

Realizing efficient quantum error-correction with three-qubit codes

Long Huang^{1,*}

¹*Coll Phys & Elect Engr, Sichuan Normal University, Chengdu 610101, China*

(Dated: November 10, 2022)

In this work, we construct the efficient quantum error-correction protocol against the general quantum noise, just with the two three-qubit quantum error-correction codes. In the protocol, the two codes are applied according to the polarizing of noise. The codes play the role of polarizing the noise channel, or the role of correcting the polarization noise channel. The performance of the protocol is highly dependent on the type of noise. For the general Pauli noise, the threshold of the protocol is 0.91518 when against the depolarizing noise, while for the amplitude damping noise is about 0.849. For the general independent noise, the threshold of the protocol is about 0.9318, which is obtained through the numerical simulations. The physical resources costed by this protocol is multiple of the physical resources costed to realize the three-qubit quantum error-correction, with no increase in complexity. We believe it will be helpful for realizing quantum error-correction in the physical system.

In quantum computation and communication, quantum error-correction (QEC) developed from classic schemes to preserving coherent states from noise and other unexpected interactions. It was independently discovered by Shor and Steane [1, 2]. The QEC conditions were proved independently by Bennett, DiVincenzo, Smolin and Wootters [3], and by Knill and Laflamme [4]. QEC codes are introduced as active error-correction. The nine-qubit code was discovered by Shor, called the Shor code. The seven-qubit code was discovered by Steane, called the Steane code. The five-qubit code was discovered by Bennett, DiVincenzo, Smolin and Wootters [3], and independently by Laflamme, Miquel, Paz and Zurek [5].

There are many constructions for specific classes of quantum codes. Rains, Hardin, Shor and Sloane [6] have constructed interesting examples of quantum codes lying outside the stabilizer codes. Gottesman [7] and Rains [8] construct non-binary codes and consider fault-tolerant computation with such codes. Aharonov and Ben-Or [9] construct non-binary codes using interesting techniques based on polynomials over finite fields, and also investigate fault-tolerant computation with such codes. Approximate QEC can lead to improved codes was shown by Leung, Nielsen, Chuang and Yamamoto [10].

Calderbank and Shor [11], and Steane [12] used ideas from classical error-correction to develop the CSS (Calderbank-Shor-Steane) codes. Calderbank and Shor also stated and proved the Gilbert-Varshamov bound for CSS codes. Gottesman [13] invented the stabilizer formalism, and used it to define stabilizer codes, and investigated some of the properties of some specific codes. Independently, Calderbank, Rains, Shor and Sloane [14] invented an essentially equivalent approach to QEC based on ideas from classical coding theory.

QEC codes are introduced as active error-correction. Another way, passive error-avoiding techniques contain decoherence-free subspaces [15–17] and noiseless subsystem [18–20]. Recently, it has been proven that both the active and passive QEC methods can be unified [21–23]. So, more QEC codes means more options for suppressing noise, and more options for optimizing the performance of QEC. Meanwhile, how to realize efficient QEC with these codes in the

physical system is still an important question.

As known, the three-qubit code is not efficient for arbitrary one-qubit errors because of the Hamming bound. We still used it for QEC simulation because it is the easiest QEC code to implement. Through these simulations, we found it is more appropriate to call the three-qubit codes polarizing codes. One reason is that the three-qubit code is bound to cause channel fidelity to improve when the weight of the polarizing error (Pauli-X, Y, or Z) is above $\frac{2}{3}$. The other reason is that the three-qubit code in Eq. (1) will change the polarizing of the effective channel to Pauli-Z after QEC, and the three-qubit code in Eq. (2) will change the polarizing of the effective channel to Pauli-X after QEC. Based on the reasons, under certain conditions, the QEC for arbitrary one-qubit errors can be realized in nine-qubit channels when the two three-qubit codes are applied in turn. Meanwhile, we should notice that correcting arbitrary one-qubit errors is an equivalent description for the performance of QEC, which means the channel fidelity of the effective channel is no less than $f^9 + 9f^8(1-f)$. Here, f is the channel fidelity of the initial channel, and $1-f$ is the possibility of all errors in the initial channel.

In this work, we construct the efficient QEC protocol against the general quantum noise, just with the two three-qubit QEC codes. One of them is the bit-flip code,

$$\begin{aligned} |0_{\mathcal{L}}\rangle &= |000\rangle, \\ |1_{\mathcal{L}}\rangle &= |111\rangle. \end{aligned} \quad (1)$$

the state $|\psi\rangle = a|0\rangle + b|1\rangle$ is encoded to $|\tilde{\psi}\rangle = a|000\rangle + b|111\rangle$. When a bit-flip error occurred on one qubit, measuring with the stabilizer $\langle Z_1Z_2, Z_2Z_3\rangle$,

$$\begin{aligned} X_1|\tilde{\psi}\rangle &= a|100\rangle + b|011\rangle, S_1 = -1, 1; \\ X_2|\tilde{\psi}\rangle &= a|010\rangle + b|101\rangle, S_2 = -1, -1; \\ X_3|\tilde{\psi}\rangle &= a|001\rangle + b|110\rangle, S_3 = 1, -1. \end{aligned}$$

Here, S_n is the measurement result for the n-qubit. We should notice that if a bit-phase-flip error occurred on one qubit, the

measurement results with the stabilizer $\langle Z_1Z_2, Z_2Z_3 \rangle$ are

$$\begin{aligned} Y_1|\tilde{\psi}\rangle &= i[a|100\rangle - b|011\rangle], S_1 = -1, 1; \\ Y_2|\tilde{\psi}\rangle &= i[a|010\rangle - b|101\rangle], S_2 = -1, -1; \\ Y_3|\tilde{\psi}\rangle &= i[a|001\rangle - b|110\rangle], S_3 = 1, -1. \end{aligned}$$

The measurement results for each qubit occurred one-qubit bit-flip or bit-phase-flip errors are the same, which means the bit-flip code can be used to correct one-qubit bit-flip or bit-phase-flip error in the single-error environment, and not in mixed noise environment because the bit-flip and bit-phase-flip errors can not be identified simultaneously.

With another code, the state $|\psi\rangle = a|0\rangle + b|1\rangle$ is encoded to $|\tilde{\psi}\rangle = a|0_{\mathcal{L}}\rangle + b|1_{\mathcal{L}}\rangle$,

$$\begin{aligned} |0_{\mathcal{L}}\rangle &= \frac{1}{2}[|000\rangle + |011\rangle + |101\rangle + |110\rangle], \\ |1_{\mathcal{L}}\rangle &= \frac{1}{2}[|111\rangle + |100\rangle + |010\rangle + |001\rangle]. \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

The three-qubit code in Eq. (2) is one three-qubit phase-flip code, and the errors $\{I, Z_1, Z_2, Z_3\}$ with the stabilizer $\langle X_1X_2, X_2X_3 \rangle$. The logical Z operator is $Z_1Z_2Z_3$, and the logical X operator is one of $X_1X_2X_3, X_1, X_2$, and X_3 .

For the three-qubit code in Eq. (2), the state $|\psi\rangle = a|0\rangle + b|1\rangle$ is encoded to $|\tilde{\psi}\rangle = a[|000\rangle + |011\rangle + |101\rangle + |110\rangle] + b[|111\rangle + |100\rangle + |010\rangle + |001\rangle]$. When a phase-flip error occurred on one qubit, measuring with the stabilizer $\langle X_1X_2, X_2X_3 \rangle$,

$$\begin{aligned} Z_1|\tilde{\psi}\rangle &= a[|000\rangle + |011\rangle - |101\rangle - |110\rangle] \\ &\quad + b[-|111\rangle - |100\rangle + |010\rangle + |001\rangle], \\ R_1 &= -1, 1; \\ Z_2|\tilde{\psi}\rangle &= a[|000\rangle - |011\rangle + |101\rangle - |110\rangle] \\ &\quad + b[-|111\rangle + |100\rangle - |010\rangle + |001\rangle], \\ R_2 &= -1, -1; \\ Z_3|\tilde{\psi}\rangle &= a[|000\rangle - |011\rangle - |101\rangle + |110\rangle] \\ &\quad + b[-|111\rangle + |100\rangle + |010\rangle - |001\rangle], \\ R_3 &= 1, -1. \end{aligned}$$

Here, R_n is the measurement result for the n -qubit. And if a bit-phase-flip error occurred on one qubit, the measurement results with the stabilizer $\langle X_1X_2, X_2X_3 \rangle$ are

$$\begin{aligned} Y_1|\tilde{\psi}\rangle &= i[a[|100\rangle + |111\rangle - |001\rangle - |010\rangle] \\ &\quad + b[-|011\rangle - |000\rangle + |110\rangle + |101\rangle]], \\ R_1 &= -1, 1; \\ Y_2|\tilde{\psi}\rangle &= i[a[|010\rangle - |001\rangle + |111\rangle - |100\rangle] \\ &\quad + b[-|101\rangle + |110\rangle - |000\rangle + |011\rangle]], \\ R_2 &= -1, -1; \\ Y_3|\tilde{\psi}\rangle &= i[a[|001\rangle - |010\rangle - |100\rangle + |111\rangle] \\ &\quad + b[-|110\rangle + |101\rangle + |011\rangle - |000\rangle]], \\ R_3 &= 1, -1. \end{aligned}$$

The measurement results for each qubit occurred one-qubit phase-flip or bit-phase-flip errors are the same, which means

the three-qubit code can be used to correct the one-qubit phase-flip or bit-phase-flip error in the single-error environment, and not in mixed noise environment because the phase-flip and bit-phase-flip errors can not be identified simultaneously.




FIG. 1. (a) Encoding circuits for phase-flip code. (b) Encoding circuits for the bit-flip code.

For the general Pauli noise, we list all the different cases. For each case, we will give the error-correction threshold channel fidelity f_0 , and discuss how to realize the optimal error-correction with the two three-qubit codes. The physical noise channel is $\varepsilon(\rho_0)$, and ρ_0 is the initial state.

i. ε only contains one of the Pauli-X, Pauli-Y, and Pauli-Z noise. For these cases, only one of the codes in Eq. (1) and Eq. (2) is applied, the error-correction threshold is $f_0 = 0.5$. The effective channel after QEC can be written as

$$\tilde{\varepsilon} = Tr[U_i^\dagger R_m \varepsilon U_i[\rho_0]]. \quad (3)$$

Here, U is the encoding operation, U^\dagger is the decoding operation. And $i = 1, 2$, corresponding to which code we applied. And R is the recovery operation, $m = x, y, z$, corresponding to which Pauli error is corrected.

(1) For the Pauli-X error, $i = 1, m = x$; (2) For the Pauli-Z error, $i = 2, m = z$; (3) For the Pauli-Y error, $i = 1 \text{ or } 2, m = y$;

ii. ε contains two or three of the Pauli-X, Pauli-Y, and Pauli-Z noise. For these cases, both the codes in Eq. (1) and Eq. (2) are applied, one as the inner, and another as the outer. The effective channel after QEC can be written as

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\varepsilon}_{OUT} &= Tr[V_j^\dagger R_{V,m} \tilde{\varepsilon}_{IN} V_j[\rho_0]], \\ \tilde{\varepsilon}_{IN} &= Tr[U_i^\dagger R_{U,m} \varepsilon U_i[\rho_0]]. \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

Here, U is the inner encoding operation, U^\dagger is the inner decoding operation. And V is the outer encoding operation, V^\dagger is the outer decoding operation. And $i \neq j, i, j = 1, 2$, corresponding to which code we applied. And R_V is the outer recovery operation, R_U is the inner recovery operation, $m = x, y, z$, corresponding to which Pauli error is corrected.

(1) For the Pauli-X,Z errors, the error-correction threshold is $f_0 = 0.83375$, which is obtained when the Pauli-X and Z have the same weight. Here, $i = 1, j = 2, U_m = x, V_m = z$ or $i = 2, j = 1, U_m = z, V_m = x$, which has no different performance on channel fidelity. When the Pauli-X and Z have different weights, we should choose the inner code against the high-weight one, and it will have a better performance.

TABLE I. Results of 5-level concatenated QEC from Eq. (4), where the initial process matrix $\lambda_{L,L=0}$ is $\lambda_{II} = 0.92, \lambda_{XX} = \lambda_{ZZ} = \lambda_{YY} = \frac{0.08}{3}$, and L is the concatenation level.

$\lambda - L$	$(\lambda_{II}, \lambda_{XX}, \lambda_{ZZ}, \lambda_{YY})$
0	$(0.92, \frac{0.08}{3}, \frac{0.08}{3}, \frac{0.08}{3})$
1 - in	(0.852345, 0.00411496, 0.139425, 0.00411496)
1 - out	(0.923232, 0.0208713, 0.0524821, 0.00341433)
2 - in	(0.922795, 0.0681813, 0.00782988, 0.00119405)
2 - out	(0.960219, 0.0131944, 0.0260095, 0.000576644)
3 - in	(0.957846, 0.0400713, 0.00196852, 0.000114371)
3 - out	(0.989099, 0.00467851, 0.00618629, 0.0000363724)
4 - in	(0.985875, 0.0140098, 0.000113806, 1.87668×10^{-6})
4 - out	(0.99907, 0.000583257, 0.000346744, 2.2364×10^{-7})
5 - in	(0.998959, 1.01981×10^{-6} , 0.00104018, 0)
5 - out	(0.999994, 3.06284×10^{-6} , 3.24367×10^{-6} , 0)

TABLE II. Results of 5-level concatenated QEC with the Shor code, where the initial process matrix $\lambda_{L,L=0}$ is $\lambda_{II} = 0.92, \lambda_{XX} = \lambda_{ZZ} = \lambda_{YY} = \frac{0.08}{3}$, and L is the concatenation level.

$\lambda - L$	Shor code $(\lambda_{II}, \lambda_{XX}, \lambda_{ZZ}, \lambda_{YY})$
0	$(0.92, \frac{0.08}{3}, \frac{0.08}{3}, \frac{0.08}{3})$
1	(0.934261, 0.0414538, 0.02211, 0.00217564)
2	(0.968208, 0.0153426, 0.0159628, 0.00048693)
3	(0.990936, 0.00683566, 0.00220061, 0.0000274494)
4	(0.999438, 0.000140051, 0.000421678, 1.84203×10^{-7})
5	(0.999995, 4.79366×10^{-6} , 1.76974×10^{-7} , 0)

(2) For the Pauli-X,Y errors or Pauli-Y,Z, the error-correction threshold is $f_0 = 0.8353$, which is obtained when the two Pauli errors have the same weight. Here, we should notice when ε contains the Pauli-Y error, the inner recovery must be $U_m = y$, and the outer code should against the rest Pauli error. It leads to a worse performance when the Pauli-Y has a low weight, and one more time QEC is needed in the outer.

(3) For the Pauli-X,Y,Z errors, the error-correction threshold is $f_0 = 0.91518$, which is obtained when the three Pauli errors have the same weight. Here, we should abandon the Pauli-Y error if it had the lowest weight. On the other hand, the inner recovery must be $U_m = y$ when the weight of the Pauli-Y is not the lowest, and the outer code should against the rest higher-weight Pauli error.

In conclusion, against the general Pauli noise with the QEC protocol in Eq. (4), the error-correction threshold is $f_0 = 0.91518$ when the noise is depolarizing errors. It is foreseeable as we discussed in the fifth paragraph, because the

three-qubit codes are more appropriate for polarizing errors. And the QEC performance is much better than just correcting arbitrary one-qubit errors in nine-qubit channels, in which the effective channel fidelity is $0.91518^9 + 9 \times 0.91518^8(1 - 0.91518) = 0.826017$. The reason is that the three-qubit code is not only correcting the three one-qubit polarizing errors through distinguishable subspace, but also nine two-qubit errors and three three-qubit errors because of the code construction. As an example, for the code in Eq. (1), the correctable errors are $X_1, X_2, X_3, Z_1Z_2, Z_1Z_3, Z_2Z_3, Y_1Z_2, Y_1Z_3, Y_2Z_3, Z_1Y_2, Z_1Y_3, Z_2Y_3$, and $Z_1Z_2X_3, Z_1Z_3X_2, Z_2Z_3X_1$ (for correcting Pauli-Y errors, the correctable errors are replacing the X as Y , and the Y as X). Applied to the depolarizing channel with fidelity $f_0 = 0.91518, p_x = p_z = p_y = \frac{0.08482}{3}$, the effective channel,

$$\begin{aligned}
f_1 &= f_0^3 + 3f_0^2p_x + 3f_0p_x^2 + 6f_0p_y p_z + 3p_x p_z^2 \\
&= 0.844206, \\
p_1z &= p_z^3 + 3p_z^2p_y + 3p_z f_0^2 + 6f_0p_x p_z + 3p_y f_0^2 \\
&= 0.146563, \\
p_1x &= p_x^3 + 3p_x^2f_0 + 3p_x p_y^2 + 6p_x p_y p_z + 3f_0 p_y^2 \\
&= 0.00461548, \\
p_1y &= p_y^3 + 3p_y^2p_z + 3p_y p_x^2 + 6f_0p_y p_x + 3p_z p_x^2 \\
&= 0.00461548.
\end{aligned} \tag{5}$$

Then, apply the code in Eq. (2), whose correctable errors are $Z_1, Z_2, Z_3, X_1X_2, X_1X_3, X_2X_3, Y_1X_2, Y_1X_3, Y_2X_3, X_1Y_2, X_1Y_3, X_2Y_3$, and $X_1X_2Z_3, X_1X_3Z_2, X_2X_3Z_1$ (for correcting Pauli-Y errors, the correctable errors are replacing the Z as Y , and the Y as Z). The effective channel,

$$\begin{aligned}
f_2 &= f_1^3 + 3f_1^2p_1z + 3f_1p_1^2x + 6f_1p_1x p_1y + 3p_1z p_1^2x \\
&= 0.915183, \\
p_2z &= p_1z^3 + 3p_1z^2f_1 + 3p_1z p_1^2y + 6p_1z p_1x p_1y + 3f_1p_1^2y \\
&= 0.0576325, \\
p_2x &= p_1x^3 + 3p_1x^2p_1y + 3p_1x f_1^2 + 6f_1p_1x p_1z + 3p_1y f_1^2 \\
&= 0.0231631, \\
p_2y &= p_1y^3 + 3p_1y^2p_1x + 3p_1y p_1^2z + 6f_1p_1z p_1y + 3p_1x p_1^2z \\
&= 0.00402167.
\end{aligned} \tag{6}$$

As shown in Eq. (5) and Eq. (6), the error-correction threshold for the protocol is $f_0 = 0.91518$. In the QEC protocol, the two codes in Eq. (1) and Eq. (2) are applied in turn. The inner code mainly plays the role of polarizing the noise channel, and the outer code mainly plays the role of correcting the polarization noise channel. Meanwhile, we notice the effective channel in Eq. (6) is still one polarizing-Z noise channel as in Eq. (5), the next code applied should still be the code in Eq. (2). To combine Eq. (5) and Eq. (6), the all correctable errors in the 9-qubits can be obtained which are 4^8 different combinations with the four Pauli operators. In the end, we conclude that choosing the codes in Eq. (1) and Eq. (2) according to the weight of polarizing noise, if the channel fidelity of effective channel increased, the degree of polarizing of the effective

channel must be decreased, meanwhile, if the channel fidelity of the effective channel decreased, the degree of polarizing of the effective channel must be increased, and the channel fidelity of the effective channel could be increased under the QEC with the other code.

For the three-qubit codes, based on the ability of polarizing channels, we think the protocol is efficient against general independent quantum noise. To verify the deduction, we fixed the initial channel fidelity f_0 , then generated $N = 300000$ independent quantum noise randomly through the noise model in Eq. (32) of [24]. Because the random independent noise is unknown, we should apply all the four different QEC protocols with the two three-qubit codes independently. Until the best performances are recorded, in which all the channel fidelity of the effective channels f_1 are above the initial channel fidelity f_0 . Here, we have noticed that the performance of this protocol is highly dependent on the type of noise. For example, to against the amplitude damping noise with channel fidelity $f_0 = 0.91518$, we apply the QEC protocol with $i = 2, j = 1, U_m = y, V_m = x$, and the channel fidelity of the effective channel is 0.945147. The error-correction threshold for the amplitude damping noise is about 0.849, while for the general Pauli noise is 0.91518, and for the general independent noise is about 0.9318. Meanwhile, we should notice that the error-correction threshold can be much lower when high concatenated of the protocol is available.

For depolarizing channel, we list the change of the process matrix to show the exact performance of the QEC protocol in Table I. In level-1, $i = 1, j = 2, U_m = y, V_m = z$. In level-2,3,4, $i = 2, j = 1, U_m = z, V_m = x$. In level-5, $i = 1, j = 2, U_m = x, V_m = z$. As a comparison, the performance of the Shor code is in Table II.

As shown in the tables, both protocols are efficient. The biggest difference between the protocol from Eq. (4) and the Shor code (five-qubit code and Steane code) is that the physical resources costed by this protocol is multiple of the physical resources costed to realize the three-qubit QEC. The quantum gate operations needed are as simple as realizing three-qubit QEC, which is

$$C_l = 1 + 3 + 3^2 + 3^3 + 3^4 + 3^5 \dots \quad (7)$$

Here, l is the level of the QEC protocol, $2l$ is the number of terms of the cost, and 1 represents the cost of realizing three-qubit QEC. With no complicated quantum gate operations like others.

In the realization of QEC, some studies have been done [25, 26]. Why the QEC protocol from Eq. (4) can be efficient, the reason may arise from the ability to change the logical error when applying inner QEC, and the outer QEC is good at against it. Meanwhile, it is easy for realizing just because it is with repeated implementation of three-qubit QEC. Similar phenomena for other codes have been noted in [24, 27, 28], but the realizations need more complicated quantum gate operations. As an example, once the QEC with the three-qubit

code had been realized as in [29], the efficient QEC for depolarizing noise can be realized if four QEC with the three-qubit codes realized at the same time. Based on the realization, any one-qubit error can be corrected, and fault-tolerant quantum computation may be realized in the practical quantum computer.

* huangl@sicnu.edu.cn

- [1] P. W. Shor, Phys. Rev. A **52**, R2493(R) (1995).
- [2] A. M. Steane, Phys. Rev. Lett. **77**, 793 (1996).
- [3] C. H. Bennett, D. P. DiVincenzo, J. A. Smolin, and W. K. Wootters, Phys. Rev. A **54**, 3824 (1996).
- [4] E. Knill and R. Laflamme, Phys. Rev. A **55**, 900 (1997).
- [5] R. Laflamme, C. Miquel, J. P. Paz, and W. H. Zurek, Phys. Rev. Lett. **77**, 198 (1996).
- [6] E. M. Rains, R. H. Hardin, P. W. Shor, and N. J. A. Sloane, Phys. Rev. Lett. **79**, 953 (1997).
- [7] D. Gottesman, arXiv e-print quant-ph/9802007 (1998).
- [8] E. M. Rains, IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory **45**, 1827 (1999).
- [9] D. Aharonov and M. Ben-Or, arXiv e-print quant-ph/9906129 (1999).
- [10] D. W. Leung, M. A. Nielsen, I. L. Chuang, and Y. Yamamoto, Phys. Rev. A **56**, 2567 (1997).
- [11] A. R. Calderbank and P. W. Shor, Phys. Rev. A **54**, 1098 (1996).
- [12] A. M. Steane, Proc. R. Soc. London A **452**, 2551 (1996).
- [13] D. Gottesman, Phys. Rev. A **54**, 1862 (1996).
- [14] A. R. Calderbank, E. M. Rains, P. W. Shor, and N. J. A. Sloane, Phys. Rev. Lett. **78**, 405 (1997).
- [15] L.-M. Duan and G.-C. Guo, Phys. Rev. Lett. **79**, 1953 (1997).
- [16] D. A. Lidar, I. L. Chuang, and K. B. Whaley, Phys. Rev. Lett. **81**, 2594 (1998).
- [17] P. Zanardi and M. Rasetti, Phys. Rev. Lett. **79**, 3306 (1997).
- [18] E. Knill, R. Laflamme, and L. Viola, Phys. Rev. Lett. **84**, 2525 (2000).
- [19] P. Zanardi, Phys. Rev. A **63**, 012301 (2000).
- [20] J. Kempe, D. Bacon, D. A. Lidar, and K. B. Whaley, Phys. Rev. A **63**, 042307 (2001).
- [21] D. Kribs, R. Laflamme, and D. Poulin, Phys. Rev. Lett. **94**, 180501 (2005).
- [22] D. Poulin, Phys. Rev. Lett. **95**, 230504 (2005).
- [23] D. W. Kribs and R. W. Spekkens, Phys. Rev. A **74**, 042329 (2006).
- [24] L. Huang, B. You, X. H. Wu, and T. Zhou, Phys. Rev. A **92**, 052320 (2015).
- [25] J. Kelly, R. Barends, A. G. Fowler, A. Megrant, E. Jeffrey, T. C. White, D. Sank, J. Y. Mutus, B. Campbell, Y. Chen et al., Nature **519**, 66 (2015).
- [26] IIKwon Sohn, Seigo Tarucha, and Byung-Soo Choi, Phys. Rev. A **95**, 012306 (2017).
- [27] M. A. Nielsen and I. L. Chuang, *Quantum Computation and Quantum information*(Cambridge University Press,Cambridge, 2000).
- [28] L. Huang, X. H. Wu, and T. Zhou, Phys. Rev. A **100**, 042321 (2019).
- [29] J. Chiaverini, D. Leibfried, T. Schaetz, M. D. Barrett, R. B. Blakestad, J. Britton, W. M. Itano, J. D. Jost, E. Knill, C. Langer, R. Ozeri, D. J. Wineland, Nature **432**, 602 (2004).