

Unfolding the Toric Code Model with Emergent Qubits

Brijesh Kumar*

School of Physical Sciences, Jawaharlal Nehru University, New Delhi 110067

(Dated: March 31, 2023)

We present the idea of emergent qubits by exact constructions. We rigorously transform the toric code model into a problem of emergent qubits, and write all its eigenstates exactly. As byproducts of this exercise, we introduce a punctured version of the model on torus and an open version on cylinder, both realizing independent emergent qubits perfectly. The exact eigenstates of the toric code and other models are shown to be realized by applying CNOT gates on independent qubits.

The toric code model presents a physical setting for doing fault-tolerant quantum computation [1]. It is a model of great interest. It concerns interacting quantum spin-1/2's (qubits) on torus. Interestingly, we reduce the toric code model into independent 'emergent' qubits and write all its eigenstates exactly. Below we first introduce the idea of emergent qubits by an exact one-dimensional construction analogous to the toric code; a general model on arbitrary graph is also presented; their exact eigenstates are quantum paramagnetic, and realize multipolar moments. Then we rigorously show how the toric code model turns into independent emergent qubits. We do this first on cylinder, then on torus, by constructing appropriate unitary transformations (in a similar spirit as we did in Refs. [2, 3]). We find these transformations to reduce into CNOT gates, which presents a basic scheme to realize toric code and other eigenstates.

Emergent Qubits on a Closed Trestle.— Consider a closed two-legged triangular strip, a trestle, of qubits interacting via the Hamiltonian given below.

$$\hat{H} = \sum_{n=1}^N \left(I_{z,n} \hat{Z}_n + I_{x,n} \hat{X}_n \right) \quad (1)$$

Here, $\hat{Z}_n = \hat{\sigma}_{2n-1}^z \hat{\sigma}_{2n}^z \hat{\sigma}_{2n+1}^z$ and $\hat{X}_n = \hat{\sigma}_{2n}^x \hat{\sigma}_{2n+1}^x \hat{\sigma}_{2n+2}^x$ are three-qubit interactions with arbitrary strengths $I_{z,n}$ and $I_{x,n}$; see Fig. 1. The two legs of the trestle have N qubits each. On a closed trestle, $\hat{\sigma}_{2N+l}^\alpha = \hat{\sigma}_l^\alpha$ for qubit label $l = 1, 2, \dots, 2N$ and $\alpha = z, x, y$. The qubit operators $\hat{\sigma}_l^z$ and $\hat{\sigma}_l^x$ are the usual Pauli operators; the two states, $|\pm\rangle$, of the l^{th} qubit are denoted as $|\sigma_l\rangle$ for $\sigma_l = \pm 1$ such that $\hat{\sigma}_l^z |\sigma_l\rangle = \sigma_l |\sigma_l\rangle$ and $\hat{\sigma}_l^x |\sigma_l\rangle = |\bar{\sigma}_l\rangle$ where $\bar{\sigma}_l = -\sigma_l$; corresponding many-qubit product states are denoted as $|\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_{2N}\rangle = \prod_{n=1}^N |\sigma_{2n-1}\rangle |\sigma_{2n}\rangle \equiv |\{\sigma\}\rangle$.

Note that all the \hat{Z}_n 's and \hat{X}_n 's commute with each other, because a \hat{Z}_n overlaps with an \hat{X}_n by two qubits or none. Moreover, $\hat{Z}_n^2 = \hat{1} = \hat{X}_n^2$ for all n ; here $\hat{1}$ denotes




FIG. 1. Closed trestle with three-qubit interactions, Eq. (1). Dark (light) triangles denote \hat{Z}_n 's (\hat{X}_n 's).

identity. It implies that these operators have eigenvalues ± 1 ; let these eigenvalues be denoted as z_n for \hat{Z}_n and as x_n for \hat{X}_n . Equation (1) is a one-dimensional analog of the toric code model [1]. Since every \hat{Z}_n and \hat{X}_n commutes with \hat{H} , Eq. (1) is a system of $2N$ interacting qubits with exactly $2N$ conserved quantities. So, while its Hilbert space is 2^{2N} dimensional, it also has 2^{2N} conserved sectors given by different z_n 's and x_n 's. It ensures a one-to-one resolution of the eigenstates into conserved sectors, exhibiting perfect quantum integrability!

Let $|\{z\}, \{x\}\rangle \equiv |\{z_1, z_2, \dots, z_N\}, \{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_N\}\rangle$ denote the eigenstates of \hat{H} such that $\hat{Z}_n |\{z\}, \{x\}\rangle = z_n |\{z\}, \{x\}\rangle$ and $\hat{X}_n |\{z\}, \{x\}\rangle = x_n |\{z\}, \{x\}\rangle$ for all n . Then, $\hat{H} |\{z\}, \{x\}\rangle = E_{\{z\}, \{x\}} |\{z\}, \{x\}\rangle$ with eigenvalue $E_{\{z\}, \{x\}} = \sum_{n=1}^N (I_{z,n} z_n + I_{x,n} x_n)$. The conserved z_n 's and x_n 's immediately help us write the following exact expression for these eigenstates.

$$|\{z\}, \{x\}\rangle = \frac{1}{2^{N/2}} \text{tr} \left\{ \prod_{n=1}^N \mathbb{M}^{(n)} \right\} \quad (2)$$

Here, $\mathbb{M}^{(n)}$ is a matrix with elements $\mathbb{M}_{\sigma_{2n-1}, \sigma_{2n+1}}^{(n)} = x_n \frac{1-\sigma_{2n+1}}{2} |\sigma_{2n-1}\rangle |\sigma_{2n} = \sigma_{2n-1} z_n \sigma_{2n+1}\rangle$. In matrix form, it reads as: $\mathbb{M}^{(n)} = \begin{bmatrix} |+\rangle |z_n\rangle & x_n |+\rangle |\bar{z}_n\rangle \\ |-\rangle |\bar{z}_n\rangle & x_n |-\rangle |z_n\rangle \end{bmatrix}$. Equation (2) presents a new many-qubit basis with $\{z\}$ and $\{x\}$ as the 'emergent' qubit quantum numbers.

We also find the transformation

$$\hat{U} = \prod_{n=1}^N (\hat{\sigma}_{2n-1}^z \hat{\sigma}_{2n+1}^z)^{\hat{Q}_{z,2n}} = \prod_{n=1}^N (\hat{\sigma}_{2n}^x \hat{\sigma}_{2n+2}^x)^{\hat{Q}_{z,2n+1}} \quad (3)$$

that turns the interacting constituent qubits in Eq. (1) into the same number of free emergent qubits, i.e. $\hat{U}^\dagger \hat{H} \hat{U} = \sum_n (I_{z,n} \hat{\sigma}_{2n}^z + I_{x,n} \hat{\sigma}_{2n+1}^x)$. In Eq. (3), $\hat{Q}_{\alpha,l} = (\hat{1} - \hat{\sigma}_l^\alpha)/2$, and the different terms in the product mutually commute. Equation (3) connects with Eq. (2) as $|\{z\}, \{x\}\rangle = \hat{U} \prod_{n=1}^N |\sigma_{2n} = z_n\rangle \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \sum_{\sigma_{2n+1}} x_n \frac{1-\sigma_{2n+1}}{2} |\sigma_{2n+1}\rangle$. Under this \hat{U} , the qubit operators transform as follows: $\hat{\sigma}_{2n}^{z(y)} \rightarrow \hat{\sigma}_{2n-1}^z \hat{\sigma}_{2n}^{z(y)} \hat{\sigma}_{2n+1}^z$ and $\hat{\sigma}_{2n+1}^{x(y)} \rightarrow \hat{\sigma}_{2n}^x \hat{\sigma}_{2n+1}^{x(y)} \hat{\sigma}_{2n+2}^x$, while $\hat{\sigma}_{2n}^x$ and $\hat{\sigma}_{2n+1}^z$ remain invariant.

The $|\{z\}, \{x\}\rangle$ states are quantum paramagnetic, as $\langle \{z\}, \{x\} | \hat{\sigma}_l^\alpha | \{z\}, \{x\} \rangle = 0$ for any l and α . But they are not spin singlets. For the total spin, $\hat{S}_\alpha = \frac{1}{2} \sum_l \hat{\sigma}_l^\alpha$, we get $\langle \{z\}, \{x\} | \hat{S}_\alpha^2 | \{z\}, \{x\} \rangle = N/2$ for $\alpha = x, y, z$; these states have contributions from different total spins of low value ($\sim \sqrt{N}$). For the two-point correlations, we get $\langle \{z\}, \{x\} | \hat{\sigma}_{l_1}^{\alpha_1} \hat{\sigma}_{l_2}^{\alpha_2} | \{z\}, \{x\} \rangle = \delta_{l_1, l_2} \delta_{\alpha_1, \alpha_2}$, i.e. a complete absence of pairwise correlation between qubits! Next consider three-point correlations. Clearly, $\langle \{z\}, \{x\} | \hat{\sigma}_{2n-1}^z \hat{\sigma}_{2n}^z \hat{\sigma}_{2n+1}^z | \{z\}, \{x\} \rangle = z_n$ and $\langle \{z\}, \{x\} | \hat{\sigma}_{2n}^x \hat{\sigma}_{2n+1}^x \hat{\sigma}_{2n+2}^x | \{z\}, \{x\} \rangle = x_n$; a three-point correlation is non-zero only when the qubits form ‘octupolar’ moments \hat{Z}_n or \hat{X}_n , otherwise it’s zero. All sorts of correlations are zero in $|\{z\}, \{x\}\rangle$, except those involving \hat{Z}_n ’s and \hat{X}_n ’s. This is so implied by the ‘paramagnetic’ form, $\hat{U}^\dagger \hat{H} \hat{U}$, of this model. These states also exhibit long-ranged correlations, first such at the six-point level: $\langle \{z\}, \{x\} | \hat{Z}_{n_1} \hat{Z}_{n_2} | \{z\}, \{x\} \rangle = z_{n_1} z_{n_2}$, $\langle \{z\}, \{x\} | \hat{X}_{n_1} \hat{X}_{n_2} | \{z\}, \{x\} \rangle = x_{n_1} x_{n_2}$, and $\langle \{z\}, \{x\} | \hat{Z}_{n_1} \hat{X}_{n_2} | \{z\}, \{x\} \rangle = z_{n_1} x_{n_2}$ for any n_1 and n_2 . More generally, $\langle \{z\}, \{x\} | \prod_i \hat{Z}_{n_i} | \{z\}, \{x\} \rangle = \prod_i z_{n_i}$ and other such forms involving \hat{X}_n ’s. But there is no true long-range order in these correlations because the system is paramagnetic in \hat{Z}_n ’s and \hat{X}_n ’s.

The density matrix for a $|\{z\}, \{x\}\rangle$ can be written as $\hat{\rho}[\{z\}, \{x\}] = \prod_{n=1}^N \left(\frac{\hat{1} + z_n \hat{Z}_n}{2} \right) \left(\frac{\hat{1} + x_n \hat{X}_n}{2} \right)$. From this, we find the reduced density matrix of a pair of qubits to be $\hat{\rho}_{l_1, l_2} = \left(\frac{\hat{1}}{2} \right)_{l_1} \left(\frac{\hat{1}}{2} \right)_{l_2}$ for any $l_1 \neq l_2$. Thus, no two qubits remain entangled upon tracing out the rest. But this tracing results in the maximally mixed state, $\frac{\hat{1}}{2}$, for each qubit [4]. It means the qubits in $|\{z\}, \{x\}\rangle$ are entangled, but not pairwise. To see this collective entanglement, trace over all the even numbered qubits of the trestle. It gives the reduced density matrix, $\hat{\rho}_o = \left(\hat{1} + \prod_{n=1}^N x_n \hat{\sigma}_{2n-1}^x \right) / 2^N$, for the remaining N odd numbered qubits. Likewise, the reduced density matrix of N even numbered qubits is $\hat{\rho}_e = \left(\hat{1} + \prod_{n=1}^N z_n \hat{\sigma}_{2n}^z \right) / 2^N$.

Tracing out one more qubit in $\hat{\rho}_o$ or $\hat{\rho}_e$ gives $\left(\frac{\hat{1}}{2} \right)^{\otimes (N-1)}$, i.e. any further tracing immediately separates all the remaining qubits at once. Thus, N odd qubits only collectively entangle with N even qubits in these states. The entropy of this entanglement in every $|\{z\}, \{x\}\rangle$ is $\mathcal{S}_{o,e} = -\text{tr}_e \{ \hat{\rho}_e \ln \hat{\rho}_e \} = -\text{tr}_o \{ \hat{\rho}_o \ln \hat{\rho}_o \} = N \ln 2 - \ln 2$; here the entropy deficit, $-\ln 2$, arises because while tracing over all the even (or odd) qubits, the last qubit traced (whichever that be) doesn’t generate entropy (mixing). It amounts to mixing exactly half of the Hilbert space of all odd (or all even) qubits.

This construction on trestle can be easily adapted to arbitrary lattices. Consider any lattice (graph) with qubits sitting on its sites (nodes) and on the bonds connecting these sites. A bond between two nodes n and n' is denoted as (n, n') ; see Fig. 2. Define a multi-qubit




FIG. 2. (a) Model with exact emergent qubit eigenstates on arbitrary graph. (b) Interaction operators involving qubits sitting on sites (filled circles) and bonds (empty circles).

interaction, $\hat{Z}_n = \hat{\sigma}_n^z \prod_{n'} \hat{\tau}_{(n,n')}^z$, between the qubit at node n and the qubits on all the bonds meeting at n ; the qubit operators on the nodes and the bonds are denoted respectively as $\hat{\sigma}_n^\alpha$ and $\hat{\tau}_{(n,n')}^\alpha$. Also define a three-qubit interaction, $\hat{X}_{(n,n')} = \hat{\sigma}_n^x \hat{\tau}_{(n,n')}^x \hat{\sigma}_{n'}^x$, between the qubits on a bond and the sites it connects. Now consider the Hamiltonian, $\hat{H}_2 = \sum_n I_{z,n} \hat{Z}_n + \sum_{(n,n')} I_{x,(n,n')} \hat{X}_{(n,n')}$, with N_s sites and N_b bonds, and arbitrary interaction strengths $I_{z,n}$ and $I_{x,(n,n')}$. All these \hat{Z}_n ’s and $\hat{X}_{(n,n')}$ ’s commute with each other, and $\hat{Z}_n^2 = \hat{1} = \hat{X}_{(n,n')}^2$. Hence, \hat{H}_2 has $N_s + N_b$ conserved \hat{Z}_n ’s and $\hat{X}_{(n,n')}$ ’s with respective quantum numbers z_n ’s and $x_{(n,n')}$ ’s of value ± 1 , which fully resolve the eigenstates of \hat{H}_2 .

In a straightforward generalization of Eq. (2), the eigenstates of \hat{H}_2 , with eigenvalues $E_{\{z\}, \{x\}} = \sum_n I_{z,n} z_n + \sum_{(n,n')} I_{x,(n,n')} x_{(n,n')}$, can be written as: $|\{z\}, \{x\}\rangle = \frac{1}{2^{(N_b/2)}} \sum_{\{\sigma\}} \sum_{\{\tau\}} \mathcal{M}_{\{\sigma\}, \{\tau\}} |\{\sigma\}, \{\tau\}\rangle$, where $|\{\sigma\}, \{\tau\}\rangle = \prod_n |\sigma_n\rangle \prod_{(n,n')} |\tau_{(n,n')}\rangle$ are the basis states with $\sigma_n = \pm 1$ and $\tau_{(n,n')} = \pm 1$ as the quantum numbers of $\hat{\sigma}_n^z$ and $\hat{\tau}_{(n,n')}^z$ respectively, and the tensor coefficients of linear superposition are given below.

$$\mathcal{M}_{\{\sigma\}, \{\tau\}} = \prod_{(n,n')} x_{(n,n')}^{\frac{1-\tau_{(n,n')}}{2}} \prod_n \delta_{\sigma_n, z_n} \prod_{n'} \tau_{(n,n')} \quad (4)$$

The transformation that changes \hat{H}_2 into independent emergent qubits can be written as: $\hat{U}_2 = \prod_n \left[\prod_{n'} \hat{\tau}_{(n,n')}^z \right]^{\hat{Q}_n^x} = \prod_{(n,n')} (\hat{\sigma}_n^x \hat{\sigma}_{n'}^x)^{\hat{Q}_n^z}$, where $\hat{Q}_n^x = (\hat{1} - \hat{\sigma}_n^x) / 2$ and $\hat{Q}_n^z = \left[\hat{1} - \hat{\tau}_{(n,n')}^z \right] / 2$. This generalization of Eq. (3) leads to $\hat{U}_2^\dagger \hat{H}_2 \hat{U}_2 = \sum_n I_{z,n} \hat{\sigma}_n^z + \sum_{(n,n')} I_{x,(n,n')} \hat{\tau}_{(n,n')}^x$ and $|\{z\}, \{x\}\rangle = \hat{U}_2 \prod_n \prod_{(n,n')} |\sigma_n = z_n\rangle \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \sum_{\tau_{(n,n')}} x_{(n,n')}^{\frac{1-\tau_{(n,n')}}{2}} |\tau_{(n,n')}\rangle$. These states too do not exhibit dipolar (magnetic) order, but carry multipolar moments as the expectation values of \hat{Z}_n ’s and $\hat{X}_{(n,n')}$ ’s. Under this \hat{U}_2 , we get $\hat{\sigma}^{z(y)} \rightarrow \hat{\sigma}^{z(y)} \prod_{n'} \tau_{(n,n')}^z$ and $\tau_{(n,n')}^x \rightarrow \hat{\sigma}_n^x \tau_{(n,n')}^x \hat{\sigma}_{n'}^x$, while $\hat{\sigma}_n^x$ and $\hat{\tau}_{(n,n')}^z$ remain invariant. Hence, $\hat{H}_2 + \sum_n h_{x,n} \hat{\sigma}_n^x + \sum_{(n,n')} h_{z,(n,n')} \hat{\tau}_{(n,n')}^z$ also transforms exactly into independent qubits under \hat{U}_2 ; the fields $h_{x,n}$ and $h_{z,(n,n')}$ induce magnetic moment in the eigenstates.

Unfolding the Toric Code Model.– In an intricate but exact manner, we also transform the toric code model into emergent qubits. First consider the model obtained by cutting open the toric code into a cylinder, and adding on its open ends the three-qubit interactions of the model on trestle; see Fig. 3. Let this model be called \hat{H}_3 .

$$\hat{H}_3 = \sum_{n_1=1}^{N_1} \sum_{n_2=1}^{N_2} \left[I_{n_1, n_2}^x \hat{X}_{n_1, n_2} + I_{n_1+\frac{1}{2}, n_2-\frac{1}{2}}^z \hat{Z}_{n_1+\frac{1}{2}, n_2-\frac{1}{2}} \right] \quad (5)$$

Here the integers n_1 and n_2 specify the sites of the square lattice formed by thin dotted lines in Fig. 3; it is periodic along n_1 and open along n_2 . The qubits sitting on the nearest-neighbour bonds of this square lattice interact via $\hat{X}_{n_1, n_2} = \hat{\sigma}_{n_1-\frac{1}{2}, n_2}^x \hat{\sigma}_{n_1, n_2+\frac{1}{2}}^x \hat{\sigma}_{n_1+\frac{1}{2}, n_2}^x \hat{\sigma}_{n_1, n_2-\frac{1}{2}}^x$ and $\hat{Z}_{n_1+\frac{1}{2}, n_2-\frac{1}{2}} = \hat{\sigma}_{n_1, n_2-\frac{1}{2}}^z \hat{\sigma}_{n_1+\frac{1}{2}, n_2}^z \hat{\sigma}_{n_1+1, n_2-\frac{1}{2}}^z \hat{\sigma}_{n_1+\frac{1}{2}, n_2-1}^z$ shown respectively by light and dark gray squares. Dark and light gray triangles at the bottom and the top denote $\hat{Z}_{n_1+\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}} = \hat{\sigma}_{n_1, \frac{1}{2}}^z \hat{\sigma}_{n_1+\frac{1}{2}, 1}^z \hat{\sigma}_{n_1+1, \frac{1}{2}}^z$ and $\hat{X}_{n_1, N_2} = \hat{\sigma}_{n_1-\frac{1}{2}, N_2}^x \hat{\sigma}_{n_1+\frac{1}{2}, N_2}^x \hat{\sigma}_{n_1, N_2-\frac{1}{2}}^x$ respectively. The strengths of these interactions are site dependent and arbitrary.

We construct a transformation $\hat{U}_3 = \hat{U}_{3_1} \hat{U}_{3_2}$ given below. It maps \hat{H}_3 into independent emergent qubits.

$$\hat{U}_{3_1} = \prod_{n_2=1}^{N_2} \left[\prod_{n_1=1}^{N_1} \left(\hat{X}_{n_1, n_2} \hat{\sigma}_{n_1, n_2-\frac{1}{2}}^x \right)^{\hat{Q}_{n_1, n_2-\frac{1}{2}}^z} \right] \quad (6a)$$

$$\hat{U}_{3_2} = \prod_{n_1=1}^{N_1} \left[\prod_{n_2=N_2}^2 \left(\hat{\sigma}_{n_1+\frac{1}{2}, n_2-1}^z \right)^{\hat{Q}_{n_1+\frac{1}{2}, n_2}^x} \right] \quad (6b)$$

Under \hat{U}_{3_1} , the qubits shown by filled circles in Fig. 3 become free, while the empty circles form independent Ising chains along n_2 . Under \hat{U}_{3_2} , these Ising chains also transform into independent qubits. Hence, $\hat{U}_3^\dagger \hat{H}_3 \hat{U}_3 = \sum_{n_1=1}^{N_1} \sum_{n_2=1}^{N_2} \left\{ I_{n_1, n_2}^x \hat{\sigma}_{n_1, n_2-\frac{1}{2}}^x + I_{n_1+\frac{1}{2}, n_2-\frac{1}{2}}^z \hat{\sigma}_{n_1+\frac{1}{2}, n_2}^z \right\}$. The exact eigenstates of \hat{H}_3 , written neatly in the density matrix form as $\hat{\rho}_3[\{z\}, \{x\}] = \frac{1}{2^{2N_1 N_2}} \prod_{n_1, n_2} (\hat{1} + x_{n_1, n_2} \hat{X}_{n_1, n_2}) (\hat{1} + z_{n_1+\frac{1}{2}, n_2-\frac{1}{2}} \hat{Z}_{n_1+\frac{1}{2}, n_2-\frac{1}{2}})$, are given completely by the emergent qubit quantum numbers $z_{n_1+\frac{1}{2}, n_2-\frac{1}{2}} = \pm 1$ and $x_{n_1, n_2} = \pm 1$ such that $\hat{X}_{n_1, n_2} \hat{\rho}_3 = x_{n_1, n_2} \hat{\rho}_3$ and $\hat{Z}_{n_1+\frac{1}{2}, n_2-\frac{1}{2}} \hat{\rho}_3 = z_{n_1+\frac{1}{2}, n_2-\frac{1}{2}} \hat{\rho}_3$. The correlations, except those of \hat{Z} 's and \hat{X} 's, will be zero in these states, as implied by the paramagnetic $\hat{U}_3^\dagger \hat{H}_3 \hat{U}_3$.

Unlike the toric code model, this \hat{H}_3 has uniquely resolved eigenstates because it realizes the same number of emergent qubits as the constituent qubits, i.e. $2N_1 N_2$. (It can be thought of as a two-dimensional analog of the trestle model.) Without the three-qubit interactions at its open ends, the \hat{H}_3 can still be solved exactly, but will have a degeneracy of 2^{2N_1} for every eigenstate.

Now consider the toric code model [1]; see Fig. 4(a). It is periodic along n_1 as well as n_2 , and has only four-qubit interactions (of arbitrary strengths like in \hat{H}_3); call it \hat{H}_4 .




FIG. 3. An ‘open’ toric code model, Eq. (5), on a cylinder padded on top and bottom by the interactions of Eq. (1). It is periodic along n_1 direction, and open along n_2 , with $2N_1 N_2$ qubits. Dark (light) gray squares and triangles denote $\hat{Z}(\hat{X})$ interactions involving four and three qubits respectively.

Let the operators defined below together form a unitary transformation $\hat{U}_4 = \hat{U}_{4_1} \hat{U}_{4_2} \hat{U}_{4_3} \hat{U}_{4_4}$.

$$\hat{U}_{4_1} = \prod_{n_1=1}^{N_1} \left[\prod_{n_2=n_2'+1}^{n_2'-1+N_2} \left(\hat{X}_{n_1, n_2} \hat{\sigma}_{n_1, n_2-\frac{1}{2}}^x \right)^{\hat{Q}_{n_1, n_2-\frac{1}{2}}^z} \right] \quad (7a)$$

$$\hat{U}_{4_2} = \prod_{n_1=1}^{N_1} \left[\prod_{n_2=n_2''-1}^{n_2''+1-N_2} \left(\left\{ \hat{\sigma}_{n_1, n_2-\frac{1}{2}}^z \hat{\sigma}_{n_1+1, n_2-\frac{1}{2}}^z \right\}^{\delta_{n_2, n_2''}} \times \hat{\sigma}_{n_1+\frac{1}{2}, n_2-1}^z \right)^{\hat{Q}_{n_1+\frac{1}{2}, n_2}^x} \right] \quad (7b)$$

$$\hat{U}_{4_3} = \prod_{n_1=n_1'+1}^{n_1'-1+N_1} \left[\hat{\sigma}_{n_1+\frac{1}{2}, n_2''}^x \prod_{n_2 \neq n_2''} \hat{\sigma}_{n_1, n_2-\frac{1}{2}}^x \right]^{\hat{Q}_{n_1-\frac{1}{2}, n_2''}^z} \quad (7c)$$

$$\hat{U}_{4_4} = \prod_{n_1=n_1''+1}^{n_1''-1+N_1} \left[\hat{\sigma}_{n_1+1, n_2'-\frac{1}{2}}^z \prod_{n_2 \neq n_2''} \hat{\sigma}_{n_1+\frac{1}{2}, n_2}^z \right]^{\hat{Q}_{n_1, n_2'-\frac{1}{2}}^x} \quad (7d)$$

This \hat{U}_4 is a sufficiently general extension of \hat{U}_3 ; it can also be constructed in an even more general way. It is defined with reference to two arbitrary rows (columns) labelled by integers n_2' and n_2'' (n_1' and n_1''); see Fig. 4(b). By applying it on the toric code model, we get: $\hat{U}_4^\dagger \hat{H}_4 \hat{U}_4 = \sum_{n_1=1}^{N_1} \sum_{n_2 \neq n_2'} I_{n_1, n_2}^x \hat{\sigma}_{n_1, n_2-\frac{1}{2}}^x + \sum_{n_1=1}^{N_1} \sum_{n_2 \neq n_2''} I_{n_1+\frac{1}{2}, n_2-\frac{1}{2}}^z \hat{\sigma}_{n_1+\frac{1}{2}, n_2}^z + \sum_{n_1 \neq n_1'} I_{n_1, n_2'}^x \hat{\sigma}_{n_1-\frac{1}{2}, n_2''}^x + \sum_{n_1 \neq n_1''} I_{n_1+\frac{1}{2}, n_2'-\frac{1}{2}}^z \hat{\sigma}_{n_1+\frac{1}{2}, n_2'-\frac{1}{2}}^z + I_{n_1', n_2'}^x \left(\prod_{n_1 \neq n_1'} \hat{\sigma}_{n_1-\frac{1}{2}, n_2''}^x \right) \left(\prod_{n_1=1}^{N_1} \prod_{n_2 \neq n_2'} \hat{\sigma}_{n_1, n_2-\frac{1}{2}}^x \right) + I_{n_1'', n_2'-\frac{1}{2}}^z \left[\prod_{n_1 \neq n_1''} \hat{\sigma}_{n_1, n_2'-\frac{1}{2}}^z \right] \left[\prod_{n_1=1}^{N_1} \prod_{n_2 \neq n_2''} \hat{\sigma}_{n_1+\frac{1}{2}, n_2}^z \right]$.

See, under \hat{U}_4 , every \hat{X} and \hat{Z} operator of the toric code model transforms into an emergent qubit, except the last two ‘accumulation’ terms [depicted as a blue and a purple plaquette in Fig. 4(b)] that represent the constraints $\prod_{n_1=1}^{N_1} \prod_{n_2=1}^{N_2} \hat{X}_{n_1, n_2} = \hat{1} = \prod_{n_1=1}^{N_1} \prod_{n_2=1}^{N_2} \hat{Z}_{n_1+\frac{1}{2}, n_2-\frac{1}{2}}$.




FIG. 4. (a) The toric code model; it's called \hat{H}_4 in the text. (b) The transformed toric code, $\hat{U}_4^\dagger \hat{H}_4 \hat{U}_4$, with \hat{U}_4 defined in Eq. (7). The original interacting qubits (filled and empty circles) of (a) transform into independent emergent qubits (vertical ovals denoting $\hat{\sigma}^x$ and horizontal denoting $\hat{\sigma}^z$) in (b), with two missing qubits (colored circle on the red lines). Four (colored) reference lines at $n'_{1(2)}$ and $n''_{1(2)}$ required for \hat{U}_4 are arbitrary; they mark the positions of two accumulation terms (colored plaquettes) and two missing qubits.

Note that a ‘punctured’ toric code model, with $I_{n'_1, n'_2}^x = 0 = I_{n'_1 + \frac{1}{2}, n'_2 - \frac{1}{2}}^z$, will not have these accumulation terms! (This is akin to an Ising chain being closed or open.) In $\hat{U}_4^\dagger \hat{H}_4 \hat{U}_4$, with or without this puncture, we also have two missing qubits at $(n'_1 - \frac{1}{2}, n'_2)$ and $(n''_1, n'_2 - \frac{1}{2})$, shown in Fig. 4(b) by a blue and a purple circle. It gives rise to a degeneracy of four in every conserved sector given by $2(N_1 N_2 - 1)$ emergent qubit quantum numbers $\{z\}$ and $\{x\}$. Below we write an exact expression for all the eigenstates of the toric code model, \hat{H}_4 (with or without puncture), in the pure density matrix form.

$$\hat{\rho}_{\text{toric-code}} = \prod_{(n_1, n_2) \neq (n'_1, n'_2)} \left(\frac{\hat{1} + x_{n_1, n_2} \hat{X}_{n_1, n_2}}{2} \right) \times \prod_{(n_1, n_2) \neq (n''_1, n''_2)} \left(\frac{\hat{1} + z_{n_1 + \frac{1}{2}, n_2 - \frac{1}{2}} \hat{Z}_{n_1 + \frac{1}{2}, n_2 - \frac{1}{2}}}{2} \right) \times \left[\frac{1 + \chi \left(u_z \prod_{n_1=1}^{N_1} \hat{\sigma}_{n_1 - \frac{1}{2}, n'_2}^z + u_x \prod_{n_2=1}^{N_2} \hat{\sigma}_{n'_1 - \frac{1}{2}, n_2}^x \right)}{2} \right] \times \left[\frac{1 + \zeta \left(v_z \prod_{n_2=1}^{N_2} \hat{\sigma}_{n'_1, n_2 - \frac{1}{2}}^z + v_x \prod_{n_1=1}^{N_1} \hat{\sigma}_{n_1, n'_2 - \frac{1}{2}}^x \right)}{2} \right] \quad (8)$$

Besides $\{z\}$ and $\{x\}$, the $\hat{\rho}_{\text{toric-code}}$ has two other quantum numbers $\zeta = \pm 1$ and $\chi = \pm 1$ for the two qubits that go missing in $\hat{U}_4^\dagger \hat{H}_4 \hat{U}_4$. The energy eigenvalues of the toric code model, $E_{\{z\}, \{x\}} = \sum_{(n_1, n_2) \neq (n'_1, n'_2)} I_{n_1, n_2}^x x_{n_1, n_2} + \sum_{(n_1, n_2) \neq (n''_1, n''_2)} I_{n_1 + \frac{1}{2}, n_2 - \frac{1}{2}}^z z_{n_1 + \frac{1}{2}, n_2 - \frac{1}{2}} + I_{n'_1 + \frac{1}{2}, n'_2 - \frac{1}{2}}^z \prod_{(n_1, n_2) \neq (n''_1, n''_2)} z_{n_1 + \frac{1}{2}, n_2 - \frac{1}{2}} + I_{n'_1, n'_2}^x \prod_{(n_1, n_2) \neq (n'_1, n'_2)} x_{n_1, n_2}$, do not depend on ζ

and χ ; hence the degeneracy of four. The two arbitrary unit vectors (u_x, u_y, u_z) and (v_x, v_y, v_z) are the quantization directions of the missing qubits at sites $(n'_1 - \frac{1}{2}, n'_2)$ and $(n''_1, n'_2 - \frac{1}{2})$ respectively. [In Eq. (8), u_y and v_y are taken to be zero for some simplicity; we can also take them to be nonzero, if required.]

We conclude by outlining the basic plan for a physical realization of the states described here. To this end, we note that the unitary operators that transform the toric code and other models into independent emergent qubits can be implemented exactly by using CNOT quantum gates. For instance, we realize that Eq. (3) is a product of CCNOT (Toffoli [5]) gates, $(\hat{\sigma}_{2n-1}^z \hat{\sigma}_{2n+1}^z)^{\hat{Q}_{2n}^z}$, which are pairs of CNOT's, $(\hat{\sigma}_{2n-1}^z)^{\hat{Q}_{2n}^z} (\hat{\sigma}_{2n+1}^z)^{\hat{Q}_{2n}^z}$, with target qubit at $2n$ and control qubits at $2n \pm 1$. The eigenstates of the trestle model, Eq. (2), can thus be prepared by applying this sequence of CNOT gates on the product state, $\prod_{n=1}^N |\sigma_{2n} = z_n\rangle \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \sum_{\sigma_{2n+1}} x_n^{\frac{1-\sigma_{2n+1}}{2}} |\sigma_{2n+1}\rangle$, of $2N$ independent qubits for different z_n 's and x_n 's. The other states discussed here can also be similarly realized. For example, Eq. (6b) is a sequence of CNOT's, but Eq. (6a) is a product of the controlled unitary gates of the form $(\hat{\sigma}_1^x \hat{\sigma}_2^x \hat{\sigma}_3^x)^{\hat{Q}_4^z}$ with three target qubits and one control qubit. Interestingly, this multiqubit gate too can be formed by a product of three CNOT gates, i.e. $(\hat{\sigma}_1^x \hat{\sigma}_2^x \hat{\sigma}_3^x)^{\hat{Q}_4^z} = (\hat{\sigma}_1^x)^{\hat{Q}_4^z} (\hat{\sigma}_2^x)^{\hat{Q}_4^z} (\hat{\sigma}_3^x)^{\hat{Q}_4^z}$. Hence, the eigenstates of the model on cylinder (Fig. 3) can be implemented by applying CNOT gates as per \hat{U}_3 on the product states of the qubits as in $\hat{U}_3^\dagger \hat{H}_3 \hat{U}_3$. The toric-code eigenstates can likewise be realized by applying CNOT gates in accordance with \hat{U}_4 on the product states of the qubits as in $\hat{U}_4^\dagger \hat{H}_4 \hat{U}_4$. Recent experiment on the realization of toric code ground state [6] may be revisited in view of the understanding developed here.

* bkumar@mail.jnu.ac.in

- [1] A. Kitaev, Fault-tolerant quantum computation by anyons, *Annals of Physics* **303**, 2 (2003).
- [2] B. Kumar, Exact solution of the infinite- U hubbard problem and other models in one dimension, *Phys. Rev. B* **79**, 155121 (2009).
- [3] B. Kumar, Exact spin-orbital separation in a solvable model in one dimension, *Phys. Rev. B* **87**, 195105 (2013).
- [4] A D -dimensional quantum system is said to be in a maximally mixed state if it is found in any of its D basis states with equal probability $1/D$. Hence, the maximally mixed state is $\hat{1}/D$, and it has the maximum entropy $\ln D$.
- [5] M. A. Nielsen and I. L. Chuang, *Quantum Computation and Quantum Information* (Cambridge University Press, 2002).
- [6] K. J. Satzinger et al, Realizing topologically ordered states on a quantum processor, *Science* **374**, 1237 (2021).