

Quantum Error Correction Code in the Hamiltonian Formulation

Yong Zhang ¹

Department of Physics, University of Utah
115 S, 1400 E, Room 201, Salt Lake City, UT 84112-0830

Abstract

The Hamiltonian model of quantum error correction code in the literature is often constructed with the help of its stabilizer formalism. But there have been many known examples of nonadditive codes which are beyond the standard quantum error correction theory using the stabilizer formalism. In this paper, we suggest the other type of Hamiltonian formalism for quantum error correction code without involving the stabilizer formalism, and explain it by studying the Shor nine-qubit code and its generalization, the Steane seven-qubit code, and the five-qubit code saturating the quantum Hamming bound. In this Hamiltonian formulation, the unitary evolution operator at a specific time is a unitary basis transformation matrix from the product basis to the quantum error correction code. This basis transformation matrix acts as an entangling quantum operator transforming a separate state to an entangled one, and hence the entanglement nature of the quantum error correction code can be explicitly shown up. Furthermore, as it forms a unitary braid representation of the Artin braid group, the quantum error correction code can be described by a braiding operator. Moreover, as the unitary evolution operator is a solution of the quantum Yang–Baxter equation, the corresponding Hamiltonian model can be explained as an integrable model in the Yang–Baxter theory. On the other hand, we generalize the Shor nine-qubit code and articulate a topic called quantum error correction codes using Greenberger-Horne-Zeilinger states to yield new nonadditive codes and channel-adapted codes.

Key Words: Quantum Error Correction, Hamiltonian, GHZ State, the Shor Code

PACS numbers: 03.65.Ud, 02.10.Kn, 03.67.Lx

¹yong@physics.utah.edu

1 Introduction

Quantum information and computation [1, 2] is a new interdisciplinary field combining (quantum) physics, (advanced) mathematics and (modern) computer science, and one of its great aims is to build a real quantum computer on which quantum algorithms can successfully run. Quantum error correction codes are devised to protect quantum information from various kinds of noise in the quantum world and perform a large-scale quantum computation with imperfect quantum gates made by the present technology. They were originally invented by Shor, Steane, Calderbank, et al. [3, 4, 5, 6], for examples, the Shor nine-qubit code [3], the Steane seven-qubit code [5, 6], and the perfect five-qubit code saturating the quantum Hamming bound [7, 8]. Additive quantum codes analogous to classical linear codes can be described in the stabilizer formalism which have two well known forms [9, 10] and [11]. Quantum error correction conditions [7, 12] play a fundamental role in the quantum error correction theory as a good guidance of devising good quantum error correction codes. Fault-tolerant quantum computations [13, 14, 15, 16, 17] study how to perform reliable quantum computation with the help of quantum error correction codes, and the threshold theorem [18, 19] can be used to evaluate various proposals for fault-tolerant quantum computations and guide physicists to propose reasonable experiments in quantum information and computation.

Quantum computer is a physical system described by quantum mechanics, i.e., its dynamics determined by the Hamiltonian in the Schrödinger equation. The focus of the present paper is to study the Hamiltonian model underlying quantum error correction code. In Kitaev's toric code [14], the Hamiltonian is a linear combination of elements of the stabilizer group, its degenerate ground state acts as quantum codes, and there is a gap between its ground state and its first excited state to protect these codes from environment noise. Subsequent to the toric code is topological quantum computing [14, 20, 21] in which anyons (quasiparticles obeying the braid statistics) are qubits and unitary braid representations act as quantum gates. In condensed matter physics, Abelian or non-Abelian anyons can be created in the fractional quantum Hall effect [22]. Recently, it is realized that encoding quantum information into a subsystem of a physical system is a most general method for protecting quantum information from decoherence, and this is summarized in operator quantum error correction [12, 23, 24]. Similar to the Hamiltonian model of the toric code, Bacon presents two examples for how to construct a Hamiltonian model for operator quantum error correction subsystem codes [25]. Remarkably, the Hamiltonian model of the toric code [26] on a four dimensional lattice and the Hamiltonian model of the subsystem code [25] on the three-dimensional cubic lattice may be theoretical candidates for self-correcting quantum memory where the robust storage of quantum information is guaranteed by physical properties of the system (i.e., the Hamiltonian and boundary conditions or topology). Besides Hamiltonian models for self-correcting quantum memory, fault-tolerant quantum computation can be also described by a physical system with time-dependent Hamiltonian [27, 28, 29]. In this paper, however, we will discuss quantum error correction code in a different Hamiltonian formalism from what have been introduced as above. We study quantum states themselves which represent a quantum error

correction code, rewrite them by a unitary transformation on the product basis and then derive the Hamiltonian to determine this unitary transformation. The stabilizer formalism is not involved in this time-independent Hamiltonian formulation. We will explain our motivation in detail and make simple examples in the paper.

In the literature, there have been presented many new kinds of quantum error correction approaches, for examples: nonadditive codes [30, 31, 32, 33, 34] beyond the stabilizer formalism, entanglement-assisted quantum error correction [35], topological color codes [36], subsystem codes [37, 38], channel-adapted codes [39, 40, 41], etc. But, creating new quantum error correction code is not the primary goal of this paper, whereas revisiting quantum error correction codes from a new point of view is our first point. Quantum error correction code is represented by a unitary basis transformation matrix from the product basis to the entangling basis in terms of quantum error correction code, and this explicitly shows the entanglement nature of quantum error correction codes (i.e., “fight entanglement with entanglement” by Preskill [15, 16]). A possible experiment realization of such a basis transformation matrix can be referred to [42]. We are only concerned about quantum error correction code itself instead of its underlying physical, informational, algebraic, graphical, topological, and geometrical mechanism. On the other hand, we will indeed articulate a new topic called “quantum error correction codes using Greenberger-Horne-Zeilinger (GHZ) states” which include as examples the Shor nine-qubit code [3], amplitude damping channel-adapted codes [39, 40, 41], and nonadditive codes [30, 41]. It is possible to invent a theoretical framework for devising quantum error correction codes using GHZ states based on recognizable properties of GHZ states. GHZ states [43, 44, 45] are usually assumed to be maximally entangled states in various entanglement measure theories [1, 2].

Though this paper deals with topics in quantum error correction, it is originally based on both observations and techniques in a series of recent papers [46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57]. These papers mainly study interdisciplinary themes arising from quantum information and computation, low dimensional topology [58], the Yang–Baxter equation [59, 60, 61] and (almost-complex) differential geometry. For examples: connections among quantum entanglements, topological entanglements and geometric entanglements as well as integrable quantum computation in terms of non-trivial unitary solutions of the Yang–Baxter equation are discussed in [46, 47, 48, 49]; a possible link between quantum error correction and topological quantum computing [53] can be set up via the Bell matrix which forms a unitary braid representation and acts as a unitary basis transformation matrix from the product basis to GHZ states. In the sense of quantum information and computation, these papers articulate integrable quantum computation using integrable models [48, 49, 59, 60, 61] which are constructed via solutions of the quantum Yang–Baxter equation (the Yang–Baxter equation with the spectral parameter), as well as topological-like (partial topological) quantum computation [55, 56, 57] which exploits low dimensional topology [58], unitary braid gates and non-braid gates. In this paper, the Hamiltonian formulation of quantum error correction code can also have an interpretation by a braiding operator and the corresponding Hamiltonian model can be recognized as an integrable model determined by a solution of the quantum Yang–Baxter equation. In Subsection 2.3, we will explain

more detail by recasting Shor's nine-qubit code as a product of the braid group elements.

We hereby summarize our main result which is new to our knowledge. 1) Quantum error correction code is described in the Hamiltonian formulation, and the unitary evolution operator at the specific time is a unitary basis transformation from the product basis to the entangling basis formed by quantum error correcting code. 2) In this Hamiltonian formulation, quantum error correction code can be described by a braiding operator and have a dynamical evolution even determined by a solution of the quantum Yang–Baxter equation. 3) Quantum error correction codes using GHZ states are analyzed as an independent topic for yielding new nonadditive codes or channel-adapted codes. The plan of this paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, with the helpful formalism of GHZ states, Shor's nine-qubit code is described in the Hamiltonian formulation and then explained in the language of the braid group. In Section 3, we study quantum error correction codes using GHZ states including generalized Shor's codes and comments on nonadditive codes and channel-adapted codes. In Section 4, we describe the perfect five-qubit code and Stean's seven-qubit code in our Hamiltonian formulation. Finally, we conclude this paper by remarking possible interesting problems for further research.

2 Notations, motivations and examples

Notations for most symbols in this paper are introduced, and an overview is made on physical, informational and mathematical properties of GHZ states. Hamiltonian formulations of Shor's nine-qubit code are explored in detail, so that our motivations for the Hamiltonian formulation of quantum error correction codes (without exploiting the stabilizer formalism) can be understood well. Besides, the original motivation takes root in our previous work [53] recasting GHZ states as unitary solutions of the Yang–Baxter equation (or the braid group relation).

2.1 Notations

In quantum information and computation [1, 2], a two dimensional Hilbert space \mathcal{H}_2 over the complex field \mathbb{C} is called a qubit, for example, $\alpha|0\rangle + \beta|1\rangle$, $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{C}$ where $|0\rangle$ and $|1\rangle$ form an orthonormal basis of $\mathcal{H}_2 \cong \mathbb{C}^2$ and are usually chosen as eigenvectors of the Pauli matrix operator Z : $Z|0\rangle = |0\rangle$ and $Z|1\rangle = -|1\rangle$. The Pauli matrices have the conventional forms,

$$X = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad Z = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad Y = ZX = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ -1 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \quad (1)$$

which denote the bit-flip, phase-flip, and bit-phase flip operation on a single qubit.

The symbol \mathbb{I}_2 denotes the 2-dimensional identity operator or $2 \otimes 2$ identity matrix. The notations $A^{\otimes n}$ and $|a\rangle^{\otimes n}$ denote the following n -fold tensor products,

$$A^{\otimes n} = \underbrace{A \otimes \cdots \otimes A}_n, \quad |a\rangle^{\otimes n} = \underbrace{|a\rangle \otimes \cdots \otimes |a\rangle}_n. \quad (2)$$

The n -fold tensor product in terms of the identity operator $\mathbb{1}_2$ and Pauli matrices X, Y, Z has a simpler notation in which the lower index of the Pauli matrix labels the position of this Pauli matrix in the tensor product, for example, $Z_1 Z_2$ and $X_4 X_5 X_6 X_7 X_8 X_9$ in the 9-fold tensor product describing the formulations

$$Z_1 Z_2 = Z \otimes Z \otimes (\mathbb{1}_2)^{\otimes 7}, \quad X_4 X_5 X_6 X_7 X_8 X_9 = (\mathbb{1}_2)^{\otimes 3} \otimes X^{\otimes 6}. \quad (3)$$

The symbols M and B are exploited in the entire paper. The M is an anti-Hermitian operator $M^\dagger = -M$ satisfying $M^2 = -Id$ with Id denoting the identity operator, and $B = e^{\frac{\pi}{4}M}$. But M and B will have different forms depending on sections or subsections where they appear. If M is a k -fold tensor product in terms of Pauli matrices X, Y, Z , then we introduce a notation for n -fold tensor products M_i by

$$M_i = (\mathbb{1}_2)^{\otimes i-1} \otimes M \otimes (\mathbb{1}_2)^{\otimes n-k-i+1}, \quad 1 \leq i \leq n+1-k \quad (4)$$

where the lower index of M_i can be relabeled for convenience. In [52, 53], the symbol M is called the *almost-complex structure* in the (almost-complex) differential geometry, and it can yield an anti-Hermitian representation of the extraspecial two-groups. As $B = e^{\frac{\pi}{4}M}$ is a solution of the Yang–Baxter equation [59, 60] and can generate a unitary braid representation π_n of the Artin braid group \mathcal{B}_n [58], it is called the *Bell matrix*, see [48, 49, 51, 52, 53]. Since unitary braids are used as quantum gates in topological quantum computing [14, 20, 21] and extraspecial two-groups are exploited in quantum error correction [9, 10], the formula $B = e^{\frac{\pi}{4}M}$ suggests there may exist a possible link between quantum error correction and topological quantum computing, which is the main proposal of our paper [53].

2.2 An overview on Greenberger-Horne-Zeilinger states

The GHZ states [43, 44, 45] are multipartite generalization of the bipartite maximally entangled Bell states, and are defined by various known entanglement measures as maximally entangled. They are found to play crucial roles in both fundamental problems and practical applications of quantum information theory. The Bell theorem [62] for incompatibility between quantum theory and classical deterministic local models is expressed in the form of inequalities (the Bell inequalities) among various statistical correlations, whereas the GHZ theorem [43, 44] asserts that the quantum correlations represented by the GHZ states allows us to describe the Bell theorem in terms of equalities and to test the expected incompatibility only by perfect correlations. The GHZ states are the simplest multipartite maximally entanglement sources, and have been widely exploited in the study of quantum information theory, for examples, multiparty quantum key distributions [63] and quantum teleportation [64]. Besides, GHZ states are often called *cat states* acting as ancillas in fault-tolerant quantum computation [13, 15, 16, 17].

Besides the fundamental importance of GHZ states in quantum physics and information, they have been found to possess (beautiful and deep) topological, algebraic and geometric properties. Aravind [46] observed that there are similarities between the GHZ

states and knot configurations [58], by identifying the measurement of a specific state of a particle with cutting the corresponding link component. Furthermore, we describe GHZ states by the Bell matrix $B = e^{\frac{\pi}{4}M}$ which has become a common topic among quantum error correction, topological quantum computing, the braid group, the Yang–Baxter equation, and (almost-complex) differential geometry [47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53]. The GHZ states of n -qubit are defined to have the form,

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|s\rangle \pm |\bar{s}\rangle), \quad s = i_1 i_2 \cdots i_n, \quad \bar{s} = \bar{i}_1 \bar{i}_2 \cdots \bar{i}_n \quad (5)$$

where $i_j = 0, 1$, $j = 1, \dots, n$ and $i_j + \bar{i}_j = 1$ with the Abelian addition modulo 2. In [53], the GHZ states of the n -qubit are generated by the exponential function $B = e^{\frac{\pi}{4}M}$ acting on the product basis, for example,

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|0\rangle^{\otimes n} + |1\rangle^{\otimes n}) = B|0\rangle^{\otimes n}, \quad \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|0\rangle^{\otimes n} - |1\rangle^{\otimes n}) = B^{-1}|0\rangle^{\otimes n}, \quad (6)$$

where $M = -Y \otimes X^{\otimes n}$ and $B^{-1} = e^{-\frac{\pi}{4}M}$ denotes the inverse of the B matrix. Note that $B = e^{\frac{\pi}{4}M}$ is called the Bell matrix only if it forms a unitary solution of the Yang–Baxter equation [59, 60] (or a unitary braid representation [58]).

2.3 Hamiltonian formulation of Shor’s nine-qubit code

The first quantum error correction code was proposed by Shor [3], and it describes a logical qubit state in terms of nine-qubit states in the way

$$\begin{aligned} |0\rangle &\rightarrow |0\rangle_L = \frac{1}{2\sqrt{2}}(|000\rangle + |111\rangle) \otimes (|000\rangle + |111\rangle) \otimes (|000\rangle + |111\rangle), \\ |1\rangle &\rightarrow |1\rangle_L = \frac{1}{2\sqrt{2}}(|000\rangle - |111\rangle) \otimes (|000\rangle - |111\rangle) \otimes (|000\rangle - |111\rangle) \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

where two GHZ states $\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|000\rangle \pm |111\rangle)$ are repeatedly used and hence Shor’s code is also called the repetition code. In the stabilizer formalism [11] for additive quantum error correction codes, the encoded logical qubit $\alpha|0\rangle_L + \beta|1\rangle_L$, $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{C}$ is uniquely determined to be a common eigenvector with the eigenvalue 1 of the following eight stabilizer operators,

$$Z_1 Z_2, Z_2 Z_3, Z_4 Z_5, Z_5 Z_6, Z_7 Z_8, Z_8 Z_9, X_1 X_2 X_3 X_4 X_5 X_6, X_4 X_5 X_6 X_7 X_8 X_9 \quad (8)$$

which form an Abelian group called the stabilizer group. The logical bit-flip operation \bar{X} and logical phase-flip operation \bar{Z} usually have the form

$$\bar{X} = Z^{\otimes 9}, \quad \bar{Z} = X^{\otimes 9}. \quad (9)$$

In this and the next subsections, we firstly describe Shor’s nine-qubit code in our Hamiltonian formulation and then present an interpretation in the language of the

braid group. Denote the symbol M by $M = -Y \otimes Y \otimes Y$ in this subsection. It is a transition operator between $|000\rangle$ and $|111\rangle$,

$$M|000\rangle = |111\rangle, \quad M|111\rangle = -|000\rangle \quad (10)$$

due to $-Y|0\rangle = |1\rangle$ and $-Y|1\rangle = -|0\rangle$, and it is an anti-Hermitian operator $M^\dagger = -M$ determining $e^{\frac{\pi}{4}M}$ to be a unitary operator,

$$e^{\frac{\pi}{4}M} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(\mathbb{1}_2^{\otimes 3} + M), \quad M^2 = -\mathbb{1}_2^{\otimes 3}. \quad (11)$$

Furthermore, introduce M_1, M_4, M_7 as

$$M_1 = M \otimes \mathbb{1}_2^{\otimes 6}, \quad M_4 = \mathbb{1}_2^{\otimes 3} \otimes M \otimes \mathbb{1}_2^{\otimes 3}, \quad M_7 = \mathbb{1}_2^{\otimes 6} \otimes M \quad (12)$$

and denote the summation of M_1, M_4, M_7 by $M_t = M_1 + M_4 + M_7$. After some simple algebra, the Shor nine-qubit code has a new compact formulation,

$$|0\rangle_L = e^{\frac{\pi}{4}M_t}|0\rangle^{\otimes 9}, \quad |1\rangle_L = e^{-\frac{\pi}{4}M_t}|0\rangle^{\otimes 9} \quad (13)$$

which derives the bit-phase flip operation \bar{Y} on the encoded qubit by $|0\rangle_L$ and $|1\rangle_L$,

$$|0\rangle_L = e^{\frac{\pi}{2}M_t}|1\rangle_L, \quad |1\rangle_L = e^{-\frac{\pi}{2}M_t}|0\rangle_L. \quad (14)$$

Namely, \bar{Y} has the form

$$\bar{Y} = e^{\frac{\pi}{2}M_t} = M_1 M_4 M_7 = -Y^{\otimes 9} \quad (15)$$

where the minus sign in the front of $Y^{\otimes 9}$ partly explains the reason why in the literature the logical bit-flip operator \bar{X} and the logical phase-flip operator \bar{Z} have the formulation given by (9) because of $\bar{Y} = \bar{Z}\bar{X}$ and $XZ = -ZX$.

Now let us associate the formulation (14) of the Shor nine-qubit code with the Hamiltonian defined by $H = iM_t$. A logical qubit basis, $|0\rangle_L$ and $|1\rangle_L$, are explained as unitary evolutions of the product basis state $|0\rangle^{\otimes 9}$ (or $|1\rangle^{\otimes 9}$) with the unitary evolution operator $U(\theta) = e^{-i\theta H}$ determined by the Hamiltonian H , namely,

$$|0\rangle_L = U\left(\frac{\pi}{4}\right)|0\rangle^{\otimes 9}, \quad |1\rangle_L = U\left(-\frac{\pi}{4}\right)|0\rangle^{\otimes 9} = -U\left(\frac{\pi}{4}\right)|1\rangle^{\otimes 9} \quad (16)$$

which leads that the encoded qubit $\alpha|0\rangle_L + \beta|1\rangle_L$ has a form

$$\alpha|0\rangle_L + \beta|1\rangle_L = U\left(\frac{\pi}{4}\right)(\alpha|0\rangle^{\otimes 9} - \beta|1\rangle^{\otimes 9}), \quad \alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{C}. \quad (17)$$

The Schrödinger equation with the unitary evolutional solution $U(\theta)$ will have the following form,

$$i\frac{\partial}{\partial\theta}\psi(\theta) = H\psi(\theta), \quad H = -i(Y_1Y_2Y_3 + Y_4Y_5Y_6 + Y_7Y_8Y_9) \quad (18)$$

where the Planck constant $\hbar = 1$, θ is regarded as the time variable and $\psi(\theta)$ represents the wave function in quantum mechanics. The three-body spatially local Hamiltonian H can be simulated on various lattice models but all of which can be equivalent to the one-dimensional spin chain because only the Y operation is involved in this Hamiltonian.

In the above Hamiltonian formulation, obviously, Shor's nine-qubit code is not the eigenvector of the Hamiltonian H and is not its ground state. This is essentially different from Hamiltonian models [14][25] respectively for the toric code and subsystem code which are constructed with the help of the stabilizer formalism. In spite of this fact, we expect our Hamiltonian formulation to be helpful for exploring the topics of how to encode and decode Shor's code, how to perform the fault-tolerant quantum computation with Shor's code and especially how to construct Hamiltonian model of nonadditive code which does not have an interpretation in the standard stabilizer formalism. In the next subsection, furthermore, we will recast the Shor nine-qubit code as a braiding operator to explain our motivation for the Hamiltonian formulation from the different point of view.

2.4 Artin braid group, Yang–Baxter equation and Shor's code

The Artin braid group \mathcal{B}_n [58] has the generators σ_i , $i = 1, \dots, n-1$ satisfying the the braid group relations 1) and commutative relations 2):

$$1) \sigma_i \sigma_{i+1} \sigma_i = \sigma_{i+1} \sigma_i \sigma_i, \quad 2) \sigma_i \sigma_j = \sigma_j \sigma_i, \quad |i-j| > 1. \quad (19)$$

In terms of the identity matrix $\mathbb{1}_2$ and a k -fold tensor product M involving Pauli matrices, a unitary braid representation π_n of the Artin braid group \mathcal{B}_n can be constructed in the way,

$$B_i \equiv \pi_n(\sigma_i) = (\mathbb{1}_2)^{\otimes i-1} \otimes e^{\frac{\pi}{4}M} \otimes (\mathbb{1}_2)^{\otimes n-k-i+1}, \quad 1 \leq i \leq n+1-k. \quad (20)$$

where $e^{\frac{\pi}{4}M}$ satisfies the Yang–Baxter equation [59, 60, 53],

$$(G \otimes Id)(Id \otimes G)(G \otimes Id) = (Id \otimes G)(G \otimes Id)(Id \otimes G), \quad (21)$$

where $G = e^{\frac{\pi}{4}M}$ and $Id = \mathbb{1}_2$ and which is a presentation of the braid group relation $\sigma_i \sigma_{i+1} \sigma_i = \sigma_{i+1} \sigma_i \sigma_i$, see [53] for more details. Besides, the quantum Yang–Baxter equation is defined as the Yang–Baxter equation with the spectral parameter,

$$(G(x) \otimes Id)(Id \otimes G(xy))(G(y) \otimes Id) = (Id \otimes G(y))(G(xy) \otimes Id)(Id \otimes G(x)), \quad (22)$$

where x, y are the spectral parameter and which can be referred to our previous papers [48, 49, 51, 52, 53]. It is well known that in the literature an integrable model can be constructed using a solution of the quantum Yang–Baxter equation, see [61].

In Figure 1, the diagram without boxes around crossings is a diagrammatic representation of the Yang–Baxter equation (21) or (22) in which different strands are allowed to represent Hilbert spaces of different dimensions, for example, thin strands acting on \mathcal{H}_2 (i.e., a qubit) and thick strands acting on the tensor product of \mathcal{H}_2 (i.e., at




Figure 1: Yang–Baxter equation and quantum circuits

least two qubits). On the other hand, $G = e^{\frac{\pi}{4}M}$ can be explained as a universal quantum gate [65, 47] which transforms a separate state to a maximally entangled state, for examples, GHZ state. The diagram with boxes is hence regarded as a diagrammatical identity between two quantum circuits where universal quantum gates are labeled by boxes with inputs and outputs. In other words, we are presenting two sorts of interpretations on the same diagrammatical object: the one is the Yang–Baxter equation (or the braid group relation) [58, 59, 60, 61] and the other is quantum information and computation [1, 2]. We are trying to build a bridge between quantum information theory and Yang–Baxter equation (or low dimensional topology), which is the underlying motivation of a series of papers [48, 49, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57]. For examples, we have recognized *Werner states* [66] as a sort of rational solutions of the quantum Yang–Baxter equation [54]; in the formulation of GHZ states [52, 53], found mathematical structures including unitary braid representations, extraspecial two-groups and almost-complex structure; described quantum teleportation protocol [64] by the braiding configuration [55, 56]; and recast quantum information protocols involving maximally bipartite entangled states as the extended Temperley–Lieb diagrammatical configuration [55, 56, 57]. In the following, we refine the braid group relation from our Hamiltonian formulation of the Shor nine-qubit code.

Choose M to be the form $M = -Y \otimes X \otimes X$ and define the unitary braid representations B_1, B_4, B_7 by

$$B_1 = e^{\frac{\pi}{4}M} \otimes \mathbb{1}_2^{\otimes 6}, \quad B_4 = \mathbb{1}_2^{\otimes 3} \otimes e^{\frac{\pi}{4}M} \otimes \mathbb{1}_2^{\otimes 3}, \quad B_7 = \mathbb{1}_2^{\otimes 6} \otimes e^{\frac{\pi}{4}M}, \quad (23)$$

and then rewrite Shor’s nine-qubit code into the other compact formulation

$$|0\rangle_L = B_1 B_4 B_7 |0\rangle^{\otimes 9}, \quad |1\rangle_L = B_1^{-1} B_4^{-1} B_7^{-1} |0\rangle^{\otimes 9}. \quad (24)$$

The B_1, B_4, B_7 are presentations of the braid group generators, and have a diagrammatic representation, see Figure 2. Every straight strand denotes a two-dimensional Hilbert space \mathcal{H}_2 (i.e., a qubit), and the crossing denotes $e^{\frac{\pi}{4}M}$ and acts on $\mathcal{H}_2^{\otimes 3}$. For convenience, we can assign \mathcal{H}_2 to the first strand of the crossing and $\mathcal{H}_2^{\otimes 2}$ to the second strand. Therefore, we can read the Shor nine-qubit code from the braiding configuration as a product of three braids B_1, B_4, B_7 .




Figure 2: Artin braid group generators for Shor's nine-qubit code

On the other hand, in terms of $M_t = M_1 + M_4 + M_7$ where M_1, M_4, M_7 have a form exploited in the literature on quantum error correction codes, see (3),

$$M_1 = -Y_1 X_2 X_3, \quad M_4 = -Y_4 X_5 X_6, \quad M_7 = -Y_7 X_8 X_9, \quad (25)$$

we obtain the other Hamiltonian formulation of Shor's code similar to (14) but the logical bit-phase flip operation \bar{Y} is given by

$$\bar{Y} = -Y_1 X_2 X_3 Y_4 X_5 X_6 Y_7 X_8 X_9. \quad (26)$$

In view of our previous work on integrable quantum computation with unitary solutions of the quantum Yang–Baxter equation [48, 49, 51, 52, 53], the unitary evolution operator $U(\theta) = e^{-i\theta H}$ with $H = iM_t$ is a solution of the quantum Yang–Baxter equation (22) with the spectral parameter θ , and hence the corresponding Hamiltonian model is an integrable model determined by the solution of the quantum Yang–Baxter equation [59, 60, 61].

As a remark about the unitary braiding description of Shor's nine-qubit code, it provides an interesting example for our observation [53] that there exists a possible link between quantum error correction and topological quantum computing via the unitary braid representation using anti-Hermitian representation of extraspecial two-groups. Besides, it is possible to make connections between our work and the geometric paradigm of Shor's code [67].

3 Quantum error correction codes using GHZ states

Quantum error correction codes using GHZ states are defined as those codes in terms of GHZ states or tensor products of GHZ states, while *generalized Shor's codes using GHZ states* are specified to be *repetition codes* as a straightforward generalization of the Shor nine-qubit code, i.e., only involving GHZ states of the type, $1/\sqrt{2}(|0\rangle^{\otimes n} \pm |1\rangle^{\otimes n})$. They are degenerate quantum error correction codes in which different errors may be corrected by the same correction operation. Besides the Shor nine-qubit code, some nonadditive codes [30, 41] and channel-adapted codes [39, 40, 41] are good examples for quantum error correction codes using GHZ states. The motivation for our articulation of this topic is based on the observation that GHZ states have nontrivial physical,

informational, and mathematical properties (see our overview on GHZ states in Subsection 2.2) and these properties are expected to be very helpful in the construction of interesting quantum error correction codes using GHZ states.

In the literature, the triple $[n, k, d]$ of natural numbers represents a quantum error correction code [4] which is a unitary mapping \mathcal{Q} from $\mathcal{H}_2^{\otimes k}$ to $\mathcal{H}_2^{\otimes n}$ ($k \leq n$) and encodes information of k -qubit quantum states into n -qubit quantum states in order to detect and correct t -qubit errors, where $t = \frac{d-2}{2}$ for d even and $t = \frac{d-1}{2}$ for d odd. Quantum states in this 2^k -dimensional subspace $\mathcal{QH}_2^{\otimes k}$ are called *codewords*. For example, Shor's nine-qubit code is usually denoted by $[9, 1, 3]$ and it can correct any single-qubit errors, and the logical qubit $\alpha|0\rangle_L + \beta|1\rangle_L$, $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{C}$ represents a codeword in Shor's code.

In this section, for simplicity, we denote quantum error correction codes $[n, k, d]$ by $[n, k]$, and focus on whether or not they are able to correct arbitrary single-qubit errors, i.e., $t = 1$. For example, the Shor code is denoted by $[9, 1]$. Note that we emphasize our perspectives of constructing quantum error correction codes using GHZ states and describe them in our Hamiltonian formulation, but leave the systematic construction of procedures for encoding, error syndrome measurement, error correction and decoding of these codes elsewhere.

3.1 Generalized Shor's codes using GHZ states

First of all, we introduce symbols and names necessary for constructing generalized Shor's codes using GHZ states. The *type* of a GHZ state $\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|s\rangle \pm |\bar{s}\rangle)$ (5) is specified by the number of its qubits and the sign \pm . Generalized Shor's codes exploit different types of GHZ states to encode one qubit into codewords of N -qubit. The same GHZ states form a *block* in the codeword, and different blocks correspond to orthogonal subspaces of $\mathcal{H}_2^{\otimes N}$. The symbol I is the number counting types of GHZ states (or the number of blocks) in the codeword; i denotes the i -th type of GHZ state (or i -th block) in the codeword, $i = 1, \dots, I$; q_i counts the number of qubits in the i -th type of GHZ state; n_i is the repetition number of the i -th type of GHZ state in the i -th block of the codeword; $B = \sum_{i=1}^I n_i$ counts the number of GHZ states in a codeword; $N = \sum_{i=1}^I n_i q_i$ is the total number of qubits in the codeword.

For example, the Shor nine-qubit code exploits GHZ states of three-qubit and repeatedly use them three times in a codeword: $I = 1$, $q_1 = 3$, $n_1 = 3$, $B = 3$ and $N = 9$. On the other hand, $B = 3$ is the number counting all phase-flip single-qubit errors (i.e., Z -errors), and $2N = 18$ counts all bit-flip and phase-flip errors (i.e., X -errors and Y -errors). Hence Shor's code satisfies the quantum Hamming bound condition,

$$2^t(1 + B + 2N) \leq 2^N \quad (27)$$

where $t = 1$, and it suggests the Shor code as a degenerate code and able to correct some two-qubit errors. Now let us discuss the application of the above bound inequality at $t = 1$. Obviously, the lowest bound for N has to be $N \geq 5$.

At $N = 5$, we can either construct a logical qubit using GHZ states of five-qubit,

$$|0\rangle_L = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|0\rangle^{\otimes 5} + |1\rangle^{\otimes 5}), \quad |1\rangle_L = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|0\rangle^{\otimes 5} - |1\rangle^{\otimes 5}) \quad (28)$$

where $B = 1$, $n_1 = 1$ and $q_1 = 5$, or have a logical qubit in terms of Bell states (i.e., GHZ states of two-qubit) and GHZ states of three-qubit,

$$|0\rangle_L = \frac{1}{2}(|0\rangle^{\otimes 2} + |1\rangle^{\otimes 2})(|0\rangle^{\otimes 3} + |1\rangle^{\otimes 3}), \quad |1\rangle_L = \frac{1}{2}(|0\rangle^{\otimes 2} - |1\rangle^{\otimes 2})(|0\rangle^{\otimes 3} - |1\rangle^{\otimes 3}) \quad (29)$$

where $B = 2$, $n_1 = n_2 = 1$, $q_1 = 1$ and $q_2 = 1$.

At $N = 6$, we can construct a logical qubit in terms of GHZ states of six-qubit (or four-qubit or three-qubit) or Bell states, for examples,

$$\begin{aligned} |0\rangle_L &= \frac{1}{2\sqrt{2}}(|0\rangle^{\otimes 2} + |1\rangle^{\otimes 2})(|0\rangle^{\otimes 2} + |1\rangle^{\otimes 2})(|0\rangle^{\otimes 2} + |1\rangle^{\otimes 2}), \\ |1\rangle_L &= \frac{1}{2\sqrt{2}}(|0\rangle^{\otimes 2} - |1\rangle^{\otimes 2})(|0\rangle^{\otimes 2} - |1\rangle^{\otimes 2})(|0\rangle^{\otimes 2} - |1\rangle^{\otimes 2}). \end{aligned} \quad (30)$$

where $B = 3$, $n_1 = 3$ and $q_1 = 3$.

In view of the Hamiltonian formulation of the Shor nine-qubit code, generalized Shor's codes have the following Hamiltonian formulation,

$$|0\rangle_L = e^{\frac{\pi}{4} \sum_{i=1}^I M_t^{(i)}} |0\rangle^{\otimes N}, \quad |1\rangle_L = e^{-\frac{\pi}{4} \sum_{i=1}^I M_t^{(i)}} |0\rangle^{\otimes N} \quad (31)$$

where the Hamiltonian $H^{(i)} = \sqrt{-1} M_t^{(i)}$ determines how to yield the i -th type of GHZ state in the i -th block of the codeword and has the form

$$H^{(i)} = \sqrt{-1} \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} M_j^{(i)}. \quad (32)$$

Different $M_j^{(i)}$ are commutative with each other because the corresponding subspace of each type of GHZ state in the codeword is orthogonal with those for other types. Note that the lower indices of $M_j^{(i)}$ are different from those exploited in the Hamiltonian formations of the Shor nine-qubit code in Subsections 2.3 and 2.4.

Note on a link between the cat code $[n, 1]$ and quantum error correction codes using GHZ states. The cat code $[n, 1]$ has the form $|0\rangle_L = |0\rangle^{\otimes n}$ and $|1\rangle_L = |1\rangle^{\otimes n}$ leading to

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|0\rangle_L \pm |1\rangle_L) = e^{\pm \frac{\pi}{4} M} |0\rangle_L, \quad |0\rangle_L + |1\rangle_L = M(|0\rangle_L - |1\rangle_L) \quad (33)$$

in which M can take a form $M = -Y \otimes X^{\otimes n}$ or other possible forms. Also, it is interesting to compare generalized Shor's codes using GHZ states with generalized Shor's subsystem codes [37], because they are constructed under completely different motivations and terminologies.

3.2 Comments on channel-adapted codes and nonadditive codes

As has been shown in Subsection 2.2, GHZ states are maximally entangled multipartite quantum states and possess (simple and deep) algebraic, topological and geometric

properties. These properties have been used to explore connections among quantum information and computation, the Yang–Baxter equation, low dimensional topology and differential geometry, see [53]. On the other hand, GHZ states have been exploited to yield quantum error correction codes [30, 39, 40, 41]. Some of them [39, 40] can be described in the stabilizer formalism, i.e., additive codes, but many of them [30, 41] are nonadditive codes which do not have classical analogues and do not satisfy the quantum Hamming bound (27). Note that nonadditive codes using GHZ states are called self-complementary codes in [30, 41]. These codes using GHZ states (either additive or nonadditive) are also channel-adapted quantum error correction for the amplitude damping channel [39, 40, 41]. However, it remains an open problem how to create nonadditive codes using GHZ states in a unified theoretical framework, though interesting examples have been found. We suggest that algebraic (or topological or geometrical) properties of GHZ states [53] can be helpful for solving this problem. This is the motivation for our articulating quantum error correction codes using GHZ states.

As examples, we analyze two codes [39, 40] devised for the amplitude damping channel in our Hamiltonian formalism. They may be helpful for seeking the theoretical framework underlying nonadditive codes using GHZ states. The first one is the code [4, 1] in [39] having a logical qubit spanned by

$$|0\rangle_L = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|0000\rangle + |1111\rangle), \quad |1\rangle_L = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|0011\rangle + |1100\rangle). \quad (34)$$

This code can be rewritten as the unitary basis transformation $e^{-i\frac{\pi}{4}H}$,

$$(|0\rangle_L, |1\rangle_L) = e^{-i\frac{\pi}{4}H}(|0000\rangle, |0011\rangle) \quad (35)$$

where $iH = Y \otimes X^{\otimes 3}$ is called the almost-complex structure and the Bell matrix $B = e^{-i\frac{\pi}{4}H}$ forms a unitary braid representation, see [53]. Note that the Bell matrix B can generate all the GHZ states of four-qubit from the product basis, i.e., it has all the information of GHZ states of four-qubit. In this sense, the Hamiltonian formulation of the code [4, 1] suggests that it appears to work only with two GHZ states of four-qubit but in fact it involves all other GHZ states of four-qubit through the Bell matrix B . This may be one of the reasons why it violates the quantum Hamming bound (27) but works well for the amplitude-damping channel. The second example is the code [6, 2] which has the form in the Hamiltonian formulation,

$$(|00\rangle_L, |01\rangle_L, |10\rangle_L, |11\rangle_L) = e^{-i\frac{\pi}{4}H}(|000000\rangle, |001001\rangle, |000110\rangle, |110000\rangle), \quad (36)$$

where $H = -iY \otimes X^{\otimes 5}$. A similar analysis can be made: the unitary evolution operator $e^{-i\frac{\pi}{4}H}$ has the information of all GHZ states of six-qubit and hence the code [6, 2] actually encodes two-qubit information into the entire Hilbert space spanned by 2^6 GHZ basis instead of its four-dimensional subspace. In this sense, we may understand why a 12-dimensional subspace can be encoded into the GHZ states of 8-qubit and protected by a nonadditive code [41].

Furthermore, we discuss how to protect one-dimensional space by quantum error correction codes using GHZ states. The quantum Hamming bound condition (27) at

$t = 0$ has a perfect solution in terms of $B = 1$, $N = 3$ saturating the bound, i.e., $(1 + 1 + 2 \times 3) \leq 2^3$. Let us encode the one-dimensional space $|\psi\rangle$ using a GHZ state of three-qubit,

$$|\psi\rangle_L = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|000\rangle + |111\rangle) = e^{-i\frac{\pi}{4}H}|0\rangle^{\otimes 3}, \quad H = -iY \otimes Y \otimes Y. \quad (37)$$

There are three bit-flip errors, one phase-flip errors and three bit-phase flip errors giving rise to the other seven GHZ states of three-qubit,

$$X_1|\psi\rangle_L, X_2|\psi\rangle_L, X_3|\psi\rangle_L, Z_1|\psi\rangle_L, Z_1X_1|\psi\rangle_L, Z_2X_2|\psi\rangle_L, Z_3X_3|\psi\rangle_L, \quad (38)$$

which form an orthonormal basis of $\mathcal{H}_2^{\otimes 3}$ together with $|\psi\rangle_L$. They can be recast in the following Hamiltonian formulation

$$\begin{aligned} & (Id, X_1, X_2, X_3, Z_1, Z_1X_1, Z_2X_2, Z_3X_3)|\psi\rangle_L \\ & = e^{-i\frac{\pi}{4}H}(|000\rangle, |011\rangle, |110\rangle, -|111\rangle, -|100\rangle, -|010\rangle, -|001\rangle) \end{aligned} \quad (39)$$

where four minus signs can be absorbed by rescaling the phase flip Z -error by minus Z -error. Besides, here we can exploit the standard procedures of encoding, error syndrome measurement, correcting and decoding devised for the stabilizer codes [11].

4 More codes in the Hamiltonian formalism

In the above sections, we have described quantum error correction codes using GHZ states in the Hamiltonian formulation mainly with the help of algebraic properties of GHZ states. Based on the entanglement nature of quantum error correction codes, it is possible in principle to rewrite other codes which do not use GHZ states into our Hamiltonian formulation. In this section, we study the Hamiltonian formulations of the perfect five-qubit code [7, 8] and Steane's seven-qubit code [5, 6], as heuristic examples.

4.1 Five-qubit code in the Hamiltonian formalism

The five-qubit quantum error correcting code saturates the quantum Hamming bound, and its logical qubit is defined in the way [2],

$$\begin{aligned} |0\rangle_L &= \frac{1}{4}(Id + M'_1)(Id + M'_2)(Id + M'_3)(Id + M'_4)|0\rangle^{\otimes 5}, \\ |1\rangle_L &= \frac{1}{4}(Id + M'_1)(Id + M'_2)(Id + M'_3)(Id + M'_4)|1\rangle^{\otimes 5} \end{aligned} \quad (40)$$

where M'_1, M'_2, M'_3 and M'_4 take the form

$$\begin{aligned} M'_1 &= Z_1X_2X_3Z_4, & M'_2 &= Z_0Z_2X_3X_4, \\ M'_3 &= X_0Z_1Z_3X_4, & M'_4 &= X_0X_1Z_2Z_4. \end{aligned} \quad (41)$$

In terms of four anti-Hermitian commutative operators M_1, M_2, M_3, M_4 respectively having the square to be a minus identity operator,

$$\begin{aligned} M_1 &= -Z_1 Y_2 X_3 Z_4, & M_2 &= -Z_0 Z_2 X_3 Y_4, \\ M_3 &= -X_0 Z_1 Z_3 Y_4, & M_4 &= -X_0 Y_1 Z_2 Z_4, \end{aligned} \quad (42)$$

the perfect five-qubit code has the Hamiltonian formulation

$$|0\rangle_L = e^{-i\frac{\pi}{4}H}|0\rangle^{\otimes 5}, \quad |1\rangle_L = e^{-i\frac{\pi}{4}H}|1\rangle^{\otimes 5}, \quad (43)$$

where the Hamiltonian has the form $H = i(M_1 + M_2 + M_3 + M_4)$.

4.2 Steane's seven-qubit code in the Hamiltonian formalism

The Steane's seven-qubit code encodes one qubit into codewords of seven-qubit instead of five-qubit, but this code seems to much more interesting in the present fault-tolerant quantum computation [15, 16]. Its logical qubit has the form [2],

$$\begin{aligned} |0\rangle_L &= \frac{1}{2\sqrt{2}}(1 + M'_1)(1 + M'_2)(1 + M'_3)|0\rangle^{\otimes 7}, \\ |1\rangle_L &= \frac{1}{2\sqrt{2}}(1 + M'_1)(1 + M'_2)(1 + M'_3)|1\rangle^{\otimes 7}, \end{aligned} \quad (44)$$

where M'_1, M'_2 and M'_3 have the form

$$M'_1 = X_0 X_4 X_5 X_6, \quad M'_2 = X_1 X_3 X_5 X_6, \quad M'_3 = X_2 X_3 X_4 X_6. \quad (45)$$

Similarly to our recipe on the five-qubit code, we introduce

$$M_1 = -Y_0 X_4 X_5 X_6, \quad M_2 = -Y_1 X_3 X_5 X_6, \quad M_3 = -Y_2 X_3 X_4 X_6. \quad (46)$$

which are commutative with each other and are anti-Hermitian operators with the square as minus identity operator. Hence we recast the Steane seven-qubit code in the Hamiltonian formulation

$$|0\rangle_L = e^{-i\frac{\pi}{4}H}|0\rangle^{\otimes 7}, \quad |1\rangle_L = e^{-i\frac{\pi}{4}H}|1\rangle^{\otimes 7}, \quad (47)$$

where the Hamiltonian has the form $H = i(M_1 + M_2 + M_3)$.

As a remark, the Hamiltonians for Shor's nine-qubit represent three-body spatially local interaction, whereas Hamiltonians for the perfect five-qubit code and Steane's seven-qubit code involve nearest and next-nearest-neighbor interaction.

5 Concluding remarks and outlook

Motivated by the problem how to construct a Hamiltonian model for nonadditive quantum error correction code, we suggest a new Hamiltonian formulation of quantum error

correction code without appealing to its stabilizer formalism (if it exists). In this formulation, the unitary evolution operator at a specific time is a unitary basis transformation matrix from the product basis to the quantum error correction code, and we explain this by studying examples including Shor's nine-qubit code, Steane's seven-qubit code and the perfect five-qubit code. Remarkably, as this basis transformation matrix is a solution of the Yang–Baxter equation, the corresponding quantum error correction code can be explained as a braiding operator and the Hamiltonian model is an integrable model determined by the solution of the quantum Yang–Baxter equation. On the other hand, we articulate the topic called quantum error correction codes using GHZ states in which new nonadditive codes and channel-adapted codes may be constructed with the help of beautiful properties of GHZ states.

There still remain many interesting problems about our work in this paper. 1) Devise a theoretical framework for describing quantum error correction codes in the Hamiltonian formulation without involving the stabilizer formalism. Our typical examples are actually based on algebraic properties of GHZ states. 2) Study physical properties of these Hamiltonian models and explore their applications to quantum error correction. As a comparison, quantum error correction code in the Hamiltonian model based on the stabilizer formalism is its degenerate ground state and there is a gap between this ground state and its first excited state. 3) Study experimental realizations of these Hamiltonian models on optical lattices or atomic spin lattices [68, 69]. The unitary basis transformation from the product basis to GHZ states can be experimentally performed in view of the work [42]. 4) Study applications of these Hamiltonian models to develop the theoretical framework of integrable quantum computation or topological-like quantum computation. Note that unitary evolution operator in the Hamiltonian model for a quantum error correction code using GHZ states can be chosen to be a solution of the quantum Yang–Baxter equation. 5) About quantum error correction codes using GHZ states, there are at least three types of questions to be answered: devise a general framework for producing nonadditive codes; study quantum circuits for encoding, error correction and decoding; explore fault-tolerant quantum computation with the help of properties of GHZ states, for example, channel-adapted fault-tolerant quantum computation for the amplitude damping channel.

Acknowledgements

The author thanks Yong-Shi Wu for support, thanks Peter W. Shor for helpful comment, and he is in part supported by the seed funding of University of Utah and NSF-China Grant-10605035.

He was a participant in First International Conference on Quantum Error Correction (University of Southern California, Los Angeles, USA, Dec. 17-21, 2007), and thanks Dave Bacon and John Preskill for a relevant discussion.

References

- [1] M. Nielsen and I. Chuang, *Quantum Computation and Quantum Information* (Cambridge University Press, 1999).
- [2] N.D. Mermin, *Quantum Computer Science* (Cambridge University Press, 2007).
- [3] P.W. Shor, *Schemes for Reducing Decoherence in Quantum Memory*, Phys. Rev. A **52**(1995) 2493.
- [4] A. Calderbank and P.W. Shor, *Good Quantum Error-Correcting Code Exist*, Phys. Rev. A **54** (1996) 1098-1105.
- [5] A. M. Steane, *Error Correcting Codes in Quantum Theory*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **77** (1996) 793.
- [6] A.M. Steane, *Multiple Particle Interference and Quantum Error Correction*, Proc. Roy. Soc. of London A **452** (1996) 2551-2577.
- [7] C.H. Bennett, D.P. DiVincenzo, J.A. Smolin, and W.K. Wothers, *Mixed State Entanglement and Quantum Error Correction*, Phys. Rev. A, **54** (1996) 3824.
- [8] R. Laflamme, C. Miquel, J.-P. Paz, and W.H. Zurek, *Perfect Quantum Error Correction Code*, Phys. Rev. Lett., **77** (1996) 198.
- [9] A. Calderbank, E. Rains, P.W. Shor and N. Sloane, *Quantum Error Correction and Orthogonal Geometry*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **78** (1997) 405.
- [10] A. Calderbank, E. Rains, P.W. Shor and N. Sloane, *Quantum Error Correction via Codes over $GF(4)$* , IEEE Transactions on Information Theory, **44**(4) (1998) 1369.
- [11] D. Gottesman, *Stablizer Codes and Quantum Error Correction*, Ph.D. Thesis, Caltech, 1997.
- [12] E. Knill and R. Laflamme, *A Theory of Quantum Error-Correcting Codes*, Phys. Rev. A (55) (1997) 900.
- [13] P.W. Shor, *Fault-tolerant Quantum Computation*. In *Proceedings, 37th Annual Symposium on the Foundations of Computer Science*, pp. 56-65, IEEE Press, Los Alamitos, CA, 1996.
- [14] A. Kitaev, *Fault-tolerant Quantum Computation by Anyons*, Ann. Phys. **303** (2003) 2. Arxiv: quant-ph/9712048.
- [15] J. Preskill, *Fault-tolerant Quantum Computation*. Arxiv: quant-ph/9712048.
- [16] J. Preskill, *Reliable Quantum Computers*, Proc. R. Soc. London A **454** (1998) 385-410.

- [17] E. Knill, R. Laflamme, and W.H. Zurek, *Resilient Quantum Computation: Error Models and Thresholds*, Proc. R. Soc. London A, **454** (1998) 365-384.
- [18] D. Aharonov and M. Ben-Or, *Fault Tolerant Computation with Constant Error*, in *Proceedings of the Twenty-Ninth Annual ACM Symposium on the Theory of Computing*, pp. 176-188, 1997.
- [19] D. Aharonov, *Noisy Quantum Computation*, Ph.D. Thesis, The Hebrew University, Jerusalem, 1999.
- [20] M. Freedman, A. Kitaev, M. Larsen and Z. Wang, *Topological Quantum Computation*, Bull. Amer. Math. Soc. (N.S.) **40** no. 1 (2003) 31–38.
- [21] L.H. Kauffman and S.J. Lomonaco Jr, *Q-Deformed Spin Networks, Knot Polynomials and Anyonic Topological Computation*, J. Knot Theory Ramifications, **16** (2007) 267-332.
- [22] S. Das Sarma, M. Freedman, C. Nayak, S. Simon and A. Stern, *Non-Abelian Anyons and Topological Quantum Computation*. ArXiv: cond-mat.str-el/0707.1889.
- [23] E. Knill, R. Laflamme, and L. Viola, *Theory of Quantum Error Correction for General Noise*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **84** (2000) 002525.
- [24] D. Kribs, R. Laflamme, and D. Poulin, *Unified and Generalized Approach to Quantum Error Correction*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **94** (2005) 180501.
- [25] D. Bacon, *Operator Quantum Error-Correcting Subsystems for Self-Correcting Quantum Memories*, Phys. Rev. A **73** (2006) 012340.
- [26] E. Dennis, A. Kitaev, A. Landahl, and J. Preskill, *Topological Quantum Memory*, J. Math. Phys. **43** (2002) 4452.
- [27] P. Aliferis, D. Gottesman, and J. Preskill, *Accuracy Threshold for Postselected Quantum Computation*, Quant. Inf. Comp, accepted. ArXiv:quant-ph/0703264.
- [28] E. Novais, E.R. Mucciolo, and H.U. Baranger, *Resilient Quantum Computation in Correlated Environments: A Quantum Phase Transition Perspective*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **98** (2007) 040501.
- [29] E. Novais, E.R. Mucciolo, and H.U. Baranger, *Hamiltonian Formulation of Quantum Error Correction and Correlated Noise*. arXiv:0710.1624.
- [30] J.A. Smolin, G. Smith, and S. Wehner, *A Simple Family of Nonadditive Quantum Codes*. ArXiv:quant-ph/0701065.
- [31] S. Yu, Q. Chen, C.H. Lai, and C.H. Oh, *Non-Additive Quantum Error-Correcting Code*. ArXiv: 0704.2122.

- [32] A. Cross, G. Smith, J.A. Smolin, and B. Zeng, *Codeword Stabilized Quantum Codes*. arXiv:0708.1021.
- [33] S. Yu, Q. Chen, and C.H. Oh, *Graphical Quantum Error-Correcting Codes*. ArXiv: 0709.1780.
- [34] M. Grassl and M. Roetteler, *Non-Additive Quantum Codes from Goethals and Preparata Codes*. ArXiv: 0801.2144.
- [35] T. Brun, I. Devetak, M.-H. Hsieh, *Correcting Quantum Errors with Entanglement*, Science, vol. **314**, no. **5798** (2006) 436-439.
- [36] H. Bombin and M.A. Martin-Delgado, *Statistical Mechanical Models and Topological Color Codes*, arXiv:0711.0468.
- [37] D. Bacon and A. Casaccino, *Quantum Error Correcting Subsystem Codes From Two Classical Linear Codes*, arXiv: quant-ph/0610088.
- [38] S.A. Aly and A. Klappenecker, *Subsystem Code Constructions*. Arxiv: arXiv: 0712.4321.
- [39] D.W. Leung, M.A. Nielsen, I.L. Chuang and Y. Yamamoto, *Approximate Quantum Error Correction Can Lead to Better Codes*, Phys. Rev. A. **56** (1997) 2567-2573.
- [40] A.S. Fletcher, *Channel-Adapted Quantum Error Correction*, Ph.D. thesis, MIT, 2007.
- [41] R. Lang and P.W. Shor, *Nonadditive Quantum Error Correcting Codes Adapted to the Amplitude Damping Channel*. ArXiv: 0712.2586.
- [42] E. Knill, R. Laflamme, R. Martinez, and C.-H. Tseng, *A Cat-State Benchmark on a Seven Bit Quantum Computer*. Arxiv: quant-ph/9908051.
- [43] D.M. Greenberger, M.A.Horne and A.Zeilinger, *Going beyond Bell's Theorem*, in *Bell's Theorem, Quantum Theory, and Conceptions of the Universe*, edited by M. Kafatos, pp. 73–76, (Kluwer Academic, Dordrecht, 1989).
- [44] D.M. Greenberger, M.A. Horne, A. Shirnonny, and A.Zeilinger, *Bell's Theorem Without Inequalities*, Am. J. Phys. **58** (1990) 1131-1143.
- [45] D. Bouwmeester, J.-W. Pan, M. Daniell, H. Weinfurter and A. Zeilinger, *Observation of Three-Photon Greenberger-Horne-Zeilinger Entanglement*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **82** (1999) 1345-1349.
- [46] P.K. Aravind, *Borromean Entanglement of the GHZ state*, in *Potentiality, Entanglement and Passion-at-a-Distance*, R.S. Cohen, M. Horne, and J. Stachel (eds.), pp. 53-59, Kluwer Academic Publishers, Boston 1997.
- [47] L.H. Kauffman and S.J. Lomonaco Jr., *Braiding Operators are Universal Quantum Gates*, New J. Phys. **6** (2004) 134.

- [48] Y. Zhang, L.H. Kauffman and M.L. Ge, *Universal Quantum Gate, Yang–Baxterization and Hamiltonian*. Int. J. Quant. Inform. vol. **3**, no. 4, (2005) 669-678.
- [49] Y. Zhang, L.H. Kauffman and M.L. Ge, *Yang–Baxterizations, Universal Quantum Gates and Hamiltonians*. Quant. Inf. Proc. vol. **4**, no. 3, (2005) 159-197.
- [50] J. Franko, E.C. Rowell and Z. Wang, *Extraspecial 2-Groups and Images of Braid Group Representations*. J. Knot Theory Ramifications, **15** (2006) 413-428.
- [51] Y. Zhang, N. Jing and M.L. Ge, *Quantum Algebras Associated with Bell States*. J.Phys. A: Math. Theor. **41** (2008) 000000.
- [52] Y. Zhang and M.L. Ge, *GHZ States, Almost-Complex Structure and Yang–Baxter Equation*. Quant. Inf. Proc. vol. **6**, no. 5, (2007) 363-379.
- [53] Y. Zhang, E.C. Rowell, Y.-S Wu, Z. Wang and M.L. Ge, *From Extraspecial Two-Groups To GHZ States*. Arxiv: quant-ph/0706.1761.
- [54] Y. Zhang, L.H. Kauffman and R.F. Werner, *Permutation and its Partial Transpose*. Int. J. Quant. Inform. vol. **5**, no. 4 (2006) 469-507.
- [55] Y. Zhang, *Teleportation, Braid Group and Temperley–Lieb Algebra*. J.Phys. A: Math. Theor. **39** (2006) 11599-11622.
- [56] Y. Zhang, *Algebraic Structures Underlying Quantum Information Protocols*. ArXiv: quant-ph/0601050.
- [57] Y. Zhang and L.H. Kauffman, *Topological-Like Features in Diagrammatical Quantum Circuits*, Quant. Inf. Proc. vol. **6**, no. 5 (2007) 477-507.
- [58] L.H. Kauffman, *Knots and Physics* (World Scientific Publishers, 2002).
- [59] C.N. Yang, *Some Exact Results for the Many Body Problems in One Dimension with Repulsive Delta Function Interaction*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **19** (1967) 1312-1314.
- [60] R.J. Baxter, *Partition Function of the Eight-Vertex Lattice Model*, Annals Phys. **70** (1972) 193-228.
- [61] L.D. Faddeev, *Lectures on Quantum Inverse Scattering Method*, in Nankai Lectures on Mathematical Physics, “Integrable Systems”, pp. 23-70 (World Scientific, 1987).
- [62] J.S. Bell, *On the Einstein-Podolsky-Rosen paradox*, Physics **1** (1964) 195-200.
- [63] A.K. Ekert, *Quantum Cryptography Based on Bell’s Theorem*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **67** (1991) 661-663.
- [64] C.H. Bennett, G. Brassard, C. Crepeau, R. Jozsa, A. Peres and W. K. Wootters, *Teleporting an Unknown Quantum State via Dual Classical and Einstein-Podolsky-Rosen Channels*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **70** (1993) 1895-1899.

- [65] J.L. Brylinski and R. Brylinski, *Universal Quantum Gates*, in *Mathematics of Quantum Computation*, Chapman & Hall/CRC Press, Boca Raton, Florida, 2002 (edited by R. Brylinski and G. Chen).
- [66] R.F. Werner, *Quantum States with Einstein-Podolsky-Rosen Correlations Admitting a Hidden-Variable Model*, Phys. Rev. A **40** (1989) 4277.
- [67] M.H. Freedman and D.A. Meyer, *Projective Plane and Planar Quantum Codes*, Found. Comput. Math. **1**, no.3, (2001) 325C332.
- [68] J. K. Pachos, W. Wieczorek, C. Schmid, N. Kiesel, R. Pohlner, and H. Weinfurter, *Revealing Anyonic Statistics With Multiphoton Entanglement*. Arxiv: 0710.0895.
- [69] L. Jiang, G.K. Brennen, A.V. Gorshkov, K. Hammerer, M. Hafezi, E. Demler, M. D. Lukin, and P. Zoller, *Anyonic Interferometry and Protected Memories in Atomic Spin Lattices*. arXiv:0711.1365.