

Comment on “Practical Decoy State for Quantum Key Distribution”

Xiang-Bin Wang

IMAI Quantum Computation and Information Project, ERATO, JST, Daini Hongo White Bldg. 201,
5-28-3, Hongo, Bunkyo, Tokyo 133-0033, Japan

The protocol in quant-ph/0503003, with using the main ideas of our previous works, is totally different from H.K. Lo’s trivial proposals raised prior to our works. Therefore, even there is an advantage for their new protocol, this does not change the obvious fact that prior to our works, H.-K. Lo never raised anything that can really work efficiently in practice. We also point out that their so called advantage to our earlier protocol is not trustworthy because they have missed the larger-than-one factor in calculating the key rate of our protocol.

The method, “Vacuum+ Weak decoy state” stated in section 3.3 of Ref[1] is totally different from H.K. Lo’s earlier proposals [2, 3]. To my surprise, they claimed that the method there[1] was first raised by H.-K. Lo: “This special case was first proposed in(Ref[2, 3, 4]) and analyzed in [6].” This is entirely untrue. The truth is, we proposed the method in quant-ph/0410075 in Oct. 2004[7]. Let’s examine their three literatures one by one:

1. quant-ph/0411004

This paper was presented later than our paper, quant-ph/0410075[7]. The paper, quant-ph/0411004[4] cannot “first” propose the protocol as studied in[1, 7] by any normal logic. One cannot say that Wang studied the protocol in quant-ph/0410075[7] and latter H.-K. Lo “for the first time” proposed the protocol in quant-ph/0411004[4]. It is rather strange that our paper, quant-ph/0410075 is missing in their literatures[1].

2. Conference talks[2].

These are totally irrelevant to the protocol studied in their recent paper[1]. In ref[2], what H.-K. Lo has advocated is simply a useless protocol using infinite number of different decoy states. This is even worse than a trivial idea of using single-photon source, as has been commented by Wang[8]. Actually, in the website[2], one can even find the whole video record of H.-K. Lo’s talk. In his whole talk, except for a type of useless toy model, there isn’t a *single* word talking about how to make it with a few decoy states. H.-K. Lo’s *only* emphasis is on how to make it with *infinite* number decoy states. Any reader may visit the website[2] and check my words.

3. Conference proceeding of ISIT 2004[3]

In this paper, an idea was very shortly stated: “On one hand, by using a vacuum as decoy state, Alice and Bob can verify the so called dark count rates of their detectors. On the other hand, by using a very weak coherent pulse as decoy state, Alice and Bob can easily lower bound the yield (channel transmittance) of single-photon pulses.” As it has been commented by Wang[8], this simple-minded idea doesn’t work in practice, due to the statistical fluctuation. This simple-minded idea should never be explained to be the protocols in[1, 7] because new protocol[1, 7] uses non-trivial methods. For example, the new protocol[1, 7] watches the counting rates of both decoy states and signal states and treats them jointly with non-trivial inequalities. Definitely, the

simple-minded method in[3] *only* watches the counting rate of decoy states therefore it doesn’t work due to the statistical fluctuation, as was commented by Ref[8].

In the following, we list some more evidence for the conclusion that, before my presentation of Ref[7], H.K. Lo didn’t know at all the main idea of my method[7].

Evidence 1.

Is it possible that H.-K. Lo knew something more but didn’t write it in Ref[3] due to the lack of space there[3] ? The answer is definitely no. That paper[3] contains two parts, the introduction part (part 1) and part 2 which states their own ideas. Actually, their introduction part is much longer than the second part. The second part[3] only contains 6 sentences. That is to say, there is plenty of space for them to give any more non-trivial ideas, if he indeed had some. In particular, if he really had known the main idea of of Ref[1, 7], it should not difficult for him to state it there shortly. At least he should state it clearly that Alice and Bob should also observe the counting rate of the signal pulses and treat inequalities jointly. The statement given in Ref[3] in its present form should be *uniquely* interpreted as that Alice and Bob only watch the counting rate decoy states. There isn’t other interpretation.

Evidence 2.

In their paper[1], H.-K. Lo claimed that he proposed my protocol[7] in[2, 3]. Now we produce evidence that, at the time of presentation of[2], H.-K. Lo must not know our method at all. At that time, H.-K. Lo even didn’t really understand Hwang’s main result and mathematical tricks[9]. Thinking in his simple-minded way, H.-K. Lo thought[2] that Hwang[9] used the intensity $\mu = 2$ for the decoy states to verify the multi-photon counts. This primary-level wrong claim has been clearly recorded in his transparencies[2]. Contrary to one’s common sense, to optimize the verification of the upper bound of multi-photon counts in Hwang’s protocol[9], $\mu = 1$ is *always* the best choice for decoy states. Note that my method is a non-trivial extending of Hwang’s method and my method[7] can also obtain Hwang’s result as a special application. If somebody even had primary level mistake in understanding Hwang’s main result at certain time, how could he know my method at that time ? Note that ref[2] was presented latter than ref[3]. If he didn’t know my method[7] in presenting[2], how could he know my

method in presenting[3] at an earlier time ? This is to say, in presenting Ref.[2, 3], H.-K. Lo didn't even meet the necessary condition to understand my method[7]. Then how can he "first" proposed my protocol[7] in those presentations[2, 3] ?

Evidence 3.

Thinking in his simple-minded way, H.-K. Lo also made some other primary level mistakes[2]. For example, he claimed that if we had state $|2\rangle\langle 2|$, then one can estimate the yield of two-photon state and we can do key distillation with coherent states. This is untrue. Given the overall transmittance of 10^{-4} , this requires the intensity of coherent states less than 0.01 to exclude the significant contribution of higher order terms. Neither Hwang's result[9] nor my result[7] have to worry about the higher order contribution and both methods[7, 9] can use signal pulses much larger than 0.01, even in the case that the transmittance is only 10^{-4} . This again shows that, in presenting[2, 3], H.K. Lo didn't understand the main spirit of non-trivial methods[7, 9] at all.

Evidence 4

The talks of [2] were given later than the presentation of[3]. If H.K. Lo really thought the idea of ref[3] to be so useful, why did he only presented the useless protocol with infinite different decoy states in later conferences[2] without a *single* word mentioning how to make it with a few decoy states[3] ? Instead of believing that H.-K. Lo intentionally misled the audience of those conferences[2], I believe the more reasonable explanation: H.-K. Lo he himself knows that his simple-minded idea in Ref.[3] does not work so he didn't mention it in a number of conferences later. However, after I presented my non-trivial method[7], he found that their simple-minded idea[3] was a bit similar to my protocol at a first look. Then he decided to claim something that does not belong to him.

All these evidence have confirmed the simple fact that prior to my work[7], H.-K. Lo has never presented any practically feasible decoy-state protocol.

H.K. Lo's claim that he first proposed the protocol studied in[1, 7] is simply untrue. Although at a first look, my protocol is a bit similar to the idea stated in Ref[3], they are entirely different things in both methodology and result. In particular, the idea stated in Ref[3] doesn't work[8] while my method works efficiently[7]. My method was then further developed[6].

Due to my wrong clicking in the submission, v4 of quant-ph/0411047 has used a wrong file and it is actually identical to Ref[7]. However, I then found the mistake and replaced v4 by v5. All versions of quant-ph/0411047 were presented earlier than [1]. It is rather strange to me why quant-ph/0410075 is missing in their paper[1]. What they have actually used in their paper[1] is the protocol in quant-ph/0410075. H.-K. Lo is a matured scientist rather than a child. He definitely knows that v4 of quant-ph/0411047 is a wrong file. In such a case, they should cite quant-ph/0410075. H.K. Lo didn't cite quant-ph/0410075 only because this paper was presented

earlier than his paper, quant-ph/0411004[4]. Or, in other words, it is for the ease of claiming something that does not belong to him.

Their method[1] in estimating the value Δ_1 by the protocol of "vacuum + weak decoy state", the fraction of single photon count is not really new. All their results about the fraction of single photon counts and the fraction of multi-photon counts in that case can be easily obtained by our method[7]. Actually, our formula for Δ , the upper bound of multi-photon counts, Eq.(2) of their paper[1] works with whatever specific parameter setting for the intensity of decoy states or signal states. Given this formula, calculation of the lower bound of single-photon counts is trivial.

Also, we remind the readers that Wang is the first person who considers the effects of statistical fluctuation[6, 7] for the decoy-state method. I have also emphasized that the statistical fluctuation in decoy-state method is crucially important[6, 7]. This idea has obviously been adopted and extended in their paper[1].

Given the comment above, we do not intend to diminish their contributions[1], e.g., they pointed out that one can improve the key rate by using the strong ILM-GLLP formula[5], they did numerical simulations about the fluctuation of e_1 . But, all these have nothing to do with the estimation method of Δ or Δ_1 values itself. Using the strong ILM-GLLP formula, the key rate of our protocol will be also improved. Also, in the future, if there is an even more efficient key distillation method, we should change to that. But our method[6, 7] of estimating the values for Δ_1 or Δ is not at all affected. Also, if combined with the strong formula as recommended by ref[1], there is no difference between our protocol[7] and their "Vacuum+Weak decoy"[1].

In completion, we also point out that the so called "advantage" of key rate of their protocol is not trustworthy, even compared with our earlier protocol[7]. In their calculation[1], they have used eq(35) to estimating the key rate of our protocol in Ref[7]. However, they have ignored one important fact: In our protocol, except for the class of vacuum, all signals in both classes of μ, μ' can be used for key distillation. Note that in our protocol, we have assumed the case that the number of pulses of class μ and μ' are almost equal. In the special case of $\mu \approx \mu'$, there should be a factor 2 in calculating the key rate of our method. If they use a different setting, e.g., the number of signal pulses is larger than the number of their very weak coherent states, they still need to multiply a larger-than-one factor to obtain the true key rate of our protocol[7]. For example, by the settings of their Table 2, they should multiply the result by a factor of 1.44 for the true key rate of our protocol. We don't accept their currently presented results unless they have given the true results of our key rate. In their protocol, they use the low intensity for their decoy states. The key rate of these decoy pulses is negligible if the intensity is very small.

-
- [1] X.Ma, B. Qi, Yi Zhao and H.-K. Lo, quant-ph/0503005, March 1, 2005.
- [2] H.-K. Lo et al, <http://www.fields.utoronto.ca/programs/scientific/04-05/quantumIC/abstracts/lo.ppt>; /lo.pdf : Decoy state quantum key distribution (QKD), July 19-23, 2005 <http://www.newton.cam.ac.uk/webseminars/pg+ws/2004/qisw01/0826/lo/> ;Aug 26-29
- [3] H.-K. Lo, p.17, Proceedings of 2004 IEEE Int. Symp. on Inf. Theor., June 27-July 2, 2004, Chicago.
- [4] H. K. Lo et al, quant-ph/0411004.
- [5] H. Inamori, N. Lutkenhause and D. Mayers, quant-ph/0107017; Gottesman, H.K. Lo, N. Lutkenhause and J. Preskill, Quantum Information and Computation, 4, 325(2004).
- [6] X. B. Wang, quant-ph/0411047, v5, Feb 21, 2005; and v1-v3, 2004.
- [7] X. B. Wang, quant-ph/0410075.
- [8] X.-B. Wang, quant-ph/0501143
- [9] W.-Y Hwang, Phys. Rev. Lett., 91057901(2003).