

Universal quantum computation in a hidden basis

L. M. Ioannou^{1,*} and M. Mosca^{2,3,†}

¹*Centre for Quantum Computation, University of Cambridge,
Wilberforce Road, Cambridge, CB3 0WA, UK*

²*Institute for Quantum Computing, University of Waterloo,
200 University Avenue, Waterloo, Ontario, N2L 3G1, Canada*

³*Perimeter Institute for Theoretical Physics
31 Caroline Street North, Waterloo, Ontario, N2L 2Y5, Canada*

Suppose we are given several copies each of two orthogonal states $|0\rangle$ and $|1\rangle$ that are promised to come from known orthogonal subspaces, but are otherwise unknown. We consider the quantum-information-theoretic tasks of state preparation and universal quantum computation with respect to the hidden basis $\{|0\rangle, e^{i\theta}|1\rangle\}^{\otimes l}$, of an l -logical-qubit system, for a random θ . We give an exact algorithm for state preparation, and give an efficient approximation algorithm for universal computation. We apply our results to quantum-public-key authentication protocols, by showing that a class of digital signature schemes is insecure and giving an example of a (potentially secure) protocol based on these techniques.

1 Introduction

Consider the following quantum-information-theoretic problem. Suppose we are given t copies each of two orthogonal states $|0\rangle$ and $|1\rangle$ that are promised to come from known orthogonal subspaces, but are otherwise unknown. Is it possible to carry out any state preparation or, more generally, universal quantum computation with respect to the *hidden basis* $\{|0\rangle, e^{i\theta}|1\rangle\}^{\otimes l}$, of an l -logical-qubit system, for a random, unknown θ ? In Section 2, we show that the state preparation problem is achievable with zero-error as long as $t \geq l$. In Section 3, we show how to approximate efficiently any universal quantum computation, by using the given copies as a phase-reference state that mimics a coherent light state. In Section 4, we show how the state preparation result is a cryptanalytic tool, rendering a class of digital signature schemes insecure. As well, we give an example of how these ideas might be used to build cryptographic protocols.

*lmi22@cam.ac.uk

†mmosca@iqc.ca

2 Exact state preparation

As a representative example, we first give an error-free algorithm for mapping

$$|\mathbf{0}\rangle^{\otimes l} |\mathbf{1}\rangle^{\otimes l} \mapsto (|\mathbf{0}\rangle + e^{i\theta} |\mathbf{1}\rangle)^{\otimes l} \quad (1)$$

for an unknown, random θ (we often omit normalization factors). For any state in $\{|\mathbf{0}\rangle, |\mathbf{1}\rangle\}^{\otimes l}$, define its *weight* as the number of tensor-product factors that are $|\mathbf{1}\rangle$ (this is analogous to the usual Hamming weight). Note that

$$(|\mathbf{0}\rangle + e^{i\theta} |\mathbf{1}\rangle)^{\otimes l} = \sum_{r=0}^l \binom{l}{r}^{1/2} e^{i\theta r} |S_r^l\rangle, \quad (2)$$

where $|S_r^l\rangle$ is the normalized symmetric sum of all $\binom{l}{r}$ states in $\{|\mathbf{0}\rangle, |\mathbf{1}\rangle\}^{\otimes l}$ that have weight r . Let $\theta \equiv 2\pi k/(l+1)$ and define the $(l+1)$ distinct allowable target states

$$|\varphi_k\rangle \equiv \sum_{r=0}^l \sqrt{\binom{l}{r}} 2^{-l/2} e^{2\pi i k r/(l+1)} |S_r^l\rangle \quad (3)$$

for $k = 0, 1, \dots, l$. Using the fact that

$$\sum_{k=0}^l e^{2\pi i k(r-y)/(l+1)} = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } r \neq y, \\ l+1 & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \quad (4)$$

we now note the general fact that, for any orthogonal set $\{|\phi_r\rangle\}_{r=0}^l$ of states,

$$\frac{1}{l+1} \sum_{k=0}^l |\varphi'_k\rangle \langle \varphi'_k| = \sum_{r=0}^l |c_r|^2 |\phi_r\rangle \langle \phi_r|, \quad (5)$$

where $|\varphi'_k\rangle \equiv \sum_{r=0}^l c_r e^{2\pi i k r/(l+1)} |\phi_r\rangle$. Thus, in our case, we have

$$\frac{1}{l+1} \sum_{k=0}^l |\varphi_k\rangle \langle \varphi_k| = \sum_{r=0}^l \binom{l}{r} 2^{-l} |S_r^l\rangle \langle S_r^l|. \quad (6)$$

Therefore, to prepare a uniformly random $|\varphi_k\rangle$ (which is our goal), it suffices that we prepare the state $|S_r^l\rangle$ with probability $\binom{l}{r} 2^{-l}$. But, for any given r , preparing $|S_r^l\rangle$ from $l-r$ copies of $|\mathbf{0}\rangle$ and r copies of $|\mathbf{1}\rangle$ is information-theoretically possible via the following constructive (and efficient) algorithm.

The algorithm for state generation in [1] can be adapted to transform $|\mathbf{0}\rangle^{\otimes l-r}|\mathbf{1}\rangle^{\otimes r}$ into $|S_r^l\rangle$. Assume $0 < r < l$. Hypothetically, suppose we had a copy of $|S_r^l\rangle$ and we measured the leftmost j registers in the basis $\{|\mathbf{0}\rangle, |\mathbf{1}\rangle\}^{\otimes j}$, $j = 2, 3, \dots, l$. Denote the binary outcome of measuring a register by 0 (if the register was in state $|\mathbf{0}\rangle$) or 1 (if the register was in state $|\mathbf{1}\rangle$). Let X_i , for $i = 1, 2, \dots, l$, denote the random variable representing the outcome of measuring register i (registers are enumerated from left to right). For any $x \in \{0, 1\}^{j-1}$ and $x_j \in \{0, 1\}$, define the probabilities $p_x \equiv P(X_1 \cdots X_{j-1} = x)$ and $p_{x_j|x} \equiv P(X_j = x_j | X_1 \cdots X_{j-1} = x)$, where adjacent bit-values denote string concatenation and we note that the definition of p_x holds also for $j = l + 1$. Then we have $p_{x_j|x} = p_{xx_j}/p_x$ and $p_{1|x} = (r - H(x))/(l - j + 1) = 1 - p_{0|x}$, where $H(x)$ is the Hamming weight (sum of the bits) of x . Define the shorthand notation, for nonnegative integers c and d ,

$$|d^{c+d}\rangle \equiv |\mathbf{0}\rangle^{\otimes c}|\mathbf{1}\rangle^{\otimes d} \quad (7)$$

and, for any bit-string $y = y_1 y_2 \cdots y_b \in \{0, 1\}^b$,

$$|\mathbf{y}\rangle \equiv |\mathbf{y}_1\rangle|\mathbf{y}_2\rangle \cdots |\mathbf{y}_b\rangle. \quad (8)$$

We can prepare $|S_r^l\rangle$ by starting with $|r^l\rangle$, and then applying a sequence of successively larger unitary operators. For each $j = 2, 3, \dots, l$, and for any $x = x_1 x_2 \cdots x_{j-1} \in \{0, 1\}^{j-1}$, we define the operators

$$U_j : |\mathbf{x}\rangle |d^{l-d-(j-1)}\rangle \mapsto \quad (9)$$

$$|\mathbf{x}\rangle (\sqrt{p_{0|x}}|\mathbf{0}\rangle |d^{l-d-j}\rangle + \sqrt{p_{1|x}}|\mathbf{1}\rangle |(d-1)^{l-d-j}\rangle). \quad (10)$$

Thus each U_j performs an operation similar to a root-SWAP operator³ on the target, controlled on registers 1 through $j - 1$, swapping register j with the next closest register to the right whose state is orthogonal to the subspace containing $|\mathbf{0}\rangle$. (Our U_j also has built into it a final phase-clean-up operation, controlled on registers 1 through j , which removes the imaginary factor of i arising from the root-SWAP operation.) Finally, define

$$U_1 : |r^l\rangle \mapsto \sqrt{p_0}|\mathbf{0}\rangle |r^{l-1}\rangle + \sqrt{p_1}|\mathbf{1}\rangle |(r-1)^{l-1}\rangle, \quad (11)$$

where $p_1 = r/l = 1 - p_0$. We can now show that $|S_r^l\rangle = U_l \cdots U_2 U_1 |r^l\rangle$. A straightforward induction (similar to that in [1]) shows that, after U_j is applied, the state of the l registers is

$$\sum_{x \in \{0,1\}^j} \sqrt{p_x} |\mathbf{x}\rangle |(r - H(x))^{l-j}\rangle \quad (12)$$

³For $0 < \alpha < 1$, we can define a root-SWAP-like operator, which maps $|\mathbf{0}\rangle|\mathbf{0}\rangle \mapsto |\mathbf{0}\rangle|\mathbf{0}\rangle$, $|\mathbf{0}\rangle|\mathbf{1}\rangle \mapsto \alpha|\mathbf{0}\rangle|\mathbf{1}\rangle + i\sqrt{1-\alpha^2}|\mathbf{1}\rangle|\mathbf{0}\rangle$, $|\mathbf{1}\rangle|\mathbf{0}\rangle \mapsto i\sqrt{1-\alpha^2}|\mathbf{0}\rangle|\mathbf{1}\rangle + \alpha|\mathbf{1}\rangle|\mathbf{0}\rangle$, and $|\mathbf{1}\rangle|\mathbf{1}\rangle \mapsto |\mathbf{1}\rangle|\mathbf{1}\rangle$. When $\alpha = 1/\sqrt{2}$, this is the square-root-of-SWAP operator.

so that, after U_l is applied, the state is $\sum_{x \in \{0,1\}^l} \sqrt{p_x} |\mathbf{x}\rangle = |S_r^l\rangle$.

The above algorithm can also be used to create any superposition of constant-weight states in $\{|\mathbf{0}\rangle, |\mathbf{1}\rangle\}^{\otimes l}$. Any state in the span of $\{|\mathbf{0}\rangle, |\mathbf{1}\rangle\}^{\otimes l}$ can be written $\sum_r e^{i\theta r} |C_r^l\rangle$, where $|C_r^l\rangle$ is a superposition of weight- r states. After averaging this state over k as in the lefthand side of line (6), where $\theta = 2\pi k/(l+1)$, we get a mixture of $|C_r^l\rangle$ states, each of which we can create using the algorithm (we refer to [1] for how to create the correct phases of any complex coefficients of the $|C_r^l\rangle$ states).⁴ Thus we have the following theorem:

Theorem 1. *Let the pure state $\sigma(|\mathbf{1}\rangle)$ be in the span of the orthogonal basis $\{|\mathbf{0}\rangle, |\mathbf{1}\rangle\}^{\otimes l}$, where $|\mathbf{0}\rangle$ and $|\mathbf{1}\rangle$ are any unknown states promised to come from known orthogonal subspaces, and the coefficients of $\sigma(|\mathbf{1}\rangle)$ with respect to this basis are known. Then there exists a quantum operation from $(|\mathbf{0}\rangle\langle\mathbf{0}|)^{\otimes l}(|\mathbf{1}\rangle\langle\mathbf{1}|)^{\otimes l}$ to the uniform mixture of $\sigma(e^{i2\pi k/(l+1)} |\mathbf{1}\rangle)$ over $k = 0, 1, \dots, l$.*

3 Approximate universal computation with a phase-reference state

Mapping $|\mathbf{0}\rangle \mapsto |\mathbf{0}\rangle + e^{i\theta} |\mathbf{1}\rangle$ is consistent with applying a Hadamard gate with respect to the basis $\{|\mathbf{0}\rangle, e^{i\theta} |\mathbf{1}\rangle\}$ of a *logical qubit*. Let us consider a general quantum computation in the n -logical-qubit computational basis $\{|\mathbf{0}\rangle, e^{i\theta} |\mathbf{1}\rangle\}^{\otimes n}$ for random θ . If we began such a computation, with the goal of preparing a certain state in the span of $\{|\mathbf{0}\rangle, e^{i\theta} |\mathbf{1}\rangle\}^{\otimes n}$ (for a random θ), we could prepare any state we like using the algorithm of the previous section, as long as we have n copies each of $|\mathbf{0}\rangle$ and $|\mathbf{1}\rangle$ available. But what if, more generally, we would just like to carry out an arbitrary quantum computation? We now show how we can achieve this approximately, by using copies of $|\mathbf{0}\rangle$ and $|\mathbf{1}\rangle$ as a phase-reference state, which will be approximately classically correlated to our n -logical-qubit target register throughout the entire computation (the quality of the approximation increases with the number t of copies of $|\mathbf{0}\rangle$ and $|\mathbf{1}\rangle$ available to us).

For universal computation in the basis $\{|\mathbf{0}\rangle, e^{i\theta} |\mathbf{1}\rangle\}^{\otimes n}$, it suffices to be able implement the following unitary operations (gates), expressed as matrices with respect to the basis $\{|\mathbf{0}\rangle, |\mathbf{1}\rangle\}$ (in the case of the one-logical-qubit gates) or the basis $\{|\mathbf{0}\rangle|\mathbf{0}\rangle, |\mathbf{0}\rangle|\mathbf{1}\rangle, |\mathbf{1}\rangle|\mathbf{0}\rangle, |\mathbf{1}\rangle|\mathbf{1}\rangle\}$ (in the case

⁴The algorithm is efficient as long as the conditional probabilities $p_{x_j|x}$ are efficiently computable. We disregard efficiency in our information-theoretic framework. Thus, strictly speaking, we only needed to prove that the transformation $|\mathbf{0}\rangle^{\otimes l-r} |\mathbf{1}\rangle^{\otimes r} \mapsto |C_r^l\rangle$, for any $|\mathbf{1}\rangle$ orthogonal to $|\mathbf{0}\rangle$, is unitary (and hence is possible to implement on a quantum computer). Our “constructive proof of unitarity” of the transformation has the advantage that it is efficient for some known classes of states $|C_r^l\rangle$, e.g., the symmetric states $|S_r^l\rangle$.

of the two-logical-qubit gate):

$$H_\theta = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{bmatrix} 1 & e^{-i\theta} \\ e^{i\theta} & -1 \end{bmatrix}, \quad S = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & i \end{bmatrix}, \quad T = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & e^{i\pi/4} \end{bmatrix}, \quad c\text{-}Z = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 \end{bmatrix}. \quad (13)$$

Note that θ only shows up in the matrix for the Hadamard gate H_θ . The other three gates are θ -independent, and hence (assuming perfect quantum channels) are exactly implementable without any reference to copies of $|0\rangle$ or $|1\rangle$, since $|0\rangle$ and $|1\rangle$ are promised to come from known orthogonal subspaces. It thus suffices to show how to implement H_θ (approximately), on an arbitrary input.

We can actually implement, for any $\alpha \in [0, 1]$, the generalized logical Hadamard gate

$$H_\theta(\alpha) : \quad |0\rangle \mapsto \alpha|0\rangle + \sqrt{1-\alpha^2}e^{i\theta}|1\rangle \quad (14)$$

$$e^{i\theta}|1\rangle \mapsto \sqrt{1-\alpha^2}|0\rangle - \alpha e^{i\theta}|1\rangle. \quad (15)$$

Just as before, we will make use of root-SWAP-like operations, which introduce imaginary i factors; thus it will be more convenient to directly implement the gate,

$$G_\theta(\alpha) : \quad |0\rangle \mapsto \alpha|0\rangle + \sqrt{1-\alpha^2}ie^{i\theta}|1\rangle \quad (16)$$

$$|1\rangle \mapsto \sqrt{1-\alpha^2}ie^{-i\theta}|0\rangle + \alpha|1\rangle, \quad (17)$$

and then we have, for example, $ZSG_\theta(\alpha)SZ = H_\theta(\alpha)$, where Z is the (θ -independent) Pauli- Z gate

$$Z = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 \end{bmatrix}. \quad (18)$$

Also, for clarity of exposition, we will assume $\alpha = 1/\sqrt{2}$ (but we will indicate in footnotes how the procedure is modified for general α). Let $G_\theta \equiv G_\theta(1/\sqrt{2})$.

Consider how one might create $G_\theta|0\rangle$ starting from $|0\rangle$, using t copies of $|1\rangle$. Assume $t > l$. A simple square-root-of-SWAP gate applied to the first two registers maps

$$|0\rangle \underbrace{|1\rangle|1\rangle^{\otimes(t-1)}}_{|\Psi\rangle} \mapsto |0\rangle \underbrace{|1\rangle|1\rangle^{\otimes(t-1)}}_{|a\rangle} + i|1\rangle \underbrace{|0\rangle|1\rangle^{\otimes(t-1)}}_{|b\rangle}. \quad (19)$$

Since $|a\rangle$ and $|b\rangle$ are very different (in fact, orthogonal) vectors, the quantity on the righthand side of line (19) cannot be well approximated by the product state $(|0\rangle + i|1\rangle)|\Psi'\rangle$ for some

state $|\Psi'\rangle$. Instead of starting with $|\Psi\rangle = |\mathbf{1}\rangle^{\otimes t}$ as the resource of $|\mathbf{1}\rangle$'s, can we find some other state $|\Psi\rangle$ that is approximately invariant under the removal (swapping out) of one copy of $|\mathbf{1}\rangle$? Here, we take inspiration from a coherent light state $\sum_{r=0}^{\infty} (\gamma^r / \sqrt{r!}) |r\rangle$ (see, e.g., Chapter 7 of Ref. [2]), which is a resource of photons with this property: if you take one photon away, the coherent state is unchanged up to a slight correction in the amplitudes (it is an eigenstate of the photon-annihilation operator). Recalling the definition in line (7), we mimic coherent light states with the following states

$$|\Psi_k^t\rangle \equiv \sum_{r=1}^t e^{2\pi i k r / t} |r^{t+1}\rangle \quad (20)$$

defined for all $k = 1, \dots, t$. Each occurrence of $|\mathbf{1}\rangle$ (respectively, $|\mathbf{0}\rangle$) in the state $|r^{t+1}\rangle$ is analogous to one photon (respectively, one vacuum). Thus, it will be convenient to refer to the state $|r^{t+1}\rangle$ as a ***1-number state***, in analogy with the photon-number state $|r\rangle$.

Remark 2. Note that, in practice, performing a quantum computation in the basis $\{|0\rangle, |1\rangle\}^{\otimes n}$, is actually equivalent to performing a computation in the basis $\{|0\rangle, e^{i\phi}|1\rangle\}^{\otimes n}$, where one replaces $|1\rangle$ with $e^{i\phi}|1\rangle$ in all the operations. In optics, one typically assumes that a laser outputs coherent states $\sum_{r=0}^{\infty} (\gamma^r / \sqrt{r!}) |r\rangle$ with a random, but consistent, phase parameter $\phi = \arg(\gamma)$. When using these coherent states to drive transformations in the qubits, this is equivalent to performing the entire computation in the basis $\{|0\rangle, e^{i\phi}|1\rangle\}^{\otimes n}$. It is essential that the experimentalist maintains a consistent phase reference for the duration of the computation; the actual value of ϕ is unimportant. We are mimicking this basic idea, where the unknown states $|\mathbf{0}\rangle$ and $|\mathbf{1}\rangle$ play the role of the states $|0\rangle$ and $|1\rangle$ above, and our reservoir of copies of $|\mathbf{0}\rangle$ and $|\mathbf{1}\rangle$ is mimicking the phase reference states. Note that since we are not restricted to the standard interaction Hamiltonians present in nature (because we are just mimicking such interactions using a universal quantum computer), our version of the coherent states and how they interact with the other systems looks slightly different; we need only mimic the main property of coherent light states – that the argument (phase-angle) of successive coefficients scales linearly with the photon number.⁵ \square

Define the controlled-square-root-of-SWAP gate U , which acts on $(t+2)$ equally-sized registers, and in particular operates as follows for any $|\mathbf{0}\rangle$ and $|\mathbf{1}\rangle$ from known orthogonal subspaces:

$$U : |\mathbf{0}\rangle |r^{t+1}\rangle \mapsto |\mathbf{0}\rangle |r^{t+1}\rangle + i |\mathbf{1}\rangle |(r-1)^{t+1}\rangle \quad (21)$$

⁵States that are similar to our coherent-state analogues $|\Psi_k^t\rangle$ have independently been used in Ref. [3]. In their application, the phase parameter is not an issue. Rather, they use this property of coherent states behaving more and more “classically”, i.e. with less and less disturbance to the coherent state, as the size of the coherent state gets bigger. In their case, a bigger coherent state corresponds to a larger amount of shared entanglement, and they used this to show that more entanglement always improves the success probability of their protocol. Generally, all such states are forms of so-called “embezzling” states [4, 5].

for all $r = 1, \dots, t$.⁶ Using the general fact of equation (5), we have

$$\sum_{k=1}^t |\Psi_k^t\rangle\langle\Psi_k^t| = \sum_{r=1}^t |r^{t+1}\rangle\langle r^{t+1}|; \quad (22)$$

thus we can prepare the state $|\Psi\rangle = |\Psi_k^t\rangle$ for a random value of k by preparing a uniformly random $\mathbf{1}$ -number state, which is easy to do with t copies each of $|\mathbf{0}\rangle$ and $|\mathbf{1}\rangle$. Let $|\phi\rangle \equiv \alpha'|\mathbf{0}\rangle + \beta'|\mathbf{1}\rangle$ be an arbitrary one-qubit pure state to which we want to apply $G_\theta \equiv G_\theta(1/\sqrt{2})$, where, now, $\theta \equiv 2\pi k/t$. Applying U to $|\phi\rangle|\Psi_k^t\rangle$, the resulting state contains the term (with proper leading coefficient)

$$\sqrt{\frac{t-2}{t}}(G_\theta|\phi\rangle) \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{t-2}} \sum_{r=2}^{t-1} e^{i\theta r} |r^{t+1}\rangle \right). \quad (23)$$

The other (“junk”) terms are of $\mathbf{1}$ -number 0, 1, t , and $t+1$. Note that terms of different $\mathbf{1}$ -number are orthogonal. Recall that it suffices to compute the minimum gate fidelity over all *pure* inputs $|\phi\rangle$, because of the joint concavity of the fidelity [2]. Thus, the G_θ gate was effectively applied with minimum fidelity $\sqrt{(t-2)/t}$, and the rightmost $(t+1)$ registers have this same fidelity with the state $|\Psi_k^t(1)\rangle$, where we define

$$|\Psi_k^t(i)\rangle \equiv (1/\sqrt{t-2i}) \sum_{r=1+i}^{t-i} e^{i\theta r} |r^{t+1}\rangle, \quad (24)$$

for $i \geq 0$. To implement a second G_θ gate, we use these *same* rightmost $(t+1)$ registers (which are almost in the state $|\Psi_k^t(1)\rangle$). And so on. In general, we find that $U|\phi\rangle|\Psi_k^t(i)\rangle$ equals

$$\sqrt{\frac{t-2(i+1)}{t-2i}}(G_\theta|\phi\rangle)|\Psi_k^t(i+1)\rangle \quad (25)$$

plus orthogonal “junk”, where $|\phi\rangle$ is again an arbitrary pure qubit state. The gate fidelity of the final approximation of G_θ is thus at least $\sqrt{(t-2l)/t}$. Thus, to achieve a minimum gate fidelity of $\sqrt{1-\epsilon^2}$ for l arbitrary applications of G_θ , it suffices to have $t = \lceil 2l/\epsilon^2 \rceil$ copies of $|\mathbf{1}\rangle$.

We have shown that it is possible to approximate universal quantum computation in the n -logical-qubit computational basis $\{|\mathbf{0}\rangle, e^{i\theta}|\mathbf{1}\rangle\}^n$ for random θ . The state $|\Psi_k^t\rangle$ acts as a reference frame, degrading with every simulated $G_\theta(\alpha)$ gate, which allows us to keep a consistent relative phase between $|\mathbf{0}\rangle$ and $|\mathbf{1}\rangle$.

⁶Here is a complete description of U : If the registers are enumerated $0, 1, \dots, t+1$ starting from the left, then U applies the square-root-of-SWAP to registers 0 and j exactly when either registers 0 through $(j-1)$ are in the state subspace containing $|\mathbf{0}\rangle$ and registers $j, \dots, t+1$ are in the subspace containing $|\mathbf{1}\rangle$ or registers 1 through j are in the subspace containing $|\mathbf{0}\rangle$ and registers 0 and $j+1, \dots, t$ are in the subspace containing $|\mathbf{1}\rangle$ (and, otherwise, U acts as the identity operator). In the case of general α , use the root-SWAP-like operator (defined in a previous footnote) instead of the square-root-of-SWAP.

4 Applications to public-key authentication

Our motivation is information-theoretically-secure *quantum-public-key* cryptography, where the public keys are quantum states. The first example of such a framework was given by Gottesman and Chuang in Ref. [6]; we describe it now. Let $A_0 \subset \mathbf{C}^M$ be a set of superpolynomially (in $\log(M)$) many quantum states such that, for every distinct $|\psi\rangle$ and $|\phi\rangle$ in A_0 ,

$$|\langle\psi|\phi\rangle| \leq \delta \tag{26}$$

for some constant $\delta < 1$. Such sets A_0 are sometimes called *quantum fingerprint sets*, and explicit constructions for them, with $|A_0| \in 2^{\Omega(M)}$, are known [7]. A (succinct) classical description of A_0 is published. Alice randomly chooses $|\psi\rangle \in A_0$ and keeps this choice secret, but she distributes a limited number of physical copies of $|\psi\rangle$ among several members of the public (including Bob). The classical description of $|\psi\rangle$, which can be encoded by a bit-string of length $\Theta(\log(|A_0|))$, serves as a *private key*, while several authentic copies of the state $|\psi\rangle$ serve as a *public key*. Assuming each $|\psi\rangle$ is an $O(\log(M))$ -qubit state, the maximum number of bits of information one can extract from t copies of $|\psi\rangle$ is $O(t \log(M))$, by the Holevo bound. Thus, as long as $t \ll \log(|A_0|)/\log(M)$, the private key is protected even if t copies of $|\psi\rangle$ exist. A more general framework can be obtained by allowing the public key to contain other states that may depend on the private key (and we will use this more general framework in Section 4.2).

We are primarily interested in public-key *authentication* protocols (either for messages, as in digital signature schemes, or for entities, as in identification schemes), a general approach to which is the following. Suppose that A_0 also satisfies the condition

$$\langle 0|\psi\rangle = 0 \tag{27}$$

for all $|\psi\rangle \in A_0$ and some known $|0\rangle \in \mathbf{C}^M$. Alice can easily create states like $|0\rangle + |\psi\rangle$ and, more generally, she can perform any computation in the basis formed by $\{|0\rangle, |\psi\rangle\}^{\otimes n}$.

Remark 3 (Definitions of squashing and the no-squashing conjecture). In general, it is not known how to perform such computations efficiently, and we conjecture that it takes superpolynomially (in $\log(M)$) many copies of a uniformly random $|\psi\rangle \in A_0$ to even prepare one copy of $|0\rangle + |\psi\rangle$, if the procedure is to work for all $|\psi\rangle \in A_0$. We call this the *no-squashing conjecture*. We call the task of creating $|0\rangle + |\psi\rangle$ for every $|\psi\rangle \in A_0$, given copies of $|\psi\rangle$, *squashing*. Note that the classical descriptions of states in A_0 also specify a “global phase”, so the target state $|0\rangle + |\psi\rangle$ is well defined.

The hope is to use this framework, for example, for Alice to convince Bob that she has prepared some state (like a signature) that no one without full knowledge of $|\psi\rangle$ could have done with

only the limited number of copies of the state $|\psi\rangle$ available. Moreover, we are interested in *reusable* schemes, by which we mean that the same private key (and corresponding public keys) can be used to authenticate Alice many times (the digital signature scheme in Ref. [6] is not reusable: it can only be used to sign one message). Our framework is suitable for reusable schemes, because, as suggested by our example protocol in Section 4.2, it seems to allow Alice a significant advantage over an adversary (who does not know the private key), without her having to divulge a significant amount of extra information about the private key (beyond that which is already available from all the copies of the public key) to an honest verifier.

In this cryptographic setting, the unknown state $|\psi\rangle$ is now playing the role of $|\mathbf{1}\rangle$. Thus, for the remainder of the paper, we redefine $|r^{t+1}\rangle$ and $|\Psi_k^t\rangle$:

$$|r^{t+1}\rangle \equiv |0\rangle^{\otimes t+1-r} |\psi\rangle^{\otimes r} \quad (28)$$

$$|\Psi_k^t\rangle \equiv \sum_{r=1}^t e^{2\pi i k r/t} |r^{t+1}\rangle. \quad (29)$$

Note that $|0\rangle$ here is a known vector; our cryptographic framework only uses one unknown state – not two.

4.1 Insecurity of a class of digital signature schemes

Theorem 1 can be interpreted as a restriction on any potential digital signature scheme in the above framework.

Corollary 4 (Insecurity of a class of digital signature schemes). *Suppose there is a digital signature scheme with the signature state $\sigma(|\psi\rangle)$ in the span of the orthogonal basis $\{|0\rangle, \dots, |N\rangle, |\psi\rangle\}^{\otimes l}$ such that $|\psi\rangle$ is unknown but promised to come from a particular subspace that is orthogonal to the span of the set $\{|0\rangle, \dots, |N\rangle\}$ of known states, and the coefficients of $\sigma(|\psi\rangle)$ with respect to this basis are publicly known.⁷ Suppose further that an adversary can obtain l copies of $|\psi\rangle$. Then the scheme is not information-theoretically secure if $\sigma(e^{i\theta}|\psi\rangle)$ also passes the verification procedure for any θ .*

The corollary says that the verification procedure for any secure signature scheme in our framework will have to exploit the “global phase” (see Remark 3) of $|\psi\rangle \in A_0$, for if it is independent of this “global phase”, then the scheme is insecure.

⁷The signature state also depends on the (known) message being signed. The coefficients of $\sigma(|\psi\rangle)$ with respect to the basis $\{|0\rangle, \dots, |N\rangle, |\psi\rangle\}^{\otimes l}$ are known, in that they do not depend on the private key (classical description of $|\psi\rangle$). This allows the adversary to compute the “conditional probabilities” required for our state preparation algorithm of Section 2.

4.2 Example of a cryptographic protocol in this framework

We close with an example of a cryptographic protocol that uses many of the ideas we have presented.

We refrain from giving a technical definition of “secure, reusable honest-verifier quantum-public-key identification scheme”, as we do not prove the “security” of the scheme we present. The following intuitive definition suffices (see Section 10.4 of Ref. [8] for more details in the traditional, computationally-secure setting). Such an identification scheme is an interactive protocol between a prover and a verifier Bob, where Bob is assumed to hold an authentic copy of Alice’s public key and assumed never to deviate from the protocol. At the end of the interaction, Bob should be convinced (with high probability) that the prover is Alice, that is, that the prover knows the private key corresponding to Alice’s public key. Moreover, the honest prover Alice, by participating in the protocol, does not give away (to Bob or a passive eavesdropper) a significant amount of extra information about the private key (beyond that which is already available from all the copies of the public key) or, more generally, any information that would allow a passive eavesdropper or Bob (if he turned evil) to masquerade as Alice later in an interaction with a possibly different honest verifier. Without the honest verifier assumption, such a scheme is susceptible to an attack whereby an adversary Bev first participates as a devious verifier in an interaction with Alice (thereby extracting from Alice information that allows Bev to cheat later), and then later masquerades as Alice in an interaction with the honest verifier Bob.

As part of the public key distribution phase of our protocol, we assume Alice has chosen a random $|\psi\rangle \in A_0$, and has distributed at most j copies of the public key

$$|\psi\rangle^{\otimes t} (|0\rangle + |\psi\rangle). \quad (30)$$

The parameter j thus governs the reusability of the scheme.

The kernel of our interactive protocol is the following three steps, which form a typical “challenge-response” interactive proof. As is normally the case with such protocols, the kernel is intended to be repeated several times with different $|\psi\rangle$ -values in order to increase the security to an acceptable level.

1. Bob uses $|\psi\rangle^{\otimes t}$ to create $|\Psi_k^t\rangle$, for random $k \in [1, 2, \dots, t]$, and uses it as a phase-reference state (as shown in Section 3) to make an approximation to the state $(|0\rangle + e^{2\pi ik/t} |\psi\rangle)$. Bob sends the now-slightly-perturbed phase-reference state $|\tilde{\Psi}_k^t\rangle$ to Alice.
2. Alice measures the received state with respect to the orthogonal basis $\{|\Psi_k^t\rangle\}_k$, to get an approximation \tilde{k} to k , which she sends to Bob.
3. Bob uses \tilde{k} to “correct” (or remove) the relative phase $e^{2\pi ik/t}$ on his approximate copy of $(|0\rangle + e^{2\pi ik/t} |\psi\rangle)$, and then SWAP-tests the resulting state (which should be approximately $|0\rangle + |\psi\rangle$) with the authentic copy of $|0\rangle + |\psi\rangle$.

The above kernel is repeated enough times so that Bob’s estimation of the probability that each SWAP-test passes is sufficiently high. Below, we provide some justification for why Eve, an adversarial prover who does not know Alice’s private key, should cause Bob’s SWAP-test to fail with higher probability than Alice should. It is self-evident that, if Bob is honest, then Alice only sends to Bob uniformly random values from the set $\{1, 2, \dots, t\}$, so that Bob (or a passive eavesdropper) does not gain any useful information from the interaction. This suggests that the scheme may be reusable.

Remark 5. In the following, we only consider an attack by an adversary who treats each copy of $|\psi\rangle$ (or each component of $|\psi\rangle$ in a copy of $|0\rangle + |\psi\rangle$) as a black-box quantum state. That is, we do not consider any attack where Eve attempts to use the available quantum information about the *private key* to help her cheat. A security proof would need to consider such attacks.

To argue why the scheme might be secure, we now give Alice’s algorithm in Step 2 of the kernel, and then assume that Eve’s best cheating strategy is her best approximation to Alice’s algorithm. Alice performs an optimal phase estimation, which could algorithmically be implemented with the following two steps: Given (approximate) $|\Psi_k^t\rangle$, for random k , Alice (1) performs the unitary “conversion-to-binary” map

$$|r^{t+1}\rangle \mapsto |0\rangle^{\otimes(t-\lfloor\log_2(t+1)\rfloor)} |(r)_2\rangle, \quad (31)$$

where the label $(r)_2$ is a string in $\{0, \psi\}^{\lfloor\log_2(t+1)\rfloor+1}$ representing r in binary, and then (2) performs an inverse quantum Fourier transform (in the basis $\{|0\rangle, |\psi\rangle\}^{\lfloor\log_2(t+1)\rfloor+1}$) to get an estimate \widetilde{k}/t of k/t .

In order to approximate this phase estimation, Eve can use $(|0\rangle + |\psi\rangle)^j$ as her phase reference. Note that after a change of basis (corresponding to the inverse of the unitary operation given in Section 2)

$$|S_r^\psi\rangle \mapsto |0\rangle^{\otimes j-r} |\psi\rangle^{\otimes r}, \quad (32)$$

this state becomes almost exactly like $|\Psi_0^j\rangle$ but with binomial coefficients instead of constant coefficients. The state thus serves as a phase-reference state that is approximately as good as $|\Psi_0^j\rangle$. For simplicity, we assume that Eve uses $|\Psi_0^j\rangle$ as a reference frame when she performs the two operations of the previous paragraph.

We have already shown in Section 3 that the fidelity of Eve’s operations depends on how many Hadamard-like gates $G_\theta(\alpha)$, including NOT gates, are needed to do the two operations. The quantum Fourier transform usually needs $\log(t)$ Hadamard gates, but the conversion to binary needs $\Omega(t - \log(t))$ NOT gates per basis state on average. Assuming our error analysis in Section 3 is nearly tight, Eve’s total fidelity to the phase estimation is thus, roughly, $1 - O((t - \log(t))/j)$.

On the other hand, Alice’s error in her phase estimation is governed by the error in the state she received from Bob, which has fidelity $\sqrt{1 - 1/t}$ with $|\Psi_k^t(1)\rangle$, which in turn has fidelity $\sqrt{1 - 1/t}$ with $|\Psi_k^t\rangle$, for a combined fidelity of $1 - 1/t$.

Thus, if j is not too much bigger than $t - \log(t)$, it is plausible that Eve’s fidelity to the ideal phase estimation can be kept significantly lower than Alice’s, which will cause Bob’s SWAP-test to fail with higher probability with Eve than with Alice.

Two comments about the scheme are in order. First, note that if squashing required only a small number of copies of $|\psi\rangle$ (see Remark 3), then Eve could, at least, prepare many more copies of $|0\rangle + |\psi\rangle$ to use as a phase reference to achieve a higher swap-test passing probability than Alice. This is how our scheme depends on the no-squashing conjecture.

Finally, if a dishonest verifier Bev deviates from the protocol, then the scheme is not secure [9]. Bev can use a large number T of copies of $|\psi\rangle$ to prepare the state $|\Psi_k^T\rangle$ for random $k \in \{1, 2, \dots, T\}$, as well as use t copies of $|\psi\rangle$ to prepare $|\Psi_{k'}^t\rangle$ for random $k' \in \{1, 2, \dots, t\}$. Bev can then measure the phase difference $k - k'$ with good fidelity (dependent on T), and then give the slightly perturbed state that was $|\Psi_{k'}^t\rangle$ to Alice, who will send back an estimate of k' , from which Bev can compute a good estimate of k . Once Bev knows k , she effectively has in her possession the large phase-reference state $|\Psi_0^T\rangle$.

5 Conclusion

By borrowing ideas from optics, we have shown how to compute efficiently in a hidden basis, which is a quantum-information-theoretic task that was previously not known to be possible. We have demonstrated that considering such tasks has cryptological application.

Acknowledgements

We thank Scott Aaronson for discussions on the squashing problem and for naming it. We thank Daniel Gottesman for useful discussions on signature and identity schemes. L. M. Ioannou was supported by the EPSRC. M. Mosca was partially supported by NSERC, DTO-ARO, ORDCF, CFI, CIFAR, Ontario-MRI, CRC, OCE, QuantumWorks and MITACS.

References

- [1] Phillip Kaye and Michele Mosca. Quantum networks for generating arbitrary quantum states. In *Proceedings, International Conference on Quantum Information (ICQI)*, 2001.

- [2] M. Nielsen and I. Chuang. *Quantum Computation and Quantum Information*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2000.
- [3] Debbie Leung, Ben Toner, and John Watrous. Coherent state exchange in multi-prover quantum interactive proof systems, 2001. arXiv:0804.4118.
- [4] Wim van Dam and Patrick Hayden. Universal entanglement transformations without communication. *Phys. Rev. A*, 67(6):060302(R), 2003.
- [5] Wim van Dam and Patrick Hayden. Embezzling entangled quantum states, 2002. arXiv:quant-ph/0201041.
- [6] Daniel Gottesman and Isaac L. Chuang. Quantum digital signatures, 2001. quant-ph/0105032.
- [7] Harry Buhrman, Richard Cleve, John Watrous, and Ronald de Wolf. Quantum fingerprinting. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 87:167902, 2001.
- [8] A. J. Menezes, P. van Oorschot, and S. Vanstone. *Handbook of Applied Cryptography*. CRC Press LLC, Boca Raton, 1996.
- [9] Daniel Gottesman. private communication.