

# Lower bound the T-count via unitary stabilizer nullity

Jiaqing Jiang<sup>1,2,\*</sup> and Xin Wang<sup>1,†</sup>

<sup>1</sup>*Institute for Quantum Computing, Baidu Research, Beijing 100193, China*

<sup>2</sup>*Computing and Mathematical Sciences, California Institute of Technology, Pasadena, CA USA*

(Dated: October 25, 2021)

We introduce magic measures for multi-qubit quantum gates and establish lower bounds on the non-Clifford resources for fault-tolerant quantum computation. First, we introduce the stabilizer nullity of an arbitrary multi-qubit unitary, which is based on the subgroup of the quotient Pauli group associated with the unitary. This unitary stabilizer nullity extends the state stabilizer nullity by Beverland *et al.* to a dynamic version. We in particular show this magic measure has desirable properties such as sub-additivity under composition and additivity under tensor product. Second, we prove that a given unitary's stabilizer nullity is a lower bound for the T-count, utilizing the above properties in gate synthesis. Third, we compare the state and the unitary stabilizer nullity, proving that the lower bounds for the T-count obtained by the unitary stabilizer nullity are never less than the state stabilizer nullity. Moreover, we show an explicit  $n$ -qubit unitary family of unitary stabilizer nullity  $2n$ , which implies that its T-count is at least  $2n$ . This gives an example where the bounds derived by the unitary stabilizer nullity strictly outperform the state stabilizer nullity by a factor of 2. We further connect the unitary stabilizer nullity and the state stabilizer nullity with auxiliary systems, showing that adding auxiliary systems and choosing proper stabilizer states can strictly improving the lower bound obtained by the state stabilizer nullity.

## Contents

<b>I. Introduction</b>	2
<b>II. Preliminary</b>	4
A. Notations	4
B. Pauli function	5
C. Stabilizer nullity	6
<b>III. Basic properties</b>	7
A. Basic properties of the unitary Pauli function	7
B. Basic properties of the unitary stabilizer nullity	10
<b>IV. Applications</b>	13
A. Lower bounds for the T-count	13
B. Comparison between the unitary and state stabilizer nullity	14
C. Explicit expressions of the unitary stabilizer nullity for unitary families	18
D. Adding auxiliary systems improves the state stabilizer nullity	19
<b>V. Discussions</b>	22
<b>References</b>	23

---

\*Electronic address: [jiaqingjiang95@gmail.com](mailto:jiaqingjiang95@gmail.com)

†Electronic address: [wangxin73@baidu.com](mailto:wangxin73@baidu.com)

<b>A. Equivalence between the definitions of the state stabilizer nullity</b>	24
<b>B. Non-Clifford resources in two computational models</b>	25
1. Two computation models	25
2. Non-Clifford resources used in the two models	26
3. Relation between number of non-Clifford resources in two models	26
<b>C. Clarification on properties of the state stabilizer nullity</b>	27
1. Corollary 23 does not violate properties of the state stabilizer nullity	27
2. The state stabilizer nullity does not satisfy the sub-additivity under composition	27
3. Non-decreasing of state stabilizer nullity with higher-dimensional systems	28
<b>D. The transpose trick</b>	28

## I. INTRODUCTION

A quantum circuit comprised of only Clifford gates confers no computational advantage since it can be efficiently simulated on a classical computer [1, 2]. However, the addition of T gates into Clifford circuits [3, 4] can achieve universal quantum computation.

The minimum number of T gates used, or the *T-count*, plays an important role in quantum computation. In the theoretical study of classically simulating quantum computation, T-count serves as a quantifier of difficulty for such simulation in many algorithms [5–7]. It is shown that quantum circuits composed of Clifford gates and  $t$  T gates can be simulated on a classical computer in time which is exponential in  $t$  [5]. On the other hand, in the framework of fault-tolerant quantum computation [8, 9], T-count dominates the cost of computation. This is because in many promising fault-tolerant architectures, the Clifford gates can be implemented transversely [10] and the required T gate for universality can be performed via state injection [8, 11]. The key of this resolution is to perform magic-state distillation [9, 12], which is a resource-intensive subroutine with a costly overhead [12, 13] (see [14–21] for recent progress). To better realize quantum computation, there are many algorithms aim to reduce the number of T gates in the implementation of a given unitary operator [22–25], providing a better upper bound for its T-count.

This work aims to study lower bounds for the T-count and identify the magic resources required for quantum computation. Specifically, for a given  $n$ -qubit unitary  $U$ , write  $t(U)$  as the minimum number of T gates among all implementation of  $U$  over the Clifford+T gate set, i.e., the T-count equals  $t(U)$ . The task is to calculate a quantity  $v(U)$  such that  $v(U) \leq t(U)$ . A good lower bound is a  $v(U)$  which is as large as possible, and the time complexity for computing  $v(U)$  is as small as possible. From the theoretical perspective, the explicit expressions of  $v(U)$  for some  $n$ -qubit unitary families are useful and desirable. For the decision version of the lower bound task, Gosset *et al.* [25] gives an algorithm which for any integer  $m$  and  $n$ -qubit unitary  $U$ , it decides whether the T-count for  $U$  is less than  $m$ , with both time and space complexity of  $O(2^{nm} \text{poly}(m, 2^n))$ . Although this algorithm can be used to calculate the exact value of the T-count, the time complexity is quite high. For even linear  $m$ , such as  $m = n$ , the complexity will scale as  $O(2^{cn^2})$  for some constant  $c$ . Other methods for deriving lower bounds for the T-count are mostly based on magic monotones. Those magic monotones are primarily designed for quantifying the non-Clifford resources for constructing quantum states, such as quantifying the number of the magic state  $|T\rangle$  needed for constructing a given state  $|\psi\rangle$ . Those magic monotones could also naturally induce a lower bound for the T-count for a given unitary. Note that due to the adaptive operations allowed in the model of computation with magic states, which are not allowed in the model of computation with unitary, the lower bound of the T-count for  $U$  induced by those

magic monotones can be strictly smaller than the T-count for  $U$  [25–27]. This subtle distinction is clarified in Appendix B.

The relevant magic monotones can be summarized as follows. For a pure state  $|\psi\rangle$ , The stabilizer rank [7] is defined as the minimum number of non-zero coefficients when decomposing  $|\psi\rangle$  onto a linear combination of stabilizer states. The stabilizer extent [7, 28] is defined as the square of the minimum  $l_1$ -norm of the above coefficients. It relates to the approximate stabilizer rank, that is the stabilizer rank of states which approximate  $|\psi\rangle$  within given precision. The robustness of magic [26] is also related to the minimum  $l_1$ -norm but can be generalized to mixed states. The channel robustness and magic capacity [29] are closely related to the robustness of magic. They can be used for quantifying the non-Clifford resources for multi-qubit operations. All of the above magic monotones are more or less involving optimization over the set of stabilizer states, and thus are costly to compute since the cardinality of stabilizer states increases as  $2^{(1/2+o(1))n^2}$  [2]. Moreover, since they involve optimization, it's hard to derive explicit expressions for those magic monotones for  $n$ -qubit unitary families. Beyond the magic monotones based on optimization, Beverland *et al.* [30] proposed the state stabilizer nullity based on quantities related to the Pauli group. More specifically, let  $s(|\psi\rangle)$  be the size of the stabilizer of  $|\psi\rangle$ , where the stabilizer is the subgroup of the Pauli group for which  $|\psi\rangle$  is a +1 eigenvector, the state stabilizer nullity of  $|\psi\rangle$  is defined as  $v_s(|\psi\rangle) = n - \log_2 s(|\psi\rangle)$ . In general, the state stabilizer nullity can be computed in time  $O(2^{4n})$ . Moreover, for some important unitary families, the explicit expressions of their state stabilizer nullity can be easily computed. An example is showing that the  $n$ -qubit Toffoli gate is of state stabilizer nullity  $n$ , implying that implementing such a gate needs at least  $n$   $|T\rangle$  states or  $T$  gates. The state stabilizer nullity is originally defined for quantifying non-Clifford resources for constructing states, although it can be used to derive lower bounds for the T-count for unitaries, a “unitary stabilizer nullity” is desirable for better quantifying the magic and estimate the T-count of multi-qubit gates. It's unclear and non-trivial to generalize the definition from states to unitaries. Beyond all the above, there are also magic monotones defined for qudit systems of odd prime dimension, which can not be directly used for qubit systems [21, 31].

In this work, we define the unitary stabilizer nullity. Instead of counting the operators in the Pauli group which stabilize  $|\psi\rangle$ , for a target  $U$  we count the  $\pm 1$ s in the Pauli transfer matrix [32]. In other words, we calculate the size of the intersection between  $UP_nU^\dagger$  and  $\mathcal{P}_n$ , where  $\mathcal{P}_n$  is the quotient Pauli group, that is the Pauli group modulo phases. Denoting the size as  $s(U)$ , the unitary stabilizer nullity is defined as  $v(U) = 2n - \log_2 s(U)$ . Intuitively,  $s(U)$  quantifies the similarity between  $U$  and Clifford unitaries, where for Clifford unitary  $U$ ,  $s(U) = 4^n$ . To use  $v(\cdot)$  to derive a lower bound for the T-count, we prove two key properties:  $v(\cdot)$  satisfies faithfulness, i.e.  $v(U) \geq 0$  for any  $U$ ,  $v(U) = 0$  iff  $U$  is Clifford, and subadditivity under composition, i.e.  $v(U \cdot V) \leq v(U) + v(V)$  or equivalently,  $s(U)s(V) \leq 4^n s(UV)$ . We further apply these properties to establish the lower bound for the T-count.

We then compare the lower bounds of the T-count obtained by the state stabilizer nullity and the unitary stabilizer nullity. We show that the bound given by the unitary stabilizer nullity will never be smaller than the bound given by the state stabilizer nullity, that is  $v(U) \geq v_s(U|\phi\rangle)$ , for any stabilizer state  $|\phi\rangle$ . We also prove that for any diagonal  $U$ ,  $v(U) = v_s(U|+\rangle^{\otimes n})$ , which in turn shows that for any diagonal  $U$ , the maximum lower bound obtained by the state stabilizer nullity, i.e.,  $v_s(U|\phi\rangle)$  for some stabilizer state  $|\phi\rangle$ , is achieved by  $|\phi\rangle = |+\rangle^{\otimes n}$ . Moreover, we give an explicit  $n$ -qubit unitary family which has unitary stabilizer nullity  $2n$ . Since the state stabilizer nullity is always less than  $n$ , such a unitary family illustrates that the lower bound of the T-count given by the unitary stabilizer nullity can be strictly better than the bound given by the state stabilizer nullity by a factor of 2.

In general, the unitary stabilizer nullity can be computed in time  $O(2^{7n})$ , which is less than  $O(2^{(1/2+o(1))n^2})$  but still costly. However, as mentioned above, for certain  $n$ -qubit unitary families

the explicit expressions of the unitary stabilizer nullity can be easily computed. We believe this property will make it useful in the theoretical study. At the technical level, most of the proofs are based on connecting  $s(U)$  to certain subgroups and applying the Lagrangian theorem [33] and its variants, deriving relationships between the sizes of subgroups. Based on the group theory, an interesting fact is that unlike other magic monotones, both the state and the unitary stabilizer nullity are always integers. Note that since the unitary stabilizer nullity is bounded by  $2n$ , the lower bound for T-count it gives is up to  $2n$ .

Finally, we connect the unitary stabilizer nullity and the state stabilizer nullity with auxiliary systems. Specifically, We prove that  $v(U)$  equals the best bound one can obtain by the state stabilizer nullity with auxiliary systems. That is for any  $d$ -qubit auxiliary system, for any  $(d + n)$ -qubit stabilizer state  $|\psi\rangle$ , we have  $v(U) \geq v_s((I_{2^d} \otimes U)|\psi\rangle)$ . In particular, we show that  $v(U) = v_s((I_{2^n} \otimes U)|\phi\rangle)$  where  $|\phi\rangle$  is the  $2n$ -qubit maximally entangled state.

*Outline and main contributions* The outline and main contribution of this paper can be summarized as follows:

- In section II, we set the notations and introduce the unitary stabilizer nullity.
- In section III, we prove basic properties of the unitary stabilizer nullity, that is faithfulness, invariance under Clifford operations, and additivity under tensor product. Moreover, we show that the unitary stabilizer nullity satisfies the sub-additivity under composition.
- In section IV, we show that the unitary stabilizer nullity can derive a lower bound of the T-count for a given unitary  $U$ . We also compare the lower bound obtained by the unitary and the state stabilizer nullity. We prove that the bound by the unitary stabilizer nullity will never perform worse than the state stabilizer nullity. Moreover, we show that there is an explicit  $n$ -qubit unitary family of unitary stabilizer nullity  $2n$ , illustrating our bounds can strictly outperform the state stabilizer nullity. Besides, for diagonal unitaries, we prove our bounds coincide with the state stabilizer nullity. Finally, we connect the unitary stabilizer nullity with the state stabilizer nullity with auxiliary systems.
- Finally in Section V, we summarize and discuss open problems.

## II. PRELIMINARY

### A. Notations

In this part, we set the notations. We use  $i$  as the imaginary number. We use  $\mathbb{C}$  as the complex field,  $\mathbb{N}^+$  as the positive integers. For a complex number  $\lambda$ , we use  $\lambda^\dagger$  as its conjugate,  $|\lambda|$  as its norm. Let  $A, B$  be two subgroups of a group  $G$ , we use  $A \times B$  as the set  $A \times B := \{ab | a \in A, b \in B\}$ . Note that when  $G$  is Abelian,  $A \times B$  is a subgroup of  $G$ . For any  $n$ -bit string  $\mathbf{x} \in \{0, 1\}^n$ , we use  $\odot(\mathbf{x})$  as the product  $x_1 x_2 \dots x_n$ . We use  $1^n$  as the  $n$ -bit string of all ones. Given two strings  $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in \{0, 1\}^n$ , we use  $\mathbf{x} \cdot \mathbf{y}$  as their inner product,  $\mathbf{x} \oplus \mathbf{y}$  as their bitwise XOR operation. We abbreviate  $x \in \{-1, +1\}$  as  $x = \pm 1$ . We use  $I_d$  as the  $d$ -dimensional identity matrix. We abbreviate  $I_d$  as  $I$  when  $d$  is clear in the context. We write the state  $\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|0\rangle + |1\rangle)$  as  $|+\rangle$ . For a matrix  $U$ , we use  $U^T$  as its transpose,  $U^\dagger$  as its transpose conjugate. For integer  $d, k$ , we use  $d|k$  to denote  $d$  is a factor of  $k$ . We abbreviate “with respect to” as “w.r.t”.

We use  $[n]$  as the set  $\{0, 1, \dots, n-1\}$ . We use  $4^{[n]}$  as the set of length- $n$  strings with alphabet  $[4]$ , i.e.  $4^{[n]} := \{0, 1, 2, 3\}^n$ . We represent Pauli operators as

$$\sigma_0 = I_2 = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}, \sigma_1 = X = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \sigma_2 = Y = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & -i \\ i & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \sigma_3 = Z = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 \end{bmatrix} \quad (1)$$

We write Phase gate (S), T gate (T) and Hadamard gate (H) as

$$S = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & i \end{bmatrix}, T = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & e^{\frac{\pi i}{4}} \end{bmatrix}, H = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 1 & -1 \end{bmatrix}, \quad (2)$$

The CNOT gate is the two qubit control not gate, i.e.  $CNOT|x_1\rangle|x_2\rangle = |x_1\rangle|x_1 \oplus x_2\rangle$ . The  $C^{n-1}Z$  is the multi-controlled Z gate, i.e.  $C^{n-1}Z|x_1\dots x_n\rangle = (-1)^{x_1x_2\dots x_n}|x_1\dots x_n\rangle$ .

The 1-qubit Pauli group is the group generated by the Pauli operators, i.e.  $\hat{\mathcal{P}}_1 = \{i^k \sigma_h | k, h \in [4]\}$ . The  $n$ -qubit Pauli group is defined to be the  $n$ -fold tensor product of the 1-qubit Pauli group, i.e.  $\hat{\mathcal{P}}_n := \hat{\mathcal{P}}_1^{\otimes n}$ . In the following, we are uninterested in the overall phases. We define the 1-qubit Pauli group modulo phases to be

$$\mathcal{P}_1 = \hat{\mathcal{P}}_1 / \{i^k I_2 | k \in [4]\} = \{\sigma_h | h \in [4]\}. \quad (3)$$

where the last equality means we use  $\sigma_h$  as a representative of elements in  $\{i^k \sigma_h | k \in [4]\}$ . Similarly, we define the  $n$ -qubit Pauli group modulo phases, or the  $n$ -qubit quotient Pauli group, to be

$$\mathcal{P}_n := \mathcal{P}_1^{\otimes n} = \{\sigma_h | h \in [4]\}^{\otimes n} \quad (4)$$

Notice that  $\mathcal{P}_n$  is an Abelian group w.r.t matrix product modulo phases. We have  $|\mathcal{P}_1| = 4$  and  $|\mathcal{P}_n| = 4^n$  where  $|\cdot|$  is the size of the group. Elements in  $\mathcal{P}_n$  can be represented by a string  $\mathbf{u} \in 4^{[n]}$ , that is

$$\sigma_{\mathbf{u}} = \otimes_{k=1}^n \sigma_{\mathbf{u}_k}. \quad (5)$$

The  $n$ -qubit Clifford group  $\mathcal{C}_n$  is the set of  $n$ -qubit unitary  $U$  which maps Pauli group to Pauli group, i.e.  $U\hat{\mathcal{P}}_nU^\dagger = \hat{\mathcal{P}}_n$ . An  $n$ -qubit state  $|\psi\rangle$  is called a stabilizer state if  $|\psi\rangle = U|0\rangle^{\otimes n}$  for some  $U \in \mathcal{C}_n$ . One can verified that  $U\mathcal{P}_nU^\dagger = \mathcal{P}_n$ , w.r.t matrix product modulo phases. In the following context, when involving the quotient group  $\mathcal{P}_n$ , we always assume the operation is matrix product modulo phases.

For a given unitary  $U$ , we define its T-count  $t(U)$  as the minimum number of T gates required when decomposing  $U$  into a sequence of gates over Clifford plus T gate set, without auxiliary qubits and measurement. Here we view Clifford gates, or Clifford unitaries, as free resources. More clarifications can be seen in the quantum computation with unitary part in Appendix B. If  $U$  cannot be exactly synthesized by Clifford plus T gate set, we denote its T-count as  $+\infty$ .

## B. Pauli function

In this part, we introduce the state Pauli function and the unitary Pauli function, which are the basic elements for defining the state and the unitary stabilizer nullity. We emphasize that those functions have been used in previous works — The state Pauli function is used in the Pauli spectrum [30], and the unitary Pauli function is used in the Pauli transfer matrix [32]. We name them as the Pauli functions in order to unify the framework of the state and the unitary stabilizer nullity, and to better analyze their properties.

**Definition 1 (State Pauli function)** For  $\mathbf{u} \in 4^{[n]}$ , the Pauli function of an  $n$ -qubit pure state  $|\psi\rangle$  is defined as

$$P_{|\psi\rangle}(\mathbf{u}) := \text{Tr} |\psi\rangle\langle\psi| \sigma_{\mathbf{u}}. \quad (6)$$

**Definition 2 (Unitary Pauli function)** For  $\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v} \in 4^{[n]}$ , the Pauli function of an  $n$ -qubit unitary  $U$  is defined as

$$P_U(\mathbf{u}|\mathbf{v}) = \text{Tr}(\sigma_{\mathbf{u}}U\sigma_{\mathbf{v}}U^\dagger)/2^n. \quad (7)$$

The matrix whose  $(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v})$ -th element is  $P_U(\mathbf{u}|\mathbf{v})$  is known to be the Pauli transfer matrix of  $U$  [32]. Note that both the state and the unitary Pauli functions take values in  $[-1, 1]$ . A useful fact is that for a given  $n$ -qubit unitary  $U$  and Pauli operator  $\sigma_{\mathbf{v}}$ , we have

$$U\sigma_{\mathbf{v}}U^\dagger = \sum_{\mathbf{u}} P_U(\mathbf{u}|\mathbf{v})\sigma_{\mathbf{u}}. \quad (8)$$

To analyze the properties of the unitary Pauli function, we connect  $U$  to a subgroup of the quotient Pauli group.

**Definition 3 (Subgroup associated with  $U$ )** Given an  $n$ -qubit unitary  $U$ , we define the subgroup associated with  $U$  to be

$$\mathcal{P}_U := U\mathcal{P}_nU^\dagger \cap \mathcal{P}_n \quad (9)$$

One can verify that  $\mathcal{P}_U$  is a subgroup of  $\mathcal{P}_n$ . It is worth noting that  $U\mathcal{P}_UU^\dagger$  may **not** be equal to  $\mathcal{P}_U$ , and  $\mathcal{P}_U$  is **not**  $U\mathcal{P}_nU^\dagger$ .

### C. Stabilizer nullity

In this part, we give the definitions of the state stabilizer nullity and the unitary stabilizer nullity.

**Definition 4 (State stabilizer nullity [30])** For an  $n$ -qubit state  $|\psi\rangle$ , the stabilizer nullity of  $|\psi\rangle$  is defined as

$$v_s(|\psi\rangle) := n - \log_2 s(|\psi\rangle), \quad (10)$$

where  $s(|\psi\rangle)$  is equal to the number of  $\pm 1$ s in the Pauli function of  $|\psi\rangle$  when varying  $\mathbf{u} \in 4^{[n]}$ .

By definition, the state stabilizer nullity is at most  $n$ .

**Definition 5 (Unitary Stabilizer nullity)** For an  $n$ -qubit unitary  $U$ , the stabilizer nullity of  $U$  is defined as

$$v(U) := 2n - \log_2 s(U) \quad (11)$$

where  $s(U)$  is equal to the number of  $\pm 1$ s in the Pauli function of  $U$  when varying  $\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v} \in 4^{[n]}$ .

Note that Beverland *et al* [30] originally defines the state stabilizer nullity as  $\nu(|\psi\rangle) = n - \log_2 |\text{Stab } |\psi\rangle|$ , where  $\text{Stab } |\psi\rangle = \{P \in \hat{\mathcal{P}}_n : P|\psi\rangle = |\psi\rangle\}$ , that is  $\text{Stab } |\psi\rangle$  is the subgroup of the Pauli group  $\hat{\mathcal{P}}_n$  for which  $|\psi\rangle$  is a  $+1$  eigenvector. Definition 4 is equivalent to Beverland's definition, that is  $v_s(|\psi\rangle) = \nu(|\psi\rangle)$ , as illustrated in Appendix A.

For any stabilizer state  $|\psi\rangle$ , Beverland *et al* [30] shows that  $v_s(|\psi\rangle) = 0$ . For any Clifford unitary  $U$ , one can verify that  $v(U) = 0$  by Lemma 1.

### III. BASIC PROPERTIES

#### A. Basic properties of the unitary Pauli function

We firstly analyze the basic properties of the unitary Pauli function. Roughly speaking, the unitary Pauli function measures the similarity between  $U$  and the Clifford operators, where the similarity is quantified by how well the map  $U(\cdot)U^\dagger$  keeps the Pauli group invariant. To see this intuition, we prove some basic properties of the unitary Pauli function.

**Lemma 1** *If  $U$  is an  $n$ -qubit Clifford unitary, for  $\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v} \in 4^{[n]}$ ,*

- *for every  $\mathbf{u}$ , there is only one  $\mathbf{v}$  such that  $P_U(\mathbf{u}|\mathbf{v}) = \pm 1$ , and for all  $\mathbf{v}' \neq \mathbf{v}$ ,  $P_U(\mathbf{u}|\mathbf{v}') = 0$ .*
- *for every  $\mathbf{v}$ , there is only one  $\mathbf{u}$  such that  $P_U(\mathbf{u}|\mathbf{v}) = \pm 1$ , and for all  $\mathbf{u}' \neq \mathbf{u}$ ,  $P_U(\mathbf{u}'|\mathbf{v}) = 0$ .*

**Proof.** We only give proof to the first statement, the second is similar. Recall that

$$P_U(\mathbf{u}|\mathbf{v}) = \text{Tr}(\sigma_{\mathbf{u}}U\sigma_{\mathbf{v}}U^\dagger)/2^n \quad (12)$$

$$\text{Tr}(\sigma_{\mathbf{u}}\sigma_{\mathbf{v}}) = \begin{cases} 2^n, & \text{if } \mathbf{u} = \mathbf{v} \\ 0, & \text{else.} \end{cases} \quad (13)$$

Since  $U$  is Clifford,  $U(\cdot)U^\dagger$  is an isomorphism of  $\hat{\mathcal{P}}_n$ , i.e.  $U\hat{\mathcal{P}}_nU^\dagger = \hat{\mathcal{P}}_n$ . Thus  $\forall \mathbf{u} \in 4^{[n]}$ , there exists  $\mathbf{v} \in 4^{[n]}$ ,  $k \in [4]$  such that  $Ui^k\sigma_{\mathbf{v}}U^\dagger = \sigma_{\mathbf{u}}$ , or equivalently  $U\sigma_{\mathbf{v}}U^\dagger = (-i)^k\sigma_{\mathbf{u}}$ . Furthermore, since the conjugate operation would not change the eigenvalues of  $\sigma_{\mathbf{v}}$ , which is  $\pm 1$ . Thus the global phase  $(-i)^k$  must be  $\pm 1$ . Thus there exists at least one  $\mathbf{v}$  such that  $P_U(\mathbf{u}|\mathbf{v}) = \pm 1$ .

On the other hand, by the linearity of  $U(\cdot)U^\dagger$ , if there exists  $\mathbf{v} \neq \mathbf{v}'$  such that

$$U\sigma_{\mathbf{v}}U^\dagger = (-i)^{k_{\mathbf{v}}}\sigma_{\mathbf{u}} \quad (14)$$

$$U\sigma_{\mathbf{v}'}U^\dagger = (-i)^{k_{\mathbf{v}'}}\sigma_{\mathbf{u}} \quad (15)$$

Then

$$U\left((-i)^{k_{\mathbf{v}'}}\sigma_{\mathbf{v}'} - (-i)^{k_{\mathbf{v}}}\sigma_{\mathbf{v}}\right)U^\dagger = 0 \quad (16)$$

which leads to a contradiction by the fact that  $\sigma_{\mathbf{v}}$  and  $\sigma_{\mathbf{v}'}$  are linear independent. Thus we prove that there are only one such  $\mathbf{v}$  which satisfies  $P_U(\mathbf{u}|\mathbf{v}) = \pm 1$ . Since  $U(\cdot)U^\dagger$  is an isomorphism of  $\hat{\mathcal{P}}_n$  by (13) we know for any  $\mathbf{v}' \neq \mathbf{v}$ , we have  $P_U(\mathbf{u}|\mathbf{v}') = 0$ . ■

Similar results also hold for general unitary  $U$  beyond Clifford operators.

**Lemma 2** *For any  $n$ -qubit unitary  $U$ , if there exist  $\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v} \in 4^{[n]}$  such that  $P_U(\mathbf{u}|\mathbf{v}) = \pm 1$ . Then*

$$U\sigma_{\mathbf{v}}U^\dagger = \pm\sigma_{\mathbf{u}} \quad (17)$$

$$\forall \mathbf{u}' \neq \mathbf{u}, P_U(\mathbf{u}'|\mathbf{v}) = 0. \quad (18)$$

**Proof.** Since  $\sigma_{\mathbf{u}}$  is a Pauli operator,  $2^{n-1}$  number of its eigenvalues are  $+1$ , and  $2^{n-1}$  eigenvalues are  $-1$ . We write

$$\sigma_{\mathbf{u}} = \sigma_{\mathbf{u}}^+ - \sigma_{\mathbf{u}}^- \quad (19)$$

where  $\sigma_{\mathbf{u}}^\pm$  are the projections onto the  $\pm 1$  eigenspace of  $\sigma_{\mathbf{u}}$ . Similay, we write

$$\sigma_{\mathbf{v}} = \sigma_{\mathbf{v}}^+ - \sigma_{\mathbf{v}}^- \quad (20)$$

$$Q_{\mathbf{v}}^+ = U\sigma_{\mathbf{v}}^+U^\dagger \quad (21)$$

$$Q_{\mathbf{v}}^- = U\sigma_{\mathbf{v}}^-U^\dagger \quad (22)$$

Then

$$P_U(\mathbf{u}|\mathbf{v}) = \text{Tr} \sigma_{\mathbf{u}} U \sigma_{\mathbf{v}} U^\dagger / 2^n \quad (23)$$

$$= \text{Tr}(2\sigma_{\mathbf{u}}^+ - I)(2Q_{\mathbf{v}}^+ - I) / 2^n \quad (\text{Since } \sigma_{\mathbf{u}}^+ + \sigma_{\mathbf{u}}^- = I) \quad (24)$$

$$= (4 \text{Tr} \sigma_{\mathbf{u}}^+ Q_{\mathbf{v}}^+ - 2^n) / 2^n \quad (25)$$

Since  $P_U(\mathbf{u}|\mathbf{v}) = \pm 1$ , we have either

$$\text{Tr} \sigma_{\mathbf{u}}^+ Q_{\mathbf{v}}^+ = 0. \quad (26)$$

or

$$\text{Tr} \sigma_{\mathbf{u}}^+ Q_{\mathbf{v}}^+ = 2^{n-1}. \quad (27)$$

Note that the eigenvalues of  $\sigma_{\mathbf{u}}^+$  (or  $Q_{\mathbf{v}}^+$ ) are  $2^{n-1}$  1-eigenvalue and  $2^{n-1}$  0-eigenvalue.

If equation (26) holds, we must have  $Q_{\mathbf{v}}^+ = \sigma_{\mathbf{u}}^-$ . To prove this, let  $\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_{2^{n-1}}$  be an orthogonal basis of the +1-eigenspace of  $Q_{\mathbf{v}}$ . Since  $Q_{\mathbf{v}}^+$  and  $\sigma_{\mathbf{u}}^-$  are all projections, it suffices to prove vector spaces  $\{\mathbf{x} | Q_{\mathbf{v}}^+ \mathbf{x} = \mathbf{x}\} = \{\mathbf{x} | \sigma_{\mathbf{u}}^- \mathbf{x} = \mathbf{x}\}$ . Since the two spaces have the same dimension of  $2^{n-1}$ , it suffices to prove

$$\sigma_{\mathbf{u}}^- \mathbf{x}_i = \mathbf{x}_i, \forall i. \quad (28)$$

or by the fact  $\sigma_{\mathbf{u}}^+ + \sigma_{\mathbf{u}}^- = I$ , equivalently to prove

$$\sigma_{\mathbf{u}}^+ \mathbf{x}_i = 0, \forall i \quad (29)$$

If the above is not true,  $\exists i_0, \sigma_{\mathbf{u}}^+ \mathbf{x}_{i_0} \neq 0$ . Extend  $\{\mathbf{x}_i\}_{i=1}^{2^{n-1}}$  to the basis of the whole ( $2^n$ -dimensional) space, we have

$$\text{Tr} \sigma_{\mathbf{u}}^+ Q_{\mathbf{v}}^+ = \sum_{i=1}^{2^n} \langle \mathbf{x}_i | \sigma_{\mathbf{u}}^+ Q_{\mathbf{v}}^+ | \mathbf{x}_i \rangle \quad (30)$$

$$= \sum_{i=1}^{2^{n-1}} \langle \mathbf{x}_i | \sigma_{\mathbf{u}}^+ | \mathbf{x}_i \rangle \quad (31)$$

$$\geq \langle \mathbf{x}_{i_0} | \sigma_{\mathbf{u}}^+ | \mathbf{x}_{i_0} \rangle \quad (32)$$

$$> 0 \quad (33)$$

which leads to a contradiction. Thus we conclude  $Q_{\mathbf{v}}^+ = \sigma_{\mathbf{u}}^-$ , that is

$$U\sigma_{\mathbf{v}}U^\dagger = 2Q_{\mathbf{v}}^+ - I \quad (34)$$

$$= 2\sigma_{\mathbf{u}}^- - I \quad (35)$$

$$= -\sigma_{\mathbf{u}} \quad (36)$$

Then  $\forall \mathbf{u}' \neq \mathbf{u}, P_U(\mathbf{u}'|\mathbf{v}) = 0$ .

If equation (27) holds, notice that

$$\text{Tr} \sigma_{\mathbf{u}}^- Q_{\mathbf{v}}^+ = \text{Tr}(I - \sigma_{\mathbf{u}}^+) Q_{\mathbf{v}}^+ \quad (37)$$

$$= 2^{n-1} - 2^{n-1} \quad (38)$$

$$= 0 \quad (39)$$

Similarly, we conclude  $Q_{\mathbf{v}}^+ = \sigma_{\mathbf{u}}^+$ .  $\blacksquare$

In the following, we give a simple but important connection between the unitary stabilizer nullity and the subgroup associated with  $U$ . Recall that  $s(U)$  is the number of  $\pm 1$ s in the unitary Pauli function, as in Definition 5. In the following Lemma, we prove that  $s(U)$  equals to the size of  $\mathcal{P}_U$ , that is the intersection of  $U\mathcal{P}_nU^\dagger$  and  $\mathcal{P}_n$ . Note that  $\mathcal{P}_n$  is the quotient Pauli group rather than the Pauli group  $\hat{\mathcal{P}}_n$ .

**Lemma 3** *For any  $n$ -qubit unitary  $U$ ,  $\mathcal{P}_U$  is a subgroup of  $\mathcal{P}_n$ . What's more,*

$$|\mathcal{P}_U| = |\mathcal{P}_{U^\dagger}| = s(U) \quad (40)$$

**Proof.** Firstly notice that

$$|\mathcal{P}_U| = |U\mathcal{P}_nU^\dagger \cap \mathcal{P}_n| \quad (41)$$

$$= |U(\mathcal{P}_n \cap U^\dagger\mathcal{P}_nU)U^\dagger| \quad (42)$$

$$= |\mathcal{P}_n \cap U^\dagger\mathcal{P}_nU| \quad (43)$$

$$= |\mathcal{P}_{U^\dagger}| \quad (44)$$

In the following we show that  $|\mathcal{P}_U| = s(U)$ . Since  $\mathcal{P}_U$  is an intersection of two groups, thus  $\mathcal{P}_U$  is a group. Since  $\mathcal{P}_U \subseteq \mathcal{P}_n$ , thus further  $\mathcal{P}_U$  is a subgroup of  $\mathcal{P}_n$ . To prove  $|\mathcal{P}_U| = s(U)$ , it suffices to prove that there is an one-to-one correspondence between  $\sigma_{\mathbf{u}} \in \mathcal{P}_U$  and a pair  $(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v})$  such that  $P_U(\mathbf{u}|\mathbf{v}) = \pm 1$ .

The proof is as follows. On one hand if  $\sigma_{\mathbf{u}} \in \mathcal{P}_U = U\mathcal{P}_nU^\dagger \cap \mathcal{P}_n$ , then by definition there exists  $\mathbf{v}_{\mathbf{u}} \in 4^{[n]}$  such that

$$U\sigma_{\mathbf{v}_{\mathbf{u}}}U^\dagger = \pm\sigma_{\mathbf{u}} \quad (45)$$

Thus

$$P_U(\mathbf{u}|\mathbf{v}_{\mathbf{u}}) = \pm 1. \quad (46)$$

Further we know such  $\mathbf{v}_{\mathbf{u}}$  is unique since (45) implies  $U^\dagger\sigma_{\mathbf{u}}U = \pm\sigma_{\mathbf{v}_{\mathbf{u}}}$ , and for any  $\mathbf{v} \neq \mathbf{v}_{\mathbf{u}}$  we have  $\text{Tr}(\sigma_{\mathbf{v}_{\mathbf{u}}}\sigma_{\mathbf{v}}) = 0$ .

On the other hand, for any  $(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v})$  such that  $P_U(\mathbf{u}|\mathbf{v}) = \pm 1$ , by Lemma 2 we have  $U\sigma_{\mathbf{v}}U^\dagger = \pm\sigma_{\mathbf{u}}$  thus

$$\sigma_{\mathbf{u}} \in \mathcal{P}_U = U\mathcal{P}_nU^\dagger \cap \mathcal{P}_n. \quad (47)$$

An interesting corollary is that the unitary stabilizer nullity is always an integer, although we do not utilize this property in the following sections.

**Corollary 4** *For any  $n$ -qubit unitary  $U$ ,  $v(U)$  must be an integer, or equivalently,  $s(U) = 2^k$  for some non-negative integer  $k$ .*

**Proof.** by Lemma 3,  $s(U) = |\mathcal{P}_U|$ . Since  $\mathcal{P}_U$  is a subgroup of  $\mathcal{P}_n$ , where  $|\mathcal{P}_n| = 4^n$ , by group theory, we know that

$$s(U)|4^n. \quad (48)$$

Thus

$$v(U) = 2n - \log_2 s(U) \quad (49)$$

is always an integer.  $\blacksquare$

## B. Basic properties of the unitary stabilizer nullity

In this section, we prove the basic properties of the unitary stabilizer nullity, that is the faithfulness, invariance under Clifford operations, additivity under tensor product and sub-additivity under composition.

**Theorem 5 (Faithfulness)** *Let  $U$  be an  $n$ -qubit unitary. Then  $v(U) \geq 0$ . Furthermore,  $v(U) = 0$  if and only if  $U$  is a Clifford unitary. Or equivalently,  $s(U) \leq 4^n$  and  $s(U) = 4^n$  iff  $U$  is a Clifford unitary.*

**Proof.** For any  $n$ -qubit unitary  $U$ , we firstly prove  $v(U) \geq 0$ , or equivalently,  $s(U) \leq 4^n$ . By Lemma 2, if there exists  $\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}$  such that  $P_U(\mathbf{u}|\mathbf{v}) = 1$  then for any  $\mathbf{u}' \neq \mathbf{u}$ ,  $P_U(\mathbf{u}'|\mathbf{v}) = 0$ . Thus every  $\pm 1$  in the Pauli function must come together with  $4^n - 1$  number of 0s. Thus  $s(U) \leq 4^n$ .

If  $s(U) = 4^n$ , by Lemma 2, for every Pauli operator  $\sigma_{\mathbf{v}}$ ,  $U\sigma_{\mathbf{v}}U^\dagger$  is a Pauli operator, thus  $U$  is a Clifford unitary. On the other hand, if  $U$  is a Clifford operator, by Lemma 1, it's easy to verify  $s(U) = 4^n$ . ■

**Theorem 6 (Invariant under Clifford operation)** *For an  $n$ -qubit unitary  $U$  and an  $n$ -qubit Clifford unitary  $V$ , the following holds*

$$v(VU) = v(U). \quad (50)$$

$$s(VU) = s(U) \quad (51)$$

Similarly, it also holds that  $v(UV) = v(U)$ ,  $s(UV) = s(U)$ .

**Proof.** Notice that the unitary Pauli function

$$P_{VU}(\mathbf{u}|\mathbf{v}) = \text{Tr } \sigma_{\mathbf{u}} V U \sigma_{\mathbf{v}} U^\dagger V^\dagger / 2^n \quad (52)$$

$$= \text{Tr } V^\dagger \sigma_{\mathbf{u}} V U \sigma_{\mathbf{v}} U^\dagger / 2^n \quad (53)$$

Since  $V$  is Clifford, then  $V^\dagger(\cdot)V$  is an isomorphism over the Pauli group, i.e.  $V^\dagger \hat{\mathcal{P}}_n V = \hat{\mathcal{P}}_n$ . Further, since  $V^\dagger \sigma_{\mathbf{u}} V$  does not change the eigenvalue of  $\sigma_{\mathbf{u}}$ , where is  $\pm 1$ . Thus

$$V^\dagger \{\sigma_{\mathbf{u}} | \mathbf{u} \in 4^{[n]}\} V = \{p_{\mathbf{u}} \sigma_{\mathbf{u}} | \mathbf{u} \in 4^{[n]}, p_{\mathbf{u}} = \pm 1\} \quad (54)$$

In other words, the set of unitary Pauli functions satisfies

$$\{P_{VU}(\mathbf{u}|\mathbf{v})\} = \{p_{\mathbf{u}} P_U(\mathbf{u}|\mathbf{v}) | p_{\mathbf{u}} = \pm 1\} \quad (55)$$

Thus  $s(VU) = s(U)$ , thus  $v(VU) = s(U)$ . Similarly, it holds that  $v(UV) = v(U)$ ,  $s(UV) = s(U)$ . ■

**Theorem 7 (Additivity under tensor product)** *Given  $n$ -qubit unitary  $U$  and  $m$ -qubit unitary  $V$ , the following holds*

$$v(U \otimes V) = v(U) + v(V) \quad (56)$$

**Proof.** For simplicity, given  $\mathbf{u} \in 4^{[n+m]}$ , we write  $\mathbf{u}^{(1)}$  as the first  $n$  bits of  $\mathbf{u}$ , i.e.  $\mathbf{u}^{(1)} = \mathbf{u}_1 \mathbf{u}_2 \dots \mathbf{u}_n$ . We write  $\mathbf{u}^{(2)}$  as the last  $m$ -bits of  $\mathbf{u}$ , i.e.  $\mathbf{u}^{(2)} = \mathbf{u}_{n+1} \mathbf{u}_{n+2} \dots \mathbf{u}_{n+m}$ .

It suffices to notice that

$$P_{U \otimes V}(\mathbf{u}|\mathbf{v}) = \text{Tr } \sigma_{\mathbf{u}^{(1)}} \otimes \sigma_{\mathbf{u}^{(2)}} (U \otimes V) \sigma_{\mathbf{v}^{(1)}} \otimes \sigma_{\mathbf{v}^{(2)}} (U^\dagger \otimes V^\dagger) / 2^{(n+m)} \quad (57)$$

$$= \text{Tr } \sigma_{\mathbf{u}^{(1)}} U \sigma_{\mathbf{v}^{(1)}} U^\dagger / 2^n \cdot \text{Tr } \sigma_{\mathbf{u}^{(2)}} V \sigma_{\mathbf{v}^{(2)}} V^\dagger / 2^m \quad (58)$$

$$= P_U(\mathbf{u}^{(1)}|\mathbf{v}^{(1)}) \cdot P_V(\mathbf{u}^{(2)}|\mathbf{v}^{(2)}) \quad (59)$$

Thus

$$s(U \otimes V) = s(U)s(V) \quad (60)$$

Thus

$$2(n+m) - \log_2 s(U \otimes V) = (2n - \log_2 s(U)) + (2m - \log_2 s(V)) \quad (61)$$

Thus

$$v(U \otimes V) = v(U) + v(V). \quad (62)$$

■

**Lemma 8** For any  $n$ -qubit unitary  $U$  and  $V$ ,

$$|\mathcal{P}_{U^\dagger} \cap \mathcal{P}_V| \leq s(UV). \quad (63)$$

**Proof.** Firstly notice that

$$\mathcal{P}_{UV} = UV\mathcal{P}_nV^\dagger U^\dagger \cap \mathcal{P}_n \quad (64)$$

$$= U \left( V\mathcal{P}_nV^\dagger \cap U^\dagger\mathcal{P}_nU \right) U^\dagger \quad (65)$$

$$(66)$$

Since  $U(\cdot)U^\dagger$  is injection we have

$$|\mathcal{P}_{UV}| = |V\mathcal{P}_nV^\dagger \cap U^\dagger\mathcal{P}_nU| \quad (67)$$

$$\geq |V\mathcal{P}_nV^\dagger \cap U^\dagger\mathcal{P}_nU \cap \mathcal{P}_n| \quad (68)$$

$$\geq |\mathcal{P}_V \cap \mathcal{P}_{U^\dagger}| \quad (69)$$

By Lemma 3 we know  $|\mathcal{P}_{UV}| = s(UV)$ , we conclude

$$|\mathcal{P}_{U^\dagger} \cap \mathcal{P}_V| \leq s(UV). \quad (70)$$

■

The following Lemma is a variation of the Lagrange's theorem in group theory. It connects the sizes between subgroups and their intersections.

**Lemma 9** Suppose  $A, B$  are subgroups of  $H$ , then

$$|A \times B| = \frac{|A| \cdot |B|}{|A \cap B|} \quad (71)$$

Since  $A \times B \subseteq H$  we have

$$|A| \cdot |B| \leq |H| \cdot |A \cap B|. \quad (72)$$

**Proof.** For any  $a_1, a_2 \in A$ , notice that

$$a_2^{-1}a_1 \in B \rightarrow a_1B = a_2B \quad (73)$$

$$a_2^{-1}a_1 \notin B \rightarrow a_1B \cap a_2B = \emptyset \quad (74)$$

Thus  $A \times B$  can be written as the union of disjoint cosets: If we write  $\hat{A}$  as the set of coset representatives, that is a maximum set which satisfies

$$\begin{cases} \hat{A} \subseteq A \\ \forall a_1, a_2 \in \hat{A}, a_2^{-1}a_1 \notin B \end{cases} \quad (75)$$

Then we have

$$A \times B = \cup_{a \in \hat{A}} aB \quad (76)$$

$$\forall a_1, a_2 \in \hat{A}, a_1B \cap a_2B = \emptyset. \quad (77)$$

Thus

$$|A \times B| = |\hat{A}| \cdot |B| \quad (78)$$

Since  $A, B$  are groups, so does  $A \cap B$ . Further notice that since  $\hat{A} \subseteq A$ , (75) is equivalent to

$$\begin{cases} \hat{A} \subseteq A \\ \forall a_1, a_2 \in \hat{A}, a_2^{-1}a_1 \notin B \cap A \end{cases} \quad (79)$$

This implies  $\hat{A}$  is also the set of coset representative for  $A \cap B$  in  $A$ . Thus

$$|\hat{A}| = \frac{|A|}{|A \cap B|} \quad (80)$$

Combine (78)(80) we finally conclude that

$$|A \times B| = \frac{|A| \cdot |B|}{|A \cap B|} \quad (81)$$

■

Utilizing Lemma 9, we can prove the unitary stabilizer nullity satisfies the sub-additivity under composition.

**Theorem 10 (Sub-additivity under composition)** *Given  $n$ -qubit unitary  $U$  and  $V$ , the following holds*

$$v(UV) \leq v(U) + v(V). \quad (82)$$

Or equivalently

$$s(U)s(V) \leq 4^n s(UV). \quad (83)$$

**Proof.** Let  $H = \mathcal{P}_n, A = \mathcal{P}_{U^\dagger}, B = \mathcal{P}_V$ , we know  $A, B$  are subgroups of  $H$ . By Lemma 9 we have

$$|\mathcal{P}_{U^\dagger}| \cdot |\mathcal{P}_V| \leq |\mathcal{P}_{U^\dagger} \cap \mathcal{P}_V| \cdot 4^n. \quad (84)$$

combine with Lemma 8, we have

$$|\mathcal{P}_{U^\dagger}| \cdot |\mathcal{P}_V| \leq |s(UV)| \cdot 4^n. \quad (85)$$

Further by Lemma 3, we know

$$|\mathcal{P}_V| = s(V), |\mathcal{P}_{U^\dagger}| = |\mathcal{P}_U| = s(U). \quad (86)$$

thus finally we get

$$s(U)s(V) \leq 4^n s(UV). \quad (87)$$

■

#### IV. APPLICATIONS

Interestingly, by the properties in section III, especially the sub-additivity under composition, we can use  $v(\cdot)$  to give a lower bound for the T-count. In section IV A, we prove this connection. In section IV B we compare the lower bound for T-count obtained by the state and the unitary stabilizer nullity, and prove that the unitary stabilizer nullity never performs worse than the state stabilizer nullity. We also prove that for diagonal unitary, the two lower bounds coincide. Finally, in section IV C, we give an  $n$ -qubit unitary family which has unitary stabilizer nullity  $2n$ . This circuit family gives an example where the lower bound obtained by the unitary stabilizer nullity strictly outperforms the state stabilizer nullity by a factor of 2. Furthermore, in section IV D, we connect the unitary stabilizer nullity and the state stabilizer nullity with auxiliary systems, showing that adding auxiliary systems and choosing proper stabilizer states can strictly improving the lower bound obtained by the state stabilizer nullity.

##### A. Lower bounds for the T-count

Recall that for a given unitary  $U$ , its T-count  $t(U)$  is the minimum number of T gates used among any implementation of  $U$  that decomposes  $U$  into a sequence of gates from Clifford plus T gate set, without ancillary qubits and measurement.

**Theorem 11 (Lower bound for the T-count)** *For any  $n$ -qubit unitary  $U$ , its T-count is lower bounded by its unitary stabilizer nullity, that is*

$$t(U) \geq v(U). \quad (88)$$

**Proof.** Firstly notice that  $v(T) = 1$  by verifying the unitary Pauli function of  $T$

$$\{P_T(\mathbf{u}|\mathbf{v})\} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \frac{\sqrt{2}}{2} & -\frac{\sqrt{2}}{2} & 0 \\ 0 & \frac{\sqrt{2}}{2} & \frac{\sqrt{2}}{2} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \quad (89)$$

Thus

$$v(T) = 2 - \log_2 2 = 1 \quad (90)$$

Besides, since  $I_2$  is a Clifford operator, by the faithfulness, i.e. Theorem 5, we have

$$v(I_2) = 0 \quad (91)$$

By the additivity under tensor product, i.e. Theorem 7, we have

$$v(T \otimes I_2 \otimes I_2 \dots \otimes I_2) = v(T) + 0 = 1 \quad (92)$$

From Theorem 5 we know that all the Clifford unitaries have unitary stabilizer nullity 0. Suppose  $U$  is decomposed into sequence of Clifford gates and  $t(U)$  T gates, using the sub-additivity of composition sequentially, that is Theorem 10, we have

$$v(U) \leq 0 + t(U) \cdot v(T) \quad (93)$$

$$= t(U) \quad (94)$$

Thus concludes the theorem. ■

To compare the lower bound got by the unitary stabilizer nullity and the lower bound by the state stabilizer nullity, we would use the following theorem from [30].

**Theorem 12** [30] *For any  $n$ -qubit unitary  $U$ , for any  $(n + t)$ -qubit stabilizer state  $|\phi\rangle$ , the T-count of  $U$  is lower bounded by*

$$t(U) \geq v_s((I_{2t} \otimes U)|\phi\rangle) \quad (95)$$

In general, our method can be further applied to estimate the number of gates  $W$  that are required to realize a target gate  $U$  under Clifford unitaries.

**Theorem 13 (Lower bound for gate synthesis)** *For any  $n$ -qubit unitary  $U$ , the number of gates  $W$  required to realize  $U$  under Clifford unitaries is lower bounded by*

$$\frac{v(U)}{v(W)}. \quad (96)$$

The proof follows the similar steps of Theorem 11.

## B. Comparison between the unitary and state stabilizer nullity

Beverland *et al.* [30] showed that for a unitary  $U$ , for any stabilizer state  $|\psi\rangle$ , the state stabilizer nullity can derive a lower bound for T-count for  $U$  as  $v_s(U|\psi\rangle)$ . We compare this lower bound with the lower bound obtained by the unitary stabilizer nullity from Theorem 11. We prove that our method will never perform worse, as in Theorem 14, and prove that our bound can perform strictly better for a certain unitary family by a factor of 2, as in Corollary 21. We also prove that for diagonal unitary, the lower bounds for T-count obtained by the state and the unitary stabilizer nullity are the same, as in Theorem 18.

**Theorem 14** *For any  $n$ -qubit unitary  $U$ , for any  $n$ -qubit stabilizer state  $|\psi\rangle$ ,*

$$v(U) \geq v_s(U|\psi\rangle) \quad (97)$$

That is

$$v(U) \geq \max_{C \in \mathcal{C}_n} v_s(UC|0\rangle^{\otimes n}). \quad (98)$$

The equality holds iff there exists Clifford  $C \in \mathcal{C}_n$  such that

$$\left\{ \mathbf{u} \in 4^{[n]} \mid \langle 0^{\otimes n} \mid C^\dagger U^\dagger \sigma_{\mathbf{u}} U C \mid 0 \rangle^{\otimes n} = \pm 1 \right\} = \left\{ \mathbf{u} \in 4^{[n]} \mid C^\dagger U^\dagger \sigma_{\mathbf{u}} U C \in \pm \{I, Z\}^{\otimes n} \right\} \quad (99)$$

$$C \{I, Z\}^{\otimes n} C^\dagger \times \left( U^\dagger \mathcal{P}_n U \cap \mathcal{P}_n \right) = \mathcal{P}_n. \quad (100)$$

The equality in equation (100) is w.r.t product modulo phases.

**Proof.** Fix any  $n$ -qubit stabilizer state, that is  $|\psi\rangle = C|0\rangle^{\otimes n}$  for some Clifford operator  $C \in \mathcal{C}_n$ . For any  $\mathbf{u} \in 4^{[n]}$ , notice that the condition that  $|0\rangle^{\otimes n}$  is an eigenvector of  $C^\dagger U^\dagger \sigma_{\mathbf{u}} U C$ , would imply  $P_{U|\psi}(\mathbf{u}) = \pm 1$ , then

$$C^\dagger U^\dagger \sigma_{\mathbf{u}} U C \in \pm \{I, Z\}^{\otimes n} \rightarrow P_{U|\psi}(\mathbf{u}) = \pm 1. \quad (101)$$

Note that in the following all the matrix product is the matrix product modulo phases. For Clifford operator  $C \in \mathcal{C}_n$ , define

$$H := \mathcal{P}_n \quad (102)$$

$$A := C \{I, Z\}^{\otimes n} C^\dagger \quad (103)$$

$$B := \mathcal{P}_{U^\dagger} = U^\dagger \mathcal{P}_n U \cap \mathcal{P}_n \quad (104)$$

Notice that  $A, B$  and  $A \cap B$  are subgroups of  $H$ , with respect to the matrix product modulo phase. Besides, we have

$$|H| = 4^n \quad (105)$$

$$|A| = 2^n \quad (106)$$

$$|B| = |\mathcal{P}_{U^\dagger}| = |\mathcal{P}_U| = s(U) \text{ (by Lemma 3)} \quad (107)$$

$$(108)$$

Further, we have

$$|A \cap B| = |C \{I, Z\}^{\otimes n} C^\dagger \cap U^\dagger \mathcal{P}_n U \cap \mathcal{P}_n| \quad (109)$$

$$= |\{I, Z\}^{\otimes n} \cap C^\dagger U^\dagger \mathcal{P}_n U C \cap \mathcal{P}_n| \text{ (Since } C^\dagger \mathcal{P}_n C = \mathcal{P}_n) \quad (110)$$

$$= |\{I, Z\}^{\otimes n} \cap C^\dagger U^\dagger \mathcal{P}_n U C| \text{ (Since } \{I, Z\}^{\otimes n} \in \mathcal{P}_n) \quad (111)$$

$$\leq s(U|\psi) \text{ (By (101))} \quad (112)$$

By Lemma 9, we conclude

$$2^n \cdot s(U) \leq |A \cap B| \cdot 4^n \quad (113)$$

$$\leq s(U|\psi) \cdot 4^n \quad (114)$$

$$n - \log_2 s(U|\psi) \leq 2n - \log_2 s(U) \quad (115)$$

Thus

$$v_s(U|\psi) \leq v(U). \quad (116)$$

The equality holds iff equality holds for (112) and (113), that is

$$\left\{ \mathbf{u} \in 4^{[n]} \mid \langle 0^{\otimes n} \mid C^\dagger U^\dagger \sigma_{\mathbf{u}} U C \mid 0 \rangle^{\otimes n} = \pm 1 \right\} = \left\{ \mathbf{u} \in 4^{[n]} \mid C^\dagger U^\dagger \sigma_{\mathbf{u}} U C \in \pm \{I, Z\}^{\otimes n} \right\} \quad (117)$$

and

$$A \times B = H. \quad (118)$$

■

**Lemma 15** For any  $\mathbf{u} \in 4^{[n]}$ ,

$$\sum_{\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in \{0,1\}^n} |\langle \mathbf{x} \sigma_{\mathbf{u}} \mathbf{y} \rangle| |\mathbf{x}\rangle \langle \mathbf{y}| \in \{I, X\}^{\otimes n}. \quad (119)$$

Here  $|\langle \mathbf{x} \sigma_{\mathbf{u}} \mathbf{y} \rangle|$  is the norm of the complex number  $\langle \mathbf{x} \sigma_{\mathbf{u}} \mathbf{y} \rangle$ .

**Proof.** Firstly we prove this Lemma for  $n = 1$ . We can directly verify that

$$\sum_{\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in \{0,1\}} |\langle \mathbf{x} \sigma \mathbf{y} \rangle| |\mathbf{x}\rangle \langle \mathbf{y}| = \begin{cases} I, & \text{If } \sigma \in \{I, Z\} \\ X, & \text{If } \sigma \in \{X, Y\} \end{cases} \quad (120)$$

It is worth noting that  $\sum_{\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in \{0,1\}} |\langle \mathbf{x} \sigma \mathbf{y} \rangle| |\mathbf{x}\rangle \langle \mathbf{y}|$  records the positions of the non-zero values in  $\sigma$ . From this point of view, we can generalize this proof to all  $n$ . ■

By Theorem 14 we prove that the lower bound for the  $T$ -count obtained by the unitary stabilizer nullity will never perform worse than the bound obtained by the state stabilizer nullity. In particular, we prove that for the diagonal unitary, the two bounds coincide.

We would use (99) and set  $C = H^{\otimes n}$ . We would like to prove the following lemma.

**Lemma 16** For any diagonal  $n$ -qubit unitary  $U$ ,

$$\{\mathbf{u} \in 4^{[n]} \mid \langle + |^{\otimes n} U^\dagger \sigma_{\mathbf{u}} U | + \rangle^{\otimes n} = \pm 1\} = \{\mathbf{u} \in 4^{[n]} \mid U^\dagger \sigma_{\mathbf{u}} U \in \pm \{I, X\}^{\otimes n}\} \quad (121)$$

**Proof.** We prove the inclusion relationships for both sides.

← Suppose  $\mathbf{u} \in 4^{[n]}$  satisfies that  $U^\dagger \sigma_{\mathbf{u}} U \in \pm \{I, X\}^{\otimes n}$ . Since

$$H^{\otimes n} \{I, X\}^{\otimes n} H^{\otimes n} = \{I, Z\}^{\otimes n} \quad (122)$$

we have

$$\langle + |^{\otimes n} U^\dagger \sigma_{\mathbf{u}} U | + \rangle^{\otimes n} = \pm 1 \quad (123)$$

→ Since  $U$  is a diagonal unitary, we can write

$$U = \text{diag}(\dots, \lambda_{\mathbf{x}}, \dots), \mathbf{x} \in \{0, 1\}^n, |\lambda_{\mathbf{x}}| = 1 \quad (124)$$

Since

$$U | + \rangle^{\otimes n} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2^n}} \sum_{\mathbf{x} \in \{0,1\}^n} \lambda_{\mathbf{x}} |\mathbf{x}\rangle \quad (125)$$

Then

$$\langle + |^{\otimes n} U^\dagger \sigma_{\mathbf{u}} U | + \rangle^{\otimes n} = \frac{1}{2^n} \sum_{\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in \{0,1\}^n} \lambda_{\mathbf{x}}^\dagger \lambda_{\mathbf{y}} \langle \mathbf{x} \sigma_{\mathbf{u}} \mathbf{y} \rangle. \quad (126)$$

Note that  $|\langle \mathbf{x} \sigma_{\mathbf{u}} \mathbf{y} \rangle| \in \{0, 1\}$  and (126) has in total  $2^n \times 2^n$  terms. However, for fixed  $\mathbf{u}$ , for any  $\mathbf{x} \in \{0, 1\}^n$ , there exists exactly one  $\mathbf{y}_{\mathbf{x}} \in \{0, 1\}^n$  such that  $|\langle \mathbf{x} \sigma_{\mathbf{u}} \mathbf{y}_{\mathbf{x}} \rangle| = 1$ , and other terms are all 0, that is

$$|\langle \mathbf{x} \sigma_{\mathbf{u}} \mathbf{y}_{\mathbf{x}} \rangle| = 1 \quad (127)$$

$$|\langle \mathbf{x} \sigma_{\mathbf{u}} \mathbf{y} \rangle| = 0, \forall \mathbf{y} \neq \mathbf{y}_{\mathbf{x}}. \quad (128)$$

Thus if  $\langle + |^{\otimes n} U^\dagger \sigma_{\mathbf{u}} U | + \rangle^{\otimes n} = 1$  (The case for  $-1$  is similar), we must have all the non-zero term  $\lambda_{\mathbf{x}}^\dagger \lambda_{\mathbf{y}_x} \langle \mathbf{x} \sigma_{\mathbf{u}} \mathbf{y}_x \rangle = 1$ . Together with the fact that  $\langle \mathbf{x} \sigma_{\mathbf{u}} \mathbf{y} \rangle = 0, \forall \mathbf{y} \neq \mathbf{y}_x$ . Thus we have

$$\lambda_{\mathbf{x}}^\dagger \lambda_{\mathbf{y}} \langle \mathbf{x} \sigma_{\mathbf{u}} \mathbf{y} \rangle = |\lambda_{\mathbf{x}}^\dagger \lambda_{\mathbf{y}} \langle \mathbf{x} \sigma_{\mathbf{u}} \mathbf{y} \rangle|, \quad \forall \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in \{0, 1\}^{\otimes n}. \quad (129)$$

Note that for any operator  $(\cdot)$ , the following holds

$$(\cdot) = \sum_{\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in \{0, 1\}^n} \langle \mathbf{x}(\cdot) \mathbf{y} | \mathbf{x} \rangle \langle \mathbf{y} | \quad (130)$$

Thus

$$U^\dagger \sigma_{\mathbf{u}} U = \sum_{\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in \{0, 1\}^n} \langle \mathbf{x}(U^\dagger \sigma_{\mathbf{u}} U) \mathbf{y} | \mathbf{x} \rangle \langle \mathbf{y} | \quad (\text{By (130)}) \quad (131)$$

$$= \sum_{\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in \{0, 1\}^n} \lambda_{\mathbf{x}}^\dagger \lambda_{\mathbf{y}} \langle \mathbf{x} \sigma_{\mathbf{u}} \mathbf{y} | \mathbf{x} \rangle \langle \mathbf{y} | \quad (\text{By } U | \mathbf{y} \rangle = \lambda_{\mathbf{y}} | \mathbf{y} \rangle) \quad (132)$$

$$= \sum_{\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in \{0, 1\}^n} |\lambda_{\mathbf{x}}^\dagger \lambda_{\mathbf{y}} \langle \mathbf{x} \sigma_{\mathbf{u}} \mathbf{y} \rangle| \cdot | \mathbf{x} \rangle \langle \mathbf{y} | \quad (\text{By (129)}) \quad (133)$$

$$= \sum_{\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in \{0, 1\}^n} | \langle \mathbf{x} \sigma_{\mathbf{u}} \mathbf{y} \rangle | \cdot | \mathbf{x} \rangle \langle \mathbf{y} | \quad (|\lambda_{\mathbf{x}}| = |\lambda_{\mathbf{y}}| = 1) \quad (134)$$

$$\in \{I, X\}^{\otimes n} \quad (\text{By Lemma 15}) \quad (135)$$

■

**Lemma 17** For any diagonal unitary  $U$ ,

$$\{I, X\}^{\otimes n} \times (U^\dagger \mathcal{P}_n U \cap \mathcal{P}_n) = \mathcal{P}_n \quad \text{w.r.t product modulo phases.} \quad (136)$$

**Proof.** Note that for any diagonal unitary  $U$ , since  $U$  commutes with  $\{I, Z\}^{\otimes n}$ , that is

$$U^\dagger \{I, Z\}^{\otimes n} U = \{I, Z\}^{\otimes n} \quad (137)$$

we have

$$\{I, Z\}^{\otimes n} \in U^\dagger \mathcal{P}_n U \cap \mathcal{P}_n \quad (138)$$

and since

$$\{I, X\}^{\otimes n} \times \{I, Z\}^{\otimes n} = \mathcal{P}_n \quad (139)$$

$$\{I, X\}^{\otimes n} \times (U^\dagger \mathcal{P}_n U \cap \mathcal{P}_n) \subseteq \mathcal{P}_n. \quad (140)$$

Thus the lemma holds. ■

**Theorem 18** For any diagonal  $n$ -qubit unitary  $U$ ,

$$v(U) = \max_{C \in \mathcal{C}_n} v_s(UC|0\rangle^{\otimes n}). \quad (141)$$

**Proof.** By setting  $C = H^{\otimes n}$  in Theorem 14 and then use Lemma 16, Lemma 17 to show that equations (99)(100) are satisfied. ■

**Corollary 19** For any diagonal  $n$ -qubit unitary  $U$ , the maximum of its corresponding state stabilizer nullity, i.e.  $v_s(U|\psi\rangle)$  over all  $n$ -qubit stabilizer state  $|\psi\rangle$ , is achieved by  $|\psi\rangle = |+\rangle^{\otimes n}$ .

### C. Explicit expressions of the unitary stabilizer nullity for unitary families

As proved in the previous sections, for the task of lower bounding the T-count for a given unitary, the bound obtained by the unitary stabilizer nullity is always no less than the bound obtained by the state stabilizer nullity. In this section, we give an example where the unitary stabilizer nullity performs strictly better.

In Proposition 4.1 of [30] it showed that for  $n \geq 3$ , the state stabilizer nullity of the  $n$ -bit controlled Z gate is  $n$ , i.e.  $v_s(C^{n-1}Z|+\rangle^{\otimes n}) = n$ . This implies the T-count for  $C^{n-1}Z$  is at least  $n$ . One may wonder whether the unitary stabilizer nullity can improve this bounds. Unfortunately, since  $C^{n-1}Z$  is diagonal, by Theorem 18 we know its unitary stabilizer nullity is also  $n$ . To find examples to differentiate the state and unitary stabilizer nullity, we should focus on non-diagonal unitaries.

In the following, we give a family of  $n$ -qubit unitary which has unitary stabilizer nullity  $2n$ . This implies constructing such a unitary needs at least  $2n$  T gates by Theorem 11. This unitary, or its corresponding quantum circuit, consists an  $n$ -qubit controlled Z gate, a layer of Hadamard gate, and an  $n$ -qubit controlled Z gate.

**Theorem 20** For  $n \geq 3$ ,

$$v(C^{n-1}Z H^{\otimes n} C^{n-1}Z) = 2n. \quad (142)$$

**Proof.** We prove this theorem by directly calculating the unitary Pauli functions. Recall that for any  $\mathbf{x} \in \{0, 1\}^n$ ,  $\odot(\mathbf{x}) := x_1 x_2 \dots x_n$ , and  $1^n$  is the  $n$ -bit string of all ones. If we ignore a global phase  $\pm 1$ , we may write any  $\sigma_{\mathbf{u}}, \sigma_{\mathbf{v}} \in \mathcal{P}_n$  as

$$\sigma_{\mathbf{u}} = X^{\mathbf{s}} Z^{\mathbf{t}}, \sigma_{\mathbf{v}} = X^{\mathbf{p}} Z^{\mathbf{q}}. \quad (143)$$

where  $\mathbf{s}, \mathbf{t}, \mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q} \in \{0, 1\}^n$ . Notice that ignoring the global phase  $\pm 1$  does not influence the number of  $\pm 1$ s in the Pauli functions. Write

$$U = C^{n-1}Z H^{\otimes n} C^{n-1}Z \quad (144)$$

One can verify that for any  $\mathbf{x} \in \{0, 1\}^n$ ,

$$\langle \mathbf{x} | \sigma_{\mathbf{u}} U \sigma_{\mathbf{v}} U^\dagger | \mathbf{x} \rangle = \frac{1}{2^n} (-1)^{\mathbf{s} \cdot \mathbf{p} + \mathbf{s} \cdot \mathbf{t}} (-1)^{\mathbf{x} \cdot (\mathbf{p} + \mathbf{t})} (-1)^{\odot(\mathbf{x}) + \odot(\mathbf{s} + \mathbf{x})} \sum_{\mathbf{y} \in \{0, 1\}^n} (-1)^{(\mathbf{q} + \mathbf{s}) \cdot \mathbf{y}} (-1)^{\odot(\mathbf{y}) + \odot(\mathbf{y} + \mathbf{p})} \quad (145)$$

Define

$$f(\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{s}, \mathbf{p}) = \sum_{\mathbf{y} \in \{0, 1\}^n} (-1)^{(\mathbf{q} + \mathbf{s}) \cdot \mathbf{y}} (-1)^{\odot(\mathbf{y}) + \odot(\mathbf{y} + \mathbf{p})} \quad (146)$$

We can see that

$$\text{Tr}(\sigma_{\mathbf{u}} U \sigma_{\mathbf{v}} U^\dagger) = \sum_{\mathbf{x} \in \{0, 1\}^n} \langle \mathbf{x} | \sigma_{\mathbf{u}} U \sigma_{\mathbf{v}} U^\dagger | \mathbf{x} \rangle \quad (147)$$

$$= \frac{1}{2^n} (-1)^{\mathbf{s} \cdot \mathbf{p} + \mathbf{s} \cdot \mathbf{t}} f(\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{t}, \mathbf{s}) f(\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{s}, \mathbf{p}) \quad (148)$$

To further simplify the equations, similar as in [30] we notice that

$$(-1)^{\odot(\mathbf{y}) + \odot(\mathbf{y} + \mathbf{p})} = \begin{cases} 1 & \forall \mathbf{y}, \text{ if } \mathbf{p} = 0 \\ 1 & \text{if } \mathbf{p} \neq 0; \mathbf{y} \neq 1^n \text{ and } \mathbf{y} \neq \mathbf{p} \oplus 1^n, \\ -1 & \text{if } \mathbf{p} \neq 0; \mathbf{y} = 1^n \text{ or } \mathbf{p} + 1^n. \end{cases} \quad (149)$$

Combine the fact that

$$\sum_{y \in \{0,1\}^n} (-1)^{z \cdot y} = \begin{cases} 2^n, & \text{if } z = 0 \\ 0, & \text{else.} \end{cases} \quad (150)$$

We can see that

$$f(\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{s}, \mathbf{p}) = \begin{cases} 2^n, & \text{if } \mathbf{p} = 0, \mathbf{q} = \mathbf{s} \\ 0, & \text{if } \mathbf{p} = 0, \mathbf{q} \neq \mathbf{s} \\ 2^n - 4, & \text{if } \mathbf{p} \neq 0, \mathbf{q} = \mathbf{s} \\ -2(-1)^{(\mathbf{q}+\mathbf{s}) \cdot 1^n} - 2(-1)^{(\mathbf{q}+\mathbf{s}) \cdot (1^n + \mathbf{p})}, & \text{if } \mathbf{p} \neq 0, \mathbf{q} \neq \mathbf{s} \end{cases} \quad (151)$$

Combine with (147) we know that the unitary Pauli function  $\text{Tr}(\sigma_{\mathbf{u}} U \sigma_{\mathbf{v}} U^\dagger) / 2^n = \pm 1$  iff both  $f(\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{t}, \mathbf{s}) = 2^n$ ,  $f(\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{s}, \mathbf{p}) = 2^n$ , thus by (151) we conclude this implies

$$\mathbf{p} = \mathbf{t} = \mathbf{q} = \mathbf{s} = 0. \quad (152)$$

Thus we conclude that

$$s(U) = 1 \quad (153)$$

$$v(U) = 2n - \log_2 s(U) = 2n. \quad (154)$$

■

**Corollary 21** *There exists a family of  $n$ -qubit unitary  $U_n$  such that*

$$v(U_n) > \max_{C \in \mathcal{C}_n} v_s(U_n C |0\rangle^{\otimes n}). \quad (155)$$

**Proof.** Notice that the state stabilizer nullity is at most  $n$ . Thus it suffices to let

$$U_n = C^{n-1} Z H^{\otimes n} C^{n-1} Z \quad (156)$$

and use Theorem 20. ■

#### D. Adding auxiliary systems improves the state stabilizer nullity

In this section, we re-connect the state stabilizer nullity and the unitary stabilizer nullity. For any  $n$ -qubit unitary  $U$ , instead of comparing  $v_s(U|\psi\rangle)$  and  $v(U)$  for some  $n$ -qubit stabilizer state  $|\psi\rangle$  as in section IV B. We add auxiliary systems and carefully choose the stabilizer states in the computation of  $v_s(\cdot)$ , i.e.  $v_s(I_{2^d} \otimes U|\phi\rangle)$  for some  $d$ -qubit auxiliary system and  $(d+n)$ -qubit stabilizer state  $|\phi\rangle$ . By Theorem 22 and Corollary 23, we prove that adding auxiliary systems can strictly increase the value of the state stabilizer nullity, thus strictly improving the lower bound for the T-count through Theorem 12. Furthermore, we prove that the unitary stabilizer nullity  $v(U)$  equals the best lower bound for the T-count which one can get through this method, i.e. computing the state stabilizer nullity with auxiliary systems, as in Theorem 24.

It is worth noting that although the state stabilizer nullity  $v_s(\cdot)$  can derive a lower bound for the T-count, it is not the T-count itself, and it holds different properties to the T-count. Thus although the T-count for  $I_{2^d} \otimes U$  is no more than the T-count for  $U$ , the state stabilizer nullity for  $I_{2^d} \otimes U$  (with respect to some stabilizer state) can be strictly larger than the state stabilizer nullity for  $U$ , as in Corollary 23.

**Theorem 22** Let  $|\Phi\rangle$  be the maximally entangled states on  $2n$ -qubit systems, i.e.  $|\Phi\rangle = \sum_{x \in \{0,1\}^n} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2^n}} |x\rangle|x\rangle$ . For any  $n$ -qubit unitary  $U$ ,

$$v(U) = v_s(I_{2^n} \otimes U|\Phi\rangle) \quad (157)$$

**Corollary 23** For the  $2n$ -qubit maximally entangled states  $|\Phi\rangle = \sum_{x \in \{0,1\}^n} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2^n}} |x\rangle|x\rangle$ , for any  $n$ -qubit unitary  $U$ ,

$$v_s(I_{2^n} \otimes U|\Phi\rangle) \geq \max_{C \in \mathcal{C}_n} v_s(UC|0\rangle^{\otimes n}) \quad (158)$$

The above inequality can be strict, that is

$$\exists U \text{ such that } v_s(I_{2^n} \otimes U|\Phi\rangle) > \max_{C \in \mathcal{C}_n} v_s(UC|0\rangle^{\otimes n}) \quad (159)$$

Before giving proofs to the theorem and the corollary, we want to make several clarifications:

- One can easily check the following argument holds as in Appendix C 3

$$\max_{C' \in \mathcal{C}_{2n}} v_s(I_{2^n} \otimes U) C'|0^{\otimes 2n}\rangle \geq \max_{C \in \mathcal{C}_n} v_s(UC|0\rangle^{\otimes n}) \quad (160)$$

That is when adding the auxiliary systems, the best lower bounds for the T-count we can get by the state stabilizer nullity, is never less than the case when there is no auxiliary system. Compared to this easy argument, Theorem 22 has two key differences. The first one is finding the best bound in the left side of (160), or equivalent enumerating all possible  $2n$ -qubit stabilizer state  $C'|0^{2n}\rangle$ , need at least  $O(2^{(1/2+o(1))n^2})$  time and thus is hard. On the contrary, in Corollary 23 and Theorem 24 we show that to find the best bound, it suffices to set the  $2n$ -qubit stabilizer state to be a fixed state, that is the maximally entangled state. The second difference is (160) only shows  $\geq$ , Corollary 23 shows that this inequality can be strict  $>$  in some cases. Combined with Theorem 12, this implies analyzing the state stabilizer nullity with auxiliary systems can strictly improve the lower bound for the T-count.

- One may expect whether using higher-dimensional auxiliary systems or choosing other stabilizer states other than the maximally entangled states can further improve the bound by the state stabilizer nullity. The answer is no. See as in Theorem 24.
- Since in general the state stabilizer nullity does not satisfy the sub-additivity under composition (Counterexample can be seen as in Appendix C 2), thus using properties of the state stabilizer nullity and the Theorem 22 is not sufficient to imply the sub-additivity under composition of the unitary stabilizer nullity, that is Theorem 10.
- Corollary 23 and equation (159) does not violate the property that the state stabilizer nullity is invariant under Clifford unitaries, i.e. for any unitary  $V$ , one have  $v_s(CV|\psi\rangle) = v_s(V|\psi\rangle)$  for any Clifford unitary  $C$  and stabilizer state  $|\psi\rangle$ . More clarification can be seen at Appendix C.

**Proof.** [of Theorem 22] By the symmetry of the maximally entangled states, for any  $n$ -qubit operator  $M \in \mathbb{C}^{2^n \otimes 2^n}$ , we have

$$(M \otimes I_{2^n})|\Phi\rangle = (I_{2^n} \otimes M^T)|\Phi\rangle \quad (161)$$

This is known as the transpose trick, for those who are not familiar with the fact, please check Appendix D.

For simplicity, in the following we abbreviate  $I_{2^n}$  as  $I$ . Suppose the  $2n$ -qubit maximally entangled state  $|\Phi\rangle$  is on systems  $A \otimes B$ , where both  $A, B$  are  $n$ -qubit systems. Then for any  $2n$ -qubit Pauli operator  $\sigma_{\mathbf{u}} \otimes \sigma_{\mathbf{v}}$ , where  $\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v} \in 4^{[n]}$ , the corresponding state Pauli function satisfies

$$P_{(I \otimes U)|\Phi\rangle}(\mathbf{u}\mathbf{v}) = \text{Tr}_{AB} \left( \sigma_{\mathbf{u}} \otimes \sigma_{\mathbf{v}} (I \otimes U) |\Phi\rangle\langle\Phi| (I \otimes U^\dagger) \right) \quad (162)$$

$$= \text{Tr}_{AB} \left( (I \otimes U^\dagger) \sigma_{\mathbf{u}} \otimes \sigma_{\mathbf{v}} (I \otimes U) |\Phi\rangle\langle\Phi| \right) \quad (163)$$

$$= \text{Tr}_{AB} \left( (\sigma_{\mathbf{u}} \otimes U^\dagger \sigma_{\mathbf{v}} U) |\Phi\rangle\langle\Phi| \right) \quad (164)$$

$$= \text{Tr}_{AB} \left( (I \otimes U^\dagger \sigma_{\mathbf{v}} U) (\sigma_{\mathbf{u}} \otimes I) |\Phi\rangle\langle\Phi| \right) \quad (165)$$

$$= \text{Tr}_{AB} \left( (I \otimes U^\dagger \sigma_{\mathbf{v}} U \sigma_{\mathbf{u}}^T) |\Phi\rangle\langle\Phi| \right) \quad (\text{The transpose trick}) \quad (166)$$

$$= \gamma \text{Tr}_{AB} \left( (I \otimes U^\dagger \sigma_{\mathbf{v}} U \sigma_{\mathbf{u}}) |\Phi\rangle\langle\Phi| \right) \quad (\gamma \in \{-1, +1\}) \quad (167)$$

Further, notice that

$$|\Phi\rangle\langle\Phi| = \frac{1}{2^n} \sum_{\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in \{0,1\}^n} |\mathbf{x}\rangle\langle\mathbf{x}| \langle\mathbf{y}| \langle\mathbf{y}| \quad (168)$$

The above equations can be further simplified by

$$P_{(I \otimes U)|\Phi\rangle}(\mathbf{u}\mathbf{v}) = \gamma \text{Tr}_{AB} \left( (I \otimes U^\dagger \sigma_{\mathbf{v}} U \sigma_{\mathbf{u}}) \frac{1}{2^n} \sum_{\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in \{0,1\}^n} |\mathbf{x}\rangle\langle\mathbf{x}| \langle\mathbf{y}| \langle\mathbf{y}| \right) \quad (169)$$

$$= \gamma \text{Tr}_B \left( U^\dagger \sigma_{\mathbf{v}} U \sigma_{\mathbf{u}} \frac{1}{2^n} \sum_{\mathbf{x} \in \{0,1\}^n} |\mathbf{x}\rangle\langle\mathbf{x}| \right) \quad (\text{Trace A system}) \quad (170)$$

$$= \gamma \text{Tr}_B \left( U^\dagger \sigma_{\mathbf{v}} U \sigma_{\mathbf{u}} \frac{1}{2^n} I \right) \quad (\text{Trace system A first}) \quad (171)$$

$$= \frac{\gamma}{2^n} \text{Tr}_B \left( \sigma_{\mathbf{v}} U \sigma_{\mathbf{u}} U^\dagger \right) \quad (172)$$

$$= \gamma P_U(\mathbf{v}|\mathbf{u}) \quad (173)$$

In other words, if we ignore the  $\gamma = \pm 1$  factor, then there is a one to one correspondence between the values of state pauli functions and the unitary Pauli function. Thus the two Pauli functions have the same number of  $\pm 1$ s, that is

$$s(U) = s((I \otimes U)|\Phi\rangle) \quad (174)$$

Since  $|\Phi\rangle$  is a  $2n$ -qubit state, we have

$$2n - s(U) = 2n - s((I \otimes U)|\Phi\rangle) \quad (175)$$

Thus

$$v(U) = v_s((I \otimes U)|\Phi\rangle) \quad (176)$$

**Proof.** [of Corollary 23] Corollary 23 can be proved by combining Theorem 22, Theorem 14 and Corollary 21. ■

In the following, we prove that  $v(U)$  equals the best lower bound for the T-count that can be obtained from the state stabilizer nullity with auxiliary systems. In the following theorem the maximization is over  $d$ -qubit auxiliary systems for any positive integer  $d$ .

**Theorem 24** For any  $n$ -qubit unitary  $U$ , we have

$$v(U) = \max_{d \in \mathbb{N}^+} \max_{C \in \mathcal{C}_{d+n}} v_s \left( (I_{2^d} \otimes U) C |0\rangle^{\otimes(d+n)} \right) \quad (177)$$

**Proof.** Since for any  $d \geq d'$ , we have

$$\max_{C \in \mathcal{C}_{d+n}} v_s \left( (I_{2^d} \otimes U) C |0\rangle^{\otimes(d+n)} \right) \geq \max_{C' \in \mathcal{C}_{d'+n}} v_s \left( (I_{2^{d'}} \otimes U) C' |0\rangle^{\otimes(d'+n)} \right) \quad (\text{Appendix C3}) \quad (178)$$

It suffices to give proofs for sufficiently large  $d$ , namely  $d \geq n$ . For any  $d \geq n$ , by Theorem 14 we know that

$$v(I_d \otimes U) \geq \max_{C \in \mathcal{C}_{d+n}} v_s \left( (I_{2^d} \otimes U) C |0\rangle^{\otimes(d+n)} \right) \quad (179)$$

Besides notice that since the unitary stabilizer nullity satisfies the additivity under tensor product and faithfulness, we have

$$v(I_d \otimes U) = v(I_d) + v(U) \quad (\text{Theorem 7}) \quad (180)$$

$$= 0 + v(U) \quad (\text{Theorem 5}) \quad (181)$$

Thus

$$v(U) \geq \max_{C \in \mathcal{C}_{d+n}} v_s \left( (I_{2^d} \otimes U) C |0\rangle^{\otimes(d+n)} \right) \quad (182)$$

On the other side, by Theorem 22 we have

$$v(U) = v_s(I_{2^n} \otimes U | \phi) \quad (183)$$

$$\leq \max_{C \in \mathcal{C}_{2n}} v_s \left( (I_{2^n} \otimes U) C |0\rangle^{\otimes 2n} \right) \quad (184)$$

$$\leq \max_{C \in \mathcal{C}_{d+n}} v_s \left( (I_{2^d} \otimes U) C |0\rangle^{\otimes(d+n)} \right) \quad (d \geq n, \text{ use (179)}) \quad (185)$$

Combine the both sides we conclude for  $d \geq n$

$$v(U) = \max_{C \in \mathcal{C}_{d+n}} v_s \left( (I_{2^d} \otimes U) C |0\rangle^{\otimes(d+n)} \right) \quad (186)$$

Combine with (179) we conclude

$$v(U) = \max_{d \in \mathbb{N}^+} \max_{C \in \mathcal{C}_{d+n}} v_s \left( (I_{2^d} \otimes U) C |0\rangle^{\otimes(d+n)} \right) \quad (187)$$

■

## V. DISCUSSIONS

In this manuscript, for any  $n$ -qubit unitary  $U$ , we introduce its unitary stabilizer nullity as  $v(U) = 2n - s(U)$ , where  $s(U)$  is the number of  $\pm 1$ s in the Pauli transfer matrix. We prove that the unitary stabilizer nullity satisfies several desirable properties, and in particular show that it is a lower bound for the T-count of  $U$ . We show that the lower bound obtained by the unitary stabilizer nullity never performs worse than the state stabilizer nullity. Moreover, we give an  $n$ -qubit unitary family of unitary stabilizer nullity  $2n$ , providing examples where the unitary stabilizer nullity strictly outperforms. For the diagonal unitaries, we prove the lower bounds obtained by the state and the unitary stabilizer nullity are the same. Besides, we connect the unitary stabilizer nullity and the state stabilizer nullity with auxiliary systems.

Beyond this work, there are still various interesting open questions on the quantification of non-Clifford resources:

- For the task of lower bounding T gates for a given unitary, the unitary stabilizer nullity gives a bound up to  $2n$ . Is it possible to get a super-linear bound by devising new magic monotones?
- Here we define the T-count to be the minimum number of T gates used for exactly synthesizing a given unitary  $U$ . Is it possible to lower bound the number of T gates for unitary  $V$  which approximates  $U$ , i.e.  $|V - U| \leq \epsilon$ ? Beverland *et al.* [30] have considered this setting for single-qubit unitaries.

- 
- [1] D. Gottesman, "The heisenberg representation of quantum computers," Los Alamos National Lab., NM (United States), Tech. Rep., 1998.
- [2] S. Aaronson and D. Gottesman, "Improved simulation of stabilizer circuits," *Physical Review A*, vol. 70, no. 5, p. 052328, 2004.
- [3] C. Dawson and M. Nielsen, "The solovay-kitaev algorithm," *Quantum Information and Computation*, vol. 6, no. 1, pp. 81–95, 2006.
- [4] M. A. Nielsen and I. Chuang, "Quantum computation and quantum information," 2002.
- [5] S. Bravyi and D. Gosset, "Improved classical simulation of quantum circuits dominated by clifford gates," *Physical review letters*, vol. 116, no. 25, p. 250501, 2016.
- [6] S. Bravyi, G. Smith, and J. A. Smolin, "Trading classical and quantum computational resources," *Physical Review X*, vol. 6, no. 2, p. 021043, 2016.
- [7] S. Bravyi, D. Browne, P. Calpin, E. Campbell, D. Gosset, and M. Howard, "Simulation of quantum circuits by low-rank stabilizer decompositions," *Quantum*, vol. 3, p. 181, 2019.
- [8] X. Zhou, D. W. Leung, and I. L. Chuang, "Methodology for quantum logic gate construction," *Physical Review A*, vol. 62, no. 5, p. 052316, 2000.
- [9] S. Bravyi and A. Kitaev, "Universal quantum computation with ideal clifford gates and noisy ancillas," *Physical Review A*, vol. 71, no. 2, Feb 2005.
- [10] D. Gottesman, "Stabilizer codes and quantum error correction," Ph.D. dissertation, California Institute of Technology, 1997.
- [11] D. Gottesman and I. L. Chuang, "Demonstrating the viability of universal quantum computation using teleportation and single-qubit operations," *Nature*, vol. 402, no. 6760, pp. 390–393, 1999.
- [12] S. Bravyi and J. Haah, "Magic-state distillation with low overhead," *Physical Review A*, vol. 86, no. 5, p. 052329, 2012.
- [13] E. T. Campbell, B. M. Terhal, and C. Vuillot, "Review Roads towards fault-tolerant universal quantum computation," *Nature Publishing Group*, vol. 549, no. 7671, pp. 172–179, 2017.
- [14] M. B. Hastings and J. Haah, "Distillation with Sublogarithmic Overhead," *Physical Review Letters*, vol. 120, no. 5, p. 050504, jan 2018.
- [15] C. Chamberland and A. W. Cross, "Fault-tolerant magic state preparation with flag qubits," *Quantum*, vol. 3, p. 143, may 2019.
- [16] X. Wang, M. M. Wilde, and Y. Su, "Efficiently Computable Bounds for Magic State Distillation," *Physical Review Letters*, vol. 124, no. 9, p. 090505, mar 2020.
- [17] J. O’Gorman and E. T. Campbell, "Quantum computation with realistic magic-state factories," *Physical Review A*, vol. 95, no. 3, p. 032338, mar 2017.
- [18] A. Krishna and J.-P. Tillich, "Towards Low Overhead Magic State Distillation," *Physical Review Letters*, vol. 123, no. 7, p. 070507, aug 2019.
- [19] K. Fang and Z.-W. Liu, "No-Go Theorems for Quantum Resource Purification," *Physical Review Letters*, vol. 125, no. 6, p. 060405, aug 2020.
- [20] B. Regula, K. Bu, R. Takagi, and Z.-W. Liu, "Benchmarking one-shot distillation in general quantum resource theories," *Physical Review A*, vol. 101, no. 6, p. 062315, jun 2020.
- [21] X. Wang, M. M. Wilde, and Y. Su, "Quantifying the magic of quantum channels," *New Journal of Physics*, vol. 21, no. 10, p. 103002, 2019.
- [22] P. Selinger, "Efficient clifford+ t approximation of single-qubit operators," *Quantum Information & Computation*, vol. 15, no. 1-2, pp. 159–180, 2015.

- [23] N. J. Ross and P. Selinger, "Optimal ancilla-free clifford+ t approximation of z-rotations," *Quantum Information & Computation*, vol. 16, no. 11-12, pp. 901–953, 2016.
- [24] L. E. Heyfron and E. T. Campbell, "An efficient quantum compiler that reduces t count," *Quantum Science and Technology*, vol. 4, no. 1, p. 015004, 2018.
- [25] D. Gosset, V. Kliuchnikov, M. Mosca, and V. Russo, "An algorithm for the t-count," *Quantum Information & Computation*, vol. 14, no. 15-16, pp. 1261–1276, 2014.
- [26] M. Howard and E. Campbell, "Application of a resource theory for magic states to fault-tolerant quantum computing," *Physical review letters*, vol. 118, no. 9, p. 090501, 2017.
- [27] C. Jones, "Low-overhead constructions for the fault-tolerant toffoli gate," *Physical Review A*, vol. 87, no. 2, p. 022328, 2013.
- [28] B. Regula, "Convex geometry of quantum resource quantification," *Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and Theoretical*, vol. 51, no. 4, p. 045303, jan 2018.
- [29] J. R. Seddon and E. T. Campbell, "Quantifying magic for multi-qubit operations," *Proceedings of the Royal Society A*, vol. 475, no. 2227, p. 20190251, 2019.
- [30] M. E. Beverland, E. Campbell, M. Howard, and V. Kliuchnikov, "Lower bounds on the non-clifford resources for quantum computations," *Quantum Science and Technology*, 2020.
- [31] J. Emerson, "The resource theory of stabilizer computation," *Bulletin of the American Physical Society*, vol. 59, 2014.
- [32] J. M. Chow, J. M. Gambetta, A. D. Corcoles, S. T. Merkel, J. A. Smolin, C. Rigetti, S. Poletto, G. A. Keefe, M. B. Rothwell, J. R. Rozen *et al.*, "Universal quantum gate set approaching fault-tolerant thresholds with superconducting qubits," *Physical review letters*, vol. 109, no. 6, p. 060501, 2012.
- [33] Wikipedia contributors, "Lagrange's theorem (group theory) — Wikipedia, the free encyclopedia," 2020, [Online; accessed 15-January-2021].
- [34] A. G. Fowler, M. Mariantoni, J. M. Martinis, and A. N. Cleland, "Surface codes: Towards practical large-scale quantum computation," *Physical Review A*, vol. 86, no. 3, p. 032324, 2012.

### Appendix A: Equivalence between the definitions of the state stabilizer nullity

In this section, we show Definition 4 is equivalent to the definition of the state stabilizer nullity in the original paper [30]. Recall that for an  $n$ -qubti state  $|\psi\rangle$ , Beverland *et al* [30] define the state stabilizer nullity as

$$\nu(|\psi\rangle) = n - \log_2 |\text{Stab } |\psi\rangle| \quad (\text{A1})$$

where  $\text{Stab } |\psi\rangle$  is the stabilizer of  $|\psi\rangle$ , that is

$$\text{Stab } |\psi\rangle = \{P \in \hat{\mathcal{P}}_n : P|\psi\rangle = |\psi\rangle\}. \quad (\text{A2})$$

Here we prove our definition  $v_s(|\psi\rangle)$  is equivalent to  $\nu(|\psi\rangle)$ , that is  $v_s(|\psi\rangle) = \nu(|\psi\rangle)$ , by building a one-to-one correspondence between  $\mathbf{u} \in 4^{[n]}$  where  $P_{|\psi\rangle}(\mathbf{u}) = \pm 1$ , and  $P \in \hat{\mathcal{P}}_n$  where  $P|\psi\rangle = |\psi\rangle$ . The key is noticing that the state Pauli functions are ranging over the quotient group  $\mathcal{P}_n$ , while the Stab is ranging over the Pauli group  $\hat{\mathcal{P}}_n$  where

$$\mathcal{P}_n = \{\sigma_{\mathbf{u}} | \mathbf{u} \in 4^{[n]}\} \quad (\text{A3})$$

$$\hat{\mathcal{P}}_n = \{\pm\sigma_{\mathbf{u}}, \pm i\sigma_{\mathbf{u}} | \mathbf{u} \in 4^{[n]}\} \quad (\text{A4})$$

More precisely,

→ For one direction, if any  $\mathbf{u}$  satisfies that  $P_{|\psi\rangle}(\mathbf{u}) = \gamma$  where  $\gamma = \pm 1$ , since  $\sigma_{\mathbf{u}}$  only has  $\pm 1$  eigenvalues and  $|\psi\rangle$  is unit, we must have

$$\sigma_{\mathbf{u}}|\psi\rangle = \gamma|\psi\rangle \quad (\text{A5})$$

Thus we find  $P^{(\mathbf{u})} := \gamma\sigma_{\mathbf{u}} \in \hat{\mathcal{P}}_n$  such that

$$P^{(\mathbf{u})} \in \text{Stab}|\psi\rangle \quad (\text{A6})$$

Further notice that for  $\mathbf{u} \neq \mathbf{v}$  where  $P_{|\psi\rangle}(\mathbf{u}) = P_{|\psi\rangle}(\mathbf{v}) = \pm 1$ , we have  $P^{(\mathbf{u})} \neq P^{(\mathbf{v})}$ . Thus the map from  $\mathbf{u}$  to  $P^{(\mathbf{u})}$  is bijection.

← For the other direction, firstly notice that since  $i\sigma_{\mathbf{u}}$  has eigenvalues  $\pm i$ , we have

$$i\sigma_{\mathbf{u}}|\psi\rangle \neq |\psi\rangle, \forall |\psi\rangle. \quad (\text{A7})$$

Then for any  $P \in \text{Stab}|\psi\rangle$ , there exists  $\mathbf{u}_P \in 4^{[n]}$  such that  $P = \gamma\sigma_{\mathbf{u}_P}$  where  $\gamma = \pm 1$ . We can verify that

$$P_{|\psi\rangle}(\mathbf{u}_P) = \gamma \quad (\text{A8})$$

Also notice that by the linearity, if  $P \in \text{Stab}|\psi\rangle$ , then  $-P \notin \text{Stab}|\psi\rangle$ . Thus for any  $P \neq P' \in \text{Stab}|\psi\rangle$ ,  $\mathbf{u}_P \neq \mathbf{u}_{P'}$ . Thus the map from  $P \in \text{Stab}|\psi\rangle$  to  $\mathbf{u}_P$  is also a bijection.

Combine all the above we conclude that

$$v_s(|\psi\rangle) = \nu(|\psi\rangle) \quad (\text{A9})$$

## Appendix B: Non-Clifford resources in two computational models

In this section, we specify two computation models which we mentioned in this manuscript, that is the quantum computation model with magic states, and the quantum computation model with unitary. We would use examples from [25–27] to clarify the relationship between the number of non-Clifford resources used in the two models, that is Proposition 25 and Proposition 26.

To begin with, we firstly clarify the two computation models. We write T gate as  $T = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & e^{i\pi/4} \end{bmatrix}$ , T state as  $|T\rangle = T|+\rangle$ .

### 1. Two computation models

**Quantum computation with magic state [9].** In this model, the computational task is to construct a target  $n$ -qubit quantum state  $\rho$ , either a pure state or a mixed state. The valid operations are as follows.

- Initiate qubits in state  $|0\rangle^{\otimes m}|T\rangle^{\otimes s}$  for some integer  $m, s$ .
- Perform stabilizer operations, including using Clifford unitaries and qubit measurement in the computational basis. Here the Clifford unitary is performed adaptively, that is the Clifford unitary used can depend on previous measurement outcomes.
- After the computation, use the first  $n$  qubits as the output, which should be in state  $\rho$ .

There are variants of this model which allow using catalyst states in the initiation, we do not consider those variants here. For readers who are interested, more can be seen in [30].

**Quantum computation with unitary.** In this model, the computational task is to construct a target  $n$ -qubit unitary  $U$  using basic gates. More specifically, the task is to decompose  $U$  into a sequence of gates from the Clifford+T gate set, without using ancillary qubits and measurement. Mathematically, we aim to find unitary  $U_1, \dots, U_l$  such that

$$U = U_1 U_2 \dots U_l, \quad (\text{B1})$$

where each  $U_i$  corresponds to either a Clifford gate, or a T gate. Here  $l$  is an integer corresponding to the size of the circuit.

**Differences:** Note that in the quantum computation with magic state, one can use auxiliary qubits, do measurements and perform Clifford unitary adaptively, while in the quantum computation with unitary, one cannot use auxiliary qubits, cannot do measurements and there are no adaptive operations.

## 2. Non-Clifford resources used in the two models

In the quantum computation with magic state model, the T state  $|T\rangle$  is the non-Clifford resource, while the stabilizer operations is viewed as free operations. For an  $n$ -qubit state  $\rho$ , we use  $w_s(\rho)$  to denote the minimum  $s$ , that is the minimum number of  $|T\rangle$  needed to construct  $\rho$ . We denote  $w_s(\rho) = +\infty$  if  $\rho$  cannot be exactly constructed through the above process.

In the quantum computation with unitary model, the T gate is the non-Clifford resources, while the Clifford gate, or Clifford unitary, are viewed as free resources. We use  $t(U)$  to denote the minimum number of T gates used in (B1). We denote  $t(U) = +\infty$  if  $U$  cannot be exactly synthesized with Clifford+T gate set. We also call  $t(U)$  the T-count of  $U$ .

## 3. Relation between number of non-Clifford resources in two models

As we inexplicitly used in the manuscript, firstly the lower bound of  $|T\rangle$  can derive a lower bound of  $T$ . This fact is used in [30].

**Proposition 25** [30] *For an  $n$ -qubit unitary  $U$ , for any  $n$ -qubit stabilizer state  $|\phi\rangle$ ,*

$$t(U) \geq w_s(U|\phi). \quad (\text{B2})$$

**Proof.** This proof is direct. Suppose we decompose  $U$  into sequences of gates in Clifford+T gate set with in total  $t(U)$  T gates. Then use gate injection [8, 34] we can construct state  $U|\phi\rangle$  by using  $t(U)$  copies of  $|T\rangle$ . ■

In the other direction, one may wonder if  $t(U)$  can be completely characterized by  $w_s(\cdot)$ , via enumerating all stabilizer states  $|\phi\rangle$ . We emphasize here this is not true.

**Proposition 26** [25–27] *There exists 3-qubit unitary  $U$  such that*

$$t(U) > \max_{|\phi\rangle} w_s(U|\phi)$$

where the maximum is over all 3-qubit stabilizer states  $|\phi\rangle$ .

**Proof.** This fact is implied by [25–27]. Here  $U$  is set to be the Toffoli gate. Using algorithm which outputs exactly  $w(\cdot)$ , Gosset shows  $t(U) = 7$  [25]. On the other hand, by utilizing the adaptive computation,  $w_s(U|\phi) \leq 4$  [27]. ■

## Appendix C: Clarification on properties of the state stabilizer nullity

### 1. Corollary 23 does not violate properties of the state stabilizer nullity

Corollary 23 and equation (159) does not violate the property that the state stabilizer nullity is invariant under Clifford unitaries, i.e., for any  $n$ -qubit unitary  $V$ , for any  $n$ -qubit Clifford unitary  $C \in \mathcal{C}_n$  and any  $n$ -qubit stabilizer state  $|\psi\rangle$ , one have

$$v_s(CV|\psi\rangle) = v_s(V|\psi\rangle). \quad (\text{C1})$$

What the corollary implies is slightly different. Specifically, what it implies is  $\exists V, C$  such that

$$v_s(VC|\psi\rangle) \neq v_s(V|\psi\rangle) \quad (\text{C2})$$

Or equivalently there may exist different  $n$ -qubit stabilizer states  $|\psi_1\rangle$  and  $|\psi_2\rangle$  such that

$$v_s(V|\psi_1\rangle) \neq v_s(V|\psi_2\rangle) \quad (\text{C3})$$

Write  $|\Phi\rangle$  to be the  $2n$ -qubit maximally entangled states, Corollary 23 implies  $\exists n$ -qubit unitary  $U$  such that setting  $V = (I_{2^n} \otimes U)$

$$v_s(V|\Phi\rangle) > v_s(V(I_{2^n} \otimes C''|0^{\otimes 2n}\rangle)) \quad (\text{C4})$$

for any  $n$ -qubit Clifford  $C'' \in \mathcal{C}_n$ .

### 2. The state stabilizer nullity does not satisfy the sub-additivity under composition

In this section, we show that for any 1-qubit stabilizer state  $|\psi\rangle$ , there exists single-qubit unitary  $U, V$  such that

$$v_s(UV|\psi\rangle) > v_s(U|\psi\rangle) + v_s(V|\psi\rangle) \quad (\text{C5})$$

Thus the state stabilizer nullity does not satisfy the subadditivity under composition. In particular, suppose

$$|\psi\rangle = C|0\rangle, C \in \mathcal{C}_1 \quad (\text{C6})$$

Set

$$U = e^{iX}HC^{-1} \quad (\text{C7})$$

$$V = CHC^{-1} \quad (\text{C8})$$

Since  $|+\rangle$  is an eigenstate of  $e^{iX}$ , one can verify that

$$v_s(U|\psi\rangle) = v_s(e^{iX}|+\rangle) = 0 \quad (\text{C9})$$

Since  $CH$  is Clifford, then

$$v_s(V|\psi\rangle) = v_s(CH|0\rangle) = 0 \quad (\text{C10})$$

Finally, one can verify by calculating the state Pauli function to show that

$$v_s(UV|\psi\rangle) = v_s(e^{iX}|0\rangle) = 1 \quad (\text{C11})$$

Thus (C5) holds. This counterexample can be generalized to  $n$ -qubit case.

### 3. Non-decreasing of state stabilizer nullity with higher-dimensional systems

**Lemma 27** For any  $n$ -qubit unitary  $U$ , for any  $d \geq d'$ , we have

$$\max_{C \in \mathcal{C}_{d+n}} v_s \left( (I_{2^d} \otimes U)C|0\rangle^{\otimes d+n} \right) \geq \max_{C' \in \mathcal{C}_{d'+n}} v_s \left( (I_{2^{d'}} \otimes U)C'|0\rangle^{\otimes d'+n} \right) \quad (\text{C12})$$

**Proof.** It suffices to see for any  $C' \in \mathcal{C}_{d'+n}$ , let

$$C := I_{2^{d-d'}} \otimes C' \quad (\text{C13})$$

we have

$$v_s \left( (I_{2^d} \otimes U)C|0\rangle^{\otimes d+n} \right) = v_s \left( (I_{2^{d-d'}} \otimes I_{2^{d'}} \otimes U)C|0\rangle^{\otimes d+n} \right) \quad (\text{C14})$$

$$= v_s \left( |0\rangle^{d-d'} \otimes (I_{2^{d'}} \otimes U)C'|0\rangle^{\otimes d'+n} \right) \quad (\text{C15})$$

$$= v_s \left( |0\rangle^{d-d'} \right) + v_s \left( (I_{2^{d'}} \otimes U)C'|0\rangle^{\otimes d'+n} \right) \quad (\text{C16})$$

$$= v_s \left( (I_{2^{d'}} \otimes U)C'|0\rangle^{\otimes d'+n} \right) \quad (\text{C17})$$

where the (C16) is by the property that the state stabilizer nullity is additive under tensor product. The (C17) is by the property that  $v_s(|\phi\rangle) = 0$  for stabilizer state  $pket\phi$ . The proof of the two properties can be seen in [30].  $\blacksquare$

### Appendix D: The transpose trick

In this section, for the self-contained reason, we provide a short proof to the well-known transpose trick in quantum information.

**Lemma 28** Let  $|\Phi\rangle$  be the maximally entangled states on  $2n$ -qubit systems, i.e.  $|\Phi\rangle = \sum_{x \in \{0,1\}^n} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2^n}} |x\rangle|x\rangle$ . For any  $n$ -qubit operator  $M \in \mathbb{C}^{2^n \otimes 2^n}$ , we have

$$(M \otimes I_{2^n})|\Phi\rangle = (I_{2^n} \otimes M^T)|\Phi\rangle \quad (\text{D1})$$

**Proof.** For simplicity, we abbreviate  $I_{2^n}$  as  $I$  in the following context. Write

$$M = \sum_{\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in \{0,1\}^n} \langle \mathbf{x} | M | \mathbf{y} \rangle | \mathbf{x} \rangle \langle \mathbf{y} | \quad (\text{D2})$$

Then one can verify that

$$(M \otimes I)|\Phi\rangle = \sum_{\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in \{0,1\}^n} \langle \mathbf{x} | M | \mathbf{y} \rangle (| \mathbf{x} \rangle \langle \mathbf{y} | \otimes I) \sum_{\mathbf{z} \in \{0,1\}^n} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2^n}} | \mathbf{z} \rangle | \mathbf{z} \rangle \quad (\text{D3})$$

$$= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2^n}} \sum_{\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z} \in \{0,1\}^n} \langle \mathbf{x} | M | \mathbf{z} \rangle | \mathbf{x} \rangle \otimes | \mathbf{z} \rangle \quad (\text{D4})$$

$$= (I \otimes \sum_{\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z} \in \{0,1\}^n} \langle \mathbf{x} | M | \mathbf{z} \rangle | \mathbf{z} \rangle \langle \mathbf{x} |) \sum_{\mathbf{y} \in \{0,1\}^n} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2^n}} | \mathbf{y} \rangle | \mathbf{y} \rangle \quad (\text{D5})$$

$$= (I \otimes \sum_{\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z} \in \{0,1\}^n} \langle \mathbf{z} | M^T | \mathbf{x} \rangle | \mathbf{z} \rangle \langle \mathbf{x} |) |\Phi\rangle \quad (\text{D6})$$

$$= (I \otimes M^T)|\Phi\rangle \quad (\text{D7})$$

$\blacksquare$