# State Synthesis Using PRS.

#### David Ponarovsky

September 19, 2023

#### Abstract

We studies the complexity of synthesis quantum states using PRS, our reasch continues the work by [Ira+22], [Ros23], [RY21], [MY23], [Del+23].

### 1 Pseudorandomness.

**Definition 1.1** (Pseudorandom Quantum states). Let  $\mathcal{H}$ ,  $\mathcal{K}$  be the Hilbert and the key spaces, their diminsions depend on a security parameter n. A state famliy  $\{|\psi_k\rangle\}_{k\in\mathcal{K}}$  is a pseudiorandom, if the following hold:

- 1. Efficient generation. There is a polynomial-time quantum algorithm G that generates state  $|\psi_k\rangle$  on input k.
- 2. Pseudorandomness. Any polynomially many copies of  $|\phi_k\rangle$  with the same random  $k \in K$  is computationaly indistinguishable from the same number of copies of the Haar random state.

**Definition 1.2** (Pseudorandom Unitary Operators). A famliy of unitary operators  $\{U_k \in U(\mathcal{H})\}_{k \in \mathcal{K}}$  is pseudorandom, if two conditions hold:

- 1. Efficient computation. There is an efficient quantum algorithm Q, such that for all k and any  $|\psi\rangle \in \mathcal{H}\ Q(k,|\psi\rangle) = U_k |\psi\rangle$ .
- 2. Pseudorandomness. The uniform random distribution on  $U_k$  is computationally in distinguishable from a Haar random unitary operator.

**Definition 1.3** (The keeping setting). Let  $R^A \otimes R^B$  be a general two registers domain. We define the **keeping setting** to let one construct quntum/classical circuits<sup>1</sup>  $G: R^A \otimes R^B \to R^A \otimes R^B$  such that it is gurnted that the register  $R^B$  cann't be accessed after the computation.

**Claim 1.1.** Let G be a PRS generator, than under the keeping setting one can assume that G takes as input two register, the first contains n ancille qubits initiliazied to  $|0\rangle$  and the seconed contain a classic string initilized to be the seed k.

*Proof.* Given a PRS  $G: R^A \to R^A$  define  $\tilde{G}: R^A \otimes R^B \to R^A \otimes R^B$  as follow, first  $\tilde{G}$  copy the calsical state in  $R^B$  (the k-length seed) to  $R^A$  and then appaly G on  $R^A$ , Hence on sampled seed  $k \in R^B$  results the output  $|\psi_k\rangle \otimes |k\rangle$ . Under the keeping setting any polynomial distingushier-canidate D has acsses only for  $|\psi_k\rangle$ , So if D distinguish between the distrubition generated by  $\tilde{G}$  and the Haar measure then it also distingush between G and Haar measure.

Claim 1.2. Let  $G: |0\rangle^n \otimes \mathbb{F}_2^k \to \{|\psi_k\rangle\}_{k \in \mathcal{K}}$  be a PRS generator uses n- ancilles and k classic bits. Then for any unitary  $V: \mathcal{H}_n \to \mathcal{H}_n$  it holds that  $(V \otimes I^{\otimes k})G$  is also a PRS.

Proof.	
	٦

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup>On which we think as a canidate for PRS/PRF/PRG generator.

**Claim 1.3** (Levis Lemma for PRS). Let  $f: \mathcal{H} \to R$  be a **BQP**-computible function on the n-qubits hilbert space, and let  $g: (0,1) \to \mathbb{R}$  a function such that:

$$\mathbf{Pr}_{|\psi\rangle\sim U}\left[f\left(|\psi\rangle\right) > \varepsilon\right] < g(\varepsilon)$$

Then, a similar inequality also holds for states sampled by the PRS, when the probability for the measure f-value grater than  $\varepsilon$  is bounded by  $g(2\varepsilon)$ . Namely,

$$\mathbf{Pr}_{|\psi\rangle\sim|\psi_k\rangle}\left[f\left(|\psi\rangle\right)>\varepsilon\right]< g(2\varepsilon)$$

In praticular, Levi's lemma has a version that capture consetration of states sampled by PRS generator, states the following: Assume there exsists K such that for any  $|\psi\rangle$ ,  $|\phi\rangle \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{C}^d)$   $|f(|\psi\rangle) - |f(|\phi\rangle)| < K||\psi\rangle - |\phi\rangle|$ . Then there exsists a universal constant C > 0 such:

$$\mathbf{Pr}_{|\psi\rangle\sim|\psi_{k}\rangle}\left[\left|f\left(\left|\psi\right\rangle\right)-\mathbf{E}_{\left|\phi\right\rangle\sim U}\left[f\left(\left|\phi\right\rangle\right)\right]\right|>\varepsilon\right]<\exp\left(-\frac{Cd}{K^{2}}4\varepsilon^{2}\right)$$

Proof.

Claim 1.4. Probablisite counting argument and  $\varepsilon$ -net over PRS.

**Claim 1.5.** exsistness of poly(n) gates  $G_1, G_2$ .. such that, any  $G_i$  has a polynomial depth,  $\langle p(G_i)|\tau\rangle > a$  and  $\langle \tau^{\perp}|p(G_i)\rangle \langle p(G_i)|\tau^{\perp}\rangle < b$  for any  $i \neq j$ .

Claim 1.6. bla bla bla

**Definition 1.4.**  $\varepsilon$ -bised test 2-degree for testing RPU/RPS.  $f(\langle x_j|G_s|\theta\rangle) = 1$  For example ask if  $\langle \psi_{j'}\tau^{\perp}\rangle \langle \tau^{\perp}|\psi_j\rangle$  what I can say about that quantenty as polynomail?

## 2 What We Need for Synthesis.

**Definition 2.1** (Pseudorandom Unitary for Synthesis). A famliy of unitary operators  $\{U_k \in U(\mathcal{H})\}_{k \in \mathcal{K}}$  is pseudorandom for synthesis, if two conditions hold:

- 1. Efficient computation. There is an efficient quantum algorithm Q, such that for all k and any  $|\psi\rangle \in \mathcal{H}\ Q(k,|\psi\rangle) = U_k |\psi\rangle$ .
- 2. Pseudorandomness for synthesis. Given a state  $|\tau\rangle$  and polynomial number of samples  $U_1, U_2...U_m$ . Then:
  - (a)  $|\langle \Phi(\tau, U_k)|U_k\tau\rangle|^2 > a$
  - (b)  $|\langle \Phi(\tau, U_k) | U_k \tau^{\perp} \rangle \langle \tau^{\perp} U_j^{\dagger} | \Phi(\tau, U_j) \rangle|^2 < b$

The uniform random distribution on  $U_k$  is computationally in distinguishable from a Haar random unitary operator.

What about, Assume that U is a quantum circuit such that  $\log n$  qubits are intilaized to some to some input and instead anciles, we have noisy ancilea, can we show that circuit is equavilanent to  $\log n$  circuit? That will enable us to prove a quantum version for Nisan Wigerzdon PRG (BPP = P).

**Problem.** Let U be a quntum circuit which get  $\log n$  stable qubits and  $\operatorname{poly}(n)$  more random qubits obtained from the random Haar masure, can we simulate the circuit in  $\log n$  time?

approximate the absoulte value function, For example, you can consider the binomial expansion of  $\sqrt{1-y}$  on [0,1]. Namely, setting  $y=1-x^2$ , we have  $|x|=\sqrt{1-y}=\sum_{m=0}^{\infty}\binom{1/2}{m}(-y)^m$ ,  $x\in[-1,1]$ . That will allow me to bound the k-design.

Denote by  $q_d(x)$  the d-order approximation of |x|, Namely

$$q_d(x) = \sum_{m=0}^{d} {1/2 \choose m} (-1)^m (1-x^2)^m$$

and as the series is convergres to any  $x \in (-1,1)$  we have that  $|x| = q_d(x) + O(\binom{1/2}{d}(1-x^2)^d)$  which by the fact that  $1-x^2 \in (-1,1)$  can be simplified to  $|x| = q_d(x) + O(\binom{1/2}{d}) = q_d(x) + O(1/d^{1+1/2})$ .

$$\begin{split} \mathbf{E}_{U \sim D} \left[ (\langle \Phi(\tau, U) | \operatorname{Re} U\tau \rangle)^{2} \right] &= \mathbf{E}_{U \sim D} \left[ \frac{1}{2^{n/2}} \sum_{x} (-1)^{\operatorname{sign}(\operatorname{Re}\langle x | U\tau \rangle)} \operatorname{Re}\langle x | x \rangle \langle x | U\tau \rangle \right] \\ &= \mathbf{E}_{U \sim D} \left[ \sum_{x} |\operatorname{Re}\langle x | U\tau \rangle | \right] \\ &= \mathbf{E}_{U \sim D} \left[ \sum_{x} |\operatorname{Re}\langle x | U\tau \rangle | 2^{n/2} | \right] \\ &\geq \mathbf{E}_{U \sim D} \left[ \sum_{x} q_{d} \left( \operatorname{Im}\langle x | U\tau \rangle | / 2^{n/2} \right) - \binom{1/2}{d} \left( \frac{|\operatorname{Im}\langle x | U\tau \rangle|}{2^{n/2}} \right)^{d} \right] \\ &\geq \mathbf{E}_{U \sim Haar} \left[ \sum_{x} q_{d} \left( \operatorname{Im}\langle x | U\tau \rangle | / 2^{n/2} \right) - \binom{1/2}{d} \left( \frac{|\operatorname{Im}\langle x | U\tau \rangle|}{2^{n/2}} \right)^{d} \right] - \delta \cdot 2^{n} \\ &\geq \mathbf{E}_{U \sim Haar} \left[ \sum_{x} q_{d} \left( \operatorname{Im}\langle x | U\tau \rangle | / 2^{n/2} \right) - \mathbf{2} \cdot \binom{1/2}{d} \left( \frac{|\operatorname{Im}\langle x | U\tau \rangle|}{2^{n/2}} \right)^{d} \right] - \delta \cdot 2^{n} \\ &\sim \mathbf{E}_{U \sim Haar} \left[ \sum_{x} \operatorname{Re}\langle x | U\tau \rangle / 2^{n/2} | - \binom{1/2}{d} \left( \frac{|\operatorname{Im}\langle x | U\tau \rangle|}{2^{n/2}} \right)^{d} \right] - \delta \cdot 2^{n} \end{split}$$

## References

- [RY21] Gregory Rosenthal and Henry Yuen. Interactive Proofs for Synthesizing Quantum States and Unitaries. 2021. arXiv: 2108.07192 [quant-ph].
- [Ira+22] Sandy Irani et al. "Quantum Search-To-Decision Reductions and the State Synthesis Problem". en. In: Schloss Dagstuhl Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 2022. DOI: 10. 4230/LIPICS.CCC.2022.5. URL: https://drops.dagstuhl.de/opus/volltexte/2022/16567/.
- [Del+23] Hugo Delavenne et al. Quantum Merlin-Arthur proof systems for synthesizing quantum states. 2023. arXiv: 2303.01877 [quant-ph].
- [MY23] Tony Metger and Henry Yuen. stateQIP = statePSPACE. 2023. arXiv: 2301.07730 [quant-ph].
- [Ros23] Gregory Rosenthal. Efficient Quantum State Synthesis with One Query. 2023. arXiv: 2306.01723 [quant-ph].