

Universal Blind Quantum Computation

Anne Broadbent¹, Joseph Fitzsimons², and Elham Kashefi^{3,4}

¹ Université de Montréal
Département d'informatique et de recherche opérationnelle
`broadbea@iro.umontreal.ca`

² University of Oxford, Department of Materials
`joe.fitzsimons@materials.ox.ac.uk`

³ University of Edinburgh, School of Informatics

⁴ Laboratoire d'Informatique de Grenoble
`ekashefi@inf.ed.ac.uk`

Abstract. We present the first protocol which allows Alice to have Bob carry out a quantum computation for her such that Alice's inputs, outputs and computation remain perfectly private, and where Alice does not require any quantum computational power or memory. She only needs to be able to prepare single qubits from a finite set and send them to Bob, who has the balance of the required quantum computational resources. Our protocol is interactive: after the initial preparation of quantum states, Alice and Bob use two-way classical communication which enables Alice to drive the computation, giving single-qubit measurement instructions to Bob, depending on previous measurement outcomes. The interaction is polynomial in the size of Alice's underlying quantum circuit. Our protocol works for inputs and outputs that are either classical or quantum. We also discuss the use of authentication in order for Alice to detect an interfering Bob. Furthermore, our construction involves a new, regular universal resource for measurement-based quantum computing called the *brickwork state* which may also be of independent interest.

Keywords: quantum cryptography, two-party computation, measurement-based quantum computing

1 Introduction

When the technology to build quantum computers finally becomes available, it is highly likely that it will only be accessible to a handful of centers around the world. Much like today's rental system of supercomputers, users will probably be granted access to the computers in a limited way. This begs the question: how will the users interface with the quantum computer? They surely won't be allowed anywhere near the precious machine. Instead, they will have to provide a description of their target computation, as well as their inputs. Here, we consider the scenario where

a user is unwilling to provide such information in the clear but still wishes to carry out a computation on a remote quantum computer.

More precisely, we give a protocol that allows Alice (who does not have any quantum computational resources or quantum memory) to interact with Bob (who has a quantum computer) in order for Alice to obtain the outcome of her target computation such that privacy is preserved. This implies that Bob learns nothing about Alice's inputs, outputs, or desired computation. The privacy is perfect, does not rely on any computational assumptions, and holds no matter what actions a cheating Bob undertakes. Our protocol requires a polynomial number of rounds (in the depth of the underlying quantum circuit), each of polynomial length (in the width of the underlying quantum circuit).

We also give a method to detect if Bob is not cooperating. Note that if Alice wanted to compute the solution to a classical problem in NP, she can efficiently verify the outcome. Other cases are covered by an authentication technique which detects an interfering Bob with overwhelming probability. This is the best that we can hope for since there is always an exponentially small probability that Bob can guess a path that will make Alice accept. Note also that we cannot prevent Bob from refusing to perform the computation, but if he is making a business out of performing quantum computation for Alice, then economic reasons should force him to cooperate.

We now review some applications of our protocol.

- *Classical input, efficiently verifiable classical output.* Factoring is a prime application of our protocol: by implementing Shor's factoring algorithm [Sho97] as a blind quantum computation, Alice can use Bob to help her factor a product of large primes which is associated with an RSA public key [RSA78]. Thanks to the properties of our protocol, Bob will not only be unable to determine Alice's input, but will be completely oblivious to the fact that he is helping her factor.
- *Classical input, classical output.* Our protocol could be used by Alice to solve a BQP-complete problem (BQP is the class of problems that can be solved efficiently using a quantum computer), for instance approximating the Jones polynomial [AJL06]. Since it is not known if $BQP = NP$, Alice does not know a classical method to efficiently verify the solution, which motivates the need for authentication of Bob's computation, even in the classical case (see Section 5).
- *Classical input, quantum output.* In *quantum state preparation*, Alice has a classical description of a quantum state that she wishes to prepare. As long as Alice knows a polynomial-size quantum circuit to

prepare the state, our protocol gives an efficient way for her to blindly accomplish this task with the help of Bob.

- *Quantum input, classical output.* Suppose Alice is a quantum verifier running an interactive proof for a problem in QMA. Using blind quantum computation, she can use Bob to help her perform her quantum verification without him learning what she is doing.
- *Quantum input, quantum output.* Again, Alice is a quantum verifier, this time in a multi-round quantum interactive proof. She can use our protocol to process quantum inputs and give quantum outputs back to the prover.

As already mentioned, authentication is necessary to verify that Bob has cooperated in the computation of a BQP-complete problem. This is also the case for the last three examples given above. Authentication is discussed in Section 5.

1.1 Related work

In the classical world, Joan Feigenbaum introduced the notion of *computing with encrypted data* [Fei86]. According to her definition, a function f is called *encryptable* if Alice can easily transform an instance x into instance x' , obtain $f(x')$ from Bob and easily compute $f(x)$ from $f(x')$, in such a way that Bob cannot infer x from x' . Following this, Martín Abadi, Joan Feigenbaum and Joe Kilian [AFK89] gave an impossibility result: no NP-hard function is encryptable leaking at most the length of the input (even probabilistically and with polynomial interaction), unless the polynomial hierarchy collapses at the third level.

Still in the model where the function f is classical and public, Pablo Arrighi and Louis Salvail [AS06] gave an approach using quantum resources. The idea of their protocol is that Alice gives Bob multiple inputs, most of which are *decoys*. Bob applies the target function on all inputs, and then Alice verifies his behaviour on the decoys. There are two important points to make here. First, the protocol only works for a restricted set of classical functions called *random verifiable*: it must be possible for Alice to efficiently generate random input-output pairs (this allows her to verify the decoys). Second, the protocol does not prevent Bob from learning Alice's private input. It provides only *cheat sensitivity*, which gives a trade off between the amount of private information that Bob can learn and his probability of being detected. The proof is only given against individual attacks.

Is it possible to achieve secure and universal blind *quantum* computing for any polynomial-time quantum computation? Such an attempt

was first proposed by Andrew Childs [Chi05] based on the idea of encoding the input qubits with a quantum one-time pad [AMTW00, BR03]. At each stage, Alice sends the encrypted qubits to Bob, who applies a known quantum gate (some gates requiring further interaction with Alice). Bob returns the quantum state, which Alice decrypts using her key (the protocol allows Alice to decrypt while maintaining the action of Bob’s gate). Cycling through a fixed set of universal gates ensures that Bob learns nothing about the circuit. Unfortunately, the protocol does not provide any method for the detection of malicious errors. Further, the protocol requires that Alice have a quantum memory.

1.2 Our contribution

We present the first protocol for universal blind quantum computation where Alice has no quantum memory. Our protocol works for *any* polynomial-size quantum circuit and assumes Alice has a classical computer, augmented with the power to prepare single qubits randomly chosen in $\{\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|0\rangle + e^{i\theta}|1\rangle) \mid \theta = 0, \pi/4, 2\pi/4, \dots, 7\pi/4\}$. Interestingly, it is sufficient for our purposes to restrict Alice’s classical computation to modulo 8 arithmetic! Similar results from a non-cryptographic context have been considered in [AB08]. The privacy is perfect and an interfering Bob is detected with overwhelming probability. Table 1 compares our contribution to previous results.

Childs [Chi05]	Alice’s power	– quantum memory – Pauli operations
	function	polynomial-size quantum circuit
	privacy	perfect
	interfering Bob	undetected
Arrighi and Salvail [AS06]	Alice’s power	– preparation of classical superposition – multi-qubit measurements
	function	classical random verifiable functions
	privacy	– function is public – cheat sensitive against individual attacks
	interfering Bob	– detected, except with polynomially small probability
This contribution	Alice’s power	single-qubit random preparation in $\{\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(0\rangle + e^{i\theta} 1\rangle) \mid \theta = 0, \pi/4, 2\pi/4, \dots, 7\pi/4\}$
	function	polynomial-size quantum circuit
	privacy	perfect
	interfering Bob	detected, except with exponentially small probability

Table 1. Comparison

Our protocol is described in terms of the view offered by the model of measurement-based quantum computation (MBQC) [RB01,RBB03]. While the computational power of this model is the same as in the quantum circuit model [Deu89], it has proven to be conceptually enlightening to reason about the distributed task of blind quantum computation using the MBQC approach. Similar to Childs' work, our protocol makes use of the quantum one-time pad; however the MBQC approach relieves Alice of the requirement of having quantum memory. Instead, her classical interaction with Bob drives the computation: in each round, she instructs Bob how to measure an entire layer of qubits. The measurement outcomes are used by Alice to adapt the measurements of future rounds. In related literature, the MBQC approach has also proved useful in analyzing the extra resources required to promote a limited classical computer to full-scale classical computer [AB08].

The main advantages of the MBQC approach is in perfect hiding of the underlying unitary operator that Alice wishes Bob to compute. This becomes evident once we note that similar to the classical setting any reasonable definition of the security of blind computation will allow for some leakage of information about Alice's input such as the length of the data [AFK89]. In our protocol Bob will learn an upper bound of the size of the input and of the depth of the computation. However since the unitary structure is hidden, the protocol can be successfully used for computation over classical input. In order to achieve this we construct a new universal resource for measurement-based quantum computing with a regular structure that can hide the underlying computation.

All previous protocols for blind quantum computation require technology for Alice that is today unavailable: Arrighi and Salvail's protocol requires multi-qubit preparations and measurements, while Childs' protocol requires fault-tolerant quantum memory. In sharp contrast to this, from Alice's point of view, our protocol can be implemented with physical systems that are already available and well-developed. The required apparatus can be achieved by making only minor modifications to equipment used in the BB84 key exchange protocol [BB84]. Single nitrogen vacancy centers in diamond, for example, offer the necessary functionality and can be used even at room temperature, removing the necessity for cumbersome equipment such as cryostats [GOD⁺06].

The outline of the protocol is as follows. Alice has in mind a quantum computation given as a *measurement pattern* on a fixed but universal graph state that we call the *brickwork* state. (*Graph states* are initial entangled states required for the computation in the measurement-based

model; the brickwork state is new and may also be of independent interest, see Section 2.3.) There are two stages: *preparation* and *computation*. In the preparation stage, Alice prepares single qubits chosen randomly from $\{\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|0\rangle + e^{i\theta}|1\rangle) \mid \theta = 0, \pi/4, 2\pi/4, \dots, 7\pi/4\}$ and sends them to Bob. After receiving all the qubits, Bob entangles them according to the brickwork state. Note that this unavoidably reveals upper bounds on the dimensions of Alice’s underlying graph state, that corresponds to the length of the input and depth of the computation. However due to universality, it does not reveal any additional information on Alice’s computation. The computation stage involves interaction: for each layer of the brickwork state, for each qubit, Alice sends a classical message to Bob to tell him in what basis of the $X - Y$ plane he should measure the qubit. Bob performs the measurement and communicates the outcome; Alice’s choice of angles in future rounds will depend on these values. Importantly, Alice’s quantum states and classical messages are astutely chosen so that, no matter what Bob does, he cannot infer anything about her measurement pattern. If Alice is computing a classical function, the protocol finishes when all the qubits are measured. If she is computing a quantum function, Bob returns to her the final qubits. A modification of the protocol also allows Alice’s inputs to be quantum.

The remainder of the paper is structured as follows: Section 2 presents the technical tools that are of use. The main protocol is given in Section 3, where correctness, privacy and efficiency are proven. Section 4 discusses extensions to the case of quantum inputs or outputs as well as authentication techniques that are used to detect an interfering Bob.

2 Toolbox

2.1 Private quantum channels

The classical one-time pad [Ver26] is well-known to provide perfect secrecy of a classical message. Similarly, the quantum one-time pad (also called *private quantum channel*) [AMTW00, BR03] provides perfect secrecy for a quantum message. We give the general encryption method in the next lemma, which is given for a single qubit; extending to multiple qubits just involves repeating the encryption independently for each qubit. Let $I = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$, $X = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$, $Z = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix}$, and $Y = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -i \\ i & 0 \end{pmatrix}$.

Lemma 1 ([AMTW00]). *To perfectly encrypt a single qubit, it is sufficient to randomly apply an operation chosen from $\{I, Z, X, XZ\}$.*

Lemma 1 tells us that two classical bits are sufficient to encrypt a single qubit. The reason for this is that from an eavesdropper's point of view, the system is always in the totally mixed state. In the special case that the qubit to be encrypted is known to be of the form $\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|0\rangle + e^{i\theta}|1\rangle)$ (i.e. it lies in the X - Y plane), it is sufficient to apply one of $\{I, Z\}$ randomly (a single classical bit of key suffices).

2.2 Measurement-based quantum computing

We give a brief introduction to the MBQC (a more detailed description is available in [Joz05,Nie05,BB06,DKP07]). Our notation follows that of [DKP07].

Let $|\pm_\alpha\rangle$ stand for $\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|0\rangle \pm e^{i\alpha}|1\rangle)$. Computations in the MBQC involve the following commands: 1-qubit preparations N_i^α (prepares qubit i in state $|+\alpha\rangle_i$), 2-qubit entanglement operators $E_{ij} := \text{ctrl-}Z$ operator (the controlled phase flip operator), 1-qubit destructive measurements M_i^α , and 1-qubit corrections Pauli X_i , Pauli Z_i and Phase Rotation $Z_i(\alpha) := \exp(i\alpha/2Z_i)$, where i and j represent the qubits on which each of these operations apply, and $\alpha \in \{0, \pi/4, 2\pi/4, \dots, 7\pi/4\}$. Measurement M_i^α is defined by orthogonal projections onto the state $|+\alpha\rangle_i$ (with classical outcome $s_i = 0$) and the state $|-\alpha\rangle_i$ (with classical outcome $s_i = 1$). Measurement outcomes can be summed (modulo 2) resulting in expressions of the form $s = \sum_{i \in I} s_i$ which are called *signals*.

Dependent corrections are written as X_i^s , Z_i^s and $Z_i^s(\alpha)$ with

$$\begin{aligned} X_i^0 &= Z_i^0 = Z_i^0(\alpha) = I \\ X_i^1 &= X_i \\ Z_i^1 &= Z_i \\ Z_i^1(\alpha) &= Z_i(\alpha). \end{aligned}$$

Dependent corrections on a qubit can be always absorbed in the measurement angles of that qubit:

$$M_i^\alpha X_i^s = M_i^{(-1)^s \alpha} \tag{1}$$

$$M_i^\alpha Z_i^s = M_i^{\alpha + s\pi} \tag{2}$$

$$M_i^\alpha Z_i^s(\beta) = M_i^{\alpha - s\beta} \tag{3}$$

A measurement pattern \mathcal{P} is described with a finite sequence of commands acting on a finite set of qubits V , for which $I \subset V$ and $O \subset V$ are input and output sets, respectively. Patterns are executed from right to left. Any pattern can be rewritten in a *standard* form where all the

preparation and entangling command are performed only at the beginning of the computation [DKP07]. This is due to the following commutation relationships:

$$E_{ij} X_i^s = X_i^s Z_j^s E_{ij} \quad (4)$$

$$E_{ij} Z_i^s = Z_i^s E_{ij} \quad (5)$$

$$E_{ij} Z_i^s(\alpha) = Z_i^s(\alpha) E_{ij} \quad (6)$$

2.3 The brickwork state and its universality

Since Bob should not learn anything about Alice's pattern, his actions to create an entangled graph state must be independent of Alice's pattern. We know that the family of *cluster states* [RB01] is universal for MBQC. However, the method that allows arbitrary computation on the cluster state consists in first tailoring the cluster state to the specific computation by performing computational basis measurements. If we were to use this principle for blind quantum computing, Alice would have to reveal to Bob something about the structure of the underlying graph state. We now introduce a new family of states called the *brickwork states* (due to the tiling that appears like rectangular bricks, see Figure 1) that do not require any initial computational basis measurements. This new family graph states may be of independent interest.

In the following lemma, we prove that the brickwork state satisfies the required criteria for our protocol.




Fig. 1. The *brickwork state*, $\mathcal{G}_{n \times m}$. Qubits $|\psi_{x,y}\rangle$ ($x = 1, \dots, n, y = 1, \dots, m$) are arranged according to layer x and row y , corresponding to the vertices in the above graph, and are originally in the $|+\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}|0\rangle + \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}|1\rangle$ state. Controlled-Z gates are then performed between qubits which are joined by an edge. Here n is even.

Lemma 2. *The brickwork state $\mathcal{G}_{n \times m}$ is universal for quantum computation. Furthermore, we only require single-qubit measurements under the angles $\{0, \pm\pi/4, \pm\pi/2\}$, and measurements can be done layer-by-layer.*

Proof. It is well-known that the set $U = \{\text{CTRL-}X, H, T\}$ is a universal set of gates, where:

$$\text{CTRL-}X = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad H = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 1 & -1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \text{and} \quad T = \begin{pmatrix} e^{-i\frac{\pi}{8}} & 0 \\ 0 & e^{i\frac{\pi}{8}} \end{pmatrix}.$$

We will show how the brickwork state can be used to compute any gate in U . Recall the *rotation* transformations:

$$X(\theta) = e^{-i\frac{\theta}{2}X} = \begin{pmatrix} \cos(\frac{\theta}{2}) & -i \sin(\frac{\theta}{2}) \\ -i \sin(\frac{\theta}{2}) & \cos(\frac{\theta}{2}) \end{pmatrix} \quad Z(\theta) = e^{-i\frac{\theta}{2}Z} = \begin{pmatrix} e^{-i\frac{\theta}{2}} & 0 \\ 0 & e^{i\frac{\theta}{2}} \end{pmatrix}.$$




Fig. 2. Pattern with arbitrary rotations. Squares indicate output qubits.




Fig. 3. Implementation of a Hadamard gate.




Fig. 4. Implementation of a $\pi/8$ gate.




Fig. 5. Implementation of the identity.




Fig. 6. Implementation of a CTRL- X .

Consider the measurement pattern and underlying graph state given in Figure 2. The implicit required corrections are implemented according to the flow condition [DK06] which guarantees determinism, and allows measurements to be performed layer-by-layer. The action of the measurement of the first three qubits on each wire is clearly given by the rotations in the right-hand part of Figure 2 [BB06]. The the circuit identity follows since CTRL- Z commutes with $Z(\alpha)$ and is self-inverse.

By assigning specific values to the angles, we get the Hadamard gate (Figure 3), the T gate (Figure 4) and the identity (Figure 5). By symmetry, we can get H or T acting on logical qubit 2 instead of logical qubit 1.

In Figure 6, we give a pattern and show using circuit identities that it implements a CTRL- X . The verification of the circuit identities is straightforward. Again by symmetry, we can reverse the control and target qubits. Note that as long as we have CTRL- X s between any pair of neighbours, this is sufficient to implement CTRL- X between further away qubits.

We now show how we can tile the patterns as given in Figures 2 through 6 (the underlying graph states are the same) to implement any circuit using U as a universal set of gates. In Figure 7, we show how a 4-qubit circuit with three gates, U_1 , U_2 and U_3 (each gate acting on a maximum of two adjacent qubits) can be implemented on the brickwork state $G_{4,9}$. We have completed the top and bottom logical wires with a pattern that implements the identity. Generalizing this technique, we get the family of brickwork states as given in Figure 1. \square




Fig. 7. Tiling for a 4-qubit circuit with three gates.

3 Main Protocol

Suppose Alice has in mind a unitary operator U that is implemented with a pattern \mathcal{P}_U on a brickwork state $\mathcal{G}_{n \times m}$ with measurements given as multiples of $\pi/4$. This pattern could have been designed either directly or from a circuit construction. Each qubit $|\psi_{x,y}\rangle \in \mathcal{G}_{n \times m}$ is indexed by a *row* $x \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ and a *layer* $y \in \{1, \dots, m\}$. Thus each qubit is assigned the following:

1. a measurement angle $\phi_{x,y}$
2. a set of X -dependencies $X_{x,y} \subset [n] \times [m]$
3. a set of Z -dependencies $Z_{x,y} \subset [n] \times [m]$.

The dependency sets $X_{x,y}$ and $Z_{x,y}$ are obtained via the flow construction [DK06] and assure determinism. As given by Equations 1 and 2, the corrections are absorbed into the angle of measurements, thus defining dependent measurement commands. To be more specific, during the execution of the pattern, the actual measurement angle, $\phi'_{x,y}$, is a modification of $\phi_{x,y}$ that depends on previous measurement outcomes in the following way: let $s_X = \bigoplus_{i \in X_{x,y}} s_i$ be the parity of all measurement outcomes for qubits in $X_{x,y}$ and similarly, $s_Z = \bigoplus_{i \in Z_{x,y}} s_i$ be the parity of all measurement outcomes for qubits in $Z_{x,y}$. Then

$$\phi'_{x,y} = (-1)^{s_X} \phi_{x,y} + s_Z \pi. \quad (7)$$

Protocol 1 gives a method to realize universal blind quantum computation. (We have used the convention that \in_R denotes randomly choosing an element of a set according to the uniform distribution.) Theorems 1 and 2 establish correctness and privacy, respectively. Our protocol is presented for the case of classical inputs and outputs (we thus assume that the classical input is built into Alice's pattern); in Section 4, we discuss modifications in the case of quantum inputs or quantum outputs, and in Section 5, we discuss the addition of authentication techniques to detect an interfering Bob.

Protocol 1 Universal Blind Quantum Computation

1. Alice's preparation

For each row $x = 1, \dots, n$

For each layer $y = 1, \dots, m$

- 1.1 Alice prepares $|\psi_{x,y}\rangle \in_R \{|+\theta_{x,y}\rangle \mid \theta_{x,y} = 0, \pi/4, 2\pi/4, \dots, 7\pi/4\}$ and sends the qubits to Bob.

2. Bob's preparation

- 2.1 Bob creates an entangled state from all received qubits, according to their indices, by applying CTRL- Z gates between the qubits in order to create a brickwork state $\mathcal{G}_{n \times m}$ (see Figure 1).

3. Interaction and measurement

For each row $x = 1, \dots, n$

For each layer $y = 1, \dots, m$

- 3.1 Alice computes $\phi'_{x,y}$ as in Equation 7, where $s_X = s_Z = 0$ for the first layer.
 - 3.2 Alice chooses $r_{x,y} \in_R \{0, 1\}$ and computes $\delta_{x,y} = \phi'_{x,y} + \theta_{x,y} + \pi r_{x,y}$.
 - 3.3 Alice transmits $\delta_{x,y}$ to Bob. measures in the basis $\{|+\delta_{x,y}\rangle, |-\delta_{x,y}\rangle\}$.
 - 3.4 Bob transmits the result $s_{x,y} \in \{0, 1\}$ to Alice.
 - 3.5 If $r_{x,y} = 1$ above, Alice flips $s_{x,y}$; otherwise she does nothing.
-

Theorem 1 (Correctness). *Assume Bob follows the steps of Protocol 1. Then the outcome is correct.*

Proof. We wish to show that the outcome of the protocol is the same as the outcome if Alice had run the pattern herself.

Firstly, since CTRL- Z commutes with Z -rotations, **steps 1** and **2** do not change the underlying graph state; only the phase of each qubit is locally changed, and it is as if Bob had done the Z -rotation after the CTRL- Z .

Secondly, since a measurement in the $|+\phi\rangle, |-\phi\rangle$ basis on a state $|\psi\rangle$ is the same as a measurement in the $|+\phi+\theta\rangle, |-\phi+\theta\rangle$ basis on $Z(\theta)|\psi\rangle$ (Equation 3), and since $\delta = \phi' + \theta + \pi r$, if $r = 0$, Bob's measurement will have the same effect as Alice's target measurement; if $r = 1$, all Alice needs to do is flip the outcome. \square

The next theorem proves that whatever Bob chooses to do (including arbitrary deviations from the protocol), Alice's quantum computation is perfectly concealed. One way of seeing the proof is that the security relies on a combination of the classical and quantum one-time pads. Note that Bob does learn the dimensions of the brickwork state, giving an upper bound on the size of Alice's computation. Intuitively, this would seem unavoidable. Indeed, a simple adaptation of the proof of Theorem 2 from [AFK89], confirms this.

Theorem 2 (Privacy). *In Protocol 1, Bob cannot learn anything about Alice’s computation or about the classical output.*

Proof. As already argued, the universality of the brickwork state guarantees that Bob’s CTRL-Z commands do not reveal the structure of the underlying graph state. We now prove that during the execution of the protocol, the true angles of measurements are hidden from Bob.

Fix x, y , and for ease of notation let $\phi_{x,y} = \phi$ be the true angle of measurement, $\phi'_{x,y} = \phi'$ the true angle of measurement incorporating the dependencies (Equation 7), and $\delta_{x,y} = \delta$ the angle of Bob’s measurement. Also $r_{x,y} = r$ is the random bit used by Alice to introduce a π rotation. Finally $\theta_{x,y} = \theta$ is the angle of the preparation and the prepared state sent to Bob is $|\psi_{x,y}\rangle = |\psi\rangle$. We’ll show that Bob’s knowledge of δ as well as $|\psi\rangle$ does not reveal anything about ϕ' . This implies that he does not know anything about ϕ .

Bob sees δ . Because θ and r are chosen uniformly at random, from Bob’s point of view, with equal probability, one of the following two has occurred:

1. $r = 0$ so $\delta = \phi' + \theta$ and $|\psi\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|0\rangle + e^{i(\delta-\phi)}|1\rangle)$
2. $r = 1$ so $\delta = \phi' + \theta + \pi$ and $|\psi\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|0\rangle - e^{i(\delta-\phi)}|1\rangle)$

For any choice of ϕ' , the density matrix for this system is totally mixed, hence Bob can’t distinguish between different values of ϕ' . Further, this prohibits Bob from measuring correlations between different ϕ'_i .

The last step is to prove that from Bob’s point of view all unitaries (circuits) are equally likely, hence the target circuit is completely hidden. This is due to the fact that two different unitaries, can have precisely the same transcript of instructions sent by Alice to Bob. Furthermore, for a fixed size brickwork state, the probability of Bob receiving the instruction to measure with any angles in $\{0, \pi/4, 2\pi/4, \dots, 7\pi/4\}$ is equal.

Finally, as evidenced in Protocol 1, due to the random choice of r , Alice randomly adds a rotation of π to the measurement angle and hence all the measurement results $s_{x,y}$ are completely random from Bob’s point of view. Although Bob knows which qubits contribute to s_X and s_Z , he does not have the true result of those measurements. Hence each output bit of the circuit is encrypted with a classical one-time pad.

□

The following corollary shows an even stronger privacy property, that will be necessary for dealing with quantum outputs in Section 4.2.

Corollary 1. *At every step of Protocol 1, Bob’s quantum state is one-time padded.*

Proof. We saw that s_X and s_Z are unknown to Bob, and at each qubit, they introduce independent Pauli operators. Therefore they act as the keys for the full one-time pad over Bob’s state. \square

We now look at the exact power that each participant in **Protocol 1** needs to have. A particular case of proposition 1 is when Alice prepares the qubits herself.

Proposition 1. *In Protocol 1, the only computational resource, additional to classical computation, that Alice needs is to have access to is a trusted source that individually prepares qubits uniformly chosen in $\{|+\theta\rangle \mid \theta = 0, \pi/4, 2\pi/4, \dots, 7\pi/4\}$, and that outputs the prepared qubit and its classical description.*

Let the *size* of a pattern be the number of qubits on the underlying graph state, and the *depth* of a pattern that is given on a brickwork state be the depth of the graph state. The following quantifies the amount of communication between Alice and Bob.

Proposition 2. *The channels that are required between Alice and Bob for protocol 1 are, in step 1 a quantum channel from Alice to Bob and in step 3, a two-way classical channel. Furthermore, the single quantum message sent from Alice to Bob is polynomial in the size of Alice’s pattern and the classical interaction requires a number of rounds that is equal to the depth of the pattern, each round comprising a polynomial number of bits.*

We will see in Section 4.2 that Alice and Bob can adapt **Protocol 1** to the case of quantum inputs or quantum outputs. In the former case, no extra channel resources are required, while the latter case requires a quantum channel from Bob to Alice in order for him to return the output qubits. Alice will also need to be able to apply X and Z Pauli operators in order to undo the quantum one-time pad. In the case of an authenticated computation (Section 5), Alice also needs the ability to decode the the final state from some error correction encoding. It should be noted, however, that these authentication steps allow Alice to participate in multiparty protocols, such as interactive proofs, without any additional computational resources. This is achieved by simply instructing the other parties on how to decode her communications as prepared through Bob.

4 Extensions to Quantum Inputs or Quantum Outputs

As discussed in introduction, we can modify Protocol 1 to extend the class of functions that can be computed blindly: Protocol 2 deals with quantum inputs while Protocol 3 deals with quantum outputs. Both techniques can be combined to obtain a protocol for quantum inputs and quantum outputs.

4.1 Quantum Inputs

Protocol 2 Universal Blind Quantum Computation with Quantum Inputs

1. Alice's input preparation

For the input layer ($y = 0, x = 1, \dots, n$)

1.1 Alice applies $Z_{x,0}(\theta)$ for $\theta \in_R \{0, \pi/4, 2\pi/4, \dots, 7\pi/4\}$.

1.2 Alice chooses $i_{x,0} \in_R \{0, 1\}$ and applies $X_{x,0}^{i_{x,0}}$. She sends the qubits to Bob.

2. Alice's auxiliary preparation

For each row $x = 1, \dots, n$

For each layer $y = 1, \dots, m$

2.1 Alice prepares $|\psi_{x,y}\rangle \in_R \{|+\theta_{x,y}\rangle \mid \theta_{x,y} = 0, \pi/4, 2\pi/4, \dots, 7\pi/4\}$ and sends the qubits to Bob.

3. Bob's preparation

3.1 Bob creates an entangled state from all received qubits, according to their indices, by applying CTRL-Z gates between the qubits in order to create a brickwork state $\mathcal{G}_{n \times (m+1)}$.

4. Interaction and measurement

For each row $x = 1, \dots, n$

For each layer $y = 0 \dots, m$

4.1 Alice computes $\phi'_{x,y}$ as in Equation 7, with the special case $\phi'_{x,0} = (-1)^{i_{x,0}} \phi_{x,0}$.

4.2 Alice chooses $r_{x,y} \in_R \{0, 1\}$ and computes $\delta_{x,y} = \phi'_{x,y} + \theta_{x,y} + \pi r_{x,y}$.

4.3 Alice transmits $\delta_{x,y}$ to Bob.

4.4 Bob measures in the basis $\{|+\delta_{x,y}\rangle, |-\delta_{x,y}\rangle\}$.

4.5 Bob transmits the result $s_{x,y} \in \{0, 1\}$ to Alice.

4.6 If $r_{x,y} = 1$ above, Alice flips $s_{x,y}$; otherwise she does nothing.

We consider the scenario where Alice's input are in the form of physical qubits and she has no efficient classical description of the inputs to be able to incorporate it into Protocol 1. In this case, she needs to be able to apply a random $Z(\theta)$ rotation ($\theta \in_R \{0, \pi/4, 2\pi/4, \dots, 7\pi/4\}$) and also a local Pauli-X operator to implement a full one-time pad over the input qubits. She will then add a first layer to her pattern and will undo

the Pauli-X operation if necessary. By Theorems 1 and 2, this modified protocol is still correct and private.

Here we assume that Alice already has in her hands the quantum inputs: unless she receives the inputs one-by-one, she requires for this initial step some quantum memory. She also needs to be able to apply the single-qubit gates as described above. Note that this is only asking slightly more than the private quantum channel (which would be the minimum required in *any* blind quantum computation protocol with quantum inputs).

4.2 Quantum Outputs

Protocol 3 Universal Blind Quantum Computation with Quantum Output

1. Alice's preparation

For each row $x = 1, \dots, n$

For each layer $y = 1, \dots, m - 1$

1.1 Alice prepares $|\psi_{x,y}\rangle \in_R \{|+\theta_{x,y}\rangle \mid \theta_{x,y} = 0, \pi/4, 2\pi/4, \dots, 7\pi/4\}$ and sends the qubits to Bob.

1.2 Alice prepares the last row of qubits $|\psi_{x,m}\rangle = |+\rangle$ and sends the qubits to Bob.

2. Bob's preparation

2.1 Bob creates an entangled state from all received qubits, according to their indices, by applying CTRL-Z gates between the qubits in order to create a brickwork state $\mathcal{G}_{n \times m}$.

3. Interaction and measurement

For each row $x = 1, \dots, n$

For each layer $y = 1, \dots, (m - 1)$

3.1 Alice computes $\phi'_{x,y}$ as in Equation 7, where $s_X = s_Z = 0$ for the first layer.

3.2 Alice chooses $r_{x,y} \in_R \{0, 1\}$ and computes $\delta_{x,y} = \phi'_{x,y} + \theta_{x,y} + \pi r_{x,y}$.

3.3 Alice transmits $\delta_{x,y}$ to Bob.

3.4 Bob measures in the basis $\{|+\delta_{x,y}\rangle, |-\delta_{x,y}\rangle\}$.

3.5 Bob transmits the result $s_{x,y} \in \{0, 1\}$ to Alice.

3.6 If $r_{x,y} = 1$ above, Alice flips $s_{x,y}$; otherwise she does nothing.

4. Output Correction

4.1 Bob sends to Alice all qubits in the last layer.

4.2 Alice performs the final Pauli corrections $Z^{s_Z} X^{s_X}$.

Protocol 3 is used when Alice requires a quantum output, for example in the case of blind quantum state preparation. Therefore the last layer of qubits will not be measured by Bob so all Alice needs to do is perform the final layer of Pauli corrections according to the flow construction. By

Theorems 1 and 2, and Corollary 1 this modified protocol is still correct and private.

5 Authentication

We now focus on Alice’s ability to detect if Bob is not cooperating. There are two possible ways in which Bob can be uncooperative. The first way in which this can happen is for Bob to refuse to perform the computation. Clearly this is immediately apparent to Alice. The second way in which Bob can be uncooperative is by actively interfering with the computation, while pretending to follow the protocol. It is this latter case that we will focus on detecting.

If Alice wishes to compute a classical problem in NP using Protocol 1, she can efficiently verify the outcome and thus detect an interfering Bob. But as mentioned in Section 1, in many other scenarios, she will not be able to verify Bob’s output.

These other cases are covered by an authentication technique which enables Alice to detect an interfering Bob with overwhelming probability (strictly speaking, either Bob’s interference is corrected and he is not detected, or his interference is detected with overwhelming probability). Note that this is the best that we can hope for since nothing prevents Bob from refusing to perform the computation. Bob could also be lucky and guess a path that Alice will accept. This happens with exponentially small probability, hence our technique is optimal.

Quantum error correction provides a natural mechanism for detecting unintended changes to a computation, whereas the theory of fault-tolerant computation provides a way to correct for faulty quantum gates. Unfortunately, error correction, even when combined with fault-tolerant gate constructions is insufficient to detect deliberate tampering if the error correction code is known. As evidenced by the quantum authentication protocol [BCG⁺02], error correction encodings can be adapted for this purpose.

The authentication proceeds along the following lines. Alice chooses an n_C -qubit error correction code \mathbb{C} , with distance d_C . (The values of n_C and d_C are taken as security parameters.) If the original computation involves N logical qubits, the authenticated version will involve $Nn_C + 3n_T$ logical qubits: throughout the computation, each logical qubit is encoded with \mathbb{C} , while the remaining $3n_T$ qubits are used as traps to detect an interfering Bob. The trap qubits are prepared as a first step of the computation in

eigenstates of the Pauli operators X , Y and Z , with an equal number of qubits in each state.

The protocol also involves fault-tolerant gates, for some of which it is necessary to have Bob periodically measure qubits[ZCC07]. In order to accomplish this, the blind computation protocol is extended by allowing Alice to instruct Bob to measure specific qubits within the brickwork state in the computational basis at regular intervals. These qubits are chosen at regular spacial intervals so that no information about the structure of the computation is revealed.

We give in Protocol 4 our method that allows Alice to detect an interfering Bob. Both cases of classical or quantum outputs are covered.

Protocol 4 Blind Quantum Computing with Authentication

1. Alice chooses \mathbb{C} and n_T , where \mathbb{C} is some $n_{\mathbb{C}}$ -qubit error-correcting code with distance $d_{\mathbb{C}}$. The values of $n_{\mathbb{C}}$ and $d_{\mathbb{C}}$ are security parameters.
 2. Alice chooses the role of each logical qubit in her pattern at random, such that $Nn_{\mathbb{C}}$ qubits are used to encode the logical qubits in the computation, with the remaining qubits are used as traps.
 3. Alice uses the first phase of the blind computation to encode each of the logical qubits with \mathbb{C} , as well as to create the trap states.
 4. Next Alice uses the blind computation protocol to perform fault-tolerant measurements to verify that the encoding has been performed faithfully. It is important to also measure the stabilizers of the trap qubits. These measurements randomly interspersed with $|3n_T/N|$ measurements of trap qubits.
 5. Alice performs the desired blind computation with Bob using fault-tolerant gate constructions.
 6.
 - If Alice requires only classical output, then she ends the computation after fault-tolerantly measuring each of the qubits using the same procedure as in 4.
 - If Alice requires a quantum output, then she instructs Bob to send her each of the qubits from the final column in order. Alice measures each of the trap qubits. The remaining qubits can then be passed on to a third party, Charlie, if for example Alice wishes to participate in an interactive quantum protocol with him. As the state transmitted to Charlie is in a known encoding, Alice can instruct Charlie on how to decode and verify the state. Note that Alice does not require a quantum memory or the ability to perform single qubit Pauli operations unless she wishes to retain the state locally.
 7. If at any time Alice detects an error, then she knows that the blind computation protocol has not been followed faithfully.
-

Theorem 3. *If Bob interferes with an authenticated computation then either he is detected except with exponentially small probability, or his actions fail to alter the computation.*

Proof. If Bob interferes with the computation, then in order for his actions to affect the outcome of the computation he must perform a non-trivial operation on the subspace in which the logical qubits are encoded. Due to the fault-tolerant construction of Alice's computation, Bob must act non-trivially on at least $d_{\mathbb{C}}$ qubits. Due to discretization of errors, we can treat Bob's action as introducing a Pauli error with some probability p .

If a Pauli error acts non-trivially on a trap qubit then the probability of this going undetected is $1/3$. Pauli operators which remain within the code space must act on at least $d_{\mathbb{C}}$ qubits. As Bob has no knowledge about the roles of qubits, the probability of him acting on any qubit is equal. As the probability of acting on a trap is $\frac{3n_T}{Nn_{\mathbb{C}}+3n_T}$, for each qubit upon which he acts non-trivially, the probability of Bob being detected is $\frac{2n_T}{Nn_{\mathbb{C}}+3n_T}$. Thus the probability of an M -qubit Pauli operator going undetected is $\left(1 - \frac{2n_T}{Nn_{\mathbb{C}}+3n_T}\right)^M$. If Alice chooses $n_T \approx Nn_{\mathbb{C}}$, then the minimum probability Bob affecting the computation and going undetected is $\epsilon = 2^{-d_{\mathbb{C}}}$.

While the quantum Singleton bound[KL00] allows error correction codes for which $d_{\mathbb{C}} \propto n_{\mathbb{C}}$, it may be more convenient to use the Toric Code[Kit97] for which $d_{\mathbb{C}} \propto \sqrt{n_{\mathbb{C}}}$, as this represents a rather simple encoding while retaining a high ratio of $d_{\mathbb{C}}$ to $n_{\mathbb{C}}$. For the special case of deterministic classical output, a classical repetition code is sufficient and preferable as such an encoding maximises $n_{\mathbb{C}}$.

It should be noted that it is possible for Bob to take advantage of the verification protocol to gain some knowledge about the computation being performed: this happens if Alice decides to reveal to Bob whether or not she accepts the final result. This information represents a single bit and can be thought of as bisecting the space of possible target computations. However, the size of the space of possible target computations is exponential in N , and the probability of any given computation is exponentially small due to the random encoding. As a result, information about the success or failure of the protocol does not allow Bob to determine Alice's computation except with exponentially small probability.

6 Conclusion and discussion

We have presented the first universal blind quantum computing protocol that permits Alice to compute with Bob's quantum computer without revealing any information about her data. In order to do so, Alice needs the minimal resources: classical memory and a mod 8 computing machine augmented with the power to prepare single qubits randomly

chosen in $\{\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|0\rangle + e^{i\theta}|1\rangle) \mid \theta = 0, \pi/4, 2\pi/4, \dots, 7\pi/4\}$. Our protocols can be easily modified to various scenarios with classical or quantum input and output and is the first application completely designed within the framework of the measurement-based quantum computing (MBQC).

We have put in use the structural tools that have been previously constructed for this model and demonstrated novel features of MBQC that might be further used for other distributed tasks. In particular, we have introduced a new family of symmetric universal resources for MBQC that can hide completely the underlying computation, an essential property for blind quantum computing.

The unconditional security of our protocol is based on a combination of classical and quantum one-time pads, as well as authentication techniques that detect if Bob is interfering. All these methodologies can be naturally adapted to the MBQC setting to derive simple and feasible protocols implementable from Alice’s point of view, with current available technology.

Classical impossibility results [AFK89] state that no NP-hard function is encryptable leaking at most the length of the input (even probabilistically and with polynomial interaction), unless the polynomial hierarchy collapses at the third level. It is important to emphasize that our contribution is in a different model as we hide f and require polynomial interaction in the size of the circuit that Alice is implementing; however it is interesting to contrast our contribution with this classical complexity result.

7 Acknowledgements

We would like to thank Pablo Arrighi, Frédéric Dupuis, Sébastien Gambs, Oded Regev, Louis Salvail and Alain Tapp for helpful discussions. This work is partially supported by Singapore’s National Research Foundation and Ministry of Education.

References

- [AB08] J. Anders and D.E. Browne. Measurement-based classical computation. Available as [arXiv:0805.1002\[quant-ph\]](https://arxiv.org/abs/0805.1002), 2008.
- [AFK89] M. Abadi, J. Feigenbaum, and J. Kilian. On hiding information from an oracle. *Journal of Computer and System Sciences*, 39:21–50, 1989.
- [AJL06] D. Aharonov, V. Jones, and Z. Landau. A polynomial quantum algorithm for approximating the jones polynomial. In *Proceedings of the 38th annual ACM symposium on Theory of computing (STOC 2006)*, pages 427–436, 2006.

- [AMTW00] A. Ambainis, M. Mosca, A. Tapp, and R. De Wolf. Private quantum channels. In *Proceedings of the 41st Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS 2000)*, pages 547–553, 2000.
- [AS06] P. Arrighi and L. Salvail. Blind quantum computation. *International Journal of Quantum Information*, 4:883–898, 2006.
- [BB84] C.H. Bennett and G. Brassard. Quantum cryptography: Public-key distribution and coin tossing. pages 175–179, 1984.
- [BB06] D.E. Browne and H.-J. Briegel. One-way quantum computation. In *Lectures on Quantum Information*, pages 359–380. Wiley-VCH, Berlin, 2006.
- [BCG⁺02] H. Barnum, C. Crépeau, D. Gottesman, A. Smith, and A. Tapp. Authentication of quantum messages. In *Proceedings of the 43rd Annual IEEE Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS 2002)*, page 449, 2002.
- [BR03] P.O. Boykin and V. Roychowdhury. Optimal encryption of quantum bits. *Physical Review A*, 67:042317, 2003.
- [Chi05] A.M. Childs. Secure assisted quantum computation. *Quantum Information and Computation*, 5, 2005. Initial version appeared online in 2001.
- [Deu89] D. Deutsch. Quantum computational networks. *Proceeding of the Royal Society of London A*, pages 425–467, 1989.
- [DK06] V. Danos and E. Kashefi. Determinism in the one-way model. *Physical Review A*, 2006.
- [DKP07] V. Danos, E. Kashefi, and P. Panangaden. The measurement calculus. *Journal of ACM*, 54:8, 2007.
- [Fei86] J. Feigenbaum. Encrypting problem instances: Or ... can you take advantage of someone without having to trust him? In *Advances in Cryptology: Proceedings to CRYPTO '85*, pages 477–488, 1986.
- [GOD⁺06] A. D. Greentree, P. Olivero, M. Draganski, E. Trajkov, J. R. Rabeau, P. Reichart, B. C. Gibson, S. Rubanov, S. T. Huntington, D. N. Jamieson, and S. Praver. Critical components for diamond-based quantum coherent devices. *Journal of Physics: Condensed Matter*, 18:825–842, 2006.
- [Joz05] Richard Jozsa. An introduction to measurement based quantum computation. Available as [arXiv:quant-ph/0508124v2](https://arxiv.org/abs/quant-ph/0508124v2), 2005.
- [Kit97] A. Y. Kitaev. Quantum computations: algorithms and error correction. *Russ. Math. Surv.*, 52(6):1191–1249, 1997.
- [KL00] Emanuel Knill and Raymond Laflamme. A theory of quantum error-correcting codes. *Physical Review Letters*, 84:2525, 2000.
- [Nie05] M. A. Nielsen. Cluster-state quantum computation. *Reviews in Mathematical Physics (to appear)*, 2005. [quant-ph/0504097](https://arxiv.org/abs/quant-ph/0504097).
- [RB01] R. Raussendorf and H. J. Briegel. A one-way quantum computer. *Physical Review Letters*, 86:5188 – 5191, 2001.
- [RBB03] R. Raussendorf, D. E. Browne, and H. J. Briegel. Measurement-based quantum computation with cluster states. *Physical Review A*, 68:022312, 2003.
- [RSA78] R. L. Rivest, A. Shamir, and L. Adleman. A method for obtaining digital signatures and public-key cryptosystems. *Communications of the ACM*, 21:120–126, 1978.
- [Sho97] P. W. Shor. Polynomial-time algorithms for prime factorization and discrete logarithms on a quantum computer. *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 26:1484–1509, 1997. First published in 1995.
- [Ver26] G.S. Vernam. Cipher printing telegraph systems for secret wire and radio telegraphic communications. *Journal of American Institute of Electrical Engineering*, 55:109–115, 1926.

- [ZCC07] B. Zeng, A. Cross, and I. L. Chuang. Transversality versus Universality for Additive Quantum Codes. *ArXiv e-prints*, 706, June 2007.