

Delegating Quantum Computation Using Only Hash Functions

Jiayu Zhang^{1*}

Boston University (jyz16@bu.edu)

Abstract. In this paper, we construct a new scheme for delegating a large circuit family, which we call "C+P circuits". "C+P" circuits are the circuits composed of Toffoli gates and diagonal gates. Our scheme is non-interactive, only requires small quantum resources on the client side, and can be proved secure in the quantum random oracle model, without relying on additional assumptions, for example, the existence of fully homomorphic encryption. In practice the random oracle can be replaced by an appropriate hash functions, for example, SHA-3, AES.

This protocol allows a client to delegate the most expensive part of some quantum algorithms, for example, Shor's algorithm. The previous protocols that are powerful enough to delegate Shor's algorithm require either many rounds of interaction or the existence of FHE. The quantum resources required by the client are fewer than when it runs Shor's algorithm locally.

Different from many previous protocols, our scheme is not based on quantum one time pad, but on a new encoding called "entanglement encoding". We then generalize the garbled circuit to reversible garbled circuit to allow computation on this encoding.

To prove the security of this protocol, we study key dependent message(KDM) security in the quantum random oracle model. Then as a natural generalization, we define and study quantum KDM security. KDM security was not previously studied in quantum settings.

Keywords: Quantum Computation Delegation· Quantum Cryptography· Garbled Circuit· Quantum Random Oracle· KDM Security

1 Introduction

In computation delegation, there is a client holding secret data φ and the description of circuit C that he wants to apply, but he doesn't have the ability to compute $C(\varphi)$ himself. A delegation protocol allows the client to compute $C(\varphi)$ with the help from a more computationally powerful server. The delegation is *blind* (or *private*) if the server cannot learn anything about the input φ during the protocol. After some communications, the client can decrypt the response from the server and get the computation result(see Figure 1.) This problem is important in the quantum setting: it's likely that quantum computers, when they

* Supported in part by NSF awards IIS-1447700 and AF-1763786

are built, will be expensive, and made available as a remote service. If a client wants to do some quantum computation on secret data, a quantum computation delegation protocol is required.




Fig. 1. An illustration for computation delegation

Delegation of computation is a central problem in modern cryptography, and has been studied for a long time in classical settings. Related works include multiparty computation, fully homomorphic encryption(FHE), etc. When we delegate, there are two key aspects: privacy and authenticity. This paper will focus on privacy.

We want the delegation protocol to be useful, efficient and secure. Previous work falls into two classes: some protocols have information-theoretically security, but they either can only support a small circuit class or require huge client side quantum resources; other protocols rely on classical fully homomorphic encryption(FHE). This raises the following question:

Is it possible to delegate quantum computation for a large circuit family, with small amount of quantum resources on the client side, without assuming classical FHE?

In the classical world, Yao's garbled circuit answers this question. Garbled circuit is also a fundamental tool in many other cryptographic tasks, like multiparty computation and functional encryption.

1.1 Our Contribution

In this paper we develop a non-interactive(1 round) quantum computation delegation scheme for "C+P circuits", the circuits composed of classical gates and diagonal gates. We prove the following:

Theorem 1. *It's possible to delegate C+P circuits non-interactively and securely in the quantum random oracle model without assuming trapdoor one-way functions, and with this protocol the quantum resources on the client side are $O(\kappa'N_q + N_q^2)$ CNOT gates, where κ' is the security parameter, N_q is the number of qubits in the input.*

In our protocol, the client side resources are actually $O(\kappa N_q)$, where κ is the secret key length in our protocol. For the proof of security to work, our current

technique requires that κ is dependent on N_q , thus we get an N_q^2 term. We conjecture that this step is not necessary(Conjecture 2); and this implies:

Conjecture 1. The client side quantum resources can be reduced to $O(\kappa'N_q)$.

We argue that our protocol is important for three reasons: (1)The client only needs small quantum resources. Here we say "small" to mean the quantum resources only depend on the key length and the input size, and is independent of the circuit size. (2)It is based on the quantum random oracle model, without assuming some trapdoor one-way function. Many protocols before, for example, [11][14] are based on classical FHE and therefore rely on some kinds of lattice cryptographic assumptions, for example, LWE assumption. Our protocol is based on the quantum random oracle(therefore based on hash function in practice), and this provides an alternative, incomparable assumption on which we can base security of quantum delegation. (3)Our protocol introduces some new ideas and different techniques, which may be useful in the study of other problems.

Our protocol can be applied to Shor's algorithm. Since the hardest part of Shor's algorithm consists of Toffoli gates on quantum states, the client can use this protocol securely with the help of a remote quantum server.

Corollary 1. *It's possible to delegate Shor's algorithm within one round of communication, where the client side quantum resources are only $O(\kappa'n + n^2)$ CNOT gates, and assuming Conjecture 2, are $\tilde{O}(\kappa'n)$.*

Our protocol is closely related to the concept of key-dependent message(KDM) security. As a side product, we study KDM security in the quantum random oracle model. As far as we know, we are the first to study this problem. We point out that although there already exists classical KDM secure encryption scheme in random oracle model[5], the security in the quantum random oracle model still needs an explicit proof. We provide such a proof in this paper. Furthermore, we generalize KDM security to the quantum KDM security, and construct a protocol for it in the quantum random oracle model.

1.2 Related Work

To delegate quantum computation, people raised the concepts of blind quantum computation[7] and quantum homomorphic encryption(QHE)[8]. These two concepts are a little different but closely related: in quantum homomorphic encryption, no interaction is allowed and the circuits to be evaluated are known by the server. While in blind quantum computation, interactions are usually allowed and the circuits are usually only known by the client.

The concept of blind quantum computation was first raised in [3]. And [7] gave a universal blind quantum computation protocol, based on measurement based quantum computation(MBQC)[17]. What's more, secure assisted quantum computation based on quantum one-time pad(QOTP) technique was raised in [9], with which we can easily apply Clifford gates securely but T gates are hard to apply and requires interactions.

Quantum homomorphic encryption is the homomorphic encryption for quantum circuits. Based on QOTP and classical FHE, [8] studies the quantum homomorphic encryption for circuits with low T gate complexity. Later [11] constructed a quantum homomorphic encryption scheme for polynomial size circuits. But it still requires some quantum computing ability on the client side to prepare the evaluation gadgets, and the size of gadgets is propotional to the number of T gates. Recently Mahadev constructed a protocol[14], which achieves fully quantum homomorphic encryption, and what makes this protocol amazing is that the client can be purely classical, which hugely reduces the requirements on the client side.

Another viewpoint of these protocols is the computational assumption needed. With interaction, we can do blind quantum computation for universal quantum circuits information theoretically(IT-) securely. But for non-interactive protocols, [24] gives a limit for IT-secure QHE, which implies IT-secure quantum FHE is impossible. But it's still possible to design protocols for some non-universal circuit family, [13] gives a protocol for IQP+ circuits, which contain CNOT gates and IQP gates and [23] gives a QHE based on quantum error correction code, for circuit with logarithmic number of T gates.

On the other hand, [8][11][14] relies on classical FHE. The current constructions of classical FHE are all based on various kinds of lattice-based cryptosystem, and the most standard assumption for lattice is the Learning-With-Error(LWE) assumption.

The following table compares different protocols for quantum computation delegation.

Protocols	Circuit class	Client's quantum resources	Assumption
QOTP[9]	Clifford	$O(N_q)$ Pauli operations	-
[7]	All	$O(N_q + L)$ Rounds: Circuit Depth	-
[14]	All	$O(N_q)$ Pauli operations	FHE
[13]	IQP+	$O(N_q)$	-
[23]	Clifford+small number of T gates	Exponential in the number of T gates	-
This paper C+P		$O(\kappa' N_q + N_q^2)$ (Proved)	Quantum ROM
		$O(\kappa' N_q)$ (Conjectured)	
		CNOT operations	

Table 1. L is the number of gates in the circuits, N_q is the number of qubits in the input, κ' is the security parameter.

1.3 Techniques

A new encoding scheme for quantum states In many previous protocols, when we want to hide a quantum state, the usual way is to use "quantum

one time pad”: $\rho \rightarrow X^a Z^b(\rho)$, where a, b are two classical strings. When taking average on a, b , the encrypted state becomes a completely mixed state. We notice that this type of encoding maps one qubit in the plaintext into one qubit in the ciphertext. In our protocol, we introduce a new way to hide quantum states, which maps one qubit in the plaintext to κ qubits in the ciphertext:

$$\text{Et}_{k_0, k_1} : |0\rangle \rightarrow |k_0\rangle, |1\rangle \rightarrow |k_1\rangle$$

where k_0, k_1 are chosen uniformly random in $\{0, 1\}^\kappa$ and distinct.

We can prove when we apply this operator on each qubit in the input state, and take average on all the keys, the result will be exponentially close to a completely mixed state, for all possible states of the quantum register.

Reversible garbled circuits The second ingredient in our construction is ”reversible garbled circuit”. In the usual usage of Yao’s garbled table, we feed the input keys into the garbled table, and get output keys; and in the decoding phase, we use an output mapping to map the keys to the result. This well-studied classical construction does not work with quantum states. Even if the original circuit is reversible, evaluation of Yao’s garbled circuit is not! To use it with quantum states, besides the original garbled table, we add another table from the output keys to the input keys. This makes the whole scheme reversible, which means we can use it on quantum state and the computation result won’t be entangled with auxiliary qubits. For security, we remove the output mappings. In the context of delegation, these are kept by the client.




Fig. 2. Reversible garbled table

Note The proof of security of this scheme is subtle. The extra information included to allow reversible execution introduces cycles in the graph of which keys are used to encrypt which others. We address by introducing key-dependent message security in the quantum model. We show that KDM-secure encryption exists in the quantum oracle model, and use the result to prove the security of our garbled circuit construction.

Phase gate The reversible garbled circuit allows evaluating Toffoli circuits. To handle phase gates, instead of applying $|k_{in}\rangle \rightarrow |k_{out}\rangle$, we can implement the following transformation:

$$|k_0\rangle \rightarrow |k_0\rangle |m\rangle, |k_1\rangle \rightarrow |k_1\rangle |m+1\rangle \quad (1)$$

Then we apply a "qudit Z gate" $\sum_i \omega_n^i |i\rangle \langle i|$ (define $\omega_n := e^{i\pi/n}$), on the second register, where $i \in \mathbb{Z}_n$ goes through all the integers in \mathbb{Z}_n . (This operation can be done efficiently.) This will give us:

$$|k_0\rangle \rightarrow \omega_n^m |k_0\rangle |m\rangle, |k_1\rangle \rightarrow \omega_n^{m+1} |k_1\rangle |m+1\rangle$$

Then we apply (1) again to erase the second register. After removing the global phase the result is the same as the output of applying a phase gate $R_Z(\frac{\pi}{n}) = |0\rangle \langle 0| + \omega_n |1\rangle \langle 1|$.

1.4 Organisation

This paper is organized as follows. Section 2 contains some background for this paper. In Section 3 we give the entanglement encoding scheme, and use it to design a public key quantum encryption scheme. In Section 4 we give our construction of the quantum computation delegation protocol for C+P circuits. In Section 5 we prove the security of classical KDM secure scheme in quantum random oracle, as the preparation for the security proof of main protocol. Then in Section 6 we discuss the security of our protocol. Section 7.1 turns this delegation scheme to a fully blind protocol, Section 7.2 adds interaction into the protocol, and Section 7.3 shows how to use our protocol on Shor's algorithm. Section 8 generalizes KDM security to quantum settings, constructs a quantum KDM secure protocol and proves its security. Then we discuss the open questions and complete this paper. The appendix contains some omitted proof.

2 Background

2.1 Basis of Quantum Computation

We give a simple introduction for quantum computing, and clarify some notations in this paper. For more detailed explanations, we refer to [15].

In quantum computing, a pure state is described by a unit vector in a Hilbert space. A qubit, or a quantum bit, in pure state, can be described by a vector $|\varphi\rangle \in \mathbb{C}^2$. The symbol $|\cdot\rangle$ and $\langle \cdot|$ is called Dirac symbols.

But a quantum system isn't necessary in pure state. When the quantum system is open, we will need to consider mixed states. To describe both pure and mixed states, the state of a qubit is described by a density matrix in $\mathbb{C}^{2 \times 2}$. A density matrix is a trace-one positive semidefinite complex matrix. The density matrix that corresponds to pure state $|\varphi\rangle$ is $|\varphi\rangle \langle \varphi|$, and we abbreviate it as φ .

For an n -qubit state, its density matrix is in $\mathbb{C}^{2^n \times 2^n}$. The space of density operators in system \mathcal{S} is denoted as $\mathbb{D}(\mathcal{S})$.

Quantum operations on pure states can be described by a unitary transform $|\varphi\rangle \rightarrow U|\varphi\rangle$. And the operations on mixed states can be described by superoperator $\rho \rightarrow \mathcal{E}(\rho) = \text{tr}_R(U(\rho \otimes |0\rangle \langle 0|)U^\dagger)$. We use calligraphic characters like \mathcal{D} , \mathcal{E} to denote superoperators, and use normal font like U , D to denote unitary transform. We will also use Sans-serif font like X , Z , Et to denote quantum operations:

When it is used as $\text{Et}|\varphi\rangle$ it means unitary operations(used on Dirac symbol and without parenthesis), and when used as $\text{Et}(\rho)$ it means superoperator.

The quantum gates include X, Y, Z, CNOT, H, T, Toffoli and so on. What's more, denote $R_Z(\theta) = |0\rangle\langle 0| + e^{i\theta}|1\rangle\langle 1|$, where i is the imaginary unit. Denote $\omega_n = e^{i\pi/n}$, we can write $R_Z(k\pi/n) = |0\rangle\langle 0| + \omega_n^k|1\rangle\langle 1|$. Since the i will be used as the symbol for index and "input", we will avoid using i to denote the imaginary unit in this paper, and use ω_n instead.

The trace distance of two quantum states is defined as $\Delta(\rho, \sigma) = \frac{1}{2}|\rho - \sigma|_{\text{tr}}$, where $|\cdot|_{\text{tr}}$ is the trace norm.

2.2 Basis of Cryptography

A quantum public key encryption scheme contains three mappings: $\text{KeyGen}(1^\kappa) \rightarrow (pk, sk)$, $\text{Enc}_{pk} : \mathbb{D}(\mathcal{M}) \rightarrow \mathbb{D}(\mathcal{C})$, $\text{Dec}_{sk} : \mathbb{D}(\mathcal{C}) \rightarrow \mathbb{D}(\mathcal{M})$. In a symmetric key encryption scheme, the key generation and encryption is replaced by $\text{KeyGen}(1^\kappa) \rightarrow (sk)$ and $\text{Enc}_{sk} : \mathbb{D}(\mathcal{M}) \rightarrow \mathbb{D}(\mathcal{C})$. [16]

In this paper, we need the scheme to have a key verification procedure, which is $\text{Ver} : \mathcal{K} \times \mathbb{D}(\mathcal{C}) \rightarrow \{\perp, 1\}$ So a verifiable symmetric(or public) key encryption scheme will contain four mappings: KeyGen , Enc , Dec , Ver .

A verifiable quantum symmetric key encryption scheme is correct if:

1. $\forall \rho \in \mathbb{D}(\mathcal{S} \otimes \mathcal{R})$, $\mathbb{E}_{sk \leftarrow \text{KeyGen}(1^\kappa)} |(I \otimes \text{Dec}_{sk})((I \otimes \text{Enc}_{sk})(\rho)) - \rho|_{\text{tr}} = \text{negl}(\kappa)$
2. $\forall \rho \in \mathbb{D}(\mathcal{S} \otimes \mathcal{R})$, $\Pr_{sk \leftarrow \text{KeyGen}(1^\kappa)} (\text{Ver}(sk, (I \otimes \text{Enc}_{sk})(\rho)) = \perp) = \text{negl}(\kappa)$,
and $\Pr_{sk \leftarrow \text{KeyGen}(1^\kappa), r \leftarrow \text{KeyGen}(1^\kappa)} (\text{Ver}(r, (I \otimes \text{Enc}_{sk})(\rho)) = 1) = \text{negl}(\kappa)$

Here the encryption and decryption are all on system S , and R is the reference system. For public key encryption, we only need to replace the keys for encryption with pk .

Sometimes we also need to encrypt the message with multiple keys. In a verifiable symmetric multi-key encryption scheme, $\text{KeyGen}(1^\kappa)$ is the same as the symmetric key scheme, $\text{Enc}_{k_1, k_2, \dots, k_i}$ encrypt the message under keys $K = (k_1, k_2, \dots, k_i)$, $\text{Dec}_{k_1, k_2, \dots, k_i}$ decrypts the ciphertext given all the keys k_1, k_2, \dots, k_i , and $\text{Ver}(k, i, c) \rightarrow \{\perp, 1\}$ verifies whether k is the i th key used in the encryption of c .

The next problem is how to define "secure" exactly. The concept of indistinguishability under chosen plaintext attack was introduced in [4][12]. Let's first review the security definition in the classical case.

Definition 1. For a symmetric key encryption scheme, consider the following game, called "IND-CPA game", between a challenger and an adversary \mathcal{A} :

1. The challenger runs $\text{KeyGen}(1^\kappa) \rightarrow sk$ and samples $b \leftarrow_r \{0, 1\}$.
2. The adversary gets the following oracle, whose input space is $\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{M})$, and tries it for some times:
 - (a) The adversary chooses $m \in \mathcal{M}$, the message space. The adversary sends m to the oracle.

(b) If $b = 0$, the oracle computes Enc on m and send it to the adversary. The adversary will hold state $\text{Enc}(m)$. If $b = 1$, the oracle will compute $\text{Enc}(0^{|m|})$.

3. The adversary tries to guess b with some distinguisher \mathcal{D} . Denote the guessing result as b' .

The guessing advantage is defined by $\text{Adv}^{\text{IND-CPA}}(\mathcal{A}, \kappa) = |\Pr(b' = 1|b = 1) - \Pr(b' = 1|b = 0)|$.

Definition 2. We say this protocol is IND-CPA secure against quantum adversaries if for any BQP adversary \mathcal{A} which can run quantum circuit as the distinguisher, there exists a negligible function negl such that $\text{Adv}^{\text{IND-CPA}}(\mathcal{A}, \kappa) = \text{negl}(\kappa)$.

Note that the IND-CPA against quantum adversary is the security of protocol against an adversary who has the quantum computing ability but can only run the protocol classically.

A related concept is key dependent message(KDM) security, which was raised in [5] and developed in several papers[2].

Definition 3. The KDM-CPA game is defined similar to the IND-CPA game, while the client is allowed to query the encryption oracle with a function $f \in \mathcal{F}$, a message m , and an index i of the keys, and the encryption oracle will return $\text{Enc}_{sk_i}(f(K, m))$ or $\text{Enc}_{sk_i}(0^{|f(K, m)|})$. Note that the output of functions in \mathcal{F} should be fixed-length, otherwise $|f(K, m)|$ will not be well-defined.

Classical KDM secure encryption scheme can be constructed and proven secure in classical random oracle model, which is proved in [5].

For quantum cryptographic scheme, we use the concept of "qIND-CPA" raised in [8].

Definition 4. For a symmetric key encryption scheme, consider the following game, called "qIND-CPA game", between a challenger and an adversary \mathcal{A} :

1. The challenger runs $\text{KeyGen}(1^\kappa) \rightarrow sk$ and samples $b \leftarrow_r \{0, 1\}$.
2. The adversary gets the following oracle, whose input space is $\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{M})$, and tried it for some times:
 - (a) The adversary chooses $\rho \in \mathbb{D}(\mathcal{M} \otimes \mathcal{R})$. The adversary sends system \mathcal{M} to the oracle, and keep \mathcal{R} as the reference system.
 - (b) If $b = 0$, the oracle computes Enc on \mathcal{M} and send it to the adversary. The adversary will hold state $(\text{Enc} \otimes \text{I})(\rho)$. If $b = 1$, the oracle will encrypt $0^{|m|}$ and the adversary will get $(\text{Enc} \otimes \text{I})(0^{|m|} \otimes \rho_{\mathcal{R}})$, where $\rho_{\mathcal{R}}$ is the density operator for subsystem \mathcal{R} .
3. The adversary tries to guess b with some distinguisher \mathcal{D} . Suppose the guessing output is b' .

The guessing advantage is defined by $\text{Adv}^{\text{qIND-CPA}}(\mathcal{A}, \kappa) = |\Pr(b' = 1|b = 1) - \Pr(b' = 1|b = 0)|$.

Definition 5. We say a protocol is *qIND-CPA secure* if for any BQP adversary \mathcal{A} which can make polynomial queries to the oracle, there exists a negligible function negl such that $\text{Adv}^{\text{qIND-CPA}}(\mathcal{A}, \kappa) = \text{negl}(\kappa)$.

What's more, we call it *one-shot IND-CPA secure* if the adversary is only allowed to query the encryption oracle once.

In the definition of qIND-CPA security, the adversary can query the encryption oracle with quantum state, and he can also run quantum distinguisher.

2.3 Blind Quantum Computation and Quantum Homomorphic Encryption

We then compare the definitions of quantum homomorphic encryption and blind quantum computation. For reference, we cite [3][7][8].

Some blind quantum computation protocol is interactive, but we focus on non-interactive protocols in this paper. Under this restriction, the difference of quantum homomorphic encryption and blind quantum computation is only which party knows the circuit: in blind quantum computation, the circuit is only known by the client but not the server; in homomorphic encryption, the circuit is known by the server but not necessarily known by the client. In our paper, we use "delegation of quantum computation" to mean in our original protocol, the circuit is known by both parties.

A non-interactive blind quantum computation protocol BQC on circuits family $\mathcal{F} = \{F_n\}$ contains 4 mappings:

BQC.KeyGen($1^\kappa, 1^N, 1^L$) \rightarrow (sk): The key generation algorithm takes key length κ , input length N and circuit length L and returns the secret key.

BQC.Enc $_{sk} : \mathbb{D}(\mathcal{M}) \times \mathcal{F} \rightarrow \mathbb{D}(\mathcal{C})$. Given public key and circuit in $\mathcal{F} = \cup\{F_n\}$, maps inputs to a ciphertext.

BQC.Eval : $\mathbb{D}(\mathcal{C}) \rightarrow \mathbb{D}(\mathcal{C}')$. Maps the ciphertext to another ciphertext, follows the instructions which may be contained in \mathcal{C} .

BQC.Dec $_{sk} : \mathbb{D}(\mathcal{C}') \rightarrow \mathbb{D}(\mathcal{M}')$. Decrypt the ciphertext and store the output in \mathcal{M}

Here we put N, L into the KeyGen algorithm, which are needed in our protocol. In quantum computation delegation, the definition of encryption is replaced by Enc $_{sk}^C : \mathbb{D}(\mathcal{M}) \rightarrow \mathbb{D}(\mathcal{C})$, and the evaluation is replaced by Eval C .

When designing quantum homomorphic encryption or blind quantum computation protocols, one factor that we care about is the "quantum resources" on the client side. The "quantum resources" can be defined as the sum of the cost of the following: (1)the number of quantum memory that the client needs; (2)the size of quantum circuit that the client needs to apply; (3)the quantum communication that the client needs to make. Note that if the input(or computation, communication) is partly quantum and partly classical, we only consider the quantum part. Since the classical part is usual much easier to implement than the quantum part, as long as the classical part is polynomial, it's reasonable to say we can ignore it and only consider the complexity of quantum resources.(One

exception is communication within the protocol: if the server needs to hold a big quantum state while classical communication in the protocol "blocks" the quantum computation on the server side, it will be a huge burden.)

2.4 Garbled Table

We make a simple introduction of Yao's garbled table construction[22] here.

Garbled table is a powerful technique for randomized encodings of functions. When constructing the garbled table of some circuit C , we will pick two keys for each wire, and denote them as k_b^w , where $b \in \{0, 1\}$, and w is the index of wires.

The garbled table is based on a verifiable symmetric key encryption scheme. For gate g , suppose its input wires are w_1, w_2 , and the output wires are v . We construct the following table:

$$\text{Enc}_{k_0^{w_1}, k_0^{w_2}}(k_{g(0,0)}^v) \quad (2)$$

$$\text{Enc}_{k_0^{w_1}, k_1^{w_2}}(k_{g(0,1)}^v) \quad (3)$$

$$\text{Enc}_{k_1^{w_1}, k_0^{w_2}}(k_{g(1,0)}^v) \quad (4)$$

$$\text{Enc}_{k_1^{w_1}, k_1^{w_2}}(k_{g(1,1)}^v) \quad (5)$$

And we pick a random permutation in S_4 to shuffle them.

If we are given the garbled table for some gate, and give a pair of input keys, we can evaluate the output keys in this way: first try each line in the garbled table and see whether the given keys pass the verification. If they pass, use it to decrypt this line and get the output keys.

By providing the input keys and the garbled table for each gate in the circuit, we can evaluate the output keys for the whole circuit. And if we provide the mapping from the output keys to the corresponding value: $k_b^w \rightarrow b$, the server will know the output of circuit C on wire w on this input, but the value on other wires will be hidden. So the garbled circuit construction allows us to delegate the evaluation of C to the server with an NC^0 client.

2.5 Quantum Random Oracle Model

A classical random oracle is an oracle which all parties can query, returns independent random value for different inputs, and returns fixed value for the same input. In practice, a random oracle is usually replaced by a hash function.

A quantum random oracle is a random oracle that allows the user to query it with quantum state. It can do the map $\mathcal{H} : |a\rangle|b\rangle \rightarrow |a\rangle|\mathcal{H}(a) \oplus b\rangle$. Quantum random oracle is studied in several papers[6][21].

Classical symmetric key KDM secure encryption scheme can be constructed in classical random oracle model[5]. But its security in quantum random oracle model has not been studied yet. In this paper we give such a proof.

This paper will focus on the quantum encryption protocols in the quantum random oracle model. What's more, in our proof, the random oracle doesn't need to be programmable.

3 A New Encoding Scheme of Quantum States

Let's first introduce our new encoding scheme, Et , to "hide" the quantum state. For each qubit in the input, we pick two random different keys $k_0, k_1 \in \{0, 1\}^\kappa$ and encode the input qubits with the following operator:

$$\text{Et}_{k_0, k_1} : |0\rangle \rightarrow |k_0\rangle, |1\rangle \rightarrow |k_1\rangle$$

The dimensions of two sides are not the same, but we can add some auxiliary qubits on the left side. As long k_0, k_1 are distinct, the operator is unitary.

For pure quantum state $|\varphi\rangle = \sum \alpha_{i_1 i_2 \dots i_N} |i_1 i_2 \dots i_N\rangle$, given key set $K = \{k_i^n\}$, where $n \in [N]$, $i \in \{0, 1\}$, if we use this operator on each qubit, and encode the n th qubit with keys $\{k_0^n, k_1^n\}$, we will get:

$$\text{Et}_K |\varphi\rangle = \sum \alpha_{i_1 i_2 \dots i_n} |k_{i_1}^{(1)} k_{i_2}^{(2)} \dots k_{i_n}^{(N)}\rangle$$

A direct calculation shows that if the keys are long enough, chosen randomly and kept secret, this encoding is statistically secure, which means, the mixed state after we take average on all the possible keys, are close to a completely mixed state with exponentially small distance:

Lemma 1. *Suppose $\rho \in \mathbb{D}(\mathcal{S} \otimes \mathcal{R})$, $\mathcal{S} = (\mathbb{C}^2)^{\otimes N}$. Suppose we apply the Et operation with key length κ only on system \mathcal{S} , and take average on all the valid keys, we get*

$$\sigma = \frac{1}{(2^\kappa(2^\kappa - 1))^N} \sum_{\forall n \in [N], k_0^n, k_1^n \in \{0, 1\}^\kappa, k_0^n \neq k_1^n} (\text{Et}_{\{k_i^n\}}^{\mathcal{S}} \otimes \mathbb{1})(\rho)$$

we have $\Delta(\sigma, (\frac{1}{2^{\kappa N}} \mathbb{1}) \otimes \text{tr}_{\mathcal{S}}(\rho)) \leq (\frac{1}{2})^{\kappa-4} N$

We put the proof in the appendix.

Since Et is a unitary mapping, given K and $\text{Et}_K(\rho)$, we can apply the inverse of Et and get ρ : $\text{Et}_K^{-1}(\text{Et}_K(\rho)) = \rho$. Note that when applying Et we enlarge the space by appending auxiliary qubits, and when applying Et^{-1} we remove these auxiliary qubits.

Fact 1 *Et can be implemented with only CNOT operations.*

Proof. First implement mapping $|0\rangle \rightarrow |0^\kappa\rangle, |1\rangle \rightarrow |k_0 \oplus k_1\rangle$. This can be done by CNOT the input into the places where $k_0 \oplus k_1$ has bit value 1. Then use X gate on the places where k_0 has bit value 1. This will xor k_0 into the registers and complete the mapping $|0\rangle \rightarrow |k_0\rangle, |1\rangle \rightarrow |k_1\rangle$.

3.1 Quantum Public Key Encryption Scheme Based on Et Encoding

Based on the Et operator, we can define a public key quantum encryption scheme. The scheme can be based on any classical public key encryption scheme CLPK which is IND-CPA secure against quantum attacker. The public key quantum encryption scheme, which we call QPK, will pick several random bitstrings, use it as the randomness in Et operator, and use CLPK to encrypt the randomness:

QPK.KeyGen(1^κ): Output $pk, sk \leftarrow \text{CLPK.KeyGen}(1^\kappa)$
 QPK.Enc $_{pk}(\rho)$: Sample $K = \{r_0^n, r_1^n\}_{n=1}^N$, where N is the length of inputs,
 $r_i^n \leftarrow_r \{0, 1\}^\kappa$. Output $(\text{Et}_K(\rho), \text{CLPK.Enc}_{pk}(K))$
 QPK.Dec $_{sk}((\rho, c))$: Compute $K \leftarrow \text{CLPK.Dec}_{sk}(c)$, output $\text{Et}_K^{-1}(\rho)$

Note that this encryption scheme does not require the ability to apply phase gate. And the security can be based on a reasonable assumption:

Theorem 2. *If CLPK is IND-CPA secure against quantum attacker, QPK above is qIND-CPA secure.*

We can also try to add some other gadgets in the ciphertext to achieve more complicated cryptographic scheme. In the following section, we will use this encoding to design a quantum computation delegation protocol.

4 A Quantum Computation Delegation Protocol for C+P Circuits

4.1 C+P Circuits

[19] defined "almost classical" circuit. Here we rename it to "C+P" circuit.

Definition 6 ([19]). *C+P is the family of quantum circuits which are composed of Toffoli gates and diagonal gates.*

Fact 2 *Any C+P circuit can be decomposed to Toffoli gates and single qubit phase gates. Furthermore, it can be approximated by Toffoli gates and single qubit phase gates of the form $R_Z(\frac{\pi}{n}) = |0\rangle\langle 0| + \omega_n |1\rangle\langle 1|$, $n \in \mathbb{N}_+$, where ω_n is the n th root of unity. To approximate a circuit of length L of Toffoli gates and single qubit phase gates to precision ϵ , we can only use Toffoli gates and gates $R_Z(\frac{\pi}{2^d})$, $d \in [D]$, where $D = \Theta(\log \frac{L}{\epsilon})$.*

We will consider D as a fixed value in this paper. Since ϵ depends exponentially on D , a small D in practice should be enough and it will at most add a logarithmic term in the complexity.

4.2 Construction of the Protocol

The idea comes from the Yao's Garbled Circuit construction. We have discussed the construction in section 2.4. The garbled circuit construction is commonly used for randomized encoding, but we find it can be revised for quantum computation delegation. Let's first discuss the idea briefly.

If we try to use garbled table construction on a quantum circuit, the first problem is, the classical garbled circuit is not reversible, and it's not possible to use it to implement the quantum operations. But there is a direct fix: when constructing the garbled tables, instead of just creating one table for each gate, we construct two tables, in one table we encrypt the output keys with the input

keys, and in the other table we encrypt the input keys with the output keys! This will make the garbled circuit reversible, which means, the garbled circuit mapping can be applied on quantum state unitarily.

But another problem arises: If we construct a "reversible garbled circuit" in this way, it's not secure any more. But it turns out, if we remove the output mapping(which is used in randomized encoding to map the output keys to the plaintext of output), it will become secure again, under some reasonable assumptions. And that will give us a delegation protocol, which is what we want. The full protocol is specified in Protocol 1, and let's first explain it with more details.

Toffoli gates: reversible garbled table First recall that in the classical garbled circuit, the evaluation operation on each garbled gate takes the input keys as the inputs and computes the keys in the output wires. This mapping is classical, and there is a standard way to transform classical mapping to quantum mappings, by introducing auxiliary output registers, and keeping the input:

$$U : |k_{in}\rangle |c\rangle \xrightarrow{\text{garbled gate}} |k_{in}\rangle |k_{out} \oplus c\rangle \quad (6)$$

Where k_{in} is the input keys, and k_{out} is the corresponding output keys. We use the second register as the output register, and c is the original value in the output register. This mapping compute the output keys from the garbled table and xor it to the second register.

This mapping is unitary, and we can also put entangled state in the left hand of (6). But the problem is, if you use the it directly on a quantum state, the input and output will be entangled together. Explicitly, for a specific Toffoli gate, we use $k_u^{w1}, k_v^{w2}, k_w^{w3}$ to denote the keys of the input wires $w1, w2, w3$ and which corresponds to the input (u, v, w) ; for the output part we can write $k_u^{v1}, k_v^{v2}, k_w^{v3}$. If we use (6) directly, we will get:

$$\begin{aligned} U : & |k_u^{w1}\rangle |k_v^{w2}\rangle |k_w^{w3}\rangle |c_1\rangle |c_2\rangle |c_3\rangle \\ & \rightarrow |k_u^{w1}\rangle |k_v^{w2}\rangle |k_w^{w3}\rangle |k_u^{v1} \oplus c_1\rangle |k_v^{v2} \oplus c_2\rangle |k_w^{v3} \oplus c_3\rangle \end{aligned}$$

But what we need is the following mapping:

$$U : |k_u^{w1}\rangle |k_v^{w2}\rangle |k_w^{w3}\rangle \rightarrow |k_u^{v1}\rangle |k_v^{v2}\rangle |k_w^{v3} \oplus uv\rangle$$

Which means, we need to disentangle and erase the input registers from the output registers.

Remember for each Toffoli gate there are eight possible combinations of input keys, and this mapping should work for all the eight combinations.

To erase the input from the output, we need two mappings: $|k_{in}\rangle |0\rangle \rightarrow |k_{in}\rangle |k_{out}\rangle$ and $|k_{in}\rangle |k_{out}\rangle \rightarrow |0\rangle |k_{out}\rangle$. Both operations have the same form as equation (6). (For the second step, we could view the k_{out} as input, k_{in} as c , and get $|k_{out}\rangle |k_{in} \oplus k_{in}\rangle$) So we need two garbled tables for this "reversible garbled table"!

So instead of computing $\text{CL.Enc}_{k_{in}}(k_{out})$ as in the original garbled table scheme, for each gate and each input-output pair, we will compute:

$$\text{CL.Enc}_{k_{in}}(k_{out}) \quad \text{CL.Enc}_{k_{out}}(k_{in})$$

where CL is some verifiable multiple key encryption scheme.

And we put the $\text{CL.Enc}_{k_{in}}(k_{out})$ given above into a table (there are eight input-output key pairs so there are eight rows in this table), and shuffle them randomly; and we do the same thing for $\text{CL.Enc}_{k_{out}}(k_{in})$ above. So we get two tables for each gate. We will use the first table to apply the map $|k_{in}\rangle|0\rangle \rightarrow |k_{in}\rangle|k_{out}\rangle$, and use the second table to compute the input from the output keys, which when applied on $|k_{in}\rangle|k_{out}\rangle$, will "erase" the input and implement the mapping $|k_{in}\rangle|k_{out}\rangle \rightarrow |0\rangle|k_{out}\rangle$.

Then let's design the encoding of inputs. Recall that in the normal garbled table construction, we encrypt each bit in the inputs with mapping:

$$0 \rightarrow k_0, 1 \rightarrow k_1 \tag{7}$$

To make it quantum, instead of replacing the classical inputs with the corresponding keys, we use Et operator to hide the inputs. And we notice that (7) is a special case of Et where the input is classical!

Phase gates Now we can evaluate the Toffoli gates. But what if we meet a phase gate?

From Fact 2, we only need to consider the single qubit phase gate in the form of $R_Z(\frac{\pi}{n}), n \in \mathbb{Z}_+$. Suppose we want to implement such a gate on some wire, where the keys are k_0, k_1 , which correspond to value 0 and 1, as discussed in the last subsection.

To implement $R_Z(\frac{\pi}{n})$, we first pick a random integer $m \in \mathbb{Z}_n$. What we will do is to create a table of two rows, put $\text{CL.Enc}_{k_0}(c)$ and $\text{CL.Enc}_{k_1}(c+1)$ into the table and shuffle it. When we need to evaluate $R_Z(\frac{\pi}{n})$, we will first decrypt the garbled table and store the output on an auxiliary register $|0\rangle$. So we can implement the following transformation:

$$|k_0\rangle \rightarrow |k_0\rangle|m\rangle, |k_1\rangle \rightarrow |k_1\rangle|m+1\rangle \tag{8}$$

This step is similar to implementing equation (6).

Then we apply a "qudit Z gate" $\sum_i \omega_n^i |i\rangle\langle i|$ on the second register, where $i \in \mathbb{Z}_n$ goes through all the integers in \mathbb{Z}_n . (This operation can be done efficiently.) This will give us:

$$|k_0\rangle \rightarrow \omega_n^m |k_0\rangle|m\rangle, |k_1\rangle \rightarrow \omega_n^{m+1} |k_1\rangle|m+1\rangle$$

Then we apply (8) again to erase the second register. After removing the global phase the result is the same as the output of applying a phase gate $R_Z(\frac{\pi}{n}) = |0\rangle\langle 0| + \omega_n |1\rangle\langle 1|$.

What's more, since m is chosen randomly the garbled gate won't reveal the keys. The security proof can be found in Section 6.

4.3 Protocol Design

Based on these subprotocols, the protocol GBC can be formalized as follows. Notice that, we index the wires in the circuit in this way: If two wires are separated by a single qubit phase gate, we consider them as the same wire; if they are disjoint or separated by a Toffoli gate, they are different wires. For a circuit with N input bits and L gates, the number of wires is at most $N + 3L$.

Protocol 1 *The GBC protocol, with CL being the underlying classical encryption scheme, for circuit C which is composed of Toffoli gates and phase gates in the form of $R_Z(\frac{x}{n})$:*

Key Generation $\text{GBC.KeyGen}(1^\kappa, 1^N, 1^L)$: Sample keys $K = (k_b^l)$,
 $k_b^l \leftarrow \text{CL.KeyGen}(1^\kappa, b \in \{0, 1\}, l \in [N + 3L])$.

Encryption $\text{GBC.Enc}_K^C(\rho)$: Initialize r as an empty string to store the output. Suppose C only contains Toffoli and single qubit phase gates. Output $= (\text{Et}_{K_{in}}(\rho), \text{TAB}_{\text{CL}}^C(K))$. Note that with reference system, the mapping is $(\mathbb{1} \otimes \text{Et}_{K_{in}})(\rho_{RS})$

Evaluation $\text{GBC.Eval}^C((\rho_q, \text{tabs}))$: Output $\text{EvalTAB}_{\text{CL}}^C(\rho_q, \text{tab}(g))$

Decryption $\text{GBC.Dec}_K(\sigma)$: Suppose the output key in K is K_{out} . Apply the map $\text{Et}_{K_{out}}^{-1}(\cdot)$ on σ and return the result.

Where $\text{TAB}_{\text{CL}}^C(K)$ and $\text{EvalTAB}_{\text{CL}}^C(\rho_q, \text{tab}(g))$ is defined as follows:

Protocol 2 $\text{TAB}_{\text{CL}}^C(K)$, where K is the set of keys:

Suppose circuit C has gates $(g_i)_{i=1}^L$, compute and return $(\text{tab}_{g_i})_{i=1}^L$, where tab_g is defined as follows:

1. If g is a Toffoli gate: Suppose g has controlled input wires w_1, w_2 and target wire w_3 , and the corresponding output wires are v_1, v_2, v_3 . Suppose the corresponding keys in K are $\{k_b^w\}, w \in \{w_1, w_2, w_3, v_1, v_2, v_3\}, b \in \{0, 1\}$: Create table1 as follows: For each triple $u, v, w \in \{0, 1\}^3$, add the following as a row:

$$\text{CL.Enc}_{k_u^{w_1}, k_v^{w_2}, k_w^{w_3}}(k_u^{v_1} || k_v^{v_2} || k_w^{v_3 \oplus uv})$$

and pick a random permutation in S_8 to shuffle this table.

Create table2 as follows: For each triple $u, v, w \in \{0, 1\}^3$, add the following as a row:

$$\text{CL.Enc}_{k_u^{v_1}, k_v^{v_2}, k_w^{v_3}}(k_u^{w_1} || k_v^{w_2} || k_w^{w_3})$$

and pick another random permutation in S_8 to shuffle this table. Return (table1, table2)

2. If g is a phase gate, Suppose g is a phase gate $R_Z(\frac{x}{n})$ on wire w : Sample $m_0 \leftarrow_r \mathbb{Z}_n, m_1 = m_0 + 1$. Create table as follows: For each $u \in \{0, 1\}$, add the following as a row:

$$\text{CL.Enc}_{k_u^w}(m_u)$$

and pick a random permutation in S_2 to shuffle this table. Return table.

Protocol 3 EvalTAB_{CL}^C(ρ, tab):

Suppose circuit C has gates $(g_i)_{i=1}^L$. For each gate g in C , whose corresponding garbled gate is tab_g in tab :

If g is a Toffoli gate, with input wires $w1, w2, w3$, output wires $v1, v2, v3$: Suppose $\text{tab}_g = (\text{tab1}, \text{tab2})$, where tab1 is the table from input keys to output keys, and tab2 is from output keys to input keys. Suppose $\rho \in \mathbb{D}(\mathcal{S}_g \otimes \mathcal{S}')$, where \mathcal{S}_g is the system that is currently storing the keys on the input wires of g , and \mathcal{S}' is the remaining systems:

1. Introduce three auxiliary registers and denote the system as \mathcal{S}'_g . Use tab1 to apply the following mapping on \mathcal{S}_g , as discussed in the Section 4.2:

$$|k_u^{w1}\rangle |k_v^{w2}\rangle |k_w^{w3}\rangle |0\rangle |0\rangle |0\rangle \rightarrow |k_u^{w1}\rangle |k_v^{w2}\rangle |k_w^{w3}\rangle |k_u^{v1}\rangle |k_v^{v2}\rangle |k_{w\oplus uv}^{v3}\rangle$$

2. Use tab2 to apply the following mapping on $\mathcal{S}_g \otimes \mathcal{S}'_g$, as discussed in the section 4.2:

$$|k_u^{w1}\rangle |k_v^{w2}\rangle |k_w^{w3}\rangle |k_u^{v1}\rangle |k_v^{v2}\rangle |k_{w\oplus uv}^{v3}\rangle \rightarrow |0\rangle |0\rangle |0\rangle |k_u^{v1}\rangle |k_v^{v2}\rangle |k_{w\oplus uv}^{v3}\rangle$$

3. Remove system \mathcal{S}_g , rename \mathcal{S}'_g as \mathcal{S}_g . Denote the final state as the new ρ .

If g is a phase gate in the form of $R_Z(\pi/2^d)$, applied on wire w : Suppose $\rho \in \mathbb{D}(\mathcal{S}_g \otimes \mathcal{S}')$, where \mathcal{S}_g is the system that is currently storing the keys on the input wires of g , and \mathcal{S}' is the remaining systems:

1. Use tab_g to apply the mapping $|k^w\rangle |0\rangle \rightarrow |k^w\rangle |m\rangle$, where m is the decryption output.
2. Apply $\sum_i \omega_n^i |i\rangle \langle i|$ on the system of m .
3. Apply the mapping $|k^w\rangle |m\rangle \rightarrow |k^w\rangle |0\rangle$ again to erase m .

The following two theorems summarize its correctness and efficiency:

Theorem 3. Protocol GBC is a correct non-interactive quantum computation delegation protocol for $C+P$ circuits.

Theorem 4. In GBC protocol, the quantum resources required on the client side are $O(\kappa N_q)$ CNOT gates, where κ stands for the key length used in the protocol, N_q is the number of quantum registers in the input, and independent to the circuit to be evaluated.

Here we use N_q instead of N because we want to consider the case where some part of the input is classical and some part of it is quantum. To make the protocol secure we may need to choose κ depending on N_q . This is discussed with more details in Section 6.

This means the amount of quantum resources of this protocol is independent of the circuit to be evaluated! In practice the circuit may be a large polynomial of the input length, and our protocol will not be affected by this.

4.4 Relation to Impossibility Results

There are several impossibility results on delegation of quantum computation, for example, [24][1]. [24] gives us a limit on IT-secure QHE, and their result can be applied to C+P gates. That might make us think that delegation of quantum computation on C+P gates must rely on trapdoor one-way functions, but our protocol bypasses the limit in two ways: (1) making the circuit public; (2) using quantum random oracle. In practice, these conditions don't affect the usability too much; but they lead to something different, and lots of open questions arise here. (See Section 9 for further discussion.)

5 KDM Security of Classical Encryption against Quantum Attack

To prove the security, we will need to first discuss the key dependent message security (KDM security). As we can see, in GBC we encrypt the output keys with the input keys and encrypt the input keys with the output keys. That means usual security is not enough and we need at least KDM security. In this paper we will discuss it in the quantum random oracle model.

KDM security is raised and discussed in several papers, for example, [5][2]. It's already known that classical KDM secure encryption scheme can be constructed in random oracle model [5], and some papers constructed KDM secure protocol in standard models, based on some hard problems, for example, Learning-With-Error.

In our work we need a weaker form of usual definition of KDM security. In the previous research, KDM security is usually defined adaptively, which means, the adversary can make encryption queries after he has received some ciphertext. But in our work we only need to consider the non-adaptive setting. What's more, we only need to consider the symmetric key case. To summarize, the game between the adversary and the challenger can be defined as:

Definition 7 (naSymKDM Game). *This definition is parameterized by a family \mathcal{F} of classical functions. A symmetric key non-adaptive KDM game naSymKDM for function family \mathcal{F} against quantum adversary \mathcal{A} in the quantum random oracle model with parameter (κ, L, T, q) is defined as follows.*

1. First, the challenger chooses bit $b \leftarrow_r \{0, 1\}$ and samples $K = \{sk_i\}_{i=1}^L$, $sk_i \leftarrow \text{KeyGen}(1^\kappa)$.
2. The adversary and the challenger do the following T times, and these are done non-adaptively, which means, the challenger will only send out the answer in the second step after he has received all the queries:
 - (a) The adversary picks index i , function $f \in \mathcal{F}$ and message $msg \in \{0, 1\}^*$, and send them to the challenger. The size of msg should be compatible with f .
 - (b) If $b = 1$, the oracle outputs $c = \text{Enc}_{sk_i}(f(K, msg))$ to the adversary. If $b = 0$, the oracle outputs $c = \text{Enc}_{sk_i}(0^{|f(K, msg)|})$.

3. The adversary tries to guess b by using distinguisher \mathcal{D} and output b' . \mathcal{D} is a quantum operation and can query the oracle with quantum states. Suppose \mathcal{D} will query the random oracle for at most q times.

f can also query the random oracle, and it only makes queries in classical states. What's more, the output of functions in \mathcal{F} should has a fixed length, otherwise $|f(K, m)|$ will not be well-defined.

The guessing advantage is defined as $\text{Adv}_{\mathcal{F}}^{\text{naSymKDM}}(\mathcal{A}_{(L,T,q)}, \kappa) = |\Pr(b' = 1|b = 1) - \Pr(b' = 1|b = 0)|$.

Definition 8. A symmetric key encryption scheme is nonadaptive KDM secure for circuit \mathcal{F} against quantum adversaries in the quantum random oracle model if for any BQP adversary,

$$\text{Adv}_{\mathcal{F}}^{\text{naSymKDM}}(\mathcal{A}_{(L(\kappa), T(\kappa), q(\kappa))}, \kappa) = \text{negl}(\kappa)$$

Where $L(\kappa), T(\kappa), q(\kappa)$ are all polynomial function that depends on the choices the adversary.

5.1 KDM Secure Protocols in the Quantum Random Oracle Model

Based on the quantum random oracle model, we can give a construction of the classical KDM secure encryption scheme KDMP. Here "classical" means the encryption and decryption are purely classical. But the distinguisher may query the quantum random oracle in superposition.

Protocol 4 We can construct a verifiable symmetric KDM secure encryption scheme KDMP in the quantum random oracle model, where we denote the random oracle as \mathcal{H} :

KDMP.KeyGen(1^κ): output $sk \leftarrow_r \{0, 1\}^\kappa$
 KDMP.Enc $_{sk}(m)$: $R_1, R_2 \leftarrow_r \{0, 1\}^\kappa$, output ciphertext $c = (R_1, \mathcal{H}(sk||R_1) \oplus m)$, key tag $(R_2, \mathcal{H}(sk||R_2))$
 KDMP.Dec $_{sk}(c)$: output $\mathcal{H}(sk||c_1) \oplus c_2$, where c_1 and c_2 are from $c = (c_1, c_2)$.
 KDMP.Ver(k, tag): suppose $tag = (tag1, tag2)$, Output 1 if $\mathcal{H}(k||tag1) = tag2$, and \perp otherwise.

Since the execution of this protocol is classical, the correctness can be proved classically and is obvious. We refer to [5] here and write it out explicitly for convenience.

Theorem 5 (Correctness). KDMP is a correct verifiable symmetric key encryption scheme in the quantum random oracle model.

The security under classical random oracle model has been proven. But here we study the quantum random oracle, so although the protocol is almost the same, we still need to give a new proof.

Theorem 6 (Security). Define $\mathcal{F}[q']$ as the set of classical functions that queries the random oracle at most q' times. For any adversary which can query the random oracle q times (either with classical or quantum inputs), then

$$\text{Adv}_{\text{KDMP}, \mathcal{F}[q']}^{\text{naSymKDM}}(\mathcal{A}_{(L, T, q)}, \kappa) \leq \text{poly}(q, q', L, T) 2^{-0.5\kappa}$$

where poly is a fixed polynomial.

The proof is similar to the optimality of Grover's algorithm, and we put it in the appendix.

6 Security of GBC Protocol

6.1 Construction of the Underlying Classical Encryption Scheme

Protocol 5 The underlying multi-key encryption scheme CL construction in the quantum random oracle model is defined as:

CL.KeyGen(1^κ): output $sk \leftarrow_r \{0, 1\}^\kappa$

CL.Enc $_{k_1, k_2, k_3}(m)$: $R_1, R_2, R_3, R_4, R_5, R_6 \leftarrow_r \{0, 1\}^\kappa$, output

$$\begin{aligned} & (R_1, R_2, R_3, \mathcal{H}(k_1||R_1) \oplus \mathcal{H}(k_2||R_2) \oplus \mathcal{H}(k_3||R_3) \oplus m), & (9) \\ & ((R_4, \mathcal{H}(k_1||R_4)), (R_5, \mathcal{H}(k_2||R_5)), (R_6, \mathcal{H}(k_3||R_6))) & (10) \end{aligned}$$

where \mathcal{H} is the quantum random oracle.

CL.Dec $_{k_1, k_2, k_3}(c)$: Suppose $c = (R_1, R_2, R_3, c_4)$. Output $(\mathcal{H}(k_1||R_1) \oplus \mathcal{H}(k_2||R_2) \oplus \mathcal{H}(k_3||R_3) \oplus c_4)$.

CL.Ver(k, i, c): Suppose the i th key tag in c is $\text{tag}_i = (R_i, r)$. Output 1 if $r = \mathcal{H}(k||R_i)$, and \perp otherwise.

Note that this is very similar to Protocol 4, except that this is multi-key and Protocol 4 is single-key. We will use it as the underlying scheme of GBC.

6.2 Security of GBC against Classical or Quantum Attack

Proposition 1. GBC_{CL} is one-shot IND-CPA secure against quantum adversary in the quantum random oracle model. Explicitly, if the distinguisher of the adversary makes at most q queries to the quantum random oracle, the input size is N and the size of circuit C is L ,

$$\text{Adv}_{\text{GBC}_{\text{CL}}}^{\text{IND-CPA}}(\mathcal{A}, \kappa) \leq \text{poly}(q, N, L) 2^{-0.5\kappa}$$

Where poly is a fixed polynomial that does not depend on \mathcal{A} or the parameters.

But we meet some difficulty when we try to prove the qIND-CPA security. We leave it as a conjecture:

Conjecture 2. GBC_{CL} is one-shot qIND-CPA secure in the quantum random oracle model.

But if we use a bigger key length, we can prove its security.

Theorem 7. *Suppose N_q is the size of inputs that is in quantum states, in the quantum random oracle model, GBC_{CL} is one-shot qIND-CPA secure when we take $\kappa \geq 4N_q$ and consider $\kappa' = \kappa - 4N_q$ as the security parameter, where κ is the key length. Which means, for any BQP adversary \mathcal{A} , there exists a negligible function negl :*

$$\text{Adv}_{\text{GBC}_{\text{CL}}}^{\text{qIND-CPA}}(\mathcal{A}, \kappa) = \text{negl}(\kappa - 4N_q)$$

Although we can't give a proof for Conjecture 2, we conjecture it is true, since this protocol seems to be a very natural generalization from classical to quantum. We leave it as an open problem. But from Theorem 7 we know when we take $\kappa \geq 4N_q$ and consider $\kappa - 4N_q$ as the security parameter the protocol is provable secure. And in this case, if $L = \omega(N_q^2)$, the quantum resources for the client to run this protocol are still smaller than that to evaluate the circuit himself.

What's more, we claim that this protocol is still secure when we replace the random oracle with practical hash functions:

Conjecture 3. When we replace the quantum random oracle in GBC_{CL} with practical hash functions, like the SHA-3 or AES, its security still holds.

6.3 Security Proof

Proof of IND-CPA security of Protocol 1 In this subsection we will prove Proposition 1. The proof starts from Theorem 6, which is about KDM security for general KDM function. Note that definition of IND-CPA security for protocol GBC has an important difference from the KDM game security: in GBC we are trying to say the input of Et is hidden, but KDM security is about the encrypted messages in the garbled table. So it doesn't follow from the security of KDMP protocol trivially.

First, let's prove a lemma. To handle the case that there are some revealed keys in the GBC game, we introduce the following game, which we called "rG" game, which is the starting point of our proof, and whose security can be proved from Theorem 6.

Lemma 2. *Let's first define an intermediate game for CL. Let's call restricted game rG, with parameters $(N, L, J, q), \kappa$:*

1. *The challenger chooses bit $b \leftarrow \{0, 1\}$ and samples $(sk_i)_{i=1}^L, sk_i \leftarrow \text{KeyGen}(1^\kappa)$*
2. *The adversary picks (1) a set of pairs $P = \{(S_j, T_j)\}_{j=1}^J$, where S_j, T_j are all tuples of indexes, $\forall j, S_j \subseteq [L], T_j \subseteq [L], |S_j| = |T_j| = 3$ or $|S_j| = 1, |T_j| = 0$; (2) a sequence of messages $M = (m_1, m_2, \dots, m_J)$; (3) index set $\text{Rev} = \{rid_s\}_{s=1}^N, rid_s \in [L]$.*
Define $\text{Closure}(\text{Rev})$ as the minimum set that satisfies:
(1) $\text{Rev} \subseteq \text{Closure}(\text{Rev})$; (2) $\forall (S_j, T_j) \in P$, if $S_j \subseteq \text{Closure}(\text{Rev})$, then $T_j \subseteq \text{Closure}(\text{Rev})$.

3. The challenger sends a set of secret keys $\{sk_{rid}\}$, $rid \in Rev$ to the adversary. And for all $i \in [J]$, the challenger also sends:

$$\text{CL.Enc}_{sk_{S_i}}(sk_{T_i} || m_i), \text{ if } b = 1 \text{ or } S_i \subseteq \text{Closure}(Rev) \quad (11)$$

$$\text{CL.Enc}_{sk_{S_i}}(0^{|sk_{T_i}||m_i|}), \text{ otherwise} \quad (12)$$

Here we use sk_{S_i} as the abbreviation of the three keys used for encryption whose indexes are in S_i , and use sk_{T_i} to denote the concatenation of keys whose indexes are in T_i .

4. The adversary tries to guess b with some distinguisher \mathcal{D} , which will query the random oracle (either in classical or quantum states) q times.

The guess advantage is defined as $\text{Adv}_{\text{CL}}^{rG}(\mathcal{A}_{(N,L,J,q)}, \kappa) = |\Pr(b' = 1 | b = 1) - \Pr(b' = 1 | b = 0)|$.

We have $\text{Adv}_{\text{CL}}^{rG}(\mathcal{A}_{(N,L,J,q)}, \kappa) = \text{poly}(q, L, J)2^{-0.5\kappa}$, where poly is a polynomial that does not depend on \mathcal{A} or the parameter.

The proof is based on Theorem 6 and is postponed to the appendix.

Now we can prove Proposition 1 from Lemma 2.

Proof (Proof of Proposition 1). Note that, what the adversary gets in this game is already very similar to the ciphertext in Protocol 1 when the input is classical. So with an adversary for IND-CPA game for GBC_{CL}^C with parameter (N, L, q) , κ , which will choose $|i\rangle\langle i|$ as input and use \mathcal{D} as the distinguisher, we can design an adversary for rG with parameters $(N, 3L, 16L, q)$, κ in this way:

1. A key set $K = (k_b^i)$ is sampled. Let's reindex the key with $[3L]$. Choose Rev_i to be the set of indexes of keys revealed in $\text{Enc}_K(i)$, where i is the input string to the IND-CPA game of GBC.
2. Choose P_C and M_C corresponding to circuit C . Explicitly, each element of P_C corresponds to a row in garbled tables, and for each row in the form of $\text{CL.Enc}_{k_1, k_2, k_3}(sk)$, it corresponds to an index i such that S_i is the indexes of k_1, k_2, k_3 , and T_i is the indexes of sk , m_i is empty. And for each row in the form of $\text{CL.Enc}_k(m)$, S_i contains the index of k , and m is $m_i \in M_C$, $T_i = \emptyset$.

and define Shuffle as the operation that arranges these ciphertexts into the corresponding places in garbled tables and shuffles each table randomly. Explicitly, let's use $\text{Oracle}_b^{rG}(P_C, M_C)$ as the output of the rG game in the third step, taking average on all the randomness. Then we have

$$\text{TAB}_{\text{CL}}^C(K) = \mathbb{E}_M \text{Shuffle}(\text{Oracle}_{b=1}^{rG}(P_C, M_C))$$

$$\text{GBC}_{\text{CL}}^C.\text{Enc}_K(i) = K_{Rev_i} \otimes \text{TAB}_{\text{CL}}^C(K)$$

$$\text{GBC}_{\text{CL}}^C.\text{Enc}_K(0^N) = K_{Rev_0} \otimes \text{TAB}_{\text{CL}}^C(K)$$

This means if we have an adversary which can distinguish $\mathbb{E}_K \text{GBC.Enc}_K(i)$ and $\mathbb{E}_K \text{GBC.Enc}_K(0^N)$ by some distinguisher \mathcal{D} , we can design an adversary for rG

by first choosing the corresponding P, Rev, M and get $K_{Rev} \otimes \text{Oracle}_{b=1}^{rG}(P, M)$, apply Shuffle and then use \mathcal{D} to distinguish the two cases. Explicitly, by Lemma 2, when the input is i :

$$\begin{aligned} & |\Pr(\mathcal{D}(\mathbb{E}_K(K_{Rev_i} \otimes \text{Shuffle}(\text{Oracle}_{b=0}^{rG}(P_C, M_C)) = 1))) \\ & \quad - \Pr(\mathcal{D}(\mathbb{E}_K(K_{Rev_i} \otimes \text{Shuffle}(\text{Oracle}_{b=1}^{rG}(P_C, M_C)))) = 1)| \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

$$= \text{Adv}_{\text{CL}}^{rG}(\mathcal{A}'_{(N, 6L, 16L, q)}, \kappa) \quad (14)$$

$$\leq \text{poly}(q, N, L)2^{-0.5\kappa} \quad (15)$$

When the input is 0:

$$\begin{aligned} & |\Pr(\mathcal{D}(\mathbb{E}_K(K_{Rev_0} \otimes \text{Shuffle}(\text{Oracle}_{b=0}^{rG}(P_C, M_C)) = 1))) \\ & \quad - \Pr(\mathcal{D}(\mathbb{E}_K(K_{Rev_0} \otimes \text{Shuffle}(\text{Oracle}_{b=1}^{rG}(P_C, M_C)) = 1)))| \end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

$$= \text{Adv}_{\text{CL}}^{rG}(\mathcal{A}''_{(N, 6L, 16L, q)}, \kappa) \quad (17)$$

$$\leq \text{poly}(q, N, L)2^{-0.5\kappa} \quad (18)$$

And after shuffling the tables and taking average on all the possible keys we have

$$\begin{aligned} & |\mathbb{E}_K \mathbb{E}_M(K_{Rev_i} \otimes \text{Shuffle}(\text{Oracle}_{b=0}^{rG}(P_C, M_C))) \\ & \quad - \mathbb{E}_K \mathbb{E}_M(K_{Rev_0} \otimes \text{Shuffle}(\text{Oracle}_{b=0}^{rG}(P_C, M_C)))|_{tr} = 0 \end{aligned} \quad (19)$$

This is because the keys and the m for phase gates are all chosen randomly. Notice that we need to take average on the choices of M_C here.

And this implies

$$\text{Adv}_{\text{GBC}_{\text{CL}}}^{\text{IND-CPA}}(\mathcal{A}, \kappa) \quad (20)$$

$$= |\Pr(\mathcal{D}(\mathbb{E}_K \text{GBC.Enc}_K(i)) = 1) - \Pr(\mathcal{D}(\mathbb{E}_K \text{GBC.Enc}_K(0^N)) = 1)| \quad (21)$$

$$\begin{aligned} & = |\Pr(\mathcal{D}(\mathbb{E}_K(K_{Rev_i} \otimes \mathbb{E}_M \text{Shuffle}(\text{Oracle}_{b=1}^{rG}(P_C, M_C)) = 1))) \\ & \quad - \Pr(\mathcal{D}(\mathbb{E}_K(K_{Rev_0} \otimes \mathbb{E}_M \text{Shuffle}(\text{Oracle}_{b=1}^{rG}(P_C, M_C)))) = 1)| \end{aligned} \quad (22)$$

$$\begin{aligned} & \leq |\mathbb{E}_K \mathbb{E}_M(K_{Rev_i} \otimes \text{Shuffle}(\text{Oracle}_{b=0}^{rG}(P_C, M_C))) \\ & \quad - \mathbb{E}_K \mathbb{E}_M(K_{Rev_0} \otimes \text{Shuffle}(\text{Oracle}_{b=0}^{rG}(P_C, M_C)))|_{tr} \\ & \quad + \mathbb{E}_M |\Pr(\mathcal{D}(\mathbb{E}_K(K_{Rev_0} \otimes \text{Shuffle}(\text{Oracle}_{b=0}^{rG}(P_C, M_C)))) = 1) - \\ & \quad \Pr(\mathcal{D}(\mathbb{E}_K(K_{Rev_0} \otimes \text{Shuffle}(\text{Oracle}_{b=1}^{rG}(P_C, M_C)))) = 1)| \\ & \quad + \mathbb{E}_M |\Pr(\mathcal{D}(\mathbb{E}_K(K_{Rev_i} \otimes \text{Shuffle}(\text{Oracle}_{b=0}^{rG}(P_C, M_C)))) = 1) - \\ & \quad \Pr(\mathcal{D}(\mathbb{E}_K(K_{Rev_i} \otimes \text{Shuffle}(\text{Oracle}_{b=1}^{rG}(P_C, M_C)))) = 1)| \end{aligned} \quad (23)$$

$$\leq \text{poly}(N, L, q)2^{-0.5\kappa} \quad (24)$$

Where the last step is by (15)(18)(19).

Discussions of qIND-CPA Proving theorem 7 requires some deeper discussion in the classical settings. We need to prove the keys that are not revealed

are "hard to compute". Then we will expand the expression of qIND-CPA game advantage, write it as the sum of exponential number of terms whose form is just the probability of "computing the unrevealed keys". But since each term is exponentially small, we can still bound the whole expression.

So let's formalize the lemma.

Lemma 3. *For any C+P circuit C , $|C| = L$, any adversary that uses distinguisher \mathcal{D} can query the quantum random oracle q times (either with classical or quantum inputs), and any $i \neq j, |\varphi_i\rangle$, we have*

$$\mathbb{E}_K \mathbb{E}_R \text{tr}((\text{Et}_K |j\rangle)^\dagger \mathcal{D}(\text{Et}_K(|i\rangle \langle i| \otimes \varphi_i \otimes \text{TAB}_{\text{CL}}^C(K, R))(\text{Et}_K |j\rangle)) \leq \text{poly}(q, N, L) 2^{-0.5\kappa} \quad (25)$$

where poly is a fixed polynomial that does not depend on \mathcal{A} or the parameters, N is the size of inputs, and R denotes the randomness used in the computation of $\text{TAB}_{\text{CL}}^C(K)$, including the random oracle outputs, the random paddings and the random shuffling. And $\text{TAB}_{\text{CL}}^C(K, R)$ is the output of $\text{TAB}_{\text{CL}}^C(K)$ using randomness R , and since R is given as parameter there will be no randomness inside.

We postpone the proof into supplementary materials. This lemma means when we are given the garbled table and input keys corresponding to i , we can't compute the input keys corresponding to other input, like j . Since we have already fixed all the randomness, $\text{TAB}_{\text{CL}}^C(K, R)$ is pure.

Let's prove Theorem 7 from Proposition 1 and Lemma 3. The idea is to expand the input state in the computational basis, and expand the expression of qIND-CPA advantage. Then since the input is quantum there will be many cross terms, and each terms can be seen as the left hand side of equation (25), whose distinguisher is defined as follows: suppose the distinguisher in the qIND-CPA game is \mathcal{D} , first apply \mathcal{D} , make a projection measurement, and inverse \mathcal{D} . This will give us the bound we need.

Proof (Proof of Theorem 7). First, suppose the state that the adversary uses is $|\varphi\rangle = \sum_i c_i |i\rangle |\varphi_i\rangle$, where there are 2^{N_q} terms, $i \in [2^{N_q}]$ and $|\varphi_i\rangle$ is the state in the reference system. We can only consider pure states since we can always purify mixed states with reference system.

Then we can assume the distinguisher \mathcal{D} is a unitary operation D on the output and auxiliary qubits, followed by a measurement on a specific output qubit. So we can write $\mathcal{D}(\rho) = \text{tr}_R(D(\rho \otimes |0\rangle \langle 0|)D^\dagger)$, where $|0\rangle \langle 0|$ stands for big enough auxiliary qubits. Let's use $\mathcal{E}_{proj}(\rho)$ to denote the operation of project ρ on the computational basis. Denote the projection operator to the $|0\rangle \langle 0|$ space as P_0 , we have

$$\text{Adv}_{\text{GBC}}^{\text{qIND-CPA}}(\mathcal{A}, \kappa) \quad (26)$$

$$= |\Pr(\mathcal{D}(\mathbb{E}_K \text{GBC.Enc}_K(\varphi)) = 1) - \Pr(\mathcal{D}(\mathbb{E}_K \text{GBC.Enc}_K(0^N)) = 1)| \quad (27)$$

$$\leq |\Pr(\mathcal{D}(\mathbb{E}_K \mathbb{E}_R(\rho)) = 1) - \Pr(\mathcal{D}(\mathbb{E}_K \mathbb{E}_R(\mathcal{E}_{proj}(\rho))) = 1)| + |\Pr(\mathcal{D}(\mathbb{E}_K \text{GBC.Enc}_K(\mathcal{E}_{proj}(\varphi))) = 1) - \Pr(\mathcal{D}(\mathbb{E}_K \text{GBC.Enc}_K(0^N)) = 1)| \quad (28)$$

Here we write $\rho := (\mathbb{1} \otimes \text{Et}_K)(\varphi) \otimes \text{TAB}(K, R)$.

Let's first compute the first term.

$$\begin{aligned} & |\Pr(\mathcal{D}(\mathbb{E}_K \mathbb{E}_R(\rho)) = 1) - \Pr(\mathcal{D}(\mathbb{E}_K \mathbb{E}_R(\mathcal{E}_{proj}(\rho))) = 1)| \quad (29) \\ & = |\text{tr}(P_0(\mathbb{E}_K \mathbb{E}_R D(\rho \otimes |0\rangle \langle 0|)D^\dagger)) - \text{tr}(P_0(\mathbb{E}_K \mathbb{E}_R D(\mathcal{E}_{proj}(\rho) \otimes |0\rangle \langle 0|)D^\dagger))| \quad (30) \end{aligned}$$

The first term inside can be expanded as

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}_K \mathbb{E}_R D(\rho \otimes |0\rangle \langle 0|)D^\dagger \quad (31) \\ & = \mathbb{E}_K \mathbb{E}_R D((\mathbb{1} \otimes \text{Et}_K)(\varphi) \otimes \text{TAB}(K, R) \otimes |0\rangle \langle 0|)D^\dagger \quad (32) \\ & = \mathbb{E}_K \mathbb{E}_R D((\mathbb{1} \otimes \text{Et}_K)((\sum_i c_i |i\rangle |\varphi_i\rangle)(\sum_i c_i^\dagger \langle i| \langle \varphi_i|)) \\ & \quad (\mathbb{1} \otimes \text{Et}_K)^\dagger \otimes \text{TAB}(K, R) \otimes |0\rangle \langle 0|)D^\dagger \quad (33) \end{aligned}$$

Denote $|x_i\rangle = \text{Et}_K |i\rangle \otimes |\varphi_i\rangle$, we can simplify the expression and we have:

$$(33) = \mathbb{E}_K \mathbb{E}_R D(\sum_i c_i |x_i\rangle \sum_i c_i^\dagger \langle x_i| \otimes \text{TAB}(K, R) \otimes |0\rangle \langle 0|)D^\dagger \quad (34)$$

$$\begin{aligned} & = \mathbb{E}_K \mathbb{E}_R D(\sum_i |c_i|^2 |x_i\rangle \langle x_i| \otimes \text{TAB}(K, R) \otimes |0\rangle \langle 0|)D^\dagger \\ & \quad + \mathbb{E}_K \mathbb{E}_R D(\sum_{i \neq j} c_i c_j^\dagger |x_i\rangle \langle x_j| \otimes \text{TAB}(K, R) \otimes |0\rangle \langle 0|)D^\dagger \quad (35) \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} & = \mathbb{E}_K \mathbb{E}_R D(\mathcal{E}_{proj}(\rho) \otimes |0\rangle \langle 0|)D^\dagger \\ & \quad + \mathbb{E}_K \mathbb{E}_R D((\mathbb{1} \otimes \text{Et}_K)(\sum_{i \neq j} c_i c_j^\dagger |x_i\rangle \langle x_j| \otimes \text{TAB}(K, R) \otimes |0\rangle \langle 0|)D^\dagger \quad (36) \end{aligned}$$

Substitute it to expression (30) and we get

$$(30) \quad (37)$$

$$= |\mathbb{E}_K \mathbb{E}_R \text{tr}(P_0 D(\sum_{i \neq j} c_i c_j^\dagger |x_i\rangle \langle x_j| \otimes \text{TAB}(K, R) \otimes |0\rangle \langle 0|)D^\dagger)| \quad (38)$$

$$= |\sum_{i \neq j} c_i c_j^\dagger \mathbb{E}_K \mathbb{E}_R (\langle x_j| \langle \text{TAB}(K, R) | \langle 0| D^\dagger P_0 D(|x_i\rangle | \text{TAB}(K, R) \rangle |0\rangle)| \quad (39)$$

$$\leq \sqrt{\sum_{i \neq j} c_i^2 c_j^2} \sqrt{\sum_{i \neq j} |\mathbb{E}_K \mathbb{E}_R \langle 0| \langle \text{TAB}(K, R) | \langle x_j| D^\dagger P_0 D(|x_i\rangle \otimes | \text{TAB}(K, R) \rangle |0\rangle)|^2} \quad (40)$$

$$\leq \sqrt{\sum_{i \neq j} \mathbb{E}_K \mathbb{E}_R |(\langle 0| \otimes \langle \text{TAB}(K, R) | \langle x_j|) D^\dagger P_0 D(|x_i\rangle \otimes | \text{TAB}(K, R) \rangle |0\rangle)|^2} \quad (41)$$

By Lemma 3, consider the operation \mathcal{E} as follows: expand the space and apply D , make measurement with operators $\{P_0, P_1\}$ and apply D^\dagger . Let $\mathcal{E}_0 =$

$D^\dagger P_0 D(\cdot \otimes |0\rangle \langle 0|) D^\dagger P_0 D$, and $\mathcal{E}_1 = D^\dagger P_1 D(\cdot \otimes |0\rangle \langle 0|) D^\dagger P_1 D$ we have:

$$\mathbb{E}_K \mathbb{E}_R (\text{tr}((\text{Et}_K |j\rangle)^\dagger \mathcal{E}_0(\text{Et}_K(i) \otimes \varphi_i \otimes \text{TAB}(K, R)) \text{Et}_K |j\rangle)) \quad (42)$$

$$+ \text{tr}((\text{Et}_K |j\rangle)^\dagger \mathcal{E}_1(\text{Et}_K(|i\rangle \langle i|) \otimes \varphi_i \otimes \text{TAB}(K, R)) \text{Et}_K |j\rangle)) \quad (43)$$

$$\leq \text{poly}(q, N, L) 2^{-0.5\kappa} \quad (44)$$

With this, we can bound the inside part of (41) further:

$$\mathbb{E}_K \mathbb{E}_R |(\langle 0| \otimes \langle \text{TAB}(K, R)| \langle x_j|) D^\dagger P_0 D(|x_i\rangle \otimes |\text{TAB}(K, R)\rangle |0\rangle)|^2 \quad (45)$$

$$= \mathbb{E}_K \mathbb{E}_R |(\langle 0| \otimes \langle \text{TAB}(K, R)| (\text{Et}_K |j\rangle) \otimes |\varphi_j\rangle)^\dagger D^\dagger P_0 D(\text{Et}_K |i\rangle \otimes |\varphi_i\rangle) \otimes |\text{TAB}(K, R)\rangle |0\rangle|^2 \quad (46)$$

$$\leq \mathbb{E}_K \mathbb{E}_R \text{tr}((\text{Et}_K |j\rangle)^\dagger \mathcal{E}_0(\text{Et}_K(|i\rangle \langle i|) \otimes \varphi_i \otimes \text{TAB}(K, R) \otimes |0\rangle \langle 0|) \text{Et}_K |j\rangle) \quad (47)$$

$$\leq \text{poly}(q, N, L) 2^{-0.5\kappa} \quad (48)$$

Substitute it back to (41), we will know

$$|\Pr(\mathcal{D}(\mathbb{E}_K \mathbb{E}_R(\rho)) = 1) - \Pr(\mathcal{D}(\mathbb{E}_K \mathbb{E}_R(\mathcal{E}_{proj}(\rho))) = 1)| \quad (49)$$

$$\leq 2^{N_q} \text{poly}(q, N, L) 2^{-0.25\kappa} \quad (50)$$

The second term in (28) can be bounded by Proposition 1. $\mathcal{E}_{proj}(\rho)$ is a classical states so we have

$$|\Pr(\mathcal{D}(\mathbb{E}_K \text{GBC.Enc}_K(\mathcal{E}_{proj}(\varphi))) = 1) - \Pr(\mathcal{D}(\mathbb{E}_K \text{GBC.Enc}_K(0^N)) = 1)| \leq \text{poly}(q, N, L) 2^{-\kappa}$$

Combining these two inequalities we have

$$\text{Adv}_{\text{GBC}}^{qIND-CPA}(\mathcal{A}, \kappa) \leq \text{poly}(q, N, L) 2^{-0.25(\kappa - 4N_q)}$$

6.4 Standard Model

In the last section we prove the security in the quantum random oracle model. In practice, the random oracle can usually be replaced with hash functions, and we claim that our protocol is not an exception(Conjecture 3). The proof of Theorem 7 and Proposition 1 relies on Theorem 6, and in this protocol we only use affine functions in KDM game, thus we need at least that the hash function is secure against quantum adversary under KDM game for affine functions. Although this is a strong assumption, it's still reasonable in practice.

7 Applications

7.1 Blind Quantum Computation for C+P Circuits

Protocol 1 is a quantum computation delegation protocol. But since the circuit can be put into inputs, we can turn it into a blind quantum computation protocol.

Here "blind" means the server doesn't know either input state or the circuit to be applied. What it knows is that the circuit is a C+P circuit, and an upper bound on the circuit size. We can construct a universal machine \mathcal{O} such that for all the C+P circuit C , $C(\rho) = \mathcal{U}(C, \rho)$. What's more, we want \mathcal{U} to be C+P so that we can use our protocol.

The construction is as follows. As before, suppose C only contains Toffoli gates and phase gate $R_Z(\pi/2^d)$. We can first introduce three auxiliary wires, and convert the circuit to a circuit that only contains the gates that are (1) $R_Z(\pi/2^d)$, or (2) a SWAP operation between the normal wire and auxiliary wire, or (3) a Toffoli gate on the auxiliary wires. After converting the circuit in this way, the gates appeared in the circuit can only be within a set of $N+1+ND$ choices. That means we can describe a gate g by a string of length $(N+1+ND)$ where there is only one "1" in the string, and "0" in the remaining places. And given the description of g , the operation of \mathcal{U} is a series of controlled gate operations: N controlled SWAP operations conditioned on the first N bits of the input, controlled Toffoli operation conditioned on the next 1 bit, and controlled $R_Z(\pi/2^d)$ operations on wire n , conditioned on bit $(n, d) \in [N] \times [D]$ in the next ND bits.

We can see \mathcal{U} itself is a C+P circuit, we can delegate it by applying Protocol 1. Then the original circuit will be indistinguishable from 0^N , which means we know nothing beyond an upper bound on its size.

7.2 Adding Interactions

What's more, by making it interactive we can get a blind quantum computation protocol for universal circuits. As we discussed before, our protocol can work for C+P gates, but not H gates. Every time the circuits meet an H layer, the server can send the whole state back, the client decrypts, applies H and encrypts again, and send it to the server and continue the protocol.

[20] contains some results on the H depth of quantum circuits, and introduced the concept of "Fourier Hierarchy" (FH). Then we get

Theorem 8. *For circuits in FH_k , there is a quantum computation delegation protocol such that it's secure in the quantum random oracle model, and the client side quantum resources are $O(k(\kappa' N_q + N_q^2))$ CNOT gates (assuming Conjecture 2, $O(k\kappa' N_q)$), and requires $O(k)$ rounds of interactions.*

The number of interaction is linear to the H depth. This is different from several previous protocols, for example, [7], where the number of interactions is linear to the T depth.

7.3 Delegation of Shor's algorithm

Shor's algorithm can be viewed as two parts: first we need to apply a series of Toffoli gates on $|+\rangle^{\otimes n} \otimes |M\rangle$, where M is, for example, the number to be factored, $n = \log M$; then measure, apply quantum Fourier transform and measure

again. From [10][18] we know the quantum Fourier transform is actually easy to implement: to implement a quantum Fourier transform on n qubits, the time complexity is $\tilde{O}(n)$. The main burden of Shor's algorithm is the Toffoli part. ([18] contains an estimation on elliptic curve.) With this protocol we can let the server do the Toffoli part of Shor's algorithm without revealing the actual value of the input.

Explicitly, suppose the client wants to run Shor's algorithm on M while wants to keep M secret, the client can use the following protocol:

Protocol 6 *Protocol for delegation of Shor's algorithm:*

Suppose ShorToff is the Toffoli gate part of Shor's algorithm, and its length is L .

1. The client samples $K \leftarrow \text{GBC.KeyGen}(1^\kappa, 1^{2n}, 1^L)$. Then the client prepares $(\rho, \text{tab}) \leftarrow \text{GBC.Enc}_K^{\text{ShorToff}}(|+\rangle^{\otimes n} \otimes |M\rangle)$ and send it to the server.
2. Server evaluates $\text{GBC}_{\text{CL}}.\text{Eval}^{\text{ShorToff}}(\rho, \text{tab})$ and sends it back to the client.
3. Client decrypts with GBC.Dec_K . Then he does quantum Fourier transform himself and measures to get the final result.

So the quantum resource in the client part is only $O(\kappa n)$ CNOT gates plus $\tilde{O}(n)$ gates for quantum Fourier transform, and it can delegate Shor's algorithm to the server side securely.

Theorem 9. *Protocol 1 can be used to delegate Shor's algorithm securely and non-interactively, in quantum random oracle without assuming trapdoor one-way functions, and for n bit inputs, the amount of quantum resources on the client side is $O(\kappa'n + n^2)$ CNOT gates, and when assuming Conjecture 2, it's $\tilde{O}(\kappa'n)$.*

For comparison, if the client runs Shor's algorithm locally, even if it uses fast multiplication method, it needs $\omega(n^2)$ Toffoli gates.

8 Quantum KDM security

Definition 9. *A symmetric key non-adaptive quantum KDM game naSymQKDM for function family \mathcal{F} in the quantum random oracle model is defined as follows:*

1. The challenger chooses bit $b \leftarrow_r \{0, 1\}$ and samples $K = \{sk_i\}_{i=1}^N$, $sk_i \leftarrow \text{KeyGen}(1^\kappa)$.
2. The adversary and the challenger do the following L times, and these are done non-adaptively, which means, the challenger will only send out the answer in the second step after he has received all the queries:
 - (a) The adversary picks index i , function $f \in \mathcal{F}$ and message $\rho \in \mathbb{D}(\mathcal{R} \otimes \mathcal{M})$, and send system \mathcal{M} to the challenger.
 - (b) If $b = 1$, the oracle outputs $c = \text{Enc}_{sk_i}(f(K, \rho_m))$ to the adversary. If $b = 0$, the oracle outputs $c = \text{Enc}_{sk_i}(0^{|f(K, \rho_m)|})$.
3. The adversary tries to guess b with some distinguisher \mathcal{D} , and output b' .

Note that \mathcal{F} can be quantum operations and can query the random oracle on quantum states. The output of functions in \mathcal{F} should be fixed-lengthed, otherwise $|f(K, m)|$ will not be well-defined.

The guessing advantage is defined as $\text{Adv}^{\text{naSymQKDM}}(\mathcal{A}, \kappa) = |\Pr(b' = 1|b = 1) - \Pr(b' = 1|b = 0)|$

Definition 10. *A symmetric key quantum encryption scheme is nonadaptively qKDM-CPA secure for function \mathcal{F} if for all the BQP adversary \mathcal{A} ,*

$$\text{Adv}_{\mathcal{F}}^{\text{naSymQKDM}}(\mathcal{A}, \kappa) = \text{negl}(\kappa)$$

8.1 Protocol Design

Protocol 7 *Quantum KDM Secure Protocol in the Quantum Random Oracle Model:*

Key Generation $\text{QKDM.KeyGen}(1^\kappa)$: $sk \leftarrow \{0, 1\}^\kappa$.

Encryption $\text{QKDM.Enc}_{sk}(\rho)$: *Sample $a, b \in_r \{0, 1\}^N$, where N is the length of inputs.*

Output $(X^a Z^b(\rho), \text{KDMP.Enc}_{sk}(a, b))$.

Decryption $\text{QKDM.Dec}_{sk}((\rho, c))$: *First compute $a, b \leftarrow \text{KDMP.Dec}_{sk}(c)$, then output $X^a Z^b(\rho)$*

Theorem 10. *Protocol 8.1 is nonadaptively qKDM-CPA secure for function $\mathcal{F}[\text{poly}]$ in the quantum random oracle model, where $\mathcal{F}[\text{poly}]$ is the function family that makes at most $\text{poly}(\kappa)$ queries to the quantum random oracle.*

9 Open Problems

One obvious open problem in our paper is to prove Conjecture 2, the qIND-CPA security without additional requirement on κ . We believe this is true, but we can only prove the security when $\kappa - 4N_q = \Theta(\kappa')$. And another further research direction is to base these protocols on standard model. We can also study whether it's possible to optimize this protocol, and how efficient it is compared to other protocols based on quantum one time pad.

Another open question is whether this algorithm is useful in other problems than Shor's algorithm. Lots of previous works study quantum circuits on $\{\text{Clifford}, \text{T}\}$ gate set, and our work shows $\{\text{C+P}, \text{H}\}$ is also important and worth studied. There are not many works on converting quantum circuits into layers of C+P gates and H gates, and it's possible that some famous quantum algorithms which require a lot of T gates, after converted into $\{\text{C+P}, \text{H}\}$ gate set, can have small H depth. This problem is still quite open, and further research is needed here.

What's more, KDM security in quantum settings is an interesting problem. This paper gives some initial study on it, but there are still a lot of open

questions. Is it possible to construct quantum KDM secure protocol in standard model? Could quantum cryptography help us design classical KDM secure scheme? Again, further research is needed here.

This paper also gives some new idea on constructing "provable-secure" quantum encryption schemes. [24] proved a limit for information-theoretically secure quantum homomorphic encryption, but our work shows that by introducing quantum ROM and making the circuits public, the limit doesn't hold any more. So here comes lots of interesting problems on the possibility and impossibility of quantum computation delegation: What is the limit for non-interactive provable-secure delegation of quantum computation, where the circuit is public/private, with/without quantum ROM? If we allow small amount of quantum/classical communication, does it lead to something different?

Acknowledgements

Thanks to Prof. Adam Smith. Thanks to NSF funding.

References

1. Aaronson, S., Cojocaru, A., Gheorghiu, A., Kashefi, E.: On the implausibility of classical client blind quantum computing. CoRR **abs/1704.08482** (2017)
2. Applebaum, B., Cash, D., Peikert, C., Sahai, A.: Fast cryptographic primitives and circular-secure encryption based on hard learning problems pp. 595–618 (2009)
3. Arrighi, P., Salvail, L.: Blind quantum computation. International Journal of Quantum Information **04** (10 2003)
4. Bellare, M., Desai, A., Jokipii, E., Rogaway, P.: A concrete security treatment of symmetric encryption. (01 1997)
5. Black, J., Rogaway, P., Shrimpton, T.: Encryption-scheme security in the presence of key-dependent messages. In: Nyberg, K., Heys, H. (eds.) Selected Areas in Cryptography. pp. 62–75. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, Berlin, Heidelberg (2003)
6. Boneh, D., Dagdelen, Ö., Fischlin, M., Lehmann, A., Schaffner, C., Zhandry, M.: Random oracles in a quantum world. In: Lee, D.H., Wang, X. (eds.) Advances in Cryptology – ASIACRYPT 2011. pp. 41–69. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, Berlin, Heidelberg (2011)
7. Broadbent, A., Fitzsimons, J., Kashefi, E.: Universal blind quantum computation. In: Proceedings of the 2009 50th Annual IEEE Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science. pp. 517–526. FOCS '09, IEEE Computer Society, Washington, DC, USA (2009)
8. Broadbent, A., Jeffery, S.: Quantum homomorphic encryption for circuits of low t-gate complexity. In: Gennaro, R., Robshaw, M. (eds.) Advances in Cryptology – CRYPTO 2015. pp. 609–629. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, Berlin, Heidelberg (2015)
9. Childs, A.M.: Secure assisted quantum computation. Quantum Info. Comput. **5**(6), 456–466 (Sep 2005)
10. Cleve, R., Watrous, J.: Fast parallel circuits for the quantum fourier transform (06 2000)

11. Dulek, Y., Schaffner, C., Speelman, F.: Quantum homomorphic encryption for polynomial-sized circuits. In: Proceedings, Part III, of the 36th Annual International Cryptology Conference on Advances in Cryptology — CRYPTO 2016 - Volume 9816. pp. 3–32. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, Heidelberg (2016)
12. Goldwasser, S., Micali, S.: Probabilistic encryption & how to play mental poker keeping secret all partial information. In: Proceedings of the Fourteenth Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing. pp. 365–377. STOC '82, ACM, New York, NY, USA (1982)
13. Lai, C.Y., Chung, K.M.: On statistically-secure quantum homomorphic encryption (09 2018)
14. Mahadev, U.: Classical homomorphic encryption for quantum circuits. CoRR (2017)
15. Nielsen, M.A., Chuang, I.L.: Quantum Computation and Quantum Information: 10th Anniversary Edition. Cambridge University Press, New York, NY, USA, 10th edn. (2011)
16. Okamoto, T., Tanaka, K., Uchiyama, S.: Quantum public-key cryptosystems. In: Bellare, M. (ed.) Advances in Cryptology — CRYPTO 2000. pp. 147–165. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, Berlin, Heidelberg (2000)
17. Raussendorf, R.: Measurement-based quantum computation with cluster states. *International Journal of Quantum Information* **07**(06), 1053–1203 (2009)
18. Roetteler, M., Naehrig, M., Svore, K., Lauter, K.: Quantum resource estimates for computing elliptic curve discrete logarithms (06 2017)
19. Selinger, P.: Quantum circuits of t -depth one. *Phys. Rev. A* **87**, 042302 (Apr 2013)
20. Shi, Y.: Quantum and classical tradeoffs. *Theor. Comput. Sci.* **344**(2-3), 335–345 (Nov 2005)
21. Unruh, D.: Revocable quantum timed-release encryption (2013)
22. Yao, A.C.: How to generate and exchange secrets. In: 27th Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (sfcs 1986). pp. 162–167 (Oct 1986). <https://doi.org/10.1109/SFCS.1986.25>
23. Yingkai Ouyang, Si-Hui Tan, J.F.: Quantum homomorphic encryption from quantum codes (2015)
24. Yu, L., Perez-Delgado, C.A., Fitzsimons, J.: Limitations on information theoretically secure quantum homomorphic encryption **90** (06 2014)
25. Zalka, C.: Grover’s quantum searching algorithm is optimal. *Phys. Rev. A* **60**, 2746–2751 (Oct 1999)

Supplemental Materials

A Missing Proofs

A.1 Missing Proofs in Section 3 to 5

Proof (Proof of Lemma 1). Let's first consider the encryption of one qubit. Suppose the input is $|\phi_{SR}\rangle = \alpha|0\rangle|\varphi_0\rangle + \beta|1\rangle|\varphi_1\rangle$, and we apply Et on the first register. The lemma holds since:

$$\frac{1}{2^\kappa(2^\kappa - 1)} \sum_{k_0, k_1 \in \{0,1\}^\kappa, k_0 \neq k_1} (\text{Et}_{k_0, k_1}^S \otimes \text{I}^R)(\phi) \quad (51)$$

$$= \frac{1}{2^\kappa(2^\kappa - 1)} \sum_{k_0, k_1 \in \{0,1\}^\kappa, k_0 \neq k_1} (\alpha|k_0\rangle|\varphi_0\rangle + \beta|k_1\rangle|\varphi_1\rangle)(\alpha^\dagger\langle k_0| \langle \varphi_0| + \beta^\dagger\langle k_1| \langle \varphi_1|) \quad (52)$$

$$= \left(\frac{1}{2^\kappa}\mathbb{I}\right) \otimes (|\alpha|^2\varphi_1 + |\beta|^2\varphi_2) + \frac{1}{2^\kappa - 1} (|\Phi\rangle\langle\Phi| - \frac{1}{2^\kappa}\mathbb{I}) \otimes (\alpha^\dagger\beta|\varphi_2\rangle\langle\varphi_1| + \alpha\beta^\dagger|\varphi_1\rangle\langle\varphi_2|) \quad (53)$$

where $|\Phi\rangle = \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|0\rangle + |1\rangle)\right)^{\otimes \kappa}$.

The first term can be written as $\frac{1}{2^\kappa}\mathbb{I} \otimes \text{tr}_S(\phi)$. Which means

$$\Delta((\text{Et}_{k_0, k_1}^S \otimes \text{I}^R)(\phi), \frac{1}{2^\kappa}\mathbb{I} \otimes \text{tr}_S(\phi)) \leq \left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^{\kappa-4}$$

Using this inequality on all the encrypted qubits completes the proof.

Proof (Proof of Theorem 2). The proof uses the same techniques as [8], and we make some revisions to fit our problem.

With an adversary for QPK, we can design an adversary for CLPK as follows:

Suppose we have a distinguisher to distinguish $\mathbb{E}_K \text{Et}_K(\rho) \otimes \text{CLPK.Enc}(K)$ and $\mathbb{E}_K \text{Et}_K(0^N) \otimes \text{CLPK.Enc}(K)$ with non-negligible advantage. (a, b, ρ can be chosen adaptively, but this doesn't influence our proof.) Then the adversary can simulate this game with CLPK.Enc replaced by the encryption oracle call in the IND-CPA game of CLPK. Notice that when $b = 1$ the simulation will work correctly.

If $b = 0$, the simulator will try to distinguish $\text{Et}_K(\rho) \otimes \text{CLPK.Enc}(0^*)$ and $\text{Et}_K(0^N) \otimes \text{CLPK.Enc}(0^*)$. But taking average on K , the distribution of $\text{Et}_K(\rho) \otimes \text{CLPK.Enc}(0^*)$ is always the same as the distribution of $\text{Et}_K(0^N) \otimes \text{CLPK.Enc}(0^*)$, so that they can't be distinguished. That means in the IND-CPA game of CLPK, we can distinguish the case $b = 1$ with the case $b = 0$ by running the distinguishing procedure of QPK and see whether it can distinguish them.

Proof (Proof of Theorem 2). For $R_Z(\theta)$, expand θ on $\pi/2^d, d = 1, \dots, D$ will complete the proof.

A.2 Proof of Proposition 6

Proof (Proof of Proposition 6). The proof is similar to the proof of optimality of Grover's algorithm, which can be found in [25]. But we need to make some revisions which are necessary for this problem.

First, we notice that the key tag can also be seen as part of ciphertext, where the message to be encrypted is 0^* . So we can prove this proposition without considering the key tags, and we need to redefine T as $2T$. This won't affect the final result since 2 can be absorbed into poly function.

After getting the ciphertexts from the encryption phase, the adversary will use some distinguisher \mathcal{D} to distinguish the state and compute b' . By expanding the space, we can assume the distinguisher \mathcal{D} is a measurement of a specific output qubit after applying a unitary transform O on the ciphertexts and auxiliary qubits. O can be written as $O = U_q \mathcal{H}_q U_{q-1} \cdots \mathcal{H}_1 U_0$, where \mathcal{H}_i means i th query to the quantum random oracle.

Furthermore, suppose the secret keys generated by the key generator is $K = \{sk_i\}_{i=1}^L$, and R is the set of all the randomness in the encryption phase (including the random padding and the random output from the random oracle). Let $c_{K,R}$ denote the ciphertexts that the adversary gets in the naSymKDM game when $b = 1$, and $e_{K,R}$ denote the ciphertexts when $b = 0$. Then what we need to prove can be rewritten as

$$\text{Adv}_{\text{KDMP}, \mathcal{F}[q']}^{\text{naSymKDM}}(\mathcal{A}_{(L,T,q)}, \kappa) \quad (54)$$

$$= \text{tr}(P_0(\mathbb{E}_K \mathbb{E}_R(O(|c_{K,R}\rangle \langle c_{K,R}| \otimes |0\rangle \langle 0|)O^\dagger) - \mathbb{E}_K \mathbb{E}_R(O(|e_{K,R}\rangle \langle e_{K,R}| \otimes |0\rangle \langle 0|)O^\dagger))) \quad (55)$$

$$\leq \frac{1}{2} |\mathbb{E}_K \mathbb{E}_R(O(|c_{K,R}\rangle \langle c_{K,R}| \otimes |0\rangle \langle 0|)O^\dagger) - \mathbb{E}_K \mathbb{E}_R(O(|e_{K,R}\rangle \langle e_{K,R}| \otimes |0\rangle \langle 0|)O^\dagger)|_{\text{tr}} \quad (56)$$

Where $|0\rangle \langle 0|$ can be very large system.

Suppose \mathcal{H}' is a new random oracle, which is independent from \mathcal{H} on inputs which contain a prefix in K . Notice that if we can replace the random oracle query in O with \mathcal{H}' , the randomness that the encryption phase used will be independent of the output of \mathcal{H}' , and after taking expectation on the randomness of random oracle the message will be hidden.

Define $O_i = U_q \mathcal{H}_q U_{q-1} \cdots \mathcal{H}_{i+1} U_i \mathcal{H}'_i U_{i-1} \cdots \mathcal{H}'_1 U_0$. So $O = O_0$. Define

$$\phi^i = \mathbb{E}_R(O_i(|c_{K,R}\rangle \langle c_{K,R}| \otimes |0\rangle \langle 0|)O_i^\dagger) \quad (57)$$

$$\psi^i = \mathbb{E}_R(O_i(|e_{K,R}\rangle \langle e_{K,R}| \otimes |0\rangle \langle 0|)O_i^\dagger) \quad (58)$$

So

$$\text{Adv}_{\text{KDMP}, \mathcal{F}[q']}^{\text{naSymKDM}}(\mathcal{A}_{(L,T,q)}, \kappa) \quad (59)$$

$$= \frac{1}{2} |\mathbb{E}_K(\phi^0 - \psi^0)|_{\text{tr}} \quad (60)$$

$$\leq \frac{1}{2} (|\mathbb{E}_K(\phi^0 - \phi^q)|_{\text{tr}} + |\mathbb{E}_K(\phi^q - \psi^q)|_{\text{tr}} + |\mathbb{E}_K(\psi^0 - \psi^q)|_{\text{tr}}) \quad (61)$$

Let's first estimate $|\mathbb{E}_K(\phi^q - \psi^q)|_{\text{tr}}$. First by dividing the randomness R into R' , which is the randomness in \mathcal{H}' , and $R_{K||}$, which is the randomness in \mathcal{H} on queries with prefix in K together with the random paddings. we can see

$$|\mathbb{E}_K(\phi^q - \psi^q)|_{\text{tr}} = |\mathbb{E}_K \mathbb{E}_{R'} O_i(\mathbb{E}_{R_{K||}}(|c_{K,R}\rangle \langle c_{K,R}| - |e_{K,R}\rangle \langle e_{K,R}|)) O_i^\dagger)|_{\text{tr}} \quad (62)$$

$|c_{K,R}\rangle$ can be written as a list of tuples in the form of $(R_i, \mathcal{H}(sk||R_i) \oplus m)$. We can't say the randomness $R_{K||}$ erases everything in m since the computation of $m = f(K, msg)$ may also contains some random oracle calls. But the random oracle queries of f are all in classical states so the probability that $sk||R_i$ does not appear before can be bounded. Denote the queries to the random oracle inside the computation of f as Q . Define *bad* as one of the following two events: (1) for some i , $sk_i||R_i \in Q$; (2) the set of $sk_i||R_i$ contains repetitions. And define *good* as the complement of *bad*.

$$|\mathbb{E}_{R_{K||}}(|c_{K,R}\rangle \langle c_{K,R}| - |e_{K,R}\rangle \langle e_{K,R}|)|_{\text{tr}} \quad (63)$$

$$= |\Pr(\text{bad}) \mathbb{E}_{R_{K||}}(|c_{K,R}\rangle \langle c_{K,R}| | \text{bad}) + \Pr(\text{good}) \mathbb{E}_{R_{K||}}(|c_{K,R}\rangle \langle c_{K,R}| | \text{good})|_{\text{tr}} \quad (64)$$

$$- \Pr(\text{bad}) \mathbb{E}_{R_{K||}}(|e_{K,R}\rangle \langle e_{K,R}| | \text{bad}) - \Pr(\text{good}) \mathbb{E}_{R_{K||}}(|e_{K,R}\rangle \langle e_{K,R}| | \text{good})|_{\text{tr}} \quad (65)$$

$$= |\Pr(\text{bad}) \mathbb{E}_{R_{K||}}(|c_{K,R}\rangle \langle c_{K,R}| | \text{bad}) - \Pr(\text{bad}) \mathbb{E}_{R_{K||}}(|e_{K,R}\rangle \langle e_{K,R}| | \text{bad})|_{\text{tr}} \quad (66)$$

$$\leq 2 \Pr(\text{bad}) \quad (67)$$

$$\leq 4T^2(q' + 2)2^{-\kappa} \quad (68)$$

(65) to (66) is because when $sk||R_i$ does not appear in any other places of the random oracle query, we can take average on the randomness of $\mathcal{H}(sk||R_i)$ and the distribution of $\mathcal{H}(sk||R_i) \oplus 0$ will be the same as $\mathcal{H}(sk||R_i) \oplus m$.

Substitute back into (62) we will know

$$|\mathbb{E}_K(\phi^q - \psi^q)|_{\text{tr}} \leq 4T^2(q' + 2)2^{-\kappa} \quad (69)$$

And we have:

$$|\phi^0 - \phi^q|_{\text{tr}} \tag{70}$$

$$\leq \sum_i |\phi^i - \phi^{i-1}|_{\text{tr}} \tag{71}$$

$$\leq \sum_i \mathbb{E}_R |((\mathcal{H}_i - \mathcal{H}'_i)V_i(|c_{K,R}\rangle \otimes |0\rangle))| \quad (V_i := U_i \mathcal{H}'_{i-1} U_{i-1} \cdots \mathcal{H}'_1 U_0) \tag{72}$$

$$\leq \sum_i \mathbb{E}_R 2\sqrt{\text{tr}(P_K V_i(|c_{K,R}\rangle \langle c_{K,R}| \otimes |0\rangle \langle 0|) V_i^\dagger)} \tag{73}$$

$$\leq 2 \sum_i \sqrt{\mathbb{E}_R \text{tr}(P_K (V_i(|c_{K,R}\rangle \langle c_{K,R}| \otimes |0\rangle \langle 0|) V_i^\dagger))} \tag{74}$$

$$\leq 2 \sqrt{q \sum_i \text{tr}(P_K (\mathbb{E}_{R'} (V_i (\mathbb{E}_{R_{K||}} (|c_{K,R}\rangle \langle c_{K,R}| \otimes |0\rangle \langle 0|) V_i^\dagger)))} \tag{75}$$

$$\leq 2 \sqrt{q \sum_i (\text{tr}(P_K (\mathbb{E}_{R'} (V_i (\mathbb{E}_{R_{K||}} (|e_{K,R}\rangle \langle e_{K,R}| \otimes |0\rangle \langle 0|) V_i^\dagger))) + 4T^2(q' + 2)2^{-\kappa})} \tag{76}$$

Where the last step is by (63)-(68).

And when we take the expectation on K , we have

$$\mathbb{E}_K |\phi^0 - \phi^q|_{\text{tr}} \tag{77}$$

$$\leq \sqrt{\mathbb{E}_K |\phi^0 - \phi^q|_{\text{tr}}^2} \tag{78}$$

$$\leq \sqrt{4q \mathbb{E}_K \sum_i (\text{tr}(P_K (\mathbb{E}_{R'} (V_i (\mathbb{E}_{R_{K||}} (|e_{K,R}\rangle \langle e_{K,R}| \otimes |0\rangle \langle 0|) V_i^\dagger))) + 2T(q' + T)2^{-\kappa})} \tag{79}$$

$$\leq \sqrt{(4q(qL + 4T^2(q' + 2)))2^{-\kappa}} \tag{80}$$

(79) to (80) is because the inner part is the same for different K so we can take average on P_K .

Similarly we have

$$\mathbb{E}_K |\psi^0 - \psi^q|_{\text{tr}} \leq \sqrt{(4q(qL + 4T^2(q' + 2)))2^{-\kappa}} \tag{81}$$

Substitute (69)(80)(81) to (61), we have

$$\text{Adv}_{\text{KDMP}, \mathcal{F}^{[q']}}^{\text{naSymKDM}}(\mathcal{A}_{(L,T,q)}, \kappa) \leq 2\sqrt{(4q(qL + 4T^2(q' + 2)))2^{-\kappa}} + 4T^2(q' + 2)2^{-\kappa}$$

A.3 Proof of Lemma 2

Proof. First, let's give an estimation of $\text{Adv}_{\text{CL}}^{rG}(\mathcal{A}, \kappa)$. Notice that the construction of multi-key encryption CL is the same as cascading encryption

$\text{Enc}_{k_1}(\text{Enc}_{k_2}(\text{Enc}_{k_3}(m)))$, where $\text{Enc}_k(m) = (R, \mathcal{H}(k||R) \oplus m)$. And we can view the inner Enc as part of KDM function $f \in \mathcal{F}[q' = 2]$. What's more, the key tags can be obtained by encrypting 0^* with the corresponding keys. So an adversary \mathcal{A} for rG game with parameters $\kappa, (N, L, J, q)$ can be used to design an adversary \mathcal{A}' for naSymKDM game for function family $\mathcal{F}[q' = 2]$ with parameter $\kappa, (L, J + L, q)$ in the following way:

1. In the step 1 of naSymKDM game, $K = \{sk_i\}_{i=1}^L$ is sampled. The adversary simulates an rG game, and samples $K' = \{sk'_i\}_{i=1}^L$.
The step 2(a) of naSymKDM game is done by the adversary. The adversary first runs the step 2 of rG game. Suppose what the adversary picks are P, R, M . Denote $|Closure(Rev)| = L_1, L - |Closure(Rev)| = L_2$. The adversary in rG game will regard $\{sk_i\}_{i=1}^{L_2} \cup \{sk'_i\}_{i=1}^{L_1}$ as the keys sampled in the first step in rG game by the challenger.
2. Then the adversary in rG goes to step 3. It will get a set of ciphertexts from the challenger in rG . Notice that what the adversary gets in rG can be simulated with naSymKDM game as follows:
 - (a) For $i \in [J]$, suppose $S_i = (a, b, c)$. If $a \notin Closure(Rev)$, query KDMP.Enc on $f(K, m) = \text{Enc}_{sk_b}(\text{Enc}_{sk_c}(sk_{T_i}||m_i))$ under sk_a . If $k_1 \in Closure(Rev)$ but $k_2 \notin Closure(Rev)$, query on $f = \text{Enc}_{sk_c}(sk_{T_i}||m_i)$ under sk_b . If $k_1, k_2 \in Closure(Rev)$ but $k_3 \notin Closure(Rev)$, query on $sk_{T_i}||m$ under sk_c . If all the three indexes are in $Closure(Rev)$, skip this query.
Then for each key tag in the form of $(R_i, \mathcal{H}(sk_i||R_i))$, query the encryption of 0 on sk_i .
 - (b) In step 2(b) of naSymKDM game, \mathcal{A}' gets a list of ciphertext. For $i \in [J]$, suppose $S_i = (a, b, c)$. Suppose c is the ciphertext corresponding to S_i that the adversary gets in step 2(if there is). If $a \notin Closure(Rev)$, assign $c' = c$. If $k_1 \in Closure(Rev)$ but $k_2 \notin Closure(Rev)$, assign $c' = \text{Enc}_{sk'_a}(c)$. If $k_1, k_2 \in Closure(Rev)$ but $k_3 \notin Closure(Rev)$, assign $c' = \text{Enc}_{sk'_a}(\text{Enc}_{sk'_b}(c))$. If all the three indexes are in $Closure(R)$, assign $c' = \text{Enc}_{sk'_a}(\text{Enc}_{sk'_b}(\text{Enc}_{sk_c}(sk_{T_i}||m_i)))$. Store this c' into a list.
3. Use the distinguisher of rG game on the list of c' that the adversary gets in the last step. Suppose the result is b' . Output b' as the distinguishing output in naSymKDM game.

So from the security of KDM protocol we know

$$\text{Adv}_{\text{CL}}^{rG}(\mathcal{A}_{(N, L, J, q)}, \kappa) \leq \text{Adv}_{\text{KDMP}, \mathcal{F}[q'=2]}^{\text{naSymKDM}}(\mathcal{A}_{(L, J+N, q)}, \kappa) \leq \text{poly}(q, L, J)2^{-0.5\kappa}$$

A.4 Proof of Lemma 3

Proof (Proof of Lemma 3). For any operation $\mathcal{D}, i \neq j, |\varphi_j\rangle$,

$$p = \mathbb{E}_K \mathbb{E}_R \text{tr}((\text{Et}_K |j\rangle)^\dagger \mathcal{D}(\text{Et}_K(|i\rangle \langle i|) \otimes \varphi_i \otimes \text{TAB}(K, R))(\text{Et}_K |j\rangle))$$

is the probability that the input is $\text{Et}_K |i\rangle$ and the output is $\text{Et}_K |j\rangle$. But since $\text{Et}_K |i\rangle$ is a classical state we can make one copy of it and in the end we will know both from \mathcal{D} with this probability.

Let's use it to design an adversary \mathcal{A} for the rG game of CL:

1. The adversary picks $|i\rangle \otimes |\varphi_j\rangle$ as the input and P_C, M_C defined as the proof of Proposition 1. Then the adversary will get $\text{Et}_K |i\rangle \otimes |\varphi_i\rangle \otimes \text{Oracle}_b^{rG}(P_C, M_C)$ from the challenger in the rG game.
2. Then the adversary applies the distinguisher \mathcal{D}' defined as follows:
 - (a) The adversary makes a copy of the outputs and applies Shuffle^C to get $\text{TAB}_{\text{CL}}^C(K) = \text{Shuffle}^C(\text{Oracle}_b^{rG}(P_C, M_C))$. Then he gets

$$\text{Et}_K |i\rangle \otimes \text{Oracle}_b^{rG}(P_C, M_C) \otimes \text{Et}_K |i\rangle \otimes \text{TAB}_{\text{CL}}^C(K) \otimes |\varphi_i\rangle$$

Then the adversary applies \mathcal{D} on the last three systems and measures in the computational basis.

- (b) Find a w such that i and j differ in bit w . There are two keys k_0^w and k_1^w on this wire, from $\text{Et}_K |i\rangle$ the adversary knows one key on wire w , and from the last step the adversary gets some result which might be $\text{Et}_K |j\rangle$ (with some probability), from which he can get another key on w . Then the adversary verifies whether this value is another key with the key verification information in $\text{Oracle}_b^{rG}(P_C, M_C)$. If the verification passes, output 1. Otherwise, output 0.

By the rG game security we have

$$\text{Adv}_{\text{GBC}_{\text{CL}}}^{rG}(\mathcal{A}_{(N,6L,16L,q+1)}, \kappa) \tag{82}$$

$$\begin{aligned} &= |\Pr(\mathcal{D}'(\text{Et}_K |i\rangle \otimes |\varphi_i\rangle \otimes \text{Oracle}_{b=1}^{rG}(P_C, M_C)) = 1) \\ &\quad - \Pr(\mathcal{D}'(\text{Et}_K |i\rangle \otimes |\varphi_i\rangle \otimes \text{Oracle}_{b=0}^{rG}(P_C, M_C)) = 1)| \tag{83} \\ &\leq \text{poly}(N, L, q) 2^{-0.5\kappa} \tag{84} \end{aligned}$$

And $\Pr(\mathcal{D}'(\text{Et}_K |i\rangle \otimes |\varphi_i\rangle \otimes \text{Oracle}_{b=0}^{rG}(P_C, M_C)) = 1)$ is the probability of "compute and verify successfully", it can be bounded by the optimality of Grover search. Let's analyze with more details.

Suppose in \mathcal{D}' we choose to compute and verify the key sk_x^w on input wire w . That will mean the index of sk_{1-x}^w is in Rev , and the index of sk_x^w is not in $Closure(Rev)$. Recall that in the construction of $\text{Oracle}_{b=0}^{rG}(P_C, M_C)$, if the index of some key is not in $Closure(Rev)$, and when $b = 0$, the Oracle will replace the ciphertext with encryption of 0^* . So the only information related to sk_x^w is contained in: (1) the oracle output in the form of $\text{CL.Enc}_{S_i}(0^*)$, $sk_b^w \in S_i$. (2) the key verification tag in the form of $\text{CL.Enc}_{sk_b^w}(0^*)$.

Write $\mathcal{D}' = \text{Ver} \circ \text{Compute}$, where Compute is the operation in the 2(a) of \mathcal{D} . Since the key tag can be very long (the output length of \mathcal{H} is arbitrary), the probability that sk_x^w is not the only value that can pass the verification is exponentially small. So conditioned on it is the only entry that can pass the verification, we have

$$\Pr(\mathcal{D}'(\text{Et}_K |i\rangle \otimes |\varphi_i\rangle \otimes \text{Oracle}_{b=0}^{rG}(P_C, M_C)) = 1) \tag{85}$$

$$= \Pr(\text{Compute}(\text{Et}_K |i\rangle \otimes |\varphi_i\rangle \otimes \text{Oracle}_{b=0}^{rG}(P_C, M_C)) = sk_b^w) \tag{86}$$

which is the probability of computing the key sk_x^w in q queries. From the result in [25] we know

$$\Pr(\mathcal{D}'(\text{Shuffle}(\text{Oracle}_{b=0}^{rG}(P_C, M_C))) = 1) = \Theta(q^2 2^{-\kappa})$$

Combining it with (84) we can get a bound on the first term in (83):

$$\Pr(\mathcal{D}'(\text{Et}_K | i) \otimes |\varphi_i\rangle \otimes \text{Shuffle}(\text{Oracle}_{b=1}^{rG}(P_C, M_C))) = 1) \leq \text{poly}(N, L, q) 2^{-0.5\kappa}$$

Return to the original problem.

$\mathbb{E}_K \mathbb{E}_R \text{tr}((\text{Et}_K | j)^\dagger \mathcal{D}(\text{Et}_K(|i\rangle \langle i|) \otimes \varphi_i \otimes \text{TAB}(K, R))(\text{Et}_K | j))$ is the probability that the input is $\text{Et}_K(|i\rangle)$ and the output is $\text{Et}_K(|j\rangle)$, and when we construct \mathcal{D}' from \mathcal{D} , conditioned on this event, the result will pass the verification in 2(b) step with probability 1. That implies

$$\mathbb{E}_K \mathbb{E}_R \text{tr}((\text{Et}_K | j)^\dagger \mathcal{D}(\text{Et}_K(|i\rangle \langle i|) \otimes \varphi_i \otimes \text{TAB}(K, R))(\text{Et}_K | j)) \quad (87)$$

$$\leq \Pr(\mathcal{D}'(\text{Et}_K | i) \otimes |\varphi_i\rangle \otimes \text{Shuffle}(\text{Oracle}_{b=1}^{rG}(P_C, M_C))) = 1) \quad (88)$$

$$\leq \text{poly}(N, L, q) 2^{-0.5\kappa} \quad (89)$$

A.5 Proof of Theorem 10

Proof. Explicitly, define $\text{Adv}_{\mathcal{F}[q']}^{\text{naSymQKDM}}(\mathcal{A}_{(L,T,q)}, \kappa)$ as the advantage in the game where the adversary is allowed to sample L keys, make T queries to the encryption oracle, and the distinguisher is allowed to query the random oracle q times, and the function family is $\mathcal{F}[q']$.

The proof is similar to the proof of Theorem 6. Let $c_{K,R}$ denote the ciphertexts that the adversary gets in the naSymQKDM game when $b = 1$, and $e_{K,R}$ denote the ciphertexts when $b = 0$. These are the same as that in proof of Proposition 6. One difference here is c and e are not necessarily classical any more, so we need to consider c and e as the state of the ciphertexts returned by the challenger together with the reference system kept by the adversary. We can bound the naSymQKDM following the same route as the proof of Theorem 6, and we only need to give a new estimation of

$$|\mathbb{E}_{R_{K||}}(|c_{K,R}\rangle \langle c_{K,R}| - |e_{K,R}\rangle \langle e_{K,R}|)|_{\text{tr}}$$

Here K is a fixed key set, and $R_{K||}$ stands for the randomness in the random paddings, output of \mathcal{H} on inputs with prefix in K , and the one time pad keys.

The ciphertexts $c_{K,R}$ and $e_{K,R}$ should be viewed as the ciphertexts for all the queries. Since we only consider non-adaptive settings, the computation of the ciphertexts can be written as

$$\mathbb{E}_{R_{K||}}(|c_{K,R}\rangle \langle c_{K,R}|) = \mathbb{E}_{R_{K||}}(\mathbb{I} \otimes \text{QKDM.Enc}^{\otimes T})(\rho)$$

$$\mathbb{E}_{R_{K||}}(|e_{K,R}\rangle \langle e_{K,R}|) = \mathbb{E}_{R_{K||}}(\mathbb{I} \otimes \text{QKDM.Enc}^{\otimes T})(\rho_R \otimes 0^{|\mathcal{M}|})$$

Where

$$\rho = (\mathbb{I} \otimes O)(\sigma_{msg} \otimes K \otimes |0\rangle \langle 0|)(\mathbb{I} \otimes O^\dagger), \rho \in \mathbb{D}(\mathcal{R} \otimes \mathcal{M}), \mathbb{I} \text{ operates on } \mathcal{R}$$

where O is a unitary operation which stands for the circuit of $f \in \mathcal{F}$, σ_{msg} is the density operator of the input to f together with its reference system, and the system \mathcal{M} of ρ contains the inputs to Enc in all the queries. Pay attention that this O is different from these defined in the proof of Theorem 6.

Once we get a bound for it, we can substitute it into (75)-(76) and then we will get a new bound for (80), and similarly substitute the new bound for (69)(80)(81) into (61) will give us the naSymQKDM advantage we need.

O can be written as $O = U_q \mathcal{H}_q U_{q-1} \cdots \mathcal{H}_1 U_0$. Suppose Q is the set of queries to the random oracle in the calling of KDM.PEnc , and since we have already fixed the keys, the randomness comes from the random paddings. Suppose R_Q is the randomness of \mathcal{H} on the queries in Q . Let R_{ab} denote the randomness from the choices of one time pad keys. Then we have

$$|\mathbb{E}_{R_{K||}}(|c_{K,R}\rangle \langle c_{K,R}|) - \mathbb{E}_{R_{K||}}(|e_{K,R}\rangle \langle e_{K,R}|)|_{\text{tr}} \quad (90)$$

$$= |\mathbb{E}_Q \mathbb{E}_{R_Q} \mathbb{E}_{R_{ab}}(|c_{K,R}\rangle \langle c_{K,R}|) - \mathbb{E}_Q \mathbb{E}_{R_Q} \mathbb{E}_{R_{ab}}(|e_{K,R}\rangle \langle e_{K,R}|)|_{\text{tr}} \quad (91)$$

First consider a fixed Q . Denote \mathcal{H}'' as a quantum random oracle that is independently random from \mathcal{H} on entries in Q . Use R' to denote the randomness in \mathcal{H}'' . And let

$$O_i = U_q \mathcal{H}_q U_{q-1} \cdots \mathcal{H}_{i+1} U_i \mathcal{H}_i'' U_{i-1} \cdots \mathcal{H}_1'' U_0$$

Define

$$\psi^i = \mathbb{E}_{R'}(\mathbb{I} \otimes \text{QKDM.Enc}^{\otimes T})(\mathbb{I} \otimes O_i)(\sigma_{msg} \otimes K \otimes |0\rangle \langle 0|)(\mathbb{I} \otimes O_i^\dagger)$$

Note that this is not the same ψ as defined in (58). And we have

$$|\mathbb{E}_{R_{K||}}(|c_{K,R}\rangle \langle c_{K,R}|) - \mathbb{E}_{R_{K||}}(|e_{K,R}\rangle \langle e_{K,R}|)|_{\text{tr}} \quad (92)$$

$$\leq |\mathbb{E}_Q \mathbb{E}_{R_Q} \mathbb{E}_{R_{ab}}(\psi^0) - \mathbb{E}_Q \mathbb{E}_{R_Q} \mathbb{E}_{R_{ab}}(\psi^q)|_{\text{tr}} \quad (93)$$

$$+ \mathbb{E}_Q |\mathbb{E}_{R_Q} \mathbb{E}_{R_{ab}}(\psi^q) - \mathbb{E}_{R_Q} \mathbb{E}_{R'} \mathbb{E}_{R_{ab}}(|e_{K,R}\rangle \langle e_{K,R}|)|_{\text{tr}} \quad (94)$$

And by the same technique as (71)-(75) we have

$$|\psi^0 - \psi^q|_{\text{tr}} \quad (95)$$

$$\leq \sum_i |\psi^i - \psi^{i-1}|_{\text{tr}} \quad (96)$$

$$\leq 2 \sqrt{q' \sum_i \text{tr}(P_Q(\mathbb{E}_{R'}(V_i(\sigma_{msg} \otimes K \otimes |0\rangle \langle 0|)V_i^\dagger)))} \quad (V_i := U_i \mathcal{H}_{i-1}'' U_{i-1} \cdots \mathcal{H}_1'' U_0) \quad (97)$$

Which means

$$|\mathbb{E}_Q \mathbb{E}_{R_Q} \mathbb{E}_{R_{ab}}(\psi^0) - \mathbb{E}_Q \mathbb{E}_{R_Q} \mathbb{E}_{R_{ab}}(\psi^q)|_{\text{tr}} \quad (98)$$

$$\leq 2 \mathbb{E}_Q \mathbb{E}_{R_Q} \sqrt{q' \sum_i \text{tr}(P_Q(\mathbb{E}_{R'}(V_i(\sigma_{msg} \otimes K \otimes |0\rangle \langle 0|)V_i^\dagger)))} \quad (99)$$

$$\leq 2 \sqrt{q' \sum_i \mathbb{E}_Q \mathbb{E}_{R_Q} \text{tr}(P_Q(\mathbb{E}_{R'}(V_i(\sigma_{msg} \otimes K \otimes |0\rangle \langle 0|)V_i^\dagger)))} \quad (100)$$

$$\leq 2 \sqrt{(q')^2 T 2^{-\kappa}} \quad (101)$$

And for the second term in (94), since the randomness of R_Q is not correlated to the plaintext anymore, taking average on R_Q will hide the one time pad keys perfectly. Then taking average on one time pad key will hide ρ perfectly:

$$\forall Q, |\mathbb{E}_{R_Q} \mathbb{E}_{R_{ab}}(\psi^q) - \mathbb{E}_{R_Q} \mathbb{E}_{R'} \mathbb{E}_{R_{ab}}(|e_{K,R}\rangle \langle e_{K,R}|)|_{\text{tr}} = 0 \quad (102)$$

Combining (101)(94)(102), we have

$$|\mathbb{E}_R(|c_{K,R}\rangle \langle c_{K,R}|) - \mathbb{E}_R(|e_{K,R}\rangle \langle e_{K,R}|)|_{\text{tr}} \leq \text{poly}(L, T, q, q') 2^{-0.5\kappa}$$

And substitute it to (61)(75), we know

$$\text{Adv}_{\mathcal{F}[q']}^{naSymQKDM}(\mathcal{A}_{(L,T,q)}, \kappa) \leq \text{poly}(L, T, q, q') 2^{-0.25\kappa}$$