

Beyond Bell sampling: stabilizer state learning and quantum pseudorandomness lower bounds on qudits

Jonathan Allcock^{*1}, Joao F. Doriguello^{†2}, Gábor Ivanyos^{‡3}, and Miklos Santha^{§4,5}

¹Tencent Quantum Laboratory, Hong Kong, China

²HUN-REN Alfréd Rényi Institute of Mathematics, Budapest, Hungary

³HUN-REN Institute for Computer Science and Control, Budapest, Hungary

⁴Centre for Quantum Technologies, National University of Singapore, Singapore

⁵CNRS, IRIF, Université Paris Cité

May 13, 2024

Abstract

Bell sampling is a simple yet powerful measurement primitive that has recently attracted a lot of attention, and has proven to be a valuable tool in studying stabiliser states. Unfortunately, however, it is known that Bell sampling fails when used on qudits of dimension $d > 2$. In this paper, we explore and quantify the limitations of Bell sampling on qudits, and propose new quantum algorithms to circumvent the use of Bell sampling in solving two important problems: learning stabiliser states and providing pseudorandomness lower bounds on qudits. More specifically, as our first result, we characterise the output distribution corresponding to Bell sampling on copies of a stabiliser state and show that the output can be uniformly random, and hence reveal no information. As our second result, for $d = p$ prime we devise a quantum algorithm to identify an unknown stabiliser state in $(\mathbb{C}^p)^{\otimes n}$ that uses $O(n)$ copies of the input state and runs in time $O(n^4)$. As our third result, we provide a quantum algorithm that efficiently distinguishes a Haar-random state from a state with non-negligible stabiliser fidelity. As a corollary, any Clifford circuit on qudits of dimension d using $O(\log n / \log d)$ auxiliary non-Clifford single-qudit gates cannot prepare computationally pseudorandom quantum states.

1 Introduction

Bell sampling, introduced by Montanaro [Mon17], is a measurement primitive which has attracted a lot of attention recently due to its simplicity and far reaching applications [Mon17, GNW21, HG23, GIKL23a, GIKL23b, GIKL24a]. At a high level, Bell sampling consists of measuring two copies $|\psi\rangle^{\otimes 2}$ of some n -qubit state $|\psi\rangle \in (\mathbb{C}^2)^{\otimes n}$ in the Bell basis. The power of Bell sampling becomes evident when combined with the stabiliser formalism [Got96, Got97] in order to learn properties of stabiliser states. A *stabiliser group* on n qubits is a set of 2^n commuting Pauli operators, and a *stabiliser state* is the joint $+1$ -eigenvector of a stabiliser group. As shown by Montanaro [Mon17], one Bell sample on two copies of a stabiliser state returns information on its associated stabiliser group, which in turn can be used to infer some of its properties [MW16, AA24]. This procedure was later explored by Gross, Nezami, and Walter [GNW21], who introduced a measurement primitive called *Bell difference sampling* which,

^{*}jonallcock@tencent.com

[†]doriguello@renyi.hu

[‡]gabor.ivanyos@sztaki.mta.hu

[§]cqmts@nus.edu.sg

when performed on copies of a stabiliser state, returns the label of a generator of the associated stabiliser group. Bell difference sampling consists of performing Bell sampling twice and subtracting the two outcomes, thus using four copies $|\psi\rangle^{\otimes 4}$ of a state.

Part of Bell (difference) sampling’s appeal comes from the importance of stabiliser states, which find applications in quantum error correction [Sho95, CS96, Got96, Got97], efficient classical simulations of quantum circuits [AG04, BSS16, BBC⁺19], low-rank recovery [KZG16], randomized benchmarking [KLR⁺08, MGE11, HWFW19], measurement-based quantum computation [RB00], tensor networks for holography codes [HNQ⁺16, NW20], and quantum learning algorithms [HKP20]. As mentioned, Bell difference sampling can be used to learn several properties of a stabiliser state. Montanaro [Mon17] implicitly used Bell difference sampling to identify an unknown stabiliser state, which simplified or improved upon previous works on the same task [AG08, Röt09, ZPDF16]. Later, Gross, Nezami, and Walter [GNW21] proposed a stabiliser-ness testing algorithm based on Bell difference sampling to decide whether a given unknown state is a stabiliser state or is far from one. More recently, Hangleiter and Gullans [HG23] used Bell sampling to detect and learn circuit errors and to extract useful information, e.g. the depth and the number of T-gates of a circuit. Around the same time, Grewal, Iyer, Kretschmer, and Liang [GIKL23c, GIKL23a, GIKL23b, GIKL24b, GIKL24a] employed Bell difference sampling in several tasks: obtaining the classical description of the output of a Clifford circuit augmented with a few non-Clifford single-qubit gates (called *doped Clifford circuits* [LOH23, LOLH24]), testing whether a state is Haar-random or the output of a doped Clifford circuit, approximating an arbitrary quantum state with a stabiliser state, and testing stabiliser fidelity of a given state, which is its maximum overlap with any stabiliser state [BBC⁺19].

Unfortunately, it is known that Bell (difference) sampling cannot be used for qudits of dimension d higher than 2 [GNW21], or, more precisely, it reveals little information on the stabiliser group it samples from. At a high level, this stems from the well-known fact that the transpose map $\psi \mapsto \bar{\psi} = \psi^\top$ is not completely positive, or from the fact that the involution $x \mapsto -x$ is non-trivial if $x \in \mathbb{Z}_d$ for $d > 2$. This means that Bell sampling falls short in solving the aforementioned problems related to stabiliser states on qudits and, as a result, little is known about them for $d > 2$. In this work, we propose new algorithms to circumvent the use of Bell sampling and solve two important tasks on qudits: learning an unknown stabiliser state and deciding whether a given state is Haar-random or has non-negligible stabiliser fidelity.

1.1 Our results

1.1.1 Exploring Bell difference sampling

Bell sampling [Mon17] measures two copies of an n -qubit state $|\psi\rangle \in (\mathbb{C}^2)^{\otimes n}$ in the Bell basis $|\mathcal{W}_{\mathbf{x}}\rangle \triangleq (\mathcal{W}_{\mathbf{x}} \otimes \mathbb{I})|\Phi^+\rangle$, where $|\Phi^+\rangle \triangleq 2^{-n/2} \sum_{\mathbf{q} \in \mathbb{F}_2^n} |\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{q}\rangle$ is a maximally entangled state and the operators $\mathcal{W}_{\mathbf{x}}$, called *Weyl operators*, are defined as

$$\mathcal{W}_{\mathbf{x}} \triangleq i^{\langle \mathbf{v}, \mathbf{w} \rangle} (X^{v_1} Z^{w_1}) \otimes \cdots \otimes (X^{v_n} Z^{w_n}) \quad \forall \mathbf{x} = (\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{w}) \in \mathbb{F}_2^{2n},$$

where $\langle \mathbf{v}, \mathbf{w} \rangle = \sum_{i=1}^n v_i w_i$ is the usual scalar product. One can think of the Weyl operators as the Pauli operators labelled by a $2n$ -bit string. The outcome of Bell sampling is thus some bit-string $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{F}_2^{2n}$. Bell difference sampling, as proposed by [GNW21], performs Bell sampling twice and computes the difference of the two outcome strings. Gross, Nezami, and Walter [GNW21] proved that Bell difference sampling on an arbitrary state $|\psi\rangle^{\otimes 4}$ has a useful interpretation. More specifically, they proved that a string $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{F}_2^{2n}$ is sampled with probability

$$q_\psi(\mathbf{x}) \triangleq \sum_{\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{F}_2^{2n}} p_\psi(\mathbf{y}) p_\psi(\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{y}), \quad \text{where } p_\psi(\mathbf{x}) \triangleq 2^{-n} |\langle \psi | \mathcal{W}_{\mathbf{x}} | \psi \rangle|^2 \quad (1)$$

is called the *characteristic distribution* (see Section 2.3 for a proof that p_ψ is indeed a probability distribution). In other words, the *Weyl distribution* q_ψ is the convolution of p_ψ with itself (up

to normalisation). If $|\psi\rangle$ is a stabiliser state $|\mathcal{S}\rangle$ of some stabiliser group \mathcal{S} (i.e., a commuting group of 2^n Weyl operators, with $|\mathcal{S}\rangle$ the joint $+1$ -eigenvector of all such Weyl operators), then $p_{\mathcal{S}}(\mathbf{x}) = 2^{-n}$ for all strings $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{F}_2^{2n}$ such that $\mathcal{W}_{\mathbf{x}} \in \mathcal{S}$ and 0 otherwise. Equation (1) thus implies that $q_{\mathcal{S}}(\mathbf{x}) = 2^{-n}$ if $\mathcal{W}_{\mathbf{x}} \in \mathcal{S}$ and 0 otherwise. Bell difference sampling on copies of a stabiliser state thus returns an element of its stabiliser group, and that is where its power lies. By repeating Bell difference sampling $O(n)$ times it is possible to recover a basis of \mathcal{S} and learn $|\mathcal{S}\rangle$ [Mon17], or by repeating it $O(1)$ times it is possible to decide if a given state is either a stabiliser state or far from one [GNW21]. Many properties of q_{ψ} , especially Fourier-related ones, were explored in more depth in [GIKL23c, GIKL23a, GIKL23b, GIKL24a].

The situation with qudits, on the other hand, is not so well understood. Apart from general arguments provided in [GNW21] based on the fact that the transpose map $\psi \mapsto \bar{\psi} = \psi^\top$ is not completely positive, or that the involution $x \mapsto -x$ is non-trivial if $x \in \mathbb{Z}_d$ for $d > 2$, and therefore that Bell difference sampling is no longer useful, little is known about its actual structure. Therefore, we ask, and give answers to, the following questions in Section 3.

What is the measurement outcome probability distribution corresponding to performing Bell difference sampling on qudits? Is it possible to extract any information on the stabiliser group of a qudit stabiliser state via Bell difference sampling?

In what follows, $p > 2$ is prime and thus \mathbb{F}_p^n is a vector space over \mathbb{F}_p . Let $\omega \triangleq e^{2\pi i/p}$ be the p -th root of unity. Our results shall be stated for qudits with dimension $d = p$ prime. The Pauli operators on qudits are defined using the shift and clock operators X and Z , respectively, as

$$X|q\rangle = |q+1\rangle, \quad Z|q\rangle = \omega^q|q\rangle, \quad \forall q \in \mathbb{F}_p.$$

The Weyl operators on qudits are then defined to be

$$\mathcal{W}_{\mathbf{x}} = \mathcal{W}_{\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{w}} \triangleq \omega^{2^{-1}\langle \mathbf{v}, \mathbf{w} \rangle} (X^{v_1} Z^{w_1}) \otimes \dots \otimes (X^{v_n} Z^{w_n}) \quad \forall \mathbf{x} = (\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{w}) \in \mathbb{F}_p^{2n},$$

where $2^{-1} = (p+1)/2$ denotes the multiplicative inverse of 2 mod p . Bell sampling on qudits is defined similarly as it is on qubits: measure two copies of an n -qudit state $|\psi\rangle \in (\mathbb{C}^p)^{\otimes n}$ in the generalised Bell basis $|\mathcal{W}_{\mathbf{x}}\rangle \triangleq (\mathcal{W}_{\mathbf{x}} \otimes \mathbb{I})|\Phi^+\rangle$, where $|\Phi^+\rangle \triangleq p^{-n/2} \sum_{\mathbf{q} \in \mathbb{F}_p^n} |\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{q}\rangle$ is a maximally entangled state. The outcome is a string $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{F}_p^{2n}$. Bell difference sampling involves performing Bell sampling twice and taking the difference of the two outcomes. More formally:

Definition 33. *Bell difference sampling corresponds to performing the projective measurement given by*

$$\Pi_{\mathbf{x}} = \sum_{\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{F}_p^{2n}} |\mathcal{W}_{\mathbf{y}}\rangle \langle \mathcal{W}_{\mathbf{y}}| \otimes |\mathcal{W}_{\mathbf{x}+\mathbf{y}}\rangle \langle \mathcal{W}_{\mathbf{x}+\mathbf{y}}|, \quad \mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{F}_p^{2n}.$$

One of our main results concerning Bell difference sampling is to show that its outcomes are distributed according to an “involved” version of Equation (1). Let $J : \mathbb{F}_p^{2n} \rightarrow \mathbb{F}_p^{2n}$ be the involution defined as $J(\mathbf{x}) = J((\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{w})) = (-\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{w})$ for $\mathbf{x} = (\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{w}) \in \mathbb{F}_p^{2n}$ [App05, App09, GNW21].

Theorem 35. *Bell difference sampling on $|\psi\rangle^{\otimes 4}$ corresponds to sampling from the distribution*

$$b_{\psi}(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{F}_p^{2n}} p_{\psi}(\mathbf{y}) p_{\psi}(J(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y})), \quad \text{where } p_{\psi}(\mathbf{x}) \triangleq p^{-n} |\langle \psi | \mathcal{W}_{\mathbf{x}} | \psi \rangle|^2.$$

We call the distribution $b_{\psi}(\mathbf{x})$ the *involved Weyl distribution* of the pure state $|\psi\rangle$. The above result is a generalisation of Equation (1) since the involution is trivial for the case of qubits, i.e., $J(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{x}$ for all $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{F}_2^{2n}$. More interestingly, though, is to explore b_{ψ} when $|\psi\rangle = |\mathcal{S}\rangle$ is a stabiliser state. In the following, given a matrix $\mathbf{M} \in \mathbb{F}_p^{m \times n}$, let $\text{col}(\mathbf{M}) \triangleq \{\mathbf{M}\mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{F}_p^m : \mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{F}_p^n\}$ be its column space, and given subspaces \mathcal{V}, \mathcal{W} , let $\mathcal{V} + \mathcal{W} \triangleq \{\mathbf{v} + \mathbf{w} : \mathbf{v} \in \mathcal{V}, \mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{W}\}$ and $\mathcal{V} \times \mathcal{W} \triangleq \{(\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{w}) : \mathbf{v} \in \mathcal{V}, \mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{W}\}$.

Theorem 39. Let \mathcal{S} be a stabiliser group with generators $\{\omega^{s_i} \mathcal{W}_{\mathbf{x}_i}\}_{i \in [n]}$, and let $|\mathcal{S}\rangle \in (\mathbb{C}^p)^{\otimes n}$ be its stabiliser state. Arrange the labels $\{\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_n\}$ as the columns of the $2n \times n$ matrix $\begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{V} \\ \mathbf{W} \end{bmatrix}$, where $\mathbf{V}, \mathbf{W} \in \mathbb{F}_p^{n \times n}$. Let $\mathcal{M} \triangleq \text{col}(\begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{V} \\ \mathbf{W} \end{bmatrix})$ and $J(\mathcal{M}) \triangleq \{J(\mathbf{x}) \in \mathbb{F}_p^{2n} : \mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{M}\}$. Bell difference sampling on $|\mathcal{S}\rangle^{\otimes 4}$ returns $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{F}_p^{2n}$ with probability

$$b_{\mathcal{S}}(\mathbf{x}) = \begin{cases} p^{-2n} |\mathcal{M} \cap J(\mathcal{M})| & \text{if } \mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{M} + J(\mathcal{M}), \\ 0 & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

$$= \begin{cases} |\text{col}(\mathbf{V})|^{-1} |\text{col}(\mathbf{W})|^{-1} & \text{if } \mathbf{x} \in \text{col}(\mathbf{V}) \times \text{col}(\mathbf{W}), \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

This result shows that Bell difference sampling on $|\mathcal{S}\rangle^{\otimes 4}$ allows one to learn \mathbf{V} and \mathbf{W} separately, up to some change of basis, but not $\begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{V} \\ \mathbf{W} \end{bmatrix}$ and thus \mathcal{S} . Equivalently, we only learn the subspace $\mathcal{M} + J(\mathcal{M})$. In a way, the involution function separates and mixes the clock and shift parts of the Weyl operators belonging to a stabiliser group. In the case when both \mathbf{V} and \mathbf{W} are full rank, Bell difference sampling returns a uniformly random $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{F}_p^{2n}$. This is in stark contrast to the case of qubits ($p = 2$), where Bell difference sampling on $|\mathcal{S}\rangle^{\otimes 4}$ returns $\mathbf{x} \in \text{col}(\begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{V} \\ \mathbf{W} \end{bmatrix})$ with probability $q_{\mathcal{S}}(\mathbf{x}) = 2^{-n}$ [Mon17, GNW21], which can be seen from the above result since $J(\mathcal{M}) = \mathcal{M}$ for qubits.

1.1.2 Learning stabiliser states

As shown by several previous works [AG08, Röt09, ZPDF16, Mon17], stabiliser states are among the classes of states that can be efficiently identified, in contrast to arbitrary n -qubit states $|\psi\rangle$ which require exponentially many (in n) copies of $|\psi\rangle$ to determine, by Holevo's theorem [Hol73]. Other examples of efficiently learnable states include matrix product states [CPF⁺10, LCLP10], non-interacting fermion states [AG23], and low-degree phase states [ABDY23].

The simplest and most efficient learning algorithm for stabiliser states on qubits is Montanaro's [Mon17] based on Bell (difference) sampling, which identifies an unknown stabiliser state $|\mathcal{S}\rangle \in (\mathbb{C}^2)^{\otimes n}$ in time $O(n^3)$ by using $O(n)$ copies of $|\mathcal{S}\rangle$ and making collective measurements across at most two copies of $|\mathcal{S}\rangle$ at a time. The situation, however, is not as clear in the case of qudits because, as explained above, Bell difference sampling cannot be used to learn stabiliser groups. We propose a new algorithm that circumvents the need for Bell difference sampling in order to learn an unknown stabiliser state. As far as we are aware, there have not previously been any direct results in this direction. Our algorithm is based on the observation that any stabiliser state can be written in a very specific form.

Lemma 22. Let \mathcal{S} be a stabiliser group with generators $\{\omega^{s_i} \mathcal{W}_{\mathbf{x}_i}\}_{i \in [n]}$. Let $\mathbf{s} = (s_1, \dots, s_n) \in \mathbb{F}_p^n$ and arrange the labels $\{\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_n\}$ as the columns of the $2n \times n$ matrix $\begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{V} \\ \mathbf{W} \end{bmatrix}$, where $\mathbf{V}, \mathbf{W} \in \mathbb{F}_p^{n \times n}$. Then there exists $\mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{F}_p^n$ such that $\mathbf{V}^\top \mathbf{u} + \mathbf{s} \in \text{col}(\mathbf{W}^\top)$, and the unique stabiliser state of \mathcal{S} is

$$|\mathcal{S}\rangle = \frac{\sqrt{|\text{col}(\mathbf{W})|}}{p^n} \sum_{\mathbf{q} \in \mathbb{F}_p^n} \omega^{\mathbf{s}^\top \mathbf{q} + \mathbf{u}^\top \mathbf{V} \mathbf{q} + 2^{-1} \mathbf{q}^\top \mathbf{V}^\top \mathbf{W} \mathbf{q}} |\mathbf{u} + \mathbf{W} \mathbf{q}\rangle$$

for any $\mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{F}_p^n$ such that $\mathbf{V}^\top \mathbf{u} + \mathbf{s} \in \text{col}(\mathbf{W}^\top)$.

We note that a similar, but somewhat more convoluted, form for stabiliser states was given in [HDDM05, Theorem 1]. Our proof of Lemma 22 is quite simple in comparison. It tells us that any stabiliser state is a superposition of basis states from an affine subspace of \mathbb{F}_p^n with relative phases given by a quadratic polynomial over \mathbb{F}_p . Based on this form, we leverage ideas from hidden subgroup/polynomial problems [BCD05, ISS12, KR08, DHIS14, IS17] to develop a quantum algorithm that learns a stabiliser state $|\mathcal{S}\rangle \in (\mathbb{C}^p)^{\otimes n}$ given $O(n)$ copies of $|\mathcal{S}\rangle$.

Theorem 41. *Let \mathcal{S} be an unknown stabiliser group generated by $\{\omega^{s_i} \mathcal{W}_{\mathbf{v}_i, \mathbf{w}_i}\}_{i \in [n]}$ with stabiliser state $|\mathcal{S}\rangle \in (\mathbb{C}^p)^{\otimes n}$. Let $\mathbf{W} \in \mathbb{F}_p^{n \times n}$ be the matrix with column vectors $\mathbf{w}_1, \dots, \mathbf{w}_n$. There is a quantum algorithm that identifies \mathcal{S} by using $O(n)$ copies of $|\mathcal{S}\rangle$. It makes measurements only on the computational basis, runs in time $O(n^3 \text{rank}(\mathbf{W}))$, and fails with probability $\leq 2p^{-n}$.*

The idea of our algorithm is to learn both \mathbf{V} and \mathbf{W} which, together, make up a set $\begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{V} \\ \mathbf{W} \end{bmatrix}$ of generators for \mathcal{S} . The first step is to simply measure several copies of $|\mathcal{S}\rangle$ in the computational basis to learn \mathbf{W} . In the second step, we learn the corresponding pair \mathbf{V} of the previously obtained matrix \mathbf{W} . To do so, we employ techniques from hidden polynomial problems [DHIS14, IS17] to learn a quadratic function, in our case $\mathbf{s}^\top \mathbf{q} + \mathbf{u}^\top \mathbf{V} \mathbf{q} + 2^{-1} \mathbf{q}^\top \mathbf{V}^\top \mathbf{W} \mathbf{q}$, and, therefore, extract the matrix \mathbf{V} . In particular, we use a trick of introducing parameters $\delta_1, \delta_2, \delta_3 \in \mathbb{F}_p$, not all 0, such that $\delta_1^2 + \delta_2^2 + \delta_3^2 = 0$, into the phase one wants to learn. This kills any quadratic term and we are only left with a linear term that can be determined via a quantum Fourier transform. The three parameters $\delta_1, \delta_2, \delta_3 \in \mathbb{F}_p$ are inputs to the algorithm and can be found in time $O(\text{poly log } p)$ by using the Las Vegas method of [ISS12] or the deterministic method of [Woe05]. The final step of the algorithm is to measure copies of $|\mathcal{S}\rangle$ in the eigenbasis of $\mathcal{W}_{\mathbf{v}_i, \mathbf{w}_i}$ to obtain the corresponding phases ω^{s_i} . Our quantum algorithm only measures in the computational basis and, in the worst case, runs in time $O(n^4)$ if $\text{rank}(\mathbf{W}) = \Omega(n)$. However, it makes extensive use of vector spaces, so it is not clear whether it can be extended to qudits of dimension d not prime.

We remark that, if one also has access to copies of the complex conjugate $|\mathcal{S}^*\rangle$ of the stabiliser state $|\mathcal{S}\rangle$, then it is possible to use Bell sampling to learn $|\mathcal{S}\rangle$. This is because Bell sampling on $|\mathcal{S}\rangle|\mathcal{S}^*\rangle$ returns $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{F}_p^{2n}$ with probability $p_{\mathcal{S}}(\mathbf{x}) = p^{-n} |\langle \mathcal{S} | \mathcal{W}_{\mathbf{x}} | \mathcal{S} \rangle|^2$ which equals p^{-n} if $\mathcal{W}_{\mathbf{x}} \in \mathcal{S}$ and 0 otherwise.

Theorem 40. *Let \mathcal{S} be an unknown stabiliser group with stabiliser state $|\mathcal{S}\rangle \in (\mathbb{C}^p)^{\otimes n}$. There is a quantum algorithm that identifies \mathcal{S} using $O(n)$ copies of $|\mathcal{S}\rangle$ and $|\mathcal{S}^*\rangle$. Its runtime is $O(n^3)$ and failure probability is at most p^{-n} .*

Theorem 40 is valid for any dimension, not necessarily prime. We note that the phenomenon of having considerably more power from the access to the complex conjugate of a quantum state has been observed by King, Wan, and McClean [KWM24] in the context of shadow tomography.

The time complexities of Theorem 41 and Theorem 40 (and throughout the paper) assume a computational model wherein classical operations over the field \mathbb{F}_p (or ring \mathbb{Z}_d for d non-prime) take $O(1)$ time, and measurements in the computational basis and single and two-qudit gates from a universal gate set [MS00, BB02, BOB05, BBO06] require $O(1)$ time to be performed. The latter assumption is supported by the fact that there exists quantum hardware that naturally encodes information in qudits [MHZ⁺23].

1.1.3 Pseudorandomness lower bounds

Pseudorandom states were introduced by Ji, Liu, and Song [JLS18] and have attracted a lot of attention due to their applicability in quantum cryptography and complexity theory [JLS18, Kre21, AQY22, MY22, HMY23, KQST23]. At a high level, a set of quantum states is pseudorandom if they are efficiently preparable by some quantum algorithm and mimic the Haar measure over n -qudit states. In the following, a function $\epsilon(\kappa)$ is negligible if $\epsilon(\kappa) = o(\kappa^{-c}) \forall c > 0$.

Definition 1 ([JLS18, Definition 2]). *Given a security parameter κ , a keyed family of n -qudit quantum states $\{|\phi_k\rangle \in (\mathbb{C}^d)^{\otimes n}\}_{k \in \{0,1\}^\kappa}$ is pseudorandom if (i) there is a polynomial-time quantum algorithm that generates $|\phi_k\rangle$ on input k , and (ii) for any $\text{poly}(\kappa)$ -time quantum adversary \mathcal{A} ,*

$$\left| \mathbb{P}_{k \sim \{0,1\}^\kappa} [\mathcal{A}(|\phi_k\rangle^{\otimes \text{poly}(\kappa)}) = 1] - \mathbb{P}_{|\psi\rangle \sim \mu_{\text{Haar}}} [\mathcal{A}(|\psi\rangle^{\otimes \text{poly}(\kappa)}) = 1] \right| = \text{negl}(\kappa),$$

where μ_{Haar} is the n -qudit Haar measure and $\text{negl}(\kappa)$ is an arbitrary negligible function of κ .

A few works have explored the resources required for constructing pseudorandom states, e.g. Ref. [ABF⁺24] explored possible constructions of pseudorandom states using limited entanglement. Grewal, Iyer, Kretschmer, and Liang [GIKL23c, GIKL23b], on the other hand, analysed pseudorandomness from the perspective of stabiliser complexity. More specifically, they proposed a quantum algorithm to test whether a quantum state is Haar-random or has non-negligible *stabiliser fidelity* [BBC⁺19]. As a consequence, they proved that any Clifford+T circuit that uses $O(\log n)$ T-gates cannot generate a set of n -qubit pseudorandom quantum states [GIKL23c]. This bound was later improved to $n/2$ non-Clifford single-qubit gates [GIKL23b] by employing Bell difference sampling to distinguish Haar-random states from doped Clifford circuit outputs.

In this work, we propose a quantum algorithm to distinguish Haar-random states from states with non-negligible stabiliser fidelity on qudits and, as a consequence, we prove similar pseudorandomness lower bounds for doped Clifford circuits on qudits. Here, the stabiliser fidelity of $|\psi\rangle$ is the maximum overlap between $|\psi\rangle$ and any stabiliser state. Moreover, a Clifford circuit on n qudits of dimension p is any $p^n \times p^n$ unitary operator that normalises the generalised Pauli group $\mathcal{P}_p^n = \{\omega^s \mathcal{W}_{\mathbf{x}} : s \in \mathbb{F}_p, \mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{F}_p^{2n}\}$, i.e., any element of $\mathcal{C}_p^n = \{\mathcal{U} \in \mathbb{C}^{p^n \times p^n} : \mathcal{U}^\dagger \mathcal{U} = \mathbb{I}, \mathcal{U} \mathcal{P}_p^n \mathcal{U}^\dagger = \mathcal{P}_p^n\}$.

Theorem 46. *Let $\delta \in (0, 1)$ and $|\psi\rangle \in (\mathbb{C}^p)^{\otimes n}$ be a state promised to be either Haar-random or to have stabiliser fidelity at least k^{-1} . There is a quantum algorithm that distinguishes the two cases with probability at least $1 - \delta$, uses $O(k^8 \log(1/\delta))$ copies of $|\psi\rangle$, and has runtime $O(nk^8 \log(1/\delta))$.*

Since Bell difference sampling has limited utility for qudits, we employ a completely different technique from the one used by [GIKL23c, GIKL23b]. We instead utilise the binary POVM proposed by Gross, Nezami, and Walter [GNW21] – originally used to test stabiliserness – and show that it can be used to successfully distinguish Haar-random states from those with non-negligible stabiliser fidelity. Our analysis uses some tools from [GIKL23c, GIKL23b] to bound the stabiliser fidelity of Haar-random states. As a byproduct, our quantum algorithm can also be used to distinguish between Haar-random states and those output by doped Clifford circuits, since the latter have non-negligible stabiliser fidelity. If the doped Clifford circuit uses at most t non-Clifford single-qudit gates, then the sample and time complexities of our algorithm are $O(p^{4t} \log(1/\delta))$ and $O(np^{4t} \log(1/\delta))$, respectively. As a corollary, we have the following.

Corollary 52. *Any doped Clifford circuit in $(\mathbb{C}^p)^{\otimes n}$ that uses $O(\log n / \log p)$ non-Clifford single-qudit gates cannot produce an ensemble of pseudorandom quantum states.*

We point out the contrast between the above result and Ref. [HIN⁺23] which proved that learning the output distribution of a Clifford circuit over qubits with a single T-gate is as hard as the problem of learning parities with noise. The discrepancy with our results stems from the difference in access models: while we assume access to multiple copies of a state, [HIN⁺23] considers only algorithms that deal with computational-basis measurements of the state.

Even though we prove Theorem 46 and Corollary 52 for qudits of dimension p prime, they can be generalised to arbitrary dimension d by using the POVM of [GNW21] for arbitrary d . If r is any coprime with d , then this leads to an algorithm that uses $O(rk^{4r} \log(1/\delta))$ copies of $|\psi\rangle$ and runs in time $O(nrk^{4r} \log(1/\delta))$. The pseudorandomness bound is still $O(\log n / \log d)$.

1.2 Open problems

A few open problems remain from our work. The first would be to extend our learning algorithm to qudits of arbitrary dimension d (not necessarily prime). Ideally, a new technique akin to Bell difference sampling for qudits could resolve this problem, or a more clever version of our algorithm which does not rely on vector spaces so much. Another open problem is to improve our pseudorandomness lower bound of $O(\log n / \log p)$. We believe it can be exponentially strengthened to $O(n)$ by designing a better algorithm. Finally, there are a plethora of

results on qubits which were proven using Bell (difference) sampling that we have not considered, e.g. finding a succinct description of a stabiliser state close in stabiliser fidelity to a given state, learning the output of a doped Clifford circuit, giving pseudoentangled state lower bounds [GIKL23a, GIKL23b, HG23, GIKL24b, GIKL24a]. It would be interesting to extend these results to qudits.

2 Preliminaries

Given $n \in \mathbb{N} \triangleq \{1, 2, \dots\}$, let $[n] \triangleq \{1, \dots, n\}$. Throughout this paper, unless stated otherwise, let $p \in \mathbb{N}$ be prime and $p > 2$. Let $\omega \triangleq e^{2\pi i/p}$ be the p -th root of unity and let $\tau \triangleq \omega^{2^{-1}}$, where $2^{-1} = (p+1)/2$ denotes the multiplicative inverse of 2 mod p , so that $\tau^2 = \omega$. For any state $|\psi\rangle = \sum_{\mathbf{w} \in \mathbb{F}_p^n} a_{\mathbf{w}} |\mathbf{w}\rangle$ in $(\mathbb{C}^p)^{\otimes n}$, let $|\psi^*\rangle = \sum_{\mathbf{w} \in \mathbb{F}_p^n} \overline{a_{\mathbf{w}}} |\mathbf{w}\rangle$ denote its complex conjugate with respect to the computational basis. We shall often write ψ to denote $|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|$. By \mathbb{I} we mean the identity matrix or operator, and $\mathbf{1}[\cdot]$ is the indicator function such that $\mathbf{1}[\text{statement}]$ equals 1 if the statement is true and 0 if it is false. We assume that the field operations of \mathbb{F}_p (addition and multiplication) require constant time.

2.1 Scalar product vector spaces and symplectic vector spaces

Let $n, m \in \mathbb{N}$. We shall work with two types of vectors space over \mathbb{F}_p : (i) the vector space \mathbb{F}_p^n equipped with the *scalar product* $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle : \mathbb{F}_p^n \times \mathbb{F}_p^n \rightarrow \mathbb{F}_p$ defined as $\langle \mathbf{v}, \mathbf{w} \rangle = \sum_{i=1}^n v_i w_i$, which we refer to as a scalar product vector space; (ii) the vector space \mathbb{F}_p^{2n} equipped with the *symplectic product* $[\cdot, \cdot] : \mathbb{F}_p^{2n} \times \mathbb{F}_p^{2n} \rightarrow \mathbb{F}_p$ defined as $[\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}] = \sum_{i=1}^n (x_i y_{n+i} - x_{n+i} y_i)$, which we refer to as a symplectic vector space. It should be clear from context whether we are considering a scalar product or a symplectic vector space. Note that both scalar product $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ and symplectic product $[\cdot, \cdot]$ are *non-degenerate*, meaning that the zero vector $\mathbf{0}$ is the only vector orthogonal to any vector in the vector space.

Given subspaces \mathcal{V}, \mathcal{W} of the scalar product vector space \mathbb{F}_p^n and function $f : \mathbb{F}_p^n \rightarrow \mathbb{F}_p^m$, let $\mathcal{V} + \mathcal{W} \triangleq \{\mathbf{v} + \mathbf{w} : \mathbf{v} \in \mathcal{V}, \mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{W}\}$, $f(\mathcal{V}) \triangleq \{f(\mathbf{v}) : \mathbf{v} \in \mathcal{V}\}$, $\mathcal{V} \times \mathcal{W} \triangleq \{(\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{w}) : \mathbf{v} \in \mathcal{V}, \mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{W}\}$.

As subcases, $\mathbf{u} + \mathcal{V} \triangleq \{\mathbf{u} + \mathbf{v} : \mathbf{v} \in \mathcal{V}\}$ and $\mathbf{M}\mathcal{V} \triangleq \{\mathbf{M}\mathbf{v} : \mathbf{v} \in \mathcal{V}\}$ for $\mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{F}_p^n$ and $\mathbf{M} \in \mathbb{F}_p^{m \times n}$. Similarly for the symplectic vector space \mathbb{F}_p^{2n} , given subspaces $\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y} \subseteq \mathbb{F}_p^{2n}$ and a function $f : \mathbb{F}_p^{2n} \rightarrow \mathbb{F}_p^{2m}$, define

$$\mathcal{X} + \mathcal{Y} \triangleq \{\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{y} : \mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}, \mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{Y}\}, f(\mathcal{X}) \triangleq \{f(\mathbf{x}) : \mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}\}, \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y} \triangleq \{(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) : \mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}, \mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{Y}\}.$$

As subcases, $\mathbf{z} + \mathcal{X} \triangleq \{\mathbf{z} + \mathbf{x} : \mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}\}$ and $\mathbf{N}\mathcal{X} \triangleq \{\mathbf{N}\mathbf{x} : \mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}\}$ for $\mathbf{z} \in \mathbb{F}_p^{2n}$ and $\mathbf{N} \in \mathbb{F}_p^{2m \times 2n}$.

Let $\mathbf{e}_i \in \mathbb{F}_p^n$ be the vector whose i -th component is 1 and the remaining components are 0. Let vec be the vectorisation operator defined by $\text{vec}(|\mathbf{v}\rangle\langle\mathbf{w}|) = |\mathbf{v}\rangle|\mathbf{w}\rangle$ for computational basis states $\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{w} \in \mathbb{F}_p^n$. Note that vec preserves inner products, i.e., $\langle \text{vec}(\mathbf{A}) | \text{vec}(\mathbf{B}) \rangle = \text{Tr}[\mathbf{A}^\dagger \mathbf{B}]$ for all $\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{B} \in \mathbb{F}_p^{m \times n}$. Given a matrix $\mathbf{M} \in \mathbb{F}_p^{m \times n}$, let

$$\begin{aligned} \text{col}(\mathbf{M}) &\triangleq \{\mathbf{M}\mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{F}_p^m : \mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{F}_p^n\} && \text{be its column space,} \\ \text{row}(\mathbf{M}) &\triangleq \text{col}(\mathbf{M}^\top) && \text{be its row space,} \\ \text{null}(\mathbf{M}) &\triangleq \{\mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{F}_p^n : \mathbf{M}\mathbf{v} = \mathbf{0}\} && \text{be its null space.} \end{aligned}$$

Given a subspace $\mathcal{V} \subseteq \mathbb{F}_p^n$ of the scalar product vector space \mathbb{F}_p^n , its *orthogonal complement* is $\mathcal{V}^\perp \triangleq \{\mathbf{w} \in \mathbb{F}_p^n : \langle \mathbf{v}, \mathbf{w} \rangle = 0, \forall \mathbf{v} \in \mathcal{V}\}$. Given a subspace $\mathcal{X} \subseteq \mathbb{F}_p^{2n}$ of the symplectic vector space \mathbb{F}_p^{2n} , its *symplectic complement* is $\mathcal{X}^\perp \triangleq \{\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{F}_p^{2n} : [\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}] = 0, \forall \mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}\}$. We shall use the following facts about orthogonal and symplectic complements throughout.

Fact 2. Let $\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{W} \subseteq \mathbb{F}_p^n$ and $\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y} \subseteq \mathbb{F}_p^{2n}$ be subspaces of the scalar product and symplectic vector spaces \mathbb{F}_p^n and \mathbb{F}_p^{2n} , respectively. Then

- a. \mathcal{V}^\perp is a subspace;
- b. $(\mathcal{V}^\perp)^\perp = \mathcal{V}$;
- c. $\dim(\mathcal{V}) + \dim(\mathcal{V}^\perp) = n$;
- d. $|\mathcal{V}||\mathcal{V}^\perp| = p^n$;
- e. $\mathcal{V} \subseteq \mathcal{W} \iff \mathcal{W}^\perp \subseteq \mathcal{V}^\perp$;
- f. $(\mathcal{V} + \mathcal{W})^\perp = \mathcal{V}^\perp \cap \mathcal{W}^\perp$;
- g. \mathcal{X}^\perp is a subspace;
- h. $(\mathcal{X}^\perp)^\perp = \mathcal{X}$;
- i. $\dim(\mathcal{X}) + \dim(\mathcal{X}^\perp) = 2n$;
- j. $|\mathcal{X}||\mathcal{X}^\perp| = p^{2n}$;
- k. $\mathcal{X} \subseteq \mathcal{Y} \iff \mathcal{Y}^\perp \subseteq \mathcal{X}^\perp$;
- l. $(\mathcal{X} + \mathcal{Y})^\perp = \mathcal{X}^\perp \cap \mathcal{Y}^\perp$.

The concept of isotropic and Lagrangian subspaces will be fundamental to our analysis.

Definition 3. A subspace $\mathcal{X} \subset \mathbb{F}_p^{2n}$ of a symplectic vector space \mathbb{F}_p^{2n} is isotropic if $[\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}] = 0$ for all $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{X}$, and is Lagrangian if $\mathcal{X}^\perp = \mathcal{X}$.

Fact 4. Every Lagrangian subspace of a $2n$ -dimension vector space is isotropic and has dimension n . Every isotropic subspace can be extended to a Lagrangian one.

Definition 5 (Involution). The involution $J : \mathbb{F}_p^{2n} \rightarrow \mathbb{F}_p^{2n}$ on the symplectic vector space \mathbb{F}_p^{2n} is defined as $J(\mathbf{x}) = J((\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{w})) = (-\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{w})$ where $\mathbf{x} = (\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{w})$ and $\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{w} \in \mathbb{F}_p^n$.

Lemma 6. Let $J : \mathbb{F}_p^{2n} \rightarrow \mathbb{F}_p^{2n}$ be the involution. For any $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{F}_p^{2n}$ and subspace $\mathcal{X} \subseteq \mathbb{F}_p^{2n}$, it holds that $J(J(\mathbf{x})) = \mathbf{x}$, $[J(\mathbf{x}), J(\mathbf{y})] = -[\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}]$, and $J(\mathcal{X}^\perp) = J(\mathcal{X})^\perp$.

The following fact will be useful. A proof is provided in [Appendix A](#).

Lemma 7. Let $\mathcal{V} \subseteq \mathbb{F}_p^n$ and $\mathcal{X} \subseteq \mathbb{F}_p^{2n}$ be subspaces and $\mathbf{w} \in \mathbb{F}_p^n$ and $\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{F}_p^{2n}$. Then

$$\sum_{\mathbf{v} \in \mathcal{V}} \omega^{\langle \mathbf{v}, \mathbf{w} \rangle} = \begin{cases} |\mathcal{V}| & \text{if } \mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{V}^\perp, \\ 0 & \text{if } \mathbf{w} \notin \mathcal{V}^\perp, \end{cases} \quad \sum_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}} \omega^{[\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}]} = \begin{cases} |\mathcal{X}| & \text{if } \mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{X}^\perp, \\ 0 & \text{if } \mathbf{y} \notin \mathcal{X}^\perp. \end{cases}$$

2.2 Symplectic Fourier analysis

Boolean Fourier analysis is a well-established field wherein a Boolean function is studied through its Fourier expansion using the characters $\omega^{\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle}$ defined with respect to the scalar product. See e.g. [Wol08, O'D14] for an introduction. A character of \mathbb{F}_p^{2n} is a group homomorphism $\chi : \mathbb{F}_p^{2n} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ such that $\chi(\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{y}) = \chi(\mathbf{x})\chi(\mathbf{y})$ for all $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{F}_p^{2n}$. In this paper, we shall work with *symplectic* Fourier analysis, which is similar to the usual Boolean Fourier analysis but the Fourier characters are instead defined with respect to the symplectic product as $\omega^{[\cdot, \cdot]}$. It is a standard result that every character of the symplectic vector space \mathbb{F}_p^{2n} can be written as $\omega^{[\mathbf{x}, \cdot]}$ for some $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{F}_p^{2n}$. Refs. [GNW21, GIKL23b] studied some aspects of symplectic Fourier analysis, especially over the domain \mathbb{F}_2^{2n} ($p = 2$).

Definition 8. Let $f : \mathbb{F}_p^{2n} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$. The symplectic Fourier transform of f , $\hat{f} : \mathbb{F}_p^{2n} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$, is

$$\hat{f}(\mathbf{y}) \triangleq \frac{1}{p^{2n}} \sum_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{F}_p^{2n}} \omega^{[\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{x}]} f(\mathbf{x}).$$

It is possible to expand any function $f : \mathbb{F}_p^{2n} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ using its symplectic Fourier transform as

$$f(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{F}_p^{2n}} \omega^{[\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}]} \hat{f}(\mathbf{y}).$$

Indeed, by [Lemma 7](#),

$$\sum_{\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{F}_p^{2n}} \omega^{[\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}]} \hat{f}(\mathbf{y}) = \frac{1}{p^{2n}} \sum_{\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{z} \in \mathbb{F}_p^{2n}} \omega^{[\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}] + [\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{z}]} f(\mathbf{z}) = \frac{1}{p^{2n}} \sum_{\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{z} \in \mathbb{F}_p^{2n}} \omega^{[\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{z}, \mathbf{y}]} f(\mathbf{z}) = \sum_{\mathbf{z} \in \mathbb{F}_p^{2n}} f(\mathbf{z}) \mathbf{1}[\mathbf{z} = \mathbf{x}] = f(\mathbf{x}).$$

The transformation $f \mapsto \hat{f}$ is unitary, meaning that (a generalised) Parseval's identity holds.

Lemma 9 (Parseval's identity). *Given $f, g : \mathbb{F}_p^{2n} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ and $\mathbf{t} \in \mathbb{F}_p^{2n}$, then*

$$\frac{1}{p^{2n}} \sum_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{F}_p^{2n}} \omega^{[\mathbf{t}, \mathbf{x}]} f(\mathbf{x}) g(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{F}_p^{2n}} \hat{f}(\mathbf{y}) \hat{g}(\mathbf{t} - \mathbf{y}).$$

Proof.
$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{F}_p^{2n}} \omega^{[\mathbf{t}, \mathbf{x}]} f(\mathbf{x}) g(\mathbf{x}) &= \sum_{\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{z} \in \mathbb{F}_p^{2n}} \omega^{[\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} + \mathbf{z} - \mathbf{t}]} \hat{f}(\mathbf{y}) \hat{g}(\mathbf{z}) \\ &= p^{2n} \sum_{\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{z} \in \mathbb{F}_p^{2n}} \hat{f}(\mathbf{y}) \hat{g}(\mathbf{z}) \cdot \mathbf{1}[\mathbf{z} = \mathbf{t} - \mathbf{y}] = p^{2n} \sum_{\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{F}_p^{2n}} \hat{f}(\mathbf{y}) \hat{g}(\mathbf{t} - \mathbf{y}). \quad \blacksquare \end{aligned}$$

The usual Parseval's identity follows from the above lemma by taking $\mathbf{t} = \mathbf{0}$ and $g(\mathbf{x}) = \overline{f(\mathbf{x})}$. We also define the convolution operation.

Definition 10 (Convolution). *Let $f, g : \mathbb{F}_p^{2n} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$. The convolution between f and g is the function $f * g : \mathbb{F}_p^{2n} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ defined by*

$$(f * g)(\mathbf{x}) \triangleq \frac{1}{p^{2n}} \sum_{\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{F}_p^{2n}} f(\mathbf{y}) g(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}) = \frac{1}{p^{2n}} \sum_{\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{F}_p^{2n}} f(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}) g(\mathbf{y}).$$

Lemma 11. *Let $f, g : \mathbb{F}_p^{2n} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$. Then, for all $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{F}_p^{2n}$, $\widehat{f * g}(\mathbf{x}) = \hat{f}(\mathbf{x}) \hat{g}(\mathbf{x})$.*

Proof.
$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{f * g}(\mathbf{x}) &= \frac{1}{p^{2n}} \sum_{\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{F}_p^{2n}} \omega^{[\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}]} (f * g)(\mathbf{y}) = \frac{1}{p^{4n}} \sum_{\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{z} \in \mathbb{F}_p^{2n}} \omega^{[\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}]} f(\mathbf{z}) g(\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{z}) \\ &= \frac{1}{p^{4n}} \sum_{\mathbf{z} \in \mathbb{F}_p^{2n}} \omega^{[\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}]} f(\mathbf{z}) \sum_{\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{F}_p^{2n}} \omega^{[\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} - \mathbf{z}]} g(\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{z}) = \hat{f}(\mathbf{x}) \hat{g}(\mathbf{x}). \quad \blacksquare \end{aligned}$$

2.3 Weyl operators

Define the unitary shift and clock operators \mathbf{X} and \mathbf{Z} , respectively, as

$$\mathbf{X}|q\rangle = |q + 1\rangle, \quad \mathbf{Z}|q\rangle = \omega^q |q\rangle, \quad \forall q \in \mathbb{F}_p.$$

The clock and shift operators generate the n -qudit Pauli group \mathcal{P}_p^n over \mathbb{F}_p , also known as Weyl-Heisenberg group, i.e.,

$$\mathcal{P}_p^n \triangleq \langle \tau \mathbb{I}, \mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Z} \rangle^{\otimes n}.$$

The corresponding n -qudit Clifford group \mathcal{C}_p^n is defined as the normaliser of the Pauli group in the unitary group, modulo phases, i.e.,

$$\mathcal{C}_p^n \triangleq \{ \mathcal{U} \in \mathbb{C}^{p^n \times p^n} : \mathcal{U}^\dagger \mathcal{U} = \mathbb{I}, \mathcal{U} \mathcal{P}_p^n \mathcal{U}^\dagger = \mathcal{P}_p^n \}.$$

Another way to characterise the Pauli group \mathcal{P}_p^n is through the *Weyl operators*, also known as the generalised Pauli operators, defined as

$$\mathcal{W}_{\mathbf{x}} = \mathcal{W}_{\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{w}} = \tau^{\langle \mathbf{v}, \mathbf{w} \rangle} (\mathbf{X}^{w_1} \mathbf{Z}^{v_1}) \otimes \cdots \otimes (\mathbf{X}^{w_n} \mathbf{Z}^{v_n}), \quad \forall \mathbf{x} = (\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{w}) \in \mathbb{Z}^{2n}.$$

It is not hard to see that the Weyl operators only depend on \mathbf{x} modulo p , since, for any $\mathbf{z} = (\mathbf{v}', \mathbf{w}') \in \mathbb{Z}^{2n}$,

$$\mathcal{W}_{\mathbf{x}+p\mathbf{z}} = \tau^{p\langle \mathbf{v}, \mathbf{w}' \rangle + p\langle \mathbf{v}', \mathbf{w} \rangle + p^2\langle \mathbf{v}', \mathbf{w}' \rangle} \mathcal{W}_{\mathbf{x}} = \mathcal{W}_{\mathbf{x}}.$$

It is thus without loss of generality that \mathbf{x} can be restricted to \mathbb{F}_p^{2n} . The action of $\mathcal{W}_{\mathbf{x}}$ on the Hilbert space $(\mathbb{C}^p)^{\otimes n}$ is

$$\mathcal{W}_{\mathbf{x}}|\mathbf{q}\rangle = \mathcal{W}_{\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{w}}|\mathbf{q}\rangle = \omega^{\langle \mathbf{q}, \mathbf{v} \rangle + 2^{-1}\langle \mathbf{v}, \mathbf{w} \rangle} |\mathbf{q} + \mathbf{w}\rangle, \quad \forall \mathbf{q} \in \mathbb{F}_p^n, \quad \forall \mathbf{x} = (\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{w}) \in \mathbb{F}_p^{2n}.$$

The Weyl operators are fundamental in the phase space picture of finite-dimensional quantum mechanics [Woo87, App05, Gro06, Bea13]. It is clear that every Weyl operator is an element of the Pauli group \mathcal{P}_p^n . Conversely, every Pauli operator is equal to some Weyl operator up to a phase that is a power of τ or, equivalently since p is odd, of ω . This means that

$$\mathcal{P}_p^n = \{\omega^s \mathcal{W}_{\mathbf{x}} : \mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{F}_p^{2n}, s \in \mathbb{F}_p\}.$$

A Pauli gate is any element from \mathcal{P}_p^n and a Clifford gate is any element from \mathcal{C}_p^n . More generally, an n -qudit quantum gate is any unitary in $\mathbb{C}^{p^n \times p^n}$. We assume that measuring a qudit on the computational basis and single and two-qudit quantum gates from a universal gate set [MS00, BB02, BOB05, BBO06] all require constant time to be performed. An example of a universal gate set is the set of all single-qudit gates plus the controlled shift operator $\mathbb{I}_{p^2-p} \otimes X$ [BBO06].

We say that $\{\omega^{s_i} \mathcal{W}_{\mathbf{x}_i}\}_{i \in [\ell]} \subset \mathcal{P}_p^n$, $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$, are dependent if there are $m_1, \dots, m_\ell \in \mathbb{F}_p$, not all 0, such that $\prod_{i=1}^{\ell} (\omega^{s_i} \mathcal{W}_{\mathbf{x}_i})^{m_i} = \mathbb{I}$. The order of any $\sigma \in \mathcal{P}_p^n \setminus \{\mathbb{I}\}$ is $\text{ord}(\sigma) = p$ since p is prime. This means that $\sigma^p = \mathbb{I}$ and the eigenvalues of σ are $\{1, \omega, \dots, \omega^{p-1}\}$. The center of \mathcal{P}_p^n is $Z(\mathcal{P}_p^n) \triangleq \{\phi \in \mathcal{P}_p^n : \phi\sigma = \sigma\phi, \forall \sigma \in \mathcal{P}_p^n\} = \{\omega^s \mathbb{I} \in \mathcal{P}_p^n : s \in \mathbb{F}_p\}$.

The following properties hold for the Weyl operators.

Lemma 12. For any $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{F}_p^{2n}$,

$$\begin{aligned} a. \quad & \mathcal{W}_{\mathbf{x}} \mathcal{W}_{\mathbf{y}} = \tau^{[\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}]} \mathcal{W}_{\mathbf{x}+\mathbf{y}} = \omega^{[\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}]} \mathcal{W}_{\mathbf{y}} \mathcal{W}_{\mathbf{x}}; & c. \quad & \mathcal{W}_{\mathbf{x}}^m = \mathcal{W}_{m\mathbf{x}} \quad \forall m \in \mathbb{F}_p; \\ b. \quad & \mathcal{W}_{\mathbf{x}}^\dagger = \mathcal{W}_{-\mathbf{x}}; & d. \quad & \text{Tr}[\mathcal{W}_{\mathbf{y}}^\dagger \mathcal{W}_{\mathbf{x}}] = \text{Tr}[\mathcal{W}_{\mathbf{y}} \mathcal{W}_{\mathbf{x}}^\dagger] = p^n \cdot \mathbf{1}[\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{y}]. \end{aligned}$$

Lemma 13. Let $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\{\mathcal{W}_{\mathbf{v}_i, \mathbf{w}_i}\}_{i \in [\ell]}$. Let $\mathbf{V}, \mathbf{W} \in \mathbb{F}_p^{n \times \ell}$ be the matrices with column vectors $\mathbf{v}_1, \dots, \mathbf{v}_\ell$ and $\mathbf{w}_1, \dots, \mathbf{w}_\ell$, respectively. Then $\mathbf{V}^\top \mathbf{W} = \mathbf{W}^\top \mathbf{V}$ if and only if $\{\mathcal{W}_{\mathbf{v}_i, \mathbf{w}_i}\}_{i \in [\ell]}$ pair-wise commute.

Proof. The elements $\{\mathcal{W}_{\mathbf{v}_i, \mathbf{w}_i}\}_{i \in [\ell]}$ pair-wise commute if and only if $[(\mathbf{v}_i, \mathbf{w}_i), (\mathbf{v}_j, \mathbf{w}_j)] = 0 \quad \forall i, j \in [\ell]$ if and only if $\langle \mathbf{v}_i, \mathbf{w}_j \rangle = \langle \mathbf{v}_j, \mathbf{w}_i \rangle \quad \forall i, j \in [\ell]$, which is equivalent to $\mathbf{V}^\top \mathbf{W} = \mathbf{W}^\top \mathbf{V}$. \blacksquare

From Lemma 12, $\mathcal{W}_{\mathbf{x}}$ and $\mathcal{W}_{\mathbf{y}}$ commute if and only if $[\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}] = 0$. Moreover, the re-scaled Weyl operators $\{p^{-n/2} \mathcal{W}_{\mathbf{x}} : \mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{F}_p^{2n}\}$ form an orthonormal basis with respect to the Hilbert-Schmidt inner product $\langle \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B} \rangle = \text{Tr}[\mathcal{A}^\dagger \mathcal{B}]$. Therefore, any operator \mathcal{B} on $(\mathbb{C}^p)^{\otimes n}$ can be expanded as

$$\mathcal{B} = p^{-n/2} \sum_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{F}_p^{2n}} c_{\mathcal{B}}(\mathbf{x}) \mathcal{W}_{\mathbf{x}} \quad \text{where } c_{\mathcal{B}} : \mathbb{F}_p^{2n} \rightarrow \mathbb{C} \text{ given by } c_{\mathcal{B}}(\mathbf{x}) = p^{-n/2} \text{Tr}[\mathcal{W}_{\mathbf{x}}^\dagger \mathcal{B}]$$

is the *characteristic function* of the operator \mathcal{B} . We note that $\text{Tr}[\mathcal{A}^\dagger \mathcal{B}] = \sum_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{F}_p^{2n}} \overline{c_{\mathcal{A}}(\mathbf{x})} c_{\mathcal{B}}(\mathbf{x})$. In particular, for any quantum state $|\psi\rangle \in (\mathbb{C}^p)^{\otimes n}$,

$$\psi \triangleq |\psi\rangle\langle\psi| = p^{-n/2} \sum_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{F}_p^{2n}} c_{\psi}(\mathbf{x}) \mathcal{W}_{\mathbf{x}} \quad \text{where } c_{\psi}(\mathbf{x}) = p^{-n/2} \text{Tr}[\mathcal{W}_{\mathbf{x}}^\dagger \psi] = p^{-n/2} \langle \psi | \mathcal{W}_{\mathbf{x}} | \psi \rangle.$$

Note that $\overline{c_\psi(\mathbf{x})} = c_\psi(-\mathbf{x})$ since $\mathcal{W}_\mathbf{x}^\dagger = \mathcal{W}_{-\mathbf{x}}$. From the characteristic function of the pure state ψ we define its *characteristic distribution*

$$p_\psi : \mathbb{F}_p^{2n} \rightarrow [0, p^{-n}], \quad p_\psi(\mathbf{x}) = |c_\psi(\mathbf{x})|^2 = p^{-n} |\langle \psi | \mathcal{W}_\mathbf{x} | \psi \rangle|^2 = p^{-n} \text{Tr}[\psi \mathcal{W}_\mathbf{x} \psi \mathcal{W}_\mathbf{x}^\dagger].$$

Note that $p_\psi(-\mathbf{x}) = p_\psi(\mathbf{x})$ and that $p_\psi(\mathbf{x}) \leq p^{-n}$ since $|\langle \psi | \mathcal{W}_\mathbf{x} | \psi \rangle| \leq 1$ for all $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{F}_p^{2n}$. To check that p_ψ is indeed a probability distribution, note that $\sum_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{F}_p^{2n}} p_\psi(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{F}_p^{2n}} \overline{c_\psi(\mathbf{x})} c_\psi(\mathbf{x}) = \text{Tr}[\psi \times \psi] = 1$.

It is possible to combine the characteristic distribution and the involution into a new function

$$j_\psi : \mathbb{F}_p^{2n} \rightarrow [0, p^{-n}], \quad j_\psi(\mathbf{x}) = p_\psi(J(\mathbf{x})),$$

called the *involution characteristic distribution*. Note that j_ψ is also a probability distribution since $\sum_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{F}_p^{2n}} j_\psi(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{F}_p^{2n}} p_\psi(\mathbf{x})$ by a simple change of variable. The next result, which is a slight generalisation of [GNW21, Eq. (3.5)] for $p > 2$, shows that both p_ψ and j_ψ are invariant (up to renormalisation) under the symplectic Fourier transform.

Lemma 14. *For any $|\psi\rangle \in (\mathbb{C}^p)^{\otimes n}$ and $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{F}_p^{2n}$, $\widehat{p}_\psi(\mathbf{x}) = p^{-n} p_\psi(\mathbf{x})$, $\widehat{j}_\psi(\mathbf{x}) = p^{-n} j_\psi(\mathbf{x})$, and $\widehat{p}_\psi(J(\mathbf{x})) = \widehat{j}_\psi(\mathbf{x})$.*

Proof. With the aid of Parseval's identity,

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{p}_\psi(\mathbf{x}) &= \frac{1}{p^{2n}} \sum_{\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{F}_p^{2n}} \omega^{[\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}]} p_\psi(\mathbf{y}) = \frac{1}{p^{3n}} \sum_{\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{F}_p^{2n}} \omega^{[\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}]} \langle \psi | \mathcal{W}_\mathbf{y} | \psi \rangle \langle \psi | \mathcal{W}_\mathbf{y}^\dagger | \psi \rangle \\ &= \frac{1}{p^{3n}} \sum_{\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{F}_p^{2n}} \langle \psi | \mathcal{W}_\mathbf{y} | \psi \rangle \langle \psi | \mathcal{W}_\mathbf{x}^\dagger \mathcal{W}_\mathbf{y}^\dagger \mathcal{W}_\mathbf{x} | \psi \rangle = \frac{1}{p^{2n}} \sum_{\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{F}_p^{2n}} \overline{c_\psi(\mathbf{y})} c_{\mathcal{W}_\mathbf{x} \psi \mathcal{W}_\mathbf{x}^\dagger}(\mathbf{y}) \\ &= \frac{1}{p^{2n}} \text{Tr}[\psi \mathcal{W}_\mathbf{x} \psi \mathcal{W}_\mathbf{x}^\dagger] = p^{-n} p_\psi(\mathbf{x}). \end{aligned}$$

From the above we can also see that

$$p^{2n} \widehat{p}_\psi(J(\mathbf{x})) = \sum_{\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{F}_p^{2n}} \omega^{[J(\mathbf{x}), \mathbf{y}]} p_\psi(\mathbf{y}) = \sum_{\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{F}_p^{2n}} \omega^{[J(\mathbf{x}), J(\mathbf{y})]} p_\psi(J(\mathbf{y})) = \sum_{\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{F}_p^{2n}} \omega^{-[\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}]} j_\psi(\mathbf{y}) = p^{2n} \widehat{j}_\psi(\mathbf{x}).$$

Since p_ψ and j_ψ are real-valued, the above implies that \widehat{p}_ψ and \widehat{j}_ψ are also real-valued. Finally, $\widehat{j}_\psi(\mathbf{x}) = \widehat{p}_\psi(J(\mathbf{x})) = p^{-n} p_\psi(J(\mathbf{x})) = p^{-n} j_\psi(\mathbf{x})$. \blacksquare

2.4 Stabiliser groups

In this section, we review *stabiliser groups*, which are among the most important subgroups of \mathcal{P}_p^n . For completeness and the reader's convenience (and at the risk of being wordy), we provide proofs for a number of important claims. Longer proofs can be found in [Appendix A](#). We point the reader to [[App05](#), [Gro06](#), [App09](#), [Bea13](#), [GNW21](#)] for more information.

Definition 15 (Stabiliser group). *A stabiliser group \mathcal{S} is a maximal subgroup of \mathcal{P}_p^n which contains only the identity from the center of \mathcal{P}_p^n , i.e., $\mathcal{S} \cap \mathcal{Z}(\mathcal{P}_p^n) = \{\mathbb{I}\}$.*

Stabiliser groups are well studied and several properties are known, even in the case when p is not prime (see e.g. [[Gro06](#), [Bea13](#)]). The next lemmas cover some of these properties.

Lemma 16. *Any stabiliser group $\mathcal{S} \subset \mathcal{P}_p^n$ can be written as $\mathcal{S} = \{\omega^{[\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{x}]} \mathcal{W}_\mathbf{x} : \mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{M}\}$, where $\mathbf{a} \in \mathbb{F}_p^{2n}$ and $\mathcal{M} \subset \mathbb{F}_p^{2n}$ is a Lagrangian subspace such that $\dim(\mathcal{M}) = n$. As a consequence, \mathcal{S} is commutative and $|\mathcal{S}| = p^n$.*

Given a basis $\{\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_n\}$ of \mathcal{M} , we can write $\mathcal{S} = \langle \{\omega^{[\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{x}_i]} \mathcal{W}_{\mathbf{x}_i}\}_{i \in [n]} \rangle$ since $\{\mathbf{x}_i\}_{i \in [n]}$ are linearly independent if and only if $\{\omega^{[\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{x}_i]} \mathcal{W}_{\mathbf{x}_i}\}_{i \in [n]}$ are independent as proven below.

Lemma 17. *Given $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$ and a stabiliser group $\mathcal{S} \subset \mathcal{P}_p^n$, then $\{\omega^{s_i} \mathcal{W}_{\mathbf{x}_i}\}_{i \in [\ell]} \subset \mathcal{S}$ are dependent if and only if $\{\mathbf{x}_i\}_{i \in [\ell]} \subset \mathbb{F}_p^{2n}$ are linearly dependent.*

Proof. It follows from $\prod_{i=1}^{\ell} (\omega^{s_i} \mathcal{W}_{\mathbf{x}_i})^{m_i} = \omega^{\sum_{i=1}^{\ell} m_i s_i} \mathbb{I} = \mathbb{I} \iff \sum_{i=1}^{\ell} m_i \mathbf{x}_i = \mathbf{0}$, for some $m_1, \dots, m_{\ell} \in \mathbb{F}_p$, not all 0, where the equality $\omega^{\sum_{i=1}^{\ell} m_i s_i} \mathbb{I} = \mathbb{I}$ holds since $\mathcal{S} \cap Z(\mathcal{P}_p^n) = \{\mathbb{I}\}$. ■

Note the subspace $\mathcal{M} \subseteq \mathbb{F}_p^{2n}$ can be written as $\mathcal{M} = \text{col}(\begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{V} \\ \mathbf{W} \end{bmatrix})$ for matrices $\mathbf{V}, \mathbf{W} \in \mathbb{F}_p^{n \times n}$. In the next lemma, we explore several properties of the matrices \mathbf{V}, \mathbf{W} for when \mathcal{M} is Lagrangian.

Lemma 18. *Let $\mathcal{S} = \{\omega^{[\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{x}]} \mathcal{W}_{\mathbf{x}} : \mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{M}\}$ be a stabiliser group. Let $\mathbf{V}, \mathbf{W} \in \mathbb{F}_p^{n \times n}$ be matrices such that $\mathcal{M} = \text{col}(\begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{V} \\ \mathbf{W} \end{bmatrix})$. Then*

- a. $\mathbf{V}^{\top} \mathbf{W} = \mathbf{W}^{\top} \mathbf{V}$;
- b. $\text{rank}(\begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{V} \\ \mathbf{W} \end{bmatrix}) = \dim(\mathcal{M}) = n$;
- c. $\text{row}(\mathbf{V}) + \text{row}(\mathbf{W}) = \mathbb{F}_p^n$;
- d. $\text{null}(\mathbf{V}) \cap \text{null}(\mathbf{W}) = \{\mathbf{0}\}$;
- e. $\text{null}(\begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{V}^{\top} & \mathbf{W}^{\top} \end{bmatrix}) = \text{col}(\begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{W} \\ -\mathbf{V} \end{bmatrix})$;
- f. $\text{null}(\mathbf{V}^{\top} \mathbf{W}) = \text{null}(\mathbf{V}) + \text{null}(\mathbf{W})$;
- g. $\text{null}(\mathbf{W}^{\top}) \subseteq \text{col}(\mathbf{V})$;
- h. $\text{null}(\mathbf{V}^{\top}) \subseteq \text{col}(\mathbf{W})$.

Together with the concept of stabiliser group is the concept of stabiliser state, which is the joint +1-eigenstate of all elements of a stabiliser group.

Definition 19 (Stabiliser state). *A non-zero state $|\psi\rangle \in (\mathbb{C}^p)^{\otimes n}$ is stabilised by $\sigma \in \mathcal{P}_p^n$ if $\sigma|\psi\rangle = |\psi\rangle$. A non-zero state $|\Psi\rangle \in (\mathbb{C}^p)^{\otimes n}$ is a stabiliser state of a stabiliser group \mathcal{S} if $\sigma|\Psi\rangle = |\Psi\rangle$ for all $\sigma \in \mathcal{S}$. Let S_p^n be the set of all stabiliser states in $(\mathbb{C}^p)^{\otimes n}$.*

Consider the group $\mathcal{G} = \{\omega^{[\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{x}]} \mathcal{W}_{\mathbf{x}} : \mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}\}$ where $\mathcal{X} \subset \mathbb{F}_p^{2n}$ is an isotropic subspace and let $V_{\mathcal{G}} \triangleq \{|\Psi\rangle \in (\mathbb{C}^p)^{\otimes n} : \sigma|\Psi\rangle = |\Psi\rangle, \forall \sigma \in \mathcal{G}\}$. The next two lemmas construct a projector onto $V_{\mathcal{G}}$ and show that $\dim(V_{\mathcal{G}}) = p^{n - \dim(\mathcal{X})}$. As an immediate consequence, any stabiliser group has a unique stabiliser state. This result is also true for p non-prime [Gro06, GW13, GNW21].

Lemma 20. *Let $\mathcal{G} = \{\omega^{[\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{x}]} \mathcal{W}_{\mathbf{x}} : \mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}\}$ be a group where $\mathcal{X} \subset \mathbb{F}_p^{2n}$ is an isotropic subspace, and let $V_{\mathcal{G}} \triangleq \{|\Psi\rangle \in (\mathbb{C}^p)^{\otimes n} : \omega^{[\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{x}]} \mathcal{W}_{\mathbf{x}}|\Psi\rangle = |\Psi\rangle, \forall \mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}\}$. Then the projector onto $V_{\mathcal{G}}$ is*

$$\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{G}} = \frac{1}{|\mathcal{X}|} \sum_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}} \omega^{[\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{x}]} \mathcal{W}_{\mathbf{x}}.$$

Proof. It is easy to see that $\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{G}}$ is Hermitian by the change of index $\mathbf{x} \mapsto -\mathbf{x}$. It is also idempotent,

$$\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{G}}^2 = \frac{1}{|\mathcal{X}|^2} \sum_{\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{X}} \omega^{[\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{x} + \mathbf{y}]} \mathcal{W}_{\mathbf{x}} \mathcal{W}_{\mathbf{y}} = \frac{1}{|\mathcal{X}|^2} \sum_{\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{X}} \omega^{[\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{x} + \mathbf{y}]} \mathcal{W}_{\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{y}} = \frac{1}{|\mathcal{X}|^2} \sum_{\mathbf{z} \in \mathcal{X}} \omega^{[\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{z}]} \mathcal{W}_{\mathbf{z}} = \mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{G}}.$$

Therefore, $\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{G}}$ is a projector. Moreover, $\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{G}}|\Psi\rangle = |\Psi\rangle$ for any $|\Psi\rangle \in V_{\mathcal{G}}$. On the other hand, given $\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{G}}|\psi\rangle$ for any $|\psi\rangle$, $\omega^{[\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{x}]} \mathcal{W}_{\mathbf{x}}(\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{G}}|\psi\rangle) = \mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{G}}|\psi\rangle$ for all $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}$, and thus $\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{G}}|\psi\rangle \in V_{\mathcal{G}}$. This proves that $\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{G}}$ is the projector onto $V_{\mathcal{G}}$. ■

Lemma 21. *Let $\mathcal{G} = \{\omega^{[\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{x}]} \mathcal{W}_{\mathbf{x}} : \mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}\}$ be a group where $\mathcal{X} \subset \mathbb{F}_p^{2n}$ is an isotropic subspace. Then $\dim(V_{\mathcal{G}}) = p^{n - \dim(\mathcal{X})}$, where $V_{\mathcal{G}} \triangleq \{|\Psi\rangle \in (\mathbb{C}^p)^{\otimes n} : \omega^{[\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{x}]} \mathcal{W}_{\mathbf{x}}|\Psi\rangle = |\Psi\rangle, \forall \mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}\}$. It then follows that any stabiliser group \mathcal{S} has a unique stabiliser state, i.e., $\dim(V_{\mathcal{S}}) = 1$.*

Following [Gro06, GNW21], we can denote the unique stabiliser state $|\mathcal{S}\rangle$ of a stabiliser group $\mathcal{S} = \{\omega^{[\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{x}]} \mathcal{W}_{\mathbf{x}} : \mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{M}\}$ as $|\mathcal{M}, \mathbf{a}\rangle$, where $\mathcal{M} \subset \mathbb{F}_p^{2n}$ and $\mathbf{a} \in \mathbb{F}_p^{2n}$ are the Lagrangian subspace and phase string defining \mathcal{S} , respectively. We note that the choice of \mathbf{a} given \mathcal{M} is not unique, but can be replaced with $\mathbf{a} + \mathbf{z}$ for any $\mathbf{z} \in \mathcal{M}$ and still define the same stabiliser group \mathcal{S} . In other words, any string from a coset $\mathcal{C} \in \mathbb{F}_p^{2n}/\mathcal{M}$ yields the same stabiliser state. We can then also write a stabiliser state as $|\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{C}\rangle$ where $\mathcal{C} \in \mathbb{F}_p^{2n}/\mathcal{M}$. Conversely, given a Lagrangian subspace \mathcal{M} , any state that is a simultaneous eigenvector of $\{\mathcal{W}_{\mathbf{x}}\}_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{M}}$ is a stabiliser state of some stabiliser group. The eigenvectors of $\{\mathcal{W}_{\mathbf{x}}\}_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{M}}$ thus determine a stabiliser basis $\{|\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{C}\rangle\}_{\mathcal{C} \in \mathbb{F}_p^{2n}/\mathcal{M}}$.

Consider a stabiliser group $\mathcal{S} = \{\omega^{[\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{x}]} \mathcal{W}_{\mathbf{x}} : \mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{M}\}$. According to Lemma 20, the operator $p^{-n} \sum_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{M}} \omega^{[\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{x}]} \mathcal{W}_{\mathbf{x}}$ is the orthogonal projection onto the set $V_{\mathcal{S}}$ spanned by the stabiliser state $|\mathcal{S}\rangle$ of \mathcal{S} . Therefore,

$$|\mathcal{S}\rangle\langle\mathcal{S}| = \frac{1}{p^n} \sum_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{M}} \omega^{[\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{x}]} \mathcal{W}_{\mathbf{x}} \quad (2)$$

and the characteristic function and probability of $|\mathcal{S}\rangle\langle\mathcal{S}|$ are

$$c_{\mathcal{S}}(\mathbf{x}) = \begin{cases} p^{-n/2} \omega^{[\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{x}]} & \text{if } \mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{M}, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \quad \text{and} \quad p_{\mathcal{S}}(\mathbf{x}) = \begin{cases} p^{-n} & \text{if } \mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{M}, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (3)$$

Thus $p_{\mathcal{S}}$ is the uniform distribution on the subspace \mathcal{M} , a fact which will be of paramount importance when studying Bell (difference) sampling in the next section. While we have obtained an expression for $|\mathcal{S}\rangle\langle\mathcal{S}|$, in the following lemma, we obtain an expression for $|\mathcal{S}\rangle$, which will be the basis of our quantum algorithm for learning stabiliser states in Section 4. We note that a similar form for stabiliser states was given in [HDDM05, Theorem 1].

Lemma 22. *Let $\mathcal{S} = \langle\{\omega^{s_i} \mathcal{W}_{\mathbf{v}_i, \mathbf{w}_i}\}_{i \in [n]}\rangle$ be a stabiliser group. Let $\mathbf{s} = (s_1, \dots, s_n) \in \mathbb{F}_p^n$ and let $\mathbf{V}, \mathbf{W} \in \mathbb{F}_p^{n \times n}$ be the matrices with column vectors $\mathbf{v}_1, \dots, \mathbf{v}_n$ and $\mathbf{w}_1, \dots, \mathbf{w}_n$, respectively. Then there exists $\mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{F}_p^n$ such that $\mathbf{V}^\top \mathbf{u} + \mathbf{s} \in \text{row}(\mathbf{W})$, and the unique stabiliser state of \mathcal{S} is*

$$|\mathcal{S}\rangle = \frac{\sqrt{|\text{col}(\mathbf{W})|}}{p^n} \sum_{\mathbf{q} \in \mathbb{F}_p^n} \omega^{\mathbf{s}^\top \mathbf{q} + \mathbf{u}^\top \mathbf{V} \mathbf{q} + 2^{-1} \mathbf{q}^\top \mathbf{V}^\top \mathbf{W} \mathbf{q}} |\mathbf{u} + \mathbf{W} \mathbf{q}\rangle$$

for any $\mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{F}_p^n$ such that $\mathbf{V}^\top \mathbf{u} + \mathbf{s} \in \text{row}(\mathbf{W})$.

Proof. First note that the unnormalised state $|\mathcal{S}_{\mathbf{u}}\rangle \triangleq \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{S}} \sigma |\mathbf{u}\rangle$, for any $\mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{F}_p^n$, is either the stabiliser state $|\mathcal{S}\rangle$ of \mathcal{S} (up to normalisation) or the zero state, since $p^{-n} \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{S}} \sigma$ is the orthogonal projection onto $|\mathcal{S}\rangle$. Because $\{\omega^{s_i} \mathcal{W}_{\mathbf{v}_i, \mathbf{w}_i}\}_{i \in [n]}$ are independent,

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathcal{S}_{\mathbf{u}}\rangle &= \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{S}} \sigma |\mathbf{u}\rangle = \sum_{\mathbf{q} \in \mathbb{F}_p^n} (\omega^{s_n} \mathcal{W}_{\mathbf{v}_n, \mathbf{w}_n})^{q_n} \dots (\omega^{s_1} \mathcal{W}_{\mathbf{v}_1, \mathbf{w}_1})^{q_1} |\mathbf{u}\rangle \\ &= \sum_{\mathbf{q} \in \mathbb{F}_p^n} \omega^{\mathbf{s}^\top \mathbf{q}} \mathcal{W}_{q_n \mathbf{v}_n, q_n \mathbf{w}_n} \dots \mathcal{W}_{q_1 \mathbf{v}_1, q_1 \mathbf{w}_1} |\mathbf{u}\rangle \\ &= \sum_{\mathbf{q} \in \mathbb{F}_p^n} \omega^{\mathbf{s}^\top \mathbf{q}} \mathcal{W}_{\mathbf{V} \mathbf{q}, \mathbf{W} \mathbf{q}} |\mathbf{u}\rangle \quad ([(\mathbf{v}_i, \mathbf{w}_i), (\mathbf{v}_j, \mathbf{w}_j)] = 0 \ \forall i, j \in [n]) \\ &= \sum_{\mathbf{q} \in \mathbb{F}_p^n} \omega^{\mathbf{s}^\top \mathbf{q} + \mathbf{u}^\top \mathbf{V} \mathbf{q} + 2^{-1} \mathbf{q}^\top \mathbf{V}^\top \mathbf{W} \mathbf{q}} |\mathbf{u} + \mathbf{W} \mathbf{q}\rangle \\ &= \sum_{\mathbf{q} \in \mathbb{F}_p^n} \omega^{f(\mathbf{q})} |\mathbf{u} + \mathbf{W} \mathbf{q}\rangle, \end{aligned}$$

where we defined $f : \mathbb{F}_p^n \rightarrow \mathbb{F}_p$ as $f(\mathbf{q}) = \mathbf{s}^\top \mathbf{q} + \mathbf{u}^\top \mathbf{V} \mathbf{q} + 2^{-1} \mathbf{q}^\top \mathbf{V}^\top \mathbf{W} \mathbf{q}$. To analyse the case when $|\mathcal{S}_{\mathbf{u}}\rangle$ is the stabiliser state, we compute $|\langle \mathcal{S}_{\mathbf{u}} | \mathcal{S}_{\mathbf{u}} \rangle|$ as follows:

$$|\langle \mathcal{S}_{\mathbf{u}} | \mathcal{S}_{\mathbf{u}} \rangle| = \left| \sum_{\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{q}' \in \mathbb{F}_p^n} \omega^{f(\mathbf{q}') - f(\mathbf{q})} \langle \mathbf{u} + \mathbf{W} \mathbf{q} | \mathbf{u} + \mathbf{W} \mathbf{q}' \rangle \right| = \left| \sum_{\mathbf{q} \in \mathbb{F}_p^n} \sum_{\mathbf{q}' \in \text{null}(\mathbf{W})} \omega^{f(\mathbf{q} + \mathbf{q}') - f(\mathbf{q})} \right|.$$

Since $f(\mathbf{q} + \mathbf{q}') - f(\mathbf{q}) = (\mathbf{s}^\top + \mathbf{u}^\top \mathbf{V} + \mathbf{q}^\top \mathbf{V}^\top \mathbf{W}) \mathbf{q}' + 2^{-1} \mathbf{q}'^\top \mathbf{V}^\top \mathbf{W} \mathbf{q}'$ (using that $\mathbf{V}^\top \mathbf{W} = \mathbf{W}^\top \mathbf{V}$), then

$$|\langle \mathcal{S}_{\mathbf{u}} | \mathcal{S}_{\mathbf{u}} \rangle| = \left| \sum_{\mathbf{q} \in \mathbb{F}_p^n} \sum_{\mathbf{q}' \in \text{null}(\mathbf{W})} \omega^{(\mathbf{s} + \mathbf{V}^\top \mathbf{u})^\top \mathbf{q}'} \right| = p^n \left| \sum_{\mathbf{q}' \in \text{null}(\mathbf{W})} \omega^{(\mathbf{s} + \mathbf{V}^\top \mathbf{u})^\top \mathbf{q}'} \right|.$$

According to [Lemma 7](#),

$$\sum_{\mathbf{q}' \in \text{null}(\mathbf{W})} \omega^{(\mathbf{s} + \mathbf{V}^\top \mathbf{u})^\top \mathbf{q}'} = \begin{cases} |\text{null}(\mathbf{W})| & \text{if } \mathbf{s} + \mathbf{V}^\top \mathbf{u} \in \text{null}(\mathbf{W})^\perp = \text{row}(\mathbf{W}), \\ 0 & \text{if } \mathbf{s} + \mathbf{V}^\top \mathbf{u} \notin \text{null}(\mathbf{W})^\perp = \text{row}(\mathbf{W}). \end{cases}$$

Thus $|\langle \mathcal{S}_{\mathbf{u}} | \mathcal{S}_{\mathbf{u}} \rangle| = p^n |\text{null}(\mathbf{W})| = p^{2n} / |\text{col}(\mathbf{W})|$ if $\mathbf{V}^\top \mathbf{u} + \mathbf{s} \in \text{row}(\mathbf{W})$, and $|\langle \mathcal{S}_{\mathbf{u}} | \mathcal{S}_{\mathbf{u}} \rangle| = 0$ otherwise. It only remains to prove that one can always find $\mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{F}_p^n$ such that $\mathbf{V}^\top \mathbf{u} + \mathbf{s} \in \text{row}(\mathbf{W})$, from which the corresponding $|\mathcal{S}_{\mathbf{u}}\rangle$ must be the stabiliser state of \mathcal{S} . But this is straightforward since $\{\mathbf{V}^\top \mathbf{u} : \mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{F}_p^n\} \triangleq \text{row}(\mathbf{V})$ and, according to [Lemma 18](#), $\text{row}(\mathbf{V}) + \text{row}(\mathbf{W}) = \mathbb{F}_p^n$. Thus, any \mathbf{s} can be expressed as $\mathbf{V}^\top \mathbf{q}_1 + \mathbf{W}^\top \mathbf{q}_2$ for some $\mathbf{q}_1, \mathbf{q}_2 \in \mathbb{F}_p^n$. Choosing $\mathbf{u} = -\mathbf{q}_1$ then gives $\mathbf{V}^\top \mathbf{u} + \mathbf{s} = \mathbf{W}^\top \mathbf{q}_2 \in \text{row}(\mathbf{W})$. \blacksquare

Sometimes we are interested in the Pauli operators that stabilise a given pure state $|\psi\rangle$ up to a phase. This is captured by the *unsigned stabiliser group* of $|\psi\rangle$.

Definition 23 (Unsigned stabiliser group and stabiliser dimension). *Given $|\psi\rangle \in (\mathbb{C}^p)^{\otimes n}$, its unsigned stabiliser group is $\text{Weyl}(|\psi\rangle) \triangleq \{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{F}_p^{2n} : \mathcal{W}_{\mathbf{x}} |\psi\rangle = \omega^s |\psi\rangle \text{ for some } s \in \mathbb{F}_p\}$ and its stabiliser dimension is $\dim(\text{Weyl}(|\psi\rangle))$.*

Lemma 24. *For any non-zero $|\psi\rangle \in (\mathbb{C}^p)^{\otimes n}$, $\text{Weyl}(|\psi\rangle)$ is isotropic and $\text{Weyl}(|\psi\rangle) \subseteq \text{Weyl}(|\psi\rangle)^\perp$.*

Proof. Suppose there are $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in \text{Weyl}(|\psi\rangle)$ such that $[\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}] \neq 0$. On the one hand, $\mathcal{W}_{\mathbf{x}} \mathcal{W}_{\mathbf{y}} |\psi\rangle = \omega^{s(\mathbf{x}) + s(\mathbf{y})} |\psi\rangle$, while on the other hand, $\mathcal{W}_{\mathbf{x}} \mathcal{W}_{\mathbf{y}} |\psi\rangle = \omega^{[\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}]} \mathcal{W}_{\mathbf{y}} \mathcal{W}_{\mathbf{x}} |\psi\rangle = \omega^{[\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}] + s(\mathbf{x}) + s(\mathbf{y})} |\psi\rangle$, which is a contradiction. The inclusion $\text{Weyl}(|\psi\rangle) \subseteq \text{Weyl}(|\psi\rangle)^\perp$ follows from the isotropy property. \blacksquare

The stabiliser dimension of a state is invariant under Clifford transformations as a corollary of the next result.

Lemma 25 ([GNW21, Lemma 2.1]). *For each $\mathcal{U} \in \mathcal{C}_p^n$, there is a symplectic matrix $\Gamma \in \mathbb{F}_p^{2n \times 2n}$ and a function $f : \mathbb{F}_p^{2n} \rightarrow \mathbb{F}_p$ such that $\mathcal{U} \mathcal{W}_{\mathbf{x}} \mathcal{U}^\dagger = \omega^{f(\mathbf{x})} \mathcal{W}_{\Gamma \mathbf{x}}$ for all $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{F}_p^{2n}$.*

Corollary 26. *The stabiliser dimension is invariant under Clifford transformations. In other words, $\dim(\text{Weyl}(\mathcal{U}|\psi\rangle)) = \dim(\text{Weyl}(|\psi\rangle))$ for all $\mathcal{U} \in \mathcal{C}_p^n$ and $|\psi\rangle \in (\mathbb{C}^p)^{\otimes n}$.*

The next lemma covers another important property of unsigned stabiliser groups: the stabiliser dimension is at most n and is maximised for stabiliser states. See [Appendix A](#) for an extended version of [Lemma 27](#).

Lemma 27. *Let $\mathcal{G} = \{\omega^{[\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{x}]} \mathcal{W}_{\mathbf{x}} : \mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}\}$ be a group where $\mathcal{X} \subset \mathbb{F}_p^{2n}$ is an isotropic subspace. Let $V_{\mathcal{G}} \triangleq \{|\Psi\rangle \in (\mathbb{C}^p)^{\otimes n} : \omega^{[\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{x}]} \mathcal{W}_{\mathbf{x}} |\Psi\rangle = |\Psi\rangle, \forall \mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}\}$. Then*

$$\mathcal{X} \subseteq \text{Weyl}(|\Psi\rangle) \subseteq \text{Weyl}(|\Psi\rangle)^\perp \subseteq \mathcal{X}^\perp, \quad \forall |\Psi\rangle \in V_{\mathcal{G}}.$$

As a consequence, if $\mathcal{S} = \{\omega^{[\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{x}]} \mathcal{W}_{\mathbf{x}} : \mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{M}\}$ is a stabiliser group with stabiliser state $|\mathcal{S}\rangle$, then $\text{Weyl}(|\mathcal{S}\rangle) = \mathcal{M}$.

Proof. For any $|\Psi\rangle \in V_{\mathcal{G}}$, the inclusion $\mathcal{X} \subseteq \text{Weyl}(|\Psi\rangle)$ follows from the definition of $\text{Weyl}(|\Psi\rangle)$, while the inclusion $\text{Weyl}(|\Psi\rangle) \subseteq \text{Weyl}(|\Psi\rangle)^\perp$ follows from $\text{Weyl}(|\Psi\rangle)$ being isotropic. ■

Corollary 28. *For any $|\psi\rangle \in (\mathbb{C}^p)^{\otimes n}$, $\dim(\text{Weyl}(|\psi\rangle)) \leq n$, with equality if and only if $|\psi\rangle$ is a stabiliser state.*

Alongside its stabiliser dimension, another important measure of the “stabiliser complexity” of a quantum state is its *stabiliser fidelity* [BBC⁺19].

Definition 29 (Stabiliser fidelity). *Given an n -qudit quantum state $|\psi\rangle$, its stabiliser fidelity is $F_{\mathcal{S}}(|\psi\rangle) \triangleq \max_{|\mathcal{S}\rangle \in \mathcal{S}_p^n} |\langle \mathcal{S} | \psi \rangle|^2$, where \mathcal{S}_p^n is the set of all stabiliser states in $(\mathbb{C}^p)^{\otimes n}$.*

It is possible to relate the stabiliser fidelity $F_{\mathcal{S}}(|\psi\rangle)$ of a quantum state $|\psi\rangle$ to its characteristic distribution p_ψ as shown next, which generalises [GIKL23b, Lemma 5.2 and Corollary 7.4].

Lemma 30. *Given a quantum state $|\psi\rangle \in (\mathbb{C}^p)^{\otimes n}$, let $|\mathcal{M}, \mathbf{a}\rangle = \arg \max_{|\mathcal{S}\rangle \in \mathcal{S}_p^n} |\langle \mathcal{S} | \psi \rangle|^2$ be the stabiliser state that maximises the stabiliser fidelity $F_{\mathcal{S}}(|\psi\rangle)$. Then*

$$\sum_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{M}} p_\psi(\mathbf{x}) \leq F_{\mathcal{S}}(|\psi\rangle) \leq \sqrt{\sum_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{M}} p_\psi(\mathbf{x})}.$$

Proof. For the upper bound,

$$\begin{aligned} F_{\mathcal{S}}(|\psi\rangle) &= |\langle \psi | \mathcal{M}, \mathbf{a} \rangle \langle \mathcal{M}, \mathbf{a} | \psi \rangle| \\ &= \frac{1}{p^n} \left| \sum_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{M}} \omega^{[\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{x}]} \langle \psi | \mathcal{W}_{\mathbf{x}} | \psi \rangle \right| && \text{(Equation (2))} \\ &\leq \sqrt{\frac{1}{p^n} \sum_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{M}} |\langle \psi | \mathcal{W}_{\mathbf{x}} | \psi \rangle|^2} && \text{(Cauchy-Schwarz)} \\ &= \sqrt{\sum_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{M}} p_\psi(\mathbf{x})}. \end{aligned}$$

For the lower bound, recall that $\{|\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{C}\rangle\}_{\mathcal{C} \in \mathbb{F}_p^{2n}/\mathcal{M}}$ forms a basis of stabiliser states. Then

$$\begin{aligned} F_{\mathcal{S}}(|\psi\rangle) &= \max_{\mathcal{C} \in \mathbb{F}_p^{2n}/\mathcal{M}} \langle \mathcal{M}, \mathcal{C} | \psi \rangle \langle \mathcal{M}, \mathcal{C} | \psi \rangle \\ &\geq \sum_{\mathcal{C} \in \mathbb{F}_p^{2n}/\mathcal{M}} \langle \mathcal{M}, \mathcal{C} | \psi \rangle \langle \mathcal{M}, \mathcal{C} | \psi \rangle^2 && (\sum_{\mathcal{C} \in \mathbb{F}_p^{2n}/\mathcal{M}} \langle \mathcal{M}, \mathcal{C} | \psi \rangle \langle \mathcal{M}, \mathcal{C} | \psi \rangle = 1) \\ &= \frac{1}{p^{2n}} \sum_{\mathcal{C} \in \mathbb{F}_p^{2n}/\mathcal{M}} \sum_{\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{M}} \omega^{[\mathbf{b}_{\mathcal{C}}, \mathbf{x} + \mathbf{y}]} \langle \psi | \mathcal{W}_{\mathbf{x}} | \psi \rangle \langle \psi | \mathcal{W}_{\mathbf{y}} | \psi \rangle, \end{aligned}$$

where $\mathbf{b}_{\mathcal{C}}$ is any element of the coset \mathcal{C} . By taking the average over all elements $\mathbf{b} \in \mathcal{C}$, then

$$\begin{aligned} F_{\mathcal{S}}(|\psi\rangle) &\geq \frac{1}{p^{3n}} \sum_{\mathcal{C} \in \mathbb{F}_p^{2n}/\mathcal{M}} \sum_{\mathbf{b} \in \mathcal{C}} \sum_{\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{M}} \omega^{[\mathbf{b}, \mathbf{x} + \mathbf{y}]} \langle \psi | \mathcal{W}_{\mathbf{x}} | \psi \rangle \langle \psi | \mathcal{W}_{\mathbf{y}} | \psi \rangle \\ &= \frac{1}{p^{3n}} \sum_{\mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{F}_p^{2n}} \sum_{\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{M}} \omega^{[\mathbf{b}, \mathbf{x} + \mathbf{y}]} \langle \psi | \mathcal{W}_{\mathbf{x}} | \psi \rangle \langle \psi | \mathcal{W}_{\mathbf{y}} | \psi \rangle \\ &= \frac{1}{p^n} \sum_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{M}} \langle \psi | \mathcal{W}_{\mathbf{x}} | \psi \rangle \langle \psi | \mathcal{W}_{-\mathbf{x}} | \psi \rangle && \text{(Lemma 7)} \\ &= \sum_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{M}} p_\psi(\mathbf{x}). \end{aligned} \quad \blacksquare$$

3 Exploring Bell difference sampling

In this section, we generalise and explore Bell (difference) sampling as proposed by [Mon17, GNW21] to qudits, ultimately uncovering its limitations. We start with defining the generalised Bell states. Let $|\Phi^+\rangle \triangleq p^{-n/2} \sum_{\mathbf{q} \in \mathbb{F}_p^n} |\mathbf{q}\rangle^{\otimes 2}$ be a maximally entangled state. The generalised Bell states over \mathbb{F}_p^n are defined as

$$|\mathcal{W}_{\mathbf{x}}\rangle \triangleq (\mathcal{W}_{\mathbf{x}} \otimes \mathbb{I})|\Phi^+\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{p^n}} \sum_{\mathbf{q} \in \mathbb{F}_p^n} \omega^{\langle \mathbf{q}, \mathbf{v} \rangle + 2^{-1} \langle \mathbf{v}, \mathbf{w} \rangle} |\mathbf{q} + \mathbf{w}\rangle |\mathbf{q}\rangle, \quad \forall \mathbf{x} = (\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{w}) \in \mathbb{F}_p^{2n}.$$

Notice that $|\mathcal{W}_{\mathbf{x}}\rangle = p^{-n/2} \text{vec}(\mathcal{W}_{\mathbf{x}})$ since $\mathcal{W}_{\mathbf{x}} = \sum_{\mathbf{q} \in \mathbb{F}_p^n} \omega^{\langle \mathbf{q}, \mathbf{v} \rangle + 2^{-1} \langle \mathbf{v}, \mathbf{w} \rangle} |\mathbf{q} + \mathbf{w}\rangle \langle \mathbf{q}|$. As previously mentioned, the re-scaled Weyl operators $\{p^{-n/2} \mathcal{W}_{\mathbf{x}} : \mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{F}_p^{2n}\}$ form an orthonormal basis in the space of operators, therefore the states $\{|\mathcal{W}_{\mathbf{x}}\rangle : \mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{F}_p^{2n}\}$ form an orthonormal basis in the Hilbert space $(\mathbb{C}^p)^{\otimes n} \otimes (\mathbb{C}^p)^{\otimes n}$. Indeed, $\langle \mathcal{W}_{\mathbf{x}} | \mathcal{W}_{\mathbf{y}} \rangle = p^{-n} \text{Tr}[\mathcal{W}_{\mathbf{x}}^\dagger \mathcal{W}_{\mathbf{y}}] = \mathbf{1}[\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{y}]$. In addition, for all $\mathbf{x} = (\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{w}) \in \mathbb{F}_p^{2n}$,

$$(\mathcal{W}_{\mathbf{x}} \otimes \mathcal{W}_{J(\mathbf{x})})|\Phi^+\rangle = (\mathcal{W}_{\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{w}} \otimes \mathcal{W}_{-\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{w}})|\Phi^+\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{p^n}} \sum_{\mathbf{q} \in \mathbb{F}_p^n} |\mathbf{q} + \mathbf{w}\rangle |\mathbf{q} + \mathbf{w}\rangle = |\Phi^+\rangle.$$

The following representation of $|\mathcal{W}_{\mathbf{x}}\rangle \langle \mathcal{W}_{\mathbf{x}}|$ will be useful.

Lemma 31. *For all $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{F}_p^{2n}$,*

$$|\mathcal{W}_{\mathbf{x}}\rangle \langle \mathcal{W}_{\mathbf{x}}| = \frac{1}{p^{2n}} \sum_{\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{F}_p^{2n}} \omega^{[\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}]} \mathcal{W}_{\mathbf{y}} \otimes \mathcal{W}_{J(\mathbf{y})}.$$

Proof. For all $\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{z}' \in \mathbb{F}_p^{2n}$,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{F}_p^{2n}} \omega^{[\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}]} \langle \mathcal{W}_{\mathbf{z}} | \mathcal{W}_{\mathbf{y}} \otimes \mathcal{W}_{J(\mathbf{y})} | \mathcal{W}_{\mathbf{z}'} \rangle &= \sum_{\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{F}_p^{2n}} \omega^{[\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}]} \langle \Phi^+ | (\mathcal{W}_{\mathbf{z}}^\dagger \otimes \mathbb{I}) (\mathcal{W}_{\mathbf{y}} \otimes \mathcal{W}_{J(\mathbf{y})}) (\mathcal{W}_{\mathbf{z}'} \otimes \mathbb{I}) | \Phi^+ \rangle \\ &= \sum_{\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{F}_p^{2n}} \omega^{[\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{z}' - \mathbf{x}]} \langle \Phi^+ | (\mathcal{W}_{\mathbf{z}}^\dagger \mathcal{W}_{\mathbf{z}'} \otimes \mathbb{I}) (\mathcal{W}_{\mathbf{y}} \otimes \mathcal{W}_{J(\mathbf{y})}) | \Phi^+ \rangle \\ &= \sum_{\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{F}_p^{2n}} \omega^{[\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{z}' - \mathbf{x}]} \langle \Phi^+ | (\mathcal{W}_{\mathbf{z}}^\dagger \mathcal{W}_{\mathbf{z}'} \otimes \mathbb{I}) | \Phi^+ \rangle \\ &= \mathbf{1}[\mathbf{z} = \mathbf{z}'] \sum_{\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{F}_p^{2n}} \omega^{[\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{z}' - \mathbf{x}]} \\ &= p^{2n} \mathbf{1}[\mathbf{z} = \mathbf{z}' = \mathbf{x}], \end{aligned}$$

using Lemma 7 together with $(\mathbb{F}_p^{2n})^\perp = \{\mathbf{0}\}$ (the symplectic product is non-degenerate). \blacksquare

Given a pure state of $2n$ qudits divided into systems A_1, \dots, A_n and B_1, \dots, B_n , we call *Bell sampling* the operation of measuring each pair $A_i B_i$ of qudits in the generalised Bell basis, which returns a vector in \mathbb{F}_p^{2n} . A similar operation, called *Bell difference sampling*, performs Bell sampling twice and subtracts the results from each other.

Definition 32 (Bell sampling). *Bell sampling is the projective measurement given by $|\mathcal{W}_{\mathbf{x}}\rangle \langle \mathcal{W}_{\mathbf{x}}|$ for $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{F}_p^{2n}$.*

Definition 33 (Bell difference sampling). *Bell difference sampling is defined as performing Bell sampling twice and subtracting the results from each other (modulo p). More precisely, it is the projective measurement given by*

$$\Pi_{\mathbf{x}} = \sum_{\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{F}_p^{2n}} |\mathcal{W}_{\mathbf{y}}\rangle \langle \mathcal{W}_{\mathbf{y}}| \otimes |\mathcal{W}_{\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{y}}\rangle \langle \mathcal{W}_{\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{y}}|, \quad \forall \mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{F}_p^{2n}.$$

While Bell (difference) sampling was originally considered for copies of stabiliser states in $(\mathbb{C}^2)^{\otimes n}$ [Mon17], Gross, Nezami, and Walter [GNW21] proved that it is a meaningful procedure for copies of any pure state $|\psi\rangle \in (\mathbb{C}^2)^{\otimes n}$ and corresponds to sampling from the convolution of the characteristic distribution p_ψ with itself (up to normalisation). Here we extend their results for $p > 2$ prime.

Lemma 34. *Given two pure states $|\psi_1\rangle, |\psi_2\rangle \in (\mathbb{C}^p)^{\otimes n}$, Bell sampling on $|\psi_1\rangle|\psi_2\rangle$ returns $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{F}_p^{2n}$ with probability $p^{-n}|\langle\psi_1|\mathcal{W}_{\mathbf{x}}|\psi_2^*\rangle|^2$. In particular, if $|\psi_1\rangle = |\psi_2^*\rangle = |\psi\rangle$, Bell sampling on $|\psi\rangle|\psi^*\rangle$ corresponds to sampling from the distribution $p_\psi(\mathbf{x})$.*

Proof. We have $|\langle\mathcal{W}_{\mathbf{x}}(|\psi_1\rangle|\psi_2\rangle)|^2 = p^{-n}|\text{Tr}(\mathcal{W}_{\mathbf{x}}^\dagger|\psi_1\rangle\langle\psi_2^*|)|^2 = p^{-n}|\langle\psi_1|\mathcal{W}_{\mathbf{x}}|\psi_2^*\rangle|^2$, since $|\psi_1\rangle|\psi_2\rangle = \text{vec}(|\psi_1\rangle\langle\psi_2^*|)$. ■

Theorem 35. *Let $|\psi\rangle \in (\mathbb{C}^p)^{\otimes n}$ be a pure state. Bell difference sampling on $|\psi\rangle^{\otimes 4}$ corresponds to sampling from the distribution*

$$b_\psi(\mathbf{x}) \triangleq \text{Tr}[\Pi_{\mathbf{x}}\psi^{\otimes 4}] = p^{2n}(p_\psi * j_\psi)(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{F}_p^{2n}} p_\psi(\mathbf{y})j_\psi(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}).$$

We call the distribution $b_\psi(\mathbf{x})$ the *involved Weyl distribution* of the pure state $|\psi\rangle$.

Proof. First note that, according to Lemma 31,

$$\begin{aligned} \Pi_{\mathbf{x}} &= \frac{1}{p^{4n}} \sum_{\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{z}, \mathbf{z}' \in \mathbb{F}_p^{2n}} \omega^{[\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{z}']} \omega^{[\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{z}]} \mathcal{W}_{\mathbf{z}'} \otimes \mathcal{W}_{J(\mathbf{z}')} \otimes \mathcal{W}_{\mathbf{z}} \otimes \mathcal{W}_{J(\mathbf{z})} \\ &= \frac{1}{p^{2n}} \sum_{\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{z}' \in \mathbb{F}_p^{2n}} \mathbf{1}[\mathbf{z}' = -\mathbf{z}] \omega^{[\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}]} \mathcal{W}_{\mathbf{z}'} \otimes \mathcal{W}_{J(\mathbf{z}')} \otimes \mathcal{W}_{\mathbf{z}} \otimes \mathcal{W}_{J(\mathbf{z})} \\ &= \frac{1}{p^{2n}} \sum_{\mathbf{z} \in \mathbb{F}_p^{2n}} \omega^{[\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}]} \mathcal{W}_{\mathbf{z}}^\dagger \otimes \mathcal{W}_{J(\mathbf{z})}^\dagger \otimes \mathcal{W}_{\mathbf{z}} \otimes \mathcal{W}_{J(\mathbf{z})}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Tr}[\Pi_{\mathbf{x}}\psi^{\otimes 4}] &= \frac{1}{p^{2n}} \sum_{\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{F}_p^{2n}} \omega^{[\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}]} \text{Tr}[\mathcal{W}_{\mathbf{y}}^\dagger \psi \otimes \mathcal{W}_{J(\mathbf{y})}^\dagger \psi \otimes \mathcal{W}_{\mathbf{y}} \psi \otimes \mathcal{W}_{J(\mathbf{y})} \psi] \\ &= \sum_{\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{F}_p^{2n}} \omega^{[\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}]} p_\psi(\mathbf{y}) p_\psi(J(\mathbf{y})) \\ &= p^{2n} \sum_{\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{F}_p^{2n}} \widehat{p}_\psi(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}) \widehat{j}_\psi(\mathbf{y}) \quad (\text{Parseval's identity, Lemma 9}) \\ &= \sum_{\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{F}_p^{2n}} p_\psi(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}) j_\psi(\mathbf{y}) \quad (\text{Lemma 14}) \\ &= p^{2n}(p_\psi * j_\psi)(\mathbf{x}). \quad \blacksquare \end{aligned}$$

In the case of qubits ($p = 2$), the involution is trivial, i.e., $J(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{x}$ for all $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{F}_p^{2n}$. Thus $j_\psi = p_\psi$ and Bell difference sampling corresponds to sampling from the distribution $4^n(p_\psi * p_\psi)$. Theorem 35 is a clear generalisation of this fact and starts to show the role of the involution on higher dimensions.

We now explore the distributions p_ψ and b_ψ in more details. More specifically, we start by showing the following identities regarding the mass on a subspace $\mathcal{X} \subseteq \mathbb{F}_p^{2n}$ under p_ψ or b_ψ , which are simple generalisations of [GIKL23b, Theorem 3.1 and Theorem 3.2] for $p > 2$ prime.

Lemma 36. Let $\mathcal{X} \subseteq \mathbb{F}_p^{2n}$ be a subspace. Then

$$\sum_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}} p_\psi(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{|\mathcal{X}|}{p^n} \sum_{\mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{X}^\perp} p_\psi(\mathbf{y}) \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{1}{|\mathcal{X}|} \sum_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}} b_\psi(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{\mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{X}^\perp} p_\psi(\mathbf{y}) j_\psi(\mathbf{y}).$$

Proof. For the second identity,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}} b_\psi(\mathbf{x}) &= \sum_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}} \sum_{\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{F}_p^{2n}} \omega^{[\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}]} \widehat{b_\psi}(\mathbf{y}) \\ &= p^{2n} \sum_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}} \sum_{\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{F}_p^{2n}} \omega^{[\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}]} \widehat{p_\psi}(\mathbf{y}) \widehat{j_\psi}(\mathbf{y}) \quad (\text{Theorem 35 and Lemma 11}) \\ &= \sum_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}} \sum_{\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{F}_p^{2n}} \omega^{[\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}]} p_\psi(\mathbf{y}) j_\psi(\mathbf{y}) \quad (\text{Lemma 14}) \\ &= |\mathcal{X}| \sum_{\mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{X}^\perp} p_\psi(\mathbf{y}) j_\psi(\mathbf{y}). \quad (\text{Lemma 7}) \end{aligned}$$

Regarding the first identity, we similarly have

$$\sum_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}} p_\psi(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}} \sum_{\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{F}_p^{2n}} \omega^{[\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}]} \widehat{p_\psi}(\mathbf{y}) = \frac{1}{p^n} \sum_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}} \sum_{\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{F}_p^{2n}} \omega^{[\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}]} p_\psi(\mathbf{y}) = \frac{|\mathcal{X}|}{p^n} \sum_{\mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{X}^\perp} p_\psi(\mathbf{y}),$$

where we used Lemma 14 and Lemma 7. ■

Lemma 36 allows one to further explore the characteristic and Weyl distributions, e.g. we can generalise Lemma 30.

Lemma 37. Given a quantum state $|\psi\rangle \in (\mathbb{C}^p)^{\otimes n}$, let $|\mathcal{M}, \mathbf{a}\rangle = \arg \max_{|\mathcal{S}\rangle \in \mathbb{S}_p^n} |\langle \mathcal{S} | \psi \rangle|^2$ be the stabiliser state that maximises the stabiliser fidelity $F_S(|\psi\rangle)$. Let \mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y} be subspaces such that $\mathcal{X} \subseteq \mathcal{M} \subseteq \mathcal{Y}$. Then

$$\frac{p^n}{|\mathcal{Y}|} \sum_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{Y}} p_\psi(\mathbf{x}) \leq F_S(|\psi\rangle) \leq \sqrt{\frac{p^n}{|\mathcal{X}|}} \sum_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}} p_\psi(\mathbf{x}).$$

Proof. Using Lemma 30 and Lemma 36,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{p^n}{|\mathcal{Y}|} \sum_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{Y}} p_\psi(\mathbf{x}) &= \sum_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{Y}^\perp} p_\psi(\mathbf{x}) \leq \sum_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{M}} p_\psi(\mathbf{x}) \leq F_S(|\psi\rangle), \\ \frac{p^n}{|\mathcal{X}|} \sum_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}} p_\psi(\mathbf{x}) &= \sum_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}^\perp} p_\psi(\mathbf{x}) \geq \sum_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{M}} p_\psi(\mathbf{x}) \geq F_S(|\psi\rangle)^2. \end{aligned} \quad \blacksquare$$

As another consequence of Lemma 36, the support of p_ψ and b_ψ are related to $\text{Weyl}(|\psi\rangle)$, which is a generalisation of [GIKL23b, Lemma 4.3 and Corollary 4.4].

Lemma 38. Let $|\psi\rangle \in (\mathbb{C}^p)^{\otimes n}$ and let its characteristic and Weyl distributions p_ψ and b_ψ , respectively. The support of p_ψ is contained in $\text{Weyl}(|\psi\rangle)^\perp$, while the support of b_ψ is contained in $\text{Weyl}(|\psi\rangle)^\perp + J(\text{Weyl}(|\psi\rangle)^\perp)$.

Proof. We show that the mass of p_ψ on $\text{Weyl}(|\psi\rangle)^\perp$ equals 1.

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{\mathbf{x} \in \text{Weyl}(|\psi\rangle)^\perp} p_\psi(\mathbf{x}) &= \frac{|\text{Weyl}(|\psi\rangle)^\perp|}{p^n} \sum_{\mathbf{y} \in \text{Weyl}(|\psi\rangle)} p_\psi(\mathbf{y}) \quad (\text{Lemma 36}) \\ &= \frac{|\text{Weyl}(|\psi\rangle)^\perp|}{p^n} \frac{|\text{Weyl}(|\psi\rangle)|}{p^n} = 1. \quad (p_\psi(\mathbf{x}) = p^{-n} \text{ iff } \mathbf{x} \in \text{Weyl}(|\psi\rangle)) \end{aligned}$$

By the same token, the involution characteristic distribution $j_\psi(\mathbf{x}) = p_\psi(J(\mathbf{x}))$ is supported on $J(\text{Weyl}(|\psi\rangle)^\perp)$ since $J(\text{Weyl}(|\psi\rangle)^\perp)^\perp = J(\text{Weyl}(|\psi\rangle)^\perp)$ and $|J(\text{Weyl}(|\psi\rangle)^\perp)| = |\text{Weyl}(|\psi\rangle)^\perp|$. On the other hand, according to [Theorem 35](#),

$$b_\psi(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{F}_p^{2n}} p_\psi(\mathbf{y}) j_\psi(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}) = \sum_{\mathbf{y} \in \text{Weyl}(|\psi\rangle)^\perp} p_\psi(\mathbf{y}) j_\psi(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}).$$

For $\mathbf{y} \in \text{Weyl}(|\psi\rangle)^\perp$, $\mathbf{x} \notin \text{Weyl}(|\psi\rangle)^\perp + J(\text{Weyl}(|\psi\rangle)^\perp) \implies \mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y} \notin J(\text{Weyl}(|\psi\rangle)^\perp)$. This means that, if $\mathbf{x} \notin \text{Weyl}(|\psi\rangle)^\perp + J(\text{Weyl}(|\psi\rangle)^\perp)$ and $\mathbf{y} \in \text{Weyl}(|\psi\rangle)^\perp$, then $j_\psi(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}) = 0$, and so $b_\psi(\mathbf{x}) = 0$. Therefore, the support of b_ψ is contained in $\text{Weyl}(|\psi\rangle)^\perp + J(\text{Weyl}(|\psi\rangle)^\perp)$. \blacksquare

[Lemma 38](#) is quite powerful. As we have previously seen, the characteristic function of a stabiliser state $|\mathcal{S}\rangle$ is uniformly distributed on its associated Lagrangian subspace \mathcal{M} , i.e., $p_{\mathcal{S}}(\mathbf{x}) = p^{-n}$ if $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{M}$ and 0 otherwise. This fact also follows from [Lemma 38](#) since $p_{\mathcal{S}}$ is supported on $\text{Weyl}(|\mathcal{S}\rangle)^\perp = \mathcal{M}^\perp = \mathcal{M}$ and $p_{\mathcal{S}}(\mathbf{x}) = p^{-n}$ for $\mathbf{x} \in \text{Weyl}(|\mathcal{S}\rangle) = \mathcal{M}$. [Lemma 38](#) also implies that $b_{\mathcal{S}}$ is supported on $\text{Weyl}(|\mathcal{S}\rangle)^\perp + J(\text{Weyl}(|\mathcal{S}\rangle)^\perp) = \mathcal{M} + J(\mathcal{M})$, where $J(\mathcal{M}) \triangleq \{J(\mathbf{x}) \in \mathbb{F}_p^{2n} : \mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{M}\}$. This is formalised in the next result, which is the main result of this section.

Theorem 39. *Let $\mathcal{S} = \{\omega^{[\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{x}]} \mathcal{W}_{\mathbf{x}} : \mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{M}\}$ be a stabiliser group with stabiliser state $|\mathcal{S}\rangle \in (\mathbb{C}^p)^{\otimes n}$. Let $\mathbf{V}, \mathbf{W} \in \mathbb{F}_p^{n \times n}$ be matrices such that $\mathcal{M} = \text{col}(\begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{V} \\ \mathbf{W} \end{bmatrix})$. Bell difference sampling on $|\mathcal{S}\rangle^{\otimes 4}$ returns $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{F}_p^{2n}$ with probability*

$$b_{\mathcal{S}}(\mathbf{x}) = \begin{cases} p^{-2n} |\mathcal{M} \cap J(\mathcal{M})| & \text{if } \mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{M} + J(\mathcal{M}), \\ 0 & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \\ = \begin{cases} |\text{col}(\mathbf{V})|^{-1} |\text{col}(\mathbf{W})|^{-1} & \text{if } \mathbf{x} \in \text{col}(\mathbf{V}) \times \text{col}(\mathbf{W}), \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Proof. According to [Theorem 35](#) and [Equation \(3\)](#), Bell difference sampling on $|\mathcal{S}\rangle^{\otimes 4}$ returns $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{F}_p^{2n}$ with probability

$$b_{\mathcal{S}}(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{F}_p^{2n}} p_{\mathcal{S}}(\mathbf{y}) j_{\mathcal{S}}(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}) = \frac{1}{p^n} \sum_{\mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{M}} p_{\mathcal{S}}(J(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y})).$$

Since $p_{\mathcal{S}}(J(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y})) = p^{-n}$ if $J(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}) \in \mathcal{M} \iff \mathbf{x} \in \mathbf{y} + J(\mathcal{M})$ and $\mathcal{M} + J(\mathcal{M})$ is a subspace, we conclude that $p_{\mathcal{S}}(J(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y})) = 0$ if $\mathbf{x} \notin \mathcal{M} + J(\mathcal{M})$. Let us compute then $b_{\mathcal{S}}(J(\mathbf{x}))$ for $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{M} + J(\mathcal{M})$. Write $\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{x}_1 + \mathbf{x}_2$, where $\mathbf{x}_1 \in \mathcal{M}$ and $\mathbf{x}_2 \in J(\mathcal{M})$. Then

$$b_{\mathcal{S}}(J(\mathbf{x})) = \frac{1}{p^n} \sum_{\mathbf{y} \in J(\mathcal{M})} p_{\mathcal{S}}(\mathbf{x}_1 + \mathbf{x}_2 - \mathbf{y}) \stackrel{\mathbf{y}=\mathbf{y}+\mathbf{x}_2}{=} \frac{1}{p^n} \sum_{\mathbf{y} \in J(\mathcal{M})} p_{\mathcal{S}}(\mathbf{x}_1 - \mathbf{y}).$$

If $\mathbf{y} \notin \mathcal{M}$, then $\mathbf{x}_1 - \mathbf{y} \notin \mathcal{M}$ and so $p_{\mathcal{S}}(\mathbf{x}_1 - \mathbf{y}) = 0$. Therefore, $p_{\mathcal{S}}(\mathbf{x}_1 - \mathbf{y}) = p^{-n}$ if $\mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{M} \cap J(\mathcal{M})$ and 0 otherwise. All in all, we conclude that

$$b_{\mathcal{S}}(\mathbf{x}) = \begin{cases} p^{-2n} |\mathcal{M} \cap J(\mathcal{M})| & \text{if } \mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{M} + J(\mathcal{M}), \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Now, notice that $J(\mathcal{M}) = J(\text{col}(\begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{V} \\ \mathbf{W} \end{bmatrix})) = \text{col}(J(\begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{V} \\ \mathbf{W} \end{bmatrix})) = \text{col}(\begin{bmatrix} -\mathbf{V} \\ \mathbf{W} \end{bmatrix})$. Then

$$\mathcal{M} + J(\mathcal{M}) = \text{col}(\begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{V} \\ \mathbf{W} \end{bmatrix}) + \text{col}(\begin{bmatrix} -\mathbf{V} \\ \mathbf{W} \end{bmatrix}) = \text{col}(\mathbf{V}) \times \text{col}(\mathbf{W}),$$

since $\begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{V} \\ \mathbf{W} \end{bmatrix} \frac{\mathbf{z}_1 + \mathbf{z}_2}{2} + \begin{bmatrix} -\mathbf{V} \\ \mathbf{W} \end{bmatrix} \frac{\mathbf{z}_1 - \mathbf{z}_2}{2} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{V} \mathbf{z}_2 \\ \mathbf{W} \mathbf{z}_1 \end{bmatrix}$ for any $\mathbf{z}_1, \mathbf{z}_2 \in \mathbb{F}_p^n$. Finally, $\mathcal{M} \cap J(\mathcal{M}) = (\mathcal{M} + J(\mathcal{M}))^\perp$ implies $|\mathcal{M} \cap J(\mathcal{M})| = p^{2n} / |\mathcal{M} + J(\mathcal{M})| = p^{2n} / |\text{col}(\mathbf{V}) \times \text{col}(\mathbf{W})| = p^{2n} / (|\text{col}(\mathbf{V})| |\text{col}(\mathbf{W})|)$. \blacksquare

The above result reveals highlights the limitations of Bell difference sampling on qudits, which stems from the involution function. More precisely, it shows that Bell difference sampling on $|\mathcal{S}\rangle^{\otimes 4}$ allows one to learn \mathbf{V} and \mathbf{W} separately up to some change of basis, but not $\begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{V} \\ \mathbf{W} \end{bmatrix}$ and thus \mathcal{M} . Equivalently, we only learn the subspace $\mathcal{M} + J(\mathcal{M})$. This is in stark contrast to the case of qubits ($p = 2$), where Bell difference sampling on $|\mathcal{S}\rangle^{\otimes 4}$ returns $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{M}$ with probability $b_{\mathcal{S}}(\mathbf{x}) = q_{\mathcal{S}}(\mathbf{x}) = 2^{-n}$ [GNW21]. Indeed, $4^n(p_{\mathcal{S}} * p_{\mathcal{S}}) = p_{\mathcal{S}}$ due to Theorem 35 and Equation (3).

4 Learning stabiliser states

After exploring the limitations of Bell difference sampling, we propose alternative quantum algorithms to tackle important problems regarding stabiliser states. In this section, we look at the problem of identifying an unknown stabiliser state $|\mathcal{S}\rangle \in (\mathbb{C}^p)^{\otimes n}$ given access to copies of $|\mathcal{S}\rangle$. We start in Section 4.1 with the simple observation that, if one also has access to the complex conjugate $|\mathcal{S}^*\rangle$ of $|\mathcal{S}\rangle$, then it is possible to apply Bell sampling, since, according to Lemma 34, Bell sampling on $|\mathcal{S}\rangle|\mathcal{S}^*\rangle$ is equivalent to sampling from the characteristic distribution $p_{\mathcal{S}}$. In Section 4.2, we develop our alternative quantum algorithm that only uses copies of $|\mathcal{S}\rangle$.

4.1 Method 1: Bell sampling

Consider a stabiliser group $\mathcal{S} = \{\omega^{[\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{x}]} \mathcal{W}_{\mathbf{x}} : \mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{M}\}$. According to Equation (3), Bell sampling on $|\mathcal{S}\rangle|\mathcal{S}^*\rangle$ returns $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{M}$. Therefore, it is possible to learn the stabiliser state of a stabiliser group by several applications of Bell sampling on $|\mathcal{S}\rangle|\mathcal{S}^*\rangle$, as shown next.

Algorithm 1: Learning \mathcal{S} via Bell sampling

Input: $3n$ copies of a stabiliser state $|\mathcal{S}\rangle \in (\mathbb{C}^p)^{\otimes n}$ and $2n$ copies of its complex conjugate $|\mathcal{S}^*\rangle$.
Output: a succinct description of the stabiliser group \mathcal{S} , with probability $\geq 1 - p^{-n}$.
1 for $i \leftarrow 1$ **to** $2n$ **do**
2 Bell sample on $|\mathcal{S}\rangle|\mathcal{S}^*\rangle$ to obtain $\mathbf{x}_i \in \mathbb{F}_p^{2n}$.
3 Determine a basis \mathcal{B} for $\text{span}(\{\mathbf{x}_i\}_{i \in [2n]})$.
4 For each $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{B}$, measure a copy of $|\mathcal{S}\rangle$ in the eigenbasis of $\mathcal{W}_{\mathbf{x}}$ to determine $s(\mathbf{x}) \in \mathbb{F}_p$ such that $\mathcal{W}_{\mathbf{x}}|\mathcal{S}\rangle = \omega^{-s(\mathbf{x})}|\mathcal{S}\rangle$.
5 return $\mathcal{S} = \langle \{\omega^{s(\mathbf{x})} \mathcal{W}_{\mathbf{x}}\}_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{B}} \rangle$.

Theorem 40. Let $\mathcal{S} = \{\omega^{[\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{x}]} \mathcal{W}_{\mathbf{x}} : \mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{M}\}$ be an unknown stabiliser group with stabiliser state $|\mathcal{S}\rangle \in (\mathbb{C}^p)^{\otimes n}$. There is a quantum algorithm (Algorithm 1) that identifies \mathcal{S} using $3n$ copies of $|\mathcal{S}\rangle$ and $2n$ copies of $|\mathcal{S}^*\rangle$. Its runtime is $O(n^3)$ and failure probability is at most p^{-n} .

Proof. According to Lemma 34, Bell sampling on $|\mathcal{S}\rangle|\mathcal{S}^*\rangle$ returns $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{F}_p^{2n}$ with probability $p_{\mathcal{S}}(\mathbf{x})$, i.e., \mathbf{x} is uniformly distributed on the subspace \mathcal{M} . Thus, Bell sample $|\mathcal{S}\rangle|\mathcal{S}^*\rangle$ a number of $2n$ times to obtain $\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_{2n} \in \mathcal{M}$. If $\dim(\text{span}(\{\mathbf{x}_i\}_{i \in [2n]})) = n$, then any basis \mathcal{B} of $\text{span}(\{\mathbf{x}_i\}_{i \in [2n]})$ is a basis for \mathcal{M} , which can be identified by using Gaussian elimination in time $O(n^3)$. Finally, for each element $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{B}$, measure a copy of $|\mathcal{S}\rangle$ in the eigenbasis of $\mathcal{W}_{\mathbf{x}}$ to determine $s(\mathbf{x}) \in \mathbb{F}_p$ such that $\mathcal{W}_{\mathbf{x}}|\mathcal{S}\rangle = \omega^{-s(\mathbf{x})}|\mathcal{S}\rangle$, which requires $O(n^2)$ time. The algorithm fails if the $2n$ samples $\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_{2n}$ are contained in a subspace of dimension $n-1$. The probability that the samples are all contained in any such subspace is p^{-2n} . By a union bound over all $(p^n - 1)/(p - 1)$ subspaces of dimension $n - 1$, the failure probability is at most p^{-n} . ■

4.2 Method 2: learning quadratic functions

In many situations, one might not have access to copies of $|\mathcal{S}^*\rangle$. This raises the question of whether it is possible to learn a stabiliser state $|\mathcal{S}\rangle$ using only copies of $|\mathcal{S}\rangle$. It is well known that this is possible when $p = 2$ [Mon17], since $|\mathcal{S}^*\rangle = \sigma|\mathcal{S}\rangle$ for some $\sigma \in \mathcal{P}_p^n$. Indeed, when $p = 2$, Bell difference sampling on $|\mathcal{S}\rangle^{\otimes 4}$ returns $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{M}$. However, for $p > 2$, Theorem 39 shows that Bell difference sampling on $|\mathcal{S}\rangle^{\otimes 4}$ cannot be used to learn $|\mathcal{S}\rangle$. Nonetheless, we now provide an algorithm, based on a completely different technique, that learns \mathcal{S} using only copies of $|\mathcal{S}\rangle$.

Algorithm 2: Learning \mathcal{S} by learning quadratic functions

Input: $3(m + n) + 4$ copies of a stabiliser state $|\mathcal{S}\rangle \in (\mathbb{C}^p)^{\otimes n}$, where $m \triangleq 2n + \lceil \log_p r \rceil$, and $\delta_1, \delta_2, \delta_3 \in \mathbb{F}_p$, not all 0, such that $\delta_1^2 + \delta_2^2 + \delta_3^2 = 0$.

Output: a succinct description of the stabiliser group \mathcal{S} , with probability $\geq 1 - 2p^{-n}$.

- 1 **for** $i \leftarrow 0$ **to** $2n$ **do**
- 2 Measure $|\mathcal{S}\rangle$ to obtain $\mathbf{b}_i \in \mathbb{F}_p^n$.
- 3 **if** $i \neq 0$ **then**
- 4 $\mathbf{b}_i \leftarrow \mathbf{b}_i - \mathbf{b}_0$.
- 5 $r \leftarrow \dim(\text{span}(\{\mathbf{b}_i\}_{i \in [2n]}))$.
- 6 Take $\mathbf{w}_i = \mathbf{e}_i$ for $i \in [r]$ and $\mathbf{w}_i = \mathbf{0}$ for $i \in \{r + 1, \dots, n\}$.
- 7 Take $\mathbf{v}_i = \mathbf{e}_i$ for $i \in \{r + 1, \dots, n\}$.
- 8 **for** $\ell \leftarrow 0$ **to** m **do**
- 9 Use 3 copies of $|\mathcal{S}\rangle$ to create the state $p^{-n} \sqrt{|\text{col}(\mathbf{W})|} \sum_{\mathbf{t} \in \mathbb{F}_p^n} |\mathbf{W}\mathbf{t}\rangle |\mathcal{S}\rangle^{\otimes 3}$.
- 10 For $i \in [3]$, apply $U_{\delta_i} : |\mathbf{t}, \mathbf{q}\rangle \mapsto |\mathbf{t}, \mathbf{q} - \delta_i \mathbf{t}\rangle$, $\forall \mathbf{t}, \mathbf{q} \in \mathbb{F}_p^n$, onto the i -th copy of $|\mathcal{S}\rangle$ controlled on the register $|\mathbf{W}\mathbf{t}\rangle$.
- 11 Apply an inverse quantum Fourier transform onto the register $|\mathbf{W}\mathbf{t}\rangle$.
- 12 Measure the 4 registers to obtain a tuple $(\mathbf{c}^{(\ell)}, \mathbf{q}_1^{(\ell)}, \mathbf{q}_2^{(\ell)}, \mathbf{q}_3^{(\ell)}) \in \mathbb{F}_p^{4n}$.
- 13 **if** $\ell \neq 0$ **then**
- 14 $(\mathbf{c}^{(\ell)}, \mathbf{q}_1^{(\ell)}, \mathbf{q}_2^{(\ell)}, \mathbf{q}_3^{(\ell)}) \leftarrow (\mathbf{c}^{(\ell)} - \mathbf{c}^{(0)}, \mathbf{q}_1^{(\ell)} - \mathbf{q}_1^{(0)}, \mathbf{q}_2^{(\ell)} - \mathbf{q}_2^{(0)}, \mathbf{q}_3^{(\ell)} - \mathbf{q}_3^{(0)})$.
- 15 **for** $k \leftarrow 1$ **to** r **do**
- 16 Solve the linear system of m equations $\sum_{j=1}^n V_{jk} (\sum_{i=1}^3 \delta_i \mathbf{q}_i^{(\ell)})_j = (\mathbf{W}^\top \mathbf{c}^{(\ell)})_k$, $\ell \in [m]$, with unknown variables V_{1k}, \dots, V_{nk} .
- 17 **for** $i \leftarrow 1$ **to** n **do**
- 18 Measure a copy of $|\mathcal{S}\rangle$ in the eigenbasis of $\mathcal{W}_{\mathbf{v}_i, \mathbf{w}_i}$ to determine $s_i \in \mathbb{F}_p$ such that $\mathcal{W}_{\mathbf{v}_i, \mathbf{w}_i} |\mathcal{S}\rangle = \omega^{-s_i} |\mathcal{S}\rangle$.
- 19 **return** $\mathcal{S} = \langle \{\omega^{s_i} \mathcal{W}_{\mathbf{v}_i, \mathbf{w}_i}\}_{i \in [n]} \rangle$.

Theorem 41. Let $\mathcal{S} = \langle \{\omega^{s_i} \mathcal{W}_{\mathbf{v}_i, \mathbf{w}_i}\}_{i \in [n]} \rangle$ be an unknown stabiliser group with stabiliser state $|\mathcal{S}\rangle \in (\mathbb{C}^p)^{\otimes n}$. Let $\mathbf{W} \in \mathbb{F}_p^{n \times n}$ be the matrix with column vectors $\mathbf{w}_1, \dots, \mathbf{w}_n$. There is a quantum algorithm (Algorithm 2) that identifies \mathcal{S} by using $9n + 3\lceil \log_p \text{rank}(\mathbf{W}) \rceil + 4$ copies of $|\mathcal{S}\rangle$. Its runtime is $O(n^3 \text{rank}(\mathbf{W}))$ and failure probability is at most $2p^{-n}$.

Proof. By Lemma 22, the stabiliser state of $\mathcal{S} = \langle \{\omega^{s_i} \mathcal{W}_{\mathbf{v}_i, \mathbf{w}_i}\}_{i \in [n]} \rangle$ is given by

$$|\mathcal{S}\rangle = \frac{\sqrt{|\text{col}(\mathbf{W})|}}{p^n} \sum_{\mathbf{q} \in \mathbb{F}_p^n} \omega^{f(\mathbf{q})} |\mathbf{u} + \mathbf{W}\mathbf{q}\rangle,$$

where $f(\mathbf{q}) = \mathbf{s}^\top \mathbf{q} + \mathbf{u}^\top \mathbf{V}\mathbf{q} + 2^{-1} \mathbf{q}^\top \mathbf{V}^\top \mathbf{W}\mathbf{q}$ and $\mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{F}_p^n$ is such that $\mathbf{V}^\top \mathbf{u} + \mathbf{s} \in \text{row}(\mathbf{W})$. Here $\mathbf{V}, \mathbf{W} \in \mathbb{F}_p^{n \times n}$ are the matrices with column vectors $\mathbf{v}_1, \dots, \mathbf{v}_n$ and $\mathbf{w}_1, \dots, \mathbf{w}_n$, respectively,

and $\mathbf{s} = (s_1, \dots, s_n) \in \mathbb{F}_p^n$. Let $r = \text{rank}(\mathbf{W})$. Without loss of generality, we can assume that $\mathbf{w}_{r+1} = \dots = \mathbf{w}_n = \mathbf{0}$. In order to identify \mathcal{S} , we must learn \mathbf{s} and $\begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{V} \\ \mathbf{W} \end{bmatrix}$.

The first step is to learn \mathbf{W} . To do so, measure $|\mathcal{S}\rangle$ $2n+1$ times, in time complexity $O(n^2)$. The outcome vectors are $\mathbf{b}_0, \dots, \mathbf{b}_{2n} \in \mathbb{F}_p^n$, where $\mathbf{b}_i = \mathbf{u} + \mathbf{W}\mathbf{q}_i$ for some $\mathbf{q}_i \in \mathbb{F}_p^n$, $i \in \{0, \dots, 2n\}$. By subtracting the vector \mathbf{b}_0 from all the others, we obtain $\mathbf{b}_i - \mathbf{b}_0 = \mathbf{W}(\mathbf{q}_i - \mathbf{q}_0) \in \text{col}(\mathbf{W})$, $i \in [2n]$. We find a basis for $\text{span}(\{\mathbf{b}_i - \mathbf{b}_0\}_{i \in [2n]})$ using Gaussian elimination in time $O(n^3)$. If $\dim(\text{span}(\{\mathbf{b}_i - \mathbf{b}_0\}_{i \in [2n]})) = r$, then the vectors from the basis span \mathbf{W} . Without loss of generality, we can pick $\mathbf{w}_i = \mathbf{e}_i$ for $i \in [r]$. Learning \mathbf{W} fails if $\dim(\text{span}(\{\mathbf{b}_i - \mathbf{b}_0\}_{i \in [2n]})) < r$. The probability that all vectors $\{\mathbf{b}_i - \mathbf{b}_0\}_{i \in [2n]}$ are contained in any subspace in $\text{col}(\mathbf{W})$ of dimension $r-1$ is p^{-2n} . By a union bound over all $(p^r - 1)/(p-1)$ subspaces in $\text{col}(\mathbf{W})$ of dimension $r-1$, the failure probability is at most $p^{r-2n} \leq p^{-n}$.

In possession of \mathbf{W} , we now learn the corresponding \mathbf{V} , starting with $\mathbf{v}_{r+1}, \dots, \mathbf{v}_n$. Since $\langle \mathbf{v}_i, \mathbf{w}_j \rangle = \langle \mathbf{v}_j, \mathbf{w}_i \rangle$ for all $i, j \in [n]$, then $\mathbf{v}_{r+1}, \dots, \mathbf{v}_n \in \text{col}(\mathbf{W})^\perp$, i.e., $\mathbf{v}_{r+1}, \dots, \mathbf{v}_n$ are orthogonal to $\text{col}(\mathbf{W})$. Since $\{\omega^{s_i} \mathcal{W}_{\mathbf{v}_i, \mathbf{w}_i}\}_{i \in [n]}$ are independent, $\dim(\text{span}(\{\mathbf{v}_i\}_{i=r+1}^n)) = n-r$. We conclude that $\text{span}(\{\mathbf{v}_i\}_{i=r+1}^n) = \text{col}(\mathbf{W})^\perp$. We can thus pick any basis for $\text{col}(\mathbf{W})^\perp$ as the vectors $\mathbf{v}_{r+1}, \dots, \mathbf{v}_n$, which can be done in time $O(n^3)$ using Gaussian elimination. As a possibility, we can simply take $\mathbf{v}_i = \mathbf{e}_i$ for $i \in \{r+1, \dots, n\}$.

We now show how to learn the remaining corresponding vectors $\mathbf{v}_1, \dots, \mathbf{v}_r \in \mathbb{F}_p^n$ given the obtained \mathbf{W} . Let $m \triangleq 2n + \lceil \log_p r \rceil$. Let $\delta_1, \delta_2, \delta_3 \in \mathbb{F}_p$, not all 0, be such that $\delta_1^2 + \delta_2^2 + \delta_3^2 = 0$. These can be found in time $O(\text{poly log } p)$ by using the Las Vegas method of [ISS12] or the deterministic method of [Woe05]. We shall generate $m+1$ vector constraints of the form

$$\mathbf{V}^\top \sum_{i=1}^3 \delta_i \mathbf{q}_i = \mathbf{W}^\top \mathbf{c} - \sum_{i=1}^3 \delta_i \mathbf{s}, \quad (4)$$

for random $\mathbf{q}_1, \mathbf{q}_2, \mathbf{q}_3 \in \mathbf{u} + \text{col}(\mathbf{W})$ and some $\mathbf{c} \in \mathbb{F}_p^n$. This is done by repeating the following procedure $m+1$ times. Start with 3 copies of $|\mathcal{S}\rangle$ and an auxiliary register as

$$\left(\frac{p^{r/2}}{p^n} \sum_{\mathbf{t} \in \mathbb{F}_p^n} |\mathbf{W}\mathbf{t}\rangle \right) |\mathcal{S}\rangle^{\otimes 3} = \frac{p^{2r}}{p^{4n}} \sum_{\mathbf{t} \in \mathbb{F}_p^n} |\mathbf{W}\mathbf{t}\rangle \bigotimes_{i=1}^3 \sum_{\mathbf{q}_i \in \mathbb{F}_p^n} \omega^{f(\mathbf{q}_i)} |\mathbf{u} + \mathbf{W}\mathbf{q}_i\rangle.$$

Let U_δ be the shift unitary such that $U_\delta |\mathbf{t}\rangle |\mathbf{q}\rangle = |\mathbf{t}\rangle |\mathbf{q} - \delta \mathbf{t}\rangle$ for all $\mathbf{t}, \mathbf{q} \in \mathbb{F}_p^n$. For $i \in [3]$, apply U_{δ_i} onto the register $|\mathbf{u} + \mathbf{W}\mathbf{q}_i\rangle$ controlled on the register $|\mathbf{W}\mathbf{t}\rangle$ to obtain

$$\frac{p^{2r}}{p^{4n}} \sum_{\mathbf{t} \in \mathbb{F}_p^n} |\mathbf{W}\mathbf{t}\rangle \bigotimes_{i=1}^3 \sum_{\mathbf{q}_i \in \mathbb{F}_p^n} \omega^{f(\mathbf{q}_i)} |\mathbf{u} + \mathbf{W}(\mathbf{q}_i - \delta_i \mathbf{t})\rangle = \frac{p^{2r}}{p^{4n}} \sum_{\mathbf{t} \in \mathbb{F}_p^n} |\mathbf{W}\mathbf{t}\rangle \bigotimes_{i=1}^3 \sum_{\mathbf{q}_i \in \mathbb{F}_p^n} \omega^{f(\mathbf{q}_i + \delta_i \mathbf{t})} |\mathbf{u} + \mathbf{W}\mathbf{q}_i\rangle.$$

Applying U_{δ_i} requires $O(n)$ time, since it is composed of n two-qudit shifts. We now notice that

$$\begin{aligned} f(\mathbf{q} + \delta \mathbf{t}) &= \mathbf{s}^\top (\mathbf{q} + \delta \mathbf{t}) + \mathbf{u}^\top \mathbf{V} (\mathbf{q} + \delta \mathbf{t}) + 2^{-1} (\mathbf{q} + \delta \mathbf{t})^\top \mathbf{V}^\top \mathbf{W} (\mathbf{q} + \delta \mathbf{t}) \\ &= f(\mathbf{q}) + \delta \mathbf{t}^\top \mathbf{s} + \delta \mathbf{t}^\top \mathbf{V}^\top \mathbf{u} + \delta \mathbf{t}^\top \mathbf{V}^\top \mathbf{W} \mathbf{q} + 2^{-1} \delta^2 \mathbf{t}^\top \mathbf{V}^\top \mathbf{W} \mathbf{t}, \end{aligned}$$

where we used that $\mathbf{W}^\top \mathbf{V} = \mathbf{V}^\top \mathbf{W}$. Therefore

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i=1}^3 f(\mathbf{q}_i + \delta_i \mathbf{t}) - f(\mathbf{q}_i) &= \mathbf{t}^\top \mathbf{V}^\top \mathbf{W} \left(\sum_{i=1}^3 \delta_i \mathbf{q}_i \right) + \left(\sum_{i=1}^3 \delta_i \right) \mathbf{t}^\top (\mathbf{s} + \mathbf{V}^\top \mathbf{u}) + 2^{-1} \left(\sum_{i=1}^3 \delta_i^2 \right) \mathbf{t}^\top \mathbf{V}^\top \mathbf{W} \mathbf{t} \\ &= \mathbf{t}^\top \mathbf{W}^\top \mathbf{V} \left(\sum_{i=1}^3 \delta_i \mathbf{q}_i \right) + \left(\sum_{i=1}^3 \delta_i \right) \mathbf{t}^\top (\mathbf{s} + \mathbf{V}^\top \mathbf{u}). \end{aligned}$$

The resulting quantum state is

$$\frac{p^{2r}}{p^{4n}} \sum_{\mathbf{t} \in \mathbb{F}_p^n} |\mathbf{W}\mathbf{t}\rangle \bigotimes_{i=1}^3 \sum_{\mathbf{q}_i \in \mathbb{F}_p^n} \omega^{f(\mathbf{q}_i) + \delta_i \mathbf{t}^\top (\mathbf{W}^\top \mathbf{V} \mathbf{q}_i + \mathbf{s} + \mathbf{V}^\top \mathbf{u})} |\mathbf{u} + \mathbf{W}\mathbf{q}_i\rangle.$$

Note that $\mathbf{s} + \mathbf{V}^\top \mathbf{u} \in \text{row}(\mathbf{W}) \implies \mathbf{s} + \mathbf{V}^\top \mathbf{u} = \mathbf{W}^\top \mathbf{a}$ for some $\mathbf{a} \in \mathbb{F}_p^n$. Measure the registers $\bigotimes_{i=1}^3 |\mathbf{u} + \mathbf{W}\mathbf{q}_i\rangle$ in time $O(n)$ to obtain $\mathbf{u} + \mathbf{W}\mathbf{q}'_i$ for some $\mathbf{q}'_i \in \mathbb{F}_p^n$, $i \in [3]$. Consider the inverse quantum Fourier transform given by

$$|\mathbf{t}\rangle = |t_1, \dots, t_n\rangle \mapsto \bigotimes_{i=1}^n \sum_{c_i \in \mathbb{F}_p} \omega^{-t_i c_i} |c_i\rangle = \sum_{\mathbf{c} \in \mathbb{F}_p^n} \omega^{-\mathbf{t}^\top \mathbf{c}} |\mathbf{c}\rangle, \quad \forall \mathbf{t} \in \mathbb{F}_p^n.$$

The inverse quantum Fourier transform requires $O(n)$ time, as it is composed of n single-qudit rotations. Perform then an inverse quantum Fourier transform onto register $|\mathbf{W}\mathbf{t}\rangle$ to map (ignore the registers $\bigotimes_{i=1}^3 |\mathbf{u} + \mathbf{W}\mathbf{q}'_i\rangle$)

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{p^{r/2}}{p^n} \sum_{\mathbf{t} \in \mathbb{F}_p^n} \omega^{\mathbf{t}^\top \mathbf{W}^\top \sum_{i=1}^3 \delta_i(\mathbf{V}\mathbf{q}'_i + \mathbf{a})} |\mathbf{W}\mathbf{t}\rangle &\mapsto \frac{p^{r/2}}{p^{3n/2}} \sum_{\mathbf{t}, \mathbf{c} \in \mathbb{F}_p^n} \omega^{\mathbf{t}^\top \mathbf{W}^\top (\sum_{i=1}^3 \delta_i(\mathbf{V}\mathbf{q}'_i + \mathbf{a}) - \mathbf{c})} |\mathbf{c}\rangle \\ &= \sqrt{\frac{p^r}{p^n}} \sum_{\substack{\mathbf{c} \in \mathbb{F}_p^n \\ \mathbf{W}^\top \mathbf{c} = \mathbf{W}^\top \sum_{i=1}^3 \delta_i(\mathbf{V}\mathbf{q}'_i + \mathbf{a})}} |\mathbf{c}\rangle, \end{aligned}$$

where we used that $\sum_{\mathbf{t} \in \mathbb{F}_p^n} \omega^{\mathbf{t}^\top \mathbf{z}}$ equals 0 if $\mathbf{z} \neq \mathbf{0} \in \mathbb{F}_p^n$ and equals p^n if $\mathbf{z} = \mathbf{0} \in \mathbb{F}_p^n$. By measuring the register $|\mathbf{c}\rangle$ (again in time $O(n)$), we get $\mathbf{c}' \in \mathbb{F}_p^n$ such that

$$\mathbf{W}^\top \mathbf{c}' = \mathbf{W}^\top \sum_{i=1}^3 \delta_i(\mathbf{V}\mathbf{q}'_i + \mathbf{a}) = \sum_{i=1}^3 \delta_i(\mathbf{s} + \mathbf{V}^\top (\mathbf{u} + \mathbf{W}\mathbf{q}'_i)),$$

which is a vector constraint as in Equation (4).

Repeat the above procedure $m+1$ times to get $m+1$ tuples $(\mathbf{c}^{(\ell)}, \mathbf{q}_1^{(\ell)}, \mathbf{q}_2^{(\ell)}, \mathbf{q}_3^{(\ell)}) \in \mathbb{F}_p^{4n}$, $\ell \in \{0, \dots, m\}$, satisfying Equation (4). Subtract the tuple $(\mathbf{c}^{(0)}, \mathbf{q}_1^{(0)}, \mathbf{q}_2^{(0)}, \mathbf{q}_3^{(0)})$ from the other tuples to obtain the vector constraints

$$\mathbf{V}^\top \sum_{i=1}^3 \delta_i(\mathbf{q}_i^{(\ell)} - \mathbf{q}_i^{(0)}) = \mathbf{W}^\top (\mathbf{c}^{(\ell)} - \mathbf{c}^{(0)}), \quad \ell \in [m],$$

with rn unknown variables V_{jk} , $j \in [n]$, $k \in [r]$, which make up the r vectors $\mathbf{v}_1, \dots, \mathbf{v}_r$. We notice that each vector constraint is made up of r linear constraints that can be treated as independent of each other. In other words, we can solve each of the r linear systems

$$\sum_{j=1}^n V_{jk} \left(\sum_{i=1}^3 \delta_i(\mathbf{q}_i^{(\ell)} - \mathbf{q}_i^{(0)}) \right)_j = (\mathbf{W}^\top (\mathbf{c}^{(\ell)} - \mathbf{c}^{(0)}))_k, \quad \ell \in [m],$$

with unknown variables V_{1k}, \dots, V_{nk} independently from one another, where $k \in [r]$. The time complexity for solving each linear system with n unknown variables is $O(n^3)$ using Gaussian elimination, for a total of $O(rn^3)$ runtime. Learning $\mathbf{v}_1, \dots, \mathbf{v}_r$ fails if, for some linear system, its m rows lie in a subspace of \mathbb{F}_p^n of dimension at most $n-1$. The probability that m rows are contained in any one subspace of dimension $n-1$ is p^{-m} . By a union bound over all $(p^n - 1)/(p - 1)$ subspaces of dimension $n-1$ and over all r linear systems, the algorithm fails with probability at most $rp^{n-m} \leq p^{-n}$.

Finally, for $i \in [n]$, we measure a copy of $|\mathcal{S}\rangle$ in the eigenbasis of $\mathcal{W}_{\mathbf{v}_i, \mathbf{w}_i}$ to determine $s_i \in \mathbb{F}_p$ such that $\mathcal{W}_{\mathbf{v}_i, \mathbf{w}_i} |\mathcal{S}\rangle = \omega^{-s_i} |\mathcal{S}\rangle$. This completes the learning of \mathbf{s} and $\left[\frac{\mathbf{V}}{\mathbf{W}}\right]$, which identifies \mathcal{S} . The algorithm uses $9n + 3\lceil \log_p r \rceil + 4$ copies of $|\mathcal{S}\rangle$. The most expensive step is performing r Gaussian eliminations on n variables, thus the total time complexity is $O(rn^3)$. The failure probability is at most $2p^{-n}$. \blacksquare

5 Pseudorandomness lower bounds

In this section, we prove that quantum states with non-negligible stabiliser fidelity can be efficiently distinguished from Haar-random quantum states. As a consequence, the output of any Clifford circuit augmented with a few non-Clifford single-qudit gates can be efficiently distinguished from a Haar-random quantum state, and therefore Clifford circuits require several non-Clifford single-qudit gates in order to generate pseudorandom quantum states (Definition 1). These results generalise the work of [GIKL23c, GIKL23b] from qubits to qudits. The ideas behind our proof are somewhat similar to the ones from [GIKL23c, GIKL23b]: a Haar-random state has vanishing stabiliser fidelity with very high probability, while the output of a Clifford circuit with just a few non-Clifford single-qudit gates has a high stabiliser dimension and thus stabiliser fidelity. Our algorithm, however, is quite different from the one of [GIKL23c, GIKL23b]. Instead of using Bell difference sampling, we show that the stabiliser testing algorithm on qudits of Gross, Nezami, and Walter [GNW21] also works in this setting. Before presenting the algorithm, we need a few auxiliary results about Haar-random states.

5.1 Anti-concentration of Haar-random states

In this section, we shall upper-bound the mass of $p_\psi(\mathbf{x})^2$ for when $|\psi\rangle$ is Haar-random. To do so, we will make use of Lévy's lemma [MS86, Led01].

Fact 42 (Lévy's lemma). *Let $f : \mathbb{S}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a function defined on the d -dimensional hypersphere \mathbb{S}^d . Assume f is K -Lipschitz, meaning that $|f(\psi) - f(\phi)| \leq K\|\psi - \phi\|$. Then, for every $\epsilon > 0$,*

$$\mathbb{P}_{\psi \sim \mu_{\text{Haar}}} [|f(\psi) - \mathbb{E}[f]| \geq \epsilon] \leq 2 \exp \left(-\frac{(d+1)\epsilon^2}{9\pi^3 K^2} \right).$$

The next result is basically [GIKL23c, Lemma 20]. The proof can be found in Appendix A.

Lemma 43. *For any Weyl operator $\mathcal{W}_{\mathbf{x}} \in \mathcal{P}_p^n$, the function $f_{\mathbf{x}} : \mathbb{S}^{p^n} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ defined as $f_{\mathbf{x}}(|\psi\rangle) = \langle \psi | \mathcal{W}_{\mathbf{x}} | \psi \rangle$ is 2-Lipschitz.*

We are now ready to prove the main result of this section.

Lemma 44. *For any $\epsilon \geq p^{-n/2}$,*

$$\mathbb{P}_{|\psi\rangle \sim \mu_{\text{Haar}}} \left[\sum_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{F}_p^{2n}} p_\psi(\mathbf{x})^2 \geq 2\epsilon^4 \right] \leq 2p^{2n} \exp \left(-\frac{p^n \epsilon^2}{36\pi^3} \right).$$

Proof. We first prove that, for any $\epsilon > 0$,

$$\mathbb{P}_{|\psi\rangle \sim \mu_{\text{Haar}}} \left[\exists \mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{F}_p^{2n} \setminus \{\mathbf{0}\} : |\langle \psi | \mathcal{W}_{\mathbf{x}} | \psi \rangle| \geq \epsilon \right] \leq 2p^{2n} \exp \left(-\frac{p^n \epsilon^2}{36\pi^3} \right). \quad (5)$$

Consider the function $f_{\mathbf{x}}(|\psi\rangle) = \langle \psi | \mathcal{W}_{\mathbf{x}} | \psi \rangle$ from Lemma 43 for $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{F}_p^{2n} \setminus \{\mathbf{0}\}$. We know that $f_{\mathbf{x}}$ is 2-Lipschitz. Moreover, $\mathbb{E}[f_{\mathbf{x}}] = 0$ over the Haar measure because p^{-1} -fraction of the eigenvalues of $\mathcal{W}_{\mathbf{x}}$ are ω^s , $s \in \mathbb{F}_p$. Equation (5) thus follows from Lévy's lemma and a union bound over all p^{2n} possible Weyl operators. We note that it generalises [GIKL23c, Corollary 22].

Equation (5) readily implies that, with high probability and for $\epsilon \geq p^{-n/2}$,

$$\sum_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{F}_p^{2n}} p_\psi(\mathbf{x})^2 = \frac{1}{p^{2n}} + \frac{1}{p^{2n}} \sum_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{F}_p^{2n} \setminus \{\mathbf{0}\}} |\langle \psi | \mathcal{W}_{\mathbf{x}} | \psi \rangle|^4 \leq \frac{1}{p^{2n}} + \epsilon^4 \leq 2\epsilon^4. \quad \blacksquare$$

5.2 Distinguishing non-negligible stabiliser fidelity from Haar-random

In order to present our algorithm for distinguishing Haar-randomness from states with non-negligible stabiliser fidelity, we briefly review the stabiliser testing algorithm from [GNW21].

Lemma 45 ([GNW21]). *Let $\mathcal{V} \triangleq p^{-n} \sum_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{F}_p^{2n}} (\mathcal{W}_{\mathbf{x}} \otimes \mathcal{W}_{\mathbf{x}}^\dagger)^{\otimes 2}$. Then the operator $\Pi_{\text{accept}} = \frac{1}{2}(\mathbb{I} + \mathcal{V})$ is a projector and the binary POVM $\{\Pi_{\text{accept}}, \mathbb{I} - \Pi_{\text{accept}}\}$ can be implemented in $O(n)$ time.*

Proof. It is easy to see that the operator \mathcal{V} is Hermitian by a change of index. Moreover, \mathcal{V} is unitary, since

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{V}^2 &= \frac{1}{p^{2n}} \sum_{\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{F}_p^{2n}} (\mathcal{W}_{\mathbf{x}} \mathcal{W}_{\mathbf{y}} \otimes \mathcal{W}_{\mathbf{x}}^\dagger \mathcal{W}_{\mathbf{y}}^\dagger)^{\otimes 2} = \frac{1}{p^{2n}} \sum_{\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{F}_p^{2n}} \omega^{2[\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}]} (\mathcal{W}_{\mathbf{x}+\mathbf{y}} \otimes \mathcal{W}_{\mathbf{x}+\mathbf{y}}^\dagger)^{\otimes 2} \\ &= \frac{1}{p^{2n}} \sum_{\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z} \in \mathbb{F}_p^{2n}} \omega^{2[\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}]} (\mathcal{W}_{\mathbf{z}} \otimes \mathcal{W}_{\mathbf{z}}^\dagger)^{\otimes 2} = \mathbb{I}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, $\Pi_{\text{accept}} = \frac{1}{2}(\mathbb{I} + \mathcal{V})$ is a projector, since $\Pi_{\text{accept}}^2 = \frac{1}{4}(\mathbb{I} + 2\mathcal{V} + \mathcal{V}^2) = \Pi_{\text{accept}}$.

It is possible to implement the binary POVM $\{\Pi_{\text{accept}}, \mathbb{I} - \Pi_{\text{accept}}\}$ by employing quantum phase estimation with $O(1)$ ancillae, $O(1)$ controlled versions of \mathcal{V} , and $O(1)$ auxiliary operations (we do not require a high accuracy in determining the eigenvalues of \mathcal{V} since they are simply ± 1). And since we can write $\mathcal{V} = (p^{-1} \sum_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{F}_p^{2n}} (\mathcal{W}_{\mathbf{x}} \otimes \mathcal{W}_{\mathbf{x}}^\dagger)^{\otimes 2})^{\otimes n}$, then a controlled version of \mathcal{V} is equal to a composition of n controlled versions of $p^{-1} \sum_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{F}_p^{2n}} (\mathcal{W}_{\mathbf{x}} \otimes \mathcal{W}_{\mathbf{x}}^\dagger)^{\otimes 2}$, each of which acts only on a constant (with respect to n) number of qudits. Therefore, the POVM $\{\Pi_{\text{accept}}, \mathbb{I} - \Pi_{\text{accept}}\}$ can be implemented in time $O(n)$. \blacksquare

By using Π_{accept} as the accepting part of the binary POVM $\{\Pi_{\text{accept}}, \mathbb{I} - \Pi_{\text{accept}}\}$, the accepting probability when measuring the state $|\psi\rangle^{\otimes 4}$ is

$$\mathbb{P}[\text{accept}] = \text{Tr}[\psi^{\otimes 4} \Pi_{\text{accept}}] = \frac{1}{2}(1 + \text{Tr}[\psi^{\otimes 4} \mathcal{V}]) = \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2p^n} \sum_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{F}_p^{2n}} |\text{Tr}[\psi \mathcal{W}_{\mathbf{x}}]|^4 = \frac{1}{2} + \frac{p^n}{2} \sum_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{F}_p^{2n}} p_\psi(\mathbf{x})^2.$$

Notice that, if $|\psi\rangle$ is a stabiliser state, then the acceptance probability is 1. Gross, Nezami, and Walter [GNW21] employed the above projection to test whether a given state is a stabiliser state or is far from one (i.e., has low stabiliser fidelity), conditioned on one of the cases being true. Their algorithm simply measures a few copies of $|\psi\rangle$ using $\{\Pi_{\text{accept}}, \mathbb{I} - \Pi_{\text{accept}}\}$. With high probability, if it always accepts, then $|\psi\rangle$ is a stabiliser state, otherwise $|\psi\rangle$ is far from one.

We can use the same idea to decide whether a state $|\psi\rangle \in (\mathbb{C}^p)^{\otimes n}$ is Haar-random or has non-negligible stabiliser fidelity, i.e., by repetitively measuring copies of $|\psi\rangle$ with the POVM $\{\Pi_{\text{accept}}, \mathbb{I} - \Pi_{\text{accept}}\}$. With enough measurements we can estimate the mass $\sum_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{F}_p^{2n}} p_\psi(\mathbf{x})^2$ which, according to the previous section and Lemma 30, tells us what the correct case is. This is elaborated in the next result.

Theorem 46. *Let $|\psi\rangle \in (\mathbb{C}^p)^{\otimes n}$ be a state promised to be either Haar-random or to have stabiliser fidelity at least k^{-1} . Let $\delta \in (0, 1)$ and assume that $k^{-1} \geq p^{-n/5}$. There is a quantum algorithm (Algorithm 3) that distinguishes the two cases with probability at least $1 - \delta$ for large enough n , uses $\lceil 72k^8 \ln(2/\delta) \rceil$ copies of $|\psi\rangle$, and has runtime $O(nk^8 \log(1/\delta))$.*

Proof. Let $m \triangleq \frac{1}{4} \lceil 72k^8 \ln(2/\delta) \rceil \geq 18k^8 \ln(2/\delta)$. Use the POVM $\{\Pi_{\text{accept}}, \mathbb{I} - \Pi_{\text{accept}}\}$ on $|\psi\rangle^{\otimes 4}$ a number of m times, where $\Pi_{\text{accept}} = \frac{1}{2}(\mathbb{I} + p^{-n} \sum_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{F}_p^{2n}} (\mathcal{W}_{\mathbf{x}} \otimes \mathcal{W}_{\mathbf{x}}^\dagger)^{\otimes 2})$. For $i \in [m]$, define the $\{-1, 1\}$ indicator random variable

$$X_i \triangleq \begin{cases} +1 & \text{if } \Pi_{\text{accept}} \text{ is measured,} \\ -1 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Algorithm 3: Distinguishing non-negligible-stabiliser-fidelity states from Haar-random

Input: $4m$ copies of $|\psi\rangle \in (\mathbb{C}^p)^{\otimes n}$, where $m \triangleq \frac{1}{4}\lceil 72k^8 \ln(2/\delta) \rceil$.

Promise: $|\psi\rangle$ is Haar-random or has stabiliser fidelity at least k^{-1} .

Output: 0 if $|\psi\rangle$ is Haar-random and 1 otherwise, with probability at least $1 - \delta$.

1 Let $X = 0$.

2 **for** $i \leftarrow 1$ **to** m **do**

3 Measure $|\psi\rangle^{\otimes 4}$ using the POVM $\{\Pi_{\text{accept}}, \mathbb{I} - \Pi_{\text{accept}}\}$.

4 If the outcome is Π_{accept} , then $X \leftarrow X + 1/m$, otherwise $X \leftarrow X - 1/m$.

5 **return** 0 if $X < 2k^{-4}/3$ and 1 otherwise.

As previously discussed, the acceptance probability of the POVM $\{\Pi_{\text{accept}}, \mathbb{I} - \Pi_{\text{accept}}\}$ on $|\psi\rangle^{\otimes 4}$ is $\mathbb{P}[\text{accept}] = \frac{1}{2} + \frac{p^n}{2} \sum_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{F}_p^{2n}} p_\psi(\mathbf{x})^2$, which implies that

$$\mathbb{E}[X_i] = p^n \sum_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{F}_p^{2n}} p_\psi(\mathbf{x})^2.$$

If $F_S(|\psi\rangle) \geq k^{-1}$, then, according to [Lemma 30](#), $p^n \sum_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{F}_p^{2n}} p_\psi(\mathbf{x})^2 \geq F_S(|\psi\rangle)^4 \geq k^{-4}$. Hence

$$\mathbb{E}[X_i \mid F_S(|\psi\rangle) \geq k^{-1}] \geq k^{-4}.$$

Therefore, by a Hoeffding's bound,

$$\mathbb{P}\left[\frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m X_i < k^{-4} - \eta \mid F_S(|\psi\rangle) \geq k^{-1}\right] \leq e^{-m\eta^2/2}.$$

By taking $\eta = k^{-4}/3$, then $\frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m X_i < 2k^{-4}/3$ with probability at most $e^{-mk^{-8}/18} \leq \delta/2$.

On the other hand, if $|\psi\rangle$ is Haar-random, then $\sum_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{F}_p^{2n}} p_\psi(\mathbf{x})^2 \leq 2\epsilon^4$ with probability at least $1 - 2p^{2n} \exp(-p^n \epsilon^2/36\pi^3)$, according to [Lemma 44](#). By taking $\epsilon^2 = k^{-4}/\sqrt{6}$, this probability is at least $1 - 2p^{2n} \exp(-k^{-4}p^n/36\sqrt{6}\pi^3) \geq 1 - \delta/2$ for sufficiently large n since $k^{-1} \geq p^{-n/5}$. Thus, with probability at least $1 - \delta/2$,

$$\mathbb{E}[X_i \mid |\psi\rangle \text{ Haar-random}] \leq k^{-4}/3. \tag{6}$$

Assuming that the above inequality holds, then, by a Hoeffding's bound,

$$\mathbb{P}\left[\frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m X_i > k^{-4}/3 + \eta \mid |\psi\rangle \text{ Haar-random}\right] \leq e^{-m\eta^2/2}.$$

By taking $\eta = k^{-4}/3$, then $\frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m X_i > 2k^{-4}/3$ with probability at most $e^{-mk^{-8}/18} \leq \delta/2$.

Therefore, [Algorithm 3](#) can distinguish whether $|\psi\rangle$ is Haar-random or has stabiliser fidelity at least k^{-1} by computing $\frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m X_i$. If $\frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m X_i > 2k^{-4}/3$, then $F_S(|\psi\rangle) \geq k^{-1}$ with probability at least $1 - \delta/2$. Otherwise, if $\frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m X_i < 2k^{-4}/3$, then $|\psi\rangle$ is Haar-random with probability at least $1 - \delta$ (there is a δ -failure probability of [Equation \(6\)](#) not holding). In total, the algorithm requires $4m = \lceil 72k^8 \ln(2/\delta) \rceil$ copies of $|\psi\rangle$. Its runtime is m times the runtime of using the POVM $\{\Pi_{\text{accept}}, \mathbb{I} - \Pi_{\text{accept}}\}$, i.e., $O(nm) = O(nk^8 \log(1/\delta))$. ■

5.3 Distinguishing t -doped Clifford circuits from Haar-randomness

As a consequence of [Theorem 46](#), we prove in this section that (i) output states of doped Clifford circuits can be efficiently distinguished from Haar-random states and (ii) a Clifford circuit requires several non-Clifford single-qudit gates in order to generate pseudorandom quantum states. Following [\[LOH24, LOH23\]](#), we first define t -doped Clifford circuits over qudits. Recall that a Clifford gate is any element belonging to the Clifford group \mathcal{C}_p^n .

Definition 47 (*t*-doped Clifford circuits). A *t*-doped Clifford circuit is a quantum circuit composed of Clifford gates and at most *t* non-Clifford single-qudit gates that starts in the state $|0\rangle^{\otimes n}$.

We now lower bound the stabiliser fidelity $F_S(|\psi\rangle)$ for any output $|\psi\rangle$ of a *t*-doped Clifford circuit. We shall need the following auxiliary result, which is a simple generalisation of [GIKL23b, Lemma 4.2] (see [Appendix A](#) for a proof).

Lemma 48. Let $|\psi\rangle \in (\mathbb{C}^p)^{\otimes n}$ be the output state of a *t*-doped Clifford circuit. Then the stabiliser dimension of $|\psi\rangle$ is at least $n - 2t$, i.e., $\dim(\text{Weyl}(|\psi\rangle)) \geq n - 2t$.

Lemma 49. Let $|\psi\rangle \in (\mathbb{C}^p)^{\otimes n}$ be the output of a *t*-doped Clifford circuit with $t \leq n/2$. Then $F_S(|\psi\rangle) \geq p^{-2t}$.

Proof. Using [Lemma 37](#), [Lemma 48](#), and that $\sum_{\mathbf{x} \in \text{Weyl}(|\psi\rangle)^\perp} p_\psi(\mathbf{x}) = 1$,

$$F_S(|\psi\rangle) \geq \frac{p^n}{|\text{Weyl}(|\psi\rangle)^\perp|} \sum_{\mathbf{x} \in \text{Weyl}(|\psi\rangle)^\perp} p_\psi(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{p^n}{|\text{Weyl}(|\psi\rangle)^\perp|} \geq p^{-2t}. \quad \blacksquare$$

[Lemma 49](#) implies that we can employ [Algorithm 3](#) to distinguish between a Haar-random state and the output of a *t*-doped Clifford circuit.

Theorem 50. Let $|\psi\rangle \in (\mathbb{C}^p)^{\otimes n}$ be a state promised to be either Haar-random or the output of a *t*-doped Clifford circuit. Let $\delta \in (0, 1)$ and assume that $t < n/10$. There is a quantum algorithm ([Algorithm 3](#) with $k = p^{-2t}$) that distinguishes the two cases with probability at least $1 - \delta$ for large enough n , uses $\lceil 72p^{16t} \ln(2/\delta) \rceil$ copies of $|\psi\rangle$, and has runtime $O(np^{16t} \log(1/\delta))$.

Remark 51. The sample and time complexity of [Theorem 50](#) can be improved to $\lceil 72p^{4t} \ln(2/\delta) \rceil$ and $O(np^{4t} \log(1/\delta))$, respectively, by working directly with the lower bound

$$p^n \sum_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{F}_p^{2n}} p_\psi(\mathbf{x})^2 \geq p^n \sum_{\mathbf{x} \in \text{Weyl}(|\psi\rangle)} p_\psi(\mathbf{x})^2 = \frac{|\text{Weyl}(|\psi\rangle)|}{p^n} \geq p^{-2t}$$

in the proof of [Theorem 46](#) if $|\psi\rangle$ is the output of a *t*-doped Clifford circuit.

If $t = O(\log n / \log p)$, then [Theorem 50](#) has sample and time complexity $\text{poly}(n)$. As an immediate corollary, we have the following.

Corollary 52. Any doped Clifford circuit that uses $O(\log n / \log p)$ non-Clifford single-qudit gates cannot produce an ensemble of pseudorandom quantum states in $(\mathbb{C}^p)^{\otimes n}$.

Even though we have stated the results from this section for $p > 2$ prime, they can be generalised to arbitrary dimension $d = p > 2$. The results from [Section 5.3](#) and [Section 5.1](#) also hold for $d > 2$, while [Algorithm 3](#) can be generalised by considering the POVM $\{\Pi_{\text{accept}}, \mathbb{I} - \Pi_{\text{accept}}\}$ from [GNW21, Section 3.2] for arbitrary dimension, where $\Pi_{\text{accept}} = \frac{1}{2}(\mathbb{I} + \mathcal{V}_r)$ with

$$\mathcal{V}_r = \frac{1}{d^n} \sum_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{Z}_d^{2n}} (\mathcal{W}_{\mathbf{x}} \otimes \mathcal{W}_{\mathbf{x}}^\dagger)^{\otimes r}$$

for any $r \geq 2$ such that $\gcd(d, r) = 1$. The sample and time complexity of [Theorem 46](#) become $O(rk^{4r} \log(1/\delta))$ and $O(nrk^{4r} \log(1/\delta))$, respectively, while the sample and time complexity of [Theorem 50](#) become $O(rd^{4t} \log(1/\delta))$ and $O(nrd^{4t} \log(1/\delta))$, respectively. The pseudorandomness bound is still $O(\log n / \log d)$.

Acknowledgements

JFD thanks Sabee Grewal, Vishnu Iyer, and William Kretschmer for valuable discussions. JFD thanks Sabee Grewal for providing the proof of [Lemma 43](#), Vishnu Iyer for suggesting to work with stabiliser fidelity, and Robbie King and William Kretschmer for pointing out Ref. [\[KWM24\]](#). This research is funded by ERC grant No. 810115-DYNASNET and by the National Research Foundation, Singapore and A*STAR under its CQT Bridging Grant and its Quantum Engineering Programme under grant NRF2021-QEP2-02-P05. The research of GI was also supported by the Hungarian Ministry of Innovation and Technology NRDI Office within the framework of the the Artificial Intelligence National Laboratory Program. MS also acknowledges support from the joint Israel-Singapore NRFISF Research grant NRF2020-NRF-ISF004-3528. This project was finalised while JFD and MS were visiting researchers at the Simons Institute for the Theory of Computing.

References

- [AA24] Anurag Anshu and Srinivasan Arunachalam. A survey on the complexity of learning quantum states. *Nature Reviews Physics*, 6(1):59–69, Jan 2024. [1](#)
- [ABDY23] Srinivasan Arunachalam, Sergey Bravyi, Arkopal Dutt, and Theodore J. Yoder. Optimal algorithms for learning quantum phase states. In Omar Fawzi and Michael Walter, editors, *18th Conference on the Theory of Quantum Computation, Communication and Cryptography (TQC 2023)*, volume 266 of *Leibniz International Proceedings in Informatics (LIPIcs)*, pages 3:1–3:24, Dagstuhl, Germany, 2023. Schloss Dagstuhl – Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik. [4](#)
- [ABF⁺24] Scott Aaronson, Adam Bouland, Bill Fefferman, Soumik Ghosh, Umesh Vazirani, Chenyi Zhang, and Zixin Zhou. Quantum pseudoentanglement. In Venkatesan Guruswami, editor, *15th Innovations in Theoretical Computer Science Conference (ITCS 2024)*, volume 287 of *Leibniz International Proceedings in Informatics (LIPIcs)*, pages 2:1–2:21, Dagstuhl, Germany, 2024. Schloss Dagstuhl – Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik. [6](#)
- [AG04] Scott Aaronson and Daniel Gottesman. Improved simulation of stabilizer circuits. *Phys. Rev. A*, 70:052328, Nov 2004. [2](#)
- [AG08] Scott Aaronson and Daniel Gottesman. Identifying stabilizer states. <http://pirsa.org/08080052/>, 2008. [2](#), [4](#)
- [AG23] Scott Aaronson and Sabee Grewal. Efficient tomography of non-interacting-fermion states. In Omar Fawzi and Michael Walter, editors, *18th Conference on the Theory of Quantum Computation, Communication and Cryptography (TQC 2023)*, volume 266 of *Leibniz International Proceedings in Informatics (LIPIcs)*, pages 12:1–12:18, Dagstuhl, Germany, 2023. Schloss Dagstuhl – Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik. [4](#)
- [App05] D. M. Appleby. Symmetric informationally complete–positive operator valued measures and the extended Clifford group. *Journal of Mathematical Physics*, 46(5):052107, 04 2005. [3](#), [10](#), [11](#)
- [App09] D. M. Appleby. Properties of the extended Clifford group with applications to SIC-POVMs and MUBs. *arXiv preprint arXiv:0909.5233*, 2009. [3](#), [11](#)
- [AQY22] Prabhanjan Ananth, Luowen Qian, and Henry Yuen. Cryptography from pseudorandom quantum states. In Yevgeniy Dodis and Thomas Shrimpton, editors,

Advances in Cryptology – CRYPTO 2022, pages 208–236, Cham, 2022. Springer Nature Switzerland. [5](#)

- [BB02] Jean-Luc Brylinski and Ranee Brylinski. Universal quantum gates. In *Mathematics of quantum computation*, pages 117–134. Chapman and Hall/CRC, 2002. [5](#), [10](#)
- [BBC⁺19] Sergey Bravyi, Dan Browne, Padraic Calpin, Earl Campbell, David Gosset, and Mark Howard. Simulation of quantum circuits by low-rank stabilizer decompositions. *Quantum*, 3:181, September 2019. [2](#), [6](#), [15](#)
- [BBO06] G. K. Brennen, S. S. Bullock, and D. P. O’Leary. Efficient circuits for exact-universal computation with qudits. *Quantum Info. Comput.*, 6(4):436–454, jul 2006. [5](#), [10](#)
- [BCD05] Dave Bacon, Andrew M Childs, and Wim van Dam. From optimal measurement to efficient quantum algorithms for the hidden subgroup problem over semidirect product groups. In *46th Annual IEEE Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS’05)*, pages 469–478. IEEE, 2005. [4](#)
- [Bea13] Niel de Beaudrap. A linearized stabilizer formalism for systems of finite dimension. *Quant. Inf. Comput.*, 13:0073–0115, 2013. [10](#), [11](#)
- [BOB05] Gavin K. Brennen, Dianne P. O’Leary, and Stephen S. Bullock. Criteria for exact qudit universality. *Phys. Rev. A*, 71:052318, May 2005. [5](#), [10](#)
- [BSS16] Sergey Bravyi, Graeme Smith, and John A. Smolin. Trading classical and quantum computational resources. *Phys. Rev. X*, 6:021043, Jun 2016. [2](#)
- [CPF⁺10] Marcus Cramer, Martin B. Plenio, Steven T. Flammia, Rolando Somma, David Gross, Stephen D. Bartlett, Olivier Landon-Cardinal, David Poulin, and Yi-Kai Liu. Efficient quantum state tomography. *Nature Communications*, 1(1):149, Dec 2010. [4](#)
- [CS96] A. R. Calderbank and Peter W. Shor. Good quantum error-correcting codes exist. *Phys. Rev. A*, 54:1098–1105, Aug 1996. [2](#)
- [DHIS14] Thomas Decker, Peter Høyer, Gábor Ivanyos, and Miklos Santha. Polynomial time quantum algorithms for certain bivariate hidden polynomial problems. *Quant. Inf. Comput.*, 14:790–806, 2014. [4](#), [5](#)
- [GIKL23a] Sabee Grewal, Vishnu Iyer, William Kretschmer, and Daniel Liang. Efficient learning of quantum states prepared with few non-Clifford gates. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.13409*, 2023. [1](#), [2](#), [3](#), [7](#)
- [GIKL23b] Sabee Grewal, Vishnu Iyer, William Kretschmer, and Daniel Liang. Improved stabilizer estimation via Bell difference sampling. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.13915*, 2023. [1](#), [2](#), [3](#), [6](#), [7](#), [8](#), [15](#), [17](#), [18](#), [24](#), [27](#)
- [GIKL23c] Sabee Grewal, Vishnu Iyer, William Kretschmer, and Daniel Liang. Low-stabilizer-complexity quantum states are not pseudorandom. In Yael Tauman Kalai, editor, *14th Innovations in Theoretical Computer Science Conference (ITCS 2023)*, volume 251 of *Leibniz International Proceedings in Informatics (LIPIcs)*, pages 64:1–64:20, Dagstuhl, Germany, 2023. Schloss Dagstuhl – Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik. [2](#), [3](#), [6](#), [24](#)
- [GIKL24a] Sabee Grewal, Vishnu Iyer, William Kretschmer, and Daniel Liang. Agnostic tomography of stabilizer product states. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.03813*, 2024. [1](#), [2](#), [3](#), [7](#)

- [GIKL24b] Sabee Grewal, Vishnu Iyer, William Kretschmer, and Daniel Liang. Pseudoentanglement ain't cheap. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.00126*, 2024. [2](#), [7](#)
- [GNW21] David Gross, Sepehr Nezami, and Michael Walter. Schur–Weyl duality for the Clifford group with applications: Property testing, a robust Hudson theorem, and de Finetti representations. *Communications in Mathematical Physics*, 385(3):1325–1393, Aug 2021. [1](#), [2](#), [3](#), [4](#), [6](#), [8](#), [11](#), [12](#), [13](#), [14](#), [16](#), [17](#), [20](#), [24](#), [25](#), [27](#)
- [Got96] Daniel Gottesman. Class of quantum error-correcting codes saturating the quantum hamming bound. *Phys. Rev. A*, 54:1862–1868, Sep 1996. [1](#), [2](#)
- [Got97] Daniel Gottesman. *Stabilizer codes and quantum error correction*. California Institute of Technology, 1997. [1](#), [2](#)
- [Gro06] D. Gross. Hudson’s theorem for finite-dimensional quantum systems. *Journal of Mathematical Physics*, 47(12):122107, 12 2006. [10](#), [11](#), [12](#), [13](#)
- [GW13] David Gross and Michael Walter. Stabilizer information inequalities from phase space distributions. *Journal of Mathematical Physics*, 54(8):082201, 08 2013. [12](#)
- [HDDM05] Erik Hostens, Jeroen Dehaene, and Bart De Moor. Stabilizer states and Clifford operations for systems of arbitrary dimensions and modular arithmetic. *Phys. Rev. A*, 71:042315, Apr 2005. [4](#), [13](#)
- [HG23] Dominik Hangleiter and Michael J Gullans. Bell sampling from quantum circuits. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.00083*, 2023. [1](#), [2](#), [7](#)
- [HIN⁺23] M. Hinsche, M. Ioannou, A. Nietner, J. Haferkamp, Y. Quek, D. Hangleiter, J.-P. Seifert, J. Eisert, and R. Sweke. One T gate makes distribution learning hard. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 130:240602, Jun 2023. [6](#)
- [HKP20] Hsin-Yuan Huang, Richard Kueng, and John Preskill. Predicting many properties of a quantum system from very few measurements. *Nature Physics*, 16(10):1050–1057, Oct 2020. [2](#)
- [HMY23] Minki Hhan, Tomoyuki Morimae, and Takashi Yamakawa. From the hardness of detecting superpositions to cryptography: Quantum public key encryption and commitments. In Carmit Hazay and Martijn Stam, editors, *Advances in Cryptology – EUROCRYPT 2023*, pages 639–667, Cham, 2023. Springer Nature Switzerland. [5](#)
- [HNQ⁺16] Patrick Hayden, Sepehr Nezami, Xiao-Liang Qi, Nathaniel Thomas, Michael Walter, and Zhao Yang. Holographic duality from random tensor networks. *Journal of High Energy Physics*, 2016(11):9, Nov 2016. [2](#)
- [Hol73] Alexander Semenovich Holevo. Bounds for the quantity of information transmitted by a quantum communication channel. *Problemy Peredachi Informatsii*, 9(3):3–11, 1973. [4](#)
- [HFW19] Jonas Helsen, Joel J. Wallman, Steven T. Flammia, and Stephanie Wehner. Multi-qubit randomized benchmarking using few samples. *Phys. Rev. A*, 100:032304, Sep 2019. [2](#)
- [IS17] Gábor Ivanyos and Miklos Santha. Solving systems of diagonal polynomial equations over finite fields. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 657:73–85, 2017. Frontiers of Algorithmics. [4](#), [5](#)

- [ISS12] Gábor Ivanyos, Luc Sanselme, and Miklos Santha. An efficient quantum algorithm for the hidden subgroup problem in Nil-2 groups. *Algorithmica*, 62(1-2):480–498, 2012. 4, 5, 22
- [JLS18] Zhengfeng Ji, Yi-Kai Liu, and Fang Song. Pseudorandom quantum states. In Hovav Shacham and Alexandra Boldyreva, editors, *Advances in Cryptology – CRYPTO 2018*, pages 126–152, Cham, 2018. Springer International Publishing. 5
- [KLR⁺08] E. Knill, D. Leibfried, R. Reichle, J. Britton, R. B. Blakestad, J. D. Jost, C. Langer, R. Ozeri, S. Seidelin, and D. J. Wineland. Randomized benchmarking of quantum gates. *Phys. Rev. A*, 77:012307, Jan 2008. 2
- [KQST23] William Kretschmer, Luowen Qian, Makrand Sinha, and Avishay Tal. Quantum cryptography in algorithmica. In *Proceedings of the 55th Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing*, STOC 2023, page 1589–1602, New York, NY, USA, 2023. Association for Computing Machinery. 5
- [KR08] Hari Krovi and Martin Rötteler. *An efficient quantum algorithm for the hidden subgroup problem over Weyl-Heisenberg groups*, pages 70–88. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2008. 4
- [Kre21] William Kretschmer. Quantum Pseudorandomness and Classical Complexity. In Min-Hsiu Hsieh, editor, *16th Conference on the Theory of Quantum Computation, Communication and Cryptography (TQC 2021)*, volume 197 of *Leibniz International Proceedings in Informatics (LIPIcs)*, pages 2:1–2:20, Dagstuhl, Germany, 2021. Schloss Dagstuhl – Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik. 5
- [KWM24] Robbie King, Kianna Wan, and Jarrod McClean. Exponential learning advantages with conjugate states and minimal quantum memory. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.03469*, 2024. 5, 28
- [KZG16] Richard Kueng, Huangjun Zhu, and David Gross. Low rank matrix recovery from clifford orbits. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1610.08070*, 2016. 2
- [LCLP10] Olivier Landon-Cardinal, Yi-Kai Liu, and David Poulin. Efficient direct tomography for matrix product states. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1002.4632*, 2010. 4
- [Led01] Michel Ledoux. *The Concentration of Measure Phenomenon*. Mathematical surveys and monographs. American Mathematical Society, 2001. 24
- [LOH23] Lorenzo Leone, Salvatore F. E. Oliviero, and Alioscia Hamma. Learning t -doped stabilizer states. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.15398*, 2023. 2, 26
- [LOLH24] Lorenzo Leone, Salvatore F. E. Oliviero, Seth Lloyd, and Alioscia Hamma. Learning efficient decoders for quasichaotic quantum scramblers. *Phys. Rev. A*, 109:022429, Feb 2024. 2, 26
- [MGE11] Easwar Magesan, J. M. Gambetta, and Joseph Emerson. Scalable and robust randomized benchmarking of quantum processes. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 106:180504, May 2011. 2
- [MHZ⁺23] Michael Meth, Jan F Haase, Jinglei Zhang, Claire Edmunds, Lukas Postler, Alex Steiner, Andrew J Jena, Luca Dellantonio, Rainer Blatt, Peter Zoller, et al. Simulating 2D lattice gauge theories on a qudit quantum computer. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.12110*, 2023. 5

- [Mon17] Ashley Montanaro. Learning stabilizer states by Bell sampling. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1707.04012*, 2017. 1, 2, 3, 4, 16, 17, 21
- [MS86] Vitali D. Milman and Gideon Schechtman. *Asymptotic theory of finite dimensional normed spaces: Isoperimetric inequalities in Riemannian manifolds*, volume 1200. Springer Science & Business Media, 1986. 24
- [MS00] Ashok Muthukrishnan and C. R. Stroud. Multivalued logic gates for quantum computation. *Phys. Rev. A*, 62:052309, Oct 2000. 5, 10
- [MW16] Ashley Montanaro and Ronald de Wolf. *A Survey of Quantum Property Testing*. Number 7 in Graduate Surveys. Theory of Computing Library, 2016. 1
- [MY22] Tomoyuki Morimae and Takashi Yamakawa. Quantum commitments and signatures without one-way functions. In Yevgeniy Dodis and Thomas Shrimpton, editors, *Advances in Cryptology – CRYPTO 2022*, pages 269–295, Cham, 2022. Springer Nature Switzerland. 5
- [NW20] Sepehr Nezami and Michael Walter. Multipartite entanglement in stabilizer tensor networks. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 125:241602, Dec 2020. 2
- [O’D14] Ryan O’Donnell. *Analysis of Boolean functions*. Cambridge University Press, 2014. 8
- [RB00] Robert Raussendorf and Hans J. Briegel. Quantum computing via measurements only. *arXiv preprint quant-ph/0010033*, 2000. 2
- [Röt09] Martin Rötteler. Quantum algorithms to solve the hidden shift problem for quadratics and for functions of large Gowers norm. In Rastislav Kráľovič and Damian Niwiński, editors, *Mathematical Foundations of Computer Science 2009*, pages 663–674, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2009. Springer Berlin Heidelberg. 2, 4
- [Rud90] Walter Rudin. *Fourier analysis on groups*. Wiley-Interscience, New York, 1990. 34
- [Sho95] Peter W. Shor. Scheme for reducing decoherence in quantum computer memory. *Phys. Rev. A*, 52:R2493–R2496, Oct 1995. 2
- [Woe05] Christiaan van de Woestijne. Deterministic equation solving over finite fields. In *Proceedings of the 2005 International Symposium on Symbolic and Algebraic Computation*, ISSAC ’05, page 348–353, New York, NY, USA, 2005. Association for Computing Machinery. 5, 22
- [Wol08] Ronald de Wolf. A brief introduction to Fourier analysis on the Boolean cube. *Theory of Computing*, pages 1–20, 2008. 8
- [Woo87] William K Wootters. A Wigner-function formulation of finite-state quantum mechanics. *Annals of Physics*, 176(1):1–21, 1987. 10
- [ZPDF16] Liming Zhao, Carlos A. Pérez-Delgado, and Joseph F. Fitzsimons. Fast graph operations in quantum computation. *Phys. Rev. A*, 93:032314, Mar 2016. 2, 4

A Auxiliary results

Here we prove auxiliary results from the main text.

Lemma 53. Let $\mathcal{V} \subseteq \mathbb{F}_p^n$ and $\mathcal{X} \subseteq \mathbb{F}_p^{2n}$ be subspaces and $\mathbf{w} \notin \mathcal{V}^\perp$ and $\mathbf{y} \notin \mathcal{X}^\perp$. Consider the sets $\mathcal{S}_k \triangleq \{\mathbf{v} \in \mathcal{V} : \langle \mathbf{v}, \mathbf{w} \rangle = k\}$ and $\mathcal{T}_k \triangleq \{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X} : [\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}] = k\}$ for $k \in \mathbb{F}_p$. Then $|\mathcal{S}_k| = |\mathcal{V}|/p$ and $|\mathcal{T}_k| = |\mathcal{X}|/p$ for all $k \in \mathbb{F}_p$.

Proof. The proof that $|\mathcal{T}_k| = |\mathcal{X}|/p$ is exactly the same as for $|\mathcal{S}_k| = |\mathcal{V}|/p$, so we focus on the latter. Since $\mathbf{w} \notin \mathcal{V}^\perp$, there exist $k \in \mathbb{F}_p \setminus \{0\}$ such that \mathcal{S}_k is non-empty. Given the set $\mathcal{S}_{k'}$ for $k' \in \mathbb{F}_p \setminus \{0\}$, $|\mathcal{S}_k| = |\mathcal{S}_{k'}|$ due to the bijection $\mathcal{S}_k \rightarrow \mathcal{S}_{k'}$ defined by $\mathbf{v} \mapsto (k'/k)\mathbf{v}$, which is well defined since \mathcal{V} is a subspace and p is prime. Regarding \mathcal{S}_0 , for all $\mathbf{v} \in \mathcal{S}_k$, $\mathbf{v} + \mathcal{S}_0 \subseteq \mathcal{S}_k$, thus $|\mathcal{S}_0| \leq |\mathcal{S}_k|$. On the other hand, for all $\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{v}' \in \mathcal{S}_k$, $\mathbf{v} - \mathbf{v}' \in \mathcal{S}_0$, thus $|\mathcal{S}_k| \leq |\mathcal{S}_0|$. Therefore $|\mathcal{S}_0| = |\mathcal{S}_k|$, which concludes the proof. ■

Lemma 7. Let $\mathcal{V} \subseteq \mathbb{F}_p^n$ and $\mathcal{X} \subseteq \mathbb{F}_p^{2n}$ be subspaces and $\mathbf{w} \in \mathbb{F}_p^n$ and $\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{F}_p^{2n}$. Then

$$\sum_{\mathbf{v} \in \mathcal{V}} \omega^{\langle \mathbf{v}, \mathbf{w} \rangle} = \begin{cases} |\mathcal{V}| & \text{if } \mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{V}^\perp, \\ 0 & \text{if } \mathbf{w} \notin \mathcal{V}^\perp, \end{cases} \quad \sum_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}} \omega^{[\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}]} = \begin{cases} |\mathcal{X}| & \text{if } \mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{X}^\perp, \\ 0 & \text{if } \mathbf{y} \notin \mathcal{X}^\perp. \end{cases}$$

Proof. The proof for the symplectic product is the same as for the inner product, so we focus on the latter. The case $\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{V}^\perp$ is straightforward. If $\mathbf{w} \notin \mathcal{V}^\perp$, note that, according to Lemma 53, the sets $\mathcal{S}_k \triangleq \{\mathbf{v} \in \mathcal{V} : \langle \mathbf{v}, \mathbf{w} \rangle = k\}$ have the same cardinality $|\mathcal{V}|/p$, where $k \in \mathbb{F}_p$. Therefore

$$\sum_{\mathbf{v} \in \mathcal{V}} \omega^{\langle \mathbf{v}, \mathbf{w} \rangle} = |\mathcal{S}_0| + \sum_{\mathbf{v} \in \mathcal{V} : \langle \mathbf{v}, \mathbf{w} \rangle \neq 0} \omega^{\langle \mathbf{v}, \mathbf{w} \rangle} = |\mathcal{S}_0| + \sum_{k=1}^{p-1} \sum_{\mathbf{v} \in \mathcal{V} : \langle \mathbf{v}, \mathbf{w} \rangle = k} \omega^k = \frac{|\mathcal{V}|}{p} \left(1 + \sum_{k=1}^{p-1} \omega^k \right) = 0. \quad \blacksquare$$

Lemma 16. Any stabiliser group $\mathcal{S} \subset \mathcal{P}_p^n$ can be written as $\mathcal{S} = \{\omega^{[\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{x}]} \mathcal{W}_{\mathbf{x}} : \mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{M}\}$, where $\mathbf{a} \in \mathbb{F}_p^{2n}$ and $\mathcal{M} \subset \mathbb{F}_p^{2n}$ is a Lagrangian subspace such that $\dim(\mathcal{M}) = n$. As a consequence, \mathcal{S} is commutative and $|\mathcal{S}| = p^n$.

Proof. There cannot be two operators $\omega^s \mathcal{W}_{\mathbf{x}}, \omega^{s'} \mathcal{W}_{\mathbf{x}} \in \mathcal{S}$ with $s \neq s'$ since $\mathcal{S} \cap Z(\mathcal{P}_p^n) = \{\mathbb{I}\}$. Thus $\mathcal{S} = \{\omega^{s(\mathbf{x})} \mathcal{W}_{\mathbf{x}} : \mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{M}\}$ for some set $\mathcal{M} \subset \mathbb{F}_p^{2n}$ and $s : \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathbb{F}_p$. That \mathcal{M} is a subspace follows from \mathcal{S} being a group. It is isotropic because, given $\omega^{s(\mathbf{x})} \mathcal{W}_{\mathbf{x}}, \omega^{s(\mathbf{y})} \mathcal{W}_{\mathbf{y}} \in \mathcal{S}$, then $(\omega^{s(\mathbf{x})} \mathcal{W}_{\mathbf{x}})^\dagger (\omega^{s(\mathbf{y})} \mathcal{W}_{\mathbf{y}})^\dagger (\omega^{s(\mathbf{x})} \mathcal{W}_{\mathbf{x}}) (\omega^{s(\mathbf{y})} \mathcal{W}_{\mathbf{y}}) = \omega^{[\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}]} \mathbb{I}$ is an element of \mathcal{S} , which implies that $[\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}] = 0$ since $\mathcal{S} \cap Z(\mathcal{P}_p^n) = \{\mathbb{I}\}$. The function s must be linear since $(\omega^{s(\mathbf{x})} \mathcal{W}_{\mathbf{x}})(\omega^{s(\mathbf{y})} \mathcal{W}_{\mathbf{y}}) = \omega^{s(\mathbf{x})+s(\mathbf{y})} \mathcal{W}_{\mathbf{x}+\mathbf{y}}$ (due to commutativity), and therefore $s(\mathbf{x}) + s(\mathbf{y}) = s(\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{y})$ (by the uniqueness of phase of each Weyl operator). Moreover, $s(\mathbf{0}) = 0$ again due to $\mathcal{S} \cap Z(\mathcal{P}_p^n) = \{\mathbb{I}\}$. Therefore, $\omega^{s(\cdot)}$ is a character and we can write $s(\mathbf{x}) = [\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{x}]$ for some $\mathbf{a} \in \mathbb{F}_p^{2n}$. Let us now prove that $\dim(\mathcal{M}) = n$. Write $m \triangleq \dim(\mathcal{M})$. Thus there are m linearly independent elements $\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_m \in \mathbb{F}_p^{2n}$ such that $[\mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{x}_j] = 0$ for all $i, j \in [m]$. Write $\mathbf{x}_i = (\mathbf{v}_i, \mathbf{w}_i)$ for all $i \in [m]$ and let $\mathbf{V}, \mathbf{W} \in \mathbb{F}_p^{n \times m}$ be the matrices with column vectors $\mathbf{v}_1, \dots, \mathbf{v}_m$ and $\mathbf{w}_1, \dots, \mathbf{w}_m$, respectively. Then $\mathbf{V}^\top \mathbf{W} = \mathbf{W}^\top \mathbf{V}$ and $\text{rank}(\begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{V} \\ \mathbf{W} \end{bmatrix}) = \text{rank}(\begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{W} \\ \mathbf{V} \end{bmatrix}) = m$. By the rank-nullity theorem, we have that $\text{rank}(\begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{V}^\top & \mathbf{W}^\top \end{bmatrix}) + \dim(\text{null}(\begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{V}^\top & \mathbf{W}^\top \end{bmatrix})) = 2n \implies \dim(\text{null}(\begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{V}^\top & \mathbf{W}^\top \end{bmatrix})) = 2n - m$. Moreover, $\text{col}(\begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{V} \\ \mathbf{W} \end{bmatrix}) \subseteq \text{null}(\begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{V}^\top & \mathbf{W}^\top \end{bmatrix})$ since $\begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{V}^\top & \mathbf{W}^\top \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{V} \\ \mathbf{W} \end{bmatrix} \mathbf{q} = \mathbf{V}^\top \mathbf{W} \mathbf{q} - \mathbf{W}^\top \mathbf{V} \mathbf{q} = 0$ for all $\mathbf{q} \in \mathbb{F}_p^n$. Therefore $\dim(\text{null}(\begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{V}^\top & \mathbf{W}^\top \end{bmatrix})) \geq \text{rank}(\begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{V} \\ \mathbf{W} \end{bmatrix}) \implies 2n - m \geq m \implies m \leq n$. If $m < n$, then $\dim(\mathcal{M} + \mathbf{x}) > \dim(\mathcal{M})$ for any non-zero vector $\mathbf{x} \in \text{col}(\begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{V} \\ \mathbf{W} \end{bmatrix}) \setminus \text{null}(\begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{V}^\top & \mathbf{W}^\top \end{bmatrix})$, which means that the stabiliser group \mathcal{S} is not maximal, a contradiction. Thus $\dim(\mathcal{M}) = n$. Finally, \mathcal{M} is Lagrangian as a consequence of being isotropic and maximal. ■

Lemma 18. Let $\mathcal{S} = \{\omega^{[\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{x}]} \mathcal{W}_{\mathbf{x}} : \mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{M}\}$ be a stabiliser group. Let $\mathbf{V}, \mathbf{W} \in \mathbb{F}_p^{n \times n}$ be matrices such that $\mathcal{M} = \text{col}(\begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{V} \\ \mathbf{W} \end{bmatrix})$. Then

- a. $\mathbf{V}^\top \mathbf{W} = \mathbf{W}^\top \mathbf{V};$
- b. $\text{rank}(\begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{V} \\ \mathbf{W} \end{bmatrix}) = \dim(\mathcal{M}) = n;$
- c. $\text{row}(\mathbf{V}) + \text{row}(\mathbf{W}) = \mathbb{F}_p^n;$
- d. $\text{null}(\mathbf{V}) \cap \text{null}(\mathbf{W}) = \{\mathbf{0}\};$

$$\begin{aligned}
e. \quad \text{null}([\mathbf{v}^\top \mathbf{w}^\top]) &= \text{col}([\begin{smallmatrix} \mathbf{W} \\ -\mathbf{V} \end{smallmatrix}]); & g. \quad \text{null}(\mathbf{W}^\top) &\subseteq \text{col}(\mathbf{V}); \\
f. \quad \text{null}(\mathbf{V}^\top \mathbf{W}) &= \text{null}(\mathbf{V}) + \text{null}(\mathbf{W}); & h. \quad \text{null}(\mathbf{V}^\top) &\subseteq \text{col}(\mathbf{W}).
\end{aligned}$$

Proof. The first fact follows from the commutativity of the stabiliser group, while $\text{rank}([\begin{smallmatrix} \mathbf{V} \\ \mathbf{W} \end{smallmatrix}]) = \dim(\mathcal{M}) = n$ follows from [Lemma 16](#). Note that $[\mathbf{v}^\top \mathbf{w}^\top][\begin{smallmatrix} \mathbf{v} \\ \mathbf{w} \end{smallmatrix}] = \mathbf{V}^\top \mathbf{v} + \mathbf{W}^\top \mathbf{w}$ for $\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{w} \in \mathbb{F}_p^n$, hence $\text{row}([\begin{smallmatrix} \mathbf{V} \\ \mathbf{W} \end{smallmatrix}]) = \text{row}(\mathbf{V}) + \text{row}(\mathbf{W})$. Thus $\text{rank}([\begin{smallmatrix} \mathbf{V} \\ \mathbf{W} \end{smallmatrix}]) = n \implies \text{row}(\mathbf{V}) + \text{row}(\mathbf{W}) = \mathbb{F}_p^n$ and so $\text{null}(\mathbf{V}) \cap \text{null}(\mathbf{W}) = (\text{row}(\mathbf{V}) + \text{row}(\mathbf{W}))^\perp = (\mathbb{F}_p^n)^\perp = \{\mathbf{0}\}$.

Now note that $\text{rank}([\mathbf{v}^\top \mathbf{w}^\top]) + \dim(\text{null}([\mathbf{v}^\top \mathbf{w}^\top])) = 2n \implies \dim(\text{null}([\mathbf{v}^\top \mathbf{w}^\top])) = n$ by the rank-nullity theorem. Therefore, $\text{null}([\mathbf{v}^\top \mathbf{w}^\top]) = \text{col}([\begin{smallmatrix} \mathbf{W} \\ -\mathbf{V} \end{smallmatrix}])$ since $[\mathbf{v}^\top \mathbf{w}^\top][\begin{smallmatrix} \mathbf{W} \\ -\mathbf{V} \end{smallmatrix}]\mathbf{q} = \mathbf{V}^\top \mathbf{W}\mathbf{q} - \mathbf{W}^\top \mathbf{V}\mathbf{q} = \mathbf{0}$ for all $\mathbf{q} \in \mathbb{F}_p^n$ and $\dim(\text{null}([\mathbf{v}^\top \mathbf{w}^\top])) = \text{rank}([\begin{smallmatrix} \mathbf{W} \\ -\mathbf{V} \end{smallmatrix}]) = n$. Moreover, $\text{null}(\mathbf{V}^\top) \times \text{null}(\mathbf{W}^\top) \subseteq \text{null}([\mathbf{v}^\top \mathbf{w}^\top]) = \text{col}([\begin{smallmatrix} \mathbf{W} \\ -\mathbf{V} \end{smallmatrix}])$, which means that $\text{null}(\mathbf{V}^\top) \subseteq \text{col}(\mathbf{W})$ and $\text{null}(\mathbf{W}^\top) \subseteq \text{col}(\mathbf{V})$. Finally, it is clear that $\text{null}(\mathbf{V}) + \text{null}(\mathbf{W}) \subseteq \text{null}(\mathbf{V}^\top \mathbf{W})$. On the other direction, given $\mathbf{q} \in \text{null}(\mathbf{V}^\top \mathbf{W})$, then $\mathbf{W}\mathbf{q} \in \text{null}(\mathbf{V}^\top)$ and $\mathbf{V}\mathbf{q} \in \text{null}(\mathbf{W}^\top)$. By $\text{null}(\mathbf{V}^\top) \times \text{null}(\mathbf{W}^\top) \subseteq \text{col}([\begin{smallmatrix} \mathbf{W} \\ -\mathbf{V} \end{smallmatrix}])$, this means that $\mathbf{W}\mathbf{q} = \mathbf{W}\mathbf{u}$ and $\mathbf{V}\mathbf{q} = -\mathbf{V}\mathbf{u}$ for some $\mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{F}_p^n$. Thus $\mathbf{q} \in \mathbf{u} + \text{null}(\mathbf{W})$ and $\mathbf{q} \in -\mathbf{u} + \text{null}(\mathbf{V})$, from which $\mathbf{q} \in \text{null}(\mathbf{V}) + \text{null}(\mathbf{W})$. Thus $\text{null}(\mathbf{V}^\top \mathbf{W}) = \text{null}(\mathbf{V}) + \text{null}(\mathbf{W})$. \blacksquare

Lemma 21. Let $\mathcal{G} = \{\omega^{[\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{x}]} \mathcal{W}_{\mathbf{x}} : \mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}\}$ be a group where $\mathcal{X} \subset \mathbb{F}_p^{2n}$ is an isotropic subspace. Then $\dim(V_{\mathcal{G}}) = p^{n - \dim(\mathcal{X})}$, where $V_{\mathcal{G}} \triangleq \{|\Psi\rangle \in (\mathbb{C}^p)^{\otimes n} : \omega^{[\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{x}]} \mathcal{W}_{\mathbf{x}} |\Psi\rangle = |\Psi\rangle, \forall \mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}\}$. It then follows that any stabiliser group \mathcal{S} has a unique stabiliser state, i.e., $\dim(V_{\mathcal{S}}) = 1$.

Proof. According to [Lemma 20](#), the operator $\mathcal{P}_{\mathbf{a}} = |\mathcal{X}|^{-1} \sum_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}} \omega^{[\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{x}]} \mathcal{W}_{\mathbf{x}}$ is the projector onto $V_{\mathcal{G}}$. Now, due to the Pontryagin duality theorem (see [[Rud90](#), Theorem 1.7.2]) and \mathcal{X} being a finite group, there are $p^{\dim(\mathcal{X})}$ characters of \mathcal{X} (since the set of characters of \mathcal{X} is isomorphic to \mathcal{X}). Each character gives rise to a distinct projector $\mathcal{P}_{\mathbf{b}}$ with equal rank. In other words, each left coset $\mathcal{C} \in \mathbb{F}_p^{2n} / \mathcal{X}^\perp$ leads to a distinct projector $\mathcal{P}_{\mathbf{b}}$ for any $\mathbf{b} \in \mathcal{C}$. Two different projectors are orthogonal since they belong to different eigenvalues of at least one Weyl operator or, alternatively,

$$\mathcal{P}_{\mathbf{a}} \mathcal{P}_{\mathbf{b}} = \frac{1}{|\mathcal{X}|^2} \sum_{\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{X}} \omega^{[\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{x}] + [\mathbf{b}, \mathbf{y}]} \mathcal{W}_{\mathbf{x}} \mathcal{W}_{\mathbf{y}} = \frac{1}{|\mathcal{X}|^2} \sum_{\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z} \in \mathcal{X}} \omega^{[\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{x}] + [\mathbf{b}, \mathbf{z} - \mathbf{x}]} \mathcal{W}_{\mathbf{z}} = 0,$$

using that $\sum_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}} \omega^{[\mathbf{a} - \mathbf{b}, \mathbf{x}]} = 0$ since $\mathbf{a} - \mathbf{b} \neq \mathcal{X}^\perp$ ([Lemma 7](#)). This means that the rank of each projector must be a $p^{\dim(\mathcal{X})}$ -fraction of the Hilbert space dimension p^n , i.e., $p^{n - \dim(\mathcal{X})}$. This implies that $\dim(V_{\mathcal{G}}) = \text{rank}(\mathcal{P}_{\mathbf{a}}) = p^{n - \dim(\mathcal{X})}$. \blacksquare

Lemma 27. Let $\mathcal{G} = \{\omega^{[\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{x}]} \mathcal{W}_{\mathbf{x}} : \mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}\}$ be a group where $\mathcal{X} \subset \mathbb{F}_p^{2n}$ is an isotropic subspace. Let $V_{\mathcal{G}} \triangleq \{|\Psi\rangle \in (\mathbb{C}^p)^{\otimes n} : \omega^{[\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{x}]} \mathcal{W}_{\mathbf{x}} |\Psi\rangle = |\Psi\rangle, \forall \mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}\}$. Then, for any $|\Psi\rangle \in V_{\mathcal{G}}$, $\mathcal{X} \subseteq \text{Weyl}(|\Psi\rangle) \subseteq \text{Weyl}(|\Psi\rangle)^\perp \subseteq \mathcal{X}^\perp$. Moreover, $\bigcap_{|\Psi\rangle \in V_{\mathcal{G}}} \text{Weyl}(|\Psi\rangle) = \bigcap_{|\Psi\rangle \in V_{\mathcal{G}}} \text{Weyl}(|\Psi\rangle)^\perp = \mathcal{X}$.

Proof. For any $|\Psi\rangle \in V_{\mathcal{G}}$, the inclusion $\mathcal{X} \subseteq \text{Weyl}(|\Psi\rangle)$ follows from the definition of $\text{Weyl}(|\Psi\rangle)$, while the inclusion $\text{Weyl}(|\Psi\rangle) \subseteq \text{Weyl}(|\Psi\rangle)^\perp$ follows from $\text{Weyl}(|\Psi\rangle)$ being isotropic. Now, it is straightforward to see that $\mathcal{X} \subseteq \bigcap_{|\Psi\rangle \in V_{\mathcal{G}}} \text{Weyl}(|\Psi\rangle) \subseteq \bigcap_{|\Psi\rangle \in V_{\mathcal{G}}} \text{Weyl}(|\Psi\rangle)^\perp$. In the other direction, consider two extensions of \mathcal{X} to Lagrangian subspaces \mathcal{M}_1 and \mathcal{M}_2 such that $\mathcal{M}_1 \cap \mathcal{M}_2 = \mathcal{X}$. Let $|\mathcal{S}_1\rangle = |\mathcal{M}_1, \mathbf{a}_1\rangle$ and $|\mathcal{S}_2\rangle = |\mathcal{M}_2, \mathbf{a}_2\rangle$ be stabiliser states of stabiliser groups \mathcal{S}_1 and \mathcal{S}_2 determined by \mathcal{M}_1 and \mathcal{M}_2 , respectively (\mathcal{G} is a subgroup of both \mathcal{S}_1 and \mathcal{S}_2). We must then have that $|\mathcal{S}_1\rangle, |\mathcal{S}_2\rangle \in V_{\mathcal{G}}$, and also that $\text{Weyl}(|\mathcal{S}_1\rangle) = \text{Weyl}(|\mathcal{S}_1\rangle)^\perp = \mathcal{M}_1$ and $\text{Weyl}(|\mathcal{S}_2\rangle) = \text{Weyl}(|\mathcal{S}_2\rangle)^\perp = \mathcal{M}_2$. Therefore, $\bigcap_{|\Psi\rangle \in V_{\mathcal{G}}} \text{Weyl}(|\Psi\rangle) \subseteq \bigcap_{|\Psi\rangle \in V_{\mathcal{G}}} \text{Weyl}(|\Psi\rangle)^\perp \subseteq \text{Weyl}(|\mathcal{S}_1\rangle)^\perp \cap \text{Weyl}(|\mathcal{S}_2\rangle)^\perp = \mathcal{M}_1 \cap \mathcal{M}_2 = \mathcal{X}$. \blacksquare

Lemma 48. Let $|\psi\rangle \in (\mathbb{C}^p)^{\otimes n}$ be the output state of a t -doped Clifford circuit. Then the stabiliser dimension of $|\psi\rangle$ is at least $n - 2t$.

Proof. The proof is by induction on t . For $t = 0$, the output state is a stabiliser state, which has stabiliser dimension n . Assume then the induction hypothesis for $t - 1$. Write $|\psi\rangle = \mathcal{C}\mathcal{U}|\phi\rangle$, where $|\phi\rangle$ is the output of a $(t - 1)$ -doped Clifford circuit, \mathcal{U} is a single-qudit gate, and \mathcal{C} is a Clifford circuit. Since the stabiliser dimension is unchanged by Clifford circuits ([Corollary 26](#)), we just need to show that the stabiliser dimension of $\mathcal{U}|\phi\rangle$ is at least $n - 2t$. For such, consider $\text{Weyl}(|\phi\rangle)$ with $\dim(\text{Weyl}(|\phi\rangle)) \geq n - 2(t - 1)$ by the induction assumption. Note that, for any $\mathbf{x} \in \text{Weyl}(|\phi\rangle)$, if $\mathcal{W}_{\mathbf{x}}$ commutes with \mathcal{U} , then

$$\langle\phi|\mathcal{U}^\dagger\mathcal{W}_{\mathbf{x}}\mathcal{U}|\phi\rangle = \langle\phi|\mathcal{W}_{\mathbf{x}}|\phi\rangle \in \{1, \omega, \dots, \omega^{p-1}\}.$$

Consider the set of commuting elements with \mathcal{U} , $\mathcal{E} \triangleq \{\mathbf{x} \in \text{Weyl}(|\phi\rangle) : \mathcal{U}^\dagger\mathcal{W}_{\mathbf{x}}\mathcal{U} = \mathcal{W}_{\mathbf{x}}\}$. Then the stabiliser dimension of $\mathcal{U}|\phi\rangle$ is at least the dimension of \mathcal{E} , but $|\mathcal{E}| \geq |\text{Weyl}(|\phi\rangle)|/p^2$, because \mathcal{E} contains all elements $\mathbf{x} \in \text{Weyl}(|\phi\rangle)$ for which $\mathcal{W}_{\mathbf{x}}$ restricts to the identity on the qudit to which \mathcal{U} applies, i.e., $x_i = (v_i, w_i) = (0, 0) \in \mathbb{F}_p^2$ if \mathcal{U} acts on the i -th qudit. Therefore, the stabiliser dimension of $\mathcal{U}|\phi\rangle$ is at least $n - 2t$ as required. ■

Lemma 43. *For any Weyl operator $\mathcal{W}_{\mathbf{x}} \in \mathcal{P}_p^n$, the function $f_{\mathbf{x}} : \mathbb{S}^{p^n} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ defined as $f_{\mathbf{x}}(|\psi\rangle) = \langle\psi|\mathcal{W}_{\mathbf{x}}|\psi\rangle$ is 2-Lipschitz.*

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Proof. } |\langle\psi|\mathcal{W}_{\mathbf{x}}|\psi\rangle - \langle\phi|\mathcal{W}_{\mathbf{x}}|\phi\rangle| &= |\langle\psi|\mathcal{W}_{\mathbf{x}}|\psi\rangle - \langle\phi|\mathcal{W}_{\mathbf{x}}|\psi\rangle + \langle\phi|\mathcal{W}_{\mathbf{x}}|\psi\rangle - \langle\phi|\mathcal{W}_{\mathbf{x}}|\phi\rangle| \\ &\leq |(\langle\psi| - \langle\phi|)\mathcal{W}_{\mathbf{x}}|\psi\rangle| + |\langle\phi|\mathcal{W}_{\mathbf{x}}(|\psi\rangle - |\phi\rangle)| \\ &\leq \|\mathcal{W}_{\mathbf{x}}|\psi\rangle\| \|\psi\rangle - |\phi\rangle\| + \|\mathcal{W}_{\mathbf{x}}|\phi\rangle\| \|\psi\rangle - |\phi\rangle\| \\ &= 2\|\psi\rangle - |\phi\rangle\|. \end{aligned}$$

■