

Deterministic Quantum Distribution of a d -ary key

Anita Eusebi^{1,*} and Stefano Mancini^{2,†}

¹*Dipartimento di Matematica ed Informatica, Università di Camerino, I-62032 Camerino, Italy*

²*Dipartimento di Fisica, Università di Camerino, I-62032 Camerino, Italy*

We extend to d -ary alphabets a recently proposed deterministic quantum key distribution protocol. By considering a powerful, although specific attack, we show that the security of the protocol increases in terms of the alphabet dimension d .

PACS numbers: 03.67.Dd, 03.65.Fd

I. INTRODUCTION

Quantum Key Distribution (QKD) is recognized to complement the One Time Pad to a secure system for reliable transfer of confidential information [1]. A paradigm for QKD (not exploiting entanglement) is the pioneering BB84 protocol [2]. It allows two remote parties (Alice and Bob) to share a secret key by a *unidirectional* use of a quantum channel (supplemented by a public authenticated classical channel).

Protocols like BB84 have a *probabilistic* character, in the sense that, on each use of the quantum channel, the receiver (Bob) is not able to decode with certainty what symbol was encoded by the sender (Alice). Typically, Bob can do this only with probability $1/2$.

Recently a new generation of protocols has been introduced making the QKD process *deterministic* [3]. In this case, Bob is able to decode with certainty the symbol Alice has encoded. This paradigm shift has been realized by a *bidirectional* use of the quantum channel. These new generation protocols are more versatile with respect to the old generation ones, and are supposed to outperform them.

As much as like extensions of BB84 to larger alphabets have been developed [4, 5], there is a persistent aim to also extend the protocol of Ref.[3] to larger alphabets. A construction has been recently devised for tri-dimensional alphabet [6], and then another for continuous infinite-dimensional alphabet [7].

Here we present a simple protocol that realizes a straightforward extension of the deterministic protocol of Ref.[3] to a d -ary alphabet. Since our construction is based on Mutually Unbiased Bases (MUB) [8], it holds for prime dimensions d . We then consider a powerful individual attack (coherent between forward and backward use of the quantum channel) and show that the security threshold increases with the alphabet dimension d .

II. QUDITS AND MUB

Let us consider a qudit, i.e., a d -dimensional quantum system. In its Hilbert space \mathcal{H}_d we choose a computational basis $\{|j\rangle\}$ labeled by modular integers $j \in \mathbb{Z}_d := \{0, \dots, d-1\}$. An arbitrary unitary transformation $\mathcal{H}_d \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_d$ can be expanded in terms of d^2 generalized Pauli operators

$$X^m Z^n, \quad m, n \in \mathbb{Z}_d, \quad (1)$$

which are defined by

$$X|j\rangle = |j \oplus 1\rangle, \quad Z|j\rangle = \omega^j |j\rangle, \quad (2)$$

where \oplus stands for the addition modulus d and

$$\omega := \exp(i2\pi/d). \quad (3)$$

Note that the generalized Pauli operators are not Hermitian and satisfy the anticommutation relation

$$ZX = \omega XZ. \quad (4)$$

*Electronic address: anita.eusebi@unicam.it

†Electronic address: stefano.mancini@unicam.it

In a Hilbert space \mathcal{H}_d two different vector bases, $\{|v_t^k\rangle\}$ and $\{|v_{t'}^{k'}\rangle\}$ with k, k' labelling the basis and t, t' the vector, are defined *mutually unbiased bases* iff [8]

$$\left| \langle v_t^k | v_{t'}^{k'} \rangle \right| = \frac{1}{\sqrt{d}} (1 - \delta_{kk'}) + \delta_{tt'} \delta_{kk'}, \quad (5)$$

where δ stands the Kronecker delta. By restricting our attention to prime dimensions d , we know that there are $d+1$ MUB [9]. A set is given by the normalized eigenvectors of the following operators

$$Z, \quad XZ^1, \quad XZ^2, \quad \dots, \quad XZ^{d-1}, \quad XZ^d (\equiv X). \quad (6)$$

The Z operator has eigenvectors

$$|v_t^0\rangle = |t\rangle, \quad (7)$$

with $t = 0, 1, \dots, d-1$.

The operators XZ^k , with $k = 1, 2, \dots, d-1$, have eigenvectors

$$|v_t^k\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{d}} \sum_{j=0}^{d-1} (\omega^t)^{d-j} (\omega^{-k})^{s_j} |j\rangle, \quad (8)$$

with $t = 0, 1, \dots, d-1$ and $s_j := j + (j+1) + \dots + (d-1)$.

The X operator has eigenvectors

$$|v_t^d\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{d}} \sum_{j=0}^{d-1} (\omega^t)^{d-j} |j\rangle, \quad (9)$$

with $t = 0, 1, \dots, d-1$.

It is easy to check that vectors of Eqs.(7), (8) and (9) satisfy the condition (5). Notice that the vectors of the first d MUB of Eq.(6), i.e. the eigenvectors of $Z, XZ, XZ^2, \dots, XZ^{d-1}$, can be written in the following compact way

$$|v_t^k\rangle = \frac{(1 - \delta_{k0})}{\sqrt{d}} \sum_{j=0}^{d-1} (\omega^t)^{d-j} (\omega^{-k})^{s_j} |j\rangle + \delta_{k0} |t\rangle, \quad (10)$$

where $k, t = 0, 1, \dots, d-1$.

III. THE PROTOCOL

Moving from the protocol of Ref.[3], and by refereeing to Fig.1, we consider Bob sending to Alice a qudit state randomly chosen from a set of maximally non orthogonal states. Then, whatever is the state, Alice has to encode a symbol belonging to a d -ary alphabet $\mathcal{A} = \{0, \dots, d-1\}$ in such a way that Bob will be able to unambiguously decode it (deterministic character of the protocol).

It is known [10] that there exist unitary operations able to encode on a set of vectors belonging to at most d MUB. For instance, if we consider states of Eq.(10), Alice encoding operation will be a shift operation X^a with $a \in \mathcal{A}$, such that

$$X^a |v_t^k\rangle = (1 - \delta_{k0}) \omega^{t \oplus ka} |v_{t \oplus ka}^k\rangle + \delta_{k0} |t \oplus a\rangle. \quad (11)$$

In such a case, Bob receiving back the state $|v_{t \oplus ka}^k\rangle$ can unambiguously determine a by means of a projective measurement onto the k th basis. In fact, he will get a value

$$b = \begin{cases} t \oplus a & \text{for } k = 0 \\ t \oplus ka & \text{for } k \neq 0 \end{cases}, \quad (12)$$

from which, knowing k and t , can extract a .

Then, the protocol runs as follow:

1. Bob randomly prepares one of the d^2 qudit states $|v_t^k\rangle$, $k, t = 0, \dots, d-1$, and sends it to Alice.




FIG. 1: The scheme summarizing our protocol. Labels B and E stand for Bob's and Eve's qudit systems respectively. Label A denotes Alice's operation on Bob's qudit. U_1 and U_2 represent the eavesdropping operations on the forward and backward path respectively.

2. Alice, upon receiving the qudit state has two options.
 - a) With probability $\wp \neq 0$ she performs a measurement by projecting over one of the d bases (*control mode*). She then sends back to Bob the resulting state.
 - b) With probability $1 - \wp$ she randomly encodes a symbol $a \in \mathcal{A}$ by applying the operation X^a (*message mode*). She then sends back to Bob the resulting state.
3. Bob, upon receiving back the qudit state, performs a measurement by projecting over the basis to which the qudit state initially belong.
4. At the end of the transmission, Alice publicly declare on which runs she performed the control mode and on which others the message mode. In the first case, Alice announces the bases over which she measured. Then, by public discussion, a comparison of Alice's and Bob's measurements results is performed over coincident bases. In the ideal case (noiseless channels and no eavesdropping) their results must coincide. In the message mode runs Bob gets the encoded value of a by knowing k and t .

IV. SECURITY OF THE PROTOCOL

We are going to prove the security of the protocol against a powerful individual attack. In individual attacks Eve lets the carrier of information interact with an ancilla system she has prepared and then try to gain information by measuring the ancilla. In this protocol she has to do that two times, in the forward path (to gain information about the state Bob sends to Alice) and in the backward path (to gain information about the state Alice sends back to Bob, hence about Alice's transformation). Moreover by using the same ancilla in the forward and backward path Eve could benefit from quantum interference effects (see Fig.1).

In particular we consider the operations U_1 and U_2 describing the attack as controlled shifts. A controlled shift is a straightforward extension of the CNOT operation between qubits, that is $CX : \mathcal{H}_d \otimes \mathcal{H}_d \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_d \otimes \mathcal{H}_d$ defined in the computational basis by

$$CX|i\rangle|j\rangle := |i\rangle|j \oplus i\rangle, \quad i, j = 0, \dots, d-1. \quad (13)$$

We then consider Eve intervening with $U_1 = CX^{-1}$ in the forward path and with $U_2 = CX$ in the backward path. The choice of this attack is motivated by the fact that (as we shall see) for $d = 2$ it allows Eve to steal 1 bit with probability $1/4$ to be outwitted. This is a much more powerful attack with respect to a trivial intercept-resend, with which Eve can steal 0.5 bit with probability $3/8$ to be outwitted [3].

A. Message Mode

Let us then analyze in detail the transformations of the quantum states on an entire message mode run.

- Attack on the forward path.

The initial Bob state is one of the d^2 states $|v_t^k\rangle$, con $k, t = 0, 1, \dots, d-1$. Furthermore, it can be shown that the best solution for Eve is to initially prepare the ancilla state in one of the state of the computational basis (Z eigenstates). For simplicity we assume it to be $|0\rangle$. Then, by using Eq.(10) we get

$$|v_t^k\rangle_B |0\rangle_E \xrightarrow{CX^{-1}} \frac{(1 - \delta_{k0})}{\sqrt{d}} \sum_{j=0}^{d-1} (\omega^t)^{d-j} (\omega^{-k})^{s_j} |j\rangle_B | -j\rangle_E + \delta_{k0} |t\rangle_B | -t\rangle_E. \quad (14)$$

- Encoding.

Bob's qudit of the state (14) undergoes the shift X^a with $a \in \mathcal{A}$, then

$$\xrightarrow{X^a} \frac{(1 - \delta_{k0})}{\sqrt{d}} \sum_{j=0}^{d-1} (\omega^t)^{d-j} (\omega^{-k})^{s_j} |j \oplus ka\rangle_B | -j\rangle_E + \delta_{k0} |t \oplus a\rangle_B | -t\rangle_E. \quad (15)$$

- Attack on the backward path.

The state (15) undergoes a CX operation, hence

$$\begin{aligned} \xrightarrow{CX} & \frac{(1 - \delta_{k0})}{\sqrt{d}} \sum_{j=0}^{d-1} (\omega^t)^{d-j} (\omega^{-k})^{s_j} |j \oplus ka\rangle_B |ka \pmod{d}\rangle_E + \delta_{k0} |t \oplus a\rangle_B |a\rangle_E \\ & = (1 - \delta_{k0}) \omega^{t \oplus ka} |v_{t \oplus ka}^k\rangle_B |ka \pmod{d}\rangle_E + \delta_{k0} |t \oplus a\rangle_B |a\rangle_E. \end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

We first notice that the attacks left unchanged Bob's qudit states since they are realized through controlled operations. Hence, Bob's measurement by projection onto the k th basis to which the initial state belongs, always gives the value a Alice has encoded [see Eq.(12)].

Eve, at the end of the run has to measure her ancilla system. She does not know to what basis project the state. According to the chosen initial ancilla state, measurement in the computational basis, $k = 0$, results optimal. Then, in the case Bob has sent a state $|v_t^k\rangle$ with $k = 0, 1$ she will be able to steal the whole information. In the other cases she will not be able to exactly determine the encoded value a as it is hidden in the product $ka \pmod{d}$. Let us evaluate the amount of information Eve can steal on average on each message mode.

In practice, Alice, Bob and Eve deal with three random variable A , B and E taking values a , b and e in \mathcal{A} . From point 2.b) of Section 3 we have

$$p(a = 0) = p(a = 1) = \dots = p(a = d-1) = \frac{1}{d}. \quad (17)$$

It follows that the Alice amount of Shannon information is[12]

$$H(A) = - \sum_{a=0}^{d-1} p(a) \log p(a) = \log d. \quad (18)$$

The Eve-Alice conditional probability results from Eq.(16) by considering Eve projecting onto the basis $k = 0$,

$$p(e|a) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{for } e = a \wedge a = 0 \\ 0 & \text{for } e \neq a \wedge a = 0 \\ \frac{2}{d} & \text{for } e = a \wedge a \neq 0 \\ 0 & \text{for } e = 0 \wedge a \neq 0 \\ \frac{1}{d} & \text{for } e \neq a \wedge a \neq 0 \end{cases}. \quad (19)$$

Then it is easy to find the joint probability

$$p(e, a) = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{d} & \text{for } a = 0 \wedge e = a \\ 0 & \text{for } a = 0 \wedge e \neq a \\ \frac{2}{d^2} & \text{for } a \neq 0 \wedge e = a \\ 0 & \text{for } a \neq 0 \wedge e = 0 \\ \frac{1}{d^2} & \text{for } a \neq 0 \wedge e \neq a \end{cases}, \quad (20)$$

and the joint entropy

$$H(E, A) = - \sum_{e, a=0}^{d-1} p(e, a) \log p(e, a) = \left(\frac{2d-1}{d} \right) \log d - \frac{2(d-1)}{d^2}. \quad (21)$$

From Eqs.(17) and (20) we also get Eve's probability

$$p(e=0) = p(e=1) = p(e=2) = \dots = p(e=d-1) = \frac{1}{d}, \quad (22)$$

and Eve's information

$$H(E) = - \sum_{e=0}^{d-1} p(e) \log p(e) = \log d. \quad (23)$$

Finally, we arrive at the Eve-Alice mutual information

$$I_E := H(A) + H(E) - H(E, A) = \frac{1}{d} \log d + \frac{2(d-1)}{d^2}. \quad (24)$$

It represents the average amount of information that Eve can steal on each run of the message mode. We see that it is equal to 1 for $d = 2$, and then decreases by increasing the alphabet dimension d .

B. Control Mode

We would like to evaluate the probability P_E Alice and Bob have to reveal Eve during the control mode. Alice and Bob only compare the results of their measurements when, by public discussion, they agree on the used basis. Hence we get rid of all the other cases.

1) Let be $k = 0$ and $\bar{t} \in \mathcal{A}$, then on the forward path

$$|v_{\bar{t}}^0\rangle_B |0\rangle_E \equiv |\bar{t}\rangle_B |0\rangle_E \xrightarrow{CX^{-1}} |\bar{t}\rangle_B |-\bar{t}\rangle_E. \quad (25)$$

Alice, measuring in the computational basis, gets \bar{t} with probability 1 and projects into $|\bar{t}\rangle_B$. On the backward path we have

$$|\bar{t}\rangle_B |-\bar{t}\rangle_E \xrightarrow{CX} |\bar{t}\rangle_B |0\rangle_E. \quad (26)$$

Bob, in turn, by measuring in the computational basis gets \bar{t} with probability 1. Thus, Alice and Bob have perfect correlation and $P_E = 0$.

2) Let be $\bar{k} \in \mathcal{A} - \{0\}$ and $\bar{t} \in \mathcal{A}$, then by using Eq.(10) we get on the forward path

$$|v_{\bar{t}}^{\bar{k}}\rangle_B |0\rangle_E \xrightarrow{CX^{-1}} \frac{1}{\sqrt{d}} \sum_{j=0}^{d-1} (\omega^{\bar{t}})^{d-j} (\omega^{-\bar{k}})^{s_j} |j\rangle_B | -j\rangle_E. \quad (27)$$

By expressing the vectors of the computational basis in terms of the eigenvectors of the basis used by Bob, we rewrite the right hand side of Eq.(27) as

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{d}} \sum_{j=0}^{d-1} (\omega^{\bar{t}})^{d-j} \left[\frac{1}{\sqrt{d}} \sum_{t=0}^{d-1} (\omega^{-t})^{d-j} |v_t^{\bar{k}}\rangle_B \right] | -j\rangle_E. \quad (28)$$

Alice, measuring in the basis \bar{k} , can project Bob's qudit of Eq.(28) on each vector t of the basis \bar{k} with probability $\frac{1}{d}$. Among the d possibilities we distinguish

a) $t = \bar{t}$ for which the resulting state is

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{d}} \sum_{j=0}^{d-1} |v_{\bar{t}}^{\bar{k}}\rangle_B | -j \rangle_E; \quad (29)$$

b) $t \neq \bar{t}$ for which the resulting state is

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{d}} \sum_{j=0}^{d-1} \left(\omega^{\bar{t}-t} \right)^{d-j} |v_{\bar{t}}^{\bar{k}}\rangle_B | -j \rangle_E. \quad (30)$$

We have now to apply the CX operation of the backward path starting from the two possible states (29) and (30). Thus,

a') For $t = \bar{t}$, Eq.(29) transforms by

$$\xrightarrow{CX} |v_{\bar{t}}^{\bar{k}}\rangle_B \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{d}} \sum_{j=0}^{d-1} |j\rangle_E \right). \quad (31)$$

It results that Eve's attack does not alter the eigenvector $|v_{\bar{t}}^{\bar{k}}\rangle_B$. Hence, Bob upon his measurement will get \bar{t} .

b') For $t \neq \bar{t}$, Eq.(30) transforms by

$$\xrightarrow{CX} |v_{\bar{t}}^{\bar{k}}\rangle_B \frac{1}{\sqrt{d}} \sum_{j=0}^{d-1} \omega^{(\bar{t}-t)j} |j\rangle_E. \quad (32)$$

We see that when Bob sends one of the eigenvectors of XZ^k with $k = 1, 2, \dots, d-1$, whatever is the result of Alice's measurement, he will get back the same eigenvector.

In summary we have:

- $\frac{1}{d^2}$ the probability with which Bob chooses any eigenvector of any basis.
- $\frac{d-1}{d}$ the probability that a vector \bar{t} of a basis $k \neq 0$ sent by Bob gives a measurement result $t \neq \bar{t}$ to Alice.
- $d^2 - d$ the number of states that do not belong to the computational basis.

We then conclude that the probability for Alice and Bob to outwit Eve is

$$P_E = \frac{1}{d^2} \cdot \frac{d-1}{d} \cdot (d^2 - d) = \frac{(d-1)^2}{d^2}. \quad (33)$$

We see that it is equal to 1/4 for $d = 2$, and then increases towards 1 by increasing the alphabet dimension d .

V. RESULTS AND CONCLUSION

We have proposed a deterministic cryptographic protocol working with a d -ary alphabet and exploiting a bidirectional quantum channel. When considering a coherent (between the two directions of the quantum channel use) attack, we have found that the information Eve can steal decreases by increasing the dimension of the alphabet [Eq.(24)], while the probability to outwit her increases towards 1 [Eq.(33)]. In Fig.2 we show the behavior of the fraction of information $I_E / \log d$ (black bars) and the probability P_E (grey bars) versus the dimension of the alphabet (bars are in correspondence of prime numbers).

By considering Eq.(16) and the decoding procedure as described in Section 3, we see that Bob is always able to unambiguously extract the value of a in the message mode. That is $p(b = a|a) = 1$ and $p(b \neq a|a) = 0$. It follows that Alice-Bob mutual information is $I_B := H(A) + H(B) - H(A, B) = \log d$. Quite generally, we know that to distill a secret key the condition $I_B > I_E$ must be satisfied [11]. We immediately notice that the difference $I_B - I_E$ increases




FIG. 2: The fraction $\frac{I_E}{\log d}$ of information Eve steals (black bars) and the probability P_E to outwit her (grey bars) versus the dimension (bars correspond to prime numbers).

with the dimension thus allowing higher security threshold. We also notice that for $d = 2$ the two quantities equal. This does not mean that the protocol is unsafe, but simply that Alice and Bob by revealing Eve cannot proceed ahead with key distillation.

Contrarily to probabilistic protocols, the deterministic nature of this protocol also allows the realization of quantum direct communication between legitimate users. In this case Alice and Bob (after authentication) can communicate directly the meaningful message without encryption. However, for this kind of communication only an asymptotic security can be proven. In fact, if we assume that Eve wants to gain full information in each attack without being detected, the probability she successfully eavesdrops the first bit is given by geometric series

$$(1 - \varphi) + \varphi(1 - P_E)(1 - \varphi) + \varphi^2(1 - P_E)^2(1 - \varphi) + \dots = \frac{1 - \varphi}{1 - \varphi(1 - P_E)}. \quad (34)$$

Being I_E the quantity of information that Eve eavesdrops in a single attack, if she wants to obtain an amount of information I , she must realize successfully a number $n = I/I_E$ of attacks. Thus the probability that Eve eavesdrops an amount of information I without being detected is given by

$$\left(\frac{1 - \varphi}{1 - \varphi(1 - P_E)} \right)^{I/I_E}, \quad (35)$$

with I_E and P_E given in Eqs.(24) and (33) respectively. In Fig.3 we have plotted the quantity of Eq.(35), with $\varphi = 1/2$, versus the number n of bits stolen by Eve without being outwitted for different alphabet's dimension. We notice that such a probability asymptotically goes to zero and that happens as faster as the alphabet's dimension increases.

In conclusion, we believe that this work opens up new horizons for deterministic cryptographic protocols till now based on qubit [3] and continuous variable [7] systems. In a future perspective a deeper study of the security would involve more general attacks and d -ary alphabets with non prime dimensions.

Acknowledgments

We warmly thank C. Toffalori for illuminating discussions and a careful reading of the ms. A.E. would also like to thank M. Lucamarini for useful comments and R. Piergallini for encouragement.

[1] Physics World (March 1998).

[2] C. H. Bennett and G. Brassard, Proc. of IEEE Int. Conf, on Computers, Systems and Signal Processing, Bangalore, India (IEEE, New York, 1984).




FIG. 3: Eavesdropping success probability as a function of the maximal eavesdropped information, plotted for different dimensions. From top to bottom $d = 2$, $d = 3$, $d = 5$, $d = 7$, $d = 11$, ...

- [3] M. Lucamarini and S. Mancini, Phys. Rev. Lett. **94**, 140501 (2005).
- [4] H. Bechmann-Pasquinucci and W. Tittel, Phys. Rev. A **61**, 062308 (2000).
- [5] N. Cerf, M. Bourennane, A. Karlson and N. Gisin, arXiv:quant-ph/0107130.
- [6] J. S. Shaari, M. Lucamarini and M. R. B. Wahiddin, Phys. Lett. A **358**, 85 (2006); J. S. Shaari and M. R. B. Wahiddin, Phys. Lett. A **361**, 445 (2007).
- [7] S. Pirandola, S. Mancini, S. Braunstein and S. Lloyd, arXiv:quant-ph/0611167.
- [8] I. D. Ivanovic, J. Phys. A **14**, 3241 (1981).
- [9] S. Bandyopadhyay, P. Oscar Boykin, V. Roychowdhuri and F. Vatan, Algorithmica **34**, 512 (2002).
- [10] J. S. Shaari, S. Mancini and M. R. B. Wahiddin, Phys. Lett. A (2007), doi:10.1016/j.physleta.2007.08.076; arXiv:quant-ph/0701055.
- [11] I. Csiszár and J. Körner, IEEE Trans. Inf. Th. **24**, 339 (1978).
- [12] Throughout the paper log is intended as logarithm on base 2.