

# General Qubit Errors Cannot Be Corrected

Subhash Kak

June 27, 2002

## Abstract

Error correction in the standard meaning of the term implies the ability to correct all small analog errors and some large errors. Examining assumptions at the basis of the recently proposed quantum error-correcting codes, it is pointed out that these codes can correct only a subset of errors, and are unable to correct small phase errors which can have disastrous consequences for a quantum computation. This shortcomings will restrict their usefulness in real applications.

Colours seen by candle-light  
Will not look the same by day.

—Robert Browning

## 1 Introduction

Since the work of Calderbank, Shor, and Steane [1, 8, 2] (CSS), the question of error-correction coding for quantum computing has attracted much attention and several codes have been proposed. But these codes have been devised to work under very restrictive conditions and they can potentially correct only bit flips and phase flips and some combinations thereof, which errors represent a small subset of all the errors that can corrupt a quantum state. This would not be an issue if phase errors were not important in a quantum computation. But they are, since we manipulate the phases to drive a quantum computation to a useful conclusion. Many quantum algorithms require the computation begin with no phase errors in the start of the computation. CSS codes cannot correct for errors such as a  $\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|j\rangle_i + |l\rangle_i)$  changing into a  $\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|j\rangle_i + e^{i0.002} |l\rangle_i)$ ,

without assuming that there is some part of the code that does not suffer any error at all, no matter how small.

It might appear odd for anyone to question quantum error correction when researchers have been working in this area for several years. Actually, the ability of quantum error correction methods to eliminate analog quantum noise has been questioned before[3]. Analog errors in the analog domain (which is like the quantum information situation) can simply not be completely eliminated. Using redundancy could, at best, reduce errors under appropriate conditions. Therefore, the claim that analog quantum errors could somehow be eliminated has been found puzzling, especially because the No-Cloning theorem makes it impossible to copy quantum states. But the proponents of quantum error correction codes felt that "quantum errors could be fixed with quantum tricks[2]." These tricks seem to work because the term "error correction" in quantum computing has been used in a non-standard manner. But we wish to stress that this is not just a semantic problem.

Error correction, intuitively and in classical theory, implies that if

$$y = x + n;$$

where  $x$  is the discrete codeword,  $n$  is analog noise, and  $y$  is the analog noisy codeword, one can recover  $x$  completely and fully so long as the analog noise function  $n$  is less than a certain threshold. If it exceeds this threshold, then also there is full correction so long as this does not happen more than a certain number of times (the Hamming distance for which the code is designed) at the places the analog signal  $y$  is sampled.

In other words, the hallmark of classical error-correcting codes is the correction of all possible small analog errors and many others which exceed the thresholds associated with the code alphabet. This full correction of all possible small analog errors is beyond the capability of the proposed quantum error-correcting codes.

This definition of error correction in classical theory is not merely a matter of convention or intuition. In classical information science, errors are analog and, therefore, all the possible small errors must be corrected by error-correcting codes. To someone who looks at this field from the outside, it might appear that one only needs to fix bit flips. In reality, small analog errors, occurring on all the bits, are first removed by the use of clamping and hard-limiting.

Since the definition of a qubit includes arbitrary phase, it is necessary to consider errors from the perspective of the quantum state and not just from that of final measurement. As mentioned above, in the classical theory, it is implicitly accepted that all possible small analog errors have already been corrected by means of an appropriate thresholding operation. Therefore, we must define correction of small analog phase errors as a requirement for quantum error correction.

This paper reviews assumptions behind the CSS quantum error-correcting codes. The construction of these codes requires precise knowledge of the state of the coded qubit, in which no phase uncertainties are conceded. This precisely known coded qubit state helps to determine a standard against which errors are measured. This precision will not be available in practice.

The paper is organized as follows: Section 2 briefly reviews the CSS model, Section 3 presents the qubit sphere to highlight the difficulty posed by unknown phase, and Section 4 considers the question of what errors can be corrected, which is followed by conclusions.

## 2 The quantum error correction model

A quantum error-correcting code is defined to be a unitary mapping of  $k$  qubits into a subspace of the quantum state space of  $n$  qubits such that if any  $t$  of the qubits undergo arbitrary decoherence, not necessarily independently, the resulting  $n$  qubits can be used to faithfully reconstruct the original quantum state of the  $k$  encoded qubits[1]. The assumptions in the quantum error correction model are[8]: Arbitrary errors of qubits are divided into 'amplitude errors', that is, changes of the form  $|j\rangle_i \rightarrow |j\rangle_i$ , and 'phase errors', that is, changes of the form  $|j\rangle_i \rightarrow |j\rangle_i e^{i\phi_j}$ .

These assumptions seem to have been made with the final measurement in mind, where the objective is to get a binary sequence from the measurement apparatus. The idea here is that if 0s have been converted into 1s and vice versa, the redundancy of the error-correction code will be able to tell us where the error has occurred, allowing us to reconstruct the correct sequence.

A quantum system is correctly viewed as being apart from the observer, who enters the picture only when the measurement is made. This means that one can speak of two perspectives as far as errors are concerned: (A), errors relative to the quantum state itself; and (B), errors relative to the

observer who will make the measurement. Since the transformation between the quantum state and the measurement is many-to-one, the two perspectives are not identical. The CSS model considers the second perspective only, without relating it to the errors in the quantum state. By doing so, the model misses out on errors that can have a catastrophic effect on the computing process.

Note that classical error correction theory does not bother about such a dual perspective because of two reasons: first, the absence of anything analogous to state collapse; second, the small analog errors are assumed to have been corrected by a hard-limiting operation prior to converting the received analog signal by sampling into the discrete, binary codeword. In classical theory, all the useful information within the system is accessible, which is not the case in a quantum system.

The perspective B is described elsewhere by the author [3, 4, 5, 6], where it is argued that random, small errors in phase as well as admixture of unwanted states can be problematic for the implementation of quantum algorithms.

**Phase errors in the codeword** In one well known one qubit error-correcting code, each qubit is represented by seven qubits. The seven qubit system is interpreted as a pair of abstract particles: the abstract qubit, and the syndrome space. The idea behind the method is that the error will leave the state component unchanged, and by measuring the syndrome one would know the unitary transformation to be applied to correct the error. The code for  $|j\rangle_i$  has an even number of 1s and the code for  $|\bar{j}\rangle_i$  has an odd number of 1s. In reality, the coded qubits should be:

$$\begin{aligned} |j\rangle_{i\text{code}} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{8}} (&|0000000\rangle_i + e^{i\cdot 01} |0001111\rangle_i + e^{i\cdot 02} |0110011\rangle_i + e^{i\cdot 03} |0111100\rangle_i \\ &+ e^{i\cdot 04} |\bar{1}010101\rangle_i + e^{i\cdot 05} |\bar{1}011010\rangle_i + e^{i\cdot 06} |\bar{1}100110\rangle_i + e^{i\cdot 07} |\bar{1}101001\rangle_i); \quad (1) \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} |\bar{j}\rangle_{i\text{code}} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{8}} (&|\bar{1}111111\rangle_i + e^{i\cdot 11} |\bar{1}110000\rangle_i + e^{i\cdot 12} |\bar{1}001100\rangle_i + e^{i\cdot 13} |\bar{1}000011\rangle_i \\ &+ e^{i\cdot 14} |\bar{1}010101\rangle_i + e^{i\cdot 15} |\bar{1}001010\rangle_i + e^{i\cdot 16} |\bar{1}011001\rangle_i + e^{i\cdot 17} |\bar{1}010110\rangle_i); \quad (2) \end{aligned}$$

where  $\phi_{ij}$  are random phase errors. But in the theory, the uncertainties related to  $\phi_{ij}$  are taken to be zero. This makes it possible to use the codewords as the standard against which other errors can be checked. In a realistic theory the  $\phi_{ij}$  cannot be taken to be zero.

Similarly, in the 9-qubit code, the codewords should be:

$$|0\rangle_{\text{code}} = (|000\rangle + e^{i\phi_1}|111\rangle)(|000\rangle + e^{i\phi_2}|111\rangle)(|000\rangle + e^{i\phi_3}|111\rangle) \quad (3)$$

$$|1\rangle_{\text{code}} = (|000\rangle - e^{i\phi_4}|111\rangle)(|000\rangle - e^{i\phi_5}|111\rangle)(|000\rangle - e^{i\phi_6}|111\rangle) \quad (4)$$

where  $\phi_i$  are small phase errors. But, again, it is assumed that the  $\phi_i$  are zero.

Computing the overlap of the codewords (3) and (4) with error states shows clearly that there would be a large probability that small errors will not be corrected. Neither the small random phase errors in the codewords, nor those that occur later, will be eliminated.

**Ancilla qubits** We refer the reader to the CSS constructions where ancilla bits are used to obtain the noise free state of the quantum code [9, 2]. The ancilla bits are assumed to be in the precise all zero state, with no phase errors, whatsoever! Steane acknowledges [9]<sup>1</sup> that for quantum error correction to work the assumption that the ancilla be noise free needs to be dropped. He suggests that fault-tolerant quantum computation [7] will help alleviate this difficulty. But the fault-tolerant system only shifts the burden by assuming zero phase errors elsewhere in the constructions.

Even for the correction of a single qubit, there is circularity of argument. One needs perfect ancilla bits, and even if we had them, one can allow for only one error in a 9-qubit code. How can one guarantee that there will be absolutely no phase error (no matter how small) in the rest of the 9 qubits?

### 3 The qubit sphere

To examine the perspective A, which is with respect to the quantum state, it's useful to begin with the representation of a qubit as the superposition  $|j\rangle =$

---

<sup>1</sup>Page 39

$e^{i\phi_1} |0\rangle + e^{i\phi_2} |1\rangle$ ; where  $\phi_1, \phi_2 \in \mathbb{R}$  and  $e^{i\phi_1} + e^{i\phi_2} = 1$ , as a four-dimensional sphere. To simplify matters, we consider only the difference in phases and reduce the qubit to  $|j\rangle = e^{i\phi_j} |j\rangle$ . The qubit is now a triple  $(\phi_0, \phi_1, \phi_2)$  and it can be represented by a three-dimensional sphere of Figure 1.

Parenthetically, let it be noted that our qubit sphere is drawn differently from the qubit sphere of Tittel and Wehls[10], who show  $|0\rangle$  and  $|1\rangle$  as opposite points on the same circle on the sphere.

In the qubit sphere of Figure 1, the motion counterclockwise is taken to be positive. The point of intersection of the two spheres at the front end will be the state  $|j\rangle$ .

Assuming, for example, that we are speaking of polarized photons, we see that with respect to  $|0\rangle$  the  $45^\circ$  polarized photons are points anywhere on the circle to the right. Also, if there is unknown phase associated with  $|0\rangle$ , the  $45^\circ$  photons can be anywhere on the sphere surface[4].

CSS considers just four points  $|0\rangle, |1\rangle$ , and their sums and differences on the qubit sphere, because doing this reduces the quantum problem to two separate classes of classical error correction. These four points represent a small subset of all the points on the qubit sphere. Furthermore, the location of these four points will be characterized by small errors.

## 4 What errors can be corrected?

Error correction is possible only for discrete quantities. In classical information theory, error correction of a single bit is possible because there is a separation in amplitude between 0 and 1. When bit slips between these two values are considered, one can, by introducing redundancy, increase distance between codewords, ensuring the capacity to correct certain errors. The CSS method appears to do the same thing ensuring that under the assumed noise model it will work fine as long as the qubits suffer only bit and phase slips and their combinations. But these errors are a small subset of all the errors that are possible.

The idea of using bit slips and phase slips comes from the fact that the Pauli group consists of four operators: identity (I), bit flip (X), phase flip (Z), and bit-and-phase flip (Y). These four matrices:




Figure 1: The qubit sphere ( ; ; ). The vertical circles represent  $\lvert 1 \rangle$  and its phase shifts. The circle on the right represents  $\lvert 1 \rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} (\lvert 0 \rangle + e^{i\phi} \lvert 1 \rangle)$ , which are various combinations of  $\lvert 0 \rangle$  with phase shifted  $\lvert 1 \rangle$  (i.e. 45° polarized photons, for example). The point A is  $e^{i\pi/2} \lvert 1 \rangle$ ; B is  $\lvert 1 \rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} (\lvert 0 \rangle + i \lvert 1 \rangle)$ ; C is  $\lvert 1 \rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} (\lvert 0 \rangle + \lvert 1 \rangle)$ .

$$I = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, X = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, Z = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix}, Y = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & i \\ i & 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

span the space of  $2^n \times 2^n$  matrices, and the  $n$ -qubit Pauli group spans the space of  $2^n \times 2^n$  matrices. A general phase error will then be represented by a linear combination of bit and phase errors.

However, to correct an analog phase error one still needs perfectly error-free ancilla qubits which is impossible to guarantee and, therefore, we are unable to proceed further.

The CSS noise model is restrictive from a practical point of view. It ignores that each qubit, being a triple  $(\sigma_x, \sigma_y, \sigma_z)$ , will have small, unknown values initially, even when the strategy of using atom cooling is employed to generate a coherent state.

Furthermore, the application of quantum algorithms by means of electric and magnetic fields, and decoherence, will introduce additional phase uncertainty. Small phase errors will become large as unitary transformations are applied repeatedly in the execution of a quantum algorithm. Since quantum calculations are sensitive to the phase values, they will have uncontrollable effects.

In fact, the starting states will not only have small random phase errors, but also an admixture of all other states, albeit with small complex amplitudes. This introduces an additional complicating factor which the CSS model ignores.

Just as classical error models assume the same type of analog error corrupting each bit, one needs to accept that analog error will corrupt each qubit. But an analysis of such a situation, given further that the initial state is correctly seen as an admixture, will be difficult. As a start, it may be useful to determine the influence on performance of random phase errors in the qubit state and those in the measurement of the syndrome state.

Only discrete quantities to which small values of noise are added can be corrected; noise added to an analog variable cannot be removed, and quantum phase is an analog variable. Analog quantities (such as qubit phases) cannot be corrected unconditionally.

One can measure analog variables with respect to a standard, and then correct any deviations from the standard. This is what appears to be happening in the disregarding of random phases in the coded qubit. But that is tantamount to a backdoor discretization of the problem.



## 5 Conclusions

Error correction requires correction of all small errors and some large errors. This the CSS quantum error correction model is unable to do.

The error model used by CSS is not realistic. It assumes zero phase errors in many of its constructions, which precision will be absent in the real world. There can never be any guarantee of zero phase error in the qubits. Unlike classical error models where each bit is corrupted by noise, the CSS model assumes that most qubits are perfectly precise. This only shifts the task from error correction to initialization, without indicating how that might be done [6]. As far as the constructions of quantum error correcting codes refer to physical reality, they are not certain, and as far as they are certain, they do not refer to physical reality. A realistic error model must assume that all qubits, including the ancilla bits, have the same type of errors.

Because qubits are arbitrary combinations of  $|0\rangle$  and  $|1\rangle$  ( $|0\rangle$  ;  $|1\rangle$ ), lack of knowledge of the relative phase can send the qubit to any point on the sphere. The CSS model is a less than successful joining of the classical error-control theory to quantum information. It violates the basic premise of error correction, that it should be possible to correct all possible small errors, and some large errors.

The CSS model may be called a method of error reduction, under narrow conditions of some of the qubits escaping all error. But if there are perfect, error-free qubits, why not use them in the first place? Error reduction, even if there was a way of estimating it in the presence of unknown small phase errors, may not be of use in quantum computing techniques where absolutely no error is permitted for useful computation to take place.

We cannot be hopeful for other methods of qubit error correction either, since the difficulty arises out of the analog nature of the error process.

Acknowledgement I would like to thank Daniel Gottesman and Andreas Klappenecker for their comments on an earlier version of this paper. I am especially grateful to Michel Dyakonov for criticism and sage advice.

## References

1. A.R. Calderbank and P.W. Shor, "Good quantum error-correcting codes exist." LANL Archive quant-ph/9512032.

2. D. Gottesman, "An introduction to quantum error correction," LANL Archive quant-ph/0004072.
3. S. Kak, "The initialization problem in quantum computing," Foundations of Physics 29, 267 (1999). LANL Archive quant-ph/9805002.
4. S. Kak, "Rotating a qubit," Information Sciences 128, 149 (2000). LANL Archive quant-ph/9910107.
5. S. Kak, "Statistical constraints on state preparation for a quantum computer," Pramana 57, 683 (2001). LANL Archive quant-ph/0010109.
6. S. Kak, "Uncertainty in quantum computation," LANL Archive quant-ph/0206006.
7. P. W. Shor, "Fault-tolerant quantum computation," LANL Archive quant-ph/9605011.
8. A. M. Steane, "Simple quantum error correcting codes," LANL Archive quant-ph/9605021.
9. A. M. Steane, "Quantum computing," Rept. Prog. Phys. 61, 117 (1998). LANL Archive quant-ph/9708022.
10. W. Tittel and G. Weihs, "Photonic entanglement for fundamental tests and quantum communication," Quantum Information and Communication 1, 3 (2001).