

Quantum computation in correlation space and extremal entanglement

J.-M. Cai^{1,2}, W. Dür^{1,2}, M. Van den Nest³, A. Miyake^{1,2,4}, and H. J. Briegel^{1,2}

¹*Institut für Quantenoptik und Quanteninformation der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Innsbruck, Austria*

²*Institut für Theoretische Physik, Universität Innsbruck, Technikerstraße 25, A-6020 Innsbruck, Austria*

³*Max-Planck-Institut für Quantenoptik, Hans-Kopfermann-Str. 1, D-85748 Garching, Germany*

⁴*Perimeter Institute for Theoretical Physics, 31 Caroline St. N., Waterloo ON, N2L 2Y5, Canada*

Recently, a framework was established to systematically construct novel universal resource states for measurement-based quantum computation using techniques involving finitely correlated states. With these methods, universal states were found which are in certain ways much less entangled than the original cluster state model, and it was hence believed that with this approach many of the extremal entanglement features of the cluster states could be relaxed. The new resources were constructed as “computationally universal” states—i.e. they allow one to efficiently reproduce the classical output of each quantum computation—whereas the cluster states are universal in a stronger sense since they are “universal state preparators”. Here we show that the new resources are universal state preparators after all, and must therefore exhibit a whole class of extremal entanglement features, similar to the cluster states.

Introduction.— The paradigm of the one-way quantum computer [1] established that there exist certain states of large scale quantum systems—the cluster states [2]—with the remarkable feature that universal quantum computation can be achieved by merely performing single-qubit measurements on these states. This new computational model has opened a novel approach towards the possible experimental realization of quantum computation, but also provides a different perspective to study fundamental questions regarding the power and limitations of quantum computation [3]. The properties of the cluster-state scheme have been intensively studied, and it was found that these states exhibit several rather singular features: e.g., they are highly entangled [2, 3, 4, 5], have vanishing two-point correlation functions [4] and cannot occur as non-degenerate ground states of two-local spin-1/2 Hamiltonians [6]. These properties are sometimes viewed as a drawback of the scheme, since they indicate that it may be not be easy to find cluster states as states of naturally occurring physical systems. This has raised the question whether there might exist other universal resource states for which some of these extremal features could be relaxed and which are easier to prepare experimentally (see also [7, 8, 9]). More fundamentally, this connects to the important problem of understanding which requirements must be met by every universal resource state.

Recently [10, 11, 12], a framework was proposed to construct novel universal resource states. The approach, sometimes called “quantum computation in correlation space” (\mathcal{QC}_{cs}), uses techniques known from the study of finitely correlated states [13] and projected-entangled-pairs states [14, 15]. Interestingly, with this approach universal states have been constructed in which several of the above extremal features are indeed no longer present. For example, universal states have been found which are locally arbitrarily pure and which have non-zero two-point correlations [10, 11].

These results raised the impression that the \mathcal{QC}_{cs} universal states are fundamentally different from the cluster states, and that extremal entanglement features are generally not necessary to achieve universality. The aim of this construction was to obtain states that are universal in a strictly weaker sense than the cluster states. Upon closer inspection [5] one finds that the cluster states are “universal state preparators”: they allow to (efficiently) reproduce the *quantum output* of every quantum computation. The \mathcal{QC}_{cs} universal states, instead, are “computationally universal”: with the help of such a universal state, it is possible to efficiently reproduce the *classical output* of every quantum computation. As shown in [5], every universal state preparator must exhibit a whole class of extremal entanglement features. Whether or not the universal \mathcal{QC}_{cs} states are universal state preparators as well, was initially unclear. It seemed as if, the stringent entanglement criteria for universal state preparators did not apply to the \mathcal{QC}_{cs} universal states.

As the main result of this letter, we show that, under rather general conditions, \mathcal{QC}_{cs} universal states are universal state preparators after all—and therefore have to meet all extremal entanglement requirements for universal state preparators as derived in [5]. Our results apply in particular to the general construction of universal \mathcal{QC}_{cs} resources presented in [12].

Quantum computation in correlation space.— \mathcal{QC}_{cs} has been introduced as a scheme for measurement-based quantum computation that enables one to systematically construct universal resource states [10, 11, 12]. A resource state for \mathcal{QC}_{cs} is described by a computational tensor network or, equivalently, by a projected-entangled-pairs state or valence bond state [14, 15] with certain boundary conditions (see Fig. 1). Quantum information is processed in a virtual system, the “correlation space”, that consists of entangled pairs of D -dimensional systems arranged on a lattice. Each physical particle is associated with t of these virtual systems by means

of a projection (or tensor), mapping the D^t -dimensional “virtual” space to the d -dimensional “physical” space. It can be shown that single-qubit projective measurements on the physical particles induce operations in the virtual system, and, for properly chosen resource states, in this way every quantum state $|\psi_{\text{out}}\rangle = U|0\rangle^{\otimes n}$ (where U is any poly-size unitary operation) can be (efficiently) prepared in the virtual system. Furthermore, the quantum information stored within the correlation system can be read out by local projective measurements on the physical sites as well. Hence, it is possible to efficiently reproduce the measurement statistics of every quantum computation, even though the output state $|\psi_{\text{out}}\rangle$ is never prepared in the physical Hilbert space but rather in the abstract correlation space. Therefore, the \mathcal{QC}_{cs} resource states are naturally computationally universal, but at first sight do not appear to be universal state preparators. Here, however, we provide an explicit protocol to prepare $|\psi_{\text{out}}\rangle$ in the physical Hilbert space for a large class of \mathcal{QC}_{cs} universal states. Following [5], we thereby consider the slightly more general class of local measurements, including positive operator-valued measures (POVM), and classical communications, and show that these resources are universal state preparators after all.

General universal \mathcal{QC}_{cs} resources can be constructed by connecting 1D quantum computational “wires”, which are matrix product states that allow processing of one logical qubit, into universal 2D quantum “webs” [12]. Here, we will follow a similar line of argument as in [12], by first considering the 1D quantum wires and then 2D webs. We will show that quantum information stored in the correlation system can be localized at physical sites by a simple procedure. To simplify the discussion, we will consider $D = d = 2$ in the following; however, our results are not restricted to this case.




Figure 1: (Color online) \mathcal{QC}_{cs} in a 1D wire, where the single-qubit output state $|\psi\rangle$ is localized at the physical site $k+1$. (i) Local measurements (blue arrows) on the physical sites 1 to k implement the desired unitary rotation U on the correlation system, the output quantum state $|\psi\rangle$ is in the red virtual qubit. (ii) Local measurements (brown arrows) on the physical sites $k+2$ to k' implement a specific unitary transformation $V = |+\rangle\langle\varphi_0| + |-\rangle\langle\varphi_1|$, and a measurement in the basis $|m_0\rangle, |m_1\rangle$ at site $k'+1$ allows one to localize the quantum information at site $k+1$.

Quantum computation on 1D resources.— We start from 1D quantum wires described by matrix prod-

uct states (MPS) [10, 11]

$$\Phi(|L\rangle)_1^N = \sum_{s_i=0,1} \langle R|A[s_n]\cdots A[s_1]|L\rangle |s_1\cdots s_n\rangle \quad (1)$$

where 1 and N denote the starting and ending site, $|L\rangle$ and $|R\rangle$ represent left and right boundary conditions, and we assume in the following that $|R\rangle$ is fixed. The matrices $A[s_j]$ are determined by the projections from the virtual system to the physical system, see Fig. 1.

The state $\Phi(|L\rangle)_1^N$ is called a universal quantum wire if, by performing suitable single-qubit measurements on, say, the first k sites, it is possible to efficiently prepare $\Phi(|\psi\rangle)_{k+1}^N$ (cf. Eq. (1)) on the unmeasured qubits, for every one-qubit state $|\psi\rangle$. We will show that, for each universal quantum wire, it is possible to post-process the state $\Phi(|\psi\rangle)_{k+1}^N$ by local measurements, in such a way that the state $|\psi\rangle$ is efficiently prepared, i.e. localized, in one of the physical sites of the chain.

In order to demonstrate our basic idea, we first consider a simple instance of a universal quantum wire, which nevertheless covers many of the resources in [10, 11]: we assume that there exists a local basis $\{|m_s\rangle\}$ such that

$$A[m_0] = |\varphi_0\rangle\langle 0|, \quad A[m_1] = |\varphi_1\rangle\langle 1| \quad (2)$$

where $A[m_s] = \langle m_s|0\rangle A[0] + \langle m_s|1\rangle A[1]$ with $\langle\varphi_i|\varphi_j\rangle = \delta_{ij}$. For such a state, by performing local measurements on the first k physical sites, one can indeed efficiently prepare $\Phi(|\psi\rangle)_{k+1}^N$, for every $|\psi\rangle = \lambda_0|0\rangle + \lambda_1|1\rangle$ [10, 11]. The output quantum state $|\psi\rangle$ is associated with the virtual qubit corresponding to the physical site $k+1$ (i.e. the red virtual qubit in Fig.1). Our goal is now to “localize” the state $|\psi\rangle$ in one of the physical sites by performing further measurements. This will proceed in two steps.

(i) We rewrite the state $\Phi(|\psi\rangle)_{k+1}^N$ in terms of the basis $\{|m_s\rangle\}$ at site $k+1$:

$$\Phi(|\psi\rangle)_{k+1}^N = \sum_{s=0,1} \lambda_s |m_s\rangle_{k+1} \Phi(|\varphi_s\rangle)_{k+2}^N \quad (3)$$

Although this state can already be viewed as an encoded version of the output state $|\psi\rangle$ with the block encoding $|s_L\rangle \equiv |m_s\rangle_{k+1} \Phi(|\varphi_s\rangle)_{k+2}^N$, the quantum output is carried by all the unmeasured physical sites.

(ii) By performing suitable local measurements on the physical sites from $k+2$ to, say, k' (see Fig. 1) one can implement the unitary single qubit rotation V which maps $|\varphi_0\rangle \rightarrow |+\rangle$ and $|\varphi_1\rangle \rightarrow |-\rangle$, where $|\pm\rangle$ denote the Pauli X eigenstates. This is possible by the very assumption that the MPS defined by $\{A[0], A[1]\}$ is a universal computational wire—i.e. the two states $\Phi(|\varphi_s\rangle)_{k+2}^N$ can further be used to implement arbitrary single-qubit rotations in the correlation space, where in fact the required measurement pattern is the same in both cases. In this

way, the state (3) is mapped to

$$\lambda_0 |m_0\rangle_{k+1} \Phi(|+\rangle)_{k'+1}^N + \lambda_1 |m_1\rangle_{k+1} \Phi(|-\rangle)_{k'+1}^N. \quad (4)$$

Expanding site $k'+1$ in the basis $\{|m_s\rangle\}$, it can be readily shown that the resulting state is equal to

$$\sum_{s=0,1} Z_m^s |\psi_m\rangle_{k+1} |m_s\rangle_{k'+1} \Phi(|\varphi_s\rangle)_{k'+2}^N, \quad (5)$$

where $|\psi_m\rangle = \lambda_0 |m_0\rangle + \lambda_1 |m_1\rangle$ and $Z_m = |m_0\rangle\langle m_0| - |m_1\rangle\langle m_1|$. By measuring the physical site $k'+1$ in the basis $\{|m_s\rangle\}$, we obtain the (encoded) output quantum state $|\psi_m\rangle$ at site $k+1$, with possible local Pauli correction Z_m , which is now decoupled from the remaining wire. That is, the desired output quantum state is generated at the physical site $k+1$ in the basis $\{|m_0\rangle, |m_1\rangle\}$.

We now turn to the general universal 1D computational wires as considered in [12]. These are MPS having the canonical form $A[0] \propto W$ and $A[1] \propto W \text{diag}(e^{-i\alpha}, e^{i\alpha})$, for some $W \in SU(2)$. For such MPS, there always exists a basis $\{|m_s\rangle\}$ such that

$$A[m_0] = r_0 |\varphi_0\rangle\langle 0|, \quad A[m_1] = r_1 |\varphi_0\rangle\langle 0| + |\varphi_1\rangle\langle 1| \quad (6)$$

where $r_0 > 0$, $r_1 \geq 0$, and $r_0^2 + r_1^2 = 1$ (in fact, these canonical forms are equivalent). Since we have a universal computational wire, we can generate the desired output state $|\psi\rangle$ in the correlation system by suitable local measurements on, say, the first k sites, see Fig. 2. The remaining chain is in the state $\Phi(|\psi\rangle)_{k+1}^N$.

(i) We can now rewrite

$$\Phi(|\psi\rangle)_{k+1}^N = \sum_{s=0,1} \lambda_s |m'_s\rangle_{k+1} \Phi(|\varphi_s\rangle)_{k+2}^N \quad (7)$$

where $|m'_0\rangle = r_0 |m_0\rangle + r_1 |m_1\rangle$ and $|m'_1\rangle = |m_1\rangle$. This situation is very similar as before (Eq. (3)); however, we have to deal with non-orthogonal states as $\langle m'_0 | m'_1 \rangle = r_1$. Let us now define a filter operation described by a local two-outcome generalized measurement $\{\mathcal{F}, \bar{\mathcal{F}}\}$ with

$$\mathcal{F} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{1+r_1}} (|m_0\rangle\langle m_0| + r_0 |m_1\rangle\langle m_1| - r_1 |m_1\rangle\langle m_0|) \quad (8)$$

$$\bar{\mathcal{F}} = \sqrt{\frac{2r_1}{1+r_1}} |\chi\rangle\langle \chi|, \quad (9)$$

where $|\chi\rangle = \sqrt{(1-r_1)/2} |m_0\rangle + \sqrt{(1+r_1)/2} |m_1\rangle$ [16]. Note that $\bar{\mathcal{F}}$ has rank one. We now apply the filter operation to site $k+1$. If the filter operation is successful, the mapping $|m'_s\rangle \rightarrow \sqrt{1-r_1} |m_s\rangle$ is accomplished (note that $1-r_1$ is the success probability). That is, the basis states at site $k+1$ become orthogonal and the resulting overall state of the chain is described by Eq. (3). In case the filter operation is not successful, the mapping $|m'_s\rangle \rightarrow \sqrt{r_1} |\chi\rangle$ is obtained, i.e. the measured site is factored out. In this case, one uses part of the remaining wire to implement the unitary operation $|\varphi_s\rangle \rightarrow |s\rangle$ in the correlation system. The state of the remaining wire

is then again described by $\Phi(|\psi\rangle)_{k+1}^N$, and we can repeat (i) until we succeed. The success probability after l trials is given by $p = 1 - r_1^l$. For any $\epsilon > 0$, one can achieve $p \geq 1 - \epsilon$ with l scaling efficiently as $\log \frac{1}{\epsilon}$. Below we will see that l is in fact related to the correlation length of the resource state.

(ii) Without further touching site $k+1$, we use the remaining wire (starting from $k+2$ to, say, site k') to implement the unitary operation $|\varphi_0\rangle \rightarrow |+\rangle, |\varphi_1\rangle \rightarrow |-\rangle$. After rewriting the state at site $k'+1$ similarly as before, we obtain

$$\sum_{s=0,1} Z_m^s |\psi_m\rangle_{k+1} |m'_s\rangle_{k'+1} \Phi(|\varphi_s\rangle)_{k'+2}^N, \quad (10)$$

(iii) Again, the filter operation $\{\mathcal{F}, \bar{\mathcal{F}}\}$ applied at site $k'+1$ allows one to obtain orthogonal states $|m_s\rangle$, which can subsequently be distinguished, leading in both cases to the state $|\psi_m\rangle$ localized at site $k+1$ (up to a Pauli correction). If the filter operation does not succeed, site $k'+1$ is mapped to the state $|\chi\rangle$ and hence factored out. One may now use again part of the remaining wire to implement the unitary operation $|\varphi_s\rangle \rightarrow |s\rangle$ in the correlation system. The state of the remaining wire is then again described by Eq. (10), and we can repeat (iii) until we succeed. The success probability after l trials is again given by $1 - r_1^l$, and we have thus shown that one can indeed efficiently localize the quantum information at a physical site. [17]




Figure 2: (Color online) Generation of arbitrary single-qubit output states from general quantum wires by Eq. (6). (i) Local measurements (blue arrows) on the physical sites 1 to k_1 generate the output quantum state $|\psi\rangle$ in the red virtual qubit at site k_1+1 . (ii) A filter measurement $\mathcal{F}, \bar{\mathcal{F}}$ is applied at site k_1+1 . When not successful, local measurements (brown arrows) on the physical sites k_1+2 to k_2 implement a unitary transformation $V' = |0\rangle\langle\varphi_0| + |1\rangle\langle\varphi_1|$ on the correlation system, and (ii) is repeated until the filtering operation is successful. (iii) The unitary operation $V = |+\rangle\langle\varphi_0| + |-\rangle\langle\varphi_1|$ is implemented by measuring physical sites k_1+2 to k' . (iv) The filter operation $\mathcal{F}, \bar{\mathcal{F}}$ is now applied at site k'_1+1 . When not successful, local measurements (brown arrows) on the physical sites k'_1+2 to k'_2 implement the unitary operation V' , and (iv) is repeated until the filtering operation is successful. A final measurement at site k'_1+1 in the basis $|m_0\rangle, |m_1\rangle$ allows one to localize the quantum information at site k_l+1 .

Quantum computation with 2D resources.— We now turn to 2D resource states (computational webs) which are constructed by coupling quantum wires vertically as in [12]. Each logical qubit is associated with

a particular (horizontal) wire, and the computation proceeds by measuring sites from left to right, similar to the one-way quantum computer. In a universal computational web, it is possible to efficiently generate every M -qubit state $|\psi\rangle = U|0\rangle^{\otimes M}$ resulting from a poly-size quantum circuit U , in the correlation system. Using the results established here for the 1D wires, we now argue that it is always possible to further process the system such that the state $|\psi\rangle$ is (efficiently) prepared on a subset of the *physical* sites. To do so, we again make use of the fact that the remaining computational web is still universal. In fact, all we need is that arbitrary single qubit rotations in the correlation system can be achieved by processing individual wires. This allows us to localize each qubit of $|\psi\rangle$ to a physical site by applying precisely the same procedure as discussed in the 1D case to each wire independently. In order to do so, we make use of the fact that the each wire carrying a logical qubit can be decoupled from the remaining system [12]. In short, this shows that every universal computational web state [12] is a universal state preparator as well.

Extensions.— Although our protocols focus on the qubit resources of quantum computational webs [12], extensions to more general resources—including all examples presented in [10, 11]—are possible. Consider e.g. 1D universal wires with $d \geq 2$ which satisfy the following natural condition: there exists a basis $\{|e_0\rangle, \dots, |e_{d-1}\rangle\}$ associated with each physical site such that the corresponding operators $\{A[e_0], \dots, A[e_{d-1}]\}$ are unitary up to certain constant. Moreover, at least two operators $A[e_i]$ and $A[e_j]$ are different in the sense that $A^\dagger[e_i]A[e_j] \neq cI$, where c is a constant. In this case one can also localize quantum information to physical sites efficiently, i.e. the corresponding \mathcal{QC}_{cs} resources are in fact universal state preparators. The only additional operation is the local POVM $P = |m_0\rangle\langle m_0| + |m_1\rangle\langle m_1|$, to cast the physical site into the encoding subspace. An example of such a resource is the AKLT state [8, 11]. One can also extend the current protocol to prepare encoded physical states from the resources for encoded quantum computation in correlation space, where one logical qubit is encoded into several correlation systems, e.g. the modified toric code states [11]. The common feature in these arguments seems to be that the very properties which must be present in a \mathcal{QC}_{cs} in order to make the preparation of arbitrary states in the *correlation* system possible, also make it possible to execute a post-processing protocol to eventually prepare output states in the *physical* Hilbert space.

Entanglement criteria.— Based on the above protocols, one can conclude that many of the \mathcal{QC}_{cs} universal states, in particular all examples presented in [10, 11, 12], have the same quantum information processing power as the universal resources in the one-way model. That is, they allow one to efficiently reproduce the *quantum* output of each quantum computation by only local op-

erations, i.e., they are universal state preparators. As a consequence, the entanglement-based criteria for (efficient quasi-deterministic) universal state preparators are fully applicable [5]. This imposes—contrary to what was originally believed—rather severe entanglement requirements on the universal \mathcal{QC}_{cs} states. For example, the \mathcal{QC}_{cs} universal resource states in Refs. [10, 11, 12] must contain a high degree of entanglement in terms of either Schmidt-rank width, geometric measure or Schmidt measure. All of these must all scale faster than logarithmically with the system size—even though e.g. the local entropy per site may be arbitrarily small and the two-point correlations may be non-vanishing. Notice that in cases where output states are generated in an encoded form—as e.g. in the example of “W-encoding” in [10]—, the entanglement criteria for encoded universal state preparators [5] need to be applied.

Role of correlation length.— We have seen that for general 1D wires given by (6), a probabilistic element—associated with the POVM $\{\mathcal{F}, \bar{\mathcal{F}}\}$ —enters in the protocol to prepare the output state $|\psi\rangle$ in one of the physical sites. Next we illustrate that this additional computational cost is related to the nonzero correlation length ξ of the resource state; the latter describes qualitatively how far two distant physical sites still affect each other. For nonzero correlation length, we have to “concentrate” information which has been distributed roughly over a distance ξ during the computation.

As an example, consider an MPS resource with matrices $A[0] = \cos\theta H$ and $A[1] = \sin\theta HZ$ where H is the Hadamard gate and $\theta \in (0, \frac{\pi}{4}]$; equivalently, there exists a basis $\{|m_0\rangle, |m_1\rangle\}$ such that $A[m_0] = \sin 2\theta|+\rangle\langle 0|$, $A[m_1] = \cos 2\theta|+\rangle\langle 0| + |-\rangle\langle 1|$. Thus, this resource falls into the more general class of Eq. (6), with $r_1 = \cos 2\theta$. Note that the 1D cluster state is obtained for $\theta = \pi/4$. Following [13, 15], we find that the correlation length satisfies $e^{-1/\xi} = \sqrt{\cos 2\theta} = \sqrt{r_1}$. The success probability to localize the output quantum state after l trials is $1 - r_1^l$. In order to retain the state preparation quasi-deterministic within the success probability $1 - \epsilon$, it is required that $l \geq \frac{1}{2} \log(\frac{1}{\epsilon}) \xi$. In other words, we have to keep the number l of trials in proportion to the correlation length ξ (with a logarithmic factor dependent on ϵ), in order to cover distributed output information and to convert it into a single physical site arbitrarily faithfully.

Conclusions.— The broader context of this investigation is to understand which features make a quantum computer more powerful than a classical device. In the context of measurement based quantum computation, this means to understand the features of universal states that are necessary to guarantee their universality. Interestingly, the \mathcal{QC}_{cs} method showed that features such as vanishing two-point correlations and a high degree of local entanglement are *not* necessary [10, 11, 12]. However, the current results show that in many cases this method cannot circumvent the stringent entanglement

requirements from [5]: we have shown that, under rather general conditions, \mathcal{QC}_{cs} universal resources are universal state preparators, and hence must fulfill all entanglement requirements as derived in [5].

The results presented here cover the standard scenario of resources where quantum information is processed in a 2D grid and individual horizontal wires carry one logical qubit. It remains unclear whether there exist computationally universal resources where such a wire structure is no longer present but where each logical qubit is highly de-localized, and if so, whether our constructions can be extended to such a setting. More generally, it would be interesting to understand whether resources for measurement-based quantum computation exist that are computationally universal, but do not allow to prepare the corresponding (encoded) quantum output state, i.e. are not (encoded) universal state preparators. Also the role of general local measurements as opposed to projective measurements needs to be further investigated.

We acknowledge support from the FWF (J.-M. C. through the Lise Meitner Program) and the European Union (QICS, SCALA). The research at the Perimeter Institute is supported by the Government of Canada through Industry Canada and by Ontario-MRI. MVDN acknowledges the excellence cluster MAP.

-
- [2] H. J. Briegel and R. Raussendorf, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **86**, 910–913 (2001).
 - [3] H.J. Briegel et al., *Nature Physics* **51**, 19-26 (2009).
 - [4] M. Hein et al., In *Proceedings of the International School of Physics “Enrico Fermi” on “Quantum Computers, Algorithms and Chaos”* (2005); arXiv:quant-ph/0602096.
 - [5] M. Van den Nest et al., *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **97**, 150504 (2006); M. Van den Nest et al., *New J. Phys.* **9**, 204 (2007); C. E. Mora et al., arXiv: 0904.3641.
 - [6] M. A. Nielsen, quant-ph/0504097; M. Van den Nest et al., *Phys. Rev. A* **77**, 012301 (2008).
 - [7] S. D. Bartlett and T. Rudolph, *Phys. Rev. A* **74**, 040302(R) (2006).
 - [8] G. K. Brennen, A. Miyake, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **101**, 010502 (2008).
 - [9] X. Chen, B. Zeng, Z.-C. Gu, B. Yoshida, I. L. Chuang, arXiv:0812.4067.
 - [10] D. Gross and J. Eisert, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **98**, 220503 (2007).
 - [11] D. Gross et al., *Phys. Rev. A* **76**, 052315 (2007).
 - [12] D. Gross and J. Eisert, arXiv:0810.2542.
 - [13] M. Fannes, B. Nachtergaele, and R. F. Werner, *Comm. Math. Phys.* **144**, 443–490 (1992).
 - [14] F. Verstraete and J. I. Cirac, *Phys. Rev. A* **70**, 060302 (2004).
 - [15] D. Perez-Garcia, F. Verstraete, M. M. Wolf, and J.I. Cirac, *Quant. Inf. Comp.* **7**, 401 (2007).
 - [16] W. Dür, C. Simon, and J. I. Cirac, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **89**, 210402 (2002).
 - [17] We note that byproduct operators that occur in the \mathcal{QC}_{cs} scheme do not affect our protocol.

[1] R. Raussendorf and H. J. Briegel, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **86**, 5188–5191 (2001).