

Pseudorandom density matrices

Nikhil Bansal,^{1,2,*} Wai-Keong Mok,^{3,†} Kishor Bharti,^{1,4,5,6,‡} Dax Enshan Koh,^{1,4,6,§} and Tobias Haug^{7,¶}

¹*Institute of High Performance Computing (IHPC), Agency for Science, Technology and Research (A*STAR), 1 Fusionopolis Way, #16-16 Connexis, Singapore 138632, Republic of Singapore*

²*Department of Physical Sciences, Indian Institute of Science Education and Research (IISER) Mohali, Sector 81, SAS Nagar, Mohali, Punjab, 140306, India*

³*Institute for Quantum Information and Matter, California Institute of Technology, Pasadena, CA 91125, USA*

⁴*A*STAR Quantum Innovation Centre (Q.InC), Institute of High Performance Computing (IHPC), Agency for Science, Technology and Research (A*STAR), 1 Fusionopolis Way, #16-16 Connexis, Singapore 138632, Singapore*

⁵*Centre for Quantum Engineering, Research and Education, TCG CREST, Sector V, Salt Lake, Kolkata 700091, India*

⁶*Science, Mathematics and Technology Cluster, Singapore University of*

Technology and Design, 8 Somapah Road, Singapore 487372, Singapore

⁷*Quantum Research Center, Technology Innovation Institute, Abu Dhabi, UAE*

Pseudorandom states (PRSs) are state ensembles that cannot be distinguished from Haar random states by any efficient quantum algorithm. However, the definition of PRSs has been limited to pure states and lacks robustness against noise. In this work, we introduce pseudorandom density matrices (PRDMs), ensembles of n -qubit states that are computationally indistinguishable from the generalized Hilbert-Schmidt ensemble (GHSE), which is constructed from $(n + m)$ -qubit Haar random states with m qubits traced out. For a mixedness parameter $m = 0$, PRDMs are equivalent to PRSs, whereas for $m = \omega(\log n)$, PRDMs are computationally indistinguishable from the maximally mixed state. In contrast to PRSs, PRDMs with $m = \omega(\log n)$ are robust to unital noise channels and a recently introduced PostBQP attack. Further, we show that PRDMs allow one to disguise valuable quantum resources as trivial states. In particular, we construct pseudomagic and pseudocoherent state ensembles, which possess near-maximal magic and coherence, but are computationally indistinguishable from states with zero magic and coherence. PRDMs can exhibit a pseudoresource gap of $\Theta(n)$ vs 0, surpassing previously found gaps. We also conjecture the existence of pseudoentanglement ensembles with the same gap. We introduce noise-robust EFI pairs, which are state ensembles that are computationally indistinguishable yet statistically far, even when subject to noise. These EFI pairs have high robustness to mixed unitary noise including local depolarizing noise. We show that the GHSE can have near-maximal entanglement, magic and coherence while being statistically indistinguishable from the maximally mixed state. This implies that testing entanglement, magic and coherence is not efficient, and these quantum resources are in general not efficiently observable. Further, we prove that black-box resource distillation requires a superpolynomial number of copies. We also establish lower bounds on the purity needed for efficient testing and black-box distillation. Finally, we introduce memoryless PRSs, a noise-robust notion of PRS which are indistinguishable to Haar random states for efficient algorithms without quantum memory. Our work provides a comprehensive framework of pseudorandomness for mixed states, which yields powerful quantum cryptographic primitives and fundamental bounds on quantum resource theories.

I. INTRODUCTION

Research at the pairwise intersections of cryptography, quantum theory, information theory, and complexity theory has revealed many fascinating insights. These fields have evolved significantly over time, giving rise to new areas of study such as quantum information theory (arising from quantum theory and information theory), quantum complexity theory (arising from quantum theory and complexity theory), and modern cryptography (arising from cryptography and complexity theory).

In contrast, considering the comprehensive intersection of all four fields—cryptography, complexity theory, information theory, and quantum theory—has led to new developments. A key example is quantum pseudorandom states (PRSs), which are efficiently preparable state ensembles that are indistinguishable from Haar random states for any efficient quantum algorithm [1]. Further developments includes the generation of certifiable true randomness [2], pseudorandom unitaries [1], homogeneous space pseudorandomness [3], pseudorandom isometries [4], pseudorandom state scramblers [5], computational entanglement theory [6] and new cryptographic principles under minimal assumptions [7]. Similar to the emergence of modern cryptography from classical cryptography and complexity theory [8], there is hope for establishing a new sub-field called “modern quantum information theory” (see Appendix A), where the computational aspects of objects from quantum information theory are rigorously explored. There is the potential

* nikhilbansaliiser@gmail.com

† darielmok@caltech.edu

‡ kishor.bharti1@gmail.com

§ dax_koh@ihpc.a-star.edu.sg

¶ tobias.haug@u.nus.edu




FIG. 2. Copies needed to test whether a state ρ contains $Q(\rho) = 0$ or $Q(\rho) = \Theta(n)$ magic, coherence or entanglement, as function of purity $\text{tr}(\rho^2)$. We show testing is inefficient for negligible purity, while efficient protocols are known for pure states, and only inefficient tomography protocols for $1/\text{poly}(n)$ purity.

and serve as important cryptographic primitives [24–27]. We show that PRDMs and the maximally mixed state can form noise-robust EFI pairs, which remain EFI pairs even when subjected to mixed unitary noise channels, including local depolarizing noise up to a relatively high noise probability of $p \lesssim 1/4$.

We prove several fundamental no-go theorems: We show that entanglement, magic and coherence are not efficiently observable, as testing these resources for mixed states requires a superpolynomial number of samples. Further, we show that black-box distillation of entanglement, magic and coherence is sample inefficient. To efficiently test and black-box distill entanglement, magic and coherence, states must have a non-negligible amount of purity.

Finally, we define a weaker notion of PRS called memoryless PRSs, which are indistinguishable from Haar random states only for efficient algorithms without quantum memory. We show that memoryless PRS are robust to unital noise, contrary to general PRSs.

Our work generalizes the notion of PRS to mixed states, promising applications in cryptography and quantum resource theories. The main results of this paper and relationships between the concepts introduced are shown in Fig. 1. Sample complexity of testing is summarized in Fig. 2.

II. QUANTUM RESOURCES

Performing specific non-trivial tasks in quantum information require quantum resources as a fuel to run the process. To characterize the resource content of a given state ρ , quantum resource monotones $Q(\rho)$ have been defined [9]. Resource monotones are characterized by free operations F_Q which cannot increase the resource, i.e. $Q(F_Q(\rho)) \leq Q(\rho)$, and a set of free states $\sigma \in S_Q$ with $Q(\sigma) = 0$. Intuitively, free states and operations are ‘easy’ in the context of the resource and are readily available. To perform non-trivial tasks, one needs ‘expensive’ resource states $\rho \notin S_Q$ which have $Q(\rho) > 0$, or non-free operations which can increase the resource. We consider sub-additive resource monotones which are bounded as $0 \leq Q \leq \Theta(n)$.

Depending on the task, different resource theories are relevant. In fault-tolerant quantum computing, stabilizer states and Clifford operations are easy to perform [28]. They constitute the free states and operations, while the key resource needed to perform universal quantum computation is called *magic*. A commonly used magic monotone for qubits is the log-free robustness of magic [29, 30]

$$\text{LR}(\rho) = \log \left(\min |c_\phi| \text{ s.t } \rho = \sum_{\phi \in \text{STAB}} c_\phi \phi \right) \quad (1)$$

where STAB is the set of all pure n -qubit stabilizer states. Another key resource in quantum information is coherence, which describes the degree in which the state is a superposition of computational basis states [31, 32]. The free operations are diagonal operations, while the free states are density matrices with only diagonal entries in the computational basis. A commonly used coherence monotone is the relative entropy of coherence [31, 32]

$$C(\rho) = S(\Delta[\rho]) - S(\rho) \quad (2)$$

where $S(\rho) = -\text{tr}(\rho \log \rho)$ denotes the von Neumann entropy and $\Delta[\rho] = \sum_i |i\rangle\langle i|\rho|i\rangle\langle i|$ is the fully dephasing channel applied on ρ , where $\{|i\rangle\}_i$ are the computational basis states. Finally, for quantum communication tasks one requires entanglement as resource, while local operations and classical communication (LOCC) are free operations, and separable states are the free states. An often used entanglement monotone of a bipartite state is the logarithmic negativity between bipartition A and B [33–35]

$$E(\rho) = \log(\|\rho^{\text{T}_A}\|_1) \quad (3)$$

where $(\cdot)^{\text{T}_A}$ is the partial transpose over subsystem A .

III. GENERALIZED HILBERT-SCHMIDT ENSEMBLE (GHSE)

For pure quantum states, one can define a unique ensemble of random states, namely Haar random states: One draws pure states $|\psi\rangle \in \mathcal{S}(2^n)$ from the space of n -qubit quantum states $\mathcal{S}(2^n)$ according to the Haar measure μ_n . However, general quantum states are not pure, but probabilistic mixtures of quantum states described by density matrices $\rho = \sum_j p_j |\psi_j\rangle\langle\psi_j|$ with probability p_j for state $|\psi_j\rangle$.

We now study a random ensemble of quantum states that interpolates between Haar random states and maximally mixed state $I_n/2^n$ via a mixedness parameter m , where I_n is the identity matrix over n -qubits. In particular, we consider the random ensemble of mixed states induced by the partial trace of m qubits over $(n+m)$ -qubit Haar random states, which we call the GHSE [17–21]:

Definition 1 (Generalized Hilbert-Schmidt ensemble (GHSE) Appendix C). *The (n, m) GHSE is an ensemble of n -qubit states*

$$\eta_{n,m} = \{\text{tr}_m(|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|)\}_{\psi \in \mu_{n+m}} \quad (4)$$

generated by tracing out m qubits from $(n+m)$ -qubit states drawn from the Haar measure μ_{n+m} .

The case $m=0$ corresponds to Haar random states, while $m=n$ corresponds to the Hilbert-Schmidt ensemble [18].

Haar random states are known to contain near-maximal coherence [36], magic [37] and entanglement [19]. Increasing mixedness by tracing out m qubits in general reduces the quantumness of states. For example, the limit $m \rightarrow \infty$ yields an equal mixture of all quantum states, the maximally mixed state $I_n/2^n$, which has zero magic, coherence and entanglement.

We find that states drawn from the GHSE possess two key behaviors: First, they are statistically indistinguishable from the maximally mixed state when tracing out $m = \omega(\log n)$ qubits. Second, for $m = O(\text{polylog}(n))$, GHSE states remain highly resourceful in terms of magic, coherence and entanglement. Here, $\text{polylog}(n)$ denotes a polynomial of the logarithm, e.g. $(\log n)^c$ with $c \geq 1$. Thus, we find surprisingly that GHSE with $m = \text{polylog}(n)$ hold two properties which on first glance appear counter-intuitive: They are statistically indistinguishable from the maximally mixed state (which has no quantum resources), yet possess a large amount of quantum resources. This means that GHSE for $m = \text{polylog}(n)$ are effectively hiding quantum resources in plain sight, pretending to be trivial states while having near-maximal quantum resources.

We summarize the properties of GHSE in the following, while the proofs are deferred to the Appendix:

Theorem 1 (Properties of GHSE). *The (n, m) GHSE $\eta_{n,m}$ is statistically close to the maximally mixed state (Appendix D), with*

$$\text{TD} \left(\mathbb{E}_{\rho \in \eta_{n,m}} [\rho^{\otimes t}], (I_n/2^n)^{\otimes t} \right) = O(t^2/2^m), \quad (5)$$

where TD denotes the trace distance. With overwhelming probability, states $\rho \in \eta_{n,m}$ have log-free robustness of magic (Appendix E)

$$LR(\rho) \geq n - m - 2 \log(n + m) - 1, \quad (6)$$

relative entropy of coherence (Appendix F)

$$C(\rho) \geq n - m - 1, \quad (7)$$

and logarithmic negativity between bipartition $n_1 = |A|$ and $n_2 = |B|$ with $n_1 \leq n_2$, $m < n$ and $n \gg 1$ [38] (also Ref. [39])

$$E(\rho) \approx \begin{cases} \frac{1}{2}(n - m) + \log(8/3\pi), & n_2 < n_1 + m \\ n_1, & \text{else} \end{cases} \quad (8)$$

We note that resource monotones are not unique. However, similar bounds can be found for most other practical definition of resource monotones. For example, the entanglement of formation, an entanglement monotone, has been shown to exhibit a similar scaling as the logarithmic negativity for the GHSE [13, 19, 40].

IV. PSEUDORANDOM DENSITY MATRIX (PRDM)

GHSE states cannot be efficiently prepared in general, as Haar random states are known to be hard to prepare [41]. However, one can achieve efficient preparation by relaxing to a weaker notion of quantum randomness. In particular, PRS have been recently proposed as a notion of quantum pseudorandomness that is efficiently preparable, but only computationally indistinguishable from Haar random states [1]. Here, indistinguishability is defined from a computational perspective: There is no efficient quantum algorithm that can tell PRS and Haar random states apart given a polynomial number of copies of the state. While computational pseudorandomness is weaker than statistical randomness, for practical applications indistinguishability in respect to efficient quantum algorithms is already sufficient.

PRS has only been defined for pure states. We now generalize this concept to general density matrices. We define PRDM as efficiently preparable states that are computational indistinguishable from GHSE.

Definition 2 (Pseudo-random density matrix (PRDM)). *Let $\kappa = \text{poly}(n)$ be the security parameter with keyspace $\mathcal{K} = \{0, 1\}^\kappa$. A keyed family of n -qubit density matrices $\{\rho_{k,m}\}_{k \in \mathcal{K}}$ is defined as the pseudorandom density matrix (PRDM) ensemble with mixedness parameter m if:*

1. *Efficiently preparable: There exists an efficient quantum algorithm G such that $G(1^\kappa, k, m) = \rho_{k,m}$.*
2. *Computational Indistinguishability: $t = \text{poly}(n)$ copies of $\rho_{k,m}$ are computationally indistinguishable, i.e. for any quantum polynomial time adversary \mathcal{A} , from the GHSE $\eta_{n,m}$ of Def. 1*

$$\left| \Pr_{k \leftarrow \mathcal{K}} [\mathcal{A}(\rho_{k,m}^{\otimes t}) = 1] - \Pr_{\rho \leftarrow \eta_{n,m}} [\mathcal{A}(\rho^{\otimes t}) = 1] \right| = \text{negl}(n). \quad (9)$$

Here, $\text{negl}(\cdot)$ are functions that decay faster than any inverse polynomial (see Appendix B). Depending on m , PRDMs are indistinguishable from different notions of randomness: For $m=0$, PRDMs are computationally indistinguishable from Haar random states $\{|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|\}_{\psi \in \mu_n}$ and thus equivalent to PRS. For $m = \omega(\log n)$, we find that PRDMs become indistinguishable from the maximally mixed state for any efficient observer:

Theorem 2 (Computational indistinguishability of PRDMs from maximally mixed state). *PRDMs $\rho_k \equiv \rho_{k,\omega(\log n)}$ with $t = \text{poly}(n)$ copies and $m = \omega(\log n)$ are indistinguishable from the maximally mixed state $\sigma_n = I_n/2^n$ for any efficient quantum algorithm \mathcal{A} ,*

$$\left| \Pr_{k \leftarrow \mathcal{K}} [\mathcal{A}(\rho_k^{\otimes t}) = 1] - \Pr[\mathcal{A}((\sigma_n)^{\otimes t}) = 1] \right| = \text{negl}(n). \quad (10)$$

To see this, note that PRDM and GHSE are computationally indistinguishable by definition. Further, the

maximally mixed state and GHSE are statistically indistinguishable for $m = \omega(\log n)$ due to Eq. (5). Then, Thm. 2 follows directly from the triangle inequality.

Now, PRS have been noted to be fragile against noise [11]. In particular, after applying depolarizing noise on only a single qubit, PRSs become distinguishable from Haar random states and thus are not PRS anymore. One can easily check that this susceptibility to noise carries over to PRDMs with small m . In particular, for $m = O(\log n)$ PRDMs are not robust to noise as the SWAP test [42], which uses only two copies, can efficiently distinguish the state before and after application of the noise channel due to non-negligible purity [11].

As noise is ubiquitous in quantum systems, we would like to have pseudorandomness that can survive even with noise:

Definition 3 (Noise-robust PRDM). *A PRDM is noise robust to channel $\Gamma(\cdot)$ if it remains a PRDM after application of the noise channel $\Gamma(\cdot)$, i.e. if $\{\rho_k\}_{k \in \mathcal{K}}$ is PRDM, then $\{\Gamma(\rho_k)\}_{k \in \mathcal{K}}$ is also PRDM.*

We now show that PRDMs with $m = \omega(\log n)$ are robust to arbitrary unital noise channels that can be efficiently implemented, which includes common noise models such as depolarizing noise:

Theorem 3. *PRDMs are robust to efficiently implementable unital noise channels, i.e. channels where the identity is the fixed point $\Gamma(I) = I$, if and only if $m = \omega(\log n)$.*

This follows from the computational indistinguishability from the maximally mixed state and the fixed point condition of unital channels as shown in Appendix H.

Recently, Ref. [7] showed that one can distinguish PRS from Haar random states using classical shadows and an (inefficient) PostBQP oracle. Here, PostBQP is the class of quantum algorithms combined with post-selection, which is known to be equivalent to PP [43]. We show that PRDMs for $m = \omega(\log n)$ are robust to this PostBQP attack:

Theorem 4 (Security of PRDMs against Kretschmer’s attack). *To distinguish PRDM ρ_k with $m = \omega(\log n)$ from the GHSE using observable $O_k = \rho_k$ as shown in Ref. [7] requires super-polynomially many copies.*

The proof in Appendix I follows from the negligible purity of PRDMs for $m = \omega(\log n)$.

To efficiently construct PRDMs, we can harness any existing construction of PRS: We take an $(n + m)$ -qubit PRS, and trace out m qubits. PRDMs can be prepared with very short circuit depth as shown recently: PRS (and pseudorandom unitaries) can be prepared in $O(\text{polylog } n)$ depth using one-dimensional local circuits, and $O(\text{polylog } \log n)$ depth assuming arbitrary connectivity [44]. In the following, we now consider an explicit PRDM construction that we can use for applications. In particular, we construct a real-valued PRDM by taking partial trace of PRS constructed from binary phase states [1, 10, 45, 46]:

Fact 1 (Binary phase PRDM). *The n -qubit binary phase PRDM $\rho_{k,m} = \text{tr}_m(|\psi_k\rangle\langle\psi_k|)$ is efficiently prepared by tracing out m qubits of the binary phase PRS of $n + m$ qubits $|\psi_k\rangle = 2^{-(n+m)/2} \sum_{x \in \{0,1\}^{n+m}} (-1)^{f_k(x)} |x\rangle$ [1, 10, 45, 46] with pseudorandom function $f_k(x) : \{0,1\}^{n+m} \rightarrow \{0,1\}$, key $k \in \{0,1\}^\kappa$ and security parameter $\kappa = O(n + m)$.*

This construction of PRDM requires the existence of PRS, which in turn have been proven to exist assuming quantum-secure one-way functions exist [47]. However, it has been noted that PRS can exist under even weaker assumptions [7].

V. PSEUDORESOURCES

Can one efficiently mask the fact that a state contains quantum resources? Recently, pseudoresources have been proposed as efficiently preparable ensembles which are computationally indistinguishable, yet possess substantially different amount of resources [10–12]:

Definition 4 (Pseudoresources). *Let Q be a quantum resource monotone. A pseudoresource pair with gap $f(n)$ vs. $g(n)$ (where $f(n) > g(n)$) consists of two efficiently preparable state ensembles:*

1. a ‘high resource’ ensemble of n -qubit quantum states $\{\rho_{k_1}\}$ such that $Q(\rho_{k_1}) = f(n)$ with high probability over key k_1 , and
2. a ‘low resource’ ensemble of n -qubit quantum states $\{\sigma_{k_2}\}$ such that $Q(\sigma_{k_2}) = g(n)$ with high probability over key k_2 ,

such that the two ensembles are computationally indistinguishable given $t = \text{poly}(n)$ copies.

Pseudoresource ensembles allow one to efficiently generate states masquerading as high resource states with $f(n)$ resource, yet actually contain only $g(n)$ of a given resource. For example, a pseudoresource gap of $f(n) = \Theta(n)$ vs $g(n) = \omega(\log n)$ has been found for pseudoentanglement [10], pseudomagic [12] and pseudocoherence [11]. For pure states (i.e. PRSs) these pseudoresource gaps are indeed maximal. However, it turns out that for mixed states we can hide quantum resources even better: In particular, PRDMs as constructed via binary phase states allow for asymptotically maximal pseudoresource gaps:

Theorem 5 (Maximal pseudocoherence and pseudomagic gap). *The PRDM ensemble of Fact 1 with $m = \text{polylog}(n)$, and the maximally mixed state $I_n/2^n$, form a pseudomagic (Appendix J) and pseudocoherence (Appendix K) ensemble with gap $f(n) = \Theta(n)$ vs $g(n) = 0$.*

We conjecture that this PRDM ensemble also forms a pseudoentangled ensemble in respect to logarithmic negativity with $f(n) = \Theta(n)$ vs $g(n) = 0$. As a strong indication, we note that random stabilizer states, which form the basis of many PRS constructions [44], have near-maximal entanglement when $m = \text{polylog}(n)$ [40].

VI. NOISE-ROBUST EFI PAIRS

We now consider another application of pseudorandomness: EFI pairs are efficiently preparable ensembles which are statistical far, yet computationally indistinguishable [23]. They are an important cryptographic primitive for various applications, such as for bit commitment [24], quantum oblivious transfer [25], multi-party quantum computation [26], and zero knowledge proofs [27]. EFI pairs can be constructed from PRS [23] and single-copy PRS [48]. However, there have been no performance guarantees under noise. Here, we show that one can construct noise-robust EFI pairs using PRDMs and the maximally mixed state:

Theorem 6 (Noise-robust EFI pair). *PRDMs constructed by tracing out m qubits from $(n+m)$ qubit PRS with security parameter $\kappa = cn$ with $0 < c < 1$, and the maximally mixed state $I_n/2^n$ are EFI pairs when $\omega(\log n) < m < \frac{n}{2}(1-c) - \frac{1}{2}$. They remain EFI pairs after applying efficient mixed unitary channel $\Phi(\rho) = \sum_{i=1}^r p_i U_i \rho U_i^\dagger$ with unitaries U_i and probabilities $\{p_i\}_i$ whenever its Shannon entropy is bounded as*

$$H(\{p_i\}_i) \leq n(1-c) - m - 2. \quad (11)$$

The proof in Appendix L follows from the Fannes-Audenaert inequality [49]. Intuitively, the inequality can be interpreted as saying that two states with very different von Neumann entropies must also be far apart in trace distance. The maximally mixed state has an entropy of n , while for PRDMs it is upper bounded by $m + \kappa$. Thus, whenever $m + \kappa < n$, these states are far apart in trace distance [48], and remain distinguishable even after application of noise as long as the entropy remains sufficiently below that of the maximally mixed state. While our proof of noise-robustness is restricted to mixed unital noise channels, we believe it can be extended to arbitrary efficiently implementable unital channels.

Our result implies that EFI pairs from PRDMs are robust to many realistic noise models, such as dephasing, depolarizing or Pauli channels. For noisy intermediate-scale quantum computers and quantum error correction models, the most commonly used noise model is local depolarizing noise $\Lambda_p(\rho)^{\otimes n}$ which acts on all n qubits [50, 51]. Here, $\Lambda_p(\rho) = p/4 \sum_{\alpha \in \{x,y,z\}} \sigma^\alpha \rho \sigma^\alpha + (1-3p/4)\rho$ is the local depolarizing channel, σ^α with $\alpha \in \{x,y,z\}$ Pauli operators, and p the depolarizing probability. Here, we find noise robustness even for relatively high noise rates of $p \lesssim \frac{1}{4}$ (see SM L):

Corollary 1 (Noise-robust EFI pair against local depolarizing noise). *EFI pairs of Thm. 6 remain EFI pairs after applying the local depolarizing channel on all n qubits $\Lambda_p^{\otimes n}(\rho)$ whenever $H(\{1-3p/4, p/4, p/4, p/4\}) \leq (1-c) - m/n - 2/n$. In particular, for $m = \text{polylog}(n)$ and $c = 10^{-4}$, we have robustness for all $p < \frac{1}{4} - O(\text{polylog}(n)/n)$.*

Further, we find that there is a fundamental connection between pseudoentanglement and construction of

EFI pairs. In particular, EFI pairs have to be statistical far, which due to the Fannes-Audenaert inequality is easier to satisfy whenever the PRS used to construct the PRDM has low entanglement. In particular, when constructing the PRDM by tracing m qubits from pseudoentangled PRS such as introduced in Ref. [10], we can achieve EFI pairs for any $m = cn$ with $c > 0$.

VII. PROPERTY TESTING OF RESOURCES

Given an unknown object, are there experiments that can verify its properties? Property testing deals exactly with this question: A property tester is a quantum algorithm that checks whether a given quantum state does not have a particular resource, or contains a lot of it (see Refs. [13, 52–54] or SM B). Depending on the property, it has been known that the property tester may need a vastly different number of copies of the states to succeed [13]. For example, testing whether the description of a quantum state has imaginary numbers requires exponentially many copies [11]. In contrast, checking whether a quantum state is pure or highly mixed can be done efficiently with only $O(1)$ copies [42].

Entanglement, magic and coherence are fundamental signatures of quantum complexity and strongly affect the structure of quantum states. Thus, it is natural to ask whether they can be tested efficiently. For pure states, efficient property testers using $O(1)$ copies are known for entanglement [10, 55], magic [56–58] and coherence [11]. Can efficient property testers also exist for general mixed states? Here, we answer this question in negative, showing that testing logarithmic negativity E , log-free robustness of magic LR, and relative entropy of coherence C is inefficient:

Theorem 7 (Testing entanglement, coherence and magic is inefficient). *For resource monotones $Q = \{E, LR, C\}$, testing whether a given state ρ has resource $Q(\rho) = 0$ or $Q(\rho) = \Theta(n)$ requires $2^{\omega(\log n)}$ many copies.*

We show this result in Appendix E, F, G by contradiction: If a property tester using polynomial copies exist, then it could efficiently distinguish the GHSE with $m = \text{polylog}(n)$ and $Q(\rho) = \Theta(n)$ from the maximally mixed state with $Q(I_n/2^n) = 0$, which contradicts the indistinguishability shown in Thm. 1. We note that inefficiency of property testing from a computational point of view can be similarly established using our pseudoresource ensembles. We note that the inefficiency of testing entanglement was already pointed out in Ref. [13] regarding the entanglement of formation.

Crucially, we can identify purity as the resource that makes property testing hard: Pure states $\text{tr}(\rho^2) = 1$ can be efficiently tested, while testing highly mixed states $\text{tr}(\rho^2) = \text{negl}(n)$ is inefficient. Thus, one requires at least inverse polynomial purity to efficiently test states:

Corollary 2 (Lower bound on purity for efficient testing of entanglement, coherence and magic (Appendix E, F,

G)). *Efficient testing for resource $Q = \{E, LR, C\}$ requires at least a non-negligible purity $\text{tr}(\rho^2) = \Omega(n^{-c})$ with $c > 0$.*

For the sample complexity for purity $\text{tr}(\rho^2) = 1/\text{poly}(n)$, the best known upper bounds are from tomography as $O(4^n)$ [59]. Note that similarly one finds that efficient testing requires $\text{rank}(\rho) = O(\text{poly}(n))$. In Fig. 2, we summarize the currently known copies complexities of property testing for magic, coherence and entanglement as function of purity.

VIII. BLACK-BOX RESOURCE DISTILLATION

Another key task in quantum information is to generate special resource states that are useful for information processing. For example, quantum teleportation needs entangled Bell states [15, 60, 61], universal quantum computing uses magical T -states [28] and creating quantum superpositions requires coherence [62–64]. However, generating these resource states directly is often difficult. This necessitates resource distillation, which takes in many copies of a noisy resource state, and applies the free operations of the resource theory to prepare one noise-free resource state.

Commonly, resource distillation is considered for the case where the noisy input state is known beforehand. Indeed, for classes of mixed states limits on distillation have been shown [65–68]. However, often noise and input states are not well characterized. Yet, if we are guaranteed that these noisy states are resourceful, can one still extract noise-free resource states from them? Such an algorithm that distills resources from unknown, but resourceful states is called black-box resource distillation [12]:

Definition 5 (Black-box resource distillation). *A black-box resource distillation algorithm \mathcal{D}_Q uses the free operations of resource theory Q on arbitrary input state ρ , which is guaranteed to contain resource $Q(\rho) \geq Q_{in}$. \mathcal{D}_Q prepares pure resource state $|\psi\rangle$ with $Q(|\psi\rangle) \geq Q_{out}$, where $|\psi\rangle$ can depend on ρ .*

Here, we show that black-box resource distillation of entanglement, magic and coherence is inefficient:

Theorem 8 (No-go theorem for black-box resource distillation). *Any black-box resource distillation algorithm \mathcal{D}_Q for resource monotones $Q = \{E, LR, C\}$ with $Q_{in} = \Theta(n)$, $Q_{out} = \Omega(n^{-c})$ and $c > 0$, requires a superpolynomial number of input states ρ .*

This is proven by contradiction in Appendix E, F, G: if black-box distillation algorithms exist, they could be used for efficient property testing which contradicts Thm. 7. This argument can be extended even to probabilistic black-box distillation algorithms, which prepare the resource state with non-negligible probability.

As we have done for property testing, we can also place a lower bound on the purity required for efficient black-box resource distillation:

Corollary 3 (Purity is necessary for black-box distillation). *Any efficient black-box resource distillation \mathcal{D}_Q with $Q = \{E, LR, C\}$ requires input states ρ with purity $\text{tr}(\rho^2) = \Omega(n^{-c})$ to prepare non-trivial resource states.*

Similarly, efficient black-box distillation requires input states with at most $\text{rank}(\rho) = O(\text{poly}(n))$.

IX. NOISE-ROBUST PSEUDORANDOM STATES

Finally, we revisit the question of noise-robustness of PRS. So far, PRS and PRDMs were defined via indistinguishability with respect to arbitrary efficient algorithms. However, in many practical scenarios the distinguishing algorithm has even stronger limitations on its computational power. We show that such restricted algorithms allow one to define a weaker notion of PRS that is noise robust. In particular, we propose memoryless PRS, which are indistinguishable from Haar random states for any efficient algorithms which have no access to quantum memory [69, 70]. Algorithms without quantum memory can only perform measurements on a single copy at a time, and do not have a register to store quantum information between measurements. However, they can adaptively choose the measurement depending on the previous measurement outcomes.

Theorem 9 (Noise robustness of memoryless PRS Appendix M). *Algorithms without quantum memory require superpolynomial number of copies to distinguish memoryless PRS subject to unital noise channels and Haar random states.*

We give the formal definition of memoryless PRS and the proof of Thm. 9 in Appendix M using the techniques of Ref. [70]. In particular, without quantum memory one cannot distinguish Haar random states and maximally mixed state, which we use to establish noise robustness. Memoryless PRS can be prepared by the same state preparation algorithms as for PRS. However, potentially easier state constructions with non-trivial quantum resources may exist. No access to quantum memory can naturally occur in different scenarios of quantum information processing. Here, we give three explicit examples: First, in a distributed communication scenario, each agent receives only one copy of the state and can only communicate classical information with other agents. Second, in near-term quantum computing, the number of available qubits is often limited. In the case where the state has almost as many qubits as supported by the near-term quantum computer, then it only can perform memoryless algorithms. Third, we can also consider the case in which the distinguishing algorithm receives one copy of the memoryless PRS at a time, with a

time interval longer than the coherence time of the quantum register storing the state. These correspond to algorithms without quantum memory. In these scenarios, our weaker notion of memoryless PRS is already sufficient for practical applications, which could potentially be easier to prepare in experiments than PRS or PRDMs. Note that any memoryless PRS is also a single-copy PRS, where the distinguisher algorithm is given only a single copy the state [48, 71], while there are single-copy PRS which are not memoryless PRS (see Appendix M).

Finally, in Appendix N, we also show that when the distinguisher algorithm has access to bad quantum memory, i.e. quantum memory subject to noise, this does not yield any notion of noise-robust PRS.

Although the standard definition of PRS is not noise-robust, we find that applications of PRS can still function even when subject to noise. In particular, in Ref. [1], PRS were applied for a private-key quantum money scheme. Here, a bank issues PRS with secret key as quantum banknotes, which are secure against counterfeiting for any efficient algorithm. We show that this scheme remains robust even when noise is applied to the banknotes:

Lemma 1 (Quantum money based on PRS is noise-robust (Appendix O)). *The private quantum money scheme based on PRS by [1] is secure even when the quantum banknotes are subject to efficiently implementable noise channel $\Gamma(\rho)$ under the condition*

$$\text{tr}(\rho_k \Gamma(\rho_k)) > 1 - \epsilon, \forall k \in \mathcal{K} \quad (12)$$

where $\epsilon \leq 1/3$ is the completeness error of the quantum money verification.

X. DISCUSSION

We have introduced PRDMs as ensembles of quantum states which are indistinguishable from the GHSE by any efficient algorithm, generalizing the concept of PRS to mixed states. Here, the GHSE is the ensemble induced by the m -qubit partial trace over $n + m$ qubit Haar random states. PRDMs with $m = 0$ correspond to PRSs, while PRDMs with $m = \omega(\log n)$ are indistinguishable from the maximally mixed states for any efficient algorithm. Further, we show that PRDMs with $m = \omega(\log n)$ are robust to arbitrary unital noise, in contrast to PRS.

This is a non-trivial generalization since PRDMs with $m = \omega(\log n)$ appear to any efficient observer as trivial states, yet can contain a near-maximal amount of magic and coherence. With PRDMs, we can completely hide quantum resources in plain sight, where we find a class of pseudomagic and pseudocoherent ensembles with maximal resource gap of $f(n) = \Theta(n)$ vs $g(n) = 0$. We further conjecture that our PRDMs also have the same gap for pseudoentanglement. Pseudoresource ensembles based on PRDMs possess larger gaps than the ones based on PRS, which are limited to $f(n) = \Theta(n)$ vs $g(n) = \omega(\log n)$ [10–12]. For pure states, one can only

hide resources up to an amount of $\omega(\log n)$ due to the existence of efficient property testing algorithms, while PRDMs allow one to hide the asymptotically maximal possible amount of resources.

We show that PRDMs yield noise-robust EFI pairs [23], which remain EFI pairs even when mixed unitary channels are applied. This includes local depolarizing noise, the most commonly used noise model for noisy-intermediate scale quantum computers [50, 51] and quantum error correction. Curiously, EFI pairs can tolerate error rates of up to $p \approx 1/4$, which is higher than the corresponding threshold of surface codes [72]. Thus, EFI pairs can potentially exist even in noise regimes where quantum error correction fails. Further, high noise robustness opens up potential application of EFI pairs on near-term quantum computers [50]. Our proof of noise-robustness is limited to PRDMs with security parameter $\kappa < n$, which future work could improve upon. The concept of a quantum one-way state generator, similar to the classical one-way function, has been proposed recently [73] and shown to be equivalent to quantum commitments [74]. Furthermore, quantum commitments are known to be equivalent to EFI [23, 24]. Since PRDMs yield noise robust EFI pairs, it would be interesting to explore if the noise robustness can be translated to quantum one way state generators and quantum commitment schemes.

Our work contributes to several new understandings on learning properties of quantum states. Cryptography and machine learning are often seen as opposites [75, 76]: cryptography hides patterns, while machine learning aims to reveal them. This connection between cryptography and machine learning can establish fundamental bounds on property testing. For pure states, pseudoresources imply that one can efficiently test whether a state has $O(1)$ or $\omega(\log n)$ of a given resource [10–12], where efficient testing for entanglement [10, 55], magic [56–58] and coherence [11] has been demonstrated. However, we find that there is a fundamental difference whether one tests pure state or general mixed states: For mixed states testing resources is not efficient, as it requires superpolynomially many copies. This follows from the existence of resource-rich GHSE (and mixed pseudoresource ensembles) which are indistinguishable from the resource-free maximally mixed state. Entanglement, magic and coherence are the most fundamental resources that separate the quantum and classical world, and directly impact most applications of quantum technologies. Yet, it turns out that these quantum resources are in general not physically observable even when having access to polynomial number of copies and performing arbitrary measurements. We show that purity is a fundamental condition needed for testing: States with negligible purity cannot be efficiently tested, while efficient test are known for pure states. It remains an open question whether efficient tests can exist for inverse polynomial purity. It would also be interesting to explore testing of physical many-body quantum systems such as Gibbs states.

We prove fundamental no-go theorems on black-box distillation: Here, one is given arbitrary states which are guaranteed to contain a large amount of quantum resources. Then, using the free operations of the resource theory, the black-box distillation algorithm prepares a pure resource state [12]. We show that for entanglement, magic and coherence, black-box distillation is inefficient as it requires a superpolynomial number of input states. This implies that efficient distillation of entanglement, magic and coherence always requires specific knowledge about the input state. In particular, we show that to efficiently perform black box distillation, one must know that the state has non-negligible purity.

We note that the definition of random mixed states and PRDMs is not unique, in contrast to pure states [18, 20, 21]. For example, as an alternative one could consider the ensemble of random n -qubit mixed states ρ with $\text{rank}(\rho) = 2^m$ and identical eigenvalues. This ensemble is also indistinguishable from the maximally mixed state for $m = \omega(\log n)$ [14, 77] and has large entanglement [13, 19]. As such, other definitions of PRDMs are expected to have similar properties. As a key advantage, our definition of PRDM can be easily prepared from PRS via partial trace.

Finally, we also study other notions of noise-robust pseudorandomness. In Appendix O, we study recently proposed private key quantum money schemes based on PRS [1]. We show that this scheme is noise-robust in the presence of specific types of noises. This implies that even when the definition of PRS itself is not noise-robust,

practical applications of PRS can still work even in the presence of noise. We also define memoryless PRS, which are secure to observers without quantum memory. Restrictions to observers without quantum memory can be found in communication scenarios or noisy quantum computers with limited qubit number. We show that these memoryless PRS are robust to unital noise.

Future work can generalize our work to noisy pseudorandom unitaries [1] and isometries [4]. Further, we leave proving the noise-robustness of EFI pairs to arbitrary unital noise, computing the pseudoentanglement gap, and improving the bounds on purity for testing and black-box distillation as open problems. Finally, we believe PRDM and memoryless pseudorandomness can yield promising applications in cryptography, learning theory, resource theory and experimental demonstrations.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

KB thanks Rahul Jain for interesting discussions. This research is supported by A*STAR C230917003. NB acknowledges INSPIRE-SHE scholarship by DST, India. The Institute for Quantum Information and Matter is an NSF Physics Frontiers Center. DEK acknowledges funding support from the Agency for Science, Technology and Research (A*STAR) Central Research Fund (CRF) Award.

-
- [1] Z. Ji, Y.-K. Liu, and F. Song, Pseudorandom quantum states, in *Annual International Cryptology Conference* (Springer, 2018) pp. 126–152.
 - [2] Z. Brakerski, P. Christiano, U. Mahadev, U. Vazirani, and T. Vidick, A cryptographic test of quantumness and certifiable randomness from a single quantum device, *J. ACM* **68**, 31 (2021).
 - [3] R. Arvind, K. Bharti, J. Y. Khoo, D. E. Koh, and J. F. Kong, A quantum tug of war between randomness and symmetries on homogeneous spaces, *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.05253* (2023).
 - [4] P. Ananth, A. Gulati, F. Kaleoglu, and Y.-T. Lin, Pseudorandom isometries, *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.02901* (2023).
 - [5] C. Lu, M. Qin, F. Song, P. Yao, and M. Zhao, Quantum pseudorandom scramblers, *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.08941* (2023).
 - [6] R. Arnon-Friedman, Z. Brakerski, and T. Vidick, Computational entanglement theory, *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.02783* (2023).
 - [7] W. Kretschmer, Quantum Pseudorandomness and Classical Complexity, in *16th Conference on the Theory of Quantum Computation, Communication and Cryptography (TQC 2021)*, Leibniz International Proceedings in Informatics (LIPIcs), Vol. 197, edited by M.-H. Hsieh (Schloss Dagstuhl – Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, Dagstuhl, Germany, 2021) pp. 2:1–2:20.
 - [8] J. Katz and Y. Lindell, *Introduction to modern cryptography: principles and protocols* (Chapman and Hall/CRC, 2007).
 - [9] E. Chitambar and G. Gour, Quantum resource theories, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **91**, 025001 (2019).
 - [10] S. Aaronson, A. Bouland, B. Fefferman, S. Ghosh, U. Vazirani, C. Zhang, and Z. Zhou, Quantum pseudoentanglement, *arXiv preprint arXiv:2211.00747* (2022).
 - [11] T. Haug, K. Bharti, and D. E. Koh, Pseudorandom unitaries are neither real nor sparse nor noise-robust, *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.11677* (2023).
 - [12] A. Gu, L. Leone, S. Ghosh, J. Eisert, S. F. Yelin, and Y. Quek, Pseudomagic quantum states, *Physical Review Letters* **132**, 210602 (2024).
 - [13] A. Montanaro and R. de Wolf, *A Survey of Quantum Property Testing*, Graduate Surveys No. 7 (Theory of Computing Library, 2016) pp. 1–81.
 - [14] J. Wright, *How to learn a quantum state*, Ph.D. thesis, Carnegie Mellon University (2016).
 - [15] C. H. Bennett, H. J. Bernstein, S. Popescu, and B. Schumacher, Concentrating partial entanglement by local operations, *Phys. Rev. A* **53**, 2046 (1996).
 - [16] B. Regula and R. Takagi, Fundamental limitations on distillation of quantum channel resources, *Nature Communications* **12**, 4411 (2021).
 - [17] M. J. Hall, Random quantum correlations and density operator distributions, *Physics Letters A* **242**, 123 (1998).

- [18] K. Życzkowski and H.-J. Sommers, Induced measures in the space of mixed quantum states, *Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and General* **34**, 7111 (2001).
- [19] P. Hayden, D. W. Leung, and A. Winter, Aspects of generic entanglement, *Communications in mathematical physics* **265**, 95 (2006).
- [20] K. Życzkowski, K. A. Penson, I. Nechita, and B. Collins, Generating random density matrices, *Journal of Mathematical Physics* **52**, 062201 (2011).
- [21] A. Sarkar and S. Kumar, Bures–Hall ensemble: spectral densities and average entropies, *Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and Theoretical* **52**, 295203 (2019).
- [22] T. Haug and L. Piroli, Stabilizer entropies and nonstabilizerness monotones, *Quantum* **7**, 1092 (2023).
- [23] Z. Brakerski, R. Canetti, and L. Qian, On the computational hardness needed for quantum cryptography, *arXiv preprint arXiv:2209.04101* (2022).
- [24] J. Yan, General properties of quantum bit commitments, in *International Conference on the Theory and Application of Cryptology and Information Security* (Springer, 2022) pp. 628–657.
- [25] J. Bartusek, A. Coladangelo, D. Khurana, and F. Ma, One-way functions imply secure computation in a quantum world, in *Advances in Cryptology–CRYPTO 2021: 41st Annual International Cryptology Conference, CRYPTO 2021, Virtual Event, August 16–20, 2021, Proceedings, Part I 41* (Springer, 2021) pp. 467–496.
- [26] P. Ananth, L. Qian, and H. Yuen, Cryptography from pseudorandom quantum states, in *Advances in Cryptology–CRYPTO 2022: 42nd Annual International Cryptology Conference, CRYPTO 2022, Santa Barbara, CA, USA, August 15–18, 2022, Proceedings, Part I* (Springer, 2022) pp. 208–236.
- [27] P. Ananth, K.-M. Chung, and R. L. L. Placa, On the concurrent composition of quantum zero-knowledge, in *Advances in Cryptology–CRYPTO 2021: 41st Annual International Cryptology Conference, CRYPTO 2021, Virtual Event, August 16–20, 2021, Proceedings, Part I 41* (Springer, 2021) pp. 346–374.
- [28] S. Bravyi and A. Kitaev, Universal quantum computation with ideal Clifford gates and noisy ancillas, *Phys. Rev. A* **71**, 022316 (2005).
- [29] M. Howard and E. Campbell, Application of a resource theory for magic states to fault-tolerant quantum computing, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **118**, 090501 (2017).
- [30] Z.-W. Liu and A. Winter, Many-body quantum magic, *PRX Quantum* **3**, 020333 (2022).
- [31] T. Baumgratz, M. Cramer, and M. B. Plenio, Quantifying coherence, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **113**, 140401 (2014).
- [32] A. Streltsov, G. Adesso, and M. B. Plenio, Colloquium: Quantum coherence as a resource, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **89**, 041003 (2017).
- [33] J. Eisert and M. B. Plenio, A comparison of entanglement measures, *Journal of Modern Optics* **46**, 145 (1999).
- [34] G. Vidal and R. F. Werner, Computable measure of entanglement, *Phys. Rev. A* **65**, 032314 (2002).
- [35] M. B. Plenio, Logarithmic negativity: A full entanglement monotone that is not convex, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **95**, 090503 (2005).
- [36] U. Singh, L. Zhang, and A. K. Pati, Average coherence and its typicality for random pure states, *Phys. Rev. A* **93**, 032125 (2016).
- [37] J. Liu, H. Yuan, X.-M. Lu, and X. Wang, Quantum Fisher information matrix and multiparameter estimation, *Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and Theoretical* **53**, 023001 (2019).
- [38] H. Shapourian, S. Liu, J. Kudler-Flam, and A. Vishwanath, Entanglement negativity spectrum of random mixed states: A diagrammatic approach, *PRX Quantum* **2**, 030347 (2021).
- [39] U. T. Bhosale, S. Tomsovic, and A. Lakshminarayan, Entanglement between two subsystems, the Wigner semicircle and extreme-value statistics, *Phys. Rev. A* **85**, 062331 (2012).
- [40] G. Smith and D. Leung, Typical entanglement of stabilizer states, *Phys. Rev. A* **74**, 062314 (2006).
- [41] M. A. Nielsen and I. L. Chuang, *Quantum computation and quantum information* (Cambridge University Press, 2010).
- [42] A. Barenco, A. Berthiaume, D. Deutsch, A. Ekert, R. Jozsa, and C. Macchiavello, Stabilization of quantum computations by symmetrization, *SIAM Journal on Computing* **26**, 1541 (1997).
- [43] S. Aaronson, Quantum computing, postselection, and probabilistic polynomial-time, *Proceedings of the Royal Society A: Mathematical, Physical and Engineering Sciences* **461**, 3473 (2005).
- [44] T. Schuster, J. Haferkamp, and H.-Y. Huang, Random unitaries in extremely low depth, *arXiv preprint arXiv:2407.07754* (2024).
- [45] Z. Brakerski and O. Shmueli, (Pseudo) random quantum states with binary phase, in *Theory of Cryptography Conference* (Springer, 2019) pp. 229–250.
- [46] P. Ananth, A. Gulati, L. Qian, and H. Yuen, Pseudorandom (function-like) quantum state generators: New definitions and applications, in *Theory of Cryptography Conference* (Springer, 2022) pp. 237–265.
- [47] M. Zhandry, How to construct quantum random functions, *Journal of the ACM (JACM)* **68**, 1 (2021).
- [48] T. Morimae and T. Yamakawa, Quantum commitments and signatures without one-way functions, in *Advances in Cryptology–CRYPTO 2022: 42nd Annual International Cryptology Conference, CRYPTO 2022, Santa Barbara, CA, USA, August 15–18, 2022, Proceedings, Part I* (Springer, 2022) pp. 269–295.
- [49] K. M. Audenaert, A sharp continuity estimate for the von Neumann entropy, *Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and Theoretical* **40**, 8127 (2007).
- [50] K. Bharti, A. Cervera-Lierta, T. H. Kyaw, T. Haug, S. Alperin-Lea, A. Anand, M. Degroote, H. Heimonen, J. S. Kottmann, T. Menke, W.-K. Mok, S. Sim, L.-C. Kwek, and A. Aspuru-Guzik, Noisy intermediate-scale quantum algorithms, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **94**, 015004 (2022).
- [51] S. Chen, J. Cotler, H.-Y. Huang, and J. Li, The complexity of NISQ, *Nature Communications* **14**, 6001 (2023).
- [52] R. Rubinfeld and M. Sudan, Robust characterizations of polynomials with applications to program testing, *SIAM Journal on Computing* **25**, 252 (1996).
- [53] O. Goldreich, S. Goldwasser, and D. Ron, Property testing and its connection to learning and approximation, *Journal of the ACM (JACM)* **45**, 653 (1998).
- [54] H. Buhrman, L. Fortnow, I. Newman, and H. Röhrig, Quantum property testing, *SIAM Journal on Computing* **37**, 1387 (2008).
- [55] A. K. Ekert, C. M. Alves, D. K. L. Oi, M. Horodecki, P. Horodecki, and L. C. Kwek, Direct estimations of linear and nonlinear functionals of a quantum state, *Phys.*

- Rev. Lett. **88**, 217901 (2002).
- [56] D. Gross, S. Nezami, and M. Walter, Schur–Weyl duality for the Clifford group with applications: Property testing, a robust Hudson theorem, and de Finetti representations, *Communications in Mathematical Physics* **385**, 1325 (2021).
- [57] T. Haug and M. Kim, Scalable measures of magic resource for quantum computers, *PRX Quantum* **4**, 010301 (2023).
- [58] T. Haug, S. Lee, and M. S. Kim, Efficient quantum algorithms for stabilizer entropies, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **132**, 240602 (2024).
- [59] R. O’Donnell and J. Wright, Efficient quantum tomography, in *Proceedings of the forty-eighth annual ACM symposium on Theory of Computing* (2016) pp. 899–912.
- [60] C. H. Bennett, G. Brassard, S. Popescu, B. Schumacher, J. A. Smolin, and W. K. Wootters, Purification of noisy entanglement and faithful teleportation via noisy channels, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **76**, 722 (1996).
- [61] C. H. Bennett, D. P. DiVincenzo, J. A. Smolin, and W. K. Wootters, Mixed-state entanglement and quantum error correction, *Phys. Rev. A* **54**, 3824 (1996).
- [62] A. Winter and D. Yang, Operational resource theory of coherence, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **116**, 120404 (2016).
- [63] K. Fang, X. Wang, L. Lami, B. Regula, and G. Adesso, Probabilistic distillation of quantum coherence, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **121**, 070404 (2018).
- [64] B. Regula, K. Fang, X. Wang, and G. Adesso, One-shot coherence distillation, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **121**, 010401 (2018).
- [65] S. Krastanov, V. V. Albert, and L. Jiang, Optimized Entanglement Purification, *Quantum* **3**, 123 (2019).
- [66] K. Fang and Z.-W. Liu, No-go theorems for quantum resource purification, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **125**, 060405 (2020).
- [67] I. Marvian, Coherence distillation machines are impossible in quantum thermodynamics, *Nature communications* **11**, 25 (2020).
- [68] K. Fang and Z.-W. Liu, No-go theorems for quantum resource purification: New approach and channel theory, *PRX Quantum* **3**, 010337 (2022).
- [69] D. Aharonov, J. Cotler, and X.-L. Qi, Quantum algorithmic measurement, *Nature communications* **13**, 887 (2022).
- [70] S. Chen, J. Cotler, H.-Y. Huang, and J. Li, Exponential separations between learning with and without quantum memory, in *2021 IEEE 62nd Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS)* (IEEE, 2022) pp. 574–585.
- [71] B. Chen, A. Coladangelo, and O. Sattath, The power of a single Haar random state: constructing and separating quantum pseudorandomness, *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.03295* (2024).
- [72] H. Bombin, R. S. Andrist, M. Ohzeki, H. G. Katzgraber, and M. A. Martin-Delgado, Strong resilience of topological codes to depolarization, *Phys. Rev. X* **2**, 021004 (2012).
- [73] T. Morimae and T. Yamakawa, One-wayness in quantum cryptography, *arXiv preprint arXiv:2210.03394* (2022).
- [74] R. Batra and R. Jain, Commitments are equivalent to one-way state generators, *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.03220* (2024).
- [75] R. L. Rivest, Cryptography and machine learning, in *International Conference on the Theory and Application of Cryptology* (Springer, 1991) pp. 427–439.
- [76] M. Kearns and L. Valiant, Cryptographic limitations on learning Boolean formulae and finite automata, *Journal of the ACM (JACM)* **41**, 67 (1994).
- [77] A. M. Childs, A. W. Harrow, and P. Wocjan, Weak Fourier-Schur sampling, the hidden subgroup problem, and the quantum collision problem, in *STACS 2007: 24th Annual Symposium on Theoretical Aspects of Computer Science, Aachen, Germany, February 22-24, 2007. Proceedings 24* (Springer, 2007) pp. 598–609.
- [78] C. E. Shannon, Communication theory of secrecy systems, *The Bell System Technical Journal* **28**, 656 (1949).
- [79] C. E. Shannon, A mathematical theory of communication, *The Bell system technical journal* **27**, 379 (1948).
- [80] W. Diffie and M. Hellman, New directions in cryptography, *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory* **22**, 644 (1976).
- [81] S. Goldwasser and S. Micali, Probabilistic encryption & how to play mental poker keeping secret all partial information, in *Proceedings of the Fourteenth Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing*, STOC ’82 (Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 1982) p. 365–377.
- [82] I. Nechita, Asymptotics of random density matrices, *Annales Henri Poincaré* **8**, 1521 (2007).
- [83] A. Holevo, Statistical decision theory for quantum systems, *Journal of Multivariate Analysis* **3**, 337 (1973).
- [84] C. W. Helstrom, Quantum detection and estimation theory, *Journal of Statistical Physics* **1**, 231 (1969).
- [85] J. Bae and L.-C. Kwek, Quantum state discrimination and its applications, *Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and Theoretical* **48**, 083001 (2015).
- [86] Z. Puchała and J. Miszczyk, Symbolic integration with respect to the Haar measure on the unitary groups, *Bulletin of the Polish Academy of Sciences: Technical Sciences* **65**, 21 (2017).
- [87] L. Zhang, U. Singh, and A. K. Pati, Average subentropy, coherence and entanglement of random mixed quantum states, *Annals of Physics* **377**, 125–146 (2017).
- [88] J. C. Garcia-Escartin and P. Chamorro-Posada, SWAP test and Hong-Ou-Mandel effect are equivalent, *Phys. Rev. A* **87**, 052330 (2013).
- [89] J. L. Beckey, G. Pelegrí, S. Foulds, and N. J. Pearson, Multipartite entanglement measures via Bell-basis measurements, *Phys. Rev. A* **107**, 062425 (2023).
- [90] A. Lowe and A. Nayak, Lower bounds for learning quantum states with single-copy measurements, *arXiv preprint arXiv:2207.14438* (2022).
- [91] C. Bădescu and R. O’Donnell, Improved quantum data analysis, in *Proceedings of the 53rd Annual ACM SIGACT Symposium on Theory of Computing* (2021) pp. 1398–1411.
- [92] L. Leone, S. F. E. Oliviero, and A. Hamma, Stabilizer Rényi entropy, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **128**, 050402 (2022).
- [93] S. Aaronson and P. Christiano, Quantum money from hidden subspaces, in *Proceedings of the Forty-Fourth Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing*, STOC ’12 (Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 2012) p. 41–60.

Appendix

We provide proofs and additional details supporting the claims in the main text.

A. Extended motivation and outlook	12
B. Definitions	13
C. Generalized Hilbert-Schmidt ensemble	13
D. Indistinguishability of maximally mixed state and generalized Hilbert-Schmidt ensemble	14
E. Magic	15
1. Magic testing	17
2. Black-box magic state distillation	17
F. Coherence	18
1. Coherence testing	19
2. Black-box coherence distillation	20
G. Entanglement	20
1. Entanglement testing	20
2. Black-box entanglement distillation	21
H. Noise robustness of PRDM	21
I. PRDM are robust against Kretschmer’s PostBQP attack	22
J. Pseudomagic	22
K. Pseudocoherence	23
L. Noise-robust EFI pairs	24
1. EFI pairs from PRDM	25
2. Proof of noise-robustness	26
M. PRS without quantum memory	28
N. PRS with noisy quantum memory	31
O. Noise robustness of private key quantum money based on PRS	33

Appendix A: Extended motivation and outlook

Research at the intersection of cryptography, quantum theory, information theory, and complexity theory has the potential to reveal many fascinating insights. Over time, these fields have evolved, leading to development of new fields such as quantum information (from quantum theory and information theory), quantum complexity theory (from quantum theory and complexity theory), and modern cryptography (from cryptography and complexity theory).

Historically, cryptography was considered an art. In 1948, Shannon introduced the concept of perfect secrecy [78], showing that a one-time pad could achieve it. In his groundbreaking paper, “A Mathematical Theory of Communication” [79], Shannon proved that a perfectly secure communication system requires a pre-agreed random key bit for every bit of the message to ensure privacy. For secret communication, parties needed to share a key that adversaries must not know. By the 1980s, researchers realized that an encryption scheme could still be secure if it leaked only a negligible amount of information to an attacker with limited computational power. This led to the concept of computational security [80, 81], which considers the practical limits on an attacker’s computing power and allows for a small chance of failure. This approach has become the standard for defining cryptographic security. The shift from information-theoretic security to computational security enabled public-key cryptography [80], allowing secure communication between parties who have never met. Modern cybersecurity relies heavily on computational security, with computational complexity being central to ensuring security.

In the 1990s, the combination of quantum theory and information theory gave birth to the field of quantum information theory. Recently, the integration of cryptography, complexity theory, information theory, and quantum theory has led to new insights, such as the generation of certifiable true randomness [2], quantum pseudorandom states and unitaries [1], homogeneous space pseudorandomness [3], pseudorandom isometries [4], pseudorandom state scramblers [5], computational entanglement theory [6] and new cryptographic principles under minimal assumptions [7]. These advancements have introduced pseudoresources like pseudoentanglement, pseudomagic, and pseudoimaginariness [10–12]. At this point, there is hope for establishing a new sub-field called “modern quantum information theory,” where the computational aspects of objects from quantum information theory are rigorously explored. There is a potential of similar breakthrough as cryptography went through in 1980s. This calls for the development of new primitives, such as pseudorandom density matrices and pseudorandom channels, which extend our understanding beyond pseudorandom states, unitaries, isometries [4] and scramblers [5]. Our work can be seen as a step toward realizing the vision of shaping this new field, viz. modern quantum information theory.

Finally, our work on pseudorandom density matrices contributes to several new insights in quantum property testing. Property testing algorithms can serve as a preliminary step towards learning, allowing for the efficient selection of a hypothesis class for further learning. Cryptography and machine learning are often seen as opposites [75, 76]: cryptography hides patterns, while machine learning aims to reveal them. This connection between cryptography and machine learning leads to improved understanding of property testing for quantum properties such as magic, coherence, and entanglement. Previous results focused solely on pure states as in Refs. [10–12] which turn out to be special cases of our results on general mixed states. In particular, there is a fundamental difference whether one tests a pure or state, or a general mixed states. While for pure states one can efficiently test whether a state has $\Omega(1)$ or $\omega(\log n)$ of a given resource, for general mixed states testing is inefficient for any amount of the resource.

Appendix B: Definitions

Negligible functions $\text{negl}(n)$ can be defined as follows:

Definition B.1 (Negligible function). *A real-valued function $\mu : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is negligible if and only if $\forall c \in \mathbb{N}, \exists n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\forall n > n_0, \mu(n) < n^{-c}$.*

A property tester \mathcal{A}_Q regarding a property Q has to fulfill two conditions [13, 52–54]: Completeness and soundness. Completeness demands that the tester accepts with high probability if the state has the property within a threshold β . Soundness implies that the tester rejects with high probability if the state exceeds a threshold value δ of the property.

Definition B.2 (Property tester). *An algorithm \mathcal{A}_Q is a tester for property Q using $t = t(n, \delta, \beta)$ copies if, given t copies of n -qubit quantum state ρ , constants $\beta > 0$ and $\delta > \beta$, when the following holds:*

- (Completeness) If $Q(\rho) \leq \beta$, then

$$\Pr[\mathcal{A}_Q \text{ accepts given } \rho^{\otimes t}] \geq \frac{2}{3}. \quad (\text{B1})$$

- (Soundness) If $Q(\rho) \geq \delta$, then

$$\Pr[\mathcal{A}_Q \text{ accepts given } \rho^{\otimes t}] \leq \frac{1}{3}. \quad (\text{B2})$$

Appendix C: Generalized Hilbert-Schmidt ensemble

For pure states, the Haar measure is the unique left and right-invariant measure. In contrast, for mixed states there is no universally agreed-upon measure on the set of density matrices. Several candidate measures have been studied [18, 20, 21], based on different induced measures. A common choice is to generate random density matrices by tracing out qubits from Haar random states. We call this the generalized Hilbert-Schmidt ensemble (GHSE):

Definition C.1 (Generalized Hilbert-Schmidt ensemble (GHSE)). *Let μ_{n+m} be the Haar measure on pure states of $n + m$ qubits, then $\eta_{n,m}$ is the induced measure on random density matrices whose states can be generated as:*

$$\eta_{n,m} = \{\text{tr}_m(|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|)\}_{|\psi\rangle \in \mu_{n+m}}. \quad (\text{C1})$$

The GHSE is invariant under arbitrary unitary transformations, i.e. $\eta_{n,m} = \{U \text{tr}_m(|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|)U^\dagger\}_{|\psi\rangle \in \mu_{n+m}}$ [82]. We note that the GHSE can also be generated by drawing random matrices from the Ginibre ensemble:

Fact C.1 ([82]). Let X be a $2^n \times 2^m$ matrix with entries independently and identically distributed according to $\mathcal{N}_{\mathbb{C}}(0, 1)$ (complex Gaussian). Then, then the matrix

$$\rho = \frac{XX^\dagger}{\text{tr}XX^\dagger} \quad (\text{C2})$$

is distributed according to $\eta_{n,m}$.

A special case of the GHSE is the Hilbert-Schmidt ensemble based on the Hilbert-Schmidt metric

$$D_{\text{HS}}(\rho, \sigma) = [\text{tr}(\rho - \sigma)^2]^{1/2}. \quad (\text{C3})$$

This metric defines a product measure in the space of density matrices, consisting of two parts: the eigenvalues part and the eigenvectors part. The eigenvector distribution is just the Haar distribution. The uniform random ensemble \mathcal{G}_{HS} induced by the Hilbert-Schmidt measure can be constructed by tracing out n qubits from a $2n$ qubit Haar random state [18, 20]

$$\mathcal{G}_{\text{HS}} = \eta_{2n,n}. \quad (\text{C4})$$

Appendix D: Indistinguishability of maximally mixed state and generalized Hilbert-Schmidt ensemble

Here, we show that the GHSE is statistically indistinguishable from the maximally mixed state.

Theorem D.1 (t -copy indistinguishability of GHSE from maximally mixed state). *The trace distance between t copies of maximally mixed state $I_n/2^n$ and t copies of a state drawn from the GHSE $\eta_{n,m}$ is $O(t^2/2^m)$. For $t = \text{poly}(n)$ and $m = \omega(\log n)$, the two ensembles are indistinguishable as the trace distance is $\text{negl}(n)$.*

Proof. Let us consider a bipartite pure state $|\psi\rangle_{AB}$ with subsystem dimensions d_A and d_B respectively. We construct the t -th moment of the GHSE as

$$\rho_{\text{GHS}}^{(t)} = \mathbb{E}_{\psi \in \text{Haar}(d_A d_B)} [(\text{tr}_B(|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|))^{\otimes t}] = \frac{(d_A d_B - 1)!}{(d_A d_B + t - 1)!} \sum_{\pi \in S_t} d_B^{\text{cycles}(\pi)} \hat{\pi}_A. \quad (\text{D1})$$

S_t is the symmetric group of degree t , and $\hat{\pi}_A$ is the permutation unitary operator acting on the t copies of subsystem A associated with the element π of the symmetric group. The function $\text{cycles}(\pi)$ counts the number of cycles in the permutation $\pi \in S_t$. In our context of the GHSE $\eta_{n,m}$, $d_A = 2^n$ and $d_B = 2^m$. The trace distance $\text{TD}(x, y) = \frac{1}{2}\|x - y\|_1$ between $\rho_{\text{GHS}}^{(t)}$ and the maximally mixed state is

$$\begin{aligned} \text{TD}\left(\rho_{\text{GHS}}^{(t)}, \frac{I_A^{\otimes t}}{(d_A)^t}\right) &= \text{TD}\left(\frac{1}{(d_A d_B)^t} \left(1 - \frac{t(t-1)}{2d_A d_B} + O\left(\frac{t^4}{d_A^2 d_B^2}\right)\right) \sum_{\pi \in S_t} d_B^{\text{cycles}(\pi)} \hat{\pi}_A, \frac{I_A^{\otimes t}}{(d_A)^t}\right) \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \left\| \frac{1}{(d_A)^t} \left(-\frac{t(t-1)}{2d_A d_B} + O\left(\frac{t^4}{d_A^2 d_B^2}\right)\right) I_A^{\otimes t} + \frac{1}{(d_A d_B)^t} \left(1 - \frac{t(t-1)}{2d_A d_B} + O\left(\frac{t^4}{d_A^2 d_B^2}\right)\right) \sum_{\substack{\pi \in S_t \\ \pi \neq I}} d_B^{\text{cycles}(\pi)} \hat{\pi}_A \right\|_1 \\ &\leq \frac{t(t-1)}{2d_A d_B} + O\left(\frac{t^4}{d_A^2 d_B^2}\right) + \frac{1}{(d_B)^t} \left(1 - \frac{t(t-1)}{2d_A d_B} + O\left(\frac{t^4}{d_A^2 d_B^2}\right)\right) \sum_{\substack{\pi \in S_t \\ \pi \neq I}} d_B^{\text{cycles}(\pi)} \\ &= \frac{t(t-1)}{2d_A d_B} + O\left(\frac{t^4}{d_A^2 d_B^2}\right) + \frac{1}{(d_B)^t} \left(1 - \frac{t(t-1)}{2d_A d_B} + O\left(\frac{t^4}{d_A^2 d_B^2}\right)\right) \left(\frac{(d_B + t - 1)!}{(d_B - 1)!} - (d_B)^t\right) \\ &= \frac{t(t-1)}{2d_A d_B} + O\left(\frac{t^4}{d_A^2 d_B^2}\right) + \left(1 - \frac{t(t-1)}{2d_A d_B} + O\left(\frac{t^4}{d_A^2 d_B^2}\right)\right) \left(\frac{t(t-1)}{2d_B} + O\left(\frac{t^4}{d_B^2}\right)\right) \\ &= \frac{t(t-1)}{2d_B} \left(1 + \frac{1}{2d_A}\right) + O\left(\frac{t^4}{d_B^2}\right). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{D2})$$

In the second line, we split the sum over S_t into the identity permutation and a sum over non-identity permutations. In the third line, we used the triangle inequality and the trace norm $\|I_A^{\otimes t}\|_1 = \|\hat{\pi}_A\|_1 = (d_A)^t$ since $\hat{\pi}_A$ is unitary. Substituting $d_A = 2^n$ and $d_B = 2^m$ gives the desired bound $O(t^2/2^m)$ for the trace distance. \square

This result implies that if $t = \text{poly}(n)$, then $m = \omega(\log n)$ suffices for the PRDM to be computationally indistinguishable from the maximally mixed state.

One can also consider a different notion of random mixed states which yields similar results: In particular, one can consider random states ρ sampled from the space of n -qubit states with fixed rank $\text{rank}(\rho) = m$. This ensemble has been shown to be indistinguishable from the maximally mixed state for $m = \omega(\log n)$ in Ref. [77] via the quantum collision problem, as well as in Ref. [14] as the rank testing problem.

Appendix E: Magic

Here, we show that the robustness of magic, a magic monotone, cannot be efficiently tested, as well as results regarding black-box magic state distillation.

The robustness of magic $R(\rho)$ for a given state ρ is defined via a linear optimization program [29, 30]

$$R(\rho) = \min |c_\phi| \text{ s.t. } \rho = \sum_{\phi \in \text{STAB}} c_\phi \phi, \quad (\text{E1})$$

where ϕ is from the set of n -qubit pure stabilizer states STAB. Note that $R(\phi) = 1$ for convex combination of stabilizer states, and else $R(\rho) > 1$. Its upper bound is $R(\rho) \leq 2^n$.

The sub-additive version of the robustness of magic is the log-free robustness of magic [30]

$$\text{LR}(\rho) = \log \left(\min |c_\phi| \text{ s.t. } \rho = \sum_{\phi \in \text{STAB}} c_\phi \phi \right) \quad (\text{E2})$$

with $0 \leq \text{LR}(\rho) \leq n$.

First, we bound the magic of the GHSE.

Theorem E.1 (Magic of GHSE). *Each state $\rho \in \eta_{n,m}$ of the GHSE $\eta_{n,m}$ has the log-free robustness $\text{LR}(\rho) \geq n - m - 2 \log(n) - 1$ with overwhelming probability.*

Proof. We can regard the well known dual of the linear program that computes the robustness magic [30]

$$R(\rho) = \max_A \text{tr}(\rho A) \text{ s.t. } |\text{tr}(A\phi)| \leq 1 \forall \phi \in \text{STAB} \quad (\text{E3})$$

where A are Hermitian matrices. Instead of maximization to get the exact $R(\rho')$, we now want to find only a lower bound. For this, it is sufficient to find one A which satisfies the constraints of Eq. (E3). Thus, we have

$$R(\rho) \geq \text{tr}(\rho A) \text{ s.t. } |\text{tr}(A\phi)| \leq 1 \forall \phi \in \text{STAB}. \quad (\text{E4})$$

Next, we note that the constraint condition can also be written as bound of a maximization over all pure stabilizer states

$$R(\rho) \geq \text{tr}(\rho A) \text{ s.t. } \max_{\phi \in \text{STAB}} |\text{tr}(A\phi)| \leq 1. \quad (\text{E5})$$

Next, we note that the robustness of magic does not increase when taking tensor products with Clifford states. We now tensor with m -qubit maximally mixed state $I_m/2^m$ to get

$$R(\rho) \geq R(\rho \otimes I_m/2^m) \text{ s.t. } \max_{\phi \in \text{STAB}} |\text{tr}(A\phi)| \leq 1, \quad (\text{E6})$$

where now A is an $n + m$ qubit operator and the maximization is taken over all $n + m$ qubit Clifford states.

Now, we regard n -qubit states from the GHSE $\eta_{n,m}$ which are of the form $\text{tr}_m(|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|)$ where $|\psi\rangle$ is an $(n + m)$ -qubit state. Further, we regard the $n + m$ qubit Hermitian operator $A = c|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|$. Here, A is a rank 1 projector with coefficient $c > 0$. This simplifies the constraint considerably as we can drop the absolute value on the constraint as A has only positive eigenvalues. This allows us to connect the maximization to another magic monotone

$$\max_{\phi \in \text{STAB}} \text{tr}(c|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|\phi) = cF_{\text{STAB}}(|\psi\rangle) \quad (\text{E7})$$

where $F_{\text{STAB}}(|\psi\rangle) = \max_{|\phi\rangle \in \text{STAB}} |\langle\psi|\phi\rangle|^2$ is the stabilizer fidelity which is the fidelity with the closest stabilizer state. We have

$$R(\text{tr}_m(|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|)) \geq c \text{tr}(\text{tr}_m(|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|) \otimes I_m/2^m |\psi\rangle\langle\psi|) \text{ s.t. } cF_{\text{STAB}}(|\psi\rangle) \leq 1. \quad (\text{E8})$$

Now, we note that the constraint can be rewritten into $c \leq (F_{\text{STAB}}(|\psi\rangle))^{-1}$. Thus, we can simplify our bound as follows:

$$R(\text{tr}_m(|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|)) \geq 2^{-m} F_{\text{STAB}}(|\psi\rangle)^{-1} \text{tr}(\text{tr}_m(|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|) \otimes I_m |\psi\rangle\langle\psi|). \quad (\text{E9})$$

Now, we regard the term $\text{tr}(\text{tr}_m(|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|) \otimes I_m |\psi\rangle\langle\psi|)$ closer. We can rewrite this as

$$\text{tr}(\text{tr}_m(|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|) \otimes I_m |\psi\rangle\langle\psi|) = \text{tr}(\text{tr}_m(|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|) \otimes (\sum_i |i\rangle\langle i|) |\psi\rangle\langle\psi|) = \quad (\text{E10})$$

$$\text{tr}(\text{tr}_m(|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|) \otimes \sum_i (|i\rangle\langle\psi| \langle\psi|i\rangle)) = \text{tr}(\text{tr}_m(|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|)^2) \geq 2^{-m}. \quad (\text{E11})$$

where the last inequality follows from the fact that $\text{tr}_m(|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|)$ is a at most rank m operator with trace 1.

Thus, the robustness of magic for ρ is bounded as

$$R(\text{tr}_m(|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|)) \geq 2^{-2m} F_{\text{STAB}}(|\psi\rangle)^{-1}. \quad (\text{E12})$$

and similarly the log-free robustness of magic

$$\text{LR}(\text{tr}_m(|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|)) \geq -\log(F_{\text{STAB}}(|\psi\rangle)) - 2m, \quad (\text{E13})$$

where we note that $D_{\min} = -\log(F_{\text{STAB}})$ is the min-relative entropy of magic. Thus, we transformed the problem of finding a lower bound on the log-free robustness for a mixed state into finding the stabilizer fidelity F_{STAB} for a pure state, which is a much simpler problem.

Now, we regard the case where $|\psi\rangle$ is a $n + m$ qubit Haar random state. Here, it is known that $F_{\text{STAB}}(|\psi\rangle)$ concentrates when $|\psi\rangle$ is drawn from Haar measure μ over $n + m$ -qubits [30]

$$\Pr_{|\psi\rangle \leftarrow \mu} [F_{\text{STAB}}(|\psi\rangle) > \epsilon] < \exp(0.54(n + m)^2 - 2^{n+m}\epsilon), \quad (\text{E14})$$

which is valid for $n + m \geq 6$. For concentration, we need the right hand side to scale as $\exp(-(n + m)^2)$ or faster to zero, thus we have $\epsilon \geq 1.54(n + m)^2 2^{-n-m}$, where we make the simplified choice of $\epsilon = 2(n + m)^2 2^{-n-m}$. Eq. (E14) implies that we have

$$\Pr_{|\psi\rangle \leftarrow \mu} [F_{\text{STAB}}(|\psi\rangle) > 2(n + m)^2 2^{-n-m}] < \exp(-(n + m)^2). \quad (\text{E15})$$

In particular, with overwhelming probability for Haar random states $|\psi\rangle$ we have

$$F_{\text{STAB}}(|\psi\rangle) \leq 2(n + m)^2 2^{-n-m} \quad (\text{E16})$$

and

$$D_{\min}(|\psi\rangle) \geq n + m - 2 \log(n + m) - 1. \quad (\text{E17})$$

We now consider the GHSE $\eta_{n,m} = \{\text{tr}_m(|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|)\}_{|\psi\rangle \in \mu}$ where $|\psi\rangle$ is drawn from the Haar measure μ . The average log-free robustness of GHSE is given by

$$\mathbb{E}_{\rho \in \eta_{n,m}} [\text{LR}(\rho)] = \int_{\psi \in \mu} d\psi \text{LR}(\text{tr}_m(|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|)) \geq -2m - \int_{|\psi\rangle \in \mu} d\psi \log(F_{\text{STAB}}(|\psi\rangle)). \quad (\text{E18})$$

Using Jensen's inequality $-\int_{\psi} d\psi \log(x) \geq -\log(\int_{\psi} d\psi x)$ and Eq. (E15), we now get

$$\mathbb{E}_{\rho \in \eta_{n,m}} [\text{LR}(\rho)] \geq -2m - \log\left(\int_{|\psi\rangle \in \mu} d\psi F_{\text{STAB}}(|\psi\rangle)\right) \geq n - m - 2 \log(n + m) - 1. \quad (\text{E19})$$

In particular, by choosing $m = \text{polylog}(n)$, we have $\mathbb{E}_{\rho \in S^1} [\text{LR}(\rho)] = \Theta(n)$. \square

1. Magic testing

Theorem E.2 (Magic cannot be efficiently tested for mixed states). *Any tester \mathcal{A}_M according to Def. B.2 of log-free robustness of magic LR requires superpolynomial number of copies for $\delta = \Theta(n)$, $\beta = 0$ to test n -qubit states.*

Proof. The proof idea is that there the GHSE with $m = \text{polylog}(n)$ has near-maximal magic, while being indistinguishable from maximally mixed states with zero magic.

We now consider the GHSE ensemble. The average log-free robustness of ensemble $\eta_{n,m}$ is lower bounded by

$$\mathbb{E}_{\rho \in \eta_{n,m}} [\text{LR}(\rho)] \geq n - m - 2 \log(n + m) - 1, \quad (\text{E20})$$

where due to concentration this bound is satisfied for nearly all states with exponentially high probability.

Now, we choose $m = \text{polylog}(n)$ and $\eta \equiv \eta_{n, \text{polylog}(n)}$, where we have $\mathbb{E}_{\rho \in \eta} [\text{LR}(\rho)] = \Theta(n)$ with overwhelming probability.

As second ensemble, we choose the maximally mixed state $I_n/2^n$ with $\text{LR}(I_n/2^n) = 0$.

Now, η is indistinguishable from the maximally mixed state

$$\text{TD} \left(\mathbb{E}_{\rho \leftarrow \eta} [\rho^{\otimes t}], (I_n/2^n)^{\otimes t} \right) = O \left(\frac{t^2}{2^m} \right). \quad (\text{E21})$$

The two ensembles can be distinguished with probability P_{discr} only if they are sufficiently far in TD distance as given by the Helstrom bound [83–85]

$$P_{\text{discr}}(\rho, \sigma) = \frac{1}{2} + \text{TD}(\rho, \sigma). \quad (\text{E22})$$

In particular, any algorithm trying to distinguish two ensembles with $P_{\text{discr}} \geq 2/3$ requires at least $\text{TD}(\rho, \sigma) \geq 1/6$.

Now, we want to distinguish η and $I_n/2^n$, which have $\text{LR} = \Theta(n)$ and $\text{LR} = 0$ log-free robustness of magic respectively with overwhelming probability, which implies $\delta = \Theta(n)$ and $\beta = 0$. Eq. (E21) implies that any algorithm, which includes property testers for log-free robustness of magic, must use $t = \Omega(2^{\text{polylog}(n)/2})$ copies to distinguish the two ensembles with non-negligible probability. \square

Corollary 4 (Lower bound on purity for efficient testing of magic). *Using $t = \text{poly}(n)$ copies of n -qubit state ρ , testing whether ρ has $\text{LR}(\rho) = 0$ or $\text{LR}(\rho) = \Theta(n)$ requires purity $\text{tr}(\rho^2) = \Omega(n^{-c})$ with $c > 0$.*

The lower bound follows from the inefficiency of testing of magic for negligible purity states as shown in Thm. E.2. We note that for pure states with $\text{tr}(\rho^2) = 1$ explicit tests of magic with $t = O(1)$ are known [57, 58].

2. Black-box magic state distillation

Theorem E.3 (Impossibility of black-box magic state distillation). *Any algorithm that uses stabilizer operations and $t = \text{poly}(n)$ copies of an arbitrary input state ρ with $\text{LR}(\rho) = \Theta(n)$ can only synthesize trivial pure states $|\psi\rangle$ with $\text{LR}(|\psi\rangle) = \text{negl}(n)$.*

Proof. The proof idea is as follows: Lets assume there exists a magic state distillation algorithm \mathcal{A}_M which uses stabilizer operations to turn $t = \text{poly}(n)$ copies of ρ with $\text{LR}(\rho) = \Theta(n)$ into a single magical state $|\psi\rangle$ with $\text{LR}(|\psi\rangle) = \Omega(n^{-c})$ with $c > 0$. The same algorithm \mathcal{A}_M applied to a state ρ' with $\text{LR}(\rho') = 0$ can only yield some stabilizer state $\sigma \in \text{STAB}$ as stabilizer operations cannot increase magic.

We now draw ρ from the GHSE with $m = \omega(\log n)$ which has $\text{LR}(\rho) = \Theta(n)$, while $\rho' = I/2^n$ is the maximally mixed state with $\text{LR}(\rho') = 0$. GHSE and maximally mixed state are indistinguishable for any algorithm with $t = \text{poly}(n)$ copies. However, the proposed magic state distillation algorithm \mathcal{A}_M could be used to distinguish both ensembles, as the distilled magic state $|\psi\rangle$ can be efficiently distinguished from stabilizer states [57, 58]. Thus, from contradiction the proposed magic state distillation algorithm \mathcal{A}_M cannot exist. \square

We note this is no-go theorem significantly improves the previously known bound by Ref. [12] which stated that the copies is bounded by $t = \Omega(\text{LR}(\rho) / \log^{1+c}(\text{LR}(|\psi\rangle)))$.

Corollary 5 (Lower bound on purity for black-box magic state distillation). *For black-box magic state distillation of state $|\psi\rangle$ with $LR(|\psi\rangle) = \Omega(n^{-c})$ with $c > 0$ using $t = \text{poly}(n)$ copies of input state ρ , one requires purity $\text{tr}(\rho^2) = \Omega(n^{-c})$.*

This lower bound on purity follows directly from the proof of Theorem E.3 which was demonstrated using state ensembles with purity $\text{tr}(\rho^2) = \text{negl}(n)$.

Appendix F: Coherence

Here, we show that coherence cannot be efficiently tested, as well as results regarding black-box distillation of coherence. We regard the relative entropy of coherence which is a coherence monotone [31, 32]

$$C(\rho) = S(\Delta[\rho]) - S(\rho) \quad (\text{F1})$$

where $S(\rho) = -\text{tr}(\rho \log \rho)$ denotes the von Neumann entropy of the state ρ . $\Delta[\rho] = \sum_i |i\rangle\langle i|\rho|i\rangle\langle i|$ corresponds to the state ρ with only diagonal elements left, which is equivalent to applying the completely dephasing channel to ρ .

Now, we calculate the lower bound on the relative entropy of coherence for the GHSE:

Lemma F.1 (Expectation and variance of relative entropy of coherence of GHSE). *The expected relative entropy of coherence of GHSE $\eta_{n,m} = \{\text{tr}_m(|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|)\}_{|\psi\rangle \in \mu_{n+m}}$ is lower bounded as*

$$\mathbb{E}_{\rho \leftarrow \eta_{n,m}} [C(\rho)] \geq n - m - 1. \quad (\text{F2})$$

Proof. The average relative entropy of coherence is given by $\mathbb{E}_{\rho \leftarrow \eta_{n,m}} [C(\rho)] = \mathbb{E}_{\rho \leftarrow \eta_{n,m}} [S(\Delta[\rho])] - \mathbb{E}_{\rho \leftarrow \eta_{n,m}} [S(\rho)]$.

To find a lower bound on $\mathbb{E}_{\rho \leftarrow \eta_{n,m}} [C(\rho)]$, we require a lower bound on $\mathbb{E}_{\rho \leftarrow \eta_{n,m}} [S(\Delta[\rho])]$ and an upper bound on $\mathbb{E}_{\rho \leftarrow \eta_{n,m}} [S(\rho)]$.

First, as upper bound we find

$$\mathbb{E}_{\rho \leftarrow \eta_{n,m}} [S(\rho)] \leq m. \quad (\text{F3})$$

This is easy to see by regarding $\rho = \text{tr}_m(|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|)$ with arbitrary $n+m$ qubit state $|\psi\rangle$. We recall that the von Neumann entropy is upper bounded by the rank

$$\log(\text{rank}(\rho)) \geq S(\rho). \quad (\text{F4})$$

After the partial trace over m qubits, we have $m \geq \log(\text{rank}(\rho))$, which immediately gives us Eq. (F3).

Now, we find a lower bound on $\mathbb{E}_{\rho \leftarrow \eta_{n,m}} [S(\Delta[\rho])]$. The lower bound on average von Neumann entropy of the diagonal $\Delta[\rho]$ for $\rho \in \eta_{n,m}$ can be bounded using monotonicity of α -Rényi entropy:

$$S(\Delta[\rho]) = -\text{tr}(\Delta[\rho] \log(\Delta[\rho])) \geq \frac{1}{1-\alpha} \log(\text{tr}(\Delta[\rho]^\alpha)), \quad \alpha \geq 2 \quad (\text{F5})$$

For $\alpha = 2$ and using Jensen's inequality for the function $g(x) = -\log x$, we get,

$$\mathbb{E}_{\rho \leftarrow \eta_{n,m}} [S(\Delta[\rho])] \geq -\log(\mathbb{E}_{\rho \leftarrow \eta_{n,m}} \text{tr}(\Delta[\rho]^2)). \quad (\text{F6})$$

Now, we can expand $U = \sum_{i,j}^{2^{n+m}-1} U_{i,j} |i\rangle\langle j|$ to get,

$$\begin{aligned} \rho &= \text{tr}_m[U|0\rangle\langle 0|U^\dagger], \quad U \leftarrow \mu_{n+m} \\ &= \text{tr}_m \left[\sum_{i_1, k_1}^{2^n-1} \sum_{i_2, k_2}^{2^m-1} U_{i_1 i_2, 0} U_{k_1 k_2, 0}^* |i_1 i_2\rangle\langle k_1 k_2| \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{F7})$$

Then, it is easy to observe that the diagonal part can be obtained as:

$$\Delta[\rho] = \sum_i^{2^n-1} \sum_j^{2^m-1} U_{ij,0} U_{ij,0}^* |i\rangle\langle i|. \quad (\text{F8})$$

Now, we can calculate the expectation of purity of the above state,

$$\mathbb{E}_{U \leftarrow \eta_{n+m}} [\text{tr} \Delta[\rho]^2] = \sum_i^{2^n-1} \sum_{j,l}^{2^m-1} \int_U d\mu_{n+m} U_{ij,0} U_{ij,0}^* U_{il,0} U_{il,0}^*. \quad (\text{F9})$$

Now, using the identity [86],

$$\begin{aligned} \int d\mu_{n+m} U_{i_1 j_1} U_{i_2 j_2} U_{i'_1 j'_1}^* U_{i'_2 j'_2}^* &= \frac{1}{d^2 - 1} (\delta_{i_1 i'_1} \delta_{i_2 i'_2} \delta_{j_1 j'_1} \delta_{j_2 j'_2} + \delta_{i_1 i'_2} \delta_{i_2 i'_1} \delta_{j_1 j'_2} \delta_{j_2 j'_1}) \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{d(d^2 - 1)} (\delta_{i_1 i'_1} \delta_{i_2 i'_2} \delta_{j_1 j'_2} \delta_{j_2 j'_1} + \delta_{i_1 i'_2} \delta_{i_2 i'_1} \delta_{j_1 j'_1} \delta_{j_2 j'_2}), \end{aligned} \quad (\text{F10})$$

with $d = 2^{n+m}$, we get:

$$\mathbb{E}_{U \leftarrow \eta_{n+m}} [\text{tr} \Delta[\rho]^2] = \sum_i^{2^n-1} \sum_{j,l}^{2^m-1} \left[\frac{1}{d^2 - 1} (1 + \delta_{ji}) - \frac{1}{d(d^2 - 1)} (1 + \delta_{jl}) \right] = \frac{2^m + 1}{2^{n+m} + 1}. \quad (\text{F11})$$

Thus, from Jensen's inequality we get $\mathbb{E}_{U \leftarrow \eta_{n+m}} [S(\Delta[\rho])] \geq -\log \frac{2^m+1}{2^{n+m}+1}$. Using this and Eq. (F3), we get:

$$\mathbb{E}_{U \leftarrow \eta_{n+m}} [C(\rho)] \geq \log(2^{n+m} + 1) - \log(2^m + 1) - m \geq n - m - 1. \quad (\text{F12})$$

for $m = \text{poly log}(n)$. □

Further, the relative entropy of coherence concentrates around its mean for GHSE [87]. This follows directly from Lévy's lemma and the fact that the relative entropy of coherence is Lipschitz continuous. In particular, we have the Lipschitz function $f : \mathbb{S}^a \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, defined as $f(\psi_{AB}) = S(\Delta[\rho_A]) - S(\rho_A)$ with $\rho_A = \text{tr}_B[|\psi_{AB}\rangle\langle\psi_{AB}|]$ and $a = 2d_A d_B - 1$ where in our case $d_A = 2^n$, $d_B = 2^m$. The Lipschitz constant for relative entropy of coherence for GHSE with $d_A \geq 3$ is shown to be $2\sqrt{8} \log d_A$ [87]. Thus, we get, from Lévy's lemma,

$$\Pr_{\rho \leftarrow \eta_{n,m}} \left[\left| C(\rho) - \mathbb{E}_{\rho' \leftarrow \eta_{n,m}} [C(\rho')] \right| > \epsilon \right] \leq 2 \exp \left(-\frac{2^{n+m} \epsilon^2}{144 \pi^3 n^2 \log 2} \right). \quad (\text{F13})$$

Now, using Lemma F.1, we get

$$\Pr_{\rho \leftarrow \eta_{n,m}} [C(\rho) < n - m - 1 - \epsilon] \leq 2 \exp \left(-\frac{2^{n+m} \epsilon^2}{144 \pi^3 n^2 \log 2} \right). \quad (\text{F14})$$

1. Coherence testing

Theorem F.1 (Coherence testing is inefficient for mixed states). *Any tester \mathcal{A}_C of relative entropy of coherence C according to Def. B.2 requires superpolynomially many copies to test coherence with $\delta = \Theta(n)$ and $\beta = 0$ for n -qubit states.*

Proof. We now set $m = \text{poly log}(n)$ and use Eq. (F14) with $\epsilon = 1$. Then, it follows that the coherence of the GHSE ensemble $\eta_{n, \text{poly log}(n)}$ is $\Theta(n)$ with overwhelming probability. The trace distance between GHSE with $m = \text{poly log}(n)$, $t = \text{poly}(n)$ and maximally mixed state with zero coherence is negligible as shown by Theorem D.1. The two ensembles can be distinguished with probability P_{discr} only if they are sufficiently far in TD distance as given by the Helstrom-Holevo bound [83–85]

$$P_{\text{discr}}(\rho, \sigma) = \frac{1}{2} + \text{TD}(\rho, \sigma). \quad (\text{F15})$$

In particular, any algorithm trying to distinguish two ensembles with $P_{\text{discr}} \geq 2/3$ requires at least $\text{TD}(\rho, \sigma) \geq 1/6$. Now, distinguishing GHSE for $m = \text{poly log}(n)$ and maximally mixed state with probability at least $2/3$, requires $t = \Omega(2^{\text{poly log}(n)})$ copies for any possible algorithm. This implies that any coherence tester must also use at least a superpolynomial number of copies. □

Corollary 6 (Lower bound on purity for efficient testing of coherence). *Using $t = \text{poly}(n)$ copies of n -qubit state ρ , testing whether ρ has $C(\rho) = 0$ or $C(\rho) = \Theta(n)$ requires purity $\text{tr}(\rho^2) = \Omega(n^{-c})$ with $c > 0$.*

The lower bound follows from the inefficiency of testing of coherence for negligible purity states as shown in Thm. F.1. We note that for pure states with $\text{tr}(\rho^2) = 1$ explicit tests of coherence with $t = O(1)$ are known [11].

2. Black-box coherence distillation

Theorem F.2 (Impossibility of black-box coherence state distillation). *Any algorithm that uses incoherent operations and $t = \text{poly}(n)$ copies of an arbitrary input state ρ with $C(\rho) = \Theta(n)$ can only synthesize trivial pure states $|\psi\rangle$ with $C(|\psi\rangle) = \text{negl}(n)$.*

Proof. The proof idea is as follows: Let us assume there exists a coherence distillation algorithm \mathcal{A}_C which uses incoherent operations to turn $t = \text{poly}(n)$ copies of ρ with $C(\rho) = \Theta(n)$ into a single coherent state $|\psi\rangle$ with $C(|\psi\rangle) = \Omega(n^{-c})$ with $c > 0$. The same algorithm \mathcal{A}_C applied to a state ρ' with $C(\rho') = 0$ can only yield some incoherent state σ with $C(\sigma) = 0$ as incoherent operations cannot increase the relative entropy of coherence as it is a monotone.

We now either draw ρ from a GHSE with $m = \omega(\log n)$ which has $C(\rho) = \Theta(n)$, or the maximally mixed state $\rho' = I_n/2^n$ with $C(\rho') = 0$. GHSE and maximally mixed state are statistically indistinguishable for $t = \text{poly}(n)$ copies. However, the proposed coherence state distillation algorithm \mathcal{A}_C could be used to distinguish both ensembles, as the distilled coherent state $|\psi\rangle$ from ρ can be efficiently distinguished from the incoherent output σ generated from ρ' [11]. In particular, if σ is pure, one can test that it is not coherent efficiently [11]. If σ is a mixed incoherent state, one can use the SWAP test to distinguish it from $|\psi\rangle$. Thus, from contradiction the proposed coherence distillation algorithm \mathcal{A}_C cannot exist. \square

Corollary 7 (Lower bound on purity for black-box coherence distillation). *Black-box coherence distillation of state $|\psi\rangle$ with $C(|\psi\rangle) = \Omega(n^{-c})$ with $c > 0$ and $t = \text{poly}(n)$ copies of input state ρ requires purity $\text{tr}(\rho^2) = \Omega(n^{-c})$.*

This lower bound on purity follows directly from the proof of Theorem F.2 which was proven using state ensembles with purity $\text{tr}(\rho^2) = \text{negl}(n)$.

Appendix G: Entanglement

Here, we show that entanglement as measured by the logarithmic negativity cannot be efficiently tested, as well as results regarding black-box entanglement distillation. Logarithmic negativity is an entanglement monotone between some bipartition A and B of ρ [33–35]

$$E(\rho) = \log(\|\rho^{\text{T}_A}\|_1), \quad (\text{G1})$$

where T_A is the partial transpose over subsystem A .

First, the logarithmic negativity has well known behavior for the GHSE

Theorem G.1 (Logarithmic negativity of GHSE [38]). *Each state $\rho \in \eta_{n,m}$ of the GHSE $\eta_{n,m}$ has the logarithmic negativity between bipartition $n_1 = |A|$ and $n_2 = |B|$ with $n_1 \leq n_2$, $n \geq m$ and $n \gg 1$*

$$E(\rho) \approx \begin{cases} \frac{1}{2}(n - m) + \log(8/3\pi), & n_2 < n_1 + m \\ n_1, & \text{else} \end{cases}$$

with overwhelming probability.

This result has been achieved using diagrammatic techniques [38]. One can get the same scaling using the spectral properties of the GHSE [39]. The entanglement of formation of GHSE has also been studied in Ref. [19, 39, 40] where similar scaling as for the logarithmic negativity has been found.

1. Entanglement testing

Theorem G.2 (Logarithmic negativity cannot be efficiently tested for mixed states). *Any tester \mathcal{A}_E according to Def. B.2 of logarithmic negativity $E(\rho)$ requires a superpolynomial number of copies for $\delta = \Theta(n)$, $\beta = 0$ to test n -qubit states.*

Proof. This follows directly by regarding two ensembles which are statistically indistinguishable, yet have widely different logarithmic negativity. In particular, the maximally mixed state has $E(I_n/2^n) = 0$, while the GHSE $\rho \in \eta_{n,m}$ for $m = \text{polylog}(n)$ has $E(\rho) = \Theta(n)$.

Any algorithm, including property testers for logarithmic negativity, require $\Omega(2^{\text{polylog}(n)/2})$ copies to distinguish those two ensembles due to Thm. D.1. \square

Corollary 8 (Lower bound on purity for efficient testing of logarithmic negativity). *Using $t = \text{poly}(n)$ copies of n -qubit state ρ , testing whether ρ has $E(\rho) = 0$ or $E(\rho) = \Theta(n)$ requires purity $\text{tr}(\rho^2) = \Omega(n^{-c})$ with $c > 0$.*

The lower bound follows from the inefficiency of testing of logarithmic negativity for negligible purity states as shown in Thm. G.2. We note that for pure states with $\text{tr}(\rho^2) = 1$ explicit tests of entanglement with $t = O(1)$ are known [10, 55].

2. Black-box entanglement distillation

Theorem G.3 (Impossibility of black-box entanglement distillation). *Any algorithm that uses LOCC operations and $t = \text{poly}(n)$ copies of an arbitrary input state ρ with logarithmic negativity $E(\rho) = \Theta(n)$ can only synthesize trivial pure states $|\psi\rangle$ with $E(|\psi\rangle) = \text{negl}(n)$.*

Proof. The proof idea is as follows: Lets assume there exists a entanglement distillation algorithm \mathcal{A}_E which uses LOCC operations to turn $t = \text{poly}(n)$ copies of state ρ with $E(\rho) = \Theta(n)$ into a single entangled state $|\psi\rangle$ with $E(|\psi\rangle) = \Omega(n^{-c})$ with $c > 0$. The same algorithm \mathcal{A}_E applied to a state ρ' with $E(\rho') = 0$ can only yield some separable state $\sigma \in \text{SEP}$ as LOCC operations cannot increase the logarithmic negativity as it is an entanglement monotone.

We now draw ρ from the GHSE with $m = \omega(\log n)$ which has $E(\rho) = \Theta(n)$, while $\rho' = I/2^n$ is the maximally mixed state with $E(\rho') = 0$. GHSE and maximally mixed state are indistinguishable for any algorithm with $t = \text{poly}(n)$ copies. However, the proposed entanglement distillation algorithm \mathcal{A}_E could be used to distinguish both ensembles, as the distilled state $|\psi\rangle$ can be efficiently distinguished from non-entangled states [55].

Thus, from contradiction the proposed entanglement distillation algorithm \mathcal{A}_E cannot exist. \square

Corollary 9 (Lower bound on purity for black-box entanglement distillation). *For black-box entanglement distillation of state $|\psi\rangle$ with logarithmic negativity $E(|\psi\rangle) = \Omega(n^{-c})$ with $c > 0$ using $t = \text{poly}(n)$ copies of input state ρ , one requires purity $\text{tr}(\rho^2) = \Omega(n^{-c})$.*

This lower bound on purity follows directly from the proof of Theorem G.3 which was demonstrated using a state ensembles with purity $\text{tr}(\rho^2) = \text{negl}(n)$.

Appendix H: Noise robustness of PRDM

A PRDM is noise robust to a noise channel if it remains PRDM after application of the channel. Here, we restrict ourselves to unital noise channels, i.e. noise channels where the maximally mixed state is a fixed point. Such noise channels encompass many noise models in quantum information, including depolarizing noise, Pauli channels, and dephasing noise.

First, we show that PRDMs with $m = O(\log n)$ are not robust to unital noise channels. In particular, any PRDM with non-negligible purity $\text{tr}(\rho^2)$ cannot be noise robust. Then, we show that PRDMs with $m = \omega(\log n)$ are robust to unital noise.

Lemma H.1. *PRDMs with non-negligible purity $\text{tr}(\rho^2) = \Omega(n^{-c})$ with $c > 0$ are not noise robust to unital channels. This includes all PRDMs with $m = O(\log n)$.*

Proof. We use the global depolarisation channel as example of a unital noise model

$$\Lambda_p(\rho) = (1-p)\rho + \frac{p}{2^n}I. \quad (\text{H1})$$

Now, it is easy to see that the expected purity of the globally depolarised state is:

$$\text{tr}(\Lambda_p(\rho)^2) = (1-p)^2 \text{tr}\rho^2 + \text{negl}(n). \quad (\text{H2})$$

Now, for noise probability $p = \Omega(n^{-c})$, we can compare the purity of ensembles $\eta_{n,m}$ and the ensemble $\mathcal{E}_{n,m}$ of globally depolarised $\eta_{n,m}$ states using SWAP test [42, 88, 89] to get,

$$\left| \mathbb{E}_{\rho \leftarrow \eta_{n,m}} \left[\Pr_{\text{SWAP}}(\rho) \right] - \mathbb{E}_{\rho \leftarrow \mathcal{E}_{n,m}} \left[\Pr_{\text{SWAP}}(\Lambda_p(\rho_k)) \right] \right| = \left| (p - p^2/2) \mathbb{E}_{\rho \leftarrow \eta_{n,m}} [\text{tr}\rho^2] \right| = \Omega(n^{-c} \mathbb{E}_{\rho \leftarrow \eta_{n,m}} [\text{tr}\rho^2]). \quad (\text{H3})$$

Thus, the SWAP test only fails to distinguish ensembles $\mathcal{E}_{n,m}$ and $\eta_{n,m}$ efficiently iff $\mathbb{E}_{\rho \leftarrow \eta_{n,m}} [\text{tr}\rho^2] = \text{negl}(n)$. Thus negligible expected purity is a necessary condition for PRDMs to be noise-robust. For PRDMs, it is easy to see that $\text{tr}(\rho_k^2) \geq 2^{-m}$. Thus, for $m = O(\log n)$ PRDMs have non-negligible purity, and thus are not robust to noise. \square

Next, we show that PRDMs with $m = \omega(\log n)$ are robust to unital noise:

Theorem H.1 (PRDMs are robust to unital noise). *PRDMs with $m = \omega(\log n)$ are robust under efficiently implementable unital noise channels, i.e. channels where the identity is the fixed point $\Gamma(I) = I$. In particular, if $\{\rho_k\}_k$ is PRDM, then $\{\Gamma(\rho_k)\}_k$ is also PRDM.*

Proof. PRDMs are indistinguishable from the maximally mixed state for any efficient algorithm for $m = \omega(\log n)$

$$\left| \Pr_{k \leftarrow \mathcal{K}}[\mathcal{A}(\rho_k^{\otimes t}) = 1] - \Pr[\mathcal{A}((I_n/2^n)^{\otimes t}) = 1] \right| = \text{negl}(n). \quad (\text{H4})$$

In particular, let us define the efficient algorithm $\mathcal{A}(\Gamma(\rho))$ to which the indistinguishability must also apply. Now, we use \mathcal{A} and apply the the fixed point condition $\Gamma(I) = I$ for the maximally mixed state

$$\left| \Pr_{k \leftarrow \mathcal{K}}[\mathcal{A}(\Gamma(\rho_k)^{\otimes t}) = 1] - \Pr[\mathcal{A}((I_n/2^n)^{\otimes t}) = 1] \right| = \text{negl}(n), \quad (\text{H5})$$

which is also indistinguishable. \square

Appendix I: PRDM are robust against Kretschmer's PostBQP attack

Ref. [7] showed that PRS and Haar random states can be distinguished using classical shadows, where the algorithm requires a PostBQP oracle and post-selection. The idea of the attack is to use classical shadows to check whether the given state has high overlap with keyed states ρ_k from the PRDM. We now show that this attack does not work for PRDMs with $m = \omega(\log n)$:

Theorem I.1. *[Security of PRDMs against Kretschmer's attack] To distinguish PRDM ρ_k with $m = \omega(\log n)$ from the GHSE using observable $O_k = \rho_k$ as shown in Ref. [7] requires super-polynomially many copies.*

Proof. The attack computes overlaps $\text{tr}(\rho_k O_i)$ where observable $O_i = \rho_i$ is a state from the PRDM. For $\omega(\log n)$, we have $\text{tr}(\rho_k \rho_i) = \text{negl}(n)$ for any i , including the correct state $i = k$. This is because ρ_k has negligible purity, i.e. $\text{tr}(\rho_k^2) = \text{negl}(n)$. Thus to measure the overlap, the additive precision required will be $\epsilon = \text{negl}(n)$. Now, classical shadows [90] have a lower bound on sample complexity $T = \Omega(n \log(M)^2 / \epsilon^2)$ [91] where M is the number of observables to be measured. As $\epsilon = \text{negl}(n)$, we get the number of samples as $T = \Omega(1/\text{negl}(n))$. \square

Appendix J: Pseudomagic

Here, we explicitly construct a PRDM ensemble which we call the pseudomagic ensemble: This pseudomagic ensemble consists of two ensembles with different log-free robustness of magic $\text{LR}(\rho)$. In particular, the first ensemble has high magic, while the second ensemble has zero magic. The gap in terms of magic between the two ensembles is maximal $f(n) = \Theta(n)$ vs $g(n) = 0$. First, we define pseudomagic state ensemble:

Definition J.1 (Pseudomagic). *A pseudomagic state ensemble with gap $f(n)$ vs. $g(n)$ consists of two ensembles of n -qubit states ρ_k and σ_k , indexed by a secret key $k \in \mathcal{K}$, $k \in \{0, 1\}^{\text{poly}(n)}$ with the following properties:*

1. *Efficient Preparation: Given k , ρ_k (or σ_k , respectively) is efficiently preparable by a uniform, poly-sized quantum circuit.*
2. *Pseudomagic: With probability $\geq 1 - \frac{1}{\text{poly}(n)}$ over the choice of k , the log-free robustness of magic $\text{LR}(\rho) = \log(\min |c_\phi| \text{ s.t. } \rho = \sum_{\phi \in \text{STAB}} c_\phi \phi)$ for ρ_k (or σ_k , respectively) is $\Theta(f(n))$ (or $\Theta(g(n))$, respectively).*
3. *Indistinguishability: For any polynomial $p(n)$, no poly-time quantum algorithm can distinguish between the ensembles of $\text{poly}(n)$ copies with more than negligible probability. That is, for any poly-time quantum algorithm A , we have that*

$$\left| \Pr_{k \leftarrow \mathcal{K}}[A(\rho_k^{\otimes \text{poly}(n)}) = 1] - \Pr_{k \leftarrow \mathcal{K}}[A(\sigma_k^{\otimes \text{poly}(n)}) = 1] \right| = \text{negl}(n).$$

Theorem J.1 (Maximal pseudomagic). *There are pseudomagic state ensembles with pseudomagic gap $f(n) = \Theta(n)$ vs $g(n) = 0$.*

Proof. Our second ensemble is the maximally mixed state $\{I_n/2^n\}$ with zero magic LR = $g(n) = 0$. We note that the maximally mixed state can be efficiently prepared via n Bell pairs $|\Phi\rangle = [\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|00\rangle + |11\rangle)]^{\otimes n}$, and tracing out the last qubit of each Bell pair, i.e. $I_n/2^n = \text{tr}_n(|\Phi\rangle\langle\Phi|)$.

As our first ensemble, we construct the PRDMs $\chi_{n,m} = \{\text{tr}_m(|\psi_k\rangle\langle\psi_k|)\}_{k \leftarrow \mathcal{K}}$ with $m = \text{polylog}(n)$ which we define as $\chi_n \equiv \chi_{n, \text{polylog}(n)}$. Here, we have the $n + m$ qubit PRS construction via the binary phase state $|\psi_k\rangle = 2^{-(n+m)/2} \sum_x (-1)^{f_k(x)} |x\rangle$ with pseudorandom function $f_k(x) : \{0, 1\}^{n+m} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ by Ref. [1, 10, 45, 46]. Now, we need to compute the magic of this PRDM.

We can use the same formalism as for computing the log-free robustness for the GHSE, i.e. Eq. (E13). Further, we now use the stabilizer Rényi entropy instead of the stabilizer fidelity. In particular, we have [22]

$$F_{\text{STAB}}(|\psi\rangle) \leq 2^{-\frac{1}{4}M_2(|\psi\rangle)}, \quad (\text{J1})$$

where we have the 2-Rényi stabilizer entropy [92]

$$M_2(|\psi\rangle) = -\log \left(2^{-n} \sum_{P \in \mathcal{P}_{n+m}} \langle \psi | P | \psi \rangle^4 \right) \quad (\text{J2})$$

where \mathcal{P}_{n+m} is the set of unsigned tensor products of Pauli operators with $|\mathcal{P}_n| = 4^{n+m}$. Thus, we can write

$$\text{LR}(\text{tr}_m(|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|)) \geq -\log(F_{\text{STAB}}(|\psi\rangle)) - 2m \geq \frac{1}{4}M_2(|\psi\rangle) - 2m. \quad (\text{J3})$$

For the 2-Rényi stabilizer entropy, a lower bound was found for the binary phase state in Ref. [12]. In particular, when the pseudorandom function is sampled randomly from the ensemble of 8-wise independent pseudorandom functions, we have $M_2(|\psi_k\rangle) = \Theta(n + m)$ overwhelming probability [12]. Thus, the average log-free robustness of magic for the PRDM is given by

$$\mathbb{E}_k[\text{tr}_m(|\psi_k\rangle\langle\psi_k|)] = \Theta(n) - 2m. \quad (\text{J4})$$

In particular, for $m = \text{polylog}(n)$ we have

$$\mathbb{E}_k[\text{tr}_m(|\psi_k\rangle\langle\psi_k|)] = f(n) = \Theta(n). \quad (\text{J5})$$

□

Appendix K: Pseudocoherence

Here we explicitly construct a special PRDM ensemble which we call the pseudocoherence ensemble: This pseudocoherence ensemble consists of two ensembles with different relative entropy of coherence $C(\rho)$. In particular, the first ensemble has high coherence, while the second ensemble has zero coherence. The gap in terms of coherence between the two ensembles is maximal $f(n) = \Theta(n)$ vs $g(n) = 0$. First, we define pseudocoherent state ensemble:

Definition K.1 (Pseudocoherent State Ensemble). *A pseudocoherent state ensemble with gap $f(n)$ vs. $g(n)$ consists of two ensembles of n -qubit states ρ_k and σ_k , indexed by a secret key $k \in \mathcal{K}$, $k \in \{0, 1\}^{\text{poly}(n)}$ with the following properties:*

1. *Efficient Preparation: Given k , ρ_k (or σ_k , respectively) is efficiently preparable by a uniform, poly-sized quantum circuit.*
2. *Pseudocoherence: With probability $\geq 1 - \frac{1}{\text{poly}(n)}$ over the choice of k , the relative entropy of coherence of ρ_k (or σ_k , respectively) is $\Theta(f(n))$ (or $\Theta(g(n))$, respectively).*
3. *Indistinguishability: For any polynomial $p(n)$, no poly-time quantum algorithm can distinguish between the ensembles of $\text{poly}(n)$ copies with more than negligible probability. That is, for any poly-time quantum algorithm \mathcal{A} , we have that*

$$\left| \Pr_{k \leftarrow \mathcal{K}}[A(\rho_k^{\otimes \text{poly}(n)}) = 1] - \Pr_{k \leftarrow \mathcal{K}}[A(\sigma_k^{\otimes \text{poly}(n)}) = 1] \right| = \text{negl}(n).$$

Theorem K.1 (Maximal pseudocoherence). *There exists pseudocoherent state ensembles with pseudocoherence gap $f(n) = \Theta(n)$ vs $g(n) = 0$.*

Proof. The second ensemble is simply the maximally mixed state $I_n/2^n$. The maximally mixed state has coherence $C(I_n/2^n) = g(n) = 0$.

We construct the first ensemble as $\chi_{n,m} = \{\text{tr}_m(|\psi_k\rangle)\}_{k \in \mathcal{K}}$ where we choose $m = \text{polylog}(n)$ and define $\chi \equiv \chi_{n,\text{polylog}(n)}$. Here, \mathcal{K} is the key space, $|\psi_k\rangle = 2^{-(n+m)/2} \sum_x (-1)^{f_k(x)} |x\rangle$ the $n+m$ qubit binary phase state with pseudorandom function $f_k(x) : \{0,1\}^{n+m} \rightarrow \{0,1\}$. The PRDM can be efficiently constructed using the PRS construction of Ref. [45].

The coherence of $\chi_{n,m}$ is straightforward to compute. In particular,

$$\mathbb{E}_k[C(\text{tr}_m(|\psi_k\rangle))] = \mathbb{E}_k[S(\Delta[\text{tr}_m(|\psi_k\rangle))] - \mathbb{E}_k[S(\text{tr}_m(|\psi_k\rangle))] \geq n - m. \quad (\text{K1})$$

The last term can be upper bounded as $\mathbb{E}_k[S(\text{tr}_m(|\psi_k\rangle))] \leq m$ due to it being at most rank m as shown in Eq. (F4). The first term in Eq. (K1) can be directly computed. It is easy to see that $S(\Delta[|\psi_k\rangle]) = n+m$ as $\Delta[|\psi_k\rangle] = I_{n+m}/2^{n+m}$. Thus, we have $S(\text{tr}_m(\Delta[|\psi_k\rangle])) = n$. Next, we note that one can interchange partial trace and diagonal operator $\Delta[\rho]$

$$\text{tr}_m(\Delta[\rho]) = \Delta[\text{tr}_m(\rho)]. \quad (\text{K2})$$

We have

$$\Delta[\text{tr}_m(\rho)] = \sum_j |j\rangle\langle j| \left(\sum_\ell \langle \ell | \rho | \ell \rangle \right) |j\rangle\langle j| \quad (\text{K3})$$

and

$$\text{tr}_m(\Delta[\rho]) = \sum_\ell \langle \ell | \left(\sum_{ij} |ij\rangle\langle ij| \rho |ij\rangle\langle ij| \right) | \ell \rangle \quad (\text{K4})$$

where ℓ and i is the summation over the m qubits, while j the summation over the n qubits.

Now, one can easily show

$$\text{tr}_m(\Delta[\rho]) = \sum_\ell \langle \ell | \left(\sum_{ij} |ij\rangle\langle ij| \rho |ij\rangle\langle ij| \right) | \ell \rangle = \sum_\ell \left(\sum_{ij} \delta_{\ell i} |j\rangle\langle ij| \rho |ij\rangle\langle j| \delta_{\ell i} \right) = \quad (\text{K5})$$

$$\sum_\ell \left(\sum_j |j\rangle\langle \ell j| \rho | \ell j\rangle\langle j| \right) = \sum_j |j\rangle\langle j| \left(\sum_\ell \langle \ell | \rho | \ell \rangle \right) |j\rangle\langle j| = \text{tr}_m(\Delta[\rho]). \quad (\text{K6})$$

With this result and $\Delta[|\psi_k\rangle] = I_{n+m}/2^{n+m}$ we immediately get

$$S(\Delta[\text{tr}_m(|\psi_k\rangle)]) = n. \quad (\text{K7})$$

Now, finally we choose $m = \text{polylog}(n)$ to get

$$\mathbb{E}_k[C(\text{tr}_m(|\psi_k\rangle))] = f(n) = \Theta(n). \quad (\text{K8})$$

□

Appendix L: Noise-robust EFI pairs

Here, we show that PRDMs can be used to construct EFI pairs. An EFI pair is a pair of efficient quantum algorithms which prepare states that are statistically far but computationally indistinguishable:

Definition L.1 (EFI pairs [23]). *We call $\nu = (\nu_{b,\kappa})$ a pair of EFI states if it satisfies the following criteria:*

1. Efficient generation: *There exists efficient quantum algorithm \mathcal{G} that on input $(1^\kappa, b)$ for some integer security parameter κ and $b \in \{0,1\}$, outputs the mixed state $\nu_{b,\kappa}$.*
2. Statistically distinguishable: $\|\nu_{0,\kappa} - \nu_{1,\kappa}\|_1 = \Omega(1/\text{poly}(\kappa))$.
3. Computational indistinguishability: $(\nu_{0,\kappa})_\kappa$ is computationally indistinguishable to $(\nu_{1,\kappa})_\kappa$.

1. EFI pairs from PRDM

We now show that PRDM and maximally mixed states form EFI pairs for a security parameter κ that scales linearly in n :

Theorem L.1 (EFI pairs with PRDM). *PRDMs constructed by tracing out $\omega(\log n) < m < \frac{n}{2}(1-c) - \frac{1}{2}$ qubits from an $n+m$ qubit PRS with security parameter $\kappa = cn$ and constant $0 < c < 1$, and the maximally mixed state $I_n/2^n$ form EFI pairs.*

Proof. We choose ν_0 to be a PRDM, and ν_1 the maximally mixed state. Here, we note that the distinguishing algorithm (both for the statistical and computational case) only knows the integer security parameter κ , however does not know the specific key $k \in \{0,1\}^\kappa$. Thus, the distinguisher only sees the ensemble average over all keys k . The corresponding ensemble density matrix for the distinguisher is given by $\nu_1 = I_n/2^n$, and $\nu_0 = 2^{-\kappa} \sum_{k \in \{0,1\}^\kappa} \rho_k$ with $\rho_k \in \zeta_{n,m}$, where we have the PRDM construction $\zeta_{n,m} = \{\text{tr}_m(|\psi_k\rangle\langle\psi_k|)\}_{k \in \{0,1\}^\kappa}$ from PRS $|\psi_k\rangle$.

Efficient generation and computationally indistinguishability has already been shown in the main text, which gives us the lower bound $m = \omega(\log n)$.

Now, statistical distinguishability follows from the Fannes-Audenaert inequality [49]:

$$|S(\nu_1) - S(\nu_0)| \leq T \log(2^n - 1) + H(\{T, 1 - T\}), \quad (\text{L1})$$

where $S(\rho)$ is the von Neumann entropy of ρ ,

$$T = \text{TD}(\nu_1, \nu_0) = \frac{1}{2} \|\nu_1 - \nu_0\|_1 \quad (\text{L2})$$

is the trace distance between ν_1 and ν_0 , and $H(\{T, 1 - T\})$ is the binary entropy of the probability distribution $\{T, 1 - T\}$. Since $S(\nu_1) = n$ and $H(\{T, 1 - T\}) \leq 1$, rearranging Eq. (L1) yields

$$T \geq 1 - \frac{S(\nu_0) + 1}{n}. \quad (\text{L3})$$

To achieve distinguishability we have to achieve a lower bound of $T \geq 1/\text{poly}(n)$. Now, we show how to choose $S(\nu_0)$ and m to achieve this.

Now, let us compute $S(\nu_0)$. Remember we have $\nu_0 = 2^{-\kappa} \sum_{k \in \{0,1\}^\kappa} \text{tr}_m(|\psi_k\rangle\langle\psi_k|)$ with PRS $|\psi_k\rangle$. First, we bound the von-Neumann entropy of each state of the ensemble

$$S(\text{tr}_m(|\psi_k\rangle\langle\psi_k|)) \leq m \quad (\text{L4})$$

due to the rank being maximally m after partial trace. Now, the ensemble average over the key space can increase the entropy by at most κ [48], and we finally get

$$S(\nu_0) \leq \kappa + S(\text{tr}_m(|\psi_k\rangle\langle\psi_k|)) \leq \kappa + m. \quad (\text{L5})$$

Inserting into Eq. (L3) we get

$$T \geq 1 - \frac{\kappa + m + 1}{n}. \quad (\text{L6})$$

Let us now assume a security parameter scaling as $\kappa = O(m+n)$. Then, we make the ansatz $\kappa = c(n+m)$ with some constant $0 < c < 1$ [48]

$$T \geq 1 - \frac{cn + m(c+1) + 1}{n}. \quad (\text{L7})$$

We now demand $T \geq 1/\text{poly}(n)$, which is fulfilled when

$$1 - \frac{cn + m(c+1) + 1}{n} \geq 1/\text{poly}(n), \quad (\text{L8})$$

which can be satisfied for

$$m < \frac{n}{2}(1-c) - \frac{1}{2}. \quad (\text{L9})$$

□

For general PRDMs we require $m = \omega(\log n)$ and $m < \frac{n}{2}(1 - c) - \frac{1}{2}$. However, the upper bound comes from the upper bound of the entropy of PRDM states due to the partial trace over m qubits. However, there are PRDM constructions with much lower entropy and thus wider upper bounds in terms of m . In particular, particular, we show how to achieve scaling $m < an$, with arbitrary constant $a > 0$ by using PRDM construction via the PRS proposed for pseudoentanglement [10]. In Ref. [10], a PRS with 1D pseudo-area law was given, which has entanglement entropy of only $\text{polylog}(n + m)$ across every bipartition:

Fact L.1 (EFI pair with pseudoentanglement). *PRDMs constructed by tracing out m qubits from the $(n + m)$ -qubit PRS with 1D pseudo-area law entanglement entropy $\text{polylog}(n + m)$ across every bipartite cut, and the maximally mixed state $I_n/2^n$ form an EFI pair for $m = \frac{1-c}{c}n - \text{polylog}(n)$, security parameter $\kappa = cn$ and constant $0 < c < 1$.*

Proof. It is known that pseudoentangled PRS can be constructed from $n + m$ -qubit binary phase PRS. They are guaranteed to have $S(\text{tr}_m(|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|)) = \Theta(\text{polylog}(n + m))$ entanglement across every bipartition, as measured by the von Neumann entropy [10]. This gives us now a lower bound on $S(\nu_0)$ than in general case, where we have according to Eq. (L5)

$$S(\nu_0) \leq \kappa + S(\text{tr}_m(|\psi_k\rangle\langle\psi_k|)) \leq \kappa + \text{polylog}(n + m). \quad (\text{L10})$$

Inserting into Eq. (L3) we get

$$T \geq 1 - \frac{\kappa + \text{polylog}(n + m) + 1}{n}. \quad (\text{L11})$$

We again make the ansatz $\kappa = c(n + m)$ for the security parameter with constant $0 < c < 1$

$$T \geq 1 - \frac{cn + mc + \text{polylog}(n + m) + 1}{n}. \quad (\text{L12})$$

We now demand $T \geq 1/\text{poly}(n)$, which is fulfilled when

$$1 - \frac{cn + mc + \text{polylog}(n + m) + 1}{n} > 1/\text{poly}(n). \quad (\text{L13})$$

This is satisfied when

$$m < \frac{1 - c}{c}n - \text{polylog}(n). \quad (\text{L14})$$

Thus, by choosing c arbitrarily close to 0, i.e. $c \rightarrow 0$, one can have m scale linear in n with arbitrary prefactor. \square

2. Proof of noise-robustness

We can also show that EFI pairs constructed from PRDMs and maximally mixed state are noise-robust. To this end, let us consider a general mixed unitary noise channel

$$\Phi(\rho) = \sum_{i=1}^r p_i U_i \rho U_i^\dagger, \quad (\text{L15})$$

where p_i are probabilities that sum to unity, U_i are unitary operators and r is the mixed-unitary rank of the channel Φ .

Theorem L.2 (Noise-robust EFI pairs). *PRDMs constructed by tracing out $m = \omega(\log n)$ qubits from $(n + m)$ qubit PRS with security parameter $\kappa = cn$ with $0 < c < 1$, and the maximally mixed state $I_n/2^n$ remain EFI pairs under application of efficient mixed unitary channel $\Phi(\rho) = \sum_{i=1}^r p_i U_i \rho U_i^\dagger$ whenever the Shannon entropy of its probabilities is bounded as*

$$H(\{p_i\}_i) \leq n(1 - c) - m - 2. \quad (\text{L16})$$

Proof. First, we note that the maximally mixed state is invariant under mixed unitary noise channels as it is its fixed point, i.e. $\Phi(\nu_0) = \nu_0$. Next, we consider the PRDM under noise. First, we note that PRDMs remain PRDMs after application of efficiently implementable unital channels. Now, we need to show that the PRDM remains statistically far. Denoting $\nu'_0 = \Phi(\nu_0)$, we can bound the von Neumann entropy of the noisy state ν'_0 by

$$S(\nu'_0) = S\left(\sum_{i=1}^r p_i U_i \nu_0 U_i^\dagger\right) \leq \sum_{i=1}^r p_i S(U_i \nu_0 U_i^\dagger) + H(\{p_i\}_i) = S(\nu_0) + H(\{p_i\}_i), \quad (\text{L17})$$

where $H(\{p_i\}_i)$ is the Shannon entropy for the probability distribution $\{p_i\}_i$. The analogous equation to Eq. (L3) for the new trace distance $T' = \text{TD}(\nu'_0, \nu_1)$ is

$$T' \geq 1 - \frac{S(\nu_0) + H(\{p_i\}_i) + 1}{n}. \quad (\text{L18})$$

Noise robustness is achieved when $T' = \Omega(1/\text{poly}(n))$. Thus, it is sufficient to have

$$S(\nu_0) + H(\{p_i\}_i) \leq n - 1 - \frac{1}{\text{poly}(n)}. \quad (\text{L19})$$

This sets a bound on the probability distribution for the Kraus operators,

$$H(\{p_i\}_i) \leq n - S(\nu_0) - 1 - \frac{1}{\text{poly}(n)}. \quad (\text{L20})$$

Since $S(\nu_0) \leq m + \kappa$ and we consider $m < n - 1$, the above condition can be achieved when

$$H(\{p_i\}_i) < n - m - \kappa - 2. \quad (\text{L21})$$

We now choose $\kappa = cn$ with $0 < c < 1$, where we find

$$H(\{p_i\}_i) < n(1 - c) - m - 2. \quad (\text{L22})$$

□

For $m = \text{polylog}(n)$, the bound on $H(\{p_i\}_i)$ is asymptotically linear with the number of qubits n .

A noise model highly relevant in physical systems and commonly used to model noise in near-term and quantum error correction models is the local depolarizing noise $\Lambda_p^{\otimes n}(\rho)^{\otimes n}$ acting on all n qubits. It consists of the local depolarizing channel $\Lambda_p(\rho) = p/4 \sum_{\alpha \in \{x,y,z\}} \sigma^\alpha \rho \sigma^\alpha + (1 - 3p/4)\rho$, Pauli operators σ^α with $\alpha \in \{x, y, z\}$, and the depolarizing probability p . This noise model has maximal rank of $H(\{p_i\}_i)$ with $r = 4^n$. Nonetheless, we show that EFI pairs remain robust against such noise even for relatively high constant noise rate p .

Corollary 10 (Noise-robust EFI pairs against local depolarizing noise). *PRDMs constructed by tracing out $m = \omega(\log n)$ qubits from $(n + m)$ qubit PRS with security parameter $\kappa = cn$ with $0 < c < 1$ remain EFI pairs after application of local depolarizing channel on all n qubits $\Lambda_p^{\otimes n}(\rho)$, when $H(\{1 - 3p/4, p/4, p/4, p/4\}) \leq (1 - c) - m/n - 2/n$. In particular, when $m = \text{polylog}(n)$ and $c = 10^{-4}$, we have $p < \frac{1}{4} - O(\text{polylog}(n)/n)$.*

Proof. Since the local depolarizing channel acts independently on the n qubits, the Shannon entropy of the probability distribution in Eq. (L15) is

$$H(\{p_i\}_{i=1}^{4^n}) = nH(\{1 - 3p/4, p/4, p/4, p/4\}). \quad (\text{L23})$$

Using Theorem L.2, noise robustness is guaranteed when

$$H(\{1 - 3p/4, p/4, p/4, p/4\}) \leq (1 - c) - \frac{m - 2}{n}. \quad (\text{L24})$$

Now, we choose $m = \text{polylog}(n)$ and choose a security parameter $\kappa = cn$ that scales linearly in n , but with constant c . If we choose arbitrarily small $c \rightarrow 0$, we find that noise-robustness is fulfilled for any $p < 0.252 - O(\text{polylog}(n)/n)$. Choosing $c = 10^{-4}$, we have $p < 0.25 - O(\text{polylog}(n)/n)$, while for $c = 1/12$ we have $p < 0.22 - O(\text{polylog}(n)/n)$.

□

Appendix M: PRS without quantum memory

We define the notion of memoryless PRS which are indistinguishable to Haar random states for any efficient algorithm without access to quantum memory. In particular, the observer has access to polynomial many copies of the state, however can only perform efficient measurements on one copy at a time, where the measurements can be chosen adaptively on previous measurements outcomes.

We note that the previously introduced single-copy PRS is a special case of PRS without access to quantum memory [48, 71]. Single-copy PRS is indistinguishable for any observer with access to only a single copy of the state. Any PRS without quantum memory is a single-copy PRS, while there are single-copy PRS which are not PRS without quantum memory. A simple example is the ensemble of all computational basis states $\{|j\rangle\}_{j=1}^{2^n}$: It is a single-copy PRS as it is indistinguishable from Haar random states for a single copy, but not a PRS without quantum memory as one can distinguish it from multiple copies of Haar random states by testing the coherence, which does not require quantum memory [11].

First, let us define algorithms without quantum memory:

Definition M.1 (Learning without quantum memory [70]). *An algorithm \mathcal{W} without quantum memory obtains classical data from an oracle that prepares ρ by performing arbitrary POVM measurements on ρ . For each access to the oracle, \mathcal{W} can select a POVM $\{F_s\}_s$ that can depend on previous outcomes, and obtain the classical outcome s with probability $\text{tr}(F_s\rho)$. After T oracle accesses, \mathcal{W} predicts the properties of ρ .*

As we will see, memoryless PRS are robust to noise for algorithms without quantum memory:

Definition M.2 (Memoryless PRS). *Let λ be the polynomial sized security parameter and \mathcal{K} be the key space respectively dependent on the security parameter. Then, a keyed family of pure quantum states $\{|\phi_k\rangle\}_{k\leftarrow\mathcal{K}}$ is called memoryless PRS, which is secure to algorithms \mathcal{W} without quantum memory if:*

1. *Efficient Generation: There exist an efficient quantum algorithm S such that $S(k, 1^\lambda) = |\phi_k\rangle$.*
2. *Computational Indistinguishability without quantum memory: For a random key $k \in K$, given $t = \text{poly}(\lambda)$ copies of $|\phi_k\rangle$ are computationally indistinguishable from t copies of Haar random states for any quantum polynomial time algorithm \mathcal{W} with no quantum memory:*

$$\left| \Pr_{k\leftarrow K} [D(|\phi_k\rangle^{\otimes m}) = 1] - \Pr_{|\psi\rangle\leftarrow\eta_H} [D(|\psi\rangle^{\otimes m}) = 1] \right| = \text{negl}(\lambda) \quad (\text{M1})$$

Any PRS is also a memoryless PRS, making memoryless PRS a weaker notion of pseudorandomness than PRS.

We describe the computational model of the memoryless adversary to be such that the adversary has black-box access to oracles that either prepare PRS or Haar random state. The main idea is to use the tree method [70] to perform many vs one distinguishability task by comparing the probability distributions over the leaf nodes. We will denote $p^\rho(l)$ as the probability of getting to leaf l when the given state is ρ . For the given many vs one distinguishability task, we are then interested in the comparison of the expectation of this probability of the ensemble and the given state. Note that the POVM measurements that we are going to consider will be Rank-1 POVM measurements which with post-processing are equivalent to general POVM for the case when we are not interested in post-measurement quantum state as shown in [70]. Formally, we put it below.

Definition M.3 (Tree method for learning without quantum memory [70]). *The tree method consists of a rooted tree \mathcal{T} with the following features:*

1. *At every depth of tree, the learner chooses a positive operator valued measurement (POVM) $\{2^n c_s^u |\psi_s^u\rangle\langle\psi_s^u|\}_s$ where u represents the depth of tree to measure the given copy and record its output in the classical memory.*
2. *Each node in the tree represents the state of classical memory and is assigned a probability which represents the probability of reaching that node from the root by successive adaptive POVM measurements. As an example, for a child node v of w connected through an edge corresponding to POVM element $2^n c_s^u |\psi_s^u\rangle\langle\psi_s^u|$*

$$p(v) = p(w) 2^n c_s^u \text{tr}[\rho |\psi_s^u\rangle\langle\psi_s^u|] \quad (\text{M2})$$

where $p(v)$ and $p(w)$ are probabilities associated with nodes v and w respectively.

Note that, by definition, the root node will have probability $p^\rho(r) = 1$, and the probability distribution on leaf nodes is given by $\{p^\rho(l)\}_l$ which operationally represents the state of probability distribution over the state of classical

memory. Now, we use this distribution over states of classical memory to compare the given ensembles. It is easy to see that the expected probability of reaching a leaf node l on a given ensemble ρ_H is given as the product of probabilities of nodes that are in the path from the root to the leaf l i.e.

$$p^{\rho_H}(l) = \mathbb{E}_{\rho_H} \prod_{t=1}^T 2^n c_{s_t}^{u_t} \text{tr}[\rho_H |\psi_{s_t}^{u_t}\rangle\langle\psi_{s_t}^{u_t}|] \quad (\text{M3})$$

where the path from root to leaf l is given by nodes corresponding to POVM elements $\{2^n c_s^u |\psi_{s_t}^{u_t}\rangle\langle\psi_{s_t}^{u_t}|\}_{t=1}^T$ as T is depth of the tree.

Fact M.1 (Le Cam one sided bound [70]). *For learning without quantum memory described using a rooted tree \mathcal{T} , if for all leaves of the tree l ,*

$$\frac{\mathbb{E}_{\rho} p^{\rho}(l)}{p^{T/2^n}(l)} \geq 1 - \delta \quad (\text{M4})$$

then the probability of distinguishing the ensemble $\{\rho\}$ from the maximally mixed state is upper bounded by δ .

Fact M.2 ([70]). *For any collection of pure states $\{|\psi_i\rangle\}_i$, we have:*

$$\sum_{\pi \in S_T} \text{tr} \left[\pi \left(\otimes_{i=1}^T |\psi_i\rangle\langle\psi_i| \right) \right] \geq 1 \quad (\text{M5})$$

where S_T represents all permutation over T -copies.

Theorem M.1. *A memoryless adversary requires exponential copies to distinguish noisy Haar and maximally mixed state when noise is represented by a general unital CPTP map $\mathcal{E}[\rho] = \sum_i E_i \rho E_i^\dagger$.*

Proof. From Fact M.1, we need to look at the expression $\frac{\mathbb{E}_{\rho \leftarrow \mu_n} p^{\rho}(l)}{p^{T/2^n}(l)}$ for every l where μ_n represents Haar measure on n qubit pure states. Using Eq. (M3), we rewrite the expression as:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{\rho \leftarrow \mu_n} \left(\prod_{t=1}^T \frac{2^n c_t \langle \psi_{s_t}^{u_t} | \sum_i E_i \rho E_i^\dagger | \psi_{s_t}^{u_t} \rangle}{2^n c_t \langle \psi_{s_t}^{u_t} | \frac{I}{2^n} | \psi_{s_t}^{u_t} \rangle} \right) &= \mathbb{E}_{\rho \leftarrow \mu_n} \left(\prod_{t=1}^T 2^n \langle \psi_{s_t}^{u_t} | \sum_i E_i \rho E_i^\dagger | \psi_{s_t}^{u_t} \rangle \right) \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{\rho \leftarrow \mu_n} 2^{nT} \text{tr} \left[\left(\sum_i E_i \rho E_i^\dagger \right)^{\otimes T} \left(\otimes_{t=1}^T |\psi_{s_t}^{u_t}\rangle\langle\psi_{s_t}^{u_t}| \right) \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{M6})$$

Now, using the cyclic property of trace, $\text{tr}[\sum_i E_i \rho E_i^\dagger |\psi_{s_t}^{u_t}\rangle\langle\psi_{s_t}^{u_t}|] = \text{tr}[\rho \sum_i E_i^\dagger |\psi_{s_t}^{u_t}\rangle\langle\psi_{s_t}^{u_t}| E_i]$. Using this, we get:

$$\mathbb{E}_{\rho \leftarrow \mu_n} 2^{nT} \text{tr} \left[\left(\sum_i E_i \rho E_i^\dagger \right)^{\otimes T} \left(\otimes_{t=1}^T |\psi_{s_t}^{u_t}\rangle\langle\psi_{s_t}^{u_t}| \right) \right] = \mathbb{E}_{\rho \leftarrow \mu_n} 2^{nT} \text{tr} \left[\left(\rho \right)^{\otimes T} \left(\otimes_{t=1}^T \sum_i E_i^\dagger |\psi_{s_t}^{u_t}\rangle\langle\psi_{s_t}^{u_t}| E_i \right) \right]. \quad (\text{M7})$$

Since the CPTP map \mathcal{E} is unital thus we can define the new map $\mathcal{F}[\rho] = \sum_j E_j^\dagger \rho E_j$ which will also be CPTP. Using this fact, we can write $\sum_i E_i^\dagger |\psi_{s_t}^{u_t}\rangle\langle\psi_{s_t}^{u_t}| E_i = \sum_j p_{j_t} |\psi_{j_t}^t\rangle\langle\psi_{j_t}^t|$ for every t where $\{|\psi_{j_t}^t\rangle\}_{j_t}$ are some pure states and $\sum_{j_t} p_{j_t} = 1$. Then we can write:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{\rho \leftarrow \mu_n} 2^{nT} \text{tr} \left[\left(\rho \right)^{\otimes T} \left(\otimes_{t=1}^T \sum_i E_i^\dagger |\psi_{s_t}^{u_t}\rangle\langle\psi_{s_t}^{u_t}| E_i \right) \right] &= \mathbb{E}_{\rho \leftarrow \mu_n} 2^{nT} \text{tr} \left[\left(\rho \right)^{\otimes T} \left(\otimes_{t=1}^T \sum_{j_t} p_{j_t}^t |\psi_{j_t}^t\rangle\langle\psi_{j_t}^t| \right) \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{\rho \leftarrow \mu_n} 2^{nT} \sum_{j_1, j_2, \dots, j_T} p_{j_1} p_{j_2} \dots p_{j_T} \text{tr} \left[\left(\rho \right)^{\otimes T} \left(\otimes_{t=1}^T |\psi_{j_t}^t\rangle\langle\psi_{j_t}^t| \right) \right] \\ &= 2^{nT} \sum_{j_1, j_2, \dots, j_T} p_{j_1} p_{j_2} \dots p_{j_T} \binom{2^n + T - 1}{T} \frac{1}{T!} \sum_{\pi \in S_T} \text{tr} \left[\pi \left(\otimes_{t=1}^T |\psi_{j_t}^t\rangle\langle\psi_{j_t}^t| \right) \right], \end{aligned} \quad (\text{M8})$$

where in the last equality, we used the fact that $\mathbb{E}_{\rho \leftarrow \mu_n} \rho^{\otimes T} = \binom{2^n + T - 1}{T} \frac{1}{T!} \sum_{\pi \in S_T} \pi$ where $\pi = \sum_{\bar{x}} |\pi(\bar{x})\rangle\langle \bar{x}|$. Now, using Fact M.2, we have:

$$\begin{aligned}
2^{nT} \sum_{j_1, j_2, \dots, j_t} p_{j_1} p_{j_2} \dots p_{j_T} \binom{2^n + T - 1}{T} \frac{1}{T!} \sum_{\pi \in S_T} \text{tr} \left[\pi \left(\otimes_{t=1}^T |\psi_{j_t}^t\rangle\langle \psi_{j_t}^t| \right) \right] \\
\geq 2^{nT} \binom{2^n + T - 1}{T} \frac{1}{T!} \prod_{t=1}^T \left(\sum_{j_t} p_{j_t} \right) \\
= \frac{2^{nT}}{(2^n) \dots (2^n + T - 1)} \\
\geq \left(1 - \frac{T}{2^n} \right)^T.
\end{aligned} \tag{M9}$$

Assume that $\frac{T^2}{2^n} = \text{negl}(n)$ which also covers the case when $T = \text{poly}(n)$. In this case, we have:

$$\mathbb{E}_{\rho \leftarrow \eta_H} \left(\prod_{t=1}^T \frac{2^n c_t \langle \psi_{s_t}^{u_t} | \sum_i E_i \rho E_i^\dagger | \psi_{s_t}^{u_t} \rangle}{2^n c_t \langle \psi_{s_t}^{u_t} | \frac{I}{2^n} | \psi_{s_t}^{u_t} \rangle} \right) \geq \left(1 - \frac{T^2}{2^n} \right) = 1 - \text{negl}(n) \tag{M10}$$

where we use binomial approximation to obtain the first inequality. Then, using this, we have the probability to distinguish noisy Haar and maximally mixed state according to Le Cam one point method is:

$$\delta \leq 1 - \mathbb{E}_{\rho \leftarrow \eta_H} \left(\prod_{t=1}^T \frac{2^n c_t \langle \psi_{s_t}^{u_t} | \sum_i E_i \rho E_i^\dagger | \psi_{s_t}^{u_t} \rangle}{2^n c_t \langle \psi_{s_t}^{u_t} | \frac{I}{2^n} | \psi_{s_t}^{u_t} \rangle} \right) = \text{negl}(n). \tag{M11}$$

But to efficiently distinguish the given ensembles, we require $\delta \geq 1/2 + \Omega(n^{-c})$, which is not possible for the case when $T^2/2^n = \text{negl}(n)$. Thus, $T = \Omega(2^{n/2})$. \square

Fact M.3 (Maximally mixed state and Haar random state are indistinguishable without quantum memory [70]). *In the absence of quantum memory, any learning algorithm requires $T = \Omega(2^{n/2})$ samples to distinguish whether it is sampled from Haar ensemble or singleton maximally mixed state.*

Theorem M.2. *An adversary without quantum memory cannot efficiently distinguish between PRS affected by arbitrary unital noise channels, and Haar random states.*

Proof. Using theorem M.1, we get that noisy Haar random state ensemble is indistinguishable from maximally mixed state for a memoryless adversary. Now, using Fact M.3 and triangle inequality, we get that noisy Haar random states are statistically indistinguishable from noiseless Haar random states for memoryless adversary. Now, this translates to PRS, from the fact that noisy Haar random state ensemble is computationally indistinguishable from noisy PRS thus providing computational indistinguishability of noisy PRS and Haar random states. \square

The above lemma gives us other notion of noise-robust pseudorandomness. Note that, the above proof is information theoretic which implies computational indistinguishability, but we also provide a weaker version of the above theorem simply by computational indistinguishability arguments based on the fact that maximally mixed state is indistinguishable from Haar ensemble in the many vs one distinguishability task without quantum memory.

Theorem M.3 (Weaker version of theorem M.2). *Any adversary without quantum memory cannot efficiently distinguish between PRS affected by efficient unital noise channels Γ , and Haar random states.*

Proof. Let the PRS family be $\{|\phi_k\rangle\}_{k \in \mathcal{K}}$ and let the noise in PRS be given by the unital CPTP channel Γ . Then, we create 3 hybrids as follows:

1. **Hybrid 1:** t copies of $\Gamma(|\phi_k\rangle)$ with $k \leftarrow \mathcal{K}$ and provide adversary with one copy at a time.
2. **Hybrid 2:** t copies of $\Gamma(|\psi\rangle)$ with $|\psi\rangle \leftarrow \mu_n$ and provide adversary with one copy at a time.
3. **Hybrid 3:** t copies of maximally mixed state on n qubits: $\frac{I}{2^n}$ and provide adversary with one copy at a time.
4. **Hybrid 4:** t copies of Haar random state $|\psi\rangle \leftarrow \mu_n$ and provide adversary with one copy at a time.

Now computational indistinguishability of H_3 and H_4 follows from Fact M.3 as shown in [70]. To see the computational indistinguishability of H_2 and H_3 , we first assume that the hybrids are distinguishable and there is a quantum polynomial time distinguisher \mathcal{A} which given only $t = \text{poly}(n)$ copies of hybrids, can distinguish between them. Then we can design a new distinguisher \mathcal{A}' which first acts the efficient unital noise channel Γ and then use the distinguisher \mathcal{A} as subroutine to distinguish hybrids H_3 and H_4 in polynomial time with $t = \text{poly}(n)$ samples which contradicts with computational indistinguishability of hybrids H_3 and H_4 . Thus, hybrid H_2 and H_4 are also computationally indistinguishable. Finally computational indistinguishability of H_1 and H_2 follows from definition of PRS and from the fact that Γ is efficiently implementable. \square

Lemma M.1. *PRDMs are also memoryless PRS, but PRDMs is not the same as PRS.*

Proof. To prove that PRDM is also a memoryless PRS, it is easy to see that we can obtain n qubit PRDM from $n + m$ qubits Haar ensemble by partial trace on m qubits, and as partial trace is computationally efficient, we will have that n qubit PRDM is close to n qubit maximally mixed state. Then, by using transitivity of computational indistinguishability, it will also be computationally close to memoryless PRS. Furthermore, PRDM is not the same as PRS which can be seen by the fact that one can distinguish two copies of PRDM from two copies of PRS using the SWAP test. \square

Appendix N: PRS with noisy quantum memory

Similar to standard PRS, we can define PRS with noisy quantum memory. Firstly, we define the notion of noisy quantum memory as inspired from [51]. The authors in [51] considered the adversary's quantum memory with two registers: state loading register A with n qubits and workspace register B with $\text{poly}(n)$ qubits. Then, the adversary can query the state preparing oracle O and the noise channel acts on both state loading and memory register of adversary just after the query. Between any two queries, the adversary has access to noiseless operations and measurements. We allow the adversary to receive two copies of state from the oracle in one query. Then, an entangling noise D_q acts on the adversary's quantum memory. We mention that this allows us to look at more general noise, particularly entangling noise channels then just one copy noise channels.

Definition N.1 (Adversary with noisy quantum memory). *An adversary with noisy quantum memory has an initial state σ on $n' \geq 2n$ qubits and it can query the oracle O_i which prepares the state:*

$$O_i(\sigma) = \rho_i \otimes \rho_i \otimes \text{tr}_2 \sigma \quad (\text{N1})$$

where $\text{tr}_2 \sigma$ is partial trace on state loading register of state σ . Then, the noise channel D_q with noise probability q acts on all qubits of adversary just after querying the oracle and prepares the state:

$$D_q O_i(\sigma) = D_q(\rho_i \otimes \rho_i \otimes \text{tr}_2 \sigma). \quad (\text{N2})$$

We can now formally define pseudorandom states with noisy quantum memory as below.

Definition N.2 (PRS with noisy quantum memory). *Let λ be the security parameter and let \mathcal{H} and \mathcal{K} be the Hilbert space and key space respectively both dependent on the security parameter. Then, a keyed family of pure quantum states $\{|\phi_k\rangle\}_{k \leftarrow \mathcal{K}}$ is called a pseudorandom state family with noisy quantum memory if:*

1. *Efficient Generation: There exist an efficient quantum algorithm S such that $S(k, 1^\lambda) = |\phi_k\rangle$.*
2. *Computational Indistinguishability: For a random key $k \in \mathcal{K}$, given $t = \text{poly}(\lambda)$ copies of $|\phi_k\rangle$ are computationally indistinguishable from t copies of Haar random states for any quantum polynomial time algorithm B with noisy quantum memory as defined in Def. N.1:*

$$\left| \Pr_{k \leftarrow \mathcal{K}} [B(|\phi_k\rangle^{\otimes m}) = 1] - \Pr_{|\psi\rangle \leftarrow \eta_{\mathcal{H}}} [B(|\psi\rangle^{\otimes m}) = 1] \right| = \text{negl}(\lambda). \quad (\text{N3})$$

It is trivial to see that standard PRS is an example of PRS with noisy quantum memory when the noise probability is $O(\text{negl}(n))$. Thus, this notion of PRS is much more general. Now, we will see that even this does not help in noise robustness. Particularly, we show it using Holevo Helstrom bound [85] for distinguishability on two copies of PRS subject to noise. For simplicity, we assume only $2n$ qubit quantum memory for the adversary, but it can be readily generalized to any $n' \geq 2n$. We will denote the noise channel representing noise in the quantum memory using D_q and the noise channel representing noise in the PRS as $\Gamma(\rho)$ in following results.

Theorem N.1. *The probability of distinguishing a noisy PRS from noiseless PRS for a noisy quantum memory adversary is lower bounded by $1/2 + \Omega(n^{-c})$ for the probability of noise $\Theta(1/\text{poly}(n))$ in the quantum memory.*

Proof. We compute the lower bound on $\text{TD}[D_q O_0(\sigma), D_q O_1(\rho)]$ where D_q is general noise channel of form $D_q(\rho) = q\rho + (1-q)\mathcal{E}(\rho)$ where \mathcal{E} is general CPTP map and O_i prepares the two copies of noiseless PRS, $\rho \otimes \rho$ and two copies of noisy PRS, $\Gamma(\rho) \otimes \Gamma(\rho)$ for $i = 0$ and $i = 1$ respectively. Now,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{TD}[D_q O_0(\sigma), D_q O_1(\sigma)] &= \frac{1}{2} \text{tr} \left| q \mathbb{E}_{\rho \leftarrow \eta_H} \rho \otimes \rho + (1-q) \mathbb{E}_{\rho \leftarrow \eta_H} \mathcal{E}(\rho \otimes \rho) \right. \\ &\quad \left. - q \mathbb{E}_{\rho \leftarrow \eta_H} \Gamma(\rho) \otimes \Gamma(\rho) - (1-q) \mathbb{E}_{\rho \leftarrow \eta_H} \mathcal{E}(\Gamma(\rho) \otimes \Gamma(\rho)) \right|. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{N4})$$

Now, using the reverse triangle inequality given by $\text{tr}|x - y| \geq |\text{tr}|x| - \text{tr}|y|| \geq \text{tr}|x| - \text{tr}|y|$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \text{TD}[D_q O_0(\sigma), D_q O_1(\sigma)] &\geq \frac{1}{2} \left[q \text{tr} |\mathbb{E}_{\rho \leftarrow \eta_H} \rho \otimes \rho - \mathbb{E}_{\rho \leftarrow \eta_H} \Gamma(\rho) \otimes \Gamma(\rho)| \right. \\ &\quad \left. - (1-q) \text{tr} |\mathbb{E}_{\rho \leftarrow \eta_H} \mathcal{E}(\rho \otimes \rho) - \mathbb{E}_{\rho \leftarrow \eta_H} \mathcal{E}(\Gamma(\rho) \otimes \Gamma(\rho))| \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{N5})$$

Now, we will use the contractivity of trace distance under completely positive trace-preserving maps: $\text{TD}(\mathcal{E}(\rho), \mathcal{E}(\sigma)) \leq \text{TD}(\rho, \sigma)$ to obtain:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{TD}[D_q O_0(\sigma), D_q O_1(\sigma)] &\geq \frac{1}{2} \left[q \text{tr} |\mathbb{E}_{\rho \leftarrow \eta_H} \rho \otimes \rho - \mathbb{E}_{\rho \leftarrow \eta_H} \Gamma(\rho) \otimes \Gamma(\rho)| \right. \\ &\quad \left. - (1-q) \text{tr} |\mathbb{E}_{\rho \leftarrow \eta_H} \rho \otimes \rho - \mathbb{E}_{\rho \leftarrow \eta_H} \Gamma(\rho) \otimes \Gamma(\rho)| \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{N6})$$

Now, we can just recombine the terms and use the fact that two copies of noisy PRS for probability of noise $p = \Omega(n^{-c})$, are distinguishable from two copies of noiseless PRS using the SWAP test with high probability. From efficient distinguishability and the Holevo-Helstrom bound, we get, $\text{tr} |\mathbb{E}_{\rho \leftarrow \eta_H} \rho \otimes \rho - \mathbb{E}_{\rho \leftarrow \eta_H} \Gamma(\rho) \otimes \Gamma(\rho)| = \Omega(n^{-c})$. Putting this back in Eq. (N6)

$$\begin{aligned} \text{TD}[D_q O_0(\sigma), D_q O_1(\sigma)] &\geq \frac{1}{2} \left[(2q-1) \text{tr} |\mathbb{E}_{\rho \leftarrow \eta_H} \rho \otimes \rho - \mathbb{E}_{\rho \leftarrow \eta_H} \Gamma(\rho) \otimes \Gamma(\rho)| \right] \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \left[(2q-1) \Omega(n^{-c}) \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{N7})$$

Now, for $q = 1 - \Theta\left(\frac{1}{\text{poly}(n)}\right)$, we get that $\text{TD}[D_q O_0(\sigma), D_q O_1(\sigma)] = \Omega(n^{-c})$ for some $c > 0$. Thus, using Holevo-Helstrom bound [83–85],

$$\text{Pr} = \frac{1}{2} + \Omega(n^{-c}), \quad (\text{N8})$$

which suggests efficient distinguishability. \square

We further give an example to show the distinguishability for the case when the noise in quantum memory acts on one copy only. For simplicity, we assume $2n$ qubit memory:

Lemma N.1. *An adversary with noisy quantum memory can distinguish noisy PRS from noiseless PRS if the noise in PRS and memory is modeled as local depolarisation noise with noise probability r ,*

$$\Lambda_r(\rho) = r\rho + \frac{1-r}{2}(I_1 \otimes \text{tr}_1 \rho) \quad (\text{N9})$$

where $r = \{p, q\}$ for noise in PRS and noise in memory respectively.

Proof. We prove this using the SWAP test [42, 88, 89]. In this model, we can realize the SWAP test by first querying the oracle, using the SWAP operation to swap the workspace register and memory register, then querying the oracle again, and finally performing the SWAP test. Now, we assume a single copy noise in the quantum memory here, a local depolarisation channel acts on the copy in the quantum memory. Hence, we will have a state like $\rho_i \otimes \Lambda_q(\rho_i)$ and in the SWAP test, we will obtain $\text{tr}(\rho_i \Lambda_q(\rho_i))$. In other words,

$$\sigma \xrightarrow{O_i} \rho_i \otimes \rho_i \xrightarrow{\Lambda_q} \rho_i \otimes \Lambda_q(\rho_i) \xrightarrow{\text{SWAP test}} \text{tr}(\rho_i \Lambda_q(\rho_i)). \quad (\text{N10})$$

It is easy to check for the oracles $O_0(\sigma) = \rho \otimes \text{tr}\sigma$, preparing noiseless PRS and $O_1(\sigma) = \Lambda_p(\rho) \otimes \text{tr}\sigma$, preparing noisy PRS, we will have $\text{tr}(\rho\Lambda_q(\rho))$ and $\text{tr}(\Lambda_p(\rho)\Lambda_{pq}(\rho))$ respectively and the absolute value of average difference between these for Λ being local depolarisation channel is $|p^2q - q|$ up to a constant multiplicative factor. This term is negligible if and only if either $q = \text{negl}(n)$ or $p = 1 - \text{negl}(n)$ where the former case would mean very high noise in memory and the latter case mean very low noise in PRS. \square

Thus, even for simple unital noise models such as local depolarizing noise, we find that PRS where the observer has noisy quantum memory are not noise robust.

Appendix O: Noise robustness of private key quantum money based on PRS

Here, we show that private key quantum money schemes based on PRS can function even in the presence of noise. Although PRS are not robust even to small levels of noise, it turns out the application of PRS as quantum money can remain robust.

We first describe the private key quantum money scheme based on pseudorandom states.

Definition O.1 (Private key quantum money [1, 93]). *Let λ be the security parameter. A private key quantum money scheme consists of following algorithms:*

1. **KeyGen:** Takes in the unary 1^λ and outputs a key uniformly randomly.
2. **Bank:** Takes a key as input and generates a quantum state, called banknote in this context.
3. **Ver:** Takes a key and an alleged bank note and either it accepts or rejects.

Let **Count** be the money counter algorithm which takes in private key k and t' copies of the alleged banknotes, calls the algorithm **Ver** on each copy and returns the number of times that it accepts.

Definition O.2 (Security of private key quantum money scheme [1, 93]). *Let λ be the security parameter. Given a private key money scheme \mathcal{A} as defined above,*

1. **Completeness error:** The private key quantum money scheme \mathcal{A} has completeness error ϵ if **Ver**(k, ρ_k) accepts with probability at least $1 - \epsilon$ for all valid banknotes ρ_k .
2. **Soundness error:** The private key quantum money scheme \mathcal{A} is defined to have soundness error δ if for any polynomial time counterfeiter algorithm C , which maps t banknotes to $t' \geq t$ banknotes,

$$\Pr[\text{Count}(k, C(\rho_1, \rho_2, \dots, \rho_t)) > t] \leq \delta. \quad (\text{O1})$$

The private key quantum money scheme is said to be secure if it has completeness error $\epsilon \leq 1/3$ and soundness error $\delta = \text{negl}(\lambda)$.

Definition O.3 (JLS [1]). *Let λ be the security key. For any pseudorandom state ensemble with key space \mathcal{K} , $\{|\phi_k\rangle\}_{k \in \mathcal{K}}$, we can define a private-key quantum money scheme \mathcal{A}_{PRS} such that:*

1. **KeyGen:** A polynomial time algorithm G which uniformly samples a key from \mathcal{K} i.e. $G(1^\lambda) = k$.
2. **Bank:** A quantum polynomial time algorithm B which takes k as input and generates a PRS i.e. $B(k) = \rho_k = |\phi_k\rangle\langle\phi_k|$.
3. **Verifier:** A quantum polynomial time algorithm **Ver** which takes k and ρ as input, applies the projective measurement and accepts the banknote ρ with probability $\text{Ver}(k, \rho) = \text{tr}(\rho_k \rho)$.

Now, we describe the private key quantum money scheme based on pseudorandom states in presence of noise channel $\mathcal{E}(\rho)$. Here, we assume the noise affects only the banknotes, and the bank can perform noiseless measurements. The key idea is that even if noise affects the bank notes, as long as the noise is not too strong the bank is still able to verify the notes with high probability while counterfeiting banknotes remains hard:

Lemma O.1. *The private quantum money scheme based on PRS of Def. O.3 is secure even when the quantum banknotes are subject to efficient noise channel $\Gamma(\rho)$ under the condition*

$$\text{tr}(\rho_k \Gamma(\rho_k)) > 1 - \epsilon, \forall k \in \mathcal{K} \quad (\text{O2})$$

where $\epsilon \leq 1/3$ is the completeness error.

Proof. Completeness: The bank verifies the banknote using the projector $\rho_k = |\phi_k\rangle\langle\phi_k|$. A good private key quantum money scheme requires to identify correct bank notes with probability $\text{tr}(\rho_k \Gamma_p(\rho_k)) > 1 - \epsilon$, which gives us the condition on the channel

$$\text{tr}(\rho_k \Gamma(\rho_k)) > 1 - \epsilon. \quad (\text{O3})$$

Soundness: The bank should reject counterfeit banknotes with probability at least $1 - \delta$. In particular, there should be no algorithm that learns from correct bank notes and can make additional (noisy) banknotes accepted by the bank. Let us assume there is a polynomial time counterfeit algorithm C , which as input gets t copies of correct (and even noise-less) bank notes, and generates as output $t + 1$ (noisy) bank-notes such that for some $c \geq 1$:

$$\delta = \Pr[\text{Count}(k, C((\rho_k)^{\otimes t})) > t] = \Omega(\lambda^{-c}). \quad (\text{O4})$$

Now, from the security of noiseless private key money scheme based on PRS as shown in [1], we get for any polynomial time counterfeit algorithm C' :

$$\Pr[\text{Count}(k, C'(\rho_k^{\otimes t})) > t] = O(\text{negl}(\lambda)). \quad (\text{O5})$$

This provides a contradiction to Eq. O4 and hence the soundness error will be $O(\text{negl}(n))$. Note that Count algorithm used by the bank is independent of whether the bank receives noisy or noise-free bank notes. Thus, the inefficiency of cloning $t' > t$ banknotes from noisy or noise-free t copies for both cases. Moreover, when the counterfeiter has access to only noisy bank notes, generating noiseless bank notes becomes a strictly harder task than in the original noise-free case. \square