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Abstract

We review and consider the entanglement swapping between two Bell states proposed by Żukowski et al. [Phys. Rev. Lett. 71(26) 4287]. We introduce a special class of Greenberger-Horne-Zeilinger states, and consider their entanglement swapping. We also show the applications of the proposed entanglement swapping schemes in quantum cryptography.

PACS: 03.65.Ud, 03.67.-a, 03.67.Dd

Keywords: entanglement swapping, Bell state, Greenberger-Horne-Zeilinger state, quantum cryptography

1 Introduction

Entanglement plays a central role in quantum information processing tasks such as quantum computation [1], quantum dense coding [2], quantum teleportation [3], quantum error correction [4], and quantum cryptography [5–14]. As one of the most surprising effects of the nonlocality of quantum mechanics, entanglement swapping is a particularly intriguing and useful method to create entanglement [15]. With the assistance of a third party, two distant parties who have never shared entanglement can share entanglement, such that they can complete many quantum communication tasks [15–22]. A typical example is provided by the creation of Greenberger-Horne-Zeilinger (GHZ) states and the use of their entanglement swapping in quantum cryptography [24–27], such as quantum key distribution and quantum secure multiparty computation [17–23].

Entanglement swapping was originally proposed by Żukowski et al. [15]. Their idea is that Alice and Bob share an entangled state beforehand, and Bob shares another entangled state with Charlie; then Bob performs a Bell measurement on the two particles he holds, which eventually enables Alice and Charlie to share a new entangled state. Later, entanglement swapping was generalized to multipartite quantum systems by Zeilinger et al. [24] and Bose et al. [25] independently. The generalizations of entanglement swapping for multipartite and arbitrary dimensional quantum systems were presented in Refs. [16, 20]. Entanglement swapping schemes for discrete and continuous variable systems were proposed and demonstrated in Refs. [28–32]. In addition, entanglement swapping was experimentally realized using different quantum resources such as polarization entangled photons and linear optics phase gate [26, 33–35]. Recently, entanglement swapping between two entangled states each composed of more than two subsystems was demonstrated [36]. Ottaviani et al. proposed and demonstrated a multipartite entanglement swapping protocol with continuous-variable architecture, which is able to generate an entangled cluster state in an optical lossy network [37].

In this paper, we will first review Żukowski et al.’s entanglement swapping scheme, that is, the entanglement swapping of two Bell states [15]. We will then introduce a special class of GHZ states (hereinafter called SGHZ states), and consider their entanglement swapping. We will first consider the entanglement swapping for two Bell states and two SGHZ states, respectively, and then consider the entanglement swapping for any number of Bell states and any number of SGHZ states. Our aim is to look for the cases where two identical GHZ can be created after entanglement swapping. We will show that the creation of two identical GHZ states or two identical Bell states by entanglement swapping can be applied to quantum cryptography, including quantum key distribution [7], quantum private comparison [38, 39], and quantum secret sharing [20].

The structure of the rest of this paper is as follows. In Sec. 2, we introduce the SGHZ states, and consider the entanglement swapping of Bell states and SGHZ states. In Sec. 3, we apply the entanglement swapping schemes considered to quantum key distribution, quantum private comparison, and quantum secret sharing. We summarize this paper in Sec. 4.
2 Entanglement swapping

Let us start by reviewing the entanglement swapping between two Bell states. The Bell states can be expressed as

\[ |\psi^\pm\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} (|00\rangle \pm |11\rangle), \quad |\phi^\pm\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} (|01\rangle \pm |10\rangle). \]  

One can get

\[ |00\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} (|\psi^+\rangle + |\psi^-\rangle), \quad |11\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} (|\phi^+\rangle - |\phi^-\rangle), \quad |01\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} (|\psi^+\rangle + |\psi^-\rangle), \quad |10\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} (|\phi^+\rangle - |\phi^-\rangle). \]  

We would first like to review the entanglement swapping of two identical Bell states, including four cases: \((|\psi^+\rangle, |\phi^-\rangle), \ (|\phi^+\rangle, |\psi^-\rangle), \ (|\psi^+\rangle, |\phi^-\rangle), \text{ and } (|\phi^+\rangle, |\psi^-\rangle).\) For simplicity, let us use \(|0\rangle \pm |1\rangle (i \in \{0, 1\})\) to denote four Bell states, where a bar over a bit value indicates its logical negation (similarly hereinafter). Suppose that a Bell measurement is performed on the particles \(1, 3\) (see Fig. 1 similarly hereinafter), then the entanglement swapping can be expressed as

\[
\left( |0\rangle \pm |1\rangle \right)_{12} \otimes \left( |0\rangle \pm |1\rangle \right)_{34} = \left( |0\rangle |0\rangle \right)_{1234} \pm \left( |0\rangle |1\rangle \right)_{1234} \pm \left( |1\rangle |0\rangle \right)_{1234} + \left( |1\rangle |1\rangle \right)_{1234} = \left( |\psi^+\rangle_{13} |\phi^+\rangle_{24} + |\phi^-\rangle_{13} |\phi^+\rangle_{24} + |\phi^-\rangle_{13} |\phi^-\rangle_{24} \pm |\phi^-\rangle_{13} |\phi^+\rangle_{24} = |\phi^-\rangle_{13} |\phi^-\rangle_{24} \right. \\
\left. \left. - |\phi^-\rangle_{13} |\phi^-\rangle_{24} + |\phi^+\rangle_{13} |\phi^+\rangle_{24} + |\phi^-\rangle_{13} |\phi^-\rangle_{24} = |\phi^-\rangle_{13} |\phi^+\rangle_{24} \right) \right)_{12} \otimes \left( |0\rangle \pm |1\rangle \right)_{34},
\]

where the subscripts \((1, 2)\) and \((3, 4)\) denote two particles in the two Bell states, respectively. Note here that we swap particles 2 and 3 in the third step of the above formula. In addition, for simplicity, we have calculated the four cases in the above equation and ignored all the coefficients (similarly hereinafter).

The entanglement swapping between two different Bell states includes the following 12 different cases: \(\left( |0\rangle \pm |1\rangle \right)_{12} \otimes \left( |0\rangle \pm |1\rangle \right)_{34}, \left( |0\rangle \pm |1\rangle \right)_{12} \otimes \left( |0\rangle \pm |1\rangle \right)_{34}, \) and \(\left( |0\rangle \pm |1\rangle \right)_{12} \otimes \left( |0\rangle \pm |1\rangle \right)_{34},\) which can be expressed as

\[
\left( |0\rangle \pm |1\rangle \right)_{12} \otimes \left( |0\rangle \pm |1\rangle \right)_{34} = \left( |0\rangle |0\rangle \right)_{1234} \pm \left( |0\rangle |1\rangle \right)_{1234} \pm \left( |1\rangle |0\rangle \right)_{1234} - \left( |1\rangle |1\rangle \right)_{1234} = \left( |\phi^+\rangle_{13} |\phi^+\rangle_{24} + |\phi^-\rangle_{13} |\phi^+\rangle_{24} + |\phi^-\rangle_{13} |\phi^-\rangle_{24} \right. \\
\left. \left. - |\phi^-\rangle_{13} |\phi^-\rangle_{24} + |\phi^+\rangle_{13} |\phi^+\rangle_{24} + |\phi^-\rangle_{13} |\phi^-\rangle_{24} = |\phi^-\rangle_{13} |\phi^+\rangle_{24} \right) \right)_{12} \otimes \left( |0\rangle \pm |1\rangle \right)_{34},
\]

and

\[
\left( |0\rangle \pm |1\rangle \right)_{12} \otimes \left( |0\rangle \pm |1\rangle \right)_{34} = \left( |0\rangle |0\rangle \right)_{1234} \pm \left( |0\rangle |1\rangle \right)_{1234} \pm \left( |1\rangle |0\rangle \right)_{1234} - \left( |1\rangle |1\rangle \right)_{1234} = \left( |\phi^+\rangle_{13} |\phi^-\rangle_{24} + |\phi^-\rangle_{13} |\phi^+\rangle_{24} + |\phi^-\rangle_{13} |\phi^-\rangle_{24} \right. \\
\left. \left. - |\phi^-\rangle_{13} |\phi^-\rangle_{24} + |\phi^+\rangle_{13} |\phi^+\rangle_{24} + |\phi^-\rangle_{13} |\phi^-\rangle_{24} = |\phi^-\rangle_{13} |\phi^+\rangle_{24} \right) \right)_{12} \otimes \left( |0\rangle \pm |1\rangle \right)_{34},
\]
From Eqs. (3) to (6), we find that when the initial two Bell states are the same, the two Bell states created after the Bell measurement are the same (i.e., the measurement result is the same as the Bell state that the particles (2,4) collapse into), otherwise they are different.

In what follows, we will introduce a special class of GHZ states and consider entanglement swapping. Let us first introduce the full set of canonical orthonormal $m$-qubit ($m \in \mathbb{N}$, and $m \geq 3$) GHZ states:

\[
|G^+_{m}\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2^m}} \left( |0\rangle |0\rangle \ldots |0\rangle + |1\rangle |1\rangle \ldots |1\rangle \right),
\]

where $d = 0, 1, \ldots, 2^{m-1} - 1$, and $B(d) = 0b_1b_2 \cdots b_m$ is the binary representation of $d$ in an $m$-bit string, thus $d = b_1 \cdot 2^{m-2} + b_2 \cdot 2^{m-3} + \cdots + b_m \cdot 2^0$. These states are complete,

\[
\langle G^+_{m} | G^+_{m} \rangle = \delta_{d,d'},
\]

and they can be written in a more concise form:

\[
|G^+_{m}\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2^{m-1}}} \left( |0\rangle b_1 |0\rangle b_2 \cdots |b_m\rangle \right).
\]

Let us now introduce the special class of GHZ states (hereinafter called SGHZ states for simplicity),

\[
|G^+_{m}\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2^{m-1}}} \left( |0\rangle i_1 |0\rangle i_2 \cdots |i_m\rangle \right),
\]

each of which contains $2^m$ qubits, where $n \in \mathbb{N}$, and $n \geq 2$, $e = i_1 \cdot 2^{m-2} + i_2 \cdot 2^{m-3} + \cdots + i_m \cdot 2^0$, and $0i_2 \cdots i_m$ or $1i_2 \cdots i_m = i_{n+1}i_{n+2} \cdots i_{2n}$ or $0i_2 \cdots i_m = i_{n+1}i_{n+2} \cdots i_{2n}$ (this is what makes these GHZ states special). One can get

\[
|0i_2 \cdots i_m\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \left( |G^+_{m}\rangle + |G^-_{m}\rangle \right), \quad |1i_2 \cdots i_m\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \left( |G^+_{m}\rangle - |G^-_{m}\rangle \right).
\]

Now we consider the entanglement swapping between two SGHZ states. Let us first describe the entanglement swapping between two identical SGHZ states, that is, $(|G^+_{m}\rangle_{12} \otimes |G^+_{m}\rangle_{34})$ and $(|G^+_{m}\rangle_{12} \otimes |G^-_{m}\rangle_{34})$, where the subscripts 1 and 3 denote the first $n$ particles in $|G^+_{m}\rangle_{12}$ and $|G^+_{m}\rangle_{34}$, and 2 and 4 the last $n$ particles. Suppose that a GHZ measurement is performed on the particles 1 and 3 (see Fig. 2, similarly hereinafter), then the entanglement swapping can be expressed as

\[
|G^+_{m}\rangle_{12} \otimes |G^+_{m}\rangle_{34} = \left( |0i_2 \cdots i_m\rangle \right)_{12} \otimes \left( |1i_2 \cdots i_m\rangle \right)_{34} \quad \text{if } i_1 \cdots i_m = i_{n+1}i_{n+2} \cdots i_{2n};
\]

\[
|G^+_{m}\rangle_{12} \otimes |G^+_{m}\rangle_{34} = \left( |0i_2 \cdots i_m\rangle \right)_{12} \otimes \left( |1i_2 \cdots i_m\rangle \right)_{34} \quad \text{if } i_1 \cdots i_m = i_{n+1}i_{n+2} \cdots i_{2n}.
\]
\[
\begin{align*}
&= \left\{ |\phi_{+}\rangle_{13} |\phi_{+}\rangle_{24} + |\phi_{+}\rangle_{13} |\phi_{+}\rangle_{24} \pm |\phi_{+}\rangle_{13} |\phi_{+}\rangle_{24} \pm |\phi_{+}\rangle_{13} |\phi_{+}\rangle_{24} \right\}, \\
&= \left\{ |\phi_{+}\rangle_{13} |\phi_{+}\rangle_{24} - |\phi_{+}\rangle_{13} |\phi_{+}\rangle_{24} \pm |\phi_{+}\rangle_{13} |\phi_{+}\rangle_{24} \pm |\phi_{+}\rangle_{13} |\phi_{+}\rangle_{24} \right\},
\end{align*}
\]

where \( |\phi_{+}\rangle = |0\rangle_{i_{1}} \cdots |i_{n_{1}}+1\rangle_{i_{n_{2}}} \cdots |i_{2n} \rangle \). Let us then describe the entanglement swapping between two different GHZ states, that is, \( \langle |\phi_{+}\rangle, |\phi_{+}\rangle \), \( \langle |\phi_{+}\rangle, |\phi_{+}\rangle \), and \( \langle |\phi_{+}\rangle, |\phi_{+}\rangle \), where \( e \neq e' \) and \( |\phi_{+}\rangle = |0\rangle_{j_{1}} \cdots |j_{2n} \rangle \).
where \( |G_p^n\rangle = |0i_3\bar{i}_3\cdots i_n\bar{i}_n\rangle \pm |\bar{i}_3i_3\cdots \bar{i}_ni_n\rangle \) and \( |G_q^n\rangle = |0i_3\bar{i}_3\cdots i_n\bar{i}_n\rangle \pm |\bar{i}_3i_3\cdots \bar{i}_ni_n\rangle \).

\[
\begin{align*}
|G_r^n\rangle & \otimes |G_s^n\rangle = \left( |0i_3\bar{i}_3\cdots i_n\bar{i}_n\rangle \pm |\bar{i}_3i_3\cdots \bar{i}_ni_n\rangle \right) \otimes \left( |0j_3\bar{j}_3\cdots j_n\bar{j}_n\rangle \pm |\bar{j}_3j_3\cdots \bar{j}_nj_n\rangle \right) \\
& = |0i_3\bar{i}_3\cdots i_n\bar{i}_n\rangle |0j_3\bar{j}_3\cdots j_n\bar{j}_n\rangle + |0i_3\bar{i}_3\cdots i_n\bar{i}_n\rangle |\bar{j}_3j_3\cdots \bar{j}_nj_n\rangle \\
& \quad - |\bar{j}_3j_3\cdots \bar{j}_nj_n\rangle |0i_3\bar{i}_3\cdots i_n\bar{i}_n\rangle - |\bar{j}_3j_3\cdots \bar{j}_nj_n\rangle |\bar{j}_3j_3\cdots \bar{j}_nj_n\rangle.
\end{align*}
\]

From Eqs. [12] to [15], for two initial GHZ states, denoted as \( |G_0\rangle_{12} \otimes |G_0\rangle_{34} \), the two identical GHZ states can be obtained whether \( a = b \) or not after the entanglement swapping iff \( |G_a\rangle \) and \( |G_b\rangle \) meet the following two conditions: (1) \( 0i_3\cdots i_n = \bar{i}_n\bar{i}_n1\bar{i}_3\cdots \bar{i}_30 \) and \( 0j_3\cdots j_n = \bar{j}_n\bar{j}_n1\bar{j}_3\cdots \bar{j}_30 \), or \( 0i_3\cdots i_n = \bar{i}_n\bar{i}_n1\bar{i}_3\cdots \bar{i}_30 \) and \( 0j_3\cdots j_n = \bar{j}_n\bar{j}_n1\bar{j}_3\cdots \bar{j}_30 \). (2) Both \( |G_a\rangle \) and \( |G_b\rangle \) are in \( |G_p^n\rangle \) or \( |G_q^n\rangle \).

Now we would like to summarize all the above calculation results. To simplify the expression, let us first introduce the following quantum states:

\[
|\bar{X}^+\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \left( |0i_3\bar{i}_3\cdots i_n\bar{i}_n\rangle + |\bar{i}_3i_3\cdots \bar{i}_ni_n\rangle \right).
\]

where \( i_1, i_2, \ldots, i_2l, i_2l+1, i_2l+2, \ldots, i_n \in \{0, 1\}, 0i_3\cdots i_n = i_1i_2\cdots i_{2l} \text{ or } \bar{i}_1\bar{i}_2\cdots \bar{i}_{2l} \), and \( l \in \mathbb{N}_+ \) (when \( l = 1, |\bar{X}^+\rangle \) are Bell states; when \( l > 1, \) they are GHZ states). Our summary is as follows:

**Theorem 1** Suppose that there are two entangled states each in one of the states \( |\bar{X}^+\rangle \). Let us mark them by

\[
|\psi_1\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \left( |0i_3\bar{i}_3\cdots i_n\bar{i}_n\rangle \pm |\bar{i}_3i_3\cdots \bar{i}_ni_n\rangle \right), |\psi_2\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \left( |0j_3\bar{j}_3\cdots j_n\bar{j}_n\rangle \pm |\bar{j}_3j_3\cdots \bar{j}_nj_n\rangle \right).
\]

Suppose that a GHZ (Bell) measurement is performed on the first \( l \) particles in each state (the measurement is a Bell measurement iff \( l = 1 \)). Let us denote the measurement result as \( |G_a\rangle \), and the state that the remaining particles collapse into as \( |G_b\rangle \). If the two states \( |\psi_1\rangle \) and \( |\psi_2\rangle \) meet the following two conditions:
Figure 2: The graphical description of the entanglement swapping between two SGHZ states, each composed of 2m particles. The marks $a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_{2m}$ and $b_1, b_2, \ldots, b_{2m}$ represents the particles in the two SGHZ states, respectively. The dotted box represents the GHZ measurement which is performed on the first m particles in each state.

1. $0_l i_1 \cdots i_l = i_{l+1} i_{l+2} \cdots i_{2l}$ and $0_j j_1 \cdots j_l - i_l = \tilde{i}_{l+1} \tilde{i}_{l+2} \cdots \tilde{i}_{2l}$, or $0_l i_1 \cdots i_l = i_{l+1} i_{l+2} \cdots i_{2l}$ and $0_j j_1 \cdots j_l = \tilde{j}_{l+1} \tilde{j}_{l+2} \cdots \tilde{j}_{2l}$.

2. Both $|\Psi_l\rangle$ and $|\Psi_r\rangle$ are in $|\mathcal{X}^+\rangle$ or $|\mathcal{X}^-\rangle$.

then $|\mathcal{G}_a\rangle$ and $|\mathcal{G}_b\rangle$ are the same. Otherwise they are different.

We have shown that two identical Bell (GHZ) states can be created after entanglement swapping when the two initial entangled states satisfy the two conditions in Theorem 1. A natural question is whether two identical GHZ states can be created by entanglement swapping for any number of entangled states that satisfy the two conditions in Theorem 1. To address this question, let us assume that there are n entangled states, each in one of the states $|\mathcal{X}^\pm\rangle$ and satisfies the two conditions in Theorem 1. We would first like to consider the case where each state is in one of the states $|\mathcal{X}^+\rangle$. Let us denote these states as $|\Psi_1^+\rangle, |\Psi_2^+\rangle, \ldots, |\Psi_{2n}^+\rangle$, where $|\Psi_k^\pm\rangle = |\hat{\Psi}_k^\pm\rangle = |\hat{\Psi}_k^0\rangle$ (k = 1, 2, \ldots, n), the subscripts (1, 2, \ldots, 2n) denote the first l particles and the last l particles in these states, respectively. Suppose that a GHZ (Bell) measurement is performed on the first l particles in each state (the measurement is the Bell measurement if $n = 2$ and l = 1, we will only consider the GHZ measurement and ignore this special case). We arrive at

$$
|\Psi_1^+\rangle \otimes |\Psi_2^+\rangle \otimes \cdots \otimes |\Psi_{2n}^+\rangle = \sum_{a_1, b_1, \ldots, a_{2l}, b_{2l} \in \{0, 1\}} a_1 a_2 \cdots a_{2l} b_1 b_2 \cdots b_{2l} + \left(1 - a_1 a_2 \cdots a_{2l} b_1 b_2 \cdots b_{2l}\right) |\hat{\Psi}_1^+\rangle \otimes |\hat{\Psi}_2^+\rangle \otimes \cdots \otimes |\hat{\Psi}_{2n}^+\rangle.
$$

where $p = a_1 \cdot 2^{n-2} + a_2 \cdot 2^{n-3} + \cdots + a_{2l} \cdot 2^{0}$, and $q = b_1 \cdot 2^{n-2} + b_2 \cdot 2^{n-3} + \cdots + b_{2l} \cdot 2^{0}$. Note here that in the first step of the above equation, we obtain the polynomial with $2^n$ terms, and then in the third step, we add the k-th (k = 1, 2, \ldots, 2^{m-1}) term and the $(2^n - k + 1)$-th term of the polynomial in turn, such that we realize the elimination in the last step (similarly hereinafter). Next is the case where each state is in one of the states $|\mathcal{X}^-\rangle$. As before, we arrive at

$$
|\Psi_1^-\rangle \otimes |\Psi_2^-\rangle \otimes \cdots \otimes |\Psi_{2n}^-\rangle.
$$
where \(c(j = 1, 2, \ldots, 2n)\) denote the number of 1\(\bar{2}\)\(\bar{3}\)\(\bar{2}\) in the item \(|0a_2a_3 \cdots a_{2n}\rangle\). In the case described in Eq. (18) two identical GHZ states can be created after entanglement swapping, while in the case described in Eq. (19) two identical GHZ states can be created if \(n\) is even. More generally, let us assume that there are \(n\) entangled states, each of which consists of \(2n\) particles and satisfies the two conditions in Theorem 1, and among which \(m\) states and in \(|\bar{X}^-\rangle\) while the rest are in \(|\bar{X}^+\rangle\). As before, we still denote these states as \(|\Phi^j\rangle_{12} \otimes |\Phi^j\rangle_{13} \otimes \cdots \otimes |\Phi^j\rangle_{2n-12n}\) then we arrive at

\[
= (-1)^{y_1} |0c_2^1 \cdots 1c_2^10c_2^2 \cdots 1c_2^2 \cdots 0c_2^n \cdots 1c_2^n\rangle_{123-2n} + (-1)^{y_2} |0c_2^1 \cdots 1c_2^10c_2^2 \cdots 1c_2^2 \cdots 0c_2^n \cdots 1c_2^n\rangle_{123-2n} \\
+ \cdots + (-1)^{y_n} |12^n_1 \cdots 12^n_102^n_1 \cdots 02^n_1 \cdots 12^n_n \cdots 02^n_n\rangle_{123-2n} \\
= (-1)^{y_1} |0c_2^1 \cdots 1c_2^10c_2^2 \cdots 1c_2^2 \cdots 0c_2^n \cdots 1c_2^n\rangle_{1135-(2n-1)24-2n} + (-1)^{y_2} |0c_2^1 \cdots 1c_2^10c_2^2 \cdots 1c_2^2 \cdots 0c_2^n \cdots 1c_2^n\rangle_{1135-(2n-1)24-2n} \\
+ \cdots + (-1)^{y_n} |12^n_1 \cdots 12^n_102^n_1 \cdots 02^n_1 \cdots 12^n_n \cdots 02^n_n\rangle_{1135-(2n-1)24-2n}
\]
Suppose that there are \( n \) entangled states in one of the states \(|\mathcal{E}^\pm\rangle\), and that \( m \) of them are in one of \(|\mathcal{E}^-\rangle\) while the rest are in one of \(|\mathcal{E}^+\rangle\). Let us denote these states as \(|\mathcal{G}_1\rangle, |\mathcal{G}_2\rangle, \ldots, |\mathcal{G}_m\rangle\), where \(|\mathcal{G}_k\rangle = |0\rangle_{a_{2k}}|\bar{a}_{2k}\rangle + |1\rangle_{a_{2k}}|\bar{a}_{2k}\rangle\) (\(k = 1, 2, \ldots, n\)). Suppose that a GHZ measurement is performed on the first \( l \) particles in each state. Let us denote the measurement result as \(|\mathcal{G}_a\rangle\), and the state that the remaining particles collapse into as \(|\mathcal{G}_b\rangle\). If the \( n \) entangled states meet the following two conditions:

1. \( m \) is an even number;
2. \( \forall k \in \{1, 2, \ldots, n\}, 0\bar{a}_{2k}^1 \cdots \bar{a}_{2k}^l = \bar{a}_{2k+1}^1 \cdots \bar{a}_{2k+1}^l \) or \( 0\bar{a}_{2k}^1 \cdots \bar{a}_{2k}^l = \bar{a}_{2k+1}^1 \cdots \bar{a}_{2k+1}^l \)

then \(|\mathcal{G}_a\rangle\) and \(|\mathcal{G}_b\rangle\) are the same.

Then we can arrive at the following two corollaries:

**Corollary 1** Suppose that there are \( n \) entangled states in one of the states \(|\mathcal{E}^\pm\rangle\), and that a GHZ measurement is performed on the first \( l \) particles in each state. Let us denote the measurement result as \(|\mathcal{G}_a\rangle\), and the state that the remaining particles collapse into as \(|\mathcal{G}_b\rangle\). If the \( n \) entangled states are all in \(|\mathcal{E}^+\rangle\), then \(|\mathcal{G}_a\rangle\) and \(|\mathcal{G}_b\rangle\) are always the same whether \( n \) is odd or even. If the \( n \) entangled states are all in \(|\mathcal{E}^-\rangle\), then \(|\mathcal{G}_a\rangle\) and \(|\mathcal{G}_b\rangle\) are the same when \( n \) is even, otherwise they are different, that is, \(|\mathcal{G}_a\rangle\) and \(|\mathcal{G}_b\rangle\) are different when \( n \) is odd.

**Corollary 2** Suppose that there are \( n \) identical entangled states, and that a GHZ measurement is performed on the first \( l \) particles in each state. Let us denote the measurement result as \(|\mathcal{G}_a\rangle\), and the state that the remaining particles collapse into as \(|\mathcal{G}_b\rangle\). If the \( n \) entangled states are all in one of the states \(|\mathcal{E}^\pm\rangle\), then \(|\mathcal{G}_a\rangle\) and \(|\mathcal{G}_b\rangle\) are always the same whether \( n \) is odd or even. If the \( n \) entangled states are all in one of the states \(|\mathcal{E}^\pm\rangle\), then \(|\mathcal{G}_a\rangle\) and \(|\mathcal{G}_b\rangle\) are the same when \( n \) is even, otherwise they are different.

Corollary 1 can be proved by Eqs. 18 and 19 Conclusion 2 can be proved similarly.

### 3 Applications in quantum cryptography

In this section, we will describe several applications of the entanglement swapping considered in quantum cryptography, including quantum key distribution, quantum private comparison, and quantum secret sharing.
3.1 Quantum key distribution

Alice and Bob can share a key sequence through the following steps:

1. Alice (Bob) prepare randomly \( n \) quantum states, each of which is in one of the states \( |\mathcal{X}^+\rangle \) (see Eq. [16], and marks them by

\[
|X(a^1_1, a^2_1, \ldots, a^n_1), X(a^1_2, a^2_2, \ldots, a^n_2), \ldots, X(a^1_n, a^2_n, \ldots, a^n_n)\rangle
\]

which particles in the state are marked by \( a^i_j \) and marks it by \( p \), where the particles in the state are marked by \( a^i_j \) and takes the last (first) \( l \) of them by \( x^a_{j-l+1} \).\( \sum_{i=1}^{n} a^i_j \) and \( b^i_j \) denote the 2l particles in \( |X(a^1_1, a^2_1, \ldots, a^n_1)\rangle \).

2. Alice (Bob) takes the last (first) \( l \) particles out from \( |X(a^1_1, a^2_1, \ldots, a^n_1)\rangle \) (\( |X(b^1_1, b^2_1, \ldots, b^n_1)\rangle \)) to construct the sequence

\[
a^1_{i+1}, a^2_{i+1}, a^3_{i+1}, \ldots, a^n_{i+1}, a^1_{i}, a^2_{i}, \ldots, a^n_{i}, \ldots, a^1_{i+2}, a^2_{i+2}, \ldots, a^n_{i+2}, \ldots, b^1_{i}, b^2_{i}, \ldots, b^n_{i}.
\]

3. Alice and Bob sends \( S_a \) and \( S_b \) to each other. Then Alice measures in the turn the particles marked by \( a^1_i, a^2_i, \ldots, a^n_i \) and \( b^1_i, b^2_i, \ldots, b^n_i \) (if \( i = 1 \), Alice performs Bell measurements, otherwise she performs GHZ measurements). Likewise, Bob measures in turn the particles marked by \( a^1_i, a^2_i, \ldots, a^n_i \) and \( b^1_i, b^2_i, \ldots, b^n_i \). Let us denote the measurement results of Alice (Bob) as \( |X'_a (X'_b)\rangle \),

\[
|X'_a \rangle = |0j_2, j_3 \ldots, j_2 n \rangle \text{ or } |0k_2, k_3 \ldots, k_2 n \rangle
\]

\[
|X'_b \rangle = |0k_2, k_3 \ldots, k_2 n \rangle \text{ or } |0l_2, l_3 \ldots, l_2 n \rangle
\]

4. Alice and Bob publish the prepared quantum states to each other. When the two states prepared by them are the same, they can generate a shared key sequence in many ways (according to Theorem 1, the measurement results of Alice and Bob are the same; we assume that there are enough states prepared by Alice and Bob to generate the key sequence). For example, they can calculate \( 0 \oplus f_1 \oplus f_2 \oplus \cdots \oplus f_n \) and \( 0 \oplus k_1 \oplus k_2 \oplus \cdots \oplus k_n \), respectively, and take the calculation results as shared keys. They can also calculate \( f_2 \cdot 2^{j_1} \cdot 2^{j_2} + f_3 \cdot 2^{j_1} \cdot 2^{j_2} + \cdots + f_n \cdot 2^{j_1} \cdot 2^{j_2} \) to generate shared keys. (Note here that \( 0 \oplus f_1 \oplus f_2 \oplus \cdots \oplus f_n = 0 \oplus k_1 \oplus k_2 \oplus \cdots \oplus k_n \), and \( f_2 \cdot 2^{j_1} \cdot 2^{j_2} + f_3 \cdot 2^{j_1} \cdot 2^{j_2} + \cdots + f_n \cdot 2^{j_1} \cdot 2^{j_2} = k_2 \cdot 2^{j_1} \cdot 2^{j_2} + k_3 \cdot 2^{j_1} \cdot 2^{j_2} + \cdots + k_n \cdot 2^{j_1} \cdot 2^{j_2} \)). When the two states prepared are different, Alice and Bob use them for eavesdropping checking.

3.2 Quantum private comparison

Let us first give three prerequisites of the protocol.

1. Suppose that Alice and Bob have the secret data \( X \) and \( Y \), respectively, and that the binary representations of \( X \) and \( Y \) are \( (x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_n) \) and \( (y_1, y_2, \ldots, y_n) \), respectively, where \( n \in \mathbb{N}^+ \), \( x_i, y_i \in \{0, 1\} \) \( \forall i = 1, 2, \ldots, n \). \( X = \sum_{i=1}^{n} x_i 2^{i-1} \), and \( Y = \sum_{i=1}^{n} y_i 2^{i-1} \). Alice and Bob want to judge whether \( X = Y \) with the help of the semi-honest third party (conventionally called TP); TP is assumed to be faithful to execute the protocol processes and not to conspire with Alice or Bob, but he can record calculation results generated in the protocol, from which he will attempt to deduce the participants’ data [39].

2. Alice, Bob and TP agree on the following coding rules: \( |0\rangle \leftrightarrow 0 \) and \( |1\rangle \leftrightarrow 1 \).

Now let us introduce the steps of the protocol.

1. According to the value of \( x_i(y_i) \), Alice (Bob) prepares the Bell states

\[
|B(p^0_i, p^1_i)\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \left[ |0a_i^0 \rangle + |1a_i^1 \rangle \right], \quad |B(q^0_i, q^1_i)\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \left[ |0b_i^0 \rangle + |1b_i^1 \rangle \right]
\]

where the particles in the state are marked by \( p^0_i, p^1_i \) (\( q^0_i, q^1_i \)), the value of \( a^i_i \) (\( b^j_j \)) is the same as that of \( x_i(y_i) \).
2. Alice (Bob) takes all the particles out from $|B(p'_0, p'_i)⟩$ to construct the sequence

$$\left| B(q_0, q'_1) \right⟩ \left| B(q_0, q'_2) \right⟩ \cdots \left| B(q_0, q'_n) \right⟩,$$

and denotes it as $S_n(S_b)$.

3. Alice (Bob) sends $S_n(S_b)$ to TP, where decoy photon technology is used for eavesdropping checking [23, 38, 39]. If there are no eavesdroppers, TP performs Bell measurements on the first particle in $|B(p'_0, p'_i)⟩$ and the first particle in $|B(q_0, q'_1)⟩$, and marks the measurement results by $|B'_1⟩$. Similarly, he then measures the remaining particles in $|B(p'_0, p'_i)⟩$ and $|B(q_0, q'_i)⟩$, and marks the measurement results by $|B'_j⟩$. According to Theorem 1, if $|B'_i⟩ = |B'_j⟩ \forall i \in [1, 2, \ldots, n]$, TP can conclude that $X = Y$, otherwise $X \neq Y$. Finally, TP announces publicly the comparison result to Alice and Bob.

In this protocol, if TP attempts to perform single-particle measurements on the Bell states that he receives at the last step of the protocol, he can guess Alice’s data $X$ with the successful probability of $1/2^n$. Obviously, $1/2^n$ decreases with the increase in $n$, and when the value of $n$ is small, there are many ways to increase it. For example, Alice and Bob can agree in advance on a secret positive integer $M$ (or generate it using a quantum key distribution protocol), and then they can calculate $X \times M$, or $X^M$ ($Y \times M$, or $Y^M$). For participants, they can only steal each other’s data through quantum channels because there is no particle exchange between them. In this case, they will be caught during eavesdropping checking.

### 3.3 Quantum secret sharing

Suppose that Alice wants to share a secret with Bob$_1$, Bob$_2$, …, Bob$_n$, and that Bob$_1$, Bob$_2$, …, Bob$_n$ can infer this secret only by their mutual assistance. Alice, Bob$_1$, Bob$_2$, …, Bob$_n$ agree on the coding rules: $|0⟩ \rightarrow 0$ and $|1⟩ \rightarrow 1$. They can achieve this through the following steps:

1. Alice prepares $n$ copies of the Bell state

$$|φ^+(p_1, p_2)⟩ = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} (|00⟩ + |11⟩),$$

and marks them by

$$|φ^+(p_1^1, p_2^1)⟩, |φ^+(p_1^2, p_2^2)⟩, \ldots, |φ^+(p_1^n, p_2^n)⟩,$$

in turn to construct an ordered sequence, where the subscripts $1, 2, \ldots, n$ denote the order of the Bell states in the sequence, and the superscripts 1, 2 denote two particles in each state, respectively.

2. Alice takes the first particles marked by $p'_i (i = 1, 2, \ldots, n)$ out from $|φ^+(p'_1, p'_i)⟩$ to construct the new sequence $p'_1, p'_2, \ldots, p'_i$. The remaining particles construct another new sequence $p'_2, p'_2, \ldots, p'_i$. Then Alice sends the particle marked by $p'_i$ to Bob$_i$.

3. Alice performs GHZ measurements on the particles marked by $p'_1, p'_2, \ldots, p'_i$, and then Bob$_i$ performs single-particle measurements on his particle marked by $p'_i$. Let us denote the measurement result of Alice as $|X_a⟩$, then

$$|X_a⟩ = |j_2 j_3 \cdots j_n⟩ + |\bar{j_2} j_3 \cdots j_n⟩ \text{ or } |0 j_2 j_3 \cdots j_n⟩ - |1 j_2 j_3 \cdots j_n⟩,$$

where $j_k \in \{0, 1\} \forall k = 2, \ldots, n$. Alice calculates $j_2 \cdot 2^{n-2} + j_3 \cdot 2^{n-3} + \cdots + j_n \cdot 2^0$, and takes the calculation result as a key; this key is unknown to Bob$_1$, Bob$_2$, …, Bob$_n$, unless they share their measurement results with each other.

For eavesdropping checking, Alice can prepare $n + mn$ copies of the Bell state $|φ^+(p_1, p_2)⟩$ in the first step, and send $n + 1$ particles to Bob$_i$. Then Alice and Bob$_i$ use $m$ Bell states to check whether there is eavesdropping in the quantum channel between them, and the remaining Bell state to complete secret sharing.

We would like to give a simple example to illustrate the correctness of the protocol. Let us assume that Alice’s measurement result in the last step of the protocol is $|X_a⟩ = |0110⟩ + |1001⟩$, Alice calculates $1 \cdot 2^3 + 1 \cdot 2^2 + 0 \cdot 2^0 = 6$, and takes it as the secret. According to Corollary 2, the particles of Bob$_1$, Bob$_2$, Bob$_3$ and Bob$_4$ collapses into the same quantum state as $|X_a⟩$. Therefore, after they perform single-particle measurements, the binary number corresponding to the measurement results is either 0110 or 1001. If the binary number is 1001, they flip it to 0110. In this way, by sharing the measurement results, they can know Alice’s secret.
4 Conclusion

We have introduced a special class of GHZ states, and considered entanglement swapping. We have shown that two identical Bell (GHZ) states can be generated through Bell (GHZ) measurements, which enables users to realize quantum key distribution, quantum secret sharing and quantum private comparison. The proposed entanglement swapping schemes will be useful for multiuser quantum cryptography and distributed quantum computing. An open question is whether there are other cases for Bell states or GHZ states except for the cases that we have described, so that two identical GHZ states can be obtained after entanglement swapping.
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