

# Outcome determinism in measurement-based quantum computation with qudits

Robert I. Booth<sup>1,2</sup>, Aleks Kissinger<sup>3</sup>, Damian Markham<sup>1,4</sup>, Clément Meignant<sup>1</sup>, and Simon Perdrix<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Sorbonne Université, CNRS, LIP6, 4 place Jussieu, F-75005 Paris, France

<sup>2</sup> LORIA CNRS, Inria Mocqua, Université de Lorraine, F-54000 Nancy, France

<sup>3</sup> University of Oxford, United Kingdom

<sup>4</sup> JFLI, CNRS / National Institute of Informatics, University of Tokyo, Tokyo, Japan

In measurement-based quantum computing (MBQC), computation is carried out by a sequence of measurements and corrections on an entangled state. Flow, and related concepts, are powerful techniques for characterising the dependence of the corrections on previous measurement outcomes. We introduce flow-based methods for MBQC with qudit graph states, which we call  $\mathbb{Z}_d$ -flow, when the local dimension is an odd prime. Our main results are a proof that  $\mathbb{Z}_d$ -flow is a necessary and sufficient condition for a strong form of outcome determinism. Along the way, we find a suitable generalisation of the concept of measurement planes to this setting and characterise the allowed measurements in a qudit MBQC. We also provide a polynomial-time algorithm for finding an optimal  $\mathbb{Z}_d$ -flow whenever one exists.

In measurement based quantum computation (MBQC), one starts with an entangled resource state (usually graph states [BR01]), and computation is carried out by sequential measurements where at each stage the measurement choice depends on previous results [RB01; RB02; DK06; DKP07]. This adaptivity is necessary to combat the randomness induced by measurements, and plays an important role both foundationally [dGK11; Rau+11] and in terms of trade-offs in optimizing computations [BK09; MHM15].

Causal flow [DK06], and its generalisation gflow [Bro+07], are graph-theoretical tools for characterising and analysing adaptivity for graph states in MBQC. They have proven a powerful tool including optimizing adaptive measurement patterns [Esl+18], translating between MBQC and the circuit picture [MHM15; Bac+21], with application for parallelising quantum circuits [BK09], to construct schemes for the verification of blind quantum computation [FK17; Man+17], to extract bounds on the classical simulatability of MBQC [MK14], to prove depth complexity separations between the circuit and measurement-based models of computation [BK09; MHM15], to study trade-offs in adiabatic quantum computation [AMA14] and recently for applying ZX-calculus techniques [Dun+20; de+20], including to circuit compilation [Dun+20].

In recent years, we have seen increased interest in computing, and quantum information in general, over higher dimensional qudit systems, as opposed to qubits [Wan+20]. The added flexibility of increased dimension allows, for example, for shorter circuits in computation [Kik+20], asymptotic improvement in circuit depths [Gok+19], optimal error correcting codes [CGL99] and noise tolerance in quantum key distribution [BT00; Cer+02]. Furthermore many physical systems exist which naturally encode qudits [BW08;

Erh+18; Gao+19]. This has motivated the translation of MBQC into qudits [Zho+03], which naturally leads to the question: can the flow techniques above be extended to the qudit setting?

In this work we generalise gflow to the qudit setting, when the local dimension is an odd prime. In section 1 we review quantum computation with qudits and introduce our computational model, a qudit version of the measurement calculus [DKP07]. This requires careful consideration of the measurements which are allowed as part of the MBQC. We also discuss the various determinism conditions present in the literature and in particular define robust determinism. In section 2 we introduce  $\mathbb{Z}_d$ -flow, and show that it is sufficient to obtain a robustly deterministic MBQC. We also prove a converse: any robustly deterministic MBQC is shown to have a  $\mathbb{Z}_d$ -flow. Finally, in section 3 we present a polynomial-time algorithm for determining if a given graph has a  $\mathbb{Z}_d$ -flow, and further prove that it always produces  $\mathbb{Z}_d$ -flows of minimal depth (if it succeeds). These results are the first step in a characterisation of outcome determinism in MBQC for a large class of finite-dimensional quantum systems.

## 1 Preliminaries

Throughout this paper,  $d$  denotes an arbitrary prime, and  $\mathbb{Z}_d = \mathbb{Z}/d\mathbb{Z}$  the ring of integers with arithmetic modulo  $d$ . We also put  $\omega := e^{i\frac{2\pi}{d}}$ , and let  $\mathbb{Z}_d^*$  be the group of units of  $\mathbb{Z}_d$ . Since  $d$  is prime,  $\mathbb{Z}_d$  is a field and  $\mathbb{Z}_d^* = \mathbb{Z}_d \setminus \{0\}$  as a set.

### 1.1 Computational model

The Hilbert space of a qudit [Got99; Wan+20] is  $\mathcal{H} = \text{span}\{|m\rangle \mid m \in \mathbb{Z}_d\} \cong \mathbb{C}^d$ , and we write  $U(\mathcal{H})$  the group of unitary operators acting on  $\mathcal{H}$ . We have the following standard operators on  $\mathcal{H}$ , also known as the clock and shift operators:

$$Z|m\rangle := \omega^m|m\rangle \quad \text{and} \quad X|m\rangle := |m+1\rangle \quad \text{for any } m \in \mathbb{Z}_d. \quad (1)$$

In particular, note that  $ZX = \omega XZ$ . We call any operator of the form  $\omega^k X^a Z^b$  for  $k, a, b \in \mathbb{Z}_d$  a *Pauli operator*, although we will often drop the phase  $\omega^k$  as it is of little importance in most cases. We say a Pauli operator is *trivial* if it is proportional to the identity. The Paulis are further related by the Hadamard gate:

$$H|m\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{d}} \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}_d} \omega^{mn} |n\rangle \quad \text{s.t.} \quad HXH^\dagger = Z \quad \text{and} \quad HZH^\dagger = X^{-1}. \quad (2)$$

Equations (1) and (2) imply that both  $X$  and  $Z$ , and in fact every Pauli has spectrum  $\{\omega^k \mid k \in \mathbb{Z}_d\}$ .

We also use the controlled-Z gate, which acts on  $\mathcal{H} \otimes \mathcal{H}$ ,

$$E|m\rangle|n\rangle := \omega^{mn}|m\rangle|n\rangle. \quad (3)$$

It is important to emphasise a key difference between the qudit and the qubit case: when  $d \neq 2$ , none of these operators are self-inverse. In fact, if  $Q$  is a Pauli and  $I$  the identity operator on  $\mathcal{H}$ , we have:

$$Q^d = I, \quad E^d = I \otimes I \quad \text{and} \quad H^4 = I. \quad (4)$$

As a result, they are not self-adjoint either, something which needs to be taken into account when describing measurements.

### 1.1.1 Measurement spaces

For qubit MBQC, it is well established that by using a Pauli  $X$ ,  $Y$  or  $Z$  as an acausal correction operator, it is possible to perform MBQC on graph states where the measurements are taken from the plane on the Bloch sphere orthogonal to the correction [Bro+07]. Since there are three Pauli operators for qubits, this yields three allowable measurement planes for MBQC.

This interpretation is not as clear in the qudit case, partly because Pauli operators are self-adjoint only in the case  $d = 2$ , but mostly because the geometry of the Bloch “space” is not as intuitive in the general case. A qudit-measurement will be described by a unitary matrix  $M$ : given its spectral decomposition  $M = \sum_i \lambda_i P_i$ , an  $M$ -measurement is the projective measurement  $\{P_i\}_{i \in \mathbb{Z}_d}$ . In the context of MBQC, we would like to have a distinguished measurement outcome, the one that does not need corrections, so we assume that all measurements have a fixpoint.

**Definition 1.**  $M$  is a fixpoint unitary if  $M^\dagger M = M M^\dagger = I$  and  $\exists |\phi\rangle \neq 0$  s.t.  $M|\phi\rangle = |\phi\rangle$ . Given  $(a, b) \in \mathbb{Z}_d^2 \setminus \{(0, 0)\}$ , the measurement space  $\mathcal{M}(a, b)$  is defined as  $\mathcal{M}(a, b) := \{\text{fixpoint unitaries } M \text{ s.t. } X^a Z^b M = \omega M X^a Z^b\}$ .

It should be pointed out that the commutation relation used to define the measurement space  $\mathcal{M}(a, b)$  is somewhat arbitrary. We could have chosen instead to use the relation

$$X^a Z^b M = \omega^p M X^a Z^b \quad \text{for some } p \in \mathbb{Z}_d^*. \quad (5)$$

However, nothing is lost by considering only  $p = 1$ , since if  $M$  verifies equation (5), then

$$X^{p^{-1}a} Z^{p^{-1}b} M = \omega^{p^{-1}p} M X^{p^{-1}a} Z^{p^{-1}b} = \omega M X^{p^{-1}a} Z^{p^{-1}b}, \quad (6)$$

(where this calculation is formally carried out using  $p^{-1} = \frac{d+1}{p}$ ) which implies that  $M \in \mathcal{M}(p^{-1}a, p^{-1}b)$ .

In fact, this construction is very analogous to one used in qudit quantum error correction where the  $M$  are called detectable errors [Got99]. The main point of this definition is that the Pauli  $X^a Z^b$  can be used to translate the eigenvectors of any measurement in the corresponding measurement space:

**Proposition 2.** If  $M \in \mathcal{M}(a, b)$  for some non-trivial Pauli  $Q = X^a Z^b$ , then the spectrum of  $M$  is  $\{\omega^m \mid m \in \mathbb{Z}_d\}$ , each eigenvalue has multiplicity 1, and  $M$  is special unitary. Denoting  $|0 : M\rangle$  the fixpoint of  $M$ , then  $|m : M\rangle = Q^{-m} |0 : M\rangle$  is an eigenvector of  $M$  associated with eigenvalue  $\omega^m$ .

*Proof.* By assumption, if  $M \in \mathcal{M}(Q)$  then  $M$  has a fixpoint  $M|0 : M\rangle = |0 : M\rangle$ . Then, it follows from the commutation relation that

$$MQ|0 : M\rangle = \omega^{-1}QM|0 : M\rangle = \omega^{-1}Q|0 : M\rangle, \quad (7)$$

so  $Q|0 : M\rangle$  is an eigenvector of  $M$  associated with eigenvalue  $\omega^{-1}$ . Repeating this procedure, we find that  $|k : M\rangle = Q^{-k}|0 : M\rangle$  is an eigenvector of  $M$  associated with eigenvalue  $\omega^k$ , and a counting argument shows that each of these eigenvalues must have multiplicity 1. Now, we have that  $\det(M) = \prod_{k \in \mathbb{Z}_d} \omega^k = 1$ .  $\square$

This means that the Pauli  $Q$  can be used as correction for any measurement in the corresponding measurement space, as is described in section 2. As in the qubit case, pairs of measurements within the same measurement space  $\mathcal{M}(a, b)$  are still related to each other by rotations around the “correction” axis  $X^a Z^b$ :

**Proposition 3.** *Let  $Q = X^a Z^b$  be a non-trivial Pauli operator and  $N \in \mathcal{M}(a, b)$ . Then  $M \in \mathcal{M}(a, b)$  if and only if there is a special unitary  $U \in SU(d)$  such that  $M = UNU^\dagger$  and  $[U, Q] = 0$ .*

*Proof.* ( $\implies$ ) If  $M \in \mathcal{M}(Q)$  then  $\text{sp}(M) = \text{sp}(N) = \{\omega^k \mid k \in \mathbb{Z}_d\}$  and each eigenvalue has multiplicity one. It follows that  $M$  and  $N$  are similar so that there is a unitary  $U$  such that  $M = UNU^\dagger$ .

Furthermore, by proposition 2, the eigenvector  $|k : M\rangle$  of  $M$  can be obtained as  $Q^{-k}|0 : M\rangle$ , from which it also follows that  $|k+1 : M\rangle = Q|k : M\rangle$ . But, we also have  $MU|k+1 : N\rangle = UNU^\dagger U|k+1 : N\rangle = \omega^{k+1}U|k+1 : N\rangle$  from which it follows that

$$QU|k : N\rangle = Q|k : M\rangle = |k+1 : M\rangle = U|k+1 : N\rangle = UQ|k : N\rangle. \quad (8)$$

This is true for any  $k \in \mathbb{Z}_d$ , and since  $N$  is unitary its eigenvectors form a basis for  $\mathcal{H}$ . We deduce that  $QU = UQ$ .

Finally, it is clear we can choose  $U$  to be special unitary, since for any unit norm  $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$ ,  $(\lambda U)N(\lambda U)^\dagger = |\lambda|^2 UNU^\dagger = UNU^\dagger$ .

( $\impliedby$ ) Let  $M = UNU^\dagger$  such that  $[U, Q] = 0$ , then we have

$$MQ = UNU^\dagger Q = UNQU^\dagger = \omega UQNU^\dagger = \omega QUNU^\dagger = \omega QM. \quad (9)$$

Furthermore,  $M$  and  $N$  have the same spectrum, and in particular  $M$  has a fixpoint since  $N$  does. Then,  $M \in \mathcal{M}(Q)$ .  $\square$

In turn, this allows us to recover a parametrisation of measurement spaces much closer to the qubit case, where a measurement is given by angles relative to a reference Pauli axis of the Bloch sphere.

**Corollary 4** (Measurement angles). *For any non-zero  $(a, b) \in \mathbb{Z}_d^2$ , a measurement  $M \in \mathcal{M}(a, b)$  is characterised by  $d-1$  angles  $\vec{\theta} = (\theta_1, \dots, \theta_{d-1}) \in [0, 2\pi)^{d-1}$ , up to a choice of reference axis  $P \in \mathcal{M}(a, b)$ .*

*Proof.* Fix some  $P \in \mathcal{M}(a, b)$ , then by the proposition, every  $M \in \mathcal{Q}^\dagger$  is such that  $M = UPU^\dagger$ , and in particular  $[U, Q] = 0$ . This implies that in the eigenbasis of  $Q$ ,  $U$  takes the form of a diagonal matrix  $\text{diag}(e^{i\theta_k} \mid k \in \mathbb{Z}_d)$  with  $\theta_k \in [0, 2\pi)$ . Since  $\det(U) = 1$ , we have that  $\sum_{k=0}^{d-1} \theta_k = 0$  and one of these phases is redundant. Then,  $U$  and by extension,  $M$ , is uniquely determined by the  $d-1$  phases  $\{\theta_k\}_{k=1}^{d-1}$  (and the arbitrary choice of  $P$ ).  $\square$

As is the case for qubits, the choice of reference axes (one per measurement space) is entirely arbitrary, so we assume for the rest of the article that some fixed choice has been made for each measurement space.

### 1.1.2 Measurement patterns

Given that we are interested in procedures with an emphasis on measurements and corrections conditioned on the outcomes of measurements, the quantum circuit description of computations is not very practical for our needs. Instead, we describe an MBQC by a sequence of commands, called a measurement pattern. The description of measurements hinges on the characterisation of measurement spaces in corollary 4. We suppose some arbitrary choice of reference is made for each measurement space, then:

**Definition 5** ([DKP07]). *A measurement pattern on a register  $V$  of qudits consists in a finite sequence of  $V$ -indexed commands chosen from:*

- $N_u$  : initialisation of a qudit  $u$  in the state  $|0 : X\rangle = H|0\rangle$ ;
- $E_{u,v}^\lambda$  : application of  $E^\lambda$  on qudits  $u$  and  $v$  for some  $\lambda \in \mathbb{Z}_d$ , with  $u \neq v$ ;
- $M_u^{a,b}(\vec{\theta})$  : measurement of qudit  $u$  in the measurement space  $\mathcal{M}(a,b)$  with angles  $\vec{\theta}$ ;
- $X_u^{m_v}$  and  $Z_u^{m_v}$  : Pauli corrections depending on the outcome  $m_v$  of the measurement of vertex  $v$ .

A measurement pattern is *runnable* if no commands act on non-inputs before they are initialised (except initialisations) or after they are measured, and no commands depend on the outcome of a measurement before it is made.

## 1.2 A graph-theoretical representation

Following Perdrix and Sanselme [PS17], we show that measurement patterns can be equivalently represented as labelled graphs. Then, following [Zho+03], these measurement patterns are universal for all qudit quantum circuits.

**Notation.** A  $\mathbb{Z}_d$ -graph  $G$  is a loop-free undirected  $\mathbb{Z}_d$ -edge-weighted graph on a set  $V$  of vertices. We will identify the graph  $G$  with its symmetric adjacency matrix  $G \in \mathbb{Z}_d^{V \times V}$  (for some arbitrary ordering of the rows and columns). If  $A, B \subseteq V$ , we will also denote  $G[A, B]$  the submatrix of  $G$  obtained by keeping only the rows corresponding to elements of  $A$  and the columns corresponding to elements of  $B$ . If  $A \subset V$ , then we denote  $1_A \in \mathbb{Z}_d^V$  the column vector whose  $u$ -th element is 1 if  $u \in A$ , 0 otherwise. Similarly we consider  $\mathbb{Z}_d$ -multisets of vertices where each vertex occurs with a multiplicity in  $\mathbb{Z}_d$  and we will identify the  $\mathbb{Z}_d$ -multiset with column vectors in  $\mathbb{Z}_d^V$ . The size of a multiset is defined by  $|A| = \sum_{u \in V} A(u) \in \mathbb{Z}_d$ .  $x^\top$  is the transpose of  $x$ . Given a Pauli operator  $P$  and a multiset  $A$ , let  $P_A := \bigotimes_{u \in V} P_u^{A(u)}$ .

The commands of a measurement pattern verify the following identities, for every  $u, v \in V$  such that  $u \neq v$ :

$$X_u Z_v = Z_v X_u, \quad X_u Z_u \simeq Z_u X_u, \quad (10)$$

$$X_u M_v = M_v X_u, \quad Z_u M_v = M_v Z_u, \quad (11)$$

$$E_{u,v} X_u = X_u Z_v E_{u,v}, \quad E_{u,v} Z_u = Z_u E_{u,v}. \quad (12)$$

where we use the notation  $A \simeq B$  to mean that there is a phase  $e^{i\alpha}$  such that  $A = e^{i\alpha} B$ . It was shown by Danos et al. [DKP07] that any runnable measurement pattern can be rewritten using these commutation relations to the standard form<sup>1</sup>:

$$\mathfrak{P} \simeq \left( \prod_{v \in O^c}^{\prec} X_{\mathbf{x}(v)}^{m_v} Z_{\mathbf{z}(v)}^{m_v} M_v^{a_v, b_v}(\vec{\theta}_v) \right) \left( \prod_{(u,v) \in G} E_{u,v}^{G_{uv}} \right) \left( \prod_{v \in I^c} N_v \right), \quad (13)$$

where  $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}$  are functions  $O^c \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_d^V$ ,  $m_v$  is the outcome of the measurement  $M_v$ ,  $G$  is the adjacency matrix of a  $\mathbb{Z}_d$ -graph, and  $(u, v) \in G$  identifies an edge in the graph  $G$ . The functions  $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}$  implicitly describe a measurement order: the transitive closure of the relation  $\{(u, v) \mid \mathbf{x}(v)_u \neq 0 \text{ or } \mathbf{z}(v)_u \neq 0\}$  gives a strict partial order  $\prec$  on  $O^c$ . The measurement order must agree with  $\prec$  if the pattern is runnable.

This motivates the following definition [DK06; Bro+07; Bac+21]:

---

<sup>1</sup>They worked in the qubit setting but their proof is purely symbolic. Rewriting  $U^\lambda = \prod_{k=0}^{\lambda-1} U$  where  $U$  is any unitary from equations (10)-(12), and applying their standardisation procedure results in a pattern of the form (13).

**Definition 6.** An open  $\mathbb{Z}_d$ -graph is a triple  $(G, I, O)$  where  $G$  is a  $\mathbb{Z}_d$ -graph over  $V$ , and  $I, O \subseteq V$  are distinguished sets of vertices which identify inputs and outputs in an MBQC.

A labelled open  $\mathbb{Z}_d$ -graph is a tuple  $(G, I, O, \lambda)$  where  $(G, I, O)$  is an open  $\mathbb{Z}_d$ -graph and  $\lambda : O^c \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_d^2 \setminus \{(0, 0)\}$  assigns a measurement space to each measured vertex.

Given the form (13), it is clear that we can describe a runnable measurement pattern by a tuple  $(G, I, O, \lambda, \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}, \mathbf{M})$ , where  $(G, I, O, \lambda)$  is a labelled open  $\mathbb{Z}_d$ -graph,  $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}$  are functions  $O^c \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_d^V$ , and  $\mathbf{M}$  is a function  $O^c \rightarrow U(\mathcal{H})$  such that  $\mathbf{M}(u) \in \mathcal{M}(\lambda(u))$  for all  $u \in O^c$ .  $\mathbf{M}$  gives the measurement to be made at each non-output vertex, and  $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}$  describe corresponding outcome-dependant corrections. The labelling  $\lambda$  is technically required since the syntax of measurements in equation (13) depend on the labelling, but as we shall see in the next section, once the choice of  $\mathbf{M}$  is made,  $\lambda$  has no effect on the actual computation carried out by the MBQC (the semantics of the measurement pattern).

### 1.3 Determinism

An MBQC  $(G, I, O, \lambda, \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}, \mathbf{M})$  describes an inherently probabilistic computation with  $d \times |O^c|$  possible branches (one for each set of measurement outcomes). Given an input state  $|\phi\rangle \in \mathcal{H}^{\otimes I}$  and set of outcomes  $\vec{m} \in \mathbb{Z}_d^{O^c}$ , the corresponding branch is given by:

$$A_{\vec{m}}(|\phi\rangle) := \left( \prod_{v \in O^c}^{\prec} X_{\mathbf{x}(v)}^{m_v} Z_{\mathbf{z}(v)}^{m_v} \langle m_v : \mathbf{M}(v) |_v \right) \left( \prod_{(u,v) \in G} E_{u,v}^{G_{u,v}} \right) \left( |\phi\rangle \bigotimes_{u \in I^c} |0 : X\rangle \right) \quad (14)$$

The branch maps give a Kraus decomposition for the CPTP map  $\mathcal{H}^{\otimes I} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}^{\otimes O}$  implemented by the MBQC:

$$\rho \mapsto \sum_{\vec{m} \in \mathbb{Z}_d^{O^c}} A_{\vec{m}} \rho A_{\vec{m}}^\dagger. \quad (15)$$

A measurement pattern is said to be *deterministic* if the output does not depend on the outcomes of the measurements. This is equivalent to saying that all branches (14) are proportional, in which case the pattern is described by the single Kraus operator  $K_{\vec{0}}$ , corresponding to obtaining outcome 0 for all measurements. This is by construction a correction-less branch since we have then obtained the “preferred” outcome of each measurement. However, a problem comes up if  $K_{\vec{0}} = 0$ , in which case two deterministic MBQCs can have the same open graph but implement different maps. See [DK06; Bro+07; PS17] for examples.

To exclude these pathological cases, a stronger determinism condition was introduced by Danos and Kashefi [DK06]: a measurement pattern is *strongly deterministic* if all branch maps are equal up to a global phase. In particular, strongly deterministic measurement patterns implement isometries.

Now, the original purpose of flow was to obtain sufficient and necessary conditions for deciding when such an MBQC is deterministic. However, a characterisation of strong determinism is still an open question, even in the case of qubits. Instead, we restrict our attention to a yet stronger form of determinism, which is both more tractable and arguably more practical [PS17]:

**Definition 7** (Robust determinism).  $(G, I, O, \lambda, \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z})$  is robustly deterministic if for any  $\prec$ -lowerset<sup>2</sup>  $S \subseteq O^c$  and any  $\mathbf{M} : S \rightarrow U(\mathcal{H})$  such that  $\mathbf{M}(u) \in \mathcal{M}(\lambda(u))$ , the MBQC  $(G, I, O \cup S^c, \lambda|_S, \mathbf{x}|_S, \mathbf{z}|_S, \mathbf{M})$  is strongly deterministic.

---

<sup>2</sup>If  $\prec$  is a partial order on  $V$ , then a  $\prec$ -lowerset is a subset  $S \subseteq V$  such that if  $u \prec v$  for some  $v \in S$ , then  $u \in S$ .

Robust determinism is equivalent to the uniformly and stepwise strong determinism of Browne et al. [Bro+07] in the qubit case.

## 1.4 Graph states

For an open graph  $(G, I, O)$  and an arbitrary input state  $|\phi\rangle \in \mathcal{H}^{\otimes I}$ , we write

$$|G(\phi)\rangle = \left( \prod_{\substack{u,v \in V \\ u < v}} E_{u,v}^{G_{u,v}} \right) \left( |\phi\rangle \bigotimes_{u \in I^c} |0 : X\rangle_u \right), \quad (16)$$

which we call an open graph state. Open graph states are resource states for the MBQCs which we describe in this paper. In the case  $I = \emptyset$ , we recover the well-known qudit graph states [Zho+03; MMP13]. The stabilisers of an open graph state are given by:

**Proposition 8** (Open graph stabilisers). *Let  $(G, I, O)$  be an open graph, and  $Q$  a product of Paulis. Then,  $Q|G(\phi)\rangle = |G(\phi)\rangle$  for all  $|\phi\rangle \in \mathcal{H}^{\otimes I}$  if and only if there is a multiset  $A \in \mathbb{Z}_d^V$  such that  $A_v = 0$  for all  $v \in I$  and  $Q = \omega^{\frac{A^\top G A}{2}} X_A Z_{GA}$ .*

*Proof.* The stabilisers of  $|G(\phi)\rangle$  are simply the stabilisers of  $|\phi\rangle \bigotimes_{u \in I^c} |0 : X\rangle$  conjugated by  $E_G$ . It is clear that the stabiliser group of  $|0 : X\rangle$  is generated by  $X^m$  for all  $m \in \mathbb{Z}_d$ . Since no Pauli stabilises every  $|\psi\rangle \in \mathcal{H}$ , it follows that the stabiliser group of  $|\phi\rangle \bigotimes_{u \in I^c} |0 : X\rangle$  is of the form  $X_A$  for some  $A \in \mathbb{Z}_d^V$  such that  $A_v = 0$  if  $v \in I$ . Now, we have

$$E_G X_k^{A_k} E_G^\dagger = \prod_{\substack{u,v \in V \\ u < v}} E_{u,v}^{G_{u,v}} X_k^{A_k} \prod_{\substack{u,v \in V \\ u < v}} E_{u,v}^{G_{u,v}} = X_k^{A_k} \prod_{v \in V} Z_v^{G_{vk} A_k} = X_{A_k} Z_{GA_k} \quad (17)$$

so that

$$E_G X_A E_G^\dagger = E_G \prod_{k \in V} X_k^{A_k} E_G^\dagger = X_k^{A_k} \prod_{v \in V} Z_v^{G_{vk} A_k} \quad (18)$$

$$= \prod_{k \in V} X_{A_k} Z_{GA_k} = \omega^{\sum_{k \in V} A_k^\top G \sum_{k \in V} A_k} X_{\sum_{k \in V} A_k} Z_{\sum_{k \in V} G A_k} \quad (19)$$

$$= \omega^{A^\top G A} X_A Z_{GA} \quad (20)$$

as claimed.  $\square$

## 2 $\mathbb{Z}_d$ -flow and outcome determinism

This leads us to the statement of our novel flow condition. It is a strict generalisation of gflow to qudits, which must take into account the additional freedom in open graphs described above.

**Definition 9.**  $(G, I, O, \lambda)$  has an  $\mathbb{Z}_d$ -flow  $(C, \Lambda)$  if  $C$  is a matrix in  $\mathbb{Z}_d^{V \times V}$  and  $\Lambda$  a totally ordered partition of  $V$  such that

1.  $\forall u \in O^c, \lambda(u) = (C_{uu}, (GC)_{uu})$ ;
2.  $C[I, V] = 0$  and  $C[V, O] = 0$ ;
3. for any  $M, N \in \Lambda$ ,

- $C[M, M]$  and  $(GC)[M, M]$  are diagonal;
- whenever  $M < N$ ,  $C[M, N] = (GC)[M, N] = 0$ .

We call  $\Lambda$  a layer decomposition of  $(G, I, O, \lambda)$  for  $C$  and the elements of  $\Lambda$  are layers.

If  $(G, I, O, \lambda)$  is a labelled open graph with  $\mathbb{Z}_d$ -flow  $(C, \Lambda)$ , then we obtain a runnable MBQC  $(G, I, O, \lambda, \mathbf{x}_C, \mathbf{z}_C)$  by imposing

$$\mathbf{x}_C(v) := (C_{\bullet v} - \lambda(v)_1 1_{\{v\}}) \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{z}_C(v) := ((GC)_{\bullet v} - \lambda(v)_2 1_{\{v\}}), \quad (21)$$

where  $M_{\bullet v}$  is the  $v$ -th column of a matrix  $M$ .

The layer decomposition  $\Lambda$  describes a (partial) measurement order for the non-output qudits: the qudits can be measured in any totalisation of the order induced on  $O^c$  by the order of  $\Lambda$ , and qudits within the same layer can be measured simultaneously. This order is a (not necessarily strict) extension of the order  $\prec$  induced by  $\mathbf{x}_C, \mathbf{z}_C$  as described in the previous section.

The  $u$ -th columns (minus the  $u$ -th element) of  $C$  and  $GC$  describe where to apply  $X$  and  $Z$  corrections for the measurement of vertex  $u \in V$ , respectively. The elements in the  $u$ -th columns above  $u$  then correspond to qudits that have already been measured, and must be zero for there to be no unwanted back-action. The elements in the  $u$ -th columns that corresponds to vertices in the same layer as  $u$  must also be 0, since those vertices can be measured before  $u$ . These considerations impose condition (iii).

Condition (ii) follows from the fact that the outputs are not measured and thus no correction is needed. Furthermore, we cannot apply  $X$  corrections at an input vertex, since the measurement pattern we introduce relies on the fact that  $X_u N_u = N_u$ . Finally, the  $u$ -th element of the  $u$ -th column describes what correction is applied at vertex  $u$ ,  $X_{uu}^C Z^{(GC)_{uu}}$ , when we follow this procedure. This correction must match the measurement space assigned to  $u$  so that we can use the back-action to perform the correction, which implies condition (i).

Then this MBQC is deterministic and implements an isometry:

**Theorem 10.** *Suppose the graph state  $(G, I, O, \lambda)$  has  $\mathbb{Z}_d$ -flow  $(C, \Lambda)$ , then the MBQC  $(G, I, O, \lambda, \mathbf{x}_C, \mathbf{z}_C)$  is runnable and robustly deterministic. Furthermore, for a given choice of measurements  $\mathbf{M}$ , it realises the isometry*

$$\mathcal{H}^{\otimes I} \longrightarrow \mathcal{H}^{\otimes O}$$

$$|\phi\rangle \longmapsto \bigotimes_{u \in O^c} \langle 0 : \mathbf{M}(u) | E_G \left( |\phi\rangle \bigotimes_{u \in I^c} |0 : X\rangle \right). \quad (22)$$

*Proof.* Assume  $(G, I, O, \lambda)$  has a  $\mathbb{Z}_d$ -flow  $(C, \Lambda)$ . We perform the measurements in the order given by any totalisation of the order induced by  $\Lambda$  on  $V$ . We measure qudit  $u$  with a  $M$ -measurement, and we obtain a classical outcome  $s_u \in \mathbb{Z}_d$ . Let  $Q_u := X_u^{C_{uu}} Z_u^{(GC)_{uu}}$  then by lemma 3, the action of any measurement in  $\mathcal{M}(\lambda(u))$  correspond to the application on qudit  $u$  of the projector  $\langle m : M | = \langle 0 : M | Q_u^{s_u}$ . Thus a correction must consist in simulating the application of  $Q^{-s_u}$  on  $u$ . The definition of  $\mathbb{Z}_d$ -flow implies that  $C$  and  $GC$  must be lower triangular, so that  $X_{(C\{u\}) \setminus \{u\}} Z_{(GC\{u\}) \setminus \{u\}}$  acts only on unmeasured qudits, where  $A \setminus \{u\}$  removes all the occurrences of  $u$  in  $A$ :

$$A \setminus \{u\} = v \mapsto \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } u = v \\ A(v) & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}. \quad (23)$$






Figure 1: An example of a labelled open graph (left) with corresponding  $\mathbb{Z}_d$ -flow (right). The inputs of the open graph are square vertices, and the outputs are white. The labelling is written in parentheses next to the unmeasured vertices. The edge weights can take any values in  $\mathbb{F}$  with the only constraint being that  $a$  must be invertible. We measure the input vertex before the auxiliary non-output, which gives the corresponding layer decomposition.

Then we have that:

$$X_{(C\{u\})\setminus\{u\}}^{s_u} Z_{(GC\{u\})\setminus\{u\}}^{s_u} |G\rangle = X_{(C\{u\})\setminus\{u\}}^{s_u} Z_{(GC\{u\})\setminus\{u\}}^{s_u} Q_u^{s_u} Q_u^{-s_u} |G\rangle \quad (24)$$

$$= X_{C\{u\}}^{s_u} Z_{GC\{u\}}^{s_u} Q_u^{-s_u} |G\rangle = Q_u^{-s_u} |G\rangle. \quad (25)$$

As a consequence, the correction  $X_{(C\{u\})\setminus\{u\}}^{s_u} Z_{(GC\{u\})\setminus\{u\}}^{s_u}$  is runnable and makes the computation uniformly deterministic.

Since all the branch maps are equal, the computation is strongly deterministic, and since we have considered only a single measurement and the associated corrections, it is stepwise deterministic.

In [DK06] it was shown that if a measurement pattern is strongly deterministic then it implements an isometry. Since we correct each measurement to the outcome  $m = 0$ , it is clear that the final isometry is given by  $\mathcal{H}^{\otimes I} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}^{\otimes O} : \prod_{u \in O^c} \langle 0 : M_u | E_G N_{I^c}$  as claimed.  $\square$

## 2.1 Recovering other flow conditions

gflow was originally formulated in terms of a partial order on the vertices to be measured [Bro+07]. It is easy to see that the order of the layer decomposition  $\Lambda$  induces a (non-unique) partial order on the vertices  $V$ . Given a partial order  $\prec$  on the vertices  $V$ , then there is of course a (also non-unique) ordered partition of  $V$  that agrees with  $\prec$ . Since either of these orders are only used to describe the measurement order for the vertices of the graph, we can write the  $\mathbb{Z}_d$ -flow condition in terms which are closer to [Bro+07] (stated without proof):

**Lemma 11** (Partial order  $\mathbb{Z}_d$ -flow).  *$(G, I, O, \lambda)$  has a  $\mathbb{Z}_d$ -flow if and only if there exists a matrix  $C \in \mathbb{Z}_d^{V \times V}$  and a partial order  $\prec$  on  $V$  such that*

1.  $\forall u \in O^c, \lambda(u) = (C_{uu}, (GC)_{uu})$ ;
2.  $C_{uv} = 0$  whenever  $u \in I$  or  $v \in O$ ;
3. when the columns and rows of  $G$  and  $C$  are ordered according to any totalisation of  $\prec$ ,  $C$  and  $GC$  are lower triangular.

It is straightforward from this formulation to recover the gflow condition, since the parity conditions in the original formulation correspond to linear equations over  $\mathbb{Z}_2$  (also stated without proof):

**Proposition 12.** *An open  $\mathbb{Z}_2$ -graph  $(G, I, O, \lambda)$  has a gflow if and only if it has a  $\mathbb{Z}_2$ -flow.*

Although the semantics are subtly different, we also can also recover CV-flow [BM21] as a special case of our definition:

**Proposition 13.** *An open  $\mathbb{R}$ -graph  $(G, I, O, \lambda)$  such that  $\lambda(O^c) = \{(0, 1)\}$  has a CV-flow if and only if it has an  $\mathbb{R}$ -flow.*

## 2.2 The converse result

It has been shown in the qubit case that any measurement pattern that is robustly deterministic is such that the underlying open graph has a gflow [Bro+07]. We generalise this result to the case of qudits:

**Theorem 14.** *If  $(G, I, O, \lambda, \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z})$  is a robustly deterministic MBQC on  $\mathbb{Z}_d$ , then the underlying open  $\mathbb{F}$ -graph  $(G, I, O, \lambda)$  has an  $\mathbb{Z}_d$ -flow  $(C, \Lambda)$  such that  $\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{x}_C$  and  $\mathbf{z} = \mathbf{z}_C$ .*

Our proof of theorem 14 relies crucially on the following lemma, which has a technical proof left to appendix A:

**Lemma 15.** *Let  $(G, I, O, \lambda)$  be an open graph,  $|\phi\rangle, |\phi'\rangle \in (\mathcal{H}^{\otimes V})_1$  and  $R \subseteq V$ . For any  $\mathbf{M} : R \rightarrow U(\mathcal{H})$  such that, for each  $u \in V$ ,  $\mathbf{M}(u) \in \mathcal{M}(\lambda(u))$ , and  $\vec{m} \in \mathbb{F}^R$ , put  $|\vec{m} : \mathbf{M}\rangle = \bigotimes_{r \in R} |m_r : \mathbf{M}(r)\rangle$ . If, for every such  $\vec{m}$  and  $\mathbf{M}$ , we have*

$$\langle \vec{m} : \mathbf{M} | \phi \rangle \simeq \langle \vec{m} : \mathbf{M} | \phi' \rangle \quad \text{and} \quad \|\langle \vec{m} : \mathbf{M} | \phi \rangle\| = \frac{1}{\sqrt{d^{|R|}}} = \|\langle \vec{m} : \mathbf{M} | \phi' \rangle\|, \quad (26)$$

*then there is a subset  $L \subseteq R$ ,  $\vec{x}, \vec{y} \in \mathbb{F}^L$  and  $|\psi\rangle \in \mathcal{H}^{\otimes V \setminus L}$  such that*

$$|\phi\rangle \simeq |\psi\rangle \bigotimes_{n \in L} |x_n : Q_n\rangle \quad \text{and} \quad |\phi'\rangle \simeq |\psi\rangle \bigotimes_{n \in L} |y_n : Q_n\rangle. \quad (27)$$

In the original gflow article [Bro+07], this lemma was not taken into account in full generality, the proof of the converse result is however fixed in [PSM] for the qubit case.

*Proof of theorem 14.* Let  $\prec$  be the order on  $O^c$ , and consider the last measurement made according to some totalisation of  $\prec$ . Suppose it is made at vertex  $u$ . Let  $\mathbf{M} : O^c \rightarrow U(\mathcal{H})$  be such that  $\mathbf{M}(v) \in \mathcal{M}(\lambda(v))$  for all  $v \in O^c$ . Performing the measurement with outcome  $m$ , there is a corresponding correction  $X_{\mathbf{x}(u)}^m Z_{\mathbf{z}(u)}^m$  that acts only on outputs, and which induces the branch map:

$$|G(\phi)\rangle \mapsto X_{\mathbf{x}(u)}^m Z_{\mathbf{z}(u)}^m \left( \langle m : \mathbf{M}(u) | \bigotimes_{v \in O^c \setminus \{u\}} \langle 0 : \mathbf{M}(v) | \right) |G(\phi)\rangle \quad (28)$$

$$= X_{\mathbf{x}(u)}^m Z_{\mathbf{z}(u)}^m \left( \bigotimes_{v \in O^c} \langle 0 : \mathbf{M}(v) | \right) Q_u^m |G(\phi)\rangle, \quad (29)$$

$$= \left( \bigotimes_{v \in O^c} \langle 0 : \mathbf{M}(v) | \right) X_{\mathbf{x}(u)}^m Z_{\mathbf{z}(u)}^m Q_u^m |G(\phi)\rangle \quad (30)$$

$$= \bigotimes_{v \in O^c} \langle 0 : \mathbf{M}(v) | G(\phi) \rangle. \quad (31)$$

By the uniformity condition, this equation is true for any choice of measurements in  $\prod_{v \in O^c} \mathcal{M}(\lambda(v))$ . In particular, for any  $\mathbf{M}(v) \in \mathcal{M}(\lambda(v))$ , by proposition 3 we have  $Q_v^{-m} \mathbf{M}(v) Q_v^m \in \mathcal{M}(\lambda(v))$ , and

$$\langle 0 : Q_v^{-m} \mathbf{M}(v) Q_v^m | = \langle 0 : \mathbf{M}(v) | Q_v^m = \langle m : \mathbf{M}(v) |. \quad (32)$$

It follows that for any choice of measurements  $\mathbf{M}$  and any  $\vec{m} \in \mathbb{Z}_d^{O^c}$ ,

$$\langle \vec{m} : \mathbf{M} | X_{\mathbf{x}(u)}^m Z_{\mathbf{z}(u)}^m Q_u^m | G(\phi) \rangle = \langle \vec{m} : \mathbf{M} | G(\phi) \rangle, \quad (33)$$

so by lemma 15, there is a subset  $L \subseteq O^c$ , vectors  $\vec{x}, \vec{y} \in \mathbb{Z}_d^{|L|}$  and a state  $|\psi\rangle \in \mathcal{H}^{\otimes V \setminus L}$  such that

$$X_{\mathbf{x}(u)}^m Z_{\mathbf{z}(u)}^m Q_u^m | G(\phi) \rangle \simeq |\psi\rangle \bigotimes_{n \in L} |x_n : Q_n\rangle \quad \text{and} \quad |G(\phi)\rangle \simeq |\psi\rangle \bigotimes_{n \in L} |y_n : Q_n\rangle. \quad (34)$$

Then,

$$X_{\mathbf{x}(u)}^m Z_{\mathbf{z}(u)}^m Q_u^m |\psi\rangle \bigotimes_{n \in L} |x_n : Q_n\rangle \simeq X_{\mathbf{x}(u)}^m Z_{\mathbf{z}(u)}^m Q_u^m |G(\phi)\rangle \quad (35)$$

$$\simeq |G(\phi)\rangle \simeq |\psi\rangle \bigotimes_{n \in L} |y_n : Q_n\rangle. \quad (36)$$

If  $u \notin L$ , then since the corrections only act on outputs this implies that

$$(X_{\mathbf{x}(u)}^m Z_{\mathbf{z}(u)}^m Q_u^m |\psi\rangle) \bigotimes_{n \in L} |x_n : Q_n\rangle \simeq |\psi\rangle \bigotimes_{n \in L} |y_n : Q_n\rangle, \quad (37)$$

so we must have  $x_n = y_n$  for all  $n \in L$ .

If  $u \in L$ ,

$$(X_{\mathbf{x}(u)}^m Z_{\mathbf{z}(u)}^m Q_u^m |\psi\rangle) \bigotimes_{n \in L} |x_n : Q_n\rangle \quad (38)$$

$$\simeq (X_{\mathbf{x}(u)}^m Z_{\mathbf{z}(u)}^m |\psi\rangle) \otimes Q_u^m |x_u : Q_u\rangle \bigotimes_{n \in L \setminus \{u\}} |x_n : Q_n\rangle, \quad (39)$$

$$\simeq (X_{\mathbf{x}(u)}^m Z_{\mathbf{z}(u)}^m |\psi\rangle) \otimes \omega^{mx_u} |x_u : Q_u\rangle \bigotimes_{n \in L \setminus \{u\}} |x_n : Q_n\rangle, \quad (40)$$

$$\simeq |\psi\rangle \otimes |y_u : Q_u\rangle \bigotimes_{n \in L \setminus \{u\}} |y_n : Q_n\rangle, \quad (41)$$

which which also implies that  $x_n = y_n$  for all  $n \in L$ . Then,

$$X_{\mathbf{x}(u)}^m Z_{\mathbf{z}(u)}^m Q_u^m |G(\phi)\rangle \simeq |G(\phi)\rangle, \quad (42)$$

and  $X_{\mathbf{x}(u)} Z_{\mathbf{z}(u)} Q_u$  stabilises the graph state for any  $m \in \mathbb{Z}_d$ , up to a phase  $e^{i\alpha}$ . By proposition 8 there is some multiset  $C_{\bullet u} \in \mathbb{Z}_d^V$  such that

$$e^{i\alpha} X_{\mathbf{x}(u)} Z_{\mathbf{z}(u)} Q_u = \omega^{C_{\bullet u}^T G C_{\bullet u}} X_{C_{\bullet u}} Z_{G C_{\bullet u}} \quad \text{and} \quad (C_{\bullet u})_v = 0 \quad \text{if} \quad v \in I. \quad (43)$$

The corrections act only on outputs, so that the factor of  $X_{C_{\bullet u}} Z_{G C_{\bullet u}}^{-1}$  acting on  $u$  must be  $Q_u$ . This implies that  $X_{C_{uu}} Z_{(G C)_{uu}}^{-1} \simeq Q_u$ , so that  $\lambda(u) = ((C_{\bullet u})_u, (G C_{\bullet u})_u)$ , and furthermore, that  $(C_{\bullet u})_v = (G C_{\bullet u})_v = 0$  if  $v \notin O \cup \{u\}$  since  $X_{\mathbf{x}(u)}^m Z_{\mathbf{z}(u)}^m$  acts only

on outputs. Furthermore, tensor products of Paulis form a basis of the space of linear operators, so that we must have

$$\mathbf{x}(v) := (C_{\bullet v} - \lambda(v)1_{\{v\}}) \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{z}(v) := ((GC)_{\bullet v} - \lambda(v)21_{\{v\}}). \quad (44)$$

Now, consider the open graph  $(G, I, O \cup \{u\})$ . Since  $(G, I, O, \lambda, \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z})$  is robustly deterministic, we can repeat the same procedure on the new open graph

$$(G, I, O \cup \{u\}, \lambda|_{(O \cup \{u\})^c}, \mathbf{x}|_{(O \cup \{u\})^c}, \mathbf{z}|_{(O \cup \{u\})^c}), \quad (45)$$

obtaining  $C_{\bullet v}$  for the last measured vertex  $v$  in  $O^c \setminus \{u\}$ . This procedure eventually terminates, and we end up with a column vector  $C_{\bullet w}$  for each  $w \in O^c$ . Let  $C \in \mathbb{F}^{V \times V}$  be the matrix whose  $u$ -th column is  $C_{\bullet u}$ , or 0 if  $u \in O$ . Then from the equations in lemma 21 we see that the pair  $(C, <)$  gives an  $\mathbb{Z}_d$ -flow for  $(G, I, O, \lambda)$  by lemma 11. Furthermore, it is also clear from equations (21) and (44) that  $\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{x}_C$  and  $\mathbf{z} = \mathbf{z}_C$ .  $\square$

### 3 A polynomial-time algorithm for $\mathbb{Z}_d$ -flow

**input:** A labelled open graph  $(G, I, O, \lambda)$

**output:** An  $\mathbb{Z}_d$ -flow  $(C, \Lambda)$  or **fail**

```

1: procedure F-FLOW( $G, I, O, \lambda$ )
2:   find  $L := \{u \in V \mid (\forall v \in V) : G_{uv} = 0\}$  ▷ Isolated vertices
3:   layer(0) :=  $O \cup L$ 
4:    $C := 0_{|V| \times |V|}$ 
5:   return F-FLOW-AUX( $G, I, O \cup L, \lambda|_{O^c \setminus L}, C, \text{layer}, 1$ )

6: procedure F-FLOW-AUX( $G, I, O, \lambda, C, \text{layer}, k$ )
7:    $L := \emptyset$  ▷ Vertices which we are correcting in this layer
8:   for all  $v \in O^c$  do
9:      $(a, b) := \lambda(v)$ 
10:    solve in  $\mathbb{F}$ :  $G[O^c, O \setminus I]\vec{c} = b1_{\{v\}} - aG[O^c, \{v\}]$ 
11:    if there is a solution  $\vec{c}$  then
12:       $L := L \cup \{v\}$  ▷ Assign  $v$  to the current layer
13:       $C[O \setminus I, \{v\}] := \vec{c}$  ▷ The corrections for vertex  $v$ 
14:       $C[\{v\}, \{v\}] := a$ 
15:    if  $L = \emptyset$  then ▷ If we cannot correct for additional vertices, either:
16:      if  $O = V$  then
17:        return  $(C, \text{layer})$  ▷ we have found an  $\mathbb{Z}_d$ -flow; or,
18:      else
19:        fail ▷ there is no  $\mathbb{Z}_d$ -flow.
20:    else
21:      layer( $k$ ) :=  $L$ 
22:      return F-FLOW-AUX( $G, I, O \cup L, \lambda|_{O^c \setminus L}, C, \text{layer}, k + 1$ )

```

#### 3.1 Correctness

This algorithm is strongly inspired by the analogous algorithm for finding gflows for  $\mathbb{Z}_2$ -graphs [MP08], and its generalisations to multiple measurement planes [Bac+21] and to finding CV-flows [BM21].

**Theorem 16.**  $(G, I, O, \lambda)$  has an  $\mathbb{Z}_d$ -flow if and only if the algorithm above returns a valid  $\mathbb{Z}_d$ -flow.

*Proof.* It is clear the algorithm terminates, since at each call to Z-FLOW-AUX, the algorithm either passes vertices from  $V \setminus O$  to  $O$ , returns an  $\mathbb{Z}_d$ -flow, or fails. Since  $V$  is finite, there are a finite number of recursions after which the algorithm either returns an  $\mathbb{Z}_d$ -flow or fails.

(*Outputs a valid  $\mathbb{Z}_d$ -flow*) Suppose the algorithm terminates with a pair  $(H, C)$ . We need to show this defines a valid  $\mathbb{F}_q$ -flow. Consider the function Z-FLOW-AUX at a given call, and let  $H' := G[O^c, O \setminus I]$  and  $h := G[O^c, v]$ .

The output columns of  $C$  are 0, and since the solution vector  $x$  from line 11 never contains an input, the input rows of  $C$  are also 0. Hence condition (i) is satisfied.

Similarly, the solution vector  $x$  only has rows labelled by vertices  $v \geq u$ , so  $C$  is lower triangular by construction. If the linear equation in line 11 is satisfied, then the entries above  $(HC)_{uu}$  in the  $u$ -th column of  $HC$  will be 0. Hence (ii) is satisfied. Indeed, for any  $u > v$ ,  $(HC)_{vu} = \sum_w H_{vw} C_{wu} = \sum_{w < u} H_{vw} C_{wu} + H_{vu} C_{uu} + \sum_{w > u} H_{vw} C_{wu} = h_w a + \sum_{w > u} H'_{vw} x_w$ . Since  $C_{uu} = a$ ,  $H_{vu} = h_v$ ,  $\forall w < u$ ,  $C_{wu} = 0$ , and  $\forall w > u$ ,  $H_{vw} = H'_{vw}$  and  $C_{wu} = x_w$ . As a consequence  $(HC)_{vu} = (ah + H'x)_v = (ah + b\{u\} - ah)_v$ .

Finally, for a non-output  $u$ ,  $C_{uu} = a$ . As a consequence  $C$  is an  $\mathbb{F}_q$ -flow for  $H$ .

(*Outputs a valid layer decomposition*) Let  $L$  be as in line 21 of the algorithm for some call  $k$  to Z-FLOW-AUX. It is clear that the equation line 10 doesn't depend on the vertices in  $L$  which appear before or after  $\{v\}$  and therefore  $L$  is independent of the order in which the elements of  $L$  are found. As a result, the output of the algorithm is invariant any permutation of the vertices in  $L$ . Since this corresponds tautologically to a permutation of the layer  $V_k$  output by the algorithm, and every permutation that preserves the partition can be written as a product of such permutations, the  $\mathbb{Z}_d$ -flow found by the graph is invariant under permutations that preserve the layers (whenever the algorithm succeeds).

(*Outputs a  $\mathbb{Z}_d$ -flow whenever there is one*) Assume the algorithm fails, that is, for some call to Z-FLOW-AUX, line 10 has no solution for any remaining unfinished vertices. Let  $\overline{O}$  be the third parameter at that function call, and further assume that  $D$  is an  $\mathbb{Z}_d$ -flow for  $(G, I, O, \lambda)$ .

Let  $\overline{D}$  be the matrix obtained by replacing the columns in  $D$  corresponding to  $\overline{O}$  with zeros and permuted such that the columns  $\overline{O}$  appear last. Then,  $\overline{D}$  is an  $\mathbb{Z}_d$ -flow for  $(G, I, \overline{O}, \lambda|_{\overline{O}^c})$ . Let  $v \in \overline{O}^c$  be the last column before  $\overline{O}^c$ , and put  $c := \overline{D}[\overline{O} \setminus I, \{v\}]$ . Then,

$$(G[\overline{O}^c, \overline{O} \setminus I]c)_u = \sum_{j \in \overline{O} \setminus I} G_{uj} c_j = \sum_{j \in \overline{O} \setminus I} G_{uj} \overline{D}_{jv} = \sum_{j \in \overline{O}} G_{uj} \overline{D}_{jv} = \sum_{j \in \overline{O}} G_{uj} D_{jv} \quad (46)$$

$$= \sum_{j \in V} G_{uj} D_{jv} - \sum_{j \in \overline{O}^c} G_{uj} D_{jv} = (GD)_{uv} - \sum_{j \in \overline{O}^c} G_{uj} D_{jv} \quad (47)$$

$$= b\delta_{u,v} - G_{uv} D_{vv} = b\delta_{u,v} - aG_{uv}. \quad (48)$$

As a result, we see that  $c$  verifies the equation of line 10, which contradicts the failure of the algorithm. It follows that  $(G, I, O, \lambda)$  cannot have an  $\mathbb{Z}_d$ -flow if the algorithm fails. By contrapositive, if  $(G, I, O, \lambda)$  has an  $\mathbb{Z}_d$ -flow, the algorithm succeeds.  $\square$

The core of the algorithm is the loop line 8. Letting  $n = |V|$ ,  $\ell = |O|$  and  $\ell' = |O \setminus I|$  at a given call to Z-FLOW-AUX, note that  $\ell' \leq \ell \leq n$ . The loop amounts to solving  $n - \ell$  systems of  $n - \ell$  equations in  $\ell'$  variables. Let  $x_v$  be the right hand side of equation line 10. Solving the system can be done by transforming the matrix

$$[G[O^c, O \setminus I] \mid x_{v_1} \mid \cdots \mid x_{v_{n-\ell}}] \quad (49)$$

to upper echelon form. This can be done in time  $O(n^3)$  by Gaussian elimination, and backsubstituting to find the corresponding  $\vec{c}_j$  to each  $x_j$  takes time  $O(n^2)$  or for all solutions  $O(n^3)$  since there are at most  $n$  backsubstitutions to perform. Finally, since each call to Z-FLOW-AUX either eliminates a vertex or terminates, the algorithm recurses at most  $n$  times. The total complexity is therefore  $O(n^4)$ .

Note this procedure can also be adapted to find an  $\mathbb{Z}_d$ -flow for *any* labelling, rather than one fixed in advance. First, note that, for the existence of an  $\mathbb{Z}_d$ -flow, it suffices to choose measurement planes up to a scalar factor. That is,  $(C, \Lambda)$  is an  $\mathbb{Z}_d$ -flow for  $(G, I, O, \lambda)$  with  $\lambda(u) = (a, b)$  if and only if it is an  $\mathbb{Z}_d$ -flow for  $(G, I, O, \lambda')$  where  $\lambda'(u) = (ka, kb)$ . Hence we can solve for measurement planes at the same time as  $C$  by either fixing  $a = 1$  and solving for  $b$  in the equation line 10 of the algorithm, or for non-inputs, fixing  $b = 1$  and solving for  $a$ .

### 3.2 Depth optimality

Our proofs follow the structure of [MP08], which introduced the idea of optimising gflows starting from the last layer and working back. The idea is to find corrections for as many measured vertices as possible at the part of the MBQC when there are the most constraints on possible corrections: when the only vertices left unmeasured are the outputs. This motivates the following definition which allows us to conveniently manipulate layer decompositions “from the back”:

**Definition 17.** Let  $(C, \Lambda)$  be an  $\mathbb{Z}_d$ -flow for an open graph  $(G, I, O, \lambda)$ . Then, the depth of  $(C, \Lambda)$  is  $|\Lambda| - 1$ . Furthermore, we define an  $\mathbb{N}$ -indexing of the elements of  $\Lambda$  by:

$$\Lambda_k := \max(\Lambda \setminus \{\Lambda_n \mid n < k\}), \quad (50)$$

where we note that  $\Lambda_m < \Lambda_n$  as elements of  $\Lambda$  if and only if  $n > m$ , and  $\Lambda_k \neq \emptyset$  if and only if  $k$  is less than or equal to the depth of  $(C, \Lambda)$ .

This definition of the depth of an  $\mathbb{Z}_d$ -flow corresponds to the intuitive interpretation: all measurements (and corresponding corrections) within a layer can be made concurrently, therefore there is an implementation that runs the MBQC in  $|\Lambda| - 1$  rounds of measurements (since the outputs are not measured).

Now, we can use this definition to compare the depths of different  $\mathbb{Z}_d$ -flows:

**Definition 18.** Let  $(C, \Lambda)$  and  $(D, \Phi)$  be  $\mathbb{Z}_d$ -flows for an open graph  $(G, I, O, \lambda)$ . Then  $(C, \Lambda)$  is more delayed than  $(D, \Phi)$  if for each  $k$ ,

$$\left| \bigcup_{n=0}^k \Lambda_n \right| \geq \left| \bigcup_{n=0}^k \Phi_n \right|. \quad (51)$$

and this inequality is strict for at least one  $k$ . It is maximally delayed if there is no layer decomposition which is more delayed.

Then, we can give a complete characterisation of the layer decompositions of maximally delayed  $\mathbb{Z}_d$ -flows, which turn out to be uniquely defined:

**Proposition 19.** If  $(C, \Lambda)$  is a maximally delayed  $\mathbb{Z}_d$ -flow for an open graph  $(G, I, O, \lambda)$ , then  $\Lambda_0 = O \cup \{u \in V \mid (\forall v \in V) : G_{uv} = 0\}$  and for  $k > 0$ ,

$$\Lambda_k = \left\{ u \in \left( O \bigcup_{1 \leq n < k} \Lambda_n \right)^c \mid \exists c \in \mathbb{F}^V \quad \text{s.t.} \quad \begin{array}{l} (c_u, (Gc)_u) = \lambda(u) \\ \forall v \notin \left( O \bigcup_{1 \leq n < k} \Lambda_n \right) \cup \{u\}, c_v = (Gc)_v = 0 \end{array} \right\}. \quad (52)$$

In particular, if  $(C, \Lambda)$  and  $(D, \Phi)$  are maximally delayed  $\mathbb{Z}_d$ -flows for the same open graph, then  $\Lambda = \Phi$ .

To make this proof we need the following three lemmas, which have somewhat cumbersome proofs that we have chosen to leave to appendix B:

**Lemma 20.** *If  $(C, \Lambda)$  is a maximally delayed  $\mathbb{Z}_d$ -flow for an open graph  $(G, I, O, \lambda)$ , then  $\Lambda_0 = O \cup \{u \in V \mid (\forall v \in V) : G_{uv} = 0\}$ , i.e. the union of the outputs and isolated vertices of  $(G, I, O, \lambda)$ .*

**Lemma 21.** *If  $(C, \Lambda)$  is maximally delayed for  $(G, I, O, \lambda)$ , then*

$$\Lambda_1 = \left\{ u \in O^c \mid \exists c \in \mathbb{Z}_d^{|V|} \text{ s.t. } \begin{array}{l} (c_u, (Gc)_u) = \lambda(u) \\ \forall v \notin O \cup \{u\}, c_v = (Gc)_v = 0 \end{array} \right\}. \quad (53)$$

**Lemma 22.** *If  $(C, \Lambda)$  is a maximally delayed  $\mathbb{Z}_d$ -flow of  $(G, I, O, \lambda)$ ,  $(D, \Phi)$  is a maximally delayed  $\mathbb{Z}_d$ -flow of  $(G, I, O \cup \Lambda_1, \lambda|_{(O \cup \Lambda_1)^c})$ , where*

- $D$  is the matrix obtained by replacing the columns of  $C$  corresponding to  $\Lambda_1$  with zeros;
- $\Phi$  is given by

$$\Phi_k := \begin{cases} \Lambda_1 \cup O & \text{if } k = 0; \\ \Lambda_{k+1} & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (54)$$

*Proof of proposition 19.*  $\Lambda_0$  must take the form given in lemma 20. Then, a recursive application of lemma 22 and lemma 21 shows that the layer decomposition of a maximally delayed  $\mathbb{Z}_d$ -flow is uniquely defined.

Since the open graph obtained from lemma 22 and used to calculate  $\Lambda_k$  with lemma 21 is  $(G, I, O \cup_{1 \leq n \leq k} \Lambda_n, \lambda|_{(O \cup_{1 \leq n \leq k} \Lambda_n)^c})$ , it is clear that  $\Lambda_k$  must take the form claimed.  $\square$

This can be understood from the following principle. If a correction exists for the measurement of a vertex that acts only on outputs, then this correction can be performed at any point during the MBQC, since the outputs are never measured and therefore always available for corrections. As a result, we can delay this measurement as much as possible, to the penultimate layer, to give ourselves as much flexibility as possible in corrections for previous layers. As a result, we can put all vertices whose corrections act only on outputs in the final layer. Any vertices which do not verify this property must be in a layer which precedes the penultimate layer, since at the time they are measured there must be non-output vertices which are left unmeasured. Then, it suffices to show that there is a minimal depth  $\mathbb{Z}_d$ -flow that is maximally delayed to obtain:

**Proposition 23.** *A maximally delayed  $\mathbb{Z}_d$ -flow for an open graph  $(G, I, O, \lambda)$  has minimal depth.*

*Proof.* First, note that if  $(C, \Lambda)$  is more delayed than  $(D, \Phi)$ , then in particular,

$$|V| = \left| \bigcup_{n=0}^{|\Lambda|} \Lambda_n \right| \geq \left| \bigcup_{n=0}^{|\Lambda|} \Phi_n \right|, \quad (55)$$

so that  $|\Lambda| \leq |\Phi|$ . Assume now that  $(D, \Phi)$  has minimal depth, then any  $\mathbb{Z}_d$ -flow that is more delayed has the same depth. It follows that either  $(D, \Phi)$  is maximally delayed and has minimal depth, or there is a maximally delayed  $\mathbb{Z}_d$ -flow that is more delayed than  $(D, \Phi)$  thus has the same depth. But by proposition 19, every maximally delayed  $\mathbb{Z}_d$ -flow has the same layer decomposition for a given open graph, so that every maximally delayed  $\mathbb{Z}_d$ -flow has minimal depth.  $\square$

Note however that a minimal depth decomposition is not necessarily maximally delayed. For example, we can always measure the entirety of the inputs first without changing the depth, but this measurement order is not always maximally delayed since this allows us to move inputs into earlier layers. Since the algorithm is constructed such that it finds a maximally delayed  $\mathbb{Z}_d$ -flow:

**Theorem 24.** *The algorithm outputs an  $\mathbb{Z}_d$ -flow of minimal depth.*

*Proof.* Assume that the algorithm succeeds with output  $(D, \Phi)$ . We show that this output  $\mathbb{Z}_d$ -flow  $(D, \Phi)$  is maximally delayed. Firstly, we show that the output flow has  $\Phi_1 = \Lambda_1$  from lemma 21. We know that  $\Phi_1 \subseteq \Lambda_1$  and it is clear from the definition of the algorithm that

$$\Phi_1 = \left\{ u \in O^c \mid \exists \vec{c} \in \mathbb{Z}_d^{|O \setminus I|} \text{ s.t. } G[O^c, O \setminus I] \vec{c} = b1_{\{v\}} - aG[O^c, \{v\}] \right\} \quad (56)$$

Let  $u \in \Lambda_1$ , that is there is some vector  $\vec{c} \in \mathbb{Z}_d^{|V|}$  such that

$$\begin{cases} (c_u, (Gc)_u) = \lambda(u) \\ \forall v \notin O \cup \{u\}, c_v = (Gc)_v = 0 \end{cases} \quad (57)$$

Then, for any  $v \in O^c$ ,

$$(G[O^c, V]c)_v = \sum_{j \in V} G_{vj} c_j = \sum_{j \in O \cup \{u\}} G_{vj} c_j \quad (58)$$

$$= \sum_{j \in O} G_{vj} c_j + aG_{vu} = (Gc)_v + aG_{vu} = b\delta_{vu} + aG_{vu} \quad (59)$$

from which we see that  $u \in \Phi_1$  whence  $\Phi_1 = \Lambda_1$ .

Now,  $\Phi_2$  is calculated in the next call to Z-FLOW-AUX where the open graph passed as argument is  $(G, I, O \cup \Phi_1, \lambda|_{(O \cup \Phi_1)})$ . Using the same argument as for  $\Phi_1$ ,  $\Phi_2$  must match the layer  $\Lambda_2$  obtained by applying lemma 21 to the  $\mathbb{Z}_d$ -flow resulting from 22.

Then, using the same recursion as in the proof of proposition 19, we see that  $(D, \Phi)$  is maximally delayed. It follows from proposition 23 that the  $\mathbb{Z}_d$ -flow output by the algorithm has optimal depth.  $\square$

## Conclusion and future work

We have defined a flow condition suitable for qudit MBQC, and shown that it is sufficient to obtain deterministic MBQCs. We leave two major open questions for future work: firstly, we have only considered the case of fields of prime cardinality. Most of our results generalise straightforwardly to the case of power-of-prime fields, with the exception of theorem 14 (or more specifically, lemma 26). Secondly, an important tool for studying MBQC is ancilla-less circuit extraction. Work in this direction was started by the first and third authors in [BM21] where an algorithm was found for measurement patterns where all the measurements belong to  $\mathcal{M}(0, 1)$  (the measurement space of  $Z$ ), but no extraction algorithm is known for all measurement spaces.



**Acknowledgements.** R. I. B., D. M. and S. P. were supported by the ANR VanQuTe project (ANR-17-CE24-0035).

## References

- [AMA14] B. Antonio, D. Markham, and J. Anders. “Adiabatic Graph-State Quantum Computation”. en. In: *New Journal of Physics* 16.11 (Nov. 2014), p. 113070. DOI: [10.1088/1367-2630/16/11/113070](https://doi.org/10.1088/1367-2630/16/11/113070).
- [Bac+21] Miriam Backens, Hector Miller-Bakewell, Giovanni de Felice, Leo Lobski, and John van de Wetering. “There and Back Again: A Circuit Extraction Tale”. en-GB. In: *Quantum* 5 (Mar. 2021), p. 421. DOI: [10.22331/q-2021-03-25-421](https://doi.org/10.22331/q-2021-03-25-421).
- [BT00] H. Bechmann-Pasquinucci and W. Tittel. “Quantum Cryptography Using Larger Alphabets”. In: *Physical Review A* 61.6 (May 2000), p. 062308. DOI: [10.1103/PhysRevA.61.062308](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevA.61.062308).
- [BW08] Rainer Blatt and David Wineland. “Entangled States of Trapped Atomic Ions”. en. In: *Nature* 453.7198 (June 2008), pp. 1008–1015. DOI: [10.1038/nature07125](https://doi.org/10.1038/nature07125).
- [BM21] Robert I. Booth and Damian Markham. “Flow conditions for continuous variable measurement-based quantum computing”. In: *arXiv:2104.00572 [quant-ph]* (Apr. 2021).
- [BR01] Hans J. Briegel and Robert Raussendorf. “Persistent Entanglement in Arrays of Interacting Particles”. In: *Physical Review Letters* 86.5 (Jan. 2001), pp. 910–913. DOI: [10.1103/PhysRevLett.86.910](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.86.910).
- [BK09] Anne Broadbent and Elham Kashefi. “Parallelizing Quantum Circuits”. en. In: *Theoretical Computer Science* 410.26 (June 2009), pp. 2489–2510. DOI: [10.1016/j.tcs.2008.12.046](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tcs.2008.12.046).
- [Bro+07] D. E. Browne, E. Kashefi, M. Mhalla, and S. Perdrix. “Generalized flow and determinism in measurement-based quantum computation”. en. In: *New Journal of Physics* 9.8 (Aug. 2007), pp. 250–250. DOI: [10.1088/1367-2630/9/8/250](https://doi.org/10.1088/1367-2630/9/8/250).
- [Cer+02] Nicolas J. Cerf, Mohamed Bourennane, Anders Karlsson, and Nicolas Gisin. “Security of Quantum Key Distribution Using d-Level Systems”. In: *Physical Review Letters* 88.12 (Mar. 2002), p. 127902. DOI: [10.1103/PhysRevLett.88.127902](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.88.127902).
- [CGL99] Richard Cleve, Daniel Gottesman, and Hoi-Kwong Lo. “How to Share a Quantum Secret”. en. In: *Physical Review Letters* 83.3 (July 1999), pp. 648–651. DOI: [10.1103/PhysRevLett.83.648](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.83.648).
- [dGK11] Raphael Dias da Silva, Ernesto F. Galvao, and Elham Kashefi. “Closed Time-like Curves in Measurement-Based Quantum Computation”. en. In: *Physical Review A* 83.1 (Jan. 2011), p. 012316. DOI: [10.1103/PhysRevA.83.012316](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevA.83.012316).
- [DK06] Vincent Danos and Elham Kashefi. “Determinism in the one-way model”. In: *Physical Review A* 74.5 (Nov. 2006), p. 052310. DOI: [10.1103/PhysRevA.74.052310](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevA.74.052310).
- [DKP07] Vincent Danos, Elham Kashefi, and Prakash Panangaden. “The Measurement Calculus”. In: *Journal of the ACM* 54.2 (Apr. 2007), 8–es. DOI: [10.1145/1219092.1219096](https://doi.org/10.1145/1219092.1219096).
- [de +20] Niel de Beaudrap, Ross Duncan, Dominic Horsman, and Simon Perdrix. “Pauli Fusion: A computational model to realise quantum transformations from ZX terms”. en. In: *Electronic Proceedings in Theoretical Computer Science* 318.Proceedings QPL 2019 (Apr. 2020), pp. 85–105. DOI: [10.4204/EPTCS.318](https://doi.org/10.4204/EPTCS.318).

- [Dun+20] Ross Duncan, Aleks Kissinger, Simon Pedrix, and John van de Wetering. “Graph-Theoretic Simplification of Quantum Circuits with the ZX-Calculus”. en. In: *Quantum* 4 (June 2020), p. 279. DOI: [10.22331/q-2020-06-04-279](https://doi.org/10.22331/q-2020-06-04-279).
- [Erh+18] Manuel Erhard, Robert Fickler, Mario Krenn, and Anton Zeilinger. “Twisted Photons: New Quantum Perspectives in High Dimensions”. en. In: *Light: Science & Applications* 7.3 (Mar. 2018), pp. 17146–17146. DOI: [10.1038/lsa.2017.146](https://doi.org/10.1038/lsa.2017.146).
- [Esl+18] Maryam Eslamy, Mahboobeh Houshmand, Morteza Saheb Zamani, and Mehdi Sedighi. “Geometry-Based Optimization of One-Way Quantum Computation Measurement Patterns”. In: *International Journal of Theoretical Physics* 57.11 (Nov. 2018), pp. 3296–3317. DOI: [10.1007/s10773-018-3844-x](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10773-018-3844-x).
- [FK17] Joseph F. Fitzsimons and Elham Kashefi. “Unconditionally Verifiable Blind Quantum Computation”. en. In: *Physical Review A* 96.1 (July 2017). DOI: [10.1103/PhysRevA.96.012303](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevA.96.012303).
- [Gao+19] Xiaoqin Gao, Mario Krenn, Jaroslav Kysela, and Anton Zeilinger. “Arbitrary  $d$ -Dimensional Pauli  $X$  Gates of a Flying Qudit”. In: *Physical Review A* 99.2 (Feb. 2019), p. 023825. DOI: [10.1103/PhysRevA.99.023825](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevA.99.023825).
- [Gok+19] Pranav Gokhale, Jonathan M. Baker, Casey Duckering, Natalie C. Brown, Kenneth R. Brown, and Frederic T. Chong. “Asymptotic Improvements to Quantum Circuits via Qutrits”. en. In: *Proceedings of the 46th International Symposium on Computer Architecture*. Phoenix Arizona: ACM, June 2019, pp. 554–566. DOI: [10.1145/3307650.3322253](https://doi.org/10.1145/3307650.3322253).
- [Got99] Daniel Gottesman. “Fault-Tolerant Quantum Computation with Higher-Dimensional Systems”. In: *Chaos, Solitons & Fractals* 10.10 (Sept. 1999), pp. 1749–1758. DOI: [10.1016/S0960-0779\(98\)00218-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0960-0779(98)00218-5).
- [Kik+20] E. O. Kiktenko, A. S. Nikolaeva, Peng Xu, G. V. Shlyapnikov, and A. K. Fedorov. “Scalable Quantum Computing with Qudits on a Graph”. In: *Physical Review A* 101.2 (Feb. 2020), p. 022304. DOI: [10.1103/PhysRevA.101.022304](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevA.101.022304).
- [Man+17] Atul Mantri, Tommaso F. Demarie, Nicolas C. Menicucci, and Joseph F. Fitzsimons. “Flow Ambiguity: A Path Towards Classically Driven Blind Quantum Computation”. en. In: *Physical Review X* 7.3 (July 2017). DOI: [10.1103/PhysRevX.7.031004](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevX.7.031004).
- [MMP13] Anne Marin, Damian Markham, and Simon Perdrix. “Access Structure in Graphs in High Dimension and Application to Secret Sharing”. en. In: (2013), 17 pages. DOI: [10.4230/LIPICS.TQC.2013.308](https://doi.org/10.4230/LIPICS.TQC.2013.308).
- [MK14] Damian Markham and Elham Kashefi. “Entanglement, Flow and Classical Simulatability in Measurement Based Quantum Computation”. en. In: *Horizons of the Mind. A Tribute to Prakash Panangaden: Essays Dedicated to Prakash Panangaden on the Occasion of His 60th Birthday*. Ed. by Franck van Breugel, Elham Kashefi, Catuscia Palamidessi, and Jan Rutten. Lecture Notes in Computer Science. Cham: Springer International Publishing, 2014, pp. 427–453. DOI: [10.1007/978-3-319-06880-0\\_22](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-06880-0_22).
- [MP08] Mehdi Mhalla and Simon Perdrix. “Finding Optimal Flows Efficiently”. en. In: *Automata, Languages and Programming*. Ed. by Luca Aceto, Ivan Damgård, Leslie Ann Goldberg, Magnús M. Halldórsson, Anna Ingólfssdóttir, and Igor Walukiewicz. Lecture Notes in Computer Science. Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer, 2008, pp. 857–868. DOI: [10.1007/978-3-540-70575-8\\_70](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-540-70575-8_70).

- [MHM15] Jisho Miyazaki, Michal Hajdušek, and Mio Murao. “An Analysis of the Trade-off between Spatial and Temporal Resources for Measurement-Based Quantum Computation”. In: *Physical Review A* 91.5 (May 2015), p. 052302. DOI: [10.1103/PhysRevA.91.052302](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevA.91.052302).
- [PS17] Simon Perdrix and Luc Sanselme. “Determinism and Computational Power of Real Measurement-Based Quantum Computation”. en. In: *Fundamentals of Computation Theory*. Ed. by Ralf Klasing and Marc Zeitoun. Vol. 10472. Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2017, pp. 395–408. DOI: [10.1007/978-3-662-55751-8\\_31](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-662-55751-8_31).
- [PSM] Simon Perdrix, Luc Sanselme, and Mehdi Mhalla. “Characterising determinism in measurement-based quantum computations involving Pauli measurements”. To Appear.
- [Rau+11] R. Raussendorf, P. Sarvepalli, T.-C. Wei, and P. Haghnegahdar. “Measurement-Based Quantum Computation—a Quantum-Mechanical Toy Model for Space-time?”. In: *arXiv:1108.5774 [quant-ph]* (Aug. 2011).
- [RB01] Robert Raussendorf and Hans J. Briegel. “A One-Way Quantum Computer”. In: *Physical Review Letters* 86.22 (May 2001), pp. 5188–5191. DOI: [10.1103/PhysRevLett.86.5188](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.86.5188).
- [RB02] Robert Raussendorf and Hans J. Briegel. “Computational Model Underlying the One-Way Quantum Computer”. In: *Quantum Info. Comput.* 2.6 (Oct. 2002), pp. 443–486. DOI: [10.5555/2011492.2011495](https://doi.org/10.5555/2011492.2011495).
- [Wan+20] Yuchen Wang, Zixuan Hu, Barry C. Sanders, and Sabre Kais. “Qudits and High-Dimensional Quantum Computing”. English. In: *Frontiers in Physics* 8 (2020). DOI: [10.3389/fphy.2020.589504](https://doi.org/10.3389/fphy.2020.589504).
- [Zho+03] D. L. Zhou, B. Zeng, Z. Xu, and C. P. Sun. “Quantum Computation Based on D-Level Cluster States”. en. In: *Physical Review A* 68.6 (Dec. 2003), p. 062303. DOI: [10.1103/PhysRevA.68.062303](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevA.68.062303).

## A Proof of lemma 15

**Lemma 25.** *Let  $|\phi\rangle$  be a state of a register  $V$  of qudits,  $Q$  a Pauli operator and fix some  $v \in V$ . If for every measurement  $M \in \mathcal{M}(Q_v)$  of the qudit  $v$  and every  $m \in \mathbb{F}$ , we have*

$$\|\langle m : M | \phi \rangle\| = \frac{1}{\sqrt{d}} \quad (60)$$

*then  $|\phi\rangle$  has a Schmidt decomposition of the form*

$$|\phi\rangle = \sum_{x \in \mathbb{F}} c_x |x : Q\rangle \otimes |\psi_x\rangle, \quad (61)$$

*where  $|x : Q\rangle$  is an eigenvector of  $Q$  associated with eigenvalue  $\omega^x$ , and we take the coefficients  $c_x$  to be real and non-negative.*

*Proof.* Pick some  $M \in \mathcal{M}(Q)$ , we can write

$$|\phi\rangle = \sum_{m \in \mathbb{F}} |m : M\rangle |\phi_m\rangle \quad \text{where} \quad |\phi_m\rangle := \langle m : M | \phi \rangle \quad (62)$$

and  $\|\langle m : M | \phi \rangle\| = \frac{1}{\sqrt{d}}$ .

Letting  $\{|\psi_m\rangle\}$  be the collection of vectors obtained by orthonormalising  $\{|\phi_m\rangle\}$ , we can expand  $|\phi\rangle$  in this basis:

$$|\phi\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{d}} \sum_{m,n \in \mathbb{F}} \Psi_{mn} |m : M\rangle |\psi_n\rangle, \quad \text{and for any } m \in \mathbb{F}, \quad \|\Psi_{m\bullet}\|^2 = 1 \quad (63)$$

where  $\Psi$  is therefore a  $d \times p$  matrix such that  $p$  is the dimension of the subspace of  $\mathcal{H}$  generated by the  $|\phi_m\rangle$  and we denote  $\Psi_{m\bullet}$  the  $m^{\text{th}}$  line vector of  $\Psi$ .

We know that, for every rotation  $U$  in  $SU(d)$  preserving  $Q$  and every  $M$  in  $\mathcal{M}(Q_v)$ ,  $UMU^\dagger$  is also in  $\mathcal{M}(Q_v)$ . The group of all such rotations acts on  $\Psi$  from the left via the Hilbert space representation, and this action is generated by the rotations of the form  $V_M^{-1} R_{k,l}(\xi) V_M$ , where  $V_M$  is the  $d$ -dimensional discrete Fourier transform matrix<sup>3</sup> in the eigenbasis of  $M$ , and  $R_{k,l}(\xi)$  is the diagonal matrix given by  $k \in \mathbb{F}$ ,  $l \in \mathbb{F}^*$  and  $\xi \in \mathbb{R}$ , by

$$R_{k,l}(\xi)_{mm} := \begin{cases} e^{-i\xi} & \text{if } m = k; \\ e^{i\xi} & \text{if } m = k + l; \\ 1 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (64)$$

According to Eq. (60), applying a rotation preserving  $Q$  to  $v$  preserves the outcomes' probabilities. As such, we deduce that the action of rotations  $V_M^{-1} R_{k,l}(\xi) V_M$  on matrix  $\Psi$  will preserve the norm of its line vectors. Namely, for every  $k \in \mathbb{F}$ ,  $l \in \mathbb{F}^*$  and  $\xi \in \mathbb{R}$ ,

$$\|\Psi_{m\bullet}\|^2 = \|(D_{k,l,\xi}\Psi)_{m\bullet}\|^2 \quad \text{where,} \quad D_{k,l,\xi} := V_M^{-1} R_{k,l}(\xi) V_M. \quad (65)$$

Below, we explicit the right side of this equality to find which  $\Psi$  satisfy Eq. (65). First, we compute the transformed matrix' line vectors:

$$(D_{k,l,\xi}\Psi)_{m\bullet} = \Psi_{m\bullet} + \frac{1}{d} \sum_{\alpha \in \mathbb{F}} \Psi_{\alpha\bullet} \left( \phi(k(m-\alpha))(e^{-i\xi} - 1) + \phi((k+l)(m-\alpha))(e^{i\xi} - 1) \right) \quad (66)$$

$$= \Psi_{m\bullet} + P_m^{k,l,1} \sin \xi + P_m^{k,l,2} (\cos \xi - 1) \quad (67)$$

where

$$P_m^{k,l,1} := -\frac{2}{d} \sum_{\alpha \in \mathbb{F}} \Psi_{\alpha\bullet} \omega^{(k+\frac{l}{2})(m-\alpha)} \sin\left(\frac{\pi l}{d}(m-\alpha)\right) \quad \text{and} \quad (68)$$

$$P_m^{k,l,2} := \frac{2}{d} \sum_{\alpha \in \mathbb{F}} \Psi_{\alpha\bullet} \omega^{(k+\frac{l}{2})(m-\alpha)} \cos\left(\frac{\pi l}{d}(m-\alpha)\right). \quad (69)$$

We rewrite Eq. (65) as,

$$\|\Psi_{m\bullet}\|^2 = \|(D_{k,l,\xi}\Psi)_{m\bullet}\|^2 \quad (70)$$

$$= \left\| \Psi_{m\bullet} + P_m^{k,l,1} \sin \xi + P_m^{k,l,2} (\cos \xi - 1) \right\|^2 \quad (71)$$

$$= \|\Psi_{m\bullet}\|^2 + A + B \sin \xi + C \cos \xi + D \cos 2\xi + E \sin 2\xi, \quad (72)$$

from which we deduce:

$$A + B \sin \xi + C \cos \xi + D \cos 2\xi + E \sin 2\xi = 0. \quad (73)$$

---

<sup>3</sup>Explicitely,  $V_M$  is given by  $\langle m : M | V_M | n : M \rangle = \phi(mn)$ .

We specify these five alphabetic constants for our kind reader while emphasizing that only the expression of  $D$  will be used thereafter:

$$A := \frac{3}{2} \|P_m^{k,l,2}\|^2 - 2 \operatorname{Re} \left( \Psi_{m\bullet} P_m^{k,l,2*} \right) + \frac{1}{2} \|P_m^{k,l,1}\|^2, \quad (74a)$$

$$B := 2 \operatorname{Re} \left( \Psi_{m\bullet} P_m^{k,l,1*} \right) - 2 \operatorname{Re} \left( P_m^{k,l,1} P_m^{k,l,2*} \right), \quad (74b)$$

$$C := 2 \operatorname{Re} \left( \Psi_{m\bullet} P_m^{k,l,2*} \right) - 2 \|P_m^{k,l,2}\|^2, \quad (74c)$$

$$D := \frac{1}{2} \left( \|P_m^{k,l,2}\|^2 - \|P_m^{k,l,1}\|^2 \right), \quad (74d)$$

$$E := 2 \operatorname{Re} \left( P_m^{k,l,1} P_m^{k,l,2*} \right), \quad (74e)$$

where  $P_m^{k,l,i*}$  denotes the complex conjugate of  $P_m^{k,l,i}$ .

We know that  $\{\cos(m\xi), \sin(n\xi)\}_{m,n \in \mathbb{N}}$  forms an orthogonal set in the space of periodic functions of period  $2\pi$  with respect to the Hermitian form  $\langle f, g \rangle := \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} f^*(t)g(t)dt$ , and as such, the five alphabetic constants of the left side of Eq. (73) must be zero.

We develop the two terms of the constant  $D$ ,  $\forall m, k \in \mathbb{F}$ ,  $l \in \mathbb{F}^*$ , and obtain:

$$\|P_m^{k,l,1}\|^2 = \frac{4}{d^2} \sum_{\alpha, \alpha' \in \mathbb{F}} \Psi_{\alpha\bullet}^* \Psi_{\alpha'\bullet} \omega^{(k+\frac{l}{2})(\alpha-\alpha')} \cos\left(\frac{\pi l}{d}(m-\alpha)\right) \cos\left(\frac{\pi l}{d}(m-\alpha')\right), \quad (75a)$$

$$\|P_m^{k,l,2}\|^2 = \frac{4}{d^2} \sum_{\alpha, \alpha' \in \mathbb{F}} \Psi_{\alpha\bullet}^* \Psi_{\alpha'\bullet} \omega^{(k+\frac{l}{2})(\alpha-\alpha')} \sin\left(\frac{\pi l}{d}(m-\alpha)\right) \sin\left(\frac{\pi l}{d}(m-\alpha')\right). \quad (75b)$$

Using the addition formulas of trigonometry, we deduce,

$$D = \frac{2}{d^2} \sum_{\alpha, \alpha' \in \mathbb{F}} \Psi_{\alpha\bullet}^* \Psi_{\alpha'\bullet} \omega^{(k+\frac{l}{2})(\alpha-\alpha')} \cos\left(\frac{\pi l}{d}(2m-\alpha-\alpha')\right) = 0. \quad (76)$$

We introduce the following change of variables  $2\beta := \alpha + \alpha'$  and  $2\beta' := \alpha - \alpha'$ , such that we obtain,

$$\forall k, n \in \mathbb{F} \text{ and } l \in \mathbb{F}^*, \quad \sum_{\beta, \beta' \in \mathbb{F}} \omega^{2(k+\frac{l}{2})\beta'} \Psi_{\beta+\beta'\bullet}^* \Psi_{\beta-\beta'\bullet} \cos\left(\frac{2\pi l}{d}(m-\beta)\right) = 0. \quad (77)$$

Now, for any  $l \in \mathbb{F}^*$ , the square matrix given by  $\Omega_{k,\beta'} := \omega^{2(k+\frac{l}{2})\beta'}$  is invertible. As a consequence, we deduce from the previous equation that  $\forall m \in \mathbb{F}$  and  $\forall l \in \mathbb{F}^*$ ,

$$\sum_{\beta \in \mathbb{F}} \Psi_{\beta+\beta'\bullet}^* \Psi_{\beta-\beta'\bullet} \cos\left(\frac{2\pi l}{d}(m-\beta)\right) = 0. \quad (78)$$

Developing the cosine, we obtain

$$\cos\left(\frac{2\pi lm}{d}\right) \sum_{\beta \in \mathbb{F}} \Psi_{\beta+\beta'\bullet}^* \Psi_{\beta-\beta'\bullet} \cos\left(\frac{2\pi l\beta}{d}\right) + \sin\left(\frac{2\pi lm}{d}\right) \sum_{\beta \in \mathbb{F}} \Psi_{\beta+\beta'\bullet}^* \Psi_{\beta-\beta'\bullet} \sin\left(\frac{2\pi l\beta}{d}\right) = 0, \quad (79)$$

from which we deduce, using again the argument used in Eq. (73), that  $\forall l \in \mathbb{F}^*$ ,

$$\sum_{\beta \in \mathbb{F}} \Psi_{\beta+\beta'\bullet}^* \Psi_{\beta-\beta'\bullet} \cos\left(\frac{2\pi l\beta}{d}\right) = 0, \quad (80a)$$

$$\sum_{\beta \in \mathbb{F}} \Psi_{\beta+\beta'\bullet}^* \Psi_{\beta-\beta'\bullet} \sin\left(\frac{2\pi l\beta}{d}\right) = 0. \quad (80b)$$

These equations force the following conclusion: for all  $\beta \in \mathbb{F}$ , the Hermitian product of  $\Psi_{\beta+\beta'\bullet}$  and  $\Psi_{\beta-\beta'\bullet}$  depends only of  $\beta'$ , namely:

$$\Psi_{\beta+\beta'\bullet}^* \Psi_{\beta-\beta'\bullet} = r_{\beta'}. \quad (81)$$

At this point, we define a “Fourier transform” of our line vectors  $\Psi_{m\bullet}$  as

$$\Psi_{\gamma\bullet}^F := \frac{1}{\sqrt{d}} \sum_{m \in \mathbb{F}} \Psi_{m\bullet} \omega^{m\gamma}. \quad (82)$$

This tranformation is invertible as:

$$\Psi_{m\bullet} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{d}} \sum_{\gamma \in \mathbb{F}} \Psi_{\gamma\bullet}^F \omega^{-m\gamma}, \quad (83)$$

so that going back to  $|\phi\rangle$ ,

$$|\phi\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{d}} \sum_{m,n \in \mathbb{F}} \Psi_{mn} |m\rangle |\psi_n\rangle \quad (84)$$

$$= \frac{1}{d} \sum_{m,n \in \mathbb{F}} \left( \sum_{\gamma \in \mathbb{F}} \Psi_{\gamma n}^F \omega^{-m\gamma} \right) |m\rangle |\psi_n\rangle \quad (85)$$

$$= \frac{1}{d} \sum_{m,\gamma \in \mathbb{F}} \omega^{-m\gamma} |m\rangle \sum_{n \in \mathbb{F}} \Psi_{\gamma n}^F |\psi_n\rangle \quad (86)$$

$$= \frac{1}{\sqrt{d}} \sum_{\gamma \in \mathbb{F}} |-\gamma : Q\rangle |\psi_\gamma^F\rangle, \quad (87)$$

where  $|\psi_\gamma^F\rangle := \sum_{n \in \mathbb{F}} \Psi_{\gamma n}^F |\psi_n\rangle$ . Making good use of Eq.(81), we find that for  $\gamma_1, \gamma_2 \in \mathbb{F}$

$$\langle \psi_{\gamma_1}^F | \psi_{\gamma_2}^F \rangle = \sum_{n \in \mathbb{F}} \Psi_{\gamma_1 n}^{F*} \Psi_{\gamma_2 n}^F \langle \psi_n | \psi_n \rangle \quad (88)$$

$$= \sum_{n \in \mathbb{F}} \Psi_{\gamma_1 n}^{F*} \Psi_{\gamma_2 n}^F \quad (89)$$

$$= \frac{1}{d} \sum_{n \in \mathbb{F}} \left( \sum_{m_1, m_2 \in \mathbb{F}} \Psi_{m_1 n}^* \Psi_{m_2 n} \omega^{-m_1 \gamma_1 + m_2 \gamma_2} \right) \quad (90)$$

$$= \frac{1}{d} \sum_{m_1, m_2 \in \mathbb{F}} \left( \sum_{n \in \mathbb{F}} \Psi_{m_1 n}^* \Psi_{m_2 n} \right) \omega^{-m_1 \gamma_1 + m_2 \gamma_2} \quad (91)$$

$$\text{according to Eq. (81),} \quad = \frac{1}{d} \sum_{m_1, m_2 \in \mathbb{F}} r_{\frac{m_1 - m_2}{2}} \omega^{-m_1 \gamma_1 + m_2 \gamma_2} \quad (92)$$

$$= \frac{1}{d} \sum_{\alpha_1, \alpha_2 \in \mathbb{F}} r_{\alpha_2} \omega^{-(\alpha_1 + \alpha_2) \gamma_1 + (\alpha_1 - \alpha_2) \gamma_2} \quad (93)$$

$$\text{summing over } \alpha_1, \quad = \sum_{\alpha_2 \in \mathbb{F}} r_{\alpha_2} \omega^{-\alpha_2 (\gamma_1 + \gamma_2)} \delta_{\gamma_1, \gamma_2}. \quad (94)$$

The family  $\{|\psi_\gamma^F\rangle\}_{\gamma \in \mathbb{F}}$  forms an orthogonal family. Note that, depending on the value of the  $r_\alpha$ , some  $|\psi_\gamma^F\rangle$  can be of norm 0. Nevertheless, whenever the condition of Eq. (60) is

met, we have a valid Schmidt decomposition of  $|\phi\rangle$  of the form

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{d}} \sum_{\gamma \in \mathbb{F}} |-\gamma : Q\rangle |\psi_\gamma^F\rangle. \quad (95)$$

□

**Lemma 26.** *Let  $|\phi\rangle, |\phi'\rangle$  be two states of a register  $V$  of qudits,  $x \in \mathbb{F}^2$  be non-zero and fix some  $n \in N$ . If for every measurement  $M \in \mathcal{M}(x)$  of the qudit  $n$  and every  $m \in \mathbb{F}$ , we have*

$$\langle m : M | \phi \rangle \simeq \langle m : M | \phi' \rangle \quad \text{and} \quad \|\langle m : M | \phi \rangle\| = \frac{1}{\sqrt{d}} = \|\langle m : M | \phi' \rangle\|, \quad (96)$$

then at least one of the following holds:

1.  $|\phi\rangle \simeq |\phi'\rangle$ ;
2.  $|\phi\rangle$  and  $|\phi'\rangle$  are separable and there are  $x, y \in \mathbb{F}$  and  $|\psi\rangle \in \mathcal{H}_{V \setminus \{v\}}$  such that

$$|\phi\rangle = |x : Q\rangle_v \otimes |\psi\rangle \quad \text{and} \quad |\phi'\rangle \simeq |y : Q\rangle_v \otimes |\psi\rangle, \quad (97)$$

where  $|x : Q\rangle$  is the eigenvector of  $Q$  associated with eigenvalue  $\omega^x$ .

*Proof.* Assume that both  $|\phi\rangle, |\phi'\rangle$  have Schmidt rank 1. According to the previous lemma, we can write both states as

$$|\phi\rangle = |x : Q\rangle \otimes |\psi_x\rangle \quad \text{and} \quad |\phi'\rangle = |y : Q\rangle \otimes |\psi'_y\rangle, \quad (98)$$

using Eq. (96),

$$|\psi_x\rangle = \sqrt{d} \langle 0 : M | \phi \rangle = e^{i\alpha} \sqrt{d} \langle 0 : M | \phi' \rangle = e^{i\alpha} |\psi'_y\rangle, \quad (99)$$

and we are clearly in subcase (2) of the main lemma.

Now, assuming the Schmidt rank along the partition  $\{v; V \setminus \{v\}\}$  of both  $|\phi\rangle$  and  $|\phi'\rangle$  is greater than or equal to 2. According to the previous lemma,

$$|\phi\rangle = \sum_{x \in \mathbb{F}} c_x |x : Q\rangle \otimes |\psi_x\rangle \quad \text{and} \quad |\phi'\rangle = \sum_{x \in \mathbb{F}} c'_x |x : Q\rangle \otimes |\psi'_x\rangle. \quad (100)$$

Then, for any  $m, k, l \in \mathbb{F}$ , and any  $\xi \in \mathbb{T}^d$ , we have

$$\langle m : M | \phi \rangle = e^{i\alpha_m} \langle m : M | \phi' \rangle, \quad (101)$$

$$\langle m : M | D_{k,l,\xi} | \phi \rangle = e^{i\beta(k,l,\xi,m)} \langle m : M | D_{k,l,\xi} | \phi' \rangle, \quad (102)$$

where  $D_{k,l,\xi}$  is defined as in Eq. (65) and  $\beta$  is a function of the different parameters which define the rotation. Developing the right-hand side of the previous equation we find

$$\langle m : M | D_{k,l,\xi} | \phi' \rangle = \sum_x c'_x \langle m : M | D_{k,l,\xi} | x : Q \rangle |\psi'_x\rangle \quad (103)$$

$$= \sum_x \left[ \omega^{mx} + \frac{1}{d} \sum_n \omega^{nx} \left( \omega^{k(m-n)} (e^{-i\xi} - 1) + \omega^{(k+l)(m-n)} (e^{i\xi} - 1) \right) \right] c'_x |\psi'_x\rangle. \quad (104)$$

Likewise, for the left-hand side, we have for any  $m, k, l \in \mathbb{F}$ , and any  $\xi \in \mathbb{T}^d$ ,

$$\langle m : M | D_{k,l,\xi} | \phi \rangle \quad (105)$$

$$= \langle m : M | \phi \rangle + \frac{1}{d} \sum_n \left( \omega^{j(m-n)} (e^{-i\xi} - 1) \omega^{(j+k)(m-n)} (e^{i\xi} - 1) \right) \langle n : M | \phi \rangle \quad (106)$$

$$= e^{i\alpha_m} \langle m : M | \phi' \rangle + \frac{1}{d} \sum_n \left( \omega^{j(m-n)} (e^{-i\xi} - 1) \omega^{(j+k)(m-n)} (e^{i\xi} - 1) \right) e^{i\alpha_n} \langle n : M | \phi' \rangle \quad (107)$$

$$= \sum_x \left[ e^{i\alpha_m} \omega^{mx} + \frac{1}{d} \sum_n e^{i\alpha_n} \omega^{nx} \left( \omega^{k(m-n)} (e^{-i\xi} - 1) \omega^{(k+l)(m-n)} (e^{i\xi} - 1) \right) \right] c'_x |\psi'_x\rangle, \quad (108)$$

where we have used Eq. (101) between the first two lines. By identifying components along the orthonormal basis elements  $\{|\psi'_x\rangle\}$  and removing terms where  $c'_x = 0$ , we can write Eq. (102) as

$$\begin{aligned} & e^{i\beta(j,k,\xi,m)} \left( \omega^{mx} + \frac{1}{d} \sum_n \omega^{nx} \omega^{k(m-n)} (e^{-i\xi} - 1) + \frac{1}{d} \sum_n \omega^{nx} \omega^{(k+l)(m-n)} (e^{i\xi} - 1) \right) \\ &= \omega^{mx} e^{i\alpha_m} + \frac{1}{d} \sum_n e^{i\alpha_n} \omega^{nx} \omega^{k(m-n)} (e^{-i\xi} - 1) + \frac{1}{d} \sum_n e^{i\alpha_n} \omega^{nx} \omega^{(k+l)(m-n)} (e^{i\xi} - 1). \end{aligned} \quad (109)$$

Since  $|\phi'\rangle$  has Schmidt rank of at least 2, we can find  $y, z \in \mathbb{F}$  such that  $y \neq z$ ,  $c'_y \neq 0$  and  $c'_z \neq 0$ . For the next part, let  $k = y$  and  $l = z - y$  such that the phase of  $D_{k,l,\xi}$  is applied on the two non-zero components.

From now on, we note  $\beta(\xi, m) := \beta(y, z - y, \xi, m)$ . Taking the coefficients along  $|\psi'_y\rangle$ , we rewrite the previous equation, for any  $\xi \in \mathbb{T}$  and  $m \in \mathbb{F}$ , as

$$\begin{aligned} & e^{i\beta(\xi,m)} \omega^{my} e^{-i\xi} \\ &= \omega^{my} e^{i\alpha_m} + \frac{1}{d} \sum_n e^{i\alpha_n} \omega^{ny} \omega^{y(m-n)} (e^{-i\xi} - 1) + \frac{1}{d} \sum_n e^{i\alpha_n} \omega^{ny} \omega^{z(m-n)} (e^{i\xi} - 1), \end{aligned} \quad (110)$$

taking the coefficients along  $|\psi'_z\rangle$  we extract a different equation,

$$\begin{aligned} & e^{i\beta(\xi,m)} \omega^{mz} e^{i\xi} \\ &= \omega^{mz} e^{i\alpha_m} + \frac{1}{d} \sum_n e^{i\alpha_n} \omega^{nz} \omega^{y(m-n)} (e^{-i\xi} - 1) + \frac{1}{d} \sum_n e^{i\alpha_n} \omega^{nz} \omega^{z(m-n)} (e^{i\xi} - 1). \end{aligned} \quad (111)$$

Finally, for any  $\xi \in \mathbb{T}$  and  $m \in \mathbb{F}$ ,

$$e^{i\beta(\xi,m)} = e^{i\xi} e^{i\alpha_m} + \frac{1}{d} \sum_n e^{i\alpha_n} (1 - e^{i\xi}) + \frac{1}{d} \sum_n e^{i\alpha_n} \omega^{(z-y)(m-n)} (e^{i2\xi} - e^{i\xi}) \quad (112)$$

and

$$e^{i\beta(\xi,m)} = e^{-i\xi} e^{i\alpha_m} + \frac{1}{d} \sum_n e^{i\alpha_n} \omega^{(y-z)(m-n)} (e^{-i2\xi} - e^{-i\xi}) + \frac{1}{d} \sum_n e^{i\alpha_n} (1 - e^{-i\xi}). \quad (113)$$

So, the right sides of both equations are equal. However, we can use again the argument below Eq. (74),  $\{e^{m\xi}\}_{m \in \mathbb{N}}$  is an orthogonal set in the space of periodic functions. As such,



taking the terms in  $e^{2\xi}$  and  $e^\xi$ ,

$$\sum_n e^{i\alpha_n \omega(z-y)(m-n)} = 0 \quad (114a)$$

$$e^{i\alpha_m} - \frac{1}{d} \sum_n e^{i\alpha_n} - \sum_n e^{i\alpha_n \omega(z-y)(m-n)} = 0. \quad (114b)$$

Instantly, we get, for all  $m$ ,

$$e^{i\alpha_m} = \frac{1}{d} \sum_n e^{i\alpha_n} \quad \text{and in particular} \quad e^{i\alpha_m} = e^{i\alpha_0}. \quad (115)$$

We note this common phase  $\alpha$ , and this implies by direct calculation that

$$c_x |\psi_x\rangle = e^{i\alpha} c'_x |\psi'_x\rangle \quad (116)$$

Based on this result, we can conclude that we are in subcase (1) of the lemma:

$$|\phi\rangle = \sum_x c_x |x : Q\rangle \otimes |\psi_x\rangle, \quad (117)$$

$$= \sum_x |x : Q\rangle \otimes (c_x |\psi_x\rangle), \quad (118)$$

$$= \sum_x |x : Q\rangle \otimes (e^{i\alpha} c'_x |\psi'_x\rangle), \quad (119)$$

$$= e^{i\alpha} \sum_x c'_x |x : Q\rangle \otimes |\psi'_x\rangle, \quad (120)$$

$$= e^{i\alpha} |\phi'\rangle, \quad (121)$$

as desired.

We have shown that any choice of  $|\psi\rangle, |\psi'\rangle$  which verify the conditions of equation (96) must fall into either subcase (1) or (2) of the lemma, and we are done.  $\square$

**Lemma 15.** *Let  $(G, I, O, \lambda)$  be an open graph,  $|\phi\rangle, |\phi'\rangle \in (\mathcal{H}^{\otimes V})_1$  and  $R \subseteq V$ . For any  $\mathbf{M} : R \rightarrow U(\mathcal{H})$  such that, for each  $u \in V$ ,  $\mathbf{M}(u) \in \mathcal{M}(\lambda(u))$ , and  $\vec{m} \in \mathbb{F}^R$ , put  $|\vec{m} : \mathbf{M}\rangle = \bigotimes_{r \in R} |m_r : \mathbf{M}(r)\rangle$ . If, for every such  $\vec{m}$  and  $\mathbf{M}$ , we have*

$$\langle \vec{m} : \mathbf{M} | \phi \rangle \simeq \langle \vec{m} : \mathbf{M} | \phi' \rangle \quad \text{and} \quad \|\langle \vec{m} : \mathbf{M} | \phi \rangle\| = \frac{1}{\sqrt{d^{|R|}}} = \|\langle \vec{m} : \mathbf{M} | \phi' \rangle\|, \quad (26)$$

then there is a subset  $L \subseteq R$ ,  $\vec{x}, \vec{y} \in \mathbb{F}^L$  and  $|\psi\rangle \in \mathcal{H}^{\otimes V \setminus L}$  such that

$$|\phi\rangle \simeq |\psi\rangle \bigotimes_{n \in L} |x_n : Q_n\rangle \quad \text{and} \quad |\phi'\rangle \simeq |\psi\rangle \bigotimes_{n \in L} |y_n : Q_n\rangle. \quad (27)$$

*Proof.* The proof proceeds by induction on the size of  $R$ . The case  $|R| = 0$  is trivial, and the case  $|R| = 1$  is lemma 26. Assume the statement is true for some non-empty  $R$ , if  $R = V$  we are done since the induction cannot continue. If this is not the case, pick  $u \in V \setminus R$ . If

$$\begin{aligned} (\langle m : \mathbf{M}(u) | \otimes \langle \vec{m} : \mathbf{M}|_R | \phi \rangle &\simeq (\langle m : \mathbf{M}(u) | \otimes \langle \vec{m} : \mathbf{M}|_R | \phi' \rangle \\ \text{and} \quad \left\| \sqrt{d^{|R|}} (\langle m : \mathbf{M}(u) |_u \otimes \langle \vec{m} : \mathbf{M}|_R | \phi \rangle) \right\| &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{d}} \end{aligned} \quad (122)$$

hold for all  $m \in \mathbb{F}$ , then by lemma 26 we have one of the following cases:

1.  $\langle \vec{m} : \mathbf{M} | \phi \rangle \simeq \langle \vec{m} : \mathbf{M} | \phi' \rangle$  and  $\|\langle \vec{m} : \mathbf{M} | \phi \rangle\| = \frac{1}{\sqrt{d^{|R|}}}$  for any  $\vec{m} \in \mathbb{F}^R$  so that by the induction hypothesis we are done.
2. For each  $\vec{m} \in \mathbb{F}^R$ , there are  $x, y \in \mathbb{F}$  and  $|\psi_{\vec{m}:\mathbf{M}}\rangle \in \mathcal{H}^{\otimes V \setminus \{u\}}$  such that  $\langle \vec{m} : \mathbf{M} | \phi \rangle \simeq |x : Q_u\rangle_u \otimes |\psi_{\vec{m}:\mathbf{M}}\rangle$  and  $\langle \vec{m} : \mathbf{M} | \phi' \rangle \simeq |y : Q_u\rangle_u \otimes |\psi_{\vec{m}:\mathbf{M}}\rangle$ .

In the latter case, make some arbitrary choice of measurements  $\mathbf{M} : R \rightarrow U(\mathcal{H})$ , and expand  $|\phi\rangle$  in their common eigenbases:

$$|\phi\rangle = \sum_{n \in \mathbb{F}} \sum_{\vec{a} \in \mathbb{F}^R} c(n, \vec{a}) |n : Q_u\rangle_u \otimes |\vec{a} : \mathbf{M}\rangle_R \otimes |\phi(a)\rangle. \quad (123)$$

Then in particular, we have that for any choice  $\vec{m} \in \mathbb{F}^R$ ,

$$\langle \vec{m} : \mathbf{M} | \phi \rangle = \sum_{n \in \mathbb{F}} c(n, \vec{m}) |n : Q_u\rangle_u \otimes |\phi(n, \vec{m})\rangle \simeq |x : Q_u\rangle_u \otimes |\psi_{\vec{m}:\mathbf{M}}\rangle, \quad (124)$$

which implies that  $c(n, \vec{m}) = 0$  whenever  $n \neq x$ , and we have  $|\phi\rangle = |x : Q_u\rangle \otimes |\psi_x\rangle$ , where

$$|\psi_x\rangle = \sum_{\vec{m} \in \mathbb{F}^R} c(x, \vec{m}) |\vec{m} : \mathbf{M}\rangle \otimes |\phi(x, \vec{m})\rangle. \quad (125)$$

Similarly  $\langle \vec{m} : \mathbf{M} | \phi' \rangle \simeq |y : Q_u\rangle \otimes |\psi'_y\rangle$ . It follows that for any  $\vec{m} \in \mathbb{F}^R$ , we must have  $\langle \vec{m} : \mathbf{M} | \psi_x \rangle \simeq |\psi_{\vec{m}:\mathbf{M}}\rangle$  and  $\langle \vec{m} : \mathbf{M} | \psi'_y \rangle \simeq |\psi_{\vec{m}:\mathbf{M}}\rangle$ , so that  $\langle \vec{m} : \mathbf{M} | \psi_x \rangle \simeq \langle \vec{m} : \mathbf{M} | \psi'_y \rangle$ . Then, by the induction hypothesis, there is  $L \subseteq R$  and  $\vec{x}, \vec{y} \in \mathbb{F}^{L \cup \{u\}}$  such that  $|\phi\rangle = |\psi\rangle \otimes_{v \in L \cup \{u\}} |x_u : Q_u\rangle$  and  $|\phi'\rangle = |\psi\rangle \otimes_{v \in L \cup \{u\}} |y_u : Q_u\rangle$ , and we are done.  $\square$

## B Proof of lemmas 20-22

**Lemma 20.** *If  $(C, \Lambda)$  is a maximally delayed  $\mathbb{Z}_d$ -flow for an open graph  $(G, I, O, \lambda)$ , then  $\Lambda_0 = O \cup \{u \in V \mid (\forall v \in V) : G_{uv} = 0\}$ , i.e. the union of the outputs and isolated vertices of  $(G, I, O, \lambda)$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $A := O \cup \{u \in V \mid (\forall v \in V) : G_{uv} = 0\}$ , and define a layer decomposition  $\Lambda'$  on  $(G, I, O, \lambda)$  by

$$\Lambda'_k := \Lambda_k \setminus A \quad \text{for } k > 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \Lambda'_0 = \Lambda_0 \cup A. \quad (126)$$

Then it is clear that  $\Lambda'$  is more delayed than  $\Lambda$ . Let  $C'$  be the matrix obtained by replacing, for every isolated vertex  $u \in V$ , the  $u$ -th column of  $C$  by  $C_{uu}1_{\{u\}}$ .

We show that  $(C', \Lambda')$  is an  $\mathbb{Z}_d$ -flow for  $(G, I, O, \lambda)$ .

1. We haven't touched the diagonal elements of  $C$  and have only changed the columns corresponding to isolated vertices. Then

$$(GC')_{uu} = \begin{cases} \sum_v G_{uv} C_{vu} = 0 & \text{if } u \text{ is isolated;} \\ (GC)_{uu} & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}. \quad (127)$$

and condition (i) of the definition is still verified.

2. Since  $C'_{uv} = C_{uv}$  if  $u \in I$  or  $v \in O$ , we have condition (ii) of the definition.

3. For every  $m > n \in \mathbb{N}^*$ ,  $C[\Lambda'_m, \Lambda'_n] = (GC)[\Lambda'_m, \Lambda'_n] = 0$ , since they are submatrices of  $C[\Lambda_m, \Lambda_n] = (GC)[\Lambda_m, \Lambda_n] = 0$ , and  $C[\Lambda'_m, \Lambda'_m], (GC)[\Lambda'_m, \Lambda'_m]$  are diagonal for the same reason. Also,

$$(GC')[\Lambda'_m, \Lambda'_0]_{uv} = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } v \in \Lambda_0 \text{ since otherwise } (C, \Lambda) \text{ is not an } \mathbb{Z}_d\text{-flow;} \\ \sum_{k \in V} G_{uk} C'_{kv} = G_{uu} C_{uu} = 0 & \text{if } v \text{ is isolated;} \\ \sum_{k \in V} G_{uk} C'_{kv} = \sum_{k \in V} G_{uk} C_{kv} = 0 & \text{if } v \in O. \end{cases} \quad (128)$$

Finally, it is clear that  $C'[\Lambda'_0, \Lambda'_0]$  is diagonal if  $C[\Lambda_0, \Lambda_0]$  was, since we have only added zero for outputs or “diagonal” columns for isolated vertices. Therefore we have condition (iii).

As a result,  $(C', \Lambda')$  is an  $\mathbb{Z}_d$ -flow for  $(G, I, O, \lambda)$  that is more delayed than  $(C, \Lambda)$ . This implies that we must have  $A \subseteq \Phi_0$  if  $\Phi$  is maximally delayed.

Now assume there is some  $v \in \Lambda_0 \setminus O$ . We know that  $C[\Lambda_0, \Lambda_0]$  is diagonal and that  $GC[\Lambda_n, \Lambda_0] = \sum_{k \leq |\Lambda|} G[\Lambda_n, \Lambda_k] C[\Lambda_k, \Lambda_0] = G[\Lambda_n, \Lambda_0] C[\Lambda_0, \Lambda_0]$ . If  $C_{uu} \neq 0$ , then for  $GC[\Lambda_0, \Lambda_0]$  to be diagonal and  $GC[\Lambda_n, \Lambda_0] = 0$ , we must have either  $C_{uv} = 0$  or for all  $u \in V$ ,  $G_{uv} = 0$  since then  $(GC)_{uv} = G_{uv} C_{vv}$  must be 0 if  $u \neq v$ . In the latter case,  $v$  is isolated in the graph  $G$ .

In the former case,  $G_{uu} C_{uu} = 0$ , and we have  $(C_{uu}, (GC)_{uu}) = (0, 0)$ . But since  $u$  is not an output, we must have  $(C_{uu}, (GC)_{uu}) = \lambda(u)$ , so that  $(C, \Lambda)$  is not a  $\mathbb{Z}_d$ -flow for  $(G, I, O, \lambda)$ . As a result, there can be no such  $u$  if  $(C, \Lambda)$  is a valid  $\mathbb{Z}_d$ -flow. We conclude that  $\Lambda_0 = O \cup \{u \in V \mid (\forall v \in V) : G_{uv} = 0\}$ .  $\square$

**Lemma 21.** *If  $(C, \Lambda)$  is maximally delayed for  $(G, I, O, \lambda)$ , then*

$$\Lambda_1 = \left\{ u \in O^c \mid \exists c \in \mathbb{Z}_d^{|V|} \text{ s.t. } \begin{array}{l} (c_u, (Gc)_u) = \lambda(u) \\ \forall v \notin O \cup \{u\}, c_v = (Gc)_v = 0 \end{array} \right\}. \quad (53)$$

*Proof.* Let  $(D, \Phi)$  be a maximally delayed  $\mathbb{Z}_d$ -flow for  $(G, I, O, \lambda)$  and define  $c^u$  as the  $u$ -th column of  $D$ . The only elements below the diagonal in column  $v \in \Phi_1$  of  $D$  correspond to  $\Phi_1$  or  $\Phi_0$ . Since  $D[\Phi_1, \Phi_1]$  and  $(GD)[\Phi_1, \Phi_1]$  are diagonal, and  $\Phi_0 = O$  by lemma 20, for any  $v \notin O \cup \{u\}$  we must have  $D_{vu} = c_v^u = 0$  and  $(GD)_{vu} = (Gc^u)_v = 0$ . The condition  $\lambda(u) = (c_u, (Gc)_u)$  itself corresponds to part (iii) of the definition of  $\mathbb{Z}_d$ -flow. As a result, every maximally delayed  $\mathbb{Z}_d$ -flow of  $(G, I, O, \lambda)$  must verify equation (53), and there can be no layer decomposition  $\Phi$  where  $\Phi_1$  is not contained in  $\Lambda_1$ .

Now, assume  $(G, I, O, \lambda)$  is an open graph with  $\mathbb{Z}_d$ -flow, that  $(D, \Phi)$  is a maximally delayed  $\mathbb{Z}_d$ -flow and let  $u \in \Lambda_1 \setminus \Phi_1$ . Let  $E$  be the matrix obtained by replacing the  $u$ -th column of  $D$  by  $c^u$  and permuting the  $u$ -th column to the start of  $\Phi_1$ . Then  $(E, \Psi)$  where

$$\Psi_k := \begin{cases} \Lambda_1 \cup \{u\} & \text{if } k = 1; \\ \Lambda_k \setminus \{u\} & \text{otherwise;} \end{cases} \quad (129)$$

is a more delayed  $\mathbb{Z}_d$ -flow than  $(D, \Phi)$ . As a result, there can be no such  $u$ , so that if  $(D, \Phi)$  is maximally delayed,  $\Phi_1 = \Lambda_1$ .  $\square$

**Lemma 22.** *If  $(C, \Lambda)$  is a maximally delayed  $\mathbb{Z}_d$ -flow of  $(G, I, O, \lambda)$ ,  $(D, \Phi)$  is a maximally delayed  $\mathbb{Z}_d$ -flow of  $(G, I, O \cup \Lambda_1, \lambda|_{(O \cup \Lambda_1)^c})$ , where*

- $D$  is the matrix obtained by replacing the columns of  $C$  corresponding to  $\Lambda_1$  with zeros;

- $\Phi$  is given by

$$\Phi_k := \begin{cases} \Lambda_1 \cup O & \text{if } k = 0; \\ \Lambda_{k+1} & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (54)$$

*Proof.* It is clear that  $(D, \Phi)$  is a layer decomposition, since if it were not, this would imply that  $(C, \Phi)$  is not either.

There cannot be a more delayed  $\mathbb{Z}_d$ -flow of  $(G, I, O \cup \Lambda_1, \lambda)$  since that would immediately imply that there is a layer decomposition of  $(G, I, O, \lambda)$  that is more delayed than  $(C, \Lambda)$ .  $\square$