

# Quantum Vault: Secure Token Authentication Without Classical State Information Benchmarked on IBMQ

Portability dossier - app

agQSL portability pipeline

2026-06-07

---

Field	Value
Slug	2026-arxiv-2605.03564-quantum-vault-authentication
Source	arXiv
Link	<a href="https://arxiv.org/abs/2605.03564">https://arxiv.org/abs/2605.03564</a>
Category	app
Triaged	2026-05-21 by port_until_julien_parallel
Bootstrapped	2026-06-07

---

## Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>Source</b>	<b>3</b>
1.1	Domain classification . . . . .	3
1.2	Expert persona for Julien . . . . .	3
1.3	Related prior work (brief bibliography) . . . . .	3
1.4	Difficulty estimate . . . . .	4
<b>2</b>	<b>Extraction</b>	<b>5</b>

2.1	What the paper does (one paragraph)	5
2.2	Quantum hardware used	5
2.3	Computational primitive	5
2.4	Resource fingerprint	6
2.5	Assumptions and results	7
2.6	Portability flags	7
2.7	Caveats	8
<b>3</b>	<b>Portability matrix</b>	<b>9</b>

# 1 Source

## 1.1 Domain classification

cryptography (quantum money / quantum token authentication). The application is unforgeable token authentication built on the no-cloning theorem, with the novelty being removal of the classical side information  $(\theta, \phi)$  in favour of a stored quantum copy (the “vault”). Secondary domain: quantum communication / networks, since the public-verifiability variant assumes a quantum channel (teleportation or flying-qubit conversion) between bank and verifier. The Ezratty index places this squarely under ch. 14 (quantum communications and cryptography), in the quantum-money / qPUF cluster. Note that `edges.json` already carries this paper under IBM’s `crypto_security` group (entry “Quantum-token authentication on three IBMQ processors (Vault protocol)”).

## 1.2 Expert persona for Julien

A quantum-information scientist who works on quantum money, token, or qPUF protocols and is fluent in the SWAP test (controlled-SWAP / Fredkin) as a state-overlap estimator, where the shot-averaged register encodes  $|\langle \psi_1 | \psi_2 \rangle|^2$ . Crucially this person also needs hands-on NISQ superconducting intuition: IBM Heron r2 native gate sets, two-qubit and readout error budgets, coherence-limited circuit depth, and how repeated mid-circuit measurement plus SWAP-test back-action degrades the token states over the  $N$  repetitions. The fingerprint to extract here is about Fredkin-circuit depth and overlap-estimation fidelity on a 156-qubit device, not an application Hamiltonian, so calibrated feel for transpiled controlled-SWAP cost (the authors disable transpiler optimisation) matters more than chemistry or optimisation domain knowledge.

## 1.3 Related prior work (brief bibliography)

- Tsunaki et al., *Ensemble-Based Quantum Token Protocol Benchmarked on IBM Quantum Processors*, Quantum Sci. Technol. 10, 045042 (2025). arXiv:2412.08530, DOI 10.1088/2058-9565/ae03e6. Direct predecessor from the same group: same IBMQ-benchmarked token-forgery framework, ensemble rather than single-qubit tokens. The single most relevant portability comparison.
- Bauerhenne et al., *Security Analysis of Ensemble-Based Quantum Token Protocol Under Advanced Attacks*, Quantum Sci. Technol. (2025). arXiv:2412.20243, DOI 10.1088/2058-9565/ae03e7. Companion attack-model paper; calibrates what “query attack” means for the same hardware family.
- Fanizza et al., *Beyond the SWAP test: optimal estimation of quantum state overlap*, Phys. Rev. Lett. 124, 060503 (2020). DOI 10.1103/PhysRevLett.124.060503. The optimal overlap-estimation primitive that the SWAP test approximates; relevant if a future port swaps in a better verification circuit.
- Barnett, Cheffles, Jex, *Comparison of two unknown pure quantum states*, Phys. Lett. A 307, 189 (2003). DOI 10.1016/S0375-9601(02)01602-X. Establishes the optimality conditions the authors invoke to justify the SWAP test as the verification measurement.
- Behera and Sattath, *Almost public quantum coins*. arXiv:2002.12438. SWAP-test-based public-coin scheme; the security-comparison anchor the paper improves upon (standard vs rational unforgeability).

- Buhrman, Cleve, Watrous, de Wolf, *Quantum fingerprinting*, Phys. Rev. Lett. 87, 167902 (2001). DOI [10.1103/PhysRevLett.87.167902](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.87.167902). Origin of the SWAP test in the form used here.

#### 1.4 Difficulty estimate

low. The paper is short (intro, results, discussion, methods; PRA two-column) and fully readable: arXiv HTML plus complete LaTeX source are already vendored in `paper-source/`, so there is no paywall or SI-fetch blocker. The hardware fingerprint is unusually explicit and ready for extraction: three named IBM Heron r2 processors (Kingston, Fez, Marrakesh, 156 qubits), exact qubit indices for vault and auxiliary, 1000 shots,  $N = 20$  SWAP-test repetitions, Qiskit 2.1.0 / IBMQ Runtime 0.45.0, transpilation to native gates with optimisation disabled, all runs on 08.04.2026, plus calibration reports and GPL-3 open-source code in the authors' GitHub repo. The primitive (controlled-SWAP / Fredkin overlap estimation) is standard, not exotic, and the supplementary material is just the same figures for the other two processors. The only mild friction is that this is a crypto/communication application rather than the usual chemistry or optimisation shape, so Julien should read the fingerprint as circuit-depth and overlap-fidelity quality factors ( $Q_a, Q_o$ ) rather than an application observable.

## 2 Extraction

### 2.1 What the paper does (one paragraph)

Quantum tokens (the primitive behind quantum money) rely on the no-cloning theorem so a token state  $|\psi\rangle$  cannot be copied. Prior schemes still store the token’s preparation angles  $(\theta, \phi)$  classically at the bank, so an attacker who steals that classical record can mint perfect fakes without ever cloning a qubit. This paper removes the classical side information: the bank prepares two identical Haar-random tokens  $|\psi_1\rangle = |\psi_2\rangle$ , gives one to the user and keeps the other in a quantum “vault”, then discards the angles. Authentication is a SWAP test (controlled-SWAP / Fredkin) comparing the user’s token with the vault copy, repeated  $N = 20$  times. The protocol is benchmarked on three IBM Heron r2 processors, reduced to two hardware quality factors  $Q_a$  (contrast) and  $Q_o$  (offset), and shown secure against a query forgery attack when tokens are bundled into multi-token “bills”.

### 2.2 Quantum hardware used

- **Vendor / machine:** IBM Quantum (IBMQ), Heron r2 family. Three processors: Kingston, Fez, Marrakesh (Methods).
- **Qubit count:** 3 used per circuit out of 156 available on each device (Methods). Two qubits hold the token pair (the “vault”) and a third serves as the SWAP-test auxiliary. Specific indices: Kingston 55 and 59 (vault) with 75 (auxiliary); Fez 144 and 145 with 146; Marrakesh 134 and 135 with 139 (Methods).
- **Connectivity:** heavy-hex. Not stated in the paper; this is the standard Heron r2 topology (confirmed via Ezratty 2025 section 8.3.7 and `vendor-notes/superconducting_qubits.tex`). The protocol only needs the Fredkin control (auxiliary) coupled to both token qubits, a low-degree requirement met by transpiler layout.
- **Gate set:** transpiled “to the native gates of the hardware without optimization or gate approximation”, synthesised to the densest layout qubits with longest coherence and shortest gate times/errors (Methods). The native gate names are not given in the paper; the Heron r2 native basis is tunable-coupler CZ plus single-qubit  $S_x / X / R_z$ , with a fractional-gate extension  $R_{ZZ}(\theta) / R_x(\theta)$  (substrate reference, not the paper).
- **Notable features leveraged:** repeated mid-circuit measurement of the auxiliary qubit (measured once per SWAP-test repetition,  $N = 20$  times, with the two token qubits persisting across all repetitions); the controlled-SWAP (Fredkin) primitive; the SWAP test’s property that it collapses only the auxiliary, not the token states, so it can be iterated. No error mitigation or dynamical decoupling was applied in the reported runs (both named only as future improvements).

### 2.3 Computational primitive

Other: **SWAP test (controlled-SWAP / Fredkin) state-overlap estimation**, a sampling primitive. The shot-averaged auxiliary register estimates the token overlap  $|\langle\psi_1|\psi_2\rangle|^2$  (Eq. for  $\bar{c}_n$  below). This is not VQE / QAOA / Trotter / QPE / analog evolution; there is no variational or classical optimisation loop.

## 2.4 Resource fingerprint

Metric	Value	Source (page / equation / SI)
Qubits (logical)	3 per circuit (2 token + 1 auxiliary)	Fig. 2 circuit (results.tex); Methods
Qubits (physical)	3 used of 156 available (Heron r2); indices Kingston 55/59/aux 75, Fez 144/145/aux 146, Marrakesh 134/135/aux 139	Methods
Circuit depth	not reported (transpiled depth not given; logical structure is $N = 20$ repetitions of [ $H$ , controlled-SWAP, $H$ , measure])	Fig. 2; Methods
2Q-gate count (total)	not reported (one controlled-SWAP / Fredkin per repetition $\times N = 20$ , decomposed to native CZ with transpiler optimisation disabled; explicit count not given)	Methods
Measurement shots	1000 shots per circuit (sampler mode)	Methods
Classical loop iter.	not applicable; no variational/classical optimisation loop. Quantum repetition $N = 20$ SWAP tests per circuit; data sweeps of 400 Bloch-sphere angle points for the $\tau$ and attack distributions	results.tex (Eqs. for $\mathcal{C}_N, \tau$ ); Methods
Wall-clock runtime	not reported (all runs completed “within a few hours” on 08.04.2026)	Methods

## 2.5 Assumptions and results

- **Claimed.** Removing the classical side information  $(\theta, \phi)$  and replacing it with a stored quantum copy (the vault) gives a token protocol that symmetrically protects bank and user by no-cloning, with public-accessible verifiability, standard unforgeability, traceability and revocability. For a quantum bill of  $M = 200$  tokens, the false-negative (Type II) probability is  $1 - \mathcal{P}_b < 10^{-4}$  while the probability that a forged bill is accepted is  $\mathcal{P}_f < 10^{-18}$ , even on the worst-performing device (Marrakesh).
- **Core equations.** SWAP-test register, shot-averaged:

$$\bar{c}_n = \frac{1 - |\langle \psi_1 | \psi_2 \rangle|^2}{2}$$

Observable over  $N$  repetitions  $\mathcal{C}_N \equiv \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N c_n$ , modelled against the inter-state angle  $\Theta$  as

$$\bar{\mathcal{C}}_N(\Theta) = Q_o + \frac{Q_a}{4} [1 - \cos(\Theta)]$$

with quality factors  $Q_a = 2[\mathcal{C}_N(\pi) - \mathcal{C}_N(0)]$  (contrast, ideally 1) and  $Q_o = \mathcal{C}_N(0)$  (offset, ideally 0). Bill acceptance is binomial:  $\mathcal{P}_b(m, M, p_b) = \binom{M}{m} p_b^m (1 - p_b)^{M-m}$ .

- **Measured quality factors (Table I, results.tex), parenthetical = fit/bootstrap uncertainty.** Kingston:  $Q_o = 0.10$  (0.01),  $Q_a = 0.56$  (0.03),  $\tau = 0.222$  (0.001),  $p_f = 0.586$  (0.005),  $\mathcal{P}_f^{(M=20)} = 0.01$ ,  $\mathcal{P}_f^{(M=200)} = 10^{-33}$ . Fez:  $Q_o = 0.135$  (0.004),  $Q_a = 0.42$  (0.01),  $\tau = 0.231$ ,  $p_f = 0.635$ ,  $\mathcal{P}_f^{(M=20)} = 0.03$ ,  $\mathcal{P}_f^{(M=200)} = 10^{-27}$ . Marrakesh:  $Q_o = 0.151$  (0.003),  $Q_a = 0.47$  (0.01),  $\tau = 0.263$ ,  $p_f = 0.713$ ,  $\mathcal{P}_f^{(M=20)} = 0.13$ ,  $\mathcal{P}_f^{(M=200)} = 10^{-18}$ . Kingston is best (lower readout/gate errors, longer coherence), Marrakesh worst.
- **Error bars / noise assumptions.**  $Q_a, Q_o$  uncertainties are fit standard deviations;  $\tau$  uncertainty is from statistical bootstrapping;  $p_f$  uncertainty from binomial error propagation.  $\mathcal{P}_f$  uncertainties are not estimated (discrete  $m$ ). The SWAP-test signal  $\bar{c}_n$  decays exponentially with repetition index  $n$  due to pulse-error back-action, so authentication is destructive on current hardware.
- **Comparison to classical baseline.** None in the compute-speedup sense; there is no classical runtime comparison. The benchmark compares genuine-token acceptance ( $p_b = 0.99$  by construction) against forged-token acceptance ( $p_f$ ). Single tokens are weak ( $p_f \approx 0.59$ – $0.71$ , so an attacker often passes one token); all security comes from binomial amplification over the  $M$  tokens in a bill. The conceptual baseline is prior public quantum-coin schemes, over which the paper claims an upgrade from rational to standard unforgeability.

## 2.6 Portability flags

- **Controlled-SWAP (Fredkin) is the whole circuit.** A portable implementation must re-synthesise the Fredkin into each platform’s native two-qubit entangler (Heron r2: tunable-coupler CZ). The authors deliberately disable transpiler optimisation and gate approximation, so the reported behaviour reflects the raw textbook Fredkin decomposition, not an optimised one; 2Q-gate count and depth will differ markedly per native gate set and per transpiler setting. No native three-qubit gate is assumed.

- **Requires repeated mid-circuit measurement with qubit reuse.** The auxiliary is measured (and reused/reset) once per SWAP-test repetition,  $N = 20$  times in a single circuit, while the two token qubits persist. Platforms without mid-circuit measurement would need  $N$  separate circuits each with a fresh auxiliary (and fresh token copies), changing both the resource profile and the back-action physics.
- **Token-qubit coherence across  $N = 20$  entangling-plus-measurement cycles.** The tokens must survive 20 SWAP cycles; back-action degrades them and sets the destructive-authentication regime. This is a coherence-depth requirement, not a gate requirement, and will rescale with each platform’s  $T_2$  and gate-error budget; the quality factors  $Q_a, Q_o$  are the portable summary of it.
- **Low connectivity demand.** Only the Fredkin control (auxiliary) needs links to both token qubits. Trivial on all-to-all platforms (trapped ion), handled by layout on heavy-hex, but a linear-only chain would need SWAP insertions.
- **Hardware-agnostic by construction (good news for the portability analysis).** The paper abstracts the device into two scalar quality factors  $Q_a$  (contrast) and  $Q_o$  (offset); the security follows from these plus the bill size  $M$ . This gives Brilliant a ready parametrisation: any candidate platform is characterised by its  $(Q_a, Q_o)$  and the same binomial security curve applies.
- **Public-verifiability variant needs a quantum channel.** Beyond the device, the public-accessible authentication mode assumes teleportation or flying-qubit conversion of the vault token between bank and verifier. This is a protocol-level network assumption and was not exercised in the IBMQ runs.

## 2.7 Caveats

- Full access: the arXiv HTML rendering and the complete LaTeX source bundle are vendored in `paper-source/`. No paywall and no separate supplementary-information fetch was needed. The “supplementary” content is `figs/sup_fig.pdf`, which repeats the same benchmark and attack panels for Fez and Marrakesh (referenced in `discussion.tex`); it carries no additional resource numbers beyond Table I.
- Transpiled circuit depth and total two-qubit-gate counts are not reported numerically. Only the logical three-qubit circuit structure and the repetition count  $N = 20$  are given. I have not inferred the transpiled depth or gate count.
- Native gate names and the heavy-hex connectivity are not stated in the paper; they are supplied here from the Ezratty 2025 index and `vendor-notes/superconducting_qubits.tex` as substrate context, explicitly flagged as such above.
- IBMQ device calibration reports for 08.04.2026 and the GPL-3 implementation code live in the authors’ GitHub repository (cited as ref. `git_repo`); they were not retrieved for this extraction, so per-qubit  $T_1/T_2$ , readout and gate-error figures behind the Kingston-best / Marrakesh-worst ranking are not transcribed here.

### 3 Portability matrix