5}X_{15}X_{25}$ | $Z_{5}$ | $Z_{5}Z_{15}Z_{25}$ |
| $X_{6}$ | $X_{6}X_{16}X_{26}$ | $Z_{6}$ | $Z_{6}Z_{16}Z_{26}$ |
| $X_{7}$ | $X_{7}X_{17}X_{27}$ | $Z_{7}$ | $Z_{7}Z_{17}Z_{27}$ |
| $X_{8}$ | $X_{8}X_{18}X_{28}$ | $Z_{8}$ | $Z_{8}Z_{18}Z_{28}$ |
| $X_{9}$ | $X_{9}X_{19}X_{29}$ | $Z_{9}$ | $Z_{9}Z_{19}Z_{29}$ |
| $X_{10}$ | $X_{10}X_{20}X_{30}$ | $Z_{10}$ | $Z_{10}Z_{20}Z_{30}$ |

**TABLE I**: A choice of logical operators for the $[[30,14,3]]$ code.
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Appendix A: Proof of the lemmas

Proof of Lemma 1: We will prove that $E_{0,n}^x$ is distinguishable by $C$ iff for all $p, q \in \{0, 1, \ldots, n-1\}$ such that $p > q$, there exists $i \in \{1, \ldots, r_x\}$ such that $x_{i,n-p+1} \oplus \cdots \oplus x_{i,n-q} = 1$. Consider errors $E_p = I^\otimes n-p \otimes Z^\otimes p$ and $E_q = I^\otimes n-q \otimes Z^\otimes q$ where $p, q \in \{0, 1, \ldots, n-1\}, p > q$. Let $s(E_p), s(E_q) \in \mathbb{Z}_2^n$ be error syndromes corresponding to errors $E_p$ and $E_q$, respectively. By Definition 4, $E_p$ and $E_q$ are distinguishable by $C$ iff $s(E_p) \neq s(E_q)$, i.e., there exists $i \in \{1, 2, \ldots, r_x\}$ such that $s(E_p)_i \neq s(E_q)_i$ (here $i$ corresponds to the $i^{th}$ component of $s(E_p)$ and $S(E_q)$). From the parity check matrix $H_x$, the $i^{th}$ component of $s(E_p)$ and $s(E_q)$ is given by

$$s(E_p)_i = x_{i,n-p+1} \oplus x_{i,n-p+2} \oplus \cdots \oplus x_{i,n}, \quad (A1)$$

$$s(E_q)_i = x_{i,n-q+1} \oplus x_{i,n-q+2} \oplus \cdots \oplus x_{i,n}. \quad (A2)$$

From Eqs. (A1) and (A2), we have that

$$s(E_p)_i \neq s(E_q)_i \iff s(E_p)_i + s(E_q)_i = 1$$

$$\iff x_{i,n-p+1} \oplus \cdots \oplus x_{i,n-q} = 1. \quad (A3)$$

Thus, $E_{0,n}^x$ is distinguishable by $C$ iff for all $p, q \in \{0, 1, \ldots, n-1\}$ such that $p > q$, there exists $i \in \{1, 2, \ldots, r_x\}$ such that $x_{i,n-p+1} \oplus \cdots \oplus x_{i,n-q} = 1$. \quad (A4)

The proof of the statement for $E_{0,n}^x$ is similar.

Now we will prove that $E_{0,n}^{p} \neq E_{0,n}^x$ is distinguishable by $C$ iff both $E_{0,n}^{p}$ and $E_{0,n}^x$ are distinguishable by $C$. Let $X_p = I^\otimes n-p \otimes X^\otimes p$ and $Z_q = I^\otimes n-q \otimes Z^\otimes q$, where $p, q \in \{0, \ldots, n-1\}$. Observe that any element of $E_{0,n}^{p}$ is of the form $E_{p,q} = X_p Z_q$ where $X_p \in E_{0,n}^{p}$ and $Z_q \in E_{0,n}^x$. The syndrome of $E_{p,q}$ is $s(E_{p,q}) = (s(X_p) \mid s(Z_q))$. If $E_{0,n}^{p}$ is distinguishable by $C$, i.e., $s(E_{p,q}) \neq s(E_{p,q})$ for all choices of $p_1, p_2, q_1, q_2$ such that $(p_1, q_1) \neq (p_2, q_2)$, then we have that any pair of $X_{p_1}$ and $X_{p_2}$ and any pair of $Z_{q_1}$ and $Z_{q_2}$ are distinguishable. Conversely, if any pair of $X_{p_1}$ and $X_{p_2}$ and any pair of $Z_{q_1}$ and $Z_{q_2}$ are distinguishable, then any pair of $E_{p_1,q_1}$ and $E_{p_2,q_2}$ will have different syndromes. This implies Statement 3.

Proof of Lemma 2: Observe that any element of $C$ in symplectic representation is of the form $(x|z)$ where $x \in C_x^+$ and $z \in C_z$ since each $g^x_i$ and each $g^z_i$ correspond to each row of $H_x$ and $H_z$, respectively. For any choice of $l \in \{0, 1, \ldots, n-1\}$, let $H_x$ and $H_z$ be parity check matrices corresponding to $L(g^x_i, l)$ and $L(g^z_i, l)$. We find that a code $C_{0,n}^+$ generated by $H_z$ differs from $C_{0,n}^+$ by an $l$-step left cyclic permutation. However, since $C_x^+$ and $C_z$ are cyclic codes, we have that $C_{0,n}^+ = C_x^+$ and $C_{0,n}^+ = C_z$. Therefore, $\{L(g^x_1, l), \ldots, L(g^x_{r_x}, l), L(g^z_1, I), \ldots, L(g^z_{r_z}, I)\}$ and $\{g^x_1, \ldots, g^z_1, \ldots, g^x_{r_x}, \ldots, g^z_{r_z}\}$ generate the same code $C$ for any $l \in \{0, 1, \ldots, n-1\}$.

Proof of Lemma 3: First we will prove that $E_{0,n}^x$ is distinguishable by $C$ iff for all $u_x \in \{2, 3, \ldots, n\}$, there exists $i \in \{1, \ldots, r_x\}$ such that $x_{i,n-u_x+1} \oplus \cdots \oplus x_{i,n} = 1$. Applying Lemma 1, we would like to prove that for all $p, q \in \{0, \ldots, n-1\}$ such that $p > q$, there exists $i \in \{1, \ldots, r_x\}$ such that $x_{i,n-p+1} \oplus \cdots \oplus x_{i,n-q} = 1$ for all $u_x \in \{2, 3, \ldots, n\}$, there exist $i' \in \{1, \ldots, r_x\}$ such that $x_{i',n-u'_{x}+1} \oplus \cdots \oplus x_{i',n} = 1$. \quad (\Rightarrow) By choosing $q = 0$ and $p = n-u+1$, the proof is trivial.

(\Leftarrow) Assume that for all $u_x \in \{2, 3, \ldots, n\}$, there exists $i' \in \{1, \ldots, r_x\}$ such that $x_{i',u_x+n-1} \oplus \cdots \oplus x_{i',n} = 1$. Let $p, q \in \{0, 1, \ldots, n-1\}$ be integers such that $p > q$. Let $S$ be the stabilizer group corresponding to the code $C$. We want to find an operator $M \in S$ that can distinguish between $E_p = I^\otimes n-p \otimes Z^\otimes p$ and $E_q = I^\otimes n-q \otimes Z^\otimes q$. By assumption, there exists an operator $g^r_q = (x_{i',1}, \ldots, x_{i',n})$ such that $x_{i',n-(p-q)+1} \oplus \cdots \oplus x_{i',n} = 1$. Since $C$ is constructed from a classical cyclic code $C_x$, an operator $M = L(g^r_q) = (x_{i',1}, \ldots, x_{i',n-(p-q)+1}, \ldots, x_{i',n}, x_{i',1}, \ldots, x_{i',n})$ which is a left cyclic-shift of $g^r_q$ is also in the stabilizer. Note that the $(n-p+1)^{th}$ component of $M$ is $x_{i',n-(p-q)+1}$ and the $(n-q+1)^{th}$ component of $M$ is $x_{i',1}$. Let $s(M(E_p))$ and $s(M(E_q))$ be the measurement outcomes corresponding to the measurement of $E_p$ and $E_q$ by $M$. Then we have

$$s(M(E_p)) = x_{i',n-(p-q)+1} \oplus \cdots \oplus x_{i',n} \oplus x_{i',1} \oplus \cdots \oplus x_{i',q}, \quad (A5)$$

$$s(M(E_q)) = x_{i',1} \oplus \cdots \oplus x_{i',q}. \quad (A6)$$

Now given that $x_{i',n-(p-q)+1} \oplus \cdots \oplus x_{i',n} = 1$, we have $s(M(E_p)) \neq s(M(E_q))$. Since $M \in S$, there exists a set of $a_1, \ldots, a_{r_x} \in \{0, 1\}$ such that $M = (g^r_1)^{a_1} \cdots (g^r_{r_x})^{a_{r_x}}$ where in symplectic form $g^r_i = (x_{i,1}, \ldots, x_{i,n})$. Observe that $s(M(E_p))$ and $s(M(E_q))$ can be written as

$$s(M(E_p)) = \sum_{i=1}^{r_x} a_i s(E_p)_i = \sum_{i=1}^{r_x} \sum_{j=n-p+1}^{n} a_i x_{i,j}, \quad (A7)$$

$$s(M(E_q)) = \sum_{i=1}^{r_x} a_i s(E_q)_i = \sum_{i=1}^{r_x} \sum_{j=n-q+1}^{n} a_i x_{i,j}. \quad (A8)$$

Thus, $s(M(E_p)) \neq s(M(E_q))$ iff

$$\sum_{i=1}^{r_x} \sum_{j=n-p+1}^{n} a_i x_{i,j} = 1. \quad (A9)$$

Eq. (A9) implies that there exists an $i \in \{1, \ldots, r_x\}$ such that $a_i = 1$ and $x_{i,n-p+1} \oplus \cdots \oplus x_{i,n-q} = 1$, which means that $E_p$ and $E_q$ are distinguishable by some generator $g^r_q$. Note that this is true for all $p, q \in \{0, 1, \ldots, n-1\}$ with $p > q$.

The proof of statement for $E_{0,n}^{x}$ is similar to the proof.
of statement for $\mathcal{E}_{0,n}^z$, while the proof of statement for $\mathcal{E}_{0,n}^p$ is similar to the proof of Statement 3 in Lemma 1.

We already proved statements for $\mathcal{E}_{0,n}^z$, $\mathcal{E}_{0,n}^x$, and $\mathcal{E}_{0,n}^p$. We will generalize the statements to $\mathcal{E}_{l,n}^z$, $\mathcal{E}_{l,n}^x$, and $\mathcal{E}_{l,n}^p$ for any $l \in \{0, \ldots, n-1\}$. Let $\tilde{C}$ be a cyclic CSS code generated by \{L$(g_i^z, l)$, $\ldots$, L$(g_r^z, l)$, L$(g_i^x, l)$, $\ldots$, L$(g_r^x, l)$\}. Observe that by qubit reordering, $\mathcal{E}_{l,n}^p$ is distinguishable by $\tilde{C}$ iff $\mathcal{E}_{0,n}^p$ is distinguishable by $C$. Since $\tilde{C}$ and $C$ are the same code by Lemma 2, we have that $\mathcal{E}_{l,n}^p$ is distinguishable by $C$ for any $l \in \{0, \ldots, n-1\}$ iff $\mathcal{E}_{0,n}^p$ is distinguishable by $C$. The proof is also applied to $\mathcal{E}_{l,n}^z$ and $\mathcal{E}_{l,n}^x$. 