

# Mixed Clifford + non-Clifford execution via Clifford frames

December 12, 2025

Consider a quantum circuit  $U$  composed of  $m$  gates, which may be Clifford or non-Clifford:

$$U = g_m g_{m-1} \cdots g_1,$$

Let the logical state at the  $k$ th computational step be

$$|\psi_k\rangle = g_k g_{k-1} \cdots g_1 |\psi_0\rangle. \quad (1)$$

We maintain:

- a classical *Clifford frame*  $F_k \in \mathcal{C}_n$ ,
- a physical state  $|\phi_k\rangle$ ,

such that the invariant

$$|\phi_k\rangle = F_k |\psi_k\rangle \quad (2)$$

holds for every  $k$ .

**Base case:** Initially,

$$F_0 = I, \quad |\phi_0\rangle = |\psi_0\rangle, \quad (3)$$

so (2) trivially holds at  $k = 0$ .

**Clifford step:** If  $g_{k+1} = C \in \mathcal{C}_n$  is Clifford, we perform no physical operation and simply update

$$F_{k+1} := C F_k, \quad |\phi_{k+1}\rangle := |\phi_k\rangle. \quad (4)$$

Since

$$|\psi_{k+1}\rangle = C |\psi_k\rangle, \quad (5)$$

we have by (2), (4), (5):

$$\begin{aligned} F_{k+1} |\psi_{k+1}\rangle &= (C F_k)(C |\psi_k\rangle) \\ &= C F_k |\psi_k\rangle \\ &= C |\phi_k\rangle \\ &= |\phi_k\rangle = |\phi_{k+1}\rangle. \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

Thus the invariant (2) is preserved.

**Non-Clifford step:** Suppose  $g_{k+1} = N$  is non-Clifford. Define the physical gate

$$N_{\text{phys}} := F_k N F_k^\dagger. \quad (7)$$

Apply  $N_{\text{phys}}$  to hardware and keep the frame unchanged:

$$|\phi_{k+1}\rangle := N_{\text{phys}}|\phi_k\rangle, \quad F_{k+1} := F_k. \quad (8)$$

By (1),

$$|\psi_{k+1}\rangle = N|\psi_k\rangle. \quad (9)$$

Then, using (7), (8), (9),

$$\begin{aligned} |\phi_{k+1}\rangle &= (F_k N F_k^\dagger)|\phi_k\rangle \\ &= (F_k N F_k^\dagger)(F_k|\psi_k\rangle) \\ &= F_k N |\psi_k\rangle \\ &= F_k |\psi_{k+1}\rangle. \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

Hence (2) also holds at  $k+1$ .

**Final state.** By induction using (1), (6), (10), the invariant (2) holds for all  $k$ . Thus

$$|\phi_m\rangle = F_m|\psi_m\rangle = F_m U |\psi_0\rangle. \quad (11)$$

I.e., the hardware state  $|\phi_m\rangle$  is the logical output  $U|\psi_0\rangle$  up to the final Clifford frame  $F_m$ . Thus the overall computation is equivalent to applying  $U$  directly.

If one requires the *exact* logical output on hardware, apply the known Clifford inverse at the end:

$$|\phi'_m\rangle := F_m^\dagger|\phi_m\rangle = U|\psi_0\rangle. \quad (12)$$

**Conjugation of Pauli rotations.** The only Non-Clifford gate necessary to reach universality is the single-qubit Z-rotation  $R_Z(\theta) = e^{-i\theta/2Z}$ . Since Cliffords conjugate Paulis to Paulis, the non-Cliffords remain on this form. I.e., if

$$N = e^{-i\theta/2P}, \quad P \in \mathcal{P}_n,$$

the frame action satisfies

$$F_k N F_k^\dagger = e^{-i\theta/2(F_k P F_k^\dagger)} = R_{P'}(\theta), \quad (13)$$

That is, we just get another rotation by the same angle around a different Pauli axis  $P' = F_k P F_k^\dagger$ .

Unproblematic examples: Conjugating by single-qubit Cliffords and CX with control on the non-Clifford qubit don't increase complexity:

$$H R_Z(\theta) H^\dagger = H e^{-i\theta/2Z} H = e^{-i\theta/2HZH} = e^{-i\theta/2X} = R_X(\theta). \quad (14)$$

$$\text{CX}(R_Z(\theta) \otimes I) \text{CX}^\dagger = \text{CX} e^{-i\theta/2(Z \otimes I)} \text{CX} \quad (15)$$

$$= e^{-i\theta/2 \text{CX}(Z \otimes I) \text{CX}} = e^{-i\theta/2(Z \otimes I)} = R_Z(\theta) \otimes I. \quad (16)$$

Problematic example: Conjugating by CX with target on the non-Clifford qubit turns single-qubit rotation into two-qubit rotation:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{CX}(I \otimes R_Z(\theta)) \text{CX}^\dagger &= \text{CX} e^{-i\theta/2(I \otimes Z)} \text{CX} \\ &= e^{-i\theta/2 \text{CX}(I \otimes Z) \text{CX}} = e^{-i\theta/2(Z \otimes Z)} = R_{ZZ}(\theta). \end{aligned} \quad (17)$$

Happy example: Conjugating  $R_{ZZ}(\theta)$  by CX with target on one of the qubits returns a single-qubit rotation:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{CX}(R_{ZZ}(\theta)) \text{CX}^\dagger &= \text{CX} e^{-i\theta/2(Z \otimes Z)} \text{CX} \\ &= e^{-i\theta/2 \text{CX}(Z \otimes Z) \text{CX}} = e^{-i\theta/2(Z \otimes I)} = R_Z(\theta) \otimes I. \end{aligned} \quad (18)$$

That is, CX can both increase and decrease the qubit count of the non-Clifford rotation.