

Secure and efficient decoy-state quantum key distribution with inexact pulse intensities

Xiang-Bin Wang^{1,*}

¹Department of Physics, Tsinghua University, Beijing 100084, China

Abstract

We present a general theorem for the efficient verification of the lower bound of single-photon transmittance. We show how to do decoy-state quantum key distribution efficiently with large random errors in the intensity control. In our protocol, the linear terms of fluctuation disappear and only the quadratic terms take effect. We then show the unconditional security of decoy-state method with whatever error pattern in intensities of decoy pulses and signal pulses provided that the intensity of each decoy pulse is less than μ and the intensity of each signal pulse is larger than μ' .

PACS numbers: 03.67.Dd, 42.81.Gs, 03.67.Hk

Introduction.— The decoy-state method[1, 2, 3, 4, 5] or some other methods[6, 7, 8] can be used for two remote parties, Alice and Bob to do secure quantum key distribution (QKD)[9, 10, 11] Even Alice only uses an imperfect source, e.g., a coherent light[12, 13, 14]. A secure final key can be distilled by using the separate theoretical results[15] if one knows the upper bound of the fraction of tagged bits (those raw bits generated by multi-photon pulses from Alice) or equivalently, the lower bound of the fraction of un-tagged bits (those raw bits generated by single-photon pulses from Alice). The goal of decoy-state method is to verify such bounds faithfully and efficiently.

Recently, a number of experiments on decoy-state QKD have been done[16, 17, 18]. However, the existing theory of decoy-state method assumes the exact control of pulse intensities. A new problem arose in practice is how to carry out the decoy-state method efficiently given the inexact control of pulse intensity. In this Letter, we study this problem and we find that if the intensity of each pulses are bounded in a reasonable range, we can still verify the fraction of single-photon counts efficiently.

General idea.— There are two goals here, security and efficiency. For security, the verified value of fraction of single-photon counts from our method must never larger than the true value given whatever channel. For this part we should not assume any specific property for the channel. This section will give a general method for secure verification of fraction of un-tagged bits. We also want our protocol to be efficient. We want that, in the normal situation where there is no Eve, the verified value of the fraction of single-photon counts is rather close to the true value. We shall evaluate the efficiency of our protocol in another section.

We start from the definition of the *counting rate* of certain pulses. Given a class of N independent pulses, after Alice transmits them to Bob one by one, if Bob observes n counts at his side, the counting rate for pulses in this class is $s = n/N$. If the state of source in photon-number space is known, the fraction of single-photon counts is known given the counting rate of all those single-photon pulses. We shall only consider how to find the single-photon pulse counting rate hereafter. Suppose there are l different subclasses of independent light pulses in a certain class. We denote the fractions of pulses in each subclasses by $a_0, a_1 \cdots, a_l$. If all these pulses are sent to Bob through whatever channel, the total counts observed by Bob should be equal to the summation of the counts due to the pulses of each

subclasses. Therefore we have

$$S = \sum_0^l a_i s_i \quad (1)$$

S is the counting rate of the whole class while s_i is the counting rate of the i th class.

The decoy-state method itself does *not* require the Possonian distribution of source light, though it has been applied to the case of Possonian distribution[1, 2, 3, 4, 5]. Most generally, in a 3-intensity decoy-state protocol, we consider 3 classes of states, Y_0, Y, Y' . Y_0 contains all vacuum pulses. Y contains three subclasses y_0, y_1, y_c for vacuum pulses, single-photon pulses and multi-photon pulses, respectively. Classes Y' contains 4 subclasses, y'_0, y'_1, y'_c, y'_d . We shall use notations S_0, S, S' for counting rates of classes of Y_0, Y, Y' , respectively; notations $\{s_x\}, \{s'_x\}$ for counting rates of subclasses $\{y_x\}, \{y'_x\}$ and x can be $0, 1, c, d$. Using eq.(1) we have

$$\begin{aligned} S &= a_0 s_0 + a_1 s_1 + a_c s_c \\ S' &= a'_0 s'_0 + a'_1 s'_1 + a'_c s'_c + a'_d s'_d \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

We shall regard S_0, S, S' as *known* parameters since they are observed directly in the protocol. In general, $s_x \neq s'_x$. Since all of them are non-negative, we can assume

$$s'_1 = (1 - r_1) s_1, \quad s'_c = \omega_c s_c \quad (3)$$

and $(1 - r_1), \omega_c$ are non-negative numbers. If we define $b'_c = \omega_c a'_c$, eqs.(2) is equivalent to

$$\begin{cases} E = a_1 s_1 + a_c s_c \\ E' = a'_1 s_1 + b'_c s_c \end{cases} \quad (4)$$

and $E = S - a_0 s_0$; $E' = S' - b'_0 s'_0 + f_1 - a'_d s'_d$ and $f_1 = r_1 a'_1 s_1$. Therefore, it will be secure if we find the smallest value s_1 satisfying the equation above among all possible values for parameters $E, E', a_1, a_c, a'_1, b'_c$. In general, this can be done numerically. To seek the lower bound of s_1 based on eqs.(4), we need first find the ranges of all parameters. As we are going to show, the parameters of $\{a_x, a'_x\}$ can be determined rather precisely by a type of tomography. In our protocol, we mix all pulses from 3 classes randomly and we can simply deduce ω_c, f_1 by classical random sampling theory. In a decoy-state method, we let subclass $y_0(y'_0), y_1(y'_1)$ contains all those vacuum pulses, single-photon pulses from class $Y(Y')$, y_c contains all those multi-photon photon pulses from Y . Suppose the state of multi-photon pulses from Y are ρ_c and state of class Y' is a convex form of ρ_c and other states. We

require the state of a pulse from y'_c be also ρ_c , same to that of y_c . We emphasize that in the protocol Alice does not need to know which pulse belongs to which subclass, we only need that mathematically there exists such subclasses[2].

For certain two subclasses, if each pulses are independent and the states for pulses of two subclasses are same, the pulses of one class can be regarded as samples of all pulses of both classes, if all pulses are randomly mixed. Therefore, if each pulses of classes Y, Y' are independent and randomly mixed, the counting rates for pulses of subclasses $\{y_1, y'_1\}$, $\{y_c, y'_c\}$, $\{y_0, Y_0\}$ and $\{y'_0, Y'_0\}$ can only be different by a statistical fluctuation. Therefore, bounds of s_0, s'_0 are known and parameters of r_1, ω_c can be formulated by s_1, s_c and the number of pulses from classical sampling theory[2]. If there are a larger number of pulses, counting rates of the same state from different classes should be almost the same. For the case of using exact intensities of $0, \mu, \mu'$, the parameters of $\{a_x\}$ and $\{a'_x\}$ are known from the information of the source state. For example, given coherent light of intensity $0, \mu, \mu'$ for classes Y_0, Y, Y' , respectively, we have[2]

$$\begin{aligned}
a_0 &= A_0 = e^{-\mu}; a_1 = A_1 = \mu e^{-\mu}, \\
a_c &= A_c = 1 - e^{-\mu} - \mu e^{-\mu} \\
a'_0 &= A'_0 = e^{-\mu'}, a'_1 = A'_1 = \mu' e^{-\mu'} \\
b'_c &= \omega_c A'_c = \omega_c \frac{\mu'^2 e^{-\mu'}}{\mu^2 e^{-\mu}} A_c
\end{aligned} \tag{5}$$

A theorem for calculation of s_1 .— Most directly, given the ranges of each parameters involved in our protocol, we can solve Eqs.(4) numerically for the lower bound of single-photon counts. However, since here there are a number of parameters, the numerical complexity can be huge. We can avoid the complexity by the following treatment. Define $K_1 = \frac{E}{a_1}$, $K_c = \frac{E}{a_c}$, $K'_1 = \frac{E'}{a'_1}$, $K'_c = \frac{E'}{b'_c}$. We can always find a meaningful solution for s_1, s_c if

$$K'_1 > K_1 > 0, \quad K_c > K'_c > 0. \tag{6}$$

As it is shown in Fig.(1), the solution of s_1, s_c is the crossing point of the two lines in $s_c - s_1$ plane. In this plane, it is easy to see that s_1 value rises if K'_1 or K'_c decreases, or if K_1 or K_c rises. Therefore, the largest possible values of K'_1, K'_c and the smallest possible values of K_1, K_c will produce the lower bound of s_1 . We have the following theorem: **Theorem 1:** Given eqs.(4), if eqs.(6) holds, the maximum of values of $a_0 s_0, a_1, a_c, f_1$ and minimum values of $a'_0 s'_0, a'_1, b'_c, a'_d$ will give the smallest result of s_1 in eqs.(4). An alternative proof is shown




FIG. 1: Graphics of eqs.(4) in $s_1 - s_c$ plane. Obviously, s_1 value will be raised if K_1 or K_c is raised, or if K'_1 or K'_c is decreased. This leads to our theorem 1.

in the appendix.

Decoy-state QKD with simple tomography.— We assume that the intensity fluctuation of each individual pulse is random. Consider a protocol where Alice controls the intensity by a feedback circuit. Each time she first produces a father pulse F_i whose intensity is not known exactly. This pulse is then split into two daughter pulses: D_i and Ω_i . The intensity of pulse D_i is detected (e.g., by homodyne measurement) and this detection outcome determines the instantaneous attenuation to Ω_i to obtain the supposed intensity. There could be *random* errors in detecting D_i , in instantaneously controlling the attenuator. (The feedback circuit is not drawn in Fig.(2)).

Whenever Alice wants to use μ or μ' , she actually uses

$$\mu_i = (1 + \delta_i)\bar{\mu}; \quad \mu'_i = (1 + \delta'_i)\bar{\mu}'. \quad (7)$$

She does not know each specific value of δ_i or δ'_i . But as we shall show she can know the averaged value of

$$\bar{\mu} = \frac{1}{N} \sum_1^N \mu_i; \quad \bar{\mu}' = \frac{1}{N'} \sum_1^{N'} \mu'_i \quad (8)$$

rather exactly. Here N, N' are number pulses in class Y, Y' , respectively. Moreover, given the fact

$$\sum_0^N \delta_i = \sum_0^{N'} \delta'_i = 0 \quad (9)$$

Alice can find rather narrow ranges for relevant parameters of her states by a type of simple tomography. She can, as shown in Fig.(2) , every time first produces a pulse of intensity




FIG. 2: Our proposed set-up for decoy-state QKD. D: detector, A: attenuator, BS: 50:50 beam-splitter. The transmitted light is sent to Bob and the reflected light is detected by Alice.

$2\mu_i$ or $2\mu'_i$ by attenuation. The pulse is then split by a 50:50 beam-splitter. The transmitted mode is sent to Bob, the reflected mode goes to a low efficient photon detector, e.g., a detection efficiency of $\xi \leq 10\%$. We shall simply use the mathematical model of an attenuator with transmittance ξ and a perfect yes/no detector. Suppose she has observed the clicking rate of $h + d_0$ and $h' + d_0$ for those N reflected pulses of intensity $\{\mu_i\}$ and N' reflected pulses of intensity $\{\mu'_i\}$, respectively. Here d_0 is the dark count rate of her detector. Mathematically,

$$\sum_0^N (1 - e^{-\xi\mu_i})/N = h \quad (10)$$

This leads to the following facts after Taylor expansions:

$$\bar{\mu} \geq h/\xi; \quad (11)$$

$$\bar{\mu} \leq \mu_+ = \frac{1 - \sqrt{1 - 2h(1 + \zeta)}}{\xi(1 + \zeta)} \approx h/\xi + h^2(1 + \zeta)/(2\xi) \quad (12)$$

and notation $\zeta = \sum \delta_i^2/N \leq \delta^2$, $\delta = \text{Max}\{|\delta_i|\}$. Combine Eqs(11,12) and the Taylor expansion of Eq.(10) we obtain an even more tightened lower bound formula

$$\bar{\mu} \geq \mu_- = h/\xi + h^2/(2\xi) - \xi^2\mu_+^3/3! \quad (13)$$

Replacing h with h' in Eqs.(12,13) we can also bound $\bar{\mu}'$ by $\mu'_- \leq \bar{\mu}' \leq \mu'_+$. Similarly, we shall use $\zeta' = \sum \delta_i'^2/N' \leq \delta'^2$, $\delta' = \text{Max}\{\delta_i'\}$. Later, she can verify the bounds of all parameters with the observed values h, h' and the above formulas for $\bar{\mu}, \bar{\mu}'$. The true state for a pulse in class Y is

$$\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i,n=0}^{N,\infty} \frac{\mu_i^n e^{-\mu_i}}{n!} |n\rangle\langle n| = a_0|0\rangle\langle 0| + a_1|1\rangle\langle 1| + a_c\rho_c \quad (14)$$

and a_0, a_1 , are $\sum_i e^{-\mu_i}/N, \sum_i \mu_i e^{-\mu_i}/N, a_c = 1 - a_0 - a_1$. Here ρ_c is the averaged state of all multi-photon pulses in class Y . Obviously, if $\bar{\mu}'$ is sufficiently large than $\bar{\mu}$ and the intensity error is not *too* large, we can also write $\rho_{\mu'}$ in a convex form including ρ_c :

$$\rho_{\mu'} = a'_0|0\rangle\langle 0| + a'_1|1\rangle\langle 1| + a'_c\rho_c + a'_d\rho_d \quad (15)$$

and a'_0, a'_1 are $\sum_i e^{-\mu'_i}/N', \sum_i \mu'_i e^{-\mu'_i}/N', a'_c = \frac{\sum \mu'^2_i e^{-\mu'_i}/N'}{\sum \mu'^2_i e^{-\mu'_i}/N'} a_c, a'_d \geq 0, \rho_d$ is a density operator.

We have the following bound values those parameters involved

$$\begin{cases} e^{-\mu_+} \leq a_0 \leq e^{-\mu_-} (1 + \bar{\mu}^2 \delta^2 / 2) \\ (1 - \mu_- \delta^2) \mu_- e^{-\mu_-} \leq a_1 \leq \mu_+ e^{-\mu_+} \\ a_c \leq 1 - e^{-\mu_+} - \mu_+ e^{\mu_+} + \mu_+ \delta^2 \end{cases} \quad (16)$$

$$\begin{cases} a'_0 = \frac{1}{N'} \sum e^{-\mu'_i} \geq e^{-\bar{\mu}'_+} \\ a'_1 \geq (1 - \mu'_- \delta'^2) \mu'_- e^{-\mu'_-} \\ b'_c \geq \omega_c \frac{\mu'^2_- [1 - e^{-\mu'_-} - \mu'_- e^{-\mu'_-}]}{(1 + \delta'^2) \mu'^2_+ e^{\mu'_- - \mu'_+}} \\ a'_d \geq 0 \end{cases} \quad (17)$$

Efficiency evaluation.— We shall compare the efficiencies of two protocols, the ideal protocol where the intensity of every light pulse in class Y or Y' is exactly μ or μ' and our protocol where the intensity of each light pulses is inexactly controlled. In a real experiment using our protocol, Alice simply reads h, h' values and then calculate the lower bound of s_1 . Here we assume the model that Alice has observed

$$h = \xi \mu - \xi^2 \mu^2 / 2; \quad h' = \xi \mu' - \xi^2 \mu'^2 / 2. \quad (18)$$

Given these, we can calculate bounds for $\bar{\mu}, \bar{\mu}'$ by our earlier equations. We take the following assumptions: $\mu = 0.2, \mu' = 0.6, \xi = 5\%$ for Alice's detection efficiency, linear channel with transmittance $\eta = 10^{-4}, S_0 = s_0 = s'_0 = 0, N = 10^9$ and $\delta = \delta'$. In both protocols we use $f_1 \leq 10a_1 \sqrt{\frac{s_1}{N\mu e^{-\mu}}}$ and $\omega_c \geq 1 - 10 \sqrt{\frac{1}{s_c(1-a_0-a_1)N}}$. To compare the efficiencies of our protocol and the ideal protocol, we only need to compare solutions of eqs.(4) for two protocols. We now denote s_1, \tilde{s}_1 to be the results of single-photon transmittance from our protocol and the ideal protocol, respectively. The fraction of un-tagged bits from class Y' is given by

$$\begin{cases} \Delta'_1 = s_1 A'_1 (1 - \mu \delta^2) / (1 - e^{-\eta \mu'}) \\ \tilde{\Delta}'_1 = \tilde{s}_1 A'_1 / (1 - e^{-\eta \mu'}) \end{cases} \quad (19)$$

TABLE I: Efficiency comparison of our protocol and an ideal protocol.

δ	5%	10%	15%	20%	25%	30%	35%
T	99.8%	99.6%	99.2%	98.7%	98.0%	97.2%	96.3%
R	99.7%	99.0%	97.9%	96.3%	94.4%	91.9%	89.2%

Δ'_1 is for our protocol, $\tilde{\Delta}'_1$ is for the ideal protocol. We shall calculate $T = s_1/\tilde{s}_1$, $R = \Delta'_1/\tilde{\Delta}'_1$. We find very good results given various δ values. (See details in table 1.) Moreover, the results our protocol can be even improved because there are obviously better ways to bound ζ, ζ' more tightly. For example, suppose we know that the fluctuation of more than 90% of the pulses is less than 10%, even though the largest fluctuation is 50%, we have $\zeta \leq 3.4\%$ and we can verify a $R \geq 96\%$ with δ^2 being replaced by ζ in all equations. For another example, Alice can use two detectors of efficiency ξ_1, ξ_2 to tightly verify the upper bound of ζ : Every time she first produces a pulse of intensity $3x$, (x can be 0, around μ or μ'). She equally divides the pulse into 3 modes, mode b ia sent to Bob, modes 1 and 2 are sent to detector 1 and 2 respectively. Using the number of counts of each detector, she can verify an upper bound of ζ value only *a little bit* larger than the true value of ζ . (This will be reported elsewhere separately.)

Our theorem 1 is based on the conditions of eqs.(6). These conditions are related to the statistical fluctuations which are dependent on the value of s_1, s_c . But we can verify these conditions *before* knowing the exact values of s_1, s_c . First, we assume $s_c > 2\eta$. This assumption leads to $s_1 < \eta$. Here η is the channel transmittance. We can assume so safely. If the assumption $s_c > 2\eta$ is incorrect, then $s_1 > \eta$ which is a quite good result. If the assumption of $s_c > 2\eta$ is correct, then our calculation based on this is alright. In whatever case, it is secure if we use the assumption for calculation and we then use $Min\{\eta, s_1\}$ (s_1 is the calculated result.) Therefore we can have bound values of

$$f_1 \leq 10a_1\sqrt{\frac{\eta}{a_1N}}; \quad \omega_c \geq 1 - \sqrt{\frac{1}{2\eta a_c N}}. \quad (20)$$

Given these, we can easily verify eqs.(6) and then use our theorem 1 safely.

Effect of inexact vacuum pulses in class Y_0 .— In general, $S_0 \neq 0$. We can safely set $s'_0 = 0$ according to our theorem 1 and we only need to consider the upper bound of s_0 . Asymptotically, we can simply replace s_0 by S_0 even though pulses in Y_0 are not strictly vacuum.

Let's assume the actual state in Y_0 is $\rho_0 = (1 - \epsilon_0)|0\rangle\langle 0| + \epsilon_1|1\rangle\langle 1| + \epsilon_m\rho_m$. Here ρ_m is a state of multi-photon pulses, $\epsilon_m = O(\epsilon_1^2)$, $\epsilon_1 \ll 1$ and $\epsilon_0 = \epsilon_1 + \epsilon_m$. Therefore, we have

$$S_0 = (1 - \epsilon_0)s_0 + \epsilon_1s_1 + \epsilon_ms_m. \quad (21)$$

This leads to a preliminary upper bound of $s_0 \leq \frac{S_0}{1 - \epsilon_0}$. We then replace s_0 in eqs.(4) and solve the equation for lower bound of s_1 . We assume $s_1 \geq 1.5S_0$ at this stage, otherwise the protocol should be discarded. Now we consider eq.(21) again. We have a new bound of $s_0 \leq \frac{S_0}{1 - \epsilon_0} - \epsilon_1s_1 \leq S_0$.

The unconditional security for whatever error pattern.— Suppose we don't use the feedback control for Ω_i in Fig.(2). Most generally, the intensity fluctuation of each pulses is not perfectly random. Now the probability for a pulse from y_x or from y'_x can change slightly at different time intervals therefore s_x can be slightly different from s'_x in the whole time series even there is no statistical fluctuation. For example, it is possible that in a certain time interval, the probability of using y_1 (y'_1) is less (larger) than the averaged probability of using y_1 (y'_1), Eve can produce a certain time-dependent channel transmittance for those single-photon pulses sent from Alice and the averaged counting rates of y_1 and y'_1 in the whole time series can be different from each other, even there is no statistical fluctuation. This is to say, in general, pulses of sub-class y_x and y'_x in principle can *not* be regarded as *randomly mixed* if the intensities of each pulses are not exactly controlled. We need a separate security proof for a protocol with *whatever* pattern of intensity error. We now prove that the protocol is secure if $\mu_i \leq \mu$ and $\mu'_i \geq \mu'$.

We start from a virtual protocol, *Protocol 1*: At each time i in sending a pulse to Bob, Alice produces a bipartite state

$$\rho_i(2) = p_0|z_0\rangle\langle z_0| \otimes |0\rangle\langle 0| + p|z_1\rangle\langle z_1| \otimes \rho_\mu + p'|z_2\rangle\langle z_2| \otimes \rho_{\mu'_i} \quad (22)$$

and announces the value of μ'_i . Here $\rho_x = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{x^n e^{-x}}{n!} |n\rangle\langle n|$, the value μ keeps to be constant but μ'_i can change from time to time and μ'_i is not less than a constant value μ' . States $\{|z_x\rangle\}$ are orthogonal to each other for different x ($x = 0, 1, 2$) and $p_0 + p + p' = 1$. Alice keeps the light pulse in the first subspace and sends out the pulse in the second subspace of the bipartite state to Bob, i runs from 1 to N_t , the number of total pulses sent to Bob. Later, Alice measures her states ($\{|z_x\rangle\}$) and she can know which pulse in the second subspace of the bipartite state belongs to which class (Y_0, Y or Y'). As we have shown in Eqs.(5), state ρ_μ can

be written in the convex form of $\rho_\mu = A_0|0\rangle\langle 0| + A_1|1\rangle\langle 1| + A_c\rho_c$ and $A_c\rho_c = \sum_2^\infty \frac{\mu^n e^{-\mu}}{n!} |n\rangle\langle n|$. Since $\mu'_i \geq \mu'$, we always have the following convex form for state $\rho_{\mu'_i}$

$$\rho_{\mu'_i} = A'_1|1\rangle\langle 1| + A'_c\rho_c + (1 - A'_1 - A'_c)\rho_e^i \quad (23)$$

where $A'_1 = \mu' e^{-\mu'}$, $A'_c = \frac{A_c \mu'^2 e^{-\mu'}}{\mu'^2 e^{-\mu}}$. Obviously, the specific formula for ρ_e^i exists but it is unimportant here since we only need the fact that ρ_e^i is a density operator[2]. To anybody outside Alice's lab, Alice *could* have used a tripartite state of

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_i(3) = & p_0|z_0\rangle\langle z_0| \otimes |z_0\rangle\langle z_0| \otimes |0\rangle\langle 0| \\ & + p|z_1\rangle\langle z_1| \otimes (A_0|v_0\rangle\langle v_0| \otimes |0\rangle\langle 0| + A_1|v_1\rangle\langle v_1| \otimes |1\rangle\langle 1| + A_c|v_c\rangle\langle v_c| \otimes \rho_c) \\ & + p'|z_2\rangle\langle z_2| \otimes [A'_1|v'_1\rangle\langle v'_1| \otimes |1\rangle\langle 1| + A'_c|v'_c\rangle\langle v'_c| \otimes \rho'_c + (1 - A'_1 - A'_c)|v'_e\rangle\langle v'_e| \otimes \rho_e^i] \end{aligned} \quad (24)$$

and those states in the second subspace are all orthogonal to each other. Alice keeps the pulses in the first and second subspaces and sends out the pulse in the third subspace to Bob. Given this, we can define 3 classes Y_0, Y, Y' of pulses: if Alice obtained her measurement outcome of $|z_0\rangle, |z_1\rangle$ or $|z_2\rangle$ in the first subspace, the corresponding pulse sent out is regarded as a pulse of class Y_0, Y or Y' . We can also define 3 subclasses y_0, y_1, y_c of Y and 3 subclasses $\tilde{y}'_1, \tilde{y}'_c, y'_e$ of Y' : if Alice obtains her measurement outcome of $|v_0\rangle, |v_1\rangle$ or $|v_c\rangle$ in the second subspace, the corresponding pulse sent out is regarded as a pulse of sub-class y_0, y_1 or y_c ; if Alice obtains her measurement outcome of $|v'_1\rangle, |v'_c\rangle$ or $|v'_e\rangle$ in the second subspace, the corresponding pulse sent out is regarded as a pulse of sub-classes $\tilde{y}'_1, \tilde{y}'_c$ or y'_e . Here \tilde{y}'_1 is a bit different from the sub-class y'_1 defined before: y'_1 defined before contains all those single-photon pulses of Y' while \tilde{y}'_1 here possibly does not contain all single-photon pulses in Y' if $\mu'_i < \mu'$, since some of single-photon pulses from Y' are regarded as elements of y'_e now, according to our definition. Similarly, \tilde{y}'_c here is also a bit different from y'_c as defined before. Since pulses of sub-classes $\tilde{y}'_1, \tilde{y}'_c$ occur with *constant* probabilities, pulses from sub-class y_1, \tilde{y}'_1 , pulses from y_c, \tilde{y}'_c and pulses from y_0, Y_0 are *randomly mixed*. For simplicity in presentation, we only consider the asymptotic case here, i.e., the counting rates for two sub-classes containing the same state must be equal to each other. We can use the following constraints to verify the single-photon transmittance s_1 :

$$\begin{cases} A_1 s_1 + A_c s_c = E \\ A'_1 s_1 + A'_c s_c \leq S' \end{cases} \quad (25)$$

and $E = S - e^{-\mu} s_0$, S, S' are the counting rates of classes Y, Y' , s_1 is the counting rate of class y_1 or \tilde{y}'_1 , s_c is the counting rate of class y_c or \tilde{y}'_c , $A_1 = \mu e^{-\mu}$, $A_c = 1 - A_0 - A_1$. The value s_0 can be deduced from the observed counting rate of class Y_0 by classical sampling theory. In obtaining the second constraint above, we have used the fact that $N_t p'(A'_1 s_1 + A'_c s_c) \leq N_t p' S'$, i.e., the number of counts caused by part of pulses ($y'_1 \cup y'_c$) of class Y' cannot be larger than the number of counts caused by all pulses of class Y' . Here, in using Eqs.(25), Alice actually does not need any information of which pulse belong to which sub-class. Therefore she can discard the pulse in the second subspace of the tripartite state $\rho_i(3)$, consequently, she can just use the bipartite state $\rho_i(2)$ and obtain s_1 value through Eqs.(25). In this protocol, Alice announces μ'_i value at each time but it is still secure since her announcement does not change the fact that pulses of each sub-classes $y_0, y_1, y_c, y'_1, y'_c$ will occur with constant probabilities therefore classical randomly sampling theory works, so that Eqs.(25) holds. (Definitely, the protocol is also secure if Alice does not announce μ'_i value at each time.)

Suppose in another protocol, *Protocol 2*, Alice uses source state γ_i which can in principle be obtained through attenuating $\rho_i(2)$ in the second subspace by a factor χ_i . If Eve can attack this protocol effectively with scheme \mathcal{A} then Eve can also attack *Protocol 1* effectively by first attenuating the pulses by a time-dependent factor χ_i and then using scheme \mathcal{A} . Given this fact, we conclude that any source can be used securely if that source can in principle be obtained through attenuating state $\rho_i(2)$ in the second subspace. This gives rise to **Lemma 1**: Alice can use Eqs.(25) safely if the source she has actually used in principle can be produced by attenuating $\rho_i(2)$ in the second subspace. This leads to **Lemma 2**: Alice can safely use Eqs.(25) for lower bound value of s_1 if she actually at each time had used any state $W_i = p_0|z_0\rangle\langle z_0| \otimes |0\rangle\langle 0| + p|z_1\rangle\langle z_1| \otimes \rho_{\nu_i} + p'|z_2\rangle\langle z_2| \otimes \rho_{\nu'_i}$ provided that $\nu_i \leq \mu$ and $\nu'_i \geq \mu'$. Proof: We denote the (time-dependent) attenuation factor $\omega_i = \frac{\nu_i}{\mu}$. In protocol 1, we can set $\mu'_i = \frac{\nu'_i \mu}{\nu_i}$ for the bipartite state $\rho_i(2)$ and the protocol with such a setting is secure since $\frac{\nu'_i \mu}{\nu_i} \geq \nu'_i \geq \mu'$. After attenuating $\rho_i(2)$ by the factor ω_i in the second subspace, $\rho_i(2)$ is changed to state W_i . According to our lemma 1, Alice can use W_i directly and uses Eqs.(25) for lower bound of s_1 . Moreover, it is of no difference if Alice measures her states $\{|z_x\rangle\}$ in the very beginning. If she does this, the protocol with source state W_i is changed into a 3-intensity protocol with intensities $0, \{\nu_i\}, \{\nu'_i\}$ and $\nu_i \leq \mu, \nu'_i \geq \mu'$, with probability p_0, p, p' for using each of them at each time. Consequently we arrive at **Theorem 2**: The 3-intensity protocol is secure with whatever error pattern for intensities of decoy pulses (class Y) and

signal pulses (class Y') provided that 1) the intensity of each decoy pulses is less than μ and the intensity of each signal pulses is larger than μ' ; 2) we use Eqs.(25) to calculate s_1 . Our result here can obviously be extended to the non-asymptotic case. To do so, we only need to 1) replace s_1, s_c by s'_1, s'_c in the second constraint of Eqs.(25); 2) give the possible ranges for difference between s_1 and s'_1 and difference between s_c, s'_c with exponential certainty by classical random sampling theory[2]; 3) solve Eqs.(25) numerically in the ranges and find the smallest s_1 .

Although the method shown above is unconditionally secure, in the efficiency criterion, we can have a better choice, e.g., we use the protocol presented in Ref[19]. However, there we request using the same father pulse and exact control of attenuation. Here in Eqs.25 we don't need these and it is unconditionally secure. The result here can apply to all existing experiments immediately, i.e., we only need to redo the calculation of s_1 using our method and the existing experimental data but we don't have to redo the experiment itself.

In summary, we have shown that decoy-state method QKD is secure and efficient even there are errors in the intensity control.

* Electronic address: xbwang@mail.tsinghua.edu.cn

- [1] W.-Y. Hwang, Phys. Rev. Lett. **91**, 057901 (2003).
- [2] X.-B. Wang, Phys. Rev. Lett. **94**, 230503 (2005).
- [3] X.-B. Wang, Phys. Rev. A **72**, 012322 (2005).
- [4] H.-K. Lo, X. Ma, and K. Chen, Phys. Rev. Lett. **94**, 230504 (2005); X. Ma *et al.*, Phys. Rev. A **72**, 012326 (2005).
- [5] J.W. Harrington *et al.*, quant-ph/0503002.
- [6] R. Ursin et al, quant-ph/0607182.
- [7] V. Scarani, A. Acin, G. Robordy, N. Gisin, Phys. Rev. Lett. **92**, 057901 (2004); C. Branciard, N. Gisin, B. Kraus, V. Scarani, Phys. Rev. A **72**, 032301 (2005).
- [8] M. Koashi, Phys. Rev. Lett., **93**, 120501(2004); K. Tamaki, N. Lükenhaus, M. Loashi, J. Batuwantudawe, quant-ph/0608082
- [9] C.H. Bennett and G. Brassard, in *Proc. of IEEE Int. Conf. on Computers, Systems, and Signal Processing (IEEE, New York, 1984)*, pp. 175-179.

- [10] N. Gisin, G. Ribordy, W. Tittel, and H. Zbinden, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **74**, 145 (2002).
- [11] M. Dusek, N. Lütkenhaus, M. Hendrych, "Quantum Cryptography", in *Progress in Optics VVVX*, edited by E. Wolf (Elsevier, 2006).
- [12] M. Bourennane *et al.*, F. Gibson, A. Karlsson, A. Hening, P. Jonsson, T. Tsegaye, D. Ljunggren, and E. Sundberg, *Opt. Express* **4**, 383 (1999); D. Stucki *et al.*, D. Stucki, N. Gisin, O. Guinnard, G. Ribordy and H. Zbinden, *New. J. Physics*, **4**, 41, (2002); H. Kosaka *et al.*, *Electron. Lett.* **39**, 1199 (2003); C. Gobby, Z.L. Yuan, and A.J. Shields, *Appl. Phys. Lett.* **84**, 3762 (2004); X.-F Mo *et al.*, *Opt. Lett.* **30**, 2632 (2005); G.Wu, J. Chen, Y. Li, L.-L. Xuand H.-P. Zeng, quant-ph/0607099.
- [13] B. Huttner, N. Imoto, N. Gisin, and T. Mor, *Phys. Rev. A* **51**, 1863 (1995); H.P. Yuen, *Quantum Semiclassic. Opt.* **8**, 939 (1996)
- [14] G. Brassard, N. Lütkenhaus, T. Mor, and B.C. Sanders, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **85**, 1330 (2000); N. Lütkenhaus, *Phys. Rev. A* **61**, 052304 (2000); N. Lütkenhaus and M. Jahma, *New J. Phys.* **4**, 44 (2002).
- [15] H. Inamori, N. Lütkenhaus, D. Mayers, quant-ph/0107017; D. Gottesman, H.K. Lo, N. Lütkenhaus, and J. Preskill, *Quantum Inf. Comput.* **4**, 325 (2004).
- [16] Y. Zhao *et al.*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **96**, 070502 (2006); Y. Zhao *et al.*, quant-ph/0601168.
- [17] C. Z. Peng *et al.*, quant-ph/0607129.
- [18] D. Rosenberg *et al.*, quant-ph/0607186.
- [19] X.-B. Wang *et al.*, quant-ph/0609137.

APPENDIX I

Suppose S_1, S_c are solution of Eq.(4). Then S_1 must satisfy

$$S_1 = \frac{b'_c E - a_c E'}{a_1 b'_c - a'_1 a_c} \quad (26)$$

Consider another set of parameters $\{\tilde{a}_x \leq a_x, \tilde{a}'_x \geq a'_x\}, \tilde{b}'_c \geq b'_c, \tilde{f}_1 \leq f_1, \tilde{s}_0 \leq s_0, \tilde{s}'_0 \geq s'_0$. We define $\tilde{E}' = S' - \tilde{a}'_0 \tilde{s}'_0 + \tilde{f}_1 \leq E'$, $\tilde{E} = S - \tilde{a}_0 \tilde{s}_0 \geq E$. We suppose \tilde{s}_1, \tilde{s}_c are solution for eqs.(4) with those tilde parameters. Therefore \tilde{s}_1 should satisfy

$$\tilde{s}_1 = \frac{\tilde{b}'_c \tilde{E} - \tilde{a}_c \tilde{E}'}{\tilde{a}_1 \tilde{b}'_c - \tilde{a}'_1 \tilde{a}_c} \geq \frac{\tilde{b}'_c E - \tilde{a}_c E'}{a_1 b'_c - a'_1 a_c} \quad (27)$$

Since $\tilde{b}'_c \geq b'_c, \tilde{a}_c \leq a_c$, we can assume $\tilde{b}'_c = (1 + \lambda_1)b_c, \tilde{a}_c = (1 + \lambda_2)a_c$ and $\lambda_1, \lambda_2 \geq 0$. Also we denote $\chi = \frac{b'_c E}{a_c E'}, \gamma = \frac{a_1 b'_c}{a_c a'_1}$ and we have

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{s}_1 &\geq S_1 \left(1 + \frac{\lambda_1 \chi + \lambda_2}{\chi - 1} - \frac{\lambda_1 \gamma + \lambda_2}{\gamma - 1}\right) \\ &= S_1 \left(1 + \frac{(\lambda_2 + \lambda_1)(\gamma - \chi)}{(\chi - 1)(\gamma - 1)}\right).\end{aligned}\tag{28}$$

While we know that $\frac{\gamma}{\chi} = \frac{a_1 b'_c / (a'_1 a_c)}{b'_c E / (a_c E')} = \frac{K'_1}{K_1} > 1$, eqs.(28) is changed to $\tilde{s}_1 \geq S_1$. This completes the proof of our theorem.

APPENDIX II

In this appendix we derive the inequalities of (16,17). First, $a_0 = \frac{1}{N} \sum e^{-\mu_i} = \frac{1}{N} e^{-\bar{\mu}} \sum e^{-\bar{\mu} \delta_i}$. After the Taylor expansion, we have

$$\sum e^{-\bar{\mu} \delta_i} = \sum \left(1 - \bar{\mu} \delta_i + \frac{\bar{\mu}^2 \delta_i^2}{2} - \dots\right).\tag{29}$$

Using the fact $\sum \delta_i = 0$ and $\delta = \text{Max}\{|\delta_i|\}$, we obtain

$$e^{-\bar{\mu}} \leq a_0 \leq e^{-\bar{\mu}} (1 + \bar{\mu}^2 \delta^2 / 2).\tag{30}$$

Further, the fact that $\mu_- \leq \bar{\mu} \leq \mu_+$ leads to

$$e^{-\bar{\mu}_+} \leq a_0 \leq e^{-\bar{\mu}_-} (1 + \bar{\mu}^2 \delta^2 / 2).\tag{31}$$

This is the first inequality in Eq.(16). We have the following equivalent form for $a_1 = \frac{1}{N} \sum \mu_i e^{-\mu_i}$:

$$a_1 = \frac{1}{N} \bar{\mu} e^{-\bar{\mu}} \sum (1 + \delta_i) \left(1 - \bar{\mu} \delta_i + \frac{1}{2} \bar{\mu}^2 \delta_i^2 - \dots\right)\tag{32}$$

This means

$$\bar{\mu} e^{-\bar{\mu}} (1 - \bar{\mu} \delta^2) \leq a_1 \leq \bar{\mu} e^{-\bar{\mu}}\tag{33}$$

which gives rise to

$$\mu_- e^{-\mu_-} (1 - \mu_- \delta^2) \leq a_1 \leq \mu_+ e^{-\mu_+},\tag{34}$$

the second inequality of Eq.(16). Next we consider $a_c = 1 - a_0 - a_1 = 1 - \frac{1}{N} \sum (e^{-\mu_i} + \mu_i e^{-\mu_i})$.

The As a result of Taylor expansion

$$a_1 = 1 - e^{-\bar{\mu}} \left(1 + \bar{\mu} - \frac{\delta^2 \bar{\mu}^2}{2} + \dots\right)\tag{35}$$

which leads to

$$1 - e^{-\bar{\mu}} - \bar{\mu}e^{-\bar{\mu}} \leq a_c \leq 1 - e^{-\bar{\mu}} - \bar{\mu}e^{-\bar{\mu}} + e^{-\bar{\mu}}\bar{\mu}^2\delta^2/2. \quad (36)$$

Given the bounds of $\bar{\mu}$, we have

$$1 - e^{-\bar{\mu}_-} - \bar{\mu}_-e^{-\bar{\mu}_-} \leq a_c \leq 1 - e^{-\bar{\mu}_+} - \bar{\mu}_+e^{-\bar{\mu}_+} + e^{-\bar{\mu}_+}\bar{\mu}_+^2\delta^2/2. \quad (37)$$

The derivations of the first two inequalities in Eq.(17) are same with that of Eq.(16). We only show the third one here. To obtain the lower bound, we have

$$\frac{\sum \mu_i'^2 e^{-\mu_i'} / N'}{\sum \mu_i^2 e^{-\mu_i} / N} \geq \frac{\bar{\mu}'^2 e^{-\bar{\mu}'}}{(1 + \delta^2)\bar{\mu}^2 e^{-\bar{\mu}}}. \quad (38)$$

Therefore we have

$$a'_c \geq \frac{\bar{\mu}'^2 e^{\bar{\mu} - \bar{\mu}'}}{\bar{\mu}^2 (1 + \delta^2)} \geq \frac{\mu_-'^2 (1 - e^{-\bar{\mu}_-} - \bar{\mu}_- e^{-\bar{\mu}_-})}{(1 + \delta^2)\mu_+^2 e^{\mu_- - \mu_+}}. \quad (39)$$

Given that $b'_c = \omega_c a'_c$, we arrive at the third inequality of Eq.(17).