

High-dimensional quantum XYZ product codes for biased noise

Zipeng Liang, Zhengzhong Yi, Fusheng Yang, Jiahan Chen, Zicheng Wang, and Xuan Wang

Harbin Institute of Technology, Shenzhen, China

Three-dimensional (3D) quantum XYZ product can construct a class of non-CSS codes by using three classical codes. However, their error-correcting performance has not been studied in depth so far and whether this code construction can be generalized to higher dimension is an open question. In this paper, we first study the error-correcting performance of the 3D Chamon code, which is an instance of 3D XYZ product of three repetition codes. Next, we show that 3D XYZ product can be generalized to four dimension and propose four-dimensional (4D) XYZ product code construction, which constructs a class of non-CSS codes by using either four classical codes or two CSS codes. Compared with 4D homological product, we show that 4D XYZ product can construct non-CSS codes with higher code dimension or code distance. Finally, we consider two instances of 4D XYZ product, to which we refer as 4D Chamon code and 4D XYZ product concatenated code, respectively. Our simulation results show that, 4D XYZ product can construct non-CSS codes with better error-correcting performance for Z -biased noise than CSS codes constructed by 4D homological product.

1 Introduction

Quantum error-correcting code (QECC)[1, 2] provides a promising approach to realize large-scale fault-tolerant quantum computing. In recent years, quantum low density parity-check (QLDPC) codes[3, 4] have attracted a great deal of attention, since they may have high coding rate, large code distance and low stabilizer

weight, which benefits their engineering application. So far, many constructions of QLDPC codes have been proposed, such as XYZ product[5], hypergraph product[6], homological product[7], lifted product[8], and balanced product[9]. All the above construction methods generate CSS codes, except XYZ product which generates non-CSS codes.

Compared with CSS codes[10], non-CSS codes have shown better error-correcting performance against biased noise[11, 12]. In quantum computing hardware system, the probabilities of Pauli Z noise are often much higher than those of Pauli X and Y noise[13–15], thus considering quantum error-correcting codes with better performance against biased noise is more meaningful in this sense.

Three-dimensional (3D) XYZ product proposed in Ref. [5] constructs a class of non-CSS codes by using three classical codes. However, so far there has been no in-depth study of the error-correcting performance of 3D XYZ product codes, and there are several natural questions: whether this construction method can be generalized to higher dimension? If possible, how is the error-correcting performance of these high-dimensional XYZ product codes, especially against biased noise?

The motivation of our work is to answer the problems above. In this paper, we first study the error-correcting performance of 3D Chamon codes[16, 17], which is an instance of 3D XYZ product of three repetition codes with length n_1, n_2, n_3 and is a non-CSS variant of the 3D toric code. Exploiting fully decoupled binary belief propagation combined with *order-0* ordered statistics decoding (FDBP-OSD-0[18]), when $n_1 = n_2 = n_3$, the code-capacity threshold of the corresponding Chamon codes is around 14% under depolarizing noise, and around 13%, 14%, 14% under pure Pauli X, Y and Z noise, respectively.

Zhengzhong Yi: zhengzhongyi@cs.hitsz.edu.cn

Xuan Wang: wangxuan@cs.hitsz.edu.cn

Second, we show that that XYZ product can be generalized to four dimension and propose four-dimensional (4D) XYZ product code construction, which constructs a non-CSS code by making use of either 4 classical codes or 2 CSS codes. It also can be regarded as a non-CSS variant of standard homological product of two CSS codes (namely, 4D homological product).

Third, we show that using the same 2 CSS codes, 4D XYZ product can construct codes with higher code dimension (the number of encoded logical qubits) or code distance than those constructed by 4D homological product.

At last, to explore the error-correcting performance of 4D XYZ product codes, we consider two instances. The first one is constructed from two quantum concatenated codes, which are obtained from two pairs of repetition codes. The second one is constructed from two hypergraph product codes, which are also obtained from two pairs of repetition codes. We refer these two codes to 4D XYZ product concatenated code and 4D Chamon code, respectively. Exploiting FDBP-OSD-0, our simulation results show that under pure Pauli Z noise the code-capacity thresholds of 4D XYZ product concatenated codes and 4D Chamon codes are much higher than those of the 4D toric codes[19] and 4D homological product concatenated codes (namely, the codes constructed by 4D homological product of two quantum concatenated codes, which are the same two codes used to construct 4D XYZ product concatenated code) respectively, while their code-capacity thresholds are close under depolarizing noise. Besides, under Z -biased noise model with different bias rate, from the perspective of code-capacity threshold, 4D XYZ product concatenated codes and 4D Chamon codes also show good error-correcting performance. Our simulation results means that, using the same two codes, 4D XYZ product can constructed non-CSS codes with better error-correcting performance against biased noise than CSS codes constructed by 4D homological product.

This paper is organized as follow. Sect. 2 introduces some preliminaries, including quantum stabilizer codes, chain complex, hypergraph product and 3D XYZ product code construction. In Sect. 3, we introduce the 4D XYZ product code construction and study its code dimension and code distance. In Sect. 4, we explore the

error-correcting performance of 3D XYZ Chamon codes, 4D Chamon codes and 4D XYZ product concatenated codes. In Sect. 5, we conclude our work.

2 Preliminaries

2.1 Quantum stabilizer codes

Quantum stabilizer codes (QSCs)[20] are an important class of quantum error correcting codes, which can be seen as the analogue of classical linear codes in the quantum field.

Giving a $[[n, k]]$ QSC C is equivalent to explicitly giving a set of independent n -qubits Pauli operators $S_1, \dots, S_{(n-k)} \in \mathcal{P}_n$, which commute with each other and are called stabilizer generators, where \mathcal{P}_n is the n -qubits Pauli group. This is because the code space \mathcal{P}_C of C is the common $+1$ eigenspace of $S_1, \dots, S_{(n-k)} \in \mathcal{P}_n$. Formally,

$$\mathcal{Q}_C = \left\{ |\varphi\rangle \in \mathcal{H}_2^{(\otimes n)} : S|\varphi\rangle = |\varphi\rangle, \forall S \in \mathcal{S} \right\} \quad (1)$$

where $\mathcal{H}_2^{(\otimes n)}$ is the n -qubits Hilbert space and \mathcal{S} is the stabilizer group, which is generated by $S_1, \dots, S_{(n-k)}$, namely $\mathcal{S} = \langle S_1, \dots, S_{(n-k)} \rangle$.

If the stabilizer generators of a QSC C can be divided into two parts, each of which only contains either Pauli X or Pauli Z operators, it is a CSS code, otherwise it is a non-CSS code. It can be seen that each stabilizer generator of a CSS code can only detect two types of Pauli errors, while that of a non-CSS code can detect all three types of Pauli errors.

The logical operators of a QSC C are the set of operators in \mathcal{P}_n which commute with all elements in \mathcal{S} but are not in \mathcal{S} . Formally, the logical operators are the elements of $\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{S}) \setminus \mathcal{S}$, where $\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{S})$ is the centralizer of \mathcal{S} , which is defined as $\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{S}) = \{P \in \mathcal{P}_n : SP = PS, \forall S \in \mathcal{S}\}$. For a $[[n, k, d]]$ QSC, we can find k pairs of logical operators $(\bar{X}_j, \bar{Z}_j)_{j=1, \dots, k}$ such that $\bar{X}_i \bar{Z}_j = (-1)^{\delta_{ij}} \bar{Z}_j \bar{X}_i$, where δ is the Kronecker delta, which means for the same pair of logical operators \bar{X}_j, \bar{Z}_j , they are anti-commute, but they commute with other pairs of logical operators. We can see that $\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{S}) = \langle S_1, \dots, S_{(n-k)}, \bar{X}_1, \bar{Z}_1, \dots, \bar{X}_k, \bar{Z}_k \rangle$. The code distance d is defined as the minimum weight of logical operators, namely,

$$d = \min_{L \in \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{S}) \setminus \mathcal{S}} wt(L) \quad (2)$$

where the weight of an operator $P \in \mathcal{P}_n$ is defined as the number of qubits on which it acts nontrivially, and we use notation $wt(\cdot)$ to denote it. For instance, $wt(I_1 X_2 Y_3 Z_4) = 3$.

2.2 Chain complex

In this section, we introduce the concept of chain complex, which will help to better understand the hypergraph product code, 3D XYZ product code and our proposed 4D XYZ product code.

A chain complex \mathfrak{C} with length L is a collection of $L+1$ vector spaces C_0, C_1, \dots, C_L and L linear maps (which are also called boundary operators) $\partial_i : C_i \rightarrow C_{i+1}$ ($0 \leq i \leq L-1$), namely,

$$\mathfrak{C} = C_0 \xrightarrow{\partial_0} C_1 \xrightarrow{\partial_1} \dots \xrightarrow{\partial_{L-1}} C_L \quad (3)$$

which satisfies $\partial_i \partial_{i-1} = 0$ for all $0 \leq i \leq L-1$.

If we consider vector space over \mathbb{F}_2 , namely, $C_i := \mathbb{F}_2^{m_i}$, a chain complex \mathfrak{C} with length 2 naturally corresponds to a CSS code $C(\mathfrak{C})$, namely,

$$C(\mathfrak{C}) = \mathbb{F}_2^{m_z} \xrightarrow{H_z^T} \mathbb{F}_2^N \xrightarrow{H_x} \mathbb{F}_2^{m_x} \quad (4)$$

where the commutation condition $H_x H_z^T = \mathbf{0}$ is naturally satisfied.

It can be seen that a classical linear code $C = \ker H$ corresponds to a chain complex of length 1, namely,

$$\mathbb{F}_2^N \xrightarrow{H} \mathbb{F}_2^m \quad (5)$$

2.3 Hypergraph product and 3D XYZ product code construction

Hypergraph product is making use of two classical linear codes to construct a CSS code[6]. More precisely, given two classical linear code $C_1 = \ker H_1$ and $C_2 = \ker H_2$ (where $H_i, i \in \{1, 2\}$, are the parity check matrices of size $m_i \times n_i$ of codes C_i), hypergraph product is to construct a chain complex \mathfrak{C} with length 2 as follow,

$$\mathfrak{C} = \mathbb{F}_2^{m_1 \times n_2} \xrightarrow{H_z^T} \mathbb{F}_2^{n_1 \times n_2 \oplus m_1 \times m_2} \xrightarrow{H_x} \mathbb{F}_2^{n_1 m_2} \quad (6)$$

where $H_x = (I_{n_1} \otimes H_2, H_1^T \otimes I_{m_2})$ and $H_z = (H_1 \otimes I_{n_2}, I_{m_2} \otimes H_2^T)$. It is easy to verify that $H_x H_z^T = 2H_1^T \otimes H_2 = \mathbf{0}$. Thus Eq. (6) naturally corresponds to a CSS code $C(\mathfrak{C})$. Fig. 1 shows the tensor-product structure corresponding to Eq. (6).




Figure 1: The tensor-product structure of hypergraph product of two classical linear codes $C_1 = \ker H_1$ and $C_2 = \ker H_2$.

The tensor-product structure depicted in Fig. 1 can derive not only a CSS code but also a non-CSS code. As shown in Fig. 1, the stabilizer generators can be divided into two parts, S and T , and each part consists of two classes of qubits, A and B . In the case of constructing a CSS code, we assign X -type stabilizers to one of S or T and Z -type stabilizers to the other. If we let stabilizer generators in S and T to be mixed X and Z types, we can obtain a non-CSS code. More precisely, let the nontrivial operators of stabilizers in S acting on qubits in A and B be Pauli X and Z operators, respectively. Similarly, let the nontrivial operators of stabilizers in T acting on qubits in A and B be Pauli Z and X operators, respectively. In this way, we obtain the following stabilizer generator matrix,

$$\mathcal{S} = \begin{bmatrix} S \\ T \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} X^{(H_1 \otimes I_{n_2})}, Z^{(I_{m_1} \otimes H_2^T)} \\ Z^{(I_{n_1} \otimes H_2)}, X^{(H_1^T \otimes I_{m_2})} \end{bmatrix} \quad (7)$$

where the notation $\mathcal{P} = P^H$ ($P \in \{X, Y, Z\}$) denotes a Pauli tensor, which means for any entry of matrix H , if the entry is 1, the tensor \mathcal{P} places a Pauli operator P at the corresponding position, and an identity operator I otherwise. It can be verified any pair of stabilizer generators in \mathcal{S} commutes.




Figure 2: The tensor-product structure of 3D XYZ product of three classical linear code $C_1 = \ker H_1$, $C_2 = \ker H_2$ and $C_3 = \ker H_3$.

The 3D XYZ product is making use of three classical linear codes to construct a non-CSS

code, which can be seen as a three-fold variant of the hypergraph product. Formally, giving three parity check matrices H_i of size $m_i \times n_i$ ($i = 1, 2, 3$), one can construct the tensor-product structure as shows in Fig. 2.

In Fig. 2, A, B, C and D represent vector spaces which index the qubits and S, T, U and V represent vector spaces which index the stabilizer

$$\mathcal{S} = \begin{bmatrix} X(H_1 \otimes I_{n_2} \otimes I_{n_3}) & Y(I_{m_1} \otimes H_2^T \otimes I_{n_3}) & Z(I_{m_1} \otimes I_{n_2} \otimes H_3^T) & I(m_1 n_2 n_3 \times n_1 m_2 m_3) \\ Y(I_{n_1} \otimes H_2 \otimes I_{n_3}) & X(H_1^T \otimes I_{m_2} \otimes I_{n_3}) & I(n_1 m_2 n_3 \times m_1 n_2 m_3) & Z(I_{n_1} \otimes I_{m_2} \otimes H_3^T) \\ Z(I_{n_1} \otimes I_{n_2} \otimes H_3) & I(n_1 n_2 m_3 \times m_1 m_2 n_3) & X(H_1^T \otimes I_{n_2} \otimes I_{m_3}) & Y(I_{n_1} \otimes H_2^T \otimes I_{m_3}) \\ I(m_1 m_2 m_3 \times n_1 n_2 n_3) & Z(I_{m_1} \otimes I_{m_2} \otimes H_3) & Y(I_{m_1} \otimes H_2 \otimes I_{m_3}) & X(H_1 \otimes I_{m_2} \otimes I_{m_3}) \end{bmatrix} \quad (10)$$

The code length is $N = n_1 n_2 n_3 + m_1 m_2 n_3 + m_1 n_2 m_3 + n_1 m_2 m_3$.

So far, the error-correcting performance of 3D XYZ product codes has not been studied in depth. In Sect. 4, we study the error-correcting performance of 3D Chamon code, which is a non-CSS variant of the 3D toric code and an instance of the 3D XYZ product of three repetition codes.




Figure 3: The tensor-product structure of 4D XYZ product of two length-2 chain complexes $\mathfrak{C}_1 = C_{-1} \xrightarrow{\delta_{-1}} C_0 \xrightarrow{\delta_0} C_1$ and $\mathfrak{C}_2 = \tilde{C}_{-1} \xrightarrow{\tilde{\delta}_{-1}} \tilde{C}_0 \xrightarrow{\tilde{\delta}_0} \tilde{C}_1$.

generators, namely,

$$\begin{aligned} A &\in \mathbb{F}_2^{n_1 \times n_2 \times n_3}, B \in \mathbb{F}_2^{m_1 \times m_2 \times n_3}, \\ C &\in \mathbb{F}_2^{m_1 \times n_2 \times m_3}, D \in \mathbb{F}_2^{n_1 \times m_2 \times m_3} \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} S &\in \mathbb{F}_2^{m_1 \times n_2 \times n_3}, T \in \mathbb{F}_2^{n_1 \times m_2 \times n_3}, \\ U &\in \mathbb{F}_2^{n_1 \times n_2 \times m_3}, V \in \mathbb{F}_2^{m_1 \times m_2 \times m_3} \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

Similar with the case of constructing a non-CSS code from the tensor-product structure shown in Fig. 1, the stabilizer generator matrix \mathcal{S} of the corresponding 3D XYZ product code is

3 Four-dimensional XYZ product codes

In this section, we first introduce the 4D XYZ product code construction. Second, we explain how to compute the code dimension of 4D XYZ product codes and compute two instances' code dimension. Third, we give out the general form of the logical operators of the 4D XYZ product codes, based on which we prove the upper bound of code distance.

3.1 4D XYZ product code construction

The construction of 4D XYZ product code involves either two CSS codes or four classical linear codes to create a non-CSS code, since one can use four classical codes to construct two CSS codes through hypergraph product or concatenation. Formally, the 4D XYZ product code construction is defined as follows.

Definition 1 (4D XYZ product code construction). *Giving two length-2 chain complexes*

$$\mathfrak{C}_1 = C_{-1} \xrightarrow{\delta_{-1}} C_0 \xrightarrow{\delta_0} C_1 \quad \text{and} \quad \mathfrak{C}_2 = \tilde{C}_{-1} \xrightarrow{\tilde{\delta}_{-1}} \tilde{C}_0 \xrightarrow{\tilde{\delta}_0} \tilde{C}_1$$

which corresponds to two CSS codes $C(\mathfrak{C}_1)$ and $C(\mathfrak{C}_2)$, one can construct the tensor-product structure as shown in Fig. 3, where the qubits are divided into A, B, C, D, E five parts and stabilizer generators are divided into $S, T, U,$

V four parts. The corresponding stabilizer matrix \mathcal{S} is

$$\mathcal{S} = \begin{bmatrix} S \\ T \\ U \\ V \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} X^{(I_{m_1} \otimes \tilde{\delta}_0^T)} & Y^{(I_{m_1} \otimes \tilde{\delta}_{-1})} & Z^{(\delta_{-1}^T \otimes I_{n_B})} & I & I \\ Y^{(\delta_{-1} \otimes I_{m_4})} & I & X^{(I_{n_A} \otimes \tilde{\delta}_0)} & Z^{(\delta_0^T \otimes I_{m_4})} & I \\ I & Z^{(\delta_{-1} \otimes I_{m_3})} & X^{(I_{n_A} \otimes \tilde{\delta}_{-1}^T)} & I & Y^{(\delta_0^T \otimes I_{m_3})} \\ I & I & Z^{(\delta_0 \otimes I_{n_B})} & Y^{(I_{m_2} \otimes \tilde{\delta}_{-1})} & X^{(I_{m_2} \otimes \tilde{\delta}_{-1})} \end{bmatrix} \quad (11)$$

where $m_1, m_2, m_3, m_4, n_A, n_B$ are the dimensions of spaces $C_{-1}, C_1, \tilde{C}_{-1}, \tilde{C}_1, C_0$ and \tilde{C}_0 , respectively. The total number of qubits is

$$N = m_1 m_4 + m_1 m_3 + n_A n_B + m_2 m_4 + m_2 m_3 \quad (12)$$

One can see that the tensor-product structure of 4D XYZ product in Fig. 3 is the same as that of 4D homological product. Therefore, it can be considered as a variant of the standard 4D homological product of two CSS codes.

$$H_x = \begin{bmatrix} I_{m_1} \otimes \tilde{\delta}_0^T & I_{m_1} \otimes \tilde{\delta}_{-1} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} \\ \delta_{-1} \otimes I_{m_4} & \mathbf{0} & I_{n_A} \otimes \tilde{\delta}_0 & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & I_{n_A} \otimes \tilde{\delta}_{-1}^T & \mathbf{0}, & \delta_0^T \otimes I_{m_3} \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & I_{m_2} \otimes \tilde{\delta}_{-1} & I_{m_2} \otimes \tilde{\delta}_{-1} \end{bmatrix} \quad (13)$$

and

$$H_z = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{0} & I_{m_1} \otimes \tilde{\delta}_{-1} & \delta_{-1}^T \otimes I_{n_B} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} \\ \delta_{-1} \otimes I_{m_4} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \delta_0^T \otimes I_{m_4} & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & \delta_{-1} \otimes I_{m_3} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0}, & \delta_0^T \otimes I_{m_3} \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \delta_0 \otimes I_{n_B} & I_{m_2} \otimes \tilde{\delta}_{-1} & \mathbf{0} \end{bmatrix} \quad (14)$$

Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} & H_x H_z^T + H_z H_x^T \\ &= 2 \begin{bmatrix} \tilde{\delta}_{-1} \tilde{\delta}_{-1}^T & \delta_{-1}^T \otimes \tilde{\delta}_0^T & \delta_{-1}^T \otimes \tilde{\delta}_{-1} & \mathbf{0} \\ \delta_{-1} \otimes \tilde{\delta}_0 & \delta_{-1} \delta_{-1}^T & \mathbf{0} & \delta_0^T \otimes \tilde{\delta}_0^T \\ \delta_{-1} \otimes \tilde{\delta}_{-1}^T & \mathbf{0} & \delta_0^T \delta_0 & \delta_0^T \otimes \tilde{\delta}_{-1}^T \\ \mathbf{0} & \delta_0 \otimes \tilde{\delta}_0^T & \delta_0 \otimes \tilde{\delta}_{-1} & \tilde{\delta}_0^T \tilde{\delta}_0 \end{bmatrix} \\ &= \mathbf{0} \end{aligned} \quad (15)$$

which means any pair of stabilizers commute and the proof is completed. \square

Next, we prove that the resulting stabilizer group in Eq. (11) is Abelian.

Corollary 1. *The stabilizer group of the 4D XYZ product code is Abelian.*

Proof. To prove that the stabilizer group of the 4D XYZ product code is Abelian, we need to prove that any pair of stabilizers commute. Given the stabilizer matrix \mathcal{S} of the 4D XYZ product code as shown in Eq. (11), the corresponding parity-check matrix H in symplectic representation is $H = (H_x | H_z)$, where

3.2 Code dimension of 4D XYZ product code

In this section, we compute the code dimension of the 4D XYZ product codes. Similar to Ref. [5], this problem reduces to finding the number of independent stabilizer generators. First, we give a general solution to this problem in **Theorem 1**. Second, we consider two instances of 4D XYZ product. The first one is constructed from two concatenated codes, which are obtained from two pairs of repetition codes with block lengths (n_1, n_2) and (n_3, n_4) (here n_1, n_2, n_3 and n_4 are all odd), and its code dimension is

proven to be 1 in **Corollary 2**. The second one is constructed from two hypergraph product codes, which are also obtained from two pairs of repetition codes with block lengths (n_1, n_2) and (n_3, n_4) , and its code dimension is proven to be

$$\mathcal{S} = \begin{bmatrix} S \\ T \\ U \\ V \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} X^{(I_{m_1} \otimes H_{x_2}^T)} & Y^{(I_{m_1} \otimes H_{z_2}^T)} & Z^{(H_{z_1} \otimes I_{n_B})} & I & I \\ Y^{(H_{z_1}^T \otimes I_{m_4})} & I & X^{(I_{n_A} \otimes H_{x_2})} & Z^{(H_{x_1}^T \otimes I_{m_4})} & I \\ I & Z^{(H_{z_1}^T \otimes I_{m_3})} & X^{(I_{n_A} \otimes H_{z_2})} & I & Y^{(H_{x_1}^T \otimes I_{m_3})} \\ I & I & Z^{(H_{x_1} \otimes I_{n_B})} & Y^{(I_{m_2} \otimes H_{x_2}^T)} & X^{(I_{m_2} \otimes H_{z_2}^T)} \end{bmatrix} \quad (16)$$

where $H_{x_1} = \delta_0$ ($H_{x_2} = \tilde{\delta}_0$) and $H_{z_1} = \delta_{-1}^T$ ($H_{z_2} = \tilde{\delta}_{-1}^T$) are the X -type and Z -type parity-check matrices of code $C(\mathcal{C}_1)$ [$C(\mathcal{C}_2)$], respectively. Recall that the dimensions of H_{x_1} , H_{z_1} , H_{x_2} and H_{z_2} are $m_1 \times n_A$, $m_2 \times n_A$, $m_3 \times n_B$ and $m_4 \times n_B$, respectively.

For the remainder of this paper, bold lowercase letters represent column vectors.

Theorem 1 (The code dimension of 4D XYZ product code). *The code dimension k of 4D XYZ product code is $(n_A - m_1 - m_2)(n_B - m_3 - m_4) + k_{SV} + k_{TU}$, where $k_{SV} = \dim \left(\ker \left(\begin{bmatrix} H_{z_1}^T & H_{x_1}^T \end{bmatrix} \right) \otimes \ker \left(\begin{bmatrix} H_{x_2} \\ H_{z_2} \end{bmatrix} \right) \right)$ is*

the number of independent solutions $\begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{s} \\ \mathbf{v} \end{bmatrix}$ of

$$\begin{aligned} I_{m_1} \otimes H_{x_2} \mathbf{s} &= I_{m_1} \otimes H_{z_2} \mathbf{s} = \mathbf{0} \\ I_{m_2} \otimes H_{x_2} \mathbf{v} &= I_{m_2} \otimes H_{z_2} \mathbf{v} = \mathbf{0} \\ H_{z_1}^T \otimes I_{n_B} \mathbf{s} &+ H_{x_1}^T \otimes I_{n_B} \mathbf{v} = \mathbf{0} \end{aligned} \quad (17)$$

and $k_{TU} = \dim \left(\ker \left(\begin{bmatrix} H_{x_1} \\ H_{z_1} \end{bmatrix} \right) \otimes \ker \left(\begin{bmatrix} H_{z_2}^T & H_{x_2}^T \end{bmatrix} \right) \right)$

is the number of independent solutions $\begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{t} \\ \mathbf{u} \end{bmatrix}$ of

$$\begin{aligned} H_{z_1} \otimes I_{m_4} \mathbf{t} &= H_{x_1} \otimes I_{m_4} \mathbf{t} = \mathbf{0} \\ H_{z_1} \otimes I_{m_3} \mathbf{u} &= H_{z_1} \otimes I_{m_3} \mathbf{u} = \mathbf{0} \\ I_{n_A} \otimes H_{x_2}^T \mathbf{u} &= I_{n_A} \otimes H_{z_2}^T \mathbf{u} = \mathbf{0} \end{aligned} \quad (18)$$

Proof. The total number m of stabilizer generators in Eq. (16) is $m = m_1 n_B + m_2 n_B + m_3 n_A + m_4 n_A$. Thus, according to Eq. (12), the 4D XYZ product code encodes at least $N - m = (n_A - m_1 - m_2)(n_B - m_3 - m_4)$ logical qubits.

$8 \gcd(n_1, n_2) \gcd(n_3, n_4)$ in **Corollary 3**. We refer to these two codes as the 4D XYZ concatenated code and the 4D Chamon code (the rationale for this name is discussed in Sect. 4.2), respectively.

For convenience, we rewrite Eq. (11) as

However, we should notice that stabilizer generators in Eq. (16) may not be independent of each other. Thus, we should find out the number of independent stabilizer generators in Eq. (16).

Observing Eq. (16), one can see that the stabilizer generators are divided into S , T , U , V four parts, and any stabilizer in S or V cannot be generated by the product of some stabilizers in T and U . Thus, we first consider the independence of the stabilizers in S and V , with a similar analysis applied to the stabilizers in T and U .

Considering stabilizers in S and V simultaneously, one can see that the product of some stabilizers in S might be equal to the product of some stabilizers in V , namely,

$$\begin{aligned} & \left[I_{m_1} \otimes H_{x_2}^T, I_{m_1} \otimes H_{z_2}^T, H_{z_1} \otimes I_{n_B}, \mathbf{0}, \mathbf{0} \right]^T \mathbf{s} \\ &= \left[\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{0}, H_{x_1} \otimes I_{n_B}, I_{m_2} \otimes H_{x_2}^T, I_{m_2} \otimes H_{z_2}^T \right]^T \mathbf{v} \end{aligned} \quad (19)$$

Then we have Eq. (17).

Our goal is to compute k_{SV} and k_{TU} . Observing that equation systems (17) and (18) are similar, thus we only need to compute k_{SV} , and k_{TU} will follow a similar fashion.

It can be seen that the solution of $I_{m_1} \otimes H_{x_2} \mathbf{s} = I_{m_1} \otimes H_{z_2} \mathbf{s} = \mathbf{0}$ is $\mathbf{s} \in \mathcal{C}_{m_1} \otimes \ker \left(\begin{bmatrix} H_{x_2} \\ H_{z_2} \end{bmatrix} \right)$ and the solution of $I_{m_2} \otimes H_{x_2} \mathbf{v} = I_{m_2} \otimes H_{z_2} \mathbf{v} = \mathbf{0}$ is $\mathbf{v} \in \mathcal{C}_{m_2} \otimes \ker \left(\begin{bmatrix} H_{x_2} \\ H_{z_2} \end{bmatrix} \right)$. Similarly, the solution of $H_{z_1}^T \otimes I_{n_B} \mathbf{s} = H_{x_1}^T \otimes I_{n_B} \mathbf{v}$ is $\begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{s} \\ \mathbf{v} \end{bmatrix} \in \ker \left(\begin{bmatrix} H_{z_1}^T & H_{x_1}^T \end{bmatrix} \right) \otimes \mathcal{C}_{n_B}$. Thus,

the solution of equation system (17) is $\begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{s} \\ \mathbf{v} \end{bmatrix} \in$

$\ker \left(\begin{bmatrix} H_{z_1}^T & H_{x_1}^T \end{bmatrix} \right) \otimes \ker \left(\begin{bmatrix} H_{x_2} \\ H_{z_2} \end{bmatrix} \right)$, and the dimension of $\ker \left(\begin{bmatrix} H_{z_1}^T & H_{x_1}^T \end{bmatrix} \right) \otimes \ker \left(\begin{bmatrix} H_{x_2} \\ H_{z_2} \end{bmatrix} \right)$ is the number of independent solutions $\begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{s} \\ \mathbf{v} \end{bmatrix}$ of equation system (17).

Notice that

$$k_{SV} = \dim \left(\ker \left(\begin{bmatrix} H_{z_1}^T & H_{x_1}^T \end{bmatrix} \right) \otimes \ker \left(\begin{bmatrix} H_{x_2} \\ H_{z_2} \end{bmatrix} \right) \right) \quad (20)$$

and according to the theory of linear algebra, the number of independent stabilizers in S and V , r_{SV} , is

$$r_{SV} = m_1 n_B + m_2 n_B - k_{SV} \quad (21)$$

Similarly, notice that $k_{TU} = \dim \left(\ker \left(\begin{bmatrix} H_{x_1} \\ H_{z_1} \end{bmatrix} \right) \otimes \ker \left(\begin{bmatrix} H_{z_2}^T & H_{x_2}^T \end{bmatrix} \right) \right)$ is the number of independent solutions $\begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{t} \\ \mathbf{u} \end{bmatrix}$ of equation system (18), thus the number of independent stabilizers in T and U , r_{TU} , is

$$r_{TU} = m_3 n_A + m_4 n_A - k_{TU} \quad (22)$$

Thus, the total number of independent stabilizers in Eq. (16) is $r_{SV} + r_{TU}$, and the code dimension of 4D XYZ product code is

$$\begin{aligned} N - r_{SV} - r_{TU} \\ = (n_A - m_1 - m_2)(n_B - m_3 - m_4) + k_{SV} + k_{TU} \end{aligned} \quad (23)$$

□

Next, we first consider 4D XYZ product of two concatenated codes obtained from two pairs of repetition codes with block lengths (n_1, n_2) and (n_3, n_4) (n_1, n_2, n_3 and n_4 are all odd), and compute its code dimension. Consider the repetition code C_1 with length n_1 be the outer code and the code C_2 with length n_2 be the inner code, whose parity-check matrices are H_1 with dimension $(n_1 - 1) \times n_1$ and H_2 with dimension $(n_2 - 1) \times n_2$ respectively, the corresponding X -type and Z -type parity-check matrices H_x and H_z of the concatenated code obtained from C_1

and C_2 are as follows:

$$H_x = \begin{bmatrix} \overbrace{1, \dots, 1}^{n_2} & \overbrace{1, \dots, 1}^{n_2} & \overbrace{0, \dots, 0}^{(n_1-2)n_2} \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \underbrace{0, \dots, 0}_{(n_1-2)n_2} & \underbrace{1, \dots, 1}_{n_2} & \underbrace{1, \dots, 1}_{n_2} \end{bmatrix} \quad (24)$$

$$H_z = \begin{bmatrix} H_1 & \cdots & \mathbf{0} \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \mathbf{0} & \cdots & H_1 \end{bmatrix} \quad (25)$$

Corollary 2 (The code dimension of 4D XYZ product concatenated code). *The code dimension k of the 4D XYZ product of two concatenated codes obtained from two pairs of repetition codes with block lengths (n_1, n_2) and (n_3, n_4) (where n_1, n_2, n_3 and n_4 are all odd) is 1.*

Proof. According to Theorem 1 and $(n_A - m_1 - m_2)(n_B - m_3 - m_4) = 1$, the code dimension k of 4D XYZ product concatenated code is $1 + k_{SV} + k_{TU}$, where $k_{SV} = \dim \left(\ker \left(\begin{bmatrix} H_{z_1}^T & H_{x_1}^T \end{bmatrix} \right) \otimes \ker \left(\begin{bmatrix} H_{x_2} \\ H_{z_2} \end{bmatrix} \right) \right)$ and $k_{TU} = \dim \left(\ker \left(\begin{bmatrix} H_{x_1} \\ H_{z_1} \end{bmatrix} \right) \otimes \ker \left(\begin{bmatrix} H_{z_2}^T & H_{x_2}^T \end{bmatrix} \right) \right)$.

Observing that $\dim \left(\ker \left(\begin{bmatrix} H_x \\ H_z \end{bmatrix} \right) \right)$ can be seen as the number of independent solutions $\hat{\mathbf{e}} = (\mathbf{e}, \mathbf{e})^T$ of

$$\begin{pmatrix} H_x & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & H_z \end{pmatrix} (\mathbf{e}, \mathbf{e})^T = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} \end{pmatrix} \quad (26)$$

Here, the solution $\hat{\mathbf{e}}$ can be interpreted as the symplectic representation of undetectable Y -type errors, which include Y -type stabilizers and logical operators of the corresponding code.

For a concatenated code C obtained from a pair of repetition codes, whose X -type and Z -type parity-check matrices are H_x and H_z as shown in Eq. (24) and Eq. (25) respectively, it is easy to prove that $\dim \left(\ker \left(\begin{bmatrix} H_x \\ H_z \end{bmatrix} \right) \right) = 1$ and $\dim \left(\ker \left(\begin{bmatrix} H_z^T & H_x^T \end{bmatrix} \right) \right) = n - 1 - \dim \left(\text{row} \left(\begin{bmatrix} H_x \\ H_z \end{bmatrix} \right) \right) = n - 1 - (n - 1) = 0$. The reason is that the undetectable Y -type error of




Figure 4: Y -type logical operators of 2D toric code with lattice size 3×3 .

code C only contains one Y -type logical operator whose weight is code length. Thus, the code dimension k of 4D XYZ product concatenated code is 1. \square

Next, we consider the second instance of 4D XYZ product, 4D Chamon code, and compute its code dimension. Before computing it, we first prove **Lemma 1** which will be used later.

Lemma 1 (The number of independent undetectable Y -type errors of two-dimensional (2D) toric code). *The number of independent Y -type stabilizers and logical operators of 2D toric code is $2 \gcd(j, k)$, where j and k are dimensions of the toric code lattice.*

Proof. Without loss of generality, we assume that $j \leq k$, and the proof consists of two parts:

1. Proving that the number of independent Y -type logical operators of 2D toric code is 2.
2. Proving that the number of independent Y -type stabilizers of 2D toric code is $2[\gcd(j, k) - 1]$.

Since 2D toric code encodes 2 logical qubits, there are 2 independent Y -type logical operators at most. When the toric code lattice is a square, these two independent Y -type logical operators are full diagonal of Pauli Y operators from the upper right to the lower left and from the upper left to the lower right, respectively. In Fig. 4, we give an example of Y -type logical operators of 2D toric code with lattice size 3×3 .




Figure 5: A Y -type stabilizer of toric code with lattice size $j = 4$, $k = 6$. The red solid lines represent the qubits which the Y -type stabilizer acts on. The blue-grey plaquettes denote the selected Z -type stabilizers, while the top-right and bottom-left vertices indicate the selected X -type stabilizers.

Any Y -type stabilizer must be generated by the product of some X -type and Z -type stabilizers both of which act on the same set of qubits. According to the topology of toric code, this can only be realized by selecting plaquettes (Z -type stabilizers) and vertices (X -type stabilizers) along the diagonal of $j \times j$ square lattices periodically. Fig. 5 gives an example of Y -type stabilizer of toric code with size of $j = 4$, $k = 6$.

When j and k are coprime, namely, $\gcd(j, k) = 1$, it is impossible to select some X -type and Z -type stabilizers to generate a Y -type stabilizer, thus the number of Y -type stabilizers is zero. While in the case of $\gcd(j, k) = g \neq 1$, using the selection method as shown in Fig. 5, one can find $2(g - 1)$ independent Y -type stabilizers by shifting to left or right, where the factor 2 comes from the left-right symmetry of toric code.

To sum up, the total number of independent Y -type stabilizers and logical operators of 2D toric code is $2 \gcd(j, k)$, and the proof is completed. \square

Corollary 3 (The code dimension of the 4D Chamon code). *The code dimension k of the 4D Chamon code, which is 4D XYZ product of two hypergraph product codes that are obtained from two pairs of repetition codes with block lengths (n_1, n_2) and (n_3, n_4) , is*

$$k = 8 \gcd(n_1, n_2) \gcd(n_3, n_4) \quad (27)$$

Proof. The hypergraph product of a pair of repetition codes is a 2D toric code[6]. Thus, given

two toric codes which are obtained from two pairs of repetition codes with block lengths (n_1, n_2) and (n_3, n_4) , whose parity-check matrices are H_1, H_2, H_3 and H_4 , respectively, by **Definition 1**, the corresponding stabilizer matrix \mathbf{S} of the 4D Chamon code is as shown in Eq. (16), where $H_{x_1} = [I_{n_1} \otimes H_2, H_1^T \otimes I_{n_2}]$ with dimension of $m_1 \times n_A$ and $H_{z_1} = [H_1 \otimes I_{n_2}, I_{n_1} \otimes H_2^T]$ with dimension of $m_2 \times n_A$ are the X -type and Z -type parity-check matrices of toric code C_1 , respectively, and $H_{x_2} = [I_{n_3} \otimes H_4, H_3^T \otimes I_{n_4}]$ with dimension of $m_3 \times n_B$ and $H_{z_2} = [H_3 \otimes I_{n_4}, I_{n_3} \otimes H_4^T]$ with dimension of $m_4 \times n_B$ are the X -type and Z -type parity-check matrices of toric code C_2 , respectively. Recall that $n_A = 2n_1n_2 = m_1 + m_2$ and $n_B = 2n_3n_4 = m_3 + m_4$ is the code length of C_1 and C_2 , respectively.

According to **Theorem 1** and $(n_A - m_1 - m_2)(n_B - m_3 - m_4) = 0$, the code dimension k of the 4D Chamon code is $k_{SV} + k_{TU}$, where $k_{SV} = \dim \left(\ker \left([H_{z_1}^T, H_{x_1}^T] \right) \otimes \ker \left([H_{x_2}] \right) \right)$ and $k_{TU} = \dim \left(\ker \left([H_{x_1}] \right) \otimes \ker \left([H_{z_2}^T, H_{x_2}^T] \right) \right)$.

Similar with the proof in **Corollary 2**, $\ker \left([H_{x_2}] \right)$ is the number of undetectable Y -type errors, which include Y -type stabilizers and logical operators of the toric code C_2 . According to **Lemma 1**, the number of independent solutions \hat{e} is $2 \gcd(n_3, n_4)$.

For $\dim \left(\ker \left([H_{z_1}^T, H_{x_1}^T] \right) \right)$, it is equal to $n_A - \dim \left(\text{Im} \left([H_{z_1}^T, H_{x_1}^T] \right) \right) = n_A - \text{row} \left([H_{x_1}] \right) = \ker \left([H_{z_1}] \right) = 2 \gcd(n_1, n_2)$, where $\text{Im} \left([H_{z_1}^T, H_{x_1}^T] \right)$ is the image space of $[H_{z_1}^T, H_{x_1}^T]$ and $\text{row} \left([H_{x_1}] \right)$ is the row space of $[H_{x_1}]$.

Observing that the dimension k_{SV} of $\ker \left([H_{z_1}^T, H_{x_1}^T] \right) \otimes \ker \left([H_{x_2}] \right)$ is $\dim \left(\ker \left([H_{z_1}^T, H_{x_1}^T] \right) \right) \times \dim \left(\ker \left([H_{x_2}] \right) \right)$, thus $k_{SV} = 4 \gcd(n_1, n_2) \gcd(n_3, n_4)$. Similarly, the dimension k_{TU} of

$\dim \left(\ker \left([H_{x_1}] \right) \otimes \ker \left([H_{z_2}^T, H_{x_2}^T] \right) \right)$ is also $4 \gcd(n_1, n_2) \gcd(n_3, n_4)$. Thus, the code dimension k of the 4D Chamon code is $k = k_{SV} + k_{TU} = 8 \gcd(n_1, n_2) \gcd(n_3, n_4)$, which completes the proof. \square

For 4D toric code which is 4D homological product of two 2D toric codes, its code dimension remains 6 regardless of the values of n_1, n_2, n_3 and n_4 . While the code dimension of 4D Chamon code, $8 \gcd(n_1, n_2) \gcd(n_3, n_4)$, is higher than that of 4D toric code, which means using the same two CSS codes, 4D XYZ product may construct codes with higher code dimensions than 4D homological product.

3.3 Logical operators and code distance of 4D XYZ product code

In this section, we study the logical operators and the code distance of 4D XYZ product code. First, we present the general forms of the logical operators in **Theorem 2**, followed by the proof of the upper bound of their minimum weight in **Corollary 4**.

Here we define a permutation notation $\pi(\cdot)$ as

$$\pi \left(\begin{bmatrix} x_1 \mathbf{a} \\ \vdots \\ x_{m_1} \mathbf{a} \\ x_1 \mathbf{b} \\ \vdots \\ x_{m_1} \mathbf{b} \\ y_1 \mathbf{a} \\ \vdots \\ y_{m_2} \mathbf{a} \\ y_1 \mathbf{b} \\ \vdots \\ y_{m_2} \mathbf{b} \end{bmatrix} \right) = \begin{bmatrix} x_1 \mathbf{a} \\ x_1 \mathbf{b} \\ \vdots \\ x_{m_1} \mathbf{a} \\ x_{m_1} \mathbf{b} \\ y_1 \mathbf{a} \\ y_1 \mathbf{b} \\ \vdots \\ y_{m_2} \mathbf{a} \\ y_{m_2} \mathbf{b} \end{bmatrix} \quad (28)$$

which will be used in the proof of **Theorem 2**.

Theorem 2 (The general forms of the logical operators of 4D XYZ product code). *Given two CSS codes C_1 and C_2 , whose X -type and Z -type parity-check matrices are H_{x_1}, H_{z_1} and H_{x_2}, H_{z_2} , respectively, the logical operators of the corresponding 4D XYZ product code are divided into two types. The first type of logical*

operators are

$$\begin{aligned} X_L &= \begin{bmatrix} I & I & X(\mathbf{r}^T) & I & I \\ I & I & Z(\mathbf{w}^T) & I & I \end{bmatrix} \\ Z_L &= \begin{bmatrix} I & I & X(\mathbf{r}^T) & I & I \\ I & I & Z(\mathbf{w}^T) & I & I \end{bmatrix} \end{aligned} \quad (29)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{r} &\in \ker \left(\begin{bmatrix} H_{x_1} \\ H_{z_1} \end{bmatrix} \right) \otimes (\mathcal{C}_{n_B} \setminus \text{Im} \left(\begin{bmatrix} H_{x_2}^T \\ H_{z_2}^T \end{bmatrix} \right)) \\ \mathbf{w} &\in (\mathcal{C}_{n_A} \setminus \text{Im} \left(\begin{bmatrix} H_{x_1}^T \\ H_{z_1}^T \end{bmatrix} \right)) \otimes \ker \left(\begin{bmatrix} H_{x_2} \\ H_{z_2} \end{bmatrix} \right) \end{aligned} \quad (30)$$

The second type of logical operators are

$$\begin{bmatrix} X_{L_2} \\ X_{L_3} \\ Z_{L_2} \\ Z_{L_3} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} X(\mathbf{a}_1^T) & I & I & Y(\mathbf{b}_1^T) & I \\ I & Y(\mathbf{a}_2^T) & I & I & X(\mathbf{b}_2^T) \\ Y(\mathbf{c}_1^T) & Z(\mathbf{d}_1^T) & I & I & I \\ I & I & I & Z(\mathbf{c}_2^T) & Y(\mathbf{d}_2^T) \end{bmatrix} \quad (31)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} &\pi \left(\mathbf{a}_1^T, \mathbf{a}_2^T, \mathbf{b}_1^T, \mathbf{b}_2^T \right)^T \\ &\in \ker \left(\begin{bmatrix} H_{z_1}^T \\ H_{x_1}^T \end{bmatrix} \right) \otimes \left(\mathcal{C}_{m_3+m_4} \setminus \text{Im} \left(\begin{bmatrix} H_{x_2} \\ H_{z_2} \end{bmatrix} \right) \right) \\ &\pi \left(\mathbf{c}_1^T, \mathbf{d}_1^T, \mathbf{c}_2^T, \mathbf{d}_2^T \right)^T \\ &\in \left(\mathcal{C}_{m_1+m_2} \setminus \text{Im} \left(\begin{bmatrix} H_{z_1} \\ H_{x_1} \end{bmatrix} \right) \right) \otimes \ker \left(\begin{bmatrix} H_{x_2}^T \\ H_{z_2}^T \end{bmatrix} \right) \end{aligned} \quad (32)$$

The proof of Theorem 2 is given in the Appendix A.

Next, we will prove the upper bound of code distance of 4D XYZ product code in **corollary 4**. Before proving it, we first present **Lemma 2** which will be used later.

Lemma 2. *Given a vector space \mathcal{C}_n with dimension n over $GF(2)$, two binary matrices H_1 and H_2 with size $n \times m_1$ and $m_2 \times n$ respectively, the minimum weight of non-zero vector in $\mathcal{C}_n \setminus \text{Im}(H_1)$ and $\mathcal{C}_n \setminus \ker(H_2)$ is one.*

The proof of **Lemma 2** is given in the Appendix B.

Corollary 4 (The upper bound of code distance of 4D XYZ product code). *The upper bound of code distance of 4D XYZ product code is*

$$d \leq \min\{d_1, d_2, d_3, d_4\} \quad (33)$$

where d_1, d_2, d_3 and d_4 is the minimum weight of the non-zero vectors in spaces $\ker \left(\begin{bmatrix} H_{x_1} \\ H_{z_1} \end{bmatrix} \right)$, $\ker \left(\begin{bmatrix} H_{x_2} \\ H_{z_2} \end{bmatrix} \right)$, $\ker \left(\begin{bmatrix} H_{z_1}^T \\ H_{x_1}^T \end{bmatrix} \right)$ and $\ker \left(\begin{bmatrix} H_{z_2}^T \\ H_{x_2}^T \end{bmatrix} \right)$, respectively.

Proof. As proved in **Theorem 2**, the logical operators of 4D XYZ product code can be divided into two types. Thus, we should consider the upper bound of the minimum weight of these two types of logical operators separately.

First considering the first type of logical operators, and let α and β (whose weight is d_β) be minimal weight non-zero vectors in the spaces $\ker \left(\begin{bmatrix} H_{x_1} \\ H_{z_1} \end{bmatrix} \right)$ and $(\mathcal{C}_{n_B} \setminus \text{Im} \left(\begin{bmatrix} H_{x_2}^T \\ H_{z_2}^T \end{bmatrix} \right))$ respectively, then we have $\alpha \otimes \beta \in \ker \left(\begin{bmatrix} H_{x_1} \\ H_{z_1} \end{bmatrix} \right) \otimes (\mathcal{C}_{n_B} \setminus \text{Im} \left(\begin{bmatrix} H_{x_2}^T \\ H_{z_2}^T \end{bmatrix} \right))$ and the weight of $\alpha \otimes \beta$ is $d_1 d_\beta$. According to **Lemma 2**, we have $d_\beta = 1$. Thus the weight of $\alpha \otimes \beta$ is d_1 . For $(\mathcal{C}_{n_A} \setminus \text{Im} \left(\begin{bmatrix} H_{x_1}^T \\ H_{z_1}^T \end{bmatrix} \right)) \otimes \ker \left(\begin{bmatrix} H_{x_2} \\ H_{z_2} \end{bmatrix} \right)$, we have similar conclusion. Thus the upper bound of minimum weight of the vectors in space $\ker \left(\begin{bmatrix} H_{x_1} \\ H_{z_1} \end{bmatrix} \right) \otimes (\mathcal{C}_{n_B} \setminus \text{Im} \left(\begin{bmatrix} H_{x_2}^T \\ H_{z_2}^T \end{bmatrix} \right))$ and $(\mathcal{C}_{n_A} \setminus \text{Im} \left(\begin{bmatrix} H_{x_1}^T \\ H_{z_1}^T \end{bmatrix} \right)) \otimes \ker \left(\begin{bmatrix} H_{x_2} \\ H_{z_2} \end{bmatrix} \right)$ is d_1 and d_2 , respectively.

For the second type of logical operators, the upper bound of the minimum weight for the vector $\pi \left(\mathbf{a}_1^T, \mathbf{a}_2^T, \mathbf{b}_1^T, \mathbf{b}_2^T \right)^T \in \ker \left(\begin{bmatrix} H_{z_1}^T \\ H_{x_1}^T \end{bmatrix} \right) \otimes \left(\mathcal{C}_{m_3+m_4} \setminus \text{Im} \left[\begin{bmatrix} H_{x_2} \\ H_{z_2} \end{bmatrix} \right] \right)$ is d_3 . Observing Eq. (31), it is obvious that the minimum weight of the logical operators X_{L_2} and X_{L_3} is no more than d_3 . Similarly, the the minimum weight of the logical operators Z_{L_2} and Z_{L_3} is no more than d_4 . To sum up, the upper bound of code distance is no more than the minimum of d_1, d_2, d_3 and d_4 . \square

Here we exploit Monte Carlo method proposed in Ref. [21, 22] to verify the code distance of 4D Chamon codes and 4D XYZ product concatenated codes and the results are consistent with **Corollary 4**. Further, we compare the code dimension and the code distance between 4D Chamon codes, 4D toric codes, 4D XYZ product con-

concatenated codes and 4D homological product concatenated codes in Table 1, where n_1, n_2, n_3, n_4 are the code length of the repetition codes. The comparison results support that using the same

two CSS codes, 4D XYZ product can construct non-CSS codes with higher code dimension or code distance than the CSS codes constructed by 4D homological product.

Table 1: Comparison of 4D Chamon codes, 4D toric codes, 4D XYZ product concatenated codes and 4D homological product concatenated codes in code dimension and code distance.

	n_1, n_2, n_3, n_4	code dimension	code distance
4D Chamon codes	2, 2, 2, 2	32	4
	3, 3, 3, 3	72	6
	4, 4, 4, 4	128	8
	5, 5, 5, 5	200	20
	2, 3, 2, 3	8	6
	3, 4, 3, 4	8	12
	4, 5, 4, 5	8	20
4D toric codes	2, 2, 2, 2	6	4
	3, 3, 3, 3	6	9
	4, 4, 4, 4	6	16
	5, 5, 5, 5	6	25
	2, 3, 2, 3	6	4
	3, 4, 3, 4	6	9
	4, 5, 4, 5	6	16
4D XYZ product concatenated codes	3, 3, 3, 3	1	9
	5, 5, 5, 5	1	25
	7, 7, 7, 7	1	49
	3, 5, 3, 5	1	15
	3, 7, 3, 7	1	21
4D homological product concatenated codes	3, 3, 3, 3	1	9
	5, 5, 5, 5	1	25
	7, 7, 7, 7	1	49
	3, 5, 3, 5	1	9
	3, 7, 3, 7	1	9

4 Numerical simulations

In this section, we exploit FDBP-OSD-0 proposed in Ref. [18] to study the error-correcting performance of 3D Chamon codes, 4D Chamon codes and 4D XYZ product concatenated codes under the independent single-qubit Pauli noise model, in which each qubit independently suffers a Pauli error I, X, Y , or Z with error probability $1 - p$, p_x, p_y, p_z , respectively, where $p = p_x + p_y + p_z$ is physical qubit error rate. Under this noise model, the bias rate of Pauli Z noise is defined as

$$\eta = \frac{p_z}{p_x + p_y} \quad (34)$$

For instance, the bias rate of depolarizing and pure Pauli Z noise is $\eta = 0.5$ and $\eta = \infty$, respectively. In this paper, we only consider noiseless stabilizer measurements.

It is important to note that this paper does not focus on optimizing the decoding algorithm for 3D and 4D XYZ product codes. Instead, we use the FDBP-OSD-0 algorithm, which is an improved version of binary BP and is applicable to all quantum stabilizer codes with improved performance over traditional binary BP.[23, 24]. However, as shown in Ref. [25], even though tradition binary BP combined with OSD[26] has demonstrated strong decoding performance for a

wide range of QLDPC codes, but its performance can degrade for the codes with large code length and high degeneracy. FDBP also has the same problem, and its performance is also greatly degraded by short cycles, especially 4-cycles in the Tanner graph. In Appendix C, we compare the number of 4-cycles in the Tanner graphs of 3D Chamon code, 3D toric codes, 4D Chamon codes and 4D toric codes. Our analysis reveals that the 4D XYZ product codes exhibit significantly more 4-cycles in their Tanner graphs compared to 3D and 4D homological product codes. Thus, the error-correcting performance of 3D Chamon codes, 4D Chamon codes and 4D XYZ product concatenated codes obtained by FDBP-OSD-0 in this paper is not the optimal. Nonetheless, from the perspective of code-capacity threshold, they still show good error-correcting performance against Z -biased noise.

4.1 3D Chamon code

3D Chamon code proposed in Ref. [16] is an instance of 3D XYZ product of three repetition codes[5] and can be seen as a non-CSS variant of 3D toric code. Bravyi *et al.* study its characteristics in depth in Ref. [17]. However, its error-correcting performance under different noise models remains unexplored. Our work aims to address this gap by evaluating the code's performance under various Pauli and depolarizing noise models.

The code dimension of 3D Chamon code is $4 \gcd(n_1, n_2, n_3)$, where n_1 , n_2 and n_3 are the code length of three repetition codes, respectively. Besides, we can also understand 3D Chamon code from the perspective of three-dimensional layout. As shown in Fig. 6, on a three-dimensional cubic Bravais lattice, the qubits of 3D Chamon code are placed on the face centers each of which neighbors two cubes and on the vertices each of which is shared in eight cubes. Each edge of cube represents a stabilizer that involves neighboring six qubits. These six qubits are divided into three classes, each of which contains two qubits along one of the x , y , z three directions. For each class of qubits, the type of the Pauli operators that the stabilizer acts on them is consistent with the type of direction. We conjecture that 3D Chamon code may have the same error-correcting capability for Pauli X , Z and Y errors when $n_1 = n_2 = n_3$, since there exists spatial symmetry in this case.




Figure 6: Three-dimensional layout of 3D Chamon code. Qubits are placed on the face centers and the vertices of the cubes. Each edge of the cube represents a stabilizer, which involves neighboring six qubits. Some qubits are omitted for clearly.

In Fig. 7, we consider the case of $n_1 = n_2 = n_3 = n$, and the corresponding 3D Chamon code encodes $4n$ logical qubits. Fig. 7(a)~(c) show the single logical qubit error rate against the physical qubit error rate p under pure Pauli X , Y and Z noise model, respectively. One can see that the code-capacity threshold of 3D Chamon code under pure Pauli X , Y and Z noise model is close, which supports our conjecture. Fig. 7(d) shows that the code-capacity thresholds of 3D Chamon code under depolarizing noise model are around 14%. In the legend, we use notation $L = n_1, n_2, n_3$ to represent the corresponding 3D Chamon code, which is constructed by three repetition codes with code length of n_1 , n_2 and n_3 .

4.2 4D Chamon code

We refer the code which is 4D XYZ product of four repetition codes with code length n_1 , n_2 , n_3 and n_4 to 4D Chamon code and conjecture that it is 4D generalization of 3D Chamon code, just as the relation between 3D toric code and 4D toric code. There are two reasons. First, the code dimension of 4D Chamon code is $8 \gcd(n_1, n_2) \gcd(n_3, n_4)$, which is similar with $4 \gcd(n_1, n_2, n_3)$, the code dimension of 3D Chamon code. Second, from the perspective of code




Figure 7: The error-correcting performance of Chamon codes under (a) pure Pauli X noise model, (b) pure Pauli Z noise model, (c) pure Pauli Y noise model and (d) depolarizing noise model.

construction, the tensor structures of 3D and 4D XYZ product, as shown in Fig. 2 and 3, are the same as those of 3D and 4D homological product, respectively, while 3D and 4D toric codes are constructed from 3D and 4D homological product, respectively.

In Fig. 8, we first consider the case of $n_1 = n_2 = n_3 = n_4$. Fig. 8(a) and (b) show the single logical qubit error rate against the physical qubit error rate p of 4D Chamon codes and 4D toric codes under depolarizing noise model, respectively. In this case, the 4D Chamon code encodes $8n_1^2$ logical qubits, while the 4D toric codes always encodes 6 logical qubits. In the legend, we use notation $L = n_1, n_2, n_3, n_4$ to represent the corresponding code, which is constructed by four repetition codes with code length of n_1, n_2, n_3 and n_4 . One can see that the code-capacity threshold of 4D Chamon codes and 4D toric codes obtained by FDBP-OSD-0 is around 12.8% and 15.9%, respectively, and the single logical qubit error rate of 4D Chamon codes is much higher than that of 4D toric codes. We attribute this to the fact that the number of 4-cycles of 4D Chamon codes is much more than that of 4D toric codes as shown in Appendix C, which degrades the decoding performance of FDBP-OSD-0.

The code dimension of 4D Chamon code is $8 \gcd(n_1, n_2) \gcd(n_3, n_4)$, when n_1, n_2, n_3 and n_4 are coprime, the corresponding code always encode 8 logical qubits, which is close to 4D toric codes. Thus, it is more reasonable to compare the




Figure 8: When $n_1 = n_2 = n_3 = n_4$, the error-correcting performance of (a) 4D Chamon codes and (b) 4D toric codes under depolarizing noise model.

error-correcting performance between 4D Chamon codes and 4D toric codes in this case. First, we consider the pure Pauli Z noise model. As shown in Fig. 9 (a) and (b), the code capacity of 4D Chamon codes and 4D toric codes obtained by FDBP-OSD-0 under Pauli Z noise is around 18% and 9.5%, respectively. This result means, from the perspective of code-capacity threshold, 4D Chamon codes have better error-correcting performance than that of 4D toric codes against pure Pauli Z noise.




Figure 9: When n_1, n_2, n_3 and n_4 are coprime, the error-correcting performance of (a) 4D Chamon codes and (b) 4D toric codes against pure Pauli Z noise.

Further, we explore the error-correcting performance of 4D Chamon codes under Z -biased noise with bias rate $\eta = 1000, 100, 10$ and 0.5 . Our simulation results show that the corresponding code-capacity threshold is around 19%, 18%, 17% and 13%, respectively.

4.3 4D XYZ product concatenated code

As described in Sect. 3.2, 4D XYZ product concatenated code is constructed from two concatenated code, which are obtained from two pairs of repetition codes with block lengths (n_1, n_2) and (n_3, n_4) (n_1, n_2, n_3 and n_4 are all odd), and only encodes one logical qubit. According to **Theorem 2** and **Corollary 4**, the minimum weight of its logical Z operator is $n_3 n_4$, thus we conjecture that




Figure 10: When n_1 , n_2 , n_3 and n_4 are coprime, The error-correcting performance of 4D Chamon codes against Z -biased noise with bias rate (a) $\eta = 1000$, (b) 100, (c) 10 and (d) 0.5.




Figure 11: The error-correcting performance of (a) 4D XYZ product concatenated codes and (b) 4D homological product concatenated codes against pure Z noise.

increasing the block lengths (n_3 , n_4) of the pair of repetition codes can construct the corresponding 4D XYZ product concatenated codes, which have better error-correcting performance against Z -biased noise than 4D homological product concatenated codes.

First, we consider pure Pauli Z noise. In Fig. 11(a), the code-capacity threshold of 4D XYZ product concatenated codes obtained by FDBP-OSD-0 is around 37%, which is much higher than that of 4D homological product concatenated codes, which is around 15% as shown in Fig. 11(b).

Further, we explore the error-correcting performance of 4D XYZ product concatenated codes against Z -biased noise with bias rate $\eta = 1000$, 100, 10 and 0.5. Our simulation results show that the corresponding code-capacity threshold is around 37%, 32%, 22% and 10%, respectively, which support that 4D XYZ product code can

construct codes with good error-correcting performance for Z -biased noise.




Figure 12: The error-correcting performance of 4D XYZ product concatenated codes against Z -biased noise with bias rate (a) $\eta = 1000$, (b) 100, (c) 10 and (d) 0.5.

5 Conclusion

In this paper, exploiting FDBP-OSD-0, we first explore the error-correcting performance of 3D Chamon codes, which has not been studied in depth before. For 3D Chamon codes constructed by 3D XYZ product of three repetition codes with code length n_1 , n_2 , n_3 , when $n_1 = n_2 = n_3$, simulation results show that the corresponding code-capacity threshold is around 14% under depolarizing noise model and 13%, 14% and 14% under pure Pauli X , Y and Z noise model, respectively. Then we show that XYZ product can be generalized to four dimension and propose 4D XYZ product code construction, which constructs a class of non-CSS codes by using 4 classical codes or 2 CSS codes. Compared with 4D homological product, 4D XYZ product can construct non-CSS codes with higher code dimension or code distance.

To explore the error-correcting performance of 4D XYZ product codes, we study two instances—4D XYZ product concatenated code and 4D Chamon code. Exploiting FDBP-OSD-0, under pure Pauli Z noise model, simulation results show that the code-capacity thresholds of 4D Chamon code and 4D XYZ product concatenated code are around 18% and 38% respectively, which are much higher than those of 4D toric code and 4D homological product concate-

nated code, which are around 9.5% and 15% respectively. Besides, we also study their error-correcting performance under Z -biased noise with bias rate $\eta = 1000, 100, 10$ and 0.5 . For 4D Chamon codes encoding 8 logical qubits, the corresponding code-capacity threshold is around 19%, 18%, 17% and 13%, respectively. For 4D XYZ product concatenated codes, the corresponding code-capacity threshold is around 37%, 32%, 22% and 10%, respectively.

These results indicate that, using the same two CSS codes, the 4D XYZ product can construct non-CSS codes with superior error-correcting performance against Z -biased noise compared to the CSS codes generated by the 4D homological product.

Data Availability

The data that support the findings of this study are available from the corresponding author upon reasonable request.

Acknowledgements

This work was supported by the Colleges and Universities Stable Support Project of Shenzhen, China (No.GXWD20220817164856008), the Colleges and Universities Stable Support Project of Shenzhen, China (No.GXWD20220811170225001) and Harbin Institute of Technology, Shenzhen - SpinQ quantum information Joint Research Center Project (No.HITSZ20230111).

References

- [1] Peter W. Shor. “Scheme for reducing decoherence in quantum computer memory”. *Phys. Rev. A* **52**, R2493–R2496 (1995).
- [2] A. M. Steane. “Error correcting codes in quantum theory”. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **77**, 793–797 (1996).
- [3] Nikolas P Breuckmann and Jens Niklas Eberhardt. “Quantum low-density parity-check codes”. *PRX Quantum* **2**, 040101 (2021).
- [4] Daniel Gottesman. “Fault-tolerant quantum computation with constant overhead” (2014). [arXiv:1310.2984](https://arxiv.org/abs/1310.2984).
- [5] Anthony Leverrier, Simon Apers, and Christophe Vuillot. “Quantum xyz product codes”. *Quantum* **6**, 766 (2022).
- [6] Jean-Pierre Tillich and Gilles Zémor. “Quantum ldpc codes with positive rate and minimum distance proportional to the square root of the blocklength”. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory* **60**, 1193–1202 (2013).
- [7] Sergey Bravyi and Matthew B. Hastings. “Homological product codes”. In Proceedings of the Forty-Sixth Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing. Page 273–282. New York, NY, USA (2014). Association for Computing Machinery.
- [8] Pavel Panteleev and Gleb Kalachev. “Quantum ldpc codes with almost linear minimum distance”. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory* **68**, 213–229 (2022).
- [9] Nikolas P. Breuckmann and Jens N. Eberhardt. “Balanced product quantum codes”. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory* **67**, 6653–6674 (2021).
- [10] A.R. Calderbank, E.M. Rains, P.M. Shor, and N.J.A. Sloane. “Quantum error correction via codes over $gf(4)$ ”. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory* **44**, 1369–1387 (1998).
- [11] J Pablo Bonilla Ataides, David K Tuckett, Stephen D Bartlett, Steven T Flammia, and Benjamin J Brown. “The xzzx surface code”. *Nature communications* **12**, 2172 (2021).
- [12] Qian Xu, Nam Mannucci, Alireza Seif, Aleksander Kubica, Steven T. Flammia, and Liang Jiang. “Tailored xzzx codes for biased noise”. *Phys. Rev. Res.* **5**, 013035 (2023).
- [13] P Aliferis, F Brito, D P DiVincenzo, J Preskill, M Steffen, and B M Terhal. “Fault-tolerant computing with biased-noise superconducting qubits: a case study”. *New Journal of Physics* **11**, 013061 (2009).
- [14] M. D. Shulman, O. E. Dial, S. P. Harvey, H. Bluhm, V. Umansky, and A. Yacoby. “Demonstration of entanglement of electrostatically coupled singlet-triplet qubits”. *Science* **336**, 202–205 (2012).
- [15] D. Nigg, M. Müller, E. A. Martinez, P. Schindler, M. Hennrich, T. Monz, M. A. Martin-Delgado, and R. Blatt. “Quantum computations on a topologically encoded qubit”. *Science* **345**, 302–305 (2014).

- [16] Claudio Chamon. “Quantum glassiness in strongly correlated clean systems: An example of topological overprotection”. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **94**, 040402 (2005).
- [17] Sergey Bravyi, Bernhard Leemhuis, and Barbara M. Terhal. “Topological order in an exactly solvable 3d spin model”. *Annals of Physics* **326**, 839–866 (2011).
- [18] Zhengzhong Yi, Zhipeng Liang, Kaixin Zhong, Yulin Wu, Zhou Fang, and Xuan Wang. “Improved belief propagation decoding algorithm based on decoupling representation of pauli operators for quantum ldpc codes” (2023). [arXiv:2305.17505](#).
- [19] Nikolas P. Breuckmann, Kasper Duivenvoorden, Dominik Michels, and Barbara M. Terhal. “Local decoders for the 2d and 4d toric code” (2016). [arXiv:1609.00510](#).
- [20] Daniel Gottesman. “Stabilizer codes and quantum error correction”. California Institute of Technology. (1997).
- [21] Zhipeng Liang, Zicheng Wang, Zhengzhong Yi, Yulin Wu, Chen Qiu, and Xuan Wang. “Determining the upper bound of code distance of quantum stabilizer codes through monte carlo method based on fully decoupled belief propagation” (2024). [arXiv:2402.06481](#).
- [22] Sergey Bravyi, Andrew W Cross, Jay M Gambetta, Dmitri Maslov, Patrick Rall, and Theodore J Yoder. “High-threshold and low-overhead fault-tolerant quantum memory”. *Nature* **627**, 778–782 (2024).
- [23] Zunaira Babar, Panagiotis Botsinis, Dimitrios Alanis, Soon Xin Ng, and Lajos Hanzo. “Fifteen years of quantum ldpc coding and improved decoding strategies”. *IEEE Access* **3**, 2492–2519 (2015).
- [24] Joschka Roffe, David R White, Simon Burton, and Earl Campbell. “Decoding across the quantum low-density parity-check code landscape”. *Physical Review Research* **2**, 043423 (2020).
- [25] Oscar Higgott and Nikolas P. Breuckmann. “Improved single-shot decoding of higher-dimensional hypergraph-product codes”. *PRX Quantum* **4**, 020332 (2023).
- [26] Pavel Panteleev and Gleb Kalachev. “Degenerate Quantum LDPC Codes With Good Finite Length Performance”. *Quantum* **5**, 585 (2021).

A Proof of Theorem 2

Proof. Our goal is to find out all independent logical operators, and our method is divided into three steps. First, finding out some operators that commutes with all stabilizer generators in Eq. (16). Second, excluding those operators which are stabilizers from the operators that we find in the first step, and the remaining operators are logical operators. Finally, we prove that the number of independent logical operator pairs that we find in the second step is equal to the code dimension of the corresponding 4D XYZ product code that we prove in **Theorem 1**.

First, we consider the operators with the following form, which commute with all stabilizer generators,

$$\begin{aligned} X_{G_1} &= \begin{bmatrix} I & I & X(\mathbf{r}'^T) & I & I \end{bmatrix} \\ Z_{G_1} &= \begin{bmatrix} I & I & X(\mathbf{w}'^T) & I & I \end{bmatrix} \end{aligned} \quad (35)$$

where $\mathbf{r}'^T \in \ker \left(\begin{bmatrix} H_{x_1} \otimes I_{n_B} \\ H_{z_1} \otimes I_{n_B} \end{bmatrix} \right) = \ker \left(\begin{bmatrix} H_{x_1} \\ H_{z_1} \end{bmatrix} \right) \otimes \mathcal{C}_{n_B}$ and $\mathbf{w}'^T \in \ker \left(\begin{bmatrix} I_{n_A} \otimes H_{x_2} \\ I_{n_A} \otimes H_{z_2} \end{bmatrix} \right) = \mathcal{C}_{n_A} \otimes \ker \left(\begin{bmatrix} H_{x_2} \\ H_{z_2} \end{bmatrix} \right)$.

Let $\mathbf{r}''^T \in \ker \left(\begin{bmatrix} H_{x_1} \\ H_{z_1} \end{bmatrix} \right) \otimes \text{Im} \left(H_{x_2}^T, H_{z_2}^T \right) \subset \ker \left(\begin{bmatrix} H_{x_1} \\ H_{z_1} \end{bmatrix} \right) \otimes \mathcal{C}_{n_B}$, next we prove that $X_{G'_1} = \begin{bmatrix} I & I & X(\mathbf{r}''^T) & I & I \end{bmatrix}$ is a stabilizer which can only be generated by the product of some stabilizer generators in T and U and thus should be excluded. Considering an operator P_1 which is the product

of some stabilizer generators in T and U , it must have the following form

$$\begin{aligned}
P_1 &= \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{t}^T, \mathbf{u}^T \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} Y^{(H_{z_1}^T \otimes I_{m_4})} & I & X^{(I_{n_A} \otimes H_{x_2})} & Z^{(H_{x_1}^T \otimes I_{m_4})} & I \\ I & Z^{(H_{z_1}^T \otimes I_{m_3})} & X^{(I_{n_A} \otimes H_{z_2})} & I & Y^{(H_{x_1}^T \otimes I_{m_3})} \end{bmatrix} \\
&= \begin{bmatrix} Y^{\mathbf{t}^T (H_{z_1}^T \otimes I_{m_4})} & Z^{\mathbf{u}^T (H_{z_1}^T \otimes I_{m_3})} & X^{\mathbf{t}^T (I_{n_A} \otimes H_{x_2}) + \mathbf{u}^T (I_{n_A} \otimes H_{z_2})} & Z^{\mathbf{t}^T (H_{x_1}^T \otimes I_{m_4})} & Y^{\mathbf{t}^T (H_{x_1}^T \otimes I_{m_3})} \end{bmatrix}
\end{aligned} \tag{36}$$

If the form of P_1 is the same with that of $X_{G'_1}$, we must have

$$\begin{aligned}
H_{z_1} \otimes I_{m_4} \mathbf{t} &= H_{x_1} \otimes I_{m_4} \mathbf{t} = \mathbf{0} \\
H_{z_1} \otimes I_{m_3} \mathbf{u} &= H_{x_1} \otimes I_{m_3} \mathbf{u} = \mathbf{0}
\end{aligned} \tag{37}$$

Thus, we have $\mathbf{t} \in \ker \left(\begin{bmatrix} H_{x_1} \\ H_{z_1} \end{bmatrix} \right) \otimes \mathcal{C}_{m_4}$ and $\mathbf{u} \in \ker \left(\begin{bmatrix} H_{x_1} \\ H_{z_1} \end{bmatrix} \right) \otimes \mathcal{C}_{m_3}$. Let $\mathbf{t} = \mathbf{x} \otimes \mathbf{i}$, and $\mathbf{u} = \mathbf{y} \otimes \mathbf{j}$, where $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in \ker \left(\begin{bmatrix} H_{x_1} \\ H_{z_1} \end{bmatrix} \right)$, $\mathbf{i} \in \mathcal{C}_{m_4}$ and $\mathbf{j} \in \mathcal{C}_{m_3}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&(I_{n_A} \otimes H_{x_2}^T) (\mathbf{x} \otimes \mathbf{i}) + (I_{n_A} \otimes H_{z_2}^T) (\mathbf{y} \otimes \mathbf{j}) \\
&= \mathbf{x} \otimes H_{x_2}^T \mathbf{i} + \mathbf{y} \otimes H_{z_2}^T \mathbf{j} \in \ker \left(\begin{bmatrix} H_{x_1} \\ H_{z_1} \end{bmatrix} \right) \otimes \text{Im} (H_{x_2}^T, H_{z_2}^T)
\end{aligned} \tag{38}$$

Thus, for vector $\mathbf{r} \in \ker \left(\begin{bmatrix} H_{x_1} \\ H_{z_1} \end{bmatrix} \right) \otimes (\mathcal{C}_{n_B} \setminus \text{Im} (H_{x_2}^T, H_{z_2}^T))$, the corresponding operator $X_L = (I I X (\mathbf{r}^T) I I)$ is a logical operator.

Similarly, for vector $\mathbf{w}'' \in \text{Im} ([H_{x_1}^T, H_{z_1}^T]) \otimes \ker \left(\begin{bmatrix} H_{x_2} \\ H_{z_2} \end{bmatrix} \right)$, the corresponding $Z_{G'_1} = (I I Z (\mathbf{w}''^T) I I)$ is a stabilizer which can only be generated by the product of some stabilizer generators in S and V and thus should be excluded.

To sum up, for vectors $\mathbf{r} \in \ker \left(\begin{bmatrix} H_{x_1} \\ H_{z_1} \end{bmatrix} \right) \otimes (\mathcal{C}_{n_B} \setminus \text{Im} ([H_{x_2}^T, H_{z_2}^T]))$ and $\mathbf{w} \in (\mathcal{C}_{n_A} \setminus \text{Im} ([H_{x_1}^T, H_{z_1}^T])) \otimes \ker \left(\begin{bmatrix} H_{x_2} \\ H_{z_2} \end{bmatrix} \right)$, the corresponding operators $X_L = (I I X (\mathbf{r}^T) I I)$ and $Z_L = (I I Z (\mathbf{w}^T) I I)$ must be logical operators.

Notice that the dimension of vector space $\mathcal{C}_{n_B} \setminus \text{Im} ([H_{x_2}^T, H_{z_2}^T])$ is $n_B - \dim (\text{Im} ([H_{x_2}^T, H_{z_2}^T])) = n_B - \dim \left(\text{row} \left(\begin{bmatrix} H_{x_2} \\ H_{z_2} \end{bmatrix} \right) \right) = \dim \left(\ker \left(\begin{bmatrix} H_{x_2} \\ H_{z_2} \end{bmatrix} \right) \right)$. Similarly, the dimension of vector space $\mathcal{C}_{n_A} \setminus \text{Im} ([H_{x_1}^T, H_{z_1}^T])$ is equal to $n_A - \dim \left(\text{row} \left(\begin{bmatrix} H_{x_1} \\ H_{z_1} \end{bmatrix} \right) \right) = \dim \left(\ker \left(\begin{bmatrix} H_{x_1} \\ H_{z_1} \end{bmatrix} \right) \right)$. Thus, the numbers of independent logical operators X_L and Z_L are both $\dim \left(\ker \left(\begin{bmatrix} H_{x_1} \\ H_{z_1} \end{bmatrix} \right) \right) \times \dim \left(\ker \left(\begin{bmatrix} H_{x_2} \\ H_{z_2} \end{bmatrix} \right) \right)$. Moreover, for any vector $\mathbf{r} \in \ker \left(\begin{bmatrix} H_{x_1} \\ H_{z_1} \end{bmatrix} \right) \otimes (\mathcal{C}_{n_B} \setminus \text{Im} ([H_{x_2}^T, H_{z_2}^T]))$, we can find a vector $\mathbf{w} \in (\mathcal{C}_{n_A} \setminus \text{Im} ([H_{x_1}^T, H_{z_1}^T])) \otimes \ker \left(\begin{bmatrix} H_{x_2} \\ H_{z_2} \end{bmatrix} \right)$, such that $\mathbf{r} \cdot \mathbf{w}^T = 1$, which means the corresponding X_L and Z_L anti-commute. Thus, there are $\dim \left(\ker \left(\begin{bmatrix} H_{x_1} \\ H_{z_1} \end{bmatrix} \right) \right) \times \dim \left(\ker \left(\begin{bmatrix} H_{x_2} \\ H_{z_2} \end{bmatrix} \right) \right)$ pairs of the first type logical operators.

Second, we consider operators with the following form, which also commute with all stabilizer generators,

$$\begin{bmatrix} X_{G_2} \\ X_{G_3} \\ Z_{G_2} \\ Z_{G_3} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} X(\mathbf{a}'_1{}^T) & I & I & Y(\mathbf{b}'_1{}^T) & I \\ I & Y(\mathbf{a}'_2{}^T) & I & I & X(\mathbf{b}'_2{}^T) \\ Y(\mathbf{c}'_1{}^T) & Z(\mathbf{d}'_1{}^T) & I & I & I \\ I & I & I & Z(\mathbf{c}'_2{}^T) & Y(\mathbf{d}'_2{}^T) \end{bmatrix} \quad (39)$$

where $(\mathbf{a}'_1{}^T, \mathbf{b}'_1{}^T)^T \in \ker\left(\left[H_{z_1}^T \otimes I_{m_4}, H_{x_1}^T \otimes I_{m_4}\right]\right) = \ker\left(\left[H_{z_1}^T, H_{x_1}^T\right]\right) \otimes \mathcal{C}_{m_4}$ and $(\mathbf{a}'_2{}^T, \mathbf{b}'_2{}^T)^T \in \ker\left(\left[H_{z_1}^T \otimes I_{m_3}, H_{x_1}^T \otimes I_{m_3}\right]\right) = \ker\left(\left[H_{z_1}^T, H_{x_1}^T\right]\right) \otimes \mathcal{C}_{m_3}$.

Let $\pi(\mathbf{a}''_1{}^T, \mathbf{a}''_2{}^T, \mathbf{b}''_1{}^T, \mathbf{b}''_2{}^T)^T \in \ker\left(\left[H_{z_1}^T, H_{x_1}^T\right]\right) \otimes \text{Im}\left(\begin{bmatrix} H_{x_2} \\ H_{z_2} \end{bmatrix}\right)$ and $\begin{bmatrix} X'_{G_2} \\ X'_{G_3} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} X(\mathbf{a}''_1{}^T) & I & I & Y(\mathbf{b}''_1{}^T) & I \\ I & Y(\mathbf{a}''_2{}^T) & I & I & X(\mathbf{b}''_2{}^T) \\ X(\mathbf{a}''_1{}^T) & Y(\mathbf{a}''_2{}^T) & I & Y(\mathbf{b}''_1{}^T) & X(\mathbf{b}''_2{}^T) \end{bmatrix}$. Next, we prove that $X_{G_2}' X_{G_3}' =$ is a stabilizer, which can only be generated by the product of some stabilizer generators in S and V , thus should be excluded. Considering an operator P_2 which is the product of some stabilizer generators in S and V , it must have the following form

$$\begin{aligned} P_2 &= \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{s}^T, \mathbf{v}^T \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} X^{(I_{m_1} \otimes H_{x_2}^T)} & Y^{(I_{m_1} \otimes H_{z_2}^T)} & Z^{(H_{z_1} \otimes I_{n_B})} & I & I \\ I & I & Z^{(H_{x_1} \otimes I_{n_B})} & Y^{(I_{m_2} \otimes H_{x_2}^T)} & X^{(I_{m_2} \otimes H_{z_2}^T)} \end{bmatrix} \\ &= \begin{bmatrix} X^{\mathbf{s}^T(I_{m_1} \otimes H_{x_2}^T)} & Y^{\mathbf{s}^T(I_{m_1} \otimes H_{z_2}^T)} & Z^{\mathbf{s}^T(H_{z_1} \otimes I_{n_B}) + \mathbf{v}^T(H_{x_1} \otimes I_{n_B})} & Y^{\mathbf{v}^T(I_{m_2} \otimes H_{x_2}^T)} & X^{\mathbf{v}^T(I_{m_2} \otimes H_{z_2}^T)} \end{bmatrix} \end{aligned} \quad (40)$$

If the form of P_2 is the same with $X_{G_2}' X_{G_3}'$, we must have

$$H_{z_1}^T \otimes I_{n_B} \mathbf{s} + H_{x_1}^T \otimes I_{n_B} \mathbf{v} = \mathbf{0} \quad (41)$$

Thus, we have $\begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{s} \\ \mathbf{v} \end{bmatrix} \in \ker\left(\left[H_{z_1}^T \otimes I_{n_B}, H_{x_1}^T \otimes I_{n_B}\right]\right) = \ker\left(\left[H_{z_1}^T, H_{x_1}^T\right]\right) \otimes \mathcal{C}_{n_B}$. Let $\begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{s} \\ \mathbf{v} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{x} \\ \mathbf{y} \end{bmatrix} \otimes \mathbf{i}$, where $\begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{x} \\ \mathbf{y} \end{bmatrix} = [x_1, \dots, x_{m_1}, y_1, \dots, y_{m_2}]^T \in \ker\left(\left[H_{z_1}^T, H_{x_1}^T\right]\right)$ and $\mathbf{i} \in \mathcal{C}_{n_B}$, we have

$$\begin{bmatrix} I_{m_1} \otimes H_{x_2} & \mathbf{0} \\ I_{m_1} \otimes H_{z_2} & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & I_{m_2} \otimes H_{x_2} \\ \mathbf{0} & I_{m_2} \otimes H_{z_2} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{x} \\ \mathbf{y} \end{bmatrix} \otimes \mathbf{i} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{x} \otimes H_{x_2} \mathbf{i} \\ \mathbf{x} \otimes H_{z_2} \mathbf{i} \\ \mathbf{y} \otimes H_{x_2} \mathbf{i} \\ \mathbf{y} \otimes H_{z_2} \mathbf{i} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} x_1 H_{x_2} \mathbf{i} \\ \vdots \\ x_{m_1} H_{x_2} \mathbf{i} \\ x_1 H_{z_2} \mathbf{i} \\ \vdots \\ x_{m_1} H_{z_2} \mathbf{i} \\ y_1 H_{x_2} \mathbf{i} \\ \vdots \\ y_{m_2} H_{x_2} \mathbf{i} \\ y_1 H_{z_2} \mathbf{i} \\ \vdots \\ y_{m_2} H_{z_2} \mathbf{i} \end{bmatrix} \quad (42)$$

It can be seen that

$$\pi \begin{pmatrix} x_1 H_{x_2} \mathbf{i} \\ \vdots \\ x_{m_1} H_{x_2} \mathbf{i} \\ x_1 H_{z_2} \mathbf{i} \\ \vdots \\ x_{m_1} H_{z_2} \mathbf{i} \\ y_1 H_{x_2} \mathbf{i} \\ \vdots \\ y_{m_2} H_{x_2} \mathbf{i} \\ y_1 H_{z_2} \mathbf{i} \\ \vdots \\ y_{m_2} H_{z_2} \mathbf{i} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} x_1 H_{x_2} \mathbf{i} \\ x_1 H_{z_2} \mathbf{i} \\ \vdots \\ x_{m_1} H_{x_2} \mathbf{i} \\ x_{m_1} H_{z_2} \mathbf{i} \\ y_1 H_{x_2} \mathbf{i} \\ y_1 H_{z_2} \mathbf{i} \\ \vdots \\ y_{m_2} H_{x_2} \mathbf{i} \\ y_{m_2} H_{z_2} \mathbf{i} \end{pmatrix} \in \ker \left(\begin{bmatrix} H_{z_1}^T & H_{x_1}^T \end{bmatrix} \right) \otimes \text{Im} \begin{bmatrix} H_{x_2} \\ H_{z_2} \end{bmatrix} \quad (43)$$

which means $X_{G'_2} X_{G'_3}$ is a stabilizer. Thus, for vectors $\pi \left(\mathbf{a}_1^T, \mathbf{a}_2^T, \mathbf{b}_1^T, \mathbf{b}_2^T \right)^T \in \ker \left(\begin{bmatrix} H_{z_1}^T & H_{x_1}^T \end{bmatrix} \right) \otimes \left(\mathcal{C}_{m_3+m_4} \setminus \text{Im} \begin{bmatrix} H_{x_2} \\ H_{z_2} \end{bmatrix} \right)$, the corresponding operators $\begin{bmatrix} X_{L_2} \\ X_{L_3} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} X(\mathbf{a}_1^T) & I & I & Y(\mathbf{b}_1^T) & I \\ I & Y(\mathbf{a}_2^T) & I & I & X(\mathbf{b}_2^T) \end{bmatrix}$ are logical operators.

Similarly, for vector $\left(\mathbf{c}_1''^T, \mathbf{d}_1''^T, \mathbf{c}_2''^T, \mathbf{d}_2''^T \right)^T \in \text{Im} \left(\begin{bmatrix} H_{z_1} \\ H_{x_1} \end{bmatrix} \right) \otimes \ker \left(\begin{bmatrix} H_{x_2}^T & H_{z_2}^T \end{bmatrix} \right)$ and $\begin{bmatrix} Z_{G'_2} \\ Z_{G'_3} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} Y(\mathbf{c}_1''^T) & Z(\mathbf{d}_1''^T) & I & I & I \\ I & I & I & Z(\mathbf{c}_2''^T) & Y(\mathbf{d}_2''^T) \end{bmatrix}$, the operator $Z_{G'_2} Z_{G'_3} = \begin{bmatrix} Y(\mathbf{c}_1''^T) & Z(\mathbf{d}_1''^T) & I & Z(\mathbf{c}_2''^T) & Y(\mathbf{d}_2''^T) \end{bmatrix}$ is a stabilizer which can only be generated by the product of some stabilizer generators in T and U and thus should be excluded.

To sum up, for vectors $\pi \left(\mathbf{a}_1^T, \mathbf{a}_2^T, \mathbf{b}_1^T, \mathbf{b}_2^T \right)^T \in \ker \left(\begin{bmatrix} H_{z_1}^T & H_{x_1}^T \end{bmatrix} \right) \otimes \left(\mathcal{C}_{m_3+m_4} \setminus \text{Im} \begin{bmatrix} H_{x_2} \\ H_{z_2} \end{bmatrix} \right)$ and $\pi \left(\mathbf{c}_1^T, \mathbf{d}_1^T, \mathbf{c}_2^T, \mathbf{d}_2^T \right)^T \in \left(\mathcal{C}_{m_1+m_2} \setminus \text{Im} \begin{bmatrix} H_{z_1} \\ H_{x_1} \end{bmatrix} \right) \otimes \ker \left(\begin{bmatrix} H_{x_2}^T & H_{z_2}^T \end{bmatrix} \right)$, the corresponding $\begin{bmatrix} X_{L_2} \\ X_{L_3} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} X(\mathbf{a}_1) & I & I & Y(\mathbf{b}_1) & I \\ I & Y(\mathbf{a}_2) & I & I & X(\mathbf{b}_2) \end{bmatrix}$ and $\begin{bmatrix} Z_{L_2} \\ Z_{L_3} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} Y(\mathbf{c}_1) & Z(\mathbf{d}_1) & I & I & I \\ I & I & I & Z(\mathbf{c}_2) & Y(\mathbf{d}_2) \end{bmatrix}$ must be logical operators.

Notice that the dimension of vector space $\mathcal{C}_{m_3+m_4} \setminus \text{Im} \begin{bmatrix} H_{x_2} \\ H_{z_2} \end{bmatrix}$ is $m_3 + m_4 - \dim \left(\text{Im} \begin{bmatrix} H_{x_2} \\ H_{z_2} \end{bmatrix} \right) = m_3 + m_4 - \dim \left(\text{row} \left(\begin{bmatrix} H_{x_2}^T & H_{z_2}^T \end{bmatrix} \right) \right) = \dim \left(\ker \left(\begin{bmatrix} H_{x_2}^T & H_{z_2}^T \end{bmatrix} \right) \right)$. Similarly, the dimension of vector space $\mathcal{C}_{m_1+m_2} \setminus \text{Im} \begin{bmatrix} H_{z_1} \\ H_{x_1} \end{bmatrix}$ is $m_1 + m_2 - \dim \left(\text{Im} \begin{bmatrix} H_{z_1} \\ H_{x_1} \end{bmatrix} \right) = m_1 + m_2 - \dim \left(\text{row} \left(\begin{bmatrix} H_{z_1}^T & H_{x_1}^T \end{bmatrix} \right) \right) = \dim \left(\ker \left(\begin{bmatrix} H_{z_1}^T & H_{x_1}^T \end{bmatrix} \right) \right)$. Thus, the total number of independent logical operators X_{L_2} and X_{L_3} and that of Z_{L_2} and Z_{L_3} are both $\dim \left(\ker \left(\begin{bmatrix} H_{z_1}^T & H_{x_1}^T \end{bmatrix} \right) \right) \times \dim \left(\ker \left(\begin{bmatrix} H_{x_2}^T & H_{z_2}^T \end{bmatrix} \right) \right)$. Moreover, for any vector $\mathbf{r} \in \ker \left(\begin{bmatrix} H_{z_1}^T & H_{x_1}^T \end{bmatrix} \right) \otimes \left(\mathcal{C}_{m_3+m_4} \setminus \text{Im} \begin{bmatrix} H_{x_2} \\ H_{z_2} \end{bmatrix} \right)$, we can find a vector $\mathbf{w} \in \left(\mathcal{C}_{m_1+m_2} \setminus \text{Im} \begin{bmatrix} H_{z_1} \\ H_{x_1} \end{bmatrix} \right) \otimes \ker \left(\begin{bmatrix} H_{z_2}^T & H_{x_2}^T \end{bmatrix} \right)$, such that $\mathbf{r} \cdot \mathbf{w}^T = 1$, which means the corresponding X_L and Z_L anti-commute. Thus, there are $\dim \left(\ker \left(\begin{bmatrix} H_{z_1}^T & H_{x_1}^T \end{bmatrix} \right) \right) \times \dim \left(\ker \left(\begin{bmatrix} H_{z_2}^T & H_{x_2}^T \end{bmatrix} \right) \right)$ pairs of the second type logical operators.

The total number of the first and the second types of logical operators is $\dim\left(\ker\left(\begin{bmatrix} H_{x_1} \\ H_{z_1} \end{bmatrix}\right)\right) \times \dim\left(\ker\left(\begin{bmatrix} H_{x_2} \\ H_{z_2} \end{bmatrix}\right)\right) + \dim\left(\ker\left(\begin{bmatrix} H_{z_1}^T & H_{x_1}^T \end{bmatrix}\right)\right) \times \dim\left(\ker\left(\begin{bmatrix} H_{z_2}^T & H_{x_2}^T \end{bmatrix}\right)\right)$. Now, we prove that this number is equal to the code dimension of the corresponding 4D XYZ product code as we prove in **Theorem 1**.

Let $a = \dim\left(\ker\left(\begin{bmatrix} H_{x_1} \\ H_{z_1} \end{bmatrix}\right)\right)$ and $b = \dim\left(\ker\left(\begin{bmatrix} H_{x_2} \\ H_{z_2} \end{bmatrix}\right)\right)$, we have $\dim\left(\ker\left(\begin{bmatrix} H_{z_1}^T & H_{x_1}^T \end{bmatrix}\right)\right) = m_1 + m_2 - \dim\left(\text{row}\left(\begin{bmatrix} H_{z_1}^T & H_{x_1}^T \end{bmatrix}\right)\right) = m_1 + m_2 - \left(n_A - \dim\left(\ker\left(\begin{bmatrix} H_{x_1} \\ H_{z_1} \end{bmatrix}\right)\right)\right) = m_1 + m_2 - (n_A - a)$. Similarly, $\dim\left(\ker\left(\begin{bmatrix} H_{z_2}^T & H_{x_2}^T \end{bmatrix}\right)\right) = m_3 + m_4 - \dim\left(\text{row}\left(\begin{bmatrix} H_{z_2}^T & H_{x_2}^T \end{bmatrix}\right)\right) = m_3 + m_4 - \left(n_B - \dim\left(\ker\left(\begin{bmatrix} H_{x_2} \\ H_{z_2} \end{bmatrix}\right)\right)\right) = m_3 + m_4 - (n_B - b)$. Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} & \dim\left(\ker\left(\begin{bmatrix} H_{x_1} \\ H_{z_1} \end{bmatrix}\right)\right) \times \dim\left(\ker\left(\begin{bmatrix} H_{x_2} \\ H_{z_2} \end{bmatrix}\right)\right) + \dim\left(\ker\left(\begin{bmatrix} H_{z_1}^T & H_{x_1}^T \end{bmatrix}\right)\right) \times \dim\left(\ker\left(\begin{bmatrix} H_{z_2}^T & H_{x_2}^T \end{bmatrix}\right)\right) \\ &= ab + [m_1 + m_2 - (n_A - a)][m_3 + m_4 - (n_B - b)] \\ &= a[b - (n_B - m_3 - m_4)] + b[a - (n_A - m_1 - m_2)] + (n_A - m_1 - m_2)(n_B - m_3 - m_4) \end{aligned} \tag{44}$$

which is equal to the code dimension as we prove in **Theorem 1**. Thus, the proof is completed. \square

B Proof of Lemma 2

Proof. Here, we prove the minimum weight of non-zero vectors in space $\mathcal{C}_n \setminus \text{Im}(H_1)$ with that of $\mathcal{C}_n \setminus \ker(H_2)$ following a similar fashion.

The space \mathcal{C}_n can be represented by the row space of an $n \times n$ identity matrix I_n , namely, $\text{row}(I_n)$. Thus, this problem is equivalent to finding the minimum weight of non-zero vectors in space $\text{row}(I_n)$ but not in $\text{Im}(H_1)$. To do this, one can construct a block matrix $[H_1, I_n]$, then using Gaussian elimination to find out a set of column indices of its pivots \mathbf{P} . For the rows which are in I_n but not in H_1^T and whose indices are in \mathbf{P} , they are the vectors in space $\text{row}(I_n)$ but not in $\text{Im}(H_1)$. Since the weight of each row of I_n is one, thus the minimum weight of non-zero vectors in space $\mathcal{C}_n \setminus \text{Im}(H_1)$ is one and the proof is completed. \square

C Comparison of number of 4-cycles

Table 2 gives the number of 4-cycles in the Tanner graphs of 3D Chamon codes, 4D Chamon codes, 3D toric codes and 4D toric codes. One can see that the numbers of 4-cycles in the Tanner graph of 3D and 4D Chamon codes are much higher than those of 3D and 4D toric codes.

Table 2: Comparison of 3D Chamon codes, 4D Chamon codes, 3D toric codes and 4D toric codes in the number of 4-cycles.

	n_1, n_2, n_3	number of 4-cycles
3D Chamon codes	2, 2, 2	240
	3, 3, 3	648
	4, 4, 4	1536
	2, 3, 4	624
	3, 4, 5	1440
3D toric codes	2, 2, 2	132
	3, 3, 3	324
	4, 4, 4	768
	2, 3, 4	201
	3, 4, 5	467
	n_1, n_2, n_3, n_4	number of 4-cycles
4D Chamon codes	2, 2, 2, 2	1792
	2, 3, 2, 3	3744
4D toric codes	2, 2, 2, 2	519
	2, 3, 2, 3	1095