Braiding defects in topological stabiliser codes of any dimension cannot be universal
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Braiding defects in topological stabiliser codes has been widely studied as a promising approach to fault-tolerant quantum computing. We present two no-go theorems that place very strong limitations on the potential of such schemes for universal fault-tolerant quantum computing in any spatial dimension. In particular, we show that all logical operators implemented by braiding defects in topological stabiliser codes are in the Clifford group, regardless of dimension, and therefore cannot be universal. Moreover, supplementing braiding of defects with locality-preserving logical operators (a generalisation of transversal gates to topological codes) still cannot achieve a universal gate set in any topological stabiliser code.

Topological stabiliser codes are a promising approach to protecting quantum information, as they possess high thresholds and allow for the correction of very general local errors. In addition, any quantum logic gates that can be performed with locality-preserving logical operators on these codes (a generalisation of transversal operators) are fault-tolerant, meaning that local errors remain local and correctable. Quantum computing requires a universal set of fault-tolerant logical gates, however, and the set of locality-preserving logical operators in a topological stabiliser code cannot be universal.

However, there are other approaches to performing fault-tolerant logic in topological codes, such as braiding of topological defects. Defects can have a richer braiding structure compared with the anyonic excitations of the topological code. A number of schemes to encode qubits into defects and implement gates by braiding these defects have been proposed and explored for codes in two spatial dimensions. One class of encodings uses holes [3–13]. Qubits encoded in holes in two-dimensional topological stabiliser codes can admit entangling gates by braiding, and schemes based on supplementing these gates by locality-preserving logical operators have been proposed for both the two-dimensional surface and colour codes [3-13]; however, braiding holes alone cannot give a universal set of logical operators in two-dimensional topological stabiliser codes [14]. Focussing on more exotic topological defects, encodings into twist defects that lie on the boundary of domain walls have also been widely studied due to their similarity to non-abelian anyons [13–23]. Fault-tolerant logic with such twist defects has been studied in a range of two dimensional codes, including the surface code [13, 15], colour code [16], subsystem colour codes [17] and the $\mathbb{Z}_3$ quantum double model [18] (a generalisation of the surface code to qutrits). As with holes, braiding twist defects in these codes does not give a universal gate set.

Because braiding defects has many similar features to braiding non-abelian anyons even in abelian topological models [13, 18], and because some non-abelian braiding models allow for universal gate sets [24, 25], it is natural to question whether there exist (abelian) topological stabiliser codes with defects that similarly allow for universality through braiding. The idea seems plausible, as there are examples of topological models that do not admit a universal set of fault-tolerant logical operators, but which do allow for universality when genons (a type of twist defect) are introduced and braided [26].

In this Letter, we prove that braiding defects in topological stabiliser codes in any dimension cannot be universal. Specifically, we generalise the notion of encoding qubits in defects from two dimensional codes to topological stabiliser codes of any spatial dimension. For this generalisation, we show that the set of operators obtained by braiding topological defects—of any type, in any topological stabiliser code, of any spatial dimension—is contained in the Clifford group. Moreover, we show that the set of operators that can be implemented by a combination of braiding defects and locality-preserving logical operators in a topological stabiliser code also cannot be universal. Our results place the strongest restrictions to date on the possible fault-tolerant logic gates that can be performed in topological stabiliser codes of any dimension.

**Defects in Topological Stabiliser Codes.**—A topological stabiliser code is a stabiliser code in which physical qubits are arranged in a lattice of $D \geq 2$ spatial dimensions such that the stabiliser group admits a generating set of local operators and logical information is encoded in topologically protected degrees of freedom of these qubits [3–13, 26–29]. To allow for a notion of defects, we assume that there is some fundamental (defect-free) code that is translationally invariant. A defect is defined to be a $k$-dimensional region of this code where this translational invariance is broken, with $0 \leq k < D$.

We refer to a defect at which excitations can condense as a topological defect, as this condensation allows the defect to carry topological charge. For example, in the surface code, holes created with rough or smooth boundaries can condense electric or magnetic charge, respectively, and so are topological defects. Transparent domain walls, such as a lattice dislocation in the surface...
code, form topological defects referred to as *twists* at their boundaries, again allowing excitations to condense. Note that in this case the entire boundary of the domain wall, for example a pair of points for a one dimensional wall, or a loop for a two dimensional wall, is considered to be a single topological defect. While the fundamental code is assumed to have only Pauli stabilisers, we allow for stabilisers acting at defects to include non-Pauli operators. For example, we allow for the domain wall that exists at the boundary of the transversal $T$ logical operator in the three dimensional colour code, which has non-Pauli stabilisers that are the result of non-Clifford $T$ operators acting on the $X$-type stabilisers of the colour code [30].

In keeping with the local structure of topological models, we do not allow for non-local interactions between parts of a defect; the stabilisers of the code with defects must remain local. Note that topological defects need not be point-like; for $D \geq 2$ topological defects can take the form of higher-dimensional objects. However we assume that a defect cannot partition a code into two parts, or into two different codes. More precisely, if such a partitioning defect exists, we reinterpret it as a boundary of the code and note that the only braiding operators admitted by such boundaries are trivial rotations of the code. On the other hand, we do allow for infinite defects that do not partition the code, such as one-dimensional line-like twists in three dimensional codes.

We now specify how quantum information can be encoded in defects. The encoding we describe is a natural generalisation of two dimensional defect encodings to codes of any spatial dimension. Specifically, a pair of topological defects that allow for the condensation of some excitation, $a$, can then be used to encode a logical qubit. Specifically, we assume the defect pair as a whole to have no charge, and associate the computational basis states of a qubit with the parity of excitation $a$ in either of the defects. Note that we make the additional assumption that $a$ is an *eigenstate excitation* of the code [4, 31], by which we mean that it can be propagated by Pauli operators. This assumption is trivially satisfied in two dimensional codes, but is important for higher dimensions, where more exotic *non-eigenstate excitations* can also be constructed [4, 30, 31].

We consider two ways to implement fault-tolerant logical operators on such qubits. The first is to apply a locality-preserving logical operator, which is a unitary operator that ensures that local errors prior to the operator’s implementation remain local (and hence correctable) afterwards. These operators are a natural generalisation of transversal gates to topological codes. Strong constraints on the locality-preserving logical operators admitted by a topological stabiliser code are known [4, 31], as is a full classification for a large class of the most widely studied instances [4]. Alternatively, fault-tolerant logical operators may be implemented by *braiding*. Such *braiding logical operators* are performed by braiding defects; a process by which the positions of defects in the code are altered smoothly. Our results are independent of the physical details of how this is implemented. However, for concreteness, we note that it is generally proposed to be done by code deformation, in which the Hamiltonian is adiabatically transformed through successive expressions corresponding to gradually changed positions of defects [13, 32]. Provided that the initial size and separation of defects is maintained at each stage of this process, the topological protection of the qubit is preserved throughout and so the operator it implements is naturally fault-tolerant. Note that schemes that break this natural topological protection and restore it only with additional error correction, such as dimensional jumping [32], are not included in our framework. In particular, such schemes require non-local classical processing of measurement outcomes and so are beyond the scope of the purely local operations that we consider [31, 54].

**Results.**—In preparation for proving our main results, we first consider relevant properties of locality-preserving logical operators and how they transform under braiding. Define the spatial dimension of a locality-preserving logical operator to be the smallest $k$ such that there exists a $k$-dimensional manifold that supports an implementation of the operator. That is, it is the smallest number $k$ for which there is an implementation of the operator that is effectively $k$-dimensional. We now observe that if $U$ is a $k$-dimensional locality-preserving logical operator and $B$ is a braiding logical operator, then $BUB^\dagger$ is also a $k$-dimensional locality-preserving logical operator. Indeed, since defects can only have local interactions, $U$ must remain locality-preserving when its support is crossed by a defect. Apart from these crossings, $B$ may only shift the support of $U$ around the lattice which also clearly keeps $U$ locality-preserving.

We now define *confinability*, which is a property that can be possessed by a locality-preserving logical operator. A confinable locality-preserving logical operator is one that can be implemented by acting only on a compact region around the defects that encode the relevant logical qubits. More precisely, for a logical qubit $i$, let $D_i$ be the set of physical qubits that lie on the defects on which this logical qubit is encoded. (A physical qubit is said to lie on a defect if it is in the support of any local stabiliser operator that is altered in creating the defect.) We denote by $\Delta(A; B)$ the largest distance, $\delta$, such that there is a qubit $a \in A$ that is a distance of at least $\delta$ from all qubits in $B$. A locality-preserving logical operator is $k$-*confined* if it has an implementation $\bar{U}$ so that $\Delta(\text{supp}(\bar{U}); D_i) \leq k$ for each logical qubit, $i$, on which $\bar{U}$ acts non-trivially. A locality-preserving logical operator is confinable if it is $k$-confined for some $k$ that can depend on the separation of defects, but is constant in the system size of the underlying code. Otherwise, it is un-
confinable. Braiding logical operators preserve the confinability of locality-preserving logical operators. Indeed, any braiding logical operator, $\bar{B}$, can be implemented by acting only in some region of the code independent of the total system size of the code. A locality-preserving logical operator $\bar{U}$ initially confined to this region must remain confined to it under the action of $B$. Thus, if $\bar{U}$ is confinable, then so is $\bar{B} \bar{U} B^\dagger$ for any braiding logical operator, $B$.

Logical Pauli operators must be confinable locality-preserving logical operators. Indeed, consider a logical qubit encoded in a pair of topological defects that allow for an excitation, $a$, to condense. The logical $X$ operator may be realised by transporting $a$ between the defects. More precisely, it is implemented by condensing $a$ at one of the defects, applying Pauli operators to propagate it to the second defect, and allowing it to be absorbed. The logical $\bar{Z}$ operator may be realised by braiding an excitation, $b$, around one of the defects in a way that distinguishes the parity of $a$ in the region. This can be done by implementing Pauli operators that anticommute with those used to propagate $a$, thus ensuring that $\bar{Z}$ anticommutes with $X$ as required.

**Lemma 1.** Any locality-preserving logical operator that is not a logical Pauli is necessarily unconfinable.

**Proof.** Consider a confinable locality-preserving logical operator, $\bar{U}$, that acts non-trivially on a logical qubit encoded in some defect pair. Assume initially that $\bar{U}$ is in the Clifford group. We show that $\bar{U}$ is necessarily a logical Pauli operator by showing first that its action on $X_i$ must be trivial up to a phase for each logical qubit $i$ on which it acts, and then similarly for $Z_i$.

Let logical qubit $i$ denote an arbitrary logical qubit on which $\bar{U}$ acts. Denote the defects in which qubit $i$ is encoded by $D_{i1}$ and $D_{i2}$ and let $a$ be the excitation that can condense on these defects and is used to define the computational basis states. Since $\bar{U}$ is confinable, there exists some $k$ such that there is an implementation of $\bar{U}$ that acts trivially on all qubits that are a distance of more than $k$ away from both $D_{i1}$ and $D_{i2}$. Now, consider the following implementation of $\bar{X}_i$. First, condense an excitation $a$ at each of defects, $D_{i1}$ and $D_{i2}$. Apply physical Pauli operators to translate or grow both excitations as necessary, without bringing either closer to the other defect, until all qubits in their support are a distance of more than $k$ from both defects. Then apply physical Pauli operators to propagate one of the excitations until it annihilates with the other, while remaining at a distance of more than $k$ from both defects throughout. Since this has the effect of changing the parity of $a$ excitations at each defect, it indeed implements a $\bar{X}_i$ operator. However, the intersection of the support of this $\bar{X}_i$ operator and the support of $\bar{U}$ cannot support a logical Pauli operator, since it does not connect a pair of defects or enclose a defect. Thus, $\bar{U}$ must act on $\bar{X}_i$ trivially up to a phase.

Similarly, consider the following implementation of $\bar{Z}_i$. Condense a pair of excitations, $b$, that braid with $a$ to give a phase of $-1$ such that the excitations have support only on qubits a distance of more than $k$ from both $D_{i1}$ and $D_{i2}$. Braid one of these excitations around defect $D_{i1}$. The intersection of $\bar{U}$ and this implementation of $\bar{Z}_i$ then does not connect a pair of defects or enclose a defect, and so $\bar{U}$ must act trivially up to a phase on $\bar{Z}_i$. Thus, since $\bar{U}$ acts trivially up to a phase on both $\bar{X}_i$ and $\bar{Z}_i$, it must act as a logical Pauli operator on qubit $i$. This argument applies to any logical qubit $i$, and so we conclude that $\bar{U}$ must be a logical Pauli operator.

For $\bar{U}$ beyond the Clifford group, we now proceed inductively on the Clifford hierarchy. Specifically, assume all non-Pauli logical operators in the $k$th level of the Clifford hierarchy are unconfinable. Then braiding logical operators in the $(k + 1)$th level of the Clifford hierarchy must map logical Pauli operators to logical Pauli operators and so must be in the Clifford group. Since we have already shown that confinable logical operators in the Clifford group are logical Pauli operators, this completes the proof.

We now present our two main results, in the form of two Theorems. The first result is that any logical operator implemented by braiding in a topological stabiliser code is in the Clifford group. The second result is that the set of logical operators implementable by combinations of locality-preserving logical operators and braiding defects in a topological stabiliser code cannot be universal.

**Theorem 1.** The set of logical operators implementable by braiding defects in a topological stabiliser code is contained in the Clifford group.

**Proof.** Recall first that logical Pauli operators acting on qubits encoded in defects must be confinable. Thus, a braiding logical operator must take Pauli logical operators to confinable locality-preserving logical operators under conjugation. However, by Lemma 1, non-Pauli locality-preserving logical operators must be unconfinable. Thus, braiding defects must take Pauli logical operators to Pauli logical operators under conjugation, and so can only implement Clifford logical operators.

At its essence, Theorem 1 demonstrates a tension between locality-preserving logical operators and those that are obtained through braiding. Consider what would be required of a non-Clifford braiding logical operator if such an operator could be realised. Because a braiding logical operator must map locality-preserving logical operators to other locality-preserving logical operators under conjugation, this means that the admission of locality-preserving logical operators by a code introduces a new constraint on the type of braiding logical operators that it
can admit. In particular, as we have noted, logical qubits encoded in defects in topological stabiliser codes admit locality-preserving implementations of all Pauli logical operators. Note that this is not true of more general schemes that use braiding to realise logical operators in more exotic models. A non-Clifford braided logical operator would then have to take a Pauli operator to some non-Pauli locality-preserving logical operator. Thus, we conclude that the set of non-Pauli locality-preserving logical operators admitted by a defect setup is relevant to the braided logical operators it can admit.

Lemma 1 tells us that the structure of non-Pauli locality-preserving logical operators required by a defect setup does not maintain the intended spirit of the setup. In particular, we generally expect locality-preserving logical operators to have support on some closed loop (or in higher dimensions hypersurface) enclosing a defect or parts of defects. In higher dimensions, we allow for the possibility that defects may extend indefinitely to a boundary or periodically in some dimensions, but the same expectation still holds for Pauli logical operators considered in cross-sections in which the extent of the defect is finite. This expectation is what is encapsulated by the notion of confinability. However, as shown in Lemma 1, this is not true of non-Pauli logical operators. Pauli logical operators may be expanded to arbitrarily far away from the defects containing the logical qubits on which they act, and this property requires that non-Pauli logical operators can only transform these operators on a topologically non-trivial part of their support if they extend arbitrarily far away from the defects. The implication of this is that non-Pauli logical operators for logical qubits in defects have fundamentally different structures from their Pauli logical operators. As shown in Theorem 1, this prevents Pauli and non-Pauli logical operators from being interchanged by braiding, and so prevents non-Clifford logical operators by braiding.

We also note an interesting correspondence between our result and that of Ref. [35] for two dimensional models. Specifically, Ref. [35] highlighted an apparent trade-off between the locality-preserving logical operators admitted by a model and its braided logical operators. In particular, they find no instances of codes with a locality-preserving Pauli group admitting non-Clifford braiding logical operators. This is consistent with our findings, which confirm that transversal Pauli operators in topological stabiliser codes of any dimension prevent non-Clifford braided gates. Thus, our results suggest that the trade-off they describe in two dimensions may generalise to higher dimensional models as well.

**Theorem 2.** The set of logical operators implementable by any combination of locality-preserving logical operators and braiding logical operators in a topological stabiliser code cannot be universal.

**Proof.** By Theorem 1, non-Clifford logical operators cannot be implemented by braiding. Moreover, since the Clifford operators form a group, any product of braiding and locality-preserving logical operators can only be non-Clifford if at least one of the locality-preserving logical operators is non-Clifford. Any non-Pauli locality-preserving logical operator must be of larger dimension than the minimum dimension of a Pauli logical operator in the code, since it must intersect all implementations of some Pauli logical operator in a topologically non-trivial region. In particular, if all Pauli logical operators are of the same dimension then any locality-preserving Clifford logical operator must be of greater dimension than all Pauli logical operators. In that case, a non-Clifford locality-preserving logical operator cannot be implemented since it would have to increase the dimension of a locality-preserving logical operator and so would not preserve locality. Thus, a non-Clifford locality-preserving logical operator can only be implemented by a combination of braiding and locality-preserving logical operators if there exists some non-empty proper subset, \( Q \), of Pauli logical operators that are of a smaller dimension than all locality-preserving logical operators outside \( Q \). Since the Clifford group is insufficient for universal quantum computing, such a \( Q \) is necessary for universality.

However, any braiding logical operator preserves the dimension of locality-preserving logical operators by braiding. This is also true of locality-preserving logical operators \( Q \). Thus, all logical operators implemented by braiding and locality-preserving logical operators must map elements of \( Q \) to other elements of \( Q \). Thus, the subspace of the codespace invariant under \( Q \) must be invariant under combinations of locality-preserving and braiding logical operators. Hence, the set of such logical operators cannot be universal. This argument can be applied to either the full set of logical qubits, or a subset, and so it rules out the possibility that a universal set of such operators is admitted on any subset of logical qubits.

To illustrate the key ideas underpinning Theorem 2, we consider a simple example involving a single logical qubit. While the proof applies to the more general case of any number of logical qubits, this simple example is sufficient to convey the intuition underlying it. Specifically, a logical Hadamard operator can only be implemented on a logical qubit (either as a locality-preserving or braiding logical operator) if the dimensions of its \( Z \) and \( X \) logical operators are equal. This is because both types of operators preserve the dimension of locality-preserving logical operators under conjugation. However, any single qubit non-Clifford locality-preserving logical operator requires that the dimension of the \( X \) and \( Z \) operators be of different dimensions \( [4] \). A well-known instance of this is the two and three dimensional colour codes, which between them admit a universal set of transversal logical operators, but with no non-Clifford operator in the two dimen-
sional code and no Hadamard in the three dimensional case \[4\]. This dilemma applies to both locality-preserving and braiding logical operators under the same conditions, and so combining them does not help to resolve it.

We note that the fact that this dilemma applies to both types of operators leads one to wonder if the approaches to fault tolerance are more closely tied than they first appeared. In particular, recent work has studied the possibility of using a constant depth circuit to braid non-abelian anyons \[36, 37\]. If such a circuit could analogously be used to braid defects in topological stabiliser codes, then we would expect the logical operators implementable by such braiding in topological stabiliser codes to be constrained by the result of Ref. \[2\]. Our constraints on the logical operators implementable as locality-preserving logical operators and by braiding defects are indeed consistent with this result. Thus, our work is suggestive of the possibility that defect braiding in topological stabiliser codes may indeed be implementable using constant-depth circuits.

Discussion. — Our results provide strong limitations on the potential of braiding defects for the purpose of quantum gates in topological stabiliser codes, while also offering motivation for future work. Since they attract such widespread attention, we particularly emphasise the implications of our work for two dimensional defect-braiding schemes. In particular, we have shown that logical operators implemented by braiding defects in two dimensional topological stabiliser codes are restricted to the Clifford group. This also naturally generalises to two-dimensional abelian quantum double models \[31\]. Our results provide the strongest limitations on such schemes to date, and rule out the hope that further work may uncover such a scheme that admits a universal gate set. They imply that further work towards achieving universality with defects in two dimensional codes must include more sophisticated techniques, such as magic state distillation \[38\] or topological charge measurement, which lie outside the scope of this work.

For higher dimensional codes our results also place significant constraints, but the picture is more complicated. We note that our proof that the logical operators obtained by braiding defects in topological stabiliser codes of any dimension are contained in the Clifford group is a significantly stronger constraint than that for locality-preserving operators \[2\]. In particular, it is known that for any spatial dimension, \(D\), there exist \(D\)-dimensional topological stabiliser codes that admit transversal logical operators in the \(D\)th level of the Clifford hierarchy \[4, 36\]. One might expect that corresponding braiding logical operators in the \(D\)th level of the hierarchy could similarly be constructed. This expectation is furthered by the fact that higher dimensional topological stabiliser codes are known to admit a greater range of defects and braiding phenomena than two dimensional codes \[35\]. However, Theorem 1 shows that braiding logical operators are restricted to the Clifford group (the second level of the Clifford hierarchy) in all dimensions.

This surprisingly strong constraint suggests that realising the full potential of defect schemes in higher dimensional codes may require exploration of a broader range of phenomena than the standard encodings and braiding we have studied. In our companion paper \[31\], we begin such an exploration by allowing for less conventional encodings of logical qubits which have no analogue in two dimensional codes, such as those using a single extended defect or explicitly using more exotic non-eigenstate excitations to define computational basis states. We show in that paper that in such a broader framework, universality is still not achievable by braiding and locality-preserving logical operators. However, we do not rule out the possibility of non-Clifford braiding logical operators in such generalised schemes. As in two dimensions, however, universality still requires the use of additional techniques such as magic state distillation \[38\] or gauge fixing \[33, 42, 44\]. Such techniques require non-local classical processing and so are outside the scope of all our no-go theorems \[31, 34\].
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