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Discrete-modulated continuous-variable quantum key distribution with homodyne detection is widely known for the simplicity on implementation, the efficiency in error correction and the compatibility with modern optical communication devices. However, recent work indicates that using homodyne detection will lead to poor tolerance of excess noise and insufficient transmission distance, hence seriously restricting the large-scale deployment of quantum secure communication networks. Here, we propose a homodyne detection protocol using the technique of quadrature phase keying. By limiting information leakage, our protocol enhances excess noise tolerance to a high level. Furthermore, we demonstrate that using homodyne detection performs better than heterodyne detection in quaternary-modulated continuous-variable quantum key distribution under the untrusted detector noise scenario. The security is analyzed by tight numerical method against collective attacks in the asymptotic regime. Results imply that our protocol possesses the ability to distribute keys in nearly intercity area. This progress will make our protocol the main force in constructing low-cost quantum secure communication networks.

I. INTRODUCTION

A growing body of achievements in quantum computing [1, 2] recently implies a quantum era is close at hand, which threatens modern secure communications. For instance, the most widely used public key cryptography, Rivest-Shamir-Adleman cryptosystem [3], whose security relies on the complexity of factorizing a large number, can be cracked by Shor algorithm [4] with quantum computers. Fortunately, one-time pad algorithm [5] can promise the information-theoretically secure communication provided that two remote users share a large amount of identical secret keys. Quantum key distribution (QKD) [6, 7] is the only solution that enables two distant users to share secure keys against the most general attacks [8–10].

Since the first protocol was proposed by Bennett and Brassard in 1984 [6], plenty of discrete-variable quantum key distribution (DV-QKD) protocols spring up based on various discrete degrees of freedom of a single photon, such as polarization [11–13] and time-bin [14–16]. Many attempts have been made to realize network deployment of DV-QKD [9, 10, 17, 18]. Compared with DV-QKD, continuous-variable quantum key distribution (CV-QKD) [8, 19] has competitive advantages of lower-cost implementations and higher secret key rates over metropolitan areas thus receiving wide attention.

CV-QKD encodes keys on the quadratures of the quantized electromagnetic field by preparing and measuring coherent states [20–22] or squeezed states [23]. In experimental aspects, CV-QKD based on Gaussian modulation has made remarkable achievements [24–35], such as the security against all detection loopholes [33], the integration of all optical components on chips [34] and the record-breaking distance up to 200 km [35]. Since Gaussian modulation which samples quadratures from Gaussian distribution possesses $U(n)$ symmetry, it has a relatively complete security analysis [36–40] based on the optimality of Gaussian attacks [41, 42]. However, modulating quadratures continuously is not feasible in experiments [43]. Practical implementations sample from a discrete and finite distribution of coherent states to approximate Gaussian distribution, resulting in an un-closed gap between the security analysis and the experimental implementation. Moreover, Gaussian modulation requires complex post-processing procedure, mainly due to low signal-to-noise ratio and complex data structure, which usually consumes huge amounts of computing resources [27, 44].

In comparison with Gaussian modulation, discrete modulation [45–49] can sample from a very small set of coherent states with different phases and thus can perform an easier error correction. The security proof of discrete modulation carefully takes the effect of discrete distribution of prepared states into account. Even though discrete modulation lacks of $U(n)$ symmetry, brilliant numerical methods [50–52] and analytical methods [53, 54] for security analysis are constantly emerging, and the security against collective attacks in the asymptotic regime has been proved. Recently, the security proof of a binary-modulated protocol has been proposed in the finite-key-size regime against general coherent attacks [55]. With the improvement of security and the simplification of implementations, discrete modulation becomes a trend of low-cost CV-QKD [9, 10].

Currently, for implementations of CV-QKD, homodyne detection is a relatively mature technology with advantages of simple structures, stable performance,
high efficiency and low noise, which makes it widely adopted [24–35]. However, the existing homodyne detection protocol for discrete modulation, specifically quaternary modulation [51], performs poorly in excess noise tolerance, which is far from practical demands.

In this work, we present a quaternary-modulated protocol with homodyne detection. Different from previous quaternary-modulated protocols [50, 51], we prepare each signal with the phase chosen from \( \{ \frac{\pi}{4}, \frac{3\pi}{4}, \frac{5\pi}{4}, \frac{7\pi}{4} \} \), which can be implemented by the classical quadrature phase shift keying (QPSK) technology. We require the sender to generate her raw keys according to quadrature choices of the receiver. By this interesting operation, our protocol shows good tolerance of excess noise and promises significantly longer transmission distances than the previous homodyne detection protocol [51]. Additionally, the secret key rate of our protocol is comparable to that of the well-performed heterodyne detection protocol [51]. Considering imperfections of detectors, our protocol even performs better than the heterodyne detection protocol.

We introduce our protocol in Section II, with an instruction of a possible experimental setup. In Section III, the formula of secret key rate is given against collective attacks in the asymptotic regime. In Section IV, we numerically simulate the performance of our protocol, which demonstrates the promotion in transmission distance and secret key rate. Further discussions are shown in Section V.

II. PROTOCOL DESCRIPTION

We illustrate our protocol in this section, with the preparing and mapping method in Fig. 1 and the experimental diagram in Fig. 2.

1) Preparation.— For each round, the sender Alice prepares one of four coherent states \( \{ |\alpha e^{i\frac{\pi}{4}}\rangle, |\alpha e^{i\frac{3\pi}{4}}\rangle, |\alpha e^{i\frac{5\pi}{4}}\rangle, |\alpha e^{i\frac{7\pi}{4}}\rangle \} \) with equal probabilities. She sends the prepared state to the receiver Bob.

2) Measurement.— After receiving the state, Bob selects a quadrature from \( \{ \hat{q}, \hat{p} \} \) with equal probabilities and performs corresponding homodyne detection to obtain the measurement outcome.

3) Announcement and parameter estimation.— After sufficient rounds of the above two steps, Alice and Bob communicate through an authenticated public channel. First, Bob announces his choice of quadratures for each round. Then, Alice and Bob randomly select a test subset from all rounds. For each round in the test subset, Alice discloses the state she sends and Bob discloses the outcome. According to the information they expose, they calculate the secret key rate under reverse reconciliation. If calculations show no secret keys can be generated, they abort the protocol. Otherwise, they proceed.

4) Raw key generation.— Alice and Bob can obtain their raw keys using the remaining undisclosed rounds. Assuming that \( M \) rounds remain, they number these rounds according to the order of sending. For \( k \)th round, Alice labels the corresponding state \( |\phi_k\rangle \in \{ |\alpha e^{i\frac{\pi}{4}}\rangle, |\alpha e^{i\frac{3\pi}{4}}\rangle, |\alpha e^{i\frac{5\pi}{4}}\rangle, |\alpha e^{i\frac{7\pi}{4}}\rangle \} \) as \( \alpha_k \in \{ 00, 10, 11, 01 \} \). Then the raw key bit \( x_k \) is equal to the first bit of the label \( \alpha_k \) when the round is measured in \( \hat{q} \), and equal to the second bit of \( \alpha_k \) when the round is measured in \( \hat{p} \). Thus she obtains her string \( X' = (x_1, ..., x_k, ..., x_M) \). For \( k \)th round, Bob maps the outcome greater than \( \Delta \) into the raw key bit \( z_k = 0 \) and the outcome smaller than \( -\Delta \) into \( z_k = 1 \). The outcome with other values is mapped into \( z_k = \bot \). He thus obtains his string \( Z' = (z_1, ..., z_k, ..., z_M) \). \( \Delta \) is a non-negative parameter and related to post-selection. A protocol without post-selection can set \( \Delta = 0 \). If \( \Delta > 0 \), Bob communicates with Alice about positions of bits with value \( \bot \) and they get rid of these positions from their strings. In the end, they obtain their raw key strings \( X \) and \( Z \).

5) Error correction and privacy amplification.— Alice and Bob choose suitable methods to conduct error correction and privacy amplification. Finally they generate secret keys.
posed in Fig. 2. Necessary components are displayed with unnecessary details omitted. Our schematic includes two parts, namely Alice and Bob.

To avoid security loopholes of local oscillator, we adopt LLO scheme with secure phase compensation [30–32]. Alice randomly [32] sends reference pulses and signal pulses. Signal pulses are modulated by QPSK technology and used for generating keys. Setting the phase of signal pulses before QPSK as the reference phase, Alice prepares reference pulses which are brighter than signal pulses and contributes nothing to generating keys. Through quantum channels, reference pulses and signal pulses are transmitted to Bob’s side. The polarization of any pulse received by Bob is corrected by electrical polarization controller. Bob generates LLO with phase randomly chosen from \( \{0, \pi/2\} \) using phase modulator, which will be sent to beam splitter together with signal pulses or reference pulses for interference. The photodetector with a subtractor reveals the interference outcomes, according to which Bob evaluates the exact phase difference between the reference phase and LLO. Then Bob uses this phase information to conduct phase compensation [32]. After that, Alice and Bob conduct post-processing described by steps (3)-(5) and we do not show this part in the figure.

### III. THE SECRET KEY RATE

To evaluate the secret key rate, we analyze the security of an equivalent entanglement-based protocol of our prepare-and-measure protocol. Then we calculate the secret key rate against collective attacks in the asymptotic regime by applying the numerical method [51, 52].

#### A. Entanglement-based protocol

An equivalent entanglement-based protocol of our prepare-and-measure protocol can be described below. Alice prepares an entangled state

\[
|\Phi\rangle_{AA'} = \sum_x \sqrt{p_x} |x\rangle_A |\phi_x\rangle_{A'},
\]

where the subscripts \( A \) and \( A' \) represent two entangled systems. \( x \) represents one of four labels in \( \{00, 10, 11, 01\} \). \( p_x = 0.25 \) means the probability for the entangled state to collapse into the state labeled by \( x \). \( \{|x\rangle\} \) is the set of orthogonal bases in system \( A \), which can be measured by a set of POVM \( \{M^x = |x\rangle\langle x|\} \). Four states in \( \{\phi_x\} \) are \( \{|ae^{i\pi/2}\rangle, |ae^{i\pi/4}\rangle, |ae^{i\pi/4}\rangle, |ae^{i\pi/2}\rangle\} \) respectively. \( A \) is kept by Alice and \( A' \) is sent to Bob via a quantum channel. Thus the final state is given by

\[
\rho_{AB} = (\hat{I}_A \otimes \mathcal{E}_{A' \rightarrow B})(|\Phi\rangle\langle \Phi|)_{AA'},
\]

where \( \mathcal{E}_{A' \rightarrow B} \) is a completely positive and trace-preserving mapping. This mapping includes the influence of the environment and attacks of Eve. Alice randomly projects the system \( A \) to an eigenstate by \( \{M^x\} \). Then she can write down the corresponding label \( x \) without additional operations. Bob measures the system \( B \) as with the step (2) in our prepare-and-measure protocol and follows the remaining steps.

#### B. Key rate formula

Applying reverse reconciliation means that Alice corrects her string \( X \) according to Bob’s string \( Z \), which implies that adversary Eve should derive Bob’s string unscrupulously. In the case that Eve performs collective attacks in the asymptotic regime, the secret key rate formula [51, 56] is given by

\[
R^\infty = p_{pass} \min_{\rho_{AB} \in \mathcal{S}} H(Z|E) - p_{pass} \delta_{EC},
\]

where \( p_{pass} \) is the sifting probability of preserving a raw key in the post-selection step to generate a raw key. The conditional von Neumann entropy \( H(Z|E) \) describes the uncertainty of the string \( Z \) in Eve’s view. Eve’s maximal knowledge of Bob’s string \( Z \) leads to the minimum uncertainty of \( Z \) under a certain density matrix \( \rho_{AB} \). To evaluate Eve’s maximal knowledge when \( \rho_{AB} \) is uncertain for Alice and Bob, we need to find the minimum conditional entropy \( H(Z|E) \) of all \( \rho_{AB} \) that conforms to constraints \( \mathcal{S} \). \( \delta_{EC} \) is the amount of information leakage of each round in error correction step. Considering the reconciliation efficiency, the leakage is

\[
\delta_{EC} = H(Z) - \beta I(X;Z) = (1 - \beta)H(Z) + \beta H(Z|X).
\]
where $H(Z)$ is the total information of $Z$ related to the probability distribution of Bob’s measurement outcomes. $I(X;Z)$ is the classical mutual information between two strings. $H(Z|X)$ is the conditional entropy describing the uncertainty of the string $Z$ conditioned on knowing the string $X$. The parameter $\beta$ represents the efficiency of error correction.

Since Bob announces the measurement quadrature of each round, they can analyze the security of each quadrature separately. We can rewrite the secret key rate formula as

$$R^\infty = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{y \in \{q,p\}} p_y^{\text{pass}} \left\{ \min_{\rho_{AB} \in S} H(Z_y|E) - \delta_y^{EC} \right\}, \quad (5)$$

The coefficient $\frac{1}{2}$ represents half of states are measured in $\hat{q}$ and half in $\hat{p}$. The secret key rate is composed of the secret key rate in $\hat{q}$ and the secret key rate in $\hat{p}$. Note that Eve manipulates the density matrix $\rho_{AB}$ before Bob measures it, thus she has no knowledge of Bob’s choice of quadrature at that time. We can move the summation sign into the minimization problem since $\rho_{AB}$ of different quadratures are shared.

According to Ref. [57, 58], the conditional entropy terms in formula (5) with their coefficients can be reformulated as

$$\frac{1}{2} \min_{\rho_{AB} \in S} \sum_{y \in \{q,p\}} D(G_y(\rho_{AB})||Z(G_y(\rho_{AB}))), \quad (6)$$

where $D(\rho||\sigma) = \text{Tr}(\rho \log_2 \rho) - \text{Tr}(\rho \log_2 \sigma)$ is the quantum relative entropy. $G_y$ describes the post-processing of different quadratures. $Z$ is a pinching quantum channel to read out the key information. The post-processing mapping $G_y(\rho) = K_y \rho K_y^\dagger$ corresponds to the measurement $\hat{y} \in \{\hat{q}, \hat{p}\}$ and is given by

$$K_y = \sum_{b=0}^1 |b\rangle_R \otimes I_A \otimes \sqrt{I_y^b}_B, \quad (7)$$

where $|b\rangle_R$ is the state of the key register $R$, which is determined by interval operators $\{I_y^b\}$. $I_y^b$ projects the system $B$ to one of two subspaces spanned by the eigenstates of operator $\hat{y}$ in terms of the mapping rule:

$$I_y^0 = \int_{-\Delta}^{\infty} dy |y\rangle \langle y|, \quad I_y^\delta = \int_{-\infty}^{-\Delta} dy |y\rangle \langle y|. \quad (8)$$

$Z(\rho) = \sum_{b=0}^1 Z_b \rho Z_b$ reads out the key from the mapping $G_y(\rho_{AB})$ with $Z_0 = |0\rangle\langle 0|_R \otimes I_{AB}$ and $Z_1 = |1\rangle\langle 1|_R \otimes I_{AB}$. Here, $G_y$ is in a simplified form introduced by Ref. [51]. Kraus operators $\{K_y\}$ describe the part of measurement and announcement: Alice’s operation is described by an identity matrix since Alice announces nothing and has no effect on the register $R$. Her measurement in entanglement-based protocol can be moved after the announcement and never influences $K_y$. Bob would announce the choice of quadratures. His measurement is represented by interval operators. When considering the security, we can discuss two quadratures separately, denoted by the parameter $y \in \{q,p\}$ in those formulas.

Finally, the key rate formula is

$$R^\infty = \frac{1}{2} \left\{ \min_{\rho_{AB} \in S} \sum_{y \in \{q,p\}} D(G_y(\rho_{AB})||Z(G_y(\rho_{AB}))) - \sum_{y \in \{q,p\}} p_y^{\text{pass}} \delta_y^{EC} \right\}. \quad (9)$$

C. Numerical method

To realize the calculation of secret key rates, a photon-number cutoff assumption [51] is adopted. Based on this assumption, we can describe operators and density matrices in photon number representation with finite dimensions $N_c$. Since $\delta_{EC}$ and $p_{\text{pass}}$ are only concerned with the information held by Alice and Bob, the term $\sum_{y \in \{q,p\}} p_y^{\text{pass}} \delta_y^{EC}$ in key rate formula (9) is easy to calculate according to general definitions [51]. We calculate the rest of the formula numerically. The rest is a mini-
mization problem that can be described by

$$\text{minimize} \sum_{y \in \{0,1\}} D(G_y(\rho_{AB}))\|Z[G_y(\rho_{AB})]$$

subject to

$$\text{Tr}[\rho_{AB}(|x\rangle_A \langle x| \otimes \hat{q})] = p_x(\hat{q})_x,$$
$$\text{Tr}[\rho_{AB}(|x\rangle_A \langle x| \otimes \hat{p})] = p_x(\hat{p})_x,$$
$$\text{Tr}[\rho_{AB}(|x\rangle_A \langle x| \otimes \hat{n})] = p_x(\hat{n})_x,$$
$$\text{Tr}[\rho_{AB}(|x\rangle_A \langle x| \otimes \hat{d})] = p_x(\hat{d})_x,$$
$$\text{Tr}_{B}[\rho_{AB}] = \sum_{i,j=0}^{3} \sqrt{p_i p_j} \langle \phi_j | \phi_i \rangle \langle i | j \rangle_A,$$
$$\text{Tr}[\rho_{AB}] = 1,$$
$$\rho_{AB} \geq 0.$$  

The variable is the density matrix $\rho_{AB}$ subject to constraints $S$ [51]. The first four constraints come from the experimental outcomes, where $x$ belongs to $\{0,10,11,01\}$ and $(\hat{q})_x, (\hat{p})_x, (\hat{n})_x, (\hat{d})_x$ are expectation values of operators when Bob measures states labeled by $x$. Homodyne detection directly outputs outcomes of operators $\hat{q}$ and $\hat{p}$, while $\hat{n} = \frac{1}{2}(\hat{q}^2 + \hat{p}^2 - 1)$ and $\hat{d} = \hat{q}^2 - \hat{p}^2$ correspond to the second moments of $\hat{q}$ and $\hat{p}$. Next constraint about partial trace of system $B$ comes from the requirement of the completely positive and trace-preserving mapping, which means that the channel quantum cannot influence the system $A$ of Alice. Last two constraints are natural requirements since $\rho_{AB}$ is a density matrix.

This minimization problem can be solved in many ways. We adopt one using a linearization method, given in Appendix A. Briefly speaking, the numerical method involves two steps. First, we approach the optimal value of the minimization problem (10) by at most $N_i$ iterations. Second, the dual problem of the minimization problem is considered to guarantee that the result is less than or equal to the optimal value.

**IV. PERFORMANCE**

Here, we investigate the performance of our protocol by numerical simulation. The method of simulation is mentioned in Appendix B, where we set the reconciliation efficiency $\beta = 0.95$.

To simulate the performance, we adopt the phase-invariant Gaussian channel model in the absence of Eve [51], which adds an effective excess noise on the input of the channel and transmits the input under the loss-only scenario. In this channel, the transmittance is $\eta = 10^{-\frac{aL}{10}}$ in the distance $L$ with $a = 0.2$ dB/km, and the effective excess noise is $\xi = \frac{(\Delta q_{\text{vac}})^2}{(\Delta q_{\text{obs}})^2} - 1$. $(\Delta q_{\text{vac}})^2$ is the effective variance of $\hat{q}$ quadrature for the input of the channel, including the influence of detection noises. $(\Delta q_{\text{vac}})^2 = 1/2$ is the variance of the vacuum state in $\hat{q}$ quadrature. Both variances are under the natural unit.

$m$ is the effective variance of $\hat{p}$ quadrature. Both variances are under the natural unit.

Since $\xi$ is normalized by $(\Delta q_{\text{vac}})^2$, the excess noise is under the shot-noise unit without vacuum noise.

We first emphasize the remarkable performance improvement of our protocol by comparing with the Protocol 1 in Ref. [51] that also prepares four kinds of coherent states and does homodyne detection without post-selection.

In Fig. 3, we investigate the excess noise tolerance at different distances. The excess noise tolerance is calculated by maximizing the excess noise $\xi$ that enables the protocol to generate keys. The cut-off photon number $N_r$ is truncated at 12 with $N_i = 100$ iterations in the first step of the numerical method. The excess noise tolerance of our protocol approximately doubles that of the Protocol 1.

In Fig. 4, we investigate the best secret key rates of our protocol for different excess noises by optimizing the amplitude $\alpha$ of signal states in the interval $[0.6, 1.1]$ with step of 0.01. We also calculate the best secret key rates of the Protocol 1 by optimizing the amplitude $\alpha$ of signal states in the interval $[0.35, 0.6]$ with step of 0.01. Different search ranges are used because the optimal range of $\alpha$ varies for different protocols. The cut-off photon number $N_r$ is 8 and the maximal iteration number of the first step in numerical method is $N_i = 300$. The solid lines show the performance of our protocol and the dashed lines show the performance of the Protocol 1. When the excess noise is experimentally feasible such as $\xi = 0.02$, our protocol enables to distribute keys for around 200 km with meaningful $10^{-6}$ bit secret keys per pulse. More-
over, when the Protocol 1 can hardly generate keys for \( \xi = 0.04 \), our protocol can still distribute secret keys over 50 km.

In Fig. 5, we show the improvement of transmission distance even happens for the small excess noise with \( N_c = 8 \) and \( N_l = 300 \). When the excess noise is sufficiently small but still possible, our protocol has potential to distribute secret keys over 350 km. The transmission distance and secret key rates are increased a lot, which makes our protocol applicable and useful in the quantum secure communication network.

We further compare our protocol with a well-performed quaternary-modulated heterodyne detection protocol named Protocol 2 in Ref. [51]. Due to differences in detection methods, the comparison is made under two scenarios: ideal detector scenario and untrusted detector noise scenario.

Under ideal detector scenario, both excess noise and loss are coming from the channel. We set the detection (electronic) noise of detectors \( \xi_{\text{det}} = 0 \) and the detection efficiency \( n_{\text{det}} = 1 \). In Fig. 6, our protocol and the Protocol 2 are simulated with parameters \( \xi = 0.04 \), \( N_c = 8 \) and \( N_l = 300 \). We search the best secret key rates of our protocol and the Protocol 2 by optimizing the amplitude \( \alpha \) of signal states in the interval \([0.6, 1.1]\) with step of 0.01. The protocol 2 can generate higher secret key rate compared with our protocol under ideal detector scenario, because the heterodyne detection can accumulate twice the amount of raw key data for the homodyne detection. We call the secret key rate of the Protocol 2 \( R_{\text{het}} \) and the secret key rate of our protocol \( R_{\text{our}} \). Then we use \( R_{\text{het}}/R_{\text{our}} - 1 \) to represent the proportion of the secret key rate difference \( R_{\text{het}} - R_{\text{our}} \) in \( R_{\text{our}} \), as shown by the dashed line in Fig. 6. The secret key rate of the Protocol 2 is no more than 10% higher than ours within 30 km. The uncertainty relation limits the accuracy of measuring both quadratures simultaneously and increases the bit error rate of the Protocol 2. Therefore, the improvement of the secret key rate by heterodyne detection are not obvious. We also shows the secret key rate of the Gaussian-modulated homodyne detection protocol in Fig. 6. The modulated variance in the Gaussian-modulated protocol is the parameter that has been optimized.

In Fig. 7, we regard the detector as a noisy and lossy device and Eve can control the imperfection of the device, which is a more practical condition. We should note that the heterodyne detector is usually composed of two homodyne detectors and one 50:50 beam splitter splitting signal pulses. Therefore, two points of imperfection are considered under untrusted detector noise scenario we used here. First, the detection noise of a homodyne detector is \( \xi_{\text{hom}} = 0.002 \) and the detection noise of a heterodyne detector is at least \( \xi_{\text{het}} = 2\xi_{\text{hom}} = 0.004 \). Second, the imperfection in the beam splitter usually
The upper line is the secret key rate of this work and the lower line is the secret key rate of the Protocol 2 with heterodyne detection [51]. The excess noise of our protocol is \( \xi = \xi_{\text{oth}} + \frac{\xi_{\text{hom}}}{\eta} \) and the excess noise of the heterodyne protocol is \( \xi = \xi_{\text{oth}} + \frac{2\xi_{\text{hom}}}{\eta \times 10^{-11}} \), where \( \xi_{\text{hom}} = 0.002 \) is the detection noise of one homodyne detector and \( \xi_{\text{oth}} = 0.01 \) is excess noise except detection noise. \( \eta = 10^{-6} \) is the transmittance with distance \( L \). We search the optimal amplitude for both protocols in range \([0.6, 1.1]\) with step of 0.01. For all points, \( \beta = 0.95 \) and \( \Delta = 0 \) are used. We plot this figure with \( N_c = 12 \) and \( N_i = 100 \).

causes an additional insertion loss about 0.7 dB. With setting other excess noise as \( \xi_{\text{oth}} = 0.01 \), the total excess noise of our protocol is \( \xi = \xi_{\text{oth}} + \frac{\xi_{\text{hom}}}{\eta} \) and the total excess noise of the Protocol 2 with heterodyne detection is \( \xi = \xi_{\text{oth}} + \frac{2\xi_{\text{hom}}}{\eta \times 10^{-11}} \). The cut-off photon number \( N_c \) is 12 with \( N_i = 100 \) iterations in the first step of the numerical method. Under this untrusted detector noise scenario, our protocol can perform better than the heterodyne detection protocol.

To give suggestions for experiments, we show the optimal amplitudes searched in different transmission distances with parameters \( N_c = 8 \) and \( N_i = 300 \). As shown in Fig. 8, under the circumstance of a long distance, the optimal amplitude decreases with the transmission distance increasing except some jitters, and a larger excess noise induces a lower optimal amplitude with little violation. The optimal amplitude for remote users is about 0.66. This conclusion also applies to the condition where \( N_c = 12 \) and \( N_i = 100 \).

The post-selection is a useful method to further improve the transmission distance and the secret key rate. In Fig. 9, we optimize the sifting parameter \( \Delta \) with the amplitude of signal states that has been optimized without post-selection. The cut-off photon number \( N_c \) is truncated at 12 with \( N_i = 100 \) iterations. The step of the available \( \Delta \) is 0.01. At distances where secret key rates are zero without post-selection, we search the best post-selection parameter \( \Delta \) by setting the amplitude to 0.66. This choice is reasonable considering that the optimal amplitude in the long distance is around 0.66 in average, as depicted in Fig. 8. The post-selection is more important for higher excess noise scenario. For \( \xi = 0.04 \), the secret key rates are improved, and the largest transmission distance is extended. For smaller excess noise \( \xi = 0.03 \), the improvement of post-selection is subtle. At a long distance, it shows no improvement of secret key rates for \( \xi = 0.03 \). This is due to the fact that with the increasing excess noise, the overlap of outcome distributions by measuring different kinds of signal states also increases, which causes higher bit error rates. The post-selection discards outcomes around zero since the overlap of outcome distributions most likely happens around zero. By post-selection, we discard many error bits, thus reducing the bit error rates. Protocols with heterodyne detection enjoy the same advantages of post-selection [59]. The optimal \( \Delta \) is larger under longer transmission distance. The sifting probability related to post-selection decreases to around 0.15 at the longest transmission distance for \( \xi = 0.04 \). The post-selection makes sense in our protocol. This operation can work well when the amplitude cannot be prepared optimally in experiment.

Note that curves in above figures should have been smooth in theory. Although the secret key rate formula is a convex function with convex domain \( \rho_{AB} \), the imprecision of \( \rho_{AB} \) is difficult to be unified under different amplitudes and transmittances. The calculation inaccuracy also accumulates along with steps of calculations, which results in some calculation noise. Finally, as a numerical method, limited by the calculation accuracy of computers and the stability of convex optimization algo-
FIG. 9. Performance of the optimal post-selection. \( \xi = 0.03 \) and \( \xi = 0.04 \) are considered. The top solid line in blue represents the performance of the post-selection \( (\Delta > 0) \) with \( \xi = 0.03 \), while the top dashed line in blue is the performance without post-selection. The lower solid line in red represents the performance of the post-selection \( \xi = 0.04 \), while the lower dashed line in red is the performance without post-selection \( (\Delta = 0) \). The amplitude for the point in dashed lines is optimized in range \([0.6, 1.1]\) with step of 0.01. The amplitude for the point in solid lines is the same with dashed lines under same distance and excess noise. For \( \xi = 0.04 \), at the distance where our protocol is unable to generate keys, we use the amplitude \( \alpha = 0.66 \) in post-selection. For all points, \( \beta = 0.95 \) and \( \Delta = 0 \) are used. We plot this figure with \( N_c = 12 \) and \( N_i = 100 \).

rithm, unstable points and unsmooth curves appear. The quality of the algorithm largely determines the secret key rates. When the ideal secret key rate is so small that it reaches the calculating accuracy limit of computer, numerical results sometimes show no keys can be generated. The calculation speed of the numerical method is usually slow with perhaps 20 min per set of parameters. The speed largely depends on the number of iterations and the truncated photon number. The improvement of the algorithm may help to further improve the transmission distance and stabilize the key rates.

V. DISCUSSION

Homodyne detection is the first adopted measurement method of CV-QKD with noticeable performance experimentally, which provides great tolerance of excess noise in Gaussian-modulated protocols. Our main goal is to inherit this mature technology and apply it in the discrete-modulated protocol. We propose a quaternary-modulated homodyne detection protocol with significant high excess noise tolerance and long transmission distance that has never been reached by previous discrete-modulated homodyne detection protocols \([51, 60, 61]\). There is a quaternary-modulated heterodyne detection protocol \([51]\) that shows high secret key rate and long transmission distance under large excess noise in simulation. However, the heterodyne detector \([62, 63]\) is more sophisticated in structure than the homodyne detector and introduces more noise and loss in experiments \([64–67]\). We show that our protocol can offer a comparable performance with this heterodyne detection protocol under ideal detector scenario. Our protocol can even perform better than this heterodyne detection protocol when taking the untrusted detector noise condition into account.

We figure out why the previous quaternary-modulated homodyne detection protocol \([51]\) cannot transmit in long distance although they also send four kinds of states. Especially, from a practical point of view, our protocol and the previous protocol all generate one bit per pulse by homodyne detection. Compared with Eq. (17) in Ref. \([51]\), the mapping \( K_p \) of our protocol in Eq. (7) is an identity matrix at Alice’s part, which means that Alice keeps silence in our protocol. This mathematical difference implies that additional announcements cause more information leakage.

In addition, adopting QPSK in preparation is necessary. Note that QPSK is a mature method in classical communication, shifting the phase of states by \( \{ \frac{\pi}{4}, \frac{3\pi}{4}, \frac{5\pi}{4}, \frac{7\pi}{4} \} \). In previous quaternary-modulated protocols \([50, 51]\), they use states with phases \( \{ 0, \frac{\pi}{4}, \pi, \frac{3\pi}{4} \} \). The probability distribution of a state in quadrature \( \hat{p} \) is symmetric about original point if the state has phase 0 or \( \pi \). Thus states with phase 0 or \( \pi \) cannot represent keys when Bob applies \( \hat{q} \) measurement. Similarly, states with \( \frac{\pi}{4} \) or \( \frac{3\pi}{4} \) cannot represent keys when Bob applies \( \hat{q} \). The additional \( \frac{\pi}{4} \) phase shift in our protocol offers chances to generate keys in both quadratures and Alice can thus announce nothing.

Eventually, due to the tolerance of excess noise, the transmission distance is improved, which removes the obstruction of the proceedings of large-scale discrete-modulated CV-QKD network. It is worth recalling that commercial instruments for QPSK have been updated to over 50 Gbps \([68]\), which implies that the speed of preparation in our protocol can be also promoted to 50 Gbps. Our protocol will make full use of the mature homodyne detection technology to achieve the long-distance key distribution. It is of great practical value for the network security and information security to experimentally demonstrate our protocol. Moreover, we can take the trusted detector noise model into account \([48]\). With simpler preparation, our protocol has a chance to exceed the transmission record 202.81 km set by Gaussian modulation protocol \([35]\) with an ultralow-loss fiber and small excess noise parameters. The experimental schematic and the search of optimal amplitudes in the text provide instructions for the experimental implementation.

Further studies of our protocol’s security are also desirable. Note that the photon-number cutoff assumption can be removed \([69]\) in the heterodyne detection protocol, which inspires us to present a more rigorous security anal-
ysis of our protocol in the future work. Moreover, we can put our efforts in finding a proper adjustment of security theory to deal with the finite-size effects. The security against coherent attacks is another interesting and important direction for discrete-modulated CV-QKD. The quantum de Finetti representation theorem \[70\] is a possible path to equalize the information leaked by coherent attacks and collective attacks.
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Appendix A: Numerical methods of calculating the key rates

The minimization problem in Eq. (10) is a convex optimal problem with one unique solution. It can be described as follows:

The independent variable is the density matrix \(\rho_{AB}\). The dimension number of Alice’s system is 4, which is determined by the number of different states she prepared. \(|x\rangle\langle x|\) \(x \in \{00, 10, 11, 01\}\) projects Alice’s system into a one-dimensional subspace, which means that Alice sends state \(|\phi_x\rangle \in \{|\alpha e^{-i\frac{\pi}{4}}\rangle, |\alpha e^{-i\frac{3\pi}{4}}\rangle, |\alpha e^{-i\frac{\pi}{4}}\rangle, |\alpha e^{-i\frac{3\pi}{4}}\rangle\}\) to Bob. The state Bob receives, however, is infinite-dimensional. The photon-number cutoff assumption is proposed to cut off the dimension of Bob’s system. According to the assumption, \(\rho_{AB}\) can be represented by a finite-dimensional matrix in Fock representation. Thus the numerical method can be applied. The operators \(\hat{q}, \hat{p}, \hat{n}, \hat{d}\) correspond to the measurement on Bob’s system. Considering the photon-number representation, they can be defined by the annihilation operator \(\hat{a}\):

\[
\begin{align*}
\hat{q} &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} (\hat{a} + \hat{a}^\dagger), \\
\hat{p} &= \frac{i}{\sqrt{2}} (\hat{a}^\dagger - \hat{a}), \\
\hat{n} &= \hat{a}^\dagger \hat{a} = \hat{a}^2 - 1, \\
\hat{d} &= \hat{a}^2 + (\hat{a})^2.
\end{align*}
\]

To calculate them numerically, the matrix of \(\hat{a}\) in photon-number representation is also cut off according to the photon-number cutoff assumption. We introduce notations \(|\hat{q}_x\rangle, |\hat{p}_x\rangle, |\hat{n}_x\rangle, |\hat{d}_x\rangle\) to represent the expectation values of these operators. The relative entropy \(D(\rho || \sigma)\) is the dependent variable we need to minimize. \(G(\rho) = K_{\rho}K^\dagger\) is the map in post-processing with Kraus operator \(K\).

To implement the convex optimization, a two-step numerical method is introduced \[58\] below. To be convenient, we use \(f(\rho)\) to represent the function \(D(G(\rho)||Z[G(\rho)]\). The constraints can be described by a set \(S\):

\[
S = \{\rho \in \mathcal{H}_+ | \text{Tr}(\Gamma_i \rho) = \gamma_i, \forall i\},
\]

where \(\mathcal{H}_+\) is the set of positive semidefinite operators. \(\Gamma_i\) is the Hermitian operator and \(\gamma_i\) is the corresponding expectation value. To fit this form, one should rewrite the fifth constraint in Eq. (10). Specifically one need transform partial trace on Bob into some Hermitian operators.

Through the linearization method, we can get

\[
f(\rho^*) \geq f(\rho) + \min_{\rho^* + \Delta \rho \in S} \left[ \text{Tr}((\Delta \rho)^T \nabla f(\rho)) \right] - \zeta,
\]

\[
= f(\rho) - \text{Tr}(\rho^T \nabla f(\rho)) + \min_{\sigma \in S} \left[ \text{Tr}(\sigma \nabla f(\rho)) \right] - \zeta,
\]

where \(\rho^*\) is the optimal density matrix, i.e. the solution of minimization problem Eq. (10). \(\epsilon\) represents a perturbation parameter, by which the gradient of \(f(\rho)\) can exist. Due to the existence of \(\epsilon\), the term \(\zeta = 2\epsilon(d - 1) \log_2 \frac{d}{d-1}\) is applied to correct the difference between \(f(\rho)\) and \(f(\rho)\) caused by perturbation. In our simulation, we set \(\epsilon = 10^{-12}\) to decrease the value of \(\zeta\). With \(\epsilon\), the dependent variable becomes

\[
f(\rho) = D(G(\rho)||Z[G(\rho)]).
\]

The gradient of \(f(\rho)\) is

\[
[\nabla f(\rho)]^T = G(\log_2 G(\rho)) - G(\log_2 Z[G(\rho)]),
\]

in which

\[
G(\rho) = (1 - \epsilon)G(\rho) + \epsilon I/d',
\]

\[
Z[G(\rho)] = (1 - \epsilon)Z[G(\rho)] + \epsilon I/d'.
\]

\(d'\) is the dimension of the matrix \(G(\rho)\), which is twice the dimension of density matrix \(\rho\).

Through the linearization showed in Eq. (A3), the optimization problem is transformed into a semi-definite program, such as the second term of the first line or the third term of the second line in Eq. (A3). Therefore, we only need to find \(\Delta \rho\) or \(\sigma = \rho + \Delta \rho\) that minimizes the related term. We take \(\Delta \rho\) as an example, the first step is to find a density matrix \(\rho\) that is very close to the optimal one. To accomplish this step, we perform algorithm as follows:

1. Begin with any \(\rho_0 \in S\) and set \(i = 0\).
2. Compute \(\text{min}_{\rho + \Delta \rho \in S} \left[ \text{Tr}((\Delta \rho)^T \nabla f(\rho)) \right]\).
3. If \(\text{Tr}((\Delta \rho)^T \nabla f(\rho_i))\) is sufficiently small, STOP.
4. Find \(\lambda \in (0, 1)\) that minimizes \(f(\rho_i + \lambda \Delta \rho)\).
5. Set \(\rho_{i+1} = \rho_i + \lambda \Delta \rho, i \leftarrow i + 1\) and go to 2.

The iteration of 2-5 sometimes needs to be broken manually otherwise it may take too much time to converge.
or even never stops. The largest iteration number in our simulation is 300 or 100. After 300 or 100 iterations we choose $\rho_i$ with the smallest $\text{Tr}((\Delta \rho)^T \nabla f_\epsilon (\rho_i))$ among all iterations as our result of the first step.

The reference [58] does not offer any method to deal with the minimization of $f_\epsilon (\rho_i + \lambda \Delta \rho)$, since its DV-QKD example is simple for calculation. However, it is not an easy task for CV-QKD. We provide our own method inspired by BinarySearch:

1. Set a starting point $\lambda = 0$, an ending point $\lambda_e = 1$ and a middle point $\lambda_m = 0.5$.
2. Calculate $f_\epsilon (\rho_i + \lambda \Delta \rho)$ in three points and compare them.
3. If $\lambda$ is the smallest one, update the ending point by $\lambda_e = \lambda_m$ and the middle point by $\lambda_m = 0.5(\lambda_s + \lambda_e)$. Then go to 2.
4. If $\lambda_s$ is the smallest one, update the starting point by $\lambda_s = \lambda_m$ and the middle point by $\lambda_m = 0.5(\lambda_s + \lambda_e)$. Then go to 2.
5. If $\lambda_m$ is the smallest one, two temporary points are generated by $\lambda_1 = 0.5(\lambda_s + \lambda_m)$ and $\lambda_2 = 0.5(\lambda_m + \lambda_e)$. Calculate $f_\epsilon (\rho_i + \lambda_1 \Delta \rho)$ and $f_\epsilon (\rho_i + \lambda_2 \Delta \rho)$ of two temporary points and compare them with $\lambda_m$.
6. Calculate $f_\epsilon (\rho_i + \lambda \Delta \rho)$ of two temporary points and compare them with $\lambda_m$.
7. If $\lambda_m$ is still the smallest one, set $\lambda_s = \lambda_1$ and $\lambda_e = \lambda_2$ and go to 2.
8. If $\lambda_1$ is the smallest one, set $\lambda_s = \lambda_m$ and $\lambda_m = \lambda_1$ and go to 2.
9. If $\lambda_2$ is the smallest one, set $\lambda_s = \lambda_m$ and $\lambda_m = \lambda_2$ and go to 2.

Calculation results of some points can be temporarily stored for next iteration. The termination of the iteration is decided by the calculation accuracy of computers.

After the first step, we seemingly find an appropriate density matrix $\rho$. However, considering the imprecision of numerical calculations, we can not guarantee the solution of the first step is the optimal one. In fact, we find an upper bound of the solution. To protect the security of the generated keys, we use the dual problem in the second step.

One can transform the primal problem $\min_{\sigma \in \mathbb{S}} \{\text{Tr}(\sigma \nabla ) \} \leq \nabla f_\epsilon (\rho)\}$ into the dual problem $\max_{\bar{y} \in \mathbb{S}^*} \{\bar{y} \cdot \tilde{y}\}$. The variable $\tilde{y}$ obeys the constraints:

$$\mathbb{S}^*(\rho) = \{\tilde{y} \in \mathbb{R}^n | \sum_i y_i \Gamma_i \leq \nabla f_\epsilon (\rho)\}. \quad (A7)$$

In general, primal and dual problems satisfy the weak duality. The weak duality emphasizes the optimal value of the dual problem is always less than or equal to the optimal value of the primal problem. According to this principle, the final solution we obtain from the dual problem must be a lower bound of the primal problem even if it is not optimal. The lower bound of the primal problem is also the lower bound of the secret key rates according to Eq. (A3).

Additionally, we can consider the imprecision of the floating-point representations of $\{\Gamma_i\}$ and $\{\gamma_i\}$ where $\{\tilde{\Gamma}_i\}$ and $\{\tilde{\gamma}_i\}$ are the approximate representations used in calculation. Furthermore, the solution $\rho$ may not satisfy the constraints, especially the positive semi-definite constraint. Ref. [58] encourages one to transform $\rho$ into positive semi-definite matrix $\rho'$ by subtracting a term $\lambda^\alpha$ when the smallest eigenvalue $\lambda^\alpha$ of $\rho$ is negative. Then we restrict the imprecision by

$$|\text{Tr}(\tilde{\Gamma}_i \rho') - \tilde{\gamma}_i| \leq \epsilon_\text{sol}. \quad (A9)$$

After the first step, we extract the quantity $\epsilon' = \max(\epsilon_\text{rep}, \epsilon_\text{sol})$ from the output $\rho$. This quantity influences the second step. The dual problem solved in second step is adjusted to

$$\max_{\langle \tilde{y}, \tilde{z} \rangle \in \mathbb{S}^*(\rho)} \left\{ \tilde{\gamma}_i \cdot \tilde{y} - \epsilon' \sum_i z_i \right\}, \quad (A10)$$

where

$$\mathbb{S}^*(\rho) := \{ (\tilde{y}, \tilde{z}) \in (\mathbb{R}^n, \mathbb{R}^n) | -\tilde{z} \leq \tilde{y} \leq \tilde{z}, \sum_i y_i \Gamma_i \leq \nabla f_\epsilon (\rho)\}. \quad (A11)$$

The description above is about one quadrature. Since $f_\epsilon (\rho)$ for $\hat{q}$ and $f_\epsilon (\rho)$ for $\hat{p}$ are added linearly, we can replace $f_\epsilon (\rho)$ by $f_{q,\epsilon} (\rho) + f_{p,\epsilon} (\rho)$. Then $\nabla f_\epsilon (\rho)$ in primal and dual problems is replaced by $\nabla f_{q,\epsilon} (\rho) + \nabla f_{p,\epsilon} (\rho)$. Additionally, the perturbation compensation $y^\alpha$ is multiplied by 2.

So far, the lower bound of the minimization problem is solved numerically. We solve primal and dual problems by the SDP3 solver in CVX 1.22 package on MATLAB R2020b. This package is for specifying and solving convex programs and SDPT3 is a free solver [71, 72].

Appendix B: Methods of simulation

We simulate the experiment statistical results by supposing a phase-invariant Gaussian channel, as referred in Ref. [51]. When Alice sends a coherent state $|\alpha\rangle$, Bob obtains a displaced thermal state centered at $\sqrt{\eta} \alpha$ with the variance $\frac{1}{2} + \frac{\eta^2}{2}$ for each quadrature. The first term $\frac{1}{2}$ in the variance is the vacuum noise. Thus $\rho_B$ can be given by

$$\rho_B = \frac{1}{\pi V_A} \int e^{-|\beta - \sqrt{\eta} \alpha|^2 / V_A} |\beta|^2 |\beta|^2 \beta, \quad (B1)$$

with $\alpha_x \in \{\alpha e^{i\phi}, \alpha e^{i\phi}, \alpha e^{i\phi}, \alpha e^{i\phi}\}$ and $V_A = \frac{\eta^2}{2}$. $\xi$ is the excess noise and $\eta = 10^{-\frac{a}{2}}$ is the transmittance with $a = 0.2$ dB/km in the distance $L$. Thus the expectation values of measurement operators
are
\begin{align}
\langle \hat{q} \rangle_x &= \sqrt{2\eta} \text{Re}(\alpha_x), \\
\langle \hat{p} \rangle_x &= \sqrt{2\eta} \text{Im}(\alpha_x), \\
\langle \hat{n} \rangle_x &= \eta|\alpha_x|^2 + \frac{\eta\xi}{2}, \\
\langle \hat{d} \rangle_x &= \eta[(\alpha_x)^2 + (\alpha_x^*)^2].
\end{align} \tag{B2}

In order to simulate the error-correction, the conditional probability between Alice’s sending state and Bob’s mapping result can be given by:

\begin{align}
P(q|x) &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{\pi(\eta^2+1)}} e^{-(q-\sqrt{2\eta}\text{Re}(\alpha_x))^2/(\eta\xi+1)}, \tag{B3}
\end{align}

for measuring \(\hat{q}\), and

\begin{align}
P(p|x) &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{\pi(\eta^2+1)}} e^{-(q-\sqrt{2\eta}\text{Im}(\alpha_x))^2/(\eta\xi+1)}, \tag{B4}
\end{align}

for measuring \(\hat{p}\). According to the bit mapping of Bob, the probability distribution of the bit is

\begin{align}
P_y(0|x) &= \int_{-\Delta}^{\Delta} P(y|x)dy, \\
P_y(1|x) &= \int_{-\Delta}^{\Delta} P(y|x)dy, \tag{B5}
\end{align}

where \(y \in \{q, p\}\). Then we can find the sifting probability

\begin{align}
p_{\text{pass}}^y = \sum_x p_x (P_y(0|x) + P_y(1|x)), \tag{B6}
\end{align}

and normalize the probability distribution after discarding bits \(\perp\). The conditional entropy for each quadrature is thus calculated by

\begin{align}
H(Z_y|X_y) &= -\sum_x p_x \sum_{z \in \{0,1\}} \frac{P_y(z|x)}{p_{\text{pass}}^y} \log_2 \frac{P_y(z|x)}{p_{\text{pass}}^y}. \tag{B7}
\end{align}

Utilizing the equations above, the experimental results required for calculating the key rates can be simulated.
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