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We present a device independent quantum secret sharing scheme in arbitrary even dimension. We propose a d-dimensional N-partite linear game, utilizing a generic multipartite higher dimensional Bell inequality, a generalization of Mermin’s inequality in the higher dimension. Probability to win this linear game defines the device independence testing of the proposed scheme. The security is proved under causal independence of measurement devices and it is based on the polygamy property of entanglement. By defining $\epsilon_{cor}$-correctness and $\epsilon$-completeness for a quantum secret sharing scheme, we have also shown that the proposed scheme is $\epsilon_{cor}$-correct and $\epsilon$-complete.

I. INTRODUCTION

Quantum physics pledges the security of cryptographic protocols from an adversary having unbounded computational power. The journey of quantum cryptography was started in the year 1984, when Bennett and Brassard [1] proposed a scheme for Quantum Key distribution (QKD). QKD is the most discussed area of quantum cryptography which allows two distant users Alice and Bob to agree on a common secret key in a quantum mechanical way. Although it has been proven that the BB84 QKD protocol [1] is unconditionally secure [2], but the practical implementation of QKD confronted side channel attacks in which classical information gets leaked [3-4]. To avert these type of attack Mayers and Yao [2] proposed the idea of device independence in which the security of the scheme is based on a statistical test performed on spatially separated measurement devices. Since then numerous proposals [5-18] have been suggested for device independent QKD (DI-QKD) based on the properties of entanglement. The statistical test performed for the security of DI-QKD is based on the quantum violation of Bell inequality [26]. Although, in recent few years researchers became interested to explore device independent security outside QKD [19-25], but it is very little known outside QKD till today. Nowadays, quantum cryptography is observant of more multipartite higher dimensional schemes. Those schemes can be proven secure under device independence paradigm by employing the higher dimensional multi-particle Bell inequality.

Quantum nonlocality is visible by measuring two entangled particles in the spatially separated region. Bell [26] showed that the quantum correlations obtained by measuring two spatially separated entangled particles, can not be reproduced by local realism. Allowing more flexibility in local measurements than original Bell inequality, Clauser, Horne, Shimony, and Holt [27] proposed an inequality (CHSH inequality) which is maximally violated when each particle of a two-dimensional bipartite maximally entangled system is measured by two mutually unbiased bases. Then it was a natural question that, how to generalize this Bell inequality for multipartite and/or multidimensional system. By generalizing the Bell inequality for arbitrarily many qubits, Mermin [28] derived that the degree of violation is increased with number of involved parties. The search of Bell inequality for arbitrarily many qubits, pursued by Ardehali [29] and Belinskii and Klyshko [30]. Generalization of Bell inequality for the bipartite multidimensional system has been investigated in [31-35]. The long-awaited proof of such violation of Bell correlations in the higher dimensional multipartite system was presented by Son et al. [36]. However, that was further generalized for more than two possible settings in the measurement devices [37-38]. The applications of multipartite arbitrary dimensional Bell inequality in quantum information science is still to explore.

After QKD, quantum secret sharing (QSS) is the most remarkable example of quantum advantages. QSS is an adaption of classical secret sharing scheme (CSS) in the quantum world. CSS was first proposed by Shamir [39]. In a secret sharing scheme, there is a dealer named Alice wants to share a secret among a number (≥2) of participants (say Bobs) in such a way that a set of authorized participants can only recover the secret. Hillery et al. [40] first proposed a QSS scheme using three-particle and four particle GHZ states of qubits. Cleave et al. [41] proposed another QSS scheme that shares a quantum secret using CSS code [42-43], a quantum error correcting code. After that a large number of schemes on QSS have been proposed such as circular QSSs [44-46], dynamic QSSs [47-48], single particle QSSs [49-50], graph state QSSs [51-52], verifiable QSSs [53-54], and QSSs based on error correcting codes [55], phase shift operations [56-57] and quantum search algorithms [61]. Gogioso [62] proposed device independent quantum secret sharing scheme using Mermin-type contextuality. Although, it was initially claimed that the scheme is provably secure against non-signaling attackers but later it was confronted some errors in the proof of main result [62]. Our proposal is independent and very different from that proposal.

In this current draft, We have presented a device independent quantum secret sharing scheme in arbitrarily even dimension. The device independence test of the proposed scheme is based on the Bell violation for a multipartite arbitrary even dimensional system [39]. We have
proposed an $N$-partite $d$-dimensional linear game based on that inequality. It has been shown that to share and recover the secret securely, it is enough to pass the testing phase of the proposed scheme. The criteria to pass the testing phase is directly related to the probability to win the proposed game. The security is depending on the polygamy property of entanglement, which states that an $N$-partite GHZ state cannot be shared among more than $N$ parties [30]. By defining the notions of $\epsilon$-correct and $\epsilon'$-complete, we have also shown the correctness and completeness of the proposed QSS scheme. Complete-ness and security of the scheme is proved under causally independence assumption on measurement devices. As per our best knowledge, this is the first quantum cryptographic scheme that uses higher dimensional multipartite Bell inequality to prove the security of a scheme in device independent paradigm.

II. BELL INEQUALITIES FOR MULTIPARTITE ARBITRARY EVEN DIMENSIONAL SYSTEM

Son et al. [30] have proposed generic Bell inequalities for multipartite arbitrary dimensional system. As in the case of a two-dimensional dimensional bipartite system, quantum mechanics outperforms the constraint on the correlations between subsequent measurements of the particles given by any local realistic theory for a multipartite arbitrary even dimensional system. Let us consider the scenario that, each of $N$ observers independently chooses one of two variables (denoted by $A_j$ and $B_j$ for the $j$th observer), each of which takes a value from a set $S$ generated by the $d$th root of unity $\omega$ over complex field. The generic Bell function presented in [30] is:

$$\hat{B} = \frac{1}{2^N} \sum_{n=1}^{d-1} \left( \prod_{j=1}^{N} (A_j^n + \omega^\frac{j}{d} B_j^n) \right) + C. C., \quad (1)$$

where C. C. stands for complex conjugate.

From the classical viewpoint, the symbol $\langle \cdot \rangle$ denotes the statistical average over many runs. The theory of local realism implies that,

$$\hat{B} \leq \begin{cases} d(2^{-\frac{N}{2}} + 2^{-1}) - 1, & \text{if } N \text{ and } d \text{ both are even} \\ d(2^{-\frac{N+1}{2}} + 2^{-1}) - 1, & \text{if } N \text{ is odd and } d \text{ is even} \\ d - 1, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

In case of quantum mechanical description, the statistical average is replaced by quantum average on a given state $|\psi\rangle$. The quantum expectation $\hat{B}_q$ of $\hat{B}$ takes the maximum value $(d - 1)$ i.e. $\hat{B}_q \leq (d - 1)$. One can clearly see that the constraint on $\hat{B}$ imposed by local realism, formally known as generic Bell inequality, is violated by quantum mechanics for an even dimensional system. In particular, the maximum quantum violation is reached by a maximally entangled state $|\psi\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{d}} \sum_{\alpha=0}^{d-1} |\alpha\rangle_1 |\alpha\rangle_2 \ldots |\alpha\rangle_N$, and for the observable operators $\hat{V} = \sum_{\alpha=0}^{d-1} \omega^\alpha |\alpha\rangle_V \langle\alpha|$, where $V \in \{A, B\}$, $|\alpha\rangle_A = \sum_{\beta=0}^{d-1} \omega^{-\alpha\beta} |\beta\rangle$, $|\alpha\rangle_B = \sum_{\beta=0}^{d-1} \omega^{-(\alpha + \frac{1}{2})\beta} |\beta\rangle$ and $|\alpha\rangle$ is the eigen vector of generalized $Z$ operator corresponding to the eigen value $\omega^\alpha$. Here $\hat{A}$ and $\hat{B}$ are the quantum observable operators analogous to the classical variable $A$ and $B$.

For our purpose, we have used a slight different form of the above Bell function (1), as:

$$\mathcal{B} = \frac{1}{2^N} \sum_{n=1}^{d-1} \left( \prod_{j=1}^{N} (A_j^n + \omega^{-\frac{j}{d}} B_j^n) \right) + C. C. \quad (2)$$

One can easily verify that the classical and quantum bounds for $\mathcal{B}$ are same as of $\hat{B}$. Note that, to reach the maximum violation achievable by quantum mechanics, it is important to use an observable $\hat{B}$, with an eigen vector $|\alpha\rangle_B = \sum_{\beta=0}^{d-1} \omega^{-(\alpha - \frac{1}{2})\beta} |\beta\rangle$, corresponding to the eigen value $\omega^\alpha$. By choosing $A_j = P_{0,j}$ and $\hat{B}_j = P_{1,j}$, one can rewrite the Bell function (2) as:

$$\mathcal{B} = \frac{1}{2^N} \sum_{n=1}^{d-1} \sum_{x \in \{0,1\}^N} \omega^{-nf(x)} \left( \prod_{j=1}^{N} P_{x_j,j}^n \right),$$

where $x_i \in \{0,1\}$ is the $i$th bit of $x$, $f : \{0,1\}^N \rightarrow \{0,1,\ldots, d - 1, \perp\}$ is a function such that it takes the value $\perp$ for half of the elements in the domain and $\omega^\perp = 0$. We can see that the function $f$ is one-to-one and it will be bijective for $N \geq (2d - 1)$.

III. $N$-PARTITE $d$-DIMENSIONAL XOR GAME

In this section, we have associated the above Bell function (2) to an XOR game between $N$ spatially separated players Bob$_1$, Bob$_2$, $\ldots$, Bob$_N$ in such a way that they are not allowed to communicate during the game. The players can communicate before the game starts and discuss their strategy (or send physical systems to each other). Now, for each $k \in [N]$, a question $x_k \in \{0,1\}$ is asked to a player Bob$_k$ uniformly at random and independent to the questions $x_1,\ldots,x_{k-1},x_{k+1},\ldots,x_N$ asked to the other players. Bob$_k$ gives an answer $a_k \in \{0,1,\ldots,d - 1\}$ to a question $x_k$. The players will win the game if

$$\bigoplus_{i=1}^{N} a_i = f(x_1,\ldots,x_N)(\text{mod } d),$$

where the function $f$ is the same function defined in the previous section. It is obvious that, they will never win the game for $f(x_1,\ldots,x_n) = \perp$. Here, we have assumed $d$ as an even positive integer.

Quantum strategy to win the game: Before the game starts, $N$ players Bob$_1$, Bob$_2$, $\ldots$, Bob$_N$ shares an $N$-partite $d$-dimensional GHZ state $|\psi\rangle = \sum_{\alpha=0}^{d-1} |\alpha\rangle_1 |\alpha\rangle_2 \ldots |\alpha\rangle_N$. Here, the suffixes are used to clarify that Bob$_k$ ($k \in [N]$) holds the $k$th particle. For
a question \( x_k \in \{0, 1\} \), \( Bob_k \) measures his particle with the observable \( P_{x_k, k} \) and gets the eigen value \( \omega_k \) as measurement result. Then \( Bob_k \) outputs \( a_k \) as an answer to the question \( x_k \). Here the observable operators are defined by \( P_{x_k, k} = \sum_{\alpha=0}^{d-1} \omega_k^\alpha |\alpha\rangle x_{\alpha}^{x_k} \langle \alpha| \), where \( |\alpha\rangle_0 = \sum_{\beta=0}^{d-1} \omega^{-\alpha \beta} |\beta\rangle \).

One can notice that, in the case of two dimensions, the observable operators \( P_{0, k} \) and \( P_{1, k} \) will be reduced to Pauli X and Y operators, \( \sigma_x \) and \( \sigma_y \). Thus one can call the observable operators \( P_{0, k} \) and \( P_{1, k} \) as generalized X and Y operator.

**Probability to win the game:** We will calculate the probability to win the game \( p_w \) using the approach of Murta et al. \[64\]. The question \( x_k \) is chosen from \( \{0, 1\} \) uniformly at random. Then \( \text{Pr}(x_1, \ldots, x_N) = 2^{-N} \). Here, we have used the symbol \( \bigoplus \) for addition modulo \( d \) and \( x_k \) is the \( i^{th} \) bit of \( x \).

Let us consider the Abelian group \( \mathbb{Z}_d \) of integers of modulo \( d \) under addition and \( a_1, \ldots, a_N \in \mathbb{Z}_d \). Now, we can use the Fourier transformation on Abelian group and rewrite the success probability \( p_w \) as

\[
p_w = \sum_{x \in \{0, 1\}^N} \text{Pr}(x_1, \ldots, x_N) \text{Pr} \left( \bigoplus_{i=1}^{N} a_i = f(x_1, \ldots, x_N) | x_1, \ldots, x_N \right)
\]

\[
= 2^{-N} \sum_{j=0}^{d-1} \sum_{x \in \{0, 1\}^N} \text{Pr} \left( \bigoplus_{i=1}^{N} a_i = j | x_1, \ldots, x_N \right)
\]

\[
+ 2^{-N} \sum_{x \in \{0, 1\}^N} \text{Pr} \left( \bigoplus_{i=1}^{N} a_i = \perp | x_1, \ldots, x_N \right)
\]

\[
= 2^{-N} \sum_{x \in \{0, 1\}^N} \sum_{j=0}^{d-1} \text{Pr} \left( \bigoplus_{i=1}^{N} a_i = j | x_1, \ldots, x_N \right)
\]

defined as

\[
A^{a_k}_{x_k, k} = \sum_{a_k=0}^{d-1} \omega^{a_k} P^{a_k}_{x_k, k}
\]

\[
= \sum_{a_k=0}^{d-1} \omega^{a_k} P^{a_k}_{x_k, k}
\]

\[
= (P^{a_k}_{x_k, k})^a.
\]

Here we have used the fact that, \( P^{a_k}_{x_k, k} = \sum_{a_k=0}^{d-1} \omega^{a_k} P^{a_k}_{x_k, k} \)

\[
\langle A^n_{x_1, 1} \ldots A^n_{x_N, N} \rangle = \langle P^n_{x_1, 1} \ldots P^n_{x_N, N} \rangle.
\]

Finally, by substituting (4) in (3), the probability to win \( (p_w) \) the above \( N \)-partite \( d \)-dimensional game becomes

\[
p_w = \frac{1}{d} \left( 1 + 2^{-N} \sum_{j=0}^{d-1} \sum_{x \in \{0, 1\}^N} \sum_{f(x)=j} \sum_{k=0}^{d-1} \omega^{-nj} \langle p^n_{x_1, 1} \ldots p^n_{x_N, N} \rangle \right)
\]

\[
= \frac{1}{d} \left( 1 + 2^{-N} \sum_{x \in \{0, 1\}^N} \sum_{f(x)=\perp} \sum_{k=0}^{d-1} \sum_{n=1}^{d-1} \omega^{-nj} \langle p^n_{x_1, 1} \ldots p^n_{x_N, N} \rangle \right)
\]

\[
= \frac{1}{d} \left( 1 + 2^{-N} \sum_{x \in \{0, 1\}^N} \sum_{f(x)=\perp} \sum_{k=0}^{d-1} \sum_{n=1}^{d-1} \omega^{-nj} \langle p^n_{x_1, 1} \ldots p^n_{x_N, N} \rangle \right)
\]

The third equality follows from \( \omega^{\perp} = 0 \) and the final equality comes from the fact that the Bell function \( B \)

\[
B = A_0A_1 + A_0B_1 + B_0A_1 - B_0B_1,
\]

where \( A_i, B_i \) are the operators corresponding to the \( i^{th} \) player, \( i \in \{0, 1\} \). For \( d = 2 \) and \( N = 2 \), the function \( B \) reduces to

\[
B = A_0A_1 - B_0B_1.
\]

Thus the winning probability of the game introduced in this study fails to generalize the winning probability of the CHSH game. It remains an open question to generalize the exact CHSH inequality \[27\] for a \( d \)-dimensional \( N \)-partite system.
IV. THE PROTOCOL

In this section, we will use the game introduced in the previous section to propose a device independent quantum secret sharing scheme (DIQSS). In this scheme, a dealer Alice wants to share a classical secret among $N - 1$ participants $Bob_1, Bob_2, \ldots, Bob_{N-1}$ in such a way that all the Bobs together can recover the secret. Before describing the proposed scheme, we first enumerate a minimal set assumptions determining the security of the scheme.

Assumptions:

1. Alice and Bobs’ laboratories are perfectly isolated from outside (in particular from Eve) in such a way that any unintended information cannot go outside the labs.

2. Each party holds a trusted random number generator.

3. Each of Alice and $Bob_1, Bob_2, \ldots, Bob_{N-1}$ has a measurement device in their laboratory with two inputs $\{0, 1\}$. Each input has $d$ outputs. The measurement devices are causally independent and also independent of the source. Otherwise, the measurement devices are arbitrary and therefore could be prepared by an eavesdropper Eve.


1. For every round $i \in [M]$:

   - A dealer Alice and $N - 1$ participants $Bob_1, \ldots, Bob_{N-1}$ shares an $N$-partite $d$-dimensional GHZ state
     
     $|\psi\rangle_i = \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{d}} \sum_{\alpha=0}^{d-1} |\alpha\rangle_1 \ldots |\alpha\rangle_N\right)_i,$

     where $d$ is an even positive integer.

   - Alice picks a random bit $T_i$ with $Pr(T_i = 1) = \mu$ and publicly communicates the choice of $T_i$ with Bobs.

   - For $T_i = 1$, Alice randomly picks $x_i \in \{0, 1\}$ and for each $k \in [N]$, $Bob_k$ picks $y_{ki} \in \{0, 1\}$ uniformly at random. They input $x_i, y_{1i}, \ldots, y_{(N-1)i}$ to the respective measurement devices and records the outputs as $a_i, b_{1i}, \ldots, b_{(N-1)i}$ respectively. Then Alice and Bobs announce their input and output pairs. They define a random variable $C_i$ by,

     $C_i = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if they win the } N \text{-partite } d \text{ dimensional XOR game}, \\ 0, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$

2. Testing: Alice and Bobs calculate $C = \frac{1}{\sum_{T_i=1}^{T_i} \sum_{i=0}^{M} C_i}$ together. They abort the scheme if $C < p_w - \eta$, where $\eta$ is the noise tolerance. Otherwise, they proceed to the next steps to share and reconstruct the secret.

3. Sharing the secret: For each $i \in [M]$ such that $T_i = 0$, Alice and every Bobs measure their particles with generalized X-operator i.e., they input 0 to their measurement devices. Alice and $Bob_1, \ldots, Bob_{N-1}$ stores their output as $S_{A_i}, S_{B_{1i}}, \ldots, S_{B_{(N-1)i}}$. Suppose Alice’s secret corresponding to this round $i$ is $S_i \in \{0, 1, \ldots, d-1\}$, then she calculates $\hat{S}_i = S_i + S_{A_i}(\text{mod } d)$ and announces $\hat{S}_i$.

4. Secret recovery: Bobs calculate $\hat{S}_i = (\hat{S}_i + \sum_{k=1}^{N-1} S_{B_{ki}})(\text{mod } d)$ and gets the secret $S_i$ corresponding to the $i^{th}$ round.

5. Error correction: Alice picks a hash function $h(\cdot)$ from a family of two-universal hash functions uniformly at random. She computes a dit-string $Z$ of length $\epsilon_{EC}$ by applying $h(\cdot)$ on $S$ and sends $Z$ to Bobs together with the choice of the hash function $h(\cdot)$. Bobs verify the hash value calculated from their recovered secret with the hash value sent by Alice. If it matches, they consider the recovered secret as the dealer’s secret. Otherwise, they abort the protocol.

Algorithm 1: Proposed Device Independent Quantum Secret Sharing Scheme (DIQSS)
V. CORRECTNESS

In this section, we will show that the participants Bob₁, ..., Bobₙ₋₁ can reconstruct the dealer Alice’s secret using the secret recovery phase of the proposed scheme.

After passing the device independence test, for every \( i \in [M] \) with \( T_i = 0 \), Alice and Bob₁, ..., Bobₙ₋₁ shares an \( N \)-partite \( d \)-dimensional GHZ state \(| \psi \rangle \) and each of them measures their own particle along with generalized X-operator. For simplicity, we will write \(| \psi \rangle \) in place of \(| \psi \rangle \). Now the operator of Alice and all Bobs together can be expressed as

\[
X_A \otimes X_{B₁} \otimes \ldots \otimes X_{Bₙ₋₁} = \left( \sum_{Sₐ = 0}^{d-1} \omega^{Sₐ} | Sₐ \rangle \langle Sₐ | \right) \otimes \left( \sum_{Sₜ = 0}^{d-1} \omega^{Sₜ} | Sₜ \rangle \langle Sₜ | \right) \otimes \ldots \otimes \left( \sum_{Sₜ = 0}^{d-1} \omega^{Sₜ} | Sₜ \rangle \langle Sₜ | \right)
\]

Then,

\[
P = \langle \psi | Sₐ Sₜ₁ \ldots Sₜₙ₋₁ \rangle \langle Sₐ Sₜ₁ \ldots Sₜₙ₋₁ | \psi \rangle
= \left| \langle \psi | Sₐ Sₜ₁ \ldots Sₜₙ₋₁ \rangle \langle Sₐ Sₜ₁ \ldots Sₜₙ₋₁ | \psi \rangle \right|^2
= \frac{1}{d^{N-1}} \sum_{\alpha = 0}^{d-1} \omega^{(Sₐ + Sₜ₁ + \ldots + Sₜₙ₋₁) \alpha}^2
= \begin{cases} \frac{1}{d^{(N-1)}} - \epsilon_{cor}, & \text{if } (Sₐ + Sₜ₁ + \ldots + Sₜₙ₋₁) = 0 \\ 0, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}
\]

Thus the condition to get a measurement result \( Sₐ \) from the observable \( Xₐ \) and \( Sₜ_i \) from \( X_{Bₜ_i} \) (for \( k \in [N-1] \)) by measuring the entangled state \(| \psi \rangle \) with a nonzero probability is \( (Sₐ + Sₜ₁ + \ldots + Sₜₙ₋₁) = 0 \) (mod \( d \)) i.e.,

\[
\sum_{k=1}^{N-1} S_{Bₜ_k} = -Sₐ \text{ (mod } d) \).
\]

For a secret \( S \), Alice declares \( \hat{S} = S + Sₐ \) (mod \( d \)). After Alice’s declaration Bobs calculate

\[
\hat{S} = \hat{S} + \sum_{k=1}^{N-1} S_{Bₜ_k} \text{ (mod } d) = S - Sₐ \text{ (mod } d) = S \text{ (mod } d).
\]

Thus, in the absence of effective eavesdropping the dealer’s secret can be perfectly reconstructed by the participants by an honest implementation of secret distribution and secret recovery phase of the proposed scheme.

\[\text{Theorem 1. The proposed scheme is } \epsilon_{cor}-\text{correct.}\]

\[\text{Proof.}\]

In the error correction phase of the scheme, Alice picks a hash function \( h(\cdot) \) from a family of two-universal hash functions uniformly at random. Then, by the definition of two-universal hash function, two hash values \( h(S) \) and \( h(\hat{S}) \) will coincide for two different values of \( S \) and \( \hat{S} \), with a probability atmost \( d^{-\epsilon_{EC}} \), i.e.,

\[
\Pr(h(\hat{S}) = h(S) | \hat{S} \neq S) \leq d^{-\epsilon_{EC}}.
\]

Thus the probability that the scheme does not abort at the error correction phase for \( \hat{S} \neq S \) is atmost \( \epsilon_{cor} \) for a choice of \( \epsilon_{EC} \) such that \( \epsilon_{EC} > \log_d(\frac{1}{\epsilon_{cor}}) \). Hence the proposed scheme is \( \epsilon_{cor}-\text{correct}. \]

VI. COMPLETENESS

\[\text{Definition 1. A quantum secret sharing scheme is called } \epsilon\text{-complete if there exists an honest implementation of the scheme such that the probability of aborting the scheme is less than } \epsilon.\]

By the term ‘honest implementation of the scheme’, we mean that none of the parties deviate from the scheme and there is no eavesdropping.

\[\text{Theorem 2. The proposed scheme is } \epsilon\text{-complete.}\]

\[\text{Proof.}\]

The proposed scheme can be aborted either in testing phase or in error correction phase. the probability to abort in the testing phase is given by

\[
P_{\text{test}} = \Pr(\sum_i C_i < (p_\omega - \eta) \sum_i T_i) = \sum_{j=0}^M \Pr(\sum_i C_i < (p_\omega - \eta) j) \sum_i T_i = j) \Pr(T_i = j).
\]
If the testing phase of the proposed scheme is successful, then Alice and Bob can proceed for the share distribution and reconstruction phases securely for large $M$.

**Proof.** In the proposed scheme, there is a one to one correspondence between the entangled states $\{|\psi\rangle\}_{i=1}^M$ and the random bit string $T = \{T_1 \ldots T_M\} \in \{0, 1\}^M$ in such a way that, the entangled state $|\psi\rangle_i$ will be associated with the testing phase for $T_i = 1$. For the $i \in [M]$ such that $T_i = 1$, we have defined a random variable $C_i$ by: $C_i = 1$, if they win the $N$-partite $d$-dimensional XOR game and 0, otherwise. Now, define $C = \sum_{i=1}^{M} \sum_{j=0}^{M-1} C_i$. Then $E(C) = p_{w}$. By applying Hoeffding bound [67], we get that

$$\Pr(|C - E(C)| \geq \delta) \leq \exp(-2\delta^2 \sum_{i} T_i) = \epsilon_{test},$$

where $\epsilon_{test}$ is a negligibly small positive value. Thus we can express $\delta$ in term of $\epsilon_{test}$, i.e.,

$$\delta = \sqrt{\frac{1}{2 \sum_{i} T_i} \ln \left( \frac{1}{\epsilon_{test}} \right)}.$$

VII. SECURITY ANALYSIS

**Theorem 3.** If the testing phase of the proposed scheme is successful, then Alice and Bob can proceed for the share distribution and reconstruction phases securely for large $M$.

**Proof.** The probability of aborting in error correction phase, We have assumed that, it has passed the testing phase.

Which implies that the particles are entangled in the specified form and measurement devices also reach the specification. In the previous section, we have shown that in the absence of any active eavesdropping the shared and the recovered secret is same except the interference of noise. From the property of the hash function, it is clear that if $S = S$, then $h(S) = h(S)$. Thus in case of honest implementation of the scheme, the probability to abort in error correction phase ($P_{EC}$) is bounded above by the noise tolerance $\eta$ i.e., $P_{EC} \leq \eta$.

Thus the total probability of aborting the protocol is

$$P_{abort} = P_{test} + P_{EC} \leq (1 - \mu(1 - \exp(2\eta^2)))^M + \eta.$$

Hence the proposed protocol is $\epsilon^c$-complete for $\epsilon^c > (1 - \mu(1 - \exp(2\eta^2)))^M + \eta$.

VIII. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

We have presented the device independent quantum secret sharing scheme in the arbitrary even dimension. An $N$-partite $d$-dimensional XOR game has been proposed utilizing the violation of generic $N$-partite $d$-dimensional Bell inequality (here, $d$ is even). One obvious generalization is to enhance the scheme to any (even or odd) dimension. As we have described earlier that the proposed game does not generalizes the CHSH game. So, it remains an open question that, how to propose a generalization of multipartite CHSH game in arbitrary dimension by using a variant of multipartite higher dimensional Bell inequality. Device independence test is based on the winning probability of the proposed linear game. We have shown that this testing phase is enough to ensure that, the entangled particles are in the desired form and measurement devices also meet our specification. The security of the scheme is based on the polygamy property of entanglement which implies that an $N$-partite maximally entangled state cannot be distributed among more than $N$ parties. Introducing the definition of $\epsilon_{cor}$-correctness and $\epsilon^c$-completeness of quantum secret sharing scheme, we have shown that the proposed secret sharing scheme is $\epsilon_{cor}$-correct and $\epsilon^c$-complete. But, for the sake of security and completeness, we have assumed that the ma-
The proposed scheme can be easily adopted for the other variants of multipartite higher dimensional Bell inequality.
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