

# Invariant Theory and Magic State Distillation

Amolak Ratan Kalra<sup>1,2</sup> and Shiroman Prakash<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *Institute for Quantum Computing, and David R. Cheriton School of Computer Science  
University of Waterloo, Waterloo, Ontario, Canada*

<sup>2</sup> *Perimeter Institute for Theoretical Physics Waterloo, Ontario, Canada*

<sup>3</sup> *Department of Physics and Computer Science, Dayalbagh Educational Institute, Agra,  
India*

## Abstract

We show that the performance of a linear self-orthogonal  $GF(4)$  code for magic state distillation of Bravyi and Kitaev's  $|T\rangle$ -state is characterized by its simple weight enumerator. We compute weight enumerators of all such codes with less than 20 qubits and find none whose threshold exceeds that of the 5-qubit code. Using constraints on weight enumerators from invariant theory and linear programming, we obtain bounds on the exponent characterizing noise suppression of a  $|T\rangle$ -state distillation protocol. We also obtain new non-negativity constraints on such weight enumerators by demanding consistency of the associated magic state distillation routine. These “quantum constraints” lead to new bounds on the distance of classical self-dual and maximal self-orthogonal linear  $GF(4)$  codes, in particular, implying the nonexistence of a self-dual  $[12m, 6m, 2m+4]_{GF(4)}$  linear code.

# Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>Introduction</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>Magic state distillation and weight enumerators</b>	<b>4</b>
2.1	Stabilizer projectors and signed weight enumerators . . . . .	5
2.2	Magic state distillation and signed weight enumerators . . . . .	7
2.3	Signed weight enumerators from simple weight enumerators . . . . .	8
2.4	The 5-qubit code and other examples . . . . .	11
2.5	An exhaustive search over all $[[n, 1]]$ $M_3$ -codes for $n < 20$ . . . . .	13
<b>3</b>	<b>Implications of invariant theory</b>	<b>13</b>
3.1	Results from invariant theory . . . . .	13
3.2	Constraining the noise-suppression exponent . . . . .	16
3.3	Linear programming bounds for the noise suppression exponent . . . . .	20
3.4	Illustration for $n = 5$ . . . . .	22
<b>4</b>	<b>New constraints on weight enumerators from magic state distillation</b>	<b>23</b>
4.1	Quantum constraints . . . . .	23
4.2	Small examples . . . . .	25
4.3	Bounds on distance of $[[n, 1, d]]$ $M_3$ -codes . . . . .	29
<b>5</b>	<b>Quantum bounds for classical self-dual codes</b>	<b>32</b>
5.1	Nonexistence of an extremal type $4^H$ self-dual code of length $12m$ . . . . .	32
5.2	Explicit bounds for small codes . . . . .	35
5.3	Bounds on the classical distance of maximal self-orthogonal linear $GF(4)$ codes of odd length . . . . .	39
<b>6</b>	<b>Integer programming</b>	<b>39</b>
<b>7</b>	<b>Discussion</b>	<b>42</b>

# 1 Introduction

Magic state distillation [1, 2] is an approach to fault-tolerant quantum computing in which the quantum-error correcting codes play an important role. Much progress has been made in the decades since [1] was first published, [3–12], and in particular, recently, asymptotically good magic state distillation routines were discovered [13–16]. However, many theoretical aspects of magic state distillation still remain mysterious.

In the magic state model of fault tolerant quantum computing, certain non-stabilizer states known as magic states are injected to implement non-Clifford gates. In particular, Bravyi and Kitaev [1] defined two single-qubit magic states, which they denote as  $|H\rangle$  and  $|T\rangle$ ,

$$|H\rangle\langle H| = \frac{1}{2} \left( I + \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(X + Z) \right), \quad (1.1)$$

$$|T\rangle\langle T| = \frac{1}{2} \left( I + \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}}(X + Y + Z) \right). \quad (1.2)$$

As shown in Figure 1, the state  $|H\rangle$  lies above an edge of the stabilizer octahedron and the state  $|T\rangle$  lies directly above a face of the stabilizer octahedron. While such states are produced with low fidelity by non-fault tolerant means, from many copies of a noisy magic state, it is possible to distill a few pure magic states by projecting them onto the codespace of certain stabilizer codes, and then decoding. While much progress has been made constructing codes for the distillation of  $|H\rangle$ -type magic states (and its cousins) with low overhead, e.g., [8, 14–16], distillation of  $|T\rangle$  states remains somewhat poorly understood.

The question of  $|T\rangle$ -state distillation is important theoretically because it directly relates to the question of the best attainable threshold of magic state distillation routine, as explained in [1]. Figure 1 provides a bound on the best attainable threshold of any magic state distillation routine. Mixed states within the stabilizer octahedron cannot be used to achieve universal quantum computation, as Clifford operations and stabilizer measurements on such states are classically simulable, via the Gottesman-Knill theorem [17]. Any state outside the stabilizer octahedron, can via Clifford unitaries and twirling, be made to lie on the line connecting pure  $|T\rangle$  states to the maximally mixed state in the Bloch sphere representation, shown in Figure 1. If noisy  $|T\rangle$  states can be distilled with a threshold to depolarizing noise coinciding with the face of the stabilizer octahedron, it would demonstrate that non-stabilizerness is necessary and also sufficient for universal quantum computing. If not, it would imply the existence of a new complexity class somewhere between stabilizer quantum mechanics and universal quantum computation.

This question, when generalized to qudits of odd dimension, is closely tied to whether or not contextuality is the essential aspect of quantum mechanics responsible for the power of quantum computers [18, 19]. For qubits, the connection to contextuality is subject to subtleties associated with state-independent contextuality. See [20, 21].

Given the theoretical importance of constructing distillation routines of optimal threshold,




Figure 1: Qubit magic states on the Bloch sphere. The red point denotes the  $|T\rangle$  magic state and the green point denotes the  $|H\rangle$  magic state.

it is somewhat surprising that, the best known threshold for distillation of  $|T\rangle$  states is still the 5-qubit code originally proposed by Bravyi and Kitaev [1] 20 years ago, which is some distance away from the theoretical upper bound, as we review in section 2.40. We therefore focus exclusively on distillation of  $|T\rangle$  states in this paper.

The starting point for our paper is the work of [22] who showed that signed weight enumerators characterize magic state distillation protocols. We first show that the performance of a natural class of codes, called  $M_3$ -codes by [22], can be characterized by their simple weight enumerators.

Recall that quantum error correcting codes correspond to additive self-orthogonal codes over  $GF(4)$  under the Hermitian inner product.  $M_3$ -codes are essentially stabilizer codes that correspond to *linear* self-orthogonal codes over  $GF(4)$  with a particular choice of sign for the stabilizers.  $[[n, 1]]$   $M_3$ -codes correspond to maximal self-orthogonal linear codes over  $GF(4)$  of odd length, and  $[[n, 0]]$   $M_3$ -codes are stabilizer states that correspond to self-dual linear codes over  $GF(4)$ . The study of magic state distillation via  $M_3$ -codes thus reduces to the study of weight enumerators of maximal self-orthogonal linear codes over  $GF(4)$  of odd length.

Using classifications of classical self-dual linear codes over  $GF(4)$  available in [23–27], we computed weight enumerators of all maximal self-orthogonal linear codes over  $GF(4)$  of odd length less than 20. We found that no code has a threshold exceeding that of the 5-qubit code.

Inspired by classical results on the close connection between invariant theory and weight enumerators for classical self-dual codes [28–30], we then study the implications of invariant

theory for weight enumerators of the  $M_3$ -codes and their associated magic state distillation protocols. We use linear programming to give bounds on the noise suppression of the magic state distillation protocols, using techniques previously used to bound the distance of classical and quantum codes, in e.g., [30] and references therein.

When studying the linear programming problem, we come across a somewhat unexpected result. We show that the requirements that (1) the projection of noisy  $|T\rangle$  states onto the codespace of an  $M_3$ -code be non-negative and, (2) that the resulting threshold for magic state distillation lie outside the stabilizer octahedron, provide independent constraints that restrict the allowed space of weight enumerators for self-orthogonal linear  $GF(4)$ -codes. We show that these place stronger constraints on the distance of  $[[n, 1]]$   $M_3$ -codes than the classical constraints, which give rise to bounds identical to those in [30] for additive codes.

In section 5, we show that the new quantum constraints allow us to place new bounds on the distances of classical linear self-dual codes over  $GF(4)$ , which correspond to a class of stabilizer states. In particular, we are able to rule out the existence of an extremal code with parameters  $[12m, 6m, 2m + 4]_{GF(4)}$  by a simple calculation. This result explains the non-existence of  $[12, 6, 6]_{GF(4)}$ ,  $[24, 6, 8]_{GF(4)}$  codes, previously observed in the coding-theory literature [23, 31–33], and predicts the non-existence of many other extremal codes of length  $12m$ , for which the question of existence was still open. To our knowledge, this is the first instance of the theory of quantum error correcting codes giving rise to new results for the theory of classical codes.

We conclude by generating some integral weight enumerators for  $[[n, 1]]$   $M_3$ -codes of lengths  $23 \leq n \leq 35$ , with thresholds exceeding that of the 5-qubit code and high noise-suppression exponents. The existence of codes corresponding to these enumerators is an open question.

## 2 Magic state distillation and weight enumerators

In [22] the concept of a signed weight enumerator was introduced to characterize the performance of a qubit magic state distillation routine. Signed weight enumerators are relatively mysterious compared to their unsigned counterparts which have been extensively studied both in classical and quantum coding theory see [34, 29, 35–38]. For qudits of odd prime dimension, using a formalism based on discrete Wigner functions, [39] related the performance of a stabilizer code for magic state distillation to its unsigned complete weight enumerator. [39] further showed that the unsigned simple weight enumerator characterizes the performance of distillation routines for a particular qutrit magic state known as the strange state [40–42, 11]. In this section we will show that the unsigned simple weight enumerator of a code can also be used to characterize the performance of the stabilizer code for distillation of the qubit  $|T\rangle$  magic state.

Signed weight enumerators differ from simple weight enumerators in that they also keep track of the eigenvalues of stabilizers used to define the stabilizer code, in addition to the

stabilizers themselves. In order to characterize magic state distillation via unsigned weight enumerators [39] demanded that a particular Clifford gate, the square of the single-qudit Hadamard operator, be exactly transversal for the stabilizer code used for distillation. This condition fixes the eigenvalues of all stabilizers in the code to be  $+1$ , in a particular convention. For qubits, the square of the Hadamard gate is the identity, so we cannot set all eigenvalues of the code to  $+1$ . As we will see, by demanding transversality of the  $M_3$  gate for stabilizer codes, determines the eigenvalues of each stabilizer in terms of its Hamming weight, thus allowing one to express the signed weight enumerator in terms of unsigned weight enumerators. In the next two subsections, we rederive, and slightly generalize, results first obtained by [22].

## 2.1 Stabilizer projectors and signed weight enumerators

We first show that the probability for successfully projecting  $n$  copies of a quantum state onto the codespace of a stabilizer code is captured by its signed signed weight enumerators.

Let  $I$  be the identity operator, and  $X$ ,  $Y$  and  $Z$  be the Pauli matrices. Let  $\mathcal{P}_n$  be the set of all  $n$ -fold tensor products of  $I$ ,  $\pm X$ ,  $\pm Y$ ,  $\pm Z$  and let  $\mathcal{P}_n^+$  denote the set of all  $n$ -fold tensor products of  $I$ ,  $+X$ ,  $+Y$ ,  $+Z$ . We refer to  $\mathcal{P}_n^+$  as the set of positive Pauli operators. Any element of  $\tilde{P} \in \mathcal{P}_n$  can be written in the form  $\tilde{P} = \lambda P$  with  $\lambda = \pm 1$ . and  $P \in \mathcal{P}_n^+$ .

An  $[[n, k]]$  stabilizer code is defined as a joint eigenspace of a collection of  $n - k$  independent, commuting  $n$ -qubit Pauli operators. These operators generate an abelian subgroup  $\mathcal{S}$  of  $\mathcal{P}_n$ . Each Pauli operator has two eigenvalues  $+1$  and  $-1$ , so to completely specify the codespace, for each Pauli operator  $P \in \mathcal{S}$  one must also specify the eigenvalue, which we denote as  $\lambda(P) = \pm 1$ , specifying the eigenspace onto which we wish to project. The projector onto the codespace can be written as

$$\Pi_{\mathcal{S}} = \frac{1}{2^{n-k}} \sum_{\lambda(P)P \in \mathcal{S}} \lambda(P)P, \quad (2.1)$$

where, to avoid ambiguity, we will always assume that each  $\tilde{P} \in \mathcal{S}$  is specified as  $\tilde{P} = \lambda(P)P$  the product of a sign,  $\lambda(P) = \pm 1$ , and a positive Pauli operator,  $P \in \mathcal{P}^+$ .

A general single-qubit density matrix can be written as,

$$\rho(\vec{a}) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{Q \in \{I, X, Y, Z\}} a_Q Q, \quad (2.2)$$

where  $a_I = 1$  if the state is normalized. Let us compute the probability

$$\eta = \text{tr} [\Pi_{\mathcal{S}} \rho(\vec{a})^{\otimes n}], \quad (2.3)$$

of successfully projecting the  $n$ -fold tensor product of  $\rho(\vec{a})$  onto the stabilizer code  $\mathcal{S}$ .

Let  $Q$  be a single-qubit Pauli operator, and let  $\text{wt}_Q(P)$  denote the total number of  $Q$ 's in a multi-qubit Pauli operator  $P$ , so, e.g.,  $\text{wt}_Z(XZZXI) = 2$ . We can write,

$$\rho(\vec{a})^{\otimes n} = \frac{1}{2^n} \sum_{P \in P_n^+} a_I^{\text{wt}_I(P)} a_X^{\text{wt}_X(P)} a_Y^{\text{wt}_Y(P)} a_Z^{\text{wt}_Z(P)} P. \quad (2.4)$$

Now,

$$\text{tr}(P\Pi_S) = \begin{cases} 2^k \lambda(P) & \lambda(P)P \in \mathcal{S} \\ 0 & \lambda(P)P \notin \mathcal{S}. \end{cases} \quad (2.5)$$

Hence,

$$\eta = \text{tr}(\Pi_S \rho(\vec{a})^{\otimes n}) = \frac{1}{2^{n-k}} \sum_{\lambda(P)P \in \mathcal{S}} a_I^{\text{wt}_I(P)} a_X^{\text{wt}_X(P)} a_Y^{\text{wt}_Y(P)} a_Z^{\text{wt}_Z(P)} \lambda(P). \quad (2.6)$$

This expresses the probability of successful projection onto the stabilizer code,  $\eta$ , in terms of the **signed complete weight enumerator** of the stabilizer code  $\mathcal{S}$ , defined as,

$$W_I(a_I, a_X, a_Y, a_Z) = \sum_{\lambda(P)P \in \mathcal{S}} a_I^{\text{wt}_I(P)} a_X^{\text{wt}_X(P)} a_Y^{\text{wt}_Y(P)} a_Z^{\text{wt}_Z(P)} \lambda(P). \quad (2.7)$$

Note that,  $\eta \geq 0$ , as it is a probability, for  $\rho(\vec{a})$  describing a physical density matrix, i.e.,  $|\vec{a}| \leq 1$ .

Let  $Q_L$  be any  $n$ -qubit Pauli operator in  $N(\mathcal{S})$  representative of the logical operator  $L$ . Then, we also have,

$$\begin{aligned} \eta_L &\equiv \text{tr}(\Pi_S \rho(\vec{a})^{\otimes n} Q_L) = \frac{1}{2^{n-k}} \sum_{\lambda(P)P \in Q_L \mathcal{S}} a_I^{\text{wt}_I(P)} a_X^{\text{wt}_X(P)} a_Y^{\text{wt}_Y(P)} a_Z^{\text{wt}_Z(P)} \lambda(P), \\ &\equiv \frac{1}{2^{n-k}} W_L(a_I, a_X, a_Y, a_Z), \end{aligned} \quad (2.8)$$

where  $Q_L \mathcal{S}$  is the set of all Pauli operators representative of  $L$  in the stabilizer code.

In this paper, we will primarily be interested in the states of the form  $\rho_T(r)^{\otimes n}$ , where,

$$\rho_T(r) = \frac{1}{2} \left( I + \frac{r}{\sqrt{3}} (X + Y + Z) \right). \quad (2.9)$$

For such states, the above expressions reduce to ,

$$\eta = \text{tr}(\Pi_S \rho_T(r)^{\otimes n}) = \frac{1}{2^{n-k}} \sum_{\lambda(P)P \in \mathcal{S}} \left( \frac{r}{\sqrt{3}} \right)^{\text{wt}(P)} \lambda(P) \quad (2.10)$$

and

$$\eta_L = \text{tr}(Q_L \Pi_S \rho_T(r)^{\otimes n}) = \frac{1}{2^{n-k}} \sum_{\lambda(P)P \in Q_L \mathcal{S}} \left( \frac{r}{\sqrt{3}} \right)^{\text{wt}(P)} \lambda(P), \quad (2.11)$$

where  $\text{wt } P$  denotes the Hamming weight of the Pauli operator  $P$ . Using the notation of [22], we therefore define the **signed simple weight enumerators** of a stabilizer code,

$$W_I(\bar{r}) = \sum_{\lambda(P)P \in \mathcal{S}} \bar{r}^{\text{wt}(P)} \lambda(P). \quad (2.12)$$

$$W_L(\bar{r}) = \sum_{\lambda(P)P \in Q_L \mathcal{S}} \bar{r}^{\text{wt}(P)} \lambda(P), \quad (2.13)$$

where one sets  $\bar{r} = r/\sqrt{3}$  to recover  $\eta$  and  $\eta_L$ .

Recall that any  $[[n, k]]$  quantum stabilizer code can be represented as a classical additive, self-orthogonal<sup>1</sup> code over  $GF(4)$ , as described in [43]. However, this representation does not keep track of the eigenvalues of the Pauli operators needed to completely specify the projector, which must also be specified to compute the signed-weight enumerators above. In particular, note that, for a classical  $GF(4)$  code  $\mathcal{C}$ , one can define an (unsigned) simple weight enumerator,

$$A(x, y) = \sum_{j=0}^n A_j x^{n-j} y^j, \quad (2.14)$$

where  $A_j$  is the number of codewords in  $\mathcal{C}$  of Hamming weight  $j$ . For a stabilizer code  $\mathcal{S}$  with the simplest choice of signs  $\lambda(P) = +1$  for all  $P \in \mathcal{S}$ , the signed weight enumerator is equal to the unsigned weight enumerator. However, more generally, and, particularly in the context of magic state distillation, we encounter stabilizer codes  $\mathcal{S}$  that contain some Pauli operators with  $\lambda(P) = -1$ . For such codes, unsigned weight enumerators differ from signed weight enumerators defined above.

## 2.2 Magic state distillation and signed weight enumerators

With the above results in place, it is easy to see that signed weight enumerators characterize magic state distillation.

An  $n$ -to-1 magic state distillation protocol takes as input  $n$  noisy copies of a magic state, which we assume is the state  $|T\rangle$ , as input. The state  $|T\rangle$  is the eigenvector of an element of the Clifford group of order three that we denote as  $M_3$ .  $M_3$  acts on Pauli's as follows,

$$M_3^\dagger X M_3 = Y, \quad M_3^\dagger Y M_3 = Z, \quad M_3^\dagger Z M_3 = X. \quad (2.15)$$

Its eigenvectors are  $|T_+\rangle \equiv |T\rangle$  and  $|T_-\rangle$ , given by

$$|T_\pm\rangle \langle T_\pm| = \frac{1}{2} \left( I \pm \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}}(X + Y + Z) \right), \quad (2.16)$$

with  $M_3 |T_\pm\rangle = e^{\pm\pi i/3} |T_\pm\rangle$  [1].

---

<sup>1</sup>In this paper, orthogonality and duality of codes over  $GF(4)$  will always be defined using the Hermitian inner product, as is conventional in quantum computing.



In principle, three parameters are required to describe a general noisy  $|T\rangle$  state, however, one can convert all noise to depolarizing noise, by randomly applying the unitary  $M_3$  to the  $|T\rangle$  state 0, 1, or 2 times.<sup>2</sup> After twirling, noisy magic states can be written as,

$$(1 - \epsilon) |T_+\rangle \langle T_+| + \epsilon |T_-\rangle \langle T_-| = \rho_T(1 - 2\epsilon) \quad (2.17)$$

which is of the form of Equation (2.9). The parameter  $r$  in Equation (2.9) for  $\rho_T(r)$  is the radial coordinate in the Bloch sphere representation, and is related to the *error rate*,  $\epsilon$ , via

$$r = 1 - 2\epsilon. \quad (2.18)$$

The twirled  $n$ -qubit state,  $\rho_{\text{in}}^{(n)}$  is purified by projecting it onto the codespace of an  $[[n, 1]]_2$  stabilizer code  $S$ , which results in an  $n$ -qubit density matrix  $\rho_{\text{out}}^{(n)}$ .

We then decode the resulting state to obtain the normalized single qubit density matrix,  $\rho_{\text{out}}$ , which can be expressed as a sum of Pauli operators,

$$\rho_{\text{out}} = \frac{1}{2} (\bar{a}_I I + \bar{a}_X X + \bar{a}_Y Y + \bar{a}_Z Z) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{L \in \{I, X, Y, Z\}} \bar{a}_L L. \quad (2.19)$$

After normalizing by the probability of successful projection, each  $a_L$  is given by

$$\bar{a}_L = \frac{W_L(\bar{r})}{W_I(\bar{r})}. \quad (2.20)$$

If the input state was not twirled prior to projection, we would need to use signed complete weight enumerators in the above expression.

For distillation by a code with an transversal  $M_3$  gate,  $W_X = W_Y = W_Z \equiv W_L$ . The output magic state has  $\bar{a}_X = \bar{a}_Y = \bar{a}_Z$ , and can be written in the form  $\rho_T(r_{\text{out}})$ . The performance of the magic state distillation protocol is therefore encoded in the function,

$$r_{\text{out}}/\sqrt{3} = f(r) = W_L(\bar{r})/W_I(\bar{r}). \quad (2.21)$$

It is convenient to instead work with the error rate  $\epsilon$ , for which we find,

$$\epsilon_{\text{out}} = \frac{W_I(\bar{r}(\epsilon_{\text{in}})) - \sqrt{3}W_L(\bar{r}(\epsilon_{\text{in}}))}{2W_I(\bar{r}(\epsilon_{\text{in}}))}, \quad (2.22)$$

where

$$\bar{r}(\epsilon) = \frac{1 - 2\epsilon}{\sqrt{3}}. \quad (2.23)$$

### 2.3 Signed weight enumerators from simple weight enumerators

A natural choice of  $[[n, k]]$  stabilizer codes for magic state distillation of the  $|T\rangle$  state are those with a transversal gate of the form  $M_3^{\otimes n}$ , which we refer to as  $M_3$ -codes following [22].

<sup>2</sup>In principle, twirling is not a necessary step, see [44].

For such codes,  $[M_3^{\otimes n}, \Pi_{\mathcal{S}}] = 0$ . Note that, an  $[[n, 0]]$   $M_3$ -code is a stabilizer state that is an eigenvector of  $M_3^{\otimes n}$ .

As observed in [22], if  $P \in \mathcal{S}$  then  $(M_3^{\otimes n})^\dagger P M_3^{\otimes n} \in \mathcal{S}$ . In the  $GF(4)$  representation of [43], conjugation by  $M_3^{\otimes n}$  corresponds to multiplication by the primitive element of  $GF(4)$ , so any  $[[n, k]]$  quantum  $M_3$ -code corresponds to a *linear* classical  $[n, (n - k)/2]$  self-orthogonal code over  $GF(4)$ . Unlike the more general case of additive codes, this correspondence is a bijection – given any classical linear self-orthogonal code over  $GF(4)$ , one can uniquely determine the signs of any Pauli operators in the  $M_3$ -code from its Hamming weight, using the following rule, which we refer to as *Rall’s rule*.

**Theorem 1 (Rall’s rule).** *Let  $\mathcal{S}$  be an  $M_3$ -code. Then, for any  $P \in \mathcal{S}$ ,*

1. *wt  $P$  is even.*
2. *If  $\text{wt } P \equiv 0 \pmod{4}$ ,  $\lambda(P) = +1$ .*
3. *If  $\text{wt } P \equiv 2 \pmod{4}$ ,  $\lambda(P) = -1$ .*

*Proof.* This theorem is proven in [22], as we review here.

For any  $\tilde{P} \in \mathcal{P}_n$  define  $\tilde{P}' = M_3^{\dagger \otimes n} \tilde{P} M_3^{\otimes n}$  and  $\tilde{P}'' = M_3^{\dagger \otimes n} \tilde{P}' M_3^{\otimes n}$ . Consider any  $\tilde{P} \in \mathcal{S}$ . Write  $\tilde{P} = \lambda(P)P$  for  $P \in \mathcal{P}_n^+$ .  $\tilde{P}' = \lambda(P)P'$  and  $\tilde{P}'' = \lambda(P)P''$  must also be in  $\mathcal{S}$  since  $\mathcal{S}$  is an  $M_3$  code.

Using  $XY = iZ$ ,  $YZ = iX$  and  $ZX = iY$ , it follows that  $PP' = i^{\text{wt}P}P''$ , and  $P'P = (-i)^{\text{wt}P}P''$ .

1. Demanding  $[\tilde{P}, \tilde{P}'] = 0$  implies  $\text{wt } P$  is even.
2. Using  $\tilde{P}'' = \lambda(P)P''$  and  $\tilde{P}'' = \tilde{P}\tilde{P}' = \lambda(P)^2 i^{\text{wt}P}P'' = i^{\text{wt}P}P''$ , we see that  $\lambda(P) = i^{\text{wt}P}$ .

□

Using this rule, we can determine the signed weight enumerator of a code from the simple weight enumerator of the classical linear  $GF(4)$  code,  $A(x, y)$ , by setting  $y = i\bar{r}$ .

**Theorem 2 (Signed weight enumerators from simple weight enumerators).** *Let  $\mathcal{S}$  be a quantum  $M_3$  stabilizer code. Then its signed weight enumerator is given by,*

$$W_I(\bar{r}) = A(1, i\bar{r}), \tag{2.24}$$

where  $A(x, y)$  is the simple weight enumerator of the classical linear  $GF(4)$  code that corresponds to  $\mathcal{S}$ .

While this theorem follows directly from Rall’s rule above, it appears not to have been noted in the literature before.

Before we continue, let us mention a few more properties of  $M_3$  codes. Since a linear code over  $GF(4)$  with  $\kappa$  generators, corresponds to an additive code over  $GF(4)$  with  $2\kappa$  generators the number of stabilizers of any  $M_3$ -code  $\mathcal{S}$  must be even. Also, because  $\text{wt}P = \text{wt}P' = \text{wt}P''$ , the number of stabilizers of non-zero weight  $j$ ,  $A_j$ , must be divisible by three.

Let us now focus our attention on  $[[n, 1]]$   $M_3$  codes for magic state distillation. We use overbars to denote logical states and operators for our code. We demand that  $\text{tr}(\Pi_{\mathcal{S}} |T\rangle^{\otimes n}) > 0$ , and that the logical  $|\bar{T}\rangle$  state of our code is given by, up to normalization  $|\bar{T}\rangle = (\Pi_{\mathcal{S}} |T\rangle^{\otimes n})$ . From,

$$M_3^{\otimes n}(\Pi_{\mathcal{S}} |T\rangle^{\otimes n}) = \omega_6^n(\Pi_{\mathcal{S}} |T\rangle^{\otimes n}) = \omega_6^n |\bar{T}\rangle, \quad (2.25)$$

we see that, we must demand  $n \equiv \pm 1 \pmod{6}$ . Furthermore, if  $n \equiv 1 \pmod{6}$ , we should choose our logical operators such that  $M_3^{\otimes n} = \bar{M}_3$ , and, if  $n \equiv 5 \pmod{6}$ , we should choose our logical operators such that  $M_3^{\otimes n} = \bar{M}_3^{-1}$ . We emphasize these choices are based on the requirement that  $\Pi_{\mathcal{S}} |T\rangle^{\otimes n} \neq 0$ , which, although natural, is not true for all  $M_3$ -codes.<sup>3</sup>

For an  $[[n, 1]]$   $M_3$  code, we can also express the signed weight enumerator of logical operators,  $W_L$ , in terms of simple weight enumerators. Let  $B(x, y)$  denote the weight enumerator of the dual of a classical linear  $GF(4)$  code, which is related to  $A(x, y)$  by the MacWilliams identity,

$$B(x, y) = \frac{1}{2^{n-1}} A(x + 3y, x - y). \quad (2.26)$$

Then  $C(x, y) = B(x, y) - A(x, y)$  is the weight enumerator of logical operators in the stabilizer code. To relate  $W_L$  to  $C(1, i\bar{r})$  we need to fix the signs of all the logical operators.

We will show in Lemma 1 that any  $[[n, 1]]$ ,  $M_3$ -code contains only odd-weight logical operators and must contain a weight- $n$  logical operator. This follows from the MacWilliams identity. Now, twirled input states are invariant under local  $M_3$  transformations. Hence, two stabilizer codes which differ by local  $M_3$  unitaries are equivalent for magic state distillation. We can therefore choose our logical operators to be  $X^{\otimes n}$ ,  $Y^{\otimes n}$  and  $Z^{\otimes n}$ , possibly permuted, with an overall sign  $\lambda(L)$  that must be the same for all three. We make one of the following two choices of logical operators for our code, depending on whether  $M_3^{\otimes n} = \bar{M}_3$  or  $\bar{M}_3^\dagger$ :

1. For  $M_3^{\otimes n} = \bar{M}_3$ , we choose,

$$\bar{X} = \lambda_+ X^{\otimes n}, \quad \bar{Y} = \lambda_+ Y^{\otimes n}, \quad \bar{Z} = \lambda_+ Z^{\otimes n}, \quad (2.27)$$

with  $\lambda_+ = i^{1-n}$ , which is fixed by demanding  $\bar{X}\bar{Y} = \bar{Z}$ .

2. For  $M_3^{\otimes n} = \bar{M}_3^\dagger$ , we choose,

$$\bar{X} = \lambda_- Y^{\otimes n}, \quad \bar{Y} = \lambda_- X^{\otimes n}, \quad \bar{Z} = \lambda_- Z^{\otimes n}, \quad (2.28)$$

with  $\lambda_- = (-1)^n i^{1-n}$ .

---

<sup>3</sup>In particular, [22] found a  $[[7, 1]]$   $M_3$ -code that distills the  $|T\rangle$  state but has  $\Pi_{\mathcal{S}} |T\rangle^{\otimes n} = 0$ . This code can be regarded as the tensor product of the 5-qubit code and the 2-qubit  $M_3$ -state discussed in the example below, and therefore cannot out perform the 5-qubit code.

Note that for  $P$  in  $\mathcal{S}^\perp$ ,  $\lambda(P) = \lambda(L)$  if  $\text{wt}P = n \pmod 4$  and  $\lambda(P) = -\lambda(L)$  if  $\text{wt}P = n + 2 \pmod 4$ . Therefore, with the above two choices of logical operators, we have,

$$3W_L(\bar{r}) = i^{-n}\lambda_\pm C(1, i\bar{r}) = i\hat{\lambda}_\pm C(1, i\bar{r}). \quad (2.29)$$

We define  $i\hat{\lambda}_\pm = i^{-n}\lambda_\pm$ , where  $\hat{\lambda}_\pm = \mp 1$ .

Thus, Equation (2.21), characterizing the performance of a magic state distillation routine reduces to,

$$\frac{r_{\text{out}}}{\sqrt{3}} = \frac{i\hat{\lambda}_\pm}{3} \frac{B(1, i\bar{r}) - A(1, i\bar{r})}{A(1, i\bar{r})}. \quad (2.30)$$

Or, in terms of the error-rate,  $\epsilon$ ,

$$\epsilon_{\text{out}} = \frac{A(1, i\bar{r}) - i\hat{\lambda}_\pm \frac{B(1, i\bar{r}) - A(1, i\bar{r})}{\sqrt{3}}}{2A(i\bar{r})} \equiv \frac{M(\epsilon_{\text{in}})}{2N(\epsilon_{\text{in}})}, \quad (2.31)$$

where  $\hat{\lambda}_n = \hat{\lambda}_\pm$ .

## 2.4 The 5-qubit code and other examples

Let us now present an example that illustrates the difference between signed weight enumerators and simple weight enumerators:

**Example 1.** Consider the stabilizers  $\mathcal{S}_1$  and  $\mathcal{S}_2$ ,

$$\mathcal{S}_1 = \{XX, ZZ, -YY, II\} \quad (2.32)$$

$$\mathcal{S}_2 = \{-XX, -ZZ, -YY, II\} \quad (2.33)$$

which are  $[[2, 0]]$  stabilizer codes that describe entangled stabilizer states. The signed weight enumerators for the codes are:

$$W_I^{\mathcal{S}_1}(\bar{r}) = 1 + (2 - 1)\bar{r}^2 = 1 + \bar{r}^2, \quad (2.34)$$

and,

$$W_I^{\mathcal{S}_2}(\bar{r}) = 1 - 3\bar{r}^2. \quad (2.35)$$

The simple weight enumerator for both the codes is:

$$A(x, y) = x^2 + 3y^3. \quad (2.36)$$

The stabilizer code  $\mathcal{S}_1$  does not obey Rall's rule, and is therefore not an  $M_3$ -code, while  $\mathcal{S}_2$  is an  $M_3$ -code, and therefore does obey Rall's rule. Explicitly,  $\mathcal{S}_1$  describes the state  $|\mathcal{S}_1\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|00\rangle + |11\rangle)$  and  $\mathcal{S}_2$  describes the state  $|\mathcal{S}_2\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|01\rangle - |10\rangle)$ . One can verify that  $M_3 \otimes M_3 |\mathcal{S}_2\rangle = |\mathcal{S}_2\rangle$ , while  $M_3 \otimes M_3 |\mathcal{S}_1\rangle = -\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|01\rangle + |10\rangle)$ .

Next let us consider the five qubit code proposed in [1] and show how the noise suppression can be related to the signed and simple weight enumerators:




Figure 2:  $\epsilon_{\text{out}}$  versus  $\epsilon_{\text{in}}$  for the 5-qubit code.

**Example 2.** *The five qubit code is generated by the Pauli operators:*

$$+XZZXI, +IXZZX, +XIXZZ, +ZXIXZ. \quad (2.37)$$

*For this code,  $A(1, y) = 1 + 15y^4$ , and  $B(1, y) = 1 + 30y^3 + 15y^4 + 18y^5$ . As this is an  $M_3$  code, one obtains,*

$$W_I(\bar{r}) = A(1, i\bar{r}) = 1 + 15\bar{r}^4. \quad (2.38)$$

*Using the choice of logical operators in Equation (2.28), we obtain,*

$$\begin{aligned} 3W_L(\bar{r}) &= i\hat{\lambda}_- C(1, i\bar{r}) = i(30(i\bar{r})^3 + 18(i\bar{r})^5), \\ &= 30\bar{r}^3 - 18\bar{r}^5. \end{aligned} \quad (2.39)$$

*This gives the relation,*

$$\begin{aligned} \epsilon_{\text{out}}(\epsilon) &= \frac{15\bar{r}^4 - \sqrt{3}(10\bar{r}^3 - 6\bar{r}^5) + 1}{30\bar{r}^4 + 2} \\ &= \frac{\epsilon^2(5 - 15\epsilon + 15\epsilon^2 - 4\epsilon^3)}{1 - 5\epsilon + 15\epsilon^2 - 20\epsilon^3 + 10\epsilon^4} \\ &\sim 5\epsilon^2. \end{aligned} \quad (2.40)$$

Equation (2.40) is plotted in Figure 2. The threshold of a magic state distillation routine is a fixed point,  $\epsilon_* = \epsilon_{\text{out}}(\epsilon_*)$  such that  $\epsilon_{\text{out}} < \epsilon$  for  $\epsilon < \epsilon_*$ . For the five qubit code, we obtain the threshold,

$$\epsilon_*^{(5\text{-qubit})} = \frac{1}{14} (7 - 0\sqrt{21}) \approx 0.172673. \quad (2.41)$$

To date, this is the best known threshold of any qubit magic state distillation routine, although the 23-qubit Golay code comes close [3].

One can place a theoretical upper bound on the best attainable threshold of a magic distillation routine as follows. Clifford unitaries and stabilizer measurements acting on any mixture of stabilizer states are classically simulable via the Gottesman Knill theorem. Therefore a noisy  $|T\rangle$  state that is so noisy that it can be represented as a convex combination

of stabilizer states, i.e., that it lives inside the stabilizer octahedron (whose vertices are the 6 single-qubit stabilizer states), cannot possibly be distilled into a pure  $|T\rangle$  state, as such a state could be used to achieve universal quantum computation. This translates into a possibly-distillable region described by  $r_* > \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}}$ , or

$$\epsilon_* < \epsilon_{\max} = \frac{1}{2} \left( 1 - \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}} \right) \approx 0.211. \quad (2.42)$$

It was shown in [45] that this bound can never be attained by a finite distillation routine, hence these inequalities are strict. 0 (An analogous result holds for qudits [46].)

## 2.5 An exhaustive search over all $[[n, 1]]$ $M_3$ -codes for $n < 20$

Given the above results, it is straightforward to carry out a computational search for magic state distillation routines of a given length that outperform the 5-qubit code. Here we present a search for all codes with size  $n < 20$ . Other authors have mentioned carrying out smaller searches in [1,3] but to our knowledge, these were not claimed to be exhaustive, and [22] only searched over  $M_3$ -codes of length  $n \leq 7$ .

As shown above, an  $[[n, 1]]$   $M_3$ -code is determined by a maximal self-orthogonal linear code over  $GF(4)$  of odd length  $n$ . Any such code can be obtained by shortening a self-dual linear code over  $GF(4)$  at one coordinate. All linear self-dual codes over  $GF(4)$  with  $n \leq 20$  have been classified in a series of papers over the past few decades [23–26], and are conveniently available at [27]. Using MAGMA [47], we computed all inequivalent ways of shortening these codes to obtain all inequivalent  $[[n, 1]]$   $M_3$ -codes of length  $n < 20$ . For each such code, we computed the weight enumerator and then the threshold using Equation (2.31).

Results for  $n = 17$  and  $n = 19$  using codes classified only somewhat recently in [25, 26] are shown in Figure 3. We found that no codes have a threshold which exceed that of the 5-qubit code.

While we hope to extend this computational search to codes of larger length in the near future, in the next section, we will attempt to use Equation (2.31) place more general constraints on magic state distillation routines.

## 3 Implications of invariant theory

### 3.1 Results from invariant theory

Weight enumerators for self-dual classical codes are constrained by the fact that  $A(x, y) = B(x, y)$ , where  $B(x, y)$  is determined from  $A(x, y)$  via the appropriate MacWilliams identity. Additional constraints can arise if one can show, or demands, that the code only contain codewords whose weights are multiples of a small number, e.g., 2, 3 or 4. As reviewed in [48], Using methods from invariant theory, one can explicitly solve these constraints.




Figure 3:  $\epsilon_{\text{out}}(\epsilon)$  computed for all  $[[n, 1]] M_3$  codes with  $n = 17$  (above) and  $n = 19$  (below) with nonzero success probability. While many  $[[17, 1]]$  codes distill the  $|T\rangle$  state, no code has threshold exceeding that of the 5-qubit code, 0.172673.

In particular, there are 4 types of self-dual codes over finite fields – type 1 (binary self dual codes, for which all codewords must have weights divisible by 2), type 2 (binary self dual codes subject to the additional constraint that all codewords have weights divisible by 4), type 3 (ternary self-dual codes, for which all codewords must have weights divisible by 3) and type 4 (linear self-dual codes over  $GF(4)$  for which all codewords have must weights divisible by 2) to which a Gleason’s theorem [49, 50] applies. The case of type 4<sup>H</sup> codes, is of primary interest to us, and is worked out in [23]. It is also possible to constrain the weight enumerators of maximal self-orthogonal codes using the MacWilliams identity, as described in [51, 52]. These results can then be used to obtain bounds on the distances of self-dual codes using linear programming techniques, as in, e.g., [30, 53–55]. See [34] for a complete review.

An  $[[n, 1]]$   $M_3$ -code for magic state distillation corresponds to a linear, maximal Hermitian self-orthogonal code over  $GF(4)$  of odd length. In Chapter 10 of [34], the weight enumerators of such codes are constrained via the following theorem.

**Theorem 3.** (Theorem 10.5.1 in [34]) *The simple weight enumerator of any  $[[n, 1]]$   $M_3$ -code must be of the form:*

$$A(x, y) = x \underbrace{\sum_{j=0}^{\lfloor (n-1)/6 \rfloor} c'_j \hat{f}(x, y)^{\frac{n-1}{2}-3j} \hat{g}(x, y)^j + xy^2(x^2 - y^2)}_{S_1} \underbrace{\sum_{j=0}^{\lfloor (n-5)/6 \rfloor} d'_j \hat{f}(x, y)^{\frac{n-5}{2}-3j} \hat{g}(x, y)^j}_{S_2}, \quad (3.1)$$

where

$$\hat{f}(x, y) = x^2 + 3y^2 \quad \hat{g}(x, y) = y^2(x^2 - y^2)^2, \quad (3.2)$$

and the  $c'_j$  and  $d'_j$  are arbitrary coefficients.

The above theorem constrains the form of the weight enumerator  $A(x, y)$  – *a priori*,  $A(x, y)$  is a function of  $n/2$  variables  $A_{2j}$  for  $j = 0, \dots, n/2$ , however, the above theorem shows that there are only  $\lfloor (n-1)/6 \rfloor + \lfloor (n-5)/6 \rfloor + 2 \sim n/3$  free parameters in  $A(x, y)$ . This result can be derived, as in [51, 52], by demanding a consistency condition involving a MacWilliams identity for the complete weight enumerator is satisfied. In particular, one can check that,

$$\hat{f}(x + 3y, x - y) = 2^2 \hat{f}(x, y) \quad \hat{g}(x + 3y, x - y) = 2^6 \hat{g}(x, y). \quad (3.3)$$

For future reference, we define

$$S_1(\hat{f}, \hat{g}) = \sum_{j=0}^{\lfloor (n-1)/6 \rfloor} c'_j \hat{f}^{\frac{n-1}{2}-3j} \hat{g}^j, \quad (3.4)$$

$$S_2(\hat{f}, \hat{g}) = \sum_{j=0}^{\lfloor (n-5)/6 \rfloor} d'_j \hat{f}^{\frac{n-5}{2}-3j} \hat{g}^j. \quad (3.5)$$



Using the MacWilliams identity, the dual weight enumerator  $B(x, y)$  has the following form,

$$\begin{aligned} B(x, y) &= \frac{1}{2^{n-1}} A(x + 3y, x - y) \\ &= (x + 3y)S_2 + 2^{-1}y(x - y)(x + 3y)(x^2 - y^2)S_2, \end{aligned} \quad (3.6)$$

and the weight-enumerator for logical operators  $C(x, y)$ , is therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} C(x, y) &= B(x, y) - A(x, y) \\ &= 3yS_1 + 2^{-1}y(x^2 - y^2)(x^2 - 3y^2)S_2. \end{aligned} \quad (3.7)$$

Note that, for any code,  $A_0 = 1$ , which implies  $c'_0 = 1$ . We can fix some more coefficients by demanding our code is non-trivial. We demand  $C_1 = 0$ . This is because any  $[[n, 1]]$   $M_3$ -code with a weight 1 logical operator must be the tensor product of the identity operator with a  $[[n - 1, 0]]$  stabilizer state, and is therefore trivial. This implies  $d'_0 = -6$ . Note that any  $M_3$ -code with  $A_2 \neq 0$  is equivalent to a code that contains the stabilizers  $-X \otimes X \otimes I^{\otimes n-2}$ ,  $-X \otimes X \otimes I^{\otimes n-2}$ , and  $-Z \otimes Z \otimes I^{\otimes n-2}$  is therefore a tensor product of the two-qubit  $M_3$ -state with another  $[[n - 2, 1]]$   $M_3$ -code, so is trivial. Demanding  $A_2 = 0$  gives  $c'_1 = \frac{3}{2}(5 - n)$ .

Let us also prove the lemma referenced in the earlier section.

**Lemma 1.** *Any  $[[n, 1]]$   $M_3$ -code contains logical operators of only odd weight, including at least one logical operator of weight  $n$ .*

*Proof.* This is a well-known fact about linear  $GF(4)$  codes (see e.g., [23]). Here, we will only show that this result is contained in Theorem 3.  $C(x, y)$  above contains only odd powers of  $y$ , so all logical operators have odd weight. The total number of logical operators of weight  $n$  is given by  $C(x = 0, y = 1)$ . When  $x = 0$  and  $y = 1$ ,  $\hat{f}(0, 1) = 3$  and  $\hat{g}(0, 1) = 1$ , and  $C(0, 1) = 3S_1(3, 1) + \frac{3}{2}S_2(3, 1)$ . Note that, we also have  $\hat{f}(\frac{3}{2}, \frac{1}{2}) = 3$  and  $\hat{g}(\frac{3}{2}, \frac{1}{2}) = 1$ . Note that  $A(\frac{3}{2}, \frac{1}{2}) = \frac{1}{2}(S_1(3, 1) + \frac{1}{2}S_2(3, 1)) = \frac{1}{6}C(0, 1)$ . But clearly  $A(\frac{3}{2}, \frac{1}{2}) > 0$ , as  $A_0 = 1$  and all other  $A_j \geq 0$ . Therefore  $C(0, 1) > 0$ .  $\square$

Note that  $A$  contains only even powers of  $y$  and  $C$  contains only odd powers of  $y$ . Therefore one can reconstruct both  $A$  and  $C$  from knowledge of  $B$ . Finally note that  $B_j$  for  $j \geq 1$  must be a non-negative integer divisible by three, since, for each stabilizer of non-zero weight  $j$ , one can obtain two more codewords of weight  $j$  by acting with  $M_3$  and  $M_3^2$ .

### 3.2 Constraining the noise-suppression exponent

From the perspective of magic state distillation, we would like to use invariant theory to constrain the threshold of a magic state distillation routine. However, it turns out that this is not so easy to do, as we will explain in Section 4. However, we are still able to place some non-trivial constraints on magic state distillation routines using invariant theory.

A magic state distillation routine is characterized by a function

$$\epsilon_{\text{out}}(\epsilon_{\text{in}}) \sim \Theta(\epsilon_{\text{in}}^\nu). \quad (3.8)$$

We refer to the exponent  $\nu$  in this formula as the *noise-suppression exponent*. Note that the noise suppression exponent,  $\nu$ , is not necessarily equal to the distance of the code, as evidenced from the  $[[5, 1, 3]]$  code, which has distance 3, but, as we found from Equation (2.40), has noise suppression exponent 2.

We now attempt to constrain the noise-suppression exponent of a magic state distillation routine using a combination of invariant theory and linear programming techniques similar to that of [28, 30, 53, 54] and related works.

Our first result is the following theorem, which follows directly from invariant theory.

**Theorem 4.** *The noise suppression exponent of any magic state distillation routine based on an  $[[n, 1]]$   $M_3$ -code must satisfy*

$$\nu \equiv \begin{cases} 1 \pmod 3 & n \equiv 1 \pmod 6 \\ 2 \pmod 3 & n \equiv -1 \pmod 6, \end{cases} \quad (3.9)$$

if the probability of successfully projecting  $n$  pure copies of the  $|T\rangle$ -magic state onto the codespace is non-zero.

To arrive at this result, we first translate Theorem 3 into an expression characterizing the noise-reduction of a magic state distillation routine in terms of invariants. We have,

$$\epsilon_{\text{out}} = \frac{M(\epsilon)}{2N(\epsilon)}, \quad (3.10)$$

$N(\epsilon)$  in the denominator of Equation (3.10), expressed in terms of the sums of invariants  $S_1$  and  $S_2$ , for  $x = 1$  and  $y = i\bar{r}(\epsilon)$  becomes,

$$N(\epsilon) = S_1 - \frac{4}{9}(1 - 2\epsilon)^2((\epsilon - 1)\epsilon + 1)S_2. \quad (3.11)$$

The exact form of the numerator depends on the choice of logical operators, which depends on the value of  $n \pmod 6$ . For a non-trivial code with  $n \equiv -1 \pmod 6$ , the numerator of Equation (3.10), becomes,

$$M^{(-)}(\epsilon) = (2 - 2\epsilon)S_1 - \frac{8}{9}\epsilon^2(2\epsilon - 1)(\epsilon^2 - \epsilon + 1)S_2. \quad (3.12)$$

For a non-trivial code with  $n \equiv +1 \pmod 6$ , the numerator of Equation (3.10), becomes

$$M^{(+)}(\epsilon) = 2\epsilon S_1 + \frac{8}{9}(\epsilon - 1)^2(2\epsilon - 1)(\epsilon^2 - \epsilon + 1)S_2. \quad (3.13)$$

We refer to these as class-5 and class-1 codes respectively.

Before we proceed, note that  $\hat{f}$  and  $\hat{g}$ , expressed in terms of  $\epsilon$ , are

$$\hat{f} = 4(1 - \epsilon)\epsilon, \quad \hat{g} = -\frac{16}{27}(1 - 2\epsilon)^2 (\epsilon^2 - \epsilon + 1)^2. \quad (3.14)$$

It is convenient to instead define,

$$f(\epsilon) = (1 - \epsilon)\epsilon, \quad g(\epsilon) = (1 - 2\epsilon)^2 (\epsilon^2 - \epsilon + 1)^2. \quad (3.15)$$

We now write,

$$S_1(\epsilon) = \sum_{j=0}^{\lfloor (n-1)/6 \rfloor} c_j f(\epsilon)^{\frac{n-1}{2}-3j} g(\epsilon)^j, \quad S_2(\epsilon) = \sum_{j=0}^{\lfloor (n-5)/6 \rfloor} d_j f(\epsilon)^{\frac{n-5}{2}-3j} g(\epsilon)^j. \quad (3.16)$$

where we the new coefficients  $c_j$  and  $d_j$ , related to the old coefficients  $c'_j$  and  $d'_j$  by

$$c_j = \left(-\frac{16}{27}\right)^j c'_j 4^{\frac{n-1}{2}-3j}, \quad (3.17)$$

$$d_j = \left(-\frac{16}{27}\right)^j d'_j 4^{\frac{n-5}{2}-3j}. \quad (3.18)$$

### 3.2.1 Class 5 codes

Let us focus on codes with class 5. For such codes, let  $n = 6m + 5$ . We can write,

$$M^{(-)} = g(\epsilon)^m (2 - 2\epsilon)(1 - \epsilon)^2 \epsilon^2 \left( \tilde{S}_1 + \frac{4}{9} H(\epsilon) \tilde{S}_2 \right), \quad (3.19)$$

with,

$$\tilde{S}_1 = \sum_{j=0}^m c_{m-j} \phi^j, \quad \tilde{S}_2 = \sum_{j=0}^m d_{m-j} \phi^j, \quad (3.20)$$

where

$$\phi(\epsilon) = \frac{f^3}{g} = -\frac{\hat{f}^3}{108\hat{g}} = \frac{(1 - \epsilon)^3 \epsilon^3}{(1 - 2\epsilon)^2 (\epsilon^2 - \epsilon + 1)^2}, \quad (3.21)$$

and

$$H(\epsilon) = \frac{(2\epsilon - 1)(\epsilon^2 - \epsilon + 1)}{(\epsilon - 1)^3}. \quad (3.22)$$

For  $0 \leq \epsilon < 1/2$ , we can write  $H(\epsilon)$  as a function of  $\phi$ ,

$$H(\epsilon(\phi)) = \frac{(\sqrt{4\phi + 1} - 1)}{2\phi}. \quad (3.23)$$

We now demand that  $\frac{M^{(-)}(\epsilon)}{2N(\epsilon)} = O(\epsilon^\nu)$ , which implies that,

$$\tilde{S}_1 + \frac{4}{9} H(\epsilon(\phi)) \tilde{S}_2 = O(\phi^{\frac{\nu-2}{3}}). \quad (3.24)$$

Let us expand  $H(\epsilon)$  as a power series in  $\phi$ , near  $\phi = 0$ . We find

$$H(\epsilon(\phi)) = \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} H_j \phi^j, \quad H_j = \frac{(-4)^j \left(\frac{1}{2}\right)_j}{(2)_j}, \quad (3.25)$$

where  $\left(\frac{1}{2}\right)_{m-1}$  denotes the Pochhammer symbol:  $a_n = a(a+1)\dots(a+n-1) = \frac{\Gamma(a+n)}{\Gamma(a)}$ . The first few powers are given by,

$$H(\epsilon(\phi)) \approx 1 - \phi + 2\phi^2 - 5\phi^3 + 14\phi^4 - 42\phi^5 + O(\phi^6). \quad (3.26)$$

Crucially, only positive integer powers of  $\phi$  appear. This means that the left-hand-side of Equation (3.24) is an integer power of  $\phi$  and proves Theorem 4 for class 5 codes.

Note that, in the above analysis, we implicitly assumed that the denominator of Equation (3.10) is non-zero when  $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$ ,

$$\lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} N(\epsilon) \neq 0. \quad (3.27)$$

If this condition is not satisfied the code would be useless for magic state distillation. For class 5 codes that meet this condition, we generically, i.e., in the absence of any cancellations on the LHS of Equation (3.24), expect quadratic noise suppression.

### 3.2.2 Class 1 codes

For class 1 codes  $n = 6m + 1$ , we can express the numerator as follows:

$$M_{(+)}(\epsilon) = 2\epsilon g(\epsilon)^m H(\epsilon)^{-1} \left( H(\epsilon) \tilde{S}_1 - \frac{4}{9} \tilde{S}_2 \right). \quad (3.28)$$

where,

$$\tilde{S}_1 = \sum_{j=0}^m c_{m-j} \phi^j(\epsilon) \quad \tilde{S}_2 = \sum_{j=0}^{m-1} d_{m-1-j} \phi^j(\epsilon) \quad (3.29)$$

where  $\phi$  is given by Equation (3.21) and  $H(\epsilon)$  is given by Equation (3.22).

We now demand that  $\frac{M^{(-)}(\epsilon)}{2N(\epsilon)} = O(\epsilon^\nu)$ , which implies that,

$$H(\epsilon(\phi)) \tilde{S}_1 + \tilde{S}_2 = O(\phi^{\frac{\nu-1}{3}}). \quad (3.30)$$

Again, because  $H(\epsilon(\phi))$  can be expanded as a power series in  $\phi$  containing only integer powers of  $\phi$ , we have  $\nu \equiv 1 \pmod{3}$ , proving theorem 4 for class 1 codes. For class 1 codes with  $N(0) > 0$ , we generically, i.e., in the absence of any cancellations on the LHS of Equation (3.30), expect linear noise suppression (or enhancement.)

### 3.2.3 Extremal weight enumerators for distillation

We now attempt to use the above results to place an upper bound on  $\nu$ , following [53].

In [53], the concept of an extremal weight enumerator for a classical code was defined. The idea in [53] is that, we demand  $A_0 = 1$  and  $A_i = 0$  for all  $i < d_{\max}$  – and then use these equations to solve for the coefficients in the analogue of Equation (3.1), expressing the weight enumerator in terms of invariants. The total number of equations must be less than or equal to the total number of unknowns, and this determines the largest possible distance  $d_{max}$ . For the distance of a quantum code, we would instead impose  $A_0 = 1$ , and  $C_i = 0$  for  $i < d_{\max}$ .

Here we are interested in the noise-suppression exponent. In analogy to [53], we could define an extremal weight enumerator for distillation. For class 5 codes, there are  $2m + 1$  unknown coefficients:  $c'_j$ , for  $j = 1, \dots, m$  and  $d'_k$ , for  $k = 0, \dots, m$ . By using these  $2m + 1$  unknowns to cancel the first  $2m + 1$  powers of  $\phi$  that appear in the LHS of Equation (3.24) for class 5 codes – we obtain  $\frac{\nu_{\max}-2}{3} = 2m + 1$  for an extremal distillation routine. Similar analysis can also be carried out for class 1 codes, for which  $\frac{\nu_{\max}-1}{3} = 2m$ . Putting these together, we have the result that  $\nu \leq n$  for an extremal  $M_3$ -code for magic state distillation of either class. Unlike the analogous results for extremal distance weight enumerators in [53], this is a trivial result, since we know *a priori* that  $\nu \leq n$ . We can, however, still ask whether or not extremal codes for magic state distillation exist.

The extremal weight enumerators for distillation for  $n < 20$  that arise from this procedure are given in Table 1. As can be seen from the table, we find that many coefficients of  $A$  are negative. In particular, we find

$$A_2 = \begin{cases} -30 - 81m - 54m^2 & n = 6m + 5, \\ -9m - 54m^2 & n = 6m + 1, \end{cases} \quad (3.31)$$

is always negative.<sup>4</sup> Therefore extremal distillation routines do not exist, and we have the result that  $\nu \leq n - 3$  for any distillation routine based on an  $M_3$ -code.

In the next subsection, we use linear programming to place stronger bounds on  $\nu$ .

### 3.3 Linear programming bounds for the noise suppression exponent

We now derive linear programming bounds on the noise suppression exponent, which arise from demanding only  $A_i, B_i, C_i \geq 0$ , without any integrality constraint.

For class 5 codes, we modify the analysis of the previous subsection for, and instead try to cancel only the first  $2m + 1 - L$  powers of  $\phi$  in Equation (3.24), which corresponds to  $\frac{\nu-2}{3} = 2m + 1 - L$ . We refer to  $L$  as the level of cancellation. For class 1 codes, we try to cancel only the first  $2m - L$  powers of  $\phi$  in Equation (3.30), and we would instead have  $\frac{\nu-1}{3} = 2m - L$ .

---

<sup>4</sup>Interestingly, however, the  $A_i$  are all integers divisible by 3 for  $i > 0$ .

$n$	$A(1, y)$
5	$1 - 30y^2 + 45y^4$
7	$1 - 63y^2 + 315y^4 - 189y^6$
11	$1 - 165y^2 + 2970y^4 - 12474y^6 + 13365y^8 - 2673y^{10}$
13	$1 - 234y^2 + 6435y^4 - 46332y^6 + 104247y^8 - 69498y^{10} + 9477y^{12}$
17	$1 - 408y^2 + 21420y^4 - 334152y^6 + 1969110y^8 - 4725864y^{10} + 4511052y^{12} - 1487160y^{14} + 111537y^{16}$
19	$1 - 513y^2 + 34884y^4 - 732564y^6 + 6122142y^8 - 22447854y^{10} + 36732852y^{12} - 25430436y^{14} + 6357609y^{16} - 373977y^{18}$

Table 1: Extremal weight enumerators for distillation for  $n < 20$ .

For various values of  $m$ , we attempted to determine the smallest value of  $L$ ,  $L_{\min}$  such that the two constraints  $B_j \geq A_j \geq 0$  can be satisfied. (Note that, since  $A_j \neq 0$  only for even  $j$  and  $C_j \neq 0$  for only odd  $j$ , it is sufficient to focus only on  $B_j$ .) We also imposed the constraints  $B_1 = 0$  and  $A_2 = 0$  to rule out obviously trivial codes.

Our results are summarized in the following theorem.

**Theorem 5.** *For all  $n \leq 215$ , the noise suppression exponent  $\nu$  of a magic state distillation routine based on a non-trivial  $M_3$ -code satisfies,*

$$\nu \leq \begin{cases} 1 & n = 7, \\ 3m - 5 & n = 6m + 1 \in [13, 211] \\ 2 & n = 5, 11, \\ 5 & n = 17, \\ 3m - 4 & n = 6m + 5 \in [23, 215]. \end{cases} \quad (3.32)$$

We proved this theorem for the values of  $n$  in the ranges specified by solving the linear programming problem using the computer algebra system, Mathematica. However, we believe it almost certainly holds for arbitrarily large values of  $n$ , and should, in principle, be provable using methods such as those used in [29, 55].

Are the bounds in Theorem 5 saturated? When we searched over all  $[[n, 1]]$   $M_3$ -codes of size  $n < 20$ , we found that no class 1 code had noise suppression coefficient greater than 1 and no class 5 code had noise suppression coefficient greater than 2. This agrees with the theorem above but for  $n = 17$  and  $n = 19$ , the bounds ( $\nu = 5$  and  $\nu = 4$ , respectively) are not saturated. In the next section, we will show that additional quantum constraints, combined with integer programming rule out a noise suppression exponent of  $\nu = 5$  for  $n = 17$ . For

$n = 19$ , however, seemingly consistent integral weight enumerators with  $\nu = 4$  do exist but do not correspond to actual  $[[19, 1]] M_3$ -codes.

### 3.4 Illustration for $n = 5$

Let us illustrate the computation for the case  $n = 5$ . First recall that  $A_0 = 1$  implies  $c'_0 = 1$  which implies that  $c_0 = 2^{n-1}$ .

For this case,  $m = 0$ , and

$$\tilde{S}_1 = c_0 = 16, \quad \tilde{S}_2 = d_0. \quad (3.33)$$

There is one undetermined coefficient  $d_0$ . We can attempt to use  $d_0$  to cancel the lowest power of  $\phi$  in Equation (3.24).

$$\tilde{S}_1 + H(\epsilon(\phi))\tilde{S}_2 = O(\phi) \quad (3.34)$$

$$16 + \frac{4}{9}(1 - \phi + \dots)d_0 = O(\phi), \quad (3.35)$$

We choose  $d_0$  so that the order  $\phi^0$  term vanishes:

$$d_0 = -36, \quad (3.36)$$

to obtain a noise suppression exponent,

$$\frac{\nu - 2}{3} = 1 \implies \nu = 5. \quad (3.37)$$

This condition defines the extremal weight enumerator for magic state distillation. Substituting into the expression for  $A(x, y)$  we find,

$$A(x, y) = x^5 - 30x^3y^2 + 45xy^4. \quad (3.38)$$

The coefficient of  $x^3y^2$  is negative. This implies that this extremal weight enumerator for distillation cannot be realized.

If we now set  $L = 1$ , and cancel one less power than the number of variables, we will obtain a weight enumerator for a magic state distillation routine with  $\nu = 2$ . We are left with the free parameter  $d_0$ . We write  $A(x, y)$  as a function of  $d_0$  and find,

$$B(x, y) = x^5 + \left(3 + \frac{d_0}{2}\right)x^4y + (6 + d_0)x^3y^2 + (18 - 2d_0)x^2y^3 + (9 - d_0)xy^4 + \left(27 + \frac{3}{2}d_0\right)y^5 \quad (3.39)$$

which implies that

$$-6 \leq d_0 \leq 9. \quad (3.40)$$

We will see in the next section that magic state distillation places additional linear programming constraints on  $d_0$ . In particular, the success probability  $2^{-n+1}W_I(\bar{r}) = 2^{-n+1}A(1, i\bar{r}) = 2^{-n}N(\epsilon)$ , must be non-negative for  $-\frac{1}{3} \leq \bar{r}^2 \leq \frac{1}{3}$ . We find,

$$A(1, i\bar{r}) = 1 + (6 + d_0)(-\bar{r}^2) + (9 - d_0)\bar{r}^4, \quad (3.41)$$




Figure 4: Linear programming bounds for  $n = 5$ . The dashed blue line corresponds to the classical linear programming constraints in Equation 3.40 and the yellow line corresponds to the bound the additional success probability constraint (Equation 3.42). The two black points are the two inequivalent  $[[5, 1]]$   $M_3$ -codes. the extremal weight enumerator,  $d_0 = -36$ , for magic state distillation is far outside the allowed region.

at  $\bar{r} = \frac{1}{3}$  evaluates to  $\frac{-4d_0}{9}$ , which implies  $d_0 \leq 0$ . We thus have,

$$-6 \leq d_0 \leq 0. \quad (3.42)$$

The 5-qubit code used in [1] is obtained by taking  $d_0 = -6$ . There is only one other 5-qubit  $M_3$ -code, which is obtained from the other limit of this inequality by setting  $d_0 = 0$ . This other code has zero probability of successfully projection on pure  $|T\rangle$  states, so it is useless for magic state distillation. These results are summarized in Figure 4.

## 4 New constraints on weight enumerators from magic state distillation

Conventionally, when constraining weight enumerators via linear programming, one demands positivity of coefficients  $A_i$ ,  $B_i$  and  $C_i$ , as well as shadow enumerators<sup>5</sup>. One might ask whether these constraints are enough to ensure consistency of the magic state distillation routine arising from an  $M_3$ -code? In this section, we show that the answer to this question is no.

### 4.1 Quantum constraints

There are, in particular, two constraints that  $\epsilon_{\text{out}}(\epsilon)$  must satisfy for any code:

1. *Non-negative success probability:*  $N(\epsilon) \geq 0$  for all  $\epsilon$ . The probability of successfully projecting a supply of noisy magic states is  $2^{-n+1}N(\epsilon)$ . This probability must be non-negative for any error correcting code and any  $\epsilon$ , so we demand  $N(\epsilon) \geq 0$  for all  $\epsilon$ .
2. *Maximum threshold:* Recall that  $\epsilon_{\text{max}} = \frac{1}{2} \left(1 - \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}}\right)$  is the boundary of the stabilizer octahedron. For any  $\epsilon \in [\epsilon_{\text{max}}, \frac{1}{2}]$ , we require that  $\epsilon_{\text{out}}(\epsilon) \geq \epsilon_{\text{max}}$ . In other words, states within the stabilizer octahedron must be mapped to states within the stabilizer

<sup>5</sup>For  $M_3$ -codes, the shadow enumerator of [30] is equal to  $B(x, y)$ , so provides no new information.






Figure 5: The distillation performance of a putative weight enumerator with  $n = 11$ . While the weight enumerator satisfies positivity and integrality of  $A_i$ ,  $B_i$  and  $C_i$ , as well as consistency with the MacWilliams identity, the weight enumerator is clearly unphysical, as the threshold for distillation is deep within the stabilizer polytope.

octahedron by the magic state distillation routine. Recall that the function  $\epsilon_{\text{out}}(\epsilon)$  depends on the choice of sign for the weight- $n$  logical operators for the  $M_3$ -code. This condition must be satisfied for either choice of sign, so it gives rise to two constraints for  $\epsilon$ , for  $\epsilon_{\text{out}} = \frac{M^{(\pm)}(\epsilon)}{N(\epsilon)}$ .

By numerical experimentation, we found that these two constraints are independent of the classical constraints of non-negativity of  $A_i$ ,  $B_i$  and  $C_i$ . This is illustrated for small values of  $n$  in the following subsections. An example of a weight enumerator that satisfies non-negativity of  $B_i$ , but violates both of these requirements is,

$$A(1, y) = 1 + 11y^2 + 138y^4 + 22y^6 + 645y^8 + 207y^{10} \quad (4.1)$$

which arises from  $c'_1 = -2$ ,  $d'_0 = -2$ ,  $d'_1 = 72$  in Equation (3.1). This gives rise to the putative distillation routine plotted in Figure 5.<sup>6</sup>

Let us discuss how we would impose these constraints. Demanding that a function  $N(\epsilon) \geq 0$  for  $\epsilon \in [0, 1]$  is non-trivial. It is however, straightforward to implement the necessary condition  $N(\epsilon \rightarrow 0) \geq 0$ . For codes with  $n = 6m + 5$ , this translates into the simple linear constraint,

$$N(\epsilon \rightarrow 0) \sim -d_m \geq 0. \quad (4.2)$$

For codes with  $n = 6m + 1$ , we instead have

$$N(\epsilon \rightarrow 0) \sim c_m \geq 0. \quad (4.3)$$

---

<sup>6</sup>Of course, this particular weight enumerator can be ruled out via integer programming, since all  $A_j$  must be divisible by 3, and only serves to illustrate that magic state distillation provides new linear programming constraints.

We found from numerical experimentation that demanding only  $N(0) \geq 0$  does not guarantee  $N(\epsilon) \geq 0$  for all  $0 \leq \epsilon \leq 1$ . For small  $n$  the full constraint can be translated into a non-linear constraint (or, more precisely, an infinite family of linear constraints) on the  $c_j$  and  $d_j$  by hand. For numerical searches for larger  $n$ , one can also impose the condition for a large number of randomly chosen values of  $\epsilon$ . Alternatively, a sufficient, but not necessary condition, for  $N(\epsilon) \geq 0$ , is that  $N(\epsilon)$  can be expressed as a sum of Bernstein basis polynomials  $\beta_j^{\tilde{n}}(\epsilon)$  of some degree  $\tilde{n} \geq n$ ,

$$N(\epsilon) = \sum_{j=0}^{\tilde{n}} \beta_j^{\tilde{n}}(\epsilon) a_j \quad (4.4)$$

with non-negative coefficients  $a_j$ . We found, choosing  $\tilde{n} = n + 1$ , this method is useful for generating weight enumerators with non-negative  $N(\epsilon)$ .

For constraint on threshold, we found, that at least for small  $n$ , it was sufficient to impose only

$$\epsilon_{\text{out}}(\epsilon_{\text{max}}) > \epsilon_{\text{max}}, \quad (4.5)$$

as long as we also impose  $N(0) \geq 0$ . The constraint (4.5) (which must be imposed for both choices of sign for logical operators) is a non-linear constraint, but can be made into a linear constraint when supplemented with  $N(0) \geq 0$ .

We were not able to find any simple way to guarantee a threshold below the theoretical upper bound, other than directly imposing the inequality (4.5). For this reason, it seems difficult to use linear programming to place bounds on directly on the threshold.

We find that for small codes  $n < 50$ , imposing these non-linear constraints does not change our bound on the noise suppression exponent in Theorem 5, but we had difficulty checking the full set of non-linear constraints for larger values of  $n$ . However, the non-linear constraints do provide interesting constraints on the existence of  $M_3$ -codes, as we illustrate in the next two subsections. In particular, in Section 5, we show that they can be used to obtain stronger bounds on the distance of classical linear self-dual and maximal-self orthogonal  $GF(4)$  codes.

## 4.2 Small examples

Here we illustrate the role played by the new quantum constraints in constraining the space of consistent weight enumerators for small values of  $n$ . The case of  $n = 5$  was covered in section 3.4, so we begin with  $n = 7$ .

### 4.2.1 $n = 7$

The weight enumerator for a  $[[7, 1]]$   $M_3$ -code depends on two undetermined coefficients,  $c'_1$  and  $d'_0$ , and is

$$A(1, y) = 1 + y^2 (c'_1 + d'_0 + 9) + y^4 (-2c'_1 + 2d'_0 + 27) + y^6 (c'_1 - 3d'_0 + 27). \quad (4.6)$$

The classical linear programming constraints, which apply to linear  $GF(4)$  self-orthogonal codes, that  $B_i \geq 0$  can be reduced to,

$$\begin{aligned} d'_0 &\geq -6, \\ c'_1 + d'_0 &\geq -9, \\ 6c'_1 - d'_0 &\geq -54, \\ c'_1 - d'_0 &\leq \frac{27}{2}, \\ 4c'_1 + 3d'_0 &\leq 54, \\ c'_1 - 3d'_0 &\geq -27. \end{aligned}$$

The convex polytope defined by these inequalities is shown as the blue hexagon in Figure 6.

Let us now look at the additional quantum constraints that arise from viewing the code as a potential magic state distillation routine. The constraint that  $N(0) \geq 0$  translates into  $c'_1 \leq 0$ . This is a special case of the more general constraint that  $N(\epsilon) \geq 0 \forall \epsilon \in [0, 1]$ , which translates into a non-linear constraint on  $c'_1$  and  $d'_0$ , shown in green in Figure 6.

The constraint that  $\epsilon_{\text{out}}(\epsilon_{\text{max}}) \geq \epsilon_{\text{max}}$  depends on the choice of logical operators, (and holds for both choices). For the choice  $\epsilon_{\text{out}} = \frac{M^{(+)}(\epsilon)}{2N(\epsilon)}$ , one gets the constraint,

$$\frac{d'_0}{25c'_1 + 15d'_0 - 54} \geq 0, \quad (4.7)$$

and for the choice  $\epsilon_{\text{out}} = \frac{M^{(-)}(\epsilon)}{2N(\epsilon)}$ , one gets the constraint,

$$\frac{3(25c'_1 - 54)}{25c'_1 + 15d'_0 - 54} \geq 1. \quad (4.8)$$

The intersection of these two constraints is shown as the orange region in Figure 6.

We see that both quantum constraints are independent of each other, as well as the classical constraints. Moreover, the four  $[[7, 1]]$   $M_3$ -codes that exist lie on the extremal points of the intersection of the quantum and classical constraints. For this reason, we do not look for additional quantum constraints in this case.

It is also possible to solve the integer linear programming problem exactly for this case. One can check that, for  $c'_1 \equiv 0 \pmod{3}$  and  $d'_0 \equiv 0 \pmod{6}$ , solutions to the linear programming problem become solutions to integer programming, where we have the additional constraint that  $B_i$  are integers such that  $B_i \equiv 0 \pmod{3}$ . Without quantum constraints, there are 18 integer solutions. This is reduced to 6 integer solutions when the two quantum constraints are included.<sup>7</sup>

Let us also illustrate how the bound on noise suppression exponent from Theorem 5 fits into this case. The line corresponding to enumerators with noise suppression exponent  $\nu \geq 4$

<sup>7</sup>The two fake weight enumerators correspond to  $(d'_0, c'_1) = (0, -3)$  and  $(0, -6)$ , and would both correspond to trivial distillation routines which would have  $\epsilon_{\text{out}} = \epsilon$ .




Figure 6: Linear programming constraints for  $n = 7$  magic state distillation routines. The blue region corresponds to the constraints  $B_i \geq 0$ . The orange region corresponds to the constraint  $\epsilon_* \leq \epsilon_{\max}$ , and the green region corresponds to  $N(\epsilon) \geq 0$  for all  $\epsilon$ . Black points denote all  $[[7, 1]]$   $M_3$ -codes, which lie at the boundary of the intersection of all three regions. The line corresponding to enumerators with noise suppression exponent  $\nu \geq 4$  is shown in gray – it only intersects one enumerator which has zero success probability.

corresponds to the equation  $c'_1 = -3d'_0$ , which is shown in gray in Figure 6. It only intersects the allowed region at the point one  $(d'_0, c'_1) = (0, 0)$ , which has zero success probability at  $\epsilon = 0$  and is therefore useless for magic state distillation. In particular, it intersects the line of non-trivial codes, specified by  $C_1 = 0 \implies d'_0 = -6$ , far outside the blue region, hence demonstrating that  $\nu \leq 1$  purely from linear programming.

#### 4.2.2 $n = 11$

For  $n = 11$  there are three coefficients,  $c'_1$ ,  $d'_0$  and  $d'_1$ . We reduce this to two coefficients, by demanding that  $C_1 = 0$  which implies that  $d'_0 = -6$  for non-trivial codes. Then,

$$\begin{aligned}
 B = & 1 + y^2 (c'_1 + 9) + \frac{1}{2}y^3 (6c'_1 + d'_1 + 60) + y^4 (4c'_1 + d'_1 + 42) \\
 & + 3y^5 (4c'_1 - d'_1 + 96) + y^6 (-2c'_1 - 3d'_1 + 162) + y^7 (-6c'_1 + 6d'_1 + 972) \\
 & + 3y^8 (-4c'_1 + d'_1 + 135) + y^9 (-36c'_1 - 5d'_1 + 1296) + y^{10} (9c'_1 - d'_1 + 405) \\
 & + \frac{3}{2}y^{11} (18c'_1 + d'_1 + 324).
 \end{aligned}$$

As before, we plot the classical and quantum constraints in Figure 7.

Note that, we can define a unique weight enumerator corresponding to a code with distance 4, which is the intersection of the dashed line with the blue region in Figure 7, corresponding




Figure 7: Linear programming constraints for  $n = 11$  magic state distillation routines, restricted to the plane defined by  $C_1 = 0$ . Regions are labeled as in Figure 6. Black points denote all  $[[11, 1]]$   $M_3$ -codes, which lie at the boundary of the intersection of all three regions. The line corresponding to noise suppression exponent  $\nu \geq 5$  is shown in gray – it only intersects one enumerator which has zero success probability. The line corresponding to enumerators with distance 4 is shown as a dashed line. It intersects the classically-allowed region at an integer point, but is ruled out by the quantum constraints.

to  $(c'_1, d'_1) = (-9, -6)$ . This has a weight enumerator with all positive coefficients,

$$B(1, y) = 1 + 198y^5 + 198y^6 + 990y^7 + 495y^8 + 1650y^9 + 330y^{10} + 234y^{11}, \quad (4.9)$$

and one might have expected that it corresponds to a valid  $[[11, 1, 5]]$   $M_3$ -code. However, it is ruled out by the quantum constraints, which imply that the maximum distance for an  $[[11, 1]]$   $M_3$ -code is 3. This observation is generalized to codes of larger length in Section 4.3.

We also note that the top left-corner of the blue region in Figure 7,  $(c'_1, d'_1) = (-9, 60)$  lies within the quantum constraints, and has weight enumerator,

$$B(1, y) = 1 + 33y^3 + 66y^4 + 1386y^7 + 693y^8 + 1320y^9 + 264y^{10} + 333y^{11} \quad (4.10)$$

with integer coefficients, divisible by 3, but does not correspond to any  $[[11, 1]]$   $M_3$ -code. If this code did exist, it would have a threshold of 0.190827, exceeding that of the 5-qubit code. It would be interesting to understand why this code does not exist. Presumably, there are additional quantum constraints, or constraints from the complete weight enumerator, that rule this code out.

#### 4.2.3 $n = 13$

A general weight enumerator for  $n = 13$  depends on four coefficients, but we can eliminate  $d'_0$  and  $c'_1$  by demanding  $C_1 = 0$  and  $A_2 = 0$ . A plot of all  $[[13, 1]]$  codes meeting these constraints is shown in Figure 8. The proof of Theorem 5 for this value of  $n$  follows from observing that the line determined by demanding  $\nu \geq 4$  never intersects the allowed region.

#### 4.2.4 $n = 17$

A general weight enumerator for  $n = 17$  depends on 5 coefficients. We can eliminate  $d'_0 = -6$  and  $c'_1 = -18$  by demanding  $C_1 = 0$  and  $A_2 = 0$ . We can eliminate one more variable by demanding either  $\nu \geq 5$  or  $C_3 = 0$ . Plots of the allowed regions in both cases, with all  $[[17, 1]]$   $M_3$ -codes meeting these constraints are shown in Figures 9 and 10.

We see from Figure 10 that, there is a small region of allowed parameter space that satisfies  $\nu \geq 5$  – the intersection of blue, orange, and green regions. However, one can easily show that there is no integral weight enumerator, with coefficients  $B_i$  divisible by 3, and non-zero success probability, in this region. Therefore, using the quantum constraints, we can rule out a  $[[17, 1]]$   $M_3$ -code with noise suppression exponent  $\nu \geq 5$ .

### 4.3 Bounds on distance of $[[n, 1, d]]$ $M_3$ -codes

In the example of  $n = 11$  above, we saw that the new quantum constraint of non-negative success probability  $N(0) \geq 0$  could be used to rule out the existence of an  $[[11, 1, 5]]$   $M_3$ -code,




Figure 8: Linear programming bounds for  $n = 13$ , in the plane defined by  $C_1 = A_2 = 0$ . Regions are labeled as in Figure 6. The gray line denotes those enumerators for which  $\nu \geq 4$ , and never intersects the allowed region.




Figure 9: Linear programming bounds for  $n = 17$ , in the plane defined by  $C_1 = A_2 = 0$  and  $\nu \geq 5$ . Regions are labeled as in Figure 6. Intersection of gridlines denote integral weight enumerators with non-zero weights divisible by 3. We see that there is no integral weight enumerator possible in the interior of the allowed region.




Figure 10: Linear programming bounds for  $n = 17$ , in the plane defined by  $C_1 = A_2 = 0$  and  $d \geq 5$ . Regions are labeled as in Figure 6, and actual codes are shown as black points.

which was otherwise allowed by the classical constraint of positivity of the  $B_i$ . Here, we show that this can be generalized to  $n = 12m - 1 < 101$ .

Let us first summarize the bounds obtainable using the classical linear programming constraints. Recall that the distance of the quantum code is the minimum weight of a logical operator, i.e., the smallest value  $d$  such that  $C_d \neq 0$ . In [30] bounds for general quantum codes (i.e., additive codes over  $GF(4)$ ) were obtained using linear programming, demanding non-negativity of  $A_i$ ,  $B_i$  and  $C_i$  as well as the shadow. For  $M_3$ -codes, these bounds continue to hold without modification, of the form  $[[n, 1, d]]$ , i.e., that encode one qubit, as summarized in the following theorem.

**Theorem 6.** *Demanding only non-negativity of  $A_i$ ,  $B_i$  and  $C_i$  implies that the distance of an  $[[n, 1, d]]$   $M_3$ -code satisfies  $d < d_{\max}$ , with*

$$d_{\max} \leq \begin{cases} 2m + 1 & n = 6m + 1, n = 6m + 3 \\ 2m + 3 & n = 6m + 5. \end{cases} \quad (4.11)$$

The above theorem holds for arbitrary  $n$ , however, solving the linear programming problem on a computer algebra system, we find that for larger values of  $n$ , one can obtain stronger bounds. These are contained in the following two theorems:

**Theorem 7.** *The distance of an  $[[n, 1, d]]$   $M_3$ -code satisfies  $d < d_{\max}$ , with*

$$d_{\max} \leq \begin{cases} 2m - 1 & n = 6m + 1 \in [121, 229], \quad n = 6m + 3 \in [135, 243] \\ 2m + 1 & n = 6m + 5 \in [101, 209]. \end{cases} \quad (4.12)$$

for  $101 \leq n \leq 209$ .



For larger  $n$  we have the following conjecture which is consistent with computational evidence,

**Conjecture 1.** *The distance of an  $[[n, 1, d]]$   $M_3$ -code satisfies  $d < d_{\max}$ , with*

$$d_{\max} \leq \begin{cases} 2m - 3 & n = 6m + 1 \geq 235, n = 6m + 3 \geq 249 \\ 2m - 1 & n = 6m + 5 \geq 215. \end{cases} \quad (4.13)$$

When we also include the quantum constraint that the success probability  $N(0) = A(1, \frac{i}{\sqrt{3}})$  is non-negative, we get a slightly stronger bound on the distance for  $n = 6m + 5$ , for  $n < 101$ :

**Theorem 8.** *When non-negativity of  $N(0)$  is also imposed, the distance of an  $[[n, 1, d]]$   $M_3$ -code satisfies  $d < d_{\max}$ , with*

$$d_{\max} \leq \left\{ 4 \lfloor \frac{m}{2} \rfloor + 3 \quad n = 6m + 5 < 101. \right. \quad (4.14)$$

For larger values of  $n$ ,  $101 \leq n \leq 209$ , and also for  $n = 6m + 1 \leq 229$  and  $n = 6m + 3 \leq 243$ , we found non-negativity of  $N(0) = A(1, \frac{i}{\sqrt{3}})$  does not give a stronger constraint on distance than classical linear programming, and we therefore did not check larger values of  $n$ .

We plot our bound and the bound of [30] in Figure 11. We also computed the distance for all  $M_3$ -codes with  $n \leq 19$  from [27], and found that our bound is saturated. For  $n > 19$ , all  $M_3$ -codes have not yet been classified, but using two copies of a shortened self-dual binary code, we computed the distance of all CSS  $M_3$ -codes with  $n \leq 29$ . CSS  $M_3$ -codes saturate our bound for  $n = 23$ , but not for larger  $n$ .

## 5 Quantum bounds for classical self-dual codes

Self-dual codes of type  $4^H$ , i.e., classical linear self-dual  $GF(4)$  codes, are one of the four celebrated types of classical self-dual codes over finite fields for which a Gleason's theorem holds [29]. We now show that we can use the ideas of the previous section to place new bounds on the weight enumerators of such codes.

### 5.1 Nonexistence of an extremal type $4^H$ self-dual code of length $12m$

An  $[[n, 0]]$   $M_3$ -code is an  $n$ -qubit stabilizer state  $|\mathcal{S}\rangle$  with the property that the projector  $\Pi_{\mathcal{S}} = |\mathcal{S}\rangle\langle\mathcal{S}|$  onto  $|\mathcal{S}\rangle$  commutes with  $M_3^{\otimes n}$ ,

$$M_3^{\otimes n} \Pi_{\mathcal{S}} = \Pi_{\mathcal{S}} M_3^{\otimes n}. \quad (5.1)$$




Figure 11: We plot our bounds from Theorem 5 (in blue) and the bounds from Rains [30] (in orange, dashed) for codes of size less than 30. We also plot distances of all quantum  $[[n, 1, d]] M_3$ -codes for  $n \leq 19$  (black), and all (indecomposable) CSS  $[[n, 1, d]] M_3$  codes for  $n \leq 30$  (gray). Our bound is stronger for  $n \equiv 11 \pmod{12}$ , and in particular, explains the non-existence of a  $[[11, 1, 5]] M_3$  code, and predicts the non-existence of a  $[[23, 1, 9]] M_3$  code. For  $n \geq 25$ , we find that CSS codes do not saturate the bound, but it is possible that as yet undiscovered quantum codes could be found that saturate these bounds.

Such a stabilizer state must have even  $n$ , and corresponds to a self-dual linear code over  $GF(4)$ . An example is the 6-qubit perfect tensor [56], given by stabilizers

$$+ZXXZII, +XYXXII, +IXYYXI, +IZXXZI, +IIXYYX, +IIZXXZ, \quad (5.2)$$

which corresponds to the hexacode [23].

Following the analysis in section 2.1, the probability for successfully projecting  $|T\rangle^{\otimes n}$  onto the stabilizer state,  $|\langle \mathcal{S} | (|T\rangle^{\otimes n})|^2$  is given by  $2^{-n} A(1, \frac{i}{\sqrt{3}})$ , which must be non-negative. This provides an additional, linear programming constraint,

$$A(1, \frac{i}{\sqrt{3}}) = A_0 - 3^{-1}A_2 + 3^{-2}A_4 - 3^{-3}A_6 + \dots = \sum_{j=0}^{n/2} A_{2j}(-3)^{-j} \geq 0 \quad (5.3)$$

that must be satisfied by any weight enumerator of a self-dual linear  $GF(4)$  code. As in the previous section, we will see that this is an independent constraint from the requirement that  $A_i \geq 0$ , and we refer to it as a new “quantum constraint”.

Let us show that the quantum constraint provides a new bounds on the classical distance of extremal self-dual codes. By invariant theory, the weight enumerator of any linear self-dual  $GF(4)$  code must take the form [23, 34],

$$A(x, y) = \sum_{j=0}^{\lfloor \frac{n}{6} \rfloor} c_j \hat{f}(x, y)^{\frac{n}{2} - 3j} \hat{g}(x, y)^j, \quad (5.4)$$

with  $\hat{f} = x^2 + 3y^2$  and  $\hat{g} = y^2(x^2 - y^2)^2$  as before, and  $c_0 = 1$ .

Let us first consider the example of  $n = 12$ . The unique extremal weight enumerator maximizing the distance can be computed [23] and is,

$$A(1, y) = 1 + 396y^6 + 1485y^8 + 1980y^{10} + 234y^{12}. \quad (5.5)$$

This appears to have positive coefficients and one might expect that it corresponds to a valid classical  $[12, 6, 6]_{GF(4)}$  code – moreover, as shown in Figure 13, this code exists at an extremal vertex of conventional linear programming constraints  $A_i \geq 0$ , so several authors did conjecture that such a code exists [57, 58]. However, subsequent computer searches revealed, somewhat surprisingly, that no  $[12, 6, 6]_{GF(4)}$  exists [23]. Understanding why no such code exists has been something of a mystery for many years. One can check that the signed weight enumerator arising from Equation (5.5) is

$$A(1, \frac{i}{\sqrt{3}}) = 1 - \frac{396}{3^3} + \frac{1485}{3^4} - \frac{1980}{3^5} + \frac{234}{3^6} = -(256/81) < 0, \quad (5.6)$$

thus explaining the non-existence of an extremal  $[12, 6, 6]_{GF(4)}$ . In subsequent decades, researchers, with some difficulty, [31] also established the non-existence of an extremal  $[24, 6, 10]_{GF(4)}$  code (see also, [32, 33]), which we can also explain in one line by the fact that  $A(1, \frac{i}{\sqrt{3}}) = -\frac{1245184}{19683}$  for such a code.

$n$	$A(1, i/\sqrt{3})$
12	$-\frac{256}{81}$
24	$-\frac{1245184}{19683}$
36	$-\frac{12146704384}{14348907}$
48	$-\frac{121921236631552}{10460353203}$
60	$-\frac{1264863882942349312}{762597484987}$
72	$-\frac{4471893160093900865536}{1853020188851841}$
84	$-\frac{433405775278763760286695424}{12157665459056928801}$
96	$-\frac{1572944082477201192612565876736}{2954312706550833698643}$

Table 2: Extremal  $[12m, 6m, 4m + 2]_{GF(4)}$  codes do not exist, due to negativity of  $A(1, \frac{i}{\sqrt{3}})$ .

We extend these observations into the following theorem, which, in particular, rules out extremal type  $4^H$  self-dual codes of length 36, 48, 60, 72, 84 and 96 – the existence of which was previously an open question.

**Theorem 9.** *No extremal type  $4^H$  self-dual code with parameters length divisible by 12 exists.*

*Proof.* For  $n = 12m$ , such a code would have parameters  $[12m, 6m, 4m + 2]_{GF(4)}$ . Using Equation (5.4), we find such a code must have,  $A(1, \frac{i}{\sqrt{3}}) = (-16/27)^{2m} c_{2m}$ .

Using the Burmann-Lagrange theorem, [23, 53] shows that the extremal weight enumerator for which  $A_0 = 1$  and  $A_i = 0$  for  $i < 4m + 2$ , is given by,  $c_0 = 1$  and, for  $k > 0$ ,

$$c_k = \frac{n}{2k} \sum_{r=0}^{k-1} (-3)^{r+1} \binom{n/2 - 3k + r}{r} \binom{3k - r - 2}{k - r - 1}. \quad (5.7)$$

Using this result, one can easily show that that  $c_{2m} < 0$  for  $n = 12m$ . This implies that  $A(1, \frac{i}{\sqrt{3}}) < 0$  for such an enumerator, thereby showing that no extremal code with length divisible by 12 exists.  $\square$

Alternatively, note that extremal weight enumerators for  $[12m, 6m, 4m + 2]_{GF(4)}$  codes with all  $A_j$  positive can only be constructed for  $n = 12m \leq 96$ , or  $m \leq 8$ . (For  $12m > 96$ , it was shown in [23] that  $A_{4m+4} < 0$ .) We therefore need only to consider a finite number of cases  $1 \leq m \leq 8$ . For each such extremal weight enumerator, we computed  $A(1, i/\sqrt{3})$  and found that it was negative, as shown in Table 2.

## 5.2 Explicit bounds for small codes

More generally, we require the  $M_3$ -state  $\mathcal{S}$  corresponding to any linear, self-dual  $GF(4)$  code to satisfy,

$$\text{tr } \Pi_{\mathcal{S}} \rho_T(\epsilon) \geq 0, \quad (5.8)$$

which implies  $A(1, \frac{i}{\sqrt{3}}(1 - 2\epsilon)) \geq 0$ , for  $0 \leq \epsilon \leq 1$ . This is an infinite number of linear constraints, which are more constraining than demanding only  $A(1, \frac{i}{\sqrt{3}}) \geq 0$ .

This family of quantum constraints can be translated into relatively simple conditions on  $c_k$ . Demanding that  $\lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} A(1, \frac{i}{\sqrt{3}}(1 - 2\epsilon)) \geq 0$  implies

$$(-1)^{\lfloor n/6 \rfloor} c_{\lfloor n/6 \rfloor} \geq 0. \quad (5.9)$$

For non-zero  $\epsilon$ , we have

$$1 + \sum_{j=1}^{\lfloor n/6 \rfloor} \phi^j (-1)^j c_j \geq 0, \quad \forall \phi \in [0, \infty). \quad (5.10)$$

This can be minimized as a function of  $\phi$ , to obtain non-linear bounds on the  $c_j$ .

To illustrate the role played by these quantum bounds in constraining codes, we work out the linear programming constraints for small values of  $n$  explicitly, and compare them to the codes that actually exist, taken from the classification in [27].

### 5.2.1 Bounds for $6 \leq n \leq 10$

Bounds on distance of For  $n = 6, 8$ , and  $10$ , the weight enumerator depends on a single undetermined coefficient  $c_1$ . The classical bounds,  $A_i \geq 0$  translate to:

$$n = 6 : \quad -9 \leq c_1 \leq \frac{27}{2}, \quad (5.11)$$

$$n = 8 : \quad -12 \leq c_1 \leq \frac{108}{5}, \quad (5.12)$$

$$n = 10 : \quad -15 \leq c_1 \leq \frac{135}{4}. \quad (5.13)$$

The quantum bound reduces to simply  $c_1 \leq 0$ . These are plotted, along with points representing weight enumerators of all codes that exist (from [27]), in Figure 12. We see that, when the quantum bound is included, both sides of the linear programming bounds are saturated.

### 5.2.2 Bounds for $12 \leq n \leq 16$

For  $n = 12, 14$  and  $16$  a general weight enumerator is determined by two coefficients  $c_1$  and  $c_2$ . The quantum bound,  $1 - c_1\phi + c_2\phi^2 \geq 0$  (for  $\phi \in [0, \infty)$ ), reduces to

$$c_2 \geq \begin{cases} 0 & c_1 < 0 \\ c_1^2/4 & c_1 \geq 0. \end{cases} \quad (5.14)$$

For the case of  $n = 12$ , a general weight enumerator is of the form,

$$\begin{aligned} A(1, y) = & 1 + y^2(18 + c_1) + y^4(135 + 7c_1 + c_2) + y^6(540 + 10c_1 - 4c_2) \\ & + y^8(1215 - 18c_1 + 6c_2) + y^{10}(1458 - 27c_1 - 4c_2) + y^{12}(729 + 27c_1 + c_2). \end{aligned}$$




Figure 12: Classical and quantum constraints for codes with  $n = 6, 8$  and  $10$ . Classical constraints from  $A_i \geq 0$  are shown in blue dashed lines, and quantum constraints are shown in orange solid line. Weight enumerators of all self-dual codes that exist are shown as black points.

In Figure 13, we plot the region of  $c_1, c_2$  plane allowed by classical linear programming constraints,  $A_i \geq 0$ , as well as the region allowed by the quantum constraint  $A(1, i \frac{1-2\epsilon}{\sqrt{3}}) \geq 0$ . We also plot the 9 distinct weight enumerators of all linear  $[12, 6]_{GF(4)}$  codes which actually exist. We see that, when the new constraints are taken into account, all the codes lie on the boundary of the convex region of allowed weight enumerators. We also see that demanding  $A(1, i \frac{1-2\epsilon}{\sqrt{3}}) \geq 0$  for all  $\epsilon$  places stronger constraints than demanding it only for pure states at  $\epsilon = 0$ . The putative  $[12, 6, 6]_{GF(4)}$  extremal weight enumerator lies at a vertex of the polytope defined by the classical constraints  $A_i \geq 0$ , but is ruled out by the quantum constraints. Similar linear programming bounds for  $n = 14$  and  $n = 16$  are shown in Figure 14.

We can also solve the integer programming problem explicitly for these cases. The constraint that  $A_i$  be integers, divisible by three, for  $i > 0$ , simply translates into  $c_1 \equiv 0 \pmod{3}$  and  $c_2 \equiv 0 \pmod{3}$ . The total number of solutions to the integer linear programming problem for  $n = 12$  without including quantum constraints is 2919. Including quantum constraints reduces the number of solutions to 570, which, however, is still much larger than 9, the number of distinct weight enumerators corresponding to actual codes.

One observes that for  $n = 6$  and  $n = 12$ , all codes lie on the boundary of the region allowed by classical and quantum constraints. We checked that this is also true for  $n = 18$ , and it would be interesting to know whether or not it holds for all  $n \equiv 0 \pmod{6}$ .




Figure 13: Linear programming bounds for classical self-dual linear  $[12, 6]_{GF(4)}$  codes. The region of the  $c_1$ - $c_2$  plane allowed by classical linear programming constraints is shown in blue. The region allowed by the quantum linear programming constraints  $A(1, i^{\frac{1-2\epsilon}{\sqrt{3}}}) \geq 0$  for all  $0 \leq \epsilon \leq 1$  is shown in green. (The region allowed by demanding only  $A(1, i^{\frac{1}{\sqrt{3}}}) \geq 0$  is shown in orange.) Black points denote all self-dual  $[12, 6]_{GF(4)}$  linear codes. The red point denotes the putative extremal  $[12, 6, 6]_{GF(4)}$  weight enumerator which does not correspond to an actual self-dual linear code.




Figure 14: Classical (blue) and quantum (green) linear programming bounds for classical self-dual linear  $[14, 7]_{GF(4)}$  (left) and  $[16, 8]_{GF(4)}$  (right) codes. All self-dual codes of these lengths which exist are shown as black points.

### 5.3 Bounds on the classical distance of maximal self-orthogonal linear $GF(4)$ codes of odd length

Using Theorem 3, we can also obtain new bounds for the classical distance of maximal self-orthogonal linear  $GF(4)$  codes of the form  $[n, (n-1)/2, d]$ , with  $n$  odd. Recall that the classical distance is the minimum weight of a codeword, and is the smallest  $d > 1$  such that  $A_d \neq 0$ .

We find that for  $n = 12m - 1 < 101$ , the quantum bound places stronger constraints on the classical distance than classical linear programming.

**Theorem 10.** *Demanding only non-negativity of  $A_i$ ,  $B_i$  and  $C_i$  implies that the classical distance of an  $[n, (n-1)/2, d]$  linear  $GF(4)$  code satisfies  $d \leq d_{\max}$ , with*

$$d_{\max} = \begin{cases} 2m & n = 6m + 1 \leq 181, \quad n = 6m + 3 \leq 183, \\ 2m + 4 & n = 6m + 5 < 101. \end{cases} \quad (5.15)$$

When the quantum constraint is included, the bound for  $n = 6m + 5$  is modified to

$$d_{\max} = \begin{cases} 4\lfloor m/2 \rfloor + 4 & n = 6m + 5 < 101. \end{cases} \quad (5.16)$$

For larger values of  $n$ , the classical bounds become stronger so the quantum bound no longer provides new constraints on maximum classical distance.

## 6 Integer programming

Here we ask, do there exist integral weight enumerators saturating the bound on noise suppression exponent  $\nu$  given in Theorem 5? We saw in the previous section that no integral solution for  $n = 17$  exists. However, for  $19 \leq n \leq 35$ , we are able to find integral weight enumerators saturating the bound Theorem 5 that satisfy all quantum and classical constraints.

We found an effective strategy to find these solutions was to treat the  $B_i$  as independent variables rather than  $c_j$  and  $d_j$ . After demanding some cancellations to obtain a distillation exponent  $\nu = 2m + 1 - L$ , we are left with  $L$  undetermined variables,  $B_1, \dots, B_L$ . We demand that these are integers divisible by three, and try to find a solution to all the constraints mentioned above. Usually, when we find a solution, all the other  $B_i$  for  $i > L$  also turn out to also be integers divisible by three.

We list some putative weight enumerators for  $n \leq 35$ , that pass all our consistency constraints, as well as the non-triviality constraint  $B_1 = 0$  and  $B_2 = 0$ , with large noise suppression exponent. Of course, most solutions to integer linear programming constraints, including our new quantum constraints, do not correspond to codes. However, we tried to construct examples with large distance, and low degeneracy, that may be somewhat more likely to exist than generic weight enumerators.



For  $n = 19$ , we find several weight enumerators with  $\nu = 4$ , such as,

$$A(1, y) = 1 + 36y^6 + 1194y^8 + 9108y^{10} + 53736y^{12} + 103404y^{14} + 80877y^{16} + 13788y^{18}, \quad (6.1)$$

which would give rise to a code with  $\epsilon_{\text{out}} \approx 395\epsilon^4 + O(\epsilon^5)$ . However, none of the weight enumerators saturating Theorem 5 correspond to actual codes.

Some putative weight enumerators with  $\nu \geq 5$  for  $n \geq 23$  with integer coefficients satisfying all our constraints are presented below. A complete classification of  $M_3$ -codes of size  $n = 23$  and higher, does not exist in the literature, so we do not yet know if codes possessing these weight enumerators exist.

Let us first present some class 5 enumerators, with  $\nu \geq 5$ ,

- A weight enumerator for a putative  $[[23, 1, 7]]$  code with  $\epsilon_{\text{out}} \approx 587\epsilon^5 + O(\epsilon^6)$ , and threshold  $\epsilon_* = 0.175343$ :

$$A(1, y) = 1 + 90y^6 + 1314y^8 + 348y^{10} + 107280y^{12} + 434880y^{14} + 1282869y^{16} + 1543428y^{18} + 738072y^{20} + 86022y^{22}. \quad (6.2)$$

This weight enumerator saturates both the bound on  $\nu$  in Theorem 5 and the bound on distance in Theorem 8, so it would be particularly interesting to know whether or not a corresponding code exists.

- A weight enumerator for a putative  $[[29, 1, 7]]$  code with  $\epsilon_{\text{out}} \approx \frac{52999\epsilon^8}{2} + O(\epsilon^9)$ , and threshold  $\epsilon_* = 0.211288$ :

$$A(1, y) = 1 + 810y^6 + 8985y^8 + 13134y^{10} + 19728y^{12} + 362820y^{14} + 6283203y^{16} + 24574140y^{18} + 64556616y^{20} + 91398066y^{22} + 63125091y^{24} + 16705494y^{26} + 1387368y^{28}. \quad (6.3)$$

- A weight enumerator for a putative  $[[35, 1, 7]]$  code with  $\epsilon_{\text{out}} \approx 1116496\epsilon^{11} + O(\epsilon^{12})$ , and threshold  $\epsilon_* = 0.21123$ :

$$A(1, y) = 1 + 2988y^6 + 45834y^8 + 296382y^{10} + 939012y^{12} + 390696y^{14} + 478032y^{16} + 36246354y^{18} + 352884120y^{20} + 1382651340y^{22} + 3406283646y^{24} + 5132651490y^{26} + 4553571492y^{28} + 1995562656y^{30} + 279328743y^{32} + 38536398y^{34}. \quad (6.4)$$

- A weight enumerator for a putative  $[[35, 1, 11]]$  code with  $\epsilon_{\text{out}} \approx \frac{11781\epsilon^5}{23} + O(\epsilon^6)$ , and threshold  $\epsilon_* = 0.16331$ :

$$A(1, y) = 1 + 42840y^{12} + 6715170y^{16} + 46236960y^{18} + 339481296y^{20} + 1334551680y^{22} + 3443179320y^{24} + 5213799360y^{26} + 4481873880y^{28} + 1943770752y^{30} + 353253285y^{32} + 16964640y^{34}. \quad (6.5)$$

For class 1 enumerators, note that concatenating the 5-qubit code with itself gives a class 1  $[[25, 1]]$  code with  $\nu = 4$ . Some potential class 1 weight-enumerators with  $\nu \geq 7$  are:

- A weight enumerator for a putative  $[[25, 1, 3]]$  code with  $\epsilon_{\text{out}} \approx \frac{23591\epsilon^7}{5} + O(\epsilon^8)$ , and threshold  $\epsilon_* = 0.209325$ :

$$\begin{aligned} A(1, y) = & 1 + 39y^4 + 1155y^6 + 8679y^8 + 8796y^{10} + 112482y^{12} \\ & + 487338y^{14} + 2805963y^{16} + 5398860y^{18} + 5548959y^{20} \\ & + 2268459y^{22} + 136485y^{24}. \end{aligned} \quad (6.6)$$

- A weight enumerator for a putative  $[[25, 1, 5]]$  code with  $\epsilon_{\text{out}} \approx 21181\epsilon^7 + O(\epsilon^8)$ , and threshold  $\epsilon_* = 0.18769$ :

$$\begin{aligned} A(1, y) = & 1 + 21y^4 + 759y^6 + 5109y^8 + 8556y^{10} + 61854y^{12} \\ & + 578946y^{14} + 2755767y^{16} + 5546652y^{18} + 5370165y^{20} \\ & + 2263167y^{22} + 186219y^{24}. \end{aligned} \quad (6.7)$$

- A weight enumerator for a putative  $[[31, 1, 3]]$  code with  $\epsilon_{\text{out}} \approx 1144115\epsilon^{10} + O(\epsilon^{11})$ , and threshold  $\epsilon_* = 0.210862$ :

$$\begin{aligned} A(1, y) = & 1 + 522y^4 + 15045y^6 + 163953y^8 + 889332y^{10} + 2605962y^{12} \\ & + 3622425y^{14} + 3506211y^{16} + 24209232y^{18} + 130869318y^{20} \\ & + 302765415y^{22} + 355566699y^{24} + 209428092y^{26} + 39798054y^{28} \\ & + 301563y^{30}. \end{aligned} \quad (6.8)$$

- A weight enumerator for a putative  $[[31, 1, 9]]$  code with  $\epsilon_{\text{out}} \approx 18569\epsilon^7 + O(\epsilon^8)$ , and threshold  $\epsilon_* = 0.174321$ :

$$\begin{aligned} A(1, y) = & 1 + 369y^6 + 2898y^8 + 4521y^{10} + 57951y^{12} + 466488y^{14} \\ & + 6245181y^{16} + 36350466y^{18} + 139591494y^{20} + 293155569y^{22} \\ & + 343995552y^{24} + 204720453y^{26} + 45717291y^{28} + 3433590y^{30}. \end{aligned} \quad (6.9)$$

- A weight enumerator for a putative  $[[31, 1, 9]]$  code with  $\epsilon_{\text{out}} \approx \frac{245939\epsilon^7}{59} + O(\epsilon^8)$ , and threshold  $\epsilon_* = 0.209924$ :

$$\begin{aligned} A(1, y) = & 1 + 573y^4 + 4548y^6 + 10872y^8 + 57435y^{10} + 1568526y^{12} \\ & + 2104353y^{14} + 14274369y^{16} + 4369902y^{18} + 141384465y^{20} \\ & + 311881446y^{22} + 382394646y^{24} + 166952583y^{26} + 30493908y^{28} \\ & + 18244197y^{30}. \end{aligned} \quad (6.10)$$

## 7 Discussion

In this paper, building on the work of [22], we showed that the magic state distillation routines the  $|T\rangle$  state of [1] can be characterized in terms of the simple weight enumerator of an  $M_3$ -code,  $A(x, y)$ , evaluated at purely imaginary values of  $y = i \frac{(1-2\epsilon)}{\sqrt{3}}$ . This result allowed us to use techniques from invariant theory and linear programming previously used to place bounds on the best attainable distances of classical self-dual and quantum codes to restrict the best attainable noise suppression exponent  $\nu$  of an  $M_3$ -code of length  $n$ , via Theorem 5.

Any linear self-orthogonal  $GF(4)$  code defines an  $M_3$ -code. Consistency of the resulting magic state distillation routine has two important implications – the probability for successfully projecting noisy magic states onto the codespace must be non-negative, and, the threshold of the distillation routine must lie outside the stabilizer polytope. These consistency conditions are independent of the classical constraints of positivity of the coefficients of the weight enumerators  $A_i$ ,  $B_i$  and  $C_i$ , and constitute a new set of quantum constraints for weight enumerators of linear self-orthogonal  $GF(4)$  codes.

In particular, self-dual linear  $GF(4)$  codes correspond to  $M_3$ -states, and the quantum constraint  $A(1, i \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}}) \geq 0$  rules out the existence of extremal codes of the form  $[12m, 6m, 4m + 2]_{GF(4)}$ , solving a long-standing mystery in the theory of classical self-dual coding theory [23, 31–33]. Is there a classical combinatorial interpretation of  $A(1, i \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}})$  that explains why it cannot be negative? It would be of interest to extend these results to place new bounds on type II self-dual binary codes. It would also be interesting to investigate possible applications to modular bootstrap, via [59–63].

To date, no qubit magic state distillation routine is known with threshold exceeding that of the 5-qubit code originally proposed by Bravyi and Kitaev [1]. The connection between magic state distillation and simple weight enumerators facilitates computational searches for codes with better thresholds. We were able to search over all  $M_3$ -codes of size  $n < 20$  using the classification available in [27], and found no code which outperforms the 5-qubit code in terms of threshold. We hope to extend this search to larger codes in the near future. In particular, we were able to construct many weight enumerators with integer coefficients that satisfy all known consistency conditions for codes with size  $n \geq 23$ , that would correspond to magic state distillation routines with very good thresholds. It would be interesting to know whether any code realizing these weight enumerators actually exists.

With regards to strengthening the bounds on noise suppression exponent and distance, there are a few avenues of potential research. In [52], it was shown that complete weight enumerators can provide stronger constraints than simple weight enumerators. Perhaps one can extend the analysis of this paper to obtain stronger bounds on quantum codes via complete weight enumerators. We should also remark that Theorem 5 for the noise-suppression exponent  $\nu$ , was demonstrated only up to a large but finite value of  $n$ . While it almost certainly holds for all  $n$ , it would be satisfying to provide an analytical proof of this, perhaps using methods such as those discussed in [55]. Presumably, there exist other, quantum consistency

conditions which help rule out weight enumerators, besides those we obtained in the context of magic state distillation.

In this paper we consider only distillation routines for the  $|T\rangle$  magic states of [1], which are at present the most mysterious and poorly understood. However, it would be interesting to attempt to use the methods of this paper to study distillation routines for  $|H\rangle$ -type magic states. We also hope to apply invariant theory to constrain magic state distillation routines for qudit magic states, such as the qutrit strange state, which, as shown in [39] are also characterized by the simple weight enumerator of a qutrit error-correcting code with a particular set of transversal gates. Such results would more directly connect with the question of whether contextuality [18, 64, 65] is sufficient for quantum computation.

## Acknowledgments

SP thanks Prof. P.S. Satsangi for inspiration and guidance. Both SP and ARK thank Eric Rains for several helpful comments and suggestions. SP acknowledges the support of MeitY QCAL, Amazon Braket and DST-SERB grant (CRG/2021/009137). SP thanks the International Centre for Theoretical Sciences, Bengaluru for hospitality where part of this work was completed. ARK would like to thank Debbie Leung, Michele Mosca and Graeme Smith for useful discussions. ARK acknowledges NTT research for financial support. Research at Perimeter Institute and IQC is supported by the Government of Canada through Innovation, Science and Economic Development Canada, and by the Province of Ontario through the Ministry of Research, Innovation and Science.

## References

- [1] S. Bravyi and A. Kitaev, “Universal quantum computation with ideal Clifford gates and noisy ancillas,” *Phys. Rev. A* **71** (2005) 022316.
- [2] E. Knill, “Fault-tolerant postselected quantum computation: Schemes,” *arXiv preprint quant-ph/0402171* (2004).
- [3] B. W. Reichardt, “Quantum universality from magic states distillation applied to CSS codes,” *Quantum Information Processing* **4** (2005), no. 3 251–264.
- [4] B. Reichardt, “Quantum universality by state distillation,” *Quantum Information and Computation* **9** (2009) 1030–1052.
- [5] H. Anwar, E. T. Campbell, and D. E. Browne, “Qutrit magic state distillation,” *New J. Phys.* **14** (2012) 063006.
- [6] E. T. Campbell, H. Anwar, and D. E. Browne, “Magic-State Distillation in All Prime Dimensions Using Quantum Reed-Muller Codes,” *Phys. Rev. X* **2** (2012) 041021.

- [7] E. T. Campbell, “Enhanced Fault-Tolerant Quantum Computing in  $d$ -Level Systems,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **113** (2014) 230501.
- [8] S. Bravyi and J. Haah, “Magic-state distillation with low overhead,” *Phys. Rev. A* **86** (2012) 052329.
- [9] M. B. Hastings and J. Haah, “Distillation with Sublogarithmic Overhead,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **120** (2018) 050504.
- [10] J. Haah and M. B. Hastings, “Codes and Protocols for Distilling  $T$ , controlled- $S$ , and Toffoli Gates,” *Quantum* **2** (2018) 71.
- [11] S. Prakash, “Magic state distillation with the ternary Golay code,” *Proc. R. Soc. A* **476** (2020) 20200187, 2003.02717.
- [12] S. Prakash and T. Saha, “Low Overhead Qutrit Magic State Distillation,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.06228* (2024).
- [13] Q. T. Nguyen and C. A. Pattison, “Quantum fault tolerance with constant-space and logarithmic-time overheads,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2411.03632* (2024).
- [14] A. Wills, M.-H. Hsieh, and H. Yamasaki, “Constant-overhead magic state distillation,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2408.07764* (2024).
- [15] L. Golowich and V. Guruswami, “Asymptotically good quantum codes with transversal non-clifford gates,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2408.09254* (2024).
- [16] S. Tamiya, M. Koashi, and H. Yamasaki, “Polylog-time-and constant-space-overhead fault-tolerant quantum computation with quantum low-density parity-check codes,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2411.03683* (2024).
- [17] S. Aaronson and D. Gottesman, “Improved simulation of stabilizer circuits,” *Phys. Rev. A* **70** (2004), no. 5 052328.
- [18] M. Howard, J. Wallman, V. Veitch, and J. Emerson, “Contextuality supplies the ‘magic’ for quantum computation,” *Nature* **510** (2014), no. 7505 351–355.
- [19] N. Delfosse, C. Okay, J. Bermejo-Vega, D. E. Browne, and R. Raussendorf, “Equivalence between contextuality and negativity of the Wigner function for qudits,” *New J. Phys.* **19** (2017) 123024.
- [20] R. Raussendorf, D. E. Browne, N. Delfosse, C. Okay, and J. Bermejo-Vega, “Contextuality and Wigner-function negativity in qubit quantum computation,” *Phys. Rev. A* **95** (2017) 052334.
- [21] P. Lillystone, J. J. Wallman, and J. Emerson, “Contextuality and the Single-Qubit Stabilizer Subtheory,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **122** (2019) 140405.

- [22] P. Rall, “Signed quantum weight enumerators characterize qubit magic state distillation,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:1702.06990* (2017).
- [23] F. J. MacWilliams, A. M. Odlyzko, N. J. Sloane, and H. N. Ward, “Self-dual codes over GF (4),” *Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series A* **25** (1978), no. 3 288–318.
- [24] J. Conway, V. Pless, and N. Sloane, “Self-dual codes over GF(3) and GF(4) of length not exceeding 16,” *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory* **25** (1979), no. 3 312–322.
- [25] M. Harada, C. Lam, A. Munemasa, and V. D. Tonchev, “Classification of generalized Hadamard matrices H (6, 3) and quaternary Hermitian self-dual codes of length 18,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:1007.2555* (2010).
- [26] M. Harada and A. Munemasa, “Classification of quaternary Hermitian self-dual codes of length 20,” *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory* **57** (2011), no. 6 3758–3762.
- [27] M. Harada and A. Munemasa, “Database of self-dual codes.” <http://www.math.is.tohoku.ac.jp/~munemasa/selfdualcodes.htm>, 2024. Accessed: 2024-12-30.
- [28] C. Mallows, A. Odlyzko, and N. Sloane, “Upper bounds for modular forms, lattices, and codes,” *J. Algebra* **36** (1975), no. 1 68–76.
- [29] E. M. Rains and N. J. Sloane, “Self-dual codes,” *arXiv preprint math/0208001* (2002).
- [30] E. Rains, “Shadow bounds for self-dual codes,” *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory* **44** (1998), no. 1 134–139.
- [31] C. W. H. Lam and V. Pless, “There is no (24, 12, 10) self-dual quaternary code,” *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory* **36** (1990), no. 5 1153–1156.
- [32] W. C. Huffman, “On extremal self-dual quaternary codes of lengths 18 to 28. I,” *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory* **36** (1990), no. 3 651–660.
- [33] W. C. Huffman, “On extremal self-dual quaternary codes of lengths 18 to 28. II,” *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory* **37** (1991), no. 4 1206–1216.
- [34] G. Nebe, E. M. Rains, and N. J. A. Sloane, *Self-Dual Codes and Invariant Theory (Algorithms and Computation in Mathematics)*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2006.
- [35] P. Shor and R. Laflamme, “Quantum analog of the MacWilliams identities for classical coding theory,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **78** (1997), no. 8 1600.
- [36] E. M. Rains, “Quantum weight enumerators,” *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory* **44** (1998), no. 4 1388–1394.
- [37] E. M. Rains, “Quantum shadow enumerators,” *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory* **45** (1999), no. 7 2361–2366.

- [38] E. M. Rains, “Polynomial invariants of quantum codes,” *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory* **46** (2000), no. 1 54–59, [quant-ph/9704042](#).
- [39] S. Prakash and R. Singhal, “A Search for High-Threshold Qutrit Magic State Distillation Routines,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2408.00436* (2024).
- [40] W. van Dam and M. Howard, “Noise thresholds for higher-dimensional systems using the discrete Wigner function,” *Phys. Rev. A* **83** (2011) 032310.
- [41] V. Veitch, S. H. Mousavian, D. Gottesman, and J. Emerson, “The resource theory of stabilizer quantum computation,” *New J. Phys.* **16** (2014), no. 1 013009.
- [42] A. Jain and S. Prakash, “Qutrit and ququint magic states,” *Phys. Rev. A* **102** (2020) 042409.
- [43] A. R. Calderbank, E. M. Rains, P. M. Shor, and N. J. Sloane, “Quantum error correction via codes over GF (4),” *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory* **44** (1998), no. 4 1369–1387.
- [44] P. Rall, “Fractal Properties of Magic State Distillation,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:1708.09256* (2017) 1708.09256.
- [45] E. T. Campbell and D. E. Browne, “Bound states for magic state distillation in fault-tolerant quantum computation,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **104** (2010), no. 3 030503.
- [46] S. Prakash and A. Gupta, “Contextual bound states for qudit magic state distillation,” *Phys. Rev. A* **101** (2020) 010303.
- [47] W. Bosma, J. Cannon, and C. Playoust, “The Magma Algebra System I: The User Language,” *J. Symb. Comput.* **24** (1997), no. 3 235–265.
- [48] N. J. Sloane, “Error-correcting codes and invariant theory: new applications of a nineteenth-century technique,” *Am. Math. Mon* **84** (1977), no. 2 82–107.
- [49] A. M. Gleason, “Weight polynomial of self-dual codes and the MacWilliams identities,” in *Actes Congres International des Mathematiciens*, vol. 3, pp. 211–215, Gauthier-Villards, 1971.
- [50] F. MacWilliams, C. Mallows, and N. Sloane, “Generalizations of Gleason’s theorem on weight enumerators of self-dual codes,” *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory* **18** (1972), no. 6 794–805.
- [51] C. L. Mallows and N. J. Sloane, “Weight enumerators of self-orthogonal codes,” *Discrete Mathematics* **9** (1974), no. 4 391–400.
- [52] C. Mallows and N. Sloane, “Weight enumerators of self-orthogonal codes over  $GF(3)$ ,” *SIAM Journal on Algebraic Discrete Methods* **2** (1981), no. 4 452–460.
- [53] C. Mallows and N. Sloane, “An upper bound for self-dual codes,” *Information and Control* **22** (1973), no. 2 188–200.

- [54] J. H. Conway and N. J. Sloane, “A new upper bound on the minimal distance of self-dual codes,” *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory* **36** (1990), no. 6 1319–1333.
- [55] E. M. Rains, “New asymptotic bounds for self-dual codes and lattices,” *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory* **49** (2003), no. 5 1261–1274.
- [56] F. Pastawski, B. Yoshida, D. Harlow, and J. Preskill, “Holographic quantum error-correcting codes: Toy models for the bulk/boundary correspondence,” *J. High Energy Phys.* **2015** (2015), no. 6 1–55.
- [57] N. Semakov, V. A. Zinov’ev, and G. Zaitsev, “Uniformly packed codes,” *Problemy Peredachi Informatsii* **7** (1971), no. 1 38–50.
- [58] J. M. Goethals and H. C. A. V. Tilborg, “Uniformly packed codes,” *In Philips Research Reports* *30.1* (1975).
- [59] A. Dymarsky and A. Shapere, “Solutions of modular bootstrap constraints from quantum codes,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **126** (2021), no. 16 161602.
- [60] A. Dymarsky and A. Shapere, “Quantum stabilizer codes, lattices, and CFTs,” *J. High Energy Phys.* **2021** (2021), no. 3 1–84.
- [61] A. Dymarsky and R. R. Kalloor, “Fake Z,” *J. High Energy Phys.* **2023** (2023), no. 6 1–29.
- [62] N. Angelinos, D. Chakraborty, and A. Dymarsky, “Optimal Narain CFTs from codes,” *J. High Energy Phys.* **2022** (2022), no. 11 1–22.
- [63] Y. F. Alam, K. Kawabata, T. Nishioka, T. Okuda, and S. Yahagi, “Narain CFTs from nonbinary stabilizer codes,” *J. High Energy Phys.* **2023** (2023), no. 12 1–38.
- [64] D. P. Srivastava, V. Sahni, and P. S. Satsangi, “Modelling microtubules in the brain as n-qudit quantum Hopfield network and beyond,” *Int. J. Gen. Syst.* **45** (2016), no. 1 41–54.
- [65] D. P. Srivastava, V. Sahni, and P. S. Satsangi, “From n-qubit multi-particle quantum teleportation modelling to n-qudit contextuality based quantum teleportation and beyond,” *Int. J. Gen. Syst.* **46** (2017), no. 4 414–435.