

Magic Secret Sharing: Threshold Control of Quantum Computational Power via GHZ Entanglement

Portability dossier - app

agQSL portability pipeline

2026-06-07

Field	Value
Slug	2026-arxiv-2605.16614-magic-secret-sharing
Source	arXiv
Link	https://arxiv.org/abs/2605.16614
Category	app
Triaged	2026-05-21 by port_until_julien_parallel
Bootstrapped	2026-06-07

Contents

- 1 Source** **3**
- 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

- 2 Extraction** **5**

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	6
2.6	Portability flags	7
2.7	Caveats	8
3	Portability matrix	9

1 Source

1.1 Domain classification

Primary: **cryptography**. The paper introduces a quantum cryptographic primitive (Magic Secret Sharing) with a $(n - 1, n)$ threshold structure, an explicit threat model, and a one-sided device-independent (1SDI) certification built on an EPR steering inequality, with the application target being multi-server blind quantum computation.

Secondary: **other** (resource theory of magic / fault-tolerant computation). The “secret” is the non-stabilizer computational resource itself; security and faithfulness are defined over the magic monotone $C(\rho)$ (a Wigner-distance against the stabilizer polytope) rather than over information-theoretic distinguishability. Julien will need fluency in both halves to read the fingerprint correctly.

1.2 Expert persona for Julien

A quantum-information theorist who is equally at home in two literatures: quantum cryptographic protocols (secret sharing, blind quantum computation, EPR steering, one-sided device independence) and the resource theory of magic (stabilizer polytope, Wigner negativity, magic monotones computed by linear programming). For the hardware fingerprint specifically, they should have calibrated intuition about small GHZ-state preparation on superconducting transmons, the post-selection overhead of projecting Alice onto $|+\rangle$, single-qubit state tomography over $X/Y/Z$, and Qiskit shot-budget and LSb-0 measurement conventions. They do not need to be a hardware engineer, but they must be able to tell which numbers ($C(\rho_B)$, $C(\rho_C)$, fidelity, shot count, qubit indices) are the device-level fingerprint and which are protocol-level theory.

1.3 Related prior work (brief bibliography)

- S. Bravyi and A. Kitaev, *Universal quantum computation with ideal Clifford gates and noisy ancillas*, Phys. Rev. A **71**, 022316 (2005). DOI: [10.1103/PhysRevA.71.022316](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevA.71.022316). Foundational magic-state / non-Clifford-injection model the security argument rests on.
- S. Dutta and Tushar, *Wigner-distance magic monotone*, arXiv:2603.20792 (2026). Defines the exact LP monotone C and its dual witness H^* used throughout; Julien will likely need this for the LP construction behind every reported C value.
- B. A. Bell et al., *Experimental demonstration of graph-state quantum secret sharing*, arXiv:1411.5827 (Nat. Commun. **5**, 5480, 2014). Same application (QSS) on an all-optical photonic platform; directly relevant to the paper’s stated graph-state route to general (k, n) thresholds. Cross-vendor portability comparison.
- P. Drmota et al., *Verifiable Blind Quantum Computing with Trapped Ions and Single Photons*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **132**, 150604 (2024). DOI: [10.1103/PhysRevLett.132.150604](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.132.150604). Same end application (BQC) on a hybrid trapped-ion plus photonic stack; the cleanest cross-vendor comparison for the BQC use case.

- *Universal distributed blind quantum computing with solid-state qubits*, arXiv:2412.03020 (2024). Distributed BQC on solid-state spin qubits, a third hardware axis for the same primitive.
- R. A. Macêdo et al., *Bell-inequality magic witnesses*, arXiv:2503.18734 (2025). The contrasting certification approach the paper positions against: binary non-stabilizerness witnessing versus the paper’s exact monotone-valued steering certificate.

1.4 Difficulty estimate

low. The full LaTeX source is in `paper-source/main.tex` (no paywall, no missing SI), the paper is short, and the hardware fingerprint is small and fully explicit: three qubits on `ibm_marrakesh` (156-qubit IBM Heron r2), a GHZ prep plus a single phase gate $P(\varphi)$, X measurements, classical post-selection and a software Z -correction, single-qubit tomography, 4096 to 8192 shots, four φ values, and a quoted IBM job ID. The only dependency outside this folder is the companion monotone paper (arXiv:2603.20792) if Julien needs the exact LP definition of C ; the device-level numbers themselves do not require it. The conceptual machinery (magic resource theory, steering, 1SDI) is heavier than the extraction, so an expert with the right background should find the fingerprint quick to lift.

2 Extraction

2.1 What the paper does (one paragraph)

The paper introduces *Magic Secret Sharing* (MSS), a cryptographic primitive whose “secret” is computational capability (non-Clifford / magic resource) rather than a classical string or a state’s identity. Using a pre-shared three-party GHZ state and a single local phase gate $P(\varphi) = \text{diag}(1, e^{i\varphi})$ on one party’s qubit, the protocol distributes magic with an $(n - 1, n)$ threshold: any single party holds the maximally mixed state $I/2$ (zero magic, $C(I/2) = 0$), while the authorised coalition of $n - 1$ parties reconstructs magic content $C(\varphi) = (|\sin \varphi| + |\cos \varphi| - 1)/2$ on the recipient’s qubit, enabling a logical phase gate (a T gate at $\varphi = \pi/4$) by gate teleportation in multi-server blind quantum computation. Security is argued from the $I/2$ fixed-point property and certified one-sided device-independently via an EPR-steering inequality built from the LP dual witness of the magic monotone. The authors run the $(2, 3)$ instance on the IBM `ibm_marrakesh` processor and report 4/4 faithfulness and $C(\rho_B)$ consistent with zero in every run.

2.2 Quantum hardware used

- **Vendor / machine:** IBM / `ibm_marrakesh` (156-qubit IBM Heron r2 processor). Sec. 5.1, line 527-530; abstract line 69-70.
- **Qubit count:** 3 used / 156 available. Three logical roles $q_0 = \text{Alice}$, $q_1 = \text{Bob}$, $q_2 = \text{Charlie}$ (Sec. 5.1). The specific physical device qubit indices used on the 156-qubit lattice are not reported.
- **Connectivity:** heavy-hex (IBM Heron r2 lattice). The paper does not state the connectivity explicitly; this is the documented Heron topology (confirmed against `vendor-notes/superconducting_qubits.tex` master table and the Ezratty 2025 IBM vendor section). The logical circuit needs Alice (q_0) entangled with both Bob and Charlie (two CX gates from the same control), i.e. a degree- ≥ 2 hub.
- **Gate set:** The paper specifies only the *logical* circuit (Fig. 1, lines 286-300): Hadamard H , two CNOTs (GHZ preparation), the injected phase gate $P(\varphi) = \text{diag}(1, e^{i\varphi})$, and a Pauli Z correction. The native Heron r2 basis (not stated in the paper; from the substrate reference) is a tunable-coupler CZ entangler plus the fractional-gate single-qubit/two-qubit basis ($R_{ZZ}(\theta)$, $R_x(\theta)$) with virtual R_Z . The transpiled native circuit, its depth, and its gate counts are not reported.
- **Notable features leveraged:** sequential X -basis measurements implementing quantum steering (Alice then Bob); classical broadcast of measurement outcomes; classical **post-selection** on Alice’s $|+\rangle$ outcome and a **software** Z -correction on Charlie applied in post-processing (Qiskit LSb-0 convention, `measure_all()`); single-qubit state tomography over $X/Y/Z$ on Charlie (and Bob). The hardware run does **not** use mid-circuit measurement or real-time feedforward; the conditional structure is emulated classically after the fact (Sec. 5.1, lines 531-533).

2.3 Computational primitive

Other - measurement-based / steering state-preparation. Concretely: GHZ-state preparation followed by single-qubit phase-gate magic injection, projective X -basis measurements with classical post-selection and Pauli correction, read out by **sampling** and reconstructed

by **single-qubit state tomography**. It is not VQE, QAOA, Trotterised Hamiltonian simulation, QPE, amplitude estimation, or a QML inference loop; there is no variational or feedback optimisation.

2.4 Resource fingerprint

Metric	Value	Source (page / equation / SI)
Qubits (logical)	3 (Alice, Bob, Charlie)	Sec. 5.1 (line 527-530); Fig. 1 (line 286-300)
Qubits (physical)	3 of 156 used (specific device qubit indices not reported)	Sec. 5.1 (line 527-530)
Circuit depth	not reported (logical circuit in Fig. 1; transpiled depth not stated)	Fig. 1 (line 286-300)
2Q-gate count (total)	2 logical CX gates for GHZ prep (Fig. 1); transpiled native 2Q count not reported	Fig. 1 (line 289-291)
Measurement shots	4096-8192 per circuit (Table 1 uses 4096); $N_{\text{eff}} \approx 2048$ post-selected shots	Sec. 5.1 (line 530); Table 1 caption (line 541-550)
Classical loop iter.	none (no variational/feedback loop); 4 distinct φ values run; error bars by parametric bootstrap $N_{\text{boot}} = 2000$	Table 1 + caption (line 539-562)
Wall-clock runtime	not reported (IBM job ID <code>d82nutnoha1c73blr2f0</code> quoted, but no timing)	Sec. 5.1 footnote (line 535)

For any row marked “not reported”, the paper does not state the number; values are not invented.

2.5 Assumptions and results

- **Claimed.** The (2, 3) MSS protocol is faithful (recipient’s magic $C(\rho_C) = C(\varphi)$) for all four test phases $\varphi \in \{\pi/8, \pi/4, \pi/3, 3\pi/4\}$, with state fidelity 0.959 to 0.986; security ($C(\rho_B)$ consistent with 0, reported as $< 10^{-6}$) holds in every run. Near-exact recovery at $\varphi = \pi/8$ ($C = 0.154 \pm 0.013$ vs theory 0.153). The largest deviation is at $\varphi = 3\pi/4$ ($C = 0.173$ vs theory 0.207, i.e. within 0.034). Table 1 (lines 552-562).

- **Error bars / noise assumptions.** Uncertainties are 1σ parametric bootstrap ($N_{\text{boot}} = 2000$, $N_{\text{eff}} \approx 2048$): $\sigma_C \approx 0.013$, $\sigma_F \approx 0.007$ to 0.008. The per-Pauli-estimator shot noise is $\sigma = 1/\sqrt{N_{\text{eff}}} \approx 0.022$. The reported $C(\rho_B) < 10^{-6}$ is bounded by the LP solver tolerance, not by shot noise: a 3σ Bloch perturbation (≈ 0.066) is argued to be roughly $15\times$ too small to push the reconstructed Bob state outside the stabilizer polytope (Table 1 caption, lines 544-550). Security is argued to be noise-robust by construction because $U(I/2)U^\dagger = I/2$ for any unitary (Remark, lines 328-336).
- **Comparison to classical baseline.** No classical compute-time baseline; this is a cryptographic-primitive demonstration, not an optimisation benchmark. The comparison is against (a) the closed-form theory curve $C(\varphi) = (|\sin \varphi| + |\cos \varphi| - 1)/2$ (Lemma, eq. line 182-186) and (b) the quoted 15-to-1 magic-state-distillation fidelity threshold 0.856, which all four runs exceed (lines 569-570).

2.6 Portability flags

- **Post-selection in place of real-time feedforward (largest caveat).** The demonstration uses classical post-selection on Alice’s $|+\rangle$ outcome plus a software Z -correction applied in post-processing, not mid-circuit measurement with conditional gates (Sec. 5.1, lines 531-533). A genuine BQC or steering deployment requires real-time feedforward (dynamic circuits): mid-circuit measurement, classical broadcast, and conditional Pauli corrections within coherence time. Post-selection cost scales multiplicatively with the number of measured parties (one party already costs a factor ~ 2 : $N_{\text{eff}} \approx 2048$ from 4096 shots), so the post-selected route does not scale to the $(n-1, n)$ protocol without feedforward. Brilliant should treat “needs mid-circuit measurement + classical feedforward for real deployment” as the binding portability requirement; platforms with strong dynamic-circuit support (IBM dynamic circuits, trapped-ion mid-circuit readout) are favoured.
- **GHZ preparation needs a degree- ≥ 2 hub qubit.** The circuit applies two CX gates from Alice (q_0) to Bob and Charlie, so Alice must be coupled to two neighbours. Native on heavy-hex (max degree 3) and trivially native on all-to-all (trapped-ion, neutral-atom global) hardware; on a linear chain it costs one SWAP. Low overhead at 3 qubits.
- **Arbitrary-angle phase gate $P(\varphi)$.** On IBM this is a virtual R_Z (free, exact). Platforms without a continuous virtual-phase primitive must synthesise an arbitrary Z -rotation. Generally portable; this single gate is the only non-stabilizer (magic) resource in the protocol.
- **Single-qubit state tomography over $X/Y/Z$.** Standard and platform-agnostic; cost is three measurement settings per characterised qubit. Portable.
- **Otherwise Clifford-only, shallow, no variational loop.** Apart from the one phase gate, the protocol is Clifford and the circuit is shallow (GHZ prep + measurements). Hardware demands are light, so the primitive itself is portable to any gate-model platform with entangling gates and projective measurement. The native-gate mismatch (logical H/CX to Heron tunable-coupler $CZ + R_Z/R_x$) is routine transpilation; because the paper does not report transpiled depth or 2Q counts, the cross-platform 2Q-overhead cannot be read directly from this paper.
- **Substrate-agnostic threat model.** The $I/2$ security claim holds for any unitary/noise on the unauthorised party’s device, so it does not lean on a hardware-specific feature; this part of the result is platform-independent.

2.7 Caveats

- Full open-access arXiv LaTeX source (`paper-source/main.tex`) was available; there is no paywall and no separate Supplementary Information to reach. All numbers above are lifted from the main text, Table 1, and Fig. 1. No section was unreachable.
- The exact linear-programming definition of the magic monotone $C(\rho)$ (eq. line 167-170) and its dual witness H^* used in the 1SDI certification (Proposition, lines 445-467) are developed in the companion paper arXiv:2603.20792 (ref. Dutta2026), not reproduced here. The device-level fingerprint numbers do not depend on that construction; only the interpretation of the steering functional does.
- The companion paper DuttaTushar2026b (“Non-Markovian revival of magic in quantum hardware”, in preparation) reuses the same MSS circuit on the same hardware as a diagnostic probe (line 146-148) but is not needed for this fingerprint.
- Minor source artefacts: the LaTeX file’s top comment names the paper “via Non-Markovian Dynamics” (the companion paper’s topic) while the actual title is the threshold-control one; the abstract says “IBM Heron” whereas Sec. 5.1 specifies “IBM Heron r2”. Neither affects the extracted numbers.

3 Portability matrix