

# Quantum secret sharing between multi-party and multi-party without entanglement

Feng-Li Yan<sup>1,2</sup>, Ting Gao<sup>2,3,4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *College of Physics, Hebei Normal University, Shijiazhuang 050016, China*

<sup>2</sup> *CCAST (World Laboratory), P.O. Box 8730, Beijing 100080, China*

<sup>3</sup> *College of Mathematics and Information Science,  
Hebei Normal University, Shijiazhuang 050016, China*

<sup>4</sup> *Department of Mathematics, Capital Normal University, Beijing 100037, China*

We propose a quantum secret sharing protocol between multi-party ( $m$  members in Group 1) and multi-party ( $n$  members in Group 2) using a sequence of single photons. These single photons are used directly to encode classical information in quantum secret sharing process. In this protocol, all members in Group 1 directly encode their respective keys on the states of single photons via unitary operations, then the last one (the  $m^{\text{th}}$  member of Group 1) send  $1/n$  of the resulting qubits to each of Group 2. Thus the secret message shared by all members of Group 1 are shared by all members of Group 2 in such a way that no subset of each Group is efficient to read the secret message, but the entire set (not only Group 1 but also Group 2) is. We also show that is unconditionally secure. This protocol is feasible with present-day technique.

PACS numbers: 03.67.Dd; 03.67.Hk; 89.70.+c

## I. INTRODUCTION

Suppose two groups such as two government departments, where there are  $m$  and  $n$  members respectively, want to correspond with each other, but members of each group do not trust each other. What can they do? Classical cryptography gives an answer which is known as secret sharing [1]. It can be used, to guarantee that no single person or part of each department can read out the secret message, but all members of each group can. This means that for security to be breached, all people of one group must act in concert, thereby making it more difficult for any single person who wants to gain illegal access to the secret information. It can be implement as follows: from his original message, each member (called sender) of group 1 separately creates  $n$  coded messages and send each of them to each member (called receiver) of group 2. Each of the encrypted message contains no information about senders's original message, but the combination of all  $nm$  coded messages contain the complete message of group 1. However, either a  $(m + n + 1)$ -th party or the dishonest member of two groups gains access to all senders' transmissions can learn the contents of their (all senders) message in this classical procedure. Fortunately, quantum secret sharing protocols [2, 3, 4, 5] can accomplish distributing information securely where multi-photon entanglement is employed. Recently, many kinds quantum secret sharing with entanglement have been proposed [6, 7, 8, 9]. The combination of quantum key distribution (QKD) and classical sharing protocol can realizes secret sharing safely. Quantum secret sharing protocol provides for secure secret sharing by enabling one to determine whether an eavesdropper has been active during the secret sharing procedure. But it is not easy to implement such multi-party secret sharing tasks [2, 6], since the efficiency of preparing even tripartite or four-partite entangled states is very low [10, 11], at the same time the efficiency of the existing quantum secret

sharing protocols using quantum entanglement can only approach 50%.

More recently, a protocol for quantum secret sharing without entanglement has been proposed by Guo and Guo [12]. They present an idea to directly encode the qubit of quantum key distribution and accomplish one splitting a message into many parts to achieve multi-party secret sharing only by product states. The theoretical efficiency is doubled to approach 100%.

In this paper, we propose a quantum secret sharing scheme employing single qubits to achieve the aim mentioned above — the secret sharing between multi-party (say  $m$  parties of group 1) and multi-party (say  $n$  parties of group 2). That is, instead of giving his information to any one individual of group 1, each sender to split his information in such a way that no part members of group 1 or group 2 have any knowledge of the combination of all senders (group 1), but all members of each group can jointly determine the combination of all senders (group 1). Just as [12], the security of our scheme is based on the quantum no-cloning theory just as the BB84 quantum key distribution. Comparing with the efficiency 50% limiting for the existing quantum secret sharing protocols with quantum entanglement, the present scheme can also be 100% efficient in principle.

## II. QUANTUM KEY SHARING BETWEEN MULTI-PARTY AND MULTI-PARTY

Suppose there are  $m$  ( $m \geq 2$ ) and  $n$  ( $n \geq 2$ ) members in government department1 and department2, respectively, and Alice1, Alice2,  $\dots$ , Alicem, and Bob1, Bob2,  $\dots$ , Bobn are their respective all members.  $m$  parties of department1 want quantum key sharing with  $n$  parties of department2 such that neither one nor part of each department know the key, but only by all members' working together can each department determine

what the string (key) is. In this case it is the quantum information that has been split into  $n$  pieces, no one of which separately contains the original information, but whose combination does.

Alice1 begins with  $A_1$  and  $B_1$ , two strings each of  $nN$  random classical bits. She then encodes these strings as a block of  $nN$  qubits,

$$\begin{aligned} |\Psi^1\rangle &= \otimes_{k=1}^{nN} |\psi_{a_k^1 b_k^1}\rangle \\ &= \otimes_{j=0}^{N-1} |\psi_{a_{nj+1}^1 b_{nj+1}^1}\rangle |\psi_{a_{nj+2}^1 b_{nj+2}^1}\rangle \cdots |\psi_{a_{nj+n}^1 b_{nj+n}^1}\rangle \end{aligned} \quad (1)$$

where  $a_k^1$  is the  $k^{th}$  bit of  $A_1$  (and similar for  $B_1$ ), each qubit is one of the four states

$$|\psi_{00}\rangle = |0\rangle, \quad (2)$$

$$|\psi_{10}\rangle = |1\rangle, \quad (3)$$

$$|\psi_{01}\rangle = |+\rangle = \frac{|0\rangle + |1\rangle}{\sqrt{2}}, \quad (4)$$

$$|\psi_{11}\rangle = |-\rangle = \frac{|0\rangle - |1\rangle}{\sqrt{2}}. \quad (5)$$

The effect of this procedure is to encode  $A_1$  in the basis  $Z = \{|0\rangle, |1\rangle\}$  or  $X = \{|+\rangle, |-\rangle\}$ , as determined by  $B_1$ . Note that the four states are not all mutually orthogonal, therefore no measurement can distinguish between all of them with certainty. Alice1 then sends  $|\Psi^1\rangle$  to Alice2, over their public quantum communication channel.

Depending on a string  $A_2$  of random classical bits which she generate, Alice2 subsequently applies a unitary transformation  $\sigma_0 = I = |0\rangle\langle 0| - |1\rangle\langle 1|$  (if the  $k^{th}$  bit  $a_k^2$  of  $A_2$  is 0), or  $\sigma_1 = i\sigma_y = |0\rangle\langle 1| - |1\rangle\langle 0|$  (if  $a_k^2 = 1$ ) on each  $|\psi_{a_k^1 b_k^1}\rangle$  of the  $nN$  qubits she receives from Alice1 such that  $|\psi_{a_k^1 b_k^1}\rangle$  is changed into  $|\psi_{a_k^2 b_k^2}^0\rangle$ , and obtains  $nN$ -qubit product state  $|\Psi^{20}\rangle = \otimes_{k=1}^{nN} |\psi_{a_k^2 b_k^2}^0\rangle$ . After that, she performs a unitary operator  $I$  (if  $b_k^2 = 0$ ) or  $H = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|0\rangle + |1\rangle)\langle 0| + \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|0\rangle - |1\rangle)\langle 1|$  (if  $b_k^2 = 1$ ) on each qubit  $|\psi_{a_k^2 b_k^2}^0\rangle$  according to her another random classical bits string  $B_2$ , and makes  $|\psi_{a_k^2 b_k^2}^0\rangle$  to be turned into  $|\psi_{a_k^2 b_k^2}\rangle$ . Alice2 sends Alice3  $|\Psi^2\rangle = \otimes_{k=1}^{nN} |\psi_{a_k^2 b_k^2}\rangle$ . Similar to Alice2, Alice3 applies quantum operations on each qubit and send the resulting  $nN$  qubits to Alice4. This procedure goes on till Alicem.

Similarly, Alicem first creates two strings  $A_m$  and  $B_m$  of  $nN$  random classical bits. Then she makes a unitary operator  $\sigma_0$  (if  $a_k^m = 0$ ) or  $\sigma_1$  (if  $a_k^m = 1$ ) on each qubit  $|\psi_{a_k^{m-1} b_k^{m-1}}\rangle$ , after which  $|\psi_{a_k^{m-1} b_k^{m-1}}\rangle$  is changed into  $|\psi_{a_k^m b_k^m}^0\rangle$ . After that she applies operator  $I$  (if  $b_k^m = 0$ ) or  $H$  (if  $b_k^m = 1$ ) on the resulting qubit  $|\psi_{a_k^m b_k^m}^0\rangle$  such that  $|\psi_{a_k^m b_k^m}^0\rangle$  is turned into  $|\psi_{a_k^m b_k^m}\rangle$ . Alicem sends  $N$ -qubit product states  $|\Psi_1^m\rangle = \otimes_{j=0}^{N-1} |\psi_{a_{nj+1}^m b_{nj+1}^m}\rangle$ ,  $|\Psi_2^m\rangle = \otimes_{j=0}^{N-1} |\psi_{a_{nj+2}^m b_{nj+2}^m}\rangle$ ,  $\cdots$ ,  $|\Psi_n^m\rangle = \otimes_{j=0}^{N-1} |\psi_{a_{nj+n}^m b_{nj+n}^m}\rangle$  of the resulting  $nN$  qubits  $|\Psi^m\rangle = \otimes_{k=1}^{nN} |\psi_{a_k^m b_k^m}\rangle$  to Bob1, Bob2,  $\cdots$ , Bobn, respectively.

When all Bob1, Bob2,  $\cdots$ , and Bobn have announced the receiving of their strings of  $N$  qubits, Alice1, Alice2,  $\cdots$ , and Alicem publicly announce the strings  $B_1$ ,  $B_2$ ,  $\cdots$ , and  $B_m$  one after another, respectively. Note that  $B_1$ ,  $B_2$ ,  $\cdots$ , and  $B_m$  reveal nothing about  $A_i$  ( $i = 1, 2, \cdots, m$ ), but it is important that all Alice1, Alice2,  $\cdots$ , and Alicem not publish their respective  $B_1$ ,  $B_2$ ,  $\cdots$ , and  $B_m$  until after all Bob1, Bob2,  $\cdots$  and Bobn announce the reception of the  $N$  qubits Alicem sends to them.

Bob1, Bob2,  $\cdots$ , and Bobn then measure each qubit of their respective strings in the basis  $X$  or  $Z$  according to the XOR result of corresponding bits of strings  $B_1$ ,  $B_2$ ,  $\cdots$ ,  $B_m$ . Since the unitary transformation  $\sigma_1 = i\sigma_y$  flips the state in both measuring basis such that  $\sigma_1|0\rangle = -|1\rangle$ ,  $\sigma_1|1\rangle = |0\rangle$ ,  $\sigma_1|+\rangle = |-\rangle$  and  $\sigma_1|-\rangle = -|+\rangle$ , i.e.  $I, i\sigma_y$  leave bases  $X$  and  $Z$  unchanged, but  $H$  turns  $|0\rangle$ ,  $|1\rangle$ ,  $|+\rangle$  and  $|-\rangle$  into  $|+\rangle$ ,  $|-\rangle$ ,  $|0\rangle$  and  $|1\rangle$ , respectively, i.e.  $H$  changes bases  $X$  and  $Z$ , so if  $\oplus_{i=2}^m b_k^i = b_k^2 \oplus b_k^3 \oplus \cdots \oplus b_k^m = 0$ , then  $|\psi_{a_k^m b_k^m}\rangle$  should be measured in the same basis with  $|\psi_{a_k^1 b_k^1}\rangle$ ; if  $\oplus_{i=2}^m b_k^i = 1$ ,  $|\psi_{a_k^m b_k^m}\rangle$  should be measured in the basis different with  $|\psi_{a_k^1 b_k^1}\rangle$ , where the symbol  $\oplus$  is the addition modulo 2. Therefore, if  $\oplus_{i=2}^m b_k^i = b_k$ ,  $|\psi_{a_k^m b_k^m}\rangle$  is measured in the  $Z$  basis, otherwise in the basis  $X$ . That is, if  $\oplus_{i=1}^m b_{nj+l}^i = 0$ , then Bobl measures  $|\psi_{a_{nj+l}^m b_{nj+l}^m}\rangle$  in the basis  $Z$ , otherwise, he measures in the basis  $X$ . Moreover, after measurements, Bobl can extract out all Alices's encoding information  $\oplus_{i=1}^m a_{nj+l}^i$ ,  $j = 0, 1, 2, \cdots, N$ , for  $l = 1, 2, \cdots, n$ .

Now all Alices and Bobs perform some tests to determine how much noise or eavesdropping happened during their communication. Alice1, Alice2,  $\cdots$ , and Alicem select some bits  $nj_r + l$  (of their  $nN$  bits) at random, and publicly announce the selection. Here  $j_r \in \{j_1, j_2, \cdots, j_{r_0}\} \subseteq \{j_1, j_2, \cdots, j_{r_0}, j_{r_0+1}, \cdots, j_N\} = \{0, 1, 2, \cdots, N-1\}$ , and  $l = 1, 2, \cdots, n$ . All Bobs and all Alices then publish and compare the values of these checked bits. If they find too few the XOR results  $\oplus_{i=1}^m a_{nj_r+l}^i$  of the corresponding bits  $a_{nj_r+l}^i$  of these checked bits of all Alices and the values of Bobl's checked bits  $|\psi_{a_{nj_r+l}^m b_{nj_r+l}^m}\rangle$  agree, then they abort and re-try the protocol from the start. The XOR results  $\oplus_{l=1}^n (\oplus_{i=1}^m a_{nj_s+l}^i)$  of Bobl's corresponding bits  $\oplus_{i=1}^m a_{nj_s+l}^i$  of the rest unchecked bits  $nj_s + l$  of  $\{\oplus_{i=1}^m a_{nj+1}^i\}_{j=0}^{N-1}$ ,  $\{\oplus_{i=1}^m a_{nj+2}^i\}_{j=0}^{N-1}$ ,  $\cdots$ ,  $\{\oplus_{i=1}^m a_{nj+n}^i\}_{j=0}^{N-1}$  (or  $\otimes_{j=0}^{N-1} |\psi_{a_{nj+1}^m b_{nj+1}^m}\rangle$ ,  $\otimes_{j=0}^{N-1} |\psi_{a_{nj+2}^m b_{nj+2}^m}\rangle$ ,  $\cdots$ ,  $\otimes_{j=0}^{N-1} |\psi_{a_{nj+n}^m b_{nj+n}^m}\rangle$ ) can be used as raw keys for secret sharing between all Alices and all Bobs, where  $j_s = j_{r_0+1}, j_{r_0+2}, \cdots, j_N$ .

This protocol is summarized as follows:

M1. Alice1 chooses two random  $nN$ -bit strings  $A_1$  and  $B_1$ . She encodes each data bit of  $A_1$  as  $\{|0\rangle, |1\rangle\}$  if the corresponding bit of  $B_1$  is 0 or  $\{|+\rangle, |-\rangle\}$  if  $B_1$  is 1. Explicitly, she encodes each data bit 0 (1) of  $A_1$  as  $|0\rangle$  ( $|1\rangle$ ) if the corresponding bit of  $B_1$  is 0 or  $|+\rangle$  ( $|-\rangle$ ) if the corresponding bit of  $B_1$  is 1, i.e. she encodes each bit  $a_k^1$

of  $A_1$  as  $|\psi_{a_k^1 b_k^1}\rangle$  of Eqs.(2), where  $b_k^1$  is the corresponding bit of  $B_1$ . Then she sends the resulting  $nN$ -qubit state  $|\Psi^1\rangle = \otimes_{k=1}^{nN} |\psi_{a_k^1 b_k^1}\rangle$  to Alice2.

M2. Alice2 creates two random  $nN$ -bit strings  $A_2$  and  $B_2$ . She applies  $\sigma_0$  or  $\sigma_1$  to each qubit  $|\psi_{a_k^1 b_k^1}\rangle$  of  $nN$ -qubit  $|\Psi^1\rangle$  according to the corresponding bit of  $A_2$  being 0 or 1, then she applies  $I$  or  $H$  to each qubit of the resulting  $nN$ -qubit state depending on the corresponding bit of  $B_2$  being 0 or 1. After this, she sends Alice3 the resulting  $nN$ -qubit state  $|\Psi^2\rangle$ .

M3. Alice $i$  does likewise,  $i = 3, 4, \dots, m-1$ . Depending on the corresponding bit  $a_k^m$  of a random  $nN$ -bit string  $A_m$ , which she generates on her own, Alice $m$  performs  $\sigma_0$  (if  $a_k^m = 0$ ) or  $\sigma_1$  (if  $a_k^m = 1$ ) on each qubit of  $|\Psi^{m-1}\rangle$ . According to a random bits string  $B_m$  which she generates, she subsequently applies  $I$  (if the corresponding bit  $b_k^m$  of  $B_m$  is 0) or  $H$  (if  $b_k^m = 1$ ) on each qubit of the resulting  $nN$ -qubit state  $|\Psi^{m0}\rangle$ , and results in  $nN$ -qubit state  $|\Psi^m\rangle = \otimes_{k=1}^{nN} |\psi_{a_k^m b_k^m}\rangle$ . After it, she sends  $N$ -qubit state  $\otimes_{k=0}^{N-1} |\psi_{a_{nk+l}^m b_{nk+l}^m}\rangle$  to Bob $l$ ,  $1 \leq l \leq n$ .

M4. Bob1, Bob2,  $\dots$ , Bob $m$  receive  $N$  qubits, and announce this fact, respectively.

M5. Alice1, Alice2,  $\dots$ , and Alice $m$  publicly announce the strings  $B_1, B_2, \dots$ , and  $B_m$ , respectively.

M6. Bob1, Bob2,  $\dots$  and Bob $n$  measure each qubit of their respective strings in the basis  $Z$  or  $X$  according to the XOR results of corresponding bits of strings  $B_1, B_2, \dots, B_m$ . That is, Bob $l$  measures  $|\psi_{a_{nk+l}^m b_{nk+l}^m}\rangle$  in the basis  $Z$  (if  $\oplus_{i=1}^m b_{nk+l}^i = 0$ ) or in basis  $X$  (if  $\oplus_{i=1}^m b_{nk+l}^i = 1$ ),  $k = 0, 1, \dots, N-1, l = 1, 2, \dots, n$ .

M7. All Alices select randomly a subset that will serve as a check on Eve's interference, and tell all Bobs the bits they choose. In the check procedure, all Alices and Bobs are required to broadcast the values of their checked bits, and compare the XOR results of the corresponding bits of checked bits of  $A_1, A_2, \dots, A_m$  and the values of the corresponding bits of Bob1, Bob2,  $\dots$  and Bob $n$ . If more than an acceptable number disagree, they abort this round of operation and restart from first step.

M8 All Alices and Bobs perform information reconciliation and privacy amplification on the XOR results  $\oplus_{l=1}^n (\oplus_{i=1}^m a_{nj_s+l}^i)$  of Bob $l$ 's corresponding bits  $\oplus_{i=1}^m a_{nj_s+l}^i$  of the remaining bits  $nj_s + l$  of  $\{\oplus_{i=1}^m a_{nj+1}^i\}_{j=0}^{N-1}, \{\oplus_{i=1}^m a_{nj+2}^i\}_{j=0}^{N-1}, \dots, \{\oplus_{i=1}^m a_{nj+n}^i\}_{j=0}^{N-1}$  (or  $\otimes_{j=0}^{N-1} |\psi_{a_{nj+1}^m b_{nj+1}^m}\rangle, \otimes_{j=0}^{N-1} |\psi_{a_{nj+2}^m b_{nj+2}^m}\rangle, \dots, \otimes_{j=0}^{N-1} |\psi_{a_{nj+n}^m b_{nj+n}^m}\rangle$ ) to obtain  $N'$  shared key bits for secret sharing between all Alices and all Bobs, where  $j_s = j_{r0+1}, j_{r0+2}, \dots, j_{rN}$ .

For example,  $m = 2$  and  $n = 3$ . Suppose  $A_1 = \{1, 0, 0, 1, 0, 1, 0, 1, 1, 0, 0, 0, 1, 1, 1, 0, 1, 0\}$  and  $B_1 = \{0, 1, 0, 1, 1, 0, 1, 1, 0, 0, 1, 0, 1, 0, 1, 0, 0, 1\}$  are two random bits strings of Alice1. Depending on  $B_1$ , then she encode  $A_1$  as  $|\Psi^1\rangle = |1\rangle|+\rangle|0\rangle|-\rangle|+\rangle|1\rangle|+\rangle|-\rangle|1\rangle|0\rangle|+\rangle|0\rangle|-\rangle|1\rangle|-\rangle|0\rangle|1\rangle|+\rangle$ . If Alice2's two strings of random bits are  $A_2 = \{1, 1, 1, 0, 0, 1, 1, 1, 0, 0, 0, 1, 0, 1, 1, 0, 0, 1\}$  and

$B_2 = \{1, 0, 0, 1, 1, 0, 0, 0, 1, 1, 1, 0, 0, 0, 1, 0, 1\}$ , she applies  $i\sigma_y$  to the  $1^{th}, 2^{th}, 3^{th}, 6^{th}, 7^{th}, 8^{th}, 12^{th}, 14^{th}, 15^{th}, 18^{th}$  qubits of  $|\Psi^1\rangle$ , getting  $|\Psi^{20}\rangle = |0\rangle|-\rangle|1\rangle|-\rangle|+\rangle|0\rangle|-\rangle|+\rangle|1\rangle|0\rangle|+\rangle|1\rangle|-\rangle|0\rangle|+\rangle|0\rangle|1\rangle|-\rangle$ , then she performs  $H$  on  $1^{th}, 4^{th}, 5^{th}, 9^{th}, 10^{th}, 11^{th}, 12^{th}, 16^{th}, 18^{th}$  qubits of  $|\Psi^{20}\rangle$ , obtaining  $|\Psi^2\rangle = \otimes_{k=1}^{18} |\psi_{a_k^2 b_k^2}\rangle = |+\rangle|-\rangle|1\rangle|1\rangle|0\rangle|0\rangle|-\rangle|+\rangle|-\rangle|+\rangle|0\rangle|-\rangle|-\rangle|0\rangle|+\rangle|+\rangle|1\rangle|1\rangle$ . After that, she sends the 6-qubit states  $|\Psi_1^2\rangle = \otimes_{j=0}^5 |\psi_{a_{3j+1}^2 b_{3j+1}^2}\rangle = |+\rangle|1\rangle|-\rangle|+\rangle|-\rangle|+\rangle$ ,  $|\Psi_2^2\rangle = \otimes_{j=0}^5 |\psi_{a_{3j+2}^2 b_{3j+2}^2}\rangle = |-\rangle|0\rangle|+\rangle|0\rangle|0\rangle|1\rangle$ , and  $|\Psi_3^2\rangle = \otimes_{j=0}^5 |\psi_{a_{3j+3}^2 b_{3j+3}^2}\rangle = |1\rangle|0\rangle|-\rangle|-\rangle|+\rangle|1\rangle$  to Bob1, Bob2 and Bob3, respectively. When each of Bob1, Bob2 and Bob3 has received 6-qubit state and announced the fact, Alice1 and Alice2 publicly inform all Bobs their respective strings  $B_1$  and  $B_2$ . Then Bob1 measures his qubit  $|\psi_{a_{3j+l}^2 b_{3j+l}^2}\rangle$  in the basis  $Z$  if  $b_{3j+l}^1 \oplus b_{3j+l}^2 = 0$  or in basis  $X$  if  $b_{3j+l}^1 \oplus b_{3j+l}^2 = 1$ , for  $j = 0, 1, \dots, 5, l = 1, 2, 3$ . From this, Bob1, Bob2 and Bob3 derive Alice1 and Alice2's encoding information  $\{0, 1, 1, 0, 1, 0\}$ ,  $\{1, 0, 0, 0, 0, 1\}$  and  $\{1, 0, 1, 1, 0, 1\}$  of their respective 6-qubit states if no Eve's eavesdropping exists. If Alice1 and Alice choose the  $1^{th}, 2^{th}, 3^{th}, 13^{th}, 14^{th}, 15^{th}$  bits as the check bits, then the XOR results  $1 \oplus 0 \oplus 0, 1 \oplus 0 \oplus 1, 0 \oplus 0 \oplus 1, 0 \oplus 1 \oplus 1$  (or 1, 0, 1, 0) of the corresponding bits of Bob1, Bob2 and Bob3's remaining bites  $\{1, 1, 0, 0\}$ ,  $\{0, 0, 0, 1\}$  and  $\{0, 1, 1, 1\}$  are used as raw keys for secret sharing between two Alices and three Bobs.

Note that  $B_1, B_2, \dots$ , and  $B_m$  reveal nothing about  $A_i$  ( $i = 1, 2, \dots, m$ ), but it is important that all Alice1, Alice2,  $\dots$ , and Alice $m$  not publish their respective  $B_1, B_2, \dots$ , and  $B_m$  until after all Bob1, Bob2,  $\dots$  and Bob $n$  announce the reception of the  $N$  qubits Alice $m$  sends to them. If all Alices broadcast their respective  $B_1, B_2, \dots$ , and  $B_m$  before all Bobs announce the reception of the  $N$  qubits Alice $m$  sends to them, then either a  $(m + n + 1)$ -th party or the dishonest member of two groups intercepts  $nN$  qubits  $|\Psi^m\rangle = \otimes_{k=1}^{nN} |\psi_{a_k^m b_k^m}\rangle$  can learn the contents of their (all senders) message in this procedure by measuring each qubit in the  $Z$  basis (if  $\oplus_{i=1}^m b_{nk+l}^i = 0$ ) or in the  $X$  basis (if  $\oplus_{i=1}^m b_{nk+l}^i = 1$ ).

It is necessary for Alice $i$  ( $2 \leq i \leq m$ ) applying unitary operation  $H$  randomly on some qubits. Each sender Alice $i$  encoding string  $B_i$  on the sequence of states of qubits is to achieve the aim such that no one or part of Alice1,  $\dots$ , Alice $m$  can extract some information of others. Case I: Alice2 does not encode a random strings of  $I$  and  $H$  on the sequence of single photons, Alice1 can enforce the intercept-resend strategy to extract whole information. Alice1 can intercept all the single photons and measure them, then resend them. As the sequence of single photons is prepared by Alice1, Alice1 knows the measuring-basis, and the original state of each photon. She uses the same measuring-basis when she prepared the photon to measure the photon, and read out Alice2's complete secret messages directly. Case II: Alice $i_0$  ( $3 \leq i_0 \leq m$ ) is the first one who does not encode a ran-

dom strings of  $I$  and  $H$  on the sequence of single photons, then one of Alice1, Alice2,  $\dots$ , Alice( $i_0 - 1$ ) can also enforce the intercept-resend strategy to extract Alice $i_0$ 's whole information by their cooperation. Without loss of generation, suppose that Alice2 intercepts all the particles that Alicem sends. Alice2 can obtain Alice $i_0$ 's secret message if Alice1, Alice3,  $\dots$ , Alice( $i_0 - 1$ ) inform her their respective strings  $B_1, B_2, \dots, B_{i_0}$ .

This secret sharing protocol between  $m$  parties and  $n$  parties is almost 100% efficient as all the keys can be used in the ideal case of no eavesdropping, while the quantum secret sharing protocols with entanglement states [2] can be at most 50% efficient in principle. In this protocol, quantum memory is required to store the qubits which has been shown available in the present experiment technique [13]. However, if no quantum memory is employed, all Bobs measure their qubits before Alice $i$  ( $1 \leq i \leq m$ ) announcement of basis, the efficiency of the present protocol falls to 50%.

Two groups can also realize secret sharing by Alice1 preparing a sequence of  $nN$  polarized single photons such that the  $n$ -qubit product state of each  $n$  photons is in the basis  $Z$  or  $X$  as determined by  $N$ -bit string  $B_1$ , instead that in the above protocol. For instance, (A) Alice $i$  ( $1 \leq i \leq m$ ) creates a random  $nN$ -bit string  $A_i$  and a random  $N$ -bit string  $B_i$ , and Alice1 encodes her two strings as a block of  $nN$  qubits  $|\Phi^1\rangle = \otimes_{j=1}^N |\phi_{a_{n(j-1)+1}^1 b_j^1}\rangle |\phi_{a_{n(j-1)+2}^1 b_j^1}\rangle \cdots |\phi_{a_{n(j-1)+n}^1 b_j^1}\rangle$ , where each qubit  $|\phi_{a_{n(j-1)+l}^1 b_j^1}\rangle$  is one of  $|\phi_{00}\rangle = |0\rangle$ ,  $|\phi_{10}\rangle = |1\rangle$ ,  $|\phi_{01}\rangle = |+\rangle$  and  $|\phi_{11}\rangle = |-\rangle$ . Then Alice1 sends  $|\Phi^1\rangle$  to Alice2. Alice $i$  ( $1 \leq i \leq m$ ) applies  $\sigma_0$  or  $\sigma_1$  to each qubit  $|\phi_{a_{n(j-1)+l}^{i-1} b_j^{i-1}}\rangle$  ( $1 \leq l \leq n$ ) according to the corresponding bit  $a_{n(j-1)+l}^i$  of  $A_2$  being 0 or 1, then she applies  $I$  (if  $b_j^i = 0$ ) or  $H$  (if  $b_j^i = 1$ ) to each resulting qubit  $|\phi_{a_{n(j-1)+l}^i b_j^i}\rangle$ . Alicem sends  $N$  qubits

$\otimes_{j=1}^N |\phi_{a_{n(j-1)+l}^m b_j^m}\rangle$  of the resulting  $nN$  qubits  $|\Phi^m\rangle = \otimes_{j=1}^N |\phi_{a_{n(j-1)+1}^m b_j^m}\rangle |\phi_{a_{n(j-1)+2}^m b_j^m}\rangle \cdots |\phi_{a_{n(j-1)+n}^m b_j^m}\rangle$  to Bob $l$ ,  $1 \leq l \leq n$ . After all Bobs receive their respective  $N$  qubits, Alice $i$  announce  $B_i$ , then Bob $l$  measures his each qubit  $|\phi_{a_{n(j-1)+l}^m b_j^m}\rangle$  in the basis  $Z$  if  $\oplus_{i=1}^m b_j^i = 0$  or  $X$  if  $\oplus_{i=1}^m b_j^i = 1$ , and deduces its value  $\oplus_{i=1}^m a_{n(j-1)+l}^i$ , if there is no Eve's eavesdropping. A subset of  $\{\oplus_{i=1}^n (\oplus_{i=1}^m a_{n(j-1)+l}^i)\}_{j=1}^N$  will serve as a check, passing the test, the unchecked bits of  $\{\oplus_{i=1}^n (\oplus_{i=1}^m a_{n(j-1)+l}^i)\}_{j=1}^N$  will take as the raw keys for secret sharing between two groups. (B) Alice $i$  chooses two random  $N$ -bit strings  $A_i$  and  $B_i$ , and Alice1 prepare a block of  $nN$  qubits  $|\Psi^1\rangle = \otimes_{j=1}^N |\psi_{a_{j1}^1 b_{j1}^1}\rangle |\psi_{a_{j2}^1 b_{j2}^1}\rangle \cdots |\psi_{a_{jn}^1 b_{jn}^1}\rangle$ , where  $a_{jl}^1$  and  $b_{jl}^1$  are 0 or 1,  $\oplus_{l=1}^n a_{jl}^1 = a_j^1$  and  $\oplus_{l=1}^n b_{jl}^1 = b_j^1$ . Alice $i$  applies unitary operations  $\sigma_0$  or  $\sigma_1$  depending on  $A_i$ , following it,  $I$  or  $H$  according to  $B_i$ , to each particle. Bob $l$  measures his each particle  $|\psi_{a_{jl}^m b_{jl}^m}\rangle$  in the basis  $Z$  (if  $\oplus_{i=1}^m b_j^i = 0$ ) or  $X$  (if  $\oplus_{i=1}^m b_j^i = 1$ ). All Alices select randomly some bits and announce their selection. All Bobs and all Alices compares the values of these check

bits. If the test passes, then the rest unchecked bits of  $\{\oplus_{i=1}^m a_j^i\}_{j=1}^N$  are the raw key for secret sharing between two groups.

### III. SECURITY

We now discuss the unconditional security of this quantum secret sharing protocol between  $m$  parties and  $n$  parties. We notice that the encoding of secret messages by Alice $i$  ( $1 \leq i \leq m$ ) is identical to the process in a one-time-pad encryption where the text is encrypted with a random key as the state of the photon in the protocol is completely random. The great feature of a one-time-pad encryption is that as long as the key strings are truly secret, it is completely safe and no secret messages can be leaked even if the cipher-text is intercepted by the eavesdropping. Here the secret sharing protocol is even more secure than the classical one-time-pad in the sense that an eavesdropper Eve can not intercept the whole cipher-text as the photons' measuring-basis is chosen randomly. Thus the security of this secret sharing protocol depends entirely on the second part when Alicem sends the  $l$ -th  $N$  photons sequence of to Bob $l$  ( $1 \leq l \leq n$ ).

The process for ensuring a secure block of  $nN$  qubits ( $n$  secure sequences of  $N$  photons) is similar to that in BB84 QKD protocol [14]. The process of this secret sharing between  $m$  parties and  $n$  parties after all Alices encoding their respective messages using unitary operations is in fact identical to  $n$  independent BB84 QKD processes, which has been proven unconditional secure [15, 16]. Thus the security for the present quantum secret sharing between multi-party and multi-party is guaranteed.

In summary, we propose a scheme for quantum secret sharing between multi-party and multi-party, where no entanglement is employed. In the protocol, Alice1 prepares a sequence of single photons in one of four different states according to her two random bits strings, other Alice $i$  ( $2 \leq i \leq m$ ) directly encodes her two random classical information strings on the resulting sequence of Alice( $i - 1$ ) via unitary operations, after that Alicem sends  $\frac{1}{n}$  of the sequence of single photons to each Bob $l$  ( $1 \leq l \leq n$ ). Each Bob $l$  measures his photons according all Alices' measuring-basis sequences. All Bobs must cooperate in order to infer the secret key shared by all Alices. Any subset of all Alices or all Bobs can not extract secret information, but the entire set of all Alices and the entire set of all Bobs can. As entanglement, especially the inaccessible multi-party entangled state, is not necessary in the present quantum secret sharing protocol between  $m$ -party and  $n$ -party, it may be more applicable when the numbers  $m$  and  $n$  of the parties of secret sharing are large. Its theoretic efficiency is also dubbed to approach 100%. This protocol is feasible with present-day technique.

### Acknowledgments

This work was supported by Hebei Natural Science Foundation of China under Grant No: A2004000141 and

Key Natural Science Foundation of Hebei Normal University.

- 
- [1] B. Schneier, Applied Cryptography, Wiley, New York, 1996. See also J. Gruska, Foundations of Computing, Thomson Computer Press, London, 1997.
  - [2] M. Hillery, V. Bužek, and A. Berthiaume, Phys. Rev. A **59**, 1829 (1999).
  - [3] W. Tittel, H. Zbinden, N. Gisin, Phys. Rev. A **63**, 042301 (2001).
  - [4] D. Gottesman, Phys. Rev. A **61**, 042311 (2000).
  - [5] A. C. A. Nascimento, J. M. Quade and H. Imai, Phys. Rev. A **64**, 042311 (2002).
  - [6] A. Karlsson, M. Koashi and N. Imoto, Phys. Rev. A **59**, 162 (1999).
  - [7] R. Cleve, D. Gottesman and H. K. Lo, Phys. Rev. Lett. **83**, 648 (1999).
  - [8] V. Karimipour, A. Bahraminasab and S. Bagherinezhad, Phys. Rev. A **65**, 042320 (2002).
  - [9] S. Bagherinezhad and V. Karimipour, arXiv: quant-ph/0204124.
  - [10] D. Bouwmeester, et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. **82**, 1345 (1999).
  - [11] J. W. Pan, et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. **86**, 4435 (2001).
  - [12] G. P. Guo and G. C. Guo, Phys. Lett. A **310**, 247 (2003).
  - [13] G. C. Guo and G. G. Guo, arXiv: quant-ph/0206041.
  - [14] C. H. Bennett and G. Brassard, Proc. IEEE Int. Conf. on Computers, Systems and Signal Processing, Bangalore, India, (IEEE, New York, 1984), PP. 175-179.
  - [15] P. W. Shor and J. Preskill, Phys. Rev. Lett. **85**, 441 (2000).
  - [16] N. J. Cerf, M. Bourennane, A. Karlsson and N. Gisin, Phys. Rev. Lett. **88**, 127902 (2002).