

Fault-Tolerant Logical Gate Networks for CSS Codes

Andrew M. Steane and Ben Ibinson

Centre for Quantum Computation, Department of Atomic and Laser Physics, University of Oxford,
Clarendon Laboratory, Parks Road, Oxford OX1 3PU, England.

(dated: December 19, 2021)

Fault-tolerant logical operations for qubits encoded by CSS codes are discussed, with emphasis on methods that apply to codes of high rate, encoding k qubits per block with $k > 1$. It is shown that the logical qubits within a given block can be prepared by a single recovery operation in any state whose stabilizer generator separates into X and Z parts. Optimized methods to move logical qubits around and to achieve controlled-not and Toffoli gates are discussed. It is found that the number of time-steps required to complete a fault-tolerant quantum computation is the same when $k > 1$ as when $k = 1$.

I. INTRODUCTION

Fault tolerant quantum computation is quantum computation of high fidelity carried out with physical qubits and operations that are noisy and imperfect. Fault tolerance covers a variety of concepts, but there are three main ones: (generalized) geometric or adiabatic phases, composite pulses, and quantum error correction (QEC). This paper is concerned purely with the latter.

The main ideas for fault-tolerant universal quantum computation on encoded states were introduced by Shor [1]. Two aspects have to be considered: the error correction or recovery process, which uses a noisy quantum network, and the implementation of quantum gates to evolve the logical state of the machine. This paper is concerned purely with the latter task, but we will study methods in which the two aspects are to some extent merged.

The present work builds on a series of ideas that were established as follows. Shor's seminal work [1] discussed CSS codes encoding a single qubit per block. It established such central concepts as the use of ancillary entangled states that are partially verified, repetition of syndrome measurements, and a discrete universal set of logical operations. Divincenzo and Shor [2] generalised the fault-tolerant syndrome measurement protocol to any stabilizer code, and Steane [3] discovered the more efficient technique of using prepared logical zero states to extract syndromes, which will be adopted in this paper.

Gottesman [4] discovered fault-tolerant universal methods that can be applied to all stabilizer codes. The main new ingredient is to use measurements of observables in the Pauli group, combined with preparation of 'cat' states, to achieve desired operations. Teleportation in particular is used to extract an individual logical bit from one block and place it in another. Steane [5] showed that the measurements of Pauli observables required in Gottesman's methods can be absorbed into the syndrome measurement, so that they are achieved at close to zero cost.

The important concept of 'teleporting a gate' or teleporting qubits through a gate was introduced by Nielsen and Chuang [6] and applied to fault-tolerant gate con-

structions by Gottesman and Chuang [7].

In this paper we study methods for quantum codes encoding more than one qubit per block. We introduce extensions and generalisations of the ideas just listed, and identify networks requiring the least computation resources to perform a given operation. One interesting result is that the number of time steps required to complete a logical algorithm is the same for $k = 1$ and $k > 1$, where k is the number of logical qubits per block. This is because the methods allow much of the required processing to take place 'offline', without interrupting the evolution of the computer. The 'offline' operations involve the preparation of ancillary qubits in specific states, and the transfer of logical qubits to otherwise empty blocks by teleportation.

The paper is organised as follows. Section II introduces terminology and notation. Section III lists some ways to achieve a universal set of fault-tolerant operations. Section IV then presents our first main result (theorem 1 and its corollary). This is an extension of a theorem in [5], it shows that CSS-encoded qubits can be fault-tolerantly prepared in a useful class of states by use of a single recovery operation. We also discuss how to simplify some more general state-preparations by decomposing stabilizer operators into simpler components.

Section V gives a set of basic operations for CSS codes. The main aim is to discuss the transfer and teleportation operations whose use for manipulating bits encoded by stabilizer codes was proposed by Gottesman [4]. We list the constructions and present the most efficient implementation of teleportation between blocks. We use theorem 1 to avoid the need to prepare 'cat' states for preparing and measuring states, including states in the Bell basis of encoded qubits.

Sections VI and VII discuss implementation of the controlled-not and Toffoli gates respectively, between qubits encoded in the same block.

II. TERMINOLOGY AND NOTATION

The following notation will be adopted. The single-qubit operators X , Y and Z are the Pauli operators σ_x , σ_y and σ_z , respectively, (it will be convenient to de-

Y so that it is Hermitian, not real as is sometimes chosen in QEC discussions). We use H for the single-qubit Hadamard operation and S for the rotation about the z axis through $\pi/2$ (phase shift of $\pi/2$ by i). Thus $S^2 = Z$ and $(HS)^2 = X$. The general phase shift of $\pi/2$ by $\exp(i\theta)$ will be written $P(\theta)$, so $S = P(\pi/2)$, $Z = P(\pi)$, etc.

A controlled U operation is written ${}^C U$, so for example ${}^C X$ is controlled-not, and $T = {}^C C X$ is the Toffoli gate.

The logic gate hierarchy introduced in [7] is defined recursively by

$$C_j = f U_j U_{C_1} U^j C_j \text{ for } j \geq 1; \quad (1)$$

where C_1 is the Pauli group (the set of tensor products of Pauli operators, including the identity I and iI). Each C_j contains $C_{j-1} \cdot P(\pi/2)^{2^{j-1}} C_{j-1} n C_j$ where n denotes the set difference. The Clifford group is \mathcal{C} in the hierarchy (1). By the definition of \mathcal{C} , this group is the normalizer of the Pauli group. It is generated by $fH; S; X; g$ [7, 8].

All operators are understood to act on the logical, i.e. encoded qubits (operations on the physical qubits are discussed in the appendix). A blockwise operation is defined to be one such that the relevant operator acts on each of the logical qubits in a given block, or each corresponding pair in two blocks in the case of 2-qubit operators (blockwise action of 3- or more-bit operators will not arise in the discussion).

We define an operation to be 'fault tolerant' if it does not cause errors in one physical qubit to propagate to two or more qubits in any one block. The fault tolerance of the operations used in the networks to be discussed is proved in the appendix.

A block of n physical qubits stores k logical qubits. The notation M_u , where u is an k -bit binary word, means a tensor product of single-qubit M operators acting on those logical qubits identified by the 1s in u (for example $X_{101} = X \otimes I \otimes X$). The letters $u; v; w; x; y; z$ when used as a subscript or inside a ket symbol (as in $|x\rangle_L$) always refer to binary words. When we wish to treat a list of operators such as $fM_i; i = 1 :: k$ then the letters $i; j; r; p$ are used as subscripts.

The notation $X^i \otimes X_{2^k-i}$ or $Z^i \otimes Z_{2^k-i}$, where i is a number running from 1 to k , means a single operator applied to the i 'th logical bit in a block. For example $X^2 \otimes X_{01000}$ for $k = 5$; N.B. no powers (greater than 1) of Pauli operators appear anywhere in this paper.

A. Computational resources

Most of the computational resources of the physical computer are dedicated to the QEC networks. The complete network to recover (error-correct) a single block involves $\sim nd^2$ physical gates [9], where d is the minimum distance of the code, whereas the operations acting in between recoveries of a given block typically only involve n physical operators (one for each physical bit in the block). To assess the resources of the networks to be

described we will therefore primarily count blocks and recoveries.

Whenever a single block is recovered, all are, because the duration of the recovery network is assumed to be long enough that even 'resting' blocks accumulate significant memory errors. We allow at most one set of gates connecting different blocks between successive recoveries, to prevent avalanches of errors. However, we allow combinations of twin- and single-block operations, such as ${}^C X$ followed by H , without requiring a further recovery. We define one 'time step' to be the interval between the completion of one recovery, and the completion of the next. The 'area' of a network is defined to be the product (number of blocks) (number of time steps).

Measurement of logical bits, and preparation of logical bits in required states, is absorbed as much as possible into the recovery operations as described in section IV.

Most of the operations on the computer are either measurements absorbed into recoveries or a physical gate applied once to each bit in a block or pair of blocks (so-called 'transversal' application of a gate). We will treat in this paper the case where the QEC encoding is a CSS code based on a doubly even classical code, such that fault-tolerant Clifford group gates are relatively straightforward (see section V) but the members of C_3 (including the Toffoli gate and ${}^C S; P(\pi/4)$) are not. To implement the latter, we adopt Shor's method of preparing a block of n physical bits in the 'cat' state $|j\rangle^n + |i\rangle^n$ and using it to measure Clifford group observables such as blockwise ${}^C X$ on encoded bits. This method is fault-tolerant, but it is an undesirable element because the noise associated with preparing the cat states and connecting them to the data qubits is larger than that of a single transversal gate. Therefore we will aim to keep the use of such cat states to a minimum.

We distinguish between 'offline' and 'online' parts of the networks to be discussed. The 'offline' parts are so called because they involve operations on the logical data qubits of the computer, and therefore can only take place at the correct moment in the algorithm being computed. The 'online' parts are state preparations which can take place at any time prior to when they are needed, and operations to move passive qubits (i.e. those not immediately involved in a logical gate) around in order to conserve memory blocks. The offline parts can proceed in parallel with other operations of the computer as long as there are sufficient spare blocks available, but the computer's algorithm cannot be evolved further while the online part of a given step is completed, because the algorithm (in all but rare instances) requires the logical operations to take place sequentially. This means that when considering the computation resources required for a given network, the most important cost measure is the duration of the online part.

In the methods to be discussed, it often happens that data qubits are moved from one block to another in order to make it possible to apply logical operations to them. At any given moment, most blocks in the computer act

as memory, and a few act as an 'accumulator' where the logical operations take place. The movement of memory qubits too and from the accumulator is intermediate between 'offline' and 'online'. For, suppose a data bit has been moved to an accumulator block and a logical operation has just been applied to it. In order to free the accumulator for further use, the bit must be moved out again. If this bit were required in the next logical operation, however, then it is usually possible to apply the logical operation straight away, and move it afterwards. If the bit were not required, then the operation to move it back into memory could proceed offline, as long as there is another accumulator block available to allow the next logical gate to proceed at the same time. Therefore we will count each operation to move qubits from memory to accumulator as online, and operations to move them back to memory as offline.

III. UNIVERSAL SETS

In this section we will consider universal sets of quantum gates for which fault-tolerant constructions have been put forward.

For operations on bare qubits, the most commonly considered universal set of quantum gates is $fU(\gamma; \theta)^\dagger X g$ where $U(\gamma; \theta)$ is a rotation of a single qubit through about an axis in the $x-y$ plane specified by θ . However, this is not a useful set to consider for the purpose of finding fault-tolerant gates on encoded qubits, because $U(\gamma; \theta)$ is not readily amenable to fault-tolerant methods.

Several different proposals for fault-tolerant universal sets have been put forward. All involve the Clifford group. The Clifford group is not sufficient for universal quantum computation, nor even for useful quantum computation, since it can be shown that a quantum computer using only operations from the Clifford group can be efficiently simulated on a classical computer [10, 11]. To complete the set a further operator must be added, and it can be shown [1, 11] that an operator in $C_3 \cap C_2$ suffices.

1. Shor [1] proposed adding the Toffoli gate, making the universal set $fH; S; C^2X; Tg$ (or $fR; S; C^2X; Tg$ which is equivalent since $R = H S^2$). Obviously, C^2X can be obtained from T , but this does not reduce the set since Shor's method to obtain T assumes that C^2X is already available.
2. $fH; S; C^2X; C^2Sg$ was considered for example by Knill, Laflamme and Zurek [12]. This is similar to (1) because C^2S and C^2X suffice to produce C^2Z , which with H makes $C^2X = T$.
3. The same authors [12] also considered $fS; C^2X; C^2Sg$ together with the ability to prepare the encoded (or 'logical') states $\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(j_1 i_L + j_2 i_L) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}, j_1 i_L - j_2 i_L = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}$. This can be shown to be sufficient

since preparation of $j_1 i_L$ together with S and X can produce H , and the rest follows as in (2).

4. $fH; S; C^2X; P(\pi/4)g$ is the 'standard set' discussed by Nielsen and Chuang [11].
5. Knill et al. [8] proposed $fH; S; C^2Xg$ combined with preparation of $j_1 i_L = \cos(\pi/8) j_1 i_L + \sin(\pi/8) j_2 i_L$. The latter is prepared by making use of the fact that it is an eigenstate of H , and once prepared is used to obtain a C^2H operation, from which the Toffoli gate can be obtained.
6. Gottesman [4] showed that C^2X , combined with the ability to measure $X; Y$ and Z , is sufficient to produce any operation in C_2 . The universal set is completed by an operation in $C_3 \cap C_2$ such as T .
7. Shi [13] proved that $fH; Tg$ is universal; some further insights are given by Aharonov [14].

Many of these methods are summarized and explained in [11], where the proof of universality and the efficiency of approximating a continuous set with a discrete one (Solovay-Kitaev theorem) is also discussed.

(1) is a useful starting point and we will use it in this paper, but generalized to $[[n; k; d]]$ codes storing more than one qubit per block. Similar methods apply to (2) and (4). A generalization of the ideas of Knill et al. used for (2) is given in the appendix; however, the codes for which it works turn out to be non-optimal. (5) will not be adopted because it is slow, requiring 12 preparations of $j_1 i_L$ for every Toffoli gate, and the preparation is itself non-trivial. (6) is important because measurement of X, Y and Z can be performed fault-tolerantly for any stabilizer code, not just $[[n; 1; d]]$ codes. Gottesman also proposed the use of measurements and whole-block operations to swap logical qubits between and within blocks. (7) is a nice result, but the known fault-tolerant constructions for T assume that fault-tolerant versions of other gates such as C^2X are already available, so this 'minimal' set has not so far been used to generate fault-tolerant universal computation.

The Gottesman methods rely heavily on measurement, which might be thought to be disadvantageous. In fact, since the measurements can be absorbed into the recoveries (see section IV and [5]) they are available at no cost and therefore are advantageous. In any case all the methods involve measurement and/or state preparation to implement the Toffoli or an equivalent gate. Since any useful quantum computation must make significant use of gates outside the Clifford group (otherwise it could be efficiently simulated classically), the methods are all roughly equivalent in this regard. For example, the speed of Shor's algorithm to factorize integers is limited by the Toffoli gates required to evaluate modular exponentials [11, 15, 16].

IV. MEASUREMENT OF LOGICAL PAULI OBSERVABLES

Theorem 1. For any CSS code, measurement of a set M of logical observables in the Pauli group can be performed at almost no cost by merging it with a single recovery operation, as long as the set has the following properties: every $M \subseteq M$ is of the form either X_u or Y_u or Z_u (i.e. a product of one type of Pauli operator), and not all three types of operator appear in the set.

Theorem 1 was put forward in [5] for the case of measuring a single observable of the form X_u , Y_u or Z_u . The method is to prepare an ancilla in $|j_u\rangle = |j_L\rangle + |j_R\rangle$, then operate blockwise C^X or C^Y or C^Z from ancilla to data, then measure the ancilla in the $f|j\rangle; |j\rangle$ basis. The measurement outcomes permit both an error syndrome and the eigenvalue of the relevant observable to be deduced. The ancilla preparation is done fault-tolerantly. One fault-tolerant method is to produce an imperfect version of the desired state $|j_u\rangle$ by any means, and then to measure all those observables in the stabilizer of $|j_u\rangle$ that consist of only Z operators; the prepared state is rejected if any of these verifying measurements yield the wrong eigenvalue (-1), and in such cases a further preparation attempt is initiated. Any prepared ancilla state that passes the verification does not have correlated X errors in it [17], so can safely act as the control bits in a blockwise controlled gate with the data. Z errors in the ancilla preparation (whether correlated or not) cause the wrong syndrome and/or wrong eigenvalue of the observable being measured on the data to be deduced. This is guarded against by repetition and taking a majority vote. This vote corrects the effects of Z errors in the ancilla preparation; it explains why it was not necessary to measure the X -type stabilizer observables in the verification step. The whole procedure is fault-tolerant if the noise is uncorrelated and stochastic. It is efficient if the initial preparation attempt has a non-negligible probability of success (i.e. of producing $|j_u\rangle$ with no X ; Y or Z errors).

In the method just outlined, only a subset of the observables in the stabilizer of $|j_u\rangle$ was measured in order to verify the ancilla. Other methods are possible. For example a measurement of the complete set of observables, combined with rotations conditional on the outcomes, is one way to prepare $|j_u\rangle$. Further copies could be produced and then compared by controlled-not.

To generalize to the complete result presented in the theorem, consider first a set of observables of a single type $fM_u g$ where M is either X or Y or Z . A measurement of any pair $M_u; M_v$ is equivalent, both in the eigenvalue information obtained, and in the state projection which results, to measuring all members of the closed Abelian group $fI; M_u; M_v; M_u M_v = M_{u+v} g$. Similarly, measuring the whole set is equivalent to measuring an Abelian

group, and the corresponding binary vectors fug form a linear vector space. The ancilla is prepared in


$$a_{fug} = \sum_u X_{j_L} \quad (2)$$

and the rest of the method proceeds as before.

When the set M to be measured contains members of two different types, the members of each type are measured during each part of the syndrome extraction. That is, the syndrome extraction proceeds in two parts for CSS codes. These are normally envisaged to collect X -error and then Z -error syndromes, but we are free to choose any one out of the three pairs $fX; Zg$, $fX; Yg$, $fY; Zg$ to get the complete syndrome information. Each is obtained by operating the relevant type of controlled gate from ancilla to data, so we can simultaneously measure the same combinations of observable types. We cannot measure single observables of mixed type because we only have blockwise controlled-gates of un-mixed type available.


A. Logical state preparation

Next we address preparation of logical states. In order to introduce notation, let us list the simplest measurements that theorem 1 permits, namely measurement of X , Z or Y on any single qubit in a block. These are indicated thus:



Each group of lines in such a diagram represents the logical qubits of a given block by showing more than one line to indicate that the operation can act on a single bit within the block. The dotted box indicates that the group of operations take place in a single step.

Now, the measurement procedure is such as to leave the encoded block in an eigenstate of the measured observable, in the logical Hilbert space. Furthermore, it is shown in the appendix that we can also apply Pauli operators to individual qubits, and groups of qubits, within a block. It follows that we can prepare any logical qubit in the eigenstate of eigenvalue +1 of any Pauli operator (by a measurement followed by application of an anti-commuting Pauli operator when the measured eigenvalue is -1). This gives the following set of basic fault-tolerant state preparations:



where $j_i = |j_L\rangle + |j_R\rangle$; $j_{ii} = |j_L\rangle - |j_R\rangle$.

Measurements can be useful for preparing logical qubits not only in the standard states just listed, but also in entangled states. The class of logical states which can be prepared by the method described is a fairly large and powerful class:

Corollary to theorem 1. Any set of logical qubits within a given block can be prepared in a quantum codeword state of any quantum stabilizer code whose stabilizer separates into pure-X and pure-Z parts, using a single recovery.

Note, the logical qubits remain encoded in their original 'inner' code; the corollary describes the preparation of certain superpositions of logical states. The corollary follows immediately from the remarks above: the recoveries are used to measure the stabilizers of the outer code, which have the right form when the stabilizer separates as stated. The operator to move from a -1 to a $+1$ eigenstate is a tensor product of Pauli operators and so is also available.

For example, the Bell state $|00\rangle_L + |11\rangle_L$ is a quantum codeword of a $[[2;0;2]]$ CSS code with stabilizer $XX;ZZ$. The corollary allows us to prepare such states of pairs of logical qubits in the same block; this is very useful for teleportation. The following diagrams record this fact and give a slightly more complicated example, which we will use later and which further illustrates the method:

The first example is used in all the constructions presented in the rest of this paper, see (8) to (17). The stabilizer for the 2nd example is generated by $X_{1110}; X_{0101}; Z_{0111}; Z_{1010}$. For this case the ancilla used to extract the syndrome for Z errors is prepared in $|000\rangle_L + |110\rangle_L + |101\rangle_L + |101\rangle_L$; the ancilla used to extract the syndrome for X errors is prepared in $|000\rangle_L + |111\rangle_L + |101\rangle_L + |101\rangle_L$.

For the sake of clarity, let us examine the ancilla preparation in a little more detail, by using preparation of $|00\rangle_L + |11\rangle_L$ in the ancilla as an example. Let G_0 and H_0 be the generator and check matrices of the classical code C_0 which forms the zeroth quantum codeword (see equation (18)). G_0 is $(n-k)=2n$; H_0 is $(n+k)=2n$.

The state $|00\rangle_L$ may be prepared using a network obtained directly from G_0 [18]. To prepare $|00\rangle_L + |11\rangle_L$ it suffices to add the single row (110)D to G_0 and use the resulting matrix to construct the generator network (c.f. equation (20)); the expression (110)D is a product of a row vector (110) with a $3 \times n$ matrix D).

Next we need to verify the state against X errors. The stabilizer of $|00\rangle_L + |11\rangle_L$ has a Z part consisting of H_0 with one row removed, and an X part consisting of G_0 plus the extra row (110)D (since $X_{110}(|00\rangle_L + |11\rangle_L) = |00\rangle_L + |11\rangle_L$). The verification only measures the Z part of the stabilizer. To identify the correct row of H_0 to remove, note that H_0 consists of the Z part of the quantum code stabilizer, which has $(n-k)=2$ rows and is the same as G_0 , plus k further rows which are the logical Z operators. The desired state is stabilized by Z_{110} but not by Z_{100} or Z_{010} . Therefore we replace the two rows Z_{100} and Z_{010} in H_0 by the single row Z_{110} .

A useful further insight is provided by considering the quantity of information obtained by the adapted syndrome extraction. This can be seen from a simple counting argument, as follows. A single quantum codeword such as $|0\rangle_L$ in a CSS code is an equal superposition of 2^{n-k} product states in the computational basis, where $n-k=2$ is the size of the classical code C_0 (equation (19)). The Hadamard transformed state is then an equal superposition of 2^n product states. When we are using such a state to extract an error syndrome, for a zero syndrome we expect to observe one of these 2^n states. Correctable errors will transform the state onto an orthogonal one. There is a total of n bits of remaining room in Hilbert space for mutually orthogonal subspaces, so the measurement yields n bits of information, this is the error syndrome (for either X or Y or Z errors). If instead the state was originally prepared in $|0\rangle_L + |1\rangle_L$, then it consisted of an equal superposition of 2^{n+1} product states. Upon being Hadamard transformed, it becomes an equal superposition of 2^{n+1} states, hence there are $n+1$ bits of information about what has happened to it available from measurements on it. These are the error syndrome and the eigenvalue of the measured observable, which are commuting observables so can be simultaneously measured. The argument extends in an obvious manner when further mutually commuting observables are measured.

B. More general state preparations

The available tools for state preparation can be extended as follows. We wish to prepare a state $|j\rangle_L$ of k logical qubits that is uniquely specified by a set $\{M_i\}$; ($i = 1 \dots k$) of k linearly independent commuting observables; this set generates the stabilizer of $|j\rangle_L$ in the logical Hilbert space. If $|j\rangle_L = G_0 |k\rangle_L$ then one possible choice of the stabilizer operators is [19] $M_i = G_0 Z^i G_0^Y$. Define $Q_i = G_0 X^i G_0^Y$, then each Q_i anticommutes with its associated stabilizer operator and commutes with all the others: $M_i Q_i = Q_i M_i$ and $M_i Q_{j \neq i} = 0$. The M_i and the Q_i all have eigenvalues ± 1 .

One method to prepare $|j\rangle_L$ is to measure all the M_i on some arbitrary input state in the code space, and whenever an eigenvalue -1 is found, apply the operator Q_i that moves the -1 eigenstate to the $+1$ eigenstate. However, it may not be straightforward to measure one of more of the M_i fault-tolerantly.

Let M_r be a stabilizer operator whose fault-tolerant measurement is not straightforward. Decompose it as $M_r = N_{r;1} N_{r;2} \dots N_{r;p}$ where there exists a state which is a $+1$ eigenstate of all the $N_{r;j}$ simultaneously, and where the $N_{r;j}$ are simpler to work with fault-tolerantly than M_r , for example because they each act on fewer qubits. To prepare $|j\rangle_L$, first prepare a $+1$ eigenstate of all the $N_{r;j}$; ($j = 1 \dots p$) (e.g. by measuring them if they commute), and then measure all the other $M_{i \neq r}$. Typically the $N_{r;j}$ will not commute with all the

M_{i6r} , but as long as the measurements are done in the order described the final state is the same as if M_r had been measured.

For example, suppose we require the input state

$$j i_L = j0i_L + j1i_L + j0i_L + j1i_L : \quad (4)$$

This has stabilizer $X_{10}Z_{01} = XZ$, $X_{01}Z_{10} = ZX$. Neither of these observables can be measured easily, but the product $(XZ)(ZX) = YY$ can, since it is not of mixed type. We therefore adopt the set $fM_{ig} = fXZ; YYg$. Decomposing $M_1 = XI - IZ$, we see it is sufficient to prepare a $+1$ eigenstate of X in the first qubit, and of Z in the second qubit, which is easy: the starting state is $j0i_L + j1i_L$. Upon measuring YY (and applying IZ if the measured eigenvalue is -1), $j i_L$ is obtained.


It was pointed out in [19] that the starting state which will produce $j i_L$ when a single stabilizer observable M_i is measured is the state $(I + Q_i) j i_L$. This observation can also help in identifying suitable starting states.

We can go further and split up further M_i operators into their components N_{ij} as long as a $+1$ eigenstate of all the N operators at once can be prepared. For example, the state required for the Togliate gate discussed in section VII has a set of 8 stabilizer generators including $X^1X^5C^{67}$, $X^2X^6C^{57}$, Z^1Z^5 and Z^2Z^6 . We split the first two of these into X^1X^5 and C^{67} , X^2X^6 and C^{57} respectively. Preparing the 7th bit in $j i_L$ is sufficient to ensure a $+1$ eigenstate of both the controlled-gates. At the same time we prepare the 1st and 5th bits in the Bell state $j0i_L + j1i_L$ to ensure they are in a $+1$ eigenstate of X^1X^5 and Z^1Z^5 , and similarly for the 2nd and 6th bits | see (17).

V. A FAULT-TOLERANT TOOLBOX

We will now summarize some basic fault-tolerant operations and methods that will be used in the constructions to be described.

We restrict attention to CSS codes based on a doubly-even classical code that is contained by its dual. For such codes the following fault-tolerant operations are easily available (see appendix):




1. Operators in the Pauli group, acting on any logical qubit or group of qubits in a block.

2. Blockwise H and CX and hence CZ .

3. S acting blockwise but such that different logical qubits may be acted on by different powers of S , depending on the code (see lemma 4 in appendix).


A. Transfer operation

Gottesman [4] introduced the operation by which a state is transferred from one qubit to another by a single CX gate and a measurement, and its use in stabilizer codes to move a single qubit between blocks:




(5) shows two versions of the operation (referred to as examples of 'one-bit teleportation' in [19]). Since CX acts as an identity operator when either the control bit is in $j0i$ or the target in $j1i$, we can ensure the blockwise CX does not disturb other qubits in either the source block or the destination block, by preparing states accordingly. The next set of diagrams introduce a shorthand notation for transfer operations of the first type in (5), illustrating various possibilities for the state preparations. In the

first case a qubit is transferred out of a full block without disturbing the other bits in that block; in the last case a qubit is transferred into a full block without disturbing the other bits there; the middle example is an intermediate case:



The broken line followed by a zero is shorthand for measurement in the $j0i; j1i$ basis followed by X if the -1 eigenvalue was obtained, thus leaving the qubit in state $j0i$. The relevant point is that this state preparation does not need a further recovery, so it takes place in the same time-step as the rest of the transfer operation.

An illustrative set of possible transfer operations of the second type in (5) is:



The vertical bar after the line break is shorthand for preparation of $|j\rangle$, that takes place via the measurement in (5).

B. Teleportation

We define the following notation for teleportation:

$$\begin{array}{c} |\psi\rangle \\ \text{---} \text{CNOT} \text{---} \text{H} \text{---} \text{M} \end{array} \equiv \begin{array}{c} |\psi\rangle \\ \text{---} \text{---} \text{---} \end{array} \quad \begin{array}{c} |\psi\rangle \\ \text{---} \text{CNOT} \text{---} \text{H} \text{---} \text{M} \end{array} \equiv \begin{array}{c} |\psi\rangle \\ \text{---} \text{---} \text{---} \end{array} \quad (8)$$

This is used to move a qubit from one block to a different location in another block:

$$\begin{array}{c} |x\rangle \\ |y\rangle \\ |z\rangle \\ |+ \rangle \\ |0\rangle \\ |+ \rangle \\ \text{---} \end{array} \quad \begin{array}{c} |x\rangle \\ |y\rangle \\ |z\rangle \\ |+ \rangle \\ |0\rangle \\ |+ \rangle \\ \text{---} \end{array} \quad \begin{array}{c} |x\rangle \\ |y\rangle \\ |z\rangle \\ |+ \rangle \\ |0\rangle \\ |+ \rangle \\ \text{---} \end{array} \quad (9)$$

The initial Bell state preparation is done by a single recovery as in (3), so the complete network requires 3 time steps, these are shown separated by dashed vertical lines.

The qubit is moved from the i 'th position in the source block to the j 'th position in the destination block. The network construction is straightforward when both the i 'th and j 'th qubits of the destination block are available to be prepared in the Bell state, as in (9). The next network shows how to accomplish teleportation from a full block to another which has only one unused position. This requires two transfers to put the Bell state in the right place, and a naive construction would require 4 time steps. However, the second transfer can take place simultaneously with the teleportation step:

$$\begin{array}{c} |0\rangle \\ |+ \rangle \\ |0\rangle \\ |x\rangle \\ |0\rangle \\ |z\rangle \\ \text{---} \end{array} \quad \begin{array}{c} |0\rangle \\ |+ \rangle \\ |0\rangle \\ |x\rangle \\ |0\rangle \\ |z\rangle \\ \text{---} \end{array} \quad \begin{array}{c} |0\rangle \\ |+ \rangle \\ |0\rangle \\ |x\rangle \\ |0\rangle \\ |z\rangle \\ \text{---} \end{array} \quad (10)$$

This network has the interesting feature that the transfer and teleportation in the final step commute, and therefore are applied simultaneously. One way to 'read' the network is to argue that the upper of the two simultaneous blockwise C^X gates creates a GHZ state $|00i\rangle + |11i\rangle$ between the middle bits of the 1st two blocks and the upper bit of the 3rd; this entangled triplet replaces the entangled pair in the standard teleportation. X -measurements on two of these qubits are then needed to disentangle them from the one which is teleported.

VI. CONTROLLED-NOT

We now turn to implementing C^X between any single pair of qubits. We treat the case where the qubits are in the same block, which will illustrate all the essential ideas.

One method is to use two teleportations and a blockwise C^X . A naive construction would require $3 + 1 + 3 = 7$ time steps, but by choosing transfer operations that leave states ready-prepared for the subsequent step, and combining steps where possible, this is reduced to 5:

$$\begin{array}{c} + \\ 0 \\ + \\ |x\rangle \\ |y\rangle \\ |z\rangle \\ \text{---} \end{array} \quad \begin{array}{c} + \\ 0 \\ + \\ |x\rangle \\ |y\rangle \\ |z\rangle \\ \text{---} \end{array} \quad \begin{array}{c} + \\ 0 \\ + \\ |x\rangle \\ |y\rangle \\ |z\rangle \\ \text{---} \end{array} \quad (11)$$

The shaded area is the online part, where, as discussed in section IIA, we count the initial teleportation (from 'memory' to 'accumulator') as online, and the final teleportation (from 'accumulator' to 'memory') as offline.

The Bell-state measurement that forms part of the standard teleportation operation, see (8), begins with a C^X gate involving one of the qubits of the entangled pair. However, when using whole-block operations it is easier to implement a group of C^X gates such that both qubits of the entangled pair are operated on (either as target or control bits). We therefore consider the following network which teleports the second logical qubit (initially in state $|j_L\rangle$), where the initial blockwise C^X is implemented without insisting that the first qubit is prepared

in \mathcal{D}_L (it is in some general state $|x_L\rangle$ instead):

$$(12)$$

This shows that the result is a C_X operation between the first and second bits, with the second output bit teleported into the second block. Equation (12) may be derived by starting with the right hand side (which shows a teleport followed by C_X) and commuting the final C_X backwards, as in [7, 19]. To complete the C_X operation, the target qubit can be teleported back to its original block at the end as in (10). Using similar ideas to those in (11), the complete network, including gathering the qubits into one block at the end, requires 4 blocks and 3 time steps, of which 1 is online.

The concept behind equation (12) can be extended so as to achieve networks of C_2 gates involving up to half the qubits in a block in a single online step, as long as the network finishes with a set of X gates connecting the non-teleported bits to the teleported ones. For example:

$$(13)$$

The initial preparation step is an example of the corollary to theorem 1. This network is an example of a class of networks discussed below in connection with theorem 2.

When $x = z = 0$, (13) is an example of the general method introduced by Gottesman and Chuang in [7].

If we introduce a further ancillary block, the Gottesman-Chuang method can achieve C_X between bits in the same block while teleporting the whole block, thus keeping its constituent logical bits together:

$$(14)$$

The online state preparation shown in the dashed box can be accomplished in three time steps, by making use

	Network (11)	(12)	(14)
	online	online	online
blocks	4	4	2
time steps	3	2	1
area	13	5	6

TABLE I: Summary of resources required by three networks for C_X between bits in the same block.

of the following equivalences:

$$(15)$$

The zeros just after the transfer operation represent state preparations that take place at the same time as the transfer. They ensure the final blockwise C_X in (15) has the correct entangling effect.

The resources required by the C_X constructions of equations (11), (12), (14) are summarized in table 1.

A. Discussion

For a code with $k = 1$ the gate we have discussed would be trivial: a single transversal C_X suffices, followed by a single recovery. It is noteworthy that the more complicated (but more space-efficient) codes with $k > 1$ can achieve the gate without any slow-down: the online parts of (12) and (14) require only a single time step. Similar constructions can be found for other operators in the group C_2 , using the general insight of commuting gates backwards through teleportations [7, 19]. The main contributions of the present study are the extended use of recovery operations for preparing entangled states (avoiding the need for cat states), the minimization of time steps by careful construction in (10), (11), (15), and the possibility of multi-qubit networks of C_2 gates in a single online step, as illustrated by (13). We now generalize the latter point.

Theorem 2. Any network of gates in C_2 (the Clifford group) can be applied fault-tolerantly to any group of logical bits (in the same or different blocks) using a single online time step.


Proof: The result is obtained from applying the Gottesman-Chuang method illustrated in (14) not just to single gates such as C_X or H , but to networks of gates. Suppose the bits involved in the network occupy N blocks. They are all teleported using N pairs of blocks. As long as all the gates in the network to be implemented

are in C_2 , they can all be commuted backwards through the Pauli operations involved in the teleportations such that still only Pauli operations are required to complete the teleportation. The final Pauli operations can then be applied all at once immediately after the measurements.

Diagram (13) illustrates a related result: some networks of C_2 gates can be implemented among bits in a single block using only a single extra block.

VII. TOFFOLIGATE

Following [7], we will use the following type of construction for the Toffoli gate:



This approach, rather than Shor's original network (related to one-bit teleportation, see [19]) is adopted because it lends itself better to blockwise operations. In (16) a fourth qubit of each block is included in order to show what happens to the rest of the bits that are not involved in the gate itself.

In order to keep the network as rapid as possible, all the measurements should take place together, and then whichever of the further operations are needed (conditional on the measurement results) should be applied as soon as possible. This flexibility in timing of the final operations is not shown in the diagram.


The dashed box is an online preparation which we will discuss below. Of the 8 measurements in (16), 5 involve single-bit operators that can be applied (when needed) in the same time step as the blockwise CX and the measurements themselves. The other three involve 2-bit gates. Using the methods of either (12) or (14) each such gate needs only a single online time step, as long as sufficient spare blocks are available for online preparations and/or teleportations. However, they cannot all take place simultaneously if we retain the condition that only one two-block gate involving any given block is allowed per recovery, to prevent avalanches of errors. Of the 8 equiprobable measurement outcomes of this group of 3 measurements, one requires no action, three require a single time-step, three require 2 time-steps and one requires 3. The average number of online time steps required by the complete network is therefore $13 = 8 \cdot 1.6$.

$M_1 = X^1 X^5 C_X^{67}$	$Q_1 = Z^1$
$M_2 = X^2 X^6 C_X^{57}$	$Q_2 = Z^2$
$M_3 = X^3 X^7$	$Q_3 = Z^3$
$M_4 = X^4 X^8$	$Q_4 = Z^4$
$M_5 = Z^1 Z^5$	$Q_5 = X^1$
$M_6 = Z^2 Z^6$	$Q_6 = X^2$
$M_7 = Z^3 Z^7 C_Z^{56}$	$Q_7 = X^3$
$M_8 = Z^4 Z^8$	$Q_8 = X^4$

TABLE II: Stabilizer operators M_i for the input state in the Toffoli gate network, with their associated anticommuting operators Q_i .

Let j_{i_L} be the state we need to prepare, as defined by the dashed box in (16). The stabilizer of j_{i_L} is generated by the operators listed in table 2. Five of these operators are in the Pauli group C_1 , three are not in C_1 but are in the Clifford group C . Fault-tolerant measurement of the 5 Pauli group operators can be done through a recovery as in section IV A. Fault-tolerant measurement of the 3 Clifford group operators can be done by Shor's cat state method [1]. Shor described the method as applied to certain $[[n;1;d]]$ CSS codes, we generalize it in the appendix to $[[n;k;d]]$ codes of the type under discussion (lemma 5).

We would like to minimize the need to prepare cat states. Recalling the discussion in section IV B, we can factorize the stabilizer operators in any convenient way and prepare a $+1$ eigenstate of the component operators $N_{r,j}$. By this means it is possible to avoid the need to measure any two out of M_1, M_2 and M_7 . For example, the discussion at the end of section IV B showed how to avoid the need to measure M_1 and M_2 . The complete state preparation indicated by the dashed box in (16) is then obtained with



where the diagram on the right explains the logical effect of the fault-tolerant diagram on the left. Bit number 6 has been left in a separate block so that if the CZ^{56} gate in (16) is needed then it can be implemented immediately. To minimize the number of online time steps bit 7 should also be positioned in a separate block. This can be done

using the same Bell-state preparation followed by transfer as is indicated in (17) for bits 2 and 6. The diagram shows an alternative approach that uses fewer blocks. Bit 6 (and 7 if necessary) can be repositioned back into the same block as 5 and 8 by teleportations after the end of (16).

A. Discussion

The network for the Toffoli gate between bits within a block involves at least 5 blocks (one of which is used for the cat state) and 1 cat-state-based measurement. The average number of online time steps is $13/8$ if a further block is used, and slightly more than this otherwise. The main result is that the number of online time steps is independent of k , and in particular is the same for $[[n; k; d]]$ codes with $k > 1$ as for $k = 1$. Similar methods apply to other gates in the class C_3 .

VIII. CONCLUSION

We have considered fault-tolerant networks for logic operations on bits encoded in CSS codes, concentrating on codes based on a doubly-even classical code that is contained by its dual (some of the methods are more general). We have shown how to extend the use of the recovery operation to allow preparation of an interesting class of logical states (theorem 1 and its corollary). The implementation of certain networks in a single online time step (theorem 2) is implicit in the Gottesman-Chuang work; we have shown that the online state preparation for such networks can be accomplished efficiently using theorem 1.

We have presented optimized constructions of fault-tolerant networks for all the members of a universal set of operations. The optimization is primarily to minimize on-line time steps, where one 'time step' is defined to include a single recovery of the whole computer. The constructions show that fault-tolerant operations for $[[n; k > 1; d]]$ codes require the same number of time steps as those for $[[n; 1; d]]$ codes. It follows that the total number of recoveries needed to implement a complete algorithm is the same when $k > 1$ as when $k = 1$. The number of individual block recoveries is smaller when $k > 1$ because then there are fewer blocks, assuming the computer has more memory blocks than workspace.

We would like to thank D. Lewis and S. O'Keefe for contributions to the development of the network designs. This work was supported by the EPSRC, the Research Training and Development and Human Potential Programs of the European Union, the National Security Agency (NSA) and Advanced Research and Development Activity (ARDA) (P-43513-PH-QCO-02107-1).

IX. APPENDIX: BASIC OPERATIONS FOR CSS CODES

We describe the fault-tolerant implementation of the basic gates assumed in the main text. Some of the results, such as lemmas 2 and 3 were obtained by Gottesman using stabilizer methods. We derive them by a different method and add further information.

Consider the effect of some operation (produced by a network of quantum gates or measurements) on the physical qubits of one or more encoded blocks. We define an operation to be 'legitimate' if it maps the encoded Hilbert space onto itself. Transversal application of a two-bit operator is defined to mean the operator is applied once to each pair of corresponding physical bits in two blocks, and similarly for transversal three-bit operations across three blocks. Legitimate transversal operations are fault tolerant.

Typically a legitimate transversal operation will result in a blockwise operation (defined in section II, c.f. lemma 2), but this need not always be the case.

The tilde as in \tilde{U} is used to denote the operation U applied to the physical qubits. Operators without a tilde are understood to act on the logical, i.e. encoded qubits. Thus $\tilde{L} \tilde{H} \tilde{U} \tilde{J} \tilde{i}_L = \tilde{H} \tilde{U} \tilde{J} \tilde{i}$.

The CSS quantum codes are those whose stabilizer generators separate into X and Z parts [18, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24]. We restrict attention to these codes, rather than any stabilizer code, because they permit a larger set of easy-to-implement fault tolerant operations, and their coding rate $k=n$ can be close to that of the best stabilizer codes. The CSS codes have the property that the zeroth quantum codeword can be written as an equal superposition of the words of a linear classical code C_0 ,

$$\tilde{j}i_L = \sum_{x \in C_0} \tilde{j}x; \quad (18)$$

where $\tilde{j}x$ is a product state, x is a binary word (1 $\times n$ row vector), and the other codewords are formed from cosets of C_0 . Let D be the $k \times n$ binary matrix of coset leaders, then the complete set of encoded basis states is given by

$$\tilde{j}i_L = \sum_{x \in C_0} \tilde{j}x + uD; \quad (19)$$

where u is a k -bit binary word (1 $\times k$ row vector).

Consider a CSS code as defined in eq. (19). Then one possible choice for the encoded X and Z operators is

$$X_u = X_{uD} \quad (20)$$

$$Z_u = Z_{uD(D^T D)^{-1}}; \quad (21)$$

Equation (20) follows immediately from the code construction (19). Eq. (21) may be obtained as follows. Since we are dealing with row vectors, the scalar product is $x \cdot y = x \tilde{y}^T$. Now, consider $y \in C_0$: then

$Z_y \mathbf{j} + uD \mathbf{i} = (1)^y uD \mathbf{j} + uD \mathbf{i}$ and hence

$$Z_y \mathbf{j} i_L = (1)^y uD \mathbf{j} i_L \quad (22)$$

$$\text{but } Z_v \mathbf{j} i_L = (1)^v uD \mathbf{j} i_L \quad (23)$$

so we need to solve $v \mathbf{u} = y \mathbf{u} (uD)$ for y :

$$vu^T = yD^T u^T \quad (24)$$

$$\Rightarrow v = yD^T \quad (25)$$

$$\Rightarrow y = vD(D^T D)^{-1} \quad (26)$$

where we assume the inverse of the square matrix $D^T D$ exists. We will mostly be concerned with cases where $D^T D$ is an identity matrix. To check for consistency, we should confirm that $y \in C_0^2$ as was assumed in the proof of this is omitted here, but it is obvious for the case of a weakly selfdual code with $D^T D = I$.

Note that, when operating on codewords, X_{x+y} is equivalent to X_x for all $y \in C_0$, so each X operator is a member of a group of 2 equivalent operators, where $2 = (n-k)/2$ is the size of C_0 . Another way of seeing this is to note that since $C_0 = C_0^2$, $X_{y \in C_0}$ is in the quantum code stabilizer. Similar statements apply to the Z operators. The complete set of 2^{2n} Pauli X or Z operators on n bits is thus divided up as

$$\begin{aligned} 2^{(n-k)/2} & \quad X\text{-stabilizer members} \\ 2^{(n-k)/2} & \quad Z\text{-stabilizer members} \\ 2^k & \quad X\text{ operators} \\ 2^k & \quad Z\text{ operators} \\ 2^{(n-k)/2} & \quad \text{detectable } X\text{ errors} \\ 2^{(n-k)/2} & \quad \text{detectable } Z\text{ errors} \end{aligned}$$

Lemma 1. For $[[n; 1; d]]$ codes where all words in $\mathbf{j} i_L$ have weight $r_0 \bmod w$, and all words in $\mathbf{j} i_L$ have weight $r_1 \bmod w$, transversal application of the following are legitimate: $P(2 \bmod w)$, ${}^C P(4 \bmod w)$, ${}^{CC} P(8 \bmod w)$, and achieve respectively $P(2r \bmod w)$, ${}^C P(4r \bmod w)$, ${}^{CC} P(8r \bmod w)$, where $r = r_1 - r_0$.

Lemma 1 applied to codes with $w = 8$ or more provides a quicker way to generate the To oligate T and its partners ${}^C S$ and $P(\bmod 4)$ than has been previously discovered. The concept generalizes to ${}^{CC} P(16 \bmod w)$ and so on, but the codes for which this is useful (i.e. having $w \geq 16$) are either inefficient or too unwieldy to produce good error thresholds.

Proof: for clarity we will take $r_0 = 0$ and $r_1 = r$, the proof is easily extended to general r_0 . The argument for ${}^C P(4 \bmod w)$ was given in [12], but we shall need it for ${}^{CC} P(8 \bmod w)$, so we repeat it here. Consider ${}^C P(4 \bmod w)$ applied to a tensor product of two codewords. Let $x; y$ be binary words appearing in the expressions for the two codewords, and let a be the overlap (number of positions sharing a 1) between x and y . Let $\mathbf{j} x \mathbf{j}$ denote the weight of a word x . Then $2a = \mathbf{j} x \mathbf{j} + \mathbf{j} y \mathbf{j} - \mathbf{j} x + y \mathbf{j}$. There are three cases to consider. First if $x; y \in C_0$ then $\mathbf{j} x \mathbf{j} = 0 \bmod w$; $\mathbf{j} y \mathbf{j} = 0 \bmod w$ and $\mathbf{j} x + y \mathbf{j} = 0 \bmod w$

so $2a = 0 \bmod w$ from which $a = 0 \bmod w/2$. Therefore the multiplying factor introduced by the transversal operation is 1. If $x \in C_0$ and $y \in C_1$ then $x + y \in C_1$ so $\mathbf{j} x \mathbf{j} = 0 \bmod w$; $\mathbf{j} y \mathbf{j} = \mathbf{j} x + y \mathbf{j} = r \bmod w$ so $2a = 0 \bmod w$ again. If $x; y \in C_1$ then $x + y \in C_0$ so $a = r \bmod w/2$ and the multiplying factor is $\exp(ir/4 \bmod w)$. The resulting operation in the logical Hilbert space is therefore ${}^C P(4r \bmod w)$.

Next consider ${}^{CC} P(8 \bmod w)$ applied to a tensor product of three codewords. Let $x; y; z$ be words appearing in the three codeword expressions, and $a; b; c$ be the overlap between x and y , y and z , and z and x , respectively. Let d be the common overlap of $x; y$ and z , so

$$\mathbf{j} x + y + z \mathbf{j} = \mathbf{j} x \mathbf{j} + \mathbf{j} y \mathbf{j} + \mathbf{j} z \mathbf{j} - 2a - 2b - 2c + 4d \quad (27)$$

There are four cases to consider. If $x; y; z \in C_0$ then $d = 0 \bmod w/4$. If $x; y \in C_0; z \in C_1$ then $\mathbf{j} x + y + z \mathbf{j} = \mathbf{j} z \mathbf{j} - 2a - 2b - 2c = 0 \bmod w$ from the argument just given, therefore $d = 0 \bmod w/4$. If $x \in C_0; y; z \in C_1$ then $x + y + z \in C_0$, $2a = 2c = 0 \bmod w$ while $2b = 2r \bmod w = \mathbf{j} y \mathbf{j} + \mathbf{j} z \mathbf{j}$ so again $d = 0 \bmod w/4$. If $x; y; z \in C_1$ then $x + y + z \in C_1$, $2a = 2b = 2c = 2r \bmod w$, therefore $d = r \bmod w/4$. The overall effect is that of the operation ${}^{CC} P(8r \bmod w)$. QED

Lemma 2. Transversal ${}^C X$ is legitimate for all CSS codes, and acts as blockwise ${}^C X$.

Proof: transversal ${}^C X$ acts as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} {}^C X_{tr} \mathbf{j} i_L \mathbf{j} i_L &= \sum_{x \in C_0} \sum_{y \in C_0} \mathbf{j} x + uD \mathbf{i} \mathbf{j} y + vD \mathbf{i} + x + uD \mathbf{i} \\ &= \sum_{x \in C_0} \sum_{y \in C_0} \mathbf{j} x + uD \mathbf{i} \mathbf{j} y + (u+v)D \mathbf{i} \\ &= \mathbf{j} i_L \mathbf{j} i_L + v i_L : \end{aligned} \quad (28)$$

This is ${}^C X$ from each logical qubit in the first block to the corresponding one in the second. QED

Lemma 3. Transversal H and ${}^C Z$ are legitimate for any $[[n; 2k_c; n; d]]$ CSS code obtained from a $[[n; k_c; d]]$ classical code that contains its dual, giving the effects

$$H_{tr} \mathbf{j} i_L = \sum_{v=0}^{2^k-1} (1)^{uD D^T v^T} \mathbf{j} i_L ; \quad (29)$$

$${}^C Z_{tr} \mathbf{j} i_L \mathbf{j} i_L = (1)^{uD D^T v^T} \mathbf{j} i_L \mathbf{j} i_L : \quad (30)$$

Equation (29) is a blockwise H when $DD^T = I$, and is a closely related transformation when $DD^T \neq I$. Equation (30) is a blockwise ${}^C Z$ when $DD^T = I$, and a related transformation otherwise.

Proof: transversal H acts as follows on $\mathbf{j} i_L$:

$$H_{tr} \mathbf{j} i_L = \sum_{x \in C_0} \sum_{y \in C_0} \mathbf{j} x + uD \mathbf{i} = \sum_{y \in C_0} (1)^{uD y^T} \mathbf{j} y : \quad (31)$$

If $C_0^?$ contains its dual C_0 , as required for lemma 3, then D and C_0 together generate $C_0^?$, so this can be written

$$\begin{aligned} H_{tr} j_{i_L} &= \sum_{v=0}^{2^{x_2 C_0}-1} (1)^{uD D^T v^T} j_k + vD i \\ &= \sum_{v=0}^{2^{x_2 C_0}-1} (1)^{uD D^T v^T} j_{i_L} \end{aligned} \quad (32)$$

where to simplify the power of (1) in the first equation we used the fact that C_0 is generated by the parity check matrix of $C_0^?$, so uD satisfies the parity check $x \times 2 C_0$.

Equation (30) is proved straightforwardly by expanding j_{i_L} and j_{i_L} as in (19), and then using $(x + uD)(y + vD)^T = uD D^T v^T \pmod{2}$ for all the terms in the sum when $C_0 = C_0^?$.

Lemma 4. Let C be a $[n; k; d]$ classical code that contains its dual, and for which the weights of the rows of the parity check matrix are all integer multiples of 4. Then transversal S is legitimate for the $[[n; 2k - n; d]]$ CSS code obtained from C , and has the effect

$$S_{tr} j_{i_L} = i^{jD \cdot j} j_{i_L} : \quad (33)$$

The case $DD^T = I$, which leads to a simple effect for transversal H , also simplifies transversal S . If $DD^T = I$ then every row of D has odd overlap with itself (i.e. odd weight) and even overlap with all the other rows. Using an argument along similar lines to that in the proof of lemma 1, we deduce that the effect is the S^r operator applied to every logical qubit in the block, where r is the weight of the relevant row of D .

Proof: We will prove lemma 4 by showing that all the quantum codewords have $j_k + uD \cdot j = jD \cdot j \pmod{4}$, so the

weights modulo 4 of the components in (19) depend on u but not on x . The effect of transversal S will therefore be to multiply j_{i_L} by the phase factor $i^{jD \cdot j}$.

The zeroth codeword is composed from the code $C_0 = C^?$ generated by H_C , the parity check matrix of C . Let y and z be two rows of H_C , then the conditions of the lemma guarantee $y \cdot j = 0 \pmod{4}$ and $z \cdot j = 0 \pmod{4}$. Furthermore, since C contains its dual, each row of H_C satisfies all the checks in H_C , so y and z have even overlap $2m$. Therefore $y + z \cdot j = 4m \pmod{4} = 0 \pmod{4}$, therefore $j \cdot j = 0 \pmod{4}$ for all words in j_{i_L} . Next consider a coset, formed by displacing C_0 by the vector $w = uD$. Since this coset is in C it also satisfies all the checks in H_C , therefore its members have even overlap with any $x \times 2 C_0$. Hence if $j \cdot j = r \pmod{4}$ then $j_k + w \cdot j = r \pmod{4}$ for all the terms in the coset, which proves the lemma. QED

Lemma 5. For CSS codes in which transversal CZ is legitimate, transversal C^2Z is legitimate when operating on two control blocks in the logical Hilbert space, and a target block in the space spanned by $j^{n_i} i, j^{l_{n_i}} i$. If transversal CZ has the effect $j_{i_L} j_{i_L} \rightarrow (1)^{uv^T} j_{i_L} j_{i_L}$, then transversal C^2Z has the effect $j_{i_L} j_{i_L} \rightarrow j^{n_i} i \cdot (1)^{a(uv^T)} j_{i_L} j_{i_L} \rightarrow j^{n_i} i$, where $a = 0$ or 1 .

Proof: Consider eq. (30) and expand $j_{i_L} j_{i_L}$ into a sum of $2n$ -bit product states $j_k j_i$. The transversal CZ operator can only have the effect $\{0\}$ if the overlap of x and y is the same, modulo 2, for every term in the sum. Therefore the transversal C^2Z operator as described in lemma 5 produces the same number of Z operations on the cat state, modulo 2, for every term in the corresponding expansion, and the effect is as described. QED

-
- [1] P. W. Shor. Fault-tolerant quantum computation. In Proc. 35th Annual Symposium on Fundamentals of Computer Science, pages 56{65, Los Alamitos, 1996. IEEE Press. quant-ph/9605011.
- [2] D. P. DiVincenzo and P. W. Shor. Fault-tolerant error correction with efficient quantum codes. Phys. Rev. Lett., 77:3260{3263, 1996.
- [3] A. M. Steane. Active stabilisation, quantum computation, and quantum state synthesis. Phys. Rev. Lett., 78:2252{2255, 1997. quant-ph/9608026.
- [4] D. Gottesman. A theory of fault-tolerant quantum computation. Physical Review A, 57:127{137, 1998. quant-ph/9702029.
- [5] A. M. Steane. Efficient fault-tolerant quantum computing. Nature, 399:124{126, 1999. quant-ph/9809054.
- [6] M. A. Nielsen and I. L. Chuang. Programmable quantum gate arrays. Phys. Rev. Lett., 79:321{324, 1997.
- [7] D. Gottesman and I. L. Chuang. Quantum teleportation is a universal computational primitive. Nature, 402:390, 1999. quant-ph/9908010.
- [8] E. Knill, R. Laamme, and W. H. Zurek. Resilient quantum computation: error models and thresholds. Science, 279:342{345, 1998.
- [9] Andrew M. Steane. Overhead and noise threshold of fault-tolerant quantum error correction. Phys. Rev. A, 68:042322, 2003.
- [10] D. Gottesman. The Heisenberg representation of quantum computers. 1998. quant-ph/9807006.
- [11] Michael A. Nielsen and Isaac L. Chuang. Quantum Computation and Quantum Information. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2000.
- [12] Emanuel Knill, Raymond Laamme, and Wojciech Zurek. Accuracy threshold for quantum computation. quant-ph/9610011, 1996.
- [13] Y. Shi. Both tooli and controlled-not need little help to do universal quantum computation. 2002. quant-ph/0205115.
- [14] Y. Shi. A simple proof that tooli and hadamard are quantum universal. 2003. quant-ph/0301040.
- [15] D. Beckman, A. N. Chari, S. Devabhaktuni, and J. Preskill. Efficient networks for quantum factoring. Phys. Rev. A, 54:1034{1063, 1996.
- [16] Vlatko Vedral, Adriano Barenco, and Artur Ekert. Quantum networks for elementary arithmetic operations.

- Phys. Rev. A, 54:147{153, 1996.
- [17] A. M. Steane. A fast fault-tolerant iter for quantum codewords. quant-ph/0202036.
- [18] A. M. Steane. Multiple particle interference and quantum error correction. Proc. Roy. Soc. Lond. A, 452:2551{2577, 1996.
- [19] Xinlan Zhou, Debbie W. Leung, and Isaac L. Chuang. Methodology for quantum logic gate construction. Phys. Rev. A, 62:052316, 2000.
- [20] D. Gottesman. Class of quantum error-correcting codes saturating the quantum hamming bound. Phys. Rev. A, 54:1862{1868, 1996.
- [21] A. M. Steane. Error correcting codes in quantum theory. Phys. Rev. Lett., 77:793{797, 1996.
- [22] A. R. Calderbank and P. W. Shor. Good quantum error-correcting codes exist. Phys. Rev. A, 54:1098{1105, 1996.
- [23] A. R. Calderbank, E. M. Rains, N. J. A. Sloane, and P. W. Shor. Quantum error correction and orthogonal geometry. Phys. Rev. Lett., 78:405{409, 1997.
- [24] A. R. Calderbank, E. M. Rains, P. W. Shor, and N. J. A. Sloane. Quantum error correction via codes over GF(4). IEEE Transactions on Information Theory, 44:1369{1387, 1998.