

Encoding a qubit in a spin

Jonathan A. Gross^{1,*}

¹*Institut Quantique & Département de Physique, Université de Sherbrooke, Québec J1K 2R1, Canada*
(Dated: January 19, 2022)

I present a new approach for designing quantum error-correcting codes that guarantees a physically natural implementation of Clifford operations. Inspired by the scheme put forward by Gottesman, Kitaev, and Preskill for encoding a qubit in an oscillator, in which Clifford operations may be performed via Gaussian unitaries, this approach yields new schemes for encoding a qubit in a large spin in which single-qubit Clifford operations may be performed via spatial rotations. I construct all possible examples of such codes, provide universal-gate-set implementations using Hamiltonians that are at most quadratic in angular-momentum operators, and derive criteria for when these codes exactly correct physically relevant noise channels to lowest order, illustrating their performance numerically for specific low-dimensional examples.

Great quantum error-correcting codes shield quantum information from a noisy environment while simultaneously making it easily accessible to the programmer. The very name of these structures betrays an emphasis on the former goal, prioritizing the exact correction of the most likely errors. In this manuscript I develop an alternative approach to finding new codes that begins by ensuring straightforward logical manipulation of the encoded quantum information.

The encoding of a qubit in an oscillator described by Gottesman, Kitaev, and Preskill [1] is an example of a great error-correcting code. By construction, it protects against unwanted shifts in position and momentum up to a certain threshold. This protection also optimally corrects damping errors [2], which are the most prevalent sources of noise in the optical, superconducting, and mechanical systems for which the code is designed. One can also straightforwardly perform logical operations, since the full set of Clifford operations—the largest set of unitary gates that can be implemented easily—are realized by Hamiltonians at most quadratic in position and momentum—the largest set of Hamiltonians that are easy to engineer in an oscillator. For these reasons, the Gottesman-Kitaev-Preskill (GKP) code attracts considerable theoretical and experimental attention [3–7].

Other physical systems deserve their own great error-correction codes. While others have successfully adapted the stabilizer approach of GKP codes to protect against rotational errors [8], alternative single-system codes with easy Cliffords remain unexplored. I design such codes by starting with an algebra of physical Hamiltonians that are natural to the system at hand. The construction guarantees that a suitably large and discrete sets of unitary gates—such as logical Clifford operations—can be implemented using only these natural physical interactions. As a consequence these codes naturally offer resilience against relevant noise channels since environmental fluctuations typically take the form of such natural Hamiltonians. This approach therefore succeeds in allowing desired manipulations to be performed in a straightforward way while suppressing unwanted environmental

interference.

To put this philosophy into practice I demonstrate the construction for large single spins, such as atomic nuclei. Natural physical operations correspond to spatial rotations of the spin, so I construct all qubit codes on which logical single-qubit Cliffords can be implemented via these spatial rotations. The codes so constructed allow one to perform the entangling and non Clifford gates necessary for universal quantum computation with only marginally more complex Hamiltonians. They also automatically exhibit robustness against relevant environmental noise, including random rotations and T_1 and T_2 processes. By engineering the satisfaction of a single additional constraint—that the expectation value of J_z vanishes for one of the codewords—these codes exactly correct such environmental noise to lowest order, outperforming all previously studied encodings of qubits into qudits with respect to these errors. The success of the construction in this particular case builds confidence that the same approach will bear fruit in additional physical systems.

Encoding qubits in spins.—The physics of a system dictates which transformations are straightforward. For large single spins the relevant physics is angular momentum, and the easy transformations are generated by Hamiltonians linear in the angular-momentum operators J_x , J_y , and J_z . These Hamiltonians arise naturally in practice, for example as the result of driving the spin with a resonant AC magnetic field. The physical unitaries generated by these Hamiltonians form a representation of the special unitary group $SU(2)$ on the spin’s Hilbert space. The explicit map from an abstract $SU(2)$ element to its representative physical unitary is

$$D : \exp(-i\theta \hat{\mathbf{n}} \cdot \boldsymbol{\sigma}/2) \mapsto \exp(-i\theta \hat{\mathbf{n}} \cdot \mathbf{J}), \quad (1)$$

where $\boldsymbol{\sigma}$ is the vector of abstract Pauli matrices and \mathbf{J} is the vector of the spin’s angular-momentum operators. These representative unitaries are a significantly restricted subgroup of the most general physical unitaries that can act on the large spin’s Hilbert space. Since these restricted unitaries are straightforward to implement, the

goal is to find a codespace where the maximum number of logical unitaries can be implemented by physically applying the $SU(2)$ representatives.

Any $SU(2)$ representative that realizes a logical unitary must map the codespace to itself. Because the $SU(2)$ representation for a large single spin is an irreducible representation (irrep), the only subspaces mapped to themselves by the full set of $SU(2)$ representatives are the trivial subspace containing only the zero vector and the full Hilbert space of the spin. Neither of these alternatives is a viable codespace. The consequence of this observation is that one must limit oneself to a proper subset of $SU(2)$ representatives when searching for easy physical implementations of logical operations.

I consider two particularly relevant subsets that are representations of finite subgroups of $SU(2)$. The subgroup to which I dedicate the most attention is known to quantum-information scientists as the single-qubit Clifford group [9], also called the binary octahedral group 2O because it is the double cover of the rotational symmetry group of the octahedron in the same way $SU(2)$ is the double cover of $SO(3)$. The techniques used for 2O are easily adapted to other finite subgroups of $SU(2)$, and I comment on an important example from the binary icosahedral group 2I.

For the sake of clarity I now specialize to the subgroup 2O. The advantage of restricting the set of physical operations to the representatives of 2O is that these physical operations map nontrivial subspaces to themselves, and these subspaces provide candidate codespaces. Specifically, the desired qubit codespaces are two-dimensional subspaces of the spin's Hilbert space that are mapped to themselves by 2O representatives, and on which nontrivial representative unitaries act nontrivially (since the point is for these physical unitaries to act as logical Clifford gates). In the language of representation theory, the codespaces should be faithful two-dimensional irreps of 2O obtained by restricting the $SU(2)$ irrep to the 2O representatives.

The criteria for the desired codespaces having been established, I now present the representation theory of 2O needed to establish their existence.

Identifying binary-octahedral irreps.—The generators for 2O, concretely realized as 2×2 special-unitary matrices, are the phase and Hadamard gates

$$S = \exp\left(-i\frac{\pi}{2}\hat{\mathbf{z}} \cdot \boldsymbol{\sigma}/2\right) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(1 - i\sigma_z) \quad (2)$$

$$H = \exp\left(-i\pi\frac{\hat{\mathbf{x}}+\hat{\mathbf{z}}}{\sqrt{2}} \cdot \boldsymbol{\sigma}/2\right) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(-i\sigma_x - i\sigma_z). \quad (3)$$

The unusual phases are a consequence of the convention to enforce the unit-determinant constraint of special unitaries. Being a finite group of 48 elements, 2O possesses only a finite number of irreps. As detailed in the Supplemental Material [10], only two of these irreps satisfy the criteria of being two dimensional and acting as logical Clifford gates. Label these two irreps ϱ_4 and ϱ_5 in

$SU(2)$ -irrep dim.	ϱ_4 mult.	ϱ_5 mult.
$24q$	$2q$	$2q$
$24q + 2$	$2q + 1$	$2q$
$24q + 4$	$2q$	$2q$
$24q + 6$	$2q$	$2q + 1$
$24q + 8$	$2q + 1$	$2q + 1$
$24q + 10$	$2q + 1$	$2q$
$24q + 12$	$2q + 1$	$2q + 1$
$24q + 14$	$2q + 1$	$2q + 2$
$24q + 16$	$2q + 1$	$2q + 1$
$24q + 18$	$2q + 2$	$2q + 1$
$24q + 20$	$2q + 2$	$2q + 2$
$24q + 22$	$2q + 1$	$2q + 2$

TABLE I. Multiplicities of the irreps of interest, ϱ_4 and ϱ_5 , in the reducible 2O representation derived from the even-dimensional $SU(2)$ irreps. Because these irreps only appear in even dimensions, and their multiplicities follow a pattern that repeats every 24 dimensions, the dimension is presented in the form $24q + 2p$, where q is any non-negative integer and $0 \leq p \leq 11$.

recognition of their place amongst the other irreps of 2O. These irreps are inequivalent as complex representations, ϱ_4 straightforwardly mapping $S \mapsto S$ and $H \mapsto H$, but ϱ_5 mapping $S \mapsto -S$ and $H \mapsto -H$. This inequivalence means that codespaces cannot be split between these two irreps, but since the projective action of a unitary $U : \rho \mapsto U\rho U^\dagger$ is all that is relevant from a quantum perspective, the two representations behave identically when considered separately.

Having identified the two relevant irreps, the task now is to determine whether they appear in the decompositions of the reducible 2O representations obtained by restricting the $SU(2)$ irreps to the 2O representatives. The decomposition of an irrep of a group into irreps of a subgroup proceeds according to what are called *branching rules* [11]. The characters of the representations in question are extraordinarily useful in computing such branching rules. These characters are functions of the group elements obtained by taking traces of the matrices assigned to them by the representation:

$$\chi_D(g) = \text{tr}(D(g)). \quad (4)$$

Characters of irreps are orthonormal under a suitable inner product, and characters of reducible representations are sums of the characters of the irreps into which they decompose. Therefore, by taking inner products of reducible characters with the various irrep characters one determines the multiplicity with which each irrep appears in a given reducible representation.

The result of the calculation, worked out explicitly in the Supplemental Material [10], is that the irreps of interest do not appear at all in integer spins (with odd-dimensional Hilbert spaces). The multiplicities of these

irreps in the half-integer spins increase according to a pattern that repeats every 24 dimensions, presented in Table I. Spin 1/2 (dimension 2) contains the standard irrep of 2O, but given that this is the entirety of the Hilbert space it does not provide a code. Spin 3/2 (dimension 4) does not contain any of the irreps of interest, being instead a 4-dimensional irrep of 2O. For spin 5/2 (dimension 6) and above, however, every half-integer spin contains at least one two-dimensional codespace on which 2O representatives perform logical Clifford operations.

This result identifies how many codespaces exist in each large single spin. The next step is to explicitly construct these codes and determine their additional properties.

Constructing example codes.—Producing explicit codewords proceeds by building projectors onto irreps ϱ_4 and ϱ_5 . The projector onto irrep ϱ of dimension $\dim \varrho$ within reducible representation D emerges as the sum

$$P_\varrho = \frac{\dim \varrho}{|2O|} \sum_{g \in 2O} \chi_\varrho(g)^* D(g), \quad (5)$$

where $|2O| = 48$ is the order of the binary-octahedral group. The codeword $|\bar{0}\rangle$ is taken to be an element of the +1 eigenspace of the irrep Pauli $\bar{\sigma}_z$, where irrep Paulis are defined by

$$\bar{\sigma}_w := P_\varrho (i \exp(-i\pi J_w)) P_\varrho. \quad (6)$$

To obtain $|\bar{1}\rangle$, simply apply $\bar{\sigma}_x$ to $|\bar{0}\rangle$. If the irrep ϱ occurs with multiplicity 1, then the +1 eigenspace of $\bar{\sigma}_z$ is one dimensional, and no further choices are required. If the irrep ϱ occurs with higher multiplicity, further properties of the code can be engineered as explored in the discussion of the error-correction conditions by making an appropriate choice for $|\bar{0}\rangle$ within the multidimensional +1 eigenspace of $\bar{\sigma}_z$. Table II gives the explicit codewords for the four lowest-dimensional codes, each corresponding to an irrep appearing with multiplicity 1. Figure 1 depicts the Wigner functions for these same codes, defined via a self-dual kernel obeying the Stratonovitch-Weyl postulates for SU(2) [12, 13]. See the Supplemental Material [10] for more details.

Computing with encoded qubits.—Employing these codes in the service of quantum computation requires the ability to do more than single-qubit logical Clifford operations. I focus now on the following minimal set of logical operations required for universal quantum computation,

$$\{\mathcal{P}_{|\bar{0}\rangle}, \mathcal{M}_{\bar{\sigma}_z}, \bar{S}, \bar{H}, \bar{CZ}\} \cup \{\bar{T}\}, \quad (7)$$

where the bars denote logical operators, \mathcal{P} denotes state preparation, and \mathcal{M} denotes operator measurement. In this set, the single-qubit Cliffords are generated by \bar{S} and \bar{H} , multi-qubit Cliffords are obtained by the addition of \bar{CZ} , and \bar{T} supplies a non Clifford gate. Since these allow efficient arbitrarily precise approximation of all logical

Spin	Irrep	Codewords
5/2	ϱ_5	$ \bar{0}\rangle = \sqrt{\frac{1}{6}} \left \frac{5}{2}, \frac{5}{2} \right\rangle - \sqrt{\frac{5}{6}} \left \frac{5}{2}, -\frac{3}{2} \right\rangle$ $ \bar{1}\rangle = -\sqrt{\frac{5}{6}} \left \frac{5}{2}, \frac{3}{2} \right\rangle + \sqrt{\frac{1}{6}} \left \frac{5}{2}, -\frac{5}{2} \right\rangle$
7/2	ϱ_5	$ \bar{0}\rangle = \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2} \left \frac{7}{2}, \frac{5}{2} \right\rangle - \frac{1}{2} \left \frac{7}{2}, -\frac{3}{2} \right\rangle$ $ \bar{1}\rangle = \frac{1}{2} \left \frac{7}{2}, \frac{3}{2} \right\rangle - \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2} \left \frac{7}{2}, -\frac{5}{2} \right\rangle$
7/2	ϱ_4	$ \bar{0}\rangle = \sqrt{\frac{7}{12}} \left \frac{7}{2}, \frac{1}{2} \right\rangle + \sqrt{\frac{5}{12}} \left \frac{7}{2}, -\frac{7}{2} \right\rangle$ $ \bar{1}\rangle = -\sqrt{\frac{5}{2}} \left \frac{7}{2}, \frac{7}{2} \right\rangle - \sqrt{\frac{7}{2}} \left \frac{7}{2}, -\frac{1}{2} \right\rangle$
9/2	ϱ_4	$ \bar{0}\rangle = \frac{\sqrt{6}}{4} \left \frac{9}{2}, \frac{9}{2} \right\rangle + \frac{\sqrt{21}}{6} \left \frac{9}{2}, \frac{1}{2} \right\rangle + \frac{\sqrt{6}}{12} \left \frac{9}{2}, -\frac{7}{2} \right\rangle$ $ \bar{1}\rangle = \frac{\sqrt{6}}{12} \left \frac{9}{2}, \frac{7}{2} \right\rangle + \frac{\sqrt{21}}{6} \left \frac{9}{2}, -\frac{1}{2} \right\rangle + \frac{\sqrt{6}}{4} \left \frac{9}{2}, -\frac{9}{2} \right\rangle$

TABLE II. Codewords for the four lowest-dimensional non-trivial examples of 2O-irrep codes.

unitaries, the ability to prepare at least one logical state (here chosen to be $\mathcal{P}_{|\bar{0}\rangle}$) and perform at least one measurement (here chosen to be $\mathcal{M}_{\bar{\sigma}_z}$) results in universal quantum computation.

By construction these codes have Pauli and single-qubit Clifford operations realizable with Hamiltonians linear in angular-momentum operators (the SU(2) representation). This construction gives the codes special structure in the J_z basis which additionally provides explicit recipes for measuring logical Paulis, performing logical \bar{CZ} gates between two encoded qubits, and performing logical \bar{T} gates.

To efficiently discuss this structure, I introduce the following notation for a nondegenerate Hermitian operator A :

$$\text{supp}_A |\psi\rangle := \{\lambda \mid A|\lambda\rangle = \lambda|\lambda\rangle \text{ and } \langle\lambda|\psi\rangle \neq 0\}. \quad (8)$$

This choice leverages the notation for the support of a function, since a vector $|\psi\rangle$ is a function from the eigenbasis of A to the complex numbers and nondegeneracy of A ensures a one-to-one relation between the eigenvectors and eigenvalues.

As shown explicitly in the Supplemental Material [10], restricting to codespaces where S and X are effected by the corresponding SU(2) representatives implies

$$\text{supp}_{J_z} |\bar{0}\rangle \subseteq \begin{cases} +\frac{1}{2} + 4\mathbf{Z} \\ -\frac{3}{2} + 4\mathbf{Z} \end{cases} \quad (9a)$$

$$\text{supp}_{J_z} |\bar{1}\rangle = -\text{supp}_{J_z} |\bar{0}\rangle, \quad (9b)$$

where the term $4\mathbf{Z}$ indicates the set of all integer multiples of 4. This structure means that one can perform a controlled- Z gate (\bar{CZ}) using a strategy similar to that used for rotation-symmetric bosonic codes [14]. In the bosonic case, a cross-Kerr interaction $a^\dagger a \otimes a^\dagger a$ generates the CROT gate used to perform \bar{CZ} on the codespaces. In




FIG. 1. Wigner functions for $|\bar{0}\rangle$, $|\bar{1}\rangle$, and the codespace projector in order from left to right for several different codes. The positive z axis passes through the point of fourfold rotational symmetry at the top of the sphere, and the x and y axis pass through the additional fourfold-rotational-symmetry points of the code projector along the equator. Note that, due to the realization of single-qubit Cliffords by $SU(2)$ rotations, the Wigner function for $|\bar{1}\rangle$ is simply the Wigner function for $|\bar{0}\rangle$ turned upside down, and the code projector has the symmetry of a cube/octahedron.

the spin case, the analogous $J_z \otimes J_z$ interaction performs the \overline{CZ} gate (up to individual J_z corrections). As worked out in the Supplemental Material [10], the \overline{CZ} gate takes the following form:

$$\overline{CZ} = \exp(i\frac{\pi}{2}J_z \otimes \mathbb{1}) \exp(i\frac{\pi}{2}\mathbb{1} \otimes J_z) \exp(-i\pi J_z \otimes J_z). \quad (10)$$

Again, like in rotation-symmetric bosonic codes, a slightly more complicated single-system Hamiltonian yields a more exotic gate. A self-Kerr interaction $(a^\dagger a)^2$ allows one to perform an \bar{S} gate on the bosonic codes. The 2O-irrep codes already have an \bar{S} gate using linear Hamiltonians, so adding the analogous J_z^2 interaction allows one to perform a \bar{T} gate (again up to a J_z correction). The \bar{T} gate so obtained, as worked out in the Supplemental Material [10], takes the following forms for the two different $|\bar{0}\rangle$ supports:

$$\bar{T} = \begin{cases} \exp(-i\frac{\pi}{4}J_z) \exp(-i\frac{\pi}{4}J_z^2) & m_0 = \frac{1}{2} \\ \exp(-i\frac{5\pi}{4}J_z) \exp(-i\frac{\pi}{4}J_z^2) & m_0 = -\frac{3}{2} \end{cases} \quad (11)$$

Destructive measurement in the $\bar{\sigma}_z$ eigenbasis is possible via projecting onto the corresponding angular-momentum basis due to the disjoint support of the eigenstates in these bases. A nondestructive measurement can be realized with an additional encoded qubit coupled via a \overline{CZ} gate which can then be measured destructively as previously described.

Due to the octahedral symmetry of these codes, all the above constructions hold when replacing z with x or y .

Correcting errors.—As alluded to in the introduction, the fact that only a finite subset of $SU(2)$ representatives preserve the codespace suggests that these codes might

correct errors taking the form of small random $SU(2)$ representatives in much the same way that GKP codes protect from small random displacements. I therefore consider noise generated by the Lindblad master equation

$$d\rho = \gamma dt \sum_{w \in \{x,y,z\}} (J_w \rho J_w - \frac{1}{2} J_w^2 \rho - \frac{1}{2} \rho J_w^2), \quad (12)$$

where γ is the depolarizing rate. For $\gamma dt \ll 1$, the following Kraus operators map $\rho \mapsto \rho + d\rho$:

$$E_0 = \mathbb{1} - \frac{1}{2}\gamma dt \|\mathbf{J}\|^2 = (1 - \frac{j(j+1)}{2}\gamma dt)\mathbb{1} \quad (13)$$

$$E_w = \sqrt{\gamma dt} J_w. \quad (14)$$

Correcting the errors corresponding to these Kraus operators is equivalent to correcting random rotations to lowest order. In spin systems it may be more natural to think of the dominant noise sources in terms of T_2 -type dephasing errors J_z , T_1 -type relaxation errors J_- , and thermalization errors J_+ . Since these error operators are linear combinations of the random-rotation error operators, correcting either family of errors is equivalent. This mirrors the situation in GKP codes, whose manifest protection of random-displacement errors extends to relaxation errors as well [2].

The elements of the quantum-error-correction matrix indicate whether the codes exactly correct such errors. The exact-correction condition [15] is

$$\langle \bar{a} | E_j E_k | \bar{b} \rangle = C_{jk} \delta_{ab}. \quad (15)$$

Because of the octahedral symmetry of the codes, the

conditions reduce to

$$\langle \bar{a} | J_z^2 | \bar{b} \rangle = C_{zz} \delta_{ab} \quad (16a)$$

$$\langle \bar{a} | J_x J_y | \bar{b} \rangle = C_{xy} \delta_{ab} \quad (16b)$$

$$\langle \bar{a} | J_z | \bar{b} \rangle = C_{0z} \delta_{ab}. \quad (16c)$$

Many of these are automatically satisfied by construction. Because the $SU(2)$ unitary that inverts J_z also exchanges $|\bar{0}\rangle$ and $|\bar{1}\rangle$,

$$\langle \bar{1} | J_z^2 | \bar{1} \rangle = \langle \bar{0} | (-J_z)^2 | \bar{0} \rangle = \langle \bar{0} | J_z^2 | \bar{0} \rangle, \quad (17)$$

and because $|\bar{0}\rangle$ and $|\bar{1}\rangle$ have disjoint support on J_z ,

$$\langle \bar{0} | J_z^2 | \bar{1} \rangle = \langle \bar{1} | J_z^2 | \bar{0} \rangle = 0, \quad (18)$$

completing verification of Eq. (16a).

Since $J_x J_y \propto J_+^2 - 2J_z - J_-^2$ and $\langle \bar{a} | J_\pm^2 | \bar{b} \rangle = 0$ due to Eq. (9), Eqs. (16b) and (16c) are equivalent to one another. An additional invocation of the support structure of Eq. (9) and the J_z inversion yields

$$\langle \bar{0} | J_z | \bar{1} \rangle = \langle \bar{1} | J_z | \bar{0} \rangle = 0 \quad (19a)$$

$$\langle \bar{1} | J_z | \bar{1} \rangle = -\langle \bar{0} | J_z | \bar{0} \rangle. \quad (19b)$$

The error-correction conditions are therefore satisfied if and only if $\langle \bar{0} | J_z | \bar{0} \rangle = 0$.

In general it is not the case that $\langle \bar{0} | J_z | \bar{0} \rangle = 0$. For example, in all the codes explicitly presented earlier, $|\bar{0}\rangle$ has a nonzero J_z expectation value. However, if an irrep appears with higher multiplicity, and the projection of J_z onto the $+1$ eigenspace of $\bar{\sigma}_z$ has both positive and negative eigenvalues (or a 0 eigenvalue), then a propitious choice for $|\bar{0}\rangle$ ensures that the quantum-error-correction criteria are exactly satisfied for these first-order rotation errors. The first spin in which one of the irreps appears with higher multiplicity is spin $13/2$. The two eigenvalues of J_z projected onto the $+1$ eigenspace of $\bar{\sigma}_z$ are $-13/6$ and $5/2$, with associated eigenvectors

$$|\bar{0}_{-13/6}\rangle = \frac{\sqrt{910}}{56} \left| \frac{13}{2}, \frac{13}{2} \right\rangle - \frac{3\sqrt{154}}{56} \left| \frac{13}{2}, \frac{5}{2} \right\rangle - \frac{\sqrt{770}}{56} \left| \frac{13}{2}, -\frac{3}{2} \right\rangle + \frac{\sqrt{70}}{56} \left| \frac{13}{2}, -\frac{11}{2} \right\rangle \quad (20)$$

$$|\bar{0}_{5/2}\rangle = \frac{\sqrt{231}}{84} \left| \frac{13}{2}, \frac{13}{2} \right\rangle + \frac{\sqrt{1365}}{84} \left| \frac{13}{2}, \frac{5}{2} \right\rangle - \frac{\sqrt{273}}{28} \left| \frac{13}{2}, -\frac{3}{2} \right\rangle - \frac{\sqrt{3003}}{84} \left| \frac{13}{2}, -\frac{11}{2} \right\rangle. \quad (21)$$

To get a codeword with zero J_z expectation value one takes linear combinations of the following form:

$$|\bar{0}_\phi\rangle = \frac{\sqrt{105}}{14} |\bar{0}_{-13/6}\rangle + e^{i\phi} \frac{\sqrt{91}}{14} |\bar{0}_{5/2}\rangle. \quad (22)$$

Considerations for first-order correction of random-rotation errors make no distinction between different values of the phase ϕ , leaving a free parameter that may be further optimized over.

Since nuclear spins are obvious host systems for these codes, it would be nice to have examples with good error-correcting properties in a Hilbert space of dimension at

most 10 (corresponding to the largest available nuclei of spin $9/2$). The smallest spin with a Hilbert space for large-enough J_x , J_y , and J_z errors to map the codespace to orthogonal error subspaces is spin $7/2$. As just demonstrated, the 2O codespaces in spin $7/2$ do not have this property. Using the same tools developed for 2O, one can construct a qubit codespace in spin $7/2$ on which one can use $SU(2)$ representatives to perform gates corresponding to the symmetries of a regular icosahedron:

$$|\bar{0}\rangle = \sqrt{\frac{3}{10}} \left| \frac{7}{2}, \frac{7}{2} \right\rangle + \sqrt{\frac{7}{10}} \left| \frac{7}{2}, -\frac{3}{2} \right\rangle \quad (23)$$

$$|\bar{1}\rangle = \sqrt{\frac{7}{10}} \left| \frac{7}{2}, \frac{3}{2} \right\rangle - \sqrt{\frac{3}{10}} \left| \frac{7}{2}, -\frac{7}{2} \right\rangle \quad (24)$$

Unlike the spin- $7/2$ 2O codes, this spin- $7/2$ binary-icosahedral (2I) code *does* correct small random-rotation errors. Since the images of the codewords under the various errors span the whole Hilbert space without any overlap, this code is analogous to a perfect block code.

Measuring code performance.—To evaluate the performance of these codes under finite-strength random-rotation channels I compute the entanglement fidelity after application of the optimal recovery channel using the semidefinite-programming technique described in [16]. As a reference I compare to the best previously-considered single-system codes in the given Hilbert space. These are the minimal qudit codes [17] designed to protect against a discrete set of J_z -rotation errors and the finite-dimensional analogues of the GKP code [1, 18] designed to protect against a discrete set of noncommuting errors. While the minimal qudit codes are defined for all Hilbert spaces of dimension $4k+2$, The smallest-dimensional example of a qudit GKP code is in spin $17/2$.

Note that decoherence-free subspaces and noiseless subsystems for random-rotation errors do not exist in the Hilbert spaces of large single spins since these errors generate an irrep. Another family of codes designed to protect against rotation errors are molecular codes [8]. In their current formulation, these codes are built in spaces that are direct sums of $SU(2)$ irreps and additionally protect against shifts in total angular momentum, making direct comparison difficult.

For small spins where the irreps ρ_4 and ρ_5 appear with multiplicity 1, the nonzero J_z expectation value of the code words results in performance that is only marginally better than that of the minimal qudit codes. The spin- $13/2$ codes defined by Eq. (22) exhibit dramatic improvement over the minimal qudit code, as seen in the left panel of Fig. 2.

Enlarging the Hilbert space to spin $17/2$, the qudit GKP code shows a significant performance increase over the minimal qudit code due to its ability to correct noncommuting errors. The irrep that appears in spin $17/2$ with multiplicity 2 beats all these codes by several orders of magnitude, however, as demonstrated in Fig. 2.

These simulations demonstrate how well *in princi-*




FIG. 2. Left: comparison in spin $13/2$ of the minimal qudit code (min. qudit) with 2O-irrep codes exactly satisfying the quantum-error-correction conditions for first-order random-rotation errors. The first-order correction criteria leave a phase unspecified for the codespace, so both the best and worst choices for the phase are plotted. All choices of the undetermined phase exhibit multiple orders of magnitude of improvement over the minimal qudit code, illustrating the power of satisfying the first-order correction criteria. Right: analogous comparison for spin $17/2$ with the addition of the performance of the smallest qudit GKP code (qudit GKP). The qudit GKP code is a substantial improvement upon the minimal qudit code, but still dramatically underperforms the 2O-irrep codes which satisfy the quantum-error-correction criteria, regardless of the choice of phase for small-enough evolution times.

ple this new family of codes can correct against errors, leaving the exact operations required for error correction unspecified. The highly noncommutative nature of $\{J_x, J_y, J_z\}$ errors makes the definition of physically natural commuting stabilizers difficult, though one can use the structure of the support in the angular-momentum basis defined in Eq. (9) to build noncommuting projectors that are analogous to stabilizers. The construction of practical error-correction procedures using such elements is an ongoing project.

Generalizing to other systems.—The construction presented for spin codes exemplifies a more general procedure. One can replace the representation of the Lie algebra $\mathfrak{su}(2)$ given by angular-momentum operators with any representation of a Lie algebra \mathfrak{g} given by physically natural Hamiltonians on a Hilbert space. Exponentiating these Hamiltonians will generate easily implementable unitaries forming a representation of a Lie group G analogous to $SU(2)$. One will then want to consider a discrete subgroup $K \subset G$ just as I considered $2O \subset SU(2)$. The representation of G restricts to a representation of K , and the small-dimensional irreps of K into which this representation decomposes form the candidate codespaces. At this point one must tailor the procedure to the particular set of errors and the particular discrete subgroup K . When considering random rotations, the error-correction conditions were greatly simplified because the noise was generated by Lindblad operators taken from a subalgebra of $\mathfrak{su}(2)$ and $2O$ contained a rich set of symmetries of this subalgebra. One expects similar simplifications to take place in the more general case when analogous

structure is present. Some obvious candidate Lie-algebra representations are those given by quadratic bosonic and fermionic Hamiltonians. Pursuing the bosonic Hamiltonians brings the prospect of finding additional GKP-like codes in oscillators, though the noncompact nature of the Gaussian unitaries they generate presents qualitatively different challenges than encountered in the $SU(2)$ case. Quadratic fermionic Hamiltonians generate compact Lie groups [19, Thm. 13.1], and so provide an arena for a much more straightforward application of the techniques presented here.

Conclusion.—In this manuscript I have constructed all single-spin qubit codes admitting Cliffords via $SU(2)$ unitaries. These codes exist for all half-integer spins larger than $3/2$ and admit the entangling gate \overline{CZ} and the non Clifford gate \overline{T} via Hamiltonians quadratic in angular-momentum operators. I have also exhibited codes in spins as small as $7/2$ that exactly protect against random-rotation errors to first order. In addition to showing how to build better qubits out of large spins, these achievements illustrate the power of the finite-group-representation approach. Adapting these techniques to systems with different algebras of natural Hamiltonians offers a new path by which to discover useful quantum-error-correcting codes.

I thank Arne L. Grimsmo and Joshua Combes for their insights regarding adapting gate techniques from rotation-symmetric bosonic codes, Clément Godfrin and Éva Dupont-Ferrier for inspiring conversations about error correction in spin qubits, Asaf Diring and Daniel Carney for helpful discussions about the representation

theory used in this construction, the Les Houches school “Quantum Information Machines” for hospitality during a portion of this work, and Alexandre Blais for guidance and direction throughout the project. This research was undertaken thanks in part to funding from the Canada First Research Excellence Fund and from NSERC.

* jonathan.gross@usherbrooke.ca

- [1] D. Gottesman, A. Kitaev, and J. Preskill, “Encoding a qubit in an oscillator,” *Physical Review A* **64**, 012310 (2001).
- [2] K. Noh, V. V. Albert, and L. Jiang, “Quantum capacity bounds of Gaussian thermal loss channels and achievable rates with Gottesman-Kitaev-Preskill codes,” *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory* **65**, 2563 (2019).
- [3] S. Glancy and E. Knill, “Error analysis for encoding a qubit in an oscillator,” *Physical Review A* **73**, 012325 (2006).
- [4] D. J. Weigand and B. M. Terhal, “Generating grid states from Schrödinger-cat states without postselection,” *Physical Review A* **97**, 022341 (2018).
- [5] B. Q. Baragiola, G. Pantaleoni, R. N. Alexander, A. Karanjai, and N. C. Menicucci, “All-Gaussian universality and fault tolerance with the Gottesman-Kitaev-Preskill code,” *arXiv:1903.00012 [quant-ph]* (2019), arXiv: 1903.00012.
- [6] C. Flühmann, T. L. Nguyen, M. Marinelli, V. Negnevitsky, K. Mehta, and J. P. Home, “Encoding a qubit in a trapped-ion mechanical oscillator,” *Nature* **566**, 513 (2019).
- [7] P. Campagne-Ibarcq, A. Eickbusch, S. Touzard, E. Zayls-Geller, N. E. Frattini, V. V. Sivak, P. Reinhold, S. Puri, S. Shankar, R. J. Schoelkopf, L. Frunzio, M. Mirrahimi, and M. H. Devoret, “A stabilized logical quantum bit encoded in grid states of a superconducting cavity,” *arXiv:1907.12487 [quant-ph]* (2019), arXiv: 1907.12487.
- [8] V. V. Albert, J. P. Covey, and J. Preskill, “Robust encoding of a qubit in a molecule,” *arXiv:1911.00099 [cond-mat, physics:physics, physics:quant-ph]* (2019), arXiv: 1911.00099 version: 1.
- [9] D. Gottesman, “The heisenberg representation of quantum computers,” *arXiv:quant-ph/9807006* (1998), arXiv: quant-ph/9807006.
- [10] See supplemental material.
- [11] M. Fallbacher, “Breaking classical Lie groups to finite subgroups - an automated approach,” *Nuclear Physics B* **898**, 229 (2015), arXiv: 1506.03677.
- [12] R. L. Stratonovich, “On distributions in representation space,” *Soviet Physics JETP-USSR* **4**, 891 (1957).
- [13] S. Heiss and S. Weigert, “Discrete Moyal-type representations for a spin,” *Physical Review A* **63**, 012105 (2000).
- [14] A. L. Grimsmo, J. Combes, and B. Q. Baragiola, “Quantum computing with rotation-symmetric bosonic codes,” *arXiv:1901.08071 [quant-ph]* (2019), arXiv: 1901.08071.
- [15] E. Knill and R. Laflamme, “Theory of quantum error-correcting codes,” *Physical Review A* **55**, 900 (1997).
- [16] K. Audenaert and B. De Moor, “Optimizing completely positive maps using semidefinite programming,” *Physical Review A* **65**, 030302 (2002).
- [17] S. Pirandola, S. Mancini, S. L. Braunstein, and D. Vitali, “Minimal qudit code for a qubit in the phase-damping channel,” *Physical Review A* **77**, 032309 (2008).
- [18] C. Cafaro, F. Maiolini, and S. Mancini, “Quantum stabilizer codes embedding qubits into qudits,” *Physical Review A* **86**, 022308 (2012).
- [19] D. H. Sattinger and O. L. Weaver, *Lie groups and algebras with applications to physics, geometry, and mechanics*, Vol. 61 (Springer Science & Business Media, 2013).
- [20] T. Dokchitser, “GroupNames,” <https://people.maths.bris.ac.uk/~matyd/GroupNames/index.html> (2020), [Online; accessed 2-April-2020].

Supplemental Material

Irrep multiplicities

To decompose reducible 2O representations into their irreps, I make use of the characters of the relevant representations. The character of a representation D maps group elements to their traces in the representation:

$$\chi_D(g) = \text{tr}(D(g)). \quad (25)$$

Because the trace doesn't change when you conjugate by an invertible matrix, the character is constant on conjugacy classes $[g] = \{h \mid \exists x : g = xhx^{-1}\}$ of the group, and therefore it's efficient to present a character by specifying its values on the conjugacy classes. The group 2O has 8 conjugacy classes, which implies that it has only 8 irreps. Representative elements for each conjugacy class and their images under the characters of the irreps of interest ϱ_4 and ϱ_5 are presented in Table III.

Since the reducible representations of interest come from irreps of $\text{SU}(2)$, the Weyl character formula provides the character values, which only depend of the value of θ in $e^{-i\theta\hat{\mathbf{n}}\cdot\boldsymbol{\sigma}/2}$:

$$\chi_{D^{(d)}}(e^{-i\theta\hat{\mathbf{n}}\cdot\boldsymbol{\sigma}/2}) = \frac{\sin d\frac{\theta}{2}}{\sin \frac{\theta}{2}}. \quad (26)$$

Using the recursive multiple-angle formula $\sin n\theta = 2 \cos \theta \sin(n-1)\theta - \sin(n-2)\theta$ together with $\sin 2\theta / \sin \theta = 2 \cos \theta$ yields a recursive formula for the characters:

$$\chi_{D^{(d)}} = \chi_{D^{(2)}} \cdot \chi_{D^{(d-1)}} - \chi_{D^{(d-2)}}, \quad (27)$$

where \cdot denotes pointwise function multiplication: $(f \cdot g)(x) := f(x)g(x)$. The representation $D^{(1)}$ is the trivial representation mapping every group element to the scalar 1, and corresponds with the 2O irrep labeled ϱ_1 . The representation $D^{(2)}$ is the defining representation for $\text{SU}(2)$, and corresponds with the 2O irrep labeled ϱ_4 . Knowing these characters allows one to compute the characters of all the remaining 2O representations derived from $\text{SU}(2)$ irreps. Conjugacy class 1 is the identity representative, which simply yields the value d . Conjugacy class 2 is only slightly more complicated, yielded $(-1)^{d+1}d$. All other conjugacy classes have character values that are periodic in the dimension, which can be verified as a consequence of the recursive formula by observing the repeated occurrence of two elements in order. Class 3 repeats with period 3, classes 4a and 4b repeat with period 4, class 6 repeats with period 6, and classes 8a and 8b repeat with period 8, all shown in Table IV. This means all but the first two columns repeat with period 24.

One important property of the characters of the irreps is their orthonormality under the inner product

$$\langle \chi_1, \chi_2 \rangle = \frac{1}{|G|} \sum_{[g]} |[g]| \chi_1([g])^* \chi_2([g]). \quad (28)$$

Here $|G|$ is the order of the group (number of group elements) and $|[g]|$ is the order of the conjugacy class $[g]$. Since the character of a reducible representation is the sum of the characters of its irreps, one can count the occurrences of an irrep in a reducible representation by taking the inner product of their characters.

Taking the inner products $\langle \chi_{\varrho_4}, \chi_{D^{(d)}} \rangle$ and $\langle \chi_{\varrho_5}, \chi_{D^{(d)}} \rangle$ (where $\chi_{D^{(d)}}$ indicates the character of the representation obtained from the d -dimensional irrep of $\text{SU}(2)$), I leverage the patterns observed in $\chi_{D^{(d)}}$ to demonstrate that the irreps of interest do not appear in odd dimensions, and obtain the period-24 formulae given in the main text for the ϱ_4 and ϱ_5 multiplicities in even dimensions.

The same procedure can be carried out for other discrete subgroups of $\text{SU}(2)$. The double covers of the symmetry groups for the other platonic solids are especially interesting to consider. These are the binary tetrahedral group 2T (for the tetrahedron) and the binary icosahedral group 2I (for the icosahedron and its dual, the dodecahedron). For the sake of completeness I tabulate the characters and multiplicities within the restrictions of $\text{SU}(2)$ irreps of the irreps of 2T, 2O, and 2I in Tables V to IX. These tables have been adapted from [20], from where the convention for irrep and conjugacy-class labels have also been adopted.

Spin Wigner functions

The graphical representations of spin operators used in this manuscript are analogous to the Wigner functions so often used to illustrate harmonic-oscillator operators. As the set of spin coherent states forms a sphere in contrast

class	1	2	3	4a	4b	6	8a	8b
size	1	1	8	6	12	8	6	6
rep. elem.	[1] [-1]	$[\frac{1}{2}(-1-i\sigma_x-i\sigma_y-i\sigma_z)]$	$[-i\sigma_x]$	$[\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(-i\sigma_x-i\sigma_y)]$	$[\frac{1}{2}(1-i\sigma_x-i\sigma_y-i\sigma_z)]$	$[\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(1-i\sigma_x)]$	$[\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(-1-i\sigma_x)]$	
θ	0	2π	$\frac{4\pi}{3}$	π	π	$\frac{2\pi}{3}$	$\frac{\pi}{2}$	$\frac{3\pi}{2}$
$\chi_{D^{(1)}} = \chi_{\varrho_1}$	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
$\chi_{D^{(2)}} = \chi_{\varrho_4}$	2	-2	-1	0	0	1	$\sqrt{2}$	$-\sqrt{2}$
χ_{ϱ_5}	2	-2	-1	0	0	1	$-\sqrt{2}$	$\sqrt{2}$

TABLE III. Character-table information for 2O. Each column corresponds to a conjugacy class and presents the size (number of elements), a representative element from the class, the rotation angle θ associated with all elements in the class, and the character value for the three irreps of 2O needed to calculate the relevant multiplicities: ϱ_1 , ϱ_4 , and ϱ_5 . Two of these irreps correspond to SU(2) irreps restricted to 2O elements: $D^{(1)} = \varrho_1$ and $D^{(2)} = \varrho_4$.

class	1	2	3	4a	4b	6	8a	8b
$\chi_{D^{(1)}}$	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
$\chi_{D^{(2)}}$	2	-2	-1	0	0	0	$\sqrt{2}$	$-\sqrt{2}$
$\chi_{D^{(3)}}$	3	3	0	-1	-1	-1	1	1
$\chi_{D^{(4)}}$	4	-4	1	0	0	-1	0	0
$\chi_{D^{(5)}}$	5	5	-1	1	1	0	-1	-1
$\chi_{D^{(6)}}$	6	-6	\vdots	0	0	1	$-\sqrt{2}$	$\sqrt{2}$
$\chi_{D^{(7)}}$	7	7	\vdots	\vdots	\vdots	1	-1	-1
$\chi_{D^{(8)}}$	8	-8				0	0	0
$\chi_{D^{(9)}}$	9	9				\vdots	1	1
$\chi_{D^{(10)}}$	10	-10					$\sqrt{2}$	$-\sqrt{2}$
$\chi_{D^{(11)}}$	11	11					\vdots	\vdots

TABLE IV. Characters for the reducible 2O representations showing the periodic columns up to the point where two rows repeat in order.

to the plane of harmonic-oscillator coherent states, the functions representing the spin operators are functions on the sphere. The map $W : A \mapsto W_A$ from operator to function satisfies the Stratonovitch-Weyl postulates:

- Linearity: W is linear and one-to-one
- Reality: $W_{A^\dagger}(\hat{\mathbf{n}}) = W_A^*(\hat{\mathbf{n}})$
- Standardization: $4\pi \text{tr}(A) = (2j+1) \int_{S^2} d\hat{\mathbf{n}} W_A(\hat{\mathbf{n}})$
- Traciality: $4\pi \text{tr}(AB) = (2j+1) \int_{S^2} d\hat{\mathbf{n}} W_A(\hat{\mathbf{n}}) W_B(\hat{\mathbf{n}})$
- Covariance: $W_{D(g)AD(g)^\dagger}(\hat{\mathbf{n}}) = W_A(R^{-1}(g)\hat{\mathbf{n}})$, $g \in \text{SU}(2)$

Here $R(g)$ is the SO(3) representation of the SU(2) group element g , which acts on the three-dimensional real vector space containing the unit vectors $\hat{\mathbf{n}}$ which make up the sphere S^2 . As shown in [12, 13], such a map W is realized by taking the trace with a kernel $\Delta(\hat{\mathbf{n}})$ such that $W_A(\hat{\mathbf{n}}) = \text{tr}(\Delta(\hat{\mathbf{n}})A)$, where

$$\Delta(R(g)\hat{\mathbf{z}}) = \sum_{m=-j}^j \sum_{\ell=0}^{2j} \frac{2\ell+1}{2j+1} \left\langle \begin{matrix} j & \ell \\ m & 0 \end{matrix} \middle| \begin{matrix} j \\ m \end{matrix} \right\rangle D(g)|j, m\rangle \langle j, m| D(g)^\dagger. \quad (29)$$

This is not the only choice of kernel satisfying the postulates, but it is a pleasing choice due to similarities to the parity operator discussed in [13].

Support of codewords

The requirement that $\exp(-i\frac{\pi}{2}J_z)$ yields $\pm\bar{S}$ when restricted to the codespace means $\text{supp}_{J_z} |\bar{a}\rangle \subseteq m_a + 4\mathbf{Z}$ for $a \in \{0, 1\}$, since \bar{S} only puts a phase on the computational-basis states. The phases imparted, which depend on

the state-dependent offset m_a , are $\bar{S}|\bar{a}\rangle = \exp(-i\frac{\pi}{2}m_a)|\bar{a}\rangle$. For these to yield the appropriate relative phases further imposes $m_0 - m_1 \equiv 1 \pmod{4}$. One obtains another constraint by recalling that $\exp(-i\pi J_x)$ performs a logical X gate, exchanging $|\bar{0}\rangle$ and $|\bar{1}\rangle$. Since this π rotation about the x axis inverts the z axis, it must be that $\text{supp}_{J_z}|\bar{0}\rangle = -\text{supp}_{J_z}|\bar{1}\rangle$. This leaves the two possibilities for the $|\bar{0}\rangle$ support presented in the main text:

$$\text{supp}_{J_z}|\bar{0}\rangle \subseteq \begin{cases} \frac{1}{2} + 4\mathbf{Z} \\ -\frac{3}{2} + 4\mathbf{Z} \end{cases}, \quad (30)$$

where again the term $4\mathbf{Z}$ indicates the set of all integer multiples of 4. The octahedral symmetry of the codes implies that analogous statements hold for the supports of the $\bar{\sigma}_x$ and $\bar{\sigma}_y$ eigenstates in the J_x and J_y bases, respectively.

Quadratic gates

Here I demonstrate that the Hamiltonian parameters given in the main text for the \overline{CZ} and \bar{T} gates give the desired evolution on the codespace. I begin with the simpler \bar{T} calculation, which illustrates most of the procedures necessary for the slightly longer \overline{CZ} calculation. In all calculations I express the logical states as

$$|\bar{a}\rangle = \sum_m c_{a,m} |j, m\rangle. \quad (31)$$

Apply a general Hamiltonian containing J_z and J_z^2 terms to the computational basis states to figure out parameters yielding a \bar{T} gate. Start with the case where $\text{supp}_{J_z}|\bar{0}\rangle \subseteq \frac{1}{2} + 4\mathbf{Z}$.

$$\exp(-i\phi J_z) \exp(-i\theta J_z^2) |\bar{a}\rangle = \sum_k c_{a,4k \pm 1/2} \exp(-i(4k \pm \frac{1}{2})\phi - i(4k \pm \frac{1}{2})^2\theta) |j, 4k \pm \frac{1}{2}\rangle \quad (32)$$

This exponential must not depend on k . Write the coefficient of $-i$ in the exponent:

$$16\theta k^2 + 4(\phi \pm \theta)k + \frac{1}{4}(\theta \pm 2\phi). \quad (33)$$

Remove the quadratic term (modulo 2π) by requiring $\theta = n\frac{\pi}{8}$:

$$(4\phi \pm n\frac{\pi}{2})k + n\frac{\pi}{32} \pm \frac{1}{2}\phi. \quad (34)$$

Remove the linear term (modulo 2π) by setting $n = 2$ ($\theta = \frac{\pi}{4}$) and $\phi = \frac{\pi}{4}$. This leaves $\frac{\pi}{16} \pm \frac{\pi}{8}$ in the exponent. The constant term is an overall phase on the code subspace which can be ignored, and the \pm term gives precisely the relative phase difference between $|\bar{0}\rangle$ and $|\bar{1}\rangle$ needed to perform a \bar{T} gate. An analogous calculation shows that $\theta = \frac{\pi}{4}$ and $\phi = \frac{5\pi}{4}$ implement a \bar{T} gate in the case where $\text{supp}_{J_z}|\bar{0}\rangle \subseteq -\frac{3}{2} + \mathbf{Z}$.

Apply a general Hamiltonian containing $\mathbf{1} \otimes J_z$, $J_z \otimes \mathbf{1}$, and $J_z \otimes J_z$ terms to the computational basis states to figure out parameters yielding a \overline{CZ} gate. Start with the case where $\text{supp}_{J_z}|\bar{0}\rangle \subseteq \frac{1}{2} + 4\mathbf{Z}$.

$$\begin{aligned} & \exp(-i\phi_1 J_z \otimes \mathbf{1}) \exp(-i\phi_2 \mathbf{1} \otimes J_z) \exp(-i\theta J_z \otimes J_z) |\bar{a}\rangle |\bar{b}\rangle = \\ & \sum_{k_1, k_2} c_{a,4k_1 \pm 1/2} c_{b,4k_2 \pm 1/2} \exp(-i(4k_1 \pm \frac{1}{2})\phi_1 - i(4k_2 \pm \frac{1}{2})\phi_2 - i\theta(4k_1 \pm \frac{1}{2})(4k_2 \pm \frac{1}{2})) |j, 4k_1 \pm \frac{1}{2}\rangle |j, 4k_2 \pm \frac{1}{2}\rangle \end{aligned} \quad (35)$$

Again write the coefficient of $-i$ in the exponent:

$$16\theta k_1 k_2 + 2(2\phi_1 \pm \theta)k_1 + 2(2\phi_2 \pm \theta)k_2 \pm \frac{1}{2}\phi_1 \pm \frac{1}{2}\phi_2 \pm \frac{1}{4}\theta. \quad (36)$$

Again require $\theta = n\frac{\pi}{8}$:

$$(4\phi_1 \pm n\frac{\pi}{4})k_1 + (4\phi_2 \pm n\frac{\pi}{4})k_2 \pm \frac{1}{2}\phi_1 \pm \frac{1}{2}\phi_2 \pm \frac{1}{4}n\frac{\pi}{32}. \quad (37)$$

To kill the linear terms, set $n = 4q$ and $\phi = r\frac{\pi}{2} + q\frac{\pi}{4}$.

$$\pm \frac{1}{2}(r_1 \frac{\pi}{2} + q \frac{\pi}{4}) \pm \frac{1}{2}(r_2 \frac{\pi}{2} + q \frac{\pi}{4}) \pm \frac{1}{4}q \frac{\pi}{8}. \quad (38)$$

class	1	2	3a	3b	4	6a	6b	class	1	2	3	4a	4b	6	8a	8b
size	1	1	4	4	6	4	4	size	1	1	8	6	12	8	6	6
χ_{ϱ_1}	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	χ_{ϱ_1}	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
χ_{ϱ_2}	1	1	$e^{i4\pi/3}$	$e^{i2\pi/3}$	1	$e^{i4\pi/3}$	$e^{i2\pi/3}$	χ_{ϱ_2}	1	1	1	1	-1	1	-1	-1
χ_{ϱ_3}	1	1	$e^{i2\pi/3}$	$e^{i4\pi/3}$	1	$e^{i2\pi/3}$	$e^{i4\pi/3}$	χ_{ϱ_3}	2	2	-1	2	0	-1	0	0
χ_{ϱ_4}	2	-2	-1	-1	0	1	1	χ_{ϱ_4}	2	-2	-1	0	0	1	$\sqrt{2}$	$-\sqrt{2}$
χ_{ϱ_5}	2	-2	$e^{i5\pi/3}$	$e^{i\pi/3}$	0	$e^{i2\pi/3}$	$e^{i4\pi/3}$	χ_{ϱ_5}	2	-2	-1	0	0	1	$-\sqrt{2}$	$\sqrt{2}$
χ_{ϱ_6}	2	-2	$e^{i\pi/3}$	$e^{i5\pi/3}$	0	$e^{i4\pi/3}$	$e^{i2\pi/3}$	χ_{ϱ_6}	3	3	0	-1	-1	0	1	1
χ_{ϱ_7}	3	3	0	0	-1	0	0	χ_{ϱ_7}	3	3	0	-1	1	0	-1	-1
								χ_{ϱ_8}	4	-4	1	0	0	-1	0	0

TABLE V. Character tables for 2T (left) and 2O (right)

class	1	2	3	4	5a	5b	6	10a	10b
size	1	1	20	30	12	12	20	12	12
χ_{ϱ_1}	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
χ_{ϱ_2}	2	-2	-1	0	$\frac{-1+\sqrt{5}}{2}$	$\frac{-1-\sqrt{5}}{2}$	1	$\frac{1+\sqrt{5}}{2}$	$\frac{1-\sqrt{5}}{2}$
χ_{ϱ_3}	2	-2	-1	0	$\frac{-1-\sqrt{5}}{2}$	$\frac{-1+\sqrt{5}}{2}$	1	$\frac{1-\sqrt{5}}{2}$	$\frac{1+\sqrt{5}}{2}$
χ_{ϱ_4}	3	3	0	-1	$\frac{1-\sqrt{5}}{2}$	$\frac{1+\sqrt{5}}{2}$	0	$\frac{1+\sqrt{5}}{2}$	$\frac{1-\sqrt{5}}{2}$
χ_{ϱ_5}	3	3	0	-1	$\frac{1+\sqrt{5}}{2}$	$\frac{1-\sqrt{5}}{2}$	0	$\frac{1-\sqrt{5}}{2}$	$\frac{1+\sqrt{5}}{2}$
χ_{ϱ_6}	4	4	1	0	-1	-1	1	-1	-1
χ_{ϱ_7}	4	-4	1	0	-1	-1	-1	1	1
χ_{ϱ_8}	5	5	-1	1	0	0	-1	0	0
χ_{ϱ_9}	6	-6	0	0	1	1	0	-1	-1

TABLE VI. Character table for 2I

Take $r_1 = r_2 = r$. For $\overline{\text{CZ}}$, the $+1+2$, $+1-2$, and $-1+2$ cases should all return the same phase. The cross terms $+1-2$ and $-1+2$ yield the coefficient $-q\frac{\pi}{8}$. Equating to the $+1+2$ term:

$$r\frac{\pi}{2} + q\frac{\pi}{4} + q\frac{\pi}{8} \equiv -q\frac{\pi}{8} \pmod{2\pi}, \quad (39)$$

implying $(r+q)\frac{\pi}{2} \equiv 0 \pmod{2\pi}$, so $r+q$ must be a multiple of 4. To get the right phase difference in the $-1-2$ case it must be that

$$-r\frac{\pi}{2} - q\frac{\pi}{4} + q\frac{\pi}{8} \equiv -q\frac{\pi}{8} + \pi \pmod{2\pi}, \quad (40)$$

implying $-r\frac{\pi}{2} \equiv \pi \pmod{2\pi}$, so r must be twice an odd number. Satisfy all criteria by choosing $r = q = 2$, implying $\theta = \pi$ and $\phi = -\frac{\pi}{2}$. An analogous calculation shows that the same parameters work in the case where $\text{supp}_{J_z} |\bar{0}\rangle \subseteq -\frac{3}{2} + 4\mathbf{Z}$.

SU(2)-irrep dim.	ϱ_4 mult.	ϱ_5 mult.	ϱ_6 mult.	SU(2)-irrep dim.	ϱ_1 mult.	ϱ_2 mult.	ϱ_3 mult.	ϱ_7 mult.
$12q+0$	$2q$	$2q$	$2q$	$12q+1$	$q+1$	q	q	$3q$
$12q+2$	$2q+1$	$2q$	$2q$	$12q+3$	q	q	q	$3q+1$
$12q+4$	$2q$	$2q+1$	$2q+1$	$12q+5$	q	$q+1$	$q+1$	$3q+1$
$12q+6$	$2q+1$	$2q+1$	$2q+1$	$12q+7$	$q+1$	q	q	$3q+2$
$12q+8$	$2q+2$	$2q+1$	$2q+1$	$12q+9$	$q+1$	$q+1$	$q+1$	$3q+2$
$12q+10$	$2q+1$	$2q+2$	$2q+2$	$12q+11$	q	$q+1$	$q+1$	$3q+3$

TABLE VII. Multiplicities of all 2T irreps that appear in half-integer (left) and integer (right) irreps of SU(2). The dimension of the SU(2) irrep is presented in the form $12q+2p$ or $12q+2p+1$, where q is any non-negative integer and $0 \leq p \leq 5$.

SU(2)-irrep dim.	ϱ_4 mult.	ϱ_5 mult.	ϱ_8 mult.	SU(2)-irrep dim.	ϱ_1 mult.	ϱ_2 mult.	ϱ_3 mult.	ϱ_6 mult.	ϱ_7 mult.
$24q$	$2q$	$2q$	$4q$	$24q+1$	$q+1$	q	$2q$	$3q$	$3q$
$24q+2$	$2q+1$	$2q$	$4q$	$24q+3$	q	q	$2q$	$3q+1$	$3q$
$24q+4$	$2q$	$2q$	$4q+1$	$24q+5$	q	q	$2q+1$	$3q$	$3q+1$
$24q+6$	$2q$	$2q+1$	$4q+1$	$24q+7$	q	$q+1$	$2q$	$3q+1$	$3q+1$
$24q+8$	$2q+1$	$2q+1$	$4q+1$	$24q+9$	$q+1$	q	$2q+1$	$3q+1$	$3q+1$
$24q+10$	$2q+1$	$2q$	$4q+2$	$24q+11$	q	q	$2q+1$	$3q+2$	$3q+1$
$24q+12$	$2q+1$	$2q+1$	$4q+2$	$24q+13$	$q+1$	$q+1$	$2q+1$	$3q+1$	$3q+2$
$24q+14$	$2q+1$	$2q+2$	$4q+2$	$24q+15$	q	$q+1$	$2q+1$	$3q+2$	$3q+2$
$24q+16$	$2q+1$	$2q+1$	$4q+3$	$24q+17$	$q+1$	q	$2q+2$	$3q+2$	$3q+2$
$24q+18$	$2q+2$	$2q+1$	$4q+3$	$24q+19$	$q+1$	$q+1$	$2q+1$	$3q+3$	$3q+2$
$24q+20$	$2q+2$	$2q+2$	$4q+3$	$24q+21$	$q+1$	$q+1$	$2q+2$	$3q+2$	$3q+3$
$24q+22$	$2q+1$	$2q+2$	$4q+4$	$24q+23$	q	$q+1$	$2q+2$	$3q+3$	$3q+3$

TABLE VIII. Multiplicities of all 2O irreps that appear in half-integer (left) and integer (right) irreps of SU(2). The dimension of the SU(2) irrep is presented in the form $24q+2p$ or $24q+2p+1$, where q is any non-negative integer and $0 \leq p \leq 11$.

SU(2)-irrep dim.	ϱ_2 mult.	ϱ_3 mult.	ϱ_7 mult.	ϱ_9 mult.	SU(2)-irrep dim.	ϱ_1 mult.	ϱ_4 mult.	ϱ_5 mult.	ϱ_6 mult.	ϱ_8 mult.
$60q+0$	$2q$	$2q$	$4q$	$6q$	$60q+1$	$q+1$	$3q$	$3q$	$4q$	$5q$
$60q+2$	$2q+1$	$2q$	$4q$	$6q$	$60q+3$	q	$3q+1$	$3q$	$4q$	$5q$
$60q+4$	$2q$	$2q$	$4q+1$	$6q$	$60q+5$	q	$3q$	$3q$	$4q$	$5q+1$
$60q+6$	$2q$	$2q$	$4q$	$6q+1$	$60q+7$	q	$3q$	$3q+1$	$4q+1$	$5q$
$60q+8$	$2q$	$2q+1$	$4q$	$6q+1$	$60q+9$	q	$3q$	$3q$	$4q+1$	$5q+1$
$60q+10$	$2q$	$2q$	$4q+1$	$6q+1$	$60q+11$	q	$3q+1$	$3q+1$	$4q$	$5q+1$
$60q+12$	$2q+1$	$2q$	$4q+1$	$6q+1$	$60q+13$	$q+1$	$3q+1$	$3q$	$4q+1$	$5q+1$
$60q+14$	$2q+1$	$2q+1$	$4q+1$	$6q+1$	$60q+15$	q	$3q+1$	$3q+1$	$4q+1$	$5q+1$
$60q+16$	$2q$	$2q$	$4q+1$	$6q+2$	$60q+17$	q	$3q$	$3q+1$	$4q+1$	$5q+2$
$60q+18$	$2q$	$2q+1$	$4q+1$	$6q+2$	$60q+19$	q	$3q+1$	$3q+1$	$4q+2$	$5q+1$
$60q+20$	$2q+1$	$2q+1$	$4q+1$	$6q+2$	$60q+21$	$q+1$	$3q+1$	$3q+1$	$4q+1$	$5q+2$
$60q+22$	$2q+1$	$2q$	$4q+2$	$6q+2$	$60q+23$	q	$3q+2$	$3q+1$	$4q+1$	$5q+2$
$60q+24$	$2q+1$	$2q+1$	$4q+2$	$6q+2$	$60q+25$	$q+1$	$3q+1$	$3q+1$	$4q+2$	$5q+2$
$60q+26$	$2q+1$	$2q+1$	$4q+1$	$6q+3$	$60q+27$	q	$3q+1$	$3q+2$	$4q+2$	$5q+2$
$60q+28$	$2q$	$2q+1$	$4q+2$	$6q+3$	$60q+29$	q	$3q+1$	$3q+1$	$4q+2$	$5q+3$
$60q+30$	$2q+1$	$2q+1$	$4q+2$	$6q+3$	$60q+31$	$q+1$	$3q+2$	$3q+2$	$4q+2$	$5q+2$
$60q+32$	$2q+2$	$2q+1$	$4q+2$	$6q+3$	$60q+33$	$q+1$	$3q+2$	$3q+1$	$4q+2$	$5q+3$
$60q+34$	$2q+1$	$2q+1$	$4q+3$	$6q+3$	$60q+35$	q	$3q+2$	$3q+2$	$4q+2$	$5q+3$
$60q+36$	$2q+1$	$2q+1$	$4q+2$	$6q+4$	$60q+37$	$q+1$	$3q+1$	$3q+2$	$4q+3$	$5q+3$
$60q+38$	$2q+1$	$2q+2$	$4q+2$	$6q+4$	$60q+39$	q	$3q+2$	$3q+2$	$4q+3$	$5q+3$
$60q+40$	$2q+1$	$2q+1$	$4q+3$	$6q+4$	$60q+41$	$q+1$	$3q+2$	$3q+2$	$4q+2$	$5q+4$
$60q+42$	$2q+2$	$2q+1$	$4q+3$	$6q+4$	$60q+43$	$q+1$	$3q+3$	$3q+2$	$4q+3$	$5q+3$
$60q+44$	$2q+2$	$2q+2$	$4q+3$	$6q+4$	$60q+45$	$q+1$	$3q+2$	$3q+2$	$4q+3$	$5q+4$
$60q+46$	$2q+1$	$2q+1$	$4q+3$	$6q+5$	$60q+47$	q	$3q+2$	$3q+3$	$4q+3$	$5q+4$
$60q+48$	$2q+1$	$2q+2$	$4q+3$	$6q+5$	$60q+49$	$q+1$	$3q+2$	$3q+2$	$4q+4$	$5q+4$
$60q+50$	$2q+2$	$2q+2$	$4q+3$	$6q+5$	$60q+51$	$q+1$	$3q+3$	$3q+3$	$4q+3$	$5q+4$
$60q+52$	$2q+2$	$2q+1$	$4q+4$	$6q+5$	$60q+53$	$q+1$	$3q+3$	$3q+2$	$4q+3$	$5q+5$
$60q+54$	$2q+2$	$2q+2$	$4q+4$	$6q+5$	$60q+55$	$q+1$	$3q+3$	$3q+3$	$4q+4$	$5q+4$
$60q+56$	$2q+2$	$2q+2$	$4q+3$	$6q+6$	$60q+57$	$q+1$	$3q+2$	$3q+3$	$4q+4$	$5q+5$
$60q+58$	$2q+1$	$2q+2$	$4q+4$	$6q+6$	$60q+59$	q	$3q+3$	$3q+3$	$4q+4$	$5q+5$

TABLE IX. Multiplicities of all 2I irreps that appear in half-integer (left) and integer (right) irreps of SU(2). The dimension of the SU(2) irrep is presented in the form $60q+2p$ or $60q+2p+1$, where q is any non-negative integer and $0 \leq p \leq 29$.