

# High Efficient Secret Key Distillation for Long Distance Continuous Variable Quantum Key Distribution

Yi-Bo Zhao,\* Zheng-Fu Han,† Jin-Jian Chen, You-Zhen Gui, and Guang-Can Guo

*Key Lab of Quantum Information, University of Science and Technology of China, (CAS), Hefei, Anhui 230026, China*

The continuous variable quantum key distribution is expected to provide high secret key rate without single photon source and detector, but the lack of the secure and effective key distillation method makes it unpractical. Here, we present a secure single-bit-reverse-reconciliation protocol combined with secret information concentration and post-selection, which can distill the secret key with high efficiency and low computational complexity. The simulation results show that this protocol can provide high secret key rate even when the transmission fiber is longer than 150km, which may make the continuous variable scheme to outvie the single photon one.

PACS numbers: 03.67.Dd, 42.50.-p, 89.70.+c

Recently, many approaches for quantum key distribution have been put forward, which may be divided into two major types, single photon one [1, 2] and continuous variable one [3, 4, 5, 6]. The former needs single photon detector and single photon source or weak coherent source [2], therefore the high secret key rate becomes a hot topic. Fortunately, the continuous variable quantum key distribution (CVQKD) is potentially to provide high secret key rate even for long transmission distance [6], and only requires the coherent light source as well as the homodyne detection. Many experiments show the physical possibility of this scheme [6, 7, 8]. However, unlike the single photon one, after the quantum transmission process, the CVQKD only provides continuously distributed raw key elements [6] that should be converted into binary keys. Although its potential has been demonstrated, how to distill the secret key is still an open problem. Firstly, some information will be certainly lost or leaked during the distillation. Secondly, if taking the concrete distillation into account, Eve's attack may be much more sophisticated than that considered in Refs. [3, 4, 5, 6]. When the channel loss is high, the maximum mutual information between Alice and Bob is only slightly higher than that between Eve and Bob, and it is possible that even if the CVQKD could be proved unconditionally secure, any secure binary key could not be distilled.

The only existing reconciliation protocol was proposed by Assche *et al* [9], and used in current experimental demonstrations [6]. In the protocol, they subtly combined the quantization with error correction and tried the best to reduce publicly exchanged information. However, it is effective only when the quantum channel loss is small [3, 6]. In Ref. [6], the error correction block size for the reconciliation was selected as 50 000, which is already very complex to implement, but only within 3.1 dB loss, could a secret key be distilled. In fact, the basic assumption of the previous security proofs of CVQKD is perfect, i.e. an ideal reconciliation that can convert the continuous-element into common bits without any

auxiliary tactics. However, such reconciliation cannot be realized under the high loss condition because the error correction it demands will be too complex to implement [10]. Therefore, a feasible reconciliation is necessary to show the practical security of the CVQKD.

In the following, we present a single-bit-reverse-reconciliation protocol to convert the element into common bits, after which large portion of secret information can still be kept secret from Eve. We prove that Eve's attack is based on a Markov chain under the condition of no excess noise, and under the noisy condition, Eve's tapped additional information can be eliminated. Then we show this protocol to be secure, which is also a practical security proof for the CVQKD. In this protocol we concentrate the secret information into certain bits, expose other useless information and flexibly employ some tactics, such as post-selection, to keep Eve at a disadvantage, and then the computational complexity is largely reduced. With this protocol, 18% of the theoretical maximum keys can be distilled at 100km transmission distance (0.01dB loss) and even at 150km transmission distance (0.001dB loss) the secret keys can still be distilled.

Here, we discuss the CVQKD scheme of reference [6], namely the Gaussian modulated coherent state scheme. Suppose Alice and Bob's  $x$  and  $p$  quadratures are  $A_x$ ,  $A_p$ ,  $B_x$  and  $B_p$  respectively, Alice's modulation variance is  $V_A N_0$ , where  $N_0$  denotes the shot noise variance, and Alice, Bob and Eve's raw key elements are  $a$ ,  $b$  and  $c$  respectively. In this scheme we require that Alice and Bob estimate the conditional entropy and distribution between them. Then the single-bit-reverse-reconciliation protocol runs as follows.

1. Alice slices her raw key element space into regions, and denotes those regions with natural numbers in the order as shown in Fig.1. The width of each region must be much smaller than the variance of Eve's and Bob's estimates of Alice's quadratures.

2. Alice sorts her regions into pairs, making sure that each region belongs to only one pair. The distance be-




FIG. 1: An example of the pairing method, where identical colors have been used to denote the two parties of one pair.

tween two parties of one pair is  $\delta a$ . For example, we can select pairs by combining 4 with -4, 1 with 8, 2 with 9, ...,  $m$  with  $m+7$ , and so on.

3. Alice converts her key elements into binary bits according to whether they belong to the left or the right regions of their pairs. If a certain element belongs to the left region of one pair, Alice designates it as 0, and if to the right hand side, as 1. Then she tells Bob which pair each of her raw key elements belongs to, but without exposing her designated bit results. For example, if one of Alice's key elements belongs to region 2 or 9, then she sends the pairing sign 2-9 to Bob, and assigns it as 0 or 1 correspondingly. The slicing, sorting and assignment methods are publicly known.

4. According to Alice's pairing sign and his own results, Bob calculates the conditional probabilities  $P(0|b)$ ,  $P(1|b)$  [14] and the bit error rate (BER) of each of his key elements, where  $P(1|b)$  and  $P(0|b)$  denote the probability that Alice assigns her data as 1 or 0, while Bob's measurement is  $b$ . The BER actually is  $\min[P(0|b), P(1|b)]$ . Then Bob divides his elements into 0 or 1 according to which of  $P(0|b)$  and  $P(1|b)$  is bigger. What should be emphasized is that the channel may be binary asymmetric.

5. After many such communications, Alice and Bob share a series of binary strings. Then Bob discards those bits with high BER and sorts remained bits into groups according to the BERs and pairing information to make it convenient for further error correction, privacy amplification and so on. For example, he sorts those bits of one pair with approximately identical BERs into one group. Later, Bob tells Alice which group each of her bits belongs to.

6. Bob sends the appropriate error correction information of each group to Alice. After error correction, Alice and Bob share a series of common binary strings. Then through privacy amplification [11], they thus finally have a common secret key.

In the coherent state scheme, depending on Alice's quadratures and Eve's attack, the entropy of Bob's measurement satisfies [3]:  $H(B_x|E_x) + H(B_p|A_p) \geq$

$2H_0$ , where  $E_x$  represents the tapped result of Eve,  $H(\cdot|\cdot)$  denotes the conditional entropy and  $H_0$  is the entropy of a quadrature of the vacuum state. Because Bob randomly chooses  $x$  or  $p$  for his measurement, the secret key rate guaranteed by the reverse reconciliation is  $\Delta I = I(A : B) - I(B : E) = H(B|E) - H(B|A)$ , where  $I(\cdot|\cdot)$  denotes the mutual information. In the same way, we also have  $H(B_x|E_x, A_x) + H(B_p|A_p) \geq 2H_0$ .

We will first discuss the case without excess noise [6]. The states that Alice sends to Bob are coherent states, so that  $H(B_x|A_x) + H(B_p|A_p) = 2H_0$ . In the channel estimation, Alice and Bob should estimate the conditional entropy exactly, which means that any eavesdropping should maintain  $H(B|c, A) = H(B|A)$ . Then we obtain:

$$\Delta I = I(A : B|E) \quad (1)$$

From  $\Delta I = I(A : B) - I(B : E)$  and Eq.(1) we have:

$$H(B, E|A) = H(E|A) + H(B|A) \quad (2)$$

On the other hand, Alice sends Bob the coherent state  $|a\rangle$ , which is attenuated to  $|\sqrt{G}a\rangle$  by the time it arrives at Bob when the channel transmission is  $G$ . Thereby, under the case of Gaussian modulation, the distributions of  $a$  and  $b$  can be written as:

$$P(a) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi V_A N_0}} \exp\left(-\frac{a^2}{2V_A N_0}\right) \quad (3)$$

$$P(b|a) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi N_0}} \exp\left[-\frac{(\sqrt{G}a - b)^2}{2N_0}\right] \quad (4)$$

The coherent state guarantees the conditional distribution  $P(b|a)$  to be the distribution with the minimum shot noise, and since Eve cannot know which quadrature Bob will choose to measure, after many communications Alice and Bob can employ, for example, the normality test to limit Eve's tapped information. Any of her attacks should maintain the conditional distribution of Eq.(4), which means  $P(b|a) = P(b|a, c)$ .

We can then obtain  $P(b, c|a) = P(c|a)P(b|a, c) = P(c|a)P(b|a)$  and  $P(c, a|b) = P(c|a)P(b|a)P(a)/P(b) = P(c|a)P(a|b)$ .

Thus

$$P(c|b) = \int P(c|a)P(a|b)da \quad (5)$$

$$P(b|c) = \int P(b|a)P(a|c)da \quad (6)$$

Eqs.(1) (2) (5) and (6) show that under the condition that Alice's quadratures are known, Bob's and Eve's measurements are independent. They also illustrate that, for reverse CVQKD, if there is no excess noise, any eavesdropping of Bob's information is equivalent to a Markov chain

of *Eve*  $\rightarrow$  *Alice*  $\rightarrow$  *Bob*, which means that for the reverse scheme, the information can be regarded as having been sent by Bob, received by Alice, and then transmitted to Eve by Alice. All of Eve's information about Bob is obtained from Alice. To estimate Bob's result, at first Eve should estimate Alice's quadrature, which is restricted by the direct reconciliation schemes [12]

After Alice announces her pairing information, Eve can only know that Alice's sent state is equivalent to  $|a_0\rangle$  or  $|a_0 + \delta a\rangle$ , where  $|a_0\rangle$  describes Alice's certain sent state. After Bob public his grouping information, Eve knows the channel properties between Alice and Bob, but her estimates of Bob's result are still based on her estimates of Alice's quadrature. To Eve, the probability of Bob's assignment results is  $P(b \rightarrow 1|c) = P(|a_0 + \delta a\rangle|c)P(b \rightarrow 1|a_0 + \delta a) + P(|a_0\rangle|c)P(b \rightarrow 1|a_0)$ , where  $b \rightarrow 1$  correspond to Bob assigning his data as 1 and  $P(|a_0\rangle|c)$  describes the probability that Alice has sent  $|a_0\rangle$  while Eve's result is  $c$ .  $\min[P(b \rightarrow 1|c), P(b \rightarrow 0|c)]$  actually denotes Eve's BER. It shows that after the assignment the binary channel is a binary Markov chain of *Bob*  $\rightarrow$  *Alice*  $\rightarrow$  *Eve*. If Eve cannot estimate Alice's result correctly, she cannot estimate Bob's correctly. The final amount of practical secret keys can be given by

$$\Delta I = n \sum_G P(G) [I_{BG}(A : B) - I_{BG}(E : B)] \quad (7)$$

where  $n$  denotes the number of raw key elements,  $\sum_G$  means summation over the groups,  $P(G)$  describes the probability of the groups, and  $I_{BG}(\cdot : \cdot)$  denotes the mutual information of a group after their exposure. We see that because of the Markov chain  $I_{BG}(A : B) \geq I_{BG}(E : B)$  is always maintained [13]. Through Alice's pairing information and Bob's grouping information, the transmission characteristics of the binary channel between Alice and Bob can be given. The properties of the channel between Eve and Alice are discussed in many direct reconciliation schemes [12]. Then the maximum information tapped by Eve can also be given.

If Bob sorts those bits of a pair with roughly the same BER into one group, for a certain group and pair,  $I_{BG}(A : B) = H_{BG}(A) - \sum_{G_{group}} P_G(b) \Gamma[P(0|b)]$ , where  $H_{BG}(\cdot)$  denotes the Shannon entropy of the distribution of 0 and 1 in a certain group,  $\sum_{G_{group}}$  denotes summation in the group,  $P_G(\cdot)$  is the distribution within the group, depending on Bob's grouping method, and  $\Gamma(\lambda) = -\lambda \log_2 \lambda - (1 - \lambda) \log_2 (1 - \lambda)$  is the Shannon entropy.

The mutual information of a group between Eve and Bob can be given by  $I_{BG}(E : B) = H_{BG}(B) - \int P_G(c) \Gamma[P(b \rightarrow 1|c)] dc$ . The minimum noise on Alice's side in estimating Eve's quadrature is given by reference [12]:  $N_E = N_0 + \frac{GN_0}{1-G} = \frac{N_0}{1-G}$ . For the minimum Gaussian noise case, we have the conditional distributions:  $P(c|a) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi\alpha N_E}} \exp[-\frac{(\sqrt{\alpha}a-c)^2}{2\alpha N_E}]$ , where  $\alpha$  is a parameter which do not affect the final results. Then by the




FIG. 2: Simulation results for secret key rate versus transmission line distance. Dashed line: theoretical key rate from Ref. [6]; solid line: practical key rate from our simulation result using the above method; dotted line: efficiency defined as the ratio of the practical to the theoretical key rates

grouping information,  $P_G(c)$ ,  $P(|a_0\rangle|c)$  and consequently  $I_{BG}(E : B)$  can be obtained. The concrete calculation is complex and depending on Bob's grouping method. Here, we only give the simulation results.

The simulation results of the binary secret key rate as a function of the channel transmission distance are shown in Fig.2, where we have set  $\delta a = (1 + 0.02L)\sqrt{N_E}$ ,  $V_A = 500$  and the width of the region  $\delta a/7$  and  $L$  is the transmission distance in the unit of km. The pairing method is that shown in Fig.1, and the bits of both Alice and Bob are sorted into groups with roughly the same BER, while those bits with too high a BER, higher than 40%, are discarded. In the simulation we see that the maximum efficiency, defined as the ratio of the practical to the theoretical secret key rates, is about 37%. At the distance of 100km, the efficiency is 18%, the BER between Alice and Eve is higher than 4% and the secret information per final bit carries is approximately equal that per key element carries. Even for long distances approaching 150km the efficiency is about 0.15%. While in Ref. [6], they distilled the key only within 3.1dB loss (15km fiber). For long distances the BER between Alice and Bob is increased, so many bits should be discarded to reduce the computational complexity, at the cost of lower efficiency.

When the channel has excess noise  $\xi N_0$ , we have  $V_{B|A} = (1 + G\xi)N_0$  [6], where  $V_{\cdot|}$  denotes the conditional variance, so  $H(B|A) = H_0 + 0.5 \log_2(1 + G\xi) = H_0 + H'$ . Under this condition through entropy estimation Alice and Bob may not be able to find a lurking Eve when  $H(B|A, c) \geq H(B|A) - 2H'$ , and then the secret key rate becomes  $\Delta I = I(A : B|E) - 2H'$ . Obviously, this case is not always a Markov chain. In this situation Eve can do entangling cloner attack, using a noiseless line to replace the noise one between Alice and Bob and injecting an entangled beam into the line to tap more of Bob's information [6]. However, under this case, the

maximum variance change caused by the entangled beam cannot exceed that of the excess noise, so the maximum additional information Eve can attack is  $I_{add} = 0.5 \log_2[V_{B|A}/\min(V_{vacuum})] = 0.5 \log_2(V_{B|A}^2/N_0^2) = 2H'$  bits [13, 15], where  $\min(V_{vacuum})$  denotes the minimum variance of vacuum noise. Moreover, previous analyses show that  $I(A : B|E)$  is only determined by the Markov chain. Thus, this process is equivalent to that besides through the previous Markov chain Eve can obtain additional information of  $2H'$  bits from Bob. It can be proved that the exactly same result in reference [6] can be derived by this way. Therefore, at first Alice and Bob can suppose the channel is still a Markov chain, and estimate the maximum information tapped by Eve. If the results satisfy  $\Delta I > 2H'$ , Alice and Bob can still distill a secret key, but the final amount should be subtracted by  $2nH'$  bits. Then the amount of secret keys becomes:  $\Delta I = n\{\sum_G P(G)[I_{BG}(A : B) - I_{BG}(E : B)] - 2H'\}$ .

What should be noticed is that if there is excess noise, the conditional distribution of Bob and Eve's measurements will all be changed correspondingly. The  $N_E$  will become  $N_0 + N_0/(\frac{1-G}{G} + \xi)$  [12]. If the efficiency is 100%, only when  $\xi < 0.5$ , can the secret key be distilled [6]. If the reconciliation efficiency is  $\gamma$ , it requires  $\xi < 0.5\gamma$ , which can be improved by choose proper post-selection.

In this protocol, after Alice and Bob's exposure, the assignment process is equivalent to binary modulation, but Eve's attack is still limited by CVQKD. To reduce the computational complexity, we should concentrate the secret information into certain bits and increase the difference between Eve's minimum BER and Alice's BER [10]. In this protocol we see that if there is no excess noise the channel is a Markov chain, so if the BER between Alice and Eve is maintained nonzero, then the BER between Eve and Bob is certainly larger than that between Alice and Bob [16]. Alice and Bob can use post-selection, discarding those bits with a high BER between them. Then the BER of remained bits between Eve and Bob will be sufficiently larger than that between Alice and Bob, so the complexity of the error correction can be significantly reduced [10]. For example, if the BER between Alice and Bob of remained bits is below 15%, while that between Eve and Alice is maintained to be 25%, then the difference between the BER between Eve and Bob and that between Alice and Bob is larger than 17%. In addition, to reduce the computational complexity and increase the secret key rate we should choose an appropriate value for  $\delta a$ , since  $\delta a$  affects both the BER between Alice and Bob and that between Alice and Eve. We slice Alice's raw key element space into very small regions, mainly because by doing so Alice and Bob can estimate their BERs exactly. Moreover, Bob should sort his binary strings into different groups according to the BERs, because the bits with different BERs may contribute different amounts of

secret key, and require different error corrections.

In this letter, we show that under the condition of no excess noise Eve's attack is based on a Markov chain in the reverse reconciliation CVQKD scheme, and the excess noise will only cause additional information loss, which can be easily subtracted in the final result. Then we propose a secure single-bit-reverse-reconciliation protocol, with low computational complexity. The numerical simulation results show that almost 18% of the theoretical maximum secret information can be distilled by the protocol with low computational complexity even when the transmission fiber is longer than 100km.

**Acknowledgement:** Special thanks are given to Professor Ling-An Wu and Professor P. Grangier. We also thank F. Zhang for valuable discussions on classical quantization, and bit assignment. Thanks are also due to X. N. Ji, Q. Fu, B. Zhu, J. Chen, H. Wen and Y. Liu for their help in the simulations. Support from Science Foundation of China under Grant No. 60537020 and No. 60121503 and the Knowledge Innovation Project of Chinese Academy of Sciences.

---

\* Electronic address: zhaoyibo@mail.ustc.edu.cn

† Electronic address: zfhan@ustc.edu.cn

- [1] C. H. Bennett and G. Brassard. *Proceedings of IEEE International Conference on Computers, Systems, and Signal Processing (IEEE, New York, 1984)*, pp. 175-179.
- [2] W. Y. Hwang, Phys. Rev. Lett. **91**, 057901 (2003).
- [3] F. Grosshans, N. J. Cerf, Phys. Rev. Lett. **92**, 047905 (2004).
- [4] S. Iblisdir, G. VanAssche and N. J. Cerf, Phys. Rev. Lett. **93**, 170502 (2004).
- [5] C. Weedbrook, A. M. Lance, W. P. Bowen, T. Symul, T. C. Ralph and P. K. Lam, Phys. Rev. Lett. **93**, 170504 (2004).
- [6] F. Grosshans, G. VanAssche, J. Wenger, R. Brouil, N. J. Cerf and P. Grangier, Nature **421**, 238 (2003).
- [7] M. Legre, H. Zbinden and N. Gisin, arXiv: quant-ph/0511113 (2005).
- [8] J. Lodewyck, T. Debuisschert, R. Tualle-Brouiri and P. Grangier, Phys. Rev. A **72**, 050303(R) (2005).
- [9] G. VanAssche, J. Cardinal and N. J. Cerf, IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory, **50**, 394 (2004).
- [10] Y. B. Zhao, Y. Z. Gui, J. J. Chen, Z. F. Han, G. C. Guo, arXiv: quant-ph/0602019 (2006).
- [11] C. H. Bennett, G. Brassard, C. Crepeau, U. M. Maurer, IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory, **41**, 1915 (1995).
- [12] F. Grosshans, P. Grangier, Phys. Rev. Lett. **88**, 057902 (2002).
- [13] C. E. Shannon, Bell Syst. Tech. J. **27**, 379 (1948).
- [14]  $P(1|b) = 1/\{1 + \exp\{\frac{\delta a}{2V_A N_0}[(1 + GV_A)(2a_0 + \delta a) - 2\sqrt{GV_{Ab}}]\}$ .
- [15]  $V_{B|A} \min(V_{vacuum}) = N_0^2$ .
- [16] For symmetry binary channels,  $e_{EB} = e_{EA} + e_{AB} - 2e_{EA}e_{AB}$ , where  $e.$  is the BER.