

# Multiparty Quantum Key Agreement That is Secure Against Collusive Attacks

Hussein Abulkasim,<sup>1</sup> Atefeh Mashatan,<sup>1</sup> and Shohini Ghose<sup>2,3</sup>

<sup>1</sup>*Ted Rogers School of Information Technology Management, Ryerson University, Toronto, Canada,*

<sup>2</sup>*Department of Physics and Computer Science, Wilfrid Laurier University, Waterloo, Canada,*

<sup>3</sup>*Institute for Quantum Computing, University of Waterloo, Waterloo, Canada.*

Quantum key agreement enables remote users to fairly establish a secure shared key based on their private inputs. In the circular-type multiparty quantum key agreement protocol, two or more malicious participants can collude together to steal the private inputs of honest participants or to generate the final key alone. In this paper, we focus on a powerful collusive attack strategy in which two malicious participants in particular positions, can learn sensitive information or generate the final key alone without revealing their malicious behavior. Most of the proposed circular-type multiparty quantum key agreement protocols are not secure against this particular collusive attack strategy. As an example, we analyze the security of a recently proposed multiparty key agreement protocol to show the vulnerability of existing circular-type multiparty quantum key agreement protocols against this collusive attack. We then design a general secure multiparty key agreement model that would remove this vulnerability from such circular-type key agreement protocols and describe the necessary steps to implement this model. Our model is general and does not depend on the specific physical implementation of quantum key agreement.

(e-mail: [abulkasim@ryerson.ca](mailto:abulkasim@ryerson.ca))

## I. INTRODUCTION

The concept of key agreement was first presented by Diffie–Hellman in 1976 [1]. It describes how two remote users are able to fairly establish a secured shared key based on their private inputs. In 1982, Ingemarsson et al. [2] extended the two-party key agreement protocol to a multiparty or group key agreement protocol. After that, several multiparty key agreement protocols have been published [3]. However, future quantum computers with sufficient power will threaten most current cryptosystems whose security mainly relies on unproven mathematical assumptions. For that reason, quantum applications in cryptography have attracted the attention of a lot of scientists and researchers in order to develop information-theoretically unconditional secure cryptosystems. One of the most common quantum cryptographic applications is quantum key distribution (QKD) [4], in which remote parties can generate a shared random key securely even in the presence of an attacker with unlimited classical or

quantum computing power. Subsequently, several quantum cryptographic applications have been introduced to solve various classical security issues [5-14]. Recently, quantum key agreement (QKA) has attracted the attention of a lot of researchers [15]. QKA ensures fairness between the involved parties to generate a shared secure key based on their private inputs. Using the quantum teleportation protocol, Zhou et al. [15], in 2004, presented the first two-party QKA scheme.

In 2013, the two-party QKA was extended to multiparty QKA protocols [16]. Subsequently, several multiparty QKA protocols have been presented [17-20]. In general, as noted in [16], there are three types of MQKA protocols; 1) the first type is the tree-type in which every party sends their secret data through independent quantum channels to all other parties [21]; 2) the second type is the complete-graph-type in which every participant sends a sequence of qubits to each of the others parties to encode her or his secret information, 3)

while in the third type that is the circle-type (sometimes called traveling-mode) [6,22], every party generates a random sequence of qubits and sends this sequence to another party who applies an encoding process producing a new evolved sequence of qubits and sends the new sequence to the next party; this process continues over all parties until the evolved sequence reaches the party who generates the first sequence. Compared to the other QKA types, the circle-type is more efficient and more easily achieves the property of fairness. For that reason, the QKA circle-type has been intensively investigated.

In 2016, Liu et al. [16] pointed out that all existing circle-type multiparty quantum key agreement (CT-MQKA) protocols are vulnerable to collusive attack, and asked a challenging question about the possibility of designing a secure CT-MQKA protocol. In response to this question, several CT-MQKA protocols have been proposed to avoid a collusive attack. However, in this work, we show that most of the existing CT-MQKA protocols are also not secure against a collusive attack. We study, as an example, the security of Sun et al.'s MQKA protocol (named SCWZ protocol hereafter) to show the vulnerability of the existing CT-MQKA protocols to collusive attacks. Furthermore, we design a general secure model for CT-MQKA protocols and propose the necessary steps for this model.

## II. THE INSECURITY OF EXISTING CT-MQKA PROTOCOLS

In this section, we show that most of the recently published works in CT-MQKA are not secure against collusive attacks [17-19,23,24]. In general, there are two main collusive attack strategies, which could be applied to the CT-MQKA protocols:

### 1) The first collusive attack strategy

The first collusive attack strategy has been pointed out in [16,17]. Any two dishonest participants  $P_i$  and  $P_j$  (where  $i > j$ ;  $i, j \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$  and  $n$  is the number of participants) in particular positions in the circle-type protocols can control the final key if their particular positions meet the following two conditions:

$$i - j = \frac{n}{2} \quad \text{when } n \text{ is even,} \quad (1)$$

$$i - j = \frac{n+1}{2} \text{ or } \frac{n-1}{2} \quad \text{when } n \text{ is odd.} \quad (2)$$

### 2) The second collusive attack strategy

The second collusive attack strategy, as pointed out in our previous work [6], can be described as follows. In the CT-MQKA schemes, any two dishonest participants  $P_i$  and  $P_j$  can steal the private inputs of an honest participant  $P_k$  ( $i, j, k \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ ) without being detected, if their particular positions meet one of the two following conditions:

$$i - j = 2; \text{ then } k = i - 1; \quad (3)$$

$$j - i = 2; \text{ then } k = j - 1. \quad (4)$$

### A. Review of SCWZ's protocol

In SCWZ's protocol, there are  $n$  participants and each participant  $P_i$  ( $i = 1, 2, \dots, n$ ) has an  $m$ -bit key ( $K_i$ ). The participants want to generate a shared secret key  $K$  fairly, where  $K = K_1 \oplus K_2 \oplus \dots \oplus K_n$ . The steps of the SCWZ's protocol can be described as follows.

- 1) Preparation phase. The server generates  $n$  sequences of random single-photons. Each sequence  $S_i$  ( $i = 1, 2, \dots, n$ ) contains  $m$  single-photons and each photon is selected randomly from the four states  $\{|+\rangle, |-\rangle, |0\rangle, |1\rangle\}$ , where  $|\pm\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|0\rangle \pm |1\rangle)$ . The server also generates  $n$  sequences of random single photons (called  $C_i$ ), which are used as decoy photons to check the existence of eavesdroppers. Each single decoy photon is randomly selected from the states  $\{|+\rangle, |-\rangle, |+\rangle, |-\rangle\}$ , where  $|\pm\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|0\rangle \pm |1\rangle)$ . The server then randomly inserts and distributes the single-photons of  $C_i$  into  $S_i$  getting a new sequence  $S'_i$ , and sends the new sequence ( $S'_i$ ) to  $P_i$ .
- 2) Detection phase. Upon receiving  $S'_i$ , each participant sends an acknowledgment to the server. Then the server announces the positions of  $C_i$  and their measurement bases. Each  $P_i$  measures  $C_i$  based on the corresponding measurement bases and stores the results.  $P_i$  then randomly announces half of the measurement results of  $C_i$ ; the server, in turn, announces the initial states of the second half of  $C_i$ . Then both the server and  $P_i$  collaborate to compute the error rate. They end the protocol if the error rate higher than a

predefined value. Otherwise, they continue to finish the protocol.

- 3) After  $P_i$  gets the secure sequence  $S_i$ , each participant performs the next sub-steps:
  - A. Encoding phase.  $P_i$  encodes secret information ( $K_i$ ) onto  $S_i$  by applying the unitary operation  $U = |0\rangle\langle 1| - |1\rangle\langle 0|$  when the classical bit of the secret  $K_i$  is 1, and by applying the unitary operation  $I = |0\rangle\langle 0| + |1\rangle\langle 1|$  when the classical bit  $K_i$  is 0.  $P_i$  then reorders the decoy states prepared and inserted by the server in Step (1) and reinserts them in random positions into the encoded sequence obtaining a new sequence ( $S_i^{i+1}$ ), and sends  $S_i^{i+1}$  to  $P_{i+1}$ .
  - B. Eavesdropping check phase. Upon receiving  $S_i^{i+1}$ ,  $P_{i+1}$  and  $P_i$  check the security of the transmission by performing the same process indicated in step (2) between the server and  $P_i$ .
  - C. Encoding phase. After checking the security of transmission,  $P_{i+1}$  encodes secret information ( $K_{i+1}$ ) onto  $S_i$  following the same rules as in step (A).  $P_{i+1}$  then reorders the decoy states and reinserts them in random positions into the encoded sequence obtaining a new sequence ( $S_i^{i+2}$ ), and sends  $S_i^{i+2}$  to  $P_{i+2}$ .
  - D. Similarly, the rest of the participants ( $P_{i+2}, P_{i+3}, \dots, P_{i-2}$ ) perform the *Eavesdropping check phase* and the *Encoding phase* indicated in steps (B) and (C).
  - E. Upon receiving  $S_i^{i-2}$ ,  $P_{i-1}$  and  $P_{i-2}$  check the security of transmission. If the quantum channel between  $P_{i-1}$  and  $P_{i-2}$  is secure,  $P_{i-2}$  discards the decoy photons to get  $S_i$ , and informs the server of this fact.
- 4) When all the  $P_{i-1}$  receive  $S_i$ , they send an acknowledgment to the server, and the server announces the measurement bases of  $S_i$  to all the  $P_{i-1}$ . After that, each  $P_{i-1}$  uses the corresponding measurement bases to measure  $S_i$  obtaining  $K'_i$ , where  $K'_i =$

$K_i \oplus K_{i+1} \oplus \dots \oplus K_{i-2}$ . Finally,  $P_{i-1}$  can recover the final shared secret key  $K = K'_i \oplus K_{i-1}$ .

## B. The collusive attack against CT-MQKA protocols

In this section, we show that the SCWZ's protocol, as an example of CR-MQKA protocols, is insecure against a collusive attack. Although the authors have presented the security analysis to prove the security of their protocol against the first model of the collusive attack mentioned in Section 2, their protocol is not secure against the second security model of collusive attack. That is to say, any two dishonest participants  $P_i$  and  $P_j$  in particular positions meeting the conditions in (3) and (4) can easily steal the private key of the honest participants ( $P_k$ ).

Without loss of generality, assume we have three participants  $P_1, P_2$ , and  $P_3$  and they have three private keys, e.g.,  $K_1 = 1000$ ,  $K_2 = 0101$ , and  $K_3 = 1001$ , respectively. And the three participants intend to share a secret key ( $K$ ), here  $K = K_1 \oplus K_2 \oplus K_3 = 0100$ . We also assume that  $P_1$  and  $P_3$  are two dishonest participants and they need to steal the private key of the honest one ( $P_2$ ); hence they can deduce the final key without being caught. The server generates three random sequences, e.g.,  $S_1 = \{|+\rangle, |0\rangle, |1\rangle, |-\rangle\}$ ,  $S_2 = \{|0\rangle, |1\rangle, |0\rangle, |1\rangle\}$ , and  $S_3 = \{|0\rangle, |+\rangle, |-\rangle, |1\rangle\}$  each one consists of four single-photons. Also, the server generates three random sequences  $C_1, C_2$ , and  $C_3$  each one consists of four decoy single-photon states. Then the server randomly inserts the decoy state  $C_1 (C_2/C_3)$  into  $S_1 = \{|+\rangle, |0\rangle, |1\rangle, |-\rangle\}$  ( $S_2 = \{|0\rangle, |1\rangle, |0\rangle, |1\rangle\}/S_3 = \{|0\rangle, |+\rangle, |-\rangle, |1\rangle\}$ ) and sends it to  $P_1 (P_2/P_3)$ . After checking the security of the transmission, each participant discards the decoys and encodes their private information based on the encoding rule mentioned in Step 3.A. Subsequently, each participant sends the sequence in a circle to the other participants to encode their private inputs until the sequence is returned back to the participant.

For simplicity, we show here the circle of  $S_1$  (Fig. 1.a) which will be used by the participant  $P_1$  to get the final key ( $K$ ). First,  $P_1$  encodes a private input, i.e.,  $K_1 = 1000$  into  $S_1$  getting the new sequence

$S_1 = \{U|+\rangle, I|0\rangle, I|1\rangle, I|-\rangle\}$ . Then  $P_1$  inserts some decoy photons into  $S_1$  and sends it to the dishonest  $P_3$  instead of sending it to  $P_2$ . After checking the security of the transmission,  $P_3$  discards the decoy states and gets  $S_1 = \{U|+\rangle, I|0\rangle, I|1\rangle, I|-\rangle\}$ . In addition, the dishonest  $P_1$  generates a counterfeit sequence, e.g.,  $S'_1 = \{|0\rangle, |0\rangle, |-\rangle, |+\rangle\}$  with decoy states and sends it to both  $P_2$  and  $P_3$ . Obviously,  $P_2$  cannot distinguish between the genuine sequences and the counterfeit one. So,  $P_2$  encodes the private data, i.e.,  $K_2 = 0101$  into  $S'_1$  getting  $S'_1 = \{I|0\rangle, U|0\rangle, I|-\rangle, U|+\rangle\}$  and sends  $S'_1$  with decoy states to  $P_3$ . After checking the security of the transmission,  $P_3$  discards the decoy qubits and gets  $S'_1$ .  $P_3$  then requests the corresponding measurement bases of  $S'_1$  from  $P_1$  to get  $K_2 = 0101$ . Based on her or his private key, i.e.,  $K_3 = 1001$  and the private key of  $P_2$ ,  $P_3$  applies the corresponding unitary operations to the genuine sequence  $S_1 = \{U|+\rangle, I|0\rangle, I|1\rangle, I|-\rangle\}$  getting  $S_1 = \{U(I(U|+\rangle)), I(U(I|0\rangle)), I(I(I|1\rangle)), U(U(I|-\rangle))\}$  and sends it to  $P_1$ . Then the participants announce to the server that the quantum channels are secure. Finally, the server announces the measurement bases of  $S_1$  to  $P_1$  thus enabling  $P_1$  to get  $K$ .

Similarly, if  $P_2$  and  $P_3$  ( $P_2$  and  $P_1$ ) are the dishonest participants they can steal the private key of the honest participant  $P_1$  ( $P_3$ ) in the circle while sending  $S_2$  ( $S_3$ ), as shown in Fig. 1.b (Fig. 1.c). By applying the same attack strategy, most of the existing CR-MQKA protocols [17-19,23,24] are vulnerable to this collusive attack.

### III. THE PROPOSED SECURE CT-MQKA PROTOCOL

In this section, we give a general secure model of CT-MQKA against the collusive attack described above. Whereas our protocol can be implemented with photons, we describe it in more general terms here. The idea of adopting a semi-honest client-server model (or a third party) has been adopted in many previous QKA protocols to ensure the security of communication [17,20,25-27]. Suppose we have  $n$  participants who want to generate a shared secret key  $K$  fairly, where  $K = K_1 \oplus K_2 \oplus \dots \oplus K_n$  with length  $m$ . Every participant ( $P_i$ ) has a private classical key ( $K'_i$ ), where  $K'_i = K_i + n\ell$ . Here,  $\ell$  is

the number of decoy states used for checking the security of a quantum channel, and  $i = 1, 2, \dots, n$ .

The general steps of this secure CT-MQKA model can be described as follows:

Step (1): The server generates  $n$  sequences  $S_i$  ( $i=1, 2, \dots, n$ ), with each sequence containing  $m + n\ell$  single qubits. The server records the position of each single qubit. Every qubit is selected randomly from the four quantum states  $\{|+\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|0\rangle + |1\rangle), |-\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|0\rangle - |1\rangle), |0\rangle, |1\rangle\}$ . The server also generates  $n$  sequences of random single qubits (called  $C_i$ ), which are used as decoy states to check the existence of eavesdroppers. Every single decoy qubit is randomly selected from the four quantum states  $\{|+\rangle, |-\rangle, |0\rangle, |1\rangle\}$ . Then the server inserts  $C_i$  into  $S_i$  producing a new sequence  $S'_i$ , and sends the new sequence ( $S'_i$ ) to  $P_i$ .

Step (2): Upon receiving  $S'_i$ , every participant sends an acknowledgment to the server. Then the server announces the positions of  $C_i$  and their measurement bases. Every  $P_i$  measures  $C_i$  based on the corresponding measurement bases and stores the results.  $P_i$  then randomly announces half of the measurement results of  $C_i$ ; the server, in turn, announces the initial states of the second half of  $C_i$ . Then both the server and  $P_i$  collaborate to compute the error rate. They end the protocol if the error rate is higher than a predefined value. Otherwise,  $P_i$  discards  $C_i$  from  $S'_i$  getting  $S_i$  and continues to Step (3).

Step (3): After every  $P_i$  gets the secure sequence  $S_i$ , each  $P_i$  performs the next substeps:

- a) Encoding phase.  $P_i$  encodes the secret information ( $K'_i$ ) onto  $S_i$  by applying the unitary operation  $I = |0\rangle\langle 0| + |1\rangle\langle 1|$  when the classical bit  $K_i$  is 0, and by applying the unitary operation  $U = |0\rangle\langle 1| - |1\rangle\langle 0|$  if the classical bit  $K_i$  is 1 (see also Table 1).
- b) Detecting the external attack phase. For detecting external eavesdroppers,  $P_i$  generates a sequence of random single qubits ( $C_{pi}$ ), which are used as decoy qubits to check the existence of eavesdroppers in the quantum channel between  $P_i$  and  $P_{i+1}$  (note, the symbol  $+$  in “ $i + 1$ ” represents the additional mod  $n$ ). Every single decoy qubit is




FIG 1. An example of a three-party QKA protocol. Any two dishonest participants in particular positions can steal the private input of an honest participant.

randomly selected from the four quantum states  $\{|+\rangle, |-\rangle, |0\rangle, |1\rangle\}$ . Then  $P_i$  inserts  $C_{pi}$  into  $S_i$  producing a new sequence  $S_{i \rightarrow i+1}$ , and sends the new sequence ( $S_{i \rightarrow i+1}$ ) to  $P_{i+1}$ . As in *Step (2)*,  $P_i$  and  $P_{i+1}$  share the information of  $C_{pi}$  to measure it; then, they collaborate to compute the error rate.  $P_i$  and  $P_{i+1}$  end the protocol if the error rate is higher than a predefined value. Otherwise,  $P_{i+1}$  discards  $C_{pi}$  from  $S_{i \rightarrow i+1}$  obtaining  $S_i$  and continues to the next process.

- c) *Detecting the internal attack phase.* Upon confirming that the communication between  $P_i$  and  $P_{i+1}$  is secure against the external attackers, the server randomly selects  $\ell$  single-qubits as decoy qubits from  $S_{i \rightarrow i+1}$ , by announcing their positions, and asks  $P_i$  to publicly announce the unitary operations that were applied to the  $\ell$  qubits. Then, the server announces the measurement bases of the  $\ell$  qubits to  $P_{i+1}$ .  $P_{i+1}$  measures the  $\ell$  qubits using the corresponding measurement bases. Based on the measurement results, the measurement bases and the applied unitary operations,  $P_{i+1}$  can judge whether the  $\ell$  qubits are genuine or not. If not,  $P_{i+1}$  ends the protocol. Otherwise, the participants do the following: i)  $P_{i+1}$  discards the  $\ell$  qubits selected by the server, from  $S_{i \rightarrow i+1}$ ; ii) the server also discards the corresponding  $\ell$  qubits from  $S_i$ ; iii) every  $P_i$  discards the corresponding classical bits from their private keys  $K_i'$ .

- d) After discarding the  $\ell$  qubits and the corresponding classical bits,  $P_{i+1}$  encodes the secret information ( $K'_{i+1}$ ) onto  $S_i$  as in *Step (3.a)*, then inserts some random decoy states ( $C_{pi+1}$ ) into  $S_{i \rightarrow i+1}$  producing  $S_{i \rightarrow i+2}$ . Then,  $P_{i+1}$  sends  $S_{i \rightarrow i+2}$  to  $P_{i+2}$ .
- e) Upon receiving  $S_{i \rightarrow i+2}$ ,  $P_{i+1}$  and  $P_{i+2}$  collaborate to check the security of communication by performing the *Step (3.a – 3.d)*; then  $P_{i+2}$  encodes her or his information and sends the new sequences to the next participants. This process continues until  $P_i$  receives the secure quantum message ( $S_{i \rightarrow i-1}$ ) from  $P_{i-1}$ ; here, the symbol “ $-$ ” in “ $i - 1$ ” represents the subtraction mod  $n$ .

*Step (4):* When all  $P_i$ s receive  $S_{i \rightarrow i-1}$ , they discard the decoy qubits getting  $S_i$ . Hence, each participant loses  $n\ell$  classical bits from  $K_i'$  getting  $K_i$  with length  $m$ . After that, they send an acknowledgment to the server, and the server announces the measurement bases of  $S_i$  to all the  $P_i$ s. Subsequently, every  $P_i$  uses the corresponding measurement bases to measure  $S_i$  obtaining  $K$ , where  $K = K_1 \oplus K_2 \oplus \dots \oplus K_n$ .

#### IV. ILLUSTRATION OF THE PROPOSED PROTOCOL

For simplicity, suppose we have three participants  $P_1$ ,  $P_2$ , and  $P_3$  and they want to generate a shared secret key  $K = K_1 \oplus K_2 \oplus K_3$  with length  $m$  (e.g.,  $m = 3$ ). The three participants  $P_1$ ,  $P_2$ , and  $P_3$  have three private keys  $K'_1$ ,  $K'_2$ , and  $K'_3$ , respectively, with length  $m + n\ell$ , e.g.,  $m + n\ell = 3 + (3 * 3) = 12$ ; here  $n\ell$  is the number of decoy states for checking the security of all quantum channels in one complete

TABLE I. The encoding rules.

Unitary operations / quantum states	$ 0\rangle$	$ 1\rangle$	$ +\rangle$	$ -\rangle$
$0 \Rightarrow I$	$ 0\rangle$	$ 1\rangle$	$ +\rangle$	$ -\rangle$
$1 \Rightarrow U$	$- 1\rangle$	$ 0\rangle$	$ -\rangle$	$- +\rangle$

The unitary operation  $I$  represents 0 and the unitary operation  $U$  represents 1.

circle, and for the  $n$  circle it will be  $n * n\ell$ . Here, there are three complete circles for three participants, and the number of decoy qubits for checking the security of all quantum channels is  $n * n\ell = 9\ell$ . Also, we assume that,  $K'_1 = 000001101101$ ,  $K'_2 = 111011101000$ , and  $K'_3 = 110011010110$ .

The server generates a sequence of quantum states contains 12 random states (e.g.,  $S_1 = |0\rangle, |0\rangle, |0\rangle, |1\rangle |0\rangle, |0\rangle, |1\rangle |0\rangle, |1\rangle, |-\rangle, |+\rangle, |-\rangle$ ) for the first circle and sends it to  $P_1$ .  $P_1$  checks the security of the transmission with the server as in *Step (2)*. Based on her/his private data ( $K'_1$ ),  $P_1$  applies the unitary operations  $\{I, I, I, I, I, U, U, I, U, U, I, U\}$  to  $S_1$  getting

$S_{1 \rightarrow 2} = |0\rangle, |0\rangle, |0\rangle, |1\rangle |0\rangle, -|1\rangle, |0\rangle |0\rangle, |0\rangle, -|+\rangle, |+\rangle, -|+\rangle$ .  $P_1$  then inserts some decoy qubits into  $S_{1 \rightarrow 2}$  and sends it to  $P_2$ .  $P_2$  then performs *Step (3.b)* to detect the external attack. As in *Step (3.c)*, the server chooses random  $\ell$  states (e.g.,  $\ell = 1$ ) from  $S_1$  and announce the position of  $\ell$  (e.g., the position of last state in  $S_1$ ) to  $P_1$  and  $P_2$ . The server then asks  $P_1$  to announce the unitary operation that was applied to  $\ell$ , and asks  $P_2$  to announce the measurement result of the corresponding states in  $S_{1 \rightarrow 2}$  (i.e.,  $-|+\rangle$ ), respectively. Based on the announced information ( $|-\rangle, U, -|+\rangle$ ), the server can judge whether  $P_2$  has received genuine information or not. Then, the server and  $P_2$  discard the last sequence from  $S_1$  and  $S_{1 \rightarrow 2}$  getting new updated sequences  $S_1 = (|0\rangle, |0\rangle, |0\rangle, |1\rangle |0\rangle, |0\rangle, |1\rangle |0\rangle, |1\rangle, |-\rangle, |+\rangle)$  and  $S_{1 \rightarrow 2} = (|0\rangle, |0\rangle, |0\rangle, |1\rangle |0\rangle, -|1\rangle, |0\rangle |0\rangle, |0\rangle, -|+\rangle, |+\rangle)$ ,

respectively. Also, all participants update their private keys by discarding the corresponding classical bits. The updated private keys of  $P_1$ ,  $P_2$ , and  $P_3$  become  $K'_1 = 00000110110$ ,  $K'_2 = 11101110100$ , and  $K'_3 = 11001101011$ , respectively. They also consume two quantum states (e.g., the last two states) for checking the quantum channel between ( $P_2$  and  $P_3$ ) and ( $P_3$  and  $P_1$ ). The updated private keys after completing one circle are

as follows:  $K'_1 = 000001101$ ,  $K'_2 = 111011101$ , and  $K'_3 = 110011010$ . And the updated private keys after completing the three circles are as follows:  $K'_1 = 000$ ,  $K'_2 = 111$ , and  $K'_3 = 110$ . Now,  $|K| = |K_1| = |K_2| = |K_3| = |K'_1| = |K'_2| = |K'_3|$ . Finally, each participant can get the final key  $K = K_1 \oplus K_2 \oplus K_3 = 000 \oplus 111 \oplus 110 = 001$ . Note, for simplicity, we assumed that each time, the server chooses the last state for checking the security of communication; but the selected positions should be completely random.

## V. THE SECURITY ANALYSIS

This section presents detailed security analyses for both the external eavesdropping and internal attacks.

### A. External attack

In the proposed protocol, the decoy state technique is used to prevent external eavesdroppers from attacking the protocol. To achieve that, a sequence of single decoy qubits is randomly selected from the states  $\{|+\rangle, |-\rangle, |0\rangle, |1\rangle\}$  and then inserted in random positions into the secret message. The eavesdropper (Eve) cannot distinguish between the decoy-states and secret message states. Eve may try to entangle a secret message state with an auxiliary quantum state ( $|\epsilon\rangle$ ) by applying a unitary operation ( $U_\epsilon$ ) as follows:

$$U_\epsilon |0\rangle|\epsilon\rangle = \alpha_1 |0\rangle|\epsilon_{00}\rangle + \alpha_2 |1\rangle|\epsilon_{01}\rangle, \quad (5)$$

$$U_\epsilon |1\rangle|\epsilon\rangle = \alpha_1 |0\rangle|\epsilon_{00}\rangle + \alpha_2 |1\rangle|\epsilon_{01}\rangle, \quad (6)$$

$$U_\epsilon |+\rangle|\epsilon\rangle = \frac{1}{2} [|+\rangle(\alpha_1|\epsilon_{00}\rangle + \alpha_2|\epsilon_{01}\rangle + \alpha_3|\epsilon_{10}\rangle + \alpha_4|\epsilon_{11}\rangle) + |-\rangle(\alpha_1|\epsilon_{00}\rangle - \alpha_2|\epsilon_{01}\rangle + \alpha_3|\epsilon_{10}\rangle - \alpha_4|\epsilon_{11}\rangle)], \quad (7)$$

$$U_\epsilon |-\rangle|\epsilon\rangle = \frac{1}{2} [|+\rangle(\alpha_1|\epsilon_{00}\rangle + \alpha_2|\epsilon_{01}\rangle - \alpha_3|\epsilon_{10}\rangle - \alpha_4|\epsilon_{11}\rangle) + |-\rangle(\alpha_1|\epsilon_{00}\rangle - \alpha_2|\epsilon_{01}\rangle - \alpha_3|\epsilon_{10}\rangle + \alpha_4|\epsilon_{11}\rangle)]. \quad (8)$$

In (5) and (6),  $|\alpha_1|^2 + |\alpha_2|^2 = 1$  and  $|\alpha_3|^2 + |\alpha_4|^2 = 1$ . Also,  $|\epsilon_{00}\rangle, |\epsilon_{01}\rangle, |\epsilon_{10}\rangle$ , and  $|\epsilon_{11}\rangle$  are four ancilla states decided by Eve. To pass the external eavesdropping detection phase, Eve sets  $\alpha_2 = \alpha_3 = 0$ , if the targeted quantum state is  $|0\rangle$  or  $|1\rangle$ , and  $(\alpha_1|e_{00}\rangle - \alpha_2|e_{01}\rangle - \alpha_3|e_{10}\rangle + \alpha_4|e_{11}\rangle) =$

$(\alpha_1|e_{00}\rangle - \alpha_2|e_{01}\rangle + \alpha_3|e_{10}\rangle - \alpha_4|e_{11}\rangle) = 0$ , if the targeted quantum state is  $|+\rangle$  or  $|-\rangle$ . But these malicious procedures cannot help Eve to extract any useful information from the private inputs. For example, if Eve sets  $\alpha_2 = \alpha_3 = 0$ , she gets  $|\alpha_1|^2 = |\alpha_4|^2 = 1$ , which means that  $\alpha_1|\epsilon_{00}\rangle = \alpha_4|\epsilon_{11}\rangle$ . So, Eve cannot reveal private inputs. Besides, the proposed CT-MQKA protocol is not open to the Trojan horse attack since all information is sent in a one-way manner [28,29].

### B. Internal attack

In the QKA protocols, a collusive attack is the most powerful internal attack in which two or more dishonest participants collude together to extract sensitive information or generate the final key alone without revealing their malicious behavior. In this subsection, we show that the proposed model is immune to collusive attacks, such that any group of dishonest participants trying to perform a collusive attack (including the two attack strategies mentioned in section 2) will be detected immediately. Indeed, dishonest participants rely mainly on two important processes to successfully achieve the collusive attack; 1) sharing information about the carrier quantum states that will be used to encode the private data and generate the final key, 2) deceiving the honest participants to deduce their private data by sending forged data. Therefore, to prevent the collusive attack, dishonest participants should be prevented from conducting these two processes. In our protocol, a semi-honest server is used, as indicated in *Step (1)*, to generate the initial quantum states ( $S_i$ ) that will be used to encode the private inputs of the participants. The server shares ( $S_i$ ) with all participants after they receive the encoded data. In that case, all participants use the shared information to deduce the final key fairly. Also, the server checks the security of the quantum channel between every two participants and makes sure that the receiver has received genuine quantum states. Using these two processes, the protocol guarantees that the honest participant has received genuine data, and the dishonest participants cannot obtain useful information to generate the final key alone or steal the private inputs of honest participants.

## VI. CONCLUSION

In this work, we showed that most of the existing circular-type multiparty quantum key agreement protocols are insecure against a specific type of collusive attack. We analyzed the security of a recently proposed circular-type multiparty quantum key agreement protocol to demonstrate the vulnerability of such protocols. Then, we proposed a general secure quantum key agreement model to avoid the different types of collusive attacks. We showed that the proposed protocol could generate the final key correctly, and that the proposed protocol is secure against all known collusive attack strategies.

## REFERENCES

- [1] W. Diffie and M. Hellman, IEEE transactions on Information Theory **22**, 644 (1976).
- [2] I. Ingemarsson, D. Tang, and C. Wong, IEEE Transactions on Information theory **28**, 714 (1982).
- [3] J. Pieprzyk and C.-H. Li, IEE Proceedings-Computers and Digital Techniques **147**, 229 (2000).
- [4] C. BENNET and G. Brassard, in *Proc. of IEEE Int. Conf. on Comp., Syst. and Signal Proc., Bangalore, India, Dec. 10-12, 1984* (1984).
- [5] H. Abulkasim, A. Farouk, S. Hamad, A. Mashatan, and S. Ghose, Scientific reports **9**, 1 (2019).
- [6] H. Abulkasim, A. Farouk, H. Alsuqaih, W. Hamdan, S. Hamad, and S. Ghose, Quantum Information Processing **17**, 316 (2018).
- [7] W. Wu, Q. Cai, S. Wu, and H. Zhang, International Journal of Quantum Information **17**, 1950026 (2019).
- [8] R. Qi *et al.*, Light: Science & Applications **8**, 1 (2019).
- [9] L. Li and Z. Li, Information Sciences **521**, 343 (2020).
- [10] H. Abulkasim and A. Alotaibi, International Journal of Theoretical Physics **58**, 4235 (2019).
- [11] R.-h. Shi and M. Zhang, Scientific reports **9**, 1 (2019).
- [12] N. Bao and N. Y. Halpern, Physical Review A **95**, 062306 (2017).
- [13] A. Chowdhury *et al.*, Physical Review Letters **124**, 023601 (2020).
- [14] H. Abulkasim, H. N. Alsuqaih, W. F. Hamdan, S. Hamad, A. Farouk, A. Mashatan, and S. Ghose, IEEE Access **7**, 17917 (2019).
- [15] N. Zhou, G. Zeng, and J. Xiong, Electronics Letters **40**, 1149 (2004).
- [16] B. Liu, D. Xiao, H.-Y. Jia, and R.-Z. Liu, Quantum Information Processing **15**, 2113 (2016).
- [17] Z. Sun, R. Cheng, C. Wu, and C. Zhang, Scientific reports **9**, 1 (2019).
- [18] Z. Sun, C. Wu, S. Zheng, and C. Zhang, IEEE Access **7**, 102377 (2019).
- [19] H.-N. Liu, X.-Q. Liang, D.-H. Jiang, Y.-H. Zhang, and G.-B. Xu, International Journal of Theoretical Physics **58**, 1659 (2019).

- [20] W.-J. Liu, Z.-Y. Chen, S. Ji, H.-B. Wang, and J. Zhang, *International Journal of Theoretical Physics* **56**, 3164 (2017).
- [21] R.-H. Shi and H. Zhong, *Quantum information processing* **12**, 921 (2013).
- [22] L. Wang and W. Ma, *Quantum Information Processing* **16**, 130 (2017).
- [23] H.-N. Liu, X.-Q. Liang, D.-H. Jiang, G.-B. Xu, and W.-M. Zheng, *Quantum Information Processing* **18**, 242 (2019).
- [24] W. Huang, Q. Su, B. Liu, Y.-H. He, F. Fan, and B.-J. Xu, *Scientific reports* **7**, 1 (2017).
- [25] Y.-H. Zhou, J. Zhang, W.-M. Shi, Y.-G. Yang, and M.-F. Wang, *Modern Physics Letters B* **34**, 2050083 (2020).
- [26] H. Cao and W. Ma, *Quantum Information Processing* **17**, 219 (2018).
- [27] W.-c. Huang, Y.-k. Yang, D. Jiang, C.-h. Gao, and L.-j. Chen, *International Journal of Theoretical Physics* **58**, 4093 (2019).
- [28] X.-H. Li, F.-G. Deng, and H.-Y. Zhou, *Physical Review A* **74**, 054302 (2006).
- [29] F.-G. Deng, X.-H. Li, H.-Y. Zhou, and Z.-j. Zhang, *Physical Review A* **72**, 044302 (2005).