

# Response to “Retraction Note: Can Two-Way Direct Communication Protocols Be Considered Secure?”

Mladen Pavičić\*

*Department of Physics—Nanooptics, Faculty of Math. and Natural Sci. I, Humboldt University of Berlin, Germany and  
Center of Excellence for Advanced Materials and Sensing Devices (CEMS),  
Photonics and Quantum Optics Unit, Ruđer Bošković Institute, Zagreb, Croatia*

This is a response to “Retraction Note: Can Two-Way Direct Communication Protocols Be Considered Secure? Mladen Pavičić,” *Nanoscale Research Letters*, **14**, 242 (2019). The “anonymised” report which served the editors to retract the paper is reproduced in full. A response to the report by the author of the original paper, sent to the editors of the journal, is also reproduced in full. The author analyses and discusses both the report and the retraction note and explains why he cannot agree to the retraction.

PACS numbers: 03.67.Dd, 03.67.Ac, 42.50.Ex

## I. INTRODUCTION

The editors of the *Nanoscale Research Letters* recently published the following Retraction Note:

“Retraction Note: Can Two-Way Direct Communication Protocols Be Considered Secure?”  
*Nanoscale Research Letters*, **14**, 242 (2019)  
<https://doi.org/10.1186/s11671-019-3086-8>

The editors have retracted this article [1] because after publication concerns were raised regarding the validity of the conclusions drawn. Post-publication peer review has revealed a flaw in the application of the key rate equation  $r = I_{AB} - I_{AE}$ . For calculation of the term  $I_{AE}$ , the effect of disturbance ( $D$ ) on both the message mode (MM) and control mode (CM) was not taken into account. The main claim of the paper cannot be reliably reached. The author does not agree to this retraction.

1. Pavičić, M. (2017), Can Two-Way Direct Communication Protocols Be Considered Secure? *Nanoscale Res. Lett.* **12**:552.

Reportedly, the editors decided to obtain a post-publication peer review report of the original article that then served them to retract the article. The report is given in Sec. II.

## II. ANONYMISED REPORT

The original article deals with the ping-pong protocol. These type of protocols were originally sold as a way to distribute secret keys directly (without the need for two-way communication involving error correction and privacy amplification), but it is by now widely recognized in the community that this was not a useful direction. Hence, the author of the article, and also the authors

of the comment on that article, treat the protocol as a specific form of a QKD protocol, which performs error correction and privacy amplification after the initial exchange of quantum signals and subsequent measurements.

I fully agree with the comments made by the comment authors [1–3]. The author of the original article [4] misunderstood the origin of the key rate formula  $r = I_{AB} - I_{AE}$ . (Note that the security definitions changed since the late 1990s, and we would not write this type of formula anymore.) But for the sake of argument, let’s stick to the old notions: The information is always the information on the raw data. And while  $I_{AB}$  directly comes from the observed error rate of the raw data (disturbance  $D$  of the message mode (MM)) in this case, the term  $I_{AE}$  needs to be calculate from all available constraints, including the disturbance in the MM and also the control mode CM.

For the given Man-in-the-middle attack, we would create no disturbance in the MM mode, but full disturbance (random outcome) in the CM mode. Therefore, one would conclude that  $I_{AB} = 1$  (no disturbance in the MM mode) and also  $I_{AE} = 1$ , since the disturbance of CM shows that Eve could have performed the attack, thus obtain all signal, and thus the key rate would be zero for this attack. This is contained in the security analyses of these protocols. For smaller disturbance rate, the key rate turns positive, utilizing the privacy amplification method. Again, we are doing QKD here, where privacy amplification is allowed...

I will not go in more detail on the discussion between the author [5] of the article [4] and the authors of the comment [1–3] regarding the question whether this particular attack is covered in the original security proofs. Only that much: of course the SWAP operation is a valid interaction of Eve with the signal, and thus should be covered by the original security proofs, as long as those security proofs also allowed a coherent quantum mechanical interaction between ancilla and the signal on both directions, just as the authors of the comment pointed out. The paragraph in the reply to the comment (page

---

\* mpavicic@irb.hr

3) [5] is a mystery to me.

What happens if Eve attacks only a fraction of the signals with that particular attack? Yes, no error correction needed ( $I_{AE} = 1$ ) and from the disturbance  $D$  in the CM mode one can prove that Eve does not learn more than a fraction  $f$  of the messages, so  $I_{AE} = f$ . As a result, the key rate would be  $r = 1 - f$ . Of course we don't need to know which bits Eve knows and which she does not know. Privacy amplification can take care of it, similar as how it takes care of signals that Eve could have learned from multi-photon signals in weak coherent pulse QKD. There she also learns a fraction of signals, and Alice and Bob don't know where those bits are located in the raw key, and still can distill a secret key.

Note that in his response to the comment the author alludes to 'the exponential loss in fiber', apparently thinking that this loss, as with multi-photon signals, might eventually allow Eve to make sure that only signals where she knows the outcome remain in the raw data. However, that does not work in the particular case. Eve could not prevent Alice and Bob from performing the CM part of the protocol, hiding that part in the loss. Eve cannot distinguish between CM and MM signals, and thus cannot selectively suppress one or the other (quite in contrast to multi-photon signals in WCP BB84). Note that no corresponding argument is made in the original article, though there are remarks made, such as on page 3, right column:

Here, it should be stressed that photons in LM05 cover twice the distance they cover in BB84. So, if the probability of a photon to be detected over only Bob-Alice distance is  $p$ , the probability of being detected over Bob-Alice-Bob distance will be  $p^2$  and Eve would be able to hide herself in CM exponentially better than in BB84.

I cannot follow that logic. As said before, there is no handle for Eve to suppress signals selectively in CM mode. The author does not give a clear way how this attack angle could be exploited. (And I am sure there isn't any way to exploit it.)

I am afraid that the author misunderstood the security framework that stands behind the formula  $r = I_{AB} - I_{AE}$  in a fundamental way, and thus that his conclusions are deeply flawed and invalid in a very apparent way.

### III. AUTHOR'S RESPONSE TO THE REPORT

The whole report is busy with  $r = I_{AB} - I_{AE}$ . It claims (2nd paragraph from the bottom) - when Eve attacks only a fraction of signals - that (a)  $I_{AB} = 1$  (she/he writes  $I_{AE}$ , but this is a misprint) and (b) "from the disturbance  $D$  in the CM (control mode) Eve does not learn more than a fraction  $f$  of the messages, so  $I_{AE} = f$ . As a result, the key rate would be  $r = 1 - f$ ." Then it claims that I did not take all that into account and that I misunderstood  $r = I_{AB} - I_{AE}$ .

But in Fig. 5(b), on p. 4 of [4], I plotted  $I_{AE}(D)$ ,

stressing that " $D$  is the disturbance in the CM (control mode)." Also, in Conclusions, p. 5, last paragraph of [4] "Eve induces a disturbance ( $D$ ) only in the control mode (CM) and therefore the standard approach and protocols for estimating and calculating the security are not available since they all assume the presence of  $D$  in MM (message mode)."

Yet, the referee claims immediately afterwards that "we don't need to know which bits Eve knows and which she does not know. Privacy amplification (PA) can take care of it."

But PA for the considered attack has never been explicitly calculated. And on p. 5, left column, bottom and right column, top of [4] I write: "The only procedure we are left with to establish the security is the privacy amplification. When Eve possesses just a fraction of data, she will lose trace of her bits and Alice and Bob's ones will shrink. Eve might be able to recover data by guessing the bits she misses and reintroduces all bits again in the hash function. If unsuccessful, her information will be partly wiped away. However, Alice and Bob meet a crucial problem with designing their security procedure (e.g., hash function) which would guarantee that Eve is left with no information about the final key. They do not have a critical amount of Eve's bits" which would tell them at which  $D$  in the CM they have to abort the transmission, and this is the main conclusion of my paper.

So, the "explanation" of the forceful retraction is nonsensical: "peer review has revealed a flaw in the application of the key rate equation  $r = I_{AB} - I_{AE}$ . For calculation of the term  $I_{AE}$ , the effect of disturbance ( $D$ ) on both the message mode (MM) and control mode (CM) was not taken into account."

### IV. DISCUSSION

We all agree that

- (i) There is no disturbance ( $D$ ) in the message mode (MM), only in the control mode (CM);
- (ii) Under the man-in-the-middle attack we always have  $I_{AB} = 1$  and therefore LM05 protocol, "in effect, [amounts to] sending plain text via MM secured by occasional verification of photon states in CM" [4, p. 5, right column, 2nd paragraph];
- (iii) The only available procedure to sift out Eve's bits is the privacy amplification.

There are two disagreements, though.

1. The editors, the anonymised referee, and the authors of [1-3] claim that something is wrong and deeply flawed with the way I handle  $r = I_{AB} - I_{AE}$  but they do not say what is wrong. They only say (see Sec. I) that "the effect of disturbance ( $D$ ) on

both the message mode (MM) and control mode (CM) was not taken into account.” But there is no  $D$  in MM, as we all agree, and in Fig. 5(b) of [4] I plot  $I_{AE}(D)$ , i.e.,  $I_{AE}$  as a function of  $D$  in CM. Hence, the accusation is void and unscientific.

2. The anonymised referee writes in his report above: “from the disturbance  $D$  in the CM mode one can prove that Eve does not learn more than a fraction  $f$  of the messages, so  $I_{AE} = f$ . As a result, the key rate would be  $r = 1 - f$ . Of course we don’t need to know which bits Eve knows and which she does not know. Privacy amplification can take care of it, similar as how it takes care of signals that Eve could have learned from multi-photon signals in weak coherent pulse QKD. There she also learns a fraction of signals, and Alice and Bob don’t know where those bits are located in the raw key, and still can distill a secret key.”

The problem with this is that the referee does not tell us *how* “privacy amplification can take care of it.” When Eve is in the line all the time ( $D = 0.5$ ), then privacy amplification obviously does not work since then Bob-Alice’s key and Eve’s key are identical and Eve’s bits cannot be distilled out. So, is it feasible for  $D = 0.499$ ? Or for  $D = 0.3$ ? Or for  $D = 0.2$ ? Or for  $D = 0.11$ ? Has anyone carried out such an analysis? No one to my knowledge.

And that is why the main point of my paper is, as I stressed in my response above, that we do not have a procedure “which would tell Alice [and Bob] at which  $D$  in the CM they have to abort the transmission, and this is the main conclusion of my paper.”

Consequently, I cannot agree to this unfounded, unscientific, and rather Kafkian [6] retraction.

I put together all this as a service to community and readers.

---

[1] J. S. Shaari, S. Mancini, S. Pirandola, and M. Lucamarini, **arXiv:1805.01651v1 [quant-ph]** (2018).  
 [2] J. S. Shaari, S. Mancini, S. Pirandola, and M. Lucamarini, **arXiv:1805.01651v2 [quant-ph]** (2018).  
 [3] J. S. Shaari, S. Mancini, S. Pirandola, and M. Lucamarini, **arXiv:1805.01651v3 [quant-ph]** (2018).

[4] M. Pavičić, *Nanoscale Research Letters* **12**, 552 (2017).  
 [5] M. Pavičić, **arXiv:1811.06138 [quant-ph]** (2018).  
 [6] F. Kafka, *The Trial* (Planet Ebook, 1915, posth. 1925), <https://www.planetebook.com/free-ebooks/the-trial.pdf>.