arXiv:quant-ph/9712016 v1 7 Dec 1997

Protection of information in quantum databases

Y.Ozhigov

November 9, 2002

Address: Department of mathematics, Moscow state technological
University "Stankin", Vadkovsky per. 3a, 101472, Moscow, Russia
E-mail: y@oz.msk.ru

1 Summary

The conventional protection of information by cryptographical keys makes no sense if a key can be quickly discovered by an unauthorized person. This way of penetration to the protected systems was made possible by a quantum computers in view of results of P.Shor ([Sh]) and L.Grover ([Gr]). This work presents the method of protection of an information in a database from a spy even he knows all about its control system and has a quantum computer, whereas a database can not distinguish between operations of spy and legal user.

Such a database with quantum mechanical memory plays a role of probabilistic oracle for some Boolean function $f:$ it returns the value $f(a)$ for a query a of user in time $O(N^2 \log^3 n)$, after that restors its initial state also in this time, where N is cardinality of $Dom f$. The software of database is independent of a function f. Classical state of such a database must contain the list of pairs $(a, f(a)),\ a \in Dom\ f$, taken in some order. Quantum mechanical principles allow to mix all these lists with different orders and the same amplitude in one quantum state called normal, and perform all user's operations extracting $f(a)$ only in states of such a sort. Now if somebody S tries to learn $f(b)$ for $b \neq a$ then this action so ruins the normal state that the legal user with high probability will not obtain a pair of the form $a, \ldots$ and hence the presence of S will be detected. It is proved that for a spy the probability to learn $f(b)$ asymptotically (when $N \longrightarrow \infty$) does not acceed the probability of its exposure.

Here advantage is taken of relative diffusion transforms (RDT), which make possible to fulfill all operations in normal states. Such transforms look like diffusion transforms applied by L.Grover in [Gr] but RDT are defined in a quite different manner.

A classical database with property of such a sort is impossible.

2 Introduction. The main definitions

All known models of quantum computers: quantum Turing Machines (look in [De], [BV]), quantum circuits (look in [Ya]) and quantum cellular automata (look in [Wa]) can simulate each ather with a polynomial slowdown and have the same computational power as classical computers. It is unknown is it possible to simulate absolute (without oracles) quantum computations by a classical computer with a polynomial slowdown or not. Such a simulation is known only with exponential slowdown (look in [BV]). As for relativized (with oracles) computations, the classical simulation with a polynomial slowdown is impossible (look in [BB]) and there is much evidence that quantum computers are substantially more effective than any classical device (look in [DJ], [BB], [Sh], [Gr]).

To create databases we shall use the model of quantum computer with two parts: classical part, which transforms by classical lows (say as Turing Machine or cellular automaton), and quantum part which transforms by the quantum mechanical principles. We proceed with the exact definitions.

Memory (*quantum part*). It is a set $\mathcal{E}$ which elements are called qubits. $\mathcal{E}$ may be designed as a discrete lattice: $\mathcal{E} \subseteq \mathrm{Z}^{\mathrm{M}}$ or as a tree, etc. Each qubit takes values from the complex 1-dimensional sphere of radius 1: $\{z_0\mathbf{0} + z_1\mathbf{1} \mid z_1, z_2 \in \mathtt{C}, |z_0|^2 + |z_1|^2 = 1\}$. Here $\mathbf{0}$ and $\mathbf{1}$ are referred as basic states of qubit and form the basis of $\mathtt{C}^2$. It will be convenient to divide $\mathcal{E}$ into registers of 2 neighboring qubits each so that each register takes values from $\omega = \{0, 1, 2, 3\}$.

A basic state of the quantum part is a function of the form $e:\ \mathcal{E} \longrightarrow \{0, 1\}$. If we fix some order on $\mathcal{E} = \{\nu_1, \nu_2, \ldots, \nu_r\}$ (r even), the basic state e may be encoded as $|e(\nu_1), e(\nu_2), \ldots, e(\nu_r)\rangle$. Such a state can be naturally identified with the corresponding word in alphabet ω.

Let $e_0, e_1, \ldots, e_{K-1}$ be all basic states, taken in some fixed order, $\mathcal{H}$ be K-dimensional Hilbert space with orthonormal basis $e_0, e_1, \ldots, e_{K-1},\ 2^r = K$. This Hilbert space can be regarded as tensor product $\mathcal{H}_1 \bigotimes \mathcal{H}_2 \bigotimes \cdots \bigotimes \mathcal{H}_r$ of 2-dimensional spaces, where $\mathcal{H}_i$ is generated by the possible values of $e(\nu_i),\ \ \mathcal{H}_i \cong \mathtt{C}^2$. A (pure) state of quantum part is such element $x \in \mathcal{H}$ that $|x| = 1$. Thus, in contrast to classical devices, quantum device may be not only in basic states, but also in coherent states, and this imparts surprising properties to such devices.

Put $\mathcal{K} = \{0, 1, \ldots, K-1\}$. For elements $x = \sum\limits_{s\in\mathcal{K}} \lambda_s e_s,\ y = \sum\limits_{s\in\mathcal{K}} \mu_s e_s \in \mathcal{H}$ their dot product $\sum\limits_{s\in\mathcal{K}} \lambda_s \bar{\mu}_s$ is denoted by $\langle x|y\rangle$, where $\bar{\mu}$ means complex conjugation of $\mu \in \mathtt{C}$, hence $\langle x|y\rangle = \overline{\langle y|x\rangle}$.

Unitary transformations. Let $\{1, \ldots, r\} = \bigcup_{i=1}^{l} L_i^s,\ \ L_i^s \cap L_j^s = \emptyset\ (i \neq j)$, unitary transform U_i^s acts on $\bigotimes_{j\in L_i^s} e_j$, then $U^s = \bigotimes_{i=1}^{l} U_i^s$ acts on $\mathcal{H},\ \ s = 1, 2, \ldots, M$. We require that all U_i^s belong to some finite set of transformation independent of $\mathcal{E}$ which can be easily performed by physical devices.

A computation is a chain of such unitary transformations:

$$\chi_0 \xrightarrow{U^1} \chi_1 \xrightarrow{U^2} \dots \xrightarrow{U^M} \chi_M.$$

The passages $U^s \longrightarrow U^{s+1}$ $s = 1, \dots, M$ and the value M are determined by the classical algorithm which points the partition $\bigcup L_i$ and chooses the transformations U_i^s sequentially for each s. This algorithm is performed by the *classical part* of computer.

Observations. Let $\chi = \sum\limits_{s \in \mathcal{K}} \lambda_s e_s$ be some fix state of computer, often $\chi = \chi_M$. If $A \in \{0,1\}^k$ is the list of possible values for the first k qubits, then we put $B_A = \{i \mid \exists a_{k+1}, a_{k+2}, \dots, a_r \in \{0,1\} : \quad e_i = Aa_{k+1}a_{k+2} \dots a_r\}$. A (quantum) result of this observation is a new state $\chi^A = \sum\limits_{i \in B_A} \frac{\lambda_i}{\sqrt{p_a}} e_i$, where $p_A = \sum\limits_{i \in B_A} \lambda_i^2$. The *observation* of the first register in state χ is the procedure which gives the pair: $<$ classical word A , quantum state $\chi^A >$ with probability p_A for any possible $A \in \{0,1\}^k$. To receive such words A is the unique way for anybody to learn the result of quantum computations.

3 Diffusion transform

In this section we recollect some notions and ideas from the works [Gr] and [BBHT].

Every unitary transformation $U : \mathcal{H} \longrightarrow \mathcal{H}$ can be represented by it's matrix $U = (u_{ij})$ where $u_{ij} = \langle U(e_j) | e_i \rangle$ so that for $x = \sum\limits_{p \in \mathcal{K}} \lambda_p e_p$, $U(x) = \sum\limits_{p \in \mathcal{K}} \lambda'_p e_p$ we have $\bar{\lambda}' = U\bar{\lambda}$, where $\bar{\lambda}, \bar{\lambda}'$ are columns with elements λ_p, λ'_p respectively. The following significant *diffusion* transform D (introduced in [Gr]) is defined by $D = -WRW^{-1}$, where $W = U_1 \bigotimes U_2 \bigotimes \dots \bigotimes U_r$, each U_i acts on $\mathcal{H}_i$ and has the matrix

$$J = \begin{pmatrix} 1/\sqrt{2} & 1/\sqrt{2} \\ 1/\sqrt{2} & -1/\sqrt{2} \end{pmatrix},$$

and R is the phase invertion of e_0. For every state $x = \sum\limits_{p \in \mathcal{K}} \lambda_p e_p$ an average amplitude is taken as $x_{av} = \sum\limits_{p \in \mathcal{K}} \lambda_p / K$.

Proposition 1 (Grover , [Gr]). *For every state x*

$$\langle e_p | x \rangle - x_{av} = x_{av} - \langle e_p | D(x) \rangle. \tag{1}$$

This means that D is the inversion about average.

One step of Grover's algorithm is unitary transform $G = DR_t$ where R_t is phase rotation of some target state e_t. Proposition 1 implies that the amplitude of e_t grows approximately on $1/\sqrt{K}$ as a result of application of G to the state $x_0 = (e_0 + e_1 + \dots + e_{K-1})/\sqrt{K}$.

The following two notes about this algorithm have been done in the work [BBHT].

1. If we have the set T of target states of cardinality $|T| = K/4$, then one step of so modified transform G makes all amplitudes of the states $e \notin T$ equal to zero.

2. Let W' be any unitary transform satisfying $W'(e_0) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{K}} \sum\limits_{i \in \mathcal{K}} e_i$. Then Proposition remains true if W' is taken instead of W in the definition of D.

4 Relative diffusion transform

In this section we introduce the generalization of diffusion transform - relative diffusion transform (RDT) which is the key notion for the construction of the control system for our database.

In what follows for the set $C = \{0, 1, \dots, N-1\}$, $N < K$, C' denotes $\{e_i \mid 0 \leq i \leq N-1\}$.

Fix the notation: $\chi_C = \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \sum\limits_{i \in C} e_i$. Let M be unitary transformation of the form $\mathcal{H} \longrightarrow \mathcal{H}$ such that $M(e_0) = \chi_C$. Such transform M is called C-mixing. We do not require that subspace, spanned by C' is M-invariant.

Definition. RDT(B) is the following transform: $D_C = -MRM^{-1}$ where R is defined above, M is C-mixing.

The following Lemma generalizes Proposition.

Lemma 1 *D_C does not change an amplitude μ_s of e_s if $s \notin C$ and makes it $\frac{2A}{N} - \mu_s$ if $s \in C$, where $A = \sum\limits_{s \in C} \mu_s$, $N = |C|$.*

Proof

At first note that for every $s \in \mathcal{K}$ $M^{-1}(e_s) = \sum\limits_{i \in \mathcal{K}} \alpha_s^i e_i$, $\alpha_s^0 = 1/\sqrt{N}$ for any $s \in C$ and $\alpha_s^0 = 0$ for other s. Really, $\alpha_s^0 = \langle M^{-1}(e_s) \mid e_0 \rangle = \langle e_s \mid M(e_0) \rangle = 1/\sqrt{N}$ in view of unitarity M. Now for $x = \sum\limits_{s \in \mathcal{K}} \mu_s e_s$ we have the following equations:

$$\begin{aligned} D_C(x) &= -MR_0\big(\sum_{s \in \mathcal{K}} \mu_s \sum_{i \in \mathcal{K}} \alpha_s^i e_i\big) \\ &= -M\big(\sum_{s \in \mathcal{K}} \mu_s \sum_{i \in \mathcal{K}} \alpha_s^i e_i - 2 \sum_{s \in C} e_0/\sqrt{N}\big) \\ &= -\sum_{s \in \mathcal{K}} \mu_s e_s + \frac{2}{\sqrt{N}} \sum_{s \in C} \mu_s \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \sum_{j \in C} e_j \\ &= -\sum_{s \notin C} \mu_s e_s + \sum_{j \in C} e_j\big(\frac{2A}{N} - \mu_j\big). \quad \Box \end{aligned}$$

Corollary 1 *Let $C \subset \mathcal{K}$, $|C| = N$, $T \subseteq C$, $|T| = N/4$, and M is C-mixing. Then $-MR_0M^{-1}R_T(\chi_C) = \chi_T$.*

It is readily seen that the applying of $D_C R_T$ for $|T| = N/4$ doubles amplitudes in states of the form χ_C, whereas Grover's algorithm increases them only on constant $(O(1/\sqrt{K})$. Note that generally speaking, RDT(C) can not be realized on a quantum computer for arbitrary subset $C \subset \mathcal{K}$ (look at [Oz]). But in the next section we shall show how RDT can be realized in our specific case: for the databases.

5 Realization of RDT on quantum computer. Control system for the database

Let f be a function of the form: $\{0,1\}^n \longrightarrow \{0,1\}^n$. A *presentation* of f is a basic state of the form

$a_0, f(a_0), a_1, f(a_1), \dots, a_{N-1}, f(a_{N-1}), \gamma_1, \gamma_2, \dots$, where $a_0, a_1, \dots, a_{N-1}$ are all different strings from $\{0,1\}^n$ taken in some order, $N = 2^n$,

$\gamma = (\gamma_1, \gamma_2, \dots, \gamma_{2nN})$ are values of ancillary qubits. There are $M = N!$ forms of presentations different only in ancillary qubits, we denote them by $P_0^\gamma, P_1^\gamma, \dots, P_{M-1}^\gamma$, where P_0 corresponds to the lexicographic order on $\{0,1\}^n$. Notation: $P_i = a_0^i, f(a_0^i), \dots$, we shall omitt $\gamma = \bar{0}$ in notations. A string $B_a = (a, f(a))$ is called block. Put $\mathcal{M} = \{0, 1, \dots, M-1\}$.

Control system of the database consists of the following two parts:

Preparation of the main state This is a unitary transformation

$$P_0 \longrightarrow \frac{1}{\sqrt{M}} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{M}} P_i \overset{def}{=} \chi_0.$$

Extracting and restoring procedures Given a query a an extracting procedure consists of two parts:

1. Unitary transform

$$Ex \;:\; \chi_0 \longrightarrow \chi_a \overset{def}{=} \frac{1}{\sqrt{(N-1)!}} \sum_{i \in \zeta(a)} P_i,$$

where $\zeta(a) = \{i \mid a_0^i = a\}$.

2. Following observation of the first $2n$ qubits. This observation gives the required information $a, f(a)$ with certainty and does not change the observed state because χ_a has the form $|a, f(a)\rangle \bigotimes \chi'_a$.

The restoring procedure is $(Ex)^{-1}$ which gives again χ_0 and the database is ready for the following query.

We shall describe only Ex because the main state can be prepared along similar lines. If $a = \sigma_1 \sigma_2 \dots \sigma_{n/2}$ is some query to the database, all $\sigma_i \in \omega$, then C_j denotes the set of all basic states of the form P_j where $a_0^j = \sigma_1 \sigma_2 \dots \sigma_j \delta_{j+1} \delta_{j+2} \dots \delta_{n/2}$, all $\delta_k \in \omega$, n even. Given some RDT(C_j): D_j , the sequential application of $D_j R_{C_{j+1}}$ for $j = 1, 2, \dots, \frac{n}{2} - 1$ results in χ_a in view of Corollary. Now to complete the construction of Ex it would suffice to realize some C_j-mixing transform M_j on a quantum computer. M_j will be constructed in 3 steps. Here we can not apply Walsh -Hadamard transform like in the work [Gr] because P_j do not exhauste all basic states of $\mathcal{H}$.

Step 1. Given $e_0 = P_0 = B_0, B_1, \dots, B_{N-1}, 0, 0, \dots, 0$, at first we create the state $\xi = \mid B_0, \dots, B_{N-1}\rangle \bigotimes \chi_{H_0} \bigotimes \chi_{H_{N-1}} \bigotimes \chi_{H_{N-2}} \bigotimes \chi_{H_1}$, where $H_l = \{0, 1, \dots, l-1\}$ if $l \neq 0$ and $H_0 = \{0, 1, \dots, 2^{n-2j}\}$. This can be done by independent applying to the ancillary registers the transformations $|0\rangle \longrightarrow \chi_{H_l}$ built by A.Kitaev in the work [Ki].

Given a pair of sequences $\bar{i} = i_0, i_1, \dots, i_{N-1}; \quad \bar{r} = r_0, r_1, \dots, r_{N-1}$, where $r_s \in H_{N-s}$ $s = 1, \dots, N-1$, $r_0 \in H_0$, we define the pair of sequences: $k_0, k_1, \dots, k_s; \quad h^s_{s+1}, \dots, h^s_{N-1}$ by induction on s, where k_i, h^s_i depend on $\bar{i}$ and $\bar{r}$.

Basis. $s = 0$. $k_0 = j_s$, $\quad h^0_1, \dots, h^0_{N-1}$ is obtained from $\bar{i}$ by deleting of j_{r_0}.

Step. $s > 0$. All $k_0, \dots, k_{s-1}$ are already defined. Put $k_s = h^{s-1}_{s+r_s}$, the new sequence $h^s_{s+1}, \dots, h^s_{N-1}$ is obtained from $h^{s-1}_s, \dots, h^{s-1}_{N-1}$ by deleting of k_s. Denote $0, 1, \dots, N-1$ by $\bar{1}$, $0, 0, \dots, 0$ by $\bar{0}$.

Let $T = 2^{n-2j}$, $j_1 < j_2 < \dots < j_T$, $\quad B_{j_1}, b_{j_2}, \dots, B_{j_T}$ be all blocks from C_j.

Step 2. It is the chain of classical transformations (with unitary matrices containing only ones and zeroes): $\xi \longrightarrow \xi_0 \longrightarrow \dots \xi_{N-1}$, where

$\xi_s = B_{k_0}, B_{k_1}, \dots, B_{k_{s-1}}, B_{h^{s-1}_s}, B_{h^{s-1}_{N-1}}, \rho_0, \dots, \rho_{s-1}, r_s, \dots, r_{N-1}$.

A. Passage $\xi \longrightarrow \xi_0$. It is the replacement of r_0 by the number q such that $i_q = j_{r_0}$, where $i_{r_0} = j_t$. This can be done in view of that the mapping $q \longrightarrow j_q$ is reversible.

B. Passage $\xi_s \longrightarrow \xi_{s+1}$, $\quad s = 0, 1, \dots, N-2$. We find the block B_{k_s} and establish it immediately after $B_{k_{s-1}}$, the order of all other blocks remains unchanged. In view of the definition of k_s this can be done by means of classical unitary transform independently of the contents of blocks. Replacement $r_s \longrightarrow \rho_s$ ensure the reversibility, e.g. unitarity of this transformation.

Step 3 (Optional). Transform $\rho_s(\bar{i}, \bar{r}) \longrightarrow \rho_s(\bar{i}, \bar{r}) - \rho_s(\bar{1}, \bar{0})$,

$s = 0, 1, \dots, N-1$ results in zeroes in ancillary qubits if an initial state is P_0. These steps been applied to P_0 give any states from C_j with the same amplitudes, therefore they give χ_a. □

More detailed analysis gives that steps 1-3 take the time $O(N^2 \log^2 N + T(N))$ on a quantum Turing Machine where $T(N)$ is the time required for the Step 1 when precision is fixed. Hence the procedure Ex takes the time $O((N^2 \log^2 N + T(N)) \log N)$.

We have described the procedure of extracting $a, f(a)$. The reverse prosedure restores the main state of the database. The main state χ_0 can be prepared along similar lines which takes $O(N^3 \log^3 N + NT(N) \log N)$ time.

Note that the observation of the first block described above gives $a, f(a)$ only in ideal case, e.g. if the following effects can be neglected.

1. Precision of transformations is not absolute, especially for the procedures in Step 1.

2. Presence of noice: spontaneous transformations of the forms: $0 \longrightarrow 1,\ 0 \longrightarrow -0$, which touch sufficiently small part of each block B_i.

3. Unauthorized actions. Some actions with the database with the aim to learn a value $f(b)$ when the control system works at the query $a \neq b$. We now turn to the point 3. In the last section we shall briefly run through the point 2.

6 Protection of information against unauthorized actions

We presume that the aim of such actions is to learn $f(b)$ for $b \neq a$ with high probability p and some g blocs are inaccessible for these actions, the first block (where control system observes the result) is among them. To do this would require to deal with Np blocks of memory because values $f(b)$ are distributed among all blocks but the first with the same probability at any instant of time.

We shall regard the following scenario. Let somebody S (say, spy) be equipped with a quantum computer with its own memory. When our database is in state χ_{C_j} when working on a query a S fulfills the following:

a) observes any Np accessible blocks of our database at one instant of time, then

b) fulfills unitary transforms with the accessible part of the database and a memory his computer with the aim to cover up all traces of his observations.

After that the control system continues its work as usually. Denote by P_{ex} the probability of that the control system will not receive the word of the form a, A when observing the first block (exposure of S).

Theorem 1 *There exists a function $\alpha(g,N)$ such that $\forall \varepsilon > 0\ \exists g :\ \alpha(g,N) > 1-\varepsilon\quad N = 1,2,\dots$ with the following property. For every choise of the block observed by S and his unitary transformations*

$$P_{ex} \geq p\alpha.$$

Sketch of the proof

The memory of computer used by S can be considered as ancillary part of memory in our database.

We shall write $\chi_i,\ R_i$ instead of $\chi_{C_i},\ R_{C_i}$. Denote by Q_0 the state after unauthorized action with the state χ_j. Then the control system performs sequentially transformations $D_{i+j}R_{i+j+1},\ i = 1,2,\dots,t-j-1,\ t = n/2$, we denote by Q_{i+1} its results: $Q_{i+1} = D_{i+j}R_{i+j+1}(Q_i)$ and put $\varepsilon = \langle Q_0 \mid \chi_j\rangle$. In view of unitarity of all transformations at hand $\forall i = 1,\dots,t-j-1\ \ \langle Q_i \mid \chi_{i+j}\rangle = \varepsilon$. Denote by S_{suc} the set of such basic states, that the first block has the form

a, A for some A. For any final state Q_{t-j-1} the probability to expose S is $1 - \sum\limits_{e \in S_{suc}} |\langle e \mid Q_{t-j-1}\rangle|^2$. We have:

$$1 - P_{ex} = pP_1 + (1-p)P_2,$$

where P_1 (P_2) is the probability that the control system receives a, A on condition that the block $a, f(a)$ was observed by S, (was not observed by S respectively).

Case 1). The block $a, f(a)$ was observed by S

Let $L_i = (N-1)!2^{t-(i+j)}$ be the cardinality of C_i. Denote by q_i^{av} the average amplitude of all basic states from C_{i+j} when database is in state Q_i. We thus have $|q_i^{av}| \leq |\varepsilon|/\sqrt{L_i}$. Let δ_{norm} and δ_S denote absolute growth of average amplitudes among basic C_t -states in cases without S and with S respectively. It follows from Lemma that $\delta_{norm} \geq \varepsilon\delta_S$ and in state Q_{t-j-1} all basic states from S_{suc} with nonzero amplitudes contain in C_t. Therefore $P_1 \leq |\varepsilon|^2$.

Case 2). The block $a, f(a)$ was not observed by S.

Here we rouphly estimate $P_2 \leq 1$. Joining these cases we conclude that $1 - P_{ex} \geq p\varepsilon^2 + 1 - p$. At last, in view of assumed conditions ε can be estimated as $|\varepsilon| \leq 2(1-p)^g$. □

7 Error correcting procedure for the database

A random error in the database is a transformations on the basic states induced by changes of qubits values of the forms $0 \longrightarrow 1$ or vise versa and changes of phases $0 \longrightarrow -0$ or $1 \longrightarrow -1$, touching only small part of the qubits in each block of memory. Note that the phase errors : $0 \longrightarrow -1,\ 1 \longrightarrow -1$ can be reduced to the changes of values as it is shown in the work [CS] . Error correcting codes (ECC) is the conventional tool to correct errors of such a sort. Let each block contains n qubits.

Encoding is an injection of the form : $E :\ \{0,1\}^n \longrightarrow \{0,1\}^{n_1}$, where $n_1 > n$. If $w_n(A) = \sum\limits_{i=1}^{n} a_i$ is Hamming weight of the word $A = a_1a_2 \ldots a_n \in \{0,1\}^n$, the distance between two such words A, B is $d_n(A,B) = w_n(A \bigoplus B)$ where $\bigoplus$ denotes a bitwise addition modulo 2. Put $d(E) = \min\limits_{A,B \in \{0,1\}^n} d_{n_1}(E(A), E(B))$. Then if for some $A', B' \in \{0,1\}^{n_1}$ $B' \in \mathrm{Im(E)}$ $\mathrm{d_{n_1}(A', B') < d(E)/2}$ then such B' is defined for A' uniquely and we obtain the partial functions $A' \longrightarrow B' \longrightarrow E^{-1}(B') = A \in \{0,1\}^n$. Their superposition $\mathcal{D} :\ A' \longrightarrow A$ is called decoding procedure for encoding E. $\mathcal{D}$ corrects $\leq d(E)/2$ errors occured in encoding words B'. This procedure is essentially classical because the mapping $A' \longrightarrow B'$ is not reversible. But if we use additional registers consisting of ancillary qubits and denote by γ its contents we can regard a reversible function $A' \longrightarrow B',\ \gamma(A') \longrightarrow E^{-1}(B'), \gamma(A')$ instead of classical decoding and fulfill this procedure on quantum computer. The work [CS] also proposed simple and convenient quantum linear codes.

ECC can be used in course of computations to correct errors which occure randomly as a result of noise. The size of ancillary register thus is the bigger the time of computation is longer. The paper [AB] presents error correcting procedure which correct errors with constant rate repeatedly in course of computing and requires the size of ancillary registers polylogarithmical on the time of computing. This error correcting procedure can be applied to our database which results in basic states of the form $E(e_i), \gamma_i$ instead of e_i considered below, here all properties of the database will remain unchanged.

8 Acknowledgments

I am grateful to Peter Hoyer for his comments and criticism and to Lov Grover for his attention to my work.

References

[AB] D.Aharonov , M.Ben-Or *Fault-Tolerant Quantum Computation With Constant Error* (lanl e-print quant-ph/9611025)

[CS] A.R.Calderbank, P.W.Shor *Good quantum error-correcting codes exist*

[Gr] L.K.Grover, *A fast quantum mechanical algorithm for database search*, Proceedings, STOC 1996, Philadelphia PA USA, pp 212-219

[Sh] P.W.Shor, *Polynomial-Time Algorithms for Prime Factorization and Discrete Logarithms on Quantum Computer*, http: lanl.gov, quant-ph/9508027 v2 (A preliminary version in Proceedings of the 35th Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science, Santa Fe, NM, Nov. 20-22, 1994, IEEE Computer Society Press, pp 124-134)

[BBHT] M.Boyer, G.Brassard, P.Hoyer, Alain Tapp, *Tight bounds on quantum searching*, Fourth Workshop on Physics and Computation, Boston University, 22-24 Nov. 1996 , (lanl e-print quant-ph/9605034

[BBBV] C.H.Bennett, E.Bernstein, G.Brassard, U.Vazirani, *Strenths and Weakness of Quantum Computing*, To appear in SIAM Journal on Computing (lanl e-print quant-ph/9701001)

[BV] E.Bernstein, U.Vazirani, *Quantum complexity theory*, Manuscript, (preliminary version in Proceedings of the 25 Annual ACM Symposium On Theory of Computing, 1993, pp 11-20),

[De] D.Deutsch, *Quantum theary, the Church-Turing principle and the universal quantum computer*, Proc.R.Soc.Lond. A 400, pp 97-117 (1985),

[DJ] , D.Deutsch, R.Jozsa, *Rapid solution of problems by quantum computation*, Proc. Roy. Soc. Lond. A **439** 553-558

[BB] A.Berthiaume, G.Brassard, *Oracle quantum computing*, Journal of modern optics,

[Ki] A.Kitaev, *Quantum measurements and the Abelian Stabilizer Problem* (lanl e-print quant-ph/9511026)

[Oz] Y.Ozhigov, *About quantum mechanical speeding up of classical algorithms* (lanl e-print quant-ph/9706003)

[Ya] A.Yao, *Quantum Circuit Complexity*, Proceedings 34th Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS), 1993, pp 352-361

[Wa] J.Watrous *On One-Dimensional Quantum Cellular Automata*, Proceedings of the 36th Annual IEEE Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science, 1995