

# Efficient Verification of Pure Quantum States in the Adversarial Scenario

Huangjun Zhu<sup>1,2,3,4,\*</sup> and Masahito Hayashi<sup>5,6,7,8</sup>

<sup>1</sup>*Department of Physics and Center for Field Theory and Particle Physics, Fudan University, Shanghai 200433, China*

<sup>2</sup>*State Key Laboratory of Surface Physics, Fudan University, Shanghai 200433, China*

<sup>3</sup>*Institute for Nanoelectronic Devices and Quantum Computing, Fudan University, Shanghai 200433, China*

<sup>4</sup>*Collaborative Innovation Center of Advanced Microstructures, Nanjing 210093, China*

<sup>5</sup>*Graduate School of Mathematics, Nagoya University, Nagoya, 464-8602, Japan*

<sup>6</sup>*Shenzhen Institute for Quantum Science and Engineering,*

*Southern University of Science and Technology, Shenzhen, 518055, China*

<sup>7</sup>*Center for Quantum Computing, Peng Cheng Laboratory, Shenzhen 518000, China*

<sup>8</sup>*Centre for Quantum Technologies, National University of Singapore, 3 Science Drive 2, 117542, Singapore*

(Dated: March 18, 2022)

Efficient verification of pure quantum states in the adversarial scenario is crucial to many applications in quantum information processing, such as blind measurement-based quantum computation and quantum networks. However, little is known about this topic so far. Here we establish a general framework for verifying pure quantum states in the adversarial scenario and clarify the resource cost. Moreover, we propose a simple and general recipe to constructing efficient verification protocols for the adversarial scenario from protocols for the nonadversarial scenario. With this recipe, arbitrary pure states can be verified in the adversarial scenario with almost the same efficiency as in the nonadversarial scenario. Many important quantum states can be verified in the adversarial scenario using local projective measurements with unprecedented high efficiencies.

*Introduction.*—Bipartite and multipartite entangled states play a central role in quantum information processing and foundational studies [1, 2]. Accurate preparation and verification of desired quantum states is a key to various applications. However, characterization methods based on traditional tomography are inefficient as the resource required grows exponentially with the number of qubits. Even popular alternatives, such as compressed sensing [3] and direct fidelity estimation (DFE) [4], cannot avoid this scaling behavior. Recently, a powerful approach known as quantum state verification (QSV) [5–7] has attracted increasing attention. Efficient protocols based on local measurements have been constructed for bipartite pure states [5–11], stabilizer states (including graph states) [7, 12–15], hypergraph states [16], weighted graph states [17], and Dicke states [18].

The problem is much more complicated in the adversarial scenario, in which the states to be verified are prepared by a malicious adversary. Efficient verification of quantum states in this scenario is a key to many important applications, such as blind measurement-based quantum computation (MBQC) [12–14, 19, 20] and quantum networks [15, 21, 22]. However, little is known on this topic. The approach proposed in Ref. [7] does not apply although it is quite successful in the nonadversarial scenario. Other approaches known in the literature only apply to certain special types of states and are highly inefficient. To verify hypergraph states with recent approaches in Refs. [23, 24] for example, the number of required tests is enormous even in the simplest nontrivial cases. An outstanding problem underlying this deadlock is that, even for a given verification strategy, no efficient method is known for determining the minimal number of tests required to achieve a given precision, as character-

ized by the infidelity and significance level [24, 25].

In this paper we establish a general framework of QSV in the adversarial scenario and settle several fundamental problems. First, we determine the precision achievable with a given strategy and a given number of tests and thereby clarify the resource cost to achieve a given precision. Then we propose a general recipe to constructing efficient verification protocols for the adversarial scenario from protocols for the nonadversarial scenario. With this recipe, arbitrary pure states can be verified in the adversarial scenario with almost the same efficiency as in the nonadversarial scenario. For high-precision verification, the overhead in the number of tests is at most three times. Together with recent works, this recipe can be applied immediately to efficiently verify many important quantum states, such as bipartite pure states, stabilizer states (including graph states), hypergraph states, weighted graph states, and Dicke states, even if we can only perform local projective measurements.

This paper extracts the key results in Ref. [26], which contains complete technical details and additional results, including the proofs of all statements presented here.

*Verification of a pure state.*—Consider a device that is supposed to produce some target state  $|\Psi\rangle$  in the Hilbert space  $\mathcal{H}$ , but actually produces  $\sigma_1, \sigma_2, \dots, \sigma_N$  in  $N$  runs. Our task is to verify whether each  $\sigma_j$  is sufficiently close to the target state on average. To achieve this task we can perform two-outcome measurements  $\{E_l, 1 - E_l\}$  randomly from a set of accessible measurements in each run. Each measurement is specified by a test operator  $E_l$ , which corresponds to passing the test and satisfies  $E_l|\Psi\rangle = |\Psi\rangle$ , so that the target state can always pass the test. After  $N$  runs, we accept the source if and only

if it passes all tests. Suppose the test  $E_l$  is performed with probability  $\mu_l$ ; then the efficiency of the verification strategy is determined by the verification operator  $\Omega := \sum_l \mu_l E_l$ . If  $\langle \Psi | \sigma_j | \Psi \rangle \leq 1 - \epsilon$ ; then the maximal probability that  $\sigma_j$  can pass each test on average reads

$$\max_{\langle \Psi | \sigma | \Psi \rangle \leq 1 - \epsilon} \text{tr}(\Omega \sigma) = 1 - [1 - \beta(\Omega)]\epsilon = 1 - \nu(\Omega)\epsilon, \quad (1)$$

where the maximization is taken over all quantum states  $\sigma$  that satisfy  $\langle \Psi | \sigma | \Psi \rangle \leq 1 - \epsilon$  [7, 26]. Here  $\beta(\Omega)$  is the second largest eigenvalue of  $\Omega$ , and  $\nu(\Omega) := 1 - \beta(\Omega)$  is the spectral gap from the maximal eigenvalue.

Suppose the outputs  $\sigma_1, \sigma_2, \dots, \sigma_N$  of the device are independent of each other. Let  $\epsilon_j = 1 - \langle \Psi | \sigma_j | \Psi \rangle$  be the infidelity between  $\sigma_j$  and  $|\Psi\rangle$ . Then these states can pass  $N$  tests with probability at most

$$\prod_{j=1}^N \text{tr}(\Omega \sigma_j) \leq \prod_{j=1}^N [1 - \nu(\Omega)\epsilon_j] \leq [1 - \nu(\Omega)\bar{\epsilon}]^N, \quad (2)$$

where  $\bar{\epsilon} = \sum_j \epsilon_j / N$  is the average infidelity. The bound in Eq. (2) is saturated when all  $\epsilon_j$  are equal and each  $\sigma_j$  is supported in the subspace of  $\mathcal{H}$  associated with the two largest eigenvalues of  $\Omega$ . So passing  $N$  tests can ensure the condition  $\bar{\epsilon} < \epsilon$  with significance level  $\delta = [1 - \nu(\Omega)\epsilon]^N$ , where the significance level is the maximal probability of accepting the source when  $\bar{\epsilon} \geq \epsilon$ . Accordingly, to verify  $|\Psi\rangle$  within given infidelity  $\epsilon$  and significance level  $\delta$ , the minimum number of tests can be determined by minimizing the number  $N$  that satisfies the inequality  $[1 - \nu(\Omega)\epsilon]^N \leq \delta$ , with the result

$$N_{\text{NA}}(\epsilon, \delta, \Omega) = \left\lceil \frac{1}{\ln[1 - \nu(\Omega)\epsilon]} \ln \delta \right\rceil \leq \left\lceil \frac{1}{\nu(\Omega)\epsilon} \ln \frac{1}{\delta} \right\rceil. \quad (3)$$

A formula similar to Eq. (3) was previously derived in Ref. [7]; however, here the underlying assumption and the interpretation are quite different. Notably, we do not require the unnatural assumption that either  $\langle \Psi | \sigma_j | \Psi \rangle = 1$  for all  $j$  or  $\langle \Psi | \sigma_j | \Psi \rangle \leq 1 - \epsilon$  for all  $j$ . In addition, our conclusion concerns the average fidelity, which is more relevant than the maximal fidelity addressed in Ref. [7]. It should be pointed out that the above conclusion is meaningful only if the states produced after the verification procedure have the same average fidelity as in the verification. This assumption is reasonable and is usually taken for granted in experiments if the source is not malicious. If this assumption fails, then we have to apply a protocol tailored for the adversarial scenario to be discussed shortly.

In view of Eq. (3), to minimize the number of tests, we need to maximize the spectral gap. If there is no restriction on the accessible measurements, then the optimal strategy consists of the single test  $\{|\Psi\rangle\langle\Psi|, 1 - |\Psi\rangle\langle\Psi|\}$ , so that  $\Omega = |\Psi\rangle\langle\Psi|$ ,  $\beta(\Omega) = 0$ , and  $\nu(\Omega) = 1$ ; cf. Ref. [7]. In practice, we need to consider various constraints on

measurements. In addition, the situation for the adversarial scenario is quite different as we shall see.

*Adversarial scenario.*—In the adversarial scenario, the device is controlled by a potentially malicious adversary and can produce an arbitrarily correlated or even entangled state  $\rho$  on  $\mathcal{H}^{\otimes(N+1)}$ , as encountered in blind MBQC. For example, the device can prepare  $(|\Psi\rangle\langle\Psi|)^{\otimes(N+1)}$  with probability  $0 < a < 1$  and  $\sigma^{\otimes(N+1)}$  with probability  $1 - a$ . In this case, the above approach and the variant in Ref. [7] are not applicable as analyzed in Ref. [26]. It turns out they can be applied to the adversarial scenario after some modification, but the analysis on the minimal number of tests will be completely different. Here we shall clarify this issue and propose a simple and efficient recipe to QSV in the adversarial scenario.

To verify the state produced, we randomly choose  $N$  systems and apply a certain strategy  $\Omega$  to each system chosen. Our goal is to ensure that the reduced state on the remaining system has fidelity at least  $1 - \epsilon$  if  $N$  tests are passed. Since  $N$  systems are chosen randomly, without loss of generality, we may assume that  $\rho$  is permutation invariant. Suppose the strategy  $\Omega$  is applied to the first  $N$  systems, then the probability that  $\rho$  can pass  $N$  tests reads  $p_\rho = \text{tr}[(\Omega^{\otimes N} \otimes 1)\rho]$ . The reduced state on system  $N + 1$  (assuming  $p_\rho > 0$ ) is given by  $\sigma'_{N+1} = p_\rho^{-1} \text{tr}_{1,2,\dots,N}[(\Omega^{\otimes N} \otimes 1)\rho]$ , where  $\text{tr}_{1,2,\dots,N}$  means the partial trace over the systems  $1, 2, \dots, N$ . The fidelity between  $\sigma'_{N+1}$  and  $|\Psi\rangle$  reads  $F_\rho = \langle \Psi | \sigma'_{N+1} | \Psi \rangle = p_\rho^{-1} f_\rho$ , where  $f_\rho = \text{tr}[(\Omega^{\otimes N} \otimes |\Psi\rangle\langle\Psi|)\rho]$ .

To characterize the performance of the strategy  $\Omega$  adapted to the adversarial scenario, define

$$F(N, \delta, \Omega) := \min_{\rho} \{p_\rho^{-1} f_\rho \mid p_\rho \geq \delta\}, \quad 0 < \delta \leq 1. \quad (4)$$

This figure of merit denotes the minimum fidelity of  $\sigma'_{N+1}$  with the target state suppose that  $\rho$  can pass  $N$  tests with probability at least  $\delta$ ; it is nondecreasing in  $\delta$  by definition. For  $0 < \epsilon, \delta < 1$ , define  $N(\epsilon, \delta, \Omega)$  as the minimum number of tests required to verify  $|\Psi\rangle$  within infidelity  $\epsilon$  and significance level  $\delta$ , that is,

$$N(\epsilon, \delta, \Omega) := \min\{N \geq 1 \mid F(N, \delta, \Omega) \geq 1 - \epsilon\}. \quad (5)$$

*Homogeneous strategies.*—A strategy (or verification operator)  $\Omega$  for  $|\Psi\rangle$  is *homogeneous* if it has the form

$$\Omega = |\Psi\rangle\langle\Psi| + \lambda(1 - |\Psi\rangle\langle\Psi|), \quad (6)$$

where  $0 \leq \lambda < 1$ . In this case, all eigenvalues of  $\Omega$  are equal to  $\lambda$  except for the largest one, so we have  $\beta = \lambda$  and  $\nu = 1 - \lambda$ . Now it is natural and more informative to replace  $\Omega$  with  $\lambda$  in the notations of various figures of merit; for example, we can write  $F(N, \delta, \lambda)$  in place of  $F(N, \delta, \Omega)$ . A homogeneous strategy is the most efficient among all verification strategies with a given spectral gap and so plays a key role in QSV.




FIG. 1. (color online) Number of tests  $N(\epsilon, \delta, \lambda)$  required to verify a pure state within infidelity  $\epsilon$  and significance level  $\delta$  in the adversarial scenario using a homogeneous strategy characterized by  $\lambda$ . For comparison, the approximate formula  $(\ln \delta)/(\lambda \epsilon \ln \lambda)$  is plotted as curves.

When  $\lambda = 0$ , the verification operator  $\Omega$  is singular (has a zero eigenvalue). For  $0 < \delta \leq 1$ , calculation shows that

$$F(N, \delta, \lambda = 0) = \max \left\{ 0, \frac{(N+1)\delta - 1}{N\delta} \right\}. \quad (7)$$

To verify the target state within infidelity  $\epsilon$  and significance level  $\delta$ , the minimum number of tests required is

$$N(\epsilon, \delta, \lambda = 0) = \left\lceil \frac{1 - \delta}{\epsilon \delta} \right\rceil. \quad (8)$$

The scaling with  $1/\delta$  is suboptimal although the strategy is optimal for the nonadversarial scenario by Eq. (3) when there is no restriction on the accessible measurements.

When  $0 < \lambda < 1$ , the verification operator  $\Omega$  is nonsingular (positive definite). Let  $\mathbb{Z}^{\geq 0}$  denote the set of nonnegative integers. For  $k \in \mathbb{Z}^{\geq 0}$ , define

$$\zeta(N, \delta, \lambda, k) := \frac{\lambda \{ \delta [1 + (N - k)\nu] - \lambda^k \}}{\nu(k\nu + N\lambda)}. \quad (9)$$

The following theorem clarifies the precision that can be achieved by a homogeneous strategy given  $N$  tests.

*Theorem 1.* Suppose  $0 < \lambda < 1$ ; then  $F(N, \delta, \lambda) = 0$  if  $0 < \delta \leq \lambda^N$  and  $F(N, \delta, \lambda) = \zeta(N, \delta, \lambda, k_*)/\delta$  if instead  $\lambda^N < \delta \leq 1$ , where  $k_*$  is the largest integer  $k$  that satisfies  $(N+1-k)\lambda^k + k\lambda^{k-1} \geq (N+1)\delta$ .

Let  $k_+ := \lceil \log_\lambda \delta \rceil$  and  $k_- := \lfloor \log_\lambda \delta \rfloor$ ; then  $k_*$  equals either  $k_+$  or  $k_-$  given the assumption  $\lambda^N < \delta \leq 1$ . Define

$$\tilde{N}(\epsilon, \delta, \lambda, k) := \frac{k\nu^2\delta F + \lambda^{k+1} + \lambda\delta(k\nu - 1)}{\lambda\nu\delta\epsilon}, \quad (10)$$

where  $F = 1 - \epsilon$  and  $\nu = 1 - \lambda$ . The following two theorems provide analytical formulas and informative bounds for  $N(\epsilon, \delta, \lambda)$ . The results are illustrated in Fig. 1.

*Theorem 2.* Suppose  $0 < \epsilon, \delta, \lambda < 1$ . Then

$$N(\epsilon, \delta, \lambda) = \left\lceil \min_{k \in \mathbb{Z}^{\geq 0}} \tilde{N}(\epsilon, \delta, \lambda, k) \right\rceil = \left\lceil \tilde{N}(\epsilon, \delta, \lambda, k^*) \right\rceil, \quad (11)$$

where  $k^*$  is the largest integer  $k$  that obeys the inequality  $\delta \leq \lambda^k/(F\nu + \lambda) = \lambda^k/(F + \lambda\epsilon)$ .

*Theorem 3.* Suppose  $0 < \epsilon, \delta, \lambda < 1$ . Then

$$k_- + \left\lceil \frac{k_- F}{\lambda \epsilon} \right\rceil \leq N(\epsilon, \delta, \lambda) \leq \left\lceil \frac{\ln \delta}{\lambda \epsilon \ln \lambda} - \frac{\nu k_-}{\lambda} \right\rceil. \quad (12)$$

Both the upper bound and lower bound are saturated when  $(\ln \delta)/\ln \lambda$  is an integer.

In the high-precision limit  $\epsilon, \delta \rightarrow 0$ ,  $k_\pm \approx (\ln \delta)/\ln \lambda$ , so Theorem 3 implies that

$$N(\epsilon, \delta, \lambda) \approx (\lambda \epsilon \ln \lambda)^{-1} \ln \delta = (\lambda \epsilon \ln \lambda^{-1})^{-1} \ln \delta^{-1}. \quad (13)$$

The efficiency is characterized by the factor  $(\lambda \ln \lambda^{-1})^{-1}$ , as reflected in Fig. 1. The number of tests is minimized when  $\lambda = 1/e$  (with  $e$  being the base of the natural logarithm), in which case  $N(\epsilon, \delta, \lambda = e^{-1}) \approx e\epsilon^{-1} \ln \delta^{-1}$ , which is comparable to the counterpart  $\epsilon^{-1} \ln \delta^{-1}$  for the nonadversarial scenario.

*General verification strategies.*—Now we turn to a general verification strategy  $\Omega$ ; let  $\beta = \beta(\Omega)$  and  $\nu = \nu(\Omega)$ .

*Theorem 4.* Suppose  $0 < \delta, \nu \leq 1$ . Then

$$F(N, \delta, \Omega) \geq 1 - \frac{1 - \delta}{N\nu\delta}; \quad (14)$$

the inequality is saturated for  $\frac{1+N\beta}{N+1} \leq \delta \leq 1$ .

Theorem 4 implies that

$$N(\epsilon, \delta, \Omega) \leq \left\lceil \frac{1 - \delta}{\nu \delta \epsilon} \right\rceil. \quad (15)$$

This bound is much smaller than previous results based on the quantum de Finetti theorem [23, 24]. Nevertheless, the scaling with  $1/\delta$  is suboptimal, and this behavior is inevitable if  $\Omega$  is singular; cf. Eq. (8).

For a nonsingular verification operator  $\Omega$ , the efficiency is mainly determined by its second largest eigenvalue  $\beta$  (or  $\nu = 1 - \beta$ ) and the smallest eigenvalue  $\tau$ . Let  $\tilde{\beta} := \beta$  if  $\beta \ln \beta^{-1} \leq \tau \ln \tau^{-1}$  and  $\tilde{\beta} := \tau$  otherwise.

*Lemma 1.* Suppose  $0 < \delta \leq 1$ , and  $\Omega$  is a nonsingular verification operator. Then

$$F(N, \delta, \Omega) \geq \frac{N+1 - (\ln \beta)^{-1} \ln(\tau\delta)}{N+1 - (\ln \beta)^{-1} \ln(\tau\delta) - h \ln(\tau\delta)}, \quad (16)$$

where  $h = (\tilde{\beta} \ln \tilde{\beta}^{-1})^{-1} = [\min\{\beta \ln \beta^{-1}, \tau \ln \tau^{-1}\}]^{-1}$ .

*Theorem 5.* Suppose  $0 < \epsilon, \delta < 1$ , and  $\Omega$  is a nonsingular verification operator. Then

$$k_-(\tilde{\beta}) + \left\lceil \frac{k_-(\tilde{\beta})F}{\tilde{\beta}\epsilon} \right\rceil \leq N(\epsilon, \delta, \Omega) < \frac{h \ln(F\delta)^{-1}}{\epsilon}, \quad (17)$$

where  $F = 1 - \epsilon$  and  $k_-(\tilde{\beta}) = \lfloor (\ln \delta)/\ln \tilde{\beta} \rfloor$ .

In the limit  $\epsilon, \delta \rightarrow 0$ , the upper and lower bounds in Eq. (17) are tight with respect to the relative deviation, so we have

$$N(\epsilon, \delta, \Omega) \approx \frac{h \ln(\delta^{-1})}{\epsilon} = \frac{\ln \delta}{\epsilon \tilde{\beta} \ln \tilde{\beta}}. \quad (18)$$

This number has the same scaling behaviors with  $\epsilon^{-1}$  and  $\delta^{-1}$  as the counterpart for the nonadversarial scenario in Eq. (3). The overhead is quantified by  $\nu h = \nu/(\tilde{\beta} \ln \tilde{\beta}^{-1})$ .

*Recipe to constructing efficient protocols for the adversarial scenario.*— The overhead of QSV in the adversarial scenario could be quite large if the verification operator  $\Omega$  is singular or nearly singular. To resolve this problem here we introduce a general recipe by adding the trivial test, where the “trivial test” means the test operator  $E$  coincides with the identity operator, that is,  $E = 1$ , so that all quantum states can always pass the test.

Given a verification operator  $\Omega$  for the pure state  $|\Psi\rangle$ , we can construct a *hedged verification operator* as follows,

$$\Omega_p = p + (1 - p)\Omega, \quad 0 \leq p < 1. \quad (19)$$

It is realized by performing the trivial test and  $\Omega$  with probabilities  $p$  and  $1 - p$ , respectively. The second largest and smallest eigenvalues of  $\Omega_p$  read

$$\beta_p = p + (1 - p)\beta, \quad \tau_p = p + (1 - p)\tau, \quad (20)$$

where  $\beta$  and  $\tau$  are the second largest and smallest eigenvalues of  $\Omega$ , respectively. By Eq. (17), to verify  $|\Psi\rangle$  within infidelity  $\epsilon$  and significance level  $\delta$ , the number of tests required by the strategy  $\Omega_p$  (assuming  $\tau_p > 0$ ) satisfies

$$N(\epsilon, \delta, \Omega_p) < h(p, \nu, \tau) \epsilon^{-1} \ln(F\delta)^{-1}, \quad (21)$$

where  $F = 1 - \epsilon$  and

$$h(p, \nu, \tau) = [\min\{\beta_p \ln \beta_p^{-1}, \tau_p \ln \tau_p^{-1}\}]^{-1}. \quad (22)$$

Compared with the nonadversarial scenario, the overhead satisfies

$$\frac{N(\epsilon, \delta, \Omega_p)}{N_{\text{NA}}(\epsilon, \delta, \Omega)} < \nu h(p, \nu, \tau) \frac{[\ln(1 - \nu\epsilon)^{-1}] \ln(F\delta)}{\nu\epsilon \ln \delta}. \quad (23)$$

This bound decreases monotonically with  $1/\epsilon$ ,  $1/\delta$ , and  $1/\nu$  [26]; it approaches  $\nu h(p, \nu, \tau)$  in the limit  $\epsilon, \delta \rightarrow 0$ , in which case the bound is saturated. So the function  $\nu h(p, \nu, \tau)$  is of key interest to characterizing the overhead of high-precision QSV in the adversarial scenario.

To achieve a high performance, we need to minimize  $h(p, \nu, \tau)$  over  $p$ . The optimal probability  $p$  reads

$$p_*(\nu, \tau) = \min\{p \geq 0 | \beta_p \geq e^{-1} \text{ \& } \tau_p \ln \tau_p^{-1} \geq \beta_p \ln \beta_p^{-1}\}, \quad (24)$$

which is nondecreasing in  $\nu$  and nonincreasing in  $\tau$ . For a homogeneous strategy  $\Omega$  with  $\tau = \beta = 1 - \nu$ , we have  $p_*(\nu, 1 - \nu) = (e\nu - e + 1)/(e\nu)$  if  $\nu \geq 1 - (1/e)$  and  $p_*(\nu, 1 - \nu) = 0$  otherwise. When  $\tau = 0$ , the probability  $p_*(\nu) := p_*(\nu, 0)$  can be approximated by  $\nu/e$ . In general, it is easy to compute  $p_*(\nu, \tau)$  numerically.




FIG. 2. (color online) Overhead of QSV in the adversarial scenario compared with the nonadversarial scenario. Each curve represents an upper bound for the ratio  $N(\epsilon, \delta, \Omega_p)/N_{\text{NA}}(\epsilon, \delta, \Omega)$ , where  $p = \nu/e$  and  $\nu$  is the spectral gap of  $\Omega$ . The same bound holds if  $p_*(\nu, \tau) \leq p \leq p_*(\nu)$ ; cf. Eq. (26).

*Theorem 6.* If  $p = \nu/e$  or  $p_*(\nu, \tau) \leq p \leq p_*(\nu)$ , then

$$N(\epsilon, \delta, \Omega_p) < \frac{h(\nu/e, \nu, 0) \ln(F\delta)^{-1}}{\epsilon} \leq \frac{\ln(F\delta)^{-1}}{(1 - \nu + e^{-1}\nu^2)\nu\epsilon}. \quad (25)$$

Here the number of tests  $N(\epsilon, \delta, \Omega_p)$  achieves the optimal scaling behaviors in both  $\epsilon$  and  $\delta$  as in the nonadversarial scenario, which have never been achieved before. Theorem 6 sets a general upper bound on the overhead of QSV in the adversarial scenario. If  $p = \nu/e$  or  $p_*(\nu, \tau) \leq p \leq p_*(\nu)$  for example, then

$$\frac{N(\epsilon, \delta, \Omega_p)}{N_{\text{NA}}(\epsilon, \delta, \Omega)} < \nu h(\nu/e, \nu, 0) \frac{[\ln(1 - \nu\epsilon)^{-1}] \ln(F\delta)}{\nu\epsilon \ln \delta}. \quad (26)$$

Analysis shows that  $h(\nu/e, \nu, 0)$  decreases monotonically in  $\nu$  (for  $0 < \nu \leq 1$ ), while  $\nu h(\nu/e, \nu, 0)$  increases monotonically and satisfies  $1 < \nu h(\nu/e, \nu, 0) \leq e$  [26]. So the bound in Eq. (26) decreases monotonically with  $1/\epsilon$ ,  $1/\delta$ , and  $1/\nu$ , as illustrated in Fig. 2. The overhead is at most three times when  $\epsilon, \delta \leq 1/10$  and is negligible as  $\nu, \epsilon, \delta$  approach zero. Surprisingly, we can choose the probability  $p$  for performing the trivial test without even knowing the value of  $\tau$ , while achieving a nearly optimal performance. In particular, the choices  $p = p_*(\nu)$  and  $p = \nu/e$  are nearly optimal. Meanwhile, the performance of  $\Omega_{p_*}$  is not sensitive to  $\tau$ , unlike  $\Omega$ .

Furthermore, our recipe for the adversarial scenario requires the same measurement settings as required for the nonadversarial scenario except for the trivial test. So pure states can be verified in the adversarial scenario with almost the same efficiency as in the nonadversarial scenario with respect to both the total number of tests and the number of measurement settings. This conclusion holds even if we can only perform local measurements.

*Summary.*—We established a general framework for verifying pure quantum states in the adversarial scenario and clarified the resource cost. Moreover, we proposed a



simple but powerful recipe to constructing efficient verification protocols for the adversarial scenario from the counterpart for the nonadversarial scenario. Thanks to this recipe, any pure state can be verified with almost the same efficiency as in the nonadversarial scenario. To construct an efficient protocol for the adversarial scenario, it suffices to find an efficient protocol for the nonadversarial scenario and then apply our recipe.

Our study can readily be applied to verifying many important quantum states in the adversarial scenario with unprecedented high efficiencies. In conjunction with recent works, optimal protocols based on local projective measurements can be constructed for all bipartite pure states which require only  $\lceil \epsilon \epsilon^{-1} \ln \delta^{-1} \rceil$  tests to achieve infidelity  $\epsilon$  and significance level  $\delta$ . Nearly optimal protocols can be constructed for stabilizer states (including graph states) which require  $\lceil 3\epsilon^{-1} \ln \delta^{-1} \rceil$  tests. General hypergraph states, weighted graph states, and Dicke states can also be verified efficiently with about  $n\epsilon^{-1} \ln \delta^{-1}$  tests, where  $n$  is the number of qubits. More details can be found in the companion paper [26]. These results are instrumental to many applications in quantum information processing.

This work is supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China (Grant No. 11875110). MH is supported in part by Fund for the Promotion of Joint International Research (Fostering Joint International Research) Grant No. 15KK0007, Japan Society for the Promotion of Science (JSPS) Grant-in-Aid for Scientific Research (A) No. 17H01280, (B) No. 16KT0017, and Kayamori Foundation of Informational Science Advancement.

---

\* zhuhuangjun@fudan.edu.cn

- [1] R. Horodecki, P. Horodecki, M. Horodecki, and K. Horodecki, “Quantum entanglement,” *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **81**, 865 (2009).
- [2] O. Gühne and G. Tóth, “Entanglement detection,” *Phys. Rep.* **474**, 1 (2009).
- [3] D. Gross, Y.-K. Liu, S. T. Flammia, S. Becker, and J. Eisert, “Quantum state tomography via compressed sensing,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **105**, 150401 (2010).
- [4] S. T. Flammia and Y.-K. Liu, “Direct fidelity estimation from few Pauli measurements,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **106**, 230501 (2011).
- [5] M. Hayashi, K. Matsumoto, and Y. Tsuda, “A study of LOCC-detection of a maximally entangled state using hypothesis testing,” *J. Phys. A: Math. Gen.* **39**, 14427 (2006).
- [6] M. Hayashi, “Group theoretical study of LOCC-detection of maximally entangled states using hypothesis testing,” *New J. Phys.* **11**, 043028 (2009).
- [7] S. Pallister, N. Linden, and A. Montanaro, “Optimal verification of entangled states with local measurements,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **120**, 170502 (2018).
- [8] H. Zhu and M. Hayashi, “Optimal verification and fidelity estimation of maximally entangled states,” *Phys. Rev. A* **99**, 052346 (2019).
- [9] Z. Li, Y.-G. Han, and H. Zhu, “Efficient verification of bipartite pure states,” *Phys. Rev. A* **100**, 032316 (2019).
- [10] K. Wang and M. Hayashi, “Optimal verification of two-qubit pure states,” *Phys. Rev. A* **100**, 032315 (2019).
- [11] X.-D. Yu, J. Shang, and O. Gühne, “Optimal verification of general bipartite pure states,” *npj Quantum Inf.* **5**, 112 (2019).
- [12] M. Hayashi and T. Morimae, “Verifiable measurement-only blind quantum computing with stabilizer testing,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **115**, 220502 (2015).
- [13] K. Fujii and M. Hayashi, “Verifiable fault tolerance in measurement-based quantum computation,” *Phys. Rev. A* **96**, 030301(R) (2017).
- [14] M. Hayashi and M. Hajdušek, “Self-guaranteed measurement-based quantum computation,” *Phys. Rev. A* **97**, 052308 (2018).
- [15] D. Markham and A. Krause, “A simple protocol for certifying graph states and applications in quantum networks,” (2018), arXiv:1801.05057.
- [16] H. Zhu and M. Hayashi, “Efficient verification of hypergraph states,” *Phys. Rev. Applied* **12**, 054047 (2019).
- [17] M. Hayashi and Y. Takeuchi, “Verifying commuting quantum computations via fidelity estimation of weighted graph states,” *New J. Phys.* **21**, 093060 (2019).
- [18] Y.-C. Liu, X.-D. Yu, J. Shang, H. Zhu, and X. Zhang, “Efficient verification of Dicke states,” *Phys. Rev. Applied* **12**, 044020 (2019).
- [19] T. Morimae and K. Fujii, “Blind quantum computation protocol in which Alice only makes measurements,” *Phys. Rev. A* **87**, 050301(R) (2013).
- [20] Y. Takeuchi, T. Morimae, and M. Hayashi, “Quantum computational universality of hypergraph states with Pauli-X and Z basis measurements,” *Sci. Rep.* **9**, 13585 (2019).
- [21] S. Perseguers, G. J. Lapeyre Jr, D. Cavalcanti, M. Lewenstein, and A. Acín, “Distribution of entanglement in large-scale quantum networks,” *Rep. Prog. Phys.* **76**, 096001 (2013).
- [22] W. McCutcheon, A. Pappa, B. A. Bell, A. McMillan, A. Chailloux, T. Lawson, M. Mafu, D. Markham, E. Diamanti, I. Kerenidis, J. G. Rarity, and M. S. Tame, “Experimental verification of multipartite entanglement in quantum networks,” *Nat. Commun.* **7**, 13251 (2016).
- [23] T. Morimae, Y. Takeuchi, and M. Hayashi, “Verification of hypergraph states,” *Phys. Rev. A* **96**, 062321 (2017).
- [24] Y. Takeuchi and T. Morimae, “Verification of many-qubit states,” *Phys. Rev. X* **8**, 021060 (2018).
- [25] Y. Takeuchi, A. Mantri, T. Morimae, A. Mizutani, and J. F. Fitzsimons, “Resource-efficient verification of quantum computing using Serfling’s bound,” *npj Quantum Inf.* **5**, 27 (2019).
- [26] H. Zhu and M. Hayashi, “General framework for verifying pure quantum states in the adversarial scenario,” *Phys. Rev. A* **100**, 062335 (2019).