

A Blindness Property of the Min-Sum Decoding for the Toric Code

Julien du Crest¹, Mehdi Mhalla², Valentin Savin³

¹Université Grenoble Alpes, Grenoble INP, LIG, F-38000 Grenoble, France

²Université Grenoble Alpes, CNRS, Grenoble INP, LIG, F-38000 Grenoble, France

³Université Grenoble Alpes, CEA-Léti, F-38054 Grenoble, France

Kitaev's toric code is one of the most prominent models for fault-tolerant quantum computation, currently regarded as the leading solution for connectivity constrained quantum technologies. Significant effort has been recently devoted to improving the error correction performance of the toric code under message-passing decoding, a class of low-complexity, iterative decoding algorithms that play a central role in both theory and practice of classical low-density parity-check codes. Here, we provide a theoretical analysis of the toric code under min-sum (MS) decoding, a message-passing decoding algorithm known to solve the maximum-likelihood decoding problem in a localized manner, for codes defined by acyclic graphs. Our analysis reveals an intrinsic limitation of the toric code, which confines the propagation of local information during the message-passing process. We show that if the unsatisfied checks of an error syndrome are at distance ≥ 5 from each other, then the MS decoding is locally blind: the qubits in the direct neighborhood of an unsatisfied check are never aware of any other unsatisfied checks, except their direct neighbor. Moreover, we show that degeneracy is not the only cause of decoding failures for errors of weight at least 4, that is, the MS non-degenerate decoding radius is equal to 3, for any toric code of distance ≥ 9 . Finally, complementing our theoretical analysis, we present a pre-processing method of practical relevance. The proposed method, referred to as stabiliser-blowup, has linear complexity and allows correcting all (degenerate) errors of weight up to 3, providing quadratic improvement in the logical error rate performance, as compared to MS only.

1. Introduction

Message passing (MP) decoding stands as both the fundamental theoretical reason behind the invention of classical LDPC codes (departing from previous minimum distance centric constructions), and the key to their success and widespread application in real-world systems. However, quantum LDPC codes are known to be classically degenerate [1], thus the sparsity of their Tanner graph does no longer fulfill its role of enabling efficient MP decoding, but merely acts as an enabler for fault-tolerance (*e.g.*, fault-tolerant syndrome extraction and fault-tolerant operations on logical qubits). Consequently, a significant effort has been devoted over the last few years to efficient decoding of quantum LDPC codes, by either combining the MP decoding with a post-processing step [2–5], and/or improving the MP decoding performance itself [6–10].

Here, we consider the MP decoding of the Kitaev toric code [11], the planar version of which is currently the dominant error-correction solution to achieve fault-tolerance in

large-scale quantum computers, especially for connectivity constrained technologies [12]. Among the large class of quantum LDPC codes, the toric code is also known to be the less responsive to MP, due to the presence of weight-2 degenerate errors undecodable by vanilla MP decoders, such as belief-propagation (BP)¹ or min-sum (MS). Consequently, the logical error rate of these vanilla decoders scales as p^2 , where p is the physical error rate, well behind the $p^{\lceil \frac{d}{2} \rceil}$ scaling of a minimum distance decoding (*i.e.*, correcting any error of weight $\leq \lfloor \frac{d-1}{2} \rfloor$), where d is the minimum distance of the code. A few approaches proposed in the literature, such as BP with memory [8], generalized BP [10], or neural-BP [13,14], succeeded to improve the logical error rate performance for small distance toric codes ($d \leq 9$), but they all failed to scale to larger distance codes. Precisely, for $d \leq 9$, the above approaches may yield a logical error rate that scales as $p^{\lceil \frac{d}{2} \rceil}$, but this scaling does not longer improve with increasing minimum distance², indicating the presence of undecodable errors of weight 5. Here, we try to understand if such difficulties come from an intrinsic limitation of the toric code itself, hindering further improvement of MP-based decoding for $d > 9$.

We consider binary MP decoding, corresponding to separate decoding of X and Z -type errors. The input of the decoder consists of the error syndrome and the *a priori soft value* of each qubit (*e.g.*, error probabilities or log-likelihood ratio values). Decoding is carried out through an iterative exchange of extrinsic messages between qubits and checks they participate in, which is conveniently described via the Tanner graph representation of the code. In this representation, messages are exchanged between neighboring qubit and checks of the Tanner graph, and the iterative nature of the decoding process is aimed at spreading the information globally. At each decoding iteration, an *a posteriori soft value* is computed for each qubit, based on the collected messages, gradually improving the estimation of the error. In the sequel, we shall simply use the terminology of *a priori* and *a posteriori* value (omitting soft). For details on MP decoders we refer to [15].

Our goal is to understand how the information is spreading on the toric code, and what is the maximum length it can travel. To provide a formal statement, we first introduce the notion of local blindness of an MP decoder. Informally, given an error syndrome \mathbf{s} and an unsatisfied check c , *i.e.*, such that $\mathbf{s}(c) = 1$, we consider a fake syndrome \mathbf{s}^c , having c as the only unsatisfied check (note that \mathbf{s}^c is not a valid error syndrome, since no error can generate it). We say that the MP decoding of \mathbf{s} is *locally blind* in the neighborhood of c , if running the MP decoding on the error syndrome \mathbf{s} , or on the fake syndrome \mathbf{s}^c , yields the same *a posteriori* value for any qubit q neighboring c , and for any number of decoding iterations. Put differently, at no iteration are the qubits neighboring c aware that it is not the only unsatisfied check of the syndrome: the MP decoder fails to convey

¹We use BP for the MP decoding using Bayesian rules to update the exchanged messages (also known as sum-product). It performs the exact Bayesian inference on trees, but may be used on more general graphical models. Note that BP is sometimes used (included in some of the papers cited here) with the generic meaning of MP.

²The Adaptive BP with Memory (MBP) in [8] may improve the slope of the logical error rate curve beyond $d = 9$, which comes from the use of many MBP decoders (with different meta-parameter values). Put differently, this improvement is attributable to a form of decoding diversity, rather than the intrinsic error correction capacity of the MBP decoder, which saturates at $d = 9$ [8, Section 4.4].

the information from the other unsatisfied checks. Intuitively, this may happen when c is too far away from the other unsatisfied checks of the syndrome.

Main Results

In this work, we focus on the MS decoding, with the conventional flooded scheduling. The reason is twofold. First, MS is an MP decoding algorithm that is aimed at solving the maximum likelihood (ML) decoding problem in a *localized* manner (see Section 2 for details). It actually succeeds in doing so for codes defined by acyclic graphs. However, quantum LDPC codes (as well as good classical LDPC codes) are defined by graphs with cycles, preventing local information from being spread effectively, and causing a degradation of the error correction performance with respect to ML decoding. Second, MS presents a number of practical advantages, *e.g.*, low computational complexity (only requires additions and comparisons) and robustness to low precision arithmetic (*e.g.*, below 6-bit messages), being the *de facto* solution used in practical applications and hardware implementations [16]. Moreover, assuming a Pauli channel model for physical qubit errors, with X and Z errors decoded independently, MS does not need an *a priori* knowledge of the channel X, Y, Z error probabilities [4].

Our first result states that the **local** information exchange of the MS is not spreading **globally**:

Theorem 1 (MS Local Blindness). *Consider an error syndrome \mathbf{s} on a toric code, such that all the unsatisfied checks are at distance at least 5 from each other. Then, under the i.i.d. noise assumption, the MS decoding of \mathbf{s} is locally blind in the neighborhood of any unsatisfied check.*

In particular, it follows that such a syndrome is undecodable by MS. Further, we are interested in determining the smallest weight of an undecodable non-degenerate error. We say that an error \mathbf{e} is **non-degenerate** if it generates a syndrome that cannot be generated by any other error $\mathbf{e}' \neq \mathbf{e}$, such that $|\mathbf{e}'| \leq |\mathbf{e}|$. For instance, 1-dimensional errors \mathbf{e} of weight $|\mathbf{e}| \leq \lfloor \frac{d-1}{2} \rfloor$ and generating a syndrome of weight 2 are non-degenerate. But some 2-dimensional errors may also be non-degenerate.

Before introducing the next Theorem, we refine the classical notion of decoding radius (*i.e.*, the largest integer ω , such that any error of weight $\leq \omega$ is decoded correctly), by introducing the **non-degenerate decoding radius**, which only takes into account non-degenerate errors.

Theorem 2 (MS Non-Degenerate Decoding Radius). *For any toric code of distance ≥ 9 , the non-degenerate decoding radius of the MS is 3.*

We give formal proofs of Theorems 1 and 2, based on the formalism of decoding trees. We also conjecture that Theorem 1 holds for the normalized MS decoder, irrespective of the normalization factor (note also that for an appropriate choice of the normalization factor, the normalized MS provides a good approximation of BP). Although the proof techniques

we use do not translate directly to normalized MS, we provide numerical evidence to corroborate our conjecture.

Finally, we propose a method to remove low-weight degeneracy on the toric code, which naturally complements the above analysis. Although the toric code is known to be the hypergraph product code of two classical repetition codes [17], on which the MS decoding radius is equal to $\lfloor \frac{d-1}{2} \rfloor$, the decoding radius of the MS on the toric code is only equal to 1, and the essence of Theorem 2 is that even the **non-degenerate** decoding radius is no greater than 3. We propose a new pre-processing that runs in linear time and allows correcting all (degenerate) errors of weight up to 3 thus improving the decoding radius of the MS to 3. We refer to this pre-processing step as stabiliser-blowup (SB), and it amounts to applying a change of variable that locally removes the degeneracy to allow the decoder to converge. We formally prove the following Theorem.

Theorem 3 (Stabilizer Blowup Pre-Processing). *SB+MS is able to correct all errors of weight up to 3 on a toric code of distance ≥ 7 .*

It follows that the SB+MS yields a quadratic improvement in the logical error rate performance, as compared to MS only. In particular, it can be applied to quadratically reduce the number of calls to a possible post-processing step, which remains a must³ for the MS-based decoding of toric codes of minimum distance $d \geq 9$.

2. Preliminaries

2.1. The Decoding Problem

In the rest of the paper, we will restrict ourselves to a simple setup: decoding independent and identically distributed (i.i.d.) X errors on the toric code. In this noise model, the *a priori* values of all qubits are the same, and only depend on the probability of X error on each qubit. Everything said here also applies to Z errors.

Since the toric code is a CSS code, the maximum likelihood⁴ (ML) decoding of X errors can be stated as: for a matrix \mathbf{H} , and a syndrome \mathbf{s} , find the most likely error \tilde{e} such that $\mathbf{H}\tilde{e} = \mathbf{s}$. Assuming an i.i.d. noise model, finding the most likely error is equivalent to finding the error of smallest weight.

A tie occurs in the ML decoding if there are several smallest weight (or in the general setting, most likely) errors satisfying the syndrome. If the decision is taken globally, the ML decoder may output either the list of all such errors, or any one of them (*e.g.*,

³According to the limited performances of state of the art MS improvements, of which the poor performances are likely being explained by the local blindness property from Theorem 1.

⁴Here we only discuss the ML decoding of quantum codes and not the quantum ML decoding, where one is interested in decoding the most likely equivalence class of errors. This simplification of the problem makes sense in the rest of the paper since our goal is to show that the decoder is unable to decode even constant sized errors, so we are not so much concerned about logical errors, but rather about decoding failures (inability to output a valid correction).

randomly chosen). This is no longer possible for decoders based on local decisions, such as MP decoders, where each qubit is decided based on local information. In this case, it is more convenient to consider the following *localized* version of the ML decoder. For a matrix \mathbf{H} , a syndrome \mathbf{s} , and a qubit q : if all the smallest weight errors satisfying the syndrome agree on qubit q , that is, $\exists a \in \{0, 1\}$, such that $\mathbf{e}(q) = a$ for any smallest weight \mathbf{e} satisfying $\mathbf{H}\mathbf{e} = \mathbf{s}$, then set $\tilde{\mathbf{e}}(q) = a$; otherwise, set $\tilde{\mathbf{e}}(q)$ to a random value in $\{0, 1\}$. Obviously, if there is only one smallest weight error satisfying the syndrome, then both the ML and its localized variant output this error. Otherwise, the error outputted by the localized ML may actually not satisfy the given syndrome.

2.2. Degenerate Errors

For a given syndrome \mathbf{s} , we write $\mathbf{s}(c)$ to denote the value of \mathbf{s} on check c . If $\mathbf{s}(c) = 1$, we say that check c is **unsatisfied**, otherwise we say it is **satisfied**.

The notions of degenerate syndrome and degenerate error, introduced below, capture the fact that there may be several errors of minimal weight explaining a given syndrome. Such a syndrome would intuitively be hard to decode, since it would be difficult for the decoder to arbitrate between those errors, as it is a classical decoder, not aware of the degeneracy of the code.

For a given parity-check matrix \mathbf{H} , for any syndrome \mathbf{s} , we denote by $\mathcal{E}(\mathbf{s})$ the set of errors satisfying this syndrome.

$$\mathcal{E}(\mathbf{s}) = \{\mathbf{e} \mid \mathbf{H}\mathbf{e} = \mathbf{s}\}$$

Moreover, we denote by $|e|$ the (Hamming) weight of an error e , and define $\mathcal{E}_{\min}(\mathbf{s})$ as the subset of errors of minimal weight.

$$\mathcal{E}_{\min}(\mathbf{s}) = \{\mathbf{e} \in \mathcal{E}(\mathbf{s}) \mid |\mathbf{e}| = \min_{\mathbf{e}' \in \mathcal{E}(\mathbf{s})} |\mathbf{e}'|\}$$

Definition 1. A syndrome \mathbf{s} is said **degenerate** if $|\mathcal{E}_{\min}(\mathbf{s})| > 1$.

Definition 2. An error \mathbf{e} is said **degenerate** if there exists $\mathbf{e}' \neq \mathbf{e}$ such that $|\mathbf{e}'| \leq |\mathbf{e}|$ and $\mathbf{H}\mathbf{e}' = \mathbf{H}\mathbf{e}$.

Lemma 1. If $\mathbf{e} \in \mathcal{E}_{\min}(\mathbf{s})$, then \mathbf{e} is degenerate iff \mathbf{s} is degenerate.

We also refine the classical notion of decoding radius to discuss more precisely the decoding of non-degenerate errors.

Definition 3. The **non-degenerate** decoding radius ω , for a given decoder and code, is the largest integer ω such that all non-degenerate errors of weight $\leq \omega$ are correctly decoded.

2.3. The MS Decoder

For LDPC codes, the two main MP decoders used are the BP and the MS. On acyclic graphs, the first solves the maximum *a posteriori* decoding problem, while the second solves the *localized* ML decoding problem, discussed above (see also [15]). Algorithmically, they both function by iteratively exchanging messages on the Tanner graph of the code. Although they are usually described in an algorithmic way, by specifying the functions used to compute the exchanged messages, they can be alternatively described by means of decoding (or computation) trees, introduced by Wiberg [15], which is more convenient for our purposes. We refer to [15] for the algorithmic description and the definition of the decoding tree in the general setting, and provide below the definition of the decoding tree for the particular case of the toric code.

It is straightforward to see that the localized ML corrects all the non-degenerate errors, and fails (with high probability⁵) on the degenerate ones. Although the MS decoder aims at solving the localized ML decoding problem, we show in this paper that it fails even to decode some non-degenerate errors of small weight on the toric code. However, counter intuitively, the MS is also able to correct some degenerate errors. A discussion on the decoding of degenerate errors by the MS on the toric code can be found in Appendix A.

2.4. The Decoding Tree of the Toric Code

We represent the toric code as a square tiling of the torus, *i.e.*, a two-dimensional square lattice with periodic boundaries, where the qubits are located on the edges, the Z checks on the vertices, and the X checks on the plaquettes. Note that the definition of X and Z checks is reversed by considering the dual lattice. Thus, we shall only consider here one type of checks, and we assume they are located on the vertices of the lattice. A toric code is depicted in Figure 1a (or see [11] for a formal introduction).

For the graph representation of the toric code, and more generally for any graph $G = (V, E)$, we use the notation $\mathcal{N}(\cdot)$ to refer to the set of edges incident to a vertex, or the set of vertices incident to an edge, clear from the context:

$$\mathcal{N}(v) = \{e \in E \mid e \text{ incident to } v\}, \quad \mathcal{N}(e) = \{v \in V \mid v \text{ incident to } e\}$$

As mentioned above, the MS algorithm converges to a localized ML decision if the Tanner graph of the code is a tree [15]. This is not true if the Tanner graph contains cycles, however, there is a neat way to explicitly compute the *a posteriori* value that the MS will output for every qubit at every iteration, using the notion of minimal configurations on decoding trees. Those ideas were first presented in [15], and we quickly review here what will be necessary for the proofs of the next section.

For a given qubit q , one may recursively trace back through time the computation of its *a posteriori* value, by examining the updates that have occurred. This trace back will

⁵Since ties are resolved randomly in the localized ML, there is a non-zero probability that such random choices yield a valid minimum-weight explanation of the syndrome.




Figure 1: Decoding tree of the toric code. (a) Toric code defined by a square lattice with periodic boundaries. Checks are represented by squares, placed on the lattice vertices, and qubits are represented by edges. (b) The decoding tree of qubit q is shown for three decoding iterations. A check c from the original lattice may have several associated vertices in the decoding tree, denoted as v_c, v'_c . Similarly, each qubit from the original lattice may have several associated edges in the decoding tree (*e.g.*, the edge (v_1, v_2) and one of the dangling edges of v'_2 are both associated with the qubit incident to checks 1 and 2 in the original lattice). We consider the decoding tree as being rooted in the edge e_q , associated with qubit q from the original lattice (see main text).

form a tree graph rooted at q and consisting of interconnected qubit and checks in the same way as in the original graph, but the same qubit or checks may appear at several places in the tree because of the loopy structure of the decoding graph. For toric codes, checks are represented by vertices of a square lattice, while qubits are represented by edges (Figure 1a). Accordingly, the decoding tree of the toric code will have vertices and edges representing, respectively, checks and qubits at different decoding iterations. Decoding trees can be formally defined by using the notion of walk without return, introduced below.

Definition 4. A *walk* W in a graph $G = (V, E)$ as a sequence of edges $W = e_1 e_2 \dots e_k$, for which there exists a sequence of vertices $v_1 v_2 \dots v_{k+1}$, such that

$$e_i = (v_i, v_{i+1}), \quad \forall i \in \{1, k\}.$$

We say that W is a *walk without return (wwr)* if $v_i \neq v_{i+2}, \forall i \in \{1, \dots, k-1\}$. The length $|W|$ of a walk is the number of edges it contains.

Definition 5. A *path* is a walk such that all edges are distinct.

Definition 6. (For the toric code) The **decoding tree** $\mathcal{T}_{i,q}$ is composed of all the wwr of length i in the toric code lattice, starting with edge e_q (associated to qubit q).

When necessary, we also subscript the vertices with the name of the associated check, so $u_c \in V(\mathcal{T}_{i,q})$ is a vertex in $\mathcal{T}_{i,q}$ associated to check c .

A decoding tree is illustrated in Figure 1b. Note that we consider this tree as being rooted in the edge e_q , and that it ends with **dangling edges** (defined below). Technically, we could insert a qubit vertex on each edge, such that the decoding tree would be rooted in a qubit vertex, and terminated with qubit vertices. We will not do this here, and will rather stick to the usual convention for toric codes, where qubits are represented by edges. Remark that since a decoding tree is defined by walks without return, each vertex u has exactly 3 children (see Figure 1b).

Definition 7. A **dangling edge** of $\mathcal{T}_{i,q}$ is an edge e such that $|\mathcal{N}(e)| = 1$.

In the context of decoding trees, we naturally extend the definitions of **walk**, **walk without return** and **path**, that can now eventually start/end with dangling edges.

Definition 8. The **distance** between two vertices in $\mathcal{T}_{i,q}$ is the length of the path (the number of edges) from one to the other. The **distance of a vertex to the bottom** is the minimum over the length of all paths that start with that vertex and end with a dangling edge.

Since the graph representation of the toric code contains loops, several vertices/edges in the decoding tree may be associated to the same check/qubit of the toric code. Therefore, we extend the notation of the syndrome to vertices of $\mathcal{T}_{i,q}$ as: $\mathbf{s}(v_c) = \mathbf{s}(c), \forall v_c \in V(\mathcal{T}_{i,q})$.

Definition 9. For a decoding tree $\mathcal{T}_{i,q}$ and a syndrome \mathbf{s} , a **configuration** is a function $C : E(\mathcal{T}_{i,q}) \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ such that:

$$\sum_{e \in \mathcal{N}(v)} C(e) = \mathbf{s}(v) \pmod{2}, \quad \forall v \in V(\mathcal{T}_{i,q})$$

If $C(e) = 1$, the edge e is said to be **labeled** otherwise it is **unlabeled**.

Additionally, we are interested to know the labeling of the root edge of the tree, and will call a **root-labeled** configuration C_\bullet if $C_\bullet(e_q) = 1$ and a **root-unlabeled** configuration C_\circ if $C_\circ(e_q) = 0$.

Definition 10. We define the **weight** of a configuration as:

$$|C| = \sum_{e \in E(\mathcal{T}_{i,q})} C(e) \in \mathbb{N}$$

Let \mathfrak{C} be the set of all configurations for decoding tree $\mathcal{T}_{i,q}$ and syndrome \mathbf{s} . We write

$$\mathfrak{C} = \mathfrak{C}_\bullet \cup \mathfrak{C}_\circ$$

where \mathfrak{C}_\bullet and \mathfrak{C}_\circ are the subset of root-labeled/unlabeled configurations. These sets are non-empty since it is always possible to define a configuration starting from the root down to the dangling edges.

Definition 11. A *minimal root-labeled/unlabeled configuration* C_\circ^*/C_\bullet^* is a configuration such that

$$|C_\circ^*| = \min_{C_\circ \in \mathfrak{C}_\circ} |C| \quad / \quad |C_\bullet^*| = \min_{C_\bullet \in \mathfrak{C}_\bullet} |C|$$

For i.i.d. noise, all qubits have the same *a priori* value, which factors out through all the MS decoding steps, and thus can be set to 1 (which amounts to saying that the maximum likelihood error is the minimum weight one). This will be implicitly assumed in the next theorem and throughout the rest of the paper.

Theorem 4 ([15, Section 4.1]). *For i.i.d. noise, and given minimal configurations C_\circ^* and C_\bullet^* for the decoding tree $\mathcal{T}_{i,q}$ and syndrome \mathbf{s} , the a posteriori value $\text{APP}(q, i)$ computed by the MS for qubit q at iteration i is given by $\text{APP}(q, i) = |C_\bullet^*| - |C_\circ^*|$.*

3. The MS Limited Scope

In this section we prove Theorems 1 and 2. We first prove the first Theorem that introduces all the ideas and is quite short and intuitive. Building on the ideas of the first Theorem, together with some technical Lemmas, we then show the second Theorem.

3.1. Theorem 1: MS Local Blindness

Consider an error syndrome \mathbf{s} , and let c be an unsatisfied check, *i.e.*, such that $\mathbf{s}(c) = 1$.

Let also \mathbf{s}^c denote the binary vector, such that $\mathbf{s}^c(c') = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } c = c' \\ 0, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$.

Note that \mathbf{s}^c is not a valid error syndrome, as no error can generate it. If one runs MS or any other MP decoder on \mathbf{s}^c , the decoder will run for infinitely many iterations, without finding a valid explanation of the input “fake” syndrome \mathbf{s}^c . We are interested in the *a posteriori* values computed by the decoder for the qubits neighboring c . We denote by $\text{APP}(q, i)$ the *a posteriori* value of a qubit q at iteration i , when the decoder is supplied with the real error syndrome \mathbf{s} . Likewise, we denote by $\text{APP}^c(q, i)$ the *a posteriori* value of a qubit q at iteration i , when it is supplied with the fake error syndrome \mathbf{s}^c .

Definition 12. *Consider the MP decoding of a syndrome \mathbf{s} , and let c be an unsatisfied check. We say that **the decoding of \mathbf{s} is locally blind in the neighborhood of c** , if $\text{APP}(q, i) = \text{APP}^c(q, i)$, for any qubit q neighboring c , and any iteration $i \geq 0$.*

We restate here our first Theorem.

Theorem 1 (MS Local Blindness). *Consider an error syndrome \mathbf{s} on a toric code, such that all the unsatisfied checks are at distance at least 5 from each other. Then, under the*

i.i.d. noise assumption, the MS decoding of \mathbf{s} is locally blind in the neighborhood of any unsatisfied check.

We will prove Theorem 1 by investigating the minimal configurations in the decoding tree. We introduce first several definitions and prove some preliminaries Lemmas, and delay the proof of Theorem 1 to Section 3.1.3.

3.1.1. Links and Alternating Chains

Below, we give a few definitions, and adapt some usual definitions in graph theory to cope with the specificity of decoding trees (taking into account dangling edges).

Definition 13. *A **link** is a path in the decoding tree such that its vertex endpoints (if they exist) are associated with unsatisfied checks.*

A link can have dangling edges as endpoints.

*We call a **proper link** a link with both endpoints associated to unsatisfied checks, and a **dangling link** a link where at least one of its endpoints is a dangling edge. For short, we usually only give the vertex endpoints of a link. Giving the endpoints of a proper link is enough to fully characterize it, so we write $u \square v$. For a dangling link, we write $u \square \cdot$. Although this is not enough to uniquely determine a dangling link (there exist many dangling links with endpoint u), whenever this notation is used, it is always considered that this is one of the possible dangling links of minimal length.*

Definition 14. *Below we give a name to the 3 possible shapes of proper links of length 4 not containing the root (see Figure 2):*

- *The I-link going from an unsatisfied check 4 times down,*
- *The Γ -link going once up then 3 times down,*
- *The Λ -link going twice up then twice down.*

For the I and Γ link, we naturally refer to the upper and lower unsatisfied vertices relative to their depth in the tree.

Definition 15. *A **labeled link** is a link where all edges are labeled. An **unlabeled link** is a link where at least one edge is unlabeled. From now on we use the notation \blacksquare to denote a labeled link, and \square to denote an unlabeled link.*

Definition 16. *An **alternating chain** is a walk in the tree consisting of a succession of links alternating between labeled and unlabeled (see Figure 3). Subsequent links can have overlapping edges.*

*Precisely, an **alternating chain** is a sequence of links L_1, L_2, \dots, L_k where*

$$\forall L_i = e_1 \dots e_k v_k, \quad L_{i+1} = v'_1 e'_1 \dots e'_{k'} : \quad v_k = v'_1$$

L_i, L_{i+1} cannot be both labeled or both unlabeled




Figure 2: The three different shapes of 4-link are depicted in bold. Square vertices represent checks (black for unsatisfied and white for satisfied). Note that in the following the bold notation will only be used to denote labeled links.




Figure 3: An example of an alternating chain $(\square u_3 \overset{\Lambda}{\blacksquare} u_2 \square u_1 \overset{\Gamma}{\blacksquare} v_1 \square v_2 \overset{I}{\blacksquare} _)$ going from one dangling edge to another (Notice how the two edges above u_2 are used twice, in $u_1 \square u_2$ and $u_2 \blacksquare u_3$). Labeled edges are depicted in bold. All three types of 4-links are depicted here, the Λ and Γ links are **proper**, and the labeled I -link is **dangling**.

Lemma 2 (Walk Inversion Lemma). *Let C be a configuration for a decoding tree $\mathcal{T}_{i,q}$ and syndrome \mathbf{s} , and $W = e_1 \dots e_k$ a walk in $\mathcal{T}_{i,q}$ such that both its endpoints are dangling edges. Let $C' : E(\mathcal{T}_{i,q}) \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ be the map defined by*

$$\forall e \in E(\mathcal{T}_{i,q}), C'(e) = (C(e) + (-1)^{n_e})/2 \text{ where } n_e = |\{e_i = e, e_i \in W\}|$$

Then C' is a configuration for \mathbf{s} . Put differently, inverting the label of each edge as many times as it appears in the walk preserves the property of being a configuration for a syndrome.

Proof. Any vertex will touch an even number of edges (counting multiplicities) in W . Hence inverting the labels as many times as they appear along W will keep the parity of all the vertices in the new configuration. \square

3.1.2. Minimal Configurations in the MS Decoding Tree

In this section we prove the existence of minimal configurations with special properties, which will be used later in the proof of Theorems 1 and 2.

Lemma 3 (4-links Lemma for root-unlabeled configuration). *Given a syndrome where all unsatisfied checks are at distance 4 or more from one another, there exist a minimal configuration $C_{\circ}^{\leq 4}$ where all labeled links are of length ≤ 4 .*

Proof (Sketch). We give the proof for the existence of $C_{\circ}^{\leq 4}$ in the form of an algorithm that takes any minimal configuration C_{\circ}^* and transforms it into a minimal configuration $C_{\circ}^{\leq 4}$ that satisfies the condition that all labeled links are of length at most 4. The algorithm works as follows: as long as there is a labeled link of length ≥ 5 , we find a path from dangling edge to dangling edge containing it, then use Lemma 2 to remove it. The path is chosen so that the new configuration stays minimal. The details of the proof can be found in Appendix B.2 \square

We now prove a similar statement for C_{\bullet} , but only for decoding trees associated with any of the four qubits neighboring an unsatisfied check⁶.

Lemma 4 (4-link Lemma for root-labeled configuration). *Given a syndrome where all unsatisfied checks are at distance 4 or more from one another, for a decoding tree $\mathcal{T}_{i,q}$ where q is neighboring an unsatisfied check c , there exists a minimal configuration $C_{\bullet}^{\leq 4}$ where all labeled links are of length ≤ 4 .*

Proof (Sketch). Starting with a minimal configuration C_{\bullet}^* , and using the algorithm from the proof of Lemma 3, one can remove all the length ≥ 5 labeled links not containing the root. Note that even if the algorithm could be applied on a labeled link containing the root, this would yield an unlabeled configuration which is not what we want. Supposing that there is a labeled link containing the root of length ≥ 5 , it will also be removed using the walk inversion Lemma, but the path used will be created differently. The details of the proof can be found in Appendix B.3. \square

Lemma 5. *Given a syndrome where all unsatisfied checks are all at distance at least 5, and a configuration $C^{\leq 4}$ such that all labeled links are of length ≤ 4 , then all proper labeled links have endpoints associated with a same check c (i.e., all proper links are of the form $u_c \blacksquare v_c$ for some unsatisfied check c).*

Proof. Since all labeled links are of length ≤ 4 and all unsatisfied checks are at distance ≥ 5 , any proper labeled link necessarily joins vertices associated to the same check (by following a path around a plaquette of the toric code). \square

⁶It can be shown that the statement does not hold for any other qubit.

3.1.3. Proof of Theorem 1 (MS Local Blindness)

Using configurations from Lemma 3 and 4, and the property of the labeled links from Lemma 5, we can now prove Theorem 1.

Proof. Let \mathbf{s} be a syndrome such that all the unsatisfied checks are at distance ≥ 5 from each others, c be an unsatisfied check in \mathbf{s} , and $q \in \mathcal{N}(c)$. Let \mathbf{s}^c be the fake syndrome (defined in Section 3.1) where only c is unsatisfied, and $\mathbf{s}^{\neq c} = \mathbf{s} - \mathbf{s}^c$ (informally, we can think of \mathbf{s} as the disjoint union of \mathbf{s}^c and $\mathbf{s}^{\neq c}$).

Let also $\mathcal{T}_{i,q}$ be the decoding tree associated to q at iteration i . On $\mathcal{T}_{i,q}$, we now consider some minimal configurations C_\bullet, C_\circ associated to syndrome \mathbf{s} , and C_\bullet^c, C_\circ^c associated to \mathbf{s}^c , such that all four configurations satisfy Lemmas 3, 4, and 5. Now, considering C_\bullet (the same will hold for C_\circ), we define $C_{\bullet|c}, C_{\bullet|\neq c} : E(\mathcal{T}_{i,q}) \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ where:

- (i) $C_{\bullet|c}$ is defined by the labeled links in C_\bullet that have all their vertex endpoints equal to c (i.e., the proper labeled links of the form $u_c \blacksquare v_c$ and the dangling labeled links of the form $u_c \blacksquare _$). Formally,

$$C_{\bullet|c}(e) = 1 \iff e \in u_c \blacksquare v_c \text{ or } e \in u_c \blacksquare _$$

Clearly $C_{\bullet|c}$ is a configuration for \mathbf{s}^c .

- (ii) $C_{\bullet|\neq c}$ is defined by the remaining labeled links (that is, labeled links with endpoint(s) different from c). Alternatively,

$$C_{\bullet|\neq c} = C_\bullet - C_{\bullet|c}$$

Using the fact that all proper links are between vertices associated to the same check, it holds that $C_{\bullet|\neq c}$ is a configuration for $\mathbf{s}^{\neq c}$.

Since C_\bullet is minimal, we conclude that $C_{\bullet|c}$ is a minimal root-labeled configuration for \mathbf{s}^c , and $C_{\bullet|\neq c}$ is a minimal root-unlabeled configuration for $\mathbf{s}^{\neq c}$.

Similarly, we can write C_\circ as $C_\circ = C_{\circ|c} + C_{\circ|\neq c}$, where $C_{\circ|c}$ is a minimal root-unlabeled configuration for \mathbf{s}^c , and $C_{\circ|\neq c}$ is a minimal root-unlabeled configuration for $\mathbf{s}^{\neq c}$. It follows that:

$$|C_{\bullet|\neq c}| = |C_{\circ|\neq c}|, \quad |C_{\bullet|c}| = |C_\bullet^c|, \quad \text{and} \quad |C_{\circ|c}| = |C_\circ^c|$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{APP}(q, i) &= |C_\circ| - |C_\bullet| \\ &= |C_{\circ|c}| + |C_{\circ|\neq c}| - (|C_{\bullet|c}| + |C_{\bullet|\neq c}|) \\ &= |C_{\circ|c}| - |C_{\bullet|c}| \\ &= |C_\circ^c| - |C_\bullet^c| \\ &= \text{APP}^c(q, i) \end{aligned}$$

So the blindness property is satisfied for any qubit q neighboring c , which concludes the proof of Theorem 1. \square

Corollary 1. *Such a syndrome is undecodable by the MS*

Proof. The blindness property for Theorem 1 implies that each of the four qubits around an unsatisfied check has the same *a posteriori* value (thus the same error estimate), at each iteration, as its horizontal/vertical symmetric. Hence the parity of each unsatisfied check is never satisfied, for any number of iterations, and as such, this syndrome is undecodable by the MS. \square

Finally, we note that the blindness property can actually be proven for qubit-to-check messages entering an unsatisfied check, the computation tree of such a message being given by the either left or right half of the decoding tree in Figure 1b (with root edge e_q becoming a dangling edge). Consequently, it also applies to check-to-qubit messages going out from an unsatisfied check, since such outgoing messages only depend on the incoming ones.

3.2. Theorem 2 : MS Non-Degenerate Decoding Radius

We now go on to prove Theorem 2, which we restate here for the reader's convenience.

Theorem 2 (MS Non-Degenerate Decoding Radius). *For any toric code of distance ≥ 9 , the non-degenerate decoding radius of the MS is 3.*

We first show that there exist weight 4 non-degenerate errors that are undecodable by the MS. Specifically, we use the error consisting of 4 consecutive horizontal qubits in error, denoted by ϵ^4 , and \mathbf{s}^4 its weight 2 syndrome. Note that this error can appear anywhere on the code up to translation, and rotations. The proof follows the ideas of Theorem 1. Since Lemmas 3 and 4 were shown for unsatisfied checks at distance ≥ 4 , they automatically apply in the context of Theorem 2 for syndrome \mathbf{s}^4 . We only need to show a (weaker) analog of Lemma 5.

We then need to show that all weight ≤ 3 non-degenerate errors are decodable by the MS. This is done using exhaustive search for small codes, and by reduction to localized errors by analysing the number of iterations needed to decode.


3.2.1. Preliminary Lemmas

We now show the analog of Lemma 5, only this time the result is a little weaker. But first we show a preliminary Lemma used in the proof.

Lemma 6. *For the syndrome \mathbf{s}^4 , and for any decoding tree $\mathcal{T}_{i,q}$ associated to qubit q neighboring an unsatisfied check c :*

Let $u \square v$ be a Λ -link in $\mathcal{T}_{i,q}$ and S be the smallest subtree of $\mathcal{T}_{i,q}$ containing it, then for any vertex $w \in V(\mathcal{T}_{i,q}) \setminus V(S)$ associated to an unsatisfied check,

$$d(u, w) = d(v, w) \geq 6$$



(a) Λ -link between two vertices associated to the same check, visualized on the toric code.

(b) Λ -link between two vertices associated to different checks, visualized on the toric code.

Figure 4: The cases of Λ -link

Proof. Suppose there is a Λ -link $u_c \sqcap v_{c'}$. We now consider the corresponding walk without return between the checks c and c' on the toric code. There are two possibilities, either $c = c'$ (Figure 4a), or $c \neq c'$ (Figure 4b). In any case, let g be the toric code check associated with the grandfather of u_c and $v_{c'}$ in $\mathcal{T}_{i,q}$. On the toric code, let q and q' be the qubits incident to g on the related walks without return to c and c' . Then any wwr from g to c or c' and starting with $q'' \notin \{q, q'\}$ is of length ≥ 4 . Hence, any vertex associated to an unsatisfied check in $V(\mathcal{T}_{i,q}) \setminus S$ must be at distance ≥ 6 from u_c and $v_{c'}$. \square

The following corollary is a straight application of Lemma 6.

Corollary 2. *Under the hypothesis of Lemma 6, let $u \sqcap v$ be an I -link with v being its the bottom endpoint. Then v cannot belong to a Λ -link.*

The following Lemma is a (weaker) analog of Lemma 5 for the syndrome \mathbf{s}^4 .

Lemma 7. *For the syndrome \mathbf{s}^4 , and for any decoding tree $\mathcal{T}_{i,q}$ associated to qubit q neighboring an unsatisfied check c , there exists a minimal configuration such that the endpoints of any I or Γ labeled link are vertices associated to the same check.*

Proof. Take a configuration having all labeled links of length ≤ 4 . Suppose there is a labeled link between u_c^0 and $v_{c'}^0$, and take one deepest if there are several. If applying, always consider u^0 always be on a higher level than v^0 .

- (i) If this link is an I -link or a Γ -link, then there must exist an unlabeled I -link $u_c^0 \sqcap u_c^1$ where u_c^1 is at the same depth as v^0 . Then set $\mathcal{A} = \{u_c^1 \sqcap u_c^0, u_c^0 \sqcap v_{c'}^0\}$. The link $u_c^0 \sqcap u_c^1$ must be unlabeled as otherwise the link $u_c^1 \blacksquare v_{c'}^0$ of length ≥ 5 would contradict the assumptions of Lemma 3.
- (ii) If the link contains the root edge q (in case of a labeled configuration), then there must also exist an unlabeled link $u_c^0 \sqcap u_c^1$ where u_c^1 is at the same depth as v^0 using the same argument. Then set $\mathcal{A} = \{u_c^1 \sqcap u_c^0, u_c^0 \sqcap v_{c'}^0\}$.

Now complete this into an alternating chain from dangling edge to dangling edge by doing the following iterative algorithm that satisfies the property:

(P) *At each iteration of the algorithm, the chain endpoints are at the same depth on both sides*

At a given iteration, suppose without loss of generality that u^i came from a labeled link and v^i from an unlabeled link. Then pick one labeled link from v^i going down. There must be one and it must be unique since we assumed this is a valid labeling, and by Lemma 6, this cannot be a labeled Λ -link. Also pick an unlabeled link of the same type in the neighborhood of u^0 . There must exist one, otherwise this would give a labeled link of length ≥ 5 .

This algorithm gives a path from dangling edge to dangling edge. Now inverting this path will remove the link between u_c^0 and $v_{c'}^0$ while maintaining exactly the same weight, hence keeping the minimality of the configuration. \square

3.2.2. Sketch of Proof of Theorem 2

To prove the blindness of the qubits around the unsatisfied checks of \mathbf{s}^4 , we cannot use the fact that all proper labeled links are between copies of the same checks. Fortunately, the only time there can be a proper labeled link $u_c \blacksquare v_{c'}$, $c \neq c'$, it must be a Λ -link. Using a notion of pruning of the decoding tree, we are able to split the decoding tree into a pruned tree where the only remaining unsatisfied vertices are associated to c , and removed subtrees where there might still be vertices associated to c , but with the guarantee (that will be the bulk of the proof) that there are no labeled edges between the removed subtrees and the pruned tree. The details of the proof can be found in Appendix C.2.

To show that all non-degenerate errors of weight ≤ 3 are decodable, we do it by a formal argument for codes of larger distance ($d \geq 18$) by introducing the notion of δ -local syndrome, and we verify it numerically for smaller codes ($9 \leq d < 18$). We defer the proof to Appendix C.3.

3.3. Conjectures about Normalized MS and BP

For Normalized MS (NMS), we conjecture that Theorem 1 holds for any normalization factor in $]0, 1[$. To support our claim, we did some numerical testing for codes with minimum distance $d \in \{11, 24\}$ (giving a “small” and a “larger” code, odd and even size), normalization factor λ between 0.0625 and 1, with a step of 0.0625, and for a maximum number of decoding iterations equal to 100. Note that since the normalization factors are sums of powers of two, we do not have to worry about numerical instability and check equality up to floating point precision. Verifying the statement for all error syndromes with all the unsatisfied checks at distance ≥ 5 even for reasonably small code sizes is not feasible, so we only tested syndromes of weight 2, satisfying the condition that the two unsatisfied checks are at distance ≥ 5 . Also to support even more our claim, we tested the syndrome defined by $\mathbf{s}(c_{i,j}) = 1 \iff j = 5i \pmod{13}$ on toric codes of distance $d = 13$ (Figure 5) and $d = 26$. This is a syndrome “packed” with as many unsatisfied checks as possible, all at distance 5 or 6 from each other. In all our numerical experiments, the blindness property is conserved.

For BP, we know the blindness statement of Theorem 1 to be false, since BP takes into




Figure 5: Syndrome defined by $\mathbf{s}(c_{i,j}) = 1 \iff j = 5i \pmod{13}$ on a toric code of distance $d = 13$. Note that this is not a valid error syndrome (as it is of odd weight), but it is only used to verify the blindness property. For $d = 26$ we get a valid error syndrome.

account all the configurations in the decoding tree (for a given syndrome), and not only a minimal one (see [15] for more details). However, the minimal configurations are still somehow dominant in the *a posteriori* reliabilities computed by the BP, so we wonder if a similar statement could be made, perhaps using a relaxed notion of blindness. So far, our preliminary numerical results suggest that syndromes satisfying the hypothesis of Theorem 1 are not decodable by BP, and moreover $\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} (\text{APP}(q, i) - \text{APP}^c(q, i)) = 0$, which is likely explained by the fact that minimal configurations become more dominant as the decoding tree size increases.

4. Stabiliser-Blowup Pre-Processing

In Section 3, we made a point that there is more than just degeneracy preventing the convergence of the MS, and that there is no hope to correct adversarial errors of weight 4 or more on the toric code using MS. While all the non-degenerate errors of weight ≤ 3 are decodable by the MS (see Appendix C.3), numerical simulations show that most degenerate errors are not (see Appendix A for a detailed discussion). Here we present a new pre-processing that runs in linear time and allows to correct all errors of weight up to 3. The idea of the pre-processing is to infer where the decoder might fail by looking at local degenerate syndromes. We then apply a code modification, corresponding to a change of variables, that locally removes the degeneracy to allow the decoder to converge.




Figure 6: Stabiliser-blowup for degenerate errors of weight 2: the four edges around the original plaquette are replaced by four new edges, connecting the checks around the plaquette to a new check in the middle of the plaquette. Labels q_i 's on the edges of the original plaquette are interpreted here as binary random variables, equal to 1 if the corresponding qubit is in error, and 0 otherwise. Each new edge is labeled by the sum of the q_i 's incident to the same check. (a) The diagonal weight-2 syndrome, shown on the original plaquette together with one of its possible explanations ($q_1 = q_2 = 1$) on the left. After the blowup, the syndrome is uniquely explained as $q_4 + q_1 = q_2 + q_3 = 1$. (b) The square weight-4 syndrome, shown on the original plaquette together with one of its possible explanations ($q_1 = q_3 = 1$). After the blowup, the syndrome is uniquely explained as $q_4 + q_1 = q_1 + q_2 = q_2 + q_3 = q_3 + q_4 = 1$.




Figure 7: Stabiliser-blowup for degenerate errors of weight 3: an example of a weight-3 degenerate error on the original toric code (generating a weight-2 syndrome) becoming a weight-3 non-degenerate error after the blowup.

4.1. The Stabiliser-Blowup Graph Modification

The stabiliser-blowup is a decoding graph modification that allows to locally remove the degeneracy of the code around a plaquette. In the following, we use it as a preprocessing to remove the degeneracy of degenerate weight 2 errors (depicted in Figure 6) and degenerate weight 3 errors (depicted in Figure 7).

We remove the four edges associated to the qubits around a given plaquette and replace them by four new edges connecting the four corner checks of the plaquette to an additional (satisfied) check in the middle. Each new edge corresponds to the parity of the two removed edges around a given check. Thus, the sum of the four new edges must be even, hence the addition of the satisfied middle check connecting them. We later show that any solution satisfying the syndrome on the modified graph will easily yield a valid solution for the original graph, and this solution is unique up to stabiliser equivalence. As a remark, this code change should not be applied on two neighboring plaquettes, as this would create new degeneracy issues between them (see Figure 8). Therefore, we use the stabiliser-blowup as a pre-processing, and only apply the blowup where the error syndrome suggests that degeneracy issues might occur. One could ask why those local degeneracy issues are not directly solved “by hand” as a pre-processing, by assigning a fixed value to one of the qubits thus removing the degeneracy. But this could lead to a degradation of the decoding by




Figure 8: Stabiliser-blowup on adjacent plaquettes leads to undecodable weight-1 errors: the weight-1 error on the original toric code becomes a weight-2 degenerate error after the blowup.

systematically increasing the weight of the outputted error, thus increasing the likelihood of logical errors, so we instead rely on the MS to decide on the error pattern.

4.2. The Algorithm

In order to correct all errors of weight ≤ 3 , it is enough to consider the syndromes of *local* degenerate errors of weight 2 and 3. Whenever one of those patterns appears around a plaquette, we do the blowup, except if an adjacent plaquette (sharing an edge) is already blown-up.

To remove all errors of weight ≤ 3 , we use the following **greedy heuristic**: We go through all plaquettes in the lexicographical order of their coordinates. We do this three times, corresponding to steps (i) (ii) (iii) below, each time checking for a different set of patterns. If one of the patterns looked for at this step is found in the neighborhood of a plaquette p , we apply the blowup on p if it has no adjacent plaquette that has been blown-up. The local neighborhood of each plaquette is labeled in Figure 9.




Figure 9: The neighborhood of plaquette p , corresponding to the 16 checks in its surrounding. In bold the corner case of the heuristic in (i) is depicted.

Each check is given a number, and in the following we associate to each check a true/false value depending on whether it is unsatisfied/satisfied.

(i) Weight 2 degenerate errors with condition on diagonal

$$\begin{aligned}
 & - \mathbf{s}(c_1) \wedge \mathbf{s}(c_2) \wedge \mathbf{s}(c_3) \wedge \mathbf{s}(c_4) \\
 & - \overline{\mathbf{s}(c_1)} \wedge \mathbf{s}(c_2) \wedge \overline{\mathbf{s}(c_3)} \wedge \mathbf{s}(c_4) \wedge (\mathbf{s}(c_9) \oplus \mathbf{s}(c_{11}) \oplus \mathbf{s}(c_5) \oplus \mathbf{s}(c_{15}) = 0)
 \end{aligned}$$

$$- \mathbf{s}(c_1) \wedge \overline{\mathbf{s}(c_2)} \wedge \mathbf{s}(c_3) \wedge \overline{\mathbf{s}(c_4)} \wedge \left(\mathbf{s}(c_6) \oplus \mathbf{s}(c_8) \oplus \mathbf{s}(c_{12}) \oplus \mathbf{s}(c_{14}) = 0 \right)$$

(ii) Weight 2 diagonal degenerate errors without condition

$$\begin{aligned} & - \overline{\mathbf{s}(c_1)} \wedge \mathbf{s}(c_2) \wedge \overline{\mathbf{s}(c_3)} \wedge \mathbf{s}(c_4) \\ & - \mathbf{s}(c_1) \wedge \overline{\mathbf{s}(c_2)} \wedge \mathbf{s}(c_3) \wedge \overline{\mathbf{s}(c_4)} \end{aligned}$$

(iii) Weight 3 degenerate errors - patterns not yet caught by (i) and (ii)

$$\begin{aligned} & - \mathbf{s}(c_1) \wedge \overline{\mathbf{s}(c_2)} \wedge \overline{\mathbf{s}(c_{11})} \wedge \overline{\mathbf{s}(c_4)} \wedge \overline{\mathbf{s}(c_3)} \wedge \mathbf{s}(c_{12}) \\ & - \overline{\mathbf{s}(c_1)} \wedge \overline{\mathbf{s}(c_2)} \wedge \mathbf{s}(c_{11}) \wedge \mathbf{s}(c_4) \wedge \overline{\mathbf{s}(c_3)} \wedge \overline{\mathbf{s}(c_{12})} \\ & - \mathbf{s}(c_1) \wedge \overline{\mathbf{s}(c_2)} \wedge \overline{\mathbf{s}(c_4)} \wedge \overline{\mathbf{s}(c_3)} \wedge \overline{\mathbf{s}(c_{15})} \wedge \mathbf{s}(c_{14}) \\ & - \overline{\mathbf{s}(c_1)} \wedge \mathbf{s}(c_2) \wedge \overline{\mathbf{s}(c_4)} \wedge \overline{\mathbf{s}(c_3)} \wedge \mathbf{s}(c_{15}) \wedge \overline{\mathbf{s}(c_{14})} \end{aligned}$$

The diagonal condition of (i) comes from a corner case that would make the heuristic fail if not properly taken into account. This is illustrated in Figure 9, where, if the plaquette p is blown-up, then the plaquette on the right could not be blown-up in its turn, and the MS would fail to converge. Clearly (i) and (ii) are enough to take care of all weight 2 degenerate errors. There are some weight 3 errors which are also taken into account by (i) and (ii), the remaining ones being taken care of by (iii).

Theorem 3 (Stabilizer Blowup Pre-Processing). *SB+MS is able to correct all errors of weight up to 3 on a toric code of distance ≥ 7 .*

The proof of the Theorem is given in Appendix C.4, by using the tools introduced to prove the second part of Theorem 2.

4.2.1. Numerical Results

Here we plot the error correction performance of the MS versus the SB+MS. One can see that the slopes match the expected values. Indeed, the MS is able to converge on all errors of weight 1 but fails on some errors of weight 2. The dominant term is thus p^2 and the slope matches it for small p . For the SB+MS since the smallest undecodable error is of weight 4, and the slope matches the p^4 curve.

4.2.2. SB+MS+OSD

One of the most used post-processing is Ordered Statistic Decoding (OSD), proposed in [2]. Numerically, MS+OSD is a good approximation of the classical ML for the toric code (see for example [3]). However since the OSD post-processing is very costly, namely $\mathcal{O}(n^3)$,⁷ it is interesting to run the best possible decoder beforehand to avoid unnecessary use of OSD. Looking at the curves from Figure 10, this yields a quadratic improvement in the number of calls of OSD, only needing to call OSD with probability $\approx p^4$ compared to $\approx p^2$.

⁷We acknowledge that the theoretical complexity of Gaussian elimination is $\mathcal{O}(n^{2.38})$ (see for example [18]), but such algorithms are not practical as they suffer from huge constant costs, and for real life use cases, the Gaussian elimination algorithm is used.




Figure 10: Numerical results for MS and SB+MS decoding on the toric code of distance 11. A maximum number of 15 decoding iterations are used for the MS decoding. The slope of the MS is p^2 since the smallest undecodable errors are of weight 2, and the slope of the SB+MS is p^4 since the smallest undecodable errors are of weight 4.

Since our post-processing is linear, this implies a significant improvement on the average decoding complexity for small p , going from $\mathcal{O}(n \log(n) + p^2 n^3)$ to $\mathcal{O}(n \log(n) + p^4 n^3)$.

5. Conclusion

Using the powerful framework of decoding tree, we were able to show that there is an inherent limitation to the error-correction capability of the MS on the toric code. This was done by introducing the notion of blindness, which not only emphasize the fact that the decoder is unable to converge, but also prove that the spreading of the messages in the code is inherently limited. We also showed that by using a low cost syndrome-aware pre-processing we were able to make the decoding radius and the non-degenerate decoding radius of the MS match. In the vein of what had been done recently on the limitations of the renormalization decoder on the toric code in [19], to the best of our knowledge this is the first formal result explaining why the MS decoder does not perform well on the toric code, and we also conjecture that similar results could be obtained for other iterative decodings (NMS and BP) that have similar decoding processes, and can also be explained using the decoding tree, although in a different manner that do not allow the proofs to transfer directly.

The blindness property we proved here comes from a strong imbalance between the girth and the diameter of the graph. This can be seen as a *graph degeneracy*, complementing the standard notion of *code degeneracy* (*i.e.*, classical minimum distance smaller than the

quantum minimum distance), the latter being independent of the Tanner graph representation of the code. It is worth noticing that for well-constructed classical LDPC codes, *e.g.*, constructed by the progressive edge growth algorithm [20], such a graph degeneracy does not happen: the length of the shortest cycle passing through a given check is greater than or equal to the maximum distance between that check and all the others. This ensures fast spreading of messages in the Tanner graph. We suspect that the graph degeneracy could have blindness effects for more general quantum LDPC codes, although the imbalance between girth and diameter would be reduced for finite-length Tanner graphs with increased connectivity degree.

Additionally, it might be interesting to explore the stabiliser-blowup pre-processing on its own, to see if it can be applied to a wider class of codes. There should be a straightforward generalisation for all planar codes, but we do believe that the pre-processing could be extended to generic quantum LDPC codes.

Acknowledgment

The authors would like to thank Leonid Pryadko and Xingrui Liu for useful discussions during the elaboration of this work. This work was supported by the QuantERA grant EQUIP (French ANR-22-QUA2-0005-01), and by the Plan France 2030 (NISQ2LSQ project, ANR-22-PETQ-0006).

A. Additional Results on Small Weight Non-Degenerate and Degenerate Errors

A.1. Weight 2 Degenerate Errors are Undecodable by MS

There are only two degenerate errors of weight 2 up to translation and rotations (depicted in Figure 11). To show that they are both undecodable by the MS, we use the fact that both syndromes are invariant under some symmetries. The two cases are depicted in Figure 11 (a) and (b). For the weight 2 syndrome of (a), it is clear that by the symmetry about the ℓ line, $\text{APP}(q_k, i) = \text{APP}(q'_k, i)$ for $k \in \{0, 1\}$, $\forall i \geq 0$. Hence the estimate error around c will never satisfy the syndrome \mathbf{s} . A similar argument applies for (b).




Figure 11: Undecodable degenerate errors of weight 2

A.2. A Weight 3 Degenerate Error Decodable by MS

Although we said earlier that degenerate syndromes are key to understand the failures of the MS, and we made it clear using numerical simulations in the above subsection, it is not true that degenerate implies undecodable by MS. In Figure 12 we provide the smallest example of a degenerate syndrome that is decodable (in 1 iteration) by the MS.




Figure 12: Equivalent weight 3 decodable degenerate errors (generating the same degenerate syndrome of weight 4): Although the three errors are all of weight 3, the MS will converge to the middle error in just one iteration (this can be easily checked, by computing “by hand” the *a posteriori* value of each qubit after one iteration).

B. Proof of Lemmas 3 and 4

We first start by showing a few technical lemmas before proving Lemmas 3 and 4.

B.1. Technical Lemmas

Definition 17. A labeled link is said **maximal** if it cannot be extended into a longer labeled link. It is said **robustly maximal** if there is no other labeled link sharing at least one edge with it that is of greater length.

Lemma 8. Given a configuration C , and a maximal proper labeled link $u \blacksquare v$. Then at least 2 of the 3 edges going down from v are unlabeled.

Proof. Since v is the endpoint of a maximal labeled link, it is either true that:

- (i) u belongs to the subtree rooted in v , in which case the only labeled edge going down from v is the one belonging to the labeled link $u \blacksquare v$, as otherwise $u \blacksquare v$ could be extended and would not be maximal.
- (ii) On the other hand, if u does not belong to the subtree rooted in v , all three edges below v are unlabeled as otherwise the labeled link $u \blacksquare v$ could be extended and would not be maximal.

□

Lemma 9. Given a configuration C for a syndrome where all unsatisfied checks are at distance ≥ 4 , and a maximal proper labeled link $u \blacksquare v_c$, where v_c is at distance ≥ 5 from the bottom. Then there exists an unlabeled I -link $v_c \square v'_c$ such that v_c is its upper endpoint.

Proof. By Lemma 8, there must be one unlabeled edge e_q going down from v_c . In the toric code, there exists a path of length 4 that starts from c , goes through qubit q and loops back to c . Hence, since e_q is unlabeled, there exist an unlabeled I -link $v_c \square v'_c$. □

Lemma 10. Given a minimal configuration C for a syndrome where all unsatisfied checks are at distance ≥ 4 , and a maximal proper labeled link $u \blacksquare v$ of length ≥ 4 , where v is a distance $d \leq 4$ from the bottom. Then any dangling link $v \square _$ is of length d and unlabeled.

Proof. We note that the subtree rooted in v does not contain any unsatisfied vertex (since all vertices in the subtree are at distance ≤ 3 from v). In particular, the proper link $u \blacksquare v$ must come from above. Since $u \blacksquare v$ is maximal, it cannot be extended inside the subtree rooted in v , and since C is minimal it follows that all the edges in this subtree are unlabeled. Thus, any dangling link $v \square _$ is of length d and unlabeled. □

B.2. Proof of Lemma 3

Proof. Let C_o^* be any minimal root-unlabeled configuration on the decoding tree $\mathcal{T}_{i,q}$.

Case 1 (Proper labeled link $u^0 \blacksquare v^0$): Suppose there is a proper labeled link $u^0 \blacksquare v^0$ of length ≥ 5 . If there are several choices, it is always possible to take one that is robustly

maximal and as deep as possible (*i.e.*, that in the subtrees rooted in u^0 and v^0 , there are no labeled links of length ≥ 5 , except possibly $u^0 \blacksquare v^0$).

Now recursively create an alternating chain \mathcal{A} containing the labeled link $u^0 \blacksquare v^0$ that goes from one dangling edge to another. This alternating chain will have the property:

P : all labeled links in \mathcal{A} are maximal

We start with $\mathcal{A} = \{u^0 \blacksquare v^0\}$. Set $i = 0$ and do recursively starting from u^0 (and later do the same for v^0):

- (i) i even: an unlabeled link must be appended. If u^i is at distance ≥ 5 from the bottom, then there exists an unlabeled I link $u^i \square u^{i+1}$ such that u^i is its upper endpoint (by Lemma 9). Set $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{A} \cup \{u^i \square u^{i+1}\}$ ⁸.

Otherwise, u^i is at distance $d \leq 4$ from the bottom, and there exists a dangling unlabeled link $u^i \square _$ of length d (by Lemma 10). Set $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{A} \cup \{u^i \square _ \}$ and terminate the algorithm on this side.

- (ii) i odd: a labeled link must be appended. Take any labeled link having u^i as endpoint (we show below that is necessarily maximal). If it is a proper labeled link $u^i \blacksquare u^{i+1}$, set $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{A} \cup \{u^i \blacksquare u^{i+1}\}$.

Otherwise, it is a dangling link $u^i \blacksquare _$. Set $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{A} \cup \{u^i \blacksquare _ \}$ and terminate the algorithm on this side.

Since $u^0 \blacksquare v^0$ was taken to be as deep as possible, any time a labeled link is appended, it must be of length ≤ 4 , and if it is a proper link, since all vertices associated to unsatisfied checks are at distance ≥ 4 , it must be of length exactly 4, and thus maximal, so property P is conserved throughout the algorithm.

This algorithm will always terminate because, one of the following is always true:

- (i) When adding an unlabeled link, either the algorithm terminates on this side or an I -link was appended, in which case the depth increases by 4.
- (ii) When adding a labeled link, either the algorithm terminates on this side, or a proper labeled link $u^i \blacksquare u^{i+1}$ of length 4 has been appended, in which case the depth decreases by at most 3 as u^i is already the bottom endpoint of an unlabeled I link so it cannot also be the bottom endpoint of a labeled I link.

Thus the algorithm must end.

We now have an algorithm to construct an alternating chain that goes from dangling edge to dangling edge. This is not enough to use the inversion Lemma directly, so we further modify it to ensure that there is no dangling unlabeled link of length ≥ 3 .

Suppose there is one unlabeled dangling link of length ≥ 3 , without loss of generality write it $u^k \square _$. Then since u^k it at distance ≥ 3 from the bottom, u^k must be the upper endpoint of a Γ -link $u^k \square u^{k+1}$. This Γ -link must be unlabeled because :

⁸Strictly speaking, an alternating chain is an ordered sequence of links so the union should be seen as preappending/appending the link to the ordered list.

- (i) If $k = 0$, $u^{k-1} = v^0$ and $u^{k-1} \blacksquare u^{k+1}$ would be longer than $u^0 \blacksquare v^0$ and this would give a contradiction to the fact that $u^0 \blacksquare v^0$ is robustly maximal.
- (ii) If $k \neq 0$, then $u^{k-1} \blacksquare u^{k+1}$ would be a labeled link of length ≥ 6 which would contradict the fact that $u^0 \blacksquare v^0$ was taken as deep as possible.

Now set $\mathcal{A} = (\mathcal{A} \setminus \{u^k \square \cdot\}) \cup \{u^k \square u^{k+1}\}$.

At this point, we arrive at unsatisfied check u^{k+1} at distance ≤ 2 of the bottom, and we need to add a labeled dangling link to finish our alternating chain. Since u^{k+1} is unsatisfied, it must be the endpoint of a labeled link. It is impossible that u^{k+1} is the bottom endpoint of a labeled I or Γ link as it would contradict the fact that $u^k \square u^{k+1}$ is unlabeled. So it must either be a labeled dangling link, in which case we are done, or it is a labeled Λ -link. In that case we append it and then finish the alternating chain by appending a length 2 unlabeled dangling link that must exist according to Lemma 10. We now have the alternating chain with all the required properties to finish the proof.

We look at the walk given by the alternating chain (with possible back-and-forth). We do the path inversion according to Lemma 2. This gets rid of the labeled link $u^0 \blacksquare v^0$ of length ≥ 5 .

To conclude the proof, we now argue that the configuration obtained by applying the walk inversion Lemma is minimal.

The added cost of labeling each previously unlabeled proper 4-link will be compensated by unlabeled the next proper labeled 4-link, if it exists. As they are both of length 4 and there will be as many edges being unlabeled as being relabeled⁹. We only need to deal with the dangling links at both ends of the alternating chain. We show that whatever weight will be added at both end is compensated by the unlabeled of $u^0 \blacksquare v^0$, thus keeping the minimality of the configuration.

There are several cases to consider. On both sides, the chain can end with either an unlabeled link of length 1 or 2, or a labeled link of length 1, 2, 3 or 4, preceded by an unlabeled I link of length 4. Consider one end of the alternating chain, and denote these cases as U_1, U_2 and L_1, \dots, L_4 respectively.

- U_1, U_2 : adds 1 or 2 to the weight
- L_1 : adds 3 to the weight.
- L_2, L_3, L_4 : adds respectively 2, 1 or 0 to the weight

The only troublesome case is L_1 , since if that were to happen on both ends of the alternating chain, the added weight of 6 might not be compensated by unlabeled of a weight 5 labeled link $u^0 \blacksquare v^0$. A simple parity argument takes care of this corner case: in case the $u^0 \blacksquare v^0$ is of length 5, u^0 and v^0 must be at a depth of different parity in the tree¹⁰. Since at each step adding a 4-link conserves the parity of the depth, it cannot be that the case L_1 happens on both ends.

⁹It should be easy to convince oneself that this is also true when there are overlapping edges.

¹⁰The only case where this is not true is when the link contains the root but this case is purposefully avoided in the Theorem

Case 2 (Dangling labeled link $u^0 \blacksquare _$): Suppose there is a dangling labeled link with endpoint u^0 of length ≥ 5 . The same algorithm can be applied from u^0 , except the argument for the minimality has to be (easily) adapted from Case 1.

Recursive Application of the Algorithm: By applying the algorithm as long as there are labeled links of length ≥ 5 (except possibly if it contains the root), this algorithm transforms any minimal root-unlabeled configuration in a minimal root-unlabeled configuration where all labeled links not containing the root are of length ≤ 4 . \square

B.3. Proof of Lemma 4

Proof. Starting with a minimal configuration C_\bullet^* , and using the algorithm from the proof of Lemma 3, one can remove all the length ≥ 5 labeled links not containing the root.

Now suppose there is a labeled link of length ≥ 5 containing the root e_q . Since q is neighboring an unsatisfied check c , we know that there is an unsatisfied vertex u_c just next to e_q .

Note that the edges going down from u_c must be unlabeled. This is because, since e_q is labeled, to keep the parity of u_c , it must be that two edges below u_c are labeled, hence, that there are two labeled links $u_c \blacksquare u'$ and $u_c \blacksquare u''$ below it. But then the labeled link $u' \blacksquare u''$ does not contain the root and must be of length ≥ 8 which is a contradiction. So we conclude that the longest labeled link starting from u_c and going through the root e_q is robustly maximal.

Case 1 (proper labeled link $u_c \blacksquare v$): Suppose the labeled link containing the root is of length ≥ 5 of the form $u_c \blacksquare v$. Let u_c and w be the vertices adjacent to e_q . Since all the labeled links not containing the root are of length ≤ 4 , it follows that from the three edges going down from w , only the one contained in the path going to v is labeled. Then, we can take an unlabeled edge e going down from w , such that there exists a proper unlabeled 4-link $u_c \square v'_c$ containing e_q and e .

- (i) Suppose v'_c is contained in a labeled proper 4-link $v'_c \blacksquare v''_c$. In that case, we use a “trick” and run the algorithm from the proof of Lemma 3, as if $v''_c \square v$ was a proper labeled link (we can do this since the edges adjacent to v''_c and v on the $v''_c \square v$ link are labeled; also, note that the link $v''_c \square v$ contains at least 5 labeled edges, which guarantees the minimality of the new configuration, obtained after applying the algorithm). This will invert the labels of the edges on the $v''_c \square v$, giving us a configuration where the link $u_c \blacksquare v'_c$ is labeled and contains the root e_q , and where all the labeled links are of length 4, thus concluding the proof.
- (ii) Suppose v'_c is not contained in a proper link, it must then be contained in a dangling labeled link $v'_c \blacksquare _$. This dangling labeled link cannot be of length 1 since we know v is deeper than v'_c . So it can be of length 2, 3 or 4. In which case v is the vertex endpoint of an unlabeled dangling link $v \square _$, of length respectively 1, 2 or 3.

In that case inverting the alternating chain $\{v'_c \blacksquare -, v'_c \square v, v \square -\}$ gives a minimal configuration where all labeled links are of length at most 4, and this concludes the proof.

Case 2 (dangling labeled link $u_c \blacksquare -$): Suppose the labeled link containing the root is a dangling link of length ≥ 5 . The same argument as above can be adapted in combination with Case 2 in the proof of Lemma 3 to conclude the proof.

□

C. Proof of Theorem 2 and 3

C.1. Pruning

Definition 18. Pruning

Given a decoding tree $\mathcal{T}_{i,q}$, we define the pruning of $\mathcal{T}_{i,q}$ as a pair $(\hat{\mathcal{T}}_{i,q}, \mathcal{S})$ where:

- \mathcal{S} is a set of **removed subtrees** (each subtree in \mathcal{S} is rooted in some vertex).
- $\hat{\mathcal{T}}_{i,q}$, the **pruned tree**, is a connected subgraph of $\mathcal{T}_{i,q}$ containing the root edge e_q , obtained by removing the subtrees in \mathcal{S} .

Since each subtree in \mathcal{S} is rooted in a vertex, $\hat{\mathcal{T}}_{i,q}$ has new dangling edges (which are incident in $\mathcal{T}_{i,q}$ to the root of some tree in \mathcal{S}). We refer to those as **severed edges**.

C.2. The Non-Degenerate Error ϵ^4 of Weight 4 is Undecodable by MS

We now proceed to show the upper bound on the decoding radius of Theorem 2, by showing that the decoder is blind on the syndrome \mathbf{s}^4 .

Let c be an unsatisfied check in \mathbf{s}^4 , the syndrome associated to ϵ^4 , and $q \in \mathcal{N}(c)$. Let $\mathcal{T}_{i,q}$ be the decoding tree associated to q at iteration i , and let also \mathbf{s}^c be the fake syndrome where only c is unsatisfied (Section 3.1).

On $\mathcal{T}_{i,q}$, we now consider some minimal configurations C_\bullet, C_\circ associated to syndrome \mathbf{s} , and C_\bullet^c, C_\circ^c associated to syndrome \mathbf{s}^c where all labeled links are of length ≤ 4 and for all proper I and Λ links, both endpoints are a copy of the same check (thanks to Lemmas 3,4, and 7).

Outline of the proof: We now proceed to show that $|C_\bullet| - |C_\circ| = |C_\bullet^c| - |C_\circ^c|$, which implies the blindness property for qubit q by Theorem 4.

Step 1, the Pruning: Explore $\mathcal{T}_{i,q}$ by doing a breadth-first search. Whenever a vertex $w_{c'}$ associated to a check such that $\mathbf{s}(w_{c'}) = 1$ and $c' \neq c$ is found in $\mathcal{T}_{i,q}$, proceed as follows.

Let g be the grandfather of $w_{c'}$ in $\mathcal{T}_{i,q}$, and prune the subtree rooted in g in $\mathcal{T}_{i,q}$. After doing that for the whole tree, we are left with a pair $(\hat{\mathcal{T}}_{i,q}, \mathcal{S})$.

Note that for any subtree in \mathcal{S} , it holds that all unsatisfied vertices are at depth ≥ 2 , as otherwise this would give a path in the toric code between unsatisfied checks of length < 4 .

Claim 1: In any of the minimal configurations $C_\bullet, C_\circ, C_\bullet^c$ and C_\circ^c all severed edges are unlabeled.

Consider a severed edge, incident (in $\mathcal{T}_{i,q}$) to the root vertex of some removed subtree S . If e is labeled, it must belong to a labeled link. There are 3 cases:

- (i) Suppose e belongs to a dangling labeled link $v \blacksquare _$ with endpoint v in S . Since S was removed, v must be at depth ≥ 2 in S . So $v \blacksquare _$ must be of length ≥ 7 (2 to go from v to e , plus e , plus at least 4 edges to go back down to a dangling edge in $\hat{\mathcal{T}}_{i,q}$) which is impossible.
- (ii) Suppose e belongs to a dangling labeled link $v \blacksquare _$ with endpoint v in $\hat{\mathcal{T}}_{i,q}$. Since there is an unsatisfied vertex u at depth 2 in S , and that u and v must be at distance ≥ 4 , then v is at distance ≥ 5 from the bottom, thus the length of $v \blacksquare _$ is ≥ 5 which is impossible by assumption.
- (iii) Suppose e belongs to a labeled proper link. It must be of the form $u_c \blacksquare v_c$ where $u_c \in \hat{\mathcal{T}}_{i,q}$ and $v_c \in S$ and of length 4. But S was removed because of the unsatisfied vertex $w_{c'}$ with $c' \neq c$, which is at depth 2 in S . Since $d(u_c, v_c) = 4$, v_c is at depth ≥ 2 in S , and $d(u_c, w_{c'}) \geq 4$, we conclude that v_c must be at depth exactly 2 in S , and moreover $d(u_c, v_c) = d(u_c, w_{c'}) = 4$. Thus, $w_{c'} \square v_c$ is a Λ -link with both endpoints at distance 4 from u_c , which yields a contradiction by applying Lemma 6.

Claim 2: Denoting $\hat{C}_\circ, \hat{C}_\bullet, \hat{C}_\circ^c, \hat{C}_\bullet^c$ the restriction of the minimal configurations to the pruned tree $\hat{\mathcal{T}}_{i,q}$, we have that $|\hat{C}_\circ| = |\hat{C}_\circ^c|$ and $|\hat{C}_\bullet| = |\hat{C}_\bullet^c|$.

This is because all the severed edges are unlabeled so the labeling induced by configurations \hat{C}_\bullet and \hat{C}_\bullet^c (resp. \hat{C}_\circ and \hat{C}_\circ^c) are interchangeable and of same weight, as otherwise it would contradict the minimality of C_\bullet and C_\bullet^c (resp. C_\circ and C_\circ^c).

Claim 3: For every subtree $S \in \mathcal{S}$, since the corresponding severed edge e is unlabeled in both C_\circ and C_\bullet , then the restriction of C_\circ and C_\bullet to S have the same weight.

Clearly the minimality of the labeling on such a subtree does not depend on the rest of the tree since e is unlabeled in both cases, so they must have the same weight.

By Claims 1 and 3,

$$|C_\bullet| - |C_\circ| = |\hat{C}_\bullet| - |\hat{C}_\circ| \text{ and } |C_\bullet^c| - |C_\circ^c| = |\hat{C}_\bullet^c| - |\hat{C}_\circ^c|$$

By Claim 2,

$$|\hat{C}_\bullet| - |\hat{C}_\circ| = |\hat{C}_\bullet^c| - |\hat{C}_\circ^c|$$

Hence

$$|C_\bullet| - |C_\circ| = |C_\bullet^c| - |C_\circ^c|$$

C.3. Decoding of Non-Degenerate Errors of Weight ≤ 3 by MS

We now show that the non-degenerate decoding radius of the MS is ≥ 3 , to conclude the proof of Theorem 2. We first give a few definitions and prove two preliminary Lemmas.

Given a toric code T , we will refer to a connected planar subgraph τ induced by one or several plaquettes of T as a patch. Precisely, τ is a connected subgraph induced by its vertex set $V(\tau)$, which must satisfy $V(\tau) = \cup_i V(p_i)$, where $V(p_i)$ denotes the set of vertices (checks) of plaquette p_i . It is easily seen that if τ is a patch of T and T' is a toric code of higher minimum distance, then τ can be embedded in T' via a graph monomorphism $\tau \rightarrow T'$, and this embedding is unique up to translations, reflections, and rotations in T' . We will use such a patch embedding to embed in T' planar subgraphs of T and syndromes. We note that (i) for any planar subgraph σ of T there exists a patch τ in T such that σ is a subgraph of τ , and (ii) there exists a patch τ with $V(\tau) = V(T)$.

Definition 19. Let T and T' be toric codes, with T' of larger minimum distance.

- (i) Consider a planar subgraph σ of T , it must be contained in a patch τ in T . We define the embedding of σ in T' as the subgraph σ' of T' induced by embedding τ in T' . This embedding is unique up to translations, reflections, and rotations in T' .
- (ii) Consider a syndrome \mathbf{s} on T , and a minimal connected (necessarily planar) subgraph σ of T covering all its unsatisfied checks. We define the embedding of \mathbf{s} in T' as the syndrome \mathbf{s}' on T' induced by embedding σ in T' . This embedding is unique up to translations, reflections, and rotations in T' .

Definition 20. For a toric code T , the distance between two sets of checks $C, C' \subseteq V(T)$ is defined as $d(C, C') := \min\{d(c, c') \mid c \in C, c' \in C'\}$. We extend this definition to qubits, errors, syndromes, and subgraphs of the toric code in the following way (where the same extension applies to the second argument of $d(-, -)$):

- For a set of qubits $Q \subset E(T)$, $d(Q, -) := d(\mathcal{N}(Q), -)$, where $\mathcal{N}(Q) := \cup_{q \in Q} \mathcal{N}(q)$.
- For a syndrome \mathbf{s} , $d(\mathbf{s}, -) := d(\text{supp}(\mathbf{s}), -)$, where $\text{supp}(\mathbf{s}) := \{c \in V(T) \mid \mathbf{s}(c) = 1\}$
- For an error \mathbf{e} , $d(\mathbf{e}, -) := d(\text{supp}(\mathbf{e}), -)$, where $\text{supp}(\mathbf{e}) := \{q \in E(T) \mid \mathbf{e}(q) = 1\}$.
- For a subgraph σ of T , $d(\sigma, -) := d(V(\sigma), -)$, where $V(\sigma)$ is the vertex set of σ .

Definition 21. The **diameter** of a syndrome \mathbf{s} is the minimum over the diameters of all the connected subgraphs covering its unsatisfied checks.

Definition 22. For a toric code, a δ -**local syndrome** \mathbf{s} is a syndrome where all unsatisfied checks are contained in a connected subgraph of diameter δ .

Definition 23. We say a syndrome \mathbf{s} is **decoded in k iterations** if the MS decoder finds an error \mathbf{e} such that $\mathbf{H}\mathbf{e} = \mathbf{s}$ at iteration k and not before.

Lemma 11. *Let T be a toric code of distance d , and \mathbf{s} be a δ -local syndrome decoded in k iterations. If $d \geq 2k + \delta$, then for any toric code T' of distance $d' > d$, the embedding of \mathbf{s} in T' will be corrected in k iterations.*

Proof. Let σ be the connected subgraph containing all the edges at distance $\leq \delta$ from \mathbf{s} , and their check neighborhood, that is:

$$E(\sigma) = \{e \in E(T) \mid d(e, \mathbf{s}) \leq \delta\} \text{ and } V(\sigma) = \bigcup_{e \in E(\sigma)} \mathcal{N}(e).$$

Note that σ is planar as $\delta < d$ so we can define σ' to be the embedding of σ in T' . For any qubit $q' \in T'$, either $d(q', \mathbf{s}) \geq k$ in which case one can see that its *a posteriori* at each iteration will be $\text{APP}(q', i) = 1 + 2i$, for $i \leq k$ or $d(q', \mathbf{s}) < k$, in which case, $q' \in \sigma'$, and at each iteration, its *a posteriori* is the same as that of $q \in \sigma$, its corresponding qubit in T . This is because since $d \geq 2k + \delta$, there are no qubits in T that have a decoding tree reaching unsatisfied checks of \mathbf{s} by going around the toric code. Formally, this condition can be stated as: given τ a minimal connected covering of \mathbf{s} , then for all q in T , $E(\tau) \cup \{e \in E(T), d(e, q) \leq k\}$ does not contain a logical operator. Thus at iteration k , the decoder will converge on the embedding of \mathbf{s} on T' . \square

Lemma 12. *Let T be any toric code, \mathbf{s}_1 a syndrome decoded in k_1 iterations and \mathbf{s}_2 a syndrome decoded in k_2 iterations. Further assume that $k_1 \leq k_2$, and that if the decoder were left to run on \mathbf{s}_1 for any number $k \in [k_1, k_2]$ of iterations (even after the syndrome is satisfied), the error outputted at each iteration would still satisfy the syndrome. Let δ be the distance between \mathbf{s}_1 and \mathbf{s}_2 . If $\delta \geq 2k_2$ then the syndrome $\mathbf{s}_1 + \mathbf{s}_2$ is decodable in k_2 iterations.*

Proof. For any qubit q , either is true:

- (i) $d(\mathbf{s}_1, q) \geq k_2$ and $d(\mathbf{s}_2, q) \geq k_2$. In this case the decoding tree of q does not contain unsatisfied checks for any iteration $k \leq k_2$. So $\text{APP}(q, k) = 1 + 2k$.
- (ii) There exist i, j with $\{i, j\} = \{1, 2\}$ such that $d(e_i, q) < k_2$ and $d(e_j, q) \geq k_2$

In that case the decoder will take the same decision on q as if the syndrome was only \mathbf{s}_i .

At iteration k_2 , by (ii) in the k_2 -neighborhood of \mathbf{s}_1 and \mathbf{s}_2 , both syndromes are satisfied, and by (i) all the other qubits are not in error, so the syndrome $\mathbf{s}_1 + \mathbf{s}_2$ is satisfied. \square

We are now ready to finish the proof of Theorem 2. We do this by treating the first cases numerically, and then use the Lemmas 11, 12 introduced before to prove the result for $d \geq 18$.

Proof. For any toric code of distance $9 \leq d < 18$, all the non-degenerate errors of weight ≤ 3 are decodable by the MS algorithm. This is checked by exhaustive numerical verification.

For toric codes of minimum distance ≥ 18 , we do the following :




Figure 13: The weight 2 errors of diameter 3 (up to symmetries and translation), all are decodable in 2 iterations of the MS.

- (i) It can be easily checked that all weight 1 errors are non-degenerate and can be decoded by the MS in 1 iteration, for any toric code of distance $d \geq 3$.
- (i') Moreover, it is also true that for a weight 1 error on a toric code of distance ≥ 5 , if the decoder were allowed to continue after the first iteration (when it already decodes the error), at the second iteration it would still output the same weight 1 error.
- (ii) Any weight 2 non-degenerate error where the two qubits in error are at distance ≥ 2 will be decodable in 1 iteration because of (i) and Lemma 12 for any toric code of distance $d \geq 6$.
- (ii') For the remaining non-degenerate errors of weight 2, those where the distance between the two qubits in error is at most 1 (*i.e.*, of diameter 3), there are only 4 types of error up to symmetries and translations (shown in Fig. 13). For those, we check numerically that the decoder converges in at most 2 iterations on a toric code of distance 7. Using Lemma 11, since $2k + \delta = 2 \times 2 + 3 = 7$, we conclude that all the errors of weight 2 and diameter 3 are corrected on a toric code of any distance $d \geq 7$.
- (iii) Any weight 3 error where the distance between any two pair of qubits is ≥ 2 is correctable in 1 iteration by Lemma 12 for any toric code of distance ≥ 3 .
- (iii') Remaining errors can be written as the sum of an error \mathbf{e}_1 of weight 1 (of diameter 1) and an error \mathbf{e}_2 of weight 2 and of diameter ≤ 3 (depicted in Figure 13). Suppose $d(\mathbf{e}_1, \mathbf{e}_2) \geq 4$. By (i), \mathbf{e}_1 is decoded in 1 iterations. and by (ii'), \mathbf{e}_2 is decoded in ≤ 2 iterations. We can thus use Lemma 12 on the syndromes associated to \mathbf{e}_1 and \mathbf{e}_2 to conclude that $\mathbf{e}_1 + \mathbf{e}_2$ is decoded in 2 iterations. Note that this argument is true for any error of weight 3 satisfying the condition $d(\mathbf{e}_1, \mathbf{e}_2) \geq 4$ irrespective of the distance of the code.
- (iii'') For the remaining finite number of weight 3 errors of diameter $\delta \leq 8 = 4 + 1 + 3$ (where $d(\mathbf{e}_2, \mathbf{e}_2) \leq 4$, the diameter of \mathbf{e}_1 is 1 and the diameter of \mathbf{e}_2 is at most 3). We check numerically that these errors are decodable in ≤ 5 iterations on a toric code of distance 18. By applying Lemma 11, and since $2k + \delta = 2 \times 5 + 8 \leq 18$, we conclude that for any toric code of distance $d \geq 18$, all weight 3 non-degenerate errors are decodable.

□

C.4. Proof of Theorem 3

We now prove Theorem 3, using the tools introduced in the proof of the second part of Theorem 2.

For all toric codes of distance $7 \leq d \leq 28$ we enumerate all errors of weight ≤ 3 and check that SB+MS is able to correct them. There are two cases:

- (i) the diameter of the error is ≤ 8 .
- (ii) there must be one qubit in error that is at distance ≥ 4 from the others.

For case (i), we know that all errors of weight ≤ 3 take at most 10 iterations to converge, hence using Lemma 11, we conclude that this holds for any toric code of distance $\geq 2 \times 10 + 8 = 28$. Case (ii) can be taken care of using Lemma 12 using the same argument as above, so we conclude this is true for any toric code of distance ≥ 28 .

References

- [1] D. Poulin and Y. Chung, “On the iterative decoding of sparse quantum codes,” *Quantum Information and Computation*, vol. 8, no. 10, pp. 987–1000, 2008, [arXiv:0801.1241](#).
- [2] P. Panteleev and G. Kalachev, “Degenerate quantum LDPC codes with good finite length performance,” *Quantum*, vol. 5, p. 585, 2021, [arXiv:1904.02703](#).
- [3] J. Roffe, D. R. White, S. Burton, and E. Campbell, “Decoding across the quantum low-density parity-check code landscape,” *Physical Review Research*, vol. 2, no. 4, p. 043423, 2020, [arXiv:2005.07016](#).
- [4] J. du Crest, M. Mhalla, and V. Savin, “Stabilizer inactivation for message-passing decoding of quantum LDPC codes,” in *IEEE Information Theory Workshop (ITW)*. IEEE, 2022, pp. 488–493, [arXiv:2205.06125](#).
- [5] J. du Crest, F. Garcia-Herrero, M. Mhalla, V. Savin, and J. Valls, “Check-agnosia based post-processor for message-passing decoding of quantum LDPC codes,” *Quantum*, vol. 8, p. 1334, 2024, [arXiv:2310.15000](#).
- [6] Y.-J. Wang, B. C. Sanders, B.-M. Bai, and X.-M. Wang, “Enhanced feedback iterative decoding of sparse quantum codes,” *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 58, no. 2, pp. 1231–1241, 2012, [arXiv:0912.4546](#).
- [7] A. Rigby, J. Olivier, and P. Jarvis, “Modified belief propagation decoders for quantum low-density parity-check codes,” *Physical Review A*, vol. 100, no. 1, p. 012330, 2019, [arXiv:1903.07404](#).
- [8] K.-Y. Kuo and C.-Y. Lai, “Exploiting degeneracy in belief propagation decoding of quantum codes,” *npj Quantum Information*, vol. 8, no. 1, p. 111, 2022, [arXiv:2104.13659](#).
- [9] H. Yao, W. A. Laban, C. Häger, H. D. Pfister *et al.*, “Belief propagation decoding of

- quantum LDPC codes with guided decimation,” 2023, preprint, [arXiv:2312.10950](https://arxiv.org/abs/2312.10950).
- [10] J. Old and M. Rispler, “Generalized belief propagation algorithms for decoding of surface codes,” *Quantum*, vol. 7, p. 1037, 2023, [arXiv:2212.03214](https://arxiv.org/abs/2212.03214).
- [11] A. Y. Kitaev, “Fault-tolerant quantum computation by anyons,” *Annals of physics*, vol. 303, no. 1, pp. 2–30, 2003, [arXiv:quant-ph/9707021](https://arxiv.org/abs/quant-ph/9707021).
- [12] Google Quantum AI, “Suppressing quantum errors by scaling a surface code logical qubit,” *Nature*, vol. 614, no. 7949, pp. 676–681, 2023, [arXiv:2207.06431](https://arxiv.org/abs/2207.06431).
- [13] Y.-H. Liu and D. Poulin, “Neural belief-propagation decoders for quantum error-correcting codes,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, vol. 122, p. 200501, May 2019, [arXiv:1811.07835](https://arxiv.org/abs/1811.07835).
- [14] S. Varsamopoulos, K. Bertels, and C. G. Almudever, “Comparing neural network based decoders for the surface code,” *IEEE Transactions on Computers*, vol. 69, no. 2, pp. 300–311, 2019, [arXiv:1811.12456](https://arxiv.org/abs/1811.12456).
- [15] N. Wiberg, “Codes and decoding on general graphs,” 1996. [Online]. Available: <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:115168171>
- [16] E. Boutillon and G. Masera, “Hardware design and realization for iteratively decodable codes,” in *Channel coding: Theory, algorithms, and applications*, D. Declercq, M. Fossorier, and E. Biglieri, Eds. Elsevier, 2014, pp. 583–642.
- [17] J.-P. Tillich and G. Zémor, “Quantum LDPC codes with positive rate and minimum distance proportional to the square root of the blocklength,” *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 60, no. 2, pp. 1193–1202, 2013, [arXiv:0903.0566](https://arxiv.org/abs/0903.0566).
- [18] G. H. Golub and C. F. Van Loan, *Matrix computations*. JHU press, 2013.
- [19] W. Rozendaal and G. Zémor, “Analysis of the error-correcting radius of a renormalisation decoder for Kitaev’s toric code,” *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 2024, [arXiv:2309.12165](https://arxiv.org/abs/2309.12165).
- [20] X.-Y. Hu, E. Eleftheriou, and D.-M. Arnold, “Regular and irregular progressive edge-growth Tanner graphs,” *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 51, no. 1, pp. 386–398, 2005, [arXiv:1007.3588](https://arxiv.org/abs/1007.3588).