

Matchgates and classical simulation of quantum circuits

Richard Jozsa¹ and Akimasa Miyake^{2,3}

¹*Department of Computer Science, University of Bristol, Merchant Venturers Building, Bristol BS8 1UB U.K.*

²*Institute for Theoretical Physics, University of Innsbruck, Technikerstrasse 25, A-6020 Innsbruck, Austria.*

³*Institute for Quantum Optics and Quantum Information, Austrian Academy of Sciences, Innsbruck, Austria.*

(February 26, 2019)

Abstract

Let $G(A, B)$ denote the 2-qubit gate which acts as the 1-qubit $SU(2)$ gates A and B in the even and odd parity subspaces respectively, of two qubits. Using a Clifford algebra formalism we show that arbitrary uniform families of circuits of these gates, restricted to act only on nearest neighbour (n.n.) qubit lines, can be classically efficiently simulated. This reproduces a result originally proved by Valiant using his matchgate formalism, and subsequently related by others to free fermionic physics. We further show that if the n.n. condition is slightly relaxed, to allowing the same gates to act only on n.n. and next-n.n. qubit lines, then the resulting circuits can efficiently perform universal quantum computation. From this point of view, the gap between efficient classical and quantum computational power is bridged by a very modest use of a seemingly innocuous resource (qubit swapping). We also extend the simulation result above in various ways. In particular, by exploiting properties of Clifford operations in conjunction with the Jordan-Wigner representation of a Clifford algebra, we show how one may generalise the simulation result above to provide further classes of classically efficiently simulatable quantum circuits, which we call Gaussian quantum circuits.

1 Introduction

Quantum computation is widely regarded as being more powerful than classical computation. Indeed in some scenarios there are provable benefits, such as an exponential reduction in communication resources for some distributed computing tasks (e.g. [1]) and in quantum cryptography, the ability to communicate with unconditional security against eavesdropping. These results do not depend on any computational hardness assumptions nor on the presence of any oracle relativisations. Furthermore in suitably relativised oracle models of computation there are various known exponential savings in quantum versus classical query complexity such as [2, 3]. However for pure (unrelativised) computation there is to date no proof of separation and it is still possible that efficient classical and quantum computational power might coincide i.e. the complexity classes BPP and BQP might be equal. (See for example [4] for a definition of these classes. Here and below the term “efficient” is synonymous with “polynomial time”). Note that this is not the same question as the issue of efficient

classical simulation of quantum processes since any BQP algorithm is a quantum process of only a severely restricted kind, required to satisfy infinitely many constraints relative to an infinite set of input states viz. all computational basis states. In this paper we will study a representation of quantum computation in which the gap (if it exists) between efficient classical and efficient quantum computation appears to be surprisingly fragile, being provably bridged by a very modest use of a seemingly trivial resource (cf theorems 1 and 2 below).

We will provide a self contained development of a class of quantum circuits based on so-called matchgates, a notion that was introduced by Valiant in [5]. Our approach is closely related to work of Knill [6] and Terhal and DiVincenzo [7, 8], relating matchgate circuits to fermionic quantum computation (and later further extended by Bravyi [9, 10]). Here we will emphasise the underlying mathematical ingredients and consider some further properties and generalisations that go beyond the fermionic formalism. Indeed the existence of a physical interpretation in terms of fermionic physics, although interesting, appears to be entirely fortuitous and of no particular consequence for our considerations of computational complexity issues *per se*.

Consider 2-qubit gates $G(A, B)$ of the form (in the computational basis):

$$G(A, B) = \begin{pmatrix} p & 0 & 0 & q \\ 0 & w & x & 0 \\ 0 & y & z & 0 \\ r & 0 & 0 & s \end{pmatrix} \quad A = \begin{pmatrix} p & q \\ r & s \end{pmatrix} \quad B = \begin{pmatrix} w & x \\ y & z \end{pmatrix} \quad (1)$$

where A and B are both in $SU(2)$ or both in $U(2)$ with the *same determinant*. Thus the action of $G(A, B)$ amounts to A acting in the even parity subspace (spanned by $|00\rangle$ and $|11\rangle$) and B acting in the odd parity subspace (spanned by $|01\rangle$ and $|10\rangle$). We will denote the Pauli operators by X , Y , and Z .

Theorem 1 *Consider any uniform (hence poly-sized) quantum circuit family comprising only $G(A, B)$ gates such that:*

- (i) *the $G(A, B)$ gates act on nearest neighbour (n.n.) lines only;*
- (ii) *the input state is any product state;*
- (iii) *the output is a final measurement in the computational basis on any single line.*

Then the output may be classically efficiently simulated. More precisely for any k we can classically efficiently compute the expectation value $\langle Z_k \rangle_{\text{out}} = \langle \psi_{\text{out}} | Z_k | \psi_{\text{out}} \rangle = p_0 - p_1$ where Z_k is the Pauli Z operator on the k^{th} line, $|\psi_{\text{out}}\rangle$ is the final state and p_0, p_1 are the outcome probabilities.

Theorem 1 is very similar to the classical simulation result of Valiant in [5] and Terhal and DiVincenzo in [7]. Our result is more general in the feature of allowing arbitrary product state inputs (rather than just computational basis states) but more restrictive in considering only single bit outputs i.e. decision problems (rather than individual probabilities of computational basis measurements across many lines) and adaptive circuits in [7].

The notion of *efficient classical simulation* that we will use in this paper is the following. Let C_n be any uniform family of quantum circuits together with (i) a specified class of input states (usually taken to be product states, but we may also restrict to just computational

basis states) and (ii) a specified class of output measurements (which we take to be Z_k , a Z -basis measurement on any single line). We say that C_n is *classically efficiently simulatable* (relative to (i) and (ii)) if the probabilities of measurement outcomes can be *computed* by classical means to m digits of accuracy in $\text{poly}(n, m)$ time.

Note that this ability to efficiently *compute* the probabilities to *exponential* accuracy is a rather strong notion e.g. we might instead adopt weaker criteria such as the ability to compute the probabilities to accuracy $1/\text{poly}(m)$ i.e. $O(\log m)$ digits in $\text{poly}(n, m)$ time, or the ability to *sample* the output probability distribution *once* (by classical efficient probabilistic means, to suitably accuracy). Indeed the last requirement would suffice in issues of the comparison of quantum to classical computational power but we will in fact achieve the strongest notion above in our results and we thus adopt it as our definition. We make further comments about implications of this strong notion of classical simulation in the concluding section 7 below.

Note that if the n.n. $G(A, B)$ circuits in theorem 1 are considered with computational basis inputs and also required to satisfy the BQP bounded probability conditions (viz. that the output probabilities are always $\geq \frac{2}{3}$ or $\leq \frac{1}{3}$), then the ability to classically *calculate* the output probabilities (rather than the ability merely to sample the output distribution once) implies that the corresponding decision problem is not just in BPP but actually in P i.e. *deterministic* classical polynomial time.

In the following sections we will first prove a universality result for $G(A, B)$ gates, if these gates are also allowed to act on next-n.n. lines in addition to the n.n. lines of theorem 1. Then we give some background on the origin of the notion of matchgates, which first lead to the consideration of circuits of $G(A, B)$ gates in [5]. Next we consider a formalism of anti-commuting variables that form a Clifford algebra, leading to a proof of theorem 1. This approach is essentially the one given in [6, 7], but we give some more transparent proofs and we develop further properties. First, we elucidate the n.n. condition (i) in theorem 1: we show that the general class of simulatable gates comprises a uniformly describable family that may act on any number of the n qubits, in which the $G(A, B)$ gates appear as the subset of n.n. 2-qubit gates. We show furthermore that all gates in the family can be obtained as *circuits* of n.n. $G(A, B)$ gates (hence adding nothing new) and that non-n.n. $G(A, B)$ gates are not generally in the family. Second, by considering Clifford *operations*¹ [4] (i.e. n -qubit unitary operations that normalise the n -qubit Pauli group in $U(2^n)$) in conjunction with the Clifford algebra formalism, we will describe an avenue for generalising theorem 1 and give some examples of simulatable circuits which cannot be obtained as circuits of n.n. $G(A, B)$ gates only. Since all our classes of classically simulatable circuits comprise gates that are generated by Hamiltonians expressible as quadratic elements of a Clifford algebra, we call them *Gaussian quantum circuits*.

2 Universality of n.n. and next-n.n. $G(A, B)$ gates

The n.n. condition in theorem 1(i) is perhaps a surprising ingredient but it is crucial: it was already mentioned in [7] (based on the result in [11]) that n.n. $G(A, B)$ gates together

¹The appellation ‘‘Clifford’’ here, commonly used in quantum computation literature, appears not to be mathematically related to the well established notion of Clifford *algebra* in mathematics generally.

with the swap gate $SWAP$, or equivalently $G(A, B)$ gates acting on arbitrary pairs of qubit lines, can perform universal quantum computation. We will prove a stronger result:

Theorem 2 *Let C_n be any uniform family of quantum circuits with output given by a Z basis measurement on the first line. Then C_n may be simulated by a circuit of $G(A, B)$ gates acting on n.n. or next n.n. lines only (i.e. on line pairs at most distance 2 apart) with at most a constant increase in the size of the circuit.*

Before the proof we make a few remarks. As an immediate corollary we have that any BQP algorithm can be simulated by a poly-sized circuit of $G(A, B)$ gates acting only on n.n. and next-n.n. lines. This fact together with theorem 1 shows that a very limited use of the seemingly innocuous operation $SWAP$ (on n.n. lines) allowing n.n. $G(A, B)$ gates to act on lines just one further apart, suffices to bridge the gap between classical and quantum efficient computational power. The result becomes perhaps even more striking if we note that $SWAP$ itself is very close to being expressible in the allowed $G(A, B)$ form. Indeed $SWAP = G(I, X)$ and fails only through a mere minus sign in $\det X = -\det I$. Thus if we drop the $\det A = \det B$ condition in eq. (1), then the resulting $G(A, B)$ gates acting on n.n. lines become efficiently universal for quantum computation.

The significance of $SWAP$ (or equivalently the ability of 2-qubit gates to act on distant lines) for quantum computational power appears also in a different context. Using the formalism of tensor network contractions it may be shown [12, 13, 14] that any poly-sized quantum circuit of 1- and 2- qubit gates, which has log depth and in which the 2-qubit gates are restricted to act at bounded range (i.e. on line pairs at most distance c apart, for some constant c) may be classically efficiently simulated. It is also known [15] that Shor's quantum factoring algorithm [16] can be implemented as a log depth circuit but its 2-qubit gates act on distant lines, $O(n)$ apart, which is not bounded with increasing input size n . Thus from this point of view, the quantum advantage of the algorithm (over classical algorithms) rests entirely on the presence of *unboundedly* distant actions (or unbounded use of $SWAP$). Also it is shown in [17, 13] that all depth 2 circuits (followed by a measurement) are classically efficiently simulatable even if 2-qubit gates act on arbitrary line pairs while the same simulation result for depth 3 circuits (with a suitably strong notion of classical simulation) would imply equality of BPP and BQP. Here again the feature of unboundedly distant action is essential, whereas our result in theorems 1 and 2 achieves full efficient quantum computational power by passage from distance one to just bounded distance two.

Proof of theorem 2: Given any uniform quantum circuit family we may assume w.l.o.g. that it comprises n.n. controlled- Z gates (n.n. CZ) and 1-qubit gates A .

We start with a *quadrupled* number of qubit lines and encode the original input $|0\rangle$'s and $|1\rangle$'s as logical basis states $|0_L\rangle = |0000\rangle$ and $|1_L\rangle = |1001\rangle$ respectively in consecutive blocks of 4 lines each (cf the remark after the proof). Then with suitably encoded gate operations the whole computation will stay within tensor products of $\text{span}\{|0_L\rangle, |1_L\rangle\}$ of each quadruple of qubits.

On any such quadruple of lines, say 1234, we can perform the encoded 1-qubit gate A as the following sequence of allowed n.n. gates (depicted in figure 1 (a)):

$$G(Z, X)_{12} G(Z, X)_{34} G(A, A)_{23} G(Z, X)_{12} G(Z, X)_{34} \tag{2}$$




Figure 1: Encoded universality by n.n. and next n.n. $G(A, B)$ gates. The logical single-qubit unitary gate A and the logical two-qubit CZ gate are illustrated in (a) and (b), respectively.

(where the subscripts denote the line numbers). To see this, note that

$$G(Z, X) = G(Z, I)G(I, X) = (CZ)(SWAP),$$

so that $G(Z, X)_{12}G(Z, X)_{34}$ can be thought of (for our logical basis states) as just swapping lines 1 and 4 into positions 2 and 3. In view of the form of the encoding $|0_L\rangle$ and $|1_L\rangle$, the logical qubit is then encoded in the $\{|00\rangle, |11\rangle\}$ subspace of lines 2 and 3 so $G(A, A)$ will apply the 1-qubit gate A to it. Finally the lines are swapped back to their original positions, restoring the encoding.

To perform an encoded CZ on two consecutive quadruples, say 1234 and 5678 we simply apply CZ_{45} i.e. CZ on the “crossover” pair of lines 4 and 5. Indeed for any pair of basis states $|abcd\rangle_{1234}$ and $|efgh\rangle_{5678}$ we’ll get a minus sign iff $d = e = 1$ giving the correct action on any encoded $|x_L\rangle$ and $|y_L\rangle$. Next note that since composition of $G(A, B)$ gates amounts to multiplying the A ’s and B ’s separately we obtain (with all gates acting on lines 4 and 5)

$$CZ_{45} = G(Z, I) = G(H, H)G(X, I)G(H, H) = G(H, H)G(X, X)G(I, X)G(H, H) \quad (3)$$

where $H = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(X + Z)$ is the Hadamard operator. In the last expression, $G(I, X)$ is $SWAP$ and all other gates are allowable $G(A, B)$ gates. This implementation of CZ_{45} is depicted in figure 1 (b).

Finally note that in an arbitrary such circuit, $SWAP$ is used only on “crossover” pairs (4,5), (8,9) etc. of the encoding quadruples (1,2,3,4), (5,6,7,8), (9,10,11,12) etc. Hence no line is ever moved more than one position distant from its original location, by overall action of any number of such $SWAP$ operations. We may commute all these $SWAP$ operations out to the output end of the circuit. In so doing, any line of each (originally n.n.) $G(A, B)$ gate in eq. (2) may be moved by at most one place but we can never move both lines of any n.n. $G(A, B)$ gate in view of the block size 4 of the encoding. Thus the resulting circuit (with $SWAP$ ’s eliminated) comprises only $G(A, B)$ gates acting on n.n. or next-n.n. lines, as required.

In this process *SWAP* gates need to be commuted across $G(X, X)$ and $G(H, H)$ gates (cf eq. (3)). But for any $G(A, B)$ we have (using $SWAP = G(I, X)$) that

$$G(A, B) SWAP = SWAP (SWAP G(A, B) SWAP) = SWAP G(A, XBX)$$

and the last gate is an allowed $G(A, B)$ gate. Since the whole computation is engineered to represent the original given circuit, recoded in the $\{|0_L\rangle = |0000\rangle, |1_L\rangle = |1001\rangle\}$ subspaces of consecutive line quadruples, a final measurement on line 1 will produce the same output distribution as a measurement on qubit 1 in the original given circuit. This completes the proof of theorem 2. \square

We remark that instead of the quadruple encoding above, we might have considered the simpler $|0_L\rangle = |00\rangle$ and $|1_L\rangle = |11\rangle$ as a potentially more natural choice. Indeed in that case the 1-qubit gate A is applied very simply as $G(A, A)$ (in contrast to eq. (2)) but the *SWAP*'s from the *CZ* actions may now move both lines of a n.n. $G(A, B)$ gate in opposite directions, resulting in $G(A, B)$'s on lines up to distance 3 (rather than just 2) apart.

3 Perfect matchings and matchgates

Before beginning our development of theorem 1 we give some brief background remarks on the interesting provenance of Valiant's notion of matchgates. (These remarks will not be used in any further results). Matchgates arose [5, 18] in the context of the theory of perfect matchings in graphs. For a graph G a perfect matching is a set M of edges such that each vertex is the endpoint of exactly one edge in M . It is known that the problem of counting the number of perfecting matchings in a graph is computationally very hard [19] (being complete for the complexity class $\#P$) but for *planar* graphs it is, remarkably, computable in polynomial time, using the Fisher-Kasteleyn-Temperley (FKT) algorithm [20, 21, 22].

More generally we may consider weighted graphs G in which each edge (ij) is assigned a weight w_{ij} and introduce the so-called match sum:

$$PerfM(G) = \sum_{\substack{\text{perfect matchings} \\ M}} \prod_{(ij) \in M} w_{ij}. \quad (4)$$

Then the FKT algorithm provides a polynomial time computation of the match sum for any planar graph.

Next consider a (planar) weighted graph with a designated set $\{v_1, \dots, v_n\}$ of "input" vertices and a disjoint designated set $\{v'_1, \dots, v'_m\}$ of "output" vertices, and consider the indexed collection (tensor)

$$M_{j_1 \dots j_m}^{i_1 \dots i_n} = PerfM(G_{j_1 \dots j_m}^{i_1 \dots i_n})$$

where each index takes values 0 and 1 and $G_{j_1 \dots j_m}^{i_1 \dots i_n}$ is the graph obtained from G by deleting all those input and output vertices (together with their incident edges) that have corresponding index i or j set to 1. Hence the tensor components are each computable in poly time by the FKT algorithm.

Matchgates are essentially these tensors with some additional technical modifications [5, 18] whose specification we will omit here. Suffice it to say that the full definition is

chosen so that a circuit of matchgates, representing contraction of a matchgate tensor network, corresponds to the problem of evaluating the match sum of G_{tot} where G_{tot} (with possibly some residual uncontracted input and output vertices) is the graph obtained from the graphs of the individual matchgates by identifying (or “glueing along”) input and output vertices that are contracted in the tensor network. It follows that the components of the contraction are computable in poly time too. This is essentially the content of Valiant’s so-called Holant theorem [18]. The expression and clarification of the Holant theorem in terms of tensor contractions (and its invariance under appropriate basis changes in representing the tensors) was developed in a series of works by Cai and Choudhary [23, 24].

For some choices of graphs and weights (with equal numbers $m = n$ of input and output nodes) the matchgate tensors can be *unitary* i.e. unitary operations on m qubits. Hence the above formalism leads to a class of quantum circuits (comprising unitary matchgates) that can be classically efficiently simulated. For example it may be shown [5] that the unitary gates $G(A, B)$ in eq. (1) arise as matchgates with 2 input and 2 output vertices.

The FKT algorithm [20, 21, 22] proceeds by setting up a suitable antisymmetric incidence matrix A of the graph’s weights and then computing $\text{PerfM}(G)$ as the Pfaffian of A (which in fact equals $\sqrt{\det A}$). Like the determinant of an arbitrary matrix, the definition of Pfaffian of an antisymmetric matrix is an expression involving exponentially many terms a priori yet computable on polynomial time. It is known that Pfaffians also occur in the mathematical formalism of fermionic quantum physics which suggests that there may be some relationship (or at least some form of translation of basic problems) between fermionic physics and perfect matchings in graphs. Indeed soon after the appearance of Valiant’s work [5] on classical simulation of matchgate quantum circuits, Knill [6] and Terhal and DiVincenzo [7] provided an interpretation of it in terms of fermionic quantum gates and this formalism was subsequently further developed by Bravyi [9, 10].

4 Clifford algebras, quadratic Hamiltonians and classical simulation

We now return to developing a formalism for treating theorem 1 and some generalisations. For n qubit lines, we introduce the set of $2n$ hermitian operators c_μ which satisfy the anti-commutation relation,

$$\{c_\mu, c_\nu\} \equiv c_\mu c_\nu + c_\nu c_\mu = 2\delta_{\mu\nu} I \quad \mu, \nu = 1, \dots, 2n. \quad (5)$$

These relations define a *Clifford algebra* \mathcal{C}_{2n} on $2n$ generators whose elements are arbitrary complex linear combinations of products of generators². Since each generator squares to the identity a general element in the algebra may be expressed as a polynomial of degree at most $2n$,

$$\sum_{i_1 < \dots < i_k} A_{i_1 \dots i_k} c_{i_1} \dots c_{i_k} \quad (6)$$

²As mentioned in [6, 25], it is possible to consider $2n + 1$ anti-commuting operators to define the Clifford algebra and correspondingly to have $SO(2n + 1)$ symmetry in theorem 3 below. However, this extension appears not to lead to a significant generalization of our results.

(where the index set $\{i_1, \dots, i_k\}$ may be empty). It follows from eq. (5) that the monomials in the sum are linearly independent so as a vector space \mathcal{C}_{2n} has dimension $2^{2n} = 2^n \times 2^n$. Hence (hermitian) matrix representations of the c_μ 's will involve matrices of size $2^n \times 2^n$.

Operators c_μ satisfying eq. (5) arise in the formalism of fermionic physics where they are known as Majorana spinors. In that formalism we start with a set of operators a_1, \dots, a_n associated to n free fermionic modes, satisfying the standard anti-commutation relations for fermionic creation and annihilation operators:

$$\{a_i, a_j\} \equiv a_i a_j + a_j a_i = 0 = \{a_i^\dagger, a_j^\dagger\} \quad \{a_i, a_j^\dagger\} = \delta_{ij} I.$$

Then as a consequence of these relations, the following hermitian operators (which are fermionic analogues of position and momentum operators):

$$c_{2k-1} = a_k + a_k^\dagger \quad c_{2k} = (a_k - a_k^\dagger)/i \quad k = 1, \dots, n,$$

satisfy the Clifford algebra relations eq. (5). However we emphasise that in the present paper we are not concerned with the study of free fermions *per se* but rather, consideration of general quantum circuit simulation properties, based on the Clifford algebra structure, which can also go beyond the fermionic formalism (such as the statement in theorem 2 and results in section 6 below).

For theorem 1 and generalisations we will (in later sections) consider matrix representations of the Clifford algebra but we first develop some further abstract algebra. A *quadratic Hamiltonian* is an element of \mathcal{C}_{2n} of the form,

$$H = i \sum_{\mu \neq \nu=1}^{2n} h_{\mu\nu} c_\mu c_\nu \quad (7)$$

where $h_{\mu\nu}$ is a $2n \times 2n$ matrix of coefficients. Note that we omit $\mu = \nu$ terms which contribute only an overall additive constant to H . Since $c_\mu c_\nu = -c_\nu c_\mu$ and imposing $H = H^\dagger$ we may w.l.o.g. take $h_{\mu\nu}$ to be a real antisymmetric matrix.

Given H we consider the unitary operation $U = e^{iH}$ (where the exponential is calculated in the algebra of \mathcal{C}_{2n} as the power series). Any such unitary operation corresponding to a *quadratic* Hamiltonian is called a *Gaussian* operation. The following result from fermionic linear optics (cf [6, 7, 8, 9]) will be basic for our classical simulation results and we include a simple proof of it.

Theorem 3 *Let H be any quadratic Hamiltonian and $U = e^{iH}$ the corresponding Gaussian operation. Then for all μ :*

$$U^\dagger c_\mu U = \sum_{\nu=1}^{2n} R_{\mu\nu} c_\nu$$

where the matrix R is in $SO(2n)$, and we obtain all of $SO(2n)$ in this way. In fact $R = e^{2h}$.

Proof: Write c_μ as $c_\mu(0)$ and introduce $c_\mu(t) = U(t)c_\mu(0)U(t)^\dagger$ with $U(t) = e^{iHt}$. Then

$$\frac{dc_\mu(t)}{dt} = i[H, c_\mu(t)]$$

(with square brackets $[a, b]$ denoting the commutator $ab - ba$). But $[c_{\nu_1}c_{\nu_2}, c_\mu] = 0$ if $\mu \neq \nu_1, \nu_2$ and $[c_\mu c_\nu, c_\mu] = -2c_\nu$ (using eq.(5)) so

$$\frac{dc_\mu(t)}{dt} = \sum_{\nu} 2h_{\mu\nu}c_\nu(t) \quad \text{and hence} \quad c_\mu(t) = \sum_{\nu} R_{\mu\nu}(t)c_\nu(0)$$

where $R = e^{2ht}$. It is well known that antisymmetric matrices are the infinitesimal generators of rotations and the theorem follows by just setting $t = 1$. \square

The significance of theorem 3 for us is the following: note that e^{iH} generally involves all products of all generators so the expression $Uc_\mu U^\dagger$ could potentially finish up anywhere in the exponentially large (2^{2n} -dimensional) linear space \mathcal{C}_{2n} . However it always happens to stay within the *polynomially small* ($2n$ -dimensional) subspace spanned by just the generators themselves. We exploit this feature of the adjoint representation (cf. also [25] for a more general Lie-theoretic setting), using the following strategy.

We find a hermitian representation of the c_μ 's on n -qubit operators and then the Gaussian operations corresponding to quadratic Hamiltonians define a class of n -qubit unitary gates. Let \tilde{U} be any circuit of these with $|\psi_{\text{out}}\rangle = \tilde{U}|\psi_{\text{in}}\rangle$ for some choice of input state. Then by theorem 3 for each μ we have the expectation value

$$\langle c_\mu \rangle_{\text{out}} = \langle \psi_{\text{in}} | \tilde{U}^\dagger c_\mu \tilde{U} | \psi_{\text{in}} \rangle = \sum_{\nu=1}^{2n} \tilde{R}_{\mu\nu} \langle \psi_{\text{in}} | c_\nu | \psi_{\text{in}} \rangle \quad (8)$$

where $\tilde{R}_{\mu\nu}$ is the product of all $SO(2n)$ matrices corresponding to the individual gates of M . Hence the full matrix $\tilde{R}_{\mu\nu}$ is poly time computable.

Now suppose further that $|\psi_{\text{in}}\rangle = |\xi_1\rangle \dots |\xi_n\rangle$ is a *product* state and that c_μ is represented by a *product* operator $P_1 \otimes \dots \otimes P_n$. Then $\langle \psi_{\text{in}} | c_\mu | \psi_{\text{in}} \rangle = \prod_{i=1}^n \langle \xi_i | P_i | \xi_i \rangle$ is also poly time computable and hence $\langle c_\mu \rangle_{\text{out}}$ is poly time computable for each μ .

However we really want $\langle Z_k \rangle_{\text{out}} = p_0 - p_1$ where Z_k is the Pauli Z operator acting on the k^{th} line. Recall that \mathcal{C}_{2n} as a vector space has dimension $2^n \times 2^n$ so it spans all n -qubit matrices in our representation. Thus Z_k must be expressible as some polynomial of the form eq. (6). If this polynomial has a constant degree, independent of n , then $\langle Z_k \rangle_{\text{out}}$ will be poly time computable too. As an example suppose $Z_1 = -ic_1c_2$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \langle Z_1 \rangle_{\text{out}} &= \langle \psi_{\text{in}} | (-i)\tilde{U}^\dagger c_1c_2\tilde{U} | \psi_{\text{in}} \rangle = \langle \psi_{\text{in}} | (-i)(\tilde{U}^\dagger c_1\tilde{U})(\tilde{U}^\dagger c_2\tilde{U}) | \psi_{\text{in}} \rangle \\ &= \sum_{\nu_1 \neq \nu_2=1}^{2n} \tilde{R}_{1\nu_1} \tilde{R}_{2\nu_2} \langle \psi_{\text{in}} | (-i)c_{\nu_1}c_{\nu_2} | \psi_{\text{in}} \rangle. \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

If the c_μ are product operators then so are all the monomials such as $c_{\nu_1}c_{\nu_2}$ and $\langle \psi_{\text{in}} | c_{\nu_1}c_{\nu_2} | \psi_{\text{in}} \rangle$ will be poly time computable for any product state input $|\psi_{\text{in}}\rangle$. Note also that the size of the sum in eq. (9) is $O(n^2)$ (compared to the $O(n)$ sized sum for $\langle c_\mu \rangle_{\text{out}}$ in eq. (8) and hence $\langle Z_1 \rangle_{\text{out}}$ is poly time computable too. This argument is easily generalized to give the following result.

Theorem 4 Consider any poly-sized circuit of Gaussian gates acting on a product input state. If the observable Z_k in the final measurement is expressible in \mathcal{C}_{2n} as a polynomial of degree d , then for each of its monomials the corresponding sum as in eq. (9) for $\langle Z_k \rangle_{\text{out}}$ will be $O(n^d)$ sized and hence $\langle Z_k \rangle_{\text{out}}$ will be poly time computable if d does not increase with n .

5 The Jordan-Wigner representation and theorem 1

Introduce the $2n$ hermitian operators on n -qubits (omitting tensor product symbols \otimes throughout):

$$\begin{aligned} c_1 &= X I \dots I & c_3 &= Z X I \dots I & \dots & & c_{2k-1} &= Z \dots Z X I \dots I & \dots \\ c_2 &= Y I \dots I & c_4 &= Z Y I \dots I & \dots & & c_{2k} &= Z \dots Z Y I \dots I & \dots \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

where X and Y are in the k^{th} slot for c_{2k-1} and c_{2k} , and k ranges from 1 to n . Thus the operators c_{2k-1}, c_{2k} are associated to the k^{th} qubit line. It is straightforward to check that these matrices satisfy the relations eq. (5) so we have a representation of the Clifford algebra \mathcal{C}_{2n} , known as the Jordan-Wigner representation [26]. This is in fact the unique representation of \mathcal{C}_{2n} up to a *global unitary equivalence*. Furthermore, $Z_k = -ic_{2k-1}c_{2k}$, which has bounded degree two, and the c_μ 's are all product operators. Hence for any poly sized circuit of Gaussian gates with a product state input, $\langle Z_k \rangle_{\text{out}}$ is poly time computable. But what do these Gaussian gates actually look like?

Consider first just qubit lines 1 and 2 (i.e. c_1, c_2, c_3 and c_4) and corresponding quadratic Hamiltonians which involve 6 possible terms:

$$\begin{aligned} -ic_1c_2 &= ZI & -ic_2c_3 &= XX \\ ic_1c_3 &= YX & -ic_2c_4 &= XY \\ ic_1c_4 &= YY & -ic_3c_4 &= IZ. \end{aligned}$$

These operators are all trace free and all preserve the even and odd parity subspaces. Hence the corresponding 6 parameter family of Gaussian gates must be $SU(2) \oplus SU(2)$ decomposed relative to the two parity subspaces. More explicitly we may first construct the ‘‘encoded’’ Pauli X, Y, Z operators acting within the two subspaces (e.g. $\frac{1}{2}(XX + YY)$ is X acting in the odd subspace and maps the even subspace to zero) and generate the two $SU(2)$'s by direct exponentiation. Hence we get precisely the $G(A, B)$ gates for lines 1 and 2 as the Gaussian operations $U = e^{iH}$ with the quadratic Hamiltonian of eq. (7) restricted to use of c_1, c_2, c_3, c_4 only. Similarly for any pair of *consecutive* lines we get all n.n. $G(A, B)$ gates (since for lines $k, k+1$ the initial Z operators in eq. (10) are eliminated in all quadratic products $c_\mu c_\nu$ and the calculation proceeds exactly as above).

Thus all n.n. $G(A, B)$ gates are Gaussian for the Jordan-Wigner representation and this completes the proof of theorem 1.

But there are still more Gaussian gates, generated by quadratic Hamiltonians involving more c_μ 's associated to a larger number and more distant lines. Note first that if we use only the four c_μ 's associated to a pair of not-n.n. lines, we do *not* get the corresponding (now non-n.n.) $G(A, B)$ gate acting on those lines. For example consider the quadratic

term c_2c_4 (associated to n.n. lines 1 and 2) replaced by c_2c_6 (being the corresponding operator associated to lines 1 and 3). We have $c_2c_4 = X_1Y_2$ but $c_2c_6 = X_1Z_2Y_3$. Hence exponentiation of the latter does not correspond to exponentiation of XY for lines 1 and 3 but gives a gate acting nontrivially across all three lines.

In summary so far, we see that non-n.n. $G(A, B)$'s are not generally Gaussian. But n.n. $G(A, B)$'s are all examples of Gaussian operations, albeit only special cases in the full set of such operations that may generally act on any number of qubit lines. Finally we show that these apparently more general Gaussian operations actually bring nothing new, in the context of *circuits* of gates:

Theorem 5 *Let $H = i \sum_{\mu, \nu} h_{\mu\nu} c_\mu c_\nu$ be any quadratic Hamiltonian with corresponding Gaussian gate $V = e^{iH}$ on n qubits. Then V as an operator on n qubits is expressible as a circuit of $O(n^3)$ n.n. $G(A, B)$ gates i.e. $V = U_N U_{N-1} \dots U_1$ where each $U_j = e^{iH_j}$ having $H_j = i \sum_{\mu, \nu} h_{\mu\nu} c_\mu c_\nu$ with the sum involving only four c 's associated to two n.n. lines viz. $c_{2k-1}, c_{2k}, c_{2k+1}, c_{2k+2}$ for some fixed k .*

Note that (as shown in the proof below) the circuit expression of theorem 5 is *exact, analytic, and explicitly describable in poly-time*, in contrast to an alternative standard, but generally inefficient, asymptotic decomposition utilising the Lie-Trotter expansion (for an exponential of a sum of generally non-commuting operators).

Proof: Let $V = e^{iH}$ be any Gaussian operation as above. We have

$$V^\dagger c_\mu V = \sum_{\nu=1}^{2n} R_{\mu\nu} c_\nu$$

with $R \in SO(2n)$. We can efficiently decompose R into its generalized Euler angles (by the algorithm of section 4 in [27]), obtaining $R = r_1 r_2 \dots r_M$ where $M = O(n^2)$ and each r_j is a rotation in $2n$ dimensions that acts non-trivially only in 2-dimensions, spanned by say the a^{th} and b^{th} co-ordinates. Thus $r_j = e^{2h_j}$ where h_j is an antisymmetric matrix with nonzero values (denoted $\pm\theta/2$) only in its a^{th} and b^{th} columns and rows. Then introduce $H_j = i\theta c_a c_b$ so $U_j = e^{iH_j}$ has

$$U_j^\dagger c_\mu U_j = \sum_{\nu=1}^{2n} (r_j)_{\mu\nu} c_\nu.$$

In this construction c_a and c_b do not generally belong to n.n. qubit lines. To remedy this we introduce the n.n. “modified swap” operation [28] defined, for example for lines 1 and 2, by

$$S_{12} = \exp\left(-\frac{\pi}{4}(-c_1c_4 + c_2c_3 + c_1c_2 + c_3c_4)\right). \quad (11)$$

We can readily verify that

$$S_{12}^\dagger c_1 S_{12} = c_3, \quad S_{12}^\dagger c_2 S_{12} = c_4$$

i.e. S_{12} swaps the roles of the pairs (c_1, c_2) and (c_3, c_4) . Similarly we have $S_{k,k+1}$ for any n.n. line pair to swap pairs (c_{2k-1}, c_{2k}) and (c_{2k+1}, c_{2k+2}) . Note that the exponent in eq. (11) is n.n. quadratic so S_{12} is a n.n. Gaussian gate. In fact in the Jordan-Wigner representation we get $S_{12} = (CZ)(SWAP) = G(Z, X)$.

Returning to U_j and H_j , if c_a and c_b are not associated to n.n. qubit lines we can use a ladder of $S_{k,k+1}$ conjugations to express U_j as a product of at most $O(n)$ n.n. $G(A, B)$'s. Thus starting from U we obtain a product $\tilde{U} = U_N \dots U_1$ of at most $O(n^3)$ n.n. $G(A, B)$ gates such that $V^\dagger c_\mu V = \tilde{U}^\dagger c_\mu \tilde{U}$ for all c_μ . Hence this relation holds for all monomials $c_{\mu_1} \dots c_{\mu_k}$ too and thus for arbitrary matrices M (as the monomials span all, matrices) i.e. $V^\dagger M V = \tilde{U}^\dagger M \tilde{U}$ for all M so $\tilde{U} = e^{i\delta} V$ for some overall phase δ , which may be set to zero by a further trivial $G(A, B)$ gate. \square

We remark that theorem 5 has a direct application in digital quantum simulation (algorithmic quantum simulation by the set of elementary gates) of a 1D quantum system whose Hamiltonian H is describable in the form of eq. (7). In particular, this includes the 1D XY Hamiltonian which exhibits a quantum phase transition for suitable choice of its parameters. We see that the real-time dynamics of the XY Hamiltonian *for any length of time* t can be efficiently quantumly simulated in terms of n.n. $G(A, B)$ gates. Another efficient circuit simulation of the XY Hamiltonian was described recently in [29].

6 Gaussian quantum circuits intertwined by Clifford operations

Recall [4] that the Pauli group \mathcal{P}_n on n qubits contains all n -fold tensor products $P_1 \otimes \dots \otimes P_n$ of Pauli matrices (i.e. each P_j is I, X, Y or Z) together with overall factors of ± 1 and $\pm i$. An n -qubit operation T is a Clifford operation iff $T^\dagger A T \in \mathcal{P}_n$ for all $A \in \mathcal{P}_n$ i.e. conjugation by T preserves the product Pauli structure. It is known [30, 31] that a unitary operation T is a Clifford operation iff it can be expressed as a circuit of controlled-NOT, Hadamard H and $P = \text{diag}(1, i)$ gates.

With this in mind recall also that the Jordan-Wigner representation of \mathcal{C}_{2n} comprises not only product operators, but *Pauli* products. It is easy to verify that if a set of hermitian operators c_μ satisfy the Clifford algebra relations eq. (5) then so do $c'_\mu = V^\dagger c_\mu V$ for any unitary V . Now recall that our classical simulation result relied upon the quadratic Hamiltonian property in theorem 3 – which in turn rests on the algebra relations eq. (5) – and the product structure of the matrix representation (associated to product state inputs). Hence if we choose V in $c'_\mu = V^\dagger c_\mu V$ to be a *Clifford operation* T we preserve *both* features and we can obtain new classes of classically efficiently simulatable quantum circuits using the Gaussian operations provided by the c'_μ 's. Note that the Clifford operation T itself cannot generally be obtained as a Gaussian gate of the original Clifford algebra representation c_μ , nor thus by a circuit of n.n. $G(A, B)$ gates.

The conjugation action of T can be taken outside the quadratic Hamiltonian and the exponential power series sum, showing that the new Gaussian gate $U_{\text{new}} = T^\dagger U_{\text{old}} T$ is just the original one U_{old} (e.g. n.n. $G(A, B)$'s) conjugated by T . In a new circuit comprising new Gaussian gates U_{new} , the intermediate Clifford operations T can be viewed as cancelling each other by the unitarity identity $T T^\dagger = I$. Thus we can alternatively think of these new simulatable circuits as being the same as the old ones but the input states are now $T |\psi_{\text{in,old}}\rangle$ (now generally entangled) and the final measurement is now $T Z_k T^\dagger$ (now generally a multi-line observable) rather than Z_k itself, i.e. we extend the class of allowed inputs and measured outputs in theorem 1 while maintaining classical efficient simulatability. From this point of




Figure 2: Intertwining Clifford operations T for the examples 2 and 3 in (a) and (b) respectively, in order to change the representation of the Clifford algebra.

view the new freedom associated to use of Clifford operations T appears at *the boundary* of circuits, which is analogous to the Valiant’s use of basis changes in his notion of holographic algorithm [18].

In our construction T is generally a global (n -qubit) operation, so that we require two further features:

- (a) The Pauli operator Z_k should be expressible as a *bounded* degree polynomial in the c'_μ ’s. Recall that the classical simulation cost depends on this degree d as $O(n^d)$ (cf. theorem 4), and it was previously quadratic, but with arbitrary T ’s we may get $d = O(n)$.
- (b) We wish to identify suitably *local* new gates U_{new} acting on say, some constant number K of qubit lines. For general T operators, even the conjugates of n.n. $G(A, B)$ gates may become global n -qubit operators, so we may for example, seek Clifford T ’s such that these particular conjugates remain K -local for some K .

We also remark that, in the above construction, we need to choose a Clifford operation T_n for each number n of qubit lines. A curious feature is that in addition to being able to vary the structure of T_n with n , each T_n need not itself be “translationally uniform” across the n lines whereas the class of all n.n. $G(A, B)$ gates as a whole does have a translationally uniform structure. Hence we can obtain classically simulatable quantum circuits which have different kinds of gates allowed on different sections of the qubit line set.

To conclude this section we give three illustrative examples of this construction.

Example 1. Clearly any circuit T of *SWAP* operations is a Clifford operation. In this case $T^\dagger G(A, B)_{n,n} T$ amounts to allowing the $G(A, B)$ gates to act on correspondingly selected distant lines. However in any such resulting Gaussian circuit the lines may always be simply re-ordered to restore all $G(A, B)$ ’s to n.n. status.

Example 2. Let $CNOT_{i,j}$ denote the n -qubit operation that applies the 2-qubit *CNOT* gate with control line i and target line j . Let H_i denote the 1-qubit Hadamard gate on line

i. Consider the (translationally uniform) Clifford operation:

$$T_n = CNOT_{12}CNOT_{23}\dots CNOT_{n-1n}H_1H_2\dots H_n$$

as depicted in figure 2 (a). Indeed, this T operation is known as the duality transformation of the 1D quantum system (cf. [32]). Conjugating the Jordan-Wigner representation c_μ 's of eq. (10), we obtain $c'_\mu = T^\dagger c_\mu T$ giving:

$$c'_{2k-1} = X_{k-1} \left(\prod_{j=k}^n Z_j \right) \quad c'_{2k} = -Y_k \left(\prod_{j=k+1}^n Z_j \right)$$

so that $Z_k = -ic'_{2k}c'_{2k+1}$ remains quadratic in the generators. The six n.n. quadratic Hamiltonian terms on lines $k, k+1$ are

$$i(\alpha_0 c_{2k-1} c_{2k+2} - \alpha_1 c_{2k} c_{2k+1} + \beta_1 c_{2k-1} c_{2k+1} - \beta_2 c_{2k} c_{2k+2} - \gamma_1 c_{2k-1} c_{2k} - \gamma_2 c_{2k+1} c_{2k+2})$$

and correspond in the Jordan-Wigner representation to

$$\alpha_0 Y_k Y_{k+1} + \alpha_1 X_k X_{k+1} + \beta_1 Y_k X_{k+1} + \beta_2 X_k Y_{k+1} + \gamma_1 Z_k + \gamma_2 Z_{k+1}.$$

Conjugation by T gives the Hamiltonian (also known as the three-body cluster-state interaction):

$$-\alpha_0 X_{k-1} Z_k X_{k+1} - \beta_1 X_{k-1} Y_k - \beta_2 Y_k X_{k+1} + \gamma_1 X_{k-1} X_k + \gamma_2 X_k X_{k+1} + \alpha_1 Z_k.$$

Note that this Hamiltonian (although quadratic in the c'_μ 's) has now become 3-local so that the 6 parameter family of n.n. $G(A, B)$'s on lines $k, k+1$ will conjugate to a 6 parameter class of 3-local gates on lines $k-1, k, k+1$ (and we omit computation of the explicit form of these 3-qubit gates). Since we have expanded into 3 lines we may go back and consider arbitrary quadratic Hamiltonian terms in the c_μ 's associated to lines $k-1, k, k+1$, involving ${}^6C_2 = 15$ parameters. By computing their conjugates under T we find that they all remain 3-local, giving a 15 parameter family of 3-local Gaussian gates. However by theorem 5, any member of this 15 parameter family is obtainable as a circuit of the initial 6 parameter family. Finally, we see, by the construction, that arbitrary poly-sized circuits of the 15 parameter family of 3-local gates, with input product states and a final Z_k measurement can be classically efficiently simulated.

Example 3. For odd n consider the translationally uniform Clifford operation T_n given by

$$T_n = (CNOT_{12}CNOT_{34}\dots CNOT_{n-2n-1})(CNOT_{32}CNOT_{54}\dots CNOT_{nn-1})$$

as depicted in figure 2 (b). Conjugating the Jordan-Wigner representation we obtain in this case:

$$\begin{aligned} c'_{4l} &= \left(\prod_{j=2}^{2l-1} Z_j \right) Y_{2l} Z_{2l+1}, \\ c'_{4l+1} &= \left(\prod_{j=2}^{2l-1} Z_j \right) Y_{2l} Y_{2l+1} X_{2l+2}, \\ c'_{4l+2} &= \left(\prod_{j=2}^{2l-1} Z_j \right) Y_{2l} X_{2l+1} X_{2l+2}, \\ c'_{4l+3} &= \left(\prod_{j=2}^{2l} Z_j \right) X_{2l+2}, \end{aligned}$$

supplemented by boundary terms

$$c'_1 = X_1 X_2 \quad c'_2 = Y_1 X_2 \quad c'_3 = Z_1 X_2.$$

It follows from these expressions that the conjugations of n.n. $G(A, B)$ gates on lines $k, k + 1$ become 4-local gates on lines $k, k + 1, k + 2, k + 3$. By considering all possible quadratic terms of c'_μ 's associated to these 4 lines we obtain for each k , a 13 parameter family of Gaussian gates (i.e. not all 8C_2 quadratic terms remain 4-local under conjugation). These are generated by the following Hamiltonians and their commutators:

$$\text{for } k \text{ odd: } Z_k Z_{k+1} X_{k+2} X_{k+3}, Z_k Z_{k+1} Z_{k+2}, X_{k+1} Z_{k+2} X_{k+3}, X_k X_{k+1}, \\ X_{k+1} X_{k+2}, X_{k+2} X_{k+3}, Z_k, Z_{k+2};$$

$$\text{for } k \text{ even: } X_k X_{k+1} Z_{k+2} Z_{k+3}, Z_{k+1} Z_{k+2} Z_{k+3}, X_k Z_{k+1} X_{k+2}, X_k X_{k+1}, \\ X_{k+1} X_{k+2}, X_{k+2} X_{k+3}, Z_{k+1}, Z_{k+3}.$$

Thus when k is odd Z_k is obtained as a quadratic expression in the c'_μ 's, whereas when k is even Z_k requires a sixth degree Clifford algebra monomial viz. the product of $Z_{k-1} Z_k Z_{k+1}$, Z_{k-1} and Z_{k+1} each of which is in the k -even list above and hence quadratically representable. Thus arbitrary poly-sized circuits of the 26 parameter family of 4-qubit gates defined by the Hamiltonians above, is classically efficiently simulatable albeit with a higher simulation cost which now scales as $O(n^6)$.

7 Concluding remarks

In theorems 1 and 2 we have seen that quantum computational power may be made to appear as a surprisingly delicate extension of its classical counterpart. Is it conceivable that the passage from n.n. to next-n.n. use of $G(A, B)$ gates may be achieved while maintaining classical simulatability? We relate this question to some more formal complexity theoretic considerations after introducing some further terminology.

Recall that BQP is the class of languages decided by a uniform (poly-sized) family of quantum circuits for which, given any input computational basis state, each output probability p_0 and p_1 is $\geq \frac{2}{3}$ or $\leq \frac{1}{3}$ (with output 1 resp. 0 designating acceptance resp. rejection of the input). Introduce PQP (a quantum analogue of the classical class PP [19]) to denote the corresponding class of languages for which the bounded probability conditions are relaxed to requiring only that p_0 and p_1 are $\geq \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2^n}$ or $\leq \frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{2^n}$. Clearly $\text{BQP} \subseteq \text{PQP}$ but we also have $\text{NP} \subseteq \text{PQP}$ (using a quantum algorithm for SAT that simply computes a Boolean function on an equal superposition of all its inputs and measures the function output register for values 0 versus 1) and furthermore $\text{PP} \subseteq \text{PQP}$ (e.g. by considering a similar quantum algorithm for MAJSAT [19] instead of just SAT).

Now let $V_{\text{n.n.}} \subseteq \text{PQP}$ be the class of languages decided by PQP-circuits of n.n. $G(A, B)$ gates. With our strong notion of classical simulation, theorem 1 gives $V_{\text{n.n.}} \subseteq \text{P}$. Also theorem 2 shows that every language in PQP is decidable (relative to the PQP probability conditions) by a circuit comprising only n.n. and next-n.n. $G(A, B)$ gates (and applied to a suitably restricted set of inputs, encoding strings of 0's and 1's). Thus if the latter were

also classically simulatable we would have $P = NP = PP$ i.e. in the context of the PQP probability conditions, an extra supra-classical computational power *must* be associated to the single distance extension of the range of n.n. 2-qubit $G(A, B)$ gates if these classical computational complexity classes are to be unequal.

On the other hand the same analysis carried out relative to the (far more stringent) BQP probability conditions (viz. requiring p_0 and p_1 to be bounded away from $\frac{1}{2}$ by at least $\frac{1}{6}$) is less compelling. Indeed it is generally believed (although not proven) that neither NP nor PP is contained in BQP so in the context of BQP circuits it becomes less implausible that the passage from n.n. to next n.n. $G(A, B)$ circuits might retain classical simulatability (now no longer implying equality of P, NP and PP). But then we would have $P = BQP$. Actually, a fortiori, to obtain the latter it would suffice to simultaneously relax our (very strong) notion of classical simulation to a far weaker requirement viz. the ability to merely *sample* the output distribution *once* by classical efficient means, in contrast to classically efficiently computing the probabilities to exponential accuracy.

Acknowledgments RJ and AM acknowledge support from the EC network QICS which provided collaborative opportunities for this work. AM acknowledges discussions with H.J. Briegel, B. Kraus, and R. Somma, and is supported by FWF and the EC networks OLAQUI, SCALA. RJ is supported by EPSRC QIP-IRC and EC network QAP.

References

- [1] Raz R. 1999 *Proc 31st Annual ACM Symp. Theory of Computing (New York: ACM Press)*, 358.
- [2] Deutsch D. and Jozsa R. 1992 *Proc. R. Soc. Lond. A* **439**. 553.
- [3] Simon D. 1997 *SIAM J. Computing* **26**, 1474.
- [4] Nielsen M. and Chuang I. 2000 *Quantum Computation and Quantum Information*. Cambridge University Press.
- [5] Valiant L. 2002 *SIAM J. Computing* **31:4**, 1229.
- [6] Knill E. 2001 arXiv:quant-ph/0108033.
- [7] Terhal B. and DiVincenzo D. 2002 *Phys. Rev. A* **65**, 032325.
- [8] DiVincenzo D. and Terhal B. 2004 arXiv:quant-ph/0403031.
- [9] Bravyi S. 2005 *Quant. Inf. Comp.* **5**, 216.
- [10] Bravyi S. 2008 arXiv:0801.2989v1.
- [11] Kempe J., Bacon D., DiVincenzo D., and Whaley K.B. 2001 *Quant. Inf. Comp.* **1(Special)**, 33.
- [12] Markov I. and Shi Y. 2005 arXiv:quant-ph/0511069. (To appear in *SIAM J. Computing*).

- [13] Jozsa R. 2006 arXiv:quant-ph/0603163.
- [14] Yoran N. and Short A. 2006 *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **96**, 170503.
- [15] Cleve R. and Watrous J. 2000 *Proc. 41st Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science*, 526.
- [16] Shor P. 1997 *SIAM J. Computing* **26**, 1484.
- [17] Terhal B. and DiVincenzo D.P. 2004 *Quant. Inf. Comp.* **4(2)**, 134.
- [18] Valiant L. 2007 *SIAM J. Computing* **37:5** 1565.
- [19] Papadimitriou C. 1994 *Computational Complexity*. Addison-Wesley, Reading, MA.
- [20] Kasteleyn P. 1961 *Physica* **27**, 1209.
- [21] Temperley H. and Fisher M. 1961 *Philosophical Magazine* **6**, 1061.
- [22] Jerrum M. 2003 *Counting, Sampling and Integrating: Algorithms and Complexity*. Birkhauser, Basel, Switzerland.
- [23] Cai J-Y. and Choudhary V. 2006 *Lecture Notes in Computer Science* **2959**, 248.
- [24] Cai J-Y. and Choudhary V. 2006 *On the theory of matchgate computations*, ECC-018.
- [25] Somma R., Barnum H., Ortiz G., and Knill E. 2006 *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **97**, 190501.
- [26] Jordan P. and Wigner E. 1928 *Zeitschrift für Physik* **47**, 631.
- [27] Hoffman D., Raffenetti R. and Ruedenberg K. 1972 *J. Math. Phys.* **13**, 528.
- [28] Bravyi S. and Kitaev, A. 2002 *Annals of Physics* **298:1**, 210.
- [29] Verstraete F., Cirac J.I., and Latorre J.I. 2008 arXiv:0804.1888.
- [30] Gottesman D. 1997 *Stabilizer Codes and Quantum Error Correction*, PhD thesis, California Institute of Technology, Pasadena, CA.
- [31] Gottesman D. Course on quantum error correction, Perimeter Institute, Waterloo <http://perimeterinstitute.ca/people/researchers/dgottesman/CO639-2004/index.html>
- [32] Plenio M.B., 2007 arXiv:quant-ph/0703007.