Sending or not sending: Twin-field quantum key distribution with large misalignment error
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Based on the novel idea of twin-field quantum key distribution (TF-QKD, by M. Lucamarini, Z. L. Yuan, J. F. Dynes and A. J. Shields, Nature 2018, and https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-018-0066-6), we present a protocol named as “sending or not sending TF-QKD” protocol which can tolerate large misalignment error. The revolutionary theoretical breakthrough in quantum communication, TF-QKD, changes the channel-loss dependence of the key rate from linear to square root. However, it demands the challenging technology of long distance single-photon interference, and also, as stated in the original paper, the security proof was not finalized there due to the possible effects of the afterwards announced phase information. Here we first show by a concrete Eavesdropping scheme that the afterwards phase announcement do have important effects and the traditional formulas of decoy-state method does not apply. We then present our “sending or not sending” protocol. Our protocol does not take post selection for the bits in $Z$ basis (signal pulses) and hence the traditional decoy-state method directly apply therefore automatically resolves the issue of security proof. Most importantly, our protocol presents a negligibly small error rate in $Z$-basis because it does not request any single-photon interference in this basis. This makes our protocol greatly improve the tolerable threshold of misalignment error in single-photon interference from the original a few percent to more than 45%. As shown numerically, our protocol exceeds a secure distance of 700 km, 600 km, 500 km, or 300 km even though the single-photon interference misalignment error rate is as large as 15% or 25%, 35%, or 45%.

I. INTRODUCTION

Quantum key distribution (QKD) [1, 2] can in principle present secure private communications with its security guaranteed by principles of quantum physics. With the development [3-13] in both theory and experiment, it is more and more hoped to be extensively applied in practice, though there are barriers for so. Among all barriers, channel loss of long distance QKD is the major one [5, 7]. Very recently, a revolutionary theoretical progress was made by Lucamarini et al.. They proposed the novel idea of twin-field quantum key distribution (TF-QKD) [9] which has historically changed the relationship between key rate and the channel loss from linearly dependent to square root dependent. Consequently, the TF-QKD makes a great breakthrough of a secure distance longer than 500 km. However, as was stated in the original article [9], the security is not finally completed because the possible effects of afterwards announcement of the phase information are not taken into consideration. As shown by a concrete scheme in the appendix, we find that the phase information announced afterwards makes the traditional formulas of the decoy state method [11-13] do not apply to the original protocol [9]. In fact given the scheme in the appendix, the fraction of single-photon bits among all raw bits must be not less than 50%, otherwise Eve may have full information to all bits without causing any disturbance. Although one may naturally turn to the key rate formulas for non-random-phase coherent states to resolve the issue, but in this path, the lower bound limit of 50% single-photon bits is still there. This definitely limits the key rate and also demands a very small tolerable error rate in the protocol. On the other hand, TF-QKD relied on the challenging technology of long distance single-photon interference, which may produce large misalignment error. Here we construct a “sending or not sending ” TF-QKD protocol where there is no phase-slice dependent post selection for signal bits. Not only this itself increases the amount of key bits, but also, this makes the traditional calculation formulas for the decoy state method directly apply, the security proof is automatically completed and the less efficient key rate formula for non-phase-random coherent states is not necessary. Most importantly, our protocol can tolerate large misalignment error rate due to the long distance single-photon interference.
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II. SENDING OR NOT SENDING PROTOCOL

Step 0. At any time window $i$, as requested by the TF-QKD, Alice and Bob take random phase shifts $\delta_A, \delta_B$ to their coherent states from the reference light which is supposed to send to Charlie. Charlie is also supposed to do appropriate phase compensation, but he is possibly dishonest.

Step 1. At any time window $i$, Alice (Bob) independently determines whether it is a decoy window or a signal window. If it is a decoy window, she (he) sends out a decoy pulse with random phase shift $\delta_A (\delta_B)$ to Charlie; if it is a signal window, she (he) sends out a signal pulse by probability $\epsilon$ and she does not send anything by probability $1-\epsilon$ to Charlie.

Note: This sending by small probability $\epsilon$ or not sending by probability $1-\epsilon$ is the heart of our protocol.

Step 2. In the protocol, Charlie is supposed to measure all twin-fields after taking phase compensation by a beam splitter and announce the measurement outcome.

Note: For simplicity, we define $|z_0\rangle = |01\rangle, |z_1\rangle = |10\rangle$ for the state of nothing from Alice (Bob) and one photon from Bob (Alice). We regard $|z_0\rangle, |z_1\rangle$ as states in $Z$ basis. Also, we regard $|x_{\pm}\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|z_0\rangle \pm |z_1\rangle)$ as states in $X$ basis. We define an effective event by the following criterion: (i) If Charlie announces only one detector counting in a signal window, it is an effective event; (ii) if Charlie announces only one detector counting in a decoy window and corresponding to that time window, the pre-chosen values $\delta_A, \delta_B$ satisfy

\[ 1 - |\cos(\delta_A - \delta_B)| \leq |\lambda| \tag{1} \]

Also, if a two-mode quantum state from Alice and Bob has caused an effective event, the state is regarded as an effective state.

Step 3. Alice and Bob announce which time windows are decoy windows and which time windows are signal windows. Moreover, they announce details for intensities of pulses sent from decoy windows and values $\delta_A, \delta_B$ they used.

Step 4. They randomly choose some effective states from signal windows and announce them. By this they can know the bit-error rate, $E^{\mathcal{E}}$. After this error test, the remaining bits presented by effective states are put to set $\mathcal{K}$. They will be distilled for the final key.

Note: We define bit values by effective states from signal windows. If Alice has sent out a signal state and Bob has not sent out anything, it is a bit value 1, and, if Alice has not sent out anything and Bob has sent out a signal state, it is a bit value 0. For any effective event happens at a signal window, Alice (Bob) judges the bit value in this way: if she (he) has sent out a signal pulse, she (he) denotes a bit value 1 (0); if she (he) has sent out nothing, she denotes a bit value 0 (1). One can see straightly, when both Alice and Bob have sent nothing, or both of them have sent signal states, the effective state will cause a wrong bit. In such a case, the bit value denoted by Alice is different from the bit value denoted by Bob.

Step 5. They use the announced data from decoy windows to calculate the single-photon counting rate $s_1$ for the signal bits. Define a $D$-pair as the decoy-pulse pair whose two pulses have the same intensity and satisfies Eq. (1). We define that an $X$-bit is created whenever an effective event is caused by a $D$-pair. We have the following criterion: A right $X$-bit is the left (right) detector clicking caused by a $D$-pair with positive (negative) value of $\cos(\delta_A - \delta_B)$. A wrong $X$-bit is the right (left) detector clicking caused by a $D$-pair with positive (negative) value of $\cos(\delta_A - \delta_B)$. Given the observed error rate in $X$-basis and $s_1$, the phase-flip error rate $e_1^{ph}$ for bit-values in set $\mathcal{G}$ can be calculated. Set $\mathcal{G}$ contains those bit values in set $\mathcal{K}$ caused by single-photons in the signal windows when one party from Alice and Bob decides to send a signal state.

Step 6. They distill the final key from bits in set $\mathcal{K}$ with the key rate formula

\[ N_f = n_1 - n_1 H(e_1^{ph}) - n_1 f H(E^{\mathcal{E}}) \tag{2} \]

$N_f$: number of final bits, $n_1$: number of bits caused by single-photon state in set $\mathcal{G}$ at Step 5, $n_1$: number of bits in set $\mathcal{K}$, $H(x) = -x \log_2 x - (1-x) \log_2 (1-x)$: binary entropy function, and $f$: error correction efficiency factor.

III. SECURITY ANALYSIS

First, one may argue that there are afterwards announcement of phase information for decoy pulses, how to guarantee the validity of traditional decoy-state method here, e.g., Eq. (2). Since the phase shift information of signal pulses are never announced, we can regard signal pulses as classical mixture of different photon number states. What we want to know is the number of single-photon-caused bits and their phase-flip error rate from signal bits. Once we know the facts, they do not change by any action outside the lab. Consider a virtual protocol where Alice and Bob secretly decided the random phase shift values prior to the protocol. In such a case, our calculations at Step 6 above is obviously solid. Note that the values of single-photon counts and phase-flip error rate are objective facts which do not change by any outside actions. After Alice and Bob know the fact, they can announce the phase information of all decoy pulses. But they can also choose to first announce the phase information and then calculate the crucial values for the signal bits, because no one knows at which time they have done the calculation. In such a case, they do not need to predetermine the random phase values, they just use the protocol we proposed above. Also, there is a similar story in the MDI-QKD: the bases information can not be announced before the states are measured. But it can be announced afterwards, for, the $X$-basis states are only used to know the phase-flip value of those qubits in $Z$ basis.

More clearly, we can design a faster-than-light communication scheme if the post announced phase information
can have effects to the security here. Consider two parties. Eve is one party, Alice and Bob are the other party, they stay in the same lab. Initially Alice and Bob shares all $\delta_A, \delta_B$ values in advance. In the signal pulses, every single photon is actually entangled with another single photon stored locally. Alice and Bob know exactly which signal pulse sent out contains only one photon. Then, using the decoy-state method, Alice and Bob can distill a number of almost perfect entanglement. They can check their entangled states and verify the high quality entanglement directly. Suppose now Alice leaves for Eve. If in the QKD protocol, post announcing phase information of the decoy states can change the security, in this virtual entanglement distillation protocol, the post announcement must change the entangled states with Bob. Therefore, by checking whether those entangled states have changed, Bob knows whether Alice has told Eve the phase information or not. In principle, Eve can be very far from Bob. This actually means faster-than-light communication.

Since we have already shown the validity of directly applying the traditional decoy-state method above, next we only need to show the validity for perfect single-photon states here. We do this by reduction from virtual protocols of entanglement distillation, as detailed in the appendix.

IV. NUMERICAL SIMULATION

In our protocol, we use the traditional formulas for the decoy-state method. Since we don’t need any post selection in Z basis and we only need sending or not sending, there is no misalignment error in this basis. This makes the protocol be able to work with large misalignment from the single-photon interference in X basis. The results of numerical simulation are summarized in Fig.1 and Fig.2. There we have assumed a detector with dark count rate of $10^{-11}$, and the detection efficiency of 80%. An error correction coefficient of 1.1 is set in our calculation. Here, we have only considered the asymptotic result and we have set the phase slice infinitely small. We can do so because in our case we take no post selection in Z basis. And, at each data, point, we have optimized $\epsilon$ and the signal pulse intensity so as to obtain the best key rate. We can see that our protocol is so robust to misalignment errors that it can achieve a secure distance of nearly 300 km even with the misalignment error rate of 45%. It exceeds a secure distance of 700 km or 600 km even though the single-photon misalignment error rate is as large as 15% or 25%. Also, fixed at the distance to be 500 km, the key rates are shown with different misalignment errors. The largest tolerable error rate can be 35%. These results show that our protocol by far breaks the existing a-few-percent threshold of single-photon misalignment error rate of for a larger-than-0 secure distance. When there is no misalignment error, our protocol exceeds a secure distance of more than 800 km. We believe these have significantly relieved the demanding task of precise single-photon interference over a long distance and hence much improved the practical feasibility of TF-QKD.

V. EAVESDROPPING SCHEME AND EFFECTS OF AFTERWARDS ANNOUNCED PHASE INFORMATION OF SIGNAL PULSES

Consider the original TF-QKD in Fig.3. Suppose coherent state of intensity $\mu$ is used by each sides for signal pulses. The pulse pairs are phase modulated before being sent out for Charlie. The phase modulation includes the coding phase (0 or $\pi$) at each sides and the random phase shift we assume to be $\rho$ at both
sides. After modulation, the states of signal pulse pairs are two-mode coherent states $|\psi^\pm\rangle = |\sqrt{\rho}e^{ip\phi}\rangle - |\sqrt{\rho}e^{-ip\phi}\rangle$ for bit value 0 and $|\phi^\pm\rangle = |\sqrt{\rho}e^{ip\phi}\rangle - |\sqrt{\rho}e^{-ip\phi}\rangle$ for bit value 1, which will cause clicking of detector D0 only; and also $|\phi^+\rangle = |\sqrt{\rho}e^{ip\phi}\rangle - |\sqrt{\rho}e^{-ip\phi}\rangle$ for bit value 0 and $|\phi^-\rangle = |\sqrt{\rho}e^{ip\phi}\rangle - |\sqrt{\rho}e^{-ip\phi}\rangle$ for bit value 1, which will cause the clicking of detector D1 only. Note that the strong reference light is controlled by Eve, here we have assumed the reference phase to be 0 for conciseness. 

Eve applies the following scheme: **Step 0.** Eve can set whatever channel transmittance. For simplicity, we assume Eve sets the channel transmittance to be 1 here. Consider Fig. 1. Before the twin pulses enter the beam splitter, Eve (Charlie) just honestly does whatever as requested by the the TF-QKD protocol. **Step 1** Eve takes a non-destructive crude measurement to project the output light from the beam splitter to vacuum or non vacuum subspace. Suppose she obtains non-vacuum, she stores the detected state and continue the attacking scheme. 

**Step 2** Eve takes a crude measurement to project the stored state either to the subspace $S = \{|1\rangle, |2\rangle\}$ or to the subspace $\tilde{S} = \{|3\rangle, |4\rangle, |5\rangle, \cdots\}$. Suppose the outcome is $S$, she stores the state and continues. **Step 3** Eve takes the following unitary transformation to her stored state above: $|1\rangle \rightarrow \sqrt{\rho}|1\rangle + \sqrt{1 - \rho}|m_0\rangle$, $|2\rangle \rightarrow |2\rangle$ where $|m_0\rangle$ is a state orthogonal to both $|1\rangle$ and $|2\rangle$. Eve. takes a crude measurement which collapses the stored state in Step 3 either to state $|m_0\rangle$ or the subspace $\tilde{S}$ spanned by the Fock states $\{|1\rangle, |2\rangle\}$. Suppose she obtains subspace $\tilde{S}$ in step 3, she stores the state and announces which detector (D0 or D1) has counted. She wait until Alice and Bob’s announcement, then goto Step 5. 

Note: until now we always assume Eve obtains the results in favor of her attacking in those non-trace preserving maps. The point is that, if Eve doesn’t obtain all results in favor of her in all previous steps, she just announces that she has not detected anything. 

**Step 5** After Alice and Bob announce the value of $\rho$, bases of each pulse pairs, and which pulses are decoy pulses and which pulses are signal pulses, Eve. can takes a phase shift operation to her stored state, changing it into one of the following 2 states corresponding on bit value 0 or 1 of the incident pulse pair: $\sqrt{\rho}|1\rangle \pm |2\rangle$. This enables Eve. to know the bit value for sure without causing any noise by a projective measurement. 

Here are details of the state evolution for the non-trace-preserving map above. Suppose at Step 1 detector $D0$ counts only, the incident state can be either $|\psi^+\rangle$ or $|\psi^-\rangle$. If the incident state is $|\psi^+\rangle$, the stored states $\{|\psi^+_0\rangle\}$ at the end of each Steps $\{i\}$ are: $|\psi^+_i\rangle = N_1 \sum_{k=1}^\infty \frac{\sqrt{\rho}e^{ip\phi^0}}{\sqrt{k}} |k\rangle$; $|\psi^+_2\rangle = N_2(\sqrt{\rho}|1\rangle + \mu e^{ip\phi}|2\rangle)$; $|\psi^+_3\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(1 + e^{-ip\phi}|2\rangle)$. $|\psi^-_5\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(1 + |2\rangle)$. All parameters $N_1, N_2, \mu$ are normalization factors. 

Similarly, given the incident states $\{|\psi^-\rangle\}$, we can also calculate time evolution of $\{|\psi^-\rangle\}$ at each Steps $\{i\}$, and we obtain: $|\psi^-_5\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(-|1\rangle + |2\rangle)$. This means $|\psi^-_5\rangle$ and $|\psi^-_5\rangle$ are orthogonal to each either and Eve can know the corresponding bit value for sure. In the same way, one can also show that Eve can obtain full information of bit values without causing disturbance if detector $D1$ clicks. 

In the Eavesdropping above, the fraction of bits caused by single-photon state is 50% among all raw bits. According to the key rate formula (Eq.(2)) of Ref. [9], TF-QKD will present a key rate of 50% from raw key to final key although the actual key rate is obviously 0. This means the key rate there [9] mismatches the protocol where all phase information of pulses are post announced. 

**VI. CONCLUDING REMARK.**

In conclusion, following the novel idea of TF-QKD, we proposed the sending or not sending TF-QKD protocol. Our protocol does not need to announce the phase information of signal pulses and hence the traditional decoy-state formulas can be directly applied. The single-photon interference is not needed in $Z$ basis thus the error rate in $Z$ basis can be negligibly small. This makes the protocol be tolerant to a fairly large error rate in $X$ basis where single photon interference must be done. Numerical simulation shows that the protocol can exceed a secure distance of more than 700 km with a misalignment error of 15%, while all the other existing protocols cannot realize any non-zero secure distance given the misalignment error higher than 11%. Even though the misalignment error for the single-photon interference is as large as 25%, our protocol can still reach a secure distance of more than 600 km. The secure distance of our protocol is longer than 800 km without misalignment error. Thanks to the revolutionary progress made by TF-QKD proposed in [9].

**Note added:** After we post our Eavesdropping scheme in its first version on the arXiv, it was suggested using different key rate formulas directly pointing to non-random phase coherent states [14, 15]. 

**Appendix: virtual entanglement distillation and reduction**

Consider a virtual protocol where there are two parties: Alice and Bob are one party and Charlie (Eve) is the other party. We shall use they to represent Alice and Bob if there isn’t any confusion. Initially, they (Alice, Bob, and Charlie) are connected by a virtual entanglement distillation and reduction scheme [14, 15].
and Bob) prepare two-photon pair states. In any pair, there is a χ-photon, the first photon in the pair which will be sent to Eve, and a Φ-photon, the second photon which will be stored locally by Alice and Bob in virtual protocols. A pair state is:

$$|T_2\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|\chi^0\rangle|\Phi^0\rangle + |\chi^1\rangle|\Phi^1\rangle)$$  \hspace{1cm} (3)$$

where

$$|\chi^0\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|z_0\rangle + e^{i\delta_0 + i\phi}|z_1\rangle),$$

$$|\chi^1\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|z_0\rangle - e^{i\delta_0 + i\phi}|z_1\rangle);$$

and $\delta_0$ is randomly chosen by Alice and Bob, $\phi$ is a random phase unknown to Alice and Bob but known to Charlie (Eve). States $|\Phi^0\rangle$ and $|\Phi^1\rangle$ are perfect entangled states of

$$|\Phi^0\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|z_0\rangle + |z_1\rangle);$$

$$|\Phi^1\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|z_0\rangle - |z_1\rangle).$$

Note: Values of $\phi$ are known to Eve but not known to Alice and Bob. They have many ways to create such a situation. For example, they choose $\phi$ values randomly themselves, announce the values to Eve, and then delete all those values. “Deleting all those values” simply means that they do not use those values anymore although those values were originally produced by themselves.

**Virtual protocol 1.** They divide all pairs into 3 random sets, $I, V, C$. Set $C$ contains pairs randomly chosen from all pairs. To each photon pairs in $C$, $\delta_0$-values are randomly chosen from the ones satisfying

$$1 - |\cos \delta_0| \leq |\lambda|. \hspace{1cm} (4)$$

The $\delta_0$-values for photon pairs not in $C$ are also chosen randomly, and those pairs happen to satisfy $1 - |\cos \delta_0| \leq |\lambda|$ are labeled by set $V$ and those pairs happen to satisfy $1 - |\cos \delta_0| > |\lambda|$ are labeled by set $I$. Here $|\lambda|$ value actually determines the size of phase slick[3]. They send all χ-photon to Eve. It is easy to show that, those χ-photon from whatever sets $I, V, C$ or $C$ are all identical to Eve, because they all have the same density matrix

$$\frac{1}{2}(|z_0\rangle\langle z_0| + |z_1\rangle\langle z_1|).$$

Therefore Eve cannot treat them differently according to which set they are from. Charlie then announces his measurement outcome, note that he can be dishonest.

**Definition:** If Charlie announces only one detector clicking and the clicking is due to a χ-photon from set $V$ or set $C$, we call it an effective event. The corresponding pair, χ-photon, and Φ-photon in the same pair are called an effective pair, effective χ-photon and effective Φ-photon, respectively.

**Definition:** They measure all effective Φ-photon labeled by set $V$ in $X$-basis ($\{|\Phi^0\rangle, |\Phi^1\rangle\}$). They compare Charlie’s announced measurement outcome of effective photons from set $V$ with their own measurement outcome of effective Φ-photon in set $V$. The mismatching rate is the error rate in $X$-basis, for effective Φ-photon in set $V$. We denote this by $e^X_V$. Specifically we can use a binary string $\kappa$ to represent Charlie’s announced outcome of effective χ-photon from set $V$ and another binary string $\kappa'$ to represent the measurement outcome of those effective Φ-photon in set $V$. The mismatching rate between these two strings is the error rate $e^X$ for effective Φ-photon in set $V$ in $X$-basis.

Asymptotically, the error rate in $X$-basis of effective Φ-photon in set $V$ must be equal to that in set $C$. Say, $e^X_C$ for effective Φ-photon in set $V$ must be equal to the error rate in $X$-basis for effective Φ-photon in set $C$. Therefore, to know the error rate for set $C$, they do not need measure Φ-photon in set $C$, they just use $e^X_V$ for set $V$. In another terminology, $e^X_C$ is also the phase-flip error rate $e^p^V$ in $Z$-basis for effective Φ-photon in set $V$. If there were no channel noise and Charlie is honest, they could judge each Φ-photon’s state ($|\Phi^0\rangle$ or $|\Phi^1\rangle$) exactly just by hearing Charlie’s announcement. However, in actual case, there could be channel noise and Charlie could be dishonest. They can preliminarily judge states of each effective Φ-photon according to Charlie’s announced outcome for effective χ-photon from $C$, and then distill entanglement from effective Φ-photon in set $C$ with parameter $e^p_C$. After distillation, they obtain high quality entangled states with a rate $1 - H(e^p_C)$. They measure the distilled Φ-photon in $Z$ basis ($\{|z_0\rangle, |z_1\rangle\}$, and obtain a secret string with rate $1 - H(e^p_C)$. Note that, if they only want to obtain the final secure string rather than the entangled states from effective Φ-states of $C$, they only need those operations in $Z$ basis in the “entanglement distillation”, operations in other basis and computation to find out the error positions are not needed. Therefore, for the purpose of making a secure final string only, they can actually measure all their Φ-photon of set $C$ in $Z$-basis in the very beginning, and they only need the value $e^p_C$ which is known from effective events due to set $V$. They do privacy amplification to the classical bits as the outcome from effective Φ-states in set $C$ measured in $Z$-basis in the beginning. Also, it makes no difference to Eve if they measure each Φ-photon in set $V$ in the very beginning in basis $X$-basis, ($\{|\Phi^0\rangle, |\Phi^1\rangle\}$). In the initial pairs, χ-photon and Φ-photon are perfectly entangled, after this measurement, they know the states of each χ-photon in $V$ exactly, $|\chi^0\rangle$ or $|\chi^1\rangle$. To know the error rate value $e^X_V$, they only need to compare Charlie’s announced measurement outcome and their own measurement outcome of effective χ-photon from set $V$.

**Virtual protocol 2.** They first measure those Φ-photon in
set $C$ in $Z$-basis ($\{|z_0\>, |z_1\>\}$, and also measure $\Phi$-photons in set $I$ and $V$ in $X$-basis. They then send all $\chi$-photons to Eve. They will do virtual entanglement distillation from those effective $\Phi$-photons in set $C$. This protocol and the earlier protocol are identical to Eve because the states she receives in the two protocols are all the same. They can obtain a secret string by the same rate. This protocol has removed quantum memory already. Moreover, $\Phi$-photons in all sets are actually not needed, Alice and Bob can directly prepare $\chi$-photon states as if these states were outcome from the collapse of $\Phi$-photons in the same pairs. So, we can convert the protocol here to the following simpler one:

Virtual protocol 3: At any time window $i$, they send a single-photon state randomly chosen from set $C$ containing states $|z_0\>$, $|z_1\>$ only, and set $V \cup I$ containing states $|\chi^0\>$, $|\chi^1\>$ only and with value of $\delta_0$ being randomly chosen. For any state $|\chi^0\>$, $|\chi^1\>$, it belongs to set $V$ if $1 - |\cos \delta_0| \leq |\lambda|$, and set $I$ otherwise. Using the data announced by Charlie for effective photons in set $V$, one can estimate the quantity $e_1^X$ which also represents the phase flip error rate $e_1^{ph}$ for effective states from set $C$. Secret key can thus be distilled from bits caused by effective states from set $C$, with a rate $1 - H(e_1^{ph})$.

Further reduction. Actually, states for set $V$ and set $I$ can be post selected. They are spatially separated and they can not determine in advance the set $V$, they can do this equivalently by post selection: Alice takes a random phase shift $\delta_A$ and Bob takes a random phase shift $\delta_B$, after Charlie completes announcement, they announce values of $\delta_A$, $\delta_B$, and set $|\cos \delta_0| = |\cos(\delta_A - \delta_B)|$ in applying the criterion to label the states for set $V$ or $I$. They can then calculate $e_X^I$ which is also the phase-flip rate for those qubits in $Z$-basis (states in set $C$). Note that, using the same idea as used earlier for the decoy state method with afterwards announced phase information of decoy pulses, one can also show that the post announcement of $\delta_A$, $\delta_B$ do not change the security. The protocol after reduction is now very close to our real protocol, but it still requests Alice and Bob to produce states in set $C$ in advance. We need to further reduce the protocol so that Alice and Bob do not have to pre-share anything.

Real protocol. In the real protocol, since Alice and Bob are spatially separated, there is no way for them to prepare state $|10\>$ or $|01\>$ exactly without information leakage. Note that for security they cannot discuss on who has sent or not sent a photon now. What we can do is to set a small probability $\epsilon$ for each of them to send a signal pulse in signal windows. In the signal windows of our real protocol, there are 3 classes of two-mode states. For any two-mode state, with a probability of $2(1 - \epsilon)$ it is from class 1: the situation that Alice sends a signal pulse and Bob does not send anything, or Bob sends a signal pulse and Alice does not send anything. With probability of $(1 - \epsilon)^2$ it is from class 2: Neither Alice nor Bob has decided to send anything. And with a probability of $\epsilon^2$ it is from class 3: Both Alice and Bob have sent a signal state. For the data from signal windows, if we have only used those due to effective states from class 1, the key is exactly same with that in virtual protocol 3 and we can obtain the secure final key with the same rate there. But in our real protocol, we also have a probability of having used states from other classes, class 2 and class 3. For security, we should only use the bits due to effective single-photons of class 1. This comes $n_1$ in our Eq.(2) in our paper. Note that as stated in [10], we do not need to know which ones are counts due to single-photons from class 1. Also, we have to do error correction now because effective events caused by class 2 and class 3 will lead to wrong judgement for bit values. We can find the error rate by testing: we choose some effective states from set $C$ and we can obtain the secure final key with the same rate there. Combining the decoy-state method, we finally arrive at the key rate formula Eq.(2) in our paper.