

# A Computational Separation Between Quantum No-cloning and No-teleportation

Barak Nehoran  
Princeton University

Mark Zhandry  
NTT Research & Princeton University

## Abstract

Two of the fundamental no-go theorems of quantum information are the no-cloning theorem (that it is impossible to make copies of general quantum states) and the no-teleportation theorem (the prohibition on sending quantum states over classical channels without pre-shared entanglement). They are known to be equivalent, in the sense that a collection of quantum states is clonable if and only if it is teleportable.

Our main result suggests that this is not the case when computational efficiency is considered. We give a collection of quantum states and oracles relative to which these states are efficiently clonable but *not* efficiently teleportable. Given that the opposite scenario is impossible (states that can be teleported can always trivially be cloned), this gives the most complete oracle separation possible between these two important no-go properties.

In doing so, we introduce a related quantum no-go property, *reconstructibility*, which refers to the ability to construct a quantum state from a uniquely identifying classical description. We show the stronger result of a collection of quantum states that are efficiently clonable but not efficiently reconstructible. This novel no-go property only exists in relation to computational efficiency, as it is trivial for unbounded computation. It thus opens up the possibility of further computational no-go properties that have not yet been studied because they do not exist outside the computational context.

## 1 Introduction

One of the defining features of quantum information is the no-cloning theorem: that it is impossible to copy a general quantum state [Par70, WZ82, Die82]. Another fundamental no-go theorem is the no-teleportation theorem: that it is impossible (without any pre-shared entanglement) to send quantum information over a classical channel.

These two no-go theorems are understood to be *equivalent*, in the following sense: given a set of quantum states  $S = \{|\psi_1\rangle, |\psi_2\rangle, \dots\}$ , then states in  $S$  can be cloned if and only if they can be teleported. Here,  $S$  being cloned means there is a process mapping  $|\psi_i\rangle$  to two copies of  $|\psi_i\rangle$ .  $S$  being teleported means there is a deconstruction process which maps  $|\psi_i\rangle$  into classical information  $\tau$ , and a reconstruction process that maps  $\tau$  back to  $|\psi_i\rangle$ . In fact, both cloning and teleportation are possible if and only if the states in  $S$  are orthogonal. Relaxed notions of cloning and teleportation that only require approximate success are also equivalent, both being possible exactly when the states are “almost” orthogonal in some sense.

**Introducing Computational Constraints.** The above discussion is information-theoretic. Here, we ask: *what happens when computational constraints are considered?* We consider a set  $S$  to be computationally clonable if there is a *polynomial-time* quantum algorithm that solves the cloning

task on  $S$ . Likewise, we consider  $S$  to be computationally teleportable if there is both a polynomial-time deconstruction and corresponding polynomial-time reconstruction procedure for  $S$ .

We observe the trivial relationship that computational teleportation implies computational cloning: by running reconstruction twice on the deconstructed classical information  $\tau$ , one obtains two copies of  $|\psi_i\rangle$ , therefore cloning.

However, the converse is a priori unclear: if a state can be cloned efficiently, it is not clear if there is an efficient process to deconstruct the state into a classical  $\tau$  and also an efficient process to turn  $\tau$  back into the quantum state.

## 1.1 Our Results

In this work, we provide evidence that no-cloning and no-teleportation are *not* equivalent in the computationally bounded setting. Our main theorem is:

**Theorem 1.1** (Informal). *There exists an oracle and a set of quantum states  $S$  such that  $S$  can be efficiently cloned, but there is no efficient teleportation procedure. Even more, there is no teleportation procedure where the reconstruction is efficient, even if we allow deconstruction to be unbounded.*

In other words, while no-cloning implies no-teleportation, the converse is not true, at least relative to an oracle.

We prove this theorem by starting from a certain set of orthogonal but computationally *unclonable* states (in particular, those used by [ARU14]). By the trivial relationship that teleportation implies clonability, we conclude that the states cannot be teleported. We then augment the setup with a cloning oracle that can clone the states. The main technical difficulty is that we need to show that adding this cloning oracle does not allow for teleportation. We do this through a multistep process, gradually converting any supposed teleportation scheme that uses the cloning oracle into a teleportation scheme that does not use the cloning oracle, reaching a contradiction.

An interesting consequence of our proof is that the no-teleportation property holds, *even if the sender is inefficient*. The only party that needs to be efficient to achieve a separation is the receiver.

## 1.2 Motivation

The importance of the interplay between quantum information and computational complexity is becoming increasingly clear. For example, computational complexity played a crucial role in Harlow and Hayden’s resolution to the black hole Firewall Paradox [HH13].

This interplay is also fundamentally important for many cryptographic applications. For example, despite certain information-theoretically secure quantum protocols [BB87], most cryptographic tasks still require computational constraints even when using quantum information [May96, LC98]. Nevertheless, combining quantum information with computational constraints opens up numerous possibilities, from minimizing computational assumptions [GLSV21, BCKM21] to classically-impossible applications [Aar11].

The previous examples show that scenarios with quantum information can be fundamentally altered by the presence of computational considerations. It is therefore important to develop a broad understanding of quantum information in the computationally bounded setting. This includes the famous no-go theorems of quantum information. Numerous prior works have studied no-cloning in the computational setting (see references in Section 1.3). However, the difficulty of teleportation has, to the best of our knowledge, not been previously studied. As our work shows, the equivalence of two of the most important quantum no-go theorems no longer holds in the computationally

bounded setting, giving a very different picture and allowing for new possibilities that do not exist in the information-theoretic setting.

**Potential Cryptographic Applications.** Besides addressing fundamental questions, our results are also suggestive of potential cryptographic applications, though more work will be needed to actually realize these ideas.

Concretely, consider the following key exfiltration scenario: a server contains a cryptographic key, say, for decrypting messages. An attacker remotely compromises the server, and then attempts to exfiltrate the key, sending it from the compromised server to the attacker’s computer.

A classical approach to mitigate this problem is *big key cryptography* [BKR16], where the secret decryption key is made inconveniently large. This may make it impossible for the attacker to exfiltrate the key (perhaps there are bandwidth constraints on outgoing messages from the server) or at least makes it easier to detect the exfiltration (the large communication of the key may be easily detected). Unfortunately, such large keys are also inconvenient for the honest server, as now the server needs significant storage for each key (perhaps the server is storing keys for many different users). Moreover, decrypting using the key may be problematic, since the server will have to compute on a large key, which at least requires reading it from storage.

A quantum proposal would be to have decryption keys be quantum states. It is still reasonable to consider such a setting where all communication is classical: after all, the messages being encrypted and decrypted may just be classical. The server could therefore force all outgoing communication to be classical by measuring it. This would prevent the remote adversary from exfiltrating the key, by the non-teleportability of the key.

Since teleportation trivially implies cloning, we note that any classical program which has been quantum copy protected [Aar11] will be immune from classical exfiltration. Copy protection for pseudorandom functions, decryption, and *single-use* signatures were recently constructed from indistinguishability obfuscation [CLLZ21].

However, using copy protection comes with its own limitations. Indeed, suppose the server is decrypting a large volume of incoming communication under a single decryption key. Classically, the server could divide the communication across several processors, which each decrypt in parallel. Unfortunately, this requires giving each processor a copy of the key. While trivial classically, the whole point of copy protection is to prevent copying. The server could simply store numerous copies of each copy-protected key, but it would have to store these keys forever, even when the server is sitting idle or processing other tasks. This could be a major burden on the server.

Instead, we imagine a protocol where the keys *are* copy-able, but remain impossible to teleport. This would protect against exfiltration, while allowing the server to only store a single copy of the key for long-term use. Then, if the incoming communication load ever becomes large, it can copy the key and spread the copies amongst several quantum processors that process the communication in parallel. After the load subsides and processors would return to being idle, the copies of the key can simply be discarded.

**On Oracles.** Our separation between no-cloning and no-teleportation requires oracles. Given the current state of complexity theory and the fact that these no-go theorems are equivalent for computationally unbounded adversaries, we cannot hope to achieve unconditional separations between these no-go properties in the standard model. As such, either computational assumptions or a relativized separation (that is, oracles) are required.

For cryptographic applications, certainly a standard-model construction from computational assumptions would be needed. On the other hand, by using oracles, we are able to give an uncondi-

tional separation, independent of what assumptions may or may not hold. While such a relativized separation does not necessarily rule out a standard-model equivalence, it shows that any supposed equivalence in the computational setting would have to use non-black-box techniques.

### 1.3 Other Related Work

Cloning in the complexity-theoretic setting has been extensively studied during the last decade, in the context of public key quantum money [Aar11, FGH<sup>+</sup>12, AC12, Zha19, Shm22] and copy protection [Aar11, ALP21, CLLZ21].

A recent development in quantum money has been quantum money with *classical* communication [RS19, AGKZ20, Shm22]. This can be seen as a complement to our separation, giving a setting where a quantum state *is* teleportable, but not clonable. In order to overcome the trivial teleportation-implies-cloning result, however, these works move to *interactive* teleportation, involving two or more messages between sender and receiver. Moreover, teleportation happens in only a weak sense: the receiver does not get the original quantum state. Instead, the sender’s quantum money state is actually irreversibly destroyed, but in the process the receiver is able to create a single new quantum money state.

### 1.4 Technical Overview

Let  $f$  be a random function with codomain much smaller than domain. Our clonable-but-not-teleportable states will be the the superpositions over pre-images of  $f$ :

$$|\psi_z\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{|f^{-1}(z)|}} \sum_{x|f(x)=z} |x\rangle$$

where  $f^{-1}(z) := \{x|f(x) = z\}$  is the set of preimages of  $z$  in  $f$ .

As of now, the  $|\psi_z\rangle$  are easily shown to be *unclonable*: if one could create two copies of  $|\psi_z\rangle$ , then measuring each would give two pre-images  $x_1, x_2$  such that  $f(x_1) = z = f(x_2)$ . Since  $f$  has a small codomain, there are exponentially many  $x$  in the support of  $|\psi_z\rangle$ , and therefore  $x_1 \neq x_2$  with overwhelming probability. Thus we obtain a collision for  $f$ , which is known to be intractable for query-bounded algorithms to random oracles, even ones with small codomains [Zha15].

That the  $|\psi_z\rangle$  are unclonable seems to be counterproductive for our aims. But it allows us to also readily prove that the  $|\psi_z\rangle$  are also un-teleportable: if one could teleport  $|\psi_z\rangle$ , it means one can generate a classical  $a_z$  such that from  $a_z$  it is possible to reconstruct  $|\psi_z\rangle$ . But by running reconstruction multiple times, one obtains multiple copies of  $|\psi_z\rangle$ , contradicting no-cloning.

Now that we have an unteleportable set of states, we make them clonable by adding a cloning oracle, which very roughly maps

$$|\psi_z\rangle \mapsto |\psi_z\rangle|\psi_z\rangle$$

for all valid states  $|\psi_z\rangle$  and does nothing on states that are not uniform superpositions of pre-images. This clearly makes the  $|\psi_z\rangle$  clonable. The challenge is then to prove that teleportation is still impossible, even given this cloning oracle. This is proved through a sequence of stages:

- **Stage 1.** Here, we remove the cloning oracle, and just consider the oracle  $f$ . We show that, with arbitrary classical advice  $a_z$  of polynomially-bounded size dependent on  $z$  (which could have been constructed in an arbitrary inefficient manner), it is impossible for a query-bounded algorithm to reconstruct  $|\psi_z\rangle$ . This is proved by showing that such a reconstruction procedure could be used to contradict known lower bounds on the hardness of finding  $K$  collisions [HM20].

The above shows that even if we give the *sender* the cloning oracle, then teleportation is still impossible for a query-bounded receiver, as long as the receiver does not have access to the cloning oracle. Indeed, the hypothetical output of such a sender would be an  $a_z$  contradicting the above.

- **Stage 2.** Here, we upgrade the receiver to have a limited cloning oracle that only clones a single  $|\psi_z\rangle$ , namely the unique state  $|\psi_z\rangle$  that the receiver is trying to reconstruct.

The intuition is that such a limited cloning oracle is of no use, since in order to query it on a useful input, the receiver needs to have  $|\psi_z\rangle$  in the first place. We make this formal using a careful analysis.

- **Stage 3.** Finally, we give the receiver the full cloning oracle. We show that if there is such a query-bounded receiver that can successfully reconstruct, then we can compile it into a query-bounded receiver for Stage 2, reaching a contradiction.

This is the most technically challenging part of our proof. The rough idea is that the Stage 2 receiver will simulate a set of imposter oracles, where it forwards queries relating to  $z$  to its own  $z$ -only cloning oracle, and all other queries it handles for itself. This simulation is not perfect, and care is required to prove that the simulation still allows for successful reconstruction.

Putting these together, we prove Theorem 1.1, that there cannot exist *any* teleportation scheme for the  $|\psi_z\rangle$  with a query-bounded receiver (regardless of whether the sender is query bounded).

## 1.5 Open Problems and Future Directions

**Variations on Teleportation and Cloning.** In this work, we consider teleportation to occur in a single directed round. We can see, however, as mentioned above, that there are settings in which allowing multiple rounds of classical interaction provides new capabilities. An open problem would thus be to show that our scheme resists teleportation even by adversaries that are allowed multiple rounds of interaction, or alternatively to give another clonable scheme which does. Such a result would suggest that under computational constraints, interactive teleportation is a completely independent property that neither implies nor is implied by cloning.

Along similar lines, one can also define extended versions of cloning and teleportation in which the adversaries are given multiple copies of the state to clone or teleport. They would then be tasked with producing one additional copy in the case of cloning, or teleporting one instance across the classical channel. These extended tasks appear to be inherently easier, as the multiple copies may allow for partial tomography of the state. At the very least, they are no more difficult. What kinds of states are resistant to these extended tasks under computational constraints, and what are the implication relationships between them?

**Cloning and Teleporting Subspaces.** One can define cloning and teleportation *of a subspace* rather than of a single state. That is, the parties do not need to clone or teleport the exact state, but rather any state within a particular subspace containing it. Such a definition in particular would be general enough to include the schemes for quantum money with classical communication mentioned in Section 1.3. The motivation for doing this is that multiple different states could have the same operational functionality. For instance, different banknotes could be simultaneously valid, equivalent programs might have the same functionality, or multiple valid keys could serve for the same cryptographic task. In this context the task is to clone or teleport the *functionality* of the state rather than the state itself.

In particular, single states are trivial one-dimensional subspaces, so any cloning or teleportation scheme for states is also a scheme for subspaces, which means that our separation result also holds in this context. Interestingly, however, considering subspaces has the potential to allow new or stronger separations that don't exist for tasks on individual states.

**Realistic Implementation Without Oracles.** While our results give the first proof of concept of the existence of states that are efficiently clonable but not efficiently teleportable, they do not readily imply a method for creating such states in the real world. Doing so would require replacing the oracles in our scheme with realistic functions and cryptographic primitives, whose security would have to be built on plausible computational assumptions. A related direction would be to use such a scheme to instantiate concrete cryptographic applications, including preventing key exfiltration, as mentioned in Section 1.2.

**No-go Properties Exclusive to Efficient Computation.** An artifact of our proof of the separation between cloning and teleportation is that we actually prove a stronger separation between cloning and a simplified task that we call *reconstruction*. This motivates giving this task its own no-go property: A set of quantum states  $S$  is computationally reconstructible if there is a polynomial-time reconstruction procedure that constructs a state in  $S$  from a classical description that uniquely identifies it from within the set. Note, however, that this task is trivial for unbounded procedures: Any quantum state on a finite Hilbert space can be uniquely identified with its list of complex amplitudes, up to some precision error, which means that an unbounded procedure can always reconstruct it. This means that unlike no-cloning and no-teleportation, no-reconstruction exists exclusively in the context of efficient computation. What other quantum no-go properties have until now been overlooked because they do not appear until computational efficiency is considered?

## 2 Preliminaries

### 2.1 Quantum Computation and Computational Efficiency

We give only a basic primer on quantum information and refer the reader to the textbook by Nielsen and Chuang [NC12] for a more complete background.

A quantum state  $|\psi\rangle$  is a normalized vector in a Hilbert space  $\mathcal{H}$ . If we choose a basis  $\{|\phi_i\rangle\}_i$  for  $\mathcal{H}$ , then we can measure  $|\psi\rangle$  in that basis, at which point we get outcome  $i$  with probability  $|\langle\phi_i|\psi\rangle|^2$ . A distribution  $\{p_i\}_i$  over a set of quantum states  $|\psi_i\rangle$ , often called a mixed state, can be represented as a density matrix  $\rho$ , which has the form  $\rho = \sum_i p_i |\psi_i\rangle\langle\psi_i|$ , and which captures the randomness of the quantum state and anything that can be measured about it. If we measure  $\rho$  in the basis  $\{|\phi_i\rangle\}_i$ , we get outcome  $i$  with probability  $\langle\phi_i|\rho|\phi_i\rangle = \sum_j p_j |\langle\phi_i|\psi_j\rangle|^2$ .

Quantum states are transformed to other quantum states via unitary transformations. A unitary  $\mathcal{U}$  transforms a pure quantum state  $|\psi\rangle$  by sending it to  $\mathcal{U}|\psi\rangle$ , and it transforms a mixed state  $\rho$  by sending it to  $\mathcal{U}\rho\mathcal{U}^\dagger$ . A quantum algorithm is a sequence of basic unitary transformations  $\mathcal{U}_1, \dots, \mathcal{U}_t$  chosen from some set  $U$ . It acts on a pure quantum state  $|\psi\rangle$  by applying each one in turn as  $\mathcal{U}_t\mathcal{U}_{t-1}\dots\mathcal{U}_1|\psi\rangle$  (and on a mixed state analogously). If an algorithm performs  $t$  such unitaries, then we say that the algorithm runs in time  $t$ . Note that while non-unitary transformations such as measurement or randomness can occur in general, for our purposes, we can always assume without loss of generality that all such non-unitary behavior occurs in a single measurement at the end of the algorithm.

A quantum oracle is a predefined unitary transformation that is applied atomically in a black-box fashion. That is, it is performed as if it were a single operation which cannot be broken down

and does not need to have a computationally feasible implementation. Quantum oracles can in particular also implement a classical function  $f : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}$  by applying the unitary that transforms each  $|x\rangle|y\rangle$  where  $x \in \mathcal{X}$  and  $y \in \mathcal{Y}$  to  $|x\rangle|y \oplus f(x)\rangle$ . In this case, we refer to the oracle, and to the function  $f$  itself, as a classical oracle, despite it operating on data that may be quantum. Each time that an oracle is applied is called a query to that oracle. A quantum oracle algorithm is an algorithm that may at any point perform a query to any oracle from a predefined collection of oracles by applying the unitary for that oracle onto some subset of its registers. If this occurs  $q$  times, we say that it is a  $q$ -query algorithm, or that it runs in  $q$  queries.

When considering the runtime of an algorithm, it is often useful to ignore lower order influences and focus its asymptotic behavior as the problem grows. All asymptotics are in terms of the size of the problem given as input, or a security parameter,  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ . In asymptotic notation,  $O(f(n))$  refers to the set of functions that are bounded from above by  $c \cdot f(n)$  for some constant  $c$  and sufficiently large  $n$ . The notation  $\Omega(f(n))$  likewise refers to functions that are bounded from below by  $c \cdot f(n)$  for some constant  $c$  and sufficiently large  $n$ . We say that a function  $g(n)$  is polynomial if it is  $O(n^c)$  for some constant real number  $c$ . We say that  $g(n)$  is negligible if for every constant real number  $c$ , it is not  $\Omega(n^{-c})$ . On the other hand, we say that  $g(n)$  is non-negligible if it is not negligible, and we say that it is overwhelming if  $0 \leq g(n) \leq 1$  and  $1 - g(n)$  is negligible.

We say that an algorithm is efficient if it runs in time at most  $t(n)$  and  $t(n)$  is polynomial in  $n$ . We say that an oracle algorithm is query-efficient if it makes at most  $q(n)$  oracle queries and  $q(n)$  is polynomial in  $n$ .

## 2.2 Query Magnitudes and Modifying Oracles

When working with quantum oracle algorithms, it is often useful to be able to bound the effect that replacing one oracle with another can have on the result of the computation. To this end, we recall the following definition and two theorems due to Bennett, Bernstein, Brassard, and Vazirani [BBBV97]:

**Theorem 2.1** (Theorem 3.1 from [BBBV97]). *If two unit-length superpositions are within Euclidean distance  $\varepsilon$  then observing the two superpositions gives samples from distributions which are within total variation distance at most  $4\varepsilon$ .*

**Definition 2.2** (Definition 3.2 from [BBBV97]). *Let  $|\phi_i\rangle$  be the superposition of  $M^A$  on input  $x$  at time  $i$ . We denote by  $q_y(|\phi_i\rangle)$  the sum of squared magnitudes in  $|\phi_i\rangle$  of configurations of  $M$  which are querying the oracle on string  $y$ . We refer to  $q_y(|\phi_i\rangle)$  as the query magnitude of  $y$  in  $|\phi_i\rangle$ .*

**Theorem 2.3** (Theorem 3.3 from [BBBV97]). *Let  $|\phi_i\rangle$  be the superposition of  $M^A$  on input  $x$  at time  $i$ . Let  $\varepsilon > 0$ . Let  $F \subseteq [0, T-1] \times \Sigma^*$  be a set of time-string pairs such that  $\sum_{(i,y) \in F} q_y(|\phi_i\rangle) \leq \frac{\varepsilon^2}{T}$ . Now suppose the answer to each query  $(i, y) \in F$  is modified to some arbitrary fixed  $a_{i,y}$  (these answers need not be consistent with an oracle). Let  $|\phi'_i\rangle$  be the time  $i$  superposition of  $M$  on input  $x$  with oracle  $A$  modified as stated above. Then  $||\phi_T\rangle - |\phi'_T\rangle| \leq \varepsilon$ .*

## 3 Fundamental Tasks and Their No-go Properties

### 3.1 Schemes of Quantum States

We introduce the following syntax for a scheme of quantum states. A scheme is the basic structure on which the quantum no-go properties may or may not apply. In other words, some schemes may be clonable, for instance, while other schemes may not. Schemes consist primarily

of a collection of quantum states, but they can also specify the collection of oracles which may be used, as well as a distribution for sampling from those states.

**Definition 3.1** (Scheme). *In the context of quantum no-go properties, a **scheme**,  $(S, \mathcal{D}, \mathcal{O})$ , is an indexed collection of quantum states  $S = \{|\psi_i\rangle\}_{i \in \mathcal{Z}}$  over an index set  $\mathcal{Z}$  (which we call the set of labels), a distribution  $\mathcal{D}$  over the labels, and a collection  $\mathcal{O}$  of any quantum oracles that may be used.*

Whenever either the distribution or the oracles are irrelevant or otherwise clear from context, we will drop them from the notation and write  $(S, \mathcal{O})$ ,  $(S, \mathcal{D})$ , or simply  $S$ . Note that the distribution  $\mathcal{D}$ , which allows sampling from the collection of states, is only important for defining average-case security of the scheme, and  $\mathcal{O}$  is only necessary when considering oracle algorithms.

Under a certain scheme  $(S, \mathcal{D}, \mathcal{O})$ , *verification* of an unknown quantum state  $|\phi\rangle$  for a label  $z$  is the measurement of whether  $|\phi\rangle$  passes for the intended state  $|\psi_z\rangle$ , which succeeds with probability  $p = |\langle\psi_z|\phi\rangle|^2$ . When we say that an algorithm succeeds in passing verification with some probability  $p$ , we mean that verification succeeds with that probability over the randomness of the algorithm's output as well as the randomness of the sampling from  $\mathcal{D}$  and that of the verification measurement. That is, if the algorithm is randomized and outputs a mixed state  $\rho_z$  when label  $z$  is drawn, then we say that it succeeds at verification for  $z$  with probability  $p = \mathbb{E}_{z \leftarrow \mathcal{D}} \langle\psi_z|\rho_z|\psi_z\rangle$ . Whenever an algorithm is tasked with passing verification for a label  $z$ , we call  $z$  the target label and we call  $|\psi_z\rangle$  the target state.

### 3.2 Cloning and Teleportation

We now formally define the tasks of cloning and teleportation.

**Definition 3.2** (Cloning). *A scheme  $S$  is said to be  **$\eta$ -worst case clonable** if there exists a quantum algorithm  $\text{Clone}(|\psi\rangle)$  such that for every label  $z \in \mathcal{Z}$ , when given  $|\psi_z\rangle$ , its corresponding quantum state in  $S$ , returns a quantum state  $|\phi\rangle$  on two registers that, with probability at least  $\eta$ , passes verification for  $z$  on both registers simultaneously. That is,  $|\langle\psi| \otimes \langle\psi| |\phi\rangle|^2 \geq \eta$ .*

*$(S, \mathcal{D})$  is said to be  **$\eta$ -average case clonable** if there exists a quantum algorithm  $\text{Clone}(|\psi\rangle)$  that succeeds at the cloning task with probability  $\eta$  when  $z$  is sampled from the distribution  $\mathcal{D}$ .*

**Definition 3.3** (Teleportation). *A scheme  $S$  is said to be  **$\eta$ -worst case teleportable** if there exists a pair of quantum algorithms  $\text{Send}(|\psi\rangle) \rightarrow c$  and  $\text{Receive}(c) \rightarrow |\phi\rangle$  where  $c$  is a classical string, such that for every label  $z \in \mathcal{Z}$ , when given  $|\psi_z\rangle$ , its corresponding quantum state in  $S$ ,  $|\phi\rangle := \text{Receive}(\text{Send}(|\psi_z\rangle))$  passes verification for  $z$  with probability at least  $\eta$ .*

*$(S, \mathcal{D})$  is said to be  **$\eta$ -average case teleportable** if there exists a pair of quantum algorithms  $\text{Send}(|\psi\rangle) \rightarrow c$  and  $\text{Receive}(c) \rightarrow |\phi\rangle$  that succeed at the teleporting task with probability  $\eta$  when  $z$  is sampled from the distribution  $\mathcal{D}$ .*

Note that quantum teleportation is often described as the process by which a quantum state can be transmitted through a classical channel by use of pre-shared quantum entanglement. This second definition can thus be viewed as describing a quantum teleportation protocol without the use of entanglement:  $\text{Send}$  converts the quantum state  $|\psi_z\rangle$  to a classical description  $c$ , which  $\text{Receive}$  then converts back into  $|\psi_z\rangle$ , or an approximation thereof. Here, and throughout this paper, any pair of algorithms attempting to solve the teleportation task are attempting to do so without the use of pre-shared entanglement.



**Success Probability.** We say that a scheme is  $\eta$ -*unclonable* or  $\eta$ -*unteleportable* (in either the worst case or in the average case) if no quantum algorithm succeeds at the corresponding task with probability greater than  $\eta$ . We will often just drop the parameter  $\eta$  and simply say that a scheme is unclonable (or unteleportable) if it is  $\eta$ -unclonable (respectively  $\eta$ -unteleportable) for every non-negligible probability  $\eta$ . We say that a scheme is perfectly clonable (or teleportable) if it is clonable (respectively, teleportable) with probability 1.

**Computational Restrictions.** We call the algorithms Clone, Send, and Receive the adversaries for their respective tasks. Specifying the class of algorithms from which the adversaries may originate allows us to further parameterize these definitions by computational complexity.

For instance, if the adversaries are required to be computationally efficient (polynomial-time) quantum algorithms, we say that the scheme is *efficiently* or *computationally* clonable (or unclonable, teleportable, etc.). If the scheme includes oracles and the adversaries are quantum oracle algorithms that make a polynomial number of oracle queries, that is, query-efficient algorithms, then we say that the scheme is clonable (unclonable, teleportable, etc.) by efficient oracle algorithms or query-efficient algorithms. The one thing to note is that for teleportation by efficient oracle algorithms, we require as an additional restriction that the classical message  $c$  be of polynomial length. We will often use the words “computational” and “efficient” as a catch-all for both computationally efficient and query-efficient algorithms, and we will be more explicit whenever it is necessary to differentiate between them.

Finally, if the adversaries are not bounded in any way, we say that the scheme is *statistically* or *information-theoretically* clonable (unclonable, teleportable, etc.).

**Teleportation Implies Cloning.** We now give the trivial direction of the relationship between computational cloning and computational teleportation: that teleportation implies cloning. This implication and its proof are certainly not a new result, even in the context of computational efficiency. However, both directions of the relationship have too often been taken for granted despite one direction not always holding. We therefore give a formal proof for the direction that *does* still hold in the context of efficient algorithms, both for completeness, as well as to contrast its simplicity with the relative complexity of the converse.

**Theorem 3.4** (Teleportation Implies Cloning). *Any scheme that is  $\eta$ -computationally teleportable is also  $(\frac{4}{27}\eta^3)$ -computationally clonable. Note that this applies to both computationally efficient and query-efficient algorithms as well as to both worst case and average case versions of these properties.*

*Proof.* We prove this for computationally efficient algorithms, and in the worst case, since the other cases are nearly identical to this one. Let  $S$  be a scheme that is  $\eta$ -teleportable in the worst case by computationally efficient adversaries. That is, there exist efficient quantum algorithms  $\text{Send}(|\psi\rangle) \rightarrow c$  and  $\text{Receive}(c) \rightarrow |\phi\rangle$  such that for all  $|\psi_z\rangle \in S$ ,  $|\phi\rangle := \text{Receive}(\text{Send}(|\psi_z\rangle))$  passes verification for  $z$  with probability at least  $\eta$ .

With probability at least  $\frac{1}{3}\eta$ , the classical message,  $c$ , produced by  $\text{Send}$  in this teleportation protocol is a “good” one, in the sense that for such  $c$ ,  $\text{Receive}(c)$  succeeds with probability at least  $\frac{2}{3}\eta$  (otherwise, the success probability of the protocol would have to be less than  $\frac{1}{3}\eta + \frac{2}{3}\eta = \eta$ , a contradiction).

Define a cloning adversary Clone as follows: Given a quantum state  $|\psi_z\rangle$  as input, first simulate  $\text{Send}(|\psi_z\rangle)$  to produce a classical message  $c$ . Then simulate  $\text{Receive}(c)$  twice, independently, to produce and output two new unentangled quantum states  $|\phi_1\rangle$  and  $|\phi_2\rangle$ .

Suppose that the  $c$  produced in the first step is a “good” one as defined just above (which, as we have shown, happens with probability at least  $\frac{1}{3}\eta$ ). Since the two runs of  $\text{Receive}$  are independent

by construction, the probability that they both succeed on this “good”  $c$  is at least  $(\frac{2}{3}\eta)^2$ , and therefore the overall probability of success is at least  $(\frac{1}{3}\eta)(\frac{2}{3}\eta)^2 = \frac{4}{27}\eta^3$ .  $\square$

While we incur a loss (from  $\eta$  to  $\frac{4}{27}\eta^3$ ) in going from teleportation to cloning, if what we care about is whether  $\eta$  is negligible or non-negligible, this loss ends up being insignificant. That is, if we have that a scheme is computationally teleportable with non-negligible probability, then it is also computationally clonable with non-negligible probability. This is what we mean when we say that teleportation implies cloning. Our main result, which we show in Section 4, is that the converse to this theorem does not hold, at least with respect to efficient oracle algorithms.

### 3.3 Reconstruction

Our central aim is to separate cloning from teleportation. However, in order to do so, we find it convenient to introduce an additional third task, which we call *reconstruction*.

**Definition 3.5** (Reconstruction). *A scheme  $S$  is said to be  $\eta$ -worst case reconstructible if there exists a quantum algorithm  $\text{Reconstruct}(a) \rightarrow |\phi\rangle$  such that for every label  $z \in \mathcal{Z}$ , there exists an advice string  $a_z$  such that  $|\phi\rangle := \text{Reconstruct}(a_z)$  passes verification for  $z$  with probability at least  $\eta$ .*

*$(S, \mathcal{D})$  is said to be  $\eta$ -average case reconstructible if there exists a quantum algorithm  $\text{Reconstruct}(a) \rightarrow |\phi\rangle$  that succeeds at the reconstruction task with probability  $\eta$  when  $z$  is sampled from the distribution  $\mathcal{D}$ .*

The different parameterized versions of reconstruction are defined analogously to those of cloning and teleportation. As with the classical message in the case of teleportation, for reconstruction by efficient oracle algorithms, we require as an additional restriction that the advice string  $a_z$  be of polynomial length.

Reconstruction can be viewed in one way as a subtask of teleportation, where we focus our attention only on the receiving end of the teleportation, or in another way as a teleportation protocol in which the sender is all-powerful and can implement a (potentially even nonexistent) function from  $|\psi_z\rangle$  to  $a_z$ . (This function is in fact performing the complementary task of what we call *deconstruction*, which we do not define here, but which can be roughly described as assigning a uniquely identifying label to every state in  $S$ .) Following this line of thought, we can observe another trivial implication: between teleportation and reconstruction.

**Theorem 3.6** (Teleportation Implies Reconstruction). *Any scheme that is  $\eta$ -computationally teleportable is also  $\eta$ -computationally reconstructible. Note that, as before, this applies to both computationally efficient and query-efficient algorithms as well as to both worst case and average case versions of these properties.*

*Proof.* The proof here is even simpler than that of Theorem 3.4. As we did in that proof, we prove this theorem only for computationally efficient algorithms, and in the worst case, since the other cases are much the same. Let  $S$  be a scheme that is  $\eta$ -teleportable in the worst case by computationally efficient adversaries. That is, there exist efficient quantum algorithms  $\text{Send}(|\psi\rangle) \rightarrow c$  and  $\text{Receive}(c) \rightarrow |\phi\rangle$  such that for all  $|\psi_z\rangle \in S$ ,  $|\phi\rangle := \text{Receive}(\text{Send}(|\psi_z\rangle))$  passes verification for  $z$  with probability at least  $\eta$ .

For every  $|\psi_z\rangle \in S$ ,  $\text{Send}(|\psi_z\rangle)$  produces an output  $c_z$  that comes from some distribution over classical strings. There must be at least one string  $c_z^*$  in its support for which  $\text{Receive}(c_z^*)$  succeeds with probability at least  $\eta$  (otherwise,  $\text{Receive}(c_z)$  has success probability less than  $\eta$  for all  $c_z$ , and so the teleportation could not have succeeded with probability  $\eta$ ). Thus, for each  $z \in \mathcal{Z}$ , let  $a_z := c_z^*$  and let  $\text{Receive}$  be the reconstruction adversary, which we have just shown will succeed on input  $a_z$  with probability at least  $\eta$  for all  $z \in \mathcal{Z}$ .  $\square$

The direct consequence of Theorem 3.6 is that in order to show that a scheme is not teleportable, it suffices to show that it is not reconstructible. In other words, in order to prove our separation between computational cloning and computational teleportation, it suffices to show a scheme that can be computationally cloned but *not computationally reconstructed*. Reframing our aim in such a way simplifies the analysis because now we only have to deal with a single adversary in both situations (cloning and reconstruction), as opposed to two interacting adversaries for teleportation. Furthermore, by doing so, we in fact end up showing a stronger separation.

## 4 Cloning Without Teleportability

We now come to the main theorem of the paper.

**Theorem 4.1.** *There exists a scheme, relative to an oracle, that on the one hand, can be perfectly cloned by an efficient quantum oracle algorithm in the worst case, but that on the other hand cannot be teleported by a pair of efficient quantum oracle algorithms with any non-negligible probability, even in the average case.*

As mentioned before, we in fact prove the following stronger theorem, which, as a consequence of Theorem 3.6, implies Theorem 4.1:

**Theorem 4.2.** *There exists a scheme, relative to an oracle, that on the one hand, can be perfectly cloned by an efficient quantum oracle algorithm in the worst case, but that on the other hand cannot be **reconstructed** by an efficient quantum oracle algorithm with any non-negligible probability, even in the average case.*

The rest of this paper contains the proof of Theorem 4.2. In Section 4.1, we define the scheme, Scheme 4.7, and show that it is perfectly clonable. In Section 4.2, we prove that the scheme cannot be efficiently reconstructed.

The form of our scheme is based on a set of states introduced by [ARU14] which take a uniform superposition over the preimages of a random oracle. These states cannot be cloned by query-efficient algorithms, so by Theorem 3.4 this directly implies that they are unteleportable. We want a scheme that is unteleportable and yet clonable, so we add a cloning oracle, a quantum oracle that clones only this set of states. The main technical challenge is to show that access to this cloning oracle does not allow the adversaries to teleport.

We start by showing that the states are not reconstructible, via a reduction from the problem of finding multi-collisions in the random oracle. We then show that allowing cloning for the target state cannot be detected by the adversary. We finally simulate the rest of the cloning oracle by replacing the random oracle with an impostor for which we know how to clone.

### 4.1 The scheme

Before we give the scheme, we first give a few definitions that are useful both for defining the scheme and for the proof of its unreconstructibility.

We first define a cloning oracle for orthonormal sets. This is an oracle that successfully clones a specific subset of basis states for a given basis.

**Definition 4.3** (Cloning oracle for a set). *Let  $\mathcal{H}$  be a Hilbert space and let  $S = \{|\psi_i\rangle\}_{i \in [k]}$  be an orthonormal subset of  $\mathcal{H}$ . Augment  $\mathcal{H}$  with a special symbol  $\perp$  outside the support of  $\mathcal{H}$ . That is,  $|\perp\rangle$  is orthogonal to all of  $\mathcal{H}$ .*

A **cloning oracle**  $\mathcal{C}_S$  on set  $S = \{|\psi_i\rangle\}_{i \in [k]}$  is a quantum oracle that, for all  $i \leq k$  sends  $|\psi_i\rangle|\perp\rangle$  to  $|\psi_i\rangle|\psi_i\rangle$  and  $|\psi_i\rangle|\psi_i\rangle$  to  $|\psi_i\rangle|\perp\rangle$ . For all other orthogonal states, it applies the identity. That is, when the second register is  $|\perp\rangle$ , it clones any state in  $S$  and leaves all other orthogonal states unmodified.

**Definition 4.4** (Preimage superposition state). Let  $f : \{0, 1\}^m \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^n$ . A **preimage superposition state** for image  $z \in \{0, 1\}^n$  in function  $f$  is the quantum state that is the uniform positive superposition of preimages of  $z$  in  $f$ :

$$|\psi_z\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{|f^{-1}(z)|}} \sum_{x|f(x)=z} |x\rangle$$

where  $f^{-1}(z) := \{x|f(x) = z\}$  is the set of preimages of  $z$  in  $f$ .

**Definition 4.5** (Preimage superposition set). Let  $f : \{0, 1\}^m \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^n$ . A **preimage superposition set for  $f$** ,  $S_f$ , is the set of preimage superposition states for all images in the range of  $f$ .

$$S_f := \left\{ \frac{1}{\sqrt{|f^{-1}(z)|}} \sum_{x|f(x)=z} |x\rangle \mid z \in \{0, 1\}^n \right\}$$

**Definition 4.6** (Cloning oracle relative to a function). Let  $f : \{0, 1\}^m \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^n$ . A **cloning oracle relative to  $f$** ,  $\mathcal{C}_f$ , is a cloning oracle for the preimage superposition set,  $S_f$ , of  $f$ .

We now give the formal definition of the scheme:

**Scheme 4.7.** Let  $H : \{0, 1\}^m \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^n$  be a random oracle, where  $m \geq 2n$  (but bounded by a polynomial in  $n$ ). Let  $\mathcal{C}_H$  be the cloning oracle relative to  $H$ . The scheme consists of the following:

- The collection of oracles is  $\mathcal{O} := \{H, \mathcal{C}_H\}$ .
- The set of states is  $S := S_H$ , the preimage superposition set for  $H$ .
- The distribution,  $\mathcal{D}$ , samples the image of a random domain element of  $H$ . That is, it returns  $z \leftarrow H(x)$  for a uniformly random  $x \in \{0, 1\}^m$ .

It is clear that the scheme presented here is perfectly clonable in the worst case by an efficient quantum oracle algorithm. Specifically, the cloning oracle,  $\mathcal{C}_H$ , provides that capability, and in a single oracle query. Therefore, it remains to show that no efficient quantum oracle algorithm can reconstruct it. This is the main technical challenge of our proof and takes up the remaining part of the paper.

## 4.2 Proof of Unreconstructibility

We wish to prove that Scheme 4.7 cannot be efficiently reconstructed by efficient quantum oracle algorithms in the average case. We prove this in a sequence of three stages, beginning with a simplified version of the scheme without a cloning oracle, then moving to one with an oracle that can only clone a single state, and finally to the full scheme with the full cloning oracle.

### 4.2.1 Stage 1

In the first stage, we consider an adversary,  $R$ , which is a quantum oracle algorithm with advice.  $R$  is given a polynomial length advice string  $a_z$ , and is allowed a polynomial number of queries to the random oracle. It is tasked with producing a state that passes verification for  $z$ , namely the positive uniform superposition over all the preimages of  $z$  in the random oracle. Note that this first version does not yet have access to a cloning oracle of any sort.

**Lemma 4.8.** *Let  $R$  be a quantum oracle algorithm that is given a classical advice string  $a_z \in \{0, 1\}^\ell$  for some polynomial  $\ell$  in  $n$ , and makes  $q$  queries to the random oracle, where  $q$  is a polynomial in  $n$ . For  $z \in \{0, 1\}^n$  drawn uniformly at random,  $R$  cannot output a quantum state that passes verification for  $z$  with probability that is non-negligible in  $n$ .*

*Proof.* The main idea is that if  $R$  were able to produce the target state  $|\psi_z\rangle$  with non-negligible probability, then it can also do so without the advice by guessing the advice string, albeit with significantly lower probability. Measuring  $|\psi_z\rangle$  then gives a random preimage of the random oracle, and we can do this multiple times to produce several preimages of the same image  $z$ , producing a multi-collision for the random oracle, which is harder to do than this method would give.

We now give the proof. Suppose, for the sake of contradiction, that  $R$ , when given advice string  $a_z$ , makes  $q$  queries to the random oracle and then produces a state  $|\psi_z\rangle$  which passes verification for  $z$  with non-negligible probability  $\eta$ . We use  $R$  to produce a large number of disjoint collisions of the oracle.

Let  $k$  be a sufficiently large polynomial in  $n$ , for instance let  $k = 2n(\ell + 1)$  (note that  $\ell$  is itself a positive integer bounded by a polynomial in  $n$ ). We run  $R$  repeatedly (on the same target label  $z$  and advice  $a_z$ ) a total of  $4k/\eta$  times with the goal of producing at least  $2k$  valid copies of  $|\psi_z\rangle$ . By a Chernoff bound, this succeeds with constant probability  $\Omega(1)$ : that is, if  $X$  is the number of valid instances,  $P[X \leq \frac{1}{2}(4k)] \leq e^{-4k/8} = e^{-n(\ell+1)} \leq 1/2$ .

Since the only accepting state of the scheme is the positive uniform superposition over the preimages of  $z$ , measuring each resulting copy gives an independent uniformly random preimage of  $z$ . Measuring all  $2k$  copies then gives  $2k$  independent samples from this set of preimages. We want all the samples to be unique, with no repeats, and this happens with high probability at least  $\Omega(1)$ . (That is, with high probability,  $z$  has  $\Omega(2^{m-n})$  preimages in the random oracle. Since the samples are drawn independently, the probability that any pair of samples coincides is  $O(2^{-(m-n)})$ . By a union bound over all polynomially many pairs of samples, the probability that any pair coincides is still  $2^{-\Omega(m-n)}$ , which is negligible, since we have  $m \geq 2n$ . This means that all samples are unique with high probability.)

Finally, because every pair of unique preimages is a collision, this gives  $k$  disjoint collisions of the random oracle. This process therefore produces  $k$  disjoint collisions with constant probability  $\Omega(1)$ .

Now, if this process succeeds given the advice  $a_z \in \{0, 1\}^\ell$ , then it can also succeed without being given advice, though with a much lower probability, by guessing the advice string with probability  $2^{-\ell}$ , for an overall success probability of at least  $\Omega(2^{-\ell})$ .

To recap, this gives an quantum oracle algorithm for producing  $k$  disjoint collisions of a random oracle which makes  $t = 4kq/\eta$  oracle queries and succeeds with probability at least  $\Omega(2^{-\ell})$ .

On the other hand, we recall the following theorem from Hamoudi and Magniez [HM20]:

**Theorem 4.9** (Theorem 4.6 from [HM20]). *The success probability of finding  $K$  disjoint collisions in a random function  $f : [M] \rightarrow [N]$  is at most  $O(T^3/(K^2N))^{K/2} + 2^{-K}$  for any algorithm making  $T$  quantum queries to  $f$  and any  $1 \leq K \leq N/8$ .*

Applying the bound from the above Theorem 4.9 with  $T = 4kq/\eta$ ,  $K = k$ ,  $M = 2^m$  and  $N = 2^n$ , the success probability for this task must be at most

$$\begin{aligned} O\left(\frac{T^3}{K^2N}\right)^{K/2} + 2^{-K} &= O\left(\frac{(4kq/\eta)^3}{k^22^n}\right)^{k/2} + 2^{-k} \\ &= O\left(\frac{kq^3}{\eta^32^n}\right)^{k/2} + 2^{-k} \\ &\leq 2^{-\Omega(k)} \\ &\leq 2^{-\Omega(n(\ell+1))} \end{aligned}$$

There therefore exists a sufficiently large  $n$ , for which this is a contradiction. This completes the proof of Lemma 4.8.  $\square$

## 4.2.2 Stage 2

In the second stage, we allow  $R$  access to a limited cloning oracle which can clone only the target state.

**Definition 4.10.** Let  $z$  be a label and  $|\psi_z\rangle$  the corresponding quantum state from the scheme. A  $z$ -cloning oracle,  $C_z$ , is a cloning oracle for the singleton set  $\{|\psi_z\rangle\}$ .

**Lemma 4.11.** Let  $R$  be a quantum oracle algorithm that is given a classical advice string  $a_z \in \{0,1\}^\ell$  for some polynomial  $\ell$  in  $n$ , and makes  $q$  queries (where  $q$  is a polynomial in  $n$ ) to the random oracle **as well as a  $z$ -cloning oracle**. For  $z \in \{0,1\}^n$  drawn uniformly at random,  $R$  cannot output a quantum state that passes verification for  $z$  with probability that is non-negligible in  $n$ .

*Proof.* The idea is to compare the performance of  $R$  on the  $z$ -cloning oracle to its performance on a dummy oracle which acts as the identity on all states. Since the  $z$ -cloning oracle and the dummy oracle differ only on the basis states where the first register is  $|\psi_z\rangle$ , if  $R$  puts low query weight on those basis states, then swapping between the oracles can only make minimal difference to  $R$ 's success rate.

We now give the proof. Consider an adversary  $R$  which, when given advice string  $a_z$ , makes  $k$  queries to the random oracle and  $q$  queries to the  $z$ -cloning oracle, and then produces a state  $|\psi_z\rangle$  which passes verification for  $z$  with probability  $\eta$ . We use  $R$  to construct a similar algorithm,  $R'$ , which does not make use of the  $z$ -cloning oracle, and we show that it cannot behave too differently from the one which does.

Let  $R'$  be a quantum oracle algorithm which simulates a run of  $R$  in which the  $z$ -cloning oracle is replaced by a dummy oracle (an oracle which acts as the identity on all states) by ignoring all of the  $z$ -cloning oracle queries (equivalent to performing the identity on each one).  $R'$  is then a quantum oracle algorithm with advice that satisfies the conditions of Lemma 4.8, so it must have negligible success probability  $\eta'$ .

For each  $t \in [q]$ , let  $R'_t$  be a version of  $R'$  in which the simulation is stopped prematurely at cloning query number  $t$  and which then outputs the first register of the query input. Let  $\rho'_t$  be the reduced density matrix of the outputted state. Because the runs of  $R'$  and  $R'_t$  are identical up until  $R'_t$  stops and outputs cloning query number  $t$ ,  $\rho'_t$  is also the reduced state of the first query register when  $R'$  requests query number  $t$ . The probability that  $R'_t$  succeeds in verification is  $\eta'_t := \langle \psi_z | \rho'_t | \psi_z \rangle$ . As above, since each  $R'_t$  is a quantum oracle algorithm with advice that satisfies the conditions of Lemma 4.8, all the  $\eta'_t$  must be negligible.

Choose a basis  $\{|\chi_i\rangle\}_{i \in [0, \dim(\mathcal{H})]}$  for  $\mathcal{H}' := \mathcal{H} \oplus |\perp\rangle$  as in Definition 4.3, that includes  $|\chi_0\rangle := |\perp\rangle$  and  $|\chi_z\rangle := |\psi_z\rangle$  as two basis elements. Let  $D$  be a unitary from this basis into the computational basis that sends  $|\psi_z\rangle|\perp\rangle$  to  $|z\rangle|0\rangle$  and  $|\psi_z\rangle|\psi_z\rangle$  to  $|z\rangle|1\rangle$  and which arbitrarily assigns all other orthogonal states to computational basis states. (For example, let  $B = \sum_i |i\rangle\langle\chi_i|$ , let  $C = \sum_{ij \notin \{(z,1), (z,z)\}} |i\rangle\langle j| \langle i| \langle j| + |z\rangle\langle 1| \langle z| \langle z| + |z\rangle\langle z| \langle z| \langle 1|$ , and let  $D = C \cdot (B \otimes B)$ .)

In this basis, both the  $z$ -cloning oracle and the dummy oracle can be expressed as applications of binary classical functions on all but the last bit. The  $z$ -cloning oracle becomes an application of the classical indicator function for the string  $(z, 0^{m-1})$ :  $f_{=z}(x) = \begin{cases} 1 & x = (z, 0^{m-1}) \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$ , and the dummy cloning oracle becomes an application of the all-zero function  $f_\emptyset(x) = 0$ . Let  $\mathcal{O}_{=z}$  be the unitary application of the indicator function,  $f_{=z}(x)$  above, which XORs the result into the last bit. Then the  $z$ -cloning oracle can be expressed as  $\mathcal{C}_z = D^\dagger \mathcal{O}_{=z} D$ , and the dummy oracle can be expressed as  $\mathcal{C}_\emptyset = D^\dagger \mathcal{O}_{\text{identity}} D = D^\dagger I D = I$ .

The algorithms  $R$ ,  $R'$ , and  $\{R'_t\}_{t \in [q]}$  can therefore be reformulated as quantum oracle algorithms that direct cloning queries to the classical oracles  $\mathcal{O}_{=z}$  in the case of  $R$ , or  $\mathcal{O}_{\text{identity}}$  in the case of  $R'$  and  $\{R'_t\}_{t \in [q]}$ . That is, before they make a cloning query, they apply the change of basis  $D$  into the computational basis. They then query  $\mathcal{O}_{=z}$  or  $\mathcal{O}_{\text{identity}}$ , and then apply the change of basis  $D^\dagger$  back to the original basis. Call the versions of  $R$ ,  $R'$ , and  $\{R'_t\}_{t \in [q]}$  in this new basis  $\mathcal{R}$ ,  $\mathcal{R}'$ , and  $\{\mathcal{R}'_t\}_{t \in [q]}$ .

Note that the only difference between  $\mathcal{R}$  and  $\mathcal{R}'$  is that cloning queries to  $\mathcal{O}_{=z}$  in  $\mathcal{R}$  are redirected to  $\mathcal{O}_{\text{identity}}$  in  $\mathcal{R}'$ . Furthermore,  $\mathcal{O}_{=z}$  and  $\mathcal{O}_{\text{identity}}$  only differ on inputs where the first register is  $|z\rangle$ .

We now therefore compute the query magnitude of cloning queries of  $\mathcal{R}'$  on  $|z\rangle$ . The state of the first register of cloning query number  $t$  of  $\mathcal{R}'$  to  $\mathcal{O}_{\text{identity}}$  is given by  $B\rho'_t B^\dagger = \sum_{i,j} |i\rangle\langle\chi_i| \rho'_t |\chi_j\rangle\langle j|$ . The squared overlap with  $|z\rangle$  is then  $\langle z| \left( \sum_{i,j} |i\rangle\langle\chi_i| \rho'_t |\chi_j\rangle\langle j| \right) |z\rangle = \langle\chi_z| \rho'_t |\chi_z\rangle = \langle\psi_z| \rho'_t |\psi_z\rangle = \eta'_t$ .

We now apply Theorem 2.3 on the set  $F := \{(i, y) \mid i \in [q], y = z\}$  and  $\varepsilon := \sqrt{T \sum_{t=1}^T \eta'_t}$ , with  $T := q$ . The sum of the query magnitudes of  $\mathcal{R}'$  on  $F$  is then  $\sum_{t=1}^T \eta'_t \leq \frac{\varepsilon^2}{T}$ . Let  $|\phi\rangle$  and  $|\phi'\rangle$  be the states outputted by  $\mathcal{R}$  and  $\mathcal{R}'$  respectively (and therefore also by  $R$  and  $R'$  respectively). Since  $\mathcal{R}$  is identical to  $\mathcal{R}'$ , with the only difference being that the cloning oracle queries are modified on the set  $F$ , then by Theorem 2.3,  $\|\phi\rangle - |\phi'\rangle\| \leq \varepsilon$ . By Theorem 2.1, then, the total variation distance between runs of  $R$  and  $R'$  is therefore at most  $4\varepsilon$ , so that  $\eta \leq \eta' + 4\varepsilon$ .

We have shown that  $\eta'$  is negligible, and  $\varepsilon = \sqrt{q \sum_{t=1}^q \eta'_t}$  is negligible since all the  $\eta'_t$  are negligible and  $q$  is a polynomial. Therefore,  $\eta$  must also be negligible. This completes the proof of Lemma 4.11.  $\square$

### 4.2.3 Stage 3

In the third stage, we finally allow  $R$  access to the full cloning oracle, which clones all valid states of the scheme while doing nothing for invalid states.

**Lemma 4.12.** *Let  $R$  be a quantum oracle algorithm that is given a classical advice string  $a_z \in \{0, 1\}^\ell$  for some polynomial  $\ell$  in  $n$ , and makes  $q$  queries (where  $q$  is a polynomial in  $n$ ) to the random oracle **and a full cloning oracle** for the set of valid states. For  $z \in \{0, 1\}^n$  drawn uniformly at random,  $R$  cannot output a quantum state that passes verification for  $z$  with probability that is non-negligible in  $n$ .*

*Proof.* Note that in showing this, we are demonstrating that the ability to clone other valid states does not help it produce the target state. The idea is use  $R$  to produce a new adversary  $R'$  which

queries just the  $z$ -cloning oracle with comparable success. Ideally we would take a  $z$ -cloning oracle and simply simulate the rest of the cloning oracle (for states other than the target state) by using the random oracle. However, such a simulation would require a large number of queries to the random oracle and thus be highly inefficient. We get around this issue by creating an imposter random oracle and simulating cloning queries relative to it rather than relative to the original random oracle. We must show first that the imposter random oracle is indistinguishable from the original random oracle, and second that it is possible to approximately simulate cloning queries to the imposter oracle.

We now give the proof. Consider an adversary  $R$  which, when given advice string  $a_z$ , makes  $q$  queries to the random oracle and the full cloning oracle, and then with probability  $\eta$  produces a state  $|\psi_z\rangle$  which passes verification for  $z$ . We use  $R$  to produce a similar algorithm,  $R'$ , which only makes cloning queries to the  $z$ -cloning oracle, and which must succeed with comparable probability. We produce  $R'$  as follows:

We first sample a private random function,  $H_{\text{private}} : \{0, 1\}^m \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^n \setminus \{z\}$ , which has a limited codomain such that it does not output  $z$ . That is, for each input, independently choose a uniformly random element of  $\{0, 1\}^n \setminus \{z\}$ .

We then create an imposter random oracle,  $H_{\text{impostor}} : \{0, 1\}^m \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^n$ , by combining the original and private random oracles in the following way:

$$H_{\text{impostor}}(x) = \begin{cases} z & H(x) = z \\ H_{\text{private}}(x) & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

That is, on query input  $x$ , if  $x$  is a preimage of  $z$  in  $H$ , it passes the query to the original random oracle, producing  $z$ , but otherwise passes it to the newly sampled private random oracle.

We also create a cloning oracle relative to this imposter random oracle,  $\mathcal{C}_{\text{impostor}}$ . This *impostor cloning oracle* clones the states that are valid for the imposter random oracle, which will in general be different than the set of valid states of the original random oracle. We claim that the imposter oracles perfectly mimic the originals.

**Claim 4.13.** *The joint distribution of target image  $z$  and the imposter random oracle  $H_{\text{impostor}}$  is identical to that of  $z$  and  $H$ . That is,  $H_{\text{impostor}}$  is distributed as a uniform random oracle conditioned on  $z$  being one of its images.*

*Proof.* To show this, we begin giving an equivalent lazy method of sampling the random oracle  $H$ , along with sampling the target image  $z$ .

First, we choose a random element  $x^* \in \{0, 1\}^m$  in the domain of  $H$ . We then randomly choose  $z \in \{0, 1\}^n$  as both its image in  $H$  and as the target image. Then, for each of the remaining elements of the domain of  $H$ , sample a random image from its range.

We now describe a similar method for lazily sampling the imposter random oracle  $H_{\text{impostor}}$ , along with the target image  $z$ .

As before, we choose a random element  $x^* \in \{0, 1\}^m$  in the domain, and a random image  $z \in \{0, 1\}^n$  as both its image in  $H_{\text{impostor}}$  and as the target image. For each remaining element,  $x$ , of the domain, we first sample a random image  $y$ . If  $y \neq z$ , resample an independent sample  $y'$  from  $\{0, 1\}^n \setminus \{z\}$  to be the image of  $x$ . Since, conditioned on  $y \neq z$ ,  $y$  is uniform on  $\{0, 1\}^n \setminus \{z\}$ , and so is  $y'$ , the resampled image  $y'$  is identically distributed to the original  $y$ . The extra resampling performed to sample  $H_{\text{impostor}}$  thus has no effect on the distribution, so this process produces a distribution identical to the one above for sampling  $H$  and  $z$ .  $\square$

As a consequence, no quantum oracle algorithm can tell the difference between query access to the original oracles  $H$  and  $\mathcal{C}_H$ , and query access to the imposter oracles  $H_{\text{impostor}}$  and  $\mathcal{C}_{\text{impostor}}$ .



That is, an algorithm  $R''$  which simulates  $R$  and redirects its oracle queries to the impostor oracles will succeed with the same probability  $\eta$ .

This completes the first part, showing that the impostor oracles are perfect replacements for the original oracles. It now remains to show that the impostor oracles can be simulated efficiently in terms of the number of queries to the original random oracle  $H$  and a  $z$ -cloning oracle  $\mathcal{C}_z$ .

Note that implementing  $\mathcal{C}_{\text{impostor}}$  using  $H$  and  $\mathcal{C}_z$  may be query inefficient. We therefore create a new efficient impostor cloning oracle  $\widehat{\mathcal{C}}_{\text{impostor}}$ , which for each query only makes a constant number of queries to  $H$  and  $\mathcal{C}_z$ , but which nevertheless performs nearly as well as the inefficient  $\mathcal{C}_{\text{impostor}}$ .

We would like to define  $\widehat{\mathcal{C}}_{\text{impostor}}$  by saying that it acts on computational basis states approximately as

$$\widehat{\mathcal{C}}_{\text{impostor}}|x\rangle|y\rangle = \begin{cases} \mathcal{C}_z|x\rangle|y\rangle & H(x) = z \\ \mathcal{C}_{\text{private}}|x\rangle|y\rangle & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

However, in reality, this is not unitary, since the resulting states will not be exactly orthogonal. We instead define it with an additional ancilla qubit as follows:

Define the following two unitaries acting on an ancilla qubit  $|b\rangle$  as well as the two input registers (of the cloning oracle).

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{U}_1|b\rangle|x\rangle|y\rangle &= \begin{cases} |b \oplus 1\rangle|x\rangle|y\rangle & H(x) = z \\ |b\rangle|x\rangle|y\rangle & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \\ \mathcal{U}_2|b\rangle|x\rangle|y\rangle &= \begin{cases} |b\rangle \otimes \mathcal{C}_z|x\rangle|y\rangle & b = 1 \\ |b\rangle \otimes \mathcal{C}_{\text{impostor}}|x\rangle|y\rangle & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

The action of  $\mathcal{C}_{\text{impostor}}$  with an extra ancilla qubit can be expressed as  $I \otimes \mathcal{C}_{\text{impostor}} = \mathcal{U}_1\mathcal{U}_2\mathcal{U}_1$ . That is,  $\mathcal{U}_2 = I \otimes \mathcal{C}_{\text{impostor}}$  because whenever  $H(x) = z$ , then  $\mathcal{C}_z|x\rangle|y\rangle = \mathcal{C}_H|x\rangle|y\rangle = \mathcal{C}_{\text{impostor}}|x\rangle|y\rangle$ . Furthermore, for any  $x \in \{0, 1\}^m$ , the support of  $\mathcal{C}_{\text{impostor}}|x\rangle|y\rangle$  is only on computational basis states  $|x'\rangle|y'\rangle$  such that  $H(x') = H(x)$ , which implies that  $\mathcal{U}_2 = I \otimes \mathcal{C}_{\text{impostor}}$  commutes with  $\mathcal{U}_1$ .

We now define a modified version of  $\mathcal{U}_2$ , but which makes no use of  $\mathcal{C}_{\text{impostor}}$ , and instead uses  $\mathcal{C}_{\text{private}}$ , the cloning oracle relative to  $H_{\text{private}}$ :

$$\widehat{\mathcal{U}}_2|b\rangle|x\rangle|y\rangle = \begin{cases} |b\rangle \otimes \mathcal{C}_z|x\rangle|y\rangle & b = 1 \\ |b\rangle \otimes \mathcal{C}_{\text{private}}|x\rangle|y\rangle & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

We thus define  $\widehat{\mathcal{C}}_{\text{impostor}} = \mathcal{U}_1\widehat{\mathcal{U}}_2\mathcal{U}_1$ , which we note makes two queries to  $H$  and one query to  $\mathcal{C}_z$  on each application (note that  $\mathcal{C}_{\text{private}}$  uses no oracle queries as it can be simulated directly using the private random function  $H_{\text{private}}$ ). It remains to show that  $\widehat{\mathcal{C}}_{\text{impostor}}$  cannot be distinguished from  $I \otimes \mathcal{C}_{\text{impostor}}$ . That is, we show that it is a good efficient approximation for  $\mathcal{C}_{\text{impostor}}$ .

We observe that  $I \otimes \mathcal{C}_{\text{impostor}}$  and  $\widehat{\mathcal{C}}_{\text{impostor}}$  differ only in whether they apply  $\mathcal{C}_{\text{impostor}}$  or  $\mathcal{C}_{\text{private}}$  (in  $\mathcal{U}_2$  and  $\widehat{\mathcal{U}}_2$  respectively) on the two non-ancilla registers, and only on basis states for which the first of those registers is not a preimage of  $z$ . In fact they differ only by a change of basis between a basis that includes the preimage superposition set of  $H_{\text{private}}$  and one that includes the preimage superposition set of  $H_{\text{impostor}}$ .

Taking a closer look at  $H_{\text{impostor}}$  and  $H_{\text{private}}$ , the only difference between the functions is that the domain elements that are preimages of the target image  $z$  in  $H_{\text{impostor}}$  are reassigned to another random image in  $H_{\text{private}}$ . Moreover, since the difference we observe in this setting is only

for domain elements that do not map to  $z$  in  $H$  (and thus in  $H_{\text{impostor}}$ ), we can set aside  $z$  in the analysis and focus on the other images.

Let  $|\psi_i\rangle$  and  $|\widehat{\psi}_i\rangle$  be the respective preimage superposition states of  $H_{\text{impostor}}$  and  $H_{\text{private}}$  for image  $i \in \{0, 1\}^n \setminus \{z\}$ . Let  $\theta_i := \cos^{-1}(\langle \psi_i | \widehat{\psi}_i \rangle)$  be the small angle between them. Further, let  $|\psi_{z \rightarrow i}\rangle$  be the equal positive superposition over any preimages of the target image,  $z$ , in  $H_{\text{impostor}}$  that were reassigned to image  $i$  in  $H_{\text{private}}$ . Then we can write  $|\widehat{\psi}_i\rangle = \cos(\theta_i)|\psi_i\rangle + \sin(\theta_i)|\psi_{z \rightarrow i}\rangle$ .

Note that for all  $i \neq j$ ,  $\langle \psi_i | \widehat{\psi}_j \rangle = \cos(\theta_j)\langle \psi_i | \psi_j \rangle + \sin(\theta_j)\langle \psi_i | \psi_{z \rightarrow j} \rangle = 0$  because the supports of the states (that is, their sets of preimages) are disjoint (where note again that we exclude the target image  $z$  here). And of course, each of the preimage superposition sets is orthogonal within the set:  $\langle \psi_i | \psi_j \rangle = \langle \widehat{\psi}_i | \widehat{\psi}_j \rangle = 0 \quad \forall i \neq j$ .

We can therefore partition the Hilbert space into  $2^n - 1$  orthogonal planes, each of which is spanned by a  $|\psi_i\rangle$  and its corresponding  $|\widehat{\psi}_i\rangle$  (or  $|\psi_{z \rightarrow i}\rangle$ ), as well as a remaining space orthogonal to all those planes. With this perspective, the change of basis that differentiates between  $\mathcal{C}_{\text{impostor}}$  and  $\widehat{\mathcal{C}}_{\text{impostor}}$  can be described as a small rotation of angle  $\theta_i$  in each of these planes and the identity in the remaining space.

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{U}_3 := I - \sum_i (|\psi_i\rangle\langle \psi_i| + |\psi_{z \rightarrow i}\rangle\langle \psi_{z \rightarrow i}|) \\ + \sum_i (\cos(\theta_i)|\psi_i\rangle + \sin(\theta_i)|\psi_{z \rightarrow i}\rangle)\langle \psi_i| + (-\sin(\theta_i)|\psi_i\rangle + \cos(\theta_i)|\psi_{z \rightarrow i}\rangle)\langle \psi_{z \rightarrow i}| \end{aligned}$$

Then,

$$I \otimes \mathcal{C}_{\text{impostor}} = \mathcal{U}_1 \mathcal{U}_2 \mathcal{U}_1 \quad \text{and} \quad \widehat{\mathcal{C}}_{\text{impostor}} = \mathcal{U}_1 (\mathcal{U}_3^\dagger \otimes \mathcal{U}_3^\dagger) \mathcal{U}_2 (\mathcal{U}_3 \otimes \mathcal{U}_3) \mathcal{U}_1$$

It therefore suffices to show that  $\mathcal{U}_3$  cannot be distinguished from the identity except with negligible advantage. Specifically, we want to show that the eigenvalues of  $I - \mathcal{U}_3$  are all negligible. That's because if the magnitudes of all the eigenvalues of  $I - \mathcal{U}_3$  are bounded from above by a negligible function  $\varepsilon$ , then given any quantum state  $|\phi\rangle$  before the application of  $\mathcal{U}_3$  or  $I$ , and any subsequent transformation, we have that the resulting Euclidean distance is  $\| |\phi\rangle - \mathcal{U}_3 |\phi\rangle \| = \| (I - \mathcal{U}_3) |\phi\rangle \| \leq \varepsilon$ , and thus by Theorem 2.1, when replacing  $I$  with  $\mathcal{U}_3$ , the probability of success can change by at most  $4\varepsilon$ .

Since  $I - \mathcal{U}_3$  acts independently on and maintains the  $2^n - 1$  orthogonal planes, it suffices to look at each plane individually. Specifically, its non-zero eigenvalues come in pairs of magnitude

$$\begin{aligned} |\lambda_i| &= |1 - e^{\pm i\theta_i}| \\ &= |1 - \cos(\theta_i) \mp i \sin(\theta_i)| \\ &= \sqrt{(1 - \cos(\theta_i))^2 + \sin^2(\theta_i)} \\ &= \sqrt{2(1 - \cos(\theta_i))} \\ &= \sqrt{2 \left(1 - \langle \psi_i | \widehat{\psi}_i \rangle\right)} \end{aligned}$$

In order to further break this down, let  $k_i$  be the number of preimages of  $i$  in  $H_{\text{impostor}}$  and let  $k_{z \rightarrow i}$  be the number of preimages of the target image,  $z$ , in  $H_{\text{impostor}}$  that were reassigned to

image  $i$  in  $H_{\text{private}}$ . We evaluate the inner product as

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \psi_i | \widehat{\psi}_i \rangle &= \left( \frac{1}{\sqrt{k_i}} \sum_{x|H_{\text{impostor}}(x)=i} \langle x | \right) \left( \frac{1}{\sqrt{k_i + k_{z \rightarrow i}}} \sum_{x|H_{\text{private}}(x)=i} |x\rangle \right) \\ &= \sqrt{\frac{k_i}{k_i + k_{z \rightarrow i}}} = \sqrt{1 - \frac{k_{z \rightarrow i}}{k_i + k_{z \rightarrow i}}} \geq 1 - \frac{k_{z \rightarrow i}}{k_i + k_{z \rightarrow i}} \end{aligned}$$

which gives

$$|\lambda_i| = \sqrt{2 \left( 1 - \langle \psi_i | \widehat{\psi}_i \rangle \right)} \leq \sqrt{\frac{2k_{z \rightarrow i}}{k_i + k_{z \rightarrow i}}}$$

The following claim frames this bound in terms of  $n$ .

**Claim 4.14.** *With overwhelming probability in the choice of  $H$  and  $H_{\text{private}}$ , for all  $i \in \{0, 1\}^n \setminus \{z\}$ ,*

$$\frac{k_{z \rightarrow i}}{k_i + k_{z \rightarrow i}} \leq 72n \cdot 2^{-n}$$

*Proof.* We show that the following all happen with overwhelming probability:

- a) for all  $i \in \{0, 1\}^n \setminus \{z\}$ ,  $k_i > \frac{1}{2} \cdot 2^{m-n}$
- b)  $\frac{1}{2} \cdot 2^{m-n} < k_z < 3 \cdot 2^{m-n}$
- c) for all  $i \in \{0, 1\}^n \setminus \{z\}$ ,  $k_{z \rightarrow i} < 36n \cdot 2^{m-2n}$

First we show that with overwhelming probability, for all  $i \in \{0, 1\}^n \setminus \{z\}$ ,  $k_i > \frac{1}{2} \cdot 2^{m-n}$ . The expected number of preimages of any image  $i$  is  $\mathbb{E}[k_i] = 2^{m-n}$ . By a Chernoff bound,  $P[k_i \leq \frac{1}{2}(2^{m-n})] \leq e^{-\frac{1}{8} \cdot 2^{m-n}}$  for any particular image  $i$ . By a union bound over the  $2^n - 1$  images, the probability that for any  $i$ ,  $k_i \leq \frac{1}{2}(2^{m-n})$ , is at most  $2^n \cdot e^{-\frac{1}{8} \cdot 2^{m-n}} \leq e^{-(\frac{1}{8} \cdot 2^{m-n} - n)}$ , which is negligible in  $n$  as we have that  $m \geq 2n$ .

We next bound the number of preimages of the target image  $z$ . Specifically, we show that  $\frac{1}{2} \cdot 2^{m-n} < k_z < 3 \cdot 2^{m-n}$ . The lower bound is identical to the one above for the other  $k_i$ 's. The upper bound is given by another Chernoff bound as  $P[k_z \geq 3(2^{m-n})] \leq e^{-2^{m-n}}$ , which is likewise negligible in  $n$ .

Finally, we bound the number of preimages of  $z$  in  $H_{\text{impostor}}$  that can be mapped to any one  $i$  in  $H_{\text{impostor}}$ . Specifically, we show that for all  $i \in \{0, 1\}^n \setminus \{z\}$ ,  $k_{z \rightarrow i} < 36n \cdot 2^{m-2n}$ . Since we just showed that with overwhelming probability,  $z$  has at least  $\frac{1}{2} \cdot 2^{m-n}$  and at most  $3 \cdot 2^{m-n}$  preimages, the expected number of these preimages distributed to each of the  $2^n - 1$  other images is bounded by  $\frac{1}{2} \cdot 2^{m-2n} < \mathbb{E}[k_{z \rightarrow i}] < 6 \cdot 2^{m-2n}$ . By a Chernoff bound,  $P[k_{z \rightarrow i} \geq 6n(6 \cdot 2^{m-2n})] \leq e^{-\frac{25n^2}{2+5n} \cdot \frac{1}{2} \cdot 2^{m-2n}} \leq e^{-\frac{3}{2}n \cdot 2^{m-2n}}$  for any particular image  $i$ . As before, by a union bound over the  $2^n - 1$  images, the probability that for any  $i$ ,  $k_{z \rightarrow i} \geq 36n \cdot 2^{m-2n}$  is at most  $2^n \cdot e^{-\frac{3}{2}n \cdot 2^{m-2n}} \leq e^{-(\frac{3}{2}n \cdot 2^{m-2n} - n)}$  which is negligible in  $n$  as  $m \geq 2n$ .

Putting these three things together, by a union bound over the three above events, with all but a negligible probability in  $n$ , for all  $i$ ,

$$\frac{k_{z \rightarrow i}}{k_i + k_{z \rightarrow i}} \leq \frac{36n \cdot 2^{m-2n}}{\frac{1}{2} \cdot 2^{m-n}} = 72n \cdot 2^{-n}$$

□

We therefore get an upper bound of  $\varepsilon := 12\sqrt{n} \cdot 2^{-n/2}$  on the eigenvalues of  $I - \mathcal{U}_3$ , which is negligible in  $n$ , and therefore, as shown above, an upper bound of  $4\varepsilon$  on the change in success probability incurred by replacing  $I$  with  $\mathcal{U}_3$ .

We now use a standard hybrid argument over the at most  $4q$  locations where  $\mathcal{U}_3$  might appear. We start with  $R''$ , for which all such locations have the identity, and for which the success probability is the original success probability of  $R$ , namely  $\eta$ . One at a time, we insert a  $\mathcal{U}_3$  at each location, each time incurring a loss of at most  $4\varepsilon$  in the success probability. With all  $4q$  applications of  $\mathcal{U}_3$ , we therefore get a success probability  $\eta'$  of at least  $\eta - 16q\varepsilon - \gamma$  (where  $\gamma$  is an additional negligible loss from the negligible chance that the sampled  $H$  and  $H_{\text{private}}$  are not covered by Claim 4.14).

We therefore construct  $R'$  in this way as a quantum oracle algorithm with advice with query access to the original random oracle  $H$  and a  $z$ -cloning oracle  $\mathcal{C}_z$ . It simulates  $R$  and redirects its oracles queries: Whenever  $R$  makes a random oracle query, it redirects the query to its own simulated  $H_{\text{impostor}}$ , which makes at most a single query to  $H$ . Whenever  $R$  makes a cloning oracle query, it redirects the query to its  $\hat{\mathcal{C}}_{\text{impostor}}$ , which makes at most one query to  $\mathcal{C}_z$  and two to  $H$ .  $R'$  thus satisfies the conditions of Lemma 4.11, so its success probability  $\eta' \geq \eta - 16q\varepsilon - \gamma$  must be negligible. Therefore,  $\eta$ , the success probability of  $R$ , must be negligible, thus completing the proof of Lemma 4.12, and as a consequence, completing the proof of our main theorems, Theorem 4.2 and Theorem 4.1.  $\square$

## References

- [Aar11] Scott Aaronson. Quantum copy-protection and quantum money. *Proceedings of the Annual IEEE Conference on Computational Complexity*, 10 2011.
- [AC12] Scott Aaronson and Paul Christiano. Quantum money from hidden subspaces. In *Proceedings of the Forty-Fourth Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing*, STOC '12, page 41–60, New York, NY, USA, 2012. Association for Computing Machinery.
- [AGKZ20] Ryan Amos, Marios Georgiou, Aggelos Kiayias, and Mark Zhandry. One-shot signatures and applications to hybrid quantum/classical authentication. In *Proceedings of the 52nd Annual ACM SIGACT Symposium on Theory of Computing*, STOC 2020, page 255–268, New York, NY, USA, 2020. Association for Computing Machinery.
- [ALP21] Prabhanjan Ananth and Rolando L. La Placa. Secure software leasing. In Anne Canteaut and François-Xavier Standaert, editors, *Advances in Cryptology – EUROCRYPT 2021*, pages 501–530, Cham, 2021. Springer International Publishing.
- [ARU14] A. Ambainis, A. Rosmanis, and D. Unruh. Quantum attacks on classical proof systems: The hardness of quantum rewinding. In *2014 IEEE 55th Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS)*, pages 474–483, Los Alamitos, CA, USA, oct 2014. IEEE Computer Society.
- [BB87] Charles H. Bennett and Gilles Brassard. Quantum public key distribution reinvented. *SIGACT News*, 18(4):51–53, July 1987.
- [BBBV97] Charles H Bennett, Ethan Bernstein, Gilles Brassard, and Umesh Vazirani. Strengths and weaknesses of quantum computing. January 1997.
- [BCKM21] James Bartusek, Andrea Coladangelo, Dakshita Khurana, and Fermi Ma. One-way functions imply secure computation in a quantum world. In *Advances in Cryptology*

- *CRYPTO 2021: 41st Annual International Cryptology Conference, CRYPTO 2021, Virtual Event, August 16–20, 2021, Proceedings, Part I*, page 467–496, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2021. Springer-Verlag.
- [BKR16] Mihir Bellare, Daniel Kane, and Phillip Rogaway. Big-key symmetric encryption: Resisting key exfiltration. pages 373–402, 08 2016.
- [CLLZ21] Andrea Coladangelo, Jiahui Liu, Qipeng Liu, and Mark Zhandry. Hidden cosets and applications to unclonable cryptography. In Tal Malkin and Chris Peikert, editors, *CRYPTO 2021, Part I*, volume 12825 of *LNCS*, pages 556–584. Springer, Heidelberg, August 2021.
- [Die82] D. Dieks. Communication by epr devices. *Phys. Lett. A*, 1982.
- [FGH<sup>+</sup>12] Edward Farhi, David Gosset, Avinatan Hassidim, Andrew Lutomirski, and Peter Shor. Quantum money from knots. In *Proceedings of the 3rd Innovations in Theoretical Computer Science Conference*, ITCS '12, page 276–289, New York, NY, USA, 2012. Association for Computing Machinery.
- [GLSV21] Alex B. Grilo, Huijia Lin, Fang Song, and Vinod Vaikuntanathan. Oblivious transfer is in minicrypt. In *Advances in Cryptology – EUROCRYPT 2021: 40th Annual International Conference on the Theory and Applications of Cryptographic Techniques, Zagreb, Croatia, October 17–21, 2021, Proceedings, Part II*, page 531–561, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2021. Springer-Verlag.
- [HH13] Daniel Harlow and Patrick Hayden. Quantum computation vs. firewalls. *Journal of High Energy Physics*, 2013, 01 2013.
- [HM20] Yassine Hamoudi and Frédéric Magniez. Quantum time-space tradeoff for finding multiple collision pairs. February 2020.
- [LC98] Hoi-Kwong Lo and H. Chau. Is quantum bit commitment really possible? *Physical Review Letters*, 78, 08 1998.
- [May96] Dominic Mayers. Unconditionally secure quantum bit commitment is impossible. *Physical Review Letters*, 78, 05 1996.
- [NC12] Michael A Nielsen and Isaac L Chuang. Introduction and overview. In *Quantum Computation and Quantum Information*, pages 1–59. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, June 2012.
- [Par70] James L. Park. The concept of transition in quantum mechanics. *Foundations of Physics*, 1970.
- [RS19] Roy Radian and Or Sattath. Semi-quantum money. AFT '19, New York, NY, USA, 2019. Association for Computing Machinery.
- [Shm22] Omri Shmueli. Public-key quantum money with a classical bank. In *Proceedings of the 54th Annual ACM SIGACT Symposium on Theory of Computing*, STOC 2022, page 790–803, New York, NY, USA, 2022. Association for Computing Machinery.
- [WZ82] William K. Wootters and Wojciech Zurek. A single quantum cannot be cloned. *Nature*, 299:802–803, 1982.

- [Zha15] Mark Zhandry. A note on the quantum collision and set equality problems. *Quantum Info. Comput.*, 15(7-8):557–567, May 2015.
- [Zha19] Mark Zhandry. Quantum lightning never strikes the same state twice. In Yuval Ishai and Vincent Rijmen, editors, *Advances in Cryptology – EUROCRYPT 2019*, pages 408–438, Cham, 2019. Springer International Publishing.