arXiv:2504.01083v1 [quant-ph] 1 Apr 2025

Fault-tolerant correction-ready encoding of the [[7,1,3]] Steane code on a 2D grid

Andrea Rodriguez-Blanco,^{1,*} Ho Nam Nguyen,^{2,*} and K. Birgitta Whaley¹

¹Department of Chemistry, University of California, Berkeley, CA 94720, USA

 $^{2}Department$ of Physics, University of California, Berkeley, CA 94720, USA[†]

(Dated: April 3, 2025)

Practical quantum computation heavily relies on the ability to perform quantum error correction in a fault-tolerant manner. Fault-tolerant encoding is a critical first step, and careful consideration of the error correction cycle that follows is essential for ensuring the encoding's effectiveness and compatibility. In this work, we investigate various correction-ready encoding methods to fault-tolerantly prepare the $|0\rangle_{\rm L}$ state of the [[7,1,3]] Steane code on a 2D grid. Through numerical simulations, we demonstrate that parity-check encoding with a few *Flag-Bridge* qubits outperforms verificationbased encoding by achieving lower error rates and allowing flexible tuning of the performanceefficiency trade-off. Additionally, parity-check approach enables a compact *hybrid* protocol that combines encoding and error correction, capable of matching the performance of a standalone error correction protocol with perfect encoding. Surprisingly, compared to the resource-intensive Steane error correction, this low-overhead method still offers a practical advantage in noisy settings. These findings highlight the approach with *Flag-Bridge* qubits as a robust and adaptable solution for noisy near-term quantum hardware.

I. INTRODUCTION

To fully harness the power of quantum computing for complex scientific and industrial applications, quantum processors must scale efficiently while adhering to faulttolerant designs. However, qubits are highly susceptible to errors due to environmental interactions and imperfect quantum gate operations, making the management of error essential for reliable computation. The theory of fault-tolerant quantum computation [1–5] provides the necessary tools to mitigate these errors and enable scalability.

Within this framework, quantum algorithms are not executed directly on physical qubits but instead on logical qubits encoded using a quantum error-correcting (QEC) code [6]. The purpose of a QEC code is to protect quantum information by redundantly encoding it within a subspace of a larger physical system, known as the codespace. During computation, errors on physical qubits may displace logical states from this subspace, but by interleaving error correction throughout the process, the logical states can be effectively restored. Consequently, a properly designed QEC code can tolerate some level of physical errors while preserving logical information. The threshold theorem [4, 5, 7] formalizes this principle, guaranteeing that if the physical error rate p remains below a critical threshold $p_{\rm th}$, logical error rates $p_{\rm L}$ can be exponentially suppressed, enabling arbitrarily long quantum computations.

In practice, a QEC protocol – consisting of encoding, error detection, and correction – is implemented using imperfect gates and measurements. Ensuring that each component is fault-tolerant introduces additional complexity [8–14]. For example, Steane-style parity checks double the qubit overhead [10], while flag-based techniques require fewer extra qubits but involve more gate operations and longer circuits to detect faults [13, 14]. A realistic evaluation of a QEC code must account for the actual implementation of these components using noisy gates to determine how effectively errors are suppressed at the logical level. This assessment can be performed through simulations under specific noise models or validated in physical experiments.

Recent advancements in QEC have been driven by the constraints of near-term quantum hardware, including limited physical qubits and architectural connectivity. Significant milestones have been achieved, such as the reduction of logical error rates for memory qubits as surface code distance increases [15, 16], the development of quantum low-density parity-check (qLDPC) codes to maintain constant encoding rates while mitigating nonlocality overheads [17, 18], and the use of novel concatenated codes to further reduce logical error rates while improving encoding efficiency [19–22].

Among these developments, the [[7,1,3]] Steane code [10], the smallest instance of color codes [23], remains a key testbed for fault-tolerant quantum computation. In recent years, it has been instrumental in demonstrating critical fault-tolerant capabilities, including real-time error correction [24] and the implementation of a universal logical gate set, such as transversal Clifford gates [25– 28] and non-Clifford gates [28, 29]. With fault-tolerant protocols successfully validated using the [[7,1,3]] Steane code, efforts to scale toward large-scale universal quantum computation are now focused on increasing the distance of color codes [25, 29] and employing concatenation with error-detecting codes or other quantum Hamming codes [20, 21].

Thus far, all experimental realizations of the [[7,1,3]]Steane code have relied on architectures with all-to-all

^{*} These authors contributed equally

[†] honamnguyen@berkeley.edu

rodriguezblanco@berkeley.edu

connectivity. In this work, we focus on studying its implementation in a 2D grid architecture with only local interactions, exploring fault-tolerant encoding and errorcorrection protocols that are adapted to realistic connectivity constraints. Our motivation is twofold: first, to encourage experimental realizations of the Steane code on hardware platforms with limited connectivity, such as superconducting qubits; and second, to develop schemes that minimize qubit movement, thereby reducing decoherence effects caused by ion shuttling [30–33] and atomic array reconfiguration [27]—challenges that become increasingly significant as quantum processors are scaled up. In the near term, quantum hardware will continue to be constrained by the limited availability of logical qubits and non-negligible logical error rates, which impose restrictions on the depth of quantum circuits. As a result, optimizing the performance of the [7,1,3] Steane code remains an important and timely pursuit.

Several theoretical studies have explored aspects of implementing the [[7,1,3]] Steane code in a 2D architecture [34, 35]. Ref. [34] embeds the [[7,1,3]] code using Flag-Bridge qubits to address connectivity constraints while preserving the fault-tolerant nature of parity-check circuits. However, that study assumes a standalone error correction protocol with perfect encoding, overlooking imperfections in state preparation that could degrade performance. Conversely, Ref. [35] investigates the embedding of a verification-based fault-tolerant encoding circuit [36] for the [[7,1,3]] code into a 2D grid. A reinforcement learning agent is used to efficiently map the standard encoding circuit onto a square lattice, optimizing qubit resources and reducing circuit depth. However, that work does not analyze the error-correction (EC) cycle following the encoding, potentially underestimating the benefits of optimized circuits when integrated into a full fault-tolerant QEC protocol.

In the current work, we investigate the complete stack for near term fault-tolerant implementation the [[7,1,3]]Steane code, integrating various logical state preparation circuits and error-correction schemes within a square lattice with only nearest-neighbor interactions. We design multiple fault-tolerant encoding circuits that are either inherently compatible with a given error-correction method, or require only minimal reconfiguration. Furthermore, we leverage overlapping components between encoding and error-correction gadgets to develop an optimized *hybrid* protocol that preserves overall level-1 fault tolerance while efficiently managing logical errors.

The paper is structured as follows. In Sec. II, we review the properties of the [[7,1,3]] Steane code and fault-tolerant error-correction protocols based on flag qubits and the Steane method. Sec. III introduces two encoding protocols: one utilizing fault-tolerant paritychecks with flag qubits and the other employing verification qubits. In Sec. IV, we present simulation results for different combinations of these encoding and errorcorrection strategies. We first analyze correction-ready encoding circuits in isolation before evaluating various approaches in integrating encoding and error-correction. Finally, in Sec. V, we summarize our findings and outline potential future directions.

II. BACKGROUND

We begin with a brief overview of stabilizer codes [5], a class of QEC codes to which the [[7,1,3]] Steane code belongs. Stabilizer codes are defined by an abelian subgroup S of the *n*-qubit Pauli group \mathcal{P}_n . The stabilizer group S is generated by r independent stabilizer generators (or commonly referred to as *stabilizers*) $\{S_1, S_2, ..., S_r\}$, where each stabilizer $S_i \in \mathcal{P}_n$ satisfies $S_i^2 = I$ and commutes with all other elements in S. The code subspace is defined as the simultaneous +1eigenspace of all stabilizers, meaning any valid codeword, or logical state, $|\psi\rangle$ satisfies $S_i |\psi\rangle = |\psi\rangle$ for all S_i . All other eigenspaces correspond to error subspaces with eigenvalue -1 for at least one stabilizer.

Each stabilizer imposes one constraint on the original 2^n -dimensional Hilbert space of *n* physical qubits, leaving 2^{n-r} degrees of freedom to encode k = n - r logical qubits in the code space. When an error E occurs, measuring the stabilizers projects the corrupted logical state into either the code subspace, if E commutes with all stabilizers, or one of the error subspace otherwise. The resulting measurement outcomes, known as the syndrome, provides crucial information to detect whether the logical state has left the code subspace, and if so, to determine the necessary recovery operation R. The maximum weight of a correctable error is determined by the code distance, defined as the smallest number of qubits that must be altered for one valid codeword to transform into another. Specifically, a code with distance d can correct errors with weight up to |(d-1)/2|. Altogether, the parameters [[n, k, d]] capture the key properties of a QEC code.

A. [[7,1,3]] Steane code

The [[7,1,3]] Steane code is a QEC code that encodes a single logical qubit into seven physical qubits, capable of correcting any single-qubit error. It is derived from the classical [[7,4,3]] Hamming code via the CSS (Calderbank-Shor-Steane) construction [6]. Specifically, the Hamming code's parity-check matrix

$$H_{\text{Hamming}} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix} = H_X = H_Z, \quad (1)$$

is used to construct three X-type and three Z-type stabilizers independently. The resulting stabilizers for the



FIG. 1. Fault-tolerant syndrome extraction circuits. a) Steane EC consists of two parity-check circuits where syndromes of the same type (either X or Z) are extracted simultaneously. Fault tolerance is achieved using transversal CNOT gates, which interact with only one data qubit at a time. The protocol also requires the fault-tolerant preparation of two logical ancilla states, $|0\rangle_{\rm L}$ and $|+\rangle_{\rm L}$. b) In FB EC, flag qubits are used to detect and prevent harmful faults on the syndrome qubits from propagating to multiple data qubits. Circuit 1 illustrates a weight-4 X-check that employs CNOT gates to propagate Z errors (blue) from data qubits to the syndrome qubit. It utilizes one flag qubit to catch harmful X errors originating from the middle two CNOT gates. Circuits 2 and 3 demonstrate different strategies for leveraging flag qubits as bridges, effectively reducing the connectivity requirements of the circuit.

code are given as:

$$S_1^X = X_1 X_2 X_3 X_4, \qquad S_1^Z = Z_1 Z_2 Z_3 Z_4,$$

$$S_2^X = X_2 X_3 X_5 X_6, \qquad S_2^Z = Z_2 Z_3 Z_5 Z_6, \qquad (2)$$

$$S_3^X = X_3 X_4 X_6 X_7, \qquad S_3^Z = Z_3 Z_4 Z_6 Z_7.$$

The six stabilizers define a code space to encode a single logical qubit with basis states $|0\rangle_{\rm L}$ and $|1\rangle_{\rm L}$. The $|0\rangle_{\rm L}$ logical state is a uniform superposition of all 7-qubit codewords satisfying the stabilizer constraints:

$$\begin{split} |0\rangle_{\rm L} &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{8}} \Big(|000000\rangle + |1111000\rangle + |0110110\rangle + \\ &|0011011\rangle + |1001110\rangle + |1010101\rangle + \\ &|0101101\rangle + |1100011\rangle \Big). \end{split}$$
(3)

The $\left|1\right\rangle_{\rm L}$ logical state is obtained via application the log-

ical operator $\tilde{X}_{L} = X_1 X_2 X_3 X_4 X_5 X_6 X_7$ as follows:

$$|1\rangle_{\rm L} = \tilde{X}_{\rm L} |0\rangle_{\rm L} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{8}} \Big(|11111\rangle + |0000111\rangle |1001001\rangle + + |1100100\rangle + |0110001\rangle + |0101010\rangle + |1010010\rangle + |0011100\rangle \Big).$$
(4)

For the [[7,1,3]] code, the logical operators can also be expressed in their stabilizer-equivalent form. For convenience, we adopt the following minimum-weight representation of the logical operators for the rest of the paper:

$$X_{\rm L} = S_2^X \cdot X_1 X_2 X_3 X_4 X_5 X_6 X_7 = X_1 X_4 X_7,$$

$$Z_{\rm L} = S_2^Z \cdot Z_1 Z_2 Z_3 Z_4 Z_5 Z_6 Z_7 = Z_1 Z_4 Z_7.$$
(5)

Note that this minimum weight corresponds precisely to the code distance d = 3, which represents the smallest

Syndrome $\left(s^X/s^Z\right)$	Error (Recovery)
000	Ι
100	Z_1/X_1
110	Z_2/X_2
111	Z_{3}/X_{3}
101	Z_4/X_4
010	Z_{5}/X_{5}
011	Z_{6}/X_{6}
001	Z_{7}/X_{7}

TABLE I. Standard look-up-table for the [[7,1,3]] Steane code, mapping each syndrome to the corresponding error that needs to be corrected. Each syndrome corresponds to measurement outcomes of the stabilizers $\{S_1^{X/Z}, S_2^{X/Z}, S_3^{X/Z}\}$, and the recovery operation is simply the application of the identified error to restore the original codeword.

number of physical qubit errors required to cause a logical error. Since these operators commute with the stabilizers, they enable logical operations on the encoded qubit without leaving the code space, rendering them undetectable by the stabilizer measurements.

For the single-qubit errors that the [[7,1,3]] code is designed to handle, the error detection and correction process is straightforward. Stabilizer measurements produce a binary string known as the *syndrome*, which uniquely identifies the error. Thanks to the CSS structure, the code detects each type of single-qubit error independently, X-type stabilizers detect Z errors, and Z-type stabilizers detect X errors. Each set of three stabilizers generates $2^3 = 8$ possible syndromes, corresponding to the seven single-qubit errors on the physical qubits plus the no-error case. The mapping between syndromes and errors generates a look-up table, summarized in Table I. Applying a recovery operation equivalent to the identified error then restores the original logical state.

The primary objective of a QEC code is to repeatedly extract syndromes to detect and correct errors. To reliably achieve this goal, stabilizer measurements must be designed to be fault-tolerant (FT), i.e. they should not introduce more errors than the code can handle [1, 2, 37]. We shall consider level-1 FT QEC circuits for the [[7,1,3]]code that are built from gubits encoded at level-0, corresponding to physical qubits. The construction of these level-1 circuits must guarantee that i) a level-1 QEC circuit with no fault takes an input with at most one error to an output with no error, and ii) a level-1 QEC circuit with one fault takes an input with no errors to an output with at most one error [12]. From now on, we shall simply refer to level-1 FT as the FT condition. In the following, we outline two FT error-correction protocols for the [[7,1,3]] code: one protocol proposed by Steane [10], together with a more recently developed protocol that minimizes qubit overhead by utilizing flag qubits [13, 14, 34, 38].

B. Steane error-correction

To prevent errors in faulty gadgets from propagating into harmful multi-qubit errors, Steane proposed expanding the ancilla register such that each ancilla qubit interacts transversely with only one data qubit [10, 39], a design similar to the fault-tolerant scheme of DiVincenzo and Shor [40]. Unlike the latter which relies on cat-state preparation for the ancilla, Steane error correction (Steane EC) employs a fault-tolerant preparation of logical ancilla states. Leveraging the CSS structure of the [[7,1,3]] code, Steane EC simplifies stabilizer measurements into two steps: syndromes of the same type (either X or Z) are extracted simultaneously. Each step involves seven parallel CNOT gates, applied transversally between the data and ancilla qubits, reducing the circuit depth of each step to one.

As illustrated in Fig. 1a, Steane EC requires the preparation of encoded ancilla states, namely, $|0\rangle_{\rm L}$ for X-check and $|+\rangle_{\rm L} = H^{\otimes 7} |0\rangle_{\rm L}$ for Z-check, where H is the singlequbit Hadamard gate. The logical state preparation must be done fault-tolerantly, which we will discuss in more details in the next section. Errors are then transferred from the data qubits via transversal CNOT gates between the data block and the ancilla block, followed by measurements of the ancilla qubits.

We now illustrate the conversion the measurement outcomes to corresponding syndrome for the Z-check; the process for the X-check is analogous. In the absence of errors, after applying transversal CNOT gates, the ancilla state is $|+\rangle_{\rm L} = (|0\rangle_{\rm L} + |1\rangle_{\rm L})/\sqrt{2}$. Measurements on all ancilla qubits then collapse this state to one of the 16 codewords defined in Eqs. 3 and 4, producing a measurement bit string b. An X error on a data qubit flips the corresponding bit in b, and the Z-type parity-check matrix H_Z is used to determine the associated Z syndrome as follows:

$$s^Z = H_Z \cdot b^T \mod 2,\tag{6}$$

For instance, consider a bit-flip error on the second data qubit, resulting in the Z-check measurement bit string b = 0100000. With H_Z , the corresponding syndrome is calculated as $s^Z = 110$. Referring back to Table I, this syndrome indicates that the required recovery operation is indeed X_2 . This demonstrates that the critical information for determining the error syndrome lies in the parity information encoded in the measurement bit string, rather than the specific bit string itself.

C. Flag-Bridge error-correction

In contrast to Steane EC, a resource-efficient alternative method was proposed to perform FT error-correction [13, 14] that allows a significant reduction in the number of ancilla qubits required for syndrome extraction. This approach adds one or a few extra ancilla qubits, known

5



FIG. 2. Compact parity-check encoding with *Flag-Bridge* qubits on a 2D grid. a) *Citadel*-like layout places data qubits (blue) around ancilla qubits (red), fitting neatly onto a 4×4 lattice. This design uses a total of four ancilla qubits, which are reused for each stabilizer measurement. b) *Flag-Bridge* encoding circuit prepares the $|0\rangle_{\rm L}$ state of the [[7,1,3]] code by measuring the stabilizers S_1^X, S_2^X , and S_3^X sequentially. It employs Circuit 3 from Fig. 1b, with one syndrome qubit and two flag qubits assigned per stabilizer.

as *flag qubits*, to detect and prevent the propagation of high-weight errors that can arise during syndrome extraction.

For example, let us consider Circuit 1 in Fig. 1b, which implements a weight-4 X-type parity-check. In this circuit, Z errors on the data qubits propagate through the four CNOT gates to the syndrome qubit, flipping its initial $|+\rangle$ state if an odd number of Z errors are present. Consequently, measuring the syndrome qubit in the Xbasis reveals the parity of the XXXX operator on the data qubits. At the same time, an X error on the syndrome qubit occurring after the middle two CNOT gates can propagate back to the data gubits, potentially causing a harmful weight-2 error. This can be addressed with an extra flag qubit with two syndrome-to-flag CNOT gates added around the middle two CNOT gates. The modification ensures that any such X error propagates to the flag qubit, flipping its initial $|0\rangle$ state, which is subsequently detected by the flag measurement in the Zbasis. With a single flag qubit, the modified syndrome extraction circuit limits errors on the outgoing data block to at most one qubit, satisfying the FT condition.

In addition to preserving fault tolerance, flag qubits can serve as bridges to mediate interactions between data and syndrome qubits. This role is particularly useful for mapping syndrome extraction circuits onto hardware with limited connectivity [34]. For instance, in Fig. 1b, Circuit 1 cannot be mapped onto a 2D grid with only nearest-neighbor connectivity because the syndrome qubit must interact with five other qubits. However, by incorporating *Flag-Bridge* qubits and optimizing the placement of entangling gates, Circuits 2 and 3 ensure that each qubit interacts with at most three others, making them suitable for this 2D grid topology.

The use of *Flag-Bridge* qubits offers significant advantages by enabling fault-tolerance with minimal overhead, while ensuring compatibility with constrained topologies. Moreover, as we will demonstrate later, flag measurement outcomes can be leveraged to adjust the balance between performance and efficiency. This approach, referred to as *Flag-Bridge error-correction* (FB EC), and the associated syndrome extraction circuits, will serve as a central focus of our study.

III. FT ENCODING ON A 2D GRID

With the options for fault-tolerant error correction outlined, we now focus on the critical first step: preparing a logical state in a fault-tolerant manner in a practical setting. To address connectivity constraints in various near-term devices, we describe in this section two faulttolerant encoding methods suitable for a 2D grid topology. We also detail the additional resources required to ensure compatibility with the FTEC protocols presented above.

A. Parity-check encoding with flag qubits

The most general method for preparing a logical state of a stabilizer code involves directly measuring its stabilizers. These measurements project the initial state of the data qubits onto an eigenstate corresponding to the obtained outcomes. To prepare a logical state within the simultaneous +1 eigenspace of the stabilizers - the *code space* - we selectively post-process and retain only evenparity outcomes.

In particular, we can verify that the $|0\rangle_{\rm L}$ state, which is also the +1 eigenstate of the logical Z operator, can be prepared by applying the corresponding projectors with eigenvalue +1 onto an arbitrary state:



FIG. 3. Compact verification-based encoding on a 2D grid. a) Compact layout and circuit for *GotoRL* encoding were inspired by Goto's efficient-verification method [36] and discovered using a Reinforcement Learning agent [35]. This approach uses a single ancilla qubit (red) for verification and as a bridge between the data qubits (blue). b) Preparing *GotoRL* encoding for FB EC involves applying six SWAP gates to rearrange the qubits into the *citadel* layout. The exact qubit order need not match perfectly, as discussed in the main text. c) To prepare *GotoRL* encoding for Steane EC, we use the X-check circuit in Fig. 1a. Specifically, the process repurposes the prepared $|0\rangle_L$ state as a logical ancilla and employs transversal CNOT gates to transfer the logical state to a new set of data qubits (purple).

$$|0\rangle_{\rm L} = \frac{1}{\mathcal{N}} \left(1 + Z_{\rm L}\right) \prod_{S_i \in \mathcal{S}} \left(1 + S_i\right) |\psi\rangle , \qquad (7)$$

where \mathcal{S} denotes the stabilizer group of the code and \mathcal{N} is the normalization factor.

For the [[7,1,3]] code, the all-zero initial state $|0\rangle^{\otimes 7}$ already satisfies the even-parity condition for the three Z-type stabilizers and the logical Z operator. Therefore, preparing the logical $|0\rangle_{\rm L}$ state only requires measuring the X-type stabilizers, S_1^X , S_2^X , and S_3^X , and selecting the +1 eigenvalue outcomes as follows:

$$|0\rangle_{\rm L} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{8}} \left(1 + S_3^X\right) \left(1 + S_2^X\right) \left(1 + S_1^X\right) |0\rangle^{\otimes 7} \,.$$
 (8)

In practice, stabilizers are measured using syndrome qubits, with fault tolerance ensured by flag qubits, all integrated into the FT parity-check circuits shown in Fig. 1b.

Previously proposed mappings onto a 2D grid topology using *Flag-Bridge* qubits require a 5×5 lattice and six ancilla qubits [34]. In contrast, we introduce a more spaceand resource-efficient *citadel*-like layout. As shown in Fig. 2a, our design fits neatly within a 4×4 lattice and uses only four ancilla qubits for the entire code by using Circuit 3 from Fig. 1b. Fig. 2b further depicts the sequential execution of three X-type parity-check circuits, with three out of the four ancilla qubits activated per stabilizer. Since the Z-type parity-check circuits share the same connectivity requirements, the *citadel* layout is directly compatible with the full FB EC protocol, without the need for any additional qubit reconfiguration. In essence, this *Flag-Bridge* encoding is inherently correction-ready.

An important aspect of this encoding method is its probabilistic nature. Starting from the all-zero initial state $|0\rangle^{\otimes 7} = [(|+\rangle + |-\rangle)/\sqrt{2}]^{\otimes 7}$, each X-type stabilizer measurement has an equal probability of yielding an odd or even parity. As the result, even in the absence of faulty gadgets, the probability of preparing the state in the codespace - achieving even-parity outcomes for all three X-type stabilizers - is just $(1/2)^3 = 1/8$. At first

Encoding	EC	# Anc.	# Enc.	#Extra	Layout
method	scheme	qubits	CNOTS	CNOTS	& circuit
Flag-Bridge	FB	4	24	0	Fig. 2
GotoRL	$_{\rm FB}$	5	11	18	Fig. <mark>3</mark> a-b
GotoRL	Steane	8	11	7	Fig. <mark>3</mark> a-c

TABLE II. Summary of correction-ready encoding circuits studied in this work, along with the corresponding number of ancilla qubits, CNOT gates used during encoding, and extra CNOT gates required for reconfiguration. *Flag-Bridge* encoding is inherently compatible with FB EC, requiring no additional CNOT gates. *GotoRL* encoding can be adapted for either FB EC or Steane EC. The adaptation for Steane EC reduces the number of CNOT gates but increases the ancilla qubit overhead. Complete layouts and circuits for all protocols are shown in the final column.

glance, this might suggest the need for a post-selection process to ensure proper state preparation, potentially leading to significant increase in time overhead. Fortunately, we observe that the probabilistic projections introduce only Z errors. As noted in Ref. [36], Z errors are harmless to $|0\rangle_{\rm L}$ of the [[7,1,3]] code, thanks a special property of quantum codes called *error degeneracy*. More specifically, we can verify that, any Z error, regardless of its weight, can be reduced to either the identity or a weight-1 error through some composition with the stabilizers $\{S_1^Z, S_2^Z, S_3^Z\}$ and the logical operator $Z_{\rm L}$. Since these additional single-qubit Z errors are correctable during a subsequent error-correction cycle, post-selection is not required and non-trivial syndrome measurements can be accepted without impacting the shot efficiency of the encoding process (see below).

B. Verification-based encoding

The second encoding method involves using a small number of ancilla qubits for efficient fault-tolerance verification. As proposed by Goto in Ref. [36], the approach identifies all potential harmful errors induced by a non-FT encoding circuit and determines the minimal set of parity-checks required to detect them. Notably, for the [[7,1,3]] code, Ref. [36] found that only one ancilla qubit is needed for the verification, resulting in a FT encoding circuit with remarkably low overhead. This encoding circuit has been successfully implemented in a trappedion architecture with all-to-all connectivity for real-time QEC demonstrations [25, 28, 41, 42].

For the 2D grid topology considered in this work, we adopt a similarly resource-efficient circuit, depicted in Fig 3a. Inspired by Goto's efficient verification concept, the circuit was initially discovered by a reinforcement learning agent trained to design fault-tolerant logical state preparation circuits tailored to a 2D grid topology with only nearest neighbor connectivity [35]. Remarkably, the circuit retains its low-overhead and uses s single ancilla qubit to also both detect harmful error and mediate interactions between data qubits. We will refer to this verification-based encoding approach as *GotoRL* encoding.

Unlike *Flaq-Bridge* encoding, where FB EC is a natural choice as it requires no additional reconfiguration, *GotoRL* encoding can be adapted to be compatible with either of the EC protocols. Fig. 3b illustrates the use of SWAP gates to rearrange the qubits on the 2D grid, making them compatible with FB EC. Notably, it is unnecessary to replicate the exact layout depicted in Fig. 2. Instead, it suffices to ensure that each group of four data gubits associated with a stabilizer is directly connected to three ancilla qubits, enabling the use of Circuit 3 from Fig. 1b. This rearrangement requires just six SWAP gates, which can be executed in two stages: the first four gates in parallel, followed by the last two gates in parallel. Additionally, the ancilla qubit employed for verification during the encoding stage must be reset. While each SWAP gate comprises three CNOT gates and introduces some performance degradation, this approach allows for a fair comparison with *Flag-Bridge* encoding circuit in terms of readiness for FB EC.

For compatibility with the Steane EC protocol, Fig. 3c demonstrates an alternative strategy involving CNOT gates and measurements. Here, the logical state produced during the encoding process is repurposed as a logical ancilla to initialize a new logical state on a separate set of data qubits. First, all original qubits $\{d_1,\ldots,d_7,a_1\}$ on the 3×3 lattice in *GotoRL* encoding are redefined as ancilla qubits $\{a_1, \ldots, a_7, a_8\}$. Then, we select new data qubits (in purple) adjacent to these redefined ancilla qubits, enabling direct pairwise application of transversal CNOT gates without requiring qubit movement, as depicted in Fig. 3c. This process effectively performs an X-check of the Steane EC protocol on the all-zero initial state $|0\rangle^{\otimes 7}$ of the new data qubits, thereby preparing $|0\rangle_{\rm L}$ up to some ultimately harmless Z errors induced by probabilistic projection. Making GotoRL encoding compatible with Steane EC requires only seven additional CNOT gates, significantly fewer than the eighteen required for FB EC (three per SWAP gate). As a result, we expect this protocol to offer superior performance, though at the cost of higher qubit overhead.

We summarize the correction-ready encoding circuits in Table II detailing their respective qubit requirements and the number of entangling gate operations. In Sec. IV A, we numerically benchmark the performance of these protocols during the encoding process. Following this, we analyze the performance of one cycle of error correction for FB EC, considering both the *Flag-Bridge* and *GotoRL* encoding schemes, in Sec. IV B 1. Finally, we evaluate the performance of Steane EC, specifically with *GotoRL* encoding, in Sec. IV B 2.

IV. RESULTS

We evaluate the performance of the correctionready encoding circuits through comprehensive multishot circuit-level noise state-vector simulations using Qulacs [43]. We use the following depolarizing model parameterized by a single physical error rate $p_{phys} = p$:

- 1. Each single-qubit gate is followed by a Pauli error $\{X, Y, \text{ or } Z\}$, with probability p, where each error occurs with equal probability p/3.
- 2. Each two-qubit gate is followed by an error drawn uniformly and independently from $\{I, X, Y, Z\}^{\otimes 2} \setminus \{I \otimes I\}$ with probability p, giving each error a probability of p/15.
- 3. Each $|0\rangle$ state initialization is replaced by either $|1\rangle = X |0\rangle$ or $i |1\rangle = Y |0\rangle$, each with probability p/3, giving the total probability of 2p/3 for faulty initialization.
- 4. Each Z-basis measurement outcome is flipped with probability 2p/3.
- 5. Preparation and measurement in the X-basis are achieved through application of Hadamard gates.

After running the simulations and collecting all measurements, we consider various ways to utilize postselection (PS) based on syndrome and flag information to achieve fault tolerance and improve performance, at the cost of fewer accepted shots. We quantify a circuit's shot efficiency via its *acceptance rate*, defined as the fraction of shots where the flag outcomes fall within a predefined set.

A. Benchmarking isolated encoding

As an initial benchmark, we run the noisy encoding circuits and assess whether the encoded states contain harmful, uncorrectable errors. The [[7,1,3]] code is designed to independently correct for single-qubit X and Z errors. Thus, a failed encoding results an error where either the X-part or Z-part spans two data qubits. However, this failure condition simplifies further, as only two-qubit X errors are harmful for the $|0\rangle_{\rm L}$ state of the [[7,1,3]] code [36]. Using this criterion, we define the *encoding failure rate* as:

$$p_{\rm Enc} = \lim_{N_{\rm accepted} \to \infty} \frac{N_{\rm 2Q-Xerror}}{N_{\rm accepted}},\tag{9}$$

where N_{accepted} is the number of accepted shots, chosen to be sufficiently large to ensure an accurate estimate of p_{Enc} . We also provide error bars based on standard error of the binomial distribution

$$\sigma(p_{\rm Enc}) = \sqrt{\frac{p_{\rm Enc}(1-p_{\rm Enc})}{N_{\rm accepted}}}.$$
 (10)





FIG. 4. Encoding-only performance and efficiency. a) Encoding failure rate $p_{\rm Enc}$ is plotted as a function of the physical error rate $p_{\rm phys}$ for the protocols summarized in Table II, with and without post-selecting for trivial flag outcomes. Post-selection with flags achieves fault-tolerant scaling, characterized by $p_{\rm Enc} \propto p_{\rm phys}^2$. The encoding pseudo-threshold, marked by the intersection with $p_{\rm Enc} = p_{\rm phys}$, is doubled for Flag-Bridge encoding compared to GotoRL encoding. b) The corresponding acceptance rates indicate that GotoRL encoding achieves greater shot efficiency, maintaining acceptance rates above 50%. Results are obtained from circuit-level noise simulations with 200,000 shots per data point.

Since the FT protocol is specifically designed to detect harmful weight-2 errors arising from a single fault, leaving only those caused by two or more faults, $p_{\rm Enc}$ is expected to scale as p^2 .

Fig. 4 compares the performance of the outlined correction-ready encoding circuits: *Flag-Bridge*, *GotoRL* for FB EC, and *GotoRL* for Steane EC. For all circuits, we observe the expected transition of the scaling of $p_{\rm Enc}$ from p to p^2 , when moving from a non-FT protocol (without PS) to a FT protocol (with PS). To evaluate the performance more concretely, we define the *encoding pseudothreshold* as the value of p at which

$$p_{\rm Enc}(p) = p, \tag{11}$$

indicating the point below which an encoded qubit outperforms a physical qubit. Using this metric, we find that GotoRL encoding prepared for Steane EC performs



FIG. 5. Encoding-only performance and efficiency trade-off for *Flag-Bridge* approach. a) *Encoding failure* rates for different flag sets, as detailed in Table III, worsen progressively as more flag patterns are accepted. Despite this, the scaling remains quadratic, demonstrating that fault-tolerant behavior can be preserved with strategic broadening of the accepted flag set (see App. B). b) Corresponding acceptance rates improve significantly with broader flag sets, approaching the levels achieved by GotoRL encoding. This highlights the flexibility of the *Flag-Bridge* approach, enabling users to balance performance and efficiency according to specific requirements. Results are obtained from circuit-level noise simulations with 200,000 shots per data point.

marginally better than that for FB EC. This is expected, as reconfiguration for Steane EC requires fewer entangling gates (see Table II), leading to fewer opportunities for errors to accumulate.

Notably, the *Flag-Bridge* circuit significantly outperforms both *GotoRL* circuits, achieving an encoding pseudo-threshold more than double that of the others (increasing from 1.2% to 3.4%). The improvement stems from the use of flag qubits after each parity-check, enabling early error detection. In contrast, *GotoRL* encoding executes more CNOT gates before measuring the verification qubit, increasing the chance for errors to accumulate into false positives. However, the lower failure rate comes at the expense of the acceptance rate: for large p, the acceptance rate of *Flag-Bridge* encoding can approach 0%, whereas *GotoRL* encoding maintains an acceptance rate above 50%. For near-term devices where noise levels remain high, the latter choice appears to be better suited when shot efficiency is a critical factor.

Unlike GotoRL encoding, which uses only a single flag qubit, the *Flag-Bridge* circuit employs six flag qubits, resulting in 2^6 possible flag patterns. This design enables a tunable trade-off between performance and acceptance rate by expanding the set of accepted flag patterns in post-selection. Thus far, we have reported the encoding failure rate $p_{\rm Enc}$ for the trivial flag pattern '00 00 00'. Table III categorizes additional flag patterns based on their individual contributions to $p_{\rm Enc}$. Specifically, 'Flag set 1' includes the trivial pattern plus four others, while 'Flag set 2' extends 'Flag set 1' by adding five more, each with progressively higher individual p_{Enc} . These selected patterns plausibly result from at most one fault, while those clearly indicating multiple faults are excluded. For instance, a pattern like '00 10 01' suggests at least two faults—one in the S_2^X plaquette and another in the S_3^X plaquette, and is therefore omitted.

Figure 5 illustrates the achievable range of shot efficiency when considering the flag sets defined in Table III, along with the corresponding degradation in $p_{\rm Enc}$. Notably, in some cases, shot efficiency can even surpass that of *GotoRL* encoding. This underscores the versatility of the *Flag-Bridge* circuit, which allows for dynamic tuning of the performance-efficiency trade-off during postprocessing by adjusting the accepted flag set without requiring any physical modifications to the circuit itself.

B. Benchmarking encoding + error-correction

Thus far, our benchmarking of the FT encoding circuits has assumed noiseless error-correction. Next, we extend our analysis to include a noisy FT EC cycle and evaluate performance using the *logical error rate* $p_{\rm L}$ and the *pseudo threshold* defined as the physical error rate p such that $p_{\rm L}(p) = p$. We simulate both encoding and EC circuits and record the resulting error E on the data qubits. Based on the flag and syndrome outcomes, a look-up-table (LUT) decoder is employed to determine the recovery operation R.

A logical error occurs when $[R \cdot E, Z_L] \neq 0$, where $Z_L = Z_1 Z_4 Z_7$ for the [[7,1,3]] code. This criterion becomes unreliable when syndrome measurements are noisy, as it assumes that $R \cdot E$ has already returned the state to the code space. Consequently, this method overestimates the *true* logical error rate by including non- X_L errors, such as X_1 , X_4 , and X_7 . Unless stated otherwise, the logical error rate p_L refers to the *estimated* p_L , in contrast to the *true* p_L , which accounts solely for errors that contain the X_L operator.

true
$$p_{\mathrm{L}}$$
: $R \cdot E \sim X_{\mathrm{L}}$
estimated p_{L} : $R \cdot E \sim X_{\mathrm{L}}, X_1, X_4, X_7, X_1 X_2, ...(12)$

where \sim represents stabilizer-equivalence. This distinction will be revisited later when we examine the scaling

			$p_{ m phys}$			
		Flag pattern	1.3×10^{-2}	2.4×10^{-2}	4.5×10^{-2}	
		00 00 00	0.005	0.017	0.055	
on)	et	10 00 00	0.046	0.089	0.160	
scti	50 100	$01 \ 00 \ 00$	0.051	0.090	0.160	
orre	Fla	00 01 00	0.050	0.088	0.157	
0 +		00 00 10	0.045	0.087	0.154	
5		00 11 00	0.075	0.138	0.205	
et		00 00 11	0.066	0.118	0.203	
8 S		11 00 00*	0.082	0.141	0.232	
Fla		00 10 00*	0.077	0.123	0.215	
		00 00 01*	0.074	0.128	0.224	
lti	\mathbf{ts}	00 10 01*	0.229	0.266	0.332	
Muj	faul		- - -			

TABLE III. Flag pattern breakdown supporting the performance and efficiency trade-off analysis in Fig. 5. The table presents the encoding failure rate p_{Enc} per flag pattern for three physical error probabilities p_{phys} , Flag-Bridge encoding. Each X-type stabilizer is associated with one syndrome and two flags, resulting in six flags in total for three stabilizers. The trivial flag pattern '00 00 00,' corresponding to the blue curve in Fig. 5, achieves the best performance but the lowest shot efficiency. Flag sets 1 and 2 incorporate additional flag patterns with comparable $p_{\rm Enc}$ per pattern. Fault tolerance is ensured by limiting the analysis to patterns that imply only a single fault per protocol; patterns suggesting multiple faults (non-trivial outcomes in more than one stabilizer) are excluded. A few patterns, marked with an asterisk (*), require specific corrections to maintain fault-tolerance, as detailed in App. B.

behavior of $p_{\rm L}$ with respect to the physical error rate.

A straightforward way to incorporate error correction is to append a full EC cycle after encoding. This approach, which we call the *bare protocol*, executes the FT encoding and FT EC circuits sequentially, with each stage processing information independently. However, recognizing that encoding and error correction share overlapping circuit components, we also consider a more efficient approach: the *hybrid protocol*, where the overlapping portion is executed only once, similar to the extended rectangle in Ref. [12]. This allows information collected during encoding to be directly leveraged for error correction. In the following, we analyze the performance of the three correction-ready encoding circuits from Table II with their respective EC schemes.

1. FB EC with GotoRL and Flag-Bridge encodings

Bare protocol: We first treat encoding and errorcorrection separately. Syndrome and flag measurement outcomes for the encoding step are stored as (s_0, f_0) . For *GotoRL* encoding, s_0 is empty and f_0 contains a single outcome from the verification qubit previously seen in





b. hybrid Flag-Bridge Encoding + EC



FIG. 6. Fault-tolerant encoding + EC flowcharts. a) The bare Flag-Bridge protocol begins with a FT encoding, followed by a full cycle of FT EC, consisting of two rounds to reextract syndromes in case faults are detected. Measurement outcomes (s_1, f_1, s_2, f_2) from the EC stage are used to correct errors, while flag outcomes from the encoding stage, f_0^X , are used for additional post-selection. b) A hybrid Flag-Bridge protocol combines encoding and EC into a single, streamlined protocol. Syndrome information s_0^X from the encoding stage is leveraged to assist with error correction. Due to the probabilistic nature of encoding, non-trivial s_0^X outcomes are permitted in the first round. c) A similar Hybrid approach can be adapted for Steane EC using the X-check circuit from Fig. 1a. Here, the measurement strings (b_0^X, b_0^Z) are converted to (s_0^X, s_0^Z) using the parity-check matrices in Eq. 1.

Fig. 3a. For Flag-Bridge encoding, $(s_0, f_0) = (s_0^X, f_0^X)$



FIG. 7. Encoding + EC performance and efficiency for FB EC. a) Estimated logical error rate $p_{\rm L}$ is plotted against the physical error rate $p_{\rm phys}$ for protocols prepared for FB EC. With the optimal decoding strategy, the hybrid Flag-Bridge protocol outperforms the bare protocol and achieves comparable performance to a noisy EC cycle assuming perfect encoding. b) For the hybrid Flag-Bridge protocol, optimal performance is achievable using a suboptimal decoding strategy that uses f_1 solely for post-selection. c) Corresponding acceptance rates demonstrate the efficiency of the protocols. Error bars indicate a 95% confidence level and are derived from circuit-level noise simulations, with the number of shots, from left to right, being [1800, 1600, 1400, 1200, 1000, 300, 240, 220]×10³.

representing the measurement outcomes obtained from executing three X-type parity-check circuits. Fault tolerance in the encoding step is ensured via post-selection based on the flag outcomes f_0 .

The encoding is followed by a FT EC scheme with flag qubits based on Ref. [34]. A complete EC cycle, as illustrated in Fig. 6a, consists of two rounds:

- 1. In the first round, each stabilizer circuit $S_i \in S$ is executed sequentially, with the syndrome and flag outcomes recorded as binary strings s_1 and f_1 , respectively. If any flag outcome is non-trivial or the syndrome outcome differs from previously recorded syndrome information (from encoding or a prior cycle), the round is terminated early, and zeros are appended to f_1 to account for the skipped stabilizer circuits.
- 2. If the first round completes without early termination, the second round is skipped, and we set $s_2 = s_1$ indicating no detected faults. If faults were detected in the first round, all stabilizer circuits are executed without interruption, and the syndrome outcomes are stored in s_2 .

Note that for the *bare* protocol with *Flag-Bridge* encoding, partial syndrome information s_0^X during encoding step serves as a reference to determine whether the syndrome outcome s_1 in the outlined EC cycle has changed from the encoding process. After the EC cycle, s_2 and f_1 are used for decoding.

Hybrid protocol: Observing that Flag-Bridge encoding inherently executes all three X-type stabilizers - half of the first round of the EC cycle - we propose a hybrid protocol that leverages the information gathered during the encoding stage. As depicted in Fig. 6b, this protocol modifies the first round, to perform the three X-type stabilizer circuits uninterrupted (producing s_0^X, f_0^X), followed by the Z-type stabilizer circuits executed sequentially (producing in s_0^Z, f_0^Z). The termination condition remains unchanged except that, after running the first three stabilizers, we check only for non-trivial flag outcomes, i.e. whether $\sum f_0^X \neq 0$. By integrating the encoding step into the first round, the measurement outcomes are redefined as $s_1 = (s_0^X, s_0^Z)$ and $f_1 = (f_0^X, f_0^Z)$. The rest of the protocol follows the *bare* protocol exactly, after which, s_2 and f_1 are used for decoding. Unlike in the bare protocol, f_0^X is not immediately used for postselection. Instead, it is now part of f_1 and will be used later to enhance the decoding process.

After running the EC circuits, decoding is performed on using one of two different LUTs. The first, referred to as the s_2 -LUT, relies solely on the syndrome information from the second round, It is the standard LUT for the [[7,1,3]] code already given in Table I. The second, referred to as the f_1s_2 -LUT, combines the flag information from the first round and the syndrome information from the second round (Table VI). Incorporating flag information is advantageous because certain f_1 flag patterns can uniquely identify specific two-qubit X errors propagated through the first round, enabling a more accurate recovery operation and reducing the likelihood of logical errors. The details of this enhanced LUT are discussed in App. C.

Decoding performance can be further improved through post-selection with flag outcomes f_1 . When using the s_2 -LUT, only shots with trivial flags in f_1 are accepted. Similarly, for the f_1s_2 -LUT, only shots with f_1 patterns explicitly accounted for in the LUT are accepted. Since flag qubits are critical for ensuring fault tolerance, decoding with the s_2 -LUT without any postselection is expected to exhibit non-FT behavior.

Fig. 7a compares the logical error rates of different encoding+EC protocols using the optimal decoding strategy: f_1s_2 -LUT with post-selection on f_1 . While the bare FB protocol demonstrates a slight advantage over the bare GotoRL protocol (0.07% versus 0.06% pseudothreshold), both fall short in comparison to a stand-alone EC cycle, which is equivalent to a *bare* protocol with perfect (noiseless) encoding (0.13% pseudo-threshold). Notably, the *hybrid* protocol enabled by FB encoding manages to bridge the gap, achieving a performance comparable to the perfect encoding scenario. Furthermore, Fig. 7c shows that the *hybrid* FB approach eliminates the previously observed advantage of *GotoRL* encoding in terms of shot efficiency (blue versus red curves). This significant improvement is due not only to the shorter circuit length of the *hybrid* protocol, which reduces the opportunities for faulty gadgets, but also to its effective use of information gathered during encoding for error correction.

Finally, we highlight in Fig. 7b the possibility of achieving performance comparable to the optimal decoding strategy using a sub-optimal one - decoding with the s_2 -LUT and accepting only shots with trivial f_1 (blue dotted line)- at the cost of lower acceptance rate. This is noteworthy because the control logic of the FT EC cycle (c.f. Fig. 6), with its multiple conditional branches, could pose a challenge in hardware implementation (e.g. on an FPGA). By selecting this decoding strategy in advance, the decision tree after termination can be simplified to a straightforward abort and restart, thereby making the implementation more feasible in a practical setting.

2. Steane EC with GotoRL encoding

In contrast to the previous two circuits which use FB EC, the last circuit in Table II employs Steane EC, which is FT due to its use of transversal CNOT gates involving only one data qubit at a time. As seen in Fig. 3c, the circuit inherently incorporates the X-check in Steane EC. Consequently, we can implement a similarly efficient *hybrid* protocol that combines encoding and EC, as depicted in Fig. 6c, for fair comparison with the *hybrid* Flag-Bridge protocol.

Similarly in this protocol, the X-check serves a dual purpose: encoding and parity-check. During this step, we collect flag outcomes f_0^X from the ancilla encoding and bit strings b_0^X from the Steane parity-check. Next,



FIG. 8. Encoding + EC performance comparison between FB EC and Steane EC. a) We plot the logical error rates $p_{\rm L}$ for hybrid encoding-EC protocols in the low-noise regime. In terms of estimated $p_{\rm L}$, Steane EC requires postselection with the syndrome from the Z-check to match the performance of FB EC. In terms of true $p_{\rm L}$, Steane EC without post-selection and FB EC show comparable performance, with $p_{\rm L} \propto p_{\rm phys}^2$. b) When considering the counts of true logical errors per million shots, Steane EC with post-selection results in zero logical errors. Even without post-selection, the count of logical errors for Steane EC is approximately half that of the Flag-Bridge approach.

we perform the standard Z-check to collect f_0^Z and b_0^Z . Both f_0^X and f_0^Z are used for post-selection to ensure FT encoding of the logical ancilla states $|0\rangle_{\rm L}$ and $|+\rangle_{\rm L}$, respectively. The syndromes (s_0^X, s_0^Z) are then computed from the bit strings (b_0^X, b_0^Z) using the parity-check matrices, as outlined in Sec. II B. The recovery operation is determined using the standard LUT in Table I.

Index	Gate	Fault	Initial Pauli	s	f	Error
1	CX[4,5]	- <i>X</i>	-X-	0	10	- <i>-XX</i>
1	CX[4,5]	-Y	-Y-	1	10	- <i>-XX</i>
1	CX[4,5]	X-	<i>X</i>	0	10	XX
1	CX[4,5]	XZ	<i>XZ</i> -	1	10	XX
1	CX[4,5]	Y-	<i>Y</i>	1	10	XX
1	CX[4,5]	YZ	YZ-	0	10	XX
1	CX[4,5]	ZX	ZX-	1	10	XX
1	CX[4,5]	ZY	$\dots ZY $	0	10	- <i>-XX</i>
2	CX[5,6]	XX	-XX	0	10	- <i>-XX</i>
2	CX[5,6]	XY	-XY	1	10	XX
2	CX[5,6]	YX	-YX	1	10	XX
2	CX[5,6]	YY	-YY	0	10	XX
3	CX[4,0]	XX	X $ X$	0	10	XX
3	CX[4,0]	XY	Y X	0	10	YX
3	CX[4,0]	YX	X Y	1	10	XX
3	CX[4,0]	YY	Y Y	1	10	YX

TABLE IV. Summary of all single faults that lead to harmful errors on data qubits at the end of Circuit 3 in Fig. 1b. For reference, the associated gate sequence is as follows: H[4], CX[4,5], CX[5,6], CX[4,0], CX[4,1], CX[5,2], CX[6,3], CX[5,6], CX[4,5], H[4]. Results are obtained from Clifford simulations detailed in App. A. For all of these faults, at least one flag outcome is non-trivial, confirming that Circuit 3 is fault-tolerant.

An initial comparison in the low-noise regime between these *hybrid* protocols, as shown in Fig. 8a, reveals that the *estimated* logical error rate $p_{\rm L}$ for Steane EC is unexpectedly an order of magnitude higher than that of FB EC (orange dotted vs. blue dotted curves). We can enhance the performance of Steane EC by adopting a strategy similar to the *hybrid* Flag-Bridge protocol, utilizing s_0^Z to detect faults occurring during the procedure. Unlike the Flag-Bridge protocol's 2-round structure, which allows a second run if a fault is detected via a non-trivial syndrome s_1 , here in Steane EC we can only use s_0^Z for post-selection. Specifically, we admit only trivial s_0^Z and use Table I to decode s_0^X . However, even with this additional filtering, the *estimated* $p_{\rm L}$, calculated using Eq. 12, continues to exhibit non-FT behavior, scaling linearly with p even after post-selection.

To address this apparent discrepancy, we carefully analyze the errors contributing to the logical error rates, as detailed in App. D. We find that most of the recorded logical errors do not actually involve the $X_{\rm L} = X_1 X_4 X_7$ operator. When considering the *true* logical error rate, Steane EC predictably outperforms FB EC (bold orange vs. bold blue curves in Fig. 8a-b), even without postselection. In addition, the *true* logical error rates for both protocols exhibit the expected p^2 scaling in the low-noise regime. Remarkably, as shown in Fig. 8b, incorporating s_0^2 -based post-selection reduces the number of *true* logical errors per million shots for Steane EC to virtually zero within the examined noise range. This, along with an experimental demonstration using a fidelity-based metric [44], confirms that Steane EC achieves the exceptionally low *true* logical error rate expected by design. Our findings suggest that estimating the logical error rate solely based on the commutator with logical operators significantly overestimates the logical error rate for Steane EC, highlighting the need for a more accurate metric.

V. CONCLUSION AND OUTLOOK

In this work, we have explored various fault-tolerant approaches to prepare the $|0\rangle_{\rm L}$ state of the [[7,1,3]] code through numerical simulations. Our analysis specifically incorporated several practical considerations by: (i) proposing compact implementations of the code on a 2D grid topology with minimal overhead, (ii) ensuring error-correction readiness of the encoding circuits, and (iii) extending our analysis to include both noisy encoding and noisy error correction. In particular, we focused on a flag-based approach, which utilizes flag qubits to ensure fault tolerance and facilitate interactions between data and syndrome gubits on a topology with limited connectivity (Flag-Bridge encoding). This approach supports both encoding and error-correction. We compared it against a single-ancilla, verification-based encoding method (GotoRL encoding) and the Steane EC protocol, which achieves fault tolerance through transversal CNOT gates [10].

We first demonstrated the advantage of the *Flag-Bridge* approach when considering only the encoding stage. Assuming perfect error correction, *Flag-Bridge* encoding achieves a 3.4% encoding pseudo-threshold, more than double that of *GotoRL* encoding, albeit with a lower acceptance rate. The inclusion of six flag qubits, as opposed to one in *GotoRL* encoding, enables straightforward tuning of the performance-efficiency trade-off by expanding the set of acceptable flag outcomes. This flexibility accommodates various hardware platforms with differing limitations and requirements, without necessitating additional runs or modifications.

When accounting for noisy error-correction, the *Flag-Bridge* approach supports an efficient *hybrid* protocol that integrates encoding and error-correction using the same syndrome extraction circuits. Remarkably, this *hybrid Flag-Bridge* protocol maintains a performance advantage over *GotoRL* encoding (0.13% versus 0.06% *pseudo-threshold*) while matching the performance of a standalone noisy error-correction protocol with perfect encoding. Notably, the optimal performance is achievable with a sub-optimal decoding strategy that employs flag information only for post-selection. This observation suggests a straightforward abort-and-restart strategy whenever a flag is triggered, simplifying the implementation on control devices.

Compared to Steane EC, the *Flag-Bridge* approach achieves better *estimated* logical error rates, calculated

(b) Flag pattern: 11 00 00

	14

		(a) Fl	ag pattern: 01	00 0	0	
[ndex	Gate	Fault	Initial Pauli	s	f	Error
2	CX[8,9]	- <i>X</i>	X-	000	010000	X
2	CX[8,9]	-Y	Y-	100	010000	<i>X</i>
2	CX[8,9]	ZX	$\cdots - -ZX$ -	100	010000	<i>X</i>
2	CX[8,9]	ZY	$\cdots - -ZY-$	000	010000	<i>X</i>
6	CX[9,3]	X-	X-	000	010000	
6	CX[9,3]	XX	$\cdots X \cdots \cdots X$	000	010000	<i>X</i>
6	CX[9,3]	XY	$\cdots Y \cdots -X$ -	001	010000	<i>Y</i>
6	CX[9,3]	XZ	<i>Z</i> <i>X</i> -	001	010000	Z
6	CX[9,3]	Y-	$\cdots - - Y$ -	100	010000	
6	CX[9,3]	YX	$\cdots X \cdots -Y -$	100	010000	<i>X</i>
6	CX[9,3]	YY	$\cdots Y \cdots \cdots Y \cdots$	101	010000	<i>Y</i>
6	CX[9,3]	YZ	$\cdots Z \cdots \cdots Y $	101	010000	<i>Z</i>
7	CX[8,9]	-X	X-	000	010000	
7	CX[8,9]	-Y	Y-	000	010000	
7	CX[8,9]	ZX	-ZX-	100	010000	
7	CX[8,9]	ZY	$\cdots - -ZY-$	100	010000	

Index	Gate	Fault	Initial Pauli	s	f	Error
2	CX[8,9]	Х-	-X	000	110000	-XX
2	CX[8,9]	XZ	-X <i>Z</i> -	100	110000	-XX
2	CX[8,9]	Y-	- <i>Y</i>	100	110000	-XX
2	CX[8,9]	YZ	-YZ-	000	110000	-XX
3	CX[8,1]	X-	-X	000	110000	<i>X</i>
3	CX[8,1]	XX	-X - X	000	110000	-XX
3	CX[8,1]	XY	- <i>Y</i> - <i>X</i>	010	110000	-YX
3	CX[8,1]	XZ	- <i>Z</i> - <i>X</i>	010	110000	- <i>ZX</i>
3	CX[8,1]	Y-	- <i>Y</i>	100	110000	<i>X</i>
3	CX[8,1]	YX	-X -Y	100	110000	-XX
3	CX[8,1]	YY	-Y - Y	110	110000	-YX
3	CX[8,1]	YZ	-Z - Y	110	110000	- <i>ZX</i>
4	CX[8,2]	X-	-X	000	110000	
4	CX[8,2]	XX	- <i>-X</i> <i>-X</i>	000	110000	- <i>-X</i>
4	CX[8,2]	XY	Y -X	011	110000	- <i>-Y</i>
4	CX[8,2]	XZ	<i>Z</i> - <i>X</i>	011	110000	- <i>-Z</i>
4	CX[8,2]	Y-	-Y	100	110000	
4	CX[8,2]	YX	<i>X</i> - <i>Y</i>	100	110000	- <i>-X</i>
4	CX[8,2]	YY	-Y - Y	111	110000	- <i>-Y</i>
4	CX[8,2]	YZ	<i>Z</i> - <i>Y</i>	111	110000	- <i>-Z</i>
7	CX[8,9]	XX	-XX-	000	110000	
7	CX[8,9]	XY	- <i>XY</i> -	000	110000	
7	CX[8,9]	YX	-YX-	100	110000	
7	CX[8,9]	YY	- <i>YY</i> -	100	110000	

TABLE V. Summary of faults for two exemplary flag patterns in *Flag-Bridge* encoding. The '01 00 00' flag pattern results in final errors on the data qubits of at most weight-1, allowing it to be immediately included in the accepted flag set. In contrast, the '11 00 00' flag pattern, which may lead to higher-weight errors, requires an additional correction, such as X_3 , to ensure that all final errors from a single fault are at most weight-1. The associated gate sequence for both cases is: H[8], CX[8,7], CX[8,9], CX[8,1], CX[8,2], CX[7,0], CX[9,3], CX[8,9], CX[8,7], H[8].

using the commutator with the $Z_{\rm L}$ operator. This advantage stems from the additional flag qubits, which restrict error propagation to fewer initial faults. However, Steane EC outperforms in terms of *true* logical error counts, which consider only errors containing the $X_{\rm L}$ operator, thereby justifying its use of twice as many ancilla qubits. Therefore, to fairly assess the experimental performance of Steane EC, a more accurate metric, such as a fidelitybased approach [44], is essential.

Our correction-ready encoding circuits are particularly well-suited for experimental implementation on platforms with current 2D nearest-neighbor connectivity, such as superconducting qubits. They are also compatible with architectures like trapped ions and neutral atoms, where reducing qubit movement can help mitigate errors [27, 30–33]. Although we have focused on post-selection, FT can also be ensured with active correction based on the flag information from the two-flag parity-check circuits that we have employed [45, 46]. Future work could extend this approach by adapting parallel syndrome extraction circuits to similarly compact layouts, further optimizing performance and scalability. Additionally, exploring the implementation of logical computation within these compact designs, whether through non-local entangling gates or measurement-based lattice surgery, represents a promising direction. As experimental platforms continue to advance and become more widely accessible, detailed theoretical and numerical studies tailored to the specific constraints of these platforms will be essential for enabling small-scale demonstrations and paving the way for the broader realization of quantum error correction.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This work was supported by the U.S. National Science Foundation under the Convergence Accelerator Program, Grant No. OIA-2134345, and by the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency under Grant Number HR0011-24-9-0358. HNN thanks John Paul Marceaux and Zack Weinstein for helpful conversation on various subjects pertaining to this work.

Appendix A: Verifying fault-tolerance

We verify the fault-tolerance of all circuits used in this work through brute-force Clifford simulations. Specifically, we manually inject a single Pauli fault for each possible error in the noise model described in Sec. IV, propagate the fault through the circuit, and record the resulting error E on the data qubits. We also track whether syndrome and flag measurements indicate a change. Subsequently, we compute the lowest-weight stabilizer-equivalent form, E_{equiv} , of the final error. A circuit is deemed fault-tolerant if every fault that results in a harmful error, defined as weight $(E_{equiv}) > 1$, causes at least one flag to be triggered. As an example, Table IV shows all harmful errors resulting from single faults in Circuit 3 of Fig. 1b. In all cases, the flag measurements are non-trivial, thereby confirming that the circuit is indeed fault-tolerant.

Appendix B: Handling non-trivial flag patterns

Table III provides a summary of flag outcomes that can be included during post-selection for balancing the tradeoff between performance and efficiency in *Flag-Bridge* encoding circuit. Our analysis categorizes these outcomes into two distinct types based on the brute-force simulation results detailed in App. A. Sorting the outcomes by flag patterns, we examine the final errors on the data qubits to identify the appropriate handling for each pattern.

The first type, such as '01 00 00', corresponds to errors of at most weight-1, as shown in Table Va, similar to the trivial pattern. These patterns naturally satisfy the FT condition and can be included without any further modification. The second type, marked with * in Table III, such as '11 00 00', may lead to higher-weight errors. However, as seen in Table Vb, these patterns can be made FT-compatible through simple corrections. For example, applying an X_3 correction when the '11 00 00' pattern is observed reduces the two-qubit X error to a single-qubit error while introducing, at most, a weight-1 error in previously error-free cases. By systematically identifying and addressing each pattern, we can leverage the additional information from flag measurements to tailor *Flag-Bridge* encoding circuit to our need.

Appendix C: FB EC - f_1s_2 LUT

In the analysis of FB EC in Sec. IV B1, we introduce the use of an additional lookup table that incorporates flag information from the first round (f_1) to decode the syndrome from the second round (s_2) , instead of exclusively post-selecting on trivial flag outcomes. To construct this LUT, we begin by performing the Clifford simulation detailed in App. A for each stabilizer, generating f_1 . Subsequently, we simulate a perfect round of error

f_1^X	s_2^Z	Error (Recovery)
10 00 00	100	X_1
01 00 00	101	X_4
11 00 00	001	X_5X_6
11 00 00	111	X_3
11 00 00	000	Ι
10 00 00	000	Ι
01 00 00	000	Ι
00 10 00	001	X_5X_6
00 01 00	011	X_6
00 11 00	010	X_5
00 10 00	111	X_3
00 10 00	000	Ι
00 11 00	000	Ι
00 01 00	000	Ι
00 00 01	111	X_3
00 00 10	010	X_6X_7
00 00 11	101	X_4
00 00 10	011	X_6
00 00 10	000	Ι
00 00 11	000	Ι
00 00 01	000	Ι

TABLE VI. Augmented look-up-table for the FT EC protocol of [[7,1,3]] Steane code. This LUT utilizes flag outcomes from the first round (f_1^X) and syndrome outcomes from the second round (s_2^Z) to determine the required recovery operation for correcting X errors.

correction to obtain s_2 . For each distinct combination of f_1 and s_2 , we verify that the resulting final errors on the data qubits are unique (up to stabilizer equivalence). This unique mapping establishes the desired LUT. Furthermore, since all Z errors on the $|0\rangle_{\rm L}$ state reduce to at most single-qubit errors, we can use the standard LUT in Table I to decode Z errors. As a result, the additional LUT is only required for decoding X errors. Specifically, it uses the X-part of f_1 and Z-part of s_2 , as summarized in Table VI.

Appendix D: Steane EC - Logical error rate analysis

In Sec. IV B 2, we observe that in the low noise regime, the logical error rate $p_{\rm L}$ for Steane EC, even after s_0^2 post-selection, is worse than that of FB EC, despite relying only on transversal CNOT gates. We investigate this discrepancy by analyzing the calculation of *estimated* $p_{\rm L}$ based on the commutation relation with $Z_{\rm L} = Z_1 Z_4 Z_7$, which requires accounting for all possible X and Y faults on qubits 1, 4, and 7.

We focus on the *hybrid* protocols for both *Flag-Bridge* and Steane EC, where the X-part is executed as both the encoding and parity-check stage, followed by the Z-part.



FIG. 9. Fault locations contributing to the *estimated* logical error rate p_L . Gates highlighted in red denote fault locations that can induce single-qubit X errors on qubits 1, 4, and 7, contributing to p_L as estimated via the commutation relation with $Z_L = Z_1 Z_4 Z_7$. Earlier X errors are excluded from this analysis, as they would trigger non-trivial Z-type syndrome outcomes s_0^Z . a) In the FB EC protocol, the potentially harmful fault locations are the final gates interacting with qubits 1, 4, and 7. b) In the Z-check circuit of Steane EC, three analogous fault locations similarly contribute to p_L estimation.

Faults arising during the X-part are detected by the subsequent Z-checks, resulting in non-trivial syndrome s_0^Z . Thus, by restricting our analysis to shots with trivial s_0^Z , for both FB EC and Steane EC, we can ignore X and Y faults from the X-part and focus on those originating from the Z-part.

Fig. 9 illustrates the Z-checks for both *Flag-Bridge* and Steane EC protocols, with red highlighting gates that may introduce X and Y errors on qubits 1, 4, and 7. Since X errors propagate from control to target during CNOT gates, only gates directly connected to qubits 1, 4, and 7 are potentially harmful. In the Z-part of FB EC protocol, two CNOT gates are connected to qubit 4 - one in S_1^Z and the other in S_3^Z . If the first CNOT gate induces an X error on qubit 4, the second CNOT triggers the last syndrome, producing a non-trivial s_0^Z . Therefore, only the final instances of gates connected to qubits 1, 4, and 7 are relevant.

Although the *Flag-Bridge* and Steane EC protocols initially appear to have the same number of potentially harmful gates contributing to the logical error rate, the actual error channels differ. For FB EC, only XI fault is permissible, as XX and XY will trigger the syndrome, and XZ will trigger a flag. In contrast, the Steane EC circuit, lacking flag qubits, allows both XI and XZ faults, effectively doubling the contribution to the logical error rate. Indeed, for lower physical error rates in Fig. 8b, the logical error count for Steane EC is approximately double that of FB EC. These findings further support that estimating the logical error rate based on commutation relation can significantly overestimate its value for Steane EC.

REFERENCES

- P. W. Shor, Fault-tolerant quantum computation (1997), arXiv:quant-ph/9605011 [quant-ph].
- [2] D. Aharonov and M. Ben-Or, Fault-tolerant quantum computation with constant error rate (1999), arXiv:quant-ph/9906129 [quant-ph].
- [3] A. Y. Kitaev, Quantum computations: algorithms and error correction, Russian Mathematical Surveys 52, 1191 (1997).
- [4] E. Knill, R. Laflamme, and W. H. Zurek, Resilient quantum computation: error models and thresholds, Proceedings of the Royal Society of London. Series A: Mathematical, Physical and Engineering Sciences 454, 365–384 (1998).
- [5] D. Gottesman, Stabilizer codes and quantum error correction (1997), arXiv:quant-ph/9705052 [quant-ph].
- [6] M. A. Nielsen and I. L. Chuang, Quantum Computation and Quantum Information: 10th Anniversary Edition (Cambridge University Press, 2010).
- [7] E. Dennis, A. Kitaev, A. Landahl, and J. Preskill, Topological quantum memory, Journal of Mathematical Physics 43, 4452 (2002).
- [8] D. P. DiVincenzo and P. W. Shor, Fault-tolerant error correction with efficient quantum codes, Phys. Rev. Lett. 77, 3260 (1996).
- [9] D. P. DiVincenzo and P. W. Shor, Fault-tolerant error correction with efficient quantum codes, Phys. Rev. Lett. 77, 3260 (1996).
- [10] A. Steane, Multiple-particle interference and quantum error correction, Proceedings of the Royal Society of London. Series A: Mathematical, Physical and Engineering Sciences 452, 2551–2577 (1996).
- [11] E. Knill, Quantum computing with realistically noisy devices, Nature 434, 39 (2005).
- [12] P. Aliferis, D. Gottesman, and J. Preskill, Quantum accuracy threshold for concatenated distance-3 codes (2005), arXiv:quant-ph/0504218 [quant-ph].

- [13] T. J. Yoder and I. H. Kim, The surface code with a twist, Quantum 1, 2 (2017).
- [14] R. Chao and B. W. Reichardt, Quantum error correction with only two extra qubits, Phys. Rev. Lett. 121, 050502 (2018).
- [15] R. Acharya and *et al.*, Suppressing quantum errors by scaling a surface code logical qubit, Nature 614, 676 (2023).
- [16] R. Acharya and *et al.*, Quantum error correction below the surface code threshold, Nature 10.1038/s41586-024-08449-y (2024).
- [17] Y. Hong, E. Durso-Sabina, D. Hayes, and A. Lucas, Entangling four logical qubits beyond break-even in a nonlocal code, Phys. Rev. Lett. 133, 180601 (2024).
- [18] N. Berthusen, D. Devulapalli, E. Schoute, A. M. Childs, M. J. Gullans, A. V. Gorshkov, and D. Gottesman, Toward a 2d local implementation of quantum low-density parity-check codes, PRX Quantum 6, 010306 (2025).
- [19] A. Paetznick, M. P. da Silva, C. Ryan-Anderson, J. M. Bello-Rivas, J. P. C. III, A. Chernoguzov, J. M. Dreiling, C. Foltz, F. Frachon, J. P. Gaebler, and *et al.*, Demonstration of logical qubits and repeated error correction with better-than-physical error rates (2024), arXiv:2404.02280 [quant-ph].
- [20] H. Yamasaki and M. Koashi, Time-efficient constantspace-overhead fault-tolerant quantum computation, Nature Physics 20, 247 (2024).
- [21] S. Yoshida, S. Tamiya, and H. Yamasaki, Concatenate codes, save qubits (2024), arXiv:2402.09606 [quant-ph].
- [22] H. Goto, High-performance fault-tolerant quantum computing with many-hypercube codes, Science Advances 10, eadp6388 (2024).
- [23] H. Bombin and M. A. Martin-Delgado, Topological quantum distillation, Phys. Rev. Lett. 97, 180501 (2006).
- [24] C. Ryan-Anderson, J. G. Bohnet, K. Lee, D. Gresh, A. Hankin, J. P. Gaebler, D. Francois, A. Chernoguzov, D. Lucchetti, N. C. Brown, and *et al.*, Realization of realtime fault-tolerant quantum error correction, Phys. Rev. X 11, 041058 (2021).
- [25] C. Ryan-Anderson, N. C. Brown, M. S. Allman, B. Arkin, G. Asa-Attuah, C. Baldwin, J. Berg, J. G. Bohnet, S. Braxton, N. Burdick, and *et al.*, Implementing faulttolerant entangling gates on the five-qubit code and the color code (2022), arXiv:2208.01863 [quant-ph].
- [26] C. Ryan-Anderson, N. C. Brown, C. H. Baldwin, J. M. Dreiling, C. Foltz, J. P. Gaebler, T. M. Gatterman, N. Hewitt, C. Holliman, C. V. Horst, and *et al.*, High-fidelity teleportation of a logical qubit using transversal gates and lattice surgery, Science **385**, 1327 (2024).
- [27] D. Bluvstein, S. J. Evered, A. A. Geim, S. H. Li, H. Zhou, T. Manovitz, S. Ebadi, M. Cain, M. Kalinowski, D. Hangleiter, and *et al.*, Logical quantum processor based on reconfigurable atom arrays, Nature 626, 58 (2024).
- [28] L. Postler, S. Heuβen, I. Pogorelov, M. Rispler, T. Feldker, M. Meth, C. D. Marciniak, R. Stricker, M. Ringbauer, R. Blatt, P. Schindler, M. Müller, and T. Monz, Demonstration of fault-tolerant universal quantum gate operations, Nature **605**, 675 (2022).
- [29] P. S. Rodriguez, J. M. Robinson, P. N. Jepsen, Z. He, C. Duckering, C. Zhao, K.-H. Wu, J. Campo, K. Bagnall, M. Kwon, and *et al.*, Experimental demonstration of logical magic state distillation (2024), arXiv:2412.15165 [quant-ph].

- [30] T. Ruster, C. Warschburger, H. Kaufmann, C. T. Schmiegelow, A. Walther, M. Hettrich, A. Pfister, V. Kaushal, F. Schmidt-Kaler, and U. G. Poschinger, Experimental realization of fast ion separation in segmented paul traps, Phys. Rev. A **90**, 033410 (2014).
- [31] S. A. Moses, C. H. Baldwin, M. S. Allman, R. Ancona, L. Ascarrunz, C. Barnes, J. Bartolotta, B. Bjork, P. Blanchard, M. Bohn, and *et al.*, A race-track trapped-ion quantum processor, Phys. Rev. X 13, 041052 (2023).
- [32] A. Ovide, D. Cuomo, and C. G. Almudever, Scaling and assigning resources on ion trap qccd architectures (2024), arXiv:2408.00225 [quant-ph].
- [33] C. M. Löschnauer, J. M. Toba, A. C. Hughes, S. A. King, M. A. Weber, R. Srinivas, R. Matt, R. Nourshargh, D. T. C. Allcock, C. J. Ballance, C. Matthiesen, and *et al.*, Scalable, high-fidelity all-electronic control of trapped-ion qubits (2024), arXiv:2407.07694 [quant-ph].
- [34] L. Lao and C. G. Almudever, Fault-tolerant quantum error correction on near-term quantum processors using flag and bridge qubits, Phys. Rev. A 101, 032333 (2020).
- [35] R. Zen, J. Olle, L. Colmenarez, M. Puviani, M. Müller, and F. Marquardt, Quantum circuit discovery for faulttolerant logical state preparation with reinforcement learning (2024), arXiv:2402.17761 [quant-ph].
- [36] H. Goto, Minimizing resource overheads for fault-tolerant preparation of encoded states of the steane code, Scientific Reports 6, 19578 (2016).
- [37] M. Oskin, F. Chong, and I. Chuang, A practical architecture for reliable quantum computers, Computer 35, 79 (2002).
- [38] C. Chamberland and M. E. Beverland, Flag fault-tolerant error correction with arbitrary distance codes, Quantum 2, 53 (2018).
- [39] A. M. Steane, Active stabilization, quantum computation, and quantum state synthesis, Physical Review Letters 78, 2252–2255 (1997).
- [40] D. P. DiVincenzo and P. W. Shor, Fault-tolerant error correction with efficient quantum codes, Phys. Rev. Lett. 77, 3260 (1996).
- [41] C. Ryan-Anderson, J. G. Bohnet, K. Lee, D. Gresh, A. Hankin, J. P. Gaebler, D. Francois, A. Chernoguzov, D. Lucchetti, N. C. Brown, and *et al.*, Realization of realtime fault-tolerant quantum error correction, Phys. Rev. X 11, 041058 (2021).
- [42] L. Postler, F. Butt, I. Pogorelov, C. D. Marciniak, S. Heußen, R. Blatt, P. Schindler, M. Rispler, M. Müller, and T. Monz, Demonstration of fault-tolerant steane quantum error correction, PRX Quantum 5, 030326 (2024).
- [43] Y. Suzuki, Y. Kawase, Y. Masumura, Y. Hiraga, M. Nakadai, J. Chen, K. M. Nakanishi, K. Mitarai, R. Imai, S. Tamiya, and *et al.*, Qulacs: a fast and versatile quantum circuit simulator for research purpose, Quantum 5, 559 (2021).
- [44] L. Postler, F. Butt, I. Pogorelov, C. D. Marciniak, S. Heußen, R. Blatt, P. Schindler, M. Rispler, M. Müller, and T. Monz, Demonstration of fault-tolerant steane quantum error correction, PRX Quantum 5, 10.1103/prxquantum.5.030326 (2024).
- [45] N. Delfosse and B. W. Reichardt, Short shor-style syndrome sequences (2020), arXiv:2008.05051 [quant-ph].
- [46] B. W. Reichardt, D. Aasen, R. Chao, A. Chernoguzov, W. van Dam, J. P. Gaebler, D. Gresh, D. Lucchetti, M. Mills, S. A. Moses, and *et al.*, Demonstration of quan-

tum computation and error correction with a tesseract code $(2024),\, {\rm arXiv:} 2409.04628$ [quant-ph].