

COL872

Problem Set 5

Mallika Prabhakar (2019CS50440)
Sayam Sethi (2019CS10399)
Satwik Jain (2019CS10398)

May 2023

Contents

1	Question 1	2
1.1	Question 1.1	2
1.2	Question 1.2	2
2	Question 2	3
2.1	Question 2	3
3	Question 3	4
3.1	Question 3.1	4
3.2	Question 3.2	4
4	Question 4	5
4.1	Question 4.1	5
4.2	Question 4.1	5
5	Question 5	6
5.1	Question 5.1	6
5.2	Question 5.2	6
5.3	Question 5.3	6

1 Question 1

1.1 Question 1.1

Universal Cloning

Question. Consider the following quantum process: it maps $\alpha|0\rangle + \beta|1\rangle$ to $\alpha|0\rangle|0\rangle + \beta|1\rangle|1\rangle$. Is T p -good for some constant p ?

Proof. We know that T converts a pure state to another pure state. So Application of T on the density matrix $|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|$ will give the density matrix of another pure state.

For a state to be p -good,

$$|\langle\psi|\langle\psi| \cdot T(|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|) \cdot |\psi\rangle|\psi\rangle| \geq p$$

For $|\psi\rangle = \alpha|0\rangle + \beta|1\rangle$,

we have LHS as

$$\alpha^2 \langle 0|\langle 0| + \alpha\beta(\langle 0|\langle 1| + \langle 1|\langle 0|) + \beta^2 \langle 1|\langle 1| \cdot T(|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|) \cdot \alpha^2 |0\rangle|0\rangle + \alpha\beta(|0\rangle|1\rangle + |1\rangle|0\rangle) + \beta^2 |1\rangle|1\rangle$$

where, $T(|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|) = (\alpha|0\rangle|0\rangle + \beta|1\rangle|1\rangle)(\alpha\langle 0|\langle 0| + \beta\langle 1|\langle 1|)$

then the LHS becomes $(\alpha^3 + \beta^3)^2$

Now we have $\alpha^2 + \beta^2 = 1$, $|\alpha|, |\beta| \leq 1$

Using this we get $(\alpha^3 + \beta^3)^2 \geq \frac{1}{2}$.

Therefore, T is a half-good cloning device. □

1.2 Question 1.2

Universal Cloning

Question. Prove that, for all $|\psi\rangle$, $|\langle\psi|\langle\psi| \rho |\psi\rangle|\psi\rangle| \geq 2/3$

Proof. The Partial measurement of □

2 Question 2

2.1 Question 2

Question 2

Question. Let (Setup, H) be an SSB-hash. Construct a collapsing hash function (with appropriate domain and co-domain) using the SSB-hash, and prove security of your construction.

Proof. Let H_k be an SSB-hash with input domain $(\{0, 1\}^s)^L$ and co-domain be $\{0, 1\}^l$ with hash key k . The same construction of H_k works as a collapsing hash. The property of H_k is that $\Pr[\exists x = (x[0], x[1], \dots, x[L-1])]$ \square

3 Question 3

3.1 Question 3.1

Optimal Attack on Wiesner's Scheme

Question. Give a procedure that succeeds in attacking Weisner's Scheme with probability at least $\frac{5}{8}$

Proof. The Procedure is as follows:

1. Bank sends a qubit $|\psi\rangle$ to adversary.
2. Adversary measures the qubit in $\{|0\rangle, |1\rangle\}$ basis.
3. Adversary creates two identical copies based on the measured value and sends the qubits to the Bank.

If the qubit is in $\{|0\rangle, |1\rangle\}$ basis, we will get the correct measurement and will be able to model copies correctly and fool the bank.

If the qubit is in $\{|+\rangle, |-\rangle\}$ basis, The adversary measures in $\{|0\rangle, |1\rangle\}$ basis and models the qubit in the same basis. When the bank measures the copies in $\{|+\rangle, |-\rangle\}$ basis, there is a $1/2$ probability of getting the correct measurement for each copy.

Therefore, the overall probability of fooling the Bank is $\frac{1}{2} \times 1 + \frac{1}{2} \times \frac{1}{2} \times \frac{1}{2} = \frac{5}{8}$

□

3.2 Question 3.2

Optimal Attack on Wiesner's Scheme

Question. Show that the probability of success for new procedure is higher than what was achieved in part 3.1.

Proof.

□

4 Question 4

4.1 Question 4.1

Question 4

Question. Suppose the QM adversary always outputs a forgery of the form

$$\sum_{x,s,s': H(x)=h} \alpha_{x,s,x,s'} |x\rangle_{x_1} |s\rangle_{s_1} |x\rangle_{x_2} |s'\rangle_{s_2}$$

Show that if the challenger runs *VerifyCoin* on (X_1, S_1) and (X_2, S_2) , the probability of an accept in both the verifications is at most c for some constant $c < 1$.

Proof. proof □

4.2 Question 4.1

Question x

Question. Now consider a general QM adversary that outputs a forgery of the form

$$\sum_{\substack{x,s,x',s': \\ H(x)=H(x')=h}} \alpha_{x,s,x',s'} |x\rangle_{X_1} |s\rangle_{S_1} |x'\rangle_{X_2} |s'\rangle_{S_2} \text{ where } \sum_{\substack{x,s,s' \\ H(x)=h}} |\alpha_{x,s,x,s'}|^2 > 1 - \epsilon \quad (1)$$

Show that if the challenger runs *VerifyCoin* on (X_1, S_1) and (X_2, S_2) , the probability of an accept in both the verifications is at most $c\epsilon$ for some constant $c' < 1$.

Proof. (Note: we prove a general result for any $1 \geq \epsilon > 0$)

Let the probability of success on applying *Test1* on both coins be p_1 and on applying *Test2* be p_2 . Now, we find a bound on p_2 in terms of p_1 using the trace distance between the adversary's state and the state obtained after measuring the register x ($= 2\sqrt{\epsilon}$),

$$\begin{aligned} p_1 &\leq \Pr [x = x'] \cdot (1 - p_0 + \text{Tr}_{dist}) + \Pr [x \neq x'] \cdot 1 \\ &= (1 - \epsilon) \cdot (1 - p_0 + 2\sqrt{\epsilon}) + \epsilon \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

Thus, the total probability of success is,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2}(p_0 + p_1) &= \frac{1 + \epsilon \cdot p_0 + 2\sqrt{\epsilon} \cdot (1 - \epsilon)}{2} \leq \frac{1}{2} + \frac{\sqrt{\epsilon}}{2} \cdot (2 + p_0 - \sqrt{\epsilon}) \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2} + c' \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

Therefore, any adversary has atmost a constant probability of giving a valid forgery for the publically-verifiable QM scheme. □

5 Question 5

5.1 Question 5.1

Question 5.1

Question. Complete Step V_4 .

Proof. We assume that V_4 executes iff $c = 1$. In the case when $c = 0$, the verifier simply checks if the obtained x_b is one of x_0 or x_1 (the verifier knows the two pre-images using td and y). The steps of V_4 are:

1. The verifier first computes x_0, x_1 using td, y .
2. Using r, b, d, x_0, x_1 , the verifier can uniquely determine the state $|\psi_2\rangle$. Note that $|\psi_2\rangle = |b\rangle |d\rangle |\psi\rangle$, where $|\psi\rangle \in \{|0\rangle, |1\rangle, |+\rangle, |-\rangle\}$.
3. Based on c' , the verifier knows what should be the most-likely response of the prover. If the response is the same, the verifier accepts, else it rejects.

□

5.2 Question 5.2

Question 5.2

Question. (Completeness) Prove that the honest quantum prover's response is accepted with probability 1 if $c = 0$, else it is accepted with probability $\cos^2 \frac{\pi}{8}$ if $c = 1$.

Proof. If $c = 0$, then, if the prover followed the protocol honestly, on measuring $|\psi_1\rangle$ it will definitely get one of the pre-images of y . Thus, the verifier will always accept in that case. Otherwise, if $c = 1$, then the measurement is at a distance of $\pi/8$ from the actual state $|\psi\rangle$ (which is at an angle $\theta \in \{-\pi/4, 0, \pi/4, \pi/2\}$ with respect to $|0\rangle$). Therefore, the probability of an honest prover outputting the correct bit is $\cos^2 \frac{\pi}{8}$. □

5.3 Question 5.3

Question 5.3

Question. (Soundness) Show an upper bound on the success probability of any p.p.t. (classical) prover.

Proof.

□