

# The Not-So-Secret Fourth Parameter of Quantum Codes\*

Eric Kubischta<sup>†</sup> and Ian Teixeira<sup>‡</sup>

Joint Center for Quantum Information and Computer Science,  
NIST/University of Maryland, College Park, Maryland 20742 USA

A quantum code is usually referred to using three parameters: the number of physical qubits  $n$ , the dimension of the codespace  $K$ , and the distance of the code  $d$ . But these three parameters are not the only invariants of a quantum code under code equivalence - there is also a “not-so-secret fourth parameter”  $G$ , the transversal group, which is of fundamental importance for fault tolerance.

It was shown in a recent paper of Omanakuttan and Gross that in certain cases the Dicke state mapping from spin codes to multiqubit codes preserves distance and logical gates. We prove this result in general, and use it to construct three families of non-additive codes that strictly outperform stabilizer codes with regards to the “new” parameter  $G$ . Our first family implements transversal gates which are impossible for any stabilizer code. Our second family has smaller length  $n$  than any stabilizer code with the same distance  $d$  and transversal group  $G$ . And our third family implements the famous  $T$  gate transversally for larger distance  $d$  and shorter length  $n$  than any known stabilizer codes.

## INTRODUCTION

A quantum code is usually referred to using three parameters: the number of physical qubits  $n$ , the dimension of the codespace  $K$ , and the distance of the code  $d$ . Stabilizer codes are denoted  $[[n, k, d]]$ , where  $K = 2^k$  is the dimension of the codespace. More generally, non-stabilizer quantum codes, usually called non-additive codes, are denoted  $((n, K, d))$ .

In terms of these three parameters, there is not much to gain by studying non-additive codes. For example, it is shown in [1, 2] that the distance  $d$ , relative to fixed  $n$  and  $K$ , can only increase by at most 1 when using non-additive codes over stabilizer codes. Slight improvements in  $K$ , relative to fixed  $n$  and  $d$ , are also possible [3] (stemming from the fact that  $K$  need not be a power of 2 for non-additive codes).

The limited nature of these improvements has mostly relegated non-additive codes to a subsidiary position. But these three parameters are not the only invariants of a quantum code. Although transversal gates are conjugated via non-entangling gates, the group they form  $G$  is a code invariant. This fact isn’t completely unknown - hence our title - but rarely (if ever) are codes optimized with respect to  $G$ . This is largely because very few techniques exist that can build codes with a specific transversal group  $G$ .

This brings us to the major technique of our paper - the *Dicke bootstrap* (Theorem 1 below). It was noticed in [4] that the spin codes constructed in [5] could be mapped to permutationally invariant multiqubit codes with similar error correction and transversality properties. We proved this idea rigorously for small distances in [6] and we extend it below to all distances. In particular, the Dicke bootstrap transforms a spin code with logical gate group  $G$  and spin distance  $d$  into a multiqubit code with transversal group  $G$  and distance  $d$ . See Fig. 1.

Thus instead of searching for multiqubit codes, we can




FIG. 1: Illustration of the Dicke bootstrap  $\mathcal{D}$  that transfers  $G$ -covariant spin codes to  $G$ -transversal permutationally invariant multiqubit codes with the same distance  $d$ .

search for spin codes. Spin codes are easier to work with for two main reasons: (1) they live within a single irrep of  $SU(2)$  instead of the tensor product of irreps which means symmetries are easier to keep track of, and (2) spin codes live in an exponentially smaller Hilbert space than multiqubit codes - they populate only a tiny  $n + 1$  dimensional corner of the full  $2^n$  dimensional space.

We construct new families of spin codes by studying the relationship between symmetry and the Knill-Laflamme (KL) error conditions. It is illustrative to focus on the case when the symmetry is given by the order  $2^{r+2}$  generalized quaternion group  $Q^{(r)}$ , which is the maximal

group within the  $r$ -th level of the single qubit Clifford hierarchy. We also address a generalization of this group for non powers of two, called the **binary dihedral group** of even degree, denoted by  $\text{BD}_{2b}$  where  $2b$  is the degree.

These spin families map to non-additive permutationally invariant multiqubit codes under the Dicke bootstrap. We construct three such families, each exemplifying a way in which non-additive codes can outperform stabilizer analogs (see Code Family I, Code Family II, and Code Family III below). Of all of the codes we find, perhaps the most striking is an  $((11, 2, 3))$  code that implements  $T$  transversally. This outperforms the  $[[15, 1, 3]]$  Reed-Muller code, which was proven to be the smallest stabilizer code that can implement a transversal  $T$  [7–9].

Because of the importance of the parameter  $\mathbf{G}$  with regards to non-additive codes, we will adopt new notation. We will write

$$((n, K, d, \mathbf{G})) \quad (1)$$

to denote a  $\mathbf{G}$ -transversal  $((n, K, d))$  code. And we will write  $[[n, k, d, \mathbf{G}]]$  if it is a stabilizer code.

## BACKGROUND

Spin  $j$  corresponds to the unique  $2j + 1$  dimensional irrep of  $\text{SU}(2)$ . A basis for the Hilbert space of a spin  $j$  system is given by the  $|j, m\rangle$  for  $|m| \leq j$ , which are an eigenbasis for  $J_z$  (the  $z$ -component of angular momentum).

A *spin code* [5] is simply a  $K$  dimensional subspace of a spin  $j$  system. Performance is measured by how well the subspace protects against small order isotropic rotations. This is equivalent to protecting against products of angular momentum errors  $J_x, J_y, J_z$ . However, such products are generally not linearly independent. A better error set [4] is given by the spherical tensors  $T_q^k$ . These can be written using the Wigner-Eckart theorem as

$$T_q^k = \sqrt{\frac{2k+1}{2j+1}} \sum_{m=-j}^j C_{k,q,j}^{j,m+q} |j, m+q\rangle \langle j, m|, \quad (2)$$

where  $0 \leq k \leq 2j$  is the *rank*,  $-k \leq q \leq k$ , and  $C_{k,q,j}^{j,m+q}$  are Clebsch-Gordan coefficients.

Spherical tensors are orthonormal and a complete error basis for spin  $j$  [10, 11]. Thus we say a spin  $j$  code with a codespace of dimension  $K$  has *distance*  $d$  if for each codeword  $|\bar{\psi}\rangle$  and  $|\bar{\phi}\rangle$  we have

$$\langle \bar{\phi} | T_q^k | \bar{\psi} \rangle = c \langle \bar{\phi} | \bar{\psi} \rangle \quad \text{for } 0 \leq k < d. \quad (3)$$

The constant  $c$  is allowed to depend on  $k$  and  $q$  but not on the codewords. These are the Knill-Laflamme (KL) conditions for spin codes. In analogy to multiqubit codes, we will denote such a spin code by  $((j, K, d))$ . Or  $((j, K, d, \mathbf{G}))$ , including the 4th parameter

Each  $g \in \text{SU}(2)$  has a natural action on spin  $j$  via the Wigner  $D$  rotation operators  $D^j(g)$ . If  $D^j(g)$  preserves the codespace then it will implement a logical gate. A spin code is called **covariant** if  $D^j(g)$  implements the logical gate  $\lambda(g)$  where  $\lambda$  is an irrep of a finite group  $\mathbf{G}$  [12, 13].

*Dicke Bootstrap.*— A spin  $j$  system is isomorphic to the permutationally invariant subspace of the tensor product of  $n = 2j$  many spin  $1/2$  systems [11]. An explicit isomorphism is the Dicke state mapping

$$|j, m\rangle \xrightarrow{\mathcal{D}} |D_{j-m}^{2j}\rangle. \quad (4)$$

Here  $|D_w^n\rangle$  is a Dicke state [14–18] defined as the (normalized) uniform superposition over all  $\binom{n}{w}$  of the  $n$ -qubit states with Hamming weight  $w$ . For example,

$$|D_2^3\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}}(|011\rangle + |110\rangle + |101\rangle). \quad (5)$$

The Dicke state mapping  $\mathcal{D}$  behaves as an intertwiner between the natural action of  $\text{SU}(2)$  on a spin  $j$  irrep and the natural action of  $\text{SU}(2)$  on an  $n = 2j$  qubit system via the tensor product [6]:

$$\mathcal{D}[D^j(g) |j, m\rangle] = g^{\otimes n} \mathcal{D} |j, m\rangle. \quad (6)$$

Our main result is that the Dicke state mapping  $\mathcal{D}$  always behaves well with respect to error-correcting properties.

**Theorem 1** (Dicke Bootstrap). A  $\mathbf{G}$ -covariant  $((j, K, d))$  spin code corresponds under  $\mathcal{D}$  to a  $\mathbf{G}$ -transversal  $((n, K, d))$  permutationally invariant multiqubit code, where  $n = 2j$ .

A proof is given in the Supplemental Material [19] and an illustration is given in Fig. 1. And a specific argument was given in our previous paper for the  $d = 3$  case. Ideas along these lines for small distances and the specific case of the binary octahedral group can already be found in [4].

Note that the results of [20] imply that the corresponding multiqubit code is in general non-additive.

*Gates and Groups.*— To showcase Theorem 1 we will restrict to the  $K = 2$  case, i.e., the case of encoding a single logical qubit. This means the logical gates come from  $\text{U}(2)$ . But  $\text{U}(2) = e^{i\theta} \text{SU}(2)$ , so it suffices to consider gates solely from  $\text{SU}(2)$ . We will always denote matrices from  $\text{SU}(2)$  by sans serif font, see Table I for our chosen correspondence.

Consider the (even degree) **binary dihedral** groups  $\text{BD}_{2b}$  of order  $8b$  where  $b \geq 1$  is an integer (these groups are also sometimes called “dicyclic”). There are also odd degree binary dihedral groups, but we won’t consider them here since they don’t contain  $\mathbf{Z}$  and the resulting analysis is significantly different. In particular, there is no good way to pick the codewords to be real, one of our major simplifying assumptions.

	U(2)	SU(2)
Pauli-X	$X = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$	$X = -iX$
Pauli-Y	$Y = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & i \\ -i & 0 \end{pmatrix}$	$Y = -iY$
Pauli-Z	$Z = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix}$	$Z = -iZ$
Hadamard	$H = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 1 & -1 \end{pmatrix}$	$H = -iH$
Phase	$S = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & i \end{pmatrix}$	$S = e^{-i\pi/4} S$
Facet	$F = HS^\dagger$	$F = \frac{e^{-i\pi/4}}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & -i \\ 1 & i \end{pmatrix} = HS^\dagger$
$\pi/8$ -gate	$T = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & e^{i\pi/4} \end{pmatrix}$	$T = \begin{pmatrix} e^{-i\pi/8} & 0 \\ 0 & e^{i\pi/8} \end{pmatrix}$
$\alpha$ -Phase	$Ph(\alpha) = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & e^{i\alpha} \end{pmatrix}$	$Ph(\alpha) = \begin{pmatrix} e^{-i\alpha/2} & 0 \\ 0 & e^{i\alpha/2} \end{pmatrix}$

TABLE I: Traditional gates in SU(2)

The  $BD_{2b}$  are the *binary* dihedral groups: the lift through the double cover  $SU(2) \rightarrow SO(3)$  of the order  $4b$  dihedral subgroups  $Dih_{2b} \subset SO(3)$ . They are non-abelian subgroups of  $SU(2)$ , generated as

$$BD_{2b} = \langle X, Z, Ph\left(\frac{2\pi}{2b}\right) \rangle. \quad (7)$$

For example, the order 8 group  $BD_2$  is equal to the (determinant 1) single qubit Pauli group  $P = \langle X, Z \rangle$ , and is the lift of the Klein four-group,  $Dih_2$ .

In the special case that the degree is a power of 2, say  $2b = 2^r$ , the binary dihedral groups are instead referred to as the *generalized quaternion groups*. We will denote these as

$$Q^{(r)} := BD_{2^r}. \quad (8)$$

The advantage of this notation is that  $Q^{(r)} \subset C^{(r)}$ , where  $C^{(r)}$  is the  $r$ -th level of the (special) single qubit Clifford hierarchy. Recall that this is defined recursively by

$$C^{(r)} := \{U \in SU(2) : UPU^\dagger \subset C^{(r-1)}\}, \quad (9)$$

starting from  $C^{(1)} := P$ , the 1-qubit Pauli group [21]. In fact,  $Q^{(r)}$  is exactly the  $X$  gate together with the diagonal part of  $C^{(r)}$ . It was shown in [22] that  $Q^{(r)}$  is the maximal group contained in the  $r$ -th level.

In [6] we called gates not in any finite level of the Clifford hierarchy *exotic*. All binary dihedral groups, except  $Q^{(r)}$ , contain exotic gates. Since stabilizer codes cannot have exotic transversal gates [23–25], we have the following result:

**Proposition 1.** Any code that implements  $BD_{2b}$  transversally, for  $b$  not a power of 2, must be non-additive.

The basic idea is that  $BD_{2b}$  contains the gate  $Ph\left(\frac{\pi}{b}\right) = \begin{pmatrix} e^{-i\pi/2b} & 0 \\ 0 & e^{i\pi/2b} \end{pmatrix}$  which has entries from the algebraic field  $\mathbb{Q}(\zeta_{4b})$ . In [6] it was shown that a gate in the single qubit Clifford hierarchy must have its all its entries in the field  $\mathbb{Q}(\zeta_{2^{r+1}})$  for some  $r$ . Thus, whenever  $b$  is not a power of

2 the gate  $Ph\left(\frac{\pi}{b}\right)$  is exotic and so any code implementing it transversally must be non-additive.

For example,  $BD_6 = \langle X, Z, Ph(\pi/3) \rangle$  contains the exotic gate  $Ph(\pi/3)$  and so  $BD_6$  cannot be the transversal group of a stabilizer code.

In contrast, the  $[[5, 1, 3]]$  code supports  $Q^{(1)} = BD_2 = \langle X, Z \rangle$  transversally, the  $[[7, 1, 3]]$  Steane code supports  $Q^{(2)} = BD_4 = \langle X, Z, S \rangle$  transversally, and the  $[[15, 1, 3]]$  Reed Muller code supports  $Q^{(3)} = BD_8 = \langle X, Z, S, T \rangle$  transversally. In fact, the  $[[2^{r+1} - 1, 1, 3]]$  Reed Muller family supports  $Q^{(r)} = BD_{2^r}$  transversally.

## BINARY DIHEDRAL SPIN CODES

The representation theory of the binary dihedral groups is well known and we review it more thoroughly in the Supplemental Material [19]. We will focus on the 2-dimensional irreps  $\delta_1, \dots, \delta_b$ . In the irrep  $\delta_a$  the element  $X$  is represented by itself, but the element  $Ph\left(\frac{\pi}{b}\right)$  is represented by  $Ph\left(\frac{\pi}{b}\right)^{2a-1}$ . For example, consider  $BD_4 = \langle X, Z, S \rangle$ . In the irrep  $\delta_2$ , the generators  $X, Z$ , and  $S$  are represented by  $X, -Z$ , and  $S^3$  respectively.

*Degrees of Freedom.*— The choice of covariant group  $G$  and irrep  $\lambda$  directly influence the structure of the code. A spin  $j$  codeword  $|\bar{\psi}\rangle$  can be written generically with respect to the angular momentum basis as

$$|\bar{\psi}\rangle = \sum_{m=-j}^j \alpha_m |j, m\rangle, \quad (10)$$

for some (complex) coefficients  $\alpha_m$ . The *support* of  $|\psi\rangle$  is the set of those  $m$  for which  $\alpha_m$  is non-zero. We will denote the support of a vector  $|\psi\rangle$  by  $\text{supp } |\psi\rangle$ .

**Lemma 1.** The support of a  $BD_{2b}$  covariant spin code transforming in the  $\delta_a$  irrep satisfies

$$\text{supp } |\bar{0}\rangle \subset s + 2b\mathbb{Z}, \quad (11a)$$

$$\text{supp } |\bar{1}\rangle = -\text{supp } |\bar{0}\rangle, \quad (11b)$$

where we have defined  $s = \frac{2a-1}{2}$ .

A proof is given in the Supplemental material. We illustrate this result in Fig. 2.

The number of copies of the irrep  $\delta_a$  in spin  $j$  is called the *multiplicity*. In the figure illustrating  $\text{supp } |\bar{0}\rangle$ , the multiplicity in spin  $j$  of the  $\delta_a$  irrep corresponds to the number of red boxes with  $|m| \leq j$ . For example, we see in Fig. 2 that if  $j = 11/2$  then irreps  $\delta_1$  and  $\delta_2$  have multiplicity 1 whereas irreps  $\delta_3$  and  $\delta_4$  have multiplicity 2. The multiplicity of the irrep  $\delta_a$  in spin  $j$  can be computed more systematically using the branching rules  $SU(2) \downarrow BD_{2b}$  - see the Supplemental Material [19].

The multiplicity is the number of degrees of freedom one has in choosing a  $(BD_{2b}, \delta_a)$  covariant code. For example, in spin  $13/2$  the  $\delta_2$  irrep of  $Q^{(3)}$  has multiplicity 2.




FIG. 2: Support of a  $\text{BD}_8 = \mathbf{Q}^{(3)}$  covariant spin code in the range  $|m| \leq 15/2$  for each irrep. Red values of  $m$  are included in the support, while white are not.

On the other hand, using Lemma 1 the codeword basis is written as

$$|\bar{0}\rangle = \alpha_1 \left| \frac{13}{2}, \frac{3}{2} \right\rangle + \alpha_2 \left| \frac{13}{2}, -\frac{13}{2} \right\rangle, \quad (12a)$$

$$|\bar{1}\rangle = \alpha_1 \left| \frac{13}{2}, -\frac{3}{2} \right\rangle + \alpha_2 \left| \frac{13}{2}, \frac{13}{2} \right\rangle. \quad (12b)$$

Indeed there are 2 degrees of freedom here: we can choose any  $\alpha_1$  and  $\alpha_2$  and the vectors will still transform in the  $\delta_a$  irrep.

We can also ask: what is the first spin  $j$  that guarantees  $\mu$  degrees of freedom?

**Lemma 2.** The smallest spin that supports a  $(\text{BD}_{2b}, \delta_a)$  spin code with  $\mu$  degrees of freedom is

$$j = \mu b + \kappa, \quad (13)$$

where  $\kappa = s - b$  if  $\mu$  is odd and  $\kappa = -s$  if  $\mu$  is even.

A proof is given in the Supplemental material [19]. Again we have defined

$$s := \frac{2a-1}{2} \quad (14)$$

and it stands for “starting spin” because  $j = s$  is the first spin for which the irrep  $\delta_a$  has non-zero multiplicity.

*Error Reduction.*— The spherical tensors  $T_q^k$  display simple symmetries under the action of the gates  $X$  and  $\text{Ph}(\frac{\pi}{b})$ . We can leverage this symmetry to massively reduce the number of KL conditions we need to check for a  $(\text{BD}_{2b}, \delta_a)$  code.

**Theorem 2.** Suppose a spin code is  $(\text{BD}_{2b}, \delta_a)$  covariant. Also suppose the codewords are real. Then the KL error conditions of Eq. (3) are reduced to

- $\langle \bar{0} | T_q^k | \bar{0} \rangle = \langle \bar{1} | T_q^k | \bar{1} \rangle$  for  $k$  odd,  $q \equiv 0 \pmod{2b}$ ,  $q \geq 0$ ; and
- $\langle \bar{0} | T_q^k | \bar{1} \rangle = 0$  for  $k$  odd,  $q \equiv 2a - 1 \pmod{2b}$ .

We prove this theorem in the Supplemental Material [19] and provide a detailed analysis counting error correction conditions. An immediate implication of this theorem is that spherical tensors  $T_q^k$  with even rank  $k$  are *all* automatically satisfied. In fact this implies that we can always take the distance  $d$  to be odd (analogous to the multiqubit result in [26]).

*Family of spin codes.*— Consider  $\delta_a$  for  $1 < a < b$ ; we will call these the “middle irreps”. For a  $d = 3$  code we need to satisfy the the KL conditions for rank  $k = 0, 1, 2$  spherical tensors. Theorem 2 says that, assuming real codewords, the rank  $k = 0, 2$  errors are automatically satisfied. The conditions  $\langle \bar{0} | T_q^1 | \bar{1} \rangle = 0$ ,  $q = \pm 1, 0$  are also automatically satisfied (since  $3 \leq 2a - 1 \leq 2b - 3$  for the middle irreps). So the only non-trivial KL condition is

$$\langle \bar{0} | T_0^1 | \bar{0} \rangle = \langle \bar{1} | T_0^1 | \bar{1} \rangle, \quad (15)$$

where  $T_0^1 \propto \sum_{m=-j}^j m |j, m\rangle \langle j, m|$ .

If we try to solve this equation when the codewords have only one degree of freedom we will fail. If the codewords have 2 degrees of freedom then Lemma 1 allows us to write

$$|\bar{0}\rangle = \alpha_1 |j, s\rangle + \alpha_2 |j, s - 2b\rangle, \quad (16)$$

for which the previous equation reduces to

$$s|\alpha_1|^2 + (s - 2b)|\alpha_2|^2 = 0. \quad (17)$$

This equation has a real solution  $\alpha_1 = \sqrt{\frac{2b-s}{2b}}$  and  $\alpha_2 = \sqrt{\frac{s}{2b}}$  yielding a family of  $d = 3$  spin codes

$$|\bar{0}\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2b}} \left( \sqrt{2b-s} |j, s\rangle + \sqrt{s} |j, s - 2b\rangle \right), \quad (18)$$

for any  $j \geq 2b - s$  (using Lemma 2). Each code is  $\text{BD}_{2b'}$  covariant. Recall that here  $2b' = 2b/\text{gcd}(2b, 2a-1)$  is the order of the generator  $\delta_a(\text{Ph}(\frac{2\pi}{2b})) = \text{Ph}(\frac{2\pi}{2b})^{2a-1}$ .

Choosing the irrep  $\delta_{b-1}$  yields the smallest spin code family here among all of the participating irreps. In this case,  $j = \frac{2b+3}{2}$  and the codewords are given by

$$|\bar{0}\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{4b}} \left( \sqrt{2b-3} \left| \frac{2b+3}{2}, \frac{2b+3}{2} \right\rangle + \sqrt{2b+3} \left| \frac{2b+3}{2}, -\frac{2b+3}{2} \right\rangle \right). \quad (19)$$

The code implements  $\text{BD}_{2b'}$  covariantly. Since we picked  $a = b - 1$ , then  $2b' = 2b/\text{gcd}(2b, 2b - 3)$  and the GCD is either 1 or 3. Thus  $b' = b/3$  when  $3 \mid b$  and  $b' = b$  otherwise.

## BINARY DIHEDRAL MULTIQUBIT CODES

Now we apply the Dicke bootstrap to get multiqubit codes.

**Code Family I.** For all  $b$  not of the form  $2^r$  or  $3(2^r)$ , the codewords

$$|\bar{0}\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{4b}} \left( \sqrt{4b-n} |D_0^n\rangle + \sqrt{n} |D_{2b}^n\rangle \right), \quad (20a)$$

$$|\bar{1}\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{4b}} \left( \sqrt{n} |D_3^n\rangle + \sqrt{4b-n} |D_n^n\rangle \right), \quad (20b)$$

yield a non-additive  $((2b+3, 2, 3))$  permutationally invariant  $n = 2b + 3$  multiqubit code with exotic transversal gates.

If  $3 \nmid b$  then these implement  $\text{BD}_{2b}$  transversally, otherwise they implement  $\text{BD}_{2b/3}$  transversally. These codes outperform all stabilizer codes in the sense that they transversally implement a binary dihedral group other than  $\text{Q}^{(r)} = \text{BD}_{2^r}$ , a feat which is impossible for any stabilizer code by Proposition 1 (cf. [6]).

On the other hand, suppose  $2b = 2^r$ , then the same construction above yields a family of codes whose transversal group  $\text{G}$  is the generalized quaternion group  $\text{Q}^{(r)} = \text{BD}_{2^r}$ .

**Code Family II.** For each  $r \geq 3$ , there is a non-additive  $((2^r + 3, 2, 3, \text{Q}^{(r)}))$  permutationally invariant multiqubit code given by

$$|\bar{0}\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2^{r+1}}} \left( \sqrt{2^r-3} |D_0^{2^r+3}\rangle + \sqrt{2^r+3} |D_{2^r}^{2^r+3}\rangle \right), \quad (21a)$$

$$|\bar{1}\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2^{r+1}}} \left( \sqrt{2^r+3} |D_3^{2^r+3}\rangle + \sqrt{2^r-3} |D_{2^r+3}^{2^r+3}\rangle \right). \quad (21b)$$

As a function of  $r$ , this family compares with the  $[[2^{r+1} - 1, 1, 3, \text{Q}^{(r)}]]$  Reed Muller (RM) family of stabilizer codes.

It turns out that the RM family is optimal among all stabilizer codes, i.e., they are the smallest length  $n$  stabilizer codes that can support  $\text{Q}^{(r)}$  transversally [7]. For example, the  $[[15, 1, 3]]$  RM code ( $r = 3$ ) is the smallest stabilizer code that supports  $T$  transversally and the  $[[31, 1, 3]]$  RM code ( $r = 4$ ) is the smallest stabilizer code that supports  $\sqrt{T}$  transversally. In contrast, our code family produces a non-additive  $((11, 2, 3))$  code that supports  $T$  transversally and a non-additive  $((19, 2, 3))$  code that supports  $\sqrt{T}$  transversally. This highlights the power of the Dicke bootstrap and the “non-additive codes from transversality” paradigm.

For these first two code families we fix the distance  $d = 3$  and look for codes of minimal length  $n$  that have the transversal group  $\text{BD}_{2b}$ . We can do the same thing for any fixed distance  $d$ , but the minimal  $n$  will be correspondingly larger - see the Supplemental Material [19].

Alternatively, we can fix the transversal group and look for a family of codes with respect to  $n$  and  $d$ . The most interesting example is  $\text{Q}^{(3)} = \text{BD}_8$ , since this group contains the  $T$  gate.

**Code Family III (▲).** For odd  $d$ , there are non-additive  $((n, 2, d))$  permutationally invariant multiqubit codes with transversal group  $\text{Q}^{(3)} = \langle X, Z, S, T \rangle$  and with code length given by  $n = \frac{1}{4}(3d^2 + 6d - 7 + 2(d \bmod 8))$ .

The techniques employed to create this code family are similar to the previous code family and more details can be found in the Supplemental Material [19]. Notice that the length of this code family grows quadratically with distance as  $n \sim 3d^2/4$ . When  $d = 3$ , this family intersects the previous family, again yielding the  $((11, 2, 3, \text{Q}^{(3)}))$  code. When  $d = 5$  we get an  $((27, 2, 5))$  code and when  $d = 7$  we get an  $((49, 2, 7))$  code, both supporting a transversal implementation of the  $T$  gate. In contrast, the best  $d = 5$  stabilizer code that supports  $T$  transversally is a  $[[49, 1, 5]]$  code [27]. In this context we see the clear advantage offered by non-additive codes: (1) using the  $((27, 2, 5))$  code, compared to the optimal stabilizer code, decreases the number of physical qubits by roughly half while keeping the same distance, or (2) using the  $((49, 2, 7))$  code can correct 3 errors instead of 2 using the same number of physical qubits.

Similar code finding ideas are explored in the Supplemental Material [19]. There is a code family with respect to  $n$  and  $d$  for each fixed transversal group  $\text{BD}_{2b}$  and each family grows quadratically as  $n \sim \frac{3}{4}d^2$ .

*Encoding/Decoding.*— There isn’t a general theory of encoding and decoding non-additive codes, however, permutationally invariant non-additive codes (like the ones studied here) have significantly more structure.

The theory and experimental realization of the efficient preparation of Dicke states and the encoding of a qubit into symmetric states is well studied (e.g., see [28–33]).

In contrast, it was only recently discovered how to decode a permutationally invariant code efficiently [34]. The idea of the decoding algorithm is to get an error syndrome (in the form of a standard Young tableau) by first measuring the total angular momentum on subsets of the physical qubits. Then one can get back to the original code by projecting within the error subspace and applying a unitary (using quantum Schur transforms or teleportation). The authors of [34] give protocols to implement such a decoding algorithm on a near term quantum device.



## CONCLUSION

Non-additive codes have been mostly overlooked since they provide only meager improvements in the three traditional code parameters  $n$ ,  $K$ , and  $d$ .

However, with the proper perspective, we saw that non-additive codes could significantly outperform optimal stabilizer analogs. We saw three prototypes of this advantage:

- (Code Family I) Non-additive codes can implement exotic groups whereas stabilizer codes cannot;
- (Code Family II) Non-additive codes permit better  $n$  versus  $G$  parameters, holding  $K$  and  $d$  fixed (e.g., our  $((11, 2, 3, \mathbb{Q}^{(3)}))$  and  $((19, 2, 3, \mathbb{Q}^{(4)}))$  codes compared to the  $[[15, 1, 3, \mathbb{Q}^{(3)}]]$  and  $[[31, 1, 3, \mathbb{Q}^{(4)}]]$  RM codes);
- (Code Family III) Non-additive codes permit better  $n$  versus  $d$  parameters, holding  $K$  and  $G$  fixed (e.g., our  $((27, 2, 5, \mathbb{Q}^{(3)}))$  and  $((49, 2, 7, \mathbb{Q}^{(3)}))$  codes compared with the  $[[49, 1, 5, \mathbb{Q}^{(3)}]]$  code).

All three of these code families were constructed from spin codes using the Dicke bootstrap. This method holds significant untapped promise and is the first code construction method specifically designed around the transversal group  $G$ , an important code parameter for fault tolerance.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This research was supported in part by NSF QLCI grant OMA-2120757. All figures and numeric calculations were carried out with MATHEMATICA 13.2.

We thank Sivaprasad Omanakuttan and Jonathan A. Gross for comments regarding their previous work. We thank Victor Albert for comments addressing the distance preservation of the Dicke Bootstrap and covariance. We thank Michael Gullans for helpful conversations regarding the invariance of the transversal group.

---

\* These authors contributed equally to this work.

† [erickub@umd.edu](mailto:erickub@umd.edu)

‡ [igt@umd.edu](mailto:igt@umd.edu)

- [1] A. R. Calderbank, E. M. Rains, P. W. Shor, and N. J. A. Sloane, Quantum error correction via codes over  $\text{GF}(4)$  (1997), [arXiv:quant-ph/9608006](https://arxiv.org/abs/quant-ph/9608006) [quant-ph].
- [2] E. M. Rains, Quantum shadow enumerators (1997), [arXiv:quant-ph/9611001](https://arxiv.org/abs/quant-ph/9611001) [quant-ph].
- [3] S. Yu, Q. Chen, C. H. Lai, and C. H. Oh, Nonadditive quantum error-correcting code, *Physical Review Letters* **101**, 10.1103/physrevlett.101.090501 (2008).
- [4] S. Omanakuttan and J. A. Gross, Multispin clifford codes for angular momentum errors in spin systems (2023), [arXiv:2304.08611](https://arxiv.org/abs/2304.08611) [quant-ph].
- [5] J. A. Gross, Designing codes around interactions: The case of a spin, *Physical Review Letters* **127**, 10.1103/physrevlett.127.010504 (2021).
- [6] E. Kubischta and I. Teixeira, A family of quantum codes with exotic transversal gates (2023), [arXiv:2305.07023](https://arxiv.org/abs/2305.07023) [quant-ph].
- [7] S. Koutsoumpas, D. Banfield, and A. Kay, The smallest code with transversal  $t$  (2022), [arXiv:2210.14066](https://arxiv.org/abs/2210.14066) [quant-ph].
- [8] J. Haah and M. B. Hastings, Codes and protocols for distilling  $T$ , controlled- $S$ , and toffoli gates, *Quantum* **2**, 71 (2018).
- [9] N. Rengaswamy, R. Calderbank, M. Newman, and H. D. Pfister, On optimality of CSS codes for transversal  $T$ , *IEEE Journal on Selected Areas in Information Theory* **1**, 499 (2020).
- [10] D. A. Varshalovich, A. N. Moskalev, and V. K. Khersonskii, *Quantum Theory of Angular Momentum* (WORLD SCIENTIFIC, 1988) <https://www.worldscientific.com/doi/pdf/10.1142/0270>.
- [11] J. J. Sakurai and J. Napolitano, *Modern Quantum Mechanics*, 3rd ed. (Cambridge University Press, 2020).
- [12] P. Faist, S. Nezami, V. V. Albert, G. Salton, F. Pastawski, P. Hayden, and J. Preskill, Continuous symmetries and approximate quantum error correction, *Physical Review X* **10**, 10.1103/physrevx.10.041018 (2020).
- [13] P. Hayden, S. Nezami, S. Popescu, and G. Salton, Error correction of quantum reference frame information, *PRX Quantum* **2**, 10.1103/prxquantum.2.010326 (2021).
- [14] R. H. Dicke, Coherence in spontaneous radiation processes, *Phys. Rev.* **93**, 99 (1954).
- [15] A. Bäertschi and S. Eidenbenz, Deterministic preparation of dicke states, in *Fundamentals of Computation Theory* (Springer International Publishing, 2019) pp. 126–139.
- [16] C. S. Mukherjee, S. Maitra, V. Gaurav, and D. Roy, On actual preparation of dicke state on a quantum computer (2020), [arXiv:2007.01681](https://arxiv.org/abs/2007.01681) [quant-ph].
- [17] B. Lücke, J. Peise, G. Vitagliano, J. Arlt, L. Santos, G. Tóth, and C. Klempt, Detecting multiparticle entanglement of dicke states, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **112**, 155304 (2014).
- [18] D. B. Hume, C. W. Chou, T. Rosenband, and D. J. Wineland, Preparation of dicke states in an ion chain, *Phys. Rev. A* **80**, 052302 (2009).
- [19] See supplemental material which includes refs todo, for more detailed calculations.
- [20] H. Hao, Investigations on automorphism groups of quantum stabilizer codes (2021), [arXiv:2109.12735](https://arxiv.org/abs/2109.12735) [cs.IT].
- [21] B. Zeng, X. Chen, and I. L. Chuang, Semi-clifford operations, structure of  $\mathcal{C}_k$  hierarchy, and gate complexity for fault-tolerant quantum computation, *Physical Review A* **77**, 10.1103/physreva.77.042313 (2008).
- [22] J. T. Anderson, On groups in the qubit clifford hierarchy (2022), [arXiv:2212.05398](https://arxiv.org/abs/2212.05398) [quant-ph].
- [23] K. Wirthmüller, Automorphisms of stabilizer codes (2011), [arXiv:1102.5715](https://arxiv.org/abs/1102.5715) [quant-ph].
- [24] T. Jochym-O’Connor, A. Kubica, and T. J. Yoder, Disjointness of stabilizer codes and limitations on fault-tolerant logical gates, *Physical Review X* **8**, 10.1103/physrevx.8.021047 (2018).

- [25] B. Zeng, A. Cross, and I. L. Chuang, Transversality versus universality for additive quantum codes (2007), [arXiv:0706.1382 \[quant-ph\]](#).
- [26] E. Kubischta, I. Teixeira, and J. M. Silvester, Quantum weight enumerators for real codes with  $x$  and  $z$  exactly transversal (2023), [arXiv:2306.12526 \[quant-ph\]](#).
- [27] S. Bravyi and J. Haah, Magic-state distillation with low overhead, *Physical Review A* **86**, [10.1103/physreva.86.052329](#) (2012).
- [28] C. Wu, Y. Wang, C. Guo, Y. Ouyang, G. Wang, and X.-L. Feng, Initializing a permutation-invariant quantum error-correction code, *Phys. Rev. A* **99**, [012335](#) (2019).
- [29] A. Bärttschi and S. Eidenbenz, Deterministic preparation of dicke states, in *Fundamentals of Computation Theory* (Springer International Publishing, 2019) pp. 126–139.
- [30] M. T. Johnsson, N. R. Mukty, D. Burgarth, T. Volz, and G. K. Brennen, Geometric pathway to scalable quantum sensing, *Physical Review Letters* **125**, [10.1103/physrevlett.125.190403](#) (2020).
- [31] Y. Wang and B. M. Terhal, Preparing dicke states in a spin ensemble using phase estimation, *Physical Review A* **104**, [10.1103/physreva.104.032407](#) (2021).
- [32] A. Bärttschi and S. Eidenbenz, Short-depth circuits for dicke state preparation, in *2022 IEEE International Conference on Quantum Computing and Engineering (QCE)* (2022) pp. 87–96.
- [33] S. Aktar, A. Bartschi, A.-H. A. Badawy, and S. Eidenbenz, A divide-and-conquer approach to dicke state preparation, *IEEE Transactions on Quantum Engineering* **3**, [1](#) (2022).
- [34] Y. Ouyang and G. K. Brennen, Quantum error correction on symmetric quantum sensors (2022), [arXiv:2212.06285 \[quant-ph\]](#).
- [35] E. M. Rains, Quantum codes of minimum distance two (1997), [arXiv:quant-ph/9704043 \[quant-ph\]](#).
- [36] A. Aydin, M. A. Alekseyev, and A. Barg, A family of permutationally invariant quantum codes (2023), [arXiv:2310.05358 \[quant-ph\]](#).
- [37] E. Calabi, Linear systems of real quadratic forms, *Proceedings of the American Mathematical Society* **15**, 844 (1964).

## Supplemental Material

### Invariance of the 4th parameter $G$

An  $n$ -qubit gate is called **local** if it can be written as an  $n$ -fold product of single qubit gates. An  $n$ -qubit gate is called **non-entangling** if it can be written as a product of local gates and permutations.

All unitary gates preserve the parameters  $n$  and  $K$ . However only non-entangling gates preserve the **weight** of a local gate (the number of nontrivial tensor factors). Thus only non-entangling gates preserve distance  $d$ . For this reason, two codes are said to be **equivalent** if they are related by a non-entangling gate [35].

In addition to  $n, K, d$ , the transversal group  $G$  is also a well defined parameter under code equivalence.

**Lemma S1.** Equivalent codes have the same transversal group  $G$ .

*Proof.* Let  $V$  be the encoding map (a  $2^n \times K$  matrix). Let  $U_L$  be a logical gate (a  $K \times K$  matrix) that is implemented transversally on the code by  $U_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes U_n$  (a  $2^n \times 2^n$  matrix). As an equation this means

$$\left( \bigotimes_i U_i \right) V = V U_L. \quad (\text{S1})$$

The encoding map for an equivalent code is  $V' = W V$  where  $W$  is some non-entangling gate (a  $2^n \times 2^n$  matrix). Then  $V = W^\dagger V'$  and we have

$$\left( \bigotimes_i U'_i \right) V' = V' U_L. \quad (\text{S2})$$

Here we have defined  $\bigotimes_i U'_i := W(\bigotimes_i U_i)W^\dagger$  which is indeed still a local gate since we are conjugating by a non-entangling gate.

This equation says that an equivalent code still has the same logical gates, they are just implemented by a different transversal gate. The claim follows.  $\square$

### Review of Angular Momentum

We mostly follow the conventions of [11]. The matrix elements of the operator  $D^j(g)$  are the  $(2j+1) \times (2j+1)$  Wigner-D matrices  $D^j_{mm'}(g) := \langle j, m | D^j(g) | j, m' \rangle$ . The matrix elements for the gates of interest are

$$D^j_{mm'}(\mathbf{X}) = e^{-i\pi j} \delta_{m, -m'}, \quad (\text{S3a})$$

$$D^j_{mm'}(\mathbf{Y}) = e^{-i\pi(j+m)} \delta_{m, -m'}, \quad (\text{S3b})$$

$$D^j_{mm'}(\mathbf{Z}) = e^{-i\pi m} \delta_{mm'}, \quad (\text{S3c})$$

$$D^j_{mm'}(\text{Ph}(\alpha)) = e^{-i\alpha m} \delta_{mm'}. \quad (\text{S3d})$$

But the matrix elements determine the coefficients of the operator:

$$D^j(g) |j, m'\rangle = \sum_m D^j_{mm'}(g) |j, m\rangle. \quad (\text{S4})$$

These determine the action:

$$D^j(\mathbf{X}) |j, m\rangle = e^{-i\pi j} |j, -m\rangle, \quad (\text{S5a})$$

$$D^j(\mathbf{Y}) |j, m\rangle = e^{-i\pi(j-m)} |j, -m\rangle, \quad (\text{S5b})$$

$$D^j(\mathbf{Z}) |j, m\rangle = e^{-i\pi m} |j, m\rangle, \quad (\text{S5c})$$

$$D^j(\text{Ph}(\alpha)) |j, m\rangle = e^{-i\alpha m} |j, m\rangle. \quad (\text{S5d})$$

Spherical tensors are irreducible tensors for  $\text{SU}(2)$  and so transform as

$$D^j(g)^\dagger T_q^k D^j(g) = \sum_{q'=-k}^k D_{qq'}^{k*}(g) T_{q'}^k. \quad (\text{S6})$$

Combining this fact with the properties of the matrix elements yields the following lemma.

**Lemma S2** (Spherical Tensor Symmetries).

$$D^j(\mathbf{X})^\dagger T_q^k D^j(\mathbf{X}) = (-1)^k T_{-q}^k \quad (\text{S7a})$$

$$D^j(\mathbf{Y})^\dagger T_q^k D^j(\mathbf{Y}) = (-1)^{k+q} T_{-q}^k \quad (\text{S7b})$$

$$D^j(\mathbf{Z})^\dagger T_q^k D^j(\mathbf{Z}) = (-1)^q T_q^k \quad (\text{S7c})$$

$$D^j(\text{Ph}(\alpha))^\dagger T_q^k D^j(\text{Ph}(\alpha)) = e^{iq\alpha} T_q^k \quad (\text{S7d})$$

$$T_q^{k\dagger} = (-1)^q T_{-q}^k \quad (\text{S7e})$$

$$T_q^{k*} = T_q^k. \quad (\text{S7f})$$

Lastly, the product of spherical tensors can be written as a sum of spherical tensors:

**Lemma S3.** [10]

$$T_{q_1}^{k_1} T_{q_2}^{k_2} = \sum_{k=|k_1-k_2|}^{k_1+k_2} C_{k, q_1, q_2} T_{q_1+q_2}^k,$$

for some Clebsh-Gordan coefficients  $C_{k, q}$ .

### Derivation of the Spin Code KL Conditions

A rotation in spin  $j$  is given by  $D^j(g)$  for some element  $g \in \text{SU}(2)$ . The infinitesimal version of this operation is

$$D^j(\theta \mathbf{v}) := \exp(-i\theta \mathbf{v} \cdot \mathbf{J}), \quad (\text{S8})$$

where  $\mathbf{v}$  is the axis of rotation,  $\theta$  is the angle of rotation, and  $\mathbf{J} = (J_x, J_y, J_z)$  are spin  $j$  representations of angular momenta. This can be decomposed using a matrix exponential as

$$D^j(\theta \mathbf{v}) = \sum_{p=0}^{2j} \frac{(-i\theta \mathbf{v} \cdot \mathbf{J})^p}{p!}. \quad (\text{S9})$$



A small rotation is given by  $\theta$  small (for any  $\mathbf{v}$ ) and so it would seem natural to measure performance of a spin code by counting how many orders of magnitude of  $\theta$  the spin code accounts for.

On the other hand, it is clearly also sufficient to look at  $p$ -fold products of angular momenta (since the term next to  $\theta^p$  is  $\mathbf{J}^p$ ). Thus it is natural to say that a spin code has *distance*  $d$  if for all codewords  $|\bar{u}\rangle$  and  $|\bar{v}\rangle$  we have

$$\langle \bar{u} | J_{\alpha_1} \cdots J_{\alpha_p} | \bar{v} \rangle = C \langle \bar{u} | \bar{v} \rangle \quad \text{for } 0 \leq p < d. \quad (\text{S10})$$

The constant  $C$  is allowed to depend on  $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_p$  but not on the codewords.

The  $p$ -fold product  $J_{\alpha_1} \cdots J_{\alpha_p}$  is a Cartesian tensor. With respect to  $\text{SU}(2)$  it is reducible. Naturally we split this product into irreducible pieces, the spherical tensors  $T_q^k$  for  $0 \leq |q| \leq k \leq p$ .

We might think that  $T_q^k$  technically depends on  $p$  since we need to know which Cartesian tensor it came from, but the brilliance of the Wigner-Eckart theorem says that all  $T_q^k$  are the same (regardless of  $p$ ).

What all this means is that satisfying the KL conditions for the spherical tensors  $T_q^k$  for  $k < d$  (as in Eq. (3)) is enough to guarantee that *all*  $w$ -fold products of angular momentum with  $w < d$  are also satisfied (even though there seems to be significantly fewer spherical tensors).

## Representation Theory of Binary Dihedral Groups

All of the irreps of the binary dihedral groups  $\text{BD}_{2b}$  are either 1 or 2 dimensional. We cannot form a code from the 1-dimensional irreps so we focus on the 2-dimensional irreps. All of the 2-dimensional irreps are either real or symplectic (meaning they have a Frobenius-Schur indicator of  $+1$  or  $-1$  respectively). We focus on the symplectic irreps for simplicity and they only appear in half-integral spin  $j$ .

There are  $b$  symplectic irreps of  $\text{BD}_{2b}$ , labeled  $\delta_a$  for  $1 \leq a \leq b$ . We call  $\delta_1$  the *fundamental irrep* because here  $\mathbf{X}$  is represented by  $\mathbf{X}$  and  $\text{Ph}(\frac{\pi}{b})$  is represented by  $\text{Ph}(\frac{\pi}{b})$ . More generally, in the  $\delta_a$  irrep,  $\mathbf{X}$  is represented by  $\mathbf{X}$  but  $\text{Ph}(\frac{\pi}{b})$  is represented by  $\text{Ph}(\frac{\pi}{b})^{2a-1}$ .

In the generalized quaternion groups,  $\mathbf{Q}^{(r)} = \text{BD}_{2^r}$ , all symplectic irreps are faithful. When  $b$  is not a power of 2, then some symplectic irreps won't implement all of  $\text{BD}_{2b}$ , but rather some subgroup  $\text{BD}_{2b'}$ . In particular if  $2a-1$  and  $2b$  have common divisors then the order of the element  $\text{Ph}(\frac{\pi}{b})^{2a-1}$  will decrease. In general, the irrep  $\delta_a$  of  $\text{BD}_{2b}$  implements  $\text{BD}_{2b'}$  where

$$2b' = \frac{2b}{\gcd(2b, 2a-1)}. \quad (\text{S11})$$

For example, in  $\text{BD}_6 = \langle \mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Z}, \text{Ph}(\frac{\pi}{3}) \rangle$  there are 3 symplectic irreps. Both  $\delta_1$  and  $\delta_3$  are faithful and so implement all of  $\text{BD}_6$ . On the other hand,  $\delta_2$  only implements  $\text{BD}_2$ .

## Proof of Lemma 1

Suppose a spin  $j$  code is

$$\text{BD}_{2b} = \langle \mathbf{X}, \text{Ph}(\frac{\pi}{b}) \rangle \quad (\text{S12})$$

covariant and transforms in the  $\delta_a$  irrep.

In the  $\delta_a$  irrep, the element  $\text{Ph}(\frac{\pi}{b})$  is represented by  $\text{Ph}((2a-1)\pi/b)$ . Notably,  $|0\rangle$  is an eigenvector with eigenvalue  $e^{-i\pi(2a-1)/2b}$ . On the other hand, the physical implementation of  $\text{Ph}(\frac{\pi}{b})$  in spin  $j$  is

$$D^j(\text{Ph}(\frac{\pi}{b})) |j, m\rangle = e^{-im\pi/b} |j, m\rangle. \quad (\text{S13})$$

If the spin code is to be covariant, then we must restrict  $\text{supp} |\bar{0}\rangle$  to only those values of  $m$  that make  $|\bar{0}\rangle$  an eigenvector of  $D^j(\text{Ph}(\frac{\pi}{b}))$  with eigenvalue  $e^{-i\pi(2a-1)/2b}$ . Clearly we must choose  $m \in \frac{2a-1}{2} + (2b)\mathbb{Z}$ .

On the other hand, we know that  $D^j(\mathbf{X}) |j, m\rangle = e^{-i\pi j} |j, -m\rangle$ . It follows that  $\text{supp} |\bar{1}\rangle = -\text{supp} |\bar{0}\rangle$ .  $\square$

## Branching Rules

Let  $\chi_j(g) := \text{Tr}(D^j(g))$  be the *character* of the spin  $j$  representation of the element  $g \in \text{SU}(2)$ . Using the Weyl character formula we can check that for  $j$  half-integral we have

$$\chi_j(\mathbf{X}) = 0, \quad (\text{S14a})$$

$$\chi_j(\text{Ph}(\alpha)) = \frac{\sin((2j+1)\frac{\alpha}{2})}{\sin(\frac{\alpha}{2})}. \quad (\text{S14b})$$

Let  $\chi_\lambda(g)$  denote the character of the irrep  $\lambda$  for the element  $g \in \mathbf{G}$ . Then the *multiplicity* of the irrep  $\lambda$  in spin  $j$  can be computed using the formula

$$\langle \chi_\lambda, \chi_j \rangle := \frac{1}{|\mathbf{G}|} \sum_{g \in \mathbf{G}} \chi_\lambda(g)^* \chi_j(g). \quad (\text{S15})$$

In other words,  $\langle \chi_\lambda, \chi_j \rangle$  counts the number of copies of the irrep  $\lambda$  in spin  $j$ . The process of breaking a spin  $j$  into irreps of some group  $\mathbf{G}$  is referred to as the *branching rules* and is denoted  $\text{SU}(2) \downarrow \mathbf{G}$ .

For example, consider the branching rules  $\text{SU}(2) \downarrow \mathbf{Q}^{(3)}$  where  $\mathbf{Q}^{(3)} = \text{BD}_8 = \langle \mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Z}, \mathbf{T} \rangle$ . One can check that the two dimensional irreps of  $\mathbf{Q}^{(3)}$  only show up in half-integral  $j$  and we tabulate these in Table S1. We observe that the irreps fill up in a “snaking pattern” from left to right then right to left and back again (as  $j$  increases).

This snaking pattern is a generic feature for all symplectic irreps of  $\text{BD}_{2b}$ . In successive half-integral spins, the symplectic irreps fill up from left to right and then from right to left and because there are in general  $b$  symplectic 2-dimensional irreps, this process repeats every

Spin $j$	$\delta_1$	$\delta_2$	$\delta_3$	$\delta_4$
$8p + \frac{1}{2}$	$2p + 1$	$2p$	$2p$	$2p$
$8p + \frac{3}{2}$	$2p + 1$	$2p + 1$	$2p$	$2p$
$8p + \frac{5}{2}$	$2p + 1$	$2p + 1$	$2p + 1$	$2p$
$8p + \frac{7}{2}$	$2p + 1$	$2p + 1$	$2p + 1$	$2p + 1$
$8p + \frac{9}{2}$	$2p + 1$	$2p + 1$	$2p + 1$	$2p + 2$
$8p + \frac{11}{2}$	$2p + 1$	$2p + 1$	$2p + 2$	$2p + 2$
$8p + \frac{13}{2}$	$2p + 1$	$2p + 2$	$2p + 2$	$2p + 2$
$8p + \frac{15}{2}$	$2p + 2$	$2p + 2$	$2p + 2$	$2p + 2$

TABLE S1: Branching rules  $SU(2) \downarrow Q^{(3)}$  for half-integral spin  $j$ . Here  $p \geq 0$  is an integer.

$2b$  rows. Thus the table generalizes in a fairly straightforward way: replace 8 by  $2b$  and look at the pattern between  $\frac{1}{2}$  to  $2b - \frac{1}{2}$ .

We see that an irrep with odd multiplicity  $\mu = 2p + 1$  appears for the first time in spin  $j = (2b)p + s$  where  $s = (2a - 1)/2$ . This means the smallest spin is  $j = s + b(\mu - 1)$ . An irrep with even multiplicity  $\mu = 2p + 2$  appears for the first time in spin  $j = (2b)p + (2b - s)$  which is  $j = b(\mu - 2) + 2b - s = b\mu - s$ . This proves the claim given in Lemma 2.

### Error Analysis

To start we have the following lemma.

**Lemma S4.** Suppose a spin code is  $X$ -covariant and the codewords  $|\bar{0}\rangle, |\bar{1}\rangle$  are chosen to be real. Then

$$\langle \bar{0} | T_q^k | \bar{0} \rangle = (-1)^{q+k} \langle \bar{1} | T_q^k | \bar{1} \rangle, \quad (\text{S16})$$

$$\langle \bar{0} | T_q^k | \bar{1} \rangle = (-1)^{q+k} \langle \bar{0} | T_q^k | \bar{1} \rangle, \quad (\text{S17})$$

$$\langle \bar{1} | T_q^k | \bar{0} \rangle = (-1)^{q+k} \langle \bar{1} | T_q^k | \bar{0} \rangle. \quad (\text{S18})$$

*Proof.* Let  $u, v \in \{0, 1\}$ . Then

$$\langle \bar{u} | T_q^k | \bar{v} \rangle \stackrel{1}{=} \overline{\langle u + 1 | (iX)^\dagger T_q^k iX | v + 1 \rangle} \quad (\text{S19a})$$

$$\stackrel{2}{=} \overline{\langle u + 1 | D^j(X)^\dagger T_q^k D^j(X) | v + 1 \rangle} \quad (\text{S19b})$$

$$\stackrel{3}{=} (-1)^k \overline{\langle u + 1 | T_{-q}^k | v + 1 \rangle} \quad (\text{S19c})$$

$$\stackrel{4}{=} (-1)^{q+k} \overline{\langle u + 1 | T_q^{k\dagger} | v + 1 \rangle} \quad (\text{S19d})$$

$$= (-1)^{q+k} \overline{\langle v + 1 | T_q^k | u + 1 \rangle}^* \quad (\text{S19e})$$

$$\stackrel{5}{=} (-1)^{q+k} \overline{\langle v + 1 | T_q^k | u + 1 \rangle}. \quad (\text{S19f})$$

In line (1) we use the fact that  $iX = X$  and so  $iX|w\rangle = |w + 1 \bmod 2\rangle$  for both  $w = 0, 1$  (although we will suppress the mod2 for simplicity). In line (2) we use the fact that  $X$  is covariant and so we can pull it through the encoding. In line (3) and (4) we use Lemma S2. In line (5) we use the realness of the codewords.  $\square$

*Proof of Theorem 2.*— Let's start with the on-diagonal condition. Lemma S4 shows that when  $q + k$  is even we automatically satisfy the on-diagonal KL conditions  $\langle \bar{0} | T_q^k | \bar{0} \rangle = \langle \bar{1} | T_q^k | \bar{1} \rangle$ . So we only need to check the on-diagonal cases when  $q + k$  is odd.

However Lemma 1 shows that values of  $m$  within the same codeword are separated by multiples of  $2b$ . Thus if  $q \notin (2b)\mathbb{Z}$  then the KL condition is automatically satisfied because there will be no overlap. On the other hand, if  $q \equiv 0 \pmod{2b}$  then in particular  $q$  is even. So, combining this with the fact that  $q + k$  is odd, we have that  $k$  must be odd.

Lastly suppose  $\langle \bar{0} | T_q^k | \bar{0} \rangle = \langle \bar{1} | T_q^k | \bar{1} \rangle$  for some  $q$  and  $k$ . If we take the conjugate of both sides it is easy to show that  $\langle \bar{0} | T_{-q}^k | \bar{0} \rangle = \langle \bar{1} | T_{-q}^k | \bar{1} \rangle$ . Thus we see that if  $T_q^k$  satisfies the on-diagonal conditions then so does  $T_{-q}^k$ .

Now let's move onto the off-diagonal condition. Lemma S4 shows that when  $q + k$  is odd then we automatically satisfy the off diagonal conditions  $\langle \bar{0} | T_q^k | \bar{1} \rangle = \langle \bar{1} | T_q^k | \bar{0} \rangle = 0$ . Thus the only non-trivial off-diagonal conditions are for  $q + k$  even.

Also note that if  $\langle \bar{0} | T_q^k | \bar{1} \rangle = 0$  and we take the conjugate of both sides we get  $\langle \bar{1} | T_{-q}^k | \bar{0} \rangle = 0$ . Thus if we show  $\langle \bar{0} | T_q^k | \bar{1} \rangle = 0$  for all  $q$  and  $k$  then necessarily we also get  $\langle \bar{1} | T_{-q}^k | \bar{0} \rangle = 0$  for all  $k$  and  $q$ . It is thus sufficient to focus only on the condition  $\langle \bar{0} | T_q^k | \bar{1} \rangle = 0$ .

Now recall that  $T_q^k$  moves an angular momentum ket  $|j, m\rangle$  to an angular momentum ket proportional to  $|j, m + q\rangle$ . Using Lemma 1, this means that the support of the vector  $T_q^k | \bar{1} \rangle$  is

$$\text{supp}(T_q^k | \bar{1} \rangle) = q + \text{supp} | \bar{1} \rangle \quad (\text{S20a})$$

$$= q - \text{supp} | \bar{0} \rangle \quad (\text{S20b})$$

$$= q - s + (2b)\mathbb{Z}, \quad (\text{S20c})$$

where  $s = (2a - 1)/2$ . But recall that  $\text{supp} | \bar{0} \rangle = s + (2b)\mathbb{Z}$ . It follows that  $| \bar{0} \rangle$  and  $T_q^k | \bar{1} \rangle$  have zero overlap unless  $q \in 2s + (2b)\mathbb{Z}$ , or equivalently,  $q \equiv 2a - 1 \pmod{2b}$ . Also this means the only non-trivial off-diagonal errors occur when  $q$  is odd. From the condition  $q + k$  even, we see that  $k$  must be odd as well.  $\square$

### Proof of Theorem 1 - the Dicke Bootstrap

We already proved in our recent paper [6] that the Dicke mapping preserves covariant and transversal gates

$$\mathcal{D}[D^j(g) | j, m \rangle] = g^{\otimes n} \mathcal{D} | j, m \rangle. \quad (\text{S21})$$

It remains to show that the distance  $d$  is preserved (we already checked the small case  $d = 3$  in [6]).

The symmetric group on  $n$  letters,  $S_n$ , has a natural action on  $n$  qubit Pauli errors by permuting the tensor factors. For example  $(123) \cdot XYZ = ZXY$ . For a general operator  $A$ , we define the action of  $\sigma$  on  $A$  by  $\sigma \cdot A = P_\sigma^\dagger A P_\sigma$  where  $P_\sigma$  is the  $2^n \times 2^n$  permutation matrix corresponding to permuting the  $n$  tensor factors by the permutation  $\sigma$ .

Given an  $n$  qubit Pauli error  $E$ , define the *symmetrized Pauli error*  $\text{Sym}(E)$  by

$$\text{Sym}(E) := \frac{1}{n!} \sum_{\sigma \in S_n} P_\sigma^\dagger E P_\sigma. \quad (\text{S22})$$

Suppose an  $n$  qubit Pauli error  $E$  has weight  $w$ . Then there is a unique way of writing  $E$  as a product of weight 1 errors:  $E = E_1 \cdots E_w$ . We define the *spherical Pauli error*  $\text{Sph}(E)$  to be the product of the symmetrized versions of each weight 1 error:

$$\text{Sph}(E) := \text{Sym}(E_1) \cdots \text{Sym}(E_w). \quad (\text{S23})$$

For example

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Sph}(XYZ) &= \text{Sym}(XII) \text{Sym}(IYI) \text{Sym}(IIZ) \\ &= \frac{XII+IXI+IIX}{3} \frac{YII+IYI+IIY}{3} \frac{ZII+IZI+IIZ}{3} \\ &= \frac{1}{27} (XYZ+XZY+ZXY+YXZ+YZX+ZYX \\ &\quad +2iLXX+2iXIX+2iXXI-2iIYY-2iYIY \\ &\quad -2iYYI+2iIZZ+2iZIZ+2iZZI+3iIII) \\ &= \frac{1}{27} (6 \text{Sym}(XYZ)+6i \text{Sym}(XXI)-6i \text{Sym}(YYI) \\ &\quad +6i \text{Sym}(ZZI)+3i \text{Sym}(III)). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{S24})$$

Our proof consists of 3 basic steps. We first bootstrap spin codes to multiqubit codes that can correct spherical Pauli errors. We next bootstrap multiqubit codes that correct spherical Pauli errors to multiqubit codes that correct symmetric Pauli errors. Finally, assuming permutation invariance, we bootstrap multiqubit codes that correct symmetric errors to multiqubit codes that correct arbitrary errors.

**Lemma S5** (Bootstrap 1). A  $((j, K, d))$  spin code corresponds under  $\mathcal{D}$  to a multiqubit code that satisfies the KL conditions for all spherical Pauli errors  $\text{Sph}(E)$  such that  $wt(E) < d$ .

*Proof.* Let  $0 \leq w < d$ . We know from Lemma S3 that

$$T_{q_1}^1 \cdots T_{q_w}^1 = \sum_{k \leq w} C_{kq} T_q^k, \quad \text{for } q = \sum_i q_i. \quad (\text{S25})$$

Let  $|u\rangle$  and  $|v\rangle$  be spin codewords. Then

$$\langle u | T_{q_1}^1 \cdots T_{q_w}^1 | v \rangle = \sum_{k \leq w} C_{kq} \langle u | T_q^k | v \rangle = c_{q_1, \dots, q_w} \langle u | v \rangle, \quad (\text{S26})$$

where we have used the fact that the spin code has distance  $d$  and so satisfies the KL conditions for rank  $k$  spherical tensors when  $k < d$ .

Now insert  $\mathcal{D}^\dagger \mathcal{D}$  in  $w+1$  places as follows

$$\langle u | T_{q_1}^1 \cdots T_{q_w}^1 | v \rangle = \langle u | \mathcal{D}^\dagger (\mathcal{D} T_{q_1}^1 \mathcal{D}^\dagger) \cdots (\mathcal{D} T_{q_w}^1 \mathcal{D}^\dagger) \mathcal{D} | v \rangle. \quad (\text{S27})$$

But we showed in [6] that  $\mathcal{D} T_q^1 \mathcal{D}^\dagger = \text{Sym}(T_q^1)$ . It follows from Eq. (S25) and Eq. (S27) that

$$c_{q_1, \dots, q_w} \langle u | v \rangle = \langle u | \mathcal{D}^\dagger \text{Sym}(T_{q_1}^1) \cdots \text{Sym}(T_{q_w}^1) \mathcal{D} | v \rangle \quad (\text{S28})$$

$$= \langle u | \mathcal{D}^\dagger \text{Sph}(T_{q_1}^1 \cdots T_{q_w}^1) \mathcal{D} | v \rangle. \quad (\text{S29})$$

This holds for any  $w < d$  and so we have shown that the corresponding multiqubit code under  $\mathcal{D}$  satisfies the KL conditions for the spherical Pauli errors.  $\square$

**Lemma S6** (Bootstrap 2). If a multiqubit code satisfies the KL conditions for spherical errors  $\text{Sph}(E)$  with  $wt(E) < d$  then it also satisfies the KL conditions for all symmetric errors  $\text{Sym}(E)$  with  $wt(E) < d$ .

*Proof.* Write the weight  $w$  Pauli  $E$  as  $E = E_1 \cdots E_w$ . Recall that

$$\text{Sph}(E) = \text{Sym}(E_1) \cdots \text{Sym}(E_w). \quad (\text{S30})$$

It follows that

$$\text{Sph}(E) \propto \text{Sym}(E) + \mathcal{O}(< w). \quad (\text{S31})$$

Here  $\mathcal{O}(< w)$  represents a linear combination of symmetrized Paulis of weight strictly less than  $w$  (c.f. the example  $\text{Sph}(XYZ)$  from the beginning of the section). And the constant of proportionality here is always a positive fraction. It follows, by induction on  $w$ , that  $\text{Sym}(E)$  is always a linear combination of spherical errors of weight less than or equal to  $w$ . The claim follows immediately.  $\square$

**Lemma S7** (Bootstrap 3). If a permutationally invariant multiqubit code satisfies the KL conditions for symmetric errors  $\text{Sym}(E)$  with  $wt(E) < d$  then it also satisfies the KL conditions for all Pauli errors  $E$  with  $wt(E) < d$ . In other words, the multiqubit code has distance  $d$ .

*Proof.* Let  $|\widetilde{u}\rangle$  and  $|\widetilde{v}\rangle$  be permutationally invariant multiqubit codewords. Observe that

$$\langle \widetilde{u} | \text{Sym}(E) | \widetilde{v} \rangle = \frac{1}{n!} \sum_{\sigma \in S_n} \langle \widetilde{u} | P_\sigma^\dagger E P_\sigma | \widetilde{v} \rangle \quad (\text{S32})$$

By permutation invariance of the codewords, we can simplify the sum above to  $\frac{1}{n!} \sum_{\sigma \in S_n} \langle \widetilde{u} | E | \widetilde{v} \rangle = \langle \widetilde{u} | E | \widetilde{v} \rangle$ . Noting that  $\text{Sym}(E)$  has the same weight as  $E$  completes the proof of the claim.  $\square$

Combining these 3 bootstraps in sequential order completes the proof of the Dicke bootstrap for all distances.

### Counting Errors

Using Theorem 2 we can count how many errors a  $(\text{BD}_{2b}, \delta_a)$  real covariant spin code must satisfy. In Theorem 2 let  $\nu^{\text{on-diag}}$  denote the number of on-diagonal conditions and let  $\nu^{\text{off-diag}}$  denote the number of off-diagonal conditions.

**Lemma S8.**

$$\nu^{\text{on-diag}} = \sum_{\substack{k=1 \\ k \text{ odd}}}^{d-2} 1 + \lfloor \frac{k}{2b} \rfloor, \quad (\text{S33})$$

$$\nu^{\text{off-diag}} = \sum_{\substack{k=1 \\ k \text{ odd}}}^{d-2} 1 + \lfloor \frac{k-2s}{2b} \rfloor + \lfloor \frac{k+2s}{2b} \rfloor. \quad (\text{S34})$$

*Proof.* Let's start with the on-diagonal piece. When  $k$  is even, all on-diagonal errors are automatically satisfied. When  $k$  is odd, then the number of non-trivial on-diagonal errors is equal to the number of solutions of  $q$  to the modular equation

$$q \equiv 0 \pmod{2b} \quad \text{for } 0 \leq q \leq k. \quad (\text{S35})$$

There are  $1 + \lfloor k/2b \rfloor$  such solutions.

But these are only the errors of *exactly* rank  $k$ . To guarantee a code has distance  $d$ , we need to check all ranks  $0 \leq k \leq d-1$ . Even  $k$  are automatically satisfied so we can take  $d$  to be odd - meaning we only need to sum to  $d-2$ .

Now let's move onto the off-diagonal piece. When  $k$  is even, all off-diagonal errors are automatically satisfied. When  $k$  is odd, the number of non-trivial off-diagonal errors is the number of solutions of  $q$  to the modular equation

$$q \equiv 2s \pmod{2b} \quad \text{for } -k \leq q \leq k, \quad (\text{S36})$$

where  $2s = 2a - 1$  is odd. If  $q \geq 0$  then we would have  $1 + \lfloor (k-2s)/2b \rfloor$  solutions which is the same as the on-diagonal argument just with an offset of  $s$ . If  $q \leq 0$  then we would have  $1 + \lfloor (k+2s)/2b \rfloor$  solutions. We can combine these and subtract 1 to account for the fact we double counted at 0. Thus the total number of non trivial off-diagonal errors of rank exactly  $k$  is

$$1 + \lfloor \frac{k-2s}{2b} \rfloor + \lfloor \frac{k+2s}{2b} \rfloor. \quad (\text{S37})$$

Again, this is only the number of non-trivial errors of *exactly* rank  $k$ . To guarantee distance  $d$ , we must sum these terms for all odd  $k$  between 1 and  $d-1$ .  $\square$

We can refine this more as follows. We will use the notation  $[x]_y := x \pmod{y}$  for brevity and clarity.

**Lemma S9.** Let  $d = 2t + 1$  then

$$\nu^{\text{on-diag}} = \frac{t^2}{2b} + \frac{t}{2} + c,$$

where  $c = \frac{1}{2b} [t]_b ([t]_b - 2[t - \frac{1}{2}]_b + b - 1)$  is a factor that is crudely estimated as  $0 \leq c \leq b$  for any  $t$ .

*Proof.* Write  $d = 2t + 1$ . We want to estimate

$$\nu^{\text{on-diag}} = \sum_{\substack{k=1 \\ k \text{ odd}}}^{2t-1} 1 + \lfloor \frac{k}{2b} \rfloor = t + \left( \sum_{\substack{k=1 \\ k \text{ odd}}}^{2t-1} \lfloor \frac{k}{2b} \rfloor \right). \quad (\text{S38})$$

In the sum write  $k = 2k' + 1$ . Then

$$\sum_{\substack{k=1 \\ k \text{ odd}}}^{2t-1} \lfloor \frac{k}{2b} \rfloor = \sum_{k'=0}^{t-1} \lfloor \frac{2k'+1}{2b} \rfloor = \sum_{k'=0}^{t-1} \lfloor \frac{k'+\frac{1}{2}}{b} \rfloor. \quad (\text{S39})$$

Notice there are  $t$  many terms in the sum. If  $0 \leq k' \leq b-1$  then the summand is 0, if  $b \leq k' \leq 2b-1$  then the summand is 1, if  $2b \leq k' \leq 3b-1$  then the summand is 2, etc. Each of these groupings contains a sum over  $b$  elements.

If  $t$  was a multiple of  $b$ , say  $t = pb$ , then there would be  $p$  groupings - labeled  $k' = 0$  to  $k' = p-1$  - with each grouping containing exactly  $b$  elements that each evaluate to  $k'$ . In other words, the sum would be

$$b \sum_{k'=0}^{p-1} k' = \frac{bp(p-1)}{2}. \quad (\text{S40})$$

More generally,  $t$  might not be a multiple of  $b$ , say  $t = pb + \gamma$  where  $p = \lfloor \frac{t}{b} \rfloor$  and  $\gamma = t \pmod{b} = [t]_b$ . Then we get the previous with  $p$  replaced by  $\lfloor \frac{t}{b} \rfloor$ . This *main* piece is

$$\mathcal{M} = \frac{b \lfloor \frac{t}{b} \rfloor (\lfloor \frac{t}{b} \rfloor - 1)}{2}. \quad (\text{S41})$$

But we need to also add in the ‘‘tail’’ (which comes from the fact that the  $t$  terms in the sum cannot be split evenly). The tail has  $\gamma = [t]_b$  terms in it all evaluated as the endpoint  $\lfloor \frac{2t-1}{2b} \rfloor$ , i.e., the tail is

$$\mathcal{T} = [t]_b \lfloor \frac{2t-1}{2b} \rfloor. \quad (\text{S42})$$

Thus the sum is

$$\mathcal{M} + \mathcal{T} = \frac{t^2}{2b} - \frac{t}{2} + \frac{1}{2b} [t]_b ([t]_b - 2[t - \frac{1}{2}]_b + b - 1). \quad (\text{S43})$$

In the last line we have used the fact that  $\lfloor \frac{x}{y} \rfloor = \frac{x}{y} - \frac{1}{y} [x]_y$ . This yields the form of  $\nu^{\text{on-diag}}$  given in the claim.

The crude bound is found by noting that  $0 \leq [t]_b < b$ .  $\square$

**Lemma S10.** Let  $d = 2t + 1$  then

$$\nu^{\text{off-diag}} = \frac{t^2}{b} + \frac{t}{b} + \frac{2a(a-b-1)+b+1}{2b} + c$$

where  $c$  is given in Eq. (S53) and is a factor such that  $0 \leq c \leq 2b$  for all  $t$  and for all  $a$ .

*Proof.* Let  $h$  be an odd integer (representing either  $2s = 2a - 1$  or  $-2s = -2a + 1$ ). Recall that  $1 \leq a \leq b$  so that  $|h| \leq 2b - 1$ . Consider the sum

$$\mathcal{S} = \sum_{\substack{k=1 \\ k \text{ odd}}}^{2t-1} \lfloor \frac{k+h}{2b} \rfloor = \sum_{k'=0}^{t-1} \lfloor \frac{2k'+1+h}{2b} \rfloor = \sum_{k'=0}^{t-1} \lfloor \frac{k'+h'}{b} \rfloor. \quad (\text{S44})$$

We have defined  $k' = (k - 1)/2$  and  $h' = (1 + h)/2$  to be integral. Notice that  $-b + 1 \leq h' \leq b$ .

There are  $t$  many terms in the sum. If  $0 \leq k' + h' < b$  the summand is 0, if  $b \leq k' + h' < 2b$  the summand is 1, if  $2b \leq k' + h' < 3b$  the summand 2, etc. We will break up what is going on into cases.

(Case 1) When  $h' = 0$  we have the exact same results as the previous lemma for  $\mathcal{M}$  but now the tail is evaluated at  $\lfloor \frac{t-1}{b} \rfloor$  (but still contains  $[t]_b$  terms). Thus the sum is

$$\mathcal{S} = \frac{b \lfloor \frac{t}{b} \rfloor \left( \lfloor \frac{t}{b} \rfloor - 1 \right)}{2} + [t]_b \lfloor \frac{t-1}{b} \rfloor. \quad (\text{S45})$$

(Case 2) When  $h' = b$  then the main piece from before starts at 1 instead of 0, i.e., the main piece comes from  $b \sum_{k'=1}^p k' = bp(p+1)/2$  where  $p = \lfloor \frac{t}{b} \rfloor$ . The tail is evaluated to  $\lfloor \frac{t-1+b}{b} \rfloor$  so that the sum is

$$\mathcal{S} = \frac{b \lfloor \frac{t}{b} \rfloor \left( \lfloor \frac{t}{b} \rfloor + 1 \right)}{2} + [t]_b \lfloor \frac{t+b-1}{b} \rfloor. \quad (\text{S46})$$

(Case 3) When  $1 \leq h' \leq b - 1$  then the very first grouping has only  $b - h'$  elements in it (not  $b$  elements). The summand for each of these is 0. Thus we really only have a sum of  $t - (b - h')$  elements. So the main piece is similar but with  $b \sum_{k'=1}^p k' = bp(p+1)/2$  where  $p = \lfloor \frac{t-(b-h')}{b} \rfloor$ . The tail will now have  $[t - (b - h')]_b$  terms in it all evaluated to the endpoint  $\lfloor \frac{t-1+h'}{b} \rfloor$ . Thus

$$\mathcal{S} = \frac{b \lfloor \frac{t-(b-h')}{b} \rfloor \left( \lfloor \frac{t-(b-h')}{b} \rfloor + 1 \right)}{2} + [t - (b - h')]_b \lfloor \frac{t-1+h'}{b} \rfloor. \quad (\text{S47})$$

(Case 4) When  $-b + 1 \leq h' \leq -1$  then the very first grouping has  $|h'|$  many elements in it, each evaluated to  $-1$ , i.e., the sum over the first is grouping is just  $h'$ . Thus we only have a sum over  $t + h'$  elements. So the main piece is  $b \sum_{k'=0}^{p-1} k' = bp(p-1)/2$  where  $p = \lfloor \frac{t+h'}{b} \rfloor$ . The tail has  $[t + h']_b$  elements each evaluated to  $\lfloor \frac{t-1+h'}{b} \rfloor$ . Thus

$$\mathcal{S} = h' + \frac{b \lfloor \frac{t+h'}{b} \rfloor \left( \lfloor \frac{t+h'}{b} \rfloor - 1 \right)}{2} + [t + h']_b \lfloor \frac{t-1+h'}{b} \rfloor. \quad (\text{S48})$$

Now we are interested in

$$\nu^{\text{on-diag}} = \sum_{\substack{k=1 \\ k \text{ odd}}}^{d-2} 1 + \lfloor \frac{k-2s}{2b} \rfloor + \lfloor \frac{k+2s}{2b} \rfloor \quad (\text{S49})$$

$$= t + \left( \sum_{k'=0}^{t-1} \lfloor \frac{2k'+1-(2a-1)}{2b} \rfloor + \sum_{k'=0}^{t-1} \lfloor \frac{2k'+1+(2a-1)}{2b} \rfloor \right) \quad (\text{S50})$$

$$= t + \left( \sum_{k'=0}^{t-1} \lfloor \frac{k'-a+1}{b} \rfloor + \sum_{k'=0}^{t-1} \lfloor \frac{k'+a}{b} \rfloor \right). \quad (\text{S51})$$

The term in parenthesis, say  $\mathcal{S}'$ , can be evaluated using the previous as  $\mathcal{S}' = \mathcal{S}_{h'=-a+1} + \mathcal{S}_{h'=a}$ .

When  $a = 1$  we use case 1 and case 3. Then we have

$$\nu^{\text{off-diag}} = \frac{t^2}{b} + \frac{t}{b} + \frac{1-b}{2b} + c,$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} c &= \frac{1}{2b} [t + 1]_b^2 \\ &+ \frac{1}{2b} [t + 1]_b (b - 2 - 2[t]_b) \\ &+ \frac{1}{2b} [t]_b (b - 2 - 2[t - 1]_b). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{S52})$$

Note that  $0 \leq c \leq 2b$  is an easy (but crude) estimate. When  $a = b$  then we use case 4 and case 2. But one can show we get the exact same thing as for  $a = 1$ .

This leaves us with  $2 \leq a \leq b - 1$  which come from case 3 and case 4. In these cases

$$\nu^{\text{off-diag}} = \frac{t^2}{b} + \frac{t}{b} + \frac{2a(a-b-1)+b+1}{2b} + c,$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} c &= \frac{1}{2b} [t + 1 - a]_b^2 \\ &+ \frac{1}{2b} [t + 1 - a]_b (b - 2 - 2[t - a]_b) \\ &+ \frac{1}{2b} [t + a]_b (b - 2 - 2[-1 + a + t]_b + [a + t]_b). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{S53})$$

This is also crudely estimated as  $0 \leq c \leq 2b$ . One can show that  $a = a_0$  and  $a = b - a_0 + 1$  give the same  $\nu^{\text{off-diag}}$ . One can actually check that this reproduces the  $a = 1$  and  $a = b$  cases so this is the general formula.  $\square$

Let  $\nu$  be the number of quadratic equations from Theorem 2, i.e.,  $\nu = \nu^{\text{on-diag}} + \nu^{\text{off-diag}}$ . Recall that  $d = 2t + 1$ , i.e.,  $t$  is the number of errors we can correct.

**Theorem S1.**

$$\nu = \frac{3}{2b} t^2 + \frac{(2+b)}{2b} t + \frac{2a(a-b-1)+b+1}{2b} + c, \quad (\text{S54})$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} c &= \frac{1}{2b} \left( ((-a + t + 1) \bmod b)^2 + \right. \\ &+ (-2((t - a) \bmod b) + b - 2)((-a + t + 1) \bmod b) \\ &+ ((a + t) \bmod b)(-2((a + t - 1) \bmod b) \\ &+ ((a + t) \bmod b) + b - 2) + (t \bmod b)^2 \\ &\left. + (-2((t - \frac{1}{2}) \bmod b) + b - 1)(t \bmod b) \right). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{S55})$$

A crude estimate for  $c$  is  $0 \leq c \leq 3b$  for all  $t$  and all  $a$ .



Notice that  $a = a_0$  and  $a = b + 1 - a_0$  yield the same  $\nu$ . For example,  $\delta_1$  and  $\delta_b$  yield the same  $\nu$ ,  $\delta_2$  and  $\delta_{b-1}$  yield the same  $\nu$ , etc. Also notice that for  $Q^{(1)} = BD_2$  (i.e.,  $b = 1$  and  $a = 1$ ) we have  $\nu = \frac{3}{2}t(t+1)$ . This special case reproduces the result found in [36].

**Finding Codes**

*Digression on existence of solutions.*— Finding a  $(BD_{2b}, \delta_a)$  covariant real spin code with distance  $d$  amounts to solving a system of  $\nu$  quadratic equations using kets with  $\mu$  degrees of freedom.

If this were a generic system of real *linear* equations then we could guarantee a *non-zero* real solution exists so long as  $\mu > \nu$ , the smallest solution occurring when  $\mu = \nu + 1$ . Unfortunately, there is no current theory of existence of real solutions to systems of real quadratic equations (the main obstruction is that  $\mathbb{R}$  is not algebraically closed).

Existence results analogous to the linear case do exist for quadratic equations in a slightly different setup. Consider a system of algebraically independent quadratic equations given by  $x^T B_i x = 0$ . Then Bezout’s theorem from algebraic geometry guarantees that a non-zero *complex* solution exists as long as the number of variables,  $\mu$ , is strictly greater than the number of equations,  $\nu$ . So, just as in the linear case, a non-zero complex solution exists when  $\mu = \nu + 1$ . Bezout’s theorem is not directly applicable in our case because even if the coefficients of the quadratic forms are all real, it only guarantees the existence of a complex solution, not a real one (which our analysis was entirely based on).

In the present setup we have yet to discover, either numerically or analytically, a situation where the heuristic  $\mu = \nu + 1$  fails. This observation was also noticed in [4] and the authors used this idea to construct many spin codes which are covariant for the single qubit Clifford group. This leads us to propose the following conjecture.

**Conjecture** (Real Bezout’s Theorem). Under certain reasonable restrictions, a system of  $\nu$  independent real quadratic forms in  $\nu + 1$  variables always has a nonzero real solution.

The phrase “under some reasonable restrictions” must be used because it is easy to construct counter examples in the general case. For example, if any of the quadratic forms are totally definite then the only real solution will be all zero.

This conjecture is known to be true when  $\nu = 1$ . A single quadratic form given by a symmetric matrix  $B$  has a non-zero solution in 2 variables if and only if  $B$  is not totally definite (meaning the eigenvalues of  $B$  have different signs or one of the eigenvalues is 0).

The  $\nu = 2$  case was studied as far back as 1964 by the famous Calabi [37]. A system of two quadratic forms

$B_1, B_2$  has a non-zero real solution in 3 variables if and only if the matrix pencil  $t_1 B_1 + t_2 B_2$  is not totally definite for any real values  $t_1, t_2$ .

		$d$										
		1	3	5	7	9	11	13	15 <sup>▲</sup>	17 <sup>▲</sup>	19 <sup>▲</sup>	21 <sup>▲</sup>
BD <sub>2</sub>	$\delta_1$	1	7	19	37	61	91	127	169	217	271	331
BD <sub>4</sub>	$\delta_1$	1	9	23	41	65	97	135	177	225	281	343
	$\delta_2$	3	11	21	43	67	99	133	179	227	283	341
BD <sub>6</sub>	$\delta_1$	1	13	25	47	73	107	143	191	239	289	359
	$\delta_2$	3	9	27	45	69	105	141	183	237	291	351
	$\delta_3$	5	17	29	43	77	103	139	187	235	293	355
BD <sub>8</sub>	$\delta_1$	1	17	33	49	79	113	159	193	241	305	369
	$\delta_2$	3	13	29	51	77	109	147	195	243	301	365
	$\delta_3$	5	11	27	53	75	107	149	197	245	299	363
	$\delta_4$	7	23	39	55	73	119	153	199	247	311	375
BD <sub>10</sub>	$\delta_1$	1	21	41	61	81	119	161	219	261	319	379
	$\delta_2$	3	17	37	57	83	117	157	203	257	317	377
	$\delta_3$	5	15	25	55	85	115	155	195	255	315	375
	$\delta_4$	7	13	33	53	87	113	153	207	253	313	373
	$\delta_5$	9	29	49	69	89	111	169	211	269	311	371
BD <sub>12</sub>	$\delta_1$	1	25	49	73	97	121	167	217	287	337	407
	$\delta_2$	3	21	45	69	93	123	165	213	267	333	387
	$\delta_3$	5	19	29	53	91	125	163	211	259	317	389
	$\delta_4$	7	17	31	55	89	127	161	209	257	319	391
	$\delta_5$	9	15	39	63	87	129	159	207	273	327	393
	$\delta_6$	11	35	59	83	107	131	157	227	277	347	397

TABLE S2: Smallest  $n$  permutationally invariant real multiqubit codes that support  $(BD_{2b}, \delta_a)$  transversally with distance  $d$  (we have crossed out the non-faithful irreps). A cell highlighted green means the code is smallest among all faithful irreps of the given group. We have actually constructed the codes in  $1 \leq d \leq 13$  using MATHEMATICA 13.2 up to a numeric threshold of  $10^{-12}$ . Those codes with a  $\blacktriangle$  are conjectured to exist but we haven’t found them numerically (yet).

*Analytic Code family.*— In order to get analytic results, we will proceed by assuming the conjecture is true and that it applies to our spin code setup, i.e., we will assume a covariant spin code exists when  $\mu = \nu + 1$ . Any result based on this conjecture will be marked with a triangle  $\blacktriangle$ . Notice that Code Family I and Code Family II are *not* based on this conjecture whereas Code Family III is based on this conjecture as will be made explicitly clear below.

Lemma 2 says that the first covariant code appears in spin  $j = \nu b + \kappa$  where  $\kappa = s$  if  $\nu$  is even and  $\kappa = b - s$  if  $\nu$  is odd. But we saw a closed form solution for  $\nu$  in Theorem S1, namely  $\nu \sim \frac{3}{8b} d^2$ . Thus, given that the conjecture is true, we have a quadratic family of spin codes in spin  $j \sim \frac{3}{8} d^2$ .

$((11, 2, 3, \mathbf{Q}^{(3)}), \delta_3)$	$ \bar{0}\rangle = \frac{\sqrt{5}}{4} D_0^{11}\rangle + \frac{\sqrt{11}}{4} D_8^{11}\rangle$
$((27, 2, 5, \mathbf{Q}^{(3)}), \delta_3)$	$ \bar{0}\rangle = -0.419391 D_0^{27}\rangle + 0.625017 D_8^{27}\rangle + 0.0595089 D_{16}^{27}\rangle + 0.655686 D_{24}^{27}\rangle$
$((49, 2, 7, \mathbf{Q}^{(3)}), \delta_1)$	$ \bar{0}\rangle = -0.201735 D_0^{49}\rangle + 0.3284 D_8^{49}\rangle - 0.44571 D_{16}^{49}\rangle + 0.517794 D_{24}^{49}\rangle + 0.476193 D_{32}^{49}\rangle + 0.318756 D_{40}^{49}\rangle + 0.237326 D_{48}^{49}\rangle$
$((73, 2, 9, \mathbf{Q}^{(3)}), \delta_4)$	$ \bar{0}\rangle = -0.206212 D_0^{73}\rangle + 0.227626 D_8^{73}\rangle - 0.462933 D_{16}^{73}\rangle + 0.352279 D_{24}^{73}\rangle - 0.186197 D_{32}^{73}\rangle - 0.383276 D_{40}^{73}\rangle - 0.0735981 D_{48}^{73}\rangle - 0.544932 D_{56}^{73}\rangle + 0.156301 D_{64}^{73}\rangle - 0.242669 D_{72}^{73}\rangle$
$((107, 2, 11, \mathbf{Q}^{(3)}), \delta_3)$	$ \bar{0}\rangle = 0.241938 D_0^{107}\rangle - 0.430038 D_8^{107}\rangle + 0.0927816 D_{16}^{107}\rangle + 0.154505 D_{24}^{107}\rangle + 0.429423 D_{32}^{107}\rangle - 0.0555468 D_{40}^{107}\rangle + 0.0116979 D_{48}^{107}\rangle + 0.166002 D_{56}^{107}\rangle + 0.387154 D_{64}^{107}\rangle + 0.0355115 D_{72}^{107}\rangle - 0.116024 D_{80}^{107}\rangle + 0.412203 D_{88}^{107}\rangle + 0.102736 D_{96}^{107}\rangle + 0.404712 D_{104}^{107}\rangle$
$((147, 2, 13, \mathbf{Q}^{(3)}), \delta_2)$	$ \bar{0}\rangle = -0.0655024 D_0^{147}\rangle - 0.13146 D_8^{147}\rangle - 0.0280819 D_{16}^{147}\rangle - 0.259006 D_{24}^{147}\rangle + 0.0788041 D_{32}^{147}\rangle - 0.218291 D_{40}^{147}\rangle + 0.377217 D_{48}^{147}\rangle + 0.115604 D_{56}^{147}\rangle - 0.17366 D_{64}^{147}\rangle - 0.545858 D_{72}^{147}\rangle + 0.159303 D_{80}^{147}\rangle + 0.23378 D_{88}^{147}\rangle + 0.344513 D_{96}^{147}\rangle - 0.211129 D_{104}^{147}\rangle + 0.23128 D_{112}^{147}\rangle - 0.13308 D_{120}^{147}\rangle - 0.213004 D_{128}^{147}\rangle - 0.00407857 D_{136}^{147}\rangle + 0.114171 D_{144}^{147}\rangle$

TABLE S3: Code Family III for  $d = 3, 5, 7, 9, 11, 13$ . Recall that this family implements a transversal  $T$  gate. We have given  $|\bar{0}\rangle$ , and  $|\bar{1}\rangle$  can be found by replacing  $|D_w^n\rangle$  with  $|D_{n-w}^n\rangle$ .

Using the Dicke bootstrap, we have a family of  $(\text{BD}_{2b}, \delta_a)$ -transversal permutationally invariant multi-qubit codes with distance  $d$  and

$$n \triangleq \frac{3}{4}d^2 + \frac{(b-1)}{2}d + \mathcal{O}(1). \quad (\text{S56})$$

The constant-order term  $\mathcal{O}(1)$  is given by

$$\frac{1}{4}(8a^2 - 8ab - 8a + 2b + 3) + 2bc + 2\kappa \quad (\text{S57})$$

where  $c$  is given in Theorem S1 just with  $t$  replaced with  $(d-1)/2$  and  $\kappa$  is either  $s$  or  $b-s$  (from Lemma 2). Although  $c$  depends on  $d$ , it is bounded (loosely) as  $0 \leq c \leq 3b$  (which is why this term has constant or-

der). Thus we have a conjectured family of codes that all grow quadratically.

*Constructing codes.*— Instead of taking Eq. (S56) literally, we can use it as a guiding heuristic to finding codes numerically. We have tabulated Eq. (S56) for small values of  $b$  and small values of  $d$  in Table S2. We have actually constructed all codes in the table for  $d \leq 13$  using MATHEMATICA 13.2. All of our solutions have been found using a minimization threshold of  $10^{-12}$ .

It is worth emphasizing that although Code Family III was based on the conjecture, we have actually constructed the codes within this family for  $d = 3, 5, 7, 9, 11, 13$ . For convenience we write out the numeric coefficients for this family in Table S3.