

Stabilizer codes from modified symplectic form

Tejas Gandhi¹, Piyush Kurur², and Rajat Mittal³

- 1 Dept. of Computer Science and Engineering, Indian Institute of Technology Kanpur, Kanpur, UP 208016, India
tgandhi@cse.iitk.ac.in
- 2 Dept. of Computer Science and Engineering, Indian Institute of Technology Kanpur, Kanpur, UP 208016, India
ppk@cse.iitk.ac.in
- 3 Dept. of Computer Science and Engineering, Indian Institute of Technology Kanpur, Kanpur, UP 208016, India
rmittal@cse.iitk.ac.in

Abstract

Stabilizer codes form an important class of quantum error correcting codes which have an elegant theory, efficient error detection, and many known examples. Constructing stabilizer codes of length n is equivalent to constructing subspaces of $\mathbb{F}_p^m \times \mathbb{F}_p^n$ which are *isotropic* under the symplectic bilinear form defined by $\langle (\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}), (\mathbf{c}, \mathbf{d}) \rangle = \mathbf{a}^T \mathbf{d} - \mathbf{b}^T \mathbf{c}$. As a result, many, but not all, ideas from the theory of classical error correction can be translated to quantum error correction. One of the main theoretical contributions of this article is to study stabilizer codes starting with a different symplectic form.

In this paper, we concentrate on cyclic codes. Modifying the symplectic form allows us to generalize the previous known construction for linear cyclic stabilizer codes, and in the process, circumvent some of the Galois theoretic no-go results proved there. More importantly, this tweak in the symplectic form allows us to make use of well known error correcting algorithms for cyclic codes to give efficient quantum error correcting algorithms. Cyclicity of error correcting codes is a *basis dependent* property. Our codes are no more *cyclic* when they are derived using the standard symplectic forms.¹ Hence this change of perspective is crucial from the point of view of designing efficient decoding algorithms for these families of codes. In this context, recall that for general codes, efficient decoding algorithms do not exist if some widely believed complexity theoretic assumptions are true.

Keywords and phrases Quantum Error Correction, Stabilizer codes, Linear Codes, Symplectic form

Digital Object Identifier 10.4230/LIPIcs...

1 Introduction

Classical error correcting codes have been instrumental in various areas, not just in communication and data storage systems but even in complexity and cryptography. In the quantum setting, the major technique to construct error correcting codes is through stabilizers on which there exists a substantial body of research [16, 6, 15, 2, 4, 5, 11].

The theory of quantum information is usually formulated using Hilbert spaces. Nonetheless, a stabilizer code of block length n over the p -ary alphabet (for some prime p) can be uniquely identified with a linear subspace C of the space \mathbb{F}_p^{2n} over the finite field

¹ If we ignore the error correcting properties like distance, all such symplectic forms can be converted to each other via a basis transformation.



\mathbb{F}_p . This subspace essentially determines all the important properties of the code like its distance and dimension (Theorem 3) and hence stabilizer codes can be seen as classical additive codes of twice the block length. However, for quantum stabilizer codes, the associated subspace C should be *isotropic*: for any two vectors $\mathbf{u} = (\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b})$ and $\mathbf{v} = (\mathbf{c}, \mathbf{d})$ of C , the *symplectic linear form* $\langle \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v} \rangle = \mathbf{a}^T \mathbf{d} - \mathbf{b}^T \mathbf{c}$ should vanish [5, Section II][11, Section IV]. Therefore, constructing quantum stabilizer codes boils down to constructing an isotropic subspace of \mathbb{F}_p^{2n} (Theorem 3). This additional condition of isotropy is what differentiates quantum codes from classical codes and often turns out to be a hindrance in transferring results from classical error correction to the quantum world.

Our main theoretical contribution is to rethink the role played by the form $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$, which was determined by the choice of the Weyl operators as the basis for quantum errors. The symplectic form $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ captures the commutation relation between these Weyl operators. By choosing a different set of Weyl operators, any form $\langle \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v} \rangle_A = \mathbf{u}^T A \mathbf{v}$ can be used for the construction of stabilizer codes². The main idea of this paper is to generalize the study of stabilizer codes by choosing a different symplectic form as the starting point. With this change in perspective, we obtain the following results:

1. We initiate the study of stabilizer codes based on non-standard symplectic forms. While the freedom to choose the symplectic form is indeed liberating, for codes thus constructed, the joint Hamming weight no longer measures the distance of the code. Motivated by this difficulty, we formulate the right notion of distance in this context. We identify key features of such symplectic forms required to make bounds on the distance possible.
2. To complement these theoretical results with concrete examples, we generalize the previous known construction of linear cyclic codes by Dutta et. al. [8] and are able to work around certain no-go theorems proved there. For block lengths n that divides $p^t + 1$ for some *odd* t , Dutta et.al. [8, Corollary IV.5] (see also the Ph.D thesis [7]) proved that there can be no linear cyclic stabilizer codes. This impossibility arise due to the Galois theoretical restrictions imposed on certain ideals due to the isotropy condition arising from the symplectic form $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$. By modifying the underlying form, we are able to circumvent this barrier.
3. Furthermore, we extend the efficient decoding algorithm given in Dutta et.al. [7, 8], which in turn uses the celebrated Berlekamp-Massey-Welch [3, 13, 17] algorithm for classical cyclic codes. We are able to generalize the decoding algorithm inspite of the fact that our codes are no longer cyclic. Notice that the cyclicity of a code is a basis dependent property and our codes are cyclic only when viewed under the modified symplectic form. Thus, these error correcting algorithms would not have been possible if we were stuck with the standard symplectic form. We believe this is important as efficient decoding even for general classical codes are intractable [10].

2 Preliminaries

In the quantum setting, a finite dimensional Hilbert space \mathcal{H} plays the role of the alphabet. A *quantum block code* \mathcal{C} of length n is just a subspace of the tensor product $\mathcal{H}^{\otimes n}$. From now on, we assume that the alphabet space \mathcal{H} has a prime dimension p . When p is 2, the Hilbert space \mathcal{H} is the space of qubits. We fix an orthonormal basis $\{|\mathbf{x}\rangle \mid \mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{F}_p\}$ for \mathcal{H} .

² The matrix A needs to be full rank and skew-symmetric for odd prime p . The $p = 2$ case can be separately handled.

This is analogous to picking \mathbb{F}_p as the alphabet set in the classical case. Having picked such a basis, a natural basis for the space $\mathcal{H}^{\otimes n}$ is given by the set $\{|\mathbf{x}\rangle \mid \mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{F}_p^n\}$ where $|\mathbf{x}\rangle$ denotes the state $|x_1\rangle \otimes \cdots \otimes |x_n\rangle$, where $x_i \in \mathbb{F}_p$ is the i -th component of \mathbf{x} .

For any \mathbf{a} and \mathbf{b} in \mathbb{F}_p^n , define the unitary operators

$$U_{\mathbf{a}}|\mathbf{x}\rangle = |\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{a}\rangle \text{ and } V_{\mathbf{b}}|\mathbf{y}\rangle = \omega^{\mathbf{b}^T \mathbf{y}} |\mathbf{y}\rangle, \quad (1)$$

$$V_{\mathbf{b}}U_{\mathbf{a}} = \omega^{\mathbf{b}^T \mathbf{a}} U_{\mathbf{a}}V_{\mathbf{b}} \quad (2)$$

where ω is some fixed primitive p -th root of unity. These operators are called the *Weyl operators* and are used to model errors in the quantum setting: $U_{\mathbf{a}}$ corresponds to the *bit flips* in the classical setting and $V_{\mathbf{b}}$ is the *phase flip*. The set of all Weyl operators $U_{\mathbf{a}}V_{\mathbf{b}}$ forms the basis of the operator space $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}^{\otimes n})$. It follows from the general theory of quantum mechanics that any quantum error in transmission can essentially be modelled using the Weyl operators. In particular, the group generated by these operators are what we call the error group.

► **Definition 1.** Let p be an odd prime. The *error group* \mathcal{E} associated with the block length n is the group of all operators of the form $\zeta U_{\mathbf{a}}V_{\mathbf{b}}$ where ζ is a p -th root of unity and \mathbf{a} and \mathbf{b} are elements of \mathbb{F}_p^n .

When the characteristic p is 2, the error group is similar, except that the scalar factor ζ is allowed to vary over all the 4-th roots of unity, $\{\pm 1, \pm i\}$.

2.1 Stabilizer Code

Stabilizer codes are subspaces that are fixed by some subset \mathcal{S} of the error group \mathcal{E} . More precisely, for any subset \mathcal{S} , the subspace

$$\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{S}} = \{|\psi\rangle \in \mathcal{H}^{\otimes n} \mid \forall S \in \mathcal{S} \ S|\psi\rangle = |\psi\rangle\}$$

is called the stabilizer code associated with the subset \mathcal{S} . First introduced by Gottesman [9] for the binary alphabet and subsequently generalized [15, 1, 11], the class of stabilizer codes plays a role analogous to the role played by linear codes in the classical setting. The following theorem specifies the conditions under which the code $\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{S}}$ is non-trivial, i.e, it has non-zero dimension.

► **Theorem 2.** [9] For a subset \mathcal{S} of \mathcal{E} , the associated stabilizer code $\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{S}}$ is non trivial if and only if

1. \mathcal{S} forms an Abelian subgroup of the error group \mathcal{E} .
2. The operator ζI does not belong to \mathcal{S} for any nontrivial root of unity ζ .

A subgroup \mathcal{S} satisfying the above conditions is called a *stabilizer subgroup* of the error group.

The *centralizer* $\overline{\mathcal{S}}$ is the set of all operators in \mathcal{E} that commute with all the operators of \mathcal{S} . It determines the error correcting properties of the code $\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{S}}$: an error in \mathcal{S} does not affect the code space whereas an error in $\mathcal{E} \setminus \overline{\mathcal{S}}$ leaves a nontrivial phase on every vector in $\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{S}}$ and hence can be detected. It is precisely the errors in $\overline{\mathcal{S}} \setminus \mathcal{S}$ that modifies a vector

XX:4 Stabilizer codes from modified symplectic form

in \mathcal{C}_S to another vector in \mathcal{C}_S and hence cannot be detected [9]. Thus the error correcting parameters, like the *distance* of the code, depend on the centralizer.

Finding a stabilizer subgroup can be reduced to a problem of designing special subspaces of $\mathbb{F}_p^n \times \mathbb{F}_p^n$. Given two vectors $\mathbf{u} = (\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b})$ and $\mathbf{v} = (\mathbf{c}, \mathbf{d})$ in $\mathbb{F}_p^n \times \mathbb{F}_p^n$, define the *symplectic inner product*, $\langle \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v} \rangle$, as the scalar $\mathbf{a}^T \mathbf{d} - \mathbf{b}^T \mathbf{c}$. A subspace S of $\mathbb{F}_p^n \times \mathbb{F}_p^n$ is called *isotropic* if and only if for any two vectors \mathbf{u} and \mathbf{v} in S , $\langle \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v} \rangle = 0$. From the following theorem, designing stabilizer subgroup is essentially equivalent to constructing isotropic subspace.

► **Theorem 3.** [5, 1, 11]

1. Let S be a stabilizer subgroup of the error group then the subset

$$S = \{(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}) \mid \zeta U_{\mathbf{a}} V_{\mathbf{b}} \in S\}$$

is isotropic.

2. Let S be any isotropic subset of $\mathbb{F}_p^n \times \mathbb{F}_p^n$, then the subgroup

$$\mathcal{S} = \{\rho(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}) U_{\mathbf{a}} V_{\mathbf{b}} \mid (\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}) \in S \subseteq \mathbb{F}_p^n \times \mathbb{F}_p^n\}$$

forms a stabilizer subgroup. In the above expression $\rho(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b})$ is $\omega^{\frac{1}{2} \mathbf{a}^T \mathbf{b}}$ if $p \neq 2$ and $i^{\mathbf{a}^T \mathbf{b}}$ if $p = 2$.

The above theorem follows from the fact that for two vectors $\mathbf{u} = (\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b})$ and $\mathbf{v} = (\mathbf{c}, \mathbf{d})$, the Weyl operators $W_{\mathbf{u}} = U_{\mathbf{a}} V_{\mathbf{b}}$ and $W_{\mathbf{v}} = U_{\mathbf{c}} V_{\mathbf{d}}$ commute if and only if the symplectic inner product $\langle \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v} \rangle = 0$. In view of the above theorem, from now on, stabilizer codes will be characterized by the associated isotropic subspaces S . We also define the centralizer subspace which corresponds to the centralizer subgroup \overline{S} .

► **Definition 4** (Centralizer subspace). Let S be any subspace of $\mathbb{F}_p^n \times \mathbb{F}_p^n$. The *centralizer subspace* of S , denoted by \overline{S} , is the subspace of all vectors \mathbf{u} such that $\langle \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{x} \rangle = 0$ for all \mathbf{x} in S .

The Hamming weight of an error measures the number of bits that the error corrupts in the classical setting. For quantum errors, the *joint weight* is the corresponding measure.

► **Definition 5.** Let $\mathbf{u} = (\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b})$ be any vector in the vector space $\mathbb{F}_p^n \times \mathbb{F}_p^n$. The joint weight $\text{wt}(\mathbf{u})$ is defined as the number of indices $1 \leq i \leq n$ such that the pair (a_i, b_i) is not $(0, 0)$. The joint weight of a subset S , $\text{wt}(S)$, is the minimum of the joint weights of elements in $S \setminus 0$.

We summarize the error correcting properties of the stabilizer code in the following theorem [5, 1].

► **Theorem 6.** Let S be an isotropic subspace of $\mathbb{F}_p^n \times \mathbb{F}_p^n$ and let \mathcal{C}_S be the associated stabilizer code. Then

1. The dimension of S as a vector space over \mathbb{F}_p is $n - k$ for some non-negative integer k . The dimension of \mathcal{C}_S , as a Hilbert space is p^k .
2. If every element of $\overline{S} \setminus S$ has joint weight at least d , then the associated code \mathcal{C}_S can detect up to $d - 1$ errors and correct up to $\lfloor \frac{d-1}{2} \rfloor$ errors.

Often it is easier to lower bound the distance of the code \mathcal{C}_S by the joint weight $\text{wt}(\overline{S})$. This is known as the *pure distance* of the code.

3 Modifying the symplectic form

The isotropy condition associated with the symplectic form $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ is essentially the only challenge that prevents us from lifting constructions of classical linear codes to quantum stabilizer codes (Theorem 3). This symplectic form sometimes even leads to certain Galois theoretic no-go results [8, 7]. This is what motivates us to modify the symplectic form and circumvent such impossibility theorems.

Let p be an odd prime and let A be any $2n \times 2n$ skew-symmetric matrix of full rank with entries in \mathbb{F}_p . By appropriate relabelling of the Weyl operators, the theory of stabilizer codes can be built where the underlying symplectic form is given by $\langle \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v} \rangle_A = \mathbf{u}^T A \mathbf{v}$. This is because, there is always a basis transformation C of $\mathbb{F}_p^n \times \mathbb{F}_p^n$ such that the $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{C^T A C}$ is the standard symplectic $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ [12, Chapter XV, Corollary 8.2]. The theory of codes then needs to be built out of the Weyl operators $W_{C\mathbf{u}}$ instead of the standard Weyl operators $W_{\mathbf{u}}$. A similar change of symplectic form can be done in the case when p is 2 as well.

The joint Hamming weight of the vector (\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}) measures the number of indices corrupted by the error $U_{\mathbf{a}} V_{\mathbf{b}}$. If we restrict our attention to symplectic forms given by matrices $\begin{pmatrix} 0 & \sigma \\ -\sigma^T & 0 \end{pmatrix}$, for some $n \times n$ permutation matrix σ , as opposed to general forms, a variant of joint Hamming weight would serve the purpose of measuring errors – the weight of (\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}) in the modified setting should be the joint Hamming weight of $(\mathbf{a}, \sigma \mathbf{b})$, i.e. permute the second component before computing weight. Furthermore, if the permutation σ in the above matrix is also an involution, i.e. $\sigma^T = \sigma$, the associated symplectic form simplifies further: for vectors $\mathbf{u} = (\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b})$ and $\mathbf{v} = (\mathbf{c}, \mathbf{d})$, we define the σ -symplectic inner product as follows:

$$\langle \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v} \rangle_{\sigma} = \mathbf{a}^T \sigma \mathbf{d} - \mathbf{b}^T \sigma \mathbf{c}.$$

The notion of isotropy and centralizer can now be formalized in this new setting.

► **Definition 7.** A subspace S of $\mathbb{F}_p^n \times \mathbb{F}_p^n$ is called a σ -isotropic subspace if for all \mathbf{u} and $\mathbf{v} \in S$, $\langle \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v} \rangle_{\sigma} = 0$.

For any subspace S of $\mathbb{F}_p^n \times \mathbb{F}_p^n$ the σ -centralizer \bar{S} is the subspace of all vectors \mathbf{x} in $\mathbb{F}_p^n \times \mathbb{F}_p^n$ such that $\langle \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u} \rangle_{\sigma} = 0$ for all \mathbf{u} in S .

We have the following result that connects standard isotropy and σ -isotropy.

► **Lemma 8.** For any subset S of $\mathbb{F}_p^n \times \mathbb{F}_p^n$, let S^{σ} denote the set of all elements $(\mathbf{a}, \sigma \mathbf{b})$ such that $(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}) \in S$, then.

1. S is σ -isotropic if and only if S^{σ} is isotropic
2. \bar{S} is a σ -centralizer of S if and only if \bar{S}^{σ} is a centralizer of S^{σ} .

Proof. Since σ is an involution we have $\sigma^T = \sigma$. The proof then follows from the identity

$$\langle (\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}), (\mathbf{c}, \mathbf{d}) \rangle_{\sigma} = \langle (\mathbf{a}, \sigma \mathbf{b}), (\mathbf{c}, \sigma \mathbf{d}) \rangle.$$

◀

In view of Theorem 3 and the previous lemma, it follows that constructing stabilizer codes is equivalent to constructing σ -isotropic subspaces of $\mathbb{F}_p^n \times \mathbb{F}_p^n$. We have the following variant of Theorem 6 for σ -isotropic sets.

► **Theorem 9.** Let S be a σ -isotropic subspace of $\mathbb{F}_p^n \times \mathbb{F}_p^n$ with σ -centralizer \bar{S} then

XX:6 Stabilizer codes from modified symplectic form

1. The dimension of S as a vector space over $\mathbb{F}_p^n \times \mathbb{F}_p^n$ is at most n , say $n - k$. Using S , we can construct a stabilizer code of dimension p^k .
2. Suppose, every element of $\overline{S} \setminus S$ has joint weight at least d , then the associated stabilizer code has joint weight at least $\lfloor \frac{d+1}{2} \rfloor$ and correct up to $\lfloor \frac{d-1}{4} \rfloor$ errors.

Proof. From Lemma 8, we have S^σ is isotropic and its centralizer is \overline{S}^σ . Notice that the dimension of the space S^σ and S are equal as the map $(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}) \mapsto (\mathbf{a}, \sigma\mathbf{b})$ is a permutation on the $2n$ indices. The stabilizer code required in part 1 is just the stabilizer code associated with the isotropic set S^σ .

Consider any element (\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}) and let A denote the indices i such that $a_i \neq 0$. Similarly let B denote the set of indices j such that $b_j \neq 0$. Then the joint weight of (\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}) is the cardinality of $A \cup B$. The joint weight of $(\mathbf{a}, \sigma\mathbf{b})$ is at least the maximum of the cardinalities of A and B and hence is at least $\lfloor \frac{d+1}{2} \rfloor$. It follows that $\overline{S}^\sigma \setminus S^\sigma$ has joint weight at least $\lfloor \frac{d+1}{2} \rfloor$. Using Theorem 6 we get the necessary result. \blacktriangleleft

The bound on the distance in the previous theorem is conservative. Theoretically this is the best bound that we can derive. Explicit examples constructed in Section 5 often give much better distances. It may as well be the case that the actual joint weight of $\overline{S}^\sigma \setminus S^\sigma$ could even be higher than that of $\overline{S} \setminus S$.

3.1 Cyclic codes

We fix a finite field \mathbb{F}_p as the alphabet set and a block length n that is co-prime to p . Consider the right shift operator N that maps a vector $\mathbf{a} = (a_0, \dots, a_{n-1})$ to its right shift $(a_{n-1}, a_0, \dots, a_{n-2})$. A classical code C is *cyclic* if for all \mathbf{a} in C its right shift $N\mathbf{a}$ is also in C . It turns out that the right generalization of this notion is *simultaneous cyclicity*.

► **Definition 10.** A subset S of $\mathbb{F}_p^n \times \mathbb{F}_p^n$ is *simultaneously cyclic* if for all (\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}) in S , its simultaneous shift $(N\mathbf{a}, N\mathbf{b})$ is also in S .

A quantum stabilizer code is *cyclic* if the associated isotropic set S is simultaneously cyclic [8, III.2]. It turns out that the centralizer \overline{S} is also simultaneously cyclic. As in the case of classical cyclic codes, the associated code can be seen as an ideal over an appropriate cyclotomic ring. In the more general setting of σ -isotropic sets, for a simultaneously cyclic subspace S , its centralizer \overline{S} need not be simultaneously cyclic and hence the theory of cyclotomic rings will not be applicable any more. Though, if we further restrict to involution σ to be of the form $i \mapsto mi$ modulo n for some m , we get back all the nice properties that we are accustomed to in the classical setting. We will call such an involution σ_m , fix it for the rest of the article. Notice, σ_m being an involution means m is a square root of 1 mod n . It is easy to see that the shift operator N and σ_m satisfy the commutation relation:

$$N\sigma_m = \sigma_m N^m \tag{3}$$

The following theorem follows directly.

► **Theorem 11.** Let S be a σ_m -isotropic, simultaneously cyclic subspace of $\mathbb{F}_p^n \times \mathbb{F}_p^n$. Then its σ_m -centralizer \overline{S} is also simultaneously cyclic.

Consider the cyclotomic ring $\mathcal{R} = \mathbb{F}_p[X]/\langle X^n - 1 \rangle$. As in the classical case, representing a vector \mathbf{a} as the polynomial $\mathbf{a}(X) = a_0 + a_1X + \dots + a_{n-1}X^{n-1} \in \mathcal{R}$ provides an elegant mechanism to work with cyclic codes. For example, the cyclic shift of a vector in \mathbb{F}_p^n is

equivalent to multiplication by X in the ring \mathcal{R} . The following theorem expresses the σ_m -isotropy condition in terms of these polynomial representations.

► **Theorem 12.** *Let S be a simultaneously cyclic subspace of $\mathbb{F}_p^n \times \mathbb{F}_p^n$. S is a σ_m -isotropic subspace if and only if for any two elements $\mathbf{u} = (\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b})$ and $\mathbf{v} = (\mathbf{c}, \mathbf{d})$ in S , the corresponding polynomials satisfy the identity:*

$$\mathbf{a}(X)\mathbf{d}(X^{-m}) - \mathbf{b}(X)\mathbf{c}(X^{-m}) = 0 \pmod{X^n - 1} \quad (4)$$

Proof. The constant coefficient of the polynomial on the left hand side of Equation 4 is equivalent to the σ_m -isotropy condition. So the polynomial condition implies that the subspace S is σ_m -isotropic.

For the converse, notice that $\mathbf{a}(X^m) = (\sigma_m \mathbf{a})(X)$. Hence it is sufficient to prove the identity,

$$\mathbf{a}(X)(\sigma_m \mathbf{d})(X^{-1}) - \mathbf{b}(X)(\sigma_m \mathbf{c})(X^{-1}) = 0 \pmod{X^n - 1},$$

for every $(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}), (\mathbf{c}, \mathbf{d}) \in S$. The coefficient of X^i on the left is,

$$\mathbf{a}^T(N^i \sigma_m) \mathbf{d} - \mathbf{b}^T(N^i \sigma_m) \mathbf{c}.$$

Using the Equation 3 repeatedly, the coefficient simplifies to,

$$\mathbf{a}^T(\sigma_m N^{mi}) \mathbf{d} - \mathbf{b}^T(\sigma_m N^{mi}) \mathbf{c},$$

which is equal to $\langle (\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}), (N^{mi} \mathbf{c}, N^{mi} \mathbf{d}) \rangle_{\sigma_m}$.

Since S is σ_m -isotropic and simultaneously cyclic, this coefficient is 0. ◀

3.2 Linear codes

Let p be a prime. It is well known that the finite field \mathbb{F}_p has a *unique* quadratic extension \mathbb{F}_{p^2} . Such an extension is essentially the field $\mathbb{F}_p(\eta)$ consisting of all elements of the form $a + \eta b$, where η is the root of some irreducible quadratic polynomial $\mu(Y) = Y^2 - c_1 Y - c_0$. The encoding $(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}) \mapsto \mathbf{a} + \eta \mathbf{b}$ gives an encoding of $\mathbb{F}_p^n \times \mathbb{F}_p^n$ to $\mathbb{F}_{p^2}^n$. We fix such an element for the rest of the section. A \mathbb{F}_{p^2} -linear subspace of $\mathbb{F}_{p^2}^n$ is isotropic iff the corresponding preimage forms an isotropic subspace of $\mathbb{F}_p^n \times \mathbb{F}_p^n$. Stabilizer codes associated to isotropic \mathbb{F}_{p^2} -vector spaces are called *linear stabilizer codes*. As isotropic subspace is an \mathbb{F}_{p^2} -linear subspace, it is closed under the multiplication by η .

For an \mathbb{F}_p subspace C of $\mathbb{F}_p^n \times \mathbb{F}_p^n$, the necessary and sufficient condition for it to be an \mathbb{F}_{p^2} -subspace under the above encoding is that it should be closed under multiplication by η . Since $\eta^2 = c_0 + c_1 \eta$, C is \mathbb{F}_{p^2} -linear iff for all pair (\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}) in C , the pair $(c_0 \mathbf{b}, \mathbf{a} + c_1 \mathbf{b})$ also belongs to C . We have the following theorem on σ -centralizers.

► **Theorem 13.** *Let σ be an involution in S_n and S be a σ -isotropic subspace. Let \bar{S} be the corresponding σ -centralizer subspace. Then S is \mathbb{F}_{p^2} -linear implies \bar{S} is \mathbb{F}_{p^2} -linear.*

Proof. Consider any arbitrary element $\mathbf{v} = (\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$ in \bar{S} . By the definition of σ -centralizer, for any $\mathbf{u} = (\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b})$ in S , we have $\langle \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v} \rangle_\sigma = 0$. In addition, we also have

$$\langle \eta \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v} \rangle_\sigma = c_0 \mathbf{b}^T \sigma \mathbf{y} - \mathbf{a}^T \sigma \mathbf{x} - c_1 \mathbf{b}^T \sigma \mathbf{x} = 0. \quad (5)$$

XX:8 Stabilizer codes from modified symplectic form

due to the linearity of S . Now consider $\langle \mathbf{u}, \eta \mathbf{v} \rangle_\sigma$. We have:

$$\begin{aligned}
 \langle \mathbf{u}, \eta \mathbf{v} \rangle_\sigma &= \mathbf{a}^T \sigma(\mathbf{x} + c_1 \mathbf{y}) - \mathbf{b}^T \sigma(c_0 \mathbf{y}) \\
 &= \mathbf{a}^T \sigma \mathbf{x} + c_1 \mathbf{a}^T \sigma \mathbf{y} - c_0 \mathbf{b}^T \sigma \mathbf{y} \\
 &= -c_1 \mathbf{b}^T \sigma \mathbf{x} + c_1 \mathbf{a}^T \sigma \mathbf{y} && \text{from (5)} \\
 &= c_1 \langle \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v} \rangle_\sigma \\
 &= 0
 \end{aligned}$$

This proves that $\eta \mathbf{v}$ is in \overline{S} and hence \overline{S} is a \mathbb{F}_{p^2} -subspace. \blacktriangleleft

The above theorem is true for any involution σ . In addition, if the involution is σ_m , using Theorem 11 we have

► **Theorem 14.** *Let S be a simultaneously cyclic, σ_m -isotropic and \mathbb{F}_{p^2} -linear subspace. Then its σ_m -centralizer \overline{S} is simultaneously cyclic and \mathbb{F}_{p^2} -linear subspace.*

We now look at \mathbb{F}_{p^2} -linear, σ_m -isotropic, and simultaneously cyclic subspaces. Recall that we encoded a vector \mathbf{a} as the polynomial $\sum a_i X^i$ in the ring \mathcal{R} . In this case, we encode pairs of polynomials in $\mathcal{R} \times \mathcal{R}$ as elements of $\mathcal{R}(\eta) = \mathbb{F}_{p^2}[X]/\langle X^n - 1 \rangle$. A \mathbb{F}_{p^2} -linear simultaneously cyclic subspace has to be an ideal of $\mathcal{R}(\eta)$ and hence should have a generating polynomial. A consequence of previous theorem is that its centralizer would also be an ideal and have a generating polynomial.

3.3 Linear stabilizer codes from σ_m -isotropic sets

An \mathbb{F}_{p^2} -linear simultaneously cyclic subspace is equivalent to an ideal of $\mathcal{R}(\eta)$. Define a triplet (n, p, m) to be *good* if $n \mid p^t + m$ for some t and $m^2 = 1 \pmod n$. The following theorem characterizes σ_m -isotropic ideals of $\mathcal{R}(\eta)$ for good triplets.

► **Theorem 15.** *Let $n \mid p^t + m$, where m is a square root of $1 \pmod n$. An ideal S of $\mathcal{R}(\eta)$ is σ_m -isotropic if and only if S is generated by the product of two polynomials $g(X)h(X, \eta)$ which satisfy the following conditions.*

1. $g(X)$ is a factor of $X^n - 1$ in \mathbb{F}_p which includes all the odd irreducible factors.
2. $h(X, \eta)$ is such that for any $r(X, \eta)$ which is a factor of $(X^n - 1)/g(X)$ over $\mathbb{F}_p(\eta)$ exactly one of $r(X, \eta)$ or its conjugate $r(X, \eta)^p$ divides $h(X, \eta)$.

Hence the ideal will be non-trivial only if t is even.

Proof. Refer to the section A.1 of the appendix. \blacktriangleleft

Dutta et. al. [8, 7] gave a characterization of the σ_m -isotropic ideals of $\mathcal{R}(\eta)$ for good triplets where $m = 1$. Theorem 15 generalizes there construction for other square roots of $1 \pmod n$.

Dutta et. al. [8] also proved that if $n \mid p^t + 1$ for some odd t then there are no linear cyclic stabilizer codes. This will be the case when the order of p in \mathbb{Z}_n is $2t$ (for some odd t) and $p^t = -1 \pmod n$. However, Theorem. 15 allows us to construct σ_{-1} -isotropic ideals for such (n, p) pairs.

For $m \neq -1$, the σ_m -isotropy condition as polynomials is given by

$$\mathbf{a}(X)\mathbf{d}(X)^{p^t} - \mathbf{b}(X)\mathbf{c}(X)^{p^t} \pmod{X^n - 1} \tag{6}$$

The p^t powers that occur in the above condition leads to certain Galois theoretic situations that makes such ideals trivial when t is odd. The σ_{-1} -isotropy condition on the other hand is much simpler

$$\mathbf{a}(X)\mathbf{d}(X) - \mathbf{b}(X)\mathbf{c}(X) \pmod{X^n - 1}.$$

This is the reason why we are able to construct linear cyclic stabilizer codes when we modify the symplectic condition to the bilinear form $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{\sigma_{-1}}$.

Our results also gives other variants: If p has order $4t$ and the quantity $-m = p^{2t}$ is a square root different from ± 1 , by considering σ_m -isotropic sets we get examples of codes that were not considered above. Such non-trivial square roots exists when the block length n is composite. With such variants, we may be able to prove better lower bounds than the one mentioned here (Theorem 9).

When the order of p in \mathbb{Z}_n is odd, all the factors of $X^n - 1$ have odd degree. Therefore, we do not have any non-trivial σ_m -isotropic ideals.

To summarize:

- Prime p has order $4t$ and $p^{2t} = -1$ then construct codes based on the work of Dutta et. al. [8, 7].
- Prime p has even order, construct codes based on any one of the non-trivial σ_{-1} -isotropic ideals using Theorem 15.
- Prime p has odd order in \mathbb{Z}_n , our strategy fails.

In the constructions that we have sketched above, we need a characterization of the σ -centralizer \overline{S} if we need some handle on the error correction properties. We have the following proposition (proof in section A.2 of the appendix).

► **Proposition 16.** *Consider a σ -isotropic ideal S whose generating polynomial is $g(X)h(X, \eta)$ as in Theorem 15. The σ -centralizer \overline{S} of S is given by the ideal generated by $h(X, \eta)$.*

4 BCH distance and decoding

For the generators of cyclic codes, we now define the BCH-distance.

► **Definition 17.** Let $f(X)$ be any factor of $X^n - 1$ over a field \mathbb{F}_q . The BCH distance of $f(X)$ is the maximum l such that there exists a sequence of $l - 1$ consecutive powers $\beta, \beta^2, \dots, \beta^{l-1}$, all of which are roots of $f(X)$ for some primitive n -th root of unity β .

The BCH distance of $f(X)$ gives a lower bound on the distance of the associated ideal as a code. Notice that for the codes constructed in the previous section, the centralizer as an ideal over $\mathcal{R}[\eta]$ has generator $h(X, \eta)$ and the Hamming distance of this code is its joint weight in the quantum setting. Using Theorem 9, we have the following proposition.

► **Proposition 18.** *Let S be a linear cyclic stabilizer code generated using one of Theorems 15 and let $g(X)h(X, \eta)$ be its generator polynomial. If the polynomial $h(X, \eta)$ has BCH distance d , then the associated stabilizer code has distance at-least $\lfloor \frac{d+1}{2} \rfloor$.*

For a classical cyclic code, the celebrated Berlekamp-Massey-Welch [3, 13, 17] algorithm gives an efficient error correction procedure. We reformulate this result for our use in the decoding of quantum cyclic codes.

► **Theorem 19** (Berlekamp-Massey-Welch [3, 13, 17]). *Let $f(X)$ be any factor of $X^n - 1$ over a finite field \mathbb{F}_q with BCH distance at least $2t + 1$. Let $e(X)$ be any unknown polynomial with Hamming weight at most t . There exists an efficient algorithm, that takes as input any $r(X) = e(X) \pmod{f(X)}$ and outputs $e(X)$.*

XX:10 Stabilizer codes from modified symplectic form

Let S be any σ_m -isotropic cyclic code that we constructed in the previous section. We fix some notation for this section. Recall, S^{σ_m} is the space of all elements $(\mathbf{a}, \sigma_m \mathbf{b})$, where (\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}) is in S . This set forms an isotropic subset under the standard symplectic form (Lemma 8). The corresponding stabilizer group \mathcal{S}' consists of Weyl operators $W'_{\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}} = \rho(\mathbf{a}, \sigma_m \mathbf{b}) U_{\mathbf{a}} V_{\sigma_m \mathbf{b}}$, (\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}) is in S , and the quantum code \mathcal{C} is the space of vectors stabilized by \mathcal{S}' .

Suppose $|\psi\rangle$ in \mathcal{C} was the message that was transmitted and the received message was $|\phi\rangle = U_{\mathbf{e}_1} V_{\sigma_m \mathbf{e}_2} |\psi\rangle$ for some unknown \mathbf{e}_1 and \mathbf{e}_2 in \mathbb{F}_p^n . It is sufficient to find \mathbf{e}_1 and \mathbf{e}_2 to recover the actual message: given \mathbf{e}_1 and \mathbf{e}_2 we apply the operator $V_{\sigma_m \mathbf{e}_2}^\dagger U_{\mathbf{e}_1}^\dagger$ to $|\phi\rangle$. The following proposition plays an important role in finding \mathbf{e}_1 and \mathbf{e}_2 efficiently.

► **Proposition 20.** *For any $(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}) \in S$, we can efficiently compute the polynomial $\mathbf{a}(X)\mathbf{e}_2(X^{-m}) - \mathbf{b}(X)\mathbf{e}_1(X^{-m}) \pmod{X^n - 1}$*

Proof. We need to compute the following polynomial.

$$\mathbf{a}(x)\mathbf{e}_2(X^{-m}) - \mathbf{b}(X)\mathbf{e}_1(X^{-m}) = \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \langle (N^i \mathbf{a}, N^i \mathbf{b}), (\mathbf{e}_1, \mathbf{e}_2) \rangle_{\sigma_m} X^{mi} \pmod{X^n - 1} \quad (7)$$

We would recover one coefficient at a time. Recall that the sent message $|\psi\rangle$ is stabilized by $W'_{\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}}$ and it is easy to verify the commutation relation

$$W'_{\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}} U_{\mathbf{e}_1} V_{\sigma_m \mathbf{e}_2} = \omega^{((\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}), (\mathbf{e}_1, \mathbf{e}_2))_{\sigma_m}} U_{\mathbf{e}_1} V_{\sigma_m \mathbf{e}_2} W'_{\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}}.$$

Hence the received vector $|\phi\rangle = U_{\mathbf{e}_1} V_{\sigma_m \mathbf{e}_2} |\psi\rangle$ is an eigen vector of $W'_{\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}}$ with eigen value $\omega^{((\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}), (\mathbf{e}_1, \mathbf{e}_2))_{\sigma_m}}$. Using the phase estimation algorithm [14, 5.2], we extract the inner product $\langle (\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}), (\mathbf{e}_1, \mathbf{e}_2) \rangle_{\sigma_m}$ without modifying the received state $|\phi\rangle$. This recovers the constant term of the polynomial

We repeat the above procedure with the Weyl Operator $W'_{N^i \mathbf{a}, N^i \mathbf{b}}$ to compute the coefficient $\langle (N^i \mathbf{a}, N^i \mathbf{b}), (\mathbf{e}_1, \mathbf{e}_2) \rangle_{\sigma_m}$. Each of these phase estimations gives us an additional coefficient of the polynomial. This allows us to recover the polynomial in Equation 7 after n phase estimations. ◀

Notice that if the pair $(\mathbf{e}_1, \sigma_m \mathbf{e}_2)$ is of joint weight less than τ , the polynomial $\mathbf{e}_1 + \eta \mathbf{e}_2$ as a polynomial in $\mathcal{R}[\eta]$ will have at most 2τ non-zero coefficients. The main idea is to use Proposition 20 to recover the polynomial $\mathbf{e}_1 + \eta \mathbf{e}_2$ modulo the generator polynomial $h(X, \eta)$. Then using the classical Berlekamp-Massey-Welch algorithm we recover $\mathbf{e}_1 + \eta \mathbf{e}_2$. This is formalized in the following proposition.

► **Theorem 21.** *Let S be σ_m -isotropic ideal of $\mathcal{R}(\eta)$. Let $g(X)$, $h(X, \eta)$ be the polynomial satisfying the properties in Theorem 15. Let $h(X, \eta)$ be of BCH distance $4\tau + 1$. There exists an efficient quantum algorithm that corrects errors of joint weight τ*

Proof. From the proof of Theorem 15 (Section A.1), we know that there exists a polynomial $\mathbf{a}(X) \in \mathcal{R}$ such that $\mathbf{g}(X) + \eta \mathbf{a}(X)\mathbf{g}(X)$ belongs to the ideal S . By abusing the notation, let $(\mathbf{g}, \mathbf{a}\mathbf{g}) \in S$. For $(\mathbf{e}_1, \mathbf{e}_2) \in \mathbb{F}_p^n \times \mathbb{F}_p^n$,

$$r'(X) = \mathbf{g}(X)\mathbf{e}_2(X^{-m}) - \mathbf{a}(X)\mathbf{g}(X)\mathbf{e}_1(X^{-m})$$

By Proposition 20, we can compute $r'(X)$ efficiently.

Divide both side by $g(X)$ and then take modulo $h(X, \eta)$. From the proof of Theorem 15 (Section A.1, Proposition 25) we know that $\mathbf{a}(X) = \eta^p \pmod{h(X, \eta)}$. Thus,

$$r(X) = \mathbf{e}_2(X^{-m}) - \eta^p \mathbf{e}_1(X^{-m}) \pmod{h(X, \eta)}$$

If joint weight $wt(\mathbf{e}_1, \sigma_m \mathbf{e}_2)$ is at most τ then the joint weight of $wt(\mathbf{e}_1, \mathbf{e}_2)$ is at most 2τ . Notice that the joint weight $wt(\sigma_m \mathbf{e}_1, \sigma_m \mathbf{e}_2)$ is equal to the joint weight $wt(\mathbf{e}_1, \mathbf{e}_2)$. Thus, we could use Berlekamp-Massey-Welch algorithm (Theorem 19) to compute $\mathbf{e}_1, \mathbf{e}_2$. \blacktriangleleft

5 Explicit examples

The Table 1 shows the codes constructed over \mathbb{F}_2 based on Theorem 15. Fix a primitive n -th root of unity β . The table uses the following notation: g_i (respectively h_i) is the irreducible factor of $X^n - 1$ over the field \mathbb{F}_2 (respectively \mathbb{F}_{2^2}) with β^i as one of its roots.

■ **Table 1** Explicit examples of codes over \mathbb{F}_2

n	k	Factors		Consecutive Root of $h(X, \eta)$	Theorem 9		Brute Force	
		$g(X)$	$h(X, \eta)$		Detect	Correct	Detect	Correct
5	1	g_0	h_2	β^2, β^3	1	0	1	0
9	1	g_0	$h_2 h_6$	β^5, β^6	1	0	1	0
11	1	g_0	h_1	$\beta^3, \beta^4, \beta^5$	1	0	2	1
13	1	g_0	h_2	β^5, \dots, β^8	2	1	4	2
15	1	g_0	$h_1 h_5 h_6 h_7$	β^4, \dots, β^7	2	1	3	1
15	5	$g_0 g_7$	$h_1 h_5 h_6$	$\beta^4, \beta^5, \beta^6$	1	0	2	1
15	9	$g_0 g_3 g_7$	$h_1 h_5$	β^4, β^5	1	0	1	0
17	1	g_0	$h_2 h_6$	$\beta^6, \dots, \beta^{11}$	3	1	5	2
19	1	g_0	h_1	β^4, \dots, β^7	2	1	3	1
21	13	$g_0 g_3 g_5 g_9$	h_1	β^7, β^8	1	0	1	0
25	1	g_0	$h_1 h_5$	$\beta^4, \beta^5, \beta^6$	1	0	2	1
27	7	$g_0 g_3$	$h_1 h_9$	β^9, β^{10}	1	0	1	0
29	1	g_0	h_1	β^4, \dots, β^7	2	1	3	1

The Table 1 shows distance based on Theorem 9 as well as by brute force computation. In our experiments we found the minimum distance of \overline{S}^σ to be almost equal to the minimum distance of \overline{S} (which could be seen in the table). This corroborates our claim that the distance bound of Theorem 9 is a bit conservative.

In order to better analyze the performance of our codes we have performed simulation of the effect of depolarizing channel on some of the codes presented in Table 1. These simulations show that there exists a threshold probability below which increasing the dimension improves the performance of our codes. More details are given in the appendix B.

6 Conclusion

The main theme of this article is to construct stabilizer codes based on alternate symplectic forms. Any two (full rank) symplectic forms are equivalent in the sense that the associated Weyl operators form a basis set for the error space and hence can mathematically model all quantum operations on the relevant Hilbert space. Modifying the symplectic form therefore is clearly *not just restricted* to cyclic codes. However, if we need to get meaningful bounds on the distance, these changes need to be balanced carefully. In the context of cyclic linear stabilizer code, symplectic forms of the kind $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{\sigma_m}$ were the only ones that gave us enough control to carry out our constructions and get nontrivial distance bounds at the same time.

A future line of work would be to extend some of the ideas here to general stabilizer codes. We believe would lead to some interesting examples of quantum codes.

The equivalence of symplectic forms means that our construction could as well be carried out by considering the set S^{σ_m} under the standard isotropy condition. However, notice that the set S^{σ_m} as opposed to S is *not cyclic* and hence the efficient decoding algorithms that we have will not be apparent in the setting of the standard symplectic forms. The reason for this anomaly is that properties like distance and cyclicity are *not preserved* under a basis change. Therefore, visualizing this code as the subspace S as opposed to S^{σ_m} is crucial. This is what sets the codes apart from other constructions of codes for similar lengths. In general, decoding is an intractable problem even for classical codes.

References

- 1 V. Arvind and K. R. Parthasarathy. A family of quantum stabilizer codes based on the Weyl commutation relations over a finite field. *preprint available at url: xxx.arxiv.org/quant-ph/0206174*, 2002.
- 2 Alexei Ashikhmin and Emanuel Knill. Nonbinary quantum stabilizer codes. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 47(7):3065–3072, 2001.
- 3 E. R. Berlekamp. *Algebraic coding theory*. McGraw-Hill, New-York, 1968.
- 4 A Robert Calderbank, Eric M Rains, Peter W Shor, and Neil JA Sloane. Quantum error correction and orthogonal geometry. *Physical Review Letters*, 78(3):405, 1997.
- 5 A Robert Calderbank, Eric M Rains, PM Shor, and Neil JA Sloane. Quantum error correction via codes over GF(4). *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 44(4):1369–1387, 1998.
- 6 A Robert Calderbank and Peter W Shor. Good quantum error-correcting codes exist. *Physical Review A*, 54(2):1098, 1996.
- 7 Sagarmoy Dutta. *Exploiting Symmetry to solve Certain Computational Problems*. PhD thesis, Indian Institute of Technology Kanpur, 2012.
- 8 Sagarmoy Dutta and Piyush Kurur. Quantum cyclic code of length dividing $p^t + 1$. In *2011 IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory Proceedings, ISIT 2011, St. Petersburg, Russia, July 31 - August 5, 2011*, pages 648–652, 2011.
- 9 Daniel Gottesman. Stabilizer codes and quantum error correction. *arXiv preprint quant-ph/9705052*, 1997.
- 10 Pavithran Iyer and David Poulin. Hardness of decoding quantum stabilizer codes. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 61(9):5209–5223, 2015.
- 11 Avanti Ketkar, Andreas Klappenecker, Santosh Kumar, and Pradeep Kiran Sarvepalli. Nonbinary stabilizer codes over finite fields. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 52(11):4892–4914, 2006.
- 12 Serge Lang. *Algebra*. Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, Inc, third edition, 1999.
- 13 J. L. Massey. Shift-register synthesis and BCH decoding. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, it-15:122–127, 1969.
- 14 Michael A Nielsen and Isaac Chuang. *Quantum computation and quantum information*, 2002.
- 15 Eric M Rains. Nonbinary quantum codes. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 45(6):1827–1832, 1999.
- 16 Andrew M Steane. Error correcting codes in quantum theory. *Physical Review Letters*, 77(5):793, 1996.
- 17 Lloyd R Welch and Elwyn R Berlekamp. Error correction for algebraic block codes, December 30 1986. US Patent 4,633,470.

A

 Appendix

We will setup some preliminaries before proceeding with the proofs.

For a given polynomial $\mathbf{g}(X)$ in \mathcal{R} , the polynomial $\mathbf{g}(X^{-m})$ plays an important role in the σ_m -isotropy condition. If there exists t such that $n \mid p^t + m$, then $X^{-m} = X^{p^t}$ (If $m = -1$, then we will choose $t = 0$). Therefore, for any polynomial $\mathbf{a} \in \mathcal{R}$,

$$\mathbf{a}(X^{-m}) = \mathbf{a}(X)^{p^t} \pmod{X^n - 1}. \quad (8)$$

The σ_m -isotropy (Equation 4) becomes

$$\mathbf{a}(X)\mathbf{d}(X)^{p^t} - \mathbf{b}(X)\mathbf{c}(X)^{p^t}$$

For a given simultaneously cyclic subspace S of $\mathbb{F}_p^n \times \mathbb{F}_p^n$, let's define the following two set.

$$G = \{\mathbf{a} \mid \text{exists } \mathbf{b} \text{ such that } (\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}) \in S\} \quad (9)$$

$$H = \{\mathbf{b} \mid (\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{b}) \in S\} \quad (10)$$

As S is simultaneously cyclic, both G, H are cyclic code in \mathbb{F}_p^n . As seen earlier, they could be thought of as an ideal in \mathcal{R} . Thus they are generated by a factor of $X^n - 1$. Let $\mathbf{g}(X)$ and $\mathbf{h}(X)$ be the factors of $X^n - 1$ that generates G and H as the ideals of \mathcal{R} respectively.

It is easy to see that any simultaneously cyclic subspace of $\mathbb{F}_p^n \times \mathbb{F}_p^n$ could be described by three polynomials over \mathcal{R} .

► **Lemma 22.** *Every simultaneously cyclic subspace S of $\mathbb{F}_p^n \times \mathbb{F}_p^n$ can be described by three polynomials $\mathbf{g}(X), \mathbf{h}(X)$ which are factor of $X^n - 1$ over \mathbb{F}_p and $\mathbf{f}(X) \in \mathcal{R}$ such that $(\mathbf{g}, \mathbf{f}) \in S$ and $(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{h}) \in S$.*

In Lemma 22 if $\mathbf{h}(X) = 0 \pmod{X^n - 1}$ then such a subspace is known as *uniquely cyclic*.

► **Lemma 23.** *Let $m = -1$ or n divides $p^t + m$. Let S be a simultaneously cyclic, σ_m -isotropic and \mathbb{F}_{p^2} linear subspace then S is uniquely cyclic.*

Proof. The proof of this lemma is similar to the proof of Lemma IV.2 in [8]. For completeness we state it here.

The Lemma 22 states that S could be expressed by three polynomials $\mathbf{g}(X), \mathbf{f}(X)$, and $\mathbf{h}(X)$. The polynomials $\mathbf{g}(X), \mathbf{h}(X)$ are factors of $X^n - 1$ and $\mathbf{f}(X)$ is a polynomial in \mathcal{R} such that the elements $(\mathbf{g}, \mathbf{f}), (\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{h})$ are in S .

To show that S is an uniquely cyclic subspace we need to show that $\mathbf{h}(X)$ is a multiple of $X^n - 1$. We would show this in two steps. First, we would show $\mathbf{g}(X) \mid \mathbf{h}(X)$. This proof is similar as in Lemma IV.2[8]([7, 5.11]). Now we would show $\frac{X^n - 1}{\mathbf{g}(X)} \mid \mathbf{h}(X)$.

The elements $(\mathbf{g}, \mathbf{h}), (\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{h})$ belongs to S and it is σ_m -isotropic. Thus, from the σ_m -isotropy condition (4) between (\mathbf{g}, \mathbf{f}) and $(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{h})$, we have the following.

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{g}(X^{-m})\mathbf{h}(X) &= 0 \pmod{X^n - 1} \\ \mathbf{g}(X)^{p^t}\mathbf{h}(X) &= 0 \pmod{X^n - 1} && \text{(From Equation 8)} \\ \mathbf{h}(X) &= 0 \pmod{\frac{X^n - 1}{\mathbf{g}(X)}} \end{aligned}$$

Thus $\frac{X^n - 1}{\mathbf{g}(X)} \mid \mathbf{h}(X)$.

◀

A.1 Proof of Theorem 15

We would characterize the σ_m -isotropic ideal S of $\mathcal{R}(\eta)$. From Lemma 22 and Lemma 23, we know that such an ideal S could be expressed by two polynomials $\mathbf{g}(X)$ and $\mathbf{f}(X)$. The polynomials $\mathbf{g}(X)$ is a factor of $X^n - 1$ and $\mathbf{f}(X)$ is a polynomial in \mathcal{R} such that $(\mathbf{g}, \mathbf{f}) \in S$.

Any element of S can be expressed as $\mathbf{b}(X)\mathbf{g}(X) + \eta\mathbf{b}(X)\mathbf{f}(X)$, for some $\mathbf{b}(X)$ in \mathcal{R} . Since, we have $\mathbf{g}(X) + \eta\mathbf{f}(X)$ in S , by $\mathbb{F}_p(\eta)$ linearity, we have $\eta(\mathbf{g}(X) + \eta\mathbf{f}(X))$ in S . There exists a polynomial $\mathbf{a}(X) \in \mathcal{R}$ such that we get the following.

$$\eta(\mathbf{g}(X) + \eta\mathbf{f}(X)) = \mathbf{a}(X)(\mathbf{g}(X) + \eta\mathbf{f}(X)) \pmod{X^n - 1} \quad (11)$$

Compare the coefficient of η in Equation 11, we have the following.

$$\mathbf{f}(X) = c_0^{-1}\mathbf{a}(X)\mathbf{g}(X) \pmod{X^n - 1} \quad (12)$$

$$\mu(\mathbf{a}(X)) = 0 \pmod{\frac{X^n - 1}{\mathbf{g}(X)}} \quad (13)$$

Recall that η is a root of an irreducible quadratic polynomial $\mu(Y) = Y^2 - c_1Y - c_0$. Let $r(X)$ be any irreducible factor $r(X)$ of $\frac{X^n - 1}{\mathbf{g}(X)}$. Then Equation 13 implies that the $\mathbf{a}(X) \pmod{r(X)}$ is a root of $\mu(X)$. An immediate consequence of this is the following proposition.

► **Proposition 24.** $\mathbf{g}(X)$ contains all the odd degree factors.

Proof. The field extension $\mathbb{F}_p[X]/r(X)$ contains the root of the polynomial $\mu(X)$. Thus it contains \mathbb{F}_{p^2} as a subfield. This implies $r(X)$ has to be of even degree. ◀

By Proposition 24, we know that $r(X)$ is of even degree. Thus each $r(X)$ factorizes as $r'(X, \eta)r'(X, \eta)^p$ over \mathbb{F}_{p^2} .

► **Proposition 25.** $r'(X, \eta) \mid h(X, \eta)$ if and only if $r'(X, \eta)^p \nmid h(X, \eta)$

Sketch. It could be shown that $\mathbf{h}(X, \eta) = \gcd\left(\frac{x^n - 1}{\mathbf{g}(X)}, 1 + \eta c_0^{-1}\mathbf{a}(X)\right)$. By Equation 13 we know $\mathbf{a}(X) \pmod{r'(X, \eta)}$ is either η or η^p . We could also show that $a(X) = \eta^p \pmod{r'(X, \eta)}$ if and only if $a(X) = \eta \pmod{r'(X, \eta)^p}$. Thus $r'(X, \eta) \mid h(X, \eta)$ if and only if $\mathbf{a}(X, \eta) = \eta^p \pmod{r'(X, \eta)}$. The details of the proof could be derived from Theorem 5.15 [7, Chapter 5]. ◀

When $m = -1$, t is the order of p in \mathbb{Z}_n . However, when the order of p in \mathbb{Z}_n is odd there are no even degree factors of $X^n - 1$ over \mathbb{F}_p . From Proposition 24 we have $\mathbf{g}(X)$ is a multiple of $X^n - 1$. Thus for ideal to be non-trivial t has to be even. This completes the proof for the case when $m = -1$. However, for $m \neq -1$ a little more is required.

As the S is σ_m -isotropic subspace, the σ_m -isotropy condition of Equation 4 for (\mathbf{g}, \mathbf{f}) with itself yields the following.

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{g}(X)\mathbf{f}(X^{-m}) &= \mathbf{f}(X)\mathbf{g}(X^{-m}) && \pmod{X^n - 1} \\ \mathbf{g}(X)\mathbf{a}(X^{-m})\mathbf{g}(X^{-m}) &= \mathbf{a}(X)\mathbf{g}(X)\mathbf{g}(X^{-m}) && \pmod{X^n - 1} \end{aligned}$$

From Equation 8, we have,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{a}(X)^{p^t}\mathbf{g}(X)^{p^t+1} &= \mathbf{a}(X)\mathbf{g}(X)^{p^t+1} && \pmod{X^n - 1} \\ \mathbf{a}(X)^{p^t} &= \mathbf{a}(X) && \pmod{\frac{X^n - 1}{\mathbf{g}(X)}} \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

Its easy to see when $m = -1$ Equation 14 is trivially satisfied. Hence does not impose any further constraints in such a case. However, for $m \neq -1$ assuming t to be odd, the Equation 13 and Equation 14 leads to contradiction. Details could be derived from Theorem 5.15 [7, Chapter 5]. Thus t has to be even.

This completes the proof of Theorem 15.

A.2 Proof of Proposition 16

Let S be a σ_m -isotropic ideal of $\mathcal{R}(\eta)$ as in Theorem 15. We need to show that $h(X, \eta)$ maps to the σ_m -centralizer of S . At first, we compute the size of S . This would determine the size of σ_m -centralizer \bar{S} .

By Lemma 23 we know that S is expressed by two polynomials $g(X)$ and $h(X, \eta)$. From Section A.1 we know that there exists a polynomial $\mathbf{a}(X) \in \mathcal{R}$ and $\mathbf{g}(X)$ is a factor of $X^n - 1$ over \mathbb{F}_p such that $\mathbf{g}(X) + \eta \mathbf{a}(X) \mathbf{g}(X)$ generates S . The following proposition formalizes the dimension of the S in terms of the polynomial $g(X)$.

► **Proposition 26.** [7, Theorem 5.24][8, Theoverm V.7] *The dimension of the S as a subspace is $n - \deg \mathbf{g}(X)$.*

Let $\mathbf{a}(X) \in \mathcal{R}$ be the polynomial as in the proof of Theorem 15 (Section A.1, Equation 11). For such a fixed polynomial $\mathbf{a}(X)$, let Z be the set defined as follows.

$$Z = \left\{ (\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{u}\mathbf{a} + \mathbf{v}') \left| \begin{array}{l} \forall \mathbf{u}(X) \in \mathcal{R}, \\ \forall \mathbf{v}(X) \in \mathbb{F}_p[X] / \left(\frac{X^n - 1}{\mathbf{g}(X)} \right), \mathbf{v}'(X) = \mathbf{v}(X) \left(\frac{X^n - 1}{\mathbf{g}(X)} \right) \end{array} \right. \right\} \quad (15)$$

► **Proposition 27.** *The set Z is the σ_m -centralizer of S .*

Proof. First, we need to show that any element $(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}) \in Z$ satisfies the σ_m -isotropy condition with every element of S . It is enough to show that the element (\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}) is σ_m -isotropic with $(\mathbf{g}, \mathbf{a}\mathbf{g})$. From the polynomial form of the σ_m -isotropy condition (4), we have

$$\mathbf{u}(X)\mathbf{a}(X^{-m})\mathbf{g}(X^{-m}) = \left(\mathbf{u}(X)\mathbf{a}(X) + t(X) \frac{X^n - 1}{\mathbf{g}(X)} \right) \mathbf{g}(X^{-m}) \quad \text{mod } X^n - 1$$

From Equation 8

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{u}(X)\mathbf{a}(X)^{p^t} \mathbf{g}(X)^{p^t} &= \left(\mathbf{u}(X)\mathbf{a}(X) + t(X) \frac{X^n - 1}{\mathbf{g}(X)} \right) \mathbf{g}(X)^{p^t} && \text{mod } X^n - 1 \\ \mathbf{u}(X)\mathbf{a}(X)^{p^t} \mathbf{g}(X)^{p^t} &= \mathbf{u}(X)\mathbf{a}(X)\mathbf{g}(X)^{p^t} && \text{mod } X^n - 1 \\ \mathbf{u}(X)\mathbf{a}(X)^{p^t} &= \mathbf{u}(X)\mathbf{a}(X) && \text{mod } \frac{X^n - 1}{\mathbf{g}(X)} \end{aligned}$$

Since $\mathbf{a}(X)^{p^t} = \mathbf{a}(X) \text{ mod } (X^n - 1)/\mathbf{g}(X)$ (from Section A.1), the above equation is satisfied. The cardinality of the set Z is $p^{n + \deg g}$ which is same as the cardinality of σ_m -centralizer \bar{S} . Hence, we have shown that Z is the centralizer of S .

Now we need to show σ_m -centralizer \bar{S} maps to $h(X, \eta)$. Let $(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}) \in \mathbb{F}_p^n \times \mathbb{F}_p^n$ maps to an element $\mathbf{u}(X) + c_0^{-1} \eta \mathbf{v}(X) \in \mathcal{R}(\eta)$. It is easy to see that the joint weight of an element remains

XX:16 Stabilizer codes from modified symplectic form

unchanged under this mapping. Any element of $(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}) \in Z$ maps to $\mathbf{u}(X)(1 + c_0^{-1}\eta\mathbf{a}(X)) + c_0^{-1}\eta\left(t(X)\left(\frac{X^n-1}{\mathbf{g}(X)}\right)\right)$. As $\mathbf{h}(X, \eta) = \text{gcd}\left(\frac{x^n-1}{\mathbf{g}(X)}, 1 + \eta c_0^{-1}\mathbf{a}(X)\right)$ (from Section A.1), $\mathbf{h}(X, \eta)$ divides it. This completes the proof. \blacktriangleleft

B Simulations

Consider a depolarizing channel in which errors X, Y, Z occur independently with probability p and I with probability $1-p$, for various values of p . We simulated the performance of the maximum likelihood decoding algorithm for the codes $[[11, 1, 3]]$, $[[13, 1, 5]]$, and $[[17, 1, 6]]$ over this channel.

For the simulation, we send an all zero codeword through the depolarizing channel and compute the syndrome for the received word. We employ the hard decision maximum likelihood decoder based on a look up table. The table stores the minimum symplectic weight vector for all syndromes. Based on this vector, a recovery operator is applied to complete the decoding.


After decoding, if the resultant is a non zero codeword then we consider it as an error. We repeat this process multiple times to compute the Quantum Block Error Rate(QBER). The QBER is defined as,

$$QBER := \frac{\text{Total number of bits with error after decoding}}{\text{Total number of bits received}}.$$


In this simulation we do not take degeneracy into account.

For a general code, there is a trade-off between minimum distance and coding rate. We consider similar trade-off between QBER and the coding rate. Our simulations show that below a certain probability (threshold probability), decreasing the coding rate results in a better QBER.

We plot the QBER versus the depolarizing probability of $[[11, 1, 3]]$, $[[13, 1, 5]]$, and $[[17, 1, 6]]$ in Figure 1a, Figure 1b, and Figure 1c respectively. Figure 2 shows the threshold probability which is indicated by the dashed line. It is the point where the QBER curves of $[[11, 1, 3]]$, $[[13, 1, 5]]$, and $[[17, 1, 6]]$ crosses over each other.



■ **Figure 1** Crossover probability vs QBER for different codes



■ **Figure 2** QBER performance as the coding rate decreases