

A direct approach to fault-tolerance in measurement-based quantum computation

Vincent Danos,¹ Elham Kashe^{2,3} Harold Ollivier,⁴ and Marcus Silva^{3,5}¹ Université Denis Diderot & CNRS, 175 Rue du Chevaleret, 75013 Paris, France² Christ Church College, University of Oxford, OX1 1DP, Oxford, UK³ Institute for Quantum Computing, U. of Waterloo, Waterloo, ON, N2L 2G1, Canada⁴ Perimeter Institute for Theoretical Physics, Waterloo, ON, N2L 2Y5, Canada⁵ Department of Physics and Astronomy, U. of Waterloo, Waterloo, ON, N2L 2G1, Canada

(dated: July 21, 2022)

We discuss a simple variant of the one-way quantum computing model [R. Raussendorf and H.-J. Briegel, PRL 86, 5188, 2001], called the Pauli measurement model, where measurements are restricted to be along the eigenbases of the Pauli X and Y operators, while auxiliary qubits can be prepared both in the $|j_{\pm} i \rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|i \rangle \pm e^{i\pi/4} |i \rangle)$ state, and the usual $|j_{\pm} i \rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|i \rangle \pm |i \rangle)$ one.

We prove the universality of this quantum computation model, and establish a standardization procedure which permits all entanglement and preparation to be performed at the beginning of computation. This leads us to develop a direct approach to fault-tolerance by simple transformations of the entanglement graph and preparation operations, while error correction is performed naturally via syndrome-extracting teleportations.

PACS numbers:

I. INTRODUCTION

The one-way quantum computation (1WQC) model [1] has been widely studied since its discovery. One particular issue that has attracted attention is how to perform fault-tolerant (FT) quantum computation (QC) in such a model [2, 3, 4, 5]. Although it has been demonstrated that FTQC can be performed through such a model by simulating FT quantum circuits via 1WQC [4, 5], the problem of making any 1WQC directly FT has remained open [4].

In order to address this question, we consider a model where measurements in the full XY -plane are traded off for more complex preparations of the vertices in the entangled resource state. This model, which we call the Pauli measurement model (PMM), uses only measurements along the X and the Y directions, while the entangled resource state is obtained via initialization of individual qubits into the state $|j_{\pm} i \rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|i \rangle \pm |i \rangle)$ or $|j_{\mp} i \rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|i \rangle \pm e^{i\pi/4} |i \rangle)$, followed by application of the unitary interaction $\wedge Z = \text{diag}(1; 1; 1; -1)$ (also known as the controlled- Z gate) between certain qubits. We show that the PMM model is fault-tolerant in the usual simulation sense [4, 5]. Moreover, through the use of encoded or nested graph states [6], and the careful selection of quantum codes, all necessary operations for computation can be performed transversally on encoded information, so that the graph state computation itself is made fault-tolerant.

First, we investigate how to extend the main properties of the 1WQC model using these modified preparation states, while still maintaining the properties one needs for convenient error correction. We then demonstrate that this model naturally provides the resources necessary for fault-tolerant syndrome extraction, and illustrate how any PMM computation can be transformed

into a larger one that has a lower effective error rate, achieving fault-tolerance.

II. ONE-WAY QUANTUM COMPUTATION WITH PHASE PREPARATION

We first develop a slight extension of 1WQC so as to include as a sub-model the Pauli measurement model we are specially interested in.

A measurement pattern, or simply a pattern, is defined by a sequence of quantum operations over a finite set of qubits V , along with two subsets $I \subseteq V$ and $O \subseteq V$ representing the pattern inputs and outputs respectively (I and O may intersect).

The operations we consider are: (a) N_i , preparation of qubit i in the state $|j_{\pm} i \rangle$; (b) E_{ij} , unitary interaction between qubits i, j of the form $\wedge Z$; (c) M_i , measurement of qubit $i \notin O$ in the $|j_{\pm} i \rangle$ eigenbasis, with outcomes $s_i \in \{0, 1\}$ corresponding to collapse into the state $|j_{\pm} i \rangle$ or $|j_{\mp} i \rangle$, respectively; (d) X_j and $Z_j(\cdot) = e^{i\pi/2 Z_j}$, local unitaries on qubit j . In addition, local unitaries may depend on the outcome of measurements of other qubits, which is denoted through exponentiation, as in $X_i^{s_j}$.

Measurements are considered to be destructive, and we require that no operations be performed on measured qubits. We also only consider patterns where no operations depend on the outcome of measurements that have not yet been performed.

Both 1WQC and PMM are particular cases: to obtain the 1WQC model set $\emptyset = \emptyset$ in clauses (a) and (d); to obtain the PMM one, set $\emptyset = \emptyset$; $\neq \emptyset$ in clause (a), and $\emptyset = \emptyset$ in clauses (c) and (d).

Local unitaries are not necessary for universal computation, as we will see, but are crucial for the understanding of how universality and determinism come about (recall that measurement outcomes in quantum mechanics

are, in general, non-deterministic) [1].

Patterns, denoted by gothic letters, e.g. A and B , can be combined to create a new pattern via parallel concatenation AkB , or serial concatenation $A \circ B$. Parallel concatenation means the qubits are relabelled in such a way that all operations in A commute with all the operations in B { if A implements the unitary U_A , and B implements U_B , then AkB implements $U_A \otimes U_B$. Serial concatenation means the output of A is fed into the input of B { that is, $A \circ B$ implements the unitary $U_B U_A$.

As an example, consider the pattern

$$J := X_2^{s_1} M_1 \circ E_{12} N_2^0; \quad (1)$$

with $(V; I; 0) = (f1; 2g; f1g; f2g)$. Given an arbitrary state on qubit 1, this sequence of operations implements $J := H Z(\cdot)$ on the input state and places the resulting state $J \circ J^V$ on qubit 2. This is one of the fundamental building blocks for 1WQC [7], since it allows for arbitrary one qubit rotations. Any of our local unitaries can be merged with a (destructive) measurement as follows:

$$M_i Z_i(\cdot) = M_i \quad (2)$$

$$M_i X_i = M_i \quad (3)$$

and it is readily seen from there, that the J pattern above is the serial concatenation of a $Z(\cdot)$ rotation with a modified one-bit teleportation (implementing H) { a well known result for 1WQC [1, 8, 9]. More general patterns than the 1WQC would allow can be written:

$$X := X_3^{s_2} Z_3^{s_1} M_2^{(-1)^{s_1} + \frac{\pi}{4}} M_1^0 E_{23} E_{12} N_2^{\frac{\pi}{4}} N_3^0 \quad (4)$$

with $(V; I; 0) = (f1; 2; 3g; f1g; f3g)$, which implements the unitary $H Z(\cdot)H = e^{i\frac{\pi}{2}X} = J \circ J_0$. It follows from the equations above, that this pattern is equivalent to a $Z(\cdot)$ conjugated by a one-qubit teleportation. The importance of writing the pattern in this form, using the the $N_2^{\frac{\pi}{4}}$ preparation, will be clear later.

Other patterns which play an important role are $\wedge Z$, N and M , defined as follows: $\wedge Z := E_{12}$, with $(V; I; 0) = (f1; 2g; f1; 2g; f1; 2g)$, implements the unitary $\wedge Z$; $N := N_i^0$ implements initialization of qubit i into the state $|j\rangle_i$; and, $M := M_i^0$ implements the measurement of qubit i in the $|j\rangle_i X$ eigenbasis. These patterns are crucial in order to fulfil the DIVInenzo criteria [0].

The usual protocol for 1WQC requires computation to be performed in three steps: individual qubit state preparation, entangling operations between qubits, and measurement of individual qubits with feed-forward of outcomes. In order to follow this protocol for the generalized model, patterns must be put into a standard form where any computation can be performed by a sequence of operations in this order. Note that these steps do not include the application of single qubit unitaries, but adaptive measurements can be used to address this absence, since all quantum computations must end with the measurement of the qubits in order for information to be

extracted. Once a pattern is in standard form, it is convenient to consider the entangled state that is prepared for the computation. Such a state can be described by an entanglement graph, with vertices V and edges $(i; j)$ for every comm and E_{ij} in the pattern, where the vertices are labelled with the initial state in which the qubit is prepared.

The process of turning a given pattern into a pattern in standard form is called standardization. The rewrite rules needed for this procedure are simply (2) and (3), along with conjugation relation between unitaries, $E_{12} X_1 = X_1 Z_2 E_{12}$, and $E_{12} Z_1(\cdot) = Z_1(\cdot) E_{12}$, as well as all the free commutation relations between operations on different qubits. Simple rewriting theory arguments [7] show that by applying the conjugation relations to move all the local unitaries towards the left in the pattern, and then by applying (2) and (3), any pattern can be put in standard form.

As said, PMM is obtained by setting (i) state preparation angles to 0 or $\frac{\pi}{4}$, (ii) measurement angles to $\frac{\pi}{2}$, and (iii) local unitaries to X and $Z(\frac{\pi}{2})$.

Two simple remarks follow from there: first, PMM is closed under standardization, as can be readily seen from the merging and conjugation relations above; second, PMM contains the following patterns $\wedge Z$, J , X , N and M , where $\wedge = \frac{\pi}{2}$ and $\wedge = \frac{\pi}{2} + \frac{\pi}{4}$, as well as their concatenations.

Corollary. The PMM is universal in the Solovay-Kitaev sense.

This construction of a universal gate set is equivalent to the construction of fault-tolerant universal gate sets via teleportation [8, 11].

III. FAULT-TOLERANCE

A. Simulation approach

In reality, physical implementations of any computational model is susceptible to noise. In principle, such physical implementation can be made fault-tolerant (FT) by encoding the data and the operations in such a manner that, even after the overhead of such an encoding is considered, one can efficiently perform computations of arbitrary size [2, 12, 13, 14, 15]. The noise model that is usually considered, and which we restrict ourselves to in this work, is the model of independent random failure of each of the operations during computation. One approach to achieve FT 1WQC is by using FT in the circuit model as a stepping stone. The construction of fault-tolerant circuits is well understood [8, 11], and it is now well known that the implementation of such circuits via 1WQC can lead to fault-tolerance [4, 5]. This can be most simply understood and demonstrated through the idea of composable simulations [5, 16], and the same idea carry through to the PMM with minor modifications. The main distinction is that in the PMM, the

change of measurement bases dependent on measurement outcomes correspond to local Clifford corrections, as opposed to local Pauli correction. Thus the noisy simulations through the PMM will have an error model which consists of random application of local Clifford operators. However, because of the linearity of quantum mechanics and the fact that the Pauli group forms a basis for all single qubit operators, the errors are still correctable as in simulations through the 1WQC model. Thus, simulating fault-tolerant quantum circuits through the PMM model is also fault-tolerant.

B. Intrinsic fault-tolerance

We now turn our attention to the possibility of making any PMM computation directly fault-tolerant, instead of simulating FT quantum circuits within 1WQC.

1WQC relies on frequent measurement to implement a desired state evolution, but none of this information is used towards fault-tolerance in simulation-based approaches. The opportunity for improved performance becomes evident once one considers the well known link between teleportation and 1WQC [9, 16], and the fact that FTQC in the circuit model can achieve very high thresholds via extensive use of teleportation for simultaneous syndrome extraction and state evolution [17].

1. Encoded Computation

Before we consider how syndrome information is to be extracted, we must consider encoded computation in the PMM. The basic elements of the PMM are: preparation of qubits in either $|+\rangle$ or $|+\rangle_{\pi/4}$, pairwise entanglement via $\wedge Z$, and measurement in the X or Y eigenbases depending on the outcomes of previous measurements. Given some quantum code, we can consider these same elements, but in the subspace corresponding to the code chosen (that is, preparation of a block of qubits in the encoded states above, encoded entangling operations, and collective measurements in the encoded eigenbases X and Y). The use of the 7 qubit self-orthogonal doubly-even CSS codes [18] simplifies the problem considerably if the generators of the encoded Pauli operators are chosen to be $\overline{Z} = Z^{\otimes 7}$ and $\overline{X} = X^{\otimes 7}$. In that case, the encoded entangling operation $\wedge \overline{Z}$ is given by the transversal application of $\wedge Z$ gates between respective qubits in two blocks (in the PMM, it is the parallel concatenation of the pattern $\wedge Z$). Moreover, measurement in the encoded X and encoded Y eigenbases are performed by measuring each of the qubits within the code block in the same basis individually, followed by classical decoding of the outcomes to determine the encoded outcome. If we consider concatenated encoding using this 7 qubit code, i.e.

$$\overline{X}^{(j)} = \overline{X}^{(j-1)^{\otimes 7}} \quad \text{for the } j\text{th level of encoding with}$$


$$\overline{X}^{(0)} = X \quad \text{and similar relations for } \overline{Z}^{(j)}, \text{ these transver-}$$


FIG. 1: Entanglement graph corresponding to the encoding of a single qubit into the 7 qubit CSS code. The boxed node corresponds to an arbitrary input qubit. All but the white qubits (corresponding to the encoding output) are measured in the X basis (up to feed-forward-based corrections).

sality properties are preserved.

The encoding procedure of any given stabilizer code over qubits is known to correspond to a pattern in 1WQC which allows for arbitrary input and requires only measurements along the eigenbases of the Pauli operators X and Y [19, 20] (this includes both the isomorphism between stabilizer codes and graph codes, as well as the necessary local Clifford corrections. If we restrict the inputs to be either $|+\rangle$ or $|+\rangle_{\pi/4}$, we can obtain the encoded states $|+\rangle$ or $|+\rangle_{\pi/4}$ strictly within the PMM. In the case of the 7 qubit code we are considering, the entanglement graph of the encoding circuit is depicted in Fig. 1. Concatenated encoding proceeds in the obvious way, by serial concatenation of the measurement pattern corresponding to the encoding procedure.

However, for the purpose of FTQC, encoding requires verification of the encoded states in order to ensure that these states do not contain errors that are too correlated [2, 21]. This can be performed naturally in the PMM via state encoding at some given level of concatenation, followed by syndrome extracting teleportation of the lower levels of encoding [17]. There are purification protocols for the entangled state corresponding to the encoding procedure of any CSS code [22], (such as the 7 qubit code, as depicted in Fig. 1) which may also be employed to reduce errors and error correlations. We consider only the encoded states that have been successfully verified after preparation as part of the computation. In this manner, encoded computation in the PMM is akin to computation with nested graph states [6], where the code entanglement graph is nested within the computation entanglement graph. However, the entire concatenated graph state must not be purified directly, since the maximum vertex degree of the resulting graph grows linearly with the level of concatenation, and the purification protocol performance degrades with higher vertex degrees [22]. In order to avoid this problem, one may perform purification per level of concatenation separately, followed by syndrome extracting teleportation with post-selection of the states which have a clean syndrome.

2. Syndrome extraction

In order to perform FTQC, one must be able to extract information about the errors in the data in order to ensure that only clean enough states are introduced into the computation, as described in the previous section, but also to obtain information about which errors are likely to have occurred in order to correct them. This error syndrome extraction can be performed via teleportation, as recently described in [17, 23]. In essence, the idea is to start with a maximally entangled pair of encoded qubits $\bar{j}_{i,2}$ which is prepared offline. Given some encoded state \bar{m} from which error syndrome information is to be extracted, by measuring each transversal pair of physical qubits from \bar{m} and the first half of $\bar{j}_{i,2}$ in a basis of maximally entangled states, one teleports the state \bar{m} into the second half of the entangled pair, up to a tensor product of local Pauli operators g which is inferred from the outcomes of the pairwise measurements. The error syndrome can in turn be inferred from these corrections by considering the commutator of g with each of the generators of the stabilizer group of the code. This protocol can be seen as the transversal teleportation of all the physical qubits where the n maximally entangled pairs have been projected into the codespace being used. Note that this is different from an encoded teleportation { an encoded maximally entangled state is used, but the measurements are performed on physical qubits, not encoded qubits. This proposed technique for FTQC has not been rigorously proven to have an error threshold as is the case for many other techniques [2], but extensive numerical evidence supports such a claim [17].

The usual teleportation protocol [24] can be performed with any measurement in a maximally entangled basis, and this choice of basis fixes which maximally entangled states can be used as a resource. In fact, teleportation can be performed by the serial concatenation $J_0 \rightarrow J_1 = X_3^{s_2} Z_3^{s_1} M_2^0 M_1^0 E_{23} E_{12} N_3^0 N_2^0$, which may be understood as a teleportation using the basis obtained by applying a Hadamard gate to one of the qubits of a Bell basis. If we allow for modified preparation of the entangled resource state, the pattern, stripped of the entanglement preparation, simply becomes $T = X_3^{s_2} Z_3^{s_1} M_2^0 M_1^0 E_{12}$, which, for completeness, must be concatenated with the pattern for the modified entangled state preparation (i.e. the pattern that prepares the encoded entangled state).

In the PMM, syndrome extraction of some encoded state \bar{m} is performed by: (I) preparing and verifying the encoded state $\bar{j}_{i,2} = \wedge_{Z12} \bar{j}_1 \bar{j}_2$, (II) teleporting all qubits in \bar{m} individually using the resource state $\bar{j}_{i,2}$, and (III) performing classical post-processing to infer the syndrome information from the teleportation measurement outcomes. As discussed, step (I) can be performed by hierarchical teleportation and post-selection [17, 23]. Step (II) can be performed by parallel concatenation of the pattern T above, while step (III) is merely classical post-processing which affects the bases of subsequent measurements. Partial syndrome information can be ex-




FIG. 2: Entanglement graphs for the fault-tolerant implementation of J_0 . The boxed nodes correspond to input qubits, and all but the white nodes (corresponding to output qubits) are measured in the X eigenbasis (up to feed-forward-based corrections).

tracted in a similar fashion, as in the case of the J pattern with $\gamma = \frac{n}{2}$, where, depending on n , one can obtain information about Pauli errors which anti-commute with X or Y .

3. Performing the computation

Given any measurement pattern in the PMM, one may make it fault-tolerant by first translating each of the commands with a larger pattern representing its encoded form, then inserting instances of the syndrome extracting teleportation between each operation, and standardizing the resulting pattern.

As a simple example, consider the pattern fragment $X_2^{s_1} M_1^0 E_{12}$ that implements the unitary $J_0 = H$, with entanglement graph depicted by Fig. 2(a). Using a single level of encoding under the 7 qubit CSS code, the resulting pattern is already long and omitted for brevity, but its entanglement graph in Fig. 2(b) demonstrates the simplicity of the transformation. The subgraph enclosed in the shaded triangle corresponds to the encoded state that must be prepared and verified before the remaining operations can be performed, in what can be seen as an extension of the buffered implementation of the unencoded case [4]. With the data protected by an error correction code and offline preparation of encoded qubits, one inserts the syndrome extracting teleportation to obtain the final fault-tolerant pattern with corresponding entanglement graph depicted in Fig. 2(c). Again, the subgraph inside the irregular pentagon (corresponding to the preparation of the encoded maximally entangled pair) is to be prepared and verified before the qubits within it interact with the remainder of the graph. This demonstrates the fact that only three subgraphs need to be prepared and verified offline: the smaller subgraphs corresponding to the encoded states \bar{j}_1 and \bar{j}_4 , and the larger subgraph corresponding to the encoded state \bar{j}_i . This procedure for implementing fault-tolerance works

for any linear graph. Other graphs, corresponding to a $\wedge Z$ pattern interacting between two linear chains, can be handled in a similar fashion, by simply inserting syndrome extracting teleportations before and after the $\wedge Z$ gate.

It is important to note that these nodes, interactions and measurements added to the computation in order to extract syndrome information just correspond to Clifford operations. The measurements associated with a sequence of Clifford operations can be performed in any order, even simultaneously, and thus they do not increase the depth complexity of the computation. Moreover, this also allows for the online preparation of subgraphs corresponding to Clifford operations, along with measurement of parts of the subgraph, which allows for the elimination of some types of error via post-selection (as pointed out in [25], for the case of repeated syndrome extraction, one can post-select on subgraphs which will yield agreeing syndromes).

IV. CONCLUSION

We have described a measurement based model of computation with the notable feature that measurements are

restricted to the eigenbases of the Pauli operators X and Y . With the appropriate choice of quantum codes, any measurement pattern in this model can be directly modified into another pattern within the same model which will have a lower effective error rate for the encoded data, according to numerical evidence [17].

It remains to see if one can compare the error threshold values and usage of resources for the direct approach described here, with that of the approach of FT based on gate simulation.

Acknowledgments

M.S. is partially supported by by NSERC, MITACS and ARO. E.K. was partially supported by the ARDA, MITACS, ORDCF, and CFI projects during her stay at Institute for Quantum Computing at the University of Waterloo where this work was begun.

-
- [1] R. Raussendorf and H.-J. Briegel, Phys. Rev. Lett. 86, 5188 (2001).
 - [2] P. A. Liferis, D. Gottesman, and J. Preskill, QIC 6, 97 (2006).
 - [3] R. Raussendorf, Ph.D. thesis, Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität München (2003).
 - [4] M. A. Nielsen and C. M. Dawson, Phys. Rev. A 71, 042323 (2005).
 - [5] P. A. Liferis and D. W. Leung (2005), arxiv eprint quant-ph/0503130.
 - [6] D. E. Danielsen, Master's thesis, University of Bergen (2005).
 - [7] V. Danos, E. Kashe, and P. Panangaden, Phys. Rev. A 72, 064301 (2005).
 - [8] X. Zhou, D. W. Leung, and I. L. Chuang, Phys. Rev. A 62, 052316 (2000).
 - [9] M. Nielsen (2005), arxiv eprint quant-ph/0504097.
 - [10] D. Divincenzo, Fortschr. Phys. 48, 771 (2000).
 - [11] D. Gottesman and I. L. Chuang, Nature 402, 390 (1999).
 - [12] D. Aharonov and M. Ben-Or (1999), arxiv eprint quant-ph/9906129.
 - [13] A. Kitaev, Russ. Math. Surv. 52, 1191 (1997).
 - [14] E. Knill, R. Laflamme, and W. H. Zurek, Proc. Roy. Soc. Lond. A 454, 365 (1998).
 - [15] J. Preskill, Proc. Roy. Soc. Lond. A 454, 385 (1998).
 - [16] A. M. Childs, D. W. Leung, and M. A. Nielsen, Phys. Rev. A 71 (2005), quant-ph/0404132.
 - [17] E. Knill, Nature 434, 39 (2005).
 - [18] A. Steane, Proc. Roy. Soc. Lond. A 452, 2551 (1996).
 - [19] D. Schlingemann and R. F. Werner, Phys. Rev. A 65, 012308 (2002).
 - [20] M. Grassl, A. Klappenecker, and M. Rotteler, in Proceedings of the ISIT, Lausanne (IEEE, Lausanne, 2002), p. 45.
 - [21] P. Shor, in Proceedings of the 37th Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (1996), p. 56, arxiv eprint quant-ph/9605011.
 - [22] W. Dur, H. A. Schauer, and H.-J. Briegel, Phys. Rev. Lett. 91, 107903 (2003).
 - [23] E. Knill, Phys. Rev. A 71, 042322 (2005).
 - [24] C. Bennett, G. Brassard, C. Crépeau, R. Jozsa, A. Peres, and W. Wootters, Phys. Rev. Lett. 70, 1895 (1993).
 - [25] C. M. Dawson, H. L. Hasegrove, and M. A. Nielsen, Phys. Rev. A 73, 0502306 (2006).