

Protecting the output of a quantum computer with random circuit samplers

Zixin Huang, Pieter Kok, and Cosmo Lupo

Department of Physics and Astronomy, The University of Sheffield, Sheffield, S3 7RH, United Kingdom.

(Dated: April 16, 2020)

Random quantum circuit samplers have been used to demonstrate the exponential speed-up of quantum processors beyond what is tractable classically [1]. However, useful applications for these samplers have so far been elusive. Here, we propose random circuit as efficient devices for protecting the output of a quantum computer. We consider a scenario where the server performs universal fault-tolerant quantum computation and the user gains access to the output using a pseudo-random circuit. We show that a private key much smaller than the size of the output may prevent unauthorised access. For an n -qubit computation, a standard approach requires an n -bit key to scramble the state. We provide an information-theoretic proof showing that obfuscation can be achieved with order $n - H_{\min}(X)$ secret bits, where $H_{\min}(X)$ is the min-entropy of the output of the computation. As interesting computations are expected to have large min-entropy, this represents a substantial reduction of the key size.

Demonstrating the exponential advantage of quantum computers over their classical counterpart has been the driving force behind recent developments in quantum computation. The first evidence of “quantum supremacy” came in the form of complexity-theoretic proofs [2] that there exist tasks that can be executed exponentially faster on a quantum processor than a classical one. These tasks include Boson Sampling [3], Fourier Sampling [4], and random circuit sampling [1], with either commuting gates, known as instantaneous quantum polynomial-time computation [5, 6], or with non-commuting gates [7, 8]. These computational tasks do not need to be useful to show the power of quantum computation [7]. A noisy random circuit sampler demonstrating the exponential speed up was implemented recently by Google on superconducting qubits [1]. The question remains how this device can be used for practical quantum information processing tasks.

In the future, fault-tolerant quantum computers will be capable of important computational tasks. We imagine quantum computers as devices servicing many distributed users, where the latter may have limited computing capability, or may not know the algorithm that is realised by the server. In this scenario, we anticipate the need to encrypt the output of a quantum computer. To realise this task, we consider a protocol for short-distance private-key encryption between a quantum computer and its authorised user. Unlike blind quantum computation [9–12], which is concerned with untrusted hardware and verification, our goal is to prevent unauthorised users

from gaining access to the quantum computer’s output.

We propose that a pseudo-random circuit can efficiently obfuscate the output of a universal quantum computer. In particular, we show that this can be realised efficiently using only Clifford gates, which can be made fault tolerant much more easily than the full universal gate set used by the quantum computer [13]. We assume that the user has the ability to apply the non-universal set of Clifford gates in a fault-tolerant way, and can implement measurements in the computational basis.

The server concatenates a pseudo-random circuit with the circuit that implements a useful, fault-tolerant, quantum algorithm, as shown in Fig. 1. The authorized user applies the inverse circuit and measures the qubits in the computational basis. In order to achieve secure encryption, we require that only a negligible amount of information is obtained by a non-authorized user who does not know the private key and attempts to measure the output of the encrypted quantum computation. Note that the security does not rely on the computational complexity of random circuits. This is a feature of the protocol, since it does not make any assumptions about the computational capacity of the unauthorised user, who may have unlimited computational power.

The output of an n -qubit quantum computation can be encrypted in many different ways. One could encrypt and then decrypt the classical data obtained after the measurement using a one-time pad, which would require a secret key of n bits [14]. Otherwise, one could encrypt the quantum state $|\psi\rangle$ before the measurement. Perfect encryption obtained with the quantum one-time




FIG. 1. Circuit layout for the encryption protocol. A useful computation U is concatenated with the encryption, a pseudo-random quantum circuit C . The authorised User applies the unitary $V = C^\dagger$ and correctly decrypts the encryption. An unauthorised User/adversary can attempt to extract information by performing an arbitrary measurement.

pad would require a secret key of $2n$ bits [15]. Approximate encryption, one that encrypts the quantum state up to ϵ probability of failure, would instead require a secret key of $O(n) + O(\log 1/\epsilon)$ bits [15, 16]. These protocols require that the encrypted state be virtually indistinguishable from the maximally mixed state. Expressed in terms of the trace norm, $\|\rho - 2^{-n}\mathbb{1}\| \leq \epsilon$, for some small ϵ . However, the output of a quantum computation typically contains the answer to a meaningful question. For our purposes, we may simply require that an unauthorised user does not obtain the correct answer. This opens the possibility of performing the encryption in a much more efficient way.

In this paper we show that quantum data locking [15–20] can be exploited to achieve approximate encryption using order $n - H_{\min}(X)$ secret bits, where $H_{\min}(X)$ is the min-entropy of the output of the computation. It is natural to expect any useful quantum computation to be classically hard to simulate, therefore one has no information on the output prior to the measurement. This implies that the output has high entropy, therefore $H_{\min}(X) \sim n$ ¹. In this case $n - H_{\min}(X)$ can be substantially smaller than n . This suggests that the encryption can be implemented much more efficiently than previously thought.

I. RELATION TO OTHER WORKS

The security of the encryption protocol relies on the phenomenon of quantum data locking (QDL), first introduced by DiVincenzo *et al.* [17]. Applications of QDL have been mostly focused on quantum communication. Previous works have applied QDL, for example, to two legitimate users exchanging information through a wire-tapped channel. In order to apply QDL in this context, it is assumed that the eavesdropper measures before the honest parties perform classical post-processing. This requires that the eavesdropper has bounded quantum memory [22].

The application considered here is not subject to the bounded quantum memory assumption. The goal of the attacker is to replace the authorised user, and not to wire-tap a communication channel. Therefore, there is no loss of generality in having the attacker perform a measurement, since that is required to obtain the output of the quantum computer. Also, note that we do not require any classical post-processing by the authorised user and server. This is because fault-tolerant quantum computing includes error correction at the algorithm level, and it is not done *a posteriori* as in quantum key distribution [23].

To the best of our knowledge, our work is the first to explicitly consider an application to secure the output of

a quantum computation. The proof method builds on, improves, and generalises techniques previously applied in Refs. [24–26].

Other known QDL protocols and security proofs could be used to encrypt a quantum computer. A summary is given in Tab. I. Some of them, however, would be limited to the case where $H_{\min}(X)$ is equal to n [15, 18, 19, 24, 25]. For example, Fawzi *et al.* [18, 19] showed an explicit and efficient construction that can encrypt n bits of information using a key of $O(\log(n) \log(n/\epsilon))$ bits, with a leakage of no more than ϵn bits. However, this construction cannot be made fault-tolerant [18]. The approach of Dupuis *et al.* [27] can account for non-maximal min-entropy, and would yield results similar to Eqs. (16)-(17), but it relies on sampling unitaries from the Haar distribution, thus requiring an exponential number of gates with respect to the system size [28]. In contrast, here we are using an approximate 2-design, which in turn can be sampled using only Clifford gates.

	I_{acc}	Key Size	Circuit Class
Quantum one-time pad	0	$2n$	Pauli
Approx. encryption [15]	ϵn	$n + \log n + \log(1/\epsilon^2)$	Haar
Ref. [15]	$\epsilon n + 3$	$3 \log n$	Haar
Ref. [19]	ϵn	$O(\log(n/\epsilon) \log n)$	Universal
This paper	ϵn	$n - H_{\min}(X) + O(\log n) + O(\log(1/\epsilon))$	Clifford

TABLE I. For an n -qubit output state, summary of key size and circuit requirement for different encryption schemes; others were given in the context of quantum communication.

II. THE ENCRYPTION PROTOCOL

We consider a scenario where a server has the capacity of performing large scale fault-tolerant universal quantum computation, and the user is capable of performing fault-tolerant Clifford circuits. The encryption protocol is then defined as follows:

1. The server and the authorised user share a unconditionally secure secret key of $\log K$ bits.
2. In advance, the server and user (publicly) agree upon a set of K n -qubit pseudo-random circuits, $\{C_k\}_{k=1,\dots,K}$. These circuits are composed of Clifford gates only.
3. To encrypt the output of a quantum computer, the server applies the Clifford circuit corresponding to the unique unitary C_k associated with the private key.
4. The authorised user, who knows the private key, applies C_k^{-1} and measures the output in the computational basis to complete the quantum computation.

¹A recent work has shown that typical problems allowing for quantum supremacy have min-entropy of order $n/2$ [21]. We expect that hard problems may also have higher min-entropy.




FIG. 2. Number of secret bits ($\log K$ in Eq. (15)) required to lock an n -qubit output of a quantum computer, for $\epsilon = 10^{-8}$ and different values of H_{\min} : $H_{\min} = n$ (red solid line), $0.8n$ (green dotted-dashed line) and $0.6n$ (blue dotted line). For comparison, we plot the approximate state-randomization in Ref. [15] (purple dashed line with circles), and the quantum one-time pad [15] (black line with stars).

III. PSEUDO-RANDOM QUANTUM CIRCUITS

Unlike works that considered the uniform ensemble of random unitaries induced by the Haar measure (see e.g., [15, 18, 19]), here we apply pseudo-random unitaries from an approximate 2-design (defined below). This ensemble of unitaries has also been used in other applications related to information obfuscation, most notably system decoupling [29]. Recall that [30–32] given a $\delta > 0$ and the vectors $|\alpha\rangle$ and $|\beta\rangle$ in d dimensions, a δ -approximate t -design is a set of unitary operators C such that

$$(1 - \delta)M_\ell \leq \mathbb{E} [|\langle \alpha | C | \beta \rangle|^{2\ell}] \leq (1 + \delta)M_\ell, \quad (1)$$

for all $\ell \leq t$, where \mathbb{E} denotes the expectation value over the t -design, and

$$M_\ell = \frac{\ell!(d-1)!}{(\ell+d-1)!} \quad (2)$$

is the ℓ -th moment of the uniform distribution induced by the Haar measure, i.e., $M_\ell = \mathbb{E}_{\text{Haar}} [|\langle \alpha | C | \beta \rangle|^{2\ell}]$.

Given an n -qubit circuit, a δ -approximate 2-design can be achieved with $O(n(n + \log 1/\delta))$ two-qubit Clifford gates [33], or $O(n \log^2 n)$ random $U(4)$ gates [28]. It is known [7, 34] that calculating the output amplitude $|\langle \alpha | C | \beta \rangle|^2$ is $\#P$ -hard. There are known codes that implement the Clifford group in a straightforward fault-tolerant manner [13, 35]. Since supplementing the Clifford group with fault tolerant gates into a universal set of gates is highly non-trivial, this means that a user who can implement only Clifford gates may benefit from delegating the quantum computation to the server.

Important quantities considered here are the first and second moments $\mathbb{E} [|\langle \alpha | C | \beta \rangle|^2]$, and $\mathbb{E} [|\langle \alpha | C | \beta \rangle|^4]$. The

ratio

$$\gamma := \frac{\mathbb{E} [|\langle \alpha | C | \beta \rangle|^4]}{\mathbb{E} [|\langle \alpha | C | \beta \rangle|^2]^2}, \quad (3)$$

quantifies the spread of the random variable $|\langle \alpha | C | \beta \rangle|^2$ around its average. For δ -approximate 2-designs we can bound γ from above as

$$\gamma \leq \frac{2d(1+\delta)}{(d+1)(1-\delta)^2} \leq 2 \frac{1+\delta}{(1-\delta)^2}. \quad (4)$$

This coefficient will play a fundamental role in our analysis, and we will use this bound to estimate the required length of the private key.

IV. THE MODEL

Suppose the quantum computer is used to solve a particular problem whose solution space has cardinality M . Different outputs of the quantum computation correspond to different quantum states, denoted as $|\psi_x\rangle$ (with $x = 1, \dots, M$). We develop our analysis within the subspace of fault-tolerant computation that incorporates quantum error correction [36–38]. Therefore, the states $|\psi_x\rangle$ are assumed to be quantum error-corrected. We further assume that different outputs are associated with a prior probability $p_X(x)$, and that the output states $|\psi_x\rangle$ are (approximately) mutually orthogonal. Therefore, the uncertainty in the measurement outcome is well quantified by the min-entropy $H_{\min}(X) = -\log \max_x p_X(x)$.

From the point of view of the legitimate user (U) who knows the private key, the *a priori* description of the output of the computation is given by the statistical mixture

$$\rho_U = \sum_{x=1}^M p_X(x) |\psi_x\rangle \langle \psi_x|. \quad (5)$$

The description of this is different for an unauthorised User (U') who does not know the private key:

$$\rho_{U'} = \frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{x=1}^M p_X(x) C_k |\psi_x\rangle \langle \psi_x| C_k^\dagger. \quad (6)$$

Below we show that, if K is large enough, the unauthorised user can extract only a negligible amount of information from the state $\rho_{U'}$.

Similar to other works on QDL [15, 17, 20, 24–26, 39], we use the accessible information $I_{\text{acc}}(X; U')$ to quantify the potential information leakage. This quantity represents the maximum number of bits an unauthorised user can obtain about the output of the computation. We anticipate that similar results could be obtained using other metrics, see e.g., [18, 19, 40].

For any given measurement $\mathcal{M}_{U' \rightarrow Y}$ applied on the quantum state in Eq. (6), one can consider the mutual

information $I(\mathbf{X}; \mathbf{Y})$ between the output of the quantum computation and the measurement result of the unauthorised user. Recall that the mutual information between two random variables \mathbf{X} and \mathbf{Y} is $I(\mathbf{X}; \mathbf{Y}) = H(\mathbf{Y}) - H(\mathbf{Y}|\mathbf{X})$ where $H(\mathbf{Y}|\mathbf{X})$ is the conditional Shannon entropy. The mutual information vanishes when \mathbf{X} and \mathbf{Y} are statistically independent and reaches its maximum when they are perfectly correlated. The accessible information is then defined as

$$I_{\text{acc}}(\mathbf{X}; \mathbf{U}') = \max_{\mathcal{M}_{\mathbf{U}' \rightarrow \mathbf{Y}}} I(\mathbf{X}; \mathbf{Y}), \quad (7)$$

where the maximization is over all possible measurements $\mathcal{M}_{\mathbf{U}' \rightarrow \mathbf{Y}}$ applied on the state $\rho_{\mathbf{U}'}$. We require that the adversary's information is small not just for one particular measurement, but for all possible measurements they can perform.

V. SKETCH OF SECURITY PROOF

Proving the security of the encryption scheme relies on showing that $I_{\text{acc}}(\mathbf{X}; \mathbf{U}')$ can be made arbitrarily small if K is large enough. This also allows us to quantify the minimal length of the private key that ensures secure encryption. To show this, we first write the accessible

$$\begin{aligned} I_{\text{acc}}(\mathbf{X}; \mathbf{U}') &= \max_{\mathcal{M}_{\mathbf{U}' \rightarrow \mathbf{Y}}} \left\{ - \sum_y p_{\mathbf{Y}}(y) \log p_{\mathbf{Y}}(y) + \sum_{xy} p_{\mathbf{X}}(x) p_{\mathbf{Y}|\mathbf{X}=x}(y) \log p_{\mathbf{Y}|\mathbf{X}=x}(y) \right\} \\ &= \max_{\mathcal{M}_{\mathbf{U}' \rightarrow \mathbf{Y}}} \sum_y \alpha_y \left\{ - \langle \phi_y | \rho_{\mathbf{U}'} | \phi_y \rangle \log \langle \phi_y | \rho_{\mathbf{U}'} | \phi_y \rangle + \sum_x p_{\mathbf{X}}(x) \langle \phi_y | \rho_{\mathbf{U}'}^x | \phi_y \rangle \log \langle \phi_y | \rho_{\mathbf{U}'}^x | \phi_y \rangle \right\}. \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

The security proof proceeds by showing that for increasing K , both $p_{\mathbf{Y}}$ and $p_{\mathbf{Y}|\mathbf{X}=x}$ concentrate towards their common expectation value, and that the probability of a deviation larger than ϵ is exponentially suppressed. Therefore both the entropy $H(\mathbf{Y})$ and the conditional entropy $H(\mathbf{Y}|\mathbf{X})$ will tend to the same value.

We show that both terms in the curly brackets in Eq. (12) are arbitrarily close to $\langle \phi_y | \bar{\rho}_{\mathbf{U}'} | \phi_y \rangle \log \langle \phi_y | \bar{\rho}_{\mathbf{U}'} | \phi_y \rangle$ for all vectors ϕ_y , with $\bar{\rho}_{\mathbf{U}'} := 2^{-n} \mathbb{I}$ the n -qubit maximally mixed state. The relative minus sign between the terms then implies that $I(\mathbf{X}; \mathbf{Y})$ can be made arbitrarily small. To show this we follow the method in Ref. [26] using tail bounds.

First, we show, using the matrix Chernoff bound [41], that $\rho_{\mathbf{U}'}$ is close to $\bar{\rho}_{\mathbf{U}'}$. Assuming K is large enough, with near unit probability we have $\rho_{\mathbf{U}'} \leq (1 + \epsilon) \bar{\rho}_{\mathbf{U}'} = (1 +$

information as the difference of two entropies,

$$I_{\text{acc}}(\mathbf{X}; \mathbf{U}') = \max_{\mathcal{M}_{\mathbf{U}' \rightarrow \mathbf{Y}}} H(\mathbf{Y}) - H(\mathbf{Y}|\mathbf{X}), \quad (8)$$

and then show that $H(\mathbf{Y}) \simeq H(\mathbf{Y}|\mathbf{X})$ for all measurement $\mathcal{M}_{\mathbf{U}' \rightarrow \mathbf{Y}}$. The proof shows that for a random choice of K unitaries, one obtains $I_{\text{acc}}(\mathbf{X}; \mathbf{U}') \leq 2n\epsilon$ with probability arbitrarily close to 1.

In general, the measurement map $\mathcal{M}_{\mathbf{U}' \rightarrow \mathbf{Y}}$ is characterised by POVM elements Λ_y , such that $\Lambda_y \geq 0$, $\sum_y \Lambda_y = \mathbb{I}$. However, it is known that the optimal measurement has unit rank [17], i.e., the POVM elements take the form $\Lambda_y = \alpha_y |\phi_y\rangle\langle\phi_y|$, where ϕ_y are unit vectors, and α_y are positive numbers such that $\sum_y \alpha_y = 2^n$.

The outcomes of the measurement are distributed according to the probability distribution

$$p_{\mathbf{Y}}(y) = \alpha_y \langle \phi_y | \rho_{\mathbf{U}'} | \phi_y \rangle, \quad (9)$$

with $\rho_{\mathbf{U}'}$ given in Eq. (6). For given x , the conditional probability of a measurement outcome is

$$p_{\mathbf{Y}|\mathbf{X}=x}(y) = \alpha_y \langle \phi_y | \rho_{\mathbf{U}'}^x | \phi_y \rangle, \quad (10)$$

with

$$\rho_{\mathbf{U}'}^x = \frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=1}^K C_k |\psi_x\rangle\langle\psi_x| C_k^\dagger. \quad (11)$$

The accessible information in Eq. (8) is then given by

$\epsilon) 2^{-n} \mathbb{I}$. From this inequality we find that $\langle \phi | \rho_{\mathbf{U}'} | \phi \rangle \leq (1 + \epsilon) 2^{-n}$ uniformly in ϕ . For a random choice of the unitaries, the probability that this inequality is violated is smaller than

$$P_1 := \exp \left\{ n \ln 2 - K \frac{\epsilon^2 2^{-n}}{4 p_{\text{max}}} \right\}, \quad (13)$$

(see Appendix A for details). Next, we apply a tail bound due to Maurer [42]. We show that, for given ϕ and x , $\langle \phi | \rho_{\mathbf{U}'}^x | \phi \rangle \geq (1 - \epsilon) \langle \phi | \bar{\rho}_{\mathbf{U}'} | \phi \rangle = 2^{-n} \mathbb{I}$. This inequality needs to be extended to all codewords and to (almost) all values of x . In this way we obtain that, for a random choice of the unitaries, the inequality is verified up to a

probability smaller than

$$P_2 := \exp\left(2d \ln\left(\frac{20 \times 2^n}{\epsilon}\right) + \frac{\epsilon \ln M}{4p_{\max}} - \frac{K\epsilon^3}{128\gamma p_{\max}}\right), \quad (14)$$

where γ has been defined in Eq. (3) (see Appendix B for details). Putting these two results together, we obtain $I(\mathbf{X}; \mathbf{Y}) \leq 2\epsilon \sum_y \alpha_y 2^{-n} n$. Since $\sum_y \alpha_y 2^{-n} = 1$, we finally find $I(\mathbf{X}; \mathbf{Y}) \leq 2\epsilon n$. This bound on the accessible information hold probabilistically, but the likelihood of failure can be made arbitrary small for large enough K . Specifically, the probability of failure is no larger than $P_1 + P_2$. Therefore, it can be bounded away from 1 by choosing K such that

$$K > \max\left\{\frac{4n \times 2^n p_{\max} \ln 2}{\epsilon^2}, \frac{128\gamma}{\epsilon^3} \left[2^{n+1} p_{\max} \ln\left(\frac{20 \times 2^n}{\epsilon}\right) + \frac{\epsilon \ln M}{4}\right]\right\}. \quad (15)$$

VI. RESULTS

We have shown that for a random choice of K unitary transformations, the accessible information is upper bounded by a negligible number of bits $2n\epsilon$,

$$I_{\text{acc}}(\mathbf{X}; \mathbf{U}') \leq 2n\epsilon. \quad (16)$$

From Eq. (15), this holds for a private key of length

$$\log K = \log \gamma + n - H_{\min}(\mathbf{X}) + O(\log n) + O(\log 1/\epsilon). \quad (17)$$

Note that the secret key length depends on the coefficient γ introduced in Eq. (3). For an approximate 2-design using the bound in Eq. (4), we obtain

$$\log K \leq n - H_{\min}(\mathbf{X}) + \log \frac{1 + \delta}{(1 - \delta)^2} + O(\log n) + O(\log 1/\epsilon). \quad (18)$$

We assume that the computation needs to be run only once (or only few times, since the algorithms are designed to succeed with high probability). Compared to standard encryption which needs n -bits, we can encrypt the output using order $n - H_{\min}$ bits. Since one typically has no prior information on \mathbf{X} , one can assume that the distribution is flat and $H_{\min} \approx n$. This means that the size of the key for encryption may stay almost *constant* regardless of the size of the computation, which leads to a potentially

exponential reduction.

We plot Eq. (18) in Fig. (2), where the exact value of K is given by Eq. (15), for $\epsilon = 10^{-8}$ and different values of H_{\min} . Our protocol out-performs exact and approximate one-time pad Ref. [15] when $n \gtrsim 50$, and the advantage increases with increasing n .

VII. CONCLUSIONS

Universal quantum computers promise a vast improvement in computational power. There are propositions as to what near-term quantum processors might be capable of [43–46]. In this paper we have considered the use of a random circuit sampler to encrypt the output of a quantum computer. Unlike blind quantum computation, which is concerned with untrusted hardware and verification, we focus on preventing unauthorised users gaining access to the output of a quantum algorithm. We have considered a scenario where a server can realise fault-tolerant universal quantum computing. The user must be capable only of implementing fault-tolerant Clifford gates, and measurements in the computational basis. Quantum computation using only fault-tolerant Clifford gates requires orders of magnitude fewer physical qubits than universal fault-tolerant quantum computing [47, 48], making it much more accessible to a wide user base than fully fault tolerant universal quantum computing.

To construct the security of the quantum computer output, we exploit the benefits of quantum data locking while circumventing its known weaknesses. We have presented an information-theoretic proof that quantum circuits in the Clifford group can secure a n -qubit quantum algorithm with $\xi \simeq n - H_{\min}(\mathbf{X})$ secret bits, where $H_{\min}(\mathbf{X})$ is the min-entropy of the measurement outcome. Note that useful quantum algorithms are expected to be classically hard to simulate, therefore have high entropy, i.e., $H_{\min}(\mathbf{X}) \sim n$. These output states then can be encrypted with $\xi \ll n$ secret bits. This would mean that encryption can be obtained with a much shorter private key than previously thought.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

ZH acknowledges Ryan Mann for fruitful discussions. We also thank Earl Campell, Armanda Ottaviano-Quintavalle, Joschka Roffe, Omar Fawzi and Dominik Hangleiter for insightful comments on the manuscript. This work was supported by the EPSRC Quantum Communications Hub, Grant No. EP/M013472/1.

[1] F. Arute, K. Arya, R. Babbush, D. Bacon, J. C. Bardin, R. Barends, R. Biswas, S. Boixo, F. G. Brandao, D. A. Buell, *et al.*, Nature **574**, 505 (2019).

[2] A. W. Harrow and A. Montanaro, Nature **549**, 203 (2017).

[3] S. Aaronson and A. Arkhipov, in *Proceedings of the forty-*

- third annual ACM symposium on Theory of computing* (ACM, 2011) pp. 333–342.
- [4] B. Fefferman and C. Umans, arXiv preprint arXiv:1507.05592 (2015).
 - [5] M. J. Bremner, A. Montanaro, and D. J. Shepherd, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **117**, 080501 (2016).
 - [6] M. J. Bremner, R. Jozsa, and D. J. Shepherd, *Proceedings of the Royal Society A: Mathematical, Physical and Engineering Sciences* **467**, 459 (2010).
 - [7] A. Bouland, B. Fefferman, C. Nirkhe, and U. Vazirani, *Nature Physics* **15**, 159 (2019).
 - [8] S. Boixo, S. V. Isakov, V. N. Smelyanskiy, R. Babbush, N. Ding, Z. Jiang, M. J. Bremner, J. M. Martinis, and H. Neven, *Nature Physics* **14**, 595 (2018).
 - [9] J. F. Fitzsimons, *npj Quantum Information* **3**, 1 (2017).
 - [10] T. Morimae and K. Fujii, *Nature communications* **3**, 1036 (2012).
 - [11] A. Broadbent, J. Fitzsimons, and E. Kashefi, in *2009 50th Annual IEEE Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science* (IEEE, 2009) pp. 517–526.
 - [12] V. Dunjko, J. F. Fitzsimons, C. Portmann, and R. Renner, in *Advances in Cryptology – ASIACRYPT 2014*, edited by P. Sarkar and T. Iwata (Springer Berlin Heidelberg, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2014) pp. 406–425.
 - [13] B. Eastin and E. Knill, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **102**, 110502 (2009).
 - [14] C. E. Shannon, *Bell system technical journal* **28**, 656 (1949).
 - [15] P. Hayden, D. Leung, P. W. Shor, and A. Winter, *Communications in Mathematical Physics* **250**, 371 (2004).
 - [16] G. Aubrun, arXiv preprint arXiv:0802.4193 (2008).
 - [17] D. P. DiVincenzo, M. Horodecki, D. W. Leung, J. A. Smolin, and B. M. Terhal, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **92**, 067902 (2004).
 - [18] O. Fawzi, PhD Thesis, McGill University, School of Computer Science, preprint arXiv:1111.2026 (2011).
 - [19] O. Fawzi, P. Hayden, and P. Sen, *Journal of the ACM* **60**, 44 (2013).
 - [20] S. Guha, P. Hayden, H. Krovi, S. Lloyd, C. Lupo, J. H. Shapiro, M. Takeoka, and M. M. Wilde, *Phys. Rev. X* **4**, 011016 (2014).
 - [21] D. Hangleiter, M. Kliesch, J. Eisert, and C. Gogolin, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **122**, 210502 (2019).
 - [22] C. Lupo, *Entropy* **17**, 3194 (2015).
 - [23] C. H. Bennett, G. Brassard, and J.-M. Robert, *SIAM J. Comput.* **17**, 210 (1988).
 - [24] C. Lupo and S. Lloyd, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **113**, 160502 (2014).
 - [25] C. Lupo and S. Lloyd, *New Journal of Physics* **17**, 033022 (2015).
 - [26] Z. Huang, P. P. Rohde, D. W. Berry, P. Kok, J. P. Dowling, and C. Lupo, arXiv preprint arXiv:1905.03013 (2019).
 - [27] F. Dupuis, M. Berta, J. Wullschleger, and R. Renner, *Proc. R. Soc. A* **469**, 2159 (2013).
 - [28] A. Harrow and S. Mehraban, arXiv preprint arXiv:1809.06957 (2018).
 - [29] O. Szehr, F. Dupuis, M. Tomamichel, and R. Renner, *New Journal of Physics* **15**, 053022 (2013).
 - [30] A. Roy and A. J. Scott, *Designs, codes and cryptography* **53**, 13 (2009).
 - [31] R. L. Mann and M. J. Bremner, arXiv preprint arXiv:1711.00686 (2017).
 - [32] F. G. Brandao, A. W. Harrow, and M. Horodecki, *Communications in Mathematical Physics* **346**, 397 (2016).
 - [33] A. W. Harrow and R. A. Low, *Communications in Mathematical Physics* **291**, 257 (2009).
 - [34] D. Hangleiter, J. Bermejo-Vega, M. Schwarz, and J. Eisert, *Quantum* **2**, 65 (2018).
 - [35] B. Zeng, A. Cross, and I. L. Chuang, *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory* **57**, 6272 (2011).
 - [36] P. W. Shor, in *Proceedings of 37th Conference on Foundations of Computer Science* (IEEE, 1996) pp. 56–65.
 - [37] D. A. Lidar and T. A. Brun, *Quantum error correction* (Cambridge university press, 2013).
 - [38] J. Roffe, *Contemporary Physics*, 1 (2019).
 - [39] C. Lupo, M. M. Wilde, and S. Lloyd, *Phys. Rev. A* **90**, 022326 (2014).
 - [40] R. Adamczak, *Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and Theoretical* **50**, 105302 (2017).
 - [41] R. Ahlswede and A. Winter, *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory* **48**, 569 (2002).
 - [42] A. Maurer, *J. Inequalities in Pure and Applied Mathematics* **4**, 15 (2003).
 - [43] R. D. Somma, S. Boixo, H. Barnum, and E. Knill, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **101**, 130504 (2008).
 - [44] J. R. McClean, S. Boixo, V. N. Smelyanskiy, R. Babbush, and H. Neven, *Nature communications* **9**, 4812 (2018).
 - [45] E. Farhi and H. Neven, arXiv preprint arXiv:1802.06002 (2018).
 - [46] S. Bravyi, D. Gosset, and R. Koenig, *Science* **362**, 308 (2018).
 - [47] E. T. Campbell, B. M. Terhal, and C. Vuillot, *Nature* **549**, 172 (2017).
 - [48] J. O’Gorman and E. T. Campbell, *Phys. Rev. A* **95**, 032338 (2017).

Appendix A: Application of the matrix Chernoff bound

The matrix Chernoff bound states the following (which can be obtained directly from Theorem 19 of Ref. [41]):

Theorem 1 *Let $\{X_t\}_{t=1,\dots,K}$ be K i.i.d. d -dimensional Hermitian-matrix-valued random variables, with $X_t \sim X$, $0 \leq X \leq R$, and $\mathbb{E}[X] = 2^{-n}\mathbb{I}$. Then, for $\epsilon \geq 0$:*

$$\Pr \left\{ \frac{1}{K} \sum_{t=1}^K X_t \not\leq (1 + \epsilon)\mathbb{E}[X] \right\} \leq d \exp \left\{ -KD \left[(1 + \epsilon) \frac{2^{-n}}{R} \left\| \frac{2^{-n}}{R} \right\| \right] \right\}, \quad (\text{A1})$$

where $\Pr\{x\}$ denotes the probability that the proposition x is true, and $D[u\|v] = u \ln(u/v) - (1-u) \ln[(1-u)/(1-v)]$.

Note that for $\epsilon < 1$

$$D \left[(1 + \epsilon) \frac{2^{-n}}{R} \left\| \frac{2^{-n}}{R} \right\| \right] \geq \frac{\epsilon^2}{4} \frac{2^{-n}}{R}. \quad (\text{A2})$$

We apply the Chernoff bound to the K independent random variables

$$X_k \equiv C_k \sum_{x=1}^M p_X(x) |\psi_x\rangle \langle \psi_x| C_k^\dagger. \quad (\text{A3})$$

Note that these operators satisfy $0 \leq X_k \leq p_{\max} := \max_x p_X(x)$. Therefore, $R \equiv p_{\max}$. Also note that

$$\frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=1}^K X_k = \frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=1}^K C_k \sum_{x=1}^M p_X(x) |\psi_x\rangle \langle \psi_x| C_k^\dagger = \rho_{\mathcal{U}}, \quad (\text{A4})$$

and $\mathbb{E}[X] = \bar{\rho}_{\mathcal{U}} = 2^{-n}\mathbb{I}$. By applying the Chernoff bound we then obtain

$$\Pr \left\{ \rho_{\mathcal{U}} \not\leq (1 + \epsilon)2^{-n} \right\} \leq 2^n \exp \left\{ -K \frac{\epsilon^2}{4} \frac{2^{-n}}{p_{\max}} \right\} = \exp \left\{ n \ln 2 - K \frac{\epsilon^2}{4} \frac{2^{-n}}{p_{\max}} \right\}. \quad (\text{A5})$$

In conclusion, we have obtained that, up to a probability smaller than

$$P_1 := \exp \left\{ n \ln 2 - K \frac{\epsilon^2}{4} \frac{2^{-n}}{p_{\max}} \right\}, \quad (\text{A6})$$

the following matrix inequality holds:

$$\rho_{\mathcal{U}} \leq (1 + \epsilon)2^{-n}. \quad (\text{A7})$$

Appendix B: Application of the Maurer bound

We apply a concentration inequality obtained by Maurer in Ref. [42]:

Theorem 2 *Let $\{X_k\}_{k=1,\dots,K}$ be K i.i.d. non-negative real-valued random variables, with $X_k \sim X$ and finite first and second moments, $\mathbb{E}[X], \mathbb{E}[X^2] < \infty$. Then, for any $\tau > 0$ we have that*

$$\Pr \left\{ \frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=1}^K X_k < (1 - \tau)\mathbb{E}[X] \right\} \leq \exp \left(-\frac{K\tau^2\mathbb{E}[X]^2}{2\mathbb{E}[X^2]} \right). \quad (\text{B1})$$

For any given x and ϕ , we apply this bound to the random variables

$$X_k \equiv |\langle \phi | C_k | \psi_x \rangle|^2. \quad (\text{B2})$$

Note that

$$\frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=1}^K X_k = \langle \phi | \rho_{\mathbb{U}'}^x | \phi \rangle, \quad (\text{B3})$$

and

$$\mathbb{E}[X] = \bar{\rho}_{\mathbb{U}'} = 2^{-n} \mathbb{I}. \quad (\text{B4})$$

The application of the Maurer tail bound then yields

$$\Pr \left\{ \langle \phi | \rho_{\mathbb{U}'}^x | \phi \rangle < (1 - \tau) 2^{-n} \right\} \leq \exp \left(-\frac{K\tau^2}{2\gamma} \right). \quad (\text{B5})$$

with γ as defined in Eq. (3).

The probability bound in Eq. (B5) refers to one given value of x . Here we extend it to $\ell < M$ distinct values x_1, x_2, \dots, x_ℓ . We have

$$\Pr \left\{ \forall x = x_1, x_2, \dots, x_\ell, \langle \phi | \rho_{\mathbb{U}'}^x | \phi \rangle < (1 - \tau) 2^{-n} \right\} \leq \exp \left(-\frac{\ell K \tau^2}{2\gamma} \right). \quad (\text{B6})$$

This follows from two observations. First, for different values of x , the random variables $\langle \phi | \rho_{\mathbb{U}'}^x | \phi \rangle$ are identically distributed. Second, these variables are not statistically independent as they obey the sub-normalization constraint $\sum_x \langle \phi | \rho_{\mathbb{U}'}^x | \phi \rangle = c \leq 1$. If the ℓ random variables x_1, x_2, \dots, x_ℓ were statistically independent, then Eq. (B6) would hold. However, Eq. (B6) still holds because the normalization constraint implies that the variables are anti-correlated. Therefore, the probability that they are all small is smaller than if they were statistically independent.

We now extend the concentration inequality to all possible choices of ℓ values of x . This amount to a total of $\binom{M}{\ell}$ events. Applying the union bound we obtain

$$\Pr \left\{ \exists x_1, x_2, \dots, x_\ell, \mid \forall x = x_1, x_2, \dots, x_\ell, \langle \phi | \rho_{\mathbb{U}'}^x | \phi \rangle < (1 - \tau) 2^{-n} \right\} \leq \binom{M}{\ell} \exp \left(-\frac{\ell K \tau^2}{2\gamma} \right). \quad (\text{B7})$$

This implies that up to a probability smaller than $\binom{M}{\ell} \exp \left(-\frac{\ell K \tau^2}{2\gamma} \right)$, $\langle \phi | \rho_{\mathbb{U}'}^x | \phi \rangle \geq (1 - \tau) 2^{-n}$ for at least $M - \ell$ values of x , which yields

$$\sum_{x=1}^M p_X(x) \langle \phi | \rho_{\mathbb{U}'}^x | \phi \rangle \log \langle \phi | \rho_{\mathbb{U}'}^x | \phi \rangle \leq \left(\sum_{x \in S_{M-\ell}} p_X(x) \right) (1 - \tau) 2^{-n} \log (1 - \tau) 2^{-n}, \quad (\text{B8})$$

where $S_{M-\ell}$ denotes the set of $M - \ell$ least likely values of x . Note that

$$\sum_{x \in S_{M-\ell}} p_X(x) = 1 - \sum_{x \in L_\ell} p_X(x) \geq 1 - \ell p_{\max}, \quad (\text{B9})$$

where L_ℓ is the subset of the ℓ most likely values of x , and $p_{\max} = \max_x p_X(x)$. Putting this into Eq. (B8) yields

$$\sum_{x=1}^M p_X(x) \langle \phi | \rho_{\mathbb{U}'}^x | \phi \rangle \log \langle \phi | \rho_{\mathbb{U}'}^x | \phi \rangle \leq (1 - \ell p_{\max}) (1 - \tau) 2^{-n} \log (1 - \tau) 2^{-n} \quad (\text{B10})$$

$$\leq -(1 - \ell p_{\max}) (1 - \tau) 2^{-n} n. \quad (\text{B11})$$

Finally, putting $\ell = \tau/p_{\max}$ we obtain

$$\sum_{x=1}^M p_X(x) \langle \phi | \rho_{\mathbb{U}'}^x | \phi \rangle \log \langle \phi | \rho_{\mathbb{U}'}^x | \phi \rangle \leq (1 - \tau) 2^{-n} n = (1 - 2\tau) 2^{-n} n + O(\tau^2). \quad (\text{B12})$$

To extend to all vectors ϕ , we exploit the notion of δ -net and closely follows Ref. [15]. In this way we obtain

$$\Pr \{ \forall \phi, \exists x_1, x_2, \dots, x_\ell, \mid \forall x = x_1, x_2, \dots, x_\ell, \langle \phi | \rho_{\mathbb{U}^x}^x | \phi \rangle < (1 - 2\tau)2^{-n} \} \leq \left(\frac{5 \times 2^n}{\tau} \right)^{2d} \binom{M}{\ell} \exp \left(-\frac{\ell K \tau^2}{2\gamma} \right). \quad (\text{B13})$$