

# Unconditionally Security of Single Photon Differential Phase Shift Quantum Key Distribution

Kai Wen<sup>1</sup>, Kiyoshi Tamaki<sup>2,3</sup>, and Yoshihisa Yamamoto<sup>1,4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *Edward L. Ginzton Laboratory, Stanford University, Stanford, California 94305, USA*

<sup>2</sup> *NTT Basic Research Laboratories, NTT Corporation,*

*3-1 Morinosato Wakamiya Atsugi-Shi, Kanagawa, 243-0198, Japan*

<sup>3</sup> *CREST, JST Agency, 4-1-8 Honcho, Kawaguchi, Saitama, 332-0012, Japan*

<sup>4</sup> *National Institute of Informatics, 2-1-2 Hitotsubashi, Chiyoda-ku, Tokyo, 101-843, Japan*

(Dated: March 16, 2019)

In this Letter, we prove the unconditional security of single photon differential phase shift quantum key distribution (DPS-QKD) protocol. We group  $n$  consecutive pulses into one block and discard bit stemming from boundaries among blocks. The security proof of DPS-QKD is based on the conversion to an equivalent entanglement-based protocol. We show that Alice and Bob can estimate the maximal phase error rate from the bit error rate in the entanglement-based protocol. Our result shows that DPS-QKD can generate unconditionally secure key when the bit error rate is not greater than 4.12%.

PACS numbers: 03.67.Dd, 03.67.Hk

Quantum key distribution(QKD) protocols are one of the most important discovery and application of quantum information theory. It allows two separated parties, namely, Alice and Bob, to establish a secret key. By properly encoding the key into qubits, any kind of eavesdropping inevitably introduces errors that may be discovered by Alice and Bob. However, the unconditionally secure QKD through noisy channel is not so obvious and requires more insights. The first QKD protocol, named BB84 protocol, proposed by Bennett and Brassard in 1984[1], has been proved to be unconditionally secure[2, 3]. Especially, Shor and Preskill proposed a simple way with entanglement purification protocol to prove the security[3].

In 2002, Inoue et al. proposed the differential phase shift quantum key distribution (DPS-QKD) protocol[4, 5], where Alice encodes the key bits by preparing the relative phase shift between two consecutive pulses in 0 or  $\pi$  and Bob employs a one-bit delay Mach-Zehnder (M-Z) interferometer to retrieve the key from the differential phase shift. If Eve wants to measure the phase shift of the two consecutive pulses, she will inevitably introduce errors to its neighbor phase shifts. E. Waks et al. have proved that DPS-QKD is secure against general attack for individual photons[6]. Several experiments have been conducted based on this criterion[7, 8]. But general attack for individual photons is only a limited subset of all possible attacks; more effective attacks called sequential attacks have been recently proposed[9].

In this Letter, we present the proof of the unconditional security of DPS-QKD with single photon source against the most general attacks. We start with an entanglement-based DPS-QKD that can be equivalently converted to the prepare-and-measure DPS-QKD[3], where Alice only prepares single photons and Bob measures them immediately after receiving them. We then prove that the entanglement-based DPS-QKD is unconditional secure. Thanks to the equivalence, we

can apply the results to the prepare-and-measure DPS-QKD.

As the first step, we define the encoded states in the prepare-and-measure DPS-QKD, which are then generalized to the entanglement-based DPS-QKD. With the single photon source, Alice splits the single photon wavepacket into  $n$  pulses with identical amplitude to form a block. Particularly, the state before encoding the secret key is  $|\phi_0\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{k=1}^n a_k^\dagger |\text{vac}\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{k=1}^n |D_k\rangle$ , where  $a_k^\dagger$  is the creation operator of the pulse in the  $k$ -th slot and  $|D_k\rangle = a_k^\dagger |\text{vac}\rangle$ .

Then following the proposal of DPS-QKD, Alice encodes an  $(n-1)$ -bit random secret key into this block. Specifically, for an  $(n-1)$ -bit random integer  $j$  and its binary format  $j_1 j_2 \cdots j_{n-1}$ , the encoded state of the block of a single photon is,  $|\phi_j\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \left[ |D_1\rangle + \sum_{k=2}^n (-1)^{j'_{k-1}} |D_k\rangle \right]$ , where  $j'_k = \sum_{l=1}^k j_l$ .

Given the encoding scheme of the prepare-and-measure DPS-QKD, we can build the corresponding states in the entanglement-based protocol. For each encoding block Alice creates additional  $(n-1)$  qubits which may be stored perfectly in her own quantum memory all through the protocol. These additional qubits are entangled with the single photon in the corresponding block, in the following form:

$$|\phi\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2^{n-1}}} \sum_{j=0}^{2^{n-1}-1} [ (|j_1\rangle_{A_1} \cdots |j_{n-1}\rangle_{A_{n-1}}) \otimes |\phi_j\rangle_B ], \quad (1)$$

in which the states labeled with  $A_1, \cdots, A_{n-1}$  are the additional qubits kept in Alice's side. The state labeled with  $B$  is the single photon state that will be sent to Bob after Alice prepares this entangled state.

When Bob receives the single photons sent by Alice, he should let them go through several steps before he obtains the key. He first applies quantum non-demolition(QND)




FIG. 1: The process of the unbalanced M-Z interferometer

measurement to determine the number of incoming photons in a block, because the following entanglement purification protocol requires a well-defined single photon state in his side. If he receives a multi-photon state, he discards this block. Otherwise, this single photon should go through the unbalanced M-Z interferometer, shown in Fig. 1. With proper design, an incoming photon state in the  $k$ -th time slot described by the creation operator  $a_k^\dagger$ , is split into four different photon states in two output ports and two consecutive time slots. Particular, we obtain  $a_k^\dagger \Rightarrow \frac{1}{2}(u_k^\dagger + iv_k^\dagger + u_{k+1}^\dagger - iv_{k+1}^\dagger)$ , where  $u_k^\dagger$  and  $v_k^\dagger$  are the creation operators of the pulses of the time slot  $k$  in two output ports. For convenience, we let Bob apply a  $\pi/2$  phase rotation on each pulse in the bottom output port of M-Z interferometer and the results remain the same. So we derive the operation of the interferometer on each pulse  $|D_k\rangle$  of a single photon as

$$M_{DPS}|D_k\rangle = \frac{1}{2}(|U_k\rangle - |V_k\rangle + |U_{k+1}\rangle + |V_{k+1}\rangle), \quad (2)$$

where  $|U_k\rangle = u_k^\dagger|\text{vac}\rangle$  and  $|V_k\rangle = v_k^\dagger|\text{vac}\rangle$ .

After the interferometer, Bob further applies a hypothetical filtering operation in the entanglement-based protocol, in order to project the single photon into a two-level state that is also required for our entanglement purification protocol. The filter operation is described by the Kraus operators  $F = \{F_1, F_2, \dots, F_n\}$ , in which

$$F_l = |U_l\rangle\langle U_l| + |V_l\rangle\langle V_l|, \text{ for } l = 2, \dots, n; \quad (3)$$

$$F_1 = I - \sum_{l=2}^n F_l, \quad (4)$$

and  $I$  is the identity matrix, namely,  $I = \sum_{l=1}^{n+1} |U_l\rangle\langle U_l| + |V_l\rangle\langle V_l|$ . Then Bob publicly announces which time slot the photon is projected to. They will discard the inconclusive blocks where Bob's projection obtains  $F_1$ . With the projection to a certain time slot  $l$ , the photon is in a well-defined qubit state. Particularly, we can define the  $Z$ -basis of the photon as  $\{|U_l\rangle, |V_l\rangle\}$ , representing whether it travels along the top or bottom output port

of the output of the interferometer. The Pauli operators are well-defined, namely,  $Z_l = |U_l\rangle\langle U_l| - |V_l\rangle\langle V_l|$  and  $X_l = |U_l\rangle\langle V_l| + |V_l\rangle\langle U_l|$ .

Finally, Alice and Bob should tackle the eavesdropping and the channel errors. On the one hand, when the channel is ideal and no eavesdropping exists, it is easy to show that Alice and Bob indeed obtain a pure and maximal entangled pair from each projected qubit. Particularly, Alice discards all the qubits in her side with the label other than  $l-1$ , in which  $l$  is the projection result of Bob. Mathematically, it is equivalent to partially tracing these qubits in the state of Eq. (1). Combining with Bob's filter projection, Alice and Bob shares the Bell state, namely,  $|\Phi^+\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|0\rangle_{A_{l-1}} \otimes |U_l\rangle_B + |1\rangle_{A_{l-1}} \otimes |V_l\rangle_B)$ .

On the other hand, if the channel is noisy or there is eavesdropping, Alice can still keep only the  $(l-1)$ -th qubit and discard all other qubits, so that Alice and Bob share a corrupted two-qubit state. Alice and Bob employ an appropriate entanglement purification protocol based on Calderbank-Shor-Steane(CSS) code[11], to distill the Bell state. If the entanglement purification protocol succeeds, the resulting smaller set of states shared by Alice and Bob will have very high fidelity. Using the argument that high fidelity implies low entropy[10] or composability argument[12], Alice and Bob can generate unconditionally secure key by measuring the distilled states in their own  $Z$ -basis respectively.

Therefore, the key to unconditional security proof is whether they can estimate the bit error rate and the phase error rate so as to choose an appropriate CSS code in the entanglement purification protocol. As for the bit errors, Alice and Bob can estimate them by the test bits. Suppose that if they can estimate the maximal phase error rate from the bit error rate, the entanglement-based DPS-QKD is unconditionally secure.

Before proving that Alice and Bob can estimate the maximal phase error rate, we convert the entanglement-based DPS-QKD to the prepare-and-measure DPS-QKD with single photon source. We employ the idea of Shor and Preskill[3] for the conversion.

First, note that thanks to the property of CSS code, the phase error and bit error can be corrected independently. Also note that Bob measures the photons in the  $Z$ -basis after the decoding. It implies that even if we skip the phase error correction, Bob can still generate the same key. Thus, assuming the proper estimation of the phase error rate, without loss of any generalities we can skip the phase error detection and correction step, leaving Alice and Bob only the measurements along  $Z$ -basis. Now, Alice is allowed to perform  $Z$ -basis measurement immediately after preparing the entangled state; hence she can encode random information in a single-photon. This is what exactly Alice does in the prepare-and-measure DPS. On the other hand, Bob can also forward his  $Z$ -basis measurements to the step immediately after the filter operations. The filter operations can also be skipped because they commute with the  $Z$ -basis measurements.

Moreover, Bob can loosen the requirement of the QND measurement before the unbalanced M-Z interferometer, by assuming the photon number resolving (PNR) detectors which are capable of discriminating vacuum, single photon and multi photon states. In particular, the QND measurement commutes with all other operations in Bob's side. However, when putting the QND measurement after the interferometer, we should make sure that the total photon number from the two outputs is not greater than 1. This task can be done by using two PNR detectors, and Bob only accepts the cases when only one detector obtains a single photon state and the other one obtains a vacuum state in one block. This ends the conversion of entanglement-based QKD to prepare-and-measure DPS-QKD.

Since the prepare-and-measure DPS-QKD is equivalent to the entanglement-based DPS-QKD, the only task left is to show that Alice and Bob can estimate the maximal phase error rate of the entanglement-based QKD only from the observed quantities in the prepare-and-measure QKD. For the estimation, we appeal to Azuma's inequality [13, 14]. Particularly, as the filter operation on Bob's side also has random outcomes, for each conclusive time slot  $l$ , we can consider a set of random but dependent events when Bob projects the photon state in the  $k$ -th block onto the  $l$ -th time slot and then obtains a bit error on that block. Let  $\{p_{b,l}^{(k)}\}_{k=1,\dots,N}$  denote the set of probabilities of this bit error event sequence, where  $p_{b,l}^{(k)}$  may depend on the results of all previous  $k-1$  events. Moreover, we define  $e_{b,l}$  as the bit error rate on the  $l$ -th time slot, which is the number of bit errors on this time slot over  $N$ . Similarly, we can define the sequence  $\{p_{p,l}^{(k)}\}_{k=1,\dots,N}$  and  $e_{p,l}$  for the phase errors in the  $l$ -th time slot. Azuma's inequality states that  $\Pr \left[ \left| e_{A,l} - \frac{\sum_{k=1}^N p_{A,l}^{(k)}}{N} \right| \geq \epsilon \right] \leq 2e^{-N\epsilon^2/2}$ , for arbitrary positive number  $\epsilon$ , both  $A \in \{b, p\}$ , and all conclusive time slot  $l$ . Therefore, if we can find the relation,

$$\sum_{l=2}^n p_{p,l}^{(k)} \leq \sum_{l=2}^n C_l p_{b,l}^{(k)} \quad (5)$$

for certain  $C_2, \dots, C_n$ , the total phase error rate  $e_p = \sum_{l=2}^n e_{p,l}$  can be bound by the same relation, namely,  $e_p \leq \sum_{l=2}^n C_l e_{b,l}$ . On the other hand, the random sampling theory states that  $e_{b,l}$  is close to the measured bit error rate on the test bits with an exponentially small parameter [10].

In order to obtain the relation of Eq. (5), for all kinds of events on the  $k$ -th block, note that for Eve's most general attack can be described by an arbitrary  $(n \times n)$ -dimension matrix,  $E^{(k)}$ , acting on the single photon state [14]. This description corresponds to a general eavesdropping superoperator on the  $k$ -th block satisfying  $\sum_i \hat{E}_i^{(k)\dagger} \hat{E}_i^{(k)} \leq \mathbf{1}$ . The linearity of the superoperator lets us only use one component of the POVM, denoted by  $E^{(k)}$ . Note that  $E^{(k)}$  may depend on the measurement outcome of previous  $(k-1)$  blocks.

Given  $E^{(k)} = (a_{ij})$ , the corrupted state of the  $k$ -th block becomes  $E^{(k)}|\phi\rangle$ . Then Bob applies the unbalanced M-Z interferometer and the filter operation which projects the photon state onto the  $l$ -th conclusive time slot. Thus the final state is  $|\phi_l^{(k)}\rangle = F_l M_{DPS} E^{(k)}|\phi\rangle$ . Therefore, for this time slot, we can obtain the conditional possibilities from  $p_{b,l}^{(k)} = \langle \phi_l^{(k)} | \frac{1-Z_{A_{l-1}} Z_{B_l}}{2} | \phi_l^{(k)} \rangle$ , and  $p_{p,l}^{(k)} = \langle \phi_l^{(k)} | \frac{1-X_{A_{l-1}} X_{B_l}}{2} | \phi_l^{(k)} \rangle$ . The calculations show that

$$p_{b,l}^{(k)} = \frac{1}{4n} [ |a_{l-1,l-1} - a_{l,l}|^2 + |a_{l-1,l} - a_{l,l-1}|^2 + (|a_{l-1,1}|^2 + \dots + |a_{l-1,l-2}|^2 + |a_{l-1,l+1}|^2 + \dots + |a_{l-1,n}|^2) + (|a_{l,1}|^2 + \dots + |a_{l,l-2}|^2 + |a_{l,l+1}|^2 + \dots + |a_{l,n}|^2) ], \quad (6)$$

$$p_{p,l}^{(k)} = \frac{1}{2n} [ |a_{l,1}|^2 + \dots + |a_{l,l-1}|^2 + |a_{l-1,l}|^2 + \dots + |a_{l-1,n}|^2 ]. \quad (7)$$

These results clearly demonstrate the essential element of DPS-QKD in which the maximal value of the phase error rate in certain time slot can only be estimated by combining the bit error rates in the same time slot and its neighbor time slots. With the simple observation, we find that all  $p_{p,l}^{(k)} = 0$  if all  $p_{b,l}^{(k)} \equiv 0$ . Thus when the bit error rate is zero, so is the phase error rate.

Generally, it is easy to verify that  $2n \sum_{l=2}^n p_{p,l}^{(k)} - 4n \sum_{l=2}^n p_{b,l}^{(k)} \leq [(|a_{1,2}|^2 + |a_{2,1}|^2) - (|a_{1,2} - a_{2,1}|^2 + |a_{2,1}|^2)] + [(|a_{n-1,n}|^2 + |a_{n,n-1}|^2) - (|a_{n-1,n} - a_{n,n-1}|^2 + |a_{n-1,n}|^2)]$ . Also by observing that for any two complex number  $a$  and  $b$ ,  $|a|^2 + |b|^2 \leq \frac{3+\sqrt{5}}{2}(|a-b|^2 + |a|^2)$ , we can further simplify the inequality into  $2n \sum_{l=2}^n p_{p,l}^{(k)} - 4n \sum_{l=2}^n p_{b,l}^{(k)} \leq (1+\sqrt{5})/2 [ (|a_{1,2} - a_{2,1}|^2 + |a_{2,1}|^2) + (|a_{n-1,n} - a_{n,n-1}|^2 + |a_{n-1,n}|^2) ] \leq (1+\sqrt{5})/2 \times 4n \sum_{l=2}^n p_{b,l}^{(k)}$ , or equivalently  $\sum_{l=2}^n p_{p,l}^{(k)} \leq (3+\sqrt{5}) \sum_{l=2}^n p_{b,l}^{(k)}$ . From the discussion of the inequality (5), we therefore obtain

$$e_p \leq (3+\sqrt{5}) \sum_{l=2}^n e_{b,l} = (3+\sqrt{5})e_b, \quad (8)$$

where  $e_b = \sum_{l=2}^n e_{b,l}$  is the total bit error rate over all conclusive time slots.

Combining the above three arguments, we can successfully derive an unconditionally secure key rate for not only the entanglement-based DPS-QKD but also the prepare-and-measure DPS-QKD with single photon source. The secure key rate can be written as

$$R_{DPS} \geq p_{DPS} \left[ 1 - H(e_b) - H((3+\sqrt{5})e_b) \right], \quad (9)$$

where  $H(x)$  is the Shannon entropy, namely,  $H(x) = -x \log_2(x) - (1-x) \log_2(1-x)$ , and  $p_{DPS}$  is the conclusive detector click rates per pulse in DPS-QKD.

In the final analysis, we compare the key rates of BB84 protocol with unconditional security ( $R_{BB84}$ )[3], DPS-QKD with limited security against general attack for individual photons ( $R_{IND}$ )[6], and DPS-QKD with unconditional security ( $R_{DPS}$ ). All these three protocols assume single photon source. In presence of channel losses, we can express the secure key rates of the two other cases:

$$R_{BB84} = p_{BB84} [1 - 2H(e_b)], \quad (10)$$

$$R_{IND} = p_{IND} \left\{ -\log_2 \left[ 1 - e_b^2 - \frac{(1 - 6e_b)^2}{2} \right] - H(e_b) \right\}, \quad (11)$$

where  $p_{BB84}$  and  $p_{IND}$  are the conclusive detector click rates per pulse in the corresponding protocols. Especially, we adopt the result of DPS-QKD against general attack to individual photon[6] to the case that uses single photon source. We assume that the coding efficiency approaches to Shannon limit in all three cases. When  $R_{BB84}$ ,  $R_{IND}$  and  $R_{DPS}$  hit zero, we can obtain that the tolerable maximal bit error rates for three protocols are 11%, 6.09%, and 4.12% respectively.

We use the parameters from [8], where the dark count rate, the time window and the baseline error are 50 Hz, 50 ps and 2.3 % respectively. Therefore, the dark count rate per detector per event  $d = 2.5 \times 10^{-9}$ . In BB84 protocol, we assume that two detectors are used, so that  $p_{BB84} = (\eta + 2d)/2$ , where  $\eta$  is the total efficiency including the channel, the detectors and all other devices, and the factor of  $\frac{1}{2}$  is due to the 50% probability that Alice and Bob choose the same measurement basis. In DPS-QKD, we assume that only two detectors are used. We also assume that the loss happens equally on every pulses in the transmission, so that the probability of getting a conclusive event, namely, the event that does not happen in the first or the last time slot after the interferometer, is  $(n - 1)/n$ . On the other hand, the dark count will occur in every time slot with equal probability. Therefore, by noting that Bob only gets at most 1 photon out of a block with  $n$  pulses,  $p_{IND} = p_{DPS} = \eta(n - 1)/n^2 + 2d(n - 1)/n$ . Moreover, the bit error rates can be modeled as  $e_b = (e\eta + d)/(\eta + 2d)$  for BB84 protocol and  $e_b = [e\eta(n - 1)/n^2 + d(n - 1)/n]/[\eta(n - 1)/n^2 + 2d(n - 1)/n]$  for DPS-QKD, where  $e$  is the baseline error rate given above.

Fig. 2 demonstrates the results of the secure key rates per pulse of various protocols. As expected, the unconditionally secure key rate and the maximal tolerable bit error rate of DPS-QKD are lower than those of DPS-QKD against general attack for individual photons. We also find that the secure key rate per pulse is optimized by choosing  $n = 3$ , the lowest number of pulses in a block in DPS-QKD, as long as the maximal phase error rate in Eq. (8) is irrelevant to  $n$ . In Fig. 3, we plot the energy efficiencies of various protocols. In this figure, we find that the energy efficiency for DPS-QKD increases with  $n$  in low lossy channels, because the possibility of getting an inconclusive event for Bob is lower for higher  $n$ . However,




FIG. 2: Secure key rate per pulse as a function of the total loss. Red solid line:  $R_{BB84}$ ; blue dashed line and green dash-dot line:  $R_{DPS}$  with  $n = 3, 10$  respectively; black dash-dot line and light blue dashed line:  $R_{IND}$  with  $n = 3, 10$  respectively.




FIG. 3: Energy efficiency, i.e., secure key rate per emitting photon as a function of the total loss. The legends are the same to those in Fig. 2.

in high loss regime, larger  $n$  still limits the transmission length because the dark count rate per block is  $n$  times of the dark count rate per pulse.

In conclusion, we have proven the unconditional security of DPS-QKD with single photon source and evaluated its secure key rate. To achieve this, Alice should explicitly group every  $n$  consecutive pulses into one block. Bob should also employ the PNR detectors to obtain a well-defined single photon state in a block. Finally, we compare its secure key rate with previous results.

The authors wish to thank Norbert Lütkenhaus, Qiang Zhang, and Hiroki Takesue for very fruitful discussion on the topic of this Letter. This research was supported by NICT, the MURI Center for Photonic Quantum Informa-

tion Systems (ARMY, DAAD19-03-1-0199), NTT Basic Research Laboratories, SORST, CREST programs, Sci-

ence and Technology Agency of Japan (JST), and Hamamatsu Photonics.

- 
- [1] C. H. Bennett and G. Brassard, in *Proceedings of the IEEE International Conference on Computers, Systems, and Signal Processing, Bangalore, India* (IEEE, New York, 1984), pp. 175C179.
- [2] D. Mayers, in *Advances in Cryptology: Proceedings of Crypto96*, Lecture Notes in Computer Science Vol. 1109 (Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1996), p. 343.
- [3] P. W. Shor and J. Preskill, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **85**, 441 (2000).
- [4] K. Inoue, E. Waks, and Y. Yamamoto, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **89**, 037902 (2002).
- [5] K. Inoue, E. Waks and Y. Yamamoto, *Phys. Rev. A* **68**, 022317 (2003).
- [6] E. Waks, H. Takesue, and Y. Yamamoto, *Phys. Rev. A* **73**, 012344 (2006).
- [7] E. Diamanti, H. Takesue, C. Langrock, M. Fejer, and Y. Yamamoto, *Opt. Express* **14**, 13073-13082 (2006) and references within.
- [8] H. Takesue et al., *Nature Photonics* **1**, 343 (2007).
- [9] M. Curty, L. Zhang, H.-K. Lo and N. Lütkenhaus, *Quantum Information & Computation*, **7**, 665-688 (2007).
- [10] H.-K. Lo and H. F. Chau, *Science* **283**, 2050 (1999)
- [11] A. R. Calderbank and P. W. Shor, *Phys. Rev. A* **54**, 1098-1105 (1996); A. M. Steane, *Proc. R. Soc. London A* **452**, 2551-2577 (1996).
- [12] M. Ben-Or and D. Mayers, e-print quant-ph/0409062 (2004); M. Ben-Or, M. Horodecki, D. W. Leung, D. Mayers, and J. Oppenheim, *Theory of Cryptography: Second Theory of Cryptography Conference, TCC 2005*, J.Kilian (ed.) Springer Verlag 2005, vol. 3378 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pp. 386-406, e-print quant-ph/0409078.
- [13] K. Azuma, *Tôhuku Math. J.* **19**, 357 (1967).
- [14] J.-C. Boileau, K. Tamaki, J. Batuwantudawe, R. Laflamme, and J. M. Renes, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **94**, 040503 (2005).