

Generalized group designs: overcoming the 4-design-barrier and constructing novel unitary 2-designs in arbitrary dimensions

Ágoston Kaposi^{1,2}, Zoltán Kolarovszki^{1,2}, Adrián Solymos^{1,3},
Zoltán Zimborás^{1,2,4}

¹Quantum Computing and Quantum Information Research Group,
HUN-REN Wigner Research Centre for Physics, Konkoly–Thege Miklós
út 29-33, Budapest, H-1525, Hungary.

²Department of Programming Languages and Compilers, Eötvös Loránd
University, Pázmány Péter sétány 1/C, Budapest, H-1117, Hungary.

³Department of Physics of Complex Systems, Eötvös Loránd University,
Pázmány Péter sétány 1/A, Budapest, H-1117, Hungary.

⁴Algorithmiq Ltd, Kanavakatu 3C, Helsinki, 00160, Finland.

Contributing authors: kaposiagoston@inf.elte.hu;
kolarovszki.zoltan@wigner.hun-ren.hu;
solymos.adrian@wigner.hun-ren.hu; zimboras.zoltan@wigner.hun-ren.hu;

Abstract

Unitary designs are essential tools in several quantum information protocols. Similarly to other design concepts, unitary designs are mainly used to facilitate averaging over a relevant space, in this case, the unitary group $\mathbf{U}(\mathbf{d})$. While it is known that exact unitary \mathbf{t} -designs exist for any degree \mathbf{t} and dimension \mathbf{d} , the most appealing type of designs, group designs (in which the elements of the design form a group), can provide at most $\mathbf{3}$ -designs. Moreover, even group $\mathbf{2}$ -designs can only exist in limited dimensions. In this paper, we present novel construction methods for creating *exact generalized group designs* based on the representation theory of the unitary group and its finite subgroups that overcome the 4-design-barrier of unitary group designs. Furthermore, a construction is presented for creating generalized group $\mathbf{2}$ -designs in arbitrary dimensions.

Keywords: Unitary \mathbf{t} -designs, Quantum gate sets, Representation theory

1 Introduction

Unitary t -designs were first introduced in Refs. [1, 2], and subsequently have become an essential tool within the field of quantum information science. These finite collections of d -dimensional unitary matrices possess a unique property: By twirling (i.e., averaging) a certain matrix with the t -fold tensor products of these unitary matrices, the result is equal to the twirling over the *entire* unitary group $U(d)$ with respect to the Haar measure. This property makes them advantageous to use in protocols requiring unitaries sampled randomly from the Haar measure, thus potentially decreasing the resources needed, as generic Haar random unitaries are hard to implement. Hence, unitary designs have wide-ranging applications in quantum information science, in particular for quantum process tomography and channel fidelity estimation [2, 3], the construction of unitary codes [4], derandomization of probabilistic constructions [5], entanglement detection [6], the study of quantum chaos [7, 8], randomized benchmarking [9, 10], and shadow estimation [11–14].

One of the most elegant methods for constructing unitary designs involves delving into the representation theory of finite groups. The collection of unitaries derived from any unitary irreducible representation of a finite group constitutes a 1-design, and given additional properties, these elements can potentially form a higher-degree unitary design [15]. We call such collections of unitaries that form a group (such as those coming from representations) *unitary group designs*. Notably, some of the most renowned families of unitary t -designs fall under the category of group designs: The Clifford group over finite fields, both in their multipartite and single-particle variants, provide elegant and practical 2-designs in prime power dimensions [16]. Consequently, they find applications in randomized benchmarking for both qubit and qudit systems [9, 10, 17]. The multipartite Clifford group for qubit systems even constitutes a unitary 3-design [18–20], proving to be advantageous, for instance, in single-shot shadow estimation [12–14].

The rotten apple that spoils the barrel is the fact that there does not exist group 4-designs (and thus higher-degree designs) [21]. Moreover, one can construct group 2-designs only for a few non-prime-power dimensions (in particular, one can define modular versions of the Clifford group for non-prime-power dimensions, however, these fail to be 2-designs [22]). This severely limits the use of group designs for tasks such as randomized benchmarking in these dimensions.

Constructing unitary t -designs using finite group representations will eventually fail because the t -fold tensor product of the chosen representation will decompose nontrivially on some of the $U(d)$ -irreducible subspaces of the t -fold tensor product space. Thus, our research was mainly focused on the behavior of the group representations on those $U(d)$ -irreducible subspaces. In this paper, we present novel construction methods for creating *generalized group designs* based on such representation theoretic considerations. This allows us to build higher-degree designs from lower ones and also a procedure is given for constructing 2-designs in arbitrary dimensions.

The structure of the paper is as follows: Section 2 contains necessary basic definitions regarding unitary designs; Section 3 provides a construction of t -designs from finite unitary subgroups and presents some examples for the construction; finally,

Section 4 describes an explicit construction for generalized group 2-designs in arbitrary dimensions.

2 Preliminaries

This section provides the essential definitions and statements employed in the proposed constructions. It is important to note, that this paper is mainly concerned with the construction of exact designs, but we provide a statement for the construction of unitary 2-designs from orthogonal ones, which holds in the approximate case as well. For concrete constructions regarding approximate designs, see Refs. [2, 23–25].

Several different but equivalent definitions can be found for unitary designs and group designs in the literature [26–28]. However, the notion of unitary t -designs, where the summation over the finite set is weighted with a certain weight function, is crucial for this paper since the constructions presented are generally of this type.

Definition 1 (Unitary t -design). *A finite set $\mathcal{V} \subset \mathrm{U}(d)$ with weight function $w : \mathcal{V} \rightarrow [0, 1]$ is called a unitary t -design if the following equation holds for any linear transformation M on $(\mathbb{C}^d)^{\otimes t}$:*

$$\sum_{V \in \mathcal{V}} w(V) V^{\otimes t} M (V^{\otimes t})^\dagger = \int_{U \in \mathrm{U}(d)} U^{\otimes t} M (U^{\otimes t})^\dagger dU, \quad (1)$$

where the integral on the right-hand side is taken over all elements in $\mathrm{U}(d)$ with respect to the Haar measure. The number t is called the degree of the design.

In this definition and the rest of the paper $\mathrm{U}(d)$ can be naturally identified with its defining representation. More concretely, $U^{\otimes t} = \Pi_\square(U)^{\otimes t}$ for $U \in \mathrm{U}(d)$, where Π_\square is the defining representation of $\mathrm{U}(d)$. Moreover, the weight function of a t -design \mathcal{V} is the constant function $w \equiv 1/|\mathcal{V}|$ unless otherwise stated. Finally, a weighted unitary t -design is called a *unitary group t -design* when it possesses a group structure. In our proposals, however, we will construct t -designs which are generalizations of group t -designs in the sense that they are constructed from products of finite groups:

Definition 2 (Generalized group t -design). *Let $\mathcal{V}_1, \dots, \mathcal{V}_\ell < \mathrm{U}(d)$ be finite subgroups. We call $\mathcal{V} := \mathcal{V}_1 \cdot \dots \cdot \mathcal{V}_\ell$ a generalized group t -design if \mathcal{V} forms a unitary t -design with weight function given by*

$$w(U) := \frac{\left| \left\{ (h_1, \dots, h_\ell) \in \mathcal{V}_1 \times \dots \times \mathcal{V}_\ell : \prod_{j=1}^\ell h_j = U \right\} \right|}{|\mathcal{V}_1| \cdots |\mathcal{V}_\ell|}. \quad (2)$$

Remark 1. The above careful definition of the weight function is needed as, in general, the product of finite subgroups of a group does not form a set whose cardinality is equal to the product of the cardinalities of the constituent subgroups.

3 Constructing higher-degree generalized group designs

Construction of unitary designs for general t and d is a mathematically challenging task [29]. A well-known example of a unitary design is the Clifford group, which constitutes a group 3-design for qubit systems [18–20], but this specific example does not generalize for higher-degree designs. Fortunately, using the representation theory of finite groups, one may discover group t -designs with $t = 1, 2, 3$ for specific dimensions. However, the construction of higher-degree group designs based on representation theory is impossible because of the nonexistence of group 4-designs in dimensions greater than 2 [21]. The resulting 4-design-barrier for group designs compelled us to search for higher-degree designs that are not group designs. In this section, we present a construction that pushes the 4-design-barrier further for unitary designs based on generalized group designs (see Def. 2).

First, another characterization of unitary t -designs (equivalent to Def. 1) is presented based on representation theory (see also, Appendix of [15]). Consider the t -fold tensor product of the defining representation of $U(d)$: the underlying vector space $(\mathbb{C}^d)^{\otimes t}$ splits up under the action of $U(d)$ into the different isotypic components labeled by Young diagrams as

$$(\mathbb{C}^d)^{\otimes t} = \bigoplus_{\gamma \in \Gamma} \mathcal{K}_\gamma \otimes \mathcal{H}_\gamma, \quad (3)$$

where Γ is the set of Young diagrams with t number of boxes and at most d rows, \mathcal{H}_γ carries the $U(d)$ -irrep labeled by the Young diagram γ and \mathcal{K}_γ is the multiplicity space where $U(d)$ acts trivially [30]. Let us denote by P_γ the projection corresponding to the $V_\gamma := \mathcal{K}_\gamma \otimes \mathcal{H}_\gamma$ subspace. As previously mentioned, we present another equivalent characterization of unitary t -designs, which may be easily justified using Schur's lemma:

Proposition 1. *A finite set $\mathcal{V} \subset U(d)$ and a weight function $w : \mathcal{V} \rightarrow [0, 1]$ forms a unitary t -design if and only if the following equation is true for all linear transformations M on $(\mathbb{C}^d)^{\otimes t}$:*

$$\sum_{V \in \mathcal{V}} w(V) V^{\otimes t} M (V^{\otimes t})^\dagger = \bigoplus_{\gamma \in \Gamma} \frac{\text{Tr}_{\mathcal{H}_\gamma}(P_\gamma M P_\gamma)}{\dim \mathcal{H}_\gamma} \otimes \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{K}_\gamma}, \quad (4)$$

where we used the notation as before, and $\text{Tr}_{\mathcal{H}_\gamma}$ is the partial trace over \mathcal{H}_γ of operators supported on the subspace V_γ .

Based on Proposition 1 the condition for a finite subgroup of the unitary group to be a unitary t -design can be reformulated to require that the appropriate irreducible subspaces of the unitary group remain irreducible when restricted to this finite subgroup. In light of this, the 4-design-barrier can be formulated in the following way: there is no finite subgroup of $U(d)$ such that all irreps of $U(d)$ labeled by Young diagrams with 4 boxes, restricted to this subgroup, remain irreducible if $d > 2$. The idea behind our construction is that for each Young diagram with t boxes and at most d rows we find a finite subgroup of $U(d)$, such that the irrep of $U(d)$ corresponding

to this Young diagram remains irreducible when restricted to this subgroup. From these irreps, one can attempt to create a generalized unitary group t -design for $t \geq 4$. The fly in the ointment is that the irreducible subspace corresponding to such irreps might appear elsewhere in the irreducible decomposition of the t -fold tensor product of $U(d)$ upon restriction. This might lead to a non-trivial intertwiner between these irreducible subspaces when averaging, ruining the construction. To rescue this idea, we aim to exclude these situations, in a carefully crafted theorem.

Theorem 1. *Let Π_{\square} denote the defining representation of the unitary group $U(d)$. Let Γ denote the set of all Young diagrams with t boxes and at most d rows, corresponding to the irreducible representations appearing in the irreducible decomposition of $\Pi_{\square}^{\otimes t}$. Let $G_1, \dots, G_{\ell} < U(d)$ be finite unitary subgroups such that:*

1. *For each Young diagram $\gamma \in \Gamma$, there is a $j \in \{1, \dots, \ell\}$ such that the representation $\Pi_{\gamma}|_{G_j}$ remains an irreducible representation;*
2. *For any $\gamma, \eta \in \Gamma$, there is a $j \in \{1, \dots, \ell\}$ such that there is no non-trivial intertwiner between the representations $\Pi_{\gamma}|_{G_j}$ and $\Pi_{\eta}|_{G_j}$.*

Then the product $G_1 \dots G_{\ell}$ forms a generalized group t -design.

Proof. Let us denote twirling with a subgroup $G < U(d)$ as

$$\mathcal{T}_G(X) := \int_G U^{\otimes t} X (U^{\otimes t})^{\dagger} dU, \quad (5)$$

where the integration is done over the Haar measure of G . Moreover, let us denote the consecutive twirls with G_1, \dots, G_{ℓ} by

$$\mathcal{T} := \mathcal{T}_{G_1} \dots \mathcal{T}_{G_{\ell}}, \quad (6)$$

and let us have the following notations

$$\mathcal{P}_{\gamma, \eta}(X) := P_{\gamma} X P_{\eta}, \quad \mathcal{P}_{\gamma} := \mathcal{P}_{\gamma, \gamma}, \quad (7)$$

where X is a linear operator on $(\mathbb{C}^d)^{\otimes t}$. Considering a fixed linear operator M on $(\mathbb{C}^d)^{\otimes t}$, we want to show that

$$\mathcal{T}(M) = \sum_{\gamma \in \Gamma} \frac{\text{Tr}_{\mathcal{H}_{\gamma}}(\mathcal{P}_{\gamma}(M))}{\dim \mathcal{H}_{\gamma}} \otimes \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{H}_{\gamma}}. \quad (8)$$

For this, let us decompose $\mathcal{T}(M)$ as

$$\mathcal{T}(M) = \sum_{\gamma, \eta \in \Gamma} \mathcal{P}_{\gamma, \eta} \mathcal{T}(M) = \sum_{\gamma \in \Gamma} \mathcal{P}_{\gamma} \mathcal{T}(M) + \sum_{\substack{\gamma, \eta \in \Gamma \\ \gamma \neq \eta}} \mathcal{P}_{\gamma, \eta} \mathcal{T}(M). \quad (9)$$

Let $\gamma, \eta \in \Gamma$. Firstly, we prove that $\mathcal{P}_{\gamma, \eta} \mathcal{T}(M) = 0$ if $\gamma \neq \eta$. We can use the fact that for all $\gamma, \eta \in \Gamma$ and any subgroup $G < \mathbf{U}(d)$

$$\mathcal{P}_{\gamma, \eta} \mathcal{T}_G = \mathcal{P}_{\gamma, \eta} \mathcal{T}_G \mathcal{P}_{\gamma, \eta}, \quad (10)$$

which is trivial by using Schur's lemma. Hence, the following is true:

$$\mathcal{P}_{\gamma, \eta} \mathcal{T}(M) = \mathcal{P}_{\gamma, \eta} \mathcal{T}_{G_1} \mathcal{P}_{\gamma, \eta} \dots \mathcal{P}_{\gamma, \eta} \mathcal{T}_{G_\ell} \mathcal{P}_{\gamma, \eta}(M). \quad (11)$$

Let j be the index for which there is no non-trivial intertwiner between $\Pi_\gamma|_{G_j}$ and $\Pi_\eta|_{G_j}$ as required by the second condition. It is easy to see that $\mathcal{T}_{G_j}(X)$ is an intertwiner of the t -fold diagonal action of G_j for any linear operator X on $(\mathbb{C}^d)^{\otimes t}$. Furthermore, given that G_j is a subgroup of the unitary group, $P_\gamma \mathcal{T}_{G_j}(X) P_\eta$ is also an intertwiner for the same representation as the product of intertwiners is also an intertwiner. Given that $P_\gamma \mathcal{T}_{G_j}(X) P_\eta$ would be an intertwiner exactly between the sub-representations $\Pi_\gamma|_{G_j}$ and $\Pi_\eta|_{G_j}$ (with multiplicities), it has to be zero by the second condition. Moreover, because of the linearity of the above equation, if it transforms into the zero map at any point it will stay zero after subsequent twirls.

Secondly, considering the case when $\gamma = \eta =: \gamma$, we can write Eq. (11) as

$$P_\gamma \mathcal{T}(M) P_\gamma = P_\gamma \mathcal{T}_{G_1} P_\gamma \dots \mathcal{T}_{G_\ell} P_\gamma(M). \quad (12)$$

By the first assumption in the Theorem, for each $\gamma \in \Gamma$, there exists a group G_j such that $\Pi_\gamma|_{G_j}$ is irreducible. Note that from Proposition 1 it follows that:

$$P_\gamma \mathcal{T}_{G_j}(X) = \mathbb{0} \oplus \frac{\text{Tr}_{\mathcal{H}_\gamma}(\mathcal{P}_\gamma(X))}{\dim \mathcal{H}_\gamma} \otimes \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{H}_\gamma}, \quad (13)$$

where X is any linear transformation on $(\mathbb{C}^d)^{\otimes t}$ and where we denoted the zero operator on the orthogonal complement of P_γ by $\mathbb{0}$.

As a consequence it is clear that $P_\gamma \mathcal{T}_{G_j} \mathcal{T}_{G_k} = P_\gamma \mathcal{T}_{G_j}$ for $k = j + 1, \dots, \ell$ since

$$P_\gamma \mathcal{T}_{G_j} \mathcal{T}_{G_k}(X) = \mathbb{0} \oplus \frac{\int_{G_k} \text{Tr}_{\mathcal{H}_\gamma}([\mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{K}_\gamma} \otimes \Pi_\gamma(U)] \mathcal{P}_\gamma(X) [\mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{K}_\gamma} \otimes \Pi_\gamma(U)^\dagger]) dU}{\dim \mathcal{H}_\gamma} \otimes \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{H}_\gamma}, \quad (14)$$

where the integration is done over the Haar measure of G_k . The partial trace is cyclic on the vector space it is tracing over, i.e., \mathcal{H}_γ , and the operators on \mathcal{K}_γ commute. Therefore this partial trace can be treated as cyclic to get

$$P_\gamma \mathcal{T}_{G_j} \mathcal{T}_{G_k}(X) = \mathbb{0} \oplus \frac{\text{Tr}_{\mathcal{H}_\gamma}(\mathcal{P}_\gamma(X))}{\dim \mathcal{H}_\gamma} \otimes \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{H}_\gamma} = P_\gamma \mathcal{T}_{G_j}(X). \quad (15)$$

Moreover, the twirlings \mathcal{T}_{G_k} for $k = 1, \dots, j - 1$ leave $\mathcal{T}_{G_j}(X)$ invariant, since the above operator is invariant to the adjoint action of any subgroup. More concretely,

let $k \in \{1, \dots, j-1\}$. Then we can write for any linear transformation X on $(\mathbb{C}^d)^{\otimes t}$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{P}_\gamma \mathcal{T}_{G_k} \mathcal{P}_\gamma \mathcal{T}_{G_j} \mathcal{P}_\gamma(X) &= \mathcal{P}_\gamma \mathcal{T}_{G_k} \left(\mathbb{0} \oplus \frac{\text{Tr}_{\mathcal{H}_\gamma}(\mathcal{P}_\gamma(X))}{\dim \mathcal{H}_\gamma} \otimes \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{H}_\gamma} \right) \\ &= \mathbb{0} \oplus \int_{G_k} (\mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{K}_\gamma} \otimes \Pi_\gamma(U)) \left(\frac{\text{Tr}_{\mathcal{H}_\gamma}(\mathcal{P}_\gamma(X))}{\dim \mathcal{H}_\gamma} \otimes \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{H}_\gamma} \right) (\mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{K}_\gamma} \otimes \Pi_\gamma(U))^\dagger dU \quad (16) \\ &= \mathbb{0} \oplus \frac{\text{Tr}_{\mathcal{H}_\gamma}(\mathcal{P}_\gamma(X))}{\dim \mathcal{H}_\gamma} \otimes \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{H}_\gamma}, \end{aligned}$$

hence, $\mathcal{P}_\gamma \mathcal{T}_{G_k} \mathcal{T}_{G_j} = \mathcal{P}_\gamma \mathcal{T}_{G_j}$. By combining this with the previous fact stating that $\mathcal{P}_\gamma \mathcal{T}_{G_j} \mathcal{T}_{G_k} = \mathcal{P}_\gamma \mathcal{T}_{G_j}$ for $k = j+1, \dots, \ell$, we get that

$$\mathcal{P}_\gamma \mathcal{T} = \mathcal{P}_\gamma \mathcal{T}_{G_j}. \quad (17)$$

As a result, one gets

$$\mathcal{T}(M) = \sum_{\gamma \in \Gamma} \frac{\text{Tr}_{\mathcal{H}_\gamma}(\mathcal{P}_\gamma(M))}{\dim \mathcal{H}_\gamma} \otimes \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{H}_\gamma}. \quad (18)$$

which proves the Theorem by Proposition 1. \square

Theorem 1 enables us to search for examples of unitary t -designs using character theory. In particular, for some low-dimensional 2- and 3-design constructions a similar technique was used in Ref. [31]. To be explicit, given a finite unitary subgroup $G < \text{U}(d)$, one can examine if the representation labeled by the Young diagram γ with t boxes and at most d rows remains irreducible when restricted to G . Hence, one can search for a set of finite subgroups of $\text{U}(d)$ such that the first condition is fulfilled. For the second condition, consider two Young diagrams γ, η . When $\dim \Pi_\gamma \neq \dim \Pi_\eta$, consider $\dim \Pi_\gamma > \dim \Pi_\eta$ without loss of generality. By the first condition, there is a finite subgroup G for which the representation $\Pi_\gamma|_G$ remains irreducible, hence, the second condition is automatically fulfilled. When $\dim \Pi_\gamma = \dim \Pi_\eta$, further investigation is needed to verify that the representations are inequivalent when restricted to some finite subgroup G . To verify the irreducibility and inequivalence of the representations, one can use, e.g., character theory. For determining the character of the restricted representation $\Pi_\gamma|_G$, one can use Theorem 2.7.9 from Ref. [32].

Using the procedure described above, we have found the following examples of unitary 4-designs in the GAP system [33]:

Example 1 (4-design in 6 dimension). Any of the 6-dimensional irreducible representations of the group "S3x6_1.U4(3).2.2" or the group "6.U6(2)M6" remain irreducible on the subspaces corresponding to $\square\square, \square\square, \square\square, \square\square$. Meanwhile, the 22nd irreducible representation of the group "2.J2" is irreducible when restricted to the subspace corresponding to $\square\square\square$. Finally, the irreps corresponding to $\square\square$ and $\square\square$ have the same dimension, but are inequivalent when restricted to the corresponding group, and thus, they also satisfy the second condition in Theorem 1.

Example 2 (4-design in 12 dimension). The 153rd irreducible representation of the group "6.Suz" remains irreducible on the subspaces corresponding to $\square\square\square$, $\square\square\square$, $\square\square$ and \square . Meanwhile, the standard representation of the alternating group on 13 elements is irreducible on the subspace corresponding to \square . In this case, all irreps have different dimensions. Therefore, from these two unitary representations, a unitary 4-design can be constructed in 12 dimensions by Theorem 1.

4 Constructing 2-designs in arbitrary dimension

In prime power dimensions, the Clifford groups provide examples of unitary 2-designs [9, 10]. An inductive construction for t -designs in arbitrary dimensions is provided in Ref. [29]. However, for general dimensions, an explicit non-inductive construction for 2-designs is not known. In this section, we provide a construction for generalized group 2-designs for dimensions $d \geq 5$. Using this construction together with the Clifford group, one can explicitly construct 2-designs in arbitrary dimensions. The presented construction makes use of the notion of orthogonal designs, which we need to introduce first.

4.1 Orthogonal designs

The concept of a unitary t -design, which is based on the unitary group, may be naturally defined for other groups as well, see, e.g., Ref. [34]. For our purposes, the orthogonal group $O(d)$ will be of main concern.

Definition 3 (Orthogonal t -design). *A finite set $\mathcal{V} \subset O(d)$ with weight function $w : \mathcal{V} \rightarrow [0, 1]$ is called a weighted orthogonal t -design if the following equation holds for any linear transformation M on $(\mathbb{C}^d)^{\otimes t}$:*

$$\sum_{V \in \mathcal{V}} w(V) V^{\otimes t} M (V^{\otimes t})^\dagger = \int_{O \in O(d)} O^{\otimes t} M (O^{\otimes t})^\dagger dO, \quad (19)$$

where the integral on the right-hand side is taken over all elements in $O(d)$ with respect to the Haar measure. The number t is called the degree of the design.

In this section, let us use the notation $\mathcal{T}_{O(d)}(M) := \int_{O(d)} O^{\otimes 2} M (O^{\otimes 2})^\dagger dO$ and $\mathcal{T}_{U(d)}(M) := \int_{U(d)} U^{\otimes 2} M (U^{\otimes 2})^\dagger dU$. Moreover, for a finite subset $\mathcal{V} \subset U(d)$ with weight function w , we define $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{V}}(M) := \sum_{U \in \mathcal{V}} w(U) U^{\otimes 2} M (U^{\otimes 2})^\dagger$. Here, we are considering approximate 2-designs, since the main statement of this section holds in this general setting. We can characterize these using the diamond norm as follows [25].

Definition 4 (ϵ -approximate unitary 2-design). *We call a finite subset $\mathcal{V} \subset U(d)$ an ϵ -approximate unitary 2-design for some $\epsilon > 0$ when*

$$\|\mathcal{T}_{U(d)} - \mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{V}}\|_{\diamond} < \epsilon, \quad (20)$$

where $\|\cdot\|_\diamond$ is the diamond norm¹.

Remark 2. The definition of ϵ -approximate unitary design can be generalized to ϵ -approximate orthogonal design naturally.

To relate orthogonal 2-designs to unitary 2-designs, we need to consider the following statement.

Proposition 2. *Twirling with the unitary group can be decomposed into two consecutive twirlings with the orthogonal group, i.e.,*

$$\mathcal{T}_{U(d)} = \mathcal{T}_{O(d)^W} \circ \mathcal{T}_{O(d)}, \quad (21)$$

where $O(d)^W := \{WOW^\dagger : O \in O(d)\}$ and W is defined on the basis elements $\{|j\rangle\}_{j=0}^{d-1}$ as

$$W|j\rangle := \omega^{\alpha j}|j\rangle, \quad (22)$$

where $\omega := e^{\frac{2\pi i}{2d}}$ and $\alpha \in [0, 1]$ is a root of the equation $\left|\sum_{j=0}^{d-1} \omega^{2\alpha j}\right|^2 = \frac{2d}{d+1}$, which must exist due to continuity.

Proof. Let Φ_\square denote the defining representation of the orthogonal group with respect to the basis $\{|j\rangle\}_{j=0}^{d-1}$. This can be embedded into the defining representation of the unitary group. The irreducible decomposition of $\Phi_\square^{\otimes 2}$ is the following [35]:

$$\Phi_\square^{\otimes 2} = \Phi_t \oplus \Phi_r \oplus \Phi_\square, \quad (23)$$

where Φ_t is the trivial representation acting on the subspace spanned by $|\psi\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{d}} \sum_{j=0}^{d-1} |j\rangle \otimes |j\rangle$. The representations $\Phi_t \oplus \Phi_r$ and Φ_\square act on the symmetric subspace V_\square and on the antisymmetric subspace V_\square , respectively. The projections to their subspaces are $P_t = |\psi\rangle\langle\psi|$, $P_r = P_\square - P_t$ and P_\square , respectively.

Twirling a matrix M on $(\mathbb{C}^d)^{\otimes 2}$ with the orthogonal group $O(d)$ results in an intertwiner of the following form as a consequence of Schur's lemma:

$$\overline{M} := \mathcal{T}_{O(d)}(M) = \frac{\text{Tr}(P_t M)}{\text{Tr}(P_t)} \mathbb{1}_t \oplus \frac{\text{Tr}(P_r M)}{\text{Tr}(P_r)} \mathbb{1}_r \oplus \frac{\text{Tr}(P_\square M)}{\text{Tr}(P_\square)} \mathbb{1}_\square. \quad (24)$$

Applying the second twirling channel $\mathcal{T}_{O(d)^W}$ leaves the coefficient of the antisymmetric subspace invariant as that subspace is invariant under the action of $W \otimes W$. However, the coefficients of the remaining subspaces may mix to give

$$(\mathcal{T}_{O(d)^W} \circ \mathcal{T}_{O(d)})(M) = \frac{\text{Tr}(P_t^{W^{\otimes 2}} \overline{M})}{\text{Tr}(P_t)} \mathbb{1}_t \oplus \frac{\text{Tr}(P_r^{W^{\otimes 2}} \overline{M})}{\text{Tr}(P_r)} \mathbb{1}_r \oplus \frac{\text{Tr}(P_\square \overline{M})}{\text{Tr}(P_\square)} \mathbb{1}_\square, \quad (25)$$

¹In this section, we use the diamond norm in defining approximate designs, but similar arguments should hold for definitions using different norms, e.g., the expander norm.

where t' is the index of the subspace spanned by $W \otimes W |\psi\rangle$ and r' is the index of its respective complementary subspace inside the symmetric subspace. Given the invariance of the antisymmetric subspace under the second twirl we have $\text{Tr}(P_{\square} \overline{M}) = \text{Tr}(P_{\square} M)$. Fulfilling the condition

$$\frac{\text{Tr}(P_t^{W^{\otimes 2}} \overline{M})}{\text{Tr}(P_t)} = \frac{\text{Tr}(P_{r'}^{W^{\otimes 2}} \overline{M})}{\text{Tr}(P_{r'})} \quad (\forall M \in \mathbb{C}^{d \times d}) \quad (26)$$

means that the coefficients of $\mathbb{1}_{t'}$ and $\mathbb{1}_{r'}$ are equal to each other for *any* matrix M , then the coefficients of the subspaces $V_{t'}$ and $V_{r'}$ will become equal, leading to a unitary design. Moreover, when these coefficients are equal, they must also be equal to $\frac{\text{Tr}(P_{\square} M)}{\text{Tr}(P_{\square})}$. To achieve this, one may directly calculate the following requirement:

$$\text{Tr}(P_t^{W^{\otimes 2}} P_t) = \frac{1}{d^2} \left| \sum_{j=0}^{d-1} \omega^{2\alpha j} \right|^2 \stackrel{!}{=} \frac{2}{d(d+1)}. \quad (27)$$

In summary, when α is such that the above equality is fulfilled, the coefficients of the t' and r' subspaces will be equal, hence, $\mathcal{T}_{O(d)W} \circ \mathcal{T}_{O(d)}$ indeed constitutes a unitary 2-design using Proposition 1. \square

Lemma 1. *Consider an ϵ -approximate orthogonal 2-design $\mathcal{V} \subset O(d)$. Then $\mathcal{V}^W \cdot \mathcal{V}$ is a 2ϵ -approximate unitary 2-design where $W \in U(d)$ is a concrete unitary described in Proposition 2.*

Proof. Since \mathcal{V} is an ϵ -approximate orthogonal 2-design, by definition we know that

$$\|\mathcal{T}_{O(d)} - \mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{V}}\|_{\diamond} < \epsilon. \quad (28)$$

We want to show that

$$\|\mathcal{T}_{U(d)} - \mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{V}^W \cdot \mathcal{V}}\|_{\diamond} < 2\epsilon. \quad (29)$$

The integral $\mathcal{T}_{U(d)}$ can be written as two consecutive integrals $\mathcal{T}_{O(d)W} \circ \mathcal{T}_{O(d)}$ based on Proposition 2, while $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{V}^W \cdot \mathcal{V}}$ is the same channel as $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{V}^W} \circ \mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{V}}$. By the triangle inequality

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathcal{T}_{U(d)} - \mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{V}^W \cdot \mathcal{V}}\|_{\diamond} &= \|\mathcal{T}_{O(d)W} \circ \mathcal{T}_{O(d)} - \mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{V}^W} \circ \mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{V}}\|_{\diamond} \\ &= \|\mathcal{T}_{O(d)W} \circ \mathcal{T}_{O(d)} - \mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{V}^W} \circ \mathcal{T}_{O(d)} + \mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{V}^W} \circ \mathcal{T}_{O(d)} - \mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{V}^W} \circ \mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{V}}\|_{\diamond} \\ &\leq \|(\mathcal{T}_{O(d)W} - \mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{V}^W}) \circ \mathcal{T}_{O(d)}\|_{\diamond} + \|\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{V}^W} \circ (\mathcal{T}_{O(d)} - \mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{V}})\|_{\diamond} \\ &< 2\epsilon, \end{aligned} \quad (30)$$

since the both terms are less than ϵ by the submultiplicative property of the diamond norm and by the assumption in Eq. (28). \square

As a special case, an exact orthogonal 2-design yields an exact unitary 2-design.

Theorem 2. *Consider an orthogonal 2-design $\mathcal{V} \subset O(d)$. Then there exists a unitary $W \in U(d)$ such that the set $\mathcal{V}^W \cdot \mathcal{V}$ forms a unitary generalized group 2-design.*

Proof. Trivial based on Lemma 1 by taking $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$. \square

4.2 Unitary 2-designs from the alternating group

In this section, we provide a construction method for unitary 2-designs using Theorem 2. The construction is based on the irreducible decomposition of a certain representation of A_{d+1} , the alternating group of degree $d + 1$:

Definition 5. *The alternating group of degree k denoted by A_k is the group of even permutations of a set of order k .*

For our purposes, the natural representation of the alternating group of degree $d + 1$ is used, where $d \geq 5$.

Definition 6. *The natural representation of the alternating group A_{d+1} is the group homomorphism $\Pi_n : A_{d+1} \rightarrow U(d + 1)$. The representation acts on a fixed basis $\{|e_i\rangle\}_{i=1}^{d+1}$ by permuting the basis vectors as*

$$\Pi_n(\pi)(|e_i\rangle) := \pi \cdot |e_i\rangle := |e_{\pi(i)}\rangle. \quad (31)$$

This representation decomposes into the direct sum of the trivial and standard representations, $\Pi_n \cong \Pi_t \oplus \Pi_s$, which are irreducible. The representation Π_s is the one acting on the orthogonal complement of the one-dimensional trivial subspace spanned by the single vector

$$|\psi\rangle := \frac{1}{\sqrt{d+1}} \sum_{i=1}^{d+1} |e_i\rangle. \quad (32)$$

We define a generator set of the vector space orthogonal to the subspace spanned by $|\psi\rangle$ with the following vectors

$$|v_j\rangle := |e_j\rangle - \frac{1}{\sqrt{d+1}} |\psi\rangle. \quad (33)$$

When $d = \dim \Pi_s \geq 5$, the 2-fold tensor product of the standard representation Π_s can be decomposed as

$$\Pi_s \otimes \Pi_s \cong \Pi_{\square\square} \oplus \Pi_{\square} \cong \Pi_t \oplus \Pi_s \oplus \Pi_r \oplus \Pi_{\square}, \quad (34)$$

where Π_t, Π_s, Π_r and Π_{\square} are inequivalent, irreducible representations [30]. The projections corresponding to the invariant subspaces on the RHS of Eq. (34) are denoted with P_t, P_s, P_r and P_{\square} , respectively. The subspaces supporting these projections can

be expressed by

$$V_t \oplus V_s = \text{span} \left(\{|v_j\rangle \otimes |v_j\rangle\}_{j=1}^{d+1} \right), \quad (35)$$

$$V_t = \text{span} \left(\sum_{j=1}^{d+1} |v_j\rangle \otimes |v_j\rangle \right). \quad (36)$$

This is true since $\Pi_s \otimes \Pi_s$ acts on $\text{span} \left(\{|v_j\rangle \otimes |v_j\rangle\}_{j=1}^{d+1} \right)$ in the same way the $d+1$ dimensional natural representation acts on $\text{span} \left(\{|e_i\rangle\}_{i=1}^{d+1} \right)$. Note that V_t is also an invariant subspace of the two-fold tensor product of the defining representation of $O(d)$. Based on Eq. (34) and Schur's lemma, if one were to use the set $\mathcal{V} = \{\Pi_s(g) : g \in A_{d+1}\}$ of d -dimensional orthogonal matrices as a 2-design, one would get to the following for any given matrix $M \in \mathbb{C}^{d^2 \times d^2}$:

$$\sum_{U \in \mathcal{V}} w(U)(U \otimes U)M(U \otimes U)^\dagger = c_t P_t + c_s P_s + c_r P_r + c_{\boxplus} P_{\boxplus}, \quad (37)$$

where the parameters c_i , $i \in \{t, s, r, \boxplus\}$ come from the trace of M on the appropriate subspace.

Similarly to Theorem 2 the construction of a weighted unitary 2-design from the alternating group relies on the fact that one can find an appropriate transformation (denoted by $O \in O(d)$ in Lemma 2) such that the operators \mathcal{V} multiplied by \mathcal{V}^O (which denotes the same operators, conjugated by O) together forms an orthogonal 2-design. Using the aforementioned theorem, it can be transformed into a unitary 2-design as presented in Figure 1.

Lemma 2. *Let $\mathcal{V} = \{\Pi_s(g) : g \in A_{d+1}\}$. Then, there exists an $O \in O(d)$ such that for any matrix $M \in \mathbb{C}^{d^2 \times d^2}$ the following holds:*

$$\sum_{U \in \mathcal{V}^O \cdot \mathcal{V}} w(U)(U \otimes U)M(U \otimes U)^\dagger = c_t P_t^{O^{\otimes 2}} + \lambda \left(P_s^{O^{\otimes 2}} + P_r^{O^{\otimes 2}} \right) + c_{\boxplus} P_{\boxplus}^{O^{\otimes 2}}, \quad (38)$$

where the weight function w is defined as in Eq. (2),

$$P_i^{O^{\otimes 2}} := O^{\otimes 2} P_i (O^{\otimes 2})^T, \quad i \in \{t, s, r, \boxplus\}, \quad (39)$$

and

$$\lambda = \frac{c_s \text{Tr} P_s + c_r \text{Tr} P_r}{\text{Tr}(P_s + P_r)}. \quad (40)$$

Proof. The sum on the LHS of Eq. (38) can be split into two sums due to the function w :

$$\sum_{U \in \mathcal{V}^O \cdot \mathcal{V}} w(U)(U \otimes U)M(U \otimes U)^\dagger$$




Fig. 1 Illustration of the construction of a 2-design in dimensions ≥ 5 . On the left side, the one-parameter subgroup ϕ of $O(d+1)$ is visualized, with its continuous action by conjugation on $\iota(\mathcal{V})$ where \mathcal{V} is the set of orthogonal matrices which constitute the standard representation of A_{d+1} . Next, $\iota(\mathcal{V})$ and $\iota(\mathcal{V})^{\phi(t^*)}$ are projected to the orthogonal group $O(d)$, where ι^{-1} is the preimage of the embedding ι , yielding \mathcal{V} and \mathcal{V}^O with $O := \iota(\phi(t^*))$, respectively. The lines between \mathcal{V} and \mathcal{V}^O illustrate the elementwise products, forming an orthogonal 2-design. Finally, using a transformation $W \in U(d)$, we construct a unitary t -design based on Theorem 2.

$$= \frac{1}{|\mathcal{V}^O|} \sum_{U \in \mathcal{V}^O} (U \otimes U) \left(\frac{1}{|\mathcal{V}|} \sum_{V \in \mathcal{V}} (V \otimes V) M(V \otimes V)^\dagger \right) (U \otimes U)^\dagger. \quad (41)$$

Then, the inner sum can be written as it was in Eq. 37:

$$\overline{M} := \frac{1}{|\mathcal{V}|} \sum_{V \in \mathcal{V}} (V \otimes V) M(V \otimes V)^\dagger = c_t P_t + c_s P_s + c_r P_r + c_{\square} P_{\square}, \quad (42)$$

where $c_i = \frac{\text{Tr}(P_i M)}{\text{Tr} P_i}$ for any $i \in \{t, s, r, \square\}$. After the inner sum has been done, the outer sum can be written as:

$$\sum_{U \in \mathcal{V}^O \mathcal{V}} w(U) (U \otimes U) M(U \otimes U)^\dagger = c'_t P_t^{O^{\otimes 2}} + c'_s P_s^{O^{\otimes 2}} + c'_r P_r^{O^{\otimes 2}} + c'_{\square} P_{\square}^{O^{\otimes 2}}, \quad (43)$$

Given that O is orthogonal in the underlying basis, we have that $P_t = P_t^{O^{\otimes 2}}$ and $P_{\square} = P_{\square}^{O^{\otimes 2}}$. Therefore, the coefficients c_t, c_{\square} remain the same after the outer sum: $c'_t = c_t$ and $c'_{\square} = c_{\square}$. However, the coefficients of P_s and P_r change to the following:

$$c'_s = \frac{\text{Tr}(P_s^{O^{\otimes 2}} \overline{M})}{\text{Tr} P_s^{O^{\otimes 2}}}, \quad \text{and} \quad c'_r = \frac{\text{Tr}(P_r^{O^{\otimes 2}} \overline{M})}{\text{Tr} P_r^{O^{\otimes 2}}}. \quad (44)$$

These are equal when:

$$\frac{\text{Tr}\left(P_s^{O^{\otimes 2}}(c_s P_s + c_r P_r)\right)}{\text{Tr} P_s^{O^{\otimes 2}}} = \frac{\text{Tr}\left(P_r^{O^{\otimes 2}}(c_s P_s + c_r P_r)\right)}{\text{Tr} P_r^{O^{\otimes 2}}}. \quad (45)$$

Introducing the notation $g(O) := \text{Tr}\left(P_s^{O^{\otimes 2}} P_s\right)$, one has that:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Tr}\left(P_s^{O^{\otimes 2}} P_r\right) &= \text{Tr}\left(P_r^{O^{\otimes 2}} P_s\right) = d - g(O), \\ \text{Tr}\left(P_r^{O^{\otimes 2}} P_r\right) &= \frac{(d+1)(d-2)}{2} - d + g(O). \end{aligned} \quad (46)$$

If $c_s \neq c_r$ then the following requirement is given for $g(O)$:

$$g(O) \stackrel{!}{=} q := \frac{2d^2}{(d+2)(d-1)}. \quad (47)$$

If $c_s = c_r$ then the value of $g(O)$ can be chosen freely, and therefore will be chosen to be the one above. However, $O \in O(d)$ transforms the standard representation Π_s of A_{d+1} , and it is more convenient to work with a corresponding transformation of the natural representation Π_n that leaves the trivial subspace invariant. More concretely, one can map an orthogonal transformation $O \in O(d)$ to an orthogonal transformation $Q \in O(d+1)$ that leaves the subspace spanned by $|\psi\rangle$ unchanged. This relationship can be given by the embedding $\iota : O(d) \rightarrow O(d+1)$ as

$$\iota(O) = O \oplus |\psi\rangle\langle\psi|. \quad (48)$$

Accordingly, if there exists a $Q \in O(d+1)$, such that $Q|\psi\rangle = |\psi\rangle$, then there exists $O \in O(d)$, such that $\iota(O) = Q$. Now we may restate the question of finding $O \in O(d)$ such that $g(O) = q$ to finding such $Q \in O(d+1)$. The proof of the existence of such $Q \in O(d+1)$ is postponed until Proposition 3. \square

The requirement is to find an appropriate $O \in O(d)$, such that $g(O) = q$. The main concept behind the construction is to find a continuous path $\phi : [0, 1] \rightarrow O(d)$ such that the image of this path under the mapping g contains q . Then, there exists O_0 and O_1 , such that $g(O_1) < q < g(O_0)$, and by the continuity of g , we find $t \in [0, 1]$ such that $g(\phi(t)) = q$. The orthogonal matrix where this equality is attained can be used to construct an orthogonal 2-design.

Construction 1 (Shifted Real Discrete Fourier Transform). Consider a $(d+2)$ -dimensional DFT matrix, which has the form

$$\text{DFT}_{d+2} := \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 & \cdots & 1 \\ 1 & \omega_{d+2}^{1 \cdot 1} & \cdots & \omega_{d+2}^{1 \cdot (d+1)} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 1 & \omega_{d+2}^{(d+1) \cdot 1} & \cdots & \omega_{d+2}^{(d+1) \cdot (d+1)} \end{bmatrix}, \quad (49)$$

where $\omega_{d+2} := e^{i2\pi\frac{1}{d+2}}$. Take the minor matrix where the first row and column are omitted to obtain

$$\text{LDFT}_{d+1} := \begin{bmatrix} \omega_{d+2}^{1 \cdot 1} & \cdots & \omega_{d+2}^{1 \cdot (d+1)} \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \omega_{d+2}^{(d+1) \cdot 1} & \cdots & \omega_{d+2}^{(d+1) \cdot (d+1)} \end{bmatrix}. \quad (50)$$

Then consider the matrix

$$\text{SDFT}_{d+1} := a\text{LDFT}_{d+1} + bE_{d+1}, \quad a = \frac{1}{\sqrt{d+2}}, \quad b = \frac{a+1}{d+1}, \quad (51)$$

where E_{d+1} is the $(d+1) \times (d+1)$ matrix of ones, i.e., $E_{ij} = 1$. It can easily be verified that the SDFT matrix is unitary since we know that

$$\begin{aligned} \text{LDFT}_{d+1}^\dagger \text{LDFT}_{d+1} &= (d+2)\mathbb{1}_{d+1} - E_{d+1}, \\ E_{d+1} \text{LDFT}_{d+1} &= \text{LDFT}_{d+1} E_{d+1} = -E_{d+1}, \\ E_{d+1}^2 &= (d+1)E_{d+1}, \end{aligned} \quad (52)$$

and hence we can write

$$\begin{aligned} \text{SDFT}_{d+1}^\dagger \text{SDFT}_{d+1} &= a^2((d+2)\mathbb{1}_{d+1} - E_{d+1}) + b^2(d+1)E_{d+1} - 2abE_{d+1} \\ &= \mathbb{1}_{d+1} + ((d+1)b^2 - a^2 - 2ab)E_{d+1} = \mathbb{1}_{d+1}. \end{aligned} \quad (53)$$

Hence, the SDFT matrix is unitary, however, it is not real-valued in general. To construct an orthogonal matrix using SDFT, we use the following unitary transformation:

$$R_{d+1} = \frac{1+i}{2}\mathbb{1}_{d+1} + \frac{1-i}{2}T_{d+1}, \quad (54)$$

where T_{d+1} is a permutation matrix with ones in the anti-diagonal, $(T_{d+1})_{i,j} = \delta_{i+j,d+2}$. Then we define the Shifted Real Discrete Fourier Transform (SRDFT) as

$$\text{SRDFT}_{d+1} := R_{d+1}\text{SDFT}_{d+1}. \quad (55)$$

This is indeed real-valued since one can easily verify that $R_{d+1}\text{LDFT}_{d+1}$ is real-valued by looking at the components:

$$(R_{d+1}\text{LDFT}_{d+1})_{ij} = \frac{1+i}{2}\omega_{d+2}^{ij} + \frac{1-i}{2}\omega_{d+2}^{-ij} = \text{Re}\left((1+i)\omega_{d+2}^{ij}\right). \quad (56)$$

It is also easy to verify that this matrix leaves the 1-dimensional subspace spanned by $|\psi\rangle$ invariant, that is $\text{SRDFT}_{d+1}|\psi\rangle = |\psi\rangle$. For this, we only have to verify that

the rows in the matrix sum to 1 for all j :

$$\sum_{i=1}^{d+1} (\text{SRDFT}_{d+1})_{ij} = (d+1)b - a = 1, \quad (57)$$

where we used that $\sum_{i=1}^{d+1} \omega_{d+2}^{ij} = -1$ for all j .

Now we turn to the construction of a continuous path that connects the identity to the SRDFT_{d+1} matrix:

Lemma 3. *For each dimension $d+1$, there exists a permutation matrix S_{d+1} such that there is a continuous path $\phi : [0, 1] \rightarrow \text{O}(d+1)$ connecting the identity to $S_{d+1}\text{SRDFT}_{d+1}$, such that*

$$\phi(t) |\psi\rangle = |\psi\rangle, \quad \forall t \in [0, 1]. \quad (58)$$

Proof. Since SRDFT_{d+1} is orthogonal, $\det(\text{SRDFT}_{d+1}) = \pm 1$. When $\det(\text{SRDFT}_{d+1}) = 1$, take $S_{d+1} = \mathbb{1}_{d+1}$, otherwise take any odd permutation matrix, so that $\det(S_{d+1}\text{SRDFT}_{d+1}) = 1$. Then $S_{d+1}\text{SRDFT}_{d+1} \in \text{SO}(d+1)$, which is a compact connected Lie group, hence, for every group element there is an element $X \in \mathfrak{so}(d+1)$ such that $\exp(X) = S_{d+1}\text{SRDFT}_{d+1}$. Numerically it can be calculated by [36]. Then the path can be defined as

$$\begin{aligned} \phi : [0, 1] &\rightarrow \text{O}(d+1), \\ t &\mapsto \exp(tX), \end{aligned} \quad (59)$$

which fulfils the condition $\phi(t) |\psi\rangle = |\psi\rangle$, since $X |\psi\rangle = 0$. \square

The orthogonal transformation required for Lemma 2 is given by the following proposition:

Proposition 3. *For $d \geq 5$ there exists an $O \in \text{O}(d)$ such that*

$$g(O) = q, \quad (60)$$

where q is a dimension-dependent constant defined by Eq. (47)

Proof. Since $\text{SRDFT}_{d+1} |\psi\rangle = |\psi\rangle$, there is an orthogonal matrix $O \in \text{O}(d)$, for which $\iota(O) = \text{SRDFT}_{d+1}$, and one can also show that the composition $f := g \circ \iota^{-1}$ is well-defined. Next, we use the following inequality:

$$f(\text{SRDFT}_{d+1}) < q, \quad (61)$$

which is proved in Appendix A for brevity. Therefore the function $f \circ \phi : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ defines a continuous function with its image containing q . \square

Remark 3. To give an explicit form of $O \in \text{O}(d)$ in Proposition 3, we need to obtain an eigenvector decomposition of SRDFT_{d+1} . This decomposition can be constructed

using known eigenvector decompositions of DFT [37], see Appendix B. However, SRDFT_{d+1} is not always in the connected component of $O(d+1)$. In dimensions $d+1 = 1, 3 \pmod{4}$, instead of the permutation prescribed in Lemma 3, we can use $-\text{SRDFT}_{d+1}$, which lies in the connected component of $O(d+1)$.

Theorem 3. *Let $d \geq 5$. Given the set of operators in the d dimensional standard representation of A_{d+1} denoted by \mathcal{V} , there exists appropriate transformations W and O such that the product $\mathcal{V}^{WO} \cdot \mathcal{V}^W \cdot \mathcal{V}^O \cdot \mathcal{V}$ forms a weighted unitary 2-design in d dimensions with weights given by Eq. (2).*

Proof. Trivial based on Theorem 2 and Lemma 2. □

5 Summary and Outlook

The current paper establishes the concept of a generalized group t -design and provides several construction methods. One such construction is enabled by Theorem 1, establishing a procedure for constructing a generalized group t -design using finite groups whose representations admit an easily verifiable property. Moreover, we provide some examples of novel 4-design constructions using this procedure. Another notable construction is given in Theorem 3, which allows one to give an explicit generalized group 2-design in arbitrary dimensions. The statement builds on the previous procedure yielding generalized group t -designs together with the fact that a unitary 2-design may be constructed from an orthogonal 2-design.

There is an abundance of possible research directions based on group representations and the ideas presented here. As a start, we plan to carry out a thorough search through the finite groups using the GAP system to identify cases where 5- or higher-degree-designs could be constructed using Theorem 1. On the more ambitious side, one could envision obtaining a construction for 3-designs for general dimensions in a similar way to Theorem 3. A further research direction is to examine the consequences of our 2- and higher-degree-design constructions in applications such as quantum process tomography, randomized benchmarking, and (thrifty) shadow estimation.

Acknowledgement

This research was supported by the Ministry of Culture and Innovation and the National Research, Development and Innovation Office through the Quantum Information National Laboratory of Hungary (Grant No. 2022-2.1.1-NL-2022-00004).

Appendix A Proof that the Shifted Real Discrete Fourier Transform gives a lower bound to q

Given the following definition for f :

$$f(Q) := \text{Tr} \left(P_s Q^{\otimes 2} P_s (Q^{\otimes 2})^T \right), \quad (\text{A1})$$

and the matrix SRDFT_{d+1} detailed in Construction 1, the following proposition is true:

Proposition 4. *For $d \geq 5$ the following equation is satisfied:*

$$f(\text{SRDFT}_{d+1}) < \frac{2d^2}{(d+2)(d-1)} = q. \quad (\text{A2})$$

Before the proof, consider the following lemma:

Lemma 4. *Let $Q \in O(d+1)$ and such that $Q|\psi\rangle = |\psi\rangle$. Then, the following is true:*

$$f(Q) = \frac{(d+1)^2 \sum_{j,k=1}^{d+1} Q_{jk}^3 \left(Q_{jk} - \frac{4}{d+1} \right) - d^2 + 6d + 3}{(d-1)^2}, \quad (\text{A3})$$

Proof. We use the notation described in Section 4.2. According to Eq. (35), one can write P_s as

$$P_s = \frac{1}{d-1} \sum_{j,k=1}^{d+1} |v_j \otimes v_j\rangle \langle v_j \otimes v_j| - |v_j \otimes v_j\rangle \langle v_k \otimes v_k|, \quad (\text{A4})$$

and substituting this into Eq. (A1) we get an expression for $f(Q)$:

$$f(Q) = \frac{1}{(d-1)^2} \sum_{j,k,l,m=1}^{d+1} \left(\langle v_j | Q^T | v_l \rangle^2 - \langle v_k | Q^T | v_l \rangle^2 \right) \left(\langle v_l | Q | v_j \rangle^2 - \langle v_m | Q | v_j \rangle^2 \right). \quad (\text{A5})$$

In this expression, we can substitute the v_j vectors from Eq. (33). Moreover, since $Q|\psi\rangle = |\psi\rangle$, we can also use the fact that $\langle v_l | Q | v_j \rangle = \langle v_l | Q | e_j \rangle$ to obtain

$$\langle v_j | Q | e_k \rangle = \left(\langle e_j | - \frac{1}{d+1} \sum_{\ell=1}^{d+1} \langle e_\ell | \right) Q | e_k \rangle = Q_{jk} - \frac{1}{d+1} \underbrace{\sum_{\ell=1}^{d+1} Q_{lk}}_{=1} = Q_{jk} - \frac{1}{d+1}. \quad (\text{A6})$$

From this, we obtain the desired formula by direct calculation using the orthogonality of Q . \square

Using this, the proof of Proposition 4 is the following:

Proof. Using Lemma 4 and the definition of SRDFT_{d+1} , we get by direct calculation that

$$f(\text{SRDFT}_{d+1}) = \frac{(d+1)^4 + (4 - \tau_{d+1})(d+1)^2 - 4\sigma_{d+1}(d+1) - 8}{2(d+2)^2(d-1)^2}, \quad (\text{A7})$$

where

$$\sigma_n = \begin{cases} n+2 & \text{if } (n+1) \equiv 0 \pmod{3}, \\ -n & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

$$\tau_n = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } (n+1) \equiv 2 \pmod{4}, \\ 2n+3 & \text{if } (n+1) \equiv 0 \pmod{4}, \\ -n & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (\text{A8})$$

From now on, we have to deal with the cases depending on d in σ_{d+1} and τ_{d+1} . Luckily, it is enough to verify for the cases where $\sigma_{d+1} = \tau_{d+1} = -(d+1)$ since in the other cases the numerator will be strictly smaller. Hence, when $2, 3 \nmid (d+2)$, we have to verify that

$$f(\text{SRDFT}_{d+1}) = \frac{(d+1)^3 + 8(d+1) - 8}{2(d+2)(d-1)^2} \leq \frac{2d^2}{(d+1)(d-1)} = q, \quad (\text{A9})$$

which is true when $d \geq 1$. □

Appendix B Eigenvector decomposition of SRDFT matrices

The eigenvector decomposition of the SRDFT_{d+1} matrices can be derived from the eigenvector decomposition of the DFT_{d+2} matrix, as follows. Consider

$$\text{SRDFT}_{d+1} = a \left(\frac{1+i}{2} \text{LDFT}_{d+1} + \frac{1-i}{2} \text{LDFT}_{d+1}^\dagger \right) + bE, \quad (\text{B10})$$

with the same notations as in Construction 1. An orthogonal eigenvector decomposition of DFT_{d+2} can be given by

$$v_j = \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ c_{1,j} \\ \vdots \\ c_{d+1,j} \end{bmatrix}, \quad v_+ = \begin{bmatrix} \alpha_+ \\ 1 \\ \vdots \\ 1 \end{bmatrix}, \quad v_- = \begin{bmatrix} \alpha_- \\ 1 \\ \vdots \\ 1 \end{bmatrix}, \quad (1 \leq j \leq d) \quad (\text{B11})$$

where $\alpha_{\pm} = 1 \pm \sqrt{d+2}$. Then, since

$$c_j = \begin{bmatrix} c_{1,j} \\ \vdots \\ c_{d+1,j} \end{bmatrix}, \quad c_{d+1} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ \vdots \\ 1 \end{bmatrix}, \quad (1 \leq j \leq d) \quad (\text{B12})$$

will be eigenvectors of LDFT_{d+1} , they will also be eigenvectors of SRDFT_{d+1} since $Ec_j = (d+1)\delta_{j,d+1}c_{d+1}$. The set of orthogonal eigenvectors $C = (c_{ij})_{i,j=1}^{d+1}$ will yield an eigenvalue decomposition of SRDFT_{d+1} .

References

- [1] Dankert, C.: Efficient Simulation of Random Quantum States and Operators (2005). <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.quant-ph/0512217>
- [2] Dankert, C., Cleve, R., Emerson, J., Livine, E.: Exact and approximate unitary 2-designs and their application to fidelity estimation. *Phys. Rev. A* **80**(1) (2009) <https://doi.org/10.1103/physreva.80.012304>
- [3] Scott, A.J.: Optimizing quantum process tomography with unitary 2-designs. *J. Phys. A: Mathematical and Theoretical* **41**(5), 055308 (2008) <https://doi.org/10.1088/1751-8113/41/5/055308>
- [4] Roy, A., Scott, A.J.: Unitary designs and codes. *Des. Codes Cryptogr.* **53**(1), 13–31 (2009) <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10623-009-9290-2>
- [5] Gross, D., Krahmer, F., Kueng, R.: A Partial Derandomization of PhaseLift Using Spherical Designs. *J. Fourier Anal. Appl.* **21**(2), 229–266 (2014) <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00041-014-9361-2>
- [6] Bae, J., Hiesmayr, B.C., McNulty, D.: Linking entanglement detection and state tomography via quantum 2-designs. *New J. Phys.* **21**(1), 013012 (2019) <https://doi.org/10.1088/1367-2630/aaf8cf>
- [7] Roberts, D.A., Yoshida, B.: Chaos and complexity by design. *J. High Energy Phys.* **2017**(4), 1–64 (2017) [https://doi.org/10.1007/JHEP04\(2017\)121](https://doi.org/10.1007/JHEP04(2017)121)
- [8] Leone, L., Oliviero, S.F., Zhou, Y., Hamma, A.: Quantum chaos is quantum. *Quantum* **5**, 453 (2021) <https://doi.org/10.22331/q-2021-05-04-453>
- [9] Wallman, J.J., Flammia, S.T.: Randomized benchmarking with confidence. *New J. Phys.* **16**(10), 103032 (2014) <https://doi.org/10.1088/1367-2630/16/10/103032>
- [10] Jafarzadeh, M., Wu, Y.-D., Sanders, Y.R., Sanders, B.C.: Randomized benchmarking for qudit Clifford gates. *New J. Phys.* **22**(6), 063014 (2020) <https://doi.org/10.1088/1367-2630/ab8ab1>
- [11] Huang, H.-Y., Kueng, R., Preskill, J.: Predicting many properties of a quantum system from very few measurements. *Nat. Phys.* **16**(10), 1050–1057 (2020) <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41567-020-0932-7>
- [12] Chen, S., Yu, W., Zeng, P., Flammia, S.T.: Robust shadow estimation. *PRX Quantum* **2**(3), 030348 (2021) <https://doi.org/10.1103/PRXQuantum.2.030348>
- [13] Arienzo, M., Heinrich, M., Roth, I., Kliesch, M.: Closed-form analytic expressions for shadow estimation with brickwork circuits. *arXiv preprint* (2022) <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2211.09835>

- [14] Helsen, J., Walter, M.: Thrifty shadow estimation: re-using quantum circuits and bounding tails. arXiv preprint (2022) <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2212.06240>
- [15] Gross, D., Audenaert, K., Eisert, J.: Evenly distributed unitaries: On the structure of unitary designs. *Journal of Mathematical Physics* **48**(5), 052104 (2007) <https://doi.org/10.1063/1.2716992>
- [16] Chau, H.F.: Unconditionally secure key distribution in higher dimensions by depolarization. *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory* **51**(4), 1451–1468 (2005) <https://doi.org/10.1109/TIT.2005.844076>
- [17] Heinrich, M.: On stabiliser techniques and their application to simulation and certification of quantum devices. PhD thesis, Universität zu Köln (2021). <http://kups.ub.uni-koeln.de/id/eprint/50465>
- [18] Webb, Z.: The Clifford group forms a unitary 3-design. *Quantum Inf. Comput.* **16**, 1379–1400 (2015) <https://doi.org/10.26421/QIC16.15-16-8>
- [19] Zhu, H.: Multiqubit Clifford groups are unitary 3-designs. *Phys. Rev. A* **96**, 062336 (2017) <https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevA.96.062336>
- [20] Kueng, R., Gross, D.: Qubit stabilizer states are complex projective 3-designs. arXiv preprint arXiv:1510.02767 (2015) <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.1510.02767>
- [21] Bannai, E., Navarro, G., Rizo, N., Tiep, P.H.: Unitary t -groups. *J. Math. Soc. Jpn.* **72**(3), 909–921 (2020) <https://doi.org/10.2969/jmsj/82228222>
- [22] Graydon, M.A., Skanes-Norman, J., Wallman, J.J.: Clifford groups are not always 2-designs. arXiv preprint arXiv:2108.04200 (2021) <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2108.04200>
- [23] Brandão, F.G.S.L., Harrow, A.W., Horodecki, M.: Local Random Quantum Circuits are Approximate Polynomial-Designs. *Commun. Math. Phys.* **346**(2), 397–434 (2016) <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00220-016-2706-8>
- [24] Oszmaniec, M., Sawicki, A., Horodecki, M.: Epsilon-Nets, Unitary Designs, and Random Quantum Circuits. *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory* **68**(2), 989–1015 (2022) <https://doi.org/10.1109/TIT.2021.3128110>
- [25] Haferkamp, J.: Random quantum circuits are approximate unitary t -designs in depth $O(nt^{5+o(1)})$. *Quantum* **6**, 795 (2022) <https://doi.org/10.22331/q-2022-09-08-795>
- [26] Seymour, P.D., Zaslavsky, T.: Averaging sets: A generalization of mean values and spherical designs. *Adv. Math.* **52**(3), 213–240 (1984) <https://doi.org/10.1016/>

- [27] Bengtsson, I., Życzkowski, K.: *Geometry of Quantum States: An Introduction to Quantum Entanglement*, 2nd edn. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK (2017). <https://doi.org/10.1017/9781139207010>
- [28] Di Matteo, O.: A short introduction to unitary 2-designs. CS867/QIC890 (2014). <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:52059910>
- [29] Bannai, E., Nakata, Y., Okuda, T., Zhao, D.: Explicit construction of exact unitary designs. *Adv. Math.* **405**, 108457 (2022) <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.aim.2022.108457>
- [30] Fulton, W., Harris, J.: *Representation Theory: A First Course*. Graduate Texts in Mathematics. Springer, Springer New York, NY (1991). <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4612-0979-9>
- [31] Kaposi, A., Kolarovszki, Z., Solymos, A., Kozsik, T., Zimborás, Z.: Constructing Generalized Unitary Group Designs, pp. 233–245 (2023). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-36030-5_19
- [32] Lux, K., Pahlings, H.: *Representations of Groups: A Computational Approach*. Cambridge Stud. Adv. Math. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK (2010). <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511750915>
- [33] The GAP Group: GAP—groups, algorithms, and programming (4.12. 2 (2022)). <https://www.gap-system.org>
- [34] Chiribella, G., D’Ariano, G.M., Roetteler, M.: Identification of a reversible quantum gate: assessing the resources. *New J. Phys.* **15**(10), 103019 (2013) <https://doi.org/10.1088/1367-2630/15/10/103019>
- [35] Hashagen, A.K., Flammia, S.T., Gross, D., Wallman, J.J.: Real randomized benchmarking. *Quantum* **2**, 85 (2018) <https://doi.org/10.22331/q-2018-08-22-85>
- [36] Gallier, J., Xu, D.: Computing exponentials of skew-symmetric matrices and logarithms of orthogonal matrices. *Int. J. Robotics Autom.* **18**(1), 10–20 (2003). <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:14984310>
- [37] Dickinson, B., Steiglitz, K.: Eigenvectors and functions of the discrete Fourier transform. *IEEE Trans. Acoust., Speech, Signal. Process.* **30**, 25–31 (1982) <https://doi.org/10.1109/TASSP.1982.1163843>