

Security of quantum key distribution with discrete rotational symmetry

Masato Koashi

*Division of Materials Physics, Graduate School of Engineering Science,
Osaka University, 1-3 Machikaneyama, Toyonaka, Osaka 560-8531, Japan and
CREST Photonic Quantum Information Project,
4-1-8 Honmachi, Kawaguchi, Saitama 331-0012, Japan*

We prove the unconditional security of quantum key distribution protocols using attenuated laser pulses with M different linear polarizations. When $M = 4$, the proof covers the so-called SARG04 protocol [V. Scarani et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. **92**, 057901 (2004)], which uses exactly the same quantum communication as the Bennett-Brassard 1984 protocol. For a channel with transmission η , we show that the key rate in SARG04 scales as $O(\eta^{3/2})$. When we increase the number of states to $M = 2k - 1$ or $2k$, the key rate scaling improves as $O(\eta^{(k+1)/k})$.

PACS numbers: 03.67.Dd 03.67.-a

Information encoded on the polarization of a single photon is strongly affected by the law of quantum mechanics, and can be used to grow a shared random bit sequence (secret key) between two remote parties with negligible leak to an eavesdropper. The first protocol of this quantum key distribution (QKD) was proposed by Bennett and Brassard [1], and is called the BB84 protocol. A practically important and rather surprising fact is that the QKD is still possible [2] even if we encode the information on an attenuated laser pulse, which might be regarded as a classical object. One drawback in using such a practical light source is the decrease of the efficiency when we take the channel loss into consideration [3, 4]. For a channel with transmission η , the secure key rate in the BB84 protocol scales as $O(\eta^2)$ instead of naively expected $O(\eta)$ dependence. The reason of this poor performance is that whenever the sender Alice emits more than one photon, the eavesdropper Eve can keep extra photons without introducing any detectable error. In order to suppress this so-called photon number splitting (PNS) attack, Alice must attenuate her laser pulse in proportion to η .

A number of possibilities have been studied to remedy this performance drop. One solution is to switch to a completely different protocol and implement the B92 protocol with a strong phase-reference pulse as in its original proposal [5]. It was proved that this simple protocol using laser light achieves the key rate of $O(\eta)$ [6]. Another solution is to modify the quantum communication part of the BB84 protocol to detect the PNS attack. This can be done [7] by mixing the pulses (decoy states) with various amplitudes in the protocol, and it was proved [8] that the key rate of $O(\eta)$ can be achieved with a large number of decoy states. A third possibility is the so-called SARG04 protocol [9], which modifies *only* the classical communication part of the BB84. Since the feasibility of the BB84 with attenuated laser pulses has been repeatedly tested experimentally in the past decade, the SARG04 protocol has its unique practical importance. What we know about its security so far is the follow-

ing. Tamaki and Lo have analyzed [10] a protocol which is the SARG04 augmented with decoy states, and have shown that unconditionally secure key can be extracted from the two-photon emission part. For the unmodified SARG04 with its original spirit, Branciard *et al.* derived $O(\eta^{3/2})$ dependence of the key rate assuming a limited set of individual attacks by Eve [11].

In this paper, we prove the security of the SARG04 protocol and its natural generalization to M -state protocols with no condition on the attack by an eavesdropper. We show a lower bound on the key rate in the SARG04 protocol scaling as $\sim \alpha \eta^{3/2}$, where α is a factor depending on the bit error rate. For $M (> 4)$ states, the exponent improves to $O(\eta^{(k+1)/k})$ with $k = \lceil M/2 \rceil$, while the requirement for the bit error rate becomes severer as k increases. For the security proof, we use the $2M$ -fold discrete rotational symmetry of the system to simplify the argument. For a light source with any photon-number distribution, the protocol can be reduced to an entanglement based protocol with Hilbert space $\mathcal{H} \cong \mathbb{C}^M \otimes \mathbb{C}^2$. The whole space \mathcal{H} can be further divided into M qubits according to the angular momentum. Then we can use a standard analysis to obtain the security proof.

We consider the following protocols specified by two integers (M, L) with $2L \leq M$. Alice prepares system C in a linearly polarized, phase-randomized state of light, which is written as

$$\hat{\rho}(\theta) \equiv \sum_n \mu_n |\theta, n\rangle_{CC} \langle \theta, n|,$$

$$|\theta, n\rangle_C \equiv 2^{-n/2} (n!)^{-1/2} (e^{i\theta} \hat{a}_{-1}^\dagger + e^{-i\theta} \hat{a}_1^\dagger)^n |vac\rangle_C,$$

where \hat{a}_k is the annihilation operator for a circularly polarized photon with angular momentum k , and μ_n stands for the photon number distribution. The angle θ is chosen from the set $\Omega_M \equiv \{\pi l/M : l = 0, \dots, M-1\}$. Alice encodes her randomly chosen bit a in the following way. She chooses an integer j ($0 \leq j \leq M-1$) randomly, and sends $\hat{\rho}(a\Theta + \pi j/M)$ to Bob, where

$$\Theta \equiv \pi L/M.$$

The receiver Bob analyzes the polarization of the received light by a polarization beam splitter (PBS) followed by two photon detectors D_1 and D_2 . The whole analyzer is rotated by a randomly chosen angle $\theta' \in \Omega_M$, such that the light in state $\hat{\rho}(\theta')$ would be directed to D_1 and never to D_2 . We assume that the dark counts and the inefficiency of the detectors can be equivalently described by a noise source in the channel, and hence we treat them as ideal detectors. We say an event is ‘detected’ when D_1 and D_2 register exactly one photon in total, implying that the incoming state is found in the two-dimensional Hilbert space \mathcal{H}_B of a single photon. Bob announces when the event is detected, and records the rate η_d of detected events, which we call the detection rate. After Bob receives the light, Alice announces the value of j . Bob’s measurement determines a conclusive value for his bit b only when (a) D_1 registers no photons and D_2 registers one photon, and (b) the analyzer angle satisfies $\theta' = \Theta + \pi j/M$ ($b = 0$ in this case) or $\theta' = \pi j/M$ ($b = 1$). Let $|k\rangle_B \in \mathcal{H}_B$ ($k = 1, -1$) be the state of a single photon with angular momentum k , and define $|\xi_{\hat{\theta}}\rangle_B \equiv (e^{i\theta}| - 1\rangle_B - e^{-i\theta}|1\rangle_B)/\sqrt{2}$. Conditioned on the value of j , the POVM elements $\hat{B}_b^{(j)}$ for conclusive events ($b = 0, 1$) are given by $\hat{B}_0^{(j)} = P(|\xi_{\Theta+\pi j/M}\rangle_B)/M$ and $\hat{B}_1^{(j)} = P(|\xi_{\pi j/M}\rangle_B)/M$, where $P(|\cdot\rangle) \equiv |\cdot\rangle\langle\cdot|$. Finally, Bob announces whether the event has been conclusive or not.

It will be obvious that the $(M, L) = (4, 2)$ protocol is essentially the BB84 protocol, in which the bit a is encoded to orthogonal states ($\Theta = \pi/2$). The SARG04 corresponds to $(4, 1)$ and the bit is encoded to nonorthogonal states ($\Theta = \pi/4$), which is the crux of the protocol.

The security proof begins with the introduction of a virtual system A with M -dimensional Hilbert space \mathcal{H}_A . We take a basis $\{|2k\rangle_A\}_{k=0, \dots, M-1}$ and assume that the state $|2k\rangle_A$ has angular momentum $2k$. Let us define

$$|\Phi_n\rangle_{AC} \equiv \sqrt{2^{-n}n!} \sum_{k=0}^n [k!(n-k)!]^{-1} |2(k \bmod M)\rangle_A \otimes (\hat{a}_1^\dagger)^{n-k} (\hat{a}_{-1}^\dagger)^k |vac\rangle_C$$

and let $\hat{\rho}_{AC} \equiv \sum_n \mu_n P(|\Phi_n\rangle_{AC})$. This state is invariant under the rotation of systems AC by discrete angles $\theta \in \Omega_M$. Let us define another orthonormal basis $\{|\xi_\theta\rangle_A\}(\theta \in \Omega_M)$ by

$$|\xi_\theta\rangle_A \equiv M^{-1/2} \sum_{k=0}^{M-1} e^{-2ik\theta} |2k\rangle_A.$$

It is straightforward to see that ${}_A\langle\xi_\theta|\hat{\rho}_{AC}|\xi_\theta\rangle_A = \hat{\rho}(\theta)$ for $\theta \in \Omega_M$. Therefore, it makes no difference if Alice prepares $\hat{\rho}_{AC}$, sends system C to Bob, and then determines (a, j) by a measurement with POVM $\hat{A}_{a,j} \equiv P(|\xi_\theta\rangle_A)/2$ with $\theta = a\Theta + \pi j/M$ just before the announcement of j .

With this modification, every case in the detected events are regarded as an outcome of a measurement on $\mathcal{H}_A \otimes \mathcal{H}_B$. For example, conclusive events correspond to the operator $\hat{R}_{\text{con}} \equiv \sum_j (\hat{A}_{0,j} + \hat{A}_{1,j}) \otimes (\hat{B}_0^{(j)} + \hat{B}_1^{(j)})$, and the events with a bit error ($a \neq b$) to $\hat{R}_{\text{bit}} \equiv \sum_j (\hat{A}_{0,j} \otimes \hat{B}_1^{(j)} + \hat{A}_{1,j} \otimes \hat{B}_0^{(j)})$. The summation over j implies that these operators are invariant under the discrete rotations Ω_M . Hence, these should take the form of $\bigoplus_{k=0}^{M-1} \hat{s}_k$, where \hat{s}_k acts on the Hilbert space \mathcal{H}_k spanned by $|0\rangle_k \equiv |2k\rangle_A |1\rangle_B$ and $|1\rangle_k \equiv |2(k+1 \bmod M)\rangle_A |-1\rangle_B$, the states with total angular momentum $2k+1 \pmod{2M}$. Let us introduce the identity $\hat{1}_k$ and Pauli operators $\hat{X}_k \equiv |0\rangle_k \langle 1| + |1\rangle_k \langle 0|$, $\hat{Z}_k \equiv |0\rangle_k \langle 0| - |1\rangle_k \langle 1|$ for the qubit \mathcal{H}_k . Then, we can simply express the operators as

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{R}_{\text{con}} &= M^{-1} \bigoplus_{k=0}^{M-1} (\hat{1}_k - \cos^2 \Theta \hat{X}_k), \\ \hat{R}_{\text{bit}} &= (2M)^{-1} \bigoplus_{k=0}^{M-1} (\hat{1}_k - \hat{X}_k). \end{aligned} \quad (1)$$

The next step is to describe Bob’s measurement $\hat{B}_b^{(j)}$ as a filter followed by an ideal measurement on a qubit, as in the security proof of the B92 [12]. Consider a virtual qubit D with z basis $\{|0_z\rangle_D, |1_z\rangle_D\}$ and x basis $\{|0_x\rangle_D, |1_x\rangle_D\}$, where $|b_x\rangle_D \equiv (|0_z\rangle_D + (-1)^b |1_z\rangle_D)/\sqrt{2}$. Define an operator $\hat{F}^{(j)} : \mathcal{H}_B \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_D$ by

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{F}^{(j)} &= \sqrt{2/M} [\sin(\Theta/2) |1_x\rangle_{DB} \langle \xi_{(\Theta+\pi)/2+\pi j/M} | \\ &\quad + \cos(\Theta/2) |0_x\rangle_{DB} \langle \xi_{\Theta/2+\pi j/M} |]. \end{aligned}$$

Since $\hat{B}_b^{(j)} = \hat{F}^{(j)\dagger} |b_z\rangle_{DD} \langle b_z| \hat{F}^{(j)}$ holds, Bob’s measurement can be regarded as the filtering process described by Kraus operator $\hat{F}^{(j)}$, which tells whether the event is conclusive, followed by z -basis measurement on qubit D , which gives the bit value b . To prove the security, we are interested in what would happen if Bob measured the qubit on x basis, and how Alice could predict the outcome of that measurement. Bob’s x -basis measurement corresponds to the operator $\hat{B}_b^{(j)} \equiv \hat{F}^{(j)\dagger} |b_x\rangle_{DD} \langle b_x| \hat{F}^{(j)}$ acting on \mathcal{H}_B . In order to predict the outcome, Alice could measure $\{\hat{A}'_{a,j}\}$ instead of $\{\hat{A}_{a,j}\}$, where $\hat{A}'_{a,j} \equiv P(e^{i\varphi} |\xi_{\pi j/M}\rangle_A - (-1)^a e^{-i\varphi} |\xi_{\Theta+\pi j/M}\rangle_A)/4$. Here φ is a parameter we can freely choose. Since $\hat{A}_{0,j} + \hat{A}_{1,j} = \hat{A}'_{0,j} + \hat{A}'_{1,j}$, this change of measurement does not affect the announcement of j . The ‘‘phase error’’ event where Alice’s prediction fails ($a \neq b$) corresponds to the operator $\hat{R}_{\text{ph}} \equiv \sum_j \hat{A}'_{0,j} \otimes \hat{B}_1^{(j)} + \hat{A}'_{1,j} \otimes \hat{B}_0^{(j)}$, which is again rotationally invariant. After some algebra with

$\varphi' \equiv \varphi + (\Theta/2)$, we can express it as

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{R}_{\text{ph}} = & \frac{1}{2M} \bigoplus_{k=0}^{M-1} \left(\cos 2(k\Theta + \varphi') (\cos^2 \Theta \hat{1}_k - \hat{X}_k) \right. \\ & \left. + (1/2) \sin 2\Theta \sin 2(k\Theta + \varphi') \hat{Z}_k \right) + \hat{R}_{\text{con}}/2. \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

The rest of the task is to consider how we can estimate the number of the phase errors from the actually observed quantities. For that purpose, we consider the real protocol and a virtual protocol, both of which look identical in Eve's point of view. Suppose that there are $3N$ detected events for simplicity (The argument is the same for $N + o(N)$ instead of $3N$). Alice and Bob randomly group these into three sets of N events. For the first one, Alice measures the angular momentum of system A in the virtual protocol. In the real protocol, she refrains from disclosing j and just discards the events. Let r_{2k} be the relative frequency (number of events divided by N) of the outcome $2k$. For the second group, Alice and Bob together measure the bit error \hat{R}_{bit} in either of the protocols. Let r_{err} be its relative frequency. For the third group, from which they try to extract the key, Alice and Bob obtain $r_{\text{con}}N$ conclusive bits in the real protocol. Let $r_{\text{bit}}N$ be the number of errors in these bits. In the virtual protocol, they measure \hat{R}_{ph} and determine its relative frequency r_{ph} .

Thanks to the random grouping, $r_{\text{bit}} = r_{\text{err}}$ in the limit of $N \rightarrow \infty$ (more precisely, for any $\epsilon_0 > 0$, the probability of $|r_{\text{bit}} - r_{\text{err}}| > \epsilon_0$ is exponentially small in the limit). Further, as in [12], there must be a state $\hat{\rho} \equiv \bigoplus_k p_k \hat{\rho}_k$, where $\hat{\rho}_k$ is a normalized density operator acting on \mathcal{H}_k , such that $\text{Tr}[\hat{\rho}|2k\rangle_{AA}\langle 2k|] = r_{2k}$, $\text{Tr}[\hat{\rho}\hat{R}_{\text{bit}}] = r_{\text{bit}}$, $\text{Tr}[\hat{\rho}\hat{R}_{\text{con}}] = r_{\text{con}}$, and $\text{Tr}[\hat{\rho}\hat{R}_{\text{ph}}] = r_{\text{ph}}$. Let us write $X_k \equiv \text{Tr}[\hat{\rho}_k \hat{X}_k]$ and $X \equiv \sum_k p_k X_k$. The quantity X can be determined from the observed value r_{err} or r_{con} through the relations resulting from Eqs. (1),

$$2Mr_{\text{bit}} = 1 - X, \quad Mr_{\text{con}} = 1 - X \cos^2 \Theta. \quad (3)$$

Note that we can omit the measurement of r_{err} unless $\Theta = \pi/2$. Using Eq. (2) and the relation $X_k^2 + \text{Tr}[\hat{\rho}_k \hat{Z}_k]^2 \leq 1$, we obtain

$$r_{\text{ph}} \leq \frac{r_{\text{con}}}{2} + \frac{1}{2M} \sum_k p_k f_{2(k\Theta + \varphi')}(X_k), \quad (4)$$

where

$$f_{\phi}(x) \equiv \cos \phi (\cos^2 \Theta - x) + \frac{1}{2} \sin 2\Theta |\sin \phi| \sqrt{1 - x^2}.$$

It is seen that if $\cos 2(k\Theta + \varphi') \leq 0$, the phase error contribution from \mathcal{H}_k is too high even if $X_k = 1$ (no bit errors). We thus should choose φ' such that the contribution from such "bad" subspaces is minimized. Finally,

we derive an inequality from the fact that Eve cannot touch system A directly. Even though Eve may freely choose which events should be detected, $\{r_{2k}\}$ must still satisfy $r_{2k} \leq \eta_d^{-1} \text{Tr}[\hat{\rho}_{AC}|2k\rangle_{AA}\langle 2k|]$, which leads to

$$\begin{aligned} p_k (1 - \sqrt{1 - X_k^2}) + p_{k-1} (1 - \sqrt{1 - X_{k-1}^2}) \\ \leq 2\eta_d^{-1} \text{Tr}[\hat{\rho}_{AC}|2k\rangle_{AA}\langle 2k|], \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

where $p_{-1} \equiv p_{M-1}$. An upper bound \bar{r}_{ph} of r_{ph} can thus be calculated from the observed quantities X and η_d by taking the maximum of the rhs (right-hand side) of Eq. (4) over $\{p_k, X_k\}$, under the constraints of Eq. (5) and $X = \sum_k p_k X_k$.

Now the situation is summarized as follows. Alice and Bob have $r_{\text{con}}N$ conclusive bits with $r_{\text{err}}N$ errors. Bob's bits can be regarded as outcomes of z -basis measurements on $r_{\text{con}}N$ qubits, and if he had measured those qubits on x -basis, Alice could have predicted the outcomes with at most $\bar{r}_{\text{ph}}N$ errors. Then, by the argument in [13], we can extract an unconditionally secure secret key of length

$$G_N = Nr_{\text{con}}[1 - h(r_{\text{err}}/r_{\text{con}}) - h(\bar{r}_{\text{ph}}/r_{\text{con}})],$$

where $h(x) \equiv -x \log_2 x - (1-x) \log_2 (1-x)$. We can also derive the same key rate by assuming virtual qubits in Alice's side and invoking Shor-Preskill argument [14].

Using the general prescription derived above, here we concentrate on the most interesting case, the high channel-loss limit ($\eta \rightarrow 0$) when Alice uses an attenuated laser source with mean photon number μ , namely, $\mu_n = e^{-\mu} \mu^n / n!$. For a fair comparison of various protocols, we assume that, in addition to the transmission η , the channel applies a random rotation of polarization with probability ϵ . This results in the observed quantities $X = 1 - \epsilon$ and $\eta_d = \mu\eta$ in the limit $\eta \rightarrow 0$. Let K be a positive integer satisfying $K \leq M - 2$ and $2L(K - 1) < M$, namely, $\cos(K - 1)\Theta > 0$. We will show that by setting $\mu = (\gamma\eta)^{1/K}$, the key gain of $O(\eta^{(K+1)/K})$ is achievable in the high-loss limit $\eta \rightarrow 0$, when ϵ is small enough.

Consider the limit $\eta \rightarrow 0$ with $\mu = (\gamma\eta)^{1/K}$. For $k = K + 1$, the rhs of Eq. (5) converges to $\zeta_K \gamma$, where $\zeta_K \equiv [2^K (K + 1)!]^{-1}$ is a constant. Hence, when $K = M - 2$, we have

$$p_{M-1} (1 - \sqrt{1 - X_{M-1}^2}) + p_K (1 - \sqrt{1 - X_K^2}) \leq \zeta_K \gamma. \quad (6)$$

When $K \leq M - 3$, either $p_k = 0$ or $X_k = 0$ holds for $k = K + 1, \dots, M - 1$ since the rhs of Eq. (5) vanishes for $k \geq K + 2$. Therefore, Eq. (6) still holds, and the contributions from $\mathcal{H}_{K+1}, \dots, \mathcal{H}_{M-2}$ is not significant. On the other hand, there are no bounds for $\mathcal{H}_0, \dots, \mathcal{H}_{K-1}$. We thus choose $\varphi' = -(K - 1)\Theta/2$, making these subspaces "good" ones.

Let us divide X into two contributions as $X = qX' + (1 - q)X''$, where the first term is from \mathcal{H}_K and \mathcal{H}_{M-1} ,




FIG. 1: (a) Key gain G of SARG04 in the high channel loss limit $\eta \rightarrow 0$. (b) The same for the (5, 1) and the (6, 1) protocol. (c) Threshold channel noise ϵ for achieving $O(\eta^{(K+1)/K})$ scaling of the key gain.

namely, $q \equiv p_K + p_{M-1}$ and $qX' \equiv p_K X_K + p_{M-1} X_{M-1}$. Then, from Eq. (6), we have

$$q(1 - \sqrt{1 - X'^2}) \leq \zeta_K \gamma, \quad (7)$$

and Eq. (4) becomes

$$M(2r_{\text{ph}} - r_{\text{con}}) \leq qf_{(K+1)\Theta}(X') + (1 - q)f(X''), \quad (8)$$

where $f(x)$ is defined as the boundary of the convex hull of the union of regions below $f_{(K-1)\Theta}(x)$, $f_{(K-3)\Theta}(x)$, \dots , ($f_{\Theta}(x)$ or $f_0(x)$). For the relevant case with small bit errors (x being close to 1), $f(x)$ coincides with $f_{(K-1)\Theta}(x)$. Let $g(\gamma, \epsilon)$ be the maximum of the rhs of Eq. (8) over q, X', X'' under Eq. (7) and $1 - \epsilon = qX' + (1 - q)X''$. The key gain G (per pulse) in the limit $\eta \rightarrow 0$ is given by

$$G/\eta^{(K+1)/K} \sim \gamma^{1/K} \beta(\epsilon) M^{-1} \times \left[1 - h\left(\frac{\epsilon}{2\beta(\epsilon)}\right) - h\left(\frac{1}{2} + \max\left\{0, \frac{g(\gamma, \epsilon)}{2\beta(\epsilon)}\right\}\right) \right], \quad (9)$$

where $\beta(\epsilon) \equiv Mr_{\text{con}} = 1 - \cos^2 \Theta(1 - \epsilon)$. Since $g(0, 0) = f_{(K-1)\Theta}(1) < 0$, the rhs of Eq. (9) is positive for sufficiently small γ and ϵ . For a fixed $M \geq 4$, K can be as large as $\lceil M/2 \rceil$ when $L = 1$. Hence, the key gain scales as $O(\eta^{3/2})$ in the SARG04 protocol. The gain after optimization over γ is shown in Fig. 1(a). When $\epsilon = 0$, the optimum intensity of Alice's source scales as $\mu \sim 1.51\eta^{1/2}$. While the (5, 1) protocol and the (6, 1) protocol both achieve $O(\eta^{5/4})$ scaling, the latter protocol is better as shown in Fig. 1(b). In addition, we can double the key gain of the protocols with even M by separately collecting and processing the events where D_2 registers no photons and D_1 registers one photon. Fig. 1(c)

shows the threshold noise ϵ below which the key gain of $O(\eta^{(K+1)/K})$ is achievable. It is seen that the requirement for the noises becomes tighter as the exponent improves. This threshold depends only on Θ and not on M , since the only dependence on M of the rate (9) is the M^{-1} factor. The threshold is highest for approximately $\Theta \sim \pi/4(K - 1)$, which is achieved by the $(4(K - 1), 1)$ protocol.

In summary, we have proved the unconditional security of the SARG04 protocol and shown that the key gain scales as $O(\eta^{3/2})$. A natural generalization was given for the (M, L) protocols with M linearly polarized states. When the channel noise is low, the $(M, 1)$ protocol can achieve the key gain of $O(\eta^{(K+1)/K})$ with $K = \lceil M/2 \rceil$. One might wonder why we do not achieve $K = M - 2$, which is the bound due to the USD (unambiguous state discrimination) attack [10, 15]. But $K = \lceil M/2 \rceil$ is indeed optimal, because there is an attack which is a kind of mixture of USD and PNS. For example, if Alice emits 4 photons in the (6, 1) protocol, Eve may apply a filter to the excess 3 photons to obtain state $[e^{3i\theta}(\hat{a}_{-1}^\dagger)^3 + e^{-3i\theta}(\hat{a}_{-1}^\dagger)^3]|vac\rangle$ with a nonzero probability. She sends the remaining one photon to Bob only when the filtering has been successful. It is then obvious that Eve can always determine the bit a after the announcement of j . It is not difficult to extend this attack to larger values of M . One possible way to avoid this kind of attack is to mix the protocols with different values of L , which is just a modification of the classical communication part.

The author thanks N. Imoto and K. Tamaki for helpful discussions. This work was supported by a MEXT Grant-in-Aid for Young Scientists (B) 17740265.

-
- [1] C. H. Bennett and G. Brassard, in *Proceeding of the IEEE International Conference on Computers, Systems, and Signal Processing, Bangalore, India* (IEEE, New York, 1984), pp. 175–179.
 - [2] H. Inamori, N. Lütkenhaus, and D. Mayers, quant-ph/0107017.
 - [3] N. Lütkenhaus, Phys. Rev. A **61**, 052304 (2000).
 - [4] G. Brassard, N. Lütkenhaus, T. Mor, and B. C. Sanders, Phys. Rev. Lett. **85**, 1330 (2000).
 - [5] C. H. Bennett, Phys. Rev. Lett. **68**, 3121 (1992).
 - [6] M. Koashi, Phys. Rev. Lett. **93**, 120501 (2004).
 - [7] W. Y. Hwang, Phys. Rev. Lett. **91**, 057901 (2003).
 - [8] H. K. Lo, X. Ma, and K. Chen, Phys. Rev. Lett. **94**, 230504 (2005).
 - [9] V. Scarani, A. Acín, G. Ribordy, and N. Gisin, Phys. Rev. Lett. **92**, 057901 (2004).
 - [10] K. Tamaki and H. K. Lo, quant-ph/0412035.
 - [11] C. Branciard, N. Gisin, B. Kraus, and V. Scarani, quant-ph/0505035.
 - [12] K. Tamaki, M. Koashi, and N. Imoto, Phys. Rev. Lett. **90**, 167904 (2003).
 - [13] M. Koashi, quant-ph/0505108.

- [14] P. W. Shor and J. Preskill, Phys. Rev. Lett. **85**, 441 (2000). [15] A. Chefles, Phys. Lett. A **239**, 339 (1998).