

Lattices, Gates, and Curves: GKP codes as a Rosetta stone

Jonathan Conrad,^{1,2,*} Ansgar G. Burchards,¹ and Steven T. Flammia³

¹*Dahlem Center for Complex Quantum Systems, Physics Department,
Freie Universität Berlin, Arnimallee 14, 14195 Berlin, Germany*

²*Helmholtz-Zentrum Berlin für Materialien und Energie,
Hahn-Meitner-Platz 1, 14109 Berlin, Germany*

³*Department of Computer Science, Virginia Tech, Alexandria, USA*

(Dated: July 11, 2024)

Gottesman-Kitaev-Preskill (GKP) codes are a promising candidate for implementing fault tolerant quantum computation in quantum harmonic oscillator systems such as superconducting resonators, optical photons and trapped ions, and in recent years theoretical and experimental evidence for their utility has steadily grown. It is known that logical Clifford operations on GKP codes can be implemented fault tolerantly using only Gaussian operations, and several theoretical investigations have illuminated their general structure. In this work, we explain how GKP Clifford gates arise as symplectic automorphisms of the corresponding GKP lattice and show how they are identified with the mapping class group of suitable genus n surfaces. This correspondence introduces a topological interpretation of fault tolerance for GKP codes and motivates the connection between GKP codes (lattices), their Clifford gates, and algebraic curves, which we explore in depth. For a single-mode GKP code, we identify the space of all GKP codes with the moduli space of elliptic curves, given by $S^3 - K$, the three sphere S^3 with a trefoil knot K removed, and explain how logical degrees of freedom arise from the choice of a level structure on the corresponding curves. We discuss how the implementation of Clifford gates corresponds to homotopically nontrivial loops on the space of all GKP codes and show that the modular Rademacher function describes a topological invariant for certain Clifford gates implemented by such loops. Finally, we construct a universal family of GKP codes and show how it gives rise to an explicit construction of fiber bundle fault tolerance as proposed by Gottesman and Zhang [1] for the GKP code. On our path towards understanding this correspondence, we introduce a general algebraic geometric perspective on GKP codes and their moduli spaces, which uncovers a map towards many possible routes of future research.

I. INTRODUCTION

Gottesman-Kitaev-Preskill (GKP) codes [2] are bosonic quantum error correcting codes that encode discrete information into a collection of quantum harmonic oscillators. The code states are defined by translation invariance in their phase space representation which carries the structure of a lattice \mathcal{L} such that small displacements of these states can be measured with high precision without collapsing the structure of the states [3, 4]. As quantum error correcting codes, GKP codes have been shown to be promising candidates to protect against photon loss [3, 5, 6] and recent experiments [7–9] have demonstrated further support for their practical relevance.

Aside from their promise as a quantum memory, GKP codes allow for the implementation of the logical Clifford group through only Gaussian unitary operations. These operations can be understood as *fault-tolerant* in the sense that they maintain boundedness of errors and there always exists a threshold below which physical errors, modeled as small phase space displacements, are not expected to incur logical changes. It has also been observed that magic states of the GKP code can be obtained by performing error correction on the Gaussian vacuum state [10]. With the promise of fault-tolerant logical Clifford gates, GKP codes are hence expected to present a viable

* j.conrad1005@gmail.com




FIG. 1. The trefoil knot, which corresponds to the set of “zero distance” GKP codes within the space of all single-mode GKP codes. We illustrate a non-trivial link with the trefoil knot given by a $\pi/2$ rotation of the square lattice $\Lambda \mapsto e^{i\phi}\Lambda$, $\phi \in [0, \pi/2]$. The square lattice corresponds to the standard GKP code, and this link implements a logical Hadamard gate.

platform for large-scale fault-tolerant quantum computation once stabilizer measurements or state preparation can be performed with high precision.

While fault tolerance in the above sense heralds a qualitatively clear definition, its quantification in the literature is frequently treated as a heuristic case-by-case engineering problem, often with strong assumptions on the structure of the relevant noise, which vary across research themes and target platforms. Though the focus in this paper is on GKP codes, we note that a satisfactory general definition of fault tolerance is a long-standing problem already for qubit codes [11, 12].

One class of codes where fault tolerance has a clear *topological* interpretation is the class of homological codes [13]. In homological codes, certain logical gates are operators whose support lies on homologically nontrivial loops on the physical qubit geometry and thus are inherently robust against local noise processes.

A general topological approach to fault tolerance has been proposed by Gottesman and Zhang [1], where fault-tolerant implementations of logical gates are proposed to be identified with non-contractible loops in a suitably chosen set of codes within a given physical Hilbert space. This makes concrete the interpretation of fault-tolerant logical gates as a sequence of code-switching operations that preserve some global (e.g. distance) property. This proposal yields a *topological* understanding of fault tolerance and has the potential to provide a definition that unifies different practice-driven approaches. A few examples of this approach to fault-tolerant protocols for qubit-based error correcting codes have been discussed in [1], including transversal gates, as well as the braiding of anyons in lattice models.

Here we establish a first link between bosonic error correction and topological notions of fault tolerance by considering the topological properties of logical GKP Clifford gates and their smooth parametrizations. We explore and exploit a direct connection between GKP codes via their associated lattices, Riemann surfaces, and algebraic curves; specifically, we identify the space of all single-mode GKP codes with the moduli space of elliptic curves with level structure. We show how the understanding of logical Clifford gates for the GKP codes leads to a natural correspondence between paths over realizations of lattices and paths in the space of suitable algebraic curves.

This correspondence allows us to identify the space of (single-mode) GKP codes encoding a qudit of any fixed dimension with $S^3 - K$, a three sphere S^3 with a trefoil knot K removed. Closed loops on this space that link with this knot correspond to fault-tolerant logical Clifford gates on the GKP code. Using tools from the theory of modular forms, we show how the “knot defect” provided by the trefoil can be interpreted as the limit where GKP codes have zero distance, i.e.,

the phase space lattice becomes degenerate and the codes can no longer correct a general error.

Conversely, any point away from the trefoil corresponds to a GKP code with nonzero distance. Consequently, paths which avoid the trefoil correspond to fault-tolerant sequences of code-switches between GKP codes, in the sense of Gottesman and Zhang. It is therefore natural to investigate closed paths with nontrivial homotopy.

Our next result shows that GKP logical Clifford gates, represented by elements in $SL_2(\mathbb{Z}_d)$, can be classified by a certain topological invariant in the moduli space. In a seminal result of Ghys [14], linking numbers with the trefoil knot were found to correspond to values of the Rademacher function [15, 16], a celebrated class-invariant $SL_2(\mathbb{Z})$ from the theory of numbers. Building on Ghys' result, we show that the Rademacher function also yields an invariant on all elements of $SL_2(\mathbb{Z}_d)$ that correspond to logical Cliffords which require nontrivial squeezing. This provides a classification and topological interpretation of the logical Clifford operations which can be implemented fault tolerantly in an arbitrary single-mode GKP code.

Finally, we construct a universal family of single-mode GKP codes as a universal family of elliptic curves with level structure. Here “universal” means that every continuous parametrization of GKP codes can be described by our construction. The constructed family of GKP codes inherits the structure of a covering of a complex manifold with leaves labeled by the logical Clifford group. As such, this classification of GKP codes also yields an example of fiber bundle fault tolerance as proposed in [1] for Clifford gates.

Throughout this paper, our focus lies in describing the general connections between concepts of GKP quantum error correction and fault tolerance with corresponding concepts in algebraic geometry. We hope to inspire future studies of (GKP) quantum error correction through this lens. In particular, we only describe the simplest example of Clifford fault tolerance in a single-mode GKP code, leaving the more general treatment to future work [17]. We speculate that, once the corresponding theory for multi-mode GKP codes has been explored, through an appropriate embedding [18], the established links can also aid in understanding the properties of fiber bundle fault tolerance for quantum error correction based on discrete-variable systems.

Our paper is organized as follows. In section II we provide a brief introduction to GKP codes and discuss the general structure and classification of GKP codes, where we find that representations of GKP Clifford gates are inherently tied to representations of elements of the mapping class group of compact Riemann surfaces. We elaborate on the source of this connection and explain how GKP codes generally can arise from compact Riemann surfaces which correspond to algebraic curves. Exploring this connection more deeply, we discuss how single-mode GKP codes can be understood as instances of complex elliptic curves with a level structure such that, in section IV, we build on the well-explored classification of universal families of elliptic curves to construct the corresponding classification of GKP codes. This construction sheds light on the underlying topology of the space of single-mode GKP codes which we classify and, finally, we explain how our construction of the universal family of GKP codes naturally provides an example for the fiber bundle framework for fault tolerance by Gottesman and Zhang. We close with a discussion and point to possible lines of research building on our exposition.

II. THE GKP CODE AND ITS CLIFFORDS

We develop the mathematical structure of GKP codes to understand the structure of their Clifford gates and their fault tolerance. A lattice-theoretic treatment of GKP codes can be found in [2, 18–22] and more details regarding displacement and Gaussian unitary operators are discussed in appendix A, which we refer to for further background. GKP codes are described by a full-rank *symplectically integral* [23] lattice $\mathcal{L} \subseteq \mathcal{L}^\perp \subset \mathbb{R}^{2n}$, where the symplectic dual lattice \mathcal{L}^\perp contains

all the vectors with integer symplectic inner product induced by $J = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & I_n \\ -I_n & 0 \end{pmatrix}$ with elements in \mathcal{L} . The lattice \mathcal{L} describes elements of the stabilizer group \mathcal{S} of the GKP code which are, up to a phase factor [18], given by displacements

$$D(\boldsymbol{\xi}) = e^{-i\sqrt{2\pi}\boldsymbol{\xi}^T J \hat{\boldsymbol{x}}}, \quad (1)$$

acting on n -modes of a generalized quantum harmonic oscillator, with $\hat{\boldsymbol{x}} = (\hat{x}_1, \dots, \hat{x}_n, \hat{p}_1, \dots, \hat{p}_n)^T$ being the vector of quadrature operators (we set $\hbar = 1$). The displacement amplitude is $\boldsymbol{\xi} \in \mathcal{L}$. Displacements with amplitudes in the dual lattice \mathcal{L}^\perp describe, via the same lift, all displacement operators that commute with the stabilizer group and these are hence identified with the centralizer $\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{S})$ within the set of displacement operators. The displacements associated to representatives of (generalized) logical Pauli operators, which are also known as Heisenberg-Weyl operators, are given by $\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{S})/\mathcal{S}$ and are hence provided by the lattice cosets $\mathcal{L}^\perp/\mathcal{L}$ of which there are $|\mathcal{L}^\perp/\mathcal{L}| = \det(\mathcal{L}) = d^2$, and d is the dimensionality of the encoded Hilbert space.

We describe lattices $\mathcal{L} = \text{span}_{\mathbb{Z}}(M)$, $\mathcal{L}^\perp = \text{span}_{\mathbb{Z}}(M^\perp)$ by the integer row-span of corresponding generator matrices $M, M^\perp \in \mathbb{R}^{2n \times 2n}$. The condition for the GKP stabilizer group to be abelian, $\mathcal{L} \subseteq \mathcal{L}^\perp$ is equivalent to the integrality of the symplectic Gram matrix $A = MJM^T$ and bases can always be found such that $M = AM^\perp$ by means of a basis transformation. It is clear that all elements in the orbit $\text{SL}_{2n}(\mathbb{Z})M$ defined via left action describe the same lattice \mathcal{L} (and similarly for M^\perp) [24]. For symplectically integral lattices, a canonical basis can always be found such that A splits into a direct sum of 2×2 skew-symmetric blocks, $A = A_D = J_2 \otimes D$ where $D = \text{diag}(d_1, \dots, d_n)$ and where the d_j obey the divisibility condition $d_1 | d_2 | \dots | d_n$. This basis is unique [25] and we refer to D as the *type* of the symplectically integral lattice.

In general, a lattice basis generating a GKP code of type D can be obtained as a sublattice of a symplectic lattice (for which $D = I_n$) that is generated by a symplectic matrix $M_0 : M_0^T J M_0 = J$ to

$$M := (D \oplus I)M_0. \quad (2)$$

Equivalently, this way to construct a symplectically integral lattice of type D can also be understood as the fact that any GKP code can be obtained by performing a symplectic transformation $S = M_0^T$ on a rectangular GKP code generated by $D \oplus I$ [18].

Due to symplectic integrality [25], there always exists a basis, such that $M = (\boldsymbol{\xi}_1 \dots \boldsymbol{\xi}_{2n})^T$ is given by symplectically conjugate pairs of vectors

$$\begin{aligned} (\boldsymbol{\xi}_i, \boldsymbol{\xi}_{i+n}) : \boldsymbol{\xi}_i^T J \boldsymbol{\xi}_{i+n} &= d_i \quad \forall i \in \{1, \dots, n\}, \\ \boldsymbol{\xi}_i^T J \boldsymbol{\xi}_j &= 0 \quad \forall j \neq i+n \quad \forall i \in \{1, \dots, n\}, \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

and similarly, the dual basis $M^\perp = (\boldsymbol{\xi}_1^\perp \dots \boldsymbol{\xi}_{2n}^\perp)^T$ can be arranged into pairs of vectors $(\mathbf{e}_i, \mathbf{f}_i) = (\boldsymbol{\xi}_i^\perp, \boldsymbol{\xi}_{i+n}^\perp)$ with

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{e}_i^T J \mathbf{f}_i &= \frac{1}{d_i} \quad \forall i \in \{1, \dots, n\}, \\ \mathbf{e}_i^T J \mathbf{f}_j &= 0 \quad \forall j \neq i \in \{1, \dots, n\}. \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

These vectors constitute precisely the canonical representatives for the logical generalized Pauli operators of the GKP code and satisfy the rules of the desired Heisenberg-Weyl algebra

$$X_i := D(\mathbf{e}_i), Z_i := D(\mathbf{f}_i) : Z_i X_i = e^{i\frac{2\pi}{d_i}} X_i Z_i, \quad X_i^{d_i}, Z_i^{d_i} \in \mathcal{S}, \quad [X_i, Z_j] = 0 \quad \forall i \neq j. \quad (5)$$




FIG. 2. The symplectic lattices \mathbb{Z}^2 (left) and A_2 (right) scaled by $d = 2$ and their respective (dual) unit cells. The logical displacement amplitudes are marked in turquoise and stabilizer displacements are marked in red.

Finally, a distance

$$\Delta_{\text{GKP}}(\mathcal{L}) = \min_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{L}^\perp - \mathcal{L}} \|\mathbf{x}\|_2 \quad (6)$$

has been defined for GKP codes in [2, 18], which captures its resilience against typical noise processes such as adversarial or stochastic Gaussian errors. See [18, 26] for a more in-depth discussion of the distance.

Throughout this work, we will often focus on *scaled GKP codes*, which are GKP codes obtained from $D = dI_n$ such that (up to a squeezing operation) the GKP lattice corresponds to a rescaled symplectic lattice $\mathcal{L} = \sqrt{d}\mathcal{L}_0$. Such scaled GKP codes can be understood to encode n qudits with dimensions d and the distance is given by the rescaled length of the shortest lattice vector of the symplectic lattice $\Delta_{\text{GKP}}(\mathcal{L}) = d^{-\frac{1}{2}}\lambda_1(\mathcal{L}_0)$.

Example: the square lattice, $\mathcal{L} = \sqrt{2}\mathbb{Z}^2$. The simplest and most frequently discussed (scaled) GKP code is obtained by rescaling the symplectically self-dual lattice $\mathcal{L}_0 = \mathbb{Z}^2$ with generator $M_0 = I$ to a code that encodes one qubit into a quantum harmonic oscillator with $\mathcal{L} = \sqrt{2}\mathbb{Z}^2$ and $\mathcal{L}^\perp = \sqrt{2}^{-1}\mathbb{Z}^2$. This code has distance $\Delta_{\text{GKP}} = 1/\sqrt{2}$ [18].

Example: the hexagonal lattice, $\mathcal{L} = \sqrt{2}A_2$. The A_2 lattice, often also known as the hexagonal lattice, has generator matrix

$$M_{A_2} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\sqrt{3}}} \begin{pmatrix} 2 & 0 \\ 1 & \sqrt{3} \end{pmatrix}, \quad (7)$$

and the distance of the GKP code obtained by its $d = 2$ scaling is $\Delta_{\text{GKP}} = 3^{-\frac{1}{4}}$. The hexagonal lattice implements the densest sphere packing in 2 dimensions such that it also yields the single-mode GKP code with the largest distance.

The set of GKP *Clifford gates* form a special and important set of gates that act on the logical space of a GKP code. GKP Clifford gates are given by the symplectic automorphism group

$$\text{Cliff}(D) \equiv \text{Aut}_\infty^S(\mathcal{L}^\perp) = \text{Aut}^S(\mathcal{L}^\perp) \ltimes \mathcal{L}^\perp, \quad (8)$$

such that every logical Clifford gate can be described by the combination of a displacement by a vector in \mathcal{L}^\perp – a so-called *trivial* Clifford gate, since it only conjugates Pauli operators (displacements in \mathcal{L}^\perp) to an additional phase factor – and a symplectic automorphism of the lattice \mathcal{L}^\perp that sends logical Pauli operators to logical Pauli operators but preserves the 0 element. Symplectic

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
\text{Aut}^S(\mathcal{L}^\perp) & \longleftrightarrow & \text{Sp}_{2n}(\mathbb{Z}) \\
\downarrow \text{mod } \mathcal{L} & & \downarrow \text{mod } d \\
\text{Aut}^S(\mathcal{L}^\perp/\mathcal{L}) & \longleftrightarrow & \text{Sp}_{2n}(\mathbb{Z}_d)
\end{array}$$

FIG. 3. Commutative diagram for the structure of nontrivial Cliffords for scaled GKP codes. Note that for $n = 1$ we have the equality $\text{SL}_2(\mathbb{Z}) = \text{Sp}_2(\mathbb{Z})$.

automorphisms transform vectors constituting the lattice basis M in a way that only implements a symplectic change of basis while leaving the lattice as a geometric object invariant,

$$\text{Aut}^S(\mathcal{L}) := \{g \in \text{Sp}_{2n}(\mathbb{R}) \mid \exists U \in \text{SL}_{2n}(\mathbb{Z}) : UM = Mg^T\}, \quad (9)$$

and we refer to the basis transformation $U \in \text{SL}_{2n}(\mathbb{Z})$ as the *integral representation* of the corresponding element. An important subgroup is the group of symplectic orthogonal automorphisms $\text{Aut}^{SO}(\mathcal{L}) = \text{Aut}^S(\mathcal{L}) \cap O_{2n}(\mathbb{R})$ which is significant due to its interpretation as GKP Clifford operations realizable via passive linear optics without squeezing.

For GKP codes specified by a lattice $\mathcal{L} \subseteq \mathcal{L}^\perp$, each element of the symplectic automorphism group is uniquely specified by its integral representation given by the group

$$\text{Sp}_{2n}^D(\mathbb{Z}) = \{U \in \text{GL}_{2n}(\mathbb{Z}) : UA_D U^T = A_D\}. \quad (10)$$

These transformations preserve the symplectic form in its canonical basis $A_D = J_2 \otimes D$ [27]. In fact, we have the isomorphism

$$\text{Aut}^S(\mathcal{L}) \sim \text{Sp}_{2n}^D(\mathbb{Z}) \quad (11)$$

which we prove in appendix B, where we also show that

$$\text{Aut}^S(\mathcal{L}) = \text{Aut}^S(\mathcal{L}^\perp). \quad (12)$$

The integral representation of the automorphisms in eq. (10) can be understood to represent the *logical* action of the (non-trivial) Clifford group on the Heisenberg-Weyl operators in eq. (5). If a logical Heisenberg-Weyl operator $O(\mathbf{l}) = \prod_{i=1}^n X_i^{l_i} Z_i^{l_{i+n}}$ with X_i, Z_i from eq. (5) is specified [28] by a vector $\mathbf{l} \in \mathbb{Z}_D^{2n}$, where \mathbb{Z}_D^{2n} denotes \mathbb{Z}^{2n} with the element-wise reduction modulo $I_2 \otimes D$, such that vectors are considered equivalent if they differ only by stabilizers. The action of a non-trivial Clifford operation is given by $\mathbf{l} \mapsto g_I \mathbf{l} \text{ mod } D \oplus D$ and g_I denotes the integral representation of the corresponding $g \in \text{Aut}^S(\mathcal{L})$. The reduction modulo $I_2 \otimes D$ therefore implements the equivalence relation given by the stabilizers as translations by elements in \mathcal{L} and corresponds to the projection $\text{Aut}^S(\mathcal{L}^\perp) \rightarrow \text{Aut}^S(\mathcal{L}^\perp/\mathcal{L})$.

Henceforth we focus on scaled GKP codes, where $D = dI_n$, such that we have that $\mathcal{L} = d\mathcal{L}^\perp$ are proportional. From the definition of symplectic automorphisms in eq. (9) observe that $\text{Aut}^S(\mathcal{L})$ is one-to-one with its integral representation given by $\text{Sp}_{2n}(\mathbb{Z})$. The relationships between the integral and real representations of symplectic automorphisms for scaled GKP codes and their logical actions are illustrated in fig. 3. It can also be seen that the action of the symplectic automorphism group on the quotient $\mathcal{L}^\perp/\mathcal{L}$ is equivalent to that of $\text{Sp}_{2n}(\mathbb{Z}_d)$, the usual symplectic representation of the non-trivial Clifford group on qudits.

The symplectic automorphism groups discussed here can be generated by a set of *symplectic transvections*, given by matrices t_α , $\alpha \in \mathcal{L}^\perp$,

$$t_\alpha = I + \alpha \alpha^T J, \quad (13)$$




FIG. 4. A visualization of the surface S_n , where logical operators for the GKP code are represented as elements of the first homology group indicated by the elements (e_i, f_i) . Logical Clifford transformations are represented by sequences of Dehn-twists of the torus in this representation, and we depict how two such transformations act on these generators going from the top to the bottom figures. On the left-most handle, we show how a Dehn twist about f_1 , a.k.a. a symplectic transvection t_{f_1} , implements a logical phase gate by mapping $e_1 \mapsto e_1 + f_1$. On the right-most handle, a logical CZ gate is realized via a Dehn twist about the loop with label c_3 , which corresponds to a symplectic transvection $t_{f_3+f_4}$.

which are implemented via the Gaussian unitaries

$$U_{\alpha} = e^{-\frac{i}{2}(\alpha^T J \hat{x})^2} \quad (14)$$

with squeezing value bounded by $\text{sq}(t_{\alpha}) := \|t_{\alpha}\|_2 \leq 1 + \|\alpha\|$.

The symplectic transvection adds multiples of α to an input vector \mathbf{x} according to the symplectic inner product $\alpha^T J \mathbf{x}$, from which it is easy to see that symplectic lattices \mathcal{L}_0 are preserved under transvections by vectors in \mathcal{L}_0 . For elements of a scaled GKP code $\mathcal{L}^{\perp} = \sqrt{d}^{-1} \mathcal{L}_0$, a symplectic transvection by one of the canonical basis vectors acts non-trivially on its partner,

$$t_{\sqrt{d}e_i} f_i = f_i + e_i, \quad (15)$$

and trivially on every other canonical basis vector. In particular using $t_{\alpha} t_{\beta} t_{\alpha}^{-1} = t_{t_{\alpha}(\beta)}$ one observes that for symplectic canonical form basis vectors of the lattice α, β , the commutation of the corresponding transvections is determined by whether or not the vectors have a non-trivial symplectic inner product.

In fact, symplectic transvections are known as representations of *Dehn twists* on compact genus n surfaces S_n [29], while the group $\text{Sp}_{2n}(\mathbb{Z})$ of integral representations of symplectic automorphisms for a symplectic lattice \mathcal{L}_0 forms a representation of their mapping class group $\text{Mod}(S_n)$ [30] which is generated by Dehn twists. As homeomorphisms of the surface S_n , Dehn-twists preserve the intersection numbers of loops, which is also reflected in the preservation of commutativity of the corresponding symplectic transvections

$$t_{\gamma}[t_{\alpha}, t_{\beta}]t_{\gamma}^{-1} = [t_{t_{\gamma}(\alpha)}, t_{t_{\gamma}(\beta)}]. \quad (16)$$

In fig. 4 we depict such a generating set (known as the *Lickorish* generators [30]), where each Dehn twist label associates to a corresponding lattice vector given either by a canonical basis element e_i, f_i or a linear combination of such.

Example: the square lattice, $\mathcal{L} = \sqrt{2}\mathbb{Z}^2$. For the single-mode square GKP code we can choose bases such that $M = 2M^{\perp} = \sqrt{2}I$. Relative to this choice the first row of M^{\perp} represents the logical X -type Pauli operator $\hat{X} = e^{-i\sqrt{\pi}\hat{p}}$ while the second represents $\hat{Z} = e^{i\sqrt{\pi}\hat{q}}$.

Via eq. (9) we can identify a symplectic transformation g that implements a non-trivial Clifford gates with its integral representation via $U = g^T$.

It is convenient to introduce the S and T matrices,

$$S = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad T = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (17)$$

which generate $\text{Sp}_2(\mathbb{Z}) = \langle S, T \rangle$.

In the integral representation, the S -matrix just introduced can be seen to implement a logical Hadamard gate $U_H = S$, while the logical phase gate \hat{P} can be obtained from $U_P := T^T$ (the transpose of T). The S -matrix is orthogonal, just as the associated symplectic transformation on the lattice and thus the logical Hadamard can be implemented by a mere passive linear optical element with a representative Gaussian unitary $\hat{U}_H = e^{-i\frac{\pi}{2}\hat{n}}$ corresponding to a $\pi/2$ rotation in phase space. The T -matrix however is not orthogonal and since the vectors in \mathcal{L}^\perp corresponding to Pauli- Y operators are generically of a different length than corresponding Pauli- X or $-Z$ representatives, the logical phase gate does not admit an orthogonal implementation [19].

Example: the hexagonal lattice, $\mathcal{L} = \sqrt{2}A_2$. For the hexagonal GKP code we have $M^\perp = M_{A_2}/\sqrt{2}$. As a root lattice, orthogonal automorphisms are given by reflections

$$r_\alpha = I - 2\frac{\alpha\alpha^T}{\alpha^T\alpha} \quad (18)$$

along the so-called root α, β contained in the rows of M_{A_2} in eq. (7). Reflections are involutions with a -1 determinant, and hence are not symplectic. We can thus identify the subset of symplectic orthogonal automorphisms to lie within the even subgroup of the Weyl group $W(A_2)$ which is generated by the product of the two reflections

$$R_{\frac{2\pi}{3}} = r_\beta r_\alpha = \begin{pmatrix} \cos \frac{2\pi}{3} & -\sin \frac{2\pi}{3} \\ \sin \frac{2\pi}{3} & \cos \frac{2\pi}{3} \end{pmatrix}. \quad (19)$$

Solving $UM_{A_2} = M_{A_2}R_{\frac{2\pi}{3}}^T$ yields the integral representation

$$U = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ -1 & 1 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (20)$$

By probing its effect on the standard basis, we find that this matrix implements the transformation on logical Pauli operators $X \mapsto Z \mapsto Y \mapsto \dots$ which realizes a logical $(\hat{P}\hat{H})^\dagger$ gate [31].

III. GKP CODES FROM COMPACT RIEMANN SURFACES

The connection between the symplectic automorphism group of the $2n$ -dimensional symplectic lattice and that of the mapping class group of a compact (2-dimensional!) genus n surface S_n is in fact not a coincidence, but hints at a deeper connection between symplectic lattices and the compact surface S_n . As we elaborate below, this connection leads to some remarkable ways of viewing GKP codes as *Jacobians* of algebraic curves. We begin by first clarifying the relation between logical operators of GKP codes and the homology of compact surfaces.

The identification of symplectic lattice automorphisms with transformations generated by Dehn twists encountered earlier (or simply elements of $\text{Sp}_{2n}(\mathbb{Z})$), which are *intersection number preserving* homeomorphisms of genus g surfaces, suggests a more intuitive understanding of the topological

nature of scaled GKP codes. An equivalent way to understand this connection is to realize that the homology groups

$$H_1(\mathbb{R}^{2n}/\mathcal{L}^\perp, \mathbb{Z}) \sim H_1(S_n, \mathbb{Z}) \quad (21)$$

are isomorphic, and that the symplectic inner product between \mathbb{Z} -valued vectors representing elements in $H_1(\mathbb{R}^{2n}/\mathcal{L}^\perp, \mathbb{Z})$ is identical with the algebraic intersection number defined for elements in $H_1(S_n, \mathbb{Z})$. Since we have $\mathcal{L} = d\mathcal{L}^\perp$, the torus $\mathbb{R}^{2n}/\mathcal{L}$ is a d^2 -fold cover of $\mathbb{R}^{2n}/\mathcal{L}^\perp$, such that, when regarding elements in $\mathcal{L} = H_1(\mathbb{R}^{2n}/\mathcal{L}, \mathbb{Z})$ as logically trivial elements, the representation of logical operators on $H_1(\mathbb{R}^{2n}/\mathcal{L}^\perp, \mathbb{Z})$ descends to one on $H_1(\mathbb{R}^{2n}/\mathcal{L}^\perp, \mathbb{Z}_d)$. By eq. (21) we can thus regard elements in $H_1(S_n, \mathbb{Z}_d)$ as representations of logical operators. A d -fold wind representing a stabilizer group element is understood as trivial and the intersection number of these loops modulo d determines the commutative phase of the associated displacement operators.

A. Jacobians and compact Riemann surfaces

The Jacobian can be thought of as a first-order approximation of a compact Riemann surface, which contains the information about the first homology group of the surface and the intersection between its elements. We now outline the essential steps of the construction of the Jacobian and its associated symplectic lattice from a compact Riemann surface; for more detailed treatments see [27, 32, 33].

Let C be a compact Riemann surface of genus $n = \dim H^0(\omega_C)$, given by the dimension of the space of holomorphic differentials on C . As a n -handled torus, this Riemann surface has a canonical basis that generates its first homology group $\langle \gamma_1 \dots \gamma_{2n} \rangle = H_1(C, \mathbb{Z})$, where the intersection number between two basis elements $(\gamma_i \cdot \gamma_j) = -J_{ij}$ is determined by the symplectic form we have encountered earlier.

Choosing a basis $\omega_1, \dots, \omega_n$ for $H^0(\omega_C)$ yields a linear map

$$p: H_1(C, \mathbb{Z}) \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^n: \gamma \rightarrow \left(\int_\gamma \omega_1, \dots, \int_\gamma \omega_n \right)^T \quad (22)$$

defined from the set of $2n$ generators of $H_1(C, \mathbb{Z})$ to $2n$ vectors in \mathbb{C}^n . The $n \times 2n$ matrix

$$\Pi = (p(\gamma_1) \dots p(\gamma_{2n})) \quad (23)$$

is known as the *period matrix*.

The period matrix admits a standard form. In particular, we can always choose a basis and normalization such that Π takes the canonical form $\Pi = (I_n \ \Omega)$ where Ω is symmetric and $\text{Im } \Omega > 0$ [27].

Consider the lattice Λ spanned by the columns of Π , $\Lambda = \Pi \mathbb{Z}^{2n}$. The complex torus $T_\Lambda = \mathbb{C}^n/\Lambda$ obtained from the quotient by Λ is known as the *Jacobian variety* $J(C)$ of C . We can map Λ into real space lattice L_Λ by associating with each vector $\Lambda \ni \mathbf{v} \mapsto (\text{Re } \mathbf{v}^T, \text{Im } \mathbf{v}^T)^T$; this is known as the real representation. Writing $\Omega = X + iY$, L_Λ is generated by the rows of the matrix M defined by

$$M^T = \begin{pmatrix} I_n & X \\ 0 & Y \end{pmatrix}, \quad (24)$$

and satisfies

$$M(J_2 \otimes Y^{-1})M^T = J. \quad (25)$$

Since $Y > 0$, we can define the rescaled generator matrix

$$M_C = M(I_2 \otimes Y^{-\frac{1}{2}}), \quad (26)$$

which, by eq. (25), is symplectic and generates a symplectic lattice, such that it can be scaled to yield a GKP code as discussed earlier.

Eq. (26) also allows for an interpretation of the lattice generated by M , it is simply a stretched version of the symplectic lattice spanned by M_C with “stretching” $Y^{\frac{1}{2}} \oplus Y^{\frac{1}{2}}$. In the simple case where $Y = dI_n$, this becomes equivalent to the lattice present in a scaled GKP code of type $D = dI_n$.

To obtain an alternative interpretation of the lattice L_Λ , we apply a generalized squeezing operation via $M_C \mapsto M'_C = M_C(Y^{-\frac{1}{2}} \oplus Y^{\frac{1}{2}})$ and take the transpose to express

$$M^T = (Y \oplus I_n)M'^T_C. \quad (27)$$

Comparing this to eq. (2) yields the interpretation of the lattice L_Λ^T spanned by the generator matrix M^T as lattice corresponding to a GKP code of “type” Y , where we put type in quotes since there is no *a priori* reason for Y to be integral or diagonal.

The transpose lattice, or equivalently the lattice spanned by the rows of Π , can directly be seen to carry the symplectic structure using Riemann’s bilinear relations, which tells us that two rows of the period matrix and its conjugate $\mathbf{a}_i, \mathbf{b}_j$ given by the period integrals over the forms $\omega_i, \bar{\omega}_j$ have symplectic inner product given by

$$\int_C \omega_i \wedge \bar{\omega}_j = \mathbf{a}_i^T J \mathbf{b}_j, \quad (28)$$

which is always real and non-negative for $i = j$. In general we have that

$$i \int_C \omega_i \wedge \bar{\omega}_j = i(\Pi J^T \bar{\Pi})_{ij} \quad (29)$$

yields a positive definite matrix; for more details, see Ref. [27].

In general, a complex torus \mathbb{C}^n/Λ obtained from a symplectic lattice is also known as a *principally polarized abelian variety* [27, 32], where “polarized abelian variety” refers to the fact that there is a Hermitian inner product $H(x, y) = x^\dagger Y^{-1} y$, $Y > 0$ on this torus with the property that $\text{Im } H(\Lambda, \Lambda) \in \mathbb{Z}$. In the real representation, $\text{Im } H(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = \mathbf{x}^T (J_2 \otimes Y^{-1}) \mathbf{y}$ is precisely the product appearing in eq. (25). The adjective “principal” applies to the special case $Y = I_n$, such that L_Λ as defined above automatically is a symplectic lattice [27, 32, 33] which we have seen to arise above under the appropriate transformation.

Rather than to refer to compact Riemann surfaces, one typically refers to the Jacobian associated to a projective complex algebraic *curve*. This underlies a deep connection between algebra and geometry: projective complex algebraic curves can be understood as “explicit parametrizations” of compact Riemann surfaces. We now briefly outline this connection and refer the reader for a more detailed treatment to ref. [34, 35].

A complex algebraic curve $C = \{(x, y) \in \mathbb{C}^2, P(x, y) = 0\} \subset \mathbb{C}^2$ is the set of roots of a polynomial equation in 2 variables with maximal degree d and is equivalent to its homogenization $C_h = \{(x, y, z) \in \mathbb{C}^3, P_h(x, y, z) = 0\} \subset \mathbb{CP}^2$, given by the constant degree polynomial $P_h(x, y, z) = z^d P(x/z, y/z)$ whose set of roots in C_h satisfy the equivalence relation $(\lambda x, \lambda y, \lambda z) \sim (x, y, z)$, $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}^\times$ and $C \subset \mathbb{CP}^2$ is typically viewed as a projective curve. There are finitely many singular points $S = \{(x_0, y_0) \in C : \partial_x P(x_0, y_0) = \partial_y P(x_0, y_0) = 0\}$, away from which the curve can always be parameterized by points of the form $(x, y(x)) \in \mathbb{C}^2$ or $(x(y), y) \in \mathbb{C}^2$ such that




FIG. 5. The chain of correspondences and maps that associate a GKP code to any complex algebraic curve $C \subset \mathbb{C}\mathbb{P}^2$.

either $\partial_x y(x) = -\partial_y P(x, y)/\partial_x P(x, y)$ or $\partial_y x(y) = -\partial_x P(x, y)/\partial_y P(x, y)$ are well-defined and the projection $(x, y) \rightarrow y$ resp. $(x, y) \rightarrow x$ yields local coordinates in \mathbb{C} . The normalization theorem [34] effectively smooths out the singular points and guarantees the existence of a compactification of the curve $C^* = C \setminus S$ to obtain a compact Riemann surface \widehat{C} that covers C . Reversely, Riemann showed that all compact Riemann surfaces can be described as compactifications of algebraic curves.

While these arguments show the one-to-one correspondence between compact Riemann surfaces and algebraic curves, they are unwieldy in the explicit computation of the period integrals to construct Jacobians associated to curves. In the special case of hyperelliptic curves given by polynomials of the form

$$P(x, y) = y^2 - f(x), \quad f(x) = \prod_{i=1}^N (x - \lambda_i), \quad \lambda_i \neq \lambda_j \quad \forall i \neq j \quad (30)$$

the identification of the homology basis of the corresponding compact Riemann surface and construction of the holomorphic forms becomes more simple: Solutions to the curve are of the form $y = \sqrt{f(x)}$ where a homology basis with $2n$ generators is derived from the branch cuts of the complex square root spanned between the roots λ_i (see [36, p. 160] for a good illustration). A basis of for the holomorphic differentials is then given by $\omega_i = x^{i-1} \frac{dx}{\sqrt{f(x)}}$ for $i = 1 \dots n$ [27].

These connections allow us to construct (scaled) GKP codes from complex curves via their Jacobians. The chain of correspondences illustrating the chain of maps that map from curves to GKP codes via the construction of the Jacobian is pictured in figure 5.

These relationships have some interesting implications for GKP codes. For example, we expect that representations of quantum states in code space obtained from pulling back phase-space representations (such as the stellar representation [37]) to be constrained by the topology of the Riemann surface. However, the more interesting immediate question is whether every GKP code can be understood as a curve. Unfortunately, the answer to this is negative: there are symplectic lattices, such as the E_8 lattice, that do not arise as the Jacobian of curves [32, 33]. The general question of “which principally polarized abelian varieties arise as Jacobians of curves” is a long-standing mathematical quest known as the *Schottky problem* [32, 38].

B. Single-mode GKP codes from elliptic curves

In the previous section we have established a connection between complex curves and GKP codes which we now make more concrete for the case of a single-mode $n = 1$. An *elliptic curve* is a complex torus [36, 39]

$$E = (\mathbb{C}/\Lambda, z), \quad z \in \mathbb{C}/\Lambda, \quad (31)$$

where $\Lambda \subset \mathbb{C}$ is a complex, non-degenerate lattice and $z \in \mathbb{C}/\Lambda$ is a point on the torus [39]. The point $z \in \mathbb{C}/\Lambda$ can be thought of as the choice of 0-point on the torus (since the torus forms an additive group under addition in \mathbb{C} modulo Λ we need to fix an identity element).

This definition of an elliptic curve is one-to-one with an algebraic definition in the following sense. The curve $C_{g_2(\Lambda), g_3(\Lambda)} = \{(x, y) \in \mathbb{C}^2, y^2 = 4x^3 - g_2(\Lambda)x - g_3(\Lambda)\}$, specified by two complex numbers g_2, g_3 that are the image of a lattice under the functions defined below, is parameterized by the Weierstrass \wp function

$$\wp(z, \Lambda) := \frac{1}{z^2} + \sum_{\omega \in \Lambda \setminus \{0\}} \left(\frac{1}{(z - \omega)^2} - \frac{1}{\omega^2} \right), \quad (32)$$

where the invariance under translations by lattice vectors $\wp(z + \Lambda) = \wp(z)$ shows that this is a well-defined function on the complex torus \mathbb{C}/Λ with poles of order 2 on each lattice point. Therefore, distinct lattices Λ, Λ' are distinguished by their \wp functions.

The Weierstrass function \wp also provides an alternative parametrization of the elliptic curve $C_{g_2(\Lambda), g_3(\Lambda)}$, which can be seen as follows. Introduce the (normalized) Eisenstein series of weight k

$$G_k(\Lambda) = \sum_{\omega \in \Lambda \setminus \{0\}} \omega^{-k}, \quad (33)$$

and

$$g_2(\Lambda) = 60G_4(\Lambda), \quad g_3(\Lambda) = 140G_6(\Lambda). \quad (34)$$

Then the equation for the elliptic curve is given by

$$\wp'^2 = 4\wp^3 - g_2\wp - g_3. \quad (35)$$

The elliptic curve is non-singular, i.e. it has no cusps or self-intersections, when the discriminant of the right-hand side

$$\Delta(\Lambda) = g_2^3 - 27g_3^2 \quad (36)$$

is nonzero, which holds whenever Λ is full-rank in \mathbb{C} .

Let ω_1, ω_2 form a basis for the lattice $\Lambda = \omega_1\mathbb{Z} \oplus \omega_2\mathbb{Z}$, which is full-rank if $\text{Im}(\omega_2/\omega_1) \neq 0$. One can fix an orientation of the basis elements by choosing a basis with $\text{Im}(\omega_2/\omega_1) > 0$, corresponding to a positive intersection of the homology element ω_2 with ω_1 on the torus \mathbb{C}/Λ such that, up to an overall factor of rescaling and rotation ω_1 , the lattice $\Lambda_\tau = \mathbb{Z} \oplus \tau\mathbb{Z}$ is parameterized by $\tau \in \mathfrak{h} := \{z \in \mathbb{C}, \text{Im}(z) > 0\}$ in the complex upper half plane. As a function of τ , the Eisenstein series defined above $g_k(\tau) = g_k(\Lambda_\tau)$ are modular forms of degree $2k$ [40], implying that they satisfy the transformation rule $f(\gamma.\tau) = (c\tau + d)^k f(\tau) \forall \gamma \in \text{SL}_2(\mathbb{Z})$, where we have introduced the Möbius transformation

$$\begin{pmatrix} a & b \\ c & d \end{pmatrix} . \tau = \frac{a\tau + b}{c\tau + d}. \quad (37)$$

As a function of τ , the discriminant modular form $\Delta(\tau) = \Delta(\Lambda_\tau)$ is a modular cusp form of weight 12 that vanishes at $i\infty$. Möbius transformations with elements $\gamma = \begin{pmatrix} a & b \\ c & d \end{pmatrix} \in \text{SL}_2(\mathbb{Z})$ can be understood as basis transformation of the corresponding lattice via the map

$$\begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ \tau \end{pmatrix} \mapsto X\gamma X \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ \tau \end{pmatrix} = (c\tau + d) \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ \gamma.\tau \end{pmatrix}, \quad (38)$$




FIG. 6. The hexagonal GKP code given by Λ_ρ , $\rho = e^{i2\pi/3}$ and relative level structure $d^{-1}\Lambda_\rho$ for $d = 3$. The points $z \bmod d^{-1}\Lambda_\rho$ parametrize the syndrome of the GKP code while the d -torsion points $d^{-1}\Lambda_\rho$ in Λ_ρ are interpreted to label logical Pauli operators for the associated GKP code.

where $X = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$ and $X\gamma X \in \text{SL}_2(\mathbb{Z})$. For a fixed volume $\det \Lambda_\tau$, the lattice Λ can always be recovered via appropriate rescaling up to a global rotation.

To associate a single-mode GKP code to an elliptic curve, note that the Möbius transformation defines a transitive action on the upper half plane \mathfrak{h} . For symplectic orthogonal matrices $K \in \text{SO}_2(\mathbb{R}) = \text{Sp}_2(\mathbb{R}) \cap \text{O}_2(\mathbb{R})$, we have that i is a fixed point, $i = K.i$. Therefore every point in the upper half plane $\tau = S.i \in \mathfrak{h}$ is one-to-one with a symplectic matrix $S \in \text{Sp}_2(\mathbb{R})/\text{SO}_2(\mathbb{R})$ up to a rotation. We associate with the symplectically self-dual lattice \mathbb{Z}^2 the square GKP code encoding a qudit with dimension d by rescaling the lattice $\tau \mapsto \sqrt{d/\det(\Lambda_\tau)}\Lambda_\tau$. Since this rescaling can always be done, it suffices to identify Λ_τ , equivalently the torus \mathbb{C}/Λ_τ , with the corresponding qudit GKP code.

In fact, we can obtain *all* single-mode GKP codes as the orbit $\text{Sp}_2(\mathbb{R}).i$. We can hence identify single-mode GKP codes with elliptic curves $E = (\mathbb{C}/\Lambda_\tau, z)$, $z \in \mathbb{C}/\Lambda_\tau$. First we interpret Λ_τ as the lattice associated to the stabilizer group of a GKP code. Then z , which labels a point in \mathbb{C} up to a displacement by a (stabilizer) element in Λ_τ , is interpreted as the sum of a syndrome $z \bmod \frac{1}{d}\Lambda_\tau$ and a representative logical displacement label $\bar{z} \in \frac{1}{d}\Lambda_\tau$. See the discussion in Sec. II.

A level- d structure [39] on an elliptic curve is given by an oriented basis $(\frac{1}{d}, \frac{\tau}{d})$ of $H_1(E, \mathbb{Z}_d)$ – the so-called d -torsion points on E – where the intersection number modulo d of the basis elements is 1 such that the intersection pairing $H_1(E, \mathbb{Z}_d) \times H_1(E, \mathbb{Z}_d) \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_d$ again defines the desired Heisenberg-Weyl commutation phase of the associated displacement operators (see eq. 5). The level structure defines a finer structure on the elliptic curve. Under the above mapping from elliptic curves to GKP codes, it can be understood as the algebra of logical operators (the symplectic dual lattice to \mathcal{L}_Λ), relative to which z becomes associated with the syndrome of the GKP code.

IV. MODULI SPACE OF GKP CODES AND FIBER BUNDLE FAULT TOLERANCE

A. GKP distance and modular discriminant

In this section, we establish an equivalence between the space of all single-mode GKP codes with a nonzero distance and a certain complex parameterization of the lattice in terms of modular discriminants that are bounded away from zero.

To understand the space of GKP codes we focus on the space of symplectic lattices in 2-dimensions (equivalently, we focus on the space of elliptic curves ignoring the choice of z). We have already seen in the previous section that every point $\tau \in \mathfrak{h}$ parametrizes a symplectic lattice up to an overall rotation. Since lattices – as geometric objects – are defined independent of




FIG. 7. The fundamental domain \mathcal{F} on is marked in grey on the RHS. We illustrate the effect of a squeezing operation $\tau \mapsto (\lambda \oplus \lambda^{-1}) \cdot \tau = \lambda^2 \tau$ and the corresponding transformation on the lattice $\Lambda_\tau \mapsto \Lambda_{\lambda^2 \tau} / \sqrt{\det(\Lambda_{\lambda^2 \tau})}$.

the choice of representing basis, the set of symplectic lattices up to basis transformation is given by the left quotient $\mathrm{Sp}_2(\mathbb{Z}) \backslash \mathrm{Sp}_2(\mathbb{R})$ (remember that $\mathrm{Sp}_2(\mathbb{Z}) = \mathrm{SL}_2(\mathbb{Z})$). $\mathrm{Sp}_2(\mathbb{R})$ has a transitive action on the upper half plane \mathfrak{h} , which is trivial for the elements $\{\pm I\}$. We can hence equally parametrize the space of all symplectic lattices by the quotient

$$M_1 = \mathrm{P}\mathrm{Sp}_2(\mathbb{Z}) \backslash \mathfrak{h}, \quad (39)$$

where $\mathrm{P}\mathrm{Sp}_2(\mathbb{Z}) = \mathrm{Sp}_2(\mathbb{Z}) / \{\pm I\}$ has an *effective* action on \mathfrak{h} . Points of M_1 corresponds to isomorphism classes of elliptic curves (GKP codes)[39] and, in fact, M_1 again is a Riemann surface, where a holomorphic map to \mathbb{C} is given by the j function

$$j(\tau) = 1728 \frac{g_2^3(\tau)}{\Delta(\tau)}, \quad (40)$$

which is a modular form of weight 0. We can represent M_1 via the fundamental domain

$$\mathcal{F} = \left\{ \tau \in \mathfrak{h} : |\mathrm{Re}(\tau)| \leq \frac{1}{2}, |\tau| \geq 1 \right\}, \quad (41)$$

shown in fig. 7.

It is important to note that the space M_1 fails to be a quotient manifold in for which every point $\tau \in M_1$ has isomorphic orbits under $\mathrm{SL}_2(\mathbb{Z})$ action. At fault is the existence of fix-points in \mathfrak{h} such that the $\mathrm{P}\mathrm{Sp}_2(\mathbb{Z})$ action is not free. On the upper half plane, the S and T matrices that generate $\mathrm{Sp}_2(\mathbb{Z})$ have Möbius actions $S.z = -1/z$, $T.z = z+1$, such that the points $\tau = i$ and $\tau = \rho := e^{i2\pi/3}$ are fixed points under S and ST^{-1} . It is quickly verified that $\tau = i$ corresponds to the GKP code built from the square lattice \mathbb{Z}^2 , where the S matrix can be understood as the logical Hadamard gate \hat{H} in its integral representation and similarly, $\tau = \rho$ corresponds to the GKP code built from the hexagonal lattice (A_2) which has a logical $\hat{H}\hat{P}^\dagger$ Hadamard times phase gate corresponding to the ST^{-1} matrix. The existence of automorphisms is hence both a blessing and a curse. They show the existence and characterize possible logical Clifford gates, but also equip our classifying space M_1 with the structure of an orbifold – meaning that rather than being locally isomorphic to \mathbb{C} , it behaves locally like a quotient space of \mathbb{C} modulo a local group action by a group that varies from point to point [39, 41]. In fact, as a consequence of our choice of representation, these fixpoints are stabilized by elements in $\mathrm{SO}_2(\mathbb{R})$, i.e. they are associated to GKP codes with logical Clifford gates implementable through passive linear optical elements. Later we will construct a moduli space of GKP codes where these points are effectively removed by a choice of additional constraints, such that the moduli space can be fully treated as a complex manifold and we will leave

an investigation of spaces of GKP codes that incorporates the orbifold structure to future work. We begin by investigating the connection between the topology of M_1 and the coding theoretic properties of the associated codes.

The j function diverges in the limit $\tau \rightarrow i\infty$. Using $q = e^{i2\pi\tau}$, we can write

$$j(\tau) = q^{-1} + 744 + 19884q + \dots, \quad (42)$$

$$\Delta(\tau) = (2\pi)^{12} q \prod_{k=1}^{\infty} (1 - q^k) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \tau(n) q^n, \quad (43)$$

$$g_2(\tau) = \frac{4\pi^4}{3} \left(1 + 240 \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \sigma_3(n) q^n \right), \quad (44)$$

where we have the Ramanujan $\tau(n)$ function and the divisor sum $\sigma_3(n) = \sum_{d|n} d^3$ function, we recognize that the source of this divergence is the simple root of $\Delta(\tau)$ in the limit $\tau \rightarrow i\infty$. Comparing to the discussion in the previous chapter, this corresponds to the limit where the lattice Λ_τ is not full rank anymore. To understand this point better, write $\tau = x + iy = M \cdot i$, with

$$M = \begin{pmatrix} \sqrt{y} & x/\sqrt{y} \\ 0 & 1/\sqrt{y} \end{pmatrix}. \quad (45)$$

The shortest vector in the lattice $L(M)$ spanned by the rows of M satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda_1^2(L(M)) &= \min_{(0,0) \neq (n,m) \in \mathbb{Z}^2} \|n^2 y + (nx + m)^2 / y\|^2 \\ &\leq \left\{ y + \frac{x^2}{y}, \frac{1}{y} \right\}, \end{aligned} \quad (46)$$

such that in particular we have $\text{Im}(\tau) \leq \lambda_1^{-2}(L(M))$. That is, representing the lattice basis in \mathfrak{h} , demanding that the lattice (the corresponding GKP code) has finite non-zero distance $\lambda_1 \geq \text{const.}$ yields an upper bound on the imaginary part of its representation in \mathfrak{h} . Similarly, one can show that the squeezing value associated to M , that is the squeezing necessary to prepare a code state associated to M starting at the canonical square GKP code bounds $\text{sq}(M) = \|M^T\|_2 \geq \text{Im}(\tau)$. We illustrate the intuition behind the limit $\tau \rightarrow i\infty$ being associated to a zero distance GKP code in fig. 7, where, starting at a square GKP code, a squeezing deformation maps $\tau = i \mapsto \lambda^2 i$, $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$. While one of the lattice basis vectors gets increasingly longer, due to the volume-preserving nature of $\text{Sp}_2(\mathbb{R})$ the other shrinks until it converges to 0 in the infinite squeezing limit.

We show that the finiteness of the distance of the GKP code $\lambda_1 \geq \text{const.}$ also lower bounds the discriminant function $\Delta(\tau)$. With $\text{Im}(\tau) \leq \lambda_1^{-2}$, for large $\text{Im}(\tau)$ we also have

$$|j(\tau)| \leq e^{2\pi/\lambda_1^2} + O(1). \quad (47)$$

Using eq. (40) this bounds

$$|\Delta(\tau)| \geq e^{-2\pi/\lambda_1^2} |g_2(\tau)|^3 + O(|g_2(\tau)|^3). \quad (48)$$

Since all the zeros of the Eisenstein series lie on the unit circle $|\tau| = 1$ [42], $|\Delta(\tau)|$ will be lower bounded by $\text{const.} \times e^{-2\pi/\lambda_1^2}$ away from $|\tau| = 1$. Together with the fact that the discriminant modular form is non-zero for any finite value in \mathfrak{h} , in particular on the circle $|\tau| = 1$, this shows that any finite distance GKP code with $\lambda_1 \propto \Delta_{\text{GKP}} > 0$ will also have a non-zero modular discriminant.

We have arrived at the main result of this subsection: the space of single-mode GKP codes with bounded distance $\Delta_{\text{GKP}}(\mathcal{L}) \propto \lambda_1(\mathcal{L}) > \text{const.}$ can be parametrized by $\tau \in \mathfrak{h}$, $|\Delta(\tau)| > \text{const.}$ bounded away from zero.

B. Topological interpretation: the trefoil defect

We can understand this space topologically via an interpretation presented in [14, 43]. As we have argued above, every lattice $\Lambda \subset \mathbb{C}$, through its association to a defining equation for an elliptic curve eq. (35), is equivalently parametrized by the two parameters $(g_2, g_3) \in \mathbb{C}^2$. Since for any $c \in \mathbb{C}^\times$ we have $g_2(c\Lambda) = c^{-4}g_2(\Lambda)$, $g_3(c\Lambda) = c^{-6}g_3(\Lambda)$, one can always rescale the lattice so that $|g_2|^2 + |g_3|^2 = 1$ which is the parametrization of a 3-sphere S^3 . The space of zero-distance GKP codes is given by $0 = \Delta = g_2^3 - 27g_3^2$. In terms of the two complex parameters this equation defines a *trefoil knot* $K = \{(g_2, g_3) \in \mathbb{C}^2, g_2^3 - 27g_3^2 = 0, |g_2|^2 + |g_3|^2 = 1\}$. We can therefore understand the space of nontrivial single-mode GKP codes as the knot complement $S^3 - K \sim \text{Sp}_2(\mathbb{Z}) \backslash \text{Sp}_2(\mathbb{R})$. We illustrate the trefoil knot in fig. 1 and refer to ref. [14, 44] for further reference.

Any smooth implementation of a Clifford gate on a GKP code naturally traverses a continuous closed loop in the space of lattices $\text{Sp}_2(\mathbb{Z}) \backslash \text{Sp}_2(\mathbb{R})$ while implementing a basis transformation. The topological defect in this space carved out by the trefoil knot illustrates that such loops are in general homotopically non-trivial. One way to understand this is through the equivalence $\text{Sp}_2(\mathbb{Z}) \backslash \text{Sp}_2(\mathbb{R}) / \text{SO}_2(\mathbb{R}) = \text{Sp}_2(\mathbb{Z}) \backslash \mathfrak{h} = \mathcal{F}$. The space of lattices, up to a rotation, is labeled by an element in the fundamental domain such that each lattice – including a rotation label – can be labeled by a point in the fundamental domain \mathcal{F} together with a rotation label in S^1 (which may vary across points in \mathcal{F}). In order for a smooth transformation on the space of lattices to return to the same point in the fundamental domain with the same rotation label, it must either map to an $\text{SL}_2(\mathbb{Z}) = \text{Sp}_2(\mathbb{Z})$ equivalent point in \mathfrak{h} , or perform a full rotation in S^1 . This decomposition of $\text{Sp}_2(\mathbb{Z}) \backslash \text{Sp}_2(\mathbb{R})$ is the so-called *Seifert fibration* [45], which we illustrate in fig. 8.

In fact, the fundamental group of this space $\text{Sp}_2(\mathbb{Z}) \backslash \text{Sp}_2(\mathbb{R})$ which we now understand as the homotopy group of the knot complement $\pi_1(S^3 - K) = B_3 = \text{SL}_2(\mathbb{Z})$, is the braid group of three strands [46]. To see this, we return to label the lattice $\Lambda = \omega_1\mathbb{Z} + \omega_2\mathbb{Z}$ by the complex basis (ω_1, ω_2) for a minute. Since \mathbb{C} is algebraically closed, the defining equation of the elliptic curve takes the form [36]

$$\wp'^2 = (\wp - e_1)(\wp - e_2)(\wp - e_3), \quad (49)$$

$$\Delta = 16(e_1 - e_2)^2(e_2 - e_3)^2(e_1 - e_3)^2 \neq 0, \quad (50)$$

where $e_1 = \wp(\omega_1/2)$, $e_2 = \wp(\omega_2/2)$ and $e_3 = \wp((\omega_1 + \omega_2)/2)$ with $e_1 + e_2 + e_3 = 0$ form the three distinct roots of the equation $\wp' = 0$. Since $\wp(z + \Lambda) = \wp(z)$ is defined modulo the lattice and the coefficients g_2, g_3 , as well as the lattice, are uniquely determined by the roots e_1, e_2, e_3 , any smoothly parametrized basis transformation can also be identified by the evolution $t : [0, 1] \rightarrow e_1(t), e_2(t), e_3(t)$, which smoothly implements a permutation of the three roots. Away from the trefoil defect $\Delta = 0$, the position of these roots on \mathbb{C}/Λ remain distinct along the path, such that every non-trivial basis transformation implemented in this fashion can be identified with a non-trivial element in the braid group of three strands B_3 which has a representation in $\text{SL}_2(\mathbb{Z}) = \langle T, T^{-T} \rangle$ [46].

This shows that every smoothly parametrized logical non-trivial Clifford gate for the single-mode GKP code – given by a closed loop in the knot complement $S^3 - K$ – necessarily implements a homotopically non-trivial element in this space, i.e. it implements a nontrivial link with the cut-out trefoil knot as it avoids the “zero-distance defect” provided by the knot along the path. We illustrate the braids induced by a rotation and a shear on the square lattice – corresponding to a logical Hadamard- and phase gate for the square GKP code with $d = 2$ – in fig. 9. Note that the reverse is not generally true; there are nontrivial basis transformations of GKP lattices that implement a *trivial* Clifford element, such as the double application of the Hadamard gate for a $d = 2$ square GKP code (compare to fig. 9).




FIG. 8. The Seifert fibration describing a decomposition of $\mathrm{Sp}_2(\mathbb{Z}) \backslash \mathrm{Sp}_2(\mathbb{R})$ into the fundamental domain \mathcal{F} and a rotation label in S^1 for each point in \mathcal{F} . While every lattice has a π -rotation symmetry, there are special (singular) points i and $\rho = e^{i2\pi/3}$ with additional symmetries under $\pi/2$ and $\pi/3$ rotation. This can be pictured by a smaller circumference rotation index attached to these points in the fibration. In terms of GKP codes, it is these singular points on \mathcal{F} that correspond to GKP codes with orthogonal symplectic lattice automorphisms.




FIG. 9. A braid on $e_1 = \wp(\omega_1/2), e_2 = \wp(\omega_2/2), e_3 = \wp((\omega_1 + \omega_2)/2)$ implemented through a rotation $(\omega_1, \omega_2) \mapsto (\omega_2, -\omega_1)$ (l.) corresponding to a GKP Hadamard gate and a shear $(\omega_1, \omega_2) \mapsto (\omega_1 + \omega_2, \omega_2)$ (r.) in the case of $d = 2$. Nontrivial braiding of the three roots e_i is induced by smoothly parametrized automorphisms of the underlying lattice.

One can also define a linking number with the trefoil knot for paths in $\mathrm{Sp}_2(\mathbb{R})$ which correspond to GKP logical Cliffords. This is done by realizing that one can define a discriminant function $\tilde{\Delta} : \mathrm{Sp}_2(\mathbb{Z}) \backslash \mathrm{Sp}_2(\mathbb{R}) \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^\times$ which provides an isomorphism of the homology groups $H_1(\mathrm{Sp}_2(\mathbb{Z}) \backslash \mathrm{Sp}_2(\mathbb{R}), \mathbb{Z}) \sim H_1(\mathbb{C}^\times, \mathbb{Z})$ [47, 48], such that closed loops in the space of symplectic lattices map to closed loops in \mathbb{C}^\times . The discriminant function $\tilde{\Delta}$ is an invariant of the associated lattice, independent of the choice of basis (i.e. it is a weight-0 modular form), defined for $\gamma = \begin{pmatrix} a & b \\ c & d \end{pmatrix} \in \mathrm{Sp}_2(\mathbb{R})$ as

$$\tilde{\Delta}(\gamma) = j_{12}(\gamma, i)\Delta(\gamma.i), \quad (51)$$

where we have defined the factor of automorphy $j_{12}(\gamma, z) = (cz + d)^{-12}$. Now let $\gamma_A(t) : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathrm{Sp}_2(\mathbb{R})$ be a continuous curve with $g_A(0) \in \mathrm{Sp}_2(\mathbb{R})$ and $g_A(1) = Ag_A(0)$ $A \in \mathrm{Sp}_2(\mathbb{Z})$. The linking

number is defined by

$$\text{link}(\gamma_A, K) = \frac{1}{2\pi i} \oint_{\gamma_A} \frac{d\tilde{\Delta}}{\tilde{\Delta}} = \frac{1}{2\pi i} \oint_{\gamma_A} \frac{d\Delta}{\Delta} + \frac{1}{2\pi i} \oint_{\gamma_A} \frac{dj_{12}}{j_{12}} \quad (52)$$

and is a topological invariant of the path [47, 48].

Example: the square GKP code, $\mathcal{L} = \sqrt{2}\mathbb{Z}^2$. The two basic symplectic automorphisms of the square GKP code are firstly the Hadamard gate with integral representation S implemented by a $\pi/2$ rotation and second the phase gate with integral representation T .

From the modular transformation behavior $\tilde{\Delta}(c\Lambda) = c^{-12}\tilde{\Delta}(\Lambda)$ it can be shown that rotations of the lattices $\Lambda \rightarrow e^{i\phi}\Lambda$, $\phi \in [0, \frac{\pi}{k}]$ yield linking numbers $\text{link}(\gamma_A, K) = -\frac{6}{k}$, such that the lattice automorphism of the square lattice given by the smooth implementation of a $\pi/2$ rotation is associated with linking number $\text{link}(\gamma_S, K) = -3$. See fig. 1 for an illustration of this loop.

A continuous parametrization of a loop corresponding to the phase gate can be obtained by $t \in [0, 1]$: $M(t) = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & t \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} M_0 \subset \text{Sp}_2(\mathbb{R})$, where M_0 is the generator matrix of the initial code. In the upper half plane, this path in $\text{Sp}_2(\mathbb{R})$ is represented by $\tau(t) = M(t).i = \tau_0 + t$, where $\tau_0 = M_0.i$ represents the initial lattice. Modulo the left $\text{Sp}_2(\mathbb{Z})$ action, this path corresponds to a horizontal loop winding around the fundamental domain \mathcal{F} with linking number

$$\text{link}(\gamma_T, K) = \frac{1}{2\pi i} \oint_{\gamma_A} \frac{d\Delta}{\Delta} = \int_0^1 dt E_2(\tau_0 + t) = 1 \quad (53)$$

where $E_2(z) = 1 - 24e^{i2\pi z} + \dots$ is the second Eisenstein series normalized such that $E_2(z \rightarrow i\infty) = 1$ [40]. The last equality follows from $\int_0^1 dt e^{i2\pi nt} = \delta_{0,n}$.

Example: the hexagonal GKP code, $\mathcal{L} = \sqrt{2}A_2$. Similar to the square GKP code, the $\pi/3$ rotation symmetry of the hexagonal lattice implements a Clifford gate with integral representation U , given in eq. (20). Using the general argument presented above this corresponds a linking number $\text{link}(\gamma_U, K) = -2$ of the corresponding path with the trefoil knot.

In a seminal paper, Ghys [14] showed that for hyperbolic elements $A \in \text{Sp}_2(\mathbb{Z})$ (i.e. those with $|\text{Tr}[A]| > 2$) which are implemented via a symplectic squeezing operation

$$M \in \text{SL}_2(\mathbb{R}) \mapsto M(\lambda \oplus \lambda^{-1}) = AM, \quad \lambda > 1, \quad (54)$$

the corresponding unique modular geodesic γ_A has linking number $\text{link}(\gamma_A, K) = \psi(A)$ with the trefoil knot, where $\psi(A)$ is the well-known *Rademacher function*, which can be computed by compiling A into a product of integer powers of matrices $R = T$, with T as in eq. (17), $L = T^T$, such that $A = \prod_{i=1}^N R^{r_i} L^{l_i}$. Under this expansion,

$$\psi(A) = \sum_{i=1}^N r_i - l_i \quad (55)$$

is given by the difference of their number of appearances in the product expansion. The Rademacher symbol is a class invariant for $\text{Sp}_2(\mathbb{Z})$, that is for all $g \in \text{Sp}_2(\mathbb{Z})$ and $A \in \text{Sp}_2(\mathbb{Z})$ it holds that $\psi(gAg^{-1}) = \psi(A)$. In fact, using

$$R^{r_i} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}^{r_i} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & r_i \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad L^{l_i} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix}^{l_i} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ l_i & 1 \end{pmatrix} \quad (56)$$

the Rademacher symbol also descends to a class invariant on $\mathrm{SL}_2(\mathbb{Z}_d)$ for $A : \det(A \bmod d) = 1$ and $|\mathrm{Tr}[A] \bmod d| > 2$, with

$$\psi(A) \bmod d = \psi(A \bmod d). \quad (57)$$

The Rademacher function in particular yields a meaningful invariant for symplectic lattice automorphisms provided by a symmetric symplectic matrix. In this case, the Bloch-Messiah decomposition (see appendix D) provides a decomposition $S = O^T D O$ of the symplectic matrix into orthogonal symplectic parts O and a squeezing matrix D , such that a smoothly parametrized implementation of S can be obtained by concatenating paths in $\mathrm{Sp}_2(\mathbb{R})$ that implement O , O^T and D , respectively. The automorphism $S\mathcal{L} = \mathcal{L}$ descends to a squeezing automorphism D on the rotated lattice $O\mathcal{L}$ for which the Rademacher function measures the linking number. As a topological invariant, however, this linking number will be equal to that of the path that implements S , such that the Rademacher function can be applied to compute the linking number of all symmetric symplectic automorphisms.

In appendix E we provide more insight into the Rademacher function and investigate the statistics of the Rademacher function modulo d , which we discuss in relation to the Chebotarev law [49–52].

C. The garden of GKP codes

So far we have identified scaled single-mode GKP codes with elliptic curves with level- d structure and identified the topological defect in the space of all lattices corresponding to such codes with the limit of GKP codes with distance $\Delta_{\mathrm{GKP}} = 0$ and we have shown how logical Clifford gates quantified by their lattice automorphisms modulo d can be classified according to their linking number with this defect.

In the following we will construct a complex manifold that captures all single-mode scaled GKP codes with logical dimension d and non-zero syndrome while distinguishing between elements in the logical Clifford group, which is isomorphic to $\mathrm{Sp}_2(\mathbb{Z}_d) \times (\frac{1}{d}\mathbb{Z}_d)^2$. One way to think about this manifold is that it captures the group of inhomogeneous Gaussian unitary operations that prepare a GKP code state from the scaled square GKP code where the symplectic transformation and displacement are considered modulo logically trivial Clifford operations. A classifying space – our *GKP moduli space* – for these single-mode GKP codes that does not distinguish logical information is then obtained by quotienting the obtained manifold by the action of the logically non-trivial Clifford group. The goal of this construction is to define a fibration of this space of GKP lattices and translations into a fiber that labels only logical information of the GKP code and a base that classifies the code as a purely geometric object together with a syndrome label. This fibration is set up to provide an example of fiber bundle fault tolerance as proposed by Gottesman and Zhang [1], where smooth implementations of logical Clifford gates are facilitated by homotopically non-trivial loops on the GKP moduli space. We discuss this perspective in sec. IV D after constructing the following fiber bundle structure.

Similar to the case of generic elliptic curves, isomorphism classes of elliptic curves with level structure are classified by the quotient space $\mathcal{M}_1[d] = \Gamma(d) \backslash \mathfrak{h}$, where we define the congruence subgroup by

$$\Gamma(d) = \{A \in \mathrm{PSp}_2(\mathbb{Z}), A \bmod d = I\} \quad (58)$$

$$\subseteq \Gamma(1) := \mathrm{PSp}_2(\mathbb{Z}). \quad (59)$$

Note that here we have defined $\Gamma(d)$ as subgroup of $\mathrm{PSp}_2(\mathbb{Z}) = \mathrm{Sp}_2(\mathbb{Z})/\{\pm I\}$ so that $\Gamma(d)$ is torsion-free for all $d > 1$ and has an effective action on \mathfrak{h} .




FIG. 10. The fundamental region $F(2) = \Gamma(2) \backslash \mathfrak{h} = \cup_{\gamma \in \text{Sp}_2(\mathbb{Z}_2)} \gamma F$ is drawn in red and contains the logical Clifford translates of the fundamental region $F = \text{SL}_2(\mathbb{Z}) \backslash \mathfrak{h}$.

Define the action of $(m, n) \in \mathbb{Z}^2$ on (τ, z) as $(\tau, z + m + n\tau)$, such that the quotient $\mathbb{Z}^2 \backslash (\tau, z)$ is translation symmetric under translations of z by elements in Λ_τ and define the $\Gamma(d)$ action as

$$\gamma : (\tau, z) \mapsto (\gamma.\tau, z/(c\tau + d)) \quad (60)$$

for $\gamma = \begin{pmatrix} a & b \\ c & d \end{pmatrix} \in \Gamma(d)$. See [39] for background.

The action of elements in $\Gamma(d)$ preserves the level- d structure $d^{-1}\Lambda_\tau$ sitting inside of \mathbb{C}/Λ_τ and hence represents logically trivial basis transformations of the GKP code.

We assemble the full space of elliptic curves with level- d structure (single-mode GKP codes) as

$$E(d) = (\Gamma(d) \times \mathbb{Z}^2) \backslash \mathfrak{h} \times \mathbb{C}. \quad (61)$$

Understood as GKP codes, this space labels all possible lattices associated with GKP stabilizer groups, i.e. that are sublattices to their own symplectic dual (given by its rescaling by d), and for each lattice element (τ, z) with fixed τ , the point z labels all possible syndromes and logical displacements. With our definition, $\Gamma(d)$ is torsion-free for $d \geq 2$ such that $\Gamma(d) \backslash \mathfrak{h}$ obtains the structure of a Riemann surface [39].

Finally, we define

$$E^\times(q) = (\Gamma(d) \times \mathbb{Z}^2) \backslash \mathfrak{h} \times_\tau \mathbb{C}_d^\times, \quad (62)$$

where $\mathfrak{h} \times_\tau \mathbb{C}_d^\times$ is such that for each point $\tau \in \mathfrak{h}$, the points $d^{-1}\Lambda_\tau$ are removed from the \mathbb{C} factor. This space captures all single-mode scaled GKP codes with logical dimension d with non-zero syndrome while distinguishing between elements in the logical Clifford group, which is isomorphic to $\text{Sp}_2(\mathbb{Z}_d) \times (\frac{1}{d}\mathbb{Z}_d)^2$. In the next step, we will quotient the manifold by the action of this logical Clifford group to obtain a classifying space for these single-mode GKP codes that does not distinguish logical information.

We define the covering for $d \geq 2$ by

$$E^\times(d) \xrightarrow{\pi} M^\times = \left(\text{Sp}_2(\mathbb{Z}_d) \times \left(\frac{1}{d}\mathbb{Z}_d \right)^2 \right) \backslash E^\times(d). \quad (63)$$

The spaces $E^\times(d)$ and M^\times both have the structure of complex manifolds since the covering group $G = \left(\text{Sp}_2(\mathbb{Z}_d) \times \left(\frac{1}{d}\mathbb{Z}_d \right)^2 \right)$ acts freely and properly discontinuously on $E^\times(d)$. $E^\times(d) \xrightarrow{\pi} M^\times$

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
X & \xlongequal{\quad} & \Phi^* E^\times & \longrightarrow & E^\times \\
\downarrow p & & \downarrow & & \downarrow \pi \\
T & \xlongequal{\quad} & B & \xrightarrow{\Phi} & M^\times
\end{array}$$

FIG. 11. $E^\times \rightarrow M^\times$ forms a universal family of GKP codes, such that every family of single-mode GKP codes with non-zero syndrome can be obtained as pullback of this family. The manifolds $E^\times = E^\times(d)$, $M^\times = M^\times(d)$ implicitly depend on the scaling parameter d .




FIG. 12. Illustration of the moduli space of GKP codes M^\times discussed in the main text.

is a G -covering of complex manifolds with the discrete structure group G . In this construction, we have chosen to exclude the zero section $z = 0$ from the space of elliptic curves and its quotients since otherwise M^\times would not inherit the structure of a complex manifold – our construction considers only *GKP codes with non-zero syndrome*. If we had not excluded these sections, the existence of non-trivial fixed points of the $\mathrm{Sp}_2(\mathbb{Z})$ action on \mathfrak{h} would prevent the quotients under the group action in eqs. (62), (63) to preserve manifold structure but would ramify the fix points under the Möbius action map up to local symmetry groups (M^\times would obtain the structure of an orbifold, which are locally isomorphic to a quotient of a euclidean space with a group which does not have to be constant over the space [39, 41]). The family of GKP codes with non-zero syndrome in eq. (63) is *universal*, such that every family of GKP codes $E^\times \rightarrow M^\times$ with non-zero syndrome parametrized over a complex manifold B can be obtained as the pullback of the holomorphic function $\Phi : M^\times \rightarrow B$ that describes the embedding of B in M^\times [39]. We summarize this property in fig. 11 .

D. Towards fiber bundle fault tolerance

A geometric framework for fault-tolerant gates was proposed by Gottesman and Zhang in [1]; we only briefly outline this and refer the interested reader to the detailed treatment in [1]. This framework considers as a fundamental object the Grassmanian $\mathrm{Gr}(K, N)$, the manifold of K -dimensional subspaces of an N -dimensional Hilbert space regarded as \mathbb{C}^N [1]. Fault-tolerant gates for a code \mathcal{C} are proposed to correspond to homotopically non-trivial loops on a submanifold $\mathcal{M} \subset \mathrm{Gr}(K, N)$ based at $\mathcal{C} \in \mathcal{M}$. The manifold \mathcal{M} is constructed such that every subspace contained within it is an error correcting code and thus has some robustness to errors. More concretely one can construct a *vector bundle* over any submanifold of the Grassmanian, whose fiber over a point is the respective code space. A set of unitary operators is then called *fault tolerant*

if its left action induces a flat projective connection on this vector bundle. In this framework, a fault-tolerant logical gate implemented by a loop based at the code \mathcal{C} is determined by the parallel transport of the code along the path, such that the connections flatness implies that non-trivial fault-tolerant logical transformations are given by monodromies implied by the parallel transport, such that non-trivial fault tolerant logical gates necessarily arise from loops on \mathcal{M} with non-trivial homotopy.

The covering space structure of the family of GKP codes discussed above has the same structure. Taking the place of \mathcal{M} in Gottesman and Zhang's construction, we consider the set of *subspaces of GKP codes* of a quantum harmonic oscillator and the fibers are given by logical Clifford orbits of the local codes and choices of syndrome sector. Since these fibers are by construction discrete, paths on the base space have unique lifts to the total space while any smooth path on $E^\times(d)$ that implements a non-trivial logical Clifford gate necessarily corresponds to a homotopically non-trivial loop on the base space M^\times . This base space inherits the topology of the knot complement $S^3 - K$ together with that of a torus at each point of the knot-complement. To connect this space M^\times to a more elementary decomposition of the space of possible lattices, note that $\mathcal{F} = \mathrm{Sp}_2(\mathbb{Z}) \backslash \mathfrak{h}$ is one-to-one with $\mathrm{Sp}_2(\mathbb{Z}) \backslash \mathrm{Sp}_2(\mathbb{R}) / \mathrm{SO}_2(\mathbb{R})$, the space of 2-dimensional lattices *up to a rotation*, and one can think of the phase of the argument $z \neq 0$ as the label for the corresponding rotation. More concretely, $z \in S_{1,1}$ lives in a *punctured torus*, which has homotopy group $\pi_1(S_{1,1}) = \pi_1(S^1) \times \pi_1(S_1)$, equivalent to that of a circle and a torus which captures non-trivial rotations of elements in M^\times as non-trivial elements in $\pi_1(S_{1,1})$.

The bundle obtained via the forgetful map $M^\times \ni (\tau, z) \rightarrow \tau$ can thus again be topologically understood as the Seifert fibration (see fig. 8), that associates to each element in $\mathrm{Sp}_2(\mathbb{Z}) \backslash \mathrm{Sp}_2(\mathbb{R})$ an element in $\mathcal{F} \times S^1$. From the previous discussions we see that the fundamental group of this space has a homomorphism to the single-mode GKP Clifford group. Consequentially, our construction presented here provides an example of Clifford fiber-bundle fault tolerance for the GKP code. The construction of the classifying fiber bundle over the space of GKP lattices, or more generally, the space of possible stabilizer codes with positive distance is more constrained than the proposed classification directly using the Grassmannian. It avoids the problem of defining the relevant Grassmannian in the case of an infinite dimensional physical Hilbert space, as it is the case for GKP codes, and takes advantage of the existing classification of the moduli space of algebraic varieties that correspond to the individual GKP code instances. We expect this perspective to be practical in examining the prospect of fiber bundle fault tolerance for error correction protocols in high generality, in particular under consideration of the recent developments in the dynamical understanding quantum error protocols through intermediate stabilizer groups [53–57].

V. DISCUSSION & OUTLOOK

In this manuscript we have studied the structure and fault-tolerant implementation of Clifford gates for the GKP codes. Motivated by the results of this study, we established a connection between GKP codes and algebraic curves and obtained a topological understanding of the space of all GKP codes in the case of a single-mode. We pointed out how this space is given by the complement of a trefoil knot in the three sphere, $S^3 - K$, and have shown that the knot-defect corresponds to the limit of zero distance $\Delta_{\mathrm{GKP}} = 0$ GKP codes. By considering the modulus of the Rademacher function, we found a topological class invariant for logical Clifford gates with hyperbolic integral representation and finally, we proposed a construction of a universal family of (single-mode) GKP codes which also provides an example of fiber bundle fault tolerance as proposed by Gottesman and Zhang [1] for the GKP code. While we are only considering the simplest case of a single-mode $n = 1$, the tools we develop hint at a general connection between

the study of fiber bundle fault tolerance and the moduli spaces of (complex) algebraic varieties with additional structure. It will be the topic of future work to explore this connection in greater generality.

Possible lines of future work, that we only developed vague hints for, involve the understanding of properties and resource theories [58] for GKP codes from Jacobians. The background of this questions is that a version of the Abel-Jacobi map discussed in section 2 provides a pointwise mapping from Riemann-surfaces to points in the Jacobian variety that can be identified as the bosonic phase-space modulo a lattice symmetry. There exists a pullback of holomorphic functions on phase space, such as that provided by the stellar representation [37], where the zeros have a natural resource theoretic interpretation. As compact manifolds, the initial Riemann surfaces imply natural constraints on the dynamics of the zeros and poles of the corresponding pullbacks which are interesting to investigate.

In the study of the generalization of our construction for the space of all GKP codes, the natural replacement for the complex upper half-plane as starting point is given by the Siegel upper half space \mathbb{H}_n of symmetric complex matrices Z with $\text{Im}(Z) > 0$. Similar to the single-mode case, one can define a transitive modular action of $\text{Sp}_{2n}(\mathbb{R})$ on \mathbb{H}_n , where iI_n serves as reference and is fixed by orthogonal symplectic transformations $\text{Sp}_{2n}(\mathbb{R}) \cap \text{SO}_{2n}(\mathbb{R}) = U_n(\mathbb{C})$. It is interesting that orthogonal symplectic transformations take a special role in this structure: in the single-mode case one can argue that the transformations generated by $\text{SO}_2(\mathbb{R}) = U_1(\mathbb{C})$ are incapable of generating all elements of the logical Clifford group of an associated GKP code as $\text{SO}_2(\mathbb{R})$ is abelian and it would be interesting to understand if a similar simple argument can be made in higher dimensions.

We have explained in depth how the limit of zero-distance GKP codes expresses itself as a 1-dimensional knot-defect in the space of all GKP codes. For multimode GKP codes, whose moduli space is to be described by higher-dimensional varieties, it is expected that the corresponding defect will also be higher dimensional and aside from its classification, it would be interesting if a connection could be made between a non-trivial systole of the moduli space of multi-mode GKP codes and the properties of fault-tolerant implementations of gates for those GKP codes.

Finally, rather than traversing the space of GKP codes by continuously parametrized Gaussian unitary operations, one may be able to take infinitesimal steps in this space by slightly varying the stabilizers measured. We anticipate that the understanding of the moduli space of GKP codes developed here also implies a version of Floquet-based quantum error correction for GKP codes, where periodic measurement-cycles of varying generators can be used to implement logical gates of the GKP code, similar to the constructions presented in refs. [53–57] for qubit-based codes.

We have demonstrated that tools from the theory of algebraic curves and modular forms play a significant role in the study of GKP codes and their fault tolerance properties. Since GKP codes also present an embedding of any qubit- or qudit-based stabilizer code into lattices, we hope that the present manuscript motivates further study of the general link between algebraic geometric formulations of quantum error correction and the theory of fault tolerance.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We are grateful to V. Albert, J. Eisert, J. Franke, J. Haferkamp, J. Ueki, N. Walk and J. Magdalena de la Fuente for many inspiring and helpful discussions and we are grateful to V. Albert for pointing out the fiber bundle framework for fault tolerance during discussions at the QIP conference in early 2022 as well as sharing thoughts on the topology of GKP codes. We also thank U. Chabaud for feedback on an early version of the manuscript.

JC thanks A. Grimsmo for introducing him to STF and for inviting him to a research visit at the AWS CQC.

JC and AB gratefully acknowledge support from the BMBF (RealistiQ, MUNIQC-Atoms, PhoQuant, QPIC-1, and QSolid), the DFG (CRC 183, project B04, on entangled states of matter), the Munich Quantum Valley (K-8), as well as the Einstein Research Unit on quantum devices.

-
- [1] Daniel Gottesman and Lucy Liuxuan Zhang. Fibre bundle framework for unitary quantum fault tolerance. 2017.
 - [2] D. Gottesman, A. Kitaev, and J. Preskill. Encoding a qubit in an oscillator. *Phys. Rev. A*, 64:012310, 2001.
 - [3] B. M. Terhal, J. Conrad, and C. Vuillot. Towards scalable bosonic quantum error correction. *Quantum Science and Technology*, 5:043001, 2020.
 - [4] K. Duivenvoorden, B. M. Terhal, and D. Weigand. Single-mode displacement sensor. *Phys. Rev. A*, 95:012305, 2017.
 - [5] Victor V. Albert, Kyungjoo Noh, Kasper Duivenvoorden, Dylan J. Young, R. T. Brierley, Philip Reinhold, Christophe Vuillot, Linshu Li, Chao Shen, S. M. Girvin, Barbara M. Terhal, and Liang Jiang. Performance and structure of single-mode bosonic codes. *Phys. Rev. A*, 97:032346, Mar 2018.
 - [6] K. Noh, V. V. Albert, and L. Jiang. Quantum capacity bounds of Gaussian thermal loss channels and achievable rates with Gottesman-Kitaev-Preskill codes. *IEEE Trans. Inf. Th.*, 65:2563–2582, 2019.
 - [7] V. V. Sivak, A. Eickbusch, B. Royer, S. Singh, I. Tsioutsios, S. Ganjam, A. Miano, B. L. Brock, A. Z. Ding, L. Frunzio, S. M. Girvin, R. J. Schoelkopf, and M. H. Devoret. Real-time quantum error correction beyond break-even. *Nature*, 616(7955):50–55, mar 2023.
 - [8] C. Flühmann, T. L. Nguyen, M. Marinelli, V. Negnevitsky, K. Mehta, and J. P. Home. Encoding a qubit in a trapped-ion mechanical oscillator. *Nature*, 566:513–517, 2019.
 - [9] P. Campagne-Ibarcq, A. Eickbusch, S. Touzard, E. Zalys-Geller, N. E. Frattini, V. V. Sivak, P. Reinhold, S. Puri, S. Shankar, R. J. Schoelkopf, and et al. Quantum error correction of a qubit encoded in grid states of an oscillator. *Nature*, 584:368–372, 2020.
 - [10] Ben Q. Baragiola, Giacomo Pantaleoni, Rafael N. Alexander, Angela Karanjai, and Nicolas C. Menicucci. All-gaussian universality and fault tolerance with the gottesman-kitaev-preskill code. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 123:200502, Nov 2019.
 - [11] Daniel Gottesman. The Definition(s) of Fault Tolerance, 2017. Invited talk given at 4th International Conference on Quantum Error Correction; available at <https://youtu.be/FMXFNClAF3k>.
 - [12] Daniel Gottesman. Opportunities and challenges in fault-tolerant quantum computation, 2022.
 - [13] A. Y. Kitaev. Fault-tolerant quantum computation by anyons. *Ann. Phys.*, 303:2–30, 2003.
 - [14] Étienne Ghys. Knots and dynamics. *Proceedings of the International Congress of Mathematicians, Vol. 1, 2006-01-01, ISBN 978-3-03719-022-7, pags. 247-277*, 1, 01 2006.
 - [15] Michael Atiyah. The Logarithm of the Dedekind η -Function. *Mathematische Annalen*, 278:335–380, 1987.
 - [16] H. Rademacher and E. Grosswald. *Dedekind Sums*, volume 16. Mathematical Association of America, 1 edition, 1972.
 - [17] A. Burchards, J. Conrad, and S. Flammia. In preparation.
 - [18] J. Conrad, J. Eisert, and F. Arzani. Gottesman-Kitaev-Preskill codes: A lattice perspective. *Quantum*, 6:648, February 2022.
 - [19] B. Royer, S. Singh, and S. M. Girvin. Encoding qubits in multimode grid states. *PRX Quantum*, 3:010335, Mar 2022.
 - [20] F. Schmidt and P. van Loock. Quantum error correction with higher Gottesman-Kitaev-Preskill codes: Minimal measurements and linear optics. *Phys. Rev. A*, 105:042427, Apr 2022.
 - [21] J. Harrington and J. Preskill. Achievable rates for the Gaussian quantum channel. *Phys. Rev. A*, 64:062301, 2001.
 - [22] J. W. Harrington. *Analysis of quantum error-correcting codes: Symplectic lattice codes and toric codes*. PhD thesis, California Institute of Technology, 2004.
 - [23] or *weakly symplectic self dual*, which has been our previous terminology in [26].
 - [24] In fact the orbit $GL_{2n}(\mathbb{Z})M$ describes the set of all lattice bases that generate the same lattice. We choose to work more conveniently with basis transformations that preserve the sign of the volume form

- $\det(\mathcal{L}) = \det(M)$ w.l.o.g. for convenience.
- [25] Bourbaki. *Algèbre*. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2007.
 - [26] Jonathan Conrad, Jens Eisert, and Jean-Pierre Seifert. Good Gottesman-Kitaev-Preskill codes from the ntru cryptosystem, 2023.
 - [27] Christina Birkenhake and Herbert Lange. *Complex Abelian Varieties*. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2004.
 - [28] That is, up to phases as we usually care about the action of these operator on a projective Hilbert space.
 - [29] O.T. O’Meara. *Symplectic Groups*. Mathematical Surveys and Monographs. American Mathematical Society, 1978.
 - [30] Benson Farb and Dan Margalit. *A Primer on Mapping Class Groups (PMS-49)*. Princeton University Press, Princeton, 2012.
 - [31] Arne L. Grimsmo, Joshua Combes, and Ben Q. Baragiola. Quantum computing with rotation-symmetric bosonic codes. *Phys. Rev. X*, 10:011058, Mar 2020.
 - [32] P. Sarnak and P. Buser. On the period matrix of a Riemann surface of large genus (with an Appendix by J. H. Conway and N. J. A. Sloane). *Inventiones mathematicae*, 117:27–56, 1994.
 - [33] Anne-Marie Berge. Symplectic lattices. 1999.
 - [34] Phillip Griffiths. *Introduction to Algebraic Curves*. American Mathematical Society, December 1989.
 - [35] Alexander I. Bobenko. *Introduction to Compact Riemann Surfaces*, pages 3–64. Number Bd. 2013 in Computational Approach to Riemann Surfaces. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2011.
 - [36] Joseph H. Silverman. *The Arithmetic of Elliptic Curves*. Springer New York, 2009.
 - [37] Ulysse Chabaud and Saeed Mehraban. Holomorphic representation of quantum computations. *Quantum*, 6:831, October 2022.
 - [38] Samuel Grushevsky. The schottky problem, 2010.
 - [39] Richard Hain. Lectures on moduli spaces of elliptic curves, 2014.
 - [40] Don Zagier. *Elliptic Modular Forms and Their Applications*, pages 1–103. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2008.
 - [41] Francisco C. Caramello Jr. Introduction to orbifolds, 2022.
 - [42] F. K. C. Rankin and H. P. F. Swinnerton-Dyer. On the zeros of eisenstein series. *Bulletin of the London Mathematical Society*, 2(2):169–170, July 1970.
 - [43] John Milnor. *Introduction to Algebraic K-Theory. (AM-72), Volume 72*. Princeton University Press, Princeton, 1972.
 - [44] E. Ghys. Lorenz and modular flows: A visual introduction, 2006.
 - [45] H. Seifert. Topologie Dreidimensionaler Gefaserter Räume. *Acta Mathematica*, 60(none):147 – 238, 1933.
 - [46] Terry Gannon. *Moonshine beyond the Monster: The Bridge Connecting Algebra, Modular Forms and Physics*. Cambridge University Press, July 2023.
 - [47] W. Duke, Ö. Imamoğlu, and Á. Tóth. Modular cocycles and linking numbers. *Duke Mathematical Journal*, 166(6):1179 – 1210, 2017.
 - [48] Toshiaki Matsusaka and Jun Ueki. Modular knots, automorphic forms, and the rademacher symbols for triangle groups. *Research in the Mathematical Sciences*, 10(1), December 2022.
 - [49] Jun Ueki. Modular knots obey the chebotarev law, 2024.
 - [50] P. Sarnak. Linking numbers of modular knots, 2010.
 - [51] Letter to j. mozzochi on linking numbers of modular geodesics. ”http://publications.ias.edu/sites/default/files/MozzochiLtr_1.pdf”, 2008.
 - [52] Curtis T. McMullen. Knots which behave like the prime numbers. *Compositio Mathematica*, 149(8):1235–1244, 2013.
 - [53] Matthew B. Hastings and Jeongwan Haah. Dynamically generated logical qubits. *Quantum*, 5:564, October 2021.
 - [54] Christophe Vuillot, Lingling Lao, Ben Criger, Carmen García Almudéver, Koen Bertels, and Barbara M Terhal. Code deformation and lattice surgery are gauge fixing. *New Journal of Physics*, 21(3):033028, March 2019.
 - [55] Margarita Davydova, Nathanan Tantivasadakarn, Shankar Balasubramanian, and David Aasen. Quantum computation from dynamic automorphism codes, 2023.
 - [56] Alex Townsend-Teague, Julio Magdalena de la Fuente, and Markus Kesselring. Floquetifying the colour code. *Electronic Proceedings in Theoretical Computer Science*, 384:265–303, August 2023.

- [57] Markus S. Kesselring, Julio C. Magdalena de la Fuente, Felix Thomsen, Jens Eisert, Stephen D. Bartlett, and Benjamin J. Brown. Anyon condensation and the color code. *PRX Quantum*, 5(1), March 2024.
- [58] Hayata Yamasaki, Takaya Matsuura, and Masato Koashi. Cost-reduced all-gaussian universality with the gottesman-kitaev-preskill code: Resource-theoretic approach to cost analysis. *Phys. Rev. Res.*, 2:023270, Jun 2020.
- [59] Sergey Bravyi and Alexei Kitaev. Universal quantum computation with ideal clifford gates and noisy ancillas. *Physical Review A*, 71(2), feb 2005.
- [60] Keith Conrad. Lecture notes. <https://kconrad.math.uconn.edu/blurbs/>, 2024. [Online; accessed 06-May-2024].

Appendix A: More on quantum harmonic oscillators

Bosonic quantum error correction studies the robust embedding of discrete quantum information into a system of multiple quantum harmonic oscillators (QHO), each of which can be described by an infinite dimensional Hilbert space $\mathcal{H} = \text{span}\{|n\rangle\}_{n=0}^{\infty}$ where $|n\rangle$ denote the well known Fock states whose labels correspond to the eigenvalues of the number operator $\hat{n} = \hat{a}^\dagger \hat{a}$ and $\hat{a} = (\hat{q} + i\hat{p})/\sqrt{2}$ denotes the annihilation operator. \hat{q} and \hat{p} are the position- and momentum operators whose improper eigenstates yield a basis for the underlying Hilbert space. The associated phase space inherits a non-trivial geometry from the canonical commutation relations $[\hat{q}, \hat{p}] = i$ (we will set $\hbar = 1$ throughout) and is most naturally studied in the Heisenberg frame, i.e. in terms of the transformation behaviour of operators on this space. On a system of n QHOs – which we will refer to as having n modes – we define a generalized quadrature operator $\hat{\mathbf{x}} = (\hat{q}_1 \hat{q}_2 \dots \hat{p}_{n-1} \hat{p}_n)^T$ such that $[\hat{x}_i, \hat{x}_j] = iJ_{ij}$ where

$$J = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & I_n \\ -I_n & 0 \end{pmatrix} \quad (\text{A1})$$

is the anti-symmetric symplectic form and I_n denotes the $n \times n$ identity matrix.

Analogous to the Pauli-operators for qubit-systems, the Heisenberg-Weyl operators for this infinite dimensional Hilbert space are given by displacement operators

$$D(\boldsymbol{\xi}) = \exp\left\{-i\sqrt{2\pi}\boldsymbol{\xi}^T J \hat{\mathbf{x}}\right\}, \quad (\text{A2})$$

which form a basis for operators and are orthogonal as $\text{Tr}[D^\dagger(\boldsymbol{\xi})D(\boldsymbol{\eta})] = \delta^{(2n)}(\boldsymbol{\xi} - \boldsymbol{\eta})$, such that states can be represented by their Wigner function

$$W_\rho(\boldsymbol{x}) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2n}} d\boldsymbol{\eta} e^{-i2\pi\boldsymbol{x}^T J \boldsymbol{\eta}} \text{Tr}[D(\boldsymbol{\eta})\rho]. \quad (\text{A3})$$

Displacement operators represent the unitary time evolution induced by Hamiltonians linear in the quadrature operators that implement the transformation

$$D(\boldsymbol{\xi})^\dagger \hat{\mathbf{x}} D(\boldsymbol{\xi}) = \hat{\mathbf{x}} + \sqrt{2\pi}\boldsymbol{\xi} \quad (\text{A4})$$

and commute and multiply as

$$D(\boldsymbol{\xi})D(\boldsymbol{\eta}) = e^{-i\pi\boldsymbol{\xi}^T J \boldsymbol{\eta}} D(\boldsymbol{\xi} + \boldsymbol{\eta}), \quad (\text{A5})$$

$$= e^{-i2\pi\boldsymbol{\xi}^T J \boldsymbol{\eta}} D(\boldsymbol{\eta})D(\boldsymbol{\xi}). \quad (\text{A6})$$

It is these properties that make them a natural set to choose stabilizer groups from.

Unitary evolution via Hamiltonians strictly quadratic in the quadrature operators implement symplectic transformations

$$U_S = e^{-\frac{i}{2}\hat{\mathbf{x}}^T C \hat{\mathbf{x}}}, \quad C = C^T, \quad (\text{A7})$$

$$U_S^\dagger \hat{\mathbf{x}} U_S = S \hat{\mathbf{x}}, \quad S = e^{CJ}, \quad (\text{A8})$$

where $S \in \text{Sp}_2(\mathbb{R}) = \{S \in \mathbb{R}^{2 \times 2} : S^T J S = J\}$ is a symplectic matrix which follows from unitarity of U_S and we have

$$U_S D(\boldsymbol{\xi}) U_S^\dagger = D(S\boldsymbol{\xi}), \quad (\text{A9})$$

such that we also have

$$W_{U_S \rho U_S^\dagger}(\mathbf{x}) = W_\rho(S\mathbf{x}). \quad (\text{A10})$$

An important symplectic transformation is the *symplectic transvection*

$$t_\alpha = I + \alpha \alpha^T J, \quad (\text{A11})$$

generated by the matrix $C = J^T \alpha \alpha^T J$ such that the corresponding Hamiltonian takes the form $H = (\alpha^T J \hat{\mathbf{x}})^2$. Symplectic transvections close under conjugation

$$t_\beta t_\alpha t_\beta^{-1} = t_{t_\beta \alpha} \quad (\text{A12})$$

and can be understood as representation of Dehn-twists that generate the mapping class group of a genus g surface S_g [29].

The displacement operator also admits an illustrative complex parametrization

$$D_c(\gamma) = \exp\left\{\sqrt{\pi}\left(\gamma^T \hat{\mathbf{a}}^\dagger - \gamma^{*T} \hat{\mathbf{a}}\right)\right\} = D(\boldsymbol{\xi}), \quad (\text{A13})$$

where the equivalent real parameter is $\boldsymbol{\xi} = \text{Re}(\gamma) \oplus \text{Im}(\gamma) \in \mathbb{R}^{2n}$ and $\hat{\mathbf{a}} = (\hat{a}_1, \dots, \hat{a}_n)$, $\hat{\mathbf{a}}^\dagger = (\hat{a}_1^\dagger, \dots, \hat{a}_n^\dagger)$ define the generalized annihilation and creation operators.

In this parametrization the displacement operator acts as

$$D_c(\gamma)^\dagger \hat{\mathbf{a}} D_c(\gamma) = \hat{\mathbf{a}} + \sqrt{2\pi} \gamma. \quad (\text{A14})$$

and the commutation relation is given by

$$D_c(\gamma) D_c(\boldsymbol{\delta}) = e^{-i2\pi \text{Im}(\gamma^\dagger \boldsymbol{\delta})} D_c(\boldsymbol{\delta}) D_c(\gamma) \quad (\text{A15})$$

where the symplectic form $\omega(\gamma, \boldsymbol{\delta}) = \text{Im}(\gamma^\dagger \boldsymbol{\delta})$ is a skew-symmetric function inherited from the hermitian form $H(\gamma, \boldsymbol{\delta}) = \gamma^\dagger \boldsymbol{\delta}$ as its imaginary part.

Appendix B: GKP Clifford gates

Lemma 1. *Given a weakly symplectic self-dual lattice $\mathcal{L} \subseteq \mathcal{L}^\perp$ with symplectic Gram matrix (symplectic form) $A = J_2 \otimes D$, $D = \text{diag}(d_1, \dots, d_n)$, we have that $\text{Aut}^S(\mathcal{L})$ is equivalently specified by the integral representation*

$$\text{Sp}_{2n}^D(\mathbb{Z}) = \{U \in \text{GL}_{2n}(\mathbb{Z}) : U A U^T = A\}. \quad (\text{B1})$$

Proof. Since $M_D = D \oplus I$ is invertible, it holds that the unique S_U for which $UM_D = M_D S_U^T$ is symplectic. Since any basis for a GKP code of type D can be given by $M_D S_0^T$ for some $S_0 \in \text{Sp}_{2n}(\mathbb{R})$, it follows that the elements of $\text{Sp}_{2n}^D(\mathbb{Z})$ are integral representations for symplectic automorphisms of \mathcal{L} . Conversely, from $UM = MS^T$ it can also be shown that $A = MS^T JSM^T = UMJM^T U^T = UAU^T$ every integral representation for a symplectic automorphism needs to admit the defining relation of eq. (10). \square

Corollary 1.

$$\text{Aut}^S(\mathcal{L}) = \text{Aut}^S(\mathcal{L}^\perp) \quad (\text{B2})$$

Proof. In the canonical basis, we have $M = AM^\perp$ where by lemma 1 a symplectic automorphism $S \in \text{Aut}^S(\mathcal{L})$ is specified by a unimodular matrix U , $UAU^T = A$. Combining these statements one finds $M^\perp S^T = A^{-1}UAM^\perp = U^{-T}M^\perp$. Since inverses and transposes preserve the unimodularity of $V = U^{-T}$, we have $S \in \text{Aut}^S(\mathcal{L}^\perp)$ and thus $\text{Aut}^S(\mathcal{L}) \subseteq \text{Aut}^S(\mathcal{L}^\perp)$. Conversely, we have that $A^{-1} = -M^\perp J(M^\perp)^T$, such that for a given $S \in \text{Aut}^S(\mathcal{L}^\perp)$ the relation $VM^\perp = M^\perp S^T$ for unimodular V implies that the integral representation satisfies $VA^{-1}V^T = A^{-1}$. With $M^\perp = A^{-1}M$ this yields $MS^T = AVA^{-1}M = V^{-T}M$, such that unimodularity of V implies $S \in \text{Aut}^S(\mathcal{L})$ and thus $\text{Aut}^S(\mathcal{L}^\perp) \subseteq \text{Aut}^S(\mathcal{L})$. \square

A similar statement can be shown to hold for the orthogonal automorphism group, whose integral representation is given by matrices $U \in \text{GL}_{2n}(\mathbb{Z})$ that preserve the euclidean Gram matrix $G = MM^T$. In the special case of *scaled GKP codes* (see ref. [18]), i.e. GKP codes with $D = qI$ we have $\text{Aut}^S(\mathcal{L}^\perp) = \text{Aut}^S(\mathcal{L})$, such that every automorphism in $\text{Aut}^S(\mathcal{L}^\perp)$ also descends to an automorphism in $\mathcal{L}^\perp/\mathcal{L}$ by reducing the outcome modulo \mathcal{L} .

Symplectic self-dual lattices that are also Euclidean self dual, i.e. where for which there exist unimodular matrices such that $M = UM^{-T}J^T = UM^\perp = VM^{-T} = VM^*$ always have the orthogonal symplectic automorphism given by J , since the previous line also implies that there is a unimodular matrix W , such that $MJ^T = -UM^{-T} = WM$ and $W = MJ^T M^{-1}$ [32]. This is for instance the case for the E_8 lattice.

Appendix C: Magic states

The symplectic orthogonal automorphism group $\text{Aut}^{SO}(\mathcal{L}^\perp)$ of GKP codes have a special application in that they give rise to magic states. Let $|0\rangle^{\otimes n}$ be the n -mode vacuum state. The vacuum state is rotation symmetric and arguably the simplest state to prepare. Further let

$$\Pi_M = \sum_{\xi \in \mathcal{L}(M)} e^{i\phi_M(\xi)} D(\xi) \quad (\text{C1})$$

be the code space projector of a GKP code with generator M . In the case of a scaled GKP code where the symplectic Gram matrix A has only even entries we further have that the phases appearing in the group elements are trivial $\phi_M(\xi) = 0 \pmod{2\pi}$, such that we simply write $\Pi_{\mathcal{L}}$ and for \hat{U}_S the Gaussian unitary associated to a symplectic automorphism $S \in \text{Aut}^{SO}(\mathcal{L}^\perp) = \text{Aut}^{SO}(\mathcal{L})$, we have

$$\left[\hat{U}_S, \Pi_{\mathcal{L}} \right] = 0. \quad (\text{C2})$$

This implies that

$$|M\rangle = \Pi_{\mathcal{L}} |0\rangle^{\otimes n} \quad (\text{C3})$$

is a +1 eigenvalue eigenstate of \hat{U}_S . $|M\rangle$ lives in the codespace of the GKP code and is the +1 eigenstate of the logical Clifford gate associated to S . Using a logical CNOT gate and the ability to perform computational basis measurements states of this type can be consumed to implement non-Clifford gates to lift the previously discussed Clifford gates to a universal gate set [59]. Ref. [59] distinguished between T- and H-types of magic states given by the single qubit Clifford orbit of the states [59]

$$|H\rangle\langle H| = \frac{I}{2} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(\hat{X} + \hat{Z}), \quad (\text{C4})$$

$$|T\rangle\langle T| = \frac{I}{2} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}}(\hat{X} + \hat{Y} + \hat{Z}), \quad (\text{C5})$$

Example: $\mathcal{L} = \sqrt{2}\mathbb{Z}^2$ For the square GKP code we have already identified the logical Hadamard gate realized by $e^{-i\pi/2\hat{n}}$ as the only Clifford gate realizable using passive Gaussian unitary. Furthermore (in codespace) the +1 eigenstate of the Hadamard gate is unique such that we obtain $|M\rangle = |H+\rangle$ the +1 eigenvalue eigenstate of the logical Hadamard gate. This fact was observed in [10], where it was also shown that performing quantum error correction allows for the production of those magic states.

Example: $\mathcal{L} = \sqrt{2}A_2$ It was realized in [31] that the hexagonal GKP code has a symplectic orthogonal automorphism that realizes the $\hat{H}\hat{P}^\dagger$ gate given by $\hat{U}_{HP^\dagger} = e^{-i\frac{2\pi}{3}\hat{n}}$. The logical HP^\dagger gate is a symmetry of the $|T\rangle$ -type magic state defined in [59], such that the state $|M\rangle$ obtained by projecting the vacuum onto code space again yields a magic state.

For one mode the lattices \mathcal{L} denoted above can be uniquely described by a single parameter τ that transforms via $\tau \mapsto S^{-1}.\tau$ for $S \in \text{SL}_2(\mathbb{R})$ when the associated code space projector transforms with $\Pi_{\mathcal{L}} \mapsto U_S \Pi_{\mathcal{L}} U_S^\dagger$. Similarly, every Gaussian state can also be labeled by an element $z \in \mathfrak{h}$ by considering the unique state annihilated by $\hat{a}_z = \hat{p} - z\hat{q}$. This labeling is such that for a Gaussian unitary $U_S \hat{a}_{z'} = U_S \hat{a}_z U_S^\dagger$ satisfies $z'^{-1} = S.z^{-1}$. This allows us to compactly describe the evolution of a state of type $|M\rangle$ under Gaussian unitary evolution

$$|M\rangle \mapsto U_S |M\rangle \quad (\text{C6})$$

$$(\tau, z^{-1}) \mapsto (S^{-1}.\tau, S.z^{-1}). \quad (\text{C7})$$

In ref. [19] some non-Clifford logical gates implementable via non-Gaussian unitary gates are identified such as $\sqrt{\hat{H}}$ and a version of a controlled Hadamard gate. It would be interesting to extend the geometric classification discussed in the main text to such gates, which is left for future work.

Appendix D: Möbius acrobatics

To further illustrate the behaviour of the Möbius action on the upper half plane we illustrate how it can be used to derive the Iwasawa- and Bloch-Messiah decomposition, depicted in fig. 13. Our presentation is guided by the example presented in ref. [60]. The main ingredient to this understanding is the transitivity of $\text{SL}_2(\mathbb{R})$ on the upper half space $\mathfrak{h} = \text{SL}_2(\mathbb{R})/\text{SO}_2(\mathbb{R}).i$

To derive the Iwasawa decomposition, recognize that an arbitrary $z \in \mathfrak{h}$ can be written as

$$z = x + iy = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & x \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \cdot \begin{pmatrix} \sqrt{y} & 0 \\ 0 & 1/\sqrt{y} \end{pmatrix} \cdot i, \quad (\text{D1})$$




FIG. 13. We illustrate the Iwasawa- (l.) and Bloch-Messiah (r.) decomposition of symplectic matrices.

where the squeeze “pushes” the point $z_0 = i$ upwards to $z = iy$ and the final shear moves it horizontally to $z = x + iy$. Since every point $z \in \mathfrak{h}$ can be described by this sequence of Möbius transformations and the upper half plane is one-to-one with elements of $\mathrm{Sp}_2(\mathbb{R})$ up to a right-rotation, we can deduce that every matrix $S \in \mathrm{Sp}_2(\mathbb{R})$ can be written as $S = NAK$, where N and A are shears and squeezes as above and $K \in \mathrm{Sp}_2(\mathbb{R}) \cap \mathrm{SO}_2(\mathbb{R})$ is a rotation.

Similarly, every point z can also be expressed by a squeeze and rotation acting on $z_0 = i$, which leads to the Bloch-Messiah decomposition $S = K_1AK_2$, where A is again a squeeze and $O_1, O_2 \in \mathrm{Sp}_2(\mathbb{R}) \cap \mathrm{SO}_2(\mathbb{R})$. The steps are geometrically sketched in fig. 13.

Appendix E: The statistics of $\psi(A) \bmod q$

The Rademacher symbol is also given by [47]

$$\psi(A) = \Phi(A) - 3\mathrm{sign}(c(a+d)), \quad (\text{E1})$$

with $A = \begin{pmatrix} a & b \\ c & d \end{pmatrix}$ and where $\Phi(A)$ is the Dedekind symbol

$$\Phi(A) = \begin{cases} \frac{b}{d} & \text{if } c = 0, \\ \frac{a+d}{c} - 12\mathrm{sign}(c)s(a,c), & \text{if } c \neq 0, \end{cases} \quad (\text{E2})$$

and the Dedekind sum $s(a,c)$ is given by

$$s(a,c) = \sum_{n=1}^{|c|-1} \left(\left(\frac{n}{c} \right) \right) \left(\left(\frac{na}{c} \right) \right), \quad (\text{E3})$$

where $((x)) = x - [x] - 1/2$ if x is non-integer and 0 otherwise.

We use this expression to compute $\psi(A)$ for all hyperbolic $A \in \mathrm{SL}_2(\mathbb{Z}_q)$, and prime moduli $q = 1 \dots 29$, shown in fig. 14. We observe that the distributions are almost constant at $(q-1)^{-1}$, which is the value indicated in the red dashed line while we observe that, for each q , the value $\psi(A) = q-3$ deviates from this behaviour to a value close to zero.

It has previously been shown that it holds that [49], as a consequence of the Chebotarev law [49–52],

$$\lim_{\nu \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\#\{\gamma : |\mathrm{Tr} \gamma| < \nu, \Psi(\gamma) = k \in \mathbb{Z}_q\}}{\#\{\gamma : |\mathrm{Tr} \gamma| < \nu\}} = \frac{1}{q}, \quad (\text{E4})$$

for $\gamma \in \mathrm{SL}_2(\mathbb{Z})$ running through the primitive hyperbolic elements, where the parameter ν can be understood as the squeezing value used to implement γ – which also presents a bound on the length of the geodesic in $\mathrm{SL}_2(\mathbb{Z}) \setminus \mathfrak{h}$. Rather than explicitly ordering by squeezing, here we order by prime modulus q , which implies a bound $|\mathrm{Tr} \gamma| \leq 2(q-1)$. In the limit $q \rightarrow \infty$ this reproduces the distribution (except for the points at $\Psi(A) = q-3$) predicted in eq. (E4).




FIG. 14. We compute the density distribution of Rademacher symbols $\psi(A)$ exhaustively for all hyperbolic $A \in \mathrm{SL}_2(\mathbb{Z}_q)$ for the smallest primes $q = 5 \dots 29$, where the bars are normalized to integrate to 1.