

Optimal Trace-Distance Bounds for Free-Fermionic States: Testing and Improved Tomography

Lennart Bittel^{1,*}, Antonio Anna Mele^{1,2,†}, Jens Eisert^{1,‡} and Lorenzo Leone^{1,§}

¹*Dahlem Center for Complex Quantum Systems, Freie Universität Berlin, 14195 Berlin, Germany*

²*Theoretical Division, Los Alamos National Laboratory, Los Alamos, New Mexico 87545, USA*



(Received 14 January 2025; revised 23 April 2025; accepted 10 June 2025; published 3 September 2025)

Free-fermionic states, also known as fermionic Gaussian states, represent an important class of quantum states that are ubiquitous in physics. They are uniquely and efficiently described by their correlation matrix. However, in practical experiments, the correlation matrix can only be estimated with finite accuracy. This raises the question: How does the error in estimating the correlation matrix affect the trace-distance error of the state? We show that if the correlation matrix is known with an error ε , the trace-distance error also scales as ε (and vice versa). Specifically, we provide distance bounds between (both pure and mixed) free-fermionic states in relation to their correlation-matrix distance. Our analysis also extends to cases in which one state may not be free-fermionic. Importantly, we leverage our preceding results to derive significant advancements in property testing and tomography of free-fermionic states. Property testing involves determining whether an unknown state is close to or far from being a free-fermionic state. We first demonstrate that any algorithm capable of testing arbitrary (possibly mixed) free-fermionic states would inevitably be inefficient, implying that there is no efficient strategy to estimate the non-Gaussianity of a state. Then, we present an efficient algorithm for testing low-rank free-fermionic states. For free-fermionic state tomography, we provide improved bounds on the sample complexity in the pure-state scenario, substantially improving over previous literature, and we generalize the efficient algorithm to mixed states, discussing its noise robustness.

DOI: [10.1103/prx6-nkfb](https://doi.org/10.1103/prx6-nkfb)

I. INTRODUCTION

As the construction of quantum devices progresses, there is a growing emphasis on developing efficient learning schemes to extract key diagnostic information from quantum systems [1,2]. The tasks of quantum certification and benchmarking [2] are crucial in any effort that aims to manipulate or prepare quantum states to the utmost precision—and hence to achieve predictive power of a sort. Extracting information from quantum systems is generally a challenging task, marred by obstructions in sample and computational complexity [3,4], but real-world scenarios often defy general no-go results.

Within the realm of fermionic quantum computation, free-fermionic states [5] (also known as fermionic Gaussian states, or states prepared by one-dimensional match-gate circuits [6,7]) play a crucial role. These states are ubiquitous in various physics domains, ranging from condensed matter [8], where they typically arise in “noninteracting” settings, to the study of analog quantum simulators with ultracold fermionic atoms [9,10], and quantum chemistry [11]. What makes free-fermionic states important for quantum computation is that they belong to a nontrivial physically interesting class of efficiently classically simulable states [6,7,12].

While these states may be considered ineffective for advantageous quantum computation, they serve as an essential milestone in the ongoing construction of fault-tolerant quantum devices: Their efficiency in classical simulation [6,7,12–15] and learning [16–19] provides a powerful tool for benchmarking quantum computation to ensure the correct functionality of quantum chips. This situation is not dissimilar from that of stabilizers and matrix-product states [20–27].

However, before implementing any benchmarking protocol based on free-fermionic states, experimentalists must verify that the state prepared on a quantum device is indeed

*Contact author: l.bittel@fu-berlin.de

†Contact author: a.mele@fu-berlin.de

‡Contact author: jense@fu-berlin.de

§Contact author: lorenzo.leone@fu-berlin.de

Published by the American Physical Society under the terms of the [Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/) license. Further distribution of this work must maintain attribution to the author(s) and the published article’s title, journal citation, and DOI.




FIG. 1. (a) Testing free-fermionic quantum states and improved tomography. (b) Any procedure aiming to solve the property-testing problem for possibly mixed free-fermionic states must have a sample complexity scaling exponentially with the system size. Low-rank free-fermionic states can, however, be efficiently and robustly tested. (c) We then show sample optimal bounds for quantum state tomography for free-fermionic states. Our results strongly rely on a new set of inequalities that we derive concerning the distance of free-fermionic states (which constitute a nonconvex set) and the distance between their respective, efficiently tractable, correlation matrices (which form a convex set).

close to a free-fermionic state. This verification process can be formalized as a *property-testing problem*, which aims to determine whether a given unknown (possibly mixed) state is close to or far from the set of free-fermionic states through measurements on the unknown state. Similarly, given access to an unknown free-fermionic state, the task of quantum state tomography is to derive a full classical, possibly efficient, description of the state.

Free-fermionic quantum states are uniquely characterized by a polynomial number of correlation functions, encoded in the *correlation matrix*. Experimentally feasible strategies for the learning tasks discussed above may thus rely on directly estimating these correlations to infer the nature of the state prepared on quantum processors. However, in real experiments, it is impossible to exactly determine correlation functions, resulting in only a *perturbed* version of the correlation matrix. This raises a natural question: *Given a correlation matrix estimated with some fixed accuracy, limited by finite sample constraints, what is the resulting error in describing the corresponding free-fermionic state?* In this work, we answer this question in different flavors, providing optimal perturbation bounds for free-fermionic states. These results, described below, not only provide fundamental theoretical tools and insights but also enable practical experimental applications.

The centerpiece of our work is the derivation of optimal perturbation bounds that relate the trace distance between two free-fermionic states to the distance between their correlation matrices. While it is widely understood that specifying a free-fermionic state can be achieved through

its correlation matrix, in practice, a fundamental problem is to determine the error in trace distance when estimating the correlation matrix of an unknown free-fermionic state up to a given precision. Our Theorem 1 thoroughly addresses this problem by providing two optimal perturbation bounds, applicable to pure and mixed states, respectively. To our knowledge, such bounds constitute a novelty in the literature. However, when restricted to the pure-state scenario, similar, yet not optimal, bounds are already known [16,18]—which we consistently improve upon. Additionally, we derive bounds relating the distance between a pure free-fermionic state and an arbitrary (possibly non-free-fermionic) state in terms of the difference between their correlation matrices. We also provide efficiently computable and experimentally measurable lower bounds for the minimum distance between a given state and the set of free-fermionic states, effectively quantifying the non-Gaussianity of the state.

We leverage our preceding results to derive significant advancements in applications such as property testing and tomography of free-fermionic states. Concerning property testing, we first show that any procedure aiming to solve the property-testing problem for possibly mixed free-fermionic states must have a sample complexity scaling exponentially with the size of the system. This, in particular, implies that there exists no efficient quantum algorithm for estimating the non-Gaussianity (i.e., distance to the free-fermionic set) of a general state. However, we then provide a sample and time-efficient algorithm to test (1) whether a general state is close to or far from the set of low-rank free-fermionic states and (2) whether a low-rank state is close to or far from the full set of free-fermionic states. Although seemingly similar, the two approaches differ significantly: ultimately, the choice between them rests entirely with the user and the amount of prior knowledge they have about the state.

Concerning quantum state tomography, we first improve the sample complexity for learning pure free-fermionic states: we show that $O(n^3/\varepsilon^2)$ copies are sufficient, whereas the best bound previously known [16–19] has required $O(n^5/\varepsilon^4)$ copies, where n is the number of fermionic modes (or qubits) and ε is the desired accuracy in trace distance. We then generalize the algorithm to encompass the case in which the unknown state is possibly mixed and show that $O(n^4/\varepsilon^2)$ samples are sufficient. Both tomography algorithms, for pure and mixed states, involve measuring the correlation matrix up to precision ε , which can be efficiently done using experimentally feasible measurements, and exploit Theorem 1 to transfer the error in trace distance. We remark that the scaling $O(\varepsilon^{-2})$ that we get is optimal for state tomography. We also analyze the noise robustness of our tomography algorithm, exploring whether it can still be reliably applied to an unknown state that is not exactly free-fermionic but is sufficiently close to the set of free-fermionic states. This

situation is particularly meaningful in experimental settings in which one aims to prepare and subsequently learn a free-fermionic state for benchmarking and/or verification purposes but the noise in the device makes the state preparation inexact. Our analysis reveals the noise robustness of our algorithm, making it not only a theoretical speculation but also experiment-friendly and suitable for practical scenarios.

On a practical note, it is worth emphasizing that our testing and learning algorithms may be considered experimentally feasible to implement both in a near-term fermionic analog quantum simulator setting, such as cold atoms in optical lattices [9,10], and in digital quantum computer settings, as they rely on easy-to-implement fermionic time evolutions and local measurements.

This work is organized as follows. We first introduce preliminaries. In Sec. III, we explain our more fundamental results concerning free-fermionic states. Then, relying on such results, in Secs. IV and V, respectively, we analyze property testing and tomography of free-fermionic states. Subsequently, in Secs. VI and VII, respectively, we discuss previous works in more detail and draw our conclusions. For readability, the proofs of our results are extensively reported in the appendixes. For a more detailed treatment, the interested reader is then referred to the more technical part of this work in Appendixes A, B, C, and D.

II. PRELIMINARIES

In this section, we briefly provide the basic definitions necessary for the main results of this work, which are presented later on. We consider systems of n fermionic modes (or qubits, by virtue of the Jordan-Wigner representation). Majorana operators are defined, through standard Pauli single-qubit operators $\{I, X_j, Z_j, Y_j\}_{j=1}^n$, as

$$\gamma_{2k-1} := \left(\prod_{j=1}^{k-1} Z_j \right) X_k, \quad \gamma_{2k} := \left(\prod_{j=1}^{k-1} Z_j \right) Y_k \quad (1)$$

for $k \in [n]$, where $[n] := \{1, \dots, n\}$. Given a quantum state ρ , its *correlation matrix* (or covariance matrix) $\Gamma(\rho)$ is a $2n \times 2n$ matrix with elements

$$[\Gamma(\rho)]_{j,k} = -\frac{i}{2} \text{Tr}([\gamma_j, \gamma_k] \rho), \quad (2)$$

where $j, k \in [2n]$. Correlation matrices are real and anti-symmetric, with (purely imaginary) eigenvalues in absolute value contained in the interval $[0, 1]$. A well-known result in linear algebra [28] asserts that any real antisymmetric matrix C (such as a correlation matrix) can be

decomposed into the so-called “normal form”:

$$C = Q \bigoplus_{j=1}^n \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \lambda_j \\ -\lambda_j & 0 \end{pmatrix} Q^T, \quad (3)$$

where Q is an orthogonal matrix in $O(2n)$ and $\lambda_j \geq 0$, for any $j \in [n]$, are dubbed as “normal” eigenvalues, ordered in increasing order.

Let $O(2n)$ denote the orthogonal group on a $2n$ -dimensional vector space. There is a bijection between $O(2n)$ and *free-fermionic unitaries* (or Gaussian) acting on an n -qubit system: for any orthogonal matrix $Q \in O(2n)$, a free-fermionic unitary U_Q is a unitary satisfying

$$U_Q^\dagger \gamma_\mu U_Q = \sum_{\nu=1}^{2n} Q_{\mu,\nu} \gamma_\nu, \quad (4)$$

for any $\mu \in [2n]$. This is a mild generalization of the $SO(2n)$ case, which is associated with physical parity-preserving Gaussian unitaries. For the sake of generality, we always present our results in the context of $O(2n)$. Another subset of physical Gaussian unitaries often considered across physics is that of the *particle-number-preserving* Gaussian unitary, which we explicitly define in the Appendix A 3 and mention how our results would reduce in such a case.

Under free-fermionic unitaries U_Q with associated orthogonal matrix $Q \in O(2n)$, correlation matrices transform simply as

$$\Gamma(U_Q \rho U_Q^\dagger) = Q \Gamma(\rho) Q^T. \quad (5)$$

A free-fermionic state ρ can be defined as a state that can be expressed as

$$\rho = U_Q \bigotimes_{j=1}^n \left(\frac{I + \lambda_j Z_j}{2} \right) U_Q^\dagger, \quad (6)$$

where U_Q is the free-fermionic unitary associated with $Q \in O(2n)$ and the $\{\lambda_j\}_{j=1}^n$ are real numbers, with $|\lambda_j| \leq 1$.

Any free-fermionic state can be uniquely specified by its correlation matrix (for more details, see Appendix A).

We frequently employ the Schatten p -norms as matrix norms, defined as $\|A\|_p := \text{tr}(|A|^p)^{1/p}$, for $|A| := \sqrt{A^\dagger A}$. From this, the *trace distance* between two quantum states ρ and σ is (half of) their one-norm difference,

$$\|\rho - \sigma\|_1 := \text{tr}(|\rho - \sigma|). \quad (7)$$

The trace distance has a nice operational meaning, since it is related to the maximum success probability of distinguishing two states via arbitrary quantum measurements [29].

Before concluding the section, let us introduce the set of free-fermionic states. In particular, in the rest of this work, two sets of free-fermionic states are considered: $\mathcal{G}_{\text{mixed}}$, comprising all free-fermionic quantum states, and $\mathcal{G}_R$, encompassing free-fermionic states with a rank at most $R = 2^r$, where $r \in [n]$. We denote by $\mathcal{G}_{\text{pure}}$ the set $\mathcal{G}_R$ for $R = 1$. As a matter of fact, we have $\mathcal{G}_{\text{pure}} \subset \mathcal{G}_R \subset \mathcal{G}_{\text{mixed}}$ for $1 < r < n$.

III. PERTURBATION BOUNDS

The primary motivation behind this work was to provide robust and experiment-friendly methods for testing and learning free-fermionic states. In achieving this goal, we have derived novel bounds between the distance of fermionic states with respect to their correlation matrices. These bounds are of independent interest and are instrumental for our subsequent testing and learning analysis. Below, we first present these bounds and briefly comment on their potential usage in other contexts beyond the scope of this work. The interested reader is referred to Appendix B for additional inequalities relating distance and correlation matrices.

A. Optimal trace-distance bounds for free-fermionic states

It is a well-known part of physics folklore that “to know a free-fermionic state is sufficient to its correlation matrix.” However, in practice, one can only derive an estimation of the correlation matrix and, consequently, one can only know the free-fermionic state approximately. As explained above, due to its information-theoretic operational meaning, the trace distance is the most meaningful notion of distance to characterize the inaccuracy in the approximation. It is, therefore, a fundamental problem in quantum information to determine what is the error in trace distance when estimating the correlation matrix associated with a free-fermionic state up to precision ε . We now introduce two new perturbation bounds for the trace distance of two free-fermionic states in relation to the distance between their correlation matrices.

Theorem 1 (Perturbation bounds). Let ψ and ϕ be two pure free-fermionic states. Then, it holds that

$$\|\psi - \phi\|_1 \leq \frac{1}{2} \|\Gamma(\psi) - \Gamma(\phi)\|_2, \quad (8)$$

while for ρ and σ being two possibly mixed free-fermionic states, it holds that

$$\|\rho - \sigma\|_1 \leq \frac{1}{2} \|\Gamma(\rho) - \Gamma(\sigma)\|_1. \quad (9)$$

The proof is detailed in Appendix B. The idea behind the proof for the pure-case formula is to use the exact fidelity

formula between two free-fermionic states [30] and derive tight bounds from it. For the mixed-case scenario, we create a path in the space of correlation matrices and tightly bound each small displacement using the Schatten 1-norm between correlation matrices. Both inequalities [Eqs. (8) and (9)] are essentially optimal, as they are obtained from “exact-derivative” calculations and are saturated for some families of states. In particular, the first bound is saturated for all pure three-mode states, while the second bound is saturated for all single-mode states. To showcase the relevance of our proof method, we mention that we have applied the same technique in a follow-up work [31] on free-bosonic states, demonstrating that this method yields an optimal trace-distance bound in these different systems as well, improving upon the state-of-the-art bounds available in the literature [32,33].

We now discuss the previous state-of-the-art bounds in the literature for free-fermionic states, which are improved upon by Theorem 1. To the best of our knowledge, no bound of this type has previously been known for mixed free-fermionic states in the literature. For pure states, a bound has been established in Ref. [18] but it holds only in the more restrictive setting of particle-number-conserving states and it is strictly weaker than ours. In particular, the trace distance between two free-fermionic states was upper bounded by the *square root* of the distance between their correlation matrices. In contrast, our bound in Eq. (8) eliminates the square root, yielding a strictly tighter estimate. This improvement translates directly into better performance for tomography, as we elaborate in the following section. In Appendix B, we also give the equivalent perturbation bounds for the state fidelity between fermionic states, which may be of independent interest.

Similarly to Theorem 1, the following theorem provides a lower bound for the trace distance between two pure Gaussian states in terms of their covariance matrices.

Theorem 2 (Lower bound on trace distance). Let ψ and ϕ be two nonorthogonal pure free-fermionic states. Then, it holds that

$$\|\psi - \phi\|_1 \geq 2 \sqrt{1 - \exp\left(-\frac{\|\Gamma(\psi) - \Gamma(\phi)\|_2^2}{16}\right)}. \quad (10)$$

The proof is detailed in Appendix B and it is closely related to the proof of Theorem 1.

Besides being fundamental for the efficiency of subsequent testing and tomography algorithms, we anticipate that the inequalities of Theorem 1 will have extensive applicability in the context of free fermions, both theoretically and experimentally. This is particularly relevant when one aims to bound the distance between two free-fermionic states (or overlap if one of them is pure) in terms of the norm difference of their correlation matrices

(which, we recall, are the $2n \times 2n$ matrices that uniquely characterize a free-fermionic state).

B. Perturbation bound beyond free-fermionic states

Imagine that one is aiming to prepare a pure free-fermionic state ψ on a quantum processor. In practice, an imperfect, possibly non-free-fermionic state ρ , and yet a close version of the state, is actually prepared. The task of quantum state certification [1] is to verify the almost correct preparation of the target state with respect to the trace distance. Here, we aim to understand how the trace distance between the target pure state ψ and the unknown state ρ is controlled by their respective correlation matrices, which can be efficiently measured in practical scenarios. Below, we upper bound the trace distance between a (target) perfect pure free-fermionic state ψ and a possibly non-free-fermionic mixed imperfect realization ρ through their respective correlation matrices.

Lemma 1 (Closeness of quantum states in terms of correlation matrices). Let ψ be a free-fermionic pure state and ρ be an arbitrary (possibly non-free-fermionic) quantum state. Then,

$$\|\psi - \rho\|_1 \leq \sqrt{\|\Gamma(\psi) - \Gamma(\rho)\|_1}. \quad (11)$$

Note that Eq. (11) constitutes a generalization of Theorem 1 to the broader scenario in which one of the states may be non-free-fermionic.

Assuming that the $2n \times 2n$ correlation matrix $\Gamma(\psi)$ of the target free-fermionic state ψ is known (which can be efficiently computed given any efficient classical description of ψ), Eq. (11) offers an efficient and direct method to verify the accurate preparation of ψ , as the right-hand side can be efficiently estimated experimentally. This is further discussed and proved in Appendix B.

C. Distance from the set of free-fermionic states: Computable measures of non-Gaussianity

Given a quantum state ρ , the minimal distance from the set of free-fermionic states provides an operational measure of non-Gaussianity for fermionic systems. We recall that the minimal trace distance from a given set of free states constitutes a universally valid measure that respects all the desired properties of resource monotones [34]. However, the problem with such a measure is that it is neither computable, involving a minimization procedure, nor experimentally measurable. Here, we present lower bounds on the trace distance between a quantum state ρ and the set of free-fermionic states that allow for the efficient estimation of non-Gaussianity in practical and experimental settings.

Lemma 2 (Lower bounds to trace distances). Let $R = 2^r$, with $r \in [0, n-1]$ being an integer. Let ρ be an arbitrary quantum state and let λ_{r+1} be the $(r+1)$ th smallest normal eigenvalue of its correlation matrix $\Gamma(\rho)$. Then,

$$\min_{\sigma \in \mathcal{G}_R} \|\rho - \sigma\|_1 \geq 1 - \lambda_{r+1}, \quad (12)$$

where $\mathcal{G}_R$ is the set of free-fermionic states with rank at most R . Conversely, if ρ is a arbitrary quantum state with rank $\leq 2^r$, then

$$\min_{\sigma \in \mathcal{G}_{\text{mixed}}} \|\rho - \sigma\|_1 \geq \frac{(1 - \lambda_{r+1})^{r+1}}{1 + (r+1)(1 - \lambda_{r+1})^r}. \quad (13)$$

Note that Eq. (12) requires no assumption on the state ρ and it lower bounds the distance from $\mathcal{G}_R$, the set of free-fermionic states with rank $\leq 2^r$. Conversely, with the promise that ρ has a rank at most 2^r , Eq. (13) establishes a lower bound on the distance from the set of all free-fermionic states $\mathcal{G}_{\text{mixed}}$. The proof for the above results can be found in Sec. B 4. For the pure-case scenario, we also find the upper bound

$$\min_{\sigma \in \mathcal{G}_{\text{pure}}} \|\rho - \sigma\|_1 \leq \sqrt{2 \sum_{j=1}^n (1 - \lambda_j)}. \quad (14)$$

As discussed in Appendix A, estimating the normal eigenvalues of the correlation matrix of a quantum state can be done efficiently by employing single-qubit Pauli or free-fermionic measurements. Thus, the above inequalities provide an efficient procedure to quantify how far a state is from the set of free-fermionic states in practical scenarios.

IV. PROPERTY TESTING

A central question in the background to our work is: Given an unknown quantum state ρ , is it close to or far from the set of free-fermionic states? Our goal is to identify scenarios in which this question can be addressed resource efficiently, provide algorithms with provable efficiency guarantees, and delineate situations in which answering the question is challenging. Let us formally define the problem.

Problem 1 (Property testing of free-fermionic states). Let $\varepsilon_B > \varepsilon_A \geq 0$. Given N copies of an unknown quantum state ρ , with the promise that it falls into one of two distinct situations,

- (1) *case A*—there exists a free-fermionic state $\sigma \in \mathcal{G}$ such that $\|\rho - \sigma\|_1 \leq \varepsilon_A$
- (2) *case B*—the state ρ is ε_B -far from all free-fermionic states σ , indicating $\min_{\sigma \in \mathcal{G}} \|\rho - \sigma\|_1 > \varepsilon_B$

determine whether the state is in case A or case B with high probability through measurements performed on the provided N state copies. Further specifications regarding the rank of the state ρ and the set of free-fermionic states $\mathcal{G} \equiv \mathcal{G}_{\text{pure}}, \mathcal{G}_{\text{mixed}}, \mathcal{G}_R$ must be provided.

While we show that solving Problem 1 in its full generality requires an exponential amount of resources, rendering it unfeasible for practical purposes, we present algorithms capable of efficiently solving it under certain assumptions about the state under examination or by restricting the set of considered free-fermionic states.

When no prior assumptions on the state ρ and no restrictions on the set of free-fermionic states $\mathcal{G}$ are provided, we establish the general hardness for Problem 1, demonstrating that $N = \Omega(2^n)$ copies of the state ρ are necessary. This result also directly implies that any strategy aiming to estimate non-Gaussianity—i.e., to provide a meaningful probe of the trace distance between a given state and the set of (possibly mixed) free-fermionic states—must necessarily require an exponential number of copies in the system size. Indeed, if such an efficient estimation strategy existed, it could be used to solve the property-testing problem, contradicting our hardness result. Below, we present a more refined version of the mentioned no-go result for testing free-fermionic states.

Theorem 3 (Hardness of testing bounded-rank free-fermionic states). Let $\varepsilon_B = O(1)$ and $r \in [0, n]$. Let ρ denote the unknown state and let $\mathcal{G}$ be the set of free-fermionic states considered. To solve Problem 1, with at least a $2/3$ probability of success, $N = \Omega(2^r)$ copies are necessary if either of the following hypotheses is assumed:

- (1) ρ is such that $\text{rank}(\rho) \leq 2^r$
- (2) $\mathcal{G} \equiv \mathcal{G}_R$ with $R \leq 2^r$

with $r \in [n]$. In particular, for $r = \Omega(n)$, the sample complexity grows exponentially in the number of modes n .

While the formal proof is found in Sec. C 2, the core idea of this complexity arises from recognizing that the maximally mixed state is free-fermionic. This fact allows us to leverage the hardness of a closely related problem of the identity testing, i.e., distinguishing whether the underlying state is the maximally mixed state or far from it in trace distance [35].

Another intuition behind the hardness of this problem arises from the fact that determining whether a state is free-fermionic [see Definition (6)] is inherently harder than determining if it is a (diagonal) tensor-product state and it is well established that testing for a tensor-product structure is a hard problem [36].

The above theorem establishes necessary conditions on the samples N to solve Problem 1. Given this result,

Theorem 3 prompts the natural question of whether an algorithm exists that scales exponentially with r (polynomially with the rank), which solves the property-testing problem under the assumption that ρ has a rank at most $R = 2^r$ or when restricting to the set $\mathcal{G}_R$ of free-fermionic states with rank $\leq R$. In response, we propose two learning algorithms that scale as $O(\text{poly}(n, 2^r))$ and summarize our findings in the following informal theorem.

Theorem 4 (Efficient free-fermionic testing—informal version of Theorems C7 and C8). Problem 1 can be solved with $N = \text{poly}(n, 2^r)$ copies of ρ in the following scenarios:

- (i) The given state ρ is such that $\text{rank}(\rho) \leq 2^r$.
- (ii) The set of Gaussian states is restricted to $\mathcal{G}_R$ with $R \leq 2^r$.

We provide algorithms for both cases that require

$$\tilde{O}[n^3 \varepsilon_{\text{stat}}^{-2} + n^2 4^r \varepsilon_{\text{tom}}^{-2}] \quad (15)$$

samples (where we neglect log factors in n and $1/\delta$). Specifically, $\varepsilon_{\text{tom}} = \varepsilon_B/2 - (n+1)\varepsilon_A$ represents the desired error in the “subsystem tomography step” performed in our testing algorithm and $\varepsilon_{\text{stat}}$ is the error in estimating the correlation matrix, which differs between the two cases:

- (i) $\varepsilon_{\text{stat}} = \frac{\varepsilon_B^2}{32(n-r)} - (2\varepsilon_A)^{\frac{1}{r+1}}$
- (ii) $\varepsilon_{\text{stat}} = \frac{\varepsilon_B^2}{32(n-r)} - \varepsilon_A$

The testing protocol requires that both $\varepsilon_{\text{stat}}$ and ε_{tom} are non-negative, thereby imposing nontrivial conditions on $\varepsilon_A, \varepsilon_B$ for the success of the algorithm. In each case, the computational resources scale as $\text{poly}(n, 2^r)$.

The core idea behind the efficiency of this task lies in the fact that any rank- 2^r free-fermionic state, up to a specific free-fermionic unitary transformation, can be reduced to a diagonal product state that is mixed over at most r modes or qubits. Consequently, the algorithm identifies this free-fermionic unitary, allowing the state to be factorized into a product of an r -mode diagonal tensor-product state and a computational basis state on $n-r$ modes. This reduction simplifies the problem to testing whether the r -mode state has the desired free-fermionic structure, which can be efficiently solved with a complexity scaling as 2^r . For example, this can be achieved by performing full state tomography on r qubits only. The correctness of such algorithms relies on the inequalities we have derived and presented in Lemmas 1 and 2, and Theorem 1. Additional details, including assumptions on ε_A and ε_B , the algorithms presented in pseudocode, as well as the sample and computational analyses, can be found in Appendix C.

Let us summarize our findings. In its full generality, i.e., without rank assumptions on the state ρ and considering $\mathcal{G} \equiv \mathcal{G}_{\text{mixed}}$, Problem 1 requires $N = \Omega(2^n)$ samples of the state to be solved. However, as claimed in Theorem 4, we have established that Problem 1 can be efficiently addressed both sample-wise and computationally under two specific scenarios: (i) when the given state ρ has a rank that scales polynomially with the number of modes n or (ii) when the focus is solely on establishing the closeness to the set of Gaussian states with polynomially bounded rank. Although these two approaches share similarities in principle, they differ significantly both conceptually and operationally. Ultimately, the choice between them rests entirely with the user. Specifically, if they possess guarantees that the prepared state predominantly should have low rank, then we provide provable guarantees in probing the distance concerning all Gaussian states $\mathcal{G}_{\text{mixed}}$. Conversely, if an experimentalist lacks a clear understanding of the nature of the state due to imprecisions or noise, they only have reliable assurances in determining whether the state is close to or far from the set of Gaussian states with polynomially bounded rank. Although seemingly less satisfactory, the latter approach is more general and applicable in completely agnostic scenarios.

V. EFFICIENT AND ROBUST TOMOGRAPHY

We conclude by presenting a simple algorithm for efficiently learning an unknown n -mode or -qubit free-fermionic state, pure or mixed. More rigorously, we address the following problem: given an unknown free-fermionic state ρ , design a computationally efficient quantum learning algorithm that consumes N copies of ρ and outputs a classical description $\hat{\rho}$ such that, with probability $\geq 1 - \delta$, it is guaranteed that $\|\hat{\rho} - \rho\|_1 \leq \varepsilon$.

Our algorithm relies on accurately estimating the correlation matrix of the state, which can be done efficiently via simple free-fermionic measurements. Since such states are completely characterized by their correlation matrices, this provides a straightforward approach to tomograph free-fermionic states. However, the challenging part lies in accurately propagating the error incurred in the estimation of the correlation matrix with respect to the trace distance.

Some earlier works [16–18] have already tackled this problem for the specific case of ρ being a pure free-fermionic state. However, we provide a better sample complexity compared to previous works by capitalizing on our new inequality in Eq. (8) of Theorem 1.

Proposition 1 (Tomography of pure free-fermionic states). Let ψ be a pure free-fermionic quantum state. For $\varepsilon, \delta \in (0, 1)$, there exists a learning algorithm that utilizes $N = \lceil 32(n^3/\varepsilon^2) \log(4n^2/\delta) \rceil$ copies of the state and only single-copy measurements to learn an efficient classical




FIG. 2. Numerical simulation of the performance of the fermionic tomography algorithm for pure Gaussian states. We consider different numbers of total measurement rounds N as a function of the number of modes. The fit (dotted gray line) uses $\varepsilon = 2n^{3/2}N^{-1/2}$, where ε denotes the trace-distance error. The data are averaged over 50 randomly selected Gaussian states each.

representation of a pure state $\hat{\psi}$ obeying $\|\hat{\psi} - \psi\|_1 \leq \varepsilon$ with probability at least $1 - \delta$.

Specifically, the best previously known sample-complexity bound [16–18] has scaled as $O(n^5/\varepsilon^4)$, while our bound scales as $O(n^3/\varepsilon^2)$, without any assumptions on the nature of the free-fermionic state (e.g., a fixed number of particles). In Fig. 2, we simulate the tomography algorithm. As expected, the numerical predictions tightly match the analytical predictions, albeit with a better prefactor than the one obtained from the proof.

Moreover, our analysis extends to the more realistic mixed-state scenario. This extension also heavily relies on the toolkit developed and discussed in the first part of this work, namely, Eq. (9) of Theorem 1.

Theorem 5 (Tomography of mixed free-fermionic states). Let $\varepsilon, \delta \in (0, 1)$, and ρ be a mixed free-fermionic state. There exists a computationally efficient quantum algorithm that, employing $N = O((n^4/\varepsilon^2) \log(n^2/\delta))$ copies of the state ρ and single-copy measurements, learns an efficient classical representation of a state $\hat{\rho}$ obeying $\|\hat{\rho} - \rho\|_1 \leq \varepsilon$, with $\geq 1 - \delta$ probability.

The above theorems achieve the task of learning pure and mixed free-fermionic quantum states, respectively. We remark that the scaling in ε for both tomography algorithms is $O(\varepsilon^{-2})$ and thus optimal, given the finite shot regime. This optimal scaling is achieved only due to the optimal trace-distance bounds presented in Theorem 1.

Both algorithms assume access to a perfect copy of a free-fermionic state. Next, we address the concern about

the robustness of these algorithms with respect to noisy preparations. We strengthen these results by showing that Theorem 5 still holds if the state ρ is sufficiently close to the set of all free-fermionic states $\mathcal{G} = \mathcal{G}_{\text{mixed}}$. In particular, in Proposition D3, we show that if the unknown state ρ satisfies $\min_{\sigma \in \mathcal{G}} \|\rho - \sigma\|_1 \leq O(\varepsilon/n)$, then Theorem 5 can still be applied. Similarly, in Proposition D2, we show that Theorem 5 can also still be applied in the case in which the state ρ is such that its *relative entropy of non-Gaussianity* is $\leq \varepsilon^2$, i.e., if ρ satisfies $\min_{\sigma \in \mathcal{G}} S(\rho\|\sigma) \leq \varepsilon^2$, where $S(\rho\|\sigma)$ is the quantum relative entropy between ρ and σ . The relative entropy of non-Gaussianity possesses desirable properties, making it a meaningful measure of non-Gaussianity [37,38]. A more detailed analysis of what we have examined here can be found in Appendix D.

VI. RELATED WORKS

It should be noted that an exact formula for the fidelity between two possibly mixed free-fermionic states is known [39,40], exhibiting a notably nontrivial dependence on their correlation matrices. While one might attempt to derive a perturbation bound from this formula in terms of the norm difference between the correlation matrices, our exploration of this strategy has revealed it to be more complex and ultimately less effective in yielding an upper bound as good as that obtained with our current approach. Beside providing optimal trace-distance bounds for free-fermionic states, the main focus of this work is on practical and efficient quantum algorithms for free-fermionic state testing and tomography. In this section, we discuss previous works in the literature. Addressing the testing of specific properties in quantum states spans various contexts. A property tester for a quantum state class $\mathcal{C}$ involves taking copies of a state ρ as input and determining either whether ρ belongs to $\mathcal{C}$ (or is close enough to it) or if ρ is ε -far in trace distance from all states in $\mathcal{C}$, provided that one of these scenarios is true.

In a similar spirit to our work, Ref. [41] has analyzed property testing of pure stabilizer states [20], which are another class of nontrivial classical simulable states. It has been shown that $O(1)$ copies of the unknown state suffice to solve the property-testing problem. This remarkable efficiency is ultimately attributed to the use of entangling (Bell) measurements and techniques known as *Bell difference sampling*. In a slightly more general and practical scenario, this has been extended in Refs. [42,43] to the class $\mathcal{C}$ consisting of pure states *sufficiently* close in trace distance to pure stabilizer states, i.e., to a so-called *tolerant* testing. We remark that in our free-fermionic case also, we achieve tolerant testing (albeit with tolerant accuracy parameter scaling inversely with the system size). Property testing of matrix-product states has also been analyzed in Ref. [44]. Similar settings in the free-bosonic realm

have also been considered [45]. Recently, works have appeared in the context of testing the locality of Hamiltonians through time evolutions [46,47]. In Ref. [35], the identity-testing problem (i.e., in which the set $\mathcal{C}$ is composed only of the maximally mixed state) has been shown to require a sample complexity $\Theta(2^n)$, where n is the number of qubits. Similarly, product-state testing has been examined in Ref. [36], focusing on the class $\mathcal{C}$ being the set of product states.

Quantum state tomography [4] is the second prominent learning problem addressed in this work. Given copies of an unknown quantum state ρ , the aim of quantum state tomography is, through arbitrary measurements, to output a classical description $\hat{\rho}$ of a state that is ε -close in trace distance to ρ with high probability. In Refs. [3,48], a sample-optimal quantum state tomography algorithm has been introduced. Specifically, it has been shown that $\tilde{O}(4^n/\varepsilon^2)$ copies of the state are both necessary and sufficient for quantum state tomography of arbitrary mixed states. Given the intrinsic inefficiency of quantum state-tomography algorithms for general states, a natural question arises: If one restricts the class of input quantum states, can quantum state tomography be conducted both sample and computationally efficiently? In this regard, a number of insightful works have been produced that demonstrate sample and computational efficiency for specific classes of states, which include pure stabilizer states [21], t -doped stabilizer states [22,23,49–51] (states obtained by at most t non-Clifford local gates), matrix-product states [25,27,52–55], finitely correlated states [26], high-temperature Gibbs states [56], and more.

As already mentioned, prior to our work, previous works have tackled the problem of free-fermionic pure-state tomography [16–18]: we improve upon their sample complexity and generalize to the mixed scenario. Recently, a related work has appeared in which it has been shown how to perform efficient tomography of t -doped free-fermionic states [19], i.e., states prepared by free-fermionic circuits doped with at most t local non-free-fermionic gates. Moreover, the analogous problem of learning mixed Gaussian states has previously been unresolved also in the bosonic context. However, in a parallel work [32], together with other coauthors, we fill this gap in the bosonic literature. Furthermore, process tomography of fermionic Gaussian unitaries has been addressed in Refs. [57,58], leveraging distance error bounds between Gaussian unitaries [57,59].

VII. DISCUSSION AND OPEN QUESTIONS

In this work, we have shown important norm bounds concerning free-fermionic states, which we have leveraged to obtain multiple notable applications. First, we have demonstrated methods for testing whether or not a quantum state is free-fermionic, utilizing experimentally

feasible measurements. Moreover, we have identified scenarios in which any algorithm to solve this problem would be inevitably inefficient, distinguishing them from situations in which efficient algorithms are possible, such as ours.

Additionally, we have introduced efficiently estimable lower bounds on the distance of a state from the set of free-fermionic states, which offer valuable insights into quantifying the non-Gaussianity of a quantum system. Furthermore, we have improved the performance guarantees of previously proposed free-fermionic pure-state tomography, generalized the algorithm to the more complex mixed-state scenario, and discussed its noise robustness, relying on our novel bounds on the trace distance between two free-fermionic quantum states. We posit that the findings presented in this work can serve as a valuable resource for designing and conducting quantum simulation experiments. Moreover, while our analysis comprehensively addresses the literature on testing and tomography of free-fermionic states, we expect that the inequalities and tools shown in this work will have other applications beyond the context of quantum learning theory. In particular, our proof techniques for fermionic systems have already been instrumental in deriving similar trace-distance bounds in the bosonic setting [31].

There are several interesting open questions related to the topics discussed in this work.

A natural open question regarding the property testing of free-fermionic states is whether there exists a testing algorithm that requires only a constant $O(1)$ number of copies, independent of the system size.

Our results on tomography also open several promising directions for future research. While our algorithm is optimal in its dependence on the accuracy parameter ε and scales polynomially with the system size n , it remains an open question whether an algorithm can be designed that is also optimal in n . Fundamentally, any tomography protocol for n -mode pure free-fermionic states requires at least $\Omega(n)$ copies, as follows from standard arguments based on the Holevo bound and ε -net constructions [60]. In contrast, classical shadow techniques [60], combined with similar ε -net arguments, yield an upper bound of $O(n^2)$ copies, though such an algorithm would be computationally inefficient. Our algorithm, on the other hand, achieves efficient run-time, albeit with a sample complexity of $O(n^3)$. Closing the gap between the $\Omega(n)$ lower bound and the $O(n^2)$ upper bound (or $O(n^3)$ if computational efficiency is prioritized) remains an important open problem. For context, in the case of stabilizer state learning [21], $\Theta(n)$ copies are both necessary and sufficient. However, for free-fermionic states, the optimal scaling in n remains unresolved and we believe this is a promising direction for future work.

Furthermore, an intriguing open question is whether our mixed-state tomography algorithm can still be reliably

applied if the unknown state is promised to be close in trace distance to the set of free-fermionic states by a constant factor, rather than the $O(1/n)$ -closeness we currently assume. It would be valuable to explore whether a better algorithm can be designed that enjoys this more desirable feature.

Moreover, it would be intriguing to explore testing and tomography of states with a small Gaussian extent [13–15], which are states that can be written as a superposition of a few free-fermionic states.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We thank Frederik Von Ende for help in proving Theorem B3, as well as Francesco Anna Mele, Ludovico Lami, Alexander Nietner, and Filippo Girardi for useful discussions. This work has been supported by the Federal Ministry for Economic Affairs and Climate Action (BMWK) (“Hybrid Quantum Computing Meets Use Cases,” EniQmA), the Federal Ministry of Research, Technology, and Space (BMBF) (“Fermion Quantum Processor,” FermiQP; MuniQCAtoMs; “Digital Analog Quantum Computer,” DAQC), the European Research Council (ERC) (“Delineating the Boundary between the Computational Power of Quantum and Classical Devices,” DebuQC), and the German Research Foundation (DFG) (“Entangled States of Matter,” CRC 183). A.A.M. also acknowledges support by the Laboratory Directed Research and Development (LDRD) program of the Los Alamos National Laboratory (LANL) under Project No. 20230049DR and by the U.S. Department of Energy through a quantum computing program sponsored by the LANL Information Science & Technology Institute.

DATA AVAILABILITY

No data were created or analyzed in this study.

APPENDIX A: PRELIMINARIES

1. Notation and basic definitions

We use the following notation throughout our work. We denote by $\mathbb{C}^{d \times d}$ the set of $d \times d$ complex matrices, with $d \in \mathbb{N}$. The notation $[d]$ denotes the set of integers from 1 to d , i.e., $[d] := \{1, \dots, d\}$. We denote as I the identity operator, with a subscript specifying the dimension when necessary for clarity. The *Schatten p -norm* of a matrix $A \in \mathbb{C}^{d \times d}$, with $p \in [1, \infty]$, is given by

$$\|A\|_p := \text{Tr}((\sqrt{A^\dagger A})^p)^{1/p}, \quad (\text{A1})$$

which corresponds to the p -norm of the vector of singular values of A . The *operator norm* of a matrix $A \in \mathbb{C}^{d \times d}$ is equal to its largest singular value. We denote the *Hilbert-Schmidt scalar product* as $\langle A, B \rangle_{\text{HS}} := \text{Tr}(A^\dagger B)$. Let $A = UDV$ be the singular-value decomposition of

$A \in \mathbb{C}^{n \times n}$, with U, V being unitary matrices and $D = \text{diag}(D_1, \dots, D_n)$ being a diagonal matrix with $D_1 \geq \dots \geq D_n \geq 0$; the Ky Fan norm of order R (with $R \in [n]$) of the matrix A is defined as

$$\|A\|_{\text{KF}, R} := \sum_{i=1}^R D_i. \quad (\text{A2})$$

We denote as $O(2n)$ the group of real orthogonal $2n \times 2n$ matrices. We denote the n -qubit Pauli operators as the elements of the set $\{I, X, Y, Z\}^{\otimes n}$, where I, X, Y , and Z represent the standard single-qubit Paulis. Pauli operators are traceless, Hermitian, square to the identity, and form an orthogonal basis with respect the Hilbert-Schmidt scalar product for the space of linear operators. We define the set of quantum states as $\mathcal{S}(\mathbb{C}^d) := \{\rho \in \mathbb{C}^{d \times d} : \rho \geq 0, \text{Tr}(\rho) = 1\}$. A quantum state ρ is pure if and only if its rank is 1.

2. Free-fermionic states

In this subsection, we provide definitions and lemmas on free-fermionic states, which are useful for deriving our results. While we define these concepts in terms of qubits, it is worth noting that they can also be directly expressed in terms of fermions via the Jordan-Wigner mapping. In the following, we consider an n -qubit system (or, equivalently, n fermionic modes). Throughout this discussion, we focus on an n -qubit system. To begin, we introduce the definition of Majorana operators in relation to Pauli matrices.

Definition A1 (Majorana operators). For each $k \in [n]$, Majorana operators can be defined as

$$\gamma_{2k-1} := \left(\prod_{j=1}^{k-1} Z_j \right) X_k, \quad \gamma_{2k} := \left(\prod_{j=1}^{k-1} Z_j \right) Y_k. \quad (\text{A3})$$

As can be readily verified, Majorana operators are Hermitian, traceless, and they square to the identity

$$\gamma_\mu = \gamma_\mu^\dagger, \quad \text{Tr}(\gamma_\mu) = 0, \quad \gamma_\mu^2 = I \quad (\text{A4})$$

for all $\mu \in [2n]$. Moreover, they anticommute and are orthogonal with respect to the Hilbert-Schmidt inner product

$$\{\gamma_\mu, \gamma_\nu\} = 2\delta_{\mu,\nu}I, \quad \langle \gamma_\mu, \gamma_\nu \rangle_{\text{HS}} = 2^n \delta_{\mu,\nu} \quad (\text{A5})$$

for all $\mu, \nu \in [2n]$. As such, operators defined by Jordan-Wigner transformation conform with the Majorana anti-commutation relations. A useful and easy to verify identity is $iZ_j = \gamma_{2j-1}\gamma_{2j}$.

Definition A2 (Majorana products). Let S be the set $S := \{\mu_1, \dots, \mu_{|S|}\} \subseteq [2n]$ with $1 \leq \mu_1 < \dots < \mu_{|S|} \leq 2n$. We define

$$\gamma_S := \gamma_{\mu_1} \cdots \gamma_{\mu_{|S|}}$$

if $S \neq \emptyset$ and $\gamma_\emptyset = I$ otherwise.

It is worth noting that the number of different sets $S \subseteq [2n]$ and hence Majorana products is 4^n . For any set $S, S' \subseteq [2n]$, Majorana products are orthogonal

$$\langle \gamma_S, \gamma_{S'} \rangle_{\text{HS}} = 2^n \delta_{S,S'}.$$

Hence, they form a basis for $\mathbb{C}^{d \times d}$.

Definition A3 (Free-fermionic unitary). For any orthogonal matrix $Q \in O(2n)$, a free-fermionic unitary U_Q (also known as Gaussian unitary) is a unitary that satisfies

$$U_Q^\dagger \gamma_\mu U_Q = \sum_{\nu=1}^{2n} Q_{\mu,\nu} \gamma_\nu, \quad (\text{A6})$$

for any $\mu \in [2n]$.

From this definition, it follows that $U_Q^\dagger = U_{Q^T}$. Since products of Majorana operators γ_μ with $\mu \in [2n]$ form a basis for the linear operators $\mathbb{C}^{d \times d}$, it suffices to specify how a unitary acts on the $2n$ Majorana operators γ_μ with $\mu \in [2n]$ to uniquely specify the unitary up to a phase. Specifically, for a given orthogonal matrix, there exists a known exact implementation of the associated free-fermionic unitary, which can be achieved using either $O(n^2)$ local two-qubit gates [61] or $O(n^2)$ local two-mode free-fermionic unitary Majorana evolutions [14]. From the previous definition, the following statement follows.

Lemma A1 (Adjoint action of Gaussian unitary on a Majorana product). For any $S \subseteq [2n]$ and U_Q free-fermionic unitary with $Q \in O(2n)$, we have

$$U_Q^\dagger \gamma_S U_Q = \sum_{S' \subseteq \binom{[2n]}{|S|}} \det(Q|_{S,S'}) \gamma_{S'}, \quad (\text{A7})$$

where $\binom{[2n]}{|S|}$ is defined as the set of subsets of $[2n]$ of cardinality $|S|$, while $Q|_{S,S'}$ is the restriction of the matrix Q to rows and columns indexed by S and S' , respectively.

Proof. See Ref. [62] for a proof. ■

We now give the definition of free-fermionic states (also known as fermionic Gaussian states).

Definition A4 (Free-fermionic states). A free-fermionic state (also known as Gaussian state) in the Jordan-Wigner mapping can be defined as

$$\rho = U_Q \rho_0 U_Q^\dagger, \quad \text{with } \rho_0 := \bigotimes_{j=1}^n \left(\frac{I + \lambda_j Z_j}{2} \right), \quad (\text{A8})$$

where $\lambda_j \in [-1, 1]$ for each $j \in [n]$ and U_Q is the free-fermionic unitary associated to the orthogonal matrix $Q \in O(2n)$.

Since X_1 and $\{X_j X_{j+1}\}_{j=1}^n = \{-i\gamma_{2j} \gamma_{2j+1}\}_{j=1}^n$ are fermionic Gaussian unitaries and the product of Gaussian unitaries is Gaussian, it follows that $\{X_j\}_{j=1}^n$ are Gaussian unitaries. Thus, using that $X_j Z_j X_j = -Z_j$, without loss of generality, $\{\lambda_j\}_{j=1}^n$ can be assumed to be positive.

Definition A4 is slightly more general than defining a free-fermionic state such as a state of the form $\exp(-\beta H)/\text{Tr}(\exp(-\beta H))$, where $\beta > 0$ and H is a quadratic Hamiltonian in the Majorana operators, i.e., an Hermitian operator of the form $H = \sum_{\mu, \nu=1}^n h_{\mu, \nu} \gamma_\mu \gamma_\nu$, with $h \in \mathbb{C}^{2n \times 2n}$. From the previous definition, it follows that ρ is pure if and only if $\lambda_j \in \{-1, 1\}$ for each $j \in [n]$. In this pure case, the state vector will be $U_Q |x\rangle$, where $|x\rangle := \bigotimes_{i=1}^n |x_i\rangle$ is a computational basis state vector with $x_i := (1 - \lambda_i)/2$. Since Pauli X matrices are Gaussian unitaries, without loss of generality, any pure fermionic Gaussian state can be written as $U_Q |0^n\rangle$, which is uniquely specified by an orthogonal matrix $Q \in O(2n)$.

We can now define the correlation matrix of any (possibly non-free-fermionic) state.

Definition A5 (Correlation matrix). Given a (general) state ρ , we define its correlation matrix $\Gamma(\rho)$ as

$$[\Gamma(\rho)]_{j,k} := -\frac{i}{2} \text{Tr}([\gamma_j, \gamma_k] \rho), \quad (\text{A9})$$

where $j, k \in [2n]$.

The correlation matrix of any state is real and antisymmetric; thus it has eigenvalues in pairs of the form $\pm i\lambda_j$ for $j \in [2n]$, where λ_j are real numbers such that $|\lambda_j| \leq 1$. Under free-fermionic unitaries, the correlation matrix of any quantum state changes by the adjoint action with the associated orthogonal matrix, as expressed in the following proposition.

Lemma A2 (Transformation of the correlation matrix under free-fermionic unitary). For any state ρ , we have

$$\Gamma(U_Q \rho U_Q^\dagger) = Q \Gamma(\rho) Q^T, \quad (\text{A10})$$

for any free-fermionic unitary U_Q associated with an orthogonal matrix $Q \in O(2n)$.

This is easily verified by the definition of correlation matrix and free-fermionic unitary. We denote as Λ the correlation matrix of the $|0^n\rangle$ state vector, namely,

$$\Lambda := \bigoplus_{j=1}^n \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ -1 & 0 \end{pmatrix} = \bigoplus_{j=1}^n (iY). \quad (\text{A11})$$

The correlation matrix of a computational basis state vector $|x\rangle$ with $x \in \{0, 1\}^n$ is $\Gamma(|x\rangle) = \bigoplus_{j=1}^n (-1)^{x_j} (iY)$. It turns out that any real antisymmetric matrix can be diagonalized with an orthogonal matrix. In particular, we have the following result.

Lemma A3 (Normal decomposition of real antisymmetric matrices [5]). Any real antisymmetric matrix Γ can be decomposed in the so-called *normal form*

$$\Gamma = Q \bigoplus_{j=1}^n \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \lambda_j \\ -\lambda_j & 0 \end{pmatrix} Q^T, \quad (\text{A12})$$

for an orthogonal matrix $Q \in O(2n)$ and $\{\lambda_j\}_{j=1}^n \in \mathbb{R}$ real numbers ordered in increasing order. Thus, the eigenvalues of Γ are $\pm i\lambda_j$ for any $j \in [n]$. We denote $\{\lambda_j\}_{j=1}^n$ as normal eigenvalues.

The decomposition in Lemma A3 can be always performed in such a way that the normal eigenvalues are all non-negative with a suitable orthogonal transformation.

Also, in the case in which the normal eigenvalues are not imposed to be all non-negative, the decomposition in Lemma A3 can be always performed in such a way that the orthogonal matrix $Q \in SO(2n)$ (i.e., its determinant is one). In fact, if that is not the case, then we can write $Q = Q' \text{diag}(-1, 1, \dots, 1)$, for a matrix $Q' \in SO(2n)$ (note that this matrix Q' exists because the product of two orthogonal matrices is an orthogonal matrix and because of the Cauchy-Binet formula of the determinant).

Using Lemma A3, we can show that the correlation matrix of any state ρ has normal eigenvalues less than one (and thus also the absolute values of its eigenvalues). In fact, let $\Gamma(\rho) = Q(\bigoplus_{j=1}^n i\lambda_j Y)Q^T$ be the correlation matrix expressed in its normal form. Then, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda_j &= (Q^T \Gamma(\rho) Q)_{2j-1, 2j} = (\Gamma(U_Q^\dagger \rho U_Q))_{2j-1, 2j} \\ &= \text{Tr}(U_Q^\dagger \rho U_Q Z_j). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A13})$$

Thus, because of the Hölder inequality, we have $|\lambda_j| \leq \|U_Q^\dagger \rho U_Q\|_1 \|Z_j\|_\infty = 1$. Furthermore, by using Lemma A3, we establish a bijection between the set of free-fermionic states and the set of real antisymmetric matrices with eigenvalues smaller than one in absolute value.

Lemma A4 (Bijection between free-fermionic states and correlation matrices). Given a free-fermionic state of the form

$$\rho = U_Q \rho_0 U_Q^\dagger, \quad \text{with } \rho_0 := \bigotimes_{j=1}^n \left(\frac{I + \lambda_j Z_j}{2} \right), \quad (\text{A14})$$

where $\lambda_j \in [-1, 1]$ for each $j \in [n]$ and U_Q is the free-fermionic unitary associated with the orthogonal matrix $Q \in O(2n)$, then its correlation matrix is

$$\Gamma = Q \bigoplus_{j=1}^n \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \lambda_j \\ -\lambda_j & 0 \end{pmatrix} Q^T, \quad (\text{A15})$$

which is a real and antisymmetric matrix, with eigenvalues $\pm i\lambda_j$ in pairs such that $\lambda_j \in [-1, 1]$ for any $j \in [n]$. Conversely, given a real antisymmetric matrix Γ , it can be decomposed as in Eq. (A15), in particular, its eigenvalues are of the form $\pm i\lambda_j$, in pairs. If $\lambda_j \in [-1, 1]$, then Γ uniquely defines a state ρ of the form of Eq. (A14).

The previous theorem ensures that by specifying a valid correlation matrix (i.e., real, antisymmetric, and with eigenvalues smaller than one), we uniquely specify a free-fermionic state. Vice versa, if we have a free-fermionic state, it uniquely defines a correlation matrix. In particular, any pure free-fermionic state vector $|\psi\rangle = U_Q |0^n\rangle$ is specified by an orthogonal matrix $Q \in O(2n)$ and its correlation matrix will be $\Gamma(\psi) = Q \Lambda Q^T$, where Λ is defined in Eq. (A11). From this, we have the following.

Remark A1. The correlation matrix $\Gamma(\psi)$ of a pure free-fermionic state ψ satisfies $\det(\Gamma(\psi)) = 1$, is an orthogonal matrix, and its normal eigenvalues are all equal to one in absolute value.

Moreover, we also have that the rank of a mixed free-fermionic state is related to the number of normal eigenvalues strictly smaller than one in absolute value, as follows by using Lemma A4.

Remark A2 (Relation between rank and normal eigenvalues of a free-fermionic state). Let ρ be a free-fermionic state, expressed as $\rho = U_Q \left(\bigotimes_{j=1}^n (I + \lambda_j Z_j)/2 \right) U_Q^\dagger$, where $\{\lambda_j\}_{j=1}^n \subseteq [-1, 1]$ and U_Q is a free-fermionic unitary. Let m be the number of elements in $\{\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n\}$ that are in absolute value smaller than one. We then have $\text{rank}(\rho) = 2^m$.

In our analysis, the notion of the *Pfaffian* will be useful.

Definition A6 (Pfaffian of a matrix). Let C be a $2n \times 2n$ antisymmetric matrix. Its Pfaffian is defined as

$$\text{Pf}(C) = \frac{1}{2^n n!} \sum_{\sigma \in S_{2n}} \text{sgn}(\sigma) \prod_{i=1}^n C_{\sigma(2i-1), \sigma(2i)}, \quad (\text{A16})$$

where S_{2n} is the symmetric group of order $(2n)!$ and $\text{sgn}(\sigma)$ is the signature of σ . The Pfaffian of an $m \times m$ antisymmetric matrix with m odd is defined to be zero.

Well-known properties are the following. For any matrix B , we have $\text{Pf}(BCB^T) = \det(B) \text{Pf}(C)$ and $\text{Pf}(\lambda C) = \lambda^n \text{Pf}(C)$, where C is a $2n \times 2n$ antisymmetric matrix and $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$. Moreover, it holds that $\text{Pf}(C)^2 = \det(C)$ (note that this is consistent with the fact that the Pfaffian of an odd antisymmetric matrix is defined to be zero, since the determinant of an odd antisymmetric matrix is zero). Another useful identity is

$$\text{Pf} \left(\bigoplus_{j=1}^n \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \lambda_j \\ -\lambda_j & 0 \end{pmatrix} \right) = \prod_{j=1}^n \lambda_j. \quad (\text{A17})$$

We now recall the well-known Wick's theorem, which states that the any Majorana product expectation value over a free-fermionic state can be computed efficiently given access to its correlation matrix.

Lemma A5 (Wick's theorem [5,63]). Let ρ be a free-fermionic state with the associated correlation matrix $\Gamma(\rho)$. Then, we have

$$\text{Tr}(\gamma_S \rho) = i^{|S|/2} \text{Pf}(\Gamma(\rho)|_S), \quad (\text{A18})$$

where $\gamma_S = \gamma_{\mu_1} \cdots \gamma_{\mu_{|S|}}$, and $S = \{\mu_1, \dots, \mu_{|S|}\} \subseteq [2n]$ with $1 \leq \mu_1 < \dots < \mu_{|S|} \leq 2n$, while $\Gamma(\rho)|_S$ is the restriction of the matrix $\Gamma(\rho)$ to the rows and columns corresponding to elements in S .

Note that since for any $S \subseteq [2n]$ the restriction of the correlation matrix $\Gamma|_S$ is still antisymmetric, its Pfaffian is well defined. The Pfaffian of $\Gamma|_S$ can be computed efficiently in time $\Theta(|S|^3)$.

Definition A7 (Parity). The parity operator is defined as the operator

$$Z^{\otimes n} := (-1)^n \gamma_1 \gamma_2 \cdots \gamma_{2n-1} \gamma_{2n}. \quad (\text{A19})$$

The parity of a quantum state ρ is defined as the expectation values of the parity operator, i.e.,

$$\text{Parity}(\rho) := \text{Tr}(Z^{\otimes n} \rho).$$

Lemma A6 (Gaussian states are eigenstates of the parity operator). Any Gaussian state vector $|\psi_Q\rangle := U_Q|0^n\rangle$ associated with the orthogonal matrix $Q \in O(2n)$ satisfies

$$Z^{\otimes n} |\psi_Q\rangle = \det(Q) |\psi_Q\rangle. \quad (\text{A20})$$

Thus, we also have $\text{Parity}(\psi_Q) = \det(Q)$.

Proof. We have

$$\begin{aligned} Z^{\otimes n} |\psi_Q\rangle &= (-i)^n \gamma_{[2n]} |\psi_Q\rangle = (-i)^n U_Q U_Q^\dagger \gamma_{[2n]} U_Q |0^n\rangle \\ &= (-i)^n \det(Q) U_Q \gamma_{[2n]} |0^n\rangle \\ &= \det(Q) U_Q Z^{\otimes n} |0^n\rangle = \det(Q) |\psi_Q\rangle, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A21})$$

where the first step follows from Jordan-Wigner and we have defined $\gamma_{[2n]} := \prod_{j=1}^n \gamma_j$. The third step follows from Eq. (A7). ■

From this lemma, it follows that if two pure fermionic Gaussian states have different parity, then they have also zero overlap (however, the converse is not true: two pure Gaussian state vectors with the same parity can have zero overlap, e.g., $|0, 0\rangle$ and $|1, 1\rangle$). This result can also be derived using Wick's theorem (Lemma A5). In fact, for a possibly mixed free-fermionic state ρ , we have

$$\text{Parity}(\rho) = \text{Tr}(Z^{\otimes n} \rho) = \text{Pf}(\Gamma(\rho)). \quad (\text{A22})$$

Furthermore, according to the properties of the Pfaffian, we obtain

$$\text{Pf}(\Gamma(\rho)) = \left(\prod_{j=1}^n \lambda_j \right) \det(Q), \quad (\text{A23})$$

where $Q \in O(2n)$ and $\{\lambda_j\}_{j=1}^n$ are, respectively, the orthogonal matrix and the normal eigenvalues associated with the normal form of $\Gamma(\rho)$. If the Gaussian state ρ is pure, then all the normal eigenvalues are equal to one; hence the parity is equal to $\det(Q)$. We now mention an important formula that relates the overlap of two pure fermionic Gaussian states to their correlation matrices [63].

Lemma A7 (Overlap between two pure Gaussian states [63]). The overlap between two Gaussian state vectors $|\psi_1\rangle, |\psi_2\rangle$ is

$$|\langle \psi_1 | \psi_2 \rangle|^2 = \left| \text{Pf} \left(\frac{1}{2} (\Gamma(\psi_1) + \Gamma(\psi_2)) \right) \right|. \quad (\text{A24})$$

It can be shown that the preceding formula is consistent with the fact that two Gaussian states with opposite parity have zero overlap: in fact, the Pfaffian of the sum of the correlation matrices associated with the two pure Gaussian

states with opposite parity must be zero, as follows from Ref. [64, Corollary 2.4.(b)].

In our discussion, we also leverage the following two well-known lemmas from the literature [5].

Lemma A8 (Reduced state of a free-fermionic state is free-fermionic). Let ρ be an n -qubit free-fermionic state. Let $r \leq n$. Then, the reduced state ρ_r , obtained by tracing out the last $n - r$ qubits, is a free-fermionic state.

Proof. The proof follows by expressing the reduced state ρ_r in the Majorana basis and applying Wick's theorem, which holds for the free-fermionic state ρ . The conclusion follows from the fact that any quantum state the coefficients of which, when expressed in the Majorana basis, are consistent with Wick's theorem, is a free-fermionic state. ■

The following lemma is available in the literature in various forms (see, e.g., Ref. [65]).

Lemma A9 (Purification of a mixed free-fermionic state). Any n -qubit mixed free-fermionic state ρ can be purified into a pure free-fermionic state vector $|\psi_\rho\rangle$ of $2n$ qubits. Specifically, the purified state vector $|\psi_\rho\rangle$ corresponds to the free-fermionic state associated with the correlation matrix

$$\Gamma(\psi_\rho) = \begin{pmatrix} \Gamma(\rho) & \sqrt{I_{2n} + \Gamma^2(\rho)} \\ -\sqrt{I_{2n} + \Gamma^2(\rho)} & -\Gamma(\rho) \end{pmatrix}. \quad (\text{A25})$$

Proof. Since any free-fermionic state is fully specified by its correlation matrix, we only need to demonstrate that $\Gamma(|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|)$ is a valid correlation matrix corresponding to a pure state and that the partial trace of this pure state corresponds to ρ . This latter assertion is trivial, as taking the partial trace with respect to qubits indexed by $E := \{n+1, \dots, 2n\}$ of $|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|$ involves considering only the restriction of $\Gamma(|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|)$ to the first diagonal block, corresponding to $\Gamma(\rho)$, and thus yielding the state ρ [5]. Therefore, we are left to demonstrate that $\Gamma(|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|)$ is a valid correlation matrix corresponding to a pure state. In particular, we need to show that it is real and antisymmetric with eigenvalues $\{\pm i\}_{j=1}^{2n}$. The fact that it is antisymmetric follows from the fact that $\sqrt{I_{2n} + \Gamma^2(\rho)}$ is Hermitian. Since it is antisymmetric and real, its eigenvalues are purely imaginary. We are left to show that the eigenvalues are all one in absolute value. This follows from the fact that $\Gamma(|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|)$ is unitary, as can be verified by inspection. ■

3. Particle-number-preserving fermionic states

In this subsection, we introduce standard notions related to particle-number-preserving fermionic states, which

form a common subset of fermionic states often considered in condensed-matter physics. This concept will be useful for deriving a particle-number-preserving version of the inequality that we establish for general free-fermionic states in the subsequent section.

Definition A8 (Creation and annihilation operators). The annihilation operators $\{a_j\}_{j=1}^n$ and creation operators $\{a_j^\dagger\}_{j=1}^n$ are defined as

$$a_j := \frac{\gamma_{2j-1} + i\gamma_{2j}}{2}, \quad a_j^\dagger := \frac{\gamma_{2j-1} - i\gamma_{2j}}{2} \quad (\text{A26})$$

for all $j \in [n]$.

They satisfy the commutation relations $\{a_k, a_l\} = 0$, $\{a_k, a_l^\dagger\} = \delta_{k,l}$ for each $k, l \in [n]$. Moreover, they satisfy $a_k^\dagger a_k = \frac{1}{2}(I - Z_j) = |1\rangle\langle 1|_k$ for each $k \in [n]$. The Majorana operators can be then written as $\gamma_{2k-1} = a_j + a_j^\dagger$ and $\gamma_{2j} = -i(a_j - a_j^\dagger)$ for each $k \in [n]$.

Definition A9 (Particle-number operator). The operator $\hat{N} := \sum_{i=1}^n a_i^\dagger a_i$ is denoted as the particle-number operator.

The computational basis forms a set of eigenstates for the particle-number operator

$$\hat{N} |x_1, \dots, x_n\rangle = (x_1 + \dots + x_n) |x_1, \dots, x_n\rangle, \quad (\text{A27})$$

where $x_1, \dots, x_n \in \{0, 1\}$. The eigenvalue $|x| := x_1 + \dots + x_n$ of the particle-number operator is the Hamming weight of the bit string $x := (x_1, \dots, x_n)$.

Definition A10 (Particle-number-preserving states). A state ρ is said to be particle-number preserving if and only if it commutes with the particle-number operator, i.e., $[\hat{N}, \rho] = 0$.

From this definition, it follows that any particle-number-preserving pure state is an eigenstate of the particle-number operator $\hat{N}$ and, more generally, any particle-number-preserving mixed state can be written as a convex combination of eigenstates of the particle-number operator. We now define the particle-number-preserving correlation matrix of a quantum state ρ .

Definition A11 (Particle-number-preserving correlation matrix). Given a state ρ , we define its particle-number-preserving correlation matrix $C(\rho)$ as the $n \times n$ matrix such that, for each $j, k \in [n]$, we have

$$[C(\rho)]_{j,k} := \text{Tr}(a_j^\dagger a_k \rho). \quad (\text{A28})$$

It is easy to see that the particle-number-preserving correlation matrix is a Hermitian matrix. In fact, for each $j, k \in [n]$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} [C(\rho)]_{j,k}^* &= \text{Tr}((a_j^\dagger a_k \rho)^*) = \text{Tr}((a_j^\dagger a_k \rho)^\dagger) \\ &= \text{Tr}(\rho a_k^\dagger a_j) = [C(\rho)]_{k,j}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A29})$$

Thus, it can be unitarily diagonalized.

Lemma A10 (Relation between the correlation matrix and the particle-number-preserving one of a particle-number-preserving state). Let ρ be a particle-number-preserving quantum state. The correlation matrix $\Gamma(\rho)$ can be written in terms of the particle-number-preserving correlation matrix $C(\rho)$ as follows:

$$\Gamma(\rho) = (I - 2\text{Re}(C(\rho)) \otimes iY + (2\text{Im}(C(\rho))) \otimes I, \quad (\text{A30})$$

where $\text{Re}(\cdot)$ and $\text{Im}(\cdot)$ are the entry-wise real and imaginary parts.

Proof. Since ρ is a particle-number-preserving quantum state, it commutes with the particle-number operator $[\hat{N}, \rho] = 0$, which implies that ρ can be diagonalized as $\rho = \sum_{j=1}^{2^n} p_j |\psi_j\rangle\langle\psi_j|$, where $\{p_j\}_{j=1}^{2^n}$ are non-negative numbers that add up to one and $\{|\psi_j\rangle\}_{j=1}^{2^n}$ are eigenstates of the particle-number operators. Hence, for all $j, k \in [n]$, we have that

$$\text{Tr}(\rho a_i^\dagger a_j^\dagger) = \sum_{m=1}^{2^n} p_m \langle\psi_m| a_i^\dagger a_j^\dagger |\psi_m\rangle = 0, \quad (\text{A31})$$

where the last equality follows from the fact that $|\psi_m\rangle$ and $a_i^\dagger a_j^\dagger |\psi_m\rangle$ are two vectors that are in the span of two different orthogonal eigenspaces of the particle-number operator (i.e., associated with two different Hamming weights). Similarly, we have $\text{Tr}(\rho a_i a_j) = 0$ for each $i, j \in [n]$. For all $j, k \in [n]$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} [\Gamma(\rho)]_{2j-1,2k} &= -i\text{Tr}(\gamma_{2j-1}\gamma_{2k}\rho) \\ &= \text{Tr}((a_j + a_j^\dagger)(a_k^\dagger - a_k)\rho) \\ &= \text{Tr}(a_j a_k^\dagger \rho) - \text{Tr}(a_j^\dagger a_k \rho) \\ &= \delta_{j,k} - \text{Tr}(a_k^\dagger a_j \rho) - \text{Tr}(a_j^\dagger a_k \rho) \\ &= \delta_{j,k} - [C(\rho)]_{j,k}^* - [C(\rho)]_{j,k} \\ &= [I - 2\text{Re}(C(\rho))]_{j,k}, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A32})$$

where in the third step we have used Eq. (A31), in the fourth step we have used the commutation relation of annihilation and creation operators, and in the fifth step we

have used the definition of $C(\rho)$ and the fact that it is Hermitian. For all $j, k \in [n]$, we also have

$$\begin{aligned} [\Gamma(\rho)]_{2j, 2k-1} &= -[\Gamma(\rho)]_{2k-1, 2j} = -[I - 2\text{Re}(C(\rho))]_{k,j} \\ &= -[I - 2\text{Re}(C(\rho))]_{j,k}, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A33})$$

where in the first step we have used the fact that $\Gamma(\rho)$ is antisymmetric, in the second step we have used Eq. (A32), and in the last step we have used the fact that $I - 2\text{Re}(C(\rho))$ is a symmetric matrix. Moreover, for all $j \neq k \in [n]$, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} [\Gamma(\rho)]_{2j-1, 2k-1} &= -i\text{Tr}(\gamma_{2j-1}\gamma_{2k-1}\rho) \\ &= -i\text{Tr}((a_j + a_j^\dagger)(a_k + a_k^\dagger)\rho) \\ &= -i\text{Tr}(a_j a_k^\dagger \rho) - i\text{Tr}(a_j^\dagger a_k \rho) \\ &= i[C(\rho)]_{j,k}^* - i[C(\rho)]_{j,k} = [2\text{Im}(C(\rho))]_{j,k}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A34})$$

Similarly, we also have, for all $j \neq k \in [n]$,

$$\begin{aligned} [\Gamma(\rho)]_{2j, 2k} &= -i\text{Tr}(\gamma_{2j}\gamma_{2k}\rho) = i\text{Tr}((a_j - a_j^\dagger)(a_k - a_k^\dagger)\rho) \\ &= -i\text{Tr}(a_j a_k^\dagger \rho) - i\text{Tr}(a_j^\dagger a_k \rho) = [2\text{Im}(C(\rho))]_{j,k}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A35})$$

Thus, Eq. (A30) follows. $\blacksquare$

From the previous lemma, it follows that for two particle-number-preserving state ρ and σ and any p -norms with $p \in [1, \infty]$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\Gamma(\rho) - \Gamma(\sigma)\|_p &= 2 \|\text{Re}(C(\rho) - C(\sigma)) \otimes iY + \text{Im}(C(\rho) - C(\sigma)) \otimes I\|_p \\ &\leq 2 \cdot 2^{1/p} \|\text{Re}(C(\rho) - C(\sigma))\|_p \\ &\quad + 2 \cdot 2^{1/p} \|\text{Im}(C(\rho) - C(\sigma))\|_p, \\ &\leq 4 \cdot 2^{1/p} \|C(\rho) - C(\sigma)\|_p, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A36})$$

where in the second step we have used the triangle inequality and the fact that $\|A \otimes B\|_p = \|A\|_p \|B\|_p$, and in the last step the fact that $\text{Re}(A) = (A + A^*)/2$ and $\text{Im}(A) = -i(A - A^*)/2$.

Lemma A11 (Relation between eigenvalues of the correlation matrices). Let ρ be a particle-number-preserving quantum state. Let $\{D_j\}_{j=1}^n$ be the eigenvalues of the particle-number-preserving correlation matrix $C(\rho)$. There exists an orthogonal matrix that puts the correlation matrix $\Gamma(\rho)$ in the normal form (as in Lemma A3), with normal eigenvalues

$$\lambda_j = 1 - 2D_j \quad (\text{A37})$$

for each $j \in [n]$.

Proof. Since $C(\rho)$ is Hermitian, for the spectral theorem, there exists $u \in U(n)$ such that $C(\rho) = uDu^\dagger$, where D is a diagonal (real) matrix. We now define the matrix O :

$$O = \text{Re}(u) \otimes I + \text{Im}(u) \otimes iY. \quad (\text{A38})$$

This matrix O is orthogonal (and symplectic), as can be verified by using that

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Re}(u)\text{Re}(u)^t + \text{Im}(u)\text{Im}(u)^t &= I, \\ \text{Re}(u)\text{Im}(u)^t - \text{Im}(u)\text{Re}(u)^t &= 0, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A39})$$

which follows from the unitarity of u . Now, using Eq. (A38), Eq. (A39), and the fact that for particle-preserving states, $\Gamma(\rho)$ can be written in terms of $C(\rho)$ as in Eq. (A30), it can be verified by inspection that

$$O^T \Gamma(\rho) O = \text{diag}(1 - 2D_1, \dots, 1 - 2D_n) \otimes iY. \quad (\text{A40})$$

Thus, the normal eigenvalues of $\Gamma(\rho)$ are $\{1 - 2D_j\}_{j=1}^n$, where the D_j are the eigenvalues of $C(\rho)$. $\blacksquare$

Using the upper bound in Eq. (A36) and the eigenvalue relation in Lemma A11, we can directly transfer many of the inequalities that we show in the following appendix to the particle-preserving case.

APPENDIX B: NORM INEQUALITIES FOR FREE- AND NON-FREE-FERMIONIC STATES

In this appendix, we derive key relations concerning free-fermionic states, laying the groundwork for our subsequent analysis of property testing and tomography. Specifically, in Sec. B1, we present several results that are instrumental in proving the main result of this work, some of which have been established in previous work. Particularly noteworthy is the exact computation of the derivative of a Gaussian state with respect to an element of its covariance matrix, which proves to be fundamental for deriving the optimal trace-distance bound. In Sec. B2, we present trace-distance bounds between Gaussian states, specifically restricted to the pure-state scenario. Notably, we derive an optimal trace-distance bound between two pure Gaussian states in terms of their covariance matrices. In Sec. B3, we extend these results to the mixed-state scenario by providing a similar optimal trace-distance bound for mixed states. To conclude, in Sec. B4, we present lower bounds for both pure and mixed states on the minimum trace-distance between a generic state and the sets of Gaussian states $\mathcal{G}_{\text{pure}}$, $\mathcal{G}_{\text{mixed}}$, and $\mathcal{G}_R$, corresponding to pure, mixed, and bounded-rank- R Gaussian states, respectively. These bounds, in addition to being instrumental for the testing application, provide measurable lower bounds on non-Gaussianity.

1. General lemmas

Lemma B1 (Gentle-measurement lemma (or quantum union bound) [66]). Let $\varepsilon_1, \dots, \varepsilon_M > 0$, where $M \in \mathbb{N}$. Consider the projectors $\{P_i\}_{i=1}^M$. Let ρ be a quantum state. If $\text{Tr}(P_i \rho) \geq 1 - \varepsilon_i$ holds for all $i \in [n]$, then

$$\left\| \rho - \frac{P_n \dots P_1 \rho P_1 \dots P_M}{\text{Tr}(P_n \dots P_1 \rho P_1 \dots P_M)} \right\|_1 \leq 2 \sqrt{\sum_{i \in [M]} \varepsilon_i}. \quad (\text{B1})$$

Lemma B2 (Perturbation bounds on normal eigenvalues). Let A and B be two $2n \times 2n$ real antisymmetric matrices with eigenvalues $\{\pm i\lambda_k(A)\}_{k=1}^n$ and $\{\pm i\lambda_k(B)\}_{k=1}^n$, respectively, where $0 \leq \lambda_1(A) \leq \dots \leq \lambda_n(A)$ and $0 \leq \lambda_1(B) \leq \dots \leq \lambda_n(B)$. We then have

$$\|A - B\|_\infty \geq |\lambda_k(A) - \lambda_k(B)|, \quad (\text{B2})$$

for any $k \in [n]$.

Proof. This follows from the fact that $C := iA$ and $D := iB$ are Hermitian matrices. Applying *Weyl's perturbation theorem* (see Ref. [67, Corollary III.2.6]), which states that given two $2n \times 2n$ Hermitian matrices C and D with eigenvalues $c_1 \leq \dots \leq c_{2n}$ and $d_1 \leq \dots \leq d_{2n}$, we have

$$\|C - D\|_\infty \geq |c_j - d_j|, \quad (\text{B3})$$

for any $j \in [2n]$. This implies that

$$\begin{aligned} \|A - B\|_\infty &= \|C - D\|_\infty \\ &\geq \max_{j \in [2n]} |c_j - d_j| = \max_{k \in [n]} |\lambda_k(A) - \lambda_k(B)|. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B4})$$

■

Lemma B3 (Inequality for antisymmetric matrices). For any real antisymmetric matrix $C = -C^T$, the inequality

$$\|C\|_1^2 + 2\text{tr}(\Lambda C \Lambda C) \geq 2\|C\|_2^2 + \text{tr}(C \Lambda)^2 \quad (\text{B5})$$

holds, where $\Lambda = \mathbb{1} \otimes \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ -1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$ or, more generally, any orthogonal antisymmetric matrix.

Proof. We can write C in its normal form $C = O \Lambda_\lambda O^T$, where

$$\Lambda_\lambda := \text{diag}(\lambda) \otimes \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ -1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (\text{B6})$$

where the λ are the normal eigenvalues of C and $OO^T = \mathbb{1}$ is orthogonal. As such, the expression we want to show becomes

$$\|\Lambda_\lambda\|_1^2 + 2\text{tr}(\Lambda O \Lambda_\lambda O^T \Lambda O \Lambda_\lambda O^T) - 2\|\Lambda_\lambda\|_2^2 - \text{tr}(O \Lambda_\lambda O^T \Lambda)^2 \geq 0. \quad (\text{B7})$$

We have

$$\begin{aligned} &\|\Lambda_\lambda\|_1^2 + 2\text{tr}(\Lambda O \Lambda_\lambda O^T \Lambda O \Lambda_\lambda O^T) - 2\|\Lambda_\lambda\|_2^2 - \text{tr}(O \Lambda_\lambda O^T \Lambda)^2 \\ &= \text{Tr}(|\Lambda_\lambda|)^2 + 2\text{tr}(\Lambda O \Lambda_\lambda O^T \Lambda O \Lambda_\lambda O^T) + 2\text{tr}(\Lambda_\lambda^2) - \text{tr}(O \Lambda_\lambda O^T \Lambda)^2 \\ &= 4 \left(\sum_{j=1}^n \lambda_j \right)^2 + 2\text{tr}(\Lambda O \Lambda_\lambda O^T \Lambda O \Lambda_\lambda O^T) - 4 \sum_{j=1}^n \lambda_j^2 - \text{tr}(O \Lambda_\lambda O^T \Lambda)^2 \\ &= 4 \left(\sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i \right)^2 + 2\text{tr}(\Lambda_\lambda Q \Lambda_\lambda Q) - 4 \sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i^2 - \text{tr}(\Lambda_\lambda Q)^2, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B8})$$

where $Q = O^T \Lambda O$ is also an orthogonal antisymmetric matrix. This expression can be expanded as

$$\begin{aligned} &4 \sum_{i,j=1}^n \lambda_i \lambda_j + 4 \sum_{i,j=1}^n \lambda_i \lambda_j (-Q_{2i-1,2j-1} Q_{2j,2i} + Q_{2i-1,2j} Q_{2j-1,2i}) - 4 \sum_{i,j=1}^n \lambda_i \lambda_j Q_{2i-1,2i} Q_{2j-1,2j} - 4 \sum_{i,j=1}^n \delta_{i,j} \lambda_i \lambda_j \\ &= 4 \sum_{i,j=1}^n \lambda_i \lambda_j (1 - Q_{2i-1,2j-1} Q_{2j,2i} + Q_{2i-1,2j} Q_{2j-1,2i} - Q_{2i-1,2i} Q_{2j-1,2j} - \delta_{i,j}) \geq 0. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B9})$$

For $i = j$, this expression is trivially true. As such, we need that, for each $i \neq j \in [n]$,

$$\begin{aligned}
 0 &\leq 1 - Q_{2i-1,2j-1}Q_{2j,2i} + Q_{2i-1,2j}Q_{2j-1,2i} - Q_{2i-1,2i}Q_{2j-1,2j} \\
 &= 1 + Q_{2i-1,2j-1}Q_{2i,2j} - Q_{2i-1,2j}Q_{2i,2j-1} - Q_{2i-1,2i}Q_{2j-1,2j} \\
 &= 1 - \text{Pf} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & Q_{2i-1,2i} & Q_{2i-1,2j-1} & Q_{2i-1,2j} \\ -Q_{2i-1,2i} & 0 & Q_{2i,2j-1} & Q_{2i,2j} \\ -Q_{2i-1,2j-1} & -Q_{2i,2j-1} & 0 & Q_{2j-1,2j} \\ -Q_{2i-1,2j} & -Q_{2i,2j} & -Q_{2j-1,2j} & 0 \end{pmatrix}. \tag{B10}
 \end{aligned}$$

This corresponds to the Pfaffian of a submatrix of Q , denoted $Q|_{2i-1,2i,2j-1,2j}$. The Pfaffian is equal to the product of all normal eigenvalues of the submatrix. Since projecting onto a subspace can only reduce the singular values and the largest singular value of the orthogonal matrix Q is one, we obtain the inequality

$$\|PQP^\dagger\|_\infty \leq \|P\|_\infty \|Q\|_\infty \|P^\dagger\|_\infty = 1, \tag{B11}$$

where P is the projection matrix associated with the relevant indices. This establishes the desired bound for the Pfaffian of the submatrix. Therefore, $\text{Pf}(Q|_{2i-1,2i,2j-1,2j}) \leq 1$, which completes the proof. ■

Lemma B4 (Derivative for free-fermionic states). Let $\rho(\Gamma)$ be a possibly mixed free-fermionic state associated

with the correlation matrix Γ . Then, we have

$$\partial_\alpha \rho(\Gamma + \alpha X)|_{\alpha=0} = -\frac{i}{8} \sum_{a,b} X_{a,b} [\gamma_a, \{\gamma_b, \rho\}]. \tag{B12}$$

Proof. Let us now assume the state to be in normal form, i.e., $\Gamma = Q\Lambda_\Gamma Q^T$. For the change, we only consider the basis element $X = E_{a,b}$, i.e., an antisymmetric unit matrix. By derivative rules, the general result follows. In normal form, we can write the state as

$$\rho(\Lambda_\Gamma) = \frac{1}{2^n} \prod_{i=1}^n (1 - i\lambda_i \gamma_{2i-1} \gamma_{2i}), \tag{B13}$$

where $\{\lambda_i\}_{i \in [n]}$ are the normal eigenvalues. For the perturbed state, we have

$$\rho(\Lambda_\Gamma + \alpha E_{a,b}) = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{2^n} \prod_{i=1}^n (1 - i(\lambda_i + \delta_{c,i}\alpha) \gamma_{2i-1} \gamma_{2i}), & \text{if } a = 2c - 1, b = 2c, \\ \rho - \alpha i \gamma_a \gamma_b \frac{1}{2^n} \prod_{i=1, i \neq \lceil \frac{a}{2} \rceil, \lceil \frac{b}{2} \rceil}^n (1 - i\lambda_i \gamma_{2i-1} \gamma_{2i}). \end{cases} \tag{B14}$$

The first case follows directly, as the state is still a state in normal form. For the second, we can take all Majorana operators where the submatrix corresponds to a nonvanishing Pfaffian. This contains all the previous matrices but also the additional ones where we select the indices (a, b) , without their corresponding paired modes. As such, we have that the derivative is given by

$$\partial_\alpha \rho(\Lambda_\Gamma + \alpha E_{a,b})|_{\alpha=0} = \begin{cases} \frac{-i}{2^n} \gamma_a \gamma_b \prod_{i=1, i \neq c}^n (1 - i\lambda_i \gamma_{2i-1} \gamma_{2i}), & \text{if } a = 2c - 1, b = 2c, \\ \frac{-i}{2^n} \gamma_a \gamma_b \prod_{i=1, i \neq \lceil \frac{a}{2} \rceil, \lceil \frac{b}{2} \rceil}^n (1 - i\lambda_i \gamma_{2i-1} \gamma_{2i}). \end{cases} \tag{B15}$$

We can write it in a concise form as

$$\partial_\alpha \rho(\Lambda_\Gamma + \alpha E_{a,b})|_{\alpha=0} = \frac{-i}{2^n} \gamma_a \gamma_b \prod_{i=1}^n (1 - i\lambda_i \gamma_{2i-1} \gamma_{2i} \delta_{i \notin \{\lceil \frac{a}{2} \rceil, \lceil \frac{b}{2} \rceil\}}). \tag{B16}$$

We proceed to show that Eq. (B12) is indeed the expression for the derivative. First, let us compute $\{\gamma_b, \rho\}$, to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \{\gamma_b, \rho\} &= \frac{1}{2^n} \left[\gamma_b \prod_{i=1}^n (1 - i\lambda_i \gamma_{2i-1} \gamma_{2i}) + \prod_{i=1}^n (1 - i\lambda_i \gamma_{2i-1} \gamma_{2i}) \gamma_b \right] \\ &= \frac{2}{2^n} \gamma_b \prod_{i=1}^n (1 - i\lambda_i \gamma_{2i-1} \gamma_{2i} \delta_{i \neq \lceil \frac{b}{2} \rceil}), \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B17})$$

which follows from the fact that γ_b commutes with $\gamma_{2i-1} \gamma_{2i}$ as long as $b \notin \{2i-1, 2i\}$, which can be concisely written as $i \neq \lceil b/2 \rceil$. Applying the commutator gives (for $a \neq b$)

$$\begin{aligned} [\gamma_a, \{\gamma_b, \rho\}] &= \frac{2}{2^n} \left(\gamma_a \gamma_b \prod_{i=1}^n (1 - i\lambda_i \gamma_{2i-1} \gamma_{2i} \delta_{i \neq \lceil \frac{b}{2} \rceil}) - \gamma_b \prod_{i=1}^n (1 - i\lambda_i \gamma_{2i-1} \gamma_{2i} \delta_{i \neq \lceil \frac{b}{2} \rceil}) \gamma_a \right) \\ &= \frac{2}{2^n} \left(\gamma_a \gamma_b \prod_{i=1}^n (1 - i\lambda_i \gamma_{2i-1} \gamma_{2i} \delta_{i \neq \lceil \frac{b}{2} \rceil}) + \gamma_a \gamma_b \prod_{i=1}^n (1 - i\lambda_i \gamma_{2i-1} \gamma_{2i} \delta_{i \neq \lceil \frac{b}{2} \rceil}) (-1)^{\delta_{i=\lceil \frac{a}{2} \rceil}} \right) \\ &= \frac{4}{2^n} \gamma_a \gamma_b \prod_{i=1}^n (1 - i\lambda_i \gamma_{2i-1} \gamma_{2i} \delta_{i \notin \{\lceil \frac{a}{2} \rceil, \lceil \frac{b}{2} \rceil\}}), \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B18})$$

where we have used the fact that $\{\gamma_a, \gamma_b\} = 0$ for $a \neq b$. Hence, we can write

$$\partial_\alpha \rho(\Lambda_\Gamma + \alpha E_{a,b})|_{\alpha=0} = -\frac{i}{4} [\gamma_a, \{\gamma_b, \rho\}]. \quad (\text{B19})$$

As such, we have shown equivalence. In general, we can write

$$\begin{aligned} \rho(\Gamma + \alpha X) &= \rho(Q \Lambda_\Gamma Q^T + \alpha X) = U_Q \rho(\Lambda_\Gamma + \alpha Q^T X Q) U_Q^\dagger \\ &= U_Q \rho(\Lambda_\Gamma + \alpha \tilde{X}) U_Q^\dagger. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B20})$$

Hence, the derivative, due to the chain rule, is equal to

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_\alpha \rho(\Lambda_\Gamma + \alpha X)|_{\alpha=0} &= U_Q \partial_\alpha \rho \left(\Lambda_\Gamma + \alpha \sum_{a \leq b} \tilde{X}_{a,b} E_{a,b} \right) \Big|_{\alpha=0} U_Q^\dagger \\ &= U_Q \sum_{a \leq b} \tilde{X}_{a,b} \partial_\alpha \rho(\Lambda_\Gamma + \alpha E_{a,b})|_{\alpha=0} U_Q^\dagger \\ &= -\frac{i}{4} U_Q \sum_{a \leq b} \tilde{X}_{a,b} [\gamma_a, \{\gamma_b, \rho(\Lambda_\Gamma)\}] U_Q^\dagger \\ &= -\frac{i}{4} \sum_{a \leq b} \tilde{X}_{a,b} [U_Q \gamma_a U_Q^\dagger, \{U_Q \gamma_b U_Q^\dagger, U_Q \rho(\Lambda_\Gamma) U_Q^\dagger\}] \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B21})$$

$$= -\frac{i}{4} \sum_{a \leq b} (Q \tilde{X} Q^T)_{a,b} [\gamma_a, \{\gamma_b, \rho(\Gamma)\}]$$

$$= -\frac{i}{8} \sum_{a,b} X_{a,b} [\gamma_a, \{\gamma_b, \rho(\Gamma)\}],$$

which concludes the proof. $\blacksquare$

2. Trace-distance bounds for pure free-fermionic states

We leverage the *gentle-measurement lemma* to establish the following result.

Proposition B1 (Trace distance between a pure free-fermionic state and an arbitrary state). For a free-fermionic state vector $|\psi\rangle$ and an arbitrary (possibly non-free-fermionic) state ρ , it holds that

$$\|\rho - |\psi\rangle\langle\psi|\|_1 \leq \sqrt{\|\Gamma(\rho) - \Gamma(|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|)\|_1}. \quad (\text{B22})$$

Proof. Since $|\psi\rangle$ is a free-fermionic state, it can be expressed as $|\psi\rangle = U_Q |0^n\rangle$ for a free-fermionic unitary associated with $Q \in \text{O}(2n)$. Define $\rho' := U_Q^\dagger \rho U_Q$. For any $j \in [n]$, we have

$$\text{Tr}(|0\rangle\langle 0|_j \rho') = \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2} [\Gamma(\rho')]_{2j-1, 2j} =: 1 - \varepsilon_j, \quad (\text{B23})$$

where we have used $|0\rangle\langle 0|_j = (I + Z_j)/2 = (I - i\gamma_{2j-1}\gamma_{2j})/2$ and $\varepsilon_j := (1 - [\Gamma(\rho')]_{2j-1, 2j})/2$. Now,

we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\rho - |\psi\rangle\langle\psi|\|_1 &= \|\rho' - |0^n\rangle\langle 0^n|\|_1 \\ &\leq 2 \sqrt{\sum_{j=1}^n \varepsilon_j} = 2 \sqrt{\sum_{j=1}^n \frac{1 - [\Gamma(\rho')]_{2j-1,2j}}{2}}, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B24})$$

where we have used the unitary invariance of the one-norm and the gentle-measurement lemma (Lemma B1). Let Λ be the matrix $\Lambda := \bigoplus_{j=1}^n \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ -1 & 0 \end{pmatrix} = \Gamma(|0^n\rangle\langle 0^n|)$. Observe that $\sum_{j=1}^n [\Gamma(\rho')]_{2j-1,2j} = \frac{1}{2} \text{Tr}(\Lambda^\dagger \Gamma(\rho'))$. Using this and Eq. (B24), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\rho - |\psi\rangle\langle\psi|\|_1 &\leq \sqrt{\text{Tr}(I_{2n} - \Lambda^\dagger \Gamma(\rho'))} \\ &\leq \sqrt{\|I_{2n} - \Lambda^\dagger \Gamma(\rho')\|_1} \\ &= \sqrt{\|\Lambda - \Gamma(U_Q^\dagger \rho U_Q)\|_1} \\ &= \sqrt{\|\Lambda - Q^T \Gamma(\rho) Q\|_1} \\ &= \sqrt{\|\Gamma(|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|) - \Gamma(\rho)\|_1}, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B25})$$

where in the second step we have used the Hölder inequality; in the third step, the definition of one-norm; in the third step, the unitary invariance of the one-norm and the definition of ρ' ; in the fourth step, the fact that $\Gamma(U_Q^\dagger \rho U_Q) = Q^T \Gamma(\rho) Q$; and in the last step, the unitary invariance of the one-norm and the fact that $\Gamma(|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|) = Q \Gamma(|0^n\rangle\langle 0^n|) Q^T$. ■

As discussed in the main text, the above inequality can be useful for quantum state certification scopes, as we briefly detail now. Consider the scenario in which one aims to prepare the free-fermionic state ψ , with known correlation matrix $\Gamma(\psi)$. However, in a noisy experimental setup, an unknown state ρ is effectively prepared instead. By estimating the correlation matrix of ρ with precision ε , achievable through efficient experimental methods as discussed in Appendix C, we obtain an approximation $\tilde{\Gamma}$ satisfying $\|\tilde{\Gamma} - \Gamma(\rho)\|_1 \leq \varepsilon$. Next, we evaluate the quantity $a := \|\tilde{\Gamma} - \Gamma(\psi)\|_1$ efficiently classically, which can be related to the trace-distance error incurred during the preparation of ψ as

$$\begin{aligned} \|\psi - \rho\|_1 &\leq \sqrt{\|\Gamma(\psi) - \Gamma(\rho)\|_1} \\ &\leq \sqrt{\|\Gamma(\psi) - \tilde{\Gamma}\|_1 + \|\tilde{\Gamma} - \Gamma(\rho)\|_1} \\ &= \sqrt{a + \varepsilon} \leq \sqrt{a} + \sqrt{\varepsilon}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B26})$$

Thus, this inequality provides a bound on the trace-distance error between the prepared state ρ and the target

state ψ , incorporating both the classical evaluated error a and the experimental accuracy ε .

Theorem B1 (Trace-distance upper bound between two pure free-fermionic states). Let ψ_1, ψ_2 pure free-fermionic states with correlation matrices $\Gamma(\psi_1), \Gamma(\psi_2)$. Assuming that $\|\Gamma(\psi_1) - \Gamma(\psi_2)\|_\infty < 2$, it holds that

$$\|\psi_1 - \psi_2\|_1 \leq \frac{1}{2} \|\Gamma(\psi_1) - \Gamma(\psi_2)\|_2 \quad (\text{B27})$$

and

$$\mathcal{F}(\psi_1, \psi_2) \geq 1 - \frac{1}{16} \|\Gamma(\psi_1) - \Gamma(\psi_2)\|_2^2, \quad (\text{B28})$$

where $\mathcal{F}(\psi_1, \psi_2) = |\langle\psi_1|\psi_2\rangle|^2$. Otherwise, if the quantity $\|\Gamma(\psi_1) - \Gamma(\psi_2)\|_\infty$ (which is always ≤ 2) is equal to 2, then we simply have $\|\psi_1 - \psi_2\|_1 = 2$ and $\mathcal{F}(\psi_1, \psi_2) = 0$.

Proof. First of all, we have

$$\|\psi_1 - \psi_2\|_1 = 2\sqrt{1 - |\langle\psi_1|\psi_2\rangle|^2}. \quad (\text{B29})$$

This can be seen by considering $Q := \psi_1 - \psi_2$. The Hermitian matrix Q has a rank of at most 2, which means that it can have at most two nonzero eigenvalues denoted as λ_1 and λ_2 . Since the trace of Q is zero, we have $\lambda_2 = -\lambda_1$. Additionally, we know that $\text{Tr}(Q^2) = \lambda_1^2 + \lambda_2^2 = 2\lambda_1^2$, and $\text{Tr}(Q^2) = 2(1 - |\langle\psi_1|\psi_2\rangle|^2)$. Therefore, we can conclude that $\lambda_1 = \sqrt{1 - |\langle\psi_1|\psi_2\rangle|^2}$. The 1-norm of Q is given by $\|Q\|_1 = |\lambda_1| + |\lambda_2|$, which simplifies to

$$\|\psi_1 - \psi_2\|_1 = 2\sqrt{1 - |\langle\psi_1|\psi_2\rangle|^2}. \quad (\text{B30})$$

From Lemma A7, it follows that

$$|\langle\psi_1|\psi_2\rangle|^2 = \sqrt{\det\left(\frac{\Gamma(\psi_1) + \Gamma(\psi_2)}{2}\right)}, \quad (\text{B31})$$

where we have used that $(\text{Pf}(A))^2 = \det(A)$ (note that the determinant of an antisymmetric matrix is positive). Thus, we have

$$\begin{aligned} |\langle\psi_1|\psi_2\rangle|^2 &= \sqrt{\det(\Gamma(\psi_1)^T) \det\left(\frac{\Gamma(\psi_1) + \Gamma(\psi_2)}{2}\right)} \\ &= \sqrt{\det\left(\frac{\mathbb{1} + \Gamma(\psi_1)^T \Gamma(\psi_2)}{2}\right)} \\ &= \sqrt{\det\left(\frac{\mathbb{1} + X}{2}\right)}, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B32})$$

where the first step follows because $\det(\Gamma(\psi_1)^T) = \det(\Gamma(\psi_1)) = 1$ (see Remark A1) and the second step follows from $\det(A) \det(B) = \det(AB)$ and the fact that $\Gamma(\psi_1)$

is an orthogonal matrix (see Remark A1). In the last step, we have defined $X := \Gamma(\psi_1)^T \Gamma(\psi_2)$, which is also an orthogonal matrix (being a product of two orthogonal matrices). Since the determinant of a matrix is equal to the product of its eigenvalues, we have

$$|\langle \psi_1 | \psi_2 \rangle|^2 = \sqrt{\det\left(\frac{\mathbb{1} + X}{2}\right)} = \sqrt{\prod_{j=1}^{2n} \left(\frac{1 + \lambda_j(X)}{2}\right)}, \quad (\text{B33})$$

where we have denoted as $\{\lambda_j(X)\}_{j=1}^{2n}$ the eigenvalues of X . Since X is orthogonal, we also have that for each $j \in [2n]$, there exists $\phi_j \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $\lambda_j(X) = e^{i\phi_j}$.

We are now going to show that all eigenvalues of X have multiplicity 2. Let $|v\rangle$ be an eigenvector of X corresponding to the eigenvalue λ , so that

$$X |v\rangle = \lambda |v\rangle. \quad (\text{B34})$$

We also have that

$$\begin{aligned} X(\Gamma(\psi_2) |v\rangle^*) &= \Gamma(\psi_1)^T \Gamma(\psi_2)^2 |v\rangle^* \\ &= -\Gamma(\psi_1)^T |v\rangle^* = -\Gamma(\psi_1)^T \frac{1}{\lambda^*} (X |v\rangle)^* \\ &= \lambda(\Gamma(\psi_2) |v\rangle^*), \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B35})$$

where the third step follows from the fact that $\Gamma(\psi_2)$ is antisymmetric and orthogonal and the fifth step from the fact that $\lambda^{-1} = \lambda^*$. Thus, $\Gamma(\psi_2) |v\rangle^*$ and $|v\rangle$ are both eigenstates of X with eigenvalue λ . Note that they must be different vectors. In fact, if it holds that $\Gamma(\psi_2) |v\rangle^* = e^{i\theta} |v\rangle$ for $\theta \in [0, 2\pi]$, then multiplying by $\Gamma(\psi_2)$ we also have

$$\begin{aligned} -|v\rangle^* &= e^{i\theta} \Gamma(\psi_2) |v\rangle = e^{i\theta} (\Gamma(\psi_2) |v\rangle^*)^* \\ &= e^{i\theta} (e^{i\theta} |v\rangle)^* = |v\rangle^*. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B36})$$

Thus, we have $|v\rangle^* = -|v\rangle^*$, which cannot be true. Thus we have shown that all eigenvalues of X have multiplicity 2. Thus, without loss of generality, we can assume that $\lambda_{n+k}(X) = \lambda_k(X)$ for $k \in [n]$, meaning that we can only look at the first half of the eigenvalues. Hence, from Eq. (B33), we have

$$|\langle \psi_1 | \psi_2 \rangle|^2 = \prod_{j=1}^n \left(\frac{1 + \lambda_j(X)}{2}\right). \quad (\text{B37})$$

If an eigenvalue $\lambda_j(X) = e^{i\phi_j}$ is not real (which implies that its associated eigenstate is not a real vector), then also $\lambda_j^*(X) = e^{-i\phi_j}$ will be a distinct eigenvalue of X [as follows by simply taking the complex conjugate of Eq. (B34)]. The remaining eigenvalues will be $+1$ or -1 .

Let us denote by $2n_c$ the number of not-real eigenvalues (they are even, as they come in pairs), with n_+ as the number of $+1$ eigenvalues and with n_- as the number of -1 eigenvalues, so that we have

$$n_+ + n_- + 2n_c = n. \quad (\text{B38})$$

Thus, the eigenvalues of X will be

$$\{\lambda_1(X), \dots, \lambda_n(X)\} = \left\{ \underbrace{e^{i\phi_1}, e^{-i\phi_1}, \dots, e^{i\phi_{n_c}}, e^{-i\phi_{n_c}}}_{2n_c}, \underbrace{+1, \dots, +1}_{n_+}, \underbrace{-1, \dots, -1}_{n_-} \right\}, \quad (\text{B39})$$

where the $\{e^{i\phi_j}\}_{j=1}^{n_c}$ are not real. Hence, we find

$$\begin{aligned} |\langle \psi_1 | \psi_2 \rangle|^2 &= \delta_{n_-,0} \prod_{j=1}^{n_c} \frac{1}{4} (1 + e^{i\phi_j}) (1 + e^{-i\phi_j}) \\ &= \delta_{n_-,0} \prod_{j=1}^{n_c} \frac{1}{2} (1 + \cos(\phi_j)) \\ &= \delta_{n_-,0} \prod_{j=1}^{n_c} (1 - \sin^2(\phi_j/2)) \\ &\geq \delta_{n_-,0} \left(1 - \sum_{j=1}^{n_c} \sin^2(\phi_j/2)\right), \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B40})$$

where in the last step we have used Weierstrass's product inequality. Next, we can rewrite

$$\begin{aligned} \|\Gamma(\psi_1) - \Gamma(\psi_2)\|_2^2 &= \|1 - \Gamma(\psi_1)^T \Gamma(\psi_2)\|_2^2 \\ &= \|1 - X\|_2^2 \\ &= \sum_{j=1}^{2n} |1 - \lambda_j(X)|^2 \\ &= 2 \sum_{j=1}^n |1 - \lambda_j(X)|^2 \\ &= 2 \left(\sum_{j=1}^{n_c} (|1 - e^{i\phi_j}|^2 + |1 - e^{-i\phi_j}|^2) + \sum_{j=1}^{n_+} 0 + \sum_{j=1}^{n_-} 4 \right) \\ &= 16 \sum_{j=1}^{n_c} \sin^2(\phi_j/2) + 8n_-, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B41})$$

where in the last step we have used that $|1 - e^{i\phi_j}| = 2|\sin(\phi_j/2)|$. If $n_- > 0$, Eq. (B40) implies that

$|\langle \psi_1 | \psi_2 \rangle|^2 = 0$. Thus, using Eq. (B29), we have

$$\|\psi_1 - \psi_2\|_1 = 2, \quad \text{if } n_- > 0. \quad (\text{B42})$$

If $n_- = 0$, Eqs. (B40) and (B41) imply that

$$\mathcal{F}(\psi_1, \psi_2) = |\langle \psi_1 | \psi_2 \rangle|^2 \geq 1 - \frac{1}{16} \|\Gamma(\psi_1) - \Gamma(\psi_2)\|_2^2. \quad (\text{B43})$$

Thus, by Eq. (B29), we arrive at

$$\|\psi_1 - \psi_2\|_1 \leq \frac{1}{2} \|\Gamma(\psi_1) - \Gamma(\psi_2)\|_2, \quad \text{if } n_- = 0. \quad (\text{B44})$$

We are now only left to show that the condition $n_- = 0$ is satisfied if and only if it holds that $\|\Gamma(\psi_1) - \Gamma(\psi_2)\|_\infty < 2$. This is indeed the case, since the quantity (which is always ≤ 2)

$$\|\Gamma(\psi_1) - \Gamma(\psi_2)\|_\infty = \|1 - X\|_\infty \quad (\text{B45})$$

can be equal to 2 if and only if X has at least a -1 eigenvalues if and only if $n_- > 0$. ■

Remark B1 (Saturation of the inequality). We note that the above upper bound is saturated for all pure free-fermionic states ψ_1, ψ_2 with number of modes or qubits $n \leq 3$. Thus, we obtain

$$\|\psi_1 - \psi_2\|_1 = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{2} \|\Gamma(\psi_1) - \Gamma(\psi_2)\|_2, & \text{if } \|\Gamma(\psi_1) - \Gamma(\psi_2)\|_\infty < 2, \\ 2, & \text{if } \|\Gamma(\psi_1) - \Gamma(\psi_2)\|_\infty = 2. \end{cases} \quad (\text{B46})$$

Proof. The case $\|\Gamma(\psi_1) - \Gamma(\psi_2)\|_\infty = 2$ is analogous to the previous proof, so let us focus on $\|\Gamma(\psi_1) - \Gamma(\psi_2)\|_\infty < 2$. Using the same notation as in the previous proof, we have that $n_- = 0$, i.e., the number of -1 eigenvalues of $X := \Gamma(\psi_1)^T \Gamma(\psi_2)$ is zero. Hence, because of Eq. (B40), we have

$$|\langle \psi_1 | \psi_2 \rangle|^2 = \prod_{j=1}^{n_c} (1 - \sin^2(\phi_j)). \quad (\text{B47})$$

From Eq. (B38) and using that $n \leq 3$, we obtain

$$2n_c + n_+ \leq 3, \quad (\text{B48})$$

which implies that $n_c = 0$ or $n_c = 1$. If $n_c = 0$, we have $|\langle \psi_1 | \psi_2 \rangle|^2 = 1$, which implies that $\|\psi_1 - \psi_2\|_1 = 0$. Furthermore, because of Eq. (B41), we also have that $\frac{1}{2} \|\Gamma(\psi_1) - \Gamma(\psi_2)\|_2 = 0$.

If $n_c = 1$, we then have

$$|\langle \psi_1 | \psi_2 \rangle|^2 = 1 - \sin^2(\phi_1) = 1 - \frac{1}{16} \|\Gamma(\psi_1) - \Gamma(\psi_2)\|_2^2, \quad (\text{B49})$$

where in the first step we have used Eq. (B47) and in the second step we have used Eq. (B41). Thus, we reach the conclusion by using that $\|\psi_1 - \psi_2\|_1 = 2\sqrt{1 - |\langle \psi_1 | \psi_2 \rangle|^2}$. ■

In the next theorem, we also provide a lower bound on the trace distance between two pure Gaussian states in terms of the 2-norm difference of their covariance matrices.

Theorem B2 (Lower bound on trace distance in terms of correlation matrices). Let ψ_1 and ψ_2 be two pure nonorthogonal Gaussian states. Their trace distance is lower bounded by

$$\|\psi_1 - \psi_2\|_1 \geq 2\sqrt{1 - \exp(-\|\Gamma_1 - \Gamma_2\|_2^2/16)}. \quad (\text{B50})$$

In particular, if $\|\Gamma_1 - \Gamma_2\|_2 \leq 4$, it holds that $\|\psi_1 - \psi_2\|_1 \geq \frac{3}{8} \|\Gamma_1 - \Gamma_2\|_2$.

Proof. The proof follows the same steps as the proof of Theorem B1. As such, we use the same notation that we have defined above. On the one hand, from Eq. (B40), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\psi_1 - \psi_2\|_1 &= 2\sqrt{1 - |\langle \psi_1 | \psi_2 \rangle|^2} \\ &= 2\sqrt{1 - \delta_{n_-,0} \left(1 - \sum_{j=1}^{n_c} \sin^2(\phi_j/2)\right)}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B51})$$

On the other hand, from Eq. (B41), we have

$$\|\Gamma(\psi_1) - \Gamma(\psi_2)\|_2^2 = 16 \sum_{j=1}^{n_c} \sin^2(\phi_j/2). \quad (\text{B52})$$

As we noted in the proof of Theorem B1, whenever $n_- \neq 0$, then $\|\psi_1 - \psi_2\|_1 = 2$ (i.e., the states are maximally far

away). Setting $n_- = 0$, we therefore lower bound the trace distance with the 2-norm of the covariance matrices. Since $(1 - x) \leq e^{-x}$, we can bound Eq. (B51) from below as

$$\begin{aligned} \|\psi_1 - \psi_2\|_1 &\geq 2 \sqrt{1 - \exp\left(-\sum_{j=1}^{n_c} \sin^2(\phi_j/2)\right)} \\ &= 2 \sqrt{1 - \exp\left(-\frac{1}{16} \|\Gamma(\psi_1) - \Gamma(\psi_2)\|_2^2\right)}, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B53})$$

obtaining the desired result. $\blacksquare$

3. Trace-distance bounds for mixed free-fermionic states

Proposition B2 (Lower bound on trace distance in terms of correlation matrices). Given two quantum states ρ and σ , their trace distance is lower bounded by the operator norm difference

$$\|\rho - \sigma\|_1 \geq \|\Gamma(\rho) - \Gamma(\sigma)\|_\infty \quad (\text{B54})$$

of their correlation matrices, $\Gamma(\rho)$ and $\Gamma(\sigma)$.

Proof. Due to the Hölder inequality, we have

$$\|\rho - \sigma\|_1 \geq \sup_{\|W\|_\infty=1} |\text{Tr}(W(\rho - \sigma))|. \quad (\text{B55})$$

Now, let us restrict the operators W to the form $W = U_Q^\dagger i\gamma_j \gamma_k U_Q$, where $j, k \in [2n]$ and U_Q is a free-fermionic unitary associated with an orthogonal matrix $Q \in \text{O}(2n)$. Indeed, note that $\|U_Q^\dagger i\gamma_j \gamma_k U_Q\|_\infty = \|i\gamma_j \gamma_k\|_\infty = 1$. It holds that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\rho - \sigma\|_1 &\geq \sup_{\|W\|_\infty=1} |\text{Tr}(W(\rho - \sigma))| \\ &= \sup_{\substack{j,k \in [2n] \\ Q \in \text{O}(2n)}} |\text{Tr}(U_Q^\dagger i\gamma_j \gamma_k U_Q(\rho - \sigma))|. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B56})$$

We then have

$$\begin{aligned} &\sup_{\substack{j,k \in [2n] \\ Q \in \text{O}(2n)}} |\text{Tr}(U_Q^\dagger i\gamma_j \gamma_k U_Q(\rho - \sigma))| \\ &= \sup_{\substack{j,k \in [2n] \\ Q \in \text{O}(2n)}} |\text{Tr}(i\gamma_j \gamma_k U_Q(\rho - \sigma) U_Q^\dagger)| \\ &= \sup_{\substack{j,k \in [2n] \\ Q \in \text{O}(2n)}} |(Q(\Gamma(\rho) - \Gamma(\sigma))Q^T)_{j,k}|, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B57})$$

where in the last step we have used that

$$\Gamma(U_Q \rho U_Q^\dagger) = Q \Gamma(\rho) Q^T. \quad (\text{B58})$$

Since $\Gamma(\rho) - \Gamma(\sigma)$ is real and antisymmetric, it can be brought into a normal form $\Gamma(\rho) - \Gamma(\sigma) = O' \Lambda' O'^T$, where $\Lambda' = \bigoplus_{i=1}^n \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \lambda'_i \\ -\lambda'_i & 0 \end{pmatrix}$ and $\{\pm i\lambda'_i\}_{i=1}^n$ are the purely imaginary eigenvalues of $\Gamma(\rho) - \Gamma(\sigma)$. By choosing $Q = O'^T$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\sup_{\substack{j,k \in [2n] \\ Q \in \text{O}(2n)}} |(Q'(\Gamma(\rho) - \Gamma(\sigma))Q'^T)_{j,k}| \\ &\geq \sup_{j,k \in [2n]} |\Lambda'_{j,k}| = \sup_{i \in [n]} |\lambda'_i| = \|\Gamma(\rho) - \Gamma(\sigma)\|_\infty, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B59})$$

which concludes the proof. $\blacksquare$

Next, we present an upper bound on the trace distance between two (possibly mixed) Gaussian states in terms of the norm difference of their respective correlation matrices.

Theorem B3 (Trace-distance upper bound between two mixed free-fermionic states). Let ρ and σ be two (possibly mixed) free-fermionic states. Then, it holds that

$$\|\rho - \sigma\|_1 \leq \frac{1}{2} \|\Gamma(\rho) - \Gamma(\sigma)\|_1 \quad (\text{B60})$$

as well as (from the Fuchs–van de Graaf inequality [68])

$$\begin{aligned} F(\rho, \sigma) &\geq \left(1 - \frac{1}{4} \|\Gamma(\rho) - \Gamma(\sigma)\|_1\right)^2 \\ &\geq 1 - \frac{1}{2} \|\Gamma(\rho) - \Gamma(\sigma)\|_1, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B61})$$

where $\mathcal{F}(\rho, \sigma) := \text{Tr}(\sqrt{\sqrt{\sigma}\rho\sqrt{\sigma}})^2$ is the fidelity between ρ and σ .

Proof. Let us start with the result of Lemma B4, i.e.,

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_\alpha \rho(\Gamma + \alpha X) &= \frac{-i}{8} \sum_{a,b} X_{a,b} [\gamma_a, \{\gamma_b, \rho\}] \\ &= \frac{-i}{8} \sum_{a,b} X_{a,b} (\gamma_a \gamma_b \rho - \rho \gamma_b \gamma_a - \gamma_b \rho \gamma_a + \gamma_a \rho \gamma_b) \\ &= \frac{-i}{4} \sum_{a < b} X_{a,b} (\gamma_a \gamma_b \rho - \rho \gamma_b \gamma_a - \gamma_b \rho \gamma_a + \gamma_a \rho \gamma_b). \end{aligned}$$

Let us first consider the n -mode vacuum state $\rho \equiv |0\rangle\langle 0|$ (in the canonical Jordan–Wigner basis). We define

$$|i\rangle := \gamma_{2i-1} |0\rangle = i\gamma_{2i} |0\rangle, \quad (\text{B62})$$

$$\begin{aligned} |i, j\rangle &:= \gamma_{2i-1} \gamma_{2j-1} |0\rangle = i\gamma_{2i-1} \gamma_{2j} |0\rangle \\ &= i\gamma_{2i} \gamma_{2j-1} |0\rangle = -\gamma_{2i} \gamma_{2j} |0\rangle, \quad i \neq j, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B63})$$

$$|0\rangle = -i\gamma_{2i-1} \gamma_{2i} |0\rangle. \quad (\text{B64})$$

Using these definitions, we can rewrite Eq. (B62) as

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_\alpha \rho(\Lambda + \alpha X)|_{\alpha=0} &= \frac{-i}{8} \sum_{i \neq j \in [n]; a, b \in \{0,1\}} X_{2i-1+a, 2j-1+b} (i^{a+b} |i, j\rangle \langle 0| \\ &\quad - (-i)^{a+b} |0\rangle \langle i, j| - i^{b-a} |j\rangle \langle i| + i^{a-b} |i\rangle \langle j|) \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i \in [n]} X_{2i-1, 2i} (|0\rangle \langle 0| - |i\rangle \langle i|). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B65})$$

Therefore, we can define the two matrices

$$K_{ij} = \frac{-iX_{2i-1, 2j-1} - iX_{2i, 2j} - X_{2i-1, 2j} + X_{2i, 2j-1}}{4}, \quad (\text{B66})$$

$$L_{ij} = \frac{-iX_{2i-1, 2j-1} + iX_{2i, 2j} + X_{2i-1, 2j} + X_{2i, 2j-1}}{4}. \quad (\text{B67})$$

Note that, in general, it holds that

$$X = 2 \begin{pmatrix} -\text{Im}(K) - \text{Im}(L) & -\text{Re}(K) + \text{Re}(L) \\ \text{Re}(K) + \text{Re}(L) & -\text{Im}(K) + \text{Im}(L) \end{pmatrix}, \quad (\text{B68})$$

where the first block describes the odd indices and the second the even indices. This simplifies Eq. (B65) to

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_\alpha \rho(\Lambda + \alpha X)|_{\alpha=0} &= -|0\rangle \langle 0| \text{tr}(K) + \sum_{i,j} |i\rangle \langle j| K_{ij} \\ &\quad + \sum_{i < j} |0\rangle \langle i, j| L_{ij}^* + |i, j\rangle \langle 0| L_{ij} \\ &= \begin{pmatrix} -\text{Tr}(K) & 0 & \vec{L}^\dagger \\ 0 & K & 0 \\ \vec{L} & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}_{\{|0\rangle, |i\rangle, |i, j\rangle\}}, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B69})$$

where $\vec{L}$ is a vectorization of the top triangular component of L . Due to the block-diagonal structure of the derivative, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\partial_\alpha \rho(\Lambda + \alpha X)|_{\alpha=0}\|_1 &= \|K\|_1 + \left\| \begin{pmatrix} -\text{Tr}(K) & \vec{L}^\dagger \\ \vec{L} & 0 \end{pmatrix} \right\|_1 \\ &= \|K\|_1 + \left\| \begin{pmatrix} -\text{Tr}(K) & \frac{\|L\|_2}{\sqrt{2}} \\ \frac{\|L\|_2}{\sqrt{2}} & 0 \end{pmatrix} \right\|_1 \\ &= \|K\|_1 + \sqrt{\text{Tr}(K)^2 + 2\|L\|_2^2}, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B70})$$

where the last step follows from explicitly computing the eigenvalues of the 2×2 matrix. Next, we bound the terms

by the trace norm of X . For the first term, we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\|X\|_1}{4} &\geq \frac{\|X - \Lambda X \Lambda\|_1}{8} = \frac{1}{2} \left\| \begin{pmatrix} -\text{Im}(K) & -\text{Re}(K) \\ \text{Re}(K) & -\text{Im}(K) \end{pmatrix} \right\|_1 \\ &= \frac{1}{4} \left\| \begin{pmatrix} i & -i \\ 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} iK^\dagger & 0 \\ 0 & -iK \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} -i & 1 \\ i & 1 \end{pmatrix} \right\|_1 = \|K\|_1. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B71})$$

For the second expression, we first observe that

$$\text{Tr}(K) = \frac{1}{4} \text{Tr}(\Lambda X), \quad (\text{B72})$$

$$\|L\|_2^2 = \frac{\|X\|_2^2 - \text{tr}(X \Lambda X \Lambda)}{16}. \quad (\text{B73})$$

As such, we can rewrite

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Tr}(K)^2 + 2\|L\|_2^2 &= \frac{\text{Tr}(\Lambda X)^2 + 2\|X\|_2^2 - 2\text{tr}(X \Lambda X \Lambda)}{16} \\ &\leq \frac{\|X\|_1^2}{16}, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B74})$$

using Lemma B3 in the last step. Putting together Eqs. (B71) and (B74), we can bound the derivative in Eq. (B70) as

$$\|\partial_\alpha \rho(\Lambda + \alpha X)|_{\alpha=0}\|_1 \leq \frac{\|X\|_1}{4} + \frac{\|X\|_1}{4} = \frac{\|X\|_1}{2} \quad (\text{B75})$$

for $\rho \equiv |0\rangle \langle 0|$. Instead, for an arbitrary pure Gaussian state, using the unitary invariance of the trace norm, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\partial_\alpha \rho(\Gamma + \alpha X)|_{\alpha=0}\|_1 &= \|\partial_\alpha \rho(Q \Lambda Q^T + \alpha X)|_{\alpha=0}\|_1 \\ &= \|\partial_\alpha \rho(\Lambda + \alpha Q^T X Q)|_{\alpha=0}\|_1 \\ &\leq \frac{\|Q^T X Q\|_1}{2} = \frac{\|X\|_1}{2}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B76})$$

For mixed Gaussian states, we exploit the fact that every Gaussian state can be expressed as a convex mixture of pure Gaussian states, and hence we obtain the bound

$$\begin{aligned} \|\partial_\alpha \rho(\Gamma + \alpha X)|_{\alpha=0}\|_1 &= \left\| \sum_{a \in \{0,1\}^n} p_a \partial_\alpha \rho(Q_a \Lambda Q_a^T + \alpha X)|_{\alpha=0} \right\|_1 \\ &\leq \max_{a \in \{0,1\}^n} \|\partial_\alpha \rho(Q_a \Lambda Q_a^T + \alpha X)|_{\alpha=0}\|_1 \\ &\leq \frac{\|X\|_1}{2} \leq \frac{\|\partial_\alpha \Gamma(\alpha)|_{\alpha=0}\|_1}{2}, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B77})$$

where we have used the linearity of the derivative for the first term. To finally prove the result, we consider a transition $\Gamma(\alpha) = \Gamma_\rho + \alpha(\Gamma_\sigma - \Gamma_\rho)$ with $\alpha \in [0, 1]$, where

$\rho(\alpha)$ is the Gaussian state with $\Gamma(\alpha)$ as the correlation matrix. As such, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\sigma - \rho\|_1 &\leq \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{i=1}^m \left\| \rho\left(\frac{i}{m}\right) - \rho\left(\frac{i-1}{m}\right) \right\|_1 \\
&\leq \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m \left\| m \left(\rho\left(\frac{i}{m}\right) - \rho\left(\frac{i-1}{m}\right) \right) \right\|_1 \\
&\leq \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m \left\| \partial_\alpha \rho(\alpha) \big|_{\alpha=\frac{i}{m}} + O(m^{-1}) \right\|_1 \\
&\leq \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \left(\frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m \left\| \partial_\alpha \rho(\alpha) \big|_{\alpha=\frac{i}{m}} \right\|_1 + O(m^{-1}) \right) \\
&\leq \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m \frac{\|\partial_\alpha \Gamma(\alpha) \big|_{\alpha=\frac{i}{m}}\|_1}{2} \\
&= \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m \frac{\|\Gamma_\sigma - \Gamma_\rho\|_1}{2} = \frac{\|\Gamma_\sigma - \Gamma_\rho\|_1}{2},
\end{aligned} \tag{B78}$$

using the telescope sum in the first step, then Taylor expanding in $1/m$ at $\alpha = i/m$, followed by use of Eq. (B77). This concludes the proof. ■

Theorem B4 (Fidelity lower bound between two mixed free-fermionic states). Let ρ and σ be two (possibly

mixed) free-fermionic states. Then, it holds that

$$\mathcal{F}(\sigma, \rho) \geq 1 - \frac{1}{4} \|\Gamma(\rho) - \Gamma(\sigma)\|_1 - \frac{1}{8} \|\Gamma(\rho) - \Gamma(\sigma)\|_2^2, \tag{B79}$$

where $\mathcal{F}(\rho, \sigma) := \text{Tr}(\sqrt{\sqrt{\sigma}\rho\sqrt{\sigma}})^2$ is the fidelity between ρ and σ .

Proof. By using Lemma A9, we can purify ρ and σ to two pure free-fermionic states ψ_ρ and ψ_σ with correlation matrix

$$\Gamma(\psi_\rho) = \begin{pmatrix} \Gamma(\rho) & \sqrt{I + \Gamma(\rho)^2} \\ -\sqrt{I + \Gamma(\rho)^2} & -\Gamma(\rho) \end{pmatrix}. \tag{B80}$$

This purification has an additional symmetry. Namely, when we apply the orthogonal transformations

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{1}{2} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 1 & -1 \end{pmatrix} \Gamma(\psi_\rho) \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 1 & -1 \end{pmatrix} \\
&= \frac{1}{2} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \Gamma(\rho) - \sqrt{I + \Gamma(\rho)^2} \\ \Gamma(\rho) + \sqrt{I + \Gamma(\rho)^2} & 0 \end{pmatrix} \\
&=: \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -O_\rho^T \\ O_\rho & 0 \end{pmatrix},
\end{aligned} \tag{B81}$$

$$\frac{1}{2} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 1 & -1 \end{pmatrix} \Gamma(\psi_\rho) \Gamma(\psi_\sigma) \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 1 & -1 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} O_\rho O_\sigma^T & 0 \\ 0 & O_\rho^T O_\sigma \end{pmatrix}, \tag{B82}$$

we obtain two copies of the same operator. As such, the same structure as before in Theorem B1 holds; every eigenvalue of $\Gamma(\psi_\rho)\Gamma(\psi_\sigma)$ has an additional multiplicity, meaning that $n_- = 1$ cannot occur. This means that

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\Gamma(\psi_\rho) - \Gamma(\psi_\sigma)\|_2^2 &= 2\|\Gamma(\rho) - \Gamma(\sigma)\|_2^2 + 2\|\sqrt{I + \Gamma(\rho)^2} - \sqrt{I + \Gamma(\sigma)^2}\|_2^2 \\
&\leq 2\|\Gamma(\rho) - \Gamma(\sigma)\|_2^2 + 2\|\Gamma(\rho)^2 - \Gamma(\sigma)^2\|_1 \\
&\leq 2\|\Gamma(\rho) - \Gamma(\sigma)\|_2^2 + 2\|\Gamma(\rho)(\Gamma(\rho) - \Gamma(\sigma))\|_1 + 2\|(\Gamma(\rho) - \Gamma(\sigma))\Gamma(\sigma)\|_1 \\
&\leq 2\|\Gamma(\rho) - \Gamma(\sigma)\|_2^2 + 2\|\Gamma(\rho) - \Gamma(\sigma)\|_1 (\|\Gamma(\sigma)\|_\infty + \|\Gamma(\rho)\|_\infty) \\
&\leq 2\|\Gamma(\rho) - \Gamma(\sigma)\|_2^2 + 4\|\Gamma(\rho) - \Gamma(\sigma)\|_1,
\end{aligned} \tag{B83}$$

where in the first step we have used that the square of the 2-norm of the entire matrix is given by the sum of the square of the 2-norm of each sub-block, both being the sum of the square of the individual entries. In the second step, we have used the inequality [67, Eq. (X.23)]

$$\|A^{1/t} - B^{1/t}\|_p \leq \|A - B\|_{p/t}^{1/t}, \tag{B84}$$

which is valid for each $t \in [1, \infty)$, $p \in [1, \infty]$ and positive matrices A and B . In particular, for our case, we use $p = t = 2$. In the third step, we have used the triangle inequality and in the fourth step, the Hölder inequality for the 1-norm and the fact that the infinity norm of any correlation matrix is upper bounded by 1. From the fact that the fidelity of two mixed states is the maximum over all the

possible purifications, we conclude that

$$\begin{aligned}
 \mathcal{F}(\sigma, \rho) &\geq |\langle \psi_\rho | \psi_\sigma \rangle|^2 \\
 &\geq 1 - \frac{1}{16} \|\Gamma(\psi_\rho) - \Gamma(\psi_\sigma)\|_2^2 \\
 &\geq 1 - \frac{1}{4} \|\Gamma(\rho) - \Gamma(\sigma)\|_1 - \frac{1}{8} \|\Gamma(\rho) - \Gamma(\sigma)\|_2^2,
 \end{aligned} \tag{B85}$$

where we have used Theorem B1, and in the last step we have used Eq. (B83). ■

Note that Proposition B1 and Theorems B1 and B4 directly translate to the particle-number-preserving case by using the inequality in Eq. (A36).

4. Quantifying non-Gaussianity: Distance from the set of free-fermionic states

In this subsection, our objective is to establish lower bounds on the minimum trace distance between a state ρ and the set of free-fermionic states. This distance serves as a metric for the inherent “magic” in a given state, providing a precise quantification of its “non-Gaussianity.” The presented lower bounds on the proposed measure of non-Gaussianity are carefully designed to enable time- and sample-efficient estimation up to a constant precision in an experimental setting. This capability is crucial for quantifying the extent to which a state exhibits non-Gaussianity behavior in experimental scenarios.

We will derive bounds in different scenarios: one without prior assumptions on the state ρ and another assuming that ρ is pure or, more generally, has a rank at most R . Moreover, we consider two distinct sets of free-fermionic states: $\mathcal{G}_{\text{mixed}}$ and $\mathcal{G}_R$. Here, $\mathcal{G}_{\text{mixed}}$ represents the set of all free-fermionic states, while $\mathcal{G}_R$ represents the set of free-fermionic states constrained to those with a rank at most R . We begin with a simple result, addressing the case in which ρ is an arbitrary state, and we consider its distance from the set $\mathcal{G}_R$.

Theorem B5 (Lower bound on the distance of an arbitrary state from the set of free-fermionic states with rank at most R). Let ρ be an arbitrary n -qubit or -mode quantum state. Denote by $\mathcal{G}_R$ the set of free-fermionic states with rank at most $R = 2^r$, with $r \in \{0, \dots, n-1\}$. Let $\lambda_{r+1}(\Gamma(\rho))$ denote the $(r+1)$ th smallest normal eigenvalue of the correlation matrix of ρ (with the normal eigenvalues chosen to be all non-negative, i.e., in $[0, 1]$). We then have

$$\min_{\sigma \in \mathcal{G}_R} \|\rho - \sigma\|_1 \geq 1 - \lambda_{r+1}(\Gamma(\rho)). \tag{B86}$$

Proof. By virtue of Proposition B2, we further establish that

$$\|\rho - \sigma\|_1 \geq \|\Gamma(\rho) - \Gamma(\sigma)\|_\infty. \tag{B87}$$

Furthermore, according to Lemma B2, the infinity-norm difference serves as a lower bound for the difference in eigenvalues,

$$\|\Gamma(\rho) - \Gamma(\sigma)\|_\infty \geq |\lambda_j(\Gamma(\rho)) - \lambda_j(\Gamma(\sigma))|, \tag{B88}$$

where $\{\lambda_j(\Gamma(\rho))\}_{j=1}^n$ and $\{\lambda_j(\Gamma(\sigma))\}_{j=1}^n$ are the normal regular eigenvalues of the two correlation matrices, ordered in increasing order, and are non-negative. We then have

$$\|\Gamma(\rho) - \Gamma(\sigma)\|_\infty \geq |\lambda_{r+1}(\Gamma(\rho)) - 1| = 1 - \lambda_{r+1}(\Gamma(\rho)), \tag{B89}$$

where we have used that because of Lemma A2, $\lambda_j(\Gamma(\sigma)) = 1$ for all $j \in \{r+1, \dots, n\}$ and for all $\sigma \in \mathcal{G}_R$. The result thus follows. ■

When restricting to the set of pure free-fermionic states, $\mathcal{G}_{\text{pure}} \equiv \mathcal{G}_{R=1}$.

Proposition B3 (Trace-distance upper and lower bound from the set of free-fermionic states). Let ρ be an arbitrary quantum state. Denote by $\mathcal{G}_{\text{pure}}$ the set of free-fermionic pure states. Let $0 \leq \lambda_1 \leq \dots \leq \lambda_n$ be the normal eigenvalues of the correlation matrix $\Gamma(\rho)$, chosen to be all non-negative. We have

$$\sqrt{2 \sum_{j=1}^n (1 - \lambda_j)} \geq \min_{\phi \in \mathcal{G}_{\text{pure}}} \|\rho - \phi\|_1 \geq 1 - \lambda_1. \tag{B90}$$

Proof. The lower bound is given by Theorem B5. Let us focus on the upper bound. Let U_O be the Gaussian unitary associated with the orthogonal matrix O that puts the correlation matrix of ρ in its normal form, i.e., $\Gamma(\rho) = O \bigoplus_{j=1}^n (\text{diag}(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n) \otimes iY) O^\dagger$. Let us consider the state $\rho' := U_O^\dagger \rho U_O$. Note that because of Lemma A2, we have $\Gamma(\rho') = \Lambda$. For $k \in [n]$, we have

$$\text{Tr}(Z_k \rho') = \Gamma(\rho')_{2k-1,k} = \lambda_k = 1 - (1 - \lambda_k), \tag{B91}$$

where $Z_k = -i\gamma_{2k-1}\gamma_{2k}$ represents the Pauli-Z operator acting on the k th qubit. Consequently, we also find $\text{Tr}(|0\rangle\langle 0|_k \rho') = 1 - (1 - \lambda_k)/2$. Let us now consider a pure free-fermionic state of the form $\hat{\phi} := U_O |0^n\rangle\langle 0^n| U_O^\dagger$.

Employing the unitary invariance of the 1-norm and Lemma B1, we derive

$$\|\rho - \hat{\phi}\|_1 = \|\rho' - |0^n\rangle\langle 0^n|\|_1 \leq 2 \sqrt{\sum_{j=1}^n (1 - \lambda_j)/2}. \quad (\text{B92})$$

Thus, we conclude by using the inequality

$$\min_{\phi \in \mathcal{G}_{\text{pure}}} \|\rho - \phi\|_1 \leq \|\rho - \hat{\phi}\|_1, \quad (\text{B93})$$

where we have used that $\hat{\phi} \in \mathcal{G}_{\text{pure}}$. $\blacksquare$

It is crucial to mention that in our previous discussion (Theorem B5), we focused on the set of free-fermionic states with a rank no greater than R , while we made no assumption about the state ρ . Next, we establish a lower bound on the distance between a quantum state ρ , that we assume to have a bounded rank, and the set of all free-fermionic states $\mathcal{G}_{\text{mixed}}$. For pedagogical reasons, we begin by assuming that ρ is pure. Later, we will extend our analysis to ρ having a rank at most R .

Theorem B6 (Lower bound on the distance of a pure state from the set of all free-fermionic states). Let ψ be a pure state. Let $\lambda_{\min}$ denote the smallest normal eigenvalue of the correlation matrix of ψ (where the normal eigenvalues are chosen to be all non-negative). Then, we have

$$\min_{\sigma \in \mathcal{G}_{\text{mixed}}} \|\psi - \sigma\|_1 \geq \frac{1}{2} (1 - \lambda_{\min}). \quad (\text{B94})$$

Here, $\mathcal{G}_{\text{mixed}}$ is the set of all free-fermionic states.

Proof. Let $\sigma \in \mathcal{G}_{\text{mixed}}$ be a free-fermionic state. Let $0 \leq \lambda_1^\psi \leq \dots \leq \lambda_n^\psi$ be the (positive) normal eigenvalues of $\Gamma(\psi)$ and $0 \leq \lambda_1^\sigma \leq \dots \leq \lambda_n^\sigma$ the (positive) normal eigenvalues of $\Gamma(\sigma)$ for an arbitrary free-fermionic state σ . We have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\psi - \sigma\|_1 &\geq \|\Gamma(\psi) - \Gamma(\sigma)\|_\infty \\ &\geq \max_{i \in [n]} |\lambda_i^\psi - \lambda_i^\sigma| \geq |\lambda_1^\psi - \lambda_1^\sigma|, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B95})$$

where in the first step we have used Proposition B2, and in the second step Lemma B2. Let $\{z_i\}_{i=1}^n$ be the eigenvalues (in decreasing order) of the (possibly) mixed free-fermionic state σ . We now have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\psi - \sigma\|_1 &\geq \|\text{diag}(1, 0, \dots, 0) - \text{diag}(z_1, \dots, z_d)\|_1 \\ &= |1 - z_1| + \sum_{i=2}^d z_i = 2(1 - z_1), \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B96})$$

where in the first inequality we have used $\|A - B\|_p \geq \|\text{Eig}(A) - \text{Eig}(B)\|_p$ for any Hermitian matrix A and B

and any p -norms $\|\cdot\|_p$ (see Ref. [67, Eq. (IV.62)]), where $\text{Eig}(A)$ indicates the diagonal matrix with elements the ordered eigenvalues of A . In the last step, we have used that the eigenvalues of a state are positive and that they add up to one.

We know that the eigenvalues of σ are related to the (positive) normal eigenvalues $\{\lambda_i^\sigma\}_{i=1}^n$ of the correlation matrix $\Gamma(\sigma)$ because the diagonal form of σ reads $\bigotimes_{i=1}^n (I + \lambda_i^\sigma Z_i)/2$ (because of Definition A4 of a free-fermionic state). Therefore,

$$z_1 = \prod_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{2} (1 + \lambda_i^\sigma) \leq \frac{1 + \lambda_1^\sigma}{2}. \quad (\text{B97})$$

Plugging this upper bound on z_1 into Eq. (B96), we obtain

$$\|\psi - \sigma\|_1 \geq 1 - \lambda_1^\sigma. \quad (\text{B98})$$

Therefore, we have two lower bounds, Eqs. (B95) and (B98), to the 1-norm distance $\|\psi - \sigma\|_1$. We can consider the minimum of the 1-norm difference over the free-fermionic states σ and lower bound it with the maximum between these two lower bounds (valid for any σ). We thus write

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{\sigma \in \mathcal{G}_{\text{mixed}}} \|\psi - \sigma\|_1 &\geq \min_{\sigma \in \mathcal{G}_{\text{mixed}}} \max\{|\lambda_1^\psi - \lambda_1^\sigma|, 1 - \lambda_1^\sigma\} \\ &= \min_{\lambda_1^\sigma \in [0,1]} \max\{|\lambda_1^\psi - \lambda_1^\sigma|, (1 - \lambda_1^\sigma)\} \\ &= \frac{1 - \lambda_1^\psi}{2}, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B99})$$

where the last step follows because the function is maximized for $\lambda_1^\sigma = (1 + \lambda_1^\psi)/2$. Therefore, we obtain the lower bound,

$$\min_{\sigma \in \mathcal{G}_{\text{mixed}}} \|\psi - \sigma\|_1 \geq \frac{1 - \lambda_1^\psi}{2} \equiv \frac{1}{2} (1 - \lambda_{\min}), \quad (\text{B100})$$

on the minimal trace norm. This proves our claim. $\blacksquare$

Theorem B7 (Lower bound on the distance of a bounded-rank state from the set of all free-fermionic states). Let ρ be a quantum state such that $\text{rank}(\rho) \leq R$. Assume that $R \leq 2^r$ for some $r \in \{0, \dots, n-1\}$. Let $0 \leq \lambda_1^\rho \leq \dots \leq \lambda_n^\rho$ be the (positive) normal eigenvalues of the correlation matrix $\Gamma(\rho)$. Then, we have

$$\min_{\sigma \in \mathcal{G}_{\text{mixed}}} \|\rho - \sigma\|_1 \geq \frac{(1 - \lambda_{r+1}^\rho)^{r+1}}{1 + (r+1)(1 - \lambda_{r+1}^\rho)^r}. \quad (\text{B101})$$

In particular, this implies that for $\lambda_{r+1}^\rho \geq \frac{1}{2}$, we have

$$\min_{\sigma \in \mathcal{G}_{\text{mixed}}} \|\rho - \sigma\|_1 \geq \frac{(1 - \lambda_{r+1}^\rho)^{r+1}}{2}. \quad (\text{B102})$$

For $r = 1$, this reduces to Theorem B6, which is valid for ρ being pure.

Proof. Let $\sigma \in \mathcal{G}_{\text{mixed}}$ be a possibly mixed free-fermionic state. Let $0 \leq \lambda_1^\sigma \leq \dots \leq \lambda_n^\sigma$ be the (positive) normal eigenvalues of the correlation matrix $\Gamma(\sigma)$. We have

$$\|\rho - \sigma\|_1 \geq \|\Gamma(\rho) - \Gamma(\sigma)\|_\infty \geq |\lambda_{r+1}^\rho - \lambda_{r+1}^\sigma|, \quad (\text{B103})$$

where in the first step we have used Proposition B2 and in the second step we have used Lemma B2. Let $\{z_i^\sigma\}_{i=1}^n$ be the eigenvalues of σ , ordered in a nonincreasing way. Then, similar to Eq. (B96), we can lower bound the norm difference between ρ and σ with the norm difference of their diagonal matrices containing their eigenvalues (see Ref. [67, Eq. (IV.62)]):

$$\begin{aligned} \|\rho - \sigma\|_1 &\geq \|\text{diag}(z_1^\rho, \dots, z_R^\rho, 0, \dots, 0) \\ &\quad - \text{diag}(z_1^\sigma, \dots, z_R^\sigma, z_{R+1}^\sigma, \dots, z_d^\sigma)\|_1 \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^R |z_i^\rho - z_i^\sigma| + \sum_{i=R+1}^d z_i^\sigma \\ &\geq \sum_{i=1}^R (|z_i^\rho| - |z_i^\sigma|) + \sum_{i=R+1}^d z_i^\sigma \\ &= 1 - \sum_{i=1}^R z_i^\sigma + \sum_{i=R+1}^d z_i^\sigma \\ &= 2 - 2 \sum_{i=1}^R z_i^\sigma = 2 - 2\|\sigma\|_{\text{KF},R}, \quad (\text{B104}) \end{aligned}$$

where in the last step we have used the definition of the Ky Fan norm of order R of σ , i.e., $\|\sigma\|_{\text{KF},R} := \sum_{i=1}^R z_i$

(for more details, see Bhathia [67]). Because of Definition A4 of a free-fermionic state, σ up to a (free-fermionic) unitary is equivalent to

$$\bigotimes_{i=1}^n \frac{I + \lambda_i^\sigma Z_i}{2} = \sigma_{[1,r+1]} \otimes \sigma_{[r+1,n]}, \quad (\text{B105})$$

where we have defined

$$\sigma_{[a,b]} := \bigotimes_{i=a}^b \frac{I + \lambda_i^\sigma Z_i}{2}. \quad (\text{B106})$$

Since the Ky Fan norm is unitary invariant, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\sigma\|_{\text{KF},R} &= \|\sigma_{[1,r+1]} \otimes \sigma_{[r+1,n]}\|_{\text{KF},R} \\ &= \left\| \sigma_{[1,r+1]} \otimes \sum_{k=1}^{2^{n-r-1}} \alpha_k |v_k\rangle\langle v_k| \right\|_{\text{KF},R} \\ &\leq \sum_{k=1}^{2^{n-r-1}} \alpha_k \|\sigma_{[1,r+1]} \otimes |v_k\rangle\langle v_k|\|_{\text{KF},R} \\ &= \sum_{k=1}^{2^{n-r-1}} \alpha_k \|\sigma_{[1,r+1]}\|_{\text{KF},R} \\ &\leq \|\sigma_{[1,r+1]}\|_{\text{KF},R}, \quad (\text{B107}) \end{aligned}$$

where in the second step we have used $\sigma_{[r+1,n]}$ in its eigendecomposition $\sigma_{[r+1,n]} = \sum_{k=1}^{2^{n-r-1}} \alpha_k |v_k\rangle\langle v_k|$, in the third step we have used the triangle inequality of the Ky Fan norm, in the fourth step we have used that $\|\rho \otimes |v_k\rangle\langle v_k|\|_{\text{KF},R} = \|\rho\|_{\text{KF},R}$, and in the last step we have used that the sum of eigenvalues of a state is smaller than one. Since we have $\lambda_j^\sigma \leq \lambda_{r+1}^\sigma$ for each $j \in [r]$, we also have

$$\|\sigma_{[1,r+1]}\|_{\text{KF},R} = \left\| \bigotimes_{i=1}^{r+1} \frac{I + \lambda_i^\sigma Z_i}{2} \right\|_{\text{KF},R} \leq \left\| \bigotimes_{i=1}^{r+1} \frac{I + \lambda_{r+1}^\sigma Z_i}{2} \right\|_{\text{KF},R}. \quad (\text{B108})$$

This can be seen as follows. If $\lambda_{r+1}^\sigma = 0$, this is trivially true, so let us assume that it is not. We then have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\sigma_{[1,r+1]}\|_{\text{KF},R} &= \left\| \frac{I + \lambda_1^\sigma Z}{2} \otimes \sigma_{[2,r+1]} \right\|_{\text{KF},R} \\ &= \left\| \left(\frac{\lambda_1^\sigma}{\lambda_{r+1}^\sigma} \right) \frac{I + \lambda_{r+1}^\sigma Z}{2} \otimes \sigma_{[2,r+1]} + \left(1 - \frac{\lambda_1^\sigma}{\lambda_{r+1}^\sigma} \right) \frac{I}{2} \otimes \sigma_{[2,r+1]} \right\|_{\text{KF},R} \\ &\leq \left(\frac{\lambda_1^\sigma}{\lambda_{r+1}^\sigma} \right) \left\| \frac{I + \lambda_{r+1}^\sigma Z}{2} \otimes \sigma_{[2,r+1]} \right\|_{\text{KF},R} + \left(1 - \frac{\lambda_1^\sigma}{\lambda_{r+1}^\sigma} \right) \left\| \frac{I}{2} \otimes \sigma_{[2,r+1]} \right\|_{\text{KF},R} \\ &\leq \left\| \frac{I + \lambda_{r+1}^\sigma Z}{2} \otimes \sigma_{[2,r+1]} \right\|_{\text{KF},R}, \quad (\text{B109}) \end{aligned}$$

where in the third step we have used the triangle inequality, and in the last step we have used the facts that $\lambda_1^\sigma \leq \lambda_{r+1}^\sigma$ and that $\|I/2 \otimes \sigma_{[2,r+1]}\|_{\text{KF},R} = \|\sigma'\|_{\text{KF},R/2}$ (since appending the maximally mixed state doubles the multiplicity of the singular values, while halving their respective values). Repeating the same strategy as above, we arrive at Eq. (B108). Therefore, using Eqs. (B107) and (B108), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\sigma\|_{\text{KF},R} &\leq \|\sigma_{[1,r+1]}\|_{\text{KF},R} \\
&\leq \left\| \bigotimes_{i=1}^{r+1} \frac{I + \lambda_{r+1}^\sigma Z_i}{2} \right\|_{\text{KF},R} \\
&= \max_{\substack{S \subset \{0,1\}^{r+1} \\ |S|=R}} \sum_{s \in S} \prod_{i=1}^{r+1} \left(\frac{1 + (-1)^{s_i} \lambda_{r+1}^\sigma}{2} \right) \\
&= 1 - \min_{\substack{S_c \subset \{0,1\}^{r+1} \\ |S_c|=2^{r+1}-R}} \sum_{s \in S_c} \prod_{i=1}^{r+1} \left(\frac{1 + (-1)^{s_i} \lambda_{r+1}^\sigma}{2} \right) \\
&\leq 1 - (2^{r+1} - R) \left(\frac{1 - \lambda_{r+1}^\sigma}{2} \right)^{r+1} \\
&\leq 1 - \frac{(1 - \lambda_{r+1}^\sigma)^{r+1}}{2}, \tag{B110}
\end{aligned}$$

where in the second to last step we have bounded the sum by its smallest term and in the last step we have used that $R \leq 2^r$. Now, employing Eqs. (B104) and (B110), we obtain

$$\|\rho - \sigma\|_1 \geq 2 - 2\|\sigma\|_{\text{KF},R} = (1 - \lambda_{r+1}^\sigma)^{r+1}. \tag{B111}$$

Thus, by minimizing $\|\rho - \sigma\|_1$ over all possible mixed free-fermionic states $\sigma \in \mathcal{G}_{\text{mixed}}$ and using Eqs. (B103) and (B111), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\min_{\sigma \in \mathcal{G}_{\text{mixed}}} \|\rho - \sigma\|_1 &\geq \min_{\sigma \in \mathcal{G}_{\text{mixed}}} \max \left((1 - \lambda_{r+1}^\sigma)^{r+1}, |\lambda_{r+1}^\sigma - \lambda_{r+1}^\rho| \right) \tag{B112} \\
&= \min_{\lambda_{r+1}^\sigma \in [0,1]} \max \left((1 - \lambda_{r+1}^\sigma)^{r+1}, |\lambda_{r+1}^\sigma - \lambda_{r+1}^\rho| \right) \\
&= \min_{x \in [0,1]} \max \left((1 - x)^{r+1}, |x - \lambda_{r+1}^\rho| \right). \tag{B113}
\end{aligned}$$

The minimum point of the function $\max \left((1 - x)^{r+1}, |x - \lambda_{r+1}^\rho| \right)$ will occur where the functions $(1 - x)^{r+1}$ and $|x - \lambda_{r+1}^\rho|$ intersect. Notably, the relevant intersection will be in the interval $x \in [\lambda_{r+1}^\rho, 1]$ (for a graphical representation, see Fig. 3).




FIG. 3. A plot illustrating the behavior of the objective function $g(x) = \max\{(1-x)^{r+1}, |x-\lambda|\}$, which arises in Eq. (B113), where $\lambda = 0.7$ and $r = 2$. The red point indicates the location of the minimum value of the function.

To determine where these two functions intersect, we consider the difference function

$$f(x) := (1-x)^{r+1} - (x - \lambda_{r+1}^\rho), \tag{B114}$$

for the interval $x \in [\lambda_{r+1}^\rho, 1]$. Applying Newton's method starting from $x_0 = \lambda_{r+1}^\rho$, we obtain

$$x_1 = x_0 - \frac{f(x_0)}{f'(x_0)} = \lambda_{r+1}^\rho + \frac{(1 - \lambda_{r+1}^\rho)^{r+1}}{1 + (r+1)(1 - \lambda_{r+1}^\rho)^r}. \tag{B115}$$

Since $f(x)$ decreases monotonically and is convex on this interval, we can be confident that $x_1 \leq x^*$, the root of f . Consequently, $(1 - x_1)^{r+1} \geq |x_1 - \lambda_{r+1}^\rho|$, which allows us to conclude that

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\rho - \sigma\|_1 &\geq \min_{x \in [0,1]} \max \left((1-x)^{r+1}, |x - \lambda_{r+1}^\rho| \right) \\
&\geq \max \left((1-x_1)^{r+1}, |x_1 - \lambda_{r+1}^\rho| \right) \\
&= |x_1 - \lambda_{r+1}^\rho| \\
&= \frac{(1 - \lambda_{r+1}^\rho)^{r+1}}{1 + (r+1)(1 - \lambda_{r+1}^\rho)^r}. \tag{B116}
\end{aligned}$$

In particular, for $\lambda_{r+1}^\rho \geq \frac{1}{2}$, we have

$$1 + (r+1)(1 - \lambda_{r+1}^\rho)^r \leq 1 + \frac{r+1}{2^r} \leq 2, \tag{B117}$$

which concludes the proof. $\blacksquare$

APPENDIX C: PROPERTY TESTING OF FREE-FERMIONIC STATES

In this appendix, we address the problem of property testing free-fermionic states. Our goal is to determine

whether a given quantum state ρ is close to or far from the set of all free-fermionic states $\mathcal{G}_{\text{mixed}}$. To enable an efficient testing algorithm, we must make certain assumptions about the rank of the state ρ , as we show. Assuming that ρ is pure (i.e., rank-1), we present an efficient learning algorithm that relies solely on single-qubit measurements (as detailed in Sec. C1). However, when no assumptions are made about the rank of the state ρ , we establish the general hardness of the problem. Information-theoretically, it requires $\Omega(\text{rank}(\rho))$ copies to be solved (as discussed in Sec. C2). Moreover, we provide a matching upper bound by introducing an algorithm that utilizes only single-copy free-fermionic measurements and it is efficient as long as $\text{rank}(\rho) = O(\text{poly}(n))$ (explored in Sec. C3).

Similarly, we show that there is an efficient property-testing algorithm in the case in which ρ is an arbitrary quantum state and the goal is to determine whether a given quantum state ρ is close to or far from the set of pure free-fermionic states $\mathcal{G}_{\text{pure}}$. We also show an information-theoretic lower bound to solve the property-testing problem when ρ is arbitrary and consider $\mathcal{G}_R$, i.e., the set of all free-fermionic states with rank at most R . We conclude this section by providing a matching upper bound for the above scenario. We formalize the property-testing problem as follows.

Problem C1 (Property testing of free-fermionic states). Given N copies of an unknown quantum state ρ , with the promise that it falls into one of two distinct scenarios $\varepsilon_B > \varepsilon_A \geq 0$,

- (1) *case A*—there exists a free-fermionic state $\sigma \in \mathcal{G}$ such that $\|\rho - \sigma\|_1 \leq \varepsilon_A$
- (2) *case B*—the state ρ is ε_B -far from all free-fermionic states σ , i.e., $\min_{\sigma \in \mathcal{G}} \|\rho - \sigma\|_1 > \varepsilon_B$

determine whether we are in case *A* or case *B* by performing arbitrary measurements on the queried copies of the state ρ .

Further restrictions on the state ρ and precise specifications regarding the set of free-fermionic states $\mathcal{G}$ considered (e.g., $\mathcal{G} = \mathcal{G}_{\text{pure}}$, $\mathcal{G} = \mathcal{G}_{\text{mixed}}$, $\mathcal{G} = \mathcal{G}_R$) must be provided as input to the problem. Before delving into more details, we establish a preliminary standard lemma that will be instrumental later.

Lemma C1 (Sample complexity for infinity-norm approximation of the correlation matrix via Pauli measurements). Let $N \geq 16(n^4/\varepsilon_{\text{stat}}^2) \log(n^2/\delta)$ be the number of copies of an n -qubit state ρ . Through single-qubit Pauli-basis measurements, we can find a real and antisymmetric matrix $\hat{\Gamma}$ such that, with probability at least $1 - \delta$, it holds

that

$$\|\hat{\Gamma} - \Gamma(\rho)\|_{\infty} \leq \varepsilon_{\text{stat}}, \quad \|\hat{\Gamma} - \Gamma(\rho)\|_2 \leq \varepsilon_{\text{stat}}. \quad (\text{C1})$$

Proof. For $j < k \in [2n]$, we estimate $[\Gamma(\rho)]_{j,k} = -\text{Tr}(i\gamma_j \gamma_k \rho)$. For each $i\gamma_j \gamma_k$, which number $M := n(2n-1)$ in total, we measure $N' \geq (2/\varepsilon^2) \log(2M/\delta)$ many copies of ρ in the Pauli basis, obtaining outcomes $\{\hat{X}_m\}_{m=1}^{N'}$, where $\hat{X}_m \in \{-1, +1\}$. Define $\hat{\Gamma}_{j,k} := (1/N') \sum_{m=1}^{N'} \hat{X}_m$. By Hoeffding's inequality, we have

$$\Pr\left(|\hat{\Gamma}_{j,k} - [\Gamma(\rho)]_{j,k}| \geq \varepsilon\right) \leq 2 \exp\left(-\frac{2N'\varepsilon^2}{(b-a)^2}\right), \quad (\text{C2})$$

where $a := -1$ and $b := 1$. By the union bound, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \Pr\left(\forall j < k : |\hat{\Gamma}_{j,k} - [\Gamma(\rho)]_{j,k}| < \varepsilon\right) \\ &= 1 - \sum_{i < j} \Pr\left(|\hat{\Gamma}_{j,k} - [\Gamma(\rho)]_{j,k}| \geq \varepsilon\right) \\ &\geq 1 - 2M \exp\left(-\frac{N'\varepsilon^2}{2}\right). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C3})$$

By using that $N' \geq (2/\varepsilon^2) \log(2M/\delta)$, we have that this probability is greater than $1 - \delta$. The total number of measurements is $N = N'M$. Finally, employing the Gershgorin circle theorem, we have

$$\|\hat{\Gamma} - \Gamma(\rho)\|_{\infty} \leq 2n\varepsilon. \quad (\text{C4})$$

By choosing $\varepsilon = \varepsilon_{\text{stat}}/2n$, we can draw our conclusions. Moreover, note that by construction $\hat{\Gamma}$ is real and antisymmetric. The proof for the 2-norm bound concludes by using, instead of Eq. (C4), that

$$\|\hat{\Gamma} - \Gamma(\rho)\|_2 \leq 2n \max_{i,j \in [2n]} |[\hat{\Gamma}]_{ij} - [\Gamma(\rho)]_{ij}| \leq 2n\varepsilon. \quad (\text{C5})$$

■

While sequentially estimating correlation-matrix entries in the Pauli basis may not be the most sample efficient, it proves convenient for experiments due to its easy implementation. Alternatively, measuring commuting observables simultaneously [69] reduces sample complexity by n but requires a slightly more intricate setup. For completeness, we present a lemma establishing a sample-complexity upper bound for estimating the correlation matrix using this refined measurement scheme. The idea is to partition observables $O^{(j,k)} := -i\gamma_j \gamma_k$ into $2n-1$ sets of commuting observables. Commuting Pauli observables

can be measured simultaneously via Clifford Gaussian measurements [69]. Notably, different Pauli observables $-i\gamma_j\gamma_k$ commute only if associated with different Majorana operators. This allows us to partition $M = (2n - 1)n$ observables into $2n - 1$ sets, each containing n commuting Pauli observables (for the partition details, which are omitted here for brevity, see Ref. [69, Appendix C]).

Lemma C2 (Sample complexity for infinity-norm approximation of the correlation matrix via commuting observables). Let $\varepsilon_{\text{stat}}, \delta > 0$. Assume access to $N \geq \lceil (8n^3/\varepsilon_{\text{stat}}^2) \log(4n^2/\delta) \rceil$ copies of an n -qubit state ρ . Using N single-copy measurements, with probability $\geq 1 - \delta$, we can construct a real antisymmetric matrix $\hat{\Gamma}$ such that

$$\|\hat{\Gamma} - \Gamma(\rho)\|_{\infty} \leq \varepsilon_{\text{stat}}, \quad \|\hat{\Gamma} - \Gamma(\rho)\|_2 \leq \varepsilon_{\text{stat}}. \quad (\text{C6})$$

Proof. For each of the $2n - 1$ sets of commuting Paulis, find the Clifford C allowing simultaneous measurement of such observables and measure N' copies of $C\rho C^\dagger$ in the computational basis. Note that we can choose such a Clifford to also be Gaussian. This because such a Clifford diagonalizes the free-fermionic Hamiltonian given by the sum of the commuting Paulis (which corresponds to the quadratic Majorana operators); hence it can be chosen to be Gaussian. The same can be seen also directly by using the Gaussian unitary given in Definition A3 (see, e.g., Ref. [19]). The rest of the proof goes as in the previous lemma, by using Hoeffding's inequality and the union bound. The total number of measurements needed this time is $N = N'(2n - 1)$ (whereas in the previous lemma it was $N'(2n - 1)n$). We can also conclude now, as in the previous lemma. ■

1. Efficient testing of pure free-fermionic states

We will now show an efficient quantum learning algorithm to solve Problem C1 when ρ is assumed to be pure, having as an assumption that $\varepsilon_B, \varepsilon_A \in (0, 1)$ are such that $\varepsilon_B > 2\sqrt{n\varepsilon_A}$. The proposed algorithm uses only single

copies of the state ρ . The set of free-fermionic states $\mathcal{G}$ that will be considered can be either the set of all free-fermionic states, $\mathcal{G}_{\text{mixed}}$, or the set of free-fermionic states restricted to the pure ones, $\mathcal{G}_{\text{pure}}$. The high-level idea of the algorithm is to output A (the state is close to the free-fermionic set) if the eigenvalues of the estimated correlation matrix are all close to 1, while outputting B otherwise. We now present the following theorem that shows the correctness of Algorithm 1.

Theorem C1 (Efficient pure free-fermionic testing). Let ρ be an n -qubit pure state. Assume that $\varepsilon_B, \varepsilon_A \in (0, 1)$ such that $\varepsilon_B > 2\sqrt{n\varepsilon_A}$, $\delta \in (0, 1]$ and $\varepsilon_{\text{stat}} < \frac{1}{2}(\varepsilon_B^2/2n - 2\varepsilon_A)$. Assume that ρ is one of the two cases detailed in Problem C1, i.e., there exists a free-fermionic state $\sigma \in \mathcal{G}$ such that $\|\rho - \sigma\|_1 \leq \varepsilon_A$ or $\min_{\sigma \in \mathcal{G}} \|\rho - \sigma\|_1 > \varepsilon_B$. The set $\mathcal{G}$ considered here can be either the set of all free-fermionic states $\mathcal{G}_{\text{mixed}}$ or the set of pure free-fermionic states $\mathcal{G}_{\text{pure}}$. Then, there exists a quantum learning algorithm (Algorithm 1) that can solve Problem C1 using $N = 8(n^3/\varepsilon_{\text{stat}}^2) \log(4n^2/\delta)$ single-copy measurements of the state ρ with a probability of success at least $1 - \delta$.

Proof. Let $\varepsilon_{\text{stat}} > 0$ be an accuracy parameter to be fixed later. By Lemma C2, with $N \geq 8(n^3/\varepsilon_{\text{stat}}^2) \log(4n^2/\delta)$ single-copy measurements, we can find a matrix $\hat{\Gamma}$ such that, with probability at least $1 - \delta$, it holds that $\|\hat{\Gamma} - \Gamma(\rho)\|_{\infty} < \varepsilon_{\text{stat}}$. This implies that for all $k \in [n]$ (Lemma B2)

$$|\hat{\lambda}_k - \lambda_k| < \varepsilon_{\text{stat}}, \quad (\text{C7})$$

where $\{\hat{\lambda}_k\}_{k=1}^n, \{\lambda_k\}_{k=1}^n$ are the normal eigenvalues of $\hat{\Gamma}$ and $\Gamma(\rho)$, respectively. We can put $\hat{\Gamma}$ in its normal form,

$$\hat{\Gamma} = \hat{O}\hat{\Lambda}\hat{O}^T, \quad (\text{C8})$$

ALGORITHM 1. Property-testing algorithm for pure free-fermionic states.

Input: Error thresholds $\varepsilon_A, \varepsilon_B$, failure probability δ . $N := \lceil 8(n^3/\varepsilon_{\text{stat}}^2) \log(4n^2/\delta) \rceil$ copies of the pure state ρ , where $\varepsilon_{\text{stat}} < \frac{1}{2}(\frac{\varepsilon_B^2}{2n} - 2\varepsilon_A)$. Let $\varepsilon_T := \frac{1}{2}(\frac{\varepsilon_B^2}{2n} + 2\varepsilon_A)$.

Output: Output either Case A or Case B.

- 1 **Step 1:** Estimate the entries of the correlation matrix using N single-copy measurements, resulting in the estimated $2n \times 2n$ matrix $\hat{\Gamma}$;
 - 2 **Step 2:** Find $\hat{\lambda}_{\min}$, which corresponds to the smallest singular value of $\hat{\Gamma}$;
 - 3 **Step 3:** **if** $\hat{\lambda}_{\min} \geq 1 - \varepsilon_T$ **then**
 - 4 **Output:** Case A
 - 5 **else**
 - 6 **Output:** Case B
-

where

$$\hat{\Lambda} = \bigoplus_{i=1}^n \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \hat{\lambda}_i \\ -\hat{\lambda}_i & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (\text{C9})$$

and find its eigenvalues. Our algorithm now works as follows. Let ε_T be a parameter to fix later. If, for all $k \in [n]$, we have $\hat{\lambda}_k \geq 1 - \varepsilon_T$, then we output A ; otherwise B . In case we output A , we need to prove that there exists a free-fermionic state σ such that $\|\rho - \sigma\|_1 \leq \varepsilon_B$. From Eq. (C7), we have that for all $k \in [2n]$

$$\lambda_k \geq \hat{\lambda}_k - \varepsilon_{\text{stat}} \geq 1 - \varepsilon_T - \varepsilon_{\text{stat}}. \quad (\text{C10})$$

The antisymmetry of the correlation matrix $\Gamma(\rho)$ implies the existence of an orthogonal matrix O such that $\Gamma(\rho) = O\Lambda O^T$, where $\Lambda = \bigoplus_{i=1}^n \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \lambda_i \\ -\lambda_i & 0 \end{pmatrix}$. Moreover, because of Lemma A2, we have $\Gamma(U_O^\dagger \rho U_O) = \Lambda$, where U_O is the free-fermionic unitary associated with O . This leads to

$$\text{Tr}(Z_k U_O^\dagger \rho U_O) = \Gamma(U_O^\dagger \rho U_O)_{2k-1,2k} = \Lambda_{2k-1,2k} = \lambda_k, \quad (\text{C11})$$

where we have used that $Z_k = -i\gamma_{2k-1}\gamma_{2k}$. Consequently, we obtain

$$\text{Tr}(|0\rangle\langle 0|_k U_O^\dagger \rho U_O) = \frac{1 + \lambda_k}{2} \geq 1 - \frac{\varepsilon_T + \varepsilon_{\text{stat}}}{2}, \quad (\text{C12})$$

where we have used that $|0\rangle\langle 0|_k = (I + Z_k)/2$. Applying the quantum union bound (Lemma B1), we deduce that

$$\left\| U_O^\dagger \rho U_O - |0^n\rangle\langle 0^n| \right\|_1 \leq 2\sqrt{n \left(\frac{\varepsilon_T + \varepsilon_{\text{stat}}}{2} \right)}. \quad (\text{C13})$$

Thus, taking $\sigma := U_O |0^n\rangle\langle 0^n| U_O^\dagger$ and using the unitary invariance of the 1-norm, we have successfully demonstrated the existence of a free-fermionic state σ that closely approximates ρ in terms of the one-norm distance, i.e., $\|\rho - \sigma\|_1 \leq \sqrt{2n(\varepsilon_T + \varepsilon_{\text{stat}})}$. To ensure the validity of this approximation, we must impose the condition

$$\sqrt{2n(\varepsilon_T + \varepsilon_{\text{stat}})} \leq \varepsilon_B, \quad (\text{C14})$$

which constitutes the initial requirement for determining the values of ε_T and $\varepsilon_{\text{stat}}$, which we will fix at a later stage. Let us analyze the case in which we output case B , i.e., we observe that there exists $k \in [2n]$ such that $\hat{\lambda}_k < 1 - \varepsilon_T$. In

this case, from Eq. (C7), we have

$$\lambda_k \leq \hat{\lambda}_k + \varepsilon_{\text{stat}} < 1 - \varepsilon_T + \varepsilon_{\text{stat}}. \quad (\text{C15})$$

Using Theorems B5 and B6, we establish the following inequality:

$$\min_{\sigma \in \mathcal{G}} \|\rho - \sigma\|_1 \geq \frac{1}{2} (1 - \min_{k \in [n]} \lambda_k), \quad (\text{C16})$$

where $\mathcal{G}$ can represent either the set of all free-fermionic states, denoted as $\mathcal{G}_{\text{mixed}}$, or the set of all pure free-fermionic states, denoted as $\mathcal{G}_{\text{pure}}$. If we had considered only the set of pure free-fermionic states, the lower bound would be $1 - \min_{k \in [n]} \lambda_k$, without the factor of $1/2$, as indicated by Theorem B5. As such, Eq. (C16) holds true for both $\mathcal{G}_{\text{mixed}}$ and $\mathcal{G}_{\text{pure}}$. From this and Eq. (C15), we have that

$$\min_{\sigma \in \mathcal{G}} \|\rho - \sigma\|_1 \geq \frac{1 - (1 - \varepsilon_T + \varepsilon_{\text{stat}})}{2} = \frac{\varepsilon_T - \varepsilon_{\text{stat}}}{2}. \quad (\text{C17})$$

Therefore, we impose that

$$\frac{\varepsilon_T - \varepsilon_{\text{stat}}}{2} > \varepsilon_A. \quad (\text{C18})$$

Putting together the two inequalities in Eqs. (C14) and (C18), we have

$$2\varepsilon_A + \varepsilon_{\text{stat}} < \varepsilon_T \leq \frac{\varepsilon_B^2}{2n} - \varepsilon_{\text{stat}}. \quad (\text{C19})$$

Therefore, assuming $\varepsilon_B > \sqrt{4n\varepsilon_A}$, we can choose

$$\varepsilon_T = \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{\varepsilon_B^2}{2n} + 2\varepsilon_A \right) \quad (\text{C20})$$

and

$$\varepsilon_{\text{stat}} < \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{\varepsilon_B^2}{2n} - 2\varepsilon_A \right). \quad (\text{C21})$$

■

The preceding theorem has been presented under the assumption that ρ is pure and the set of free-fermionic states considered can either be the set of all (possibly mixed) free-fermionic states $\mathcal{G}_{\text{mixed}}$ or the more restricted set of all pure free-fermionic states $\mathcal{G}_{\text{pure}}$. However, if we focus solely on the set of all pure free-fermionic states $\mathcal{G}_{\text{pure}}$, we can establish an analogous result without assuming that ρ is pure; i.e., it can be an arbitrary quantum state. The theorem is detailed as follows and the algorithm is

the same as Algorithm 1 with slightly different accuracy parameters, as detailed below.

Theorem C2 (Efficient pure free-fermionic testing with arbitrary input states). Let ρ be an arbitrary n -qubit state. Assume $\varepsilon_B, \varepsilon_A \in (0, 1)$ such that $\varepsilon_B > \sqrt{2n\varepsilon_A}$, $\delta \in (0, 1]$ and $\varepsilon_{\text{stat}} := \frac{1}{4}(\varepsilon_B^2/2n - \varepsilon_A)$. Assume that ρ satisfies one of the two cases detailed in Problem C1, i.e., there exists a free-fermionic state $\sigma \in \mathcal{G}_{\text{pure}}$ such that $\|\rho - \sigma\|_1 \leq \varepsilon_A$ or $\min_{\sigma \in \mathcal{G}_{\text{pure}}} \|\rho - \sigma\|_1 > \varepsilon_B$. Then, there exists a quantum learning algorithm that, utilizing only single-copy measurements, can solve Problem C1 using $N = 8(n^3/\varepsilon_{\text{stat}}^2) \log(4n^2/\delta)$ copies of the state ρ with a probability of success at least $1 - \delta$.

Proof. The proof is analogous to that of the previous theorem, but instead of Eq. (C16), it utilizes Lemma B6, which makes no assumptions on the state ρ and provides the inequality

$$\min_{\sigma \in \mathcal{G}_{\text{pure}}} \|\rho - \sigma\|_1 \geq 1 - \min_{k \in [n]} (\lambda_k). \quad (\text{C22})$$

Following the same steps as before, we conclude that, assuming that $\varepsilon_B > \sqrt{2n\varepsilon_A}$, we can choose $\varepsilon_T = \frac{1}{2}(\varepsilon_B^2/2n + \varepsilon_A)$ and $\varepsilon_{\text{stat}} = \frac{1}{4}(\varepsilon_B^2/2n - \varepsilon_A)$. Note that throughout the proof of Theorem C1, there has been no need to assume that ρ is a pure state. ■

2. Hardness of testing general mixed free-fermionic states

In this subsection, we establish the general hardness of the free-fermionic property-testing problem (Problem C1), demonstrating the necessity for $\Omega(2^n)$ copies of the state when no prior assumptions on the state and no restrictions on the set of all free-fermionic states are provided. The core of this complexity arises from recognizing that the maximally mixed state is free-fermionic. This insight allows us to leverage the hardness of a problem closely related to identity testing [35]. The following theorem is essential to our reduction.

Theorem C3 (Hardness of identity testing, corollary of Theorem 1.12 in [35]). Let ρ be an n -qubit quantum state with $n > 1$, promised to belong to one of the following two cases:

- (1) $\rho_A = \frac{I}{2^n}$, the maximally mixed state; or
- (2) $\rho_B \in \left\{ \frac{1}{K} \sum_{i=1}^K U|i\rangle\langle i| U^\dagger \mid U \in U(2^n) \right\}$

where $K := \frac{3}{4}2^n$ is a positive integer. Any algorithm that distinguishes between these two cases with success probability at least $2/3$ requires $\Omega(2^n)$ copies of the state ρ .

Proof. The proof of this theorem is a direct corollary of Theorem 1.12 proven in Ref. [35]. ■

In the following, we establish the hardness of testing free-fermionic states in the nontolerant setting, i.e., when $\varepsilon_A = 0$. Note that this result also implies hardness in the more general and difficult scenario of “tolerant property testing,” where $\varepsilon_A > 0$.

Theorem C4 (Hardness of testing free-fermionic states (Problem C1)). At least $N = \Omega(2^n)$ copies of the n -qubit state ρ are necessary to solve the free-fermionic property-testing problem (Problem C1) with parameters $\varepsilon_A = 0$ and $\varepsilon_B = O(1)$, with a probability of success at least $\frac{2}{3}$. This holds when no prior assumptions about ρ are provided and the set $\mathcal{G}$ considered is that of all free-fermionic states.

Proof. We reduce the free-fermionic property-testing problem to the problem in Theorem C3. To establish equivalence, we need to show that ρ_A is free-fermionic and that any state ρ_B (as defined in Theorem C3) is far from being free-fermionic. The first condition is trivial since ρ_A , the maximally mixed state, is free-fermionic. For the second condition, we need to show that any free-fermionic state σ is far in trace norm from all ρ_B . We denote by $\{\lambda_i^\downarrow(\rho)\}$ the eigenvalues of ρ , in decreasing order, and by $\{\lambda_i^\uparrow(\rho)\}$ the eigenvalues, in increasing order. We have

$$\|\rho_B - \sigma\|_1 \stackrel{(i)}{\geq} \|\text{Eig}(\rho_B) - \text{Eig}(\sigma)\|_1 \quad (\text{C23})$$

$$= \sum_{i=1}^{2^n} |\lambda_i^\downarrow(\rho_B) - \lambda_i^\downarrow(\sigma)| \quad (\text{C24})$$

$$\geq \sum_{i=1}^{2^n/4} |\lambda_i^\downarrow(\rho_B) - \lambda_i^\downarrow(\sigma)| + \sum_{i=\frac{3}{4}2^n+1}^{2^n} |\lambda_i^\downarrow(\rho_B) - \lambda_i^\downarrow(\sigma)| \quad (\text{C25})$$

$$= \sum_{i=1}^{2^n/4} |\lambda_i^\downarrow(\rho_B) - \lambda_i^\downarrow(\sigma)| + \sum_{i=1}^{2^n/4} |\lambda_i^\uparrow(\rho_B) - \lambda_i^\uparrow(\sigma)| \quad (\text{C26})$$

$$\stackrel{(ii)}{\geq} \sum_{i=1}^{2^n/4} (\lambda_i^\downarrow(\sigma) + \lambda_i^\uparrow(\sigma)) - \sum_{i=1}^{2^n/4} (\lambda_i^\downarrow(\rho_B) + \lambda_i^\uparrow(\rho_B)) \quad (\text{C27})$$

$$\stackrel{\text{(iii)}}{\geq} \sum_{i=1}^{2^n/4} (\lambda_i^\downarrow(\sigma) + \lambda_i^\uparrow(\sigma)) - \frac{1}{3} \quad (\text{C28})$$

$$\stackrel{\text{(iv)}}{\geq} \frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{3} = \frac{1}{6}, \quad (\text{C29})$$

where in step (i) we have used that $\|\text{Eig}(A) - \text{Eig}(B)\|_p \leq \|A - B\|_p$ for any Hermitian matrices A and B and any p -norms $\|\cdot\|_p$ (see Ref. [67, Eq. (IV.62)]), where $\text{Eig}(A)$ indicates the diagonal matrix with elements being the ordered eigenvalues of A . In step (ii), we have used the fact that $|x| \geq \max(-x, x)$. In step (iii), we have used the fact that the spectrum of ρ_B has $\frac{3}{4}2^n$ nonzero eigenvalues equal to $(\frac{3}{4}2^n)^{-1}$, with only $2^n/4$ eigenvalues contained in the largest and smallest quartiles. In step (iv), we have used Lemma C3 and noted that the spectrum of free-fermionic states matches that of product states. ■

We now prove a lemma of independent interest concerning the spectrum of product states that we have used in the above proof.

Lemma C3 (Spectrum of product states). For an n -qubit product state $\sigma = \sigma_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes \sigma_n$, we have the inequality

$$\sum_{i=1}^k \left(\lambda_i^\downarrow(\sigma) + \lambda_i^\uparrow(\sigma) \right) \geq \frac{k}{2^{n-1}}, \quad (\text{C30})$$

where $k \leq 2^{n-1}$. Here, $\{\lambda_i^\downarrow(\sigma)\}_{i=1}^{2^n}$ and $\{\lambda_i^\uparrow(\sigma)\}_{i=1}^{2^n}$ denote the eigenvalues of σ in decreasing and increasing order, respectively.

Proof. We prove the result by induction on n , the number of qubits. For the base case $n = 1$, the state $\sigma = \sigma^{(1)}$ is a single-qubit density matrix with only two eigenvalues, which sum to one. Since k can only be either 0 or 1, the result trivially follows. For the induction step, we assume that the result holds for n -qubit product states $\sigma^{(n)}$, i.e.,

$$\sum_{i=1}^k \left(\lambda_i^\downarrow(\sigma^{(n)}) + \lambda_i^\uparrow(\sigma^{(n)}) \right) \geq \frac{k}{2^{n-1}}.$$

We now prove the statement for $(n+1)$ -qubit product states. Let $\sigma^{(n+1)} = \sigma^{(n)} \otimes \sigma_{n+1}$, where σ_{n+1} is a single-qubit state with eigenvalues p_{n+1} and $1 - p_{n+1}$. The eigenvalues of $\sigma^{(n+1)}$ are given by the products of the eigenvalues of $\sigma^{(n)}$ and σ_{n+1} . For a suitable choice of positive integers k' and k'' such that $k = k' + k''$, we can express the

sum of the eigenvalues of $\sigma^{(n+1)}$ in the increasing order as

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i=1}^k \lambda_i^\uparrow(\sigma^{(n+1)}) &= \sum_{i=1}^{k'} \lambda_i^\uparrow(\sigma^{(n)}) p_{n+1} \\ &\quad + \sum_{i=1}^{k''} \lambda_i^\uparrow(\sigma^{(n)}) (1 - p_{n+1}). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C31})$$

Without loss of generality, assume $p_{n+1} \leq \frac{1}{2}$, which implies that $k' \geq k''$. We can also write

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i=1}^k \lambda_i^\downarrow(\sigma^{(n+1)}) &\geq \sum_{i=1}^{k'} \lambda_i^\downarrow(\sigma^{(n)}) (1 - p_{n+1}) \\ &\quad + \sum_{i=1}^{k''} \lambda_i^\downarrow(\sigma^{(n)}) p_{n+1}, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C32})$$

where the inequality comes from us simply selecting these eigenvalues. Combining the two inequalities, we obtain

$$\sum_{i=1}^k \left(\lambda_i^\downarrow(\sigma^{(n+1)}) + \lambda_i^\uparrow(\sigma^{(n+1)}) \right) \quad (\text{C33})$$

$$\begin{aligned} &\geq \sum_{i=1}^{k'} \lambda_i^\downarrow(\sigma^{(n)}) (1 - p_{n+1}) + \sum_{i=1}^{k''} \lambda_i^\downarrow(\sigma^{(n)}) p_{n+1} \\ &\quad + \sum_{i=1}^{k'} \lambda_i^\uparrow(\sigma^{(n)}) p_{n+1} + \sum_{i=1}^{k''} \lambda_i^\uparrow(\sigma^{(n)}) (1 - p_{n+1}) \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C34})$$

$$\begin{aligned} &= \sum_{i=1}^{k''} \left(\lambda_i^\downarrow(\sigma^{(n)}) + \lambda_i^\uparrow(\sigma^{(n)}) \right) \\ &\quad + \sum_{i=k''+1}^{k'} \left(\lambda_i^\uparrow(\sigma^{(n)}) p_{n+1} + \lambda_i^\downarrow(\sigma^{(n)}) (1 - p_{n+1}) \right) \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C35})$$

$$\begin{aligned} &\geq \sum_{i=1}^{k''} \left(\lambda_i^\downarrow(\sigma^{(n)}) + \lambda_i^\uparrow(\sigma^{(n)}) \right) \\ &\quad + \sum_{i=k''+1}^{k'} \frac{\lambda_i^\uparrow(\sigma^{(n)}) + \lambda_i^\downarrow(\sigma^{(n)})}{2} \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C36})$$

$$\geq \sum_{i=1}^{k''} \frac{\lambda_i^\uparrow(\sigma^{(n)}) + \lambda_i^\downarrow(\sigma^{(n)})}{2} + \sum_{i=1}^{k'} \frac{\lambda_i^\uparrow(\sigma^{(n)}) + \lambda_i^\downarrow(\sigma^{(n)})}{2} \quad (\text{C37})$$

$$\stackrel{\text{(i)}}{\geq} \frac{k'}{2^{n-1} \times 2} + \frac{k''}{2^{n-1} \times 2} \quad (\text{C38})$$

$$= \frac{k}{2^{(n+1)-1}}, \quad (\text{C39})$$

where in (i) we have used the inductive assumption. This concludes the proof. ■

We have shown that a number of copies exponential in the system size is necessary to test free-fermionic states, without any additional prior assumption. A natural assumption to facilitate Problem C1 is to assume the state ρ to have at most a fixed rank. In this context, we establish a fundamental lower bound on the number of copies required to solve the free-fermionic testing problem, which depends on the rank of the quantum state.

Theorem C5 (Lower bound for free-fermionic testing of states with bounded rank). Let ρ be a quantum state such that $\text{rank}(\rho) \leq R$. To solve the free-fermionic property-testing problem (Problem C1) with parameters $\varepsilon_A = 0$ and $\varepsilon_B = O(1)$ with at least a $2/3$ probability of success, $N = \Omega(R)$ copies are necessary. This holds when considering the set $\mathcal{G}$ in Problem C1 corresponding to the set of all free-fermionic states $\mathcal{G}_{\text{mixed}}$.

Proof. Let $r := \lfloor \log_2(R) \rfloor$. We choose ρ of the form $\rho = \rho_r \otimes |0^{n-r}\rangle\langle 0^{n-r}|$, where $|0^{n-r}\rangle$ is the zero computational basis state on the last $(n-r)$ qubits, which is free-fermionic. We further impose that the r -qubit state ρ_r can be either ρ_A (the maximally mixed state), as denoted in Theorem C3, or of the form ρ_B , as defined in Theorem C3. Clearly, we have $\text{rank}(\rho) \leq R$. The proof follows the same lines as the proof of Theorem C4 but within the effective space of r qubits. To establish equivalence between the restricted-rank free-fermionic testing and the problem in Theorem C3, we need to show that

- (1) $\rho_A \otimes |0^{n-r}\rangle\langle 0^{n-r}|$ is free-fermionic, and
- (2) any state $\rho_B \otimes |0^{n-r}\rangle\langle 0^{n-r}|$, as defined in Theorem C3, is far from any free-fermionic state σ on n qubits

The first condition is trivial. For the second condition, we proceed analogously to the proof of Theorem C4. The only change is that, for any free-fermionic state σ on n qubits, we have

$$\|\rho_B \otimes |0^{n-r}\rangle\langle 0^{n-r}| - \sigma\|_1 \geq \|\rho_B - \sigma_r\|_1, \quad (\text{C40})$$

where σ_r is the reduced state of σ and we have used the standard fact that tracing out qubits reduces the trace distance (see, e.g., Ref. [29]). In particular, σ_r is still a free-fermionic state (since the reduced state of a free-fermionic state is also free-fermionic; see Lemma A8). ■

The same lower bound applies when considering the state ρ to be an arbitrary state, while restricting the set $\mathcal{G}$ in Problem C1 to be the set of all free-fermionic states with rank at most R , denoted by $\mathcal{G}_R$.

Theorem C6 (Lower bound for free-fermionic testing with respect to the set of bounded-rank free-fermionic

states $\mathcal{G}_R$). For an arbitrary quantum state ρ , if we consider $\mathcal{G}$ in Problem C1 to correspond to the set $\mathcal{G}_R$ of all free-fermionic states with rank at most $R := 2^r$, where $r \in [n]$, then to solve the free-fermionic testing property testing (Problem C1) with at least a $2/3$ probability of success, $N = \Omega(R)$ copies are necessary.

Proof. The proof follows the same lines as the previous theorem and everything holds analogously, even with the assumption that the set to be considered is $\mathcal{G}_R$ instead of $\mathcal{G}_{\text{mixed}}$. ■

3. Efficient testing of low-rank free-fermionic states

In the preceding subsection, we have established information-theoretic lower bounds for solving the free-fermionic property-testing problem. Specifically, we have demonstrated that when the input n -qubit state ρ has a rank less than or equal to 2^r , where $r \in [0, n]$ is an integer, a minimum of $\Omega(2^r)$ copies is required. Similarly, when no assumptions are made about ρ but $\mathcal{G}$ in Problem C1 corresponds to the set $\mathcal{G}_R$ of all free-fermionic states with rank at most $R := 2^r$, then $N = \Omega(2^r)$ copies are necessary.

Now, we address the question of whether an algorithm can match these information-theoretic lower bounds. We note that if $r = O(\log(n))$, i.e., $R = O(\text{poly}(n))$, then such an algorithm would be efficient. The following theorem provides an affirmative answer to this question. Recall that the rank of a free-fermionic state is always 2^r , for some integer $0 \leq r \leq n$.

Theorem C7 (Upper bound for free-fermionic testing with respect to the set of bounded-rank free-fermionic states $\mathcal{G}_R$). Let ρ be any n -qubit state. Assume error thresholds $\varepsilon_B, \varepsilon_A \in (0, 1)$ such that

$$\varepsilon_B > \max(\sqrt{2^5(n-r)\varepsilon_A}, 2(n+1)\varepsilon_A) \quad (\text{C41})$$

and consider a failure probability $\delta \in (0, 1]$. Suppose that ρ falls into one of two cases in Problem C1: either there exists a free-fermionic state $\sigma \in \mathcal{G}_R$ with $\|\rho - \sigma\|_1 \leq \varepsilon_A$ (case A) or $\min_{\sigma \in \mathcal{G}_R} \|\rho - \sigma\|_1 > \varepsilon_B$ (case B), where $R := 2^r$ with $r \in [0, n]$ being an integer.

Then, a quantum learning algorithm (Algorithm 2) can solve Problem C1 using

$$N := \lceil 8(n^3/\varepsilon_{\text{stat}}^2) \log(8n^2/\delta) + N_{\text{tom}}(\varepsilon_{\text{tom}}, \delta/2, r) \rceil \quad (\text{C42})$$

copies of the state ρ with a success probability at least $1 - \delta$. Here, $N_{\text{tom}}(\varepsilon_{\text{tom}}, \delta/2, r)$ is the number of copies sufficient for a full-state-tomography algorithm (see, e.g., Lemma C4 for the performance guarantees of a well-known tomography algorithm) of an r -qubit state with accuracy ε_{tom} and

ALGORITHM 2. Property-testing algorithm for bounded-rank free-fermionic states.

Input: Let $R = 2^r$, with $r \in [0, n]$ being an integer. Error thresholds $\varepsilon_A, \varepsilon_B$ such that $\varepsilon_B > \max(\sqrt{2^5(n-r)\varepsilon_A}, 2(n+1)\varepsilon_A)$, failure probability δ . $N := \lceil 8(n^3/\varepsilon_{\text{stat}}^2) \log(8n^2/\delta) + N_{\text{tom}}(\varepsilon_{\text{tom}}, \delta/2, r) \rceil$ copies of ρ . Here, $N_{\text{tom}}(\varepsilon_{\text{tom}}, \delta/2, r)$ is the number of copies sufficient for full state tomography of an r -qubit state with accuracy ε_{tom} and failure probability at most $\delta/2$. Let $\varepsilon_{\text{stat}} < \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{\varepsilon_B^2}{2^5(n-r)} - \varepsilon_A \right)$ and $\varepsilon_{\text{tom}} < \frac{1}{n+2} \left(\frac{\varepsilon_B}{2} - (n+1)\varepsilon_A \right)$.

Output: Output either Case A or Case B.

- 1 **Step 1:** Estimate the entries of the correlation matrix of ρ using $\lceil 8(n^3/\varepsilon_{\text{stat}}^2) \log(8n^2/\delta) \rceil$ single-copies measurements, resulting in the matrix $\hat{\Gamma}$;
- 2 **Step 2:** Find $\hat{\lambda}_{r+1}$, the $(r+1)$ -th smallest normal eigenvalue of $\hat{\Gamma}$;
- 3 **Step 3:** if $\hat{\lambda}_{r+1} \leq 1 - \varepsilon_T$, where $\varepsilon_T := \frac{\varepsilon_B^2}{2^5(n-r)} + \frac{1}{2}\varepsilon_A$ **then**
- 4 **Output:** Case B
- 5 **else**
- 6 **Step 4:** Evolve ρ with the free-fermionic unitary $U_{\hat{O}}$, where $\hat{O}$ is the orthogonal matrix that puts $\hat{\Gamma}$ in its normal form;
- 7 **Step 5:** Full state tomography on the first r qubits of $U_{\hat{O}}\rho U_{\hat{O}}^\dagger$, which returns the state $\hat{\rho}'_r$ with correlation matrix Γ_r ;
- 8 **Output:** Case B if $\|\hat{\rho}'_r - \sigma(\hat{\Gamma}_r)\|_1 > \varepsilon_{T,2}$, where $\varepsilon_{T,2} := \frac{n+1}{n+2} \left(\frac{\varepsilon_B}{2} + \varepsilon_A \right)$, else Case A. Here, $\sigma(\hat{\Gamma}_r)$ is the free-fermionic state associated with the correlation matrix $\hat{\Gamma}_r$ of $\hat{\rho}'_r$.

failure probability at most $\delta/2$. Here,

$$\varepsilon_{\text{stat}} < \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{\varepsilon_B^2}{2^5(n-r)} - \varepsilon_A \right) \quad \text{and} \\ \varepsilon_{\text{tom}} < \frac{1}{n+2} \left(\frac{\varepsilon_B}{2} - (n+1)\varepsilon_A \right).$$

Proof. Let $\varepsilon_{\text{stat}}$ be an accuracy parameter, yet to be determined. According to Lemma C1, with $N \geq 8(n^3/\varepsilon_{\text{stat}}^2) \log(8n^2/\delta)$ single-copy measurements, we can construct a matrix $\hat{\Gamma}$ such that, with a probability of at least $1 - \delta/2$, it satisfies $\|\hat{\Gamma} - \Gamma(\rho)\|_\infty < \varepsilon_{\text{stat}}$. Consequently, for each sorted normal eigenvalue λ_k of the correlation matrix, it holds that $|\hat{\lambda}_k - \lambda_k| < \varepsilon_{\text{stat}}$, where $\hat{\lambda}_k$ is the k th eigenvalue of $\hat{\Gamma}$. Now, consider that if ρ were a free-fermionic state with rank bounded by R , the first r normal eigenvalues could potentially be less than one, while the remaining $n - r$ should be one (as per Remark A2). We proceed to perform our first check. If $\hat{\lambda}_{r+1} \geq 1 - \varepsilon_T$, we continue; otherwise, we output case B, where $\varepsilon_T > 0$ is an error threshold to be fixed later. In case we output case B, let us demonstrate that we cannot be in case A. We need to show that $\min_{\sigma \in \mathcal{G}_R} \|\rho - \sigma\|_1 > \varepsilon_A$. We have

$$\min_{\sigma \in \mathcal{G}_R} \|\rho - \sigma\|_1 \geq 1 - \lambda_{r+1} \geq 1 - \hat{\lambda}_{r+1} - \varepsilon_{\text{stat}} > \varepsilon_T - \varepsilon_{\text{stat}}, \quad (\text{C43})$$

where the first inequality follows from Theorem B5. Therefore, by choosing

$$\varepsilon_T - \varepsilon_{\text{stat}} > \varepsilon_A, \quad (\text{C44})$$

we successfully ensure that ρ cannot be in case A. This condition forms the first criterion for determining the accuracy parameter $\varepsilon_{\text{stat}}$ and the threshold ε_T . To proceed, we

define $\hat{O}$ as the orthogonal matrix such that $\hat{O}\hat{\Gamma}\hat{O}^T = \hat{\Lambda}$, where

$$\hat{\Lambda} := \bigoplus_{k=1}^n \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \hat{\lambda}_k \\ -\hat{\lambda}_k & 0 \end{pmatrix} \quad (\text{C45})$$

and define $U_{\hat{O}}$ as the associated free-fermionic unitary. Consider the state $\rho' := U_{\hat{O}}\rho U_{\hat{O}}^\dagger$. We observe that

$$|\Gamma(\rho')_{j,k} - (\hat{\Lambda})_{j,k}| \leq \|\Gamma(\rho') - \hat{\Lambda}\|_\infty \\ \leq \|\Gamma(\rho) - \hat{\Gamma}\|_\infty \leq \varepsilon_{\text{stat}}, \quad (\text{C46})$$

leveraging the relationships $\Gamma(\rho') = \hat{O}\Gamma(\rho)\hat{O}^T$ and $\hat{\Lambda} = \hat{O}\hat{\Gamma}\hat{O}^T$, Cauchy-Schwartz, and the definition of the infinity norm. Consequently, we establish $\Gamma(\rho')_{j,k} \geq (\hat{\Lambda})_{j,k} - \varepsilon_{\text{stat}}$. Specifically, for $k \geq r+1$, we find that

$$\text{Tr}(Z_k \rho') = \Gamma(\rho')_{2k-1,k} \\ \geq (\hat{\Lambda})_{2k-1,2k} - \varepsilon_{\text{stat}} = \hat{\lambda}_k - \varepsilon_{\text{stat}} \geq 1 - \varepsilon_T - \varepsilon_{\text{stat}}, \quad (\text{C47})$$

where $Z_k = -i\gamma_{2k-1}\gamma_{2k}$ represents the Pauli-Z operator acting on the k th qubit. Consequently, we also find $\text{Tr}(|0\rangle\langle 0|_k \rho') \geq 1 - (\varepsilon_T + \varepsilon_{\text{stat}})/2$. Employing Lemma B1, we derive

$$\|\rho' - \phi \otimes |0^{n-r}\rangle\langle 0^{n-r}|\|_1 \leq 2\sqrt{(n-r)(\varepsilon_T + \varepsilon_{\text{stat}})/2}, \quad (\text{C48})$$

where $\phi \otimes |0^{n-r}\rangle\langle 0^{n-r}|$ represents the postmeasurement state obtained after measuring the outcomes corresponding to $|0^{n-r}\rangle$ in the last $n - r$ qubits. Define the subsystem

E with sites $E = \{r+1, \dots, n\}$ and define

$$\rho'_r := \text{tr}_E[\rho'] = \text{tr}_E[U_{\hat{O}} \rho U_{\hat{O}}^\dagger]. \quad (\text{C49})$$

We also have

$$\begin{aligned} & \|\rho' - \rho'_r \otimes |0^{n-r}\rangle\langle 0^{n-r}|\|_1 \\ & \leq \|\rho' - \phi \otimes |0^{n-r}\rangle\langle 0^{n-r}|\|_1 + \|\phi - \rho'_r\|_1 \\ & \leq \|\rho' - \phi \otimes |0^{n-r}\rangle\langle 0^{n-r}|\|_1 + \|\phi \otimes |0^{n-r}\rangle\langle 0^{n-r}| - \rho'\|_1 \\ & \leq 4\sqrt{(n-r)(\varepsilon_T + \varepsilon_{\text{stat}})/2}, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C50})$$

where in the first step, we have used the triangle inequality, in the second step, the data-processing inequality ($\|\text{tr}_E(\rho - \sigma)\|_1 \leq \|\rho - \sigma\|_1$ for any quantum states ρ, σ), and in the last step, we have used Eq. (C48). We now perform full state tomography on the first r qubits of ρ' . More precisely, using copies of ρ'_r , we can output a state $\hat{\rho}'_r$ such that, with a probability of at least $1 - \delta/2$, we find that

$$\|\hat{\rho}'_r - \rho'_r\|_1 \leq \varepsilon_{\text{tom}}. \quad (\text{C51})$$

There are various algorithms for full state tomography that utilize single-copy measurements (see, e.g., Ref. [70]), all having sample complexity that scales exponentially with the number of qubits constituting the quantum state, in our case, r . Furthermore, through the computation of the correlation matrix of $\hat{\rho}'_r$, we can compute its correlation matrix $\hat{\Gamma}_r$, which satisfies

$$\|\hat{\Gamma}_r - \Gamma(\rho'_r)\|_\infty \leq \|\hat{\rho}'_r - \rho'_r\|_1 \leq \varepsilon_{\text{tom}}, \quad (\text{C52})$$

where we have invoked Proposition B2. Now, let us consider the free-fermionic state $\sigma(\hat{\Gamma}_r)$ associated with the correlation matrix $\hat{\Gamma}_r$. Our second discrimination test hinges on the quantity $\|\hat{\rho}'_r - \sigma(\hat{\Gamma}_r)\|_1$, which can be computed with a time complexity scaling as $O(\exp(r))$, which is efficient as long as $r = O(\log(n))$. If $\|\hat{\rho}'_r - \sigma(\hat{\Gamma}_r)\|_1 \leq \varepsilon_{T,2}$, we output A; otherwise, we output B. In the case of outputting A, our goal is to demonstrate that we cannot be in case B. Specifically, we show that there exists a free-fermionic state closer, in trace distance, than ε_B to ρ . Consider the free-fermionic

state $U_{\hat{O}}^\dagger (\sigma(\hat{\Gamma}_r) \otimes |0^{n-r}\rangle\langle 0^{n-r}|) U_{\hat{O}}$, which is readily free-fermionic. We have

$$\begin{aligned} & \|\rho - U_{\hat{O}}^\dagger (\sigma(\hat{\Gamma}_r) \otimes |0^{n-r}\rangle\langle 0^{n-r}|) U_{\hat{O}}\|_1 \\ & = \|\rho' - \sigma(\hat{\Gamma}_r) \otimes |0^{n-r}\rangle\langle 0^{n-r}|\|_1 \\ & \leq \|\rho' - \rho'_r \otimes |0^{n-r}\rangle\langle 0^{n-r}|\|_1 + \|\rho'_r - \sigma(\hat{\Gamma}_r)\|_1 \\ & \leq \|\rho' - \rho'_r \otimes |0^{n-r}\rangle\langle 0^{n-r}|\|_1 + \|\rho'_r - \hat{\rho}'_r\|_1 \\ & \quad + \|\hat{\rho}'_r - \sigma(\hat{\Gamma}_r)\|_1 \\ & \leq 4\sqrt{(n-r)(\varepsilon_T + \varepsilon_{\text{stat}})/2} + \varepsilon_{\text{tom}} + \varepsilon_{T,2}, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C53})$$

where in the first inequality, we have used the unitary invariance of the trace norm; in the second and third steps, we have applied the triangle inequality; and in the last step, we have used the previously derived bound. Now, we must ensure that

$$4\sqrt{(n-r)(\varepsilon_T + \varepsilon_{\text{stat}})/2} + \varepsilon_{\text{tom}} + \varepsilon_{T,2} \leq \varepsilon_B. \quad (\text{C54})$$

Now, let us explore the scenario in which we output case B. We need to show that if $\|\hat{\rho}'_r - \sigma(\hat{\Gamma}_r)\|_1 > \varepsilon_{T,2}$, then we cannot be in case A, i.e., that $\min_{\sigma \in \mathcal{G}_R} \|\rho - \sigma\|_1 > \varepsilon_A$. Considering that the application of a free-fermionic unitary $U_{\hat{O}}$ and the partial trace map a free-fermionic state into another free-fermionic state (Lemma A8), we employ the data-processing inequality, leading to the inequality

$$\min_{\sigma \in \mathcal{G}_R} \|\rho - \sigma\|_1 = \min_{\sigma \in \mathcal{G}_R} \|\rho' - \sigma\|_1 \geq \min_{\sigma_r \in \mathcal{G}_R} \|\rho'_r - \sigma_r\|_1. \quad (\text{C55})$$

Let us express the lower bounds

$$\|\rho'_r - \sigma_r\|_1 \geq \begin{cases} \|\hat{\Gamma}_r - \Gamma(\sigma_r)\|_\infty - \varepsilon_{\text{tom}}, \\ \|\hat{\rho}'_r - \sigma(\hat{\Gamma}_r)\|_1 - \varepsilon_{\text{tom}} - n \|\hat{\Gamma}_r - \Gamma(\sigma_r)\|_\infty, \end{cases} \quad (\text{C56})$$

where, for the first bound, we utilize Proposition B2 and the triangle inequality together with Eq. (C52), namely,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\rho'_r - \sigma_r\|_1 & \geq \|\Gamma(\rho'_r) - \Gamma(\sigma_r)\|_\infty \\ & \geq \|\hat{\Gamma}_r - \Gamma(\sigma_r)\|_\infty - \varepsilon_{\text{tom}}, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C57})$$

and for the second bound, by utilizing Theorem B3 and the triangle inequality, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\rho'_r - \sigma_r\|_1 &\geq \|\rho'_r - \sigma(\hat{\Gamma}_r)\|_1 - \|\sigma(\hat{\Gamma}_r) - \sigma_r\|_1 \\
&\geq \|\rho'_r - \sigma(\hat{\Gamma}_r)\|_1 - \frac{1}{2}\|\hat{\Gamma}_r - \Gamma(\sigma_r)\|_1 \\
&\geq \|\hat{\rho}'_r - \sigma(\hat{\Gamma}_r)\|_1 - \varepsilon_{\text{tom}} - \frac{1}{2}\|\hat{\Gamma}_r - \Gamma(\sigma_r)\|_1 \\
&\geq \|\hat{\rho}'_r - \sigma(\hat{\Gamma}_r)\|_1 - \varepsilon_{\text{tom}} - n\|\hat{\Gamma}_r - \Gamma(\sigma_r)\|_\infty.
\end{aligned} \tag{C58}$$

Using standard norm inequalities, the result follows. Since we do not know the optimal σ_r , we use the both lower bounds to find a universal lower bound. To achieve this, we solve the equation

$$\begin{aligned}
&\|\hat{\rho}'_r - \sigma(\hat{\Gamma}_r)\|_1 - \varepsilon_{\text{tom}} - n\|\hat{\Gamma}_r - \Gamma(\sigma_r)\|_\infty \\
&= \|\hat{\Gamma}_r - \Gamma(\sigma_r)\|_\infty - \varepsilon_{\text{tom}}, \\
&\|\hat{\Gamma}_r - \Gamma(\sigma_r)\|_\infty = \frac{1}{n+1} \|\hat{\rho}'_r - \sigma(\hat{\Gamma}_r)\|_1.
\end{aligned} \tag{C59}$$

Substituting the solution into the previous inequality [Eqs. (C55) and (C56)], we obtain

$$\min_{\sigma_r \in \mathcal{G}_R} \|\rho'_r - \sigma_r\|_1 \geq \frac{1}{n+1} \|\hat{\rho}'_r - \sigma(\hat{\Gamma}_r)\|_1 - \varepsilon_{\text{tom}}. \tag{C60}$$

Now, we only need to impose that, given $\|\hat{\rho}'_r - \sigma(\hat{\Gamma}_r)\|_1 > \varepsilon_{T,2}$, we cannot be in case *A* and, therefore, impose

$$\frac{1}{n+1} \varepsilon_{T,2} - \varepsilon_{\text{tom}} > \varepsilon_A. \tag{C61}$$

To satisfy the constraints in Eqs. (C44), (C54), and (C61), we need to choose the constants $\varepsilon_{\text{stat}}$, ε_T , ε_{tom} , and $\varepsilon_{T,2}$. We start by imposing the two inequalities [which implies Eq. (C54)]

$$4\sqrt{(n-r)(\varepsilon_T + \varepsilon_{\text{stat}})/2} \leq \frac{\varepsilon_B}{2}, \tag{C62}$$

$$\varepsilon_{\text{tom}} + \varepsilon_{T,2} \leq \frac{\varepsilon_B}{2}. \tag{C63}$$

Therefore, we have “disentangled” the three inequalities in Eq. (C44), (C54), and (C61) into two systems of two inequalities, the first containing $\varepsilon_{\text{stat}}$ and ε_T involving Eq. (C44) and (C62), and the other one containing ε_{tom} and $\varepsilon_{T,2}$ involving Eqs. (C61) and (C63). By considering the one involving Eqs. (C44) and (C62), we obtain that it

suffices to choose

$$\varepsilon_T = \frac{\varepsilon_B^2}{2^6(n-r)} + \frac{1}{2}\varepsilon_A, \tag{C64}$$

$$\varepsilon_{\text{stat}} < \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{\varepsilon_B^2}{2^5(n-r)} - \varepsilon_A \right). \tag{C65}$$

Moreover, by combining the one involving Eqs. (C61) and (C63), we obtain that it is sufficient to choose

$$\varepsilon_{T,2} = \frac{n+1}{n+2} \left(\frac{\varepsilon_B}{2} + \varepsilon_A \right), \tag{C66}$$

$$\varepsilon_{\text{tom}} < \frac{1}{n+2} \left(\frac{\varepsilon_B}{2} - (n+1)\varepsilon_A \right). \tag{C67}$$

By union bound, the total failure probability of the protocol is at most $1 - \delta$. ■

The previous theorem has been presented under the assumption that ρ is an arbitrary n -qubit state and the set of free-fermionic states considered is $\mathcal{G}_R$, i.e., the set of free-fermionic states with rank at most $R = 2^r$, where $r \in [n]$. However, if we assume that ρ has at most rank R , then we can consider the largest set $\mathcal{G}_{\text{mixed}}$ and we can establish an analogous result. The theorem is detailed as follows and the algorithm is the same as Algorithm 2 with slightly different accuracy parameters, as detailed below.

Theorem C8 (Upper bound for free-fermionic testing for a bounded-rank quantum state). Let ρ be any n -qubit state with rank at most 2^r , where $r \in [n]$. Assume error thresholds $\varepsilon_B, \varepsilon_A \in (0, 1)$ such that

$$\varepsilon_B > \max(\sqrt{2^5(n-r)(2\varepsilon_A)^{1/(r+1)}}, 2(n+1)\varepsilon_A) \tag{C68}$$

and consider a failure probability $\delta \in (0, 1]$. Suppose that ρ falls into one of two cases in Problem C1: either there exists a free-fermionic state $\sigma \in \mathcal{G}_{\text{mixed}}$ with $\|\rho - \sigma\|_1 \leq \varepsilon_A$ (case *A*) or $\min_{\sigma \in \mathcal{G}_{\text{mixed}}} \|\rho - \sigma\|_1 > \varepsilon_B$ (case *B*). Then, a quantum learning algorithm (Algorithm 2) can solve Problem C1 using

$$N := \lceil 8(n^3/\varepsilon_{\text{stat}}^2) \log(8n^2/\delta) + N_{\text{tom}}(\varepsilon_{\text{tom}}, \delta/2, r) \rceil$$

copies of the state ρ with a success probability at least $1 - \delta$. Here, $N_{\text{tom}}(\varepsilon_{\text{tom}}, \delta/2, r)$ is the number of copies sufficient for a full-state-tomography algorithm (see, e.g., Lemma C4) of an r -qubit state with accuracy ε_{tom} and

failure probability at most $\delta/2$. Here, we impose

$$\varepsilon_T > (\varepsilon_{\text{stat}} + (2\varepsilon_A)^{\frac{1}{r+1}}), \quad (\text{C69})$$

$$\varepsilon_{\text{stat}} < \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{\varepsilon_B^2}{2^5(n-r)} - (2\varepsilon_A)^{\frac{1}{r+1}} \right), \quad (\text{C70})$$

$$\varepsilon_{T,2} = \frac{n+1}{n+2} \left(\frac{\varepsilon_B}{2} + \varepsilon_A \right), \quad (\text{C71})$$

$$\varepsilon_{\text{tom}} < \frac{1}{n+2} \left(\frac{\varepsilon_B}{2} - (n+1)\varepsilon_A \right). \quad (\text{C72})$$

Proof. The proof is the same as that of the previous theorem, but this time we have utilized, instead of Eq. (C43), the expression

$$\min_{\sigma \in \mathcal{G}_{\text{mixed}}} \|\rho - \sigma\|_1 \geq \frac{1}{2}(1 - \lambda_{r+1})^{r+1}, \quad (\text{C73})$$

which follows from Lemma B7. Note that Lemma B7 can be applied if $\lambda_{r+1} \geq \frac{1}{2}$; however, if it was $\lambda_{r+1} < \frac{1}{2}$, then we would have output that the state is not free-fermionic because $\hat{\lambda}_{r+1} \leq \lambda_{r+1} + \varepsilon_{\text{stat}} < \frac{1}{2} + \varepsilon_{\text{stat}} \leq 1 - \varepsilon_T$ (this is satisfied if $\varepsilon_{\text{stat}} + \varepsilon_T < 0.5$, which is the regime of interest). From this, it follows that (using the same notation as in the previous proof)

$$\min_{\sigma \in \mathcal{G}_{\text{mixed}}} \|\rho - \sigma\|_1 > \frac{1}{2}(\varepsilon_{\text{stat}} - \varepsilon_T)^{r+1}. \quad (\text{C74})$$

Hence, we have the condition

$$(\varepsilon_T - \varepsilon_{\text{stat}})^{r+1} > 2\varepsilon_A. \quad (\text{C75})$$

This is the only condition that is different from those in the previous theorem. We impose

$$(2\varepsilon_A)^{\frac{1}{r+1}}, \quad (\text{C76})$$

$$\varepsilon_{\text{stat}} < \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{\varepsilon_B^2}{2^5(n-r)} - (2\varepsilon_A)^{\frac{1}{r+1}} \right), \quad (\text{C77})$$

$$\varepsilon_{\text{tom}} < \frac{1}{n+2} \left(\frac{\varepsilon_B}{2} - (n+1)\varepsilon_A \right), \quad (\text{C78})$$

and this suffices to satisfy all the constraints. $\blacksquare$

We now present a lemma that provides, as an example, the performance guarantee for a known tomography algorithm [71]. Specifically, we provide the precise performance guarantees of an optimal tomography algorithm presented in Refs. [48,71] (see also Ref. [32, Lemma S34]).

Lemma C4 (Sample complexity of an optimal tomography algorithm [71]). Let $\varepsilon, \delta \in (0, 1)$ and let ρ be an

unknown state of dimension d (where $d = 2^n$ for n -qubit systems), such that ρ is $\varepsilon/3$ -close in trace distance to a state with rank R . Then, there exists a tomography algorithm such that, given

$$N \geq 2^{18} \frac{Rd}{\varepsilon^2} \log \left(\frac{2}{\delta} \right) \quad (\text{C79})$$

copies of ρ , it can construct (a classical description of) an rank- R estimator $\tilde{\rho}$ satisfying

$$\text{Prob} \left[\frac{1}{2} \|\rho - \tilde{\rho}\|_1 \leq \varepsilon \right] \geq 1 - \delta. \quad (\text{C80})$$

While this algorithm achieves optimal performance using entangled (and possibly highly complex) measurements across multiple copies of the unknown state, it might be impractical for experimental implementations. However, more experimentally feasible algorithms exist that use *unentangled* or *single-copy* measurements on each queried copy of the unknown state [70,72]. The best known algorithm of this kind requires $\tilde{O}(R^2 d / \varepsilon^2)$ copies [72].

APPENDIX D: OPTIMAL TOMOGRAPHY OF PURE AND MIXED FREE-FERMIONIC STATES

In this appendix, we present our results on tomography of free-fermionic states. First, we provide an improved analysis for learning pure free-fermionic states (Sec. D 1). Next, we introduce the first time-efficient algorithm for learning mixed free-fermionic states with respect to the trace distance (Sec. D 2). Finally, we analyze the tomography of states that are promised to be close to the set of free-fermionic states, exploring the applicability of our free-fermionic learning algorithm to noisy scenarios in which the prepared states are not exactly free-fermionic but *almost*.

1. Pure-state tomography

In this subsection, we present an improved analysis for learning pure free-fermionic states, which follows directly from Lemma C2 and our novel inequality for pure free-fermionic states (Theorem B1). Our analysis provides an improvement over the sample-complexity bounds for learning pure free-fermionic states found in previous works [16–18].

Proposition D1 (Tomography of pure free-fermionic states). Let ψ be a free-fermionic quantum state. For $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$ and $\delta \in (0, 1]$ there exist a learning algorithm (outlined in Algorithm 3) that utilizes $N = 8(n^3 / \varepsilon_{\text{stat}}^2) \log(4n^2 / \delta)$ copies of the state and only single-copy measurements to learn an efficient classical representation of the state $\hat{\psi}$ obeying $\|\psi - \hat{\psi}\|_1 \leq \varepsilon$ with at least $1 - \delta$ probability.

ALGORITHM 3. Learning pure free-fermionic states.

-
- Input:** Error threshold $\varepsilon > 0$, failure probability $\delta > 0$. $N = \lceil 8(n^3/\varepsilon^2) \log(4n^2/\delta) \rceil$ copies of the pure free-fermionic state ψ .
- Output:** A classical description of a state $\hat{\psi}$, such that $\|\hat{\psi} - \psi\|_1 \leq \varepsilon$ with at least $1 - \delta$ success probability.
- 1 **Step 1:** Estimate the entries of the correlation matrix of ψ using N single-copy measurements, resulting in the estimated $2n \times 2n$ matrix $\hat{\Gamma}$;
 - 2 **Step 2:** Put $\hat{\Gamma}$ in its normal form $\hat{\Gamma} = \hat{O} \hat{\Lambda} \hat{O}^T$, where $\hat{O} \in O(2n)$, and $\hat{\Lambda}$ is the matrix determined by the normal eigenvalues $\{\hat{\lambda}_j\}_{j=1}^n$;
 - 3 **return** $\hat{O}$, so that $\hat{\psi} := G_{\hat{O}} |0^n\rangle\langle 0^n| G_{\hat{O}}^\dagger$, where $G_{\hat{O}}$ is the free-fermionic unitary associated with $\hat{O}$.
-

Proof. Let $\varepsilon_{\text{stat}} > 0$ be an accuracy parameter. By Lemma C2, with $N \geq 8(n^3/\varepsilon_{\text{stat}}^2) \log(4n^2/\delta)$ copies of the state, we can find a matrix $\hat{\Gamma}$ such that, with probability at least $1 - \delta$, it holds that

$$\|\hat{\Gamma} - \Gamma(\psi)\|_2 \leq \varepsilon_{\text{stat}}. \quad (\text{D1})$$

By putting $\hat{\Gamma}$ in its normal form, we have $\hat{\Gamma} = \hat{O} \hat{\Lambda} \hat{O}^\dagger$, where $\hat{O}$ is an orthogonal matrix and $\hat{\Lambda} = \bigoplus_{i=1}^n \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \hat{\lambda}_i \\ -\hat{\lambda}_i & 0 \end{pmatrix}$. We now consider the correlation matrix $\hat{\Gamma}' := \hat{O} \Lambda \hat{O}^\dagger$, where $\Lambda = \bigoplus_{i=1}^n \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ -1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$. The correlation matrix $\hat{\Gamma}'$ is associated with the pure free-fermionic state $\hat{\psi} = U_{\hat{O}} |0^n\rangle\langle 0^n| U_{\hat{O}}^\dagger$, where $U_{\hat{O}}$ is the free-fermionic unitary associated with $\hat{O}$ (because of Lemma A4). We now have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\hat{\psi}' - \psi\|_1 &\leq \frac{1}{2} \|\hat{\Gamma}' - \Gamma(\psi)\|_2 \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2} \|\hat{\Gamma}' - \hat{\Gamma}\|_2 + \frac{1}{2} \|\hat{\Gamma} - \Gamma(\psi)\|_2 \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2} \|\Lambda - \hat{\Lambda}\|_2 + \frac{1}{2} \varepsilon_{\text{stat}} \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2} \|\Gamma(\psi) - \hat{\Gamma}\|_2 + \frac{1}{2} \varepsilon_{\text{stat}} \\ &\leq \varepsilon_{\text{stat}}, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{D2})$$

where in the first step we have used Theorem B1, in the second step we have used the triangle inequality, in the third step we have used Eq. (D1), and in the fourth step we have used that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\Lambda - \hat{\Lambda}\|_2 &= \left\| \bigoplus_{j=1}^n \begin{pmatrix} \lambda_j & 0 \\ 0 & -\lambda_j \end{pmatrix} - \bigoplus_{i=1}^n \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix} \right\|_2 \\ &\leq \|\hat{\Gamma} - \Gamma(\psi)\|_2, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{D3})$$

where we have used the fact that $i\Gamma$ and $i\hat{\Gamma}$ are Hermitian and that $\|\text{Eig}(A) - \text{Eig}(B)\|_p \leq \|A - B\|_p$ for any Hermitian matrices A and B and any p -norms $\|\cdot\|_p$ (see Ref. [67, Eq. (IV.62)]), where $\text{Eig}(A)$ indicates the diagonal matrix with elements being the ordered eigenvalues of A . ■

2. Mixed-state tomography

In this subsection, we present an efficient algorithm for learning mixed free-fermionic states. This result follows directly from Theorem B3, which establishes a relationship between the trace distance of mixed free-fermionic states and the one-norm difference of their correlation matrices.

While previous works have provided sample-complexity bounds for learning pure free-fermionic states [16–18], to the best of our knowledge, this is the first work to rigorously demonstrate an efficient method for learning mixed free-fermionic states with respect to the trace distance.

Theorem D1 (Tomography of free-fermionic mixed states). Let ρ be a free-fermionic state. For $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$ and $\delta \in (0, 1]$, there exists a quantum learning algorithm (outlined in Algorithm 4) that, utilizing $N = \lceil 16(n^4/\varepsilon^2) \log(4n^2/\delta) \rceil$ single copies of the state ρ , learns an efficient representation of a state $\hat{\rho}$ such that

$$\|\hat{\rho} - \rho\|_1 \leq \varepsilon, \quad (\text{D4})$$

with a probability of success at least $1 - \delta$.

Proof. Let $\varepsilon_{\text{stat}} > 0$ be an accuracy parameter to be fixed later. By Lemma C2, with $N \geq 8(n^3/\varepsilon_{\text{stat}}^2) \log(4n^2/\delta)$ copies of the state, we can find a matrix $\hat{\Gamma}$ such that, with probability at least $1 - \delta$, it holds that $\|\hat{\Gamma} - \Gamma(\rho)\|_2 < \varepsilon_{\text{stat}}$. In particular, $\hat{\Gamma}$ can be expressed in its normal form as $\hat{\Gamma} = \hat{O} \hat{\Lambda} \hat{O}^T$, where $\hat{O} \in O(2n)$ and $\hat{\Lambda} = \bigoplus_{k=1}^n \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \hat{\lambda}_k \\ -\hat{\lambda}_k & 0 \end{pmatrix}$. Now, as in step 3 of the algorithm, for each $j \in [n]$, we set

$$\tilde{\lambda}_j = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } \hat{\lambda}_j > 1, \\ \hat{\lambda}_j, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (\text{D5})$$

Let us now denote

$$\tilde{\Lambda} := \bigoplus_{i=1}^n \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \tilde{\lambda}_i \\ -\tilde{\lambda}_i & 0 \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad \Lambda := \bigoplus_{i=1}^n \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \lambda_i \\ -\lambda_i & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (\text{D6})$$

ALGORITHM 4. Learning mixed free-fermionic states.

-
- Input:** Error threshold $\varepsilon > 0$, failure probability $\delta > 0$. $N = \lceil 16(n^4/\varepsilon^2) \log(4n^2/\delta) \rceil$ copies of the mixed free-fermionic state ρ .
- Output:** A classical description of a state $\hat{\rho}$, such that $\|\hat{\rho} - \rho\|_1 \leq \varepsilon$ with at least $1 - \delta$ success probability.
- 1 **Step 1:** Estimate the entries of the correlation matrix of ρ using N single-copy measurements, resulting in the estimated $2n \times 2n$ matrix $\hat{\Gamma}$;
 - 2 **Step 2:** Put $\hat{\Gamma}$ in its normal form $\hat{\Gamma} = \hat{O}\hat{\Lambda}\hat{O}^T$, where $\hat{O} \in O(2n)$, and $\hat{\Lambda}$ is the matrix determined by the normal eigenvalues $\{\hat{\lambda}_j\}_{j=1}^n$;
 - 3 **Step 3:** For each $j \in [n]$, set $\tilde{\lambda}_j := \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } \hat{\lambda}_j > 1, \\ \hat{\lambda}_j, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$;
 - 4 **return** $\hat{O}$ and $\{\tilde{\lambda}_i\}_{i=1}^n$, so that $\hat{\rho} := G_{\hat{O}} \left(\bigotimes_{j=1}^n \frac{I + \tilde{\lambda}_j Z_j}{2} \right) G_{\hat{O}}^\dagger$, where $G_{\hat{O}}$ is the free-fermionic unitary associated with $\hat{O}$.
-

where Λ is the matrix containing the normal eigenvalues of the correlation matrix $\Gamma(\rho)$ (which are ≤ 1). We have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\hat{\Lambda} - \tilde{\Lambda}\|_2 &\leq \|\hat{\Lambda} - \Lambda\|_2 \\ &\leq \|\hat{\Gamma} - \Gamma(\rho)\|_2 \\ &\leq \varepsilon_{\text{stat}}, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{D7})$$

where the first inequality uses the fact that $|\hat{\lambda}_j - \tilde{\lambda}_j| \leq |\hat{\lambda}_j - \lambda_j|$ (which holds because $\lambda_j \leq 1$), the second inequality follows from the fact that $i\Gamma$ and $i\hat{\Gamma}$ are Hermitian, combined with the result $\|\text{Eig}(A) - \text{Eig}(B)\|_p \leq \|A - B\|_p$ for any Hermitian matrices A and B and any p -norms $\|\cdot\|_p$ (see Ref. [67, Eq. (IV.62)]), where $\text{Eig}(A)$ denotes the diagonal matrix of ordered eigenvalues of A . Thus, we can define the free-fermionic quantum state

$$\hat{\rho} := G_{\hat{O}} \left(\bigotimes_{j=1}^n \frac{I + \tilde{\lambda}_j Z_j}{2} \right) G_{\hat{O}}^\dagger, \quad (\text{D8})$$

where $G_{\hat{O}}$ is the free-fermionic unitary associated with $\hat{O}$. The correlation matrix associated with $\hat{\rho}$ is then $\Gamma(\hat{\rho}) = \hat{O}\tilde{\Lambda}\hat{O}^\dagger$. By Theorem B3, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\hat{\rho} - \rho\|_1 &\leq \frac{1}{2} \|\Gamma(\hat{\rho}) - \Gamma(\rho)\|_1 \\ &\leq \sqrt{\frac{n}{2}} \|\Gamma(\hat{\rho}) - \Gamma(\rho)\|_2 \\ &\leq \sqrt{\frac{n}{2}} (\|\Gamma(\hat{\rho}) - \hat{\Gamma}\|_2 + \|\hat{\Gamma} - \Gamma(\rho)\|_2) \\ &= \sqrt{\frac{n}{2}} (\|\tilde{\Lambda} - \hat{\Lambda}\|_2 + \|\hat{\Gamma} - \Gamma(\rho)\|_2) \\ &\leq \sqrt{2n} \varepsilon_{\text{stat}}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{D9})$$

By choosing $\varepsilon_{\text{stat}} = \varepsilon/\sqrt{2n}$, we conclude the proof. $\blacksquare$

The previous algorithm for learning possibly mixed free-fermionic states uses only Gaussian operations and

achieves a sample complexity of $\tilde{O}(n^4/\varepsilon^2)$. However, in the noisy intermediate-scale quantum (NISQ) era [73], it may be more practical to rely solely on single Pauli measurements. In this case, the sample complexity for learning mixed free-fermionic states would be $N = O((n^5/\varepsilon^2) \log(4n^2/\delta))$ (as follows from Lemma C1 and an analysis similar to that in the previous proof).

3. Noise robustness of the learning algorithm

In the previous section, we have shown how to efficiently learn an unknown, possibly mixed, free-fermionic state. However, it is practically significant to consider whether the proposed learning algorithm is robust to slight deviations from the assumption that the state is free-fermionic. This is particularly relevant in experimental scenarios in which one aims to prepare a free-fermionic state and learn it to verify that the quantum device is functioning correctly. In such cases, the experimental apparatus may be noisy and it is reasonable to assume that the prepared state is not exactly free-fermionic but close to, if the noise is sufficiently low. It is worth stressing that free-fermionic states are not so trivial to prepare experimentally, especially on a digital quantum computer, where $O(n^2)$ two-qubit gates are required [14], in which n is the number of qubits (or fermionic modes). However, their classical tractability may enable experimentalists to benchmark their devices by preparing specific free-fermionic quantum states, efficiently learning them, and verifying the results in a feedback loop.

Thus, the core question of this section is: Given the assumption that our state is *close* to the set of free-fermionic states, can we still achieve efficient recovery guarantees for our learning algorithm? We analyze two notions of closeness by considering the *relative entropy of non-Gaussianity* [74] (in the first subsection) and the trace distance (in the second subsection). We note that in the context of bosonic Gaussian state tomography, the tomography of a state with small relative entropy of non-Gaussianity has recently been analyzed in Ref. [32], also by our team.

a. Perturbations with respect to the relative entropy of non-Gaussianity

Here, in order to quantify the non-Gaussian (or non-free-fermionic) character of a quantum state, we employ the *relative entropy of non-Gaussianity* [37,74]. For any state ρ , the relative entropy of non-Gaussianity $d_G(\rho)$ is defined as the minimum relative entropy

$$d_G(\rho) := \min_{\sigma \in \mathcal{G}} S(\rho \| \sigma) \quad (\text{D10})$$

between ρ and any Gaussian (i.e., free-fermionic) state, where $\mathcal{G}$ denotes the set of Gaussian states and

$$S(\rho \| \sigma) := \text{Tr}[\rho \log_2 \rho] - \text{Tr}[\rho \log_2 \sigma] \quad (\text{D11})$$

represents the quantum relative entropy between ρ and σ . The relative entropy of non-Gaussianity possesses several desirable properties, making it a meaningful measure of non-Gaussianity. Specifically, $d_G(\rho)$ is faithful: $d_G(\rho) \geq 0$ and it equals zero if and only if ρ is Gaussian. Importantly, the minimum in the definition of $d_G(\rho)$ is attained by the *Gaussianification* of ρ . The Gaussianification $G(\rho)$ of a state ρ is the free-fermionic state with the same correlation matrix as ρ . The proofs of these facts can be found in Refs. [37,74,75] for bosonic Gaussian states and they generalize seamlessly to fermions, utilizing the representation of fermionic Gaussian states as Gibbs states of quadratic Hamiltonians in the Majorana operators. For instance, see Refs. [76,77] for discussions on Gaussianification in the fermionic context or Ref. [38, Appendix B] for a list of properties of the relative entropy of fermionic non-Gaussianity. Thus, the relative entropy of non-Gaussianity of a state ρ is given by [37]

$$d_G(\rho) = S(\rho \| G(\rho)), \quad (\text{D12})$$

where $G(\rho)$ is the Gaussianification of ρ .

We now proceed to analyze the robustness of our tomography algorithm for free-fermionic states. First, we highlight the following observation.

Remark D1. Let ρ be a quantum state (possibly non-free-fermionic). The algorithm designed for learning free-fermionic states presented in Algorithm 4 (see Theorem D1) effectively learns the Gaussianification $G(\rho)$. Thus, $\lceil 16(n^4/\varepsilon^2) \log(4n^2/\delta) \rceil$ copies of ρ suffice to build a classical description of a free-fermionic state $\hat{\rho}$ such that $\|\hat{\rho} - G(\rho)\|_1 \leq \varepsilon$ with probability at least $1 - \delta$.

Now, we show that if the relative entropy of non-Gaussianity is sufficiently small, then we can still apply our learning algorithm.

Proposition D2 (Robustness to small deviations in relative entropy of non-Gaussianity). Let $\varepsilon, \delta \in (0, 1)$.

Let ρ be an unknown state such that its relative entropy of non-Gaussianity satisfies $d_G(\rho) \leq \varepsilon^2$. Then, $O((n^4/\varepsilon^4) \log(4n^2/\delta))$ copies of ρ suffice to build a classical description of a free-fermionic state $\hat{\rho}$ such that $\|\hat{\rho} - \rho\|_1 \leq \varepsilon$ with probability at least $1 - \delta$.

Proof. By using Remark D1, $O((n^4/\varepsilon^2) \log(4n^2/\delta))$ copies of ρ suffice to build a classical description of a free-fermionic state $\hat{\rho}$ such that $\|\hat{\rho} - G(\rho)\|_1 \leq (1 - \sqrt{2 \ln 2}) \varepsilon$ with probability at least $1 - \delta$, where $G(\rho)$ denotes the Gaussianification of ρ . If this event happens, then

$$\begin{aligned} \|\rho - \hat{\rho}\|_1 &\leq \|G(\rho) - \hat{\rho}\|_1 + \|G(\rho) - \rho\|_1 \\ &\leq (1 - \sqrt{2 \ln 2}) \varepsilon + \|G(\rho) - \rho\|_1 \\ &\leq (1 - \sqrt{2 \ln 2}) \varepsilon + \sqrt{2 \ln 2} \sqrt{S(\rho \| G(\rho))} \\ &= (1 - \sqrt{2 \ln 2}) \varepsilon + \sqrt{2 \ln 2} \sqrt{d_G(\rho)} \\ &\leq \varepsilon. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{D13})$$

Here, in the third step, we have employed the quantum Pinsker inequality [29, Theorem 11.9.1], which states that for any τ and σ , the trace distance can be upper bounded in terms of the relative entropy as $\frac{1}{2} \|\tau - \sigma\|_1 \leq \sqrt{(\ln 2/2) S(\tau \| \sigma)}$. Finally, in the fourth step, we have used the characterization of the relative entropy of non-Gaussianity in Eq. (D12). ■

b. Perturbations with respect to the trace distance

We now discuss the case in which the unknown state is promised to be close in trace distance to the set of free-fermionic states.

Proposition D3 (Robustness to small deviations in trace distance from the set of free-fermionic states). Let $\varepsilon, \delta \in (0, 1)$. Let ρ be a quantum state such that $\min_{\sigma \in \mathcal{G}} \|\rho - \sigma\|_1 \leq \varepsilon/3n$. Then, $O((n^4/\varepsilon^2) \log(4n^2/\delta))$ copies of ρ suffice to build a classical description of a free-fermionic state $\hat{\rho}$ such that $\|\hat{\rho} - \rho\|_1 \leq \varepsilon$ with probability at least $1 - \delta$.

Proof. Let $\varepsilon_1 = \varepsilon/3n$. By assumption, there exists a free-fermionic state ρ_{free} such that $\|\rho - \rho_{\text{free}}\|_1 \leq \varepsilon_1$. Utilizing Proposition B2, we obtain

$$\|\Gamma(\rho) - \Gamma(\rho_{\text{free}})\|_\infty \leq \varepsilon_1. \quad (\text{D14})$$

By using Remark D1, $O((n^4/\varepsilon^4) \log(4n^2/\delta))$ copies of ρ suffice to build a classical description of a free-fermionic state $\hat{\rho}$ such that $\|\hat{\rho} - G(\rho)\|_1 \leq \varepsilon/3$ with probability at

least $1 - \delta$, where $G(\rho)$ denotes the Gaussianification of ρ . Subsequently, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\hat{\rho} - \rho\|_1 &\leq \|\hat{\rho} - G(\rho)\|_1 + \|G(\rho) - \rho_{\text{free}}\|_1 \\
&\quad + \|\rho_{\text{free}} - \rho\|_1 \\
&\leq \frac{\varepsilon}{3} + \frac{1}{2}\|\Gamma(G(\rho)) - \Gamma(\rho_{\text{free}})\|_1 + \varepsilon_1 \\
&\leq \frac{\varepsilon}{3} + n\|\Gamma(\rho) - \Gamma(\rho_{\text{free}})\|_\infty + \varepsilon_1 \\
&\leq \frac{\varepsilon}{3} + n\varepsilon_1 + \varepsilon_1 \\
&\leq \varepsilon,
\end{aligned} \tag{D15}$$

where in the first inequality we have employed the triangle inequality, in the second step we have utilized Theorem B3 and the assumption that the state ρ is ε_1 -close to a Gaussian state ρ_{free} , in the third step we have used that $\Gamma(\rho) = \Gamma(G(\rho))$ together with the relation between trace-norm and operator norm, and in the fourth step we have used Eq. (D14). ■

The previous proposition implies that if a given state is $O(\varepsilon/n)$ close to the set of free-fermionic states, then our learning algorithm can still be reliably applied.

-
- [1] M. Kliesch and I. Roth, Theory of quantum system certification, *PRX Quantum* **2**, 010201 (2021).
 - [2] J. Eisert, D. Hangleiter, N. Walk, I. Roth, D. Markham, R. Parekh, U. Chabaud, and E. Kashefi, Quantum certification and benchmarking, *Nat. Rev. Phys.* **2**, 382 (2020).
 - [3] J. Haah, A. W. Harrow, Z. Ji, X. Wu, and N. Yu, Sample-optimal tomography of quantum states, *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory* **63**, 5628 (2017).
 - [4] A. Anshu and S. Arunachalam, A survey on the complexity of learning quantum states, *Nat. Rev. Phys.* **6**, 59 (2024).
 - [5] J. Surace and L. Tagliacozzo, Fermionic Gaussian states: An introduction to numerical approaches, *SciPost Phys. Lect. Notes* **54** (2022).
 - [6] E. Knill, Fermionic linear optics and matchgates, *arXiv:quant-ph/0108033*.
 - [7] B. M. Terhal and D. P. DiVincenzo, Classical simulation of noninteracting-fermion quantum circuits, *Phys. Rev. A* **65**, 032325 (2002).
 - [8] L. Onsager, Crystal statistics. I. A two-dimensional model with an order-disorder transition, *Phys. Rev.* **65**, 117 (1944).
 - [9] R. Jördens, N. Strohmaier, K. Günter, H. Moritz, and T. Esslinger, A Mott insulator of fermionic atoms in an optical lattice, *Nature* **455**, 204 (2008).
 - [10] J. Vijayan, P. Sompet, G. Salomon, J. Koepsell, S. Hirthe, A. Bohrdt, F. Grusdt, I. Bloch, and C. Gross, Time-resolved observation of spin-charge deconfinement in fermionic Hubbard chains, *Science* **367**, 186 (2020).
 - [11] P. Echenique and J. L. Alonso, A mathematical and computational review of Hartree-Fock SCF methods in quantum chemistry, *Mol. Phys.* **105**, 3057 (2007).
 - [12] R. Jozsa and A. Miyake, Matchgates and classical simulation of quantum circuits, *Proc. Roy. Soc. A* **464**, 3089 (2008).
 - [13] J. Cudby and S. Strelchuk, Gaussian decomposition of magic states for matchgate computations, *arXiv:2307.12654*.
 - [14] B. Dias and R. Koenig, Classical simulation of non-Gaussian fermionic circuits, *arXiv:2307.12912*.
 - [15] O. Reardon-Smith, M. Oszmaniec, and K. Korzekwa, Improved simulation of quantum circuits dominated by free fermionic operations, *arXiv:2307.12702*.
 - [16] M. Gluza, M. Kliesch, J. Eisert, and L. Aolita, Fidelity witnesses for fermionic quantum simulations, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **120**, 190501 (2018).
 - [17] B. O’Gorman, Fermionic tomography and learning, *arXiv:2207.14787*.
 - [18] S. Aaronson and S. Grewal, Efficient tomography of non-interacting fermion states, *arXiv:2102.10458*.
 - [19] A. A. Mele and Y. Herasymenko, Efficient learning of quantum states prepared with few fermionic non-Gaussian gates, *PRX Quantum* **6**, 010319 (2025).
 - [20] D. Gottesman, The Heisenberg representation of quantum computers, *arXiv:quant-ph/9807006*.
 - [21] A. Montanaro, Learning stabilizer states by Bell sampling, *arXiv:1707.04012*.
 - [22] S. Grewal, V. Iyer, W. Kretschmer, and D. Liang, Efficient learning of quantum states prepared with few non-Clifford gates, *arXiv:2305.13409*.
 - [23] L. Leone, S. F. E. Oliviero, and A. Hamma, Learning t -doped stabilizer states, *Quantum* **8**, 1361 (2024).
 - [24] D. Hangleiter and M. J. Gullans, Bell sampling from quantum circuits, *arXiv:2306.00083*.
 - [25] M. Cramer, M. B. Plenio, S. T. Flammia, R. Somma, D. Gross, S. D. Bartlett, O. Landon-Cardinal, D. Poulin, and Y.-K. Liu, Efficient quantum state tomography, *Nat. Commun.* **1**, 149 (2010).
 - [26] M. Fanizza, N. Galke, J. Lumbreras, C. Rouzé, and A. Winter, Learning finitely correlated states: Stability of the spectral reconstruction, *arXiv:2312.07516*.
 - [27] H.-Y. Huang, Y. Liu, M. Broughton, I. Kim, A. Anshu, Z. Landau, and J. R. McClean, Learning shallow quantum circuits, *arXiv:2401.10095*.
 - [28] B. Zumino, Normal forms of complex matrices, *J. Math. Phys.* **3**, 1055 (2004).
 - [29] M. M. Wilde, *Quantum Information Theory* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2017), 2nd ed.
 - [30] S. Bravyi and D. Gosset, Improved classical simulation of quantum circuits dominated by Clifford gates, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **116**, 250501 (2016).
 - [31] L. Bittel, F. A. Mele, A. A. Mele, S. Tirone, and L. Lami, Optimal estimates of trace distance between bosonic Gaussian states and applications to learning, *arXiv:2411.02368* [quant-ph].
 - [32] F. A. Mele, A. A. Mele, L. Bittel, J. Eisert, V. Giovannetti, L. Lami, L. Leone, and S. F. E. Oliviero, Learning quantum states of continuous variable systems, *arXiv:2405.01431*.
 - [33] A. S. Holevo, On estimates of trace-norm distance between quantum Gaussian states, *arXiv:2408.11400* [quant-ph].

- [34] E. Chitambar and G. Gour, Quantum resource theories, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **91**, 025001 (2019).
- [35] R. O'Donnell and J. Wright, Quantum spectrum testing, [arXiv:1501.05028](#).
- [36] N. Yu, in *12th Innovations in Theoretical Computer Science Conference (ITCS 2021)*, Leibniz International Proceedings in Informatics (LIPIcs), edited by J. R. Lee (Schloss Dagstuhl—Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, Dagstuhl, Germany, 2021), Vol. 185, pp. 11:1–11:20.
- [37] P. Marian and T. A. Marian, Relative entropy is an exact measure of non-Gaussianity, *Phys. Rev. A* **88**, 012322 (2013).
- [38] L. Lumia, E. Tirrito, R. Fazio, and M. Collura, Measurement-induced transitions beyond Gaussianity: A single particle description, *Phys. Rev. Res.* **6**, 023176 (2024).
- [39] L. Banchi, P. Giorda, and P. Zanardi, Quantum information-geometry of dissipative quantum phase transitions, *Phys. Rev. E* **89**, 022102 (2014).
- [40] J. Zhang and M. A. Rajabpour, Trace distance between fermionic Gaussian states from a truncation method, *Phys. Rev. A* **108**, 022414 (2023).
- [41] D. Gross, S. Nezami, and M. Walter, Schur-Weyl duality for the Clifford group with applications: Property testing, a robust Hudson theorem, and de Finetti representations, *Commun. Math. Phys.* **385**, 1325 (2021).
- [42] S. Grewal, V. Iyer, W. Kretschmer, and D. Liang, Improved stabilizer estimation via Bell difference sampling, [arXiv:2304.13915](#).
- [43] S. Arunachalam and A. Dutt, Tolerant testing stabilizer states, [arXiv:2408.06289](#) [quant-ph].
- [44] M. Soleimanifar and J. Wright, Testing matrix product states, [arXiv:2201.01824](#).
- [45] L. Aolita, C. Gogolin, M. Kliesch, and J. Eisert, Reliable quantum certification for photonic quantum technologies, *Nat. Commun.* **6**, 8498 (2015).
- [46] A. Bluhm, M. C. Caro, and A. Oufkir, Hamiltonian property testing, [arXiv:2403.02968](#).
- [47] F. E. Gutiérrez, Simple algorithms to test and learn local Hamiltonians, [arXiv:2404.06282](#).
- [48] R. O'Donnell and J. Wright, Efficient quantum tomography, [arXiv:1508.01907](#).
- [49] S. F. E. Oliviero, L. Leone, S. Lloyd, and A. Hamma, Unscrambling quantum information with Clifford decoders, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **132**, 080402 (2024).
- [50] L. Leone, S. F. E. Oliviero, S. Lloyd, and A. Hamma, Learning efficient decoders for quasichaotic quantum scramblers, *Phys. Rev. A* **109**, 022429 (2024).
- [51] D. Hangleiter and M. J. Gullans, Bell sampling from quantum circuits, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **133**, 020601 (2024).
- [52] R. Hübener, A. Mari, and J. Eisert, Wick's theorem for matrix product states, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **110**, 040401 (2013).
- [53] B. P. Lanyon, C. Maier, T. B. Milan Holzapfel, C. Hempel, P. Jurcevic, I. Dhand, A. S. Buyskikh, A. J. Daley, M. Cramer, M. B. Plenio, R. Blatt, and C. F. Roos, Efficient tomography of a quantum many-body system, *Nat. Phys.* **13**, 1158 (2017).
- [54] D. Hangleiter, M. Kliesch, M. Schwarz, and J. Eisert, Direct certification of a class of quantum simulations, *Quantum Sci. Technol.* **2**, 015004 (2017).
- [55] T. Baumgratz, D. Gross, M. Cramer, and M. B. Plenio, Scalable reconstruction of density matrices, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **111**, 020401 (2013).
- [56] C. Rouzé and D. S. França, Learning quantum many-body systems from a few copies, [arXiv:2107.03333](#).
- [57] M. Oszmaniec, N. Dangniam, M. E. Morales, and Z. Zimborás, Fermion sampling: A robust quantum computational advantage scheme using fermionic linear optics and magic input states, *PRX Quantum* **3**, 020328 (2022).
- [58] J. Cudby and S. Strelchuk, Learning Gaussian operations and the matchgate hierarchy, [arXiv:2407.12649](#).
- [59] L. van Luijk, N. Galke, A. Hahn, and D. Burgarth, Error bounds for Lie group representations in quantum mechanics, *J. Phys. A: Math. Theor.* **57**, 105301 (2024).
- [60] H. Zhao, L. Lewis, I. Kannan, Y. Quek, H.-Y. Huang, and M. C. Caro, Learning quantum states and unitaries of bounded gate complexity, *PRX Quantum* **5**, 040306 (2024).
- [61] Z. Jiang, K. J. Sung, K. Kechedzhi, V. N. Smelyanskiy, and S. Boixo, Quantum algorithms to simulate many-body physics of correlated fermions, *Phys. Rev. Appl.* **9**, 044036 (2018).
- [62] A. Chapman and A. Miyake, Classical simulation of quantum circuits by dynamical localization: Analytic results for Pauli-observable scrambling in time-dependent disorder, *Phys. Rev. A* **98**, 012309 (2018).
- [63] S. Bravyi and D. Gosset, Complexity of quantum impurity problems, *Commun. Math. Phys.* **356**, 451 (2017).
- [64] T.-Y. Tam and M. C. Thompson, Determinant and Pfaffian of sum of skew symmetric matrices, *Lin. Alg. Appl.* **433**, 412 (2010).
- [65] B. Windt, A. Jahn, J. Eisert, and L. Hackl, Local optimization on pure Gaussian state manifolds, *SciPost Phys.* **10**, 066 (2021).
- [66] J. Gao, Quantum union bounds for sequential projective measurements, *Phys. Rev. A* **92**, 052331 (2015).
- [67] R. Bhatia, *Matrix Analysis*, Graduate Texts in Mathematics (Springer, New York, 1996).
- [68] C. A. Fuchs and J. van de Graaf, Cryptographic distinguishability measures for quantum-mechanical states, *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory* **45**, 1216 (1999).
- [69] X. Bonet-Monroig, R. Babbush, and T. E. O'Brien, Nearly optimal measurement scheduling for partial tomography of quantum states, *Phys. Rev. X* **10**, 031064 (2020).
- [70] D. S. França, F. G. L. Brandão, and R. Kueng, in *16th Conference on the Theory of Quantum Computation, Communication and Cryptography (TQC 2021)*, Leibniz International Proceedings in Informatics (LIPIcs), edited by M.-H. Hsieh (Schloss Dagstuhl—Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, Dagstuhl, Germany, 2021), Vol. 197, pp. 7:1–7:13.
- [71] J. Wright, Ph.D. thesis, How to Learn a Quantum State, Carnegie Mellon University, Pittsburgh, PA, 2016.
- [72] M. Guta, J. Kahn, R. Kueng, and J. A. Tropp, Fast state tomography with optimal error bounds, [arXiv:1809.11162](#).
- [73] J. Preskill, Quantum computing in the NISQ era and beyond, *Quantum* **2**, 79 (2018).

- [74] M. G. Genoni, M. G. A. Paris, and K. Banaszek, Quantifying the non-Gaussian character of a quantum state by quantum relative entropy, [Phys. Rev. A **78**, 060303 \(2008\)](#).
- [75] J. Eisert and M. M. Wolf, in *Quantum Information with Continuous Variables of Atoms and Light* (Imperial College Press, London, 2007), pp. 23–42, [arXiv:quant-ph/0505151](#).
- [76] F. Pastawski, J. Eisert, and H. Wilming, Towards holography via quantum source-channel codes, [Phys. Rev. Lett. **119**, 020501 \(2017\)](#).
- [77] M. Gluza, C. Krumnow, M. Friesdorf, C. Gogolin, and J. Eisert, Equilibration via Gaussification in fermionic lattice systems, [Phys. Rev. Lett. **117**, 190602 \(2016\)](#).