Quantum key distribution: a simple reference frame independent method
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The original Quantum Key Distribution BB84 requires the two coordinate frames of Alice and Bob to be fully aligned. Recent proposals, require that the two parties, share at least one direction. We present a quantum key distribution protocol for which these requirements are completely relaxed. Extension to the six state protocol, security against intercept-resend attack and outline of experimental realization is also discussed.

I. INTRODUCTION

Quantum physics has provided notable advantages for communication tasks in comparison to classical physics. Quantum Key Distribution (QKD) is one of the most important quantum protocols which do not have a classical counterpart [1, 2]. In contrast to classical key distribution schemes, which their security rests on the computational hardness of solving mathematical problems, the security of QKD is based on the laws of quantum theory. Hence the security of a key generated by a QKD protocol can not be broken, neither by today’s nor by future more powerful computers.

Quantum key distribution has rapidly matured from the early experimental demonstrations to the commercial applications. Even with this rapid progress, practical implementations of QKD protocols face different challenges. One of the main challenges is the necessity of a shared reference frame between authorized partners (conventionally known as Alice and Bob). While usually being assumed a priori in theoretical works (hence not discussed), the alignment of Alice and Bob’s coordinate system causes practical problems. In practice all systems are not isolated from the noise induced by the environment, two natural noises in photonic realizations of QKD are rotation of polarization state and instability of interferometers. These kinds of noise are equivalent to an unknown or varying reference frame of Alice and Bob. Consequently in most of the photonic realizations of QKD, frequent calibrating of reference frames is indispensable to assure the stable running of the protocol which in turn is a complicated practical task and will reduce the secret key generation rate [3, 4]. This active alignment of reference frames can be done in quantum communication through fiber optics, however in QKD schemes via satellites where one of the frames is constantly changing, it is of utmost important to devise schemes which are reference frame independent [5–8]. These schemes are however either based on the assumption that at least one direction is aligned between the sender (Alice) and the receiver (Bob) as in [5] or they encode their classical information into angular momentum states of light [7] for which the experimental expertise is not yet as developed as the one for polarization states (spin degrees of freedom) of photons.

Motivated by the work of [9] in optimal measurements of relative parameters, we present a scheme in which bits are encoded into the total spin of different subsets of three spin 1/2 particles. The value of the bit is the total spin of that subset which in this minimal realization is 0 or 1 and the role of different bases is played by which subset is being measured.

The structure of this paper is as follows: In section (II), we introduce the reference frame independent QKD scheme, in section (III) we briefly discuss its security, and in section (IV) we present the 6-state version of this scheme which has a higher security and a lower bit rate. We end the paper with discussion and outlook.

II. A BB84 PROTOCOL WITHOUT SHARED REFERENCE FRAME

Consider the joint Hilbert space of three spin-\(\frac{1}{2}\) particles. Hereafter we use this terminology for convenience although in experimental realizations, the discrete degrees of freedom refer to the polarizations of photons. Thus two eigenstates of Pauli \(\sigma_z\) operator, abbreviated as \(|\pm\rangle\), refer to horizontal and vertical polarizations and the eigenstates of the \(\sigma_x\) and \(\sigma_y\) operators respectively refer to oblique or circular polarization states. The Hilbert space decomposes into a direct sum of three subspaces, one with total spin 3/2, and two with total spin 1/2. In view of the relation \(1/2 \otimes 1/2 \otimes 1/2 = (0 \otimes 1) \otimes 1/2\), Alice can now prepare the following two states...
\[ |\phi_0^+\rangle := |\frac{1}{2}, 0^{12}, +\frac{1}{2}\rangle, \quad |\phi_1^+\rangle := |\frac{1}{2}, 1^{12}, +\frac{1}{2}\rangle, \quad (1) \]

where the first quantum number denotes the total spin of the three particles, the second quantum number is the total spin of the particles 1 and 2 and the third quantum number shows the \( z \) component of the total spin. She can also prepare the following two states,

\[ |\psi_0^+\rangle := |\frac{1}{2}, 0^{23}, +\frac{1}{2}\rangle, \quad |\psi_1^+\rangle := |\frac{1}{2}, 1^{23}, +\frac{1}{2}\rangle, \quad (2) \]

where now the total spin of the particles 2 and 3 is definite. The explicit form of these states are as follows:

\[ |\phi_0^+\rangle := \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} (|+,-,+\rangle - |-,-,+)\rangle, \quad |\phi_1^+\rangle := \frac{1}{\sqrt{6}} (|+,-,+\rangle - |+,+,+\rangle - 2|+,+,\rangle), \quad (3) \]

and

\[ |\psi_0^+\rangle := \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} (|+,-,-\rangle - |+,+,+)\rangle, \quad |\psi_1^+\rangle := \frac{1}{\sqrt{6}} (|+,-,+\rangle + |+,+,+\rangle - 2|-,-,+)\rangle. \quad (4) \]

Note that \( |\phi_0^+\rangle \) and \( |\phi_1^+\rangle \) are respectively anti-symmetric and symmetric with respect to the first two particles. This makes them orthogonal to each other and also perfectly distinguishable by an appropriate measurement. The same type of symmetry exists for states \( |\psi_0^+\rangle \) and \( |\psi_1^+\rangle \), with respect to interchange of particles 2 and 3.

**Remark:** Alice prepares and sends only the states \( |\phi_0^+\rangle \) or \( |\phi_1^+\rangle \) where the \( z \)-component of the total spin of the particles in her frame are positive. There are other states \( |\phi_i^-\rangle \) and \( |\psi_i^-\rangle \) (obtained from the previous states simply by the interchange \(|+\rangle \leftrightarrow |-\rangle\)) whose total \( z \)-component of spin are negative. These states are not sent by Alice, but should be taken into account in Bob’s measurements due to the mismatch of his reference frame with that of Alice.

The states have the following inner products:

\[ \langle \phi_i^\pm | \psi_j^\pm \rangle = S_{ij}, \quad \langle \phi_i^\pm | \psi_j^\mp \rangle = 0, \quad (5) \]

where \( S \) is the following matrix

\[
\frac{1}{2} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & \sqrt{3} \\ \sqrt{3} & -1 \end{pmatrix}.
\]

(6)

It is also important to note that any rotation in the coordinate system of Alice, does not change the total values of spins for the three particles or the pairs (1,2) and (2,3) and henceforth the symmetry or antisymmetry of these states with respect to the aforementioned interchanges. More precisely, suppose that the frames of Bob and Alice are not perfectly aligned and we have only partial information about their alignment in the form of a probability distribution \( P(R) \), where \( R \in SO(3) \) is the rotation necessary to align them. Then any state \( \rho \) which is sent by Alice, seems to go through a channel

\[ \mathcal{E}(\rho) = \int dR P(R) U(R)^{\otimes 3} \rho U^\dagger(R)^{\otimes 3}, \quad (7) \]

and is received by Bob, here \( U(R) \) is the spin 1/2 representation of the rotation \( R \in SO(3) \). Therefore when Alice sends a state \( |\phi_i^-\rangle \), the state received by Bob no longer has a fixed total spin in the \( z \) direction, but still has the same total spin \( (S_i^{1,2,3}) \) for the three particles (1, 2, 3) and the same total spin \( S_{tot}^{1,2} \) for the particles (1, 2). This state can be written as

\[ \mathcal{E}(|\phi_i^+\rangle \langle \phi_i^- |) = p_+ |\phi_i^+\rangle \langle \phi_i^+ | + p_- |\phi_i^-\rangle \langle \phi_i^- |, \quad (8) \]
where \( p_+ \) are determined by the probability distribution \( P(R) \) and are independent of the sent state.

Alice now encodes 0 and 1 randomly into one of the above two sets of states, i.e. she encodes 0 either in \( |\phi_+^i\rangle \) or \( |\psi_0^i\rangle \) and 1 either in \( |\phi_+^i\rangle \) or \( |\psi_+^i\rangle \) and sends the state to Bob.

Note that Bob, having no shared reference frame with Alice can measure only the total spin of either the pair (1,2) or the pair (2,3). For ease of notation and to make the scheme parallel to the BB84 protocol, we call these the two bases of measurements of Bob, and simply call them the \( \phi \) basis and the \( \psi \) basis respectively. In other words, Bob randomly uses one of the following two sets of projective measurements:

\[
E_{12} = \{(\Pi_0)_{12}, (\Pi_1)_{12}\}, \\
E_{23} = \{(\Pi_0)_{23}, (\Pi_1)_{23}\},
\]

where the projections on total spins of the particles \( i \) and \( j \) are defined as follows:

\[
(\Pi_0)_{1,2} = |\phi_0^i\rangle\langle\phi_0^i| + |\phi_0^j\rangle\langle\phi_0^j|,
\]

\[
(\Pi_1)_{1,2} = |\phi_1^i\rangle\langle\phi_1^i| + |\phi_1^j\rangle\langle\phi_1^j|,
\]

\[
(\Pi_0)_{2,3} = |\psi_0^i\rangle\langle\psi_0^i| + |\psi_0^j\rangle\langle\psi_0^j|,
\]

\[
(\Pi_1)_{2,3} = |\psi_1^i\rangle\langle\psi_1^i| + |\psi_1^j\rangle\langle\psi_1^j|.
\]

In half of the cases, the bases of Alice and Bob match, i.e. Alice has sent a \( \phi \) state and Bob is measuring in the \( \phi \) or \( E_{12} \) basis. In these cases and in the absence of noise, Bob can perfectly discriminate the two states and measures exactly what Alice has sent to him. In fact this is easily shown by a simple calculation

\[
\text{tr}[(\Pi_j)_{12}\mathcal{E}(|\phi_+^i\rangle\langle\psi_+^i|)] = \delta_{i,j}, \\
\text{tr}[(\Pi_j)_{23}\mathcal{E}(|\psi_+^i\rangle\langle\psi_+^i|)] = \delta_{i,j}.
\]

It is important to note that these results are independent of \( p_+ \) and \( p_- \) and hence independent of the probability distribution \( P(R) \).

In half of the rounds in which the bases do not match, there will be no perfect correlation. Again a simple calculation from (5) and (6) shows that

\[
\text{tr}[(\Pi_j)_{12}\mathcal{E}(|\psi_+^i\rangle\langle\psi_+^i|)] = S_{i,j}^2, \\
\text{tr}[(\Pi_j)_{23}\mathcal{E}(|\phi_+^i\rangle\langle\phi_+^i|)] = S_{i,j}^2,
\]

again independent of the probabilities \( p_+ \) and \( p_- \) and in fact independent of the probability distribution \( P(R) \).

Therefore Bob and Alice, after public announcement of their bases, discard those rounds where their bases mismatch and keep only the rounds where their bases match each other which is the case in half of the rounds. By announcement of bases, we mean public announcement of the pairs for preparation and measurement of states by Alice and Bob respectively, that is the labels \( \phi \) and \( \psi \), but not the indices 0 and 1. In this way, Alice and Bob establish a shared random key between themselves which turns out to be secure against attacks by Eve more or less as in BB84 [10–12].

**III. SECURITY**

The attacks of adversaries on QKD protocols are usually divided into individual, collective and coherent attacks. Using the current technology, only individual attacks are feasible. Collective and coherent attacks are based on the ability of Eve for preparing arbitrary multi-partite ancillary states and performing multi-partite operations and measurements. Such attacks also require long-lived quantum memories and so briefly stated, Eve needs something like a quantum computer for performing collective and coherent attacks [13–17]. On the other hand from the theoretical point of view, a QKD protocol is only considered to be completely secure when its security against any coherent attack is proved. The BB84 protocol is one of the protocols that has been proven to be secure against this most general class of attacks [10–12].
Here we consider a kind of attack which is a little more general than individual intercept-resend attacks on single qubits. That is we assume that Eve can do measurements on all the three spins which are being sent to Bob. If the qubits are sent in succession, this requires some kind of memory by Eve in order to do collective measurements on all three qubits. As we will show below the protocol is secure against this kind of attack.

Assuming that Eve does not have a reference frame common with Alice or Bob, she can try total spin measurement of a random pair of particles to discriminate between the two states. In fact since the total spin of two particles is a relative parameter in the language of \([9]\) which is invariant under change of reference frame, this type of measurement is the optimal measurement and produces the highest amount of mutual information between her and Alice or Bob.

Obviously in half of these cases, Eve measures in the basis \(\psi\) (using the projectors \((\Pi_0)_{23}, (\Pi_1)_{23}\)). Denoting Alice, Bob and Eve, respectively by A, B and E, the induced error when Alice is sending \(|\phi_0^+\rangle\) is then given by

\[
P_{\text{error}}^{(0)} = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j=0}^{1} P(|\phi_1^+\rangle, B|\psi_j^+\rangle, E) P(|\psi_j^+\rangle, E|\phi_0^+\rangle, A)
\]

\[
= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j=0}^{1} |\langle \phi_1^+ | \psi_j^+ \rangle|^2 |\langle \psi_j^+ | \phi_0^+ \rangle|^2
\]

\[
= \frac{1}{2} \left( \sum_{j=0}^{1} |S_{1j}|^2 |S_{j0}|^2 \right)
\]

\[
= \frac{1}{2} \left( \frac{1}{4} \times \frac{3}{4} + \frac{3}{4} \times \frac{1}{4} \right) = \frac{3}{16}.
\]

A similar calculation gives the error when Alice is sending \(|\phi_1^+\rangle\) and due to the symmetry of the matrix \(S\), it also turns out to be \(P_{\text{error}}^{(1)} = \frac{3}{16}\). So it turns out that the error in sending both kinds of bits are the same. Moreover due to the symmetry \(\phi \leftrightarrow \psi\) in \([5]\), it turns out that the same amount of error is induced when instead of the states \(|\phi_1^+\rangle\), the states \(|\psi_1^+\rangle\) are being sent.

While the bit rate is \(1/2\) due to the mismatch of bases of the parties in half of the rounds, the error rate induced by the adversary Eve, is slightly lower here than the error rate in the BB84 protocol which is \(1/4\). An intervention of Eve can thus be detected, as usual, by comparing only a subsequence of the bits to check their correlations.

**IV. A SIX STATE PROTOCOL WITHOUT SHARED REFERENCE FRAME**

Our protocol can be generalized to a kind of six-state protocol \([19]\) which is principally more secure. The generalized protocol is based on the use of three sets of preparation and measurements rather than two sets. That is Alice uses the total spin of (1, 2), (2, 3) or (1, 3) for encoding and Bob correspondingly have three sets of projectors. More precisely, in addition to the two sets of state given in \((1)\) and \((2)\), Alice can also encode her bits 0 and 1 into the following set of states:

\[
|\chi_0^+\rangle := \frac{1}{2}^{123}, 0^{13}, + \frac{1}{2}, \quad |\chi_1^+\rangle := \frac{1}{2}^{123}, 1^{13}, + \frac{1}{2},
\]

whose explicit form are

\[
|\chi_0^+\rangle := \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} (|+\rangle + |\rangle) - |\rangle, \quad |\chi_1^+\rangle := \frac{1}{\sqrt{6}} (|+\rangle + |\rangle) - 2|\rangle).
\]

Alongside equation \((5)\), we also have the following inner products:

\[
\langle \phi_i^+ | \chi_j^+ \rangle = \langle \psi_i^+ | \chi_j^+ \rangle = S_{ij},
\]
with the same matrix as in (6). Here in addition to the two bases given in (9), Bob also uses the following basis for his measurement

\[ E_{13} = \{(\Pi_0)_{13}, (\Pi_1)_{13}\}. \] (16)

The bit rate now drops from \(1/2\) to \(1/3\), but the security of the protocol increases from \(\frac{3}{16}\) to \(\frac{4}{16} = \frac{1}{4}\). To see this we extend equation (12) to this case: If Alice encodes in \(|\phi^+_1\rangle\) and Bob measures in \(\phi\) basis, in a fraction \(1/3\) of cases, Eve measures in \(\psi\) and in a fraction \(1/3\) of cases she measures in \(\chi\) bases. Therefore

\[ P^{(0)}_{error} = \frac{1}{3} \sum_{j=0}^{1} P(\phi^+_1, B|\psi^+_j, E)P(\psi^+_j, E|\phi^+_0, A) + P(\phi^+_1, B|\chi^+_j, E)P(\chi^+_j, E|\phi^+_0, A). \] (17)

The symmetry between the three bases, leads to

\[ P^{(0)}_{error} = \frac{1}{3} \sum_{j=0}^{1} 2 \times |S_{1j}|^2 |S_{0j}|^2 = \frac{2}{3} \times \frac{3}{8} = \frac{1}{4}. \] (18)

As expected in the 6 state protocol, intervention of Eve, is more easily detected, but at a price of lowering the key bit rate.

To see if such a protocol can be implemented in an optical setup, we note that a simple Parametric Down Conversion, can create polarized entangled photons which in conjunction with a single polarized photon can form the state

\[ |\phi^+_0\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|HV\rangle - |VH\rangle)|H\rangle. \] (19)

There are also linear optical setups for preparing generalized W states of the following form \[22\]–\[25\]

\[ |\phi^+_1\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{6}}(|HVV\rangle + |HVH\rangle - 2|HHV\rangle). \] (20)

Classically switching between the two preparation schemes and the two pairs of particles, enables Alice to send any state in any basis. On the other side, Bob need not to make a full Bell measurement, rather he simply needs to use a Bell state analyzer to implement the following projectors:

\[ (\Pi_0)_{12} = \frac{1}{2} \left( |HV\rangle - |VH\rangle \right) \left( \langle HV| - \langle VH| \right), \quad (\Pi_1)_{12} = I - (\Pi_0)_{12}. \] (21)

Such a measurement discriminates only between symmetric and anti-symmetric states of the first two particles. An optical setup for Bell-state analyzers have already been introduced in \[26\]–\[27\], see figure (1). It is easy to show that a state of the form \(|HV\rangle - |VH\rangle\) simultaneously clicks either (DH1 and DV2) or (DV1 and DH2) while any other state clicks both detectors either at port 1 or port 2.
Previous schemes for reference frame independent quantum key distributions either have assumed at least one common direction between the parties or have used angular momentum of light. In this work, we have presented a QKD protocol which does not require any shared reference frame between the legitimate parties. It does not even require that they share a single direction as assumed in previous protocols. Our scheme is based on random preparation and measurement of states of three spin 1/2 particles which have specific rotational invariance properties. The role of Basis of measurement is played by which pair of photons are encoding the random bit. Extension to 6-state protocol is also naturally possible. Preliminary ideas on implementation of this scheme by using the polarization states of photons have also been discussed. The scheme needs labeling or numbering of three photons which may be achieved by a very short time delay in sending the photons. The focus of the scheme is certainly theoretical and as such a relevant problem of theoretical interest is the following. The two bases which we have introduced are not completely MUB with respect to each other as witnessed by the probabilities in (5). A relevant question is how many spins we should use in order to find mutually unbiased bases (MUB) when we encode bits into the total spins of a subset of particles?
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