

## Few Notations

- We denote  $|+\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|0\rangle + |1\rangle)$  and  $|-\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|0\rangle - |1\rangle)$ ,
- Also,  $\ominus = \{|0\rangle, |1\rangle\}$  and  $\otimes = \{|+\rangle, |-\rangle\}$  are two orthonormal bases (**rectilinear** and **diagonal** resp.) in  $\mathcal{H}_2$ ,
- The 4 states **BB84** =  $\{|0\rangle, |1\rangle, |+\rangle, |-\rangle\}$  are called the BB84 states,
- **BB84(0)** =  $\{|0\rangle, |+\rangle\}$  are the two non-orthogonal encoding of classical bit 0,
- **BB84(1)** =  $\{|1\rangle, |-\rangle\}$  are the two non-orthogonal encoding of classical bit 1.
- $|\gamma_0\rangle = \cos \frac{\pi}{8} |0\rangle + \sin \frac{\pi}{8} |1\rangle$  and  $|\gamma_1\rangle = \sin \frac{\pi}{8} |0\rangle - \cos \frac{\pi}{8} |1\rangle$  are states of the Breidbard basis  $\{|\gamma_0\rangle, |\gamma_1\rangle\}$ .

# Purification (I)

## BB84(0)

1. Alice chooses  $b \in_R \{0, +\}$ ,
2. Alice sends  $|b\rangle$ ,

## BB84\*(0)

1. Alice prepares

$$|S(0)\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} (|0\rangle_1 |0\rangle_2 + |1\rangle_1 |+\rangle_2)$$

2. Alice sends particle 2 and keeps particle 1.

The state  $\rho_2$  of particle 2 in **BB84\***(0) is

$$\rho_2 = \text{Tr}_1(|S(0)\rangle\langle S(0)|) = \frac{1}{2} (|0\rangle\langle 0| + |+\rangle\langle +|) = \rho_{BB84}(0).$$

- **BB84\***(0) is called a purification of **BB84**(0). The purified version does not use any coin.
- In **BB84\***(0) Alice does not know the state sent before she measures particle 1.

## Purification (II)

One could also purify the mixture of pure states  $\mathcal{B} = \{(|\gamma_0\rangle, \cos^2 \frac{\pi}{8}), (|\gamma_1\rangle, \sin^2 \frac{\pi}{8})\}$  the same way:

$$|\mathcal{B}^*\rangle = \cos \frac{\pi}{8} |0\rangle_1 |\gamma_0\rangle_2 + \sin \frac{\pi}{8} |1\rangle_1 |\gamma_1\rangle_2$$

which satisfies

$$\rho_{\mathcal{B}} = \text{Tr}_1(|\mathcal{B}^*\rangle\langle\mathcal{B}^*|) = \cos^2 \frac{\pi}{8} |\gamma_0\rangle\langle\gamma_0| + \sin^2 \frac{\pi}{8} |\gamma_1\rangle\langle\gamma_1| = \rho(0).$$

- Nothing can tell given only particle 2 whether it is part of  $|\mathcal{B}^*\rangle$  or  $|S(0)\rangle$ .
- One can transform one into the other by applying a transformation to particle 1 alone...

# Equivalence between Purifications

Let  $U$  be the unitary transform acting in a 2-dimensional Hilbert space:

$$|0\rangle \mapsto \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|0\rangle - |1\rangle) \text{ and } |1\rangle \mapsto \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|0\rangle + |1\rangle)$$

Let's apply  $U$  on the particle 1 of  $|S(0)\rangle$ ,

$$\begin{aligned}(U \otimes \mathbf{1}) |S(0)\rangle &= (U \otimes \mathbf{1}) \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|0\rangle_1 |0\rangle_2 + |1\rangle_1 |+\rangle_2) \\ &= \frac{1}{2}((|0\rangle_1 - |1\rangle_1) |0\rangle_2 + (|0\rangle_1 + |1\rangle_1) |+\rangle_2) \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \{ |0\rangle_1(|0\rangle + |+\rangle) + |1\rangle(-|0\rangle + |+\rangle) \} \\ &= \cos \frac{\pi}{8} |0\rangle |\gamma_0\rangle + \sin \frac{\pi}{8} |1\rangle |\gamma_1\rangle = |B^*\rangle.\end{aligned}$$

## HJW Theorem (a special case)

**Theorem [HJW93].** Any pairs of purifications  $\{|\Psi_0\rangle, |\Psi_1\rangle\}$  in  $H_1 \otimes H_2$  for  $\rho \in H_2$  is related by some unitary transform  $U_{0,1} \in H_1$  that satisfies:

$$|\Psi_1\rangle^{1,2} = (U_{0,1} \otimes \mathbf{I}_2) |\Psi_0\rangle^{1,2}.$$

**Proof:** Write  $|\Psi_0\rangle$  and  $|\Psi_1\rangle$  in the Schmidt form:

$$|\Psi_0\rangle = \sum_{i=1}^r \sqrt{\lambda_i} |e_i^{(0)}\rangle \otimes |f_i\rangle$$

$$\Updownarrow U_{0,1}$$

$$|\Psi_1\rangle = \sum_{i=1}^r \sqrt{\lambda_i} |e_i^{(1)}\rangle \otimes |f_i\rangle$$

$\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_r$  are the eigenvalues of  $\rho = \text{Tr}_1(|\Psi_0\rangle\langle\Psi_0|) = \text{Tr}_1(|\Psi_1\rangle\langle\Psi_1|)$ , and  $\{|e_i^{(b)}\rangle\}_i$  and  $\{|f_i\rangle\}_i$  are orthonormal bases for  $\mathcal{H}_1$  and  $\mathcal{H}_2$ .

# Implications

We have seen,

- Purifications allow to encapsulate a quantum mixture in a pure state.
- Different purifications of the same density matrix  $\rho$  are related by some unitary transform  $U_{0,1}$  that is the identity on  $\rho \in H_2$ ,
- Purifications are therefore all equivalent under local quantum computation,

We shall see,

- Quantum 2-Party protocols can be implemented in such a way that each execution with the same classical inputs generates the same state. This process is called the **purification of a quantum protocols**,
- **This implies that no quantum bit commitment is secure against both parties.**

# Purifying a measurement

1. Alice chooses  $\theta \in_R \{\ominus, \otimes\}$ ,
2. Alice measures photon  $\pi$  in basis  $\theta$  and gets the outcome  $\hat{b}$ ,
3. Alice announces  $\hat{b}$  to Bob.

**convention:**  $|\ominus\rangle = |0\rangle$  and  $|\otimes\rangle = |1\rangle$ .

Let  $U_M$  acting on quantum register  $|\bullet\rangle$  and the received qubit  $|\bullet\rangle$ :

$$\begin{array}{l}
 \text{state of the register} \\
 \underbrace{\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|\ominus\rangle + |\otimes\rangle)}_{\text{photon } \pi} \quad \underbrace{|0\rangle}_{\text{photon } \pi} \quad \mapsto \quad \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|\ominus\rangle |0\rangle + \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|\otimes\rangle |0\rangle + |\otimes\rangle |1\rangle)) \\
 \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|\ominus\rangle + |\otimes\rangle) \quad |1\rangle \quad \mapsto \quad \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|\ominus\rangle |1\rangle + \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|\otimes\rangle |0\rangle - |\otimes\rangle |1\rangle))
 \end{array}$$

## An Example

$$\begin{aligned} U_M \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} (|\ominus\rangle + |\otimes\rangle) |+\rangle &= U_M \frac{1}{2} (|\ominus\rangle + |\otimes\rangle) (|0\rangle + |1\rangle) \\ &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} (|\otimes\rangle |0\rangle + \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} (|\ominus\rangle |0\rangle + |\ominus\rangle |1\rangle)) \end{aligned}$$

- The construction can easily be generalized for  $\theta \in \{(p, \ominus), (1 - p, \otimes)\}$  (for any  $0 \leq p \leq 1$ ) by starting with state

$$\sqrt{p} |\ominus\rangle + \sqrt{1 - p} |\otimes\rangle$$

- Measuring  $|\bullet\rangle$  alone gives the classical outcome of an *undetermined* random measurement  $\{\ominus, \otimes\}$ .
- $\Rightarrow$  The outcome  $\hat{b}$  can be obtained without  $\theta$  being determined,
- $\Rightarrow$  Purifying a measurement postpones the choice of it until it is really required.



# Purifying Quantum Protocols (I)

1. Set an internal register with a fresh **random bit** according to distribution  $\{(0, p), (1, 1 - p)\}$ ,
2. **Compute** a function  $f$  of the set of registers and store the outcome,
3. **Send** the content of a quantum register to the peer,
4. **Classical announcement** to the peer of the content of one register,
5. **Quantum reception** of a new qubit,
6. **Classical reception** of a new classical bit.

## Purifying Quantum Protocols (II)

1. **Randomness:** A new quantum register  $|R\rangle$  is set to

$$|R\rangle = \sqrt{p} |0\rangle + \sqrt{1-p} |1\rangle.$$

2. **Computation/Measurement:** Let  $U_f$  the unitary transformation implementing  $f$  and acting on the set  $\mathcal{V}$  of registers. The new state  $\mathcal{V}'$  for the registers is

$$|\mathcal{V}'\rangle = U_f |\mathcal{V}\rangle.$$

3. **Quantum transmission:** A quantum register is sent away.
4. **Classical announcement:** The register containing the bit is measured (in the standard basis  $\ominus$ ) and the classical result announced.
5. **Quantum/Classical reception:** The received qubit is added to the set of registers.

# Mayers' Theorem (ind. disc. Lo & Chau)

**Theorem**[PRL97]. Any unconditionally concealing quantum bit commitment protocol is necessarily not binding.

**Proof sketch.** Assume  $\rho_0 = \rho_1$  where  $\rho_b$  is the mixed state sent when Alice commits upon  $b$ .

Let  $|\Psi_0\rangle \in H_A \otimes H_B$  and  $|\Psi_1\rangle \in H_A \otimes H_B$  be the purifications for Commit(0) and Commit(1) respectively,

$$\begin{aligned} |\Psi_0\rangle &= \sum_i \lambda_i |e_i^{(0)}\rangle \otimes |f_i\rangle \\ |\Psi_1\rangle &= \sum_i \lambda_i |e_i^{(1)}\rangle \otimes |f_i\rangle. \end{aligned}$$

since  $|\Psi_0\rangle$  and  $|\Psi_1\rangle$  are purifications of the same density matrix  $\rho = \rho_0 = \rho_1$  (i.e. *required for perfectly concealing commitments*).

## Cheating Alice

- Alice executes the purification  $|\Psi_0\rangle$  for **commit**(0),
- If Alice wants to unveil 0 she just executes **unveil**(0) from  $|\Psi_0\rangle$ ,
- If Alice wants to unveil 1:
  - She applies  $U_{0,1} \in H_A$  to her part of  $|\Psi_0\rangle$  promised by Theorem [HJW93],

$$|\Psi_1\rangle = (U_{0,1} \otimes \mathbb{1}_B) |\Psi_0\rangle,$$

- She executes **unveil**(1) from  $|\Psi_1\rangle$ .

⇒ How to generalize to the case where the commitments are *statistically concealing*:

$$\rho_0 \approx \rho_1?$$

# Statistically Concealing Commitments

If  $\Lambda_0 = \{\rho_0^{(n)}\}$  and  $\Lambda_1 = \{\rho_1^{(n)}\}$  are statistically indistinguishable,

$$B(\rho_0^{(n)}, \rho_1^{(n)}) \geq 1 - \epsilon^n \Rightarrow$$

$$|\Psi_1\rangle \in \text{Purif}(\rho_1^{(n)}), |\hat{\Psi}_1\rangle \in \text{Purif}(\rho_0^{(n)}) : \|\langle \Psi_1 | \hat{\Psi}_1 \rangle\| \geq 1 - \epsilon^n$$

Let  $\hat{U}_{0,1}$  be such that  $|\hat{\Psi}_1\rangle = (\hat{U}_{0,1} \otimes \mathbb{1}_B) |\Psi_0\rangle$  (from [HJW93]):

## Alice's Attack

- Alice executes the purification  $|\Psi_0\rangle$  for **commit**(0),
- If Alice wants to unveil 0 she just executes **unveil**(0) from  $|\Psi_0\rangle$ ,
- If Alice wants to unveil 1:
  - She applies  $\hat{U}_{0,1} \in H_A : |\hat{\Psi}_1\rangle = (\hat{U}_{0,1} \otimes \mathbb{1}_B) |\Psi_0\rangle$ ,
  - She executes **unveil**(1) from  $|\hat{\Psi}_1\rangle$ .