

UNCONDITIONALLY SECURE QUANTUM BIT COMMITMENT IS POSSIBLE

Horace P. Yuen

Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering

Department of Physics and Astronomy

Northwestern University

Evanston IL 60208-3118

email: yuen@ece.northwestern.edu

Abstract

Bit commitment involves the submission of evidence from one party to another so that the evidence can be used to confirm a later revealed bit value by the first party, while the second party cannot determine the bit value from the evidence alone. It is widely believed that secure quantum bit commitment is impossible due to quantum entanglement cheating, which is codified in a general impossibility theorem. An unconditionally secure bit commitment protocol utilizing quantum states is presented below, in which the second party can deliberately destroy the entanglement needed for the first party to cheat successfully.

PACS #: 03.67Dd, 03.65Bz

NOTE UPDATE

(1) I have found that the protocol described in the first version of this paper (v1 to v3) is already secure because, with the use of anonymous states, Adam cannot determine what the cheating transformation U^A is. More about anonymous key quantum cryptography is now available in quant-ph/0009113.

(2) The issues brought up in v5 on Aug 11 have been resolved. The protocol described in the second version of this paper (v4 and v5) is insecure, and the “impossibility proof” has been extended to cover similar situations in which Babe introduces a superoperator transformation on the states committed by Adam while still being able to verify perfectly.

(3) Another protocol involving anonymous states has been found which has an unconditional security proof that can readily be completely described. A third protocol not using anonymous states but related to protocols Y2 and Y3 of my Capri talk is also found to be unconditionally secure.

(4) A long version of this paper is being prepared that would include an extended treatment of the “impossibility proof,” a discussion of its limited scope, as well as descriptions and analyses of the above-mentioned three protocols. It would appear as v7 of this paper, hopefully in a few weeks.

Quantum cryptography [1], the study of information security systems involving quantum effects, has recently been associated almost exclusively with the cryptographic objective of key distribution. This is due primarily to the universal acceptance of the general impossibility of secure quantum bit commitment (QBC), taken to be a consequence of the Einstein-Podolsky-Rosen (EPR) type entanglement cheating which rules out QBC and other quantum protocols that have been proposed for various other cryptographic objectives [2]. In a bit commitment scheme, one party, Adam, provides another party, Babe, with a piece of evidence that he has chosen a bit b (0 or 1) which is committed to her. Later, Adam would “open” the commitment: revealing the bit b to Babe and convincing her that it is indeed the committed bit with the evidence in her possession. The usual concrete example is for Adam to write down the bit on a piece of paper which is then locked in a safe to be given to Babe, while keeping for himself the safe key that can be presented later to open the commitment. The evidence should be *binding*, i.e., Adam should not be able to change it, and hence the bit, after it is given to Babe. It should also be *concealing*, i.e., Babe should not be able to tell from it what the bit b is. Otherwise, either Adam or Babe would be able to cheat successfully.

In standard cryptography, secure bit commitment is to be achieved either through a trusted third party or by invoking an unproved assumption on the complexity of certain computational problem. By utilizing quantum effects, various QBC schemes not involving a third party have been proposed that were supposed to be unconditionally secure, in the sense that neither Adam nor Babe can cheat with any significant probability of success as a matter of physical laws. In 1995-1996, a general proof on the impossibility of unconditionally secure QBC and the insecurity of previously proposed protocols were described [3]-[6]. Henceforth, it has been accepted that secure QBC and related objectives are impossible as a matter of principle [7]-[8].

Since there is no known characterization of all possible QBC protocols, logically there can really be no general impossibility proof even if it were indeed impossible to have a secure QBC protocol. In this paper, an unconditionally secure QBC scheme will be presented which is not covered by the scope of the impossibility proof. The results are developed within nonrelativistic quantum mechanics, unrelated to relativistic protocols [9]. The QBC framework is as follows.

When Adam picks $b = 0$ to commit to Babe, he sends her a state $|\phi_i\rangle \in \mathcal{H}^B$ with probability p_i within fixed openly known sets $\{|\phi_i\rangle\}$ and $\{p_i\}$ for $i \in \{1, \dots, M\}$. When he picks $b = 1$, he sends $|\phi'_i\rangle \in \mathcal{H}^B$ from another fixed openly known set $\{|\phi'_i\rangle\}$ with probabilities $\{p'_i\}$. The $\{|\phi_i\rangle\}$ and $\{|\phi'_i\rangle\}$ are so chosen that they are concealing as evidence, i.e., Babe cannot reliably discriminate between them in optimum binary quantum hypothesis testing [10]. They would also be binding if Adam is honest and sends them as they are, which he could not change after Babe receives them. In that case, when Adam reveals the bit by telling exactly which state $|\phi_i\rangle$ or $|\phi'_i\rangle$ he sent, Babe can measure the corresponding projector to verify the bit. In general, Babe can always guess the bit with a probability of success $P_c^B = \frac{1}{2}$, while Adam should not be able to change a committed bit at all. However, it is meaningful and common to grant “unconditional security” if the best \bar{P}_c^B Babe can achieve is arbitrarily close to $1/2$ and Adam’s best probability of successfully changing a committed bit \bar{P}_c^A is arbitrarily close to zero [4] even when both parties have perfect technology and unlimited computational power.

The impossibility proof gives the following general EPR cheat that Adam can launch. Instead of sending $|\phi_i\rangle$ or $|\phi'_i\rangle$, Adam can generate $|\Phi_0\rangle$ or $|\Phi_1\rangle$ depending on $b = 0$ or 1 ,

$$|\Phi_0\rangle = \sum_i \sqrt{p_i} |e_i\rangle |\phi_i\rangle, \quad |\Phi_1\rangle = \sum_i \sqrt{p'_i} |e'_i\rangle |\phi'_i\rangle \quad (1)$$

with $\{|e_i\rangle\}$, $\{|e'_i\rangle\}$ complete orthonormal in \mathcal{H}^A , and sends Babe \mathcal{H}^B while keeping \mathcal{H}^A himself. He can, as was argued, switch between $|\Phi_0\rangle$ and $|\Phi_1\rangle$ by operation on \mathcal{H}^A alone, and thus alter the evidence to suit his choice of b before opening the commitment. In the case $\rho_0^B \equiv \text{tr}_A |\Phi_0\rangle\langle\Phi_0| = \rho_1^B \equiv \text{tr}_A |\Phi_1\rangle\langle\Phi_1|$, the switching operation is to be obtained by using the so-called “Schmidt decomposition,” the expansion of $|\Phi_0\rangle$ and $|\Phi_1\rangle$ in terms of the eigenstates $|\hat{\phi}_k\rangle$ of $\rho_0^B = \rho_1^B$ and the eigenstates $|\hat{e}_k\rangle$ and $|\hat{e}'_k\rangle$ of ρ_0^A and ρ_1^A ,

$$|\Phi_0\rangle = \sum_k \lambda_k^{1/2} |\hat{e}_k\rangle |\hat{\phi}_k\rangle, \quad |\Phi_1\rangle = \sum_k \lambda_k^{1/2} |\hat{e}'_k\rangle |\hat{\phi}_k\rangle \quad (2)$$

By applying a unitary U^A that brings $\{|\hat{e}_k\rangle\}$ to $\{|\hat{e}'_k\rangle\}$, Adam can select between $|\Phi_0\rangle$ or $|\Phi_1\rangle$ any time before he opens the commitment but after he supposedly commits. When ρ_0^B and ρ_1^B are not equal but close, it was shown that one may transform (1) by an U^A to a $|\Phi''_1\rangle$

with $|\langle \Phi_1 | \Phi_1'' \rangle|$ as close to 1 as ρ_0^B is close to ρ_1^B , and thus the state $|\Phi_1''\rangle$ would serve as the effective EPR cheat.

The operation of U^A with subsequent measurement of an orthonormal basis is equivalent to the mere measurement of an orthonormal basis $\{|\tilde{e}_i\rangle\}$ on the system. Thus, the net cheating operation can be described by writing

$$|\Phi_0\rangle = \sum_i \sqrt{\tilde{p}_i} |\tilde{e}_i\rangle |\tilde{\phi}_i\rangle \quad (3)$$

$$\sqrt{\tilde{p}_i} |\tilde{\phi}_i\rangle \equiv \sum_j \sqrt{p_j} V_{ji} |\phi_j\rangle \quad (4)$$

for a unitary matrix V defined by $|e_i\rangle = \sum_j V_{ij} |\tilde{e}_j\rangle$. Note from (4) that $|\tilde{\phi}_i\rangle$ is always some proper linear combination of the committed $|\phi_i\rangle$ from $|\Phi_0\rangle$. Adam's successful cheating probability is

$$P_c^A = \sum_i \tilde{p}_i |\langle \tilde{\phi}_i | \phi'_i \rangle|^2. \quad (5)$$

Thus $P_c^A \sim 1$ if and only if

$$\tilde{p}_i \sim p'_i, \quad |\tilde{\phi}_i\rangle \sim |\phi'_i\rangle, \quad \forall i, \quad (6)$$

where \sim between pure states is used in the sense of inner product. In general, the optimal cheating probability \bar{P}_c^B for Babe is given by $\bar{P}_c^B = 1 - P_e$ in terms of the error probability P_e for optimally discriminating between two equiprobable density operators ρ_0 and ρ_1 by any quantum measurement,

$$P_e = \frac{1}{4} (2 - \|\rho_0 - \rho_1\|_1) \quad (7)$$

where $\|\cdot\|_1$ is the trace norm, $\|\tau\|_1 \equiv \text{tr}(\tau^\dagger \tau)^{1/2}$ of a trace-class operator τ [11]. The impossibility proof claims that whenever $\bar{P}_c^B = \frac{1}{2} + O(n^{-1})$, one has $\bar{P}_c^A = 1 - O(n^{-1})$.

To guarantee Adam's ability to cheat as above via the entanglement (1), which is *not* needed for a successful protocol with him just sending $|\phi_i\rangle$ or $|\phi'_i\rangle$, it was argued [4]-[5] that the coherence of the states (1) can, in principle, always be maintained by Adam alone for *any* conceivable QBC protocol. In the following, a protocol will be presented in which Babe can deliberately destroy the entanglement, reducing the states to incoherent superpositions of the $|\phi_i\rangle$'s, thus preventing the EPR cheat and making the protocol successful. Before

describing the protocol, the essential mechanism of entanglement destruction will first be described.

Consider a single mode of radiation field in state $|\psi_1\rangle = \sum_i \lambda_i |\alpha_i\rangle_1$ where $|\alpha_i\rangle_1$ are coherent states [12]. Let this mode and another vacuum mode be incident on a beamsplitter represented by the scattering matrix

$$\Gamma = \begin{pmatrix} \sqrt{\eta} & -\sqrt{1-\eta} \\ \sqrt{1-\eta} & \sqrt{\eta} \end{pmatrix}$$

for a transmittance $0 < \eta < 1$. The two beamsplitter output modes are then in the joint state

$$|\psi_{12}\rangle = \sum_i \lambda_i |\sqrt{\eta}\alpha_i\rangle_1 |\sqrt{1-\eta}\alpha_i\rangle_2 \quad (8)$$

The first mode by itself is in state

$$\rho_1 = \sum_{ij} \lambda_i \lambda_j^* |\sqrt{\eta}\alpha_i\rangle_1 \langle\sqrt{\eta}\alpha_j|_1 \langle\sqrt{1-\eta}\alpha_i|_2 \langle\sqrt{1-\eta}\alpha_j|_2 \quad (9)$$

with the off-diagonal ($i \neq j$) terms attenuated by the exponential factor

$$|{}_2\langle\sqrt{1-\eta}\alpha_i|\sqrt{1-\eta}\alpha_j\rangle_2| = \exp\{-(1-\eta)|\alpha_i - \alpha_j|^2/2\}.$$

Thus, as is well-known [13]-[15], the coherent superposition of “macroscopically distinguishable” states is supersensitive to loss: when $|\alpha_i - \alpha_j|$ is large, the coherence of ψ_1 or ρ_1 is destroyed for very small $1 - \eta$ with the loss of a single photon from mode 1. This ρ_1 of (9) can also be used to model the effect of a lossy environment on mode 1.

Consider the following protocol Y:

(I) Adam sends Babe a sequence of s states $|\alpha_\ell\rangle$, $|\alpha_\ell\rangle \in \mathcal{H}_\ell^B$, $\mathcal{H}^B = \otimes_\ell \mathcal{H}_\ell^B$, each $|\alpha_\ell\rangle$ being either one of two coherent states $\{|\alpha\rangle, |\alpha'\rangle\}$, such that an even number of $|\alpha'\rangle$ corresponds to $b = 0$ and an odd number to $b = 1$, with probability $1/2^{s-1}$ for each sequence of either parity.

(II) Babe splits each state $|\alpha_\ell\rangle$ to $|\sqrt{\eta}\alpha_\ell\rangle$ on \mathcal{H}_ℓ^B [16].

(III) Adam opens the commitment by revealing the sequence of s states. Babe verifies by measuring the corresponding projection on each $|\sqrt{\eta}\alpha_\ell\rangle$ to see that the entire sequence is correct.

Let $|\phi_i\rangle = \otimes_\ell |\alpha_{i\ell}\rangle$ where each $\alpha_{i\ell}$ is α or α' . Similar to (8)-(9), the entangled state $|\Phi_0\rangle\langle\Phi_0|$ sent by Adam would become, after the loss introduced by Babe,

$$\tilde{\rho}_0 = \sum_i p_i |e_i\rangle |\bar{\phi}_i\rangle \langle e_i| \langle \bar{\phi}_i| + \Delta\rho_0 \quad (10)$$

where $|\bar{\phi}_i\rangle$ is obtained from $|\phi_i\rangle$ by replacing $\alpha_{i\ell}$ by $\sqrt{\eta}\alpha_{i\ell}$ and the off-diagonal terms $\Delta\rho_0$ are

$$\Delta\rho_0 = \sum_{i \neq j} \sqrt{p_i p_j} |e_i\rangle |\bar{\phi}_i\rangle \langle e_j| \langle \bar{\phi}_j| \Delta_{ij} \quad (11)$$

with

$$|\Delta_{ij}| = \prod_\ell |\langle \sqrt{1-\eta}\alpha_{i\ell} | \sqrt{1-\eta}\alpha_{j\ell} \rangle| \leq \exp\{-(1-\eta)|\alpha - \alpha'|^2\} \quad (12)$$

since at least two $\alpha_{i\ell}$ differ among the $|\phi_i\rangle$'s. By choosing a large $|\alpha - \alpha'|$, we can ensure that $\tilde{\rho}_0$ is close to the separable incoherent form. Thus Adam's cheating operation U^A would produce only a vanishingly small effect, and the protocol would work as follows.

To show that the scheme is concealing, note that, as a consequence of the factorization of $\rho_0^B - \rho_1^B$ into products of individual qubit parts, Babe's optimum quantum decision reduces to optimally deciding between $|\alpha\rangle$ and $|\alpha'\rangle$ for each \mathcal{H}_ℓ^B individually and then seeing whether there is an even or odd number of $|\alpha'\rangle$. The optimum error probability p_e for each \mathcal{H}_ℓ^B is given in [11], and the optimum probability \bar{P}_c^B of correct bit decision on the sequence is, from the even and odd binomial sums,

$$\bar{P}_c^B = \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2}(1 - 2p_e)^s \quad (13)$$

Note that \bar{P}_c^B is exponentially close to $\frac{1}{2}$ regardless of whether $|\alpha_{i\ell}\rangle$ or $|\sqrt{\eta}\alpha_{i\ell}\rangle$ is to be measured. Without entanglement, the best cheating probability Adam can get is

$$P_c^A = |\langle \alpha | \alpha' \rangle|^2 \quad (14)$$

by generating any sequence of $s - 1$ states, picking the last one for the bit commitment, and declaring it to be otherwise when desired. From (11)-(14), one can make $\|\Delta\rho_0\|_1 = O(n^{-1})$, $\bar{P}_c^A = O(n^{-1})$ and $\bar{P}_c^B - 1/2 = O(2^{-n})$ with $s = O(n^2)$. Hence unconditional security is obtained for large n [17].

The principle underlying this secure protocol Y is for Babe to destroy Adam's cheating entanglement while still being able to verify when he opens. The lossy environment

introduced by Babe is originally described reversibly on a larger Hilbert space, but the observation space is one in which the environment is traced out. In particular, the transformation $|\alpha_\ell\rangle \rightarrow |\sqrt{\eta}\alpha_\ell\rangle$ cannot be effected by a unitary operator on \mathcal{H}_ℓ^B . This mechanism of entanglement destruction is, of course, not affected when Adam's cheating operation is first performed before Babe's lossy transformation, as Adam's and Babe's operations commute. To bring this out clearly, let Adam first generate, via cheating, the state $|\tilde{\phi}_i\rangle$ of (4) for some i , with $|\phi_i\rangle$ given by a product of coherent states according to step (I) of protocol Y. Thus, $|\tilde{\phi}_i\rangle$ is a coherent superposition of macroscopically distinguishable states and becomes, upon the introduction of loss,

$$\tilde{p}_i|\tilde{\phi}_i\rangle\langle\tilde{\phi}_i| \rightarrow \sum_j p_j|V_{ji}|^2|\phi_j\rangle\langle\phi_j| + \Delta\rho_0. \quad (15)$$

Thus, even though $|\tilde{\phi}_i\rangle \sim |\phi'_i\rangle$, $|\tilde{\phi}_i\rangle$ is supersensitive to loss and becomes (15), effectively an incoherent superposition of the original $|\phi_i\rangle$, from Babe's *deliberate partial observation*. If Adam sends the coherent superposition $|\tilde{\phi}_i\rangle$, the entanglement destruction would occur in the original $|\tilde{\phi}_i\rangle$ he sent, i.e. Babe would just get $b=0$ after the lossy transformation. Because Adam's cheating operation always produces a linear superposition of committed states $|\phi_i\rangle$ according to (3)-(4), at least one of $|\tilde{\phi}_i\rangle$ or $|\phi_i\rangle$ is a coherent entanglement, and such entanglement destruction by Babe cannot be prevented.

As it stands, protocol Y is only unconditionally secure in the ideal disturbance-free limit, which is sufficient for demonstrating the issues in principle as in the case of previous QBC protocols. There is a sensitivity problem that results from $|\langle\alpha|\alpha'\rangle| \sim 0$, which obscures the difference in practice between the two cases of detection for verification or cheating when the state is known or unknown. This sensitivity can be removed by using product states for $|\alpha\rangle$ and $|\alpha'\rangle$, corresponding to a concatenated hash function that could, via proper choice of parameters, alleviate the sensitivity while obtaining exponential convergence rate for both $\bar{P}_c^A \rightarrow 0$ and $\bar{P}_c^B \rightarrow \frac{1}{2}$. The details for a practical design would be given elsewhere.

Since protocol Y requires large-energy coherent states, it is not at all automatic that any previous QBC or other protocol could be modified to take advantage of this strategy of entanglement destruction. It remains to be determined whether the BCJL protocol [18] could be so modified, although it already suffers from other serious problems. However, this

entanglement destruction strategy, as well as some other strategies, can be applied to other schemes for obtaining secure QBC protocols. They will be described in future publications.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

I would like to thank Hoi-Kwong Lo, Masanao Ozawa, and numerous other colleagues, too many to list here, for their criticism, support, and discussions. This work was supported in part by the Defense Advanced Research Project Agency and in part by the Army Research Office.

References

- [1] C. H. Bennett, G. Brassard, and A. K. Ekert, *Sci. Am. (Int. Ed.)* **267** (10), 50 (1992).
- [2] A review is given by G. Brassard and C. Crépeau, *SIGACT news* **27** No. 3, 13 (1996).
- [3] D. Mayers, LANL quant-ph/9603015.
- [4] D. Mayers, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **78**, 3414 (1997).
- [5] H. K. Lo and H. F. Chau, LANL quant-ph/9605026.
- [6] H. K. Lo and H. F. Chau, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **78**, 3410 (1997).
- [7] H. K. Lo, *Phys. Rev. A* **56** 1154 (1997).
- [8] G. Brassard, C. Crépeau, D. Mayers, and L. Salvail, LANL quant-ph/9712023; quant-ph/9806031.
- [9] A. Kent, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **83**, 1447 (1999); LANL quant-ph/9906103.
- [10] C.W. Helstrom, *Quantum Detection and Estimation Theory*, Academic Press, 1976, Ch. IV.
- [11] The expression given in ref [10] can be converted to (7) by noting $\text{tr}(\rho_0 - \rho_1) = 0$. For two pure states, (7) simplifies to $P_e = \frac{1}{2}(1 - \sqrt{1 - |\langle\phi_0|\phi_1\rangle|^2})$.
- [12] L. Mandel and E. Wolf, *Optical Coherence and Quantum Optics*, Cambridge Univ. Press, 1995, Ch. 11-12.
- [13] A. O. Caldeira and A. J. Leggett, *Phys. Rev* **A31**, 1059 (1985).
- [14] D. F. Walls and G. J. Milburn, *Phys. Rev* **A31**, 2403 (1985).
- [15] H. P. Yuen, “High-Rate Strong-Signal Quantum Cryptography,” in *Proceedings of the 1995 Conference on Squeezed States and Uncertainty Relations*, NASA Conference Publication 3322, 1996; pp. 363-368.

- [16] Babe can introduce a variable loss η_ℓ for each \mathcal{H}_ℓ^B unknown to Adam, but that is not required for the protocol to succeed.
- [17] In addition to P_c^A , one can use another criterion P_a^A , the average probability that Adam's committed evidence is accepted by Babe after he opens, which is always at least $1/2$ similar to P_c^B with $P_a^A = (1 + P_c^A)/2$ when (1) is used as an initial state $|\tilde{\Phi}_0\rangle$ by Adam. For a general $|\tilde{\Phi}_0\rangle$, \bar{P}_a^A is obtained in the present case by a fixed $|\alpha_0\rangle$ with $\bar{P}_a^A = (1 + |\langle\alpha|\alpha'\rangle|)/2$. Thus, $\bar{P}_c^B - \frac{1}{2} = O(2^{-n})$ and $\bar{P}_a^A - \frac{1}{2} = O(n^{-1})$ are achieved for $s = O(n^3)$.
- [18] G. Brassard, C. Crépeau, R. Jozsa, and D. Langlois, *Proceedings of the 34 Annual IEEE Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science*, 1993, pp. 362-371.

One major problem of this protocol is that Babe's optimum quantum measurement does not factorize into individual qubit ones when a code is employed because $\rho_0^B - \rho_1^B$ does not then factorize. Also, there is no known polynomial time algorithm for the NP-hard problem of determining the minimum distance of a randomly chosen binary linear code, even probabilistically or approximately, which would be needed to execute the protocol and to prevent cheating.