

# Optimal Discrimination of Mixed Symmetric Multi-mode Coherent States

Ioannis Petrongonas\* and Erika Andersson†

*Institute of Photonics and Quantum Sciences, School of Engineering  
and Physical Sciences, Heriot-Watt University, SUPA, Edinburgh*

(Dated: October 16, 2024)

We find the optimal measurement for distinguishing between symmetric multi-mode phase-randomized coherent states. A motivation for this is that phase-randomized coherent states can be used for quantum communication, including quantum cryptography. The so-called square-root measurement is optimal for pure symmetric states, but is not always optimal for mixed symmetric states. When phase-randomizing a multi-mode coherent state, the state becomes a mixture of pure multi-mode states with different total photon numbers. We find that the optimal measurement for distinguishing between any set of phase-randomised coherent states can be realised by first counting the total number of photons, and then distinguishing between the resulting pure states in the corresponding photon-number subspace. If the multi-mode coherent states we started from are symmetric, then the optimal measurement in each subspace is a square-root measurement. The overall optimal measurement in the cases we consider is also a square-root measurement. In some cases, we are able to present a simple linear optical circuit that realizes the overall optimal measurement.

## I. INTRODUCTION

Quantum state discrimination has attracted a lot of interest in the past 50 years. Orthogonal quantum states, both mixed and pure, can be perfectly distinguished from each other, but for non-orthogonal states this is impossible even in principle. "Imperfect" state discrimination is still possible, and can be optimised in many different ways [1, 2]. In this paper, we will be concerned with finding minimum-error measurements for phase-randomized multi-mode coherent states. There is a definite phase relationship between the relative phases of the coherent states in the different modes, but the overall phase is random. This is a situation that arises for example when a sender and receiver do not share a common phase reference, including when noise effectively randomises the overall phase. In a minimum-error measurement, one minimises the probability that the result is wrong. A second type of optimal measurements which will be relevant is unambiguous or "error-free" measurements. This type of measurement is possible for some sets of states; the results are then guaranteed to be correct, at the expense of including an inconclusive "failure" outcome.

Section II is a brief review of minimum-error quantum measurements, including the so-called square-root measurement, and unambiguous quantum measurements. In Section III, we find the optimal measurement for distinguishing between equiprobable symmetric phase-randomized multi-mode coherent states, and look at some examples of this general result for two, three and four modes. In Section IV, we apply the results to a quantum protocol for 1-out-of-2 oblivious transfer, where one needs the probability for distinguishing between four mixed symmetric states, and to quantum retrieval games. Finally, we discuss how our results contribute to the

field of mixed-state discrimination, and for understanding practical ways for distinguishing between quantum states in communication protocols.

## II. MINIMUM-ERROR AND UNAMBIGUOUS QUANTUM MEASUREMENTS

In a minimum-error measurement, the probability that the obtained result is correct is as high as possible. Holevo and Helstrom [3, 4] obtained the minimum-error measurement for distinguishing between any two quantum states, pure or mixed. For more than two states, it is generally difficult to find optimal measurements. One exception is for symmetric pure states, where the minimum-error measurement is known to be the so-called square-root or "pretty good" measurement [1, 5–7].

Unambiguous state discrimination means that an inconclusive outcome is permitted, but the rest of the results are guaranteed to be correct. The goal is to minimise the probability of the inconclusive result. For two equiprobable pure states, unambiguous discrimination was analysed by Ivanovic [8], Dieks [9], and Peres [10]. Jaeger and Shimony [11] solved the case for unequal a priori probabilities. For more than two pure states, it was shown by Chefles [12] that unambiguous discrimination with a nonzero success probability (for every possible state) is only possible if the states are linearly independent. Only for some specific cases, such as symmetric pure states [13], has there been an analytical solution for the optimal unambiguous measurement for  $N$  linearly independent pure states. For mixed states, the optimal unambiguous measurement is also only known in some special cases. Lower and upper bounds for the probability of an inconclusive result have been derived for  $N$  pure or mixed states [14–18]. Numerical optimisation, such as semidefinite programming, can also be used to find optimal measurements both for unambiguous [19, 20] and minimum-error measurements [21].

\* ip2004@hw.ac.uk

† e.andersson@hw.ac.uk

### III. OPTIMAL DISCRIMINATION OF PHASE-RANDOMIZED COHERENT STATES

Phase-encoded coherent states are frequently used to encode information in quantum communication [22–26]. We will consider how to distinguish between phase-randomized multi-mode coherent states. This corresponds to a situation where the receiver (who could be a legitimate receiver, or perhaps an adversary in a quantum cryptographic protocol) and sender share no strong phase reference. Instead, information is encoded in relative phase differences between different modes.

In order to construct the states we will distinguish between, we start from different sets of symmetric pure multi-mode coherent states. A set of  $L$  equiprobable states  $\{|\psi_K\rangle\}$ , with  $K = 0, 1, \dots, L-1$ , is said to be (singly) symmetric if there is a unitary operation  $U$  for which it holds that  $U^L = \mathbb{1}$ , and  $|\psi_K\rangle = U^K |\psi_0\rangle$ . When phase-randomizing pure symmetric states they remain symmetric, but become mixed.

For distinguishing between two or more states  $\rho_i$ , each occurring with probability  $p_i$ , the so-called *square-root measurement* or *pretty good measurement* is optimal in some cases, in particular for equiprobable symmetric pure states [1, 5–7]. The measurement operators for this measurement are  $\pi_i = \rho^{-\frac{1}{2}} p_i \rho_i \rho^{-\frac{1}{2}}$ , where  $\rho = \sum_i p_i \rho_i$ . The corresponding success probability is

$$P_s = \sum_i p_i \operatorname{tr} \left[ \rho_i \left( \rho^{-\frac{1}{2}} p_i \rho_i \rho^{-\frac{1}{2}} \right) \right]. \quad (1)$$

The minimum-error measurement for pure symmetric states is the square-root measurement, but for mixed symmetric states, the square-root measurement is generally no longer optimal [6, 7, 27]. It is therefore not immediately evident what the minimum-error measurement is for multi-mode phase-randomized coherent states.

In Appendix A, we prove that each of the resulting phase-randomized mixed states is a mixture of pure states with different total photon number, with one pure state for each total photon number. This holds whether or not the pure states we start from are symmetric or not. It follows that the minimum-error measurement for any set of multi-mode phase-randomized coherent states can be realised by first counting the total number of photons, followed by the minimum-error measurement that distinguishes between the resulting pure states in the relevant subspace. Moreover, if the pure multi-mode states we start from are symmetric, and the unitary symmetry operator  $U$  does not change the total number of photons, then in each subspace with some total number of photons, the different possible pure states, each corresponding to a different  $\rho_i$ , are symmetric. The overall minimum-error measurement is then a combination of the different square-root measurements for each photon-number subspace. In Appendix A, we explicitly show that this total measurement satisfies the conditions for the measurement to be optimal. Below, we give examples

of optimal measurements for phase-randomized coherent states, obtained using the method outlined above.

#### A. Two-mode coherent states

We will first consider encoding one bit of classical information using phase-randomized versions of the two-mode coherent states

$$|\psi_0\rangle = |\alpha, \alpha\rangle, \quad |\psi_1\rangle = |\alpha, -\alpha\rangle. \quad (2)$$

The first mode can be thought of as a “weak” phase reference of the same amplitude as the second mode; both modes will be phase-randomized, retaining their relative phase difference. A classical bit could be encoded in the relative phase difference of the first and second pulses. Before phase-randomization, the two states in eq. (2) have the same pairwise overlap as  $|\alpha\rangle$  and  $|\alpha\rangle$ , and are just as distinguishable as these states. If we phase-randomize the states  $|\psi_0\rangle$  and  $|\psi_1\rangle$ , the resulting states become less distinguishable.

Using the definition of a coherent state with amplitude  $\alpha = |\alpha|e^{i\theta} \in \mathbb{C}$  in the Fock or number state basis,

$$|\alpha\rangle = e^{-\frac{|\alpha|^2}{2}} \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \frac{\alpha^j}{\sqrt{j!}} |j\rangle, \quad (3)$$

we express the two-mode coherent states in eq. (2) as

$$|\psi_b\rangle = e^{-|\alpha|^2} \sum_{j,k=0}^{\infty} \frac{(-1)^{bk} \alpha^{j+k}}{\sqrt{j!k!}} |j, k\rangle, \quad (4)$$

with  $b = 0, 1$ . By phase-randomizing the pure states  $|\psi_b\rangle$ , we obtain the mixed states

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_b &= \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} d\theta |\psi_b\rangle \langle \psi_b| \\ &= e^{-2|\alpha|^2} \sum_{\substack{j,k,p,q=0 \\ j+k=p+q}}^{\infty} \frac{(-1)^{b(k+q)} |\alpha|^{j+k+p+q}}{\sqrt{j!k!p!q!}} |j, k\rangle \langle p, q|, \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

where we used the integral representation of the Kronecker delta,

$$\frac{1}{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} e^{i(j+k-p-q)\theta} d\theta = \delta_{j+k,p+q}. \quad (6)$$

In this first example, we are distinguishing between only two states. The minimum-error measurement that optimally distinguishes between two quantum states, mixed or pure, is known to be the so-called *Helstrom measurement* [1, 3, 4], obtained as follows. Given two states  $\rho_0$  and  $\rho_1$  with respective probabilities  $p_0$  and  $p_1$ , we look for an optimal measurement with two measurement operators  $\Pi_0$  and  $\Pi_1$ , corresponding to the two outcomes.

From  $\sum_i \Pi_i = \mathbb{1}$ , which ensures that the sum of the probabilities for all results is equal to 1, we have  $\Pi_1 = \mathbb{1} - \Pi_0$ . The probability that the obtained result is correct is given by

$$\begin{aligned} P_{\text{corr}} &= p_0 \text{tr}(\rho_0 \Pi_0) + p_1 \text{tr}(\rho_1 \Pi_1) \\ &= p_1 + \text{tr}[(p_0 \rho_0 - p_1 \rho_1) \Pi_0]. \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

To maximize the probability of obtaining a correct result  $P_{\text{corr}}$ , the trace of  $(p_0 \rho_0 - p_1 \rho_1) \Pi_0$  should be maximized. This is accomplished when  $\Pi_0$  is a projector on the positive eigenspace of  $p_0 \rho_0 - p_1 \rho_1$ ;  $\Pi_1$  is then a projector on the negative eigenspace of this same operator. If there are eigenvalues equal to zero, the corresponding eigenvectors can be included either in  $\Pi_0$  or in  $\Pi_1$ , or a random guess can be made in this case, without affecting  $P_{\text{corr}}$ .

The Helstrom measurement operators for the two-mode phase-randomized states in (5) are derived in Appendix A (see eqs. (B4) and (B5)). In this particular case, however, the optimal measurement can alternatively be both derived and experimentally realised by considering that one can interfere the states on a balanced beam splitter, acting as  $U_{\text{BS}}|\alpha, \beta\rangle = |(\alpha + \beta)/\sqrt{2}, (\alpha - \beta)/\sqrt{2}\rangle$ , which transforms the incoming coherent states  $|\alpha, \alpha\rangle$  and  $|\alpha, -\alpha\rangle$  according to

$$\begin{aligned} U_{\text{BS}}|\psi_0\rangle &= U_{\text{BS}}|\alpha, \alpha\rangle = |\sqrt{2}\alpha, 0\rangle, \\ U_{\text{BS}}|\psi_1\rangle &= U_{\text{BS}}|\alpha, -\alpha\rangle = |0, \sqrt{2}\alpha\rangle. \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

When phase-randomizing the states in eq. (8), they become mixtures of states with different photon numbers in the two output modes. If the input state was  $|\alpha, \alpha\rangle$ , photons exit only in the first mode, and if it was  $|\alpha, -\alpha\rangle$ , in the second output mode. Phase randomization does not affect how many photons exit the beam splitter in each mode, and it also does not matter whether phase-randomization takes place before or after the beam splitter. This means that after applying  $U_{\text{BS}}$  and phase randomization, the optimal measurement is to detect which output contains photons. If no photons are detected, one guesses the state which was most likely. This measurement is closely related to the optimal unambiguous measurement, since detecting photons in one of the outputs unambiguously identifies the state. The difference is that for the optimal unambiguous measurement, if no photons are detected, one records a "failure" outcome.

The resulting Helstrom probability for the minimum-error measurement result to be correct is

$$P_{\text{corr}} = 1 - p_{\leq} e^{-2|\alpha|^2}, \quad (9)$$

where  $p_{\leq} = \min(p_0, p_1)$ . For the corresponding pure states in eq. (2), the Helstrom measurement is correct with probability

$$P_{\text{corr}}^{\text{pure}} = \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2} \sqrt{1 - 4p_{\leq}(1 - p_{\leq})e^{-4|\alpha|^2}}. \quad (10)$$

We plot the Helstrom probabilities both for pure and phase-randomized states in fig. 1. It can be seen that as

expected, the probability to correctly identify the state is higher for pure states than for the corresponding mixed states.

Interestingly, the Helstrom measurement (the optimal minimum-error measurement for two states) can for the phase-randomized two-mode states be experimentally realised relatively easily. This is in contrast to the minimum-error measurement for distinguishing between the pure states  $|\alpha\rangle$  and  $|-\alpha\rangle$ , or equivalently, between the pure states  $|\alpha, \alpha\rangle$  and  $|\alpha, -\alpha\rangle$ , where experimental realisation is much less straightforward [28–30]. The optimal unambiguous measurement for distinguishing between the pure states  $|\alpha\rangle$  and  $|-\alpha\rangle$  is also realized by interfering the state on a balanced beam splitter with a state  $|\alpha\rangle$ , and detecting photons at the outputs; no photons corresponds to the "failure" outcome. The optimal unambiguous measurements for the states  $|\alpha\rangle$  and  $|-\alpha\rangle$ , for the states  $|\alpha, \alpha\rangle$  and  $|\alpha, -\alpha\rangle$ , and for the phase-randomized two-mode states in equation (5), all have the same success and failure probabilities. That is, phase randomization does in this case not increase the failure probability for an unambiguous measurement, while decreasing the success probability for a minimum-error measurement. This could be useful for protocols in quantum cryptography, if an honest party should perform an unambiguous measurement, while a dishonest party might cheat using a minimum-error measurement. Phase randomization would then not increase the failure probability for an honest party, while decreasing the cheating probability for a dishonest party.

For symmetric mixed states, the square-root measurement is generally not optimal, but in Appendix B, we also show that if the two-mode phase-randomized states in (5) are equiprobable, then the square-root measurement is the same as the minimum-error measurement.

## B. Three-mode coherent states

Next, we consider the four pure three-mode coherent states

$$\begin{aligned} |\psi_{00}\rangle &= |\alpha, \alpha, \alpha\rangle, & |\psi_{01}\rangle &= |\alpha, \alpha, -\alpha\rangle, \\ |\psi_{11}\rangle &= |\alpha, -\alpha, -\alpha\rangle, & |\psi_{10}\rangle &= |\alpha, -\alpha, \alpha\rangle, \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

which can encode two bits of classical information. These states are coherent-state versions of the qutrit states used in a protocol for XOR quantum oblivious transfer [31],

$$\begin{aligned} |\psi_{00}^{\text{trit}}\rangle &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}}(|0\rangle + |1\rangle + |2\rangle), \\ |\psi_{01}^{\text{trit}}\rangle &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}}(|0\rangle + |1\rangle - |2\rangle), \\ |\psi_{11}^{\text{trit}}\rangle &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}}(|0\rangle - |1\rangle - |2\rangle), \\ |\psi_{10}^{\text{trit}}\rangle &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}}(|0\rangle - |1\rangle + |2\rangle). \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$




FIG. 1. The probability  $P_{\text{corr}}$  for the minimum-error measurement result to be correct, as a function of  $|\alpha|$ , for the pure two-mode states in eq. (2) (dashed grey lines) and the mixed two-mode states in (5) (solid black lines), for equiprobable states, with  $p_{\leq} = \frac{1}{2}$  (left) and for  $p_{\leq} = \frac{1}{4}$  (right).

and would be natural to consider if one wants to construct a corresponding protocol using coherent states instead of single qutrits. The states in eq. (11) are both singly and doubly symmetric. They are singly symmetric since it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} |\psi_{00}\rangle, \quad |\psi_{01}\rangle &= U |\psi_{00}\rangle, \\ |\psi_{11}\rangle &= U^2 |\psi_{00}\rangle, \quad |\psi_{10}\rangle = U^3 |\psi_{00}\rangle \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

with the unitary transformation

$$\begin{aligned} U &= \sum_{j,k,l=0}^{\infty} (-1)^l |j, k, l\rangle \langle j, l, k| \\ &= \bigoplus_{N=0}^{\infty} \sum_{\substack{j,k,l=0 \\ j+k+l=N}}^N (-1)^l |j, k, l\rangle \langle j, l, k| = \bigoplus_{N=0}^{\infty} U_N \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

obeying  $U^4 = \mathbf{1}$ . In the expression above, we also decomposed  $U$  in terms of unitary transforms  $U_N$ , acting in subspaces with different total photon number  $N$ , each one also obeying  $U_N^4 = \mathbf{1}$  in its respective subspace. The states are also doubly symmetric, since they can be expressed as

$$|\psi_{ij}\rangle = W^i V^j |\psi_{00}\rangle, \quad i, j = 0, 1 \quad (15)$$

where the unitaries

$$\begin{aligned} V &= \sum_{j,k,l=0}^{\infty} (-1)^l |j, k, l\rangle \langle j, k, l|, \\ W &= \sum_{j,k,l=0}^{\infty} (-1)^k |j, k, l\rangle \langle j, k, l| \end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

satisfy  $V^2 = W^2 = \mathbf{1}$  and  $[V, W] = 0$ . Evidently, the above four pure three-mode coherent states have the same pairwise overlaps as the four two-mode coherent states

$$|\psi'_{ij}\rangle = |(-1)^i \alpha, (-1)^j \alpha\rangle, \quad i, j = 0, 1 \quad (17)$$

The first mode in the three-mode states can again be thought of as a phase reference. Phase randomization of the three-mode states gives

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_{bc} &= \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} d\theta |\psi_{bc}\rangle \langle \psi_{bc}| \\ &= e^{-3|\alpha|^2} \sum_{\substack{j,k,l, \\ p,q,r=0 \\ j+k+l= \\ p+q+r}}^{\infty} \frac{(-1)^{\mathcal{J}_{bc}} |\alpha|^{2(j+k+l)}}{\sqrt{j!k!l!p!q!r!}} |j, k, l\rangle \langle p, q, r|, \end{aligned} \quad (18)$$

where

$$\mathcal{J}_{bc} = b(k+q) + c(l+r), \quad (19)$$

with  $b, c = 0, 1$ . The states  $\rho_{bc}$  are expressed in terms of states with different total photon numbers  $N = j+k+l = p+q+r$ , and the  $\rho_{bc}$  are evidently “block diagonal”, with the blocks corresponding to subspaces with different total photon number. The states  $\rho_{bc}$  can in fact be written as mixtures of pure states, each one with different total photon number (see Appendix A),

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_{bc} &= \bigoplus_{N=0}^{\infty} p_N |\psi_{bc,N}\rangle \langle \psi_{bc,N}| \\ &= \bigoplus_{N=0}^{\infty} e^{-3|\alpha|^2} M_N |\alpha|^{2N} |\psi_{bc,N}\rangle \langle \psi_{bc,N}|, \end{aligned} \quad (20)$$

where  $b, c = 0, 1$ ,  $p_N$  is the probability for the state to contain  $N$  photons, and the pure states  $|\psi_{bc,N}\rangle$  are given by

$$|\psi_{bc,N}\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{M_N}} \sum_{\substack{j,k,l=0 \\ j+k+l=N}}^N \frac{(-1)^{bk+cl}}{\sqrt{j!k!l!}} |j, k, l\rangle, \quad (21)$$

where  $M_N = 3^N/N!$  is a normalization factor. Pure states with different photon numbers  $N$  and  $N'$  are of

course orthogonal,  $\langle \psi_{bc,N} | \psi_{de,N'} \rangle = 0$ . Each total density matrix  $\rho_{bc}$  in eq. (18) is therefore a mixture of perfectly distinguishable pure states with different photon numbers.

Because both  $\rho_{bc}$  and  $U$  can be decomposed in terms of photon-number subspaces, and we have  $U_N^A = \mathbb{1}$  in each subspace, the four resulting pure states  $|\psi_{bc,N}\rangle$  in each total photon-number subspace are also symmetric. It follows that the optimal measurement that distinguishes between the three-mode phase-randomized multi-mode coherent states  $\rho_{bc}$  is to make a projection onto the different subspaces with different total photon numbers, followed by a square-root measurement for distinguishing between the pure symmetric states in the resulting subspace. The square-root measurements are different in each subspace; however, collectively the overall measurement is the square-root measurement for the mixed states  $\rho_{bc}$ .

We will now derive the success probabilities for the optimal measurements in each subspace, and the overall success probability. The success probability for optimally distinguishing between pure symmetric states using a square-root measurement can be obtained in terms of the sum of the square roots of the eigenvalues of the Gram matrix [27]. The elements of the Gram matrix for a set of states  $\{|\psi_i\rangle\}$  are given by  $\mathcal{G}_{ij} = \langle \psi_i | \psi_j \rangle$ . We denote the pairwise overlaps between the four symmetric pure states in the subspace with  $N$  photons by  $F_N = \langle \psi_{00,N} | \psi_{01,N} \rangle = \langle \psi_{01,N} | \psi_{11,N} \rangle = \langle \psi_{11,N} | \psi_{10,N} \rangle = \langle \psi_{10,N} | \psi_{00,N} \rangle$  and  $G_N = \langle \psi_{00,N} | \psi_{11,N} \rangle = \langle \psi_{01,N} | \psi_{10,N} \rangle$ . The Gram matrix for the four pure symmetric states in eq. (21) is then (see Appendix C)

$$\mathcal{G}_N = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & (\frac{1}{3})^N & (-\frac{1}{3})^N & (\frac{1}{3})^N \\ (\frac{1}{3})^N & 1 & (\frac{1}{3})^N & (-\frac{1}{3})^N \\ (-\frac{1}{3})^N & (\frac{1}{3})^N & 1 & (\frac{1}{3})^N \\ (\frac{1}{3})^N & (-\frac{1}{3})^N & (\frac{1}{3})^N & 1 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (22)$$

The probability of correctly identifying one of the four equiprobable pure symmetric states with  $N$  photons, in terms of the eigenvalues of the above Gram matrix [27, 32], becomes

$$\begin{aligned} P_{\text{corr},N} &= \frac{1}{4^2} \left| \sum_{i=0}^3 \sqrt{\lambda_i^{(N)}} \right|^2 \\ &= \frac{1}{16} \left[ 3\sqrt{1 - (-3)^{-N}} + \sqrt{1 - (-3)^{-N+1}} \right]^2. \end{aligned} \quad (23)$$

The total probability of correctly identifying one of the four phase-randomized three-mode coherent states  $\rho_{bc}$  in eq. (18) then equals

$$\begin{aligned} P_{\text{corr}} &= \sum_{N=0}^{\infty} p_N P_{\text{corr},N} \\ &= \frac{e^{-3|\alpha|^2}}{16} \sum_{N=0}^{\infty} \frac{(3|\alpha|^2)^N}{N!} \left[ 3\sqrt{1 - (-3)^{-N}} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \sqrt{1 - (-3)^{-N+1}} \right]^2. \end{aligned} \quad (24)$$

The probability to correctly distinguish between the respective pure three-mode coherent states in eq. (11) is given by (see Appendix D)

$$P_{\text{corr}}^{\text{pure}} = \frac{1}{4} \left( 1 + \sqrt{1 - e^{-4|\alpha|^2}} \right)^2. \quad (25)$$

In fig. 2, we plot the probability that the minimum-error measurement is correct for the phase-randomized three-mode states,  $P_{\text{corr}}$  in eq. (24), and for the corresponding pure states before phase randomization,  $P_{\text{corr}}^{\text{pure}}$  in eq. (25), as a function of  $|\alpha|$ . As expected, phase randomization decreases the probability that the measurement result is correct. The minimum-error probability is equal to  $1/4$  when  $|\alpha| = 0$ , corresponding to a random guess when the states are indistinguishable, and increases asymptotically to 1 when  $|\alpha| \rightarrow \infty$ . For comparison, the minimum-error probability for the qutrit states in equation (12) is equal to  $\frac{3}{4}$ . For coherent states, depending on  $|\alpha|$ , the minimum-error probability can be either smaller than or larger than this.




FIG. 2. Minimum-error probability  $P_{\text{corr}}$  as a function of  $|\alpha|$  for the equiprobable pure three-mode coherent states  $|\alpha, \alpha, \alpha\rangle, |\alpha, \alpha, -\alpha\rangle, |\alpha, -\alpha, -\alpha\rangle, |\alpha, -\alpha, \alpha\rangle$  (solid black line) and their phase-randomized counterparts (dashed grey line). As expected, phase-randomization lowers the probability that the measurement result is correct.

### C. Four-mode coherent states

We then investigate the optimal measurement for phase-randomized versions of the four-mode coherent states  $|\psi_{00}\rangle = |\alpha, \alpha, \alpha, -\alpha\rangle$ ,  $|\psi_{01}\rangle = |\alpha, \alpha, -\alpha, \alpha\rangle$ ,  $|\psi_{11}\rangle = |\alpha, -\alpha, \alpha, \alpha\rangle$  and  $|\psi_{10}\rangle = |-\alpha, \alpha, \alpha, \alpha\rangle$ . Again, these states are evidently symmetric, with a symmetry operation that permutes the modes so that  $4 \rightarrow 3, 3 \rightarrow 2, 2 \rightarrow 1$ , and  $1 \rightarrow 4$ . This unitary symmetry operator can be written as

$$\tilde{U} = \sum_{j,k,l,m=0}^{\infty} |j, k, l, m\rangle \langle m, j, k, l|. \quad (26)$$

The corresponding four phase-randomized states are

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\rho}_{bc} &= \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} d\theta |\tilde{\psi}_{bc}\rangle \langle \tilde{\psi}_{bc}| \\ &= e^{-4|\alpha|^2} \sum_{\substack{j,k,l,m, \\ p,q,r,s=0 \\ j+k+l+m= \\ p+q+r+s}}^{\infty} \frac{(-1)^{\mathcal{J}_{bc}} |\alpha|^{2(j+k+l+m)}}{\sqrt{j!k!l!m!p!q!r!s!}} \times \\ &\quad \times |j, k, l, m\rangle \langle p, q, r, s|, \end{aligned} \quad (27)$$

where

$$\tilde{\mathcal{J}}_{bc} = \bar{b}\bar{c}(m+s) + \bar{b}c(l+r) + bc(k+q) + b\bar{c}(j+p), \quad (28)$$

with  $\bar{b} = b + 1$  (addition modulo 2). The phase-randomized states  $\tilde{\rho}_{bc}$  can also be written as mixtures of pure states with different total photon number,

$$\tilde{\rho}_{bc} = \bigoplus_{N=0}^{\infty} \tilde{p}_N |\tilde{\psi}_{bc,N}\rangle \langle \tilde{\psi}_{bc,N}|, \quad (29)$$

where

$$|\tilde{\psi}_{bc,N}\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\tilde{M}_N}} \sum_{\substack{j,k,l,m=0 \\ j+k+l+m=N}}^N \frac{(-1)^{\mathcal{S}_{bc}}}{\sqrt{j!k!l!m!}} |j, k, l, m\rangle, \quad (30)$$

$$\tilde{p}_N = e^{-4|\alpha|^2} \tilde{M}_N |\alpha|^{2N}, \text{ and}$$

$$\mathcal{S}_{bc} = \bar{b}\bar{c}m + \bar{b}cl + bck + b\bar{c}j, \quad (31)$$

and  $\tilde{M}_N = 4^N/N!$ .

The unitary symmetry operation again does not alter the total photon number, so that it can be decomposed in different symmetric unitary operations, each acting in one total photon number subspace. Therefore, in each photon-number subspace, the states  $|\tilde{\psi}_{bc,N}\rangle$  are symmetric, with  $bc = 00, 01, 10, 11$ . The optimal minimum-error measurement for distinguishing between the phase-randomized states  $\tilde{\rho}_{bc}$  will again be to first project on the total photon number, followed by the square-root measurement for distinguishing between the states  $|\tilde{\psi}_{bc,N}\rangle$  in the resulting photon number subspace. The states  $|\tilde{\psi}_{bc,N}\rangle$  are in this case actually orthonormal for different choices of  $b, c$ , and therefore we can perfectly distinguish between the phase-randomized states  $\tilde{\rho}_{bc}$  if we see at least one photon in total. If we see no photons, then we have to make a guess, which is correctly with probability 1/4. There is therefore again a close correspondence between the minimum-error measurement and the optimal unambiguous measurement, similar to what we found for unambiguously distinguishing between the two-mode states  $|\alpha, \alpha\rangle$  and  $|\alpha, -\alpha\rangle$  by interfering the two modes on a 50/50 beam splitter. There too, unless zero photons are detected at the output, we perfectly distinguish the two states from each other.

This suggests that there is a linear-optical setup for both the minimum-error and the unambiguous measurement for the four-mode phase-randomized states  $\tilde{\rho}_{bc}$ . The

setup is shown in fig. 3. The same setup realises the optimal minimum-error measurement and the optimal unambiguous measurement. The only difference is that detecting no photons is a ‘‘failure’’ outcome for an unambiguous measurement, while for a minimum-error measurement, we make a random guess. The same setup also realises the optimal unambiguous measurement for the pure states before phase randomization (but not the minimum-error measurement for the pure states). Since there is a phase difference in exactly one of the input mode pairs (1,2) or (3,4), either the top output mode of BS1 and the right output mode of BS2 contain the vacuum state, or vice versa. This means that all of the light exiting beam splitters BS1 and BS2 is either interfered on BS3, with BS4 receiving no photons, or vice versa. For example, the input state  $|\alpha, \alpha, \alpha, -\alpha\rangle$  is transformed to  $|\sqrt{2}\alpha, 0, 0, \sqrt{2}\alpha\rangle$  by beam splitters BS1 and BS2. This state is further changed to  $|2\alpha, 0, 0, 0\rangle$  by BS4; all the light exits into D3, and BS3 receives no light. By checking how the other three input states are transformed, it can be confirmed that a click in D3 uniquely identifies the input state  $|\alpha, \alpha, \alpha, -\alpha\rangle$ . A click in D4 uniquely identifies  $|\alpha, \alpha, -\alpha, \alpha\rangle$ , a click in D1 identifies  $|\alpha, -\alpha, \alpha, \alpha\rangle$ , and a click in D2 identifies  $|\alpha, -\alpha, -\alpha, \alpha\rangle$ . Just as for the two-mode states, phase-randomization will not affect the number of photons detected at each output.




FIG. 3. Linear-optical setup for distinguishing between the four-mode phase-randomized states in eq. (27). A click in detectors D1, D2, D3 or D4 uniquely identifies one of the four input states. In the ideal case, it is not possible for more than one detector to click.

The probability of obtaining an unambiguous outcome for the four-mode phase-randomized coherent states equals

$$\tilde{P}_s = 1 - e^{-4|\alpha|^2}. \quad (32)$$

This is also the success probability for the optimal unambiguous measurement. The minimum-error probability for correctly discriminating between the four-mode

phase-randomized coherent states  $\tilde{\rho}_{ab}$  equals

$$\tilde{P}_{\text{corr}} = 1 - \frac{3e^{-4|\alpha|^2}}{4}. \quad (33)$$

The minimum-error measurement for the pure four-mode states is a square-root measurement. The resulting minimum-error probability to correctly distinguish between the respective pure four-mode coherent states is given by (see Appendix D)

$$\tilde{P}_{\text{corr}}^{\text{pure}} = \frac{1}{16} (\sqrt{1 + 3e^{-4|\alpha|^2}} + 3\sqrt{1 - e^{-4|\alpha|^2}})^2. \quad (34)$$

We plot the probabilities in eqs. (33) and (34) in fig. 4. As expected, both probabilities start from 1/4 for  $|\alpha| = 0$ , when the four states are indistinguishable, and increases asymptotically to 1 for  $|\alpha| \rightarrow \infty$ .




FIG. 4. Probability of obtaining a correct result  $\tilde{P}_{\text{corr}}$  as a function of  $|\alpha|$  for the minimum-error measurements for pure (solid black line) and mixed (dashed grey line) four-mode coherent states.

In analogy with the four-mode coherent states, an encoding of two bits using four-dimensional ququart (or two-qubit) states is

$$\begin{aligned} |\psi_{00}^{\text{quq}}\rangle &= \frac{1}{2}(|0\rangle + |1\rangle + |2\rangle - |3\rangle), \\ |\psi_{01}^{\text{quq}}\rangle &= \frac{1}{2}(|0\rangle + |1\rangle - |2\rangle + |3\rangle), \\ |\psi_{11}^{\text{quq}}\rangle &= \frac{1}{2}(|0\rangle - |1\rangle + |2\rangle + |3\rangle), \\ |\psi_{10}^{\text{quq}}\rangle &= \frac{1}{2}(-|0\rangle + |1\rangle + |2\rangle + |3\rangle). \end{aligned} \quad (35)$$

These states are mutually orthogonal. Because these states therefore are perfectly distinguishable, it is possible to unambiguously determine which single state was received, meaning that it is possible for the receiver to perfectly learn both bits  $x_0$  and  $x_1$  of the state  $|\psi_{x_0 x_1}^{\text{quq}}\rangle$ . The linear optical setup which achieves this is the same as the one used for the four-mode coherent states. The fact that the states in eq. (35) are orthonormal is connected

with the fact that the four-mode coherent states can be unambiguously distinguished from each other as soon as we see a single photon. The qutrit states in eq. (12), on the other hand, are non-orthogonal, and it is only possible to unambiguously exclude two of the four states. The linear optical setup that achieves this [31] does not realize either the minimum-error or the unambiguous measurement for the corresponding phase-randomised three-mode states.

#### D. Phase-encoded two-mode coherent states

Finally, we examine phase-randomized versions of the four coherent states  $|\bar{\psi}_{00}\rangle = |\alpha, \alpha\rangle$ ,  $|\bar{\psi}_{01}\rangle = |\alpha, i\alpha\rangle$ ,  $|\bar{\psi}_{11}\rangle = |\alpha, -\alpha\rangle$  and  $|\bar{\psi}_{10}\rangle = |\alpha, -i\alpha\rangle$ . Either before or after phase-randomization, the phase difference between the modes could encode two classical bits. Evidently, these states are symmetric, with a unitary symmetry operation that amounts to a phase shift of  $i$  on the second mode. This symmetry operation does not change the number of photons in a mode, and can in terms of photon-number states be written

$$\bar{U} = \sum_{j,k=0}^{\infty} i^k |j, k\rangle \langle j, k|. \quad (36)$$

Phase-randomization of the states  $|\bar{\psi}_{bc}\rangle$  gives

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{\rho}_{bc} &= \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} d\theta |\bar{\psi}_{bc}\rangle \langle \bar{\psi}_{bc}| \\ &= e^{-2|\alpha|^2} \sum_{\substack{j,k,p,q=0 \\ j+k=p+q}}^{\infty} \frac{i^{Q_{bc}k} (-i)^{Q_{bc}q} |\alpha|^{j+k+p+q}}{\sqrt{j!k!p!q!}} |j, k\rangle \langle p, q|, \end{aligned} \quad (37)$$

where

$$Q_{bc} = 2bc + \bar{b}c + 3b\bar{c}. \quad (38)$$

The phase-randomized states  $\bar{\rho}_{bc}$  can again be written as mixtures of pure states  $|\bar{\psi}_{bc,N}\rangle$ , each one with a different total number of photons. In the  $N$ -photon subspace, we have

$$|\bar{\psi}_{bc,N}\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\bar{M}_N}} \sum_{\substack{j,k=0 \\ j+k=N}}^N \frac{i^{Q_{bc}k}}{\sqrt{j!k!}} |j, k\rangle, \quad (39)$$

where  $\bar{M}_N = \frac{2^N}{N!}$ . We will again obtain the minimum-error probability using the Gram matrix. The total probability for correctly distinguishing between these mixed phase-encoded coherent states is equal to (see Appendix

D)

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{P}_{\text{corr}} &= \frac{e^{-2|\alpha|^2}}{4} + \frac{e^{-2|\alpha|^2}}{8} \\ &\times \sum_{N=1}^{\infty} \frac{(2|\alpha|^2)^N}{N!} \left[ \sqrt{1 + \sqrt{1 - 2^{-N+2} \cos^2(N\pi/4)}} \right. \\ &\left. + \sqrt{1 + \sqrt{1 - 2^{-N+2} \sin^2(N\pi/4)}} \right]^2. \end{aligned} \quad (40)$$

The probability to correctly distinguish between the corresponding pure phase-encoded two-mode coherent states is given by (see Appendix D)

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{P}_{\text{corr}}^{\text{pure}} &= \frac{e^{-|\alpha|^2}}{4} \left( \sqrt{\cosh |\alpha|^2 + \sqrt{\cosh^2 |\alpha|^2 - \cos^2 |\alpha|^2}} \right. \\ &\left. + \sqrt{\sinh |\alpha|^2 + \sqrt{\sinh^2 |\alpha|^2 - \sin^2 |\alpha|^2}} \right)^2. \end{aligned} \quad (41)$$

We plot eqs. (40) and (41) as a function of  $|\alpha|$  in fig. 5. Again, we can see how phase-randomization lowers the minimum error probability.




FIG. 5. Probability of obtaining a correct result  $\bar{P}_{\text{corr}}$  as a function of  $|\alpha|$  for the four pure (solid black line) and mixed (dashed grey line) phase-encoded coherent states.

To quantify the effect of mixing, we define the difference between the probabilities to be correct for the pure and the mixed cases, for each set of quantum states, as  $\Delta P_{\text{corr}} = P_{\text{corr}}^{\text{pure}} - P_{\text{corr}}$ . We plot  $\Delta P_{\text{corr}}$  for the three-mode, the four-mode and the phase-encoded coherent states that we examined in fig. 6.




FIG. 6. Differences between the probabilities to be correct  $\Delta P_{\text{corr}}$  for pure and phase-randomized three-mode (solid black line), four-mode (medium dashed grey line) and phase-encoded (small dashed dark grey line) coherent states. The differences reach a maximum value of about 0.25 for all cases, but this maximum occurs for different values of  $|\alpha|$ .

#### IV. APPLICATION TO QUANTUM OBLIVIOUS TRANSFER AND QUANTUM RETRIEVAL GAMES

##### A. Quantum oblivious transfer

Distinguishing between four (often symmetric) states is relevant for quantum 1-out-of-2 oblivious transfer [31, 32]. This is a cryptographic primitive where a sender has two (classical) bits, and a receiver should receive one of them, but obtain no information about the other bit. The sender Alice should not know which bit the receiver Bob has obtained. The interest in oblivious transfer stems from the fact that it is a universal building block for multi-party computation, where two or more mistrustful parties want to compute something together, without revealing any more than necessary about their individual input data. Oblivious transfer is possible “classically” (without the use of quantum resources) with computational security. If one desires information-theoretic security, then only trivial “classical” protocols where either the sender or the receiver can cheat perfectly are possible (if we restrict to protocols where the receiver always correctly obtains a bit value if both parties are honest). If the classical bit values are encoded in quantum states, then perfect oblivious transfer still is not possible, unless one restricts the quality or amount of quantum memory the parties have access to. Imperfect quantum oblivious transfer is however still possible, where neither the sender nor receiver can cheat perfectly [31–38]. They might still cheat, but their probability to do so is limited.

Until now, the quantum states which have been considered and analyzed for quantum oblivious transfer were almost always pure and symmetric. Mixed states can however sometimes lead to improved performance [33]. Hence it is of interest to examine whether phase-randomized

multi-mode coherent states could be of use. The sender's bit values would be encoded in four quantum states. In 1-out-of-2 oblivious transfer, an honest receiver should only learn one of the sender's bit values, whereas a dishonest receiver wants to learn both bit values. The minimum-error probability for optimally distinguishing between these four quantum states, which we above denoted by  $P_{\text{corr}}$ , then corresponds to the cheating probability for the receiver. To assess how suitable a particular set of states is for quantum oblivious transfer, we also need the probability for an honest receiver to correctly learn (only) one bit value, and the probability for the sender to correctly guess which bit the receiver has received.

Often an honest party actively chooses which bit they want to learn, the first or the second. This is attractive especially in non-interactive quantum oblivious transfer protocols, where a quantum state is sent from one party to the other and then measured, with no further communication taking place, because if the receiving party randomly and actively chooses between two measurements, the sending party can obtain no information about the receiver's choice of measurement. The price one has to pay is that even if both sender and receiver are honest, the probability for the receiver to obtain reliable informa-

tion about a bit they actively choose is generally lower than if they randomly obtain information about either bit value [31, 39].

The receiver's optimal measurement for learning one of the bits, with an active choice of which bit the receiver wishes to learn, is a Helstrom measurement. Their probability  $P_{\text{1bit}}$  to obtain this bit value correctly then corresponds to the probability that the protocol works as intended if both parties are honest. For example, for an oblivious transfer protocol using pure symmetric states, to learn the first bit, an honest Bob makes the Helstrom measurement to distinguish between the two equiprobable mixed states

$$\begin{aligned}\rho_0 &= \frac{1}{2}(|\psi_{00}\rangle\langle\psi_{00}| + |\psi_{01}\rangle\langle\psi_{01}|) \\ \rho_1 &= \frac{1}{2}(|\psi_{10}\rangle\langle\psi_{10}| + |\psi_{11}\rangle\langle\psi_{11}|),\end{aligned}\quad (42)$$

where  $|\psi_{x_0x_1}\rangle$  is the state encoding two bits  $x_0$  and  $x_1$ . For a protocol that uses pure symmetric states, where the sender chooses  $x_0$  and  $x_1$  uniformly at random, this probability is [33] (see also Appendix D)

$$\begin{aligned}2(2P_{\text{1bit}} - 1) &= \sqrt{1 - G^2 + \sqrt{(1 + G)^2(\text{Im}F)^2 + (1 - G)^2(\text{Re}F)^2 - 4(\text{Re}F)^2(\text{Im}F)^2}} \\ &\quad + \sqrt{1 - G^2 - \sqrt{(1 + G)^2(\text{Im}F)^2 + (1 - G)^2(\text{Re}F)^2 - 4(\text{Re}F)^2(\text{Im}F)^2}}\end{aligned}\quad (43)$$

Here  $F = \langle\psi_{00}|\psi_{01}\rangle$ ,  $G = \langle\psi_{00}|\psi_{11}\rangle$  and  $F^* = \langle\psi_{00}|\psi_{10}\rangle$  are the pairwise overlaps between different states.

To find an honest Bob's probability to obtain one bit for the different sets of phase-randomized (and thus mixed) symmetric multi-mode coherent states in the previous section, we note that the Helstrom measurement for distinguishing between the mixed states corresponding to the two values for the bit Bob wishes to learn can be realized by first measuring the total photon number, and then distinguishing between the resulting possible states in the relevant photon-number subspace. This is the optimal measurement, because the relevant density operators are block-diagonal with respect to total photon number. That is, because the phase-randomized states can be written as  $\rho_b = \sum_N p_N \rho_{b,N}$ , where  $b$  is the value of the bit Bob wishes to learn, and  $\rho_{b,N}$  is a state with exactly  $N$  photons. For example, if an honest Bob wishes to find  $x_0$ , he makes the Helstrom measurement (assuming he measured  $N$  photons) for distinguishing between the equiprobable mixed states

$$\begin{aligned}\rho_{0,N} &= \frac{1}{2}(|\psi_{00,N}\rangle\langle\psi_{00,N}| + |\psi_{01,N}\rangle\langle\psi_{01,N}|) \\ \rho_{1,N} &= \frac{1}{2}(|\psi_{10,N}\rangle\langle\psi_{10,N}| + |\psi_{11,N}\rangle\langle\psi_{11,N}|)\end{aligned}\quad (44)$$

with the probability  $P_{\text{1bit},N}$  of giving a correct result.

Then, in total, Bob's probability to correctly learn the bit value of his choice is

$$P_{\text{1bit}} = \sum_{N=0}^{\infty} p_N P_{\text{1bit},N}.\quad (45)$$

Therefore, to find the probability for Bob to correctly learn one bit of his choice, we first find his probability to correctly distinguish between the two relevant mixed states in each  $N$ -photon subspace. Then, we sum these probabilities, multiplied with the appropriate probabilities for each photon-number subspace, in analogy with how we obtained the optimal minimum-error probability for distinguishing between all four phase-randomized states in the previous section.

For the three-mode phase-randomized coherent states in eq. (18), we have  $F_N = (\frac{1}{3})^N$  and  $G_N = (-\frac{1}{3})^N$ . The probability for Bob to correctly obtain one bit value, for the  $N$ -photon subspace, is given by

$$\begin{aligned}P_{\text{1bit},N} &= \frac{1}{2} \left[ 1 + \frac{1}{2} \left[ \sqrt{G_N^2 - 2G_N + 1} \right. \right. \\ &\quad \left. \left. + \sqrt{-3G_N^2 + 2G_N + 1} \right] \right].\end{aligned}\quad (46)$$

Bob's overall probability to obtain one correct bit value for the three-mode coherent states is then

$$\begin{aligned}
P_{1\text{bit}} &= \sum_{N=0}^{\infty} p_N P_{1\text{bit},N} \\
&= \frac{1}{2} + \frac{e^{-3|\alpha|^2}}{4} \sum_{N=0}^{\infty} \frac{(3|\alpha|^2)^N}{N!} \left[ \sqrt{G_N^2 - 2G_N + 1} \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \sqrt{-3G_N^2 + 2G_N + 1} \right]. \tag{47}
\end{aligned}$$

For the four-mode phase-randomized coherent states in (27), whenever nonzero photons are detected, the state can be uniquely identified. That is, it is no more difficult to obtain both bit values than one. Hence we do not expect this set of states to be of interest for quantum oblivious transfer. Nevertheless, the probability to correctly guess one (or both) bits would be (see Appendix D)

$$\tilde{P}_{1\text{bit}} = 1 - \frac{e^{-4|\alpha|^2}}{2}. \tag{48}$$

For the phase-randomized phase-encoded states in eq. (37), the probability for Bob to obtain one bit correctly is (see Appendix D)

$$\begin{aligned}
\bar{P}_{1\text{bit}} &= \frac{1}{2} + \frac{e^{-2|\alpha|^2}}{2\sqrt{2}} \sum_{N=1}^{\infty} \frac{(2|\alpha|^2)^N}{N!} \times \\
&\quad \times \sqrt{1 + \sqrt{4^{-N+1} \sin^2(N\pi/2) - 2^{-N+2} + 1}}. \tag{49}
\end{aligned}$$

To evaluate how well a specific set of for states works for realizing quantum oblivious transfer, we find the relation between  $B_{\text{OT}}$  and  $P_{1\text{bit}}$  in each case. In particular, since it is known that mixed states can sometimes outperform pure states, we are interested in whether phase-randomisation can improve protocol performance. Also, it is interesting to know whether a protocol still works acceptably well also if the phase is randomized, since this would imply robustness against noise. The lower the receiver's cheating probability is, for a fixed success probability for an honest receiver, the better the protocol is. For the three-mode phase-randomized states, we find the relation

$$B_{\text{OT}} = \frac{3}{2}P_{1\text{bit}} - \frac{1}{2}, \tag{50}$$

while for the corresponding three-mode pure states we have

$$B_{\text{OT}}^{\text{pure}} = (P_{1\text{bit}}^{\text{pure}})^2 < \frac{3}{2}P_{1\text{bit}}^{\text{pure}} - \frac{1}{2} \tag{51}$$

for  $\frac{1}{2} < P_{1\text{bit}}^{\text{pure}} < 1$ . Therefore, phase-randomization makes the protocol performance worse for this particular set of states (fig. 7). However, protocol performance is not worsened as much as one might have expected.

For the four-mode states, the relation for both pure and mixed states is the same as in eq. (50),

For the two-mode phase-encoded coherent states in (37), because it is difficult to find an analytical form for the relation between  $B_{\text{OT}}$  and  $P_{1\text{bit}}$ , we plot  $B_{\text{OT}}$  against  $P_{1\text{bit}}$ . We note that mixedness helps marginally in some regions, but makes protocol performance worse in others (fig. 8). A protocol is better if, for the same probability  $P_{1\text{bit}}$  for an honest receiver Bob to obtain one bit value correctly, the cheating probability for a dishonest receiver to correctly guess both bit values is as low as possible. The results are explained in more detail in Appendix D.




FIG. 7. Cheating probability  $B_{\text{OT}}$  as a function of protocol success probability  $P_{1\text{bit}}$ , for pure (solid black line) and phase-randomized (dashed grey line) three-mode coherent states. We observe that employing phase randomization for the three-mode coherent states leads to a higher cheating probability as compared to using pure states.




FIG. 8. Cheating probability  $B_{\text{OT}}$  as a function of protocol success probability  $P_{1\text{bit}}$ , for pure (solid black line) and phase-randomized (dashed grey line) two-mode phase-encoded coherent states. We notice that mixedness marginally lowers the cheating probability  $B_{\text{OT}}$  for  $P_{1\text{bit}} \gtrsim 0.8$ .

## B. Quantum retrieval games

The measurements we have been investigating may also be relevant for so-called quantum retrieval games [40, 41]. In a quantum retrieval game, one party, whom we will here call sender (Alice), encodes a number of classical bits in a quantum state. The quantum states are selected from a set of non-orthogonal states. The state is sent to another party, whom we will call receiver (Bob). The receiver selects a measurement, among some possible measurements, so that the measurement will give information about some of the sender's bit values, or some of their properties, but not about others. For example, the sender might select four classical bits  $x_0, x_1, x_2$  and  $x_3$ , and encode these in a state

$$|\phi_{x_0 x_1 x_2 x_3}\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{4}} \sum_{i=0}^3 (-1)^{x_i} |i\rangle. \quad (52)$$

The receiver then chooses a matching, pairing up the four bits. In this example, the receiver might choose to pair  $x_0$  with  $x_1$ , and  $x_2$  with  $x_3$ . A measurement in the basis  $\{\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|0\rangle \pm |1\rangle), \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|2\rangle \pm |3\rangle)\}$  would then give the receiver information about either the relative phase of the basis states  $|0\rangle$  and  $|1\rangle$  (that is, about  $x_0 \oplus x_1$ ), or about the relative phase of the basis states  $|2\rangle$  and  $|3\rangle$  (that is, about  $x_2 \oplus x_3$ ). A different choice for the receiver would be to pair  $x_0$  with  $x_2$ , and  $x_1$  with  $x_3$ . The last option is to pair  $x_0$  with  $x_3$ , and  $x_1$  with  $x_2$ . Because the 16 possible states are non-orthogonal, the receiver cannot learn all four bits.

A quantum retrieval game is reminiscent of 1-out-of- $n$  XOR oblivious transfer in the sense that the sender does not know exactly what the receiver learns, and the receiver cannot perfectly learn all of the sender's bit values [42]. The former property is usually not used or even mentioned e.g. in schemes for quantum money [39, 40, 43–45], which can be constructed using quantum retrieval games. If the receiver cheats and tries to correctly guess all of the sender's bit values, then their optimal measurement is a minimum-error measurement. Since retrieval games often use symmetric states, the measurements we have derived may be relevant.

A possible set of states to use for a retrieval game might be the qutrit states in Eq. (12). In hidden matching quantum retrieval games [41], the sender Alice usually picks  $n$ -bit strings where  $n$  is even, meaning that there are  $2^n$  different states, and that all bits can be paired up. A retrieval game based on our qutrit states would be somewhat different, in that the receiver Bob does not choose a pairing, but instead probabilistically obtains either the first bit, the second bit, or their XOR [31]. We could also include four more states of the same form of the qutrit states, but with  $-|0\rangle$  instead of  $|0\rangle$ , and consider that the sender has chosen three bits instead of two. The receiver would then probabilistically obtain information about the XOR either of the first and the second bits, or of the second and third bits, or the first and the third

bits.

As for the four ququart states in Eq. (35), they are a subset of the total set of 16 states in hidden matching quantum retrieval games with 4-bit strings. The four ququart states in Eq. (35) can be perfectly distinguished, meaning that the two classical bits one could encode in these four states can both be perfectly retrieved by the receiver. Perfect knowledge allows unlimited copying of the state, which is undesirable in schemes for quantum money or tokens, since one wants to prevent copying. In order to construct a viable quantum money or token scheme, we would need to add more states to the set. If the resulting set of states is symmetric, then similar techniques as we have employed in this paper could be used to obtain optimal measurements especially for a cheating receiver, who wants to distinguish between all possible states.

## V. DISCUSSION AND FUTURE RESEARCH

We have investigated optimal quantum measurements for distinguishing between phase-randomized multi-mode coherent states. Phase-randomized weak coherent states are used in quantum communication, especially in quantum key distribution (QKD). They have been demonstrated to significantly enhance the performance of QKD protocols [46]. In quantum key distribution, security initially relied on the use of single-photon sources. However, perfect single-photon sources are difficult to realize. As an alternative, weak lasers are commonly employed, and can be modeled as coherent states with random phases. The security of QKD protocols depends on the assumption that these phases are uniformly random [46]. However, achieving continuous random phase poses challenges, and imperfect phase-randomization significantly undermines the security of QKD [46]. Several methods have been explored to address this issue, with one prominent approach being the consideration of a limited number of discrete phases [23, 47, 48].

Phase-randomized weak coherent states play an indispensable role also in other QKD techniques, including decoy-state QKD. Without phase randomization, the equations for the gain and the quantum bit error rate of the signal state, which are crucial in the theory of decoy states, cannot be obtained [49]. Additionally, phase-randomized weak coherent states are essential for protocols such as twin-field QKD. Phase-randomization allows Alice and Bob to apply the decoy-state method so that they can detect eavesdropping attempts by an adversary, often referred to as Eve. When Alice and Bob both choose the Z-basis which is for testing potential tampering by Eve, because they use phase-randomized coherent states, they can instead use decoy state intensity settings that they have at their disposal. This is based on the fact that Eve cannot distinguish between the signal and decoy states. The more decoy intensities Alice and Bob use, the better they estimate the yields, i.e. the detec-

tion statistics, and consequently the phase-error rate of the key, thus bounding the information that could have been leaked to a potential eavesdropper and achieving a higher key rate [50, 51].

When coherent states are used, a shared reference frame between the two communicating parties typically involves a strong pulse acting as a reference and a weak signal pulse, where the phase relationship between the two pulses is known [52, 53]. However, the use of phase-randomized coherent states implies scenarios where parties lack a shared frame of reference. Related to this, it has been shown that communication with no shared frame of reference can be achieved with entangled discrete-level states [54]. Consequently, phase-randomized coherent states offer a promising avenue for facilitating communication in situations where shared reference frames are absent. Another study further highlights the broad applicability of phase-randomized coherent states in communication protocols [55].

It is also generally of interest to know how well it is possible to distinguish between mixed quantum states, because noise usually leads to mixed states, and in re-

alistic problems we therefore usually deal with mixed states. Our method of finding optimal measurements can be applied whenever mixing generates photon states that separate in subspaces with different total photon number  $N$ . A similar approach can also be applied for non-symmetric mixed states, if they are block diagonal in different photon-number subspaces. Finally, exactly how mixed quantum states may be of use in quantum communication schemes such as oblivious transfer is still an open question. For the cases we examined, we found that perhaps counter-intuitively, mixing did not significantly worsen protocol performance and can even give a slight advantage in some parameter regions.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

EA would like to acknowledge support by the UK Engineering and Physical Sciences Research Council (EP-SRC) under Grant No. EP/T001011/1.

- 
- [1] Stephen M. Barnett and Sarah Croke. Quantum state discrimination. *Advances in Optics and Photonics*, 1:238–278, 2008.
- [2] János A. Bergou. Discrimination of quantum states. *Journal of Modern Optics*, 57:160 – 180, 2004.
- [3] A. S. Holevo. Statistical decision theory for quantum systems. *Journal of Multivariate Analysis*, 3(4):337–394, 1973.
- [4] C. W. Helstrom. Quantum detection and estimation theory. *New York: Academic Press*, 1976.
- [5] Stephen M. Barnett. Minimum-error discrimination between multiply symmetric states. *Phys. Rev. A*, 64:030303, 2001.
- [6] C.-L. Chou and L. Y. Hsu. Minimum-error discrimination between symmetric mixed quantum states. *Phys. Rev. A*, 68:042305, Oct 2003.
- [7] Y.C. Eldar, A. Megretski, and G.C. Verghese. Optimal detection of symmetric mixed quantum states. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 50(6):1198–1207, 2004.
- [8] I.D. Ivanovic. How to differentiate between non-orthogonal states. *Physics Letters A*, 123(6):257–259, 1987.
- [9] D. Dieks. Overlap and distinguishability of quantum states. *Physics Letters A*, 126(5):303–306, 1988.
- [10] Asher Peres. How to differentiate between non-orthogonal states. *Physics Letters A*, 128(1):19, 1988.
- [11] Gregg Jaeger and Abner Shimony. Optimal distinction between two non-orthogonal quantum states. *Physics Letters A*, 197(2):83–87, 1995.
- [12] Anthony Chefles. Unambiguous discrimination between linearly independent quantum states. *Physics Letters A*, 239:339–347, 1998.
- [13] Anthony Chefles and Stephen M. Barnett. Optimum unambiguous discrimination between linearly independent symmetric states. *Physics Letters A*, 250:223–229, 1998.
- [14] Terry Rudolph, Robert W. Spekkens, and Peter S. Turner. Unambiguous discrimination of mixed states. *Physical Review A*, 68:010301, 2003.
- [15] Yuan Feng, Runyao Duan, and Mingsheng Ying. Unambiguous discrimination between mixed quantum states. *Phys. Rev. A*, 70:012308, Jul 2004.
- [16] Philippe Raynal and Norbert Lütkenhaus. Optimal unambiguous state discrimination of two density matrices: Lower bound and class of exact solutions. *Phys. Rev. A*, 72:022342, Aug 2005.
- [17] Jaromír Fiurášek and Miroslav Ježek. Optimal discrimination of mixed quantum states involving inconclusive results. *Physical Review A*, 67(1), January 2003.
- [18] Ashley Montanaro. A lower bound on the probability of error in quantum state discrimination. *2008 IEEE Information Theory Workshop*, pages 378–380, 2008.
- [19] Xiaoming Sun, Shengyu Zhang, Yuan Feng, and Mingsheng Ying. Mathematical nature of and a family of lower bounds for the success probability of unambiguous discrimination. *Physical Review A - PHYS REV A*, 65, 04 2002.
- [20] Yonina Eldar. Eldar, y.c.: A semidefinite programming approach to optimal unambiguous discrimination of quantum states. *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory* 49(2), 446–456. *Information Theory, IEEE Transactions on*, 49:446 – 456, 03 2003.
- [21] Yonina Eldar, Alexandre Megretski, and George Verghese. Designing optimal quantum detectors via semidefinite programming. *Information Theory, IEEE Transactions on*, 49:1007 – 1012, 05 2003.
- [22] Denis Sych and Gerd Leuchs. Coherent state quantum key distribution with multi letter phase-shift keying. *New Journal of Physics*, 12(5):053019, May 2010.

- [23] Zhu Cao, Zhen Zhang, Hoi-Kwong Lo, and Xiongfeng Ma. Discrete-phase-randomized coherent state source and its application in quantum key distribution. *New Journal of Physics*, 17(5):053014, May 2015.
- [24] Hoi-Kwong Lo and John Preskill. Phase randomization improves the security of quantum key distribution. *arXiv: Quantum Physics*, 2005.
- [25] S. J. van Enk. Unambiguous state discrimination of coherent states with linear optics: Application to quantum cryptography. *Physical Review A*, 66(4), Oct 2002.
- [26] Frédéric Grosshans and Philippe Grangier. Continuous variable quantum cryptography using coherent states. *Physical Review Letters*, 88(5), Jan 2002.
- [27] Petros Wallden, Vedran Dunjko, and Erika Andersson. Minimum-cost quantum measurements for quantum information. *Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and Theoretical*, 47:125303, March 2014.
- [28] S. J. Dolinar. An optimum receiver for the binary coherent state quantum channel. *Research Laboratory of Electronics, MIT, Quarterly Progress Report*, 11:115–120, 1973.
- [29] R. S. Kennedy. A near-optimum receiver for the binary coherent state quantum channel. *Quarterly Progress Report*, 108:219–225, 1973.
- [30] Masahiro Takeoka and Masahide Sasaki. Discrimination of the binary coherent signal: Gaussian-operation limit and simple non-gaussian near-optimal receivers. *Physical Review A*, 78(2), Aug 2008.
- [31] Lara Stroh, Nikola Horová, Robert Stárek, Ittoop V. Puthoor, Michal Mičuda, Miloslav Dušek, and Erika Andersson. Non-interactive xor quantum oblivious transfer: Optimal protocols and their experimental implementations. *PRX Quantum*, 4(2), May 2023.
- [32] Ryan Amiri, Robert Stárek, David Reichmuth, Ittoop V. Puthoor, Michal Mičuda, Ladislav Mišta, Jr., Miloslav Dušek, Petros Wallden, and Erika Andersson. Imperfect 1-out-of-2 quantum oblivious transfer: Bounds, a protocol, and its experimental implementation. *PRX Quantum*, 2:010335, March 2021.
- [33] David Reichmuth, Ittoop Vergheese Puthoor, Petros Wallden, and Erika Andersson. Incomplete quantum oblivious transfer with perfect one-sided security, 2024.
- [34] André Chailloux, Iordanis Kerenidis, and Jamie Sikora. Lower bounds for quantum oblivious transfer. *Quantum Info. Comput.*, 13(1–2):158–177, January 2013.
- [35] André Chailloux, Gus Gutoski, and Jamie Sikora. Optimal bounds for semi-honest quantum oblivious transfer. *Chic. J. Theor. Comput. Sci.*, 2016, 2013.
- [36] Srijita Kundu, Jamie Sikora, and Ernest Y.-Z. Tan. A device-independent protocol for XOR oblivious transfer. *Quantum*, 6:725, May 2022.
- [37] Lara Stroh, James T. Peat, Mats Kroneberg, Ittoop V. Puthoor, and Erika Andersson. Quantum rabin oblivious transfer using two pure states. *Phys. Rev. Res.*, 6:043004, Oct 2024.
- [38] James Peat and Erika Andersson. Cheating in quantum rabin oblivious transfer using delayed measurements, 08 2024.
- [39] Ryan Amiri and Juan Miguel Arrazola. Quantum money with nearly optimal error tolerance. *Physical Review A*, 95(6), Jun 2017.
- [40] Dmitry Gavinsky. Quantum money with classical verification. In *Proceedings of the 27th Conference on Computational Complexity, CCC 2012, Porto, Portugal, June 26–29, 2012*, pages 42–52. IEEE Computer Society, 2012.
- [41] Juan Miguel Arrazola, Markos Karasamanis, and Norbert Lütkenhaus. Practical quantum retrieval games. *Physical Review A*, 93(6), Jun 2016.
- [42] Lara Stroh. *Quantum XOR and Rabin Oblivious Transfer*. Phd thesis, Heriot-Watt University, Edinburgh, May 2023.
- [43] Fernando Pastawski, Norman Y. Yao, Liang Jiang, Mikhail D. Lukin, and J. Ignacio Cirac. Unforgeable noise-tolerant quantum tokens. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 109(40):16079–16082, 2012.
- [44] Marios Georgiou and Iordanis Kerenidis. New Constructions for Quantum Money. In Salman Beigi and Robert König, editors, *10th Conference on the Theory of Quantum Computation, Communication and Cryptography (TQC 2015)*, volume 44 of *Leibniz International Proceedings in Informatics (LIPIcs)*, pages 92–110, Dagstuhl, Germany, 2015. Schloss Dagstuhl – Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik.
- [45] Jian-Yu Guan, Juan Miguel Arrazola, Ryan Amiri, Weijun Zhang, Hao Li, Lixing You, Zhen Wang, Qiang Zhang, and Jian-Wei Pan. Experimental preparation and verification of quantum money. *Physical Review A*, 97(3), Mar 2018.
- [46] Hoi-Kwong Lo and John Preskill. Security of quantum key distribution using weak coherent states with nonrandom phases, 2007.
- [47] Z. L. Yuan, B. Fröhlich, M. Lucamarini, G. L. Roberts, J. F. Dynes, and A. J. Shields. Directly phase-modulated light source. *Phys. Rev. X*, 6:031044, Sep 2016.
- [48] Yi Zhao, Bing Qi, and Hoi-Kwong Lo. Experimental quantum key distribution with active phase randomization. *Applied Physics Letters*, 90(4), Jan 2007.
- [49] Hoi-Kwong Lo, Xiongfeng Ma, and Kai Chen. Decoy state quantum key distribution. *Physical Review Letters*, 94(23), Jun 2005.
- [50] M. Lucamarini, Z. L. Yuan, J. F. Dynes, and A. J. Shields. Overcoming the rate–distance limit of quantum key distribution without quantum repeaters. *Nature*, 557(7705):400–403, May 2018.
- [51] Marcos Curty, Koji Azuma, and Hoi-Kwong Lo. Simple security proof of twin-field type quantum key distribution protocol, 2018.
- [52] Charles H. Bennett. Quantum cryptography using any two nonorthogonal states. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 68:3121–3124, May 1992.
- [53] P.D. Townsend, J.G. Rarity, and P.R. Tapster. Single photon interference in 10 km long optical fibre interferometer. *Electronics Letters*, 29(7):634 – 635, 1993.
- [54] Stephen D. Bartlett, Terry Rudolph, and Robert W. Spekkens. Classical and quantum communication without a shared reference frame. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 91:027901, Jul 2003.
- [55] Alessia Allevi, Stefano Olivares, and Maria Bondani. Manipulating the non-gaussianity of phase-randomized coherent states. *Optics Express*, 20(22):24850, Oct 2012.
- [56] Erika Andersson. Optimal minimum-cost quantum measurements for imperfect detection. *Phys. Rev. A*, 86:012120, Jul 2012.
- [57] George E. Trapp. Inverses of circulant matrices and block circulant matrices. *Kyungpook Mathematical Journal*, 13(1).

**Appendix A: Optimal measurement for the phase-randomized sets of states**

Starting from a general multi-mode coherent state

$$|\psi_0\rangle = |\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \dots, \alpha_M\rangle \quad (\text{A1})$$

we express the set of pure symmetric states as

$$|\psi_K\rangle = U^K |\psi_0\rangle, \quad K = 0, 1, \dots, L-1 \quad (\text{A2})$$

with  $U^L = \mathbf{1}$ ,  $\alpha_j = |\alpha_j|e^{i(\theta+\Delta\theta_j)}$  and  $\Delta\theta_1 = 0$ . We expand the state as

$$\begin{aligned} |\psi_0\rangle &= e^{-\frac{(|\alpha_1|^2 + \dots + |\alpha_M|^2)}{2}} \times \\ &\times \sum_{n_1, n_2, \dots, n_M=0}^{\infty} \frac{\alpha_1^{n_1} \alpha_2^{n_2} \dots \alpha_M^{n_M}}{\sqrt{n_1! n_2! \dots n_M!}} |n_1, n_2, \dots, n_M\rangle \\ &= \bigoplus_{N=0}^{\infty} \sum_{\substack{n_i=0, i \in [M] \\ \sum_k n_k = N}}^N A(\vec{r}, \vec{n}) B(\theta, \vec{n}) |n_1, n_2, \dots, n_M\rangle \\ &= \bigoplus_{N=0}^{\infty} \sqrt{p_N} |\psi_{0,N}\rangle, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A3})$$

where for  $\vec{n} = (n_1, n_2, \dots, n_M)$  and  $\vec{r} = (|\alpha_1|, |\alpha_2|, \dots, |\alpha_M|)$ , we have

$$A(\vec{r}, \vec{n}) = e^{-\frac{(|\alpha_1|^2 + \dots + |\alpha_M|^2)}{2}} \frac{|\alpha_1|^{n_1} |\alpha_2|^{n_2} \dots |\alpha_M|^{n_M}}{\sqrt{n_1! n_2! \dots n_M!}},$$

$$B(\theta, \vec{n}) = \prod_{m=1}^M e^{i(\theta + \Delta\theta_m)n_m}.$$

(A4)

The probability for  $N$  photons is given by

$$\begin{aligned} p_N &= e^{-(|\alpha_1|^2 + \dots + |\alpha_M|^2)} \frac{(|\alpha_1|^2 + \dots + |\alpha_M|^2)^N}{N!} \\ &= e^{-\langle N \rangle} \frac{\langle N \rangle^N}{N!}, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A5})$$

which is a Poisson distribution. The states  $|\psi_{0,N}\rangle$  are

$$|\psi_{0,N}\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{p_N}} \sum_{\substack{n_i=0, i \in [M] \\ \sum_k n_k = N}}^N A(\vec{r}, \vec{n}) B(\theta, \vec{n}) |n_1, n_2, \dots, n_M\rangle. \quad (\text{A6})$$

If the unitary operator  $U$  does not change the total number of photons, i.e.

$$\begin{aligned} U &= \bigoplus_{N=0}^{\infty} \sum_{\substack{b_1, \dots, b_M=0 \\ c_1, \dots, c_M=0 \\ \sum_k b_k = \sum_l c_l = N}}^N C_{b_1, \dots, b_M}^{c_1, \dots, c_M} \times \\ &\times |b_1, b_2, \dots, b_M\rangle \langle c_1, c_2, \dots, c_M| = \bigoplus_{N=0}^{\infty} U_N, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A7})$$

then it holds that

$$U^K = \bigoplus_{N_1, \dots, N_K=0}^{\infty} U_{N_1} \dots U_{N_K} = \bigoplus_{N=0}^{\infty} (U_N)^K. \quad (\text{A8})$$

The first phase-randomized state is

$$\rho_0 = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} d\theta |\psi_0\rangle \langle \psi_0|. \quad (\text{A9})$$

The  $K$ th phase-randomized state would be

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_K &= \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} d\theta |\psi_K\rangle \langle \psi_K| = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} d\theta U^K |\psi_0\rangle \langle \psi_0| (U^K)^\dagger \\ &= U^K \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} d\theta |\psi_0\rangle \langle \psi_0| (U^K)^\dagger = U^K \rho_0 (U^K)^\dagger, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A10})$$

which shows that we end up with mixed symmetric states from phase-randomization. Substituting equations (A3) and (A8) into (A10), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_K &= \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} d\theta \bigoplus_{N, N', R, R'=0}^{\infty} \sqrt{p_N p_{N'}} (U_R)^K |\psi_{0,N}\rangle \langle \psi_{0,N'}| [(U_{R'})^K]^\dagger \\ &= \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} d\theta \bigoplus_{N, N'=0}^{\infty} \sqrt{p_N p_{N'}} (U_N)^K |\psi_{0,N}\rangle \langle \psi_{0,N'}| [(U_{N'})^K]^\dagger \\ &= \bigoplus_{N, N'=0}^{\infty} (U_N)^K \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} d\theta \sqrt{p_N p_{N'}} |\psi_{0,N}\rangle \langle \psi_{0,N'}| [(U_{N'})^K]^\dagger = \bigoplus_{N, N'=0}^{\infty} (U_N)^K I_0^{(N, N')} [(U_{N'})^K]^\dagger \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A11})$$

with

$$\begin{aligned}
I_0^{(N,N')} &= \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} d\theta \sqrt{p_N p_{N'}} |\psi_{0,N}\rangle \langle \psi_{0,N'}| \\
&= \sum_{\substack{n_i=0, i \in [M] \\ \sum_k n_k = N}}^N \sum_{\substack{n'_j=0, j \in [M] \\ \sum_l n'_l = N'}}^{N'} A(\vec{r}, \vec{n}) A(\vec{r}, \vec{n}') \times \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} d\theta B(\theta, \vec{n}) (B(\theta, \vec{n}'))^* |n_1, \dots, n_M\rangle \langle n'_1, \dots, n'_M|. \tag{A12}
\end{aligned}$$

Because

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{1}{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} d\theta B(\theta, \vec{n}) (B(\theta, \vec{n}'))^* &= \prod_{m=1}^M e^{i\Delta\theta_m n_m} e^{-i\Delta\theta_m n'_m} \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} d\theta e^{i\theta(\sum_p n_p - \sum_q n'_q)} \\
&= \prod_{m=1}^M e^{i\Delta\theta_m (n_m - n'_m)} \delta_{\sum_p n_p, \sum_q n'_q}, \tag{A13}
\end{aligned}$$

the  $K$ th density matrix becomes

$$\begin{aligned}
\rho_K &= \bigoplus_{N, N'=0}^{\infty} \sum_{\substack{n_i=0, i \in [M] \\ \sum_k n_k = N}}^N \sum_{\substack{n'_j=0, j \in [M] \\ \sum_l n'_l = N'}}^{N'} A(\vec{r}, \vec{n}) A(\vec{r}, \vec{n}') \prod_{m=1}^M \delta_{\sum_p n_p, \sum_q n'_q} \times e^{i\Delta\theta_m (n_m - n'_m)} (U_N)^K |n_1, \dots, n_M\rangle \langle n'_1, \dots, n'_M| [(U_{N'})^K]^\dagger \\
&= \bigoplus_{N=0}^{\infty} \sum_{\substack{n_i=0, i \in [M] \\ \sum_k n_k = N}}^N \sum_{\substack{n'_j=0, j \in [M] \\ \sum_l n'_l = N}}^N A(\vec{r}, \vec{n}) A(\vec{r}, \vec{n}') \times \prod_{m=1}^M e^{i\Delta\theta_m (n_m - n'_m)} (U_N)^K |n_1, \dots, n_M\rangle \langle n'_1, \dots, n'_M| [(U_N)^K]^\dagger \\
&= \bigoplus_{N=0}^{\infty} p_N (U_N)^K |\phi_{0,N}\rangle \langle \phi_{0,N}| [(U_N)^K]^\dagger = \bigoplus_{N=0}^{\infty} p_N \rho_{K,N} \tag{A14}
\end{aligned}$$

with

$$|\phi_{0,N}\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{p_N}} \sum_{\substack{n_i=0, i \in [M] \\ \sum_k n_k = N}}^N A(\vec{r}, \vec{n}) \prod_{m=1}^M e^{i\Delta\theta_m n_m} |n_1, \dots, n_M\rangle, \tag{A15}$$

which shows that  $\rho_K$  is a mixture of pure states with different total number of photons.

Next, we show that the minimum-error measurement for the phase-randomized states is actually to perform the square-root measurement (the square-root measurement is not always optimal for mixed symmetric states). The  $L$  possible states are equiprobable, and are mixtures of pure states with different total photon numbers. The  $L$  different pure states with a particular total photon number are clearly symmetric (because the symmetry operation does not change the total number of photons). Therefore the ‘‘overall’’ square-root measurement is equivalent to first counting the total number of photons, and then performing the square-root measurement in each total photon number subspace. For equiprobable states, the measurement operators for the square-root measurement

are given by

$$\pi_i = \frac{1}{L} \rho^{-\frac{1}{2}} \rho_i \rho^{-\frac{1}{2}}. \tag{A16}$$

The average density operator can be written

$$\begin{aligned}
\rho &= \frac{1}{L} \sum_{i=0}^{L-1} \rho_i = \frac{1}{L} \sum_{i=0}^{L-1} \bigoplus_{N=0}^{\infty} p_N \rho_{i,N} \\
&= \frac{1}{L} \bigoplus_{N=0}^{\infty} p_N \sum_{i=0}^{L-1} \rho_{i,N} = \bigoplus_{N=0}^{\infty} p_N \rho_N, \tag{A17}
\end{aligned}$$

where  $\rho_N$  is the average density matrix in the  $N$ -photon subspace. Because the average density matrix  $\rho$  is block

diagonal, we can write

$$\rho^{-\frac{1}{2}} = \bigoplus_{N=0}^{\infty} p_N^{-\frac{1}{2}} (\rho_N)^{-\frac{1}{2}}. \quad (\text{A18})$$

The measurement operator becomes

$$\begin{aligned} \pi_i &= \frac{1}{L} \bigoplus_{N_1, N_2, N_3=0}^{\infty} p_{N_1}^{-\frac{1}{2}} p_{N_2} p_{N_3}^{-\frac{1}{2}} (\rho_{N_1})^{-\frac{1}{2}} \rho_{i, N_2} (\rho_{N_3})^{-\frac{1}{2}} \\ &= \frac{1}{L} \bigoplus_{N=0}^{\infty} (\rho_N)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \rho_{i, N} (\rho_N)^{-\frac{1}{2}} = \bigoplus_{N=0}^{\infty} \pi_i^{(N)}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A19})$$

We see that the square-root measurement operators can be written as a direct sum of operators acting in subspaces with different total photon numbers. The measurement operators in the  $N$ -photon subspace are given by

$$\pi_i^{(N)} = \frac{1}{L} (\rho_N)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \rho_{i, N} (\rho_N)^{-\frac{1}{2}}, \quad (\text{A20})$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_N &= \frac{1}{L} \sum_{l=0}^{L-1} \rho_{l, N} = \frac{1}{L} \sum_{l=0}^{L-1} |\phi_{l, N}\rangle \langle \phi_{l, N}|, \\ |\phi_{l, N}\rangle &= (U_N)^l |\phi_{0, N}\rangle. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A21})$$

Eqn. (A20) is clearly the square-root measurement for the states  $|\phi_{l, N}\rangle$  in the  $N$ -photon subspace. The overall square-root measurement for the phase-randomized states is therefore the same as the combination of the square-root measurements for distinguishing between the resulting pure symmetric states in each photon-number subspace. The square-root measurement is known to be optimal for distinguishing between pure symmetric equiprobable states. As we already mentioned, the optimal measurement for the phase-randomized states can be realized by first determining the total photon number, and then distinguishing between the resulting pure symmetric states in the corresponding photon-number subspace. We have verified that this is the same as the overall square-root measurement for the mixed phase-randomized states in eq. (A16).

### Appendix B: The optimal measurement for the two-mode states in eq. (5)

To obtain the optimal measurement for distinguishing between the two-mode phase-randomized coherent states in eq. (5), we note that applying the same unitary transform to all states we want to distinguish between leaves the optimal success probability unchanged. Since a unitary operation corresponds to a basis change, the optimal measurement operators for the original states can be found from the measurement operators

for the transformed states, using the inverse of the unitary transform. We will use the unitary transform  $U_{\text{BS}} |\alpha, \beta\rangle = |(\alpha + \beta)/\sqrt{2}, (\alpha - \beta)/\sqrt{2}\rangle$ , corresponding to a 50/50 beam splitter, giving

$$\begin{aligned} U_{\text{BS}} |\psi_0\rangle &= U_{\text{BS}} |\alpha, \alpha\rangle = |\sqrt{2}\alpha, 0\rangle \\ U_{\text{BS}} |\psi_1\rangle &= U_{\text{BS}} |\alpha, -\alpha\rangle = |0, \sqrt{2}\alpha\rangle. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B1})$$

This means that we need to distinguish between the states

$$\begin{aligned} \rho'_0 &= U_{\text{BS}} \rho_0 U_{\text{BS}}^\dagger = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} d\theta U_{\text{BS}} |\psi_0\rangle \langle \psi_0| U_{\text{BS}}^\dagger \\ &= e^{-2|\alpha|^2} \sum_{N=0}^{\infty} \frac{2^N |\alpha|^{2N}}{N!} |N, 0\rangle \langle N, 0|, \\ \rho'_1 &= U_{\text{BS}} \rho_1 U_{\text{BS}}^\dagger = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} d\theta U_{\text{BS}} |\psi_1\rangle \langle \psi_1| U_{\text{BS}}^\dagger \\ &= e^{-2|\alpha|^2} \sum_{N=0}^{\infty} \frac{2^N |\alpha|^{2N}}{N!} |0, N\rangle \langle 0, N|. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B2})$$

We will also find that the square-root measurement is equal to the Helstrom measurement in this particular case, if the two states are equiprobable, with only minor differences otherwise. Using the density matrices in eq. (B2), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} A' &= p_0 \rho'_0 - p_1 \rho'_1 \\ &= e^{-2|\alpha|^2} \sum_{N=0}^{\infty} \frac{2^N |\alpha|^{2N}}{N!} (p_0 |N, 0\rangle \langle N, 0| \\ &\quad - p_1 |0, N\rangle \langle 0, N|). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B3})$$

Because the states  $|N, 0\rangle$  and  $|0, N\rangle$  are orthogonal for  $N \neq 0$  and only overlap for  $N = 0$ , the optimal measurement operators for the Helstrom measurement are

$$\begin{aligned} \Pi_0 &= \sum_{N=1}^{\infty} |N, 0\rangle \langle N, 0| + |0, 0\rangle \langle 0, 0| \\ \Pi_1 &= \sum_{N=1}^{\infty} |0, N\rangle \langle 0, N| \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B4})$$

if  $p_0 > p_1$ , and

$$\begin{aligned} \Pi_0 &= \sum_{N=1}^{\infty} |N, 0\rangle \langle N, 0| \\ \Pi_1 &= \sum_{N=1}^{\infty} |0, N\rangle \langle 0, N| + |0, 0\rangle \langle 0, 0| \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B5})$$

if  $p_0 < p_1$ . If  $p_0 = p_1$ , then the projector onto  $|0, 0\rangle$  can be "split up" in any proportion between  $\Pi_0$  and  $\Pi_1$ . The above measurement operators add up to identity on the support of  $A'$ . (States  $|j, k\rangle$  where both  $j \neq 0$  and  $k \neq 0$  are not included in the support of  $A'$ ,  $\rho'_0$  or  $\rho'_1$ ;

corresponding events will never occur in an ideal setup. Should experimental imperfections be present, it is also possible to derive optimal measurements for this situation. The measurement one should aim to realize may or may not be identical to the optimal measurement for ideal conditions [56].)

To show that the square-root measurement coincides with the above Helstrom measurement for the above two-mode phase-randomized coherent states if they are equiprobable, we derive the measurement operators for the square-root measurement. We can write  $\rho'_0$  and  $\rho'_1$  as

$$\rho'_0 = \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} c_i P_i, \quad \rho'_1 = \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} c_i Q_i \quad (\text{B6})$$

where  $P_0 = Q_0$ , and  $P_i Q_j = 0$  for  $i, j > 0$ . We write

$$\rho'_0 = c_0 P_0 + \tilde{\rho}_0, \quad \rho'_1 = c_0 P_0 + \tilde{\rho}_1 \quad (\text{B7})$$

and

$$\rho' = p_0 \rho'_0 + p_1 \rho'_1 = c_0 P_0 + p_0 \tilde{\rho}_0 + p_1 \tilde{\rho}_1 \quad (\text{B8})$$

because  $p_0 + p_1 = 1$ . We have  $\tilde{\rho}_0, \tilde{\rho}_1 \succ 0$  because  $c_i > 0$ . Then

$$(\rho')^{-\frac{1}{2}} = c_0^{-\frac{1}{2}} P_0 + p_0^{-\frac{1}{2}} \tilde{\rho}_0^{-\frac{1}{2}} + p_1^{-\frac{1}{2}} \tilde{\rho}_1^{-\frac{1}{2}}. \quad (\text{B9})$$

The first measurement operator is

$$\begin{aligned} \pi'_0 &= p_0 (\rho')^{-\frac{1}{2}} \rho'_0 (\rho')^{-\frac{1}{2}} \\ &= p_0 \left[ c_0^{-\frac{1}{2}} P_0 + p_0^{-\frac{1}{2}} \tilde{\rho}_0^{-\frac{1}{2}} + p_1^{-\frac{1}{2}} \tilde{\rho}_1^{-\frac{1}{2}} \right] (c_0 P_0 + \tilde{\rho}_0) \times \\ &\quad \times \left[ c_0^{-\frac{1}{2}} P_0 + p_0^{-\frac{1}{2}} \tilde{\rho}_0^{-\frac{1}{2}} + p_1^{-\frac{1}{2}} \tilde{\rho}_1^{-\frac{1}{2}} \right] \\ &= p_0 P_0 + \tilde{\rho}_0^{-\frac{1}{2}} \tilde{\rho}_0 \tilde{\rho}_0^{-\frac{1}{2}} = p_0 P_0 + \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} P_i \\ &= p_0 |0, 0\rangle \langle 0, 0| + \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} |i, 0\rangle \langle i, 0|. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B10})$$

Using similar arguments, we obtain

$$\pi'_1 = p_1 P_0 + \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} Q_i = p_1 |0, 0\rangle \langle 0, 0| + \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} |0, i\rangle \langle 0, i|. \quad (\text{B11})$$

That is, if  $p_0 = p_1$ , then the square-root measurement is a minimum-error measurement for the mixed states in (5). When  $p_0 \neq p_1$ , the only difference between the square-root and the minimum-error measurement is in how the projector  $|0\rangle \langle 0|$  is "shared" between the two measurement operators.

### Appendix C: Calculating pairwise overlaps between $|\psi_{bc,N}\rangle$ and Gram matrix elements

From the trinomial expansion

$$\begin{aligned} (a + b + c)^N &= \sum_{\substack{j,k,l=0 \\ j+k+l=N}}^N \binom{N}{j,k,l} a^j b^k c^l \\ &= \sum_{\substack{j,k,l=0 \\ j+k+l=N}}^N \frac{N!}{j!k!l!} a^j b^k c^l \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C1})$$

for  $a = b = c = 1$ , we find the normalization factor  $M_N$  of the states  $|\psi_{bc,N}\rangle$  in eq. (21)

$$3^N = \sum_{\substack{j,k,l=0 \\ j+k+l=N}}^N \frac{N!}{j!k!l!} \Rightarrow M_N = \sum_{\substack{j,k,l=0 \\ j+k+l=N}}^N \frac{1}{j!k!l!} = \frac{3^N}{N!}. \quad (\text{C2})$$

For the elements of the Gram matrices in eqs. (22) and (D40), we used the multinomial expansion

$$(x_1 + x_2 + \dots + x_k)^N = \sum_{\substack{n_1, n_2, \dots \\ \dots, n_k=0 \\ n_1+n_2+\dots \\ \dots+n_k=N}}^N \frac{N!}{n_1!n_2!\dots n_k!} x_1^{n_1} x_2^{n_2} \dots x_k^{n_k}. \quad (\text{C3})$$

For example, for the four-mode coherent states in the subspace with  $N > 0$  photons, we have

$$\begin{aligned} (\tilde{\mathcal{G}}_N)_{0,1} &= \langle \tilde{\psi}_{00,N} | \tilde{\psi}_{01,N} \rangle = \frac{1}{\tilde{M}_N} \sum_{\substack{j,k,l,m=0 \\ j+k+l+m=N}}^N \frac{(-1)^l (-1)^m}{j!k!l!m!} \\ &= \frac{1}{N!} \frac{(1+1-1-1)^N}{N!} = 0. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C4})$$

### Appendix D: Success probability and cheating probability for quantum oblivious transfer

When calculating the probabilities in eqs. (47) to (49), for distinguishing between pairs of states, selected from four symmetric pure states, it is convenient to express the states using the "quantum Fourier transform" orthonormal basis  $|A_i\rangle$  [33]. The Gram matrix for a set of pure states is circulant, and circulant matrices are diagonal when expressed in this basis. This method can be used also for more than four states, e.g. when we encode three bits of classical information in eight symmetric quantum states. The quantum Fourier transform is a unitary matrix  $\mathcal{F}$  acting on a set of basis state vectors. The matrix

$\mathcal{F}$  is the discrete Fourier transform, given by

$$\mathcal{F} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{L}} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & \cdots & 1 \\ 1 & \omega & \omega^2 & \omega^3 & \cdots & \omega^{L-1} \\ 1 & \omega^2 & \omega^4 & \omega^6 & \cdots & \omega^{2(L-1)} \\ 1 & \omega^3 & \omega^6 & \omega^9 & \cdots & \omega^{3(L-1)} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 1 & \omega^{L-1} & \omega^{2(L-1)} & \omega^{3(L-1)} & \cdots & \omega^{(L-1)^2} \end{pmatrix} \quad (\text{D1})$$

where  $\omega = e^{\frac{2\pi i}{L}}$  with  $L = 2^n$ . For us,  $n$  is the number of classical bits that is encoded in the set of quantum states. A circulant matrix of size  $L \times L$  is generated from an  $L$ -vector  $\{c_0, c_1, \dots, c_{L-1}\}$  by cyclically permuting its entries. The matrix is given by

$$\mathbf{C} = \begin{pmatrix} c_0 & c_1 & \cdots & c_{L-1} \\ c_{L-1} & c_0 & \cdots & c_{L-2} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ c_1 & c_2 & \cdots & c_0 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (\text{D2})$$

Here, each row is a right cyclic shift of the row above it. The circulant operator  $\text{circ}(\cdot)$  creates a circulant matrix

from the vector  $\{c_0, c_1, \dots, c_{L-1}\}$ , so that

$$\mathbf{C} = \text{circ}(c_0, c_1, \dots, c_{L-1}). \quad (\text{D3})$$

The element at position  $(i, k)$  of the matrix is given by  $(\mathbf{C})_{ik} = c_{(k-i) \bmod L}$  where  $i, k$  range from 0 to  $L-1$ . The Gram matrix of the states  $|\psi_i\rangle = U^i |\psi_0\rangle$  is circulant with elements  $c_l = \mathcal{G}_{0l}$  and has the form

$$\mathcal{G} = \text{circ}(\mathcal{G}_{00}, \mathcal{G}_{01}, \mathcal{G}_{02}, \dots, \mathcal{G}_{0L-1}) \\ = \begin{pmatrix} \mathcal{G}_{00} & \mathcal{G}_{01} & \cdots & \mathcal{G}_{0L-2} & \mathcal{G}_{0L-1} \\ \mathcal{G}_{0L-1} & \mathcal{G}_{00} & \cdots & \mathcal{G}_{0L-3} & \mathcal{G}_{0L-2} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots \\ \mathcal{G}_{02} & \mathcal{G}_{03} & \cdots & \mathcal{G}_{00} & \mathcal{G}_{01} \\ \mathcal{G}_{01} & \mathcal{G}_{02} & \cdots & \mathcal{G}_{0L-1} & \mathcal{G}_{00} \end{pmatrix}. \quad (\text{D4})$$

We follow the notation  $|\psi_i\rangle = U^i |\psi_0\rangle$  where  $|\psi_0\rangle \equiv |\psi_{00\dots}\rangle$  for the set of symmetric states. It can be proven that the eigenvalues of a circulant matrix are [57]

$$\lambda_k = \sum_{l=0}^{L-1} c_l \omega^{kl} \quad (\text{D5})$$

with  $\omega = e^{\frac{2\pi i}{L}}$  and  $k = 0, 1, \dots, L-1$ .

---

Therefore, the eigenvalues of the Gram matrix can be written as

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda_k &= \sum_{l=0}^{L-1} \mathcal{G}_{0l} \omega^{kl} = \sum_{l=0}^{L-1} \mathcal{G}_{0l} \frac{1}{L} L \omega^{kl} \\ &= \mathcal{G}_{00} \frac{1}{L} L \omega^{k \cdot 0} + \mathcal{G}_{01} \frac{1}{L} L \omega^{k \cdot 1} + \cdots + \mathcal{G}_{0L-1} \frac{1}{L} L \omega^{k \cdot (L-1)} \\ &= \left[ \mathcal{G}_{00} \frac{1}{L} \omega^{k(0-0)} + \mathcal{G}_{11} \frac{1}{L} \omega^{k(1-1)} + \cdots + \mathcal{G}_{L-1, L-1} \frac{1}{L} \omega^{k(L-1-L+1)} \right] \\ &+ \left[ \mathcal{G}_{01} \frac{1}{L} \omega^{k(1-0)} + \mathcal{G}_{12} \frac{1}{L} \omega^{k(2-1)} + \cdots + \mathcal{G}_{L-2, L-1} \frac{1}{L} \omega^{k(L-1-L+2)} + \mathcal{G}_{L-1, 0} \frac{1}{L} \omega^{k(0-L+1)} \right] \\ &+ \cdots \\ &+ \left[ \mathcal{G}_{0L-1} \frac{1}{L} \omega^{k(L-1-0)} + \mathcal{G}_{10} \frac{1}{L} \omega^{k(0-1)} + \cdots + \mathcal{G}_{L-1, L-2} \frac{1}{L} \omega^{k(L-2-L+1)} \right] \\ &= \sum_{j,m=0}^{L-1} \mathcal{G}_{mj} \frac{1}{L} \omega^{k(j-m)} = \sum_{j,m=0}^{L-1} \mathcal{F}_{mk}^* \mathcal{G}_{mj} \mathcal{F}_{jk} \\ &= \sum_{j,m=0}^{L-1} (\mathcal{F}^\dagger)_{km} \mathcal{G}_{mj} \mathcal{F}_{jk} = (\mathcal{F}^\dagger \mathcal{G} \mathcal{F})_{kk} = (\mathcal{F}^{-1} \mathcal{G} \mathcal{F})_{kk} \end{aligned}$$

where we used the properties

$$\mathcal{G}_{ij} = \mathcal{G}_{(i+m) \bmod L, (j+m) \bmod L}, \quad \mathcal{F}^{-1} = \mathcal{F}^\dagger \quad (\text{D6})$$

with  $k = 0, 1, \dots, L-1$  and also  $\omega^{kL} = 1$ . Then, we see that

$$\lambda_k = \sum_{j,m=0}^{L-1} \mathcal{F}_{km}^* \mathcal{F}_{kj} \mathcal{G}_{mj} = \sum_{j,m=0}^{L-1} \langle \psi_m | \mathcal{F}_{km}^* \mathcal{F}_{kj} | \psi_j \rangle = \langle B_k | B_k \rangle \quad (\text{D7})$$

with

$$|B_k\rangle = \sum_{j=0}^{L-1} \mathcal{F}_{kj} |\psi_j\rangle. \quad (\text{D8})$$

The states  $|B_k\rangle$  are unnormalized. We will show that these states are orthogonal.

We have

$$\begin{aligned} \langle B_l | B_k \rangle &= \sum_{j,m=0}^{L-1} \mathcal{F}_{lm}^* \mathcal{F}_{kj} \langle \psi_m | \psi_j \rangle = \sum_{j,m=0}^{L-1} \mathcal{F}_{lm}^* \mathcal{F}_{kj} \mathcal{G}_{mj} \\ &= \sum_{j,m=0}^{L-1} \frac{1}{L} \omega^{kj-lm} \mathcal{G}_{mj} = \sum_{i=0}^{L-1} \frac{1}{L} \mathcal{G}_{0i} \omega^{ki} \sum_{m=0}^{L-1} \omega^{(k-l)m}, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{D9})$$

and for  $k \neq l$  it holds that

$$\langle B_l | B_k \rangle = \sum_{i=0}^{L-1} \frac{1}{L} \mathcal{G}_{0i} \omega^{ki} \frac{1 - \omega^{(k-l)L}}{1 - \omega^{k-l}} = 0. \quad (\text{D10})$$

Therefore

$$\langle B_l | B_k \rangle = \lambda_k \delta_{lk}. \quad (\text{D11})$$

We define an orthonormal basis  $|A_k\rangle$  from  $|B_k\rangle$  as

$$|B_k\rangle = \sqrt{\lambda_k} |A_k\rangle = \sum_{j=0}^{L-1} \mathcal{F}_{kj} |\psi_j\rangle. \quad (\text{D12})$$

We express the states  $|\psi_j\rangle$  in the basis  $\{|A_k\rangle\}$  as

$$|\psi_m\rangle = \sum_{i=0}^{L-1} \mathcal{F}_{im}^* \sqrt{\lambda_i} |A_i\rangle \quad (\text{D13})$$

where we used the unitarity relation of  $\mathcal{F}$ . We denote the corresponding density matrices by

$$\sigma_j = |\psi_j\rangle \langle \psi_j|, \quad (\text{D14})$$

or, writing out the indices explicitly,

$$\sigma_{x_0 x_1 \dots x_{n-1}} = |\psi_{x_0 x_1 \dots x_{n-1}}\rangle \langle \psi_{x_0 x_1 \dots x_{n-1}}|. \quad (\text{D15})$$

If Bob is honest and wishes to learn the value of the  $k^{\text{th}}$  bit, then he performs a measurement to distinguish between the sets of states  $\{\sigma_{x_0 x_1 \dots x_{n-1}} | x_k=0\}$  and  $\{\sigma_{x_0 x_1 \dots x_{n-1}} | x_k=1\}$  with  $x_i \in \{0,1\}$  for  $i \neq k$ , where all states are equiprobable. This is the same as making a measurement to distinguish between the equiprobable states

$$\rho_b = \frac{1}{2^{n-1}} \sum_{\substack{x_i \in \{0,1\} \\ i \neq k}} \sigma_{x_0 x_1 \dots x_{n-1} | x_k=b} \quad (\text{D16})$$

with  $b = 0, 1$ . If we construct the difference operator  $A = \frac{1}{2}(\rho_0 - \rho_1)$  for the equiprobable states in eq. (D16), then we find the probability for correctly identifying the value of the  $k^{\text{th}}$  classical bit using equation (7) as

$$P_{x_k} = \frac{1}{2} + \text{Tr}[A\Pi_0] = \frac{1}{2} + \sum_{\lambda_i \geq 0} \lambda_i. \quad (\text{D17})$$

where  $\lambda_i$  are the eigenvalues of  $A$ . On average, Bob's probability to obtain a correct bit value, which corresponds to the protocol success probability, is

$$P_{\text{1bit}} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} P_{x_k}. \quad (\text{D18})$$

If Bob's success probability is independent of which bit he tries to obtain, then  $P_{\text{1bit}} = P_{x_k}$  for every  $k$ . Next, we apply the above result to the case of two classical bits using eq. (D16). We reproduce the analysis in [33] when four states encode two classical bits. If Bob is honest and wishes to learn the value of the first bit, then he performs a measurement to distinguish between the sets of states  $\{\sigma_{00}, \sigma_{01}\}$  and  $\{\sigma_{10}, \sigma_{11}\}$ , where all states are equiprobable. This is the same as making a measurement to distinguish between the equiprobable states  $\rho_0 = \frac{1}{2}(\sigma_{00} + \sigma_{01})$  and  $\rho_1 = \frac{1}{2}(\sigma_{10} + \sigma_{11})$ . The probability of a correct result in this case is therefore

$$P_{\text{corr}} \equiv P_{\text{1bit}} = \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{8} \text{Tr} |\sigma_{00} + \sigma_{01} - \sigma_{11} - \sigma_{10}|. \quad (\text{D19})$$

The  $L = 4$  discrete Fourier transform matrix is

$$\mathcal{F} = \frac{1}{2} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & i & -1 & -i \\ 1 & -1 & 1 & -1 \\ 1 & -i & -1 & i \end{pmatrix}. \quad (\text{D20})$$

From eq. (D13) we have

$$\begin{aligned}
|\psi_0\rangle \equiv |\psi_{00}\rangle &= \frac{1}{2}(\sqrt{\lambda_0}|A_0\rangle + \sqrt{\lambda_1}|A_1\rangle + \sqrt{\lambda_2}|A_2\rangle + \sqrt{\lambda_3}|A_3\rangle) \\
|\psi_1\rangle \equiv |\psi_{01}\rangle &= \frac{1}{2}(\sqrt{\lambda_0}|A_0\rangle - i\sqrt{\lambda_1}|A_1\rangle - \sqrt{\lambda_2}|A_2\rangle + i\sqrt{\lambda_3}|A_3\rangle) \\
|\psi_2\rangle \equiv |\psi_{11}\rangle &= \frac{1}{2}(\sqrt{\lambda_0}|A_0\rangle - \sqrt{\lambda_1}|A_1\rangle + \sqrt{\lambda_2}|A_2\rangle - \sqrt{\lambda_3}|A_3\rangle) \\
|\psi_3\rangle \equiv |\psi_{10}\rangle &= \frac{1}{2}(\sqrt{\lambda_0}|A_0\rangle + i\sqrt{\lambda_1}|A_1\rangle - \sqrt{\lambda_2}|A_2\rangle - i\sqrt{\lambda_3}|A_3\rangle).
\end{aligned} \tag{D21}$$

In the basis  $\{|A_0\rangle, |A_1\rangle, |A_2\rangle, |A_3\rangle\}$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\rho_0 &= \frac{1}{2}(\sigma_{00} + \sigma_{01}) = \frac{1}{8} \begin{pmatrix} 2\lambda_0 & \sqrt{\lambda_{01}}(1+i) & 0 & \sqrt{\lambda_{03}}(1-i) \\ \sqrt{\lambda_{01}}(1-i) & 2\lambda_1 & \sqrt{\lambda_{12}}(1+i) & 0 \\ 0 & \sqrt{\lambda_{12}}(1-i) & 2\lambda_2 & \sqrt{\lambda_{23}}(1+i) \\ \sqrt{\lambda_{03}}(1+i) & 0 & \sqrt{\lambda_{23}}(1-i) & 2\lambda_3 \end{pmatrix}, \\
\rho_1 &= \frac{1}{2}(\sigma_{11} + \sigma_{10}) = \frac{1}{8} \begin{pmatrix} 2\lambda_0 & -\sqrt{\lambda_{01}}(1+i) & 0 & -\sqrt{\lambda_{03}}(1-i) \\ -\sqrt{\lambda_{01}}(1-i) & 2\lambda_1 & -\sqrt{\lambda_{12}}(1+i) & 0 \\ 0 & -\sqrt{\lambda_{12}}(1-i) & 2\lambda_2 & -\sqrt{\lambda_{23}}(1+i) \\ -\sqrt{\lambda_{03}}(1+i) & 0 & -\sqrt{\lambda_{23}}(1-i) & 2\lambda_3 \end{pmatrix}, \\
A &= \frac{1}{4}(\sigma_{00} + \sigma_{01} - \sigma_{11} - \sigma_{10}) \\
&= \frac{1}{8} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \sqrt{\lambda_{01}}(1+i) & 0 & \sqrt{\lambda_{03}}(1-i) \\ \sqrt{\lambda_{01}}(1-i) & 0 & \sqrt{\lambda_{12}}(1+i) & 0 \\ 0 & \sqrt{\lambda_{12}}(1-i) & 0 & \sqrt{\lambda_{23}}(1+i) \\ \sqrt{\lambda_{03}}(1+i) & 0 & \sqrt{\lambda_{23}}(1-i) & 0 \end{pmatrix},
\end{aligned} \tag{D22}$$

where we have used the shorthand  $\lambda_{ij} = \lambda_i\lambda_j$ . The eigenvalue equation for the last matrix above is given by  $|A - \Lambda\mathbb{1}| = 0$ , which, when evaluating the determinant, gives

$$(8\Lambda)^4 - 2(8\Lambda)^2(\lambda_0 + \lambda_2)(\lambda_1 + \lambda_3) + 16\lambda_{0123} = 0, \tag{D23}$$

where  $\lambda_{0123} = \lambda_0\lambda_1\lambda_2\lambda_3$ . The four eigenvalues of the last matrix above are consequently given by the solutions of eq. (D23),

$$\Lambda_{\pm}^2 = \frac{1}{8^2} \left[ (\lambda_0 + \lambda_2)(\lambda_1 + \lambda_3) \pm \sqrt{(\lambda_0 + \lambda_2)^2(\lambda_1 + \lambda_3)^2 - 16\lambda_0\lambda_1\lambda_2\lambda_3} \right]. \tag{D24}$$

From eq. (D7), we find

$$\begin{aligned}
\lambda_0 &= 1 + F + G + F^* = 1 + G + 2\text{Re}F \\
\lambda_1 &= 1 + iF - G - iF^* = 1 - G - 2\text{Im}F \\
\lambda_2 &= 1 - F + G - F^* = 1 + G - 2\text{Re}F \\
\lambda_3 &= 1 - iF - G + iF^* = 1 - G + 2\text{Im}F
\end{aligned} \tag{D25}$$

in that order. The solutions can be written

$$\Lambda_{\pm}^2 = \frac{1}{8^2} \left[ 4(1 - G^2) \pm 8\sqrt{(1 + G)^2(\text{Im}F)^2 + (1 - G)^2(\text{Re}F)^2 - 4(\text{Re}F)^2(\text{Im}F)^2} \right]. \tag{D26}$$

The protocol success probability is therefore given by

$$\begin{aligned}
P_{\text{1bit}} &= \frac{1}{2} \left[ 1 + \frac{1}{4} \sqrt{(\lambda_0 + \lambda_2)(\lambda_1 + \lambda_3) + \sqrt{(\lambda_0 + \lambda_2)^2(\lambda_1 + \lambda_3)^2 - 16\lambda_0\lambda_1\lambda_2\lambda_3}} \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \frac{1}{4} \sqrt{(\lambda_0 + \lambda_2)(\lambda_1 + \lambda_3) - \sqrt{(\lambda_0 + \lambda_2)^2(\lambda_1 + \lambda_3)^2 - 16\lambda_0\lambda_1\lambda_2\lambda_3}} \right] \\
&= \frac{1}{2} \left[ 1 + \frac{1}{2} \sqrt{1 - G^2 + 2\sqrt{(1 + G)^2(\text{Im}F)^2 + (1 - G)^2(\text{Re}F)^2 - 4(\text{Re}F)^2(\text{Im}F)^2}} \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \frac{1}{2} \sqrt{1 - G^2 - 2\sqrt{(1 + G)^2(\text{Im}F)^2 + (1 - G)^2(\text{Re}F)^2 - 4(\text{Re}F)^2(\text{Im}F)^2}} \right].
\end{aligned} \tag{D27}$$

We calculate  $B_{\text{OT}}$  and  $P_{\text{1bit}}$  for all the examples examined, both for pure and mixed states. For the three-mode pure symmetric coherent states in eq. (11) it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} F &= \langle \alpha, \alpha, \alpha | \alpha, \alpha, -\alpha \rangle = e^{-2|\alpha|^2} \\ G &= \langle \alpha, \alpha, \alpha | \alpha, -\alpha, -\alpha \rangle = e^{-4|\alpha|^2} = F^2. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{D28})$$

If four symmetric states are used for oblivious transfer, and Bob selects which bit he would like obtain, then the success probability is the minimum-error probability for distinguishing between the corresponding pairs of states. The protocol success probability in terms of  $F$  and  $G$  is

$$\begin{aligned} P_{\text{1bit}}^{\text{pure}} &= \frac{1}{2} \left[ 1 + \frac{1}{2} \sqrt{1 - G^2 + 2|(1 - G)F|} + \frac{1}{2} \sqrt{1 - G^2 - 2|(1 - G)F|} \right] \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \left[ 1 + \frac{1}{2} \sqrt{1 - F^4 + 2F(1 - F^2)} + \frac{1}{2} \sqrt{1 - F^4 - 2F(1 - F^2)} \right] \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \left[ 1 + \frac{1}{2} \sqrt{(1 - F)(1 + F)^3} + \frac{1}{2} \sqrt{(1 + F)(1 - F)^3} \right] = \frac{1}{2} \left[ 1 + \sqrt{1 - F^2} \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{D29})$$

Bob's cheating probability is the minimum-error probability for distinguishing between all four states. In terms of  $F$  and  $G$ , the cheating probability is

$$\begin{aligned} B_{\text{OT}}^{\text{pure}} &= \frac{1}{16} \left( \sqrt{1 + G + 2F} + \sqrt{1 + G - 2F} + 2\sqrt{1 - G} \right)^2 \\ &= \frac{1}{16} (2 + 2\sqrt{1 - F^2})^2 = \frac{1}{16} (4P_{\text{1bit}}^{\text{pure}})^2 = (P_{\text{1bit}}^{\text{pure}})^2. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{D30})$$

For the three-mode phase-randomized coherent states, Bob's cheating probability is

$$\begin{aligned} B_{\text{OT}} &= \frac{e^{-3|\alpha|^2}}{16} \sum_{N=0}^{\infty} \frac{(3|\alpha|^2)^N}{N!} \left( 3\sqrt{1 - G_N} + \sqrt{1 + 3G_N} \right)^2 \\ &= \frac{e^{-3|\alpha|^2}}{16} \sum_{N=0}^{\infty} \frac{(3|\alpha|^2)^N}{N!} \left( 10 - 6G_N + 6\sqrt{(1 - G_N)(1 + 3G_N)} \right) \\ &= \frac{4}{16} + \frac{6}{4} \frac{e^{-3|\alpha|^2}}{4} \sum_{N=0}^{\infty} \frac{(3|\alpha|^2)^N}{N!} \left( 1 - G_N + \sqrt{-3G_N^2 + 2G_N + 1} \right) \\ &= \frac{1}{4} + \frac{3}{2} \left( P_{\text{1bit}} - \frac{1}{2} \right) = \frac{3}{2} P_{\text{1bit}} - \frac{1}{2}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{D31})$$

For the four-mode pure symmetric coherent states in section III C, the pairwise overlaps are

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{F} &= \langle \alpha, \alpha, \alpha, -\alpha | \alpha, \alpha, -\alpha, \alpha \rangle = e^{-4|\alpha|^2} \\ \tilde{G} &= \langle \alpha, \alpha, \alpha, -\alpha | \alpha, -\alpha, \alpha, \alpha \rangle = e^{-4|\alpha|^2} = \tilde{F}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{D32})$$

The protocol success probability in terms of  $F$  and  $G$  is then

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{P}_{\text{1bit}}^{\text{pure}} &= \frac{1}{2} \left[ 1 + \frac{1}{2} \sqrt{1 - \tilde{G}^2 + 2(1 - \tilde{G})\tilde{F}} + \frac{1}{2} \sqrt{1 - \tilde{G}^2 - 2(1 - \tilde{G})\tilde{F}} \right] \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \left[ 1 + \frac{1}{2} \sqrt{1 - \tilde{F}^2 + 2\tilde{F}(1 - \tilde{F})} + \frac{1}{2} \sqrt{1 - \tilde{F}^2 - 2\tilde{F}(1 - \tilde{F})} \right] \\ &= \frac{3 - \tilde{F}}{4} + \frac{\sqrt{(1 - \tilde{F})(1 + 3\tilde{F})}}{4}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{D33})$$

The cheating probability for the pure four-mode coherent states is

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{B}_{\text{OT}}^{\text{pure}} &= \frac{1}{16} \left( \sqrt{1 + 3\tilde{F}} + 3\sqrt{1 - \tilde{F}} \right)^2 = \frac{1}{16} \left( 10 - 6\tilde{F} + 6\sqrt{(1 - \tilde{F})(1 + 3\tilde{F})} \right) \\ &= \frac{6}{16} \left( 3 - \tilde{F} + \sqrt{(1 - \tilde{F})(1 + 3\tilde{F})} \right) - \frac{8}{16} = \frac{6}{16} (4\tilde{P}_{\text{1bit}}^{\text{pure}}) - \frac{8}{16} = \frac{3}{2} \tilde{P}_{\text{1bit}}^{\text{pure}} - \frac{1}{2}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{D34})$$

For the four-mode phase-randomized coherent states, because  $\tilde{F}_N = \tilde{G}_N = 0$  for  $N > 0$ , and  $\tilde{F}_0 = \tilde{G}_0 = 1$  for  $N = 0$ , we have  $\tilde{P}_{1\text{bit},N} = 1$  and  $\tilde{P}_{1\text{bit},0} = \frac{1}{2}$ . The protocol success probability is thus

$$\tilde{P}_{1\text{bit}} = \sum_{N=0}^{\infty} p_N \tilde{P}_{1\text{bit},N} = 1 - \frac{e^{-4|\alpha|^2}}{2}. \quad (\text{D35})$$

For the relation between  $\tilde{B}_{\text{OT}}$  and  $\tilde{P}_{1\text{bit}}$ , we have

$$\tilde{B}_{\text{OT}} = 1 - \frac{3e^{-4|\alpha|^2}}{4} = 1 - \frac{3}{2}(1 - \tilde{P}_{1\text{bit}}) = \frac{3}{2}\tilde{P}_{1\text{bit}} - \frac{1}{2}. \quad (\text{D36})$$

We would like to see whether the phase-randomized states perform better or worse than their pure-state counterparts, without phase randomization. For the pure phase-encoded states in section III D, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{F} &= \langle \alpha, \alpha | \alpha, i\alpha \rangle = e^{-|\alpha|^2 + i|\alpha|^2} = e^{-|\alpha|^2} (\cos |\alpha|^2 + i \sin |\alpha|^2) \\ \bar{G} &= \langle \alpha, \alpha | \alpha, -\alpha \rangle = e^{-2|\alpha|^2}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{D37})$$

The protocol success probability in terms of  $\bar{F}$  and  $\bar{G}$  for the pure phase-encoded states is

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{P}_{1\text{bit}}^{\text{pure}} &= \frac{1}{2} \left[ 1 + \frac{1}{2} \sqrt{1 - \bar{G}^2 + 2\sqrt{(1 + \bar{G})^2 (\text{Im}\bar{F})^2 + (1 - \bar{G})^2 (\text{Re}\bar{F})^2 - 4(\text{Re}\bar{F})^2 (\text{Im}\bar{F})^2}} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \frac{1}{2} \sqrt{1 - \bar{G}^2 - 2\sqrt{(1 + \bar{G})^2 (\text{Im}\bar{F})^2 + (1 - \bar{G})^2 (\text{Re}\bar{F})^2 - 4(\text{Re}\bar{F})^2 (\text{Im}\bar{F})^2}} \right] \\ &= \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{4} \sqrt{1 - e^{-4|\alpha|^2} + 2\sqrt{e^{-6|\alpha|^2} + e^{-2|\alpha|^2} - e^{-4|\alpha|^2} (2 \cos 2|\alpha|^2 + \sin^2 2|\alpha|^2)}} \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{4} \sqrt{1 - e^{-4|\alpha|^2} - 2\sqrt{e^{-6|\alpha|^2} + e^{-2|\alpha|^2} - e^{-4|\alpha|^2} (2 \cos 2|\alpha|^2 + \sin^2 2|\alpha|^2)}} \\ &= \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{4} \sqrt{1 - e^{-4|\alpha|^2} + 2e^{-2|\alpha|^2} \sqrt{2 \cosh 2|\alpha|^2 - 2 \cos 2|\alpha|^2 - \sin^2 2|\alpha|^2}} \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{4} \sqrt{1 - e^{-4|\alpha|^2} - 2e^{-2|\alpha|^2} \sqrt{2 \cosh 2|\alpha|^2 - 2 \cos 2|\alpha|^2 - \sin^2 2|\alpha|^2}} \\ &= \frac{1}{2} + \frac{e^{-|\alpha|^2}}{2\sqrt{2}} \sqrt{\sinh 2|\alpha|^2 + \sqrt{2 \cosh 2|\alpha|^2 - 2 \cos 2|\alpha|^2 - \sin^2 2|\alpha|^2}} \\ &\quad + \frac{e^{-|\alpha|^2}}{2\sqrt{2}} \sqrt{\sinh 2|\alpha|^2 - \sqrt{2 \cosh 2|\alpha|^2 - 2 \cos 2|\alpha|^2 - \sin^2 2|\alpha|^2}} \\ &= \frac{1}{2} + \frac{e^{-|\alpha|^2}}{2} \sqrt{\sinh 2|\alpha|^2 + \sqrt{\sinh^2 2|\alpha|^2 - 2 \cosh 2|\alpha|^2 + 2 \cos 2|\alpha|^2 + \sin^2 2|\alpha|^2}}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{D38})$$

The cheating probability for the pure phase-encoded states in terms of  $\bar{F}$  and  $\bar{G}$  is

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{B}_{\text{OT}}^{\text{pure}} &= \frac{1}{16} (\sqrt{\lambda_1} + \sqrt{\lambda_2} + \sqrt{\lambda_3} + \sqrt{\lambda_4})^2 \\ &= \frac{1}{16} \left( \sqrt{1 + \bar{G} + 2\text{Re}\bar{F}} + \sqrt{1 + \bar{G} - 2\text{Re}\bar{F}} + \sqrt{1 - \bar{G} + 2\text{Im}\bar{F}} + \sqrt{1 - \bar{G} - 2\text{Im}\bar{F}} \right)^2 \\ &= \frac{1}{8} \left( \sqrt{1 + \bar{G} + \sqrt{(1 + \bar{G})^2 - 4(\text{Re}\bar{F})^2}} + \sqrt{1 - \bar{G} + \sqrt{(1 - \bar{G})^2 - 4(\text{Im}\bar{F})^2}} \right)^2 \\ &= \frac{1}{8} \left( \sqrt{1 + e^{-2|\alpha|^2} + \sqrt{(1 + e^{-2|\alpha|^2})^2 - 4e^{-2|\alpha|^2} \cos^2 |\alpha|^2}} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \sqrt{1 - e^{-2|\alpha|^2} + \sqrt{(1 - e^{-2|\alpha|^2})^2 - 4e^{-2|\alpha|^2} \sin^2 |\alpha|^2}} \right)^2 \\ &= \frac{e^{-|\alpha|^2}}{4} \left( \sqrt{\cosh |\alpha|^2 + \sqrt{\cosh^2 |\alpha|^2 - \cos^2 |\alpha|^2}} + \sqrt{\sinh |\alpha|^2 + \sqrt{\sinh^2 |\alpha|^2 - \sin^2 |\alpha|^2}} \right)^2. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{D39})$$

The Gram matrix for the states  $|\bar{\psi}_{bc,N}\rangle$  in eq. (39) for  $N > 0$  is

$$\bar{G}_N = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & \left(\frac{1+i}{2}\right)^N & 0 & \left(\frac{1-i}{2}\right)^N \\ \left(\frac{1-i}{2}\right)^N & 1 & \left(\frac{1+i}{2}\right)^N & 0 \\ 0 & \left(\frac{1-i}{2}\right)^N & 1 & \left(\frac{1+i}{2}\right)^N \\ \left(\frac{1+i}{2}\right)^N & 0 & \left(\frac{1-i}{2}\right)^N & 1 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (\text{D40})$$

For  $N = 0$ , the four states  $|\bar{\psi}_{bc,0}\rangle$  are all equal to the vacuum state, and therefore indistinguishable. Hence, for the phase-randomized phase-encoded states, because  $\bar{G}_N = 0$  and  $\bar{F}_N = \left(\frac{1+i}{2}\right)^N$  for  $N > 0$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{P}_{1\text{bit},N} &= \frac{1}{2} \left[ 1 + \frac{1}{2} \sqrt{1 - \bar{G}_N^2 + 2\sqrt{(1 + \bar{G}_N)^2 (\text{Im}\bar{F}_N)^2 + (1 - \bar{G}_N)^2 (\text{Re}\bar{F}_N)^2 - 4(\text{Re}\bar{F}_N)^2 (\text{Im}\bar{F}_N)^2}} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \frac{1}{2} \sqrt{1 - \bar{G}_N^2 - 2\sqrt{(1 + \bar{G}_N)^2 (\text{Im}\bar{F}_N)^2 + (1 - \bar{G}_N)^2 (\text{Re}\bar{F}_N)^2 - 4(\text{Re}\bar{F}_N)^2 (\text{Im}\bar{F}_N)^2}} \right] \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \left[ 1 + \frac{1}{2} \sqrt{1 + 2\sqrt{(\text{Im}\bar{F}_N)^2 + (\text{Re}\bar{F}_N)^2 - 4(\text{Re}\bar{F}_N)^2 (\text{Im}\bar{F}_N)^2}} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \frac{1}{2} \sqrt{1 - 2\sqrt{(\text{Im}\bar{F}_N)^2 + (\text{Re}\bar{F}_N)^2 - 4(\text{Re}\bar{F}_N)^2 (\text{Im}\bar{F}_N)^2}} \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{D41})$$

We convert  $\bar{F}_N$  from rectangular to polar form,

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{F}_N &= \left(\frac{1+i}{2}\right)^N = \left(\frac{\sqrt{2}e^{i\pi/4}}{2}\right)^N = 2^{-N/2} e^{iN\pi/4} = 2^{-N/2} [\cos(N\pi/4) + i \sin(N\pi/4)] \\ \bar{F}_N^* &= \left(\frac{1-i}{2}\right)^N = \left(\frac{\sqrt{2}e^{-i\pi/4}}{2}\right)^N = 2^{-N/2} e^{-iN\pi/4} = 2^{-N/2} [\cos(N\pi/4) - i \sin(N\pi/4)]. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{D42})$$

We find that

$$\begin{aligned} (\text{Re}\bar{F}_N)^2 + (\text{Im}\bar{F}_N)^2 &= 2^{-N} \cos^2(N\pi/4) + 2^{-N} \sin^2(N\pi/4) = 2^{-N} \\ 4(\text{Re}\bar{F}_N)^2 (\text{Im}\bar{F}_N)^2 &= 4^{-N} 4 \cos^2(N\pi/4) \sin^2(N\pi/4) = 4^{-N} \sin^2(N\pi/2). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{D43})$$

For  $N = 0$  we have  $\bar{F}_0 = \bar{G}_0 = 1$  and  $\bar{P}_{1\text{bit},0} = \frac{1}{2}$ , so the total protocol success probability becomes

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{P}_{1\text{bit}} &= \sum_{N=0}^{\infty} \bar{p}_N \bar{P}_{1\text{bit},N} = \bar{p}_0 \bar{P}_{1\text{bit},0} + \sum_{N=1}^{\infty} \bar{p}_N \bar{P}_{1\text{bit},N} = \frac{e^{-2|\alpha|^2}}{2} + \frac{e^{-2|\alpha|^2}}{2} \sum_{N=1}^{\infty} \frac{(2|\alpha|^2)^N}{N!} \\ &\quad + \frac{e^{-2|\alpha|^2}}{4} \sum_{N=1}^{\infty} \frac{(2|\alpha|^2)^N}{N!} \left( \sqrt{1 + 2\sqrt{2^{-N} - 4^{-N} \sin^2(N\pi/2)}} + \sqrt{1 - 2\sqrt{2^{-N} - 4^{-N} \sin^2(N\pi/2)}} \right) \\ &= \frac{1}{2} + \frac{e^{-2|\alpha|^2}}{4} \sum_{N=1}^{\infty} \frac{(2|\alpha|^2)^N}{N!} \left( \sqrt{1 + 2\sqrt{2^{-N} - 4^{-N} \sin^2(N\pi/2)}} + \sqrt{1 - 2\sqrt{2^{-N} - 4^{-N} \sin^2(N\pi/2)}} \right). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{D44})$$

To obtain a simpler form for the protocol success probability, we note that

$$(\sqrt{A+B} + \sqrt{A-B})^2 = 2A + 2\sqrt{A^2 - B^2} \Rightarrow \sqrt{A+B} + \sqrt{A-B} = \pm \sqrt{2(A + \sqrt{A^2 - B^2})} \quad (\text{D45})$$

where we accept the positive solution. For  $A = 1$  and  $B = 2\sqrt{2^{-N} - 4^{-N} \sin^2(N\pi/2)}$ ,

$$A^2 - B^2 = 1 - 4(2^{-N} - 4^{-N} \sin^2(N\pi/2)), \quad (\text{D46})$$

so the protocol success probability is

$$\bar{P}_{\text{1bit}} = \frac{1}{2} + \frac{e^{-2|\alpha|^2}}{2\sqrt{2}} \sum_{N=1}^{\infty} \frac{(2|\alpha|^2)^N}{N!} \sqrt{1 + \sqrt{4^{-N+1} \sin^2(N\pi/2) - 2^{-N+2} + 1}}. \quad (\text{D47})$$

For the respective cheating probability when we run the protocol with the phase-randomized phase-encoded states, the eigenvalues of the Gram matrix in eq. (D40) are  $\bar{\lambda}_{0,2}^{(N)} = 1 \pm \left[ \left( \frac{1+i}{2} \right)^N + \left( \frac{1-i}{2} \right)^N \right]$  and  $\bar{\lambda}_{1,3}^{(N)} = 1 \pm i \left[ \left( \frac{1+i}{2} \right)^N - \left( \frac{1-i}{2} \right)^N \right]$  for  $N > 0$  and  $\bar{\lambda}_0^{(0)} = 4$ ,  $\bar{\lambda}_{1,2,3}^{(0)} = 0$  for  $N = 0$ . The optimal cheating probability when using these states is

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{B}_{\text{OT}} &= e^{-2|\alpha|^2} \sum_{N=0}^{\infty} \frac{|\alpha|^{2N} \bar{M}_N}{16} \left( \sqrt{\bar{\lambda}_0^{(N)}} + \sqrt{\bar{\lambda}_1^{(N)}} + \sqrt{\bar{\lambda}_2^{(N)}} + \sqrt{\bar{\lambda}_3^{(N)}} \right)^2 \\ &= \frac{e^{-2|\alpha|^2}}{4} + \frac{e^{-2|\alpha|^2}}{16} \sum_{N=1}^{\infty} \frac{(2|\alpha|^2)^N}{N!} \left( \sqrt{\bar{\lambda}_0^{(N)}} + \sqrt{\bar{\lambda}_1^{(N)}} + \sqrt{\bar{\lambda}_2^{(N)}} + \sqrt{\bar{\lambda}_3^{(N)}} \right)^2. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{D48})$$

The eigenvalues of the Gram matrix for  $N > 0$  become

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{\lambda}_{0,2}^{(N)} &= 1 \pm (\bar{F}_N + \bar{F}_N^*) = 1 \pm 2^{-N/2+1} \cos(N\pi/4) \\ \bar{\lambda}_{1,3}^{(N)} &= 1 \pm i(\bar{F}_N - \bar{F}_N^*) = 1 \mp 2^{-N/2+1} \sin(N\pi/4), \end{aligned} \quad (\text{D49})$$

so the cheating probability can also be written as

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{B}_{\text{OT}} &= \frac{e^{-2|\alpha|^2}}{4} + \frac{e^{-2|\alpha|^2}}{16} \sum_{N=1}^{\infty} \frac{(2|\alpha|^2)^N}{N!} \left( \sqrt{1 + 2^{-N/2+1} \cos(N\pi/4)} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \sqrt{1 - 2^{-N/2+1} \cos(N\pi/4)} + \sqrt{1 + 2^{-N/2+1} \sin(N\pi/4)} + \sqrt{1 - 2^{-N/2+1} \sin(N\pi/4)} \right)^2. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{D50})$$

To simplify this, we note that

$$\begin{aligned} \sqrt{1 + 2^{-N/2+1} \cos(N\pi/4)} + \sqrt{1 - 2^{-N/2+1} \cos(N\pi/4)} &= \sqrt{2 \left( 1 + \sqrt{1 - 2^{-N+2} \cos^2(N\pi/4)} \right)} \\ \sqrt{1 + 2^{-N/2+1} \sin(N\pi/4)} + \sqrt{1 - 2^{-N/2+1} \sin(N\pi/4)} &= \sqrt{2 \left( 1 + \sqrt{1 - 2^{-N+2} \sin^2(N\pi/4)} \right)}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{D51})$$

So if we call  $\mathcal{S}_N$  the quantity in the parenthesis inside the sum, we obtain

$$\mathcal{S}_N^2 = 2 \left( \sqrt{1 + \sqrt{1 - 2^{-N+2} \cos^2(N\pi/4)}} + \sqrt{1 + \sqrt{1 - 2^{-N+2} \sin^2(N\pi/4)}} \right)^2. \quad (\text{D52})$$

Therefore

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{B}_{\text{OT}} &= \frac{e^{-2|\alpha|^2}}{4} + \frac{e^{-2|\alpha|^2}}{8} \sum_{N=1}^{\infty} \frac{(2|\alpha|^2)^N}{N!} \left[ \sqrt{1 + \sqrt{1 - 2^{-N+2} \cos^2(N\pi/4)}} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \sqrt{1 + \sqrt{1 - 2^{-N+2} \sin^2(N\pi/4)}} \right]^2. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{D53})$$

The cheating probabilities for the corresponding pure and mixed sets of states are plotted in figs. 2, 4 and 5 in the main paper. It is evident that mixing lowers the cheating probability for each value of  $|\alpha|$ . It is apparent from the plots that mixing alters the  $|\alpha|$ -dependence, resulting in a smoother shape.