# Lower Bounds on Pauli Manipulation Detection Codes

Keiya Ichikawa<sup>\*</sup> Kenji Yasunaga<sup>†</sup>

April 2, 2025

#### Abstract

We present a lower bound for Pauli Manipulation Detection (PMD) codes, which enables the detection of every Pauli error with high probability and can be used to construct quantum erasure and tamper-detection codes. Our lower bound reveals the first trade-off between the error and the redundancy parameters in PMD codes.

### 1 Introduction

Pauli Manipulation Detection (PMD) codes were introduced by Bergamaschi [2] as a coding scheme for detecting every Pauli error with high probability. PMD codes can be seen as a quantum analogue of Algebraic Manipulation Detection (AMD) codes [3], which guarantee error detection of every additive error without using secret keys. Bergamaschi [2] provided an explicit construction of PMD codes based on purity testing codes [1] and demonstrated their applications in quantum error correction and tamper detection. Specifically, he constructed approximate quantum erasure codes approaching the quantum Singleton (or non-cloning) bound by combining PMD codes with listdecodable stabilizer codes. Also, he gave a construction of quantum tamper-detection codes for qubit-wise channels using classical non-malleable codes.

AMD codes have been extensively studied since their introduction in [3]. Lower bounds on the adversary's success probability and the tag size are known [3, 4, 9], as well as near-optimal constructions [5, 9, 6, 7]. However, no such lower bounds are known for PMD codes.

In this work, we present the first lower bound for PMD codes. A  $q^k$ -dimensional subspace  $\Pi$  of  $\mathbb{C}^{q^n}$  is said to be an  $(n, k, \varepsilon)_q$ -PMD code if  $\|\Pi E\Pi\|_{\infty} \leq \varepsilon$  for every *n*-qudit Pauli error  $E \neq \mathbb{I}$ , where  $\|\cdot\|_{\infty}$  is the operator norm. (See Definition 1 for a formal definition.) We show that every  $(n, n - \lambda, \varepsilon)_q$ -PMD code satisfies  $\varepsilon \geq \sqrt{(q^{2n-\lambda} - 1)/(q^{2n} - 1)}$ , which also implies that  $\lambda \geq 2\log_q(1/\varepsilon) - \log_q 2$ . This bound reveals the trade-off between the error parameter  $\varepsilon$  and the redundancy parameter  $\lambda$ . Our derivation exploits the fact that the Pauli operators form a unitary 1-design, allowing us to analyze the average behavior of Pauli errors in the same way as that of the entire unitary errors.

<sup>\*</sup>Institute of Science Tokyo ichikawa.k.al@m.titech.ac.jp

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>†</sup>Institute of Science Tokyo yasunaga@c.titech.ac.jp

# 2 Preliminaries

#### 2.1 Quantum States and Distances

Let  $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H})$  be the set of linear operators on a finite Hilbert space  $\mathcal{H}$ . Let A be a linear operator in  $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H})$ . Then, A is said to be unitary if  $A^{\dagger}A = AA^{\dagger} = \mathbb{I}$ . We denote by  $\mathcal{U}(\mathcal{H})$  the set of all unitary operators  $U \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H})$ , which is called the unitary group. An operator A is said to be Hermitian if  $A^{\dagger} = A$ . A projection operator is a Hermitian operator A such that AA = A. The trace of  $A \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H})$  is defined as  $\operatorname{Tr}(A) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \langle e_i | A | e_i \rangle$ , where  $|e_1 \rangle, \ldots, |e_n \rangle \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H})$  are the orthogonal normal bases. The trace has the *cyclic property* of being invariant under circular shifts;  $\operatorname{Tr}(ABCD) = \operatorname{Tr}(BCDA) = \operatorname{Tr}(CDAB) = \operatorname{Tr}(DABC)$ . An operator  $A \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H})$  is positive semidefinite if  $\langle \psi | A | \psi \rangle \geq 0$  for any  $|\psi\rangle \in \mathcal{H}$ . A quantum state  $\rho \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H})$  is a linear operator that is positive semi-definite and trace 1. We use the Schatten norms for quantifying the distances between quantum states. The operator (or infinity) norm is  $||M||_{\infty} = \max_{|\psi\rangle} |\langle \psi | M^{\dagger}M | \psi \rangle|^{1/2}$ , where the maximum is taken over all quantum states  $|\psi\rangle \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H})$ .

### 2.2 *q*-ary Pauli Operators

Let  $\mathbb{F}_q$  be a finite field of  $q = p^m$  elements for a prime p. The field trace is a function  $\operatorname{tr}_{\mathbb{F}_q/\mathbb{F}_p}$ :  $\mathbb{F}_q \to \mathbb{F}_p$  such that  $\operatorname{tr}_{\mathbb{F}_q/\mathbb{F}_p}(a) = \sum_{i=1}^m a^{p^i}$ . The set of elements  $\{\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_m\}$  is a basis of  $\mathbb{F}_q$  over  $\mathbb{F}_p$  if every  $a \in \mathbb{F}_q$  can be expressed uniquely as  $a = \sum_{i=1}^m a_i \alpha_i$ , where  $a_i \in \mathbb{F}_p$ . A pair of bases  $\alpha = \{\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_m\}$  and  $\beta = \{\beta_1, \ldots, \beta_m\}$  are said to be dual bases if  $\operatorname{tr}_{\mathbb{F}_q/\mathbb{F}_p}(\alpha_i\beta_j) = \delta_{ij}$  for every  $i, j \in [m] = \{1, \ldots, m\}$ , where  $\delta_{ij} = 1$  if i = j, and  $\delta_{ij} = 0$  otherwise. When  $a, b \in \mathbb{F}_q$  are expressed as  $(a_1, \ldots, a_m)$  and  $(b_1, \ldots, b_m)$  in the dual bases  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$ , respectively, the inner product becomes the field trace;

$$\langle a,b\rangle = \sum_{i=1}^m a_i b_i = \sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{j=1}^m a_i b_j \operatorname{tr}_{\mathbb{F}_q/\mathbb{F}_p}(\alpha_i \beta_j) = \operatorname{tr}_{\mathbb{F}_q/\mathbb{F}_p}(ab).$$

We define the shift operator T and the phase operator R over  $\mathbb{C}^p$  as

$$T = \sum_{x \in \mathbb{F}_p} \left| x + 1 \right\rangle \left\langle x \right| \text{ and } R = \sum_{x \in \mathbb{F}_p} \omega^x \left| x \right\rangle \left\langle x \right|,$$

where  $\omega = e^{2\pi i/p}$ . The operators  $T^i R^j$  for  $i, j \in \mathbb{F}_p$  are said to be the Weyl-Heisenberg operators and form an orthogonal normal basis of operators over  $\mathbb{C}^p$ . If  $a, b \in \mathbb{F}_q$  are expressed as  $(a_1, \ldots, a_m)$ and  $(b_1, \ldots, b_m)$  in the dual bases  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$ , respectively, we can define a basis of operators over  $\mathbb{C}^q$ by

$$E_{a,b} = X^a Z^b = \bigotimes_{i \in [m]} T^{a_i} R^{b_i},$$

where  $\otimes$  is the tensor product. Then, we have  $E_{a,b}E_{a',b'} = \omega^{\langle a,b' \rangle - \langle a',b \rangle}E_{a',b'}E_{a,b}$ . For  $\mathbf{a} = (a^{(1)}, \ldots, a^{(n)}), \mathbf{b} = (b^{(1)}, \ldots, b^{(n)}) \in \mathbb{F}_q^n$ , we can define operators on  $\mathbb{C}^{q^n}$  by  $E_{\mathbf{a},\mathbf{b}} = \bigotimes_{j \in [n]} E_{a^{(j)},b^{(j)}}$ . The set of *n* qudit Pauli operators  $\mathbb{P}_q^n$  is  $\{E_{\mathbf{a},\mathbf{b}} : \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{F}_q^n\}$ , and the *n* qudit Pauli group  $\mathcal{P}_q^n$  is the group generated by  $E_{\mathbf{a},\mathbf{b}}$  and  $\omega^{1/2} \cdot \mathbb{I}_{q^n \times q^n}$ .

### 2.3 Haar Measure and Unitary Designs

For a unitary group  $\mathcal{U}(\mathbb{C}^d)$  for  $d \geq 1$ , the Haar measure on  $\mathcal{U}(\mathbb{C}^d)$  is the unique probability measure  $\mu_H$  such that for every integrable function f and every  $V \in \mathcal{U}(\mathbb{C}^d)$ ,

$$\int_{\mathcal{U}(\mathbb{C}^d)} f(U) d\mu_H(U) = \int_{\mathcal{U}(\mathbb{C}^d)} f(UV) d\mu_H(U) = \int_{\mathcal{U}(\mathbb{C}^d)} f(VU) d\mu_H(U).$$

Since it is a probability measure,  $\int_S d\mu_H(U) \ge 0$  for any  $S \subseteq \mathcal{U}(\mathbb{C}^d)$  and  $\int_{\mathcal{U}(\mathbb{C}^d)} d\mu_H(U) = 1$ . The expected value of f(U) on  $\mu_H$  is

$$\mathop{\mathbb{E}}_{U \sim \mu_H} [f(U)] = \int_{\mathcal{U}(\mathbb{C}^d)} f(U) d\mu_H(U).$$

A set of operators  $S \subseteq \mathcal{L}(\mathbb{C}^d)$  is called a *unitary k-design* if for every  $O \in \mathcal{L}(\mathbb{C}^{d^k})$ , it holds that

$$\mathbb{E}_{V \sim \nu_S} \left[ V^{\otimes k} O V^{\dagger \otimes k} \right] = \mathbb{E}_{U \sim \mu_H} \left[ U^{\otimes k} O U^{\dagger \otimes k} \right],$$

where  $\nu_S$  is the uniform distribution over S. If S is finite, the left-hand side is equivalent to

$$\frac{1}{|S|} \sum_{V \in S} V^{\otimes k} O V^{\dagger \otimes k}$$

Intuitively, a unitary design is a set of operators that simulates the entire unitary operators. Regarding the definition of the unitary 1-design, the right-hand side can be written as follows.

**Lemma 1.** [8, Corollary 13] For every  $O \in \mathcal{L}(\mathbb{C}^d)$ , it holds that

$$\mathop{\mathbb{E}}_{U \sim \mu_H} \left[ UOU^{\dagger} \right] = \frac{\operatorname{Tr}(O)}{d} \mathbb{I}_{d \times d}$$

It is well known that the Pauli operators  $\mathbb{P}_q^n$  forms a unitary 1-design, leading to the next lemma, which will be used in our proof.

**Lemma 2.** For every  $O \in \mathcal{L}(\mathbb{C}^{q^n})$ ,

$$\frac{1}{\left|\mathbb{P}_{q}^{n}\right|}\sum_{E\in\mathbb{P}_{q}^{n}}EOE^{\dagger}=\frac{\mathrm{Tr}(O)}{q^{n}}\mathbb{I}_{q^{n}\times q^{n}}.$$

It is known that every unitary 1-design  $S \subseteq \mathcal{L}(\mathbb{C}^d)$  satisfies  $|S| \ge d^2$  [10]. Since  $|\mathbb{P}_q^n| = q^{2n}$ , the Pauli operators  $\mathbb{P}_q^n$  is an example of a minimum-sized unitary 1-design.

## **3** PMD Codes and Their Lower Bounds

A Pauli manipulation detection (PMD) code is defined as follows.

**Definition 1.** A projection operator  $\Pi$  on a  $q^k$ -dimensional subspace of  $\mathbb{C}^{q^n}$  is said to be an  $(n,k,\varepsilon)_q$ -PMD code if for every non-trivial Pauli operator  $E \in \mathcal{P}_q^n \setminus \{\mathbb{I}_{q^n \times q^n}\},$ 

$$\|\Pi E\Pi\|_{\infty} \leq \varepsilon.$$

We also denote by  $\Pi$  the code space defined by the projection  $\Pi$ . With this definition, we can see that any code state  $|\psi_1\rangle$  corrupted by a non-trivial Pauli operator E is almost orthogonal to the code space. Namely, for any code state  $|\psi_2\rangle \in \Pi$ ,

$$|\langle \psi_1 | E^{\dagger} | \psi_2 \rangle| = \left| \langle \psi_1 | E^{\dagger} \Pi | \psi_2 \rangle \langle \psi_2 | \Pi E | \psi_1 \rangle \right|^{1/2}$$

$$\leq \|\Pi E^{\dagger} \Pi E \Pi \|_{\infty}^{1/2} = \|\Pi E \Pi \|_{\infty} \leq \varepsilon.$$
(1)

We prove a lower bound on  $\varepsilon$  for any PMD code.

**Theorem 1.** Let  $\Pi$  be an  $(n, n - \lambda, \varepsilon)_q$ -PMD code. Then, it holds that

$$\varepsilon \geq \sqrt{\frac{q^{2n-\lambda}-1}{q^{2n}-1}}.$$

*Proof.* We consider the following value to derive our bound:

$$\max_{|\psi\rangle} \mathop{\mathbb{E}}_{E \in \mathbb{P}_q^n} \left| \langle \psi | \Pi E^{\dagger} \Pi E \Pi | \psi \rangle \right|, \tag{2}$$

where the maximum is taken over all quantum states  $|\psi\rangle \in \mathcal{L}(\mathbb{C}^{q^n})$ . First, we evaluate (2) as follows:

$$\begin{split} \max_{|\psi\rangle} & \underset{E \in \mathbb{P}_{q}^{n}}{\mathbb{E}} \left| \langle \psi | \Pi E^{\dagger} \Pi E \Pi | \psi \rangle \right| \\ &= \max_{|\psi\rangle} & \underset{E \in \mathbb{P}_{q}^{n}}{\mathbb{E}} \operatorname{Tr} \left( \langle \psi | \Pi E^{\dagger} \Pi E \Pi | \psi \rangle \right) \\ &= \max_{|\psi\rangle} \frac{1}{|\mathbb{P}_{q}^{n}|} \sum_{E \in \mathbb{P}_{q}^{n}} \operatorname{Tr} \left( \langle \psi | \Pi E^{\dagger} \Pi E \Pi | \psi \rangle \right) \\ &= \max_{|\psi\rangle} \frac{1}{|\mathbb{P}_{q}^{n}|} \sum_{E \in \mathbb{P}_{q}^{n}} \operatorname{Tr} \left( \Pi E \Pi | \psi \rangle \langle \psi | \Pi E^{\dagger} \right) & \because \text{ The cyclic property} \\ &= \max_{|\psi\rangle} \operatorname{Tr} \left( \Pi \frac{1}{|\mathbb{P}_{q}^{n}|} \sum_{E \in \mathbb{P}_{q}^{n}} \left( E \Pi | \psi \rangle \langle \psi | \Pi E^{\dagger} \right) \right) & \because \text{ The linearity} \\ &= \max_{|\psi\rangle} \operatorname{Tr} \left( \Pi \frac{\operatorname{Tr} \left( \Pi | \psi \rangle \langle \psi | \Pi \right)}{q^{n}} \right) & \because \text{ Lemma 2} \\ &= \max_{|\psi\rangle} \frac{1}{q^{n}} \operatorname{Tr} \left( \Pi | \psi \rangle \langle \psi | \Pi \right) \operatorname{Tr} (\Pi) \\ &= q^{-\lambda}. & \because \text{ Tr} (\Pi) = q^{n-\lambda} \end{aligned}$$
(4)

where (3) follows from the fact that the inner products take non-negative values and that a = Tr(a)

for  $a \ge 0$ . Next, we derive an upper bound on (2) using that  $\Pi$  is an  $(n, n - \lambda, \varepsilon)_q$ -PMD:

$$\max_{|\psi\rangle} \mathbb{E}_{E\in\mathbb{P}_{q}^{n}} \left| \langle \psi | \Pi E^{\dagger} \Pi E \Pi | \psi \rangle \right| = \max_{|\psi\rangle} \frac{1}{|\mathbb{P}_{q}^{n}|} \sum_{E\in\mathbb{P}_{q}^{n}} \left| \langle \psi | \Pi E^{\dagger} \Pi E \Pi | \psi \rangle \right|$$

$$\leq \frac{1}{|\mathbb{P}_{q}^{n}|} \sum_{E\in\mathbb{P}_{q}^{n}} \max_{|\psi\rangle} \left| \langle \psi | \Pi E^{\dagger} \Pi E \Pi | \psi \rangle \right|$$

$$= \frac{1}{|\mathbb{P}_{q}^{n}|} \sum_{E\in\mathbb{P}_{q}^{n}} \|\Pi E \Pi \|_{\infty}^{2}$$

$$\leq \frac{1}{|\mathbb{P}_{q}^{n}|} \left(1 + (|\mathbb{P}_{q}^{n}| - 1)\varepsilon^{2}\right)$$
(5)

$$= \frac{1}{q^{2n}} \left( 1 + (q^{2n} - 1)\varepsilon^2 \right), \tag{6}$$

where (5) follows from the fact that  $\|\Pi E\Pi\|_{\infty} \leq \varepsilon$  for every  $E \in \mathbb{P}_q^n \setminus \{\mathbb{I}_{q^n \times q^n}\}$ . The statement follows from (4) and (6).

The above theorem implies a lower bound on the parameter  $\lambda$  using  $\varepsilon$  and q.

**Corollary 1.** For every  $(n, n - \lambda, \varepsilon)_q$ -PMD code, it holds that

$$\lambda \ge 2\log_q\left(\frac{1}{\varepsilon}\right) - \log_q 2.$$

*Proof.* Since  $n \geq \lambda$ , Theorem 1 implies that

$$\varepsilon \ge \sqrt{\frac{q^{2n-\lambda}-1}{q^{2n}-1}} \ge \sqrt{\frac{q^{\lambda}-1}{q^{2n}}} \ge q^{-n}.$$
(7)

Then, we have that

$$\begin{split} \lambda &\geq 2n - \log_q \left( 1 + (q^{2n} - 1)\varepsilon^2 \right) \\ &\geq 2n - \log_q \left( q^{2n}\varepsilon^2 + (q^{2n} - 1)\varepsilon^2 \right) \\ &\geq 2\log_q \left( \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \right) - \log_q 2, \end{split}$$

where the first inequality follows from Theorem 1 and the second from (7).

Bergamaschi [2] presented a construction of an  $(n + \ell, n - \ell, \varepsilon)_q$ -PMD code based on the purity testing codes by [1] for every prime q and sufficiently large  $n, \ell \in \mathbb{N}$ , where  $\varepsilon \leq \sqrt{(2n+1)q^{-\ell}}$ . The redundancy parameter  $\lambda$  is equal to  $2\ell$ . Corollary 1 implies that

$$\lambda \ge 2\log_q \sqrt{\frac{q^\ell}{2n+1}} - \log_q 2 = \ell - \log_q 2(2n+1).$$

Hence, there is a gap of  $\ell + O(\log_q n)$  between the construction of [2] and our lower bound.

# Acknowledgements

This work was supported in part by JSPS KAKENHI Grant Numbers 23H00468 and 24H00071.

## References

- H. Barnum, C. Crépeau, D. Gottesman, A. D. Smith, and A. Tapp. Authentication of quantum messages. In 43rd Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS 2002), 16-19 November 2002, Vancouver, BC, Canada, Proceedings, pages 449–458. IEEE Computer Society, 2002.
- [2] T. Bergamaschi. Pauli manipulation detection codes and applications to quantum communication over adversarial channels. In M. Joye and G. Leander, editors, Advances in Cryptology - EUROCRYPT 2024 - 43rd Annual International Conference on the Theory and Applications of Cryptographic Techniques, Zurich, Switzerland, May 26-30, 2024, Proceedings, Part III, volume 14653 of Lecture Notes in Computer Science, pages 404–433. Springer, 2024.
- [3] R. Cramer, Y. Dodis, S. Fehr, C. Padró, and D. Wichs. Detection of algebraic manipulation with applications to robust secret sharing and fuzzy extractors. In N. P. Smart, editor, Advances in Cryptology - EUROCRYPT 2008, 27th Annual International Conference on the Theory and Applications of Cryptographic Techniques, Istanbul, Turkey, April 13-17, 2008. Proceedings, volume 4965 of Lecture Notes in Computer Science, pages 471–488. Springer, 2008.
- [4] R. Cramer, S. Fehr, and C. Padró. Algebraic manipulation detection codes. Sci. China Math., 56:1349–1358, 2013.
- [5] R. Cramer, C. Padró, and C. Xing. Optimal algebraic manipulation detection codes in the constant-error model. In Y. Dodis and J. B. Nielsen, editors, *Theory of Cryptography - 12th Theory of Cryptography Conference, TCC 2015, Warsaw, Poland, March 23-25, 2015, Proceedings, Part I*, volume 9014 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 481–501. Springer, 2015.
- [6] S. Huczynska and M. B. Paterson. Existence and non-existence results for strong external difference families. *Discret. Math.*, 341(1):87–95, 2018.
- [7] S. Huczynska and M. B. Paterson. Weighted external difference families and r-optimal AMD codes. *Discret. Math.*, 342(3):855–867, 2019.
- [8] A. A. Mele. Introduction to Haar Measure Tools in Quantum Information: A Beginner's Tutorial. Quantum, 8:1340, May 2024.
- M. B. Paterson and D. R. Stinson. Combinatorial characterizations of algebraic manipulation detection codes involving generalized difference families. *Discret. Math.*, 339(12):2891–2906, 2016.
- [10] A. Roy and A. J. Scott. Unitary designs and codes. Des. Codes Cryptogr., 53(1):13-31, 2009.