

# Problem Set #1

Quantum Error Correction  
Instructor: Daniel Gottesman

Due Thursday, May 26, 2016

## Problem #1. Unitary decoder

Suppose  $\mathcal{H}_N = \mathcal{H}_A \otimes \mathcal{H}_B$ , with  $\mathcal{H}_B = \mathcal{H}_K$  the logical Hilbert space and  $\mathcal{H}_N$  the physical Hilbert space. (Note that this is not the same tensor product decomposition as the physical qubits; we are not even assuming there is a natural set of physical qubits here.) Also assume the errors map  $\mathcal{H}_N$  to itself and that this is a QECC for set  $\mathcal{E}$  of errors. Show that there exists unitary  $U$  such that  $U|_{|0\rangle \otimes B} = I$  (in which case  $U$  can be the encoder) and  $U^\dagger$  followed by discarding the  $\mathcal{H}_A$  subspace acts as a decoder map for the QECC.

## Problem #2. Example stabilizer

For each of the following sets of Paulis, determine if they define valid stabilizers. If so, give their parameters  $[[n, k, d]]$ .

a) Stabilizer is all products of these operators:

$$\begin{array}{cccccc} X & X & Z & Y & I & \\ Z & Y & I & I & X & \\ X & I & X & Z & Z & \end{array}$$

b) Stabilizer is all products of these operators:

$$\begin{array}{cccccc} X & X & X & X & X & X \\ Y & Y & Y & Y & Y & Y \\ Z & Z & Z & Z & Z & Z \end{array}$$

c) In binary symplectic matrix form:

$$\left( \begin{array}{cccccc|cccc} 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \end{array} \right)$$

d) The stabilizer corresponding to the GF(4) linear code with the following parity check matrix:

$$(0 \quad 1 \quad 1 \quad \omega \quad \omega^2)$$

## Problem #3. Stabilizer generating sets

Suppose we have a set of stabilizer generators  $\{M_1, \dots, M_r\}$  for a stabilizer  $S$  and  $N \in S$  is not a generator. Show that we can remove an element of the original generating set and replace it with  $N$  to get a new minimal generating set.

## Problem #4. Low-density parity check CSS codes

A classical LDPC (“low density parity check”) code is an  $[[n, k, d]]$  linear code where each row of the parity check matrix has at most  $r$  1’s and each column of the parity check matrix has at most  $c$  1’s, with  $r$  and  $c$  of constant size (as  $n$  gets large). (Sometimes LDPC codes with  $r$  and  $c$  increasing sublinearly with  $n$  are also considered, but assume  $r$  and  $c$  are constant for the purposes of this problem.) Classical LDPC codes are interesting because they can achieve good values of  $k/n$ ,  $d/n$ , and also generally have good decoding algorithms.

A quantum LDPC code is a stabilizer code for which each generator has low weight and each qubit appears in only a small number of generators. One might try to make good quantum LDPC codes using the CSS construction, based on pairs of classical LDPC codes  $C_1(n)$  and  $C_2(n)$ . Suppose that one finds a family of such codes which produce  $[[n, k, d]]$  quantum codes with  $k/n$  and  $d/n$  both constant as  $n$  gets large. Show that this family of quantum codes must be degenerate for large  $n$ .

[No such family is known in the quantum case. The point of the problem is that, because degeneracy is important to find such codes, the quantum case is not a straightforward application of the CSS construction.]