

# Quantum Private Information Retrieval from Coded and Colluding Servers

Matteo Allaix <sup>\*</sup>, Lukas Holzbaur <sup>†</sup>, Tefjol Pllaha <sup>\*</sup>, Camilla Hollanti <sup>\*</sup>

<sup>\*</sup> Aalto University, Finland. E-mails: {matteo.l.allaix, tefjol.pllaha, camilla.hollanti}@aalto.fi <sup>†</sup> Technical University of Munich, Germany. E-mail: lukas.holzbaur@tum.de

## Abstract

In the classical private information retrieval (PIR) setup, a user wants to retrieve a file from a database or a distributed storage system (DSS) without revealing the file identity to the servers holding the data. In the quantum PIR (QPIR) setting, a user privately retrieves a classical file by downloading quantum systems from the servers. The QPIR problem has been treated by Song *et al.* in the case of replicated servers, both without collusion and with all but one servers colluding. In this paper, the QPIR setting is extended to account for MDS coded servers. The proposed protocol works for any  $[n, k]$ -MDS code and  $t$ -collusion with  $t = n - k$ . Similarly to the previous cases, the rates achieved are better than those known or conjectured in the classical counterparts. It is also demonstrated how the retrieval rates can be significantly improved by using locally repairable codes (LRCs) consisting of disjoint repair groups, each of which is an MDS code. Finally, numerical results based on an implementation on an IBM quantum computer are presented, showing that even the current stability of quantum computers gives satisfactory results.

## I. INTRODUCTION

Private information retrieval (PIR), a problem initially introduced by Chor *et al.* [1], enables a user to download a data item from a database without revealing the identity of the retrieved item to the database owner. During the past few years, PIR has gained renewed interest in the setting of distributed storage systems (DSSs), where the servers are storing possibly large files that may be encoded, *e.g.*, by an MDS code. The capacity of PIR is already known in a variety of settings [2], [3], [4], [5], [6], but is still open for coded and colluding servers [7], [8]. Progress towards the general coded colluded PIR capacity was recently made in [9], [10].

More recently, Song *et al.* have considered a similar problem in a quantum setting. They consider a replicated storage system with classical files, where the servers respond to user's (classical) queries by sending quantum systems. The user is then able to privately retrieve the file by measuring the quantum systems. The servers are assumed to share some maximally entangled states, while the user and the servers are not entangled. The non-colluding case was considered in [11], and was shown to have capacity equal to one. This is in contrast to the classical replicated (asymptotic) PIR capacity  $1 - \frac{1}{n}$  for  $n$  servers. The case of all but one servers colluding was considered in [12], again achieving higher capacity than the classical counterpart. In this case, the QPIR capacity is  $\frac{2}{n}$ , while classically (and asymptotically) it is  $\frac{1}{n}$ . In [13], the authors extend their work [11], [12] by considering symmetric QPIR that can resist any  $t$  servers colluding. They prove that the  $t$ -private QPIR capacity is 1 for  $1 \leq t \leq n/2$  and  $2(n-t)/n$  for  $n/2 < t < n$  and they use the *stabilizer formalism* [14] to construct a capacity-achieving protocol.

### A. Contributions

We adapt the QPIR protocol for replicated storage systems protecting against collusion of all but one servers [12] to the case of  $[n, k]$  MDS coded servers and arbitrary  $t$ -collusion. That is, from the case  $t = n - 1$  to  $t = n - k$ . This can be seen as trading off collusion protection for reduced storage overhead. The achieved rate  $\frac{2}{n}$  is higher than the conjectured asymptotic rate in the classical coded and colluding PIR [7], giving  $\frac{1}{n}$ .

The setup is very similar to [15], which provides an optimal classical PIR scheme for the case  $t = n - k$ . This was extended to cover non-maximal collusion ( $t < n - k$ ) in [7] by considering the queries as coming from another code via the star product scheme. With this interpretation, the query code in [15] is the dual of the storage code — similarly as in the QPIR protocol presented here — while [7] enables it to be any  $[n, t]$  MDS code for  $t \leq n - k$ . One may wonder why we do not do this generalization here, but merely use the dual

L. Holzbaur was supported by TU Munich – Institute for Advanced Study, funded by the German Excellence Initiative and EU 7th Framework Programme under Grant Agreement No. 291763 and the German Research Foundation (Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft, DFG) under Grant No. WA3907/1-1. T. Pllaha was partially supported by Academy of Finland, under the Grant No. 319578. C. Hollanti was supported by the Academy of Finland, under Grants No. 303819 and 318937, and by the TU Munich – Institute for Advanced Study, funded by the German Excellence Initiative and the EU 7th Framework Programme under Grant Agreement No. 291763, via a Hans Fischer Fellowship.

as the query code. This is simply due to the limitation imposed by quantum measurement, see the discussion in Remark 2.

Further, we consider LRC coded storage, and adapt our QPIR scheme accordingly. The new scheme can achieve a higher rate, which interestingly enough, does not depend on the length of the code (or number of servers). As usual, this comes with a trade-off on collusion resistance.

In addition, we tested the QPIR scheme of Song *et al.* [11] for replicated storage on IBM's quantum computers. Numerical results of the best-performing quantum computer along with setup and discussion are presented in Section VII.

## II. BASICS ON PIR AND QUANTUM COMPUTATION

### A. Notation

For any two vectors  $u = (u_1, \dots, u_n), v = (v_1, \dots, v_n)$  of the same length  $n$  we denote their inner product by  $\langle u|v \rangle = u_1v_1 + \dots + u_nv_n$ . We will denote by  $[n]$  the set  $\{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ , and by  $\mathbb{F}_q$  the finite field of  $q$  elements. In this paper, we only consider characteristic two, *i.e.*,  $q = 2^E$  for some positive integer  $E$ .

Let  $\Gamma = \{\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_E\}$  be a basis of  $\mathbb{F}_{2^E}$  over  $\mathbb{F}_2$ . For  $\alpha \in \mathbb{F}_q$  denote by  $\varphi$  the bijective,  $\mathbb{F}_2$ -linear map

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi : \mathbb{F}_{2^E} &\rightarrow \mathbb{F}_2^E \\ \alpha = \sum_{i=1}^E \alpha_i \gamma_i &\mapsto (\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_E). \end{aligned} \quad (1)$$

Note that this mapping preserves addition, *i.e.*,  $\varphi(\alpha + \alpha') = \varphi(\alpha) + \varphi(\alpha') \forall \alpha, \alpha' \in \mathbb{F}_{2^E}$ .

### B. Private Information Retrieval

Consider a storage system storing  $m$  files  $x^i, i \in [m]$ , where each server stores a share  $y^i, i \in [m]$  of each (encoded) file (for replication  $y_K = x^K$ ). In a PIR protocol a user desiring the  $K$ -th file  $x^K$  chooses a query  $Q^K$  from a query space  $\mathcal{Q}$  and transmits it to the servers. The servers' response  $A^i$  is a function of the received queries and the shares of the (encoded) files they store. By query and response here we mean the overall matrix containing all the individual queries and responses. Below,  $Q_{\mathcal{T}}^K$  denotes the matrix of queries sent to a subset  $\mathcal{T}$ .

**Definition 1** (Correctness). *There exists a function  $\mathcal{D}$  such that*

$$\mathcal{D}(A^K, Q^K, K) = x^K, \quad \forall K \in [m].$$

As usual, we assume honest-but-curious servers who follow the assigned protocol, but might try to determine the index  $i$  of the file desired by the user.

**Definition 2** (Privacy with  $t$ -Collusion). *User privacy: Any set of at most  $t$  colluding nodes learns no information about the index  $i$  of the desired file, *i.e.*, the mutual information*

$$I(i; Q_{\mathcal{T}}^K, A_{\mathcal{T}}^K, y_{\mathcal{T}}) = 0, \quad \forall \mathcal{T} \subset [n], |\mathcal{T}| \leq t.$$

*Server privacy: The user does not learn any information about the files other than the requested one, *i.e.*,*

$$I(x^j; Q^K, A^K, K) = 0, \quad \forall j \neq K.$$

*A scheme with both user and server privacy is called symmetric.*

As customary, we assume that the size of the query vectors is negligible compared to the size of the files. Hence, we ignore the upload cost and define the PIR rate as follows:

**Definition 3** (PIR Rate and Capacity). *For a PIR scheme the rate is (non-rigorously) the number of information bits of the requested file retrieved per downloaded bits, *i.e.*,*

$$R_{\text{PIR}} = \frac{\text{Number of bits in a file}}{\text{Number of downloaded bits}}.$$

*The PIR capacity is the supremum of PIR rates of all possible PIR schemes, for a fixed parameter setting.*

**Remark 1.** *As the user and the servers do not share any entanglement in this model, the number of bits obtained when receiving a qubit, *i.e.*, the number of bits that can be communicated by transmitting a qubit from a server to the user without privacy considerations, is the dimension of the qubit.*

### C. Quantum Computation

In this section we introduce the notation to be used later on. For details we refer the reader to [16].

A *qubit* is a 2-dimensional Hilbert space  $\mathcal{H}$  along with a computational basis, that is, a prespecified orthonormal basis  $\mathcal{B} = \{|0\rangle, |1\rangle\}$ . One typically takes  $\mathcal{H} = \mathbb{C}^2$ . A *state* of  $\mathcal{H}$  is a unit vector  $|\psi\rangle \in \mathcal{H}$ , while  $\langle\psi|$  denotes the adjoint of  $|\psi\rangle$ , that is,  $\langle\psi| = |\psi\rangle^\dagger$ . Thus,  $\langle\phi|\psi\rangle$  and  $|\phi\rangle\langle\psi|$  define inner and outer products respectively.

We will work with 2-qubit systems  $\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{H}_1 \otimes \mathcal{H}_2$ . In this case the computational basis is  $\mathcal{B}^{\otimes 2} = \{|a\rangle \mid a \in \mathbb{F}_2^2\}$ , where  $|a\rangle = |a_1\rangle \otimes |a_2\rangle$ . We will also use the *maximally entangled state*

$$|\Phi\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} (|00\rangle + |11\rangle). \quad (2)$$

We denote by  $|\Phi\rangle_{ij}$  the maximally entangled state defined on qubits  $\mathcal{H}_i$  and  $\mathcal{H}_j$ . For  $a, b \in \mathbb{F}_2$ , the *Weyl operator* is defined as

$$\mathbf{W}(a, b) = (-1)^{ab} \sum_{i=0}^1 (-1)^{ai} |i+b\rangle\langle i|. \quad (3)$$

We will write  $\mathbf{W}_i(a, b)$  when the Weyl operator acts on the  $i$ -th qubit. With this notation, the following properties of the Weyl operator are well-known and easy to verify:

$$\mathbf{W}(a, b)^\top = (-1)^{ab} \mathbf{W}(a, b), \quad (4)$$

$$\mathbf{W}(a_1, b_1) \mathbf{W}(a_2, b_2) = (-1)^{a_2 b_1} \mathbf{W}(a_1 + a_2, b_1 + b_2), \quad (5)$$

$$\mathbf{W}(a, b)^\top \mathbf{W}(a, b) = \mathbf{W}(a, b) \mathbf{W}(a, b)^\top = \mathbf{I}_2, \quad (6)$$

$$\mathbf{W}_2(a, b) |\Phi\rangle = (-1)^{ab} \mathbf{W}_1(a, b) |\Phi\rangle. \quad (7)$$

**Lemma 1.** *The set*

$$\mathcal{B}_{\mathbb{F}_2^2} = \{\mathbf{B}_{(a,b)} = \mathbf{W}_1(a, b) |\Phi\rangle\langle\Phi| \mathbf{W}_1(a, b)^\top \mid a, b \in \mathbb{F}_2\}$$

*is a projection-valued measure (PVM), that is, the matrix  $\mathbf{B}_{(a,b)}$  is a Hermitian projector for any  $(a, b) \in \mathbb{F}_2^2$  and satisfies the completeness equation.*

*Proof.* Straightforward.  $\square$

**Definition 4.** *The Bell measurement is the measurement defined by the PVM  $\mathcal{B}_{\mathbb{F}_2^2}$  described in Lemma 1.*

In the following we will require the *two-sum transmission* protocol [12].

*Two-sum transmission protocol:* This protocol allows to send the sum of two pairs of classical bits by communicating two qubits. Suppose that Alice and Bob possess a qubit  $\mathcal{H}_A$  and  $\mathcal{H}_B$ , respectively, and share the maximally entangled state  $|\Phi\rangle \in \mathcal{H}_A \otimes \mathcal{H}_B$ . They would like to send the sum of Alice's information  $(a_1, a_2) \in \mathbb{F}_2^2$  and Bob's information  $(b_1, b_2) \in \mathbb{F}_2^2$  to Carol through two quantum channels. The protocol is given as follows:

- (1) Alice and Bob apply the unitaries  $\mathbf{W}(a_1, a_2)$  on  $\mathcal{H}_A$  and  $\mathbf{W}(b_1, b_2)$  on  $\mathcal{H}_B$ , respectively;
- (2) Alice and Bob send the qubits  $\mathcal{H}_A$  and  $\mathcal{H}_B$ , respectively, over *noiseless* quantum channels;
- (3) Carol performs a Bell measurement on the system  $\mathcal{H}_A \otimes \mathcal{H}_B$  and obtains  $(a_1 + b_1, a_2 + b_2)$  as the protocol output.

### III. [3,2]-CODED QPIR EXAMPLE WITH NO COLLUSION

Let us assume three servers which contain, respectively, the pieces  $x_1^i$ ,  $x_2^i$  and  $x_1^i + x_2^i$  for  $i \in [m]$ . For simplicity, we suppose that  $x_1^i, x_2^i \in \mathbb{F}_2^2$  for each  $i \in [m]$ , *i.e.*, only one round is needed in order to retrieve each piece  $x_s^i$  from server  $s$ . The intuition coming from this simple scenario is the building block of the scheme presented in Section IV.

**Preparation Step.** For each  $p \in [2]$  the servers prepare the following qubits and states. Server 2 possesses 4 qubits  $\mathcal{H}_2^{L,(p)}$ ,  $\mathcal{H}_2^{R,(p)}$ ,  $\mathcal{H}_2^{(p)}$  and  $\mathcal{H}_2^{A,(p)}$ , and the first and the last server possess qubits  $\mathcal{H}_1^{(p)}$  and  $\mathcal{H}_3^{(p)}$ , respectively. The maximally entangled state  $|\Phi\rangle^{(p)}$  is shared between the pairs  $(\mathcal{H}_1^{(p)}, \mathcal{H}_2^{L,(p)})$ ,  $(\mathcal{H}_2^{R,(p)}, \mathcal{H}_3^{(p)})$  and  $(\mathcal{H}_2^{(p)}, \mathcal{H}_2^{A,(p)})$ .

The protocol for querying the  $K$ -th file  $x^K$  is depicted in Figure 1 and is described as follows:

- 1) Suppose we want to retrieve the piece  $x_p^K$  from server  $p \in [2]$ . The user generates a uniformly random bit vector  $Q^{(p)} := (Q^{1,(p)}, \dots, Q^{m,(p)})$ . Let  $Q_p^{(p)} := Q^{(p)} + e_K^m$  and  $Q_s^{(p)} := Q^{(p)}$  for any  $s \in [n] \setminus \{p\}$ , where  $Q^{(p)} + e_K^m$  means that we are flipping the  $K$ -th bit of the query  $Q^{(p)}$ .

- 2) The user queries  $Q_s^{(p)}$  to server  $s$  for each  $s \in [3]$ .
- 3) Server  $s \in [3]$  computes  $H_s^{(p)} := \sum_{i=1}^m Q_s^{i,(p)} x_i^s \in \mathbb{F}_2^2$ . The first and the last server apply  $\mathbf{W}(H_1^{(p)})$  and  $\mathbf{W}(H_3^{(p)})$  to the qubits  $\mathcal{H}_1^{(p)}$  and  $\mathcal{H}_3^{(p)}$ , respectively. Server 2 applies  $\mathbf{W}(H_2^{(p)})$  to the qubit  $\mathcal{H}_2^{L,(p)}$  and performs a Bell measurement on  $\mathcal{H}_2^{L,(p)} \otimes \mathcal{H}_2^{R,(p)}$  whose outcome is denoted by  $G_2^{(p)} \in \mathbb{F}_2^2$ . Then, server 2 applies  $\mathbf{W}(G_2^{(p)})$  to the qubit  $\mathcal{H}_2^{(p)}$ .
- 4) Each server sends its qubit  $\mathcal{H}_s^{(p)}$  to the user. Server 2 sends also its additional qubit  $\mathcal{H}_2^{A,(p)}$ .
- 5) The user performs a Bell measurement to the pair  $\mathcal{H}_2^{(p)} \otimes \mathcal{H}_2^{A,(p)}$  to retrieve  $G_2^{(p)} + (0, 0)$  via the two-sum transmission protocol (cf. Sec. II-C). Then he applies  $\mathbf{W}(G_2^{(p)})$  to the qubit  $\mathcal{H}_2^{(p)}$  and performs a Bell measurement on  $\mathcal{H}_1^{(p)} \otimes \mathcal{H}_3^{(p)}$ , whose outcome is  $x_p^K$  with probability 1.
- 6) Repeat all the previous steps for every piece  $p \in [2]$ .
- 7) The user reconstructs the desired file  $x^K = (x_1^K, x_2^K)$ .




Figure 1. QPIR protocol with a [3,2]-parity-check code. Step 2 is depicted in blue, Step 4 in red and Step 5 in green.

The operations performed by the servers and the download step (Step 4) are visualized in Figure 2. After Step 4, the user possesses the entangled pairs of qubits  $\mathcal{H}_2^{(p)} \otimes \mathcal{H}_2^{A,(p)}$  and  $\mathcal{H}_1^{(p)} \otimes \mathcal{H}_3^{(p)}$  for each  $p \in [2]$ . The states of those two pairs are, respectively,

$$\mathbf{W}_2(G_2^{(p)}) |\Phi\rangle_{2,2^A},$$

$$(-1)^{\phi_3^{(p)}} \mathbf{W}_3\left(\sum_{s=1}^3 H_s^{(p)} + G_2^{(p)}\right) |\Phi\rangle_{1,3} = (-1)^{\phi_3^{(p)}} \mathbf{W}_3(x_p^K + G_2^{(p)}) |\Phi\rangle_{1,3}.$$

The last equality holds for every  $p \in [2]$ . In fact, assuming  $p = 1$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{s=1}^3 H_s^{(1)} &= \sum_{i=1}^m (Q^i + \delta_{iK}) x_1^i + \sum_{i=1}^m Q^i x_2^i + \sum_{i=1}^m Q^i (x_1^i + x_2^i) \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^m Q^i x_1^i + x_1^K + \sum_{i=1}^m Q^i x_2^i + \sum_{i=1}^m Q^i (x_1^i + x_2^i) \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^m Q^i \overbrace{(x_1^i + x_2^i + x_1^i + x_2^i)}^0 + x_1^K = x_1^K. \end{aligned}$$




Figure 2. Operations on servers visualized. The download step is depicted in green. These operations are performed for every  $p \in [2]$ .

The proof for  $p = 2$  is the same. Performing a Bell measurement on the first pair, the user retrieves  $G_2^{(p)}$  and then applies  $\mathbf{W}(G_2^{(p)})$  to the qubit  $\mathcal{H}_3^{(p)}$ . Doing so, the state of the second pair becomes

$$\begin{aligned} (-1)^{\phi_3^{(p)}} \mathbf{W}(G_2^{(p)})_3 \mathbf{W}(x_p^K + G_2^{(p)})_3 |\Phi\rangle_{1,3} &\stackrel{(5)}{\cong} (-1)^{\phi_u^{(p)}} \mathbf{W}_3(x_p^K + \overbrace{G_2^{(p)} + G_2^{(p)}}^0) |\Phi\rangle_{1,3} \\ &= (-1)^{\phi_u^{(p)}} \mathbf{W}_3(x_p^K) |\Phi\rangle_{1,3}. \end{aligned}$$

Performing now the Bell measurement on the second pair, the user retrieves  $x_p^K$  with probability 1.

User secrecy is achieved for any  $p$  because the query  $Q^{(p)}$  is independent of the index  $K$ . Server secrecy is achieved for any  $p$  because the received state of the user is independent of the fragments  $x_p^i$  with  $i \neq K$  and the measurement outcome  $G_2^{(p)}$  is independent of any file. The rate is  $R = \frac{2 \cdot 2}{2 \cdot 4} = \frac{1}{2}$ , since we recovered four bits and downloaded eight qubits carrying one bit over two rounds.

#### IV. $[n, k]$ -MDS CODED QPIR WITH $t$ -COLLUSION

Let  $n$  be the number of servers,  $L = \min \{l \in \mathbb{N} : 4^l \geq n\}$  and  $\mathbb{F}_{4^L}$  be the finite field with  $4^L$  elements. We present a protocol with user and server secrecy, in which the user retrieves a file  $x^K$  from a DSS of  $n$  servers coded with an  $[n, k]$ -MDS storage code  $\mathcal{C}$ . We denote the  $k \times n$  generator matrix of the code by  $\mathbf{G}_{\mathcal{C}}$ . In this setting, we can protect against  $(n - k)$ -collusion. Each file  $x^i$  is split into  $k$  pieces and then divided into  $\beta$  stripes  $x_b^i = (x_{b,1}^i, \dots, x_{b,k}^i)$ , *i.e.*, the set of files is given by  $\mathcal{X} = \{x_b^i \in (\mathbb{F}_{4^L})^k : i \in [m], b \in [\beta]\}$  with file size  $F = k\beta \log_2(4^L) = 2kL\beta$ . Server  $s \in [n]$  stores the symbol  $y_s^i = (y_{1,s}^i, \dots, y_{\beta,s}^i)$ , where  $y_{b,s}^i$  is the  $s$ -th column of  $x_b^i \mathbf{G}_{\mathcal{C}}$ .

Since the storage code is MDS, we need any  $k$  symbols of the codeword in order to retrieve the file [17]. Without loss of generality, we will retrieve the symbols stored in the first  $k$  servers, *i.e.*, we will assume to retrieve the symbol  $y_s^K$  from server  $s \in [k]$  after  $\beta$  rounds.

##### A. A coded QPIR scheme

**Preparation Step.** For each  $p \in [k]$  the servers prepare the following qubits and states. Server  $s \in \{2, \dots, n-1\}$  possesses  $3L\beta$  qubits  $\mathcal{H}_s^{L,(l,b,p)}$ ,  $\mathcal{H}_s^{R,(l,b,p)}$  and  $\mathcal{H}_s^{(l,b,p)}$ , where  $l \in [L]$ ,  $b \in [\beta]$ . The first and the last server possess  $L\beta$  qubits  $\mathcal{H}_1^{(l,b,p)} = \mathcal{H}_1^{R,(l,b,p)}$  and  $\mathcal{H}_n^{(l,b,p)} = \mathcal{H}_n^{L,(l,b,p)}$ , respectively. If  $n$  is odd, server  $n-1$  possesses  $L\beta$  additional qubits  $\mathcal{H}_{n-1}^{A,(l,b,p)}$ . The maximally entangled state  $|\Phi\rangle^{(l,b,p)}$  is shared between each pair

$(\mathcal{H}_s^{R,(l,b,p)}, \mathcal{H}_{s+1}^{L,(l,b,p)})$  for any  $s \in [n-1]$  and  $(\mathcal{H}_{2c}^{(l,b,p)}, \mathcal{H}_{2c+1}^{(l,b,p)})$  for any  $c \in [\lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor - 1]$ . If  $n$  is odd, then an additional  $|\Phi\rangle^{(l,b,p)}$  is shared between  $\mathcal{H}_{n-1}^{(l,b,p)}$  and  $\mathcal{H}_{n-1}^{A,(l,b,p)}$ .

The protocol for querying the  $K$ -th file  $x^K$  is depicted in Figure 3 and is described as follows:

- (1) Suppose the user wants to retrieve the symbol  $y_p^K$  stored in server  $p \in [k]$ . Then, he generates  $n-k$  independent and uniformly random vectors  $Z_1^{(p)}, \dots, Z_{n-k}^{(p)} \in (\mathbb{F}_{4^L})^m$ , and encodes them as codewords of the dual code of  $\mathcal{C}$ . In other words, the user builds the queries  $Q_1^{(p)}, \dots, Q_n^{(p)}$  multiplying the random vectors by the generator matrix  $\mathbf{G}_{\mathcal{C}^\perp}$  of the dual code  $\mathcal{C}^\perp$ , i.e.,

$$\begin{bmatrix} Q_1^{(p)} & \dots & Q_n^{(p)} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} Z_1^{(p)} & \dots & Z_{n-k}^{(p)} \end{bmatrix} \mathbf{G}_{\mathcal{C}^\perp} + \boldsymbol{\xi}_{K,p},$$

where  $\boldsymbol{\xi}_{K,p}$  is the null matrix with a 1 in position  $(K, p)$ .

- (2) The user send query  $Q_s^{(p)}$  to each server  $s \in [n]$ .
- (3) In round  $b$ , server  $s \in [n]$  computes  $H_s^{(b,p)} = \langle Q_s^{(p)} | y_{b,s} \rangle \in \mathbb{F}_{4^L}$  and divides it into  $L$  elements  $H_s^{(1,b,p)}, \dots, H_s^{(L,b,p)}$  of  $\mathbb{F}_2^2$  by the bijection  $\varphi$  defined in (1). For each  $l \in [L]$ , the servers perform these steps:
  - (a) server 1 and server  $n$  apply  $\mathbf{W}(H_1^{(l,b,p)})$  and  $\mathbf{W}(H_n^{(l,b,p)})$  to the qubits  $\mathcal{H}_1^{(l,b,p)}$  and  $\mathcal{H}_n^{(l,b,p)}$ , respectively;
  - (b) server  $s \in \{2, \dots, n-1\}$  applies  $\mathbf{W}(H_s^{(l,b,p)})$  to the qubit  $\mathcal{H}_s^{L,(l,b,p)}$  and performs a Bell measurement on  $\mathcal{H}_s^{L,(l,b,p)} \otimes \mathcal{H}_s^{R,(l,b,p)}$  the outcome of which is denoted by  $G_s^{(l,b,p)} \in \mathbb{F}_2^2$ . Then, server  $s$  applies  $\mathbf{W}(G_s^{(l,b,p)})$  to the qubit  $\mathcal{H}_s^{(l,b,p)}$ .
- (4) Each server sends its  $L$  qubits  $\mathcal{H}_s^{(l,b,p)}$  to the user. If  $n$  is odd, server  $n-1$  sends its additional  $L$  qubits  $\mathcal{H}_{n-1}^{A,(l,b,p)}$ .
- (5) For each  $l \in [L]$ , the user performs the following steps:
  - (a) If  $n$  is even, he performs a Bell measurement on each pair  $\mathcal{H}_{2c}^{(l,b,p)} \otimes \mathcal{H}_{2c+1}^{(l,b,p)}$  to retrieve  $G_{2c}^{(l,b,p)} + G_{2c+1}^{(l,b,p)}$  via the two-sum transmission protocol (cf. Sec. II-C) for every  $c \in [\lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor - 1]$ , and computes  $G^{(l,b,p)} = \sum_{c=1}^{\lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor - 1} (G_{2c}^{(l,b,p)} + G_{2c+1}^{(l,b,p)})$ . If  $n$  is odd, he also performs a Bell measurement on the pair  $\mathcal{H}_{n-1}^{(l,b,p)} \otimes \mathcal{H}_{n-1}^{A,(l,b,p)}$  to retrieve  $G_{n-1}^{(l,b,p)}$  and computes  $G^{(l,b,p)} = \sum_{c=1}^{\lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor - 1} (G_{2c}^{(l,b,p)} + G_{2c+1}^{(l,b,p)}) + G_{n-1}^{(l,b,p)}$ .
  - (b) He applies  $\mathbf{W}(G^{(l,b,p)})$  to the qubit  $\mathcal{H}_1^{(l,b,p)}$  and performs a Bell measurement on  $\mathcal{H}_1^{(l,b,p)} \otimes \mathcal{H}_n^{(l,b,p)}$ , whose outcome is  $y_{b,p}^{K,(l)}$  with probability 1.

Finally, he reconstructs  $y_{b,p}^K$  from the  $L$  outcomes through the bijection (1).
- (6) Repeat Steps 3, 4 and 5 for every round  $b \in [\beta]$ .
- (7) Repeat all the previous steps for every piece  $p \in [k]$ .
- (8) Now the user possesses  $\{y_{b,p}^K : b \in [\beta], p \in [k]\}$ . First, he reconstructs  $y_p^K$  from the  $\beta$  elements of  $\mathbb{F}_{4^L}$  for each  $p \in [k]$  and builds  $y^K = (y_1^K, \dots, y_k^K)$ . Then, he computes the desired file  $x^K$  from the equation  $y^K = x^K \mathbf{G}'_C$ , where  $\mathbf{G}'_C$  is the  $k \times k$  submatrix of  $\mathbf{G}_C$  constructed with its first  $k$  columns.

## B. Properties of the coded QPIR scheme


**Lemma 2.** *The scheme of Section IV-A is correct, i.e., fulfills Definition 1.*

*Proof.* The final state before the measurement performed by the user is reached in the same way as the one of the QPIR protocol in [12] for each  $p \in [k]$ . Thus, during round  $b \in [\beta]$  and for packet  $l \in [L]$ , that final state is

$$(-1)^{\tilde{\varphi}_n} \tilde{\mathbf{W}}_n \left( \sum_{s=1}^n H_s \right) |\Phi\rangle, \quad (8)$$

where  $\tilde{\varphi}_n \in \mathbb{F}_2$  is determined upon  $H_1, \dots, H_n, G_1, \dots, G_{n-1}$  and  $G$ .

We need to prove that the outcome of the measurement performed on the system  $\mathcal{H}_1^{(l,b,p)} \otimes \mathcal{H}_n^{(l,b,p)}$  is  $y_{b,p}^{K,(l)}$  for every  $b \in [\beta]$ ,  $p \in [k]$  and  $l \in [L]$ . Suppose  $L = 1$  and fixed  $b, p$ . We have  $H_s^{(b,p)} = \langle Q_s^{(p)} | y_{b,s} \rangle$ . Denoting



**Figure 3.** QPIR protocol with an  $[n, k]$ -MDS code. Step 2 is depicted in blue, Step 4 in red and Step 5 in green. Steps 4 and 5 are repeated  $L\beta$  times per piece. The maximally entangled state  $|\Phi\rangle$  in the figure denotes  $|\Phi\rangle^{(l,b,p)}$ .

$e_p^n$  the zero vector with length  $n$  and a 1 in position  $p$ ,  $\delta_{i,K} e_p^n$  is the  $i$ -th row of  $\xi_{K,p}$ . Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{s=1}^n H_s^{(b,p)} &= \sum_{s=1}^n \langle Q_s^{(p)} | y_{b,s} \rangle = \sum_{s=1}^n \sum_{i=1}^m Q_s^{i,(p)} y_{b,s}^i = \sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{s=1}^n Q_s^{i,(p)} y_{b,s}^i \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^m \langle Q^{i,(p)} | \overbrace{(y_{b,1}^i, \dots, y_{b,n}^i)}^{y_b^i} \rangle = \sum_{i=1}^m y_b^i (Q^{i,(p)})^\top \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^m (x_b^i \mathbf{G}_C) (Z^{i,(p)} \mathbf{G}_{C^\perp} + \delta_{i,K} e_p^n)^\top \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^m x_b^i \overbrace{\mathbf{G}_C (\mathbf{G}_{C^\perp})^\top}^0 (Z^{i,(p)})^\top + x_b^K \mathbf{G}_C (e_p^n)^\top \stackrel{(a)}{=} y_b^K (e_p^n)^\top = y_{b,p}^K,
\end{aligned}$$

where (a) holds because the dual of a code is its nullspace.

If  $L > 1$ , we have that  $H_s^{(l,b,p)}$  is the  $l$ -th entry of  $\langle Q_s^{(p)} | y_{b,s} \rangle$  written as vector of  $(\mathbb{F}_2^L)^L$ . Then, by the same arguments as above, we get  $\sum_{s=1}^n H_s^{(l,b,p)} = y_{b,p}^{K,(l)}$ . As the bijection of (1) between  $\mathbb{F}_{4^L}$  and  $(\mathbb{F}_2^2)^L$  preserves addition, we have that

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{s=1}^n H_s^{(b,p)} &= \sum_{s=1}^n (H_s^{(1,b,p)}, \dots, H_s^{(L,b,p)}) \stackrel{(1)}{=} \left( \sum_{s=1}^n H_s^{(1,b,p)}, \dots, \sum_{s=1}^n H_s^{(L,b,p)} \right) \\
&= (y_{b,p}^{K,(1)}, \dots, y_{b,p}^{K,(L)}) = y_{b,p}^K.
\end{aligned}$$

The same argument applies to the packetization of the element  $G^{(b,p)} = (G^{(1,b,p)}, \dots, G^{(L,b,p)})$ . Thus, the correctness of the protocol is proved for every  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ .  $\square$

**Remark 2.** The presented scheme can be viewed as the “quantum version” of the scheme in [15]. In that scheme a vector holding the  $n$  replies of the servers (denoted  $H_s$  in our work) can be viewed as a random codeword of a single parity check (SPC) code plus one symbol of the desired file added in one (known) position. As is the definition of SPCs, summing over all components of this received vector leaves only the symbol of the desired file. This sum is exactly the sum in (8). In [7] the scheme of [15] was generalized to any  $t, k$  with

$t + k \leq n$ , which allowed for recovering up to  $n - (k + t - 1)$  symbols in each round. Similarly, the received vector is a random codeword, but symbols of the desired file are added in multiple positions. To recover each of the desired symbols, the user performs multiple, distinct linear combinations of the remaining positions. The property that allows our quantum PIR protocol, as well as the protocols in [11], [12], to increase the rate compared to the classic setting is the fact that the user already receives a linear combination of these elements as an outcome of the quantum measurement, and therefore does not have to download all the symbols  $H_s$  separately. However, this quantum measurement entails that only one single linear combination can be performed, and thereby only one symbol retrieved per round. This leads to the condition  $n - (k + t - 1) = 1$  or equivalently  $n = k + t$ . Note that since the restriction of an MDS code to a subset of positions is again an MDS code, we can always apply the protocol to a subset of  $k + t$  servers if the actual number of servers in a storage system is  $n > k + t$ .

**Lemma 3.** *The scheme of Section IV-A is symmetric and protects against  $t$ -collusion in the sense of Definition 2.*

*Proof.* For any  $p$  the queries  $Q_1^{(p)}, \dots, Q_n^{(p)}$  are independent of the index  $K$  and generated by encoding random vectors by the dual code  $\mathcal{C}^\perp$ . Since the dual code is MDS<sup>1</sup>, every set of  $n - k$  positions in these codewords is independent and hence at least  $n - k + 1$  servers are needed in order to determine the file requested. Thus, user privacy is achieved. For each  $l \in [L]$ , server secrecy is achieved because in every round  $b$  the received state of the user is independent of the fragments  $y_{b,p}^{i,(l)}$  with  $i \neq K$  and the measurement outcomes  $G_s^{(l,b,p)}$  are mutually independent and independent of any file for all  $s \in \{2, \dots, n\}$ .  $\square$

**Theorem 1.** *The PIR rate of the scheme in Section IV-A is*

$$R_{\text{PIR}} = \begin{cases} \frac{2}{n}, & \text{if } n \text{ is even,} \\ \frac{2}{n+1}, & \text{if } n \text{ is odd,} \end{cases}$$

where  $n = k + t$ .

*Proof.* The upload cost is  $U_{\text{PIR}} = kn|Q| = kmn$  and  $\lim_{F \rightarrow \infty} \frac{U_{\text{PIR}}}{F} = \lim_{\beta \rightarrow \infty} \frac{kmn}{2kL\beta} = 0$ . Hence, we consider the upload cost to be negligible compared to the download cost for a large file size  $F$ . As discussed in Remark 1, every qubit carries 1 bit of information. The download cost is  $Ln$  or  $L(n + 1)$  qubits per round and piece, i.e.,  $D_{\text{PIR}} = kLn\beta$  or  $D_{\text{PIR}} = kL(n + 1)\beta$  bits, if  $n$  is even or odd, respectively. The information retrieved is a symbol of  $\mathbb{F}_{4^L}$  per round and piece, i.e.,  $I_{\text{PIR}} = k\beta \log_2(4^L) = 2kL\beta$  bits. Thus, the rate is  $R_{\text{PIR}} = \frac{2kL\beta}{kLn\beta} = \frac{2}{n}$  if  $n$  is even and  $R_{\text{PIR}} = \frac{2kL\beta}{kL(n+1)\beta} = \frac{2}{n+1}$  if  $n$  is odd.  $\square$

## V. [4,2]-CODED QPIR EXAMPLE

Let us consider  $n = 4$  servers. Then  $L = 1$ , and the base field is  $\mathbb{F}_4 = \{0, 1, \alpha, \alpha^2\}$  where  $\alpha$  is a primitive element that satisfies

$$\alpha^2 + \alpha + 1 = 0. \quad (9)$$

Suppose also  $\beta = 1$ , hence the set of files  $x^i = (x_1^i, x_2^i)$  is given by  $\mathcal{X} = \{x^i \in (\mathbb{F}_4)^2 : i \in [m]\}$ . The files are encoded with a [4, 2]-Reed–Solomon storage code with generator matrix

$$\mathbf{G}_C = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & \alpha^2 & \alpha \\ 0 & 1 & \alpha & \alpha^2 \end{bmatrix}.$$

Hence, the codewords are

$$y^i = x^i \mathbf{G}_C = [x_1^i \quad x_2^i \quad \alpha^2 x_1^i + \alpha x_2^i \quad \alpha x_1^i + \alpha^2 x_2^i].$$

Server  $s \in [4]$  stores the  $s$ -th column of  $y^i$ , namely  $y_s^i$ .

**Preparation Step.** For each  $p \in [2]$  the servers prepare the following qubits and states. Server  $s \in \{2, 3\}$  possesses 3 qubits  $\mathcal{H}_s^{L,(p)}$ ,  $\mathcal{H}_s^{R,(p)}$  and  $\mathcal{H}_s^{(p)}$ . The first and the last server possess qubits  $\mathcal{H}_1^{(p)}$  and  $\mathcal{H}_3^{(p)}$ , respectively. The maximally entangled state  $|\Phi\rangle^{(p)}$  is shared between the pairs  $(\mathcal{H}_1^{(p)}, \mathcal{H}_2^{L,(p)})$ ,  $(\mathcal{H}_2^{R,(p)}, \mathcal{H}_3^{L,(p)})$ ,  $(\mathcal{H}_3^{R,(p)}, \mathcal{H}_4^{(p)})$  and  $(\mathcal{H}_2^{(p)}, \mathcal{H}_3^{(p)})$ .

The protocol for querying the  $K$ -th file  $x^K$  is depicted in Figure 4 and is described as follows:

- (1) The user wants to retrieve the symbol  $y_p^K$  stored in server  $p \in [2]$ . He generates two independent and uniformly random vectors  $Z_1^{(p)}, Z_2^{(p)} \in (\mathbb{F}_4)^m$ , and encodes them as codewords of the dual code of  $\mathcal{C}$ . In

<sup>1</sup>It is well-known that the dual of an MDS code is also an MDS code.



other words, the user builds the queries  $Q_1^{(p)}, \dots, Q_4^{(p)}$  multiplying the random vectors by the generator matrix<sup>2</sup>  $\mathbf{G}_{C^\perp} = \mathbf{G}_C$ , i.e., during round  $p$  the queries are

$$\begin{aligned} [Q_1 \ \cdots \ Q_4] &= [Z_1 \ Z_2] \mathbf{G}_{C^\perp} + \boldsymbol{\xi}_{K,p} \\ &= [Z_1 \ Z_2 \ \alpha^2 Z_1 + \alpha Z_2 \ \alpha Z_1 + \alpha^2 Z_2] + \boldsymbol{\xi}_{K,p}, \end{aligned}$$

where  $\boldsymbol{\xi}_{K,p}$  is the null matrix with a 1 in position  $(K, p)$ .

- (2) The user sends query  $Q_s^{(p)}$  to each server  $s \in [4]$ .
- (3) Server  $s \in [4]$  computes  $H_s^{(p)} = \langle Q_s^{(p)} | y_s \rangle \in \mathbb{F}_4$ . For bijection (1) each  $H_s^{(p)}$  can be written as an element of  $\mathbb{F}_2^2$ . Then, the first and the last server apply  $\mathbf{W}(H_1^{(p)})$  and  $\mathbf{W}(H_4^{(p)})$  to the qubits  $\mathcal{H}_1^{(p)}$  and  $\mathcal{H}_4^{(p)}$ , respectively. Server  $s \in \{2, 3\}$  applies  $\mathbf{W}(H_s^{(p)})$  to the qubit  $\mathcal{H}_s^{L,(p)}$  and performs a Bell measurement on  $\mathcal{H}_s^{L,(p)} \otimes \mathcal{H}_s^{R,(p)}$  whose outcome is denoted by  $G_s^{(p)} \in \mathbb{F}_2^2$ . Finally, server  $s$  applies  $\mathbf{W}(G_s^{(p)})$  to the qubit  $\mathcal{H}_s^{(p)}$ .
- (4) Each server sends its qubit  $\mathcal{H}_s^{(p)}$  to the user.
- (5) The user performs a Bell measurement to the pair  $\mathcal{H}_2^{(p)} \otimes \mathcal{H}_3^{(p)}$  to retrieve  $G^{(p)} = G_2^{(p)} + G_3^{(p)}$  via the two-sum transmission protocol (cf. Sec. II-C). He applies  $\mathbf{W}(G^{(p)})$  to the qubit  $\mathcal{H}_4^{(p)}$  and performs a Bell measurement on  $\mathcal{H}_1^{(p)} \otimes \mathcal{H}_4^{(p)}$ , whose outcome is  $y_p^K$  with probability 1.
- (6) Repeat all the previous steps for every piece  $p \in [2]$ .
- (7) Since servers 1 and 2 contain the symbols  $x_1^i$  and  $x_2^i$  respectively, the user can directly build the file  $x^K = (x_1^K, x_2^K)$ .





Figure 4. QPIR protocol with an  $[4, 2]$ -RS code. Step 2 is depicted in blue, Step 4 in red and Step 5 in green.

The operations performed by the servers and the download step (Step 4) are visualized in Figure 5. After these steps, the user possesses the entangled pairs of qubits  $\mathcal{H}_2^{(p)} \otimes \mathcal{H}_3^{(p)}$  and  $\mathcal{H}_1^{(p)} \otimes \mathcal{H}_4^{(p)}$  for each  $p \in [2]$ . The states of those two pairs are, respectively,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{W}_2(G_2^{(p)}) \mathbf{W}_3(G_3^{(p)}) |\Phi\rangle &\stackrel{(7),(5)}{\cong} \mathbf{W}_3(G^{(p)}) |\Phi\rangle, \\ (-1)^{\phi_4^{(p)}} \mathbf{W}_4\left(\sum_{s=1}^4 H_s^{(p)} + G^{(p)}\right) |\Phi\rangle, \end{aligned}$$

<sup>2</sup>The code chosen in this example is self-dual.



**Figure 5.** Servers' operations and download step (depicted in green) for the QPIR protocol with a  $[4, 2]$ -RS code. These operations are performed for every  $p \in [2]$ .

where  $\sum_{s=1}^4 H_s^{(p)} = x_p^K$ . In fact, assuming  $p = 1$ ,

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{s=1}^4 H_s^{(1)} &= \sum_{i=1}^m (Q_1^i + \delta_{iK}) y_1^i + \sum_{i=1}^m Q_2^i y_2^i + \sum_{i=1}^m Q_3^i y_3^i + \sum_{i=1}^m Q_4^i y_4^i = \sum_{i=1}^m Z_1^i x_1^i + x_1^K \\
&+ \sum_{i=1}^m Z_2^i x_2^i + \sum_{i=1}^m (\alpha^2 Z_1^i + \alpha Z_2^i) (\alpha^2 x_1^i + \alpha x_2^i) + \sum_{i=1}^m (\alpha Z_1^i + \alpha^2 Z_2^i) (\alpha x_1^i + \alpha^2 x_2^i) \\
&\stackrel{(9)}{\cong} x_1^K + \sum_{i=1}^m Z_1^i x_1^i + \sum_{i=1}^m Z_2^i x_2^i + \sum_{i=1}^m \alpha Z_1^i x_1^i + \sum_{i=1}^m Z_1^i x_2^i + \sum_{i=1}^m Z_2^i x_1^i + \sum_{i=1}^m \alpha^2 Z_2^i x_2^i \\
&+ \sum_{i=1}^m \alpha^2 Z_1^i x_1^i + \sum_{i=1}^m Z_1^i x_2^i + \sum_{i=1}^m Z_2^i x_1^i + \sum_{i=1}^m \alpha Z_2^i x_2^i \stackrel{(9)}{\cong} x_1^K.
\end{aligned}$$

The proof for  $p = 2$  is the same. Performing a Bell measurement on the first pair, the user retrieves  $G^{(p)}$  and then applies  $\mathbf{W}(G^{(p)})$  to the qubit  $\mathcal{H}_4^{(p)}$ . Doing so, the state of the second pair becomes

$$(-1)^{\phi_4^{(p)}} \mathbf{W}_4(G^{(p)}) \mathbf{W}_4(x_p^K + G^{(p)}) |\Phi\rangle \stackrel{(5)}{\cong} (-1)^{\phi_u^{(p)}} \mathbf{W}_4(x_p^K) |\Phi\rangle.$$

Performing now the Bell measurement on the second pair, the user retrieves  $x_p^K$  with probability 1. After retrieving  $x_1^K$  and  $x_2^K$ , the user depacketizes the requested file  $x^K$ .

User and server secrecy are achieved for Lemma 3. The rate is  $R_{\text{PIR}} = \frac{2 \cdot 2}{2 \cdot 4} = \frac{1}{2}$ , since we recovered four bits and downloaded eight qubits each carrying one bit over two rounds.

## VI. IMPROVING THE RETRIEVAL RATES BY LOCALLY REPAIRABLE CODES

The restriction of the rate for the scheme presented in Section IV-A arises from only being able to download a single symbol of the codeword corresponding to the desired file in each round (cf. Rem. 2). Interestingly, for a scheme with this restriction, regardless of whether it is a quantum or a classical system, it can be advantageous in terms of the retrieval rate to operate on a storage system that is encoded with a locally repairable code (LRC) [18], [19]. Without such a restriction on the number of downloaded symbols, LRCs are not known to be able to improve the retrieval rates. For a set of integers  $\mathcal{A} \subset [n]$  denote the restriction of the  $[n, k]$  code  $\mathcal{C}$  to the coordinates indexed by  $\mathcal{A}$  by  $\mathcal{C}|_{\mathcal{A}}$ .

**Definition 5.** An  $[n, k]$  code  $\mathcal{C}$  is said to have  $(r, \rho)$ -locality if there exists a partition  $\mathcal{P} = \{\mathcal{A}_1, \dots, \mathcal{A}_\mu\}$  of  $[n]$  into sets  $\mathcal{A}_l$  with  $|\mathcal{A}_l| \leq r + \rho - 1$ ,  $\forall l \in [\mu]$  such that for the distance of the code restricted to the positions indexed by  $\mathcal{A}_l$  it holds that  $d(\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{A}_l}) \geq \rho$ ,  $\forall l \in [\mu]$ .

The sets  $\mathcal{A}_1, \dots, \mathcal{A}_\mu$  are referred to as the repair sets of the code and the restriction  $\mathcal{C}|_{\mathcal{A}_l}$  of the code  $\mathcal{C}$  to the positions of  $\mathcal{A}_l$  as the  $l$ -th local code. We say a locally repairable code is *optimal* if it fulfills the Singleton-like bound [18], [19]

$$d \leq n - k + 1 - \left( \left\lceil \frac{k}{r} \right\rceil - 1 \right) (\rho - 1)$$

with equality. For simplicity, here we only consider LRCs with disjoint repair sets and assume that  $r|k$ , so we can omit the ceiling operation. It is well known that for an optimal LRC the local codes are  $[r + \rho - 1, r]$ -MDS codes and that picking from  $\frac{k}{r}$  local codes arbitrary  $r$  positions each results in an information set. The latter can readily be seen by puncturing the LRC such that only  $\frac{k}{r}$  repair sets remain. Then the distance is

$$d \geq n - k + 1 - \left( \frac{k}{r} - 1 \right) (\rho - 1) - \underbrace{\left( \frac{n}{r + \rho - 1} - \frac{k}{r} \right) (r + \rho - 1)}_{\text{maximal decrease in distance due to puncturing}} = \rho$$

and since each of the remaining repair sets is an  $[r + \rho - 1, r]$  MDS code, it holds that  $d = \rho$ . Clearly, puncturing each of these local codes in any  $\rho - 1$  positions does not decrease the rank (dimension) within the local code, and thereby also not the overall rank (dimension). It follows that the remaining  $k$  positions form an information set of the LRC.

Assume we are given a PIR scheme  $\text{PIR}(n, k, t, i, j)$ , where  $n = k + t$ , of rate  $R_{\text{PIR}} = \frac{2}{k+t}$  that retrieves 1 symbol  $j$  of the  $i$ -th file per round from an  $[n, k]$  MDS coded storage system. Let the storage code  $\mathcal{C}$  be an optimal  $[n, k, r, \rho]$  LRC as above. Let  $\mathcal{I} \subset \bigcup_{l=1}^{k/r} \mathcal{A}_l$  such that  $|\mathcal{I} \cap \mathcal{A}_l| = r$ ,  $\forall l \in [\frac{k}{r}]$  (we choose the first  $\frac{k}{r}$  repair sets  $\mathcal{A}_1, \dots, \mathcal{A}_{\frac{k}{r}}$  w.l.o.g.). As shown above, performing the PIR scheme  $\text{PIR}(r + \rho - 1, r, t, i, j)$ ,  $\forall j \in \mathcal{I}$  on the MDS code  $\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{A}_l}$  given by the repair set with  $j \in \mathcal{A}_l$ , results in an information set of the LRC and therefore allows for the  $i$ -th file to be recovered.

**Corollary 1.** The retrieval rate of the above LRC-based QPIR scheme is

$$R_{\text{QPIR}} = \begin{cases} \frac{2}{r+t}, & \text{if } r+t \text{ is even,} \\ \frac{2}{r+t+1}, & \text{if } r+t \text{ is odd,} \end{cases} .$$

*Proof.* By Theorem 1 the rate for the retrieval of each symbol of  $\mathcal{I}$  is given by

$$R_{\text{QPIR}}^{\text{local}} = \begin{cases} \frac{2}{r+t}, & \text{if } r+t \text{ is even,} \\ \frac{2}{r+t+1}, & \text{if } r+t \text{ is odd,} \end{cases}$$

where  $t = \rho - 1$ . As the scheme is applied to the local repair sets a total of  $k$  times to obtain  $k$  symbols of the desired file, the overall rate is given by the local rate  $R_{\text{QPIR}}^{\text{local}}$ .  $\square$

Note that for LRC coded storage the QPIR rate does no longer directly depend on the length  $n$  of the code. Since the locality parameter  $r$  is usually considerably smaller than the code dimension  $k$ , this results in an increase in the retrieval rate compared to the rate for MDS coded storage of Theorem 1. On the other hand, as  $\rho$  is typically small, this comes at the cost of a lowered resistance against collusion and total number of server failures that can be tolerated. However, the scheme is still able to resist more than  $t = \rho - 1$  colluding nodes, provided that no more than  $t$  nodes collude per local group. Explicitly, for such collusion patterns, the scheme can resist collusion of up to  $t\mu = (\rho - 1)\mu$  servers.

## VII. NUMERICAL RESULTS

We implemented and tested the QPIR protocol with no collusion described by Song *et al.* [11] using the programming language Python. We chose this language because it provides the library `qiskit`, which allows for writing high-level code for simple implementations on IBM quantum computers [20]. Note that the implementation is not a perfect correspondence to our model, as a quantum channel was not at our disposal. The source code of the implementation is available on Github [21].

### A. Assumptions

The goal of testing the protocol on a real quantum computer was to determine how consistently the quantum measurement results in the requested file. Thus, we made the following assumptions.

- **Perfect qubit transmission.** There is no error in the distribution of the entangled states to the servers and in the transmission of the qubits from the servers to the user. This is achieved by making the operations of the server and the user on the same quantum computer. We made this assumption for two reasons:
  - (1) we are interested in the measurement of the pair of qubits for privately retrieving the requested file;
  - (2) `qiskit` does not provide a way to simulate the transmission of a qubit between two IBM quantum computers.
- **File requested.** The file requested is always either the bit string 0000 or the bit string 1111. This assumption was made after observing that the probability of a 0 to be measured as 1 is different from the probability of a 1 to be measured as a 0, which makes the measurement non-symmetric – in contrast to assumptions on the channel generally made in the classical setting. We give a hypothesis on the reason for this behaviour in Section VII-C.
- **Storage.** The number of files is  $m = 4096$ :
  - (1) the index of the requested file is  $K = 1$ , *i.e.*, we request the first file;
  - (2) the other  $m - 1$  uniformly distributed and generated randomly at every trial.
 The first assumption is made because the index  $K$  of the file requested is independent of the measurement of the qubits. The second assumption was made to guarantee some randomization in the operations executed by the servers.
- **File size.** Each file consists of 4 bits. This assumption was made because the number of qubits of the most stable IBM quantum computer available at the time of testing (backend name `ibmqx2`) is 5 qubits. Note that any length of  $2R$ ,  $R \in \mathbb{N}$ , would be possible, but this would have implied  $\lceil \frac{R}{2} \rceil$  requests to the `ibmqx2` computer, which is not useful for our scope. This implies that in our tests we split each file in the database in  $R = 2$  pieces of two bits.
- **Trials.** We ran the test for over 100 trials, *i.e.*, we generated 100 databases of  $m$  files each and made 100 measurements. We input 8192 shots to each measurement to obtain a more precise result. This enabled us to compute the average accuracy over a total of 819200 shots.

### B. Majority decisions

First, let us describe how a measurement is performed on an IBM quantum computer. We need to repeat the same circuit that generates the state and several measurements for sampling. Since every operation performed on a quantum computer has a certain probability of error, a single measurement consists of a number of shots, *i.e.*, repetitions of the same quantum circuit, which is 1024 by default and can be set up to 8192. The result of a measurement is a dictionary containing the following:

- the keys are the strings of bits that received at least 1 shot;
- the values are the number of shots associated to each bit string.

We recall that the probability of measuring the file requested in the last step of the protocol is 1. Thus, the number of shots given to the bit string associated to the file requested in the dictionary should be maximal in each measurement (*i.e.*, 8192), but this does not happen because the quantum computers are not perfectly stable. Hence, some other bit strings can appear in the dictionary produced from the measurement. In order to retrieve the file requested from the dictionary, we decided to implement the following majority decisions over groups of  $g$  bits:

- (1) for  $g = 1$ , perform a majority decision for each bit of the file *independently*;
- (2) for  $g = 2kL/\beta = 4$ , perform a joint majority decision for all bits of the file.

Which of these majority decisions performs favorably depends on the nature of the error events. If the errors of different bit levels are independent, an independent decision on each bit level is optimal. However, if the error probabilities of the different bit levels are correlated such that an error in the measurement of one bit increases the probability of error on the other bit levels, a majority decision on the entire file can yield better results. For both decision rules we give the average accuracy per shot and the variance.

### C. Testing on `ibmqx2`

In Table I we compare the average accuracies and variances per shot for the different realizations of the requested file and majority decision strategies. Note that on the `ibmqx2` computer every majority decision applied to the received dictionary resulted in the correct file requested during a given trial. So, despite the fact that the error probability for each shot was around 4–20%, the majority vote resulted in the correct reconstruction of the requested file.

First, we see that the average time for computing every single shot is 5.5 milliseconds. Hence, if quantum computation was perfect, we could use single-shot trials and avoid implementing the majority decisions.

|                 | File 0000             |                       |                       |                       | File 1111             |                       |                       |                       |
|-----------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| $g = 1$         | $0.9600 \pm 3.50e-03$ | $0.9679 \pm 1.59e-03$ | $0.9677 \pm 1.86e-03$ | $0.9738 \pm 2.19e-03$ | $0.9365 \pm 4.34e-03$ | $0.9389 \pm 2.17e-03$ | $0.9519 \pm 2.38e-03$ | $0.9476 \pm 2.80e-03$ |
| $g = 4$         | $0.9065 \pm 0.0116$   |                       |                       |                       | $0.8159 \pm 0.0130$   |                       |                       |                       |
| Time (per shot) | $5.56e-03$ s          |                       |                       |                       | $5.58e-03$ s          |                       |                       |                       |

**Table I.** Average accuracies and variances with  $m = 4096$  on `ibmqx2`.

Hence, error free quantum computation would imply a huge speed-up in computation. In real systems the error probability could be improved with methods such as quantum error correction.

We observe that, in general, as  $g$  is increasing, the average accuracies decrease, while the variances remain around the same order. This implies that the different bit levels are indeed independent.

Interestingly, the accuracies change significantly when requesting the file 0000 compared to requesting the file 1111. In particular, requesting 1111 appears to be much less accurate. This may happen because a qubit, when initialized, is in the state  $|0\rangle$ . In order to put it in the state  $|1\rangle$ , we have to apply an  $X$  gate, which evidently increases the error probability and can result in an error in the quantum computation. Thus, we suppose that requesting the file 0000 is the best case scenario, while requesting 1111 is the worst case scenario. This is the main reason why we only provide measurement outputs for these realizations of the file.

**Remark 3.** *The numerical results presented above correspond to tests on `ibmqx2`. We performed similar tests on different quantum computers provided by IBM, and we point out here, that as expected, the performance deteriorates with higher number of qubits.*

#### ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The authors would like to thank Prof. M. Hayashi and S. Song for helpful discussions.

#### REFERENCES

- [1] B. Chor, O. Goldreich, E. Kushilevitz, and M. Sudan, "Private information retrieval," in *Proceedings of IEEE 36th Annual Foundations of Computer Science*. IEEE, 1995, pp. 41–50.
- [2] H. Sun and S. A. Jafar, "The capacity of robust private information retrieval with colluding databases," *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 64, no. 4, pp. 2361–2370, 2017.
- [3] —, "The capacity of symmetric private information retrieval," *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 65, no. 1, pp. 322–329, 2018.
- [4] K. Banawan and S. Ulukus, "The capacity of private information retrieval from coded databases," *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 64, no. 3, pp. 1945–1956, 2018.
- [5] Q. Wang and M. Skoglund, "Symmetric private information retrieval for MDS coded distributed storage," in *2017 IEEE International Conference on Communications (ICC)*. IEEE, 2017, pp. 1–6.
- [6] K. Banawan and S. Ulukus, "The capacity of private information retrieval from Byzantine and colluding databases," *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 65, no. 2, pp. 1206–1219, Feb 2019.
- [7] R. Freij-Hollanti, O. W. Gnilke, C. Hollanti, and D. A. Karpuk, "Private information retrieval from coded databases with colluding servers," *SIAM Journal on Applied Algebra and Geometry*, vol. 1, no. 1, pp. 647–664, 2017.
- [8] H. Sun and S. A. Jafar, "Private information retrieval from MDS coded data with colluding servers: Settling a conjecture by Freij-Hollanti et al." *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 64, no. 2, pp. 1000–1022, Feb 2018.
- [9] L. Holzbaur, R. Freij-Hollanti, J. Li, and C. Hollanti, "On the capacity of private information retrieval from coded, colluding, and adversarial servers," in *2019 IEEE Inf. Theory Workshop (ITW)*, 2019.
- [10] —, "On the capacity of private information retrieval from coded, colluding, and adversarial servers," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1903.12552v3*, 2019.
- [11] S. Song and M. Hayashi, "Capacity of quantum private information retrieval with multiple servers," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1903.10209*, 2019.
- [12] —, "Capacity of quantum private information retrieval with collusion of all but one of servers," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1903.12556*, 2019.
- [13] —, "Capacity of quantum private information retrieval with colluding servers," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2001.04436*, 2020.
- [14] D. Gottesman, "Stabilizer codes and quantum error correction," PhD thesis, California Institute of Technology, 1997.
- [15] R. Tajeddine, O. W. Gnilke, and S. El Rouayheb, "Private information retrieval from MDS coded data in distributed storage systems," *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 64, no. 11, pp. 7081–7093, 2018.
- [16] M. A. Nielsen and I. L. Chuang, "Quantum computation and quantum information," *Phys. Today*, vol. 54, pp. 60–2, 2001.
- [17] F. J. MacWilliams and N. J. A. Sloane, *The theory of error-correcting codes*. Elsevier, 1977, vol. 16.
- [18] P. Gopalan, C. Huang, H. Simitci, and S. Yekhanin, "On the locality of codeword symbols," *IEEE Transactions on Information theory*, vol. 58, no. 11, pp. 6925–6934, 2012.
- [19] G. M. Kamath, N. Prakash, V. Lalitha, and P. V. Kumar, "Codes with local regeneration and erasure correction," *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 60, no. 8, pp. 4637–4660, 2014.
- [20] "IBM quantum experience," <https://quantum-computing.ibm.com/>.
- [21] "Github," <https://github.com/mattexp/quantum-pir>.