

RobustBlindVerification.jl: Emulating quantum verification with QuEST

29 Jan 2024

Summary

Verification of delegated quantum computations is a challenging task in both theory and implementation. To address the theory, methods and protocols have been developed that outline abstract verification. Implementation will likely require a quantum network in place for certain protocols. In the mean time, specialised emulators have been developed to perform quantum computation, offering a possibility to explore verification numerically. Many emulators rely solely on the gate base model and do not allow for projective, mid-circuit measurements, a key component in most quantum verification protocols. In response, we present the Julia package, `RobustBlindVerification.jl` (RBV). RBV aims to emulate blind measurement based quantum computing (MBQC and UBQC) with interactive verification in place. Quantum computation is emulated in RBV with the Julia package `QuEST.jl`, which in turn is a wrapper package, `QuEST_jll`, developed with `BinaryBuilder.jl` (Contributors 2022) to reproducibly call the C library, `QuEST` (Jones et al. 2019). RBV is developed based on the work by Leichtle et al. (2021), herein referred to as ‘the protocol’. The protocol is an example of robust blind quantum computation (RBVQC). It is a formal verification protocol with minimal overhead, beyond computational repetition and resistant to constant noise whilst maintaining security.

Statement of need

Quantum computing appears to be on a course that leads to the need for efficient, secure and verifiable delegated access through some client-server relationship. The so-called client-server paradigm in use for current classical computation via cloud or high performance computing is the current analogue. Trust in the security, data usages, computation and algorithm implementation is not a given for delegated QC. Many protocols have been implemented to address these issues. Advancements in verification has relied on verification assuming only uncorrelated noise (Gheorghiu, Hoban, and Kashefi 2018), verification assuming

reliable state preparation per qubit (Kapourniotis and Datta 2019), verification requiring more than one server and entanglement distillation (Morimae and Fujii 2013) or verification with the assumption that a verifier has access to post-quantum cryptography unbreakable by a quantum prover (Mahadev 2022). Such results fall short of a robust verification protocol that does not suffer from costly process or are inflexible to noise. To respond to these shortcomings, the protocol addresses the problem for bounded-error quantum polynomial (BQP) computations (Leichtle et al. 2021). It is known that the complexity class BQP can efficiently solve binary decision problems with quantum computers. Further, the protocol is robust to constant noise and maintain security.

The protocol is designed such that verification is separated into the execution of rounds. The content of each round has its own requirements. After some specified number of rounds, a classical analysis is conducted and a result computed whether the server and/or the computation were to be trusted. Each round is either a round of the required computation, called a *computation* round, or the round is used to test the server, called a *test* round. The computation round is prepared and executed with UBQC, whereas the test rounds utilise a trapification strategy to conduct tests against the server. The test rounds use a strategy that splits some qubits into traps and some into dummies. The traps and the dummies are prepared according to some randomness, which though the UBQC will have deterministic outcomes that can be tested. The outcome to these tests for each round are aggregated. The aggregate count of test rounds that passed the test must exceed a predetermined amount, based on parameters of the protocol. The mode response for the computation round must be greater than half the number of computation rounds. The results of the test and computation rounds dictate the trust of the server. RBV implements the protocol under these requirements. For an in depth understanding see @Leichtle et al. (2021).

Core features and functionality

The root QC paradigm of RVBQC is MBQC. Hence, a user, after initial implementations, is able to run their given MBQC circuit and obtain noiseless results. Further, without implementing the multiple rounds of the verification protocol, the user can take that same circuit and run it blindly (UBQC). The main feature of RBV is the implementation of the protocol. Here the user is able to run the protocol with no noise, uncorrelated noise, and specific noise models.

We present a basic tutorial on the usage of RBV along with targeted functions explained.

To begin, if not already done so, download and install Julia in your preferred method. Though lately JuliaUP is recommended. Then activate the Julia project of the local directory location

```
using Pkg; Pkg.activate(".")
```

Add RobustBlindVerification.jl

```
] add RobustBlindVerification
```

To run, first decide the computational backend, either a state vector or density matrix. These are **structs** named **StateVector** and **DensityMatrix**.

```
state_type = DensityMatrix()
```

Choose the number of rounds and the number of computational rounds (the number of test rounds is the difference of computation from total).

```
total_rounds,computation_rounds = 100,50
```

RBV uses **Graphs.jl** and **MetaGraphs.jl**, so defining a graph uses that syntax. In this example we use the MBQC version of the 2 qubit Gover oracle algorithm.

```
num_vertices = 8
graph = Graph(num_vertices)
add_edge!(graph,1,2)
add_edge!(graph,2,3)
add_edge!(graph,3,6)
add_edge!(graph,6,7)
add_edge!(graph,1,4)
add_edge!(graph,4,5)
add_edge!(graph,5,8)
add_edge!(graph,7,8)
```

We can specify any classical inputs to be loaded into the algorithm as well the output qubits.

```
input = (indices = (),values = ())
output = (7,8)
```

There are algorithms for automatic flow detection, these have not been implemented, so the user defines a function for the so-called *forward flow*. The function is used to determine the *backward flow*.

```
function forward_flow(vertex)
    v_str = string(vertex)
    forward = Dict{
        "1" =>4,
        "2" =>3,
        "3" =>6,
        "4" =>5,
        "5" =>8,
        "6" =>7,
        "7" =>0,
        "8" =>0)
    forward[v_str]
end
```

Note: the internal structure of the `forward_flow` does not matter, as long as vertex input returns vertex output (`Int` type) and these values correspond to the graph, then the user can define its choice of I/O for that function.

The secret angles are defined next. For the Grover algorithm, the angles are crucial in its operation.

```
function generate_grover_secret_angles(search::String)

    Dict{"00"=>(1.0* $\pi$ ,1.0* $\pi$ ),"01"=>(1.0* $\pi$ ,0),"10"=>(0,1.0* $\pi$ ),"11"=>(0,0)) |>
    x -> x[search] |>
    x -> [0,0,1.0*x[1],1.0*x[2],0,0,1.0* $\pi$ ,1.0* $\pi$ ] |>
    x -> Float64.(x)

end
```

The function `generate_grover_secret_angles` defines the angles associated to each vertex in the graph which is dependent on the `search` input. Here we will define `search` as 11

```
search = "11"
secret_angles = generate_grover_secret_angles(search)
```

Names of inputs can vary, but they are all stored in a `NamedTuple` as

```
para= (
    graph=graph,
    forward_flow = forward_flow,
    input = input,
    output = output,
    secret_angles=secret_angles,
    state_type = state_type,
    total_rounds = total_rounds,
    computation_rounds = computation_rounds)
```

To run the MBQC and UBQC we only need `para`

```
mbqc_outcome = run_mbqc(para)
ubqc_outcome = run_ubqc(para)
```

For the verification protocol we specify the type of *Server*

```
vbqc_outcome = run_verification_simulator(TrustworthyServer(),Verbose(),para)
vbqc_outcome = run_verification_simulator(TrustworthyServer(),Terse(),para)
```

Here the server is `TrustworthyServer`, so all results are done in a noiseless state and the server agent (simulated server not real one) is not interfering with the computation. The `Verbose` flag dictates the output to include extra details of the results [add content]. The `Terse` flag returns only whether the computation was `Ok` or `Abort`. For a `MaliciousServer`, meaning one that adds an additional angle to the updated angle basis for measurement.

```
malicious_angles =  $\pi/2$ 
malicious_vbqc_outcome = run_verification_simulator(MaliciousServer(),Verbose(),para,ma
```

The `malicious_angles` can be a single angle, applied uniformly to all qubits, or a vector of angles applied specifically to each qubit according to order from 1 to `num_vertices`.

To add noise to the verification, there are some ready-made models to choose from, damping, dephasing, depolarising, pauli, (need to finalise these: Kraus, two qubit, density matrix mixing, N qubit kruas).

Depending on the noise, there are constraints based on the theory of the noise, so lets scale noise `p_scale = 0.05`. Lets do a damping noise model.

```
p = [p_scale*rand() for i in vertices(para[:graph])]
model = Damping(Quest(),SingleQubit(),p)
server = NoisyServer(model)
vbqc_outcome = run_verification_simulator(server,Verbose(),para)
```

Here we generate `n` random probabilities, which will be applied to each qubit in the graph. A noise model is defined by the `struct` representing the noise, in this case, `Damping()`. Each noise model only takes three arguments. In future plans different quantum computing backends will be used (BYOQ - Bring Your Own Quantum), so the QC emulator is specified, `Quest` in this case. The noise model is applied to individual qubits, the second argument is `SingleQubit`, as opposed to `TwoQubit` or `NQubit`, the latter are not in use yet. Finally, the probability, like before this can be a scalar or a vector, the scalar being applied uniformly as before. The `model` is a container, which is stored inside the type of server, here `NoisyServer`. Then the same simulator is called `run_verification_simulator` to run the protocol, but with the specified noise model. The following show a similar implementation.

```
# Dephasing
p = [p_scale*rand() for i in vertices(para[:graph])]
model = Dephasing(Quest(),SingleQubit(),p)
server = NoisyServer(model)
vbqc_outcome = run_verification_simulator(server,Verbose(),para)
```

```
# Depolarising
p = [p_scale*rand() for i in vertices(para[:graph])]
model = Depolarising(Quest(),SingleQubit(),p)
server = NoisyServer(model)
vbqc_outcome = run_verification_simulator(server,Verbose(),para)
```

```
# Pauli
p_xyz(p_scale) = p_scale .* [rand(),rand(),rand()]
p = [p_xyz(p_scale) for i in vertices(para[:graph])]
model = Pauli(Quest(),SingleQubit(),p)
```

```
server = NoisyServer(model)
vbqc_outcome = run_verification_simulator(server,Verbose(),para)
```

The Pauli noise acts on the x,y and z axis to there are three probabilities for each qubit. In addition to each simulator being able to run a single noise model, we can run a list of noise models.

```
# Vector of noise models
model_vec = [Damping,Dephasing,Depolarising,Pauli]
p_damp = [p_scale*rand() for i in vertices(para[:graph])]
p_deph = [p_scale*rand() for i in vertices(para[:graph])]
p_depo = [p_scale*rand() for i in vertices(para[:graph])]
p_pauli = [p_xyz(p_scale) for i in vertices(para[:graph])]
prob_vec = [p_damp,p_deph,p_depo,p_pauli]

models = Vector{NoiseModels}()
for m in eachindex(model_vec)           push!(models,model_vec[m](Quest(),SingleQubit(),prob_vec[m]))
end
server = NoisyServer(models)
vbqc_outcome = run_verification_simulator(server,Verbose(),para)
```

If we want to run general Kraus maps, we can do so on single, double and n qubit levels - **NEED TO DO**. If we have a density matrix with a specified noise model, we can mix that with the algorithm as well - **NEED TO DO**.

Inside the verification simulator

Let us look closer at the TrustWorthy Verbose simulator function.

```
function run_verification_simulator(::TrustworthyServer,::Verbose,para)
...
end
```

Currently, the trapification strategy is to generate a random colouring of the presented graph, based on a greedy heuristic [Cite graphs package?]. Naively the choice is made such that out of 100 repetitions, the best coloring is picked. The computation round is simply one colour for all vertices.

```
computation_colours = ones(nv(para[:graph]))
```

For each coloured vertex, a 2-colour graph is formed, that of the colored vertex and a colour for the remaining vertices. Hence, a 4-colour graph, can be split into 4 distinct graphs according to the colouring.

```
test_colours = get_vector_graph_colors(para[:graph];reps=reps)
```

To determine the number of acceptable failed rounds a value is computed dependent on the BQP error, the number of colours and the distribution of test rounds to total rounds.

```

chroma_number = length(test_colours)
bqp = InherentBoundedError(1/3)
test_rounds_theshold = compute_trap_round_fail_threshold(para[:total_rounds],para[:comp

```

Recall that the `forward_flow` is user defined, then the `backward_flow` is numerically computed./

```

backward_flow(vertex) = compute_backward_flow(para[:graph],para[:forward_flow],vertex)

```

These computations along with the remaining values from `para` are stored in a `NamedTuple` which is used to create a `struct` wrapping all variables in a defined type.

```

p = (
    input_indices = para[:input][:indices],
    input_values = para[:input][:values],
    output_indices = para[:output],
    graph=para[:graph],
    computation_colours=computation_colours,
    test_colours=test_colours,
    secret_angles=para[:secret_angles],
    forward_flow = para[:forward_flow],
    backward_flow=backward_flow)

```

```

client_resource = create_graph_resource(p)

```

The `round_types` is a random permutation of `structs` `ComputationRound` and `TestRound` on the exact number of each.

```

round_types = draw_random_rounds(para[:total_rounds],para[:computation_rounds])

```

The type held by `round_types` is a `Vector`, which is iterated through to execute rounds determined by element of the iterator. The function `run_verification` executes the protocol for each round and return a vector of `MetaGraphs` for each round.

```

rounds_as_graphs = run_verification(
    Client(),Server(),
    round_types,client_resource,
    para[:state_type])

```

The `MetaGraph` is the core data structure for any given MBQC computation. Due to it's inherent graph and vertex properties, mulitple dispatch was used to perform appropriate computation across vertices in a graph. Results for the `Verbose` flag ar the outcomes with the results for acceptable round or failed round.

```

test_verification = verify_rounds(Client(),TestRound(),Terse(),rounds_as_graphs,test
computation_verification = verify_rounds(Client(),ComputationRound(),Terse(),rounds
test_verification_verb = verify_rounds(Client(),TestRound(),Verbose(),rounds_as_grap

```

```

computation_verification_verb = verify_rounds(Client(),ComputationRound(),Verbose())
mode_outcome = get_mode_output(Client(),ComputationRound(),rounds_as_graphs)

```

These results are returned as a NamedTuple

```

return (
    test_verification = test_verification,
    test_verification_verb = test_verification_verb,
    computation_verification = computation_verification,
    computation_verification_verb = computation_verification_verb,
    mode_outcome = mode_outcome)

```

Let's look closer at the verification function, `run_verification`.

```

function run_verification(::Client, ::Server,
    round_types, client_resource, state_type)
    ...
    round_graphs
end

```

As before, we take a `Client` and a `Server` type, the server can be replaced with a different type given a desired computation. We run the verification protocol over a vector of rounds.

```

round_graphs = []
for round_type in round_types
    ...
    client_meta_graph = ...
    push!(round_graphs, client_meta_graph)
end

```

For each `round_type` in the vector `round_types`, note `round_type` is either `TestRound` or `ComputationRound` and Julia's multiple dispatch will perform the appropriate functions based on said type, the computation is performed, details are mutated onto the property graph, `client_meta_graph` and stored in the vector `round_graphs`. Within each round several computations take place. First,

```

client_meta_graph = generate_property_graph!(
    Client(),
    round_type,
    client_resource,
    state_type)

```

a `client_meta_graph` is generated with the function `generate_property_graph!` which takes the `Client`, `round_type`, `client_resource` and `state_type` as inputs. This function will be discussed further below. The `client_meta_graph` contains round specific values, the vertex angles, the forward and backward vertices according to the flow, allocation variables for measurement outcomes,

the initialised state quantum register backed by QuEST. Note that no vertex is entangled, only initialised according the UBQC methodologies of client and server separation. To effect this distinction the client quantum register and simple graph are extracted.

```
client_graph = produce_initialised_graph(Client(),client_meta_graph)
client_quireg = produce_initialised_quireg(Client(),client_meta_graph)
```

The the server resource is created, `create_resource`, using the `Server`, `client_graph` and `client_quireg` as inputs. The server side resource is where noise is added if that is the case and where the circuit is entangled according to the edge map of the underlying MBQC graph structure.

```
server_resource = create_resource(Server(),client_graph,client_quireg)
```

From here the server quantum state, or register is extracted from the server container, `server_resource`, thus, separation of the client and the server is effected. We even extract the number of qubits based on the server register.

```
server_quantum_state = server_resource["quantum_state"]
num_qubits_from_server = server_quantum_state.numQubitsRepresented
```

Now for the given round, which has entirely driven the specific values of the property graph, the UBQC computation can be performed.

```
run_computation(Client(),Server(),client_meta_graph,num_qubits_from_server,server_quantum_state)
```

The underlying register is still in effect, so to save loading and memory usage, we clear the state of the server register, ready to take on the next round of client side computation.

```
initialise_blank_quantum_state!(server_quantum_state)
```

Now we come back to pushing the `client_meta_graph`, which now holds all of the measurement outcomes, to the `round_graphs` vector. This is then returned at the end of the function call.

```
push!(round_graphs,client_meta_graph)
```

The result is a vector of rounds. Further explanation is found at the GitHub repository.

To Do

1. Finish QuEST.jl to acceptable degree
2. Add and complete documentation to package
3. Provide tutorials
4. Get QuEST.jl linked on QuEST homepage
5. Edit paper
6. Get checklist for JOSS
7. Complete checklist

Acknowledgements

We acknowledge contributions from Brigitta Sipocz, Syrtis Major, and Semyeong Oh, and support from Kathryn Johnston during the genesis of this project.

References

- Contributors, BinaryBuilder. 2022. “BinaryBuilder.jl.” *GitHub Repository*. <https://github.com/JuliaPackaging/BinaryBuilder.jl>; GitHub.
- Gheorghiu, Alexandru, Matty J Hoban, and Elham Kashefi. 2018. “A Simple Protocol for Fault Tolerant Verification of Quantum Computation.” *Quantum Science and Technology* 4 (1): 015009. <https://doi.org/10.1088/2058-9565/aaeb3>.
- Jones, Tyson, Anna Brown, Ian Bush, and Simon C. Benjamin. 2019. “QuEST and High Performance Simulation of Quantum Computers.” *Scientific Reports* 9 (1): 10736. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-019-47174-9>.
- Kapourniotis, Theodoros, and Animesh Datta. 2019. “Nonadaptive Fault-Tolerant Verification of Quantum Supremacy with Noise.” *Quantum* 3 (July): 164. <https://doi.org/10.22331/q-2019-07-12-164>.
- Leichtle, Dominik, Luka Music, Elham Kashefi, and Harold Ollivier. 2021. “Verifying BQP Computations on Noisy Devices with Minimal Overhead.” *PRX Quantum* 2 (October): 040302. <https://doi.org/10.1103/PRXQuantum.2.040302>.
- Mahadev, Urmila. 2022. “Classical Verification of Quantum Computations.” *SIAM Journal on Computing* 51 (4): 1172–1229. <https://doi.org/10.1137/20M1371828>.
- Morimae, Tomoyuki, and Keisuke Fujii. 2013. “Secure Entanglement Distillation for Double-Server Blind Quantum Computation.” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 111 (July): 020502. <https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.111.020502>.