

We've seen how to store logical qubits safely. Want to discuss how it's done in experiment + how to apply logical gates safely.

To get there, need to introduce a bit of formalism, which is today's goal

Def: Clifford group

$$\mathcal{C}_n := \left\{ \underbrace{U \in U(2^n)}_{\text{unitary matrix on } n \text{ qubits}} : \underbrace{U^\dagger P_n U = P_n}_{U\text{-conjugation takes Pauli strings to themselves}} \right\}$$

unitary matrix  
on  $n$  qubits

$U$ -conjugation takes Pauli strings  
to themselves.

$U \in \mathcal{C}_n \Rightarrow U$  is a "Clifford gate"

Clifford gates preserve structure of Pauli stabilizer codes, so they're a natural set of gates to study.

Prop:  $\mathcal{C}_n$  is a group.

Proof:  $U_1^\dagger P_n U_1 = U_2^\dagger P_n U_2 = P_n$

$$\Rightarrow U_1^\dagger U_2^\dagger P_n U_2 U_1 = (U_2 U_1)^\dagger P_n (U_2 U_1) = P_n \quad \square$$

also easy to check identity/inverses etc.

Prop:  $P_n \leq \mathcal{C}_n$  [Paulis are Clifford]

Proof: if  $P, Q \in P_n$ ,  $Q^\dagger P Q = \eta P$  where  $\eta = \pm 1$  as discussed previously

Example: Hadamard gate  $H$  on a single qubit:

$$H := \frac{X+Z}{\sqrt{2}} \text{ is unitary}$$

$$H^\dagger X H = \frac{1}{2}(X+Z)X(X+Z) = \frac{1}{2}(X + ZXZ + Z + Z) = Z$$

$$H^\dagger Z H = X \text{ similarly.}$$

So  $H$  permutes Paulis,  
but does take  $P_n \rightarrow P_n$

How does Clifford group act on  $\mathbb{F}_2^{2n}$  rep. of Paulis?

If  $U \in C_n$  and  $P_1, P_2 \in \mathcal{P}_n$ :  $(U^\dagger P_1 U)(U^\dagger P_2 U) = U^\dagger (P_1 P_2) U$

$$\Rightarrow \varphi(U^\dagger P_1 U) + \varphi(U^\dagger P_2 U) = \varphi(U^\dagger (P_1 P_2) U)$$

map from  $\mathcal{P}_n \rightarrow \mathbb{F}_2^{2n}$

conjugation by  $U$  preserves linearity  $\Rightarrow \varphi(U^\dagger P U) = M_U \varphi(P)$

$M_U \in \mathbb{F}_2^{2n \times 2n}$  is a matrix

Since  $P_1 P_2 = \eta P_2 P_1 \Rightarrow (U^\dagger P_1 U)(U^\dagger P_2 U) = \eta (U^\dagger P_2 U)(U^\dagger P_1 U)$

we need:  $(M_U \varphi(P_1))^T J (M_U \varphi(P_2)) = \varphi(P_1)^T J \varphi(P_2)$

$$\begin{pmatrix} 0 & I \\ I & 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

or  $M_U$  is symplectic:  $M_U \in Sp(2n, \mathbb{F}_2) := \{M \in \mathbb{F}_2^{2n \times 2n} : M^T J M = J\}$

Hadamard gate  $M_H = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \in Sp(2, \mathbb{F}_2)$  for a single qubit

Since any 1-Pauli Clifford gate can only permute  $X, Y, Z$ , there must be one additional single-qubit Clifford gate...

Example: S gate:  $M_S = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$  or  $S = e^{-i\pi/4} Z$

$$S^\dagger X S = -Y, \quad S^\dagger Y S = X, \quad S^\dagger Z S = Z.$$

Once  $n > 1$ , there are also entangling Clifford gates:

Example:  $CNOT_{i \rightarrow j} = \frac{I + Z_i}{2} + \frac{I - Z_i}{2} X_j$  generates entanglement b/c  
 $CNOT_{1 \rightarrow 2} \frac{|0\rangle + |1\rangle}{\sqrt{2}} \otimes |0\rangle = \frac{|00\rangle + |11\rangle}{\sqrt{2}}$  creates Bell pair from a product state.

A short calculation shows that:

$$\text{CNOT}_{i \rightarrow j}^\dagger Z_i \text{CNOT}_{i \rightarrow j} = Z_i$$

$$\text{CNOT}_{i \rightarrow j}^\dagger X_j \text{CNOT}_{i \rightarrow j} = X_j$$

$$\text{CNOT}_{i \rightarrow j}^\dagger X_i \text{CNOT}_{i \rightarrow j} = X_i X_j$$

$$\text{CNOT}_{i \rightarrow j}^\dagger Z_j \text{CNOT}_{i \rightarrow j} = Z_i Z_j$$

in  $\mathbb{F}_2$  formalism,

$$M_{\text{CNOT}_{1 \rightarrow 2}} = \left( \begin{array}{cc|cc} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ \hline 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{array} \right) \begin{matrix} x_1 \\ x_2 \\ z_1 \\ z_2 \end{matrix}$$

It turns out that these gates suffice to generate all Clifford gates!

Thm: Define  $\hat{\mathcal{C}}_n := (\mathcal{C}_n / \text{U}(1) \mathcal{P}_n)$   
 i.e. identify  $U \sim e^{i\theta} P U$   
 phase Pauli string

Then  $\hat{\mathcal{C}}_n$  is generated by  $\langle H_i, S_i, \text{CNOT}_{1 \rightarrow i} \rangle$

If  $U \in \hat{\mathcal{C}}_n$  it is a product of ...

Moreover:  $\hat{\mathcal{C}}_n \cong \text{Sp}(2n, \mathbb{F}_2)$  [all possible symplectic transforms are realized by Cliffords].

Proof sketch: A bit tedious so we'll be brief

Lemma: If  $U \in \mathcal{C}_n / \text{U}(1)$  obeys  $U^\dagger P U = e^{i\theta_P} P \forall P \in \mathcal{P}_n$   
 then  $U \in \mathcal{P}_n / \text{U}(1)$ .

Proof sketch: if  $P^2 = I \Rightarrow e^{i\theta_P} \in \{\pm 1\} \rightarrow \mathbb{F}_2!$  (can always choose such a P)

$$U^\dagger P Q U = U^\dagger P U (U^\dagger Q U) = e^{i(\theta_P + \theta_Q)} P Q \quad [\text{phases add...}]$$

$$\Rightarrow \theta_P = \varphi(R)^T J \varphi(P) \quad \text{for some Pauli string } R$$

$$\Rightarrow U = R \quad (\text{up to phase})$$

Then one does Gaussian elimination to show  $\exists$  sequence of

$$\dots S_7 \text{CNOT}_{3 \rightarrow 2} H_3 M = I \quad \leftarrow \text{arbitrary symplectic}$$



Now that we've classified all the possible Clifford circuits, our second main result is

Def: Let  $\mathcal{S} = \langle S_1, \dots, S_m \rangle$  be a stabilizer group.

Given  $\vec{\eta} \in \{\pm 1\}^m$ , stabilizer mixed state

$$\rho_{\vec{\eta}} := 2^{m-n} \prod_{i=1}^m \frac{I + \eta_i S_i}{2}.$$

Gottesman-Knill Thm:  $\exists$  polynomial runtime algorithm for dynamics of stabilizer states under Clifford circuits, including measurement/feedforward.

So if quantum computers are more powerful than classical, Clifford circuits won't be enough... we'll return to that point later.

We can actually build this algorithm directly!

Step 1: dynamics w/o measurement: given Clifford  $U$ :

$$U \rho_{\vec{\eta}} U^\dagger = \prod_{i=1}^m \frac{I + \eta_i (US_i U^\dagger)}{2} \rightarrow \text{store stabilizers via } \mathbb{F}_2 \text{ formalism!}$$

since Clifford  $\in \text{Sp}(2n, \mathbb{F}_2)$

$$S = (\varphi(S_1) \dots \varphi(S_m)) \in \mathbb{F}_2^{2n \times m}$$

and  $\vec{\eta} \in \{\pm 1\}^m$

$\Rightarrow$  update:  $S \rightarrow M_U S$

also update  $\vec{\eta}$  [e.g.  $S \mapsto S^\dagger = \Theta X$ ]  $\rightarrow$  flips component of  $\eta$ ?

Step 2: measure a Pauli operator  $P$ .  
 if  $P \in \mathcal{S}$ , outcome deterministic [ $P = S_1 S_3 \Rightarrow$  measurement outcome  $\eta_1 \eta_3$  etc.]

else do each of: ① if any prior  $\{S_i, P\} = 0 \dots$   
 Suppose  $\{S_1, P\} = \dots = \{S_r, P\} = 0$ .

Replace:  $S \rightarrow (\varphi(S_2) + \varphi(S_1) \dots \varphi(S_r) + \varphi(S_1) \varphi(S_{r+1}) \dots)$   
 $\vec{\eta}^T \rightarrow (\eta_2 \eta_1 \dots \eta_r \eta_1 \eta_{r+1} \dots)$   
 $\rightarrow S_1 S_2$  commutes w/  $P$  so not disturbed  
 $\hookrightarrow$  and has eigenvalue  $\eta_1 \eta_2$

new  $\mathcal{S}$   
 ② add  $P$  to  $\mathcal{S}'$ :  $S \rightarrow (S \mid \varphi(P))$   
 $\vec{\eta} \rightarrow \begin{pmatrix} \vec{\eta} \\ \eta_p \end{pmatrix}$  where  $P[\eta_p = \pm 1] = \frac{1}{2}$ .  
 $\rho_{\vec{\eta}}$  contains both e-values, measurement collapses...

Matrix manipulations above require polynomial classical resources  
 Key: we can simulate (highly) entangled states, if stabilizer. This will be crucial for understanding QEC!

Short example: consider measuring  $Z_2$  in  $CNOT_{1 \rightarrow 2} H_1 |00\rangle$ :

$$S \rightarrow \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \xrightarrow{H_1} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \xrightarrow{CNOT_{1 \rightarrow 2}} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \xrightarrow{\text{measure } Z_2} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$$

$Z_1 Z_2$        $X_1 Z_2$        $X_1 X_2 \quad Z_1 Z_2$        $Z_1 Z_2 \quad Z_2$

$$\vec{q} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix} \xrightarrow{\text{until measurement}} \vec{q} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ \pm 1 \end{pmatrix}$$

↖ each w/ 50% prob

G-K gives us another way to understand why it's possible to simulate dynamics (e.g. for threshold...) of QEC at scale!

measure stabilizers of QEC code  $\Rightarrow S = H^T$   
 Keep track of  $\vec{q} \rightarrow \vec{z}$  (syndrome)

There's a useful idea here:

Def: Pauli frame tracking:

if (noisy) syndrome extraction  $\Rightarrow$  (likely) error  $E$ ,

store suitable recovery  $R$  in software w/o physically correcting.

We already implicitly did this in discussion of spacetime decoding!

in  $\mathbb{F}_2$  formalism: Let  $r$  = Pauli frame

applying Clifford gate  $U$ :  $r \rightarrow M_U r$  [ $R \rightarrow URU^\dagger$ ]

measure Pauli  $P$ : reinterpret measurement outcome

$$\eta \rightarrow \eta (-1)^{\varphi(P)^T J r}$$

[measured  $R^\dagger P R$ ]