

Experimental quantum key distribution with active phase randomization

Yi Zhao, Bing Qi, and Hoikwong Lo

Center for Quantum Information and Quantum Control,
Department of Physics and Department of Electrical & Computer Engineering,
University of Toronto, Toronto, Ontario, M5S 3G4, Canada

Phase randomization is an important assumption made in many security proofs of practical quantum key distribution (QKD) systems. Here, we present the first experimental demonstration of QKD with reliable active phase randomization. One key contribution is a polarization-insensitive phase modulator, which we added to a commercial phase-coding QKD system to randomize the global phase of each bit. We also proposed a simple but useful method to verify experimentally that the phase is indeed randomized. Our result shows very low QBER ($< 1\%$). We expect this active phase randomization process to be a standard part in future QKD set-ups due to its significance and feasibility.

Quantum key distribution (QKD) allows two authenticated parties to share a secret key [1, 2]. The security of this secret key has been rigorously proven to be unconditional [3]. Experimentally, people have demonstrated QKD over 175km optical fibre [4]. Moreover, commercial QKD systems are now available [5].

How secure are these implementations of QKD? The security proofs [3] rely on several assumptions. A frequently used one is that Alice (the sender) has a perfect single photon source. However, most QKD experiments use heavily attenuated coherent laser sources due to the great challenge to build a perfect single photon source [6, 7, 8]. This substitution causes some security concern (like the photon-number-splitting attack [9]) though, the security for QKD using weak coherent state is still provable [10, 11]. Recent study shows that by introducing decoy states, the signals can be rather strong without jeopardizing the security [12, 13, 14]. QKD with decoy states has been experimentally demonstrated recently [15].

The assumption of single photon source was removed at the price of introducing another assumption: the phase of the quantum signal is uniformly random [10, 11, 12, 13, 14], and thus is inaccessible to the eavesdropper. It has been shown that phase randomization of the quantum signal is a crucial security requirement rather than a tricky assumption [16]. The existing security proofs of non-randomized phase QKD [17] are all at a price of compromising performance. Particularly, they cannot be applied to the security proof of decoy state QKD.

QKD experiments with intentionally randomized phase have never been reported. Here we remark that the quantum signals sent by Alice are not "naturally" phase-randomized. For example, in unidirectional QKD system, strong ancillary pulses (sometimes called reference pulses) are often used for feedback control to stabilize the asymmetric Mach-Zehnder interferometer (MZI) [7]. The phase of such strong classical pulses could be (in principle) accurately measured, leaking the phase information to the eavesdropper. Even if weak signals are used, the phase coherence of the laser source could maintain for many emissions of weak signals, which makes it possible to measure the phase accurately. For bidirectional system ("plug & play" system) [8], classical

pulses sent from Bob cause the same problem as the strong ancillary pulses in unidirectional system do.

Active phase randomization in real QKD system is challenging: the phase modulator should be polarization insensitive; this extra phase modulator has to be carefully synchronized with the original system to randomize the phase in real-time; since the output from Alice is very weak (~ 0.1 photon per pulse), it is not straightforward how to verify that the phase is indeed randomized; the phase randomization must not increase the quantum bit error rate (QBER) significantly.

In this paper, we will present the first QKD experiment with reliable active phase randomization. Our implementation is based on a modified commercial "plug & play" system [8]. The global phase of each bit is randomized by an additional phase modulator, after which the bit is sent to Bob. This phase modulator is designed to be polarization-insensitive. Therefore neither polarization-maintaining fiber nor dynamic polarization control is necessary. Our result shows that the phase difference between adjacent signals has been conditionally randomized by this phase-randomization phase modulator, while the relative phase between the two pulses of the same signal is solely determined by Alice's coding phase modulator. We expect phase randomization to become a standard part in future QKD systems due to its security significance [10, 11, 16] and feasibility shown in this paper.

The schematic of our set-up is shown in FIG. 1. The original QKD system works as follows: Bob generates a frame of laser pulses at 5MHz repetition rate; each pulse is splitted into two by the asymmetric MZI; the one propagates through the shorter arm is called the reference pulse, and the one propagates through the longer arm is called the signal pulse; the insertion loss of the phase modulator (ϕ_B in FIG. 1) makes the signal pulse weaker than the reference pulse. The state of the i th bit emitted from Bob is $|j_{i1}j_{i2}\rangle$, where $|j_{i1}\rangle$ denotes the reference pulse and $|j_{i2}\rangle$ denotes the signal pulse. Pulses are sent to Alice and are reflected by the Faraday mirror (FM in FIG. 1, upper chart); Alice encodes the quantum information by modulating the phase of the signal pulse with her phase modulator (ϕ_A in FIG. 1); the pulses are then attenuated to single photon level and sent back to Bob.




FIG . 1 : Upper Chart : Schematic of the experimental set-up in our system . Inside Bob/Jr. Alice : components in Bob/Alice's package of id Quantique QKD system . Our modifications :

Φ_{PI} : polarization-insensitive phase modulator (detailed structure shown in lower chart); FG : functional generator. Original QKD system : LD : laser diode; APD : avalanche photon diode; Φ : phase modulator; PBS : polarization beam splitter; PD : classical photo detector; FM : faraday mirror. Lower chart : Detailed structure of the polarization-insensitive phase modulator. ISL : optical isolator; FC : 2 2 Fiber Coupler; Φ : electro-optical modulator; FM : faraday mirror. Solid line: SM F28 single mode optical fiber; dashed line: electric cable.

The state sent from Alice to Bob is $j_i^0 i_j^0 e^{i \Phi_{PI} i}$. Bob decodes the quantum information by modulating the phase of the reference pulse with his phase modulator (Φ_B in FIG . 1) and letting the two pulses interfere at the coupler before sending the next frame of pulses.

Alice should modulate the global phase of each signal with an extra random value to implement phase randomization. i.e., the state emitted from Alice should be $j_i^0 e^{i \Phi_{PI} i} j_i^0 e^{i(\Phi_{PI} + \Phi_{A}) i}$, where Φ_{A} should be a random value for each bit as shown in FIG . 2 (upper chart). The birefringence of optical fiber makes the polarization of laser unpredictable and changing frequently. Therefore the phase modulator should be polarization insensitive.

There have been several proposals on polarization-insensitive phase modulators, based either on liquid crystal (LC) [18] or on acousto-optic modulator (AOM) [19]. LC-based phase modulators require sophisticated fabrication, and AOM-based phase modulators cannot meet the repetition rate of the laser source (5M Hz). Therefore we need to design another polarization-insensitive phase modulator, which consists of commercial parts and can work at several megahertz.

Our design of phase modulator is shown in FIG . 1 (lower chart). It can be easily shown that the phases of both vertically- and horizontally-polarized components of incoming light are modulated by propagating through the phase modulator (Φ in FIG . 1, lower chart) twice and the π polarization rotation due to the faraday mirror (FM in FIG . 1, lower chart).

The synchronization signal from the photo detector (PD in FIG . 1) will trigger the functional generator (FG in FIG . 1) when the pulse frame enters Alice. The functional generator will hold for a time period before




FIG . 2 : Upper chart : correctly implemented phase randomization. A different random phase is applied on each bit. Lower chart : phase modulation for incorrect implementation : signal pulse and reference pulse are modulated by different phase and thus we could expect QBER to be around 50% . Right Chart : differently polarized components of the same pulse are modulated at different moments.

outputting a pre-loaded uniformly random voltage pattern (generated by id Quantique quantum random number generator) to drive the polarization-insensitive phase modulator to randomize the phase of each bit. This phase modulation extends to the full range of $[0; 2\pi]$ with an amplitude resolution of 12 bits as limited by the functional generator. The linearity of electro-optical effect [20] guarantees that the phase applied on each bit is also uniformly random. In our set-up, the frame length is 504 pulses.

This phase randomization process does not affect the performance of QKD system. The phase modulator applies the same phase shift to both pulses of the same bit as shown in FIG . 2 (upper chart). Therefore the QBER should not change. Moreover, since this extra phase modulator is in Alice's side, we can set the output intensity from Alice arbitrarily. Thus it does not affect the gain. This is good news because the QKD system will not pay any price on performance for randomizing the phase. However, it leaves us a problem : how can we see that the phase is reliably randomized?

Our answer is to shift the delay time of the functional generator (FG in FIG . 1) so that the two pulses of the same bit are modulated differently, as shown in FIG . 2 (lower chart). The relative phase between the two pulses is then uniformly random, and we should observe a sharp increase of QBER to around 50% .

We shift the delay time for 0.2 ns, i.e., a range of two periods of the QKD system, at a step of 10ns (larger step is used for the area). The result is shown in FIG . 3. We can see clearly that when the two pulses of the same bit are modulated equally as in FIG . 2 (upper chart), the QBER is indeed low ($< 1\%$), as the central part in FIG . 3. This confirms our prediction of low-QBER. However, when the delay time is shifted to the value that the two pulses are modulated differently (as in FIG . 2, lower chart), the QBER would increase to around 50% as the two spikes in FIG . 3 show. The fluctuation is only 0.5% (which is within one standard deviation) from the expected value of 50% .

We surprisingly found a "waist" on each slope of the spikes, making the slopes neither sharp nor smooth. The explanation we found is that the vertically- and the horizontally-polarized components of a pulse are modu-




FIG. 3: QBER versus delay time. Alice sent 843k bits with 0.1 photon per bit on average for each point in this diagram. QBER at $t=0$ s is surprisingly low ($<1\%$), and is comparable to QBER at $t=0.2$ s.

lated at different time: one is modulated when the pulse propagates toward the Faraday mirror (FM in FIG. 1, lower chart), and the other one is modulated when the pulse is reflected back as shown in FIG. 2 (right chart). This time difference makes it possible that the phase modulation applied on the two components are different when we shift the modulation time gradually. This modulation difference will increase the QBER to a value between a few percents to 50%, depending on the polarization of the pulse.

The fiber connecting the phase modulator (in FIG. 1, lower chart) and the Faraday mirror (FM in FIG. 1, lower chart) is roughly 2m. Therefore the time differ-

ence between the modulation of the vertically- and the horizontally-polarized components is roughly 20ns. If the modulating phase changed within this 20ns, the QBER would be between a few percent to 50%, forming a waist. The waist in FIG. 3 has two points. This result is expected recalling that the step of time shift is 10ns.

Our implementation is over 5km of telecom fiber. We address that phase randomization itself does not limit the transmission distance. It is the low intensity of the laser source (LD in FIG. 1) in our system that limits the transmission distance [21]. Transmission distance can be easily extended by using a brighter laser diode.

In summary, we have performed the first QKD experiment with reliable phase randomization. Our result shows the global phase of quantum signal is uniformly random. An important assumption in many QKD security proofs | phase randomization | is thus implemented with confidence. A potential security loophole is blocked. We expect phase randomization to become a standard part in future QKD systems due to its significance in security [10, 11, 16] and its feasibility.

We thank generous help from many colleagues including Li Qian and Gregoire Ribordy. Support of the funding agencies CFI, CIP I, the CRC program, CIAR, MITACS, NSERC, OIT, and PREA is gratefully acknowledged. This research was supported by Perimeter Institute for Theoretical Physics. Research at Perimeter Institute is supported in part by the Government of Canada through NSERC and by the province of Ontario through MEDT.

-
- [1] C. H. Bennett, G. Brassard, Proceedings of IEEE International Conference on Computers, Systems, and Signal Processing, (IEEE, 1984), pp. 175-179.
- [2] N. Gisin, G. Ribordy, W. Tittel, and H. Zbinden, Rev. Mod. Phys., 74, 145 (2002).
- [3] D. Mayers, J. of ACM 48, 351 (2001); H.-K. Lo, H. F. Chau, Science, 283, 2050 (1999); P. W. Shor, J. Preskill, Phys. Rev. Lett. 85, 441, (2000).
- [4] X.-F. Mo et al., Opt. Lett., 30 2632 (2005); C. Gobby, Z. L. Yuan, A. J. Shields, Appl. Phys. Lett. 84 3762 (2004).
- [5] MagiQ Tech. Inc. (<http://www.magiqtech.com/>); id Quantique (<http://www.idquantique.com/>).
- [6] D. Rosenberg et al., Appl. Phys. Lett., 88 021108 (2006); Z.-F. Han et al., Appl. Phys. Lett., 86 221103 (2005).
- [7] Z. Yuan and A. J. Shields, Opt. Express 13 660 (2005);
- [8] D. Stuck et al. New Journal of Physics 4 41.1 (2002).
- [9] B. Huttner, N. Imoto, N. Gisin, and T. Mor, Phys. Rev. A 51, 1893 (1995); N. Lutkenhaus, Phys. Rev. A 61, 052304 (2000); G. Brassard, N. Lutkenhaus, T. Mor and B. C. Sanders, Phys. Rev. Lett. 85 1330 (2000).
- [10] H. Inamori, N. Lutkenhaus, and D. Mayers, quant-ph/0107017.
- [11] D. Gottesman, H.-K. Lo, N. Lutkenhaus, and J. Preskill, Quantum Inf. Comput. 4, 325 (2004).
- [12] W.-Y. Hwang, Phys. Rev. Lett., 91, 057901 (2003).
- [13] H.-K. Lo, in Proceedings IEEE ISIT, (IEEE, 2004) p137;
- H.-K. Lo, X. Ma, and K. Chen, Phys. Rev. Lett. 94 230504 (2005); X. Ma et al., Phys. Rev. A 72, 012326 (2005).
- [14] X.-B. Wang, Phys. Rev. Lett., 94, 230503 (2005); X.-B. Wang, Phys. Rev. A 72, 012322 (2005); J. M. Harrington et al., quant-ph/0503002.
- [15] Y. Zhao et al., Phys. Rev. Lett., 96, 070502 (2006); Y. Zhao et al., in Proceedings of IEEE ISIT (IEEE, 2006) pp. 2094-2098; C.-Z. Peng et al., quant-ph/0607129; D. Rosenberg et al., quant-ph/0607186; Z. Yuan, A. Shape and A. Shields, quant-ph/0610015.
- [16] H.-K. Lo, and J. Preskill, quant-ph/0504209.
- [17] M. Koashi, Phys. Rev. Lett., 93, 120501 (2004); H.-K. Lo and J. Preskill, quant-ph/0610203
- [18] Y.-H. Lin et al., Opt. Express, 13, 8746 (2005).
- [19] J. Yao, D. Yu, J. Xi, J. Chicharo, Opt. Lett., 30, 189 (2005); B. Qi et al., Opt. Express, 14, 4264 (2006)
- [20] See, like, A. Yariv Optical Electronics in Modern Communications, Fifth Ed., (Oxford University Press, New York), 1997 pp. 360-363.
- [21] The extra phase modulator in our system introduces 12dB loss. This high loss makes the synchronization system in Alice's side (mainly PD in Fig. 1) unstable. Another solution is that we can use Alice's phase modulator (A in Fig. 1) to randomize the phase while encoding.