

Decoherence and Efficiency of Quantum Error Correction

M. Biskup^{1,2}, P. Cejnar³, and R. Kotecký^{2,1}

¹Dept. of Theoretical Physics, Charles University, V Holesovickach 2, 180 00 Prague, Czech Republic

²Center for Theoretical Study, Charles University, Jilská 1, 110 00 Prague, Czech Republic

³Dept. of Nuclear Physics, Charles University, V Holesovickach 2, 180 00 Prague, Czech Republic

(March 17, 2022)

Abstract

Certain physical aspects of quantum error correction are discussed for a quantum computer (n -qubit register) in contact with a decohering environment. Under rather plausible assumptions upon the form of the computer-environment interaction, the efficiency of a general correcting procedure is evaluated as a function of the spontaneous-decay duration and the rank of errors covered by the procedure. It is proved that the probability of errors can be made arbitrarily small by enhancing the correction method, provided the decohering interaction is represented by a bounded operator.

03.65.-w, 89.70.+c, 89.80.+h

I. INTRODUCTION

Since Shor [1] demonstrated that the classical factoring problem can, in principle, be efficiently solved on a quantum computer, a multitude of papers dealing with quantum computing have emerged. It was soon recognized [2,3], however, that the advantage of implementing entangled quantum states may be spoiled by their vulnerability to errors. Namely, the destructive interference of the omnipresent environment leads to an exponential loss of the probability that the computation runs in the desired way. The number of runs needed to perform a successful calculation then increases exponentially which takes one back to the purview of complexity problems.

These pessimistic views have abated to a certain extent since the first work pioneering quantum error correction appeared [4]. It immediately became a subject of fascination that something as delicate to handle as quantum state can be mended without knowing any particulars about it. In view of that, a variety of error correcting codes [5] and related complexity requirements [6-8] have been thoroughly discussed.

The basic idea of quantum correcting is fairly simple. The computational state is encoded, by introducing redundancy, into a more robust one, which can then be rectified, provided only errors from a certain sub-class have occurred. It is subsequently argued that the remaining errors appear with a small probability, which is a key prerequisite for the proof of correction effectiveness. A typical example of the above sub-class are single-qubit errors. In this case, simultaneous errors on more than one qubit are expected to conform to the law of independent probabilities, and, therefore, to be dominated by the single-qubit errors. If the latter errors can be put away, the system is indeed much less susceptible to perturbations.

While quantum codes and related topics have been well explored during over a year of their existence, little has been said on the genuine physical aspects of the quantum error correction, though some of them certainly deserve our attention. Namely, despite all correction methods resemble the watch-dog stabilization (discussed, e.g., in [9]), there is

an important difference: For the watch-dog stabilization (in the ideal case) to function, corrections have to be repeated at an infinite rate. But, in reality, there is always a principal bound on the correction frequency (apart from others, for the quantum computation must not be interfered with) | the exponential decay of the original state cannot be avoided. Of course, this does not necessarily imply that the error correction brings no profit. In order to estimate the correction efficiency, however, the temporal aspects of the correction process have to be carefully scrutinized. As shown in the following example, this cannot be done regardless the particulars of the decohering interaction.

Consider a simple correction scheme capable of eliminating single- and double-qubit amplitude errors (i.e., $|j\rangle \rightarrow |i\rangle$ | see sect.II): States of a single qubit are encoded into states of a qubit pentet, $|j\rangle \rightarrow |j0000\rangle$ and $|i\rangle \rightarrow |j1111\rangle$, and the correction is represented by the transformation $|j_1b_2b_3b_4b_5\rangle \rightarrow |jjbbbb\rangle$ on the encoded states, where b is equal to b_1 that occurs at least three times in the initial state (majorization rule). Let us try to compare the stabilization effect of the above correction under two different error-producing interactions: $H^{(1)} = \sum_{i=1}^P h_i \sigma_x^i$ and $H^{(2)} = \sum_{k=1}^P h_k \sigma_x^k \sigma_x^1$, where σ_x is the first Pauli matrix ($\sigma_x : |j\rangle \rightarrow |i\rangle$) operating on the i -th qubit. As both the interactions cause only amplitude errors, the correction procedure is, in principle, applicable. The corresponding evolution operators have the form: $U^{(1)}(t) = \sum_{i=1}^Q [\cos(\omega_i t) + i \sigma_x^i \sin(\omega_i t)]$ and $U^{(2)}(t) = \sum_{k=1}^Q [\cos(\omega_k t) + i \sigma_x^k \sigma_x^1 \sin(\omega_k t)]$. By breaking the products into parts, it is evident that the error proliferation is much faster for the second hamiltonian. Namely, for short times t , the errors which cannot be cured by our procedure (i.e., the terms in $U(t)$ corresponding to three- and higher-qubit errors) are of order t^3 in the first case and t^2 in the second one. To achieve the same level of stabilization for both interactions, the corrections in the second case have to be repeated at much higher rate.

The plan of the paper is as follows. In the second section we briefly recall the basic facts on decoherence and quantum error correction. The third section is devoted to the evaluation of the correction efficiency, under a certain mild assumption on the form of decohering interaction. In the last section we present conditions under which a rigorous

meaning can be given to our formulas, and discuss their applicability to realistic situations. In particular, we prove that the quantum computer can be stabilized if the decohering interaction is represented by a bounded operator.

II. DECOHERENCE AND CORRECTION BY CODES

Decoherence in quantum systems is, according to the current operationalistic point of view [10], induced by coupling the system to its environment. As a result, the states of the computer become entangled with the environmental ones, the fact that has a deadly impact on quantum superpositions. Formally, decoherence is described by the chain

$$\rho_0 \rightarrow D_0 = \rho_0^e \otimes \rho_0 \xrightarrow{U} D_t = U(t) D_0 U^\dagger(t) \rightarrow \rho_t = \text{Tr}_E D_t; \quad (1)$$

where ρ_0 and ρ_t are the computer states (density matrices) at time 0 and t , respectively, and ρ_0^e is the initial environmental state. Here the leftmost arrow represents enlarging of the computer's Hilbert space H_c by the environmental degrees of freedom, the middle one stands for the joint computer-environment evolution (resulting typically in a non-product density matrix D_t), and the rightmost arrow reflects our ignorance of the environment, expressed in terms of the partial trace over the environmental Hilbert space H_e . Despite the unitarity of the joint evolution $D_0 \rightarrow D_t$, the full transformation $\rho_0 \rightarrow \rho_t$ need no longer be unitary.

During the run of a calculation, the computational state faces a sequence of neatly timed unitary transformations. In the meantime, when quantum gates are being readied for the next computational step, the quantum registers containing qubits are falling victim to the harsh intervention of the environment. Consequently, to study decoherence effects in the quantum computer, one should primarily be interested in qubits suspended in the registers that are exposed just to the environmental interaction.

The simplest quantum register contains only one qubit (we denote the single-qubit Hilbert space by H_q). The action of the overall evolution operator $U(t)$ can be formalized by the following equations

$$U(t) \mathbf{e}_i \mathbf{f}_j = \mathbf{g}_i \mathbf{f}_j + \mathbf{h}_i \mathbf{g}_j; \quad U(t) \mathbf{e}_i \mathbf{g}_j = \mathbf{j}_i \mathbf{f}_j + \mathbf{k}_i \mathbf{g}_j; \quad (2)$$

Here \mathbf{e}_i is an orthonormal basis of H_e (for simplicity we suppose $\mathbf{e}_0 = \sum_i w_i \mathbf{e}_i \mathbf{h}_i$), and $\mathbf{g}_i, \mathbf{h}_i, \mathbf{j}_i$ and \mathbf{k}_i are some unknown environmental states (neither normalization nor orthogonality is required) containing t as an implicit variable. The crucial observation [4], leading ultimately to the correcting codes, is that the time-dependence of the evolution operator $U(t)$ can be totally embodied in the environmental Hilbert space H_e . Namely, $U(t)$ admits a trivial factorization $U(t) = \sum_i U_i(t) Q_i$, where $U_i(t)$ and Q_i ($i = 0, 1, 2, 3$) act on the environmental and qubit states, respectively. Let $\mathbf{j}_i = \mathbf{f}_i + \mathbf{g}_i$. The explicit form of $U(t)$ and Q_i can be deduced from the formula

$$\begin{aligned} U(t) \mathbf{e}_i \mathbf{j}_j &= \frac{\mathbf{g}_i + \mathbf{k}_i}{2} (\mathbf{f}_j + \mathbf{g}_j) + \frac{\mathbf{g}_i - \mathbf{k}_i}{2} (\mathbf{f}_j - \mathbf{g}_j) + \\ &\quad + \frac{\mathbf{h}_i + \mathbf{j}_i}{2} (\mathbf{f}_j + \mathbf{g}_j) + \frac{\mathbf{h}_i - \mathbf{j}_i}{2} (\mathbf{f}_j - \mathbf{g}_j) = \\ &= \mathbf{g}_i \mathbf{j}_j + \mathbf{h}_i \mathbf{z}_j + \mathbf{k}_i \mathbf{x}_j + \mathbf{j}_i (\mathbf{i}_y) \mathbf{j}_j; \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

Here \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} , and \mathbf{z} are Pauli matrices in the basis \mathbf{f}_j and \mathbf{g}_j . The expression (3) has led to a "discrete" classification of quantum errors [6] into amplitude errors (\mathbf{x}), phase errors (\mathbf{z}), and combined amplitude-phase errors ($\mathbf{i}_y = \mathbf{z} \mathbf{x}$); 1 represents no error. In view of (3), if the three classes of errors can be corrected, then any (even unknown) single qubit state can resist perturbations.

An error decomposition analogous to (3) is valid also for n -qubit systems. If $U(t)$ is an evolution operator (even non-unitary) on $H = H_e \otimes H_q$, with $H_q = H_q^n$, then

$$U(t) = \sum_{\mathbf{f} \in \mathcal{G}} U_{\mathbf{f} \in \mathcal{G}}(t) \mathbf{e}_1 \otimes \mathbf{e}_2 \otimes \dots \otimes \mathbf{e}_n; \quad (4)$$

where the sum runs over all n -collections $\mathbf{f} \in \mathcal{G}_{i=1}^n$ of indices $i \in \{0, 1, 2, 3\}$ and $U_{\mathbf{f} \in \mathcal{G}}$ are operators on H_e , corresponding to the respective dynamics in the qubit sector. Here we have made use of the shorthand notation

$$\mathbf{e}_k = \underbrace{\mathbf{e}_1 \otimes \dots \otimes \mathbf{e}_1}_{k-1} \otimes \mathbf{e}_k \otimes \underbrace{\mathbf{e}_1 \otimes \dots \otimes \mathbf{e}_1}_{n-k}; \quad (5)$$

where $\mathbf{e} = (1; \dots)$. The decomposition (4) is unique since it can be inverted to yield $U_{\text{fig}}(t) = 2^{-n} T_{H_c} (U(t)^{1 \ 2 \ \dots \ n})$. Now, it is meaningful to say that an error of rank k has occurred, if only collections with exactly k non-zero indices i contribute to (4).

Error correction by codes relies upon the possibility to encode single logical states $|j_i\rangle$ and $|j_l\rangle$ into specific superpositions $|j_i\rangle$ and $|j_l\rangle$ of compound n -qubit logical states (so-called code-words from H_q^n). If the states $|j_i\rangle$ and $|j_l\rangle$ are distant enough from each other, where the Hamming distance turns out to be an appropriate measure for these purposes, the histories of a certain sub-class of errors can be traced back and subsequently remedied. Let k be fixed. Then it turns out that for some n satisfying the quantum Hamming and Gilbert-Varshamov bounds [11],

$$\sum_{k=0}^n \binom{n}{k} 3^k \leq 2^n \leq \sum_{k=0}^n \binom{n}{k} 3^k; \quad (6)$$

there exists a code into n qubits capable of rectifying all errors up to rank k . The above inequalities follow from the requirement that the Hilbert space of code-words is large enough to allow both, the original information contained in ρ_0 (cf. formula 1) as well as the way it has been altered by the above sub-class of errors, to be deciphered from the register density matrix ρ_t . It will be important for us to observe the asymptotic behaviour of the above bounds as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Taking at the same time $k = n \cdot x$, the formula (6) boils down to

$$x \ln 3 \leq \ln [x^n (1-x)^{1-x}] \leq \ln 2 - 2x \ln 3 \leq \ln [(2x)^{2x} (1-2x)^{1-2x}]; \quad (7)$$

Since both the inequalities are satisfied for a nonvanishing argument $x \in [x_0; 2x_0]$ with $x_0 \in (0; 1)$, we see that the number of errors k that can be controlled grows roughly linearly with the size n of the code.

The repair of defects is standardly thought to be done by means of auxiliary qubits, so-called ancillas. Before the correction procedure is initiated, the ancillas are prepared in a fixed state $|j_i\rangle$ (this is important as it implies zero entropy input| disorder can be transferred to the ancilla Hilbert space H_A). When they are brought into contact with the computational qubits, the corresponding type of error is re-printed in the ancilla state and

subsequently rectified in the computational sector. Formally, to represent this operation, one introduces [12] a recovery operator R , acting on the product space $H_C \otimes H_A$. As can be easily shown, R can be made unitary [12,13], which allows for the coherent inclusion of the error correction into the computational algorithm.

III. CORRECTION EFFICIENCY

It is intuitively clear that the correction procedures function only when the stored computational state has not departed very far from the initial one. In this section we would like to discuss this common supposition quantitatively. In order to do that, let us recall [14] the definition of the fidelity functional ascribed to the channel decoherence + correction (represented by the operator RU). Namely, the fidelity functional $F(t)$ is the probability that the initial state $|j\rangle_i$ passes through the channel intact. If the environment is originally in the state $|\phi_0^e\rangle$, then

$$F(t) = \text{Tr} [R U(t) (P_{|j\rangle_i} \otimes |\phi_0^e\rangle\langle\phi_0^e|) U^\dagger(t) R^\dagger P_{|j\rangle_i}] \quad (8)$$

Here $P_{|j\rangle_i} = |j\rangle_i\langle j|$ is the projector onto the state $|j\rangle_i$ and, similarly, $P_A = \sum_i |i\rangle_A\langle i|$. Without being explicitly marked out, the ancilla is not to be affected by the evolution under $U(t)$. Consequently, error $E(t)$ of the respective code is defined [12] by $E(t) = \sup_{|j\rangle_i} E(t)$, where $E(t) = 1 - F(t)$ is the error functional. It is worth noting that as we suppose R to be unitary, E is expressed by the same formula as F with only the last projector P replaced by $1 - P$.

Assume now n qubit registers being in the state $|j\rangle_i$. The registers are exposed to the environmental intrusion, described by an interaction hamiltonian V . In the following, we shall be concerned with the class of non-contact interactions, i.e., those for which V takes the form

$$V = \sum_{k=1}^n \sum_{l=1}^n x_k^{\alpha} x_l^{\beta} h_{kl}^{\gamma} \quad (9)$$

where h^1 are some self-adjoint operators on the environmental Hilbert space (the term with $\delta = 0$ is absent in equation (9) as it can be incorporated into the free hamiltonian | see below). This assumption is justifiable if all inter-qubit communications are mediated by some (quasi-) particle external fields. For instance, in the linear ion-trap computer single qubits interact by exchanging photons and phonons, so the interaction is indeed a non-contact one.

In the interaction picture, the evolution operator $U(t)$ satisfies the Schrodinger equation

$$i\frac{d}{dt}U(t) = V(t)U(t); \quad (10)$$

where $V(t)$ is the freely evolved interaction hamiltonian, $V(t) = e^{iH_0 t} V e^{-iH_0 t}$ (we set $\hbar = 1$). As the free hamiltonian is not supposed to induce interaction between qubits (H_0 is the sum of environmental and single-qubit terms), the free evolution of U 's in (9) can be incorporated into the evolution of h 's. Namely, taking into account that $h^1(t) = \prod_{i=1}^P f^1_i(t) h^1_i$ (where $f^1_i(t)$ are some functions of time), we can put the operator $V(t)$ to the same form as V , only with h^1 being replaced by $\prod_{i=1}^P f^1_i(t) h^1_i$.

Let the environment be in the state $|j_i\rangle$. Then the joint time evolution of $|j_i\rangle$ in the interaction picture can be written

$$\begin{aligned} U(t)|j_i\rangle &= |j_i\rangle - i \int_0^t ds V(s)U(s)|j_i\rangle = \\ &= \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{k!} T \left(-i \int_0^t ds V(s) \right)^k |j_i\rangle + \\ &+ (-i)^{k+1} \int_0^t ds_1 \int_0^{s_1} ds_2 \dots \int_0^{s_k} ds_{k+1} V(s_1)V(s_2)\dots V(s_{k+1})U(s_{k+1})|j_i\rangle; \quad (11) \end{aligned}$$

where T is the time-ordering operator and k is chosen to be precisely the rank of errors we intend to correct. The second equality has been obtained by iterating the preceding one k -times, while tacitly supposing that $U(t)$ is sufficiently differentiable when applied to $|j_i\rangle$. Now let the ancilla qubits (initially in the state $|j_i\rangle$) join the evolution and carry out the correction R . Since the correction procedure cures all errors up to rank k , the first term in (11) is thoroughly reverted to the state $|j_i\rangle$ in the computational sector and, therefore,

brings no contribution to the error functional $E(t)$ (due to the presence of $1 - P$). This enables us to write

$$E(t) = \int_0^t ds_1 \dots \int_0^{s_k} ds_{k+1} \int_0^t ds_1^0 \dots \int_0^{s_k^0} ds_{k+1}^0 \text{Tr} [R V(s_1) \dots V(s_{k+1}) U(s_{k+1}) D_{\mathcal{A}} U^\dagger(s_{k+1}^0) V(s_{k+1}^0) \dots V(s_1^0) R^\dagger (1 - P)]; \quad (12)$$

with $D_{\mathcal{A}} = P \otimes_{\mathcal{H}_0} P_{\mathcal{A}}$. We have the first result: If the correcting method is capable of remedying all errors up to k , then $E(t) = E^{(0)}(t) = \dots = E^{(2k+1)}(t) = 0$ for all initial states j . Moreover, the behaviour for short times is given by the relation

$$E(t) = \frac{t^{2k+2}}{(k+1)!} \sum_{f_1, g, f_1^0, g} \text{Tr} [R V^{f_1} \dots V^{f_{k+1}} D_{\mathcal{A}} V^{f_{k+1}^0} \dots V^{f_1^0} R^\dagger (1 - P)] + O(t^{2k+3}); \quad (13)$$

where the sums run over all ordered $k+1$ -subsets of $f_1, 2, \dots, ng$, and $V^1 = \sum_{i=1}^P h^1_i(t) \otimes 1$. The formula (13) is obtained by substituting $V(s) = V(0)$ and $U(s) = 1$ for small times s in (12). As the errors incurred in (13) by the chains of V 's are of rank $k+1$, they are not all likely to be corrected for a generic environmental interaction, unless the correction method encompasses also higher order errors. Thus, $E^{(2k+2)}(0) \neq 0$ and (13) describes the true behaviour of $E(t)$ for short times.

We see that, indeed, the more enhanced codes are applied the slower the errors escalate. It is worth noting that the formula (13) generalizes the standard treatment of the quantum watch-dog effect. In the latter, no error correction is employed, therefore $k = 0$, which is in accord with the obtained time dependence ($E(t) = t^2$). However, as opposed to the watch-dog effect, quantum error correction by codes requires no knowledge of the initial state.

IV. STABILIZATION BY CORRECTION

We have seen in the previous section that the ancilla based correction brings about polynomial slow-down of error propagation, provided the mild condition (9) upon the form of the interaction is satisfied. In practice, however, this does not imply that decoherence

can be stopped from penetrating into the computer. Namely, as already mentioned, since the frequency at which the rectification is repeated cannot be made arbitrarily large, even the encoded quantum information in the register subjected to periodic corrections decays exponentially with time, with only the decay rate reduced. In view of these remarks, the following concept of stabilization is more appropriate: A correction procedure, depending on a discrete parameter n , qualifies to be stabilizing, if there is a range of times for which the probability of errors can be made arbitrarily small by varying the parameter n . The latter parameter represents the comprehensiveness of the correction method and is exemplified by the length of code-words in our case.

We would like to clarify when a computer register can be stabilized in the above sense. In particular, we prove the following statement: If the decohering interaction has the form (9), with the operators h^1 uniformly bounded, then there exists an error procedure stabilizing quantum computer against error proliferation. It should be noted that we make no particular assumptions on the free hamiltonian, apart from the natural self-adjointness requirement ensuring the existence of $e^{iH_0 t}$. For the proof, notice that in this setting all the above formulas can be given a good mathematical meaning. Consequently, we can derive the inequality

$$E(t) \leq \frac{t^{2k+2}}{(k+1)!} k V k^{2k+2} \quad (14)$$

by directly utilizing the boundedness assumption in (12) (k is the standard operator norm). If $kh^1 k \leq C$ for all k and l , then, in the regime $k; n \rightarrow \infty$, we get

$$E(t) \leq O(1) t C \frac{n^{2k+2}}{k} < \frac{C e^{2x_0 n}}{x_0}; \quad (15)$$

where x_0 stands for the lower bound on the asymptotic value of $k=n$ (see (7)). Hence, if $t < x_0 = C e$, the error $E(t)$ tends to zero exponentially fast as n increases. Consequently, by choosing a sufficiently enhanced encoding, the fidelity of the decoherence+correction channel outstrips every bound $1 - \epsilon$ (with $\epsilon > 0$) and the quantum information is, indeed, well stabilized.

Unfortunately, it turns out that the genuine environmental interaction cannot be represented by a bounded operator. Nevertheless, the high-energy environmental states are usually strongly suppressed due to low temperature T . Since the characteristic scale of the interaction energy h^1 is of order $k_B T$, one is led to the rough estimate $t < t_T = 1/k_B T$ for the regime of applicability of the quantum error correction. Hence, the threshold of the thermal regime t_T (cf. [2]) probably sets an absolute bound beyond which no correction is of substantial help.

The rigorous treatment of the unbounded case in this generality falls beyond the current level of mathematical quantum theory. It is not so difficult to control the formula (12) if certain plausible assumptions on the interaction $H_0 + V$ can be made. In particular, one goes from the description in terms of the Dyson series to the description by the Born series [15]. It is not clear, however, whether it is possible to derive an analogue of the bound (14), in particular, with the factor $(k + 1)^2$ in the denominator (notice that this factor is absolutely necessary to compensate the natural extensive behaviour of the operator V). We plan to address these topics in a future work.

The restriction to non-contact interactions is, actually, not essential. Our treatment can be applied also to contact hamiltonians (with multiple terms), leading, however, to correspondingly weaker results concerning the correction efficiency.

REFERENCES

- [1] P W . Shor, in Proceedings of the 35th Annual Symposium on the Foundation of Computer Science, ed. S. Goldwasser (IEEE Computer Society press, Los Alamitos, CA, 1994).
- [2] W G . Unruh, Phys. Rev. A 51 (1995) 992.
- [3] G M . Palma, K A . Suominen, A . Ekert, Proc. Roy. Soc. A, 452 567 (1996)
- [4] P W . Shor, Phys. Rev. A 52 (1995) R2493.
- [5] A R . Calderbank, P W . Shor, Phys. Rev. A (to be published). B B . Plenio, V Vedral, P L Knight, preprint quant-ph/9603022. S. Braunstein, preprint quant-ph/9603024. L Vaidman, L. Goldenberg, S. Wiesner, preprint quant-ph/9603031. P W . Shor, J A . Smolin, preprint quant-ph/9604006. A R . Calderbank, E M . Rains, P W . Shor, N J A . Sloane, preprint quant-ph/9605005. D P . Di Vincenzo, P W . Shor, preprint quant-ph/9605031. E M . Rains, R . H . Hardin, P W . Shor, N J A . Sloane, preprint quant-ph/9703002.
- [6] P . Laamme, C . Miquel, J P . Paz and W . H . Zurek, Phys. Rev. Lett. 77, 198 (1996).
- [7] D . Gottesman, preprint quant-ph/9604038.
- [8] A . Steane, preprint quant-ph/9601029.
- [9] W . H . Zurek, Phys. Rev. Lett. 53 (1984) 391.
- [10] W . H . Zurek, Physics Today 44, 36 (October 1991).
- [11] A . Ekert, C . Macciavello, Phys. Rev. Lett. 77, 2585 (1996).
- [12] E . Knill, R . Laamme, preprint quant-ph/9604034.
- [13] Ch H . Bennett, D P . Di Vincenzo, J A . Smolin, W K Wooters, preprint quant-ph/9604024.

[14] B. Schumacher, Phys. Rev. A 51, 2738 (1995).

[15] We are very grateful to Adriaan T'ip for interesting discussions of this topic.