

# General theory of decoy-state quantum cryptography

Xiang-Bin Wang,<sup>1,2</sup> Cheng-Zhi Peng,<sup>1,3</sup> Jun Zhang,<sup>3</sup> and Jian-Wei Pan<sup>1,3,4</sup>

<sup>1</sup>*Department of Physics, Tsinghua University, Beijing 100084, China*

<sup>2</sup>*Imai-Project, ERATO-SORST, JST,*

*Daini Hongo White Building, 201, 5-28-3, Hongo,*

*Bunkyo, Tokyo 113-0033, Japan Department of Physics,*

*Tsinghua University, Beijing 100084, China*

<sup>3</sup>*Hefei National Laboratory for Physical Sciences*

*at Microscale and Department of Modern Physics,*

*University of Science and Technology of China, Hefei, Anhui 230026, China*

<sup>4</sup>*Physikalisches Institut, Universität Heidelberg,*

*Philosophenweg 12, 69120 Heidelberg, Germany*

## Abstract

The existing theory of decoy-state quantum cryptography assumes the exact control of each states in photon number space. Such exact control is impossible in practice. We develop the theory of decoy-state method so that it is unconditionally secure even there are state errors of sources, if the range of a few parameters in the states are known. This theory simplifies the practical implementation of the decoy-state quantum key distribution because the unconditional security can be achieved even with state errors.

PACS numbers: 03.67.Dd, 42.81.Gs, 03.67.Hk

## I. INTRODUCTION.

Most of the existing set-ups of quantum key distribution (QKD)[1, 2, 3, 4, 5] use imperfect single-photon source. Such an implementation in principle suffers from the photon-number-splitting attack [6, 7]. The decoy-state method [8, 9, 10, 11, 12] and some other methods [16, 17, 18] can be used for unconditionally secure QKD even Alice only uses an imperfect source[6, 7].

The separate theoretical results of ILM-GLLP [5] shows that a secure final key can be distilled even though an imperfect source is used in the protocol, if one knows the lower bound of the fraction of those raw bits generated by single-photon pulses from Alice. The decoy-state method is to verify such a bound faithfully and efficiently. The ILM-GLLP theory does not need the *exact* value of the fraction of raw bits due to single-photon pulses from Alice. It only needs the lower bound of fraction of un-tagged bits. The goal of decoy-state method is to verify such a lower bound through the observed experiment data.

Recently, a number of experiments on decoy-state QKD have been done [19, 20]. However, the existing decoy-state theory assumes the perfect control of the source states in the photon number space. This is an impossible task for any real set-up in practice. A new problem arose in practice is how to carry out the decoy-state method securely and efficiently given the inexact control of the source. Even though one can control the intensity pretty well in practice, we still need quantitative criteria on the effects of possible small errors in the source states. By currently existing technology, the source error can be polynomially small rather than exponentially small. One may argue sine the source error is very small, the error-free decoy-state theory must work. But we never know how small is sufficient small so that the error can be securely regarded as 0. If we judge 20% of intensity error is too large, we have no reason to say 1% error is small enough for unconditional security with error-free decoy-state theory. There are also problems in evaluating the different set-ups. Suppose there are two set-ups, A and B, they can make QKD for the same distance. Set-up A can have a key rate of 100 bits per second with possible intensity error of 3% while set-up B can have a key rate of 80 bits per second with possible intensity error of 1%, we don't know which one is better. To answer all these questions, we need a more general theory that directly applies to the case with state errors. If we use the coherent states and we have a two-value attenuator which are perfectly stable, we can use the method in Ref.[23]. If the

parameter errors of states of each pulses are random and independent, we can apply the existing decoy-state method with the averaged-state[12, 22].

Here we study the decoy-state method with state errors of source without any of the above presumed conditions. We shall still assume that the source can only produce diagonal states in photon-number space, but each states from the same source can be different. Our result here is not limited to the intensity error only, it applies to the more general case of state errors from the source. For example, in the protocol using coherent states, intensity error is only a special type of error which changes one parameter in the coherent state only, but the state is still a coherent state, i.e., a Possonian distribution with another parameter. Generally speaking, there could be certain types of sour errors with which the state in not a coherent state, i.e., not in the Possonian distribution. Our study shows that the decoy-state method is still secure even with state errors, but the key rate will be decreased. Our result only needs the range of a few parameters in the source states, regardless of whatever error pattern. In our method, we have assumed the worst case that Eavesdropper (Eve.) knows exactly the error of each pulse. Our result immediately applies to all existing experimental results.

This paper is arranged as follows. After the introduction above, we review the main idea and basic assumptions of the existing error-free decoy-state theory. As a result, the most general conditions and formulas for the error-free decoy-state method is given. We then study the decoy-state method with an inexactly controlled source, i.e., there can be errors in states of decoy pulses and signal pulses. We present a general formula for this case. In the formula, only the bound values of a few parameters in the states are involved. The result is secure even in the case Eve. knows exactly the error of each pulse. The paper is ended with a concluding remark.

## II. REVIEW OF THE EXISTING ERROR-FREE DECOY-STATE THEORY.

We shall call the existing theory[8, 9, 10, 11, 13, 14, 15] the error-free theory because they assume no error for the source states in the photon-number states. Although most of the literatures[8, 9, 10, 11] study the error-free decoy-state method only with specific distributions of source states, assumption of specific distributions is actually not necessary. Basically, we only need a few conditions for the source states rather than the whole distri-

bution function. Here we summarize the existing theory and derive a more general result of the error-free decoy-state theory. In the 3-intensity protocol, Alice has three sources source  $Y_0$  which can produce vacuum, source  $Y$  which can only produce state

$$\rho_\mu = \sum_{k=0}^J a_k |k\rangle\langle k| \quad (1)$$

and source  $Y_\mu$  which can only produce state

$$\rho = \sum_{k=0}^J a'_k |k\rangle\langle k| \quad (2)$$

where  $|k\rangle$  is the  $k$ -photon Fock state and  $a_k \geq 0$ ,  $a'_k \geq 0$  for all  $k$ ,  $\sum a_k = \sum a'_k = 1$ . Here  $J$  can be either finite or infinite. Given a coherent-state source of a heralded single-photon source from the parametric down conversion,  $J = \infty$ . When coherent states[8, 9, 10, 11] or heralded single-photon source[13, 14] is used, the parameters  $a_k, a'_k$  are determined by the intensity (averaged photon number) of a pulse. For simplicity, we shall also call pulses from source  $Y, Y'$  the decoy pulses and signal pulses, respectively. In the protocol Alice may use each source of  $\{Y_0, Y, Y'\}$  randomly with probabilities  $p_0, p, p'$  ( $p_0 + p + p' = 1$ ) whenever she sends out a pulse to Bob. Given the states above, we can equivalently regard that source  $Y$  or  $Y'$  is a probabilistic photon-number source which sends out photon number state with probability distribution  $\{a_k\}$  or  $\{a'_k\}$ . The task here is to verify the lower bound the number of "un-tagged bits", those raw bits caused by single-photon pulses from Alice. Note that they can not directly observe the number of single-photon counts because they don't know which pulses at Alice's side are single-photon pulses. They only know which pulse belongs to which source and the state for pulses from each source. The decoy-state theory shows that they only need to know the number of counts due to the pulses from each source in order to verify how many raw bits are generated from single-photon pulses from Alice. We first define of counting rate of a class (or a sub-class) of pulses. A class or a sub-class can be just those pulses from certain source, or can be pulses of certain state. Given any class  $X$  that contains  $N_X$  pulses, after Alice sends them out to Bob, if Bob observes  $n$  counts at his side, the counting rate for pulses in this class is

$$S_x = n/N_X. \quad (3)$$

If class  $X$  is divided into  $J$  sub-classes and any pulse in the class belongs to and only to one subclass and the fraction of pulses in each subclasses are  $b_0, b_1 \dots, b_J$ , then the counting

rate of class  $X$  is

$$S_X = \sum_{k=0}^J b_k s_k \quad (4)$$

and  $s_k$  is the counting rate of the  $k$ th subclass. This is simply because the total counts of a class equals to the summation of counts of each sub-classes, i.e.,

$$n = \sum_{k=0}^J n_k \quad (5)$$

and  $n_k$  is the number of counts at Bob's side caused by pulses in  $k$ -th sub-class from Alice. In the 3-intensity decoy-state method, Alice has 3 sources, we regard pulses from one source as a class. We can regard pulses from a certain source all the decoy pulses as a class, say, class  $Y$ . We regard all those  $k$ -photon pulses from source  $Y$  as a subclass  $c_k$ .

We denote the counting rates of the decoy-source (class  $Y$ ), the signal source (class  $Y'$ ), and the vacuum source (class  $Y_0$ ) by  $S$ ,  $S'$ , and  $S_0$ , respectively. Since in the protocol, Alice knows which pulse is from which source, these  $S$ ,  $S'$ , and  $S_0$  can be observed directly in the experiment therefore we regard them as *known* parameters. Given the state of decoy pulses in Eq.(1), the fraction of  $k$ -photon pulses is  $a_k$ . Then we have

$$S = \sum_{k=0}^J a_k s_k = a_0 S_0 + a_1 s_1 + \lambda \quad (6)$$

and  $s_k$  is the counting rate of those  $k$ -photon pulses from source  $Y$ , and

$$\lambda = \sum_{k=2}^J a_k s_k. \quad (7)$$

Similarly, we also have

$$S' = \sum_{k=0}^J a'_k s'_k \quad (8)$$

and  $s'_k$  is the counting rate of those  $k$ -photon pulses from source  $Y'$ ,  $S'$  is the counting rate of all pulses from source  $Y'$ .

The counting rate of subclass  $c_k$  and subclass  $c'_k$  must be equal if pulses from these two subclasses are randomly mixed, i.e.,

$$s_k = s'_k \quad (9)$$

Here  $c'_k$  is the subclass that contains all single pulses from source  $Y'$ . According to this we also have,

$$s_0 = s'_0 = S_0, \quad (10)$$

Alice randomly uses three sources. Here  $S_0$  is the counting rate of class  $Y_0$ . We can rewrite Eq.(8) in the format

$$S' = \sum_{k=0}^J a'_k s_k = a'_0 s_0 + a'_1 s_1 + \frac{a'_2}{a_2} \lambda + \delta \quad (11)$$

and

$$\delta = \sum_{k=3}^J a'_k s_k - \frac{a'_2}{a_2} \lambda. \quad (12)$$

Obviously,

$$\delta \geq 0 \quad (13)$$

if

$$\frac{a'_k}{a_k} \geq \frac{a'_2}{a_2} \geq \frac{a'_1}{a_1}. \quad (14)$$

Given Eq.(6,11), one can find the following fact

$$s_1 = s'_1 = \frac{a'_2(S_\mu - a_0 s_0) - a_2(S' - a'_0 s_0)}{a'_2 a_1 - a'_1 a_2} + \frac{a_2 \delta}{a'_2 a_1 - a'_1 a_2}. \quad (15)$$

Since  $\delta \geq 0$ , and the second inequality in Eq.(14) is

$$a'_2 a_1 - a'_1 a_2 \geq 0, \quad (16)$$

therefore  $\frac{a_2 \delta}{a'_2 a_1 - a'_1 a_2} \geq 0$ . The minimum value of the single-photon counting rate is now verified to be

$$s_1 = s'_1 \geq \frac{a'_2(S_\mu - a_0 s_0) - a_2(S_{\mu'} - a'_0 s_0)}{a'_2 a_1 - a'_1 a_2}. \quad (17)$$

Given this, one can calculate the final key rate of the signal source by[5, 11]

$$R_s = \Delta'_1 [1 - H(t_1)] - H(t) \quad (18)$$

where

$$\Delta_1 = \frac{a_1 s_1}{S_\mu}, \quad \Delta'_1 = \frac{a'_1 s_1}{S_{\mu'}} \quad (19)$$

is and  $t_1, t$  are the QBER for single-photon pulses and the QBER for all signal pulses. This is the (extended) result of the decoy-state method with whatever diagonal source-state, including the coherent state, thermal state, heralded single-photon state, and so on with the condition on that the source states are exactly controlled and Eq.(14) holds.

### III. DECOY-STATE WITH STATE ERRORS: $s_k \neq s'_k$

However, the results above are based on the assumption that all states are produced exactly. Now we study the actual protocol with errors in the states from each sources.

A very tricky point here is that Eq.(9) in general is incorrect, if there are state errors. This problem is first pointed out in page 63, section 4.3.5 of Ref.[8], and then used as the start-point of the original shorter version of this work[24]. For the completeness, we present the main idea about this point again here:

Eq.(9) is the most important element of the error-free decoy-state theory. Now we explain why we don't use Eq.(9) here if we assume Eve. knows the state errors.

For simplicity, we consider the following two-block collective errors with coherent states: Alice wants to use intensity  $\mu = 0.2$  for decoy pulses and intensity  $\mu' = 0.6$  for signal pulses. However, in some blocks (strengthened blocks), both decoy pulses and signal pulses are 10% stronger than the assumed intensity, in the other blocks (weakened blocks), both decoy pulses and signal pulses are 10% weaker than the assumed values[8]. Suppose Alice always with probabilities of  $p_0, p, p'$  to choose one of three different sources (vacuum source, decoy source, and signal source source). The density operator of a coherent state with intensity  $x$  is

$$\rho_x = e^{-x} \sum_{k=0}^J \frac{x^k}{k!}. \quad (20)$$

Here is Eve's scheme using **time-dependent channel**: she blocks all pulses from the weakened blocks, and she produces a linear channel of transmittance  $2\eta_e$  to attenuate each pulse from the strengthened block. Straightly, the actual counting rate of those single-photon pulses from the decoy source is

$$s_1 = \frac{\frac{1}{2} \times 2\eta_e \times 1.1\mu e^{-1.1\mu}}{\mu e^{-\mu}} = e^{-0.1\mu} \eta_e \quad (21)$$

and the actual counting rate those single-photon pulses from signal source is

$$s'_1 = \frac{\frac{1}{2} \times 2\eta_e \times 1.1\mu' e^{-1.1\mu'}}{\mu' e^{-\mu'}} = e^{-0.1\mu'} \eta_e \quad (22)$$

We find

$$s_1/s'_1 = e^{-0.1(\mu-\mu')} \neq 1. \quad (23)$$

Similarly, we can also show that  $s_k \neq s'_k$ . This shows, given the correlated error which is

known to Eve, Eve can treat the identical  $k$ -photon pulses *differently* according to which source they are from !

The reason behind the above result is because the collective errors may break the "random mixture" condition of Eq.(9). Consider again the specific example above. Consider those single-photon pulses only. In a strengthened block, a single-photon pulse has probability

$$\mathcal{P}_s = \frac{1.1p\mu e^{-1.1\mu}}{1.1p\mu e^{-1.1\mu} + 1.1p'\mu' e^{-1.1\mu'}} = \frac{1}{1 + \frac{p'\mu'}{p\mu} e^{1.1(\mu-\mu')}} \quad (24)$$

that it comes from the decoy source; and probability

$$\mathcal{P}'_s = \frac{1.1p\mu e^{-1.1\mu}}{1.1p\mu e^{-1.1\mu} + 1.1p'\mu' e^{-1.1\mu'}} = \frac{1}{1 + \frac{p\mu}{p'\mu'} e^{1.1(\mu'-\mu)}} \quad (25)$$

that it comes from the signal source. In a weakened block, a single-photon pulse has probability

$$\mathcal{P}_w = \frac{1}{1 + \frac{p'\mu'}{p\mu} e^{0.9(\mu-\mu')}} \quad (26)$$

that it comes from the decoy source; and probability

$$\mathcal{P}'_w = \frac{1}{1 + \frac{p\mu}{p'\mu'} e^{0.9(\mu'-\mu)}} \quad (27)$$

that it comes from the signal source. Comparing the values of  $\mathcal{P}_s$ ,  $\mathcal{P}_w$ ;  $\mathcal{P}'_s$ ,  $\mathcal{P}'_w$ , we can easily see that in the weakened blocks, single-photon pulses from decoy source appear more frequently than that in the strengthened blocks. Also, in the weakened blocks, single-photon pulses from signal source appear less frequently than that in the strengthened blocks. These patterns have surely broken the random mixture presumption of Eq.(9).

One may question how Eve can know the state errors. In the decoy-state plug-and-play protocol[25], Eve can actually prepare the error pattern, including the above specific pattern. Suppose Alice only wants to monitor the pulse intensity but she does not want to correct the intensity error.

Even for the one-way protocol, Eve can also know the intensity errors. Say, Alice does not want to cost too much to correct each individual pulse.

In all these situations, the existing error-free decoy-state method does not work, but our theory in this work will apply.



#### IV. DECOY-STATE METHOD WITH STATE ERRORS.

We still assume that each pulse sent from Alice is randomly chosen from one of 3 sources  $\{Y_0, Y, Y'\}$  with probability  $p_0, p, p'$ . For simplicity, we assume that every pulse in class  $Y_0$  is exactly in vacuum state. But each single-shot of pulses in classes  $Y$  (the decoy source), and  $Y'$  (the signal source) can be in a state slightly different from the expected one. Eq.(4,5) still hold even though there are source errors, because they are simply the definition of summation. Also, we shall still use Eq.(3) for the definition of counting rate of a certain class which contains many pulses. Suppose Alice sends  $M$  pulses to Bob in the whole protocol.

##### A. Virtual protocol

For clarity, we first consider a virtual protocol,

**Protocol 1:** In the beginning, Alice produce  $M$  bi-pulses which are in the product state

$$\tilde{\rho} = \prod_{i=1}^M \tilde{\rho}_i. \quad (28)$$

This means, at each time  $i$ , in sending a pulse to Bob, Alice produces a two-pulse (pulse  $A$  and pulse  $B$ ) bipartite state

$$\tilde{\rho}_i = p_0|z_0\rangle\langle z_0| \otimes |0\rangle\langle 0| + p|z_d\rangle\langle z_d| \otimes \rho_i + p'|z_s\rangle\langle z_s| \otimes \rho'_i \quad (29)$$

and

$$\rho_i = \sum_{k=0}^J a_{ki}|k\rangle\langle k|, \quad (30)$$

$$\rho'_i = \sum_{k=0}^J a'_{ki}|k\rangle\langle k|. \quad (31)$$

Here the first subspace (states  $\{|z_0\rangle, |z_d\rangle, |z_s\rangle\}$ ) is for pulse  $A$  and the second subspace is for pulse  $B$ . We shall call any pulse of subspace  $A$  ( $B$ ) the  $A$ -pulse ( $B$ -pulse). Alice keeps  $A$ -pulses and sends out  $B$ -pulses to Bob,  $i$  runs from 1 to  $M$ . States  $\{|z_x\rangle\}$  are orthogonal to each other for different  $x$  ( $x = 0, d, s$ ). After Bob completes his measurements to all incident pulses, Alice measures  $A$ -pulses. The outcome of  $|z_0\rangle, |z_d\rangle$  or  $|z_s\rangle$  reveals which  $B$ -pulse belongs to which source among  $Y_0$  (vacuum source),  $Y$  (decoy source), or  $Y'$  signal

source. As shown below, based on this virtual protocol, we can formulate the number of counts from each source and therefore find the lower bound of the number of single-photon counts. The result also holds for the real protocol where Alice measures each of  $A$ -pulses in basis  $\{|z_x\rangle, x = 0, d, s\}$  before sending out any  $B$ -pulses. Note that the measurements on  $A$ -pulses do not change the states of  $B$ -pulses in the eyes of anyone outside Alice's lab. Therefore the result of the protocol is independent of when Alice measures her pulses.

## B. Our goal

Our *goal* is to find the the lower bound of the fraction of counts caused by those single-photon pulses for both the signal source and the decoy source. The following quantity are directly observed in the protocol therefore we regard them as known parameters:  $N_d$ , the number of counts caused by the decoy source, and  $N_s$ , the number of counts caused by the signal source, and  $n(Y_0)$ , the number of counts caused by the vacuum source,  $Y_0$ . Obviously,  $S = \frac{N_d}{pM}$ , the counting rate of the decoy source, and  $N_s = \frac{N_s}{p'M}$ , the counting rate of the signal source, and  $S_0 = \frac{n(Y_0)}{p_0M}$ , the counting rate of the vacuum source, are also known exactly in the protocol. Clearly, here  $pM$ ,  $p'M$  and  $p_0M$  are just the number of the decoy pulses, the number of the signal pulses, and the number of pulses from the vacuum source, respectively. Therefore, for our goal, we only need to formulate the number of counts caused by those single-photon pulses from each sources in terms of these quantities and the bound values of those parameters as appear in Eq.(29,30,31).

## C. Some definitions

Here we shall give two important definitions: The definition of “the  $i$ th pulse from Alice has caused a count”, and the definition of “set  $c_k$ ”,  $k = 0, 1, 2, \dots$ .

In what follows, some times we shall simply use the term “pulse” or “pulses” for “ $B$ -pulse” or “ $B$ -pulses”, if this does not cause any confusion.

*Definition 1.* In the protocol, Alice sends Bob  $M$  pulses, one by one. In response to Alice, Bob observes his detector for  $M$  times. As Bob's  $i$ th observed result, Bob's detector can either click or not click. If the detector clicks in Bob's  $i$ th observation, then we say that “the  $i$ th pulse from Alice has caused a count”. We disregard how the  $i$ th pulse may change

after it is sent out. When we say that Alice's  $i$ th pulse has caused a count we only need Bob's detector clicks in Bob's  $i$ th observation.

Given the source state in Eq.(29) and also the diagonal form for state  $\rho_i$  and  $\rho'_i$  in Eq.(30,31), any  $i$ th pulse sent out by Alice must be in only one photon-number state. To anyone outside Alice's lab, it looks as if that Alice only sends a photon number state at each single-shot: sometimes it's vacuum, sometimes it's a single-photon pulse, sometimes it is a  $k$ -photon pulses, and so on. We shall make use of this fact that any individual B-pulse is in one Fock state.

*Definition 2:* We define  $c_k$  as the set containing any  $k$ -photon  $B$ -pulse that has caused a click at Bob's side. For instance, if the photon number states of the first 10  $B$ -pulses from Alice are  $|0\rangle, |0\rangle, |1\rangle, |2\rangle, |0\rangle, |1\rangle, |3\rangle, |2\rangle, |1\rangle, |0\rangle$ , and the pulse 2, 3, 5, 6, 9, 10 each has caused a count at Bob's side, then we have

$$c_0 = \{2, 5, 10, \dots\}; \quad c_1 = \{3, 6, 9, \dots\} \quad (32)$$

#### D. Number of vacuum counts

For the readability, we consider the vacuum count first. Here we shall give the explicit formulas to bound  $n_{0d}$ , the number of counts caused by those vacuum pulses from the decoy source, and  $n'_{0s}$ , the number of counts caused by those vacuum pulses from the signal source. We want to formulate them by the known quantities, such as  $n(Y_0)$ , the number of counts by the vacuum source (source  $Y_0$ ) and  $S_0$ , the counting rate of the vacuum sources.

Given the definition of the set  $c_k$ , the number of counts caused by all vacuum pulses is just the number of pulses in set  $c_0$ . We want to know how many of the vacuum counts are caused by each source. This is equivalent to ask how many of pulses in set  $c_0$  come from each source. A vacuum pulse can come from any of the 3 sources, the vacuum source ( $Y_0$ ), the decoy source ( $Y$ ) and the signal source ( $Y'$ ). According to Eq.(29), if the  $i$ th  $B$ -pulse is vacuum, the (un-normalized) density matrix of the bipartite state is

$$(p_0|z_0\rangle\langle z_0| + pa_{0i}|z_d\rangle\langle z_d| + p'a'_{0i}|z_s\rangle\langle z_s|) \otimes |0\rangle\langle 0| \quad (33)$$

This means that, if the  $i$ th  $B$ -pulse is vacuum, the probability that it comes from source  $Y_0$  is

$$\mathcal{P}_{0i} = \frac{p_0}{p_0 + pa_{0i} + p'a'_{0i}}.$$

Asymptotically, in set  $c_0$ , there are

$$\sum_{i \in c_0} \mathcal{P}_{0i}$$

pulses from source  $Y_0$ . This is also the number of counts caused by source  $Y_0$ . Therefore the observed number of counts caused by source  $Y_0$  must satisfy

$$n(Y_0) = \sum_{i \in c_0} p_0 d_{0i} \quad (34)$$

Here

$$d_{0i} = \frac{1}{p_0 + pa_{0i} + p'a'_{0i}}. \quad (35)$$

Similarly, we also have

$$n_{0d} = \sum_{i \in c_0} pa_{0i} d_{0i}, \quad (36)$$

for the number of counts caused by those vacuum from the decoy source, and

$$n'_{0s} = \sum_{i \in c_0} p'a'_{0i} d_{0i}, \quad (37)$$

for the number of counts caused by those vacuum from the signal source. Therefore,  $n_{0d}$ ,  $n'_{0s}$  are bounded by

$$n_{0d}^U = pa_0^U \sum_{i \in c_0} d_{0i} \geq n_{0d} \geq pa_0^L \sum_{i \in c_0} d_{0i} = n_{0d}^L \quad (38)$$

and

$$n'_{0s}{}^U = p'a_0'^U \sum_{i \in c_0} d_{0i} \geq n'_{0s} \geq p'a_0'^L \sum_{i \in c_0} d_{0i} = n'_{0s}{}^L. \quad (39)$$

Using the fact  $\sum_{i \in c_0} d_{0i} = \frac{n(Y_0)}{p_0}$  from Eq.(34), we replace the above two equations by

$$\begin{aligned} n_{0d}^U &= \frac{pa_0^U n(Y_0)}{p_0} \geq n_{0d} \geq \frac{pa_0^L n(Y_0)}{p_0} = n_{0d}^L \\ n'_{0s}{}^U &= \frac{p'a_0'^U n(Y_0)}{p_0} \geq n'_{0s} \geq \frac{p'a_0'^L n(Y_0)}{p_0} = n'_{0s}{}^L \end{aligned} \quad (40)$$

By definition, the counting rate of source  $Y_0$  is  $S_0 = \frac{n(Y_0)}{p_0 M}$ , therefore the above equations are equivalent to

$$\begin{aligned} n_{0d}^U &= a_0^U p S_0 M \geq n_{0d} \geq a_0^L p S_0 M = n_{0d}^L \\ n'_{0s}{}^U &= a_0'^U p' S_0 M \geq n'_{0s} \geq a_0'^L p' S_0 M = n'_{0s}{}^L. \end{aligned} \quad (41)$$

### E. Calculations and main formulas

Lets first formulate the number of counts caused by those  $k$ -photon pulses from the decoy source (or the signal source). Consider those  $k$ -photon pulses ( $k \geq 1$ ). An  $k$ -photon pulse can come from either the decoy source ( $Y$ ) and the signal source  $Y'$ , depending on Alice's measurement outcome on her  $A$ -pulse. Given the source state in Eqs(29,30,31), if the  $i$ th  $B$ -pulse contains  $k$  photons, the (un-normalized) density matrix for the  $i$ th of Alice's bi-pulse ( $A$ -pulse and  $B$ -pulse) in Eq.(29) is

$$(pa_{ki}|z_d\rangle\langle z_d| + p'a'_{ki}|z_s\rangle\langle z_s|) \otimes |k\rangle\langle k|, \text{ if } k \geq 1. \quad (42)$$

With this equation one can formulate the probabilities of the measurement outcome of the  $A$ -pulse in basis  $\{|z_x\rangle, x = 0, d, s\}$ .

*Fact* : If the  $i$ th  $B$ -pulse contains  $k$  photons, it has a probability

$$\frac{pa_{ki}}{pa_{ki} + p'a'_{ki}}$$

to be from the decoy source (source  $Y$ ), and a probability

$$\frac{p'a'_{ki}}{pa_{ki} + p'a'_{ki}}$$

to be from the signal source (source  $Y'$ ), if  $k \geq 1$ . Therefore, asymptotically, the number of decoy pulses in set  $c_k$  is

$$\sum_{i \in c_k} \frac{pa_{ki}}{pa_{ki} + p'a'_{ki}}. \quad (43)$$

As we defined earlier, since every pulse in set  $c_k$  has caused a count, the above number of decoy pulses in set  $c_k$  is just the number of counts caused by  $k$ -photon decoy pulses.

Asymptotically, the number of counts caused by  $k$ -photon pulses from decoy source is

$$n_{kd} = \sum_{i \in c_k} \frac{pa_{ki}}{pa_{ki} + p'a'_{ki}} = p \sum_{i \in c_k} pa_{ki} d_{ki}, \text{ if } k \geq 1; \quad (44)$$

and

$$d_{ki} = \frac{1}{pa_{ki} + p'a'_{ki}} \quad (45)$$

Similarly, using the same definition of  $d_{ki}$ , we can also formulate the number of counts caused by  $k$ -photon pulses from the signal source as

$$n'_{ks} = p' \sum_{i \in c_k} a'_{ki} d_{ki}. \quad (46)$$

Therefore,  $N_d$ , the number of counts caused by the decoy source is,

$$N_d = \sum_{k=0}^J n_{kd} = n_{0d} + p \sum_{i \in c_1} a_{1i} d_{1i} + p \sum_{k=2}^J \sum_{i \in c_k} a_{ki} d_{ki}. \quad (47)$$

This is simply to say that the total counts caused by the decoy pulses is equal to the summation of counts caused by each  $k$ -photon pulses from the decoy source. We also have

$$N_s = \sum_{k=0}^J n'_{kd} = n'_{0s} + p' \sum_{i \in c_1} a'_{1i} d_{1i} + p' \sum_{k=2}^J \sum_{i \in c_k} a'_{ki} d_{ki} \quad (48)$$

for  $N_s$ , the number of counts caused by the signal source. Denoting  $a_k^L$  and  $a_k^U$  for the minimum values and maximum value of  $\{a_{ki} \mid i = 1, 2, \dots, M\}$ , and  $a_k'^L$  and  $a_k'^U$  for the minimum values and maximum value of  $\{a'_{ki} \mid i = 1, 2, \dots, M\}$ , our goal as stated in the subsection *B* is simply to know the minimum value of

$$D_1 = \sum_{i \in c_1} d_{1i}, \quad (49)$$

for, with this, the minimum value of the number counts caused by single-photon pulses from the signal-source (or the decoy-source) is simply

$$n_{1s}'^L = p' a_1'^L D_1 \leq n'_{1s}, \quad (\text{or } n_{1d}'^L = p a_1^L p' D_1 \leq n_{1d}). \quad (50)$$

In what follows we shall find the formula of  $D_1$  in terms of  $N_d, N_s, n_{0d}, n'_{0s}$ . ( $n_{0d}, n'_{0s}$  have been given in Eq(40). )

With the bound values  $a_k^L, a_k^U$  and  $a_k'^L, a_k'^U$  as defined above, we can now transform the Eqs.(47, 48) into the following equivalent form

$$N_d = n_{0d} + p a_1^U D_1 + p \Lambda - \xi_1 \quad (51)$$

$$N_s = n'_{0s} + p' a_1'^L D_1 + p' \Lambda' + \xi_2 \quad (52)$$

where

$$\Lambda = \sum_{k=2}^J a_k^U \sum_{i \in c_k} d_{ki}; \quad \Lambda' = \sum_{k=2}^J a_k'^L \sum_{i \in c_k} d_{ki}, \quad (53)$$

and

$$\xi_1 = p \left[ a_1^U D_1 + \Lambda - \left( \sum_{i \in c_1} a_{1i} d_{1i} + \sum_{k=2}^J \sum_{i \in c_k} a_{ki} d_{ki} \right) \right] \geq 0$$

$$\xi_2 = p' \left[ \sum_{i \in c_1} a'_{1i} d_{1i} + \sum_{k=2}^J \sum_{i \in c_k} a'_{ki} d_{ki} - (a_1'^L D_1 + \Lambda') \right] \geq 0$$

According to the definition of  $\Lambda$  and  $\Lambda'$ , we also have

$$\Lambda' = \frac{a_2'^L}{a_2^U} \Lambda + \xi_3 \quad (54)$$

and

$$\xi_3 = \Lambda' - \frac{a_2'^L}{a_2^U} \Lambda \quad (55)$$

Further, we assume the important condition

$$\frac{a_k'^L}{a_k^U} \geq \frac{a_2'^L}{a_2^U} \geq \frac{a_1'^L}{a_1^U}, \text{ for all } k \geq 2. \quad (56)$$

The first inequality above leads to

$$\xi_3 \geq 0 \quad (57)$$

as one may easily prove. With Eq.(54), Eq.(52) is simplified into

$$N_s = n'_{0s} + p' a_1'^L D_1 + p' \frac{a_2'^L}{a_2^U} \Lambda' + \xi_2 + \xi_3 \quad (58)$$

Given the Eqs.(51,58), we can formulate  $D_1$ :

$$D_1 = \frac{a_2'^L N_D/p - a_2^U N_s/p' - a_2'^L n_{0d}/p + a_2^U n'_{0s}/p' + a_2'^L \xi_1/p + a_2^U (\xi_2 + \xi_3)/p'}{a_1^U a_2'^L - a_1'^L a_2^U}. \quad (59)$$

Since  $\xi_1, \xi_2$ , and  $\xi_3$  are all non-negative, and  $a_1^U a_2'^L - a_1'^L a_2^U \geq 0$  by the second inequality of Eq.(56), we now have

$$D_1 \geq \frac{a_2'^L N_D/p - a_2^U N_s/p' - a_2'^L n_{0d}/p + a_2^U n'_{0s}/p'}{a_1^U a_2'^L - a_1'^L a_2^U}. \quad (60)$$

The bound values of  $n_{0d}$ ,  $n'_{0d}$  are worked out in Eq.(40, 41) in the earlier subsection. Therefore, we can now give the fraction of single counts among all counts caused by the signal source is

$$\Delta'_1 \geq \frac{p' a_1'^L D_1}{N_s}. \quad (61)$$

According to Eq.(50), here  $p' a_1'^L D_1$  is the lower bound of the number of counts caused by single-photon pulses from the signal source. Replacing  $n_{0d}$  in Eq.(60) by its upper bound and  $n'_{0s}$  by its lower bound as given in Eq.(41), we can simplify the right-hand-side of the inequality above and obtain

$$\Delta'_1 \geq \frac{a_1'^L (a_2'^L S - a_2^U S' - a_2'^L a_0^U S_0 + a_2^U a_0'^L S_0)}{S' (a_1^U a_2'^L - a_1'^L a_2^U)} \quad (62)$$

TABLE I: Secure key rate ( $R$ ) vs different values of intensity error upper bound ( $\delta_M$ ) using the experimental data in the case of 50 km [20]. The experiment lasts for 1481.2 seconds with the repetition rate 4 MHz. We have observed  $S_{\mu'} = 3.817 \times 10^{-4}$ ,  $S_{\mu} = 1.548 \times 10^{-4}$ ,  $S_0 = 2.609 \times 10^{-5}$  and the quantum bit error rates (QBER) for signal states and decoy states are 4.247%, 8.379% respectively.

$\delta_M$	5%	4%	3%	2%	1%	0
$R$ (Hz)	70.8	84.3	97.6	110.7	123.6	136.3

where  $S' = \frac{N_s}{p'M}$  is the counting rate of the signal source and  $M$  is the number of total B-pulses as defined earlier. Similarly, we also have

$$\Delta_1 \geq \frac{a_1^L (a_2^L S - a_2^U S' - a_2^L a_0^U S_0 + a_2^U a_0^L S_0)}{S (a_1^U a_2^L - a_1^L a_2^U)} \quad (63)$$

for the minimum value of fraction of single-photon counts for the decoy source. Here  $S = \frac{N_d}{pM}$  is the counting rate of the decoy source.

Eqs.(56,62) and (63) are our main results of this work. The results are based on the virtual protocol where Alice uses the bipartite state of Eq.(29). Obviously Alice can choose to measure all A-pulses of each bipartite state in the very beginning and the virtual protocol is reduced to the normal protocol in practice, where the bipartite state is not necessary. This does not change the mathematical result.

For coherent states, if the intensity is bounded by  $[\mu^L, \mu^U]$  for decoy pulses and  $[\mu'^L, \mu'^U]$  for signal pulses then

$$a_k^X = (\mu^X)^k e^{-\mu^X} / k!, \quad a_k'^X = (\mu'^X)^k e^{-\mu'^X} / k! \quad (64)$$

with  $X = L, U$  and  $k = 1, 2$ . Therefore, one can calculate the final key rate by Eq.(18) now, if the bound values of intensity errors are known. The asymptotic result using the experimental data of QKD distance of 50 kilometers calculated by our formula is listed in table I.

## V. APPLICATION IN THE PLUG-AND-PLAY PROTOCOL.

As shown by Gisin et al[25], combining with the decoy-state method, the plug-and-play protocol can be unconditionally secure. There, Alice receives strong pulses from Bob and



she needs to guarantee the exact intensity of the pulse sending to Bob. It is not difficult to check the intensity, but difficult to *correct* the intensity. Our theory here can help to save the difficult feed-forward intensity control: Alice checks the intensities, discards those pulses whose intensity errors are too large, and then use our theory with the known bound of intensity errors. In the Plug-and-Play protocol, Eve. actually knows the error of each individual pulse hence the error-free decoy-state theory which is based on Eq.(9) but our theory here works.

## VI. CONCLUDING REMARK AND DISCUSSIONS:

In summary, we have for the first time shown the unconditional security of decoy-state method given what-ever error patern of the source, provided that the parameters diagonal state of the source satisfy Eq.(56) and the bound values of each parameters in the state is known. Our result also answers clearly the often asked question “What happens if the state of Laser beam is not exactly in the assumed distribution?”. Our result can be directly applied to the Plug-and-Play decoy-state protocol and simplify all the existing protocols in practical use.

**Acknowledgement:** This work was supported in part by the National Basic Research Program of China grant No. 2007CB907900 and 2007CB807901, NSFC grant No. 60725416 and China Hi-Tech program grant No. 2006AA01Z420.

- 
- [1] C.H. Bennett and G. Brassard, in *Proc. of IEEE Int. Conf. on Computers, Systems, and Signal Processing (IEEE, New York, 1984)*, pp. 175-179.
  - [2] D. Bruss, *Phys. Rev. Lett*, 81, 3018(1998).
  - [3] N. Gisin, G. Ribordy, W. Tittel, and H. Zbinden, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **74**, 145 (2002).
  - [4] M. Dusek, N. Lütkenhaus, M. Hendrych, in *Progress in Optics VVVX*, edited by E. Wolf (Elsevier, 2006).
  - [5] H. Inamori, N. Lütkenhaus, D. Mayers, quant-ph/0107017; D. Gottesman, H.K. Lo, N. Lütkenhaus, and J. Preskill, *Quantum Inf. Comput.* **4**, 325 (2004).
  - [6] B. Huttner, N. Imoto, N. Gisin, and T. Mor, *Phys. Rev. A* **51**, 1863 (1995); H.P. Yuen,

- Quantum Semiclassic. Opt. **8**, 939 (1996).
- [7] G. Brassard, N. Lütkenhaus, T. Mor, and B.C. Sanders, Phys. Rev. Lett. **85**, 1330 (2000); N. Lütkenhaus, Phys. Rev. A **61**, 052304 (2000); N. Lütkenhaus and M. Jahma, New J. Phys. **4**, 44 (2002).
- [8] X.-B. Wang, T. Hiroshima, A. Tomita, and M. Hayashi, *Physics Reports* 448, 1(2007)
- [9] W.-Y. Hwang, Phys. Rev. Lett. **91**, 057901 (2003).
- [10] X.-B. Wang, Phys. Rev. Lett. **94**, 230503 (2005); X.-B. Wang, Phys. Rev. A **72**, 012322 (2005).
- [11] H.-K. Lo, X. Ma, and K. Chen, Phys. Rev. Lett. **94**, 230504 (2005); X. Ma, B. Qi, Y. Zhao, and H.-K. Lo, Phys. Rev. A **72**, 012326 (2005).
- [12] J.W. Harrington *et al.*, quant-ph/0503002.
- [13] W. Maurer and C. Silberhorn, Phys. Rev. A **75** 050305 (2007); Y. Adachi, T. Yamamoto, M. Koashi, and N. Imoto, Phys. Rev.Lett. **99**, 180503 (2008).
- [14] ; T. Hirikiri and T. Kobayashi, Phys. Rev. A (2006), 73, 032331; Q. Wang, X.-B. Wang, G.-C. Guo, Phys. Rev. A (2007), 75, 012312; W.
- [15] M. Hayashi, N. J. Phys., **9** 284.
- [16] R. Ursin *et al.*, quant-ph/0607182.
- [17] V. Scarani, A. Acin, G. Ribordy, N. Gisin, Phys. Rev. Lett. **92**, 057901 (2004); C. Branciard, N. Gisin, B. Kraus, V. Scarani, Phys. Rev. A **72**, 032301 (2005).
- [18] M. Koashi, Phys. Rev. Lett., **93**, 120501(2004); K. Tamaki, N. Lütkenhaus, M. Loashi, J. Batuwantudawe, quant-ph/0608082
- [19] Y. Zhao, B. Qi, X. Ma, H.-K. Lo and L. Qian, Phys. Rev. Lett. **96**, 070502 (2006); Y. Zhao, B. Qi, X. Ma, H.-K. Lo and L. Qian, quant-ph/0601168.
- [20] Cheng-Zhi Peng *et al.* Phys. Rev. Lett. **98**, 010505 (2007); D. Rosenberg *em et al.*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **98**, 010503 (2007), T. Schmitt-Manderbach *et al.*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **98**, 010504 (2007).
- [21] Z.-L. Yuan, A. W. Sharpe, and A. J. Shields, *Appl. Phys. Lett.* **90**, 011118 (2007).
- [22] X.-B. Wang, *Phys. Rev. A* **75**, 012301(2007)
- [23] X.-B. Wang, C.-Z. Peng and J.-W. Pan, *Appl. Phys. Lett.* **90**, 031110(2007)
- [24] The fact that  $s_n \neq s'_1$  is first given in our paper, quant-ph/0612121, v2, and v3,
- [25] N. Gisin, S. Fasel, B. Kraus, H. Zbinden, and G. Ribordy, Phys. Rev. A **73**, 022320(2006).