

Quantum Alice and Silent Bob

Qubit-based Quantum Key Recycling with almost no classical communication

Daan Leermakers and Boris Škorić

d.leermakers.1@tue.nl, b.skoric@tue.nl

Abstract

We answer an open question about Quantum Key Recycling (QKR): Is it possible to put the message entirely in the qubits without increasing the number of qubits? We show that this is indeed possible. We introduce a prepare-and-measure QKR protocol where the communication from Alice to Bob consists entirely of qubits. As usual, Bob responds with an authenticated one-bit accept/reject classical message.¹

Compared to Quantum Key Distribution (QKD), QKR has reduced round complexity. Compared to previous qubit-wise QKR protocols, our scheme has far less classical communication. We provide a security proof in the universal composability framework and find that the communication rate is asymptotically the same as for QKD with one-way postprocessing.

1 Introduction

1.1 Quantum Key Recycling

QKR achieves information-theoretically secure communication in such a way that no key material is used up as long as the quantum channel is undisturbed. Compared to QKD followed by classical one-time-pad message encryption, QKR's main advantage is *reduced round complexity*: QKR needs only one message from Alice to Bob, and one authenticated bit from Bob to Alice. QKD needs at least two messages from Alice to Bob. Furthermore, a minor advantage is that QKR does not discard any qubits, whereas QKD does.

A prepare-and-measure QKR scheme based on qubits was proposed already in 1982 [1]. Then QKR received little attention for a long time. A security proof² for qubit-based³ QKR was given only in 2017 by Fehr and Salvail [4]. In [5] it was shown (for a scheme similar to [4]) that the communication rate in case of a noisy quantum channel is asymptotically the same as for QKD with one-way postprocessing.

1.2 Related work; putting the message in the quantum states

Different from the classical setting, in the quantum cryptographic setting authentication implies encryption [6]. Portmann [7] showed that quantum authentication is possible with re-use of all the encryption keys, but states as an open problem to find a *prepare-and-measure* QKR scheme for classical messages.

All currently existing qubit-wise prepare-and-measure QKR schemes encode random bits rather than the message into the quantum state, and then extract a classical One-Time Pad (OTP) from these random bits. Alice sends a classical ciphertext (the message xor'ed with the OTP) along with the quantum states.

In 2003 Gottesman [8] proposed a scheme called ‘Unclonable Encryption’ which encodes a message directly into qubit states. Although some of the keys in his schemes can be re-used, still n key bits are discarded when sending an n -bit message. The high-dimensional QKR of Damgård, Pedersen

¹ The title refers to the movie character Silent Bob, who hardly ever speaks.

² For a scheme slightly different from [1].

³ as opposed to schemes that work with higher-dimensional spaces, e.g. using mutually unbiased bases [2, 3].

and Salvail [2, 3] has full recycling of keys, but requires quantum computation for encryption and decryption.

1.3 Contributions

We answer the open question whether it is possible to have prepare-and-measure qubit-based QKR with the message entirely contained in the qubits, without increasing the number of qubits. The answer is affirmative. We present such a scheme; compared to [5] Alice’s classical message is removed.

While the contribution of this paper may not have a great practical impact (after all the classical channel is a cheap resource compared to the quantum channel), we find that reducing the overall communication to the bare minimum is of theoretical interest.

- Our protocol is a modification of the scheme by Leermakers and Škorić [5]. The main difference lies in the masking of the message and in the privacy amplification.
- In case of **Reject**, Alice and Bob have to tap into fresh key material. We implement this key update by hashing fresh key material into the old keys. This reduces the **Reject**-case key expenditure with respect to [4] and [5]. In the absence of noise the **Reject**-case key expenditure asymptotically equals the length of the message, which is optimal [2].
- We prove the security of our protocol against general attacks. We use a universally composable measure of security, namely the diamond norm between the actual protocol and an idealized protocol in which the secrets are replaced by random strings after protocol execution. The proof follows the same steps as [5], and at an early stage the **Accept**-case part of the proof reduces exactly to the derivation in [5]. Notably, this proof technique achieves optimal rates for 6-state as well as 4-state encodings.
- The asymptotic communication rate of our scheme (the number of message bits divided by the number of qubits) equals that of QKD with one-way postprocessing. The finite-size effects are the same as [5], but with an additional small term due to the new key refresh procedure in the **Reject** case.

1.4 Outline

In Section 2 we introduce notation and briefly review post-selection and the results of [5]. We state our motivation in Section 3, and we list the steps of the proposed protocol in Section 4. Section 5 presents a stepwise re-formulation of the protocol which is equivalent in terms of security but better suited to the proof technique. In Section 6 we derive the output state of the protocol, and in Section 7 we give the security proof. We conclude with a discussion and suggestions for future work.

2 Preliminaries

2.1 Notation and terminology

Classical Random Variables (RVs) are denoted with capital letters, and their realisations with lowercase letters. The probability that a RV X takes value x is written as $\Pr[X = x]$. The expectation with respect to RV X is denoted as $\mathbb{E}_x f(x) = \sum_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \Pr[X = x] f(x)$. Sets are denoted in calligraphic font. The notation ‘log’ stands for the logarithm with base 2. The notation h stands for the binary entropy function $h(p) = p \log \frac{1}{p} + (1-p) \log \frac{1}{1-p}$. Sometimes we write $h(\{p_1, \dots, p_k\})$ meaning $\sum_i p_i \log \frac{1}{p_i}$. Bitwise XOR of binary strings is written as ‘ \oplus ’. The Kronecker delta is denoted as δ_{ab} . The complement of a bit $b \in \{0, 1\}$ is written as $\bar{b} = 1 - b$. The Hamming weight of a binary string x is written as $|x|$. We will speak about ‘the bit error rate γ of a quantum channel’. This is defined as the probability that a classical bit g , sent by Alice embedded in a qubit, arrives at Bob’s side as \bar{g} . We write $\mathbb{1}$ for the identity matrix.

For quantum states we use Dirac notation. A qubit state with classical bit x encoded in basis b is written as $|\psi_x^b\rangle$. We call x the *payload*. We will always assume that we are working with 6-state encoding (known from 6-state QKD, with three possible bases) or 8-state encoding [9, 10]. Occasionally we will comment if a result is different for BB84-encoding.

The notation ‘tr’ stands for trace. Let A have eigenvalues λ_i . The 1-norm of A is written as $\|A\|_1 = \text{tr} \sqrt{A^\dagger A} = \sum_i |\lambda_i|$. The trace distance between matrices ρ and σ is denoted as $\delta(\rho; \sigma) = \frac{1}{2} \|\rho - \sigma\|_1$. It is a generalisation of the statistical distance and represents the maximum possible advantage one can have in distinguishing ρ from σ .

Quantum states with non-italic label ‘A’, ‘B’ and ‘E’ indicate the subsystem of Alice/Bob/Eve. Consider uniform classical variables X, Y and a quantum system under Eve’s control that depends on X and Y . The combined classical-quantum state is $\rho^{XYE} = \mathbb{E}_{xy} |xy\rangle\langle xy| \otimes \rho_{xy}^E$. The state of a sub-system is obtained by tracing out all the other subspaces, e.g. $\rho^{YE} = \text{tr}_X \rho^{XYE} = \mathbb{E}_y |y\rangle\langle y| \otimes \rho_y^E$, with $\rho_y^E = \mathbb{E}_x \rho_{xy}^E$. The fully mixed state on Hilbert space \mathcal{H}_A is denoted as χ^A . The security of the variable X , given that Eve holds the ‘E’ subsystem, can be expressed in terms of a trace distance as follows [11],

$$d(X|E) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \delta(\rho^{XE}; \chi^X \otimes \rho^E) \quad (1)$$

i.e. the distance between the true classical-quantum state and a state in which X is completely unknown to Eve.

We write $\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H}_A)$ to denote the space of density matrices on the Hilbert space \mathcal{H}_A . Any quantum channel can be described by a completely positive trace-preserving (CPTP) map $\mathcal{E} : \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H}_A) \rightarrow \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H}_B)$ that transforms a mixed state ρ^A to ρ^B : $\mathcal{E}(\rho^A) = \rho^B$. For a map $\mathcal{E} : \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H}_A) \rightarrow \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H}_B)$, the notation $\mathcal{E}(\rho^{AC})$ stands for $(\mathcal{E} \otimes \mathbb{1}_C)(\rho^{AC})$, i.e. \mathcal{E} acts only on the A subsystem.

The diamond norm of \mathcal{E} is defined as $\|\mathcal{E}\|_\diamond = \frac{1}{2} \sup_{\rho^{AC} \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H}_{AC})} \|\mathcal{E}(\rho^{AC})\|_1$ with \mathcal{H}_C an auxiliary system that can be considered to be of the same dimension as \mathcal{H}_A . The diamond norm $\|\mathcal{E} - \mathcal{E}'\|_\diamond$ can be used to upper bound the probability of distinguishing two CPTP maps \mathcal{E} and \mathcal{E}' given that the process is observed once. The maximum probability of a correct guess is $\frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{4} \|\mathcal{E} - \mathcal{E}'\|_\diamond$. The security of a protocol is often quantified by the diamond norm between the real protocol \mathcal{E} and an protocol with ideal functionality \mathcal{F} . When $\|\mathcal{E} - \mathcal{F}\|_\diamond \leq \varepsilon$ we can consider \mathcal{E} to behave ideally except with probability ε ; this security metric is composable with other (sub-)protocols [12].

A family of hash functions $H = \{h : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{T}\}$ is called pairwise independent (a.k.a. 2-independent or strongly universal) [13] if for all distinct pairs $x, x' \in \mathcal{X}$ and all pairs $y, y' \in \mathcal{T}$ it holds that $\Pr_{h \in H}[h(x) = y \wedge h(x') = y'] = |\mathcal{T}|^{-2}$. Here the probability is over random $h \in H$. Pairwise independence can be achieved with a hash family of size $|H| = |\mathcal{X}|$.

2.2 Definition of QKR rate and security

We define the rate of a quantum communication protocol as the number of useful message bits communicated per sent qubit.

Informally, we define QKR security as follows. Let k denote all the shared keys of Alice and Bob in the current instantiation of the protocol. Let \tilde{k} be the keys in the next instantiation, computed in a way that depends on Bob’s feedback. We define the Key Recycling property as follows,

- If Bob’s feedback message is **Accept**, then \tilde{k} is computed without tapping into new key material.⁴

Two security properties must be satisfied:

- Even if Eve intercepts the whole ciphertext, she cannot obtain any information about the message.
- Using \tilde{k} in the next instantiation does not endanger any message.

Formally, we work with an EPR-state based version of the protocol. We consider a quantum-classical state $\rho^{K\tilde{K}M\Omega E}$ containing the classical random variables K, \tilde{K}, M, Ω , where M is the message and Ω is Bob’s feedback bit, as well as Eve’s quantum side information (the subsystem

⁴ Note that we do not require re-use of the exact same keys in unmodified form.

denoted as ‘E’). This state is the result of the protocol \mathcal{E} acting on an input state σ which represents the noisy EPR pairs prepared by Eve, $\rho^{K\tilde{K}M\Omega E} = \mathcal{E}(\sigma)$. An ‘ideal’ version of the protocol is denoted as \mathcal{F} , and we write $\varphi^{K\tilde{K}M\Omega E} = \mathcal{F}(\sigma)$. It satisfies $\varphi^{M\Omega E} = \varphi^M \otimes \varphi^{\Omega E}$ and $\varphi^{K\tilde{K}M\Omega E} = \varphi^{\tilde{K}} \otimes \varphi^{M\Omega E}$. The first equation expresses the fact that the message M is entirely decoupled from the subsystems available to Eve. The second says that, even in the case of known plaintext, Eve has no information about the updated key \tilde{K} . We say that the QKR scheme \mathcal{E} is ε -secure if $\|\mathcal{E} - \mathcal{F}\|_\diamond \leq \varepsilon$.

2.3 Post-selection

For protocols that are invariant under permutation of their inputs it has been shown [14] that security against collective attacks (the same attack applied to each qubit individually) implies security against general attacks, at the cost of extra privacy amplification. Let \mathcal{E} be a protocol that acts on $S(\mathcal{H}_{AB}^{\otimes n})$ and let \mathcal{F} describe the perfect functionality of that protocol. If for all permutations π on the input there exists a map \mathcal{K}_π on the output such that $\mathcal{E} \circ \pi = \mathcal{K}_\pi \circ \mathcal{E}$ then,

$$\|\mathcal{E} - \mathcal{F}\|_\diamond \leq (n+1)^{d^2-1} \max_{\sigma \in S(\mathcal{H}_{ABE})} \left\| (\mathcal{E} - \mathcal{F})(\sigma^{\otimes n}) \right\|_1 \quad (2)$$

where d is the dimension of the \mathcal{H}_{AB} space. ($d = 4$ for qubits). The product form $\sigma^{\otimes n}$ greatly simplifies the security analysis: now it suffices to prove security against ‘collective’ attacks, and to pay a price $2(d^2 - 1) \log(n+1)$ in the amount of privacy amplification, i.e. the output size of the privacy amplification step is reduced by this amount.

2.4 Brief summary of results from [5]

It was shown that the asymptotic communication rate of QKR is the same as the rate of QKD with one-way postprocessing. Alice encodes random bits into the qubits; over a classical channel she sends a ciphertext, OTP-encrypted information for error-correction, and an authentication tag. Let the CPTP map \mathcal{E} be the protocol of [5], and \mathcal{F} its idealized version where the message and the next round’s keys are completely unknown to Eve. It was shown that

$$\|\mathcal{E} - \mathcal{F}\|_\diamond \leq 2^{-\lambda+1} + (n+1)^{15} \min \left(\varepsilon + \frac{1}{2} \text{tr}_E \sqrt{|\mathcal{B}|^n 2^\ell \text{tr}_{BS}(\bar{\rho}^{BSE})^2}, P_{\text{corr}} \right), \quad (3)$$

where λ is the length of the authentication tags, ε the amount of state ‘smoothing’ [11], n the number of qubits, \mathcal{B} the alphabet of the qubit basis choice, ℓ the message length, B the basis sequence, S the random data encoded in the qubits, and P_{corr} the noise-dependent probability of successful error correction. The $\bar{\rho}^{BSE}$ is the state $\mathcal{E}(\sigma^{\otimes n})$ (see Section 2.3) smoothed by an amount ε , with everything traced out except the B , S and E subsystems. If 6-state encoding⁵ of bits is used then the 4×4 matrix σ is completely determined [15] by a single parameter: the bit error probability γ on the quantum channel. Asymptotically for large n , the bound (3) reduces to

$$\|\mathcal{E} - \mathcal{F}\|_\diamond \leq 2^{-\lambda+1} + n^{15} \min \left(\sqrt{2^{\ell-n+nh(\{1-\frac{3}{2}\gamma, \frac{\gamma}{2}, \frac{\gamma}{2}, \frac{\gamma}{2}\})-nh(\gamma)}}}, P_{\text{corr}} \right), \quad (4)$$

which yields exactly the same rate⁶ $1 - h(\{1 - \frac{3}{2}\gamma, \frac{\gamma}{2}, \frac{\gamma}{2}, \frac{\gamma}{2}\})$ as 6-state QKD with one-way postprocessing.⁷ The security of N QKR rounds follows from $\|\mathcal{E}_N \circ \dots \circ \mathcal{E}_1 - \mathcal{F}_N \circ \dots \circ \mathcal{F}_1\|_\diamond \leq N \|\mathcal{E} - \mathcal{F}\|_\diamond$.

3 Motivation

As mentioned in Section 1, current QKR schemes all have some drawback. Either they require a quantum computer for their implementation or they have classical ciphertext. In this work we aim for a QKR protocol that has all the desiderata one would expect:

⁵ For 4-state (BB84) ‘conjugate’ coding Eve has two degrees of freedom, i.e. a more powerful attack.

⁶ The term $nh(\gamma)$ gets cancelled because Alice and Bob expend $nh(\gamma)$ bits of key material to OTP the redundancy bits.

⁷ For 4-state encoding the result is different from (4) and yields the BB84 rate.

- All actions on quantum states should be simple single-qubit actions like state preparation and measurement.
- Alice should send only qubits, so that no bandwidth is wasted.
- Bob should send only an authenticated **Accept/Reject** bit.
- No key material should be consumed in case of **Accept**, and the bare minimum⁸ should be consumed in case of **Reject**.
- The communication rate should equal that of QKD.

4 Our Quantum Key Recycling protocol

4.1 Protocol design considerations

Our protocol is very similar to [5]. There are two main differences:

1. There is no classical communication from Alice to Bob.
2. In case of **Reject** the keys are not thrown away. Instead, fresh key material is hashed into the old keys to obtain the keys for the next round.

In the transformation from [5] to a protocol without classical ciphertext, there are several proof-technical issues. Most importantly, the qubit payload $X \in \{0,1\}^n$ needs to be uniformly random. (See Section 5.3. In the proof the X acts as a uniform mask.) This has to be reconciled with the fact that (i) the message is typically not uniform; (ii) the error-correction encoding step introduces redundancy. Our solution to these issues is shown in Fig. 1, which depicts most of the variables in the protocol. Alice first appends a random string $r \in \{0,1\}^\kappa$ to the message, which will serve for privacy amplification. Then she does the error correction encoding, resulting in a codeword $c \in \{0,1\}^n$. The c is then masked with a one-time pad z ; this masks any structure present in c . A similar construction was proposed by Gottesman [8]. However, instead of discarding z we re-use most of the entropy in z .




Figure 1: *Classical processing performed by Alice, and in reverse by Bob.*

4.2 Setup and protocol steps

Alice and Bob have agreed on a linear error-correcting code with encoding and decoding functions $\text{Enc} : \{0,1\}^{\ell+\kappa} \rightarrow \{0,1\}^n$ and $\text{Dec} : \{0,1\}^n \rightarrow \{0,1\}^{\ell+\kappa}$. The choice of κ and n depends on the bit error rate of the quantum channel and on the required amount of privacy amplification. Furthermore Alice and Bob have agreed on a MAC function $\Gamma : \{0,1\}^\lambda \times \{0,1\}^* \rightarrow \{0,1\}^\lambda$, and

⁸ For the noiseless case, the optimum is the length of the plaintext minus one [2].

two pairwise independent hash functions $F_u : \{0,1\}^n \times \mathcal{B}^n \times \{0,1\}^\kappa \rightarrow \{0,1\}^n \times \mathcal{B}^n$ ($u \in \mathcal{U}$) and $G_v : \{0,1\}^n \times \mathcal{B}^n \times \mathcal{Q} \rightarrow \{0,1\}^\ell \times \mathcal{B}^n$ ($v \in \mathcal{V}$).⁹ The λ is a security parameter for the MAC function and is constant with respect to n .

Alice's plaintext is $\mu \in \{0,1\}^{\ell-2\lambda}$. The key material shared between Alice and Bob consists of a mask $z \in \{0,1\}^n$, a MAC key $\xi \in \{0,1\}^\lambda$ for Alice's message, a basis sequence $b \in \mathcal{B}^n$, a MAC key $k \in \{0,1\}^\lambda$ for Bob's feedback bit, and seeds $u \in \mathcal{U}$, $v \in \mathcal{V}$ for pairwise independent hashing.¹⁰ Furthermore Alice and Bob have a 'reservoir' of additional spare key material.

One round of the protocol consists of the following steps (see Fig. 2):

Encryption:

Alice generates random strings $r \in \{0,1\}^\kappa$, $k' \in \{0,1\}^\lambda$. She computes the authentication tag $\tau = \Gamma(\xi, \mu \| k')$, the 'augmented message' $m = \mu \| k' \| \tau$ (with $m \in \{0,1\}^\ell$), the Encoding $c = \text{Enc}(m \| r) \in \{0,1\}^n$, and the qubit payload $x = c \oplus z$. She prepares $|\Psi\rangle = \bigotimes_{i=1}^n |\psi_{x_i}^{b_i}\rangle$ and sends $|\Psi\rangle$ to Bob.

Decryption:

Bob receives $|\Psi'\rangle$. He measures $|\Psi'\rangle$ in the basis b . The result is $x' \in \{0,1\}^n$. He computes $c' = x' \oplus z$. He tries to recover $\hat{m} \| \hat{\tau} = \text{Dec}(c')$. If decoding does not generate a failure notification, he discards $\hat{\tau}$ and parses \hat{m} as $\hat{m} = \hat{\mu} \| \hat{k}' \| \hat{\tau}$. He also computes $\hat{c} = \text{Enc}(\hat{m} \| \hat{\tau})$ and $\hat{x} = \hat{c} \oplus z$.

Feedback:

Bob checks if $\Gamma(\xi, \hat{\mu} \| \hat{k}') == \hat{\tau}$. He sets $\omega = 1$ ('Accept') if the error correction did not fail and the MAC $\hat{\tau}$ is correct; $\omega = 0$ ('Reject') otherwise. He computes $\tau_{\text{fb}} = \Gamma(k, \omega)$ and sends ω, τ_{fb} to Alice. Alice checks the MAC on the feedback.

Key Update:

The keys/seeds ξ, u, v are always re-used. The updated version of the z, b, k in the next round is denoted as $\tilde{z}, \tilde{b}, \tilde{k}$.

- In case of **Accept**:
 Alice sets $\tilde{k} = k'$ and $\tilde{z} \| \tilde{b} = F_u(x \| b \| r)$.
 Bob sets $\tilde{k} = \hat{k}'$ and $\tilde{z} \| \tilde{b} = F_u(\hat{x} \| b \| \hat{\tau})$.
- In case of **Reject**:
 Alice and Bob take new \tilde{z} and \tilde{k} from their reservoir.
 They take $q \in \mathcal{Q}$ from the reservoir and set $\tilde{b} = G_v(b \| q)$.

⁹ The set \mathcal{B} is the alphabet of qubit basis choices. In BB84 encoding we have $\mathcal{B} = \{+, \times\}$; in 6-state encoding $\mathcal{B} = \{x, y, z\}$.

¹⁰ The strings u and v are never both used in the same round. We describe them independently since they have a different length, but the shorter (v) may as well be a substring of the longer (u).




Figure 2: One round of our QKR protocol.

5 Protocol reformulation for the security proof

We introduce a sequence of small modifications to the protocol of Section 4. While the original protocol $\mathcal{E}_{\text{orig}}$ in Section 4 is the one that Alice and Bob actually execute, we will write down the security proof for the modified protocol \mathcal{E}_{mod} . Due to their (almost-)equivalence, security of \mathcal{E}_{mod} implies security of $\mathcal{E}_{\text{orig}}$ up to a constant $2^{-\lambda+1}$.

- We mask the qubit payload with public randomness.
- We go to an EPR version in order to apply standard proof methods.
- We add random permutation of the qubits so that post-selection can be used.
- We add random Pauli transforms in order to simplify the noisy state.
- We pretend that the two authentication tags cannot be forged.

5.1 Masking the qubit payload with public randomness

Alice picks a random string $a \in \{0, 1\}^n$. She computes $s = x \oplus a$. Instead of qubit states $|\psi_{x_i}^{b_i}\rangle$ she prepares $|\psi_{s_i}^{b_i}\rangle$. We denote Bob's measurement result as $t \in \{0, 1\}^n$. Alice publishes a over an authenticated channel.¹¹ Bob computes $x' = t \oplus a$. Note that Eve learns a only *after* she has attacked the qubits. Since a is public and independently random, this roundabout way of getting x' to Bob is equivalent to the original protocol as far as security is concerned.

5.2 EPR version of the protocol

Instead of having Alice prepare a qubit state and Bob measuring it, now Eve prepares a noisy two-qubit EPR state (singlet state) and gives the two subsystems 'A' and 'B' to Alice and Bob respectively. Alice and Bob measure their i 'th qubit in basis b_i ; this yields s_i for Alice and t_i for Bob, where t_i equals \bar{s}_i plus noise. The s_i (or t_i) is random.

Alice computes $a = s \oplus x$ and publishes a in an authenticated way. Bob computes $y = t \oplus a$. The rest of the classical processing is the same as in the original protocol, with $x' = \bar{y}$.

Note that the statistics of the variables s, t, a, x, x' is the same as in Section 5.1, although the origin of the variables is now different. The equivalence between prepare-and-measure on the one hand and the EPR mechanism on the other hand has been exploited in many works.

5.3 Adding a random permutation

After Eve has handed out all n EPR pairs, Alice and Bob publicly agree on a random permutation π . Before performing any measurement they both apply π to their own set of n qubits. Then they forget π . The remainder of the protocol is as in Section 5.2.

For Alice and Bob the effect of the permutation is that the noise is distributed differently over the qubits. The error-correction step is insensitive to the location of bit errors; only the number of bit errors matters. Hence all the classical variables that are processed/computed after the error correction step are unaffected by π . The only *output* variable of the protocol that is affected is a . However, a was a uniform¹² random variable and has now become a different uniform variable; as far as security is concerned, the new protocol is equivalent to the one in Section 5.2.

Let $\mathcal{E}_{\text{perm}}$ denote the protocol containing the random permutation step. In the language of Section 2.3 we can write $\mathcal{E}_{\text{perm}} \circ \pi = \mathcal{E}_{\text{perm}}$. (After all, a permutation followed by a random permutation is a random permutation.) We conclude that the post-selection criterion holds and we can apply (2).

Note that $\mathcal{E}_{\text{perm}}$ needs quantum memory. This has no practical significance, since Alice and Bob actually execute $\mathcal{E}_{\text{orig}}$, while $\mathcal{E}_{\text{perm}}$ is a proof-technical fiction.

¹¹ This is a tamper-proof channel with perfect authentication.

¹² From Eve's point of view, a gets randomized by x , which is uniform because it is built from z , which is unknown to Eve.

5.4 Adding random Pauli transforms

This is the trick introduced by [15]. For each individual EPR pair, Alice and Bob publicly agree on a random $\alpha \in \{0, 1, 2, 3\}$. They both apply the Pauli transform σ_α to their own qubit state, and then forget α . This happens before they do their measurement. The rest of the protocol is as in section 5.3. The mapping in a single qubit position can be written as

$$\rho^{\text{AB}} \mapsto \tilde{\rho}^{\text{AB}} = \frac{1}{4} \sum_{\alpha} (\sigma_{\alpha} \otimes \sigma_{\alpha}) \rho^{\text{AB}} (\sigma_{\alpha} \otimes \sigma_{\alpha}). \quad (5)$$

The net effect of the Pauli transforms is that the measurement sequence b gets randomized¹³ with public randomness; but b was already random, so security-wise nothing has changed.

The random-Paulis trick yields a major simplification: For six-state encoding (and higher), only one degree of freedom is left in the description of Eve's state, namely the bit error probability. This was an important ingredient of the security proof in [5].

5.5 Pretending that the authentication tags are unforgeable

We pretend that Eve is unable to forge the authentication tags τ and τ_{fb} , which is true except with probability $\leq 2 \cdot 2^{-\lambda}$. This has two benefits: (i) We get rid of complicated case-by-case analyses that would allow events where the error correction yields a wrong \hat{m}, \hat{r} without warning, while $\hat{\tau}$ looks correct; (ii) In the **Accept** case Bob's reconstructed variables \hat{m}, \hat{r} automatically equal Alice's m, r , thus reducing the number of variables.

5.6 Effect of the modifications

Fig. 3 depicts the protocol \mathcal{E}_{mod} . Due to the unforgeability of the tags we can write

$$\|\mathcal{E}_{\text{orig}} - \mathcal{F}_{\text{orig}}\|_{\diamond} \leq 2^{-\lambda+1} + \|\mathcal{E}_{\text{mod}} - \mathcal{F}_{\text{mod}}\|_{\diamond}. \quad (6)$$

Furthermore, due to the permutation invariance of \mathcal{E}_{mod} we can apply the post-selection proof technique and use (2). Finally, thanks to the random Paulis, the state σ in (2) will have the very simple form that makes it possible to arrive at an expression like (4).

6 The output state

The Completely Positive Trace Preserving (CPTP) map \mathcal{E}_{mod} acts on the 'AB' subsystem (the $2n$ qubits controlled by Alice and Bob) without affecting the 'E' subsystem. We write

$$\mathcal{E}_{\text{mod}} = \mathcal{T} \circ \mathcal{P} \circ \mathcal{M} \circ \mathcal{I}. \quad (7)$$

The map \mathcal{I} fetches the classical input variables, \mathcal{M} is the measurement, \mathcal{P} is the classical processing, and \mathcal{T} traces away all variables that are not outputs. The input variables are $mzbkuv$. We have $\mathcal{I}(\rho^{\text{ABE}}) = \mathbb{E}_{mzbkuv} |mzbkuv\rangle\langle mzbkuv| \otimes \rho^{\text{ABE}}$.¹⁴ Note that all input variables except m are uniform.

The measurement \mathcal{M} introduces coupling between the classical b register and the quantum state. Furthermore, it destroys the AB subsystem and creates new classical registers $s, t \in \{0, 1\}^n$.

$$\mathcal{M}(|b\rangle\langle b| \otimes \rho^{\text{ABE}}) = \mathbb{E}_{st} |bst\rangle\langle bst| \otimes \rho_{bst}^{\text{E}}. \quad (8)$$

For the factorised form of ρ^{ABE} it holds that $\mathbb{E}_{st}(\cdots) = \sum_{st} 2^{-n} P_{t|s}(\cdots)$, with $P_{t|s} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \gamma^{|s \oplus t|} (1 - \gamma)^{|s \oplus t|}$, where γ is the bit error probability caused by Eve.

¹³ Let Alice and Bob both perform a projective measurement on their own part of $\tilde{\rho}^{\text{AB}}$ in basis $|\psi_x^b\rangle, |\psi_x^{\bar{b}}\rangle$. This can be rewritten as projective measurements on ρ^{AB} in basis $\sigma_{\alpha}|\psi_x^b\rangle, \sigma_{\alpha}|\psi_x^{\bar{b}}\rangle$.

¹⁴ One can also start from a protocol description $\mathcal{E}'_{\text{mod}}$ that acts on a state $|\text{inputs}\rangle\langle \text{inputs}| \otimes \rho^{\text{AB}}$, i.e. $\mathcal{E}'_{\text{mod}}$ describes how the protocol acts on the quantum state ρ^{AB} given some value of the classical inputs. The quantity of interest is then $\mathcal{E}'_{\text{mod}}$ acting on a linear combination of input values; this exactly matches the above mapping \mathcal{I} .




Figure 3: The modified protocol with EPR states, random permutation, random Pauli transformations and perfect authentication. The notation π stands for a permutation and Σ for a vector of n Pauli matrices.

The processing \mathcal{P} introduces the new variables:¹⁵ r is generated randomly, $cxy\omega\tilde{z}\tilde{b}$ are created by Alice and Bob's computations and q is fetched from the reservoir. Let $n\beta$ be the number of bit errors that the error-correcting code can correct. We define the indicator function θ_{st} such that $\theta_{st} = 1$ when $|\bar{s} \oplus t| \leq n\beta$ and $\theta_{st} = 0$ otherwise.

$$\begin{aligned}
(\mathcal{P} \circ \mathcal{M} \circ \mathcal{I})(\rho^{\text{ABE}}) &= \mathbb{E}_{mzbrkuvr} |mzbrkuvr\rangle \langle mzbrkuvr| \otimes \mathbb{E}_{st} |st\rangle \langle st| \otimes \rho_{bst}^{\text{E}} \\
&\sum_{cxy\omega\tilde{z}\tilde{b}} |cxy\omega\tilde{z}\tilde{b}\rangle \langle cxy\omega\tilde{z}\tilde{b}| \delta_{c, \text{Enc}(m \| r)} \delta_{x, c \oplus z} \delta_{a, x \oplus s} \\
&\delta_{y, t \oplus a} \delta_{\omega, \theta_{st}} \left[\theta_{st} \delta_{\tilde{z} \| \tilde{b}, F_u(x \| b \| r)} + \overline{\theta_{st}} 2^{-n} \delta_{\tilde{b}, G_v(b \| q)} \right]. \tag{9}
\end{aligned}$$

The protocol output consists of the classical variables $\omega m \tilde{z} \tilde{b} u v$. The map \mathcal{T} traces out all the

¹⁵Here we do not keep track of the update \tilde{k} . Its security is trivial: it is updated either from m , which is confidential, or from the reservoir.

non-output registers. Applying this trace to (9) yields

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{E}_{\text{mod}}(\rho^{\text{ABE}}) &= \rho^{UV\tilde{Z}\tilde{B}MA\Omega E} \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{uv\tilde{m}\tilde{z}\tilde{b}a} \sum_{\omega} |uv\tilde{z}\tilde{b}ma\omega\rangle\langle uv\tilde{z}\tilde{b}ma\omega| \otimes [\omega\rho_{u\tilde{b}\tilde{z}a}^{\text{E}[\omega=1]} + \bar{\omega}\rho_{v\tilde{b}a}^{\text{E}[\omega=0]}]\end{aligned}\quad (10)$$

$$\rho_{u\tilde{b}\tilde{z}a}^{\text{E}[\omega=1]} = \mathbb{E}_{bst}\rho_{bst}^{\text{E}}\theta_{st}2^n|\mathcal{B}|^n\mathbb{E}_r\delta_{\tilde{z}\|\tilde{b},F_u[(s\oplus a)\|b\|r]}\quad (11)$$

$$\rho_{v\tilde{b}a}^{\text{E}[\omega=0]} = \mathbb{E}_{bst}\rho_{bst}^{\text{E}}\overline{\theta_{st}}|\mathcal{B}|^n\mathbb{E}_q\delta_{\tilde{b},G_v(b\|q)}.\quad (12)$$

In slight abuse of notation we have written $2^{-n}\sum_a = \mathbb{E}_a$, $2^{-n}\sum_{\tilde{z}} = \mathbb{E}_{\tilde{z}}$, $|\mathcal{B}|^{-n}\sum_{\tilde{b}} = \mathbb{E}_{\tilde{b}}$. In (10,11,12) we should have formally written $\rho_{uv\tilde{b}\tilde{z}ma}^{\text{E}[\omega=1]}$ and $\rho_{uv\tilde{b}\tilde{z}ma}^{\text{E}[\omega=0]}$, but in the subscript we have kept only the variables on which the state actually has dependence.

The idealized version \mathcal{F}_{mod} of the protocol is obtained by first executing \mathcal{E}_{mod} , then tracing away the message m and the keys $uv\tilde{z}\tilde{b}$, and finally replacing them with completely random values.¹⁶

$$\mathcal{F}_{\text{mod}}(\rho^{\text{ABE}}) = \chi^{UV\tilde{Z}\tilde{B}A} \otimes \mathbb{E}_m \sum_{\omega} |m\omega\rangle\langle m\omega| \otimes (\omega\rho^{\text{E}[\omega=1]} + \bar{\omega}\rho^{\text{E}[\omega=0]})\quad (13)$$

$$\rho^{\text{E}[\omega=1]} = \mathbb{E}_{bst}\rho_{bst}^{\text{E}}\theta_{st}\quad (14)$$

$$\rho^{\text{E}[\omega=0]} = \mathbb{E}_{bst}\rho_{bst}^{\text{E}}\overline{\theta_{st}}.\quad (15)$$

The states with label ‘ $[\omega = 1]$ ’ are sub-normalised; we have $\text{tr}\rho^{\text{E}[\omega=1]} = P_{\text{corr}}$ and $\mathbb{E}_u\text{tr}\rho_{u\tilde{b}\tilde{z}a}^{\text{E}[\omega=1]} = P_{\text{corr}}$, where we define P_{corr} as the probability that the number of errors can be corrected. In the factorised form of ρ it holds that

$$P_{\text{corr}}(n, \beta, \gamma) = \mathbb{E}_{st}\theta_{st} = \sum_{c=0}^{\lfloor n\beta \rfloor} \binom{n}{c} \gamma^c (1-\gamma)^{n-c}.\quad (16)$$

Similarly $\text{tr}\rho^{\text{E}[\omega=0]} = 1 - P_{\text{corr}}$ and $\mathbb{E}_v\text{tr}\rho_{v\tilde{b}\tilde{z}a}^{\text{E}[\omega=0]} = 1 - P_{\text{corr}}$.

Note that when m is uniform, the trace distance of the actual versus the ideal output state has an intuitive meaning as the distance of the keys/seeds from uniformity given Eve’s side information,

$$\left\|(\mathcal{E}_{\text{mod}} - \mathcal{F}_{\text{mod}})(\rho^{\text{ABE}})\right\|_1 = \left\|\rho^{UV\tilde{Z}\tilde{B}MA\Omega E} - \chi^{MUV\tilde{Z}\tilde{B}}\rho^{A\Omega E}\right\|_1\quad (17)$$

$$= 2d(MUV\tilde{Z}\tilde{B}|A\Omega E).\quad (18)$$

7 Security Proof

7.1 Attacker Model

The attacker model is the standard one in quantum cryptography. No information leaks from the labs of Alice or Bob, i.e. there are no side-channels. Eve fully controls the environment outside Alice and Bob’s labs. Eve has unbounded quantum memory and unbounded (quantum-)computational resources. Eve’s measurements are noiseless.

7.2 Forward secrecy

Equations (10) and (13) serve as the starting point for the security proof. Note that the expression (13) is also obtained if M is *not* traced away; consequently the analysis of known-plaintext and unknown-plaintext attacks turns out to be identical, just as was the case in [5].

An even stronger result holds: In (10) the M is entirely decoupled from Eve’s (classical and quantum) side information and from the next-round variables $UV\tilde{Z}\tilde{B}$. Hence our protocol has forward secrecy: a compromise of the updated keys has no impact on the secrecy of the message μ [16].

¹⁶ The distribution of m does not have to be uniform.

7.3 Main result: upper bound on the diamond norm

Theorem 7.1 *Let ρ^{ABE} have the factorised form $(\sigma^{\text{ABE}})^{\otimes n}$, with σ^{ABE} symmetrised by the random Pauli transform. Let ε be a smoothing parameter, and let $\bar{\rho}$ denote a smoothed state. Then*

$$\left\| \mathcal{E}_{\text{orig}} - \mathcal{F}_{\text{orig}} \right\|_{\diamond} < 2^{-\lambda+1} + (n+1)^{15} \left[\frac{1}{2\sqrt{|Q|}} + \min \left(P_{\text{corr}}, \varepsilon + \frac{1}{2} \text{tr}_E \sqrt{2^{n-\kappa} |\mathcal{B}|^n \text{tr}_{BS}(\bar{\rho}^{BSE})^2} \right) \right]. \quad (19)$$

The $\min\{\dots\}$ term is the same as in (3) with ℓ replaced by $n - \kappa$. This implies the asymptotic result (4) with ℓ replaced by $n - \kappa$. Asymptotically it holds that the error correction redundancy has size $n - (\ell + \kappa) \rightarrow nh(\gamma)$. This then yields an expression $\frac{1}{2} \sqrt{2^{\ell-n+nh(\{1-\frac{3}{2}\gamma, \frac{\gamma}{2}, \frac{\gamma}{2}, \frac{\gamma}{2}\})}}$. We conclude that the asymptotic rate (ℓ/n) equals $1 - h(\{1 - \frac{3}{2}\gamma, \frac{\gamma}{2}, \frac{\gamma}{2}, \frac{\gamma}{2}\})$, as mentioned in Section 2.4. The term $\frac{1}{2\sqrt{|Q|}}$ dictates that, in order to have α bits of security, we have to set $\log |Q| > 30 \log(n+1) - 2 + 2\alpha$. Hence in case of **Reject** the amount of expended key material is $n - 1 + 30 \log(n+1) + \lambda + 2\alpha$. Asymptotically this is $n[1 + \mathcal{O}(\frac{\log n}{n})]$.

Proof of Theorem 7.1: The term $2^{-\lambda+1}$ comes from the transition from $\mathcal{E}_{\text{orig}}$ to \mathcal{E}_{mod} . The factor $(n+1)^{15}$ comes from applying the postselection theorem (2). For bounding the trace norm $\|(\mathcal{E}_{\text{mod}} - \mathcal{F}_{\text{mod}})(\rho^{\text{ABE}})\|_1$, we start from (10),(13) and use the fact that the eigenvalue problem reduces to an individual eigenvalue problem for each value of the classical variables, orthogonal to the other values. We get

$$\|(\mathcal{E}_{\text{mod}} - \mathcal{F}_{\text{mod}})(\rho^{\text{ABE}})\|_1 = D_{\text{acc}} + D_{\text{rej}} \quad (20)$$

$$D_{\text{acc}} = \mathbb{E}_{um\tilde{z}\tilde{b}a} \left\| \rho_{ub\tilde{z}a}^{\text{E}[\omega=1]} - \rho^{\text{E}[\omega=1]} \right\|_1 \quad (21)$$

$$D_{\text{rej}} = \mathbb{E}_{vm\tilde{z}\tilde{b}a} \left\| \rho_{vb\tilde{z}a}^{\text{E}[\omega=0]} - \rho^{\text{E}[\omega=0]} \right\|_1. \quad (22)$$

First we provide two upper bounds on D_{acc} . The first one simply follows from the triangle inequality,

$$\mathbb{E}_u \left\| \rho_{ub\tilde{z}a}^{\text{E}[\omega=1]} - \rho^{\text{E}[\omega=1]} \right\|_1 \leq \mathbb{E}_u \left\| \rho_{ub\tilde{z}a}^{\text{E}[\omega=1]} \right\|_1 + \mathbb{E}_u \left\| \rho^{\text{E}[\omega=1]} \right\|_1 \quad (23)$$

$$= \mathbb{E}_u \text{tr} \rho_{ub\tilde{z}a}^{\text{E}[\omega=1]} + \text{tr} \rho^{\text{E}[\omega=1]} = 2P_{\text{corr}}. \quad (24)$$

The second bound on D_{acc} takes some more work. We introduce smoothing of ρ as in [15, 11, 17], allowing states $\bar{\rho}$ that are ε -close to ρ in the sense of trace distance. We have $D_{\text{acc}} \leq 2\varepsilon + \bar{D}_{\text{acc}}$, with $\bar{D}_{\text{acc}} = \mathbb{E}_{um\tilde{z}\tilde{b}a} \left\| \bar{\rho}_{ub\tilde{z}a}^{\text{E}[\omega=1]} - \bar{\rho}^{\text{E}[\omega=1]} \right\|_1$. We write

$$\bar{D}_{\text{acc}} = \mathbb{E}_{mu\tilde{z}\tilde{b}a} \text{tr} \sqrt{(\bar{\rho}_{ub\tilde{z}a}^{\text{E}[\omega=1]} - \bar{\rho}^{\text{E}[\omega=1]})^2} \quad (25)$$

$$\stackrel{\text{Jensen}}{\leq} \mathbb{E}_{m\tilde{z}\tilde{b}a} \text{tr} \sqrt{\mathbb{E}_u (\bar{\rho}_{ub\tilde{z}a}^{\text{E}[\omega=1]} - \bar{\rho}^{\text{E}[\omega=1]})^2} \quad (26)$$

$$= \mathbb{E}_{m\tilde{z}\tilde{b}a} \text{tr} \sqrt{\mathbb{E}_u (\bar{\rho}_{ub\tilde{z}a}^{\text{E}[\omega=1]})^2 - (\bar{\rho}^{\text{E}[\omega=1]})^2}. \quad (27)$$

In (26) we used Jensen's inequality for concave operators. In (27) we used $\mathbb{E}_u \bar{\rho}_{ub\tilde{z}a}^{\text{E}[\omega=1]} = \bar{\rho}^{\text{E}[\omega=1]}$. Next we evaluate the expression under the square root, making use of the properties of the pairwise

independent hash function F . Squaring (11) yields

$$\mathbb{E}_u(\rho_{u\tilde{b}\tilde{z}a}^{\text{E}[\omega=1]})^2 - (\rho^{\text{E}[\omega=1]})^2$$

$$= \mathbb{E}_{bb'ss'tt'} \bar{\rho}_{bst}^{\text{E}} \bar{\rho}_{b's't'}^{\text{E}} \theta_{st} \theta_{s't'} 2^{2n} |\mathcal{B}|^{2n} \mathbb{E}_{urr'} \delta_{\tilde{z} \| \tilde{b}, F_u[(s \oplus a) \| b \| r]} \delta_{\tilde{z} \| \tilde{b}, F_u[(s' \oplus a) \| b' \| r']} - (\rho^{\text{E}[\omega=1]})^2 \quad (28)$$

$$= \mathbb{E}_{bb'ss'tt'} \bar{\rho}_{bst}^{\text{E}} \bar{\rho}_{b's't'}^{\text{E}} \theta_{st} \theta_{s't'} \mathbb{E}_{rr'} [1 + (2^n |\mathcal{B}|^n - 1) \delta_{ss'} \delta_{bb'} \delta_{rr'}] - (\rho^{\text{E}[\omega=1]})^2 \quad (29)$$

$$= (2^n |\mathcal{B}|^n - 1) 2^{-\kappa} \mathbb{E}_{bb'ss'tt'} \delta_{bb'} \delta_{ss'} \bar{\rho}_{bst}^{\text{E}} \bar{\rho}_{b's't'}^{\text{E}} \theta_{st} \theta_{s't'} \quad (30)$$

$$< 2^{n-\kappa} |\mathcal{B}|^n \mathbb{E}_{bb'ss'tt'} \delta_{bb'} \delta_{ss'} \bar{\rho}_{bst}^{\text{E}} \bar{\rho}_{b's't'}^{\text{E}} \quad (31)$$

$$= 2^{n-\kappa} |\mathcal{B}|^n \mathbb{E}_{bb'ss'tt'} \delta_{bb'} \delta_{ss'} \bar{\rho}_{bst}^{\text{E}} \bar{\rho}_{b's't'}^{\text{E}} = 2^{n-\kappa} |\mathcal{B}|^n \text{tr}_{BS}(\bar{\rho}^{BSE})^2. \quad (32)$$

In (31) we used $\theta_{st} \leq 1$. We have obtained the bound $\bar{D}_{\text{acc}} < \sqrt{2^{n-\kappa} |\mathcal{B}|^n} \cdot \text{tr}_E \sqrt{\text{tr}_{BS}(\bar{\rho}^{BSE})^2}$. We derive a bound on D_{rej} using similar steps, but without the smoothing. Squaring (12) and taking the expectation \mathbb{E}_v we get

$$\mathbb{E}_v(\rho_{v\tilde{b}\tilde{z}a}^{\text{E}[\omega=0]})^2 - (\rho^{\text{E}[\omega=0]})^2$$

$$= \mathbb{E}_{bb'ss'tt'} \rho_{bst}^{\text{E}} \rho_{b's't'}^{\text{E}} \overline{\theta_{st}} \overline{\theta_{s't'}} \mathbb{E}_{qq'} |\mathcal{B}|^{2n} \mathbb{E}_v \left[\delta_{\tilde{b}, G_v(b \| q)} \delta_{\tilde{b}, G_v(b' \| q')} \right] - (\rho^{\text{E}[\omega=0]})^2 \quad (33)$$

$$= \mathbb{E}_{bb'ss'tt'} \rho_{bst}^{\text{E}} \rho_{b's't'}^{\text{E}} \overline{\theta_{st}} \overline{\theta_{s't'}} \mathbb{E}_{qq'} \left\{ 1 + (|\mathcal{B}|^n - 1) \delta_{bb'} \delta_{qq'} \right\} - (\rho^{\text{E}[\omega=0]})^2 \quad (34)$$

$$= \frac{|\mathcal{B}|^n - 1}{|\mathcal{Q}|} \mathbb{E}_{bb'ss'tt'} \delta_{bb'} \rho_{bst}^{\text{E}} \rho_{b's't'}^{\text{E}} \overline{\theta_{st}} \overline{\theta_{s't'}} \quad (35)$$

$$< \frac{|\mathcal{B}|^n}{|\mathcal{Q}|} \mathbb{E}_{bb'ss'tt'} \delta_{bb'} \rho_{bst}^{\text{E}} \rho_{b's't'}^{\text{E}} = \frac{|\mathcal{B}|^n}{|\mathcal{Q}|} \mathbb{E}_{bb'} \delta_{bb'} \rho_b^{\text{E}} \rho_{b'}^{\text{E}} = \frac{1}{|\mathcal{Q}|} (\rho^{\text{E}})^2. \quad (36)$$

In the last step we used the special property that ρ_b^{E} does not actually depend on b and thus equals ρ^{E} [5]. (This property holds for the factorised and Pauli-symmetrised form of ρ^{ABE} .) We have obtained a bound $D_{\text{rej}} < 1/\sqrt{|\mathcal{Q}|}$. \square

In the proof above the updated \tilde{k} does not appear explicitly. The security of \tilde{k} is guaranteed because (i) in the **Accept** case the update resides inside m , which is secure; (ii) in the **Reject** case the update is done from the reservoir.

Similarly, in the proof the MAC key ξ does not appear explicitly. The fact that m is secure implies that the tag τ remains confidential (τ is a part of m), and hence there is no leakage about the MAC key ξ that was used to create the tag.

8 Discussion

We have shown that the protocol in [5] can be modified in a way that *eliminates all classical communication from Alice to Bob, without increasing the number of qubits*. Essentially we have moved the classical OTP of [5] to the next QKR round. Furthermore the error correction and authentication are happening ‘inside’ the quantum state. The asymptotic communication rate is not affected and is equal to the rate of QKD with one-way postprocessing. Our protocol has forward secrecy.

The size of the keys shared by Alice and Bob is $n + n \log |\mathcal{B}| + \log |\mathcal{U}| + 2\lambda$, (namely $z \in \{0, 1\}^n$, $b \in \mathcal{B}^n$, $u \in \mathcal{U}$, $\xi \in \{0, 1\}^\lambda$, $k \in \{0, 1\}^\lambda$), with $\log |\mathcal{U}| = n + n \log |\mathcal{B}|$. The size of \mathcal{U} could be reduced to $\log |\mathcal{U}| \approx \kappa$ by using *almost-pairwise independent* hashes.

Another way of reducing the size of the initial key material is reducing the size of z by κ . In the encoding step we can choose to write c in systematic form. Then a part of c literally equals r , which is already uniform. Since there is no need to mask an already uniform string, the size of z and therefore the initial key material is reduced. Furthermore, the length of the seeds u, v is reduced by κ . The rate is unaffected by this modification.

It is possible to take the seed u from public randomness that is drawn in every QKR round. This would not affect the security, and it would reduce the amount of shared key material. However, it

would require either (a) a source of public randomness that is not known by Eve beforehand, e.g. a broadcast; or (b) communication of u from Alice to Bob or the other way round. The former involves nontrivial logistics, while the latter violates the aims of this paper.

In the **Accept** case the reservoir of shared key material remains untouched. In the **Reject** case the number of bits expended from the reservoir is $n + \mathcal{O}(\log n)$. Asymptotically, in the noiseless case ($n \rightarrow \ell + \kappa$, $\kappa \rightarrow 0$), this expenditure is very close to the optimum value ℓ [2]. (It is not possible to protect an ℓ -bit message information-theoretically with less than ℓ bits of key expenditure.)

We have not done anything about the classical feedback from Bob to Alice. It cannot be removed, because Alice needs to know if Bob correctly received her message. On the other hand, one can consider a scenario where Alice and Bob are both senders, in an alternating way. Then the feedback bit can be placed inside the next message, resulting in a fully quantum conversation.

There is one drawback to the protocol described in this paper. It is bad at dealing with erasures. As the actual message (as opposed to a random string) is encoded in the quantum state, absorption of qubits in the quantum channel has to be compensated in the error-correcting code. The effect of erasures on the rate is severe. A solution as proposed in [5] would imply that the message is no longer encoded directly in the qubits; instead Alice sends a random string to Bob, part of which survives the channel and gets used to derive an OTP. Such a solution does not satisfy the aims of this paper.

As a topic for future work we mention finite-size analysis, e.g. smoothing without taking the limit $n \rightarrow \infty$.

Acknowledgements

Part of this research was funded by NWO (CHIST-ERA project ID_IOT).

References

- [1] C.H. Bennett, G. Brassard, and S. Breidbart. Quantum Cryptography II: How to re-use a one-time pad safely even if $P=NP$. *Natural Computing*, 13:453–458, 2014. Original manuscript 1982.
- [2] I.B. Damgård, T.B. Pedersen, and L. Salvail. A quantum cipher with near optimal key-recycling. In *CRYPTO*, pages 494–510, 2005.
- [3] I.B. Damgård, T.B. Pedersen, and L. Salvail. How to re-use a one-time pad safely and almost optimally even if $P = NP$. *Natural Computing*, 13(4):469–486, 2014.
- [4] S. Fehr and L. Salvail. Quantum authentication and encryption with key recycling. In *Eurocrypt*, pages 311–338, 2017.
- [5] D. Leermakers and B. Škorić. Security proof for Quantum Key Recycling with noise. *Quantum Information & Computation*, 2019. <https://eprint.iacr.org/2018/264>.
- [6] H. Barnum, C. Crepeau, D. Gottesman, A. Smith, and A. Tapp. Authentication of quantum messages. In *The 43rd Annual IEEE Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science, 2002. Proceedings.*, pages 449–458, Nov 2002.
- [7] Christopher Portmann. Quantum authentication with key recycling. In Jean-Sébastien Coron and Jesper Buus Nielsen, editors, *Advances in Cryptology – EUROCRYPT 2017*, pages 339–368, Cham, 2017. Springer International Publishing.
- [8] D. Gottesman. Unccloneable encryption. *Quantum Information and Computation*, 3(6):581–602, 2003.
- [9] B. Škorić and M. de Vries. Quantum Key Recycling with eight-state encoding. (The Quantum One Time Pad is more interesting than we thought). *International Journal of Quantum Information*, 2017.

- [10] D. Leermakers and B. Škorić. Optimal attacks on qubit-based Quantum Key Recycling. *Quantum Information Processing*, 2018.
- [11] R. Renner and R. König. Universally composable privacy amplification against quantum adversaries. In *Theory of Cryptography*, volume 3378 of *LNCS*, pages 407–425, 2005.
- [12] M. Tomamichel and A. Leverrier. A largely self-contained and complete security proof for quantum key distribution. *Quantum*, 1:14, 07 2017.
- [13] M.N. Wegman and J.W. Carter. New hash functions and their use in authentication and set equality. *Journal of computer and system sciences*, 22:265–279, 1981.
- [14] M. Christandl, R. König, and R. Renner. Postselection technique for quantum channels with applications to quantum cryptography. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 102:020504, Jan 2009.
- [15] R. Renner. *Security of quantum key distribution*. PhD thesis, ETH Zürich, 2005.
- [16] W. Diffie, P. Van Oorschot, and M. Wiener. Authentication and authenticated key exchanges. *Designs, Codes and Cryptography*, 2(2):107–125, Jun 1992.
- [17] M. Tomamichel, C. Schaffner, A. Smith, and R. Renner. Leftover hashing against quantum side information. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 57(8):5524–5535, 2011.