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#1 Application of quantum computing: Disprove Gil Kalai! (And the Extended Church-Turing Thesis)

Might actually be able to achieve in the next couple years, e.g. with Google’s 72-qubit Bristlecone chip. “Obviously useless for anything else,” but who cares?
The Sampling Approach
Put forward by A.-Arkhipov 2011 (BosonSampling),
Bremner-Jozsa-Shepherd 2011 (IQP Model), and others

Consider problems where the goal is to sample from a desired distribution over n-bit strings

Compared to problems with a single valid output (like FACTORING), sampling problems can be

(1) Easier to solve with near-future quantum devices, and

(2) Easier to argue are hard for classical computers!

(We “merely” give up on: practical applications, fast classical way to verify the result...?)
The Random Quantum Circuit Proposal

Generate a quantum circuit $C$ on $n$ qubits in a $\sqrt{n} \times \sqrt{n}$ lattice, with $d$ layers of random nearest-neighbor gates.

Apply $C$ to $|0\rangle \otimes^n$ and measure. Repeat $T$ times, to obtain samples $x_1, \ldots, x_T$ from $\{0,1\}^n$.

Check whether $x_1, \ldots, x_T$ solve the “Heavy Output Generation” (HOG) problem—e.g., do at least $2/3$ of the $x_i$’s have more than the median probability?

(takes classical exponential time, which is OK for $n \approx 70$)

Publish $C$. Challenge skeptics to generate samples passing the test in a reasonable amount of time.
Our Strong Hardness Assumption

There’s no polynomial-time classical algorithm \( A \) such that, given a uniformly-random quantum circuit \( C \) with \( n \) qubits and \( m \gg n \) gates,

\[
\Pr_{C}[A(C)\text{ guesses whether } |0\rangle^\otimes n \langle C \rangle |0\rangle^\otimes n ]^2 > \text{median} \geq \frac{1}{2} + \Omega(2^{-n})
\]

**Note:** There is a polynomial-time classical algorithm that guesses with probability

\[
\approx \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{4^m}
\]

(just expand \( \langle 0 \rangle^\otimes n C |0\rangle^\otimes n \) out as a sum of \( 4^m \) terms, then sample a few random ones)
**Theorem:** Assume SHA. Then given as input a random quantum circuit $C$, with $n$ qubits and $m \gg n$ gates, there’s no polynomial-time classical algorithm that even **passes our statistical test for C-sampling** w.h.p.

**Proof Sketch:** Given a circuit $C$, first "hide" which amplitude we care about by applying a random XOR-mask to the outputs, producing a $C'$ such that

$$C_z \otimes C \otimes \cdots \otimes C = 0'''

Now let $A$ be a poly-time classical algorithm that passes the test for $C'$ with probability $\geq 0.99$. Suppose $A$ outputs samples $x_1, \ldots, x_T$. Then if $x_i = z$ for some $i \in [T]$, guess that

$$\left| \left\langle 0 \right| \otimes^n C \left| 0 \right\rangle \otimes^n \right|^2 \geq \text{median}$$

Otherwise, guess that with probability $\frac{1}{2} - \frac{T}{2^{n+1}}$

Of course we’d like hardness of random circuit sampling based on a weaker complexity assumption. Recent partial progress in that direction by Bouland, Fefferman, Nirkhe, Vazirani arXiv:1803.04402

**Violates SHA!**
Time-Space Tradeoffs for Simulating Quantum Circuits

Given a general quantum circuit with n qubits and m>>n two-qubit gates, how should we simulate it classically?

“Schrödinger way”:
Store whole wavefunction
O(2^n) memory, O(m2^n) time
n=40, m=1000: Feasible but requires TB of RAM

“Feynman way”:
Sum over paths
O(m+n) memory, O(4^m) time
n=40, m=1000: Infeasible but requires little RAM

Best of both worlds?
**Theorem:** Let $C$ be a quantum circuit with $n$ qubits and $d$ layers of gates. Then we can compute each transition amplitude, $\langle x | C | y \rangle$, in $d^{O(n)}$ time and poly($n,d$) memory.

**Proof:** Savitch’s Theorem! Recursively divide $C$ into two chunks, $C_1$ and $C_2$, with $d/2$ layers each. Then

$$
\langle x | C | y \rangle = \sum_{z \in \{0,1\}^n} \langle x | C_1 | z \rangle \langle z | C_2 | y \rangle
$$

Can do better for nearest-neighbor circuits, or when more memory is available.

This algorithm still doesn’t falsify the SHA! Why not?
What About Errors?

$k$ bit-flip errors $\Rightarrow$ deviation from the uniform distribution is suppressed by a $1/\exp(k)$ factor. Without error-correction, can only tolerate a few errors. Will come down to numbers.

Verification

Needs to be difficult but not impossible (like Bitcoin mining). Partly using our recursive approach, Pednault et al. from IBM and Chen et al. from Alibaba have now shown how to handle up to $\sim 70$ qubits classically. Perfectly consistent with what we’re trying to do!
Random Bits are *Obviously* Useless...
Certified Random Bits: Who Needs ‘Em?

For private use:
Cryptographic keys (a big one!)

For public use:
Election auditing, lotteries, parameters for cryptosystems, zero-knowledge protocols, proof-of-stake cryptocurrencies...

Trivial Quantum Randomness Solution!

Problem: What if your quantum hardware was backdoored by the NSA? (Like the DUAL_EC_DRBG pseudorandom generator was?) Want to trust a deterministic classical computer only
Earlier Approach: Bell-Certified Randomness Generation

Colbeck and Renner, Pironio et al., Vazirani and Vidick, Coudron and Yuen, Miller and Shi...

Upside: Doesn’t need a QC; uses only “current technology” (though loophole-free Bell violations are only ~2 years old)

Downside: If you’re getting the random bits over the Internet, how do you know Alice and Bob aren’t controlled?
Randomness from Quantum Supremacy Experiments

Key Insight: A QC can solve certain sampling problems quickly—but under plausible hardness assumptions, it can only do so by sampling (and hence, generating real entropy)

Upsides: Requires just a single device—good for certified randomness over the Internet. Ideally suited to NISQ devices

Caveats: Requires hardness assumptions and initial seed randomness. Verification (with my scheme) takes $\exp(n)$ time
Applications

For the QC owner:
Private randomness

For those connecting over the cloud:
Public randomness

The protocol does require pseudorandom challenges, but:

Even if the pseudorandom generator is broken later, the truly random bits will remain safe ("forward secrecy")

Even if the seed was public, the random bits can be private

The random bits demonstrably weren’t known to anyone, even the QC, before it received a challenge (freshness)
The Protocol

1. The classical client generates $n$-qubit quantum circuits $C_1, \ldots, C_T$ pseudorandomly (mimicking a random ensemble)

2. For each $t$, the client sends $C_t$ to the server, then demands a response $S_t$ within a very short time

   In the “honest” case, the response is a list of $k$ samples from the output distribution of $C_t |0\rangle^\otimes n$

3. The client picks $O(1)$ random iterations $t$, and for each one, checks whether $S_t$ solves “HOG” (Heavy Output Generation)

4. If these checks pass, then the client feeds $S=\langle S_1, \ldots, S_T \rangle$ into a classical randomness extractor, such as GUV (Guruswami-Umans-Vadhan), to get nearly pure random bits
Main Result

Suppose that suitable hardness assumptions hold, and that the server does at most $n^{O(1)}$ quantum computation per iteration. Suppose also that we run the protocol, for $T \leq 2^n$ steps, and the client accepts with probability $> \frac{1}{2}$. Then conditioned on the client accepting, the output bits $S$ are $1/\exp(n^{\Omega(1)})$-close in variation distance to a distribution with min-entropy $\Omega(Tn)$.

$$H_{\min}(D) := \min_{x} \log_2 \left( \frac{1}{\Pr_{D}[x]} \right)$$

Which means: the extractor will output $\Omega(Tn)$ bits that are exponentially close to uniform.

Hardest part: show accumulation of min-entropy across the $T$ iterations. E.g., rule out that the samples are correlated.
Different Approach
Brakerski, Christiano, Mahadev, Vazirani, Vidick arXiv:1804.00640

Method for a QC to generate random bits, assuming the quantum hardness of breaking lattice-based cryptosystems
2-to-1 function $f$, plus trapdoor

\[
\sum_{x} |x\rangle|f(x)\rangle \rightarrow \frac{|x\rangle + |y\rangle}{\sqrt{2}}
\]

Huge advantage of the BCMVV scheme over mine:
Polynomial-time classical verification!

Advantage of mine: Can be run on NISQ devices!
Future Directions

Can we get quantum supremacy, as well as certified randomness, under more “standard” and less “boutique” complexity assumptions?

Can we get polynomial-time classical verification and NISQ implementability at the same time?

Can we get more and more certified randomness by sampling with the same circuit C over and over? Would greatly improve the bit rate, remove the need for a PRF?

Can we prove our randomness scheme sound even against adversaries that are entangled with the QC?
Conclusions

We might be close to ~70-qubit quantum supremacy experiments. We can say nontrivial things about the hardness of simulating these experiments, but we’d like to say more.

Certified randomness generation: the most plausible application of very-near-term QCs?

This application requires sampling problems: problems with definite answers (like factoring) are useless!

Not only can we do it with ~70 qubits, we don’t want more. No expensive encoding needed; can fully exploit hardware.

With this application, all the weaknesses of sampling-based quantum supremacy experiments become strengths!