

COM-440, Introduction to Quantum Cryptography, Fall 2025

Partial Midterm Solutions

1. Superdense Coding.

- (a) Here one has to be careful about the task. Clearly you are being asked to evaluate a guessing probability. On what state? If we label Alice's two bits as $x, \theta \in \{0, 1\}$ then we can write the qubit that encodes them as $|x\rangle_\theta$. The joint state of Alice's bits and the encoded qubit is a cq state $\rho_{X\Theta E} = \frac{1}{4} \sum_{x,\theta} |x\rangle\langle x| \otimes |\theta\rangle\langle\theta| \otimes |x\rangle\langle x|_\theta$. We know that $P_{\text{guess}}(X\Theta|E) = 2^{-H_{\min}(X\Theta|E)}$. To evaluate this last term, we note that by the chain rule $H_{\min}(X\Theta|E) \geq H_{\min}(X\Theta) - \log|E|$. The first term is the min-entropy of two uniformly random bits, so it equals 2; and the second term is the size of E in qubits, which is 1. Therefore, we have established $P_{\text{guess}}(X\Theta|E) \leq \frac{1}{2}$. To show that there is equality we design a guessing strategy: Eve measures E in the standard basis, obtains an outcome $y \in \{0, 1\}$ and returns $(y, 0)$ as her two bits. This is correct with probability 1 in case the basis was indeed the standard basis, i.e. $\theta = 0$, and it is correct with probability 0 in case $\theta = 1$. Overall, the success probability is $\frac{1}{2}$.

The other questions were solved well and we do not detail the solution.

2. Secret sharing among three people.

- (a) We directly calculate one matrix and use the symmetry among A, B, C to extrapolate the others.

$$\begin{aligned}\rho_A &= \text{Tr}_{BC}(|\Psi\rangle\langle\Psi|) \\ &= \frac{1}{2}(|0\rangle\langle 0|_A \otimes \text{tr}(|0\rangle\langle 0|_B) \otimes \text{tr}(|0\rangle\langle 0|_C) + (-1)^{2b} |1\rangle\langle 1|_A \otimes \text{tr}(|1\rangle\langle 1|_B) \otimes \text{tr}(|1\rangle\langle 1|_C)) \\ &= \frac{1}{2}(|0\rangle\langle 0|_A + |1\rangle\langle 1|_A) \\ &= \frac{\mathbb{I}}{2}\end{aligned}$$

We similarly have $\rho_B = \frac{1}{2}(|0\rangle\langle 0|_B + |1\rangle\langle 1|_B) = \frac{\mathbb{I}}{2}$ and $\rho_C = \frac{1}{2}(|0\rangle\langle 0|_C + |1\rangle\langle 1|_C) = \frac{\mathbb{I}}{2}$. This state is independent of b and so any measurement on a single system will lead to an outcome distribution that is independent of b : the secret cannot be retrieved by one party only.

- (b) Again calculate one matrix and use the symmetry among A, B, C to extrapolate the others.

$$\begin{aligned}
\rho_{AB} &= \text{Tr}_C(|\Psi\rangle\langle\Psi|) \\
&= \frac{1}{2}(|0\rangle\langle 0|_A \otimes |0\rangle\langle 0|_B \otimes \text{tr}(|0\rangle\langle 0|_C) + (-1)^{2b} |1\rangle\langle 1|_A \otimes |1\rangle\langle 1|_B \otimes \text{tr}(|1\rangle\langle 1|_C)) \\
&= \frac{1}{2}(|0\rangle\langle 0|_A \otimes |0\rangle\langle 0|_B + |1\rangle\langle 1|_A \otimes |1\rangle\langle 1|_B) \\
&= \frac{1}{2}(|00\rangle\langle 00|_{AB} + |11\rangle\langle 11|_{AB})
\end{aligned}$$

and similarly $\rho_{BC} = \frac{1}{2}(|00\rangle\langle 00|_{BC} + |11\rangle\langle 11|_{BC})$ and $\rho_{AC} = \frac{1}{2}(|00\rangle\langle 00|_{AC} + |11\rangle\langle 11|_{AC})$. These densities are independent of b , so any measurement made by any pair will not give information about b .

- (c) Have Alice, Bob, and Charlie apply the Hadamard operation on their qubit to get the new state

$$|\Psi_0\rangle = \frac{1}{4}((|0\rangle + |1\rangle)^3 + (|0\rangle - |1\rangle)^3) = \frac{1}{4}(|000\rangle + |011\rangle + |110\rangle + |101\rangle)$$

if $b = 0$ and the new state

$$|\Psi_1\rangle = \frac{1}{4}((|0\rangle + |1\rangle)^3 - (|0\rangle - |1\rangle)^3) = \frac{1}{4}(|001\rangle + |010\rangle + |100\rangle + |111\rangle)$$

if $b = 1$. Next, we have Alice, Bob, and Charlie measure their qubits. Note by inspection, the tensor product of all three observations must either be in the set

$$S_0 = \{|0\rangle_A |0\rangle_B |0\rangle_C, |0\rangle_A |1\rangle_B |1\rangle_C, |1\rangle_A |1\rangle_B |0\rangle_C, |1\rangle_A |0\rangle_B |1\rangle_C\}$$

if $b = 0$, and must be in the set

$$S_1 = \{|0\rangle_A |0\rangle_B |1\rangle_C, |0\rangle_A |1\rangle_B |0\rangle_C, |1\rangle_A |0\rangle_B |0\rangle_C, |1\rangle_A |1\rangle_B |1\rangle_C\}$$

if $b = 1$.

Hence we can have Alice and Bob send their measurement to Charlie, and Charlie will see whether their collective measurements are in S_0 or S_1 to recover b .

3. **Quantum money security variant.** The scheme is *not* secure under the new security definition. Consider the following adversary, which runs in exponential time. The adversary ignores the quantum bill sent by the challenger. Instead, for every possible pair $x, \theta \in \{0, 1\}^n$ the adversary does the following: prepare the n -qubit state $|x\rangle_\theta$ and send it for verification. If verification fails, proceed to the next pair x, θ . If it succeeds, then prepare two fresh copies of $|x\rangle_\theta$ (which is possible since x, θ are known) and submit them as response to the challenger. This adversary succeeds with probability 1, after at most $2^n \times 2^n$ attempts at verification.

4. Inner product extractor.

(a) The family is not 2-universal (in fact, it is not even 1-universal) because for the case where $x = 0^n$, $x' \neq x$, $z = 1$ and z' arbitrary we calculate $\mathbf{Pr}_y[f_y(x) = z \wedge f_y(x') = z'] = 0$ (because $f_y(0^n) = 0$ for all y), and not $\frac{1}{4}$ as would be required for a 2-universal family (note that here the parameter $m = 1$).

- i. This question could be approached in different ways. One possibility is to use the characterization of the trace norm as $\|\sigma_{0,y} - \sigma_{1,y}\|_{tr} = \sup_{0 \leq M \leq \mathbb{I}} \text{Tr}(M(\sigma_{0,y} - \sigma_{1,y}))$. Because $0 \leq M \leq \mathbb{I}$ the right-hand side is always at most 1. For there to be equality, for the optimal M we must have $\text{Tr}(M\sigma_{0,y}) = 1$ and $\text{Tr}(M\sigma_{1,y}) = 0$. Now we can see that if we replace M by the projection P on its support (i.e. round the singular values to 1, unless they are 0) the condition $\text{Tr}(P\sigma_{0,y}) = 0$ still holds but $\text{Tr}(P\sigma_{1,y}) \geq \text{Tr}(M\sigma_{1,y}) = 1$. Since of course $\text{Tr}(P\sigma_{1,y}) \leq \text{Tr}(\sigma_{1,y}) = 1$, we are done.
- ii. Let P_y be the projection obtained in the previous question. We verify that the map

$$U : |\psi\rangle_E |y\rangle_Y |0\rangle_A \mapsto P_y |\psi\rangle_E |y\rangle_Y |0\rangle_A + (\mathbb{I} - P_y) |\psi\rangle_E |y\rangle_Y |1\rangle_A ,$$

defined as such on every state $|\psi\rangle_E$ and $|y\rangle$, can be extended into a valid unitary. This is verified by checking that inner products are preserved, i.e. for any $|\psi\rangle_E, |\psi'\rangle_E$ and y, y' ,

$$\begin{aligned} & (P_y |\psi\rangle_E |y\rangle_Y |0\rangle_A + (\mathbb{I} - P_y) |\psi\rangle_E |y\rangle_Y |1\rangle_A)^\dagger \cdot (P_{y'} |\psi'\rangle_E |y'\rangle_Y |0\rangle_A \\ & \quad + (\mathbb{I} - P_{y'}) |\psi'\rangle_E |y'\rangle_Y |1\rangle_A) \\ & = \delta_{yy'} \langle \psi |_E P_y |\psi'\rangle_E + \langle \psi |_E (\mathbb{I} - P_y) |\psi'\rangle_E \\ & = \delta_{yy'} \langle \psi | \psi' \rangle_E , \end{aligned}$$

where for the last two lines we used that P_y is an orthogonal projection (and in particular $P_y(\mathbb{I} - P_y) = 0$).

- iii. This is a direct calculation and we find

$$U' |\psi_x\rangle_E |y\rangle_Y |0\rangle_A |-\rangle_B = (-1)^{x \cdot y} |\psi_x\rangle_E |y\rangle_Y |0\rangle_A |-\rangle_B .$$

- iv. Given $|\psi_x\rangle$, V first applies some Hadamards on the Y register to create $\frac{1}{\sqrt{2^n}} \sum_y |y\rangle$. It also applies an X followed by a Hadamard on B to create a $|-\rangle$. It then applies U' from the previous question, and undoes all the Hadamards and the X . This amounts to performing a QFT and the result is exactly the one desired.
- v. We see that assumption (2) implies that it is possible to exactly recover X from E , and thus this is only possible in case $H_{min}(X|E) = 0$.