

## Exercise Sheet 9

Out: 2020-05-20

Due: 2020-05-27

## Problem 1: Discrete Fourier Transform

In this problem, note that the indexes in the definition of the DFT start with 0. I.e., the top-left component of  $D_N = N^{-1/2} ((e^{2i\pi kl/N}))_{kl}$  is  $N^{-1/2} e^{2i\pi 00/N} = 1$ .

(a) Show that the  $N \times N$ -DFT  $D_N$  is unitary.

**Hint:** Show first that for some  $\tilde{\omega} \in \mathbb{C}$  with  $\tilde{\omega}^N = 1$  and  $\tilde{\omega} \neq 1$ , we have  $\sum_{k=0}^{N-1} \tilde{\omega}^k = 0$ . (What is  $\tilde{\omega} \cdot (\sum_{k=0}^{N-1} \tilde{\omega}^k)$ ?)

(b) Give a circuit for  $D_2$  using only elementary gates (i.e., only gates given in the lecture notes in Sections 2 and 5).

(c) (**Bonus**) Let  $N > 0$  be an integer. Let  $r \in \{1, \dots, N\}$  with  $r \mid N$ . Let  $x_0 \in \{0, \dots, r-1\}$ . Let  $|\Psi\rangle := t^{-1/2} \sum_{k=0}^{t-1} |x_0 + kr\rangle$  where  $t$  is a normalization factor and  $t := N/r$ .

(If  $r = \text{ord } a \mid N$  for some group element  $a$ , then  $|\Psi\rangle$  is the post-measurement state we have in Shor's order-finding algorithm directly before applying the DFT  $D_N$ .)

Let  $D_N$  be the  $N \times N$ -DFT. Let  $|\Psi'\rangle := D_N|\Psi\rangle$ . Consider a measurement on  $|\Psi'\rangle$  in the computational basis and let  $\gamma$  denote the outcome. Show that  $\Pr[\frac{N}{r} \text{ divides } \gamma] = 1$ . (In other words, if  $N \nmid \gamma r$  then  $|\langle \gamma | \Psi' \rangle|^2 = 0$ .)

(That is, at least in the case where  $\text{ord } a \mid N$ , the order finding algorithm returns a multiple of  $N/\text{ord } a$ .)

**Hint:** Show first that for some  $\tilde{\omega} \in \mathbb{C}$  and  $t \in \mathbb{N}$  with  $\tilde{\omega}^t = 1$  and  $\tilde{\omega} \neq 1$ , we have  $\sum_{k=0}^{t-1} \tilde{\omega}^k = 0$ .

**Note:** This was sketched in the lecture. You only get points if your proof goes beyond the sketch in the lecture in detail/rigor.

## Problem 2: Breaking a Protocol

Consider the following commitment protocol (where  $n$  is some security parameter).

- *Commit phase.* Alice wants to commit to a bit  $b$ . First, she chooses  $n$  uniformly random bits  $x_1, \dots, x_n \in \{0, 1\}$ . If  $b = 0$  she encodes them in the computational

basis; if  $b = 1$ , in the diagonal basis. I.e., if  $b = 0, x_i = 0$ , then  $|\Psi_i\rangle := |0\rangle$ , if  $b = 0, x_i = 1$ , then  $|\Psi_i\rangle := |1\rangle$ , if  $b = 1, x_i = 0$ , then  $|\Psi_i\rangle := |+\rangle$ , if  $b = 1, x_i = 1$ , then  $|\Psi_i\rangle := |-\rangle$ .

Then Alice sends the qubits  $|\Psi_1\rangle, \dots, |\Psi_n\rangle$  to Bob.

- For each of the qubits, Bob randomly chooses whether to measure it in the computational or the diagonal basis. Let the outcomes of these measurements be denoted  $\tilde{x}_i$ .
- *Unveil phase.* Alice sends  $b, x_1, \dots, x_n$  to Bob.
- Bob checks whether  $x_i = \tilde{x}_i$  for all  $i$  where Bob measured in the right basis (computational in the case of  $b = 0$ , diagonal in the case of  $b = 1$ ).

The intuition behind this protocol is as follows: It is hiding because Bob cannot distinguish which bases Alice used. It is binding because of the following reason: If Bob measures some  $|\Psi_i\rangle$  in, say, the computational basis, but  $|\Psi_i\rangle$  was not one of  $|0\rangle, |1\rangle$ , then the outcome of the measurement is to some extent random, and Alice cannot predict the output  $\tilde{x}_i$  of Bob's measurement. On the other hand, if Bob measures  $|\Psi_i\rangle$  in the diagonal basis, but  $|\Psi_i\rangle$  was not one of  $|+\rangle, |-\rangle$ , then the outcome of the measurement is again random, and Alice cannot predict the output  $\tilde{x}_i$  of Bob's measurement. So whatever state  $|\Psi\rangle$  Alice sends, there is some probability that she will not know  $\tilde{x}_i$ . And since to unveil both as  $b = 0$  and as  $b = 1$ , Alice needs to know all  $\tilde{x}_i$ , she will fail.

Of course, this intuition cannot be correct since we know from the lecture that this (and any other) commitment protocol cannot be secure.

- Show that this protocol is perfectly hiding (i.e.,  $\varepsilon_H$ -hiding for  $\varepsilon_H = 0$ ).
- Show that this protocol is not  $\varepsilon_B$ -binding for any  $\varepsilon_B < 1$ . (I.e., it is possible for Alice to commit in a way such that she can unveil both as  $b = 0$  and as  $b = 1$ .)

**Note:** You have to actually give an attack. It is not sufficient to say that there exists an attack due to Theorem 6 in the lecture notes and (a).

**Hint:** Think of Bell pairs. Try out what happens if you measure both qubits of  $|\beta_{00}\rangle$  in the diagonal basis.