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#### Abstract

This is the second in a series of "graphical grokking" papers in which we study how stabiliser codes can be understood using the ZX calculus. In this paper we show that certain complex rules involving ZX diagrams, called spider nest identities, can be captured succinctly using the scalable ZX calculus, and all such identities can be proved inductively from a single new rule using the Clifford ZX calculus. This can be combined with the ZX picture of CSS codes, developed in the first "grokking" paper, to give a simple characterisation of the set of all transversal diagonal gates at the third level of the Clifford hierarchy implementable in an arbitrary CSS code.


The ZX calculus [11, 12] is a useful tool for expressing and reasoning about quantum computations. It represents computations, such as quantum circuits or measurement patterns, as certain labelled open graphs called $Z X$ diagrams, subject to a collection of rewrite rules that can be used to transform and simplify diagrams. While the literature tends to talk about "the" ZX calculus, there are actually several calculi of increasing power. One of the simpler versions is what we will call here the Clifford $Z X$ calculus, which is complete for Clifford ZX diagrams, i.e. diagrams whose phase parameters are restricted to integer multiples of $\pi / 2$ [3]. These give a natural generalisation of Clifford circuits, and the Clifford ZX calculus admits many efficient algorithms, e.g. for reducing Clifford diagrams to normal form, equality checking, and computing arbitrary measurement amplitudes. In some sense, it is the graphical counterpart to stabiliser theory (see e.g. [3] [5]), so it gives a natural setting for studying quantum error correction.

However, the Clifford ZX calculus, unlike some of its more powerful counterparts [20, 15] is known to be incomplete for ZX diagrams whose phase are not all multiples of $\pi / 2$. An interesting family of equations that are not provable in the Clifford ZX calculus are the spider nest identities, where elaborate configurations of phase gadgets can collectively cancel out with each other 4. For example, connecting a $\pi / 4$ phase gadget to all $2^{4}-1=15$ non-empty subsets of 4 qubits is equal to the identity:


While this might seem like a very specific and complicated rule, such identities have already been used to great effect for T-gate optimisation, originally in the language of phase polynomials [14, 2] and later explicitly as ZX diagram rules (4).

The starting point for this paper is the observation that all spider nest identities can be succinctly characterised using certain boolean matrices called triorthogonal matrices, which have been applied extensively in the study of transversal gates for quantum error correction codes and magic state distillation [7, 6,
19. This connection is not really new, and could probably best be described as folklore, as it really just explicitly connects the dots between two important results in the literature: the equivalence between T-count optimisation and Reed-Muller decoding [2] and the equivalence between triorthogonal matrices and certain Reed-Muller codewords [19].

We show that the equivalence between spider nest identities and triorthogonal matrices can be made explicit and fully graphical, with the help of the scalable $Z X$ calculus [10]. This extension to ZX notation enables one to work with entire registers of qubits at once to represent arbitrary connectivity between components using boolean biadjacency matrices. Notably, all spider nest equations take a simple form, for some triorthogonal matrix $M$ :

$$
\begin{equation*}
\overbrace{0}^{\overbrace{4}^{4}} M= \tag{2}
\end{equation*}
$$

This graphical form for spider nest identities is particularly handy when used in the context of error correcting codes. As shown in the first "graphical grokking" paper [16], the encoding map of a CSS code can be represented as a ZX diagram in a certain normal form. By "pushing" maps through the encoder, one can compute the effect of a physical map on the logical qubits or vice-versa. Of particular importance for fault-tolerant computation are those logical maps that can be implemented by a transversal operation on the physical qubits, i.e. a tensor product of single-qubit unitaries. Codes with rich sets of transversal logical gates are interesting both for supporting computation on their own encoded qubits and as part of magic state distillation protocols, used to boost (non-universal) fault-tolerant computation in other codes to universality.

Many characterisations of transversal gates exist in the literature for specific classes of gates and/or codes [7, 6, 9, 22, 23]. The one we give here is essentially equivalent to the one given in [24], although we will focus on the third level of the Clifford hierarchy for the sake of simplicity. Namely, for a fixed CSS code, we give a complete classification for the set of transversal gates whose logical action is in $\mathcal{D}_{3}$, the diagonal unitaries on the third level of the Clifford hierarchy. While we focus on $\mathcal{D}_{3}$ here, the method we show translates straightforwardly to $\mathcal{D}_{\ell}$ and phase gadgets with a $\pi / 2^{\ell-1}$ phase, as we will remark in the conclusion. A notable feature of our characterisation is not so much the result itself, but the proof technique, which demonstrates the interplay between the CSS code and the triorthogonal structure. Both of these can be treated uniformly using scalable notation, and the graphical rules allow one to easily see (and hopefully grok) how the stabiliser and non-stabiliser aspects of the computation interact.

## 1 Preliminaries

The basic building blocks of ZX diagrams are spiders, which come in two varieties, $Z$ spiders and $X$ spiders, defined respectively relative to the eigenbases of the Pauli Z and Pauli X operators.

$$
\begin{align*}
& Z_{m}^{n}[\alpha]:=m^{2}\left\{\alpha \vdots n=|0\rangle^{\otimes n}\left\langle\left. 0\right|^{\otimes m}+e^{i \alpha} \mid 1\right\rangle^{\otimes n}\left\langle\left. 1\right|^{\otimes m}\right.\right.  \tag{3}\\
& X_{m}^{n}[\alpha]:=m\left\{\begin{array}{c} 
\\
\vdots \alpha \\
\vdots
\end{array}\right\} n=|+\rangle^{\otimes n}\left\langle+\left.\right|^{\otimes m}+e^{i \alpha} \mid-\right\rangle^{\otimes n}\left\langle-\left.\right|^{\otimes m}\right.
\end{align*}
$$

where $\left\langle\left.\psi\right|^{\otimes m} \text { and } \mid \psi\right\rangle^{\otimes n}$ are the $m$ - and $n$-fold tensor products of bras and kets, respectively, and we take the convention that $(\ldots)^{\otimes 0}=1$. The parameter $\alpha$ is called the phase of a spider. If we omit the phase, it is assumed to be 0 . In addition to spiders, we allow identity wires, swaps, cups, and caps in ZX diagrams, which are defined as follows:

$$
\square:=\sum_{i}|i\rangle\langle i|=\sum_{i j}|i j\rangle\langle j i| \quad\left(:=\sum_{i}|i i\rangle \quad:=\sum_{i}\langle i i|\right.
$$

If all of the angles in a ZX diagram are integer multiples of $\pi / 2$, it is called a Clifford $Z X$ diagram. If not, it is called a non-Clifford ZX diagram. There is a direct translation from Clifford+phase circuits to ZX diagrams, where the resulting diagram is Clifford if and only if the circuit contains no non-Clifford phase gates.


Figure 1: The Clifford ZX-calculus: spider fusion $(\sqrt[s p]{\boldsymbol{p}})$, colour change $(\sqrt[c c]{\boldsymbol{c}}), \pi$-copy $(\sqrt{\pi})$, strong complementarity $(\boldsymbol{s c})$, identity $(\overline{\boldsymbol{i d}})$, H-cancellation $(\overrightarrow{\boldsymbol{h} \boldsymbol{h}})$, and Euler decomposition of $\mathrm{H}(\sqrt{\boldsymbol{e u})}$. Thanks to $(\overrightarrow{\boldsymbol{c c}})$, all rules hold with their colours reversed.

ZX diagrams have the useful property that they are invariant under arbitrary deformations and swapping input/output wires of spiders. This property is sometimes referred to as only connectivity matters. In addition to this "meta-rule", the Clifford $Z X$ calculus consists of the 7 rules shown in Figure 1 Notably, this set of rules is complete for Clifford ZX diagrams. That is, if two Clifford ZX diagrams describe the same linear map, one can transform one into the other using the Clifford ZX calculus. For the Clifford ZX calculus, this transformation is furthermore efficient. Note that we presented here the rules only up to non-zero scalar factor (denoted by $\propto$ ). Scalars will not play an important role in this paper.

In addition to encodings of basic gates, a useful unitary ZX diagram is a phase gadget, which applies a relative phase of $\alpha$ to all of the computational basis states whose bitstring has parity 1 [17]:


Phase gadgets with arbitrary angles applied to arbitrary subsets of qubits form a spanning set for all diagonal unitaries. By restricting phases to integer multiples of $\pi / 2^{r-1}$, we obtain a spanning set for all diagonal unitaries on the $r$-th level of the Clifford hierarchy [13]. For example, we can represent CCZ, on the 3rd level of the Clifford hierarchy as a collection of $\pi / 4$ phase gadgets:


Note that we can write circuits containing multiple phase gadgets compactly by fusing Z-spiders together. Each individual gadget corresponds to a term in the associated phase polynomial $\phi: \mathbb{B}^{n} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, which represents the relative phases of basis elements as $\mathbb{R}$-linear combinations of parity functions. For example, $C C Z$ can be represented as: $C C Z\left|x_{1} x_{2} x_{3}\right\rangle=e^{i \cdot \phi}\left|x_{1} x_{2} x_{3}\right\rangle$ where $\phi\left(x_{1}, x_{2}, x_{3}\right)=\frac{\pi}{4} x_{1}+\frac{\pi}{4} x_{2}+\frac{\pi}{4} x_{3}-\frac{\pi}{4} x_{1} \oplus x_{2}-\frac{\pi}{4} x_{2} \oplus$ $x_{3}-\frac{\pi}{4} x_{1} \oplus x_{3}+\frac{\pi}{4} x_{1} \oplus x_{2} \oplus x_{3}$.

It is also worth noting that phase gadgets applied to the same set of qubits "fuse" in the sense that their angles add together, as a consequence of the rules in Figure 1


This is called the gadget fusion rule [17].

### 1.1 Spider nests and triorthogonal matrices

When non-Clifford angles are assumed to be arbitrary free parameters, we are unlikely to find non-trivial equations between collections of phase gadgets beyond those already provable using the Clifford ZX calculus (cf. [25]). However, if we assume that the non-Clifford angles take specific values, especially values of the form $\pi / 2^{r}$ for some integer $r>1$, more equations hold than just those provable by the Clifford ZX-calculus. An important class of such rules are the spider nest identities [4. These are certain configurations of non-Clifford phase gadgets whose overall action is the identity, up to a global phase.

To understand the collection of all such rules, we should get some structural understanding of what is actually happening. We can do so by looking at a single phase gadget and taking its inverse Fourier transform. A single phase gadget acts on the computational basis as: $\left|x_{1} \ldots x_{n}\right\rangle \mapsto e^{i \alpha \cdot x_{1} \oplus \ldots \oplus x_{n}}\left|x_{1} \ldots x_{n}\right\rangle$. This action is totally determined by its phase polynomial $\phi: \mathbb{F}_{2}^{k} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. There are two useful bases for expressing phase polynomials: the XOR basis and the monomial basis. The XOR basis represents $\phi$ as a real linear combination of functions of the form $f(\vec{x})=\bigoplus_{i \in S} x_{i}$, where $S \subseteq\{1, \ldots, n\}$. The monomial, or "AND" basis consists of functions of the form $g(\vec{x})=\Pi_{i \in S} x_{i}$ for some subset $S \subseteq\{1, \ldots, n\}$.

We can transform from the basis of XOR functions into the basis of AND functions by using the fact that $x \oplus y=x+y-2 x \cdot y$. From this, we can derive the $n$ variable version:

$$
\begin{equation*}
x_{1} \oplus \cdots \oplus x_{n}=\sum_{S \subseteq[n]}(-2)^{|S|-1} \prod_{i \in S} x_{i} . \tag{6}
\end{equation*}
$$

Using Eq. (6) we can rewrite an $\mathbb{R}$-linear combination of XORs into a linear combination of monomials. Note that the prefactor $(-2)^{|S|-1}$ of each term grows as the degree of the monomial increases. In particular, if the coefficient of $x_{1} \oplus \ldots \oplus x_{n}$ is some integer multiple of $\pi / 4$, applying the inverse Fourier transform will result in linear terms whose coefficients are integer multiples of $\pi / 4$, quadratic terms with multiples of $\pi / 2$, cubic terms with multiples of $\pi$, and all terms of degree 4 or more being multiples of $2 \pi$, which will vanish:

$$
\begin{equation*}
e^{i \frac{\pi}{4} x_{1} \oplus \cdots \oplus x_{n}}=\exp \left(i\left(\frac{\pi}{4} \sum_{j} x_{j}-\frac{\pi}{2} \sum_{i<j} x_{i} x_{j}+\pi \sum_{i<j<k} x_{i} x_{j} x_{k}-2 \pi \cdots\right)\right) \tag{7}
\end{equation*}
$$

Hence, each phase gadget corresponds to a collection of $T$ gates (the linear terms), $C S$ gates (quadratic terms) and CCZ terms (cubic terms). A collection of phase gadgets then corresponds to adding together their respective $T, C S$ and CCZ gates. We then see that a collection of phase gadgets implements the identity precisely when all these $T, C S$ and CCZ gates cancel each other out. This happens when each single variable $x_{i}$ occurs $0 \bmod 8$ times $\left(T^{8}=I\right)$, each pair of variables occurs $0 \bmod 4$ times $\left(C S^{4}=I\right)$, and each triple occurs $0 \bmod 2$ times $\left(C C Z^{2}=I\right)$.

We can formalise the cancellation property as follows. Represent a collection of $\pi / 4$ phase gadgets as a set of bit strings $\vec{y}^{1}, \ldots, \vec{y}^{m}$, where $y_{i}^{l}=1$ means the $l$-th phase gadget is connected to the $i$-th wire. Then for the compositions of all $M$ phase gadgets to form an identity they need to satisfy:

$$
\forall i: \sum_{l} y_{i}^{l}=0(\bmod 8) \quad \forall i<j: \sum_{l} y_{i}^{l} y_{j}^{l}=0(\bmod 4) \quad \forall i<j<k: \sum_{l} y_{i}^{l} y_{j}^{l} y_{k}^{l}=0(\bmod 2)
$$

Writing these $\vec{y}$ as the rows of a binary matrix, these conditions specify precisely what it means for the matrix to be triorthogonal, namely that each column, product of pairs of columns and product of triples of columns needs to have a Hamming weight that is a multiple of respectively 8,4 and 2 [19].

Example 1.1. The collection of phase gadgets in the LHS of equation (1) corresponds to the following triorthogonal matrix, whose rows are all the non-zero length 4 bit strings:

$$
\left(\begin{array}{lllllllllllllll}
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1  \tag{8}\\
0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\
0 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 \\
1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 1
\end{array}\right)^{T}
$$

If we instead require the weaker condition that each of these properties holds just modulo 2 , then we get the notion of a semi-triorthogonal matrix. In that case, we can abbreviate the 3 conditions into one, where we no longer require $i, j, k$ to be distinct:

$$
\begin{equation*}
\forall i, j, k: \sum_{l} y_{i}^{l} y_{j}^{l} y_{k}^{l}=0(\bmod 2) \tag{9}
\end{equation*}
$$

These describe collections of phase gadgets that are equal to a Clifford, instead of exactly equal to the identity, because then each $T$ gate occurs doubled up to produce a $T^{2}=S$ Clifford gate, each $C S$ is doubled up to produce $C S^{2}=C Z$ and each CCZ is doubled up to produce an identity.

Remark 1.2. Several inequivalent definitions of the term "triorthogonal" appear in the literature. It is commonly used to describe the weaker condition equation (9), or an even weaker condition that only requires products of pairs and triples of distinct rows to have even Hamming weight. The stronger condition we call triorthogonal is also sometimes called 3-even [23]. Our terminology matches e.g. [18], with the slight difference that we impose conditions on the columns of a matrix rather than the rows, as it will make some calculations simpler.

There is clearly a close relationship between the graphical concept of spider nest identities and the (nongraphical) concepts of triorthogonal matrices and low-degree polynomials. To make this formal, it will be useful to have a bridge between the graphical notation and matrices, which thankfully is provided by the scalable ZX calculus.

### 1.2 The scalable ZX calculus

While plain ZX diagrams are convenient for doing many concrete calculations, it will be convenient when discussing quantum error correcting codes and transversal gates to adopt the scalable $Z X$ notation 10 . This notation enables us to compactly represent operations on registers of many qubits, while still maintaining much of the flavour of calculations with standard ZX diagrams.

We represent a register of qubits as a single thick wire and the product of $n$ (unconnected) copies of a Z or X spider as a bold spider:


In 10, the authors allowed bold spiders to be labelled by lists of phases $\vec{\alpha} \in \mathbb{R}^{n}$, enabling each copy to have a different phase. For our purposes, we won't need this extra generality, so a bold spider labelled by $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$ corresponds to $n$ spiders all with phase $\alpha$. The authors of [10] also introduced explicit maps called dividers and gathers for splitting a register of $m+n$ qubits into two registers of $m$ and $n$ qubits and vice-versa. For our purposes, we will leave these maps implicit. The most important new generator is the "arrow", which allows us to represent arbitrary connectivity from $m$ Z-spiders to $n$ X-spiders using an $n \times m$ biadjacency matrix $A \in \mathbb{F}_{2}^{n \times m}$ :

$$
\begin{equation*}
\xrightarrow{A}:=\bar{\vdots} \underset{-0<-\infty}{\vdots} \tag{10}
\end{equation*}
$$

We will take the convention that $A_{i}^{j}$ represents the entry in the $i$-th column and $j$-th row of the matrix $A$, and $A_{i}^{j}=1$ if and only if the $i$-th Z-spider on the left is connected to the $j$-th X -spider on the right. Concretely, this corresponds, up to scalar factors, to a linear map that acts as $A$ on computational basis vectors:

$$
\xrightarrow{A} \quad:: \quad|\vec{b}\rangle \mapsto|A \vec{b}\rangle
$$

Note that we treat the bitstring $\vec{b}$ as a column vector for the purposes of matrix multiplication.

Spiders and arrows satisfy several rules that will prove useful. First, we have two "copy" laws relating arrows to $\mathrm{Z} / \mathrm{X}$ spiders:


Second, we can express block diagonal matrices in terms of spiders:


## 2 Inductive construction of spider nest identities

We can now use the scalable notation to relate spider nest identities to certain families of triorthogonal matrices. The first thing to note is that for any boolean matrix $M$, we can write the associated $n$-qubit diagonal unitary, composed of a $\pi / 4$ phase gadget for each of the $k$ rows of $M$, as follows:

$$
D_{M}=\int_{n}^{\substack{\frac{\pi}{4}}} M
$$

$M$ has $n$ columns corresponding to the $n$ qubits of $U$ and $k$ rows, corresponding to $k$ phase gadgets. The $i$-th row of $M$ then says which qubits are connected to the $i$-th phase gadget. Hence, a matrix $M$ is triorthogonal if and only if $D_{M}=I$.

Notably, this gives us an infinite family of graphical equations, of the form $D_{M}=I$ for all triorthogonal matrices $M$. In fact, this is precisely the set of all spider nest identities, which we justified by the concrete calculations involving the inverse Fourier transform in Section 1.1 We know by completeness of the Clifford+T ZX calculus [15] that all of these equations are provable by an extended version of the ZX calculus. However, from those rules, it is very difficult to see how one could directly reduce a diagram $D_{M}$ to $I$ for some fixed $M$, and whether that reduction could be done efficiently (i.e. without expanding to a large normal form before reducing back down). Hence, it is interesting to ask just how much we need to add to the simple Clifford rules in Figure 1 in order to prove the entire family of spider nest identities directly. Toward that goal, we will now inductively construct a family of maps that will enable us to generate all the $\pi / 4$ spider nest identities.

Definition 2.1. The spider-nest maps $s_{n}: 1 \rightarrow n$ are constructed inductively as follows:


Intuitively, this inductive definition results in a phase gadget connecting the single input wire to every subset of the output wires. For example:

where the last step follows from unfolding $s_{0}$ and applying spider fusion $(\boldsymbol{s p})$ and the strong complementarity rule $(\sqrt[s c]{ })$ as much as possible.

We now formalise this intuitive explanation of $s_{n}$ using scalable notation. Let $B_{n}$ be the matrix whose $2^{n}$ rows consist of all $n$-bitstrings. That is, the matrix defined inductively as follows:

$$
B_{0}=() \quad B_{n}=\left(\begin{array}{cc}
B_{n-1} & \overrightarrow{0} \\
B_{n-1} & \overrightarrow{1}
\end{array}\right)
$$

where $\overrightarrow{0}$ and $\overrightarrow{1}$ are respectively the column vectors of all 0 's and all 1's.
Theorem 2.2. For all $n$, we have:


Proof. First, note that:


Using this equation and the scalable rules, we can prove 13 from 12 by induction on $n$.
If we connect this $s_{n}$ generator to an X-spider on the left, we obtain the following:

where $\mathbf{1}$ is the matrix where every entry is 1 . We will see in the next section how this map lets us generate all of the spider nest identities.

## 3 Proving all spider nest identities

In this section, we will show that, by adding just one rule to the Clifford ZX calculus, we can prove all spider nest equations. We call this one extra equation the $S_{4}$-rule:

$$
\begin{equation*}
-\sqrt[s]{\mathrm{s}_{4}}=-\frac{\mathrm{O}-}{\stackrel{\mathrm{O}}{\mathrm{O}-}} \tag{14}
\end{equation*}
$$

To get there, we will start by passing to an alternative characterisation for (semi-)triorthogonal matrices, in terms of polynomials of low degree. This result seems to be well-known, and appears in various guises in the literature, e.g. when applying Reed-Muller codes to T-count minimisation or magic state distillation. The version we give here is a variation on one given by Nezami and Haah [19.

Definition 3.1. For a boolean matrix $M$ with $n$ columns, its indicator polynomial $P_{M} \in \mathbb{F}_{2}\left[x_{1}, \ldots, x_{n}\right]$ sends a bitstring $\left(b_{1}, \ldots, b_{n}\right)$ to 1 if and only if that bitstring appears as a row in $M$ an odd number of times.

Theorem 3.2. A matrix $M$ with $n$ columns is semi-triorthogonal if and only if its indicator polynomial $P_{M}$ is of degree at most $n-4$.

The proof is straightforward, but relies on some basic facts about Reed-Muller codes. We give these and the proof of Theorem 3.2 in Appendix A.

Returning to the S 4 rule, we see that, thanks to the inductive definition of $s_{n}$, not only does $s_{4}$ separate, but all $s_{n}$ for $n \geq 4$.

Lemma 3.3. For $n \geq 4$, the Clifford ZX calculus augmented with the S 4 rule implies:

$$
\begin{equation*}
-\sqrt[s_{n} n]{n}=\multimap ०^{n} \tag{15}
\end{equation*}
$$

Proof. By induction on $n$. The base case $n=4$ is (14). For $n>4$, unfold $s_{n}$ using (12) and apply the induction hypothesis.

We can see that if we include $s_{n}$ in a circuit, we obtain:


The lefthand-side above consists of the set of all phase gadgets that are connected to the first $k$ wires and all combinations of the last $n$ wires. Writing these phase gadgets as the rows of a matrix, this is $M=\left(\mathbf{1} B_{n}\right)$. The indicator polynomial of this matrix $P$ satisfies the condition that $P\left(x_{1}, \ldots, x_{n+k}\right)=1$ if and only if $x_{j}=1$ for $j \in\{1, \ldots, k\}$. Hence, it is the monomial $P=x_{1} \ldots x_{k}$. By permuting wires, we can obtain any monomial on $m=k+n$ variables, and as long as the degree $k \leq m-4$, then equation (16) is satisfied.

Theorem 3.4. The Clifford ZX calculus, plus the S 4 rule 14 ) are diagonally complete for Clifford+T ZX diagrams. That is, for any boolean matrices $M, N$, if $\llbracket D_{M} \rrbracket=\llbracket D_{N} \rrbracket$, the $D_{M}$ can be transformed into $D_{N}$ using only the rules in Figure 1 and S4.

Proof. Thanks to the gadget fusion rule (5), it is always possible to cancel rows in $M$ and $N$ from equation $D_{M}=D_{N}$, modulo 8. Hence, up to Clifford ZX rules, proving $D_{M}=D_{N}$ is equivalent to proving $D_{M}=I$. Concretely, $D_{M}=I$ is true if and only if $M$ is triorthogonal. Let $P_{M}$ be its indicator polynomial, which will have degree at most $n-4$ for $n$ the number of qubits. Let $N_{1}, \ldots, N_{k}$ be matrices whose indicator monomials are $P_{1}, \ldots, P_{k}$ for $P_{M}=\sum_{j} P_{j}$. Since these all have degree $\leq n-4$, we can show using the S 4 rule that:


Then, the indicator polynomial of $L$ is $P_{M}+\sum_{j} P_{j}=0$. Hence, every row in $L$ appears an even number of times. Using gadget-fusion, we can therefore reduce all angles to integer multiples of $\pi / 2$ and apply completeness to reduce to the identity.

Remark 3.5. Note that while S 4 makes the ZX calculus diagonally complete for Clifford+T ZX diagrams, it is not complete. To see this, one can check that S 4 is sound for the $\llbracket-\rrbracket \sharp$ interpretation given in [21], hence cannot derive e.g. the supplementarity law for non-Clifford angles 1

One way to think of the Clifford +S 4 ZX calculus is as the ZX analogue of the equational presentation for CNOT-Dihedral circuits of Amy et al [1]. Indeed we can get the following as a corollary of Theorem 3.4.

Corollary 3.6. The Clifford ZX calculus plus S 4 is complete for CNOT+T circuits.
Proof. For CNOT +T circuits $U, V$ where $\llbracket U \rrbracket=\llbracket V \rrbracket$, it suffices to show that $U^{\dagger} V$ can be rewritten to the identity. Using just Clifford rules, it is possible to rewrite any CNOT+T circuit into a layer of phase gadgets $D_{M}$ followed by a CNOT circuit $C$. Since $\llbracket U^{\dagger} V \rrbracket=I$, it must be the case the $\llbracket D_{M} \rrbracket=\llbracket C \rrbracket=I$. Hence, we can use the completeness of phase-free ZX to rewrite $C$ into $I$ and Theorem 3.4 to rewrite $D_{M}$ into $I$.

[^0]
## 4 Characterisation of transversal $\mathcal{D}_{3}$ gates for CSS codes

An $\llbracket n, k, d \rrbracket$ CSS code can be totally defined by fixing $k+r \leq n$ linearly independent vectors in $\mathbb{F}_{2}^{n}$ corresponding to $k$ logical X operators and $r \mathrm{X}$ stabilisers [16]. Letting $L$ and $S$ be the matrices that have these vectors as their columns, the vectors corresponding to the remaining $n-k-r \mathrm{Z}$ checks can be recovered by fixing a basis for $\operatorname{span}(\operatorname{cols}(L) \cup \operatorname{cols}(S))^{\perp}$. Following [16], we can write the encoder for a CSS code as a phase-free ZX diagram. If we choose to write it in Z-X normal form, the encoder consists of a row of Z spiders at the input and a row of X spiders at the output. For each logical operator, an input wire connects to a Z spider, which then connects to X spiders on the output corresponding to the support of the operator. For each X stabiliser, an additional Z spider with no inputs connects to output X spiders, according to the support of the operator. While this is a bit unwieldy to say in words, the encoder can be written in terms of the matrices $L$ and $S$ straightforwardly as follows:


Indeed this corresponds to the linear map that sends basis vectors $|\vec{b}\rangle \in\left(\mathbb{C}^{2}\right)^{\otimes k}$ of the logical space to their associated codewords $\sum_{\vec{c}}|L \vec{b}+S \vec{c}\rangle \in\left(\mathbb{C}^{2}\right)^{\otimes n}$.

Note that diagonal unitaries of the form $D_{P}$ correspond to transversal applications of powers of $T$ gates if and only if the rows of $P$ each have Hamming weight 1 (as $T$ gates are phase gadgets connected to just a single qubit). With this, we are now ready to state our characterisation result.

Theorem 4.1. A CSS code with X-logical operators and X-stabilisers $L$ and $S$ admits a transversal implementation of a gate $D_{H}^{\dagger} \in \mathcal{D}_{3}$ if and only if there exists a matrix $P$ whose rows have Hamming weight 1 such that:

$$
M=\left(\begin{array}{c|c}
H & 0 \\
\hline P L & P S
\end{array}\right)
$$

is triorthogonal.
Proof. First, we will apply the scalable ZX rules to graphically decompose the block form of $M$ :


For $E$ the encoder associated with the CSS code $(L, S)$, the code implements $D_{H}^{\dagger}$ if and only if for some $P$ we have $D_{P} E D_{H}=E$. We begin by "pushing" $D_{P}$ through the encoder:


If $M$ is triorthogonal, the part marked $M$ in the diagram above will vanish and we are left with the encoder $E$. If it is not triorthogonal, then $D_{M} \neq I$. Since $D_{M}$ is diagonal, it follows that $D_{M}|+\ldots+\rangle \neq|+\ldots+\rangle$, so $D_{P} E D_{H}|+\ldots+\rangle \neq E|+\ldots+\rangle$. Hence, $D_{P} E D_{H} \neq E$.

Note if we take $P=I$ (corresponding to a single $T$ gate on each physical qubit), then from any triorthogonal matrix of the form:

$$
M=\left(\begin{array}{c|c}
H & 0 \\
\hline L & S
\end{array}\right)
$$

we can read off a CSS code $(L, S)$ with a transversal implementation of $D_{H}^{\dagger}$. Many notable CSS codes with transversal gates can be seen as instances of this construction. For the examples below we write $R M(k, n)$ for the Reed-Muller code space of polynomials on $n$ variables of degree at most $k$.

Example 4.2. The degree-1 monomial $x_{1} \in \operatorname{RM}(1,5)$ gives the following triorthogonal matrix:

$$
\left(\begin{array}{l|lllllllllllllll}
1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\
\hline 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 \\
0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1
\end{array}\right)^{T}
$$

The matrices $(L, S)$ on the right define a $\llbracket 15,1,3 \rrbracket$ quantum Reed-Muller code. Reading $H$ from the top-left, we see that it has a transversal implementation of $T^{\dagger}$. This property is used as the basis of the original 15-to-1 magic state distillation protocol given by Bravyi and Kitaev [7].

Example 4.3. The constant polynomial $1 \in \operatorname{RM}(0,4)$ gives us a triorthogonal matrix whose columns are all the 4 -bitstrings. If we partition the matrix as follows:

$$
\left(\begin{array}{llllllll|llllllll}
0 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 \\
0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\
\hline 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1
\end{array}\right)^{T}
$$

then $(L, S)$ defines the X-logical operators and X-stabiliers of an $\llbracket 8,3,2 \rrbracket$ colour code, dubbed the "smallest interesting colour code" [8]. In the upper left, we see the phase gadgets of a CCZ gate as in equation (4), hence this code admits a transversal $\mathrm{CCZ}^{\dagger}=\mathrm{CCZ}$.

While Theorem 4.1 gives a complete characterisation for the transversal gates in a CSS code, it is not obvious from the statement whether it can be used to efficiently find such gates. However, following a technique similar to [24], this is in fact possible. In fact, there are three related problems: (1) for fixed logical $H$ find transversal gates $P,(2)$ for fixed $P$ find $H$, and (3) compute a generating set of all logical gates and their associated transversal implementations. All three of these problems can be posed as a system of linear equations over $\mathbb{Z}_{8}$, which as noted in [24], can be solved in polynomial time using the Howell normal form of a matrix over a ring. We sketch this procedure in Appendix B.

## 5 Conclusion

We have shown that spider nest identities can be captured directly in terms of their associated triorthogonal matrices using the scalable ZX calculus. Combining this fact with the graphical encoders for CSS codes introduced in [16] gives us a succinct and easy to digest characterisation for the set of transversal logical gates in $\mathcal{D}_{3}$ supported by a CSS code. The results we have shown here can be straightforwardly extended up the diagonal Clifford hierarchy, from $\mathcal{D}_{3}$ to $\mathcal{D}_{\ell}$. To do this, we can generalise the inductive family $s_{n}$ in Definition 2.1 to $s_{n}^{(\ell)}$, whose base case $s_{0}^{(\ell)}$ has a $\pi / 2^{\ell-1}$ phase. Then the analogue to the S 4 equation is that $s_{\ell+1}^{(\ell)}$ separates. Interestingly, if we assume this equation for any fixed $\ell$, it automatically follows for any $\ell^{\prime} \leq \ell$. The rest of the proof goes through by noting that Theorem 3.2 generalises from triorthogonal to $\ell$-orthogonal matrices and degree $n-\ell-1$ polynomials. Hence, we can prove all spider nest identities up the $\ell$-th level of the Clifford hierarchy just by adding one rule. However, it seems that proving spider nests at all levels of the Clifford hierarchy still requires infinitely many rules. Note that this argument also holds for $\mathcal{D}_{2}$, so that we also characterise all the transversal diagonal Clifford unitaries. The proofs then don't require any additional spider-nest identity since the calculus is already complete for Cliffords.

Natural next steps are looking at non-diagonal transversal gates or non-CSS stabiliser codes. The story for diagonal gates in general stabiliser codes is relatively straightforward, given any stabiliser encoder can be decomposed into a CSS part and a diagonal part (cf. [24], Appendix C). There seems to be a nice graphical story there as well, relating to normal forms of Clifford ZX diagrams, but we leave this, along with further explorations of the graphical structure of non-CSS codes, as future work. It also remains an open question whether Clifford+S4 (or Clifford $+\mathrm{S} \ell$ ) rules can be extended naturally to a complete set of equations for the appropriate class of ZX diagrams. While other complete axiomatisations exist, constructing the rules this way could provide new insights into working effectively with quantum computations at higher levels of the Clifford hierarchy.
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## A Indicator polynomials for triorthogonal matrices

Since it is possible to represent arbitrary functions as polynomials, we can think of a polynomial $P$ in $n$ variables as a vector $[P]$ in $\mathbb{F}_{2}^{2^{n}}$ where $[P]_{\vec{b}}=P(\vec{b})$. By restricting to polynomials of a fixed degree $r$, we obtain certain subspaces called Reed-Muller codes.

Definition A.1. The Reed-Muller code $\operatorname{RM}(r, m)$ is the linear subspace of $\mathbb{F}_{2}^{2^{m}}$ consisting of vectors of the form $[P]$ for some polynomial $P \in \mathbb{F}_{2}\left[x_{1}, \ldots, x_{m}\right]$ of degree $\leq r$.

A classic property of Reed-Muller codes is their orthocomplements are also Reed-Muller codes. This fact will help establish a correspondence with triorthogonal matrices.

Theorem A.2. For any $r<m, \operatorname{RM}(r, m)^{\perp}=\operatorname{RM}(m-r-1, m)$.
Proof. First, we note that if a polynomial $P$ of $m$ variables has degree $<m$, then $\sum_{\vec{b}} P(\vec{b})=0(\bmod 2)$. This is easy to check for monomials, as any monomial of degree $<m$ must omit some variable $x_{j}$, hence

$$
\sum_{\vec{b}} P(\vec{b})=\sum_{\vec{b}, b_{j}=0} P(\vec{b})+\sum_{\vec{b}, b_{j}=1} P(\vec{b})=0(\bmod 2)
$$

The result holds for all polynomials by $\mathbb{F}_{2}$-linearity of the map $[P] \mapsto \sum_{\vec{b}} P(\vec{b})(\bmod 2)$. Now, for any polynomial $P$ of degree at most $r$ and $Q$ of degree at most $m-r-1, P Q$ has degree at most $m-1$. Hence $[P] \cdot[Q]=\sum_{\vec{b}} P Q(\vec{b})=0(\bmod 2)$. This implies $\operatorname{RM}(m-r-1, m) \subseteq \operatorname{RM}(r, m)^{\perp}$. Since $\operatorname{RM}(r, m)$ is spanned by monomials, $\operatorname{dim}(\operatorname{RM}(r, m))=\sum_{d=0}^{r}\binom{m}{d}$. By manipulating binomial coefficients, we can see that:

$$
\begin{gathered}
\operatorname{dim}(\mathrm{RM}(r, m))+\operatorname{dim}(\mathrm{RM}(m-r-1, m)) \\
=\sum_{d=0}^{r}\binom{m}{d}+\sum_{d=0}^{m-r-1}\binom{m}{d}=\sum_{d=0}^{r}\binom{m}{d}+\sum_{d=r+1}^{m}\binom{m}{d}=2^{m}=\operatorname{dim}\left(\mathbb{F}_{2}^{2^{m}}\right)
\end{gathered}
$$

so $\operatorname{RM}(m-r-1, m)=\operatorname{RM}(r, m)^{\perp}$.
This enables us to show that semi-triorthogonal matrices are closely related to Reed-Muller codes. We give a proof here similar to the one given for unital triorthogonal spaces by Nezami and Haah [19].

Theorem A.3. A matrix $M$ with $n$ columns is semi-triorthogonal if and only if its indicator polynomial $P_{M}$ is of degree at most $n-4$.

Proof. Let $M^{\prime}$ be a matrix obtained from $M$ by removing all repeated pairs of rows. $M$ is semi-triorthogonal if and only if $M^{\prime}$ is, and both matrices have the same indicator polynomial. Hence, we can assume without loss of generality that $M$ has no repeated rows.

New, let $M$ have indicator polynomial $P=P_{M}$. Then $Q=x_{j} P$ is a polynomial with the property that $Q(\vec{b})=1$ if and only if $b_{j}=1$ and $P(\vec{b})=1$, hence $\sum_{\vec{b}} Q(\vec{b})$ is equal to the Hamming weight of the $j$-th column. This also works for products of columns: for $R=x_{i} x_{j} x_{k} P, \sum_{\vec{b}} R(\vec{b})$ is equal to the Hamming weight of the element-wise product of the $i, j$ and $k$-th rows. Noting that $\sum_{\vec{b}} R(\vec{b})(\bmod 2)=\left[x_{i} x_{j} x_{k}\right] \cdot[P]$, we see that $[P]$ must be orthogonal to all degree- 3 monomials $\left[x_{i} x_{j} x_{k}\right.$. Since the latter span $\operatorname{RM}(3, n), P \in R M(3, n)^{\perp}$, so by Theorem A. $2 P \in \operatorname{RM}(n-4, n)$.

## B Computing transversal logical operations efficiently

Following a technique similar to [24], we will show that for fixed $(L, S)$ defining a CSS code, we can efficiently calculate matrices $H$ and $P$ making:

$$
M=\left(\begin{array}{c|c}
H & 0 \\
\hline P L & P S
\end{array}\right)
$$

triorthogonal.
To see this, first note that we can span the space of all logical operators $D_{H}^{\dagger}$ using phase gadgets of degree at most 3 , as larger phase gadgets can always be decomposed using spider nest identities [1]. Hence, we can replace $H$ with $Q K$, where $Q$ is a matrix whose rows all have Hamming weight 1 , and $K$ has $O\left(k^{3}\right)$ rows consisting of all bitstrings of Hamming weight $\leq 3$. Thus $M$ becomes:

$$
M=\left(\begin{array}{c|c}
Q K & 0 \\
\hline P L & P S
\end{array}\right)
$$

Since the order of rows in $M$ is not relevant, the only function of $P$ and $Q$ is to fix the multiplicity of rows in the matrix:

$$
N=\left(\begin{array}{c|c}
K & 0 \\
\hline L & S
\end{array}\right)
$$

Suppose $N$ is an $m \times n$ matrix. Form a new matrix $\widehat{N}$ over $\mathbb{Z}_{8}$ whose columns are labelled by the rows of $N$ and whose rows are labelled by all sets of at most 3 columns of $N$. Then let:

$$
\widehat{N}_{S, i}= \begin{cases}2^{|S|-1} & \text { if } \forall j \in S \cdot N_{i, j}=1 \\ 0 & \text { otherwise }\end{cases}
$$

In other words, the $i$-th column of $\mathcal{M}$ corresponds to the inverse Fourier transform of the $j$-th row of $N$. Our goal is to find multiplicities for the rows of $N$ such that the sum of the inverse Fourier transform of each
phase gadget adds to $0(\bmod 8)$ on all sets of 1,2 , or 3 qubits. In other words, we should find a multiplicity vector $\vec{m} \in \mathbb{Z}_{8}^{m}$ such that $\widehat{N} \vec{m}=\mathbf{0}$.

Given a multiplicity vector $\vec{m}$, we can make $N$ into a triorthogonal matrix $M$ by repacing each row $i$ with $\vec{m}_{i}$ copies of that row. The set of all multiplicity vectors making $N$ into a triorthogonal matrix is therefore the kernel of $\widehat{N}$.

As noted in [24], we can find a generating set for the kernel of a $\mathbb{Z}_{8}$ matrix in polynomial time using its Howell normal form. Similarly, we can fix multiplicities of the upper or lower half of the matrix and obtain an associated inhomogeneous system of equations, which can also be solved in polynomial time.


[^0]:    ${ }^{1}$ Thanks to Richie Yeung for pointing this out.

