

Quantum Quasi-Cyclic Low-Density Parity-Check Codes

Min-Hsiu Hsieh, Todd A. Brun, and Igor Devetak
Ming Hsieh Electrical Engineering Department
University of Southern California
Los Angeles, CA 90089
(Dated: October 26, 2018)

We investigate the construction of quantum low-density parity-check (QLDPC) codes from classical quasi-cyclic (QC) LDPC codes with girth greater or equal to 6. We have shown that the classical codes in the generalized CSS construction do not need to satisfy the dual-containing property as long as pre-shared entanglement is available to both sender and receiver. Therefore, we can avoid the many 4-cycles which typically arise in dual-containing LDPC codes. The advantage of such quantum codes comes from the use of efficient decoding algorithms such as sum-product algorithm (SPA). It is well known that in SPA, cycles of length 4 make successive decoding iterations highly correlated and hence limit the decoding performance. We show the principle of constructing quantum QC-LDPC codes which require only small amounts of initial shared entanglement.

I. INTRODUCTION

Low-density parity-check (LDPC) codes were first proposed by Gallager [1] in the early 1960s, and were rediscovered [2, 3, 4] in the 90s. It has been shown that these codes can achieve a remarkable performance that is very close to the Shannon limit. Sometimes, they perform even better [5] than their main competitors, the Turbo codes. These two families of codes are called modern codes.

A (J, L) -regular LDPC code is defined to be the null space of a Boolean parity check matrix H with the following properties: (1) each column consists of J “ones” (each column has weight J); (2) each row consists of L “ones” (each row has weight L); (3) both J and L are small compared to the length of the code n and the number of rows in H . Several methods of constructing good families of regular LDPC codes have been proposed [4, 6, 7]. However, probably the easiest method is based on circulant permutation matrices [7], which was inspired by Gallager’s original LDPC construction.

We define a cycle of a linear code to be of length $2s$ if there is an ordered list of $2s$ matrix elements such that: (1) all $2s$ elements of H are equal to 1; (2) successive elements in the list are obtained by alternately changing the row or column only (i.e., two consecutive elements will have either the same row and different columns, or the same column and different rows); (3) the positions of all the $2s$ matrix elements are distinct, except the first and last ones. We call the cycle of the shortest length the girth of the code.

There are various methods for decoding classical LDPC codes [6]. Among them, *sum-product algorithm* (SPA) decoding [8] provides the best trade-off between error-correction performance and decoding complexity. It has been shown that the performance of SPA decoding very much depends on the cycles of shortest length [8]—in particular, cycles of length 4. These shortest cycles make successive decoding iterations highly correlated, and severely limit the decoding performance. Therefore,

to use SPA decoding, it is important to design codes without short cycles, especially cycles of length 4.

Because classical LDPC codes have such high performance—approaching the channel capacity in the limit of large block size—there has been considerable interest in finding quantum versions of these codes [9, 10, 11, 12]. In the standard stabilizer formalism for quantum codes [13, 14, 15, 16], classical codes with high rates can be used to construct quantum codes with high rates. The iterative decoding algorithm of those classical LDPC codes can also be used to efficiently decode the error syndrome [10]. The study of quantum LDPC codes has been slow to develop, however, because of the *dual-containing constraint* of standard quantum error-correcting codes [13, 14]. While this constraint is not too difficult to satisfy for relatively small LDPC codes, it is a substantial barrier to constructing codes with long lengths. Furthermore, classical LDPC codes that satisfy the dual-containing constraint have so many 4 cycles such that the iterative decoding algorithm converges very slowly [10]. The purely quantum phenomenon of degeneracy can also lead to convergence problems [17], though these can hopefully be overcome by adapting the decoding algorithm to the quantum case.

In this paper we take a somewhat different approach to constructing high-performance quantum LDPC codes. Recently, it has been shown that the dual-containing constraint can be removed without loss of net performance [18] by the use of pre-shared entanglement between senders and receivers: that is, by allowing *entanglement-assisted* QECCs (EAQECCs). Within this framework, we can construct quantum codes from classical codes via the *generalized CSS construction*. We have also shown that the better the performance of the classical codes, the better the performance of the resulting quantum codes. With the generalized CSS construction, we can now construct quantum LDPC codes from classical LDPC codes with girth at least 6, and those quantum LDPC codes will inherit the better performance of their classical counterparts. We make use of classical quasi-cyclic LDPC codes

in our construction.

This paper is organized as follows. We discuss properties of binary circulant matrices, and give a brief introduction to classical QC-LDPC codes in section II. We also prove a few interesting lemmas regarding classical QC-LDPC codes in this section. In section III, we discuss the principle of constructing quantum QC-LDPC codes from classical QC-LDPC codes, such that the resulting quantum QC-LDPC codes require only a small amount of initial pre-shared entanglement. We also provide two examples of such construction. In section IV, we compare the performance of the quantum QC-LDPC codes illustrated in section III with some previously proposed quantum LDPC codes. Finally, in section V we conclude.

II. PRELIMINARY

A. Properties of binary circulant matrices

Let M be an $r \times r$ circulant matrix over \mathbb{F}_2 . We can uniquely associate with M a polynomial $M(X)$ with coefficients given by entries of the first row of M . If $\mathbf{c} = (c_0, c_1, \dots, c_{r-1})$ is the first row of the circulant matrix M , then

$$M(X) = c_0 + c_1X + c_2X^2 + \dots + c_{r-1}X^{r-1}. \quad (1)$$

Adding or multiplying two circulant matrices is equivalent to adding or multiplying their associated polynomials modulo $X^r - 1$. We now give some useful properties of these matrices and polynomials.

Definition II.1 *The set of binary circulant matrices of size $r \times r$ forms a ring isomorphic to the ring of polynomials of degree less than r : $\mathbb{F}_2[X]/\langle X^r - 1 \rangle$.*

Lemma II.2 *Let $M(X)$ be the polynomial associated with the $r \times r$ binary circulant matrix M . If $\gcd(M(X), X^r - 1) = K(X)$, and the degree of $K(X)$ is k , then the rank of M is $r - k$.*

Proof Let $L(X) = (X^r - 1)/K(X)$, and let $\mathbf{b} \in (\mathbb{Z}_2)^r$ be the coefficient vector associated with $L(X)$. Since the degree of $L(X)$ is $r - k$, $b_i = 0$ for $i > r - k$. It follows that

$$L(X)M(X) = 0 \pmod{X^r - 1}. \quad (2)$$

If \mathbf{r}_i is the i -th row of M , then (2) gives the following k linearly dependent equations:

$$\begin{aligned} b_0\mathbf{r}_0 + b_1\mathbf{r}_1 + \dots + b_{r-k}\mathbf{r}_{r-k} &= 0 \\ b_0\mathbf{r}_1 + b_1\mathbf{r}_2 + \dots + b_{r-k}\mathbf{r}_{r-k+1} &= 0 \\ &\vdots \\ b_0\mathbf{r}_{k-1} + b_1\mathbf{r}_k + \dots + b_{r-k}\mathbf{r}_{r-1} &= 0. \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

The set $\{\mathbf{r}_{r-k}, \dots, \mathbf{r}_{r-1}\}$ can therefore be expressed as linear combinations of $\{\mathbf{r}_0, \dots, \mathbf{r}_{r-k-1}\}$, and the rank of M is $r - k$. \square

Theorem II.3 *Let $r = p \cdot q$, and let $\mathbf{c} = (c_0, c_1, \dots, c_{r-1})$ be the first row of an $r \times r$ circulant matrix M . If c_i is 1 only when $i = 0 \pmod{p}$, then $\text{rank}(M) = p$.*

Proof Let $M(X) = \sum_{i=0}^{q-1} X^{pi}$ be the polynomial associated with M , with degree $r - p$. Since $M(X)|(X^r - 1)$, the degree of $K(X) = \gcd(M(X), X^r - 1) = M(X)$ is also $r - p$. Therefore, by lemma II.2, the rank of M is p . \square

Theorem II.4 *Let $r = p \cdot q$, and let $\mathbf{c} = (c_0, c_1, \dots, c_{r-1})$ be the first row of an $r \times r$ circulant matrix M . If c_i is 1 only when $i < p$, then $\text{rank}(M) = r - p + 1$.*

Proof In this case, $M(X) = 1 + X + \dots + X^{p-1}$ has degree $p - 1$. Since $M(X)|X^r - 1$, again by lemma II.2 the rank of M is $r - p + 1$. \square

Corollary II.5 *Let $r = p \cdot q$, and let $\mathbf{c} = (c_0, c_1, \dots, c_{r-1})$ be the first row of an $r \times r$ circulant matrix M such that the weight of \mathbf{c} is p . If $M(X)|(X^r - 1)$, then the rank κ of M is lower-bounded by $r - p + 1$.*

Proof Since the weight of \mathbf{c} is p , the lowest possible degree of $M(X)$ is $p - 1$. Then by the method of Theorem II.4, the rank κ is at least $r - p + 1$. \square

B. Classical quasi-cyclic LDPC codes

Definition II.6 *A binary linear code $C(H)$ of length $n = r \cdot L$ is called a quasi-cyclic (QC) code with period r if any codeword which is cyclically right-shifted by r positions is again a codeword. Such a code can be represented by a parity-check matrix H consisting of $r \times r$ blocks, each of which is an (in general different) $r \times r$ circulant matrix.*

By the isomorphism mentioned in Def. II.1, we can associate with each quasi-cyclic parity-check matrix $H \in \mathbb{F}_2^{Jr \times Lr}$ a $J \times L$ polynomial parity-check matrix $\mathbf{H}(X) = [h_{j,l}(X)]_{j \in [J], l \in [L]}$ where $h_{j,l}(X)$ is the polynomial, as defined in Eq. (1), representing the $r \times r$ circulant submatrix of H , and the notation $[J] := \{1, 2, \dots, J\}$.

Generally, there are two ways of constructing (J, L) -regular QC-LDPC by using circulant matrices [19]:

Definition II.7 *We say that a QC-LDPC code is Type-I if it is given by a polynomial parity-check matrix $\mathbf{H}(X)$ with all monomials. We say that a QC-LDPC code is Type-II if it is given by a polynomial parity-check matrix $\mathbf{H}(X)$ with either binomials, monomials, or zero.*

1. Type-I QC-LDPC

To give an example, let $r = 16$, $J = 3$, and $L = 8$. The following polynomial parity check matrix

$$\mathbf{H}(X) = \begin{bmatrix} X & X & X & X & X & X & X & X \\ X^2 & X^5 & X^3 & X^5 & X^2 & X^5 & X^3 & X^5 \\ X^2 & X^3 & X^4 & X^5 & X^6 & X^7 & X^8 & X^9 \end{bmatrix} \quad (4)$$

gives a Type-I (3, 8)-regular QC-LDPC code of length $n = 16 \cdot 8 = 128$. Later on, we will also express $\mathbf{H}(X)$ by its *exponent matrix* H_E . For example, the exponent matrix of (4) is

$$H_E = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 2 & 5 & 3 & 5 & 2 & 5 & 3 & 5 \\ 2 & 3 & 4 & 5 & 6 & 7 & 8 & 9 \end{bmatrix}. \quad (5)$$

The difference of arbitrary two rows of the exponent matrix H_E is defined as

$$\mathbf{d}_{ij} = \mathbf{c}_i - \mathbf{c}_j = ((c_{i,k} - c_{j,k}) \bmod r)_{k \in [L]}, \quad (6)$$

where \mathbf{c}_i is the i -th row of H_E and r is the size of the circulant matrix. We then have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{d}_{21} &= (1, 4, 2, 4, 1, 4, 2, 4) \\ \mathbf{d}_{31} &= (1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8) \\ \mathbf{d}_{32} &= (0, 14, 1, 0, 4, 2, 5, 4). \end{aligned}$$

We call an integer sequence $\mathbf{d} = (d_0, d_1, \dots, d_{L-1})$ *multiplicity even* if each entry appears an even number of times. For example, \mathbf{d}_{21} is multiplicity even, but \mathbf{d}_{32} is not, since only 0 and 4 appear an even number of times. We call \mathbf{d} *multiplicity free* if no entry is repeated; for example, \mathbf{d}_{31} .

A simple necessary condition for Type-I (J, L)-regular QC-LDPC codes to give girth $g \geq 6$ is given in [7]. However, a stronger result (both sufficient and necessary condition) is shown in [9]. We state these theorems from [9] without proof.

Theorem II.8 *A Type-I QC-LDPC code $C(H_E)$ is dual-containing if and only if $\mathbf{c}_i - \mathbf{c}_j$ is multiplicity even for all i and j , where \mathbf{c}_i is the i -th row of the exponent matrix H_E .*

Theorem II.9 *There is no dual-containing Type-I QC-LDPC having girth $g \geq 6$.*

Theorem II.10 *A necessary and sufficient condition for a Type-I QC-LDPC code $C(H_E)$ to have girth $g \geq 6$ is $\mathbf{c}_i - \mathbf{c}_j$ to be multiplicity free for all i and j .*

2. Type-II QC-LDPC

Take $r = 16$, $J = 3$, and $L = 4$. The following is an example of a Type-II (3, 4)-regular QC-LDPC code:

$$\mathbf{H}(X) = \begin{bmatrix} X + X^4 & 0 & X^7 + X^{10} & 0 \\ X^5 & X^6 & X^{11} & X^{12} \\ 0 & X^2 + X^9 & 0 & X^7 + X^{13} \end{bmatrix}. \quad (7)$$

The exponent matrix of (7) is

$$H_E = \begin{bmatrix} (1, 4) & \infty & (7, 10) & \infty \\ 5 & 6 & 11 & 12 \\ \infty & (2, 9) & \infty & (7, 13) \end{bmatrix}. \quad (8)$$

Here we denote $X^\infty = 0$.

The difference of arbitrary two rows of H_E is defined similar to (6) with the following additional rules: (1) if for some entry $c_{i,k}$ is ∞ , then the difference of $c_{i,k}$ and other arbitrary term is again ∞ ; (2) if the entries $c_{i,k}$ and $c_{j,k}$ are both binomial, then the difference of $c_{i,k}$ and $c_{j,k}$ contains four terms. In this example, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{d}_{21} &= ((4, 1), \infty, (4, 1), \infty) \\ \mathbf{d}_{31} &= (\infty, \infty, \infty, \infty) \\ \mathbf{d}_{32} &= (\infty, (12, 3), \infty, (11, 1)) \\ \mathbf{d}_{11} &= ((0, 3, 13, 0), \infty, (0, 3, 13, 0), \infty) \\ \mathbf{d}_{22} &= (0, 0, 0, 0) \\ \mathbf{d}_{33} &= (\infty, (0, 9, 7, 0), \infty, (0, 10, 6, 0)). \end{aligned}$$

The definition of **multiplicity even** and **multiplicity free** is the same except that we do not take ∞ into account. For example, \mathbf{d}_{32} is multiplicity free, since there is no pair with the same entry except ∞ . Unlike Type-I QC-LDPC codes whose \mathbf{d}_{ii} is always zero vector, \mathbf{d}_{ii} of Type-II QC-LDPC codes can have non-zero entries. Therefore it is possible to have cycles of length 4 in a single layer if \mathbf{d}_{ii} is not multiplicity free. Each layer is said to be a set of rows of size r in the original parity check matrix H that corresponds to the row of H_E . For example, \mathbf{d}_{11} is multiplicity even, therefore the first layer of this Type-II regular QC-LDPC parity check matrix contains 4-cycles.

In the following, we will generalize theorem II.8-II.10 given in the previous section to include the Type-II QC-LDPC case.

Theorem II.11 *$C(H_E)$ is a dual-containing Type-II regular QC-LDPC code if and only if $\mathbf{c}_i - \mathbf{c}_j$ is multiplicity even for all i and j .*

Proof Let $\mathbf{H}(X) = [h_{j,l}(X)]_{j \in [J], l \in [L]}$ be the polynomial parity check matrix associated with a Type-II (J, L)-regular QC-LDPC parity check matrix H . Denote the transpose of $\mathbf{H}(X)$ by $\mathbf{H}(X)^T = [h_{l,j}^t(X)]_{l \in [L], j \in [J]}$, and we have

$$h_{l,j}^t(X) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } h_{j,l}(X) = 0 \\ X^{r-k} & \text{if } h_{j,l}(X) = X^k \\ X^{r-k_1} + X^{r-k_2} & \text{if } h_{j,l}(X) = X^{k_1} + X^{k_2} \end{cases}. \quad (9)$$

Let $\hat{\mathbf{H}}(X) = \mathbf{H}(X)\mathbf{H}(X)^T$, and let the (i, j) -th component of $\hat{\mathbf{H}}(X)$ be $\hat{h}_{i,j}(X)$. Then

$$\hat{h}_{i,j}(X) = \sum_{l \in [L]} h_{i,l}(X)h_{l,j}^t(X). \quad (10)$$

The condition that $\mathbf{c}_i - \mathbf{c}_j$ is multiplicity even implies that $\hat{h}_{i,j}(X) = 0$ modulo $X^r - 1$, and vice versa. \square

Theorem II.12 *A necessary and sufficient condition for a Type-II regular QC-LDPC code $C(H_E)$ to have girth $g \geq 6$ is that $\mathbf{c}_i - \mathbf{c}_j$ be multiplicity free for all i and j .*

Proof The condition that $\mathbf{c}_i - \mathbf{c}_j$ is multiplicity free for all i and j guarantees that there is no 4-cycle between layer i and layer j , and vice versa. \square

Theorem II.13 *There is no dual-containing QC-LDPC having girth $g \geq 6$.*

Proof This proof follows directly from theorem II.11 and theorem II.12. If the Type-II regular QC-LDPC code is dual-containing, then by theorem II.11, $\mathbf{c}_i - \mathbf{c}_j$ must be multiplicity even for all i and j . However, theorem II.12 says that this QC-LDPC must contain cycles of length 4. \square

III. CONSTRUCTION OF QUANTUM QC-LDPC CODES FROM CLASSICAL QC-LDPC CODES

It has been shown that any classical linear code can be used to construct a corresponding entanglement-assisted quantum error-correcting code [18, 20].

Theorem III.1 *Let $C(H)$ be a binary classical $[n, k, d]$ code with parity check matrix H . We can obtain a corresponding $[[n, 2k - n + c, d; c]]$ EAQECC, where $c = \text{rank}(HH^T)$ is the number of ebits needed.*

Proof See [18]. \square

In the following, we will consider conditions that will give us (J, L) -regular QC-LDPC codes $C(H)$ with girth $g \geq 6$ and with the rank of HH^T as small as possible. In general, $\hat{\mathbf{H}}(X)$ represents a square Hermitian matrix \hat{H} with size $Jr \times Jr$ that contains J^2 circulant $r \times r$ matrices represented by $\hat{h}_{i,j}(X)$ as defined in (10). Next, we provide two examples to illustrate two different ways of minimizing the rank of the square Hermitian matrix represented by $\hat{\mathbf{H}}(X)$.

The first method is to make the matrix $\hat{H} = HH^T$ become a circulant matrix with a small rank. This can be achieved by choosing $\mathbf{H}(X)$ such that

$$\hat{h}_{i,j}(X) = \hat{h}_{i+1,j+1}(X),$$

for $i, j = 0, 1, \dots, J-2$. The rank κ of \hat{H} can then be read off by lemma II.2. If $\text{gcd}(\hat{\mathbf{H}}(X), X^{Jr} - 1) = K(X)$, and the degree of $K(X) = k$, then $\kappa = Jr - k$. Let's look at an example of this type using a classical Type-I QC-LDPC code. Take $r = 16$, $J = 3$, and $L = 8$. The following polynomial parity check matrix $\mathbf{H}(X)$ gives the corresponding quantum QC-LDPC code with length 128:

$$\mathbf{H}(X) = \begin{bmatrix} X & X & X & X & X & X & X & X \\ X & X^2 & X^3 & X^4 & X^5 & X^6 & X^7 & X^8 \\ X & X^3 & X^5 & X^7 & X^9 & X^{11} & X^{13} & X^{15} \end{bmatrix}. \quad (11)$$

Then

$$\hat{h}_{i,j}(X) = \begin{cases} 0, & i = j, \\ \sum_{k=0}^7 X^k, & i = j + 1 \\ \sum_{k=0}^7 X^{2k}, & i = j + 2 \end{cases} \quad (12)$$

It can be easily verified that $\hat{\mathbf{H}}(X)$ represents a circulant matrix, and the polynomial associated with \hat{H} is

$$\hat{\mathbf{H}}(X) = X^{16} \left(\sum_{k=0}^7 X^k \right) + X^{32} \left(\sum_{k=0}^7 X^{2k} \right).$$

The degree of $\text{gcd}(\hat{\mathbf{H}}(X), X^{48} - 1) = 30$, therefore by lemma II.2, the number of ebits that was needed to construct the corresponding quantum code is only 18. Actually, (11) gives us $[[128, 48, 6; 18]]$ EAQECC, and we will refer to this example as "ex1" later in section IV.

The second method is to minimize the rank of each circulant matrix inside \hat{H} . Let the rank of the circulant matrix represented by $\hat{h}_{i,j}(X)$ be $\kappa_{i,j}$. Let the rank of \hat{H} be κ . Then

$$\kappa \leq \sum_{i=1}^J \max_{j \in [J]} \kappa_{i,j}. \quad (13)$$

This upper bound is not tight for Type-I (J, L) -regular QC-LDPC codes when L is odd. This is because $\kappa_{i,i} = r$ for every i . When L is even, we have $\kappa_{i,i} = 0$ for every i . We can obtain a tighter upper bound for κ by carefully choosing the exponents of $\mathbf{H}(X)$ such that the degree of $\text{gcd}(\hat{h}_{i,j}(X), X^r - 1)$ is as large as possible for every i and j .

Theorem III.2 *Given a Type-I (J, L) -regular QC-LDPC code with $\mathbf{H}(X)$, if L is even and $\text{gcd}(\hat{h}_{i,j}(X), X^r - 1) > 1$ for $i \neq j$, then the rank κ is upper bounded by $J(r - L + 1)$.*

Proof Let $\hat{h}_{i,j}$ be the circulant matrix associated with the polynomial $\hat{h}_{i,j}(X)$, then the weight of the coefficient vector of $\hat{h}_{i,j}$ is L . By Corollary II.5, $\kappa_{i,j} \leq r - L + 1$. Therefore

$$\kappa \leq \sum_{i=1}^J \max_{j \in [J]} \kappa_{i,j} \leq J(r - L + 1). \quad \square$$

Our second example comes from a classical Type-II QC-LDPC code. Again take $r = 16$, $J = 3$, and $L = 8$. The following polynomial parity check matrix $\mathbf{H}(X)$ gives the corresponding quantum QC-LDPC code with length 128:

$$\mathbf{H}(X) = \begin{bmatrix} X + X^2 & 0 & X + X^4 & 0 & X + X^6 & 0 & X + X^8 & 0 \\ X^5 & X^5 & X^6 & X^6 & X^7 & X^7 & X^8 & X^8 \\ 0 & X + X^2 & 0 & X + X^4 & 0 & X + X^6 & 0 & X + X^8 \end{bmatrix}. \quad (14)$$

Then

$$\hat{h}_{i,j}(X) = \begin{cases} 0, & (i,j) = (2,2), (1,3), \text{ or } (3,1) \\ \sum_{k=0}^7 X^{1+2k}, & (i,j) = (1,1), (3,3) \\ \sum_{k=0}^7 X^k, & (i,j) = (2,1), (2,3) \end{cases} \quad (15)$$

In this example, each layer of the matrix $\hat{\mathbf{H}}(X)$ has rank less than 9. Actually, (14) gives a $[[128, 48, 6; 18]]$ quantum QC-LDPC code, and we will refer to this example as “ex2” in section IV.

IV. PERFORMANCE

In this section, we compare the performance of the QLDPC codes given in Sec. III to conventional (dual-containing) QLDPC codes that have been derived in the existing literature. The easiest way of constructing a QLDPC is the following technique, proposed by MacKay et al. in [10]. Take an $n/2 \times n/2$ cyclic matrix C with row weight $L/2$, and define

$$H_0 = [C, C^T].$$

Then we delete some rows from H_0 to obtain a matrix H with m rows. It is easy to verify that H is dual-containing. Therefore by the CSS construction, we can obtain conventional QLDPC codes of length n . The advantage of this construction is that the choice of n, m , and L is completely flexible; however, the column weight J is not fixed. We picked $n = 128$, $m = 48$, and $L = 8$, and called this quantum LDPC code “ex-MacKay.”

The second example of constructing a conventional QLDPC is described in the following theorem [9]:

Theorem IV.1 *Let P be an integer which is greater than 2 and σ an element of $\mathbb{Z}_P^* := \{z : z^{-1} \text{ exists}\}$ with $\text{ord}(\sigma) \neq |\mathbb{Z}_P^*|$, where $\text{ord}(\sigma) := \min\{m > 0 | \sigma^m = 1\}$ and $|X|$ means the cardinality of a set X . If we pick any $\tau \in \mathbb{Z}_P^* = \{1, \sigma, \sigma^2, \dots\}$, define*

$$c_{j,l} := \begin{cases} \sigma^{-j+l} & 0 \leq l < L/2 \\ -\tau\sigma^{j-1+l} & L/2 \leq l < L \end{cases}$$

$$d_{k,l} := \begin{cases} \tau\sigma^{-k-1+l} & 0 \leq l < L/2 \\ -\sigma^{k+l} & L/2 \leq l < L \end{cases},$$

and define the exponent matrix H_C and H_D as

$$H_C = [c_{j,l}]_{j \in [J], l \in [L]}, \quad H_D = [d_{k,l}]_{k \in [K], l \in [L]},$$

where $L/2 = \text{ord}(\sigma)$ and $1 \leq J, K \leq L/2$, then H_C and H_D can be used to construct quantum QC-LDPC codes with girth at least 6.

Here, we pick the set of parameters (J, L, P, σ, τ) to be $(3, 8, 15, 2, 3)$. The exponent matrices H_C and H_D described in theorem IV.1 are

$$H_C = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 2 & 4 & 8 & 6 & 12 & 9 & 3 \\ 8 & 1 & 2 & 4 & 12 & 9 & 3 & 6 \\ 4 & 8 & 1 & 2 & 9 & 3 & 6 & 12 \end{bmatrix} \quad (16)$$

$$H_D = \begin{bmatrix} 9 & 3 & 6 & 12 & 14 & 13 & 11 & 7 \\ 12 & 9 & 3 & 6 & 13 & 11 & 7 & 14 \\ 6 & 12 & 9 & 3 & 11 & 7 & 14 & 13 \end{bmatrix}, \quad (17)$$

and by the CSS construction, it will give a $[[120, 38, 4]]$ quantum QC-LDPC code. We will call this code “ex-HI”.




FIG. 1: performance of QLDPC with SPA decoding, and 100-iteration

We compare the performance of our examples in section IV with these two dual-containing quantum LDPC codes in figure 1. In the simulation, we assume the depolarizing channel and use of sum-product decoding algorithm. The performances of ex1 and ex2 do not differ much. This is not surprising, since these two codes have similar parameters. The reason that the performance of ex-MacKay is worse than our two examples is because there are so many 4-cycles in ex-MacKay. These cycles impair the decoding performance of sum-product algorithm. Our entanglement-assisted quantum QC-LDPC codes also outperform the quantum QC-LDPC code of

ex-HI, since the classical QC-LDPC codes used to construct our examples have better distance properties than the classical QC-LDPC of ex-HI. This simulation result is also consistent with our result in [18]: better classical codes give better quantum codes. Even though the parameters are not exactly the same, our codes have higher rate than the code rate of ex-HI.

It is not difficult to verify that the girth of ex1 is 6, and the girth of ex2 is 8. We numerically investigated the performance of these two examples with various numbers of iterations. According to our simulation results, the performance of ex1 and ex2 is almost the same. The result agrees with the classical result in [7] showing that the increase of girth from 6 to 8 is not of great help. The result is quite interesting since it implies that we do not need to worry about constructing QLDPC with higher girth.

V. CONCLUSIONS

There are two advantages of Type-II QC-LDPCs over Type-I QC-LDPCs. First, according to [19] certain configurations of Type-II QC-LDPC codes have larger minimum distance than Type-I QC-LDPC. Therefore, we

can construct better quantum QC-LDPCs from classical Type-II QC-LDPC codes. Second, it seems likely that Type-II QC-LDPCs will have more flexibility in constructing quantum QC-LDPC codes with small amount of pre-shared entanglement, because of the ability to insert zero submatrices. However, further investigation of this issue is required.

By using the entanglement-assisted error correction formalism, it is possible to construct EAQECCs from any classical linear code. We have shown how to do this for two classes of quasi-cyclic LDPC codes (Type-I and Type-II), and proven a number of theorems that make it possible to bound how much entanglement is required to send a code block for codes of these types. Using these results, we have been able to easily construct examples of quantum QC-LDPC codes that require only a relatively small amount of initial shared entanglement, and that perform better than previously constructed dual-containing QLDPCs. Since in general the performance of quantum codes follows directly from the performance of the classical codes used to construct them, and the evidence of our examples suggests that the iterative decoders can also be made to work effectively on the quantum versions of these codes, this should make possible the construction of large-scale efficient quantum codes.

-
- [1] R. G. Gallager, Ph.D. thesis, Massachusetts Institute of Technology (1963).
 - [2] D. J. C. MacKay and R. M. Neal, *Electronic Letters* **32**, 1645 (1996).
 - [3] M. C. Davey and D. J. C. MacKay, *IEEE Communications Letters* **2**, 165 (1998).
 - [4] D. J. C. MacKay, *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory* **45**, 399 (1999).
 - [5] D. J. C. MacKay, *Proc. 36th Allerton Conf. Communication, Control, and Computing* (1998), monticello, IL.
 - [6] Y. Kou, S. Lin, and M. Fossorier, *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory* **47**, 2711 (2001).
 - [7] M. Fossorier, *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory* **50**, 1788 (2004).
 - [8] R. M. Tanner, *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory* pp. 533–547 (1981).
 - [9] M. Hagiwara and H. Imai (2007), quant-ph:0701020.
 - [10] D. J. C. MacKay, G. Mitchison, and P. L. McFadden, *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory* **50**, 2315 (2004).
 - [11] T. Camara, H. Ollivier, and J.-P. Tillich, *Constructions and performance of classes of quantum ldpc codes* (2005), quant-ph/0502086.
 - [12] S. A. Aly, *A class of quantum ldpc codes constructed from finite geometries* (2007), arXiv:0712.4115.
 - [13] A. R. Calderbank and P. W. Shor, *Phys. Rev. A* **54**, 1098 (1996).
 - [14] A. M. Steane, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **77**, 793 (1996).
 - [15] D. Gottesman, Ph.D. thesis, California Institute of Technology (1997).
 - [16] A. R. Calderbank, E. M. Rains, P. W. Shor, and N. J. A. Sloane, *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory* **44**, 1369 (1998).
 - [17] Y. C. David Poulin, *On the iterative decoding of sparse quantum codes* (2008), arXiv:0801.1241.
 - [18] T. Brun, I. Devetak, and M. H. Hsieh, *Science* **314**, 436 (2006), doi: 10.1126/Science.1131563.
 - [19] R. Smarandache and P. O. Vontobel, in *Proc. 2004 IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory* (2004).
 - [20] T. Brun, I. Devetak, and M. H. Hsieh, *Catalytic quantum error correction* (2006), quant-ph/0608027.