

A simple proof that Gaussian attacks are optimal among collective attacks against continuous-variable quantum key distribution with a Gaussian modulation.

Anthony Leverrier

*Institut Telecom / Telecom ParisTech, CNRS LTCI,
46, rue Barrault, 75634 Paris Cedex 13, France*

Philippe Grangier

*Laboratoire Charles Fabry, Institut d'Optique, CNRS, Univ. Paris-Sud,
Campus Polytechnique, RD 128, 91127 Palaiseau Cedex, France*

(Dated: February 1, 2019)

In this paper, we give a simple proof of the fact that the optimal collective attacks against continuous-variable quantum key distribution with a Gaussian modulation are Gaussian attacks. Our proof makes use of symmetry properties of the quantum key distribution protocol in phase-space.

I. INTRODUCTION

Quantum key distribution (QKD) is a cryptographic primitive allowing two distant parties, traditionally referred to as Alice and Bob, to establish a secret key [1]. This key can later be used to secure sensitive communication thanks to one-time pad for instance. QKD has received a lot of attention lately as it is the first application of quantum information science which could be developed on a large scale. For instance, metropolitan networks are certainly compatible with present technology, as was recently demonstrated in Vienna with the SECOQC project [2].

Historically, QKD protocols have been using discrete variables, meaning that Alice and Bob exchange information encoded on a finite-dimensional Hilbert space such as the polarization of a single photon for instance. Hence, protocols such as BB84 [3] have been studied for a long time and their unconditional security is today well established [4], at least in a scenario where side-channels are not considered [5].

More recently, it was suggested that one could encode information on continuous variables in phase space to perform QKD [6]. Practical schemes requiring only coherent states together with an homodyne detection were introduced by Grosshans and Grangier in 2002 (GG02), first with direct [7] and then with reverse [8] reconciliation, and later successfully implemented [9, 10]. These protocols were proven secure against collective attacks [11, 12], which are optimal in the asymptotic limit [13].

The basic idea of the protocol GG02 is the following: Alice draws two random numbers q_A and p_A with a Gaussian probability distribution and sends the coherent state $|q_A + ip_A\rangle$ to Bob. Bob chooses a random quadrature and performs an homodyne detection for that quadrature: he then obtains the classical variable y , a noisy version of either q_A or p_A . He finally informs Alice of his choice of quadrature. Alice keeps her relevant classical variable which she notes x . Repeating this operation n times, Alice and Bob end up with two correlated vectors $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, \dots, x_n)$ and $\mathbf{y} = (y_1, \dots, y_n)$. Note that a small variation of this protocol consists in performing an het-

erodyne detection on Bob's side instead of an homodyne detection [14]. The security of this protocol was investigated in [15, 16] where the optimal individual attack is explicated.

Other, more radical, variations of this GG02 protocol consist in replacing the Gaussian modulation with a discrete modulation [17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22], or adding a post-selection procedure to the protocol [14, 23, 24, 25, 26].

One main advantage of the protocols with a Gaussian modulation but without post-selection is that they display a high level of symmetry. In particular, a specific symmetry of these protocols in phase space was recently investigated in [27] and appears to be a good approach in order to improve the known lower bounds of the secret key rate against arbitrary attacks *in the finite size regime*. Remember that Ref. [13] proves that collective attacks are optimal in the asymptotic regime thanks to a de Finetti-type theorem which gives rather conservative bounds when finite size effects are taken into account. A general framework for the finite size analysis of QKD was developed in [28] and the first numerical results appear to be rather pessimistic [29], hence giving incentive to improve known bounds, in particular with the help of symmetries. Partial results in this direction, such as a de Finetti-type theorem in phase-space, were already obtained in [30]. Whereas in [27], the authors examined the possibility to use the specific symmetries of GG02 to prove the security of the protocol against general attacks. Here, our goal is more modest and we show that these symmetries allow one to easily recover known results concerning the optimality of Gaussian attacks among all collective attacks.

II. A NEW SECURITY PROOF AGAINST COLLECTIVE ATTACKS

The main idea of our proof is to use symmetries of the protocol to simplify the analysis of its security. In general, the security of a usual Prepare and Measure protocol where Alice prepares and sends quantum states to Bob (coherent states with a Gaussian modulation in the case

of GG02) is analysed through an equivalent entangled version of the protocol. In the case of GG02, this entangled version consists for Alice in preparing two-mode squeezed vacua, measuring one mode of these states with an heterodyne detection and sending the other mode to Bob through the quantum channel [31].

The security of the entangled protocol is then analysed through the n -mode bipartite quantum state $\rho_{AB}^{(n)} \in (\mathcal{H}_A \otimes \mathcal{H}_B)^{\otimes n}$ shared by Alice and Bob before they perform their measurements and apply the usual post-processing composed of error reconciliation and privacy amplification. Here, $\mathcal{H}_A$ and $\mathcal{H}_B$ refer respectively to Alice and Bob's single mode Hilbert spaces. Unfortunately, the total Hilbert space $(\mathcal{H}_A \otimes \mathcal{H}_B)^{\otimes n}$ is usually too big to allow for a complete analysis.

A solution is therefore to use specific symmetries of the protocol in order to show that only a symmetric subspace of $(\mathcal{H}_A \otimes \mathcal{H}_B)^{\otimes n}$ needs to be considered. Indeed, one can show that if a QKD protocol is invariant under a certain class of symmetries, say invariance under permutation of the subsystems of Alice and Bob, then one can safely assume that the quantum state $\rho_{AB}^{(n)}$ displays the same symmetry.

This might look a bit suspicious at first sight as one may object that the eavesdropper is free to break the symmetry of the state, hence invalidating the previous statement. The way to solve this apparent paradox is to recall that, without loss of generality, one can always assume that Eve is given a purification $|\psi\rangle_{ABE}$ of $\rho_{AB}^{(n)}$. Since the protocol is invariant under the group of symmetry $\mathcal{G}$, Alice and Bob can consider the state $\bar{\rho}_{AB}^{(n)}$ which is obtained by averaging their initial state $\rho_{AB}^{(n)}$ over the group $\mathcal{G}$. As far as Alice and Bob are concerned, applying the QKD protocol (especially the reconciliation and privacy amplification) to the state $\bar{\rho}_{AB}^{(n)}$ is indistinguishable from applying it to the state $\rho_{AB}^{(n)}$. Now, because the state $\rho_{AB}^{(n)}$ is invariant under the action of $\mathcal{G}$, it is possible to find a purification $|\bar{\psi}\rangle_{ABE}$ of this state such that $g|\bar{\psi}\rangle_{ABE} = |\bar{\psi}\rangle_{ABE}$ for all $g \in \mathcal{G}$. This was proven in the case of the symmetric group $\mathcal{S}_n$ in [4] and in the case of locally compact groups in [32]. Then it is shown in [32] that there exists a completely positive trace-preserving map $\mathcal{T}$ mapping $|\bar{\psi}\rangle_{ABE}$ to $|\psi\rangle_{ABE}$. Hence, the eavesdropper has at least as much information when her state corresponds to the symmetric purification $|\bar{\psi}\rangle_{ABE}$ as when her state corresponds to the (non necessary symmetric) purification $|\psi\rangle_{ABE}$. This means that considering the state $|\bar{\psi}\rangle_{ABE}$ is sufficient to evaluate the security of the protocol. As a conclusion, Alice and Bob can always assume that their bipartite state displays the same symmetry properties as the QKD protocol.

A more radical solution to simplify the security analysis of a particular QKD protocol is to restrict the analysis to a certain class of attacks, for instance, *collective attacks*. This means that the bipartite quantum state shared by Alice and Bob is assumed to be independent

and indentially distributed (i.i.d.), that is, that there exists a probability distribution $p(\sigma_{AB})$ on $\mathcal{H}_A \otimes \mathcal{H}_B$ such that:

$$\rho_{AB}^{(n)} = \int \sigma_{AB}^{\otimes n} p(\sigma_{AB}) d\sigma_{AB}. \quad (1)$$

In the case of protocols such as BB84 which are invariant under permutation of Alice and Bob's subsystems, it is useless to consider symmetries of the protocol when considering collective attacks since an i.i.d. state is clearly invariant under permutation of its subsystems. The converse property is not true in general, but it is the content of the exponential version of de Finetti theorem [33] or of the post-selection technique introduced in [32] is that it also holds asymptotically.

In the case of continuous-variable QKD protocols, one can consider a specific symmetry in phase-space [27] which is not strictly implied by collective attacks. The protocol GG02 is indeed invariant under orthogonal transformations of the vectors $\mathbf{x}$ and $\mathbf{y}$ in phase-space, meaning that the state $\rho_{AB}^{(n)}$ can safely be considered to be invariant under conjugate passive symplectic operations applied by Alice and Bob.

Using this symmetry together with the assumption of collective attacks leads to a simple proof that the optimal collective attacks are Gaussian. More precisely, if the adversary is restricted to perform a collective attack, Alice and Bob can safely assume that this attack is Gaussian. To show this, we will use the following Lemma.

Lemma 1. *If a bipartite probability distribution $p(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$ defined over $\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n$ is both i.i.d. and invariant under orthogonal transformations in $\mathbb{R}^n$, that is $p(R\mathbf{x}, R\mathbf{y}) = p(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$ for all transformation $R \in O(n)$, then $p(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) \propto \exp(-\alpha\|\mathbf{x}\|^2 - \beta\|\mathbf{y}\|^2 - \gamma\mathbf{x} \cdot \mathbf{y})$.*

Proof. Let $p(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$ be a distribution invariant under rotations of both $\mathbf{x}$ and $\mathbf{y}$ in $\mathbb{R}^n$. Clearly, $p(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$ can only depend on three parameters, namely $\|\mathbf{x}\|^2$, $\|\mathbf{y}\|^2$ and $\mathbf{x} \cdot \mathbf{y}$ which are the only invariants under transformations in $O(n)$. Hence, there exists a function $f : \mathbb{R}^+ \times \mathbb{R}^+ \times \mathbb{R} \mapsto \mathbb{R}$ such that:

$$p(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = f(\|\mathbf{x}\|^2, \|\mathbf{y}\|^2, \mathbf{x} \cdot \mathbf{y}). \quad (2)$$

Now, using the hypothesis that $p(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$ should be i.i.d., the same must be true for f , meaning in particular that

$$f\left(\sum_{i=1}^n x_i^2, \sum_{i=1}^n y_i^2, \sum_{i=1}^n x_i y_i\right) \propto \prod_{i=1}^n f(x_i^2, y_i^2, x_i y_i). \quad (3)$$

This property implies that f is exponential in $\|\mathbf{x}\|^2$, $\|\mathbf{y}\|^2$ and $\mathbf{x} \cdot \mathbf{y}$. $\square$

As was argued in [27], the protocol GG02 is invariant under conjugate passive symplectic operations applied by Alice and Bob. Hence Alice and Bob can safely assume that their state ρ_{AB} displays the same symmetry, meaning in particular that the probability distribution of Alice

and Bob classical data is such that $p(R\mathbf{x}, R\mathbf{y}) = p(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$ for all transformation $R \in O(n)$. If the analysis is restricted to collective attacks, one can use Lemma 1 to conclude that the distribution p can be considered to be Gaussian. Since the initial state produced by Alice, a (Gaussian) two-mode squeezed vacuum is transformed through the quantum channel into another Gaussian state, this means that the action of the channel, that is of the attack, can be safely considered to be Gaussian, which gives a simple proof that Gaussian attacks are optimal among collective attacks.

III. CONCLUSION AND PERSPECTIVES

In this paper, we gave an alternative proof that Gaussian attacks are optimal against GG02 among all collective attacks. This new proof makes use of specific symmetries of the protocol in phase space, and does not require to consider specific properties of the entropy as in previous proofs [11, 12]. A natural question is whether this technique can be exploited for variants of the GG02 protocol.

Let us consider first protocols with a discrete modulation, such as [22]. In this case, our new proof cannot be applied directly as protocols with a discrete modulation are less symmetric than protocols with a Gaussian modulation. Indeed, not all rotations in phase space leave the protocol invariant: only the orthogonal transformations leaving the modulation unchanged, that is, transformations belonging to the symmetry group of the hypercube are relevant in this case. This group, however, is much smaller than the orthogonal group, and one cannot conclude directly that the state ρ_{AB} can be safely considered to be Gaussian. Note that this is still true but has to be proven with a different approach [22] based on the extremality of Gaussian states [34].

The second class of protocols one could consider is protocols with a post-selection procedure [14, 23, 24, 25, 26]. These protocols have not yet been proven secure against general collective attacks because it is not known whether Gaussian attacks are optimal among collective attacks. The technique presented in this paper cannot be used either for protocols displaying a post-selection step as this post-selection explicitly breaks the symmetry of the pro-

tol in phase-space.

In addition to its simplicity, our new proof turns out to be useful for the finite size analysis of the security of continuous-variable QKD protocols. Indeed, a specificity of the finite size analysis is that Alice and Bob cannot assume to perfectly know the quantum state they share. For continuous-variable protocols in general, this is in fact theoretically impossible as their state belongs to an infinite dimensional Hilbert space, and therefore requires an infinite number of parameters to be fully described. Fortunately, for protocols such as GG02 where the state can safely be considered to be Gaussian, Alice and Bob only need to know their covariance matrix which depends on three parameters: the modulation variance which is chosen by Alice as well as the transmission and the excess noise of the quantum channel. In a finite size scenario, these parameters are estimated by revealing part of Alice and Bob's data. In order to proceed with this estimation, one needs a statistical model and choosing a normal model seems quite natural. However, previous proofs of Gaussian optimality presented in [11, 12] assume that the covariance matrix is known from Alice and Bob and cannot justify the use of a normal statistical model for its estimation. The proof presented here, on the contrary, allows for such a justification [35]. This is crucial since, without a statistical model for their data, Alice and Bob would be unable to estimate their covariance matrix, especially in an adversarial scenario such as QKD where they should consider the *worst* covariance matrix compatible with their data except with some small probability ϵ . Whereas this could be done even without a model in the case of bounded parameters such as the quantum bit error rate for discrete-variable QKD protocols, this is much more complicated for *a priori* unbounded such as the excess noise in the GG02 protocol.

Acknowledgments

We thank Frédéric Grosshans for helpful remarks on a previous version of this work. We acknowledge support from Agence Nationale de la Recherche under projects PROSPIQ (ANR-06-NANO-041-05) and SE-QUIRE (ANR-07-SESU-011-01).

-
- [1] V. Scarani, H. Bechmann-Pasquinucci, N. J. Cerf, M. Dušek, N. Lütkenhaus, and M. Peev, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **81**, 1301 (2009).
 - [2] M. Peev, C. Pacher, R. Alléaume, C. Barreiro, J. Bouda, W. Boxleitner, T. Debuisschert, E. Diamanti, M. Dianati, J. F. Dynes, et al., *New J. Phys.* **11** (2009).
 - [3] C. Bennett and G. Brassard, in *Proceedings of IEEE International Conference on Computers, Systems and Signal Processing* (1984), vol. 175.
 - [4] R. Renner, Ph.D. thesis, ETH Zürich (2005), Arxiv preprint: quant-ph/0512258.
 - [5] V. Scarani and C. Kurtsiefer, Arxiv preprint 0906.4547 (2005).
 - [6] T. Ralph, *Phys. Rev. A* **61**, 010303 (1999).
 - [7] F. Grosshans and P. Grangier, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **88**, 057902 (2002).
 - [8] F. Grosshans and P. Grangier, Arxiv preprint quant-ph/0204127 (2002).
 - [9] F. Grosshans, G. Van Assche, J. Wenger, R. Brouri, N. Cerf, and P. Grangier, *Nature* **421**, 238 (2003).

- [10] S. Fossier, E. Diamanti, T. Debuisschert, A. Villing, R. Tualle-Brouri, and P. Grangier, *New J. Phys.* **11** (2009).
- [11] R. García-Patrón and N. J. Cerf, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **97**, 190503 (2006).
- [12] M. Navascués, F. Grosshans, and A. Acín, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **97**, 190502 (2006).
- [13] R. Renner and J. Cirac, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **102**, 110504 (2009).
- [14] C. Weedbrook, A. M. Lance, W. P. Bowen, T. Symul, T. C. Ralph, and P. K. Lam, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **93**, 170504 (2004).
- [15] J. Lodewyck and P. Grangier, *Phys. Rev. A* **76**, 022332 (2007).
- [16] J. Sudjana, L. Magnin, R. García-Patrón, and N. Cerf, *Phys. Rev. A* **76**, 052301 (2007).
- [17] R. Namiki and T. Hirano, *Phys. Rev. A* **67**, 022308 (2003).
- [18] R. Namiki and T. Hirano, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **92**, 117901 (2004).
- [19] M. Heid and N. Lütkenhaus, *Phys. Rev. A* **73**, 052316 (2006).
- [20] Y.-B. Zhao, M. Heid, J. Rigas, and N. Lütkenhaus, *Phys. Rev. A* **79**, 012307 (2009).
- [21] D. Sych and G. Leuchs (AIP, 2009), vol. 1110, pp. 347–350.
- [22] A. Leverrier and P. Grangier, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **102**, 180504 (2009).
- [23] C. Silberhorn, T. C. Ralph, N. Lütkenhaus, and G. Leuchs, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **89**, 167901 (2002).
- [24] R. Namiki and T. Hirano, *Phys. Rev. A* **72**, 024301 (2005).
- [25] R. Namiki and T. Hirano, *Phys. Rev. A* **74**, 032302 (2006).
- [26] M. Heid and N. Lütkenhaus, *Phys. Rev. A* **76**, 022313 (2007).
- [27] A. Leverrier, E. Karpov, P. Grangier, and N. Cerf, *New J. Phys.* **11**, 115009 (2009).
- [28] V. Scarani and R. Renner, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **100**, 200501 (2008).
- [29] R. Y. Q. Cai and V. Scarani, *New J. Phys.* **11** (2009).
- [30] A. Leverrier and N. J. Cerf, *Phys. Rev. A* **80**, 010102 (2009).
- [31] F. Grosshans, N. Cerf, J. Wenger, R. Tualle-Brouri, and P. Grangier, *Quantum Information and Computation* **3**, 535 (2003).
- [32] M. Christandl, R. König, and R. Renner, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **102**, 020504 (2009).
- [33] R. Renner, *Nature Physics* **3**, 645 (2007).
- [34] M. M. Wolf, G. Giedke, and J. I. Cirac, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **96**, 080502 (2006).
- [35] A. Leverrier, F. Grosshans, and P. Grangier (in preparation).