

Quantum Privacy-Preserving Data Mining

Shenggang Ying¹, Mingsheng Ying^{1,2} and Yuan Feng¹

¹*Centre for Quantum Computation and Intelligent Systems,
University of Technology Sydney, NSW 2007, Australia*

²*State Key Laboratory of Intelligent Technology and Systems,*

Department of Computer Science and Technology, Tsinghua University, Beijing 100084, China

(Dated: June 14, 2019)

Data mining is a key technology in big data analytics and it can discover understandable knowledge (patterns) hidden in large data sets. Association rule is one of the most useful knowledge patterns, and a large number of algorithms have been developed in the data mining literature to generate association rules corresponding to different problems and situations. Privacy becomes a vital issue when data mining is used to sensitive data sets like medical records, commercial data sets and national security. In this Letter, we present a quantum protocol for mining association rules on vertically partitioned databases. The quantum protocol can improve the privacy level preserved by known classical protocols and at the same time it can reduce the computational complexity and/or communication cost.

I. Introduction.— Numerous data mining techniques have been developed for discovering various knowledge patterns, using methods from statistics, machine learning, artificial intelligence and database systems. In this Letter, we focus on mining of association rules, one of the simplest but most useful knowledge patterns. An association rule is a relation between two disjoint sets of items. Suppose I is a set of items. An association rule is a probabilistic implication $X \Rightarrow Y$, where X and Y are two disjoint subsets of I with both the support (frequency) of $X \cup Y$ and the confidence of $X \Rightarrow Y$ being greater than preset values. The task of mining association rules is to find all such rules in a large database [1]. Mining association rules or association analysis was first introduced in [2] to find significant and useful relations between sets of items among a large collection of transactions in a supermarket. Since then, it has been very successfully applied in various areas including bioinformatics, medical diagnosis, market basket problem, inventory control, risk management, Web mining, telecommunication networks, Earth science, scientific data analysis [1, 3].

A key issue in the real-world applications of these techniques is how to protect privacy in data mining. In the last 15 years, several privacy-preserving algorithms for mining association rules have been proposed [4]. Two typical scenarios of privacy-preserving data mining are: (1) Discover statistical knowledge (e.g. frequency and confidence) with individual information being preserved; for example an algorithm was suggested in [5] for mining customers' behaviour in a supermarket while the personal behaviour of a customer is preserved. (2) Mine on a database that belongs to two or more parties, called a vertically partitioned database, but protect each party's privacy [6–8].

In this Letter, we propose a quantum privacy-preserving method for mining association rules on vertically partitioned databases. Our method is based on the model of Quantum Random Access Memory (QRAM), a quantum generalization of Random Access Memory (RAM). QRAM was first introduced in [9], and its phys-

ical architecture was proposed in [10]. It was applied to define a quantum support vector machine for big data classification that can achieve an exponential speedup over classical algorithms [11]. Another interesting application of QRAM is quantum private queries [12] that can detect whether the database provider cheats. The method presented in this Letter provides a new application of QRAM to one of the most researched problems in big data analytics, namely data mining association rules. This method can preserve the privacy better than known classical protocols, and meanwhile reduce the computational complexity and/or communication cost.

II. Privacy-Preserving Mining of Association Rules.— Let us first formally define the problem of mining association rules in a database. Suppose $I = \{I_1, \dots, I_k\}$ is a set of items (or attributes), and $D = \{D_0, \dots, D_{M-1}\}$ is a database, where each $D_i \subseteq I$ represents a transaction, which is, e.g. the set of items that one customer buys in one purchase. An itemset X is a subset of I , and its support is defined as $\text{supp}(X) = |\{j : X \subseteq D_j\}|/M$. The intuitive meaning of $\text{supp}(X)$ is the frequency that X appears in all transactions. A rule is a relation $X \Rightarrow Y$, meaning that itemset X implies itemset Y , where X and Y are both itemsets with $X \cap Y = \emptyset$. Its confidence is defined as $\text{conf}(X \Rightarrow Y) = \text{supp}(X \cup Y)/\text{supp}(X)$, which is actually the conditional probability $\Pr(Y|X)$. The mining problem is as follows: Given $s > 0$ and $c > 0$, find all pairs (X, Y) with $X \cap Y = \emptyset$, $\text{supp}(X \cup Y) > s$ and $\text{conf}(X \Rightarrow Y) > c$. This problem can be solved in two steps: firstly, we find all itemsets Z such that $\text{supp}(Z) > s$, called frequent itemsets; secondly, we find all disjoint partitions $X \cup Y = Z$ with $\text{conf}(X \Rightarrow Y) > c$, for every frequent itemset Z . Both of the steps can be done by a level-wise algorithm; for example the *Apriori* algorithm [13] first generates all 1-itemsets, i.e., itemsets with only 1 item. Then it generates all m -itemsets from all $(m - 1)$ -itemsets.

Now assume that the database D is vertically partitioned into two disjoint parts D^1 and D^2 belonging to two parties: the set I of items (or attributes) is divided

to $I^1 = \{I_1, \dots, I_l\}$ and $I^2 = \{I_{l+1}, \dots, I_k\}$ ($1 \leq l < k$). Alice owns (sub-)database $D^1 = \{D_0^1, \dots, D_{M-1}^1\}$ of I^1 , and Bob owns (sub-)database $D^2 = \{D_0^2, \dots, D_{M-1}^2\}$ of I^2 , where each transaction D_j in D is divided into $D_j^1 \subseteq I^1$ and $D_j^2 \subseteq I^2$ with $D_j = D_j^1 \cup D_j^2$. Then the privacy-preserving task is to mine association rules from D^1 and D^2 (e.g. compute the support of an itemset $Z \subseteq I$ with $Z^1 = Z \cap I^1 \neq \emptyset$ and $Z^2 = Z \cap I^2 \neq \emptyset$), but Alice and Bob's private information must be preserved; that is, Bob (resp. Alice) is not allowed to know either the exact value of D_j^1 (resp. D_j^2) or whether $D_j^1 \supseteq Z^1$ (resp. $D_j^2 \supseteq Z^2$).

Two classes of protocols have been developed in the literature for privacy-preserving data mining on vertically partitioned databases. The first class adds noise to the data before transmitted, but the noise will be removed from the final results [7]. The second class employs hash functions and encryptions [6, 8]; for example, to compute the support of Z , Alice and Bob use commutative bijections a and b , respectively, to encode the messages between them. Alice (resp. Bob) first sends $a(S_1) = \{a(i) : i \in S_1\}$ (resp. $b(S_2) = \{b(i) : i \in S_2\}$) to Bob (Alice), where $S_1 = \{i : Z^1 \subseteq D_i^1\}$ and $S_2 = \{i : Z^2 \subseteq D_i^2\}$. Then Alice (resp. Bob) sends back $a(b(S_2))$ (resp. $b(a(S_1))$) to Bob (resp. Alice). Finally Alice has both $a(b(S_2))$ and $b(a(S_1))$, and thus she can compute $\text{supp}(Z) = |\{S_1 \cap S_2\}|/M = |\{b(a(S_1)) \cap a(b(S_2))\}|/M$.

III. Quantum Database:— The aim of this Letter is to present a quantum protocol for privacy-preserving data mining. Before doing it, let us develop a quantum database model based on Quantum Random Access Memory (QRAM) [9]. A QRAM can realize the following transform:

$$\sum \alpha_j |j\rangle |0\rangle \rightarrow \sum \alpha_j |j\rangle |c_j\rangle,$$

where c_j is the content in the j -th memory cell of the QRAM; that is, if we input the address qubits $|\psi\rangle = \sum \alpha_j |j\rangle$ with some blank data qubits, the QRAM outputs a superposition of some orthogonal quantum states which represent both address and data. Although, for a general quantum database, an agent may query any address qubits, only the equal superposition $\frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \sum |j\rangle$ of addresses is employed in the quantum protocol presented in this Letter. This is mainly because for a general superposition $\sum \alpha_j |j\rangle |d_j\rangle$, it is hard to compute the support and confidence from the database since coefficients α_j may contribute to the statistical results.

Now we see how to store the partition D^1 and D^2 of database D into QRAMs. We use a boolean string $d_j = d_{j,1} \dots d_{j,k}$ to represent each transaction D_j , where $d_{j,i} = 1$ if and only if $I_i \in D_j$ for every $1 \leq i \leq k$. Furthermore, the string d_j is divided into two substrings: $d_j^1 = d_{j,1} \dots d_{j,l}$ for Alice and $d_j^2 = d_{j,l+1} \dots d_{j,k}$ for Bob. At Alice's (resp. Bob's) side, d_j^1 (resp. d_j^2) is stored in QRAM QD^1 (resp. QD^2). For convenience, we assume that $N = 2^n > M$ for some integer n , and $M = \Theta(N)$. If necessary, we can add blank d_j for $j \in \{M, \dots, N-1\}$ to

make the size of databases to be exactly N . Therefore, once Alice, Bob query the QRAMs QD^1 and QD^2 , they will return:

$$|\Phi^1\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \sum_{j=0}^{N-1} |j\rangle |d_j^1\rangle, \quad |\Phi^2\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \sum_{j=0}^{N-1} |j\rangle |d_j^2\rangle$$

respectively. The time complexity to generate these states is $O(nk) = O(k \log N)$ [10].

IV. Quantum Protocol for Mining Association Rules:— We are ready to present our quantum protocol now. Certain preparations are required before executing the protocol. We need to construct unitary operators U_A and U_B on address qubits, which can permute the addresses. One way to do this is to use a quantum version of the encryption suggested in [6]. Suppose p is a prime number between M and N . Let E be the set of integers between 3 to $p-2$ coprime to $p-1$. Alice randomly choose an integer e_A in E , and then prepares a unitary operator

$$U_A : |x\rangle \mapsto \begin{cases} |a(x)\rangle, & \text{if } x \in \{0, 1\}^n, x < p \\ |x\rangle, & \text{if } x \in \{0, 1\}^n, x \geq p \end{cases},$$

where $a(x) \equiv x^{e_A} \pmod{p}$. As well, Bob randomly choose an integer e_B in E and prepares a unitary operator U_B , which implements $b(x) \equiv x^{e_B} \pmod{p}$. These two unitary operators can be implemented in time $O(n^3)$ in a way similar to the modular exponentiation in the Shor factoring algorithm [14]. They will be used to encrypt and exchange the states between Alice and Bob, as the information/data sharing [6]. Note that U_A and U_B commute, i.e. $U_A U_B = U_B U_A$, because p is a prime [6].

1. Computing the support: We first present the quantum protocol for computing the suppose $\text{supp}(Z)$ of an itemset $Z \subseteq I$. It consists of the following steps:

Step 1: Alice prepares state $|\Phi^1\rangle$, applies U_A on the address qubits and get $|\psi^1\rangle = (U_A \otimes \sigma_I^{\otimes l}) |\Phi^1\rangle$, where σ_I is the identity operator on a qubit. She repeats this procedure and prepares another copy of $|\psi^1\rangle$, denoted $|\varphi^1\rangle$. Bob similarly prepares $|\psi^2\rangle = (U_B \otimes \sigma_I^{\otimes k-l}) |\Phi^2\rangle$ and its second copy $|\varphi^2\rangle = |\psi^2\rangle$.

Step 2: Alice (resp. Bob) checks whether $D_j^1 \supseteq Z^1$ (resp. $D_j^2 \supseteq Z^2$) on $|\psi^1\rangle, |\varphi^1\rangle$ (resp. $|\psi^2\rangle, |\varphi^2\rangle$):

$$\begin{aligned} |\psi_1^1\rangle &= (\sigma_I^{\otimes n} \otimes U_Z) |\psi^1\rangle |0\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \sum |a(j)\rangle |d_j^1\rangle |f_Z(d_j^1)\rangle, \\ |\psi_1^2\rangle &= (\sigma_I^{\otimes n} \otimes V_Z) |\psi^2\rangle |0\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \sum |b(j)\rangle |d_j^2\rangle |g_Z(d_j^2)\rangle, \\ |\varphi_1^1\rangle &= (\sigma_I^{\otimes n} \otimes U_Z) |\varphi^1\rangle |0\rangle, \quad |\varphi_1^2\rangle = (\sigma_I^{\otimes n} \otimes V_Z) |\varphi^2\rangle |0\rangle. \end{aligned}$$

Here, a register qubit in state $|0\rangle$ is added, U_Z is the unitary operator on data and register qubits defined by $U_Z |x\rangle |y\rangle = |x\rangle |y \oplus f_Z(x)\rangle$, and $f_Z(x) = 1$ if and only if $X \supseteq Z^1$ with X being the itemset represented by boolean string x . V_Z and g_Z are defined similarly. Operators U_Z and V_Z can be implemented by $O(k)$ CNOT gates and $O(k)$ Toffoli gates [15].

Step 3: Alice sends the address qubits of $|\psi_1^1\rangle$ and both the address and register qubits of $|\varphi_1^1\rangle$ to Bob, and Bob sends the address and register qubits of $|\psi_1^2\rangle$ and the address qubits of $|\varphi_1^2\rangle$ to Alice.

Step 4: In order to match the address of $|\psi_1^1\rangle$ with that of $|\psi_1^2\rangle$, Alice (resp. Bob) performs U_A (resp. U_B) on the address qubits of $|\psi_1^2\rangle$ and $|\varphi_1^2\rangle$ (resp. $|\psi_1^1\rangle$ and $|\varphi_1^1\rangle$):

$$|\psi_2^1\rangle = (U_B \otimes \sigma_I^{\otimes l+1})|\psi_1^1\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \sum |b(a(j))\rangle |d_j^1\rangle |f_Z(d_j^1)\rangle,$$

$$|\psi_2^2\rangle = (U_A \otimes \sigma_I^{\otimes k-l+1})|\psi_1^2\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \sum |a(b(j))\rangle |d_j^2\rangle |g_Z(d_j^2)\rangle,$$

$$|\varphi_2^1\rangle = (U_B \otimes \sigma_I^{\otimes l+1})|\varphi_1^1\rangle, \quad |\varphi_2^2\rangle = (U_A \otimes \sigma_I^{\otimes k-l+1})|\varphi_1^2\rangle.$$

Step 5: Alice sends back the address qubits of $|\varphi_2^2\rangle$ to Bob, and Bob sends back the address qubits of $|\psi_2^1\rangle$ to Alice.

Step 6: Now Alice holds the data qubits of $|\varphi_2^1\rangle$ and the qubits with subscript A in the following state:

$$\begin{aligned} |\Psi\rangle &= |\psi_2^1\rangle |\psi_2^2\rangle \\ &= \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i,j} |a(b(i)), a(b(j))\rangle_A |d_i^1\rangle_A |d_j^2\rangle_B |f_Z(d_i^1)\rangle_A |g_Z(d_j^2)\rangle_A. \end{aligned}$$

Independently, she can compute $\text{supp}(Z)$ on the address and register qubits as follows:

1. Add a register qubit in state $|0\rangle$ at the end of $|\Psi\rangle$ and perform the unitary operator W defined by $W|x, y, z\rangle = |x, y, z \oplus \delta(x, y)\rangle$ on address qubits and the new register qubit, where $\delta(i, j) = 1$ iff $i = j$. Then she gets

$$\begin{aligned} |\Psi_0\rangle &= \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i,j} |a(b(i)), a(b(j))\rangle |d_i^1\rangle |d_j^2\rangle \\ &\quad |f_Z(d_i^1)\rangle |g_Z(d_j^2)\rangle |\delta(a(b(i)), a(b(j)))\rangle. \end{aligned}$$

The time complexity to implement W is $O(n)$ [16].

2. Run $O(\sqrt{N})$ times of Grover's iterations [17] on $|\Psi_0\rangle$ to get $|\Psi'_0\rangle = \beta_0|\xi_0\rangle + \beta_1|\xi_1\rangle$, where $|\beta_1| \approx 1$, $|\beta_0| \approx 0$, and the last qubit in $|\xi_0\rangle$ and $|\xi_1\rangle$ is in state $|0\rangle, |1\rangle$, corresponding to the case $a(b(i)) \neq a(b(j))$, $a(b(i)) = a(b(j))$, respectively [18]. More explicitly,

$$\begin{aligned} |\xi_1\rangle &= \alpha \sum_{a(b(i))=a(b(j))} |a(b(i)), a(b(j))\rangle |d_i^1\rangle |d_j^2\rangle \\ &\quad |f_Z(d_i^1)\rangle |g_Z(d_j^2)\rangle |1\rangle \end{aligned}$$

where α is a factor for normalisation. Measuring the last qubit in $|\Psi'_0\rangle$, Alice gets the state $|\xi_1\rangle$ with a probability close to 1. Since $a(b(i)) = a(b(j))$ if and only if $i = j$, $|\xi_1\rangle$ has exactly N terms. So, removing the last qubit $|1\rangle$ from $|\xi_1\rangle$ yields

$$\begin{aligned} |\Psi_1\rangle &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \sum_{i=0}^{N-1} |a(b(i)), a(b(i))\rangle |d_i^1\rangle |d_i^2\rangle \\ &\quad |f_Z(d_i^1)\rangle |g_Z(d_i^2)\rangle. \end{aligned}$$

3. Add a new register qubit $|0\rangle$ at the end of $|\Psi_1\rangle$. Then applying a Toffoli gate on the three register qubits $|f_Z(d_i^1)\rangle |g_Z(d_i^2)\rangle |0\rangle$ generates

$$\begin{aligned} |\Psi_2\rangle &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \sum |a(b(i)), a(b(i))\rangle |d_i\rangle \\ &\quad |f_Z(d_i^1)\rangle |g_Z(d_i^2)\rangle |h(d_i^1, d_i^2)\rangle, \end{aligned}$$

where $h(d_i^1, d_i^2) = f_Z(d_i^1)g_Z(d_i^2)$.

4. Run the quantum counting algorithm [19] on $|\Psi_2\rangle$ to count the number t of i such that $h(d_i^1, d_i^2) = 1$. The result is $s_1 = t/M \approx \text{supp}(Z)$.

Similarly, Bob computes $s_2 \approx \text{supp}(Z)$.

Step 7: Alice and Bob announce their results s_1 and s_2 . If $|s_1 - s_2| < 0.001s$, where s is the preset threshold of support, they accept $\frac{s_1 + s_2}{2}$ as the value of $\text{supp}(Z)$. Otherwise they restart this protocol.

2. *Computing the confidence:* Since we can compute the support $\text{supp}(X)$ of itemset X , it is easy to compute the confidence $\text{conf}(X \Rightarrow Y) = \text{supp}(X \cup Y)/\text{supp}(X)$ with an error approximately equal to the sum of the errors of $\text{supp}(X \cup Y)$ and $\text{supp}(X)$.

IV. *Analysis of the Quantum Protocol:*— We now show that the quantum protocol presented above significantly improves the privacy, complexity and communication cost of known classical algorithms.

1. *Privacy:* We only consider the semi-honest model where both Alice and Bob follow the protocol, but may use the received data to compute the other party's private information [6, 8]. For the dishonest model, a slightly modified version of our protocol can achieve the same privacy. We omit the details due to the limited space.

In a classical protocol, if functions $a(x) \equiv x^{e_A} \pmod p$ and $b(x) \equiv x^{e_B} \pmod p$ are employed, it is secure in a *polynomial time* of n, k [6]. However, Alice's data can be recovered by Bob in an *exponential time* if Bob tries all possibilities of e_A , and compares the received $a(b(S_2))$ with his own $b(S_2)$; for example if $p = 11$, $e_A = 3$, $e_B = 9$ and $S_2 = \{2, 8\}$, then $b(S_2) = \{6, 7\}$ and $a(b(S_2)) = \{2, 7\}$. Since only $w = 3$ satisfies $\{6^w \pmod{11}, 7^w \pmod{11}\} = \{2, 7\}$, $e_A = 3$ can be easily found. Once e_A is recovered, Bob knows S_1 . Thus, Bob can gain the information whether $I_i \subseteq D_j^1$ from various candidate frequent itemsets.

The quantum protocol can protect the privacy much better because Bob cannot recover e_A even if he spends exponential time to try all possibilities. At the end of each round of the quantum protocol, Bob gets one of the (unnormalised) states

$$|\kappa_0\rangle = \sum_{f_Z(d_i^1)=0} |a(b(i))\rangle |\mu_i\rangle, \quad |\kappa_1\rangle = \sum_{f_Z(d_i^1)=1} |a(b(i))\rangle |\mu_i\rangle$$

where $|\mu_i\rangle$ represents the content in the remaining address, data and register qubits. Since Bob does not have Alice's data $|d_i^1\rangle$, he can only perform measurements on $|\kappa_1\rangle$ or $|\kappa_0\rangle$ to find an address, say q , in $|\kappa_1\rangle$ or $|\kappa_0\rangle$, and

thus he knows the value of $f_Z(d_q^1)$. Now consider the example in the previous paragraph. If the quantum protocol runs for one round, Bob only has one state, say $|\kappa_1\rangle$, and then he can only get one address in $|\kappa_1\rangle$, which corresponds to an element in $a(b(S_2)) = \{2, 7\}$, say 2. Since $6^9 \equiv 7^3 \equiv 2 \pmod{11}$, Bob has more than one candidate for e_A , i.e. 3, 9, and thus he cannot recover e_A with certainty. The situation is similar when Bob has more than one state by running the protocol multiple rounds for the same Z . We will find in the next subsection that the expected number of rounds for a given Z is smaller than 2. As $|S_2| = \Theta(M) = \Theta(N)$, $2/|S_2|$ will be approximately 0 and Bob has a large number of candidates for e_A .

Furthermore, even if Bob knows e_A , he still cannot recover D_j^1 for any j . To see this, we first notice that recovering D_j^1 requires to know whether $I_i \in D_j^1$ (equivalently $Z_i \subseteq D_j^1$ for some corresponding Z_i) for all $i = 1, \dots, l$. Thus the expected number of measurement outcomes used to recover D_j^1 is l . On the other hand, the expected number of measurements resulting in a fixed address j is approximately

$$\frac{\text{the number of candidate frequent itemsets}}{\text{the number of transactions}}.$$

The numerator is usually smaller than the denominator (e.g. in the case considered in [5], the numerator is tens of thousands, while the denominator is millions). Since it is expected that Bob gets less than 2 states for one itemset, he can hardly obtain l different measurement outcomes corresponding to a specific address j . Therefore, Bob cannot recover D_j^1 for any j , and our quantum protocol is much securer than classical protocols because in a classical protocol, D^1 can be recovered immediately whenever Bob knows e_A .

2. *Complexity*: Note that the complexity of our quantum protocol is determined by the complexity of the Grover iterations and the quantum counting algorithm because the other steps (including preparation) only cost $O(n^3 + nk)$. Since there are exactly N terms satisfying $a(b(i)) = a(b(j))$ in all the N^2 terms of $|\Psi_0\rangle$, the Grover search will cost time $O(\sqrt{N^2/N}) = O(\sqrt{N})$ with the success probability close to 1 [18]. On the other hand, the quantum counting will compute the support $\text{supp}(Z)$ in time $O(\sqrt{N})$ with the success probability at least $\frac{8}{\pi^2}$ and an error at most $O(\frac{1}{\sqrt{N}})$ [19, Corollary 2]. This error can be ignored when N is very large. Furthermore the terminating probability for each round is greater than $(\frac{8}{\pi^2})^2 > 0.6$, and the expected number of rounds is smaller than 2. Thus, we conclude:

Theorem .1. *The quantum protocol can compute the support of any itemset Z in time $O(\sqrt{N} + k \log N)$ with the success probability greater than 0.9 and an error smaller than 0.002s, where N is the size of the database, s is the threshold of support and k is the number of items.*

Generally, a classical protocol costs $\Omega(N(k + \text{poly}(\log N)))$ time to compute the support of an itemset Z ; for instance, the one given in [6] has the complexity $\Omega(kN + N \log^3 N)$. So, the quantum protocol is much faster than classical protocols.

3. *Communication cost*: In a classical protocol, since Alice has to send all $a(i)$ with $Z^1 \subseteq D_i^1$ to Bob, the communication bits required in each round is $\Omega(N \log N)$ [6, 8]. For example, the algorithm given in [6] costs $\Omega(Nk^3 + N \log N)$ time and $O(Nk)$ communication bits to share private information/documents. When employed to mine association rules, the time complexity and communication bits becomes $\Omega(N \log^3 N + Nk)$ and $\Omega(N \log N)$, respectively.

However, in the quantum protocol, it is only required to communicate $O(\log N)$ qubits for each Z to compute $\text{supp}(Z)$. This cost is much smaller than that for a classical protocol.

A comparison for the time complexities and communication costs of the quantum protocol presented in this Letter and that of three popular classical protocols is given in Table I.

V. *Conclusion*:—In this Letter, we developed a quantum protocol for mining association rules on vertically partitioned databases. An analysis shows that the quantum protocol can better preserve the privacy than classical protocols, and at the same time it significantly reduces the time complexity and communication costs. For the further research, we will explore the applications of quantum computation in data mining of other knowledge patterns. We will also consider how can quantum computation help to protect privacy in other models of dishonesties.

TABLE I. Comparison of classical and quantum protocols.

	Complexity	Communication cost
Classical protocol in [6]	$\Omega(N \log^3 N + Nk)$	$\Omega(N \log N)$ bits
Classical protocol in [7]	$\Omega(Nk)$	$\Omega(N)$ bits
Classical protocol in [8]	$\Omega(\text{poly}(\log N)N + Nk)$	$\Omega(N \log N)$ bits
Quantum protocol	$O(\sqrt{N} + k \log N)$	$O(\log N)$ qubits

- [1] P.-N. Tan, M. Steinbach, and V. Kumar, *Introduction to Data Mining* (Addison-Wesley, Reading, Massachusetts, 2006).
 [2] R. Agrawal, T. Imieliński, and A. Swami, in *Proceedings*

- of the 1993 ACM SIGMOD International Conference on Management of Data*, SIGMOD '93 (ACM, New York, NY, USA, 1993) pp. 207–216.
 [3] S. Kotsiantis and D. Kanellopoulos, GESTS Interna-

- tional Transactions on Computer Science and Engineering **32**, 71 (2006).
- [4] K. Sathiyapriya and G. S. Sadasivam, International Journal of Data Mining & Knowledge Management Process **3**, 119 (2013).
- [5] A. Evfimievski, R. Srikant, R. Agrawal, and J. Gehrke, Information Systems **29**, 343 (2004).
- [6] R. Agrawal, A. Evfimievski, and R. Srikant, in *Proceedings of the 2003 ACM SIGMOD International Conference on Management of Data*, SIGMOD '03 (ACM, New York, NY, USA, 2003) pp. 86–97.
- [7] J. Vaidya and C. Clifton, in *Proceedings of the eighth ACM SIGKDD international conference on Knowledge discovery and data mining* (ACM, 2002) pp. 639–644.
- [8] J. Vaidya and C. Clifton, Journal of Computer Security **13**, 593 (2005).
- [9] V. Giovannetti, S. Lloyd, and L. Maccone, Phys. Rev. Lett. **100**, 160501 (2008).
- [10] V. Giovannetti, S. Lloyd, and L. Maccone, Phys. Rev. A **78**, 052310 (2008).
- [11] P. Rebentrost, M. Mohseni, and S. Lloyd, Phys. Rev. Lett. **113**, 130503 (2014).
- [12] V. Giovannetti, S. Lloyd, and L. Maccone, Phys. Rev. Lett. **100**, 230502 (2008).
- [13] R. Agrawal and R. Srikant, in *Proceedings of the 20th International Conference on Very Large Data Bases*, VLDB '94 (Morgan Kaufmann Publishers Inc., San Francisco, CA, USA, 1994) pp. 487–499.
- [14] P. W. Shor, SIAM Journal on Computing **26**, 1484 (1997).
- [15] For instance, U_Z can be implemented as follows. Suppose $c = |Z^1| = O(k)$ is a power of 2, and $Z^1 = \{I_{i_1}, \dots, I_{i_c}\}$. We first add $2c$ register qubits $r_0, r_1, \dots, r_{2c-1}$, which are all initialized to be $|0\rangle$. Then we apply c CNOT gates $CNOT_1, \dots, CNOT_c$, where the control qubits for $CNOT_j$ is the i_j -th data qubit, which corresponds to the item I_{i_j} , and the target qubit is r_j . Furthermore, we check whether these all c register qubits are in state $|1\rangle$. In order to do this, we perform $c/2$ Toffoli gates with on the triples $(control_1, control_2, target) = (r_{2j-1}, r_{2j}, r_{c+j})$. We repeat this procedure with $c/4, c/8, \dots, 1$ Toffoli gates. The final register qubit r_{2c-1} is just the final register/target qubit, which stores $|f_z(\cdot)\rangle$. By now, we have already performed $c - 1$ Toffoli gates. Finally, we employ these Toffoli gates and CNOT gates except the last Toffoli gate on $(control_1, control_2, target) = (r_{2c-3}, r_{2c-2}, r_{2c-1})$ in reverse to disentangle the register qubits r_1, \dots, r_{2c-2} . If c is not a power of 2, the remaining register qubit in each round of the applications of the Toffoli gates will be put into the next round. The total number of Toffoli gates is still $O(c)$. Obviously, only when the control qubits of the CNOT gates are in state $|1\rangle$, the register qubits including the final register qubit r_{2c-1} will be $|1\rangle$. The time complexity for this construction is $O(c) = O(k)$, since $c \leq k$.
- [16] The unitary operator W can be implemented in time complexity $O(n)$ in a way similar to that for U_Z . The only difference is that the CNOT gate are replaced by the gate $U : |x, y, z\rangle \mapsto |x, y, z \oplus (x = y)\rangle$. This gate can be implemented by two Toffoli gates and 4 σ_X gates.
- [17] L. K. Grover, in *Proceedings of the Twenty-eighth Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing*, STOC '96 (ACM, New York, NY, USA, 1996) pp. 212–219.
- [18] M. Boyer, G. Brassard, P. Høyer, and A. Tapp, Fortsch. Phys., 493 (1998).
- [19] G. Brassard, P. Høyer, and A. Tapp, in *Automata, Languages and Programming*, Lecture Notes in Computer Science, Vol. 1443, edited by K. Larsen, S. Skyum, and G. Winskel (Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 1998) pp. 820–831.