

We now look at two detailed applications of group theory in classical and quantum error correction.

## 1 Classical Error Correcting codes(Hamming Codes)

We would like to send  $k$  bits  $m_1, m_2 \dots m_k$  over a noisy communication channel. The potential  $2^k$  bits live in a  $k$  dimensional vector space  $F_2^k = F_2 \otimes F_2 \dots F_2$  over the finite field  $F_2$ . What is done is that these  $2^k$  codes are padded with  $n-k$  *parity* bits to make an  $n$  bit encoded message in an  $2^n$  dimensional vector space. These extra parity bits are set so that they obey  $n-k$  linearly independent constraints known as *parity checks*. Each of these parity checks can be thought of as a vector in  $F_2^n$ :  $H(i) = H_1(i) \dots H_n(i)$ . The constraint is that all codewords must have a vanishing scalar product with the parity check  $H(i)$  i.e  $H(i).c = \sum_{j=1}^{j=n} H_j(i)c_j = 0$  with  $i = 1, \dots, n-k$ . These parity checks can be assembled into a matrix called the *parity check matrix* as follows

$$H = \begin{pmatrix} H_1(1) & H_2(1) & H_3(1) \dots & H_n(1) \\ \vdots & & \dots & \vdots \\ H_1(n-k) & H_2(n-k) & H_3(n-k) \dots & H_n(n-k) \end{pmatrix} \quad (1)$$

We can then write our parity condition as merely

$$H.c = 0 \quad (2)$$

The linear code  $\mathcal{C}$  with  $(n-k) \times n$  parity check matrix  $H$  consists of the  $2^k$  vectors  $c \in F_2^n$  that satisfy the parity check condition. The vectors  $c$  are referred to as codewords. Note that the linear code  $\mathcal{C}$  also forms a vector space as can be easily verified.

Since linear code  $\mathcal{C}$  for a  $k$  dimensional subspace there is a basis for the codewords  $b_1, \dots, b_k$  i.e

$$c = \sum_{j=1}^{j=k} m_j b_j \quad (3)$$

It is useful to introduced what is called the generator matrix  $G$  which is formed by assembling it from the basis vectors as columns i.e

$$G = \begin{pmatrix} b_1 & \dots & b_k \\ \vdots & \dots & \vdots \end{pmatrix} \quad (4)$$

The codespace is then the column space of  $G$ . Thus the linear transformation  $G$  can be thought of as a map  $G : F_2^k \rightarrow F_2^n$  that encodes the message,  $m$ , into the codeword  $c$ :

$$c = Gm \quad (5)$$

where

$$m = \begin{pmatrix} m_1 \\ m_2 \\ \vdots \\ m_k \end{pmatrix} \quad (6)$$

Combining 1.2 and 1.5 we find a different way of defining the linear error correcting code  $C$

$$0 = H G m \quad (7)$$

Since the above equation is true for all  $m \in F_2^k$  we have that

$$0 = H G \quad (8)$$

Now, note that the  $(n-k)$  columns of the  $H^T$  are linearly independent and from 1.8 we have that

$$0 = G^T H^T \quad (9)$$

So we can define a *dual* code space  $C_\perp$  that has as its generator matrix  $H^T$  and its parity check matrix is  $G^T$  we thus re-write 1.9 as

$$H_\perp G_\perp = 0 \quad (10)$$

Since the rows of  $G^T$  are a basis of  $C$  1.10 says that any basis for  $C$  is orthogonal to any basis for  $C_\perp$ . So any codeword in  $C_\perp$  is perpendicular to any code word in  $C$ .

## 1.1 Errors, Hamming Weight and Distance

Because we are assuming a noisy communication channel, the codeword  $c$ , we send will in general not be the message received at the other end. Let us call the received message  $y$ . Having done this we can define an error vector  $e$  as such:

$$e = y - c = \begin{pmatrix} e_1 \\ e_2 \\ \vdots \\ e_n \end{pmatrix} \quad (11)$$

If  $e_i = 0$  for all  $i$  then no errors occurred. We further make the assumption that any errors that accumulate are not correlated and occur with probability  $p_i$  for all  $i$ . We would like the decoder to look at the received message  $y$  and guess what error  $e_\star$  occurred and return the best guess  $\tilde{c}$  which is defined as follows:

$$\tilde{c} = y - e_\star \quad (12)$$

**Definition** The Hamming weight  $\text{wt}(x)$  of a vector  $x$  is equal to the number of its non-zero components  $x_i$

**Definition** The Hamming distance  $d(x,y)$  is the number of places that two vectors  $x$  and  $y$  differ.

**Theorem 1.1**  $d(x,y) = wt(x-y)$

**Proof** The places in which the two vectors are both zero when one takes the difference will not contribute to  $wt(x-y)$ . Thus the places in which they differ will contribute to  $wt(x-y)$  but these are precisely the places that also contribute to  $d(x,y)$ ,

An important property for a linear code  $C$  is the minimum distance  $d$  between any codewords.

$$d_{min} = \min d(c, c')_{c, c' \in C} \quad (13)$$

One can find a quick way of the finding  $d_{min}$  by noting the following: since  $d(x,y) = wt(x-y)$  and  $x-y \in C$  it then follows that there is a codeword in the linear code  $C$  that is equal to  $d_{min}$  so all one needs to do in order to find  $d_{min}$  is to find the codeword with the least hamming weight.

A linear code  $C$  with length  $n$ , dimension  $k$  and  $d_{min}$  is referred to as a  $[n,k,d]$  code.

**Theorem 1.2** A linear code  $C$  with minimum distance  $d$  can correct  $t = \lfloor \frac{d-1}{2} \rfloor$  bit errors

**Proof** Imagine a space in which points in that space are codewords in  $F_2^n$  and the distance between those points is equal to the hamming distance between the codewords. Let  $s \in F_2^n$  and a sphere of radius  $r$  between the set of all vectors  $v$  such that  $d(s,v) \leq r$ . IF spheres of radius  $t$  are placed around each point then none of the spheres will overlap since  $2t \leq d-1$ . Thus if in a received word  $y$ , no more than  $t$  errors occur, that word will lie in one and only one sphere and nearest neighbor decoding will correctly identify original codeword. If spheres of radius of  $t+1$  are put around the points then some of the spheres will overlap since the diameter will be  $d+1$ . Thus if  $t+1$  errors occur in a received word  $y$ , then it will lie in the overlap region and if  $d(y, c') < t+1$  then nearest neighbor decoding will give  $c'$  as the original codeword which will be wrong.

## 1.2 Error Detection and Correction

The parity check matrix  $H$  produces a linear transformation from  $F_2^n \rightarrow F_2^{n-k}$ . The image of the parity check matrix is called the error syndrome. It is important to note at this point that kernel of this mapping is our linear code  $C$  i.e

$$ker(H) = C \quad (14)$$

We can now define cosets of the linear code  $C$  as

$$x + C = \{x + c \mid c \in C\} \quad (15)$$

for  $x \in F_2^n$

**Definition** Let  $g + C$  be a coset of  $C$ . The vector  $I$  of minimum weight in this coset is called the coset leader. If there exists more than one then randomly pick one.

The cosets allow us to define the quotient group  $F_2^n / C$  since  $F_2^n$  is an abelian group and  $C$  is a normal subgroup. By the first Isomorphism theorem  $F_2^{n-k} \simeq F_2^n / C$ . We thus have a one to one correspondence between the possible error syndromes and the available cosets. This allows one to define a maximum likelihood detection scheme. Let  $y$  be the received vector and let  $g + C$  be the coset it belongs to. Thus  $y = g + x$  for some  $x$  in  $C$ . Let  $c$  be the transmitted codeword so that the error  $e = y - c = g + (x - c)$  so  $e \in g + C$ . Therefore the most probable error  $e_p$  is the vector in  $g + C$  that has the minimum weight. The decoder thus returns  $\tilde{c} = y - I$  as the most probable transmitted codeword.

In this application we used an abelian group as a setting for the codewords and identified the possible errors with elements of the quotient group.

## 2 Quantum Error Correction (Stabilizer formalism)

A quantum error correcting code (QECC) that encodes  $k$  qubits into  $n$  qubits is defined through an encoding map  $\zeta$  from the  $k$ -qubit Hilbert space  $H^k$  onto a  $2^k$  dimensional subspace  $C_q$  of the  $n$ -qubit Hilbert space  $H^n$ . It is required to be unitary. We choose the single-qubit computational basis states (CB) to be the eigenstates of  $\sigma_z^j$  i.e

$$\sigma_z^j |\delta_j\rangle = (-1)^{\delta_j} |\delta_j\rangle \quad (16)$$

where  $j$  labels the qubits. The CB states for  $H^k$  are formed by taking all possible direct products of the single-qubits CB states:

$$|\delta\rangle \equiv |\delta_1 \dots \delta_k\rangle = |\delta_1\rangle \otimes \dots \otimes |\delta_k\rangle \quad (17)$$

This establishes a one to one correspondence between the unencoded states  $|\delta\rangle = |\delta_1 \dots \delta_k\rangle$  and encoded states  $|\overline{\delta}\rangle = |\overline{\delta_1 \dots \delta_k}\rangle$  so we have that:

$$|\overline{\delta_1 \dots \delta_k}\rangle = \zeta |\delta_1 \dots \delta_k\rangle \quad (18)$$

Also we have that  $\sigma_z^j \rightarrow Z_j = \zeta \sigma_z^j \zeta^\dagger$

Quantum stabilizer codes,  $C_q$  is identified with a unique subspace that is fixed by elements of an abelian subgroup  $S$  known as the stabilizer group. More specifically we have that for all  $|c\rangle \in C_q$

$$s |c\rangle = |c\rangle \quad (19)$$

The stabilizer group is a subgroup of the Pauli group which is a group consisting of n-fold distinct tensor product of the Pauli operators  $\sigma_z, \sigma_y, \sigma_x$  and the identity operator

## 2.1 Stabilizer Group

The stabilizer group  $S$  is constructed from a set of n-k operators  $g_1, \dots, g_{n-k}$  known as the generators of  $S$  because each element in the stabilizer group can be each element can be written as a unique product of powers of the generators

$$s = g_1^{p_1} \dots g_{n-k}^{p_{n-k}} \quad (20)$$

Because the stabilizer group is abelian the generators are mutually commuting operators, Hermitian and unitary operators and of order 2. As a consequence of their order their eigenvalues are merely  $\pm 1$ .

As the parent space  $H^n$  is  $2^n$  dimensional we need n commuting operators to specify a unique state in the Hilbert space. In fact these n operators can be chosen to be the following:  $g_1 \dots g_{n-k}; Z_1 \dots Z_k$  and the  $2^n$  simultaneous eigenstates of these operators can be chosen to be the basis for  $H^n$ . These eigenstates can be labeled by strings  $l = l_1, \dots, l_{n-k}; \delta = \delta_1 \dots \delta_k$  so that

$$g_i |l, \delta\rangle = (-1)^{l_i} |l, \delta\rangle \quad (21)$$

$$Z_j |l, \delta\rangle = (-1)^{\delta_j} |l, \delta\rangle \quad (22)$$

where  $i = 1 \dots n - k$ ,  $j = 1 \dots k$  and  $l_i$  and  $\delta_j = 0, 1$

Note that for a given string  $l = l_1 \dots l_{n-k}$  the set of  $2^k$  eigenstates  $|l; \delta\rangle$  span a subspace of  $H^n$  which can be labelled by the string l i.e  $C_q(l_1, l_2 \dots l_{n-k}) \equiv C_q(l)$  and provide a partition of  $H^n$  and the subspace determined by the stabilizer group is labeled as  $C_q(00 \dots 0)$ . In other words the subspace determined by the stabilizer group are those elements in the Hilbert that are left invariant under the action of the stabilizer group elements so  $s|c\rangle = |c\rangle \forall c \in C_q$

Modeling the noise in a quantum setting is more complicated than in the classical case. It is known to be exponentially hard to exactly simulate the noise acting for example in a quantum circuit. Thus if we are to study the noise in a quantum circuit and how to apply QECC we have to assume a model of the errors that can be efficiently simulated on a classical computer. For this discussion we will model the noise as simply the random application of  $\sigma_x, \sigma_y$  and  $\sigma_z$  with probabilities  $p_x, p_y$  and  $p_z$  respectively. The  $\sigma_x$  operator flips a qubit,  $\sigma_z$  potentially changes the phase of the qubit and  $\sigma_y$  does a combination of both. To prove the above behavior apply the operators to the state  $|+\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|0\rangle + |1\rangle)$  and  $|-\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|0\rangle - |1\rangle)$  which form a basis for the one qubit hilbert space.

So what we have is that elements of the stabilizer group can be labelled by bit strings of length  $n - k$   $p = p_1 \dots p_{n-k} \in F_2^{n-k}$

**Theorem 2.1** Let  $E$  be an error operator and  $C_q$  a quantum stabilizer code with generators  $g_1, \dots, g_{n-k}$ . The image  $E(C_q)$  of  $C_q$  under  $E$  is  $C(l)$  with  $l = l_1 \dots l_{n-k}$ .

$$l_i = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } [E, g_i] = 0 \\ 1 & \text{if } \{E, g_i\} = 0 \end{cases}$$

**Proof** We assume what will be proved later, that is  $E$  either commutes or anti-commutes with  $g_i$ . So  $g_i E |c\rangle = (-1)^{l_i} E g_i |c\rangle = (-1)^{l_i} E |c\rangle$  where  $l_i = \{0, 1\}$ . This means that corrupted state is an eigenvector of the generators. Now  $\{|l; \delta\rangle : l \in H_2^{n-k}, \delta \in H_2^k\}$  span  $H_2^n$  and so  $E |c\rangle = \sum_l \sum_\delta a(l; \delta) |l; \delta\rangle$ . Because  $E$  commutes or anti-commutes with all the generators and  $|l; \delta\rangle$  are eigenvectors of the generator, this all implies that sum over  $l$  does not exist and we only have one particular value of  $l$ . Therefore  $E |c\rangle = \sum_\delta a(l; \delta) |l; \delta\rangle$ . This means that the error takes the element of the code space to a specific subspace of  $C(l)$ . Therefore  $E(C_q) \subset C(l)$ . But these vector spaces are the same dimension so they are in fact equal.  $\square$

The lesson to take is that for each  $E$  we can attach a syndrome measurement  $S(E) = l_1 \dots l_{n-k}$

### Example

#### *Quantum Stabilizer Code for Phase Flip Channel*

$$\eta : H_s^1 \mapsto C_q \subset H_2^3$$

We need 2 generators  $\{g_1, g_2\}$ . There 8 possible errors. We want to protect our state against a phase flip. Thus there are three possible errors  $E_1 = \sigma_z^1, E_2 = \sigma_z^2, E_3 = \sigma_z^3$ . Depending on whether we have  $|0\rangle, |1\rangle$  we will have a phase flip or not. The phase flip will show up as a change in the relative phase. So we choose eigenstates of  $\sigma_x^1 \sigma_x^2, \sigma_x^2 \sigma_x^3$  as elements of our code subspace.

#### *Error Syndrome*

$$S(E) = (1, 0)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \{\sigma_z^1, \sigma_x^1 \sigma_x^2\} &= 0 \\ [\sigma_z^1, \sigma_x^2 \sigma_x^3] &= 0 \end{aligned}$$

$$S(E) = (1, 1)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \{\sigma_z^2, \sigma_x^1 \sigma_x^2\} &= 0 \\ [\sigma_z^2, \sigma_x^2 \sigma_x^3] &= 0 \end{aligned}$$

$$S(E) = (0, 1)$$

$$\begin{aligned} [\sigma_z^3, \sigma_x^1 \sigma_x^2] &= 0 \\ \{\sigma_z^3, \sigma_x^2 \sigma_x^3\} &= 0 \end{aligned}$$

Elements of the stabilizer group are of the form  $s(p) = g_1^{p_1} g_2^{p_2}$   $p_1, p_2 \in \{0, 1\}$   
So  $S = \{I, \sigma_x^1 \sigma_x^3, \sigma_x^1 \sigma_x^2, \sigma_x^1 \sigma_x^3\}$

## 2.2 Deeper Study of Stabilizer Formalism

The Pauli group  $G_n$  has elements written as  $e = i^\lambda \sigma_{j_1}^1 \otimes \dots \otimes \sigma_{j_n}^n$  where  $\lambda = \{0, 1, 2, 3\}, j_k = \{I, x, y, z\}$ . Since  $\sigma_y^k = -i\sigma_x^k \sigma_z^k$  we can always write the elements of the Pauli group as  $e = i^\lambda \sigma_x(a) \sigma_z(b)$  where  $a = a_1 \dots a_n$  and  $b = b_1 \dots b_n$ .  $a$  and  $b$  are  $n$  bit strings. We will work with the quotient group  $G_n/C$   $C = \{\pm I, \pm iI\}$ .

**Theorem 2.2** 1. The order of  $G_n$  and  $G_n/C$  are  $2^{2n+2}$  and  $2^{2n}$  respectively.

2.  $\forall e \in G_n, e^2 = \pm I, e^\dagger = \pm e, e^{-1} = e^\dagger$

3.  $\forall e, f \in G_n$  either  $[e, f] = 0$  or  $\{e, f\} = 0$

**Proof** The order of the group is a trivial exercise in combinatorics. We move on to the second claim.  $e^2 = i^{2\lambda} \sigma_{j_1}^1 \otimes \dots \otimes \sigma_{j_n}^n \sigma_{j_1}^1 \otimes \dots \otimes \sigma_{j_n}^n = (-1)^\lambda (-1)^{a \cdot b} \sigma_x(a)^2 \sigma_z(b)^2 = (-1)^{\lambda+a \cdot b} I \implies \pm I$ .

$e^\dagger = (-i)^\lambda \sigma_z(b)^\dagger \sigma_x(a)^\dagger = (-1)^{a \cdot b} (-1)^\lambda (i)^\lambda \sigma_x(a) \sigma_z(b) = \pm e$ . Lastly, we prove that the elements either commute or anti-commute. Let  $e = i^{\lambda_e} \sigma_x(a_e) \sigma_z(b_e)$ ,  $f = i^{\lambda_f} \sigma_x(a_f) \sigma_z(b_f)$ . The  $ef = (i)^{\lambda_e + \lambda_f} \sigma_x(a_e) \sigma_z(b_e) \sigma_x(a_f) \sigma_z(b_f) = (i)^{\lambda_e + \lambda_f} (-1)^{b_e \cdot a_f} \sigma_x(a_e) \sigma_x(a_f) \sigma_z(b_e) \sigma_z(b_f) = (i)^{\lambda_e + \lambda_f} (-1)^{b_e \cdot a_f} (-1)^{a_e \cdot b_f} \sigma_x(a_f) \sigma_z(b_f) \sigma_x(a_e) \sigma_z(b_e) = (-1)^{b_e \cdot a_f + a_e \cdot b_f} f e$   $\Gamma = b_e \cdot a_f + a_e \cdot b_f \in \mathbb{Z}$  if  $\Gamma$  is even then the elements commute and if  $\Gamma$  is odd then the elements anti-commute  $\square$

### 2.2.1 Errors

Errors having a vanishing syndrome  $S(E) = 0$  commute with all generators of the stabilizer group. Let  $C(S)$  be the set of error  $e \in G_n$  that commute with  $e \in S$ .  $C(S)$  is called the centralizer. The centralizer is a subgroup of  $G_n$ . 1. The centralizer has the identity since  $[I, S] = 0 \forall s \in S$ , 2. For  $g \in C(S)$  we have  $[g, s] = 0 \forall s \in S$  so  $gs = sg$  so  $g^{-1}ggs = sggg^{-1}$  but  $g^2 = I \implies g^{-1}a = sg^{-1} \implies [g^{-1}, s] = 0$  so  $g^{-1} \in C(S)$ . Since the stabilizer group is Abelian  $S \subset C(S)$ . If an even  $e \in C(S)$  is in  $S$  then it needs no error correction if it is in  $C(S - S)$  it will not be detectable. Furthermore  $C(S)$  is a normal subgroup of  $G_n$ . The proof proceeds as follows.

Let  $c \in C(S), s \in S, g \in G_n$ . We have  $csc^{-1} \in S$ . Now look at  $gc(g^{-1}sg)^{-1} = g(g^{-1}sg)cg^{-1} = s(gc g^{-1}) \in C(S)$ . Therefore  $C(S)$  is normal. A slightly more abstract way is to notice that  $G_n$  acts on  $S$  by conjugation with the kernel being  $C(S)$ . Now a kernel is a group and moreover a normal subgroup. This all means we can create the quotient group  $G_n/C(S)$ .

**Theorem 2.3** *Two elements  $e_1, e_2$  are in the same coset iff they have the same error syndrome.*

**Proof** If they are in the same coset then they differ by an element  $c$  of  $C(S)$ . Let  $e_2 = e_1c$ . Consider  $e_1g_i |d\rangle$  with  $|d\rangle$  being a code word. So  $e_2c^{-1}g_i |d\rangle = e_2g_i c^{-1} |d\rangle = e_2g_i |d\rangle = e_1g_i |d\rangle$ . In other direction,  $e_2e_1g = ge_2e_1$  so the product belongs in the centralizer. Product commutes because  $e_1, e_2$  have the same syndrome measurement. Therefore  $\exists c \in C(S)$  such that  $e_2e_1 = c \implies e_1 = ce_2^{-1}$ . Proving the theorem

The result is that different error syndromes are in 1-1 relation with the cosets of the centralizer.

**Theorem 2.4**  $|G_n : C(S)| = \text{number of cosets is } 2^{n-k}$ .

**Proof** Each coset corresponds to a unique syndrome measurement. The number of syndrome measurements is  $2^{n-k}$

**Theorem 2.5** *The number of elements in  $C(S) = 2^{n+k+2}$*

**Proof** By Lagrange's theorem  $\frac{|G_n|}{|C(S)|} = |G_n : C(S)|$ . So  $\frac{|G_n|}{|G_n : C(S)|} = |C(S)| = \frac{2^{n+2}}{2^{n-k}} = 2^{n+k+2}$

Now  $C(S)/S$  has elements that commute with the stabilizer generators but change the codeword. They turn out to be the logical operators.