

Optimal ratio between phase basis and bit basis in QKD

Masahito Hayashi^{1,*}

¹*Graduate School of Information Sciences, Tohoku University, Aoba-ku, Sendai, 980-8579, Japan*

In the original BB84 protocol, we use the bit basis and the phase basis with the equal probability. Lo et al (J. of Cryptology, 18, 133-165 (2005)) proposed to modify the ratio between two bases for increasing the final key generation rate in the asymptotic setting. In the present letter, in order to treat this problem the non-asymptotic setting, we optimize the ratio between the two bases with exponential constraints for Eve's information distinguishability and the final error probability.

Bennett & Brassard [1] proposed BB84 protocol for quantum key distribution. It was shown that this protocol provides the generation of secret random bits between two distinct parties even though the quantum channel has noise [2, 3]. After the security proof, many researches [4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13] improved the key generation rate. However, it is possible to improve the key generation rate by modifying the ratio between the bit(+) basis and the phase(\times) basis. In the original BB84 protocol, the sender Alice and the receiver Bob chosen the + basis and the \times basis with the equal probability. The equal ratio is not essential because the purpose of random choice of basis is estimating the phase error rate in the channel of the qubits in the coincidence basis. That is, in order to generate the secure keys from raw keys with the + basis, it is sufficient to estimate the + error rate precisely. The aim of the present letter is improving the key generation rate by modifying the ratio between two bases.

For example, the following protocol improves the key generation rate. When Alice and Bob communicate N qubits, Alice and Bob use the \times basis only in the randomly chosen \sqrt{N} qubits and use the bit basis in the remaining $N - \sqrt{N}$ qubits. In the above protocol, when the length of the code N is sufficiently large, Alice and Bob can estimate the phase error rate precisely, and the rate of discarded qubits approaches zero. That is, it is possible that the generation rate of the raw keys with transmitted qubits is almost 100 % [14]. Unfortunately, since the real key distillation protocol has a finite-length code, it is impossible to generate the raw keys with the ratio 100%. Hence, it is required to choose the ratio maximizing the final key generation rate. As one possible formulation, one may consider the optimization of the final key generation rate with a constant constraint for Eve's information in the finite length code. However, as is discussed by Hayashi [15] and Scarani and Renner [16], the formula of finite length code is not simple. Further, its analysis depends on the length of the code.

In the present paper, we focus on the exponential constraint as an intermediate criterion between the finite-length case and the infinite-length case. Exponential rate is a common measure in information theory [17], and was discussed in QKD by several papers [15, 18, 19]. That is, we consider exponential constraints for the block error probability for final keys and for Eve's information distinguishability for final keys [20].

In this paper, we assume the key distillation protocol given by Hayashi [15, 21]. In our key distillation protocol, we first perform a classical error correction. Second, we perform the privacy amplification by using Teoplitz matrix, which is an economical random matrix [22, 23]. Hence, Eve's information distinguishability can be characterized by the phase error probability of the corresponding CSS code.

For simple analysis, we assume the single photon source and the lossless quantum channel. Further, as an ideal assumption, in the classical error correction part, the random coding and the maximum likelihood decoding are assumed. Practically, LDPC code is used for real code of classical error correction part [24], but, its error probability approaches zero only with the polynomial speed [25]. Thus, we assume the ideal classical error correction with the random coding.

[Result]

In the present paper, we focus on the asymmetric protocol, in which, Alice and Bob use the \times basis with the ratio p_2 , and they announce the check bits, which are randomly chosen with the ratio p_1 among the bits whose Alice's basis and Bob's basis are the + basis. (As shown later, the optimal case is given when the ratio of \times basis by Alice is equal with that by Bob.) The performance of the protocol is characterized by the final error probability of classical error correction and Eve's information distinguishability. The latter is equal to the value $\|\rho_{AE} - \rho_A \otimes \rho_E\|_1$ for Eve's final state ρ_E , Alice's final state ρ_A , and the final state ρ_{AE} on the joint system in the final keys.

Both quantities depend on the number N of transmitted qubits, the observed error rates q_+ of + basis, and the observed error rates q_\times of \times basis. However, the both quantities cannot be determined by the above values because these depends on Eve's attack. Hence, we have only both upper bounds, i.e., the upper bound $B_b(N, p_1, p_2, q_+)$ of the final error probability and the upper bound $B_p(N, p_1, p_2, q_\times)$ of Eve's information distinguishability [15, 21], which do not depend on Eve's attack. For a given constant C , we consider the

following exponential constraint:

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{-1}{N} \log B_b(N, p_1, p_2, q_+) \geq C \quad (1)$$

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{-1}{N} \log B_p(N, p_1, p_2, q_\times) \geq C. \quad (2)$$

Then, the main target is the calculation of the rates p_1 and p_2 optimizing the final key generation rate $R_A(p_1, p_2, q_+, q_\times, C)$ under the conditions (1) and (2), when $q := q_+ = q_\times$.

In the present paper, we numerically calculate them with the logarithm basis 2 when $C = 0.0001$. For example, when $N = 100,000$, $2^{-CN} = 2^{-10}$. However, since the value $B_p(N, p_1, p_2, q_\times)$ has some polynomial factor, it is greater than 2^{-10} .

Next, we consider the symmetric protocol, in which \times basis is chosen with the same ratio with the $+$ basis in both sides. In this case, we can control only the ratio p_1 of check bits. The original BB84 protocol is given by this case with $p_1 = 1/2$. Then, we numerically calculate the the rate p_1 optimizing the final key generation rate $R_S(p_1, q_+, q_\times, C)$ under the conditions (1) and (2), when $q := q_+ = q_\times$. Then, we obtain the following graph (Fig. 1) concerning $\max_{0 \leq p_1, p_2 \leq 1/2} R_A(p_1, p_2, q, q, 0.0001)$ and $\max_{0 \leq p_1 \leq 1/2} R_S(p_1, q, q, 0.0001)$.




FIG. 1: Asymptotic key generation rate: The upper is $\max R_A$, and the lower is $\max R_S$.

We also obtain the following graph (Fig. 2) concerning $\arg\max_{0 \leq p_1 \leq 1/2} \max_{0 \leq p_2 \leq 1/2} R_A(p_1, p_2, q, q, 0.0001)$ and $\arg\max_{0 \leq p_1 \leq 1/2} R_S(p_1, q, q, 0.0001)$.

The following graph (Fig. 3) describes $\arg\max_{0 \leq p_2 \leq 1/2} \max_{0 \leq p_1 \leq 1/2} R_A(p_1, p_2, q, q, 0.0001)$.

[Derivation]

In the single photon case, we treat the derivation of the above graph using the type method. In the present paper, we consider the security based on the key distillation protocol given in Hayashi[15], in which after the generation of raw keys, classical error correction is performed using pseudo-classical noisy channel and random




FIG. 2: Optimal rate of choice of check bits: The upper is $\arg\max R_S$, and the lower is $\arg\max R_A$.




FIG. 3: Optimal rate of choice of \times basis

privacy amplification is applied by using Toeplitz matrix. In the following, similar to Hayashi [15], we focus on the discrete-twirled channel, and discuss the phase error rate and bit error rate of this channel corresponding to raw keys.

In this case, we focus on the probability that the estimate of the phase error rate is q_\times and the phase error rate among raw keys is q'_\times . As discussed in Hayashi[15], this probability can be evaluated by hypergeometric distribution, i.e., is bounded by $\left(\binom{Np_2^2}{Np_2^2q_\times} \binom{N(1-p_2)^2(1-p_1)}{N(1-p_2)^2(1-p_1)q'_\times} \right) / \left(\binom{N(p_2^2+(1-p_2)^2(1-p_1))}{Np_2^2q_\times + N(1-p_2)^2(1-p_1)q'_\times} \right)$, where N is the total number of transmitted qubits. Since $\frac{1}{n+1} 2^{nh(k/n)} \leq \binom{n}{k} \leq 2^{nh(k/n)}$, this probability is bounded by $\left(\binom{Np_2^2}{Np_2^2q_\times} \binom{N(1-p_2)^2(1-p_1)}{N(1-p_2)^2(1-p_1)q'_\times} \right) / \left(\binom{N(p_2^2+(1-p_2)^2(1-p_1))}{Np_2^2q_\times + N(1-p_2)^2(1-p_1)q'_\times} \right) \leq \epsilon_p(q'_\times) := \frac{2^{-ND_p(p_1, p_2, q_\times, q'_\times)}}{N(p_2^2+(1-p_2)^2(1-p_1))+1}$, where the exponential

decreasing rate is given by

$$\begin{aligned} & D_p(p_1, p_2, q_\times, q'_\times) \\ & := (p_2^2 + (1-p_2)^2(1-p_1))h\left(\frac{p_2^2 q_\times + (1-p_2)^2(1-p_1)q'_\times}{p_2^2 + (1-p_2)^2(1-p_1)}\right) \\ & \quad - p_2^2 h(q_\times) - (1-p_2)^2(1-p_1)h(q'_\times). \end{aligned}$$

When the phase error rate among raw keys is q'_\times , the random privacy amplification with the sacrificed bit rate S_2 reduces the block error probability of final keys in the \times basis to $\delta_p(q'_\times) := 2^{-N[S_2 - (1-p_2)^2(1-p_1)h(q'_\times)]_+}$ [15], where $[x]_+$ is x for a positive number x while $[x]_+$ is zero for a negative number x . Since q'_\times takes the values in $\{0, 1/N, 2/N, \dots, 1\}$, the (block) error probability of the final keys in the \times basis is upperly bounded by $B_p(N, p_1, p_2, q_\times) := \sum_{k=0}^N \epsilon_p(\frac{k}{N})\delta_p(\frac{k}{N})$. Hence, applying the type method to the parameter q'_\times [26], we obtain its exponential decreasing rate (See Hayashi[15]):

$$\begin{aligned} & \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{-1}{N} \log B_p(N, p_1, p_2, q_\times) \\ & = \min_{0 \leq q'_\times \leq 1/2} \left([S_2 - (1-p_2)^2(1-p_1)h(q'_\times)]_+ \right. \\ & \quad \left. + D_p(p_1, p_2, q_\times, q'_\times) \right). \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

In the following, we denote the value S_2 satisfying (3) = C by $S_2(p_1, p_2, q_\times, C)$.

In fact, Eve's Holevo information χ_E and Eve's distinguishability $\|\rho_{A,E} - \rho_A \otimes \rho_E\|_1$ are characterized by [15, 21]

$$\begin{aligned} E\chi_E & \leq (-\log B_p(N, p_1, p_2, q_\times) + M) \cdot B_p(N, p_1, p_2, q_\times) \\ E\|\rho_{A,E} - \rho_A \otimes \rho_E\|_1 & \leq E \max_X \|\rho_{E,X} - \rho_E\|_1 \\ & \leq B_p(N, p_1, p_2, q_\times), \end{aligned}$$

where E denotes the average concerning the random privacy amplification, M denotes the length of the final keys, $\rho_{E,X}$ is the Eve's state when the final key is X . Hence, $B_p(N, p_1, p_2, q_\times)$ can be regarded as an upper bound of Eve's distinguishability. Hence, the quantity $S_2(p_1, p_2, q_\times, C)$ is the minimum sacrificed bit rate in the random privacy under the condition that the exponential decreasing rate of the upper bound of Eve's distinguishability is greater than C .

Here, we discuss why we do not choose the rate $p_{2,A}$ of \times basis of Alice to be different from the rate $p_{2,B}$ of \times basis of Bob. If we choose the different rates, the performance is characterized by the coincidence probability in $+$ basis $(1-p_{2,A})(1-p_{2,B}) = 1 + p_{2,A}p_{2,B} - 2(p_{2,A} + p_{2,B})$ and the coincidence probability in \times basis $p_{2,A}p_{2,B}$. Hence, it is sufficient to maximize the the coincidence probability in $+$ basis $(1-p_{2,A})(1-p_{2,B}) = 1 + p_{2,A}p_{2,B} - 2(p_{2,A} + p_{2,B})$ with the condition that the coincidence probability in \times basis $p_{2,A}p_{2,B}$ is equal to an arbitrary constant P . This maximum value is given when

$p_{2,A} = p_{2,B} = \sqrt{P}$. Thus, it is suitable to consider only the case of $p_{2,A} = p_{2,B}$.

In order to express the rate of sacrificed bits $S_2(p_1, p_2, q_\times, C)$ as a function of the constraint C , we introduce two quantities $q'_{\times,1}$ and $q'_{\times,2}$ as the solutions of the following in the range $[0, 1/2]$:

$$\begin{aligned} D_p(p_1, p_2, q_\times, q'_{\times,1}) & = C \\ \frac{p_2^2 q_\times + (1-p_2)^2(1-p_1)q'_{\times,2}}{p_2^2(1-q_\times) + (1-p_2)^2(1-p_1)(1-q'_{\times,2})} & = \left(\frac{q'_{\times,2}}{1-q'_{\times,2}}\right)^2. \end{aligned}$$

Then, the rate of sacrificed bits $S_2(p_1, p_2, q_\times, C)$ is given as follows.

$$S_2(p_1, p_2, q_\times, C) = (1-p_2)^2(1-p_1)h(q'_{\times,1})$$

when $q'_{\times,1} \leq q'_{\times,2}$. Otherwise,

$$S_2(p_1, p_2, q_\times, C) = D_p(p_1, p_2, q_\times, q'_{\times,2}) + C.$$

Next, we consider the (block) error probability of the final keys in the case when Gallager random coding and maximum likelihood decoding are applied[17]. When the bit error rate of the raw keys is q'_+ and the rate of sacrificed bits in classical error correction is S_1 , the final error probability is upperly bounded by $\epsilon_b(q'_+) := 2^{-N[S_1 - (1-p_2)^2(1-p_1)h(q'_+)]_+}$. We focus on the probability that the estimate of the bit error rate is q_+ and the phase error bit among raw keys is q'_+ . Similar to the case of bit error rate, by using the hypergeometric distribution, this probability is upperly bounded by $\delta_b(q'_+) := \frac{2^{-N D_b(p_1, p_2, q_+, q'_+)}}{N(1-p_2)^2 + 1}$, where the exponential decreasing rate is given by

$$\begin{aligned} & D_b(p_1, p_2, q_+, q'_+) \\ & := (1-p_2)^2 \left(h(p_1 q_+ + (1-p_1)q'_+) - p_1 h(q_+) \right. \\ & \quad \left. - (1-p_1)h(q'_+) \right). \end{aligned}$$

Thus, the (block) error probability of the final keys in the $+$ basis is upperly bounded by $B_b(N, p_1, p_2, q_+) := \sum_{k=0}^N \epsilon_b(\frac{k}{N})\delta_b(\frac{k}{N})$. Applying the type method to the parameter q'_+ [26], we obtain its exponential decreasing rate:

$$\begin{aligned} & \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{-1}{N} \log B_b(N, p_1, p_2, q_+) \\ & = \min_{0 \leq q'_+ \leq 1/2} D_b(p_1, p_2, q_+, q'_+) \\ & \quad + [S_1 - (1-p_2)^2(1-p_1)h(q'_+)]_+. \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

In the following, $S_1(p_1, p_2, q_+, C)$ presents the solution S_1 of (4) = C . Thus, the quantity $S_1(p_1, p_2, q_+, C)$ is the minimum sacrificed bit rate in the classical error correction under the condition that the exponential decreasing rate of the upper bound of error probability of the final keys is greater than C .

Similar to $S_2(p_1, p_2, q_\times, C)$, in order to express the rate of sacrificed bits $S_1(p_1, p_2, q_\times, C)$ as a function of the constraint C , we introduce two quantities $q'_{+,1}$ and $q'_{+,2}$ as the solutions of the following in the range $[0, 1/2]$:

$$D_b(p_1, p_2, q_+, q'_{+,1}) = C$$

$$\frac{p_1 q_+ + (1 - p_1) q'_{+,2}}{p_1(1 - q_+) + (1 - p_1)(1 - q'_{+,2})} = \left(\frac{q'_{+,2}}{1 - q'_{+,2}}\right)^2.$$

Therefore, $S_1(p_1, p_2, q_\times, C)$ is given as a function of the constraint C as follows. When $q'_{+,1} \leq q'_{+,2}$,

$$S_1(p_1, p_2, q_+, C) = (1 - p_2)^2(1 - p_1)h(q'_{+,1}).$$

Otherwise,

$$S_1(p_1, p_2, q_+, C) = D_b(p_1, p_2, q_+, q'_{+,2}) + C.$$

Hence, the final key generation rate $R_A(p_1, p_2, q_+, q_\times, C)$ is given by

$$R_A(p_1, p_2, q_+, q_\times, C) = (1 - p_2)^2(1 - p_1) - S_1(p_1, p_2, q_+, C) - S_2(p_1, p_2, q_\times, C).$$

Next, we consider the final key generation rate $R_S(p_1, q_+, q_\times, C)$ in the symmetric case. In this case, the exponential decreasing rate of the final error probability is given by substituting $1/2$ into p_2 in the formula $S_1(p_1, p_2, q_+, C)$. The exponential decreasing rate of Eve's distinguishability is given by substituting $1/2$ into p_2 in the formula $S_1(p_1, p_2, q_\times, C)$. Hence, $R_S(p_1, q_+, q_\times, C)$ is calculated by

$$R_S(p_1, q_+, q_\times, C) = \frac{1 - p_1}{4} - S_1(p_1, 1/2, q_+, E) - S_1(p_1, 1/2, q_\times, C).$$

Therefore, applying the numerical analysis to these formulas, we obtain Figs. 1, 2, and 3.

[Discussion]

We have shown that the asymmetric protocol extensively improves the symmetric protocol with the exponential constraint. This result expresses the importance of the choice of the ratio between two bases in the design of the QKD system. We can expect a similar result in the decoy method [27, 28, 29, 30]. It is a future topic to investigate the same problem in the finite-length framework with the decoy method [31]. In addition, through the discussion in this letter, it has been clarified that the exponential rate is a useful criterion for the case of the limited coding length. It is interesting to apply this criteria to other topics in QKD.

[Acknowledgement]

This research was partially supported by the SCOPE project of the MIC of Japan and a Grant-in-Aid for Scientific Research on Priority Area eDeepening and Expansion of Statistical Mechanical Informatics (DEX-SMI)f, no. 18079014.

* Electronic address: hayashi@math.is.tohoku.ac.jp

- [1] C. H. Bennett and G. Brassard, in *Proceedings of IEEE International Conference on Computers, Systems, and Signal Processing, Bangalore, India, 1984* (IEEE, New York, 1984), p. 175.
- [2] D. Mayers, "Quantum key distribution and string oblivious transfer in noisy channels," In *Advances in Cryptology - Proc. Crypto'96, Vol. 1109 of Lecture Notes in Computer Science* (Ed. N. Kobitz, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1996) 343; *J. Assoc. Comput. Mach.* 48 (2001) 351.
- [3] P. W. Shor and J. Preskill, "Simple Proof of Security of the BB84 Quantum Key Distribution Protocol," *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **85**, 441 (2000).
- [4] R. Renner, N. Gisin, and B. Kraus, "An information-theoretic security proof for QKD protocols," *Phys. Rev. A* **72**, 012332 (2005).
- [5] G. Smith, J. M. Renes, and J. A. Smolin, "Structured Codes Improve the Bennett-Brassard-84 Quantum Key Rate," *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **100**, 170502 (2008).
- [6] H. F. Chau, *Phys. Rev. A*, **66**, 060302(R) (2002).
- [7] J. Bae and A. Acín, "Key distillation from quantum channels using two-way communication protocols," *Phys. Rev. A*, **75**, 012334 (2007).
- [8] S. Watanabe, R. Matsumoto, T. Uyematsu, and Y. Kawano, "Key rate of quantum key distribution with hashed two-way classical communication," *Phys. Rev. A*, **76**, 032312 (2007).
- [9] R. Renner, Ph.D thesis, Dipl. Phys. ETH, Switzerland (2005), arXiv:quant-ph/0512258.
- [10] D. Gottesman and H.-K. Lo, *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, **49**, 457, (2003).
- [11] X. B. Wang, "Quantum Key Distribution with Two-Qubit Quantum Codes," *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, **92**, 077902 (2004).
- [12] X. B. Wang, "Quantum Key Distribution: Security, Feasibility and Robustness," in *Quantum Computation and Information - From Theory To Experiment -*, H. Imai and M. Hayashi, eds, (Springer, Berlin, 2006), pp. 185–233.
- [13] S. Watanabe, R. Matsumoto, and T. Uyematsu, "Tomography increases key rates of quantum key distribution protocols," arXiv:0802.2419.
- [14] H.-K. Lo, H. F. Chau, and M. Ardehali, "Efficient Quantum Key Distribution Scheme And Proof of Its Unconditional Security," *J. of Cryptology*, **18**, Number 2, 133-165 (2005).
- [15] M. Hayashi, "Practical Evaluation of Security for Quantum Key Distribution," *Phys. Rev. A*, **74**, 022307 (2006).
- [16] V. Scarani and R. Renner, "Quantum Cryptography with Finite Resources," arXiv:0708.0709.
- [17] R. G. Gallager, *Information Theory and Reliable Communication*, John Wiley & Sons, 1968.
- [18] M. Hamada, "Reliability of Calderbank-Shor-Steane codes and security of quantum key distribution," *J. Phys. A: Math. Gen.*, **37**, 8303-8328 (2004).
- [19] S. Watanabe, R. Matsumoto, and T. Uyematsu, "Noise Tolerance of the BB84 Protocol with Random Privacy Amplification," *International Journal of Quantum Information*, vol. 4, no. 6, pp. 935-946 (2006).
- [20] M. Ben-Or, M. Horodecki, D. W. Leung, D. Mayers, and J. Oppenheim, "The Universal Composable Security of Quantum Key Distribution," *Theory of Cryptology*

- tography: *Second Theory of Cryptography Conference, TCC 2005*, J. Kilian (ed.) Springer Verlag 2005, vol. 3378 of Lecture Notes in Computer Science, pp. 386-406; quant-ph/0409078.
- [21] M. Hayashi, "Upper bounds of eavesdropper's performances in finite-length code with the decoy method," *Phys. Rev. A*, **76**, 012329 (2007).
- [22] L. Carter and M. Wegman, "Universal classes of hash functions," *Journal of Computer and System Sciences*, **18**, pp. 143-154 (1979).
- [23] H. Krawczyk, "LFSR-based hashing and authentication," *Advances in Cryptology — CRYPTO '94. Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, vol. 839, Springer-Verlag, pp 129-139, 1994.
- [24] J. Hasegawa, M. Hayashi, T. Hiroshima, and A. Tomita, "Experimental Decoy State Quantum Key Distribution with Unconditional Security Incorporating Finite Statistics," arXiv:0705.3081
- [25] G. Miller and D. Burshtein, "Bounds on the maximum-likelihood decoding error probability of low-density parity-check codes," *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, **47**, 2696-2710, (2001).
- [26] I. Csiszár and J. Körner, *Information Theory: Coding Theorems for Discrete Memoryless Systems*, (Academic Press, 1981).
- [27] W.-Y. Hwang, "Quantum Key Distribution with High Loss: Toward Global Secure Communication," *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, **91**, 057901 (2003).
- [28] X.-B. Wang, "Beating the PNS attack in practical quantum cryptography," *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, **94**, 230503 (2005).
- [29] H.-K. Lo, X.-F. Ma, and K. Chen, "Decoy State Quantum Key Distribution," *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, **94**, 230504, (2005).
- [30] M. Hayashi, "General theory for decoy-state quantum key distribution with an arbitrary number of intensities," *New J. Phys.*, **9** 284 (2007).
- [31] J. Hasegawa, M. Hayashi, T. Hiroshima, and A. Tomita, "Security analysis of decoy state quantum key distribution incorporating finite statistics," arXiv:0707.3541.