

Quantum random number generation using photon arrival time selectively without post-processing

Jian-min Wang, Tian-yu Xie, Hong-fei Zhang, Dong-xu Yang, Chao Xie and Jian Wang, *Senior Member, IEEE*

Abstract—We present a high-quality quantum random number generator (QRNG) without posting processing using photon arrival time selectively in accordance with the number of photon detection events within a sampling time interval in attenuated light. It is well showed in both theoretical analysis and experiments verification that this random number production method eliminates both bias and correlation perfectly without post processing and the random number can be clearly passed the standard randomness tests. We fulfill theoretical analyses and experimental verification of the method whose rate can reach up to 45Mbps.

Index Terms—Quantum cryptography, Random number, Photon arrival time.

I. INTRODUCTION

Random number generators are applied to a wide variety of traditional fields [1] like theoretical simulation in physics, Monte Carlo method, random walk, etc. Pseudo-random numbers obtained from a deterministic algorithm can meet the requirements in these fields where the existence of long period and determinism have no effects. Recently, along with the emergence of new fields [2] as quantum cryptography, quantum ID identification and so forth, demands for physical true random numbers is becoming more and more urgent. Because quantum processes are unpredictable in theory, random numbers derived from quantum processes could be called physical true random numbers.

It is not a short history to yield random numbers using quantum process. Earlier in the 1970s, Frigerio [3] utilized nuclear decay to extract randomness, although the rate was low, they blazed a trail indeed. With the appearance of the scheme using [4-6] to bifurcate the path of a photon, people began to concentrate more on randomness extraction from optical field, mainly due

to two advantages: it is not difficult to control and detect optical field; photons are so highly dense compared to alpha or beta particles in nuclear decay that we can obtain more entropy and achieve the rate order of Mbps. photon arrival time [7-10], photon counts [11] with sampling intervals and random phase [12-13] essentially originate from random fluctuation of optical field. Researches in these three aspects have already been accumulated gradually in the last few years. Those schemes almost use post-processing method to remove bias or whiten the raw data and pass the pass random number statistical tests. A better scheme is that post-processing should not be used especially some post-processing can whiten the raw data to pass the randomness test. There are some reports for post-processing free QRNG such as [14] with a rate of 4.01 Mbps, [9] with a rate of 1Mbps and [15] with a rate of 8Mbps.

In this paper we demonstrate a post-processing free random number production scheme with the high rate to 45Mbps. We pay more attention to theoretical analyses and experimental verification and set up a high-quality quantum random number generator using photon arrival time selectively without post-processing. In the following we illuminate our scheme in paragraphs, first explaining the theory of our design, then detailing its implement as well as randomness tests performed, and finally discussing further improvements and outlook.

II. SETUP AND THEORY ANALYSIS

The set up of our experiment is shown in Fig.1, the light emitted by a light emitting diode (LED) is attenuated by the cross polarizers (CP) to the single photon level, and the illumination of LED is adjustable by a adjustable resistor. To achieve high rates of random numbers a photomultiplier (PMT) with high sensitivity is used for detecting the attenuated light. The pulses generated from PMT are amplified by AMP module and discriminated by a discriminator (DS) module which converts the analog output pulse of the PMT into a digital signal. The discriminator can distinguish two pulses only. If two pulses are separated by about the pulse width, they will overlapped and form only one pulse discriminated by the discriminator. This leads to an effective dead time t_d which equals the width of pulses. output of the discriminator is fed into the time-digital convertor (TDC) module and FPGA(Field Programmable Gate Array) module, the TDC measures arrival time of all the pulses, relative to external reference clock with f_0 Hz frequency, followed by the FPGA that selects the period of only one pulse and output the arrival time of the selected pulse.

Manuscript received . This work was supported by the Fundamental Research Funds for the Central Universities, National Natural Science Funds of China under Grant No: 11178020, 11275197

The authors Jian-min Wang and Tian-yu Xie contributed equally to this work

The authors Jian-min Wang, Tian-yu Xie, Hong-fei Zhang, Dong-xu Yang and Jian Wang are with the State Key Laboratory of Particle Detection and Electronics and Department of Modern Physics, University of Science and Technology of China, Synergetic Innovation Center of Quantum Information and Quantum Physics, University of Science and Technology of China, Hefei, Anhui 230026, China (e-mail: wangjian@ustc.edu.cn)

The author Chao Xie is with Electrical & Information Engineering Department, Huang Shan University, Huangshan, Anhui 245021, China.




Fig.1 Schematic of our experimental setup.

The stimulated emission of photons from a semiconductor device is believed to be a process in which events occur continuously and independent of each other, i.e., a Poissonian process. The probability to register k clicks with a period of time T is given by Poissonian distribution:

$$P(X = k) = e^{-\lambda T} \frac{(\lambda T)^k}{k!} \quad (1)$$

where λ is the average number of events per unit time. The distribution of arrival time of the first detection is calculated by

$$f(T = t) = \frac{\lambda e^{-\lambda t}}{\int_0^{T_0} \lambda e^{-\lambda t} dt} = \frac{\lambda e^{-\lambda t}}{1 - e^{-\lambda T_0}} \quad (2)$$

with the upper bound of time T_0 which is not uniform but exponential, quite irksome if we utilize it to yield random number directly. Owing to finite precision of the device in experiment, we have time least significant bit (LSB) bin size t_0 to digitize arrival time, with the maximum $N_0 = T_0/t_0$. The possibility to gain the value k is given by (n is the discrete random variable):

$$P(n = k) = \int_{kt_0 - t_0}^{kt_0} f(t) dt = \frac{e^{-\lambda t_0(k-1)} - e^{-\lambda kt_0}}{1 - e^{-\lambda T_0}} \approx \frac{\lambda t_0 e^{-\lambda kt_0}}{1 - e^{-\lambda T_0}} \quad (3)$$

The last approximation in Eq. (3) is valid if $\lambda t_0 \ll 1$ which can be met as long as the mean number $\mu = \lambda T_0$ of detection events within T_0 is small enough and N_0 is big enough.

It is known from Eq. (3) that the possibility decays exponentially as k increases. Some people [8] try to shape λ into $\lambda(t)$ by means of modulating the illumination intensity to change with time. If we let $\lambda(t) = I / (T_0 - t)$ by shaping the waveform, the distribution can be uniform in theory. However, the aforementioned $\lambda(t)$ cannot be well achieved physically. In order to register all detections, dead time t_d should be as small as possible, which cannot be well achieved physically either. Even if it can be realized relatively well, a more serious problem arises that severe correlation has been brought in, for the sequence of k within the same sampling interval is ordered from small to big.. So in ref.[8], post-processing with SHA-256 is used for whitening the raw data.

If we only retain such periods as only one detection event appears, and then output k as random numbers where k is the time bin of period which has only one detection. Using conditional possibility formula, we can prove simply that the distribution is uniform considering every time bin obeys Poissonian distribution with the mean λt_0 :

$$P_k = \frac{e^{-\lambda t_0} \lambda t_0 (e^{-\lambda t_0})^{n-1}}{e^{-\lambda T_0} \lambda T_0} = \frac{t_0}{T_0} = \frac{1}{N_0} \quad (4)$$

So every possibility of every time bin is uniform. Likewise small dead time t_d is required as well for experimental setup to register the number of detections within every sampling interval, thus we choose a PMT as our detector for its short dead time.

The width of electrical pulses from PMT output gives rise to the dead time t_d of PMT. Poissonian distribution needs to be modified taking the effect of t_d into consideration. The possibility [16-17] of the incident that m pulses turn up in a period of time T_0 is given by

$$P_{T_0}(X = m) = \frac{\mu_r^m}{m!} \sum_{i=0}^{K-m} \frac{(-\mu_r)^i}{i!} (1 - (i + m - 1) \frac{t_d}{T_0})^{m+i} \quad (5)$$

with

$$\mu_r = \mu \cdot e^{-\frac{\mu t_d}{T_0}}, \quad K = \left\lceil \frac{T_0}{t_d} \right\rceil$$


The possibility of only one pulse is given by

$$P_{T_0}(X = 1) = \mu_r \sum_{i=0}^{K-1} \frac{(-\mu_r)^i}{i!} (1 - \frac{i t_d}{T_0})^{1+i} \quad (6)$$

From another aspect two pulses will merge into one if the time between these two pulses is less than t_d . Therefore, the merged pulse width is longer than t_d . Nevertheless, we can merely register time points of rising edge of pulses limited by the performance of the device in the experiment, in which way we remain the periods within which only one pulse exists but not only one detection. Eventually the cases survive where the pulses of more than one detection fuse into one in that all intervals between two detections are shorter than t_d , which induces the deviation from theoretical analyses.

In our experiment, taking the dead time of PMT into more consideration, a detailed distribution is discussed below.

Thinking about the mechanism of the dead time t_d , we can easily have the thought that t_d right before the period of interest needs to be analyzed together with the period T_0 . If in the spell t_d there is a detection arriving, the pulse induced by the detection will extend into the beginning short spell of the period in which another detection arrives to merge into one pulse of which the rising edge is in the spell t_d . And if no other detections arrive within the period, there is no pulse within the period. However, as a matter of fact the detection arriving in the beginning short spell of the period does exist, and cannot be registered due to t_d . Based on the discussion above, presumably, the possibilities of the smallest ' k 's are a little smaller than the ones of the medium ' k 's. We take two steps to analyze quantitatively the effect of t_d : first consider the case of no detections in the spell t_d ; then consider the case that detections exist.

Fig.2 Schematic drawing of time bin of observed period and t_d .

As shown in Fig. 2, let $N_d = t_d / t_0$, period $T_0 = N_0 t_0$. If in the spell t_d there is a detection arriving, the pulse induced by the detection will extend into the beginning short spell of the period in which another detection arrives to merge into one pulse of which the rising edge is in the spell t_d . And if no other

detections arrive within the period, there is no pulse within the period. However, as a matter of fact the detection arriving in the beginning short spell of the period does exist, and cannot be registered due to t_d . Based on the discussion above, presumably, the possibilities of the smallest 'k's are a little smaller than the ones of the medium 'k's. We take two steps to analyze quantitatively the effect of t_d : first consider the case of no detections in the spell t_d ; then consider the case that detections exist.

Although we retain the period of only one pulse, odds are that one pulse comprises several detections of which arbitrary pairs of two contiguous detections have intervals no more than t_d . We just calculate to the order of the combination of three detections for its single photon level light, and from the results below we can know the effect of three detections is rather minute. Define two more parameters, the possibility of no detections in a time bin $p_0 = \exp(-\lambda t_0)$ and the possibility of the opposite case $p_e = 1 - p_0$. The possibility of only one pulse is the sum of three terms, the possibility of only one detection, that of two detections and that of three detections. It is easy to compute the first term that is independent from the serial number of time bin: $p_1(n, k) = p_0^{n-1} p_e$. The second term:

$p_2(n, k) = p_0^{n-2} p_e^2 \cdot h(n-k)$ where $h(n-k)$ denotes the number of the events of equal possibility that the merged pulse occurs in the k th time bin. That is to say, the first detection is in the k th time bin and the second detection is less than N_d later than the first, thus

$$h(x) = \begin{cases} N_d, & x > N_d \\ x, & 0 \leq x \leq N_d \\ 0, & x < 0 \end{cases} \quad (7)$$

Likewise, the third term: $p_3(n, k) = p_0^{n-3} p_e^3 \cdot h'(n-k)$ where $h'(k)$ is a bit more complex, but the nature is the same:

$$h'(x) = \begin{cases} N_d^2, & x \geq 2N_d \\ N_d(x - N_d) + (x-1) * (2N_d - x) / 2, & N_d + 1 \leq x < 2N_d \\ x(x-1) / 2, & 2 \leq x < N_d + 1 \\ 0, & x < 2 \end{cases} \quad (8)$$

From the above, the possibility of only one pulse is given by $p(n, k) = p_1(n, k) + p_2(n, k) + p_3(n, k)$. The period T_0 in the experiment has $N_0 t_0$. Then we take the second step: assume that the last detection within the spell t_d emerges in the i th time bin, the beginning i time bins of the period is shadowed by t_d . If no detections are in the beginning i time bins, then the possibility of the pulse in the k th time bin of the period is $p(N_0 - i, k - i)$. And if detections are, assume that the last detection within the period emerges in the j th time bin (the serial number j is reckoned from the beginning of the period), the next N_d time bins are the t_d 's regime. Then we can continue to discuss based on whether there are detections during the spell, which can last to the end of the period. However, under a fairly faint illumination, the second order is precise enough. Therefore, after we add up the all possible i and j , the

possibility that within the period only one detection appears and it is in the k th time bin is given by

$$P(N_0, k) = p_0^{N_d} \cdot p(N_0, k) + p_0^{N_d} p_e \cdot \sum_{i=1}^{N_d} p(N_0 - i, k - i) + p_0^{N_d} p_e^2 \cdot \sum_{i=1}^{N_d} p_0^{N_d-i} \sum_{j=1}^i p(N_0 - j - N_d, k - j - N_d) \quad (9)$$

Notably, if the second variable of $p(n, k)$ is less than or equal to 0, $p(n, k)$ should be 0. From the expression of $P(N_0, k)$, the approximation is equivalent to remaining the terms of equal to and less than three times of p_e . After the renormalization owing to just remaining the periods of only one pulse, the distribution is given by

$$P_{N_0}(n = k) = P_0(N_0, k) / \sum_{k=1}^{N_0} P_0(N_0, k) \quad (10)$$

Eq. (10) is pretty hard to be simplified, but by means of some mathematical softwares like **Mathematica**, we can reap the numerical outcomes when λt_0 is given as shown red solid line in Fig.3.

III. EXPERIMENTS AND RESULTS

The setup of experiment is shown in Fig.1, The precision of TDC is 0.162ns and the width of PMT pulses is about 5ns and the observed period $T_0 = N_0 t_0 = 320 * 0.162ns = 51.84ns$. The experimental data and theoretical values computed are drawn in the same plot as shown in Fig.3.




Fig.3 Red solid line is drawn theoretically based on Eq. (10) and green dots are experimental data points. The experimental data dots show a good agreement with the theoretical predictions

Let $\lambda t_0 = 0.00068$ to fit the scatter plot, thus the mean number μ of photons within a period is equal to $\lambda T_0 = 0.2176$. Meanwhile, the dead time $t_d \approx N_d t_0 = 32 * 0.162ns = 5.184ns$ to make $t_d / T_0 \approx 0.1$.

The min-entropy can be calculated according to Eq. (10):

$$H_\infty = -\frac{\log_2 P_{\max}}{\log_2 N} = -\frac{\log_2 0.003132}{\log_2 320} = 0.99961$$

which is not great enough, thus we cut off N_d on the both sides, renormalize it, and the min-entropy is given by

$$H_{\infty} = -\frac{\log_2 P_{\max}}{\log_2 256} = -\frac{\log_2 0.00390633}{\log_2 256} = 0.999996 \quad (11)$$

which is as good as the min-entropy of Ref. [9] and can be passed any tests. The remaining proportion after cutting can be given by as well

$$\sum_{k=N_d+1}^{N_0-N_d} P_{N_0}(n=k) \approx \frac{(T_0 - 2t_d)}{T_0} \quad (12)$$

Using Eq. (6), Eq. (10) and Eq. (12), every period needs to cut off t_d on the both ends and the bitrate is approximately given by

$$\begin{aligned} v &= \log_2 \left(\frac{T_0 - 2t_d}{t_0} \right) \cdot P_{T_0}(X=I) \cdot \frac{1}{T_0} \cdot \sum_{k=N_d+1}^{N_0-N_d} P_{N_0}(n=k) \\ &\approx \log_2 \left(\frac{T_0 - 2t_d}{t_0} \right) \cdot P_{T_0}(X=I) \cdot \frac{1}{T_0} \cdot \frac{T_0 - 2t_d}{T_0} \quad (13) \end{aligned}$$

with $N_d = t_d / t_0$. The first term is the bit number of k ; the second one is the possibility of only one pulse; the third one is frequency; the forth one is the proportion of the data left after truncation that is roughly represented by the ratio of intercepted time to the whole period as a result of the quasi-uniform distribution. From Eq. (5) $P(X=I) = 0.1786$, and using the parameters above associated with Eq. (13) the bitrate $v \approx 8 * 0.1786 * (1 / 51.84 \text{ ns}) * 0.803 \approx 22.13 \text{ Mbps}$ which tally well with the one in the experiment.

The real min-entropy cannot attain such a level as a result of a variety of imperfections of devices, especially the counting loss of TDC. Taking the frequency of the data as the possibility to calculate min-entropy, we can obtain $H_{\infty} = 0.99900$ from the maximum of the frequency 0.003143, regarded as a reference of the min-entropy of the real distribution. Cutting off N_d on the both ends, we can increase the min-entropy as shown in Fig.3 which exhibits the practical measured data with green dots line. The experimental data dots show a good agreement with the theoretical predictions and the effect of eliminating the periods of more than one detections is clearly verified by the comparison between two curves. After cutting off N_d , the remaining proportion $0.803 \approx 256 / 320$ proves the reasonability of the approximation of Eq. (13). According to Eq. (10), the min-entropy $H_{\infty} = 0.999996$ is perfectly enough to be applied to direct practice. Likewise, the real min-entropy $H_{\infty} = 0.99946$ can be derived from the biggest frequency 0.003918.

From Eq. (13) it is apparently shown that $T_0, P_{T_0}(X=I), t_d$ and t_0 all have a direct effect on the bitrate. T_0 and $P_{T_0}(X=I)$ can be easily controlled by adjusting the logic of FPGA which used in our experiment and the illumination intensity respectively. Based on the premise of uniformity distribution, the two parameters should be set to lift the bitrate as fast as we can. $P_{T_0}(X=I)$ can be tailored more than 0.4. t_d and t_0 are determined by the performance of the experimental devices and cannot be changed.

From the discussion above, the core factor is the dead time t_d

of PMT. The ratio of t_d to T_0 should be small enough, generally set at 0.1 or less in the experiment, otherwise refined uniformity will be lost, which restrains the lower bound of T_0 . Halving t_d means we can halve T_0 to double the bitrate, while halving t_d cannot improve the bitrate significantly resulting from the logarithm calculation of the term. Generally we set eight bits for the sake of being processed easily, and meanwhile to ensure the suitable ratio of t_d to T_0 .

There may be a sense that we have discarded a large part of the data in that the periods of more than one detection are rejected. From Eq. (12), ratio of the remaining data is great than 0.8. Thus our scheme still keeps a high utilization level for the raw sequence. Random numbers are generated at a rate up to 45Mbps if we improve the illumination intensity continuously on condition that random numbers can clearly pass the prevalent tests without post-processing.

Another most notable merit of our scheme is that the perfectly uniform distribution after cutting off N_d on the both sides depends little on the illumination intensity. Thus the quality of the random numbers generated in the experiment was extremely steady and no apparent deviation happened in the whole experimental process. Unlike the scheme of Ref. [11], an observable bias can be caused by a minute drift of the illumination intensity, so real-time controlled needs doing. Ref. [18] designed a mathematical method called Bayesian estimation for the purpose of a better estimation and manipulation. Our scheme avoids these troubles simply and thoroughly.

IV. RANDOMNESS TESTS

Two most famous tests are used which are the ‘‘Statistical Test Suite’’ (STS) [19] and the ‘‘DieHard’’ (Die) test suite [20], to test our random numbers. The results are shown in Fig.4. Every test is performed many times to give out multiple p -values to which χ^2 Test is applied finally in STS while in Die *Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test*[21] is applied. We adopted the same operating parameters and quantity as before for Die, while for STS the total of $1 \text{ Mbit} * 1000$ was tested with built-in parameters. It is notable that several tests are operated more than once with different parameters, especially the test of *NonOverlappingTemplate* 148 times. For the sake of better exhibition we apply *Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test* to multiple p -values and display mean values for multiple proportion values.

About 100GB data in total generated in all experimental processes are analyzed through the tests without post-processing. No evident defects have not been found, which sufficiently show the superiority of our scheme.




Fig.4 Typical results of STS test and DieHard test. Without processing, the p-values are routinely above the significance level confirming the quality and the reliability of the QRNG

V. CONCLUSION

We transform the obnoxious exponential distribution into desirable uniform distribution through our simple scheme. We accomplished the experimental verification for our theoretical analysis using our simple devices and achieved the steady output of high-quality and ready-for-use random numbers. Furthermore, our scheme is nonparametric more stable than any schemes with parameters involved. The bitrate can be improved largely, influenced by the core parameter t_d .

REFERENCES

- [1] J. H. Davenport, Papers from the international symposium on symbolic and algebraic computation Pages, ISSAC 123-129 (1992).
- [2] A. J. Menezes, P. C. van Oorschot and S. A. Vanstone, Handbook of Applied Cryptography (CRC Press, London, 1997).
- [3] N. A. Frigerio and N. Clark, A random number set for Monte Carlo computations, Trans. Amer. Nucl. Soc., 22 (1975), pp. 283-284.
- [4] A. Stefanov, N. Gisin, L. Guinnard, H. Zbinden, "Optical quantum random number generator," J. Mod. Opt. 47, 595-598 (2000).
- [5] J. G. Rarity, P. C. M. Owens, and P. R. Tapster, "Quantum random-number generation and key sharing," J. Mod. Opt. 41, 2435-2444 (1994).
- [6] T. Jennewin, U. Achleitner, G. Weihs, H. Weinfurter, A. Zeilinger, "A fast and compact quantum random number generator," Rev. Sci. Instr. 71, 1675-1680 (2000).
- [7] M. A. Wayne, E. R. Jeffrey, G. M. Akselrod, and P. G. Kwait, "Photon arrival time quantum random number generation," J. Mod. Opt. 56, 516-522 (2009).
- [8] M. A. Wayne, and P. G. Kwait, "Low-bias high-speed quantum random number generator via shaped optical pulses," Opt. Express 18, 9351-9357 (2010).
- [9] M. Stipčević, and B. Medved Rogina, "Quantum random number generator based on photonic emission in semi semiconductors," Rev. Sci. Instrum. 78, 045104 (2007).
- [10] M. Wahl, M. Leifgen, M. Berlin, T. Röhlicke, H. Rahn, and O. Benson, "An ultrafast quantum random number generator with provably bounded output bias based on photon arrival time measurements," Appl. Phys. Lett. 98, 171105 (2011).
- [11] M. Fürst, H. Weier, S. Nauwerth, D. G. Marangon, C. Kurt-siefer, and H. Weinfurter, "High speed optical quantum random number generation," Opt. Express 18, 13029-13037 (2010).
- [12] Z. L. Yuan, M. Lucamarini, J. F. Dynes, B. Fröhlich, A. Plews, and A. J. Shields, "Robust random number generation using steady-state emission of gain-switched laser diodes," arXiv.org 1407.0933 (2014).
- [13] B. Sanguinetti, A. Martin, H. Zbinden, and N. Gisin, "Quantum random number generation on a mobile phone," arXiv.org 1405.0435 (2014).
- [14] J. F. Dynes, Z. L. Yuan, A. W. Sharpe, and A. J. Shields, et al. "A high speed, post-processing free, quantum random number generator." applied physics letters 93.3 (2008): 031109
- [15] Mario Stipčević and John Bowers, Post-Processing Free Spatio-Temporal Optical Random Number Generator Resilient to Hardware Failure and Signal Injection Attacks, arXiv:1410.0724
- [16] K. Omote, "Dead time effects in photon-counting distributions," Nucl. Instr. Methods 293, 582-588 (1990).
- [17] J. W. Mueller, "Some formulae for a dead-time-distorted poisson process," Nucl. Instr. Methods 117, 401-404 (1974).
- [18] P. Lougovski, and R. Pooser, "An observed-data-consistent approach to the assignment of bit values in a quantum random number generator," arXiv.org 1404.5977 (2014).
- [19] J. Soto, "Statistical testing of random number generators," Proc. 22nd National Information Systems Security Conference (1999).
- [20] R. G. Brown, "Dieharder test suite," <http://www.phy.duke.edu/rgb/General/dieharder.php> (2009).
- [21] N. H. Kuiper, "Tests concerning random points on a circle," Proc. Kon. Ned. Aka Wet. A 63, 38-47 (1962).