

Symmetric Finite-Time Preparation of Cluster States via Quantum Pumps

Nathanan Tantivasadakarn and Ashvin Vishwanath

Department of Physics, Harvard University, Cambridge, MA 02138, USA

(Dated: January 9, 2022)

It has recently been established that cluster-like states – states that are in the same symmetry-protected topological phase as the cluster state – provide a family of resource states that can be utilized for Measurement-Based Quantum Computation. In this work, we ask whether it is possible to prepare cluster-like states in finite time without breaking the symmetry protecting the resource state. Such a symmetry-preserving protocol would benefit from topological protection to errors in the preparation. We answer this question in the positive by providing a Hamiltonian in one higher dimension whose finite-time evolution is a unitary that acts trivially in the bulk, but pumps the desired cluster state to the boundary. Examples are given for both the 1D cluster state protected by a global symmetry, and various 2D cluster states protected by subsystem symmetries. We show that even if unwanted symmetric perturbations are present in the driving Hamiltonian, projective measurements in the bulk along with post-selection is sufficient to recover a cluster-like state. For a resource state of size N , failure to prepare the state is negligible if the size of the perturbations are much smaller than $N^{-1/2}$.

Introduction. Symmetry-Protected Topological (SPT) states[1–5] are gapped states of matter that cannot be adiabatically connected to an unentangled product state without breaking the protecting symmetry. It has been recently realized that certain SPT states, and in some cases, entire SPT phases, can be leveraged to perform Measurement-Based Quantum Computation (MBQC)[6–9]. The fact that these states cannot be smoothly connected to an unentangled product state without breaking a global symmetry in many cases implies an adequate entanglement structure of the state which is sufficient to perform MBQC.

So far, it is known that certain fixed point ground states and sometimes small deformations around them can be used as resource states[10–21]. In one dimension, the canonical example is the 1D cluster state, defined as the unique state which satisfies $Z_{i-1}X_iZ_{i+1}|\psi\rangle = +|\psi\rangle$ on a 1D spin chain. The state enjoys a global \mathbb{Z}_2^2 symmetry and for any state within the same SPT phase, arbitrary quantum gates can be performed by choosing appropriate measurements, making the entire SPT phase universal[18, 19]. In higher dimensions, certain fixed points (with possibly finite regions around the fixed points) of SPT phases with global symmetries have been found to be universal [16, 17, 20–22] for MBQC, but an SPT with global symmetry whose entire phase is universal has yet to be found.

On the other hand, subsystem symmetries has become of increased interest due to its connections to fracton topological order in three spatial dimensions[23–30]. Unlike global symmetries, subsystem symmetries only act on a rigid sub-dimensional region, such as lines, planes or even fractals. It was recently realized that if one instead consider states protected by such symmetries, called subsystem SPTs[31–38], then there are indeed examples where the entire phase can be used as a universal resource state[39–42]. Serendipitously, these examples are again cluster states on various 2D lattices.

However, there seems to be a drawback for such a convenient property. Although cluster states is easily created by evolving a product state with, for example, an Ising Hamiltonian for a certain time[7], because the initial and final states belong to different SPT phases, any Hamiltonian that evolves one to the other in finite time necessarily breaks the global(subsystem) symmetry[43, 44]. Therefore, in experi-




FIG. 1. Time evolution by a symmetric 3-body Hamiltonian in the 2D bulk pumps a 1D cluster state to the boundary while leaving the bulk invariant. Similarly, 2D cluster states can be prepared at the boundary of a 3D bulk respecting the corresponding subsystem symmetries. In both cases the preparation only takes a finite time, independent of system size.

mental setups, unless the Hamiltonian is prepared exactly, the resulting entangled state does not need to be an SPT state, and its use as a resource state not guaranteed. We seem to come to the conclusion that in order to exploit the universality of the entire SPT phase, one must instead adiabatically prepare the resource state without breaking the symmetry. Such preparation time scales at least linearly in the system-size.

In this paper, we present a method to get around the above argument. Our motivation can be traced back to the seminal work of Thouless [45], where an evolution of a 1D system under a symmetric Hamiltonian leaves the bulk invariant after a certain period of time, but can “pump” quantized amounts of charge from one boundary to another. More recently, higher dimensional generalizations of such a construction have been realized in the field of Floquet SPTs [46–49], where in fact entire (stationary) phases of matter in one lower dimension can be pumped to the boundary under a finite time evolution while leaving the bulk invariant. Applying this concept, we are able to start with a product state and evolve the system with a Hamiltonian which respects the global(subsystem) symmetry of a 2D(3D) system in such a way that after a fixed finite time –independent of the system size–, a 1D(2D) cluster state is created on the boundary, completely uncoupled from the bulk (Fig. 1). To summarize, the previous no-go argument

only holds when the cluster state is assumed to live strictly in the dimension of the defining lattice. Because of additional ancillas coming from the extra dimension of the bulk, the constraint is lifted, and we are able to prepare cluster states both symmetrically and in finite time.

With this setup, we can now take full advantage of the universality of the entire phase. Conceptually, as long as the driving Hamiltonian is modified by any small perturbation that preserves the symmetry, the entangled state on the boundary would still be symmetric and belongs to the same phase as the cluster state. It is therefore still a universal resource state. More realistically, it is possible that symmetric perturbations to the Hamiltonian leaves the boundary state coupled to the bulk after the evolution, but we further demonstrate that by performing projective measurements and post-selection, we can recover a completely decoupled boundary resource state. Furthermore, a successful preparation is almost guaranteed as long as the perturbations are much smaller than $N^{-1/2}$ where N is the number of sites on the boundary, i.e., the size of the cluster state.

The remainder of the paper is organized as follows. We first review the notion of cluster states and how they can be viewed as SPT phases. Then, we show how a symmetric 2D Hamiltonian can be used to pump a 1D cluster state to the boundary. This procedure is generalized to pump 2D cluster states to the boundary of a 3D system using a 3D Hamiltonian that respects subsystem symmetry. Lastly, we discuss how to recover a cluster-like resource state in the case that small but symmetric perturbations are added to the Hamiltonian.

Cluster States. Let $|s\rangle$ where $s = 0, 1$ be computational basis states. Given a graph $\mathcal{G} = (V, E)$, a graph state[50] is the entangled state

$$|\psi\rangle = \prod_{ij \in E} CZ_{ij} \bigotimes_{i \in V} |+\rangle_i, \quad (1)$$

constructed from initializing with qubits in the $X = 1$ eigenstate $|+\rangle \sim |0\rangle + |1\rangle$ at each vertex and applying the controlled- Z operator

$$CZ_{ij} = \frac{1}{2}(1 + Z_i + Z_j - Z_i Z_j) = (-1)^{s_i s_j} \quad (2)$$

where $s_i = \frac{1-Z_i}{2}$, to every edge of the graph. The latter form shows the simple action of the CZ gate in the computational basis. Equivalently, the graph state is the unique ground state of the stabilizer Hamiltonian

$$H = - \sum_{i \in V} X_i \prod_{j|(ij) \in E} Z_j, \quad (3)$$

which is obtained by conjugating X_i on each vertex by the circuit $\prod_{ij \in E} CZ_{ij}$.

When the graph \mathcal{G} also forms a lattice, the state is called a cluster state. Cluster states are resource states that are universal for MBQC in two or greater spatial dimensions[8, 51]. It was later realized that cluster states are examples of SPT phases[31, 32, 52–54]. The 1D cluster state is protected by a \mathbb{Z}_2^2 global symmetry, which flips the spins on even and odd sites of the chain respectively. On the other hand, 2D cluster




FIG. 2. The computational power of the 2D cluster state on a square lattice is protected by spin-flip symmetries along individual diagonals lines of the lattice.




FIG. 3. The 2D cluster state on the honeycomb lattice. A generator of the fractal symmetries flips all the enlarged blue spins in the shape of a Sierpinski triangle. There is also another set of fractal symmetry generators for the red spins.

states are SPTs protected by subsystem symmetry. For example, on a square lattice, the cluster state can be protected by symmetries which flip spins on individual diagonal lines (see Figure 2), while on a honeycomb lattice, it can be protected by fractal symmetries which only flip certain spins in the shape of Sierpinski triangles [32, 34] (see Figure 3). Furthermore, any state in the same (subsystem) SPT phase as these cluster states (called cluster-like states) can also be used as a universal resource state [18, 19, 39–41].

Pumping SPTs protected by Global Symmetries. To design Hamiltonians whose time evolution pumps SPT states to the boundary, we take inspiration from Floquet SPTs for bosonic systems with unitary symmetry G . We first review some basic facts. The classification of Floquet SPTs protected by G can be thought of as that of a static system with symmetry $G \times \mathbb{Z}$ where \mathbb{Z} denotes time translation[46–48]. In the language of group cohomology, we can use the Künneth formula to write

$$\mathcal{H}^{d+1}(G \times \mathbb{Z}, U(1)) = \mathcal{H}^{d+1}(G, U(1)) \times \mathcal{H}^d(G, U(1)). \quad (4)$$

The first factor classifies static G -SPTs, while the latter can be interpreted as a drive which pumps G -SPT phases of one lower dimension to the boundary per driving period. We can devise a Hamiltonian to generate this Floquet unitary, which acts as the identity in the bulk, but pumps the SPT phase to the boundary while commuting with the symmetry. The idea is similar to a coupled-layer construction: dividing our d -




FIG. 4. The Union-Jack lattice, with a global \mathbb{Z}_2^2 symmetry defined as flipping spins on two of the three colors. The Hintermann-Merlini 3-body interaction commutes with this symmetry.

dimensional system with boundary into volume-filling ‘cells’, the Floquet unitary is obtained by evolving a local Hamiltonian that creates, in one Floquet period, a bubble of the $d - 1$ -dimensional SPT along the boundary of each cell. The SPTs cancel in the bulk, leaving only a $d - 1$ -dimension SPT on the boundary. Without restrictions to the number of interactions required, the pump for a general bosonic SPT can be constructed [49, 55]. However, reducing the number of interactions requires some engineering. We will focus only on SPT phases in 1+1D since it is not known whether there exists SPT phase protected by a global symmetry in higher dimensions where the entire phase is universal. Subsequently, we will turn to pumps for subsystem SPTs in higher dimensions, which are new.

Pumping the 1D Cluster state. Let us demonstrate how to prepare the 1D Cluster state on the boundary of the Union Jack lattice respecting a global \mathbb{Z}_2^2 symmetry using only three-body interactions. similar setups for the triangle and square lattices are reviewed in Appendix A. We place qubits on the vertices on a Union Jack lattice. The lattice is 3-colorable as red, blue, and green as shown in Fig. 4. The global \mathbb{Z}_2^2 symmetry is defined via the action of its three \mathbb{Z}_2 subgroups, which flip spins in the computational basis on two of the three colors. Starting with a product state, we will evolve our system with the following Hintermann-Merlini Hamiltonian [56] for time $\pi/4$

$$H = - \sum_{\Delta_{123}} Z_1 Z_2 Z_3, \quad (5)$$

where the sum is over triangles Δ_{123} of all orientations. This Hamiltonian commutes with the \mathbb{Z}_2^2 symmetry.

To see the action of the resulting unitary, let us act the unitary on a state $|s_1, s_2, s_3\rangle$ for each vertex of Δ_{123} . Using $Z_i = 1 - 2s_i$, we find

$$\begin{aligned} \exp -i \frac{\pi}{4} Z_1 Z_2 Z_3 &= e^{-i \frac{\pi}{4}} e^{i \frac{\pi}{2} (s_1 + s_2 + s_3)} e^{i \pi (s_1 s_2 + s_2 s_3 + s_3 s_1)} \\ &\propto S_1 S_2 S_3 C Z_{12} C Z_{23} C Z_{31} \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

Hence, the local three-body term exponentiates to a product of $S = |0\rangle\langle 0| + i|1\rangle\langle 1|$ gates for each vertex and CZ gates for each edge of the triangle. Taking the product of such local




FIG. 5. The tetrahedral Ising interaction on the FCC lattice is constructed for a vertex along with three adjacent face-centers within the same cube.

unitaries for all triangles, each vertex is always acted by a multiple of four S gates, which cancel both in the bulk and on the boundary. On the other hand, the CZ gates cancel pairwise in the bulk, leaving (up to an overall phase)

$$U = \exp -i H \frac{\pi}{4} \propto \prod_{ij \in \partial M} CZ_{ij}, \quad (7)$$

where ∂M denotes the boundary spins of the lattice, respectively. Therefore this unitary pumps the cluster state to the boundary.

Pumping Subsystem SPTs. We will now generalize the results to 3D with two examples. First, consider the FCC lattice with planar subsystem symmetries defined as flipping spins in individual (100), (010) or (001) planes. These planar symmetries terminate as line symmetries on the boundary. Our driving Hamiltonian will be a four-body tetrahedral Ising interaction[27]

$$H = - \sum_{\Delta_{1234}} Z_1 Z_2 Z_3 Z_4. \quad (8)$$

as shown in Fig. 5, which commutes with the planar symmetries. Evolving the product state with the above Hamiltonian for time $\pi/4$, a similar calculation to Eq. (6) shows that for each tetrahedron Δ_{1234} ,

$$\exp -i \frac{\pi}{4} Z_1 Z_2 Z_3 Z_4 \propto \prod_{i=1}^4 S_i \prod_{\substack{i,j=1 \\ i < j}}^4 CZ_{ij}. \quad (9)$$

Taking the product over all tetrahedra, we are left with CZ gates acting only along the boundary. The cluster state on the square lattice (Fig. 2) can therefore be prepared on the (100) boundary. Interestingly, choosing the (111) boundary, one can also prepare the cluster-like state on the triangular lattice protected by three intersecting line symmetries.

For our second example, we will prepare the 2D Cluster state on the honeycomb lattice. Our 3D bulk is a stack of 2D honeycombs with the two sites per unit cell labeled red and blue, as in Fig. 3. The fractal symmetry is defined as acting the fractal symmetry of Fig. 3 simultaneously for every layer. Consider the following gates defined for each blue and red

vertex, respectively

$$V_{v_b} = \text{[Diagram of CZ gates around blue site } v_b \text{]}, \quad V_{v_r} = \text{[Diagram of CZ gates around red site } v_r \text{]} \quad (10)$$

where each solid line denotes a CZ gate. This can be expanded using Eq. (2) to a sum of at most five Z operators. The blue fractal symmetries trivially commute with V_{v_b} , while the red fractal symmetries around any blue site only flips zero or two of the three adjacent red sites within in each layer. Therefore, V_{v_b} commutes with the all the fractal symmetries and similarly for V_{v_r} . The product

$$U = \prod_v V_{v_b} V_{v_r} = e^{-i\frac{\pi}{2}H} \quad (11)$$

over all vertices v in the 3D lattice creates two cluster states on the top and bottommost honeycomb layers, where

$$H = \sum_v V_{v_b} + V_{v_r}. \quad (12)$$

Generalizing this, it is possible to similarly prepare any 2D fractal cluster state[32] generated by some 1D cellular automaton. Here, we will give the underlying argument, and prove it rigorously in Appendix C. For each blue site v_b , define V_{v_b} to be a product of CZ operators connecting v_b and the blue site directly above it to its nearest neighbor red sites. Any symmetry generated by the cellular automaton will only flip an even number of the nearest neighbor red sites, so these gates are symmetric. Analogously, for each red site v_r , V_{v_r} is a product of CZ operators connecting v_r and the red site directly below it to its nearest neighbor blue sites. A product of such gates over all vertices creates the cluster state at the top and bottom-most layers, so the sum of these gates is exactly our desired driving Hamiltonian.

Recovering Cluster-like States in Practical Setups. We finally discuss how to take into account possible undesirable perturbations that could be introduced into the driving Hamiltonian when implemented in practice. These perturbations could entangle the boundary state with the bulk, rendering it useless as a resource state. However, we will show that as long as these perturbations are small and respect the symmetry, projective measurements in the bulk followed by post-selection can recover a resource state in the same phase as the cluster state.

The basic idea is as follows. Suppose the driving Hamiltonian is perturbed by symmetric local terms, whose coefficients are bounded above by a small number ϵ . To prepare the resource state, we choose a bulk which is much larger than the support of possible perturbations and initialize all qubits

to the all $|+\rangle$ state. We now consider how the terms possibly affect the cluster state on the boundary after the evolution.

1. If the perturbation acts purely in the bulk, then our resource state on the boundary is not affected.
2. If the perturbation acts purely on the boundary, then the state is perturbed symmetrically, which will still be a valid resource state as long as ϵ is small enough to keep it in the SPT phase.
3. If the perturbation acts both in the bulk and on the boundary, then this term could break the symmetry restricted to the boundary or bulk separately, while preserving the total symmetry of whole system. In that case, the term will flip an odd number of $|+\rangle$ states in the bulk to $|-\rangle$. Therefore, we can eliminate this error by performing a projective measurement in the Hadamard basis for all qubits in the bulk, and post-select the states in which we measure an even number of $|-\rangle$ states along any bulk symmetry operator.

The number of the third type of perturbation is of order N , the number of qubits on the boundary, which is used to prepare the cluster state. Thus, for perturbations of size ϵ , the probability of failure is $\epsilon^2 N$, and so we only need $\epsilon \ll N^{-1/2}$ to guarantee a finite-time preparation. An analysis for the 1D cluster state to justify our claims is given in Appendix D.

Discussion Inspired by quantum pumps and Floquet SPTs, we devised a 2D(3D) Hamiltonian which respects the global(subsystem) symmetry extended into the bulk, and showed that a product state driven by this Hamiltonian for a fixed time independent of system size prepares a 1D(2D) cluster state on the boundary. Then, exploiting the universality of the entire symmetry-protected phase, we were able to guarantee the preparation of a resource state even when the Hamiltonian is not implemented exactly as long as perturbations are small and symmetric. This was achieved by followup projective measurements and post-selection. We find it remarkable that topology proves itself useful in methods beyond topological quantum computing.

We conclude with prospects for future work.

From the point of view of topological phases, our results entails that intrinsically interacting Floquet SPTs protected by subsystem symmetry are at least classified by subsystem SPTs in one lower dimension, identical to the global symmetry case. It would be interesting to see whether this classification is complete. Furthermore, gauging Floquet SSPTs can give rise to Floquet fracton orders, where gapped excitations with restricted mobility are dynamically enriched into non-abelian excitations via the Floquet drive[57]. These models perhaps deserve further exploration.

For future prospects for MBQC, we have presented three(four)-body interactions to symmetrically prepare one(two)-dimensional cluster states. It would be interesting if this number can be further lowered given that universal resource states can arise as ground states of two-body Hamiltonians[10, 11, 13]. In addition, current computational schemes implicitly assume the cluster-like states possess translation-invariance[18, 39, 41, 42, 54][58], which might

not hold for the states prepared using this method. It would be crucial to devise a computational scheme which relaxes such assumption. Finally, we hope to investigate whether there are experimental platforms where such global or subsystem symmetries are inherent or arise as an approximate symmetry. Ultimately, finding a Hamiltonian that can be faithfully implemented experimentally, and a way to limit perturbations to ones that respect the symmetry, would provide a scalable and reliable method to create universal resource states.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We thank Yanzhu Chen, Ruihua Fan, Dominic Else, Abhishodh Prakash, Robert Raussendorf, Ryan Thorngren, Ruben Verresen, Sagar Vijay, and Tzu-Chieh Wei for helpful discussions. NT is grateful to the Yukawa Institute for Theoretical Physics at Kyoto University. Discussions during the workshop YITP-T-19-03“Quantum Information and String Theory 2019” were useful to complete this work. NT acknowledges the support of NSERC. AV was supported by the DARPA DRINQS program (award D18AC00033) and by Simons Investigator award (AV) and by the Simons Collaboration on Ultra-Quantum Matter, which is a grant from the Simons Foundation (651440, AV).

-
- [1] F. Pollmann, E. Berg, A. M. Turner, and M. Oshikawa, Symmetry protection of topological phases in one-dimensional quantum spin systems, *Phys. Rev. B* **85**, 075125 (2012).
- [2] X. Chen, Z.-C. Gu, and X.-G. Wen, Classification of gapped symmetric phases in one-dimensional spin systems, *Phys. Rev. B* **83**, 035107 (2011).
- [3] X. Chen, Z.-C. Gu, and X.-G. Wen, Complete classification of one-dimensional gapped quantum phases in interacting spin systems, *Phys. Rev. B* **84**, 235128 (2011).
- [4] X. Chen, Z.-C. Gu, Z.-X. Liu, and X.-G. Wen, Symmetry protected topological orders and the group cohomology of their symmetry group, *Phys. Rev. B* **87**, 155114 (2013).
- [5] X. Chen, Z.-C. Gu, Z.-X. Liu, and X.-G. Wen, Symmetry-protected topological orders in interacting bosonic systems, *Science* **338**, 1604 (2012).
- [6] D. Gottesman and I. L. Chuang, Demonstrating the viability of universal quantum computation using teleportation and single-qubit operations, *Nature* **402**, 390 (1999).
- [7] H. J. Briegel and R. Raussendorf, Persistent entanglement in arrays of interacting particles, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **86**, 910 (2001).
- [8] R. Raussendorf and H. J. Briegel, A one-way quantum computer, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **86**, 5188 (2001).
- [9] R. Raussendorf, D. E. Browne, and H. J. Briegel, Measurement-based quantum computation on cluster states, *Phys. Rev. A* **68**, 022312 (2003).
- [10] X. Chen, B. Zeng, Z.-C. Gu, B. Yoshida, and I. L. Chuang, Gapped two-body hamiltonian whose unique ground state is universal for one-way quantum computation, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **102**, 220501 (2009).
- [11] T.-C. Wei, I. Affleck, and R. Raussendorf, Affleck-kennedy-lieb-tasaki state on a honeycomb lattice is a universal quantum computational resource, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **106**, 070501 (2011).
- [12] A. Miyake, Quantum computational capability of a 2d valence bond solid phase, *Annals of Physics* **326**, 1656 (2011).
- [13] T.-C. Wei, I. Affleck, and R. Raussendorf, Two-dimensional affleck-kennedy-lieb-tasaki state on the honeycomb lattice is a universal resource for quantum computation, *Phys. Rev. A* **86**, 032328 (2012).
- [14] A. Prakash and T.-C. Wei, Ground states of one-dimensional symmetry-protected topological phases and their utility as resource states for quantum computation, *Phys. Rev. A* **92**, 022310 (2015).
- [15] J. Miller and A. Miyake, Resource quality of a symmetry-protected topologically ordered phase for quantum computation, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **114**, 120506 (2015).
- [16] H. P. Nautrup and T.-C. Wei, Symmetry-protected topologically ordered states for universal quantum computation, *Phys. Rev. A* **92**, 052309 (2015).
- [17] J. Miller and A. Miyake, Hierarchy of universal entanglement in 2d measurement-based quantum computation, *npj Quantum Information* **2**, 16036 (2016).
- [18] R. Raussendorf, D.-S. Wang, A. Prakash, T.-C. Wei, and D. T. Stephen, Symmetry-protected topological phases with uniform computational power in one dimension, *Phys. Rev. A* **96**, 012302 (2017).
- [19] D. T. Stephen, D.-S. Wang, A. Prakash, T.-C. Wei, and R. Raussendorf, Computational power of symmetry-protected topological phases, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **119**, 010504 (2017).
- [20] T.-C. Wei and C.-Y. Huang, Universal measurement-based quantum computation in two-dimensional symmetry-protected topological phases, *Phys. Rev. A* **96**, 032317 (2017).
- [21] Y. Chen, A. Prakash, and T.-C. Wei, Universal quantum computing using $(\mathbb{Z}_d)^3$ symmetry-protected topologically ordered states, *Phys. Rev. A* **97**, 022305 (2018).
- [22] J. Miller and A. Miyake, Latent computational complexity of symmetry-protected topological order with fractional symmetry, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **120**, 170503 (2018).
- [23] C. Chamon, Quantum glassiness in strongly correlated clean systems: An example of topological overprotection, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **94**, 040402 (2005).
- [24] J. Haah, Local stabilizer codes in three dimensions without string logical operators, *Phys. Rev. A* **83**, 042330 (2011).
- [25] B. Yoshida, Exotic topological order in fractal spin liquids, *Phys. Rev. B* **88**, 125122 (2013).
- [26] S. Vijay, J. Haah, and L. Fu, A new kind of topological quantum order: A dimensional hierarchy of quasiparticles built from stationary excitations, *Phys. Rev. B* **92**, 235136 (2015).
- [27] S. Vijay, J. Haah, and L. Fu, Fracton topological order, generalized lattice gauge theory, and duality, *Phys. Rev. B* **94**, 235157 (2016).
- [28] D. J. Williamson, Fractal symmetries: Ungauging the cubic code, *Phys. Rev. B* **94**, 155128 (2016).
- [29] R. M. Nandkishore and M. Hermele, Fractons, *Annual Review of Condensed Matter Physics* **10**, 295 (2019).
- [30] M. Pretko, X. Chen, and Y. You, Fracton phases of matter, *International Journal of Modern Physics A* **35**, 2030003 (2020).
- [31] Y. You, T. Devakul, F. J. Burnell, and S. L. Sondhi, Subsystem symmetry protected topological order, *Phys. Rev. B* **98**, 035112

- (2018).
- [32] T. Devakul, Y. You, F. J. Burnell, and S. L. Sondhi, Fractal Symmetric Phases of Matter, *SciPost Phys.* **6**, 7 (2019).
- [33] T. Devakul, D. J. Williamson, and Y. You, Classification of subsystem symmetry-protected topological phases, *Phys. Rev. B* **98**, 235121 (2018).
- [34] A. Kubica and B. Yoshida, Ungauging quantum error-correcting codes, arXiv preprint arXiv:1805.01836 (2018).
- [35] T. Devakul, W. Shirley, and J. Wang, Strong planar subsystem symmetry-protected topological phases and their dual fracton orders, *Phys. Rev. Research* **2**, 012059 (2020).
- [36] N. Tantivasadakarn and S. Vijay, Searching for fracton orders via symmetry defect condensation, *Phys. Rev. B* **101**, 165143 (2020).
- [37] N. Tantivasadakarn, Jordan-wigner dualities for translation-invariant hamiltonians in any dimension: Emergent fermions in fracton topological order, *Phys. Rev. Research* **2**, 023353 (2020).
- [38] W. Shirley, Fractonic order and emergent fermionic gauge theory, arXiv preprint arXiv:2002.12026 (2020).
- [39] R. Raussendorf, C. Okay, D.-S. Wang, D. T. Stephen, and H. P. Nautrup, Computationally universal phase of quantum matter, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **122**, 090501 (2019).
- [40] D. T. Stephen, H. P. Nautrup, J. Bermejo-Vega, J. Eisert, and R. Raussendorf, Subsystem symmetries, quantum cellular automata, and computational phases of quantum matter, *Quantum* **3**, 142 (2019).
- [41] T. Devakul and D. J. Williamson, Universal quantum computation using fractal symmetry-protected cluster phases, *Phys. Rev. A* **98**, 022332 (2018).
- [42] A. K. Daniel, R. N. Alexander, and A. Miyake, Computational universality of symmetry-protected topologically ordered cluster phases on 2D Archimedean lattices, *Quantum* **4**, 228 (2020).
- [43] X. Chen, Z.-C. Gu, and X.-G. Wen, Local unitary transformation, long-range quantum entanglement, wave function renormalization, and topological order, *Phys. Rev. B* **82**, 155138 (2010).
- [44] Y. Huang and X. Chen, Quantum circuit complexity of one-dimensional topological phases, *Phys. Rev. B* **91**, 195143 (2015).
- [45] D. J. Thouless, Quantization of particle transport, *Phys. Rev. B* **27**, 6083 (1983).
- [46] D. V. Else and C. Nayak, Classification of topological phases in periodically driven interacting systems, *Phys. Rev. B* **93**, 201103 (2016).
- [47] C. W. von Keyserlingk and S. L. Sondhi, Phase structure of one-dimensional interacting floquet systems. i. abelian symmetry-protected topological phases, *Phys. Rev. B* **93**, 245145 (2016).
- [48] A. C. Potter, T. Morimoto, and A. Vishwanath, Classification of interacting topological floquet phases in one dimension, *Phys. Rev. X* **6**, 041001 (2016).
- [49] R. Roy and F. Harper, Floquet topological phases with symmetry in all dimensions, *Phys. Rev. B* **95**, 195128 (2017).
- [50] M. Hein, W. Dür, J. Eisert, R. Raussendorf, M. Nest, and H.-J. Briegel, Entanglement in graph states and its applications, in *Quantum Computers, Algorithms and Chaos*, Vol. 162 (IOS press, 2006) pp. 115 – 218.
- [51] M. Van den Nest, A. Miyake, W. Dür, and H. J. Briegel, Universal resources for measurement-based quantum computation, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **97**, 150504 (2006).
- [52] A. C. Doherty and S. D. Bartlett, Identifying phases of quantum many-body systems that are universal for quantum computation, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **103**, 020506 (2009).
- [53] D. V. Else, S. D. Bartlett, and A. C. Doherty, Symmetry protection of measurement-based quantum computation in ground states, *New Journal of Physics* **14**, 113016 (2012).
- [54] D. V. Else, I. Schwarz, S. D. Bartlett, and A. C. Doherty, Symmetry-protected phases for measurement-based quantum computation, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **108**, 240505 (2012).
- [55] C. Z. Xiong, Minimalist approach to the classification of symmetry protected topological phases, *Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and Theoretical* **51**, 445001 (2018).
- [56] A. Hintermann and D. Merlini, Exact solution of a two dimensional ising model with pure 3 spin interactions, *Physics Letters A* **41**, 208 (1972).
- [57] A. C. Potter and T. Morimoto, Dynamically enriched topological orders in driven two-dimensional systems, *Phys. Rev. B* **95**, 155126 (2017).
- [58] More specifically, that the state can be written as a translation-invariant tensor network.
- [59] R. J. Baxter and F. Y. Wu, Exact solution of an ising model with three-spin interactions on a triangular lattice, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **31**, 1294 (1973).
- [60] B. Yoshida, Topological color code and symmetry-protected topological phases, *Phys. Rev. B* **91**, 245131 (2015).
- [61] B. Yoshida, Gapped boundaries, group cohomology and fault-tolerant logical gates, *Annals of Physics* **377**, 387 (2017).
- [62] M. S. Kesselring, F. Pastawski, J. Eisert, and B. J. Brown, The boundaries and twist defects of the color code and their applications to topological quantum computation, *Quantum* **2**, 101 (2018).
- [63] J. Haah, Commuting pauli hamiltonians as maps between free modules, *Communications in Mathematical Physics* **324**, 351 (2013).
- [64] M. E. J. Newman and C. Moore, Glassy dynamics and aging in an exactly solvable spin model, *Phys. Rev. E* **60**, 5068 (1999).
- [65] X. Chen, Y.-M. Lu, and A. Vishwanath, Symmetry-protected topological phases from decorated domain walls, *Nature communications* **5**, 3507 (2014).

Appendix A: Pumping the 1D Cluster state on the triangular and square lattices




FIG. 6. Triangular Lattice, with \mathbb{Z}_2^2 symmetry defined as flipping spins on two of the three colors. The Baxter-Wu 3-body interaction commutes with this symmetry.

We explain a setup to pump cluster states symmetrically to the boundary of the triangular and square lattices. The setup for the triangular lattice is very similar to that of the Union Jack lattice given in the main text. Qubits are placed on the vertices of the triangular lattice, which is 3-colorable as red, blue, and green as shown in Fig. 6. The global \mathbb{Z}_2^2 symmetry is defined via the action of its three \mathbb{Z}_2 subgroups, which flip spins in the computational basis on two of the three colors. Starting with a product state, we will evolve our system with the following Baxter-Wu Hamiltonian [59] for time $\pi/4$

$$H = - \sum_{\Delta_{123}} Z_1 Z_2 Z_3, \quad (\text{A1})$$

where the sum is over all up and down triangles Δ_{123} in the triangular lattice. This Hamiltonian commutes with the \mathbb{Z}_2^2 symmetry.

Using Eq. (6), the unitary obtained from evolving the Hamiltonian up to an overall phase is

$$U = \exp -iH \frac{\pi}{4} \propto \prod_{ij \in \partial M} Z_i C Z_{ij} \prod_{i \in M} Z_i, \quad (\text{A2})$$

where M and ∂M are the bulk and boundary spins of the lattice, respectively. Therefore this unitary pumps a cluster-like state to the boundary and flips all $|+\rangle$ states in the bulk to $|-\rangle$. Because of this action in the bulk, we must instead post-select an even number of $|+\rangle$ states in the presence of symmetric perturbations.

The setup for the square lattice was originally discussed in [57] in the context of Floquet SPTs and requires four-body interactions.

We endow a lattice of spins in 2D with a \mathbb{Z}_2^2 symmetry which acts as spin flip on either the red or blue sites, respectively as shown in Figure 7. The qubits are all initialized in the $|+\rangle$ state. Now, for each square \square_{1234} in the lattice, consider the following Hamiltonian, which is a sum over a product of




FIG. 7. Two \mathbb{Z}_2 symmetries on a square lattice in 2D act by flipping all the red and blue spins respectively. The driving Hamiltonian obtained by summing over product four CZ gates at the edge of all squares pumps a 1D cluster state to the boundary.

four CZ operators around each square.

$$\begin{aligned} H &= \sum_{\square_{1234}} CZ_{12} CZ_{23} CZ_{34} CZ_{41} \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\square_{1234}} (1 + Z_1 Z_3 + Z_2 Z_4 - Z_1 Z_2 Z_3 Z_4) \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A3})$$

This Hamiltonian commutes with the $\mathbb{Z}_2 \times \mathbb{Z}_2$ symmetry. Next, if we evolve the product state using the above Hamiltonian for time $\pi/2$, the resulting unitary evolution up to a phase is

$$\begin{aligned} U &= \exp -iH \frac{\pi}{2} \\ &= \prod_{\square_{1234}} \left[\cos \frac{\pi}{2} - i \sin \frac{\pi}{2} CZ_{12} CZ_{23} CZ_{34} CZ_{41} \right] \\ &\propto \prod_{ij \in \partial M} CZ_{ij}, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A4})$$

where ∂M are qubits on the boundary of the square lattice. Here, we used the fact that all the terms in the Hamiltonian mutually commute and all square to the identity. We see that the resulting unitary acts trivially in the bulk, since all the CZ operators cancel pairwise, and so we are left with CZ 's acting only along the boundary. Thus, the unitary creates a 1D cluster state along the boundary.

It is worth noting that from the perspective of gauging, the cluster state pump on the square lattice gauges to a transversal CZ gate in two toric codes, while the cluster state pump on the Union Jack and triangular lattices gauge to a transversal S gate in the color code[60–62].

Appendix B: Cellular Automata and Fractal SPTs

In this appendix, we summarize some important notions of Cellular Automata (CA), fractal symmetries, and construction of fractal SPTs. We will then show how to disentangle two copies of any fractal SPT and hence write down a driving Hamiltonian that pumps fractal SPTs to the boundary.

1. Algebraic Formalism

We summarize the algebraic formalism, which closely follows the notation in Ref. 32. For a formal treatment, see for example Ref. 63. The positions of qubits on a 2D lattice can be parametrized by coordinates $(i, j) \in \mathbb{Z}^2$. The Hamiltonian can be written as a sum of stabilizers where each term is product of X and Z operators. The location of the Paulis can be given by a Laurent polynomial $\alpha \in \mathbb{F}_2[x, \bar{x}, y, \bar{y}]$, where $\bar{x} = x^{-1}$ and $\bar{y} = y^{-1}$. Since the expansion

$$\alpha = \sum_{i,j=-\infty}^{\infty} \alpha_{ij} x^i y^j. \quad (\text{B1})$$

for $\alpha_{ij} \in \mathbb{F}_2$ is unique, the operators

$$Z(\alpha) = \prod_{ij} Z_{ij}^{\alpha_{ij}}, X(\alpha) = \prod_{ij} X_{ij}^{\alpha_{ij}}, \quad (\text{B2})$$

places Z or X operators at sites (i,j) whenever $\alpha_{ij} = 1$. In this notation, translation by the vector (i, j) is realized by multiplication of the monomial $x^i y^j$, respectively.

Given two polynomials α and β , their commutation polynomial $P(\alpha, \beta)$ is defined as

$$P(\alpha, \beta) = \alpha \bar{\beta} = \sum_{ij} P_{ij}(\alpha, \beta) x^i y^j. \quad (\text{B3})$$

The operators $X(\alpha)$ and $Z(\beta)$ can anticommute if there is an odd number of X and Z operators appearing at the same position. This corresponds to the number of terms present in both α and β . Thus, we can calculate $\alpha \bar{\beta}$ and look at the $x^0 y^0$ term. In other words, $X(\alpha)$ and $Z(\beta)$ will anticommute iff $P_{00}(\alpha, \beta) = 1$ and will commute iff $P_{00}(\alpha, \beta) = 0$.

In general, we can shift Z by $x^i y^j$ and look at the commutation between $X(\alpha)$ and $Z(x^i y^j \beta)$. The commutation is determined by the $x^0 y^0$ coefficient of $\alpha x^i y^j \beta$ or equivalently, the $x^i y^j$ coefficient of $\alpha \bar{\beta}$, which is $P_{ij}(\alpha, \beta)$. Hence, we see that

$$X(\alpha) Z(x^i y^j \beta) = (-1)^{P_{ij}(\alpha, \beta)} X(x^i y^j \beta) Z(\alpha). \quad (\text{B4})$$

We also find it useful to extend the algebraic notation to CZ operators. For simplicity, let us assume that CZ always acts between two different sublattices, which we distinguish by the presence of a monomial s . We can demand that the input of CZ is always of the form $CZ(\beta, \gamma s)$, where $\beta = \sum_{ij} \beta_{ij} x^i y^j$, and $\gamma = \sum_{ij} \gamma_{ij} x^i y^j$. Then, we define

$$CZ(\beta, \gamma s) = \prod_{ijkl} CZ_{ij,kl}^{\beta_{ij} \gamma_{kl}}. \quad (\text{B5})$$

That is, it acts CZ on all possible combinations between sites with non-zero β_{ij} sites in the s^0 sublattice and non-zero γ_{ij} sites in the s^1 sublattice.

Now, if we conjugate $X(\alpha)$ with $CZ(\beta, \gamma s)$, this creates Z operators at γs depending on the number of overlaps between α and β . Again, this can be expressed in terms of the commutation polynomial

$$CZ(\beta, \gamma s) X(\alpha) CZ(\beta, \gamma s) = X(\alpha) Z(\gamma s)^{P_{00}(\alpha, \beta)}, \quad (\text{B6})$$

and in general,

$$CZ(x^i y^j z^k \beta, \gamma s) X(\alpha) CZ(x^i y^j z^k \beta, \gamma s) = X(\alpha) Z(\gamma s)^{P_{ijk}(\alpha, \beta)}. \quad (\text{B7})$$

Swapping roles of the s^0 and s^1 sublattice, we can also obtain

$$CZ(\beta, x^i y^j z^k \gamma s) X(\alpha s) CZ(\beta, x^i y^j z^k \gamma s) = X(\alpha s) Z(\beta)^{P_{ijk}(\alpha, \gamma)}. \quad (\text{B8})$$

2. Fractal Symmetries

A cellular automaton (CA) can be generated from a function $f \in \mathbb{F}_2[x, \bar{x}]$. With such a function, we can construct the Hamiltonian

$$H = - \sum_{ij} Z(x^i y^j (1 + \bar{f}\bar{y}))$$

i.e. the Hamiltonian is a product of Z at coordinate i, j along with Z operators at position $j-1$ given according to \bar{f} . As an example, the Sierpinski rule $f = 1 + x$ gives

$$H = - \sum_{ij} Z_{i-1, j-1} Z_{i, j-1} Z_{i, j}$$

which is the Newman-Moore Hamiltonian[64].

The symmetry of this Hamiltonian can be generated by any function $q(x) \in \mathbb{F}_2[x]$ as

$$S(q(x)) = X(q(x) \mathcal{F}(x, y))$$

where

$$\mathcal{F}(x, y) = \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} f(x)^t y^t. \quad (\text{B9})$$

Intuitively, the Pauli X operators on the first row ($y = 0$) are given by $q(x)$ and subsequent rows are obtained from the previous row using the update rule $f(x)$. For example, choosing $q(x) = x^j$ flips spins on a Sierpinski triangle with apex at site j on the first row (see Figure 3 without the red sites for a visualization).

Suppose our Hamiltonian is defined in a region where $y \geq 0$ (whether x is unbounded or periodic does not affect the argument.) To prove that the symmetry defined commutes with the Hamiltonian, we need to check that the coefficients $P_{ij}(\alpha, \beta)$ of the commutation polynomial with $\alpha = q(x) \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} f(x)^t y^t$ and $\beta = 1 + \bar{f}\bar{y}$ vanishes for all $j > 0$ (because there are no terms in the Hamiltonian for $j \leq 0$). Computing, we find

$$P(\alpha, \beta) = q(x) (1 + fy) \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} f(x)^t y^t = q(x). \quad (\text{B10})$$

Therefore, P_{ij} vanishes for all $j > 0$.

3. Fractal SPTs

Let us now construct an SPT protected by fractal symmetries. Starting with a product state Hamiltonian containing two sublattices (labeled by s^0 and s^1) per site

$$H_0 = - \sum_{ij} [X(x^i y^j) + X(x^i y^j s)]. \quad (\text{B11})$$

Given a CA f , the Hamiltonian has symmetries

$$S(q(x)) = X(q(x)\mathcal{F}(x, y)), \quad (\text{B12})$$

$$S'(q(x)) = X(q(x)\bar{\mathcal{F}}(x, y)s), \quad (\text{B13})$$

with \mathcal{F} given by Eq. B9. We now evolve H_0 with a unitary

$$\begin{aligned} U &= \prod_{ij} CZ(x^i y^j(1 + \bar{f}\bar{y}), x^i y^j s) \\ &= \prod_{ij} CZ(x^i y^j, x^i y^j(1 + fy)s) \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B14})$$

The two expressions of the unitary above can be shown to be equivalent by expanding $\bar{f} = \sum_i f_i \bar{x}^i$ and performing the appropriate shifting of indices in the product. Since the unitary contains only CZ operators, the ground state of this Hamiltonian is a cluster state. We remark that this can be thought of decorating the charge excitations one sublattice to the symmetry defects of the other sublattice [32, 65].

Conjugating the first and second terms in the trivial Hamiltonian with the first and second expressions respectively, we obtain the Hamiltonian

$$\begin{aligned} H &= - \sum_{ij} [X(x^i y^j)Z(x^i y^j(1 + fy)s) \\ &\quad + X(x^i y^j s)Z(x^i y^j(1 + \bar{f}\bar{y}))]. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B15})$$

Choosing the Sierpinski CA $f(x) = 1 + x$ gives precisely the Hamiltonian for the cluster state on the honeycomb lattice [32, 34].

Appendix C: Pumping SSPTs protected by fractal symmetry

We explicitly construct the unitaries that pump fractal SPTs to opposite sides of the bulk. Our 3D bulk is constructed by L layers of 2D lattices, where each layer can be labeled by an additional index z from 1 to z^L . We define the gates

$$V_{ijk} = CZ(x^i y^j z^k(1 + z), x^i y^j(1 + \bar{f}\bar{y})z^k s), \quad (\text{C1})$$

$$V'_{ijk} = CZ(x^i y^j(1 + fy)z^k, x^i y^j z^k(1 + z)s). \quad (\text{C2})$$

For $k = 0, \dots, L-1$. These gates commute with the fractal symmetries extended weakly into the bulk

$$S(q(x)) = X\left(q(x)\mathcal{F}(x, y) \sum_{l=0}^L z^l\right), \quad (\text{C3})$$

$$S'(q(x)) = X\left(q(x)\bar{\mathcal{F}}(x, y) \sum_{l=0}^L z^l s\right). \quad (\text{C4})$$

That is, the symmetries in the bulk are products of identical fractal symmetries in all layers. Let us show this explicitly for V_{ijk} . The computation is identical for V'_{ijk} .

To show that V_{ijk} and $S(q(x))$ commute, let $\alpha = q(x)\mathcal{F}(x, y) \sum_{l=0}^L z^l$, $\beta = (1 + z)$ and $\gamma = x^i y^j(1 + \bar{f}\bar{y})z^k$. The commutation polynomial of α and β is:

$$\begin{aligned} P(\alpha, \beta) &= q(x)\mathcal{F}(x, y) \sum_{l=0}^L z^l(1 + \bar{z}) \\ &= q(x)\mathcal{F}(x, y)(\bar{z} + z^L). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C5})$$

Since $P_{ijk} = 0$ for $k = 0, \dots, L-1$, Eq. (B7) implies that the two terms commute. To show that V_{ijk} and $S'(q(x))$ commute, let $\alpha = q(x)\bar{\mathcal{F}}(x, y) \sum_{l=0}^L z^l$, $\beta = x^i y^j(1 + fy)z^k$ and $\gamma = (1 + \bar{f}\bar{y})z^k$. The coefficients P_{ijk} of the commutation polynomial

$$\begin{aligned} P(\alpha, \gamma) &= q(x)\bar{\mathcal{F}}(x, y) \sum_l z^l(1 + fy)z^k \\ &= q(x) \sum_l z^{l-k}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C6})$$

vanish for all $j > 0$, so Eq. (B8) implies that the two terms commute.

We conclude that the unitary

$$U = \prod_{ij} \prod_{k=0}^{L-1} V_{ijk} V'_{ijk} \quad (\text{C7})$$

acts trivially in the bulk, but creates cluster states at layers z^0 and z^L . This can be achieved by evolving with the Hamiltonian

$$H = \sum_{ij} \sum_{k=0}^{L-1} [V_{ijk} + V'_{ijk}] \quad (\text{C8})$$

for time $\pi/2$.

Appendix D: Bound for Perturbations in Driving Hamiltonian

In this Appendix, we estimate the bound on the size of perturbations in the driving Hamiltonian needed to ensure a successful preparation of a cluster state on the boundary. For simplicity, we give an example for the setup on the square lattice, although it is straightforward to generalize to other 2D lattices and the preparation of 2D cluster states in 3D. In particular, we will show that the bound is $\epsilon \ll N^{-1/2}$, where N is the number of sites of the desired cluster state.

We consider driving Hamiltonian in Eq. (A3) on a square lattice M with boundary ∂M . Without perturbations, evolution using this Hamiltonian leads to the state

$$U|\psi_0\rangle = |\text{cluster}\rangle_{\partial M} \otimes |+\rangle_M \quad (\text{D1})$$

To leading order, we can consider the following two types of symmetric perturbations:

$$\Delta H^Z = \epsilon \sum_{\square_{1234}} Z_1 Z_3 + Z_2 Z_4, \quad (\text{D2})$$

$$\Delta H^X = \epsilon \sum_i X_i. \quad (\text{D3})$$

Furthermore, we can consider the perturbations separately, since any mixed-terms would be higher order in ϵ . We will demonstrate the calculation for ΔH^Z , which is easier since it commutes with the Hamiltonian. The calculation for ΔH^X is nearly identical and will be briefly outlined.

Consider adding only ΔH^Z . The resulting unitary to first order in ϵ is

$$U' \approx U \prod_{\square_{1234}} \left(1 + i \frac{\pi}{2} \epsilon Z_1 Z_3 \right) \left(1 + i \frac{\pi}{2} \epsilon Z_2 Z_4 \right) \quad (\text{D4})$$

$$\approx U \left[1 + i \frac{\pi}{2} \epsilon \sum_{\square_{1234}} (Z_1 Z_3 + Z_2 Z_4) \right] \quad (\text{D5})$$

The final state to first order in order ϵL is schematically

$$U' |\psi_0\rangle \approx (|\text{cluster}\rangle_{\partial M} \otimes |+\rangle_M) + i \frac{\pi}{2} \epsilon \sum_{\square \in \partial M} (Z |\text{cluster}\rangle_{\partial M} \otimes Z |+\rangle_M). \quad (\text{D6})$$

Here, we have thrown away terms where the errors act only in the bulk, and did not affect the cluster state on the boundary since this does not affect our argument.

The final state is a superposition of the correct cluster state (tensored with a trivial bulk), with $\mathcal{O}(L)$ wrong states coming from each of the terms adjacent to the boundary. These wrong states have a single Z operator on the cluster state (breaking the symmetry on the standalone boundary) and another Z acting on the bulk, which changes one of the $|+\rangle$ states to $|-\rangle$.

We can collapse the wavefunction to the desired cluster-state by performing a projective measurement in the Hadamard basis, and throw away all readouts with outcome $|-\rangle$. Since each wrong state can appear with probability of order ϵ^2 , the probability of failure is $\mathcal{O}(\epsilon^2 L)$. Thus, we can consistently create a 1D cluster state as long as $\epsilon \ll L^{-1/2}$.

It is worth pointing out that cluster-like states (for example $Z_i Z_j |\text{cluster}\rangle_{\partial M}$ where $i, j \in \partial M$) only appear at higher orders in ϵ . Taking this into account, along with the fact that errors can also act purely in the bulk, we therefore only need to throw away measurements which result in an odd number of $|-\rangle$ states in the bulk.

For the perturbation ΔH^X , since the errors do not commute with our driving Hamiltonian, the unitary expanded to first order in ϵ is

$$U' = U e^{-i\epsilon \frac{\pi}{2} \sum_i X_i} e^{\frac{\pi^2}{8} \epsilon \sum_i [H, X_i]}. \quad (\text{D7})$$

The errors do not come from the first exponential but from the commutation between H and X_i in the second exponential. Computing the commutator explicitly, one finds that the terms with support on both bulk and boundary will also flip a $|+\rangle$ to $|-\rangle$ in the bulk, and so can be eliminated by projective measurements and post-selection.

When generalizing to 2D, we see that the number of terms that can break the symmetry on the boundary is of order L^2 , the number of sites on the boundary. Thus in general, the error only needs to be much smaller than $N^{-1/2}$ where N is the number of sites on which we prepare the cluster state.