

Approximate quantum error correcting codes from conformal field theory

Shengqi Sang,^{1,2} Timothy H. Hsieh,¹ and Yijian Zou^{1,*}

¹*Perimeter Institute for Theoretical Physics, Waterloo, Ontario N2L 2Y5, Canada*

²*University of Waterloo, Waterloo, Ontario, N2L 3G1, Canada*

The low-energy subspace of a conformal field theory (CFT) can serve as a quantum error correcting code, with important consequences in holography and quantum gravity. We consider generic 1+1D CFT codes under extensive local dephasing channels and analyze their error correctability in the thermodynamic limit. We show that (i) there is a finite decoding threshold if and only if the minimal nonzero scaling dimension in the fusion algebra generated by the jump operator of the channel is larger than $1/2$ and (ii) the number of protected logical qubits $k \geq \Omega(\log \log n)$, where n is the number of physical qubits. As an application, we show that the one-dimensional quantum critical Ising model has a finite threshold for certain types of dephasing noise. Our general results also imply that a CFT code with continuous symmetry saturates a bound on the recovery fidelity for covariant codes.

Introduction.—Quantum information is fragile and can be lost when subject to decoherence. In order to robustly store and manipulate quantum information against noise, one embeds the logical qubits into a larger set of physical qubits, forming quantum error correcting codes (QECC) [1, 2]. QECCs provide promising routes to fault-tolerant quantum computing [3, 4] and have been recently realized on quantum simulators [5]. On the theoretical side, code properties of QECCs provide insight into patterns of long-range quantum many-body entanglement, connecting quantum information with condensed matter physics [6, 7] and quantum gravity [8, 9]. More recently, studies have suggested a close relationship between mixed-state topological phases and the ability of the QECCs to correct certain errors [10, 11]. It is thus important, both from a practical and a theoretical point of view, to understand which physical systems can serve as QECCs and which errors are correctable given the system or code.

Most previous studies focus on stabilizer codes [2]. The stabilizer formalism offers a natural way for decoding, where in some cases the optimal decoder can be found [6]. However, the notion of QECC goes far beyond stabilizer codes. In order to define a QECC, one may specify a D -dimensional code subspace spanned by a set of mutually orthogonal codeword states, $\{|\phi_\alpha\rangle, \alpha = 1, 2, \dots, D\}$, where $D = 2^k$ to encode k logical qubits. In the seminal work [12], the codeword states are chosen as the eigenstates of a local Hamiltonian. The code properties can then be related to physical properties of the system in an energy window. Another example that goes beyond stabilizers is AdS/CFT correspondence, where the code subspace is the CFT low-energy subspace corresponding to bulk graviton excitations. For this code, the code properties reveal important aspects of quantum gravity [13]. Going beyond stabilizer codes poses significant challenges to determine error correctability as there are usually no explicit decoders. We note that there are existing information-theoretic criteria for approximate error correctability [14–16] which have been used in a variety of contexts.

In this work, we show that *generic* CFTs furnish approximate quantum error correcting codes [17, 18], where the code subspace is given by the low-energy subspace of the CFT. As opposed to the holographic correspondence, here the CFT can be realized by a simple spin chain at criticality, such as the transverse field Ising model. We analyze the decodability of CFT codes under a finite-time evolution of a translation-invariant Lindbladian, such as uniform dephasing noise. Our main result is that the errors can be corrected at a finite threshold if and only if $\Delta_{\min} > 1/2$, where Δ_{\min} is the minimal nonzero scaling dimension of CFT operators in fusion algebra generated by the Lindbladian jump operator. A natural corollary is that a CFT code can correct uniform depolarization noise at a finite threshold if and only if the algebra generated by the jump operator only contains CFT operators with scaling dimension larger than $1/2$. In addition, we show that for any CFT code the number of protected logical qubits $k \geq \Omega(\log \log n)$, where n is the number of physical qubits. As an example, we analyze the Ising CFT code realized by the low-energy subspace of the critical transverse-field Ising model (TFIM) in one dimension. We show that for dephasing noise, the code does not have a finite threshold for X dephasing but can correct Y and Z dephasing up to maximal strength.

Our work is in part inspired by recent developments in decoherence-induced mixed-state phases [19–40]. While previous approaches mainly focus on finite number of replicas of the system (for computing Renyi entanglement quantities), our work directly addresses the replica limit, which is provably related to the decoding transition. As a byproduct, this work also features an example where the replica limit has fundamentally different physics from other integer Renyi indices. In contrast to previous works on QECCs in gapless systems which mainly focus on code distances [12, 14, 41, 42], our results involve the decoding threshold for *extensive* noise. Furthermore, our results are applicable to generic CFTs as opposed to specific models.

CFT code—Let us start with properly defining the CFT

code. Given a critical quantum spin chain with n spins and Hamiltonian H , the low-energy physics is described by a CFT. Each low-energy eigenstate $|\phi_\alpha\rangle$ corresponds to a scaling operator ϕ_α in the CFT due to the state-operator correspondence. The energy of the state is given by $E_\alpha = \frac{2\pi}{n}(\Delta_\alpha - c/12)$, where Δ_α is the scaling dimension and c is the central charge. As $n \rightarrow \infty$, there are infinite number of low-energy eigenstates whose energies are degenerate. The encoding circuit can be chosen as a MERA tensor network [42–46], where the logical qubits are located at top layers.

In order to discuss the error-correcting properties, we specify the error model to be a finite-time evolution $e^{t\mathcal{L}}$ of a local Lindbladian \mathcal{L} , where $\mathcal{L}(\rho) = \sum_i \left[L_i \rho L_i^\dagger - \frac{1}{2} \{L_i^\dagger L_i, \rho\} \right]$ and L_i are local jump operators. More concretely, we consider two types of noise, dephasing and flagged dephasing. For both error models, the noise channel $\mathcal{N} = \otimes_j \mathcal{N}^{[j]}$ is a product of local channels $\mathcal{N}^{[j]}$ acting on a single spin j . A dephasing channel of strength p is defined by

$$\mathcal{N}_{p,\alpha}^{[j]}(\rho) = \left(1 - \frac{p}{2}\right) \rho + \frac{p}{2} \sigma_\alpha^{[j]} \rho \sigma_\alpha^{[j]}, \quad (1)$$

where $\sigma_\alpha^{[j]}$ is the Pauli operator acting on site j and $\alpha = x, y, z$. In terms of Lindbladian, this corresponds to n jump operators $L_i = \sigma_\alpha^{[i]}/\sqrt{2}$ and evolution time $t = -\log(1-p)$. A flagged dephasing channel (also known as heralded noise in quantum optics [47]) of strength p is defined by

$$\mathcal{N}_{p,\alpha;F}^{[j]}(\rho) = (1-p) \rho \otimes |0_F\rangle\langle 0_F| + p \mathcal{N}_{1,\alpha}^{[j]}(\rho) \otimes |1_F\rangle\langle 1_F|, \quad (2)$$

where we have introduced a “flag” qubit F at each site j . The flagged dephasing means that each site has a probability p to undergo a complete dephasing, but we know which sites are subject to error by measuring the flag qubit. The flagged noise has $2n$ jump operators, $L_{2i-1} = I \otimes \sigma_+^{[i]}/\sqrt{2}$, $L_{2i} = \sigma_+^{[i]} \otimes \sigma_+^{[i]}/\sqrt{2}$.

We say the noise is correctable if there exists a decoding channel \mathcal{D} at each size n such that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} F(\mathcal{D} \circ \mathcal{N}(\rho), \rho) = 1$ for any ρ in $\mathcal{H}_{\text{code}}$, where F is the Uhlmann fidelity. The uniform dephasing is harder to correct than the flagged dephasing, as one can discard the flag to obtain the uniformly dephased state, $\text{Tr}_F \mathcal{N}_{p,\alpha;F}(\rho) = \mathcal{N}_{p,\alpha}(\rho)$.

Error correcting condition.— In order to characterize the recoverability of a QEC, Ref. [48] introduces the entanglement fidelity for a decoding channel \mathcal{D} , $F_e = \langle \psi_{RQ} | \mathcal{D} \circ \mathcal{N}(|\psi_{RQ}\rangle\langle \psi_{RQ}|) | \psi_{RQ} \rangle$, where

$$|\psi_{RQ}\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{D}} \sum_{\alpha=1}^D |\alpha\rangle_R |\phi_\alpha\rangle_Q \quad (3)$$

is the maximal-entangled state between the reference R and the code subspace of the physical qubits Q . The




FIG. 1. (Left) The coherent information of the CFT code is defined by $I_c = S_Q - S_{RQ}$ for the state ρ_{RQ} in the figure, where W_{encode} is an encoding isometry which outputs states in the CFT low-energy subspace and \mathcal{N} denote noise channels acting on all physical sites. (Right) Coherent information of correctable (blue) and uncorrectable (red) noise for the CFT code. The correctability condition is $\Delta_{\min} > 1/2$, where Δ_{\min} is the smallest scaling dimension in the fusion algebra of the noise channel jump operators.

fidelity between any logical state and the recovered state is lower-bounded by F_e . Let $\rho_{RQ} = \mathcal{N}(|\psi_{RQ}\rangle\langle \psi_{RQ}|)$ (see Fig. 1), one can further define the coherent information

$$I_c = S_Q - S_{RQ}, \quad (4)$$

where $S_A := -\text{Tr}(\rho_A \log \rho_A)$. It has been shown that if the coherent information is close to its maximal value, that is, $I_c = \log D - \epsilon$, then there exists a decoding channel \mathcal{D} which achieves entanglement fidelity $F_e > 1 - 2\sqrt{\epsilon}$ [49]. A QEC can perfectly correct the error if and only if $I_c = \log D$. If $\epsilon > 0$ then the code is an approximate QEC. A CFT code can approximately correct any noise that only acts on one lattice site. The reason is that the jump operator L_i on site i connects different codeword states with an amplitude [50, 51]

$$\langle \phi_\beta | L_i | \phi_\alpha \rangle = \left(\frac{2\pi}{n} \right)^\Delta C_{\alpha\beta L}, \quad (5)$$

where Δ is the scaling dimension of the operator L_i and $C_{\alpha\beta L}$ is the operator product expansion (OPE) coefficient that is independent of n . This violation of Knill-Laflamme condition implies that the best entanglement infidelity decreases to zero polynomially in n [14].

Below we consider the CFT code under noise that uniformly acting on all sites, which is much harder to treat than the single-site noise. The coherent information $I_c(p, n)$ depends on the noise rate and the system size. The noise is correctable at error rate p if and only if

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} I_c(p, n) = \log D \quad (\text{correctable condition}). \quad (6)$$

Given a noise model, such as flagged dephasing Eq. (2) or unflagged dephasing Eq. (1), the code is said to have a threshold p_c if all noise channels with $p < p_c$ are correctable.

Perturbative expansion of coherent information– In order to derive our main result, we make use of a perturbative expansion of coherent information together with the scaling hypothesis. The derivation is sketched below.

The crucial assumption is the scaling hypothesis, that is, the coherent information has a scaling collapse of the form

$$I_c(p, n) = f(pn^\nu) \quad (7)$$

as $n \rightarrow \infty$ and $p \rightarrow 0$, where ν is a constant that is analogous to the critical exponent. The same scaling form, in particular, the same exponent ν , is assumed to hold for any scaling of p with respect to n as long as $p \rightarrow 0$. The underlying physical intuition is to treat the noisy channel as a perturbation, which flows towards or flows away from the no-noise fixed point under the renormalization group flow. Furthermore, the scaling form is also confirmed numerically, as we demonstrate later. The scaling function f is monotonically decreasing and satisfies $f(0) = \log D$ and $f(\infty) < \log D$. For dephasing noise one can easily show $f(\infty) = 0$. Therefore the sign of ν determines the error correctability in the thermodynamic limit. If $\nu > 0$, then $I_c(p, n) \rightarrow 0$ in the thermodynamic limit for arbitrary $p > 0$, thus $p_c = 0$. If $\nu < 0$, then the correctability condition Eq. (6) is satisfied for small enough p and thus the error has a finite threshold.

Next, we perform a perturbation theory on the coherent information assuming that $p = o(1/n)$. The quantum channel can be approximated by

$$\mathcal{N}_p(\rho) = \rho + \frac{p}{2}\mathcal{L}(\rho) + O(p^2), \quad (8)$$

where \mathcal{L} is the Lindbladian. The state $\rho_{RQ}(p) = \mathcal{N}(|\psi_{RQ}\rangle\langle\psi_{RQ}|)$ can be expanded to first order in p . Expanding S_Q and S_{QR} to the first order (see details in appendix), we obtain

$$I_c(p, n) = \log D + b(n)p \log p + O(p), \quad (9)$$

where

$$b(n) = \frac{1}{D^2} \sum_{i=1}^n [D \text{Tr}(L_i P L_i^\dagger P) - \text{Tr}(L_i P) \text{Tr}(L_i^\dagger P)] \quad (10)$$

and $P = \sum_\alpha |\phi_\alpha\rangle\langle\phi_\alpha|$ is the projector onto the code subspace. The noise is correctable only if $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} b(n) = 0$. It is worth noting that $b(n) \geq 0$ and the equality holds if and only if $PL_iP \propto P$, which is part of the Knill-Laflamme conditions for a single-qubit error. Higher-order perturbations can reproduce Knill-Laflamme conditions with multi-qubit errors.

Finally, using Eq. (5) we obtain $b(n) \propto n^{1-2\Delta}$, where Δ is the scaling dimension of the jump operator. The only way that $b(n) \propto n^{1-2\Delta}$ can be compatible with the scaling form $I_c(p, n) = f(pn^\nu)$ is that

$$\nu = 1 - 2\Delta.$$

Crucially, the scaling hypothesis allows us to infer the exponent ν for $p = O(1)$ from finite-order of perturbation theory performed at $p = o(1/n)$. Thus the error correctability condition $\nu > 0$ holds at finite p if and only if $\Delta > 1/2$.

Expanding to higher orders of perturbation theory, we find that correctability requires that all the OPE between L_i and itself only contains operators with scaling dimension larger than $1/2$, excluding the identity operator. If the lowest operator with scaling dimension Δ_{\min} appears at fusion order r , then $\nu = (1 - 2\Delta_{\min})/r$. We provide a calculation to the second order and an argument for higher orders in the appendix.

In order to verify our result, we numerically compute coherent information for both unflagged (Eq. (1)) and flagged (Eq. (2)) dephasing noise. We remark that two noise models should have the same ν according to our argument, because they contain the same jump operators acting on the physical system. For the unflagged case, we are restricted to small system sizes due to exponentially growing simulation complexity. For the flagged case, we can access much larger system sizes by sampling over measurement trajectories, which is a trick first explored in Ref. [52] and detailed in appendix.

Example: Ising CFT code.– As an example, let us consider the Ising CFT realized by the transverse field Ising model $H = -\sum_i (\sigma_x^{[i]} \sigma_x^{[i+1]} + g \sigma_z^{[i]})$ at $g = g_c = 1$. It has three primary operators labelled by I, σ, ε with scaling dimensions $\Delta_I = 0, \Delta_\sigma = 1/8, \Delta_\varepsilon = 1$ [53]. The code subspace can be minimally chosen to be spanned by the ground state $|I\rangle$ and the second excited state $|\varepsilon\rangle$. The three single-site Pauli operators $\sigma_x, \sigma_y, \sigma_z$ corresponds to $\sigma, \partial\sigma, \varepsilon$ in the CFT [51]. We can read off the exponent ν for the X , and Z dephasing $\nu_x = 1 - 2\Delta_\sigma = 0.75$ and $\nu_z = 1 - 2\Delta_\varepsilon = -1$. For Y dephasing, we can use second order perturbation theory to show that $\nu_y = (1 - 2\Delta_\varepsilon)/2 = -0.5$. The underlying reason is that the OPE $\partial\sigma \times \partial\sigma$ contains an operator ε with $\Delta_\varepsilon < \Delta_{\partial\sigma}$, and further fusion does not produce a lower one than ε . Thus our theory predicts that the Y and Z dephasing have a finite threshold and X dephasing has zero threshold.

We compute the coherent information for the unflagged dephasing up to $n = 16$ [54] and flagged dephasing up to $n = 128$ [55] with $p \leq 0.2$, see Fig. 2. The scaling collapses fit best with $\nu_x \approx 0.65, \nu_y \approx -0.5, \nu_z \approx -1.0$, which are close to the theoretical values.

In order to obtain the threshold, we compute I_c for flagged noise at large p and find that the threshold $p = 1$ for both Y and Z dephasing. In Fig. 3 we show the extrapolation of I_c to the thermodynamic limit and show that $I_c = \log 2$ up to $p \leq 0.8$. We also perform a scaling collapse near $p = 1$ to confirm that it is indeed an unstable RG fixed point, which indicates that $p = 1$ is the threshold. For unflagged dephasing, the threshold can be estimated by the crossing point of the curves $I_c(p)$ of different n . Our small-size simulation suggests that the




FIG. 2. Coherent information of the Ising CFT code under flagged and unflagged dephasing with $p \leq 0.2$

threshold is also $p_y = p_z = 1$, see appendix for details.




FIG. 3. Coherent information of the Ising CFT code under Z (left) and Y (right) flagged dephasing with $0.2 \leq p \leq 0.8$

We see that the correctable and uncorrectable dephasing of the Ising CFT code is identical to the repetition code. It is not unexpected since the repetition code can be realized by the spontaneous symmetry broken phase $0 < g < 1$ of TFIM. However, as opposed to the repetition code where the number of protected logical qubits is $k = O(1)$, the CFT code can protect more logical information as we increase n , as we demonstrate below.

Dimension of logical subspace.— The low-energy subspace is infinite-dimensional as $n \rightarrow \infty$, as each primary operator has infinitely many descendants. It is then natural to ask how large the code subspace can be chosen to maintain a finite threshold for correctable dephasing noise with $\Delta > 1/2$. Firstly, as $b(n) \propto n^{1-2\Delta}$ in Eq. (10) for any finite-dimensional code subspace, we can store at least constant number of qubits. Below we further argue that the dimension of code subspace can scale at least as $\text{polylog}(n)$, thus $k \geq \Omega(\log \log n)$. Let us choose the code subspace to be spanned by a primary state $|\phi\rangle$ and its global descendants $|\partial^m \bar{\partial}^{\bar{m}} \phi\rangle$, where m and \bar{m} are natural numbers smaller than a cutoff M . Then the projector to the code subspace is

$$P = \sum_{m, \bar{m}=0}^{M-1} |\partial^m \bar{\partial}^{\bar{m}} \phi\rangle \langle \partial^m \bar{\partial}^{\bar{m}} \phi| \quad (11)$$

As we show in the appendix, if $M = \text{polylog}(n)$, then

$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} b(n) \rightarrow 0$ given any $\Delta_K > 1/2$. The total dimension of code subspace $2^k = M^2$, which means $k \propto \log(M) = O(\log \log n)$. Thus, we establish that the number of logical qubits increases with the number of physical qubits. In principle one can encode more logical qubits by including Virasoro descendants in the code subspace. By including all descendants below scaling dimension $M = \text{polylog}(n)$, one may reach $k = O(\text{polylog}(n))$ by the Cardy formula [50]. We leave it to future work to investigate its error protection properties.

Covariant CFT code.— Let us consider a particular case of the CFT code where the CFT has a global $U(1)$ symmetry. Then there exists a conserved charge density which has scaling dimension $\Delta = 1$. The dephasing noise on the conserved charge is a correctable error since $\nu = 1 - 2\Delta = -1$. The coherent information gives $1 - F_e > \sqrt{\delta} I_c \propto \sqrt{p} n^{-1/2}$ at small p . The same conclusion holds for arbitrary dimensions. On the other hand, it has been shown in Refs. [56, 57] that $1 - F_e \leq O(n^{-1/2})$ for any covariant code with $U(1)$ symmetry. Thus, the CFT code with $U(1)$ symmetry saturates the covariant code bound.

Discussion.— Our result can be readily applied to depolarization noise, where all Pauli errors can happen. The CFT code can correct depolarization noise at a finite threshold if and only if all scaling dimensions $\Delta > 1/2$. Such a CFT does not exist for Virasoro minimal models and all $c = 1$ free boson models. CFTs that satisfy this condition have $c > 1$ and may only be realized beyond spin-1/2 chains and 2-local interactions [58]. One such example is the monster CFT with the lowest primary $\Delta = 4$, which has been conjectured to be dual to a bulk quantum gravity theory [59]. Another example which has $\Delta_{\min} > 1/2$ is the $SU(N)_1$ WZW model for $N \geq 3$, where the simplest case $N = 3$ can be realized by a spin-1 chain [60]. One interesting feature of these CFT codes is that they may have a finite threshold in one spatial dimension, which cannot be achieved by the ground state subspace of any gapped local Hamiltonian.

In terms of characterization of mixed-state phases, one of our technical contributions is the perturbative calculation of coherent information without applying replica

trick, while prior works mostly focus on finite replica calculations. In fact, the Renyi coherent information may give incorrect predictions of the code properties. For example, it gives a wrong decoding threshold for the toric code [20]. This work has given another example which shows that working with integer Renyi index predicts wrong error-correctability of infinitesimally small noise strength. For the Ising CFT code, uniform Z dephasing can be corrected at a finite threshold but the Renyi coherent information drops as long as $p \neq 0$, see appendix for details.

Our work opens up several future directions. Firstly, even though we have shown that some errors can be corrected for CFT code, it is still nontrivial to construct an explicit decoder, an important ingredient of QECC. Secondly, we can consider logical operations for CFT code and see if it can be performed fault-tolerantly. Thirdly, it is interesting to consider the bulk dual in AdS/CFT with boundary dephasing [61, 62], which may inspire the solution of the two questions above.

Acknowledgements. – We thank Charles Cao, Yu-Hsueh Chen, Tarun Grover, Yangrui Hu, Isaac Kim, Yaodong Li, David Lin, Peter Lu, Ruochen Ma, Alexey Milekhin, Daniel Parker, Bowen Shi, Guifre Vidal, Sisi Zhou, Tianci Zhou and Zheng Zhou for helpful discussions. Y.Z. in particular thanks Patrick Hayden for his insight that leads this work. This work was supported by the Perimeter Institute for Theoretical Physics (PI) and the Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council of Canada (NSERC). Research at PI is supported in part by the Government of Canada through the Department of Innovation, Science and Economic Development Canada and by the Province of Ontario through the Ministry of Colleges and Universities. This research was supported in part by grant NSF PHY-2309135 to the Kavli Institute for Theoretical Physics (KITP).

* yzou@perimeterinstitute.ca

- [1] P. W. Shor, Scheme for reducing decoherence in quantum computer memory, *Phys. Rev. A* **52**, R2493 (1995).
- [2] D. Gottesman, Stabilizer codes and quantum error correction (1997), arXiv:quant-ph/9705052 [quant-ph].
- [3] D. Aharonov and M. Ben-Or, Fault-tolerant quantum computation with constant error rate (1999), arXiv:quant-ph/9906129 [quant-ph].
- [4] E. Knill, R. Laflamme, and W. H. Zurek, Resilient quantum computation: error models and thresholds, *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London. Series A: Mathematical, Physical and Engineering Sciences* **454**, 365–384 (1998).
- [5] R. Acharya, I. Aleiner, R. Allen, T. I. Andersen, M. Ansmann, F. Arute, K. Arya, A. Asfaw, J. Atalaya, R. Babush, D. Bacon, J. C. Bardin, J. Basso, A. Bengtsson, S. Boixo, G. Bortoli, A. Bourassa, J. Bovaird, L. Brill, M. Broughton, B. B. Buckley, D. A. Buell, T. Burger, B. Burkett, N. Bushnell, Y. Chen, Z. Chen, B. Chiaro, J. Cogan, R. Collins, P. Conner, W. Courtney, A. L. Crook, B. Curtin, D. M. Debroy, A. Del Toro Barba, S. Demura, A. Dunsworth, D. Eppens, C. Erickson, L. Faoro, E. Farhi, R. Fatemi, L. Flores Burgos, E. Forati, A. G. Fowler, B. Foxen, W. Giang, C. Gidney, D. Gilboa, M. Giustina, A. Grajales Dau, J. A. Gross, S. Habegger, M. C. Hamilton, M. P. Harrigan, S. D. Harrington, O. Higgott, J. Hilton, M. Hoffmann, S. Hong, T. Huang, A. Huff, W. J. Huggins, L. B. Ioffe, S. V. Isakov, J. Iveland, E. Jeffrey, Z. Jiang, C. Jones, P. Juhas, D. Kafri, K. Kechedzhi, J. Kelly, T. Khattar, M. Khezri, M. Kieferová, S. Kim, A. Kitaev, P. V. Klimov, A. R. Klots, A. N. Korotkov, F. Kostritsa, J. M. Kreikebaum, D. Landhuis, P. Laptev, K.-M. Lau, L. Laws, J. Lee, K. Lee, B. J. Lester, A. Lill, W. Liu, A. Locharla, E. Lucero, F. D. Malone, J. Marshall, O. Martin, J. R. McClean, T. McCourt, M. McEwen, A. Megrant, B. Meurer Costa, X. Mi, K. C. Miao, M. Mohseni, S. Montazeri, A. Morvan, E. Mount, W. Mruczkiewicz, O. Naaman, M. Neeley, C. Neill, A. Nersisyan, H. Neven, M. Newman, J. H. Ng, A. Nguyen, M. Nguyen, M. Y. Niu, T. E. O’Brien, A. Opremcak, J. Platt, A. Petukhov, R. Potter, L. P. Pryadko, C. Quintana, P. Roushan, N. C. Rubin, N. Saei, D. Sank, K. Sankaragomathi, K. J. Satzinger, H. F. Schurkus, C. Schuster, M. J. Shearn, A. Shorter, V. Shvarts, J. Skrzuzny, V. Smelyanskiy, W. C. Smith, G. Sterling, D. Strain, M. Szalay, A. Torres, G. Vidal, B. Villalonga, C. Vollgraft Heidweiller, T. White, C. Xing, Z. J. Yao, P. Yeh, J. Yoo, G. Young, A. Zalcman, Y. Zhang, and N. Zhu, Suppressing quantum errors by scaling a surface code logical qubit, *Nature* **614**, 676–681 (2023).
- [6] E. Dennis, A. Kitaev, A. Landahl, and J. Preskill, Topological quantum memory, *Journal of Mathematical Physics* **43**, 4452–4505 (2002).
- [7] A. Kitaev, Fault-tolerant quantum computation by anyons, *Annals of Physics* **303**, 2 (2003).
- [8] A. Almheiri, X. Dong, and D. Harlow, Bulk locality and quantum error correction in ads/cft, *Journal of High Energy Physics* **2015**, 10.1007/jhep04(2015)163 (2015).
- [9] F. Pastawski, B. Yoshida, D. Harlow, and J. Preskill, Holographic quantum error-correcting codes: toy models for the bulk/boundary correspondence, *Journal of High Energy Physics* **2015**, 10.1007/jhep06(2015)149 (2015).
- [10] R. Fan, Y. Bao, E. Altman, and A. Vishwanath, Diagnostics of mixed-state topological order and breakdown of quantum memory (2024), arXiv:2301.05689 [quant-ph].
- [11] S. Sang, Y. Zou, and T. H. Hsieh, Mixed-state quantum phases: Renormalization and quantum error correction (2023), arXiv:2310.08639 [quant-ph].
- [12] F. G. Brandão, E. Crosson, M. B. Şahinoğlu, and J. Bowen, Quantum error correcting codes in eigenstates of translation-invariant spin chains, *Physical Review Letters* **123**, 10.1103/physrevlett.123.110502 (2019).
- [13] D. Harlow, The ryu-takayanagi formula from quantum error correction, *Communications in Mathematical Physics* **354**, 865–912 (2017).
- [14] J. Yi, W. Ye, D. Gottesman, and Z.-W. Liu, Complexity and order in approximate quantum error-correcting codes (2023), arXiv:2310.04710 [quant-ph].
- [15] C. Bény and O. Oreshkov, General conditions for approximate quantum error correction and near-optimal recovery channels, *Physical Review Letters* **104**,

- 10.1103/physrevlett.104.120501 (2010).
- [16] G. Zheng, W. He, G. Lee, and L. Jiang, The near-optimal performance of quantum error correction codes (2024), arXiv:2401.02022 [quant-ph].
- [17] 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**, 2567 (1997).
- [18] C. Crepeau, D. Gottesman, and A. Smith, Approximate quantum error-correcting codes and secret sharing schemes (2005), arXiv:quant-ph/0503139 [quant-ph].
- [19] R. Fan, Y. Bao, E. Altman, and A. Vishwanath, Diagnostics of mixed-state topological order and breakdown of quantum memory, arXiv preprint arXiv:2301.05689 (2023).
- [20] Y. Bao, R. Fan, A. Vishwanath, and E. Altman, Mixed-state topological order and the errorfield double formulation of decoherence-induced transitions, arXiv preprint arXiv:2301.05687 (2023).
- [21] J. Y. Lee, C.-M. Jian, and C. Xu, Quantum criticality under decoherence or weak measurement, arXiv preprint arXiv:2301.05238 (2023).
- [22] Y. Zou, S. Sang, and T. H. Hsieh, Channeling quantum criticality, *Physical Review Letters* **130**, 250403 (2023).
- [23] C. de Groot, A. Turzillo, and N. Schuch, Symmetry protected topological order in open quantum systems, *Quantum* **6**, 856 (2022).
- [24] R. Ma and C. Wang, Average symmetry-protected topological phases, *Physical Review X* **13**, 031016 (2023).
- [25] J.-H. Zhang, Y. Qi, and Z. Bi, Strange correlation function for average symmetry-protected topological phases, arXiv preprint arXiv:2210.17485 (2022).
- [26] R. Ma, J.-H. Zhang, Z. Bi, M. Cheng, and C. Wang, Topological phases with average symmetries: the decohered, the disordered, and the intrinsic, arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.16399 (2023).
- [27] T.-C. Lu, Z. Zhang, S. Vijay, and T. H. Hsieh, Mixed-state long-range order and criticality from measurement and feedback, arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.15507 (2023).
- [28] Y.-H. Chen and T. Grover, Symmetry-enforced many-body separability transitions, arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.07286 (2023).
- [29] Y.-H. Chen and T. Grover, Separability transitions in topological states induced by local decoherence (2023), arXiv:2309.11879 [quant-ph].
- [30] L. A. Lessa, M. Cheng, and C. Wang, Mixed-state quantum anomaly and multipartite entanglement, arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.17357 (2024).
- [31] Y.-H. Chen and T. Grover, Unconventional topological mixed-state transition and critical phase induced by self-dual coherent errors, arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.06553 (2024).
- [32] J. Y. Lee, Y.-Z. You, and C. Xu, Symmetry protected topological phases under decoherence, arXiv preprint arXiv:2210.16323 (2022).
- [33] P. Sala, S. Murciano, Y. Liu, and J. Alicea, Quantum criticality under imperfect teleportation (2024), arXiv:2403.04843 [quant-ph].
- [34] J. Y. Lee, Exact calculations of coherent information for toric codes under decoherence: Identifying the fundamental error threshold (2024), arXiv:2402.16937 [cond-mat.stat-mech].
- [35] R. Sohal and A. Prem, A noisy approach to intrinsically mixed-state topological order, arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.13879 (2024).
- [36] T. Ellison and M. Cheng, Towards a classification of mixed-state topological orders in two dimensions, arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.02390 (2024).
- [37] Z. Wang, Z. Wu, and Z. Wang, Intrinsic mixed-state topological order without quantum memory, arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.13758 (2023).
- [38] L. A. Lessa, R. Ma, J.-H. Zhang, Z. Bi, M. Cheng, and C. Wang, Strong-to-weak spontaneous symmetry breaking in mixed quantum states (2024), arXiv:2405.03639 [quant-ph].
- [39] P. Sala, S. Gopalakrishnan, M. Oshikawa, and Y. You, Spontaneous strong symmetry breaking in open systems: Purification perspective, arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.02402 (2024).
- [40] S. Sang and T. H. Hsieh, Stability of mixed-state quantum phases via finite markov length, arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.07251 (2024).
- [41] G. Bentsen, P. Nguyen, and B. Swingle, Approximate quantum codes from long wormholes (2023), arXiv:2310.07770 [quant-ph].
- [42] I. H. Kim and M. J. Kastoryano, Entanglement renormalization, quantum error correction, and bulk causality, *Journal of High Energy Physics* **2017**, 10.1007/jhep04(2017)040 (2017).
- [43] G. Vidal, Entanglement renormalization, *Physical Review Letters* **99**, 10.1103/physrevlett.99.220405 (2007).
- [44] R. N. C. Pfeifer, G. Evenbly, and G. Vidal, Entanglement renormalization, scale invariance, and quantum criticality, *Physical Review A* **79**, 10.1103/physreva.79.040301 (2009).
- [45] G. Evenbly and G. Vidal, Quantum criticality with the multi-scale entanglement renormalization ansatz (2013), arXiv:1109.5334 [quant-ph].
- [46] A. J. Ferris and D. Poulin, Tensor networks and quantum error correction, *Physical Review Letters* **113**, 10.1103/physrevlett.113.030501 (2014).
- [47] G. Brida, I. P. Degiovanni, M. Genovese, A. Migdall, F. Piacentini, S. V. Polyakov, and I. Ruo Berchera, Experimental realization of a low-noise heralded single-photon source, *Optics Express* **19**, 1484 (2011).
- [48] B. Schumacher and M. A. Nielsen, Quantum data processing and error correction, *Physical Review A* **54**, 2629–2635 (1996).
- [49] There is also an upper bound of F_e by $1 - F_e > O(\epsilon)$ due to monotonicity of coherent information and Fannes inequality.
- [50] J. L. Cardy, Operator content of two-dimensional conformally invariant theories, *Nuclear Physics B* **270**, 186 (1986).
- [51] Y. Zou, A. Milsted, and G. Vidal, Conformal fields and operator product expansion in critical quantum spin chains, *Physical Review Letters* **124**, 10.1103/physrevlett.124.040604 (2020).
- [52] Y. Bao, S. Choi, and E. Altman, Theory of the phase transition in random unitary circuits with measurements, *Physical Review B* **101**, 10.1103/physrevb.101.104301 (2020).
- [53] A. Belavin, A. Polyakov, and A. Zamolodchikov, Infinite conformal symmetry in two-dimensional quantum field theory, *Nuclear Physics B* **241**, 333 (1984).
- [54] We use MPO to store the purified state $|\psi\rangle_{RQE}$ and coarse-grain Q and E separately. The effective physical dimension must increase exponentially with subsystem sizes, so we have limited system size $n \leq 16$.

- [55] For the sampling algorithm we use 56000 samples.
- [56] P. Faist, S. Nezami, V. V. Albert, G. Salton, F. Pastawski, P. Hayden, and J. Preskill, Continuous symmetries and approximate quantum error correction, *Phys. Rev. X* **10**, 041018 (2020).
- [57] Z.-W. Liu and S. Zhou, Approximate symmetries and quantum error correction, *npj Quantum Information* **9**, 10.1038/s41534-023-00788-4 (2023).
- [58] J. I. Latorre and G. Sierra, The c-d conjecture (2024), arXiv:2403.17242 [cond-mat.stat-mech].
- [59] E. Witten, Three-dimensional gravity revisited (2007), arXiv:0706.3359 [hep-th].
- [60] T. Mashiko, S. Moriya, and K. Nomura, Universality class around the $su(3)$ symmetric point of the dimer-trimer spin-1 chain, *Journal of the Physical Society of Japan* **90**, 024005 (2021).
- [61] E. Mintun, J. Polchinski, and V. Rosenhaus, Bulk-boundary duality, gauge invariance, and quantum error corrections, *Physical Review Letters* **115**, 10.1103/physrevlett.115.151601 (2015).
- [62] A. Milekhin, Quantum error correction and large n , *SciPost Physics* **11**, 10.21468/scipostphys.11.5.094 (2021).

FLAGGED DEPHASING AND UNFLAGGED DEPHASING

Coherent information

In order to compute the coherent information, let us start with an unravelling of the flagged dephasing. At each site there is a probability $1 - p$ that we don't measure the state, and probability p that we measure the state in the σ_α basis, with a Born probability $q_\pm = \text{tr}(\rho_{RQ} \frac{I \pm \sigma_\alpha}{2})$ to project onto the $|\pm \alpha\rangle$ state. A crucial observation is the output states of the above three cases are mutually orthogonal. This is because, firstly, if the measured sites are different, then the flags are orthogonal, and secondly, if the measurement outcomes are different, then the measured qubits are orthogonal. Thus, $\rho_{RQF} = \mathcal{N}_{p,\alpha;F}(|\psi_{RQ}\rangle\langle\psi_{RQ}|)$ can be unravelled as

$$\rho_{RQF} = \sum_{\mathbf{m}} p_{\mathbf{m}} |\psi_{RQ}^{\mathbf{m}}\rangle\langle\psi_{RQ}^{\mathbf{m}}| \otimes |\mathbf{m}\rangle\langle\mathbf{m}|. \quad (12)$$

Note that here $|\mathbf{m}\rangle$ records not only which sites are measured but also the outcome state in the measured sites. More precisely, denote $m = \pm$ as measurement outcome and $m = 0$ as no measurement, and $P_{\pm}^{[j]} = \frac{I \pm \sigma_\alpha^{[j]}}{2}$, $P_0^{[j]} = I$ then

$$|\psi_{RQ}^{\mathbf{m}}\rangle = \sqrt{p_{\mathbf{m}}} \left(\prod_j P_{m_j}^{[j]} \right) |\psi_{RQ}\rangle. \quad (13)$$

It follows that

$$S(\rho_{RQF}) = - \sum_{\mathbf{m}} p_{\mathbf{m}} \log p_{\mathbf{m}} \quad (14)$$

$$S(\rho_{QF}) = - \sum_{\mathbf{m}} p_{\mathbf{m}} \log p_{\mathbf{m}} + \sum_{\mathbf{m}} p_{\mathbf{m}} S_Q(|\psi_{RQ}^{\mathbf{m}}\rangle). \quad (15)$$

Note that $S_Q = S_R$ for a pure state $|\psi_{RQ}^{\mathbf{m}}\rangle$. The coherent information $I_c = S(\rho_{QF}) - S(\rho_{RQF})$ is then

$$I_c = \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{m}} S_R(|\psi_{RQ}^{\mathbf{m}}\rangle), \quad (16)$$

where $\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{m}}$ is the average with respect to the joint probability distribution $p_{\mathbf{m}}$ of the flags and measurement outcomes.

Threshold of flagged dephasing

We can calculate the coherent information of the Ising CFT code under flagged dephasing using MPS techniques. We first use DMRG to diagonalize the low-energy eigenstates in the code subspace. We then construct the maximal entangled state ψ_{RQ} as an MPS by concatenating the MPS of the eigenstates. We compress the MPS to lower bond dimension by allowing a small amount 10^{-8} of truncation error. We then perform measurement on Q and obtain a sample $|\psi_{RQ}^{\mathbf{m}}\rangle$ of post-measurement states as an MPS, from which we can read off the entanglement entropy S_R . Finally we average over S_R to obtain the coherent information. The results for the flagged dephasing up to $n = 128$ and $p \leq 0.8$ are shown in the main text. Here we provide additional data for the flagged Y dephasing and the data near $p \approx 1$.

For both Y and Z flagged dephasing, we can perform a scaling collapse near $p = 1$ to obtain a scaling form $I_c((1-p)L^{\nu'})$ with $\nu' > 0$. This indicates that $p = 1$ is an unstable RG fixed point which flows to $p = 0$. Thus, for both Y and Z flagged dephasing, the decoding threshold is $p_c = 1$.




FIG. 4. Flagged Y (left) and Z (right) dephasing coherent information of the Ising CFT code near $p = 1$.

Threshold of unflagged dephasing

We provide additional evidence that the threshold for unflagged Y and Z dephasing for the Ising CFT code is also $p_c = 1$. We plot $I_c(p)$ with system sizes $7 \leq n \leq 11$ and find that the curves only intersect at $p = 0$ and $p = 1$. This suggests that the threshold is $p_c = 1$ but the evidence is not conclusive due to very small system sizes.




FIG. 5. Y (left) and Z (right) dephasing coherent information of the Ising CFT code. The only intersections of the curves are at $p = 0$ and $p = 1$, indicating a threshold $p_c = 1$ in the thermodynamic limit.

PERTURBATION OF COHERENT INFORMATION

In this section we consider the change of coherent information under an infinitesimal evolution with the Lindbladian.

First order perturbation

Under the first-order perturbation, we can approximate

$$\rho_{RQ}(p) = |\psi\rangle\langle\psi| + p \sum_{i=1}^n \left(L_i |\psi\rangle\langle\psi| L_i^\dagger - \frac{1}{2} L_i^\dagger L_i |\psi\rangle\langle\psi| - \frac{1}{2} |\psi\rangle\langle\psi| L_i^\dagger L_i \right) + O(p^2), \quad (17)$$

where

$$|\psi\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{D}} \sum_{\alpha=1}^D |\alpha\rangle_R |\phi_\alpha\rangle_Q. \quad (18)$$

We will look at the eigenvalues of the density matrix $\rho_{RQ}(p)$. It is clear that there are at most $n+1$ nonzero eigenvalues, which are $\lambda_0 = 1 - p\nu_0$ and $\lambda_i = p\nu_i$ to the first order in p . Since the first eigenvalue is non-degenerate, we can use first-order perturbation theory on the eigenvalue to obtain

$$-\nu_0 = \sum_i \left(|\langle\psi|L_i|\psi\rangle|^2 - \langle\psi|L_i^\dagger L_i|\psi\rangle \right) \quad (19)$$

Now we can compute the entropy S_{RQ} to be

$$S_{RQ} = - \sum_i \lambda_i \log \lambda_i \quad (20)$$

$$= -(1 - p\nu_0) \log(1 - p\nu_0) - \sum_i p\nu_i \log(p\nu_i) \quad (21)$$

$$= - \left(\sum_i \nu_i \right) p \log p + \left(\nu_0 - \sum_i \nu_i \log \nu_i \right) p + O(p^2). \quad (22)$$

$$= \nu_0 p \log p + \left(\nu_0 - \sum_i \nu_i \log \nu_i \right) p + O(p^2) \quad (23)$$

where we have used the fact that $\text{Tr} \rho_{RQ}(p) = 1$ in the last step. Now we turn to the state $\rho_Q(p) = \text{Tr}_R \rho_{RQ}(p)$ and consider its eigenvalues. To the first order in p ,

$$\rho_Q(p) = \sum_{\alpha=1}^D \frac{1}{D} |\phi_\alpha\rangle\langle\phi_\alpha| + \frac{p}{D} \sum_{\alpha=1}^D \sum_{i=1}^n \left(L_i |\phi_\alpha\rangle\langle\phi_\alpha| L_i^\dagger - \frac{1}{2} L_i^\dagger L_i |\phi_\alpha\rangle\langle\phi_\alpha| - \frac{1}{2} |\phi_\alpha\rangle\langle\phi_\alpha| L_i^\dagger L_i \right) + O(p^2). \quad (24)$$

The first D eigenvalues are then $(1/D - p\alpha_1, 1/D - p\alpha_2, \dots, 1/D - p\alpha_D)$ and the rest are proportional to p with at most Dn of them, $(p\beta_1, \dots, p\beta_{Dn})$. Using the degenerate perturbation theory on the subspace spanned by the first D eigenvalues, we can show that $-\alpha_k$'s are the eigenvalues of a $D \times D$ matrix V whose components are

$$V_{kk} = \frac{1}{D} \left(\sum_{i,\alpha} \langle\phi_k|L_i|\phi_\alpha\rangle\langle\phi_\alpha|L_i^\dagger|\phi_k\rangle - \sum_i \langle\phi_k|L_i^\dagger L_i|\phi_k\rangle \right) \quad (25)$$

$$V_{kl} = \frac{1}{D} \left(\sum_{i,\alpha} \langle\phi_k|L_i|\phi_\alpha\rangle\langle\phi_\alpha|L_i^\dagger|\phi_l\rangle - \sum_i \text{Re} \langle\phi_k|L_i^\dagger L_i|\phi_l\rangle \right) \quad (k \neq l) \quad (26)$$

In terms of the eigenvalues of ρ_Q , we can express

$$S_Q = \log D + \left(\sum_{k=1}^D \alpha_k \right) p \log p + \left((1 - \log D) \left(\sum_{k=1}^D \alpha_k \right) - \sum_i \beta_i \log \beta_i \right) p + O(p^2) \quad (27)$$

Since the sum of eigenvalues equals the trace,

$$\sum_{k=1}^D \alpha_k = - \sum_k V_{kk}. \quad (28)$$

Combining Eqs. (18), (19), (23), (25), (27), (28) we obtain

$$I_c = S_Q - S_{QR} = \log D + bp \log p + O(p) \quad (29)$$

where

$$b = \frac{1}{D^2} \sum_{i,\alpha,\beta} (D |\langle \phi_\beta | L_i | \phi_\alpha \rangle|^2 - \langle \phi_\alpha | L_i | \phi_\alpha \rangle \langle \phi_\beta | L_i^\dagger | \phi_\beta \rangle). \quad (30)$$

More compactly we can write

$$b = \frac{1}{D^2} \sum_{i=1}^n [D \text{Tr}(L_i P L_i^\dagger P) - \text{Tr}(L_i P) \text{Tr}(L_i^\dagger P)] \quad (31)$$

where

$$P = \sum_{\alpha=1}^D |\phi_\alpha\rangle\langle\phi_\alpha| \quad (32)$$

is the projector onto code subspace.

We have shown in the main text that $b \propto n^{1-2\Delta}$, where Δ is the scaling dimension of the jump operator. If $\Delta < 1/2$, then the leading correction term $bp \log p$ dominates Eq. (29) at small p and gives $I_c < \log D$, thus the noise is uncorrectable. If $\Delta > 1/2$, then the leading correction term $bp \log p \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. We further argue below that the subleading correction $O(p)$ term in Eq. (29) gives the same exponent $1 - 2\Delta$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Using the scaling hypothesis $I_c = I_c(pn^\nu)$ thus fixes $\nu = 1 - 2\Delta$ and gives a finite threshold for the noise.

Second-order perturbation

Before we do an explicit calculation, We will first intuitively argue how higher-order terms could potentially dominate the change of I_c and how it affects the error correctability condition. Let us consider a block spin transformation of two spins i and $i + 1$ which are blocked into a four-dimensional local Hilbert space. Then for each site there is $O(p)$ probability where one error L_i or L_{i+1} happens and there is $O(p^2)$ probability where two errors $L_i L_{i+1}$ happen. Now $L_i L_{i+1}$ is a local operator and has its own scaling dimension $\Delta^{(2)}$. For a lattice realization of CFT, if L_i corresponds to a scaling operator O_Δ with scaling dimension Δ , then $L_i L_{i+1}$ corresponds to the lowest operator (except identity) in the operator product expansion $O_\Delta \times O_\Delta \rightarrow I + :O^2: + \dots$. The normal-ordered operator $:O^2:$ has its own scaling dimension $\Delta^{(2)}$. If $\Delta^{(2)} < \Delta$, then the change of coherent information is dominated by this error for large system sizes, $\delta I_c \propto p^2 n^{1-2\Delta^{(2)}} \log p$. This then indicates that $\nu = (1 - 2\Delta^{(2)})/2$. More generally, within the self-OPE of the jump operator, if the lowest operator with scaling dimension $\Delta^{(r)}$ appears at the r -th order of fusion, then $\nu = (1 - 2\Delta^{(r)})/r$. In order to require the error to be correctable, we need all $\Delta^{(r)} > 1/2$. This could happen if all of the CFT primary operators have scaling dimensions larger than $1/2$, or there is a symmetry of the jump operator L that forbids it from fusing into primary operators with scaling dimension smaller than $1/2$.

For an explicit example, consider the Z operator the TFIM model which corresponds to the $I + \varepsilon$ operator in the CFT. Since we have the fusion rule $I \times \varepsilon = \varepsilon$ and $\varepsilon \times \varepsilon = I$, we will never encounter the σ operator in the OPE, thus the lowest operator $\Delta^{(r)} = \Delta_\varepsilon = 1$ occurs at $r = 1$. Thus $\nu = 1 - 2\Delta_\varepsilon = -1$. A more sophisticated example happens for the Y dephasing, which corresponds to $Y = \partial_t \sigma$ in the Ising CFT. Two Y 's could fuse $\partial_t \sigma \times \partial_t \sigma = I + \varepsilon$ and three Y 's can only fuse into itself, $\partial_t \sigma \times \partial_t \sigma \times \partial_t \sigma = \partial_t \sigma$. Note that fusion into σ is not possible due to time reversal symmetry. Thus, the lowest operator in the fusion appears at $r = 2$, which is again the ε operator. As a result $\nu = (1 - 2\Delta_\varepsilon)/2 = -0.5$.

Now we perform a second order perturbation theory on the coherent information $I_c = S_Q - S_{QR}$ and see how the intuition above works. To start with, we can expand

$$I_c = \log D + bp \log p + b^{(2)} p^2 \log p + \text{regular} \quad (33)$$

and we will compute $b^{(2)}$ as a function of jump operators and system size. Let us consider the perturbed density matrix

$$\rho_{QR}(p) = \rho_{QR}(0) + p \mathcal{L}(\rho_{QR}(0)) + \frac{p^2}{2} \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{L}(\rho_{QR}(0))) + O(p^3) \quad (34)$$

where $\rho_{QR}(0) = |\psi\rangle\langle\psi|$. The eigenvalues of $\rho_{QR}(p)$ can be parameterized as $1 - p\nu_0 + p^2\nu_0^{(2)}$ and $p\nu_i + p^2\nu_i^{(2)}$. To this order, we can expand

$$S_{QR} = \nu_0 p \log p - \nu_0^{(2)} p^2 \log p + \text{regular} \quad (35)$$

where regular means terms analytic in p . We will see that $\nu_0^{(2)} \propto n^{1-2\Delta^{(2)}}$ using perturbation theory. There are two contributions, one coming from the second-order perturbation with the $p\mathcal{L}(\rho_{QR}(0))$ term and one coming from the first-order perturbation with the $\frac{p^2}{2}\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{L}(\rho_{QR}(0)))$ term. Note that $\rho_{QR}(0)$ has one eigenvalue 1 and the rest are 0. Denote for shorthand $\rho := \rho_{QR}(0)$, $\delta\rho := \mathcal{L}(\rho_{QR}(0))$ and $\delta^2\rho := \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{L}(\rho_{QR}(0)))$ we have

$$\nu_0^{(2)} = \text{Tr}(\rho\delta\rho(1-\rho)\delta\rho) + \frac{1}{2}\text{Tr}(\rho\delta^2\rho). \quad (36)$$

For dephasing noise, we have $L_i^\dagger L_i = I$. This simplifies the expression but does not affect the conclusion. For this case we have

$$\delta\rho = \sum_i \frac{L_i \rho L_i^\dagger - \rho}{2}, \quad \delta^2\rho = \sum_{i,j} \frac{L_i L_j \rho L_j^\dagger L_i^\dagger - \rho}{4} \quad (37)$$

Now we can substitute the above equation to $\nu_0^{(2)}$ to obtain

$$\nu_0^{(2)} = \frac{1}{8} \sum_{i,j} \left(2\langle L_i \rangle \langle L_i^\dagger L_j \rangle \langle L_j^\dagger \rangle - 2\langle L_i \rangle \langle L_i^\dagger \rangle \langle L_j \rangle \langle L_j^\dagger \rangle + \langle L_i L_j \rangle \langle L_i^\dagger L_j^\dagger \rangle - 1 \right) \quad (38)$$

where $\langle \cdot \rangle$ is taken with respect to $|\psi\rangle_{QR}$, that is, $\langle \cdot \rangle = \frac{1}{D} \text{Tr}(\cdot P)$.

Now we turn to $\rho_Q(p)$, which takes the same form as Eq. (34) but with QR substituted as Q . The initial state is $\rho_Q(0) = \frac{1}{D}P$ where P is the projector onto the code subspace. Thus $\rho_Q(0)^2 = \frac{1}{D}\rho_Q(0)$. The first D eigenvalues of $\rho_Q(p)$ can be expanded as $1/D - p\alpha_k + p^2\alpha_k^{(2)}$, where $k = 1, 2, \dots, D$. The entropy S_Q can be expanded as

$$S_Q = \log D + \left(\sum_{k=1}^D \alpha_k \right) p \log p - \left(\sum_{k=1}^D \alpha_k^{(2)} \right) p^2 \log p + \text{regular} \quad (39)$$

We can use second order perturbation theory to compute the coefficient in front of $p^2 \log p$.

$$\sum_{k=1}^D \alpha_k^{(2)} = D \text{Tr}(P\delta P(1-P)\delta P) + \frac{1}{2} \text{Tr}(P\delta^2 P), \quad (40)$$

where the factor of D comes from the eigenvalue $1/D$ in the unperturbed ρ_Q and we have denoted

$$\delta P = \frac{1}{D} \sum_i \frac{L_i P L_i^\dagger - P}{2}, \quad \delta^2 P = \frac{1}{D} \sum_{i,j} \frac{L_i L_j P L_j^\dagger L_i^\dagger - P}{4}. \quad (41)$$

Substituting Eq. (41) into Eq. (40), we obtain

$$\sum_{k=1}^D \alpha_k^{(2)} = \frac{1}{8D} \sum_{i,j} \left(2\text{Tr}(P L_i P L_i^\dagger L_j P L_j^\dagger) - 2\text{Tr}(P L_i P L_i^\dagger P L_j P L_j^\dagger) + \text{Tr}(P L_i L_j P L_i^\dagger L_j^\dagger) - D \right) \quad (42)$$

Now we can identify the coefficient $b^{(2)}$ in Eq. (33) as

$$b^{(2)} = \sum_{k=1}^D \alpha_k^{(2)} - \nu_0^{(2)} := b_1^{(2)} + b_2^{(2)} + b_3^{(2)}, \quad (43)$$

where we separate the sum into three terms,

$$b_1^{(2)} = \frac{1}{4D^4} \sum_{i,j} \left(D^3 \text{Tr}(P L_i P L_i^\dagger P L_j P L_j^\dagger) - \text{Tr}(P L_i) \text{Tr}(P L_i^\dagger) \text{Tr}(P L_j) \text{Tr}(P L_j^\dagger) \right) \quad (44)$$

$$b_2^{(2)} = \frac{1}{4D^3} \sum_{i,j} \left(D^2 \text{Tr}(P L_i P L_i^\dagger L_j P L_j^\dagger) - \text{Tr}(P L_i) \text{Tr}(P L_i^\dagger L_j) \text{Tr}(P L_j^\dagger) \right) \quad (45)$$

$$b_3^{(2)} = \frac{1}{8D^2} \sum_{i,j} \left(D \text{Tr}(P L_i L_j P L_i^\dagger L_j^\dagger) - \text{Tr}(P L_i L_j) \text{Tr}(P L_i^\dagger L_j^\dagger) \right) \quad (46)$$

Again the result makes sense since $b^{(2)} = 0$ if and only if the Knill-Laflamme condition is satisfied to the second order, $PL_i^\dagger L_j P \propto P$ and $PL_i L_j P \propto P$. The first condition says that any codeword state with one error can be distinguished from any other codeword state with one error. The second condition says that any codeword state with two errors is distinguishable from any other codeword states with no error.

Now we analyze the scaling of each term for the CFT code. For the first term $b_1^{(2)}$, it scales as $O(n^{2-4\Delta})$. Combining with p^2 gives $(pn^{1-2\Delta})^2$, thus this term does not change the exponent from the first-order perturbation. For the second term $b_2^{(2)}$, we can separate the sum into $i = j$ and $i \neq j$ pieces. The $i = j$ piece is identical to Eq. (31) up to a constant factor. For the $i \neq j$ piece, we first analyze the scaling of the term

$$\sum_{i \neq j} \text{Tr}(PL_i^\dagger L_j) = n \sum_{\alpha=1}^D \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \langle \phi_\alpha | L_0^\dagger L_i | \phi_\alpha \rangle, \quad (47)$$

where we have made use of translation invariance. Given a lattice realization of the CFT, we can do OPE on the lattice with $O^\dagger(i)O(j) \sim |i-j|^{-2\Delta+\Delta_{O^\dagger O}} : O^\dagger O : ((i+j)/2) + \dots$, where we recall that Δ denotes the scaling dimension of O . Now the sum over i can be estimated based on whether $\Delta_{O^\dagger O} - 2\Delta > -1$. If $\Delta_{O^\dagger O} - 2\Delta > -1$, then the sum diverges as $n \rightarrow \infty$, then

$$\sum_{i \neq j} \text{Tr}(PL_i^\dagger L_j) \propto n^{2-2\Delta} \quad (\Delta_{O^\dagger O} < 2\Delta - 1) \quad (48)$$

otherwise we have a converge sum in n which gives rise to

$$\sum_{i \neq j} \text{Tr}(PL_i^\dagger L_j) \propto n^{1-\Delta_{O^\dagger O}} \quad (\Delta_{O^\dagger O} > 2\Delta - 1) \quad (49)$$

In either case, we consistently have

$$\sum_{i \neq j} \text{Tr}(PL_i^\dagger L_j) \leq O(n^{2-2\Delta}) \quad (50)$$

Taking into account the other factor $\text{Tr}(PL_i) \propto n^{-\Delta}$, we conclude that the second term $b_2^{(2)} \leq O(n^{2-4\Delta})$ cannot give a larger exponent than the first-order perturbation. The first term in $b_2^{(2)}$ can be argued analogously.

Finally, we consider $b_3^{(2)}$. Following a similar derivation as above, we use the OPE $O(i)O(j) \sim |i-j|^{-2\Delta+\Delta^{(2)}} : O^2 : ((i+j)/2) + \dots$. We can obtain

$$b_3^{(2)} \propto \begin{cases} n^{2-4\Delta} & \text{if } 2\Delta^{(2)} > 1 + 4\Delta \\ n^{1-2\Delta^{(2)}} & \text{if } 2\Delta^{(2)} < 1 + 4\Delta \end{cases} \quad (51)$$

If $\Delta^{(2)} < \Delta$, then clearly the second condition is satisfied and $b_3^{(2)} \propto n^{1-2\Delta^{(2)}}$. This term has larger exponent compared to the first-order perturbation scaling $n^{1-2\Delta}$. Thus if n is large we obtain $\delta I_c \propto p^2 n^{1-2\Delta^{(2)}} \log p$ and $\nu = (1-2\Delta^{(2)})/2$.

Higher order perturbation

Our main claim is that the noise is correctable at a finite threshold if and only if $\Delta_{\min} > 1/2$, where Δ_{\min} is the minimum of nonzero scaling dimensions in the fusion algebra of the jump operators. So far we have shown it within first and second order perturbation theory. We have argued for the ‘‘only if’’ direction to all orders using the RG argument in the last section. For the ‘‘if’’ direction one has to work out the full perturbation theory to all orders, but it will be technically very difficult. Instead, based on the second-order perturbation result, we give an argument in this section that $\Delta_{\min} > 1/2$ implies $\nu < 0$ to all orders, which in turn implies that the noise is correctable.

The singular term in the coherent information can be expanded in all orders in p ,

$$I_c = \log D + \sum_{r=1}^{\infty} b^{(r)} p^r \log p + \text{regular}. \quad (52)$$

Each of the coefficient $b^{(r)} \propto n^{1-2\Delta^{(r)}}$. The exponent ν is determined by the smallest $\Delta^{(r)}$ in the expansion by $\nu = (1 - 2\Delta^{(r)})/r$. We will argue that $\Delta^{(r)}$ is the lowest scaling dimension of the first r -th order OPE of the jump operator below.

As we have shown, to the first-order $r = 1$ and second order $r = 2$, $b^{(r)}$ reproduces part of the Knill-Laflamme conditions, see Eq. (31) and Eqs. (44)-(46). This feature should persist to all orders, because the Knill-Laflamme condition is equivalent to $I_c = \log D$, which follows from the fact that both are equivalent to exact decodability. Furthermore, to the r -th order, there are $2r$ jump operator insertions between the P operator inside the trace. This observation allows us to write down the form of $b^{(r)}$ without an explicit calculation. Take $r = 3$ as an example, the part of Knill Laflamme conditions are

$$PL_i L_j L_k P \propto P, PL_i^\dagger L_j L_k P \propto P, PL_i^\dagger L_j^\dagger L_k P \propto P, PL_i^\dagger L_j^\dagger L_k^\dagger P \propto P \quad (53)$$

One can then write down the following terms which could contribute to $b^{(3)}$,

$$\begin{aligned} b_1^{(3)} &\propto \sum_{i,j,k} [D\text{Tr}(PL_i L_j L_k PL_i^\dagger L_j^\dagger L_k^\dagger) - \text{Tr}(PL_i L_j L_k)\text{Tr}(PL_i^\dagger L_j^\dagger L_k^\dagger)] \\ b_2^{(3)} &\propto \sum_{i,j,k} [D^2\text{Tr}(PL_i PL_i^\dagger L_j L_k PL_j^\dagger L_k^\dagger) - \text{Tr}(PL_i)\text{Tr}(PL_i^\dagger L_j L_k)\text{Tr}(PL_j^\dagger L_k^\dagger)] + h.c. \\ b_3^{(3)} &\propto \sum_{i,j,k} [D^2\text{Tr}(PL_i^\dagger L_j PL_j^\dagger L_k PL_k^\dagger L_i) - \text{Tr}(PL_i^\dagger L_j)\text{Tr}(PL_j^\dagger L_k)\text{Tr}(PL_k^\dagger L_i)] \\ b_4^{(3)} &\propto \sum_{i,j,k} [D^3\text{Tr}(PL_i^\dagger PL_j PL_j^\dagger L_k PL_k^\dagger L_i) - \text{Tr}(PL_i^\dagger)\text{Tr}(PL_j)\text{Tr}(PL_j^\dagger L_k)\text{Tr}(PL_k^\dagger L_i)] \\ b_5^{(3)} &\propto \sum_{i,j,k} [D^4\text{Tr}(PL_i^\dagger PL_j PL_j^\dagger PL_k PL_k^\dagger L_i) - \text{Tr}(PL_i^\dagger)\text{Tr}(PL_j)\text{Tr}(PL_j^\dagger)\text{Tr}(PL_k)\text{Tr}(PL_k^\dagger L_i)] \\ b_6^{(3)} &\propto \sum_{i,j,k} [D^5\text{Tr}(PL_i^\dagger PL_j PL_j^\dagger PL_k PL_k^\dagger PL_i) - \text{Tr}(PL_i^\dagger)\text{Tr}(PL_j)\text{Tr}(PL_j^\dagger)\text{Tr}(PL_k)\text{Tr}(PL_k^\dagger)\text{Tr}(PL_i)] \end{aligned}$$

Denoting $\Delta_{\min}^{(3)} = \min\{\Delta, \Delta^{(2)}, \Delta^{(3)}\}$ and assuming $\Delta_{\min}^{(3)} > 1/2$, we can argue that each term above is bounded above by $b_i^{(3)} \leq O(n^{1-2\Delta_{\min}^{(3)}})$. In fact, if $\Delta^{(3)}$ is the smallest, only the first term $b_1^{(3)}$ saturates the bound. The rest of terms are controlled by Δ and $\Delta^{(2)}$ as in previous orders of perturbation theory. For example one can show that $b_6^{(3)} \propto n^{3-6\Delta} \leq O(n^{1-2\Delta_{\min}^{(3)}})$ and $b_4^{(3)} \leq O(n^{1-2\Delta}) \leq O(n^{1-2\Delta_{\min}^{(3)}})$. Now we turn to $b_1^{(3)}$. We will argue that the largest contribution comes from when i, j, k are all close to each other, where we can fuse L_i, L_j, L_k to one error with scaling dimension $\Delta^{(3)}$ and thus gives $O(n^{1-2\Delta^{(3)}}) = O(n^{1-2\Delta_{\min}^{(3)}})$. If the three points are $O(n)$ far away, then their fusion gives rise to a factor of $n^{-3\Delta}$. Each points can take $O(n)$ locations, so we have in total $n^3 \times (n^{-3\Delta})^2 = n^{3-6\Delta}$ contributions to $b_1^{(3)}$. Likewise, if two points are close and the other point is $O(n)$ far away, the contribution to $b_1^{(3)}$ would be $n^2 \times (n^{-\Delta^{(2)}-\Delta})^2 = n^{2-2\Delta^{(2)}-2\Delta} < n^{2-4\Delta_{\min}^{(3)}} < n^{1-2\Delta_{\min}^{(3)}}$.

Now we can generalize the above argument to arbitrary orders. Let $\Delta_{\min} := \min_r\{\Delta^{(r)}\}$ be the minimal scaling dimension and the minimum is achieved in the r -th order (if there are multiple orders which achieve the minimum, then we choose r to be the lowest order). The leading contribution to $b^{(r)}$ is given by

$$b^{(r)} \propto \sum_{i_1, i_2, \dots, i_r} D\text{Tr}(PL_{i_1} L_{i_2} \dots L_{i_r} PL_{i_1}^\dagger L_{i_2}^\dagger \dots L_{i_r}^\dagger) - \text{Tr}(PL_{i_1} L_{i_2} \dots L_{i_r})\text{Tr}(PL_{i_1}^\dagger L_{i_2}^\dagger \dots L_{i_r}^\dagger). \quad (54)$$

Following a similar argument as $b_1^{(3)}$ above, if $\Delta^{(r)}$ achieves the minimum, then dominant contribution comes from when all i 's are close to each other. This the gives $b^{(r)} \propto n^{1-2\Delta^{(r)}}$ and consequently $\nu = (1 - 2\Delta^{(r)})/r$.

PROVING AT LEAST $O(\log \log n)$ LOGICAL QUBITS

The main result that we will prove is that

$$b(n) = \frac{1}{D^2} \sum_{i=1}^n [D\text{Tr}(L_i PL_i^\dagger P) - \text{Tr}(L_i P)\text{Tr}(L_i^\dagger P)] \rightarrow 0 \quad (55)$$

if the jump operator L_i corresponds to a CFT primary operator O with scaling dimension $\Delta_0 > 1/2$ and

$$P = \sum_{m, \bar{m}=0}^M |\partial^m \bar{\partial}^{\bar{m}} \phi\rangle \langle \partial^m \bar{\partial}^{\bar{m}} \phi| \quad (56)$$

for $M = \text{polylog}(n)$. Recall that the condition $b(n) \rightarrow 0$ implies that the code can correct the dephasing noise at a finite threshold (assuming the scaling hypothesis). With this choice of code subspace we have $D = M^2$. Thus, this ensures at least $k = O(\log \log n)$ logical qubits. In order for proof, one first observes that

$$b(n) \leq \frac{1}{D} \text{Tr}(L_i P L_i^\dagger P) \quad (57)$$

so we only need to prove

$$\sum_{i=1}^n \text{Tr}(L_i P L_i^\dagger P) < O(M^2) \quad (58)$$

The matrix element of L_i in the code subspace must take the following form

$$|\langle \partial^p \bar{\partial}^{\bar{p}} \phi | L_i | \partial^q \bar{\partial}^{\bar{q}} \phi \rangle| = \left(\frac{2\pi}{n} \right)^{\Delta_0} C_{O\phi\phi} f(p, q) f(\bar{p}, \bar{q}) \quad (59)$$

due to conformal symmetry. The dependence on i is eliminated because of translation symmetry. Thus, we only need to prove

$$\sum_{p,q=0}^M f(p, q)^2 = o(n^{2\Delta_0-1}). \quad (60)$$

Below we compute $f(p, q)$ using conformal field theory techniques. First, let us write the overlap in terms of correlation functions by the Weyl transformation,

$$\langle \partial^p \bar{\partial}^{\bar{p}} \phi | L_i | \partial^q \bar{\partial}^{\bar{q}} \phi \rangle = \left(\frac{2\pi}{n} \right)^{\Delta_0} \frac{\langle (\partial^p \bar{\partial}^{\bar{p}} \phi(0))^\dagger O(z_1 = 1) \partial^q \bar{\partial}^{\bar{q}} \phi(0) \rangle}{\sqrt{N_{p,\bar{p}} N_{q,\bar{q}}}}, \quad (61)$$

where

$$N_{p,\bar{p}} = \langle (\partial^p \bar{\partial}^{\bar{p}} \phi(0))^\dagger \partial^p \bar{\partial}^{\bar{p}} \phi(0) \rangle \quad (62)$$

is a normalization constant. We will compute the denominator first, which goes as below

$$N_{p,\bar{p}} = \lim_{z \rightarrow \infty, \bar{z}_0 \rightarrow 0} \langle (-z^2 \partial)^p (-\bar{z}^2 \bar{\partial})^{\bar{p}} (z^{2h} \bar{z}^{2\bar{h}} \phi(z, \bar{z})) \partial_0^p \bar{\partial}_0^{\bar{p}} \phi(z_0, \bar{z}_0) \rangle \quad (63)$$

$$= \lim_{z \rightarrow \infty, \bar{z}_0 \rightarrow 0} (-z^2 \partial)^p (-\bar{z}^2 \bar{\partial})^{\bar{p}} \partial_0^p \bar{\partial}_0^{\bar{p}} (z^{2h} \bar{z}^{2\bar{h}} \phi(z, \bar{z}) \phi(z_0, \bar{z}_0)) \quad (64)$$

$$= \lim_{z \rightarrow \infty, \bar{z}_0 \rightarrow 0} [(-z^2 \partial)^p (z^{2h} \partial_0^p (z - z_0)^{-2h})] \times c.c. \quad (65)$$

$$= \lim_{z \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\Gamma(p + 2h)}{\Gamma(2h)} [(-z^2 \partial)^p (z^{2h} z^{-2h-p})] \times c.c. \quad (66)$$

$$= \lim_{z \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\Gamma(p + 2h)}{\Gamma(2h)} [(-z^2 \partial)^p z^{-p}] \times c.c. \quad (67)$$

$$= \lim_{w \rightarrow 0} \frac{\Gamma(p + 2h)}{\Gamma(2h)} [\partial_w^p w^p] \times c.c. \quad (68)$$

$$= p! \frac{\Gamma(p + 2h)}{\Gamma(2h)} \times c.c. \quad (69)$$

In this calculation we have used the fact that $\phi(0)^\dagger = \lim_{z \rightarrow \infty} z^{2h} \bar{z}^{2\bar{h}} \phi(z, \bar{z})$ and in the last step we have substitute $w = 1/z$ in the limit. Note that here $c.c.$ means substitute p with \bar{p} and h with \bar{h} .

In a similar fashion, we can compute the numerator as

$$\langle (\partial^p \bar{\partial}^{\bar{p}} \phi(0))^\dagger O(z_1 = 1) \partial^q \bar{\partial}^{\bar{q}} \phi(0) \rangle \quad (70)$$

$$= \lim_{z \rightarrow \infty, \bar{z}_0 \rightarrow 0} (-z^2 \partial)^p (-\bar{z}^2 \bar{\partial})^{\bar{p}} \partial_0^q \bar{\partial}_0^{\bar{q}} (z^{2h} \bar{z}^{2\bar{h}} \phi(z, \bar{z}) O(z_1 = 1) \phi(z_0, \bar{z}_0)) \quad (71)$$

$$= C_{O\phi\phi} \lim_{z \rightarrow \infty, \bar{z}_0 \rightarrow 0} (-z^2 \partial)^p [z^{2h} \partial_0^q ((z - z_0)^{h_0-2h} (z - 1)^{-h_0} (1 - z_0)^{-h_0})] \times c.c. \quad (72)$$

$$= C_{O\phi\phi} \left[\sum_{k=0}^{\min(p,q)} \frac{q!}{(q-k)!} \frac{\Gamma(h_0 + q - k) \Gamma(2h - h_0 + k) \Gamma(h_0 + p - k)}{\Gamma(h_0)^2 \Gamma(2h - h_0)} \right] \times c.c. \quad (73)$$

We have omitted the details of evaluating the limit and derivatives. Now we can identify the expression of $f(p, q)$,

$$f(p, q) = \frac{\Gamma(2h)}{\sqrt{p!q!\Gamma(p+2h)\Gamma(q+2h)}} \sum_{k=0}^{\min(p,q)} \frac{q!}{(q-k)!} \frac{\Gamma(h_0+q-k)\Gamma(2h-h_0+k)\Gamma(h_0+p-k)}{\Gamma(h_0)^2\Gamma(2h-h_0)}. \quad (74)$$

We now show that, if h, h_0 are $O(1)$ numbers, then

$$f(p, q) \leq \text{poly}(p, q) \quad (75)$$

We use the fact that $(n+\lfloor x \rfloor - 1)! \leq \Gamma(n+x) \leq (n+\lfloor x \rfloor)!$ for integer $n \geq 2$ and positive real number x , we can estimate that $\Gamma(h_0+q-k) = \text{poly}(q) \times (q-k)!$. In a similar way, we make the substitution $\Gamma(2h-h_0+k) = \text{poly}(k) \times k!$. Thus we estimate the term in the sum as

$$\frac{q!}{(q-k)!} \frac{\Gamma(h_0+q-k)\Gamma(2h-h_0+k)\Gamma(h_0+p-k)}{\Gamma(h_0)^2\Gamma(2h-h_0)} = \text{poly}(p, q) \times q!k!(p-k)! \quad (76)$$

The sum in k can be upper and lower bounded because $\sum_{k=0}^p k!(p-k)! = O(1) \times p!$, thus we obtain $f(p, q) \leq \text{poly}(p, q)$. As long as $M = \text{polylog}(n)$, the LHS Eq. (60) scales smaller than any power law. This completes the proof.

FREE FERMION CFT CODE

We further justify our $\nu = 1 - 2\Delta$ prediction with an example where the coherent information can be computed exactly. We consider the free Majorana fermion CFT realized by

$$H = i \sum_{i=1}^{2n} c_i c_{i+1}, \quad (77)$$

where $\{c_i, c_j\} = 2\delta_{ij}$ represents the Majorana fermions. This model is dual to the TFIM under the Jordan-Wigner transformation. We take the Neveu-Schwarz boundary condition $c_{2i+1} = -c_1$. The code subspace is taken to be spanned by the ground state (corresponding to the identity operator \mathbb{I}) and the first excited state (corresponding to the chiral fermion operator Ψ). Note that the two codewords have different fermionic parity.

We consider the amplitude damping channel as in Ref. [22]. The Lindbladian

$$\mathcal{L}(\rho) = \sum_{i=1}^n \left[L_i \rho L_i^\dagger - \frac{1}{2} \{L_i^\dagger L_i, \rho\} \right] \quad (78)$$

has local jump operators

$$L_j = a_j, \quad (79)$$

where $a_j = (c_{2j-1} + ic_{2j})/2$ is the complex fermion annihilation operator. Now we can integrate the Lindbladian to give a channel $\mathcal{N}_p = e^{t\mathcal{L}}$, where $p = 1 - e^{-t}$ is the damping probability. In terms of Kraus representation, the single-site channel can be written as

$$\mathcal{N}_p^{[j]}(\rho) = K_0 \rho K_0^\dagger + K_1 \rho K_1^\dagger \quad (80)$$

where $K_1 = \sqrt{p}a$ and $K_0 = I + (\sqrt{1-p} - 1)a^\dagger a$. The jump operator has scaling dimension $\Delta_a = 1/2$ and thus one expect that $\nu = 1 - 2\Delta_a = 0$. Thus, the coherent information only depends on p and does not depend on n . It turns out that here the coherent information can be computed using correlation matrix techniques, since $|\psi_{RQ}\rangle$ is a Gaussian state and $\mathcal{N}_p^{[j]}$ is a Gaussian channel. We indeed observe that the I_c only depends on p , see Fig. 6.

This means that the fermionic amplitude damping noise is not correctable for $p \neq 0$ in the thermodynamic limit, as $I_c < \log D$. However, as opposed to the case where $\Delta < 1/2$, the coherent information is a continuous function of p and does not jump immediately at $p = 0$. Thus, for small p the noise is still approximately correctable for any size n .




FIG. 6. Coherent information for the free fermion CFT code under amplitude damping noise

RENYI COHERENT INFORMATION FOR CFT CODE

In this section we consider the Renyi coherent information, defined by

$$I_c^{(n)} = S_Q^{(n)} - S_{QR}^{(n)}, \quad (81)$$

where

$$S^{(n)}(\rho) := \frac{1}{1-n} \log \text{Tr}(\rho^n), \quad (82)$$

We show that the Renyi coherent information still has a scaling collapse $I_c^{(n)} = f(pN\nu^{(n)})$, where $\nu^{(n)}$ could in general be different across different n . Note that in the section we will use N to denote the total number of physical qubits and n to denote the Renyi index. We show that for each Renyi index n there is a notion of relevant, irrelevant and marginal dephasing based on defect RG flow in the CFT. This defect RG flow is identical to what we encounter in Ref. [22]. We will first review the result in Ref. [22] and show that the RG flow of coherent information is identical to the defect RG flow. We will present the numerical result on the Ising model and show that the Z dephasing is marginal at $n = 2$, which means $\nu^{(2)} = 0$ and thus $I_c^{(2)}$ is independent of n . Recall that we have previously shown that Z dephasing is correctable with $\nu = -1$ in the replica limit $n \rightarrow 1$. Thus, this section also serves as an example where the Renyi index $n = 2$ gives a qualitatively different prediction from the replica limit.

Review of channeling quantum criticality

We consider the entropy of a subsystem A of a CFT eigenstate $|\phi_\alpha\rangle$ under decoherence channel \mathcal{N} . Here we have generalized the approach in Ref. [22] which only considers the CFT ground state. The mixed state of interest is $\rho_\alpha = \mathcal{N}(|\phi_\alpha\rangle\langle\phi_\alpha|)$. The n -th momentum of the reduced density matrix is

$$\text{Tr}(\rho_{\alpha,A}^n) = \text{Tr}(\rho_\alpha^{\otimes n} \tau_A^{(n)} \mathbb{I}_B) \quad (83)$$

$$= \text{Tr}((|\phi_\alpha\rangle\langle\phi_\alpha|)^{\otimes n} \mathcal{N}^{*\otimes n}(\tau_A^{(n)}) \mathbb{I}_B) \quad (84)$$

$$= \langle \phi_\alpha^{\otimes n} | \mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{N},A}^{(n)} \mathbb{I}_B | \phi_\alpha^{\otimes n} \rangle \quad (85)$$

$$= \langle \phi_\alpha^{\otimes 2n} | \mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{N},A}^{(n)} \mathbb{I}_B \rangle \quad (86)$$

where B is the complement of A , $\tau^{(n)}$ is the forward permutation on replicas and $\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{N}}^{(n)} = \mathcal{N}^{*\otimes n}(\tau^{(n)})$. In the last step we have made use of the duality between operators and states in doubled Hilbert space and the overlap is taken within $2n$ copies of CFT. In terms of the path integral, this can be represented by a three-point correlation function of a bulk operator and two boundary condition changing operators. Under RG flow, the boundary state $|\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{N}}^{(n)}\rangle$ flows to the same conformal boundary condition regardless of the bulk insertion. This means that the RG flow of the channel defined in Ref. [22] can be applied to all low-energy eigenstates. In particular, if the channel \mathcal{N} flows to complete dephasing, then the Renyi negativity of all low-energy states becomes area law under the channel. If the channel is irrelevant (i.e., flows to the identity channel), then the entanglement scaling of all low-energy eigenstates at long-distances remains unchanged (except non-universal constants).

RG flow of the Renyi coherent information

So far we have shown that the RG flow of quantum channels are identical for all low-energy states. One may naturally expect that the code property of the low-energy subspace subject to uniform decoherence follows the same RG flow. If the channel flows to complete dephasing, then the error cannot be corrected. If the channel flows to the identity channel, then the error can be corrected. The two cases correspond to relevant and irrelevant dephasing, respectively. The correctability of the error is characterized by the loss of coherent information. The subtlety is that Ref. [22] works at integer Renyi index $n \geq 2$ but the code property is only related to the replica limit $n \rightarrow 1$.

We will fix a Renyi index $n \geq 2$ below. We compute the Renyi coherent information of the CFT code and show that it decreases to zero for relevant dephasing and remains invariant for irrelevant dephasing. For marginal case, the Renyi coherent information does not depend on system size N and is a continuous function of p .

we first couple the CFT to the reference qudit,

$$|\psi\rangle_{QR} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{D}} \sum_{\alpha=1}^D |\phi_{\alpha}\rangle_Q \otimes |\alpha\rangle_R \quad (87)$$

The state subjected to decoherence is $\rho_{QR} = \mathcal{N}_Q(|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|)$. The Renyi coherent information is

$$I_c^{(n)} = \frac{1}{n-1} \log \frac{\text{Tr} \rho_{QR}^n}{\text{Tr} \rho_Q^n} \quad (88)$$

In terms of the channeled twist operator $\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{N}}^{(n)}$, the numerator and denominator can be expressed as

$$\text{Tr} \rho_{QR}^n = \frac{1}{D^n} \sum_{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n=1}^D \left\langle \bigotimes_i \phi_{\alpha_{\tau(i)}} \left| \mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{N}}^{(n)} \right| \bigotimes_i \phi_{\alpha_i} \right\rangle. \quad (89)$$

$$\text{Tr} \rho_Q^n = \frac{1}{D^n} \sum_{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n=1}^D \left\langle \bigotimes_i \phi_{\alpha_i} \left| \mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{N}}^{(n)} \right| \bigotimes_i \phi_{\alpha_i} \right\rangle, \quad (90)$$

where $\tau(i) = i + 1 \bmod n$ forward permutes the replica index. If the channel flows to identity channel, then $\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{N}}^{(n)}$ flows to the twist operator $\tau^{(n)}$. In this case the Eq. (89) gets contributions from all terms and Eq. (90) only gets contributions from the diagonal terms (where all α_i 's are equal). Thus, $\text{Tr} \rho_{QR}^n = 1$ and $\text{Tr} \rho_Q^n = D^{1-n}$, and

$$I_c^{(n)} = \log D, \quad \text{irrelevant dephasing.} \quad (91)$$

If instead the channel flows to complete dephasing, say, in the direction of $\sigma_{\vec{n}} \equiv \vec{n} \cdot \vec{\sigma}$, then the on each site

$$\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{N}}^{(n)} = \sum_{i=+,-} |i^{\otimes n}\rangle\langle i^{\otimes n}|, \quad \text{complete dephasing.} \quad (92)$$

where $|\pm\rangle$ is the eigenvector of $\sigma_{\vec{n}}$ with eigenvalue ± 1 . Since $\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{N}}^{(n)}$ is a completely symmetric tensor with respect to permutation of the $2n$ replicas, each term in Eq. (89) and Eq. (90) is equal. Thus, the Renyi coherent information Eq. (88) vanishes for all $n \geq 2$, i.e.,

$$I_c^{(n)} = 0, \quad \text{complete dephasing.} \quad (93)$$

Finally, the extreme case where we have complete depolarization (erasure) gives $\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{N}} = \mathbb{I}$. Thus, only diagonal terms contribute to Eq. (89) and

$$I_c^{(n)} = -\log D, \quad \text{complete erasure.} \quad (94)$$

Thus we have established that for a given Renyi index n , if the dephasing channel is relevant, then $I_c^{(n)} = 0$ in the thermodynamic limit; if the dephasing channel is irrelevant, then $I_c^{(n)} = \log D$ in the thermodynamic limit.

Numerical result for the Ising model

Taking the $|I\rangle$ and $|\sigma\rangle$ as the codeword states, we consider the Renyi-2 coherent information under X, Y or Z dephasing for the Ising CFT code. We obtain the following results (see Fig. 7). The result indicates that the X, Y




FIG. 7. Renyi coherent information of the Ising CFT code under X (left), Y (center) and Z (right) dephasing

and Z dephasings are relevant, irrelevant and marginal respectively, which can be seen in the following way. For X dephasing, increasing the system size decreases the coherent information. For Y dephasing, increasing the system size increases $I_c^{(2)}$ to $\log 2$ at small p . The Z dephasing is the marginal case where $I_c^{(2)}$ does not depend on N . This is in accordance with the result of Ref. [22] which considers the Renyi negativity and the g function. However, it is important to note that only Von-Neumann coherent information indicates the code properties. As we already stress, the Z dephasing here offers an example which is marginal for $n \geq 2$ but irrelevant for $n \rightarrow 1$.