

Sharing a quantum secret without a trusted party

Qin Li,^{1,2,*} Dong-Yang Long,¹ W.H. Chan,² and Dao-Wen Qiu¹

¹*Department of Computer Science, Sun Yat-sen University, Guangzhou 510006, China*

²*Department of Mathematics, Hong Kong Baptist University, Kowloon, Hong Kong, China*

(Dated: October 27, 2019)

In a conventional quantum (k, n) threshold scheme, a trusted party shares a secret quantum state with n participants such that any k of those participants can cooperate to recover the original secret, while fewer than k participants obtain no information about the secret. In this paper we show how to construct a quantum (k, n) threshold scheme without the assistance of a trusted party, who generates and distributes shares among the participants. Instead, each participant chooses his private state and contributes the same to the determination of the final secret quantum state.

PACS numbers: 03.67.Dd

Keywords: Quantum secret sharing; Quantum cryptography

1. Introduction

Suppose that n shareholders who are not mutually trusted want to share a password, with which they can open the vault and get access to some confidential documents of the company. It should be done in such a way that any k of those shareholders have the ability to reconstruct the password, while fewer than k shareholders cannot. The solutions vary under two different situations. If there exists a trusted party who generates and distributes suitable shares among the shareholders, then the problem could be addressed by classical (k, n) threshold schemes independently introduced by Blakley [1] and Shamir [2]. And if there does not exist such a party trusted by all of the shareholders, then classical (k, n) threshold schemes without the assistance of any trusted party came to rescue [3, 4, 5].

With the emergence of quantum computation and quantum communication, it is natural to consider the quantum counterparts of secret sharing schemes. Hillery *et al.* showed how to implement a classical threshold scheme using Greenberger-Horne-Zeilinger (GHZ) states in the presence of eavesdroppers, and also showed how to share an unknown qubit between two participants such that only the collaboration of two participants could reconstruct the original qubit [6]. Karlsson *et al.* presented a secret sharing scheme based on two-particle quantum entanglement, in which quantum information is sent from a sender Trent to Alice and Bob so that both persons are needed to obtain the information, and showed that it could be extended to a special (k, n) threshold scheme based on multi-particle entangled states [7]. Cleve *et al.* gave an efficient construction of more general quantum (k, n) threshold schemes, where a trusted party can share an unknown quantum state with n participants such that k participants are necessary and sufficient to reconstruct the original secret quantum state [8]. Thereafter quantum secret sharing has been an

active research field and many quantum secret sharing schemes using various techniques have been proposed [9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20].

Whereas previous quantum (k, n) threshold schemes have been considered with the assistance of a trusted party [6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20], here we consider the problem of sharing a quantum secret without having a trusted party. Actually, for lots of applications such as conference key agreement and distributed computing with faulty processors, quantum secret sharing without a trusted party is a powerful tool. Also, as referred by Ingemarsson and Simmons [3], the situation that there is nobody trusted by all of the participants is more common in commercial and/or international applications. In this case, previously proposed quantum secret schemes do not play the role well. Therefore, in this paper we give a useful construction for sharing a quantum secret in the absence of a trusted party and illustrate its feasibility by improving the quantum (k, n) threshold scheme presented by Cleve *et al.* [8] to eliminate the need of the trusted party. The novelty is that a trusted party is unnecessary and each participant acts for his own benefit.

2. Quantum (k, n) threshold schemes without a trusted party

In this section, we show how to solve the problem of sharing a quantum secret without the aid of any trusted party, drawing ideas from classical counterparts [3, 4, 5]. The problem could be stated more clearly as follows:

- all of the participants choose their own private quantum states, which must be made available in sequence for the final secret quantum state to be generated;
- all of the participants contribute identically to determining the quantum secret;
- the participants share the secret quantum state in a way that the collaboration of any k out of n participants can recover the secret quantum state, but

*liqin805@163.com

the collaboration of any $k - 1$ or fewer participants obtain no information about it.

Such a scheme is called a *quantum (k, n) threshold scheme without a trusted party*. In such a scheme, each participant acts for his own benefit and need not trust a single party unless at least k participants work together.

We would like to show that it is possible to realize a quantum (k, n) threshold scheme in the absence of a trusted party with just the operations included in a conventional quantum (k, n) threshold scheme. The most obvious way to achieve this is that: each participant shares the private state chosen by himself with the other participants using a conventional quantum (k, n) threshold scheme; then any k participants recover each participant's private state using the conventional recovery procedure; such k participants obtain the final secret quantum state from all of the recovered private states in an agreed way. This way will work; however, it is cumbersome and undesirable. The number of quantum registers required is n times as much as that in the conventional scheme; the conventional recovery procedure needs to be implemented for n times; and the private states of all the participants are betrayed. A natural question is to ask whether a better way is possible, using some different construction. The answer to this question is affirmative. We would like to provide an alternative such that the number of quantum registers required can be the same as that in the conventional scheme, the recovery procedure needs to be carried out only once, and it is unnecessary to reveal the private state of each participant.

The method used for constructing a quantum (k, n) threshold scheme without a trusted party is introduced in the following.

(1) Each participant P_i ($i = 0, 1, \dots, n - 1$) randomly selects his private quantum state ρ_i within a specified domain which is the same as that the secret quantum state to be reconstructed belongs to.

(2) P_i acts as a trusted party and splits his private quantum state ρ_i into n shares ρ_{ij} ($j = 0, 1, \dots, n - 1$) using a conventional quantum (k, n) threshold scheme such as [8], and then sends each share ρ_{ij} to the participant P_j in sequence (particularly P_i keeps ρ_{ii}).

(3) When P_i has received the share ρ_{ji} from the participants P_j , he implements operations on ρ_{ji} and his quantum registers immediately. Note that such operations are agreed before the protocol and vary with the conventional quantum (k, n) threshold schemes used. If P_i has received all the shares ρ_{ji} ($j = 0, 1, \dots, n - 1$) and implemented all the corresponding operations, he announces that he has completed his actions. If P_i has not received all the shares ρ_{ji} ($j = 0, 1, \dots, n - 1$) in time t (the time limit is agreed before the protocol), he aborts the protocol.

(4) After all of the participants have announced, any k participants can cooperate to obtain the final secret quantum state ρ_s , which each participant's private state ρ_i contributes equally to, while less than k participants obtain no information about ρ_s .

Note that we should assume that each participant must logically be willing to share the private quantum state chosen by himself with other participants and contribute the same to determining the final secret quantum state. Otherwise a malicious participant who does not distribute his private state among the participants within time t or sends improper quantum states can make the protocol abort or make k participants reconstruct a wrong quantum secret, even though doing such things is of no use for him. What's worse, if one participant sends empty states to all the other participants, less than k participants may reconstruct the secret. In addition, the security of such a quantum (k, n) threshold scheme without having a trusted party largely depends on the conventional quantum (k, n) threshold scheme used by each participant to protect his private state among the other participants.

3. A concrete quantum (k, n) threshold scheme without a trusted party

In order to clarify the feasibility of the construction of a quantum (k, n) threshold scheme without a trusted party introduced by us, we improve the quantum (k, n) threshold scheme presented by Cleve *et al.* [8] to remove the use of the trusted party. The improved scheme can allow all of the participants to choose their own private state and have the same influence on determining the final quantum secret.

Note $n < 2k$ for a quantum (k, n) threshold scheme without a trusted party, which is guaranteed by quantum no-cloning theorem [21], and note that the dimension of each share still can be bounded above by $2\max(2k - 1, m)$ through efficient quantum operations, where m is the dimension of the secret quantum state to be encoded, the same as that in [8]. In addition, we just need to consider the special case where $n = 2k - 1$, since a (k, n) threshold scheme with $n < 2k - 1$ can be obtained by discarding $2k - 1 - n$ shares from any $(k, 2k - 1)$ threshold scheme with $n > k$ [8]. Our improved scheme without the aid of the trusted party includes three parts: scheme setup, secret quantum state generation, and secret quantum state reconstruction.

3.1. Scheme setup

Given k , n and m , find a suitable prime q satisfying $\max(n, m) \leq q \leq 2\max(n, m)$ (which is always possible according to Bertrand's postulate [22]) and set a finite field $\mathbf{F} = \mathbf{Z}_q$. For $i = 0, 1, \dots, n - 1$, let $c_i = (c_{i,0}, c_{i,1}, \dots, c_{i,k-1}) \in \mathbf{F}^k$, define the polynomial as $p_{c_i}(t) = c_{i,0} + c_{i,1}t + \dots + c_{i,k-1}t^{k-1}$, and let $x_i \in \mathbf{F}$ and each x_i should be different from each other. Then a q -ary quantum state which is defined on basis states $|s_i\rangle$ ($s_i \in \mathbf{F}$) could be encoded by the linear mapping as

$$|s_i\rangle \rightarrow \sum_{\substack{c_i \in \mathbf{F}^k \\ c_{i,k-1} = s_i}} |p_{c_i}(x_0), p_{c_i}(x_1), \dots, p_{c_i}(x_{n-1})\rangle. \quad (1)$$

Define the quantum addition operation on two q -ary

quantum basis states as $|s_i\rangle + |s_j\rangle$ ($s_i, s_j \in \mathbf{F}$), which can

be encoded by the linear mapping as

$$|s_i\rangle + |s_j\rangle \rightarrow \sum_{\substack{c_i, c_j \in \mathbf{F}^k \\ c_{i,k-1} = s_i, c_{j,k-1} = s_j}} |p_{c_i}(x_0) + p_{c_j}(x_0), p_{c_i}(x_1) + p_{c_j}(x_1), \dots, p_{c_i}(x_{n-1}) + p_{c_j}(x_{n-1})\rangle. \quad (2)$$

Also define the operation applying an invertible $l \times l$ matrix M to a sequence of l quantum registers as applying the mapping

$$|(y_0, y_1, \dots, y_{l-1})\rangle \rightarrow |(y_0, y_1, \dots, y_{l-1})M\rangle. \quad (3)$$

For $z_0, z_1, \dots, z_{l-1} \in \mathbf{F}$, introduce the $l \times l$ Vandermonde matrix $[V_l(z_0, z_1, \dots, z_{l-1})]_{ij} = z_j^i$ ($i, j \in \{0, 1, \dots, l-1\}$). And notice that

$$\begin{aligned} & |c_{i,0}, c_{i,1}, \dots, c_{i,l-1} V_l(z_0, z_1, \dots, z_{l-1})\rangle \\ &= |p_{c_i}(z_0), p_{c_i}(z_1), \dots, p_{c_i}(z_{l-1})\rangle, \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

where $c_i = (c_{i,0}, c_{i,1}, \dots, c_{i,l-1}) \in \mathbf{F}^l$.

In addition, suppose that each participant P_i ($i = 0, 1, \dots, n-1$) owns a quantum register R_i in an initial state $|0\rangle$ ($0 \in \mathbf{F}$).

3.2. Secret quantum state generation

Each participant P_i ($i = 0, 1, \dots, n-1$) randomly chooses a polynomial of degree $k-1$ denoted as $p_{c_i}(t) = c_{i,0} + c_{i,1}t + \dots + c_{i,k-1}t^{k-1}$, where $c_i = (c_{i,0}, c_{i,1}, \dots, c_{i,k-1}) \in \mathbf{F}^k$.

P_i randomly chooses and prepares his own private q -ary quantum state $|s_i\rangle$ ($s_i \in \mathbf{F}$) and uses the encoding denoted as (1) to obtain

$$\sum_{c_i \in \mathbf{F}^k, c_{i,k-1} = s_i} |p_{c_i}(x_0), p_{c_i}(x_1), \dots, p_{c_i}(x_{n-1})\rangle. \quad (5)$$

Note that the above operation implies that the quantum

state $|s_i\rangle$ can be split into n shares. Then P_i sends each share to P_j for $j = 0, 1, \dots, n-1$ (including himself) in sequence.

When P_i receives a share, he adds the received state to the quantum register R_i . And if P_i has obtained the shares from all of the participants and implemented all the corresponding operations, he announces that his actions have been finished. After all of the participants have announced, it is not difficult to obtain that n quantum registers R_0, R_1, \dots, R_{n-1} are in a global state

$$\sum_{\substack{c_i \in \mathbf{F}^k, c_{i,k-1} = s_i \\ \text{for } i = 0, 1, \dots, n-1}} \left| \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} p_{c_i}(x_0), \dots, \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} p_{c_i}(x_{n-1}) \right\rangle. \quad (6)$$

Then, let the final agreed secret quantum state be $|s\rangle$ (for $s = c_{0,k-1} + c_{1,k-1} + \dots + c_{n-1,k-1}$ and $s \in \mathbf{F}$).

3.3. Secret quantum state reconstruction

In this part, we show that the collaboration of any k participants can reconstruct the agreed secret quantum state $|s\rangle$ by the following steps. Suppose that the first k participants, namely P_0, P_1, \dots, P_{k-1} , gather together and want to recover the secret, so we obtain the information about the first k quantum registers (that is, R_0, R_1, \dots, R_{k-1}).

(1) Apply $V_k(x_0, x_1, \dots, x_{k-1})^{-1}$, which represents the inverse of $V_k(x_0, x_1, \dots, x_{k-1})$, to the first k quantum registers R_0, R_1, \dots, R_{k-1} . Then the global state of the n quantum registers is

$$|\psi_1\rangle = \sum_{\substack{c_i \in \mathbf{F}^k, c_{i,k-1} = s_i \\ \text{for } i = 0, 1, \dots, n-1}} \left| \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} c_{i,0}, \dots, \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} c_{i,k-1} \right| \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} p_{c_i}(x_k), \dots, \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} p_{c_i}(x_{n-1}) \rangle. \quad (7)$$

(2) Shift the first k quantum registers by one to the right in sequence by setting R_0, R_1, \dots, R_{k-1} to

$R_{k-1}, R_0, \dots, R_{k-2}$. At this time, the global state of the n quantum registers is

$$\begin{aligned}
|\psi_2\rangle &= \sum_{\substack{c_i \in \mathbf{F}^k, c_{i,k-1} = s_i \\ \text{for } i = 0, 1, \dots, n-1}} \left| \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} c_{i,k-1}, \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} c_{i,0}, \dots, \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} c_{i,k-2} \right\rangle \left| \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} p_{c_i}(x_k), \dots, \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} p_{c_i}(x_{n-1}) \right\rangle \\
&= \sum_{\substack{c_i \in \mathbf{F}^k, c_{i,k-1} = s_i \\ \text{for } i = 0, 1, \dots, n-1}} |s\rangle \left| \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} c_{i,0}, \dots, \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} c_{i,k-2} \right\rangle \left| \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} p_{c_i}(x_k), \dots, \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} p_{c_i}(x_{n-1}) \right\rangle. \tag{8}
\end{aligned}$$

If the state in R_0 is a basis state $|s\rangle$ (for some $s \in \mathbf{F}$), it is the final secret quantum state and the recovery procedure has been done; otherwise we should continue the recovery procedure. Actually, for a general secret, which is usually a superposition of $|s\rangle$ ($s \in \mathbf{F}$), the register R_0 is entangled with the other registers, since in (8) the value of $|s\rangle$ can be determined by any of the kets

$$\left| \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} c_{i,0}, \dots, \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} c_{i,k-2} \right\rangle \left| \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} p_{c_i}(x_k), \dots, \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} p_{c_i}(x_{n-1}) \right\rangle. \tag{9}$$

(3) Apply $V_{k-1}(x_k, x_{k+1}, \dots, x_{n-1})$ to the quantum

registers R_1, R_2, \dots, R_{k-1} and add $R_0 \cdot (x_{k+i-1})^{k-1}$ to R_i for all $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, k-1\}$. And the final global state of the n quantum registers is denoted as (10). In addition, $|s\rangle$ is the final secret quantum state recovered by the first k participants (namely P_0, P_1, \dots, P_{k-1}), since there is a unique array $(\sum_{i=0}^{n-1} c_{i,0}, \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} c_{i,1}, \dots, \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} c_{i,k-1}) \in \mathbf{F}^k$ with $\sum_{i=0}^{n-1} c_{i,k-1} = s$ such that $\sum_{i=0}^{n-1} p_{c_i}(x_{k+j-1}) = y_j$ ($j = 1, 2, \dots, k-1$).

$$\begin{aligned}
|\psi_3\rangle &= \sum_{\substack{c_i \in \mathbf{F}^k, c_{i,k-1} = s_i \\ \text{for } i = 0, 1, \dots, n-1}} |s\rangle \left| \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} p_{c_i}(x_k), \dots, \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} p_{c_i}(x_{n-1}) \right\rangle \left| \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} p_{c_i}(x_k), \dots, \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} p_{c_i}(x_{n-1}) \right\rangle \\
&= \sum_{y=(y_1, \dots, y_{k-1}) \in \mathbf{F}^{k-1}} |s\rangle |y_1, \dots, y_{k-1}\rangle |y_1, \dots, y_{k-1}\rangle. \tag{10}
\end{aligned}$$

In summary, the improved scheme, which removes the use of the trusted party in Cleve *et al.*'s scheme [8], demonstrates the feasibility of the construction offered by us. Furthermore, the share of each participant is still bounded above by $2\max(2k-1, m)$; the number of quantum registers needed is the same as that in Cleve *et al.*'s scheme; the recovery procedure is implemented just once; and the private state of each participant is unnecessary to be given away. Nevertheless, each participant should be logically trusted and the security of the improved scheme largely relies on Cleve *et al.*'s scheme since each participant needs it to protect his private state among the other participants.

4. Conclusion

In this paper, we have given a useful construction of quantum (k, n) threshold schemes without a trusted party and illustrated its feasibility by improving the

quantum (k, n) threshold scheme presented by Cleve *et al.* [8] to avoid the use of the trusted party. In contrast to previous presented quantum secret sharing schemes [6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20], in which a trusted party is always needed to assist in generating and distributing shares among a group of participants, the scheme suggested in this paper requires no trusted party and thus might widen the applicability of quantum threshold schemes to the situation in which there is no single party trusted by all of the participants.

However, the construction method proposed needs the participants to be logically honest during secret quantum state generation phase; otherwise a single participant can disrupt the whole scheme and make it abort, and even worse, less than k participants may recover the secret, even though doing so is of no use for him. Although it is not quite reasonable to make such an expectation, the main intention of this paper is to demonstrate the neces-

sity and feasibility of sharing a quantum secret without a trusted party. Further investigations are expected to eliminate it.

Acknowledgement

We would like to appreciate G. P. He for useful suggestions. This work was sponsored by the Faculty Research (Grant No. FRG2/08-09/070) Hong Kong Baptist University.

-
- [1] G. R. Blakley, Safeguarding cryptographic keys, in: Proceedings of National Computer Conference, AFIPS, New York, 1979, p. 313.
- [2] A. Shamir, How to share a secret, *Commun. ACM* 22 (1979) 612.
- [3] I. Ingemarsson, G. J. Simmons, A protocol to set up shared secret schemes without the assistance of a mutually trusted party, in: *Advances in Cryptology - Proceedings of Eurocrypt'90*, Springer, Berlin, 1991, p. 266.
- [4] T. P. Pedersen, A threshold cryptosystem without a trusted party, in: *Advances in Cryptology - Proceedings of Eurocrypt'91*, Springer, Berlin, 1991, p. 522.
- [5] W.-A. Jackson, K. M. Martin, C. M. O'Keefe, Efficient secret sharing without a mutually trusted authority, in: *Advances in Cryptology - Proceedings of Eurocrypt'95*, Springer, Berlin, 1995, p. 183.
- [6] M. Hillery, V. Buzek, A. Berthiaume, Quantum secret sharing, *Phys. Rev. A* 59 (1999) 1829.
- [7] A. Karlsson, M. Koashi, N. Imoto, Quantum entanglement for secret sharing and secret splitting, *Phys. Rev. A* 59 (1999) 162.
- [8] R. Cleve, D. Gottesman, H.-K. Lo, How to share a quantum secret, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 83 (1999) 648.
- [9] D. Gottesman, Theory of quantum secret sharing, *Phys. Rev. A* 61 (2000) 042311.
- [10] S. Bandyopadhyay, Teleportation and secret sharing with pure entangled states, *Phys. Rev. A* 62 (2000) 012308.
- [11] A. C. A. Nascimento, J. Mueller-Quade, H. Imai, Improving quantum secret-sharing schemes, *Phys. Rev. A* 64 (2001) 042311.
- [12] G. P. Guo, G. C. Guo, Quantum secret sharing without entanglement, *Phys. Lett. A* 310 (2003) 247.
- [13] A. M. Lance, T. Symul, W. P. Bowen, B. C. Sanders, P. K. Lam, Tripartite quantum state sharing, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 92 (2004) 177903.
- [14] L. Xiao, G. L. Long, F. G. Deng, J. W. Pan, Efficient multiparty quantum-secret-sharing schemes, *Phys. Rev. A* 69 (2004) 052307.
- [15] Y. Tokunaga, T. Okamoto, N. Imoto, Threshold quantum cryptography, *Phys. Rev. A* 71 (2005) 012314.
- [16] Z. J. Zhang, Y. Li, Z. X. Man, Multiparty quantum secret sharing, *Phys. Rev. A* 71 (2005) 044301.
- [17] F. G. Deng, H. Y. Zhou, G. L. Long, Bidirectional quantum secret sharing and secret splitting with polarized single photons, *Phys. Lett. A* 337 (2005) 329.
- [18] H. Takesue, K. Inoue, Quantum secret sharing based on modulated high-dimensional time-bin entanglement, *Phys. Rev. A* 74 (2006) 012315.
- [19] Z. J. Zhang, Multiparty secret sharing of quantum information via cavity QED, *Opt. Comm.* 261 (2006) 199.
- [20] I. C. Yu, F. L. Lin, C.Y. Huang, Quantum secret sharing with multilevel mutually (un)biased bases, *Phys. Rev. A* 78 (2008) 012344.
- [21] W. K. Wootters, W. H. Zurek, A single quantum cannot be cloned, *Nature* 299 (1982) 802.
- [22] M. Aigner, G. M. Ziegler, *Proofs from the book*, Springer, Berlin, 2006, p. 7.