Practical Measurement-Device-Independent Twin-Field Quantum Key Distribution

Hua-Lei Yin and Yao Fu

Department of Physics and Zhejiang Institute of Modern Physics, ZJU-Phoenix Synergetic Innovation Center in Quantum Technology, Zhejiang University, Hangzhou 310027, China

(Dated: May 31, 2018)

The ultimate aim of quantum key distribution (QKD) is improving the performance of transmission distance and key generation speed. Unfortunately, it is believed to be limited by the secret-key capacity of quantum channel without quantum repeater. Recently, a novel twin-field QKD (TF-QKD) [Nature 557, 400 (2018)] is proposed to break through the limit, where the key rate is proportional to the square-root of channel transmittance. Here, by using the vacuum and one-photon state as a qubit, we show that the TF-QKD can be regarded as a measurement-device-independent QKD (MDI-QKD) with single-photon Bell state measurement. Therefore, the MDI property of TF-QKD can be understood clearly. Importantly, the universal security proof theories can be directly used for the TF-QKD, such as BB84, six-state and reference-frame-independent schemes. Furthermore, we propose a feasible experimental scheme for the proof-of-principle experimental demonstration.

Throughout history, the battle between encryption and decryption never ends. Currently, relying on computational complexity, the widely used public-key cryptosystem becomes vulnerable to quantum computing attacks. The one-time pad is the only provably secure cryptosystem according to information theory known today. Thereinto, an important issue exists that the common secret key is at least as long as the message itself and can be used only once. Quantum key distribution (QKD) constitutes the only way to solve the real time key distribution problem [1]. QKD allows two distant parties to establish a string of secret keys with information-theoretic security [2, 3]. One can ensure legitimate parties to exchange messages with perfect confidentiality by combining QKD with one-time pad.

The longest transmission distance of QKD has been implemented over 404 km with ultralow-loss optical fiber [4] and 1200 km satellite-to-ground [5]. Improving the transmission distance and key rate are the most important tasks of QKD research. However, this task has been proven impossible beyond a certain limit without quantum repeaters [6]. The secret-key capacity (SKC) of quantum channel can be used to bound the extractable quantum repeaters [6]. The secret-key capacity (SKC) of quantum channel can be used to bound the extractable quantum repeaters [6]. The secret-key capacity (SKC) of quantum channel can be used to bound the extractable quantum repeaters [6]. The secret-key capacity (SKC) of quantum channel can be used to bound the extractable quantum repeaters [6]. The secret-key capacity (SKC) of quantum channel can be used to bound the extractable quantum repeaters [6].

Recently, a novel protocol called twin-field QKD (TF-QKD) [11] has been proposed to overcome the rate-distance limit. The secret key rate of TF-QKD has been scaled with the square-root of the channel transmittance, $R \sim O(\sqrt{\eta})$. In the TF-QKD, a pair of optical fields are generated respectively at locations of two remote parties and then sent to the untrusted center to implement single-photon detection. Compared with measurement-device-independent QKD (MDI-QKD) [12, 13], TF-QKD retains the properties of being immune to all detector attack, multiplexing of expensive single-photon detectors and natural star network architecture. In the original paper of TF-QKD [11], the communication parties, Alice and Bob, prepare the phase-randomized coherent state with phase encoding in $X$ and $Y$ basis. To acquire the correction of raw keys, they should announce the random phase of each pulse. The key rate with unconditional security proof is still missing in the original paper [11]. Three different important works have been shown to give the key rate formulas with information-theoretic security [14–16]. Especially, Ref. [16] proposes TF-QKD with $Z$ and $X$ basis encoding, which can tolerate the large phase misalignment error.

Here, we prove that TF-QKD can be seen as a special type of MDI-QKD. Thereinto, a qubit is physically implemented by a two-dimensional subspace with vacuum and one-photon state. One can consider that the untrusted center performs the single-photon Bell state measurement (BSM) while Alice and Bob prepare quantum state in the complementary bases. Since the vacuum state is immune to the loss, it can always have a detection (detector without click means a successful detection), thus the probability of coincident detection is exactly equal to that of single detection. Therefore, the TF-QKD inherits all positive features of MDI-QKD and increases the key rate a lot to break through the linear key rate bound. The unconditional security proof technologies with entanglement purification [17, 18], information theory analysis [19], entropy uncertainty relation [20] can be directly applied in the TF-QKD. The bit of $Z$ basis is independent of the phase misalignment. Naturally, there is no need to publish random phase of $Z$ basis and the state can be seen as a mixture of photon number states. Therefore, the distilled secret key of $Z$ basis in the
Accordingly, the eigenvectors of $|\psi\rangle$ are the vacuum and the one-photon state, respectively.

TF-QKD can exploit the tagging-method of Gottesman-Lo-Lütkenhaus-Preskill (GLLP) analysis [21]. Combining the decoy-state method [22, 23], we could acquire the tight key rate formula for BB84-state [1], six-state [24] and reference-frame-independent [22] schemes.

Here, let us introduce an entanglement-based MDI-QKD with single-photon BSM protocol, as shown in Fig. 1(a). Let $\{0\}, \{1\}$ represent $Z$ basis, where $\{0\}$ and $\{1\}$ are the vacuum and the one-photon state, respectively. Accordingly, the eigenvectors of $X$ basis and $Y$ basis are $|\pm\rangle = (|0\rangle \pm |1\rangle)/\sqrt{2}$ and $|\pm i\rangle = (|0\rangle \pm i|1\rangle)/\sqrt{2}$. Considering that one photon inputs a lossless symmetric beam splitter, the output state is a single-photon entanglement state, $|\psi\rangle = (|0\rangle |1\rangle + |1\rangle |0\rangle)/\sqrt{2}$. Alice and Bob prepare a series of entanglement states $|\psi\rangle_{Aa} = (|0\rangle_A |1\rangle_a + |1\rangle_A |0\rangle_a)/\sqrt{2}$ and $|\psi\rangle_{Bb} = (|0\rangle_B |1\rangle_b + |1\rangle_B |0\rangle_b)/\sqrt{2}$, respectively, where $A$ ($B$) and $a$ ($b$) are a pair of field modes. Afterwards, they hold the qubit of $a$ and $b$ modes and send the quantum states of $A$ and $B$ modes to the untrusted third party, Charlie, who performs the BSM to identify the two single-photon Bell states $|\psi^+\rangle_{AB} = (|0\rangle_A |1\rangle_B + |1\rangle_A |0\rangle_B)/\sqrt{2}$ and $|\psi^-\rangle_{AB} = (|0\rangle_A |1\rangle_B - |1\rangle_A |0\rangle_B)/\sqrt{2}$. Note that the channel transmittance from Alice to Charlie and from Bob to Charlie should be equal. Therefore, a coincidence detection with $D0$ click and $D1$ no click indicates a projection into the Bell state $|\psi^+\rangle_{AB}$. A coincidence detection with $D1$ click and $D0$ no click, implies a projection into the Bell state $|\psi^-\rangle_{AB}$. Note that the identification of any one Bell state is enough to prove the security. When Charlie performs a successful BSM, the qubit that the legitimate users hold becomes a single-photon Bell state, the process of which can be regarded as an entanglement swapping, as experimentally demonstrated [26]. Alice and Bob can utilize quantum memory to store their qubit modes. After Charlie announces the events through public channels whether he has obtained a Bell state and which Bell state he has identified, Alice and Bob will measure their qubit modes. They publish the basis information through an authenticated classical channel. Bob will apply a bit flip when they choose $Z$ ($X$ or $Y$) basis and Charlie receives a Bell state $|\psi^\pm\rangle_{AB}$ ($|\psi^-\rangle_{AB}$). We use the data of $Z$ basis to form the raw key, while the data of other bases are all used to estimate information leak.

We can equivalently convert our entanglement-based protocol to the prepare-and-measure protocol as shown in Fig. 1(b) by the Shor-Preskill’s arguments [18]. Let Alice and Bob measure the modes $a$ and $b$ before they send the qubit of $A$ and $B$ modes. Hereafter, we use the TF state to represent the joint quantum state of Alice and Bob. Since the single-photon BSM exploits the vacuum state identification, namely, detector without click, the case of $|1\rangle_A |1\rangle_B$ will create error Bell state detection under the case of lossy channel, which will cause the bit value of $Z$ basis with unbalanced and high bit error rate. To solve this issue, Alice and Bob need to decrease the probability $P_1^Z$ of qubit $|1\rangle$ preparation, such as $P_1^Z \sim 5\%$ and $P_2^Z = 1 - P_1^Z$.

Manipulating the quantum state with superpositions of the vacuum and one-photon states and, in particular, requiring control about the relative phase between the vacuum and one-photon states is quite problematic [27]. However, we consider the coherent state $|\alpha\rangle = e^{-\mu^2/2} \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} (e^{i\theta}/\sqrt{n!}) |n\rangle$, where the relative phase $\theta$ between the different Fock states in the superposition is reflected physically in the phase of the classical electric field. Here, we propose an efficient TF-QKD in Fig. 1(c). The qubit prepared in $Z$ basis can turn on and off the single-photon source, while the qubit with phase encoding should exploit the laser source with phase modulation. The prepare-and-measure MDI-QKD in Fig. 1(b) can also be seen as postselecting the effective events that those single-photon Bell states are shared by Alice and Bob. This is indeed true in the laser-based TF-QKD with single-photon component, as pointed out in the original paper [11]. Therefore, we have proved the equivalency between the efficient TF-QKD in Fig. 1(c) and the prepare-and-measure MDI-QKD with single-photon BSM in Fig. 1(b).

In the following, let us explain our laser-based TF-QKD in detail as shown in Fig. 2(a). Alice and Bob use the stabilized narrow line-width continuous-wave laser and amplitude modulator to prepare the global phase stabilized optical pulses. They independently and randomly implement basis encoding with $\{Z, X, Y\}$ and intensity modulation with $\{\mu, \nu/2, \omega/2, 0\}$ by using am-

FIG. 1. Scheme to overcome the SKC of QKD. (a) Setup for entanglement-based MDI-QKD with single-photon BSM. Alice and Bob prepare single-photon Bell state, while Charlie implements entanglement swapping with vacuum and one-photon quantum states. (b) Prepare-and-measure MDI-QKD with single-photon BSM. Alice and Bob directly prepare the qubit with superpositions of the vacuum and one-photon states. (c) Effective TF-QKD with single-photon and laser sources. The photons from single-photon source and laser source are indistinguishable in every degree of freedom. The phase-reference of long-distance should be stabilized to implement laser interference.
plitude and phase modulator, respectively. The active phase randomization $\sigma_a \in \Delta_{k_a}$ ($\sigma_b \in \Delta_{k_b}$), $\Delta_{k_{a,b}} = \{2k_{a,b} + 2\pi(k_{a,b} + 1)/M\}$ is achieved by the phase modulator, where $k_{a,b} \in \{0, 1, \ldots, M-1\}$. Then, they send the quantum states to Charlie and announce the basis information after Charlie publishes the events of single-photon BSM. The intensity and random phase information $k_{a,b}$ of phase encoding basis should be disclosed, while those of $Z$ basis are confidential to Charlie. The intensities of $Z$ basis are only $\mu$ and 0, which means logic bit 1 and 0, respectively, while the intensities of phase encoding bases are $\nu/2$, $\omega/2$ and 0. The GLLP analysis \cite{21, 22} can be used for $Z$ basis due to that the random phase information is confidential to Charlie. The decoy-state method of estimating the yield and quantum bit error rate of $n$-photon state is also true because the random phase information of phase encoding bases is announced after Charlie publishes the measurement results. Before Charlie announces the results of BSM, the states of phase encoding bases can also be regarded as a mixture of photon number states. After Charlie announces the measurement results, he cannot change the yield and quantum bit error rate (QBER) of $n$-photon state due to information causality \cite{23}. Bob will always flit his bit in $Z$ basis. For the case of phase encoding bases, the data of the same intensities between Alice and Bob is exploited to estimate parameters. Note that, in the case that one sends intensity 0 in phase encoding bases and the other one sends intensity without 0 in phase encoding bases, we can regard them as extractable key type of $Z$ basis which can also be used to estimate the yield and QBER of extractable key type in $Z$ basis by redefining logical bits.

For the BB84 encoding \cite{1}, Alice and Bob only keep the data of $|k_b - k_a| = 0$ and $M/2$ when they both choose $X$ basis. If $|k_b - k_a| = 0$ ($|k_b - k_a| = M/2$), Bob will flit his bit when Charlie receives a Bell state $|\psi^-\rangle_{AB}$ ($|\psi^+\rangle_{AB}$). The secure key rate of laser-based TF-QKD can be given by

$$R_{BB84} = 2P_ZP^H_2(e^{-\mu}Y_0 + \mu e^{-\mu}Y_1[1 - H(e^1_{ZZ})]) - Q_{ZZ}fH(E_{ZZ}),$$

where $Q_{ZZ}$ and $E_{ZZ}$ are the gain and QBER in $Z$ basis acquired directly from the experiment, which contain extractable and unextractable key types. We call it the extractable key type if only one of Alice and Bob sends vacuum state and for the rest, the unextractable key type. $Y_0$ and $Y_1$ ($e^1_{ZZ} = e^{01}_{XX}$) are the gain (phase error rate) of TF state with vacuum and single-photon, which should be estimated by using decoy-state method. Here, we assume that Alice’s raw key is the reference raw key, $f = 1.15$ is the error correction coefficient, $H(x) = -x\log_2(x) - (1 - x)\log_2(1 - x)$ is the binary Shannon entropy.

For the RFI scheme \cite{25}, one can allow Alice and Bob to have different phase references and change slowly (details can be found in the Supplemental Material). Therefore, they can collect the data of $k_b - k_a = k$, $k \in \{-M + 1, -M + 2, \ldots, M - 1\}$ to form a set $D_k$, where the probability of $k_b - k_a = k$ is $(M - |k|)/M^2$. For each set $D_k$, they calculate the value $C^1_k = (1 - 2e^{01}_{XX})^2 + (1 - 2e^{10}_{YY})^2 + (1 - 2e^{10}_{XY})^2 + (1 - 2e^{01}_{YX})^2 + (1 - 2e^{01}_{XY})^2 + (1 - 2e^{01}_{YX})^2$, where $e^{01}_{XX(k|XY,k|YX,k|YY)}$ is the QBER of TF state with single-photon in set $D_k$ given that Alice and Bob choose $X - X(Y - Y, Y - X, Y - Y)$ basis. The secure key rate
The experimental demonstration of TF-QKD with independent laser in Fig. 2(a) is a very arduous task, although the MDI-QKD with two-photon BSM has been implemented over 404 km optical fiber [4]. Compared with the two-photon BSM, greater technological challenges exist in the TF-QKD with single-photon BSM. The frequency difference of two independent lasers is required more rigorously [11]. The phase-locking technique may be used to compensate the frequency difference. Importantly, the long-distance phase-stabilization technique is required to implement single-photon interference with phase matching. The RFI scheme can allow the phase mismatching. However, the relative phase change is still required to vary slowly. To rapidly implement the proof-of-principle TF-QKD experiment, we present a phase self-aligned TF-QKD with single laser interference as shown in Fig. 2(b). The horizontal polarization optical pulse generated by Charlie is divided into two pulses by the polarization-maintaining beam splitter. By exploiting the $\pi/2$ rotation effect of Faraday mirror, the two pulses interfere after they go through the same path. Though the phase self-aligned scheme would be affected by the loss and noise, the frequency difference and long-distance phase-stabilization problems are both solved [20]. An extra security analysis with untrusted source [30] should be used to defeat the attack from systems of Alice and Bob.

In summary, we have proved that the TF-QKD can be regarded as a MDI-QKD with single-photon BSM. By introducing the $Z$ basis encoding, the secret key extraction can exploit the tagging method of GLLP analysis and the decoy-state method. Compared with BB84 encoding, our TF-QKD with RFI scheme has the advantages of increasing the data of parameters estimation and reducing the effect of phase drift. We should point out that the extra $Y$ basis preparation in RFI scheme does not add additional operation due to the active phase randomization requirement, which is different from the traditional QKD. We propose a feasible experimental scheme to implement the proof-of-principle experimental demonstration. Through simulation, we show that the secure key rate of practical TF-QKD can surpass the linear key rate bound. The universally composable security with finite-key analysis needs to be considered in the future. Our proposal suggests an important avenue for practical high-speed and long-distance QKD without detector vulnerabilities.
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For simulation, we consider the case without Charlie’s disturbance. The gain $Q_{ZZ}$ and quantum bit error rate (QBER) $E_{ZZ}$ can be given by

$$Q_{ZZ} = 2p_d(1-p_d)P_0^Z P_0^Z + 4(1-p_d)e^{-\Tilde{z}\eta}[1 - (1-p_d)e^{-\Tilde{z}\eta}]P_1^Z P_0^Z + 2(1-p_d)e^{-\mu\eta}[1 - (1-p_d)e^{-\mu\eta}]P_0^Z P_1^Z,$$

(4)

and

$$E_{ZZ}Q_{ZZ} = 2p_d(1-p_d)P_0^Z P_0^Z + 2(1-p_d)e^{-\mu\eta}[1 - (1-p_d)e^{-\mu\eta}]P_0^Z P_1^Z,$$

(5)

where $P_0^Z$ and $P_1^Z$ are the probabilities that Alice (Bob) prepares logic bit 0 and 1 in Z basis. $p_d$ is the dark count and $\eta = \eta_d \times 10^{-9.92L/2}$ is the efficiency, where $L$ is the distance between Alice and Bob.

Here, we first define $Q_\theta$ and $E_\theta$ are the gain and QBER given that Alice and Bob both send the optical pulses with intensity $\nu/2$ and the phase difference with $\theta$, which can be given by

$$Q_\theta = (1-p_d)e^{-\Tilde{z}\eta[1+\cos \theta]}[1 - (1-p_d)e^{-\Tilde{z}\eta[1+\cos \theta]}] + (1-p_d)e^{-\Tilde{z}\eta[1+\cos \theta]}[1 - (1-p_d)e^{-\Tilde{z}\eta[1+\cos \theta]}],$$

(6)

and

$$E_\theta Q_\theta = (1-p_d)e^{-\Tilde{z}\eta[1+\cos \theta]}[1 - (1-p_d)e^{-\Tilde{z}\eta[1+\cos \theta]}].$$

(7)

The $Y_0$ and $Y_1$ are the yield of twin-field state with vacuum and single-photon, respectively, which can be given by $(\nu > \omega > 0)$

$$Y_0 = Q_{XX}^0 = 2p_d(1-p_d),$$

(8)

and

$$Y_1 \geq \frac{\nu}{\nu\omega - \omega^2} \left(e^{\omega}Q_{XX}^\omega - \frac{\omega^2}{\nu^2}e^{\nu}Q_{XX}^\nu - \frac{\nu^2 - \omega^2}{\nu^2}Y_0 \right).$$

(9)

Here, we should point out that Alice and Bob can keep all the data when they both send intensity 0 in phase encoding bases, which can be used to decrease the finite size effect.

For BB84 encoding [1], the upper bound of phase error rate $e_{ZZ}^{opt} = e_{XX}^{b1}$ can be given by

$$e_{XX}^{b1} \leq \frac{e^{\omega}E_{XX}^\omega Q_{XX}^\omega - e^{\omega}Y_0}{e^{\omega}Y_1},$$

(10)

where $e^{b1} = 0.5$ is the QBER of TF state with vacuum in phase encoding bases. The $e_{opt} = (1 - \cos \delta)/2$ is the optical error rate due to the uncompensated phase drift $\delta$ pointed out by the original twin-field quantum key distribution (TF-QKD) [11]. For $e_{opt} = 0.03$, we can have $\delta = 0.35$. Due to the random phase shifting, there is still an intrinsic QBER because the random phases are not perfectly matching. Therefore, the gain $Q_{XX}^\nu$, $Q_{XX}^\nu$ and QBER $E_{XX}^\nu$, $E_{XX}^\nu$ can be written as

$$Q_{XX}^\nu = \int_{\delta - \frac{\pi}{4}}^{\delta + \frac{\pi}{4}} Q_\theta^\nu, \quad Q_{XX}^\omega = \int_{\delta - \frac{\pi}{4}}^{\delta + \frac{\pi}{4}} Q_\theta^\omega,$$

(11)

and

$$E_{XX}^\nu Q_{XX}^\nu = \int_{\delta - \frac{\pi}{4}}^{\delta + \frac{\pi}{4}} E_\theta Q_\theta^\nu, \quad E_{XX}^\nu Q_{XX}^\nu = \int_{\delta - \frac{\pi}{4}}^{\delta + \frac{\pi}{4}} E_\theta Q_\theta^\nu.$$

(12)

We can see $E_{XX}^\nu \sim 4.2\%$, which is almost the same with that in the original TF-QKD [11].

For six-state encoding [24], the probability that both bit flip and phase shift occurs can be given by

$$a = \frac{e_{ZZ}^{b1} + e_{XX}^{b1} - e_{YY}^{b1}}{2}. $$

(13)

For simplification, we can assume that those cases of qubit preparation with relative phase modulation are symmetrical since the random phase is unknown before Charlie performs single-photon Bell state measurement. Therefore, we can
have a = \varepsilon_{Z\bar{Z}}^1/2. However, the parameter \varepsilon_{Z\bar{Z}}^1 is the QBER of TF state with single-photon in extractable key type of Z basis. Interestingly, the QBER \varepsilon_{Z\bar{Z}}^1 \equiv 0, which means that the key rate of TF-QKD with six-state encoding cannot have advantage compared with BB84 encoding.

For the reference-frame-independent (RFI) scheme \[25\], the Z basis is always well defined, which is Z_A = Z_B = Z for Alice and Bob. The other two bases may vary with the slow phase shifting \( \beta \), the relation can be given by X_B = \cos \beta X_A + \sin \beta Y_A, \ Y_B = \cos \beta Y_A - \sin \beta X_B \ (A) \ (B) \ (C), \ \text{where} \ Z_A, X_A \ \text{and} \ Y_A \ \text{are the location reference frames for} \ Z, X \ \text{and} \ Y \ \text{basis of Alice and Bob, respectively.} \ \beta_A (\beta_B) \ \text{is the deviation between the practical and standard reference frame for Alice (Bob). Therefore, the eigenstates of} \ X, Y, \ \text{and} \ Z \ \text{are} \ (A) \ (B) \ (C). \ \text{Interestingly, the QBER} \ E_{\text{Z}} \ \text{have advantage compared with BB84 encoding.}

Here, \( I_E(C) = (1 - e_b)H(1 + u) + e_bH(1 - u) \) quantifies the information of Eve’s knowledge, parameters \( v = \sqrt{\varepsilon_{/2} - (1 - e_b)^2 u^2} \) and \( u = \min(\sqrt{\varepsilon_{/2}}/1 - e_b, 1) \). We have \( I_E(C) = H((1 + \sqrt{\varepsilon_{/2}})/2) \) if the QBER \( e_b = 0 \). The value \( C \) can be defined as

\[
C = (X_A X_B)^2 + (X_A Y_B)^2 + (Y_A X_B)^2 + (Y_A Y_B)^2 = (1 - 2E_{XX})^2 + (1 - 2E_{XY})^2 + (1 - 2E_{YX})^2 + (1 - 2E_{YY})^2, \tag{15}
\]

which is independent of phase shifting \( \beta_A (\beta_B) \) and can just be used to bound Eve’s information. However, the phase shifting will add the QBER of phase encoding bases, which will decrease the key rate of BB84 encoding. Thereinto, \( E_{XX(YY,XY,YX)} \) is the QBER given that Alice and Bob choose \( X - X(Y - Y, X - Y, Y - X) \) basis, which can be given by

\[
E_{XX} = E_{YY} = \frac{1}{2}(1 - \cos \beta), \quad E_{XY} = \frac{1}{2}(1 + \sin \beta), \quad E_{YX} = \frac{1}{2}(1 - \sin \beta). \tag{16}
\]

One can acquire the maximum value \( C = 2 \) in the ideal case and \( I_E(C = 2) = 0 \).

In the laser-based TF-QKD with RFI scheme, the gain \( Q'_{XX(k)} \), \( Q'_{XY(k)} \), \( Q'_{YX(k)} \) and \( Q'_{YY(k)} \) of set \( D_k \) can be given by

\[
Q'_{XX(k)} = \int_{\delta + \frac{\pi}{2} (k+1)}^{\delta + \frac{\pi}{2} (k-1)} Q'_0, \quad Q'_{XY(k)} = \int_{\delta + \frac{\pi}{2} (k+1) + \frac{\pi}{2}}^{\delta + \frac{\pi}{2} (k-1) + \frac{\pi}{2}} Q'_0, \tag{17}
\]

\[
Q'_{YX(k)} = \int_{\delta + \frac{\pi}{2} (k-1)}^{\delta + \frac{\pi}{2} (k+1)} Q'_0, \quad Q'_{YY(k)} = \int_{\delta + \frac{\pi}{2} (k-1) - \frac{\pi}{2}}^{\delta + \frac{\pi}{2} (k+1) - \frac{\pi}{2}} Q'_0.
\]

The QBER \( E'_{XX(k)} \), \( E'_{XY(k)} \), \( E'_{YX(k)} \) and \( E'_{YY(k)} \) of set \( D_k \) can be written as

\[
E'_{XX(k)} Q'_{XX(k)} = \int_{\delta + \frac{\pi}{2} (k+1)}^{\delta + \frac{\pi}{2} (k-1)} E'_0 Q'_0, \quad E'_{XY(k)} Q'_{XY(k)} = \int_{\delta + \frac{\pi}{2} (k+1)}^{\delta + \frac{\pi}{2} (k-1)} E'_0 Q'_0, \tag{18}
\]

\[
E'_{YX(k)} Q'_{YX(k)} = \int_{\delta + \frac{\pi}{2} (k+1) + \frac{\pi}{2}}^{\delta + \frac{\pi}{2} (k+1) - \frac{\pi}{2}} E'_0 Q'_0, \quad E'_{YY(k)} Q'_{YY(k)} = \int_{\delta + \frac{\pi}{2} (k+1) - \frac{\pi}{2}}^{\delta + \frac{\pi}{2} (k+1) + \frac{\pi}{2}} E'_0 Q'_0.
\]
By using the decoy-state method, the upper bound of QBER $e_{XXk}^{b_1}$, $e_{YYk}^{b_1}$, $e_{XYk}^{b_1}$ and $e_{YXk}^{b_1}$ will be

\[
\begin{align*}
    e_{XXk}^{b_1} &\leq \frac{e^{\omega}E_{XXk}^{\omega}Q_{XXk}^{\omega} - e^{b_0}Y_0}{\omega Y_1}, \\
    e_{YYk}^{b_1} &\leq \frac{e^{\omega}E_{YYk}^{\omega}Q_{YYk}^{\omega} - e^{b_0}Y_0}{\omega Y_1}, \\
    e_{XYk}^{b_1} &\leq \frac{e^{\omega}E_{XYk}^{\omega}Q_{XYk}^{\omega} - e^{b_0}Y_0}{\omega Y_1}, \\
    e_{YXk}^{b_1} &\leq \frac{e^{\omega}E_{YXk}^{\omega}Q_{YXk}^{\omega} - e^{b_0}Y_0}{\omega Y_1}.
\end{align*}
\]

(19)