

Robust multi-party semi-quantum private comparison protocols with decoherence-free states against collective noise

Lihua Gong¹, Zhenyong Chen¹, Liguo Qin², and Jiehui Huang²

¹Department of Electronic Information Engineering, Nanchang University, Nanchang 330031, China

²School of Mathematics, Physics and Statistics, Shanghai University of Engineering Science, Shanghai 201620, China

January 27, 2023

Based on decoherence-free states, two multi-party semi-quantum private comparison protocols are proposed to counteract collective noises. One could resist the collective-dephasing noise well, whereas the other could resist the collective-rotation noise. Multiple classical participants could compare their secret information by performing the proposed protocols once. It is manifested that the proposed protocols could resist both external attacks and internal attacks. Besides, the operations of our protocols were simulated on the IBM Quantum Experience.

1 Introduction

As an intriguing application of quantum secure multiparty computing [1], quantum private comparison (QPC) which could compare participants' private information while keeping their secrets has gained wide attention in recent years. The first QPC protocol based on decoy particles was invented by Yang et al [2]. Afterward, QPC protocols combining various quantum technologies including entanglement-swapping [3, 4], quantum walk [5], and bit-flipping [6] have been investigated.

Multi-party QPC (MQPC) has made tremendous progress in that it could compare multiple participants' privacies within one execution of protocols. The MQPC protocol was presented based on multi-particle GHZ class states [7]. Subsequently, two MQPC protocols were put forward with multi-level entangled states in distributed model and in traveling model, respectively

Lihua Gong: lhgong@ncu.edu.cn

[8]. Some MQPC protocols were also designed with entanglement swapping [9, 10]. An MQPC without authentication channels and pre-shared keys between participants was proposed with the help of two third parties [11]. By considering multi-dimensional single particles as information carriers, two MQPC protocols were expatiated to achieve the size comparison among multiple participants' secrets [12]. Laterly, an MQPC protocol based on qubit shift operation was discussed [13]. A class of effective MQPC protocols was presented to flexibly select quantum states [14]. Recently, a participant-independent MQPC protocol was dwelt on with d -dimensional Bell states [15]. It should be noted that all participants in the above-mentioned quantum private comparison protocols should possess sufficient quantum abilities. However, the expensive quantum devices may be not always available to the participants. After the conception of semi-quantum was initiated [16], a set of semi-quantum private comparison (SQPC) protocols have been presented [17–19]. Recently, the first multi-party SQPC (MSQPC) protocol was designed with Bell states [20].

However, the MSQPC scheme in [20] could only work under the ideal noiseless environments. In fact, the negative influences of noises couldn't be neglected since the particles may be disturbed by noises during transmission. Various noise-resisting QPC protocols were researched [21–23]. Usually, the noises associated with quantum channels could be considered as collective noises. To overcome the collective noises, one of the most effective approaches is to encode and transmit secrets with the decoherence-free (DF) states. By adopting the DF states as information carriers, two robust MSQPC protocols will be designed to effectively prevent collective-dephasing noise and collective-rotation noise, respectively. The remainder of this paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, two robust MSQPC protocols against collective noises are described in detail. In Section 3, the robustness of the two protocols in resisting external attacks and internal ones are presented. In Section 4, the operations of the two protocols are implemented with the IBM quantum computer. In Section 5, the two presented MSQPC protocols are evaluated with some baseline protocols. Ultimately, a succinct conclusion is shown in Section 6.

2 Two robust MSQPC protocols against collective noises

The collective-dephasing noise U_{dp} can be modeled as

$$U_{dp} |0\rangle = |0\rangle, U_{dp} |1\rangle = e^{i\theta} |0\rangle. \quad (1)$$

where θ denotes the noise parameter fluctuating with time [23]. The logical qubits $|0_{dp}\rangle$ and $|1_{dp}\rangle$ can be expressed by the DF states $|01\rangle$ and $|10\rangle$,

$$|0_{dp}\rangle = |01\rangle, |1_{dp}\rangle = |10\rangle. \quad (2)$$

It is easily found that the two logical qubits could resist the collective-dephasing noise, since they have the same phase shift, i.e., $i\theta$,

$$U_{dp} |0_{dp}\rangle = e^{i\theta} |01\rangle, U_{dp} |1_{dp}\rangle = e^{i\theta} |10\rangle. \quad (3)$$

The superposition states $|+_{dp}\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|0_{dp}\rangle + |1_{dp}\rangle) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|01\rangle + |10\rangle) = |\psi^+\rangle$ and $|-_{dp}\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|0_{dp}\rangle - |1_{dp}\rangle) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|01\rangle - |10\rangle) = |\psi^-\rangle$ are also invariant towards the collective-dephasing noise. Besides, $Z_{dp} : \{|0_{dp}\rangle, |1_{dp}\rangle\}$ and $X_{dp} : \{|+_{dp}\rangle, |-_{dp}\rangle\}$ are two measurement bases under the collective-dephasing noise.

The collective-rotation noise U_r can be represented as

$$U_r |0\rangle = \cos \theta |0\rangle + \sin \theta |1\rangle, U_r |1\rangle = -\sin \theta |0\rangle + \cos \theta |1\rangle. \quad (4)$$

The logical qubits $|0_r\rangle$ and $|1_r\rangle$ are defined by the DF states $\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|00\rangle + |11\rangle) = |\phi^+\rangle$ and $\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|01\rangle - |10\rangle) = |\psi^-\rangle$,

$$|0_r\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|00\rangle + |11\rangle), |1_r\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|01\rangle - |10\rangle). \quad (5)$$

The two logical qubits can be immune to the collective-rotation noises,

$$U_r |0_r\rangle = |0_r\rangle, U_r |1_r\rangle = |1_r\rangle. \quad (6)$$

The superposition states $|+_r\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|0_r\rangle + |1_r\rangle) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|\phi^+\rangle + |\psi^-\rangle)$ and $|-_r\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|0_r\rangle - |1_r\rangle) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|\phi^+\rangle - |\psi^-\rangle)$ could also resist this kind of noises. Moreover, $Z_r : \{|0_r\rangle, |1_r\rangle\}$ and $X_r : \{|+_r\rangle, |-_r\rangle\}$ are two mutually nonorthogonal bases under the collective-rotation noise.

With the aid of a semi-honest party, i.e., TP to control qubits, the privacies of n classical participants P_1, P_2, \dots, P_n can be compared securely, where P_i ($i = 1, 2, \dots, n$) owns private binary information $X_i = (x_{i,0}, x_{i,1}, \dots, x_{i,l-1})$, $x_{i,j} \in \{0, 1\}$, $j = 0, 1, \dots, l-1$. The classical participants in our MSQPC protocols are allowed to execute the operations below.

- (1) CTRL: Forwarding the particles directly;
- (2) SIFT: Measuring the particles in $Z \otimes Z$ basis $\{|00\rangle |01\rangle, |10\rangle, |11\rangle\}$, preparing fresh qubits in the same states and distributing them back;
- (3) Reordering the particles with different delay lines.

2.1 MSQPC protocol against the collective-dephasing noises

Classical participants should share one common key via a secure SQKD protocol against the collective-dephasing noises beforehand [24], where $K = (K_0, K_1, \dots, K_{l-1})$, $K_j \in \{0, 1\}$.

Step 1 TP randomly prepares n sequences $S_{dp(1)}, S_{dp(2)}, \dots, S_{dp(n)}$, each sequence contains $4l(1 + \delta)$ particles in Z_{dp} basis and $l(1 + \delta)$ particles in X_{dp} basis, where δ is a fixed positive fraction. Then TP distributes $S_{dp(i)}$ to P_i .

Step 2 After receiving sequence $S_{dp(i)}$, P_i executes CTRL or SIFT randomly on the received particles. According to the encoding rule such that $|01\rangle \rightarrow 0$, $|10\rangle \rightarrow 1$, P_i writes down the classical bits when he executes the SIFT. P_i reorders the particles with different delay lines and distributes the new sequence $S'_{dp(i)}$ to TP.

Step 3 Upon receiving each particle from P_i , TP announces the particle locations in Z_{dp} basis in the original sequence to P_i . P_i publishes the correct orders of sequence $S'_{dp(i)}$ and the operations he performed on each particle pair. TP rearranges the order of sequence $S'_{dp(i)}$. According to the initial bases of particle pairs and the information of P_i , TP takes the corresponding actions, as shown in Table 1.

Table 1: Actions of TP in the MSQPC protocol against the collective-dephasing noises

	Initial basis of particle pair	Operation of P_i	Action of TP
Case 1	$Z_{dp} (X_{dp})$	CTRL	Action 1: measuring the particles with $Z_{dp} (X_{dp})$ basis
Case 2	Z_{dp}	SIFT	Action 2: counting the number of the particles
Case 3	X_{dp}	SIFT	Action 3: dropping out the particles directly

Case 1 If P_i selects to execute CTRL, then TP will take **Action 1**. TP could calculate the error rate by comparing the measurement results with the initial states. If the error rate exceeds the tolerable limit, then the quantum channel is supposed to be insecure, thus the protocol will be terminated. Otherwise, the protocol will continue to the next step.

Case 2 If P_i executes SIFT and the initial basis of particle pair is Z_{dp} , then TP will take **Action 2**. The protocol will be terminated if the number of particle groups is less than $2l$.

Case 3 If P_i executes SIFT and the initial basis of particle pair is X_{dp} , then TP will take **Action 3**.

Step 4 To verify whether TP is honest or not, P_i randomly selects l particle groups in **Case 2** as test qubits and declares the locations of the test qubits to TP. TP tells the initial states of test qubits to P_i . If the initial state of the test qubit is $|0_{dp}\rangle$, then the classical bit P_i recoded in **Step 2** will be 0. Otherwise, the classical bit will be 1. Subsequently, P_i computes the error rate. If the error rate is less than the threshold, the protocol will go to the next step. Otherwise, the protocol will be halted.

Step 5 P_i selects l particle groups from the existing particles and recodes the classical bits of the corresponding particles as m_i . Then P_i publishes

the corresponding locations to TP. P_i computes $r_{i,j} = K_j \oplus x_{i,j} \oplus m_{i,j}$ and publishes $r_{i,j}$ to TP via a classical channel, where \oplus is the exclusive-OR operation.

Step 6 TP could obtain $M_{i,j}$ easily since he knows the initial states and the positions of the selected particles. Then TP calculates and stores $u_{i,j} = M_{i,j} \oplus r_{i,j}$. Once obtaining $u_{1,j}, u_{2,j}, \dots, u_{n,j}$, TP could compare the privacies of n classical participants by calculating $C_j = (u_{1,j} \oplus u_{2,j}) + (u_{2,j} \oplus u_{3,j}) + \dots + (u_{n-1,j} \oplus u_{n,j})$. Only all elements in $C = \{C_0, C_1, \dots, C_{l-1}\}$ are 0 can TP concludes that all the classical participants' secrets are equal.

Apparently, $M_{i,j}$ is equal to $m_{i,j}$, thus TP could derive $M_{i,j} \oplus m_{i,j} = 0$ easily. $u_{1,j} \oplus u_{2,j}, u_{2,j} \oplus u_{3,j}, \dots, u_{n-1,j} \oplus u_{n,j}$ could be simplified as

$$\begin{aligned}
u_{1,j} \oplus u_{2,j} &= M_{1,j} \oplus K_j \oplus x_{1,j} \oplus m_{1,j} \oplus M_{2,j} \oplus K_j \oplus x_{2,j} \oplus m_{2,j} \\
&= x_{1,j} \oplus x_{2,j}; \\
u_{2,j} \oplus u_{3,j} &= M_{2,j} \oplus K_j \oplus x_{2,j} \oplus m_{2,j} \oplus M_{3,j} \oplus K_j \oplus x_{3,j} \oplus m_{3,j} \\
&= x_{2,j} \oplus x_{3,j}; \\
&\dots \\
u_{n-1,j} \oplus u_{n,j} &= M_{n-1,j} \oplus K_j \oplus x_{n-1,j} \oplus m_{n-1,j} \oplus M_{n,j} \oplus K_j \oplus x_{n,j} \oplus m_{n,j} \\
&= x_{n-1,j} \oplus x_{n,j}.
\end{aligned} \tag{7}$$

Therefore, C_j could be obtained as

$$\begin{aligned}
C_j &= (u_{1,j} \oplus u_{2,j}) + (u_{2,j} \oplus u_{3,j}) + \dots + (u_{n-1,j} \oplus u_{n,j}) \\
&= (x_{1,j} \oplus x_{2,j}) + (x_{2,j} \oplus x_{3,j}) + \dots + (x_{n-1,j} \oplus x_{n,j}).
\end{aligned} \tag{8}$$

The output of the MSQPC protocol against the collective-dephasing noises is accurate.

2.2 MSQPC protocol against the collective-rotation noises

Similar to the MSQPC protocol against the collective-dephasing noises, all classical participants should share one common key K^* via a SQKD protocol against the collective-rotation noises [25], where $K^* = (K_0^*, K_1^*, \dots, K_{l-1}^*)$, $K_j^* \in \{0, 1\}$.

Step 1* TP generates n quantum sequences $S_{r(1)}, S_{r(2)}, \dots, S_{r(n)}$, which involves $4l(1+\delta)$ particles in Z_r basis and $l(1+\delta)$ ones in X_r basis, respectively. Afterward, TP distributes sequence $S_{r(i)}$ to P_i .

Step 2* P_i executes CTRL or SIFT randomly on the receiving particles. According to the rule such that $|00\rangle / |11\rangle \rightarrow 0$, $|01\rangle / |10\rangle \rightarrow 1$, P_i encodes the classical bits when he executes the SIFT operation. Then P_i reorders the particles with different delay lines. After P_i finished all operations, a new sequence $S'_{r(i)}$ is generated. Hereafter, P_i distributes $S'_{r(i)}$ to TP.

Step 3* TP stores the particles in sequence $S'_{r(i)}$ and publishes the locations of the particles in Z_r basis in the origin sequence to P_i . P_i announces the correct orders of $S'_{r(i)}$ and the operations he performed on each particle pair.

Then TP rearranges the order of the sequence. According to the initial bases of the particle pairs and the operations of P_i , TP executes the relevant actions, as shown in Table 2.

Table 2: Actions of TP in the MSQPC protocol against the collective-rotation noises

	Initial basis of particle pair	Operation of P_i	Action of TP
Case 1*	$Z_r (X_r)$	CTRL	Action 1* : measuring the particles with $Z_r (X_r)$ basis
Case 2*	Z_r	SIFT	Action 2* : counting the number of the particles
Case 3*	X_r	SIFT	Action 3* : dropping out the particles directly

Case 1* If P_i performs CTRL, then TP will execute **Action 1***. TP computes the error rate by contrasting the measurement outcomes with the initial states. Only the error rate is less than the tolerable limit will the protocol continue.

Case 2* If P_i executes SIFT and the initial basis of particle pair is Z_r , then TP performs **Action 2***. The protocol will continue if the number of particle groups is higher than $2l$.

Case 3* If P_i performs SIFT and the initial basis of particle pair is X_r , TP will take **Action 3***.

Step 4* P_i randomly selects half of particle groups in **Case 2*** as test bits and announces their positions to TP via a classical channel. TP tells the initial states of test bits to P_i . If the initial state of test qubit is $|0_r\rangle (|1_r\rangle)$, then the classical bit encoded in **Step 2*** will be 0 (1). Therefore, P_i could know whether TP is honest or not. If TP is honest, the protocol will continue. Otherwise, it will be aborted.

Step 5* P_i selects l particle groups from the existing particles and codes the classical bits of the selected particles as m_i^* . Then P_i calculates $r_{i,j}^* = K_j^* \oplus x_{i,j} \oplus m_{i,j}^*$ and publishes the positions to TP. Ultimately, P_i tells $r_{i,j}^*$ to TP through a classical authenticated channel.

Step 6* Since TP knows the initial states and the locations of the selected particles, he could obtain $M_{i,j}^*$ easily. Then TP calculates and stores $u_i^* = M_i^* \oplus r_i^*$. On obtaining $u_{1,j}^*, u_{2,j}^*, \dots, u_{n,j}^*$, TP calculates $C_j^* = (u_{1,j}^* \oplus u_{2,j}^*) + (u_{2,j}^* \oplus u_{3,j}^*) + \dots + (u_{n-1,j}^* \oplus u_{n,j}^*)$. If all the elements in $C^* = \{C_0^*, C_1^*, \dots, C_{l-1}^*\}$ are 0, then TP will announce the privacies of all classical participants are equal.

Evidently, $M_{i,j}^*$ is identical to $m_{i,j}^*$. Therefore, $M_{i,j}^* \oplus m_{i,j}^* = 0$ could be easily deduced by TP. $u_{1,j} \oplus u_{2,j}, u_{2,j} \oplus u_{3,j}, \dots, u_{n-1,j} \oplus u_{n,j}$ could be

deduced as

$$\begin{aligned}
u_{1,j}^* \oplus u_{2,j}^* &= M_{1,j}^* \oplus K_j^* \oplus x_{1,j} \oplus m_{1,j}^* \oplus M_{2,j}^* \oplus K_j^* \oplus x_{2,j} \oplus m_{2,j}^* \\
&= x_{1,j} \oplus x_{2,j}; \\
u_{2,j}^* \oplus u_{3,j}^* &= M_{2,j}^* \oplus K_j^* \oplus x_{2,j} \oplus m_{2,j}^* \oplus M_{3,j}^* \oplus K_j^* \oplus x_{3,j} \oplus m_{3,j}^* \\
&= x_{2,j} \oplus x_{3,j}; \\
&\dots \\
u_{n-1,j}^* \oplus u_{n,j}^* &= M_{n-1,j}^* \oplus K_j^* \oplus x_{n-1,j} \oplus m_{n-1,j}^* \oplus M_{n,j}^* \oplus K_j^* \oplus x_{n,j} \oplus m_{n,j}^* \\
&= x_{n-1,j} \oplus x_{n,j}.
\end{aligned} \tag{9}$$

C_j^* could be generated as

$$\begin{aligned}
C_j^* &= (u_{1,j}^* \oplus u_{2,j}^*) + (u_{2,j}^* \oplus u_{3,j}^*) + \dots + (u_{n-1,j}^* \oplus u_{n,j}^*) \\
&= (x_{1,j} \oplus x_{2,j}) + (x_{2,j} \oplus x_{3,j}) + \dots + (x_{n-1,j} \oplus x_{n,j}).
\end{aligned} \tag{10}$$

The output of the MSQPC protocol against the collective-rotation noises is correct.

3 Security analyses

3.1 Outside attack

An outside eavesdropper Eve desires to acquire the secrets of classical participant P_i . The possible attack strategies exploited by Eve are mainly the intercept-resend attack, the measure-resend attack, the entanglement attack and the Trojan horse attack.

3.1.1 Intercept-resend attack

Eve intercepts sequence $S_{dp(i)}$ ($S_{r(i)}$) transmitted from TP to P_i and sends a fake sequence S_E she generated in advance to P_i . Suppose that the particles in S_E are in $|0_{dp}\rangle$ ($|0_r\rangle$). Fortunately, TP has a chance to discover Eve's illegal actions in **Case 1 (Case 1*)**. Eve couldn't be perceived if the genuine particle pair sent from TP is also in $|0_{dp}\rangle$ ($|0_r\rangle$). If the genuine particle pair sent from TP is in $|1_{dp}\rangle$ ($|1_r\rangle$), Eve will be perceived. If the genuine particle pair sent from TP is in X_{dp} (X_r) basis, the probability of perceiving attack will be $\frac{1}{2}$. The particles in $|1_{dp}\rangle$ ($|1_r\rangle$) account for $\frac{2}{5}$ of the total particles and the particles in X_{dp} (X_r) basis account for $\frac{1}{5}$ of the total particles. Besides, P_i will execute CTRL operation with a probability of $\frac{1}{2}$. Hence, when a particle group is attacked, the probability of being aware of Eve is $\frac{2}{5} \times \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{5} \times \frac{1}{2} \times \frac{1}{2} = \frac{1}{4}$. Obviously, the failure probability is $1 - \left(\frac{3}{4}\right)^m$ when m particle pairs are attacked.

3.1.2 Measure-resend attack

Eve intercepts sequence $S_{dp(i)}$ ($S_{r(i)}$) and measure the particles in Z_{dp} (Z_r) basis. Eve generates fake particles according to the measurement results and sends them to TP. The states of the particles in X_{dp} (X_r) basis will be changed by Eve's actions in **Case 1 (Case 1*)**. If the original particle pair sent from TP is in Z_{dp} (Z_r) basis, then Eve will not be perceived. If the particle pair sent from TP is in X_{dp} (X_r) basis, Eve will be detected with a probability of $\frac{1}{2}$. The probability of discovering Eve's attack is $\frac{1}{5} \times \frac{1}{2} \times \frac{1}{2} = \frac{1}{20}$. Therefore, the total detection rate of the proposed protocol is $1 - \left(\frac{19}{20}\right)^m$.

3.1.3 Entanglement attack

Eve could entangle the auxiliary state $|\varepsilon\rangle$ on the particles with unitary operation U_E . Then Eve measures the auxiliary states to filch the private secrets of classical participants. The performance of resisting the entanglement attack of the first MSQPC protocol will be analyzed. The similar conclusion could also be obtained for the second MSQPC protocol. If Eve executes unitary operation U_E , the particles will evolve into

$$\begin{aligned}
U_E |0_{dp}\rangle |\varepsilon\rangle &= \lambda_{00} |00\rangle |E_{00}\rangle + \lambda_{01} |01\rangle |E_{01}\rangle + \lambda_{10} |10\rangle |E_{10}\rangle + \lambda_{11} |11\rangle |E_{11}\rangle; \\
U_E |1_{dp}\rangle |\varepsilon\rangle &= \omega_{00} |00\rangle |E'_{00}\rangle + \omega_{01} |01\rangle |E'_{01}\rangle + \omega_{10} |10\rangle |E'_{10}\rangle + \omega_{11} |11\rangle |E'_{11}\rangle; \\
U_E |+_ {dp}\rangle |\varepsilon\rangle &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} (U_E |0_{dp}\rangle |\varepsilon\rangle + U_E |1_{dp}\rangle |\varepsilon\rangle) \\
&= \frac{1}{2} \left[\begin{array}{l} |\phi^+\rangle \left(\lambda_{00} |E_{00}\rangle + \lambda_{11} |E_{11}\rangle + \omega_{00} |E'_{00}\rangle + \omega_{01} |E'_{01}\rangle \right) \\ + |\phi^-\rangle \left(\lambda_{00} |E_{00}\rangle - \lambda_{10} |E_{10}\rangle + \omega_{00} |E'_{00}\rangle - \omega_{01} |E'_{01}\rangle \right) \\ + |\psi^+\rangle \left(\lambda_{01} |E_{00}\rangle + \lambda_{11} |E_{11}\rangle + \omega_{01} |E'_{01}\rangle + \omega_{10} |E'_{10}\rangle \right) \\ + |\psi^-\rangle \left(\lambda_{01} |E_{00}\rangle - \lambda_{11} |E_{11}\rangle + \omega_{01} |E'_{01}\rangle - \omega_{10} |E'_{10}\rangle \right) \end{array} \right]; \\
U_E |-_{dp}\rangle |\varepsilon\rangle &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} (U_E |0_{dp}\rangle |\varepsilon\rangle - U_E |1_{dp}\rangle |\varepsilon\rangle) \\
&= \frac{1}{2} \left[\begin{array}{l} |\phi^+\rangle \left(\lambda_{00} |E_{00}\rangle + \lambda_{11} |E_{11}\rangle - \omega_{00} |E'_{00}\rangle - \omega_{01} |E'_{01}\rangle \right) \\ + |\phi^-\rangle \left(\lambda_{00} |E_{00}\rangle - \lambda_{10} |E_{10}\rangle - \omega_{00} |E'_{00}\rangle + \omega_{01} |E'_{01}\rangle \right) \\ + |\psi^+\rangle \left(\lambda_{01} |E_{00}\rangle + \lambda_{11} |E_{11}\rangle - \omega_{01} |E'_{01}\rangle - \omega_{10} |E'_{10}\rangle \right) \\ + |\psi^-\rangle \left(\lambda_{01} |E_{00}\rangle - \lambda_{11} |E_{11}\rangle + \omega_{01} |E'_{01}\rangle + \omega_{10} |E'_{10}\rangle \right) \end{array} \right]. \tag{11}
\end{aligned}$$

where $|\lambda_{00}|^2 + |\lambda_{01}|^2 + |\lambda_{10}|^2 + |\lambda_{11}|^2 = |\omega_{00}|^2 + |\omega_{01}|^2 + |\omega_{10}|^2 + |\omega_{11}|^2 = 1$. If Eve attempts to pass the detection, $\lambda_{00} = \lambda_{10} = \lambda_{11} = \omega_{00} = \omega_{01} = \omega_{11} = 0$ and $\lambda_{11} |E_{11}\rangle = \omega_{01} |E'_{01}\rangle$ must be satisfied. However, Eve couldn't distinguish the auxiliary states $\lambda_{01} |E_{01}\rangle$ and $\omega_{10} |E'_{10}\rangle$. In other words, Eve couldn't learn any valuable information by measuring the auxiliary states. Hence, Eve's entanglement attack will fail.

3.1.4 Trojan horse attack

Eve could execute the Trojan horse attacks to filch the private information, since the particles are transmitted back and forth. Hence, all the legitimate participants should equip with wavelength quantum filters and photon number splitters.

3.2 Inside attack

Unlike outside attackers, internal participants seem to have strong eavesdropping capabilities [26]. The attacks from semi-honest TP and dishonest participant will be analyzed.

3.2.1 Semi-honest TP's attack

Semi-honest TP has more chance to obtain information than other attackers since he is both the sender and the receiver of particles. Suppose TP is dishonest and he attempts to obtain the privacy of P_i , he will execute any attack but couldn't cooperate with others. TP could extract the private information from $r_{i,j}$ ($r_{i,j}^*$). Fortunately, TP couldn't deduce any valuable information since n participants share the common key K (K^*) in advance.

3.2.2 Dishonest participants' attack

The roles of participants in the proposed protocols are equivalent. Assume that P_1 is dishonest and tries to acquire the other participants' personal information. If P_1 executes attacks, he will be detected as an external stealer as explicated in **Section 3.1**. That is to say, our two protocols could withstand the dishonest participant's attack.

4 Simulation

Based on the IBM Quantum Experience [27], the operations CTRL and SIFT involved in the proposed protocols are simulated.

4.1 Simulation analysis on the first MSQPC protocol

With the Bell measurement in X_{dp} basis, the relative measurements results are

$$\begin{aligned} |+_ {dp}\rangle_{12} &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|01\rangle + |10\rangle)_{12} \xrightarrow{\text{CNOT}_{12}} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|01\rangle + |11\rangle)_{12} \xrightarrow{H_1} |01\rangle_{12}, \\ |-_ {dp}\rangle_{12} &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|01\rangle - |10\rangle)_{12} \xrightarrow{\text{CNOT}_{12}} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|01\rangle - |11\rangle)_{12} \xrightarrow{H_1} |11\rangle_{12}. \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

In **Step 1**, TP should prepare the DF logical states and send them to P_i , the DF logical states can be prepared as




Figure 1: **(a)** Quantum circuit of CTRL operation, **(b)** the measurement results in a secure quantum channel with the first MSQPC protocol

$$\begin{aligned}
|00\rangle_{12} &\xrightarrow{I_1 \otimes X_2} |01\rangle_{12} = |0_{dp}\rangle; \\
|00\rangle_{12} &\xrightarrow{X_1 \otimes I_2} |10\rangle_{12} = |1_{dp}\rangle; \\
|00\rangle_{12} &\xrightarrow{H_1 \otimes X_2} |+\rangle_{12} \xrightarrow{\text{CNOT}_{12}} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|01\rangle + |10\rangle)_{12} = |+_dp\rangle; \\
|00\rangle_{12} &\xrightarrow{X_1 \otimes X_2} |11\rangle_{12} \xrightarrow{H_1 \otimes I_2} |-\rangle_{12} \xrightarrow{\text{CNOT}_{12}} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|01\rangle - |10\rangle)_{12} = |-\ dp\rangle.
\end{aligned} \tag{13}$$

4.1.1 CTRL operation

Assume that the original DF logical qubits distributed by TP are in $|-\ dp\rangle$. TP will measure the particles in X_{dp} basis in **Case 1** if P_i executes the CTRL operation on particles in **Step 2**. There are two cases in the CTRL operation. Besides, the collective-dephasing noise could be simulated by $\text{RZ}(\frac{\pi}{5})$.

(1) As for the secure quantum channel, the quantum circuit and the corresponding measurement results are described in Figure 1. TP's measurement outcome is $|11\rangle$, which signifies that the result of X_{dp} basis measurement is $|-\ dp\rangle$.

$$\begin{aligned}
|-\ dp\rangle &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|01\rangle - |10\rangle)_{12} \xrightarrow{\text{RZ}(\frac{\pi}{5})} \frac{e^{i\frac{\pi}{5}}}{\sqrt{2}}(|01\rangle - |10\rangle)_{12} \\
&\xrightarrow{\text{CNOT}_{12}} \frac{e^{i\frac{\pi}{5}}}{\sqrt{2}}(|01\rangle - |11\rangle)_{12} \xrightarrow{H_1} e^{i\frac{\pi}{5}}|11\rangle_{12}.
\end{aligned} \tag{14}$$

(2) As for the insecure quantum channel, Eve may launch intercept-resend attack or measure-resend attack. Supposed that the fake particles distributed by Eve are in $|0_{dp}\rangle$, the simulation of Eve's attacks is indicated in Figure 2. TP's measurement outcome is random in $|01\rangle$ or $|11\rangle$. As long as Eve executes attack actions, TP has the chance to detect Eve.

$$\begin{aligned}
|0_{dp}\rangle &= |01\rangle_{12} \xrightarrow{\text{RZ}(\frac{\pi}{5})} e^{i\frac{\pi}{5}}|01\rangle_{12} \\
&\xrightarrow{\text{CNOT}_{12}} e^{i\frac{\pi}{5}}|01\rangle_{12} \xrightarrow{H_1} \frac{e^{i\frac{\pi}{5}}}{\sqrt{2}}(|01\rangle + |11\rangle)_{12}.
\end{aligned} \tag{15}$$




Figure 2: **(a)** Quantum circuit of CTRL operation, **(b)** the measurement results in a insecure quantum channel with the first MSQPC protocol




Figure 3: **(a)** Quantum circuit of SIFT operation, **(b)** the measurement results of the first MSQPC protocol

4.1.2 SIFT operation

If P_i performs SIFT operation on particles in **Step 2**, the quantum circuit and the measurement results are shown in Figure 3. The final measurement outcome of P_i is random in $|01\rangle$ or $|10\rangle$.

$$|_{-dp}\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|01\rangle - |10\rangle)_{12} \xrightarrow{RZ(\frac{\pi}{5}) e^{i\frac{\pi}{5}}} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|01\rangle - |10\rangle)_{12}. \quad (16)$$

4.2 Simulation analysis on the second MSQPC protocol

Z_r basis measurements could be achieved with $Z \otimes Z$ basis measurements since the parities of $|0_r\rangle$ and $|1_r\rangle$ are different and could be distinguished with two single-photon measurements easily. Besides, X_r basis measurements

could be realized by H operation and $Z \otimes Z$ basis measurements. The results of X_r basis measurements are

$$\begin{aligned} |+_r\rangle &= \frac{1}{2}(|00\rangle + |11\rangle + |01\rangle - |10\rangle)_{12} \xrightarrow{H_2} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|00\rangle + |11\rangle)_{12}; \\ |-_r\rangle &= \frac{1}{2}(|00\rangle + |11\rangle - |01\rangle + |10\rangle)_{12} \xrightarrow{H_2} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|01\rangle + |10\rangle)_{12}. \end{aligned} \quad (17)$$

In **Step 1***, TP prepares the DF logical states as follows,

$$\begin{aligned} |00\rangle_{12} &\xrightarrow{H_1 \otimes I_2} | +0 \rangle_{12} \xrightarrow{\text{CNOT}_{12}} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|00\rangle + |11\rangle)_{12} = |0_r\rangle; \\ |00\rangle_{12} &\xrightarrow{X_1 \otimes X_2} |11\rangle_{12} \xrightarrow{H_1 \otimes I_2} |-1\rangle_{12} \xrightarrow{\text{CNOT}_{12}} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|01\rangle - |10\rangle)_{12} = |1_r\rangle; \\ |00\rangle_{12} &\xrightarrow{H_1 \otimes X_2} |+1\rangle_{12} \xrightarrow{\text{CNOT}_{12}} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|01\rangle + |10\rangle)_{12} \xrightarrow{H_1} \\ &\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|00\rangle + |11\rangle + |01\rangle - |10\rangle)_{12} = |+_r\rangle; \\ &|00\rangle_{12}|10\rangle_{12}|-0\rangle_{12} \xrightarrow{\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|00\rangle - |11\rangle)_{12}} \\ &\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|00\rangle + |11\rangle - |01\rangle + |10\rangle)_{12} = |-_r\rangle. \end{aligned} \quad (18)$$

4.2.1 CTRL operation

Suppose the original logical qubits sent by TP are in $|-_r\rangle$. If P_i operates the CTRL, TP will measure the logical qubits in X_r basis in **Case 1***. There are two cases in the CTRL operation. The collective-rotation noise could be simulated by $\text{RY}(\frac{\pi}{5})$.

(1) As for the secure quantum channel, the quantum circuit and the measurement results are shown in Figure 4. TP's measurement outcome is random in $|01\rangle$ or $|10\rangle$, which implies the result of X_r basis measurement is $|-_r\rangle$.

$$\begin{aligned} |-_r\rangle &= \frac{1}{2}(|00\rangle + |11\rangle - |01\rangle + |10\rangle)_{12} \\ &\xrightarrow{\text{RY}(\frac{\pi}{5})} \frac{1}{2}(|00\rangle + |11\rangle - |01\rangle + |10\rangle)_{12} \xrightarrow{H_2} \frac{1}{2}(|01\rangle + |10\rangle)_{12}. \end{aligned} \quad (19)$$

(2) When the quantum channel is insecure, assume that the fake particles sent by Eve are in $|0_r\rangle$, Figure 5 describes the simulation of Eve's attacks. TP's measurement outcome is random in $|00\rangle$, $|01\rangle$, $|10\rangle$ or $|11\rangle$. If TP's measurement result is $|00\rangle$ or $|11\rangle$, he could know that the quantum channel is insecure.

$$\begin{aligned} |0_r\rangle &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|00\rangle + |11\rangle)_{12} \xrightarrow{\text{RY}(\frac{\pi}{5})} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|00\rangle + |11\rangle)_{12} \\ &\xrightarrow{H_2} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|00\rangle + |01\rangle + |10\rangle - |11\rangle)_{12}. \end{aligned} \quad (20)$$




Figure 4: **(a)** Quantum circuit of CTRL operation, **(b)** the measurement results in a secure quantum channel of the second MSQPC protocol




Figure 5: **(a)** Quantum circuit of CTRL operation, **(b)** the measurement results in an insecure quantum channel of the second MSQPC protocol




Figure 6: **(a)** Quantum circuit of SIFT operation, **(b)** the measurement results in the secure quantum channel of the second MSQPC protocol

4.2.2 SIFT operation

If P_i performs SIFT operation, the quantum circuit and the measurement results are shown in Figure 6. The measurement outcome of P_i is random in one of the states $|00\rangle$, $|01\rangle$, $|10\rangle$ or $|11\rangle$, which is consistent with Equation (21).

$$|{-}_r\rangle = \frac{1}{2}(|00\rangle + |11\rangle + |01\rangle - |10\rangle)_{12} \xrightarrow{\text{RY}(\frac{\pi}{5})} \frac{1}{2}(|00\rangle + |11\rangle + |01\rangle - |10\rangle)_{12} \quad (21)$$

5 Comparison

The detailed comparison between the two proposed protocols and some baseline protocols is collected in Table 3. Similar with the protocols in [21–23], our protocols could resist the collective noises. Besides, the participants in our protocols are semi-quantum and not necessary to own full quantum capability. Like the protocols in [20, 23], our protocol could compute the private information of n the participants, while the schemes in [21, 23] only could compare two participants' privacies. Furthermore, all the classical participants in our protocols should share a common key.

The qubit efficiency of quantum protocols could be represented as $\xi = c/t$ [28], where c and t represent the number of compared bits and the total number of qubits prepared in the protocols, respectively. In the proposed protocols, the length of secrets is l , hence $c = nl$. TP should prepare $5nl$ DF logical states, equivalently, TP should generate $10nl$ qubits. Classical participants will execute SIFT operation with a probability of $\frac{1}{2}$, and they will prepare $5nl$ qubits. Hence, the qubit efficiency of our protocols is $\xi = \frac{nl}{10nl+5nl} = \frac{1}{15}$. Semi-quantum protocols require more quantum resources

since the classical participants only have restricted quantum capabilities. Besides, it is necessary to consume more quantum resources to resist noises. Though the proposed protocols have no advantage in terms of quantum efficiency, they could work in the semi-quantum mode and could resist noises effectively.

Table 3: Comparison

	Category of QPC	Number of participants	Quantum resource	Need for pre-shared key	Channel type	Quantum efficiency
[20]	SQPC	$n(n \geq 3)$	Bell state	Yes	Idea channel	$\frac{1}{5}$
[21]	Noise-resisting QPC	2	GHZ state	No	Collective noise channel	$\frac{2}{15}$
[22]	Noise-resisting QPC	$n(n \geq 3)$	Three-qubit entangled state	Yes	Collective noise channel	$\frac{1}{3}$
[23]	Noise-resisting SQPC	2	DF state	No	Collective noise channel	$\frac{1}{48}$
Our protocols	Noise-resisting SQPC	$n(n \geq 3)$	DF state	Yes	Collective noise channel	$\frac{1}{15}$

6 Conclusion

To counteract collective noises, two robust MSQPC protocols are investigated with the DF states. Our two protocols have good performance in resisting collective-dephasing noise and collective-rotation noise, respectively. Assisting by a semi-honest TP with full quantum ability, multiple classical participants could compare their privacies. Besides, the proposed MSQPC protocols perform well in resisting various external attacks and internal attacks. Furthermore, the two proposed protocols are feasible under the related quantum facilities and technology, since the operations involving in our protocols could be implemented on the IBM Quantum Experience.

Acknowledgments

This work is supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China (Grant Nos. 62161025 and 61871205), and the Top Double 1000 Talent Programme of Jiangxi Province (Grant No. JXSQ2019201055).

References

- [1] Zhao Dou, Gang Xu, Xiubo Chen, Xinxin Niu and Yixian Yang “Rational protocol of quantum secure multi-party computation”. [Quantum](#)

- Inf. Process. **17**, 199 (2018).
- [2] Yuguang Yang and Qiaoyan Wen. “An efficient two-party quantum private comparison protocol with decoy photons and two-photon entanglement. *J. Phys. A Math. Theor.* **42**, 055305 (2009).
 - [3] Ling Xu and Zhiwen Zhao. “Quantum private comparison protocol based on the entanglement swapping between χ^+ state and w-class state”. *Quantum Inf. Process.* **16**, 302 (2017).
 - [4] Chaoyang Li, Xiubo Chen, Hengji Li, Yuguang Yang and Jian Li. “Efficient quantum private comparison protocol based on the entanglement swapping between four-qubit cluster state and extended Bell state”. *Quantum Inf. Process.* **18**, 158 (2019).
 - [5] Zhaoxu Ji, Peiru Fan, Huanguo Zhang and Houzhen Wang. “Greenberger-Horne-Zeilinger-based quantum private comparison protocol with bit-flipping”. *Phys. Scr.* **96**, 015103 (2020).
 - [6] Fenglin Chen, Hai Zhang, Sugan Chen and Wentao Cheng. “Novel two-party quantum private comparison via quantum walks on circle”. *Quantum Inf. Process.* **20**, 178 (2021).
 - [7] Yaojen Chang, Chia-Wei Tsai and Tzonelih Hwang . “Multi-user private comparison protocol using GHZ class states”. *Quantum Inf. Process.* **12**, 1077–1088 (2013).
 - [8] Qingle Wang, Hongxiang Sun and Wei Huang . “Multi-party quantum private comparison protocol with n-level entangled states”. *Quantum Inf. Process.* **13**, 2375-2389 (2014).
 - [9] Tianyu Ye “Multi-party quantum private comparison protocol based on entanglement swapping of Bell entangled states”. *Commun. Theor. Phys.* **66**, 280–290 (2016).
 - [10] Zhaoxu Ji and Tianyu Ye. “Multi-party quantum private comparison based on the entanglement swapping of d-level cat states and d-level Bell states”. *Quantum Inf. Process.* **16**, 177 (2017).
 - [11] Shih-Min Hung, Sheng-Liang Hwang, Tzonelih Hwang and Shih-Hung Kao. “Multiparty quantum private comparison with almost dishonest third parties for strangers”. *Quantum Inf. Process.* **16**, 36 (2017).
 - [12] Chongqiang Ye and Tianyu Ye. “Multi-party quantum private comparison of size relation with d-level single-particle states”. *Quantum Inf. Process.* **17**, 252 (2018).
 - [13] Hao Cao, Wenping Ma, Liangdong Lü, Yefeng He and Ge Liu . “Multi-party quantum privacy comparison of size based on d-level GHZ states”. *Quantum Inf. Process.* **18**, 287 (2019).
 - [14] Chongqiang Ye, Jian Li and Zheng-wen Cao. “A class of protocols for multi-party quantum private comparison based on traveling mode”. *Quantum Inf. Process.* **20**, 56 (2021).
 - [15] Bing Wang, Lihua Gong and Sanqiu Liu. “Multi-party quantum private size comparison protocol with d-dimensional Bell states”. *Front. Phys.* **10**, 981376 (2022).
-

- [16] Michel Boyer, Dan Kenigsberg and Tal Mor. “Quantum key distribution with classical Bob”. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **99**, 140501 (2007).
 - [17] Nanrun Zhou, Qiangda Xu, Nisuo Du and Lihua Gong. “Semi-quantum private comparison protocol of size relation with d-dimensional Bell states”. *Quantum Inf. Process.* **20**, 124 (2021).
 - [18] Bing Wang, Sanqiu Liu and Lihua Gong. “Semi-quantum private comparison protocol of size relation with d-dimensional GHZ states”. *Chin. Phys. B* **31**, 010302 (2022).
 - [19] Chongqiang Ye, Jian Li , Xiubo Chen and Yuan Tian. “Efficient semi-quantum private comparison without using entanglement resource and pre-shared key”. *Quantum Inf. Process.* **20**, 262 (2021).
 - [20] Zexi Li, Tianhua Liu and Hongfeng Zhu. “Private comparison protocol for multiple semi-quantum users based on Bell states”. *Int. J. Theor. Phys.* **61**, 177 (2022).
 - [21] Chih-Hung Chang, Tzonelih Hwang and Prosanta Gope. “An efficient quantum private comparison of equality over collective-noise channels”. *Int. J. Theor. Phys.* **55**, 2125–2138 (2016).
 - [22] Mingkuai Zhou. “Robust multi-party quantum private comparison protocols against the collective noise based on three-qubit entangled states”. *Int. J. Theor. Phys.* **57**, 2931-2937 (2018).
 - [23] Yihan Tang, Hengyue Jia, Xia Wu, Huimin Chen and Yanmei Zhang. “Robust semi-quantum private comparison protocols against collective noises with decoherence-free states”. *Quantum Inf. Process.* **21**, 97 (2022).
 - [24] Minghui Zhang, Huifang Li, Jinye Peng and Xiaoyi Feng . “Fault-tolerant semiquantum key distribution over a collective-dephasing noise channel”. *Int. J. Theor. Phys.* **56**, 2659-2670 (2017).
 - [25] Xia Pan. “Semi-quantum key distribution protocol with logical qubits over the collective-rotation noise channel”. *Int. J. Theor. Phys.* **61**, 77 (2022).
 - [26] Fei Gao, Sujuan Qin, Qiaoyan Wen and Fuchen Zhu. “A simple participant attack on the Bradler-Dusek protocol”. *Quantum Inf. Comput.* **7**, 329–334 (2007).
 - [27] IBM Quantum experience, URL: <https://quantum-computing.ibm.com/composer/>
 - [28] ZhaoXu Ji and Tianyu Ye. “Quantum private comparison of equal information based on highly entangled six-qubit genuine state”. *Commun. Theor. Phys.* **65**, 711–715 (2016).
-