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The celebrated BB84 protocol was proposed in 1984 by Bennett and Brassard to distribute a secret key between two legitimate parties with a promise for unconditional security. An optimal unitary attack on this protocol using an ensemble of probes was first established by Fuchs et al. [Phys. Rev. A, 1997]. They derived the maximum information that could be learned by an eavesdropper, and specified an optimal interaction (post-interaction joint state) for that. Infinitely many such optimal interactions were derived by Acharyya et al. [Phys. Rev. A, 2017]. For practical purposes, all an eavesdropper needs to know is the specification of the optimal unitary evolution and the subsequent optimal measurement, as part of her optimal strategy. Finding an optimal unitary from a particular optimal post-interaction state is easy. But finding a closed form of the optimal unitaries for the whole family of optimal interactions is not so straightforward. Here we address this issue.

I. INTRODUCTION

Quantum mechanics could promise information theoretic security for quantum key distribution (QKD). BB84 is the first protocol, introduced by Bennett and Brassard [1]. Several attacks and follow-up security measures appeared over time. The requirement is to establish a shared secret key-string between the sender (Alice) and the receiver (Bob). Alice encodes her key-bits, each into a quantum bit (qubit) which is the state of a polarized photon, and sends the photons one-by-one to Bob. The state of the qubit lives in a Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}_A$ of dimension 2. The qubit gets prepared in one of the four basis states chosen randomly from two bases conjugate to each other: the computational basis $\{|x\rangle, |y\rangle\}$ aka the $+$ basis and the Hadamard basis $\{|u\rangle, |v\rangle\}$ aka the $\times$ basis. 0 gets encoded into $|x\rangle$ or $|u\rangle$, while 1 gets encoded into $|y\rangle$ or $|v\rangle$. Nonorthogonality of these states ensures that an eavesdropper cannot distinguish them with certainty by any measurement.

When Bob receives a qubit, he measures it in one of the bases $xy$ or $uv$ chosen randomly. Once he is done with measuring all the qubits one-by-one, he and Alice publicly compare their bases and in case of a mismatch they both discard the corresponding bits. Nevertheless, the resulting bit-string (sifted key) may still mismatch in case any error is introduced during transmission, e.g., due to channel noise or an attacker (Eve) snooping the channel to learn the state of the qubits. Alice and Bob can estimate the error rate from a part of their strings. If the error rate ensures that the information of Eve is smaller than that of Bob on Alice’s bit, then only they can do some classical post-processing to establish a common shared secret on which Eve has negligible knowledge. For that, they first reconcile the errors to establish a shared string. Since Eve may have partial information on the reconciled key, they amplify their privacy by compressing the key to a shorter one by a factor that is determined by the error rate.

There are various ways of attacking the key distribution protocol in order to learn maximum information of Alice’s states. A particular model of interest is to learn indirectly, while Eve uses a probe to attach with Alice’s qubit, performs an unitary evolution (called interaction), and later, after declaration of the basis by Alice, she can perform some measurement to gain partial knowledge regarding the state of the qubit. Subsequently, she follows some strategy to interpret her measurement outcomes to assign a guess on the state of Alice’s qubit. Fuchs et al. [2] described a framework for optimal eavesdropping, which ensures Eve to gain maximum possible information regarding the state prepared by Alice. Alice and Bob can establish a secret key only when Eve doesn’t introduce enough error in order to cross a tolerance level of disturbance by the legitimate parties. To quantify the amount of information gained by Eve, they used two functions: information gain (IG) and mutual information (MI) between Alice and Eve. Each of these quantifiers is a function of the interaction and the measurement. For a given interaction, a measurement that maximizes IG is well known [3] and we call it an optimal measurement. Further, considering that the Alice’s information carriers are prepared with equal prior probability, Fuchs et al. [2] derived the global maxima for such functions (for Eve) and was shown to be attainable by performing an optimal measurement on the probe due to a suitably chosen interaction (called optimal interaction). However, the specification of the post-interaction state in [2] was a judicious choice that was proved to be optimal. A derivation to characterize such states was performed in [4] that depicts infinitely many such candidates.

The nature of the interaction (followed by a suitable measurement) determines the amount of information...
gained by Eve. As we’ll notice, the unitary interaction determines the optimal measurement. Thus it is good enough to figure out the optimal unitary interactions, as any initial state of the probe works. Such an optimal unitary fixes the optimal post-interaction states, for which a closed form is known [4]. Deriving a closed form of the optimal unitary is the main objective here. We perform a reverse-engineering for that: we start with the family of optimal post-interaction states as input, and come up with a closed form of the associated unitary evolution. In this process, we derive an interrelation between the optimal measurement directions (of Eve) in + basis and those in × basis.

Here is a brief outline of how this article is organized. The relevant ideas regarding existing works on optimal eavesdropping [2–4] are summarized in Sec. II. Finally, Sec. III is dedicated to explore our contributions in this article as a new work.

II. SUMMARY OF EXISTING WORKS ON OPTIMAL EAVEDROPPING

An optimal eavesdropping can be viewed as a mathematical optimization problem. Two functions, IG and MI, are considered here for optimization, and are defined in Sec. II A. The corresponding optimization parameters and the optimization problem is explained in Sec. II B. The difficulty of the problem depends on the parameters considered for the optimization process. The simplest one is to optimize IG across different POVMs and briefed in Sec. II C: it figures out an optimal POVM for a given interaction [3]. Optimal eavesdropping on BB84 protocol [2] is more general problem, and the relevant ideas collectively from [2–4] are summarized in Sec. II D.

In Sec. II D 1, we explain the unitary attack [2] on BB84 protocol, where the functions to be optimized are IG and MI for equal prior, and the optimization is to be done over all interactions and all POVMs. An extension of the problem is to derive all such optimal interactions [4], and is briefed in Sec. II D 2.

A. The functions to maximize: Information Gain and Mutual Information

Alice randomly chooses a basis among xy and uv, and prepares a signal |s⟩ with prior probability ps. While |s⟩ can be any of the four states |x⟩, |y⟩, |u⟩, |v⟩, its orthogonal counterpart is denoted as |s′⟩ so that ps + ps′ = 1.

Assume, Eve interferes the communication with an ensemble of probes that interact one-by-one, unitarily with the qubits sent by Alice. Let, Eve’s probe initially was in a state |ψ0⟩ ∈ HE while Alice’s signal was in state |s⟩. The pre-interaction joint initial state |s⟩|ψ0⟩ ∈ HA ⊗ HE between Alice’s qubit and Eve’s probe goes through an unitary evolution U and produce the post-interaction joint state |S⟩, i.e.,

|S⟩ = U(|s⟩|ψ0⟩).

In case the state |S⟩ gets entangled post interaction, a convenient description of the state of Eve’s probe can be considered the density operator ρs := tr_A (|S⟩⟨S|), partially traced over Alice’s qubit. 1

Once Alice declares her choice of basis publicly, Eve performs measurement of her system one-by-one. Eve’s measurement is considered to be a Positive Operator-Valued Measure (POVM), i.e., a partition of unity into some non-negative operators [3, 5]. Denote a POVM for Eve as {EL}, which represents either {EL}λ or {FL}λ depending on whether Alice’s choice is xy or uv basis. Sometimes we denote it as MA, where λ = {λ} represents the measurement outcomes collectively. The conditional probability of the various outcomes λ of that measurement for a signal |s⟩ from Alice is given by

Pλs = tr (ρsMλ).

Suppose, Alice prepares a signal in ss′ basis (one of xy or uv basis) with prior probabilities ps, ps′. Then, averaging over both elements in a basis, the probability that Eve gets outcome λ becomes

qss′(λ) = Pλsps + Pλsp′s′.

To interpret the measurement outcome λ, Eve follows some strategy which is a rule that helps her to assign a guess for the signal sent by Alice against each outcome. The posterior probability Qss λ of the event that Alice indeed sent a signal |s⟩ while Eve has observed λ is quantified by the following ratio

Qss λ = Pλsps/qss′(λ).

These likelihoods help Eve to guess the signal sent by Alice. Whenever Qss λ > Qs′s λ for an outcome λ, it’s more likely that Alice prepared the signal |s⟩ than |s′⟩. The more is the difference between Qss λ and Qs′s λ, the higher is the chance for a correct guess by Eve, that is to say, Eve gains more knowledge regarding the signal. There are various measures [3] to quantify the gain of knowledge. One such convenient measure is information gain (IG) [2]. For a signal prepared in basis ss′ ∈ {xy, uv} and for a measurement outcome λ, it is defined as follows

Gss′ λ := |Qss λ − Qs′s λ|.

On average, Eve’s information gain over all outcomes is

Gss′ := Σλ qss′(λ)Gss′ λ = Σλ |Pλsps − Pλs′p′s′|.

Another quantification for gain of knowledge by Eve is the mutual information (MI) of the joint state between

1 Henceforth, we use the notation := to denote “defined as”.

in the following subsection. The related ideas are discussed briefly in the following subsection.

C. Maximizing IG over POVMs: Optimal measurement for a given interaction [3]

Given a fixed distribution \((p_x, p_y)\) set for the communication, and for a given interaction (which fixes the density operators \(\rho_x, \rho_y\)) by Eve, consider the following problem:

\[
\text{maximize } G_{xy} \text{ over all POVMs } \{E_\Lambda\}. 
\]

The problem looks easier, when one realizes that the expression (4) for IG can be written as a function of the POVM and an observable concealing the leftover parameters:

\[
G_{xy} = \sum_\lambda |\text{tr} \left( \hat{\Gamma}_{xy} E_\Lambda \right) |, \tag{5}
\]

with \(\hat{\Gamma}_{xy} := p_x \rho_x - p_y \rho_y\).

The operator \(\hat{\Gamma}_{xy}\), being Hermitian (i.e., \(\hat{\Gamma}_{xy} = \hat{\Gamma}_{xy}^\dagger\)), has a spectral decomposition – its eigenstates \(|\gamma_\Lambda\rangle\) form a complete orthonormal basis in the Hilbert space where Eve’s probe lives in while the eigenvalues \(\gamma_\Lambda\) are all real. Thus one can write this observable as a linear combination of some orthogonal projectors as below

\[
\hat{\Gamma}_{xy} = \sum_\lambda \gamma_\lambda \Pi_\lambda, \tag{6}
\]

where \(\Pi_\lambda\) represents an orthogonal projector onto the space of eigenvectors sharing a common eigenvalue \(\gamma_\lambda\).

When \(\gamma_\lambda\) is non-degenerate, i.e., all the eigenvalues of \(\hat{\Gamma}_{xy}\) are distinct, \(\Pi_\lambda\) becomes a projector \(|\gamma_\lambda\rangle \langle \gamma_\lambda|\) on one-dimensional subspace. In that case, \(G_{xy}\) in Eq. (5) can be shown to be bounded above [3, 4]:

\[
G_{xy} \leq \sum_i |\gamma_i| = \text{tr} \left| \hat{\Gamma}_{xy} \right|. \tag{7}
\]

The equality could be achieved by choosing a POVM

\[
E_\Lambda^* = \{\Pi_\lambda = |\lambda\rangle \langle E_\lambda| : |E_\lambda\rangle = |\gamma_\lambda\rangle\}, \tag{8}
\]

which consists of the projectors onto the orthonormal eigenbasis of \(\hat{\Gamma}_{xy}\).

Therefore, for a given interaction, maximum IG could be achieved by the eigoprojectors of \(\hat{\Gamma}_{xy}\), collectively called an optimal POVM. Unfortunately, any such POVM that is optimal for IG, may not necessarily be optimal for MI [2, 3]: optimal MI over all measurements doesn’t have any analytical expression. Fortunately, when equal prior is considered for BB84 protocol, this disparity gets removed, i.e., same measurement optimizes both IG and MI for an optimal interaction. More details is discussed in the following subsection.

D. Optimal Eavesdropping on BB84 protocol [2, 4]

For BB84 protocol, for equal prior, a global maxima for IG and for MI was derived by Fuchs et al. [2]. A
candidate post-interaction joint state in each bases was described that attains the maxima in respective bases. Given the distribution \((p_x = \frac{1}{2} = p_y)\) set for the communication using BB84 protocol, the expression of IG in Eq. (4) becomes

\[ G_{xy} = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\lambda} |P_{xx} - P_{xy}| = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\lambda} |\text{tr}[(\rho_x - \rho_y) E_{\lambda}]|, \]

which is a function of the three parameters \(\rho_x, \rho_y, E_{\lambda}\). Maximization of \(G_{xy}\) over these three parameters was done in [2]. The upper bound

\[ G_{xy}^* = \max_{\{\rho_x, \rho_y; E_{\lambda}\}} G_{xy}(p_x = 1/2 = p_y; \rho_x, \rho_y; E_{\lambda}) \]

is a global maxima for IG in \(xy\) basis. Using this bound, an upper bound \(I_{xy}^*\) on MI was also established. A set of necessary and sufficient conditions to achieve the bound \(G_{xy}^*(I_{xy}^*)\) was derived there and similarly for \(uv\) basis. A similar upper bound exists for IG (MI) in \(uv\) basis as well following analogous necessary and sufficient conditions.

To see whether these bounds could in reality be achieved, they made a judicious choice for an interaction in each of the bases that eventually appeared optimal since it satisfy the necessary and sufficient conditions when measured with the respective optimal POVM.

The optimal interaction vectors chosen in [2] are an intelligent guess. Deriving the class of optimal interactions from the first principle was first done in [4] that depicted infinitely many such optimal interactions. We summarize those results briefly in Sec. II D 2. The subsequent discussion is considered for equal prior only.

1. An optimal interaction: maximizes IG (MI) simultaneously in both the bases [2]

For equal prior, consider the problem of maximizing \(G_{xy}\) over all interactions and all POVMs, which was solved by Fuchs et al. [2].

Through a long chain of inequalities, first they derived an upper bound \(G_{xy}^*(\lambda) [2, \text{Eq. (20)}]\) as defined in Table I. It helped establishing the upper bounds \(G_{xy}^* [2, \text{Eq. (23)}]\) and \(I_{xy}^* [2, \text{Eqs. (31)}]\). Similar bounds \(G_{uv}^* [2, \text{Eq. (24)}]\) and \(I_{uv}^* [2, \text{Eqs. (32)}]\) in \(uv\) basis exists as well.

Table I consolidates all these upper bounds. Notice that each of the bounds is a function of the disturbance parameter in the conjugate basis.

As shown in [2], the upper bound \(G_{xy}^*\) can be achieved by an interaction, called an optimal interaction while its optimal counterpart (interaction) achieves the bound \(G_{uv}^*\). Thus, both the bounds for IG, one in \(xy\) and the other in \(uv\) basis, could simultaneously be achieved by Eve while fixing \(D_{xy}, D_{uv}\) independently. As a surplus, the same pair of interactions saturate the bounds for MI in the respective bases. This is so because, given a fixed basis, the set of conditions to saturate the bounds for IG and MI remain same.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE I: Optimal bounds for IG and MI in each basis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(G_{xy}^*(\lambda) = 2\sqrt{d_{uv}(\lambda)[1 - d_{uv}(\lambda)]} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(G_{xy}^* = 2\sqrt{D_{uv}(1 - D_{uv})} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(I_{xy}^* = \frac{1}{2} \phi(G_{xy}^*) )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\phi(z) := (1 + z) \ln(1 + z) + (1 - z) \ln(1 - z) )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To identify an optimal interaction in each bases, one needs to understand the nature of the postinteraction states for optimality. For an interaction in \(xy\) basis to be optimal, the disturbances \(d_{xy}(\lambda)\) for different measurement outcomes \(\lambda\) are equal [2] and each of them is equal to \(D_{uv}\) and similar condition holds for \(uv\) basis.

Then, for optimal IG in a basis \(ss'\), the Schmidt decompositions for the postinteraction states are of the following form:

\[ |S\rangle = \sqrt{1 - D_{ss'}} |s\rangle|\xi_s\rangle + \sqrt{D_{ss'}} |s'\rangle|\zeta_{s'}\rangle. \]

with \(|\xi_s\rangle \perp |\zeta_{s'}\rangle\) which are called interaction vectors representing the state of the ancilla used by Eve. Assuming all inner products \(|\xi_s\rangle|\zeta_{s'}\rangle\) are real [2], one can get the following restriction on the interaction vectors in \(xy\) basis

\[ \{|\xi_x\rangle, |\xi_y\rangle\} \perp \{|\zeta_x\rangle, |\zeta_y\rangle\}, \]

and similar restriction for \(uv\) basis. It depicts that Eve’s probe lives in a Hilbert space \(\mathcal{H}_{E}\) of dimension at most four. We consider Eve’s probe consists of 2 qubits that lives in a four-dimensional Hilbert space \(\mathcal{H}_{E} = \mathcal{H}_{E}^{\otimes 2}\) spanned by the computational basis \(|\{00\}, |01\rangle, |10\rangle, |11\rangle\rangle^\perp\). 3

At that stage, for independently chosen error rates \(D_{xy}, D_{uv}\), a judicious choice was made [2] for the optimal interaction vectors in each bases. For compact representation of these interaction vectors, we prefer to use the notations \(\mathcal{P}_{uv}, \mathcal{Q}_{uv}\) in [4] defined as follows:

\[ \mathcal{P}_{uv} := \frac{\sqrt{1 - D_{uv}} + \sqrt{D_{uv}}}{\sqrt{2}} \] \(\mathcal{Q}_{uv} := \frac{\sqrt{1 - D_{uv}} - \sqrt{D_{uv}}}{\sqrt{2}}. \)

They satisfy the following relations

\[ D_{uv}^2 - \mathcal{P}_{uv}^2 = 2\sqrt{D_{uv}(1 - D_{uv})}, \] \[ \mathcal{P}_{uv}^2 + \mathcal{Q}_{uv}^2 = 1, \] \[ 2\mathcal{P}_{uv} \mathcal{Q}_{uv} = 1 - 2D_{uv}. \]

Using these notations, the optimal interaction vectors \(\{2, \text{Eqs. (50, 51)}\}\) in \(xy\) basis can be written as

\[ |\xi_x\rangle = \mathcal{P}_{uv}|00\rangle + \mathcal{Q}_{uv}|11\rangle, \] \[ |\zeta_y\rangle = \mathcal{P}_{uv}|00\rangle + \mathcal{Q}_{uv}|11\rangle, \] \[ |\zeta_x\rangle = \mathcal{P}_{uv}|01\rangle + \mathcal{Q}_{uv}|10\rangle, \] \[ |\zeta_y\rangle = \mathcal{P}_{uv}|01\rangle + \mathcal{Q}_{uv}|10\rangle. \]

2 \(\mathcal{H}_d\) denotes \(d\)-dimensional Hilbert space.

3 We sometimes use the notations \(|0\rangle, |1\rangle, |0\rangle\) and \(|1\rangle\rangle^\perp\) instead of \(|x\rangle, |y\rangle\) and \(|z\rangle\) respectively.
For an interaction producing the postinteraction states (9) in $xy$ basis along with the interaction vectors (12), an optimal POVM [2, Eqs. (55,56)] consists of the projectors {$|E_{\lambda}\rangle\langle E_{\lambda}|$} with

$$|E_0\rangle = |00\rangle, \ |E_1\rangle = |01\rangle, \ |E_2\rangle = |10\rangle, \ |E_3\rangle = |11\rangle,$$

which in turn are the eigenstates of the observable

$$\Gamma_{xy} := \frac{1}{2} (\rho_x - \rho_y).$$

The interaction (9, 12) along with the measurement (13) are indeed optimal, since they satisfy the necessary and sufficient conditions.

One may refer to [2, Sec. IV] for another relevant model for optimal eavesdropping, where a fixed average disturbance $D_a := \frac{1}{2} (D_{xy} + D_{uv})$ is considered across the two bases. In this case, optimality of the averaged IG and the averaged MI is achieved only if $D_{xy} = D_{uv} = D$. A postinteraction state [2, Eq. (69)] was shown to achieve the upper bounds when measured by the optimal POVM [4, Eq. (46)].

Both these instantiations, i.e., the interaction vectors in Eq. (12) and those in [2, Eq. (69)], were judiciously chosen and shown to be optimal. Deriving any such optimal interaction from the first principle was done in [4]. As depicted, there are infinitely many optimal interactions, but all of them looks unique while expressed in the eigenbasis of the associated observable. We present these results in the following subsection briefly.


To derive the optimal interactions, say, in $xy$ basis, one may start with the postinteraction states (9) along with a set of arbitrary interaction vectors. For such an interaction, the density operators $\rho_x, \rho_y$ representing the state of the probe with Eve becomes a convex combination of the projectors $|\xi_s\rangle\langle \xi_s|$ as follows:

$$\rho_s = (1 - D_{xy}) |\xi_s\rangle\langle \xi_s| + D_{xy} |\bar{\xi}_s\rangle\langle \bar{\xi}_s|.$$}

The maximum information contained in such postinteraction states can be extracted by measuring with orthonormal eigenprojectors $\{E_\lambda := |E_{\lambda}\rangle\langle E_{\lambda}|\}$ of the associated $\Gamma_{xy}$ (14). Such an optimal measurement outputs some $\lambda$ with probability

$$P_{\lambda_s} = (1 - D_{xy}) \ |\langle \xi_s|E_{\lambda}\rangle|^2 + D_{xy} \ |\langle \bar{\xi}_s|E_{\lambda}\rangle|^2.$$}

For equal prior, one can calculate the amount of IG for different outcomes $\lambda$ from the expression $G_{xy}(\lambda) = (P_{\lambda_s} - P_{\bar{\lambda}_s})/ (P_{\lambda_s} + P_{\bar{\lambda}_s})$. For an interaction to be optimal, each of these values must get equal to the upper-bound $2\sqrt{D_{uv}(1-D_{uv})}$ of the IG [4, Lemma 2].

With this theoretical understanding on how to derive optimal interactions, Acharyya et al. deduced [4] a general expression representing the optimal interaction vectors as follows:

$$\xi_s = \mathcal{D}_{uv} |E_0\rangle + \mathcal{D}_{uv} |E_1\rangle, \ \ |\xi_s\rangle^* = \mathcal{D}_{uv} |E_0\rangle + \mathcal{D}_{uv} |E_1\rangle,$$

$$\bar{\xi}_s = \mathcal{D}_{uv} |E_2\rangle + \mathcal{D}_{uv} |E_3\rangle, \ \ |\bar{\xi}_s\rangle^* = \mathcal{D}_{uv} |E_2\rangle + \mathcal{D}_{uv} |E_3\rangle.$$}

Any specification of the orthonormal measurement basis $\{|E_{\lambda}\rangle\}$ provides a specific instance of optimal interaction vectors in computational basis. For instance, the choice $\{|00\rangle, |11\rangle, |01\rangle, |10\rangle\}$ of the measurement basis $\{|E_{\lambda}\rangle\}$ gives rise to the specific instance [2, Eqs. (50, 51)] provided by Fuchs et al.

Due to infinite choices of the eigenbasis $\{|E_{\lambda}\rangle\}$, one can obtain infinitely many optimal interaction vectors in computational basis 4. Maximum information can be extracted by measuring with orthonormal eigenprojectors $\{|E_{\lambda}\rangle\langle E_{\lambda}|\}$. Strategy of Eve can now be determined by evaluating the sign parameter $\text{sgn}(Q_{xy} - Q_{uv})$ for optimal interaction vectors (16) in $xy$ basis along with an optimal POVM $E_{\lambda}$. When the sign is “+”, $x$ is more likely than $y$, since $Q_{xy} > Q_{uv}$. When the sign is “-”, $y$ is more likely than $x$. For optimal interactions, these sign parameters are same as the sign of the eigenvalues [4] of the observable. Then, strategy for Eve is to output (interpret) $x$ for a positive outcome of the measurement, and output $y$ for a negative outcome. These values, as calculated in [4], are $+1, -1, +1, -1$ for $\lambda = 0, 1, 2, 3$ respectively. Therefore, for an optimally performed interaction, Eve's strategy to interpret the signal sent by Alice will be: output $|x\rangle$ for measurement outcomes $\lambda = 0, 2$ and output $|y\rangle$ for measurement outcomes $\lambda = 1, 3$.

We summarize these results in the following theorem.

**Theorem 1.** An eavesdropper gains maximum information $\mathcal{D}_{uv} - \mathcal{D}_{uv}^2$ in $xy$ basis (or $\mathcal{D}_{xy} - \mathcal{D}_{xy}^2$ in $uv$ basis), when she measures the post-interaction states $|X\rangle, |Y\rangle$ (or $|U\rangle, |V\rangle$) specified by Eq. (9, 16) (or their $uv$ counterpart) by a suitable POVM $\{E_{\lambda}\}$ (or $\{F_{\lambda}\}$). Infinitely many such optimal post-interaction states are generated by different specification of the eigenbasis $\{|E_{\lambda}\rangle\}$ (or $\{|F_{\lambda}\rangle\}$).

To understand the nature of the linear transformation that takes a four-dimensional orthonormal basis $\{|E_{\lambda}\rangle\}$ to the optimal interaction vectors (16), we introduce a few notations. Consider $a_{xy} := \langle |\xi_s\rangle, |\xi_y\rangle, |\bar{\xi}_s\rangle, |\bar{\xi}_y\rangle\rangle$ represents an array of interaction vectors and $e := (|E_0\rangle, |E_1\rangle, |E_2\rangle, |E_3\rangle)$ denotes an array of eigenkets. Then, considering

$$D_{uv} := 1 \otimes \begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{D}_{uv} & \mathcal{D}_{uv}^* \\ \mathcal{D}_{uv}^* & \mathcal{D}_{uv} \end{bmatrix},$$

4 For equal prior, one can simply replace $D_{xy}, D_{uv}$ by $D$ and get the similar results [4].
Eq. (16) of optimal interaction vectors can be written as

$$a_{xy}^* = D_{uv}e^\dagger.$$  \hspace{1cm} (17)

Clearly, the transformation is non-unitary. But, the eigenbasis \(\{|E_\lambda\}\) (which corresponds to an optimal measurement) is nothing but an unitary transformation (denote as \(M_{xy}\)) of the 4-dimensional computational basis. Clearly, \(M_{xy} = \{|E_0\}, |E_1\rangle, |E_2\rangle, |E_3\rangle\). Considering \(\varepsilon := \{(0,0), (0,1), (1,0), (1,1)\}\), we can write

$$e^\dagger = M_{xy}\varepsilon^\dagger.$$ \hspace{1cm} (18)

By fusing the two transformations in Eqs. (17, 18), the first of which is non-unitary while the later one is unitary, the optimal interaction vectors can be described by the following linear transformation of the computational basis:

$$a_{xy}^* = D_{uv}M_{xy}\varepsilon^\dagger.$$ \hspace{1cm} (19)

An instantiation of an optimal interaction vector gets fixed by a specification of the unitary \(M_{xy}\) which in turn fixes the associated optimal POVM \(E_\lambda\).

### III. NEW RESULTS

For practical purposes, an eavesdropper needs to know all the possible unitaries that ensures her IG (or MI) to be optimal. Due to simultaneous optimality in both the bases, the resulted unitary works optimally for both the \(xy\) and \(uv\) bases.

Simultaneous achievability of maximum information gain in both the bases is established in [4] via the fulfillment of the necessary and sufficient condition by the infinitely many pair of optimal post-interaction states in each bases. Given a pair of optimal post-interaction states \(|X\rangle, |Y\rangle\), their \(uv\) counterparts \(|U\rangle = (|X\rangle + |Y\rangle)/\sqrt{2}, \) and \(|V\rangle = (|X\rangle - |Y\rangle)/\sqrt{2}\) are indeed optimal. It leads to an useful relation between the optimal measurements in each bases, which is stated in the following theorem.

**Theorem 2.** Given a pair of optimal post-interaction states \(|X\rangle, |Y\rangle\) as in Eqs. (9, 16) along with Eve’s measurement \(E_\lambda\), the states \(|U\rangle = (|X\rangle + |Y\rangle)/\sqrt{2}, \) and \(|V\rangle = (|X\rangle - |Y\rangle)/\sqrt{2}\) are optimal in \(uv\) basis for Eve’s POVM \(E_\lambda\) as defined below.

$$2|F_0\rangle = |E_0\rangle + |E_1\rangle + |E_2\rangle + |E_3\rangle,$$
$$2|F_1\rangle = |E_0\rangle + |E_1\rangle - |E_2\rangle - |E_3\rangle,$$
$$2|F_2\rangle = |E_0\rangle - |E_1\rangle - |E_2\rangle + |E_3\rangle,$$
$$2|F_3\rangle = |E_0\rangle - |E_1\rangle + |E_2\rangle - |E_3\rangle.$$ \hspace{1cm} (20)

Thus, for a given pair of disturbance parameters \(D_{xy}, D_{uv}\), maximum information can be gained by Eve, simultaneously in each bases, from any of the infinitely many such paired tuples \((|X^\ast\rangle, |Y^\ast\rangle), \ (|U^\ast\rangle, |V^\ast\rangle)\).

To illustrate Th. 2, we see its connection with the specific instance provided by Fuchs et al [2, Eqs. (51, 52)]. In Eq. (20), the choice \(\{(0,0), (1,1), (0,0), (1,1)\}\) of the measurement basis \(\{|E_\lambda\}\) fixes the measurement basis \(\{|F_\lambda\}\) to be \(\{(0,0), (1,1), (1,0), (0,1)\}\). Note that the ordering of the basis elements is retained here.

The detailed proof of the Th. 2 is done in Appendix A, so that we can go ahead characterizing optimal unitaries.

#### A. Characterizing the optimal unitary evolution

Given optimal postinteraction states as input, we wish to find the associated unitary evolution. Since the same unitary works optimally for both the bases, it’s enough to solve for the unitary for a given pair of optimal postinteraction states in one of the bases. Mathematically speaking, it’s enough to solve the following equations.

$$U(|x\rangle|\psi_0\rangle) = |X^\ast\rangle, \quad U(|y\rangle|\psi_0\rangle) = |Y^\ast\rangle.$$ \hspace{1cm} (21)

We analyze it from two perspectives: the first one solves for a given instance of optimal post-interaction state and is described in Sec. III A 1, while the later one in more involved to get a closed form of the unitary for the whole family of optimal post-interaction states and is briefed in Sec. III A 2.

We keep in mind, that Eve’s probe consists of two-ubits which was initially in a state \(|\psi_0\rangle \in \mathcal{H}_4\). Since the joint post-interaction states lives in the Hilbert space \(\mathcal{H}_2 \otimes \mathcal{H}_4\), the unitary \(U\) is an 8-dimensional matrix.

1. **An individualistic approach**

Given a pair of optimal post-interaction states \(\{|X^\ast\rangle, |Y^\ast\rangle\}\), the aim is to solve the Eq. (21). The unitary \(U\) can be specified by its action on a basis. Assuming the unitary maps an orthonormal basis \(\{|\alpha_i\rangle\}\) of the Hilbert space to \(\{|\beta_i\rangle\}\), i.e.,

$$|\beta_i\rangle = U|\alpha_i\rangle,$$ \hspace{1cm} (22)

a solution can be specified by

$$U = \sum_i |\beta_i\rangle\langle\alpha_i|.$$ \hspace{1cm} (23)

Following this rationale, to solve Eq. (21), one just need to specify randomly

1. three states \(|\psi_i\rangle_{i=1,...,3}\) such that \(\{|\psi_i\rangle\}_{i=0,...,3}\) forms an orthonormal basis of Eve’s Hilbert space.

2. six states \(|X_i\rangle, |Y_i\rangle\) \(i=1,...,3\), such that \(|X_i\rangle, |Y_i\rangle\) \(i=1,...,3\) forms an orthonormal basis of the joint Hilbert space

Then, in Eq. (22), consider \(|\alpha_i\rangle\)’s as \(|b\rangle|\psi_i\rangle\) for \(b = 0, 1\), while assign \(|\beta_0\rangle = |X_i\rangle, |\beta_1\rangle = |Y_i\rangle\) and the rest of the \(|\beta_i\rangle\)’s as \(|X_i\rangle, |Y_i\rangle\). For any choice of the initial
state $|\psi_0\rangle$, a specification of the states $|\psi_i\rangle_{i=1,...,3}$ and $\{|X_i\rangle, |Y_i\rangle\}_{i=1,...,3}$ would give rise to a specific unitary $U$.

Note that, any such optimal unitary is specified by three kets from 4-dimensional Hilbert space and six kets from 8-dimensional Hilbert space. Altogether, such a solution has 60 (=12+48) degrees of freedom.

2. A closed form for the optimal unitary that produces the closed form of the family of optimal post-interaction states

Given the whole family of optimal post-interaction states $\{|(X^*), (Y^*)\rangle\}$ having a closed form as in Eqs. (9, 16), the aim is to solve the Eq. (21) to derive a closed form for the associated family of optimal unitaries. As evident from the subsequent discussion, any initial state of the probe works. However, for different choices of the state of the probe, the optimal unitary changes accordingly.

Let’s understand the motivation behind the approach that is employed here to achieve the targeted closed form. Let’s speculate Eq. (21) for the signal $|x\rangle$. Consider that $0_4^i$ represents a 4-dimensional column vector with all entries 0. Then, with a bit abuse of notations, we can write,

\[ |X^* \rangle = U( |x\rangle |\psi_0\rangle) = [U_{0-3} U_{4-7}] |\psi_0\rangle_{0-3} |0_4^i\rangle \]

Here, $[U_{0-3} U_{4-7}]$ denotes a partitioned matrix representation of the unitary $U_{8 \times 8}$, where $U_{i-j}$ represents the sub-matrix formed with columns $i$ and $j$ (both inclusive) of the matrix $U$. Clearly, given an optimal post-interaction state $|X^*\rangle$, one can only determine the left half of the matrix $U$. Similarly, since

\[ |Y^* \rangle = U_{4-7} |\psi_0\rangle, \]

given an optimal post-interaction state $|Y^*\rangle$, one can only determine the right half of the matrix $U$. Together, given both $|X^*\rangle$ and $|Y^*\rangle$, one can get a solution for the matrix $U$, for a common $|\psi_0\rangle$. We combine the two equations in Eq. (21) as follows.

\[ \begin{bmatrix} |X^*\rangle & |Y^*\rangle \end{bmatrix}_{8 \times 2} = [U( |x\rangle |\psi_0\rangle) \ U( |y\rangle |\psi_0\rangle)] = U \begin{bmatrix} |\psi_0\rangle & 0_4^i \end{bmatrix} = U (I_2 \otimes |\psi_0\rangle). \]

(24)

The objective is to solve this equation to find a closed form of the unitary $U$, given the whole family of optimal states $\{|(X^*), (Y^*)\rangle\}$ as in Eqs. (9, 16). Following the motivation above, we wish to write each of the 8-dimensional states $|X^*\rangle, |Y^*\rangle$ as a product of a $8 \times 4$ matrix and a 4-dimensional vector (as done in Eqs. (25, 27)), and combine them together.

An optimal interaction in $xy$ basis by Eve can be described by the post-interaction joint states $|X^*\rangle, |Y^*\rangle$ between Alice and Eve as in Eq. (9), along with the optimal interaction vectors (16) and a specific choice of the unitary $M_{xy} = [E_0, E_1, E_2, E_3]$ that fixes the optimal POVM. With this general setup, one can write the optimal post-interaction state $|X^*\rangle$ as follows

\[ |X^*\rangle = \sqrt{1-D_{xy}} |x\rangle |\xi^*_x\rangle + \sqrt{D_{xy}} |y\rangle |\xi^*_y\rangle \]

\[ = \begin{bmatrix} \sqrt{1-D_{xy}} |\xi^*_x\rangle \\ \sqrt{D_{xy}} |\xi^*_y\rangle \end{bmatrix} \]

\[ \begin{bmatrix} \sqrt{1-D_{xy}} (\mathcal{F}_{uv} |E_0\rangle + \mathcal{F}_{uv} |E_1\rangle) \\ \sqrt{D_{xy}} \mathcal{F}_{uv} (|E_2\rangle + \mathcal{F}_{uv} |E_3\rangle) \end{bmatrix} \]

\[ = \begin{bmatrix} |E_0\rangle & |E_1\rangle & 0_4^i & 0_4^j \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} 0_4^i & 0_4^j \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{F}_{uv} \sqrt{1-D_{xy}} \mathcal{F}_{uv} \sqrt{D_{xy}} \\ \mathcal{F}_{uv} \sqrt{1-D_{xy}} \mathcal{F}_{uv} \sqrt{D_{xy}} \end{bmatrix} \]

\[ = \mathcal{R}_x |K\rangle. \]

Note that the vector $|K\rangle \in \mathcal{H}_4$ can be expressed as a product state $|k_{xy}\rangle |K_{uv}\rangle \in \mathcal{H}^{8 \times 2}$ as follows

\[ |K\rangle = \begin{bmatrix} \sqrt{1-D_{xy}} \mathcal{F}_{uv} \sqrt{1-D_{xy}} \\ \mathcal{F}_{uv} \sqrt{1-D_{xy}} \mathcal{F}_{uv} \sqrt{1-D_{xy}} \end{bmatrix} \]

\[ = \mathcal{R}_y |K\rangle. \]

Similarly, the optimal post-interaction state $|Y^*\rangle$ can be written as follows

\[ |Y^*\rangle = \sqrt{1-D_{xy}} |y\rangle |\xi^*_y\rangle + \sqrt{D_{xy}} |x\rangle |\xi^*_x\rangle \]

\[ = \begin{bmatrix} \sqrt{1-D_{xy}} |\xi^*_y\rangle \\ \sqrt{D_{xy}} |\xi^*_x\rangle \end{bmatrix} \]

\[ \begin{bmatrix} \sqrt{D_{xy}} (\mathcal{F}_{uv} |E_2\rangle + \mathcal{F}_{uv} |E_3\rangle) \\ \sqrt{1-D_{xy}} \mathcal{F}_{uv} (|E_0\rangle + \mathcal{F}_{uv} |E_1\rangle) \end{bmatrix} \]

\[ = \begin{bmatrix} 0_4^i & 0_4^j \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} |E_0\rangle & |E_1\rangle & 0_4^i & 0_4^j \end{bmatrix} |K\rangle \]

\[ = \mathcal{R}_y |K\rangle. \]

(26)

With these matrix-vector representation (25, 27) of the optimal post-interaction states, the left-hand-side of Eq. (24) gets the following matrix representation

\[ [ |X^*\rangle & |Y^*\rangle ]_{8 \times 2} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{R}_x & \mathcal{R}_y \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} 0_4^i \\ 0_4^j \end{bmatrix} |K\rangle \]

\[ = \mathcal{R}_{xy} [I_2 \otimes |K\rangle], \text{ say.} \]

(28)

Feeding Eq. (28) back into Eq. (24), we get the following matrix equation that we need to solve for $U$ and $|\psi_0\rangle$:

\[ U_{8 \times 8} [I_2 \otimes |\psi_0\rangle] = \mathcal{R}_{xy} [I_2 \otimes |K\rangle]. \]

(29)

To do so, we need to combine the submatrices $\mathcal{R}_x$ and $\mathcal{R}_y$ in an appropriate manner to get a closed form of the $8 \times 8$ matrix $\mathcal{R}_{xy}$.

The $8 \times 4$ matrix $\mathcal{R}_x$ consists of the mutually orthonormal states $|E_i\rangle$’s. Note that, $|E_0\rangle = M_{xy} |00\rangle$ etc. Thus,
the matrix \( R_x \) can be written in terms the unitary \( M_{xy} \) as follows
\[
R_x = (I_2 \otimes M_{xy}) W_x, \tag{30}
\]
where
\[
W_x = \begin{bmatrix}
|00\rangle & |01\rangle & 0^\dagger_2 & 0^\dagger_1

|0^\dagger_2 & 0^\dagger_1 & |11\rangle & |10\rangle

|01\rangle & |00\rangle & 0^\dagger_1 & 0^\dagger_1
\end{bmatrix}. \tag{31}
\]

The matrix \( R_y \) can be written as
\[
R_y = (I_2 \otimes M_{xy}) W_y, \tag{32}
\]
where
\[
W_y = \begin{bmatrix}
0^\dagger_2 & 0^\dagger_1 & |11\rangle & |10\rangle

|01\rangle & |00\rangle & 0^\dagger_1 & 0^\dagger_1
\end{bmatrix}. \tag{33}
\]

Finally, the \( 8 \times 8 \) matrix \( R_{xy} \) becomes
\[
R_{xy} = [R_x \ R_y] = (I_2 \otimes M_{xy}) W_{xy}, \tag{34}
\]
with
\[
W_{xy} = [W_x \ W_y] = \begin{bmatrix}
I_2 & 0 & 0 & 0

0 & O_2 & O_2 & O_2

0 & O_2 & O_2 & O_2

0 & O_2 & O_2 & O_2
\end{bmatrix}. \tag{35}
\]

Here \( O_2 \) is the \( 2 \times 2 \) matrix with all entries zero and \( \sigma_z \) is the Pauli spin matrix that when exponentiated represents a rotation around \( x \)-axis.

Feeding Eq. (34) back into Eq. (29), we get the following matrix equation that we need to solve for \( U \) and \( |\psi_0\rangle \):
\[
U_{8 \times 8} (I_2 \otimes |\psi_0\rangle) = (I_2 \otimes M_{xy}) W_{xy} (I_2 \otimes |k\rangle) = (I_2 \otimes M_{xy}) W_{xy} (I_2 \otimes P^\dagger) \cdot (I_2 \otimes P |k\rangle). \tag{36}
\]

Here \( P \) is an arbitrary 4-dimensional unitary.

**Solution Space:** To look for general solutions of Eq. (36), one can choose an arbitrary initial state
\[
|\psi_0\rangle = P |k\rangle, \tag{37}
\]
by choosing an arbitrary 4-dimensional unitary \( P \). Clearly, any arbitrary 4-dimensional state will work. For a specific choice of that state, the optimal unitary looks as follows:
\[
U_{8 \times 8} = (I_2 \otimes M_{xy}) W_{xy} (I_2 \otimes P^\dagger). \tag{38}
\]

However, such a solution may not be unique: even for a fixed solution \( P |k\rangle \) of \( |\psi_0\rangle \), one can have multiple solutions for \( U \). Let’s speculate the solution space of the unitary \( U \) while the initial state is chosen as \( |\psi_0\rangle = |k\rangle \). There are solutions other than \( R_{xy} = (I_2 \otimes M_{xy}) W_{xy} \) for \( U \), we mention one of them. For this choice of the initial state, a general solution for \( U \) must obey the following equation:
\[
(U - R_{xy})_{8 \times 8} (I_2 \otimes |k\rangle) = O_{8 \times 2}. \tag{39}
\]

A general solution can be given by \( U = R_{xy} + Q \) where the matrix \( Q \) follows the restrictions below:
\[
Q_{8 \times 8} (I_2 \otimes |k\rangle) = O_{8 \times 2},
\]
and \( R_{xy} Q^\dagger + QR_{xy}^\dagger + QQ^\dagger = O_{8 \times 8} \).

The last equation follows since \( U = R_{xy} + Q \) is unitary (although, \( Q \) may not be unitary).

We explain the solution when the unitary \( M_{xy} \) is considered as identity. A direct solution becomes \( U = W_{xy} \), a permutation matrix. However, for the same unitary \( M_{xy} = I_4 \), an alternate solution for Eq. (39) can be shown to be \( U = W_{xy} + Q \) while \( Q \) considered as the following
\[
Q = \begin{bmatrix}
1 & 0 & 0 & 0
0 & 0 & 0 & 1
0 & 0 & 1 & 0
0 & 1 & 0 & 0
\end{bmatrix} \otimes 2 \begin{bmatrix}
-\frac{7}{2} & 0 & 0 & 0
0 & 1 & 0 & 0
0 & 0 & 1 & 0
0 & 0 & 0 & 1
\end{bmatrix}.
\]

We leave it as an exercise to find all possible alternate solutions of the optimal unitary \( U \) for a fixed choice of the initial state.

Clearly, we have provided a closed form for the duo \((|\psi_0\rangle, U)\), via Eqs. (37, 38) that can lead to any of the optimal post-interaction states, and works optimally in both the bases. Such a closed form captures the family of optimal interactions which in turn was shown to have a closed form provided by Eqs. (9, 16). Note that, any such 8-dimensional optimal unitary is determined by specifying two 4-dimensional unitaries: \( M_{xy} \) and \( P \). Each of the later unitaries has 16 degrees of freedom, except the restrictions of unitarity. Then, the former unitary could be fixed by specifying only 32 elements, and therefore has 32 degrees of freedom. One of the 4-dimensional unitaries \( M_{xy} \), fixes the optimal measurement. While the other unitary \( P \) plays the role to fix the initial state that Eve must prepare each of her probes.

It is interesting to notice that the solution for the unitary \( U \) depends on the four dimensional unitary \( M_{xy} \). Thereby, an unitary evolution \( U \) that defines an optimal interaction essentially determines the optimal POVM to measure the optimal post-interaction states in \( xy \) basis. The optimal POVM in \( uv \) basis can then determined by Eq. (20).

As the problem of characterizing the optimal unitary is solved, let’s analyze the difference between the two approaches. The first approach works in individualistic fashion by choosing a specific post-interaction state in the canonical basis as input and provides an unitary evolution as output which in turn has 60 degrees of freedom. In contrast, the second approach considers the entire family of optimal post-interaction states (which has a closed form) as input, and provides the family of optimal unitary as output that has a closed form and that enjoy 32 degrees of freedom. Such a drastic difference in degrees of freedom may be explained considering two possibilities. Firstly, the individualistic approach didn’t consider the expression of the optimal post-interaction states as given
Theorem 3. Given the optimal post-interaction states $|X^*\rangle, |Y^*\rangle$ in Eqs. (9, 16), which in turn get fixed for a specific choice of the unitary $M_{xy}$ (defining its optimal POVM), we can find a solution for the Eq. (21):

1. an initial state $|\psi_0\rangle = P|\lambda\rangle$ for Eve, which is an unitary ($P$) transformation of the 4-dimensional state $|\lambda\rangle$ is given by Eq. (26).

2. an unitary evolution $U = (I_2 \otimes M_{xy}) W_{xy} (I_2 \otimes P^\dagger)$ as given by Eqs. (38, 35) which is dependent on two unitary: $M_{xy}$, $P$.

The same solution produces optimal post-interaction states in $uv$ basis.

Finally, we are in the position to consolidate the steps that an eavesdropper (having 32 degrees of freedom) needs to perform in order to attain maximum IG (MI). Firstly, Eve needs to choose two arbitrary unitary, $M_{xy}$ and $P$, each of dimension four, and performs the following steps for each interaction:

1. Choose an arbitrary initial state of the probe, which is described here as an unitary ($P$) transform of the state $(\sqrt{1-D_{xy}} |0\rangle + \sqrt{D_{xy}} |1\rangle) \otimes (\mathcal{D}_{uv} |0\rangle + \mathcal{D}_{uv} |1\rangle)$.

2. Perform an unitary evolution $U = (I_2 \otimes M_{xy}) W_{xy} (I_2 \otimes P^\dagger)$ on her probe, where, $W_{xy}$ is defined in Eq. (35).

3. Eve measures her probe according to the bases-declaration by Alice. When Alice chooses $xy$ basis, Eve measures in the basis $|E_\lambda\rangle$ that in turn defines the unitary $M_{xy}$. In case Alice chooses $uv$ basis, Eve measures in the basis $|F_\lambda\rangle$ defined by Eq. (20).

IV. CONCLUSION

In this work, we have resolved the problem for an eavesdropper, by providing for her a closed form of the unitary evolutions that helps her to mount an optimal incoherent attack on the ensemble of qubits from Alice, while ensures that the eavesdropper doesn’t introduce enough disturbance at the receivers end beyond which they won’t be able to perform classical post-processing of the sifted key in order to get a shared secret. Her optimal measurements in each bases gets specified automatically as soon as she chooses her unitary evolution. We have discussed a rudimentary approach as well to fix the unitary and compared both the approaches. The second approach designed here is a new work that depicts a closed form for the entire family of optimal unitary interactions. The results demonstrated here can be considered a step forward to facilitate optimal eavesdropping in practice.

Appendix A: SIMULTANEOUS ACHIEVABILITY

Note that the optimal post-interaction states $|X^*\rangle, |Y^*\rangle$ can be instantiated by providing a specification of the optimal POVM $\{E_\lambda\}$ and vice-versa. Similar argument holds in $uv$ basis. Since the conjugate relation between Alice’s bases gets inherited in the post-interaction states, a relationship between the optimal POVMs across the bases is apparent. Such a relationship is useful, because a specification of the POVM $\{E_\lambda\}$ then immediately specify the POVM $\{F_\lambda\}$, and both these POVMs in turn instantiate the optimal post-interaction states in the respective bases.

The conjugate property of the post-interaction states dictates a relation between the interaction vectors in each bases in the following way.

$$
\begin{align*}
2\sqrt{1-D_{uv}} |\xi_0\rangle = \sqrt{1-D_{xy}} (|\xi_0\rangle + |\xi_1\rangle) + \sqrt{D_{xy}} (|\xi_0\rangle + |\xi_1\rangle), \\
2\sqrt{1-D_{uv}} |\xi_1\rangle = \sqrt{1-D_{xy}} (|\xi_0\rangle + |\xi_1\rangle) - \sqrt{D_{xy}} (|\xi_0\rangle + |\xi_1\rangle), \\
2\sqrt{D_{uv}} |\xi_0\rangle = \sqrt{1-D_{xy}} (|\xi_0\rangle - |\xi_1\rangle) + \sqrt{D_{xy}} (|\xi_0\rangle - |\xi_1\rangle), \\
2\sqrt{D_{uv}} |\xi_1\rangle = \sqrt{1-D_{xy}} (|\xi_0\rangle - |\xi_1\rangle) - \sqrt{D_{xy}} (|\xi_0\rangle - |\xi_1\rangle).
\end{align*}
$$

(40)

Given a pair $|X^*\rangle, |Y^*\rangle$ of optimal post-interaction states in $xy$ basis, the associated optimal interaction vectors (16) described in terms of the eigenbasis $\{E_\lambda\}$ obey the relations given below:

$$
\begin{align*}
|\xi_0^*\rangle + |\xi_0^*\rangle &= 2\sqrt{1-D_{uv}} (|E_0\rangle + |E_1\rangle), \\
|\xi_0^*\rangle - |\xi_0^*\rangle &= 2\sqrt{D_{uv}} (|E_0\rangle - |E_1\rangle), \\
|\xi_1^*\rangle + |\xi_1^*\rangle &= 2\sqrt{1-D_{uv}} (|E_2\rangle + |E_3\rangle), \\
|\xi_1^*\rangle - |\xi_1^*\rangle &= 2\sqrt{D_{uv}} (|E_2\rangle - |E_3\rangle).
\end{align*}
$$

(41)

Therefore, for optimal interaction vectors in $xy$ basis, owing to Eqs. (40, 41), the associated interaction vectors in $uv$ basis can be expressed by the following equations:

$$
\begin{align*}
|\xi_0\rangle &= \sqrt{1-D_{xy}} \frac{|E_0\rangle + |E_1\rangle}{\sqrt{2}} + \sqrt{D_{xy}} \frac{|E_2\rangle + |E_3\rangle}{\sqrt{2}}, \\
|\xi_1\rangle &= \sqrt{1-D_{xy}} \frac{|E_0\rangle + |E_1\rangle}{\sqrt{2}} - \sqrt{D_{xy}} \frac{|E_2\rangle + |E_3\rangle}{\sqrt{2}}, \\
|\xi_0\rangle &= \sqrt{1-D_{xy}} \frac{|E_0\rangle - |E_1\rangle}{\sqrt{2}} - \sqrt{D_{xy}} \frac{|E_2\rangle - |E_3\rangle}{\sqrt{2}}, \\
|\xi_1\rangle &= \sqrt{1-D_{xy}} \frac{|E_0\rangle - |E_1\rangle}{\sqrt{2}} + \sqrt{D_{xy}} \frac{|E_2\rangle - |E_3\rangle}{\sqrt{2}}.
\end{align*}
$$

(42)

These interaction vectors describe the post-interaction states $|U\rangle, |V\rangle$ in Eq. (9).
To see when they are optimal, we need to compare them with their optimal counterparts. For these interaction vectors in $uv$ basis, we can write,

$$\begin{align*}
|\xi_u\rangle + |\xi_v\rangle &= \sqrt{2}\sqrt{1 - D_{xy}} (|E_0\rangle + |E_1\rangle), \\
|\xi_u\rangle - |\xi_v\rangle &= \sqrt{2}\sqrt{D_{xy}} (|E_0\rangle - |E_1\rangle), \\
|\zeta_u\rangle + |\zeta_v\rangle &= \sqrt{2}\sqrt{1 - D_{xy}} (|E_2\rangle + |E_3\rangle), \\
|\zeta_u\rangle - |\zeta_v\rangle &= \sqrt{2}\sqrt{D_{xy}} (|E_2\rangle - |E_3\rangle). \\
\end{align*}$$

(43)

For optimal interaction vectors in $uv$-basis, we can get, similar to Eq. (41), the following relations:

$$\begin{align*}
|\xi_u\rangle + |\xi_v\rangle &= \sqrt{2}\sqrt{1 - D_{xy}} (|F_0\rangle + |F_1\rangle), \\
|\xi_u\rangle - |\xi_v\rangle &= \sqrt{2}\sqrt{D_{xy}} (|F_0\rangle - |F_1\rangle), \\
|\zeta_u\rangle + |\zeta_v\rangle &= \sqrt{2}\sqrt{1 - D_{xy}} (|F_2\rangle + |F_3\rangle), \\
|\zeta_u\rangle - |\zeta_v\rangle &= \sqrt{2}\sqrt{D_{xy}} (|F_2\rangle - |F_3\rangle). \\
\end{align*}$$

(44)

Thus, when the interaction vectors in $uv$ basis as in Eq. (42) are optimal, we can compare Eq. (43) and Eq. (44) to get the following relations:

$$\begin{align*}
|F_0\rangle + |F_1\rangle &= |E_0\rangle + |E_1\rangle, & |F_2\rangle + |F_3\rangle &= |E_0\rangle - |E_1\rangle, \\
|F_0\rangle - |F_1\rangle &= |E_2\rangle + |E_3\rangle, & |F_2\rangle + |F_3\rangle &= |E_3\rangle - |E_2\rangle.
\end{align*}$$

Solving these equations, we get the desired interrelation between the optimal measurements across the bases, as in Eq. (20). This proves the Th. 2.

A matrix representation of Eq. (20) shows it’s connection with the Hadamard transform of order four. Consider $f := (|F_0\rangle, |F_1\rangle, |F_2\rangle, |F_3\rangle)$ denotes an array of measurement vectors in $uv$ basis. Then the linear transformation in Eq. (20) can be read as follows:

$$f^\dagger = \tilde{H}_2 e^\dagger.$$

(45)

Here the unitary transformation

$$\tilde{H}_2 := \frac{1}{2} \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & -1 & -1 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 & -1 & -1 \end{bmatrix}$$

(46)

is a permutation $1,3,4,2$ of the columns of the Hadamard matrix $H_2 := H^{\otimes 2}$ of order four.