QII Exercise sheet 8

Quantum Fingerprinting

We consider a different scenario here where Alice and Bob have respectively a string $x \in \{0,1\}^n$ and $y \in \{0,1\}^n$. They each send a message to a referee R that has to determine whether x = y or not. Alice and Bob do not have shared randomness.

Alice, Bob and the referee cooperate and they win iff. R outputs "0" if x = y and "1" if $x \neq y$.

Assume the referee has a procedure that given any 2 states $|\psi_1\rangle$, $|\psi_2\rangle$ outputs "0" wp $\frac{1}{2} + \frac{|\langle \psi_1 | \psi_2 \rangle|^2}{2}$.

Exercise 1. Using states of the form $|\psi_x\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\sum_i |i\rangle |x_i\rangle$, give a procedure where Alice and Bob send states of size $\lceil \log_2(n) \rceil + 1$ and where the referee always succeeds when x = y and succeeds wp. $\frac{1}{2} - \frac{\delta^2}{2}$ where $\delta = \frac{1}{n} |\{i : x_i = y_i\}|$.

Exercise 2. We assume there exists a function $E : \{0,1\}^n \to \{0,1\}^m$ with m = 2n st. $\forall x, y \neq x \in \{0,1\}^n$, $|\{i \in [m] : E(x)_i = E(y)_i\}| \leq \frac{28m}{30}$ (Such a function can be constructed using an error-correcting code). Show how to use this function in order to win the game with constant probability non zero when $x \neq y$, by sending $O(\log(n))$ qubits to the referee.

Exercise 3. For 2 states $|\psi_1\rangle$, $|\psi_2\rangle$, we consider the circuit



where the second gate is a control-SWAP defined as

 $C - \text{SWAP} |0\rangle |x\rangle |y\rangle = |0\rangle |x\rangle |y\rangle ; C - \text{SWAP} |1\rangle |x\rangle |y\rangle = |1\rangle |y\rangle |x\rangle.$

for any $x, y \in \{0, 1\}$. Show that this circuit performs the procedure of the referee that outputs 0 wp. $\frac{1}{2} + \frac{|\langle \psi_1 | \psi_2 \rangle|^2}{2}$.

Hidden Matching Problem

Alice has a random string $x = (x_1, \ldots, x_n)$ unknown to Bob with n even. Bob has a matching M which is a list of $\frac{n}{2}$ disjoint pairs (i, j) for $i, j \neq i \in \{1, \ldots, n\}$. For example for n = 6, the list ((1, 4), (2, 3), (5, 6)) is a possible matching. For n = 10, the lists ((1, 7), (2, 9), (3, 4), (5, 10), (6, 8)) and ((1, 4), (2, 10), (3, 5), (6, 9), (7, 8)) are two possible matchings.

Alice and Bob cooperate and we are in the one-way communication model where Alice is allowed to send a single message to Bob. Bob outputs a triplet (i, j, b). They win iff. $(i, j) \in M$ and $x_i \oplus x_j = b$.

Exercise 4. We consider the following quantum protocol for this problem

- Alice creates the state $|\psi_x\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{l=1}^n (-1)^{x_l} |l\rangle$ and sends it to Bob.
- Bob has a matching M = ((i₁, j₁),..., (i_{n/2}, j_{n/2})). Let Π = {Π_i}_{i∈{1,...,n/2}} be a projective measurement with Π_k = |i_k⟩⟨i_k| + |j_k⟩⟨j_k|. Bob measures using this measurement. He uses the resulting outcome to output a triplet (i, j, b) in a way you will show in one of the questions.
- 1. What is the size of $|\psi_x\rangle$?
- 2. Show that Π is a valid quantum measurement.
- 3. For each $k \in \{1, \ldots, n/2\}$, what is the probability that Bob outputs "k"?
- 4. Assume Bob gets outcome k, what is the remaining state $|\psi_x^k\rangle$ after the measurement?
- 5. Show how Bob can output (i, j, b) from his outcome "k" and the state $|\psi_x^k\rangle$.

Exercise 5. Show a randomized strategy where Alice sends a message of size $O(\sqrt{n})$ that succeeds wp. at least $\frac{2}{3}$. Think of the birthday's paradox.

This is actually optimal for classical one-way communication so it shows an exponential separation between classical and quantum one-way communication complexity. See $[GKK^+06]$ for more details.

References

[GKK⁺06] Dmytro Gavinsky, Julia Kempe, Iordanis Kerenidis, Ran Raz, and Ronald de Wolf. Exponential separations for one-way quantum communication complexity, with applications to cryptography. arXiv, https://arxiv.org/abs/quant-ph/0611209, 2006.