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Fault-tolerant quantum computing

1. How to implement a reliable quantum memory. Need decoherence time larger than the runtime of a quantum algorithm.

2. How to implement reliable logical gates. Need precision smaller than the inverse number of gates in a quantum algorithm.

Solution: quantum error correction
Fault-tolerant quantum computing

How to implement operations on the logical qubits encoded by a quantum code without exposing them to the environment?

Exploit code symmetries. Certain logical operations can be implemented transversally by acting independently on each physical qubit.

Bad news: transversal logical gates cannot be universal [Eastin and Knill 2009]
Solution 1: Code Deformation
Logical gates are implemented by traversing a closed loop in the space of codes. The codes share same physical qubits but may have different parity checks.

Kitaev (1997); Raussendorf, Harrington, Goyal (2007); Fowler, Stephens, Groszkowski (2008); Horsman et al (2011); Gottesman and Zhang (2013); Landahl and Ryan-Anderson (2014)
Solution 2: Gauge Fixing Method
Transfer logical qubits between two or more codes. Universality is achieved by combining transversal logical gates of different codes.

\[ U_L \cdots U_3 U_2 U_1 \]

\[ U_1, U_3, \ldots \quad U_2, U_4, \ldots \]

Paetznick and Reichardt (2013);
Jochym-O’Connor and Laflamme (2013); Bombin (2013-2014)
Anderson, Duclos-Cianci, Poulin (2014); SB and Cross (2015);
Jochym-O’Connor and Bartlett (2015);
Jones, Brooks, Harrington (2015);
Solution 3: Magic state distillation*
Prepare unprotected ancillary qubits in a desired state. Inject the noisy ancillas into the codespace. Use protected logical gates and measurements to distill a few noiseless ancillas from many noisy ones.

*Very large overhead.*

SB and Kitaev (2004); Reichardt (2004); Meier, Eastin, and Knill (2012); SB and Haah (2012); Jones (2012); Fowler, Devitt, and Jones (2012)
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Quantum Error Correction

Logical state

ψ

encoding

error $E$

decoding

ψ

Pauli errors:

Perfect transmission $I$

Bit flip $X$

Phase flip $Z$

Bit and phase flip $Y$

$\alpha|0\rangle + \beta|1\rangle$

$\alpha|1\rangle + \beta|0\rangle$

$\alpha|0\rangle - \beta|1\rangle$

$\alpha i|1\rangle - \beta i|0\rangle$
More on Pauli errors

1. Pauli operators either commute or anti-commute

\[ P = \begin{pmatrix} X & X & Z & Z \\ I & I & I & I \end{pmatrix} \]

\[ Q = \begin{pmatrix} Z & X & I & X \\ -1 & -1 & -1 & -1 \end{pmatrix} \]

\[ PQ = (-1)^2 QP = QP \]

2. Pauli operators have eigenvalues ±1.
   Applying the same Pauli twice does nothing.

3. Pauli operators on n qubits form a group

\[ \text{Pauli}(n) = \mathbb{Z}_4 \rtimes \mathbb{Z}_2^2 \]

\[ X \leftrightarrow (01), \quad Z \leftrightarrow (10), \quad Y \leftrightarrow (11) \]

4. Weight of a Pauli operator:
\[ |P| = \# \{ a : P_a \neq I \} \]
### Dummy $[n,k]$ stabilizer code

$k$ logical qubits \hspace{2cm} $n-k$ syndrome qubits

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Logical-Z operators</th>
<th>Stabilizers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$Z_1, \ldots, Z_k$</td>
<td>$Z_{k+1}, \ldots, Z_n$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Logical-X operators</th>
<th>Destabilizers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$X_1, \ldots, X_k$</td>
<td>$X_{k+1}, \ldots, X_n$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Dummy $[n,k]$ stabilizer code

**Codespace:** a linear subspace spanned by $n$-qubit states that are $+1$ eigenvectors of any stabilizer

$$Q = \mathbb{C}^2 \otimes \cdots \otimes \mathbb{C}^2 \otimes |0^{n-k}\rangle$$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Logical-Z operators</th>
<th>Stabilizers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$Z_1, \ldots, Z_k$</td>
<td>$Z_{k+1}, \ldots, Z_n$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Logical-X operators</th>
<th>Destabilizers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$X_1, \ldots, X_k$</td>
<td>$X_{k+1}, \ldots, X_n$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
General \([n,k]\) stabilizer code

\[
U \cdot \begin{array}{cccccc}
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0
\end{array} \quad UU^\dagger = I
\]

Restriction: \(U\) must map Pauli to Pauli.

\[
\overline{Z}_a = UZ_aU^\dagger \quad \overline{X}_a = UX_aU^\dagger
\]

\(\overline{X}_a, \overline{Z}_a \in \text{Pauli}(n)\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Logical-Z operators</th>
<th>Stabilizers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(\overline{Z}_1, \ldots, \overline{Z}_k)</td>
<td>(\overline{Z}_{k+1}, \ldots, \overline{Z}_n)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Logical-X operators</th>
<th>Destabilizers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(\overline{X}_1, \ldots, \overline{X}_k)</td>
<td>(\overline{X}_{k+1}, \ldots, \overline{X}_n)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The dummy code in a rotated basis
General $[n,k]$ stabilizer code

$$U \cdot \underbrace{0 \ 0 \ 0 \ 0 \ 0 \ 0 \ 0 \ 0 \ 0}_k \quad UU^\dagger = I$$

Restriction: $U$ must map Pauli to Pauli.

$$\overline{Z}_a = UZ_aU^\dagger \quad \overline{X}_a = UX_aU^\dagger$$

$$\overline{X}_a, \overline{Z}_a \in \text{Pauli}(n)$$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Logical-Z operators</th>
<th>Stabilizers</th>
<th>Logical-X operators</th>
<th>Destabilizers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$\overline{Z}_1, \ldots, \overline{Z}_k$</td>
<td>$S_1, \ldots, S_{n-k}$</td>
<td>$\overline{X}_1, \ldots, \overline{X}_k$</td>
<td>$D_1, \ldots, D_{n-k}$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The dummy code in a rotated basis
### General \([n,k]\) stabilizer code

**Codespace:** \( Q = \{ \psi \in (\mathbb{C}^2)^\otimes n : S_a \psi = \psi \quad \forall a \} \)

\[
\dim (Q) = 2^k
\]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Logical-Z operators</th>
<th>Stabilizers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( \overline{Z}_1, \ldots, \overline{Z}_k )</td>
<td>( S_1, \ldots, S_{n-k} )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Logical-X operators</th>
<th>Destabilizers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( \overline{X}_1, \ldots, \overline{X}_k )</td>
<td>( D_1, \ldots, D_{n-k} )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The dummy code in a rotated basis
Example: surface codes

Stabilizer group: \[ S = \langle S_1, \ldots, S_{n-k} \rangle \]

Any Pauli error \( E \) admits a unique decomposition

\[ E = D \cdot L \cdot S \]

The dummy code in a rotated basis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Logical-Z operators</th>
<th>Stabilizers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( \overline{Z}_1, \ldots, \overline{Z}_k )</td>
<td>( S_1, \ldots, S_{n-k} )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Logical-X operators</th>
<th>Destabilizers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( \overline{X}_1, \ldots, \overline{X}_k )</td>
<td>( D_1, \ldots, D_{n-k} )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Error model

Random Pauli errors:

\[ \rho \rightarrow \sum_E \Pr(E) E \rho E^\dagger \]

Standard toy model: depolarizing i.i.d. noise:

\[ \Pr(X) = \Pr(Y) = \Pr(Z) = \epsilon / 3 \]

\[ \Pr(I) = 1 - \epsilon \]

\( \epsilon \) - error rate

Errors on different qubits are independent
Syndrome measurement (dummy code)

- Eigenvalue measurement of stabilizers reveals the state of syndrome qubits (error syndrome)

Error syndrome determines whether the error commutes or anti-commutes with each stabilizer

Encoded state $\psi \in \mathcal{Q}$

Error $E = I \otimes I \otimes X \otimes Y \otimes Z$

Corrupted state $E\psi$

- Error syndrome $Z_{k+1}, \ldots, Z_n$ reveals the state of syndrome qubits (error syndrome)

- Error syndrome determines whether the error commutes or anti-commutes with each stabilizer
Syndrome measurement (general code)

- Eigenvalue measurement of stabilizers \( S_1, \ldots, S_{n-k} \) reveals the state of syndrome qubits (error syndrome).

- Error syndrome determines whether the error commutes or anti-commutes with each stabilizer.
Surface code: errors vs syndromes
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Decoding problem

Given the error rate and the error syndrome. Correct the error.
Reminder: Pauli errors $E$ admit a unique decomposition

$$E = D \cdot L \cdot S$$

Syndrome of $E$ determines the destabilizer part $D$

Is this enough information to correct the error?

$$E = D \cdot L \cdot S \quad E' = D \cdot L' \cdot S'$$

$$E\psi = E'\psi \ \forall \ \psi \in \mathcal{Q} \quad \text{iff} \quad L = L'$$

Decoder has to guess the logical part of the error

The stabilizer part does not matter
Two errors have the same logical part iff they have the same commutation rules with the logical operators:

\[ L = L' \neq L'' \]
Decoding: syndrome measurement + recovery

Encoding:

- $E = DLS$
- $S_a = 1$ for all $a$

Measurement of all stabilizers:

- $S_a = 1$ if $S_aE = ES_a$
- $S_a = -1$ if $S_aE = -ES_a$

Syndrome determines $D$

Recovery:

- $R(D) = DL^*S^*$
Decoding: syndrome measurement + recovery

Decoding succeeds if the error $E$ and the recovery $R$ differ by a product of stabilizers:

$$ E \cdot R \in S \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad L = L^* $$
How to choose the recovery?

**Minimum Weight Decoder (MWD):** pick an error with the minimum weight consistent with the syndrome

\[(L^*, S^*) = \arg \min_{L,S} |D \cdot L \cdot S|\]

**Recovery:** \[R(D) = D \cdot L^* \cdot S^*\]

Depolarizing i.i.d. errors: min weight = max probability

\[\Pr(E) = (1 - \epsilon)^{n-|E|}(\epsilon/3)^{|E|} \sim \left(\frac{\epsilon}{3(1 - \epsilon)}\right)^{|E|}\]
How to choose the recovery?

**Minimum Weight Decoder (MWD):** pick an error with the minimum weight consistent with the syndrome

\[(L^*, S^*) = \arg \min_{L, S} |D \cdot L \cdot S|\]

**Recovery:** \[R(D) = D \cdot L^* \cdot S^*\]

Computing a min-weight recovery is **NP-hard problem** for classical linear codes.

Berlekamp, McEliece, van Tilborg (1978)

The same is true for quantum stabilizer codes since any classical linear code is a stabilizer code.
Code distance

Minimum weight of a Pauli error which has zero syndrome and has non-trivial logical part:

\[
d = \min_S \min_{L \neq I} |L \cdot S|
\]

[[n, k, d]]

Half-distance: \( t = (d - 1)/2 \)

Min-Weight decoder corrects any error of weight \( \leq t \)

error: \( E = D \cdot L \cdot S \quad |E| \leq t \)

recovery: \( R = D \cdot L^* \cdot S^* \quad |R| \leq |E| \leq t \)

\[|R \cdot E| = |LL^* \cdot SS^*| \leq 2t < d \quad \Rightarrow \quad L = L^*\]
Code distance

Minimum weight of a Pauli error which has zero syndrome and has non-trivial logical part:

\[ d = \min_S \min_{L \neq I} |L \cdot S| \]  
\[[[n, k, d]]\]

Computing the distance of a given stabilizer code is NP-hard problem
Berlekamp et al (1978); Vardy (1997)
Tillich and Zemor (2009)

Idea: map a classical linear code to a quantum stabilizer code (hypergraph product construction)

\[[n, k, d]\]  \rightarrow  [[n^2 + (n - k)^2, k^2, d]]
Code distance

Minimum weight of a Pauli error which has zero syndrome and has non-trivial logical part:

\[
d = \min \min_{S \neq I} |L \cdot S|
\]

[[n, k, d]]

Exercise: Given a stabilizer code on \( n \) qubits and integer \( t = O(1) \). One needs to decide whether

\[
d \geq 2t + 1
\]

Construct an algorithm for this task with a runtime

\[
O(n^{t+1} \log (n))
\]
Important special case: “homological CSS codes”

1. Each stabilizer is composed of \(X\) only or \(Z\) only

\[
\begin{align*}
X \otimes X \otimes I \otimes X \otimes I & \quad \text{OK} \\
X \otimes Z \otimes I \otimes X \otimes I & \quad \text{forbidden} \\
Z \otimes Z \otimes I \otimes Z \otimes I & \quad \text{OK}
\end{align*}
\]

2. Any single-qubit \(X\) or \(Z\) error creates \textit{at most two} non-zero syndromes
Important special case: “homological CSS codes”

1. Each stabilizer is composed of X only or Z only

- \( X \otimes X \otimes I \otimes X \otimes I \)
- \( Z \otimes Z \otimes I \otimes Z \otimes I \)
- \( X \otimes Z \otimes I \otimes X \otimes I \)
- \( X \otimes X \otimes I \otimes X \otimes I \)

2. Any single-qubit X or Z error creates at most two non-zero syndromes

Lemma. The distance of any homological CSS code on \( n \) qubits can be computed in time

\[ O(kn^2 + n^2 \log(n)) \]
Sketch of the proof

Claim 1: it suffices to consider errors composed of \textcolor{red}{X only} or \textcolor{red}{Z only}.

\[ d = \min \{ d^X, d^Z \} \]

\[ d^X = \min |E| \quad \text{subject to} \]

\[
\begin{aligned}
  & E \text{ is X-type error} \\
  & E \text{ commutes with all Z-stabilizers} \\
  & E \text{ anti-commutes with some logical-Z operator}
\end{aligned}
\]
Sketch of the proof

Define a **syndrome graph**: vertices = $\mathbb{Z}$-stabilizers
edges = qubits

A single-qubit $X$ error on edge $(u, v)$ creates syndromes at $u, v$

X-errors = subsets of edges in the syndrome graph
Sketch of the proof

Claim 2: an X-error has **zero syndrome** iff it is a cycle in the syndrome graph

Reminder: a subset of edges \( L \) is a **cycle** if any vertex has even number of incident edges from \( L \)
Sketch of the proof

We need to find a shortest cycle in the syndrome graph that has odd overlap with a given subset of edges $M$

$M = \overline{Z}_1, \ldots, \overline{Z}_k$

Try all $M$'s and pick the shortest cycle
Sketch of the proof

We need to find a shortest cycle in the syndrome graph that has odd overlap with a given subset of edges $M$.

Reduction to finding a shortest path between a given pair of vertices:
Claim 3: a shortest cycle that has odd overlap with $M$ and contains a vertex $u$ is mapped to a shortest path in the doubled graph connecting $u^t$ and $u^b$ (or connecting some dangling nodes $u^t$ and $v^b$)
Sketch of the proof

One can precompute shortest paths in the doubled graph using Dijkstra’s algorithm in time

$$|V| \cdot O(|E| + |V| \log |V|) = O(n^2 \log (n))$$

Trying all pairs of vertices $u^t$ and $v^b$ and all logical operators takes time

$$O(kn^2 + n^2 \log (n))$$
Minimum-Weight decoder is not always optimal

MWD

error

recovery A

MWD

recovery B

recovery C
Minimum-Weight decoder is not always optimal

B and C differ by a stabilizer

It does not matter whether the decoder picks B or C
Minimum-Weight decoder is not always optimal

B and C differ by a stabilizer

\[ \Pr(A) = \Pr(B) = \Pr(C) \]

Picking B or C is twice as likely to correct the error than picking A.
Max-Likelihood Decoder: pick the most likely equivalence class of errors consistent with the observed syndrome

\[ L^* = \arg\max_L \sum_S \Pr(D \cdot L \cdot S) \]

Recovery: \( R(D) = D \cdot L^* \)

Optimal decoder for a given error model.

Computing the ML recovery is \#P-hard problem

Iyer and Poulin (2013)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Min-Weight decoders*</th>
<th>Max-Likelihood decoders*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dennis, Kitaev, Landahl, Preskill (2001):</strong></td>
<td><strong>Duclos-Cianci and Poulin (2010):</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduction to <em>Minimum Matching.</em> Use Edmond’s blossom algorithm.</td>
<td><strong>RG decoder:</strong> approximate surface code by a concatenated code; use <em>belief propagation.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worst-case runtime $O(n^3)$</td>
<td>Worst-case runtime: $O(n \log(n))$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ignores correlations between X and Z errors</td>
<td>Hutter, Wootton and Loss (2014):</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fowler, Wang, Hollenberg (2010):</strong></td>
<td><strong>Markov chain decoder:</strong> sample errors with a given syndrome.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>More efficient implementation.</em></td>
<td>Average-case runtime: $O(n^2)$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average case runtime $O(n)$.</td>
<td><strong>SB, Suchara, Vargo (2014):</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The fastest decoder for small error rates.</td>
<td><em>Approximate probability of each equivalence class of errors.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fowler (2013):</strong></td>
<td><strong>Matrix Product States algorithm</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Account for <em>correlations</em> between X and Z errors.</td>
<td>Worst-case runtime $O(n)$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Surface code; Approximate implementations
Min-matching threshold: 15%

Markov chain decoder: 16% Hutter et al, PRA 89 022326 (2014)

Theoretical maximum: 18.9% Bombin et al, PRX 2 021004 (2012)
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Code Deformation

Sequence of stabilizer codes $C_1, ..., C_L$ with $C_1 = C_L$

$M_j$ : syndrome measurement for the code $C_j$

**Goal:** implement a target logical operation $V$ using only syndrome measurements, error correction, and transversal gates
Code Deformation

Sequence of stabilizer codes $C_1, \ldots, C_L$ with $C_1 = C_L$

Fault-tolerance: must implement the target operation $V$
for any pattern of low-weight errors:

$$|E_j| \leq t \quad \forall j$$

Simplification: ideal syndrome measurements
New feature: newly added stabilizers do not commute with the existing stabilizers. Non-commuting stabilizers should not be used to diagnose errors. To describe this we need subsystem quantum codes.
Logical subsystem $L$

Gauge subsystem $G$

Syndrome subsystem $S$

$\begin{array}{c|c|c}
L & G & S \\
\hline
\text{Logical-Z} & \text{Gauge operators} & \text{Stabilizers} \\
Z_a & Z_a & Z_a \\
\hline
\text{Logical-X} & \text{Gauge operators} & \text{Destabilizers} \\
X_a & X_a & X_a \\
\end{array}$

State of the gauge qubits can be arbitrary
General subsystem code

\[ U \cdot \bullet \; \bullet \; \bullet \; \bullet \; \ast \; \ast \; \ast \; \ast \; 0 \; 0 \; 0 \; 0 \; 0 \]

\[
\overline{Z}_a = U Z_a U^\dagger \quad \overline{X}_a = U X_a U^\dagger \\
\overline{X}_a, \overline{Z}_a \in \text{Pauli}(n)
\]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>L</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>S</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Logical-Z</td>
<td>Gauge operators</td>
<td>Stabilizers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\overline{Z}_a)</td>
<td>(\overline{Z}_a)</td>
<td>(\overline{Z}_a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Logical-X</td>
<td>Gauge operators</td>
<td>Destabilizers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\overline{X}_a)</td>
<td>(\overline{X}_a)</td>
<td>(\overline{X}_a)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The dummy subsystem code in a rotated basis
General subsystem code

\[ \overline{Z_a} = UZ_aU^\dagger \quad \overline{X_a} = UX_aU^\dagger \]

\( \overline{X_a}, \overline{Z_a} \in \text{Pauli}(n) \)

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
| & | & | \\
\hline
L & G & S \\
| & | & | \\
\hline
\text{Logical-Z} & \text{Gauge operators} & \text{Stabilizers} \\
\overline{Z_a} & G^Z_a & S_a \\
\hline
\text{Logical-X} & \text{Gauge operators} & \text{Destabilizers} \\
\overline{X_a} & G^X_a & D_a \\
\hline
\end{array}
\]

The dummy subsystem code in a rotated basis
General subsystem code

Codespace: \[ Q = \{ \psi \in (\mathbb{C}^2)^\otimes n : S_a \psi = \psi \quad \forall a \} \]

\[ Q = Q_L \otimes Q_G \]

A logical state \( \eta \) is encoded by

\[ \rho(\eta) = \eta \otimes \frac{I}{\dim (Q_G)} \]

The gauge subsystem can be made maximally mixed by applying a random gauge operator
Any Pauli error $E$ admits a unique decomposition

$$E = D \cdot L \cdot G \cdot S$$

destabilizer, logical operator, gauge operator, stabilizer

Syndrome of $E$ determines the destabilizer part $D$

Is this enough information to correct the error?

$$E = D \cdot L \cdot G \cdot S \quad E' = D \cdot L' \cdot G' \cdot S'$$

$$E \rho(\eta) E^\dagger = E' \rho(\eta) (E')^\dagger \quad \forall \eta \quad \text{iff} \quad L = L'$$

$$\rho(\eta) = \eta \otimes \frac{I}{\dim (\mathcal{Q}_G)}$$
Any Pauli error \( E \) admits a unique decomposition

\[
E = D \cdot L \cdot G \cdot S
\]

destabilizer  logical  gauge  stabilizer
operator  operator

Syndrome of \( E \) determines the destabilizer part \( D \)

Is this enough information to correct the error?

\[
E = D \cdot L \cdot G \cdot S \quad \quad E' = D \cdot L' \cdot G' \cdot S'
\]

\[
E \rho(\eta) E^\dagger = E' \rho(\eta) (E')^\dagger \quad \forall \ \eta \quad \text{iff} \quad L = L'
\]

Decoder has to guess the logical part of the error

The stabilizer and the gauge parts do not matter
Code distance

Minimum weight of a Pauli error which has zero syndrome and has non-trivial logical part:

$$d = \min_{G,S} \min_{L \neq I} |L \cdot G \cdot S|$$

[[n, k, d]]

Half-distance: \( t = (d - 1)/2 \)

Min-Weight decoder corrects any error of weight \( \leq t \)
Elementary code deformations

Choose new generators of $L, S, G$ (leave the code unchanged):

$U_L$  $U_S$  $U_G$

- $\overline{X}_a \leftarrow \overline{X}_a S_b$
- $G_a^X \leftarrow G_a^X S_b$
- $\overline{Z}_a \leftarrow \overline{Z}_a S_b$
- $G_a^Z \leftarrow G_a^Z S_b$

start measuring new stabilizers
measure some logical qubits

stop measuring some stabilizers
initialize some logical qubits

transversal logical gates
Fault-tolerant code deformation

Sequence of subsystem codes \( C_1, \ldots, C_L \) with \( C_1 = C_L \)

**Lemma.**

Assume \( C_j \) has distance \( d_j \geq 2t + 1 \).

Assume \( C_{j+1} \) is elementary deformation of \( C_j \).

Then any error pattern with \( |E_j| \leq t \) can be corrected.
Fault-tolerance conditions

\[ d_{j-1} \geq 2t + 1 \]

\[ d^*_{j-1} \geq 2t + 1 \]

\[ d^*_j \geq 2t + 1 \]

\[ d^*_j \geq 2t + 1 \]

\[ C_{j-1} \rightarrow C_j \]

d*: ignore logical operators that were stabilizers at the previous step. Ignore logical operators that will become stabilizers at the next step.