

# Latency in local, two-dimensional, fault-tolerant quantum computing

Federico M. Spedalieri<sup>1,\*</sup> and Vwani P. Roychowdhury<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>*Department of Electrical Engineering, University of California, Los Angeles, Los Angeles, California 90095*

(Dated: October 26, 2018)

We analyze the latency of fault-tolerant quantum computing based on the 9-qubit Bacon-Shor code using a local, two-dimensional architecture. We embed the data qubits in a 7 by 7 array of physical qubits, where the extra qubits are used for ancilla preparation and qubit transportation by means of a SWAP chain. The latency is reduced with respect to a similar implementation using Steane's 7-qubit code [1]. Furthermore, the error threshold is also improved to  $2.02 \times 10^{-5}$ , when memory errors are taken to be one tenth of the gate error rates.

## I. INTRODUCTION

The fragility of quantum information has always been one of the most important obstacles for the development of practical implementations of quantum computing [2]. The theory of fault-tolerant quantum computation was developed to deal with the problem of computing in the presence of errors, even when the quantum gates required in this process are not perfectly reliable [3]. One of the most important achievements in the field, the threshold theorem, assure us that an arbitrarily long quantum computation can be performed as long as the error rates of the faulty gates are below a certain error threshold [4].

The price of dealing with errors and faulty gates is paid in terms of the space and time overhead of the implementation. To reduce the error rates of encoded gates, a quantum error-correcting code is concatenated with itself (or other code), requiring more space and time to perform a reliable encoded gate. On top of this, many physical implementation impose more constraints on the design of fault-tolerant circuits. The most important is the locality of interactions, which forces us to move qubits next to each other whenever we want them to interact through a quantum gate. We can see that the characteristics of each implementation will be affected by its underlying architecture. Fault-tolerant designs have been studied that use different error correcting codes [5, 6] and consider different constraints and architectures [1, 7].

For many possible implementations of quantum computing (such as solid state, ions in optical lattices, superconducting qubits) the architecture is not only local but also restricted in dimensionality. In particular, a two-dimensional architecture seems appealing, since we want to be able to manipulate single qubits using classical controls, and a planar architecture will leave us room to do that. This constraint, together with the locality of interactions will clearly affect the latency of the computation, since a large amount of qubit transport will need to be accomplished. It is then important to study how to optimize this transport in order to reduce the time overhead. In this paper we analyze this problem for a local, two-dimensional architecture. Our approach is to choose the error correction code and the implementation of encoded gates in order to minimize the time required, while at the same time trying to keep the space overhead as small as possible.

The paper is organized as follows. In Section II we begin by discussing the basic ideas of fault-tolerance and identify the error-correction procedure as the main contributor to the latency of concatenated implementations. In Section III we discuss the properties of the 9-qubit Bacon-Shor error-correcting code [8, 9]. In Section IV we take a look at the very useful properties of the fault-tolerant error correction procedure for the 9-qubit code. In Section V we show how to implement fault-tolerant encoded gates using this code in a local, two-dimensional architecture, paying special attention to the latency of the encoded gates. In Section VI we compute the error threshold for the Clifford-group gates. Finally, in Section VII we discuss the results and present our conclusions.

## II. LATENCY IN FAULT-TOLERANT CIRCUIT DESIGN

Quantum encoding and fault-tolerant circuit design are the two main tools used in dealing with errors that occur during the operation of quantum gates in the implementation of a quantum circuit. By encoding quantum information in the state of several qubits we can make it more robust to the effects of errors. If these errors can be detected and

---

\*Electronic address: federico@ee.ucla.edu

corrected, the encoded quantum information can be preserved. However, since the error detection and correction must be implemented with the same faulty gates, especial care must be put into preventing possible errors from propagating too much during the computation. Fault-tolerant design deals exactly with this problem.

While encoding reduces the logical error rate of the computation, this reduction might not be enough to allow the desired computation to be performed with a high probability of success. To reduce this error rate even further, the encoding can be concatenated with itself (or some other encoding). Concatenation is very powerful in suppressing the error rate. If  $\epsilon_{phys}$  is the physical error rate, then the logical error rate  $\epsilon_L$  is given by

$$\epsilon_L = \epsilon_0 \left( \frac{\epsilon_{phys}}{\epsilon_0} \right)^{2^k}, \quad (1)$$

where  $k$  is the number of levels of concatenation, and  $\epsilon_0$  is the error threshold. We can see that if the physical error rate is below the error threshold, the logical error rate is suppressed superexponentially. The error threshold depends on the details of the encoding and its implementation.

The price of using concatenation to reduce the error rate is paid as an increase on the size of the circuit, both in depth and width. This can be seen from the canonical procedure for implementing a given quantum circuit in a fault-tolerant way at each level of concatenation. To do this we replace each physical qubit by an encoded block, and each gate by an encoded gate. On top of that, after every encoded gate we perform error correction on the encoding block. Both the encoded gates and the error correction procedure must be fault-tolerant themselves, to prevent errors from propagating to other blocks before they can be corrected. This procedure generates a self-similar structure as can be seen in Figure 1. In this paper we are interested in studying the impact on latency (or circuit depth) of concatenation,




FIG. 1: Recursive structure of concatenated implementations of quantum error correction.

in particular when other constraints are present. Let  $L_{EC}$  be the latency of the error correction routine (measured in number of time steps required) applied to every block. Since error correction is performed after every encoded gate, if the circuit has  $k$  levels of concatenation, the blowup factor with respect to the latency of the unencoded circuit will be *at least*  $L_{EC}^k$ . Other contributions to this factor will be given by the latency of the encoded gates. But for many of the most used quantum codes, encoded gates can be performed transversally (requiring only one time step) or require at most a few time steps. Thus, the latency of the implementation is most heavily influenced by the latency of the error correcting routine. Finding fast (in terms of latency) error correcting procedures becomes then the key element in trying to reduce the overall latency.

Let us first take a look at the structure of error correction. There are some basic steps that any procedure that corrects errors must follow. First, we need to prepare a suitable ancilla state. This requires preparing single qubits in a certain states, such as the eigenstates of one of the Pauli operators. This will require at least one time step. The ancilla state will also require entanglement, and hence we need at least another time step to apply the two-qubit operations required to produce it (we might need more than just one time step). Once the ancilla has been prepared, we need to make it interact with the qubits in the encoding block. Again, this process takes at least one time step, but may in general take more (for CSS coded, the data qubits interact with ancilla qubits twice to detect  $X$  and  $Z$  errors respectively.) Finally, the ancilla has to be measured to extract the error syndrome, which requires another time step. The actual error correction can be postponed by updating the Pauli frame, as long as the gates we apply belong to the Clifford group.

We can see then that performing error correction will require *at the very least 4 time steps for any implementation*. Hence, to improve latency we need to look for quantum codes that allow fault-tolerant implementations of error correction to run in as few time steps as possible. And we have given a sort of benchmark for what “few time steps” means. But we are also interested in studying this problem under other real-world constraints, like locality and a two-dimensional architecture. We will show an implementation with exactly those constraints that can perform error correction in 7 time steps.

### III. THE BACON-SHOR NINE-QUBIT CODE

Our implementation will take advantage of some of the useful properties of the Bacon-Shor 9-qubit code. We will only give a basic description of this code here, since a more detailed description can be found elsewhere [8, 9].

The Bacon-Shor 9-qubit code is a stabilizer CSS code that encodes one logical qubit into nine physical qubits. The distance of this code is 3, so using the standard notation it is a  $[[9,1,3]]$  code. To describe the properties of this code it will be useful to consider the nine physical qubits as if they were placed on the vertices of a  $3 \times 3$  lattice as seen in Figure 2.




FIG. 2: Arrangement of data qubits for the 9-qubit Bacon-Shor code.

The code can be defined by the stabilizer group  $\mathcal{S}$  generated by the stabilizer operators

$$\begin{aligned} S_1 &= X_1 X_2 X_3 X_4 X_5 X_6 \\ S_2 &= X_4 X_5 X_6 X_7 X_8 X_9 \\ S_3 &= Z_1 Z_2 Z_4 Z_5 Z_7 Z_8 \\ S_4 &= Z_2 Z_3 Z_5 Z_6 Z_8 Z_9, \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

where  $X_i$  and  $Z_i$  represent the usual Pauli operators applied to the  $i$ -th qubit. Operators  $S_1$  and  $S_2$  correspond to  $X$  operators applied to the first and second row of qubits, and the second and third row, respectively. In a similar manner,  $S_3$  and  $S_4$  correspond to the  $Z$  operators applied to the first and second column of qubits, and the second and third column, respectively.

The different syndromes (i.e., the vector of eigenvalues of the four operators in (2)) induce a decomposition of the Hilbert space of the nine qubits in the code block into subspaces encoding actually five logical qubits. In each one of these subspaces we can define a subsystem decomposition and write

$$\mathcal{H} = \bigoplus_{\text{syndromes}} (\mathcal{H}_L \otimes \mathcal{H}_T), \quad (3)$$

where the direct sum is over all possible syndromes,  $\mathcal{H}_L$  is the Hilbert space of the logical qubit that will be fully protected by the code, and  $\mathcal{H}_T$  is the Hilbert space of the remaining encoded qubits (which will not be fully protected).

The logical operators associated with the encoded qubit are given by

$$\begin{aligned} X_L &= X_1 X_2 X_3 \\ Z_L &= Z_1 Z_4 Z_7. \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

We can see that  $X_L$  corresponds to  $X$  operators acting on all the qubits on the first row of Figure 2 while  $Z_L$  corresponds to  $Z$  operators acting on the first column. It is easy to check that these logical operators commute with the stabilizer generators. The logical operators for qubits encoded in  $\mathcal{H}_T$  can be chosen from the nonabelian group

$$\begin{aligned} T = \langle & X_1 X_4, X_4 X_7, X_2 X_5, X_5 X_8, X_3 X_6, X_6 X_9, \\ & Z_1 Z_2, Z_2 Z_3, Z_4 Z_5, Z_5 Z_6, Z_7 Z_8, Z_8 Z_9 \rangle. \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

It is easy to see that any operator in  $T$  commutes not only with the stabilizer generators, but also with the logical operators in (4). This leads to one of the key features of this code (and of subsystem encoding in general): the state of the logical qubit is not uniquely encoded. Once this state has been encoded in the nine qubit block, applying any operator in  $T$  does not affect the encoded quantum information, since these operators commute with the logical operators  $X_L$  and  $Z_L$ . This simplifies error correction and makes some two-qubit errors actually trivial.

#### IV. FAUL-TOLERANT ERROR CORRECTION

Since the 9-qubit Bacon-Shor code is a CSS code, we can apply the techniques introduced by Steane to perform fault-tolerant error correction. This requires preparing the logical state  $|0\rangle$ , a simultaneous eigenstate of stabilizer generators and the logical operator  $Z_L$  with eigenvalues  $+1$ . As we pointed out before, this does not completely determine the encoded state, since we can apply any operator in the set  $T$  without perturbing the encoded information. This ambiguity can be fixed by requiring the encoded state to be an eigenstate of the operators  $X_1X_4, X_4X_7, X_2X_5, X_5X_8, X_3X_6, X_6X_9$  (which belong to  $T$ ) with eigenvalue  $+1$ . It is not difficult to check that the only state satisfying these constraints is given by

$$|\bar{0}\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{8}}(|++\rangle_{147} + |--\rangle_{147})(|++\rangle_{258} + |--\rangle_{258})(|++\rangle_{369} + |--\rangle_{369}), \quad (6)$$

where  $|\pm\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|0\rangle \pm |1\rangle)$ , as usual. Geometrically, this state corresponds to the tensor product of three “cat” states in the Hadamard rotated basis, each one comprising the qubits in each column in Figure 2. Similarly, it is not difficult to see that the encoded  $|\bar{+}\rangle$  state corresponds to three “cat” states in the computational basis, each one now lying across each one of the three rows of qubits in Figure 2. This geometric description will be very useful when we look at how to prepare and use these states in a local, two-dimensional architecture.

To extract the error syndrome in the Steane fault-tolerant error correction scheme, we need to apply the circuit in Figure 3. To look for  $Z$  errors on the data block, an ancilla block encoded in the  $|\bar{0}\rangle$  state interacts with the data




FIG. 3: Quantum circuit for Steane’s fault-tolerant syndrome extraction.

block through an encoded CNOT gate (which for this code can be implemented transversally.) The qubits in the ancilla block are then measured in the  $X$  basis, and the results of these measurements are used to classically compute the error syndrome. But before the ancilla block interacts with the data, it needs to be verified using an extra ancilla block also encoded in the  $|\bar{0}\rangle$  state, to check for possible  $X$  errors in the ancilla block that could propagate to the data. To make the procedure fault-tolerant, this verification step needs to be carried out three times, and the ancilla block is accepted if and only if no more than one verification step failed. A similar scheme is used to check the data qubits for  $X$  errors.

The ancilla verification state is the main contributor to the latency of the error correction procedure, since we need to construct a verification block at least two times before allowing the ancilla block to interact with the data. Fortunately, Aliferis and Cross [10] showed that for the 9-qubit code using Steane’s procedure *the verification step is not required*. This property can be somewhat traced back to the fact that the encoded states  $|\bar{0}\rangle$  and  $|\bar{+}\rangle$  break down into three entangled “cat” states of only three qubits each, and these “cat” states are also rather robust against pairs of errors that could be introduced by a faulty gate during their preparation. This decomposition into a tensor product of states with less qubits also makes the preparation process efficient in terms of latency.

The circuit for syndrome extraction takes then a very simple form, as can be seen in Figure 4. From this figure we can see that the latency for the error correction routine is 6 time steps. Preparing the ancilla requires 3 time steps: one for single-qubit preparations and two to entangle them to form a “cat” state (or its Hadamard rotated version). The interaction with the data block through a transversal CNOT can be accomplished in one time step and so can the final ancilla measurements. Even though each syndrome extraction can be accomplished in 5 time steps, we need to delay one of them by 1 time step since the two ancilla blocks cannot interact with the data at the same time, and this gives us a total latency of 6 time steps. And as we discussed before, instead of actually correcting an error we will only update the Pauli frame. This can be done as long as we apply gates that belong to the Clifford group, since they preserve the tensor product form of the errors. We will see that we can relegate non-Clifford gates to the highest level of concatenation (i.e., the algorithmic level), so we can run all the lower levels without physically performing Pauli operations to correct the errors.




FIG. 4: Fault-tolerant circuit for syndrome extraction for the 9-qubit Bacon-Shor code, introduced by Aliferis and Cross.

## V. LOCAL, TWO-DIMENSIONAL ARCHITECTURE

The fault-tolerant error correction procedure described above relies on an abstract architecture in which there is no restriction on the interaction between qubits. A two-qubit gate can be applied to any pair pair of qubits in one time step. In reality, a physical implementation of quantum computing will usually impose a locality constraint that requires that two interacting qubits are actually next to each other. Then, to implement an abstract quantum circuit we will need to introduce an information transport process that is based on local interactions. The simplest way of doing that is to use a chain of SWAP gates, in which the states of two neighboring qubits is exchanged. However, we need to be careful if we want to preserve the fault-tolerance of the the scheme, since a faulty SWAP might introduce two errors in one block if it is applied to two data qubits.

Besides the locality of the interaction, as a matter of practical design it is advantageous to lay our qubits in some kind of two-dimensional array. This would allow the unavoidable classical control signals to have easier access to each individual qubit in order to perform necessary operations like single qubit preparation and measurement, and single qubit gates. Then the problem becomes how to design a fault-tolerant error correction procedure that minimizes the impact on latency of the locality constraint on a two-dimensional architecture, trying to keep the space overhead under control and without lowering too much the error threshold.

In [1], Svore, DiVincenzo and Terhal studied this type of architecture, although their main objective was to compute the error threshold for that implementation. Also they used Steane’s 7-qubit code to encode the quantum information and applied Steane’s scheme for error correction. They embedded the seven data qubits in a  $6 \times 8$  array of physical qubits. The extra qubits where used for ancilla preparation and measurement, and for qubit transport by means of SWAP gates. We will consider a similar type of implementation based on the 9-qubit Bacon-Shor code.

Our implementation consists of embedding the nine data qubits of the 9-qubit code in a  $7 \times 7$  array of physical qubits. During error correction, the data qubits are located at the positions shown in Figure 5. The remaining qubits




FIG. 5: Encoding block: the data qubits are embedded in a 7 by 7 array of physical qubits. The remaining “dummy” qubits (noted by the letter  $O$ ) are used for ancilla preparation and qubit transportation.

(represented by  $O$ ) act both as the workspace in which ancillas are prepared and measured, and as the “rails” on which data and ancilla qubits are transported using chains of SWAP gates.

### A. Error Correction

As it can be seen in Figure 4, to perform error correction we need to prepare three “cat” states, each interacting with one (and only one) of the rows of data qubits in Figure 5, and three Hadamard-rotated “cat” states to interact with the three columns of data qubits. For the first and last row (column), we can use the external rows (columns) in Figure 5, to prepare the required ancilla and move some of these ancilla qubits next to the corresponding data qubit. Each of these parts of the error correction can be performed independently of one another. But for the ancilla states that interact with middle row and column, we need to carefully time their preparation, movement and interaction with the data, because they make use of the same workspace. This additional complication (due to the locality and two-dimensional character of this implementation) increases the latency of the error correction procedure with respect to the abstract case by only one time step.

In Figure 6, we present two snapshots of the error correction procedure (the complete sequence is presented in the appendix). The data qubits are denoted by  $d1, d2$ , etc., and remain fixed during the error correction procedure. The




FIG. 6: Two snapshots of the error correction procedure.

ancilla qubits (denoted by  $a1, a2$ , etc.) are prepared and transported using the workspace of dummy qubits (denoted by  $O$ .) The preparation of ancilla qubits is noted by  $P_{X,Z}(a_j)$ , and represents the preparation of the qubit in the eigenstate of either  $X$  or  $Z$ , with eigenvalue 1. Note that not all ancilla qubits are prepared at the same time, in order to reduce the number of memory error locations. The single arrows represent CNOT gates, pointing from control to target qubits. The double-headed arrows represent SWAP gates. In time step 2 we can see the second step in the preparation of all the required cat states. In time step 4 we can see the data qubits interacting with the ancilla, some ancilla qubits still moving via SWAP gates to get in position, and one ancilla qubit being measured (noted by  $M_{X,Z}(\cdot)$ .)

## B. Encoded gates

For the purpose of concatenation we need to be able to perform both the encoded CNOT and the encoded SWAP gate. The encoded SWAP gate is very simple, since it only involves moving the data qubits from one encoding block to another. This is done using SWAP gates. It is clear that the latency of the encoded SWAP gate is only 7 time steps.

For the 9-qubit code, the CNOT gate is transversal. Then we only need to move the data qubits so that the corresponding qubits of two neighboring blocks are next to each other, and then apply a single-qubit CNOT between each pair. The most efficient way of doing this, from the point of view of latency, is to interleave the rows (or columns) of the two blocks. To do this, we first move all the data qubits in one block up one row (or left one column), while the data qubits on the other block start moving laterally (or vertically) towards the first block. Then we keep moving the data qubits towards each other, interleaving the rows (columns) until the corresponding data qubits are next to each other. Then we apply a single-qubit CNOT between each pair, and move all data qubits back to their original positions. In this way, that latency of the encoded CNOT is only 9 time steps.

The encoded Hadamard gate can also be easily implemented. As noted in [10], the encoded Hadamard is equivalent to applying single-qubit Hadamards to all physical qubits and rotating the  $3 \times 3$  array of qubits by 90 degrees. In our implementation, this rotation can be accomplished by transporting the data qubits in the perimeter of the array in Figure 5 (i.e., all qubits except  $d5$ ) along that perimeter until the rows are transformed into the columns of the array. This transport can be done in 4 time steps, since we can move all qubits at the same time. Then, the total latency of the encoded Hadamard gate is only 5 time steps: one to apply single-qubit Hadamards and four to rotate the array.

## C. Encoded preparation and measurement

Finally, we need to be able to fault-tolerantly prepare the encoded  $|\bar{0}\rangle$  and  $|\bar{\pm}\rangle$  states, and fault-tolerantly measure the encoded operators  $X$  and  $Z$ . Since the 9-qubit code is a CSS code, the fault-tolerant measurement reduces to measuring the single-qubit operator  $X$  (or  $Z$ ) for each data qubit in the encoding block and classically post-processing the outcomes (as is usual, we assume that classical processing can be done flawlessly.)

For the fault-tolerant preparation of encoded states, we will use a procedure that applies to any CSS code, and is illustrated in Figure 7 for the encoded state  $|\bar{0}\rangle$ . This scheme requires that we prepare four copies of the encoded state.




FIG. 7: Fault-tolerant preparation of the encoded  $|\bar{0}\rangle$  state.

As discussed above, the state  $|\bar{0}\rangle$  is equivalent to three “cat” states in the Hadamard-rotated basis, each comprised of the qubits in one of the columns of data qubits in Figure 5. To prepare the four copies we need to use 36 physical qubits. We can choose them to be the  $6 \times 6$  array obtained when we subtract the first row and column from the  $7 \times 7$  array. We can use 3 rows and 6 columns to prepare two copies of  $|\bar{0}\rangle$ , *with their columns interleaved* (giving us the 4 copies needed in the  $6 \times 6$  array.) Once these copies are prepared we can apply encoded CNOT gates on each pair of encoded states, which takes only one time step. Then we measure two of the copies, and then move the qubits in the columns vertically using SWAP gates in order to position them next to the corresponding qubit in the remaining copy. We then apply another CNOT gate and measure one of the copies. The remaining qubits encode the state  $|\bar{0}\rangle$ . This preparation procedure requires 9 time steps. A step-by-step pictorial representation of this preparation can be found in the appendix. The encoded state  $|\bar{\pm}\rangle$  can be prepared in a similar way, interleaving rows instead of columns.

Gate	9-qubit	7-qubit
CNOT	16	35
SWAP	14	35
$ 0\rangle$ -preparation	16	41
$ +\rangle$ -preparation	16	41
Measurement	1	1

TABLE I: Latencies (in number of time steps) of encoded gates for the 9-qubit and 7-qubit codes.

#### D. 1-Recs and latency

A 1-Rectangle (1-Rec) is formed by an encoded gate followed by error correction on all the encoded blocks involved in the gate (with the exception of the 1-measurement, that requires only classical post-processing.) We can summarize the above results in the following table showing the latency in time steps, of each 1-Rec, for both the 9-qubit code discussed here and the 7-qubit code presented in [1]. The longest 1-Rec is the one corresponding to the preparation of encoded states. However, since these preparations are always performed on blocks representing dummy qubits *that are free during the previous time step*, we can always start these preparations ahead of time, reducing their effective latency. Thus, the lower limit for speed in this implementation is given by the CNOT 1-Rec, that requires 16 time steps. This produces a reduction in latency with respect to the 7-qubit code implementation in [1] by a factor of  $(16/35)^k \sim 0.45^k$ , with  $k$  the number of concatenation levels.

#### E. Universality

Universality of this scheme can be achieved by supplementing the Clifford-group gates implemented with non-Clifford gates, such as the phase gate  $S$  and its square root the  $T$  gate. Since the 9-qubit code does not allow for a simple, fault-tolerant implementation of these gates, we need to use a different approach. One possibility, following [10] is to purify noisy encoded  $|+i\rangle$  states using only Clifford-group gates (which are virtually error free at high concatenation levels), and later use the purified encoded  $|+i\rangle$  state to apply the  $S$  gate with higher reliability. This can be done at any concatenation level, using the injection by teleportation technique developed by Knill [11] to insert a noisy encoded  $|+i\rangle$  state at the required level. This approach is also used in [1] to improve the impact on the threshold of preparing the ancillas required to implement the  $S$  and  $T$  gates. There it is shown that the threshold for the preparation of these ancilla states is higher than the threshold for Clifford gates. That analysis also applies to the 9-qubit code (the only difference being the number of gates involved in the decoding during the injection by teleportation, and that number is comparable for both codes.) Once we are able to apply  $S$  we can use it to generate the ancilla state required to apply  $T$ . These preparations can be done offline, since these gates are only required at the algorithmic level.

### VI. ERROR THRESHOLD

We compute the error threshold for the case of stochastic, adversarial noise. Following the procedure presented in [12] and also used in [1], we compute the number of malignant pairs of locations for the CNOT extended rectangle. There are 7 different types of locations: (1)  $|+\rangle$  preparation, (2)  $|0\rangle$  preparation, (3) memory, (4) SWAP gate, (5)  $Z$  measurement, (6)  $X$  measurement, and (7) CNOT gate. The error probability for the  $k^{th}$  level CNOT extended rectangle is given by

$$\epsilon_7^{(k)} \leq \sum_{i \leq j}^7 \alpha_{ij} \epsilon_i^{(k-1)} \epsilon_j^{(k-1)} + B(\epsilon_{max}^{(k-1)})^3, \quad (7)$$

where  $\epsilon_i^{(l)}$  is the error rate of a gate of type  $i$  at level  $l$ , and  $\epsilon_{max}^{(k-1)}$  is the maximum of all the error rates (which in our case is  $\epsilon_7^{(k-1)}$ .) The second term on the RHS of (7) bounds the contribution of third and higher order terms, with  $B = \binom{791}{3}$ , where 791 is the number of locations in the CNOT extended rectangle. The coefficients  $\alpha_{ij}$  represent





Time step: 1

$O$	$O$	$P_Z(a1)$	$P_X(a2)$	$O$	$O$	$O$
$O$	$d1$	$O$	$d2$	$O$	$d3$	$O$
$O$	$O$	$P_Z(a4)$	$P_X(a5)$	$O$	$O$	$P_X(a16)$
$P_Z(a11)$	$d4$	$O$	$d5$	$O$	$d6$	$P_Z(a17)$
$P_X(a12)$	$O$	$P_Z(a14)$	$O$	$O$	$O$	$O$
$O$	$d7$	$P_X(a15)$	$d8$	$O$	$d9$	$O$
$O$	$O$	$O$	$P_X(a8)$	$P_Z(a9)$	$O$	$O$


Time step: 2

$O$	$O$	$a1$	$\leftarrow$	$a2$	$P_Z(a3)$	$O$	$O$
$O$	$d1$	$O$		$d2$	$O$	$d3$	$O$
$P_X(a10)$	$O$	$a4$	$\leftarrow$	$a5$	$P_Z(a6)$	$O$	$a16$
							$\downarrow$
$a11$	$d4$	$P_X(a13)$		$d5$	$O$	$d6$	$a17$
$\uparrow$							
$a12$	$O$	$a14$		$O$	$O$	$O$	$P_X(a18)$
		$\uparrow$					
$O$	$d7$	$a15$		$d8$	$O$	$d9$	$O$
$O$	$O$	$P_Z(a7)$		$a8$	$\rightarrow$	$a9$	$O$


Time step: 3

$O$	$a1$	$\Leftrightarrow$	$O$	$a2$	$\rightarrow$	$a3$	$O$	$O$
$O$	$d1$		$O$	$d2$		$O$	$d3$	$a16$
								$\Updownarrow$
$a10$	$a4$	$\Leftrightarrow$	$O$	$a5$	$\rightarrow$	$a6$	$O$	$O$
$\downarrow$								
$a11$	$d4$		$a13$	$d5$		$O$	$d6$	$a17$
			$\downarrow$					$\uparrow$
$O$	$O$		$a14$	$O$		$O$	$O$	$a18$
$\Updownarrow$								
$a12$	$d7$		$a15$	$\rightarrow$	$d8$		$O$	$d9$
$O$	$O$		$a7$	$\leftarrow$	$a8$		$O$	$\Leftrightarrow$
							$a9$	$O$


Time step: 4



Time step: 5



Time step: 6









Time step: 9

$O$	$O$	$O$	$O$	$O$	$O$	$O$
$O$	$d1$	$M_X(a10)$	$d2$	$M_X(a11)$	$d3$	$M_X(a12)$
$O$	$O$	$O$	$O$	$O$	$O$	$O$
$O$	$d4$	$M_X(a13)$	$d5$	$M_X(a14)$	$d6$	$M_X(a15)$
$O$	$O$	$O$	$O$	$O$	$O$	$O$
$O$	$d7$	$M_X(a16)$	$d8$	$M_X(a17)$	$d9$	$M_X(a18)$
$O$	$O$	$O$	$O$	$O$	$O$	$O$

---

- [1] K. M. Svore, D. P. DiVincenzo, and B. M. Terhal, *Quantum Information & Computation* **7**, 297 (2007).
- [2] M. N. Nielsen and I. L. Chuang, *Quantum computation and quantum information* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2000).
- [3] J. Preskill, *Proc. R. Soc. Lond. A* **454**, 385 (1998), [quant-ph/9705031](#).
- [4] D. Aharonov and M. Ben-Or, in *STOC '97: Proceedings of the twenty-ninth annual ACM symposium on Theory of computing* (ACM, New York, NY, USA, 1997), pp. 176–188.
- [5] A. M. Steane, *Phys. Rev. A* **68**, 042322 (2003).
- [6] D. Gottesman, *Phys. Rev. A* **57**, 127 (1998).
- [7] T. Szkopek *et al.*, *Nanotechnology*, *IEEE Transactions on* **5**, 42 (Jan. 2006).
- [8] P. W. Shor, *Phys. Rev. A* **52**, R2493 (1995).
- [9] D. Bacon, *Physical Review A* **73**, 012340 (2006).
- [10] P. Aliferis and A. W. Cross, *Physical Review Letters* **98**, 220502 (2007).
- [11] E. Knill, *Nature* **434**, 39 (2005).
- [12] P. Aliferis, D. Gottesman, and J. Preskill, *Quantum Information & Computation* **6**, 97 (2006).