Achieving fault tolerance against amplitude-damping noise
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With the intense interest in small, noisy quantum computing devices comes the push for larger, more accurate—and hence more useful—quantum computers. While fully fault-tolerant quantum computers are, in principle, capable of achieving arbitrarily accurate calculations using devices subjected to general noise, they require immense resources far beyond our current reach. An intermediate step would be to construct quantum computers of limited accuracy enhanced by lower-level, and hence lower-cost, noise-removal techniques. This is the motivation for our work, which looks into fault-tolerant encoded quantum computation targeted at the dominant noise afflicting the quantum device. Specifically, we develop a protocol for fault-tolerant encoded quantum computing components in the presence of amplitude-damping noise, using a 4-qubit code and a recovery procedure tailored to such noise. We describe a universal set of fault-tolerant encoded gadgets and compute the pseudothreshold for the noise, below which our scheme leads to more accurate computation. Our work demonstrates the possibility of applying the ideas of quantum fault tolerance to targeted noise models, generalizing the recent pursuit of biased-noise fault tolerance beyond the usual Pauli noise models. We also illustrate how certain aspects of the standard fault tolerance intuition, largely acquired through Pauli-noise considerations, can fail in the face of more general noise.

I. INTRODUCTION

A real quantum computer is prone to noise, due to the fragile nature of the quantum states carrying the information and the unavoidable imperfections in gate operations. Scaling up to large-scale, useful quantum computers relies on the theory of quantum fault tolerance,[1] a suite of methods for reliable quantum computing even with noisy memory and gates. Fault-tolerant quantum computation relies on encoding the information to be processed into physical qubits using a quantum error correcting (QEC) code. Encoded operations are performed on the qubits to manipulate the information and, in the presence of noise, these must be done in a manner that controls the spread of errors. The QEC code further allows the periodic removal of errors before they accumulate to a point where the damage is irreparable, and fault tolerance tells us how to do that even with noisy error correction operations, provided the noise is below some threshold level.[2] The theory of fault tolerance further includes a prescription for increasing the accuracy of the quantum computation by investing more physical resources in error correction.

Starting with Shor’s original proposal,[4] most fault tolerance schemes are built upon general-purpose QEC codes, such as polynomial codes,[6] stabilizer codes,[11,14] and the more recent surface codes[7], each capable of correcting a small number of arbitrary errors on the qubits. Fault tolerance noise thresholds have been estimated for such schemes, incorporating concatenation and recursive simulation,[8,9] magic-state distillation,[10] as well as teleportation-based approaches[11]. Current threshold estimates suggest very stringent noise control requirements of less than $10^{-3}$ probability of error per gate for the concatenated Steane code, to more relaxed $(10^{-2})$ numbers for the surface codes.[12] A similar threshold of $10^{-2}$ may also be obtained by concatenating the $[[4,2,2]]$ code with a 6qubit code,[13] although such a protocol requires very high resource overheads to accomplish. We refer to[14] for a comparative study of the fault tolerance threshold obtained for different quantum codes, at a single level of encoding, under depolarizing noise. A more recent overview of fault-tolerant schemes using surface codes and colour codes in different dimensions may be found in[15].

The performance of a fault tolerance scheme depends crucially on the noise in the quantum computing device in question. The standard schemes were designed assuming no knowledge of the noise in the physical qubits—hence the reliance on codes that can deal with arbitrary errors—but, threshold estimates and how well those schemes can support accurate quantum computation, give varying perspectives depending on the underlying noise models. For example, the surface code threshold numbers are usually computed for depolarizing or at best Pauli noise on the qubits; Steane-code schemes can have more relaxed threshold numbers if one assumes depolarizing noise,[9], rather than the adversarial noise model used in the main analysis of Ref.[9].

This invites the question of whether one can devise fault tolerance schemes specifically tailored to the predominant noise affecting the qubits. In the current noisy intermediate-scale quantum—or NISQ[16]—era where...
getting the errors in the quantum device under control is key to progress, experimenters usually attempt to acquire knowledge of the dominant noise afflicting their quantum system, and one might expect that this knowledge can be employed usefully in the fault tolerance design, to lower the resource overheads seen in general-noise schemes, and for less stringent threshold numbers. This is borne out by the fault tolerance scheme developed in a biased noise scenario, where dephasing noise is known to be dominant [14] [15]. This prescription was used to obtain a universal scheme for pulsed operations on flux qubits [18], taking advantage of the high degree of dephasing noise in the cZ gate, leading to a numerical threshold estimate of 0.5% for the error rate per gate operation.

Such approaches tailored to dominant noise processes can serve as the initial steps in scaling up the quantum computer. They weaken the effect of the dominant noise on the qubits until other, originally less important, noise sources become comparable in strength and one can revert to the use of the more expensive but general-purpose fault tolerance protocols. Recent efforts along these lines include fault-tolerant constructions using surface codes tailored to dephasing noise [20] [21], and the proposal to use surface codes concatenated with bosonic codes to achieve fault tolerance against photon losses [22].

Past examples of fault tolerance schemes for biased noise have focused on asymmetric Pauli noise, understandably so, as standard fault tolerance theory relies heavily on classifying the effect of general noise into Pauli errors, and then dealing with those errors using general-purpose Pauli-based QEC codes. In this work, we generalise the idea of biased-noise fault tolerance to noise models and noise-adapted codes that do not make use of this Pauli-error link. In particular, we deal with amplitude-damping noise, for which noise-adapted codes of a rather different nature than Pauli-based QEC codes have been developed. Such noise-adapted codes are known to offer a similar level of protection as general-purpose Pauli-based codes, when the underlying noise is amplitude-damping in nature, while using fewer physical qubits to encode each qubit of information. Amplitude damping, arising from physical processes like spontaneous decay, is an significant source of noise in many experimental quantum computing platforms. Our work demonstrates the possibility of biased-noise fault tolerance for such noise beyond Pauli noise, and importantly, points out the failure of traditional fault tolerance intuition built from looking only at Pauli noise.

Here, we develop fault-tolerant gadgets for qubits that are susceptible to amplitude-damping noise, using the well-known 4-qubit code [23]. At the heart of our fault tolerance scheme is a fault-tolerant error correction unit comprising a nontrivial recovery unit, in contrast to the error correction gadgets developed for Pauli noise models with simple recovery circuits. We then demonstrate a transversal, logical controlled-Z (cZ) unit that is tolerant to single-qubit amplitude-damping noise. Interestingly, we show that an analogous, transversal construction of the controlled-NOT (cnot) gate is not fault-tolerant against single-qubit damping errors, thus highlighting the need for noise-structure preserving gates in developing fault tolerance schemes based on noise-adapted codes. Finally, we construct a fault-tolerant logical X unit and preparation and measurement units, leading to a universal set of fault-tolerant gates comprising the cZ gate, the Hadamard gate, the phase gate, and the π/8 gate. We then analytically estimate the error threshold for our scheme using the logical cZ gadget, as well as a memory threshold. Our work thus provides rigorous "level-1" (following the terminology of Ref. [9]) threshold or pseudothreshold estimates for fault tolerance against amplitude-damping noise.

The rest of the paper is organised as follows. In Sec. [1] we discuss the noise model considered here and briefly review the error-correcting properties of the 4-qubit code. In Sec. [11] we present the basic encoded units that make up our fault tolerance scheme, including the error correction unit (Sec. [11A]), the preparation units (Sec. [11B]), the logical X and Z gadgets (Sec. [11D]) and the cZ gadget (Sec. [11E]). These encoded gadgets are all shown to satisfy the required fault tolerance properties, with the detailed proofs presented in Appendix [A]. In Sec. [11V] we show how these basic encoded units can be combined to obtain a fault-tolerant universal gate set via gate teleportation. Finally, we discuss the pseudothreshold calculation in Sec. [V] and future directions in Sec. [VI]. The detailed counting arguments that lead to our threshold estimate are presented in Appendix [13].

II. PRELIMINARIES

We follow the basic framework of quantum fault tolerance developed by Aliferis et al. [9], briefly reviewed here for completeness. In a fault-tolerant quantum computation, ideal operations are simulated by performing encoded operations on logical qubits. Encoded operations, in turn, are implemented by composite objects called gadgets which are made of elementary physical operations such as single- and two-qubit gates (including identity gates for wait times), state preparation, and measurements. We assume that the noise acts on the qubits individually, except when two qubits are participating in the same two-qubit gate. A location refers to any one of these elementary physical operations. A location in a gadget is said to be faulty whenever it deviates from the ideal operation, and can result in errors in the qubits storing the computational data. The key challenge is to design the gadgets in such a way as to minimize the propagation of errors due to the faults within the same encoded block.

In what follows, we refer to the elementary physical operations as unencoded operations. Our goal is to construct the encoded or logical gadgets corresponding to the 4-qubit code, which are resilient to a specific noise model, namely, the amplitude-damping channel defined in Eq. [2] below. In our scheme, we use the following un-
encoded operations to build the fault-tolerant encoded gadgets.

\{\mathcal{P}_{(+)}, \mathcal{P}_{(0)}\} \cup \{\mathcal{M}_X, \mathcal{M}_Z, \text{cnot, } \text{cz, } X, Z, S, T\}. \quad (1)

Here, \(\mathcal{P}_{(+)}\) and \(\mathcal{P}_{(0)}\) refer to the preparation of eigenstates of single-qubit \(X\) and \(Z\) Pauli operators, respectively, and \(\mathcal{M}_X\) and \(\mathcal{M}_Z\) refer to measurements in the \(X\) and \(Z\) basis, respectively. \text{cnot} refers to the two-qubit controlled-NOT gate, \text{cz} refers to the two-qubit controlled-\(Z\) gate, and \(X, Z, S, T\) are the standard single-qubit Pauli \(X\), Pauli \(Z\), phase gate, and \(\pi/8\) gate. Note that \(|0\rangle\) is the fixed state of the amplitude-damping channel defined in Eq. (2) and is therefore inherently noiseless. We assume that rest of the gates and measurements in Eq. (1) are susceptible to noise, as described below.

A. Noise model and the 4-qubit code

Our fault tolerance construction is based on the assumption that the dominant noise process affecting the quantum device is amplitude-damping noise on each physical qubit. Amplitude damping is a simple model for describing processes like spontaneous decay from the excited state in an atomic qubit, and is a common source in many current quantum devices. It is described by the single-qubit completely positive (CP) and trace-preserving (TP) channel, \(\mathcal{E}_{\text{AD}}(\cdot) = E_0(\cdot)E_0^\dagger + E_1(\cdot)E_1^\dagger\), with \(E_0\) and \(E_1\), the Kraus operators, defined as

\[
E_0 \equiv \frac{1}{2} \left[ (1 + \sqrt{1-p})I + (1 - \sqrt{1-p})Z \right] = |0\rangle\langle 0| + \sqrt{1-p}|1\rangle\langle 1|,
\]

and

\[
E_1 \equiv \frac{1}{2\sqrt{p}}(X + iY) = \sqrt{p}|0\rangle\langle 1| \equiv \sqrt{p}E. \quad (2)
\]

Here \(I\) is the qubit identity, \(X, Y, Z\) are the usual Pauli operators, and \(|0\rangle\) and \(|1\rangle\) are the eigenbasis of \(Z\). \(p \in [0, 1]\) is the damping parameter, assumed to be a small number—corresponding to weak noise—in any setting useful for quantum computing. We denote the operator \(|0\rangle\langle 1|\) simply as \(E\).

In our analysis below, it will be important to separate out the different error terms in \(\mathcal{E}_{\text{AD}}\) according to their weight in orders of \(p\). To that end, we write \(\mathcal{E}_{\text{AD}}\) as

\[
\mathcal{E}_{\text{AD}}(\cdot) = \frac{1}{4} \left( 1 + \sqrt{1-p} \right)^2 I(\cdot) + p\mathcal{F}(\cdot) \quad (3)
\]

where \(I(\cdot)\) is the identity channel, and \(\mathcal{F}(\cdot)\) is the TP (but not CP) channel,

\[
\mathcal{F}(\cdot) \equiv \frac{1}{2} \left[ (\cdot)Z + Z(\cdot) \right] + E(\cdot)E^\dagger \equiv \frac{1}{2} \mathcal{F}_Z(\cdot) + \mathcal{F}_a(\cdot). \quad (4)
\]

We refer to \(\mathcal{F}\) as an error when it affects individual qubits and refer to it as a fault when it occurs at a certain location in a circuit. Note that a single error or fault \(\mathcal{F}\) can cause two different kinds of errors in the computational data carried by the qubits, since \(\mathcal{F}\) is a sum of two terms (i) \(\mathcal{F}_Z = \frac{1}{2} [ (\cdot)Z + Z(\cdot) ]\), and (ii) \(\mathcal{F}_a = E(\cdot)E^\dagger\). Written in this manner, and neglecting the \(p^2\) and higher-order terms, \(\mathcal{E}_{\text{AD}}\) can be thought of as leading to no fault (and hence no error) when the \(Z\) part occurs, and a single fault (and hence possibly errors on the data) when the \(E\) part occurs. Furthermore, we say that the qubit has an off-diagonal error if the \(\mathcal{F}_Z\) part remains, and that the qubit has a damping error if the \(\mathcal{F}_a\) remains. That \(\mathcal{F}\) is not CP means that we cannot, in principle, regard the two terms in Eq. (1) as happening in some probabilistic combination.

In our setting, we assume that storage errors, gate errors, as well as the measurement errors are all due to \(\mathcal{E}_{\text{AD}}\). Specifically, a noisy physical gate \(\mathcal{G}\) is modeled by the ideal gate followed by the noise \(\mathcal{E}_{\text{AD}}\) on each qubit. In the case of two-qubit gates such as the \text{cnot} and \text{cz}, we assume that a noisy gate implies an ideal gate followed by amplitude-damping noise acting on both the control and the data qubits, that is, as the joint channel \(\mathcal{E}_{\text{AD}} \otimes \mathcal{E}_{\text{AD}}\) on the two qubits. A noisy measurement is modeled as an ideal measurement preceded by the noise \(\mathcal{E}_{\text{AD}}\), while a noisy preparation is an ideal preparation followed by \(\mathcal{E}_{\text{AD}}\). Note that the noise acts on each physical qubit individually, and is assumed to be time- and gate-independent. One could more generally regard the parameter \(p\) as an upper bound on the level of amplitude damping over time and gate variations.

As the basis of our fault tolerance scheme, we make use of the well-known 4-qubit code, originally introduced in [23] and studied in many subsequent papers (see, for example, [26, 27]), tailored to deal with amplitude-damping noise using four physical qubits to encode a single qubit of information. The code space \(\mathcal{C}\) is the span of

\[
|0\rangle_L \equiv \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \left( |0000\rangle + |1111\rangle \right) \quad \text{and} \quad |1\rangle_L \equiv \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \left( |1100\rangle + |0011\rangle \right), \quad (5)
\]

giving a single encoded, or logical, qubit of information. The code space can be regarded as stabilized by the 4-qubit Pauli subgroup generated by \(XXXX, ZZII,\) and \(IIZZ\) [28]. The logical \(X\) and \(Z\) operators for the 4-qubit code are identified as

\[
\widehat{X} \equiv XXII; \widehat{Z} \equiv ZIZI, \quad (6)
\]

up to multiplication by the stabilizer operators, of course.

The 4-qubit code permits detection and removal of the error in the encoded information arising from a single amplitude-damping fault (understood here as an application of the \(\mathcal{F}\)) in no more than one of the four qubits. The error-detection is achieved via a two-step syndrome extraction procedure.

Step 1. Measure \(ZZII\) and \(IIZZ\)—parity measurements on qubits 1 & 2 and 3 & 4—on the four qubits forming the code block, giving two classical bits \(s_1\) and \(s_2\), respectively. Note that \(s_1 = 0(1)\) if the \(+1(−1)\) eigenvalue of \(ZZII\) is obtained, whereas \(s_2 = 0(1)\) if the \(+1(−1)\) eigenvalue of \(IIZZ\) is obtained.
Step 2. If \( (s_1, s_2) = (0, 0) \), we conclude that no damping error \( F_a \) has been detected and proceed to correct the off-diagonal error \( F_z \); if \( (s_1, s_2) = (1, 0) \), we conclude that there is a damping error \( F_a \) in qubit 1 or 2, and measure ZIII and IIZI, yielding two further classical bits \( u_1 \) and \( v_1 \); if \( (s_1, s_2) = (0, 1) \), we measure IIIZ and IIIZ, for two classical bits \( u_2 \) and \( v_2 \). The \( (s_1, s_2) = (1, 1) \) outcome does not occur in the setting of interest.

From the extracted syndromes, we can diagnose what errors have occurred as summarized in Table I assuming that amplitude-damping faults arose in no more than one of the four physical qubits. We note here that while either of \( u_1(v_2) \) or \( v_1(v_2) \) are enough to determine which qubit has a damping error, extracting both is necessary for fault-tolerant parity measurements, as discussed in Sec. IIIA. Some of the two-qubit amplitude-damping errors can also be diagnosed with the same syndrome measurement procedure, but we ignore them, as these are higher order than the order-\( p \) terms of interest here.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>( s_1 )</th>
<th>( s_2 )</th>
<th>( u_1 )</th>
<th>( v_1 )</th>
<th>( u_2 )</th>
<th>( v_2 )</th>
<th>Diagnosis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>( \times )</td>
<td>( \times )</td>
<td>( \times )</td>
<td>( \times )</td>
<td>no damping error</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>( \times )</td>
<td>( \times )</td>
<td>Qubit 1 is damped</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>( \times )</td>
<td>( \times )</td>
<td>Qubit 2 is damped</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>( \times )</td>
<td>( \times )</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Qubit 3 is damped</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>( \times )</td>
<td>( \times )</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Qubit 4 is damped</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE I. Diagnosis of error that occurred from extracted syndrome bits, assuming amplitude-damping faults arose in no more than one of the four physical qubits. A \( \times \) symbol in the table indicates the syndrome bit was not extracted; see main text. Combinations of syndrome bits that do not appear in the table correspond to events with more faults.

To understand the syndrome measurement for the damping errors, consider an input code state \( a|11\rangle + b|1L\rangle \), with complex coefficients \( a, b \) satisfying \( |a|^2 + |b|^2 = 1 \). The damping error of the form \( E(\cdot)E^\dagger \) on different qubits results in the states,

\[
\text{damping in qubit 1: } |01\rangle \otimes |\phi\rangle,
\]

\[
\text{damping in qubit 2: } |10\rangle \otimes |\phi\rangle,
\]

\[
\text{damping in qubit 3: } |\phi\rangle \otimes |01\rangle,
\]

\[
\text{damping in qubit 4: } |\phi\rangle \otimes |10\rangle,
\]

where \( |\phi\rangle \) is the two-qubit state,

\[
|\phi\rangle \equiv a|11\rangle + b|00\rangle,
\]

with the coefficients \( a \) and \( b \) carrying the stored information.

Once the error diagnosis is done, we perform recovery to bring the state back into the code space. The recovery is again a two-step process:

**Step 1.** A damping error \( F_a \) is detected by the parity measurements and is to be followed by a corresponding recovery unit. Since this error is of the form \( E = |0\rangle\langle 1| = \frac{1}{2}(X + iY) = \frac{1}{2}(I + Z)X \), the recovery amounts to fixing the \( X \) error first and then the \( (I + Z) \) error. For the \( X \) error, when the damping occurs in qubit 1 or 2, we do a single-qubit bit flip to obtain the \( |11\rangle \) state on the first two qubits. A measurement of the stabilizer \( XXXX \) is then done to fix the \( (I + Z) \) error, simultaneously mapping the states \( |1111\rangle \) and \( |1100\rangle \) respectively to \( |0L\rangle \) and \( |1L\rangle \) if the measurement outcome is +1, or \( Z_{1,2} |0L\rangle \) and \( Z_{1,2} |1L\rangle \) if the measurement outcome is −1. A single-qubit phase flip is applied in the latter case, thereby bringing the state \( |11\rangle \otimes |\phi\rangle \) to the code state \( a|0\rangle_L + b|1\rangle_L \), spreading the information back into the four qubits. When the damping occurs in qubit 3 or 4, the same procedure applies, but with the roles of qubits 1 & 2 and qubits 3 & 4 swapped.

**Step 2.** On the other hand, the off-diagonal error \( F_z \) is not detected by the parity measurements [case \( (s_1, s_2) = (0, 0) \)] and merits a separate recovery circuit. The error \( F_z \) can be corrected by an optimal recovery that maximizes the fidelity between the recovered state and the original state (see [25]). However, for simplicity, we choose a \( p \)-independent recovery, namely, a measurement of the stabilizer \( XXXX \). The effect of the measurement is to kill the off-diagonal error whenever the measurement outcome is +1, since \( (I + XXXX)(Z_i \rho + \rho Z_i)(I + XXXX) = 0 \) for an arbitrary state \( \rho \) in the code space, where \( Z_i \) denotes a single-qubit \( Z \) operation on one of the four qubits.

The syndrome extraction unit and the recovery procedures discussed above are not sufficient to construct a fault-tolerant error correction unit. We require additional parity checks and flag qubits to obtain a fault-tolerant error correction unit, as explained in Sec. IIIA below.

The 4-qubit code is an approximate code for amplitude-damping noise in the sense that there is remnant error after the syndrome measurement and recovery, even if the fault occurs only on a single physical qubit, the case the code is designed to deal with. One can phrase this in terms of violation of the standard Knill-Laflamme error correction conditions [29] (see Refs. [23, 27]), but for our discussion here, we simply note that the \( O(p^2) \) Z—or phase—error terms in \( \mathcal{E}_{AD} \) [see Eq. (3)], necessary for ensuring the TP-nature of the channel, are neither detected nor corrected by the 4-qubit code, even though it is a single-qubit error. The 4-qubit code only detects and corrects the order-\( p \) error terms, namely, those in \( F \). The remnant \( O(p^3) \) uncorrected terms will have consequences on our fault tolerance threshold discussion later.
B. Principles of fault tolerance

We conclude this section by formalizing the notion of fault-tolerant circuits and gadgets, in the context of amplitude-damping noise. Specifically, we list the properties that the error correction unit and the encoded gadgets must satisfy, in order to lead to logical operations and circuits that are fault-tolerant against amplitude-damping noise. These properties are used in the proofs of fault tolerance in Appendix A. It is useful to recall here that in the case of amplitude-damping noise, a single $O(p)$ fault $F$ at any location or a single $O(p)$ error $F$ in the state can correspond to a single damping error $F_z$ or a single off-diagonal error $F_z$ or combination of both.

(P1) If an error correction unit has no fault, it takes an input with at most one error to an output with no errors.

(P2) If an error correction unit contains at most one fault, it takes an input with no errors to an output with at most one error.

(P3) A preparation unit without any fault propagates an input with up to one error to an output with at most one error. A preparation unit with at most one fault propagates an input with no errors to an output with at most one error.

(P4) A measurement unit with no faults leads to a correctable classical outcome for an input with at most one error. A measurement unit with at most one fault anywhere leads to a correctable classical outcome for an input with no errors.

(P5) An encoded gadget without any fault takes an input with up to a single error to an output in each output block with at most one error. An encoded gadget with at most one fault takes an input with no error to an output with at most one error in each output block.

In what follows, we first develop fault-tolerant gadgets resilient to faults that occur with probability $O(p)$, neglecting the higher order dephasing and multi-qubit damping faults. Using the 4-qubit code, we build an error correction unit, preparation and measurement units (Sec. IIIA) as well as a universal set of encoded gate gadgets (Sec. IIIB). We prove that our gadgets satisfy the principles of fault tolerance listed above, and finally establish a pseudo-threshold for the memory and the controlled-$Z$ extended gadget.

III. BASIC UNITS AND ENCODED GADGETS

In this section, we introduce the basic units which constitute the building blocks of our fault tolerance scheme. We begin by constructing the error correction unit, comprising the syndrome measurement and recovery circuits, which corrects single-qubit errors in a fault-tolerant manner. We then obtain a fault-tolerant preparation unit for a two-qubit Bell state, which eventually helps us to prepare the encoded states $|0\rangle_L$ and $|+\rangle_L$. We also construct fault-tolerant measurement units corresponding to the logical $X$ and $Z$ measurements. We finally construct a set of basic encoded gates, namely, an encoded $X$ gadget and an encoded $cZ$ gadget. In every case, the physical gates come from the elementary set given in Eq. (1).

A. Error correction unit

The error correction unit — henceforth referred to as the EC unit — shown in Fig. 3 implements the syndrome extraction and the recovery procedures described in Sec. IIA. The four qubits carrying the encoded information — henceforth referred to as data qubits to distinguish them from the ancillary qubits — are in some generic state $|\Psi\rangle$.

The circuits for a parity measurement, denoted as $P$, and for a non-destructive $Z$-measurement, denoted as $Z$, are detailed in Figs. 1(a) and 1(b), respectively. Each measurement uses one ancillary qubit initialized to the $|0\rangle$ state. The circuit for the $XXXZ$ measurement, denoted as $M'$ and shown in Fig. 1(c), uses one ancillary qubit initialized to the $|+\rangle$ state.

The syndrome extraction unit, denoted as $S$ in Fig. 2(a) consists of two parity measurements $P_L$ and $P_Z$, followed by two non-destructive $Z$-measurements to extract the position of the damped qubit, in case the measurement outcome of the first two parity measurements is nontrivial. Note that a fault at the target of the first CNOT in a parity measurement may lead to an outcome 1 of the $Z$-measurement even though there is no damped data qubit. Thus, the extraction of syndrome bits from both the data qubits in case of a non-trivial parity measurement outcome is necessary to make the syndrome extraction unit fault tolerant.

The circuit for the recovery from a damping error, following the diagnosis of a nontrivial error, is detailed in Figs. 2(b). It comprises two parts, the first part performing the bit-flip converting the data-qubit-pair with the amplitude-damping error to the state $|11\rangle$ (see Eq. (7) in Sec. IIIA), and the second part performing a measurement $M'$ of the stabilizer XXXX. The latter measurement, with outcome denoted as $c$, projects the state of the data qubits either into the code space, corresponding to the subspace with eigenvalue $+1$ ($c = 0$), or to the subspace with eigenvalue $-1$ ($c = 1$). The latter case corresponds to a single-qubit $Z$ error and we apply a suitable local $Z$ gate from the set $\{ZIII, IZII, IIZI, IIIZ\}$ to correct for it. For example, if the first data qubit is damped and $c = 1$, we can apply $Z$ to the first data qubit or to the second data qubit (since $ZZII$ is a stabilizer).

In case no damping error is detected, we proceed to the recovery for the off-diagonal error $F_z$, which is simply the measurement of the stabilizer $XXXZ$. However,
FIG. 1. Basic components of the error correction unit. (a) Parity measurement $P$ between two data qubits. (b) Non-destructive $Z$ measurement of a data qubit. (c) Measurement $M'$ of $XXXX$ stabilizer.

FIG. 2. The EC unit consists of the syndrome extraction unit $S$ and the recovery unit $R$. (a) The syndrome extraction unit is a two-step procedure. Two parity measurements $P_1$ and $P_2$ are performed on data qubits 1 & 2 and 3 & 4 respectively, giving syndrome bits $s_1$ and $s_2$. If $s_1 = 1 (s_2 = 1)$, non-destructive $Z$ measurements are performed on qubits 1&2(3&4) to obtain syndrome bits $u_1, v_1 (u_2, v_2)$ (b) The recovery circuit $R$ for damping error $F_a$. $P$ denotes the set of syndrome bits $(s_1, s_2, u_1, v_1, u_2, v_2)$. The bar over a syndrome bit denotes its binary complement. $X^b$ applies an identity (does nothing) if the syndrome bit $b$ is unavailable ($\times$). $M'$ unit measures the stabilizer $XXXX$ and a corresponding $Z$ is applied if $c = 1$.

this procedure is not fault tolerant due to the following reason. It is possible that the syndrome extraction unit detects no damping error ($s_1 = s_2 = 0$), but actually there is one in the output of the syndrome unit, for example, at the first data qubit, due to a faulty CNOT at the control. If we proceed to measure the $XXXX$ operator, the damping error $F_a$ becomes either an $X$ or a $Y$ error, which is uncorrectable by the 4-qubit code. This can be seen by noting that, the effect of the measurement after the action of a damping error $F_a$ at the $k$-th data qubit – denoted as $E_k$ – on a state $|\Psi\rangle$ in the code space, is given by
\[
\frac{1}{2}(1 \pm XXXX)E_k |\Psi\rangle = \frac{1}{2}(E_k \pm E_k^\dagger) |\Psi\rangle.
\]

Our solution for this issue is that we just perform the recovery $XXXX$ measurement anyway at every error correction step, but with additional flag qubits [30] that are added to detect faults that lead to uncorrectable errors. The circuits in Fig. 3 implement this strategy with the flag qubits marked in blue and represent our fault-tolerant EC unit. We conclude this section with a brief description of the inner workings of our fault-tolerant EC unit and leave the detailed proofs to Appendix A.1.

At the beginning of an error correction step, each data qubit is coupled to an ancillary qubit initialized in the $|0\rangle$ state, referred to as a flag qubit. We then proceed with the usual error correction procedure, starting with the syndrome extraction unit. If the syndrome extraction unit detects a nontrivial error, we decouple the flag qubits from the data qubits and use the recovery $R$ to correct
FIG. 3. Fault tolerant EC unit. $|\Psi\rangle$ denotes the encoded data state and all the flag qubits are labeled in blue. (a) The circuit when the syndrome extraction units $S$ detects a nontrivial damping error. Flag qubits are decoupled from data qubits and the recovery unit $R$ corrects errors based on the extracted syndromes. (b) The circuit when the syndrome extraction unit $S$ detects no damping error. The $M$ unit in figure (c) is performed, then flag qubits are decoupled from data qubits and measured in $Z$ basis, resulting four classical bits $(r_1 r_2 r_3 r_4)$. The parity measurement $P_{12}$ ($P_{34}$) is performed whenever at least one of two flag bits $r_1, r_2$ ($r_3, r_4$) is flipped. (c) The circuit for $M$ unit. It performs the $XXXXXXX$ measurement on all data and flag qubits.

for damping errors, based on the extracted syndrome. In case there is no damping error detected, we continue with the recovery involving the $XXXX$ measurement.

However, measuring the $XXXX$ operator on the four data qubits no longer kills off $F_z$ error, as it was originally supposed to do, because the four data qubits are now coupled to the four flag qubits. An $XXXX$ measurement on four data qubits alone before the decoupling step is equivalent to an $XXXXXXX$ measurement on all data and flag qubits after the decoupling step (this can be seen, for example, by commuting the CNOTs of the measurement step through the CNOTs of the decoupling step). Since the flag qubits are initialized in state $|0000\rangle$, which is not a stabilized state of $XXXX$, the measurement of $XXXXXXX$ will not kill off the off-diagonal term $F_z$. If the flag qubits are initialized in a stabilized state of $XXXX$, for example, $\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|0000\rangle + |1111\rangle)$, then the measurement will kill off $F_z$. However, the preparation of this state is also not an easy task, therefore, we instead modify the recovery by measuring $XXXXXXX$ on all data and flag qubits before the decoupling step.
This is equivalent to measuring $XXXX$ on the 4 data qubits alone after the decoupling step, which can kill off $F_z$. The circuit for the modified measurement, denoted as $M$, is shown in detail in Fig. 3(c). We note that the circuit for $M$ is not obviously fault tolerant because a single fault at the control of one of the CNOTs may cause multiple errors in the data qubits. However, with the use of the same set of flag qubits, this circuit can indeed be made fault tolerant (see Appendix A1).

At the end of the recovery procedure, the flag qubits are decoupled from the data qubits, and then measured in the $Z$ basis, resulting in the four bits $(r_1 r_2 r_3 r_4)$. If there is no fault up to this step, the measurement outcomes will be $(0000)$. Otherwise, if a data qubit is damped, the corresponding outcome of the flag qubit coupled to it will be flipped. However, notice that a fault at a flag qubit may also flip the flag outcomes, hence, we still need to distinguish between a fault in the data qubits and one in the flag qubits. To do so, we perform one more round of parity measurements, denoted as $P_{12}$ and $P_{34}$, and correct for the corresponding errors. Specifically, if the extracted syndrome is trivial, the fault is in the flag qubits and we only need to correct for a $Z$ error using the measurement of $XXXX$ on the data qubits. Otherwise, if the syndrome is nontrivial, the fault is in the data qubits and we also need to correct for an $X$ error.

The EC unit in Fig. 3 is fault-tolerant in the following sense: A single error $F$ in the incoming data-qubit state, or a single fault $F$ in the EC unit results in no more than a single correctable (by the 4-qubit code) error in the outgoing state of the data qubits. A detailed proof is presented in Appendix A1 but the ideas can be intuitively understood as follows. If there is one damping error $F_{a}$ in the incoming state and no fault in the EC unit, the syndrome extraction unit will detect it and the recovery unit will correct it, as promised by the 4-qubit code. If there is one off-diagonal error $F_{z}$ in the incoming state or in the syndrome extraction unit, it will be killed off by the $M$ unit even though it is not detected by the syndrome extraction unit. On the other hand, a single damping error $F_{a}$ in the syndrome extraction unit, in the $M$ unit, or in the flag qubits is detected by the set of four flag qubits. A fault in the ancilla used in the $M$ unit propagates $X$ errors to the data qubits which are also taken care of by the flag qubits.

We note here that, unlike in standard fault tolerance analysis dealing with Pauli errors where a classical frame-change is all that is needed to correct the detected errors, here, we need a nontrivial recovery unit to correct for the single damping errors. This is due to the fact that the elementary gate operations used in our gadget constructions are not amplitude-damping preserving: A single damping error propagates through some of the elementary gates (like $X$) into other kinds of errors, not correctable by the 4-qubit code tailor-made for removing damping errors. Any damping error thus has to be genuinely corrected, before the next gadget can be implemented. Note that, the final local $Z$ gate, controlled by $c$ [i.e., $Z(P,c)$], in the recovery unit does commute with subsequent damping errors and all gates in our elementary gate set and thus can, in principle, be fixed by a Pauli frame-change rather than an actual gate operation. For simplicity, however, we have kept it as a part of the recovery unit here.

### B. Bell-state preparation unit

We next describe a fault-tolerant preparation of the two-qubit state $|\tilde{\beta}_{00}\rangle$,

$$|\beta_{00}\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|00\rangle + |11\rangle),$$

which serves as the input state to multiple fault-tolerant gadgets constructed in Sec. 4.

The Bell state is first prepared in a non-fault-tolerant manner, denoted as $|\tilde{\beta}_{00}\rangle$ in Fig. 4(a). We then verify this Bell state using another copy of $|\tilde{\beta}_{00}\rangle$ prepared in a similar fashion, as shown in Fig. 4(b). The Bell state is accepted for use in further computation if the $X$ measurements yield even parity, i.e., both are 0 or both are 1, and, the parity measurement gives a 0 outcome; otherwise, the final state is rejected and we start over. That Fig. 4(b) provides a fault-tolerant preparation of $|\beta_{00}\rangle$ is explained fully in Appendix A2.

### C. Fault-tolerant $Z$ and $X$ measurement units

In this section, we demonstrate fault-tolerant circuits that perform logical $X$ and $Z$ measurements correspond-
The Bell measurements on an ideal encoded state (an encoded state with no error) lead to outcomes (0,0) or (1,0). Outcome (0,0) indicates a projection onto $|+\rangle_L$, and the outcome (1,0) indicates a projection onto $|−\rangle_L$, thus realising the logical $X$ measurement.

We show in Appendix A.3 that this measurement unit is fault-tolerant, that is, it leads to a correctable classical outcome even when there is a single fault anywhere in the circuit. We merely note here that a single fault in the circuit would lead to a faulty outcome ($(1,1)$ or $(0,1)$) for one of the Bell measurements. We simply ignore the faulty outcome and choose the majority among the rest of outcome pairs ($(0,0)$ and $(1,0)$) to decide if the state of the data qubits is projected onto $|−\rangle_L$ or $|−\rangle_L$.

D. Logical $Z$ and $X$ gadgets

To obtain a universal set of logical gates, as explained in Sec. IV we also need a fault-tolerant implementation of the logical $Z$ and $X$ operation. In standard fault tolerance schemes making use of Pauli-based codes, an operator like $X = XXII$ and $Z = ZIIZ$ (or alternatively, $IIXX$ and $IZIZ$, with the two differing by a stabilizer operator) can be applied simply by performing $X$ or $Z$ on two of four physical qubits, the fault tolerance guaranteed by the transversal nature of the operation. In the case of the amplitude-damping code, however, only the transversal logical $Z$ is fault tolerant because the off-diagonal error $F_z$ and the damping error $F_d$ commutes and anticommutes, respectively, with a physical $Z$ gate. The transversal logical $X$ operation is no longer fault tolerant, due to the fact that the damping error of the form $\frac{1}{2}(X+iY)$ becomes $\frac{1}{2}(X-iY)$ after conjugating past the $X$ operator.

Instead, to obtain a fault-tolerant logical $X$, we use the same technique as in the EC unit, by making use of flag qubits. Fig. 6 gives a fault-tolerant gadget that implements the logical $X$ combined with the error correction step. As before, $|\Psi\rangle$ denotes the state of the data qubits. Fig. 6(a) is the circuit when the syndrome extraction unit $S$ detects a damping error $F_d$. In this case, we can apply the transversal $X$ because the single fault allowed for the unit has already occurred. Fig. 6(b) is the circuit when the syndrome extraction unit detects a trivial syndrome. In this case, the transversal, non-fault-tolerant $X$ is applied first, followed by the error correction.

The fault-tolerant properties of the logical $X$ gadget are explained in detail in Appendix A.3 although they mostly follow from the fault tolerance of the EC unit. The main difference between this gadget and the EC unit is that a damping error $E$ on a data qubit becomes $E^\dagger$ after conjugating through an $X$ gate. Thus an incoming error to the $M$ unit can be either $E$ or $E^\dagger$. However, these are single-qubit errors and the set of flag qubits is still enough to detect which qubit has the error. We also note that the flag syndromes of the logical $X$ gadget differ from that of the standard EC unit by two bit flips on flag qubit 1 and 2, due to the application of two $X$ gates on data qubit 1 and 2. For example, without any faults, the flag syndrome is (1100) instead of (0000) as in the case of the standard EC unit.

![Diagram](image-url)
E. Logical $cz$ gadget

We next demonstrate a fault-tolerant two-qubit logical $cz$ operation, which is an essential ingredient for realising a universal set of logical gates. We first note that the logical CNOT and the $cz$ gadgets for the 4-qubit code both admit transversal constructions. However, as noted earlier in the construction of the $X$ gadget, transversality does not automatically translate into fault tolerance in the case of amplitude-damping errors and the 4-qubit code. In fact, the transversal CNOT is not fault-tolerant to amplitude-damping noise: a single error caused by the amplitude-damping noise can propagate through the transversal circuit into an error that is not correctable by the 4-qubit code.

For example, observe that, for two physical qubits connected by a physical CNOT operation, a damping error $E$ [see Eq. (2)] on the control qubit propagates into an $X$ error on the target (see Fig. 7). Meanwhile, a damping error on the target qubit propagates as $\frac{1}{2}(I_cX_t + Z_cZ_tX_t)$, where the subscript $c$ denotes the control qubit and $t$ denotes the target qubit. By tracing out the control qubit, we get two types of errors on the target qubit, namely, the damping error $E = \frac{1}{2}(1 + Z)X$ and its conjugate $E^\dagger = \frac{1}{2}(1 - Z)X$. We know that the 4-qubit code cannot correct for both of these errors. Therefore, a single fault on one of the qubits can thus result in an uncorrectable error, violating the requirements of fault tolerance, despite the transversal structure.

This suggests the idea of noise-structure preserving gates, as an important tool for fault-tolerant implementation of noise-adapted codes. Indeed, unlike the CNOT, it turns out that the transversal $cz$ gadget shown in Fig. 8 is fault-tolerant against amplitude-damping noise. This is explained in detail in Appendix A5. The basic idea, however, is easy to understand by contrasting with the CNOT gadget: a damping error at the control (target), after propagating through a physical $cz$ gate, propagates...
as a damping error at the control (target), as seen in Fig. 16. However, the damping error at the control (target) of the $CZ$, does lead to an additional phase ($Z$) error in the target (control). This explains the dependence between two trailing ECs in the $CZ$ gadget, indicated by the double lines in Fig. 8. Whenever one of the two EC units detects a damping error in the incoming state, and the $M$ unit in the other unit has outcome 1, a local $Z$ recovery operator is applied on the qubit in the latter block corresponding to the damped qubit in the first EC unit. For example, if the syndrome extraction unit in the first data block detects an error at the second qubit and the $M$ unit in the EC of the second data block has outcome 1, a $Z$ operator will be applied to the third data qubit of the second data block, since the two qubits are connected by a $CZ$ gate.

### IV. UNIVERSAL LOGICAL GATE SET

In the previous section, we described fault-tolerant constructions of a set of basic encoded gadgets: an EC unit that implements correction with the 4-qubit code, state preparation of the two-qubit Bell state $|\beta_{00}\rangle$, the $X$ and $Z$ measurements, the logical $X$ and $Z$ operations, as well as the logical $CZ$ operation. From these basic gadgets, we show in this section how to construct a fault-tolerant universal logical gate set, tailored for amplitude-damping noise. In particular, we demonstrate the fault-tolerant implementation of a standard universal gate set comprising the logical $CZ$, Hadamard $H$, $S$ (or phase), and $T$ (or $\pi/8$) gates, where $H \equiv |+\rangle_L \langle +| - |\rangle \langle -|_L$, $S \equiv |0\rangle_L \langle 0| + i|1\rangle_L \langle 1|$, and $T \equiv |0\rangle_L \langle 0| + e^{i\pi/4} |1\rangle_L \langle 1|$. The fault-tolerant logical $CZ$ gate is already described in Sec. IIIIB here, we complete the discussion with the logical Hadamard, $S$, and $T$ gates.

As was the problem with the CNOT gate, the physical $H$, $S$ and $T$ gates are not noise-structure preserving: They change an input damping error into an error not correctable by the 4-qubit code. We thus do not have transversal implementations of these logical gates; rather, we need a different approach for getting fault-tolerant logical gate operations. Below, we make use of the well-known technique of gate teleportation \[ \text{[11, 31]} \] to construct our fault-tolerant logical gadgets. The resulting logical gadgets are manifestly fault-tolerant against amplitude-damping noise as we build the teleportation circuits using the basic encoded gadgets shown to be fault-tolerant in Sec. IIIIB

#### A. Preparation units

Armed with the ability to prepare the Bell state fault-tolerantly, as shown in Sec. IIIIB, we can obtain fault-tolerant preparations of the logical states $|0\rangle_L$ and $|+\rangle_L$. The $|+\rangle_L$ state is straightforward: $|+\rangle_L$ is simply two copies of $|\beta_{00}\rangle$, that is,

$$|+\rangle_L = |\beta_{00}\rangle \otimes |\beta_{00}\rangle.$$  

Here, the preparation unit for the $|+\rangle_L$ state consists of two preparations of the $|\beta_{00}\rangle$ state. A fault-tolerant preparation requires that if at most one fault occurs in this combined circuit, the output has at most one error. This is different from, say, the Hadamard circuit discussed below which consists of $CZ$, $|+\rangle_L$ and $X$ units, where one fault is allowed in each of those components. Here, even though we say that the preparation of $|\beta_{00}\rangle$ is fault tolerant, we don’t allow one fault in each preparation of $|\beta_{00}\rangle$ when talking about preparation of $|+\rangle_L$ because there is no EC unit attached to the preparation of $|\beta_{00}\rangle$ and one fault in each preparation of $|\beta_{00}\rangle$ may result in two errors in the outgoing $|+\rangle_L$ state.

To get the state $|0\rangle_L$, we start with a single copy of a fault-tolerantly prepared $|\beta_{00}\rangle$ and make use of the circuit in Fig. 9 with two additional ancillas initialized to $|0\rangle$. The prepared state is accepted only when both the parity measurements are even. The fact that the preparation circuit is fault-tolerant can be seen as follows. The off-diagonal error $F_z$ of a single fault in the circuit passes through the parity measurements and causes only one $F_z$ error in the outgoing state. Meanwhile, the damping error $F_a$ in the preparation of $|\beta_{00}\rangle$ or in two CNOTs is detected by the parity measurements, and thereby, rejected. An undetected fault in the parity measurements leads to only one error in the outgoing state. In any case, the state is either rejected, or accepted with at most one error.

![FIG. 9. Fault-tolerant preparation of $|0\rangle_L$. The input Bell state $|\beta_{00}\rangle$ is assumed to have been prepared fault-tolerantly by the preparation circuit of Fig. 4.](image)

Finally, we also demonstrate fault-tolerant preparation units for the two-qubit states $|\Phi_S\rangle$ and $|\Phi_T\rangle$, which act as resource states for constructing the logical $S$ and $T$ gates, respectively:

$$|\Phi_S\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \left( |0\rangle_L + i |1\rangle_L \right)$$

and  $$|\Phi_T\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \left( |0\rangle_L + e^{i\pi/4} |1\rangle_L \right).$$

The resource states $|\Phi_S\rangle$ and $|\Phi_T\rangle$ can be prepared and verified as shown in Fig. 10 starting with a fault-tolerant
preparation of the states $|\beta_S\rangle$ and $|\beta_T\rangle$, which are local-unitary equivalents of $|\beta_{00}\rangle$:

$$|\beta_S\rangle \equiv \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} (|00\rangle + i|11\rangle)$$

and

$$|\beta_T\rangle \equiv \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} (|00\rangle + e^{i\pi/4}|11\rangle).$$

(11)

Fault-tolerant preparation units for the states $|\beta_S/T\rangle$ are shown in Fig. 10(a), using a circuit similar to that for the preparation of $|\beta_{00}\rangle$ (Fig. 4). In each case, we accept the output state only when the $X$-measurement outcomes are of even parity and the parity measurement provides a trivial outcome. Using $|\beta_{S/T}\rangle$ states, we then prepare and verify the resource states $|\Phi_{S/T}\rangle$ in Eq. (10) as shown in Fig. 10(b). We accept the prepared state only when both the parity measurements show trivial outcomes. The fault-tolerant property of the preparation of $|\Phi_{S/T}\rangle$ can be understood in a similar manner to the preparation of the $|0\rangle_L$ state. A single fault in the circuit in Fig. 10(b) leads to the state being rejected or accepted with at most one error.

**B. Logical Hadamard circuit**

Figure 11 gives our construction of the fault-tolerant logical Hadamard gate. The teleportation scheme requires the ancillary input of $|+\rangle_L$, as well as the use of the logical $CZ$ gadget, both of which admit fault-tolerant constructions, as described in Sec. III.B.

![Logical Hadamard gadget](image)

**FIG. 11.** Fault-tolerant logical Hadamard gadget, implemented using a teleportation scheme. Here, each horizontal qubit line represents 4 physical qubits, or, equivalently, one logical qubit. $|\Psi\rangle_L$ is the state of the incoming logical qubit on which we want to implement $H$.

In Fig. 11 a logical $CZ$ gadget is applied to the incoming logical (data) state $|\Psi\rangle$ and the ancillary input state $|+\rangle_L$. The data qubits are then measured in the $X$ basis, using our $X$ measurement gadget. Depending on the outcome of the $X$ measurement, the remaining four qubits (originally ancillas, but now data qubits after teleportation) end up in one of two states: $H|\Psi\rangle$ or $XH|\Psi\rangle$. In the latter case, we apply a corrective logical $X$ gadget to the outgoing state.

This logical Hadamard is fault tolerant simply due to the fact that it is constructed from a set of fault-tolerant encoded gadgets described in Sec. III, each tolerant to a single fault caused by amplitude-damping noise.

**C. Logical $S$ and $T$ circuits**

We provide the gate-teleportation circuits for the logical $S$ and $T$ gadgets in Fig. 12 and Fig. 13 respectively. Like the logical $H$, these circuits are composed of elementary encoded gadgets described in Sec. III which are provably fault tolerant.

![Logical S gate](image)

**FIG. 12.** Logical S gate

![Logical T gate](image)

**FIG. 13.** Logical T gate

In both cases, the state $|\Psi\rangle$ denotes the state of the incoming logical (data) qubits and is acted upon by the $H$.
gadget, followed by a logical CZ gate applied to $|\Psi\rangle_L$ and the appropriate ancillary input state $|\Phi_{S/T}\rangle$. Then, the data block is measured in the $X$ basis, which teleports the desired state to the ancilla block, up to a logical operation.

The final step involves a conditional logical operation on the remaining qubits. In the case of the $S$ gadget, this conditional operation is $T = ZX$, whereas in the case of the $T$ gadget, the conditional logical operation to be implemented is $SX$. Once again, the fault tolerance of the logical $S$ and $T$ gadgets follows from the fact that they are composed of basic encoded gadgets which are all known to be tolerant to single faults arising from amplitude damping noise.

V. PSEUDOTHRESHOLD CALCULATION

The feasibility of any fault tolerance scheme is partly quantified by its error threshold, which refers to that critical value of the error rate, $p_{th}$, at which the fault tolerance protocol fails to outperform the unencoded version. If $p$ refers to the unencoded error rate, and if the fault tolerance procedure can correct up to one fault, then the upper bound of the failure rate of a fault-tolerant gadget is lower-bounded by $Cp^2$, and upper-bounded by $Cp^2 + Bp^3$, where $C$ refers to the number of malignant pairs – pairs of faults that propagate an uncorrectable output, and $B$ refers to the number of ways in which the gadget can have three faults. We refer to Ref. [9] for a more rigorous derivation of these upper and lower bounds.

The critical error threshold $p_{th}$ is then upper-bounded by $p_{th}^{(u)}$, for the $p_{th}^{(u)}$ that solves

$$p_{th}^{(u)} = C(p_{th}^{(u)})^2,$$

and lower-bounded by $p_{th}^{(l)}$, for $p_{th}^{(l)}$ that solves

$$p_{th}^{(l)} = C(p_{th}^{(l)})^2 + B(p_{th}^{(l)})^3. \quad (13)$$

Eqs. (12), (13) and (13) compare the encoded scheme to the unencoded one, and we refer to the resulting threshold $p_{th}$ as a pseudothreshold, following Refs. [13] [32]. This is different from the usual quantum accuracy threshold discussed in concatenated-code fault tolerance treatments which requires a recursive simulation argument to go to higher levels of encoding for increased error-removing power (see, for example, Ref. [9]).

We note that one must be careful in assigning weights to each fault pair in order to obtain tight bounds. Recall that a fault $F$ can cause to two kinds of errors, $F_a$ and $F_z$, and not all the combinations of $F_a$ and $F_z$ lead to an uncorrectable output. For example, two CNOTs in a parity measurement (see Fig. 1(a)) each can have one fault at the controls, one with $F_a$ error and the other with $F_z$ error, and the output is still correctable; however, if the two faults cause two $F_a$ errors, then the output has a logical error. Moreover, in case the two faults are both $F_z$, the multiplicative factor should be $p^2/4$ (see Eq. (4)) instead of $p^2$. It is also often the case that a pair of locations with two $F_a$ errors can lead to an output with an $X$ error or an $(I \pm Z)$ error on one of the four data qubits. In such cases, we still get a correct state half of the time when trying to correct the output, and therefore, the multiplicative factor should be $p^2/2$. Taking all of these factors into account, we obtain a better estimate of $C$, leading to tighter bounds for the pseudothreshold.

An ideal circuit is simulated fault tolerantly by replacing each unencoded gadget in the circuit with an encoded gadget followed by an EC unit. The failure probability of such a fault-tolerant simulation can be expressed in terms of the failure probability of overlapping composite objects constituting the circuit, called extended gadgets, which take into account both incoming errors and faults occurring within a given gadget. Therefore, an extended gadget often includes both the leading EC unit and the trailing EC unit with the encoded gadget in between. The fault tolerance of the simulation circuit is then ensured by the fault tolerance of the extended gadgets. We refer the readers to Ref. [9] for a detailed discussion of this argument. In this section, we obtain the pseudothresholds for two computational situations, namely, the memory circuit with no nontrivial computational operations, and a general computational circuit.

A. Memory pseudothreshold

![FIG. 14. Extended identity gadget.](image)

Suppose we are interested only in storing the quantum information for a certain period of time. This can be thought of as a circuit comprising only identity (i.e., trivial) computational gates, with periodic error correction operations to remove errors and thus preserve the stored information. The relevant extended gadget comprises a pair of EC units surrounding the identity gate, corresponding to storage for the time between consecutive error correction cycles, as shown in the Fig. 14. To obtain the pseudothreshold for this memory situation, we enumerate the number of malignant pairs of faults leading to an uncorrectable output, assuming that the incoming state has no errors. We label the different blocks that constitute the identity gadget as follows:
We can then represent the number of malignant pairs via a matrix whose rows and columns correspond to each block in Fig. 14, with the entries of the matrix denoting the total malignant pair contributions from the respective blocks. Because of the overlap between two consecutive extended gadgets when they are strung up into the memory circuit, to avoid double counting, a fault pair in the leading EC of an extended gadget is counted as a fault pair in the trailing EC of the preceding extended gadget.

\[
\begin{pmatrix}
1 & 2 & 3 \\
1 & 0 & 702 \\
2 & 328 & 224 & 6
\end{pmatrix}
\]

The total number of malignant pairs – 6502 – is simply the sum of the entries of the matrix. Apart from the pairs of damping faults, we also need to keep track of the \(O(p^2)\) phase errors, and we argue in Appendix B1 that there are 29 malignant fault locations for the phase errors. In total, we obtain \(C = 6531\) and \(B = \binom{366}{3}\), leading to the bounds,

\[1.31 \times 10^{-4} \leq \rho_{th} \leq 1.53 \times 10^{-4}. \quad (14)\]

We refer to Appendix B1 for the details of the calculation.

**B. Computational pseudothreshold**

Next, we consider a general circuit, comprising a sequence of computational gates, chosen from the universal logical gate set of Sec. IV. Among all the possible extended gadgets constructed from our set of basic encoded gadgets, the extended \(cz\) gadget, shown in Fig. 15 turns out to have the maximum number of malignant pairs, as verified by exhaustive counting. This \(cz\) gadget thus determines the pseudothreshold relevant for this computational situation.

![Extended cz gadget for computing the pseudothreshold](image)

Similar to the extended identity gadget, we label the different blocks that constitute the extended \(cz\) as follows:

1. EC1 - leading EC
2. EC2 - trailing EC
3. 4 rest locations
4. EC3 - trailing EC
5. EC4 - trailing EC
6. \(cz\) gadget

We can then represent the number of malignant pairs via the following matrix. We merely note the final numbers here and refer to Appendix B2 for the detailed enumeration of malignant pairs for every pair of blocks:

\[
\begin{pmatrix}
1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 5 \\
1 & 0 & 2 & 702 & 5542 \\
2 & 48 & 328 & 718 & 24 \\
3 & 28 & 224 & 28 & 6
\end{pmatrix}
\]

We obtain \(C = 13835\) and \(B = \binom{732}{3}\), leading to the computational pseudothreshold bounded by

\[5.69 \times 10^{-5} \leq \rho_{th} \leq 7.22 \times 10^{-5}. \quad (15)\]

**VI. CONCLUSION**

We demonstrate a universal fault tolerance scheme tailored to amplitude-damping noise, using the 4-qubit code. We construct an error correction unit, preparation units, measurement units, and an encoded universal
gate set, all tolerant to single-qubit faults arising due to amplitude-damping noise. Our construction shows that achieving fault tolerance using noise-adapted codes for non-Pauli noise models like amplitude-damping is possible, but poses interesting challenges, and can lead to counter-intuitive results when viewed from the standpoint of the well-established principles of quantum fault tolerance.

For instance, our EC unit requires a nontrivial recovery unit to correct for the single-qubit off-diagonal fault $F_z$, unlike the standard fault tolerance schemes that only require a simple classical Pauli frame change. Another significant departure from the conventional ideas of fault tolerance is the fact that logical gates such as the CNOT and the logical $X$ which are transversal, are however not fault-tolerant against single-qubit damping errors. This in turn motivates the need to identify noise-structure preserving gates while developing fault-tolerant schemes using noise-adapted codes. Indeed, the structure of the non-Pauli noise dictates our choice of fault-tolerant gate gadgets. Thus, the transversal two-qubit $cz$ gate turns out to be the more natural choice for a two-qubit gate, rather than the transversal CNOT gate. When it comes to single-qubit gates, we do not obtain any transversal constructions for the 4-qubit code. Rather, we have to rely on gate teleportation to implement the Hadamard, $S$ and $T$ gates. These additional complications contribute to the perhaps poorer-than-expected pseudothreshold for the encoded gadgets.

Our work presents a first step towards achieving fault tolerance against specific noise models, and can already be used as an initial noise-reduction step towards more accurate computation. A further step would be to investigate possibilities of optimizing the gadget constructions for smaller ones with fewer fault locations and hence better pseudothreshold. One could even ask the standard fault tolerance question of scaling up the code beyond a single layer of encoding, by concatenation for example, or via the 2D Bacon-Shor code [33] generalization of the 4-qubit code. Such extensions of our work could provide more error correction power even within a resource-constrained scenario and have the potential to take us closer to more accurate—and hence more useful—quantum computers.


Appendix A: Fault tolerance analysis

Here, we present detailed arguments to demonstrate the fault tolerance properties of the various basic encoded gadgets presented in Sec. III of the main text.
1. EC unit

We want to show that the EC unit is fault tolerant in that it has properties (P1) and (P2) of Sec. III repeated here for the convenience of the reader:

(P1) If the EC unit has no fault, it takes an incoming (data-qubits) state with at most one damping error to an outgoing state with no errors.

(P2) If the EC unit contains one fault, it takes an incoming state with no errors to an outgoing state with at most one damping error.

That (P1) holds is ensured by the fact that the syndrome extraction and recovery, when without fault, can correct up to one damping error. We notice that an incoming state without error of the form $|\Psi\rangle = a|0\rangle_L + b|1\rangle_L$ becomes

$$\tilde{\Psi} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|0000\rangle|0000\rangle_f + |1111\rangle|1111\rangle_f) + \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|0011\rangle|0011\rangle_f + |1100\rangle|1100\rangle_f),$$

after entangling with the flag qubits by the first four CNOTs (see Fig. 3, where the subscript $f$ denotes the set of four flag qubits. When there are no faults (Fig. 3(b)), the state right before the four $Z$-measurements is $|\Psi\rangle|0000\rangle_f$. As a result, measurement of the flag qubits will give the outcome 0000 and leave the data qubits in state $|\Psi\rangle$. On the other hand, if there is a damping error in one of the data qubits, either the syndrome extraction unit will detect the damping part $F_a$ and the recovery $R$ will correct for it, or the syndrome extraction unit will detect no damping, let the off-diagonal part $F_z$ through, which is then killed off by the $M$ unit. The fact that the $M$ unit can kill off the $F_z$ error can be seen by noting that the state in Eq. (A1) is stabilized by $XXXXXXX$. Therefore, the projection on the $+1$ eigenspace of that state with an off-diagonal $Z$ is

$$\frac{1}{2}(1 + X^{\otimes 8})(Z_1 \tilde{\Psi}) \langle \tilde{\Psi} | \frac{1}{2}(1 + X^{\otimes 8}) = Zt \frac{1}{2}(1 - X^{\otimes 8}) \tilde{\Psi} \langle \tilde{\Psi}| \frac{1}{2}(1 + X^{\otimes 8}) = 0.$$

In any case, the outgoing state has no error as promised.

To verify (P2), we need to consider faults at different locations in the EC unit of Fig. 3.

We recall that a faulty CNOT is modeled as an ideal CNOT followed by a fault $F$ on both the control and target qubits; a faulty measurement is modeled as a fault $F$ followed by an ideal measurement. Since the off-diagonal part $F_z$ passes through all the parity measurements and is only killed off by the $M$ unit, a $F_z$ error occurring in any location before the $M$ unit will not survive, whereas a $F_z$ occurring inside or after the $M$ unit will lead to one $F_z$ error at the output. Hence, (P2) is satisfied for the $F_z$ error and from now on, we only consider the effect of $F_a$ error.

A fault at the control of one of the first four CNOTs is detected by the following syndrome extraction and is corrected by the recovery unit $R$ (see Fig. 3(a)). On the other hand, a fault at the target, denoted as $D_i$ ($i = 1, 2, 3, 4$) (see Tab. III), causes a flip in the corresponding flag qubit and possibly propagates a $Z$ error to the data qubits, depending on the outcome of $M$. Note that the flag syndrome alone is not enough to conclude that the fault is at the flag qubits because a fault in a data qubit may cause the same syndrome, as discussed later. Hence, another parity measurement is performed and we can conclude that the fault is at the flag qubit if the parity measurement gives trivial outcome. Now, the $Z$ error is taken care of by a measurement of $XXXX$ on the data qubits and a $Z$ is applied correspondingly if the outcome is 1.

Next, let's consider the syndrome extraction unit $S$. Note that unless the syndrome bits $s_1$ or $s_2$ are triggered, i.e., record a 1, neither of the subsequent gates in the syndrome extraction unit that measures $ZIII, IZII, IIIZ,$ or $IIIIZ$, will be performed. $s_1$ and $s_2$ are not triggered, assuming no incoming errors, unless a fault occurs in the gates that perform those parity measurements, namely, at the locations 1&2 indicated in Fig. 3(a). Note that faults can also occur in the “resting” locations within the time-steps for locations 1&2, but those can all be grouped into either incoming errors for this syndrome extraction unit, or undetected errors that will be fixed only by the next part of the EC unit. We list below the possible faults at different locations in the syndrome unit, and explain how they are diagnosed.

- **A faulty CNOT at location 1 in Fig. 3(a)** involves two cases: (i) fault at control; (ii) fault at target. Case (i) is not detected in this parity measurement, and will present as an outgoing damping error, to be dealt with in the next part of the EC unit. Case (ii) takes an incoming state without any error (see Eq. (A1) to the state $|11\rangle|\phi\rangle \otimes (|11\rangle |\phi\rangle)_f$ (see Eq. (8)). This is detected by giving an odd parity, $s_1 = 1$, and subsequently, $u_1 = 1$ and $v_1 = 1$, and after being disentangled with the flag qubits, will be corrected by the now no-fault recovery unit (since the single allowed fault in the EC unit occurred in this parity measurement); see Table III.

- **A faulty CNOT at location 2** involves again two cases: (i) fault at control; (ii) fault at target. Case (i) again is not detected in this parity measurement, and will present as an outgoing damping error. Case (ii) also results in no error as the ancilla state is in the state $|0\rangle$ right after the CNOT, a state immune to the effects of $F$; $s_1$ remains as 0 in this case.

- **A faulty $Z$ measurement on the ancillas introduces no errors to the syndrome extraction** – the ancilla qubits, assuming no incoming errors, remain in the state $|0\rangle$, immune to the damping error.
We now consider the effect of an undetected error due to a fault in the syndrome extraction unit, which is denoted as $B_i$ in Tab. III. For concreteness, consider an error on the first data qubit, errors on the other qubits can be understood in the same manner. It can be easily checked that the state after the damping error, $a|0111⟩|1111⟩_f + b|0100⟩|1100⟩_f$, becomes the following state after passing through the $M$ unit and the decoupling step

$$\left(\frac{a}{\sqrt{2}}|0111⟩ ± |1000⟩\right) + \frac{b}{\sqrt{2}}|0100⟩ ± |1011⟩)⟩|1000⟩_f$$

where plus or minus sign depends on the outcome of the measurement in the $M$ unit. We can see that the first flag qubit is flipped and there is an X or Y error on the first data qubit. In either case, from the flag syndrome and the follow-up parity measurement, we know that the first data qubit is damped and can correct correspondingly. Note that the syndrome extraction alone cannot distinguish between X errors on data qubit 1 and 2, therefore, the flag qubits are necessary in this case to make the EC unit fault tolerant.

We next move on to the $M$ unit that appears in Fig. 3 and is detailed in Fig. 1(c). A fault at the target of any CNOT coupled to a data qubit, denoted as $A_i$ in Tab. III, causes a damping error in the data qubit connected to it. This error is detected by the flag syndrome bits and corrected by the recovery $R$ since it flips the flag qubit coupled to the damped data qubit. On the other hand, a fault at the target of any CNOT coupled to a flag qubit, denoted as $A_i^{(f)}$ in Tab. III, also flips the flag qubit, but propagates $(I+Z)$ error to the data qubits. By a parity measurement at the end, we are able to distinguish this with the previous case, therefore, correctly recover the encoded state. What is more complicated is a fault at the ancilla qubit. We consider the possible faults at different locations in the $M$ unit below, and explain how they are mitigated.

- A fault in the preparation of the $|+⟩$ state, denoted as $C_0$, causes the initial state of the ancilla qubit to be $|0⟩$. This means that the $M$ unit has no effect on the data qubits and the flag qubits are left in $|0000⟩$ state after being disentangled with the data qubits. The X measurement at the end will give random outcome but we never use this outcome to decode anything.

- A fault at the control of the first CNOT, denoted as $C_1$, propagates X errors to data qubits 2, 3, 4, and to all flag qubits, which is equivalent to an X error on data qubit 2, up to a stabilizer. These X errors on data qubit 2, 3, and 4 in turns propagate through the CNOTs after the $M$ unit and flip flag qubits 2, 3, and 4. The overall effect is that data qubit 2 and flag qubit 1 are flipped, hence, the flag syndrome is $(1000)$ and we are able to correctly apply a bit flip to the first data qubit.

- A fault at the control of the second CNOT, denoted as $C_2$, propagates X errors to data qubits 3, 4, and to all flag qubits, which is equivalent to a logical X error. In this case, the flag qubits give an unique syndrome $(1100)$ which has two bit flips instead of single bit flip as in all the other cases.

- A fault at the control of the third CNOT, denoted as $C_3$, propagates X errors to data qubit 4, and to all flag qubits. After the decoupling step, the flag syndrome is $(1111)$, the recovery unit will be able to recognize and correct for it.

- A fault at the control of the fourth CNOT, denoted as $C_4$, does not cause any error to the data qubit, but flips all the flag qubit. Therefore, the flag syndrome is $(1111)$ and we conclude that no data qubit is damped.

- A fault at the control of the fifth CNOT, denoted as $C_5$, propagates X errors to flag qubit 2, 3, and 4, hence, makes the flag syndrome $(0111)$. This is a unique syndrome and we conclude that there is no data error in this case.

- A fault at the control of the sixth CNOT, denoted as $C_6$, propagates X errors to flag qubit 3 and 4, hence, makes an unique flag syndrome $(0011)$ and we also conclude that there is no error in the data qubits.

- A fault at the control of the seventh CNOT, denoted as $C_7$, propagates an X error to flag qubit 4, hence, the flag syndrome $(0001)$. A parity measurement after that is necessary to distinguish this with $A_1^{(f)}$ or $D_1$ fault.

- A fault at the control of the eighth CNOT, denoted as $C_8$, or a fault at the X-measurement does not propagate any error to data and flag qubits. It may change the measurement outcome, which has no consequence for us.

Finally, a fault at the control of the CNOTs used to disentangle data and flag qubits causes a damping error that is undetected by the current EC unit, appeared as an error in the outgoing state, to be dealt with by the next EC unit. Meanwhile, the target of those CNOTs or Z-measurements cannot be damped since the flag qubits are in state $|0000⟩$ at this step.

Tab. III summarizes all the fault locations discussed above with the corresponding error on the data qubits and syndrome. The column denoted as "$P_{12}$ or $P_{34}$" indicates which parity measurement should be performed in the second syndrome extraction unit, the other parity measurement is not necessary and always gives a trivial outcome. We note that the syndrome is not unique for each fault location, but it is enough to determine the damped qubit, thereby, enough to correct $E_1, E_1^†, X$, or $Z$ error on that qubit.
This covers all possibilities for a single fault in the EC unit, giving rise either to no more than one damping error to the outgoing state, i.e., (P2) holds.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$s_1$</th>
<th>$s_2$</th>
<th>$u_1$</th>
<th>$v_1$</th>
<th>$u_2$</th>
<th>$v_2$</th>
<th>Diagnosis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>no damping error or undetected fault</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>Qubit 1 is damped</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>Qubit 2 is damped</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>Fault in CNOT at location 1 of $P_1$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Qubit 3 is damped</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Qubit 4 is damped</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Fault in CNOT at location 1 of $P_2$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE II. Updated version of Table I, with added syndromes and diagnoses for faults in the EC unit.

2. Bell-state preparation

We now explain how the circuits in Figs. 4(a) and (b) lead to a fault-tolerant preparation of the Bell state $|\beta_{00}\rangle$, satisfying property (P3) mentioned in Sec. IIB.

First, we consider an $F_z$ error anywhere in the circuits. A $F_z$ occurring before or at the control of two CNOTs used for the $X$-measurements is killed of by the $X$-measurements themselves. A $F_z$ at the target of those two CNOTs or in the parity measurement leads to at most a $F_z$ error in the accepted Bell state.

Next, we consider the effect of a damping error $F_x$.

• A faulty Hadamard results in the preparation of the state $|00\rangle$ by the circuit in Fig. 4(a). If this happens to the first block of $|\beta_{00}\rangle$ in the circuit in Fig. 4(b), it has no effect on the second block but may change the outcomes of two $X$-measurements. The second Bell state is still rejected if the outcomes have odd parity. On the other hand, if the faulty Hadamard is in the second Bell state block, only even parity outcomes correspond to a correct Bell state; odd parity outcomes corresponds to the state $|00\rangle − |11\rangle$ in the second block, which is rejected.

• A fault in the CNOT in Fig. 4(a), at either the control or target, leads to an odd outcome for the parity measurement at the end. A fault at the control of the CNOTs in Fig. 4(b) or a faulty $X$-measurement has the same effect as a faulty Hadamard in the first block: it may cause odd parity outcomes of two $X$-measurements but does not affect the second block. On the other hand, an fault at the target causes an odd outcome for the parity measurement.

• Finally, a fault in the parity measurement is either detected by the parity measurement itself, or causes at most one error to the outgoing Bell state, in case it is accepted.

3. Logical $X$ measurement

We next prove that the $X$ measurement unit satisfies the fault tolerance property (P5) stated in Sec. IIB. Assuming the initial state of the data qubits is $|\Psi\rangle = a|+\rangle_L + b|−\rangle_L$, then after the two CNOTs between the ancilla qubits at the top and the four (data) qubits in Fig. 5 the state is given by,

$$a|\beta_{00}\rangle \otimes |\bar{b}\rangle_{10} + b|\beta_{10}\rangle \otimes |\bar{a}\rangle_{01}$$

where the first pair refers to the ancilla qubits and the other two pairs refer to the data qubits. Apart from $|\beta_{00}\rangle$, other Bell states are also labeled according to their outcome in a Bell measurement, namely, $|\beta_{01}\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|00\rangle − |11\rangle)$, $|\beta_{10}\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|01\rangle + |10\rangle)$.

If there is no error in the incoming state as well as no fault in the measurement circuit, then the outcomes of three Bell measurements are either all $(0,0)$ or $(1,0)$, corresponding to the data qubits projected to $|+\rangle_L$ or $|−\rangle_L$. However, if there is error or fault the outcomes may be different. First, note that a $F_z$ error in any data qubits or ancilla qubits, or a $F_x$ fault in any location of the measurement circuit is killed off by at least one of three Bell measurements. This can be seen by commuting a $Z$ error through the measurement circuit and noticing that it always meets at least one $X$-measurement. Therefore, we only need to consider the damping error $F_x$.

Now, we consider an error at one of the data qubits.

• If data qubit 1 or 2 is damped, then the state after being entangled with the ancilla pair is

$$|\beta_{00}\rangle |\beta_{01}\rangle ± |\beta_{10}\rangle |\beta_{11}\rangle) (a|\beta_{00}\rangle − b|\beta_{10}\rangle)$$

If the outcomes of the Bell measurements are $\{(00),(01),(00)\}$ or $\{(10),(11),(10)\}$, we can discard the invalid outcome $(01)$ and $(11)$ and determine the correct outcome of the $X$ measurement based on the other two. However, if the outcomes are $\{(00),(01),(10)\}$ or $\{(10),(11),(00)\}$, then there is a tie after discarding the invalid outcome. In this case, we further discard the outcome of the ancilla block and determine the correct outcome based on the third Bell measurement. The reason for this is that the outcomes of the first and second Bell measurements can be both wrong due to the coupling of two CNOTs, whereas the third Bell measurement is independent from the other two.

• If data qubit 3 or 4 is damped, then the state after entangled with the ancilla block is

$$(a|\beta_{00}\rangle |\beta_{01}\rangle − b|\beta_{10}\rangle |\beta_{10}\rangle) (|\beta_{01}\rangle ± |\beta_{11}\rangle)$$

In this case, the outcome of the third Bell measurement is discarded; the correct outcome is determined based on the other two Bell measurements.
Next, we consider a fault in the measurement circuit.

- If one of two ancilla qubit is faulty, then the state after entangled with the data qubits is
  \[(|\beta_{01}\rangle \pm |\beta_{11}\rangle)(a |\beta_{00}\rangle |\beta_{00}\rangle \pm b |\beta_{11}\rangle |\beta_{10}\rangle)\]  
  \[(A5)\]

  For this case, after discarding invalid outcomes, the last one gives the correct result.

- If one of two CNOTS used to entangle the data qubits with the ancilla qubits is faulty, either at control or target, it is easy to verify that the state right before the Bell measurements is one of the following states
  \[(|\beta_{01}\rangle \pm |\beta_{11}\rangle)(a |\beta_{00}\rangle |\beta_{00}\rangle - b |\beta_{10}\rangle |\beta_{10}\rangle)\]
  \[a |\beta_{00}\rangle (|\beta_{01}\rangle \pm |\beta_{11}\rangle)|\beta_{00}\rangle - b |\beta_{10}\rangle (|\beta_{01}\rangle \pm |\beta_{11}\rangle)|\beta_{10}\rangle\]
  \[(A6)\]

  As the above case, the correct logical outcome is determined after discarding the invalid Bell measurement outcomes.

- Finally, a fault in one of three Bell measurements may spoil the outcome of that measurement. However, the other two are unaffected and we can correctly determine the outcome of $X$ measurement from those two.

This covers all the possibilities of a single fault in the measurement circuit in Fig. 3, hence, shows that the $X$ measurement is fault-tolerant.

4. **Logical $X$ gadget**

Next, we demonstrate how the logical $X$ gadget described in Fig. 3 is tolerant against single faults, as stated in property (P5) in Sec. II B.

First, we note that an $F_z$ error passes through the logical $X$ in the same way as in the $E$ gadget because $F_z$ (anti)commutes with a physical $X$ gate. Therefore, it will be killed off by the $M$ unit or result in an $F_z$ in the

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fault</th>
<th>Error</th>
<th>$(r_1 r_2 r_3 r_4)$</th>
<th>$P_{12}$ or $P_{34}$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>$I$</td>
<td>(0000)</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$A_1$</td>
<td>$E_1$</td>
<td>(1000)</td>
<td>$P_{12} \rightarrow 1$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$A_2$</td>
<td>$E_2$</td>
<td>(0100)</td>
<td>$P_{12} \rightarrow 1$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$A_3$</td>
<td>$E_3$</td>
<td>(0010)</td>
<td>$P_{34} \rightarrow 1$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$A_4$</td>
<td>$E_4$</td>
<td>(0001)</td>
<td>$P_{34} \rightarrow 1$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$A'_1$</td>
<td>$I + Z_1$</td>
<td>(1000)</td>
<td>$P_{12} \rightarrow 0$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$A'_2$</td>
<td>$I + Z_2$</td>
<td>(0100)</td>
<td>$P_{12} \rightarrow 0$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$A'_3$</td>
<td>$I + Z_3$</td>
<td>(0010)</td>
<td>$P_{34} \rightarrow 0$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$A'_4$</td>
<td>$I + Z_4$</td>
<td>(0001)</td>
<td>$P_{34} \rightarrow 0$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$B_1$</td>
<td>$X_1$ or $Z_1 X_1$</td>
<td>(1000)</td>
<td>$P_{12} \rightarrow 1$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$B_2$</td>
<td>$X_2$ or $Z_2 X_2$</td>
<td>(0100)</td>
<td>$P_{12} \rightarrow 1$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$B_3$</td>
<td>$X_3$ or $Z_3 X_3$</td>
<td>(0010)</td>
<td>$P_{34} \rightarrow 1$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$B_4$</td>
<td>$X_4$ or $Z_4 X_4$</td>
<td>(0001)</td>
<td>$P_{34} \rightarrow 1$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$C_0$</td>
<td>$I$</td>
<td>(0000)</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$C_1$</td>
<td>$X_1$</td>
<td>(1000)</td>
<td>$P_{12} \rightarrow 1$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$C_2$</td>
<td>$X_2 X_4$</td>
<td>(1100)</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$C_3$</td>
<td>$X_4$</td>
<td>(1110)</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$C_4$</td>
<td>$I$</td>
<td>(1111)</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$C_5$</td>
<td>$I$</td>
<td>(0111)</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$C_6$</td>
<td>$I$</td>
<td>(0011)</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$C_7$</td>
<td>$I$</td>
<td>(0001)</td>
<td>$P_{34} \rightarrow 0$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$C_8$</td>
<td>$I$</td>
<td>(0000)</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$D_1$</td>
<td>$I$ or $Z_1$</td>
<td>(1000)</td>
<td>$P_{12} \rightarrow 0$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$D_2$</td>
<td>$I$ or $Z_2$</td>
<td>(0100)</td>
<td>$P_{12} \rightarrow 0$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$D_3$</td>
<td>$I$ or $Z_3$</td>
<td>(0010)</td>
<td>$P_{34} \rightarrow 0$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$D_4$</td>
<td>$I$ or $Z_4$</td>
<td>(0001)</td>
<td>$P_{34} \rightarrow 0$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TABLE III.** Summary of fault locations and the corresponding error and syndrome for $E$ unit in Fig. 3. The first column denotes all the fault locations mentioned in the proof. The second column is the errors on the data qubits at the point right after measuring all the flag qubits. The third column is the corresponding flag syndromes. The last column indicates which parity measurement should be performed in the second syndrome extraction unit in Fig. 3(b) and the expected outcome. $P_{12}$ and $P_{34}$ mean the parity measurements on data qubits $1\&2$ and $3\&4$, respectively.
outgoing state, as explained in Appendix A1.

- An error in the incoming state or a fault in the entangling step between the data qubits and the flag qubits is detected by the following syndrome extraction unit $S_1$ (see Fig. 6(a)). The circuit after that can be assumed to have no fault, hence, recover for the damping error and apply the transversal $X = XXII$ correctly.

- An error before one of the physical $X$ gates (due to a fault in the syndrome extraction unit) conjugates through the $X$ gate as $E_1^i = (1 - Z)X$, which in turn becomes an $E_1$ or an $E_1^i$ after the $M$ unit. The flag syndromes are swapped as compared to the case of $B_1$ faults in Tab. IIa, namely, $(r_1r_2r_3r_4)$ = (0111) for an $E_1$ error and $(r_1r_2r_3r_4)$ = (1000) for an $E_1^i$ error. In either case, a bit flip is correctly applied to the first data qubit.

- A fault at other locations is already covered in the analysis of the $E$ unit, see Appendix A1.

Thus the logical $X$ gadget is tolerant up to single-qubit errors, thereby satisfying the desired fault tolerance properties.

5. Logical $cz$ gadget

Finally, we show that the $cz$ gadget in Fig. 8 satisfies the fault tolerance property (P5) stated in Sec. IIB.

First, note that an $F_z$ in the incoming state or due to any faulty $cz$s passes through the gadget and is killed off by the $E$ unit at the end. A $F_z$ due to a faulty component in the $E$ units is either killed off by the $E$ units themselves or causes at most one $F_z$ at the outgoing state, as explained in Sec. A1.

Next, consider the case of a damping error propagating through a two-qubit $cz$ gate, as shown in Fig. 16.

$$E \quad = \quad E \quad Z$$

FIG. 16. A damping error $E$ before a $cz$ gate.

An incoming damping error right before the control (target) propagates as a damping error $E$ at the control (target) and a phase error $Z$ at the target (control). The damping error in one block is detected and corrected by the corresponding $E$ unit. Meanwhile, the additional $Z$ error in the other block is taken care of by the $M$ unit in the other $E$. If the $M$ unit detects a nontrivial outcome, it will correct by applying a $Z$ operator to the qubit that is connected to the damped qubit in the other block by a physical $cz$. It is possible that the $M$ unit detects a trivial outcome because a damping error after a $cz$ or a fault in the $E$ units can cause a qubit to be damped without propagating a $Z$ error to the other block.

Finally, a fault anywhere in one of two $E$ units leads to at most one error in the outgoing state, as shown in Sec. A1. Therefore, we conclude that our transversal $cz$ gadget satisfies the desired fault tolerance properties.

Appendix B: Pseudothreshold Calculation

We describe here the details of our pseudothreshold calculation, for the memory unit and the extended $cz$ unit. We assume that the inputs to the units do not have any errors and explicitly count the total number of malignant faults of $O(p^2)$ which will cause a given unit to fail. $O(p^2)$ faults include phase fault at a single position and damping faults at two different positions.

1. Memory Pseudothreshold

We now calculate the pseudothreshold for the memory unit in Fig. 14. We first count the malignant fault pairs due to two damping faults (assuming a no-error input to the memory unit) leading to an output that is uncorrectable. This could happen in one of three possible ways: (1) two damping faults could occur within the $E$ units, (2) both faults could occur within the rest locations, or, (3) one fault in the $E$ unit and one fault in the rest locations.

1. Malignant pairs within a $E$ unit: We count the total number of malignant pairs within a $E$ unit, shown in Fig. 3. Depending on the outcomes of the syndrome extraction unit $S$, the $E$ can take different paths as shown in Fig. 3(a) and Fig. 3(b). For easy counting, we further divide the $E$ unit into smaller parts, numbered as follows.

1. Entangling step between data and flag qubits, including the first 4 CNOTS.
2. Syndrome extraction unit $S$.
3. Disentangling step between the data and flag qubits in Fig. 3(a).
4. Recovery unit $R$ in Fig. 3(a).
5. $M$ unit.
6. Disentangling step between the data and flag qubits in Fig. 3(b).
7. Parity measurements in Fig. 3(b).
8. Recovery unit $R$ in Fig. 3(b).

The matrix below represents the number of malignant pairs with each fault in the corresponding
2. Malignant pairs in the resting locations: There are 4 locations when the qubits rest or there are 4 applications of Identity gates leading to $C(4,2) = 6$ malignant pairs.

3. 1 fault in the leading EC and 1 fault in the resting locations: Most of the single faults inside a EC is detected and corrected by the EC itself. However, there are single faults that lead to a single error at the outgoing state of the EC. They include faults at the control of one of four CNOTs at the disentangling step, which cause $F_a$ or $F_z$ errors, and faults at the target of one of eight CNOTs in $\mathcal{M}$ unit, which cause $F_z$ errors. This error in turn can combine of one error at one of four rest location, leading to an uncorrectable error. In total, we have 28 such malignant pairs.

4. 1 fault in the trailing EC and 1 fault in the rest location: A fault in one of four rest location can combine with a fault in the trailing EC to cause an uncorrectable error. In total, there are 224 pairs. In case the error in the rest location is $F_a$, the EC unit will take the path in Fig. 3(a). Otherwise, if it is $F_z$ error, the EC unit will take the path in Fig. 3(b) and the $F_z$ error will be killed by $\mathcal{M}$ unit, hence the state after that has no error.

5. 1 fault in each EC: Faults at the control of CNOTs in part 6 (disentangling step) of the leading EC can combine with one fault in the trailing EC in the same way as faults in rest location. There are 448 malignant pairs due to this. In addition, $F_z$ error due to faults at the target of CNOTs in part 5 ($\mathcal{M}$ unit) of the leading EC also can combine with faults in the trailing EC. There are 254 malignant pairs due to this. Therefore, in total, there are 702 malignant pairs for this case.

Finally, we count the malignant faults leading to $Z$ errors in the memory unit in Fig. 14. For an EC unit, this includes 11 positions in part 1, 6 positions in part 2, 36 positions in part 5, and 4 positions in part 6. Hence, 57 positions for an EC unit. For the whole memory unit, there are 29 positions in total.

Therefore, the total number of malignant pairs due to damping faults and malignant positions due to $Z$ errors is given by, $C = 5542$, leading to an upper bound $1/C \approx 1.53 \times 10^{-4}$. Furthermore, there are at most 181 locations in one EC unit, therefore $B = (360^2)$, leading to a lower bound of $1.31 \times 10^{-4}$.

2. Pseudothreshold for the extended $cz$ unit

The counting for the extended $cz$ can be done in very similar manner to the memory unit. We show here again the matrix whose rows and columns correspond to each part in Fig. 15 and whose entries are the total malignant pair contributions from the corresponding parts.

$$
\begin{pmatrix}
1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 5 \\
1 & 112 \\
2 & 263 & 61 \\
3 & 18 & 4 & 0 \\
4 & 50 & 17 & 0 & 0 \\
5 & 650 & 617 & 0 & 0 & 1767 \\
6 & 56 & 75 & 0 & 0 & 430 & 25 \\
7 & 96 & 70 & 0 & 0 & 618 & 0 & 0 \\
8 & 92 & 58 & 0 & 0 & 463 & 0 & 0 & 0
\end{pmatrix}
$$

Each entry in the matrix is the number of malignant pairs with two faults in the parts corresponding to row and column label. It is counted by choosing any one position in each part, inserting damping faults and checking if the final state is correctable or not. In total, there are 5542 malignant pairs in one EC unit.

1. Two faults in one EC: We have already counted the number for this case from the last section of memory unit.

2. One fault in EC1 and one fault in EC3: This is the same as the case when one fault is in the leading EC and the other fault is in the trailing EC of the memory unit. By symmetry, this is also the number for one fault in EC2 and one fault in EC4.

3. One fault in EC1 and one fault in EC4: Most of the faults will be corrected independently. However, if the fault in EC1 causes $F_a$ error and a $Z$ error is propagated to the second data block, then a fault in EC4 may miss this $Z$ error. First of all, faults in $\mathcal{M}$ unit at the preparation of $|+, X\rangle$, X-measurement, or the control of the last CNOT in $\mathcal{M}$ unit may lead to wrong outcome, hence, $Z$ error. Secondly, a $F_a$ error may cause logical error, for example, if a $Z$ error is propagated to the first data qubit of the second block, then a $F_a$ error at data qubit 3 or 4 may cause a logical $Z$ error because $Z_1 E_3 = Z_1 X_3 + Z_3 X_1$. In total, there are 328 malignant pairs for this case. By symmetry, this is also the number for ne fault in EC2 and one fault in EC3.

4. One fault in EC1 and one fault in EC2: Note that $F_z$ errors are okay since they are corrected independently by EC3 and EC4. Undetected $F_a$ must
be due to a fault at control of one of four CNOTs in the disentangling step. $F_a$ at qubits connected by a CZ gate are okay because after a damping, a $Z$ error has no effect. However, $F_a$ at qubits not connected by any CZ gate lead to a logical $Z$ error in one or both data blocks. Therefore, there are 48 pairs.

5. **One fault in EC$_3$ and one fault in EC$_4$:** The only case that can fail is when a fault in EC$_3$ leads to non-trivial outcomes of syndrome extraction unit and a fault in EC$_4$ leads to a wrong outcome of $M$ unit, and vice versa. A fault at the preparation of $|+\rangle$, $X$-measurement and the control of the last CNOT in $M$ unit of EC$_4$ may lead to wrong outcome. There are 8 positions in EC$_3$ that leads to non-trivial outcomes of syndrome extraction unit: controls in the entangling step and the target of the first two CNOTs in the syndrome extraction itself. But note that a redundant $Z$ error at data qubit 1 and 2 is correctable by an ideal decoder, hence, 4 among those 8 locations are safe. Therefore, in total, there are $(4 \times 3) \times 2 = 24$ pairs.

6. **One fault in CZ gadget and one fault in EC$_1$ or EC$_2$:** The number is the same as one fault in the leading EC and one fault in the rest location of memory unit.

7. **One fault in CZ gadget and one fault in EC$_3$ or EC$_4$:** The number is the same as one fault in the trailing EC and one fault in the rest location of memory unit.

8. **2 faults in CZ gadget:** There are 8 positions, hence, maximum $C(8, 2) = 28$ pairs. But if two faults are in different block then they are corrected independently. Therefore, we have 12 pairs left.

For a second order $Z$ error, there are 14.25 positions for one EC unit and 2 positions for the CZ gadget. Therefore we have a total of $14.25 \times 4 + 2 = 59$ malignant positions. Therefore, the total number of malignant pairs due to damping errors and malignant fault locations due to $Z$ errors is given by, $C = 13835$, leading to an upper bound $1/C \approx 7.22 \times 10^{-5}$. There are at most 732 locations in the extended CZ gadget, hence $B = \binom{732}{3}$, leading to a lower bound $5.69 \times 10^{-5}$. 