The power of a single Haar random state: constructing and separating quantum pseudorandomness

Boyang Chen ¹, Andrea Coladangelo², and Or Sattath³

¹Institute for Interdisciplinary Information Sciences, Tsinghua University ²Paul G. Allen School of Computer Science & Engineering, University of Washington ³Computer Science Department, Ben-Gurion University of the Negev

Abstract

In this work, we focus on the following question: what are the cryptographic implications of having access to an oracle that provides a *single* Haar random quantum state? We show, perhaps surprisingly, that such an oracle is sufficient to construct quantum pseudorandomness.

Pseudorandom states (PRS) are a family of states for which it is hard to distinguish between polynomially many copies of either a state sampled uniformly from the family or a Haar random state. A weaker notion, called single-copy pseudorandom states (1PRS), satisfies this property with respect to a single copy. Our main result is that 1PRS (as well as bit-commitments) exist relative to an oracle that provides a single Haar random state. We build on this result to show the existence of an oracle relative to which 1PRS exist, but PRS do not. This provides one of the first black-box separations between different forms of quantum pseudorandomness.

Contents

1	Introduction	3
	1.1 Our results	. 4
2	Technical Overview	7
	2.1 Construction of 1PRS in the CHRS model	. 7
	2.2 Commitments from a single Haar random state	. 11
	2.3 Oracle separation between PRS and 1PRS	. 12
3	Preliminaries	14
4	Construction of 1PRS in the CHRS model	15
	4.1 The CHRS model	. 16
	4.2 Quantum one-time pad on <i>exactly half</i> of the qubits of a Haar random state	. 17
	4.3 "Stretching" the quantum pseudorandomness	. 19
5	Oracle separation of PRS and 1PRS	25
	5.1 Quantum OR lemma	. 26
	5.2 An attack on any PRS relative to the separating oracle	. 27
	5.3 Clarifying the relationship between quantum oracle separations and black-box con-	
	structions	. 29
Α	Commitments in the CHRS model	37

1 Introduction

It is well known that computational assumptions are necessary for almost all modern classical and quantum cryptographic tasks. The minimal assumption that is useful for classical cryptography is the existence of one-way functions (OWF). This assumption is known to be equivalent to the existence of many other cryptographic applications, such as pseudorandom number generators, pseudorandom functions, digital signatures, symmetric-key encryption, and commitments (see, e.g., [Gol01, Gol04]).

The quantum setting presents a drastically different picture: a variety of quantum primitives are known that are sufficient to build cryptography, but are *potentially weaker* than one-way functions. Recently, Tomoyuki Morimae coined the term *MicroCrypt*, as an addition to Impagliazzo's five worlds [Imp95], to refer to such quantum primitives (and their cryptographic applications)¹. One of the tenants of MicroCrypt are *pseudorandom states* (PRS), first introduced by Ji, Liu, and Song [JLS18]. This is a family of efficiently generatable quantum states $\{|\phi_k\rangle\}_{k\in\{0,1\}^n}$ such that it is computationally hard to distinguish between polynomially many copies of (a) $|\phi_k\rangle$ sampled uniformly from the family, and (b) a uniformly (Haar) random quantum state. Ji, Liu, and Song also provided a black-box construction of PRS from a OWF. Subsequent to [JLS18], many other tenants of MicroCrypt have been introduced, such as pseudorandom function-like states (PRFS) [AGQY22], efficiently samplable statistically far-but-computationally-indistinguishable pairs of (mixed) quantum states (EFI pairs) [Yan22, BCQ23], one-way state generators [MY22b], and pseudorandom states with proof of destruction [BBSS23].

Many cryptographic applications are known based on MicroCrypt assumptions. By now, variants of all of the main MiniCrypt² primitives have been shown to be in MicroCrypt, including symmetric-key encryption, commitments (recently, also commitments to quantum states [GJMZ23]), PRGs, PRFs, garbled circuits, message authentication codes, and digital signatures. Perhaps more surprisingly, MicroCrypt also contains some tasks in Cryptomania, namely, secure multiparty computation [MY22b, BCKM21, GLSV21] and public-key encryption with quantum public keys [BGHD⁺23]. The key factor contributing to the surprise is Impagliazzo and Rudich's separation between one-way functions (MiniCrypt) and public-key encryption³ and oblivious transfer (Cryptomania) [IR89]. The new constructions circumvent classical impossibilities because they involve quantum states, e.g. commitments and multiparty computation rely on quantum communication, and encryption schemes have quantum ciphertexts.

The evidence that these quantum primitives are weaker than MiniCrypt comes from Kretschmer's quantum oracle separation of PRS and OWFs [Kre21]. The separating oracle consists of a family $\{\mathcal{U}_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$, where \mathcal{U}_n is a list of exponentially many Haar random *n*-qubit unitaries $\{U_k\}_{k\in\{0,1\}^n}$. Relative to this oracle, there is a simple construction of a PRS: for $k \in \{0,1\}^n$, let $|\phi_k\rangle := U_k |0^n\rangle$. Note that, if we just consider the action of the unitaries U_k on the standard basis states, i.e. the set of states $U_k |x\rangle$ for $x \in \{0,1\}^n$, then, for each *n*, Kretschmer's oracle can be viewed as providing 2^{2n} "essentially Haar random" states⁴. In another work, Bouland, Fefferman and Vazirani [BFV19] show⁵ a PRS construction relative to a family $\{\mathcal{U}_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$, where $\mathcal{U}_n = (U, U^{-1})$ for a Haar random

¹As far as we know, Morimae introduced the term in a talk https://www.youtube.com/live/PKfYJ1KD3z8? feature=share&t=1048, though he did not provide a precise definition, so our definition might be slightly different than his original intention.

 $^{^{2}}$ Minicrypt primitives are those that are equivalent to one-way functions. The term was introduced by Impagliazzo [Imp95].

 $^{^{3}}$ Note that this classical separation does not apply for public key encryption with *quantum* public keys.

⁴The states are Haar random subject to the constraint that they should be pairwise orthogonal (for each fixed k). ⁵Modulo a technical gap in their proof [BFV19, p. 19]: "We expect the same result would apply ... but we do not prove this fact."

n-qubit U. By considering the action of U on the standard basis states, this oracle can be viewed as providing 2^n essentially Haar random states. This raises a natural question. What can be done with much fewer Haar random states? We look at the most extreme case and ask:

What are the cryptographic implications of having oracle access to a single Haar random state?⁶

We define the common Haar random state (CHRS) model, where all the parties (including the adversary) have access to an arbitrary *polynomial number of copies* of a *single* Haar random state. Is quantum pseudorandomness possible in this model? In the classical setting, having access to a fixed (random) string, which can be used both by the algorithm and the adversary, is not enough to construct pseudorandomness (e.g., pseudorandom generators). In the quantum setting, one may naturally expect that, similarly, a single Haar random state is not enough to construct *quantum* pseudorandomness.

The PRS variant that is most relevant for this work is *single-copy* pseudorandom states (1PRS), introduced by Morimae and Yamakawa [MY22a]. They differ from (multi-copy) pseudorandom states (PRS) in two important ways (see Definition 3.2 for a formal definition):

- 1. The adversary needs to distinguish between a single copy of the pseudorandom state and a single copy of a Haar random state.
- 2. The construction has to be "stretching": the number of output qubits has to be greater than the key size (for this to be a non-trivial object).

1.1 Our results

Our first result is that, perhaps surprisingly, single-copy pseudorandom states exist in this model:

Theorem 1.1 (Informal). 1PRS exist in the CHRS model.

The 1PRS is statistically secure as long as the number of copies of the Haar random state that the adversary receives is polynomial. This result is shown in Section 4. One of the main technical ingredients that we introduce to prove Theorem 1.1 is a certain "stretching" result for quantum pseudorandomness in the CHRS model (Theorem 2.2 in the technical overview, and Theorem 4.6 in the main text), which may find application elsewhere.

As a result, we show that the statistical 1PRS above can be used to achieve a surprisingly strong form of bit-commitment:

Theorem 1.2 (Informal). In the CHRS model, a non-interactive quantum bit-commitment exists that is statistically hiding and binding.

The hiding property holds against a computationally unbounded adversary that receives any polynomial number of copies of the Haar random state. In contrast, the binding property holds against a computationally unbounded adversary with an unbounded number of copies. Such statistical binding and hiding cannot exist in the standard model [LC97, May97]. The theorem above is proven in Appendix A, in a similar way as shown previously by [MNY23]. Thanks to Theorem 14 in [Qia23], the commitment scheme that we obtain in the CHRS model can be compiled into an ϵ -simulation secure one, using an adaption of the compiler from [BCKM21]. This version of commitment is sufficient to build secure multiparty computation via the construction in [BCKM21].

⁶Or, more precisely, one *n*-qubit Haar random state for each value of n (which is accessed by providing the input 1^{n}).

Even though plenty of relations involving MicroCrypt primitives are known, the only *black-box* separations involving MicroCrypt are the following: Kretschmer [Kre21] separated post-quantum OWF from PRS, via a quantum oracle. Ananth, Qian and Yuen [AQY22] observed that this separation also separates OWF from PRFS. Kretschmer et al. [KQST23] separated OWF from 1PRS via a *classical* oracle. However, when we zoom in on MicroCrypt, almost nothing is known about whether different MicroCrypt primitives are equivalent to each other, or whether there is a hierarchy. The only known non-trivial⁷ separation is between short output and long output PRS (with the former being potentially stronger). This separation is an immediate consequence of the works of Barhoush et al. [BBO⁺24] (which gives a construction of quantum digital signatures from PRS with short output) and Coladangelo and Mutreja [CM24] (which shows an oracle separation between quantum digital signatures and PRS with long output), and was also shown in a concurrent work of Bouaziz–Ermann and Muguruza [BEM24].

In this work, building on our Theorem 1.1, we show a second black-box separation *within* MicroCrypt:

Theorem 1.3 (Informal). There is a quantum oracle relative to which 1PRS exist, but PRS (with output length at least $\log n + 10$, where n is the seed length) do not.⁸

The separation is essentially tight in terms of output length, since PRS with very short output $(c \cdot \log(n) \text{ for } c \ll 1)$ exist *unconditionally* [BS20]. We show this result in Section 5. Of course, this indicates that relative to the same oracle, primitives which imply a black-box construction of PRS, such as OWF (as shown in [JLS18]) and PRFS, also cannot exist.

Related work. In this work, we introduce the common Haar random state (CHRS) model, in which both the generation algorithm and the adversary have access to polynomially many copies of a Haar random state over *n* qubits. There are two related models. The first, which our work is a particular case of, was called the *quantum auxiliary input* model (where the quantum state is sometimes referred to as the quantum advice) by [MNY23], in which the parties are provided with polynomially many copies of a quantum state, which need not be efficiently generatable⁹. Chailloux, Kerenidis, and Rosgen [CKR16] showed that quantum commitments with quantum auxiliary input exist under a *computational assumption*. They provide two schemes, where either the hiding or binding properties are computational. Morimae, Nehoran, and Yamakawa [MNY23] and Qian [Qia23] recently proved, *unconditionally*, the existence of a computationally hiding and statistically binding commitment in the quantum auxiliary input model. This improves on the result of [CKR16], in the sense that the computational assumption is removed.

The second related model is the *common reference quantum state* (CRQS) model, in which the quantum state needs to be efficiently generatable. Note that, in the classical setting, the common reference string represents a model with a trusted setup. In this model, [MNY23], show

⁷[BS20] (see also [ALY23, p.3]) show that PRS with very short output $(c \cdot \log(n) \text{ for } c \ll 1)$, where *n* is the length of the key) exist *unconditionally*. Hence, they are trivially black-box separated from all of the other MicroCrypt primitives which require computational assumptions.

⁸This quantum oracle consists of an *isometry* that provides a fixed Haar random state, along with a QPSPACE machine. While the latter is a *unitary* oracle, the former is not. In Section 5.3, we formally discuss various notions of black-box oracle separations and their implications in terms of the impossibility of black-box constructions. In particular, Theorem 1.3 implies that there cannot be a fully black-box construction of a PRS from a 1PRS that uses the 1PRS as an *isometry* (see Section 5.3 for more details).

⁹We prefer not to use the term "quantum auxiliary input" since in most other works we are aware of (see $[DGK^+10]$ and references therein), a quantum auxiliary input typically represents a setting in which the adversary may have information that may depend on the honest parties' inputs, and in particular, the secret key. In contrast, in our setting and that of [MNY23], the "auxiliary" state is fixed, independently of any honest parties' input.

a statistically hiding and binding commitment with similar properties to ours. The difference is in the order of quantifiers of the hiding property: in our work, the scheme is hiding against an adversary that is allowed to have any polynomial number of copies of the quantum (Haar-random) state; in their construction (see [MNY23, Theorem 1.4]), they first pick a polynomial t(n) and show a construction which is hiding against adversaries which receive t(n) copies of the CRQS¹⁰. Of course, the main disadvantage of our work is that a Haar random state cannot be efficiently generated, whereas the state they use is efficiently generatable. However, note that if one is satisfied with security against some fixed polynomial t(n) of copies, the Haar random state can be replaced efficiently by a quantum t(n)-design.

We emphasize the features that differentiate our work:

- (i) Our common random state is *structure-less*: it is a Haar random state.
- (ii) We show how to achieve quantum pseudorandomness in this model. The related works construct commitments directly, but their constructions do not have any implications with regard to quantum pseudorandomness. We find it quite surprising that a Haar random state alone can yield quantum pseudorandomness. It is also thanks to this connection that we are able to separate different flavors of quantum pseudorandomness, namely 1PRS and PRS.

Recently, many results regarding MicroCrypt have been discovered—at this point, too many to cover in detail. A diagram showing the different MicroCrypt primitives, their relations, applications, and separations are depicted in Fig. 3 on Page 38.

Open problems. This work opens up several directions for further research.

- Our separation result (Theorem 1.3) holds relative to a quantum oracle. Can it be shown relative to a *classical* oracle? We note that Krethschmer et al. [KQST23] show a classical oracle relative to which 1PRS and commitments exist, but one-way functions do not.
- As pointed out earlier, since our separating oracle is technically an *isometry*, Theorem 1.3 implies that there does not exist a fully black-box construction of a PRS from a 1PRS that uses the 1PRS as an *isometry* (see Section 5.3 for more details). An open question is to rule out the most general kind of black-box construction, which can make use of a *unitary implementation* of the 1PRS (as well as its inverse).
- There are examples of primitives that we know can be constructed from PRS, but are *not* known to be implied by 1PRS. The main examples are one-time digital signatures with quantum public keys [MY22a], private quantum coins [JLS18], and quantum pseudo-encryption [AQY22]. Currently, we do not have a separation between those applications¹¹ and 1PRS. Understanding whether any of these applications are separated from 1PRS would be interesting.
- Lastly, in the plain model, "flavor conversion" [Yan22, HMY23] allows switching between the computational and statistical hiding and binding properties. In our work, the commitment is statistically hiding against adversaries with *polynomially many* copies of the Haar random

¹⁰Even though this was not formally claimed in [MNY23], we believe that the construction mentioned in the previous paragraph, with (inefficiently generatable) auxiliary quantum inputs, satisfies the same statistical security guarantees as ours.

¹¹or even ones which are based on stronger MicroCrypt assumptions, such as the existence of long input PRFS, which can be used to construct message authentication codes with quantum tags [AQY22], quantum symmetric key encryption [AQY22], and public key encryption with quantum ciphers and quantum public keys [BGHD⁺23].

state. It is statistically binding against adversaries with an *arbitrary* number of copies of the Haar random state. Is there a flavor conversion theorem—this time, regarding the number of copies of the state that the adversary holds—that holds in our setting?

Acknowledgments

AC and OS thank NTT research and Mark Zhandry for organizing the quantum money workshop, as well as the participants of the workshop, where this research was initiated. BC thanks Xingjian Li for helpful discussions.

OS was funded by the European Union (ERC-2022-COG, ACQUA, 101087742). Views and opinions expressed are however those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or the European Research Council Executive Agency. Neither the European Union nor the granting authority can be held responsible for them.



2 Technical Overview

This section is organized as follows. In Section 2.1, we describe the construction of a 1PRS in the CHRS model, and we give a high-level overview of the proof of security. We view this as the main technical contribution of our work. In Section 2.2, we explain how to construct statistically binding commitments from the constructed 1PRS (this follows the approach of [MNY23]). Finally, in Section 2.3, we describe an oracle separation between 1PRS and PRS. We consider the CHRS model augmented with quantum oracle access to a QPSPACE machine, and we describe a generic attack on any PRS construction in this model. Since 1PRS still exist in this model, this yields an oracle separation between the two.

2.1 Construction of 1PRS in the CHRS model

1PRS definition. Recall that, informally, a **1PRS** is a QPT algorithm that takes as input a seed $k \in \{0,1\}^n$ (where *n* is a security parameter) and outputs a state of some length m > n. We denote by $|\phi_k\rangle$ the output state on seed *k*. Then, security requires that a *single* copy of the **1PRS** state be computationally indistinguishable from a *single* maximally mixed state of the same dimension, i.e.

$$\mathbb{E}_k \ket{\phi_k} \langle \phi_k \rvert \approx_c \frac{1}{2^m}$$

(where \approx_c denotes computational indistinguishability).

Note that this requirement is only non-trivial when m > n (otherwise, one can simply output the seed itself). Equivalently, one can think of the problem of constructing a 1PRS as the problem of finding a family $\{U_k\}_{k \in \{0,1\}^n}$ of efficiently computable unitaries such that

$$\mathbb{E}_k U_k \left| 0 \right\rangle \left\langle 0 \right| U_k^{\dagger} \approx_c \frac{1}{2^m} \cdot$$

This problem becomes trivial if the family $\{U_k\}$ is large enough. In particular, if m = n, a classical one-time pad, i.e. taking $U_k = X^k$ already suffices. One way to achieve the above with m > n is, of course, to use a classical PRG, but this is of course already equivalent to assuming OWFs.

Working in the CHRS model. We will instead describe how to construct a 1PRS in the CHRS model, i.e. when polynomially many copies of a single Haar random state are available to the construction and to the adversary. Our construction uses a single copy of the state $|\psi\rangle$, but security holds even when r = poly(n) copies of $|\psi\rangle$ are available to the adversary.

We restrict ourselves to considering constructions of the following form: the 1PRS family $\{|\phi_k\rangle\}$ is such that $|\phi_k\rangle = U_k |\psi\rangle$. Let *m* be the number of qubits of $|\psi\rangle$. Thus, the problem reduces to finding a family $\{U_k\}_{k \in \{0,1\}^n}$, for m > n, such that¹²

$$\mathbb{E}_{|\psi\rangle\leftarrow\mu_{2^{m}}}\mathbb{E}_{k\in\{0,1\}^{n}}(U_{k}|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|U_{k}^{\dagger}\rangle\otimes(|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|)^{\otimes r}\approx_{c}\mathbb{E}_{|\psi\rangle\leftarrow\mu_{2^{m}}}\frac{1}{2^{m}}\otimes(|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|)^{\otimes r}.$$
(1)

In fact, we will describe a construction that achieves *statistical* (rather than just computational) indistinguishability, assuming r is polynomial in n. As anticipated, the crux of the problem is to achieve the above with m > n.

Construction of 1PRS in the CHRS model. For the reader's convenience (to help remember what the parameters refer to), going forward we have

- k: 1PRS seed.
- n = |k|.
- *m*: number of qubits of the output 1PRS state (this is also the number of qubits of the Haar random state $|\psi\rangle$).

Our construction of a 1PRS in the CHRS model is simple (although it is unclear a priori why it would work). We take the family of *m*-qubit unitaries $\{U_k\}$ to be a Quantum One-Time Pad (QOTP) on slightly less than half of the qubits, say 0.45*m*. A bit more precisely, *k* is a string of length $n \in [0.9m, m)$, which we can parse as k = (a, b), where $a, b \in \{0, 1\}^{n/2}$. Then, $U_k = (X^a Z^b) \otimes I$, i.e. U_k applies $X^a Z^b$ to the first n/2 qubits of the *m*-qubit state it acts on. We now explain the intuition behind the construction.

First key idea: a quantum one-time pad on *exactly* half of the qubits. Notice, just for the sake of argument, that if we allowed ourselves to have n = 2m (even though this violates the "length extending" requirement of m > n by a large margin), then there would be a trivial choice of U_k that works: simply pick $\{U_k\}$ to be a QOTP on *all* of the qubits. Then, the 1PRS security property of Equation (1) would be satisfied. Unfortunately, the full QOTP is very far from our goal: to comply with the length-extending requirement, a QOTP must be applied to *strictly less than half* of the qubits.

Let us simplify our life slightly for the moment: if we allow a QOTP on *exactly half* of the qubits, i.e. n = m (which still does not satisfy the requirement of m > n), is Equation (1) satisfied? It turns out that the answer is yes (although the reason may be unclear at first). We provide an informal explanation.

The starting point is a recent result by Harrow [Har24]. This says that the state obtained by applying a Haar random unitary to one-half of a maximally entangled state is statistically indistinguishable from Haar random. Crucially, this guarantee also holds for multiple copies (in

¹²Technically, as pointed out in an earlier footnote, parties in the CHRS model (including the adversary) have access to copies of one *m*-qubit Haar random state for each *m*. However, it is clear that this is immaterial to the proof, since, for a given output length *m*, we are restricting our attention to constructions (i.e. choices of U_k) that only act on the *m*-qubit Haar state, and ignore the others.

the appropriate parameter regime). A bit more precisely, Harrow proves the following. For $d \in \mathbb{N}$, let $|\Phi_d\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{d}} \sum_{i=0}^{d-1} |ii\rangle$, and for a unitary U acting on the left register, let $|\phi_U\rangle = (U \otimes I) |\Phi_d\rangle$. For a pure state $|\psi\rangle$, we denote by ψ its density matrix.

Lemma 2.1 (Harrow [Har24], informal). Let $r, d \in \mathbb{N}$. Then,

$$\left\| \mathop{\mathbb{E}}_{|\psi\rangle \leftarrow \mu_{d^2}} [\psi^{\otimes r}] - \mathop{\mathbb{E}}_{U \leftarrow SU(d)} [\phi_U^{\otimes r}] \right\| \leq \frac{r^2}{d}$$

In the case of a single copy (r = 1), the following is some intuition as to why the result holds. Consider a Haar random state and any partition of its qubits into two registers A and B. Then, with very high probability, a Haar random state has Schmidt coefficients close to uniform. This is somewhat intuitive (although it requires some work to prove). This implies that the following mixed state is close to a Haar random state:

$$\mathbb{E}_{U,U'\leftarrow SU(d)}(U\otimes U')\Phi_d(U\otimes U')^{\dagger}$$
,

(the latter is a maximally entangled state to which independent Haar random unitary changes of basis are applied to each side). However, notice that

$$\mathbb{E}_{U,U'\leftarrow SU(d)}(U\otimes U')\Phi_d(U\otimes U')^{\dagger} = \mathbb{E}_{U,U'\leftarrow SU(d)}(U\cdot U'^T\otimes I)\Phi_d(U\cdot U'^T\otimes I)^{\dagger} = \mathbb{E}_{U\leftarrow SU(d)}(U\otimes I)\Phi_d(U\otimes I)^{\dagger} = \mathbb{E}_{U\leftarrow SU(d)}\phi_U,$$

where the first equality follows from the "Ricochet" property of the maximally entangled state, and the second by the unitary invariance of the Haar measure. Thus,

$$\underset{|\psi\rangle\leftarrow\mu_{d^2}}{\mathbb{E}}[\psi]\approx\underset{U\leftarrow SU(d)}{\mathbb{E}}[\phi_U]$$

The general result for r > 1 copies is much more involved, and we refer the reader to [Har24].

So, how does Harrow's result help the analysis? The r-copy result says that

$$\mathop{\mathbb{E}}_{|\psi\rangle\leftarrow\mu_{d^2}}[\psi^{\otimes r}]\approx \mathop{\mathbb{E}}_{U\leftarrow SU(d)}[\phi_U^{\otimes r}]$$

Let m = n be even, and take $d = 2^{m/2}$, so that $|\psi\rangle$ is an *m*-qubit state, and $|\Phi_d\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2^{m/2}}} \sum_{i=0}^{2^{m/2}-1} |ii\rangle$, i.e. a maximally entangled state on *m* qubits. Let $\mathcal{P}_{m/2}$ denote the Pauli group on m/2 qubits. Applying a QOTP to the first m/2 qubits (i.e. *exactly half*) of the *first* out of the *r* copies, we get:

$$\mathbb{E}_{P \leftarrow \mathcal{P}_{m/2} |\psi\rangle \leftarrow \mu_{d^2}} \mathbb{E} \left[(P \otimes I) \psi(P^{\dagger} \otimes I) \otimes \psi^{\otimes (r-1)} \right] \approx \mathbb{E}_{P \leftarrow \mathcal{P}_{m/2} U \leftarrow SU(d)} \mathbb{E} \left[(PU \otimes I) \Phi_d (U^{\dagger} P \otimes I)^{\dagger} \otimes \phi_U^{\otimes (r-1)} \right]$$
(2)

$$= \mathop{\mathbb{E}}_{P \leftarrow \mathcal{P}_{m/2}} \mathop{\mathbb{E}}_{U \leftarrow SU(d)} \frac{1}{2^{m/2}} \sum_{i,j} PU |i\rangle \langle j| U^{\dagger} P^{\dagger} \otimes |i\rangle \langle j| \otimes \phi_{U}^{\otimes r-1}$$
$$= \mathop{\mathbb{E}}_{P \leftarrow \mathcal{P}_{m/2}} \mathop{\mathbb{E}}_{U \leftarrow SU(d)} \frac{1}{2^{m/2}} \sum_{i,j} PU |i\rangle \langle j| U^{\dagger} P^{\dagger} \otimes |i\rangle \langle j| \otimes \phi_{U}^{\otimes r-1}$$
$$= \frac{1}{2^{m}} \otimes \mathop{\mathbb{E}}_{U \leftarrow SU(d)} \phi_{U}^{\otimes r-1}, \qquad (3)$$

where the last line follows by the Pauli Twirl (Lemma 4.4). Recall that the "closeness" in the approximation of Equation (2) is $\frac{r^2}{2^{m/2}}$ (from Lemma 2.1). We emphasize the crucial step in the

last equality: thanks to the maximal entanglement between the two halves of the first register, the QOTP on the first half actually causes *both* halves to become maximally mixed.

It follows that, given r = poly(m) copies of an *m*-qubit Haar random state, applying a QOTP on the first m/2 qubits of the first copy is enough to make the first copy maximally mixed, even given the other r - 1 copies. This gets us closer to our goal, but we are not there yet: we are still using an *m*-bit seed to obtain an *m*-qubit state.

Second key idea: quantum one-time pad on *slightly less* than half of the qubits. If a QOTP on slightly less than half of the qubits were sufficient, this would solve our problem. We show that this is indeed the case!

The key technical ingredient in our proof can be viewed as a sort of "stretching" result, which may be useful elsewhere. Consider an *m*-qubit common Haar random state. Very informally, the "stretching" result says the following: if there is a way to obtain "m - 1 qubits of single-copy pseudorandomness" from *n* bits of classical randomness (where *n* should be thought of as being linear in *m*), then one can also obtain "*m* qubits of single-copy pseudorandomness" from *n* bits of classical randomness, with a slight loss in statistical distance (i.e. it is possible to get one extra qubit of pseudorandomness!). The loss is small enough that the stretching can be applied repeatedly to get up to *m* qubits of pseudorandomness from $c \cdot n$ bits of classical randomness, for some 0.9 < c < 1, while keeping the statistical loss exponentially small in *m*.

Crucially, this stretching result also applies to our base result of Equation (3) (where n = m). More precisely, we have the following.

Theorem 2.2 (Informal). Let $r, n, m \in \mathbb{N}$. Let $\{U_k\}_{k \in \{0,1\}^n}$ be a set of (m-1)-qubit unitaries. Then,

$$\begin{split} & \left\| \mathbb{E}_{k} \mathbb{E}_{|\psi\rangle} (\mathbb{1} \otimes U_{k}) \psi(\mathbb{1} \otimes U_{k}^{\dagger}) \otimes \psi^{\otimes r-1} - \frac{1}{2^{m}} \otimes \mathbb{E}_{|\psi\rangle} \psi^{\otimes r-1} \right\| \\ & \leq 5 \left\| \mathbb{E}_{k} \mathbb{E}_{|\psi'\rangle} U_{k} \psi' U_{k}^{\dagger} \otimes \psi'^{\otimes r-1} - \frac{1}{2^{m-1}} \otimes \mathbb{E}_{|\psi'\rangle} \psi'^{\otimes r-1} \right\| + O\left(\frac{r\sqrt{m}}{2^{m/2}}\right) \,. \end{split}$$

where $|\psi\rangle$ is a Haar random m-qubit state, and $|\psi'\rangle$ is a Haar random (m-1)-qubit state.

In words, this says that if $\{U_k\}_{k \in \{0,1\}^n}$ generates a (single-copy) (m-1)-qubit pseudorandom state when applied to an (m-1)-qubit Haar random state, then applying U_k to the last m-1qubits of an *m*-qubit Haar random state (and ignoring the first qubit) also suffices to achieve the same, up to a small statistical loss.

Applying Theorem 2.2 r times, gives:

Corollary 2.3 (Informal). Let $\ell < m$. Let $\{U_k\}_{k \in \{0,1\}^n}$ be a set of $(m-\ell)$ -qubit unitaries. Then,

$$\begin{split} & \left\| \mathbb{E} \underset{k}{\mathbb{E}} (\mathbb{1} \otimes U_k) \psi(\mathbb{1} \otimes U_k^{\dagger}) \otimes \psi^{\otimes r-1} - \frac{\mathbb{1}}{2^m} \otimes \underset{|\psi\rangle}{\mathbb{E}} \psi^{\otimes r-1} \right\| \\ & \leq 5^{\ell} \left\| \mathbb{E} \underset{k}{\mathbb{E}} \underset{|\psi'\rangle}{\mathbb{E}} U_k \psi' U_k^{\dagger} \otimes \psi'^{\otimes r-1} - \frac{\mathbb{1}}{2^{m-\ell}} \otimes \underset{|\psi'\rangle}{\mathbb{E}} \psi'^{\otimes r-1} \right\| + O\left(\frac{r\sqrt{m} \, 5^{\ell}}{2^{(m-\ell)/2}}\right) \,. \end{split}$$

where $|\psi\rangle$ is a Haar random m-qubit state, and $|\psi'\rangle$ is a Haar random $(m-\ell)$ -qubit state.

At first, the reader might be slightly worried about the exponential blow-up of the RHS in terms of ℓ . However, this is counteracted by the trace distance term, which, for the base case,

is exponentially small in the number of qubits. Thus, there is actually a regime of ℓ linear in m for which the upper bound is exponentially small in m. In more detail, we apply Corollary 2.3 to our base result of Equation (3) (replacing m with $m - \ell$ there). Let $L_{m-\ell}$ be the statistical closeness (in trace distance) between the two sides of Equation (3). Then we have the following: applying a QOTP to $\frac{m-\ell}{2}$ qubits of an *m*-qubit Haar random state suffices to yield a (single-copy) pseudorandom state, with a statistical loss of $L_{m-\ell} \cdot 5^{\ell} + O\left(\frac{r\sqrt{m5^{\ell}}}{2^{(m-\ell)/2}}\right)$. Recall from earlier that $L_{m-\ell} = O\left(\frac{r^2}{2^{(m-\ell)/2}}\right)$, and so the total statistical loss is $O\left(\frac{r^2}{2^{(m-\ell)/2}} \cdot 5^{\ell}\right) + O\left(\frac{r\sqrt{m5^{\ell}}}{2^{(m-\ell)/2}}\right)$. Notice crucially that, when ℓ is too large, the factor of 5^{ℓ} dominates $L_{m-\ell}$! However, when $\ell = 0.1m$, the loss is $O\left(\frac{(r^2 + r\sqrt{m5^{0.1m}})}{2^{0.45m}}\right)$, which is still exponentially small in m. Thus, interestingly, our construction methods have been easily been easily for the loss is $O\left(\frac{(r^2 + r\sqrt{m5^{0.1m}})}{2^{0.45m}}\right)$.

our construction works as long as the QOTP is applied on 0.45m qubits (a constant fraction less than half), but it does not seem to work for much smaller constant fractions¹³.

The high-level intuition for the result is that a typical Haar random state on m qubits is "close" to being maximally entangled across the (1, m - 1) bipartition (i.e. the bipartition that considers the first qubit as the "left" register, and the remaining m-1 qubits as the "right" register). More concretely, the mixed state obtained by sampling a Haar random *m*-qubit state is close (in trace distance) to the state obtained by sampling two Haar random (m-1)-qubit states $|\psi_1\rangle$ and $|\psi_2\rangle$, and outputting $|\psi'\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} |0\rangle |\psi_1\rangle + \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} |1\rangle |\psi_2\rangle$, i.e.

$$\mathbb{E}_{\psi}[\psi] \approx \mathbb{E}_{\psi_0,\psi_1}[\psi']$$

Note that in the state $|\psi'\rangle$ the two coefficients are exactly $\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}$ (while, for a Haar random *m*-qubit state, each coefficient would instead come from a *distribution* which concentrates at $\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}$). This observation also holds for r > 1 copies of ψ and ψ' , respectively, at the cost of a factor of r loss in trace distance.

How does this help? The crucial point is that if $\{U_k\}$ is a family of "twirling" unitaries, i.e. a family of unitaries such that the channel $\mathbb{E}_k U_k(\cdot) U_k^{\dagger}$ maps the "right" register to the maximally mixed state (when also taking into account the averaging over ψ'), then, similarly as in the calculation of Eq. (3), the "left" register also becomes maximally mixed (due to the fact that the two registers were originally maximally entangled). We refer the reader to Section 4.3 for more details.

Remark 2.4. The reader may wonder whether constructing a 1PRS can be achieved more easily or with better parameters by leveraging, for example, the following result from Dickinson and Nayak [DN06]. This says that $n + 2\log \frac{1}{\epsilon} + 4$ bits of key length are sufficient to encrypt an n-qubit state so that it is ϵ -close (in trace distance) to the maximally mixed state (rather than 2n bits for n qubits using the standard QOTP). While the result seems potentially very useful, it does not seem to help: crucially, when we invoke the Pauli twirl property in Equation (3), we rely on the fact that it makes the cross terms vanish perfectly. If cross terms vanished only approximately, the double sum over i, j would cause the error to blow up (given the tradeoff between key length and precision).

2.2Commitments from a single Haar random state

As mentioned below Theorem 1.3, we show that the 1PRS implies a non-interactive quantum bitcommitment. The reader may notice that this implication was already shown by Morimae and Yamakawa [MY22a] (see also [Yan22]). However, crucially, their black-box construction requires access to the inverse of the 1PRS generation procedure: this is used by the receiver in the reveal phase.

 $^{^{13}}$ We are unsure whether this regime is tight or not. Settling this is an interesting open question.

Note that the common Haar random state model can be viewed as having oracle access to an *isometry* (because the "inverse" is not available – see Section 4.1 for more details). Since our 1PRS construction is relative to a non-unitary oracle, such a black-box construction does not compile (because invoking the inverse of the 1PRS generation procedure would require invoking the inverse of the isometry oracle, which is not well defined). We formally define and discuss various notions of black-box reductions in the quantum setting in Section 5.3. To conclude, we cannot use Morimae and Yamakawa's approach since we use a quantum oracle to generate the 1PRS and do not have access to the inverse oracle. We emphasize that this limitation also applies to Kretschmer's construction [Kre21], in which the inverse transformation is not provided. Therefore, Morimae and Yamakawa's construction cannot be instantiated based on Kretchmer's construction as well. To get around this problem, we use the template by Morimae, Nehoran, and Yamakawa [MNY23], which showed a similar result, though their motivation was slightly different.

We first recall Morimae and Yamakawa's scheme [MY22a]. To commit to the bit $b \in \{0, 1\}$, the sender generates

$$|\psi_b\rangle := \frac{1}{\sqrt{2^{2m+n}}} \sum_{x,z \in \{0,1\}^m} \sum_{k \in \{0,1\}^n} |x,z,k\rangle \otimes P^b_{x,z} |\phi_k\rangle,$$

where $\{|\phi_k\rangle\}_k$ is the 1PRS family, with key-size *n* and outputs size *m*, and $P_{x,z} := \bigotimes_{j=1}^m X_j^{x_j} Z_j^{z_j}$. To commit, only the right register is sent to the receiver. (The hiding property can be seen easily: note that if b = 1, the state is maximally mixed by the properties of the quantum one-time pad, and if b = 0, the state is a random 1PRS state; these two cases are indistinguishable, by the 1PRS property.) To reveal, the committer sends the rest of the state and the bit *b*. The receiver applies V_b^{\dagger} , where $V_b | 0 \dots 0 \rangle = |\psi_b\rangle$, measures all the qubits, and accepts if and only if the outcome is $0 \dots 0$. As mentioned, the problem is that Applying V_b^{\dagger} requires the inverse transformation of the one generating the 1PRS state and cannot be done in a black-box manner.

To get around this problem, Ref. [MNY23] follows a different approach. Instead of applying the inverse, a copy of the state $|\psi_b\rangle$ is generated, and then the swap test is performed to check that they are indeed the same state. The main problem with this approach is that the binding property is compromised since even orthogonal states pass the swap test with probability $\frac{1}{2}$. To reduce the binding error, this procedure is repeated in parallel polynomially many times: many copies of the state are produced during the commitment phase, and many copies are generated by the receiver during the reveal phase, and the receiver accepts if and only if *all* of the copies pass the swap test. They show that this approach works for their commitment scheme. We follow their proof template, which works analogously for our scheme. The full details are given in Appendix A.

Remark 2.5. Bostanci et al. [BQSY23] recently proved a general parallel repetition theorem. They apply their parallel repetition result to a particular form of commitments, called canonical commitments, a notion introduced by [Yan22]. Canonical commitments use the inverse transformation of the commit phase in the reveal phase and, therefore is, not black-box, similarly to the result by Morimae and Yamakawa [MY22a] mentioned above.

2.3 Oracle separation between PRS and 1PRS

We now describe an oracle relative to which 1PRS exist, but PRS do not. We consider the CHRS model augmented with quantum oracle access to a QPSPACE machine¹⁴. Going forward, we refer

¹⁴As mentioned previously, the CHRS oracle, which provides copies of the Haar random state, can be thought of as implementing an *isometry*. This is spelled out in Section 4.1. On the other hand, the QPSPACE machine takes as input a state $|\alpha\rangle$, and the description of a unitary circuit C computable in "polynomial space", and returns $C |\psi\rangle$. For a precise definition, we refer the reader to the start of Section 5.

to the former as the "CHRS oracle" and to the latter as the "QPSPACE oracle". We refer the reader to the start of Section 5 for a precise definition of the QPSPACE oracle.

The existence of 1PRS in this model follows immediately from the fact that our construction in the CHRS model achieves *statistical*, rather than computational, security when the adversary has polynomially many copies of the common Haar random state. Thus, the QPSPACE oracle (which is independent of the sampled Haar random state), does not help the adversary.

On the other hand, we show that a PRS does not exist in this model. We describe an explicit attack on any PRS construction.

Breaking PRS security via the "Quantum OR Lemma". Notice that, in this model, since the CHRS oracle is *input-less*, we can assume, without loss of generality, that any algorithm that uses the CHRS oracle makes all of its calls to it at the start, i.e. the algorithm first obtains all of the copies of $|\psi\rangle$ that it needs, and then proceeds without making any additional call to the CHRS oracle. Thus, any PRS construction takes the following form¹⁵. Let $|\psi\rangle$ be the common Haar random state. Then, the family of pseudorandom states is $\{|\phi_k\rangle\}_{k\in\{0,1\}^n}$, with

$$|\phi_k\rangle = \operatorname{\mathsf{Gen}}_k\left(|\psi\rangle^{\otimes r}\otimes|0^t\rangle\right)\,,$$

for some r and t polynomial in n, and Gen_k a unitary that is efficiently computable given access to the QPSPACE oracle.

The problem of breaking the PRS is then the following: given polynomially many copies of $|\tilde{\phi}\rangle$, where either (i) $|\tilde{\phi}\rangle = |\phi_k\rangle$ for some k, or (ii) $|\tilde{\phi}\rangle$ is Haar random (independent of $|\psi\rangle$), decide which is the case. Notice that this problem can be recast as follows, for some appropriate projections $\{\Lambda_k\}_{k\in\{0,1\}^n}$, and some constants a, b with b-a > 0.

Given $|\tilde{\phi}\rangle$ as above, and r copies of $|\psi\rangle$, determine whether

- (i) There exists $k \in \{0,1\}^n$ such that $\operatorname{Tr}\left[\Lambda_k\left(\ket{\tilde{\phi}}\setminus \langle \tilde{\phi} \otimes (\ket{\psi}\setminus \langle \psi \rangle)^{\otimes r} \otimes (\ket{0}\setminus \langle 0 \rangle)^{\otimes t}\right)\right] > b$, or
- (ii) For all $k \in \{0,1\}^n$, $\operatorname{Tr}\left[\Lambda_k\left(\left|\tilde{\phi}\right\rangle \langle \tilde{\phi}\right| \otimes (\left|\psi\right\rangle \langle \psi\right|)^{\otimes r} \otimes (\left|0\right\rangle \langle 0\right|)^{\otimes t}\right)\right] < a$.

What are the projections Λ_k ? For clarity, let's denote the registers in $|\tilde{\phi}\rangle \langle \tilde{\phi}| \otimes (|\psi\rangle \langle \psi|)^{\otimes r} \otimes (|0\rangle \langle 0|)^{\otimes t}$ as $|\tilde{\phi}\rangle \langle \tilde{\phi}|_{\mathsf{A}} \otimes (|\psi\rangle \langle \psi|)^{\otimes r}_{\mathsf{B}} \otimes (|0\rangle \langle 0|)^{\otimes t}_{\mathsf{C}}$. Then, in words, Λ_k applies Gen_k to registers BC , followed by a "swap test" between A and BC (projecting onto the "accept" outcome of the swap test). Formally,

$$\Lambda_k = (I_{\mathsf{A}} \otimes \operatorname{\mathsf{Gen}}_{k,\mathsf{BC}}) \prod_{sym}^2 (I_{\mathsf{A}} \otimes \operatorname{\mathsf{Gen}}_{k,\mathsf{BC}}),$$

where Π_{sum}^2 is the projection onto the symmetric subspace over A and BC.

Importantly, the latter problem takes a form that is *almost* amenable to the "quantum OR lemma" [HLM17]. The version of the "quantum OR lemma" that is relevant here informally says that there is an algorithm that requires only a *single* copy of $|\tilde{\phi}\rangle |\psi\rangle^{\otimes r} |0\rangle^{\otimes t}$ such that:

- in case (i), outputs 0 with probability at least $b^2/7$.
- in case (ii), outputs 0 with probability at most $4 \cdot 2^n \cdot a$.

¹⁵Again, technically, the construction could make use of states $|\psi_m\rangle$ for different values of m (at most polynomially different values). This does not affect the argument very much, and, for simplicity, in this technical overview, we consider constructions that use only copies of $|\psi_m\rangle$ for a single m.

Moreover, the algorithm uses a number of auxiliary qubits that is *logarithmic* in the number of projections. Since the number of projections is 2^n , the number of auxiliary qubits is only polynomial in n, and thus the algorithm can be implemented by invoking the QPSPACE oracle¹⁶.

Unfortunately, in the setting described above, a, b are constant: in particular, a is approximately $\frac{1}{2}$, while b = 1. Thus, the guarantee above is not useful because of the factor of 2^{n} ! There is a natural way to get around this, which is to use "parallel repetition": the projections Λ_k should act on poly(n) copies of the state considered above, and perform poly(n) swap tests. As a result of the amplification, we then have $a = 2^{-\operatorname{poly}(n)}$, which is sufficient to give an exponentially small upper bound in case (ii), and to distinguish between cases (i) and (ii), thus breaking security of the PRS. Crucially, this attack can be carried out because the security game of a PRS allows the adversary access to polynomially many copies of $|\tilde{\phi}\rangle$. The same attack does not work in the case of a 1PRS!

Remark 2.6. One might wonder whether a different attack based on shadow tomography would work here (along the lines of the attack described by Kretschmer in [Kre21, Subsection 1.3]). The issue is that here $\text{Tr}[\Lambda_k^2]$ is exponentially large, and so the estimation of the quantity $\text{Tr}[\Lambda_k \tilde{\phi}]$ given by shadow tomography has too large of a variance. Thus, shadow tomography does not seem to be sample-efficient in this setting.

3 Preliminaries

Notation. We will use the letter *n* to denote the security parameter. We denote by μ_d the Haar measure in *d* dimensional Hilbert space. The notation $|\psi\rangle \leftarrow \mu_d$ denotes sampling a state according to μ_d . For any finite set *K*, we write $k \leftarrow K$ to mean that *k* is sampled uniformly at random from *K*. We use the notation $A^{(\cdot)}$ to refer to an algorithm (classical or quantum) that makes queries to an oracle. For an operator *H*, we use the notation ||H|| to denote its trace norm. For a pure state $|\psi\rangle$, we denote by ψ the density matrix $|\psi\rangle \langle \psi|$. We will use Π^{sym} to refer to the projector corresponding to a swap test. The definition of swap test can be found, for example, in [BCWDW01].

Definition 3.1 (Pseudorandom States (PRS), adapted from [JLS18]). A pseudorandom states family is a QPT algorithm Gen that, on input $k \in \{0,1\}^n$, outputs a pure state $|\phi_k\rangle$ consisting of m = m(n) qubits. For security, we require the following pseudorandomness property: for any polynomial t = t(n) and any QPT adversary \mathcal{A} , there exists a negligible function negl such that for all n,

$$\left| \Pr_{k \leftarrow \{0,1\}^n} \left[\mathcal{A}(|\phi_k\rangle^{\otimes t}) = 1 \right] - \Pr_{|\phi\rangle \leftarrow \mu_{2m}} \left[\mathcal{A}(|\phi\rangle^{\otimes t}) = 1 \right] \right| = \mathsf{negl}(n), \tag{4}$$

where μ_{2^m} is the Haar measure on m(n) qubit states. We say that the construction is statistically secure if Eq. (4) holds for computationally unbounded adversaries. We emphasize that these unbounded adversaries receive only polynomially many copies of the Haar random state. For constructions relative to an oracle \mathcal{O} , both the generation algorithm G and the adversary \mathcal{A} get oracle access to \mathcal{O} .

¹⁶For the algorithm to be implementable by a QPSPACE machine, we additionally need that each measurement $\{\Lambda_k, I - \Lambda_k\}$ be also implementable by a QPSPACE machine, which is the case in this setting since Gen(k) and the "swap test" are efficient. The attentive reader will notice that there is one subtlety about the latter, namely that Gen(k) is itself allowed to make queries to the QPSPACE oracle! However, this is not an issue, since the resulting computation can still be simulated using a QPSPACE oracle. We again refer the reader to the start of Section 5 for a definition of the QPSPACE oracle.

Definition 3.2 (Single-copy Pseudorandom States (1PRS), adapted from [MY22a]). Single-copy pseudorandom states (1PRS) with computational and statistical security are defined as Definition 3.1, with two modifications:

- 1. (single-copy security) Eq. (4) holds only for t = 1.
- 2. (stretch) For every n, m(n) > n.

Several aspects are worth mentioning regarding this definition:

- Any pseudorandom generator (PRG) is also a 1PRS.
- A PRG is never a (multi-time) PRS: a distinguisher can measure in the standard basis multiple copies. For the PRG, the outputs from the different copies will always be the same with probability 1, but not so for a Haar-random state.
- Without the stretch requirement, the family $|\psi_k\rangle = |k\rangle$ would have been a 1PRS: the security requirement is that $\frac{1}{|\mathcal{K}|} \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}} |\psi_k\rangle \langle \psi_k|$ is computationally indistinguishable from the maximally mixed state, which holds for this simple construction.
- It has been shown in [GJMZ23, Theorem C.2 only in the arXiv version] that PRS implies 1PRS via a black-box construction. This is non-trivial since m may be shorter than n in a PRS.

We also need some technical lemmas throughout the proof.

Lemma 3.3 (Lévy's lemma, e.g., adapted from [Wat18, Theorem 7.37]). Let $\eta > 0, \delta > 0$, and $m \in \mathbb{N}$. Let $f : \mathbb{C}^{2^m} \to \mathbb{R}$ be an η -Lipschitz function. Then,

$$\Pr_{|\psi\rangle \leftarrow \mu_{2m}} \left[\left| f(|\psi\rangle) - \mathop{\mathbb{E}}_{|\psi\rangle \leftarrow \mu_{2m}} f(|\psi\rangle) \right| \ge \delta \right] \le 4 \exp\left(-\frac{C_1 2^m \delta^2}{\eta^2}\right),$$

where C_1 can be taken to be $\frac{2}{9\pi^3}$.

4 Construction of 1PRS in the CHRS model

In this section, we prove one of the main technical contributions of the paper: 1PRS exist unconditionally in the CHRS model.

Theorem 4.1. Statistically secure 1PRS exist in the CHRS model¹⁷.

This section is organized as follows. In Section 4.1, we formally define the CHRS model, as well as the notions of PRS and 1PRS in this model. In Section 4.2, we show that a one-time pad acting on *exactly half* of the qubits of a Haar random state is sufficient to "scramble" it, so that it is statistically indistinguishable from a maximally mixed state (even given polynomially many copies of the same Haar random state). The main tool in the proof is a theorem from Harrow [Har24], about applying Haar random unitaries to one half of a maximally entangled state. In Section 4.3, we show a key technical step: the "scrambling" property persists even if the quantum one-time pad is applied to *slightly less than half* of the qubits of the Haar random state, which can be interpreted as saying that the quantum pseudorandomness can be "amplified" slightly. This is enough to yield a 1PRS.

¹⁷See Definition 4.2 in Section 4.1.

4.1 The CHRS model

The Common Haar Random State (CHRS) model can be viewed as a quantum state generalization of the Common Reference String (CRS) model introduced by [CF01]. In the CHRS model, we assume a trusted third party, who prepares a family of states $S = \{|\psi_m\rangle\}_{m\in\mathbb{N}}$, where $|\psi_m\rangle$ is sampled according to the Haar measure on m qubits μ_{2^m} . All parties in a protocol (including the adversary) have access to polynomially many (in the security parameter n) copies of states from S. Formally, parties have access to the family of isometries $\{V_m\}_{m\in\mathbb{N}}$, where $V_m : \mathbb{C} \to \mathbb{C}^{2^m 18}$ is such that

$$V_m: |0\rangle \mapsto |\psi_m\rangle$$

Equivalently, for any state $|\alpha\rangle$ of any dimension, one query to V_m performs the map:

$$|\alpha\rangle \mapsto |\alpha\rangle |\psi_m\rangle$$
.

We clarify that, in this model, parties cannot query the different isometries "in superposition". Rather, they can query each V_m individually (provided they have enough space to store the *m*qubit output state $|\psi_m\rangle$). The model is meant to capture the scenario where parties can request copies of $|\psi_m\rangle$, for any *m* of their choice, from the trusted third party, as long as they have enough space to store the requested state.

Pseudorandom states in the CHRS model We formally define the notion of (single-copy) pseudorandom states in the CHRS model. The definition is as in the "plain model" (Definitions 3.1 and 3.2), except that both the generation algorithm and the adversary may use polynomially many copies of the CHRS states.

Definition 4.2 (PRS in the CHRS model). Let $S = \{|\psi_m\rangle\}_{m \in \mathbb{N}}$ denote the CHRS family of states. A pseudorandom state (PRS) family in the CHRS model is a QPT algorithm Gen satisfying the following. There exist polynomials $m, r : \mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{N}$ such that

• Gen: takes as input a security parameter 1^n , a string $k \in \{0,1\}^n$, and states $|\psi_1\rangle^{\otimes r(n)}$, $\ldots, |\psi_{r(n)}\rangle^{\otimes r(n)} \in S$, and outputs a pure state $|\phi_k\rangle$ consisting of m = m(n) qubits¹⁹.

Moreover, the following computational (resp. statistical) pseudorandomness property should be satisfied: for any polynomials $t, r' : \mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{N}$, and any QPT (resp. unbounded quantum) adversary \mathcal{A} , there exists a negligible function negl such that, for all n,

$$\begin{vmatrix} \Pr_{k \leftarrow \{0,1\}^n, \mathcal{S}} [\mathcal{A}(|\phi_k\rangle^{\otimes t(n)}, |\psi_1\rangle^{\otimes r'(n)}, \dots, |\psi_{r'(n)}\rangle^{\otimes r'(n)}) = 1] - \\ \Pr_{|\psi\rangle \leftarrow \mu_{2^m}, \mathcal{S}} [\mathcal{A}(|\phi\rangle^{\otimes t(n)}, |\psi_1\rangle^{\otimes r'(n)}, \dots, |\psi_{r'(n)}\rangle^{\otimes r'(n)}) = 1] \end{vmatrix} = \mathsf{negl}(n),$$

where we clarify that the probabilities are also over sampling the states in S. The definition of 1PRS in the CHRS model is analogous, except that t = 1, and it must be that m(n) > n for all n.

For clarity, we state the *statistical* pseudorandomness property of a 1PRS explicitly. We focus on the case where Gen, for security parameter 1^n , only takes as input a *single* Haar random state $|\psi_{m(n)}\rangle$, since this is the setting of our construction. In this case, the *statistical* pseudorandomness

¹⁸Notice that the domain is one-dimensional.

¹⁹Clearly, taking Gen of this form is without loss of generality.

property simplifies to the following²⁰: for any r = poly(n), there exists a negligible function negl such that, for all n,

$$\left\| \underset{k \leftarrow \{0,1\}^n}{\mathbb{E}} \underset{|\psi_m\rangle \leftarrow \mu_{2^m}}{\mathbb{E}} U_k \psi_m U_k^{\dagger} \otimes \psi_m^{\otimes r-1} - \underset{|\psi_m\rangle \leftarrow \mu_{2^m}}{\mathbb{E}} \frac{1}{2^m} \mathbb{1} \otimes \psi_m^{\otimes r-1} \right\| = \mathsf{negl}(n) \,. \tag{5}$$

4.2 Quantum one-time pad on *exactly half* of the qubits of a Haar random state

In this section, we show that a quantum one-time pad (QOTP) acting on *exactly half* of the qubits of a Haar random state is sufficient to "scramble" it, so that it is statistically indistinguishable from a maximally mixed state (even given polynomially many copies of the same Haar random state). The main tool in the proof is the following theorem from Harrow [Har24].

Let $|\phi_U\rangle \coloneqq (U \otimes I) |\Phi_d\rangle$, where $|\Phi_d\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{d}} \sum_{i=0}^{d-1} |ii\rangle$ denotes the maximally entangled state in $\mathbb{C}^d \otimes \mathbb{C}^d$ and $U \in SU(d)$ is a *d*-dimensional unitary.

Lemma 4.3 (adapted from [Har24, Theorem 3]). Assume $r^2 \leq d$, then

$$\left\| \mathop{\mathbb{E}}_{|\psi\rangle \leftarrow \mu_{d^2}} [\psi^{\otimes r}] - \mathop{\mathbb{E}}_{U \leftarrow SU(d)} [\phi_U^{\otimes r}] \right\| \le \frac{r^2}{d} \,,$$

where the norm on the LHS is the trace norm.

...

We now describe a "toy construction" of a 1PRS in the CHRS model, which consists of applying a QOTP to exactly the first half of the qubits of the Haar random state. Crucially, this construction does not satisfy the length stretching requirement of a 1PRS (which is handled in Section 4.3). Nonetheless, we prove that the construction in Fig. 1 satisfies the statistical pseudorandomness property of a 1PRS (from Eq. (5)). Recall that to describe the construction we just need to specify, for each value n of the security parameter, a family $\{U_k\}_{k \in \{0,1\}^n}$ of m-qubit unitaries, where, in the case of this "toy" example, m = n. Then, for a seed k, and a common Haar random m-qubit state $|\psi\rangle$, the corresponding 1PRS state is $|\phi_k\rangle = U_k |\psi\rangle$.

Let $n \in \mathbb{N}$ be even (otherwise redefine *n* to be n-1). Let $U_k = X^a Z^b \otimes \mathbb{1}_{n/2}$, where $a, b \in \{0, 1\}^{n/2}$ are the first and second halves of *k* respectively.

Figure 1: A construction that satisfies the statistical pseudorandomness property of a 1PRS in the CHRS model, but not the length-stretching requirement.

We will use the following "Pauli twirl" lemma.

Lemma 4.4 (Pauli twirl). Let $m \in \mathbb{N}$. Let ρ be an arbitrary linear operator on the space of m qubits. Let \mathcal{P}_m be the set of Pauli operators on m qubits, Then, we have

$$\mathop{\mathbb{E}}_{P \leftarrow \mathcal{P}_m} P \rho P^{\dagger} = \frac{\operatorname{Tr}[\rho]}{2^m} \mathbb{1} .$$
(6)

Proof. By linearity, it is enough to show that

$$\mathop{\mathbb{E}}_{P \leftarrow \mathcal{P}_m} P \ket{i} \langle j | P^{\dagger} = \frac{\delta_{ij}}{2^m} \mathbb{1},$$

²⁰While the construction itself may only use the state $|\psi_{m(n)}\rangle$, the (unbounded) adversary may still access other states from \mathcal{S} . However, it is clear that these additional states do not affect the trace distance in Eq. (5) at all.

where δ_{ij} is the Kronecker delta function. Denote by $\mathcal{P}_m(\rho)$ the left hand side of Eq. (6). The map $\mathcal{P}_m(\cdot)$ is a CPTP map, preserving the identity, i.e., $\mathcal{P}_m(\mathbb{1}) = \mathbb{1}$.

Notice that the actions of Pauli operators form a group, so for any $P \in \mathcal{P}_m$, $\mathcal{P}_m(\rho) = \mathcal{P}_m(P\rho P)$. Also, $\mathcal{P}_m(\cdot)$ is a linear channel. So if $i \neq j$, we can find $\ell \in [m]$ such that $|i\rangle$ and $|j\rangle$ lie in different eigenspaces of Z_ℓ , where Z_ℓ denotes "identity everywhere, except Z is applied to the ℓ -th qubit". In other words, $Z_\ell |i\rangle \langle j| Z_\ell = -|i\rangle \langle j|$. Then we have

$$\mathcal{P}_{m}(\ket{i}\ket{j}) = \mathcal{P}(Z_{\ell}\ket{i}\ket{j}Z_{\ell}) = -\mathcal{P}_{m}(\ket{i}\ket{j}) = 0$$

If i = j, then notice that $\sum_{k=0}^{2^m-1} X^k |i\rangle \langle i| X^k = 1$, where X^k ranges over all different products of X operators. So according to group invariance and linearity of $\mathcal{P}_m(\cdot)$, we have

$$\mathcal{P}_m(|i\rangle \langle i|) = \frac{1}{2^m} \sum_k \mathcal{P}_m(X^k |i\rangle \langle i| X^k) = \frac{1}{2^m} \mathcal{P}_m(\mathbb{1}) = \frac{\mathbb{1}}{2^m}.$$

We now show that the construction in Fig. 1 satisfies the statistical pseudorandomness property (from Eq. (5)).

Theorem 4.5. Let $m, r \in \mathbb{N}$ such that m is even, and $r \leq 2^{\frac{m}{2}}$. Then, the family of unitaries $\{U_k\}_{k \in \{0,1\}^m}$ from Fig. 1 satisfies

$$\left\| \mathbb{E}_{k \leftarrow \{0,1\}^m \mid \psi \rangle \leftarrow \mu_{2^m}} \mathbb{E}_{k} \psi U_k^{\dagger} \otimes \psi^{\otimes r-1} - \mathbb{E}_{\mid \psi \rangle \leftarrow \mu_{2^m}} \frac{1}{2^m} \mathbb{1} \otimes \psi^{\otimes r-1} \right\| \leq \frac{2r^2}{2^{m/2}}$$

Proof. Recall that $U_k = X^a Z^b \otimes \mathbb{1}_{m/2}$, where $a, b \in \{0, 1\}^{m/2}$ are the first and second halves of k. Then, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}_{k} \mathbb{E}_{\psi} (U_{k} \otimes \mathbb{1}^{\otimes r-1}) \psi^{\otimes r} (U_{k}^{\dagger} \otimes \mathbb{1}^{\otimes r-1}) - \mathbb{E}_{\psi} \frac{1}{2^{m}} \otimes \psi^{\otimes r-1} \Big\| \leq \\ & \left\| \mathbb{E}_{k} (U_{k} \otimes \mathbb{1}^{\otimes r-1}) \mathbb{E}_{\psi} \psi^{\otimes r} (U_{k}^{\dagger} \otimes \mathbb{1}^{\otimes r-1}) - \mathbb{E}_{k} (U_{k} \otimes \mathbb{1}^{\otimes r-1}) \mathbb{E}_{U} \phi_{U}^{\otimes r} (U_{k}^{\dagger} \otimes \mathbb{1}^{\otimes r-1}) \Big\| + \\ & \left\| \mathbb{E}_{k} (U_{k} \otimes \mathbb{1}^{\otimes r-1}) \mathbb{E}_{U} \phi_{U}^{\otimes r} (U_{k}^{\dagger} \otimes \mathbb{1}^{\otimes r-1}) - \mathbb{E}_{U} \frac{1}{2^{m}} \otimes \phi_{U}^{r-1} \Big\| + \left\| \mathbb{E}_{U} \frac{1}{2^{m}} \otimes \phi_{U}^{r-1} - \mathbb{E}_{\psi} \frac{1}{2^{m}} \otimes \psi^{\otimes r-1} \right\| \\ & \leq \frac{2r^{2}}{2^{m/2}} + \left\| \mathbb{E}_{k} (U_{k} \otimes \mathbb{1}^{\otimes r-1}) \mathbb{E}_{U} \phi_{U}^{\otimes r} (U_{k}^{\dagger} \otimes \mathbb{1}^{\otimes r-1}) - \mathbb{E}_{U} \frac{1}{2^{m}} \otimes \phi_{U}^{r-1} \Big\| , \end{aligned}$$

$$(7)$$

where the first inequality follows from the triangle inequality, and the second inequality follows from Lemma 4.3. Notice that

$$\begin{split} \mathbb{E}_{k}(U_{k}\otimes\mathbbm{1}^{\otimes r-1}) & \mathbb{E}_{U}\phi_{U}^{\otimes r}(U_{k}^{\dagger}\otimes\mathbbm{1}^{\otimes r-1}) = \mathbb{E}_{P\leftarrow\mathcal{P}_{m/2}}\mathbb{E}(PU\otimes\mathbbm{1})\Phi_{2^{m/2}}(U^{\dagger}P^{\dagger}\otimes\mathbbm{1})\otimes\phi_{U}^{\otimes r-1} \\ &= \frac{1}{2^{m/2}}\mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{i,j}PU\left|i\right\rangle\left\langle j\right|U^{\dagger}P^{\dagger}\otimes\left|i\right\rangle\left\langle j\right|\otimes\phi_{U}^{\otimes r-1}\right] \\ &= \frac{1}{2^{m/2}}\mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{i}\frac{1}{2^{m/2}}\mathbbm{1}\otimes\left|i\right\rangle\left\langle i\right|\otimes\phi_{U}^{\otimes r-1}\right] \\ &= \frac{1}{2^{m}}\otimes\mathbb{E}\left[\phi_{U}^{\otimes r-1}\right], \end{split}$$

where, in the third equality, we use Lemma 4.4. So, the second term in the last line of Eq. (7) vanishes. Therefore, we have

$$\left\| \mathbb{E}_{k} \mathop{\mathbb{E}}_{\psi} U_{k} \psi U_{k}^{\dagger} \otimes \psi^{r-1} - \mathop{\mathbb{E}}_{\psi} \frac{\mathbb{1}}{2^{m}} \otimes \psi^{\otimes r-1} \right\| \leq \frac{2r^{2}}{2^{m/2}}$$

as desired.

4.3 "Stretching" the quantum pseudorandomness

In this section, we show that the "1PRS" from Theorem 4.5 is still secure even if we the the QOTP is applied only to 0.45m qubits, and thus the key length is shrunk slightly to n = 0.9m bits.

More precisely, we show that the following construction (Fig. 2) is a statistical 1PRS in the CHRS model, i.e. it satisfies Eq. (5). Again, recall that to describe the construction we just need to specify, for each value n of the security parameter, a family $\{U_k\}_{k \in \{0,1\}^n}$ of m-qubit unitaries, where m is the output length. Then, for a seed k, and a common Haar random m-qubit state $|\psi\rangle$, the corresponding 1PRS state is $|\phi_k\rangle = U_k |\psi\rangle$.

Let $n, m \in \mathbb{N}$, where $0.9m \leq n < m$, and n is even (otherwise, redefine n to be the n-1). Define $U_k = X^a Z^b \otimes \mathbb{1}^{\otimes (m-n/2)}$, where $a, b \in \{0, 1\}^{n/2}$ are the first and second halves of k respectively.

Figure 2: Construction of a 1PRS in the CHRS model

In the rest of this section, we show that the construction of Fig. 2 is indeed a 1PRS. The key ingredient of our proof is a "stretching" result for quantum pseudorandomness in the CHRS model. Informally, this says the following: if there is a way to obtain "m qubits of single-copy pseudorandomness" from n bits of classical randomness (where n should be thought of as being linear in m), then one can also obtain "m qubits of pseudorandomness" from n-1 bits of classical randomness, with a slight loss in statistical distance (i.e. it is possible to save one classical bit of randomness). We emphasize that this "stretching" result applies specifically to the CHRS model, and, as is, does not apply to the plain model. We will eventually apply this result recursively starting from the construction of Fig. 1 (QOTP on exactly half of the qubits), which by Theorem 4.5 yields "m qubits of pseudorandomness" from m bits of classical randomness. The stretching result is the following.

Theorem 4.6. Let $m, n, r \in \mathbb{N}$ with r < m. If $\{U_k\}_{k \in \{0,1\}^n}$ is a set of unitaries acting on m-1 qubits states, then we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\| \underset{k \leftarrow \{0,1\}^{n} |\psi\rangle \leftarrow \mu_{2m}}{\mathbb{E}} (\mathbb{1} \otimes U_{k}) \psi(\mathbb{1} \otimes U_{k}^{\dagger}) \otimes \psi^{\otimes r-1} - \underset{|\psi\rangle \leftarrow \mu_{2m}}{\mathbb{E}} \frac{\mathbb{1}}{2^{m}} \otimes \psi^{\otimes r-1} \right\| \\ & \leq 5 \left\| \underset{k \leftarrow \{0,1\}^{n} |\psi'\rangle \leftarrow \mu_{2m-1}}{\mathbb{E}} U_{k} \psi' U_{k}^{\dagger} \otimes \psi'^{\otimes r-1} - \underset{|\psi'\rangle}{\mathbb{E}} \frac{\mathbb{1}}{2^{m-1}} \otimes \psi'^{\otimes r-1} \right\| + \frac{800r\sqrt{m}}{2^{m/2}}, \end{aligned}$$
(8)

Since it is easy to miss, we emphasize that, in the above theorem, $|\psi\rangle$ is a Haar random *m*-qubit state, while $|\psi'\rangle$ is a Haar random (m-1)-qubit state.

To prove Theorem 4.6, we will need two lemmas. The first says that a typical Haar random state on m qubits is "close" to being maximally entangled across the (1, m - 1) bipartition (i.e. the

bipartition that considers the first qubit as the "left" register, and the remaining m-1 qubits as the "right" register). More concretely, the mixed state obtained by sampling a Haar random *m*-qubit state is close (in trace distance) to the state obtained by sampling two Haar random (m-1)-qubit states $|\psi_1\rangle$ and $|\psi_2\rangle$, and outputting $|\psi'\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} |0\rangle |\psi_1\rangle + \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} |1\rangle |\psi_2\rangle$. More precisely, we establish the following lemma, which considers *r* copies of the state.

Lemma 4.7. Let $m, r \in \mathbb{N}$. We have

$$\left\| \mathbb{E}_{|\psi\rangle \leftarrow \mu_{2^{m}}} \psi^{\otimes r} - \mathbb{E}_{|\psi_{1}\rangle, |\psi_{2}\rangle \leftarrow \mu_{2^{m-1}}} \psi'^{\otimes r} \right\| \leq \frac{80r\sqrt{m}}{2^{m/2}}$$

where $|\psi'\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} |0\rangle |\psi_1\rangle + \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} |1\rangle |\psi_2\rangle.$

Proof. First, notice that one can sample a Haar random state by sampling $|\tilde{\psi}\rangle = \alpha |0\rangle |\psi_1\rangle + \sqrt{1-\alpha^2} |1\rangle |\psi_2\rangle$, where $|\psi_1\rangle$ and $|\psi_2\rangle$ are Haar random m-1 qubit states, and α is sampled according to the marginal distribution of $|\langle \langle 0| \otimes 1 \rangle |\psi\rangle|$ where $|\psi\rangle$ is sampled from the Haar distribution. Denote the latter distribution by \mathcal{D}_0 . For convenience, in the rest of the section, we use the notation $\langle 0_1 | \psi \rangle = (\langle 0| \otimes 1) | \psi \rangle$. The fact that $|\tilde{\psi}\rangle$ has the same distribution as a Haar random state follows from the unitary invariance of the Haar measure. More precisely, one can see this as follows, where for (m-1)-qubit unitaries U_1 and U_2 we write $C_{U_1,U_2} = |0\rangle \langle 0| \otimes U_1 + |1\rangle \langle 1| \otimes U_2$:

$$\mathbb{E}_{\substack{|\psi\rangle \leftarrow \mu_{2m}}} \psi^{\otimes r} = \mathbb{E}_{\substack{U_1, U_2 \leftarrow SU(2^{m-1}) \\ |\psi\rangle \leftarrow \mu_{2m}}} (C_{U_1, U_2} \psi C_{U_1, U_2}^{\dagger})^{\otimes r} \\
= \mathbb{E}_{\substack{U_1, U_2 \leftarrow SU(2^{m-1}) \\ |\psi\rangle \leftarrow \mu_{2m}, \\ \alpha, |\psi_1\rangle, |\psi_2\rangle, |\tilde{\psi}\rangle : |\psi\rangle = \alpha |0\rangle |\psi_1\rangle + \sqrt{1 - \alpha^2} |1\rangle |\psi_2\rangle, \\
|\tilde{\psi}\rangle = \alpha |0\rangle U_1 |\psi_1\rangle + \sqrt{1 - \alpha^2} |1\rangle U_2 |\psi_2\rangle \\
= \mathbb{E}_{\substack{\alpha \leftarrow \mathcal{D}_0, |\psi_1\rangle, |\psi_2\rangle \leftarrow \mu_{2m-1}, \\ |\psi\rangle = \alpha |0\rangle |\psi_1\rangle + \sqrt{1 - \alpha^2} |1\rangle |\psi_2\rangle}} (9)$$

where the first equality is by the unitary invariance of the Haar measure.

Now, define a map F such that, for any state $|\psi\rangle = \alpha |0\rangle |\psi_1\rangle + \beta |1\rangle |\psi_2\rangle$, with $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{R}^+$, $F(|\psi\rangle) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} |0\rangle |\psi_1\rangle + \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} |1\rangle |\psi_2\rangle$. Then, $F(|\psi\rangle)$ is well defined on all pure states, and, by Eq. (9), the distribution of $F(|\psi\rangle)$ for a Haar random $|\psi\rangle$ is identical to the distribution of $|\psi'\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} |0\rangle |\psi_1\rangle + \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} |1\rangle |\psi_2\rangle$ for Haar random $|\psi_1\rangle$ and $|\psi_2\rangle$. It follows that

$$\left\| \mathbb{E}_{|\psi\rangle \leftarrow \mu_{2m}} \psi^{\otimes r} - \mathbb{E}_{\substack{|\psi_{1}\rangle, |\psi_{2}\rangle \leftarrow \mu_{2m-1} \\ |\psi'\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} |0\rangle |\psi_{1}\rangle + \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} |1\rangle |\psi_{2}\rangle} \psi^{\otimes r} \right\| = \left\| \mathbb{E}_{\substack{\alpha \leftarrow \mathcal{D}_{0}, |\psi_{1}\rangle, |\psi_{2}\rangle \leftarrow \mu_{2m-1}, \\ |\psi\rangle = \alpha |0\rangle |\psi_{1}\rangle + \sqrt{1-\alpha^{2}} |1\rangle |\psi_{2}\rangle} \psi^{\otimes r} - \mathbb{E}_{\substack{|\psi\rangle \leftarrow \mu_{2m-1}, \\ |\psi\rangle = \alpha |0\rangle |\psi_{1}\rangle + \sqrt{1-\alpha^{2}} |1\rangle |\psi_{2}\rangle} \psi^{\otimes r} - F(\psi)^{\otimes r} \right\|$$

$$= \left\| \mathbb{E}_{\substack{|\psi\rangle \leftarrow \mu_{2m}, \\ |\psi\rangle \leftarrow \mu_{2m}}} (\psi^{\otimes r} - F(\psi)^{\otimes r}) \right\|$$

$$= \left\| \mathbb{E}_{\substack{|\psi\rangle \leftarrow \mu_{2m}, \\ |\psi\rangle \leftarrow \mu_{2m}}} \|\psi^{\otimes r} - F(\psi)^{\otimes r} \|$$

$$\le \mathbb{E}_{\substack{|\psi\rangle \leftarrow \mu_{2m}, \\ |\psi\rangle \leftarrow \mu_{2m}}} \|\psi - F(\psi)\|, \qquad (10)$$

where the last line holds due to the triangle inequality and properties of the trace distance. So, to prove the lemma, it is enough to prove that

$$\mathbb{E}_{|\psi\rangle \leftarrow \mu_{2^m}} \|\psi - F(\psi)\| \le \frac{80\sqrt{m}}{2^{m/2}}$$

Notice that, letting $|\psi\rangle = \alpha |0\rangle |\psi_1\rangle + \sqrt{1 - \alpha^2} |1\rangle |\psi_2\rangle$, for $\alpha \ge 0$, and denoting $\beta = \sqrt{1 - \alpha^2}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\psi - F(\psi)\| &\leq \left|\alpha^{2} - \frac{1}{2}\right| \||\psi_{1}\rangle \langle\psi_{1}|\| + \left|\beta^{2} - \frac{1}{2}\right| \||\psi_{2}\rangle \langle\psi_{2}|\| + \left|\alpha\beta - \frac{1}{2}\right| \||\psi_{1}\rangle \langle\psi_{2}|\| + \left|\alpha\beta - \frac{1}{2}\right| \||\psi_{2}\rangle \langle\psi_{1}|| \\ &= \left|\alpha^{2} - \frac{1}{2}\right| + \left|\beta^{2} - \frac{1}{2}\right| + 2\left|\alpha\beta - \frac{1}{2}\right| \\ &\leq 4\left|\alpha^{2} - \frac{1}{2}\right| \end{aligned}$$
(11)

So it is enough of us to bound $\mathbb{E}_{\alpha \leftarrow \mathcal{D}_0} \left| \alpha^2 - \frac{1}{2} \right|$. Consider the function $f : U(d) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that $f(|\psi\rangle) = \| \langle 0_1 | \psi \rangle \|^2$, where recall that we denote $\langle 0_1 | \psi \rangle = (\langle 0 | \otimes I) | \psi \rangle$. f is 2-Lipschitz, because for any two states $|\psi_1\rangle$ and $|\psi_2\rangle$, we have

$$\begin{split} |f(|\psi_1\rangle) - f(|\psi_2\rangle)| &= \left| \| \langle 0_1 |\psi_1\rangle \|^2 - \| \langle 0_1 |\psi_2\rangle \|^2 \right| \\ &\leq \| \langle 0_1 |\psi_1\rangle \| \cdot \left| \| \langle 0_1 |\psi_1\rangle \| - \| \langle 0_1 |\psi_2\rangle \| \right| + \| \langle 0_1 |\psi_2\rangle \| \cdot \left| \| \langle 0_1 |\psi_1\rangle \| - \| \langle 0_1 |\psi_2\rangle \| \right| \\ &\leq 2 \Big| \| \langle 0_1 |\psi_1\rangle \| - \| \langle 0_1 |\psi_2\rangle \| \Big| \leq 2 \| |\psi_1\rangle - |\psi_2\rangle \| \,. \end{split}$$

Thus, using Lévy's lemma (Lemma 3.3), we have

$$\Pr_{|\psi\rangle \leftarrow \mu_{2^m}} \left[|f(\psi) - \mathop{\mathbb{E}}_{|\psi\rangle \leftarrow \mu_{2^m}} f(|\psi\rangle)| \ge \delta \right] \le 4 \exp\left(-\frac{2^m \delta^2}{18\pi^3}\right)$$

Let $\delta = 18 \frac{\sqrt{m}}{2^{m/2}}$. Then, since $\mathbb{E}_{|\psi\rangle \leftarrow \mu_{2m}} f(|\psi\rangle) = 1/2$, we have

$$\begin{split} \mathbb{E}_{|\psi\rangle \leftarrow \mu_{2m}} \left| f(|\psi\rangle) - 1/2 \right| &\leq \frac{1}{2} \Pr_{|\psi\rangle \leftarrow \mu_{2m}} \left(\left| f(|\psi\rangle) - \mathbb{E}_{|\psi\rangle \leftarrow \mu_{2m}} f(|\psi\rangle) \right| \geq \delta \right) + \delta \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \cdot 4 \cdot \exp\left(-\frac{2^m \delta^2}{18\pi^3} \right) + \delta \\ &\leq 2 \exp(-m/2) + \frac{18\sqrt{m}}{2^{m/2}} \\ &\leq \frac{2}{2^{m/2}} + \frac{18\sqrt{m}}{2^{m/2}} \\ &\leq \frac{20\sqrt{m}}{2^{m/2}}. \end{split}$$

Combining this with Eq. (10) and (11) gives the desired conclusion.

We can also generate the state $|\psi'\rangle$ by $|\psi_1\rangle$ and a random unitary $U \in U(2^{m-1})$, in fact, we can always write $|\psi'\rangle$ as

$$\left|\psi'\right\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(\left|0\right\rangle\left|\psi_{1}\right\rangle + \left|1\right\rangle\left|\psi_{2}\right\rangle) = CU\left|+\right\rangle\left|\psi_{1}\right\rangle$$

where $U \in U(2^{m-1})$ is the proper unitary(probability with phase) rotating $|\psi_1\rangle$ to $|\psi_2\rangle$, and $CU = |0\rangle \langle 0| \otimes \mathbb{1} + |1\rangle \langle 1| \otimes U$ is the corresponding controlled U gate. Define $|\psi_{CU}\rangle = CU |+\rangle |\psi_1\rangle$. So, with this observation, we have

$$\mathop{\mathbb{E}}_{|\psi_1\rangle\leftarrow \mu_{2^{m-1}},|\psi_2\rangle\leftarrow \mu_{2^{m-1}}}\psi'^{\otimes r} = \mathop{\mathbb{E}}_{|\psi_1\rangle\leftarrow \mu_{2^{m-1}},U\leftarrow U(2^{m-1})}\psi_{CU}^{\otimes r}$$

as they are essentially the same distribution.

We also need the following technical lemma.

Lemma 4.8. For a Hermitian matrix A, if the inequality $||\langle a|_1 A |a\rangle_1|| < \epsilon$ holds for all $|a\rangle \in \{|0\rangle, |1\rangle, |+\rangle, |+i\rangle\}$, then $||A|| < 10\epsilon$.

Proof. Let $A = |0\rangle \langle 0|_1 \otimes A_{00} + |0\rangle \langle 1|_1 \otimes A_{01} + |1\rangle \langle 0|_1 \otimes A_{10} + |1\rangle \langle 1|_1 \otimes A_{11}$, for some $A_{00}, A_{01}, A_{10}, A_{11}$, then the hypothesis of the lemma is equivalent to

$$||A_{00}|| \leq \epsilon$$

$$||A_{11}|| \leq \epsilon$$

$$\frac{1}{2} ||A_{00} + A_{01} + A_{10} + A_{11}|| \leq \epsilon$$

$$\frac{1}{2} ||A_{00} - iA_{01} + iA_{10} + A_{11}|| \leq \epsilon.$$
(12)

From Eq. (12), we can deduce that

$$\begin{aligned} \|A_{01}\| &= \left\| \frac{1}{2} (A_{00} + A_{01} + A_{10} + A_{11}) + \frac{i}{2} (A_{00} - iA_{01} + iA_{10} + A_{11}) - \frac{1+i}{2} A_{00} - \frac{1+i}{2} A_{11} \right\| \\ &\leq \epsilon + \epsilon + \frac{\sqrt{2}}{2} \epsilon + \frac{\sqrt{2}}{2} \epsilon \\ &\leq (2 + \sqrt{2}) \epsilon \end{aligned}$$

Similarly we have $||A_{10}|| \le (2 + \sqrt{2}) \epsilon$, so

$$||A|| \le ||A_{00}|| + ||A_{01}|| + ||A_{10}|| + ||A_{11}|| \le (6 + 2\sqrt{2})\epsilon < 10\epsilon.$$

We are now ready to prove Theorem 4.6.

Proof of Theorem 4.6. According to Lemma 4.8, it suffices to show that, for all $|a\rangle \in \{|0\rangle, |1\rangle, |+\rangle, |+i\rangle\},\$

$$\begin{split} \left| \mathop{\mathbb{E}}_{k} \mathop{\mathbb{E}}_{\psi} \langle a|_{1} \left(\mathbbm{1} \otimes U_{k} \right) \psi(\mathbbm{1} \otimes U_{k}^{\dagger}) \left| a \rangle_{1} \otimes \psi^{\otimes r-1} - \mathop{\mathbb{E}}_{\psi} \langle a|_{1} \frac{\mathbbm{1}}{2^{m}} \left| a \rangle_{1} \otimes \psi^{\otimes r-1} \right\| &\leq \\ \frac{1}{2} \left\| \mathop{\mathbb{E}}_{k} \mathop{\mathbb{E}}_{\psi_{1}} U_{k} \psi_{1} U_{k}^{\dagger} \otimes \psi_{1}^{\otimes r-1} - \mathop{\mathbb{E}}_{\psi_{1}} \frac{\mathbbm{1}}{2^{m-1}} \otimes \psi_{1}^{\otimes r-1} \right\| + \frac{80r\sqrt{m}}{2^{m/2}} \,. \end{split}$$

By the unitary invariance of the Haar measure, the LHS is identical for all $|a\rangle \in \{|0\rangle, |1\rangle, |+\rangle, |+i\rangle\}$. Thus, it suffices to show that

$$\begin{split} \left\| \mathbb{E} \mathop{\mathbb{E}}_{k} \psi \left\langle 0\right|_{1} (\mathbbm{1} \otimes U_{k}) \psi(\mathbbm{1} \otimes U_{k}^{\dagger}) \left| 0 \right\rangle_{1} \otimes \psi^{\otimes r-1} - \mathop{\mathbb{E}}_{\psi} \left\langle 0\right|_{1} \frac{\mathbbm{1}}{2^{m}} \left| 0 \right\rangle_{1} \otimes \psi^{\otimes r-1} \right\| &\leq \\ \frac{1}{2} \left\| \mathbb{E} \mathop{\mathbb{E}}_{k} \mathop{\mathbb{E}}_{\psi_{1}} U_{k} \psi_{1} U_{k}^{\dagger} \otimes \psi_{1}^{\otimes r-1} - \mathop{\mathbb{E}}_{\psi_{1}} \frac{\mathbbm{1}}{2^{m-1}} \otimes \psi_{1}^{\otimes r-1} \right\| + \frac{80r\sqrt{m}}{2^{m/2}} \,. \end{split}$$

To keep the notation simple in the next calculations, we write $\mathbb{E}_{|\psi_1\rangle,|\psi_2\rangle}$ as short for $\mathbb{E}_{|\psi_1\rangle,|\psi_2\rangle\leftarrow\mu_{2^{m-1}}}$, and we denote $|\psi'\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} |0\rangle |\psi_1\rangle + \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} |1\rangle |\psi_2\rangle$. We have

where the first inequality is by a triangle inequality, and the second uses Lemma 4.7 combined with the fact that the trace norm is decreasing under taking projections. Thus, it suffices for us to show that

$$\left\| \mathbb{E}_{k \mid \psi_{1} \rangle, \mid \psi_{2} \rangle} \left\langle 0 \mid_{1} (\mathbb{1} \otimes U_{k}) \psi'(\mathbb{1} \otimes U_{k}^{\dagger}) \mid 0 \rangle_{1} \otimes \psi'^{\otimes r-1} - \mathbb{E}_{\mid \psi_{1} \rangle, \mid \psi_{2} \rangle} \left\langle 0 \mid_{1} \frac{\mathbb{1}}{2^{m}} \mid 0 \rangle_{1} \otimes \psi'^{\otimes r-1} \right\|$$

$$\leq \frac{1}{2} \left\| \mathbb{E}_{k \mid \psi_{1}} U_{k} \psi_{1} U_{k}^{\dagger} \otimes \psi_{1}^{\otimes r-1} - \mathbb{E}_{\psi_{1}} \frac{\mathbb{1}}{2^{m-1}} \otimes \psi_{1}^{\otimes r-1} \right\|,$$

$$(13)$$

...

Now, for $U \in U(2^{m-1})$, define the controlled-U gate $CU = |0\rangle \langle 0| \otimes 1 + |1\rangle \langle 1| \otimes U$. Then, notice that the distribution of states $|\psi'\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|0\rangle |\psi_1\rangle + |1\rangle |\psi_2\rangle)$, where $|\psi_1\rangle, |\psi_2\rangle \leftarrow \mu_{2^{m-1}}$, is identical to the distribution of states $|\psi'\rangle = C\dot{U}|+\rangle |\psi_1\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|0\rangle |\psi_1\rangle + |1\rangle U |\psi_1\rangle)$, where $|\psi_1\rangle \leftarrow \mu_{2^{m-1}}$ and $U \leftarrow SU(2^{m-1})$ (this equivalence implicitly uses the unitary invariance of the Haar measure). For convenience, we denote $|\psi_{CU}\rangle = CU |+\rangle |\psi_1\rangle$, and we write \mathbb{E}_{ψ_1} and \mathbb{E}_U as short for $E_{|\psi_1\rangle\leftarrow\mu_{2m-1}}$ and $E_{U \leftarrow SU(2^{m-1})}$ respectively. Thus, Eq. (13) is equivalent to

$$\begin{split} & \left\| \mathbb{E}_{k} \mathbb{E}_{\psi_{1},U} \left\langle 0 \right|_{1} (\mathbb{1} \otimes U_{k}) \psi_{CU} (\mathbb{1} \otimes U_{k}^{\dagger}) \left| 0 \right\rangle_{1} \otimes \psi_{CU}^{\otimes r-1} - \mathbb{E}_{\psi_{1},U} \left\langle 0 \right|_{1} \frac{\mathbb{1}}{2^{m}} \left| 0 \right\rangle_{1} \otimes \psi_{CU}^{\otimes r-1} \right\| \\ & \leq \frac{1}{2} \left\| \mathbb{E}_{k} \mathbb{E}_{\psi_{1}} U_{k} \psi_{1} U_{k}^{\dagger} \otimes \psi_{1}^{\otimes r-1} - \mathbb{E}_{\psi_{1}} \frac{\mathbb{1}}{2^{m-1}} \otimes \psi_{1}^{\otimes r-1} \right\| \,, \end{split}$$

So, we are left with showing that the latter inequality is true, which is equivalent to

$$\left\| \mathbb{E}_{k} \mathbb{E}_{\psi_{1}, U} U_{k} \psi_{1} U_{k}^{\dagger} \otimes \psi_{CU}^{\otimes r-1} - \mathbb{E}_{\psi_{1}, U} \frac{\mathbb{1}}{2^{m-1}} \otimes \psi_{CU}^{\otimes r-1} \right\| \leq \left\| \mathbb{E}_{k} \mathbb{E}_{\psi_{1}} U_{k} \psi_{1} U_{k}^{\dagger} \otimes \psi_{1}^{\otimes r-1} - \mathbb{E}_{\psi_{1}} \frac{\mathbb{1}}{2^{m-1}} \otimes \psi_{1}^{\otimes r-1} \right\|$$

Let us denote $|\psi_1\rangle = |+\rangle |\psi_1\rangle$. Notice that

$$\begin{split} & \left\| \mathbb{E} \underset{\psi_{1},U}{\mathbb{E}} U_{k} \psi_{1} U_{k}^{\dagger} \otimes \psi_{CU}^{\otimes r-1} - \underset{\psi_{1},U}{\mathbb{E}} \frac{1}{2^{m-1}} \otimes \psi_{CU}^{\otimes r-1} \right\| \\ &= \left\| \mathbb{E} \left(\mathbb{E} \underset{k}{\mathbb{E}} U_{k} \psi_{1} U_{k}^{\dagger} \otimes (CU \tilde{\psi}_{1} CU^{\dagger})^{\otimes r-1} - \underset{\psi_{1}}{\mathbb{E}} \frac{1}{2^{m-1}} \otimes (CU \tilde{\psi}_{1} CU^{\dagger})^{\otimes r-1} \right) \right\| \\ &\leq \mathbb{E} U \left\| \mathbb{E} \underset{k}{\mathbb{E}} U_{k} \psi_{1} U_{k}^{\dagger} \otimes (CU \tilde{\psi}_{1} CU^{\dagger})^{\otimes r-1} - \underset{\psi_{1}}{\mathbb{E}} \frac{1}{2^{m-1}} \otimes (CU \tilde{\psi}_{1} CU^{\dagger})^{\otimes r-1} \right\| \\ &= \mathbb{E} U \left\| \mathbb{E} \underset{k}{\mathbb{E}} U_{k} \psi_{1} U_{k}^{\dagger} \otimes \tilde{\psi}_{1}^{\otimes r-1} - \underset{\psi_{1}}{\mathbb{E}} \frac{1}{2^{m-1}} \otimes \tilde{\psi}_{1}^{\otimes r-1} \right\| \\ &= \left\| \mathbb{E} \underset{k}{\mathbb{E}} \underset{\psi_{1}}{\mathbb{E}} U_{k} \psi_{1} U_{k}^{\dagger} \otimes \psi_{1}^{\otimes r-1} - \underset{\psi_{1}}{\mathbb{E}} \frac{1}{2^{m-1}} \otimes \psi_{1}^{\otimes r-1} \right\| . \end{split}$$

This concludes the proof of Theorem 4.6.

We now have all the ingredients to show that the 1PRS construction from Fig. 2 is secure.

Corollary 4.9. Let $n, m \in \mathbb{N}$, where $0.9m \le n < m$, and n is even. Let $\{U_k\}_{k \in \{0,1\}^n}$ be the family of m-qubit unitaries from Fig. 2, i.e. $U_k = X^a Z^b \otimes \mathbb{1}^{\otimes (m-n/2)}$, where $a, b \in \{0,1\}^{\frac{n}{2}}$ are the first and second halves of k. Then, for any $r < 2^{\frac{m}{2}}$,

$$\left\| \underset{k \leftarrow \{0,1\}^n | \psi \rangle \leftarrow \mu_{2m}}{\mathbb{E}} (\mathbb{1} \otimes U_k) \psi(\mathbb{1} \otimes U_k^{\dagger}) \otimes \psi^{\otimes r-1} - \underset{|\psi \rangle \leftarrow \mu_{2m}}{\mathbb{E}} \frac{\mathbb{1}}{2^m} \otimes \psi^{\otimes r-1} \right\| \leq \frac{(2r^2 + 800rm\sqrt{m})5^{0.1m}}{2^{0.45m}}.$$
(14)

Proof. Let $\ell = m - n$. Recursively apply Theorem 4.6 ℓ times, using Theorem 4.5 to bound the RHS of Eq. (8) the first time that Theorem 4.6 is applied.

Corollary 4.10. The construction from Fig. 2 is a 1PRS in the CHRS model (as in Definition 4.2).

Proof. Take n = 0.9m. Then, for any r = poly(m), and for all large enough m, the RHS of Eq. (14) is less than 0.86^m (since $5^{0.1m}/2^{0.45m} = (0.85987...)^m$). Note that, in Corollary 4.9, the adversary only gets access to r copies of a *single* m-qubit Haar random state $|\psi\rangle$, whereas in the definition of a 1PRS in the CHRS model (Definition 4.2), the adversary has also access to the other states from S. However, as pointed out earlier, since our construction only uses the m-qubit state (for output of length m), and all of the states in S are independently sampled, the security property of Definition 4.2 is equivalent to that of Eq. (5).

Note that in our definition of 1PRS in the CHRS model (Definition 4.2), the security guarantee is "on average over S". However, for the purpose of utilizing this result in the context of an oracle separation (as we will do in Section 5), it is important that we can find a *fixed* family of states Srelative to which 1PRS exist. We show that this is the case: with probability 1 over S, the 1PRS security holds (against *all* adversaries).

Corollary 4.11. Let $S = \{|\psi_m\rangle\}_{m \in \mathbb{N}}$ denote the CHRS family of states. Then, with probability 1, S satisfies the following property: for any adversary A with access to polynomially many copies of states in S, there exists a negligible function negl, such that, for all m,

$$\left| \mathbb{P}[\mathcal{A}^{\mathcal{S}}(1^m, \underset{k}{\mathbb{E}} U_k \psi_m U_k^{\dagger}) \to 1] - \mathbb{P}[\mathcal{A}^{\mathcal{S}}(1^m, \frac{1}{2^m})] \right| = \mathsf{negl}(m) \,,$$

where the U_k are as defined in Fig. 2, and the notation $\mathcal{A}^{\mathcal{S}}$ denotes that \mathcal{A} has access to polynomially many copies of states from \mathcal{S} .

Proof. As pointed out earlier, it suffices to consider the case where $\mathcal{A}^{\mathcal{S}}(1^m, \cdot)$ only gets polynomially many copies of the *single* state $|\psi_m\rangle$ (rather than various states in \mathcal{S}). Any adversary can be described by a Turing machine that on input 1^m outputs a distinguishing quantum circuit. Denote the length of the Turing machine by $|\mathcal{A}|$. Then, by Corollary 4.10, we know that for any adversary $\mathcal{A}^{\mathcal{S}}$ with access to poly(m) copies of $|\psi_m\rangle$,

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{S}}\left(\mathsf{adv}(\mathcal{A}^{\mathcal{S}}(1^m, \cdot))\right) < 0.86^m$$

for large enough m, where $\mathsf{adv}(\mathcal{A}^{\mathcal{S}}(1^m, \cdot))$ denotes \mathcal{A} 's distinguishing advantage (since $5^{0.1m}/2^{0.45m} = (0.85987...)^m$). Thus, by an averaging argument, for any adversary \mathcal{A} ,

$$\mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{S}}\left[\mathsf{adv}(\mathcal{A}^{\mathcal{S}}(1^m, \cdot)) > 0.95^m\right] < 0.95^m \tag{15}$$

for large enough m. For an adversary \mathcal{A} , let $E_{\mathcal{A},m}$ be the event that $\mathsf{adv}(\mathcal{A}^{\mathcal{S}}(1^m, \cdot)) > 0.95^m$. Then, Eq. (15) can be equivalently restated as: $\Pr_{\mathcal{S}} E_{\mathcal{A},m} < 0.95^m$ holds for all but finite m. Thus $\sum \Pr_{\mathcal{S}} E_{\mathcal{A},m}$ is finite. Hence, by the Borel-Cantelli lemma, with probability 1 over randomly sampling \mathcal{S} , the event $E_{\mathcal{A},m}$ happens only for finitely many m, i.e. $\mathsf{adv}(\mathcal{A}^{\mathcal{S}}(1^m, \cdot)) < 0.95^m$ holds for all large enough m.

For an adversary \mathcal{A} , denote by $F_{\mathcal{A}}$ the event that $E_{\mathcal{A},m}$ holds for infinitely many m. Then we can restate what we found above as $\Pr_{\mathcal{S}} F_{\mathcal{A}} = 0$. Now, notice that there are only countably many different adversaries \mathcal{A} (because \mathcal{A} can be described by a string of finite length). So, by a union bound, we have

$$\Pr_{\mathcal{S}}[\exists \mathcal{A} \text{ s.t. } F_{\mathcal{A}} \text{ happens}] \leq \sum_{\mathcal{A}} \Pr_{\mathcal{S}}[F_{\mathcal{A}}] = 0.$$

All in all, we have established that, with probability 1 over sampling S, it holds that, for all adversaries A, $\mathsf{adv}(\mathcal{A}^{S}(1^{m}, \cdot)) < 0.95^{m}$ holds for all large enough m.

Thus, we have the following.

Corollary 4.12. With probability 1 over sampling a family of Haar random states $S = \{|\psi_m\rangle\}_{m \in \mathbb{N}}$ where $|\psi_m\rangle \leftarrow \mu_{2^m}$, the construction from Fig. 2 is a statistically secure 1PRS (relative to S).

5 Oracle separation of PRS and 1PRS

In this section, we show that there is an oracle relative to which 1PRS exist, but PRS do not. This implies that there does not exist a (certain variant of a) *fully black-box construction* of a PRS from a 1PRS (the precise variant is stated in Corollary 5.8, and a detailed explanation of the terminology is provided in Section 5.3). We start by describing the separating oracle.

Separating oracle The separating oracle, which we denote as \mathcal{O} , consists of two oracles \mathcal{O}_1 and \mathcal{O}_2 . The first oracle \mathcal{O}_1 is identical to the oracle of the CHRS model. This is best thought of as a distribution over oracles (although we show that it is possible to fix one particular instance from the distribution). To remind the reader, \mathcal{O}_1 is obtained by sampling a sequence of Haar random states $\{|\psi_m\rangle\}_{m=1}^{\infty}$, where $|\psi_m\rangle$ is on m qubits. Then, given a unary input 1^m , \mathcal{O}_1 outputs the state $|\psi_m\rangle$. We emphasize that \mathcal{O}_1 only takes inputs of the form 1^m (and not superpositions of these). Thus, formally, each call to the oracle can be thought of as applying an isometry (see Section 4.1). Informally, the second oracle \mathcal{O}_2 is a quantum oracle that provides the ability to perform any quantum operations that a QPSPACE machine can apply: it receives as input a state $|\alpha\rangle$ on s qubits, a concise description of a polynomial space quantum circuit C acting on these s qubits, and it returns the result of C acting on $|\alpha\rangle$. Formally, \mathcal{O}_2 acts as follows: the input consists of a quantum state $|\alpha\rangle$ on some number s of qubits, a classical Turing Machine M, and a number t. The oracle runs the classical Turing machine M for t steps. The output of the Turing machine should represent a quantum circuit C that acts on exactly s qubits. Note that since the Turing machine runs only for t steps, clearly, the quantum circuit has at most t gates. If the quantum circuit that was printed does not use exactly s qubits, or if the Turing Machine does not terminate after t steps,

the oracle aborts (and outputs the \perp symbol). Otherwise, the oracle applies the circuit C on $|\alpha\rangle$, and returns the output.

We show the following.

Theorem 5.1. With respect to $\mathcal{O} = (\mathcal{O}_1, \mathcal{O}_2)$, 1PRS exist, but PRS (with output length at least $\log n + 10$, where n is the seed length) do not.

The existence of 1PRS relative to $\mathcal{O} = (\mathcal{O}_1, \mathcal{O}_2)$ follows immediately from Corollary 4.12: the construction of the 1PRS is the same as in Fig. 2, and Corollary 4.12 says that the construction is *statistically* secure against adversaries with polynomially many queries to \mathcal{O}_1 . Since the QPSPACE machine is independent of the sampled Haar random state, it can be simulated by a computationally unbounded adversary. Note that, as argued in Corollary 4.12, the construction is a secure 1PRS with probability 1 over sampling \mathcal{O}_1 , i.e. over sampling the family of Haar random states.

Thus the crux of this section is dedicated to showing that PRS do not exist relative to the oracle. We show this by describing a concrete attack on any PRS scheme, relative to \mathcal{O} . The attack breaks any PRS, with probability 1 over sampling \mathcal{O}_1 .

In Section 5.1, we review the "quantum OR lemma", which is a key ingredient in our attack. In Section 5.2, we describe our attack, and in Section 5.3, we provide a detailed discussion of the relation between black-box constructions and oracle separations in the quantum setting.

5.1 Quantum OR lemma

Informally, the "quantum OR lemma" says that there exists a quantum algorithm that takes as input a family of projectors, as well as a *single copy* of a quantum state ρ , and decides whether either:

- ρ has a significant overlap with one of the projectors, or
- ρ has small overlap with all of the projectors.

The space complexity of this quantum algorithm is especially important for us.

Lemma 5.2 (Quantum OR lemma, adapted from [HLM17, Corollary 3.1]). Let $\Lambda_1, \ldots, \Lambda_N$ be projectors, and fix real positive numbers $\epsilon \leq \frac{1}{2}$, and δ . Let ρ be a state such that either there exists $i \in [N]$ such that $\operatorname{Tr}[\Lambda_i \rho] \geq 1 - \epsilon$ (case 1) or, for all $i \in [N]$, $\operatorname{Tr}[\Lambda_i \rho] \leq \delta$ (case 2).

Then, there is a quantum circuit, C_{OR} , which we refer to as the "OR tester", such that measuring the first qubit in case 1 yields:

$$\Pr\left(C_{OR}(\rho) \to 1\right) \ge \frac{(1-\epsilon)^2}{7}$$

and in case 2:

$$\Pr\left(C_{OR}(\rho) \to 1\right) \le 4N\delta.$$

The circuit uses controlled- Λ_i gates $Ctrl-\Lambda_i = |1\rangle \langle 1| \otimes \Lambda_i - |0\rangle \langle 0| \otimes (\mathbb{1} - \Lambda_i)$, and an additional $O(\log N)$ qubits.

Remark 5.3. We observe that even when the number of measurements, N, is exponential in the number of qubits of ρ , denoted n, the circuit C_{OR} which is constructed in Ref. [HLM17] can be implemented by a QPSPACE machine²¹ as long as each Λ_i can be implemented by a QPSPACE machine.

²¹i.e., the family of circuits C_{OR} , indexed by n, is a uniform family of quantum circuits using poly(n) qubits of space.

5.2 An attack on any PRS relative to the separating oracle

We describe an attack, based on the quantum OR lemma, that breaks any PRS relative to the oracle \mathcal{O} described at the beginning of the section. Before describing our attack, we first introduce some technical tools. First, we need the following concentration bound.

Lemma 5.4. Let $N \in \mathbb{N}$, and $|\psi_0\rangle$ a N-dimensional state. Then,

$$\Pr_{\psi \rangle \leftarrow \mu_N} \left[|\langle \psi | \psi_0 \rangle|^2 \ge \frac{1}{2} \right] < 8 \exp\left(\frac{-N}{600}\right)$$

Proof. Let $\mathcal{S}(N)$ be the unit N-dimensional sphere, i.e. the set of all N-dimensional pure states. Define functions $f_1, f_2 : \mathcal{S}(N) \to \mathbb{R}$ such that $f_1(|\psi\rangle) = \operatorname{Re} \langle \psi_0 | \psi \rangle$, and $f_2(|\psi\rangle) = \operatorname{Im} \langle \psi_0 | \psi \rangle$.

 f_1 and f_2 are 1-Lipschitz functions. In fact, for any N-dimensional states $|\psi_1\rangle$ and $|\psi_2\rangle$

$$|f_1(|\psi_1\rangle) - f_1(|\psi_2\rangle)| = |\operatorname{Re}(\langle 0|(|\psi_1\rangle - |\psi_2\rangle))| \le |\langle 0|(|\psi_1\rangle - |\psi_2\rangle)| \le ||\psi_1\rangle - |\psi_2\rangle||$$

Similarly for f_2 . Now, notice that, for any $|\psi\rangle$, we have $f_1(|\psi\rangle) = -f_1(-|\psi\rangle)$, and $f_2(|\psi\rangle) = -f_2(-|\psi\rangle)$. This implies that $\mathbb{E}_{|\psi\rangle} f_1(|\psi\rangle) = \mathbb{E}_{|\psi\rangle} f_2(|\psi\rangle) = 0$. Hence, we can invoke Levy's lemma (Lemma 3.3) to deduce that

$$\Pr_{|\psi\rangle}\left[|f_1(|\psi\rangle)| \ge \frac{1}{2}\right] \le 4\exp\left(-\frac{N}{18\pi^3}\right) < 4\exp\left(-\frac{N}{600}\right).$$

A similar concentration bound holds for f_2 . Note that $|\langle \psi | \psi_0 \rangle|^2 = f_1(|\psi\rangle)^2 + f_2(|\psi\rangle)^2$, and hence, by a union bound,

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr_{|\psi\rangle} \left[\left| \langle \psi | \psi_0 \rangle \right|^2 &\geq \frac{1}{2} \right] &= \Pr_{|\psi\rangle} \left[f_1^2 + f_2^2 \geq \frac{1}{2} \right] \\ &\leq \Pr_{|\psi\rangle} \left[|f_1(|\psi\rangle)| \geq 1/2 \right] + \Pr_{|\psi\rangle} \left[|f_2(|\psi\rangle)| \geq 1/2 \right] \\ &< 8 \exp\left(\frac{-N}{600}\right). \end{aligned}$$

Now, we are ready to describe our attack, and complete the proof of Theorem 5.1.

Proof of Theorem 5.1. Consider a PRS relative to \mathcal{O} . This consists of a generation procedure $\text{Gen}^{\mathcal{O}}$ that takes as input a seed k, and outputs a state $|\phi_k\rangle$. We denote by n the length of k, and by m the number of qubits of $|\phi_k\rangle$. Recall that $\text{Gen}^{\mathcal{O}} = (\mathcal{O}_1, \mathcal{O}_2)$, where \mathcal{O}_1 is an oracle that provides states from a family of Haar random states $\{|\psi_m\rangle\}$, and \mathcal{O}_2 is the QPSPACE machine oracle (see the start of Section 5 for a precise definition).

Similarly as in Definition 4.2, without loss of generality, we can take the generation procedure to be of the following form: there is a polynomial s = s(n) and a family $\{\operatorname{\mathsf{Gen}}_{k}^{\mathcal{O}_{2}}\}_{k \in \{0,1\}^{n}}$ of efficiently generatable poly(n)-size unitary circuits that include calls to \mathcal{O}_{2} (but not \mathcal{O}_{1}) such that

$$|\phi_k\rangle = \operatorname{Gen}_k^{\mathcal{O}_2}(|\psi_1\rangle^{\otimes s} \otimes |\psi_2\rangle^{\otimes s} \dots \otimes |\psi_s\rangle^{\otimes s}).$$

In other words, the PRS generation procedure first obtains polynomially many copies of states from the family $\{|\psi_m\rangle\}$, and then, on input k, applies an efficiently generatable unitary that makes calls to \mathcal{O}_2 as a black-box. Note that Gen_k may discard some of the qubits, and those would be traced out and not be considered as part of the output state $|\phi_k\rangle$, and therefore the entire transformation is not necessarily unitary. We denote by U_k the unitary implemented by $\operatorname{Gen}_k^{\mathcal{O}_2}$ before tracing out some of the registers.²² Recall that the number of qubits in $|\phi_k\rangle$ is denoted by m, and we name the output register as A, and the register containing the qubits which are traced out by $\operatorname{Gen}_k^{\mathcal{O}_2}$ is denoted by B. We let C be another *m*-qubits register. Consider the family of projectors

$$\Pi_{k} = \left(\left((U_{k}^{\dagger})_{\mathsf{A}\mathsf{B}} \otimes \mathbb{1}_{\mathsf{C}} \right) (\Pi_{\mathsf{A}\mathsf{C}}^{sym} \otimes \mathbb{1}_{\mathsf{B}}) \left((U_{k})_{\mathsf{A}\mathsf{B}} \otimes \mathbb{1}_{\mathsf{C}} \right) \right)^{\otimes 10n},$$
(16)

where Π_{AC}^{sym} is the projection onto the symmetric subspace across the two registers A and C.

The attack is the following: the adversary queries \mathcal{O}_1 to generate $(|\psi_1\rangle^{\otimes s} \otimes |\psi_2\rangle^{\otimes s} \dots \otimes |\psi_s\rangle^{\otimes s})^{\otimes 10n}$ and stores each copy in the AB register, and receives 10n copies of $|\phi\rangle$, where $|\phi\rangle$ is either a pseudorandom state or a Haar random state, which is stored in the C register. We denote this combined state as ρ . It then uses the \mathcal{O}_2 oracle (the QPSPACE machine) to run the "OR tester" from the quantum OR lemma (Lemma 5.2), where, using the notation from Lemma 5.2, with ρ as defined above, and $\Lambda_k = \Pi_k$ as defined in Eq. (16). Recall that the "OR tester" can indeed be implemented by a QPSPACE machine, as discussed in Remark 5.3.

We now argue that the "OR tester" successfully distinguishes between pseudorandom and random $|\phi\rangle$.

• Suppose $|\phi\rangle = |\phi_k\rangle$ for some k. It is clear that the state

$$\left((|\psi_1\rangle^{\otimes s}\otimes|\psi_2\rangle^{\otimes s}\otimes\ldots\otimes|\psi_s\rangle^{\otimes s})_{\mathsf{AB}}\otimes|\phi_k\rangle_{\mathsf{C}}\right)^{\otimes 10n}$$

lies in the range of $\Pi_k = \left(\left((U_k^{\dagger})_{\mathsf{AB}} \otimes \mathbb{1}_{\mathsf{C}}\right)(\Pi_{\mathsf{AC}}^{sym} \otimes \mathbb{1}_{\mathsf{B}})\left((U_k)_{\mathsf{AB}} \otimes \mathbb{1}_{\mathsf{C}}\right)\right)^{\otimes 10n}$. Thus, we are in "case 1" of Lemma 5.2 with $\epsilon = 0$. Hence, the probability that the "OR tester" outputs 1 is at least 1/7.

• Suppose $|\phi\rangle$ is Haar random. Then, by Lemma 5.4, we have that, with probability at least $1 - 8 \exp(-\frac{2^m}{600})$,

$$|\langle \phi | \phi_k \rangle| \le \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \,.$$

Notice that the probability that $|\phi\rangle \otimes |\phi_k\rangle$ passes the "swap test" (i.e. it is found to lie in the symmetric subspace across the two registers when the measurement $\{\Pi_{sym}, I - \Pi_{sym}\}$ is performed) is exactly $\frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2} |\langle \phi | \phi_k \rangle|^2$ (cf. [BCWDW01]). Since Π_k corresponds to a projection onto 10*n* such swap tests *all* accepting, we have that, with probability at least $1 - 8 \exp(-\frac{2^m}{600})$ over the sampling of $|\phi\rangle$,

$$\operatorname{Tr}[\Pi_k \rho] \le \left(\frac{3}{4}\right)^{10n}$$

Now, by a union bound over $k \in \{0,1\}^n$, we have that, except with probability at most $8 \cdot 2^n \cdot \exp(-\frac{2^m}{600})$ over the sampling of $|\phi\rangle$, the inequality $\operatorname{Tr}[\Pi_k \phi'] \leq \left(\frac{3}{4}\right)^{10n}$ holds for all k, and we are in "case 2" of Lemma 5.2 with $\delta = \left(\frac{3}{4}\right)^{10n}$. Hence, in this case, the "OR tester" outputs 1 with probability at most $4 \cdot 2^n \cdot \left(\frac{3}{4}\right)^{10n}$. All in all, by a final union bound, the "OR tester" outputs 1 with probability at most $8 \cdot 2^n \cdot \exp(-\frac{2^m}{600}) + 4 \cdot 2^n \cdot \left(\frac{3}{4}\right)^{10n}$, which is

²²Note that the pseudorandom state must be a pure state; therefore, we can assume without loss of generality that the \mathcal{O}_2 QPSPACE machine does nor perform any measurements.

exponentially small in *n* when $m > \log n + \log 600$ (note that here the base of exp is *e*, and the base of log is 2). Notice that our attack breaks the PRS regardless of what family of the reference states $\{|\psi_m\rangle\}_{m=1}^{\infty}$ is. Thus, the attack works not only with "probability 1" over such families, but, in fact, for all possible families $\{|\psi_m\rangle\}_{m=1}^{\infty}$.

Remark 5.5. The proof of Theorem 5.1 also shows that the 1PRS family generated in Fig. 2 is not statistically secure when we allow multiple-copy access to the generated state, i.e. the family in Fig. 2 is a 1PRS against query-bounded adversaries but not a PRS against such adversaries.

Remark 5.6. The QPSPACE machine is quite a powerful oracle, and one might wonder whether a different attack based on shadow tomography would work here (along the lines of the attack described by Kretschmer in [Kre21, Subsection 1.3]). This would only require a PP oracle to carry out the classical post-processing. As pointed out earlier though, the issue is that here the projectors $\Pi_{k} = \left(\left(\mathbb{1}_{\mathsf{A}} \otimes (U_{k})_{\mathsf{A}'\mathsf{B}'}^{\dagger} \right) (\Pi_{\mathsf{A}\mathsf{A}'}^{sym} \otimes \mathbb{1}_{\mathsf{B}'}) \left(\mathbb{1}_{\mathsf{A}} \otimes (U_{k})_{\mathsf{A}'\mathsf{B}'} \right) \right)^{\otimes 10n} have large 2-norm: \operatorname{Tr} \Pi_{k}^{2} is exponential in n, and so the estimation of the quantity <math>\operatorname{Tr}[\Lambda_{k}\tilde{\phi}]$ given by shadow tomography has too large of a variance. Thus, shadow tomography does not seem to be sample-efficient in our setting.

Remark 5.7. Our attack against PRS is not relativizing: if a PRS family is constructed relative to an oracle \mathcal{O} , then our attack based on the OR lemma needs exponentially many queries to \mathcal{O} , thus it cannot be simulated by a BQP adversary with access to a QPSPACE machine. Therefore, it does not violate the oracle construction of PRS by Kretschmer [Kre21], nor a conjecture by Kretschmer et al. [KQST23, Sections 7.1–7.2] about the existence of PRS relative to a classical oracle.

A detailed discussion of the relation between black-box constructions and oracle separations in the quantum setting is postponed to Section 5.3. Combining Theorem 5.1 with Theorem 5.17 from Section 5.3 (and using the terminology introduced there), we immediately have:

Corollary 5.8. There is no fully black-box construction of a PRS from isometry access to a 1PRS (as in Definition 5.12).

5.3 Clarifying the relationship between quantum oracle separations and blackbox constructions

In this section, we clarify what we mean by a "black-box construction" of primitive Q from primitive \mathcal{P} when the primitives involve *quantum* algorithms (and possibly quantum state outputs). We also clarify the relationship between a *quantum* oracle separation of \mathcal{P} and Q and the (im)possibility of a black-box construction of one from the other. To the best of our knowledge, while black-box separations in the quantum setting have been the topic of several recent works, a somewhat formal treatment of the terminology and basic framework is missing. This section is a slightly extended version of a section that appears almost verbatim in the concurrent work [CM24].

In the quantum setting, it is not immediately obvious what the correct notion of "black-box access" is. There are a few reasonable notions of what it means for a construction to have "black-box access" to another primitive. We focus on three variants: *unitary* access, *isometry* access, and access to *both the unitary and its inverse*.

The summary is that, similarly to the classical setting, a *quantum* oracle separation of primitives \mathcal{P} and \mathcal{Q} (i.e. a quantum oracle relative to which \mathcal{P} exists but \mathcal{Q} does not) implies the impossibility of a black-box construction of \mathcal{Q} from \mathcal{P} , but with one caveat: the type of oracle separation corresponds directly to the type of black-box construction that is being ruled out. For example, if one wishes to rule out black-box constructions of \mathcal{Q} that are allowed to make use of the inverse of

unitary implementations of \mathcal{P} , then the oracle separation needs to be "closed under giving access to the inverse of the oracle", i.e. the separation needs to hold relative to an oracle *and* its inverse. We start by introducing some terminology.

Terminology. A quantum channel is a CPTP (completely-positive-trace-preserving) map. The set of quantum channels captures all admissible "physical" processes in quantum information, and it can be thought of as the quantum analogue of the set of functions $f : \{0, 1\}^* \to \{0, 1\}^*$.

For the purpose of this section, a quantum channel is specified by a family of unitaries $\{U_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ (where U_n acts on an input register of size n, and a work register of some size s(n)). The quantum channel maps an input (mixed) state ρ on n qubits to the (mixed) state obtained as follows: apply $U_n(\cdot)U_n^{\dagger}$ to $\rho \otimes (|0\rangle \langle 0|)^{\otimes s(n)}$; measure a subset of the qubits; output a subset of the qubits (measured or unmeasured). We say that the family $\{U_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ is a *unitary implementation* of the quantum channel. We say that the quantum channel is QPT if it possesses a unitary implementation $\{U_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ that is additionally a uniform family of efficiently computable unitaries. In other words, the quantum channel is implemented by a QPT algorithm.

One can also consider the family of isometries $\{V_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ where V_n takes as input n qubits, and acts like U_n , but with the work register fixed to $|0\rangle^{s(n)}$, i.e. $V_n : |\psi\rangle \mapsto U_n(|\psi\rangle |0\rangle^{\otimes s(n)})$. We refer to $\{V_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ as the *isometry implementation* of the quantum channel.

We will also consider QPT algorithms with access to some oracle \mathcal{O} . In this case, the unitary (resp. isometry) implementation $\{U_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ should be *efficiently computable given access to* \mathcal{O} .

Before diving into formal definitions, a bit informally, a *primitive* \mathcal{P} can be thought of as a set of conditions on tuples of algorithms (G_1, \ldots, G_k) . For example, for a digital signature scheme, a valid tuple of algorithms is a tuple (*Gen, Sign, Verify*) that satisfies "correctness" (honestly generated signatures are accepted by the verification procedure with overwhelming probability) and "security" (formalized via an unforgeability game). Equivalently, one can think of the tuple of algorithms (G_1, \ldots, G_k) as a *single* algorithm G (with an additional control input).

A thorough treatment of black-box constructions and reductions in the classical setting can be found in [RTV04]. Our definitions are a quantum analog of those found there. They follow the style of [RTV04] whenever possible and depart from it whenever necessary.

Definition 5.9. A primitive \mathcal{P} is a pair $\mathcal{P} = (\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{P}}, \mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{P}})^{23}$ where $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{P}}$ is a set of quantum channels, and $\mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{P}}$ is a relation over pairs (G, A) of quantum channels, where $G \in \mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{P}}$.

A quantum channel G is an implementation of \mathcal{P} if $G \in \mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{P}}$. If G is additionally a QPT channel, then we say that G is an efficient implementation of \mathcal{P} (in this case, we refer to G interchangeably as a QPT channel or a QPT algorithm).

A quantum channel A (usually referred to as the "adversary") \mathcal{P} -breaks $G \in \mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{P}}$ if $(G, A) \in \mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{P}}$. We say that G is a secure implementation of \mathcal{P} if G is an implementation of \mathcal{P} such that no QPT channel \mathcal{P} -breaks it. The primitive \mathcal{P} exists if there exists an efficient and secure implementation of \mathcal{P} .

Let U be a unitary (resp. isometry) implementation of $G \in \mathcal{P}$. Then, we say that U is a unitary (resp. isometry) implementation of \mathcal{P} . For ease of exposition, we also say that quantum channel $A \mathcal{P}$ -breaks U to mean that $A \mathcal{P}$ -breaks G.

Since we will discuss oracle separations, we give corresponding definitions *relative to an oracle*. Going forward, for ease of exposition, we often identify a quantum channel with the algorithm that implements it.

²³Here $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{P}}$ should be thought of as capturing the "correctness" property of the primitive, while $\mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{P}}$ captures "security".

Definition 5.10 (Implementations relative to an oracle). Let \mathcal{O} be a unitary (resp. isometry) oracle. An implementation of primitive \mathcal{P} relative to \mathcal{O} is an oracle algorithm $G^{(\cdot)}$ such that $G^{\mathcal{O}} \in \mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{P}}^{24}$. We say the implementation is efficient if $G^{(\cdot)}$ is a QPT oracle algorithm.

Let U be a unitary (resp. isometry) implementation of $G^{\mathcal{O}}$. Then, we say that U is a unitary (resp. isometry) implementation of \mathcal{P} relative to \mathcal{O} .

Definition 5.11. We say that a primitive \mathcal{P} exists relative to an oracle \mathcal{O} if:

- (i) There exists an efficient implementation $G^{(\cdot)}$ of \mathcal{P} relative to \mathcal{O} , i.e. $G^{\mathcal{O}} \in \mathcal{P}$ (as in Definition 5.10).
- (ii) The security of $G^{\mathcal{O}}$ holds against all QPT adversaries that have access to \mathcal{O} . More precisely, for all QPT $A^{(\cdot)}$, $(G^{\mathcal{O}}, A^{\mathcal{O}}) \notin \mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{P}}$.

There are various notions of black-box constructions and reductions (see, for example, [RTV04]). Here, we focus on (the quantum analog of) the notion of a *fully black-box construction*. We identify and define three analogs based on the type of black-box access available to the construction and the security reduction.

Definition 5.12. A QPT algorithm $G^{(\cdot)}$ is a fully black-box construction of \mathcal{Q} from isometry access to \mathcal{P} if the following two conditions hold:

- 1. (black-box construction with isometry access) For every isometry implementation V of \mathcal{P} , G^V is an implementation of \mathcal{Q} .
- 2. (black-box security reduction with isometry access) There is a QPT algorithm $S^{(\cdot)}$ such that, for every isometry implementation V of \mathcal{P} , every adversary A that Q-breaks G^V , and every isometry implementation \tilde{A} of A, it holds that $S^{\tilde{A}} \mathcal{P}$ -breaks V.

Definition 5.13. A QPT algorithm $G^{(\cdot)}$ is a fully black-box construction of \mathcal{Q} from unitary access to \mathcal{P} if the following two conditions hold:

- 1. (black-box construction with unitary access) For every unitary implementation U of \mathcal{P} , G^U is an implementation of \mathcal{Q} .
- 2. (black-box security reduction with unitary access) There is a QPT algorithm $S^{(\cdot)}$ such that, for every unitary implementation U of \mathcal{P} , every adversary A that \mathcal{Q} -breaks G^U , and every unitary implementation \tilde{A} of A, it holds that $S^{\tilde{A}} \mathcal{P}$ -breaks U.

Definition 5.14. A QPT algorithm $G^{(\cdot)}$ is a fully black-box construction of \mathcal{Q} from \mathcal{P} with access to the inverse if the following two conditions hold:

- 1. (black-box construction with access to the inverse) For every unitary implementation U of \mathcal{P} , $G^{U,U^{-1}}$ is an implementation of \mathcal{Q} .
- 2. (black-box security reduction with access to the inverse) There is a QPT algorithm $S^{(\cdot)}$ such that, for every unitary implementation U of \mathcal{P} , every adversary A that Q-breaks $G^{U,U^{-1}}$, and every unitary implementation \tilde{A} of A, it holds that $S^{\tilde{A},\tilde{A}^{-1}} \mathcal{P}$ -breaks U^{25} .

²⁴We clarify that here $G^{\mathcal{O}}$ is only allowed to query the unitary \mathcal{O} , not its inverse. However, as will be the case later in the section, \mathcal{O} itself could be of the form $\mathcal{O} = (W, W^{-1})$ for some unitary W.

²⁵One could define even more variants of "fully black-box constructions" by separating the type of access that G has to the implementation of \mathcal{P} from the type of access that S has to A (currently they are consistent in each of Definitions 5.13, 5.12, and 5.14). Here, we choose to limit ourselves to the these three definitions.

These three notions of black-box constructions are related to each other in the following (unsurprising) way.

Theorem 5.15. If there is a fully black-box construction $G^{(\cdot)}$ of primitive Q from isometry access to primitive \mathcal{P} (as in Definition 5.12), then there is a fully black-box construction $\tilde{G}^{(\cdot)}$ of Q from unitary access to \mathcal{P} (as in Definition 5.13).

Proof. \tilde{G} is defined in a natural way: for a unitary implementation U of \mathcal{P} , \tilde{G}^U runs G^V , where V is the isometry induced by U. The latter can of course be simulated with queries to U, by setting the work register to $|0\rangle$. An $\tilde{S}^{(\cdot)}$ satisfying item 2 of Definition 5.13 can be defined analogously from an S satisfying item 2 of Definition 5.12.

We also have the following.

Theorem 5.16. A fully black-box construction $G^{(\cdot)}$ of primitive Q from isometry access to primitive \mathcal{P} (as in Definition 5.13) is also a fully black-box construction of Q from \mathcal{P} with access to the inverse (as in Definition 5.14).

Proof. This is immediate since Definition 5.14 gives $G^{(\cdot)}$ and $S^{(\cdot)}$ access to strictly "more", namely the inverses.

We thus point out that our separation result (Theorem 5.1) rules out only the strongest notion of fully black-box construction of PRS from 1PRS (as in Definition 5.12), and thus is the "weakest" separating result that one could hope to obtain.

As an example to help motivate these different definitions, the original construction of commitments from PRS by Morimae and Yamakawa [MY22a] is fully black-box, but *with access to the inverse* (i.e. the weakest notion of fully black-box construction). This distinction is important, for example, when working in the CHRS model, or in the quantum auxiliary-input model considered in [MNY23] and [Qia23]: a construction of a PRS in this model does not immediately yield a commitment scheme via the black-box construction of [MY22a], because the inverse of the PRS generation procedure is not necessarily available in this model (since the generation procedure may use auxiliary states, and thus the "inverse" is not well-defined). On the other hand, the slight variation on the [MY22a] construction, proposed in [MNY23], is fully black-box with unitary access (but without needing the inverse, as in Definition 5.13).

We now clarify the relationship between a *quantum* oracle separation of primitives \mathcal{P} and \mathcal{Q} and the (im)possibility of a black-box construction of one from the other.

The following is a quantum analog of a result by Impagliazzo and Rudich [IR89] (formalized in [RTV04] using the above terminology).

Theorem 5.17. Suppose there exists a fully black-box construction of primitive Q from unitary (resp. isometry) access to primitive P. Then, for every unitary (resp. isometry) O, if P exists relative to O, then Q also exists relative to O.

This implies that a unitary (resp. isometry) oracle separation (i.e. the existence of an oracle relative to which \mathcal{P} exists but \mathcal{Q} does not) suffices to rule out a fully black-box construction of \mathcal{Q} from unitary (resp. isometry) access to \mathcal{P} .

Proof of Theorem 5.17. We write the proof for the case of unitary access to \mathcal{P} . The proof for the case of isometry access is analogous (replacing unitaries with isometries). Suppose there exists a fully black-box construction of \mathcal{Q} from \mathcal{P} . Then, by definition, there exist QPT $G^{(\cdot)}$ and $S^{(\cdot)}$ such that:

- 1. (black-box construction) For every unitary implementation U of \mathcal{P} , G^U is an implementation of \mathcal{Q} .
- 2. (black-box security reduction) For every implementation U of \mathcal{P} , every adversary A that \mathcal{Q} -breaks G^U , and every unitary implementation \tilde{A} of A, it holds that $S^{\tilde{A}}$ \mathcal{P} -breaks U.

Let \mathcal{O} be a quantum oracle relative to which \mathcal{P} exists. Since, by Definition 5.11, \mathcal{P} has an *efficient* implementation relative to \mathcal{O} , there exists a uniform family of unitaries U that is *efficiently computable* with access to \mathcal{O} , such that U is a unitary implementation of \mathcal{P} . Moreover, U (or rather the quantum channel that U implements) is a secure implementation of \mathcal{P} relative to \mathcal{O} .

We show that the following QPT oracle algorithm $\tilde{G}^{(\cdot)}$ is an efficient implementation of \mathcal{Q} relative to \mathcal{O} , i.e. $\tilde{G}^{\mathcal{O}} \in \mathcal{Q}$. $\tilde{G}^{\mathcal{O}}$ runs as follows: implement G^U by running G, and simulate each call to U by making queries to \mathcal{O} . Note that $\tilde{G}^{(\cdot)}$ is QPT because U is a uniform family of efficiently computable unitaries given access to \mathcal{O} . Since $\tilde{G}^{\mathcal{O}}$ is equivalent to G^U , and $G^U \in \mathcal{Q}$ (by property 1 above), then $\tilde{G}^{\mathcal{O}} \in \mathcal{Q}$.

We are left with showing that $\tilde{G}^{\mathcal{O}}$ is a secure implementation relative to \mathcal{O} , i.e. that there is no QPT adversary $A^{(\cdot)}$ such that $A^{\mathcal{O}}$ Q-breaks $\tilde{G}^{\mathcal{O}}$. Suppose for a contradiction that there was a QPT adversary $A^{(\cdot)}$ such that $\mathcal{A}^{\mathcal{O}}$ Q-breaks $\tilde{G}^{\mathcal{O}}$ (which is equivalent to G^U). Then, by property 2, $S^{A^{\mathcal{O}}}$ \mathcal{P} -breaks U. Note that adversary $S^{A^{\mathcal{O}}}$ can be implemented efficiently with oracle access to \mathcal{O} , because both $S^{(\cdot)}$ and $A^{(\cdot)}$ are QPT. Thus, this contradicts the security of U relative to \mathcal{O} (formally, of the quantum channel that U implements).

Similarly, we state a version of Theorem 5.17 for fully black-box constructions with access to the inverse.

Theorem 5.18. Suppose there exists a fully black-box construction of primitive \mathcal{Q} from primitive \mathcal{P} with access to the inverse. Then, for every unitary \mathcal{O} , if \mathcal{P} exists relative to $(\mathcal{O}, \mathcal{O}^{-1})$, then \mathcal{Q} also exists relative to the oracle $(\mathcal{O}, \mathcal{O}^{-1})$.

Proof. The proof is analogous to the proof of Theorem 5.17. The only difference is that now $G^{(\cdot)}$ additionally makes queries to the inverse of the unitary implementation U of \mathcal{P} . Since U^{-1} can be implemented efficiently given access to $(\mathcal{O}, \mathcal{O}^{-1})$, we can now define an efficient implementation $\tilde{G}^{(\cdot)}$ of \mathcal{P} relative to $(\mathcal{O}, \mathcal{O}^{-1})$. Proving that $\tilde{G}^{\mathcal{O}, \mathcal{O}^{-1}}$ is a secure implementation of \mathcal{P} relative to $(\mathcal{O}, \mathcal{O}^{-1})$ also proceeds analogously.

References

- [AGQY22] P. Ananth, A. Gulati, L. Qian, and H. Yuen. Pseudorandom (Function-Like) Quantum State Generators: New Definitions and Applications. In E. Kiltz and V. Vaikuntanathan, editors, Theory of Cryptography - 20th International Conference, TCC 2022, Chicago, IL, USA, November 7-10, 2022, Proceedings, Part I, volume 13747 of Lecture Notes in Computer Science, pages 237–265. Springer, 2022, arXiv: 2211.01444. 3
- [ALY23] P. Ananth, Y. Lin, and H. Yuen. Pseudorandom Strings from Pseudorandom Quantum States, 2023, arXiv: 2306.05613. 5
- [AQY22] P. Ananth, L. Qian, and H. Yuen. Cryptography from Pseudorandom Quantum States. In Y. Dodis and T. Shrimpton, editors, Advances in Cryptology - CRYPTO 2022 - 42nd Annual International Cryptology Conference, CRYPTO 2022, Santa

Barbara, CA, USA, August 15-18, 2022, Proceedings, Part I, volume 13507 of Lecture Notes in Computer Science, pages 208–236. Springer, 2022, arXiv: 2112.10020. 5, 6, 39

- [BBO⁺24] M. Barhoush, A. Behera, L. Ozer, L. Salvail, and O. Sattath. Signatures from Pseudorandom States via ⊥-PRFs. arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.00847, 2024. 5
- [BBSS23] A. Behera, Z. Brakerski, O. Sattath, and O. Shmueli. Pseudorandomness with Proof of Destruction and Applications. In G. Rothblum and H. Wee, editors, *Theory* of Cryptography, pages 125–154, Cham, 2023. Springer Nature Switzerland, arXiv: 2306.07698.3
- [BCKM21] J. Bartusek, A. Coladangelo, D. Khurana, and F. Ma. One-Way Functions Imply Secure Computation in a Quantum World. In T. Malkin and C. Peikert, editors, Advances in Cryptology - CRYPTO 2021 - 41st Annual International Cryptology Conference, CRYPTO 2021, Virtual Event, August 16-20, 2021, Proceedings, Part I, volume 12825 of Lecture Notes in Computer Science, pages 467–496. Springer, 2021, arXiv: 2011.13486. 3, 4
- [BCQ23] Z. Brakerski, R. Canetti, and L. Qian. On the Computational Hardness Needed for Quantum Cryptography. In Y. T. Kalai, editor, 14th Innovations in Theoretical Computer Science Conference, ITCS 2023, January 10-13, 2023, MIT, Cambridge, Massachusetts, USA, volume 251 of LIPIcs, pages 24:1–24:21. Schloss Dagstuhl -Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 2023. 3
- [BCWDW01] H. Buhrman, R. Cleve, J. Watrous, and R. De Wolf. Quantum fingerprinting. Physical review letters, 87(16):167902, 2001. 14, 28
- [BEM24] S. Bouaziz-Ermann and G. Muguruza. Quantum Pseudorandomness Cannot Be Shrunk In a Black-Box Way. arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.13324, 2024. 5
- [BFV19] A. Bouland, B. Fefferman, and U. Vazirani. Computational pseudorandomness, the wormhole growth paradox, and constraints on the AdS/CFT duality, 2019, arXiv: 1910.14646. 3
- [BGHD⁺23] K. Barooti, A. B. Grilo, L. Huguenin-Dumittan, G. Malavolta, O. Sattath, Q.-H. Vu, and M. Walter. Public-Key Encryption with Quantum Keys. In G. Rothblum and H. Wee, editors, *Theory of Cryptography*, pages 198–227, Cham, 2023. Springer Nature Switzerland, arXiv: 2306.07698. 3, 6
- [BQSY23] J. Bostanci, L. Qian, N. Spooner, and H. Yuen. An efficient quantum parallel repetition theorem and applications, 2023, arXiv: 2311.10681. 12
- [BS20] Z. Brakerski and O. Shmueli. Scalable Pseudorandom Quantum States. In D. Micciancio and T. Ristenpart, editors, Advances in Cryptology - CRYPTO 2020 - 40th Annual International Cryptology Conference, CRYPTO 2020, Santa Barbara, CA, USA, August 17-21, 2020, Proceedings, Part II, volume 12171 of Lecture Notes in Computer Science, pages 417-440. Springer, 2020. 5
- [CF01] R. Canetti and M. Fischlin. Universally composable commitments. In Advances in Cryptology—CRYPTO 2001: 21st Annual International Cryptology Conference, Santa Barbara, California, USA, August 19–23, 2001 Proceedings 21, pages 19–40. Springer, 2001. 16

- [CKR16] A. Chailloux, I. Kerenidis, and B. Rosgen. Quantum commitments from complexity assumptions. Comput. Complex., 25(1):103–151, 2016. 5, 37
- [CM24] A. Coladangelo and S. Mutreja. On black-box separations of quantum digital signatures from pseudorandom states. arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.08194, 2024. 5, 29
- [DGK⁺10] Y. Dodis, S. Goldwasser, Y. T. Kalai, C. Peikert, and V. Vaikuntanathan. Public-Key Encryption Schemes with Auxiliary Inputs. In D. Micciancio, editor, Theory of Cryptography, 7th Theory of Cryptography Conference, TCC 2010, Zurich, Switzerland, February 9-11, 2010. Proceedings, volume 5978 of Lecture Notes in Computer Science, pages 361–381. Springer, 2010. 5
- [DN06] P. A. Dickinson and A. Nayak. Approximate randomization of quantum states with fewer bits of key. In *AIP Conference Proceedings*, volume 864, pages 18–36. American Institute of Physics, 2006. 11
- [GJMZ23] S. Gunn, N. Ju, F. Ma, and M. Zhandry. Commitments to Quantum States. In B. Saha and R. A. Servedio, editors, *Proceedings of the 55th Annual ACM Symposium* on Theory of Computing, STOC 2023, Orlando, FL, USA, June 20-23, 2023, pages 1579–1588. ACM, 2023, arXiv: 2210.05138. 3, 15
- [GLSV21] A. B. Grilo, H. Lin, F. Song, and V. Vaikuntanathan. Oblivious Transfer Is in MiniQCrypt. In A. Canteaut and F. Standaert, editors, Advances in Cryptology
 EUROCRYPT 2021 - 40th Annual International Conference on the Theory and Applications of Cryptographic Techniques, Zagreb, Croatia, October 17-21, 2021, Proceedings, Part II, volume 12697 of Lecture Notes in Computer Science, pages 531-561. Springer, 2021, arXiv: 2011.14980. 3
- [Gol01] O. Goldreich. The Foundations of Cryptography Volume 1, Basic Techniques. Cambridge University Press, 2001. 3
- [Gol04] O. Goldreich. The Foundations of Cryptography Volume 2: Basic Applications. Cambridge University Press, 2004. 3
- [Har24] A. W. Harrow. Approximate orthogonality of permutation operators, with application to quantum information. Lett. Math. Phys., 114(1):Paper No. 1, 25, 2024. 8, 9, 15, 17
- [HLM17] A. W. Harrow, C. Y.-Y. Lin, and A. Montanaro. Sequential measurements, disturbance and property testing. In *Proceedings of the Twenty-Eighth Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms*, pages 1598–1611. SIAM, 2017. 13, 26
- [HM13] A. W. Harrow and A. Montanaro. Testing product states, quantum Merlin-Arthur games and tensor optimization. *Journal of the ACM (JACM)*, 60(1):1–43, 2013. 40
- [HMY23] M. Hhan, T. Morimae, and T. Yamakawa. From the Hardness of Detecting Superpositions to Cryptography: Quantum Public Key Encryption and Commitments. In C. Hazay and M. Stam, editors, Advances in Cryptology - EUROCRYPT 2023 - 42nd Annual International Conference on the Theory and Applications of Cryptographic Techniques, Lyon, France, April 23-27, 2023, Proceedings, Part I, volume 14004 of Lecture Notes in Computer Science, pages 639–667. Springer, 2023, arXiv: 2210.05978. 6

- [Imp95] R. Impagliazzo. A Personal View of Average-Case Complexity. In Proceedings of the Tenth Annual Structure in Complexity Theory Conference, Minneapolis, Minnesota, USA, June 19-22, 1995, pages 134–147. IEEE Computer Society, 1995. 3
- [IR89] R. Impagliazzo and S. Rudich. Limits on the Provable Consequences of One-Way Permutations. In D. S. Johnson, editor, Proceedings of the 21st Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing, May 14-17, 1989, Seattle, Washigton, USA, pages 44–61. ACM, 1989. 3, 32
- [JLS18] Z. Ji, Y. Liu, and F. Song. Pseudorandom Quantum States. In H. Shacham and A. Boldyreva, editors, Advances in Cryptology - CRYPTO 2018 - 38th Annual International Cryptology Conference, Santa Barbara, CA, USA, August 19-23, 2018, Proceedings, Part III, volume 10993 of Lecture Notes in Computer Science, pages 126–152. Springer, 2018, arXiv: 1711.00385. 3, 5, 6, 14
- [KQST23] W. Kretschmer, L. Qian, M. Sinha, and A. Tal. Quantum Cryptography in Algorithmica. In B. Saha and R. A. Servedio, editors, Proceedings of the 55th Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing, STOC 2023, Orlando, FL, USA, June 20-23, 2023, pages 1589–1602. ACM, 2023, arXiv: 2212.00879. 5, 6, 29
- [Kre21] W. Kretschmer. Quantum Pseudorandomness and Classical Complexity. In M. Hsieh, editor, 16th Conference on the Theory of Quantum Computation, Communication and Cryptography, TQC 2021, July 5-8, 2021, Virtual Conference, volume 197 of LIPIcs, pages 2:1–2:20. Schloss Dagstuhl Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 2021, arXiv: 2103.09320. 3, 5, 12, 14, 29
- [LC97] H.-K. Lo and H. F. Chau. Is Quantum Bit Commitment Really Possible? Physical Review Letters, 78(17):3410–3413, Apr 1997, arXiv: quant-ph/9603004. 4, 40
- [May97] D. Mayers. Unconditionally Secure Quantum Bit Commitment is Impossible. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 78:3414–3417, Apr 1997, arXiv: quant-ph/9605044. 4, 40
- [MNY23] T. Morimae, B. Nehoran, and T. Yamakawa. Unconditionally Secure Commitments with Quantum Auxiliary Inputs. *Cryptology ePrint Archive*, 2023. 4, 5, 6, 7, 12, 32, 37, 39
- [MY22a] T. Morimae and T. Yamakawa. Quantum Commitments and Signatures Without One-Way Functions. In Y. Dodis and T. Shrimpton, editors, Advances in Cryptology
 - CRYPTO 2022 - 42nd Annual International Cryptology Conference, CRYPTO 2022, Santa Barbara, CA, USA, August 15-18, 2022, Proceedings, Part I, volume 13507 of Lecture Notes in Computer Science, pages 269–295. Springer, 2022, arXiv: 2112.06369. 4, 6, 11, 12, 15, 32
- [MY22b] T. Morimae and Y. Yamakawa. One-Wayness in Quantum Cryptography, October 2022, arXiv: 2210.03394. 3
- [Qia23] L. Qian. Unconditionally secure quantum commitments with preprocessing, 2023, arXiv: 2311.18171. 4, 5, 32
- [RTV04] O. Reingold, L. Trevisan, and S. P. Vadhan. Notions of Reducibility between Cryptographic Primitives. In M. Naor, editor, TCC 2004, Cambridge, MA, USA Proceedings, volume 2951 of LNCS, pages 1–20. Springer, 2004. 30, 31, 32

- [Wat18] J. Watrous. The theory of quantum information. Cambridge university press, 2018. 15
- [Yan22] J. Yan. General Properties of Quantum Bit Commitments (Extended Abstract). In S. Agrawal and D. Lin, editors, Advances in Cryptology - ASIACRYPT 2022
 28th International Conference on the Theory and Application of Cryptology and Information Security, Taipei, Taiwan, December 5-9, 2022, Proceedings, Part IV, volume 13794 of Lecture Notes in Computer Science, pages 628–657. Springer, 2022, Cryptology ePrint Archive: Report 2020/1488. 3, 6, 11, 12, 42

A Commitments in the CHRS model

This section describes an unconditional bit commitment protocol in the CHRS model, and follows very closely the approach of [MNY23] to compile a 1PRS into a commitment.

We adopt the definition of bit commitment with common reference state from [MNY23] with the slight modification that the reference state must be Haar random. We point out another subtlety about this definition in Remark A.2 below.

Definition A.1 (Bit commitment in the CHRS model). A non-interactive bit commitment scheme in the CHRS model is given by a tuple of QPT algorithms: C (the sender) and R (the receiver). Let $\{|\psi_n\rangle\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ denote the family of common Haar random states. The scheme consists of the following two phases.

- Commit phase: The sender C takes polynomially many copies of |ψ_n⟩ and a bit b ∈ {0,1} as the input, generates a quantum state on registers C and R, and sends register C to the receiver R.
- Reveal phase: C sends b and register R to R. R takes polynomially many copies of |ψ_n⟩ and (b, C, R) as input, and outputs either b or ⊥.

Remark A.2. Note that in the above definition (which follows the style of [MNY23]), for a given security parameter n, parties only have access to copies of the Haar random state $|\psi_n\rangle$. In contrast, in the definition of CHRS model that we gave in Section 4.1, the entire family $\{|\psi_n\rangle\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ is available to all parties (who can request polynomially many copies, in the security parameter n). This distinction is important when proving an oracle separation, like our Theorem 5.1, because there we want to argue about the existence of a primitive relative to a fixed oracle (rather than an oracle that changes for each value of the security parameter). However, this distinction is not as important in this section, given that our 1PRS construction, and the resulting commitment scheme, does in fact use only the single state $|\psi_n\rangle$ when the security parameter is n. So, we elect to use the simpler Definition A.1 in this section for simplicity.

Next, we define the notions of hiding and sum-binding for a bit commitment in the CHRS model, analogously to [CKR16] and [MNY23]. We consider *statistical* hiding with *bounded access* to the common Haar random state, and *statistical* sum-binding against adversaries that have even *unbounded access* to the state.

Definition A.3 (Polynomial-copy statistical hiding). A quantum commitment scheme (C, R) in the CHRS model is said to be polynomial-copy statistically hiding if for any computationally unbounded



Figure 3: Diagram of the known relations and applications in MicroCrypt, as of January 2024. Regular arrows indicate implications, and dotted arrows indicate black-box separations. An interactive version of this diagram is available at https://sattath.github.io/qcrypto-graph/, with additional features, such as "mouseover a node" reveals additional details, and "mouseover an edge" shows a clickable source for that relation. The website is updated periodically, therefore, the online version may differ from the one above as new results are published.

uniform algorithm A and for any polynomial t = t(n), there exists a negligible function negl such that, for all n,

$$\begin{split} & \left| \Pr_{|\psi_n\rangle \leftarrow \mu_n} \left[1 \leftarrow \mathcal{A} \left(1^n, |\psi_n\rangle^{\otimes t}, \operatorname{Tr}_{\mathsf{R}}[\sigma_{\mathsf{C},\mathsf{R}}] \right) : \sigma_{\mathsf{C},\mathsf{R}} \leftarrow C_{com}(|\psi_n\rangle^{\otimes r}, 0) \right] \\ & - \Pr_{|\psi_n\rangle \leftarrow \mu_n} \left[1 \leftarrow \mathcal{A} \left(1^n, |\psi_n\rangle^{\otimes t}, \operatorname{Tr}_{\mathsf{R}}[\sigma_{\mathsf{C},\mathsf{R}}] \right) : \sigma_{\mathsf{C},\mathsf{R}} \leftarrow C_{com}(|\psi_n\rangle^{\otimes r}, 1) \right] \right| \leq \mathsf{negl}(n) \end{split}$$

where C_{com} is the "commit phase" of the sender algorithm C, and r = r(n) is the number of copies of the common Haar random state used by C_{com} .

Definition A.4 (Statistical sum-binding). A commitment scheme (C, R) in the CHRS model satisfies statistical sum-binding if the following holds. Let C_0^* and C_1^* be any computationally unbounded malicious committees that take an unbounded number of copies of $|\psi_n\rangle$ as input, and behave identically in the "commit phase". Let p_b be the probability that R accepts the revealed bit b in an interaction with C_b^* . Then, there exists a negligible function negl such that, for all n,

$$p_0 + p_1 \le 1 + \mathsf{negl}(n)$$

Following the approach in [MNY23], we will show that our commitment scheme satisfies a stronger binding condition, called "extractor-based binding", first introduced in [AQY22].

Definition A.5 (Statistical extractor-based binding). A commitment scheme in the CHRS model (C, R) satisfies statistical extractor-based binding if there is a computationally unbounded algorithm $\mathcal{E} = \{\mathcal{E}_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$, called the extractor, such that for any unbounded time malicious committer C^* , the experiments $\operatorname{Real}_n^{C^*}$ and $\operatorname{Ideal}_n^{C^*,\mathcal{E}}$ are statistically indistinguishable, i.e. an unbounded-time distinguisher cannot distinguish the two with non-negligible advantage, where the experiments $\operatorname{Real}_n^{C^*}$ and $\operatorname{Ideal}_n^{C^*,\mathcal{E}}$ are defined as follows. Let $\{|\psi_n\rangle\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ denote the family of common Haar random states.

- Real_n^{C*}: The malicious committer C^{*} takes polynomially many copies of $|\psi_n\rangle$ as input, and interacts with the honest receiver R in the commit and reveal phases. Let $b \in \{0, 1, \bot\}$ be the output of R and τ_{C^*} be the final state of C^{*}. The experiment outputs the pair (τ_{C^*} , b).
- $\mathsf{Ideal}_n^{C^*,\mathcal{E}}$: C^* takes $|\psi_n\rangle$ as input and runs its commit phase to generate a commitment σ_{C} where C^* may keep a state that is entangled with σ_{C} . \mathcal{E}_n takes the register C as input, outputs an extracted bit $b^* \in \{0,1\}$, and sends a post-execution state on C (which might be different from the original one) to R as a commitment. Then C^* and R run the reveal phase. Let b be the output of R and τ_{C^*} be the final state of C^* . If $b \notin \{\bot, b^*\}$, then the experiment outputs a symbol fail and otherwise outputs a tuple (τ_{C^*}, b) .

Morimae, Nehoran, and Yamakawa show the following result:

Lemma A.6 ([MNY23, Lemma 7.6]). Statistical extractor-based binding implies statistical sumbinding.

Our commitment protocol in the CHRS model takes essentially the same form as that in [MNY23]. Let $\{|\phi_k\rangle\}_k$ be an 1PRS in the CHRS model. Let R and C be registers of the same size as $|\phi_k\rangle$. Then, to commit to 0, the sender prepares

$$\sum_{k} (\ket{k} \ket{0})_{\mathsf{R}} \ket{\phi_k}_{\mathsf{C}} .$$

To commit to 1, the sender prepares

$$\sum_{x} |x\rangle_{\mathsf{R}} \, |x\rangle_{\mathsf{C}} \; ,$$

i.e. the maximally entangled state across R and C.

Substituting our 1PRS from Fig. 2, we get the following construction, where the base commitment is repeated in parallel, and the reveal phase is carried out by using SWAP tests.

Commitment phase: the sender takes as input a bit $b \in \{0, 1\}$. Let

$$|\Psi_0\rangle_{\mathsf{R},\mathsf{C}} = \sum_{a,b\in\{0,1\}^{0.45n}} |ab||0^{0.1n}\rangle_{\mathsf{R}} X^a Z^b |\psi_n\rangle_{\mathsf{C}} ,$$

and let

$$|\Psi_1\rangle_{\mathsf{R},\mathsf{C}} = \sum_{x\in\{0,1\}^n} |x\rangle_{\mathsf{R}} |x\rangle_{\mathsf{C}} \; .$$

The sender prepares $|\Psi_b\rangle_{C_1...C_n,R_1...R_n}^{\otimes n}$, and sends registers $C_1...C_n$ to the receiver.

Reveal phase: The sender sends *b* and registers $\mathsf{R}_1 \ldots \mathsf{R}_n$ to the receiver. The receiver prepares the state $|\Psi_b\rangle_{\mathsf{C}'_1\ldots\mathsf{C}'_n,\mathsf{R}'_1\ldots\mathsf{R}'_n}^{\otimes n}$, and performs a SWAP test between registers $(\mathsf{C}_1\ldots\mathsf{C}_n,\mathsf{R}_1\ldots\mathsf{R}_n)$ and $(\mathsf{C}'_1\ldots\mathsf{C}'_n,\mathsf{R}'_1\ldots\mathsf{R}'_n)$, and accepts if and only if all of the SWAP tests output 1.

Figure 4: Quantum bit commitment scheme in the CHRS model

Theorem A.7. The protocol in Fig. 4 satisfies polynomial-copy statistical hiding (as in Definition A.3) and statistical extractor-based binding (as in Definition A.5).

Remark A.8. Notice that, since a commitment scheme in the plain model cannot be both statistically binding and hiding [LC97, May97], we also cannot, in the CHRS model, simultaneously achieve statistical binding and t-copy statistical hiding for t exponentially large in n. This is because when t is exponentially large, an unbounded adversary can learn the common Haar random state $|\psi_n\rangle$ entirely via tomography. Hence, in this case, t-copy statistical hiding is equivalent to statistical hiding in the plain model.

Proof of Theorem A.7. Polynomial-copy statistical hiding. The C registers of $|\Psi_0\rangle$ and $|\Psi_1\rangle$ are respectively in the state $\rho_0 = \operatorname{Tr}_{\mathsf{R}} |\Psi_0\rangle \langle \Psi_0| = \frac{1}{2^{0.9n}} \sum_{a,b} X^a Z^b |\psi_n\rangle \langle \psi_n| X^a Z^b$ and $\rho_1 = \operatorname{Tr}_{\mathsf{R}} |\Psi_1\rangle \langle \Psi_1| = \frac{1}{2^n} \sum_x |x\rangle \langle x|$. These two states are indistinguishable even to an adversary with a polynomial number of copies of $|\psi_n\rangle$. In fact, using Corollary 4.12, we have that for any $t = \operatorname{poly}(n)$, there is negligible function negl, such that for all n,

$$\left\|\rho_0^{\otimes n} \otimes \psi^{\otimes t} - \rho_1^{\otimes n} \otimes \psi^{\otimes t}\right\| \le n \left\|\rho_0 \otimes \psi^{\otimes t} - \rho_1 \otimes \psi^{\otimes t}\right\| = \mathsf{negl}(n)$$

Statistical extractor-based binding.

To show that the construction satisfies the statistical extractor-based binding property we need two technical lemmas.

Lemma A.9 ([HM13, Lemma 2]). Let $m \in \mathbb{N}$. Let ρ be a quantum state over m registers A_1, \ldots, A_m . Let σ be a quantum state over m registers B_1, \ldots, B_m . Consider the following test, applied to $\rho \otimes \sigma$:

$\mathsf{Real}_n^{C^*}$:

- 1. C^* takes polynomially many copies of $|\psi_n\rangle$ as input and generates a state $|\phi_b\rangle$ over registers (C, R, W) along with a bit $b \in \{0, 1\}$ where W is the work register of C^* .
- 2. C^* sends C to R in the commit phase.
- 3. C^* sends (b, R) to R in the reveal phase.
- 4. *R* runs the verification in the reveal phase. That is, *R* takes as input $|\psi_n\rangle_{\mathsf{C}'}^{\otimes n}$, and $(b, \mathsf{C}, \mathsf{R})$ from C^* ; it prepares an ancilla register V in the state $|0 \dots 0\rangle_{\mathsf{V}}$, applies the projective measurement $(P_b, \mathbb{1} P_b)$ on registers $(\mathsf{C}', \mathsf{C}, \mathsf{R}, \mathsf{V})$.
- 5. If R rejects (i.e. R obtains the outcome corresponding to $1 P_b$), b is replaced by \perp .
- 6. The experiment outputs (b, W).

 $\mathsf{Ideal}^{C^*,\mathcal{E}}$:

- 1. C^* takes polynomially many copies of $|\psi_n\rangle$ as input and generates a state $|\phi_b\rangle$ over registers (C, R, W) along with a bit $b \in \{0, 1\}$ where W is the work register of C^* .
- 2. C^* sends C to R in the commit phase.
- 3. The extractor \mathcal{E}_n prepares the ancilla register E in the state $|0 \dots 0\rangle_{\mathsf{E}}$, applies the projective measurement $\{\tilde{\Pi}_0, \tilde{\Pi}_1, \tilde{\Pi}_\perp\}$ on registers C and E , and lets $b^* \in \{0, 1, \perp\}$ be the outcome. \mathcal{E}_n sends C to R.
- 4. C^* sends (b, R) to R.
- 5. *R* runs the verification in the reveal phase. That is, *R* takes as input $|\psi_n\rangle_{\mathsf{C}'}^{\otimes n}$, and $(b, \mathsf{C}, \mathsf{R})$ from C^* ; it prepares an ancilla register V in the state $|0 \dots 0\rangle_{\mathsf{V}}$, applies the projective measurement $(P_b, \mathbb{1} P_b)$ on registers $(\mathsf{C}', \mathsf{C}, \mathsf{R}, \mathsf{V})$.
- 6. If R accepts (i.e. R obtains the outcome corresponding to P_b) and $b \neq b^*$, the experiment outputs the special symbol fail and halts.
- 7. If R rejects (i.e. R obtains the outcome corresponding to $1 P_b$), b is replaced by \perp .
- 8. The experiment outputs (b, W).

Figure 5: $\operatorname{\mathsf{Real}}_n^{C^*}$ and $\operatorname{\mathsf{Ideal}}_n^{C^*,\mathcal{E}}$

1. For each $i \in [m]$, do the SWAP test between A_i and B_i .

2. Accept if all SWAP tests are successful

Then the success probability that the above test accepts is $\frac{1}{2^m} \sum_{S \subseteq [m]} \operatorname{Tr}[\rho_S \sigma_S]$, where ρ_S is the state obtained by tracing out all registers A_i of ρ such that $i \notin S$, and σ_S is the state obtained by tracing out all registers B_i of σ such that $i \notin S$.

Lemma A.10 ([Yan22, Lemma 31]). Let $|\Psi_0\rangle_{X,Y}$ and $|\Psi_1\rangle_{X,Y}$ be pure states over registers (X,Y) such that

$$F\left(\mathrm{Tr}_{\mathsf{Y}}[|\Psi_{0}\rangle\langle\Psi_{0}|_{\mathsf{X},\mathsf{Y}}],\mathrm{Tr}_{\mathsf{Y}}[|\Psi_{1}\rangle\langle\Psi_{1}|_{\mathsf{X},\mathsf{Y}}]\right) = \epsilon$$

Then there is a projective measurement $\{\Pi_0, \Pi_1, \Pi_\perp \coloneqq \mathbb{1} - \Pi_0 - \Pi_1\}$ over registers X such that for each $b \in \{0, 1\}$,

$$\left\| (\Pi_b)_{\mathsf{X}} \otimes \mathbb{1}_{\mathsf{Y}} | \Psi_b \rangle_{\mathsf{X},\mathsf{Y}} \right\|^2 \ge 1 - \sqrt{2\epsilon}$$

Recall that we defined the reduced state of the honest commitment states $|\Psi_0\rangle_{\mathsf{CR}}$ and $|\Psi_1\rangle_{\mathsf{CR}}$ on the C registers respectively as $\rho_0 = \operatorname{Tr}_{\mathsf{R}} |\Psi_0\rangle \langle \Psi_0| = \frac{1}{2^{0.9n}} \sum_{a,b} X^a Z^b |\psi_n\rangle \langle \psi_n| X^a Z^b$ and $\rho_1 = \operatorname{Tr}_{\mathsf{R}}[|\Psi_1\rangle \langle \Psi_1|] = \frac{1}{2^n} \sum_x |x\rangle \langle x|$.

Since the rank of ρ_0 does not exceed $2^{0.9n}$, while $\rho_1 = \frac{1}{2^n}$, it is straightforward to show that $\|\rho_0 - \rho_1\| \ge 1 - \frac{2^{0.9n}}{2^n} = 1 - \operatorname{negl}(n)$ (by taking the eigendecomposition of ρ_0). Set $\epsilon = 1 - \|\rho_0 - \rho_1\| = \operatorname{negl}(n)$. According to Lemma A.10, there exists a family of orthogonal projectors $\{\Pi_0, \Pi_1, \Pi_\perp = 1 - \Pi_0 - \Pi_1\}$ on C such that for each $b \in \{0, 1\}$, it holds that

$$\|(\mathbb{1} - \Pi_b)_{\mathsf{C}} \otimes \mathbb{1}_{\mathsf{R}} |\Psi_b\rangle\|^2 \le \sqrt{2\epsilon} \,. \tag{17}$$

We define the extractor \mathcal{E}_n as follows:

- Upon receiving the commitment register $C = (C_1, ..., C_n)$, for each $i \in [n]$, apply the projective measurement $\{\Pi_0, \Pi_1, \Pi_\perp\}$ on C_i to obtain an outcome $b_i \in \{0, 1, \perp\}$.
- - If $|\{i \in [n] : b_i = 0\}| > 2n/3$, output $b^* = 0$.
 - If $|\{i \in [n] : b_i = 1\}| > 2n/3$, output $b^* = 1$.
 - Otherwise, output $b^* = \perp$

We can equivalently describe \mathcal{E}_n as some projective measurement $\{\tilde{\Pi}_0, \tilde{\Pi}_1, \tilde{\Pi}_{\perp}\}$ on register C and an ancilla register E initialized as $|0...0\rangle_{\mathsf{E}}$.

For $b \in \{0, 1\}$, let $(P_b, \mathbb{1} - P_b)$ be the projective measurement corresponding to the "purified" verification performed by the receiver R in the reveal phase. That is, $(P_b, \mathbb{1} - P_b)$ is defined so that R is described as follows: on input $|\psi_n\rangle_{C'}^{\otimes n}$, where $C' := C'_1 \dots C'_n$, as well as (b, C, R) from the sender, R initializes an ancilla register V to $|0 \dots 0\rangle_V$, and applies the projective measurement $(P_b, \mathbb{1} - P_b)$ to all previous registers. R accepts if the outcome is the former, and rejects if its the latter.

Let C^* be a malicious sender. Then, concretely, the experiments $\operatorname{\mathsf{Real}}_n^{C^*}$ and $\operatorname{\mathsf{Ideal}}_n^{C^*,\mathcal{E}}$ are as in Fig. 5.

In what follows, for simplicity, we omit writing identities on registers were operators act trivially. Let $|\phi_b\rangle$ be defined as in Fig. 5. We define the mixed states $\rho_{\text{real}}(b)$ and $\rho_{\text{ideal}}(b)$ to correspond to the outputs of $\text{Real}_n^{C^*}$ and $\text{Ideal}_n^{C^*,\mathcal{E}}$ conditioned on the bit sent from C^* being b. That is, we let²⁶

$$\rho_{\mathsf{real}}(b) \coloneqq \operatorname{Tr}_{\mathsf{C}',\mathsf{C},\mathsf{R},\mathsf{V},\mathsf{E}}[P_b \left| \tilde{\phi}_b \right\rangle \left\langle \tilde{\phi}_b \right|] \otimes \left| b \right\rangle \left\langle b \right| + \operatorname{Tr}_{\mathsf{C}',\mathsf{C},\mathsf{R},\mathsf{V},\mathsf{E}}[(\mathbb{1} - P_b) \left| \tilde{\phi}_b \right\rangle \left\langle \tilde{\phi}_b \right|] \otimes \left| \bot \right\rangle \left\langle \bot \right|$$
(18)

²⁶To see that these are the correct definitions one can use the ciclicity of the partial trace.

and

$$\rho_{\mathsf{ideal}}(b) \coloneqq \operatorname{Tr}_{\mathsf{C}',\mathsf{C},\mathsf{R},\mathsf{V},\mathsf{E}}[N_b | \tilde{\phi_b} \rangle \langle \tilde{\phi_b} |] \otimes |b\rangle \langle b| + \operatorname{Tr}_{\mathsf{C}',\mathsf{C},\mathsf{R},\mathsf{V},\mathsf{E}}[N_\perp | \tilde{\phi_b} \rangle \langle \tilde{\phi_b} |] \otimes |\bot\rangle \langle \bot|
+ \operatorname{Tr}_{\mathsf{C}',\mathsf{C},\mathsf{R},\mathsf{V},\mathsf{E}}[N_{\mathtt{fail}} | \tilde{\phi_b} \rangle \langle \tilde{\phi_b} |] \otimes |\mathtt{fail}\rangle \langle \mathtt{fail}|$$
(19)

where

$$|\tilde{\phi}_b\rangle \coloneqq |\phi_b\rangle_{\mathsf{C},\mathsf{R},\mathsf{W}} \otimes |\psi_n\rangle_{\mathsf{C}'}^{\otimes n} \otimes |0\dots0\rangle_{\mathsf{V}} \otimes |0\dots0\rangle_{\mathsf{E}}$$

and

$$N_b \coloneqq \tilde{\Pi}_b P_b \tilde{\Pi}_b, \, N_{\texttt{fail}} \coloneqq (\mathbb{1} - \tilde{\Pi}_b) P_b (\mathbb{1} - \tilde{\Pi}_b), \, N_\perp \coloneqq \mathbb{1} - N_b - N_{\texttt{fail}}$$

Noting that the distribution of b is identical in both experiments, it suffices to prove

$$\|\rho_{\mathsf{real}}(b) - \rho_{\mathsf{ideal}}(b)\| = \mathsf{negl}(n)$$

for $b \in \{0, 1\}$. We show the following lemma.

Lemma A.11. For each $b \in \{0, 1\}$, it holds that

$$\left\| (P_b)_{\mathsf{C},\mathsf{R},\mathsf{C}',\mathsf{V}}(\mathbb{1}-\tilde{\Pi}_b)_{\mathsf{C},\mathsf{E}} |\tilde{\phi}_b\rangle \right\|^2 = \mathsf{negl}(n) \,.$$

Proof. By definition of P_b and $|\tilde{\phi}_b\rangle$, $\left\|P_b(\mathbb{1}-\tilde{\Pi}_b)|\tilde{\phi}_b\rangle\right\|^2$ is the probability that the bit extracted from $|\tilde{\phi}_b\rangle$ is not *b* and the residual state passes the verification performed by *R* with respect to *b*. Let $\rho_{\mathsf{C},\mathsf{R}} \coloneqq \operatorname{Tr}_{\mathsf{W},\mathsf{E}} \left[(\mathbb{1}-\tilde{\Pi}_b)_{\mathsf{C},\mathsf{E}} |\phi_b\rangle \langle \phi_b|_{\mathsf{C},\mathsf{R},\mathsf{W}} \otimes |0\dots0\rangle \langle 0\dots0|_{\mathsf{E}}\right]$. By Lemma A.9, this probability is equal to

$$\frac{1}{2^n} \sum_{S \subseteq [n]} \operatorname{Tr}[\rho_S \sigma_S]$$

where $\sigma \coloneqq \bigotimes_{i \in [n]} |\Psi_b\rangle \langle \Psi_b|$. Here ρ_S and σ_S are the states obtained by tracing out all $C_i R_i$, respectively $C'_i R'_i$, for $i \notin S$. Notice that the latter expression for the probability takes into account the fact that ρ is sub-normalized.

By the definition of $\tilde{\Pi}_b$, we can write

$$\rho = \sum_{T \subseteq [n], |T| \le 2n/3} \operatorname{Tr}_{\mathsf{W}} \left[\hat{\Pi}_{b}^{(T)} \left| \phi_{b} \right\rangle \left\langle \phi_{b} \right| \hat{\Pi}_{b}^{(T)} \right]$$

where

$$\widehat{\Pi}_{b}^{(T)} = \left(\bigotimes_{i \in T} (\Pi_{b})_{\mathsf{C}_{i}}\right) \otimes \left(\bigotimes_{i \notin T} (\mathbb{1} - \Pi_{b})_{\mathsf{C}_{i}}\right) \,.$$

We have

$$\frac{1}{2^{n}} \sum_{S \subseteq [n]} \operatorname{Tr} \left[\rho_{S} \sigma_{S} \right] \\
= \frac{1}{2^{n}} \sum_{S \subseteq [n]} \sum_{T \subseteq [n]: |T| \le 2n/3} \operatorname{Tr} \left[\left(\operatorname{Tr}_{\{\mathsf{C}_{i},\mathsf{R}_{i}\}_{i \notin S},\mathsf{W}} \hat{\Pi}_{b}^{(T)} \left| \phi_{b} \right\rangle \left\langle \phi_{b} \right| \hat{\Pi}_{b}^{(T)} \right) \left(\bigotimes_{i \in S} \left| \Psi_{b} \right\rangle \left\langle \Psi_{b} \right|_{\mathsf{C}_{i},\mathsf{R}_{i}} \right) \right].$$

Now, for any S and T, we have

$$\begin{split} &\operatorname{Tr}\left[\left(\operatorname{Tr}_{\{\mathsf{C}_{i},\mathsf{R}_{i}\}_{i\notin S},\mathsf{W}}\hat{\Pi}_{b}^{(T)}\left|\phi_{b}\right\rangle\left\langle\phi_{b}\right|\hat{\Pi}_{b}^{(T)}\right)\left(\bigotimes_{i\in S}\left|\Psi_{b}\right\rangle\left\langle\Psi_{b}\right|_{\mathsf{C}_{i},\mathsf{R}_{i}}\right)\right] \\ &=\operatorname{Tr}\left[\left(\left(\mathbbm{1}-\Pi_{b}\right)_{\{\mathsf{C}_{i}\}_{i\in S\setminus T}}^{\otimes\left|S\setminus T\right|}\left(\operatorname{Tr}_{\{\mathsf{C}_{i},\mathsf{R}_{i}\}_{i\notin S},\mathsf{W}}\hat{\Pi}_{b}^{(T)}\right)\left(\mathbbm{1}-\Pi_{b}\right)_{\{\mathsf{C}_{i}\}_{i\in S\setminus T}}^{\otimes\left|S\setminus T\right|}\right)\left(\bigotimes_{i\in S}\left|\Psi_{b}\right\rangle\left\langle\Psi_{b}\right|_{\mathsf{C}_{i},\mathsf{R}_{i}}\right)\right] \\ &=\operatorname{Tr}\left[\left(\operatorname{Tr}_{\{\mathsf{C}_{i},\mathsf{R}_{i}\}_{i\notin S},\mathsf{W}}\hat{\Pi}_{b}^{(T)}\left|\phi_{b}\right\rangle\left\langle\phi_{b}\right|\hat{\Pi}_{b}^{(T)}\right)\left(\mathbbm{1}-\Pi_{b}\right)_{\{\mathsf{C}_{i}\}_{i\in S\setminus T}}^{\otimes\left|S\setminus T\right|}\left(\bigotimes_{i\in S}\left|\Psi_{b}\right\rangle\left\langle\Psi_{b}\right|_{\mathsf{C}_{i},\mathsf{R}_{i}}\right)\left(\mathbbm{1}-\Pi_{b}\right)_{\{\mathsf{C}_{i}\}_{i\in S\setminus T}}^{\otimes\left|S\setminus T\right|}\right) \\ &\leq\left\|\hat{\Pi}_{b}\left|\phi_{b}\right\rangle\right\|^{2}\operatorname{Tr}\left[\left(\mathbbm{1}-\Pi_{b}\right)_{\{\mathsf{C}_{i}\}_{i\in S\setminus T}}^{\otimes\left|S\setminus T\right|}\left(\bigotimes_{i\in S}\left|\Psi_{b}\right\rangle\left\langle\Psi_{b}\right|_{\mathsf{C}_{i},\mathsf{R}_{i}}\right)\left(\mathbbm{1}-\Pi_{b}\right)_{\{\mathsf{C}_{i}\}_{i\in S\setminus T}}^{\otimes\left|S\setminus T\right|}\right) \\ &\leq\left\|\hat{\Pi}_{b}\left|\phi_{b}\right\rangle\right\|^{2}\left\|(\mathbbm{1}-\Pi_{b})\left|\Psi_{b}\right\rangle\right\|^{2|S\setminus T|} \\ &\leq\left\|\hat{\Pi}_{b}\left|\phi_{b}\right\rangle\right\|^{2}\left(\sqrt{2\epsilon}\right)^{|S\setminus T|}, \end{split}$$

where the final inequality follows from Eq. (17), where $\epsilon = \operatorname{negl}(n)$.

Thus for any T such that $|T| \leq 2n/3$, we have

$$\begin{split} &\frac{1}{2^n}\sum_{S\subseteq[n]}\operatorname{Tr}\left[\left(\operatorname{Tr}_{\{\mathsf{C}_i,\mathsf{R}_i\}_{i\notin S},\mathsf{W}}\hat{\Pi}_b^{(T)} \left|\phi_b\right\rangle\left\langle\phi_b\right|\hat{\Pi}_b^{(T)}\right)\left(\bigotimes_{i\in S}\left|\Psi_b\right\rangle\left\langle\Psi_b\right|_{\mathsf{C}_i,\mathsf{R}_i}\right)\right] \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2^n}\sum_{S\subseteq[n]}\left\|\hat{\Pi}_b^{(T)} \left|\phi_b\right\rangle\right\|^2 (\sqrt{2\epsilon})^{|S\setminus T|} \\ &\leq \left\|\hat{\Pi}_b^{(T)} \left|\phi_b\right\rangle\right\|^2 \cdot \frac{1}{2^n} \left(\sum_{S\subseteq[n]:S\subseteq T} 1 + \sum_{S\subseteq[n]:S\not\subseteq T} \sqrt{2\epsilon}\right) \\ &\leq 2^{-n/3} + \sqrt{2\epsilon} \,. \end{split}$$

where the final inequality follows directly from $|\{S \subseteq [n] : S \subseteq T\}| = 2^{|T|} \le 2^{2n/3}$.

Therefore, we have

$$\frac{1}{2^n} \sum_{S \subseteq [n]} \operatorname{Tr}[\rho_S \sigma_S] \le 2^{-n/3} + \sqrt{2\epsilon} \le \operatorname{\mathsf{negl}}(n) \,.$$

Recall the definitions of $\rho_{\mathsf{real}}(b)$ and $\rho_{\mathsf{ideal}}(b)$ from Equations (18) and (19) respectively. Let $\tau_{\mathsf{real}}^{(b)}$ and $\tau_{\mathsf{real}}^{(\perp)}$ be such that

$$\rho_{\mathsf{real}}(b) = \tau_{\mathsf{real}}^{(b)} \otimes |b\rangle \left\langle b\right| + \tau_{\mathsf{real}}^{(\bot)} \otimes |\bot\rangle \left\langle \bot\right| \,,$$

and let $\tau_{\mathsf{ideal}}^{(b)}, \tau_{\mathsf{ideal}}^{(\perp)}, \tau_{\mathsf{ideal}}^{(\texttt{fail})}$ be such that

$$\rho_{\mathsf{ideal}}(b) = \tau_{\mathsf{ideal}}^{(b)} \otimes |b\rangle \left\langle b\right| + \tau_{\mathsf{ideal}}^{(\perp)} \otimes |\bot\rangle \left\langle \bot\right| + \tau_{\mathsf{ideal}}^{(\texttt{fail})} \otimes |\texttt{fail}\rangle \left\langle \texttt{fail}\right| \,.$$

We can now use Lemma A.11 to show the following fact.

Lemma A.12. For each $b \in \{0, 1\}$, the following hold:

1. $\operatorname{Tr}\left[\tau_{\mathsf{ideal}}^{(fail)}\right] = \mathsf{negl}(n)$

2.
$$\left\| \tau_{\text{ideal}}^{(b)} - \tau_{\text{real}}^{(b)} \right\| = \operatorname{negl}(n)$$

3. $\left\| \tau_{\text{ideal}}^{(\perp)} - \tau_{\text{real}}^{(\perp)} \right\| = \operatorname{negl}(n)$

Proof. For the first item, we have

$$\mathrm{Tr}[\tau_{\mathsf{ideal}}^{(\mathsf{fail})}] = \mathrm{Tr}[N_{\mathsf{fail}} \, |\tilde{\phi}_b\rangle \, \langle \tilde{\phi}_b |] = \langle \tilde{\phi}_b | (\mathbb{1} - \tilde{\Pi}_b) P_b(\mathbb{1} - \tilde{\Pi}_b) | \tilde{\phi}_b \rangle = \left\| P_b(\mathbb{1} - \tilde{\Pi}_b) \, |\tilde{\phi}_b \rangle \right\|^2 = \mathsf{negl}(n) \,,$$

where the last equality is by Lemma A.11.

For the second item, we have

$$\begin{split} \left\| \tau_{\mathsf{ideal}}^{(b)} - \tau_{\mathsf{real}}^{(b)} \right\| &\leq \left\| P_b \left| \tilde{\phi}_b \right\rangle \left\langle \tilde{\phi}_b \right| P_b - P_b \tilde{\Pi}_b \left| \tilde{\phi}_b \right\rangle \left\langle \tilde{\phi}_b \right| \tilde{\Pi}_b P_b \right\| \\ &= 2 \max_Q \operatorname{Tr} \left[Q \left(P_b \left| \tilde{\phi}_b \right\rangle \left\langle \tilde{\phi}_b \right| P_b - P_b \tilde{\Pi}_b \left| \tilde{\phi}_b \right\rangle \left\langle \tilde{\phi}_b \right| \tilde{\Pi}_b P_b \right) \right] \\ &- \left[\operatorname{Tr}(P_b \left| \tilde{\phi}_b \right\rangle \left\langle \tilde{\phi}_b \right| P_b) - \operatorname{Tr}(P_b \tilde{\Pi}_b \left| \tilde{\phi}_b \right\rangle \left\langle \tilde{\phi}_b \right| \tilde{\Pi}_b P_b \right) \right] \\ &= 2 \max_Q \left(\left\| Q P_b \left| \tilde{\phi}_b \right\rangle \right\|^2 - \left\| Q P_b \tilde{\Pi}_b \left| \tilde{\phi}_b \right\rangle \right\|^2 \right) - \left(\left\| P_b \left| \tilde{\phi}_b \right\rangle \right\|^2 - \left\| P_b \tilde{\Pi}_b \left| \tilde{\phi}_b \right\rangle \right\|^2 \right) \end{split}$$

where the maximum is taken over all projectors Q on (W, C', C, R, V, E), and the first inequality follows from the fact that trace distance is decreasing under taking a partial trace. For any projector Q, we have

$$\begin{split} \left| \left\| QP_b \left| \tilde{\phi}_b \right\rangle \right\|^2 &- \left\| QP_b \tilde{\Pi}_b \left| \tilde{\phi}_b \right\rangle \left\| \right|^2 \right| \\ &= \left| \left\| QP_b (\tilde{\Pi}_b + (\mathbbm{1} - \tilde{\Pi}_b)) \left| \tilde{\phi}_b \right\rangle \right\|^2 - \left\| QP_b \tilde{\Pi}_b \left| \tilde{\phi}_b \right\rangle \right\|^2 \right| \\ &= \left| \langle \tilde{\phi}_b | P_b QP_b (\mathbbm{1} - \tilde{\Pi}_b) | \tilde{\phi}_b \rangle + \langle \tilde{\phi}_b | (\mathbbm{1} - \tilde{\Pi}_b) P_b QP_b \tilde{\Pi}_b | \tilde{\phi}_b \rangle \right| \\ &\leq 2 \left\| P_b (\mathbbm{1} - \tilde{\Pi}_b) \right\| = \operatorname{negl}(n) \,, \end{split}$$

where the last equality is by Lemma A.11.

Finally, for the third item, we have

$$\begin{split} \left\| \tau_{\mathsf{real}}^{(\perp)} - \tau_{\mathsf{ideal}}^{(\perp)} \right\| &= \left\| \operatorname{Tr}_{\mathsf{C}',\mathsf{C},\mathsf{R},\mathsf{V},\mathsf{E}} \left[\left(\mathbbm{1} - P_b\right) \left| \tilde{\phi}_b \right\rangle \left\langle \tilde{\phi}_b \right| \right] - \operatorname{Tr}_{\mathsf{C}',\mathsf{C},\mathsf{R},\mathsf{V},\mathsf{E}} \left[\left(\mathbbm{1} - N_b - N_{\mathsf{fail}}\right) \left| \tilde{\phi}_b \right\rangle \left\langle \tilde{\phi}_b \right| \right] \right\| \\ &= \left\| \operatorname{Tr}_{\mathsf{C}',\mathsf{C},\mathsf{R},\mathsf{V},\mathsf{E}} \left[\left(N_b + N_{\mathsf{fail}} - P_b\right) \left| \tilde{\phi}_b \right\rangle \left\langle \tilde{\phi}_b \right| \right] \right\| \\ &\leq \left\| \operatorname{Tr}_{\mathsf{C}',\mathsf{C},\mathsf{R},\mathsf{V},\mathsf{E}} \left[\left(N_b - P_b\right) \left| \tilde{\phi}_b \right\rangle \left\langle \tilde{\phi}_b \right| \right] \right\| + \operatorname{Tr} \left[\left(N_{\mathsf{fail}} \left| \tilde{\phi}_b \right\rangle \left\langle \tilde{\phi}_b \right| \right] = \operatorname{negl}(n) \,, \end{split}$$

where the last line follows from the triangle inequality, as well as the first and second item. \Box

We can now bound the distance between $\rho_{\mathsf{real}}(b)$ and $\rho_{\mathsf{ideal}}(b)$ as

$$\|\rho_{\mathsf{real}}(b) - \rho_{\mathsf{ideal}}(b)\| = \left\|\tau_{\mathsf{real}}^{(b)} - \tau_{\mathsf{ideal}}^{(b)}\right\| + \left\|\tau_{\mathsf{real}}^{(\perp)} - \tau_{\mathsf{ideal}}^{(\perp)}\right\| + \operatorname{Tr}\left[\tau_{\mathsf{ideal}}^{(\texttt{fail})}\right] = \mathsf{negl}(n)$$

where the last equality follows from Lemma A.12. This yields the desired statistical binding property, and completes the proof of Theorem A.7. \Box