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# ON ALMOST RANDOMIZING CHANNELS WITH A SHORT KRAUS DECOMPOSITION 

GUILLAUME AUBRUN


#### Abstract

For large $d$, we study quantum channels on $\mathbf{C}^{d}$ obtained by selecting randomly $N$ independent Kraus operators according to a probability measure $\mu$ on the unitary group $\mathcal{U}(d)$. When $\mu$ is the Haar measure, we show that for $N \succcurlyeq d / \varepsilon^{2}$, such a channel is $\varepsilon$-randomizing with high probability, which means that it maps every state within distance $\varepsilon / d$ (in operator norm) of the maximally mixed state. This slightly improves on a result by Hayden, Leung, Shor and Winter by optimizing their discretization argument. Moreover, for general $\mu$, we obtain a $\varepsilon$-randomizing channel provided $N \succcurlyeq d(\log d)^{6} / \varepsilon^{2}$. For $d=2^{k}(k$ qubits $)$, this includes Kraus operators obtained by tensoring $k$ random Pauli matrices. The proof uses recent results on empirical processes in Banach spaces.


## 1. Introduction

The completely randomizing quantum channel on $\mathbf{C}^{d}$ maps every state to the maximally mixed state $\rho_{*}$. This channel is used to construct perfect encryption systems (see []] for formal definitions). However it is a complex object in the following sense: any Kraus decomposition must involve at least $d^{2}$ operators. It has been shown by Hayden, Leung, Shor and Winter 12 that this "ideal" channel can be efficiently emulated by lower-complexity channels, leading to approximate encryption systems. The key point is the existence of good approximations with much shorter Kraus decompositions. More precisely, say that a quantum channel $\Phi$ on $\mathbf{C}^{d}$ is $\varepsilon$-randomizing if for any state $\rho,\left\|\Phi(\rho)-\rho_{*}\right\|_{\infty} \leqslant \varepsilon / d$. The existence of $\varepsilon$-randomizing channels with $o\left(d^{2}\right)$ Kraus operators has several other implications 12, such as counteraxamples to multiplicativity conjectures (16].

It has been proved in [12] that if $\left(U_{i}\right)$ denote independent random matrices Haar-distributed on the unitary group $\mathcal{U}(d)$, then the quantum channel

$$
\begin{equation*}
\Phi: \rho \mapsto \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^{N} U_{i} \rho U_{i}^{\dagger} \tag{1}
\end{equation*}
$$

is $\varepsilon$-randomizing with high probability provided $N \geqslant C d \log d / \varepsilon^{2}$ for some constant $C$. The proof uses a discretization argument and the fact that the Haar measure satisfies subgaussian estimates. We show a simple trick that allows to drop a $\log d$ factor : $\Phi$ is $\varepsilon$-randomizing when $N \geqslant C d / \varepsilon^{2}$, this is our theorem i.

The Haar measure is a nice object from the theoretical point of view, but is often too complicated to implement for concrete situations. Let us say that a measure $\mu$ on $\mathcal{U}(d)$ is isotropic when $\int U \rho U^{\dagger} d \mu(U)=\rho_{*}$ for any state $\rho$. When $d=2^{k}$, an example of isotropic measure is given by assigning equal masses at $k$-wise tensor products of Pauli operators.

The following question was asked in (12): is the quantum channel $\Phi$ defined as (1]) $\varepsilon$-randomizing when $\left(U_{i}\right)$ are distributed according to any isotropic probability measure on $\mathcal{U}(d)$ ? We answer positively this question when $N \geqslant C d \log ^{6} d / \varepsilon^{2}$. This is our main result and appears as theorem 2. Note
that previous results appearing in the litterature 12, 2, 8] involved the weaker trace-norm approximation $\left\|\Phi(\rho)-\rho_{*}\right\|_{1} \leqslant \varepsilon$.

As opposed to the Haar measure, the measure $\mu$ need not have subgaussian tails, and we need more sophisticated tools to prove theorem 2. We use recent results on suprema of empirical processes in Banach spaces. After early work by Rudelson [14] and Guédon-Rudelson [11], a general sharp inequality was obtained by Guédon, Mendelson, Pajor and Tomczak-Jaegermann 10. This inequality is valid in any Banach space with a sufficiently regular equivalent norm, such as $\ell_{1}^{d}$. The problem of $\varepsilon$-randomizing channels involves the supremum of an empirical process in the trace-class space $S_{1}^{d}$ (non-commutative analogue of $\ell_{1}^{d}$ ), which enters perfectly this setting.

The paper is organised as follows. Section 2 contains background and precise statements of the theorems. Theorem 1 (for Haar measure) is proved in section 3. Theorem 2 (for a general measure) is proved in section 4 . Section 5 contains the needed facts about the geometry of the norms in Schatten classes.

Acknowledgement. I thank Andreas Winter for several e-mail exchanges on the topic, and I am very grateful to Alain Pajor for showing me that the results of 10 can be applied here.

## 2. Background and presentation of results

Thoughout the paper, the letter $C$ and $c$ denote absolute constants whose value may change from occurence to occurence. We usually do not pay too much attention to the value of these constants.
2.1. Schatten classes. We write $\mathcal{M}\left(\mathbf{C}^{d}\right)$ for the space of complex $d \times d$ matrices. If $A \in \mathcal{M}\left(\mathbf{C}^{d}\right)$, let $s_{1}(A), \ldots, s_{d}(A)$ denote the singular values of $A$ (defined as the square roots of the eigenvalues of $A A^{\dagger}$ ). For $1 \leqslant p \leqslant \infty$, the Schatten $p$-norm is defined as

$$
\|A\|_{p}=\left(\sum_{i=1}^{d} s_{i}(A)^{p}\right)^{1 / p}
$$

For $p=\infty$, the definition should be understood as $\|A\|_{\infty}=\max s_{i}(A)$ and coincides with the usual operator norm. It is well-known (see [5], section IV.2) that $\left(\mathcal{M}\left(\mathbf{C}^{d}\right),\|\cdot\|_{p}\right)$ is a complex normed space, denoted $S_{p}^{d}$ and called Schatten class. The space $S_{p}^{d}$ is the non-commutative analogue of the space $\ell_{p}^{d}$.

The Schatten 2-norm (sometimes called Hilbert-Schmidt or Frobenius norm) is a Hilbert space norm associated to the inner product $\langle A, B\rangle=\operatorname{Tr} A^{\dagger} B$. This Hermitian structure allows to identify $\mathcal{M}\left(\mathbf{C}^{d}\right)$ with its dual space. Duality on Schatten norms holds as in the commutative case: if $p$ and $q$ are conjugate exponents (i.e. $1 / p+1 / q=1$ ), then the normed space dual to $S_{p}^{d}$ coincides with $S_{q}^{d}$.
2.2. Completely positive maps. We write $\mathcal{M}_{\mathrm{sa}}\left(\mathbf{C}^{d}\right)$ (resp. $\mathcal{M}_{+}\left(\mathbf{C}^{d}\right)$ ) for the set of self-adjoint (resp. nonnegative) $d \times d$ matrices. A linear map $\Phi: \mathcal{M}\left(\mathbf{C}^{d}\right) \rightarrow \mathcal{M}\left(\mathbf{C}^{d}\right)$ is said to be positive if $\Phi\left(\mathcal{M}_{+}\left(\mathbf{C}^{d}\right)\right) \subset \mathcal{M}_{+}\left(\mathbf{C}^{d}\right)$. Moreover, $\Phi$ is said to be completely positive if for any $k \in \mathbf{N}$, the map

$$
\Phi \otimes \operatorname{Id}_{\mathcal{M}\left(\mathbf{C}^{k}\right)}: \mathcal{M}\left(\mathbf{C}^{d} \otimes \mathbf{C}^{k}\right) \rightarrow \mathcal{M}\left(\mathbf{C}^{d} \otimes \mathbf{C}^{k}\right)
$$

is positive (we use freely the canonical identification $\mathcal{M}\left(\mathbf{C}^{d}\right) \otimes \mathcal{M}\left(\mathbf{C}^{k}\right) \approx \mathcal{M}\left(\mathbf{C}^{d} \otimes \mathbf{C}^{k}\right)$ ).
If $\left(e_{i}\right)_{0 \leqslant i \leqslant d-1}$ denotes the canonical basis of $\mathbf{C}^{d}$, let $E_{i j}=\left|e_{i}\right\rangle\left\langle e_{j}\right|$. To $\Phi: \mathcal{M}\left(\mathbf{C}^{d}\right) \rightarrow \mathcal{M}\left(\mathbf{C}^{d}\right)$ we associate $A_{\Phi} \in \mathcal{M}\left(\mathbf{C}^{d} \otimes \mathbf{C}^{d}\right)$ defined as

$$
A_{\Phi}=\sum_{i, j=1}^{d} E_{i j} \otimes \Phi\left(E_{i j}\right)
$$

The matrix $A_{\Phi}$ is called the Choi matrix of $\Phi$; it is well-known [7] that $\Phi$ is completely positive if and only if $A_{\Phi}$ is positive. Therefore, the set of completely positive operators on $\mathcal{M}\left(\mathbf{C}^{d}\right)$ is in one-to-one correspondance with $\mathcal{M}_{+}\left(\mathbf{C}^{d} \otimes \mathbf{C}^{d}\right)$. This corresponance is known as the Choi-Jamiotkowski isomorphism.

The spectral decomposition of $A_{\Phi}$ implies now the following: any completely positive map $\Phi$ on $\mathcal{M}\left(\mathbf{C}^{d}\right)$ can be decomposed as

$$
\begin{equation*}
\Phi: X \mapsto \sum_{i=1}^{N} V_{i} X V_{i}^{\dagger} \tag{2}
\end{equation*}
$$

Here $V_{1}, \ldots, V_{N}$ are elements of $\mathcal{M}\left(\mathbf{C}^{d}\right)$. This decomposition is called a Kraus decomposition of $\Phi$ of length $N$. The minimal length of a Kraus decomposition of $\Phi$ (called Kraus rank) is equal to the rank of the Choi matrix $A_{\Phi}$. In particular it is always bounded by $d^{2}$.
2.3. States and the completely depolarizing channel. A state on $\mathbf{C}^{d}$ is a element of $\mathcal{M}_{+}\left(\mathbf{C}^{d}\right)$ with trace 1. We write $\mathcal{D}\left(\mathbf{C}^{d}\right)$ for the set of states ; it is a compact convex set with (real) dimension $d^{2}-1$. If $x \in \mathbf{C}^{d}$ is a unit vector, we write $P_{x}=|x\rangle\langle x|$ for the associated rank one projector. The state $P_{x}$ is called a pure state, and it follows from spectral decomposition that any state is a convex combination of pure states. A central role is played by the maximally mixed state $\rho_{*}=\mathrm{Id} / d$ ( $\rho_{*}$ is sometimes called the random state).

A quantum channel $\Phi: \mathcal{M}\left(\mathbf{C}^{d}\right) \rightarrow \mathcal{M}\left(\mathbf{C}^{d}\right)$ is a completly positive map which preserves trace: for any $X \in \mathcal{M}\left(\mathbf{C}^{d}\right), \operatorname{Tr} \Phi(X)=\operatorname{Tr} X$. Note that a quantum channel maps states to states. The trace-preserving condition reads on the Kraus decomposition (2) as

$$
\sum_{i=1}^{N} V_{i}^{\dagger} V_{i}=\mathrm{Id}
$$

An example of quantum channel that plays a central role in quantum information theory is the (completely) randomizing channel (also called completely depolarizing channel) $R: \mathcal{M}\left(\mathbf{C}^{d}\right) \rightarrow \mathcal{M}\left(\mathbf{C}^{d}\right)$.

$$
R: X \rightarrow \operatorname{Tr} X \cdot \frac{\mathrm{Id}}{d}
$$

The randomizing channel maps every state to $\rho_{*}$. The Choi matrix of $R$ is $A_{R}=\operatorname{Id}_{\mathbf{C}^{d} \otimes \mathbf{C}^{d}}$. Since $A_{R}$ has full rank, any Kraus decomposition of $R$ must have length (at least) $d^{2}$. An explicit decomposition can be written using Fourier-type unitary operators: let $\omega=\exp (2 i \pi / d)$ and $A$ and $B$ the matrices defined as

$$
\begin{equation*}
A\left(e_{j}\right)=e_{j+1 \bmod d} \quad B\left(e_{j}\right)=\omega^{j} e_{j} \tag{3}
\end{equation*}
$$

For $1 \leqslant j, k \leqslant d$, define $V_{j, k}$ as the product $B^{j} A^{k}$. Note that $V_{j, k}$ belongs to the unitary group $\mathcal{U}(d)$. A routine calculation (see also section 2.5) shows that for any $X \in \mathcal{M}\left(\mathbf{C}^{d}\right)$,

$$
\frac{1}{d^{2}} \sum_{j, k=1}^{d} V_{j, k} X V_{j, k}^{\dagger}=\operatorname{Tr} X \cdot \frac{\mathrm{Id}}{d}
$$

This is a Kraus decomposition of the randomizing channel.
2.4. $\varepsilon$-randomizing channels. We are interested in approximating the randomizing channel $R$ by channels with low Kraus rank. Following Hayden, Leung, Shor and Winter 12], a quantum channel $\Phi$ is called $\varepsilon$-randomizing if for any state $\rho \in \mathcal{D}\left(\mathbf{C}^{d}\right)$,

$$
\left\|\Phi(\rho)-\rho_{*}\right\| \leqslant \frac{\varepsilon}{d}
$$

It is equivalent to say that the spectrum of $\Phi(\rho)$ is contained in $[(1-\varepsilon) / d,(1+\varepsilon) / d]$ for any state $\rho$. It has been proved in 12 that there exist $\varepsilon$-randomizing channels with Kraus rank equal to $C d \log d / \varepsilon^{2}$ for some constant $d$. This is much smaller that $d^{2}$ (the Kraus rank of $R$ ). The construction is simple: generate independent random Kraus operators according to the Haar measure on $\mathcal{U}(d)$ and show that the induced quantum channel is $\varepsilon$-randomizing with nonzero probability. A key step in the proof is a discretization argument. We show that a simple trick improves the efficiency of the argument from (12) to prove the following

Theorem 1 (Haar-generated $\varepsilon$-randomizing channels). Let $\left(U_{i}\right)_{1 \leqslant i \leqslant N}$ be independent random matrices Haar-distributed on the unitary group $\mathcal{U}(d)$. Let $\Phi: \mathbf{C}^{d} \rightarrow \mathbf{C}^{d}$ be the quantum channel defined by

$$
\Phi(\rho)=\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{N} U_{i} \rho U_{i}^{\dagger}
$$

Assume that $0<\varepsilon<1$ and $N \geqslant C d / \varepsilon^{2}$. Then the channel $\Phi$ is $\varepsilon$-randomizing with nonzero probability.
As often with random constructions, we actually prove that the conclusion holds true with large probability: the probability of failure is exponentially small in $d$.

It is clear that the way $N$ depends on $d$ is optimal: if $\Phi$ is a $\varepsilon$-randomizing channel with $\varepsilon<1$, its Choi rank must be at least $d$. This is because for any pure state $P_{x}, \Phi\left(P_{x}\right)$ must have full rank. The dependence in $\varepsilon$ is sharp for channels as constructed here, since lemma 2 below is sharp. However, it is not clear whether families of $\varepsilon$-randomizing channels with a better dependence in $\varepsilon$ can be found using a different construction, possibly partially deterministic.

One checks (using the value $c=1 / 6$ from 12 in lemma 3 and optimizing over the net size) that the constant in theorem 11 can the chosen to, e.g., $C=150$. This is presumably far from optimal.
2.5. Randomizing measures on unitary matrices. Although the quantum channels constructed in theorem 1 have minimal Kraus rank, it can be argued that Haar-distributed random matrices are hard to generate in real-life situations. We introduce a wide class of measures on $\mathcal{U}(d)$ that may replace the Haar measure.

Definition. Say that a probability measure $\mu$ on $\mathcal{U}(d)$ is isotropic if for any $X \in \mathcal{M}\left(\mathbf{C}^{d}\right)$,

$$
\int_{\mathcal{U}(d)} U X U^{\dagger} d \mu(U)=\operatorname{Tr} X \cdot \frac{\mathrm{Id}}{d}
$$

Similarly, a $\mathcal{U}(d)$-valued random vector is called isotropic if its law is isotropic.
Lemma 1. Let $U=\left(U_{i j}\right)$ be a $\mathcal{U}(d)$-valued random vector. The following assertions are equivalent
(1) $U$ is isotropic.
(2) For any $X \in \mathcal{M}\left(\mathbf{C}^{d}\right), \mathbf{E}\left|\operatorname{Tr} U X^{\dagger}\right|^{2}=\frac{1}{d}\|X\|_{2}^{2}$.
(3) For any indices $i, j, k, l, \mathbf{E} U_{i j} \overline{U_{k l}}=\frac{1}{d} \delta_{i, k} \delta_{j, l}$.

Proof. Implications $(3) \Rightarrow(1)$ and $(3) \Rightarrow(2)$ are easily checked by expansion. For $(1) \Rightarrow(3)$, simply take $X=\left|e_{j}\right\rangle\left\langle e_{k}\right|$. Idendity (2) implies after polarization that for any $A, B \in \mathcal{M}\left(\mathbf{C}^{d}\right)$,

$$
\mathbf{E}\left[\overline{\operatorname{Tr}\left(U A^{\dagger}\right)} \operatorname{Tr}\left(U B^{\dagger}\right)\right]=\frac{1}{d} \operatorname{Tr}\left(A B^{\dagger}\right)
$$

from which (3) follows.
Condition (3) of the lemma means that the covariance matrix of $U$ - which is an element of $\mathcal{M}\left(\mathcal{M}\left(\mathbf{C}^{d}\right)\right)$ - is a multiple of the identity matrix.

Of course the Haar measure is isotropic. Other examples are provided by discrete measures. Let $\mathscr{U}=\left\{U_{1}, \ldots, U_{d^{2}}\right\}$ be a family of unitary matrices, which are mutally orthogonal in the following sense: if $i \neq j$, then $\operatorname{Tr} U_{i} U_{j}^{\dagger}=0$. For example, one can take $\mathscr{U}=\left\{B^{j} A^{k}\right\}_{1 \leqslant j, k \leqslant d}, A, B$ defined as (3). Then the uniform probability measure on $\mathscr{U}$ is isotropic. Indeed, any $X \in \mathcal{M}\left(\mathbf{C}^{d}\right)$ can be decomposed as $X=\sum x_{i} U_{i}$ and condition (2) of lemma 1 is easily checked.

If we specialise to $d=2$, we obtain a random Pauli operator: assign probability $1 / 4$ to each of the following matrices to get a isotropic measure

$$
\sigma_{0}=\left(\begin{array}{cc}
1 & 0 \\
0 & 1
\end{array}\right), \quad \sigma_{1}=\left(\begin{array}{cc}
0 & 1 \\
1 & 0
\end{array}\right), \quad \sigma_{2}=\left(\begin{array}{cc}
0 & -i \\
i & 0
\end{array}\right), \quad \sigma_{3}=\left(\begin{array}{cc}
1 & 0 \\
0 & -1
\end{array}\right)
$$

It is straightforward to check that isotropic vectors tensorize: if $X_{1} \in \mathcal{U}\left(d_{1}\right)$ and $X_{2} \in \mathcal{U}\left(d_{2}\right)$ are isotropic, then so is $X_{1} \otimes X_{2} \in \mathcal{U}\left(d_{1} d_{2}\right)$. If we work on $\mathcal{M}\left(\left(\mathbf{C}^{2}\right)^{\otimes k}\right)$, which corressponds to a set of $k$ qubits, a natural isotropic measure is therefore obtained by choosing independently a Pauli matrix on each qubit, i.e. assigning mass $1 / 4^{k}$ to the matrix $\sigma_{i_{1}} \otimes \cdots \otimes \sigma_{i_{k}}$ for any $i_{1}, \ldots, i_{k} \in\{0,1,2,3\}^{k}$.
2.6. $\varepsilon$-randomizing channels for an isotropic measure. We can now state our main theorem asserting that up to logarithmic terms, the Haar measure can be replaced in theorem 1 by simpler notions of randomness. We first state our result

Theorem 2 (General $\varepsilon$-randomizing channels). Let $\mu$ be an isotropic measure on the unitary group $\mathcal{U}(d)$. Let $\left(U_{i}\right)_{1 \leqslant i \leqslant N}$ be independent $\mu$-distributed random matrices, and $\Phi: \mathbf{C}^{d} \rightarrow \mathbf{C}^{d}$ be the quantum channel defined as

$$
\begin{equation*}
\Phi(\rho)=\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{N} U_{i} \rho U_{i}^{\dagger} \tag{4}
\end{equation*}
$$

Assume that $0<\varepsilon<1$ and $N \geqslant C d(\log d)^{6} / \varepsilon^{2}$. Then the channel $\Phi$ is $\varepsilon$-randomizing with nonzero probability.

Theorem 2 applies in particular for product of random Pauli matrices as described in the previous section. It is of interest for certain cryptographic applications to know that $\varepsilon$-randomizing channels can be realized using Pauli matrices.

As opposed to theorem 1, the conclusion of theorem 2 is not proved to hold with exponentially large probability. Applying the theorem with $\varepsilon \eta$ instead of $\varepsilon$ and using Markov inequality shows that $\Phi$ is $\varepsilon$-randomizing with probability larger than $1-\eta$ provided $N \geqslant C d \log ^{6} d /\left(\varepsilon^{2} \eta^{2}\right)$.

The $\log ^{6} d$ appearing in theorem 2 is certainly non optimal (see also the end of section 5). However, some power of $\log d$ is needed, as shown by the next proposition.

Proposition. Let $A, B$ defined as (3) and $\mu$ be the uniform measure on the set $\left\{B^{j} A^{k}\right\}_{1 \leqslant j, k \leqslant d}$. Consider $\left(X_{i}\right)$ independent $\mu$-distributed random unitary matrices. If the quantum channel $\Phi$ defined as (4) is $\frac{1}{2}$-randomizing with probability larger than $1 / 2$, then $N \geqslant c d \log d$.

Proof. We will rely on the following standard result in elementary probability theory known as the coupon collector's problem (see [9], Chapter 1, example 5.10): if we choose independently and uniformly random elements among a set of $d$ elements, the mean (and also the median) number of choices before getting all elements at least once is equivalent to $d \log d$ for large $d$.

In our case, remember that $\omega=\exp (2 i \pi / d)$ and for $0 \leqslant j \leqslant d-1$, define $x_{j} \in \mathbf{C}^{d}$ as

$$
x_{j}=\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{d}}, \frac{\omega^{j}}{\sqrt{d}}, \frac{\omega^{2 j}}{\sqrt{d}}, \ldots, \frac{\omega^{(d-1) j}}{\sqrt{d}}\right) .
$$

Note that $\mathscr{B}=\left(x_{j}\right)_{0 \leqslant j \leqslant d-1}$ is an orthonormal basis of $\mathbf{C}^{d}$ and that $B^{j} A^{k} x_{0}=x_{j}$. Consequently, if $U$ is $\mu$-distributed, the random state $U P_{x_{0}} U^{\dagger}$ equals $P_{x_{j}}$ with probability $1 / d$. In the basis $\mathscr{B}$, the matrix $\Phi\left(P_{x_{0}}\right)$ is diagonal. Note that if $\Phi$ is $\frac{1}{2}$-randomizing, then $\Phi(\rho)$ must have full rank for any state $\rho$. The reduction to the coupon collector's problem is now immediate.

## 3. Proof of theorem 11: HaAr-distributed unitary operators.

The scheme of the proof is similar to 12. We need two lemmas from there. The first is a deviation inequality sometimes known as Bernstein's inequality. The second is proved by a volumetric argument.

Lemma 2 (Lemma II. 3 in 12]). Let $\varphi, \psi$ be pure states on $\mathbf{C}^{d}$ and $\left(U_{i}\right)_{1 \leqslant i \leqslant N}$ be independent Haardistributed random unitary matrices. Then for every $0<\delta<1$,

$$
\mathbf{P}\left(\left|\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{N} \operatorname{Tr}\left(U_{i} \varphi U_{i}^{\dagger} \psi\right)-\frac{1}{d}\right| \geqslant \frac{\delta}{d}\right) \leqslant 2 \exp \left(-c \delta^{2} N\right)
$$

Lemma 3 (Lemma II. 4 in 12). For $0<\delta<1$ there exists a set $\mathcal{N}$ of pure states on $\mathbf{C}^{d}$ with $|\mathcal{N}| \leqslant(5 / \delta)^{2 d}$, such that for every pure state $\varphi$ on $\mathbf{C}^{d}$, there exists $\varphi_{0} \in \mathcal{N}$ such that $\left\|\varphi-\varphi_{0}\right\|_{1} \leqslant \delta$. Such a set $\mathcal{N}$ is called a $\delta$-net.

The improvement on the result of 12 will follow from the next lemma
Lemma 4 (Computing norms on nets). Let $\Delta: \mathcal{B}\left(\mathbf{C}^{d}\right) \rightarrow \mathcal{B}\left(\mathbf{C}^{d}\right)$ be a Hermitian-preserving linear map. Let $A$ be the quantity

$$
A=\sup _{\varphi \in \mathcal{D}\left(\mathbf{C}^{d}\right)}\|\Delta(\varphi)\|_{\infty}=\sup _{\varphi, \psi \in \mathcal{D}\left(\mathbf{C}^{d}\right)}|\operatorname{Tr} \psi \Delta(\varphi)|
$$

Let $\mathcal{N}$ be a $\delta$-net as provided by lemma 6. We can evaluate $A$ as follows

$$
A \leqslant \frac{1}{1-2 \delta} B
$$

where

$$
B=\sup _{\varphi_{0}, \psi_{0} \in \mathcal{N}}\left|\operatorname{Tr} \psi_{0} \Delta\left(\varphi_{0}\right)\right|
$$

Proof of lemma 母. First note that for any self-adjoint operators $a, b \in \mathcal{B}\left(\mathbf{C}^{d}\right)$, we have

$$
\begin{equation*}
|\operatorname{Tr} b \Delta(a)| \leqslant A\|a\|_{1}\|b\|_{1} \tag{5}
\end{equation*}
$$

By a convexity argument, the supremum in $A$ can be restricted to pure states. Given pure states $\varphi, \psi \in \mathcal{D}\left(\mathbf{C}^{d}\right)$, let $\varphi_{0}, \psi_{0} \in \mathcal{N}$ so that $\left\|\varphi-\varphi_{0}\right\|_{1} \leqslant \delta,\left\|\psi-\psi_{0}\right\|_{1} \leqslant \delta$. Then

$$
|\operatorname{Tr} \psi \Delta(\varphi)| \leqslant\left|\operatorname{Tr}\left(\psi-\psi_{0}\right) \Delta(\varphi)\right|+\left|\operatorname{Tr} \psi_{0} \Delta\left(\varphi-\varphi_{0}\right)\right|+\left|\operatorname{Tr} \psi_{0} \Delta\left(\varphi_{0}\right)\right|
$$

Using twice (5) and taking supremum over $\varphi, \psi$ gives $A \leqslant \delta A+\delta A+B$, hence the result.
Proof of the theorem. Let $R$ be the randomizing channel. Fix a $\frac{1}{4}$-net $\mathcal{N}$ with $|\mathcal{N}| \leqslant 20^{2 d}$, as provided by lemma 3. Let $\Delta=R-\Phi$. and $A, B$ as in lemma 4. Here $A$ and $B$ are random quantities and it follows from lemma 4 that

$$
\mathbf{P}\left(A \geqslant \frac{\varepsilon}{d}\right) \leqslant \mathbf{P}\left(B \geqslant \frac{\varepsilon}{2 d}\right) .
$$

Using the union bound and lemma 2, we get

$$
\mathbf{P}\left(B \geqslant \frac{\varepsilon}{2 d}\right) \leqslant 20^{4 d} \cdot 2 \exp \left(-c \varepsilon^{2} N / 4\right)
$$

This is less that 1 if $N \geqslant C d / \varepsilon^{2}$, for some constant $C$.

## 4. Proof of theorem 2: general unitary operators.

We will deduce theorem 2 from the following result about random vectors in Schatten classes.
Theorem 3. Let $X$ be a $\mathcal{M}\left(\mathbf{C}^{d}\right)$-valued random vector and $X_{1}, \ldots, X_{N}$ be independent copies of $X$. Let $1<p<2$ and $q=p /(p-1)$ be the conjugate exponant. Define $A$ and $\sigma$ as

$$
\begin{gathered}
A=q^{5 / 2} \sqrt{\frac{\log N}{N}}\left(\mathbf{E} \max _{1 \leqslant j \leqslant N}\left\|X_{k}\right\|_{q}^{2}\right)^{1 / 2} . \\
\sigma^{2}=\sup _{Y \in B_{S_{p}^{d}}} \mathbf{E}\left|\operatorname{Tr} X Y^{\dagger}\right|^{2}
\end{gathered}
$$

Then

$$
\left.\left.\mathbf{E} \sup _{Y \in B_{S_{p}^{d}}}\left|\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{N}\right| \operatorname{Tr} X_{j} Y^{\dagger}\right|^{2}-\mathbf{E}\left|\operatorname{Tr} X Y^{\dagger}\right|^{2} \right\rvert\, \leqslant C\left(A^{2}+\sigma A\right)
$$

As usual, $C$ denotes an absolute consant.
Note that the dimension $d$ does not appear in the theorem, which can be actually stated in infinite dimension. This is a special case of a general theorem about random vectors in Banach spaces (11, 10), see section 5 .

Proof of theorem R. Let $Q$ be the quantity to estimate (which, by a convexity argument, can be restricted to pure states)

$$
\begin{aligned}
Q & : \left.=\sup _{\rho \in \mathcal{D}\left(\mathbf{C}^{d}\right)}\left\|\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{N} U_{i} \rho U_{i}^{\dagger}-\frac{\mathrm{Id}}{d}\right\|_{\infty} \quad=\left.\sup _{|x|=|y|=1}\left|\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{N}\right|\left\langle y, U_{i} x\right\rangle\right|^{2}-\frac{1}{d} \right\rvert\, \\
& \left.=\sup _{|x|=|y|=1}\left|\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{N}\right| \operatorname{Tr} U_{i}|x\rangle\left\langle\left. y\right|^{2}-\frac{1}{d}\right| \leqslant\left.\sup _{Y \in B_{S_{1}^{d}}}\left|\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{N}\right| \operatorname{Tr} U_{i} Y^{\dagger}\right|^{2}-\mathbf{E}\left|\operatorname{Tr} U_{i} Y^{\dagger}\right|^{2} \right\rvert\, .
\end{aligned}
$$

We used the equality $\left.\mathbf{E}\left|\operatorname{Tr} U_{i}\right| x\right\rangle\left.\langle y|\right|^{2}=1 / d$ which follows from lemma 1 . Let $q=\log d$ and $p=\frac{\log d}{\log d-1}$ be the conjugate exponent. We are going to approximate the Schatten 1-norm by the Schatten $p$-norm. It is elementary to check that for $Y \in \mathcal{M}\left(\mathbf{C}^{d}\right)$,

$$
\begin{gathered}
\|Y\|_{\infty} \leqslant\|Y\|_{q} \leqslant e\|Y\|_{\infty} \\
\|Y\|_{p} \leqslant\|Y\|_{1} \leqslant e\|Y\|_{p}
\end{gathered}
$$

Therefore, we can replace $S_{1}^{d}$ by $S_{p}^{d}$ in the above supremum. We now estimate the constants $A$ and $\sigma$ appearing in theorem 3.

$$
A \leqslant e(\log d)^{5 / 2} \sqrt{\frac{\log N}{N}}
$$

By lemma [1, $\mathbf{E}\left|\operatorname{Tr} X Y^{\dagger}\right|=\frac{1}{d}\|Y\|_{2}^{2}$, and

$$
\sigma^{2}=\frac{1}{d} \sup _{Y \in B_{S_{p}^{2}}}\|Y\|_{2}^{2}=\frac{1}{d}
$$

It is elementary to check that $C\left(A^{2}+A \sigma\right) \leqslant \varepsilon / d$ provided $N \geqslant C^{\prime} d \log ^{6} d / \varepsilon^{2}$. For such $N$, we have $\mathbf{E} Q \leqslant \varepsilon / d$, and therefore $Q \leqslant \varepsilon / d$ with nonzero probability.

## 5. Appendix: geometry of Banach spaces and Schatten clases

We denote by $(E,\|\cdot\|)$ a (real or complex) Banach space (actually, in our applications $E$ will be finite-dimensional). Let $\left(E^{*},\|\cdot\|_{*}\right)$ denote the dual Banach space. We need introduce some geometric parameters associated to $E$.
Definition. A Banach space $(E,\|\cdot\|)$ is said to have type 2 if there exists a constant $T_{2}$ so that for any finite sequence $y_{1}, \ldots, y_{N}$ of vectors of $E$, we have

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathbf{E}\left\|\sum_{i=1}^{N} \varepsilon_{i} y_{i}\right\|^{2} \leqslant T_{2} \sum_{i=1}^{N}\left\|y_{i}\right\|^{2} \tag{6}
\end{equation*}
$$

The smallest possible $T_{2}$ is called the type 2 constant of $E$ and denoted $T_{2}(E)$. Here, the expectation $\mathbf{E}$ is taken with respect to a sequence $\left(\varepsilon_{i}\right)$ of indepedent random variables taking values +1 and -1 with probability $\frac{1}{2}$.

A Hilbert space has type 2 with constant 1, and there is acutally equality in (6) (this is the parallelotope identity). For Schatten classes, we have the following result due to Tomczak-Jaegermann (15).

Theorem 4. If $q \geqslant 2$, then $S_{q}^{d}$ has type 2 with the estimate

$$
T_{2}\left(S_{q}^{d}\right) \leqslant C \sqrt{q}
$$

The following notion describes more precisely the geometry of the norm $\|\cdot\|$
Definition. A Banach space $(E,\|\cdot\|)$ has modulus of convexity of power type 2 with constant $\lambda$ if for any $y, z \in E$, we have

$$
\|y\|^{2}+\lambda^{-2}\|z\|^{2} \leqslant \frac{1}{2}\left(\|y+z\|^{2}+\|y-z\|^{2}\right)
$$

Both notions are related: if $E$ has a modulus of convexity of power type 2 , then $E^{*}$ has type 2 (see [13], theorem 1.e.16). The geometry of $S_{p}^{d}$ has been studied, and the following inequality is a sharp strengthening of the classical Clarkson inequalities for $L_{p}$ space. It has been proved by Ball, Carlen and Lieb 4, refining on early work by Tomczak-Jaegermann 15.
Theorem 5. For $p \leqslant 2$, the following inequality holds for $A, B \in \mathcal{M}\left(\mathbf{C}^{d}\right)$

$$
\|A\|_{p}^{2}+(p-1)\|B\|_{p}^{2} \leqslant \frac{1}{2}\left(\|A+B\|_{p}^{2}+\|A-B\|_{p}^{2}\right)
$$

Therefore, $S_{p}^{d}$ has modulus of convexity of power type 2 with constant $1 / \sqrt{p-1}$.
We now have all ingredients to see that theorem 3 is a special case of the following result.
Theorem 6. Let $E$ be a Banach space with modulus of convexity of power 2 with constant $\lambda$. Let $X$ be a E-valued random vector and denote by $\left(X_{i}\right)$ independent copies of $X$. Let

$$
\begin{gathered}
A=C \lambda^{4} T_{2}\left(E^{*}\right) \sqrt{\frac{\log N}{N}}\left(\mathbf{E} \max _{1 \leqslant j \leqslant N}\left\|X_{j}\right\|_{*}^{2}\right)^{1 / 2} \\
\sigma^{2}=\sup _{y \in B_{E}} \mathbf{E}|\langle X, y\rangle|^{2}
\end{gathered}
$$

Then

$$
\left.\left.\mathbf{E} \sup _{y \in B_{E}}\left|\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{N}\right|\left\langle X_{j}, y\right\rangle\right|^{2}-\mathbf{E}|\langle X, y\rangle|^{2} \right\rvert\, \leqslant C\left(A^{2}+\sigma A\right)
$$

Theorem 6 appears in this exact formulation in 10], and refined on previous results of 11. Unfortunalety, we cannot write a self-contained argument for our theorem 2 since the proof of theorem 6 uses sophisticated tools:
(1) A certain Gaussian process associated to the problem has to be estimated using Talagrand's majorizing measure theorem. However, it could be replaced by the simpler Dudley integral.
(2) Another technical point is related to the duality conjecture for entropy numbers (see [3] for statement and recent results on this problem). If the conjecture were true, it would provide a proof of theorem 2 with the estimate $N \geqslant C(\varepsilon) d \log ^{4} d$. However the conjecture is still open, but the proof of theorem 6] uses partial results from [6] asserting that duality holds when the underlying Banach space has a modulus of convexity of power type 2; this costs extra logarithmic factors and leads to $d \log ^{6} d$ in the final estimate.
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