

# Adaptivity is not helpful for Pauli channel learning

Xuan Du Trinh and Nengkun Yu  
The State University of New York at Stony Brook,  
Stony Brook, NY 11794

March 15, 2024

## Abstract

This note shows that adaptive strategies do not offer additional advantages for learning and testing Pauli channels with entangled input. First, the tight query complexity of learning Pauli channels with entangled input is established for the general norm  $l_p$ . In particular, the complexities for the  $l_1$ ,  $l_2$  and  $l_\infty$  norms are improved or matched compared to previous results using entanglement in the literature. We also settle the query complexity to test if Pauli channels are white noise sources across  $l_p$ . Additionally, we demonstrate that the query complexity of estimating the noise level of a Pauli channel, characterized by the entropy of its error distribution and the count of non-zero probabilities, is  $\Theta(4^n/n)$ . Further,  $\Theta(4^n/n)$  queries are sufficient to estimate the diamond norm between two Pauli channels.

## 1 Introduction

Quantum noise is a fundamental concept in quantum physics, challenging our ability to demonstrate and harness the advantages of quantum information processing. In quantum cryptography, noise primarily influences quantum communication tasks by generating errors, thereby reducing the secret key rate of quantum key distribution protocols. To build large-scale and fault-tolerant quantum computers, mitigating quantum noise and performing error correction play crucial roles. For these reasons, modeling and evaluating quantum noise always remain a topic of interest.

When we address the problems of quantum error correction, bit flips, and phase flips represent the most fundamental types of errors that illustrate the impact of noise on qubit systems. Consequently, the Pauli channel emerges as a standard noise model. Let  $\rho$  denote the density operator of an  $n$ -qubit system, the Pauli channel  $\mathcal{P}$  is a completely positive and trace-preserving (CPTP) map:

$$\rho \longmapsto \sum_{i \in \{0,1,2,3\}^n} P(i) \cdot \tau_i \rho \tau_i^\dagger \quad (1)$$

where  $\tau_i = \sigma_{i_1} \otimes \sigma_{i_2} \otimes \dots \otimes \sigma_{i_n}$  is a tensor product of Pauli operators from the set  $\{\sigma_0, \sigma_1, \sigma_2, \sigma_3\}$  of Pauli matrices and  $P(i)$  represents the probability of the error denoted by  $\tau_i$ . This probability distribution characterizes the channel  $\mathcal{P}$ . If a quantum state  $\rho$  passes through a noisy quantum device modeled by the Pauli channel, one can collect information about  $P$  through measurements on the output state  $\mathcal{P}(\rho)$ . Employing a set of known input states and appropriately choosing measurement settings, which can be projective or generalized, allows the collection of a sample of size  $N$  after repeating the experiment  $N$  times.

One might consider a specific parameterization for  $P$  while analyzing data samples based on physical observations. In particular, various simple Pauli channels with only a single parameter have been studied, such as the bit flip channel, the dephasing channel and the depolarizing

channel [GEZ21]. However, in our analysis,  $P$  is maintained as generally as possible. Learning and testing a probability distribution without presupposing its form presents a challenging and contemporary problem in statistics and learning theory. This paper explores the complexity of various related tasks, including learning the Pauli channel and testing some aspects of this model.

For  $\epsilon, \delta \in (0, 1)$ , we define the learning complexity as the number of times we query the Pauli channel and output an estimation  $\hat{P}$  that is  $\epsilon$ -close to  $P$  with error probability at most  $\delta$ . To simplify the analysis, in this study, if the value of the soundness  $\delta$  is not specified, we understand that it is fixed as a constant, namely  $\delta = 1/3$ . In literature, the learning complexity has been investigated in both senses: the number of the Pauli channel applications and the number of measurements. In the findings of this paper, distinguishing between these two notions is deemed unnecessary.

Having already established the definition of learning complexity, we need a scheme to discriminate between the actual parameters of the quantum channel and the distribution learned from data samples. The distance between two probability distributions considered here will be  $l_p$  with  $p \geq 1$ , defined by

$$\|\hat{P} - P\|_p = \left( \sum_i^n |\hat{P}(i) - P(i)|^p \right)^{\frac{1}{p}}. \quad (2)$$

It is noteworthy that  $l_1 = \sum_i^n |\hat{P}(i) - P(i)|$  represents twice the total variation distance, while  $l_\infty = \max_i |\hat{P}(i) - P(i)|$  signifies the maximal difference between two distributions at a single coordinate, and  $l_2$  corresponds to the common Euclidean distance.

<b>p</b>	<b>This study</b>	<b>With entanglement</b>	<b>Without entanglement</b>
$p = 1$	$\Theta(4^n/\epsilon^2)$	$\tilde{O}(4^n/\epsilon^2)$ [CZS]22, FOF23]	$O(n2^{3n}/\epsilon^2)$ [FW20]
$p = 2$	$\Theta(1/\epsilon^2)$	None	$O(n2^n/\epsilon^2)$ [FW20]
$p = \infty$	$\Theta(1/\epsilon^2)$	$\Theta(1/\epsilon^2)$ [FO21] <sup>1</sup>	$\Omega(1/\epsilon^2), O(1/\epsilon^2) \log(n/\epsilon)$ [FO21]

Table 1: Comparison of learning complexities obtained in Corollary 1 with existing sample complexity bounds in literature for different common values of  $p$ . The two last columns list the results previously obtained with and without entanglement resources in terms of the number of measurement rounds or the number of Pauli channel applications.

Previous research has yielded remarkable results in estimating Pauli channels under various conditions, including scenarios with and without entanglement and employing different metrics for evaluation. In the entanglement-free scheme, Flammia and Wallman introduced an algorithm requiring  $O(n2^n/\epsilon^2)$  measurements to estimate Pauli channels in norm  $l_2$  in [FW20]. Recently, Fawzi et al. refined this algorithm and established an upper bound of  $O(n2^{3n}/\epsilon^2)$  measurements in the context of norm  $l_1$  [FOF23]. While focusing on the  $l_\infty$  norm and without-entanglement condition, Flammia and O'Donnell related the learning of Pauli channels to the Population Recovery problem. They provided an algorithm that uses the channel  $O(1/\epsilon^2) \log(n/\epsilon)$  times [FO21]. In another study in the same context, Chen et al. demonstrated that  $\Theta(2^n/\epsilon^2)$  measurements are required for learning each eigenvalue  $P(i)$  [COZ<sup>+</sup>23]. Earlier, Chen et al. showed that entanglement provides an exponential advantage, with an algorithm that applies the channel  $O(n/\epsilon^2)$  times

<sup>1</sup>Flammia and O'Donnell connected the problem of learning  $\mathcal{P}$  to the estimation of the discrete distribution  $P$  in [FO21], citing the classical sample complexity of  $\Theta(1/\epsilon^2)$  for learning  $P$  as reported in [Can20]. However, they did not provide a proven lower bound for the quantum query complexity.




Figure 1: Adaptive strategy for the sampling task: The main  $n$ -qubit system and a possible ancilla of  $k$  qubits are initialized respectively in the state  $|0^n\rangle$  and  $|0^k\rangle$ . The operation  $A$  denotes an adaptive procedure comprising quantum measurements and state transformations based on measurement outcomes in any possible order. The gate  $\mathcal{P}$  processes the main system in order to extract information from  $P$ . The circuit outputs a sample from  $P$ .

[CZSJ22], leading to an upper bound of  $O(4^n/\epsilon^2)$  in the  $l_1$  distance via the Parseval–Plancherel identity [FOF23]. To the learning of the Pauli channel, Flammia and O’Donnell highlighted that  $\Theta(1/\epsilon^2)$  samples of  $P$  are both necessary and sufficient for classically learning  $P$  in the  $l_\infty$  norm. They further stated that Bell measurements can obtain these samples while ancilla, i.e., entanglement, is available [FO21]. These studies, alongside others [WE16, CLO<sup>+</sup>23, RF23], highlight the complexity and diversity of techniques in quantum channel discrimination. Motivated by this diversity, our paper aims to establish tight bounds for the learning problem across any  $l_p$  norm, where  $p \geq 1$ .

In addition to quantum channel discrimination, adaptive quantum learning algorithms play a significant role. These refer to the strategy of dynamically adjusting the choice of quantum measurements and input states based on the outcomes of previous measurements (Figure 1). This approach contrasts with non-adaptive strategies, where the measurement bases are predetermined before experimentation. Notably, the algorithms in [FW20] employ adaptivity as a crucial component. Subsequently, Fawzi *et al.* in their recent work explored lower bounds for adaptive and non-adaptive strategies in the context of  $l_1$  and  $l_\infty$  and specifically in scenarios devoid of entanglement resources [FOF23]. Their results show gaps between the aforementioned algorithms’ lower and upper bounds. This raises an essential question regarding the actual efficacy of adaptivity in enhancing the learning process.

We present the main theorems of our study, addressing the utility of adaptivity in the learning process of the Pauli channel when entanglement resources and ancillary registers are accessible. This theorem facilitates the exploration of additional aspects of Pauli channels.

**Theorem 1.** *Given a Pauli channel  $\mathcal{P}$ , the associated random variable  $P$ , and the capability to prepare maximally entangled two-qubit states, it is established that the behaviors of  $\mathcal{P}$  and  $P$  exhibit a bisimulation relationship. Specifically, the following statements hold*

- *The Pauli channel  $\mathcal{P}$  can be precisely simulated utilizing the random variable  $P$ .*
- *Obtaining each sample from  $P$  necessitates exactly one application of the channel  $\mathcal{P}$ .*

This theorem gives an insight that, in terms of information, accessing the channel  $\mathcal{P}$  is equivalent to accessing the random variable  $P$ . The intuition behind the first point is straightforward since  $P$  effectively characterizes  $\mathcal{P}$ , and the second point will be demonstrated by establishing a lower bound and introducing a sampling algorithm. The equivalence signifies that tasks such as learning or estimating properties of  $\mathcal{P}$  can be efficiently executed by sampling from the random variable  $P$  and then applying a classical processing algorithm. Another important implication here is that if the sample complexity for a task is  $\mathcal{C}$ , then the query complexity on  $\mathcal{P}$  directly aligns

with  $\mathcal{C}$ . For instance, achieving an  $\epsilon$ -close approximation in learning the distribution  $P$  within the  $l_p$  norm requires  $\Theta(\text{poly}(\frac{1}{\epsilon}, 2^n))$  samples, then an equal number of queries to the channel  $\mathcal{P}$  is required. The upper and lower bounds are all translated from sample complexity to query complexity.

The proof of Theorem 1 is presented in Section 2. Subsequent sections will discuss its applications in learning and testing problems, providing corollaries of this result while referencing earlier groundbreaking studies.

**Theorem 2.** *In estimating any property of  $\mathcal{P}$  using samples drawn from the distribution  $P$ , adaptivity does not improve the efficiency compared to non-adaptive strategies.*

*Proof.* Considering the adaptive strategy shown in Figure 1 in the context of Theorem 1, a redundancy is evident. The theorem indicates that just one application of the gate  $\mathcal{P}$  suffices to produce a sample from the distribution  $P$ . After this initial use, the entire system may undergo some possible quantum operations. Subsequently, it is subjected to quantum measurement. Afterward, no further quantum operations are necessary. Anything done at that step to obtain the sample falls into classical processing. The possible quantum operations before the measurement cannot be adaptive because no measurement outcome was available. Hence, the sample is obtained without adaptivity. In summary, given the capability to prepare a maximally entangled state between qubit pairs, adaptivity offers no advantage over the non-adaptive approach in this scenario  $\square$ .

p value	Regime	Necessary	Sufficient
$1 \leq p \leq 2$	$1 > \epsilon \geq 2^{-\frac{2n(p-1)}{p}}$	$\epsilon^{-\frac{p}{2(p-1)}}$	$\epsilon^{-\frac{p}{2(p-1)}}$
	$\epsilon < 2^{-\frac{2n(p-1)}{p}}$	$2^{\frac{n(4-3p)}{p}} \epsilon^{-2}$	$2^{\frac{n(4-3p)}{p}} \epsilon^{-2}$
$2 < p < \infty$	$\Theta\left(\frac{n}{4^n}\right) \geq \epsilon$	$n4^{-n}\epsilon^{-2}$	$2^{-n}\epsilon^{-2}$
	$\Theta\left(\frac{n}{4^n}\right) < \epsilon \leq 2^{-n}$	$\epsilon^{-1}$	$2^{-n}\epsilon^{-2}$
	$\epsilon > 2^{-n}$	$\epsilon^{-1}$	$\epsilon^{-1}$
$p = \infty$	$\Theta\left(\frac{n}{4^n}\right) \geq \epsilon$	$n4^{-n}\epsilon^{-2}$	$n4^{-n}\epsilon^{-2}$
	$\Theta\left(\frac{n}{4^n}\right) < \epsilon$	$\epsilon^{-1}$	$\epsilon^{-1}$

Table 2: Uniformity testing sample complexity bounds for different values of  $p$ .

## 2 Sampling with Bell state measurement

In the theory of quantum operations, Choi's isomorphism offers a representation of quantum channels. In this representation, the channel  $\mathcal{P}$  acting on the  $n$ -qubit system  $A$  is fully characterized by the quantum state

$$\Lambda = (\mathbb{1} \otimes \mathcal{P})(|\Phi_n\rangle\langle\Phi_n|) \quad (3)$$

where  $|\Phi_n\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2^n}} \sum_{i=0}^{2^n-1} |ii\rangle$  is the maximally entangled state in the extension  $A \otimes A'$  with  $A'$  isomorphic to  $A$ . The fact that  $\Lambda$  encodes all information about  $\mathcal{P}$  implies that extracting information from  $\Lambda$  is equivalent to "measuring" the quantum channel. It suggests a method for detecting

Pauli errors using entangled states. Nevertheless, entangled measurement on the total system  $A \otimes A'$  is generally consuming. So, we will employ  $n$  Bell measurements on  $n$  pairs of qubits.

A simple example will give an intuition of our approach. We start with the preparation of a pair of qubits in a maximally entangled state  $|\Phi^+\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|00\rangle + |11\rangle)$ . One of the two qubits is then subjected to a Pauli channel  $\mathcal{P}$ . Subsequently, a Bell measurement is performed on the qubits (Figure 2).




Figure 2: The first Hadamard and CNOT gates create a maximally entangled state. Then, the second qubit is subject to a single-qubit Pauli channel. The second CNOT and Hadamard gates help to project Bell measurement to the measurement in the computational basis.

**Effect of Pauli Errors:** If a Pauli gate error occurs on one qubit among an EPR pair, it would transform the initial entangled state  $|\Phi^+\rangle$  into another Bell state. To summarize, the measurement outcomes in a Bell measurement provide information about the types of Pauli errors that may have affected the qubits:

- $|\sigma_0\rangle = |\Phi^+\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|00\rangle + |11\rangle) = (\mathbb{1}_2 \otimes \sigma_0) |\Phi^+\rangle$  outcome indicates no errors ( $\sigma_0 = \mathbb{1}_2$ ).
- $|\sigma_1\rangle = |\Psi^+\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|01\rangle + |10\rangle) = (\mathbb{1}_2 \otimes \sigma_1) |\Phi^+\rangle$  outcome indicates a Pauli-X ( $\sigma_1$ ) error.
- $|\sigma_2\rangle = |\Psi^-\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|01\rangle - |10\rangle) = (\mathbb{1}_2 \otimes \sigma_2) |\Phi^+\rangle$  outcome indicates a Pauli-Y ( $\sigma_2$ ) error.
- $|\sigma_3\rangle = |\Phi^-\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|00\rangle - |11\rangle) = (\mathbb{1}_2 \otimes \sigma_3) |\Phi^+\rangle$  outcome indicates a Pauli-Z ( $\sigma_3$ ) error.

It is quite interesting that the summary remains true regardless of which qubit in each pair is subjected to Pauli errors. Such a strategy can be generalized to measure the  $n$ -qubit quantum channel  $\mathcal{P}$  using  $n$  pairs of maximally entangled qubits for  $n \geq 2$  thanks to the fact that

$$|\Phi_n\rangle = |\Phi^+\rangle^{\otimes n}. \quad (4)$$

From each pair, we pick one qubit to form a set. Then, we have two sets of  $n$  qubits. Subsequently, one set passes through the channel  $\mathcal{P}$ . Bell measurements detect errors on each qubit on its corresponding pairs. For the simplest case  $n = 2$ , the circuit in Figure 3 shows how the method is employed.

Intuitively, if the tuple of errors  $(\sigma_{i_1}, \sigma_{i_2}, \dots, \sigma_{i_n})$  is the output of the measurements on  $n$  qubit pairs, we get a sample of the distribution  $P$  with the value  $i = (i_1, i_2, \dots, i_n) \in \{0, 1, 2, 3\}^n$ . Then, one measurement experiment exploiting one use of  $\mathcal{P}$  results in one sample, providing an upper bound for the query complexity of the sampling task. To make the upper bound clear, the formal proof is given.

**Lemma 1.** *Resulting from the Bell measurements on  $n$  pairs of qubits by the strategy above, the tuple of errors  $(\sigma_{i_1}, \sigma_{i_2}, \dots, \sigma_{i_n})$  constitutes a sample corresponding to the value  $i = (i_1, i_2, \dots, i_n) \in \{0, 1, 2, 3\}^n$  from the distribution  $P$ .*




Figure 3: The Pauli channel is applied on the second and third qubits. Then, the errors on these two qubits are detected by Bell measurements on each initial pair.

*Proof.* We denote the post-measurement state corresponding to the tuple of error  $\tau_i = (\sigma_{i_1}, \sigma_{i_2}, \dots, \sigma_{i_n})$  by  $|\tau_i\rangle = |\sigma_{i_1}\rangle |\sigma_{i_2}\rangle \dots |\sigma_{i_n}\rangle$ . Considering the image of the Pauli channel under Choi isomorphism with the remark that  $|\sigma_{i_k}\rangle = (\mathbb{1}_2 \otimes \sigma_{i_k}) |\Phi^+\rangle$  and  $|\Phi_n\rangle \langle \Phi_n| = (|\Phi^+\rangle \langle \Phi^+|)^{\otimes n}$ , we have

$$(\mathbb{1}_A \otimes \mathcal{P})(|\Phi_n\rangle \langle \Phi_n|) = \sum_{i \in \{0,1,2,3\}} P(i) \cdot (\mathbb{1}_A \otimes \tau_i) |\Phi_n\rangle \langle \Phi_n| (\mathbb{1}_A \otimes \tau_i^\dagger) \quad (5)$$

$$= \sum_{i \in \{0,1,2,3\}} P(i) \cdot \bigotimes_{k=1}^n (\mathbb{1}_2 \otimes \sigma_{i_k}) |\Phi^+\rangle \langle \Phi^+| (\mathbb{1}_2 \otimes \sigma_{i_k}^\dagger) \quad (6)$$

$$= \sum_{i \in \{0,1,2,3\}} P(i) \cdot \bigotimes_{k=1}^n |\sigma_{i_k}\rangle \langle \sigma_{i_k}| \quad (7)$$

$$= \sum_{i \in \{0,1,2,3\}} P(i) |\tau_i\rangle \langle \tau_i|. \quad (8)$$

So with probability  $P(i)$ , the Bell measurements on  $n$  pairs of qubits detect the tuple error  $\tau_i$ .

*Proof of Theorem 1.* We start from the first point: the Pauli channel  $\mathcal{P}$  can be precisely simulated utilizing the random variable  $P$ . Consider a quantum system consisting of  $n$  qubits initially in the state  $\rho$ , on which we aim to simulate the action of the Pauli channel  $\mathcal{P}$ , given access to the random variable  $P$ . This process is straightforward. A sample of  $P$ , denoted by  $i = (i_1, i_2, \dots, i_n)$  is taken automatically by a classical computer and then the Pauli operation  $\tau_i = (\sigma_{i_1}, \sigma_{i_2}, \dots, \sigma_{i_n})$  is applied to the  $n$  qubits. The outcome will be the quantum state  $\tau_i \rho \tau_i^\dagger$ , with probability  $P(i)$ , i.e. the quantum state is presented by the density operator

$$\mathcal{P}(\rho) = \sum_{i \in \{0,1,2,3\}^n} P(i) \cdot \tau_i \rho \tau_i^\dagger. \quad (9)$$

We now consider the second point: obtaining each sample from  $P$  necessitates exactly one application of the channel  $\mathcal{P}$ . The lower bound is evident because, given the Pauli channel  $\mathcal{P}$ , to draw one sample from the distribution  $P$ , the quantum circuit must query  $\mathcal{P}$  at least once. Lemma 1 confirms that one query is enough. The upper bound and the lower bound match. Therefore, Theorem 1 is proven  $\square$ .

### 3 Learning and testing Pauli channels

Revisiting the exploration of learning and testing discrete distributions based on  $l_p$  norms reveals a longstanding research interest. Waggoner has solidified the definitive bounds for the complexities of learning and uniformity testing [Wag15]. Leveraging his main results allows us to infer the learning complexity and the white noise testing for Pauli channels, determining if  $P$  represents a completely random variable of size  $2^n$ . The logic is very simple. As discussed above, Theorem 1 identifies the number of samples required to estimate any properties of  $P$  with the necessary number of queries to  $\mathcal{P}$ . Corollaries 1 and 2 are the consequences of the main theorem in [Wag15] and the translation between the two kinds of complexities.

#### 3.1 Learning algorithm

We now consider the classical processing part of the learning channel  $\mathcal{P}$ . The algorithm proposed in the reference [Wag15] is employed to learn the distribution  $P$ . The procedure for drawing samples has been described in the previous section.

---

#### Algorithm 1 Learner the discrete distribution $P$

---

- 1: Input: channel  $\mathcal{P}$ ; number of qubits  $n$ ; distance parameter  $p \in [1, \infty]$  and  $\epsilon, \delta \in (0, 1)$
  - 2: Choose  $N$  to be sufficient for  $p, n, \epsilon, \delta$  according to proven upper bounds in Lemma 2.
  - 3: Draw  $N$  samples.
  - 4: Let  $X_i$  be the number of samples drawn of each coordinate  $i \in \{0, 1, 2, 3\}^n$ .
  - 5: Compute each  $\hat{P}_i = \frac{X_i}{N}$ .
  - 6: Output  $\hat{P}$ .
- 

We have the exact sufficient numbers of samples to learn the discrete distribution  $P$  using Algorithm 1 according to Theorem 5.2 in [Wag15], applied in the context of distribution size of  $4^n$ , as written in Lemma 2. In addition, Theorem 5.4 in [Wag15] shows the lower bounds up to constant factors of Algorithm 1, presented in Lemma 3.

**Lemma 2** (Exact upper bounds of learning sample). *For learning  $P$  with error  $\epsilon$  in distance  $l_p$  and constant success probability  $1 - \delta$ , it suffices to run Algorithm 1 with the following number of samples*

$$N_{\Omega} = \frac{1}{\delta} \begin{cases} 4^{\frac{n(2-p)}{p}} \epsilon^{-2} & \text{if } 1 \leq p \leq 2 \text{ and } \epsilon \leq 2 \cdot 4^{-\frac{n(p-1)}{p}} \\ \frac{1}{4} \left(\frac{2}{\epsilon}\right)^{\frac{p}{p-1}} & \text{if } 1 \leq p \leq 2 \text{ and } \epsilon \geq 2 \cdot 4^{-\frac{n(p-1)}{p}} \\ \epsilon^{-2} & \text{if } 2 \leq p \leq \infty. \end{cases} \quad (10)$$

**Lemma 3.** *For learning  $P$  with error  $\epsilon$  in distance  $l_p$  and a constant success probability  $1 - \delta$ , the required number of samples is at least*

$$N_{\Omega} = \begin{cases} \Omega\left(4^{\frac{n(2-p)}{p}} \epsilon^{-2}\right) & \text{if } 1 \leq p \leq 2 \text{ and } \epsilon \leq 4^{-\frac{n(p-1)}{p}} \\ \Omega\left(\left(\frac{1}{\epsilon}\right)^{\frac{p}{p-1}}\right) & \text{if } 1 \leq p \leq 2 \text{ and } \epsilon \geq 4^{-\frac{n(p-1)}{p}} \\ \Omega(\epsilon^{-2}) & \text{if } 2 \leq p \leq \infty \end{cases} \quad (11)$$

The lower bounds and upper bounds in Lemma 2 and 3 match up to constant factors. We conclude the tight bounds for learning Pauli channel  $\mathcal{P}$ .

**Corollary 1.** *Let  $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$  and  $\mathcal{P}$  be a Pauli channel of  $n$  qubits. Learning  $\mathcal{P}$  to  $\epsilon$ -close in distance  $l_p$  with a constant success probability  $1 - \delta$  requires number  $N$  of Pauli channel applications up to constant factors depending on  $\delta$  and  $p$  as*

$$N = \begin{cases} \Theta(4^{\frac{n(2-p)}{p}} \epsilon^{-2}) & \text{for } 1 \leq p \leq 2 \text{ and } \epsilon \leq 4^{-\frac{n(p-1)}{p}} \\ \Theta(4^n) & \text{for } 1 \leq p \leq 2 \text{ and } 4^{-\frac{n(p-1)}{p}} \leq \epsilon \leq 2 \cdot 4^{-\frac{n(p-1)}{p}} \\ \Theta((\frac{1}{\epsilon})^{\frac{p}{p-1}}) & \text{for } 1 \leq p \leq 2 \text{ and } \epsilon \geq 2 \cdot 4^{-\frac{n(p-1)}{p}} \\ \Theta(\epsilon^{-2}) & \text{for } 2 \leq p \leq \infty \end{cases} \quad (12)$$

*Proof.* The translation from distribution sample complexities to channel query complexities is automatic. Except the tightly bound  $\Theta(4^n)$  in the regime where  $1 \leq p \leq 2$  and  $4^{-\frac{n(p-1)}{p}} \leq \epsilon \leq 2 \cdot 4^{-\frac{n(p-1)}{p}}$ , the derivation of the other values of  $N$  directly follows from the matching up to constant factors between the bounds in Lemma 2 and 3. Considering this distinct regime, given the fact that  $\epsilon = \Theta(4^{-\frac{n(p-1)}{p}})$ , the lower bound and the upper bound converge to the same order, i.e.  $(\frac{1}{\epsilon})^{\frac{p}{p-1}} = \Theta(4^n)$  and  $4^{\frac{n(2-p)}{p}} \epsilon^{-2} = \Theta(4^n)$   $\square$ .

At the critical value  $p = 2$ , all the tight bounds in the corollary converge to  $\Theta(1/\epsilon^2)$ . Interestingly, for all  $p \geq 2$ , and specifically for the  $l_\infty$  norm, the required number of channel applications remains the same at  $\Theta(1/\epsilon^2)$ . When  $p = 1$ , we consistently find ourselves within the regime  $\epsilon \leq 2^{-\frac{2n(p-1)}{p}} = 1$ , leading to  $N = \Theta(4^n/\epsilon^2)$ . Remarkably, the complexities presented in the corollary are optimal up to only constant factors, effectively covering all possible scenarios for general  $l_p$  norms.

The algorithm employing maximally entangled qubit pairs and Bell measurements demonstrates significant quantum advantages in examining the comparisons in Table 1. For the  $l_\infty$  distance, it refines strategies from previous entanglement-free settings, reducing their complexities from  $\Theta(2^n/\epsilon^2)$  in [COZ<sup>+</sup>23] and  $O(1/\epsilon^2) \log(n/\epsilon)$  in [FO21] to  $\Theta(1/\epsilon^2)$ . The bounds for the case of learning in the distance  $l_1$  also benefit from quantum advantage, improved from  $O(n2^{3n}/\epsilon^2)$  to  $\Theta(4^n/\epsilon^2)$ , and tighter than the previous one using entanglement  $\tilde{O}(4^n/\epsilon^2)$ . Moreover, for the  $l_2$  distance, the algorithm reduces the upper bound from  $O(n2^n/\epsilon^2)$  to merely  $\Theta(1/\epsilon^2)$ , eliminating the dependency on the number of qubits. Thus, this part of the study's principal contribution is establishing tight bounds for learning Pauli channels with minimal reliance on the Pauli channel across any  $l_p$  distance. Furthermore, the effectiveness of our non-adaptive algorithm further confirms that adaptivity does not provide any additional benefit in learning the Pauli channel when entanglement resources are deployed.

### 3.2 White noise testing

We now consider the problem of testing if the Pauli channel is a white noise source, i.e.,  $P(i) = U(i) = 1/4^n$  for all  $i \in \{0, 1, 2, 3\}^n$ . Thanks to Theorem 1, it is equivalent to testing the uniformity of the discrete probability distribution. Regarding the general figure of merit  $l_p$  and the distribution  $P$ , we accept a constant error  $\epsilon$  in the distance and the error probability  $\delta$ . If  $\|P - U\|_p < \epsilon$ , the distribution is concluded to be uniform; otherwise, we say that it is not uniform. We combine the results on sample complexity of uniformity testing from the work in [Wag15] with Theorem 1 to infer Corollary 2.



**Corollary 2.** *Given  $\epsilon \in (0,1)$  and the discrete distribution  $P$  that characterizes  $\mathcal{P}$ , a Pauli channel of  $n$  qubits. Up to constant factors, Table 2 shows the necessary and sufficient number of Pauli channel applications for testing, whether  $P$  is  $\epsilon$ -close to the uniform distribution in the distance  $l_p$  with a constant success probability  $1 - \delta$ .*

### 3.3 Estimating noise level

The fundamental measure of uncertainty in a probability distribution is entropy. A high value of entropy indicates a greater level of unpredictability. We will focus on Shannon entropy, denoted by  $H$ , quantifying the expected amount of information in a random variable. In the context of the Pauli channel, the Shannon entropy of the distribution  $P$  over the domain  $\{0, 1, 2, 3\}^n$  ranges from 0 to  $2n$  bits, providing insights into the diversity and randomness of errors in the  $n$ -qubit system. This leads to a characterization of the noise level in the Pauli channel. However, a challenge arises: even if we can estimate the probability of errors in an arbitrary  $l_p$  distance with  $l \geq 1$  up to  $\epsilon$ -closeness, the resulting estimate  $\hat{P}$  may not provide an accurate estimation of entropy, that is,  $|H(P) - H(\hat{P})|$  could significantly exceed 1. This discussion aims to design an optimal algorithm for estimating  $H(P)$ .

Another aspect of the Pauli channel is that it can be sparse, meaning not all possible error  $\tau_i \in \{0, 1, 2, 3\}^n$  occur with non-zero probability, and the errors might be centralized on a particular subpart of the qubit systems or be specific to certain types among bit flips or phase flips. Given the exponential growth of the distribution's size, i.e.,  $4^n$ , collecting sufficiently large samples to observe sparsity requires substantial resources. However, if we could estimate the actual support size  $S(P)$  of the distribution  $P$  with a relatively small sample, it would provide an insight into the nature of the noise, in addition to the Shannon entropy  $H(P)$  estimation. From now on, we call the entropy and the support size the two measures of the Pauli channel's noise level.

We learned about remarkable research by Valiant et al., as referenced in [VV11, VV17], focusing on estimating the unseen aspects and characteristics of probability distributions with only a limited sample size. We employ the algorithm "Estimate Unseen" in [VV17], adapt it to the context of the distribution  $P$ , and state the result in Lemma 4. For an in-depth understanding of the algorithm, we encourage the readers to delve into these papers directly. This algorithm plays the role of classical information processing for testing the noise level of  $\mathcal{P}$ . The Bell measurement strategy is again used to draw samples from  $P$ , leading to Corollary 3 in the same logic of complexity translation offered by Theorem 1.

**Lemma 4.** *There exists an algorithm (estimator) satisfying the following property:  $\exists \alpha, \gamma > 0$  so that  $\forall \epsilon \in (0,1)$ , taking a sample of size  $\frac{\gamma}{\epsilon^2} \frac{4^n}{n}$  drawn from the distribution  $P$  as input, the algorithm outputs with probability at least  $1 - e^{-4^{n\alpha}}$*

- an estimation  $\hat{H}(P)$  of  $H(P)$  satisfying  $|\hat{H}(P) - H(P)| < \epsilon$  and
- an estimation  $\hat{S}(P)$  of  $S(P)$  satisfying  $\frac{|\hat{S}(P) - S(P)|}{4^n} < \epsilon$  if we are provided that no value  $P(i)$  lies in the interval  $(0, \frac{1}{4^n})$ .

Furthermore, the sample complexity of the algorithm is optimal up to constant factors, i.e.  $\Theta(\frac{4^n}{n\epsilon^2})$  is the necessary and sufficient size of the sample to estimate Shannon entropy and the support size of  $P$  with provided condition  $P(i) \notin (0, \frac{1}{4^n}) \forall i$ .

**Corollary 3.** *(Informal) To estimate the noise level of the Pauli channel  $\mathcal{P}$ , the necessary and sufficient number of Pauli channel applications is  $\Theta(\frac{4^n}{n\epsilon^2})$ .*

### 3.4 Estimating diamond distance between two Pauli channels

In this subsection, we explore distinguishing between two Pauli channels by employing the diamond norm. We begin by considering a system composed of  $n$  qubits, represented by the Hilbert space  $A$ , alongside an ancillary system characterized by a finite-dimensional Hilbert space  $B$ . We represent the general channel of interest,  $\mathcal{P}$ , as a CPTP map acting on  $\mathcal{L}(A)$ , which is the space of all linear homomorphisms on  $A$ . Concurrently, the map  $\mathcal{I}_d$  signifies the identity operation on  $\mathcal{L}(B)$ .

For a density matrix  $\chi$  that operates on the joint space  $A \otimes B$ , the diamond norm of the CPTP map  $\mathcal{P}$  is rigorously defined as

$$\|\mathcal{P}\|_\diamond = \max_{\chi} \|(\mathcal{I}_d \otimes \mathcal{P})\chi\|_1 \quad (13)$$

where  $\|\cdot\|_1$  denotes the trace norm for operators on  $\mathcal{L}(A \otimes B)$ . This measure effectively quantifies the maximum deviation between the actions of  $\mathcal{P}$  and an ideal channel under the most extreme cases, such as of quantum entanglement between the systems  $A$  and  $B$ . Based on this norm, the diamond distance between two CPTP maps  $\mathcal{P}_1$  and  $\mathcal{P}_2$  is introduced as

$$\|\mathcal{P}_1 - \mathcal{P}_2\|_\diamond = \max_{\chi} \|[\mathcal{I}_d \otimes (\mathcal{P}_1 - \mathcal{P}_2)]\chi\|_1. \quad (14)$$

This definition of distance is helpful as it captures the difference between two quantum channels even when they act on part of an arbitrarily larger system. This fact is particularly relevant in evaluating the accuracy of quantum operations, where small differences between ideal and actual operations may significantly impact the outcomes of quantum circuits. Hence, the diamond distance is a crucial metric for verifying the precision and reliability of quantum information processing.

In the context of Pauli channels, where two CPTP maps  $\mathcal{P}_1$  and  $\mathcal{P}_2$  are characterized by the probability distributions  $P_1$  and  $P_2$ , respectively, an insightful observation is that the diamond distance between these two maps is equal to twice the total variation distance (or the  $l_1$  distance) between  $P_1$  and  $P_2$ . Mathematically, this relationship is expressed as

$$\|\mathcal{P}_1 - \mathcal{P}_2\|_\diamond = \sum_{i \in \{0,1,2,3\}^n} |P_1(i) - P_2(i)| = \|P_1 - P_2\|_1. \quad (15)$$

According to Theorem 1, achieving an  $\epsilon$ -close approximation in  $l_1$  distance for  $P_1$  and  $P_2$ , yielding estimates  $\hat{P}_1$  and  $\hat{P}_2$ , necessitates a complexity of  $\Theta(4^n/\epsilon^2)$ . This finding suggests that to approximate their diamond distance,  $O(4^n/\epsilon^2)$  uses of the Pauli channels are sufficient, as demonstrated by the inequality

$$\|P_1 - P_2\|_1 \leq \|P_1 - \hat{P}_1\|_1 + \|\hat{P}_1 - \hat{P}_2\|_1 + \|\hat{P}_2 - P_2\|_1 < 3\epsilon. \quad (16)$$

However, the question arises regarding the optimality of this approach. By exploiting the work of Valiant et al. [VV11, VV17]. Leveraging our Bell measurement strategy, we uncover that the actual number of applications of the Pauli channels needed to estimate  $\|\mathcal{P}_1 - \mathcal{P}_2\|_\diamond$  effectively reduces to  $\Theta(\frac{4^n}{n\epsilon^2})$ , indicating a more efficient estimation process. We apply Theorem 1.13 of the reference [VV17] to state Lemma 5. In the same manner of complexity translation, this lemma directly leads to Theorem 4.

**Lemma 5.** *There exists an algorithm (estimator) satisfying the following property:  $\exists \alpha, \gamma > 0$  so that  $\forall \epsilon \in (0, 1)$ , taking two samples of size  $\frac{\gamma}{\epsilon^2} \frac{4^n}{n}$  drawn independently from the distribution  $P_1$  and  $P_2$  as input,*

the algorithm outputs with probability at least  $1 - e^{-4^{n\epsilon}}$  an estimate  $\hat{d}$  of  $l_1(P_1, P_2) = \|P_1 - P_2\|_1$  such that

$$|\hat{d} - l_1(P_1, P_2)| < \epsilon. \quad (17)$$

**Corollary 4.** To estimate the diamond distance between the two Pauli channels  $\mathcal{P}_1$  and  $\mathcal{P}_2$ , the necessary and sufficient number of applications of each channel is  $\Theta(\frac{4^n}{n\epsilon^2})$ .

## 4 Conclusion

Our work has addressed the complexities involved in learning and testing Pauli channels, introducing lower and upper bounds for these processes across any  $l_p$  norm; most are tight. By referencing foundational work on discrete probability distributions and employing novel algorithms, such as “Estimate Unseen”, we have brought a deeper understanding of quantum noise characterization within Pauli channels. Our exploration highlights the cost of accurately estimating Shannon entropy and support size, which are critical measures of the noise level in error distributions. Furthermore, our findings show that the utility of adaptivity in learning algorithms is unnecessary, provided that maximally entangled qubit pairs and Bell measurements are feasible. This work contributes to the theoretical framework for quantum information processing and offers practical insights for developing more efficient quantum computing systems. Future research may explore extending these methodologies to other quantum channel models, potentially opening new avenues for quantum error correction and noise mitigation strategies.

## References

- [Can20] Clément L. Canonne. A short note on learning discrete distributions. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2002.11457*, 2020.
- [CLO<sup>+</sup>23] S. Chen, Y. Liu, M. Otten, et al. The learnability of pauli noise. *Nature Communications*, 14:52, 2023. Received: 4 July 2022; Accepted: 23 December 2022; Published: 4 January 2023.
- [COZ<sup>+</sup>23] Senrui Chen, Changhun Oh, Sisi Zhou, Hsin-Yuan Huang, and Liang Jiang. Tight bounds on pauli channel learning without entanglement. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2309.13461>, 2023.
- [CZSJ22] Senrui Chen, Sisi Zhou, Alireza Seif, and Liang Jiang. Quantum advantages for pauli channel estimation. *Phys. Rev. A*, 105:032435, Mar 2022.
- [FO21] Steven T. Flammia and Ryan O’Donnell. Pauli error estimation via population recovery. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2105.02885>, 2021.
- [FOF23] Omar Fawzi, Aadil Oufkir, and Daniel Stilck França. Lower bounds on learning pauli channels. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2301.09192*, 2023.
- [FW20] Steven T. Flammia and Joel J. Wallman. Efficient estimation of pauli channels. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1907.12976*, 2020.

- [GEZ21] Konstantinos Georgopoulos, Clive Emary, and Paolo Zuliani. Modeling and simulating the noisy behavior of near-term quantum computers. *Phys. Rev. A*, 104:062432, Dec 2021.
- [RF23] Cambyse Rouzé and Daniel Stilck França França. Efficient learning of the structure and parameters of local pauli noise channels. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.02959*, 2023.
- [VV11] G. Valiant and P. Valiant. Estimating the unseen: An  $n/\log(n)$ -sample estimator for entropy and support size, shown optimal via new clts. In *Proceedings of the Forty-third Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing, STOC '11*, pages 685–694, 2011.
- [VV17] G. Valiant and P. Valiant. Estimating the unseen: Improved estimators for entropy and other properties. *Journal of the ACM*, 64(6), 2017.
- [Wag15] Bo Waggoner.  $l_p$  testing and learning of discrete distributions. <https://arxiv.org/abs/1412.2314>, 2015.
- [WE16] Joel J. Wallman and Joseph Emerson. Noise tailoring for scalable quantum computation via randomized compiling. *Phys. Rev. A*, 94:052325, Nov 2016.