

Edge local complementation for logical cluster states

Jaewoo Joo

School of Physics and Astronomy, University of Leeds, Leeds LS2 9JT, UK

David L. Feder

Institute for Quantum Information Science, University of Calgary, Alberta T2N 1N4, Canada

Abstract. A method is presented for the implementation of edge local complementation in graph states, based on the application of two Hadamard operations and a single controlled-phase (CZ) gate. As an application, we demonstrate an efficient scheme to construct a one-dimensional logical cluster state based on the five-qubit quantum error-correcting code, using a sequence of edge local complementations. A single physical CZ operation, together with local operations, is sufficient to create a logical CZ operation between two logical qubits. The same construction can be used to generate any encoded graph state. This approach in concatenation may allow one to create a hierarchical quantum network for quantum information tasks.

1. Introduction

Multipartite entangled states are fundamental resources for quantum computation, with many mysteries yet to be understood [1]. A particularly useful and interesting set of multipartite entangled states are the so-called graph states [2]. These are quantum states associated with mathematical graphs, where vertices represent qubits in superposition states and edges represent the maximally entangling controlled-phase (CZ) gates between them. Building complex graph states is a difficult task in practice (i.e. in experiments), because it requires the application of CZ gates between arbitrary qubits; that said, considerable strides have been made in recent years [3]. It is nevertheless useful to consider the circumstances under which specific multipartite graph states can be constructed efficiently.

A class of particularly useful graph states are quantum error-correcting codes (QECCs). These are used to prevent quantum information leakage, since quantum information is generically fragile against interactions with the environment [4]. Standard QECCs can protect quantum information against an arbitrary error on a single qubit. Several schemes of measurement-based quantum computation with embedded quantum error correction have been recently proposed but the structure of logical cluster states is very complex [5, 6, 7]. Very recently, a concatenation scheme for a single logical qubit encoded in the five-qubit QECC (5QECC) has been studied in the graph-state context [8]. While topological approaches to fault-tolerance in graph-state quantum computation yield higher error thresholds [9], directly encoding the quantum information in QECC graphs might turn out to be more practical experimentally if efficient methods for constructing these states can be found.

We propose that multipartite graph states, which are useful for constructing logical cluster states with 5QECC, can be efficiently built by local Hadamard operations from simpler graph states. In this paper, we prove that the mathematical operation called *edge local complementation* (ELC) [10], which is defined by a series of *local complementation* (LC) operations on a graph [2, 11], is efficiently realizable in specific graph states because it is equivalent to the action of local Hadamard operations. From the mathematical point of view, LC transforms a given graph into another, with a different adjacency matrix; in practice, local complementation of a given vertex complements the subgraph corresponding to its neighborhood. From the quantum information point of view, LC corresponds to a set of local operations on a given graph state that therefore preserves any entanglement measure, yet describes a different graph state. Yet the cost of generating the new graph from a completely unentangled state would be significantly higher if the total number of edges is larger than in the original graph state. Our results indicate that the apparently complex nature of multipartite 5QECC states should not in itself be an impediment to their experimental generation, because they are in fact generically simple graphs under ELC.

This paper is organized as follows. We introduce the graph state notation in Section 2. The definition of edge local complementation and its equivalence to Hadamard

operations in graph states are discussed in Section 3. In Section 4, we present the step-wise method of building one-dimensional (1D) logical cluster states. Finally, we summarize our results with future research interests.

2. Background

Let us begin with the definition of graphs and graph operations. In graph theory, a graph $G = (V, E)$ is given by N vertices $V = \{a_1, \dots, a_N\}$ and edges E corresponding to a linked line between two adjacent (neighboring) vertices. We only consider simple graphs with no self-loops and no multiple edges. If a vertex $c \in V$ is chosen in a graph, the other vertices are represented by its n neighboring vertices $\mathcal{N}(c) = \{b_1, \dots, b_n\} \in V$ and outer vertices $V \setminus \{c, b_1, \dots, b_n\} = \{o_1, \dots, o_{N-n-1}\} \in V$. The neighborhood of all of the vertices is defined by the adjacency matrix A , an $N \times N$ symmetric matrix with elements $A_{ij} = 1$ iff $\{a_i, a_j\} \in E$.

All simple graphs correspond to a class of quantum states called *graph states* [2], in which each vertex is represented by a qubit in a superposition state and an edge corresponds to the application of a maximally entangling gate. Specifically, an N -qubit graph state $|G\rangle$ is defined as

$$|G\rangle = \bigotimes_{i \neq j} (CZ_{i,j})^{A_{ij}} |+\rangle^{\otimes N}, \quad (1)$$

where $|\pm\rangle = (|0\rangle \pm |1\rangle)/\sqrt{2}$ are the ± 1 -eigenstates of X (here $\{X, Y, Z\}$ are the 2×2 Pauli operators), and $CZ = \text{diag}(1, 1, 1, -1)$ is the controlled-phase (controlled- Z) gate acting between two qubits. Graph states can be defined in at least two equivalent ways, both of which will prove useful for our purposes. Because the CZ operations can be written as

$$\begin{aligned} CZ_{i,j} &= \frac{1}{2} (I_i I_j + I_i Z_j + Z_i I_j - Z_i Z_j) \\ &= \frac{1}{2} (1 + (-1)^{x_j} + (-1)^{x_i} - (-1)^{(x_i+x_j)}) = (-1)^{x_i x_j}, \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

where I_i is the identity matrix applied at site i , the graph state is given by a quadratic form of a Boolean function $p(x)$

$$|G\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2^N}} (-1)^{p(x)} |x_1 \cdots x_N\rangle, \quad (3)$$

where $x_i \in \{0, 1\}$ and $p(x) = \sum_{i \neq j} A_{ij} x_i x_j$ [12]. Obviously, the value $x_i x_j = 1$ iff $x_i = x_j = 1$ (otherwise the value is 0), so $p(x)$ is a quadratic polynomial representing the graph adjacency matrix. Alternatively, the state $|G\rangle$ is the fixed eigenvector, with unit eigenvalue, of the N independent commuting operators

$$S(a) = X_a \bigotimes_{b \in \mathcal{N}(a)} Z_b, \quad (4)$$

i.e. $S(a)|G\rangle = |G\rangle$ for all $a \in V$. Because the $\{S(a), a \in V\}$ generate a set of 2^N stabilizer operators S , these N generators uniquely define $|G\rangle$.




Figure 1. A simple example of edge local complementation on a graph state is shown in (a). The graph consists of four qubits (blue circles) and initially has three edges (red lines), forming a linear graph. Edge local complementation is given by three sequential (vertex) local complementations at c_1 , c_2 , and c_1 , respectively. A five-qubit star graph state $|S_5\rangle \equiv |g\rangle$ is shown in (b) and (c) depicts a pentagon cycle graph state $|C_5\rangle \equiv |\diamond\rangle$.

Fig. 1(b) and (c) shows two simple and important examples of graph states that are not equivalent under local-unitary transformations, the star S_N and cycle C_N graphs. The star graphs correspond to GHZ states:

$$|S_n\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2^{n+1}}} (-1)^{q(x)} |x_{c_1} x_{a_1} \cdots x_{a_n}\rangle \quad (5)$$

with $q(x) = \sum_{i=1}^n x_{c_1} x_{a_i}$; these are LC-equivalent to the complete graphs K_{n+1} . Fig. 1(b) depicts $|S_4\rangle \equiv |g\rangle$. The cycle graph state is equal to

$$|C_N\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2^N}} (-1)^{r(x)} |x_{a_1} \cdots x_{a_N}\rangle \quad (6)$$

with $r(x) = x_{a_1} x_{a_N} + \sum_{i=2}^{N-1} x_{a_i} x_{a_{i+1}}$. Fig. 1(c) shows $|C_5\rangle \equiv |\diamond\rangle$. The former is related to classically encoded graph states and the latter to 5QECC [13].

Local complementation and edge local complementation are two operations used to classify locally-equivalent graphs that are generally inequivalent under isomorphism (vertex permutation). The action of local complementation $LC(a)$ at the vertex a transforms the graph G by replacing the subgraph associated with the neighboring vertices $\mathcal{N}(a)$ by its complement [11]. The new graph generated by $LC(a)$ on G is locally equivalent to the original graph. It is important to note that the $LC(a)$ operation does not affect the edges of outer vertices in the graph G ; only the neighborhood of vertex a is affected. The action of edge local complementation $ELC(a, b)$ on the edge $\{a, b\} \in E$ is defined by three local complementations: $ELC(a, b) = LC(a) LC(b) LC(a) = LC(b) LC(a) LC(b)$. The action of ELC on the edge $\{a, b\}$ can be understood as follows. Consider any pair of vertices $\{c, d\} \in E$, where c is a neighbor of a but not b and d is a neighbor of b but not a (or vice versa); alternatively, c and d can both be neighbors of a and b . ELC then corresponds to complementing the edge between c

and d , i.e. if $\{c, d\} \in E$ then delete the edge, and add it if $\{c, d\} \notin E$. In addition, the neighborhoods of a and b are replaced with one another. Edge local complementation has been investigated for recognizing the edge locally equivalence of two graphs [14] and for understanding the relationship between classical codes and graphs [15].

In the context of graph states, local equivalence implies that one graph state can be transformed into another by the action of single-qubit (i.e. local) operations. It is well-known that two graph states that are equivalent under stochastic local operations and classical communication (SLOCC) must also be equivalent under the local unitary (LU) operations [16]. A long-standing conjecture held that LU equivalence also implied equivalence under the action of Clifford-group elements (operations that map the Pauli group to itself), though this was recently proved to be false in general [17].

Nevertheless, the transformations LC (and therefore ELC) on graph states can be expressed solely in terms of local Clifford operations [2]:

$$LC(a) = \sqrt{-iX_a} \bigotimes_{b=\mathcal{N}(a)} \sqrt{iZ_b} \propto \sqrt{S(a)}, \quad (7)$$

where $i \equiv \sqrt{-1}$. Suppose that $|G\rangle$ possesses qubit c_1 (called a *core* qubit) connected to n neighboring qubits. The action of $LC(c_1)$ corresponds to the application of $\frac{n(n-1)}{2}$ CZ operations on the graph state, creating edges between $\mathcal{N}(c_1)$ if there were none and removing them otherwise ($CZ^2 = I$). Although entanglement between the two graph states is the same due to the invariance of entanglement under local unitary operations, the number of *effective* CZ operations (i.e. the number of edges) differs. Edge local complementation on the edge $\{a, b\}$ would then correspond to the operation

$$ELC(a, b) = \sqrt{-iX_a} \bigotimes_{c=\mathcal{N}(a)} \sqrt{iZ_c} \sqrt{-iX_b} \bigotimes_{d=\mathcal{N}'(b)} \sqrt{iZ_d} \sqrt{-iX_a} \bigotimes_{f=\mathcal{N}''(a)} \sqrt{iZ_f}, \quad (8)$$

where the \mathcal{N}' and \mathcal{N}'' are reminders that the neighborhoods themselves change under the LC operations. Recognizing that a and b remain neighbors, this can be rewritten

$$ELC(a, b) = (-i)H_a \otimes H_b \bigotimes_{c=\mathcal{N}(a)\setminus b} \sqrt{iZ_c} \bigotimes_{d=\mathcal{N}'(b)\setminus a} \sqrt{iZ_d} \bigotimes_{f=\mathcal{N}''(a)\setminus b} \sqrt{iZ_f}, \quad (9)$$

where $H_a = (X_a + Z_a)/\sqrt{2} = \sqrt{-iX_a} \sqrt{iZ_a} \sqrt{-iX_a}$ is the Hadamard operator on qubit a . One of the goals of this manuscript is to show that the result of this operation on graph states can be expressed in the simpler form $ELC(a, b)|G\rangle = H_a \otimes H_b|G\rangle$, requiring the application of far fewer local operations.

Simple examples of LC and ELC are shown in Fig. 1(a). The initial graph state $|G\rangle$ consists of four qubits and three edges. After the first $LC(c_1)$, because no edge exists between two neighboring qubits of c_1 in state $|G\rangle$, an edge is drawn between them. After $LC(c_2)$, the edge on qubits a_1 and c_1 is deleted by a rule of the local complementation because two sequential CZ operations become the identity between a_1 and c_1 . Finally, after the last $LC(c_1)$, the number of edges are four on the final graph state, which is represented by $ELC(c_1, c_2)|G\rangle$, although all four graph states are locally equivalent.

3. Edge local complementation via Hadamard gates

Consider two disconnected graphs $G_1 = (V_1, E_1)$ and $G_2 = (V_2, E_2)$ and their respective graph states $|G_1\rangle$ and $|G_2\rangle$; each possesses a core vertex (qubit) $c_1 \in V_1$ and $c_2 \in V_2$, respectively. A CZ operation is then applied to the two core qubits, linking the two graph states into a single connected graph $|G_u\rangle = CZ_{c_1, c_2}|G_1\rangle \otimes |G_2\rangle$. If a Hadamard operation is then applied to each core qubit, the graph $|G_u\rangle$ is transformed into another locally equivalent graph state $|G_H\rangle = H_{c_1} \otimes H_{c_2}|G_u\rangle$. Below we show that the state $|G_H\rangle$ is the edge local complement of $|G_u\rangle$, i.e. that $|G_H\rangle = H_{c_1} \otimes H_{c_2}|G_u\rangle = ELC(c_1, c_2)|G_u\rangle$. It is important to note that the equivalence of edge complementation on $\{c_1, c_2\} \in E$ with the application of Hadamard operations on c_1 and c_2 is only valid if $\mathcal{N}(c_1) \setminus c_2 \cap \mathcal{N}(c_2) \setminus c_1 = \emptyset$, i.e. that prior to the application of CZ_{c_1, c_2} , the neighborhoods of c_1 and c_2 were completely disjoint. Our results do not apply to graphs where c_1 and c_2 share a neighborhood (other than themselves).

The main theorem of the paper is the following:

Theorem 3.1. *Consider two graph states $|G_1\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2^{N_1}}}(-1)^{\sum_{i \neq j} A_{ij}^{(1)} x_i x_j} |x_1 \cdots x_{N_1}\rangle$ and $|G_2\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2^{N_2}}}(-1)^{\sum_{i \neq j} A_{ij}^{(2)} x_i x_j} |x_1 \cdots x_{N_2}\rangle$, defined by adjacency matrices $A^{(1)}$ and $A^{(2)}$ on independent vertex sets $V_1 \in \{a_1^{(1)}, \dots, a_{N_1}^{(1)}\}$ and $V_2 \in \{a_1^{(2)}, \dots, a_{N_2}^{(2)}\}$, respectively. If core qubits, c_1 and c_2 , are chosen at random from each of these vertex sets, and are entangled with one another by means of a CZ gate, then*

$$H_{c_1} H_{c_2} CZ_{c_1, c_2} |G_1\rangle |G_2\rangle = ELC(c_1, c_2) CZ_{c_1, c_2} |G_1\rangle |G_2\rangle, \quad (10)$$

where the edge local complementation operator on the edge $\{c_1, c_2\}$ is $ELC(c_1, c_2) = LC(c_1)LC(c_2)LC(c_1)$, and the (vertex) local complementation operator at qubit a complements the edge set of its neighborhood $\mathcal{N}(a)$.

Proof. The core qubits c_1 and c_2 have neighborhood $\mathcal{N}(c_1) = \{b_1^{(1)}, \dots, b_n^{(1)}\}$ and $\mathcal{N}(c_2) = \{b_1^{(2)}, \dots, b_m^{(2)}\}$, respectively. The remaining vertices of the graphs G_1 and G_2 are $V_1 \setminus \{c_1, b_1^{(1)}, \dots, b_n^{(1)}\} = \{o_1^{(1)}, \dots, o_{N_1-n-1}^{(1)}\} \in V_1$ and $V_2 \setminus \{c_2, b_1^{(2)}, \dots, b_m^{(2)}\} = \{o_1^{(2)}, \dots, o_{N_2-m-1}^{(2)}\} \in V_2$, respectively. Performing a CZ operation between these core qubits, the graph state $|G_u\rangle$ is

$$\begin{aligned} |G_u\rangle &= CZ_{c_1, c_2} |G_1\rangle |G_2\rangle = (-1)^{x_{c_1} x_{c_2}} |G_1\rangle |G_2\rangle, \\ &= \frac{(-1)^{x_{c_1} x_{c_2}}}{\sqrt{2^{N_1+N_2}}} (-1)^{(q_1(x)+q_2(x))} |x_{a_1^{(1)}} \cdots x_{a_{N_1}^{(1)}}\rangle |x_{a_1^{(2)}} \cdots x_{a_{N_2}^{(2)}}\rangle, \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

$$q_1(x) = \sum_{i \neq j} A_{ij}^{(1)} x_{a_i^{(1)}} x_{a_j^{(1)}} = x_{c_1} \sum_{i=1}^n x_{b_i^{(1)}} + \sum_{i \neq j} A_{ij}^{(1)} x_{o_i^{(1)}} x_{o_j^{(1)}}; \quad (12)$$

$$q_2(x) = \sum_{i \neq j} A_{ij}^{(2)} x_{a_i^{(2)}} x_{a_j^{(2)}} = x_{c_2} \sum_{i=1}^m x_{b_i^{(2)}} + \sum_{i \neq j} A_{ij}^{(2)} x_{o_i^{(2)}} x_{o_j^{(2)}}. \quad (13)$$

3.1. Two Hadamards applied to core qubits

Consider

$$|G_H\rangle = H_{c_1}H_{c_2}|G_u\rangle = \frac{1}{2}(X_{c_1}X_{c_2} + X_{c_1}Z_{c_2} + Z_{c_1}X_{c_2} + Z_{c_1}Z_{c_2})|G_u\rangle. \quad (14)$$

This can be simplified by noting that for $b_j \in \mathcal{N}(c_1)$

$$\begin{aligned} X_{c_1}(-1)^{x_{c_1}x_{b_j}} &= (-1)^{(x_{c_1}+1)x_{b_j}}X_{c_1}; \\ Z_{c_1}(-1)^{x_{c_1}x_{b_j}} &= (-1)^{x_{c_1}}(-1)^{x_{c_1}x_{b_j}} = (-1)^{x_{c_1}(x_{b_j}+1)}. \end{aligned} \quad (15)$$

One then obtains

$$\begin{aligned} H_{c_1}H_{c_2}(-1)^{x_{c_1}x_{c_2}} &= \frac{1}{2}(-1)^{x_{c_1}x_{c_2}} \left[-(-1)^{(x_{c_1}+x_{c_2})}X_{c_1}X_{c_2} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + X_{c_1} + X_{c_2} + (-1)^{(x_{c_1}+x_{c_2})} \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

Applying this to the remaining operators in Eq. (11) gives

$$\begin{aligned} |G_H\rangle &= \frac{(-1)^{x_{c_1}x_{c_2}}}{\sqrt{2^{N_1+N_2}}}(-1)^{(q_1(x)+q_2(x))} \frac{1}{2} \prod_{k,k'} \left[-(-1)^{(x_{c_1}+x_{c_2}+x_{b_k^{(1)}}+x_{b_{k'}^{(2)}})} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + (-1)^{x_{b_k^{(1)}}} + (-1)^{x_{b_{k'}^{(2)}}} + (-1)^{(x_{c_1}+x_{c_2})} \right] |x_{a_1^{(1)}} \cdots x_{a_{N_1}^{(1)}}\rangle |x_{a_1^{(2)}} \cdots x_{a_{N_2}^{(2)}}\rangle \\ &= \frac{(-1)^{x_{c_1}x_{c_2}}}{\sqrt{2^{N_1+N_2}}}(-1)^{(q_1(x)+q_2(x)+q_3(x))} |x_{a_1^{(1)}} \cdots x_{a_{N_1}^{(1)}}\rangle |x_{a_1^{(2)}} \cdots x_{a_{N_2}^{(2)}}\rangle, \end{aligned} \quad (17)$$

where

$$q_3(x) = (x_{c_1} + x_{c_2}) \left(\sum_k x_{b_k^{(1)}} + \sum_{k'} x_{b_{k'}^{(2)}} \right) + \sum_{k,k'} x_{b_k^{(1)}} x_{b_{k'}^{(2)}}. \quad (18)$$

Finally, one can combine all the terms to obtain

$$|G_H\rangle = H_{c_1}H_{c_2}CZ_{c_1,c_2}|G_1\rangle|G_2\rangle = \frac{(-1)^{p(x)}}{\sqrt{2^{N_1+N_2}}} |x_{a_1^{(1)}} \cdots x_{a_{N_1}^{(1)}}\rangle |x_{a_1^{(2)}} \cdots x_{a_{N_2}^{(2)}}\rangle, \quad (19)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} p(x) &= x_{c_1}x_{c_2} + x_{c_1} \sum_{k'=1}^m x_{b_{k'}^{(2)}} + x_{c_2} \sum_{k=1}^n x_{b_k^{(1)}} + \sum_{k=1}^n \sum_{k'=1}^m x_{b_k^{(1)}} x_{b_{k'}^{(2)}} \\ &\quad + \sum_{i \neq j} A_{ij}^{(1)} x_{o_i^{(1)}} x_{o_j^{(1)}} + \sum_{i \neq j} A_{ij}^{(2)} x_{o_i^{(2)}} x_{o_j^{(2)}}. \end{aligned} \quad (20)$$

3.2. Edge local complementation on core qubits

Recall that edge local complementation $ELC(c_1, c_2)$ on the edge $\{c_1, c_2\}$ is described by the three local complementations $LC(c_1)LC(c_2)LC(c_1) = LC(c_2)LC(c_1)LC(c_2)$. Suppose that the first local complementation is performed on $|G_u\rangle$ at qubit c_1 . The result is that all neighboring qubits of c_1 are explicitly connected to each other (adding an edge to an existing edge annihilates it). The additional edges are given by the quadratic form

$$r_1(x) = \sum_{i \neq j} x_{b_i^{(1)}} x_{b_j^{(1)}} + x_{c_2} \sum_i x_{b_i^{(1)}}. \quad (21)$$

Next one complements the neighborhood of qubit c_2 , which is given by the quadratic form $x_{c_2} \left(x_{c_1} + \sum_i x_{b_i^{(1)}} + \sum_i x_{b_i^{(2)}} \right)$; the result is $x_{c_1} \left(\sum_i x_{b_i^{(1)}} + \sum_i x_{b_i^{(2)}} \right) + \sum_{i \neq j} x_{b_i^{(1)}} x_{b_j^{(1)}} + \sum_{i \neq j} x_{b_i^{(2)}} x_{b_j^{(2)}} + \sum_{i,j} x_{b_i^{(1)}} x_{b_j^{(2)}}$. The total additional edges are then given by the quadratic form

$$\begin{aligned} r_2(x) &= x_{c_2} \sum_i x_{b_i^{(1)}} + x_{c_1} \left(\sum_i x_{b_i^{(1)}} + \sum_i x_{b_i^{(2)}} \right) + \sum_{i \neq j} x_{b_i^{(2)}} x_{b_j^{(2)}} \\ &\quad + \sum_{i,j} x_{b_i^{(1)}} x_{b_j^{(2)}}. \end{aligned} \quad (22)$$

Last, one complements the neighborhood of qubit c_1 , which is given by the quadratic form $x_{c_1} \left(x_{c_2} + \sum_i x_{b_i^{(1)}} + \sum_i x_{b_i^{(1)}} + \sum_i x_{b_i^{(2)}} \right) = x_{c_1} \left(x_{c_2} + \sum_i x_{b_i^{(2)}} \right)$; the result is simply $x_{c_2} \sum_i x_{b_i^{(2)}} + \sum_{i \neq j} x_{b_i^{(2)}} x_{b_j^{(2)}}$. The quadratic form for the additional edges after this final operation is

$$\begin{aligned} r_3(x) &= x_{c_2} \left(\sum_i x_{b_i^{(1)}} + \sum_i x_{b_i^{(2)}} \right) + x_{c_1} \left(\sum_i x_{b_i^{(1)}} + \sum_i x_{b_i^{(2)}} \right) \\ &\quad + \sum_{i,j} x_{b_i^{(1)}} x_{b_j^{(2)}}. \end{aligned} \quad (23)$$

Combining this result with the remaining terms in the quadratic form (11), the graph resulting from the edge local complementation becomes

$$ELC(c_1, c_2) |G_u\rangle = \frac{(-1)^{p(x)}}{\sqrt{2^{N_1+N_2}}} |x_{a_1^{(1)}} \cdots x_{a_{N_1}^{(1)}}\rangle |x_{a_1^{(2)}} \cdots x_{a_{N_2}^{(2)}}\rangle, \quad (24)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} p(x) &= x_{c_1} x_{c_2} + x_{c_1} \sum_i x_{b_i^{(2)}} + x_{c_2} \sum_i x_{b_i^{(1)}} + \sum_{i,j} x_{b_i^{(1)}} x_{b_j^{(2)}} \\ &\quad + \sum_{i \neq j} A_{ij}^{(1)} x_{o_i^{(1)}} x_{o_j^{(1)}} + \sum_{i \neq j} A_{ij}^{(2)} x_{o_i^{(2)}} x_{o_j^{(2)}}, \end{aligned} \quad (25)$$

which is identical to the quadratic form (20). □

Eq. (20) shows that when Hadamard gates are applied to both (core) qubits of single edge between two graphs, the result is a new graph state corresponding to the effective application of $2(n+m) + nm$ controlled-phase operations. These operations have the effect of replacing the original neighborhood of each core qubit with the neighborhood of the other core qubit (and vice versa), while simultaneously adding the neighborhood of a given core qubit to the neighborhood of the other. That is, from the edge set one deletes the combinations $\{c_1, b_k^{(1)}\}$ and $\{c_2, b_k^{(2)}\}$, and adds the combinations $\{c_1, b_k^{(2)}\}$, $\{c_2, b_k^{(1)}\}$, and $\{b_k^{(1)}, b_{k'}^{(2)}\}$. In other words, the Hadamard operations have complemented the neighborhood of the edge $\{c_1, c_2\}$, or performed edge local complementation. Of particular interest is the special case where both of the original graphs $|G_1\rangle$ and $|G_2\rangle$ were star graphs with the core qubit corresponding to the maximum-degree vertex, i.e. where $\{o_i^{(1)}\} \notin V_1$ and $\{o_i^{(2)}\} \notin V_2$. Then the resulting graph would be completely

bipartite, with every vertex of the first group $\{c_1, b_1^{(1)}, \dots, b_n^{(1)}\}$ connected to every vertex of the second group $\{c_2, b_1^{(2)}, \dots, b_n^{(2)}\}$ [18].

3.3. Vertex local complementation

The above analysis proves that the application of Hadamard operations to the core qubits c_1 and c_2 is equivalent to edge local complementation on the edge $\{c_1, c_2\}$. It is not obvious that edge local complementation based on the formal definition of local complementation given in Eq. (7), $LC(c_1) = \sqrt{-iX_{c_1}} \prod_{b \in \mathcal{N}(c_1)} \sqrt{iZ_b}$, reproduces the same result. Though graph transformations effected by this expression have already been discussed in Ref. [2] in the context of vertex local complementation, edge local complementation using this operator was not explicitly explored in that work. In fact, as shown below, the application of these unitary gates in order to effect edge local complementation requires local operations in addition to the two Hadamard gates.

It is convenient to write

$$\sqrt{-iX} = [-I + iX]/\sqrt{2}; \quad \sqrt{iZ} = [iI + Z]/\sqrt{2}. \quad (26)$$

The action of these on quadratic forms is

$$\begin{aligned} \sqrt{-iX_{c_1}} (-1)^{x_{c_1} x_{b_j}} &= (-1)^{x_{c_1} x_{b_j}} [-1 + i(-1)^{x_{b_j}} X_{c_1}] / \sqrt{2}; \\ \sqrt{iZ_{b_j}} (-1)^{x_{c_1} x_{b_j}} &= (-1)^{x_{c_1} x_{b_j}} [i + (-1)^{x_{b_j}}] / \sqrt{2}. \end{aligned} \quad (27)$$

Suppose one has an arbitrary graph state $|G\rangle$ defined by quadratic form $p(x)$ whose neighborhood of the qubit c_1 is $\mathcal{N}(c_1) = \{b_1, \dots, b_n\}$, i.e. where $p(x)$ includes the term $c_1 \sum_j b_j$. Local complementation on the vertex c_1 then yields

$$\begin{aligned} LC(c_1) &= \sqrt{-iX_{c_1}} \prod_{j=1}^n \sqrt{iZ_{b_j}} (-1)^{x_{c_1} x_{b_j}} \\ &= \frac{1}{2^{n/2}} \sqrt{-iX_{c_1}} \prod_{j=1}^n (-1)^{x_{c_1} x_{b_j}} [i + (-1)^{x_{b_j}}] \\ &= \frac{1}{2^n} \prod_{j=1}^n (-1)^{x_{c_1} x_{b_j}} [i + (-1)^{x_{b_j}}] [-1 + i(-1)^{x_{b_j}} X_{c_1}]. \end{aligned}$$

When this local complementation operator is applied to the graph state $|G\rangle$, the X_{c_1} operator will act only on its eigenstates and will effectively disappear. The effect of the various terms above is then equivalent to the new quadratic form

$$p(x)' = p(x) + \sum_{j \neq k} b_j b_k - \sum_i b_i. \quad (28)$$

In other words, $LC(c_1)$ has complemented the neighborhood of qubit c_1 , by effectively applying CZ entangling operations to all of its neighbors. In addition, it has applied Z gates to all the neighbors. These are local operations that commute with the CZ s and are therefore unimportant. That said, complete equivalence (rather than simply unitary equivalence) under edge local complementation would then require the application of additional unitary gates beyond the two Hadamard gates.

4. Application : Efficient generation of 1D logical cluster states

We now discuss a novel and useful application of the theory of edge local complementation for quantum information processing. In previous work [6], we showed that logical cluster states corresponding to 5QECC can be made with logical CZ operations consisting of many CZ operations among the physical qubits. A linear N -qubit logical cluster state is given by

$$|CS_N^L\rangle = \prod_{i=1}^{N-1} CZ_{i,i+1}^L |+\rangle_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes |+\rangle_N, \quad (29)$$

where CZ^L is a logical CZ operation between two logical qubits and $|\pm^L\rangle = (|0^L\rangle \pm |1^L\rangle)/\sqrt{2}$. For $|CS_2^L\rangle$ with 5QECC, 25 physical CZ operations are required to construct a logical CZ operation from $|+\rangle^{\otimes 10}$ (see Fig. 3 in Ref. [6]). The construction of many-qubit logical cluster states requires so many entangling operations to build logical CZ gates as to be impractical for realistic quantum information processing. In this context, the edge local complementation provides an efficient solution to this conundrum: a single physical CZ operation and two Hadamard operations are sufficient to build a logical CZ operation between two logical qubits.

First we will review how to encode a physical qubit into a logical qubit with 5QECC. One begins begin with a qubit in state $|0\rangle_{a_1}$ and four auxiliary qubits in $|++++\rangle_{a_2-a_5}$. After a Hadamard operation on qubit a_1 and four CZ operations between a_1 and the others, one obtains the five-qubit GHZ-type graph state $|g\rangle_A$ (see Fig. 1(b) but with c_1 replaced by a_1 and $a_{1,2,3,4}$ replaced by $a_{2,3,4,5}$). After an additional Hadamard operation on qubit a_1 in $|g\rangle_A$, the state is equal to a five-qubit GHZ state

$$|g_H^+\rangle_A = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|+\rangle_{a_1-a_5}^{\otimes 5} + |-\rangle_{a_1-a_5}^{\otimes 5}), \quad (30)$$

$|\pm\rangle_{a_1-a_5}^{\otimes 5} = |\pm\rangle_{a_1} |\pm\rangle_{a_2} |\pm\rangle_{a_3} |\pm\rangle_{a_4} |\pm\rangle_{a_5}$. Because $|0\rangle_{a_1} = (|+\rangle_{a_1} + |-\rangle_{a_1})/\sqrt{2}$, the state $|g_H^+\rangle$ can be understood as a classically encoded state of $|0\rangle_{a_1}$ in five qubits (here a classical encoding is meant to signify the implementation of a repetition code $|\pm\rangle \rightarrow |\pm\rangle^{\otimes 5}$). Similarly, if the physical qubit is initialized in $|1\rangle_{a_1}$, the outcome state is $|g_H^-\rangle_A = (|+\rangle_{a_1-a_5}^{\otimes 5} - |-\rangle_{a_1-a_5}^{\otimes 5})/\sqrt{2}$. The quantum encoding scheme transforms $|+\rangle_A^{\otimes 5}$ into $|+^L\rangle_A$ and $|-\rangle_A^{\otimes 5}$ into $|-^L\rangle_A$. As shown in Fig. 1(c), a pentagon graph operation is used for encoding logical qubits

$$|+^L\rangle_A \equiv |\diamond\rangle_A = C_{a_1-a_5}^{\diamond} |+\rangle_{a_1-a_5}^{\otimes 5}, \quad (31)$$

$$|-^L\rangle_A \equiv |\tilde{\diamond}\rangle_A = C_{a_1-a_5}^{\tilde{\diamond}} |-\rangle_{a_1-a_5}^{\otimes 5} = \prod_{i=1}^5 Z_i |+\rangle_A, \quad (32)$$

where $C_{a_1-a_5}^{\diamond} = CZ_{a_1,a_2} CZ_{a_2,a_3} CZ_{a_3,a_4} CZ_{a_4,a_5} CZ_{a_5,a_1}$. Therefore, the total encoding operation for a logical qubit is represented by

$$E_A^L = C_{a_1-a_5}^{\diamond} H_{a_1} \left[\prod_{i=2}^5 CZ_{a_1,a_i} \right] H_{a_1}, \quad (33)$$

and $|\pm^L\rangle_A = E_A^L |\pm\rangle_{a_1} |+\rangle_{a_2-a_5}^{\otimes 4}$.




Figure 2. The edge local complementation consisting of three sequential local complementations makes the same transformation as the operation of two Hadamard operations on core qubits. Green lines indicate new edges created by each local complementation while red lines do the pre-existing edges. The graph state $|G_H\rangle$ is completely bipartite.

With this toolkit one can show how to build logical cluster states. There are two different ways of building a two-qubit logical cluster state from ten physical qubits $|+\rangle^{\otimes 10}$. The first method is to first prepare two logical states in $|+^L\rangle$, and then to directly perform a logical CZ operation between them:

$$|CS_2^L\rangle_{AB} = CZ_{AB}^L E_A^L E_B^L |+\rangle^{\otimes 10} = CZ_{AB}^L |+^L\rangle_A |+^L\rangle_B. \quad (34)$$

Because $E_A^L E_B^L |+\rangle^{\otimes 10} = C_A^{\hat{\square}} C_B^{\hat{\square}} |+\rangle^{\otimes 10}$ for this case, 35 physical CZ operations in total are required to build $|CS_2^L\rangle$ from $|+\rangle^{\otimes 10}$ (for details refer to Ref. [6]).

In the second method, one creates classically encoded graph states by means of edge local complementations; the quantum encoding is then applied to the classically encoded states to obtain logical cluster states. Initially, the core qubit a_1 of one classical state is entangled with its counterpart b_1 in the other state, yielding a two-qubit cluster state $|CS_2\rangle_{a_1 b_1} = (|0\rangle_{a_1} |+\rangle_{b_1} + |1\rangle_{a_1} |-\rangle_{b_1}) / \sqrt{2}$. Note that the first Hadamard operations ($H_{a_1} \otimes H_{b_1}$) in $E_A^L E_B^L$ leave the state $|CS_2\rangle_{a_1 b_1}$ invariant. After the GHZ-type CZ operations are performed between a_1 (b_1) and a_i (b_i) ($i = 2, 3, 4, 5$), through the operation $\prod_i \prod_j CZ_{a_1, a_i} CZ_{b_1, b_j}$, a connected graph state $|G_u\rangle$ is obtained (see Fig. 2). When two Hadamard operations are subsequently applied to a_1 and b_1 in $|G_u\rangle$, the resulting state is transformed to another graph state $|G_H\rangle$, given by

$$|G_H\rangle_{AB} = \frac{1}{2} \left[|+\rangle_{a_1-a_5}^{\otimes 5} \left(|+\rangle_{b_1-b_5}^{\otimes 5} + |-\rangle_{b_1-b_5}^{\otimes 5} \right) + |-\rangle_{a_1-a_5}^{\otimes 5} \left(|+\rangle_{b_1-b_5}^{\otimes 5} - |-\rangle_{b_1-b_5}^{\otimes 5} \right) \right]. \quad (35)$$

This state is a classically encoded two-qubit cluster state.

In Fig. 2, it is shown that the action of three local complementations on the core vertices a_1 and b_1 provides the desired CZ operations among the physical qubits,

reproducing the state (35). The resulting graph is known as a complete bipartite graph state [18]: each of the vertices in one neighborhood (corresponding to logical register A or B) is connected with all the vertices of the other neighborhood, and vice versa. While it is possible to construct $|G_H\rangle_{AB}$ directly by applying 25 CZ operations starting with $|+\rangle^{\otimes 10}$, it can be efficiently made using only 9 CZ operations plus two local operations. For the quantum encoding scheme, the final state is given by

$$|CS_2^L\rangle_{AB} = C_{a_1-a_5}^{\hat{\square}} C_{b_1-b_5}^{\hat{\square}} |G_H\rangle_{AB} = E_A^L E_B^L CZ_{a_1 b_1} |+\rangle^{\otimes 10}. \quad (36)$$

Therefore, the state $|CS_2^L\rangle$ can be efficiently built by 19 CZ operations with the help of two Hadamard operations, instead of 35 CZ operations, and the logical CZ operation expressed by

$$CZ_{AB}^L E_A^L E_B^L = E_A^L E_B^L CZ_{a_1 b_1} \quad (37)$$

shows that a single physical CZ operation is sufficient to create a logical CZ operation between logical qubits.

While the encoding procedure for graph states is straightforward to implement, its interpretation in terms of edge local complementation is not obvious in general. For example, any encoding of a cluster state with an odd number of qubits is difficult to express in terms of edge local complementations, each requiring an even number of Hadamard operations. The interpretation of encoding linear $2N$ -qubit cluster states through edge local complementation is straightforward, however.

Consider for example the linear four-qubit logical cluster state. First one assigns five qubits each to registers A, B, C, and D. After assigning a core qubit from each, designated a_1 , b_1 , c_1 , and d_1 , respectively, one prepares the linear four-qubit cluster state $|CS_4\rangle = CZ_{a_1, b_1} CZ_{b_1, c_1} CZ_{c_1, d_1} |+\rangle_{a_1-d_1}^{\otimes 4}$. The encoding consists of acting on each register with $\prod_J E_J^L |CS_4\rangle |+\rangle^{\otimes 16}$ for $J = A, B, C, D$, where E_J^L is given in Eq. (33). The first step is to perform four Hadamard operations on $|CS_4\rangle$. Applying two Hadamard operations on qubits a_1 and b_1 , the intermediate graph state is equal to

$$|\Psi_{inter}\rangle_{a_1-d_1} = ELC(a_1, b_1) |CS_4\rangle = CZ_{a_1, b_1} CZ_{a_1, c_1} CZ_{c_1, d_1} |+\rangle_{a_1-d_1}^{\otimes 4} \quad (38)$$

using the results of edge local complementation. Because c_1 and d_1 share an edge but their neighborhoods are disjoint, it is reasonable to associate the subsequent Hadamard operations on qubits c_1 and d_1 with another edge local complementation on the edge $\{c_1, d_1\}$. The resulting state is equal to another linear four-qubit cluster state, but with the vertex labels permuted:

$$|CS_4'\rangle = ELC(c_1, d_1) |\Psi_{inter}\rangle_{a_1-d_1} = CZ_{a_1, b_1} CZ_{a_1, d_1} CZ_{c_1, d_1} |+\rangle_{a_1-d_1}^{\otimes 4}. \quad (39)$$

After four GHZ-type operations and the second set of four Hadamard operations on $|CS_4'\rangle_{a_1-d_1} |+\rangle^{\otimes 16}$, again corresponding to two edge local complementations, the outcome is a linear four-qubit cluster state with classical encoding. The Hadamard operations not only effect the edge local complementation; they also reverse the permutation of the vertex labels above. Finally, the quantum encoding scheme on all the qubits yields a logical four-qubit cluster state $|CS_4^L\rangle$, which is sufficient for universal quantum

computation with 5QECC [6]. This procedure can be trivially extended to any even-length chain, by applying Hadamard gates in pairs on nearest-neighbor edges in order to implement edge local complementations from the left boundary of the chain to the right.

5. Summary and Remarks

The main result presented in this manuscript is a proof that the action of edge local complementation on a graph state can be effected solely through the use of two Hadamard operations applied to the edge qubits. A crucial assumption in this proof is that the neighborhoods of the edge qubits were disjoint, i.e. that the neighbors $\mathcal{N}(a)$ of the first edge qubit a were different from the neighbors $\mathcal{N}(b)$ of the second qubit b . Under this restriction, edge local complementation interchanges the respective neighborhoods, i.e. $\mathcal{N}(a) \leftrightarrow \mathcal{N}(b)$, while simultaneously making neighbors of all the neighbors. In principle, this transformation would require a large number of either local unitary operations on the graph-state qubits or entangling gates between various qubits. The distinct advantage of the present scheme is the large savings in the number of (local) operations required.

As an example of the utility of this insight, we show how edge local complementation can be used to efficiently create classically encoded cluster states and one-dimensional logical cluster states based on the five-qubit error-correcting code, for an even number of logical qubits. In this scheme, a physical CZ operation, together with local operations, is sufficient to create a logical CZ operation between two logical qubits.

Arbitrary encoded graph states can be obtained by a straightforward extension of the procedure described above. The operations encoding a logical qubit, Eq. (33), are local to the physical qubits comprising the logical qubit, and therefore commute with one another. It therefore suffices to first construct the desired graph state with the core qubits, associate four ancillae to each core qubit, and operate independently with Eq. (33) on each five-qubit register.

Multipartite entangled states that fundamentally include fault tolerance might be desirable for practical measurement-based quantum computing and multipartite quantum communication [8, 19]. For a generalized scheme of level- l logical graph states based on our proposal, the same encoding procedure can be used repeatedly. Since the level-1 logical graph state is made by our protocol, a level- l concatenated logical graph state becomes an initial state to create a level- $(l+1)$ concatenated one ($|\pm_l^L\rangle \rightarrow |\pm_{l+1}^L\rangle$) with the help of the classical and quantum coding schemes described above. This concatenated method may also be useful for building multi-party quantum networks similar to classical complex networks in hierarchical organization [20].

Acknowledgements

The authors are grateful to T. P. Spiller and Jinhyoung Lee for stimulating discussions. This work was supported by the Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council of Canada, the Mathematics of Information Technology and Complex Systems Quantum Information Processing Project, and the Quantum Interfaces, Sensors, and Communication based on Entanglement Integrating Project.

References

- [1] R Horodecki, P Horodecki, M Horodecki, and K Horodecki (2009) Quantum entanglement *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **81** 865, and references therein
- [2] M Hein, J Eisert, and H J Briegel (2004) Multiparty entanglement in graph states *Phys. Rev. A* **69** 062311; M Van den Nest, J Dehaene, and B De Moor (2004) Graphical description of the action of local Clifford transformations on graph states *Phys. Rev. A* **69** 022316
- [3] C-Y Lu, X-Q Zhou, O Gühne, W-B Gao, J Zhang, Z-S Yuan, A Goebel, T Yang, and J-W Pan (2007) Experimental entanglement of six photons in graph states *Nat. Phys.* **3** 91; W-B Gao, C-Y Lu, X-C Yao, P Xu, O Gühne, A Goebel, Y-A Chen, C-Z Peng, Z-B Chen, and J-W Pan (2010) Experimental demonstration of a hyper-entangled ten-qubit Schrödinger cat state *Nat. Phys.* **6** 331
- [4] M A Nielsen and I L Chuang (2001) *Quantum Computation and Quantum Information* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press), and references therein
- [5] M Silva, V Danos, E Kashefi, and H Ollivier (2007) A direct approach to fault-tolerance in measurement-based quantum computation via teleportation *New J. Phys.* **9** 192
- [6] J Joo and D L Feder (2009) Error-correcting one-way quantum computation with global entangling gates *Phys. Rev. A* **80** 032312
- [7] K Fujii and K Yamamoto (2010) Cluster-based architecture for fault-tolerant quantum computation *Phys. Rev. A* **81** 042324
- [8] S Beigi, I Chuang, M Grassl, P Shor, and B Zeng (2011) Graph Concatenation for Quantum Codes *J. Math. Phys.* **52**, 022201
- [9] R Raussendorf and J Harrington (2007) Fault-Tolerant Quantum Computation with High Threshold in Two Dimensions *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **98** 190504; R Raussendorf, J Harrington, and K Goyal (2007) Topological fault-tolerance in cluster state quantum computation *New J. Phys.* **9** 199
- [10] A Bouchet (1988) Graphic presentations of isotropic systems *J. Combin. Theory Ser. B* **45** 58
- [11] H. de Fraysseix (1981) Local complementation and interlacement graphs *Discrete Math.* **33** 29
- [12] A Cosentino and S Severini (2009) Weight of quadratic forms and graph states *Phys. Rev. A* **80** 052309; J Dehaene and B De Moor (2003) Clifford group, stabilizer states, and linear and quadratic operations over $\text{GF}(2)$ *Phys. Rev. A* **68** 042318
- [13] C H Bennett, D P DiVincenzo, J A Smolin, and W K Wootters (1996) Mixed-state entanglement and quantum error correction *Phys. Rev. A* **54** 3824
- [14] M Van den Nest and B De Moor (2005) Edge-local equivalence of graphs *arXiv:math/0510246*
- [15] L E Danielsen, M G Parker, C Riera, J G Knudsen (2010) On Graphs and Codes Preserved by Edge Local Complementation *arXiv:1006.5802*; L E Danielsen and M G Parker (2008) Edge Local Complementation and Equivalence of Binary Linear Codes *Des. Codes Cryptogr.* **49** 161
- [16] M Van den Nest, J Dehaene, and B De Moor (2004) Local equivalence of stabilizer states *Proceedings of the 16th International Symposium of Mathematical Theory of Networks and Systems (MTNS2004)* (Belgium: Katholieke Universiteit Leuven)
- [17] Z Ji, J Chen, Z Wei, and M Ying (2010) The LU-LC conjecture is false *Quantum Inf. Comput.* **10** 97
- [18] A Gibbon (1985) *Algorithmic Graph Theory* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press)

- [19] E Knill (2005) Quantum computing with realistically noisy devices *Nature* **434** 39; E Knill (2005) Scalable quantum computing in the presence of large detected-error rates *Phys. Rev. A* **71** 042322
- [20] E Ravasz and A Barabási (2003) Hierarchical organization in complex networks *Phys. Rev. E* **67** 026112