

# Measurement-Device-Independenization of Quantum Key Distribution Protocols

Hao Shu\*

*Department of Mathematics, South China University of Technology, Guangzhou, 510641, P. R. China*

Quantum key distribution(QKD) allows the legitimated partner to establish a secret key whose security only depends on physical laws. Recent years, researches on QKD by employing insecure measurement devices, namely measurement-device-independent QKD (MDI-QKD) are increased. MDI-QKD removes all attacks on measurement devices and thus an untrusted third party can be employed for measuring. However, a weakness of previous MDI-QKD protocols is the need of joint measurements such as Bell measurements whose efficiency is low in practise. On the other hand, can all QKD protocols become measurement-device-independent remains a problem. In this paper, we present a scheme, called '*measurement – device – independerization*', making prepare-measure QKD protocols become MDI-QKD protocols, which needs not to employ joint measurements and could be efficiently implemented by weak coherence sources. The protocol might look like the detector-device-independent(DDI) protocols but it is also secure under the Trojan horse attack. To illustrate this, we investigate the photon-number-adding(PNA) attack and present a scheme, called '*photon – number – purification*', which can also be employed to close loopholes for previous protocols such as DDI and plug-and-play ones.

**Keywords:** Quantum key distribution; Measure-device-independent; Qubit; Photon number adding; Photon number purification.

## I. INTRODUCTION

Quantum key distribution(QKD) could be the most significant application in quantum information theory, which allows the legitimated partner to share an one-time pad with the security only depends on physical laws. In nearly four decades, substantial QKD protocols are proposed[1–13]. Traditional security analyses of QKD protocols focus on attacks on channels. However, the devices of the legitimated partner may also be insecure. To solve this problem, researches on device-independent quantum key distribution(DI-QKD)[2, 14–19] become interesting. Despitensess, completed DI-QKD usually results in impractical requirements. To balance the security and the practise, measurement-device-independent quantum key distribution(MDI-QKD) appears. The first MDI-QKD protocol[20] was published in 2012, followed by several relative works[21–26]. In 2018, the idea of twin-field QKD[27] was proposed, which might overcome traditional limitations of distance[28, 29]. Inspired by it, other QKD protocols appeared[30, 31].


A weakness of all such MDI-QKD protocols is the need of joint measurements such as Bell measurements which are lowly efficient in practise, while a completed Bell measurement can not be provided by linear

optics[32]. Recently, a MDI-QKD scheme without joint measurements was presented[33] by employing order-rearrangement technology. However, it is insecure unless supplied by other technologies, for example, teleportations (which also result in the need of Bell measurements) as the author suggested. Therefore, in our knowledge, no previous MDI-QKD protocols can avoid joint measurements securely. And on the other hand, can all QKD protocols become measurement-device-independent ones remains a problem.

In this paper, we present a scheme without employing joint measurements, making a prepare-measure QKD protocol measurement-device-independent, which would be called '*measurement – device – independerization*' of QKD protocols, see Figure 1. The protocol might look like the detector-devices-independent(DDI) QKD protocols which are insecure under Trojan horse attacks[34–38]. However, after applying a new scheme, our protocol can immune Trojan horse attack in DDI protocols. To illustrate this, we investigate the photon-number-adding(PNA) attack which is exactly Trojan horse attack when applying to DDI protocols and provide a solution called photon-number-purification(PNP) scheme. The scheme can also close loopholes in previous protocols, such as the DDI protocol, the protocol in [33], and the plug-and-play protocol[39, 40]. Finally, we provide a protocol under practical assumptions.

---

\* *Hao.B.Shu@163.com*



**Figure 1: Flow chart of the scheme**

## II. FOR BB84 TYPE PROTOCOL UNDER IDEAL ASSUMPTIONS

Let us investigate prepare-measure QKD protocols of BB84 type with assumptions that the legitimated partner, Alice and Bob, employs perfect devices except ones for measuring, for simplicity.

The protocol is described as follow.

### BB84 type Protocol:

**Step 1 (Alice's turn):** Alice prepares a state for each bit randomly in one of the four states  $|0\rangle, |1\rangle, |+\rangle, |-\rangle$  and sends it to Bob. Alice and Bob agree that the legitimated bit is 0 if Bob encodes the state by Pauli operator  $Z$  or Hadamard gate  $H$  and 1 if Bob encodes by Pauli operator  $X$  or operator  $HXZ$ .

**Step 2 (Bob's turn):** After receiving the state, Bob implements PNP scheme firstly (see section VI), and then provides a unitary operator, randomly in  $Z, X, H$  and  $HXZ$  on the state employed for coding. Then he sends the employed state to the untrusted third party, Eve, for measuring.

**Step 3 (Eve's turn):** Eve is required to measure the state via basis  $\{|0\rangle, |1\rangle\}$ , or  $\{|+\rangle, |-\rangle\}$ , randomly (the basis can be chosen by Alice or Bob to improve the efficiency) and publicly announce the outcome.

These steps will be repeated several times until Alice and Bob share a long enough bit string.

**Step 4 (sifting turn):** For each bit, Alice publicly announces the chosen basis as in BB84 protocol while Bob announces whether his operator is in  $\{H, HXZ\}$  (but not what it is). If Bob's operator belongs to  $\{H, HXZ\}$  while the basis of Alice and Eve are the same or if Bob's operator does not belong to  $\{H, HXZ\}$  while the basis of Alice and Eve are different, the bit will be discarded.

**Step 5 (error estimating and raw key generating turn):** Bob chooses part of the bit string for error estimating. He announces his operations on those bits for Alice who knows the ordinary states to estimate the bit error rate. If the error rate is acceptable, they generate a raw key by remaining bits and continue error correcting and privacy amplification procedures.

In the protocol, Bob knows what he encoded by while Alice knows the states she sent as well as the measurement outcomes, and therefore, also knows what Bob encoded by. On the other hand, however, since Eve only knows the measurement outcomes, the legitimated bits are random for her. Note that the protocol might look

like the DDI protocols which are insecure under Trojan horse attacks. However, they are different. On one hand, the above protocol is measurement-device independent, not only detector-device independent, since the measurement is assumed to be implemented by an untrusted third party. On the other hand, the above one can immune Trojan horse attack, thanks to PNP scheme (which will be discussed in section VI). From now on, let us ignore Trojan horse attack temporarily until section VI.

## III. SECURITY AND EFFICIENCY

The security of the protocol comes from the security of the ordinary BB84 protocol and the indistinguishability of operators employed by Bob. Precisely, to access a bit, the eavesdropper, without loss generality says Eve, which is the worst case for Alice and Bob, has to discriminate either the state sent by Alice or the operator provided by Bob. The security of the first case is the same as in the ordinary BB84 protocol while the security of the second one comes from the indistinguishability of the operators employed by Bob.

In details,  $X, Z, H$ , and  $HXZ$  are indistinguishable even unambiguously since they are linearly dependent. Moreover, we have the following theorem.

**Theorem 1** *Distinguishing the operators  $X, Z, H$ , and  $HXZ$  (with errors) is as difficult as distinguishing the four BB84 states  $|0\rangle, |1\rangle, |+\rangle, |-\rangle$ .*

The theorem could be verified as follow. Generally, to distinguish the four operators, Eve sends the B partita of a state  $|s\rangle_{EB} \in C^d \otimes C^2$  to Bob and provides a bipartite measurement after Bob operated partita B. After Bob's operation, the problem for Eve is distinguishing  $|s_Z\rangle = (I \otimes Z)|s\rangle, |s_X\rangle = (I \otimes X)|s\rangle, |s_H\rangle = (I \otimes H)|s\rangle, |s_{HXZ}\rangle = (I \otimes HXZ)|s\rangle$  in  $C^d \otimes C^2$ . On the other hand, to distinguish the four BB84 states, a protocol can be implemented as follow. An isometric transformation  $U$  transforming  $|0\rangle, |1\rangle \in C^2$  into  $|s_Z\rangle, |s_X\rangle \in C^d \otimes C^2$ , respectively, is implemented in the first step, which can be done since  $|s_Z\rangle$  is orthogonal to  $|s_X\rangle$ , followed by a distinguishing protocol of the result states, namely  $UT|0\rangle = |s_T\rangle$ , where  $T \in \{Z, X, H, HXZ\}$ . Therefore, distinguishing the four BB84 states can be transformed into distinguishing the four operators while the error rate is not larger than the optimal error rate in distinguishing the operators. Similarly, by taking  $|s\rangle = |0\rangle \in C^2$ , distinguishing the four operators becomes the problem

of distinguishing the four BB84 states. Therefore, distinguishing the four operators is as difficult as distinguishing the BB84 states.

This result is not surprising since the dimension of the subspace of the four operators is 2 and thus no matter what state is employed to distinguish them, the four states would be in a subspace of dimension at most 2, in which at most two states can be distinguished. Note that increasing dimension of the space would not give benefits for state distinguishing[41].

Hence, attacking Bob's bits would not provide benefits for Eve comparing with conventional attacks in ordinary BB84 protocol.

Therefore, the analysis of the above protocol can be justified as follow. By equivalently letting Bob provide measurements with untrusted measurement devices, the protocols are exactly the ordinary ones except Bob's encoding operations. However, the encoding operation, namely operating a single qubit gate, of Bob could be nearly perfect. Note that the single qubit gates could be highly efficient in practise[42, 43]. Hence, the security and efficiency are nearly the same as the ordinary ones.

#### IV. EMPLOYING MORE OPERATORS AND THE SIX-STATE TYPE PROTOCOL

In the above protocol, Bob employs four operators. In fact, he can employ more, for example, eight operators which are  $I, X, Z, XZ, H, HX, HZ, HXZ$  for the BB84 type protocol. If the basis of Alice and Eve agree, Alice and Bob discard the states operated by the right four operators while if the basis of Alice and Eve do not agree,

they discard the left four, see Table 1. The efficiency will not decrease but the operators of Bob could be more difficult to distinguish.

	Table 1: Eight operators							
$\begin{matrix} \text{Bob} \\ \text{Alice} \end{matrix}$	I	X	Z	XZ	H	HX	HZ	HXZ
$ 0\rangle$	$ 0\rangle$	$ 1\rangle$	$ 0\rangle$	$ 1\rangle$	$ +\rangle$	$ -\rangle$	$ +\rangle$	$ -\rangle$
$ 1\rangle$	$ 1\rangle$	$ 0\rangle$	$ 1\rangle$	$ 0\rangle$	$ -\rangle$	$ +\rangle$	$ -\rangle$	$ +\rangle$
$ +\rangle$	$ +\rangle$	$ +\rangle$	$ -\rangle$	$ -\rangle$	$ 0\rangle$	$ 0\rangle$	$ 1\rangle$	$ 1\rangle$
$ -\rangle$	$ -\rangle$	$ -\rangle$	$ +\rangle$	$ +\rangle$	$ 1\rangle$	$ 1\rangle$	$ 0\rangle$	$ 0\rangle$

The same argument is suitable for employing three mutually unbiased basis as in six-state protocol. In the measurement-device-independenization of the protocol, Alice randomly sends states in the three basis while Bob can employ twenty four operators without decreasing efficiency, see Table 2, where  $H_1 = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & -i \\ i & -1 \end{pmatrix}$ ,  $H_2 = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & i \end{pmatrix}$ ,  $H_3 = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ i & -i \end{pmatrix}$ ,  $H_4 = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & -i \\ 1 & i \end{pmatrix}$ ,  $|a\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|0\rangle + i|1\rangle)$ ,  $|b\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|0\rangle - i|1\rangle)$ , and all states are up to global phases which affect nothing.

Hence, only  $\frac{1}{3}$  states are left as in the six-state protocol. For example, if Alice employs basis  $\{|0\rangle, |1\rangle\}$  while Eve measures via  $\{|0\rangle, |1\rangle\}$ , then states on which Bob operates  $I, X, Z, XZ, H_2, H_2X, H_2Z, H_2XZ$  are left with others discarded. Here, Alice and Bob can decide coding methods after Eve's turn and error estimating, namely, for example, they agree to encode 0 by  $I, Z, H_2, H_2Z$  while encode 1 by  $X, XZ, H_2X, H_2XZ$  after estimating error rate by states in randomly chosen operators. See Table 2.

Table 2: Twenty four operators

$\begin{array}{c} \text{Bob} \\ \text{Alice} \end{array}$	I	X	Z	XZ	H	HX	HZ	HXZ	H <sub>1</sub>	H <sub>1</sub> X	H <sub>1</sub> Z	H <sub>1</sub> XZ
0>	0>	1>	0>	1>	+>	->	+>	->	a>	b>	a>	b>
1>	1>	0>	1>	0>	->	+>	->	+>	b>	a>	b>	a>
+>	+>	+>	->	->	0>	0>	1>	1>	->	->	+>	+>
->	->	->	+>	+>	1>	1>	0>	0>	+>	+>	->	->
a>	a>	b>	b>	a>	b>	a>	a>	b>	0>	1>	1>	0>
b>	b>	a>	a>	b>	a>	b>	b>	a>	1>	0>	0>	1>

$\begin{array}{c} \text{Bob} \\ \text{Alice} \end{array}$	H <sub>2</sub>	H <sub>2</sub> X	H <sub>2</sub> Z	H <sub>2</sub> XZ	H <sub>3</sub>	H <sub>3</sub> X	H <sub>3</sub> Z	H <sub>3</sub> XZ	H <sub>4</sub>	H <sub>4</sub> X	H <sub>4</sub> Z	H <sub>4</sub> XZ
0>	0>	1>	0>	1>	a>	b>	a>	b>	+>	->	+>	->
1>	1>	0>	1>	0>	b>	a>	b>	a>	->	+>	->	+>
+>	a>	a>	b>	b>	0>	0>	1>	1>	a>	a>	b>	b>
->	b>	b>	a>	a>	1>	1>	0>	0>	b>	b>	a>	a>
a>	->	+>	+>	->	+>	->	+>	+>	0>	1>	1>	0>
b>	+>	->	->	+>	->	+>	->	->	1>	0>	0>	1>

## V. MEASUREMENT-DEVICE-INDEPENDENTIZATION OF PREPARE-MEASURE QKD PROTOCOLS

Let us investigate the general scheme of measurement-device-independentization for a prepare-measure QKD protocol. Assume that the ordinary protocol encodes 0 by state  $|0\rangle$  and 1 by state  $|y\rangle = x_1|0\rangle - x_0|1\rangle \neq |0\rangle$ , where without loss generality  $x_0, x_1$  are real and hence  $x_0^2 + x_1^2 = 1$ , since we can always view the two vectors in the same plane. By making the encoding states symmetric, namely, the bit 0 is encoded by states  $|0\rangle$  and  $|x\rangle = x_0|0\rangle + x_1|1\rangle$ , while the bit 1 is encoded by states  $|1\rangle$  and  $|y\rangle = x_1|0\rangle - x_0|1\rangle$ , respectively, the protocol is described as follow.

For each bit, Alice randomly sends one of the four states to Bob. After Bob receives the state, he implements PNP scheme and randomly provides an operate in one of  $I, U, XZ, UXZ, X, Z, UX, UZ, XU, ZU, UXU$  and  $UZU$  to the state employed for coding, where  $U = \begin{pmatrix} x_0 & x_1 \\ x_1 & -x_0 \end{pmatrix}$  is the (real) unitary operator transforming basis  $\{|0\rangle, |1\rangle\}$  to basis  $\{|x\rangle, |y\rangle\}$ . Then Bob sends the state together with a chosen basis to Eve for measuring. In details, Bob chooses basis  $\{|0\rangle, |1\rangle\}$  if he operates  $X, Z, XU$  or  $ZU$ , chooses basis  $\{|x\rangle, |y\rangle\}$  if operates  $UX, UZ, UXU$ , or  $UZU$ , while randomly chooses one of the two bases if he operates others. For Eve, she is required to measure the state via the chosen basis and announce the outcome. Finally, Alice announces her basis choices

for Bob to discard those bits with incompatible bases while other bits are employed for estimating the bit error rate and generating a raw key as in the BB84 type protocol.

In such a protocol,  $\frac{1}{3} \times \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{3} \times 1 + \frac{1}{3} \times 0 = \frac{1}{2}$  states would be left after the sifting procedure, see Table 3, where N represents that the pair of Alice's state and Bob's operator is invalid no matter what basis does Bob choose.

Table 3: Twelve operators												
$\begin{array}{c} \text{Bob} \\ \text{Alice} \end{array}$	I	U	XZ	UXZ	X	Z	UX	UZ	XU	ZU	UXU	UZU
0>	0>	x>	1>	y>	1>	0>	y>	x>	N	N	N	N
1>	1>	y>	0>	x>	0>	1>	x>	y>	N	N	N	N
x>	x>	0>	y>	1>	N	N	N	N	1>	0>	y>	x>
y>	y>	1>	x>	0>	N	N	N	N	0>	1>	x>	y>

The discussions of protocols employing more than two bases are similar. It is worth noting that the efficiency of a general protocol might not be higher than the BB84 type protocol, which employs mutually unbiased bases, while the optimal strategy for the eavesdroppers and thus the secure bounds for the legitimated partner might need to recalculate. Despitensness, the theoretical feasibility of the scheme for coding by general states is verified. Most of the prepare-measure QKD protocols can be measurement-device-independentized by the scheme. It might not be surprising that the scheme can be modified for entanglement-based protocols.

## VI. PHOTON-NUMBER-ADDING ATTACK, PHOTON NUMBER PURIFICATION SCHEME AND PRACTICAL IMPLEMENT

In this section, we will investigate photon-number-adding(PNA) attack, which is exactly Trojan horse attack when applying in DDI protocols, and provide a solution called photon-number-purification(PNP) scheme. Then we will modify the BB84 type protocol for practical settings.

### A. Photon-number-adding attack: A problem

The PNA attack is described as follow. Eve adds several states in the signal (state) Alice sends to Bob (or even substitutes the signal by hers). These states are employed for distinguishing Bob's operators and will be removed before measuring. Note that despite the indistinguishability of Bob's operators via single state, they can be unambiguously distinguished via multiplied copies. If Bob can not count the photon numbers in a signal, Eve can implement such an attack without being noticed. Essentially, it is such an attack that breaks the security of certain protocols such as the detector-devices-independent(DDI) QKD protocol[34–38], the protocol in [33], and the plug-and-play protocol[39, 40].

### B. Photon number purification: A solution

The PNA attack can be handled by applying C-NOT gates which can be highly efficient, namely with more than 99% fidelity[44, 45]. We provide a solution for BB84 type protocol while it would be easily generalized to others. Denote the two C-NOT gates as follow, where  $x, y$  denote the partite.

$$\begin{aligned}
 C_{0xy} : C^2 \otimes C^2 &\rightarrow C^2 \otimes C^2 & C_{+xy} : C^2 \otimes C^2 &\rightarrow C^2 \otimes C^2 \\
 |0\rangle_x |0\rangle_y &\rightarrow |0\rangle_x |0\rangle_y & |+\rangle_x |+\rangle_y &\rightarrow |+\rangle_x |+\rangle_y \\
 |1\rangle_x |0\rangle_y &\rightarrow |1\rangle_x |1\rangle_y & |-\rangle_x |+\rangle_y &\rightarrow |-\rangle_x |-\rangle_y
 \end{aligned}$$

The scheme is described as follow. Before Bob en-

codes the state sent by Alice, he randomly copies the state via basis  $\{|0\rangle, |1\rangle\}$  or  $\{|+\rangle, |-\rangle\}$ , namely, employs source  $|0\rangle_B$  and operates  $C_{0AB}$  or employs source  $|+\rangle_B$  and operates  $C_{+AB}$ , where  $B$  denotes the auxiliary partite and  $A$  denotes the ordinary partite. Then he aborts the ordinary state which might still be employed for estimating, while employs partite  $B$ . Hence, extra states in the signal are removed and the PNA attack becomes a substituted attack (which might even not be successful), for which the security is guaranteed. We will call the procedure '*photon number purification*' (PNP). After it, Bob encodes partite  $B$  as usual and sends it to measure.


In such a procedure, a state is discarded if it is wrongly purified, namely, if the state sent by Alice is not in the same basis chosen by Bob for copying. The same investigations are suitable for six-state type protocol, in which Bob purifies via randomly chosen three basis.

Note that the PNP scheme could also be applied for DDI-QKD protocol, in which the PNA attack is exactly the combination of an intercept-resend attack and a Trojan horse attack[34–38], as well as the protocol in [33] or plug-and-play protocol, to close the loopholes[39, 40]. To verify this, just let the legitimated partner implement the PNP scheme after receiving signals and before further operations.

In fact, the PNP scheme might view as a kind of device isolation. The input signal will not be output while the output signal does not contain the input photons. The same work can be done by teleportation[46], but PNP scheme could be more efficient since it needs not to employ entanglement and Bell measurement.

### C. The practical BB84 type protocol

Inspired by the above investigations, the final BB84 type protocol employing weak coherence sources and without photon number counting technologies is described as follow, see Figure 2.



In details, Alice prepares and sends her qubit to Bob with decoy state method[47–49] to against photon-number-splitting(PNS) attack[50, 51] (step 1) while Bob employs the PNP procedure above. The ordinary signal (partita A) is employed for estimating the channel between Alice and Bob, for which Bob only needs to determine whether it is empty with insecure devices, making decoy state methods of Alice work. Then Bob encodes the signal of partita B and sends it (also by decoy state method) to untrusted Eve for measuring (step 2, 3). Step 4, 5 are similar to the protocol with ideal assumptions.

Note that in the protocol, all non-decoy states sent by Alice are employed by Bob. Therefore, to generate a raw secret bit, 4 qubits needed to be sent by Alice, not including the decoy ones, of which half are employed as decoy states by Bob, while in the scenario that Bob assumes the measurements instead of Eve, only 2 qubits needed to be sent. Note that in the standard MDI-QKD protocol[20] (employing Bell measurements with two inclusive results), 8 qubits, not including the decoy ones, are required for obtaining a secret bit. Therefore, our protocol could even be more efficient.

## VII. CONCLUSION

In conclusion, we presented MDI-QKD protocols without employing joint measurements. Their performances can nearly be the same as the ordinary ones (for example, BB84 protocol), since they can be analysed in exactly the same way, except ours are measurement-device-independent, assisted by the PNP scheme which could be

nearly perfect. Employing more basis or operators could improve their security, as we have discussed in the situation of six-state protocol, while the legitimated partner can decide the coding methods even after the turns of Eve and error estimating. The scheme is suitable for general prepare-measure QKD protocols, which is called '*measurement – device – independization*' of QKD protocols. It will not be surprising that it can be modified for even entanglement-based protocols.

We also investigated the PNA attack and presented the PNP scheme as a solution. And finally we provided the BB84 type protocol in practical settings. The protocol could be more efficient than the standard MDI-QKD protocol while needs not to employ joint measurements.

Although our protocol seems similar to DDI-QKD protocol which has been proven to be insecure under certain attacks, they are different both in the need of joint measurements and the need of security in measurement devices. The loopholes in DDI-QKD protocol are not suitable for ours since the PNP scheme. In fact, the PNP scheme can also be employed for closing the loopholes in DDI protocol as well as two-stage protocols such as plug-and-play protocol.

Finally, there might be a corresponding version for the asymptotically optimal protocols[52] which might not be efficient in practise, however, might provide an asymptotic secure bound of the bit error rate.

## DATA AVAILABILITY

The author declare that all data supporting the findings of this study are available within the paper.

[1] C. H. Bennett and G. Brassard, in *In Proceedings of IEEE International Conference on Computers* (1984).

[2] A. K. Ekert, *Physical Review Letters* **67**, 661 (1991).

- [3] C. Bennett, G. Brassard, and N. Mermin, In Proceedings of 35th Annual Symposium on the Foundations of Computer Science, IEEE Computer Society Press, Los Alamitos, CA, 124 (1994).
- [4] C. H. Bennett, Physical Review Letters **68**, 3121 (1992).
- [5] L. Goldenberg and L. Vaidman, Physical Review Letters **75**, 1239–1243 (1995).
- [6] D. Bruss, Physical Review Letters **81** (1998).
- [7] H. Lo and H. Chau, Science **283**, 2050 (1999).
- [8] N. J. Cerf, M. Bourennane, A. Karlsson, and N. Gisin, Physical Review Letters **88**, 127902 (2002).
- [9] V. Scarani, A. Acín, G. Ribordy, and N. Gisin, Physical Review Letters **92**, 10.1103/physrevlett.92.057901 (2004).
- [10] S. Kak, Foundations of Physics Letters **19**, 293–296 (2006).
- [11] V. Sharma, K. Thapliyal, A. Pathak, and S. Banerjee, Quantum Information Processing **15**, 4681–4710 (2016).
- [12] G. Gordon and G. Rigolin, Optics Communications **283**, 184 (2010).
- [13] H. Shu, arXiv: 2107.01964 (2021).
- [14] J. Barrett, L. Hardy, and A. Kent, Physical Review Letters **95**, 10.1103/physrevlett.95.010503 (2005).
- [15] A. Acín, N. Brunner, N. Gisin, S. Massar, S. Pironio, and V. Scarani, Physical Review Letters **98**, 230501 (2007).
- [16] E. Hänggi and R. Renner, (2010), arXiv:1009.1833 [quant-ph].
- [17] L. Masanes, S. Pironio, and A. Acín, Nature Communications **2**, 10.1038/ncomms1244 (2011).
- [18] C. C. W. Lim, C. Portmann, M. Tomamichel, R. Renner, and N. Gisin, Physical Review X **3**, 10.1103/physrevx.3.031006 (2013).
- [19] E. A. Aguilar, R. Ramanathan, J. Kofler, and M. Pawłowski, Physical Review A **94**, 10.1103/physreva.94.022305 (2016).
- [20] H. K. Lo, M. Curty, and B. Qi, Physical Review Letters **108**, 10.1103/physrevlett.108.130503 (2012).
- [21] X. F. Ma and M. Razavi, Physical Review A **86**, 10.1103/physreva.86.062319 (2012).
- [22] A. Mizutani, K. Tamaki, R. Ikuta, T. Yamamoto, and N. Imoto, Scientific Reports **4**, 10.1038/srep05236 (2014).
- [23] C. Jiang, Z. W. Yu, and X. B. Wang, Physical Review A **95**, 10.1103/physreva.95.032325 (2017).
- [24] W. l. Wang, K. Tamaki, and M. Curty, Scientific Reports **11**, 10.1038/s41598-021-81003-2 (2021).
- [25] H. J. Ding, X. Y. Zhou, C. H. Zhang, J. Li, and Q. Wang, (2021), arXiv:2107.07803 [quant-ph].
- [26] C. Jiang, Z. W. Yu, X. L. Hu, and X. B. Wang, Physical Review A **103**, 10.1103/physreva.103.012402 (2021).
- [27] M. Lucamarini, Z. L. Yuan, J. F. Dynes, and A. J. Shields, Nature **557**, 400–403 (2018).
- [28] S. Pirandola, R. García-Patrón, S. L. Braunstein, and S. Lloyd, Physical Review Letters **102**, 050503 (2009).
- [29] S. Pirandola, R. Laurenza, C. Ottaviani, and L. Banchi, Nature Communications **8**, 10.1038/ncomms15043 (2017).
- [30] X. F. Ma, P. Zeng, and H. Y. Zhou, Physical Review X **8**, 10.1103/physrevx.8.031043 (2018).
- [31] C. H. Cui, Z. Q. Yin, R. Wang, W. Chen, S. Wang, G. C. Guo, and Z. F. Han, Physical Review Applied **11**, 10.1103/physrevapplied.11.034053 (2019).
- [32] N. Lütkenhaus, J. Calsamiglia, and K. A. Suominen, Physical Review A **59**, 3295 (1999).
- [33] G. P. He, Quantum Inf Process **21** (2021), arXiv:2108.05440 [quant-ph].
- [34] C. C. W. Lim, B. Korzh, A. Martin, F. Bussièeres, R. Thew, and H. Zbinden, Applied Physics Letters **105**, 221112 (2014).
- [35] B. Qi, Physical Review A **91**, 020303 (2015).
- [36] P. González, L. Rebón, T. Ferreira da Silva, M. Figueroa, C. Saavedra, M. Curty, G. Lima, G. B. Xavier, and W. A. T. Nogueira, Physical Review A **92**, 022337 (2015).
- [37] W. Y. Liang, M. Li, Z. Q. Yin, W. Chen, S. Wang, X. B. An, G. C. Guo, and Z. F. Han, Physical Review A **92**, 012319 (2015).
- [38] S. Sajeed, A. Huang, S. H. Sun, F. H. Xu, V. Makarov, and M. Curty, Physical Review Letters **117**, 250505 (2016).
- [39] A. Muller, T. Herzog, B. Huttner, W. Tittel, H. Zbinden, and N. Gisin, Applied Physics Letters **70**, 793–795 (1997).
- [40] N. Gisin, S. Fasel, B. Kraus, H. Zbinden, and G. Ribordy, Physical Review A **73**, 10.1103/physreva.73.022320 (2006).
- [41] H. Shu, International Journal of Theoretical Physics **61** (2022).
- [42] F. Brito, D. P. DiVincenzo, R. H. Koch, and M. Steffen, New Journal of Physics **10**, 033027 (2008).
- [43] D. C. McKay, C. J. Wood, S. Sheldon, J. M. Chow, and J. M. Gambetta, Physical Review A **96**, 10.1103/physreva.96.022330 (2017).
- [44] A. Kandala, K. X. Wei, S. Srinivasan, E. Magesan, S. Carnevale, G. A. Keefe, D. Klaus, O. Dial, and D. C. McKay, Physical Review Letters **127**, 130501 (2021).
- [45] A. Noiri, K. Takeda, T. Nakajima, T. Kobayashi, A. Sammak, G. Scappucci, and S. Tarucha, Nature **601**, 338–342 (2022).
- [46] C. H. Bennett, G. Brassard, C. Crépeau, R. Jozsa, A. Peres, and W. K. Wootters, Physical Review Letters **70**, 1895 (1993).
- [47] W. Y. Hwang, Physical Review Letters **91**, 057901 (2003).
- [48] H. K. Lo, X. F. Ma, and K. Chen, Physical Review Letters **94**, 10.1103/physrevlett.94.230504 (2005).
- [49] X. F. Ma, B. Qi, Y. Zhao, and H. K. Lo, Physical Review A **72**, 012326 (2005).
- [50] B. Huttner, N. Imoto, N. Gisin, and T. Mor, Physical Review A **51**, 1863 (1995).
- [51] N. Lütkenhaus and M. Jahma, New Journal of Physics **4**, 44–44 (2002).
- [52] H. Shu, (2021), arXiv:2110.01973 [quant-ph].