# Magic States Distillation Using Quantum LDPC Codes.

#### David Ponarovsky

March 14, 2024

### 1 Good Codes With Large $\Lambda$ .

**Claim 1.1.** Let  $v_1, v_2..v_k$  vectors in  $\mathbb{F}_2^n$ , then there are  $u_1, u_2..u_{k'}$  for k' > k/2. Such span  $\{u_1, u_2..u_{k'}\} \subset \text{span } \{v_1, v_2..v_k\}$  and for any i, j it holds that  $u_i u_j = 0$ .

```
ı Let J \leftarrow \emptyset
ı Let J \leftarrow \emptyset
                                                                                2 for i \in [k/3] do
2 for i \in [k/2] do
                                                                                        J \leftarrow J \cup \{v_{3i-2}, v_{3i-1}, v_{3i}\}
        J \leftarrow J \cup \{v_{2i-1}, v_{2i}\}
3
                                                                                        for S \subset J do
        for S \subset J do
4
                                                                                              Compute the vector m_S
             Compute the vector m_S
5
                                                                                                 define as
                define as m_{S,j} = u_j \sum_{w \in S} w
6
                                                                                                m_{S,j,j'} = u_{j'}u_j \sum_{w \in S} w
        Pick S such m_S=0 and set
                                                                                        Pick S such m_S = 0 and set
        u_i \leftarrow \sum_{w \in S} w Choose randomly w \in S and set
                                                                                        \begin{array}{l} u_i \leftarrow \sum_{w \in S} w \\ \text{Choose randomly } w \in S \text{ and set} \end{array}
          J \leftarrow J/w
                                                                               10 end
  : Find commuted vectors u_1, u_2, ... u_{k'}
                                                                                  : Find commuted vectors u_1, u_2, ... u_{k'}
```

*Proof.* Consider Algorithm 1a, We are going to prove that at line number (8) the alg always finds a subset S that satisfies the equality. Assume not. On one hand, the number of possible values that  $m_S$  can have is  $2^i - 1$ . On the other hand, since J contains i + 1 vectors on the ith iteration, it follows that the number of subsets is  $2^{i+1} - 1 \ge 2^i$ .

Therefore, there must be at least two different subsets S and S' such that  $u_S=u_{S'}$ . However, this means that

$$m_{S\Delta S',j} = u_j \sum_{w \in S\Delta S'} w = u_j \left( \sum_{w \in S\Delta S'} w + 2 \sum_{w \in S\cap S'} w \right)$$
$$= m_{S,j} + m_{S',j} = 0$$

Thus,  $m_{S\Delta S'}=0$ . Additionally, it is clear that the rank does not decrease, as for  $u_i$ , there exists one  $v_j$  such that only  $u_i$  is supported by  $v_j$ .

Claim 1.2. Let  $v_1, v_2..v_k$  vectors in  $\mathbb{F}_2^n$  and m be an integer m < k, then there are  $u_1, u_2..u_{k'}$  for k' > k/2-m. Such span  $\{u_1, u_2..u_{k'}\} \subset \text{span } \{v_{m+1}, v_{m+2}..v_k\}$ , for any i, j it holds that  $u_iu_j = 0$  and for any  $i \in ]k'$ ,  $j \leq m$  it holds that  $u_iv_j = 0$ .

*Proof.* Modify the Algorithm 1a as follows, Initialize  $u_1, ... u_m$  to be  $v_1, ..., v_m$  and  $J = \{v_{m+1}, ... v_{2m+2}\}$ . Notice that in the *i*th iteration, for the counting argument to works in the proof of Claim 1.1, we have to ensure that:

$$|J| \ge m+i+1, \text{ So } m+i+1 \le k-m-i$$
 
$$\Rightarrow i \le k/2-m-\frac{1}{2}$$

П

In the end,  $u_{m+1}, u_{m+2}, ..., u_{k'}$  will satisfy the equations.

**Claim 1.3.** Let  $v_1, v_2..v_k$  vectors in  $\mathbb{F}_2^n$ , then there are  $u_1, u_2..u_{k'}$  for k' > k/4. Such span  $\{u_1, u_2..u_{k'}\} \subset span \{v_1, v_2..v_k\}$ . And for any  $i, j \sum u_{i,k}u_{j,k} =_4 0$ .

*Proof.* Use the Algorithm 1a twice. However, in the second iteration, define  $m_{S,j}$  to be the product of module 4. Note that  $m_{S,j}$  must be either 4n or 4n+2. Thus, we can follow the proof of Claim 1.1.

**Claim 1.4.** [COMMENT] Complete for the above the version, which handle triples. number of options is  $(2^i)^2 = 2^{2i}$  and therefore we have the correctness if |J| > 2i + 1.

**Claim 1.5.** Consider the Left-Right  $(\Delta,n)$ -Complex  $\Gamma$ . dim  $C_X/C_Z^{\perp} \cap C_Z/C_X^{\perp}$  is linear in n.

*Proof.* The rates of both  $C_X/C_Z^{\perp}$  and  $C_Z^{\perp}/C_X^{\perp}$  are  $(2\rho-1)^2$ , where  $\rho$  can be any number in the range (0,1) [LZ22]. Consider choosing  $\rho$  such that the rates of the quotient spaces are strictly greater than  $\frac{1}{2} + \alpha$ . This implies that the rate of their intersection is greater than  $2\alpha$ .

**Corollary 1.1.** Fix the rate of the small codes  $C_A$  and  $C_B$  to  $\rho = \frac{1}{2} + \alpha$ . There is a subspace  $\Lambda \subset C_X/C_Z^{\perp}$  at rate  $\frac{1}{4} \cdot 2\alpha$  such that for any  $x \in \Lambda$  and  $y, z \in C_Z^{\perp} \cup \Lambda$  it holds that:

1. 
$$xy =_4 0$$

2. 
$$xyz =_4 \sum_i x_i y_i z_i =_4 0$$

**Claim 1.6.** Consider  $C, \Lambda$  and  $C', \Lambda'$  defined in ??. Denote by  $\bar{\Lambda}$  the subspace  $C/\Lambda$ . Then:

$$d(C'/\bar{\Lambda}') > d(C/\bar{\Lambda})$$

*Proof.* The way we perform Guess elimination is critical. We want to make sure that we do not add an  $\Lambda$  row to a  $\bar{\Lambda}$  row. [COMMENT] Continue, Easy. Just need to perform the row reduction when rows of  $\Lambda$  at bottom, and then rotate the matrix  $\frown$ 

$$\begin{bmatrix} A & B \\ C & D \end{bmatrix} \curvearrowright \begin{bmatrix} D & C \\ B & A \end{bmatrix}$$

**Claim 1.7** (Not Formal). It is easy to see that by using concatenation again, one can obtain the code dim  $\Lambda' \leftarrow \frac{1}{2} \dim \Lambda'$ . For any  $x \in \text{gen } \Lambda'$ ,  $|x|_4 = 1$ , and for any  $x \in C'/\Lambda'$ , we have  $|x|_4 = 0$ .

**Proof.** [COMMENT] We will do it by iterating the generators of C after performing rows reduction to the generator matrix. Now we will concatenate the i coordinate to complete the weight of the ith row to satisfy the requirements.

### 2 Compute $|C_Z^{\perp}\rangle$ In Constant Depth.

Let  $C_0$  be a  $\Delta$ -length error linear binary code,  $\Gamma$  a  $\Delta$ -regular bipartite graph, and let  $C_Z$  be the Tanner code defined by  $C_0$  and  $\Gamma$ . We are about to prove that the uniform superposition over  $C_Z^{\perp}$  codewords can be computed at a depth dependent only on  $\Delta$ , in particular independent of the  $C_Z^{\perp}$ -length. For this, we are going to use Proposition 10 in [MN98], which states that both the encoder and the decoder of any stabilizer m-length code can be implemented by a circuit at depth  $\Theta(\log m)$  with  $\Theta(m^2)$  ancillae.

Claim 2.1. Let G be a  $\Delta$ -regular bipartite graph, and denote by  $C_Z^\perp$  the dual-tanner code  $\mathcal{T}(G,C_0^\perp)^\perp$ . Then there is a circuit that computes the state  $|C_Z^\perp\rangle$  at  $\Theta(\log \Delta)$  depth, and  $\Theta(\Delta^2)n$  ancillary qubits.

*Proof.* Let  $E_v$  and  $D_v$  be the encoder and the decoder of  $C_0$  over the local view of vertex v, By [MN98] we have that both have depth  $\Theta(\log \Delta)$  and require  $\Delta^2$  ancillae. Since  $\Gamma$  is bipartite, we can decompose V into  $V^-$  and  $V^+$  such that the local views of any two vertices in  $V^\pm$  are disjoint. Therefore, for any two different vertices  $v, u \in V^\pm$ , the encoders  $E_v$  and  $E_u$  act on disjoint subsets of qubits, each corresponding to the local view of either v or v. Consider the following algorithm:

- ${f 1}$  Initialize 2n qubits.
- <sup>2</sup> Call the left and right segments L and R.
- 3 Apply  $E_v$  in parallel on L for any  $v \in V^+$ .
- 4 Apply  $E_v$  in parallel on R for any  $v \in V^-$ .
- ${\mathfrak s}\,$  XOR R into L by applying CNOT from the  $i{\rm th}$  bit of R to the  $i{\rm th}$  bit of L.
- 6 Apply  $D_v$  in parallel on R for any  $v \in V^-$ .

**Algorithm 1:** Compute  $|C_Z^{\perp}\rangle$ 

For any  $v \in V$  denote by  $|z_v\rangle$  the superposition of  $C_0$  codewords supported by v local view, and for any subset of vertices  $W \subset V$  denote by  $|z_W\rangle = |\sum_{v \in W} z_v\rangle$ . Using the notation we have that applying at once all the encoders  $E_v$  over the positive vertices result into:

$$(\bigcup_{v \in V^+} E_v) |0\rangle^n = (\bigcup_{v \in V^+/v_0} E_v) |z_{v_0} + 0\rangle = |z_{V^+}\rangle$$

Thus the whole computation sum up into:

$$(\cup_{v \in V^{+}} E_{v}) \otimes (\cup_{v \in V^{+}} E_{v}) \qquad |0\rangle^{n} \otimes |0\rangle^{n} \mapsto$$

$$CNOT \sum_{v \in V^{+}} \sum_{u \in V^{-}} |z_{v}\rangle |z_{u}\rangle \mapsto$$

$$I \otimes (\cup_{v \in V^{-}} D) \sum_{v \in V^{+}} \sum_{u \in V^{-}} |z_{v}\rangle |z_{u}\rangle \mapsto$$

$$\sum_{v \in V^{+}} \sum_{u \in V^{-}} |z_{v}\rangle |0\rangle$$

# 3 Distillate $|\Lambda + C_Z^{\perp}\rangle$ Into Magic.

Let  $|f\rangle$  be a codeword in  $C_X$ , and let  $\hat{X}_g$  be the indicator that equals 1 if f has support on generator g, and 0 otherwise. Observe that applying  $T^{\otimes}$  on  $|f\rangle$  yields the state:

$$\begin{split} T^{\otimes n} \left| f \right\rangle &= T^{\otimes n} \left| \sum_g \hat{X}_g g \right\rangle = \exp \left( i \pi / 4 \sum_g \hat{X}_g |g| - 2 \cdot i \pi / 4 \sum_{g,h} \hat{X}_g \hat{X}_h |g \cdot h| \right. \\ &+ 4 \cdot i \pi / 4 \sum_{g,h} \hat{X}_g \hat{X}_h \hat{X}_l |g \cdot h \cdot l| - 8 \cdot i \pi / 4 \cdot \text{ integers} \right) \left| f \right\rangle \\ &= \exp \left( i \pi / 4 \sum_g \hat{X}_g |g| - 2 \cdot \pi / 4 \sum_{g,h} \hat{X}_g \hat{X}_h |g \cdot h| + 4 \cdot i \pi / 4 \sum_{g,h} \hat{X}_g \hat{X}_h \hat{X}_l |g \cdot h \cdot l| \right) \left| f \right\rangle \end{split}$$

So in our case:

$$\begin{split} T^{\otimes n} \left| f \right\rangle &= \\ &= \exp \left( i \pi / 4 \sum_{g \in \text{ gen } \Lambda} \hat{X}_g \right. \\ &\left. - 2 \cdot \pi / 4 \sum_{g,h \in \text{ gen } C_Z^{\perp}} \hat{X}_g \hat{X}_h |g \cdot h| \right. \\ &\left. + 4 \cdot i \pi / 4 \sum_{g,h \in \text{ gen } C_Z^{\perp}} \hat{X}_g \hat{X}_h \hat{X}_l |g \cdot h \cdot l| \right) |f\rangle \end{split}$$

So eventually, we have a product of gates when non-Clifford gates are applied on only on generators of  $C_Z^{\perp}$ .

$$T^n \left| f \right\rangle = \prod_{g \in \, \text{gen } \Lambda} T_g \quad \prod_{g,h \in \, \text{gen } C_Z^\perp} \{CS_{g,h} | CZ_{g,h} | I \} \quad \prod_{g,h,l \in \, \text{gen } C_Z^\perp} \{CCZ_{g,h,l} | I \} \left| f \right\rangle$$

Decompose  $f = f_1 + f_2$ , where  $f_1$  is supported only on  $C_X/C_Z^{\perp}$  and  $f_2$  is supported only on  $C_Z^{\perp}$ . By using commuting relations, the above can be turned into.

$$\begin{split} T^n \left| f \right\rangle &= \prod_{g \in \, \text{gen } \Lambda} T_g \ X_{f_1} \\ & \prod_{g,h \in \, \text{gen } \, C^\perp_Z} \{ CS_{g,h} | CZ_{g,h} | I \} \ \prod_{g,h,l \in \, \text{gen } \, C^\perp_Z} \{ CCZ_{g,h,l} | I \} \left| f_2 \right\rangle \end{split}$$

Denote by  $M_1, M_2$  the gates:

$$\begin{split} M_1 &= \prod_{g \in \text{ gen } \Lambda, h} \{CZ_{g,h}|I\} \\ M_2 &= \prod_{g,h \in \text{ gen } C_Z^{\perp}} \{CS_{g,h}|CZ_{g,h}|I\} \quad \prod_{g,h,l \in \text{ gen } C_Z^{\perp}} \{CCZ_{g,h,l}|I\} \end{split}$$

And then we get that

$$\begin{split} \prod_{g \in \text{ gen } \Lambda} T_g \left| f \right\rangle &= M_1^\dagger T^n M_2^\dagger \left| f \right\rangle \\ \prod_{g \in \text{ gen } \Lambda} T_g \left| f \right\rangle &= M_1^\dagger T^n \; \; E \; \; L[M_2^\dagger] \; \; |L[f] \rangle \end{split}$$

Claim 3.1. Let  $v \in V^-$ , and let  $g_1$  be the generator supported by v, which matches an assignment of a codeword in  $C_A \otimes C_B$  on the local view of v. Denote by  $U_{v,g_1}$  the control-gate which, depending on the control bit (v,1), turns on  $g_1$  over the edges associated with the local view of v in the graph G. Then, the depth of  $U_{v,g_1}$  depend only on  $\Delta$ .

**Claim 3.2.** Let  $(v, g_1)$  and  $(u, g_2)$  be control wires for two different generators in the graph G. Then  $U_{v,g_1}$  and  $U_{u,g_2}$  [COMMENT] There must be a claim about the relationship between two different generators intersection, But I don't sure exactly why.

**Definition 3.1.** We say that a quantum circuit C is well error spreading if the light cone define by any T.



#### Claim 3.3. The state:

$$\begin{split} \sum_{z \in C_Z^\perp} \exp \Big( - 2 \cdot \pi/4 \sum_{g,h \in \text{ gen } C_Z^\perp} \hat{X}_g \hat{X}_h |g \cdot h| \\ + 4 \cdot i \pi/4 \sum_{g,h \in \text{ gen } C_Z^\perp} \hat{X}_g \hat{X}_h \hat{X}_l |g \cdot h \cdot l| \Big) \, |z\rangle \end{split}$$

Can be computed such that any

*Proof.* Denote by  $U_v$  the gate which turn on all the generators supported on v. As any of them is just of a code word of  $C_A \otimes C_B$ , namely turning on generator require touching at most constant number of qubits combing

**Claim 3.4.** The state  $\left(M_2^{\dagger} \otimes I\right) |C_Z^{\perp} + \Lambda\rangle |0\rangle$  can be computed, such that the light cone depth of any non-clifford gate is bounded by constant.

Proof.

$$(I \otimes H_X) CX_{n \to n} (E \otimes E) \quad I \otimes L[M_2^{\dagger}] \prod_{\substack{J \in \{ \text{gen } \Lambda, g \in J} \\ \text{gen } C_Z^{\perp} \}}} \prod_{j \in \{ \text{gen } \Lambda, g \in J} \left( I + X_{L[g]} \right) \qquad |0\rangle |0\rangle$$

$$= (I \otimes H_X) CX_{n \to n} \sum_{\substack{z \in C_Z^{\perp} \\ x \in \Lambda}} e^{\varphi(z)} \qquad |x\rangle |z\rangle$$

$$= \sum_{\substack{z \in C_Z^{\perp} \\ x \in \Lambda}} \left( M_2^{\dagger} \otimes I \right) \qquad |x + z\rangle |0\rangle$$

$$= \left( M_2^{\dagger} \otimes I \right) \qquad |C_Z^{\perp} + \Lambda\rangle |0\rangle$$

Denote by  $p \in [0, 1]$  the error rate of input magic states, and let  $|A\rangle$  be an ancilla initialized to a one-qubit magic state. This  $|A\rangle$  can be used to compute the T gate, with a probability of Z error occurring with a probability of p [BH12].

**Claim 3.5.** There are constant numbers  $\zeta_{\Delta}, \xi_{\Delta}$ , and a circuit  $\mathcal{C}$  such that:

1. In the no-noise setting, The circuit compute the state

$$\mathcal{C}\left|0\right\rangle^{\Theta(n)}\otimes\left|A\right\rangle^{\Theta(n)}\rightarrow\prod_{g\in\ \mathrm{gen}\ \Lambda}T_{g}\left|C_{Z}^{\perp}+\Lambda\right\rangle$$

2. Otherwise, the circuit computes the state

$$\mathcal{C}\left|0\right\rangle^{\Theta(n)}\otimes\left|A\right\rangle^{\Theta(n)}\to Z^{e}\prod_{g\in\operatorname{gen}\Lambda}T_{g}\left|C_{Z}^{\perp}+\Lambda
ight
angle$$

, where the probability that  $e_i=1$  is less than  $\zeta_{\Delta} \cdot p$ . Additionally, for any i, there are at most  $\xi_{\Delta}$  indices j such that  $e_i$  and  $e_j$  are dependent.

*Proof.* Concatinate the  $T^n \otimes I$  with the gate in Claim 3.4.

**Claim 3.6.** For any  $\alpha \in (0,1)$  the probability that  $|e| > (1+\alpha)p\zeta_{\Delta}$  is less than:

$$\mathbf{Pr}\left[|e| > (1+\alpha)\mathbf{E}\left[|e|\right]\right] < \frac{1 \cdot \xi_{\Delta} n}{\alpha^2 \zeta_{\Delta}^2 p^2 n^2} = o\left(1/n\right)$$

*Proof.* By the Chebyshev inequality, notice that the number for which  $\mathbf{E}\left[e_{i}e_{j}\right] - \mathbf{E}\left[e_{i}\right]\mathbf{E}\left[e_{j}\right] \neq 0$  is less than  $\xi_{\Delta}n$ .

**Definition 3.2.** We will said that a decoder  $\mathcal{D}$  for the good qunatum LDPC code is an good-local decoder if

- 1. There is a treashold  $\mu n$  such that if the error size is less than  $|e| < \mu n$  then  $\mathcal{D}$  correct e in constant number of rounds. With probability 1 o(1/n).
- 2. In any rounds  $\mathcal{D}$  performs at most O(n) work (depth  $\times$  width).
- 3. The above is true in operation-noisy settings, where there is a probability of p for an error to occur after acting on a qubit.  $(\star)$
- $\star$  The motivation for this is that if the decoder does not act on the qubit, then it also does not apply a T gate on it. Therefore, in the distillation setting, there is zero chance for an error to occur.

Claim 3.7. Suppose there is a good local decoder  $\mathcal{D}$  for the good qLDPC code. Then, there exists  $p_0$  such that for any sufficiently large n, there is a distillation protocol that, given  $\Theta(n)$  magic states at an error rate  $p < p_0$ , successfully distills  $\Theta(n)$  perfect magic states with a probability of 1 - o(1/n). Furthermore, the protocol's space and time complexity (both quantum and classical) are  $\Theta(n)$  and  $\Theta(n^2)$ , respectively.

#### References

- [MN98] Cristopher Moore and Martin Nilsson. *Parallel Quantum Computation and Quantum Codes.* 1998. arXiv: quant-ph/9808027 [quant-ph].
- [BH12] Sergey Bravyi and Jeongwan Haah. "Magic-state distillation with low overhead". In: *Physical Review A* 86.5 (2012), p. 052329.
- [LZ22] Anthony Leverrier and Gilles Zémor. *Quantum Tanner codes*. 2022. arXiv: 2202.13641 [quant-ph].