

On the Power of Clifford Strategies in Interactive Protocols

Itay Shalit*

October 2024

Abstract

The Gottesman-Knill theorem shows that Clifford circuits operating on stabilizer states can be efficiently simulated classically. However, in the setting of interactive protocols, it has remained unclear whether Clifford strategies with shared entanglement between provers offer any advantage over classical ones. We provide a negative answer to this question, demonstrating that even when Clifford provers are additionally allowed to perform general classical operations on measured qubits—a computational model for which we introduce the complexity class Clifford-MIP*—there is no advantage over classical strategies. Our results imply that Clifford-MIP* = MIP.

Furthermore, we utilize our findings to resolve an open question posed by Kalai et al. (STOC 2023). We show that quantum advantage in any non-local game requires at least two quantum provers operating outside the Clifford-MIP* computational model. This rules out a suggested approach for significantly improving the efficiency of tests for quantum advantage that are based on compiling non-local games.

1 Introduction

The Clifford group over n qubits comprises quantum operations on a 2^n -dimensional Hilbert space and is generated by the Clifford gates $\{H, \text{CNOT}, S\}$. When supplemented with T gates or with the ability to create magic states, Clifford gates become sufficient for universal quantum computation [1]. However, the Gottesman-Knill theorem demonstrates that quantum circuits composed solely of Clifford gates and measurements in the standard basis can be efficiently simulated on a classical computer when acting on qubits in stabilizer states [3]. This efficient simulation arises because the Clifford group is the normalizer of the Pauli group within the group of all $2^n \times 2^n$ unitary matrices.

This implies that Clifford gates do not encapsulate the full power of quantum computation, particularly that of BQP. Moreover, quantum computation limited to Clifford gates offers no real advantage over classical computation in the BQP setting. Nonetheless, a different setting where quantum computers are known to outperform classical ones is that of non-local games and interactive protocols. This raises a natural question, not addressed by the Gottesman-Knill theorem: Do quantum computers using only Clifford gates have an advantage over classical computers in the setting of interactive protocols where they are allowed to share entanglement?

*Weizmann Institute of Science, Rehovot, Israel. Email: itay.shalit@weizmann.ac.il

1.1 Our Results

In an interactive protocol, a classical verifier interacts with non-communicating provers through one or more rounds of classical communication, ultimately deciding whether to accept or reject based on the interaction. We consider two different computational models. In the first model, which we refer to as the *classical computational model*, the provers can only perform classical operations and are allowed to share random bits prior to the interaction. In the second model, termed the *Clifford computational model*, the provers are quantum but are restricted to applying only Clifford operations to their qubits, in addition to applying any classical operations to qubits immediately after measuring them. Moreover, in this model the provers are allowed to share entangled qubits before the interaction begins.

We answer the question given above by proving a theorem:

Theorem: *For any $K, R \in \mathbb{N}$, let G be an interactive protocol with K provers and R rounds, and let S be a quantum strategy for G in the Clifford computational model. Then, there exists a classical strategy S^* for G which is equivalent to S .*

Strategies are considered equivalent if their interaction with the protocol’s verifier produces the same distribution of questions and answers. Notably, unlike the Gottesman-Knill theorem, our result is not limited to circuits operating on qubits initialized in stabilizer states; it holds for any quantum state shared by the provers, including those whose preparation requires using non-Clifford operations. The computation of random bits shared between the provers that execute the classical strategy we describe is not known to be efficient, unless the provers in the quantum strategy share a stabilizer state. However, the computation performed by the classical provers throughout the interaction is efficient with respect to the circuit complexity of provers that implement the quantum strategy and the number of qubits they use.

This result directly implies an equality between the complexity classes Clifford-MIP* and MIP. MIP is the class of languages decidable by a classical verifier interacting with multiple classical provers that may share random bits prior to the interaction. We define Clifford-MIP* as the class of languages decidable by a classical verifier interacting with multiple quantum provers sharing entanglement but limited to performing only Clifford operations in addition to classical operations on measured qubits. Notably, the class MIP*, defined similarly to Clifford-MIP* but allowing the provers to perform any quantum operations, equals the class RE of recursively enumerable languages—vastly larger than MIP [4]. The stark contrast between the powers of MIP* and Clifford-MIP* highlights the significant limitations of strategies restricted to Clifford gates and classical operations in the non-local setting compared to general quantum strategies.

Furthermore, we use this result to address a question raised by Kalai et al. in their work which introduces a method for compiling any non-local game into a single-prover interactive game [5]. A non-local game is a single-round interactive protocol. In the compiled game, quantum homomorphic encryption (QHE) is employed to simulate the spatial separation of the different provers, and is required for evaluating the strategies of all but one of the provers on encrypted queries. It is shown that, assuming the existence of quantum homomorphic encryption satisfying a natural form of correctness with respect to auxiliary quantum input, the quantum completeness and classical soundness guarantees of any non-local game are preserved under this compilation method. In follow-up work, similar (but weaker) results were obtained regarding the quantum soundness of

compiled non-local games [2, 6, 7].

When this compilation method is paired with a non-local game exhibiting a quantum advantage, it naturally suggests a protocol for verification of quantum advantage. In this protocol, a verifier plays the compiled game with a single prover, who is asked to demonstrate quantum advantage by surpassing the classical soundness guarantee of the game. Unlike other verification schemes for quantum advantage, this protocol does not require assuming the adaptive hardcore bit property, nor does it require quantum random oracles.

However, a potential weakness of this protocol is the computational cost of applying general quantum homomorphic encryption, which thus renders the resultant protocol for verification of quantum advantage rather inefficient. In contrast, QHE schemes handling only Clifford gates are much simpler than general QHE schemes; in particular, they only require applying the intended Clifford gates and additional classical computations. Therefore, the authors pose the question of whether there exists a non-local game where, once an appropriate bipartite state is prepared, all but one of the prover strategies can be implemented using only Clifford gates. If such a game exists, it could be compiled using a QHE scheme handling only Clifford gates, resulting in a truly efficient protocol.

We provide a negative answer to this question by proving the following statement:

Theorem: *Let there be a non-local game G and a quantum strategy S , such that the success probability of S in G exceeds that of any classical strategy. Then, at least two provers in S must operate outside the Clifford computational model.*

Operating outside the Clifford computational model means using quantum operations other than Clifford operations and classical operations on measured qubits. We achieve this result by describing an equivalent classical strategy for any quantum strategy for a non-local game in which all players but at most one operate in the Clifford computational model.

Overall, our results advance the understanding of the power of quantum computation restricted to Clifford operations. We show that, unlike general quantum strategies, those in the Clifford computational model cannot leverage entanglement to outperform classical strategies in interactive protocols. Our proof offers insight into the mechanisms underlying this limitation (see the Proof Overview section for details). Additionally, we provide an answer to an open question, which may contribute to a better understanding of certain potential paths towards designing realizable protocols for verification of quantum advantage.

Next, we provide a high-level overview of the proof of our main result. The proof of our result on non-local games uses a similar approach.

1.2 Proof Overview

Our main result can be stated informally as follows:

Theorem: *Let G be an interactive protocol with K provers and R rounds, and let S be a quantum strategy for G in the Clifford computational model. Then, there exists a classical strategy S^* for G which is equivalent to S .*

A formal statement of this result is Theorem 1. In our proof, we construct a classical strategy equivalent to any circuit implementation C of a quantum strategy S for an interactive protocol G , provided that S uses only Clifford operations and classical computations on measured qubits. The classical strategy operates as follows:

1. The classical provers have a hard-coded series of arbitrary questions that may be sent by the verifier of G to the provers throughout a full interaction.
2. Before the interaction begins, the classical provers jointly sample measurement results and answers from the distribution that would arise if provers following the quantum strategy S received the hard-coded questions. They share an encoding of this precomputed interaction.
3. During the interaction, when the verifier sends actual questions that may differ from the hard-coded ones, the provers compute corrections to their precomputed measurement results based on the differences between the expected and received questions. Thus, they produce responses that mimic the statistical behavior of the quantum strategy.

The corrections applied by the classical provers are computed using a sequence of operators $R_{i,w}^r$ in the Pauli group, where each $R_{i,w}^r$ corresponds to prover i ($1 \leq i \leq K$), round r ($1 \leq r \leq R$), and measurement index w ($1 \leq w \leq \ell_i^r$). Each operator $R_{i,w}^r$ encapsulates the cumulative effect of the i^{th} prover's operations up to the w^{th} measurement it performs in the r^{th} round. The result of this measurement is calculated by the i^{th} classical prover through applying $R_{i,w}^r$ to the corresponding measurement result in the precomputed interaction. Note that a Pauli operator indeed maps any standard basis element to another standard basis element.

The operators $R_{i,w}^r$ are defined recursively, based on the precomputed interaction and the actual questions received and measurement outcomes computed during the interaction of the classical provers with the verifier. Each operator is computed through the conjugation of a Pauli operator by a Clifford unitary, and hence is itself a Pauli operator. Specifically, for each prover i , round r , and measurement index w , the operator $R_{i,w}^r$ is defined as:

$$R_{i,w}^r = U_{i,w}^r (A_{i,w}^r \otimes R_{i,w-1}^r) U_{i,w}^{r\dagger},$$

where:

- $U_{i,w}^r$ is the Clifford unitary applied by prover i at step w of round r ,
- $A_{i,w}^r$ is a Pauli operator (specifically, a tensor product of Pauli- X and Pauli- I operators) that accounts for the differences between the expected and received questions or results of classical computations on measurement outcomes,
- $R_{i,w-1}^r$ is the operator from the previous measurement (with $R_{i,0}^r$ being the identity operator if $r = 1$, or otherwise the final operator from the previous round, $R_{i,\ell_i^{r-1}}^{r-1}$).

Crucially, each prover can compute their corresponding operators locally—without exchanging information with the other provers. Hence, the classical strategy respects the locality constraints of the protocol. This local computability may be seen as equivalent to the inherent limitations of strategies within the Clifford computational model in exploiting entanglement beneficially.

Consider the state of all qubits held by the quantum provers executing S with implementation C immediately after receiving the first question from the verifier. This state can be transformed, via conjugation with the Pauli operator $\bigotimes_{i=1}^K R_{i,1}^1$, into the shared state corresponding to receiving the first round of hard-coded questions used in the algorithm. Because Clifford operations normalize the Pauli group, we can show that this property is maintained throughout the interaction. That is, for any measurement result computed by a classical prover executing the classical strategy, the post-measurement state of the quantum provers—assuming they have followed the interaction simulated by the classical provers up to that point—can be modified to their state at the corresponding step in the precomputed interaction, by conjugation with the Pauli operator $\bigotimes_{i=1}^K R_{i,w}^r$, for the corresponding w, r .

Employing this fact, we show that the following two probabilities are equal with respect to any measurement result computed by the classical simulation:

1. The probability that quantum provers executing S with implementation C obtain this measurement result, given that their interaction up to that point is exactly as computed by the classical provers.
2. The probability that the quantum provers executing S with implementation C obtain the corresponding measurement result in the precomputed interaction, given that their interaction up to that point is exactly as in the precomputed interaction.

From this equality we conclude that the probability of the classical provers producing any given interaction with the verifier, is equal to the probability of quantum provers producing this interaction. This proves the correctness of the algorithm.

Regarding the efficiency of the simulation, Pauli operators can be efficiently represented classically. Additionally, the mapping of one Pauli operator to another via a Clifford operator, as well as the mapping of one standard basis element to another via a Pauli operator, can both be efficiently computed classically. This ensures that except the pre-computation of the shared encoded interaction, the computation performed by the classical provers throughout the interaction with the verifier is efficient with respect to the circuit complexity of provers that apply the corresponding quantum strategy and the number of qubits they use. Computing the shared interaction is only guaranteed to be efficient if the quantum provers share a stabilizer state.

1.3 Future Work

Our work establishes that for any quantum strategy within the Clifford computational model for a multi-round interactive protocol, as well as any quantum strategy for a single-round interactive protocol where at most one prover is outside the Clifford computational model, there exist equivalent classical strategies. This result is optimal for single-round protocols, as there are known protocols where a strategy involving two provers outside the Clifford computational model outperforms the best possible classical strategy. A famous example of such a protocol is the CHSH game. However, it remains an open question whether a multi-round protocol exists such that a quantum strategy, with exactly one prover outside the Clifford computational model, surpasses the best classical strategy.

1.4 Acknowledgements

Thanks are due to Zvika Brakerski and Thomas Vidick for helpful discussions and valuable insights, which contributed to the development of this work.

2 Preliminaries

We assume a basic knowledge of the theory of quantum information and computation. For an introduction to this topic, the reader is referred to [8]. We open with a series of definitions regarding interactive protocols.

Definition 1. *An interactive protocol with K provers and R rounds is defined as*

$$G = \left((Q_i)_{i=1}^K, (A_i)_{i=1}^K, \{\pi_r\}_{r=1}^R, v \right).$$

Here:

- For each prover i ($1 \leq i \leq K$), $Q_i \subseteq \{0, 1\}^{s_i}$ ($s_i \in \mathbb{N}$), is a finite set of possible questions that can be sent to prover i , and $A_i \subseteq \{0, 1\}^{t_i}$ is a finite set of possible answers that can be returned by prover i in the r^{th} round of interaction.
- The protocol proceeds in R rounds. In each round r ($1 \leq r \leq R$):
 - The verifier sends a question $q_i^r \in Q_i$ to each prover i .
 - Each prover i replies with an answer $a_i^r \in A_i$.
- The provers cannot communicate with each other during the protocol.
- A history up to round r ($1 \leq r \leq R$) is a sequence

$$h^r := \left((q_i^j, a_i^j)_{i=1}^K \right)_{j=1}^r$$

consisting of the questions sent to and answers received from all provers in rounds 1 to r . Let us denote the set of histories up to round r by H^r .

We denote all questions sent by the verifier in round j ($1 \leq j \leq r$) of h^r by

$$q^j := (q_i^j)_{i=1}^K$$

Similarly, we denote all answers sent by the provers in round j ($1 \leq j \leq r$) of h^r by

$$a^j := (a_i^j)_{i=1}^K$$

- For each prover i , a local history up to round r is a sequence

$$h_i^r = (q_i^j, a_i^j)_{j=1}^r,$$

consisting of the questions received by prover i and the answers provided by prover i in rounds 1 to r . Let us denote the set of local histories for prover i up to round r by H_i^r .

- For each round r , the function π_r assigns a probability mass to the sequence of questions sent by the verifier in that round, conditioned on the history up to that point:

$$\pi_r : H^{r-1} \times \prod_{i=1}^K Q_i \rightarrow [0, 1],$$

- The function v determines the outcome of the protocol (win or loss) based on the history after R rounds:

$$v : H^R \rightarrow \{0, 1\},$$

where H^R is the set of possible histories after R rounds.

Definition 2. A non-local game is an interactive protocol with a single round of communication.

Definition 3. A quantum strategy S for an interactive protocol $G = ((Q_i)_{i=1}^K, (A_i)_{i=1}^K, \{\pi_r\}_{r=1}^R, v)$ is defined as

$$S = \left(|\psi\rangle, \left((M_i^r)_{i=1}^K \right)_{r=1}^R \right).$$

Here, $|\psi\rangle$ is a pure quantum state over n qubits (for some $n \in \mathbb{N}$) which are shared by the provers. M_i^r ($1 \leq i \leq K$, $1 \leq r \leq R$) is the projective measurement (PVM) performed by the i^{th} prover in the r^{th} round, on the question (bit-string) it receives from the verifier, and on its part of $|\psi\rangle$. The outcomes of M_i^r correspond to elements of A_i .

Some definitions of a strategy allow a prover to operate on ancilla qubits in addition to the prover's part of $|\psi\rangle$. However, we assume without loss of generality that all ancilla qubits a prover operates on are included in the part of $|\psi\rangle$ that is held by the prover.

Definition 4. A classical strategy with shared randomness S for G is defined as

$$S = \left(P, \left((f_i^r)_{i=1}^K \right)_{r=1}^R \right).$$

Here, P is a probability distribution on $\{0, 1\}^\lambda$ (for some $\lambda \in \mathbb{N}$), from which the random bits that are shared by the provers are sampled at the beginning of the protocol. For each $1 \leq i \leq K$, $1 \leq r \leq R$:

- H_i^{r-1} denotes the set of possible local histories of prover i up to round $r - 1$.
- $f_i^r : \{0, 1\}^\lambda \times H_i^{r-1} \times Q_i \rightarrow A_i$ is a function that, given a shared random bit-string $s \in \{0, 1\}^\lambda$, a local history $h_i^{r-1} \in H_i^{r-1}$, and a question $q_i^r \in Q_i$ received in round r , outputs the answer $a_i^r \in A_i$ of prover i in round r .

Definition 5. A full history up to round r ($1 \leq r \leq R$) of an interaction between a verifier of a protocol G and provers following a quantum strategy S with an implementation C , is a sequence

$$h^r := \left(\left(q_i^j, a_i^j, (v_{i,w}^j)_{w=1}^{\ell_i^j} \right)_{i=1}^K \right)_{j=1}^r$$

consisting of the questions sent to and answers received from all provers, in addition to the results of all measurements performed by the provers, in rounds 1 to r . ℓ_i^j is the number of measurements performed by the i^{th} prover in the r^{th} round. Let us denote the set of full histories of implementation C up to round r by \hat{H}_C^r .

We denote all questions sent by the verifier in round j ($1 \leq j \leq r$) of h^r by

$$q^j := (q_i^j)_{i=1}^K$$

Similarly, we denote all answers sent by the provers in round j ($1 \leq j \leq r$) of h^r by

$$a^j := (a_i^j)_{i=1}^K$$

Additionally, we denote all measurements results obtained by in round j ($1 \leq j \leq r$) of h^r by

$$v^j := (v_i^j)_{i=1}^K$$

where $v_i^j := (v_{i,1}^j, \dots, v_{i,\ell_i^j}^j)$, and $v_{i,w}^j$ is the result of the w^{th} measurement performed by the i^{th} prover in the j^{th} round.

Definition 6. Let G be an interactive protocol, and let $S = (|\psi\rangle, (M_i)_{i=1}^K)$ be a quantum strategy for it. An implementation of S is a sequence of quantum circuits $\left((C_i^r)_{i=1}^K \right)_{r=1}^R$, such that for each prover i and each round r , C_i^r implements the measurement M_i^r .

Definition 7. For any strategy S for G , whether quantum or classical, we denote by $P_{G,S}$ the joint probability distribution over histories h^R after R rounds.

Formally, for any history $h^R = \left((q_i^r, a_i^r)_{i=1}^K \right)_{r=1}^R$:

$$P_{G,S}(h^R) = \prod_{r=1}^R [\pi_r(h^{r-1}, q^r) \cdot p_S(a^r | h^{r-1}, q^r)],$$

where:

- h^{r-1} is the history up to round $r-1$.
- $p_S(a^r | h^{r-1}, q^r)$ is the probability that the provers following strategy S , provide answers a_1^r, \dots, a_K^r in round r given the history h^{r-1} and the questions q_1^r, \dots, q_K^r in round r .

Definition 8. For any quantum strategy S for G , and an implementation C of S , we denote by $P_{G,S,C}$ the joint probability distribution over full histories h^R after R rounds.

Formally, for any full history $h^R = \left(\left(q_i^r, a_i^r, (v_{i,w}^r)_{w=1}^{\ell_i^r} \right)_{i=1}^K \right)_{r=1}^R$:

$$P_{G,S,C}(h^R) = \prod_{r=1}^R \pi(h^{r-1}, q^r) \cdot \prod_{w=1}^{\ell^r} p_{S,C}(v_w^r | h^{r-1}, q^r, v_1^r, \dots, v_{w-1}^r)$$

$p_{S,C}(v_w^r | h^{r-1}, q^r, v_1^r, \dots, v_{w-1}^r)$ is the probability of the w^{th} measurements of provers executing S with an implementation C being $v_w^r := (v_{1,w}^r, \dots, v_{K,w}^r)$, provided that the history of the interaction in the first $r-1$ rounds was h^{r-1} , the questions sent in round r were $q^r := q_1^r, \dots, q_K^r$, and previous measurement results in round r were $(v_1^r, \dots, v_{w-1}^r)$.

Definition 9. Two strategies S and S' for G , whether quantum or classical, are considered equivalent if and only if

$$P_{G,S} = P_{G,S'}.$$

That is, they induce the same joint probability distribution over histories after R rounds.

Definition 10. [8]

The single-qubit Pauli group \mathcal{P}_1 consists of all 2×2 unitary matrices generated by the Pauli matrices $I, X, Y,$ and $Z,$ along with multiplicative factors $\{\pm 1, \pm i\}$:

$$\mathcal{P}_1 = \left\{ e^{i\theta} P \mid \theta \in \left\{ 0, \frac{\pi}{2}, \pi, \frac{3\pi}{2} \right\}, P \in \{I, X, Y, Z\} \right\},$$

where

$$I = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad X = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad Y = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -i \\ i & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad Z = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix}.$$

The n -qubit Pauli group \mathcal{P}_n is defined as the n -fold tensor product of single-qubit Pauli operators with phase factors:

$$\mathcal{P}_n = \left\{ e^{i\theta} P_1 \otimes P_2 \otimes \cdots \otimes P_n \mid \theta \in \left\{ 0, \frac{\pi}{2}, \pi, \frac{3\pi}{2} \right\}, P_i \in \{I, X, Y, Z\} \right\}.$$

Definition 11. The set of Clifford quantum gates consists of the following unitary operations:

$$H = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 1 & -1 \end{pmatrix} \quad CNOT = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \quad S = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & i \end{pmatrix}$$

Definition 12. Let $U(2^n)$ denote the group of $2^n \times 2^n$ unitary operators acting on n qubits. The Clifford group on n qubits, denoted by \mathcal{C}_n , is the normalizer of the Pauli group \mathcal{P}_n in $U(2^n)$:

$$\mathcal{C}_n = \left\{ U \in U(2^n) \mid U\mathcal{P}_n U^\dagger = \mathcal{P}_n \right\}$$

That is, for all $U \in \mathcal{C}_n$ and all $P \in \mathcal{P}_n$, the conjugation of P by U yields another Pauli operator:

$$UPU^\dagger \in \mathcal{P}_n$$

Furthermore, the Clifford group is the largest subgroup of $U(2^n)$ that preserves the Pauli group under conjugation.

Next, let us state a lemma regarding the Clifford group.

Lemma 1. [8] The Clifford group on n qubits, denoted by \mathcal{C}_n , is generated by the following set of matrices:

$$\{H_i : 1 \leq i \leq n\} \cup \{S_i : 1 \leq i \leq n\} \cup \{CNOT_{i,j} : 1 \leq i, j \leq n, i \neq j\}$$

Where H_i, S_i are H, S (respectively) operating on the i^{th} qubit, and $CNOT_{i,j}$ is $CNOT$ operating on the $i^{\text{th}}, j^{\text{th}}$ qubits.

According to Definition 12, conjugation by any Clifford unitary $U \in \mathcal{C}_n$ maps elements of the Pauli group \mathcal{P}_n to other elements within \mathcal{P}_n . Lemma 1 establishes that any such U can be implemented using Clifford gates. To classically compute UPU^\dagger for $P \in \mathcal{P}_n$, one can proceed as follows:

1. Represent P as a tensor product of single-qubit Pauli operators and a complex phase.
2. Decompose U into a sequence of Clifford gates (e.g., $H, S,$ and $CNOT$ gates).

3. Sequentially update the representation of P by applying the conjugation action of each gate in the sequence. Since the conjugation of a Pauli operator by a Clifford gate results in another Pauli operator, the updated representation remains within \mathcal{P}_n .

The computational complexity depends on the number of gates m in the implementation of U :

- If $m = O(n)$, the computation can be performed in $O(n)$ time.
- Otherwise, the computation requires $O(m)$ time.

Theorem 1 (Gottesman-Knill Theorem). [3] *Any quantum circuit that is composed entirely of the following can be efficiently simulated on a classical computer:*

- Initialization of qubits in computational basis states.
- Application of quantum gates from the Clifford group \mathcal{C}_n .
- Measurement of qubits in the computational basis.

The simulation can be performed in polynomial time in the number of qubits n and the number of gates in the circuit.

Definition 13. *A quantum circuit limited to Clifford gates and classical operations is one that includes only the following gates:*

1. Clifford gates (CNOT, H , S).
2. Any classical logical operations, which can only be performed on qubits immediately after they are measured. These operations are not necessarily invertible.

Lemma 2. [9] *The deferred measurement principle states that measurements can be postponed until the end of a quantum circuit without affecting the outcome, provided that any operations dependent on measurement results are appropriately adjusted. If measurement results are used during the circuit, classically controlled operations can be replaced with conditional quantum operations.*

We explain how the deferred measurement principle can be applied to move all measurements in a quantum circuit to its final step, while maintaining the circuit's functionality. Let there be a quantum circuit C . The deferred measurement principle can be applied as follows:

1. For any measurement of a qubit q in C that is not at the final step, add an ancilla qubit a initialized to $|0\rangle$.
2. Instead of measuring q , insert a CNOT gate controlled by q targeting qubit a .
3. At the final step of the circuit, measure qubit a in the standard basis.

Definition (MIP): The complexity class MIP consists of all languages L for which there exists a probabilistic polynomial-time verifier V that interacts with multiple computationally unbounded but non-communicating classical provers P_1, P_2, \dots, P_k , that are allowed to share random bits before the interaction, such that there exist functions $c, s : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow [0, 1]$ satisfying $c(|x|) - s(|x|) \geq \frac{1}{\text{poly}(|x|)}$, and:

- **(Completeness)** If $x \in L$, then there exist provers that convince the verifier to accept with a probability at least $c(|x|)$.

- **(Soundness)** If $x \notin L$, then any provers can convince the verifier to accept except with a probability at most $s(|x|)$

Definition (MIP*): The complexity class MIP^* consists of all languages L for which there exists a probabilistic polynomial-time verifier V that interacts with multiple computationally unbounded but non-communicating quantum provers P_1, P_2, \dots, P_k that are allowed to share entangled qubits prior to the interaction, such that there exist functions $c, s : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow [0, 1]$ satisfying $c(|x|) - s(|x|) \geq \frac{1}{\text{poly}(|x|)}$, and::

- **(Completeness)** If $x \in L$, then there exist provers that convince the verifier to accept with a probability at least $c(|x|)$.
- **(Soundness)** If $x \notin L$, then any provers can convince the verifier to accept except with a probability at most $s(|x|)$

We define a new complexity class, denoted $\text{Clifford} - \text{MIP}^*$, as follows:

Definition (Clifford-MIP*): The complexity class $\text{Clifford} - \text{MIP}^*$ consists of all languages L for which there exists a probabilistic polynomial-time verifier V that interacts with multiple computationally unbounded but non-communicating quantum provers P_1, P_2, \dots, P_k that are allowed to share entangled qubits prior to the interaction, and are constrained to applying only Clifford operations in addition to classical computations on measured qubits, such that for some parameters $c(|x|) > s(|x|) + \frac{1}{\text{poly}(|x|)}$:

- **(Completeness)** If $x \in L$, then there exist provers that convince the verifier to accept with a probability at least $c(|x|)$.
- **(Soundness)** If $x \notin L$, then any provers can convince the verifier to accept except with a probability at most $s(|x|)$.

3 Clifford Strategies for Interactive Protocols

3.1 Classical Simulation of Clifford Strategies

We state and prove the main theorem of the current section.

Theorem 2. *Let there be an interactive protocol with K provers and R rounds*

$$G = \left((Q_i)_{i=1}^K, (A_i)_{i=1}^K, \{\pi_r\}_{r=1}^R, v \right) \text{ with } K \text{ provers, and a quantum strategy } S = \left(|\psi\rangle, \left((M_i^r)_{i=1}^K \right)_{r=1}^R \right)$$

for G . Furthermore, there exists an implementation of S denoted $C = \left((C_i^r)_{i=1}^K \right)_{r=1}^R$ such that $\forall 1 \leq i \leq K, 1 \leq r \leq R, C_i^r$ is a quantum circuit limited to Clifford gates and classical operations on measured qubits. Then, there exists a classical strategy S^ for G that meets the following conditions:*

1. S^* is equivalent to S .
2. The computation performed by the provers executing S^* throughout the interaction is efficient with respect to the circuit complexity of the provers that implement S and the number of qubits they use. However, computing the random bits that are shared between the provers before the interaction is only known to be efficient with respect to the same parameters if $|\psi\rangle$ is a stabilizer state.

Proof. In the proof, we present a classical strategy for G which is equivalent to S . However, before presenting this classical strategy, we begin by analyzing the strategy S .

3.1.1 Analysis of the Quantum Strategy S

Let (P_1, \dots, P_K) be provers that follow this strategy with an implementation C . Then at the beginning of the game (before receiving questions from the verifier), the state of all qubits held by the provers is $\rho := |\psi\rangle\langle\psi|$.

For any $1 \leq i \leq K, 1 \leq r \leq R$, the circuit C_i^r operates on the input bit-string received by P_i from the verifier in the r^{th} round of the interaction, and on P_i 's part of the shared state at that point. We can represent C_i^r as a sequence $(U_{i,1}^r, M_{i,1}^r, f_{i,1}^r, \dots, U_{i,\ell_i^r-1}^r, M_{i,\ell_i^r-1}^r, f_{i,\ell_i^r-1}^r, U_{i,\ell_i^r}^r, M_{i,\ell_i^r}^r)$, where $\forall 1 \leq w \leq \ell_i^r$, $U_{i,w}^r$ is a unitary composed of Clifford gates, $M_{i,w}^r$ is a standard basis measurement of a subset of the qubits held by the i^{th} prover in the r^{th} round, and $f_{i,w}^r$ is a classical computation which operates on the qubits measured by $M_{i,w}^r$. C_i^r is equivalent to the application of the elements in the above sequence in chronological order going from left to right.

Furthermore, consider two sequences of questions:

$$q := \left((q_i^r)_{i=1}^K \right)_{r=1}^R, \quad \tilde{q} := \left((\tilde{q}_i^r)_{i=1}^K \right)_{r=1}^R,$$

such that for all $1 \leq i \leq K$ and $1 \leq r \leq R$, we have $q_i^r, \tilde{q}_i^r \in Q_i$. Additionally, let there be two sequences of possible measurement outcomes obtained by the provers throughout the different rounds:

$$v := \left(\left((v_{i,w}^r)_{w=1}^{\ell_i^r} \right)_{i=1}^K \right)_{r=1}^R, \quad \tilde{v} := \left(\left((\tilde{v}_{i,w}^r)_{w=1}^{\ell_i^r} \right)_{i=1}^K \right)_{r=1}^R,$$

where the bit-string $v_{i,w}^r$ is a possible outcome of the measurement $M_{i,w}^r$, which is the w -th measurement performed by the i -th prover in the r -th round. Based on v and \tilde{v} , we denote by y and \tilde{y} the corresponding sequences of results of the classical computations performed on measurement outcomes. That is,

$$y_{i,w}^r = f_{i,w}^r(v_{i,w}^r), \quad \tilde{y}_{i,w}^r = f_{i,w}^r(\tilde{v}_{i,w}^r).$$

For convenience, we make two assumptions without loss of generality:

1. The result of any classical computation performed on a set of measured qubits is stored in ancilla qubits that are each initialized to $|0\rangle$ and are not used by the prover up to that point. That is, for all $1 \leq i \leq K, 1 \leq r \leq R$, and w , the unitary $U_{i,w}^r$ does not operate on qubits that are designated for storing $y_{i,w'}^{r'}$ for $w' \geq w$ and $r' \geq r$. This implies that $U_{i,w+1}^r$ may operate on more qubits than $U_{i,w}^r$ does. We denote by $d_{i,w}^r$ the number of qubits on which $U_{i,w}^r$ operates.
2. As the last step performed by the i^{th} prover in any round r , it measures t_i qubits and sends the measurement result to the verifier.

3.1.2 Definitions of Operators

Next, let there be two bitstrings $x, y \in \{0, 1\}^n$ for some $n \in \mathbb{N}$. We define the operator $A_{x,y}$ as follows:

$$A_{x,y} = \bigotimes_{i=1}^n X^{\mathbb{I}[x_i, y_i]}$$

where

$$\mathbb{I}[x_i \neq y_i] = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } x_i \neq y_i \\ 0 & \text{if } x_i = y_i \end{cases}$$

$$X^{\mathbb{I}[x_i, y_i]} = \begin{cases} X & \text{if } \mathbb{I}[x_i \neq y_i] = 1 \\ I & \text{if } \mathbb{I}[x_i \neq y_i] = 0 \end{cases}$$

X is the Pauli- X (bit-flip) operator and I is the identity operator. By definition of $A_{x,y}$, the following holds:

$$|x\rangle = A_{x,y} |y\rangle$$

We proceed to define a sequence of unitary operators which depends on $q, \tilde{q}, y, \tilde{y}$, that will be used by provers that implement the classical strategy. We denote these operators by $\left(\left(\left(R_{i,w}^r(q, \tilde{q}, y, \tilde{y}) \right)_{w=1}^{\ell_i^r} \right)_{i=1}^K \right)_{r=1}^R$.

For brevity, we will often omit $(q, \tilde{q}, y, \tilde{y})$ from the notation when the choice of parameters is clear from context. These operators are defined recursively as follows for any $1 \leq i \leq K$:

$$R_{i,1}^1 := U_{i,1}^1(A_{q_i^1, \tilde{q}_i^1} \otimes I_{i,1}^1)(U_{i,1}^1)^\dagger$$

$$\forall 2 \leq w \leq \ell_i^1 : R_{i,w}^1 := U_{i,w}^1(A_{y_{i,w-1}^1, \tilde{y}_{i,w-1}^1} \otimes R_{i,w-1}^1)(U_{i,w}^1)^\dagger$$

Furthermore, we define the following operators for any $2 \leq r \leq R$:

$$R_{i,1}^r := U_{i,1}^r(A_{q_i^r, \tilde{q}_i^r} \otimes R_{i, \ell_i^{r-1}}^{r-1})(U_{i,1}^r)^\dagger$$

$$\forall 2 \leq w \leq \ell_i^r : R_{i,w}^r := U_{i,w}^r(A_{y_{i,w-1}^r, \tilde{y}_{i,w-1}^r} \otimes R_{i,w-1}^r)(U_{i,w}^r)^\dagger$$

$I_{i,1}^r$ is the identity operator which operates on the qubits of P_i that are not designated for storing the question sent to the i^{th} prover in the r^{th} round, nor the results of later classical computation.

As mentioned above, $U_{i,w}^r$ is a unitary composed of Clifford gates. Hence $U_{i,w}^r \in \mathcal{C}_{d_{i,w}^r}$, the $d_{i,w}^r$ -qubit Clifford group. Furthermore, $A_{q_i^r, \tilde{q}_i^r} \in \mathcal{P}_{s_i}$, the s_i -qubit Pauli group. According to the definition of the Clifford group, for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$, a matrix in \mathcal{C}_n maps any matrix in the Pauli group \mathcal{P}_n to another matrix in that group by conjugation. Therefore, $\forall 1 \leq i \leq K : R_{i,1}^1 \in \mathcal{P}_{d_{i,1}^1}$. This serves as the basis for an inductive argument that proves the following statement:

$$\forall 1 \leq i \leq K, 1 \leq r \leq R, 1 \leq w \leq \ell_i^r : R_{i,w}^r \in \mathcal{P}_{d_{i,w}^r}$$

We first perform induction over w , and then over r . Let there be $1 \leq r \leq R, 1 \leq i \leq K, 1 \leq w \leq \ell_i^r - 1$, and assume that $R_{i,w}^r \in \mathcal{P}_{d_{i,w}^r}$. Hence, $\xi := A_{y_{i,w}^r, \tilde{y}_{i,w}^r} \otimes R_{i,w}^r \in \mathcal{P}_{d_{i,w}^r}$, which directly implies that $R_{i,w+1}^r = U_{i,w+1}^r \xi (U_{i,w+1}^r)^\dagger \in \mathcal{P}_{d_{i,w+1}^r}$. Next, let there be $1 \leq r \leq R - 1, 1 \leq i \leq K$. We assume that $R_{i, \ell_i^r}^r \in \mathcal{P}_{d_{i, \ell_i^r}^r}$. Hence, $\xi' := A_{q_i^{r+1}, \tilde{q}_i^{r+1}} \otimes R_{i, \ell_i^r}^r \in \mathcal{P}_{d_{i,1}^{r+1}}$. Therefore, $R_{i,1}^{r+1} = U_{i,1}^{r+1} \xi' (U_{i,1}^{r+1})^\dagger \in \mathcal{P}_{d_{i,1}^{r+1}}$.

This completes the argument.

3.1.3 An Equivalent Classical Strategy

We are now ready to discuss Algorithm 1, which describes a classical strategy for G that is equivalent to S .

In the description of Algorithm 1, $\hat{I}_{i,w}^r$ is the identity operator which operates on the same qubits on which $R_{i,w}^r$ does, excluding these that the i^{th} prover measures to obtain $v_{i,w}^r$. Next, we prove the correctness of the strategy described by Algorithm 1 and analyze its running time complexity. Consider an interaction between a verifier V executing protocol G and provers (P_1, \dots, P_K) implementing strategy S . This interaction produces a full history:

$$h^R = \left((q_i^r, v_i^r, a_i^r)_{i=1}^K \right)_{r=1}^R.$$

We denote the series of questions asked by the verifier in h^R by:

$$q = \left((q_i^r)_{i=1}^K \right)_{r=1}^R.$$

Let there be another possible series of questions $\tilde{q} = \left((\tilde{q}_i^r)_{i=1}^K \right)_{r=1}^R$. We analyze an interaction between V and classical provers executing Algorithm 1, assuming their shared randomness encodes the interaction h^R , while the questions presented to them by the verifier throughout the interaction are \tilde{q} . In this analysis, we refer to the values computed during the interaction as:

$$\left(\left((\tilde{v}_{i,w}^r, \tilde{y}_{i,w}^r)_{w=1}^{\ell_i^r} \right)_{i=1}^K \right)_{r=1}^R,$$

and to the corresponding operators:

$$\left(\left((R_{i,w}^r(q, \tilde{q}, y, \tilde{y}))_{w=1}^{\ell_i^r} \right)_{i=1}^K \right)_{r=1}^R,$$

From now on, we omit the dependence on $(q, \tilde{q}, y, \tilde{y})$ in the notation for brevity. For each $1 \leq i \leq K$ and $1 \leq r \leq R$, as in Algorithm 1, we define $b_i^r \in \{0, 1\}^{t_i}$ such that:

$$\left(|b_i^r\rangle \langle b_i^r| \otimes \hat{I}_{i,\ell_i^r}^r \right) = R_i^r \left(|a_i^r\rangle \langle a_i^r| \otimes \hat{I}_{i,\ell_i^r}^r \right) R_i^{r\dagger}.$$

Without loss of generality, we assume that for each round $1 \leq r \leq R$, the number of measurements performed in that round is the same across all provers:

$$\ell^r := \ell_1^r = \ell_2^r = \dots = \ell_K^r.$$

If this is not the case we set $\ell^r := \max_{1 \leq i \leq K} \{\ell_i^r\}$, and for any prover i with $\ell_i^r < \ell^r$, we define for $\ell_i^r < w \leq \ell^r$:

$$U_{i,w}^r = I, \quad M_{i,w}^r = M_{i,\ell_i^r}^r, \quad f_{i,w}^r = f_{i,\ell_i^r}^r.$$

This means that the redundant operations are identical to the prover's last original operation, and thus do not change its state. By assuming all provers make the same number of measurements at

Algorithm 1 Classical Simulation of a Clifford Strategy

1: An arbitrary sequence of questions for all rounds, $q = (q^1, \dots, q^R)$, is hard-coded into the algorithm. For each round $r = 1$ to R , sample measurement results v^r and answers a^r in ascending order:

- Sample v^r from the distribution $P_S(v^r \mid q^{\leq r}, v^{< r}, a^{< r})$.
- Sample a^r from the distribution $P_S(a^r \mid q^{\leq r}, v^{\leq r}, a^{< r})$.

Here, $q^{\leq r} = (q^1, \dots, q^r)$, $v^{< r} = (v^1, \dots, v^{r-1})$, and $a^{< r} = (a^1, \dots, a^{r-1})$. The measurement results v^r are given by $v^r = \left(\left(v_{i,w}^r \right)_{i=1}^K \right)_{w=1}^{\ell_i^r}$.

The provers share the randomness $h = (q^r, v^r, a^r)_{r=1}^R$.

2: The interaction with the provers begins. Denote the interaction transcript by $\tilde{h} = (\tilde{q}^r, \tilde{v}^r, b^r)_{r=1}^R$. In the first round ($r = 1$), each prover i performs the following:

1. Compute the matrix $A_{q_i^1, \tilde{q}_i^1}$, represented as a bit-string $z \in \{0, 1\}^{s_i}$, where $z_j = \mathbb{I}[(q_i^1)_j \neq (\tilde{q}_i^1)_j]$ for all $1 \leq j \leq s_i$.
2. Compute $R_{i,1}^1 = U_{i,1}^1 \left(A_{q_i^1, \tilde{q}_i^1} \otimes I_{i,1}^1 \right) U_{i,1}^{1\dagger}$ in the Pauli group.
3. Compute $\tilde{v}_{i,1}^1 = R_{i,1}^1 \left(v_{i,1}^1 \otimes \hat{I}_{i,1}^1 \right) R_{i,1}^{1\dagger}$.
4. Compute $\tilde{y}_{i,1}^1 = f_{i,1}^1 \left(\tilde{v}_{i,1}^1 \right)$ and $y_{i,1}^1 = f_{i,1}^1 \left(v_{i,1}^1 \right)$.
5. Compute $A_{y_{i,1}^1, \tilde{y}_{i,1}^1}$.
6. For $w = 2$ to ℓ_i^1 , repeat steps (2)–(5) to compute $R_{i,w}^1$ and $A_{y_{i,w}^1, \tilde{y}_{i,w}^1}$ recursively.

3: In each subsequent round $r = 2$ to R , each prover i performs:

1. Compute the matrix $A_{q_i^r, \tilde{q}_i^r}$.
2. Compute $R_{i,1}^r = U_{i,1}^r \left(A_{q_i^r, \tilde{q}_i^r} \otimes R_{i, \ell_i^{r-1}}^{r-1} \right) U_{i,1}^{r\dagger}$.
3. Compute $\tilde{v}_{i,1}^r = R_{i,1}^r \left(v_{i,1}^r \otimes \hat{I}_{i,1}^r \right) R_{i,1}^{r\dagger}$.
4. Compute $\tilde{y}_{i,1}^r = f_{i,1}^r \left(\tilde{v}_{i,1}^r \right)$ and $y_{i,1}^r = f_{i,1}^r \left(v_{i,1}^r \right)$.
5. Compute $A_{y_{i,1}^r, \tilde{y}_{i,1}^r}$.
6. For $w = 2$ to ℓ_i^r , repeat steps (2)–(5) to compute $R_{i,w}^r$ and $A_{y_{i,w}^r, \tilde{y}_{i,w}^r}$ recursively.

4: At the end of each round $r = 1$ to R , each prover i computes its answer $b_i^r \in \{0, 1\}^{t_i}$ such that:

$$(|b_i^r\rangle \langle b_i^r| \otimes I_i^r) = R_{i, \ell_i^r}^r (|a_i^r\rangle \langle a_i^r| \otimes I_i^r) (R_{i, \ell_i^r}^r)^\dagger.$$

each given round, we can model their operation by considering them to perform the w^{th} measurement in a given round simultaneously, for each w . For all $1 \leq r \leq R$ and $1 \leq w \leq \ell^r$, let $\rho_{a,q,v,r,w}$ denote the post-measurement state of all qubits held by the K provers executing the strategy S right after the w^{th} measurement of the r^{th} round, under the following conditions:

- For each $1 \leq j \leq r$, the provers receive the questions (q_1^j, \dots, q_K^j) from the verifier in the j^{th} round.
- For $1 \leq j < r$, the measurement results throughout the j^{th} round are $v^j = \left(\left(v_{i,w'}^j \right)_{i=1}^K \right)_{w'=1}^{\ell^j}$, and their final answers are $a^j = \left(a_i^j \right)_{i=1}^K$.
- In the r^{th} round, the results of the first w measurements are $\left(\left(v_{i,w'}^r \right)_{i=1}^K \right)_{w'=1}^w$.

We begin by examining $\rho_{b,\tilde{q},\tilde{v},1,1}$. We have:

$$\rho_{b,\tilde{q},\tilde{v},1,1} = \left(\bigotimes_{i=1}^K \left(|\tilde{v}_{i,1}^1\rangle \langle \tilde{v}_{i,1}^1| \otimes \hat{I}_{i,1}^1 \right) \right) \left(\bigotimes_{i=1}^K U_{i,1}^1 \right) \left(\left(\bigotimes_{i=1}^K |\tilde{q}_i^1\rangle \langle \tilde{q}_i^1| \right) \otimes \rho \right) \left(\bigotimes_{i=1}^K U_{i,1}^{1\dagger} \right) \left(\bigotimes_{i=1}^K \left(|\tilde{v}_{i,1}^1\rangle \langle \tilde{v}_{i,1}^1| \otimes \hat{I}_{i,1}^1 \right) \right).$$

Using the relation:

$$|\tilde{v}_{i,1}^1\rangle \langle \tilde{v}_{i,1}^1| \otimes \hat{I}_{i,1}^1 = R_{i,1}^1 \left(|v_{i,1}^1\rangle \langle v_{i,1}^1| \otimes \hat{I}_{i,1}^1 \right) (R_{i,1}^1)^\dagger,$$

we can rewrite $\rho_{b,\tilde{q},\tilde{v},1,1}$ as:

$$\rho_{b,\tilde{q},\tilde{v},1,1} = \left(\bigotimes_{i=1}^K R_{i,1}^1 \left(|v_{i,1}^1\rangle \langle v_{i,1}^1| \otimes \hat{I}_{i,1}^1 \right) (R_{i,1}^1)^\dagger \right) \left(\bigotimes_{i=1}^K U_{i,1}^1 \right) \left(\left(\bigotimes_{i=1}^K |\tilde{q}_i^1\rangle \langle \tilde{q}_i^1| \right) \otimes \rho \right) \left(\bigotimes_{i=1}^K U_{i,1}^{1\dagger} \right) \left(\bigotimes_{i=1}^K R_{i,1}^1 \left(|v_{i,1}^1\rangle \langle v_{i,1}^1| \otimes \hat{I}_{i,1}^1 \right) (R_{i,1}^1)^\dagger \right).$$

Since $(R_{i,1}^1)^\dagger = R_{i,1}^1$, then $(R_{i,1}^1)^\dagger U_{i,1}^1 = (R_{i,1}^1) U_{i,1}^1 = U_{i,1}^1 (A_{q_i^1, \tilde{q}_i^1} \otimes I_{i,1}^1) (U_{i,1}^1)^\dagger U_{i,1}^1 = U_{i,1}^1 (A_{q_i^1, \tilde{q}_i^1} \otimes I_{i,1}^1)$. Thus, we have:

$$\rho_{b,\tilde{q},\tilde{v},1,1} = \left(\bigotimes_{i=1}^K R_{i,1}^1 \left(|v_{i,1}^1\rangle \langle v_{i,1}^1| \otimes \hat{I}_{i,1}^1 \right) U_{i,1}^1 (A_{q_i^1, \tilde{q}_i^1} \otimes I_{i,1}^1) \right) \left(\left(\bigotimes_{i=1}^K |\tilde{q}_i^1\rangle \langle \tilde{q}_i^1| \right) \otimes \rho \right) \left(\bigotimes_{i=1}^K R_{i,1}^1 \left(|v_{i,1}^1\rangle \langle v_{i,1}^1| \otimes \hat{I}_{i,1}^1 \right) U_{i,1}^1 (A_{q_i^1, \tilde{q}_i^1} \otimes I_{i,1}^1) \right)^\dagger.$$

$A_{q_i^1, \tilde{q}_i^1} |\tilde{q}_i^1\rangle \langle \tilde{q}_i^1| A_{q_i^1, \tilde{q}_i^1} = |q_i^1\rangle \langle q_i^1|$, and therefore:

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_{b,\tilde{q},\tilde{v},1,1} &= \left(\bigotimes_{i=1}^K R_{i,1}^1 \right) \left(\bigotimes_{i=1}^K |v_{i,1}^1\rangle \langle v_{i,1}^1| \otimes \hat{I}_{i,1}^1 \right) \left(\bigotimes_{i=1}^K U_{i,1}^1 \right) \left(\left(\bigotimes_{i=1}^K |q_i^1\rangle \langle q_i^1| \right) \otimes \rho \right) \\ &\quad \left(\bigotimes_{i=1}^K U_{i,1}^1 \right)^\dagger \left(\bigotimes_{i=1}^K |v_{i,1}^1\rangle \langle v_{i,1}^1| \otimes \hat{I}_{i,1}^1 \right) \left(\bigotimes_{i=1}^K R_{i,1}^1 \right)^\dagger = \left(\bigotimes_{i=1}^K R_{i,1}^1 \right) \rho_{a,q,v,1,1} \left(\bigotimes_{i=1}^K R_{i,1}^1 \right)^\dagger. \end{aligned}$$

This serves as a basis for an inductive argument over both r and w , proving the following statement:

$$\text{For } 1 \leq r \leq R, 1 \leq w \leq \ell^r : \quad \rho_{b,\tilde{q},\tilde{v},r,w} = \left(\bigotimes_{i=1}^K R_{i,w}^r \right) \rho_{a,q,v,r,w} \left(\bigotimes_{i=1}^K R_{i,w}^r \right)^\dagger \quad (1)$$

We proceed to describe the induction step on w . Let $1 \leq r \leq R$ and $2 \leq w \leq \ell^r$. Assume that for $w-1$ the following holds:

$$\rho_{b,\tilde{q},\tilde{v},r,w-1} = \left(\bigotimes_{i=1}^K R_{i,w-1}^r \right) \rho_{a,q,v,r,w-1} \left(\bigotimes_{i=1}^K R_{i,w-1}^r \right)^\dagger \quad (2)$$

Then, the following equalities hold:

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_{b,\tilde{q},\tilde{v},r,w} &= \left(\bigotimes_{i=1}^K \left(|\tilde{v}_{i,w}^r\rangle \langle \tilde{v}_{i,w}^r| \otimes \hat{I}_{i,w}^r \right) \right) \left(\bigotimes_{i=1}^K U_{i,w}^r \right) \left(\left(\bigotimes_{i=1}^K |\tilde{y}_{i,w-1}^r\rangle \langle \tilde{y}_{i,w-1}^r| \right) \otimes \rho_{b,\tilde{q},\tilde{v},r,w-1} \right) \left(\bigotimes_{i=1}^K U_{i,w}^r \right)^\dagger \\ &\quad \left(\bigotimes_{i=1}^K \left(|\tilde{v}_{i,w}^r\rangle \langle \tilde{v}_{i,w}^r| \otimes \hat{I}_{i,w}^r \right) \right) \\ &= \left(\bigotimes_{i=1}^K R_{i,w}^r \left(|v_{i,w}^r\rangle \langle v_{i,w}^r| \otimes \hat{I}_{i,w}^r \right) R_{i,w}^{r\dagger} \right) \left(\bigotimes_{i=1}^K U_{i,w}^r \right) \left(\left(\bigotimes_{i=1}^K |\tilde{y}_{i,w-1}^r\rangle \langle \tilde{y}_{i,w-1}^r| \right) \otimes \rho_{b,\tilde{q},\tilde{v},r,w-1} \right) \\ &\quad \left(\bigotimes_{i=1}^K U_{i,w}^r \right)^\dagger \left(\bigotimes_{i=1}^K R_{i,w}^r \left(|v_{i,w}^r\rangle \langle v_{i,w}^r| \otimes \hat{I}_{i,w}^r \right) R_{i,w}^{r\dagger} \right) \quad (3) \end{aligned}$$

Where the last equality holds due to the relation

$$R_{i,w}^r \left(|v_{i,w}^r\rangle \langle v_{i,w}^r| \otimes \hat{I}_{i,w}^r \right) R_{i,w}^{r\dagger} = |\tilde{v}_{i,w}^r\rangle \langle \tilde{v}_{i,w}^r| \otimes \hat{I}_{i,w}^r$$

Moreover, since $(R_{i,w}^r)^\dagger = R_{i,w}^r$, then

$$(R_{i,w}^r)^\dagger U_{i,w}^r = (R_{i,w}^r) U_{i,w}^r = U_{i,w}^r (A_{y_{i,w-1}^r, \tilde{y}_{i,w-1}^r} \otimes R_{i,w-1}^r) (U_{i,w}^r)^\dagger U_{i,w}^r = U_{i,w}^r (A_{y_{i,w-1}^r, \tilde{y}_{i,w-1}^r} \otimes R_{i,w-1}^r)$$

Thus, we have the following:

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_{b,\tilde{q},\tilde{v},r,w} &= \left(\bigotimes_{i=1}^K R_{i,w}^r \left(|v_{i,w}^r\rangle \langle v_{i,w}^r| \otimes \hat{I}_{i,w}^r \right) U_{i,w}^r (A_{y_{i,w-1}^r, \tilde{y}_{i,w-1}^r} \otimes R_{i,w-1}^r) \right) \\ &\quad \left(\left(\bigotimes_{i=1}^K |\tilde{y}_{i,w-1}^r\rangle \langle \tilde{y}_{i,w-1}^r| \right) \otimes \rho_{b,\tilde{q},\tilde{v},r,w-1} \right) \left(\bigotimes_{i=1}^K R_{i,w}^r \left(|v_{i,w}^r\rangle \langle v_{i,w}^r| \otimes \hat{I}_{i,w}^r \right) U_{i,w}^r (A_{y_{i,w-1}^r, \tilde{y}_{i,w-1}^r} \otimes R_{i,w-1}^r) \right)^\dagger \quad (4) \end{aligned}$$

We note that $A_{y_{i,w}^r, \tilde{y}_{i,w}^r} |\tilde{y}_{i,w}^r\rangle \langle \tilde{y}_{i,w}^r| A_{y_{i,w}^r, \tilde{y}_{i,w}^r} = |y_{i,w}^r\rangle \langle y_{i,w}^r|$. Furthermore, according to the induction hypothesis, $\rho_{b, \tilde{q}, \tilde{v}, r, w-1} = \left(\bigotimes_{i=1}^K R_{i,w-1}^r \right) \rho_{a,q,v,r,w-1} \left(\bigotimes_{i=1}^K R_{i,w-1}^r \right)^\dagger$. Using these facts, we can directly derive the following equalities:

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_{b, \tilde{q}, \tilde{v}, r, w} &= \left(\bigotimes_{i=1}^K R_{i,w}^r \right) \left(\bigotimes_{i=1}^K |v_{i,w}^r\rangle \langle v_{i,w}^r| \otimes \hat{I}_{i,w}^r \right) \left(\bigotimes_{i=1}^K U_{i,w}^r \right) \left(\left(\bigotimes_{i=1}^K |y_{i,w-1}^r\rangle \langle y_{i,w-1}^r| \right) \otimes \rho_{a,q,v,r,w-1} \right) \\ &\quad \left(\bigotimes_{i=1}^K U_{i,w}^r \right)^\dagger \left(\bigotimes_{i=1}^K |v_{i,w}^r\rangle \langle v_{i,w}^r| \otimes \hat{I}_{i,w}^r \right) \left(\bigotimes_{i=1}^K R_{i,w}^r \right)^\dagger = \left(\bigotimes_{i=1}^K R_{i,w}^r \right) \rho_{a,q,v,r,w} \left(\bigotimes_{i=1}^K R_{i,w}^r \right)^\dagger. \end{aligned}$$

This completes the induction step over w . Next, we proceed to describe the induction step over r . Let $2 \leq r \leq R$ and $1 \leq w \leq \ell^r$. Assume that for $r-1$ the following holds:

$$\rho_{b, \tilde{q}, \tilde{v}, r-1, \ell^{r-1}} = \left(\bigotimes_{i=1}^K R_{i, \ell^{r-1}}^{r-1} \right) \rho_{a,q,v,r-1, \ell^{r-1}} \left(\bigotimes_{i=1}^K R_{i, \ell^{r-1}}^{r-1} \right)^\dagger \quad (5)$$

The following equalities hold:

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_{b, \tilde{q}, \tilde{v}, r, 1} &= \left(\bigotimes_{i=1}^K \left(|\tilde{v}_{i,1}^r\rangle \langle \tilde{v}_{i,1}^r| \otimes \hat{I}_{i,1}^r \right) \right) \left(\bigotimes_{i=1}^K U_{i,1}^r \right) \left(\left(\bigotimes_{i=1}^K |\tilde{q}_i^r\rangle \langle \tilde{q}_i^r| \right) \otimes \rho_{b, \tilde{q}, \tilde{v}, r-1, \ell^{r-1}} \right) \left(\bigotimes_{i=1}^K U_{i,1}^r \right)^\dagger \\ &\quad \left(\bigotimes_{i=1}^K \left(|\tilde{v}_{i,1}^r\rangle \langle \tilde{v}_{i,1}^r| \otimes \hat{I}_{i,1}^r \right) \right) \quad (6) \end{aligned}$$

We use the induction hypothesis, the relation $(|\tilde{v}_{i,1}^r\rangle \langle \tilde{v}_{i,1}^r| \otimes \hat{I}_{i,1}^r) = R_{i,1}^r (|v_{i,1}^r\rangle \langle v_{i,1}^r| \otimes \hat{I}_{i,1}^r) R_{i,1}^{r\dagger}$ and the fact $(R_{i,1}^r)^\dagger = R_{i,1}^r$ to obtain the following equality:

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_{b, \tilde{q}, \tilde{v}, r, 1} &= \left(\bigotimes_{i=1}^K R_{i,1}^r \left(|v_{i,1}^r\rangle \langle v_{i,1}^r| \otimes \hat{I}_{i,1}^r \right) R_{i,1}^r \right) \\ &\quad \left(\bigotimes_{i=1}^K U_{i,1}^r \right) \left(\left(\bigotimes_{i=1}^K |\tilde{q}_i^r\rangle \langle \tilde{q}_i^r| \right) \otimes \left(\left(\bigotimes_{i=1}^K R_{i, \ell^{r-1}}^{r-1} \right) \rho_{a,q,v,r-1, \ell^{r-1}} \left(\bigotimes_{i=1}^K R_{i, \ell^{r-1}}^{r-1} \right)^\dagger \right) \right) \\ &\quad \left(\bigotimes_{i=1}^K U_{i,1}^r \right)^\dagger \left(\bigotimes_{i=1}^K R_{i,1}^r \left(|v_{i,1}^r\rangle \langle v_{i,1}^r| \otimes \hat{I}_{i,1}^r \right) R_{i,1}^r \right) \quad (7) \end{aligned}$$

Since $R_{i,1}^r = U_{i,1}^r (A_{q_i^r, \tilde{q}_i^r} \otimes R_{i, \ell^{r-1}}^{r-1}) (U_{i,1}^r)^\dagger$, then $R_{i,1}^r U_{i,1}^r = U_{i,1}^r (A_{q_i^r, \tilde{q}_i^r} \otimes R_{i, \ell^{r-1}}^{r-1})$. Hence, we have:

$$\begin{aligned}
\rho_{b,\tilde{q},\tilde{v},r,1} &= \left(\bigotimes_{i=1}^K R_{i,1}^r \left(|v_{i,1}^r\rangle \langle v_{i,1}^r| \otimes \hat{I}_{i,1}^r \right) U_{i,1}^r (A_{q_i^r, \tilde{q}_i^r} \otimes R_{i,\ell_i^{r-1}}^{r-1}) \right) \\
&\quad \left(\left(\bigotimes_{i=1}^K |\tilde{q}_i^r\rangle \langle \tilde{q}_i^r| \right) \otimes \left(\left(\bigotimes_{i=1}^K R_{i,\ell_i^{r-1}}^{r-1} \right) \rho_{a,q,v,r-1,\ell^{r-1}} \left(\bigotimes_{i=1}^K R_{i,\ell_i^{r-1}}^{r-1} \right)^\dagger \right) \right) \\
&\quad \left(\bigotimes_{i=1}^K R_{i,1}^r \left(|v_{i,1}^r\rangle \langle v_{i,1}^r| \otimes \hat{I}_{i,1}^r \right) U_{i,1}^r (A_{q_i^r, \tilde{q}_i^r} \otimes R_{i,\ell_i^{r-1}}^{r-1}) \right)^\dagger
\end{aligned} \tag{8}$$

We use the fact that $R_{i,\ell_i^{r-1}}^{r-1}$ is in the Pauli group and the fact that $A_{q_i^r, \tilde{q}_i^r} |\tilde{q}_i^r\rangle = |q_i^r\rangle$, to derive the following result:

$$\begin{aligned}
\rho_{b,\tilde{q},\tilde{v},r,1} &= \left(\bigotimes_{i=1}^K R_{i,1}^r \right) \left(\bigotimes_{i=1}^K \left(|v_{i,1}^r\rangle \langle v_{i,1}^r| \otimes \hat{I}_{i,1}^r \right) \right) \left(\bigotimes_{i=1}^K U_{i,1}^r \right) \left(\left(\bigotimes_{i=1}^K |q_i^r\rangle \langle q_i^r| \right) \otimes \rho_{a,q,v,r-1,\ell^{r-1}} \right) \\
&\quad \left(\bigotimes_{i=1}^K U_{i,1}^r \right)^\dagger \left(\bigotimes_{i=1}^K \left(|v_{i,1}^r\rangle \langle v_{i,1}^r| \otimes \hat{I}_{i,1}^r \right) \right) \left(\bigotimes_{i=1}^K R_{i,1}^r \right)^\dagger = \left(\bigotimes_{i=1}^K R_{i,1}^r \right) \rho_{a,q,v,r,1} \left(\bigotimes_{i=1}^K R_{i,1}^r \right)^\dagger
\end{aligned} \tag{9}$$

This completes the induction step over r . Thus, we have proven statement (1). Based on it, we would like to prove the following equality:

$$\forall 1 \leq r \leq R, 1 \leq w \leq \ell^r : p_{S,C}(\tilde{v}_w^r | \tilde{h}^{r-1}, \tilde{q}^r, \tilde{v}_1^r, \dots, \tilde{v}_{w-1}^r) = p_{S,C}(v_w^r | h^{r-1}, q^r, v_1^r, \dots, v_{w-1}^r) \tag{10}$$

We will prove this for the case of $w \geq 2$. The proof for $w = 1$ is similar and it is left for the reader to verify. Let there be $1 \leq r \leq R, 2 \leq w \leq \ell^r$.

$$\begin{aligned}
&p_{S,C} \left(\tilde{v}_w^r | \tilde{h}^{r-1}, \tilde{q}^r, \tilde{v}_1^r, \dots, \tilde{v}_{w-1}^r \right) \\
&= \text{Tr} \left[\left(|\tilde{v}_w^r\rangle \langle \tilde{v}_w^r| \otimes \hat{I}_w^r \right) \left(\bigotimes_{i=1}^K U_{i,w}^r \right) \left(|\tilde{y}_{w-1}^r\rangle \langle \tilde{y}_{w-1}^r| \otimes \rho_{b,\tilde{q},\tilde{v},r,w-1} \right) \left(\bigotimes_{i=1}^K U_{i,w}^r \right)^\dagger \right]
\end{aligned} \tag{11}$$

We use the equality $\rho_{b,\tilde{q},\tilde{v},r,w-1} = \left(\bigotimes_{i=1}^K R_{i,w-1}^r \right) \rho_{a,q,v,r,w-1} \left(\bigotimes_{i=1}^K R_{i,w-1}^r \right)^\dagger$, to obtain the following result:

$$\begin{aligned}
&p_{S,C} \left(\tilde{v}_w^r | \tilde{h}^{r-1}, \tilde{q}^r, \tilde{v}_1^r, \dots, \tilde{v}_{w-1}^r \right) \\
&= \text{Tr} \left[\left(|\tilde{v}_w^r\rangle \langle \tilde{v}_w^r| \otimes \hat{I}_w^r \right) \left(\bigotimes_{i=1}^K U_{i,w}^r \right) \right. \\
&\quad \left. \left(|\tilde{y}_{w-1}^r\rangle \langle \tilde{y}_{w-1}^r| \otimes \left(\bigotimes_{i=1}^K R_{i,w-1}^r \right) \rho_{a,q,v,r,w-1} \left(\bigotimes_{i=1}^K R_{i,w-1}^r \right)^\dagger \right) \left(\bigotimes_{i=1}^K U_{i,w}^r \right)^\dagger \right]
\end{aligned} \tag{12}$$

Next, observe that $A_{\tilde{y}_{i,w-1}^r, y_{i,w-1}^r} |\tilde{y}_{i,w-1}^r\rangle = |y_{i,w-1}^r\rangle$. With that observation at hand, we continue as follows:

$$p_{S,C}(\tilde{v}_w^r | \tilde{h}^{r-1}, \tilde{q}^r, \tilde{v}_1^r, \dots, \tilde{v}_{w-1}^r) = \text{Tr}[(|\tilde{v}_w^r\rangle \langle \tilde{v}_w^r| \otimes \hat{I}_w^r) \left(\bigotimes_{i=1}^K U_{i,w}^r (A_{\tilde{y}_{i,w-1}^r, y_{i,w-1}^r} \otimes R_{i,w-1}^r) \right) (|y_{w-1}^r\rangle \langle y_{w-1}^r| \otimes \rho_{a,q,v,r,w-1}) \left(\bigotimes_{i=1}^K U_{i,w}^r (A_{\tilde{y}_{i,w-1}^r, y_{i,w-1}^r} \otimes R_{i,w-1}^r) \right)^\dagger] \quad (13)$$

Since $R_{i,w}^r = U_{i,w}^r (A_{\tilde{y}_{i,w-1}^r, y_{i,w-1}^r} \otimes R_{i,w-1}^r) (U_{i,w}^r)^\dagger$, then $U_{i,w}^r (A_{\tilde{y}_{i,w-1}^r, y_{i,w-1}^r} \otimes R_{i,w-1}^r) = R_{i,w}^r U_{i,w}^r$. Hence, we derive the following equalities:

$$\begin{aligned} p_{S,C}(\tilde{v}_w^r | \tilde{h}^{r-1}, \tilde{q}^r, \tilde{v}_1^r, \dots, \tilde{v}_{w-1}^r) &= \text{Tr}[(|\tilde{v}_w^r\rangle \langle \tilde{v}_w^r| \otimes \hat{I}_w^r) \left(\bigotimes_{i=1}^K R_{i,w}^r U_{i,w}^r \right) (|y_{w-1}^r\rangle \langle y_{w-1}^r| \otimes \rho_{a,q,v,r,w-1}) \left(\bigotimes_{i=1}^K R_{i,w}^r U_{i,w}^r \right)^\dagger] \\ &= \text{Tr}[(|\tilde{v}_w^r\rangle \langle \tilde{v}_w^r| \otimes \hat{I}_w^r) \left(\bigotimes_{i=1}^K R_{i,w}^r \right) \left(\bigotimes_{i=1}^K U_{i,w}^r \right) (|y_{w-1}^r\rangle \langle y_{w-1}^r| \otimes \rho_{a,q,v,r,w-1}) \left(\bigotimes_{i=1}^K U_{i,w}^r \right)^\dagger \left(\bigotimes_{i=1}^K R_{i,w}^r \right)^\dagger] \\ &= \text{Tr}[\left(\bigotimes_{i=1}^K R_{i,w}^r \right)^\dagger (|\tilde{v}_w^r\rangle \langle \tilde{v}_w^r| \otimes \hat{I}_w^r) \left(\bigotimes_{i=1}^K R_{i,w}^r \right) \left(\bigotimes_{i=1}^K U_{i,w}^r \right) (|y_{w-1}^r\rangle \langle y_{w-1}^r| \otimes \rho_{a,q,v,r,w-1}) \left(\bigotimes_{i=1}^K U_{i,w}^r \right)^\dagger] \\ &= \text{Tr}[\left(\bigotimes_{i=1}^K R_{i,w}^r \right) (|\tilde{v}_w^r\rangle \langle \tilde{v}_w^r| \otimes \hat{I}_w^r) \left(\bigotimes_{i=1}^K R_{i,w}^r \right)^\dagger \left(\bigotimes_{i=1}^K U_{i,w}^r \right) (|y_{w-1}^r\rangle \langle y_{w-1}^r| \otimes \rho_{a,q,v,r,w-1}) \left(\bigotimes_{i=1}^K U_{i,w}^r \right)^\dagger] \\ &= \text{Tr}[(|v_w^r\rangle \langle v_w^r| \otimes \hat{I}_w^r) \left(\bigotimes_{i=1}^K U_{i,w}^r \right) (|y_{w-1}^r\rangle \langle y_{w-1}^r| \otimes \rho_{a,q,v,r,w-1}) \left(\bigotimes_{i=1}^K U_{i,w}^r \right)^\dagger] = p_S(v_w^r | h^{r-1}, q^r, v_1^r, \dots, v_{w-1}^r) \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

where in the second to last equality, we rely on the fact that

$$\left(\bigotimes_{i=1}^K R_{i,w}^r \right) (|\tilde{v}_w^r\rangle \langle \tilde{v}_w^r| \otimes \hat{I}_w^r) \left(\bigotimes_{i=1}^K R_{i,w}^r \right)^\dagger = (|v_w^r\rangle \langle v_w^r| \otimes \hat{I}_w^r)$$

Thus, we have proven (10). We denote by $f_{G,S} : H^R \rightarrow [0, 1]$ the probability mass function marking the distribution of questions and answers in an interaction between provers that execute Algorithm 1 with respect to the strategy S and a verifier following the protocol G . We would like to show that the following holds:

$$\forall h^R \in H^R : f_{G,S}(h^R) = P_{G,S}(h^R) \quad (15)$$

We denote by $f_{S,C}(\tilde{v}_w^r | h^{r-1}, \tilde{q}^r, \tilde{v}_1^r, \dots, \tilde{v}_{w-1}^r)$, the probability that provers that execute Algorithm 1 with respect to the implementation C of S obtain the value $\tilde{v}_w^r := (\tilde{v}_{1,w}^r, \dots, \tilde{v}_{K,w}^r)$ at the relevant point of their computation (which corresponds to the w^{th} measurement of the r^{th} round that is

performed by the quantum provers they simulate), conditioned on their interaction up to this point being $(\tilde{h}^{r-1}, \tilde{q}^r, \tilde{v}_1^r, \dots, \tilde{v}_{w-1}^r)$. Then, we have:

$$f_{G,S}(\tilde{h}^R) = \prod_{r=1}^R \pi(\tilde{h}^{r-1}, \tilde{q}^r) \cdot \prod_{w=1}^{\ell^r} f_{S,C}(\tilde{v}_w^r \mid \tilde{h}^{r-1}, \tilde{q}^r, \tilde{v}_1^r, \dots, \tilde{v}_{w-1}^r)$$

We calculate $f_{S,C}(\tilde{v}_w^r \mid \tilde{h}^{r-1}, \tilde{q}^r, \tilde{v}_1^r, \dots, \tilde{v}_{w-1}^r)$. If the interaction of the provers following Algorithm 1 up to this point is $\tilde{h}^{r-1}, \tilde{q}^r, \tilde{v}_1^r, \dots, \tilde{v}_{w-1}^r$, then the next value computed by them is \tilde{v}_w^r if and only if the following condition holds:

$$\forall 1 \leq i \leq K : (|\tilde{v}_{i,w}^r\rangle \langle \tilde{v}_{i,w}^r| \otimes I_i^r) = R_{i,w}^r (|\bar{v}_w^r\rangle \langle \bar{v}_w^r| \otimes I_i^r) (R_{i,w}^r)^\dagger$$

Where \bar{v}_w^r denotes the value calculated at this point in the interaction that is encoded in the random coins of the provers following algorithm 1. This condition holds if and only if $\bar{v}_w^r = v_w^r$. Hence, we have that

$$f_{S,C}(\tilde{v}_w^r \mid \tilde{h}^{r-1}, \tilde{q}^r, \tilde{v}_1^r, \dots, \tilde{v}_{w-1}^r) = p_{S,C}(v_w^r \mid h^{r-1}, q^r, v_1^r, \dots, v_{w-1}^r)$$

Therefore

$$\begin{aligned} f_{G,S}(\tilde{h}^R) &= \prod_{r=1}^R \pi(\tilde{h}^{r-1}, \tilde{q}^r) \cdot \prod_{w=1}^{\ell^r} f_{S,C}(\tilde{v}_w^r \mid \tilde{h}^{r-1}, \tilde{q}^r, \tilde{v}_1^r, \dots, \tilde{v}_{w-1}^r) \\ &= \prod_{r=1}^R \pi(\tilde{h}^{r-1}, \tilde{q}^r) \cdot \prod_{w=1}^{\ell^r} p_{S,C}(v_w^r \mid h^{r-1}, q^r, v_1^r, \dots, v_{w-1}^r) \\ &= \prod_{r=1}^R \pi(\tilde{h}^{r-1}, \tilde{q}^r) \cdot \prod_{w=1}^{\ell^r} p_{S,C}(\tilde{v}_w^r \mid \tilde{h}^{r-1}, \tilde{q}^r, \tilde{v}_1^r, \dots, \tilde{v}_{w-1}^r) = P_{G,S}(\tilde{h}^R) \end{aligned}$$

where the second to last equality is due to (10). This implies that when interacting with the verifier of G , quantum provers following an implementation C of the strategy S produce the same probability of questions and answers as the one produced by classical provers executing Algorithm 1 with respect to an implementation C of S . This proves the correctness of Algorithm 1.

3.1.4 Running Time Complexity Analysis

We now turn to discuss the running time complexity of Algorithm 1. We begin with step 1, in which the provers draw their shared random bits. If provers executing S share a stabilizer state, then the random bits can be drawn by simulating the provers classically using the Gottesman-Knill Theorem. The operation of different provers in the same round can be computed in parallel, and hence the time complexity of classical simulation is $O(\text{poly}(d + \sum_{r=1}^R \max_{i=1, \dots, K} \{|C_i^r|\})))$, where $|C_i^r|$ is the number of Clifford gates and classical logical gates in the circuit, and d is the number of qubits held by all provers together. However, if we do not assume the provers share a stabilizer state, we do not provide a non-trivial bound on the running time complexity required to complete step 1.

Nevertheless, the next steps, which describe the computation of the classical provers during the interaction with the verifier, can be computed efficiently. Steps 2 and 3 are completed using the method for calculating the mapping of one matrix in the Pauli group to another by conjugation with a Clifford matrix, which is described in the Preliminaries section (2). Here, too, The operation of different provers in the same round can be computed in parallel. $d^r := \max_{i=1, \dots, K} \{d_{i, \ell^r}^r\}$ is the maximal number of qubits held by a prover in the r^{th} round of the interaction. The time complexity of steps 2 and 3 together is as follows: $O(\sum_{r=1}^R \max\{d^r, \max_{i=1, \dots, K} \{|C_i^r|\}\})$. This is the overall running time complexity of the computation of the provers during the interaction, because step 4 takes time $O(\sum_{r=1}^R d^r)$. \square

3.2 Clifford-MIP* = MIP

In this section, we state the following equality between complexity classes. It is a straightforward corollary of Theorem 2, but we provide a full proof of it for completeness.

Theorem 3. *Clifford-MIP* = MIP*

Proof. We will show that Clifford – MIP* = MIP by proving both inclusions.

(1) Clifford – MIP* \subseteq MIP

Let $L \in \text{Clifford – MIP}^*$. Then L is decided by an interactive proof system G where a classical verifier interacts with quantum provers limited to Clifford gates and classical operations on measured qubits. By Theorem 2, any such quantum strategy S can be replaced by an equivalent classical strategy S^* without loss of performance.

Completeness: If $x \in L$, the quantum provers have a strategy S that convinces the verifier to accept with probability at least $c(|x|)$. The equivalent classical strategy S^* achieves the same acceptance probability, satisfying the completeness condition of MIP.

Soundness: If $x \notin L$, no strategy using Clifford gates and classical operations on measured qubits can convince the verifier to accept with probability greater than $s(|x|)$, hence no classical strategy can do it as well.

Thus, $L \in \text{MIP}$.

(2) MIP \subseteq Clifford – MIP*

Let $L \in \text{MIP}$. Then there exists an interactive proof system where a classical verifier interacts with classical provers deciding L with completeness $c(|x|)$ and soundness $s(|x|)$. We show that this protocol has the same completeness and soundness parameters in the Clifford – MIP* setting.

Completeness: If $x \in L$, there exist classical provers that convince the verifier to accept with probability at least $c(|x|)$. The Clifford – MIP* provers replicate this strategy using the same classical operations, thereby achieving the same acceptance probability.

Soundness: If $x \notin L$, no classical strategy can convince the verifier to accept with probability greater than $s(|x|)$. Hence, if there existed a strategy in the Clifford – MIP* setting surpassing this soundness parameter, it would contradict Theorem 2.

Thus, $L \in \text{Clifford – MIP}^*$. \square

4 Non-Local Games with At Most One Non-Clifford Prover

In this section, we answer a question posed by Kalai et al. [5] (for details, see the Introduction section) by proving the following theorem.

Theorem 4. *Let $G = ((Q_i)_{i=1}^K, (A_i)_{i=1}^K, \pi, v)$ be a non-local game with K provers, and let $S = (|\psi\rangle, (M_i)_{i=1}^K)$ be a quantum strategy for G . Suppose there exists an implementation of S , denoted $(C_i)_{i=1}^K$, such that for all but at most one of the indices $1 \leq i \leq K$, the circuit C_i consists only of Clifford gates and classical computations on measured qubits. Then, there exists a classical strategy for G that is equivalent to S .*

This directly implies the following corollary.

Corollary 1. *Let there be a non-local game $G = ((Q_i)_{i=1}^K, (A_i)_{i=1}^K, \pi, v)$ with K provers, and a quantum strategy $S = (|\psi\rangle, (M_i)_{i=1}^K)$ for G . If the success probability of S in G is higher than that of any classical strategy, then for any implementation $(C_i)_{i=1}^K$ of S , at most $K - 2$ of the circuits C_i ($1 \leq i \leq K$) consist only of Clifford gates in addition to classical computations on measured qubits.*

We now turn to present the proof of Theorem 4.

Proof. Without loss of generality, assume that the circuits C_1, C_2, \dots, C_{K-1} consist only of Clifford gates and classical operations on measured qubits; that is, the K -th prover may perform general quantum operations.

Consider the interaction between a verifier V for the game G and provers executing the strategy S . According to Theorem 2, there exists a classical strategy S^* for $K - 1$ provers, such that the distribution of questions and answers arising from the interaction between V and provers executing S^* , is identical to the distribution of questions and answers received and sent by the first $K - 1$ of the K provers that implement S and interact with V .

An interaction of $K - 1$ provers with V is defined as follows:

1. V draws K questions $q = (q_1, q_2, \dots, q_K)$ at random from the distribution π .
2. It sends the first $K - 1$ questions q_1, q_2, \dots, q_{K-1} to the corresponding provers and discards the K -th question q_K .
3. The $K - 1$ provers send their answers $b = (b_1, b_2, \dots, b_{K-1})$ back to V .

We now define a classical strategy for K provers which is equivalent to S :

Algorithm 2 Classical Simulation of a Mostly-Clifford Strategy

- 1: A fixed arbitrary sequence of questions $q = (q_1, \dots, q_K)$ is hard-coded into the algorithm. The corresponding answers $a = (a_1, \dots, a_K)$ are sampled from the distribution $p_S(a \mid q)$ defined with respect to strategy S . The provers share an encoding of $h = (q, a)$.
 - 2: While interacting with the verifier, the first $K - 1$ provers implement the classical strategy S^* as defined in Algorithm 1, using the hard-coded questions q .
 - 3: The K -th prover, upon receiving the question \tilde{q}_K from V , samples its answer b_K from the conditional distribution $p_S(a_K \mid q_1, \dots, q_{K-1}, \tilde{q}_K, a_1, \dots, a_{K-1})$.
-

Let there be quantum provers denoted P_1, \dots, P_K that execute S with an implementation C . Assume, without loss of generality, that each prover measures all the qubits they hold as the last step of their computation and returns the measurement outcomes as their answer. This assumption does not limit generality, since if only a subset of the measurement results serve as the prover's answer, or if only a subset of the qubits are measured at the final step, then measuring all qubits and sending all outcomes does not change the probability distribution of the relevant subset.

For any possible interaction with the verifier $\tilde{h} = (\tilde{q}, b)$, let $f_{S,C}(b | \tilde{q})$ denote the probability that classical provers following Algorithm 2 with respect to strategy S and implementation C return the answer b upon receiving the questions \tilde{q} from the verifier. Similarly, let $p_{S,C}(b | \tilde{q})$ denote the probability that quantum provers executing the strategy S with the implementation C do so. To prove the correctness of Algorithm 2, we need to show that for any such interaction, $f_{S,C}(b | \tilde{q}) = p_{S,C}(b | \tilde{q})$.

For any $1 \leq i \leq K - 1$, the circuit C_i operates on the input bit-string received by P_i from the verifier, and on P_i 's part of the shared state. We can represent C_i as a sequence $(U_{i,1}, M_{i,1}, f_{i,1}, \dots, U_{i,\ell_i-1}, M_{i,\ell_i-1}, f_{i,\ell_i-1}, U_{i,\ell_i}, M_{i,\ell_i})$, where $\forall 1 \leq w \leq \ell_i$, $U_{i,w}$ is a unitary composed of Clifford gates, $M_{i,w}$ is a standard basis measurement of a subset of the qubits held by the i^{th} prover at the w^{th} round, and $f_{i,w}$ is a classical computation which operates on the qubits measured by $M_{i,w}$. C_i is equivalent to the application of the elements in the above sequence in chronological order going from left to right. We assume, without loss of generality, that each of the first $K - 1$ provers executing S with the implementation C performs $\ell = \ell_1 = \dots = \ell_{K-1}$ measurements.

Analogously to the proof of Theorem 2, we proceed to define a sequence of unitary operators that depend on $q, \tilde{q}, y, \tilde{y}$, where also here $y_{i,w}^r, \tilde{y}_{i,w}^r$ are results of classical computations performed by the provers. We denote these operators by $R_{i,w}(q, \tilde{q}, y, \tilde{y})$ for $w = 1, \dots, \ell$ and $i = 1, \dots, K - 1$. For brevity, we omit $(q, \tilde{q}, y, \tilde{y})$ from the notation. These operators are defined inductively as follows for any $1 \leq i \leq K - 1$:

$$R_{i,1} := U_{i,1}(A_{q_i, \tilde{q}_i} \otimes I_{i,1})(U_{i,1})^\dagger$$

$$\forall 2 \leq w \leq \ell : R_{i,w} := U_{i,w}(A_{y_{i,w-1}, \tilde{y}_{i,w-1}} \otimes R_{i,w-1})(U_{i,w})^\dagger$$

From the definition of Algorithm 1, we have that given the questions $\tilde{q}_1, \dots, \tilde{q}_{K-1}$ from the verifier, and having the interaction $h = (q, a)$ encoded as shared randomness, the i -th prover ($1 \leq i \leq K - 1$) following Algorithm 2 with respect to the implementation C of strategy S returns the answer b_i such that:

$$|b_i\rangle \langle b_i| = R_{i,\ell} |a_i\rangle \langle a_i| R_{i,\ell}^\dagger.$$

We have shown in the proof of Theorem 2 that for all $1 \leq i \leq K - 1$, $R_{i,\ell}$ is in the Pauli group. Denote by $\rho_{\tilde{q},b}$ the shared state of all K quantum provers executing the strategy S with the implementation C , after the first $K - 1$ provers send their answers to the verifier, and before the K -th prover performs any computation (we enforce this order between the provers for the sake of the argument), conditioned on the series of questions sent by the verifier to the provers being \tilde{q} , and on the answers of the first $K - 1$ provers being $b = (b_1, \dots, b_{K-1})$. From the proof of Theorem 2, we have:

$$\rho_{\tilde{q},b} = \left(\left(\bigotimes_{i=1}^{K-1} R_{i,\ell} \right) \otimes I \right) \rho_{q,a} \left(\left(\bigotimes_{i=1}^{K-1} R_{i,\ell} \right) \otimes I \right)^\dagger$$

where I is the identity operator acting on the qubits held by the K^{th} prover. Since we assumed the first $K - 1$ provers measure all their qubits, then we can represent $\rho_{\tilde{q},b}, \rho_{q,a}$ by $|b\rangle\langle b| \otimes \sigma_{K,b}, |a\rangle\langle a| \otimes \sigma_{K,a}$, respectively, where $\sigma_{K,b}, \sigma_{K,a}$ are quantum states over the qubits held by the K^{th} prover. Hence, the following equalities hold:

$$\begin{aligned}
|b\rangle\langle b| \otimes \sigma_{K,b} &= \rho_{\tilde{q},b} = \left(\left(\bigotimes_{i=1}^{K-1} R_{i,\ell} \right) \otimes I \right) \rho_{q,a} \left(\left(\bigotimes_{i=1}^{K-1} R_{i,\ell} \right) \otimes I \right)^\dagger \\
&= \left(\left(\bigotimes_{i=1}^{K-1} R_{i,\ell} \right) \otimes I \right) (|a\rangle\langle a| \otimes \sigma_{K,a}) \left(\left(\bigotimes_{i=1}^{K-1} R_{i,\ell} \right) \otimes I \right)^\dagger \\
&= \left(\bigotimes_{i=1}^{K-1} R_{i,\ell} \right) (|a\rangle\langle a|) \left(\bigotimes_{i=1}^{K-1} R_{i,\ell} \right)^\dagger \otimes \sigma_{K,a} \\
&= |b\rangle\langle b| \otimes \sigma_{K,a}
\end{aligned} \tag{16}$$

Therefore,

$$\sigma_{K,b} = \sigma_{K,a} \tag{17}$$

We denote by $f_{S,C}^{K-1}(b | \tilde{q})$ the probability that the first $K - 1$ classical provers implementing Algorithm 2 with respect to S and implementation C return the answer $b = (b_1, \dots, b_{K-1})$ upon receiving the question \tilde{q} . Analogously, we denote by $p_{S,C}^{K-1}(b | \tilde{q})$ the corresponding probability for the first $K - 1$ out of the K quantum provers following S with implementation C . Theorem 2 proves the correctness of Algorithm 2, hence guaranteeing that $p_{S,C}^{K-1}(b | \tilde{q}) = f_{S,C}^{K-1}(b | \tilde{q})$.

Furthermore, we denote by $f_{S,C}^K(b_K | \tilde{q}, b)$ the probability that the K -th prover implementing Algorithm 2 returns the answer b_K , conditioned on all provers receiving the question \tilde{q} and the first $K - 1$ provers returning the answers $b = (b_1, \dots, b_{K-1})$. Additionally, we denote by $p_{S,C}^K(b_K | \tilde{q}, b)$ the corresponding probability for the K -th prover following S with implementation C . By the definition of the strategy of the K -th prover following Algorithm 2,

$$f_{S,C}^K(b_K | \tilde{q}, b) = p_{S,C}^K(a_K | q, a) \tag{18}$$

According to equation (17), $p_{S,C}^K(a_K | q, a) = p_{S,C}^K(b_K | \tilde{q}, b)$. Therefore,

$$f_{S,C}^K(b_K | \tilde{q}, b) = p_{S,C}^K(b_K | \tilde{q}, b) \tag{19}$$

We can now state the equality which shows the correctness of Algorithm 2:

$$f_S(b | \tilde{q}) = f_S^{K-1}(b | \tilde{q}) \cdot f_S^K(b_K | \tilde{q}, b) = p_S^{K-1}(b | \tilde{q}) \cdot p_S^K(b_K | \tilde{q}, b) = p_S(b | \tilde{q}) \tag{20}$$

Due to the fact that Algorithm 2 requires classically simulating a general quantum computation in step 3, we do not derive a non-trivial bound on its running-time complexity. \square

References

- [1] Sergey Bravyi and Alexei Kitaev. Universal quantum computation with ideal Clifford gates and noisy ancillas. *Physical Review A—Atomic, Molecular, and Optical Physics*, 71(2):022316, 2005.
- [2] David Cui, Giulio Malavolta, Arthur Mehta, Anand Natarajan, Connor Paddock, Simon Schmidt, Michael Walter, and Tina Zhang. A Computational Tsirelson’s Theorem for the Value of Compiled XOR Games. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.17301*, 2024.
- [3] Daniel Gottesman. The Heisenberg Representation of Quantum Computers. *arXiv preprint arXiv:quant-ph/9807006*, 1998.
- [4] Zhengfeng Ji, Anand Natarajan, Thomas Vidick, John Wright, and Henry Yuen. $MIP^*=RE$. *Communications of the ACM*, 64(11):131–138, 2021.
- [5] Yael Kalai, Alex Lombardi, Vinod Vaikuntanathan, and Lisa Yang. Quantum advantage from any non-local game. In *Proceedings of the 55th Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing*, pages 1617–1628, 2023.
- [6] Alexander Kulpe, Giulio Malavolta, Connor Paddock, Simon Schmidt, and Michael Walter. A bound on the quantum value of all compiled nonlocal games. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2408.06711*, 2024.
- [7] Anand Natarajan and Tina Zhang. Bounding the quantum value of compiled nonlocal games: from CHSH to BQP verification. In *2023 IEEE 64th Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS)*, pages 1342–1348. IEEE, 2023.
- [8] Michael A. Nielsen and Isaac L. Chuang. *Quantum Computation and Quantum Information*. Cambridge University Press, 10th anniversary edition edition, 2010. See Section 10.5.1, p. 461-462.
- [9] Michael A. Nielsen and Isaac L. Chuang. *Quantum Computation and Quantum Information: 10th Anniversary Edition*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 10th anniversary edition, 2010. See Section 4.4, p. 186.