

Generalized Rényi entropy accumulation theorem and generalized quantum probability estimation

Amir Arqand¹, Thomas A. Hahn², and Ernest Y.-Z. Tan¹

¹*Institute for Quantum Computing and Department of Physics and Astronomy, University of Waterloo, Waterloo, Ontario N2L 3G1, Canada.*

²*The Center for Quantum Science and Technology, Department of Complex Systems, Weizmann Institute of Science, Rehovot, Israel*

Abstract

The entropy accumulation theorem, and its subsequent generalized version, is a powerful tool in the security analysis of many device-dependent and device-independent cryptography protocols. However, it has the drawback that the finite-size bounds it yields are not necessarily optimal, and furthermore it relies on the construction of an affine min-tradeoff function, which can often be challenging to construct optimally in practice. In this work, we address both of these challenges simultaneously by deriving a new entropy accumulation bound. Our bound yields significantly better finite-size performance, and can be computed as an intuitively interpretable convex optimization, without any specification of affine min-tradeoff functions. Furthermore, it can be applied directly at the level of Rényi entropies if desired, yielding fully-Rényi security proofs. Our proof techniques are based on elaborating on a connection between entropy accumulation and the frameworks of quantum probability estimation or f -weighted Rényi entropies, and in the process we obtain some new results with respect to those frameworks as well.

1 Introduction

Many protocols in quantum cryptography consist of performing n rounds of some operations in order to generate a long string of raw data, which is then processed into the final secret key produced by the protocol. In security proofs of such protocols, it is often extremely useful to relate some operational “one-shot” quantity of the raw data string, such as smooth min-entropy, to simpler quantities that can be computed by just analyzing single rounds of the protocol. A powerful tool developed for this purpose is the **entropy accumulation theorem** (EAT) [DFR20, DF19], which gives a relation that can be informally described as follows. Suppose the state ρ in the protocol can be produced by n channels acting “sequentially” in some sense, and denote the resulting “secret” raw data as S_1^n and some final side-information register as E_n . Then letting Ω denote the event that the protocol accepts (based on some “test data” computed over the n rounds), the EAT states that as long as ρ satisfies some Markov conditions, its smooth min-entropy conditioned on Ω satisfies a bound with the following form:

$$\text{(informal summary)} \quad H_{\min}^{\varepsilon}(S_1^n | E_n)_{\rho|\Omega} \geq nh_{vN} - O(\sqrt{n}), \quad (1)$$

where loosely speaking, h_{vN} is a value slightly smaller than the minimum von Neumann entropy over all single-round states that are “compatible with” the accept condition. This suffices to yield

a security proof, since the $O(\sqrt{n})$ “finite-size correction” becomes negligible in comparison to the leading-order nh_{vN} term at large n , so $(1/n)H_{\min}^\varepsilon(S_1^n|E_n)_{\rho|\Omega}$ converges asymptotically to h_{vN} . Subsequently, a **generalized entropy accumulation theorem** (GEAT) was developed [MFS+22a, MFS+22b], which relaxed the Markov conditions to a less restrictive no-signalling condition, allowing a broader range of applications.

However, the existing EAT and GEAT results have some limitations. In particular, computing explicit values in their bounds requires specifying a technical object known as an affine **min-tradeoff function**, which affects both the h_{vN} term and the finite-size correction. The task of choosing and computing an affine min-tradeoff function that yields “good” finite-size bounds can be a very involved procedure in practice, as noted in e.g. [GLH+22]. Furthermore, there is the question of how tight the finite-size correction terms are, since they are currently outperformed by approaches such as entropic uncertainty relations (EURs) for smooth entropies [TL17].

In this work, we address both of these challenges simultaneously. In particular, we present a bound that has no dependence on min-tradeoff functions at all, hence completely removing the issue of optimizing the choice of this function. Furthermore, the resulting finite-size bounds we obtain appear to be extremely tight. Our approach for achieving this is to first prove a bound somewhat similar to the above; specifically, a bound with the form

$$\text{(informal summary)} \quad H_\alpha^\uparrow(S_1^n|E_n)_{\rho|\Omega} \geq nh_{\hat{\alpha}} - \frac{\alpha}{\alpha-1} \log \frac{1}{\Pr[\Omega]}, \quad (2)$$

where H_α^\uparrow is a (sandwiched) Rényi entropy with $\alpha > 1$, and $h_{\hat{\alpha}}$ is a Rényi version of h_{vN} , i.e. loosely speaking, a value somewhat smaller than the minimum Rényi entropy over all single-round states that are “compatible with” the accept condition.¹ (We also show that any “reasonable” protocol yields a strictly positive $h_{\hat{\alpha}}$ value for classical S_1^n , as one would expect.) Importantly, $h_{\hat{\alpha}}$ can be computed as a convex optimization that does not involve any specification of an affine min-tradeoff function, removing the issue of choosing such a function. Our approach is based on techniques developed in [GLH+22], but we find that by working directly with Rényi entropies, we obtain simpler final results.

This bound on the overall Rényi entropy has the appealing property of being a simple linear expression with only an $O(1)$ finite-size correction instead of $O(\sqrt{n})$.² This is similar to bounds that were derived in [PM13, JMS20, Vid17, JK21, JK22] for min-entropy (the $\alpha \rightarrow \infty$ limit of H_α^\uparrow) or collision entropy, but our result holds for *any* $\alpha > 1$ (under the original EAT conditions; for the GEAT conditions it is restricted to $\alpha \in (1, 2]$, though this still suffices for most applications).³ In particular, similar to a recent work [HB24] (and a more elaborate earlier work [ZFK20]), this achieves the goal put forward in [Dup21] of finding a “fully Rényi” approach for security proofs of many protocols, by combining our bound with the Rényi privacy amplification theorem in that work.

¹While intermediate steps in the entropy accumulation proofs of [DFR20, DF19, MFS+22a] do involve bounds of a roughly similar form, the critical difference is that in those bounds, the value on the right-hand-side is a minimization over *all* possible single-round states, which results in trivial bounds if directly applied in a protocol.

²In fact the $\frac{\alpha}{\alpha-1} \log \frac{1}{\Pr[\Omega]}$ term does not affect the final keyrates in sufficiently “simple” protocols, as discussed in [Dup21, KAG+24]; however, other $O(1)$ corrections arise when considering e.g. privacy amplification theorems.

³A caveat here is that if the security proof uses a constant Rényi parameter independent of n , then the $h_{\hat{\alpha}}$ term in our result is also independent of n — this means that even at large n , it does not converge to exactly the minimum Rényi entropy over single-round states “compatible with” the accept condition. This likely reflects the general principle that Rényi entropies have “worse” chain rules as compared to von Neumann entropy. However, for the purposes of security proofs we can overcome this issue in various ways by tuning the Rényi parameters as a function of n ; we discuss this further in Sec. 7.3.

In contexts where one cannot easily tackle Rényi entropies, our result can also be easily converted to a bound of the form (1), except that there is still no involvement of min-tradeoff functions. While we emphasize that this introduces some suboptimality compared to using the bound (2) in a “fully Rényi” approach, we find that the resulting bounds still appear to be significantly tighter in practice compared to previous entropy accumulation results — in fact, we still often obtain results roughly competitive with the smooth-entropy EUR approach in [TL17].

While the entropy accumulation model is suitable for analyzing device-independent (DI) protocols and device-dependent entanglement-based (EB) protocols, it currently has limitations in device-dependent prepare-and-measure (PM) protocols, where one either has to introduce “virtual tomography” rounds [BGW+23] or impose a “single-signal interaction” condition [MR23]. Recently, in [HB24] a framework of *f*-weighted Rényi entropies was introduced, which achieves the critical goal of overcoming this issue while simultaneously providing much tighter finite-size bounds. They also show that *f*-weighted Rényi entropies yield a very natural proof framework for protocols producing variable-length keys. Our results are closely connected to theirs, and we obtain very similar bounds, though since we mostly work in the EAT or GEAT models, our results are more suitable for DI or EB protocols than PM protocols.

Still, we contribute to slightly extending the [HB24] results for PM protocols by providing some simplifications to their bounds for protocols producing fixed-length keys; in particular, we derive bounds of the form (1)–(2) under the model they consider as well. Our techniques also provide an alternative approach for choosing **tradeoff functions** in their framework (the methods developed in [ZFK20] might also be relevant here), which we elaborate on in Sec. 6.2. We thank the authors of that work for early presentations and discussions of their results to allow these comparisons. An important consequence of this analysis, however, is that PM protocol keyrates computed with previous versions of the GEAT were in fact already valid *without* requiring the “single-signal interaction” condition on Eve; we discuss this in Remark 8.

Readers interested in applying our above results to protocols that produce fixed-length keys may skip directly to Sec. 5.1, which is mostly self-contained apart from referencing background definitions in Sec. 3. In particular, we highlight the following key results, which should suffice to analyze the vast majority of fixed-length protocols:

- For DI protocols, the “fully Rényi” bound (2) we claimed above is presented in Sec. 5.1 Theorem 2, with simpler versions in Lemmas 10–11. In that section we also give intuitive qualitative explanations of those bounds.
- For device-dependent protocols, refer instead to Theorem 3 (which is an extension of the core result of [HB24]) for a simpler and more applicable variant, though the qualitative discussions in Sec. 5.1 should still be helpful for understanding that bound.
- For explicit bounds of the form (1), relating smooth min-entropy to von Neumann entropy, refer to the bounds (93) and (95) for the DI case, and (146) for the device-dependent case.

Under the GEAT or EAT model, we can also accommodate a form of “time-varying” behaviour in fixed-length protocols (similar to [ZFK20]), though this is more elaborate; refer to Corollary 1 and the discussion below it. Also, as noted above, [HB24] introduced a powerful proof technique for protocols that produce variable-length keys; we found that some steps in our analysis are sufficiently similar to theirs that we could extract analogous results, under the GEAT or EAT model rather than their model. However, this involves more elaborate concepts that we explain in Theorem 1 and Sec. 4.3.

More fundamentally, the proof techniques we used in this work expand on a connection between entropy accumulation and the concept of **quantum probability estimation** developed in [ZFK20], based on **quantum estimation factors** (QEFs). The latter was generally found to yield better finite-size keyrates than the EAT in contexts such as DI randomness expansion (DIRE), though it has not yet been explicitly applied to DIQKD. We highlight that [ZFK20] did describe some connections between the EAT and their approach, including a conversion from min-tradeoff functions in the EAT to QEFs in their framework; however, the bounds that resulted from the latter conversion were quite suboptimal, due to a sequence of conversions between von Neumann entropy and Rényi entropy. Our work shows that these conversions can be avoided by modifying some steps in the entropy accumulation proofs; in particular, under the Markov conditions of the original EAT, we can *exactly* reproduce the bounds that were obtained in the QEF framework. However, since we work in the general framework of entropy accumulation, this allowed us to obtain similar bounds under the conditions of the GEAT as well, which are less restrictive. In this sense, our results serve to slightly generalize the QEF framework as well.

This paper is structured as follows. In Sec. 2–3, we lay out various preliminary notations and concepts. In Sec. 4, we introduce the concept of a “quantum estimation score-system” (QES) inspired by QEFs and f -weighted Rényi entropies, and present our analogue of the QEF bounds under the conditions of the GEAT. In Sec. 5, we further simplify these results for applications in fixed-length protocols, including the detailed versions of the bounds (1)–(2) sketched above. We also discuss many points relevant for practical applications. In Sec. 6 we give slightly better bounds under the original EAT Markov conditions or the [HB24] model, where the latter also has the advantage of being more suited for analyzing device-dependent PM protocols. In Sec. 7 we analyze the tightness of our bounds, including keyrate computations for some example protocols. Finally, in Sec. 8 we discuss prospects for future work.

2 Preliminaries

We list some basic notation in Table 1. Apart from the notation in that table, we will also need to use some other concepts, which we shall define below, and briefly elaborate on in some cases. In this work, we will assume that all systems are finite-dimensional, but we will not impose any bounds on the system dimensions unless otherwise specified. All entropies are defined in base 2. For a channel \mathcal{E} from register Q to register Q' , we will often write the abbreviated notation

$$\mathcal{E} : Q \rightarrow Q', \tag{3}$$

rather than writing out the formal statement of it being a CPTP linear map $\mathcal{E} : \text{End}(\mathcal{H}_Q) \rightarrow \text{End}(\mathcal{H}_{Q'})$ (where $\text{End}(\mathcal{H}_Q)$ is the set of linear operators on the Hilbert space \mathcal{H}_Q). Also, throughout this work we will often leave tensor products with identity channels implicit; e.g. given a channel $\mathcal{M} : Q \rightarrow Q'$, we often use the compact notation

$$\mathcal{M}[\rho_{QR}] := (\mathcal{M} \otimes \text{id}_R)[\rho_{QR}]. \tag{4}$$

Definition 1. (Frequency distributions) For a string $z_1^n \in \mathcal{Z}^n$ on some alphabet \mathcal{Z} , $\text{freq}_{z_1^n}$ denotes the following probability distribution on \mathcal{Z} :

$$\text{freq}_{z_1^n}(z) := \frac{\text{number of occurrences of } z \text{ in } z_1^n}{n}. \tag{5}$$

Table 1: List of notation

<i>Symbol</i>	<i>Definition</i>
\log	Base-2 logarithm
H	Base-2 von Neumann entropy
h_{bin}	Binary entropy function; $h_{\text{bin}}(x) := -x \log x - (1-x) \log(1-x)$
$\mathbb{R} \cup \{-\infty, +\infty\}$	Extended real line
$\lfloor \cdot \rfloor$ (resp. $\lceil \cdot \rceil$)	Floor (resp. ceiling) function
$\ \cdot\ _p$	Schatten p -norm
$ \cdot $	Absolute value of operator; $ M := \sqrt{M^\dagger M}$
$A \perp B$	A and B are orthogonal; $AB = BA = 0$
$X \geq Y$ (resp. $X > Y$)	$X - Y$ is positive semidefinite (resp. positive definite)
$\text{Pos}(A)$	Set of positive semi-definite operators on register A
$\text{S}_=(A)$ (resp. $\text{S}_\leq(A)$)	Set of normalized (resp. subnormalized) states on register A
\mathbb{U}_A	Maximally mixed state on register A
A_j^k	Registers $A_j \dots A_k$

Definition 2. A state $\rho \in \text{S}_\leq(CQ)$ is said to be **classical on C** (with respect to a specified basis on C) if it is in the form

$$\rho_{CQ} = \sum_c \lambda_c |c\rangle\langle c| \otimes \sigma_c, \quad (6)$$

for some normalized states $\sigma_c \in \text{S}_=(Q)$ and weights $\lambda_c \geq 0$, with $|c\rangle$ being the specified basis states on C . In most circumstances, we will not explicitly specify this “classical basis” of C , leaving it to be implicitly defined by context. It may be convenient to absorb the weights λ_c into the states σ_c , writing them as subnormalized states $\omega_c = \lambda_c \sigma_c \in \text{S}_\leq(Q)$ instead.

Definition 3. (Conditioning on classical events) For a state $\rho \in \text{S}_\leq(CQ)$ classical on C , written in the form $\rho_{CQ} = \sum_c |c\rangle\langle c| \otimes \omega_c$ for some $\omega_c \in \text{S}_\leq(Q)$, and an event Ω defined on the register C , we will define a corresponding **partial state** and **conditional state** as, respectively,

$$\rho_{\wedge\Omega} := \sum_{c \in \Omega} |c\rangle\langle c| \otimes \omega_c, \quad \rho_{|\Omega} := \frac{\text{Tr}[\rho]}{\text{Tr}[\rho_{\wedge\Omega}]} \rho_{\wedge\Omega} = \frac{\sum_c \text{Tr}[\omega_c]}{\sum_{c \in \Omega} \text{Tr}[\omega_c]} \rho_{\wedge\Omega}. \quad (7)$$

The process of taking partial states is commutative and “associative”, in the sense that for any events Ω, Ω' we have $(\rho_{\wedge\Omega})_{\wedge\Omega'} = (\rho_{\wedge\Omega'})_{\wedge\Omega} = \rho_{\wedge(\Omega \wedge \Omega')}$; hence for brevity we will denote all of these expressions as

$$\rho_{\wedge\Omega \wedge \Omega'} := (\rho_{\wedge\Omega})_{\wedge\Omega'} = (\rho_{\wedge\Omega'})_{\wedge\Omega} = \rho_{\wedge(\Omega \wedge \Omega')}. \quad (8)$$

On the other hand, some disambiguating parentheses are needed when combined with taking conditional states (due to the normalization factors).

In light of the preceding two definitions, for a normalized state $\rho \in \mathcal{S}_=(CQ)$ that is classical on C , it is reasonable to write it in the form

$$\rho_{CQ} = \sum_c \rho(c) |c\rangle\langle c| \otimes \rho_{Q|c}, \quad (9)$$

where $\rho(c)$ denotes the probability of $C = c$ according to ρ , and $\rho_{Q|c}$ can indeed be interpreted as the conditional state on Q corresponding to $C = c$, i.e. $\rho_{Q|c} = \text{Tr}_C[\rho_{|\Omega}]$ where Ω is the event $C = c$. We may sometimes denote the distribution on C induced by ρ as the tuple

$$\rho_C := (\rho(1), \rho(2), \dots). \quad (10)$$

Definition 4. (Measure-and-prepare or read-and-prepare channels) A (projective) **measure-and-prepare channel** is a channel $\mathcal{E} : Q \rightarrow QQ'$ of the form

$$\mathcal{E}[\rho_Q] = \sum_j (P_j \rho_Q P_j) \otimes \sigma_{Q'|j}, \quad (11)$$

for some projective measurement $\{P_j\}$ on Q and some normalized states $\sigma_{Q'|j}$. If Q is classical and the measurement is a projective measurement in its classical basis, we shall refer to it as a **read-and-prepare channel**. Note that a read-and-prepare channel always simply extends the state “without disturbing it”, i.e. tracing out Q' results in the original state again.

The following definitions of Rényi divergences and entropies are reproduced from [Tom16], and coincide with those in [DFR20, DF19, MFS+22b] for normalized states.

Definition 5. (Rényi divergence) For any $\rho, \sigma \in \text{Pos}(A)$ with $\text{Tr}[\rho] \neq 0$, and $\alpha \in (0, 1) \cup (1, \infty)$, the (sandwiched) Rényi divergence between ρ, σ is defined as:

$$D_\alpha(\rho \parallel \sigma) = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{\alpha-1} \log \frac{\text{Tr}\left[\left(\sigma^{\frac{1-\alpha}{2\alpha}} \rho \sigma^{\frac{1-\alpha}{2\alpha}}\right)^\alpha\right]}{\text{Tr}[\rho]^\alpha} & (\alpha < 1 \wedge \rho \not\subseteq \sigma) \vee (\text{supp}(\rho) \subseteq \text{supp}(\sigma)) \\ +\infty & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \quad (12)$$

where for $\alpha > 1$ the $\sigma^{\frac{1-\alpha}{2\alpha}}$ terms are defined via the Moore-Penrose pseudoinverse if σ is not full-support [Tom16]. The above definition is extended to $\alpha \in \{0, 1, \infty\}$ by taking the respective limits. For the $\alpha = 1$ case, it reduces to the Umegaki divergence:

$$D(\rho \parallel \sigma) = \begin{cases} \frac{\text{Tr}[\rho \log \rho - \rho \log \sigma]}{\text{Tr}[\rho]} & \text{supp}(\rho) \subseteq \text{supp}(\sigma) \\ +\infty & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (13)$$

For any two classical probability distributions \mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q} on a common alphabet, we also define the Rényi divergence $D_\alpha(\mathbf{p} \parallel \mathbf{q})$ analogously, e.g. by viewing the distributions as diagonal density matrices in the above formulas; in the $\alpha = 1$ case this gives the Kullback–Leibler (KL) divergence.

Definition 6. (Rényi entropies) For any bipartite state $\rho \in \mathcal{S}_=(AB)$, and $\alpha \in [0, \infty]$, we define the following two (sandwiched) Rényi conditional entropies:

$$\begin{aligned} H_\alpha(A|B)_\rho &= -D_\alpha(\rho_{AB} \parallel \mathbb{I}_A \otimes \rho_B) \\ H_\alpha^\uparrow(A|B)_\rho &= \sup_{\sigma_B \in \mathcal{S}_=(B)} -D_\alpha(\rho_{AB} \parallel \mathbb{I}_A \otimes \sigma_B). \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

For $\alpha = 1$, both the above values coincide and are equal to the von Neumann entropy.

While we will not explicitly use the following definitions of min- and max-entropies (for subnormalized states) anywhere in our proofs, we state them here to ensure consistency with previous work such as [DFR20].

Definition 7. For $\rho \in \mathcal{S}_{\leq}(AB)$, the **min- and max-entropies of A conditioned on B** are

$$H_{\min}(A|B)_{\rho} := -\log \min_{\substack{\sigma \in \mathcal{S}_{\leq}(B) \text{ s.t.} \\ \ker(\rho_B) \subseteq \ker(\sigma_B)}} \left\| \rho_{AB}^{\frac{1}{2}} (\mathbb{I}_A \otimes \sigma_B)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \right\|_{\infty}^2, \quad (15)$$

$$H_{\max}(A|B)_{\rho} := \log \max_{\sigma \in \mathcal{S}_{\leq}(B)} \left\| \rho_{AB}^{\frac{1}{2}} (\mathbb{I}_A \otimes \sigma_B)^{\frac{1}{2}} \right\|_1^2, \quad (16)$$

where in the first equation the $(\mathbb{I}_A \otimes \sigma_B)^{-\frac{1}{2}}$ term should be understood in terms of the Moore-Penrose generalized inverse. In both equations, the optimum is indeed attained (see e.g. Sec. 6.1.2 and Sec. 6.1.3 of [Tom16]), and it can be attained by a normalized state, so $\mathcal{S}_{\leq}(B)$ can be replaced by $\mathcal{S}_{=}(B)$ without loss of generality. When $\text{Tr}[\rho] = 1$, these definitions coincide with the Rényi entropies H_{∞}^{\uparrow} and $H_{1/2}^{\uparrow}$ defined above.

Additionally, for $\varepsilon \in [0, \sqrt{\text{Tr}[\rho_{AB}]})$, the **ε -smoothed min- and max-entropies of A conditioned on B** are

$$H_{\min}^{\varepsilon}(A|B)_{\rho} := \max_{\substack{\tilde{\rho} \in \mathcal{S}_{\leq}(AB) \text{ s.t.} \\ P(\tilde{\rho}, \rho) \leq \varepsilon}} H_{\min}(A|B)_{\tilde{\rho}}, \quad H_{\max}^{\varepsilon}(A|B)_{\rho} := \min_{\substack{\tilde{\rho} \in \mathcal{S}_{\leq}(AB) \text{ s.t.} \\ P(\tilde{\rho}, \rho) \leq \varepsilon}} H_{\max}(A|B)_{\tilde{\rho}}, \quad (17)$$

where P denotes purified distance as defined in [Tom16].

We now also list some useful properties we will use throughout our work.

Fact 1. (Data-processing [FL13]; see also [MLDS+13, Bei13, MO14, Tom16]) For any $\alpha \in [1/2, \infty]$, any $\rho, \sigma \in \text{Pos}(Q)$ with $\text{Tr}[\rho] \neq 0$, and any channel $\mathcal{E} : Q \rightarrow Q'$, we have:

$$D_{\alpha}(\rho \|\sigma) \geq D_{\alpha}(\mathcal{E}[\rho] \|\mathcal{E}[\sigma]), \quad (18)$$

and thus also for any $\rho \in \mathcal{S}_{=}(Q''Q)$,

$$H_{\alpha}(Q''|Q)_{\rho} \leq H_{\alpha}(Q''|Q)_{\mathcal{E}[\rho]}, \quad (19)$$

$$H_{\alpha}^{\uparrow}(Q''|Q)_{\rho} \leq H_{\alpha}^{\uparrow}(Q''|Q)_{\mathcal{E}[\rho]}. \quad (20)$$

If \mathcal{E} is an isometry, all the above bounds hold with equality.

Fact 2. (Conditioning on classical registers; see Eq. (5.32) and Proposition 5.1 in [Tom16]) Let $\rho, \sigma \in \mathcal{S}_{=}(CQ)$ be states classical on C . Then

$$D_{\alpha}(\rho \|\sigma) = \frac{1}{\alpha - 1} \log \left(\sum_{c \in C} \rho(c)^{\alpha} \sigma(c)^{1-\alpha} 2^{(\alpha-1)D_{\alpha}(\rho_{Q|c} \|\sigma_{Q|c})} \right), \quad (21)$$

and hence for a state $\rho \in \mathcal{S}_{=}(CQ'Q')$ classical on C ,

$$H_{\alpha}(Q|CQ') = \frac{1}{1 - \alpha} \log \left(\sum_{c \in C} \rho(c) 2^{(1-\alpha)H_{\alpha}(Q|Q')_{\rho|c}} \right), \quad (22)$$

$$H_{\alpha}^{\uparrow}(Q|CQ') = \frac{\alpha}{1 - \alpha} \log \left(\sum_{c \in C} \rho(c) 2^{\frac{1-\alpha}{\alpha} H_{\alpha}^{\uparrow}(Q|Q')_{\rho|c}} \right). \quad (23)$$

3 GEAT channels

In this section, we briefly introduce the sequences of channels that we will be focusing on in this work, essentially following the definitions in [MFS+22b].

Definition 8. $\{\mathcal{N}_j\}_{j=1}^n$ is called a **sequence of GEAT channels** if each \mathcal{N}_j is a channel $R_{j-1}E_{j-1} \rightarrow S_jR_jE_j$ satisfying the following **non-signalling (NS) condition**: there exists a channel $\mathcal{R}_j : E_{j-1} \rightarrow E_j$ such that $\text{Tr}_{S_jR_j} \circ \mathcal{N}_j = \mathcal{R}_j \circ \text{Tr}_{R_{j-1}}$.

Qualitatively, S_j can be understood as (possibly quantum) registers that will be kept secret, E_j represents some side-information that can be updated by each GEAT channel, and R_j represent memory passed between the channels without being available as side-information. However, while the above definition of GEAT channels is enough for entropy to “accumulate” in a certain sense [MFS+22b], it does not straightforwardly give a means to estimate the final entropy. To accommodate this, we follow a notion of GEAT with “testing”:

Definition 9. $\{\mathcal{M}_j\}_{j=1}^n$ is called a **sequence of GEAT-with-testing (GEATT) channels** if each \mathcal{M}_j is a channel $R_{j-1}E_{j-1} \rightarrow S_jR_jE_j\widehat{C}_j\widehat{C}_j$ such that the output registers $\widehat{C}_j\widehat{C}_j$ are always classical (for any input state), and it satisfies the following **non-signalling (NS) condition**: there exists a channel $\mathcal{R}_j : E_{j-1} \rightarrow E_j\widehat{C}_j$ such that $\text{Tr}_{S_j\widehat{C}_jR_j} \circ \mathcal{M}_j = \mathcal{R}_j \circ \text{Tr}_{R_{j-1}}$. If a state $\rho \in \mathbb{S}_=(S_1^n\widehat{C}_1^n\widehat{C}_1^nE_nR_n)$ is of the form $\rho = \mathcal{M}_n \circ \dots \circ \mathcal{M}_1[\omega^0]$ (leaving some identity channels implicit) for some initial state $\omega^0 \in \mathbb{S}_=(R_0E_0)$, we say it is **generated by the sequence of GEATT channels** $\{\mathcal{M}_j\}_{j=1}^n$.

Qualitatively, the classical registers $\widehat{C}_j, \widehat{C}_j$ respectively contain secret and public information that will be used to estimate the accumulated entropy. In many applications, it is possible to take one or the other to be trivial — for instance, in device-dependent security proofs as described in [MR23], it is usually possible⁴ to put all the “test-round data” in the public registers \widehat{C}_j , so the secret registers \widehat{C}_j can be trivial. On the other hand, for device-independent security proofs, the “test-round data” does not usually satisfy the NS conditions, and hence one has to model it first using the secret registers \widehat{C}_j instead, then use chain rules to “move” them into the conditioning registers in the case of DIQKD; see [AFRV19, TSB+22, CMT23] (or Remark 11). Note that this definition of GEATT channels we have presented here is subtly different from [MFS+22b]; for readers already familiar with that work, we highlight the differences in Appendix A, though we believe there should be no significant differences in applications.

When studying GEAT (or GEATT) channels, one often has to consider purifications or extensions of the input states to the channels. In some of our subsequent analysis, it will be convenient to have compact notation for taking some arbitrary purification of an input state to the channel. We therefore introduce the following terminology:

Definition 10. For registers Q, Q' with $\dim(Q) \leq \dim(Q')$, a **purifying function for Q onto Q'** is a function $\text{Pur} : \mathbb{S}_\leq(Q) \rightarrow \mathbb{S}_\leq(QQ')$ such that for any state ρ_Q , the state $\text{Pur}(\rho_Q)$ is a purification of ρ_Q onto the register Q' , i.e. a (possibly subnormalized) rank-1 operator that is equal to ρ_Q after tracing out Q' .

Note that a purifying function is *not* a channel (i.e. CPTP map), for instance because it is necessarily nonlinear. As a concrete example, one can choose for instance the function

$$\text{Pur}(\rho_Q) = \dim(Q) (\sqrt{\rho_Q} \otimes \mathbb{I}_{Q'}) |\Phi^+\rangle\langle\Phi^+| (\sqrt{\rho_Q} \otimes \mathbb{I}_{Q'}), \quad (24)$$

⁴In that model, the E_n register will usually also contain a copy of \widehat{C}_1^n , but this does not affect any of the final bounds.

where $|\Phi^+\rangle$ is some normalized maximally entangled state across QQ' (up to the support of Q) in some arbitrary basis. However, all results we present in this work should be basically independent of any choice of purifying function, by exploiting isometric equivalence of purifications.

4 Deriving QEF-type bounds from the GEAT

In this section, we show how to derive bounds very similar to the QEF framework, but under the conditions of the GEAT instead.

4.1 QES-entropies

We begin by presenting a slight variant of the QEF concept, which we refer to as a “quantum estimation score-system” (QES) — while this is nearly identical to a QEF, we find it convenient to formulate the definition in a slightly different way, hence we coin a similar but slightly different term for it to avoid ambiguity. QES-s are also closely connected to the concept of tradeoff functions defined in [HB24]. Furthermore, there also exist potential generalizations, e.g. to Petz entropies as noted in [ZFK20]. We defer further discussion of these points to Remark 1 below, after first establishing some helpful properties.

Definition 11. Let $\rho \in S_{=}(\overline{C}\widehat{C}QQ')$ be a state where \overline{C} and \widehat{C} are classical with alphabets \overline{C} and \widehat{C} respectively. A **quantum estimation score-system (QES) on $\overline{C}\widehat{C}$** is simply a function $f : \overline{C} \times \widehat{C} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$; equivalently, we may denote it as a real-valued tuple $\mathbf{f} \in \mathbb{R}^{|\overline{C} \times \widehat{C}|}$ where each term in the tuple specifies the value $f(\overline{c}\hat{c})$. Given a QES f and a value $\alpha \in (0, 1) \cup (1, \infty)$, the **QES-entropy of order α** for ρ is defined as

$$\begin{aligned} H_\alpha^f(Q\overline{C}|\widehat{C}Q')_\rho &:= \frac{1}{1-\alpha} \log \left(\sum_{\overline{c}\hat{c}} \rho(\overline{c}\hat{c})^\alpha \rho(\hat{c})^{1-\alpha} 2^{(1-\alpha)(-f(\overline{c}\hat{c}) - D_\alpha(\rho_{QQ'|\overline{c}\hat{c}} \|\mathbb{I}_Q \otimes \rho_{Q'\hat{c}}))} \right) \\ &= \frac{1}{1-\alpha} \log \left(\sum_{\overline{c}\hat{c}} \rho(\overline{c}\hat{c}) 2^{(1-\alpha)(-f(\overline{c}\hat{c}) - D_\alpha(\rho_{QQ'\wedge\overline{c}\hat{c}} \|\mathbb{I}_Q \otimes \rho_{Q'\wedge\hat{c}}))} \right) \\ &= \frac{1}{1-\alpha} \log \left(\sum_{\overline{c}\hat{c}} 2^{-(1-\alpha)f(\overline{c}\hat{c})} \text{Tr} \left[\left((\rho_{Q'\wedge\hat{c}})^{\frac{1-\alpha}{2\alpha}} \rho_{QQ'\wedge\overline{c}\hat{c}} (\rho_{Q'\wedge\hat{c}})^{\frac{1-\alpha}{2\alpha}} \right)^\alpha \right] \right), \end{aligned} \quad (25)$$

where the sum is over all $\overline{c}\hat{c}$ values such that $\rho(\overline{c}\hat{c}) > 0$, and we leave some tensor factors of identity implicit in the last expression.

In the above, the restriction of the summation domain is just to avoid technical problems in defining the $D_\alpha(\rho_{QQ'\wedge\overline{c}\hat{c}} \|\mathbb{I}_Q \otimes \rho_{Q'\wedge\hat{c}})$ terms when $\rho(\overline{c}\hat{c}) = 0$. (In principle we could have assigned arbitrary finite values to such terms without changing the value of the sum, but this introduces some technical complications in our Sec. 5 analysis; see Remark 3.) With this convention, all terms that appear in the sum are well-defined and finite, because for all such terms we have $\text{Tr}[\rho_{QQ'\wedge\overline{c}\hat{c}}] > 0$ and

$$\text{supp}(\rho_{QQ'\wedge\overline{c}\hat{c}}) \subseteq \text{supp}(\rho_{QQ'\wedge\hat{c}}) \subseteq \text{supp}(\mathbb{I}_Q \otimes \rho_{Q'\wedge\hat{c}}), \quad (26)$$

and similarly for the normalized conditional states, hence the condition for finiteness in (12) is satisfied.

To gain some intuition about the above definition, note that if the \overline{C} register is trivial, it reduces to

$$H_\alpha^f(Q|\widehat{C}Q')_\rho = \frac{1}{1-\alpha} \log \left(\sum_{\hat{c}} \rho(\hat{c}) 2^{(1-\alpha)(-f(\hat{c})+H_\alpha(Q|Q')_{\rho_{|\hat{c}}})} \right), \quad (27)$$

in other words, it is similar to the “log-mean-exponential” (over \hat{c}) of the entropies $H_\alpha(Q|Q')_{\rho_{|\hat{c}}}$ in Fact 2, except that each term is shifted by the corresponding QES “score” $f(\hat{c})$. In particular, if we choose the QES to be simply the constant function $f(\hat{c}) = 0$, then $H_\alpha^f(Q|\widehat{C}Q')_\rho$ is just equal to the standard Rényi entropy $H_\alpha(Q|\widehat{C}Q')_\rho$. Alternatively, for $\alpha \in (1, \infty)$, if $f(\hat{c}) \leq H_\alpha(Q|Q')_{\rho_{|\hat{c}}}$ for all \hat{c} (i.e. the values $f(\hat{c})$ are lower bounds on the entropies $H_\alpha(Q|Q')_{\rho_{|\hat{c}}}$ of the conditional states), then $H_\alpha^f(Q|\widehat{C}Q')_\rho \geq 0$, i.e. we can loosely view $H_\alpha^f(Q|\widehat{C}Q')_\rho$ as quantifying how well the QES f lower-bounds the entropies $H_\alpha(Q|Q')_{\rho_{|\hat{c}}}$. This can be made even more precise by noting that from the above formula we have

$$\forall \alpha \in (1, \infty), \quad H_\alpha^f(Q|\widehat{C}Q')_\rho \geq 0 \iff \sum_{\hat{c}} \rho(\hat{c}) 2^{(1-\alpha)(-f(\hat{c})+H_\alpha(Q|Q')_{\rho_{|\hat{c}}})} \leq 1, \quad (28)$$

so $H_\alpha^f(Q|\widehat{C}Q')_\rho \geq 0$ is in fact exactly equivalent to the statement that $f(\hat{c})$ lower-bounds $H_\alpha(Q|Q')_{\rho_{|\hat{c}}}$ in a “log-mean-exponential” sense. With this, as observed in [HB24], we see that the statement $H_\alpha^f(Q|\widehat{C}Q')_\rho \geq 0$ is roughly a condition that the QES f defines a Rényi version of a min-tradeoff function as defined in the original EAT or GEAT; however, for the approach in this work we find it is more flexible to think of QES-s without imposing that condition. Analogously, for $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ the above interpretations are reversed, e.g. we have

$$\forall \alpha \in (0, 1), \quad H_\alpha^f(Q|\widehat{C}Q')_\rho \leq 0 \iff \sum_{\hat{c}} \rho(\hat{c}) 2^{(1-\alpha)(-f(\hat{c})+H_\alpha(Q|Q')_{\rho_{|\hat{c}}})} \leq 1, \quad (29)$$

so we can loosely view $f(\hat{c})$ as upper-bounding $H_\alpha(Q|Q')_{\rho_{|\hat{c}}}$ in a “log-mean-exponential” sense whenever $H_\alpha^f(Q|\widehat{C}Q')_\rho \leq 0$.

Another way to gain some intuition is the following property (based on a construction in [DFR20, DF19]): the idea is to construct a new register D that “encodes the value of $f(\overline{C}\widehat{C})$ ” via its entropy, in some sense.

Lemma 1. *Let f be a QES on some classical registers $\overline{C}\widehat{C}$, let $M \in \mathbb{R}$ be any value such that $M - f(\overline{c}\hat{c}) > 0$ for all $\overline{c}\hat{c}$, and take any $\alpha \in (0, 1) \cup (1, \infty)$. Consider any read-and-prepare channel $\overline{C}\widehat{C} \rightarrow \overline{C}\widehat{C}D$ such that the state it prepares on D always satisfies*

$$H_\alpha(D)_{\rho_{|\overline{c}\hat{c}}} = H_\alpha^\dagger(D)_{\rho_{|\overline{c}\hat{c}}} = M - f(\overline{c}\hat{c}). \quad (30)$$

(It is always possible to construct such a channel, and construct it such that D is classical.) Then for any $\rho \in \mathcal{S}_=(\overline{C}\widehat{C}QQ')$ classical on $\overline{C}\widehat{C}$, extending ρ with this channel yields⁵

$$H_\alpha(DQ\overline{C}|\widehat{C}Q')_\rho = M + H_\alpha^f(Q\overline{C}|\widehat{C}Q')_\rho. \quad (31)$$

⁵There is no danger of ambiguity in having used ρ to denote all states in this lemma, since a read-and-prepare channel always simply extends a state without “disturbing” any registers.

Proof. First we briefly verify that such channels can indeed be constructed: note that for any $\alpha > 0$ and $h > 0$, given a register D with dimension at least 2^h , one can straightforwardly construct a state on D with $H_\alpha(D) = H_\alpha^\uparrow(D) = h$ (the first equality holds simply because $H_\alpha = H_\alpha^\uparrow$ when there is no conditioning system), e.g. by taking a mixture between some pure state on D and the maximally mixed state; furthermore this can clearly be achieved using a classical D . Therefore to obtain a read-and-prepare channel satisfying (30), we simply need to it to read the classical value $\bar{c}\hat{c}$ and prepare a state on D with the corresponding desired entropy value.

We now show that such a read-and-prepare channel indeed achieves (31) (using \mathbb{U} to denote maximally mixed states):

$$\begin{aligned}
& H_\alpha(DQ\bar{C}|\widehat{C}Q')_\rho \\
&= \log(d_D d_Q d_{\bar{C}}) - D_\alpha(\rho_{DQ\bar{C}\widehat{C}Q'} \parallel \mathbb{U}_{DQ\bar{C}} \otimes \rho_{\widehat{C}Q'}) \\
&= \log(d_D d_Q d_{\bar{C}}) - D_\alpha\left(\sum_{\bar{c}\hat{c}} \rho(\bar{c}\hat{c}) |\bar{c}\hat{c}\rangle\langle\bar{c}\hat{c}|_{\bar{C}\widehat{C}} \otimes \rho_{DQQ'|\bar{c}\hat{c}} \parallel \sum_{\bar{c}\hat{c}} \frac{\rho(\hat{c})}{d_{\bar{C}}} |\bar{c}\hat{c}\rangle\langle\bar{c}\hat{c}|_{\bar{C}\widehat{C}} \otimes \mathbb{U}_{DQ} \otimes \sigma_{Q'|\hat{c}}\right) \\
&= \log(d_D d_Q d_{\bar{C}}) - \frac{1}{\alpha-1} \log\left(\sum_{\bar{c}\hat{c}} \rho(\bar{c}\hat{c})^\alpha \left(\frac{\rho(\hat{c})}{d_{\bar{C}}}\right)^{1-\alpha} 2^{(\alpha-1)D_\alpha(\rho_{DQQ'|\bar{c}\hat{c}} \parallel \mathbb{U}_{DQ} \otimes \rho_{Q'|\hat{c}})}\right) \\
&= \log(d_D d_Q d_{\bar{C}}) - \frac{1}{\alpha-1} \log\left(\sum_{\bar{c}\hat{c}} \rho(\bar{c}\hat{c})^\alpha \left(\frac{\rho(\hat{c})}{d_{\bar{C}}}\right)^{1-\alpha} 2^{(\alpha-1)(D_\alpha(\rho_{D|\bar{c}\hat{c}} \parallel \mathbb{U}_D) + D_\alpha(\rho_{QQ'|\bar{c}\hat{c}} \parallel \mathbb{U}_Q \otimes \rho_{Q'|\hat{c}}))}\right) \\
&= -\frac{1}{\alpha-1} \log\left(\sum_{\bar{c}\hat{c}} \rho(\bar{c}\hat{c})^\alpha \rho(\hat{c})^{1-\alpha} 2^{(\alpha-1)(-H_\alpha(D)_{\rho|\bar{c}\hat{c}} + D_\alpha(\rho_{QQ'|\bar{c}\hat{c}} \parallel \mathbb{I}_Q \otimes \rho_{Q'|\hat{c}}))}\right) \\
&= \frac{1}{1-\alpha} \log\left(\sum_{\bar{c}\hat{c}} \rho(\bar{c}\hat{c})^\alpha \rho(\hat{c})^{1-\alpha} 2^{(1-\alpha)(M - f(\bar{c}\hat{c}) - D_\alpha(\rho_{QQ'|\bar{c}\hat{c}} \parallel \mathbb{I}_Q \otimes \rho_{Q'|\hat{c}}))}\right) \\
&= M + \frac{1}{1-\alpha} \log\left(\sum_{\bar{c}\hat{c}} \rho(\bar{c}\hat{c})^\alpha \rho(\hat{c})^{1-\alpha} 2^{(1-\alpha)(-f(\bar{c}\hat{c}) - D_\alpha(\rho_{QQ'|\bar{c}\hat{c}} \parallel \mathbb{I}_Q \otimes \rho_{Q'|\hat{c}}))}\right) \\
&= M + H_\alpha^f(Q\bar{C}|\widehat{C}Q')_\rho, \tag{32}
\end{aligned}$$

where the fourth line holds by Fact 2, the fifth holds because $\rho_{DQQ'|\bar{c}\hat{c}} = \rho_{D|\bar{c}\hat{c}} \otimes \rho_{QQ'|\bar{c}\hat{c}}$, and the seventh line follows by substitution from Eq. (30). \square

This lemma implies that a QES-entropy is in fact just the usual Rényi conditional entropy evaluated on some extension of the state (and the extension can be produced using the same channel for all states), apart from an additive term M that does not affect any important properties.⁶ In particular, this implies that it immediately inherits many properties of the corresponding Rényi conditional entropy, which we shall shortly describe. Before doing so, we present a minor variation of the above result, in which we obtain an approximate version of the relation (31) for *all* Rényi parameters simultaneously:

⁶In fact, this M term can be entirely avoided if we first use the “normalization property” in Lemma 6 below to shift all the f values to negative values, allowing us to choose $M = 0$. Alternatively, $M = 0$ could have been achieved by modifying our construction to instead follow [DFR20] and generate a *pair* of quantum registers $D\bar{D}$, then use the fact that $H_\alpha(D|\bar{D})$ can be assigned negative values to obtain $H_\alpha(DQ\bar{C}|\bar{D}\widehat{C}Q')_\rho = H_\alpha^f(Q\bar{C}|\widehat{C}Q')_\rho$. However, in that case it might not straightforwardly hold that $H_\alpha(D|\bar{D}) = H_\alpha^\uparrow(D|\bar{D})$.

Lemma 2. *Let f be a QES on some classical registers $\overline{C}\widehat{C}$, let $M > 0$ be any value such that $M - f(\bar{c}\hat{c}) > M/2 > 0$ for all $\bar{c}\hat{c}$. Consider any read-and-prepare channel $\overline{C}\widehat{C} \rightarrow \overline{C}CD$ such that the state it prepares on D always satisfies*

$$\forall \alpha \in [0, \infty], \quad H_\alpha(D)_{\rho_{|\bar{c}\hat{c}}} = H_\alpha^\uparrow(D)_{\rho_{|\bar{c}\hat{c}}} \in \left[M - f(\bar{c}\hat{c}), M - f(\bar{c}\hat{c}) + 2^{-\frac{M}{2}} \log e \right]. \quad (33)$$

(It is always possible to construct such a channel, and construct it such that D is classical.) Then for any $\rho \in \mathbb{S}_=(\overline{C}\widehat{C}QQ')$ classical on $\overline{C}\widehat{C}$, extending ρ with this channel yields

$$\forall \alpha \in (0, 1) \cup (1, \infty), \quad M + H_\alpha^f(Q\overline{C}|\widehat{C}Q')_\rho \leq H_\alpha(DQ\overline{C}|\widehat{C}Q')_\rho \leq M + 2^{-\frac{M}{2}} \log e + H_\alpha^f(Q\overline{C}|\widehat{C}Q')_\rho. \quad (34)$$

Proof. To see that such channels indeed exist, simply consider a read-and-prepare channel that reads the classical value $\bar{c}\hat{c}$ and prepares a *uniform* mixture with support size $\lceil 2^{M-f(\bar{c}\hat{c})} \rceil$ on register D (again, this can clearly be achieved with D classical). Since all (unconditioned) Rényi entropies take the same value for a uniform distribution, we see that this means for *every* $\alpha \in [0, \infty]$, this state prepared on D has Rényi entropy

$$H_\alpha(D)_{\rho_{|\bar{c}\hat{c}}} = H_\alpha^\uparrow(D)_{\rho_{|\bar{c}\hat{c}}} = \log \left(\lceil 2^{M-f(\bar{c}\hat{c})} \rceil \right), \quad (35)$$

which lies within the interval described in (33) — the upper bound holds from observing that

$$\begin{aligned} \log \left(\lceil 2^{M-f(\bar{c}\hat{c})} \rceil \right) &\leq \log \left(2^{M-f(\bar{c}\hat{c})} + 1 \right) \\ &= \log \left(2^{M-f(\bar{c}\hat{c})} \right) + \log \left(1 + 2^{f(\bar{c}\hat{c})-M} \right) \\ &\leq M - f(\bar{c}\hat{c}) + 2^{-\frac{M}{2}} \log e, \end{aligned} \quad (36)$$

where in the second line we simply factor out $2^{M-f(\bar{c}\hat{c})}$, and the third line follows from $\ln(1+x) \leq x$ along with the lemma condition $M - f(\bar{c}\hat{c}) > M/2 > 0$.

The remainder of the proof follows the same way as in Lemma 1, except that we replace the seventh line with inequalities in either direction by bounding $H_\alpha(D)_{\rho_{|\bar{c}\hat{c}}}$ using the interval in (33) (together with the observation that the preceding line is monotone increasing with respect to the $H_\alpha(D)_{\rho_{|\bar{c}\hat{c}}}$ terms; note that this is true in both the $\alpha < 1$ and $\alpha > 1$ regimes). \square

The main difference between the above two lemmas is that Lemma 2 only achieves an “approximate” version of Lemma 1, but does so using a single channel that works for all Rényi parameters simultaneously, which is needed in some of our subsequent proofs. At large M , the gap between the upper and lower bounds in the above lemma shrinks to zero, so the approximation usually becomes sufficiently good for our analysis. We now use these two lemmas to “transfer” many properties of the standard Rényi entropy over to the QES-entropy.

Lemma 3. *(Data-processing) Let $\rho \in \mathbb{S}_=(\overline{C}\widehat{C}QQ')$ be classical on $\overline{C}\widehat{C}$, let f be a QES on $\overline{C}\widehat{C}$, and take any $\alpha \in [\frac{1}{2}, 1) \cup (1, \infty)$. Then for any channel $\mathcal{E} : Q' \rightarrow Q''$,*

$$H_\alpha^f(Q\overline{C}|\widehat{C}Q'')_{\mathcal{E}[\rho]} \geq H_\alpha^f(Q\overline{C}|\widehat{C}Q')_\rho. \quad (37)$$

If \mathcal{E} is an isometry, then we have equality in the above bound.

Proof. Let \mathcal{D} be a read-and-prepare channel as described in Lemma 1. Then we have (here for clarity we explicitly write \mathcal{D} in the formulas, instead of leaving it implicit in the state extension as in (31)):

$$\begin{aligned}
H_\alpha^f(Q\bar{C}|\widehat{C}Q'')_{\mathcal{E}[\rho]} &= H_\alpha(DQ\bar{C}|\widehat{C}Q'')_{\mathcal{D}\circ\mathcal{E}[\rho]} - M \\
&= H_\alpha(DQ\bar{C}|\widehat{C}Q'')_{\mathcal{E}\circ\mathcal{D}[\rho]} - M \\
&\geq H_\alpha(DQ\bar{C}|\widehat{C}Q'')_{\mathcal{D}[\rho]} - M \\
&= H_\alpha^f(Q\bar{C}|\widehat{C}Q')_\rho,
\end{aligned} \tag{38}$$

where the second line holds since \mathcal{D} commutes with \mathcal{E} , and the third line is simply the usual data-processing inequality for Rényi conditional entropies in the range $\alpha \in [\frac{1}{2}, \infty)$ (Fact 1). Similarly, the equality condition is simply inherited from that data-processing inequality.

Alternatively, a proof directly from the definition: first considering $\alpha \in [\frac{1}{2}, 1)$, the data-processing inequality for sandwiched Rényi divergence itself gives

$$\begin{aligned}
D_\alpha(\mathcal{E}[\rho_{QQ'} \wedge \hat{c}\hat{c}] \| \mathcal{E}[\mathbb{I}_Q \otimes \rho_{Q'} \wedge \hat{c}\hat{c}]) &\leq D_\alpha(\rho_{QQ'} \wedge \hat{c}\hat{c} \| \mathbb{I}_Q \otimes \rho_{Q'} \wedge \hat{c}\hat{c}) \\
\iff \rho(\hat{c}\hat{c}) 2^{(1-\alpha)(-f(\hat{c}\hat{c}) - D_\alpha(\mathcal{E}[\rho_{QQ'} \wedge \hat{c}\hat{c}] \| \mathcal{E}[\mathbb{I}_Q \otimes \rho_{Q'} \wedge \hat{c}\hat{c}]))} &\geq \rho(\hat{c}\hat{c}) 2^{(1-\alpha)(-f(\hat{c}\hat{c}) - D_\alpha(\rho_{QQ'} \wedge \hat{c}\hat{c} \| \mathbb{I}_Q \otimes \rho_{Q'} \wedge \hat{c}\hat{c}))},
\end{aligned} \tag{39}$$

summing over all values of $\hat{c}\hat{c}$, taking logarithm, and dividing by $1 - \alpha$ would prove the result. The proof for the case where $\alpha \in (1, \infty)$ follows from a similar argument. \square

Lemma 4. (*Conditioning on classical registers*) Let $\rho \in \mathcal{S}_=(\overline{C}\widehat{C}QQ'Z)$ be classical on $\overline{C}\widehat{C}Z$, let f be a QES on $\overline{C}\widehat{C}$, and take any $\alpha \in (0, 1) \cup (1, \infty)$. Then

$$H_\alpha^f(Q\bar{C}|\widehat{C}Q'Z)_\rho = \frac{1}{1-\alpha} \log \left(\sum_z \rho(z) 2^{(1-\alpha)H_\alpha^f(Q\bar{C}|\widehat{C}Q')_{\rho|z}} \right), \tag{40}$$

Proof. Extend ρ with a read-and-prepare channel as described in Lemma 1. Then

$$\begin{aligned}
H_\alpha^f(Q\bar{C}|\widehat{C}Q'Z)_\rho &= H_\alpha(DQ\bar{C}|\widehat{C}Q'Z)_\rho - M \\
&= \frac{1}{1-\alpha} \log \left(\sum_z \rho(z) 2^{(1-\alpha)H_\alpha(DQ\bar{C}|\widehat{C}Q')_{\rho|z}} \right) - M \\
&= \frac{1}{1-\alpha} \log \left(\sum_z \rho(z) 2^{(1-\alpha)(M + H_\alpha^f(Q\bar{C}|\widehat{C}Q')_{\rho|z})} \right) - M \\
&= \frac{1}{1-\alpha} \log \left(\sum_z \rho(z) 2^{(1-\alpha)H_\alpha^f(Q\bar{C}|\widehat{C}Q')_{\rho|z}} \right),
\end{aligned} \tag{41}$$

where in the second line we applied Fact 2, and in the third line we implicitly exploited the fact that the read-and-prepare channel in Lemma 1 achieves the relation (31) for all states (in particular, also the conditional states $\rho|_z$).

Alternatively, a proof directly from the definition: rewriting the formula for QES-entropy for the

state in the lemma, we have:

$$\begin{aligned}
H_\alpha^f(Q\bar{C}|\widehat{C}Q'Z)_\rho &= \frac{1}{1-\alpha} \log \left(\sum_z \sum_{\bar{c}\hat{c}} 2^{-(1-\alpha)f(\bar{c}\hat{c})} \text{Tr} \left[\left((\rho_{Q' \wedge z \hat{c}})^{\frac{1-\alpha}{2\alpha}} \rho_{QQ' \wedge z \bar{c}\hat{c}} (\rho_{Q' \wedge z \hat{c}})^{\frac{1-\alpha}{2\alpha}} \right)^\alpha \right] \right) \\
&= \frac{1}{1-\alpha} \log \left(\sum_z \rho(z) \sum_{\bar{c}\hat{c}} 2^{-(1-\alpha)f(\bar{c}\hat{c})} \text{Tr} \left[\left((\rho_{Q' \wedge \hat{c}|z})^{\frac{1-\alpha}{2\alpha}} \rho_{QQ' \wedge \bar{c}\hat{c}|z} (\rho_{Q' \wedge \hat{c}|z})^{\frac{1-\alpha}{2\alpha}} \right)^\alpha \right] \right) \\
&= \frac{1}{1-\alpha} \log \left(\sum_z \rho(z) 2^{(1-\alpha)H_\alpha^f(Q\bar{C}|\widehat{C}Q')_{\rho|z}} \right). \tag{42}
\end{aligned}$$

□

Lemma 5. (Chain rules) Let $\rho \in \mathcal{S}_=(\bar{C}\widehat{C}Q'Q)$ be classical on $\bar{C}\widehat{C}$, let f be a QES on $\bar{C}\widehat{C}$. Then for any $\alpha, \alpha', \alpha'' \in (\frac{1}{2}, 1) \cup (1, \infty)$ such that $\frac{\alpha}{\alpha-1} = \frac{\alpha'}{\alpha'-1} + \frac{\alpha''}{\alpha''-1}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
H_\alpha^f(Q\bar{C}|\widehat{C}Q')_\rho &\leq H_{\alpha'}^f(Q|\bar{C}\widehat{C}Q')_\rho + H_{\alpha''}^f(\bar{C}|\widehat{C}Q')_\rho && \text{if } (\alpha-1)(\alpha'-1)(\alpha''-1) < 0, \\
H_\alpha^f(Q\bar{C}|\widehat{C}Q')_\rho &\geq H_{\alpha'}^f(Q|\bar{C}\widehat{C}Q')_\rho + H_{\alpha''}^f(\bar{C}|\widehat{C}Q')_\rho && \text{if } (\alpha-1)(\alpha'-1)(\alpha''-1) > 0,
\end{aligned} \tag{43}$$

where by $H_\alpha^f(Q|\bar{C}\widehat{C}Q')_\rho$ we mean

$$\begin{aligned}
H_\alpha^f(Q|\bar{C}\widehat{C}Q')_\rho &= \frac{1}{1-\alpha} \log \left(\sum_{\bar{c}\hat{c}} \rho(\bar{c}\hat{c}) 2^{(1-\alpha)(-f(\bar{c}\hat{c}) - D_\alpha(\rho_{QQ' \wedge \bar{c}\hat{c}} \| \mathbb{1}_Q \otimes \rho_{Q' \wedge \bar{c}\hat{c}}))} \right) \\
&= \frac{1}{1-\alpha} \log \left(\sum_{\bar{c}\hat{c}} \rho(\bar{c}\hat{c}) 2^{(1-\alpha)(-f(\bar{c}\hat{c}) + H_\alpha(Q|Q')_{\rho|\bar{c}\hat{c}})} \right). \tag{44}
\end{aligned}$$

Proof. Take any $M > 0$ such that $M - f(\bar{c}\hat{c}) > \frac{M}{2} > 0$, and extend ρ with a read-and-prepare channel as described in Lemma 2. Then as stated in the lemma, we have

$$M + H_\alpha^f(Q\bar{C}|\widehat{C}Q')_\rho \leq H_\alpha(DQ\bar{C}|\widehat{C}Q')_\rho \leq M + 2^{-\frac{M}{2}} \log e + H_\alpha^f(Q\bar{C}|\widehat{C}Q')_\rho, \tag{45}$$

and also (by viewing $H_\alpha^f(Q|\bar{C}\widehat{C}Q')_\rho$ as an instance of QES-entropy where *both* the \bar{C} and \widehat{C} registers are viewed as the “public” part, as is consistent with the formula (44) above)

$$M + H_{\alpha'}^f(Q|\bar{C}\widehat{C}Q')_\rho \leq H_{\alpha'}(DQ|\bar{C}\widehat{C}Q')_\rho \leq M + 2^{-\frac{M}{2}} \log e + H_{\alpha'}^f(Q|\bar{C}\widehat{C}Q')_\rho. \tag{46}$$

Then, we have the following chain of inequalities

$$\begin{aligned}
H_\alpha^f(Q\bar{C}|\widehat{C}Q')_\rho &\leq H_\alpha(DQ\bar{C}|\widehat{C}Q')_\rho - M \\
&\leq H_{\alpha'}(DQ|\bar{C}\widehat{C}Q')_\rho + H_{\alpha''}(\bar{C}|\widehat{C}Q')_\rho - M \\
&\leq H_{\alpha'}^f(Q|\bar{C}\widehat{C}Q')_\rho + H_{\alpha''}(\bar{C}|\widehat{C}Q')_\rho + 2^{-\frac{M}{2}} \log e, \tag{47}
\end{aligned}$$

where the first line follows from the first inequality in Eq. (45), the second line is a special case of [Dup15, Proposition 8], and the third line a result of applying the second inequality in Eq. (46). Since the result holds for *arbitrary* (sufficiently large) M , we can take the $M \rightarrow \infty$ limit so the $2^{-\frac{M}{2}}$ term vanishes, which proves the lemma. The other direction holds by a similar argument, and using [Dup15, Proposition 7] instead. □

Arguably, the construction of the D register is not strictly necessary for our results; it should be possible in principle to prove these results directly from the definition of QES-entropies, and indeed we did so for Lemmas 3–4. However, the advantage of the D register construction is that more sophisticated results like the chain rule corresponding to Lemma 5 can be transferred to QES-entropies with equal ease, rather than having to re-derive it “from base principles”. Similarly, in our subsequent results involving entropy accumulation, this D register construction will allow us to exploit advanced results such as the GEAT without explicitly re-deriving them in the framework of QES-entropies.

Apart from the above, another convenient property is the following:

Lemma 6. (*Normalization property*) *Let $\rho \in \mathcal{S}_{=}(\overline{C}\widehat{C}QQ')$ be classical on $\overline{C}\widehat{C}$ and let f be a QES on $\overline{C}\widehat{C}$. Then for any constant $\kappa \in \mathbb{R}$, we have*

$$H_{\alpha}^{f+\kappa}(Q\overline{C}|\widehat{C}Q')_{\rho} = H_{\alpha}^f(Q\overline{C}|\widehat{C}Q')_{\rho} - \kappa, \quad (48)$$

where $f + \kappa$ simply denotes the QES with values $f(\widehat{c}\widehat{c}) + \kappa$.

Proof. This follows directly from the definition. □

Remark 1. *In the special case where⁷ Q is trivial, a QES is exactly equivalent to a QEF as defined in [ZFK20], except that in this work we take some logarithms or exponentials to make our results more “entropy-like” — for instance [ZFK20] mainly works directly with the trace terms in the last line of (25), which they refer to as **Rényi powers**. (Strictly speaking, they also impose a condition that corresponds to requiring $H_{\alpha}^f(Q\overline{C}|\widehat{C}Q')_{\rho} \geq 0$ over some class of states in consideration, but as noted in that work, this can be enforced using the normalization property in Lemma 6.) Similarly, in the case where \overline{C} is trivial (so (27) holds), a QES-entropy is extremely similar to an f -weighted Rényi entropy as defined in [HB24], except we used H_{α} rather than H_{α}^{\uparrow} and the convex combination is adjusted accordingly (and we again avoided imposing a “normalization” condition).*

Furthermore, as noted in [ZFK20], one can certainly consider using Petz entropies instead of sandwiched entropies when defining these concepts. However, they were unable to prove a “QEF chaining” property for Petz entropies, and similarly we do not do so here since we rely on various intermediate results in the GEAT proof that were only derived for sandwiched entropies. Another potential generalization to consider would be whether the f -weighted Rényi entropy concept of [HB24] could be extended to the case where \overline{C} is nontrivial; however, some technical care would seem necessary since it is less clear what is the equivalent of H_{α}^{\uparrow} in the general divergence-based formulas we have given in Definition 11.

4.2 QES-entropy accumulation or chaining

We now present the first key result in this work, that QES-entropies “accumulate” in a simple fashion when considering a state generated by a sequence of GEATT channels. This result is almost identical to the “QEF chaining” property described in [ZFK20]. However, we have derived it using the conditions and framework of the GEAT instead; in particular, this means that it holds under the more relaxed NS conditions of the GEAT, rather than the stricter Markov conditions of [ZFK20]

⁷It may appear strange to make the Q register trivial, since in some protocols it corresponds to the raw “secret data”, but the idea is that in [ZFK20] and follow-up works, they apply the QEF analysis in such a way that the \overline{C} register itself contains all the raw “secret data”. Our results can be viewed as slightly extending their approach by also allowing for a nontrivial (possibly quantum) Q .

or the original EAT (at the cost of a very slight “loss” in Rényi parameter; see (68) later). We also show later in Sec. 6.1 that we can exactly reproduce the bounds in [ZFK20] if we simply impose the same Markov conditions instead.

Theorem 1. (*QES-entropy accumulation*) *Let ρ be a state generated by a sequence of GEATT channels $\{\mathcal{M}_j\}_{j=1}^n$ (Definition 9). For each j , suppose that for every value $\bar{c}_1^{j-1}\hat{c}_1^{j-1}$, we have a QES $f_{|\bar{c}_1^{j-1}\hat{c}_1^{j-1}}$ on registers $\bar{C}_j\hat{C}_j$.⁸ Define the following QES on $\bar{C}_1^n\hat{C}_1^n$:*

$$f_{\text{full}}(\bar{c}_1^n\hat{c}_1^n) := \sum_{j=1}^n f_{|\bar{c}_1^{j-1}\hat{c}_1^{j-1}}(\bar{c}_j\hat{c}_j). \quad (49)$$

Take any $\alpha \in (1, 2]$ and let $\hat{\alpha} = 1/(2 - \alpha)$. Then we have

$$H_\alpha^{f_{\text{full}}}(S_1^n\bar{C}_1^n|\hat{C}_1^n E_n)_\rho \geq \sum_j \min_{\bar{c}_1^{j-1}\hat{c}_1^{j-1}} \kappa_{\bar{c}_1^{j-1}\hat{c}_1^{j-1}}, \quad (50)$$

$$\text{where } \kappa_{\bar{c}_1^{j-1}\hat{c}_1^{j-1}} := \inf_{\nu \in \Sigma_j} H_{\hat{\alpha}}^{f_{|\bar{c}_1^{j-1}\hat{c}_1^{j-1}}} (S_j\bar{C}_j|\hat{C}_j E_j \tilde{E})_\nu,$$

where Σ_j denotes the set of all states of the form $\mathcal{M}_j \left[\omega_{R_{j-1}E_{j-1}\tilde{E}} \right]$ for some initial state $\omega_{R_{j-1}E_{j-1}\tilde{E}}$ with \tilde{E} being a register of large enough dimension to serve as a purifying register for any of the $R_j E_j$ registers.

Consequently, if we instead define the following “normalized” QES on $\bar{C}_1^n\hat{C}_1^n$:

$$\hat{f}_{\text{full}}(\bar{c}_1^n\hat{c}_1^n) := \sum_{j=1}^n \hat{f}_{|\bar{c}_1^{j-1}\hat{c}_1^{j-1}}(\bar{c}_j\hat{c}_j), \quad \text{where } \hat{f}_{|\bar{c}_1^{j-1}\hat{c}_1^{j-1}}(\bar{c}_j\hat{c}_j) := f_{|\bar{c}_1^{j-1}\hat{c}_1^{j-1}}(\bar{c}_j\hat{c}_j) + \kappa_{\bar{c}_1^{j-1}\hat{c}_1^{j-1}}, \quad (51)$$

then

$$H_\alpha^{\hat{f}_{\text{full}}}(S_1^n\bar{C}_1^n|\hat{C}_1^n E_n)_\rho \geq 0. \quad (52)$$

Before presenting the full proof, we sketch out the outline. The idea is to rely on the relations between QES-entropies and standard Rényi entropies we described in the previous section, which are similar to some steps in the proofs of the (G)EAT-with-testing in [DFR20, DF19, MFS+22b]. For simplicity let us focus on a case where all the QES-s $f_{|\bar{c}_1^{j-1}\hat{c}_1^{j-1}}$ are identical (assuming all the \bar{C}_j registers have the same alphabet, and similarly for \hat{C}_j), so that all of them are equal to a single QES f . Then we basically define new channels \mathcal{N}_j that extend the \mathcal{M}_j channels by applying an additional read-and-prepare channel $\mathcal{D}_j : \bar{C}_j\hat{C}_j \rightarrow \bar{C}_j\hat{C}_j D_j$ of the form described in Lemma 2. With this, we could apply the Rényi chain rule of [MFS+22b, Lemma 3.6] to get a bound of the form

$$H_\alpha(D_1^n S_1^n \bar{C}_1^n | \hat{C}_1^n E_n)_\rho \geq \sum_j \inf H_{\hat{\alpha}}(D_j S_j \bar{C}_j | \hat{C}_j^j E_j \tilde{E})_{\nu'}, \quad (53)$$

⁸To avoid potential confusion, we highlight that this means for each j we have *multiple* different QES-s, which are indexed by the values $\bar{c}_1^{j-1}\hat{c}_1^{j-1}$. We also highlight that each such QES is a function on the alphabet of $\bar{C}_j\hat{C}_j$ only, *not* the “preceding” registers $\bar{C}_1^{j-1}\hat{C}_1^{j-1}$. Of course, by the equivalence between k -tuples and functions on a discrete set of size k , in principle we could view the tuple of values $\left\{ f_{|\bar{c}_1^{j-1}\hat{c}_1^{j-1}}(\bar{c}_j\hat{c}_j) \right\}_{\bar{c}_1^{j-1}\hat{c}_1^{j-1}}$ as being a function on the alphabet of $\bar{C}_1^j\hat{C}_1^j$, but for this theorem statement it is more convenient to use the presented form. (In other contexts, it can be convenient to view it as such a function, but we defer that discussion to whenever it should be relevant.)

with the infimum taking place over states ν' that could be produced by $\mathcal{N}_j \otimes \text{id}_{\widetilde{E}}$. (This bound is basically the same as some intermediate steps in [MFS+22b].) Now by analyzing these channels in a similar way to the Lemma 2 proof, one can show the states they produce satisfy

$$\begin{aligned} H_\alpha(D_1^n S_1^n \overline{C}_1^n | \widehat{C}_1^n E_n)_\rho &\leq nM + H_\alpha^{f_{\text{full}}}(S_1^n \overline{C}_1^n | \widehat{C}_1^n E_n)_\rho + n2^{-\frac{M}{2}} \log e, \\ H_{\widehat{\alpha}}(D_j S_j \overline{C}_j | \widehat{C}_1^j E_j \widetilde{E})_{\nu'} &\geq M + H_\alpha^f(S_j \overline{C}_j | \widehat{C}_j E_j \widetilde{E})_{\nu'}, \end{aligned} \quad (54)$$

hence relating the terms in the bound (53) to QES-entropies. Noting that the resulting nM terms simply cancel off, and recalling that we can choose arbitrarily large M so $2^{-\frac{M}{2}}$ becomes arbitrarily small, we obtain the desired result (50). Essentially, our proof differs from [DFR20, DF19, MFS+22b] because in those works they apply a condition that f lower-bounds the single-round von Neumann entropy in an ‘‘averaged’’ sense (i.e. defines a min-tradeoff function [DFR20, DF19, MFS+22b]), whereas we observe that in fact this was not necessary — we can just view f as arbitrary values (though as discussed in (28), in some contexts we can view it as being a ‘‘log-mean-exponential’’ bound on Rényi entropy).

The full proof essentially proceeds along the above lines, except that we need to define the input and output registers of the \mathcal{N}_j channels differently, such that they preserve a copy of the ‘‘past’’ testing registers $\overline{C}_1^{j-1} \widehat{C}_1^{j-1}$ registers at each step. This is needed so that the read-and-prepare channels \mathcal{D}_j can also take the values on these registers into account, which allows us to ‘‘encode’’ any QES value $f_{|\overline{c}_1^{j-1} \widehat{c}_1^{j-1}}(\overline{c}_j \widehat{c}_j)$ in the entropies of the D_j registers. We now present this in detail.

Proof. Let $M > 0$ be any value such that $M - f_{|\overline{c}_1^{j-1} \widehat{c}_1^{j-1}}(\overline{c}_j \widehat{c}_j) > \frac{M}{2} > 0$ for all the $f_{|\overline{c}_1^{j-1} \widehat{c}_1^{j-1}}(\overline{c}_j \widehat{c}_j)$ in the theorem statement (for all j). Now for each j , define a read-and-prepare channel $\mathcal{D}_j : \overline{C}_1^j \widehat{C}_1^j \rightarrow \overline{C}_1^j \widehat{C}_1^j D_j$ of the form described in Lemma 2, so that the state it prepares on D_j satisfies

$$\forall \alpha \in [0, \infty], \quad H_\alpha(D_j)_{\rho_{|\overline{c}_1^j \widehat{c}_1^j}} \in \left[M - f_{|\overline{c}_1^{j-1} \widehat{c}_1^{j-1}}(\overline{c}_j \widehat{c}_j), M - f_{|\overline{c}_1^{j-1} \widehat{c}_1^{j-1}}(\overline{c}_j \widehat{c}_j) + 2^{-\frac{M}{2}} \log e \right]. \quad (55)$$

Now let $\mathcal{N}_j : R_{j-1} E_{j-1} \overline{C}_1^{j-1} \widehat{C}_1^{j-1} \rightarrow D_j \overline{C}_j S_j R_j E_j \overline{C}_1^j \widehat{C}_1^j$ denote a channel that does the following (note that its input registers differ from \mathcal{M}_j by also including $\overline{C}_1^{j-1} \widehat{C}_1^{j-1}$, and its output registers also include $\overline{C}_1^{j-1} \widehat{C}_1^{j-1}$ and two additional registers \overline{C}_j, D_j):

1. Apply $\mathcal{M}_j \otimes \mathcal{P}_j$, where \mathcal{P}_j is a pinching channel on $\overline{C}_1^{j-1} \widehat{C}_1^{j-1}$ (in its classical basis).
2. Copy the classical register \overline{C}_j onto another classical register $\overline{\overline{C}}_j$.
3. Generate a D_j register by applying the above read-and-prepare channel \mathcal{D}_j on $\overline{C}_1^j \widehat{C}_1^j$.

Note that the third step can indeed be implemented as a read-and-prepare channel for *any* input state, even if it is not originally classical on $\overline{C}_1^{j-1} \widehat{C}_1^{j-1}$, because the pinching channel in the first step forces the resulting state to be classical on those registers. These channels \mathcal{N}_j form a valid sequence of GEAT channels (without testing) according to Definition 8, by identifying the notation in these channels with the notation in that definition as follows: for the input registers,

- $R_{j-1} \overline{C}_1^{j-1} \leftrightarrow R_{j-1}$,
- $E_{j-1} \widehat{C}_1^{j-1} \leftrightarrow E_{j-1}$,

and for the output registers,

- $D_j \overline{\overline{C}}_j S_j \leftrightarrow S_j$,
- $R_j \overline{C}_1^j \leftrightarrow R_j$,
- $E_j \widehat{C}_1^j \leftrightarrow E_j$.

To verify that the NS condition of Definition 8 is satisfied by this identification, we note that by letting \mathcal{R}_j be the channel in Definition 9, and defining $\mathcal{R}'_j := \mathcal{R}_j \otimes \mathcal{P}'_j$ where \mathcal{P}'_j is a pinching channel on \widehat{C}_1^{j-1} (in its classical basis), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{Tr}_{D_j \overline{\overline{C}}_j S_j R_j \overline{C}_1^j} \circ \mathcal{N}_j &= \text{Tr}_{S_j \overline{C}_1^j R_j} \circ (\mathcal{M}_j \otimes \mathcal{P}_j) \\
&= \left(\text{Tr}_{S_j \overline{C}_j R_j} \circ \mathcal{M}_j \right) \otimes \left(\text{Tr}_{\overline{C}_1^{j-1}} \circ \mathcal{P}_j \right) \\
&= (\mathcal{R}_j \circ \text{Tr}_{R_{j-1}}) \otimes (\mathcal{P}'_j \circ \text{Tr}_{\overline{C}_1^{j-1}}) \\
&= \mathcal{R}'_j \circ \text{Tr}_{R_{j-1} \overline{C}_1^{j-1}},
\end{aligned} \tag{56}$$

as desired. In the above, the first line holds because the partial trace $\text{Tr}_{D_j \overline{\overline{C}}_j}$ removes all registers generated by \mathcal{N}_j after applying $\mathcal{M}_j \otimes \mathcal{P}_j$, the second line is just a channel regrouping, the third line holds by the NS condition on \mathcal{M}_j in Definition 9 of GEATT channels (and collapsing part of the pinching channel with the partial trace), and the last line is again a channel regrouping.

These channels \mathcal{N}_j have the critical property that the state $\mathcal{N}_n \circ \dots \circ \mathcal{N}_1[\omega^0]$ would be identical to $\mathcal{M}_n \circ \dots \circ \mathcal{M}_1[\omega^0]$ on all registers that are present in the latter.⁹ Therefore, we can now write $\rho = \mathcal{N}_n \circ \dots \circ \mathcal{N}_1[\omega^0]$ without danger of ambiguity with respect to the state ρ in the theorem statement, by viewing the former as just an extension of the latter. Then according to a main result of [MFS+22b] (Lemma 3.6)¹⁰, since \mathcal{N}_j are a sequence of GEAT channels, we have

$$H_\alpha(D_1^n S_1^n \overline{\overline{C}}_1^n | \widehat{C}_1^n E_n)_\rho \geq \sum_j \inf_{\nu' \in \Sigma'_j} H_{\widehat{\alpha}}(D_j S_j \overline{\overline{C}}_j | \widehat{C}_1^j E_j \widetilde{E})_{\nu'} \tag{57}$$

where Σ'_j denotes the set of all states that could be produced by \mathcal{N}_j acting on some initial state $\omega'_{R_{j-1} E_{j-1} \overline{C}_1^{j-1} \widehat{C}_1^{j-1} \widetilde{E}}$.¹¹ However, recalling that the $\overline{\overline{C}}_j$ register produced by each \mathcal{N}_j channel is always just a copy of the \overline{C}_j register (and also that in the final state, we still have $\overline{\overline{C}}_1^n = \overline{C}_1^n$ because the subsequent channels do not disturb the classical \overline{C}_j registers), this is equivalent to

$$H_\alpha(D_1^n S_1^n \overline{C}_1^n | \widehat{C}_1^n E_n)_\rho \geq \sum_j \inf_{\nu' \in \Sigma'_j} H_{\widehat{\alpha}}(D_j S_j \overline{C}_j | \widehat{C}_1^j E_j \widetilde{E})_{\nu'}. \tag{58}$$

⁹While \mathcal{N}_j performs a pinching channel on $\overline{\overline{C}}_1^{j-1} \widehat{C}_1^{j-1}$ in contrast to \mathcal{M}_j which acts as the identity on those registers, this does not make a difference for states produced by applying those channels in sequence, because $\mathcal{N}_{j-1} \circ \dots \circ \mathcal{N}_1[\omega^0]$ is always already classical on $\overline{\overline{C}}_1^{j-1} \widehat{C}_1^{j-1}$. Similarly, the second and third steps performed by \mathcal{N}_j do not disturb the classical registers they act on.

¹⁰That lemma is only stated for $\alpha \in (1, 2)$, but inspecting the proof shows that it also holds at $\alpha = 2$ under the convention that we take $\widehat{\alpha} = \infty$ in that case. Alternatively, we can just take the $\alpha \rightarrow 2$ limit at the end of the proof, exploiting continuity of Rényi divergences with respect to α ([Tom16, Corollary 4.2] together with the fact that convex functions are continuous on the interior of their domain).

¹¹In this step, let us take \widetilde{E} to be of large enough dimension to be a purifying register for the input registers in the \mathcal{N}_j scenario as well; this can be achieved without loss of generality by expanding its dimension as necessary.

We shall now bound the terms on the right-hand-side in terms of quantities involving only the original channels \mathcal{M}_j . Consider any j and take any state $\nu'_{D_j \bar{C}_j S_j R_j E_j \bar{C}_1^j \widehat{C}_1^j \widetilde{E}} = \mathcal{N}_j \left[\omega'_{R_{j-1} E_{j-1} \bar{C}_1^{j-1} \widehat{C}_1^{j-1} \widetilde{E}} \right]$ (for some ω') in the corresponding infimum. This state is classical on $\bar{C}_1^{j-1} \widehat{C}_1^{j-1}$; furthermore, recalling that \mathcal{N}_j always begins by applying a pinching channel on $\bar{C}_1^{j-1} \widehat{C}_1^{j-1}$, we can also take the input state ω' to be classical on $\bar{C}_1^{j-1} \widehat{C}_1^{j-1}$ without loss of generality. Letting $\nu'_{|\bar{c}_1^{j-1} \hat{c}_1^{j-1}}$ and $\omega'_{|\bar{c}_1^{j-1} \hat{c}_1^{j-1}}$ denote the respective states conditioned on¹² $\bar{C}_1^{j-1} \widehat{C}_1^{j-1} = \bar{c}_1^{j-1} \hat{c}_1^{j-1}$, it is straightforward to see that we also have (since \mathcal{N}_j does not disturb $\bar{C}_1^{j-1} \widehat{C}_1^{j-1}$ if it is already classical):

$$\nu'_{|\bar{c}_1^{j-1} \hat{c}_1^{j-1}} = \mathcal{N}_j \left[\omega'_{|\bar{c}_1^{j-1} \hat{c}_1^{j-1}} \right], \quad (59)$$

a property we will need later in our proof. For now, we observe that since ν' is a mixture of the conditional states $\nu'_{|\bar{c}_1^{j-1} \hat{c}_1^{j-1}}$, we can lower bound it by the “worst-case” term in the mixture, as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} H_{\hat{\alpha}}(D_j S_j \bar{C}_j | \widehat{C}_1^j E_j \widetilde{E})_{\nu'} &\geq H_{\hat{\alpha}}(D_j S_j \bar{C}_j | \bar{C}_1^{j-1} \widehat{C}_1^j E_j \widetilde{E})_{\nu'} \\ &\geq \min_{|\bar{c}_1^{j-1} \hat{c}_1^{j-1}} H_{\hat{\alpha}}(D_j S_j \bar{C}_j | \widehat{C}_j E_j \widetilde{E})_{\nu'_{|\bar{c}_1^{j-1} \hat{c}_1^{j-1}}}, \end{aligned} \quad (60)$$

where the first inequality is by data-processing (Fact 1) and the second inequality holds by considering Fact 2. (Alternatively, one can directly apply quasi-convexity of Rényi entropy, as described in [KW20, Proposition 7.35].) Now consider any particular value of $\bar{c}_1^{j-1} \hat{c}_1^{j-1}$, and for brevity in the upcoming calculation, let us write $\sigma := \nu'_{|\bar{c}_1^{j-1} \hat{c}_1^{j-1}}$. This is classical on $\bar{C}_j \widehat{C}_j$, so we can follow a similar chain of calculations as in (32) to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} &H_{\hat{\alpha}}(D_j S_j \bar{C}_j | \widehat{C}_j E_j \widetilde{E})_{\sigma} \\ &= \frac{1}{1 - \hat{\alpha}} \log \left(\sum_{\bar{c}_j \hat{c}_j} \sigma(\bar{c}_j \hat{c}_j)^{\hat{\alpha}} \sigma(\hat{c}_j)^{1 - \hat{\alpha}} 2^{(1 - \hat{\alpha})} \left(H_{\hat{\alpha}}(D_j)_{\sigma_{|\bar{c}_j \hat{c}_j}} - D_{\hat{\alpha}} \left(\sigma_{S_j E_j \widetilde{E} | \bar{c}_j \hat{c}_j} \left\| \mathbb{I}_{S_j} \otimes \sigma_{E_j \widetilde{E} | \hat{c}_j} \right\| \right) \right) \right) \\ &\geq \frac{1}{1 - \hat{\alpha}} \log \left(\sum_{\bar{c}_j \hat{c}_j} \sigma(\bar{c}_j \hat{c}_j)^{\hat{\alpha}} \sigma(\hat{c}_j)^{1 - \hat{\alpha}} 2^{(1 - \hat{\alpha})} \left(M - f_{|\bar{c}_1^{j-1} \hat{c}_1^{j-1}}(\bar{c}_j \hat{c}_j) - D_{\hat{\alpha}} \left(\sigma_{S_j E_j \widetilde{E} | \bar{c}_j \hat{c}_j} \left\| \mathbb{I}_{S_j} \otimes \sigma_{E_j \widetilde{E} | \hat{c}_j} \right\| \right) \right) \right) \\ &= M + H_{\hat{\alpha}}^{f_{|\bar{c}_1^{j-1} \hat{c}_1^{j-1}}} (S_j \bar{C}_j | \widehat{C}_j E_j \widetilde{E})_{\sigma}, \end{aligned} \quad (61)$$

where the inequality in the third line holds because the expression is monotone increasing with respect to the $H_{\hat{\alpha}}(D_j)_{\sigma_{|\bar{c}_j \hat{c}_j}}$ terms (for any $\hat{\alpha} \in (0, 1) \cup (1, \infty)$), so we can apply the lower bound in (55). (More precisely, in order to apply that lower bound, we are recalling that $\sigma := \nu'_{|\bar{c}_1^{j-1} \hat{c}_1^{j-1}} = \mathcal{N}_j \left[\omega'_{|\bar{c}_1^{j-1} \hat{c}_1^{j-1}} \right]$ by (59), and therefore the D_j register in σ has indeed been produced by a read-and-prepare channel satisfying (55), acting on a state in which $\bar{C}_1^{j-1} \widehat{C}_1^{j-1} = \bar{c}_1^{j-1} \hat{c}_1^{j-1}$.)

Critically (for a fixed $\bar{c}_1^{j-1} \hat{c}_1^{j-1}$), the only registers involved in this lower bound are the registers $S_j \bar{C}_j \widehat{C}_j E_j \widetilde{E}$ that can be produced by \mathcal{M}_j (with an extension to an identity channel on \widetilde{E}).¹³

¹²For technical accuracy in the following steps, these conditional states should be interpreted to still include the registers $\bar{C}_1^{j-1} \widehat{C}_1^{j-1}$, though with those registers simply taking the fixed value $\bar{c}_1^{j-1} \hat{c}_1^{j-1}$.

¹³While the QES $f_{|\bar{c}_1^{j-1} \hat{c}_1^{j-1}}$ does depend on $\bar{c}_1^{j-1} \hat{c}_1^{j-1}$, its value is fixed by the initial choices in the theorem, not by the state.

Furthermore, recall that $\nu'_{|\hat{c}_1^{j-1}\hat{c}_1^{j-1}}$ can be produced by \mathcal{N}_j according to (59), so we can write

$$\begin{aligned} H_{\hat{\alpha}}^{f_{|\hat{c}_1^{j-1}\hat{c}_1^{j-1}}} (S_j \bar{C}_j | \widehat{C}_j E_j \widetilde{E})_{\nu'_{|\hat{c}_1^{j-1}\hat{c}_1^{j-1}}} &= H_{\hat{\alpha}}^{f_{|\hat{c}_1^{j-1}\hat{c}_1^{j-1}}} (S_j \bar{C}_j | \widehat{C}_j E_j \widetilde{E})_{\mathcal{N}_j \left[\omega'_{|\hat{c}_1^{j-1}\hat{c}_1^{j-1}} \right]} \\ &= H_{\hat{\alpha}}^{f_{|\hat{c}_1^{j-1}\hat{c}_1^{j-1}}} (S_j \bar{C}_j | \widehat{C}_j E_j \widetilde{E})_{\mathcal{M}_j[\omega]}, \end{aligned} \quad (62)$$

where ω is just $\omega'_{|\hat{c}_1^{j-1}\hat{c}_1^{j-1}}$ with $\bar{C}_1^{j-1} \widehat{C}_1^{j-1}$ traced out. This is now only a function of \mathcal{M}_j evaluated on some input state $\omega_{R_{j-1} E_{j-1} \widetilde{E}}$, and the specified QES values. Putting together the above, we conclude

$$\inf_{\nu' \in \Sigma_j} H_{\hat{\alpha}}(D_j S_j \bar{C}_j | \widehat{C}_1^j E_j \widetilde{E})_{\nu'} \geq M + \min_{\hat{c}_1^{j-1} \hat{c}_1^{j-1}} \inf_{\nu \in \Sigma_j} H_{\hat{\alpha}}^{f_{|\hat{c}_1^{j-1}\hat{c}_1^{j-1}}} (S_j \bar{C}_j | \widehat{C}_j E_j \widetilde{E})_{\nu}, \quad (63)$$

giving us a lower bound on the right-hand-side of (58) that only involves the original GEAT channels \mathcal{M}_j .

Let us now turn to the left-hand-side of (58). Again performing calculations analogous to (32), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} &H_{\alpha}(D_1^n S_1^n \bar{C}_1^n | \widehat{C}_1^n E_n)_{\rho} \\ &= \frac{1}{1-\alpha} \log \left(\sum_{\bar{c}_1^n \hat{c}_1^n} \rho(\bar{c}_1^n \hat{c}_1^n)^{\alpha} \rho(\hat{c}_1^n)^{1-\alpha} 2^{(1-\alpha) \left(H_{\alpha}(D_1^n)_{\rho_{|\bar{c}_1^n \hat{c}_1^n}} - D_{\alpha}(\rho_{S_j E_n | \bar{c}_1^n \hat{c}_1^n} \| \mathbb{I}_{S_j} \otimes \rho_{E_n | \hat{c}_1^n}) \right)} \right) \\ &= \frac{1}{1-\alpha} \log \left(\sum_{\bar{c}_1^n \hat{c}_1^n} \rho(\bar{c}_1^n \hat{c}_1^n)^{\alpha} \rho(\hat{c}_1^n)^{1-\alpha} 2^{(1-\alpha) \left(\sum_j H_{\alpha}(D_j)_{\rho_{|\bar{c}_1^j \hat{c}_1^j}} - D_{\alpha}(\rho_{S_j E_n | \bar{c}_1^n \hat{c}_1^n} \| \mathbb{I}_{S_j} \otimes \rho_{E_n | \hat{c}_1^n}) \right)} \right) \\ &\leq \frac{1}{1-\alpha} \log \left(\sum_{\bar{c}_1^n \hat{c}_1^n} \rho(\bar{c}_1^n \hat{c}_1^n)^{\alpha} \rho(\hat{c}_1^n)^{1-\alpha} 2^{(1-\alpha) \left(\sum_j \left(M - f_{|\bar{c}_1^{j-1} \hat{c}_1^{j-1}}(\bar{c}_j \hat{c}_j) + 2^{-\frac{M}{2}} \log e \right) - D_{\alpha}(\rho_{S_j E_n | \bar{c}_1^n \hat{c}_1^n} \| \mathbb{I}_{S_j} \otimes \rho_{E_n | \hat{c}_1^n}) \right)} \right) \\ &= \frac{1}{1-\alpha} \log \left(\sum_{\bar{c}_1^n \hat{c}_1^n} \rho(\bar{c}_1^n \hat{c}_1^n)^{\alpha} \rho(\hat{c}_1^n)^{1-\alpha} 2^{(1-\alpha) \left(nM - f_{\text{full}}(\bar{c}_1^n \hat{c}_1^n) + n2^{-\frac{M}{2}} \log e - D_{\alpha}(\rho_{S_j E_n | \bar{c}_1^n \hat{c}_1^n} \| \mathbb{I}_{S_j} \otimes \rho_{E_n | \hat{c}_1^n}) \right)} \right) \\ &= nM + H_{\alpha}^{f_{\text{full}}}(S_1^n \bar{C}_1^n | \widehat{C}_1^n E_n)_{\rho} + n2^{-\frac{M}{2}} \log e. \end{aligned} \quad (64)$$

In the above, the third line holds because each D_j register is produced by independently applying a read-and-prepare channel on $\bar{C}_1^j \widehat{C}_1^j$, and therefore we have $\rho_{D_1^n | \bar{c}_1^n \hat{c}_1^n} = \bigotimes_{j=1}^n \rho_{D_j | \bar{c}_1^j \hat{c}_1^j}$. The fourth line holds because the expression is again monotone increasing with respect to all the $H_{\hat{\alpha}}(D_j)$ terms (for any $\alpha \in (0, 1) \cup (1, \infty)$), so we can bound it using the upper bound in (55). The fifth line is simply substituting the definition of $f_{\text{full}}(\bar{c}_1^n \hat{c}_1^n)$ in (49).

Substituting (63) and (64) into (58), we see that the nM terms can be cancelled off, yielding the conclusion

$$H_{\alpha}^{f_{\text{full}}}(S_1^n \bar{C}_1^n | \widehat{C}_1^n E_n)_{\rho} \geq \sum_j \min_{\hat{c}_1^{j-1} \hat{c}_1^{j-1}} \inf_{\nu \in \Sigma_j} H_{\hat{\alpha}}^{f_{|\hat{c}_1^{j-1}\hat{c}_1^{j-1}}} (S_j \bar{C}_j | \widehat{C}_j E_j \widetilde{E})_{\nu} - n2^{-\frac{M}{2}} \log e. \quad (65)$$

However, since this bound holds for arbitrary (sufficiently large) M , we can take the $M \rightarrow \infty$ limit so the $2^{-\frac{M}{2}}$ term vanishes, yielding the desired final bound (50).

To obtain (52), note that by Lemma 6, each QES $\hat{f}_{|\hat{c}_1^{j-1}\hat{c}_1^{j-1}}$ as defined in (51) satisfies

$$\inf_{\nu \in \Sigma_j} H_{\hat{\alpha}}^{f_{|\hat{c}_1^{j-1}\hat{c}_1^{j-1}}} (S_j \bar{C}_j | \hat{C}_j E_j \tilde{E})_{\nu} = \inf_{\nu \in \Sigma_j} H_{\hat{\alpha}}^{f_{|\hat{c}_1^{j-1}\hat{c}_1^{j-1}}} (S_j \bar{C}_j | \hat{C}_j E_j \tilde{E})_{\nu} - \kappa_{\hat{c}_1^{j-1}\hat{c}_1^{j-1}} = 0, \quad (66)$$

and thus by simply applying (50) for these QES-s instead, we obtain (52). \square

Note that without further conditions on the channels or QES choices, the bound in the above result is almost tight (for α close to 1), since it is almost saturated by an IID example. Specifically, if the action of each channel \mathcal{M}_j is simply to independently generate a fresh copy of some fixed state σ on registers $S_j \bar{C}_j \hat{C}_j \check{E}_j$ and append \check{E}_j to E_{j-1} , then the final state is an IID state $\rho = \sigma^{\otimes n}$. Hence if all the QES-s are identical to a single QES f , we immediately get

$$H_{\alpha}^{f_{\text{full}}} (S_1^n \bar{C}_1^n | \hat{C}_1^n E_n)_{\rho} = n H_{\alpha}^f (S_1 \bar{C}_1 | \hat{C}_1 \check{E}_1)_{\sigma} = \sum_j \inf_{\nu \in \Sigma_j} H_{\alpha}^f (S_j \bar{C}_j | \hat{C}_j E_j \tilde{E})_{\nu}, \quad (67)$$

which only differs from the bound (50) by having α in place of $\hat{\alpha}$. However, if we write $\alpha = 1 + \mu$ for some $\mu > 0$ then we see

$$\hat{\alpha} = \frac{1}{1 - \mu} = 1 + \frac{\mu}{1 - \mu} = 1 + \mu + O(\mu^2), \quad (68)$$

so it only differs from α by a second-order correction (which becomes a ‘‘third-order’’ correction for the purposes of finite-size analysis; see the later discussion in Sec. 5 leading up to (94)). Hence in an IID scenario, Theorem 1 is tight up to the difference (68). In fact, in Sec. 6.1 we show that under the stricter Markov conditions in the original EAT, this change of Rényi parameter can be avoided entirely, hence producing a bound exactly identical to the QEF-chaining property in [ZFK20].

There might remain some room for improvement in scenarios where the QES-s are different in each round; for instance, at a glance it perhaps seems a bit too pessimistic to take the *worst*-case value over $\hat{c}_1^{j-1}\hat{c}_1^{j-1}$ in (50). However, inspecting our above proof shows that while this minimum first appears in the bound (60), it is easy to construct an initial state ω that saturates that bound, using (59). Hence to improve it, it seems one would have to restrict the infimum in the original ‘‘GEAT without testing’’ bound (57) from [MFS+22b], which is a challenging prospect given the proof methods in that work (unless perhaps one could design the \mathcal{N}_j channels in a different way such that the minimum over $\hat{c}_1^{j-1}\hat{c}_1^{j-1}$ does not occur at all).

We highlight that computation of the $\kappa_{\hat{c}_1^{j-1}\hat{c}_1^{j-1}}$ values in practice might be aided by the following observation, which allows it to be rewritten as a convex optimization (and is in fact critical for our later proofs in Sec. 5). In the following lemma, for flexibility in potential applications, we denote the input space for the channel as a register \tilde{Q} that does not need to straightforwardly correspond to the input spaces of GEATT channels. We have also not included a ‘‘memory register’’ R in the output of the channel, since that is not necessary for the lemma statement and our subsequent proofs.

Lemma 7. *Let \mathcal{M} be a channel $\tilde{Q} \rightarrow SE\bar{C}\hat{C}$ where the output is always classical on $\bar{C}\hat{C}$, and let f be a QES on $\bar{C}\hat{C}$. Let \tilde{E} be a register such that $\dim(\tilde{Q}) \leq \dim(\tilde{E})$, and let Pur be a purifying function for \tilde{Q} onto \tilde{E} (Definition 10). Then for any state $\omega_{\tilde{Q}\tilde{E}}$,*

$$H_{\alpha}^f (S\bar{C} | \hat{C}E\tilde{E})_{\mathcal{M}[\omega_{\tilde{Q}\tilde{E}}]} \geq H_{\alpha}^f (S\bar{C} | \hat{C}E\tilde{E})_{\mathcal{M}[\text{Pur}(\omega_{\tilde{Q}})]}, \quad (69)$$

with equality if $\omega_{\tilde{Q}\tilde{E}}$ is pure, and furthermore for $\alpha \in (1, \infty)$, the right-hand-side is a convex function of $\omega_{\tilde{Q}}$.

Proof. If ω_{QE} is pure, then by using the isometric equivalence of purifications along with the corresponding invariance of QES-entropies (one instance of equality condition in Lemma 3), we conclude the equality condition in Eq. (69). If ω_{QE} is not pure, then there exists a purification of it such that $\text{Tr}_{E'}[\omega_{QE E'}] = \omega_{QE}$. Thus, we have the following:

$$\begin{aligned} H_\alpha^f(S\bar{C}|\widehat{C}E\widetilde{E})_{\mathcal{M}[\omega_{QE}]} &= H_\alpha^f(S\bar{C}|\widehat{C}E\widetilde{E})_{\mathcal{M}\circ\text{Tr}_{E'}[\omega_{QE E'}]} \\ &\geq H_\alpha^f(S\bar{C}|\widehat{C}E\widetilde{E}E')_{\mathcal{M}[\omega_{QE E'}]} \\ &= H_\alpha^f(S\bar{C}|\widehat{C}E\widetilde{E})_{\mathcal{M}[\text{Pur}(\omega_{QE})]}, \end{aligned} \quad (70)$$

where the second line holds by applying Lemma 3, and noting that the partial trace $\text{Tr}_{E'}[\cdot]$ and \mathcal{M} commute; the last line follows by noting that purifications are isometrically equivalent, and the equality condition in Lemma 3.

To prove the convexity property, for any two states $\omega_Q^{(1)}, \omega_Q^{(2)}$, and probability distribution $\{p(i)\}_{i=0}^1$, we construct the following state, which is easily verified to be an extension of the ‘‘averaged’’ state $\omega_{\widetilde{Q}} := \sum_{i=0}^1 p(i)\omega_Q^{(i)}$:

$$\omega_{\widetilde{Q}E\widetilde{F}} := \sum_{i=0}^1 p(i) \text{Pur}\left(\omega_Q^{(i)}\right) \otimes |i\rangle\langle i|_{\widetilde{F}}. \quad (71)$$

Now consider the state $\text{Pur}(\omega_{\widetilde{Q}})$. Since this is a purification of $\omega_{\widetilde{Q}}$ onto \widetilde{E} , there exists a channel $\mathcal{E} : \widetilde{E} \rightarrow \widetilde{E}\widetilde{F}$ such that

$$\mathcal{E}\left[\text{Pur}(\omega_{\widetilde{Q}})\right] = \omega_{\widetilde{Q}E\widetilde{F}}. \quad (72)$$

Therefore, we can bound the function value at the ‘‘averaged’’ state $\omega_{\widetilde{Q}}$ via

$$\begin{aligned} H_\alpha^f(S\bar{C}|\widehat{C}E\widetilde{E})_{\mathcal{M}[\text{Pur}(\omega_{\widetilde{Q}})]} &\leq H_\alpha^f(S\bar{C}|\widehat{C}E\widetilde{E}\widetilde{F})_{\mathcal{E}\circ\mathcal{M}[\text{Pur}(\omega_{\widetilde{Q}})]} \\ &= H_\alpha^f(S\bar{C}|\widehat{C}E\widetilde{E}\widetilde{F})_{\mathcal{M}\circ\mathcal{E}[\text{Pur}(\omega_{\widetilde{Q}})]} \\ &= \frac{1}{1-\alpha} \log \left(\sum_{i=0}^1 p(i) 2^{(1-\alpha) \left(H_\alpha^f(S\bar{C}|\widehat{C}E\widetilde{E})_{\mathcal{M}[\text{Pur}(\omega_Q^{(i)})]} \right)} \right) \\ &\leq \sum_{i=0}^1 p(i) H_\alpha^f(S\bar{C}|\widehat{C}E\widetilde{E})_{\mathcal{M}[\text{Pur}(\omega_Q^{(i)})]}, \end{aligned} \quad (73)$$

as desired, where the first line is due to the data-processing property in Lemma 3, the second line holds since \mathcal{E} and \mathcal{M} commute, the third line follows from Eqs. (71)–(72) and Lemma 4, and the last line follows by concavity of log function, and noting $\alpha \in (1, \infty)$. \square

Remark 2. The only properties of H_α^f that were used in the above proof were data-processing (Lemma 3) and the fact that for $\alpha > 1$ it is ‘‘convex when conditioned on a labelling register’’, as in, for a state classical on Z , we have

$$H_\alpha^f(Q\bar{C}|\widehat{C}Q'Z)_\rho \leq \sum_z \rho(z) H_\alpha^f(Q\bar{C}|\widehat{C}Q')_{\rho|_z}, \quad (74)$$

which follows from the conditioning-on-classical-registers property (Lemma 4). Therefore, the proof immediately generalizes to any other entropy with the same properties, such as the Petz or sandwiched Rényi entropies for $\alpha \geq 1$ (as long as α is within the regime where data-processing holds; see [Tom16, FL13, BFT17]), which includes the von Neumann entropy.

Note that including the “labelling” register Z in the conditioning is vital for (74) to hold. If it is omitted, then e.g. for the case of von Neumann entropy, we know that $H(Q\bar{C}|\widehat{C}Q')_\rho$ is a concave function of ρ and hence the general inequality is instead the reverse direction $H(Q\bar{C}|\widehat{C}Q')_\rho \geq \sum_z \rho(z)H(Q\bar{C}|\widehat{C}Q')_{\rho|_z}$; i.e. the only reason we have the bound (74) for that case is that including Z in the conditioning makes it become an equality.

4.3 Applications

We now describe some applications of Theorem 1 by itself (without yet reducing it to the simpler form (2) outlined previously). Note that the key ideas in this section were already established in [HB24, ZFK20]; here we just provide an exposition of the main steps for completeness.

4.3.1 The [HB24] approach (variable-length protocols)

We first describe how [HB24] apply bounds of the form in Theorem 1 to protocols that produce an output key of variable length. The basic idea is that if the \bar{C}_1^n registers are trivial and we have the “normalized QES” bound (52) from Theorem 1 (i.e. we have $H_\alpha^{\hat{f}_{\text{full}}}(S_1^n|\widehat{C}_1^n E_n)_\rho \geq 0$), then their analysis shows that a variable-length secret key can usually be obtained by looking at the value \hat{c}_1^n on the publicly announced registers \widehat{C}_1^n , then computing $\hat{f}_{\text{full}}(\hat{c}_1^n)$ and hashing to a key length determined by that value. (Strictly speaking this needs a property that f -weighted Rényi entropies are lower bounded by QES-entropies; see Lemma 15 later.) This usually suffices for device-dependent security proofs. On the other hand, in DI security proofs, the \bar{C}_1^n registers are usually not trivial [AFRV19, LLR+21, ZFK20, TSB+22]. In that case, if we only have a bound on $H_\alpha^{\hat{f}_{\text{full}}}(S_1^n\bar{C}_1^n|\widehat{C}_1^n E_n)_\rho$, then it does not seem straightforward to immediately apply their proof approach to obtain variable-length security.

Still, one of the results we derived above provides a possible solution — specifically, Lemma 5 lets us convert this to a lower bound on $H_{\alpha'}^{\hat{f}_{\text{full}}}(S_1^n|\bar{C}_1^n\widehat{C}_1^n E_n)_\rho$ instead (see also Remark 11), after which we can apply the preceding analysis.¹⁴ Unfortunately, this may be somewhat suboptimal as the change in Rényi parameters here is somewhat significant (see (90) later), unlike the change from α to $\hat{\alpha}$. It might potentially be better to find a more “direct” analysis that uses a bound on $H_\alpha^{\hat{f}_{\text{full}}}(S_1^n\bar{C}_1^n|\widehat{C}_1^n E_n)_\rho$ to produce a variable-length secret key. We leave this interesting question for future work, though one caveat is that for protocols such as DIQKD (though potentially not DIRE), the \bar{C}_1^n registers have to be somehow communicated between Alice and Bob to perform parameter estimation, and hence it might be necessary anyway to “move” the \bar{C}_1^n registers into the conditioning systems somewhere in the analysis.

Note that in the above procedure, it might appear that computing $\hat{f}_{\text{full}}(\hat{c}_1^n)$ (more generally $\hat{f}_{\text{full}}(\bar{c}_1^n\hat{c}_1^n)$) could be challenging, because by the definition (51), the function \hat{f}_{full} depends on specifying all the QES-s $f_{|\bar{c}_1^{j-1}\hat{c}_1^{j-1}}$ across different rounds, and also all the $\kappa_{\bar{c}_1^{j-1}\hat{c}_1^{j-1}}$ values (each of which

¹⁴While the resulting lower bound on $H_{\alpha'}^{\hat{f}_{\text{full}}}(S_1^n|\bar{C}_1^n\widehat{C}_1^n E_n)_\rho$ is not zero, this is easily addressed by either using Lemma 6 to “normalize” the lower bound to zero, or equivalently just modifying the analysis to hash to a shorter key.

is some minimization problem). However, [ZFK20] presented the following critical simplification (albeit for the purposes of applying their results for fixed-length protocols): when applying the above procedure in practice, one only needs to compute $\hat{f}_{\text{full}}(\bar{c}_1^n \hat{c}_1^n)$ for the single value of $\bar{c}_1^n \hat{c}_1^n$ that actually occurred when the protocol was performed. Therefore, one can instead apply the following procedure:

1. First, implement the protocol without choosing any QES-s beforehand. Look at the value $\bar{c}_1^n \hat{c}_1^n$ that actually occurred on the registers $\bar{C}_1^n \hat{C}_1^n$.
2. For each j , apply any arbitrary procedure that looks at the values $\bar{c}_1^{j-1} \hat{c}_1^{j-1}$ that actually occurred, then (deterministically) returns a single choice of QES on $\bar{C}_j \hat{C}_j$. Denote this QES as $f_{|\bar{c}_1^{j-1} \hat{c}_1^{j-1}}$, and compute (or lower bound) the corresponding $\kappa_{\bar{c}_1^{j-1} \hat{c}_1^{j-1}}$ value.
3. The values in the preceding step suffice to determine (or lower bound) $\hat{f}_{\text{full}}(\bar{c}_1^n \hat{c}_1^n)$, so compute it and proceed with the privacy amplification.

With the above procedure, for each round we only need to choose the *single* QES $f_{|\bar{c}_1^{j-1} \hat{c}_1^{j-1}}$ (and compute $\kappa_{\bar{c}_1^{j-1} \hat{c}_1^{j-1}}$) corresponding to the value of $\bar{c}_1^{j-1} \hat{c}_1^{j-1}$ that actually occurred in the protocol, i.e. we do not need to explicitly specify QES-s $f_{|\bar{c}_1^{j-1} \hat{c}_1^{j-1}}$ or compute $\kappa_{\bar{c}_1^{j-1} \hat{c}_1^{j-1}}$ for all the other $\bar{c}_1^{j-1} \hat{c}_1^{j-1}$ values. Note, however, that the Theorem 1 bound is entirely valid to apply in this context, because this procedure does indeed specify on an abstract level a well-defined QES $f_{|\bar{c}_1^{j-1} \hat{c}_1^{j-1}}$ and value $\kappa_{\bar{c}_1^{j-1} \hat{c}_1^{j-1}}$ for every possible $\bar{c}_1^{j-1} \hat{c}_1^{j-1}$ value, even if they did not actually occur in the protocol. (Qualitatively, we are exploiting the fact that while the abstract *function* \hat{f}_{full} depends on all those quantities, in the physical protocol we only need to evaluate the single value $\hat{f}_{\text{full}}(\bar{c}_1^n \hat{c}_1^n)$, which only depends on a subset of those quantities.)

We have not yet specified how one should design a procedure that chooses the QES-s $f_{|\bar{c}_1^{j-1} \hat{c}_1^{j-1}}$ (while our above description is valid for any such procedure, we would of course want one that produces keyrates that are as high as possible). In [ZFK20], some methods were developed for this purpose, including the option of “adaptively” choosing QES-s $f_{|\bar{c}_1^{j-1} \hat{c}_1^{j-1}}$ based on the past observations $\bar{c}_1^{j-1} \hat{c}_1^{j-1}$ for each j , which may be useful for handling time-varying behaviour. However, in this work we describe an alternative procedure in Sec. 5 (see Remark 7) that may be simpler and easier to apply. Also, note that if we ignore the option to have them depend on past observations $\bar{c}_1^{j-1} \hat{c}_1^{j-1}$, so all of them are equal to a single QES f , then [HB24] also describes a procedure for choosing f . Still, we believe that the approach we present in Remark 7 should perform better in the finite-size regime, though we do not analyze this rigorously; furthermore, our approach also gives the option for “adaptive” QES choices as mentioned above, at least in principle. We defer further discussion to that section.

4.3.2 The [ZFK20] approach (fixed-length protocols)

Alternatively, [ZFK20] described how to apply bounds of the form in Theorem 1 when we are instead interested in entropy conditioned on an event, as is the case for protocols that simply make an accept/abort decision and produce a key of fixed length if they accept. (More precisely, their approach was based on QEFs; here we verify that it generalizes to QES-entropies as well.)

To that end, we first state the following lemma, which is a slight generalization of [MFS+22b, Lemma 4.5].

Lemma 8. Consider any state $\rho_{SEDC\widehat{C}}$ that is classical on $\widehat{C\bar{C}}$, and has the form

$$\rho_{SEDC\widehat{C}} = \sum_{\bar{c}\hat{c} \in \Omega} \rho(\bar{c}\hat{c}) |\bar{c}\hat{c}\rangle \langle \bar{c}\hat{c}|_{\widehat{C\bar{C}}} \otimes \rho_{SE|\bar{c}\hat{c}} \otimes \rho_{D|\bar{c}\hat{c}}, \quad (75)$$

with Ω being a subset of the alphabet of registers $\widehat{C\bar{C}}$. Then for any $\alpha \in (1, \infty)$, we have the following:

$$H_\alpha^\uparrow(DS\bar{C}|\widehat{C}E)_\rho \leq H_\alpha^\uparrow(S\bar{C}|\widehat{C}E)_\rho + \max_{\bar{c}\hat{c} \in \Omega} H_\alpha(D)_{\rho|\bar{c}\hat{c}}, \quad (76)$$

$$H_\alpha(DS\bar{C}|\widehat{C}E)_\rho \leq H_\alpha(S\bar{C}|\widehat{C}E)_\rho + \max_{\bar{c}\hat{c} \in \Omega} H_\alpha(D)_{\rho|\bar{c}\hat{c}}. \quad (77)$$

Proof. Let $\sigma_{\widehat{C}E}$ be the optimizer in Definition 6 for the conditional entropy in the LHS of Eq. (76), i.e.,

$$H_\alpha^\uparrow(DS\bar{C}|\widehat{C}E)_\rho = -D_\alpha(\rho_{DSE\widehat{C\bar{C}}}\|\mathbb{I}_{DS\bar{C}} \otimes \sigma_{\widehat{C}E}). \quad (78)$$

From Fact 2, we have

$$\begin{aligned} H_\alpha^\uparrow(DS\bar{C}|\widehat{C}E)_\rho &= \frac{1}{1-\alpha} \log \left(\sum_{\bar{c}\hat{c} \in \Omega} \rho(\bar{c}\hat{c})^\alpha \sigma(\hat{c})^{1-\alpha} 2^{(\alpha-1)D_\alpha(\rho_{DSE|\bar{c}\hat{c}}\|\mathbb{I}_{DS} \otimes \sigma_{E|\hat{c}})} \right) \\ &= \frac{1}{1-\alpha} \log \left(\sum_{\bar{c}\hat{c} \in \Omega} \rho(\bar{c}\hat{c})^\alpha \sigma(\hat{c})^{1-\alpha} 2^{(\alpha-1)(D_\alpha(\rho_{D|\bar{c}\hat{c}}\|\mathbb{I}_D) + D_\alpha(\rho_{SE|\bar{c}\hat{c}}\|\mathbb{I}_S \otimes \sigma_{E|\hat{c}}))} \right) \\ &\leq \frac{1}{1-\alpha} \log \left(\min_{\bar{c}\hat{c} \in \Omega} \left[2^{(\alpha-1)D_\alpha(\rho_{D|\bar{c}\hat{c}}\|\mathbb{I}_D)} \right] \sum_{\bar{c}\hat{c} \in \Omega} \rho(\bar{c}\hat{c})^\alpha \sigma(\hat{c})^{1-\alpha} 2^{(\alpha-1)D_\alpha(\rho_{SE|\bar{c}\hat{c}}\|\mathbb{I}_S \otimes \sigma_{E|\hat{c}})} \right) \\ &\leq \max_{\bar{c}\hat{c} \in \Omega} H_\alpha(D)_{\rho|\bar{c}\hat{c}} + H_\alpha^\uparrow(S\bar{C}|\widehat{C}E)_\rho, \end{aligned} \quad (79)$$

where the second line follows from the fact that $\rho_{DSE|\bar{c}\hat{c}} = \rho_{D|\bar{c}\hat{c}} \otimes \rho_{SE|\bar{c}\hat{c}}$, and the last line follows from Definition 6, and concavity of log function. This yields the first bound (76). To get the second bound (77), simply repeat the above computations with σ replaced by ρ itself. \square

With the above lemma in hand, we have the following corollary.

Corollary 1. Consider the same conditions and notation as in Theorem 1. Suppose furthermore that the state ρ is of the form¹⁵ $p_\Omega \rho|_\Omega + (1-p_\Omega) \rho|_{\bar{\Omega}}$ for some $p_\Omega \in (0, 1]$ and normalized states $\rho|_\Omega, \rho|_{\bar{\Omega}}$, and let $\tilde{\Omega}$ denote the set of all values $\bar{c}_1^n \hat{c}_1^n$ that have nonzero probability in $\rho|_\Omega$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} H_\alpha^\uparrow(S_1^n \bar{C}_1^n | \widehat{C}_1^n E_n)_{\rho|_\Omega} &\geq \min_{\bar{c}_1^n \hat{c}_1^n \in \tilde{\Omega}} \hat{f}_{\text{full}}(\bar{c}_1^n \hat{c}_1^n) - \frac{\alpha}{\alpha-1} \log \frac{1}{p_\Omega} \\ &\geq \left(\sum_j \min_{\bar{c}_1^{j-1} \hat{c}_1^{j-1}} \kappa_{\bar{c}_1^{j-1} \hat{c}_1^{j-1}} \right) + \min_{\bar{c}_1^n \hat{c}_1^n \in \tilde{\Omega}} \hat{f}_{\text{full}}(\bar{c}_1^n \hat{c}_1^n) - \frac{\alpha}{\alpha-1} \log \frac{1}{p_\Omega} \end{aligned} \quad (80)$$

¹⁵We write this condition in this form to highlight that Ω does not have to be an event defined entirely on the state ρ itself, which allows more flexibility in applications. This is also why we use a separate symbol $\tilde{\Omega}$ to denote the set of values $\bar{c}_1^n \hat{c}_1^n$ such that $\rho|_\Omega(\bar{c}_1^n \hat{c}_1^n) > 0$.

Proof. Let $\mathcal{D} : \overline{C}_1^n \widehat{C}_1^n \rightarrow \overline{C}_1^n \widehat{C}_1^n D$ be a read-and-prepare channel in the sense of Lemma 1 for the QES $\hat{f}_{\text{full}}(\overline{c}_1^n \hat{c}_1^n)$ stated in the theorem conditions, i.e. it reads the registers $\overline{C}_1^n \widehat{C}_1^n$ and generates a corresponding state on register D . By linearity, we can write $\mathcal{D}[\rho] = p_\Omega \mathcal{D}[\rho|_\Omega] + (1 - p_\Omega) \mathcal{D}[\rho|_{\overline{\Omega}}]$ (in this proof, for clarity we explicitly write out the \mathcal{D} channels when extending the states with them). Note that by construction of the \mathcal{D} channel, the $\mathcal{D}[\rho|_\Omega]$ term is of the form (75), with the sum over $\overline{c}\hat{c}$ being restricted to $\tilde{\Omega}$ since that was the case in the original state $\rho|_\Omega$. Hence we are allowed to apply Lemma 8, obtaining

$$\begin{aligned}
H_\alpha^\uparrow(S_1^n \overline{C}_1^n | \widehat{C}_1^n E_n)_{\mathcal{D}[\rho|_\Omega]} &\geq H_\alpha^\uparrow(D S_1^n \overline{C}_1^n | \widehat{C}_1^n E_n)_{\mathcal{D}[\rho|_\Omega]} - \max_{\overline{c}_1^n \hat{c}_1^n \in \tilde{\Omega}} H_\alpha(D)_{\rho|_{\overline{c}_1^n \hat{c}_1^n}} \\
&\geq H_\alpha(D S_1^n \overline{C}_1^n | \widehat{C}_1^n E_n)_{\mathcal{D}[\rho]} - \max_{\overline{c}_1^n \hat{c}_1^n \in \tilde{\Omega}} H_\alpha(D)_{\rho|_{\overline{c}_1^n \hat{c}_1^n}} - \frac{\alpha}{\alpha - 1} \log \frac{1}{p_\Omega} \\
&= M + H_\alpha^{\hat{f}_{\text{full}}}(S_1^n \overline{C}_1^n | \widehat{C}_1^n E_n)_\rho - \max_{\overline{c}_1^n \hat{c}_1^n \in \tilde{\Omega}} H_\alpha(D)_{\rho|_{\overline{c}_1^n \hat{c}_1^n}} - \frac{\alpha}{\alpha - 1} \log \frac{1}{p_\Omega} \\
&= H_\alpha^{\hat{f}_{\text{full}}}(S_1^n \overline{C}_1^n | \widehat{C}_1^n E_n)_\rho + \min_{\overline{c}_1^n \hat{c}_1^n \in \tilde{\Omega}} \hat{f}_{\text{full}}(\overline{c}_1^n \hat{c}_1^n) - \frac{\alpha}{\alpha - 1} \log \frac{1}{p_\Omega} \\
&\geq \min_{\overline{c}_1^n \hat{c}_1^n \in \tilde{\Omega}} \hat{f}_{\text{full}}(\overline{c}_1^n \hat{c}_1^n) - \frac{\alpha}{\alpha - 1} \log \frac{1}{p_\Omega} \\
&= \min_{\overline{c}_1^n \hat{c}_1^n \in \tilde{\Omega}} \sum_{j=1}^n \left(f_{|\overline{c}_1^{j-1} \hat{c}_1^{j-1}|}(\overline{c}_j \hat{c}_j) + \kappa_{\overline{c}_1^{j-1} \hat{c}_1^{j-1}} \right) - \frac{\alpha}{\alpha - 1} \log \frac{1}{p_\Omega} \\
&\geq \left(\sum_{j=1}^n \min_{\overline{c}_1^{j-1} \hat{c}_1^{j-1}} \kappa_{\overline{c}_1^{j-1} \hat{c}_1^{j-1}} \right) + \min_{\overline{c}_1^n \hat{c}_1^n \in \tilde{\Omega}} \hat{f}_{\text{full}}(\overline{c}_1^n \hat{c}_1^n) - \frac{\alpha}{\alpha - 1} \log \frac{1}{p_\Omega}, \quad (81)
\end{aligned}$$

where the first line follows from Lemma 8, the second line is by applying [DFR20, Lemma B.5] along with the fact that $H_\alpha^\uparrow \geq H_\alpha$, the third line is due to Eq. (31), the fourth line is the result of Eq. (30), the fifth follows from Eq. (52), and the sixth line is just the substitution of $\hat{f}_{\text{full}}(\overline{c}_1^n \hat{c}_1^n)$ from Eq. (51). \square

To apply the above corollary in practice, we can follow the approach presented in [ZFK20]: compute $\hat{f}_{\text{full}}(\overline{c}_1^n \hat{c}_1^n)$ in a protocol using the procedure described above in Sec. 4.3.1, and define the conditioning event Ω to be that $\hat{f}_{\text{full}}(\overline{c}_1^n \hat{c}_1^n) \geq K$ for some predetermined threshold value K . In that case, the above corollary tells us that $H_\alpha^\uparrow(S_1^n \overline{C}_1^n | \widehat{C}_1^n E_n)_{\rho|_\Omega} \geq K - \frac{\alpha}{\alpha - 1} \log \frac{1}{p_\Omega}$, and so we have a lower bound on the Rényi entropy of the conditional state, to use in subsequent proof steps (for example, showing we can produce a secret key of fixed length). The question of finding a “reasonable” choice of K (such that the protocol does not just almost always abort, even under the honest behaviour) is somewhat subtle, and we defer to [ZFK20] for in-depth discussion. Here, we simply note that the discussion in the next section suggests that given a “good” choice of QES-s, when the honest behaviour is IID we should pick K to be somewhat less than n times the honest single-round Rényi entropy; see the discussions in Sec. 5.1–5.2.

Thus far, we have been deferring the discussion of how to choose “good” QES-s. In the next section, we finally turn to discussing this point in great detail, which is the next main contribution of our work. A remarkable consequence of our analysis, however, is that for some scenarios (basically, where all the channels are “basically the same”) we can obtain an intuitive and very tight lower bound on $H_\alpha^\uparrow(S_1^n \overline{C}_1^n | \widehat{C}_1^n E_n)_{\rho|_\Omega}$ (namely, Theorem 2 below) that does not involve any explicit choice of QES, in that the bound is already implicitly using the best such choice. Note that even outside of

those scenarios (e.g. if the channels have time-varying behaviour, so the optimal QES choice in each round might be different, as discussed previously), our methods may still be useful; see Remark 7. We now present these results.

5 Simplified versions

In some applications of the GEAT to fixed-length protocols, the channels in the sequence can be thought of as being “basically the same” in some sense (or at least they can be “relaxed” to a common channel). In such circumstances, we can greatly simplify Corollary 1, as we shall now describe. Furthermore, the overall approach we describe here should also yield some useful (albeit more elaborate) techniques to handle variable-length protocols and/or scenarios where the channels exhibit time-varying behaviour, by combining it with the results from the previous section — we describe further details in Remark 7 later.

Remark 3. *Within this section, we explicitly specify the domains of the summations over $\widehat{c\hat{c}}$, to ensure that all terms in the calculations are well-defined — in particular, note that all terms of the form $D_\alpha(\rho_{QQ' \wedge \widehat{c\hat{c}}} \|\mathbb{I}_Q \otimes \rho_{Q' \wedge \widehat{c\hat{c}}})$ are well-defined because the sum is restricted to terms where the first argument has nonzero trace. In principle, as noted below Definition 11, we could instead assign arbitrary (finite) values to all $D_\alpha(\rho_{QQ' \wedge \widehat{c\hat{c}}} \|\mathbb{I}_Q \otimes \rho_{Q' \wedge \widehat{c\hat{c}}})$ terms with $\rho(\widehat{c\hat{c}}) = 0$, and still carry out basically the same calculations, which would yield similar results except with the summations over the whole of $\widehat{\mathcal{C}} \times \widehat{\mathcal{C}}$ instead — those results would still be valid due to other properties of the formulas; for instance, in the formula (108) we present later, the $D(\boldsymbol{\lambda} \|\boldsymbol{\rho}_{\widehat{\mathcal{C}\widehat{\mathcal{C}}}})$ term ensures that the value of the sum over $\widehat{c\hat{c}}$ only affects the value of $G_{\alpha, \rho}^*(\boldsymbol{\lambda})$ in cases where $\lambda(\widehat{c\hat{c}}) = 0$ whenever $\rho(\widehat{c\hat{c}}) = 0$. However, we find it cleaner to simply restrict the summation domain rather than constantly clarify these technicalities.*

5.1 Main results

In this section we focus only on presenting our main results and discussing their implications, with the proofs being deferred to the subsequent sections.

We first formalize a notion of all GEATT channels (Definition 9) in a protocol being “basically the same” for the purposes of our approach, via the following concept of a single **rate-bounding channel** for the entire sequence. While the definition might appear slightly elaborate since it is stated in terms of QES-entropies H_α^f (Definition 11), it is in fact usually easy to construct such a channel with no explicit consideration of QES-entropies at all — we discuss this immediately after presenting the definition. (In this definition, as in Lemma 7, we denote the input space for the rate-bounding channel as a single register \widetilde{Q} that does not necessarily have to match the GEATT channel inputs, and we have not included a “memory register” R in its output of the rate-bounding channel — again, this is because these properties will not be needed in our subsequent proofs.)

Definition 12. (Rate-bounding channel) Let $\{\mathcal{M}_j\}_{j=1}^n$ be a sequence of GEATT channels where all $\overline{\mathcal{C}}_j$ (resp. $\widehat{\mathcal{C}}_j$) are isomorphic to a single register $\overline{\mathcal{C}}$ (resp. $\widehat{\mathcal{C}}$) with alphabet $\overline{\mathcal{C}}$ (resp. $\widehat{\mathcal{C}}$). A **rate-bounding channel** for $\{\mathcal{M}_j\}_{j=1}^n$ is a channel $\mathcal{M} : \widetilde{Q} \rightarrow SE\overline{\mathcal{C}}\widehat{\mathcal{C}}$ such that for any QES f on $\overline{\mathcal{C}}\widehat{\mathcal{C}}$ and any $\alpha \in (1, 2]$, we have

$$\min_j \inf_{\nu \in \Sigma_j} H_\alpha^f(S_j \overline{\mathcal{C}}_j | \widehat{\mathcal{C}}_j E_j \widetilde{E})_\nu \geq \inf_{\nu \in \Sigma} H_\alpha^f(S\overline{\mathcal{C}} | \widehat{\mathcal{C}} E \widetilde{E})_\nu, \quad (82)$$

where Σ_j denotes the set of all states of the form $\mathcal{M}_j \left[\omega_{R_{j-1}E_{j-1}\widetilde{E}} \right]$ for some initial state $\omega_{R_{j-1}E_{j-1}\widetilde{E}}$, and analogously Σ denotes the set of all states of the form $\mathcal{M} \left[\omega_{\widetilde{Q}\widetilde{E}} \right]$ for some initial state $\omega_{\widetilde{Q}\widetilde{E}}$, with \widetilde{E} being a register of large enough dimension to serve as a purifying register for any of the R_jE_j registers or the \widetilde{Q} register.

For many practical protocols of interest, it is easy to construct a rate-bounding channel. For instance, if all the GEATT channels \mathcal{M}_j are isomorphic to each other (as was the case for the analysis of device-dependent EB-QKD in [DFR20]), we can of course simply take the rate-bounding channel to be isomorphic to one of the GEATT channels. More generally, we can also often straightforwardly obtain a useful choice of rate-bounding channel by essentially constructing the direct sum $\bigoplus_j \mathcal{M}_j$ and then identifying some of the output registers; we formalize this in the following lemma. This construction should suffice for many applications.

Lemma 9. *Let $\{\mathcal{M}_j\}_{j=1}^n$ be a sequence of GEATT channels where all S_j (resp. $\overline{C}_j, \widehat{C}_j$) are isomorphic to a single register S (resp. $\overline{C}, \widehat{C}$), so that each channel is isomorphic to a channel $\mathcal{M}'_j : R_{j-1}E_{j-1} \rightarrow SR_jE_j\overline{C}\widehat{C}$. Define \widetilde{Q} to be a register with Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}_{\widetilde{Q}} = \bigoplus_{j=1}^n \mathcal{H}_{R_{j-1}E_{j-1}}$, and define E to be a register with Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}_E = \bigoplus_{j=1}^n \mathcal{H}_{E_j}$. Define a channel $\mathcal{M} : \widetilde{Q} \rightarrow SE\overline{C}\widehat{C}$ as follows: it first performs a projective measurement where outcome j corresponds to the projector onto $\mathcal{H}_{R_{j-1}E_{j-1}}$, then conditioned on the outcome value j , implements the channel \mathcal{M}'_j and traces out the R_j register (while embedding the E_j register in E).*

Then \mathcal{M} is a valid rate-bounding channel, i.e. it satisfies the defining condition (82); furthermore, the bound in that condition becomes an equality for this \mathcal{M} .

Proof. It is easy to see that (82) holds, since this \mathcal{M} contains a “copy” of each \mathcal{M}_j (formally: every feasible point on the left-hand-side of (82) straightforwardly yields a feasible point on the right-hand-side with the same value). To see that the reverse inequality also holds, simply note that the initial projective measurement in \mathcal{M} produces a state that is a classical mixture of states supported on the $\mathcal{H}_{R_{j-1}E_{j-1}}$ spaces, so we can lower-bound its QES-entropy using the “worst-case” term in the mixture (formally: using Lemma 3 and Lemma 4 the same way as in (60)). \square

There is often no loss of tightness in analyzing this \mathcal{M} instead of the original GEATT channels (at least, in protocols where we have no reason to believe some of the \mathcal{M}_j channels behave differently from each other in some fashion that is known *a priori*), because (82) holds with equality for this \mathcal{M} . This construction suffices for use in, for instance, the analysis of device-dependent PM-QKD in [MR23], as well as device-independent QKD in [AFRV19].

We now turn to the main result of this section. Note that from a technical standpoint, our current proof of this result explicitly relies on our background assumption in this work that all registers are finite-dimensional¹⁶ (in particular, \widetilde{Q}), but for completeness we also discuss in Remark 12 of Appendix B an alternative formulation that removes this assumption in part of the proof, by imposing additional conditions on S_Ω (which should be easily satisfied in practice).

¹⁶This does not affect its applicability to DI security proofs (at least, assuming that the dimensions are finite but unbounded), because in such security proofs we can suppose that \mathcal{M} acts on systems of finite but unknown dimension, and say that the bounds we derive are independent of this dimension and hence valid for any such \mathcal{M} [TSB+22].

Theorem 2. Let ρ be a state generated by a sequence of GEATT channels $\{\mathcal{M}_j\}_{j=1}^n$ (Definition 9) with a rate-bounding channel $\mathcal{M} : \tilde{Q} \rightarrow SE\bar{C}\hat{C}$ (Definition 12). Take any $\alpha \in (1, 2]$ and let $\hat{\alpha} = 1/(2 - \alpha)$. Suppose furthermore that $\rho = p_\Omega \rho_{|\Omega} + (1 - p_\Omega) \rho_{|\bar{\Omega}}$ for some $p_\Omega \in (0, 1]$ and normalized states $\rho_{|\Omega}, \rho_{|\bar{\Omega}}$. Let S_Ω be a convex set of probability distributions on the alphabet $\bar{C} \times \hat{C}$, such that for all $\bar{c}_1^n \hat{c}_1^n$ with nonzero probability in $\rho_{|\Omega}$, the frequency distribution $\text{freq}_{\bar{c}_1^n \hat{c}_1^n}$ lies in S_Ω . Then letting $\sigma_{\bar{C}\hat{C}}$ denote the distribution on $\bar{C}\hat{C}$ induced by any state $\sigma_{\bar{C}\hat{C}}$, we have

$$H_\alpha^\uparrow(S_1^n \bar{C}_1^n | \hat{C}_1^n E_n)_{\rho_{|\Omega}} \geq n h_{\hat{\alpha}} - \frac{\alpha}{\alpha - 1} \log \frac{1}{p_\Omega},$$

$$\text{where } h_{\hat{\alpha}} = \inf_{\mathbf{q} \in S_\Omega} \inf_{\nu \in \Sigma} \left(\frac{1}{\hat{\alpha} - 1} D(\mathbf{q} \| \nu_{\bar{C}\hat{C}}) - \sum_{\bar{c}\hat{c} \in \text{supp}(\nu_{\bar{C}\hat{C}})} q(\bar{c}\hat{c}) D_{\hat{\alpha}}(\nu_{SE\bar{E}\wedge\bar{c}\hat{c}} \| \mathbb{I}_S \otimes \nu_{E\bar{E}\wedge\hat{c}}) \right), \quad (83)$$

with Σ denoting the set of all states of the form $\mathcal{M}[\omega_{\tilde{Q}\tilde{E}}]$ for some initial state $\omega_{\tilde{Q}\tilde{E}}$, where \tilde{E} is a purifying register for \tilde{Q} .

Furthermore, if Pur is any purifying function for \tilde{Q} onto \tilde{E} (Definition 10), then

$$h_{\hat{\alpha}} = \inf_{\mathbf{q} \in S_\Omega} \inf_{\omega \in S_{=}(\tilde{Q})} \left(\frac{1}{\hat{\alpha} - 1} D(\mathbf{q} \| \nu_{\bar{C}\hat{C}}^\omega) - \sum_{\bar{c}\hat{c} \in \text{supp}(\nu_{\bar{C}\hat{C}}^\omega)} q(\bar{c}\hat{c}) D_{\hat{\alpha}}(\nu_{SE\bar{E}\wedge\bar{c}\hat{c}}^\omega \| \mathbb{I}_S \otimes \nu_{E\bar{E}\wedge\hat{c}}^\omega) \right), \quad (84)$$

$$\text{where } \nu^\omega := \mathcal{M}[\text{Pur}(\omega_{\tilde{Q}})],$$

and the objective function in the above infimum is jointly convex in ω and \mathbf{q} .

Note that the condition on S_Ω is basically just the simple statement that S_Ω contains all frequency distributions on $\bar{C}_1^n \hat{C}_1^n$ “compatible with” Ω (viewing Ω as an event, e.g. by extending the state ρ with a register on which Ω is defined, if necessary). While it is true that the convexity requirement is not necessarily fulfilled “by default” in various applications, in many circumstances we can reasonably choose S_Ω such that it holds (e.g. by taking the convex hull). Still, if that is really not possible, then one can use Corollary 2 we present later (combined with Lemma 13 and the discussion below it) as an alternative to Theorem 2, albeit a more complicated one.

As discussed in the introduction, the bound (83) means that for any $\alpha \in (1, 2]$, we have obtained a simple $\Theta(n)$ lower bound on $H_\alpha^\uparrow(S_1^n \bar{C}_1^n | \hat{C}_1^n E_n)_{\rho_{|\Omega}}$, with an explicit first-order constant $h_{\hat{\alpha}}$ that can be computed as a convex optimization via (84). To get an intuitive interpretation of this constant $h_{\hat{\alpha}}$, we can lower-bound it with either of the following lemmas, which replace the Rényi divergences with some Rényi conditional entropies:

Lemma 10. In Theorem 2, the following bound holds on $h_{\hat{\alpha}}$:

$$\begin{aligned} h_{\hat{\alpha}} &\geq \inf_{\mathbf{q} \in S_\Omega} \inf_{\nu \in \Sigma} \left(\frac{1}{\hat{\alpha} - 1} D(\mathbf{q} \| \nu_{\bar{C}\hat{C}}) + \sum_{\bar{c}\hat{c} \in \text{supp}(\nu_{\bar{C}\hat{C}})} q(\bar{c}\hat{c}) H_{\hat{\alpha}}(S | E\tilde{E})_{\nu_{\bar{c}\hat{c}}} \right) \\ &= \inf_{\mathbf{q} \in S_\Omega} \inf_{\omega \in S_{=}(\tilde{Q})} \left(\frac{1}{\hat{\alpha} - 1} D(\mathbf{q} \| \nu_{\bar{C}\hat{C}}^\omega) + \sum_{\bar{c}\hat{c} \in \text{supp}(\nu_{\bar{C}\hat{C}}^\omega)} q(\bar{c}\hat{c}) H_{\hat{\alpha}}(S | E\tilde{E})_{\nu_{\bar{c}\hat{c}}^\omega} \right), \end{aligned} \quad (85)$$

and the objective function in the second line is jointly convex in ω and \mathbf{q} . If the \bar{C} register is trivial, then the above bound becomes an equality, i.e. we have

$$\begin{aligned} h_{\hat{\alpha}} &= \inf_{\mathbf{q} \in S_{\Omega}} \inf_{\nu \in \Sigma} \left(\frac{1}{\hat{\alpha} - 1} D(\mathbf{q} \| \nu_{\bar{C}}) + \sum_{\hat{c} \in \text{supp}(\nu_{\bar{C}})} q(\hat{c}) H_{\hat{\alpha}}(S|E\tilde{E})_{\nu_{\hat{c}}} \right) \\ &= \inf_{\mathbf{q} \in S_{\Omega}} \inf_{\omega \in S_{=}(\bar{Q})} \left(\frac{1}{\hat{\alpha} - 1} D(\mathbf{q} \| \nu_{\bar{C}}^{\omega}) + \sum_{\hat{c} \in \text{supp}(\nu_{\bar{C}}^{\omega})} q(\hat{c}) H_{\hat{\alpha}}(S|E\tilde{E})_{\nu_{\hat{c}}^{\omega}} \right). \end{aligned} \quad (86)$$

Lemma 11. In Theorem 2, the following bound holds on $h_{\hat{\alpha}}$, for any $\alpha', \alpha'' > 1$ such that $\frac{\hat{\alpha}}{\hat{\alpha}-1} = \frac{\alpha'}{\alpha'-1} + \frac{\alpha''}{\alpha''-1}$:

$$\begin{aligned} h_{\hat{\alpha}} &\geq \inf_{\mathbf{q} \in S_{\Omega}} \inf_{\nu \in \Sigma} \left(\frac{\alpha''}{\alpha'' - 1} D(\mathbf{q} \| \nu_{\bar{C}\bar{C}}) + H_{\alpha'}(S\bar{C}|\widehat{C}E\tilde{E})_{\nu} \right) \\ &= \inf_{\mathbf{q} \in S_{\Omega}} \inf_{\omega \in S_{=}(\bar{Q})} \left(\frac{\alpha''}{\alpha'' - 1} D(\mathbf{q} \| \nu_{\bar{C}\bar{C}}^{\omega}) + H_{\alpha'}(S\bar{C}|\widehat{C}E\tilde{E})_{\nu^{\omega}} \right), \end{aligned} \quad (87)$$

and the objective function in the second line is jointly convex in ω and \mathbf{q} .

The bound in Lemma 11 has a slightly simpler form, so we shall discuss it first to gain the desired intuition (however, it has worse Rényi parameters — we stress that it would likely be better to instead use Lemma 10 for device-dependent protocols, but we defer discussion of this point until after we have explained the basic intuition). To begin, let us compare it to just “naively” computing the worst-case entropy $H_{\alpha'}(S\bar{C}|\widehat{C}E\tilde{E})_{\nu^{\omega}}$ over *only* the set of states ω that produce a distribution contained in the acceptance set S_{Ω} , i.e.

$$\begin{aligned} &\inf_{\omega \in S_{=}(\bar{Q})} H_{\alpha'}(S\bar{C}|\widehat{C}E\tilde{E})_{\nu^{\omega}} \\ &\text{s.t. } \nu_{\bar{C}\bar{C}}^{\omega} \in S_{\Omega}. \end{aligned} \quad (88)$$

Loosely speaking (and ignoring the change of Rényi parameter), we cannot expect $h_{\hat{\alpha}}$ to be much better than this value, since every feasible point in the above optimization is a state that would be accepted with non-negligible probability in an IID scenario (supposing for simplicity that Ω is just the event that the frequency distribution on $\bar{C}_1^n \widehat{C}_1^n$ lies in S_{Ω}). Now if we compare this to the optimization (87) in Lemma 11, the only difference is that instead of the “hard” constraint $\nu_{\bar{C}\bar{C}}^{\omega} \in S_{\Omega}$ in (88), the optimization (87) imposes a “soft” version of that constraint, by introducing a “penalty function” which increases as ν^{ω} moves further outside of S_{Ω} (as measured by KL divergence). More concretely, by simply rewriting (87) as follows (since the entropy term is independent of \mathbf{q})

$$\inf_{\omega \in S_{=}(\bar{Q})} \left(H_{\alpha'}(S\bar{C}|\widehat{C}E\tilde{E})_{\nu^{\omega}} + \inf_{\mathbf{q} \in S_{\Omega}} \frac{\alpha''}{\alpha'' - 1} D(\mathbf{q} \| \nu_{\bar{C}\bar{C}}^{\omega}) \right), \quad (89)$$

we see that we are simply adding a “soft penalty” term¹⁷ $\inf_{\mathbf{q} \in S_{\Omega}} \frac{\alpha''}{\alpha'' - 1} D(\mathbf{q} \| \nu_{\bar{C}\bar{C}}^{\omega})$ for states such that $\nu_{\bar{C}\bar{C}}^{\omega} \notin S_{\Omega}$. (Although, when applying computational methods such as those in [WLC18], it

¹⁷The optimizer \mathbf{q}^* in this infimum (if attained) is sometimes termed the **information projection of $\nu_{\bar{C}\bar{C}}^{\omega}$ onto S_{Ω}** , and has some properties that may be of use in future analysis; for instance, it satisfies a form of triangle inequality.

may be easier to solve the joint optimization (87) rather than the nested-optimization formulation in (89).)

Hence with Lemma 11, we can interpret $h_{\hat{\alpha}}$ as being similar in spirit to just minimizing $H_{\alpha'}(S\bar{C}|\widehat{C}E\widetilde{E})_{\nu^\omega}$ over all states “compatible with S_Ω ”, except that the price we have paid to account for finite-size effects is simply that the constraints in the optimization have been replaced with a relaxed variant. This is very similar to e.g. the analysis of IID scenarios in [Ren05], though instead of relaxing the original constraints by just directly enlarging the feasible set, we have here a “penalty function” for violating the original constraints. Also, if we compare our results to the previous GEAT, our bound in Lemma 11 also seems much easier to evaluate in practice — the previous GEAT requires a technical construction of an *affine* “entropy-bounding function” (the **min-tradeoff function** [MFS+22b]) on the space of probability distributions on $\bar{C}\widehat{C}$, and optimizing the choice of min-tradeoff function while ensuring it is affine is often a challenging task [GLH+22]. In contrast, our bound only requires changing the objective function by an additional term $D(\mathbf{q} \parallel \nu_{\bar{C}\widehat{C}}^\omega)$, which is just a classical KL divergence, and hence convex and differentiable on the domain interior.

Remark 4. *We can also verify that $h_{\hat{\alpha}}$ should be strictly positive in any “reasonable” protocol (with classical S , so all entropies of interest are non-negative), as follows. First, observe that any “reasonable” choice of S_Ω should be such that at least the “naive” optimization (88) evaluates to some strictly positive value $h_\star > 0$, since otherwise we cannot expect a nontrivial rate.¹⁸ In that case, the lower bound on $h_{\hat{\alpha}}$ given by (87) would be strictly positive, because for any feasible point (\mathbf{q}, ω) we either have $\nu_{\bar{C}\widehat{C}}^\omega \in S_\Omega$ and so $H_{\alpha'}(S\bar{C}|\widehat{C}E\widetilde{E})_{\nu^\omega} \geq h_\star > 0$, or we have $\nu_{\bar{C}\widehat{C}}^\omega \notin S_\Omega$ and so $D(\mathbf{q} \parallel \nu_{\bar{C}\widehat{C}}^\omega) > 0$.¹⁹*

Another convenient property of the Lemma 11 bound is that with it, we can make use of single-round analysis methods that bound *any* particular Rényi entropy $H_{\alpha'}(S\bar{C}|\widehat{C}E\widetilde{E})_{\nu^\omega}$, instead of having to focus on von Neumann entropy as in the original GEAT. For instance, this means we can straightforwardly “accumulate” min-entropy or collision entropy, as studied in e.g. [PAM+10, MPA11, JK21, JK22] (or [MDR+19] for the IID case). This hence yields a variety of “fully Rényi” approaches for security proofs, at least as a proof-of-concept. Note however that in practice, even if the single-round analysis only yields bounds for a specific Rényi parameter rather than arbitrary ones, one should usually still tune the choice of Rényi parameter when applying our results, to obtain the best keyrates — we defer discussion of this point to Sec. 7.3.

¹⁸In fact, rather than $H_{\alpha'}$ specifically, for the purposes of this argument we can discuss any Rényi entropy \mathbb{H} satisfying $H_{\min} \leq \mathbb{H} \leq H$, because for any classical-quantum state ρ_{CQ} , we have $\mathbb{H}(C|Q)_\rho = 0$ for some such \mathbb{H} if and only if $\mathbb{H}(C|Q)_\rho = 0$ for all such \mathbb{H} (since $\mathbb{H}(C|Q)_\rho = 0$ implies $H_{\min}(C|Q)_\rho = 0$, which implies the conditional states $\rho_{Q|c}$ are all perfectly distinguishable and hence $H(C|Q)_\rho = 0$ as well).

¹⁹Technically, to complete the argument we must rule out the possibility of a sequence of feasible values *limiting* to zero. To do so, we can follow steps described in the proof of Lemma 13 later to replace S_Ω with its closure by a continuity argument, in which case for finite-dimensional \widehat{Q} , we get a continuous optimization over a compact set and hence the infimum is attained (and hence strictly positive). An alternative prospect is to introduce another convex optimization $\inf_{\mathbf{q} \in S_\Omega} \inf_{\omega \in S_{\widehat{C}(\widehat{Q})}} H_{\alpha'}(S\bar{C}|\widehat{C}E\widetilde{E})_{\nu^\omega}$ subject to constraint $\|\mathbf{q} - \nu_{\bar{C}\widehat{C}}^\omega\|_1 \leq \delta$, which matches the “naive” optimization (88) when picking $\delta = 0$. It seems likely that one could prove the optimal value of this optimization is continuous with respect to $\delta \geq 0$ (for instance by modifying the arguments in [Duf78]); if so, then by continuity there exists some $\delta_\star > 0$ such that this optimization is lower bounded by, say, $h_\star/2$. With this we can conclude the desired property that every feasible (\mathbf{q}, ω) in our bound (87) is *bounded away from zero*, since for every such point we either have $\|\mathbf{q} - \nu_{\bar{C}\widehat{C}}^\omega\|_1 \leq \delta$ and thus $H_{\alpha'}(S\bar{C}|\widehat{C}E\widetilde{E})_{\nu^\omega} \geq h_\star/2 > 0$, or else we have $D(\mathbf{q} \parallel \nu_{\bar{C}\widehat{C}}^\omega) \geq \delta_\star^2/(2 \ln 2) > 0$ by Pinsker’s inequality. This prospective approach has the advantage that in the DI case, it seems plausible that we still have continuity with respect to δ even after later proof steps where we further minimize over the GEATT channels themselves (to accommodate all possible measurements and dimensions). However, we leave a rigorous proof of these continuity claims for future work, since here we only aim to give a plausibility argument that $h_{\hat{\alpha}}$ is “usually” nonzero.

On that note though, it is not necessary to explicitly have single-round bounds on arbitrary Rényi entropies to apply our methods — it suffices to consider the usual von Neumann entropy, if desired. To see this (and also verify that our bounds scale as expected at large n), first note that if we write $\alpha' = 1 + \mu'$, $\alpha'' = 1 + \mu''$ in Lemma 11 (for some $\mu', \mu'' > 0$), then we have

$$\begin{aligned}\widehat{\alpha} &= 1 + \frac{1}{1 + \frac{1}{\mu'} + \frac{1}{\mu''}} = 1 + \frac{\mu'\mu''}{\mu'\mu'' + \mu' + \mu''}, \\ \alpha &= 1 + \frac{1}{2 + \frac{1}{\mu'} + \frac{1}{\mu''}} = 1 + \frac{\mu'\mu''}{2\mu'\mu'' + \mu' + \mu''},\end{aligned}\tag{90}$$

recalling $\widehat{\alpha} = 1/(2 - \alpha)$. In particular, this means that if we take $\alpha', \alpha'' \rightarrow 1$, then $\widehat{\alpha}, \alpha \rightarrow 1$ as well. This lets us describe our results in terms of more well-known entropies (von Neumann entropy and smooth min-entropy) using the same approach as [DFR20], as follows.

Remark 5. *We highlight however that for applications, since the subsequent bounds (91)–(92) are inequalities rather than equalities, it should be advantageous to avoid their use whenever possible (though in Sec. 7.2 later, we show we can still obtain rather good results even when using those bounds). In particular, it may be possible to use just one bound rather than both; for instance (91) can be avoided if one can bound the single-round Rényi entropy directly, and (92) can be avoided if the security proof can use the recent Rényi privacy amplification theorem of [Dup21] (which typically gives better finite-size keyrates; see [GLH+22] or Sec. 7.2 for comparisons).*

First, for the single-round terms we have the following continuity bound in α [DFR20, Lemma B.9]:

$$H_\alpha(\overline{SC}|\widehat{CEE}) \geq H(\overline{SC}|\widehat{CEE}) - (\alpha - 1) \log^2(1 + 2k_{\text{dim}}),\tag{91}$$

for any $\alpha \in (1, 1 + 1/\log(1 + 2k_{\text{dim}}))$, where k_{dim} is a dimension-dependent constant: in general it would be $k_{\text{dim}} = \dim(\overline{SC})$, but if \overline{C} has the property that it can be “projectively reconstructed” from $\widehat{SC}E$ in the sense of [DFR20, Lemma B.7], then²⁰ we can use the better value $k_{\text{dim}} = \dim(S)$. Note that if S is classical²¹, it should be better to instead use [DF19, Corollary IV.2], which gives a bound of the form $H(\overline{SC}|\widehat{CEE}) - (\alpha - 1) \frac{\ln 2}{2} \log^2(1 + 2k_{\text{dim}}) - O((\alpha - 1)^2)$ that is tighter than (91) for α close to 1. Moreover, for the overall entropy we can write [DFR20, Lemma B.10]

$$H_{\min}^\varepsilon(S_1^n \overline{C}_1^n | \widehat{C}_1^n E_n) \geq H_\alpha^\dagger(S_1^n \overline{C}_1^n | \widehat{C}_1^n E_n) - \frac{\vartheta_\varepsilon}{\alpha - 1}, \text{ where } \vartheta_\varepsilon := \log\left(\frac{1}{1 - \sqrt{1 - \varepsilon^2}}\right) \leq \log \frac{2}{\varepsilon^2},\tag{92}$$

for any $\alpha \in (1, 2]$ and $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$.

Substituting these two bounds (91)–(92) into Theorem 2 with the Lemma 11 bound, we obtain (for α', α'' sufficiently close to 1 to apply those two bounds):

$$\begin{aligned}H_{\min}^\varepsilon(S_1^n \overline{C}_1^n | \widehat{C}_1^n E_n)_{\rho|\Omega} &\geq \inf_{\mathbf{q} \in S_\Omega} \inf_{\omega \in S_{=}(\overline{Q})} \left(\frac{\alpha''}{\alpha'' - 1} D(\mathbf{q} \parallel \nu_{\overline{C}}^\omega) + H(\overline{SC}|\widehat{CEE})_{\nu^\omega} \right) n \\ &\quad - (\alpha' - 1) \log^2(1 + 2k_{\text{dim}}) n - \frac{\vartheta_\varepsilon}{\alpha - 1} - \frac{\alpha}{\alpha - 1} \log \frac{1}{p_\Omega}.\end{aligned}\tag{93}$$

²⁰By simply observing that in that case [DFR20, Lemma B.7] gives us $H_\alpha(\overline{SC}|\widehat{CEE}) = H_\alpha(S|\widehat{CEE})$ and $H(\overline{SC}|\widehat{CEE}) = H(S|\widehat{CEE})$, so we can apply the [DFR20, Lemma B.9] continuity bound without including \overline{C} .

²¹If S is quantum, the k_{dim} term in the following bound has to be replaced with k_{dim}^2 ; this can sometimes still be better than (91) if the dimension is small.

The above bound is the desired reformulation of our results in terms of the single-round von Neumann entropy and the n -rounds smooth min-entropy. If we choose²² $\alpha', \alpha'' = 1 + \Theta(1/\sqrt{n})$, then we see from (90) that we have $\hat{\alpha}, \alpha = 1 + \Theta(1/\sqrt{n})$ as well, so the above bound simplifies to

$$H_{\min}^{\varepsilon}(S_1^n \bar{C}_1^n | \widehat{C}_1^n E_n)_{\rho|\Omega} \geq \inf_{\mathbf{q} \in S_{\Omega}} \inf_{\omega \in S_{=}(\bar{Q})} \left(\Theta(\sqrt{n}) D(\mathbf{q} \parallel \nu_{\bar{C}\bar{C}}^{\omega}) + H(S\bar{C} | \widehat{C} E \widetilde{E})_{\nu^{\omega}} \right) n - \Theta(\sqrt{n}). \quad (94)$$

Here, the $\Theta(\sqrt{n})$ finite-size correction term is the same scaling as we would get from the AEP in the IID case, and the first-order term is a relaxed optimization of the form we have considered above (and it will again be nonzero for “reasonable” S_{Ω} , by the same arguments). Furthermore, since the “soft penalty term” $D(\mathbf{q} \parallel \nu_{\bar{C}\bar{C}}^{\omega})$ has a prefactor of order $\Theta(\sqrt{n})$, we see that at large n , the optimization approaches what we would get by simply imposing the “hard constraint” $\nu_{\bar{C}\bar{C}}^{\omega} \in S_{\Omega}$, so the bound (94) asymptotically converges to what we expect.

A drawback of the Lemma 11 bound is the change in Rényi parameters; specifically, if for simplicity²³ we set α', α'' both equal to $1 + \mu$ for some small $\mu > 0$, then from (90) we find that $\hat{\alpha}, \alpha = 1 + \mu/2 + O(\mu^2)$, i.e. the “distance from 1” for α, α'' is roughly twice that of the original Rényi parameters $\hat{\alpha}, \alpha$. Loosely speaking, this “distance from 1” is one of the major contribution to losses from finite-size effects, and so Lemma 11 roughly doubles the effect of some such losses (for instance, it effectively halves the prefactor on the $D(\mathbf{q} \parallel \nu_{\bar{C}\bar{C}}^{\omega})$ “penalty term”, and from (91) we loosely expect it to double the distance from the von Neumann entropy, even if the bound (91) is not explicitly used).

This issue can be avoided by using Lemma 10 instead: in that bound, we preserve the Rényi parameter $\hat{\alpha}$ (which matches α up to order $O((\alpha - 1)^2)$, as discussed in (68)), at the price of a slightly more elaborate form for the conditional-entropy term, which instead takes the form of a linear combination $\sum_{\bar{c}\hat{c}} q(\bar{c}\hat{c}) H_{\hat{\alpha}}(S|E\widetilde{E})$. Note that as stated in the lemma, there is no loss of tightness when using this bound in applications where the \bar{C} register is trivial, which is the case for many device-dependent protocols [MR23]. While this linear combination might be slightly harder to handle than the single $H_{\alpha'}(S\bar{C} | \widehat{C} E \widetilde{E})_{\nu^{\omega}}$ term, we note for instance that if S_{Ω} is such that it implies entrywise constraints $\mathbf{q} \geq \mathbf{q}^{\min}$ for some tuple \mathbf{q}^{\min} , then we could replace each $q(\bar{c}\hat{c})$ factor in the linear combination (though not in the KL divergence term) with a constant lower bound $q^{\min}(\bar{c}\hat{c})$, which might be simpler to handle. As above, we also have the option of reformulating the bounds using either or both of (91)–(92) if desired, at the cost of the same potential suboptimality, yielding bounds such as

$$H_{\min}^{\varepsilon}(S_1^n \bar{C}_1^n | \widehat{C}_1^n E_n)_{\rho|\Omega} \geq \inf_{\mathbf{q} \in S_{\Omega}} \inf_{\omega \in S_{=}(\bar{Q})} \left(\frac{1}{\hat{\alpha} - 1} D(\mathbf{q} \parallel \nu_{\bar{C}\bar{C}}^{\omega}) + \sum_{\bar{c}\hat{c} \in \text{supp}(\nu_{\bar{C}\bar{C}}^{\omega})} q(\bar{c}\hat{c}) H(S|E\widetilde{E})_{\nu_{\bar{c}\hat{c}}^{\omega}} \right) n - (\hat{\alpha} - 1) \log^2(1 + 2k_{\dim}) n - \frac{\vartheta_{\varepsilon}}{\alpha - 1} - \frac{\alpha}{\alpha - 1} \log \frac{1}{p_{\Omega}}. \quad (95)$$

Note however that the objective function in this version might potentially not be jointly convex; see Sec. 5.1.2 later.

However, for device-independent protocols (where \bar{C} is usually not trivial), it is less clear whether Lemma 10 or 11 is better (of course, ideally one would obtain the tightest bound by directly

²²Similar to [DF19], this choice here is just to demonstrate a possible scaling; for the best finite-size bounds one should optimize the Rényi parameter choices numerically for each n .

²³One can tune α', α'' in other ways; e.g. if we fix one as a constant and set the other to $1 + \mu$ then we can get $\hat{\alpha}, \alpha = 1 + \mu + O(\mu^2)$, but this sacrifices the option to bring the constant one closer to 1.

computing the divergence-based formula in Theorem 2, but that expression is more complicated). We discuss this point further in the next section, after first explaining the concept of infrequent-sampling channels.

Remark 6. *When using the above bounds (especially Lemma 11), a point to keep in mind is that unlike the von Neumann entropy, the Rényi entropy for $\alpha > 1$ is not concave. Hence for a state of the form $\nu = \sum_z p(z)\nu_{|z}$, in general we would have $H_\alpha(S\bar{C}|\widehat{C}E\widetilde{E})_\nu \not\geq \sum_z p(z)H_\alpha(S\bar{C}|\widehat{C}E\widetilde{E})_{\nu_{|z}}$, and in fact we cannot even say that it is lower bounded by $p(z)H_\alpha(S\bar{C}|\widehat{C}E\widetilde{E})_{\nu_{|z}}$ for arbitrary z (unless we have additional properties of that z value). In particular, this creates some inconveniences in analyzing infrequent-sampling channels (defined below), since it is harder to break up the entropy into test and generation “contributions”. However, in some situations Fact 2 can be used to work around this, possibly by introducing a conditioning register if necessary that “labels” the states in the mixture (note however that the resulting lower bounds would not simply be “linear” expressions like $\sum_z p(z)H_\alpha(S\bar{C}|\widehat{C}E\widetilde{E})_{\nu_{|z}}$).*

We now elaborate further on two other topics of importance for applications, namely how to handle protocols with “infrequent sampling”, and a caveat regarding the convexity of the various relaxed lower bounds we presented.

5.1.1 Infrequent-sampling channels

In most applications of entropy accumulation, \mathcal{M} has the structure of an “infrequent-sampling channel” as defined in [DF19]:

Definition 13. A channel \mathcal{M} with some classical registers $\bar{C}\widehat{C}$ in its output is said to be an **infrequent-sampling channel** if there is a constant **test probability** value $\gamma \in (0, 1)$ such that

$$\mathcal{M} = (1 - \gamma)\mathcal{M}^{\text{gen}} + \gamma\mathcal{M}^{\text{test}}, \quad (96)$$

for some **generation** and **test** channels $\mathcal{M}^{\text{gen}}, \mathcal{M}^{\text{test}}$, where \mathcal{M}^{gen} satisfies the property that it always sets $(\bar{C}, \widehat{C}) = (\perp, \perp)$ for some special symbol \perp , while $\mathcal{M}^{\text{test}}$ never sets $(\bar{C}, \widehat{C}) = (\perp, \perp)$.

Note that this channel structure is equivalent to saying that \mathcal{M}^{gen} is implemented with probability $1 - \gamma$ and $\mathcal{M}^{\text{test}}$ with probability γ . With this interpretation, the term **generation rounds** (resp. **test rounds**) is often used to refer to the rounds in which $\mathcal{M}_j^{\text{gen}}$ (resp. $\mathcal{M}_j^{\text{test}}$) was implemented. This also gives a useful property regarding rate-bounding channels constructed according to Lemma 9: if the GEATT channels $\{\mathcal{M}_j\}_{j=1}^n$ in that lemma are all infrequent-sampling channels with the same γ value (for some $\{\mathcal{M}_j^{\text{gen}}\}_{j=1}^n$ and $\{\mathcal{M}_j^{\text{test}}\}_{j=1}^n$), then the rate-bounding channel \mathcal{M} constructed in that lemma is also an infrequent-sampling channel with the same γ (by observing that the projection onto $\mathcal{H}_{R_{j-1}E_{j-1}}$ in Lemma 9 commutes with the “test/generation random choice” we just described).

For infrequent-sampling channels, if we only keep the “generation component” in the linear combination of entropies, we obtain a simple lower bound

$$\sum_{\bar{c}\hat{c} \in \text{supp}(\nu_{\bar{c}\hat{c}}^\omega)} q(\bar{c}\hat{c})H_{\hat{\alpha}}(S|E\widetilde{E})_{\nu_{\bar{c}\hat{c}}^\omega} \geq q(\perp\perp)H_{\hat{\alpha}}(S|E\widetilde{E})_{\nu_{\perp\perp}^\omega}. \quad (97)$$

Importantly, the above bound is an equality for any protocol in which S is set to some fixed trivial value in test rounds, or any protocol in which \bar{C} or \widehat{C} contains a copy of S in test rounds (e.g. if the

test-round data includes the raw “fine-grained” data, instead of a “coarse-grained” version such as phase error rate or CHSH winning frequency), since for such protocols we have $H_{\hat{\alpha}}(S|E\tilde{E})_{\nu_{\bar{c}\hat{c}}} = 0$ for any $\bar{c}\hat{c}$ values other than $\perp\perp$. In particular, this is often the case in device-dependent protocols of practical interest [KAG+24], in order to simplify the public announcement structure. Recalling also that for such protocols the \bar{C} register can usually be taken to be trivial [MR23] and so the Lemma 10 bound is tight as well, we can conclude that in such scenarios we have the simpler formulation

$$h_{\hat{\alpha}} = \inf_{\mathbf{q} \in S_{\Omega}} \inf_{\omega \in S_{=}(\tilde{Q})} \left(\frac{1}{\hat{\alpha} - 1} D(\mathbf{q} \parallel \nu_{\bar{C}}^{\omega}) + q(\perp) H_{\hat{\alpha}}(S|E\tilde{E})_{\nu_{\perp}^{\omega}} \right), \quad (98)$$

with the objective function being jointly convex in \mathbf{q} and ω . If needed, we could even further simplify it with the methods discussed above by replacing the $q(\perp)$ factor with some lower bound $q^{\min}(\perp)$ induced by S_{Ω} , or converting to von Neumann entropy with (91).

A drawback of the Lemma 10 bound is that for device-*independent* security proofs, the \bar{C} register is usually not trivial [AFRV19, LLR+21, ZFK20, TSB+22]. Then as mentioned above, if \bar{C} contains a copy of S in test rounds then (97) becomes an equality, which implies that in such scenarios, the Lemma 10 bound loses all the “test-round entropy contributions”.²⁴ In DI security proofs, preserving these contributions in the entropy-accumulation part of the security proof usually yields slight improvements in the finite-size keyrates [AFRV19, TSB+22], so the Lemma 10 bound is suboptimal in that respect. One could retain these contributions by using Lemma 11 instead, but as discussed above, the resulting loss in the Rényi parameters is nontrivial, roughly doubling some finite-size effects. The question of which lemma yields better results in a given scenario may have to be resolved on a case-by-case basis (as an initial impression, it seems likely that Lemma 10 will be better in many cases due to the better Rényi parameters, *except* that if the test probability γ is large, it could be worse because the “lost” test-round contribution is larger in that case). We discuss this slightly further in Sec. 7.3.

In summary, if we are considering a security proof where the \bar{C} registers are trivial, then the Lemma 10 bound is tight and should be simpler to analyze than Theorem 2. Otherwise, in principle one should use the divergence-based formulas in Theorem 2 itself to obtain the best finite-size keyrates, while Lemmas 10–11 should be considered as simpler but slightly suboptimal alternatives. In a companion work [HT24], we show that directly tackling the Theorem 2 formula is possible in theory for some DI scenarios, by applying recently developed variational formulas for Rényi divergence (though the resulting SDPs become very large if we keep all the terms in the sum over $\bar{c}\hat{c}$).

We highlight that for infrequent-sampling channels with small γ , for numerical computations it might be more stable to evaluate $D(\mathbf{q} \parallel \nu_{\bar{C}\hat{C}}^{\omega})$ with the following observation. Ordering the distributions \mathbf{q} and $\nu_{\bar{C}\hat{C}}^{\omega}$ such that the first component is the $\perp\perp$ probability, they can always be expressed in the form

$$\mathbf{q} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 - \gamma q \\ \gamma \check{\mathbf{q}} \end{pmatrix}, \quad \nu_{\bar{C}\hat{C}}^{\omega} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 - \gamma \\ \gamma \check{\nu}_{\bar{C}\hat{C}}^{\omega} \end{pmatrix}, \quad (99)$$

where $\gamma q := 1 - q(\perp\perp)$, and $\check{\mathbf{q}}, \check{\nu}_{\bar{C}\hat{C}}^{\omega}$ are normalized distributions (computed by dropping the first

²⁴We highlight that this loss comes inherently from the Lemma 10 bound rather than the subsequent bound (97), since the latter is an equality in such scenarios.

components from $\mathbf{q}, \nu_{\widehat{CC}}^\omega$ and then dividing by γ_q, γ respectively). With this we can write

$$\begin{aligned}
D\left(\mathbf{q} \parallel \nu_{\widehat{CC}}^\omega\right) &= (1 - \gamma_q) \log \frac{1 - \gamma_q}{1 - \gamma} + \sum_{\widehat{c}\widehat{c} \neq \perp\perp} \gamma_q \check{q}(\widehat{c}\widehat{c}) (\log(\gamma_q \check{q}(\widehat{c}\widehat{c})) - \log(\gamma \check{\nu}^\omega(\widehat{c}\widehat{c}))) \\
&= (1 - \gamma_q) \log \frac{1 - \gamma_q}{1 - \gamma} + \gamma_q \log \frac{\gamma_q}{\gamma} + \gamma_q D\left(\check{\mathbf{q}} \parallel \check{\nu}_{\widehat{CC}}^\omega\right) \\
&= D(\mathbf{r} \parallel \mathbf{s}) + \gamma_q D\left(\check{\mathbf{q}} \parallel \check{\nu}_{\widehat{CC}}^\omega\right) \text{ where } \mathbf{r} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 - \gamma_q \\ \gamma_q \end{pmatrix}, \mathbf{s} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 - \gamma \\ \gamma \end{pmatrix}, \tag{100}
\end{aligned}$$

which may be more numerically stable for small γ_q, γ as the dependency on those values has been explicitly ‘‘factored out’’. Also, if $\mathbf{q} \in S_\Omega$ implies that $\gamma - \delta_\gamma \leq \gamma_q \leq \gamma + \delta'_\gamma$ and $\check{\mathbf{q}} \in \check{S}_\Omega$ for some constants $\delta_\gamma, \delta'_\gamma$ and some set \check{S}_Ω , then we can write the optimization in terms of γ_q and $\check{\mathbf{q}}$ instead, relaxing the infimum over $\mathbf{q} \in S_\Omega$ to an infimum over γ_q and $\check{\mathbf{q}}$ satisfying those constraints. Alternatively or in combination, we can drop the $D(\mathbf{r} \parallel \mathbf{s})$ term as it is non-negative — note that if combined with the preceding point, we can then entirely remove the infimum over γ_q by replacing $\gamma_q D(\check{\mathbf{q}} \parallel \check{\nu}_{\widehat{CC}}^\omega)$ with the lower bound $(\gamma - \delta_\gamma) D(\check{\mathbf{q}} \parallel \check{\nu}_{\widehat{CC}}^\omega)$. However, care is needed regarding convexity of the resulting bounds; see Sec. 5.1.2 below.

In fact, the above bound lets us verify that we can choose γ to scale the same way as described in [DF19]. Specifically, supposing we have some $\delta_\gamma, \delta'_\gamma$ and \check{S}_Ω as described above, we can apply the various inequalities described earlier to obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
H_{\min}^\varepsilon(S_1^n \overline{C}_1^n | \widehat{C}_1^n E_n)_{\rho|\Omega} &\geq \inf_{\check{\mathbf{q}} \in \check{S}_\Omega} \inf_{\omega \in S = (\widetilde{Q})} \left(\frac{\gamma - \delta_\gamma}{\widehat{\alpha} - 1} D(\check{\mathbf{q}} \parallel \check{\nu}_{\widehat{CC}}^\omega) + (1 - \gamma - \delta'_\gamma) H(S|E\widetilde{E})_{\nu_{\perp\perp}^\omega} \right) n \\
&\quad - (\widehat{\alpha} - 1) \log^2(1 + 2k_{\dim}) n - \frac{\vartheta_\varepsilon}{\alpha - 1} - \frac{\alpha}{\alpha - 1} \log \frac{1}{p_\Omega}. \tag{101}
\end{aligned}$$

If we now pick $\alpha = 1 + \Theta(\sqrt{\gamma/n})$ where the implied constants depend only on $k_{\dim}, \varepsilon, p_\Omega$, then we have $\widehat{\alpha} = 1 + \Theta(\sqrt{\gamma/n})$ as well. Let us also suppose for simplicity that $\delta_\gamma, \delta'_\gamma$ can be chosen such that²⁵ they become smaller than, say, $\gamma/2$ at sufficiently large n . Then the above bound simplifies to

$$\begin{aligned}
H_{\min}^\varepsilon(S_1^n \overline{C}_1^n | \widehat{C}_1^n E_n)_{\rho|\Omega} &\geq \inf_{\check{\mathbf{q}} \in \check{S}_\Omega} \inf_{\omega \in S = (\widetilde{Q})} \left((\gamma - \delta_\gamma) \Theta\left(\sqrt{\frac{n}{\gamma}}\right) D(\check{\mathbf{q}} \parallel \check{\nu}_{\widehat{CC}}^\omega) + (1 - \gamma - \delta'_\gamma) H(S|E\widetilde{E})_{\nu_{\perp\perp}^\omega} \right) n \\
&\quad - \Theta(\sqrt{\gamma n}) - \Theta\left(\sqrt{\frac{n}{\gamma}}\right) \\
&\geq \inf_{\check{\mathbf{q}} \in \check{S}_\Omega} \inf_{\omega \in S = (\widetilde{Q})} \left(\Theta(\sqrt{\gamma n}) D(\check{\mathbf{q}} \parallel \check{\nu}_{\widehat{CC}}^\omega) + (1 - 1.5\gamma) H(S|E\widetilde{E})_{\nu_{\perp\perp}^\omega} \right) n \\
&\quad - \Theta\left(\sqrt{\frac{n}{\gamma}}\right) \text{ at sufficiently large } n \text{ such that } \delta_\gamma, \delta'_\gamma < \gamma/2, \tag{102}
\end{aligned}$$

²⁵This claim is in fact somewhat delicate. First note that for n IID instances of a Bernoulli random variable with expectation p_{exp} , if we write the observed success frequency as Q_{obs} , then the probability that $|Q_{\text{obs}} - p_{\text{exp}}|$ exceeds some value δ can be shown to be at most $2e^{-\frac{\delta^2 n}{3p_{\text{exp}}}}$ by a Chernoff bound argument. This means that (focusing only on the $\perp\perp$ term and ignoring contributions from other test-round outcomes) we can choose $\delta_\gamma = \delta'_\gamma = \sqrt{3n^{-1}\gamma \log(2/\varepsilon_{\text{com}})}$ while still ensuring an accept probability of at least $1 - O(\varepsilon_{\text{com}})$ on honest IID behaviour (by applying the Chernoff bound argument with $p_{\text{exp}} = \gamma$, viewing a single-round ‘‘success’’ as the event that $\perp\perp$ did *not* occur). In that case if we pick the scaling of γ with n to be any function that goes to zero slower than $1/n$ (as is indeed the case in the subsequent analysis), we see that $\delta_\gamma, \delta'_\gamma$ would indeed become arbitrarily small compared to γ . However if we pick $\gamma \propto 1/n$ *exactly*, this argument does not quite work, just as in [DF19]. We leave a more detailed analysis (perhaps preserving the $D(\mathbf{r} \parallel \mathbf{s})$ term to avoid invoking an explicit lower bound on γ_q) for future work.

where in the second line we trivially upper bounded the $\Theta(\sqrt{\gamma n})$ term by $\Theta(\sqrt{n/\gamma})$. With this, we observe similarly to [DF19] that if we pick the scaling of γ with n to be any function that goes to zero slower than $1/n$, then the $\Theta(\sqrt{n/\gamma})$ term grows slower than $\Theta(n)$; furthermore, the $\Theta(\sqrt{\gamma n})$ prefactor on the KL divergence “penalty” term will increase with n . Hence for any such scaling of γ with n , we would have the same limiting behaviour as the IID case:

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} H_{\min}^{\varepsilon}(S_1^n \overline{C}_1^n | \widehat{C}_1^n E_n)_{\rho|\Omega} \geq \inf_{\substack{\omega \in \mathcal{S}=\widetilde{Q} \\ \text{s.t. } \check{\nu}^{\omega} \in \check{S}_{\Omega}}} H(S|E\widetilde{E})_{\nu_{\perp\perp}^{\omega}}. \quad (103)$$

Note that just as in [DF19], there are some technical issues if we take *exactly* $\gamma = k/n$ for some constant k (basically, the expected number of test rounds). In particular, this causes some difficulties with the assumption that $\delta_{\gamma}, \delta'_{\gamma} < \gamma/2$ at large n ; furthermore, even if that issue were resolved, we would end up with a slightly but strictly worse bound, similar to that observed in [DF19]:

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} H_{\min}^{\varepsilon}(S_1^n \overline{C}_1^n | \widehat{C}_1^n E_n)_{\rho|\Omega} \geq \inf_{\check{q} \in \check{S}_{\Omega}} \inf_{\omega \in \mathcal{S}=\widetilde{Q}} \left(\Theta(k) D(\check{q} \| \check{\nu}_{\overline{C}\overline{C}}^{\omega}) + H(S|E\widetilde{E})_{\nu_{\perp\perp}^{\omega}} - \Theta\left(\frac{1}{k}\right) \right), \quad (104)$$

which could be arbitrarily close to (103) by picking large enough k , but will not be equal to it.

5.1.2 Convexity of relaxed lower bounds

We warn that while we have proven the convexity of various expressions in Theorem 2 and Lemmas 10–11, these convexity properties might not be preserved when applying the lower bounds we described above. If such properties are required for numerical techniques to tackle the resulting optimizations, one would need to separately prove that they hold, which may or may not be straightforward (while in many cases the objective functions are clearly convex in the individual variables, showing that *joint* convexity holds is more subtle). For instance, if we convert the Lemma 10 bound to von Neumann entropy with (91) and keep only the “generation component” as in (97), we would need to consider the convexity of $q(\perp\perp)H(S|E\widetilde{E})_{\nu_{\perp\perp}^{\omega}}$.²⁶ Note that the $H(S|E\widetilde{E})_{\nu_{\perp\perp}^{\omega}}$ term by itself is convex in ω , by Remark 2 applied to the \mathcal{M}^{gen} channel in (96) (a subtlety is that we need to use the fact that the test probability γ is a *fixed* constant in (96)), so if e.g. we replace the $q(\perp\perp)$ term with some fixed lower bound $q^{\min}(\perp\perp)$ induced by S_{Ω} , we do obtain a convex optimization.

However, that last replacement can potentially be avoided by a somewhat subtle argument. First, following the techniques in [WLC18] for device-dependent QKD, one can construct CP linear maps \mathcal{Z}, \mathcal{G} determined by \mathcal{M}^{gen} , such that $H(S|E\widetilde{E})_{\nu_{\perp\perp}^{\omega}} = D(\mathcal{G}[\omega] \| \mathcal{Z} \circ \mathcal{G}[\omega])$.²⁷ This is convex on the set of positive semidefinite (not necessarily normalized) ω , by the convexity of Umegaki divergence under the definition (13) we used [Tom16, Chapter 4.1.2, Property (IXb)]. Also, under that definition we see that a “scale-invariance” property $D(\mathcal{G}[\omega/t] \| \mathcal{Z} \circ \mathcal{G}[\omega/t]) = D(\mathcal{G}[\omega] \| \mathcal{Z} \circ \mathcal{G}[\omega])$ holds for any $t > 0$ (recalling \mathcal{Z}, \mathcal{G} are linear). We now use the fact that for any convex function

²⁶The KL divergence term is already convex, so it suffices to show convexity of this entropy term alone. Still, it is true that in principle there may be situations where the *sum* of the KL divergence term and entropy term is convex even if the latter is not convex by itself — considering this possibility might help in tackling the issue we shall shortly discuss regarding the full linear combination $\sum_{\check{c}\check{e}} q(\check{c}\check{e})H(S|E\widetilde{E})_{\nu_{\check{c}\check{e}}^{\omega}}$. However, we leave this more elaborate possibility for future work, if it is relevant.

²⁷If \mathcal{Z}, \mathcal{G} are not trace-preserving, care is needed to ensure consistency with the definition (13) we chose here for Umegaki divergence.

$f(\omega)$, its **perspective** function $g(\omega, t) := tf(\omega/t)$ (for $t > 0$) is jointly convex in ω and t [BV04, Chapter 3.2.6]. Therefore, if f is any convex function with a scale-invariance property $f(\omega/t) = f(\omega)$, we can see that $tf(\omega) = tf(\omega/t) = g(\omega, t)$ is jointly convex in ω and t . Hence we conclude that $q(\perp\perp)D(\mathcal{G}[\omega] \parallel \mathcal{Z} \circ \mathcal{G}[\omega])$ is in fact jointly convex in $q(\perp\perp)$ and ω . On the other hand, it is less clear how to generalize this argument to a linear combination such as $\sum_{\tilde{c}\hat{c}} q(\tilde{c}\hat{c})H(S|EE)_{\nu_{\tilde{c}\hat{c}}}^\omega$; we leave this to be resolved in future work if necessary.

Similar considerations apply to the formula (100) for the KL divergence term $D(\mathbf{q} \parallel \nu_{\widehat{CC}}^\omega)$, and the bounds described below it. While the formula (100) retains joint convexity in (\mathbf{q}, ω) since it is an equality, one might wish to have joint convexity in $(\gamma_q, \check{\mathbf{q}}, \omega)$ instead. To resolve this, we can note that $D(\check{\mathbf{q}} \parallel \check{\nu}_{\widehat{CC}}^\omega)$ is jointly convex in $(\check{\mathbf{q}}, \omega)$ (again, we need the fact that γ is a constant, so the mapping $\nu_{\widehat{CC}}^\omega \rightarrow \check{\nu}_{\widehat{CC}}^\omega$ is affine), then apply the above perspective-function analysis to see that $\gamma_q D(\check{\mathbf{q}} \parallel \check{\nu}_{\widehat{CC}}^\omega)$ is jointly convex in $(\gamma_q, \check{\mathbf{q}}, \omega)$. With this we conclude that (100) is indeed jointly convex in $(\gamma_q, \check{\mathbf{q}}, \omega)$, with or without the $D(\mathbf{r} \parallel \mathbf{s})$ term (since that term is itself convex in γ_q), though a technical caveat here is that the new optimization domain S_Ω might not automatically be convex. A similar but simpler analysis (without needing perspective functions) holds if we instead just apply $\gamma_q \geq \gamma - \delta_\gamma$ to lower bound $\gamma_q D(\check{\mathbf{q}} \parallel \check{\nu}_{\widehat{CC}}^\omega)$ with $(\gamma - \delta_\gamma) D(\check{\mathbf{q}} \parallel \check{\nu}_{\widehat{CC}}^\omega)$.

5.2 Proof of Theorem 2

We first derive a straightforward consequence of Corollary 1. This result may be of some use in its own right (note that it does not require the convexity condition on S_Ω in Theorem 2), though it is more or less just a specialization of the Corollary 1 bound.

Corollary 2. *Consider the same conditions and notation as in Theorem 2, except without requiring that S_Ω is convex. Then for any QES f on \widehat{CC} , we have*

$$\begin{aligned} H_\alpha^\uparrow(S_1^n \widehat{C}_1^n | \widehat{C}_1^n E_n)_{\rho_1 \Omega} &\geq \inf_{\mathbf{q} \in S_\Omega} \inf_{\nu \in \Sigma} \left(H_\alpha^f(S\overline{C} | \widehat{C} E \widetilde{E})_\nu + \mathbf{f} \cdot \mathbf{q} \right) n - \frac{\alpha}{\alpha - 1} \log \frac{1}{p_\Omega} \\ &= \inf_{\mathbf{q} \in S_\Omega} \inf_{\omega \in S = (\widetilde{Q})} \left(H_\alpha^f(S\overline{C} | \widehat{C} E \widetilde{E})_{\nu^\omega} + \mathbf{f} \cdot \mathbf{q} \right) n - \frac{\alpha}{\alpha - 1} \log \frac{1}{p_\Omega}, \end{aligned} \quad (105)$$

where \mathbf{f} denotes the function f viewed equivalently as a tuple in $\mathbb{R}^{|\widehat{C} \times \widehat{C}|}$. Furthermore, in the second line, $H_\alpha^f(S\overline{C} | \widehat{C} E \widetilde{E})_{\nu^\omega}$ is convex in ω , and hence the objective function in the infimum is jointly convex in ω and \mathbf{q} .

Proof. Simply set all the QES-s $f_{|\widehat{c}_1^{j-1} \widehat{c}_1^{j-1}}$ in the Corollary 1 statement to be equal to f . Then the

bound (80) becomes

$$\begin{aligned}
H_\alpha^\uparrow(S_1^n \overline{C}_1^n | \widehat{C}_1^n E_n)_{\rho_\Omega} &\geq \min_{\overline{c}_1^n \hat{c}_1^n \in \widetilde{\Omega}} \sum_{j=1}^n \left(f(\overline{c}_j \hat{c}_j) + \inf_{\nu \in \Sigma_j} H_\alpha^f(S_j \overline{C}_j | \widehat{C}_j E_j \widetilde{E})_\nu \right) - \frac{\alpha}{\alpha-1} \log \frac{1}{p_\Omega} \\
&= \min_{\overline{c}_1^n \hat{c}_1^n \in \widetilde{\Omega}} \sum_{\overline{c}\hat{c} \in \overline{C} \times \widehat{C}} f(\overline{c}\hat{c}) \text{freq}_{\overline{c}_1^n \hat{c}_1^n}(\overline{c}\hat{c})n + \sum_{j=1}^n \inf_{\nu \in \Sigma_j} H_\alpha^f(S_j \overline{C}_j | \widehat{C}_j E_j \widetilde{E})_\nu - \frac{\alpha}{\alpha-1} \log \frac{1}{p_\Omega} \\
&\geq \inf_{\mathbf{q} \in S_\Omega} \mathbf{f} \cdot \mathbf{q} n + \sum_{j=1}^n \inf_{\nu \in \Sigma_j} H_\alpha^f(S_j \overline{C}_j | \widehat{C}_j E_j \widetilde{E})_\nu - \frac{\alpha}{\alpha-1} \log \frac{1}{p_\Omega} \\
&\geq \inf_{\mathbf{q} \in S_\Omega} \inf_{\nu \in \Sigma} \left(H_\alpha^f(S \overline{C} | \widehat{C} E \widetilde{E})_\nu + \mathbf{f} \cdot \mathbf{q} \right) n - \frac{\alpha}{\alpha-1} \log \frac{1}{p_\Omega}, \tag{106}
\end{aligned}$$

where in the second line we rewrite the sum of $f(\overline{c}_j \hat{c}_j)$ values in terms of the frequency distribution $\text{freq}_{\overline{c}_1^n \hat{c}_1^n}$, the third line holds by expressing the minimization over $\overline{c}_1^n \hat{c}_1^n \in \widetilde{\Omega}$ as an minimization over its induced frequency distributions and then relaxing the domain to S_Ω (using the first condition on S_Ω), and the fourth line follows from the definition (82) of a rate-bounding channel. (It may be worth noting that the third line is a valid bound even without the existence of a rate-bounding channel, so it may be of some potential use in contexts where the channels are not “all essentially the same”, though in that case it also seems suboptimal to choose all the QES-s equal.)

The second line in (105) follows straightforwardly from Lemma 7; from that lemma, we also know that $H_\alpha^f(S \overline{C} | \widehat{C} E \widetilde{E})_{\nu\omega}$ is convex in ω as claimed, since $\hat{\alpha} > 1$ given $\alpha > 1$. \square

Next, we prove a lemma which is an essential tool in the subsequent calculations. It is based on the concept of Legendre conjugates [BV04]:

Definition 14. (Legendre conjugate) For a function $F : D \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{-\infty, +\infty\}$ where D is a convex subset of \mathbb{R}^k , its **Legendre conjugate** is the function $F^* : \mathbb{R}^k \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{-\infty, +\infty\}$ given by

$$F^*(\mathbf{y}) := \sup_{\mathbf{x} \in D} (\mathbf{x} \cdot \mathbf{y} - F(\mathbf{x})). \tag{107}$$

Under this definition, we show the following result.

Lemma 12. Consider any $\alpha \in (1, \infty)$ and any $\rho \in S_=(QQ' \overline{C} \widehat{C})$ such that $\overline{C}, \widehat{C}$ are classical with alphabets $\overline{C}, \widehat{C}$. Then letting $\mathbb{P}_{\overline{C}\widehat{C}}$ denote the set of probability distributions on $\overline{C} \times \widehat{C}$, the pair of functions $(G_{\alpha,\rho}, G_{\alpha,\rho}^*)$ on $\mathbb{R}^{|\overline{C} \times \widehat{C}|}$ defined as

$$\begin{aligned}
G_{\alpha,\rho}(\mathbf{f}) &:= -H_\alpha^f(Q \overline{C} | \widehat{C} Q')_\rho, \\
G_{\alpha,\rho}^*(\boldsymbol{\lambda}) &:= \begin{cases} \frac{1}{\alpha-1} D(\boldsymbol{\lambda} \| \rho_{\overline{C}\widehat{C}}) - \sum_{\overline{c}\hat{c} \in \text{supp}(\rho_{\overline{C}\widehat{C}})} \lambda(\overline{c}\hat{c}) D_\alpha(\rho_{QQ' \wedge \overline{c}\hat{c}} \| \mathbb{I}_Q \otimes \rho_{Q' \wedge \hat{c}}) & \text{if } \boldsymbol{\lambda} \in \mathbb{P}_{\overline{C}\widehat{C}}, \\ +\infty & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \tag{108}
\end{aligned}$$

are convex functions that are Legendre conjugates to each other, where in the $G_{\alpha,\rho}$ formula we recall that any tuple $\mathbf{f} \in \mathbb{R}^{|\overline{C} \times \widehat{C}|}$ is equivalent to a QES on $\overline{C}\widehat{C}$, and in the $G_{\alpha,\rho}^*$ formula we recall that $\rho_{\overline{C}\widehat{C}}$ denotes the distribution induced by ρ on $\overline{C}\widehat{C}$.²⁸

²⁸Note that in the $G_{\alpha,\rho}^*$ formula, the first case can still take value $+\infty$ for some values of $\boldsymbol{\lambda}$, due to the $D(\boldsymbol{\lambda} \| \rho_{\overline{C}\widehat{C}})$ term. Specifically, this happens whenever $\text{supp}(\boldsymbol{\lambda}) \not\subseteq \text{supp}(\rho_{\overline{C}\widehat{C}})$.

Proof. For brevity in this proof, let us use $\tilde{\mathbf{f}}, \tilde{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}, \tilde{\boldsymbol{\rho}}_{\widehat{C}\widehat{C}}$ respectively to denote the restrictions of $\mathbf{f}, \boldsymbol{\lambda}, \boldsymbol{\rho}_{\widehat{C}\widehat{C}}$ to $\text{supp}(\boldsymbol{\rho}_{\widehat{C}\widehat{C}})$. In particular, this means $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\rho}}_{\widehat{C}\widehat{C}}$ is a distribution on $\text{supp}(\boldsymbol{\rho}_{\widehat{C}\widehat{C}})$ with full support. Also, let $\tilde{\mathbf{D}}_\alpha$ denote the tuple of values $\{D_\alpha(\rho_{QQ' \wedge \tilde{c}\tilde{c}} \|\mathbb{I}_Q \otimes \rho_{Q' \wedge \tilde{c}\tilde{c}})\}_{\tilde{c}\tilde{c} \in \text{supp}(\boldsymbol{\rho}_{\widehat{C}\widehat{C}})}$ (note that every term in this tuple is finite, as argued below Definition 11).

We first note that by slightly rewriting the formula for $H_\alpha^f(Q\widehat{C}|\widehat{C}Q')_\rho$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} G_{\alpha,\rho}(\mathbf{f}) &= \frac{1}{(\alpha-1)\ln 2} \ln \left(\sum_{\tilde{c}\tilde{c} \in \text{supp}(\boldsymbol{\rho}_{\widehat{C}\widehat{C}})} \rho(\tilde{c}\tilde{c}) e^{(\alpha-1)(\ln 2)(f(\tilde{c}\tilde{c}) + D_\alpha(\rho_{QQ' \wedge \tilde{c}\tilde{c}} \|\mathbb{I}_Q \otimes \rho_{Q' \wedge \tilde{c}\tilde{c}}))} \right) \\ &= \frac{1}{(\alpha-1)\ln 2} \text{logsumexp} \left(\ln(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\rho}}_{\widehat{C}\widehat{C}}) + (\alpha-1)(\ln 2)(\tilde{\mathbf{f}} + \tilde{\mathbf{D}}_\alpha) \right), \end{aligned} \quad (109)$$

where logsumexp denotes the base- e log-sum-exponential function (see e.g. [BV04]), and $\ln(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\rho}}_{\widehat{C}\widehat{C}})$ simply denotes the elementwise logarithm of the distribution $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\rho}}_{\widehat{C}\widehat{C}}$ (which is well-defined since this is a full-support distribution). Since the log-sum-exponential function is convex [BV04] and we have $\alpha > 1$, the last expression is a convex function of $\tilde{\mathbf{f}}$, which implies $G_{\alpha,\rho}(\mathbf{f})$ is a convex function of \mathbf{f} as claimed (noting that it is constant with respect to any \mathbf{f} components outside of $\tilde{\mathbf{f}}$).

Since the domain of $G_{\alpha,\rho}$ is the whole of $\mathbb{R}^{|\widehat{C} \times \widehat{C}|}$ (because it is finite for all $\mathbf{f} \in \mathbb{R}^{|\widehat{C} \times \widehat{C}|}$), the fact that it is convex implies that taking the Legendre conjugate twice returns the original function [BV04]. Hence the remainder of the proof is focused only on proving that its Legendre conjugate is indeed the function $G_{\alpha,\rho}^*$ defined in (108) — once that has been shown, they will be Legendre conjugates of each other as claimed; also, Legendre conjugates are always convex, so $G_{\alpha,\rho}^*$ will be convex as claimed.

Now, by Definition 14, $G_{\alpha,\rho}^*$ is the Legendre conjugate of $G_{\alpha,\rho}(\mathbf{f})$ iff the following relation holds:

$$G_{\alpha,\rho}^*(\boldsymbol{\lambda}) = \sup_{\mathbf{f} \in \mathbb{R}^{|\widehat{C} \times \widehat{C}|}} (\boldsymbol{\lambda} \cdot \mathbf{f} - G_{\alpha,\rho}(\mathbf{f})). \quad (110)$$

We first note that for any $\boldsymbol{\lambda}$ such that $\text{supp}(\boldsymbol{\lambda}) \not\subseteq \text{supp}(\boldsymbol{\rho}_{\widehat{C}\widehat{C}})$, i.e. there exists some $\tilde{c}\tilde{c} \notin \text{supp}(\boldsymbol{\rho}_{\widehat{C}\widehat{C}})$ such that $\lambda(\tilde{c}\tilde{c}) \neq 0$, then the above optimization takes the value $+\infty$. This is because as noted in (109), the $G_{\alpha,\rho}(\mathbf{f})$ term would be independent of the corresponding $f(\tilde{c}\tilde{c})$ value, and hence we could just take either $f(\tilde{c}\tilde{c}) \rightarrow -\infty$ or $f(\tilde{c}\tilde{c}) \rightarrow +\infty$ (depending on the sign of $\lambda(\tilde{c}\tilde{c})$) to make the above optimization diverge to $+\infty$. Note that this value indeed matches the claimed formula for $G_{\alpha,\rho}^*$ in (108), because for any $\boldsymbol{\lambda}$ such that $\text{supp}(\boldsymbol{\lambda}) \not\subseteq \text{supp}(\boldsymbol{\rho}_{\widehat{C}\widehat{C}})$, either we have $\boldsymbol{\lambda} \in \mathbb{P}_{\widehat{C}\widehat{C}}$ in which case the formula gives value $+\infty$ due to the $D(\boldsymbol{\lambda} \|\boldsymbol{\rho}_{\widehat{C}\widehat{C}})$ term, or we have $\boldsymbol{\lambda} \notin \mathbb{P}_{\widehat{C}\widehat{C}}$ in which case the formula gives value $+\infty$ directly.

Hence in the remainder of our analysis, we only need to consider $\boldsymbol{\lambda}$ such that $\text{supp}(\boldsymbol{\lambda}) \subseteq \text{supp}(\boldsymbol{\rho}_{\widehat{C}\widehat{C}})$, i.e. $\boldsymbol{\lambda}$ is only supported on $\text{supp}(\boldsymbol{\rho}_{\widehat{C}\widehat{C}})$, in which case we have $\boldsymbol{\lambda} \cdot \mathbf{f} = \tilde{\boldsymbol{\lambda}} \cdot \tilde{\mathbf{f}}$. Also, note that by (109), we can write $G_{\alpha,\rho}(\mathbf{f}) = \tilde{G}_{\alpha,\rho}(\tilde{\mathbf{f}})$ where $\tilde{G}_{\alpha,\rho}$ simply denotes the last line of (109). Hence for such $\boldsymbol{\lambda}$, we see the defining optimization for $G_{\alpha,\rho}^*$ reduces to

$$\begin{aligned} G_{\alpha,\rho}^*(\boldsymbol{\lambda}) &= \sup_{\mathbf{f} \in \mathbb{R}^{|\widehat{C} \times \widehat{C}|}} (\tilde{\boldsymbol{\lambda}} \cdot \tilde{\mathbf{f}} - \tilde{G}_{\alpha,\rho}(\tilde{\mathbf{f}})) \\ &= \sup_{\mathbf{g} \in \mathbb{R}^{|\text{supp}(\boldsymbol{\rho}_{\widehat{C}\widehat{C}})|}} (\tilde{\boldsymbol{\lambda}} \cdot \mathbf{g} - \tilde{G}_{\alpha,\rho}(\mathbf{g})), \end{aligned} \quad (111)$$

since the objective only depends on the restricted values $\tilde{\mathbf{f}}$.

Since $\widetilde{G}_{\alpha,\rho}$ is convex as previously discussed, the above optimization is a concave maximization problem, and hence any stationary point yields a global maximum. By differentiating the objective function, we see that for any $\mathbf{g} \in \mathbb{R}^{|\text{supp}(\boldsymbol{\rho}_{\overline{\mathcal{C}\mathcal{C}}})|}$, it is a stationary point if and only if it satisfies

$$\forall \bar{c}\hat{c} \in \text{supp}(\boldsymbol{\rho}_{\overline{\mathcal{C}\mathcal{C}}}), \quad \lambda(\bar{c}\hat{c}) = \frac{\rho(\bar{c}\hat{c})e^{(\alpha-1)(\ln 2)(g(\bar{c}\hat{c})+D_\alpha(\rho_{QQ'} \wedge \bar{c}\hat{c} \|\mathbb{I}_Q \otimes \rho_{Q' \wedge \hat{c}}))}}{\sum_{\bar{c}'\hat{c}' \in \text{supp}(\boldsymbol{\rho}_{\overline{\mathcal{C}\mathcal{C}}})} \rho(\bar{c}'\hat{c}')e^{(\alpha-1)(\ln 2)(g(\bar{c}'\hat{c}')+D_\alpha(\rho_{QQ'} \wedge \bar{c}'\hat{c}' \|\mathbb{I}_Q \otimes \rho_{Q' \wedge \hat{c}'})}}. \quad (112)$$

We first note that (given $\text{supp}(\boldsymbol{\lambda}) \subseteq \text{supp}(\boldsymbol{\rho}_{\overline{\mathcal{C}\mathcal{C}}})$) if $\boldsymbol{\lambda} \in \mathbb{P}_{\overline{\mathcal{C}\mathcal{C}}}$ and has full support on $\text{supp}(\boldsymbol{\rho}_{\overline{\mathcal{C}\mathcal{C}}})$ (i.e. $\lambda(\bar{c}\hat{c}) > 0$ for all $\bar{c}\hat{c} \in \text{supp}(\boldsymbol{\rho}_{\overline{\mathcal{C}\mathcal{C}}})$), then $\log(\lambda(\bar{c}\hat{c})/\rho(\bar{c}\hat{c}))$ is always finite. Hence if we set

$$\forall \bar{c}\hat{c} \in \text{supp}(\boldsymbol{\rho}_{\overline{\mathcal{C}\mathcal{C}}}), \quad g(\bar{c}\hat{c}) = \frac{1}{\alpha-1} \log \frac{\lambda(\bar{c}\hat{c})}{\rho(\bar{c}\hat{c})} - D_\alpha(\rho_{QQ' \wedge \bar{c}\hat{c}} \|\mathbb{I}_Q \otimes \rho_{Q' \wedge \hat{c}}), \quad (113)$$

then we see this is a valid solution to the above conditions (112), noting that for this \mathbf{g} the denominator in those conditions is simply

$$\sum_{\bar{c}'\hat{c}' \in \text{supp}(\boldsymbol{\rho}_{\overline{\mathcal{C}\mathcal{C}}})} \rho(\bar{c}'\hat{c}')e^{(\alpha-1)(\ln 2)(g(\bar{c}'\hat{c}')+D_\alpha(\rho_{QQ' \wedge \bar{c}'\hat{c}'} \|\mathbb{I}_Q \otimes \rho_{Q' \wedge \hat{c}'})}) = \sum_{\bar{c}'\hat{c}' \in \text{supp}(\boldsymbol{\rho}_{\overline{\mathcal{C}\mathcal{C}}})} \lambda(\bar{c}'\hat{c}') = 1. \quad (114)$$

By substituting this stationary point into (111) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} G_{\alpha,\rho}^*(\boldsymbol{\lambda}) &= \sum_{\bar{c}\hat{c} \in \text{supp}(\boldsymbol{\rho}_{\overline{\mathcal{C}\mathcal{C}}})} \lambda(\bar{c}\hat{c}) \left(\frac{1}{\alpha-1} \log \frac{\lambda(\bar{c}\hat{c})}{\rho(\bar{c}\hat{c})} - D_\alpha(\rho_{QQ' \wedge \bar{c}\hat{c}} \|\mathbb{I}_Q \otimes \rho_{Q' \wedge \hat{c}}) \right) - \widetilde{G}_{\alpha,\rho}(\mathbf{g}) \\ &= \frac{1}{\alpha-1} D(\boldsymbol{\lambda} \|\boldsymbol{\rho}_{\overline{\mathcal{C}\mathcal{C}}}) - \sum_{\bar{c}\hat{c} \in \text{supp}(\boldsymbol{\rho}_{\overline{\mathcal{C}\mathcal{C}}})} \lambda(\bar{c}\hat{c}) D_\alpha(\rho_{QQ' \wedge \bar{c}\hat{c}} \|\mathbb{I}_Q \otimes \rho_{Q' \wedge \hat{c}}), \end{aligned} \quad (115)$$

where in the second line we used the definition of KL divergence and the fact that for this \mathbf{g} we have $\widetilde{G}_{\alpha,\rho}(\mathbf{g}) = 0$ due to (114).

If $\boldsymbol{\lambda} \in \mathbb{P}_{\overline{\mathcal{C}\mathcal{C}}}$ but does not have full support on $\text{supp}(\boldsymbol{\rho}_{\overline{\mathcal{C}\mathcal{C}}})$, the reasoning is basically the same, except that for every $\bar{c}\hat{c} \in \text{supp}(\boldsymbol{\rho}_{\overline{\mathcal{C}\mathcal{C}}})$ such that $\lambda(\bar{c}\hat{c}) = 0$, we note that the supremum with respect to that $g(\bar{c}\hat{c})$ term in (111) is approached by taking the $g(\bar{c}\hat{c}) \rightarrow -\infty$ limit (because $\widetilde{G}_{\alpha,\rho}$ is monotone increasing with respect to each $g(\bar{c}\hat{c})$ value). In that limit, their contribution to the sum in the definition of $\widetilde{G}_{\alpha,\rho}$ becomes trivial, since

$$\lim_{g(\bar{c}\hat{c}) \rightarrow -\infty} e^{(\alpha-1)(\ln 2)(g(\bar{c}\hat{c})+D_\alpha(\rho_{QQ' \wedge \bar{c}\hat{c}} \|\mathbb{I}_Q \otimes \rho_{Q' \wedge \hat{c}}))} = 0. \quad (116)$$

Therefore we can basically set those values in the sum to zero, and restrict our attention to the supremum over the remaining \mathbf{g} components, which then lets us apply essentially the same analysis as above.

We now handle the case of $\boldsymbol{\lambda} \notin \mathbb{P}_{\overline{\mathcal{C}\mathcal{C}}}$ (but still under the restriction $\text{supp}(\boldsymbol{\lambda}) \subseteq \text{supp}(\boldsymbol{\rho}_{\overline{\mathcal{C}\mathcal{C}}})$). Here, one possibility is that there is at least one $\bar{c}\hat{c} \in \text{supp}(\boldsymbol{\rho}_{\overline{\mathcal{C}\mathcal{C}}})$ with $\lambda(\bar{c}\hat{c}) < 0$. For such cases, note that as the corresponding $g(\bar{c}\hat{c})$ term decreases towards $-\infty$, the objective goes to $+\infty$, because the $\lambda(\bar{c}\hat{c})g(\bar{c}\hat{c})$ term goes to $+\infty$ and the $-\widetilde{G}_{\alpha,\rho}(g)$ term is monotone increasing. Therefore $G_{\alpha,\rho}^*(\boldsymbol{\lambda}) = +\infty$ for such $\boldsymbol{\lambda}$, as claimed in (108). The remaining possibility is that all $\bar{c}\hat{c} \in \text{supp}(\boldsymbol{\rho}_{\overline{\mathcal{C}\mathcal{C}}})$ satisfy $\lambda(\bar{c}\hat{c}) \geq 0$ but we have $\sum_{\bar{c}\hat{c} \in \text{supp}(\boldsymbol{\rho}_{\overline{\mathcal{C}\mathcal{C}}})} \lambda(\bar{c}\hat{c}) \neq 1$. In that case, pick \mathbf{g} to be a tuple whose

elements are equal and constant (i.e., $\forall \bar{c}\hat{c} \in \text{supp}(\rho_{\bar{C}\hat{C}})$; $g(\bar{c}\hat{c}) = k$), then, the last line of (111) becomes:

$$G_{\alpha,\rho}^*(\boldsymbol{\lambda}) = \sup_{k \in D} \left(k \left(\sum_{\bar{c}\hat{c} \in \text{supp}(\rho_{\bar{C}\hat{C}})} \lambda(\bar{c}\hat{c}) - 1 \right) + \frac{1}{(\alpha - 1) \ln 2} \text{logsumexp} \left(\ln(\tilde{\rho}_{\bar{C}\hat{C}}) + (\alpha - 1)(\ln 2)\tilde{\mathbf{D}}_\alpha \right) \right), \quad (117)$$

where $D = \mathbb{R} \cup \{-\infty, +\infty\}$. Since the logsumexp term is independent of k , we see that if $\sum_{\bar{c}\hat{c} \in \text{supp}(\rho_{\bar{C}\hat{C}})} \lambda(\bar{c}\hat{c}) > 1$ (resp. $\sum_{\bar{c}\hat{c} \in \text{supp}(\rho_{\bar{C}\hat{C}})} \lambda(\bar{c}\hat{c}) < 1$), then as $k \rightarrow +\infty$ (resp. $k \rightarrow -\infty$) the optimization increases towards $+\infty$, and thus $G_{\alpha,\rho}^*(\boldsymbol{\lambda}) = +\infty$. \square

We now have the tools required to obtain Theorem 2, by proving this final key lemma. (In this lemma, Lagrange dual problems are defined in the sense described in e.g. [BV04]. Since the constraints are equality constraints, there is an arbitrary sign convention to pick when defining the dual variables; see the last line of (123) below for the sign convention we used.)

Lemma 13. *Consider the same conditions and notation as in Corollary 2. Let $r_{\hat{\alpha}}(\mathbf{f})$ denote the value of the infimum in the second line of (105) as a function of the QES \mathbf{f} , i.e.*

$$r_{\hat{\alpha}}(\mathbf{f}) := \inf_{\mathbf{q} \in S_\Omega} \inf_{\omega \in S_{=}(\bar{Q})} \left(H_{\hat{\alpha}}^f(S\bar{C}|\widehat{C}E\widetilde{E})_{\nu^\omega} + \mathbf{f} \cdot \mathbf{q} \right). \quad (118)$$

Then the optimization problem

$$\sup_{\mathbf{f}} r_{\hat{\alpha}}(\mathbf{f}), \quad (119)$$

is the Lagrange dual problem of the constrained optimization

$$\inf_{\mathbf{q} \in S_\Omega} \inf_{\lambda \in \mathbb{P}_{\bar{C}\hat{C}}} \inf_{\omega \in S_{=}(\bar{Q})} \left(\frac{1}{\hat{\alpha} - 1} D(\boldsymbol{\lambda} \parallel \nu_{\bar{C}\hat{C}}^\omega) - \sum_{\bar{c}\hat{c} \in \text{supp}(\nu_{\bar{C}\hat{C}}^\omega)} \lambda(\bar{c}\hat{c}) D_{\hat{\alpha}}(\nu_{SE\widetilde{E}\wedge\bar{c}\hat{c}}^\omega \parallel \mathbb{I}_S \otimes \nu_{E\widetilde{E}\wedge\hat{c}}^\omega) \right), \quad (120)$$

s.t. $\mathbf{q} - \boldsymbol{\lambda} = \mathbf{0}$

in which the objective function is jointly convex in $\boldsymbol{\lambda}$ and ω (and \mathbf{q} , trivially), with $\mathbb{P}_{\bar{C}\hat{C}}$ denoting the set of probability distributions on $\bar{C}\hat{C}$.

Furthermore, if S_Ω is convex, the values of (119) and (120) are equal.

Before giving its proof, we present two critical consequences of this lemma. First, observe that the²⁹ best choice of f in Corollary 2 is exactly the same thing as the optimal \mathbf{f} in the optimization (119). The above lemma gives us a method to find this \mathbf{f} , even in situations where S_Ω does not satisfy the convexity condition in Theorem 2, by computing or approximating the optimal dual solution to (120) (see [GLH+22, KAG+24] for possible numerical approaches) — this

²⁹In this paragraph we informally refer to “the” best choice of f , though this is technically a misnomer because it is necessarily non-unique — given any QES f in Corollary 2, inspecting the bound shows that $f + \kappa$ for any $\kappa \in \mathbb{R}$ yields an identical bound, since the κ dependence “cancels off”. (Loosely speaking, this non-uniqueness seems to arise from the implicit normalization constraint in the domains $S_\Omega, \mathbb{P}_{\bar{C}\hat{C}}$, though we leave further analysis for future work.) Furthermore, it might potentially be possible that the optimal f is not attained, as we discuss later. However, this non-uniqueness or non-attainability does not have any effects on our actual proofs of Lemma 13 or Theorem 2; we are merely highlighting a technicality in our informal statements here.

approach can be used as a substitute for Theorem 2 in such circumstances. (Also, if the Rényi divergence terms in (120) are difficult to handle, then we can slightly relax the optimization using the steps in the subsequent Lemma 10–11 proofs to obtain versions with only Rényi conditional entropies; it seems reasonable to assume the dual solutions for such versions will not be far from the optimal f .) However, we must stress that in such a scenario, we do not have a guarantee that the values of the optimizations (119) and (120) are equal. Hence it would be important to actually substitute the final choice of f into Corollary 2 and compute the resulting value; it is *not* safe to assume we can obtain a valid lower bound simply by evaluating the optimization (120) on its own. (Note that while **weak duality** [BV04] always holds for Lagrange dual problems, it would be the statement that (119) is a lower bound on (120), which is the wrong inequality direction for trying to lower-bound $H_\alpha^\uparrow(S_1^n \overline{C}_1^n | \widehat{C}_1^n E_n)_{\rho|\Omega}$.)

The second important consequence is for the case where S_Ω is indeed convex, because in that case it immediately yields the desired proof of Theorem 2. Specifically, we simply need to optimize the Corollary 2 bound over all f , which gives

$$H_\alpha^\uparrow(S_1^n \overline{C}_1^n | \widehat{C}_1^n E_n)_{\rho|\Omega} \geq \left(\sup_{\mathbf{f}} r_{\widehat{\alpha}}(\mathbf{f}) \right) n - \frac{\alpha}{\alpha - 1} \log \frac{1}{p_\Omega}, \quad (121)$$

and set $h_{\widehat{\alpha}}$ to be equal to the value of the supremum over \mathbf{f} , i.e. precisely the value of the optimization (119). Then given S_Ω is convex, Lemma 13 tells us that $h_{\widehat{\alpha}}$ is also equal to the value of the optimization (120), i.e. basically that **strong duality** [BV04] holds (in the sense that the dual problems have the same value, though not necessarily in the sense that the optimum in either problem is obtained; we discuss this later at the end of the Lemma 13 proof). By simply substituting the constraint in (120) into the objective, we see that this simplifies to the desired expression (84) for $h_{\widehat{\alpha}}$, with the claimed convexity properties.

Technically, to complete the proof of Theorem 2 there is one last remaining step: showing that (84) matches the preceding expression (83). This is a straightforward data-processing argument, albeit slightly tedious. First, clearly the former is lower bounded by the latter, since (for each \mathbf{q}) every feasible point $\omega_{\widehat{Q}}$ of the former yields a feasible point of the latter by setting $\nu = \nu^\omega$. For the reverse bound, take any feasible point $\nu \in \Sigma$ in (83), i.e. $\nu = \mathcal{M}[\omega_{\widehat{Q}E}]$ for some $\omega_{\widehat{Q}E}$. Then the reduced state $\omega_{\widehat{Q}}$ is a feasible point of (84) with an objective value that is no larger, by a standard data-processing argument, as follows. Since $\text{Pur}(\omega_{\widehat{Q}})$ is a purification of $\omega_{\widehat{Q}}$, there exists some channel \mathcal{E} on \widetilde{E} such that $\omega_{\widehat{Q}E} = \mathcal{E}[\text{Pur}(\omega_{\widehat{Q}})]$. This channel \mathcal{E} commutes with \mathcal{M} , so by applying \mathcal{M} on both sides we see that $\nu = \mathcal{E}[\nu^\omega]$. Since \mathcal{E} does not act on $\overline{C}\widehat{C}$, from this relation we get $\nu_{\overline{C}\widehat{C}} = \nu_{\overline{C}\widehat{C}}^\omega$ (by tracing out everything other than $\overline{C}\widehat{C}$) and also $\nu_{\wedge \widehat{c}\widehat{c}} = \mathcal{E}[\nu_{\wedge \widehat{c}\widehat{c}}^\omega]$ (i.e. \mathcal{E} commutes with taking partial states on the $\overline{C}\widehat{C}$ registers). Therefore we have $D(\mathbf{q} \parallel \nu_{\overline{C}\widehat{C}}) = D(\mathbf{q} \parallel \nu_{\overline{C}\widehat{C}}^\omega)$ and also

$$\begin{aligned} \forall \widehat{c}\widehat{c} \in \text{supp}(\nu_{\overline{C}\widehat{C}}), \quad -D_{\widehat{\alpha}}(\nu_{SE\widetilde{E}\wedge \widehat{c}\widehat{c}} \parallel \mathbb{I}_S \otimes \nu_{E\widetilde{E}\wedge \widehat{c}\widehat{c}}) &= -D_{\widehat{\alpha}}(\mathcal{E}[\nu_{SE\widetilde{E}\wedge \widehat{c}\widehat{c}}^\omega] \parallel \mathbb{I}_S \otimes \mathcal{E}[\nu_{E\widetilde{E}\wedge \widehat{c}\widehat{c}}^\omega]) \\ &\geq -D_{\widehat{\alpha}}(\nu_{SE\widetilde{E}\wedge \widehat{c}\widehat{c}}^\omega \parallel \mathbb{I}_S \otimes \nu_{E\widetilde{E}\wedge \widehat{c}\widehat{c}}^\omega), \end{aligned} \quad (122)$$

by the data-processing property for Rényi divergences (Fact 1). This yields the desired result.

We highlight that in our above analysis proving Theorem 2 from Corollary 2 and Lemma 13, everything was an *equality*, i.e. there is no loss of tightness in using Theorem 2 (when S_Ω is convex) as compared to the Corollary 2 bound optimized over all choices of f . Hence there seem to be few

remaining ways in which Theorem 2 could be sharpened; we return to this point in more detail in Sec. 7.

Remark 7. Lemma 13 also suggests heuristic procedures for choosing QES-s to use in variable-length protocols as described in Sec. 4.3. For instance, if we simply want to use the same QES f for every round, then it seems likely that the optimal dual solution to (120) (with S_Ω being a singleton set containing only the honest behaviour, or perhaps some δ -neighbourhood of it) should yield a good choice of f , though we do not attempt to prove this here. It also suggests an approach for the broader possibility of adaptive choices of QES-s $f_{|\hat{c}_1^{j-1}\hat{c}_1^{j-1}}$ in the manner described in Sec. 4.3. Specifically, for each j at which we want to “update” the QES choice, we could consider the preceding rounds and use them to compute a loose estimate \mathbf{q}^{est} of the upcoming behaviour of the device (via any suitable physical and/or statistical model), then take $f_{|\hat{c}_1^{j-1}\hat{c}_1^{j-1}}$ to be the dual solution of the constrained optimization (120) with S_Ω being the singleton set $\{\mathbf{q}^{\text{est}}\}$ (or some small δ -neighbourhood around it, perhaps chosen according to the number of remaining rounds). This is currently a highly heuristic idea and we do not have any analysis of whether it gives reasonable performance; however, it seems like a plausible approach in light of the properties we have derived above.

We now wrap up by presenting the proof of Lemma 13, which basically consists of a sequence of convex-analysis transformations.

Proof. Following Lemma 12, we write $H_\alpha^f(S\bar{C}|\widehat{C}E\widetilde{E})_{\nu\omega} = -G_{\widehat{\alpha},\nu\omega}(\mathbf{f})$ (identifying the registers Q and Q' in that lemma with S and $E\widetilde{E}$ here respectively). With this, we can now rewrite $r_{\widehat{\alpha}}(\mathbf{f})$ as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} r_{\widehat{\alpha}}(\mathbf{f}) &= \inf_{\mathbf{q} \in S_\Omega} \inf_{\omega \in S_{=}(Q)} (-G_{\widehat{\alpha},\nu\omega}(\mathbf{f}) + \mathbf{f} \cdot \mathbf{q}) \\ &= \inf_{\mathbf{q} \in S_\Omega} \inf_{\omega \in S_{=}(Q)} \left(- \sup_{\boldsymbol{\lambda} \in \mathbb{P}_{\widehat{C}\widehat{C}}} (\boldsymbol{\lambda} \cdot \mathbf{f} - G_{\widehat{\alpha},\nu\omega}^*(\boldsymbol{\lambda})) + \mathbf{f} \cdot \mathbf{q} \right) \\ &= \inf_{\mathbf{q} \in S_\Omega} \inf_{\boldsymbol{\lambda} \in \mathbb{P}_{\widehat{C}\widehat{C}}} \inf_{\omega \in S_{=}(Q)} (G_{\widehat{\alpha},\nu\omega}^*(\boldsymbol{\lambda}) + (\mathbf{q} - \boldsymbol{\lambda}) \cdot \mathbf{f}), \end{aligned} \quad (123)$$

where in the second line we invoked Lemma 12; specifically, the fact that $G_{\widehat{\alpha},\nu\omega}$ is itself the Legendre conjugate of $G_{\widehat{\alpha},\nu\omega}^*$, and the fact that $G_{\widehat{\alpha},\nu\omega}^*$ is infinite outside of $\mathbb{P}_{\widehat{C}\widehat{C}}$. Now with the last line in this formula for $r_{\widehat{\alpha}}(\mathbf{f})$, by noting that the $G_{\widehat{\alpha},\nu\omega}^*(\boldsymbol{\lambda})$ term is entirely independent of \mathbf{f} and filling in its definition (108), we see that the maximization problem (119) is precisely the Lagrange dual problem of the constrained optimization (120), as claimed.

Turning to the case where S_Ω is convex, we would basically like to prove that strong duality holds under that condition. First recall that as mentioned in Corollary 2, the quantity $H_\alpha^f(S\bar{C}|\widehat{C}E\widetilde{E})_{\nu\omega} = -G_{\widehat{\alpha},\nu\omega}(\mathbf{f})$ is convex in ω . Combined with the Legendre-conjugate formula (110), this implies that $G_{\widehat{\alpha},\nu\omega}^*(\boldsymbol{\lambda})$ is jointly convex in $\boldsymbol{\lambda}$ and ω , since it is a supremum over a family of functions $\boldsymbol{\lambda} \cdot \mathbf{f} - G_{\widehat{\alpha},\nu\omega}(\mathbf{f})$ that are each jointly convex in $\boldsymbol{\lambda}$ and ω . With this, the objective function in (120) is jointly convex in $\boldsymbol{\lambda}$ and ω (and \mathbf{q} , trivially), and the constraints are affine, so we can apply strong duality theorems from convex optimization theory.

However, the well-known Slater condition does not yield exactly the result we claim here, because it would require some strict-feasibility conditions on S_Ω (and there are further subtleties because the $D(\mathbf{q} \parallel \nu_{\widehat{C}\widehat{C}}^\omega)$ term is sometimes infinite, which affects the definition of strict feasibility for ω). To avoid this, we shall instead use the Clark-Duffin condition [Duf78], which states that strong

duality holds when the objective and constraints are continuous convex functions on a closed convex domain (in a normed³⁰ space) and the feasible set is bounded.

We first note that we can take the purifying function Pur to be continuous without loss of generality³¹, which implies that the mapping $\omega \rightarrow \nu^\omega$ is continuous since \mathcal{M} is just a linear map. In turn, this implies $G_{\hat{\alpha}, \nu^\omega}^*(\boldsymbol{\lambda})$ is continuous with respect to $(\boldsymbol{\lambda}, \omega)$ (in an extended-real sense, accounting for the $D(\boldsymbol{\lambda} \parallel \nu_{\overline{CC}}^\omega)$ term). There is a subtlety regarding the $\sum_{\bar{c}\hat{c} \in \text{supp}(\nu_{\overline{CC}}^\omega)} \lambda(\bar{c}\hat{c}) D_{\hat{\alpha}}(\nu_{SE\widetilde{E}\wedge\bar{c}\hat{c}}^\omega \parallel \mathbb{I}_S \otimes \nu_{E\widetilde{E}\wedge\bar{c}\hat{c}}^\omega)$ term: while we have previously shown that all terms in the sum are finite (which ensures each individual term is continuous in $(\boldsymbol{\lambda}, \omega)$), there might appear to be issues caused by the change of summation domain whenever $\text{supp}(\nu_{\overline{CC}}^\omega)$ changes. To address this, we note that this change of support can only happen at points with $\nu_{\overline{CC}}^\omega(\bar{c}\hat{c}) = 0$ for one or more $\bar{c}\hat{c}$; however, for such points we either have that the corresponding $\lambda(\bar{c}\hat{c})$ terms are also zero (which ensures that the sum changes “continuously” at such points) or we have $D(\boldsymbol{\lambda} \parallel \nu_{\overline{CC}}^\omega) = +\infty$ and thus $G_{\hat{\alpha}, \nu^\omega}^*(\boldsymbol{\lambda}) = +\infty$ (which suffices to ensure continuity in an extended-real sense).³² Now, since $G_{\hat{\alpha}, \nu^\omega}^*(\boldsymbol{\lambda})$ is independent of \mathbf{q} , this trivially gives us continuity over all $(\mathbf{q}, \boldsymbol{\lambda}, \omega) \in \mathbb{P}_{\overline{CC}} \times \mathbb{P}_{\overline{CC}} \times \mathbb{S}_=(\widetilde{Q})$ as well.

With this in mind, we can suppose S_Ω is closed without loss of generality, because the objective and constraints in (120) (and similarly the objective in the last line of (123)) are continuous over all $(\mathbf{q}, \boldsymbol{\lambda}, \omega) \in \mathbb{P}_{\overline{CC}} \times \mathbb{P}_{\overline{CC}} \times \mathbb{S}_=(\widetilde{Q})$, which allows us to freely switch between an infimum over S_Ω and an infimum over its closure without changing any optimal values. Then the optimization domain $S_\Omega \times \mathbb{P}_{\overline{CC}} \times \mathbb{S}_=(\widetilde{Q})$ is a compact convex set (under the finite-dimensionality assumption), and the feasible set in (120) is certainly a bounded set as well, since it is a subset of the domain. Now we can finally apply the Clark-Duffin condition to state that strong duality holds, yielding the desired result.

As some closing remarks, we first note that instead of the Clark-Duffin condition, our above arguments could also have allowed us to apply Sion’s minimax theorem to exchange the optimizations in the last line of (123) (since the minimization domain is compact, not just the feasible set), which yields the same final result. In fact, Sion’s minimax theorem gives us a slightly more “direct” alternative proof that (119) and (120) are equal (though this would forgo the claims regarding

³⁰For our proofs, let us say continuity and closedness are defined with respect to the topology induced by the 1-norm.

³¹This is because we have argued above that the expressions (83) and (84) are equal for *any* choice of purifying function, which means that the latter is independent of the choice of purifying function. This lets us focus on any specific choice without loss of generality; in particular, under the finite-dimensionality assumption we can pick the one shown in (24) which is indeed continuous (this can be seen by e.g. computing the fidelity between purifications of δ -close states under that formula, and then applying Fuchs–van de Graaf to convert to 1-norm distance).

³²An alternative approach, similar to the convexity argument above: after noting that ν^ω is continuous in ω , observe that $G_{\hat{\alpha}, \nu^\omega}(\mathbf{f}) = -H_{\hat{\alpha}}^f(\overline{SC}|\widetilde{CE}\widetilde{E})_{\nu^\omega} = M - H_{\hat{\alpha}}(D\overline{SC}|\widetilde{CE}\widetilde{E})_{\nu^\omega}$ for a suitable extending channel as defined in Lemma 1, and so $G_{\hat{\alpha}, \nu^\omega}(\mathbf{f})$ is continuous in ω (by the continuity of conditional Rényi entropy with respect to the state). This implies that $G_{\hat{\alpha}, \nu^\omega}^*(\boldsymbol{\lambda})$ is lower semicontinuous with respect to $(\boldsymbol{\lambda}, \omega)$, since it is a supremum over a family of functions $\boldsymbol{\lambda} \cdot \mathbf{f} - G_{\hat{\alpha}, \nu^\omega}(\mathbf{f})$ that are each lower semicontinuous with respect to $(\boldsymbol{\lambda}, \omega)$. With this we have lower semicontinuity of $G_{\hat{\alpha}, \nu^\omega}^*(\boldsymbol{\lambda}) + (\mathbf{q} - \boldsymbol{\lambda}) \cdot \mathbf{f}$ with respect to $(\mathbf{q}, \boldsymbol{\lambda}, \omega)$, which suffices to apply the version of our subsequent argument based on Sion’s minimax theorem (which only requires semicontinuity rather than continuity).

Lagrange duality, which might be useful for numerical algorithms):

$$\begin{aligned}
\sup_{\mathbf{f}} r_{\hat{\alpha}}(\mathbf{f}) &= \sup_{\mathbf{f}} \inf_{\mathbf{q} \in S_{\Omega}} \inf_{\omega \in S_{=}(\tilde{Q})} (-G_{\hat{\alpha}, \nu^{\omega}}(\mathbf{f}) + \mathbf{f} \cdot \mathbf{q}) \\
&= \inf_{\mathbf{q} \in S_{\Omega}} \inf_{\omega \in S_{=}(\tilde{Q})} \sup_{\mathbf{f}} (-G_{\hat{\alpha}, \nu^{\omega}}(\mathbf{f}) + \mathbf{f} \cdot \mathbf{q}) \text{ using Sion's minimax theorem} \\
&= \inf_{\mathbf{q} \in S_{\Omega}} \inf_{\omega \in S_{=}(\tilde{Q})} G_{\hat{\alpha}, \nu^{\omega}}^*(\mathbf{q}) \text{ by definition of Legendre conjugates.} \tag{124}
\end{aligned}$$

Also, we highlight that while we have proven strong duality between the optimizations (119) and (120) in the sense that they have the same value, our above proof does not immediately yield more stringent versions of strong duality such as dual attainment, because the Clark-Duffin condition (unlike Slater's condition) does not ensure dual attainment. In fact, from the geometric interpretation of Slater's condition [BV04] we can see that the dual might not genuinely be attained in some “boundary” scenarios. For instance, in the BB84 protocol we discuss later in Sec. 7.2, if we choose the “threshold value” Q_{thresh} to be *exactly* zero when defining S_{Ω} in (149) (ignoring the practical issues with such an accept condition, since in that case S_{Ω} consists only of a single point), then from the fact that the “rate bound” (152) has infinite derivative at $\nu_{\tilde{C}}(1) = 0$, it can be argued that the corresponding dual is not attained. We leave a more extensive analysis of such aspects for future work, if it should become important.

Furthermore, while it is true that in our above proof we have relied on the finite-dimensionality assumption (to claim that the domain is compact), we believe that this should be removable in at least some situations. In Appendix B, we present a modification of the above proof that “isolates” these dependencies to improve the prospect of removing them, as well as an alternative proof based on Slater's condition that does not require the finite-dimensionality assumption but instead requires additional (though easily satisfied) conditions on S_{Ω} . \square

5.3 Proof of Lemma 10

We use a similar argument as the above proof of Theorem 2. To do so, we again begin with the second line of the bound (105). Taking any read-and-prepare channel of the form described in Lemma 1, extending any ν^{ω} in the infimum with this channel yields

$$\begin{aligned}
H_{\hat{\alpha}}^f(S\tilde{C}|\widehat{C}E\tilde{E})_{\nu^{\omega}} &= H_{\hat{\alpha}}(D\tilde{S}\tilde{C}|\widehat{C}E\tilde{E})_{\nu^{\omega}} - M \\
&\geq H_{\hat{\alpha}}(D\tilde{S}|\tilde{C}\widehat{C}E\tilde{E})_{\nu^{\omega}} - M \\
&= \frac{1}{1-\hat{\alpha}} \log \left(\sum_{\tilde{c}\hat{c} \in \text{supp}(\nu_{\tilde{C}\hat{C}}^{\omega})} \nu^{\omega}(\tilde{c}\hat{c}) 2^{(1-\hat{\alpha})H_{\hat{\alpha}}(D\tilde{S}|E\tilde{E})_{\nu_{\tilde{c}\hat{c}}^{\omega}}} \right) - M \\
&= \frac{1}{1-\hat{\alpha}} \log \left(\sum_{\tilde{c}\hat{c} \in \text{supp}(\nu_{\tilde{C}\hat{C}}^{\omega})} \nu^{\omega}(\tilde{c}\hat{c}) 2^{(1-\hat{\alpha})\left(H_{\hat{\alpha}}(D)_{\nu_{\tilde{c}\hat{c}}^{\omega}} + H_{\hat{\alpha}}(S|E\tilde{E})_{\nu_{\tilde{c}\hat{c}}^{\omega}}\right)} \right) - M \\
&= \frac{1}{1-\hat{\alpha}} \log \left(\sum_{\tilde{c}\hat{c} \in \text{supp}(\nu_{\tilde{C}\hat{C}}^{\omega})} \nu^{\omega}(\tilde{c}\hat{c}) 2^{(1-\hat{\alpha})\left(-f(\tilde{c}\hat{c}) + H_{\hat{\alpha}}(S|E\tilde{E})_{\nu_{\tilde{c}\hat{c}}^{\omega}}\right)} \right), \tag{125}
\end{aligned}$$

where the first line is due to Eq. (31), the second line is an application of [Tom16, Proposition 5.5] by noting $\nu_{\tilde{C}\hat{C}E\tilde{E}}^{\omega}$ is separable across the registers \tilde{C} and $\widehat{C}E\tilde{E}$, the third line follows from Fact 2, the

fourth line holds since $\nu_{DSE\widetilde{E}|c\hat{c}}^\omega = \nu_{D|c\hat{c}}^\omega \otimes \nu_{SE\widetilde{E}|c\hat{c}}^\omega$, and the last follows from Eq. (30). Furthermore, note that $H_{\hat{\alpha}}(DS|\widehat{C}\widehat{E}\widetilde{E})_{\nu^\omega} - M$ is convex in ω (by Remark 2) and all lines after that point are equalities; therefore, the last line is also convex in ω .

With this, we can apply exactly the same analysis as in the rest of the Theorem 2 proof, replacing $H_{\hat{\alpha}}^f(S\overline{C}|\widehat{C}E\widetilde{E})_{\nu^\omega}$ with the lower bound given in the last line above, except that we would modify the definition of $G_{\hat{\alpha},\nu^\omega}$ to

$$G_{\hat{\alpha},\nu^\omega}(\mathbf{f}) := -\frac{1}{1-\hat{\alpha}} \log \left(\sum_{\bar{c}\hat{c} \in \text{supp}(\nu_{\overline{C}\widehat{C}}^\omega)} \nu^\omega(\bar{c}\hat{c}) 2^{(1-\hat{\alpha})(-f(\bar{c}\hat{c}) + H_{\hat{\alpha}}(S|E\widetilde{E})_{\nu_{\bar{c}\hat{c}}^\omega})} \right), \quad (126)$$

and carry out the subsequent calculations with $-H_{\hat{\alpha}}(S|E\widetilde{E})_{\nu_{\bar{c}\hat{c}}^\omega}$ in place of $D_{\hat{\alpha}}(\nu_{SE\widetilde{E}\wedge\bar{c}\hat{c}}^\omega \parallel \mathbb{I}_S \otimes \nu_{E\widetilde{E}\wedge\bar{c}\hat{c}}^\omega)$.

To show that equality holds for the case where \overline{C} is trivial, we could note that the only point in the above calculations that differs from Sec. 5.2 is the inequality in the second line of (125), which is immediately redundant if \overline{C} is trivial. Alternatively, we could directly prove equality by simply noting that without the \overline{C} registers, we can replace all the divergence terms in the sum with conditional entropies by writing

$$-D_{\hat{\alpha}}(\nu_{SE\widetilde{E}\wedge\bar{c}\hat{c}}^\omega \parallel \mathbb{I}_S \otimes \nu_{E\widetilde{E}\wedge\bar{c}\hat{c}}^\omega) = -D_{\hat{\alpha}}(\nu_{SE\widetilde{E}|\bar{c}\hat{c}}^\omega \parallel \mathbb{I}_S \otimes \nu_{E\widetilde{E}|\bar{c}\hat{c}}^\omega) = H_{\hat{\alpha}}(S|E\widetilde{E})_{\nu_{\bar{c}\hat{c}}^\omega}, \quad (127)$$

where the first equality holds because the Rényi divergence remains invariant if both arguments are multiplied by a common strictly positive factor (see Definition 5), and recalling that all terms in the sum have $\nu(\hat{c}) > 0$.

5.4 Proof of Lemma 11

The proof proceeds by similar ideas. Again, begin with the second line of the bound (105). Now instead consider a read-and-prepare channel $\overline{C}\widehat{C} \rightarrow \overline{C}\widehat{C}D$ of the form described in Lemma 2, so that for any $\alpha \in [0, \infty]$ the bound (33) holds, i.e. all Rényi entropy values of the D register (conditioned on $\overline{C}\widehat{C} = \bar{c}\hat{c}$) lie in the interval $[M - f(\bar{c}\hat{c}), M - f(\bar{c}\hat{c}) + 2^{-M/2} \log e]$. If we extend any ν^ω in the infimum with this channel, we have

$$\begin{aligned} H_{\hat{\alpha}}^f(S\overline{C}|\widehat{C}E\widetilde{E})_{\nu^\omega} &\geq H_{\hat{\alpha}}(DSC|\widehat{C}E\widetilde{E})_{\nu^\omega} - M - 2^{-\frac{M}{2}} \log e \\ &\geq H_{\alpha'}(S\overline{C}|\widehat{C}E\widetilde{E})_{\nu^\omega} + H_{\alpha''}^\uparrow(D|S\overline{C}\widehat{C}E\widetilde{E})_{\nu^\omega} - M - 2^{-\frac{M}{2}} \log e, \end{aligned} \quad (128)$$

where the first line holds by (34), and the second line is a special case of Proposition 7 in [Dup15]. Before proceeding further we note that the second term in the last line of Eq. (128) can be bounded

as:

$$\begin{aligned}
H_{\alpha''}^{\uparrow}(D|S\bar{C}\widehat{C}E\widetilde{E})_{\nu^{\omega}} &= \frac{\alpha''}{1-\alpha''} \log \left(\sum_{\bar{c}\hat{c} \in \text{supp}(\nu_{\bar{C}\widehat{C}}^{\omega})} \nu^{\omega}(\bar{c}\hat{c}) 2^{\left(\frac{1-\alpha''}{\alpha''}\right) H_{\alpha''}^{\uparrow}(D|SE\widetilde{E})_{\nu_{|\bar{c}\hat{c}}^{\omega}}} \right) \\
&= \frac{\alpha''}{1-\alpha''} \log \left(\sum_{\bar{c}\hat{c} \in \text{supp}(\nu_{\bar{C}\widehat{C}}^{\omega})} \nu^{\omega}(\bar{c}\hat{c}) 2^{\left(\frac{1-\alpha''}{\alpha''}\right) H_{\alpha''}(D)_{\nu_{|\bar{c}\hat{c}}^{\omega}}} \right) \\
&\geq M + \frac{\alpha''}{1-\alpha''} \log \left(\sum_{\bar{c}\hat{c} \in \text{supp}(\nu_{\bar{C}\widehat{C}}^{\omega})} \nu^{\omega}(\bar{c}\hat{c}) 2^{-\left(\frac{1-\alpha''}{\alpha''}\right) f(\bar{c}\hat{c})} \right), \tag{129}
\end{aligned}$$

where the first line is due to Fact 2, the second line holds since $\nu_{DSE\widetilde{E}|_{\bar{c}\hat{c}}}^{\omega} = \nu_{D|_{\bar{c}\hat{c}}}^{\omega} \otimes \nu_{SE\widetilde{E}|_{\bar{c}\hat{c}}}^{\omega}$ and $H_{\alpha''}^{\uparrow}(D)_{\nu_{|\bar{c}\hat{c}}^{\omega}} = H_{\alpha''}(D)_{\nu_{|\bar{c}\hat{c}}^{\omega}}$ when there is no conditioning register, and the third line follows from the lower bound in (33). Combining Eq. (129) with Eq. (128) we have:

$$H_{\alpha}^f(S\bar{C}|\widehat{C}E\widetilde{E})_{\nu^{\omega}} \geq H_{\alpha'}(S\bar{C}|\widehat{C}E\widetilde{E})_{\nu^{\omega}} + \frac{\alpha''}{1-\alpha''} \log \left(\sum_{\bar{c}\hat{c} \in \text{supp}(\nu_{\bar{C}\widehat{C}}^{\omega})} \nu^{\omega}(\bar{c}\hat{c}) 2^{-\left(\frac{1-\alpha''}{\alpha''}\right) f(\bar{c}\hat{c})} \right) - 2^{-\frac{M}{2}} \log e. \tag{130}$$

Since the above bound holds for arbitrary (sufficiently large) M , we can take the $M \rightarrow \infty$ limit so the $2^{-\frac{M}{2}}$ term vanishes. Taking this into account and using the bound in Eq. (130), our desired result follows by applying exactly the same analysis as in the rest of the Theorem 2 proof, except that we replace $G_{\hat{\alpha}, \rho}(\mathbf{f})$ with

$$G_{\alpha', \alpha'', \nu^{\omega}}(\mathbf{f}) := -H_{\alpha'}(S\bar{C}|\widehat{C}E\widetilde{E})_{\nu^{\omega}} - \frac{\alpha''}{1-\alpha''} \log \left(\sum_{\bar{c}\hat{c} \in \text{supp}(\nu_{\bar{C}\widehat{C}}^{\omega})} \nu^{\omega}(\bar{c}\hat{c}) 2^{-\left(\frac{1-\alpha''}{\alpha''}\right) f(\bar{c}\hat{c})} \right). \tag{131}$$

Note that the above expression is concave with respect to ω , as we would require for those remaining proof steps. This follows by observing that $H_{\alpha'}(S\bar{C}|\widehat{C}E\widetilde{E})_{\nu^{\omega}}$ is convex in ω by Remark 2, and we have $\alpha'' > 1$ so $-\frac{\alpha''}{1-\alpha''} \log(\cdot)$ is a concave function, while the values $\nu^{\omega}(\bar{c}\hat{c})$ are affine functions of ω .³³ (To make the correspondence with the Theorem 2 proof even more explicit, we can rewrite the above expression as

$$G_{\alpha', \alpha'', \nu^{\omega}}(\mathbf{f}) = -\frac{1}{1-\tilde{\alpha}''} \log \left(\sum_{\bar{c}\hat{c} \in \text{supp}(\nu_{\bar{C}\widehat{C}}^{\omega})} \nu^{\omega}(\bar{c}\hat{c}) 2^{(1-\tilde{\alpha}'')(-f(\bar{c}\hat{c}) + H_{\alpha'}(S\bar{C}|\widehat{C}E\widetilde{E})_{\nu^{\omega}})} \right), \tag{132}$$

where $\tilde{\alpha}'' := \frac{2\alpha''-1}{\alpha''-1}$, so we are carrying out the remaining calculations with $\tilde{\alpha}''$ in place of $\hat{\alpha}$ and a single value $H_{\alpha'}(S\bar{C}|\widehat{C}E\widetilde{E})_{\nu^{\omega}}$ in place of all the $-D_{\hat{\alpha}} \left(\nu_{SE\widetilde{E}\wedge\bar{c}\hat{c}}^{\omega} \parallel \mathbb{I}_S \otimes \nu_{E\widetilde{E}\wedge\hat{c}}^{\omega} \right)$ terms.)

³³Pedantically, to ensure there are no issues involving the dependence of the summation domain in (131) on ω , we should first note that we can extend the summation domain to the full alphabet $\bar{C} \times \widehat{C}$ without changing the value of $G_{\alpha', \alpha'', \nu^{\omega}}(\mathbf{f})$ (in this case, there are no divergence terms in the sum and so we do not encounter any technical issues).

6 Variants for the original EAT or f -weighted Rényi entropies

6.1 EAT

In this section, we show that if we impose the Markov conditions from the original EAT in [DFR20], we can (as expected) avoid the change of Rényi parameters $\alpha \rightarrow \hat{\alpha}$ arising from the GEAT, resulting in a bound that is genuinely identical in form to the QEF chaining property in [ZFK20] (albeit still slightly generalized to allow an S register as discussed in Remark 1). Due to the relation (68), this improvement in Rényi parameters is unlikely to make much difference if α is close to 1; however, it might perhaps be useful if for some reason the security proof necessarily involves α far from 1.

Strictly speaking, the original EAT, the QEF analysis, and the GEAT differ in a subtle technical fashion regarding the scope of their constraints: the original EAT imposes the Markov condition only on the final state, the QEF analysis imposes it over a class of models, and the GEAT imposes the NS condition at the level of the channels. This makes it slightly difficult to make a strict comparison between their conditions; however, it does seem likely that the GEAT conditions are still the least restrictive in most applications. In presenting the following lemma, we simply follow the original EAT and impose the Markov condition on the state rather than the channels.

Lemma 14. *Let $\rho_{S_1^n T_1^n \bar{C}_1^n \widehat{C}_1^n \widehat{E}}$ be a state of the form $\rho = \mathcal{M}_n \circ \dots \circ \mathcal{M}_1[\omega_{R_0 \widehat{E}}^0]$ for some initial state $\omega_{R_0 \widehat{E}}^0$ and some channels $\mathcal{M}_j : R_{j-1} \rightarrow S_j T_j R_j \bar{C}_j \widehat{C}_j$ such that the output registers $\bar{C}_j \widehat{C}_j$ are always classical (for any input state). Suppose that for each j , ρ satisfies the Markov condition*

$$I(S_1^{j-1} \bar{C}_1^{j-1} : T_j \widehat{C}_j | T_1^{j-1} \widehat{C}_1^{j-1} \widehat{E})_\rho = 0, \quad (133)$$

i.e. $S_1^{j-1} \bar{C}_1^{j-1} \leftrightarrow T_1^{j-1} \widehat{C}_1^{j-1} \widehat{E} \leftrightarrow T_j \widehat{C}_j$ forms a Markov chain. Then Theorems 1-2, Corollaries 1-2, and Lemmas 10-13 all hold with the following minor modifications:

- Replace $\hat{\alpha}$ with α throughout, and allow $\alpha \in (1, \infty)$ instead of $\alpha \in (1, 2]$.
- Omit the condition that $\{\mathcal{M}_j\}_{j=1}^n$ are GEATT channels.
- Replace the registers with suitable counterparts, e.g. $\mathbb{H}(S_1^n \bar{C}_1^n | \widehat{C}_1^n E_n) \rightarrow \mathbb{H}(S_1^n \bar{C}_1^n | \widehat{C}_1^n T_1^n \widehat{E})$, $\mathbb{H}(S_j \bar{C}_j | \widehat{C}_j E_j \widehat{E}) \rightarrow \mathbb{H}(S_j \bar{C}_j | \widehat{C}_j T_j \widehat{E})$, $\mathbb{H}(S \bar{C} | \widehat{C} E \widehat{E}) \rightarrow \mathbb{H}(S \bar{C} | \widehat{C} T \widehat{E})$ and so on, where \mathbb{H} denotes any type of entropy.

Proof. We construct new channels \mathcal{N}_j the same way as the Theorem 1 proof, except that we also have them output an extra copy of \widehat{C}_j in a register $\widehat{\widehat{C}}_j$. Since the channels \mathcal{M}_j in this case have the form $\mathcal{M}_j : R_{j-1} \rightarrow S_j T_j R_j \bar{C}_j \widehat{C}_j$, we end up with channels $\mathcal{N}_j : R_{j-1} \bar{C}_1^{j-1} \widehat{C}_1^{j-1} \rightarrow D_j \bar{C}_j S_j T_j \widehat{\widehat{C}}_j R_j \widehat{C}_j \bar{C}_1^j$. Again writing $\rho = \mathcal{N}_n \circ \dots \circ \mathcal{N}_1[\omega^0]$, this is a state on registers $D_1^n S_1^n T_1^n \bar{C}_1^n \widehat{\widehat{C}}_1^n \widehat{C}_1^n \widehat{E}$ that is an extension of the state ρ in this lemma statement. We now show that the state produced by each channel \mathcal{N}_j satisfies the following Markov condition:

$$I(S_1^{j-1} \bar{C}_1^{j-1} D_1^{j-1} : T_j \widehat{\widehat{C}}_j | T_1^{j-1} \widehat{\widehat{C}}_1^{j-1} \widehat{E})_\rho = 0, \quad (134)$$

To do this, we first use the chain rule for conditional mutual information [KW20, Proposition 7.7] to obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
& I(S_1^{j-1} \overline{C}_1^{j-1} D_1^{j-1} : T_j \widehat{C}_j | T_1^{j-1} \widehat{C}_1^{j-1} \widehat{E})_\rho \\
&= I(S_1^{j-1} \overline{C}_1^{j-1} D_1^{j-1} : T_j \widehat{C}_j | T_1^{j-1} \widehat{C}_1^{j-1} \widehat{E})_\rho \\
&= I(S_1^{j-1} \overline{C}_1^{j-1} : T_j \widehat{C}_j | T_1^{j-1} \widehat{C}_1^{j-1} \widehat{E})_\rho + I(D_1^{j-1} : T_j \widehat{C}_j | S_1^{j-1} \overline{C}_1^{j-1} T_1^{j-1} \widehat{C}_1^{j-1} \widehat{E})_\rho \\
&= I(D_1^{j-1} : T_j \widehat{C}_j | S_1^{j-1} \overline{C}_1^{j-1} T_1^{j-1} \widehat{C}_1^{j-1} \widehat{E})_\rho \\
&= 0,
\end{aligned} \tag{135}$$

where the second line holds since $\overline{C}_1^{j-1} = \overline{C}_1^{j-1}$, and $\widehat{C}_1^{j-1} = \widehat{C}_1^{j-1}$. The third line is due to the chain rule for conditional mutual information, the fourth line follows from the Markov condition (133), and the last line holds by noting that D_1^{j-1} is produced from $\overline{C}_1^{j-1} \widehat{C}_1^{j-1}$. Thus, we conclude that this extended ρ satisfies the Markov condition. We now apply [DFR20, Corollary 3.5] by identifying the registers $A_1 A_2 B_1 B_2 R$ in that corollary with the registers here as follows:

- $A_1 \leftrightarrow D_1^{j-1} \overline{C}_1^{j-1} S_1^{j-1}$
- $A_2 \leftrightarrow D_j \overline{C}_j S_j$
- $B_1 \leftrightarrow \widehat{C}_1^{j-1} T_1^{j-1} \widehat{E}$
- $B_2 \leftrightarrow \widehat{C}_j T_j$
- $R \leftrightarrow R_{j-1} \overline{C}_1^j \widehat{C}_1^j$

With this identification, we obtain for each j :

$$H_\alpha(D_1^j S_1^j \overline{C}_1^j | \widehat{C}_1^j T_1^j \widehat{E})_\rho \geq H_\alpha(D_1^{j-1} S_1^{j-1} \overline{C}_1^{j-1} | \widehat{C}_1^{j-1} T_1^{j-1} \widehat{E})_\rho + \inf_{\nu' \in \Sigma_j'} H_\alpha(D_j S_j \overline{C}_j | \widehat{C}_j T_1^j \widehat{E})_{\nu'}. \tag{136}$$

Applying this for every j , we get:

$$H_\alpha(D_1^j S_1^j \overline{C}_1^j | \widehat{C}_1^j T_1^j \widehat{E})_\rho \geq \sum_j \inf_{\nu' \in \Sigma_j'} H_\alpha(D_j S_j \overline{C}_j | \widehat{C}_j T_1^j \widehat{E})_{\nu'}. \tag{137}$$

Recall that by definition of \mathcal{N}_j , the state ν' contains registers $\overline{C}_1^j \widehat{C}_1^j$ even though they do not appear in entropies in the above expression. Therefore we can apply the same argument as the bound (60) in the Theorem 1 proof, lower-bounding the $H_\alpha(D_j S_j \overline{C}_j | \widehat{C}_j T_1^j \widehat{E})_{\nu'}$ term by conditioning on $\overline{C}_1^{j-1} \widehat{C}_1^{j-1}$ and taking the worst-case value. Moreover, since \overline{C}_j and \widehat{C}_j are just a copy of \overline{C}_j and \widehat{C}_j , respectively (in particular $\overline{C}_1^n = \overline{C}_1^n$, and $\widehat{C}_1^n = \widehat{C}_1^n$), we arrive at

$$H_\alpha(D_1^n S_1^n \overline{C}_1^n | \widehat{C}_1^n T_1^n \widehat{E})_\rho \geq \sum_j \inf_{\nu' \in \Sigma_j'} \min_{\substack{c_1^{j-1} \\ \hat{c}_1^{j-1}}} H_\alpha(D_j S_j \overline{C}_j | \widehat{C}_j T_1^j \widehat{E})_{\nu'_{|c_1^{j-1} \hat{c}_1^{j-1}}}. \tag{138}$$

With this, we carry on the remainder of all the proofs in the same way, since none of the subsequent steps require the NS condition of GEATT channels. \square

6.2 f -weighted Rényi entropies

Here we briefly summarize some results from [HB24], and then explain how our methods can be applied to their results. We begin by summarizing a concept they introduced, namely, f -weighted Rényi entropies.

Definition 15. (f -weighted Rényi entropies) Let $\rho \in \mathcal{S}_=(\widehat{C}Q'Q')$ be a state where \widehat{C} is classical with alphabet \widehat{C} . A **tradeoff function on \widehat{C}** is a function $f : \widehat{C} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$; equivalently, we may denote it as a real-valued tuple $\mathbf{f} \in \mathbb{R}^{|\widehat{C}|}$ where each term in the tuple specifies the value $f(\hat{c})$. Given a tradeoff function f and a value $\alpha \in (0, 1) \cup (1, \infty)$, the **f -weighted Rényi entropy of order α** for ρ is defined as

$$H_{\alpha}^{\uparrow, f}(Q|\widehat{C}Q')_{\rho} = \frac{\alpha}{1-\alpha} \log \left(\sum_{\hat{c}} \rho(\hat{c}) 2^{\frac{1-\alpha}{\alpha}(-f(\hat{c}) + H_{\alpha}^{\uparrow}(Q|Q')_{\rho|\hat{c}})} \right), \quad (139)$$

where the sum is over all \hat{c} values such that $\rho(\hat{c}) > 0$.

Since for trivial \widehat{C} this matches our definition of QES-entropies except based on H_{α}^{\uparrow} instead of H_{α} , we intuitively have the following straightforward relation:

Lemma 15. Let $\rho \in \mathcal{S}_=(\widehat{C}Q'Q')$ be a state where \widehat{C} is classical with alphabet \widehat{C} . Then

$$H_{\alpha}^{\uparrow, f}(Q|\widehat{C}Q')_{\rho} \geq H_{\alpha}^f(Q|\widehat{C}Q')_{\rho}. \quad (140)$$

Proof. Extend the state with a read-and-prepare channel as described in Lemma 1. Then by analogous calculations (though simpler, since we can just use (23) rather than (21); note also we exploit the fact that $H_{\alpha}(D)_{\rho|\hat{c}} = H_{\alpha}^{\uparrow}(D)_{\rho|\hat{c}}$) we obtain

$$H_{\alpha}^{\uparrow}(DQ|\widehat{C}Q')_{\rho} = M + H_{\alpha}^{\uparrow, f}(Q|\widehat{C}Q')_{\rho}. \quad (141)$$

Combining this with the existing result (31) in that lemma and the general relation $H_{\alpha}^{\uparrow}(DQ|\widehat{C}Q')_{\rho} \geq H_{\alpha}(DQ|\widehat{C}Q')_{\rho}$, we obtain the desired result. \square

The families of states considered by [HB24] essentially have the following form:

Definition 16. Consider an arbitrary channel $\mathcal{M} : \widetilde{Q} \rightarrow S\widehat{C}$ with classical \widehat{C} . For $j \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$, let \widetilde{Q}_j (resp. S_j, \widehat{C}_j) be registers all isomorphic to \widetilde{Q} (resp. S, \widehat{C}), and let \widehat{E} be an arbitrary register. Then for any state $\omega^0 \in \mathcal{S}_=(\widetilde{Q}_1^n \widehat{E})$, we say that a state $\rho \in \mathcal{S}_=(S_1^n \widehat{C}_1^n \widehat{E})$ is **generated by $\mathcal{M}^{\otimes n}$ from ω^0** if it has the form $\rho = \mathcal{M}^{\otimes n}[\omega^0]$ (leaving some identity channels implicit).

States of this form are relevant in e.g. device-dependent EB-QKD protocols, where one can often model the protocol as performing an n -fold product of some trusted measurement channel $\mathcal{M} : \widetilde{Q} \rightarrow S\widehat{C}$ (where in each round \widetilde{Q} denotes Alice and Bob’s quantum registers, and again S denotes “secret” raw data and \widehat{C} denotes “public” test data) across some global state. Also, device-dependent PM-QKD protocols can be analyzed using such a model by using the source-replacement technique [BBM92, FL12] for converting PM protocols to EB protocols.³⁴

³⁴To obtain tight keyrate bounds from the source-replacement technique for generic PM protocols, one usually needs to impose a constraint on Alice’s reduced state in the resulting EB protocol, which is why the following theorems involve statements regarding such constraints. Refer to e.g. [MFS+22b, BGW+23] for further discussion.

A key finding of [HB24] is the following critical result (basically, Theorem 1 in this work is a version of this result under the conditions of the GEAT instead), which can be viewed as an “exact reduction to IID”:

Fact 3. Let $\rho_{S_1^n \widehat{C}_1^n \widehat{E}}$ be a state generated by $\mathcal{M}^{\otimes n}$ from $\omega_{\widehat{Q}_1^n \widehat{E}}^0$ (Definition 16) for some channel $\mathcal{M} : \widetilde{Q} \rightarrow S\widehat{C}$ with classical \widehat{C} ; let Σ denote the set of all states of the form $\mathcal{M}[\omega_{\widetilde{Q}\widetilde{E}}]$ for some initial state $\omega_{\widetilde{Q}\widetilde{E}}$, with \widetilde{E} being a purifying register for \widetilde{Q} . Let f be any tradeoff function on \widehat{C} (Definition 15), and define the following tradeoff function on \widehat{C}_1^n :

$$f_{\text{full}}(\hat{c}_1^n) := \sum_{j=1}^n f(\hat{c}_j). \quad (142)$$

Then we have

$$H_\alpha^{\uparrow, f_{\text{full}}}(S_1^n | \widehat{C}_1^n \widehat{E})_\rho \geq n \inf_{\nu \in \Sigma} H_\alpha^{\uparrow, f}(S | \widetilde{C}\widetilde{E})_\nu. \quad (143)$$

Furthermore, if $\widetilde{Q} = \widetilde{A}\widetilde{B}$ for some sub-registers $\widetilde{A}\widetilde{B}$, and ω^0 satisfies $\text{Tr}_{\widetilde{B}_1^n \widetilde{E}}[\omega^0] = \sigma_A^{\otimes n}$ for some fixed state σ , then the infimum on the right-hand-side can be restricted to states of the form $\mathcal{M}[\omega_{\widetilde{A}\widetilde{B}\widetilde{E}}]$ for some initial state $\omega_{\widetilde{A}\widetilde{B}\widetilde{E}}$ satisfying $\text{Tr}_{\widetilde{B}\widetilde{E}}[\omega] = \sigma_A$.

By combining the above result with the methods in this work, we obtain the following:

Theorem 3. Let $\rho_{S_1^n \widehat{C}_1^n \widehat{E}}$ be a state generated by $\mathcal{M}^{\otimes n}$ from $\omega_{\widehat{Q}_1^n \widehat{E}}^0$ (Definition 16) for some channel $\mathcal{M} : \widetilde{Q} \rightarrow S\widehat{C}$ with classical \widehat{C} ; let Σ denote the set of all states of the form $\mathcal{M}[\omega_{\widetilde{Q}\widetilde{E}}]$ for some initial state $\omega_{\widetilde{Q}\widetilde{E}}$, with \widetilde{E} being a purifying register for \widetilde{Q} . Suppose furthermore that ρ is of the form $p_\Omega \rho_{|\Omega} + (1 - p_\Omega) \rho_{|\overline{\Omega}}$ for some $p_\Omega \in (0, 1]$ and normalized states $\rho_{|\Omega}, \rho_{|\overline{\Omega}}$, and let S_Ω be a convex set of probability distributions on the alphabet \widehat{C} , such that for all \hat{c}_1^n with nonzero probability in $\rho_{|\Omega}$, the frequency distribution $\text{freq}_{\hat{c}_1^n}$ lies in S_Ω . Then if Pur is any purifying function for \widetilde{Q} onto \widetilde{E} (Definition 10) and we write $\nu^\omega := \mathcal{M}[\text{Pur}(\omega_{\widetilde{Q}})]$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} H_\alpha^{\uparrow}(S_1^n | \widehat{C}_1^n \widehat{E})_{\rho_{|\Omega}} &\geq n h_\alpha^{\uparrow} - \frac{\alpha}{\alpha - 1} \log \frac{1}{p_\Omega}, \\ \text{where } h_\alpha^{\uparrow} &= \inf_{\mathbf{q} \in S_\Omega} \inf_{\nu \in \Sigma} \left(\frac{\alpha}{\alpha - 1} D(\mathbf{q} \| \nu_{\widehat{C}}) + \sum_{\hat{c} \in \text{supp}(\nu_{\widehat{C}})} q(\hat{c}) H_\alpha^{\uparrow}(S | E\widetilde{E})_{\nu_{|\hat{c}}} \right) \\ &= \inf_{\mathbf{q} \in S_\Omega} \inf_{\omega \in S_{=}(\widetilde{Q})} \left(\frac{\alpha}{\alpha - 1} D(\mathbf{q} \| \nu_{\widehat{C}}^\omega) + \sum_{\hat{c} \in \text{supp}(\nu_{\widehat{C}}^\omega)} q(\hat{c}) H_\alpha^{\uparrow}(S | E\widetilde{E})_{\nu_{|\hat{c}}^\omega} \right), \end{aligned} \quad (144)$$

and the objective function in the last line is jointly convex in ω and \mathbf{q} .

Furthermore, if $\widetilde{Q} = \widetilde{A}\widetilde{B}$ for some sub-registers $\widetilde{A}\widetilde{B}$, and ω^0 satisfies $\text{Tr}_{\widetilde{B}_1^n \widetilde{E}}[\omega^0] = \sigma_A^{\otimes n}$ for some fixed state σ , then in the formulas for h_α^{\uparrow} , the infimum over ν can be restricted to states of the form $\mathcal{M}[\omega_{\widetilde{A}\widetilde{B}\widetilde{E}}]$ for some initial state $\omega_{\widetilde{A}\widetilde{B}\widetilde{E}}$ satisfying $\text{Tr}_{\widetilde{B}\widetilde{E}}[\omega] = \sigma_A$, and similarly the infimum over ω can be restricted to ω satisfying $\text{Tr}_{\widetilde{B}}[\omega] = \sigma_A$.

Proof. The proof follows by exactly the same chain of arguments as the previous sections: by suitably extending the states with \mathcal{D}_j channels, from Fact 3 we obtain analogues of Corollary 1 and Corollary 2 (except with $H_\alpha^{\uparrow, f}$ rather than H_α^f in the single-round terms), and then we apply the convex-analysis transformations described in the rest of Sec. 5.2 (except that since now we obtain terms involving H_α^\uparrow entropies rather than $H_{\hat{\alpha}}$ entropies, we use (23) rather than (21), and hence arrive at a prefactor of $\frac{\alpha}{\alpha-1}$ rather than $\frac{1}{\alpha-1}$ on the “penalty term” in h_α^\uparrow , analogous to the Sec. 5.4 proof). \square

Note that by similar reasoning as in Remark 7, the dual of the optimization problem

$$\inf_{\mathbf{q} \in S_\Omega} \inf_{\lambda \in \mathbb{P}_{\hat{C}}} \inf_{\omega \in S_{=}(\tilde{Q})} \left(\frac{\alpha}{\alpha-1} D(\lambda \parallel \nu_{\hat{C}}^\omega) + \sum_{\hat{c} \in \text{supp}(\nu_{\hat{C}}^\omega)} \lambda(\hat{c}) H_\alpha^\uparrow(S|E\tilde{E})_{\nu_{\hat{c}}^\omega} \right), \quad (145)$$

s.t. $\mathbf{q} - \lambda = \mathbf{0}$

for some suitable choice of S_Ω , should provide a good choice of tradeoff function in Fact 3 for variable-length protocols.

We can again reformulate the bounds using either or both of (91)–(92) if desired, at the cost of the same potential suboptimality discussed in Remark 5. This yields bounds such as

$$H_{\min}^\varepsilon(S_1^n | \hat{C}_1^n E_n)_{\rho_{|\Omega}} \geq \inf_{\mathbf{q} \in S_\Omega} \inf_{\omega \in S_{=}(\tilde{Q})} \left(\frac{\alpha}{\alpha-1} D(\mathbf{q} \parallel \nu_{\hat{C}}^\omega) + \sum_{\hat{c} \in \text{supp}(\nu_{\hat{C}}^\omega)} q(\hat{c}) H(S|E\tilde{E})_{\nu_{\hat{c}}^\omega} \right) n - (\hat{\alpha} - 1) \log^2(1 + 2 \dim(S)) n - \frac{\vartheta_\varepsilon}{\alpha-1} - \frac{\alpha}{\alpha-1} \log \frac{1}{p_\Omega}, \quad (146)$$

again with the same caveats regarding convexity as in Sec. 5.1.2.

Remark 8. *The above analysis has the following important consequence. Specifically, suppose that (starting from Fact 3) rather than following the proof steps described above, we instead follow the proof steps in one of the various existing (G)EAT-with-testing proofs such as [DFR20, DF19, LLR+21, MFS+22b].³⁵ In that case, one could obtain exactly the same formulas in the final bounds on $H_\alpha^\uparrow(S_1^n | \hat{C}_1^n \hat{E})_{\rho_{|\Omega}}$ as those works (at least, when the “secret” test registers \bar{C}_1^n are trivial), except that the formulas would have been obtained under the [HB24] model rather than the GEAT or EAT models. With this, we can draw the critical conclusion that all (achievable) finite-size keyrates computed using the previous GEAT or EAT bounds were in fact also valid under the [HB24] model, i.e. they immediately translate to such scenarios. This means that for device-dependent PM-QKD, all such keyrates were valid without the “single-signal interaction” structure previously required for the GEAT analysis.*

Alternatively, we could come to the same conclusion by observing that the bound (144) we presented above for the [HB24] scenario is strictly higher than our Theorem 2 bound (or the Lemma 14 version for the original EAT conditions) for trivial \bar{C}_j , because $\hat{\alpha} > \alpha > 1$ and $H_\alpha^\uparrow \geq H_\alpha \geq H_{\hat{\alpha}}$. As we discuss in Sec. 7.1 below, this should in turn imply that it is lower bounded by the previous GEAT or EAT bounds in [DFR20, DF19, LLR+21, MFS+22b], and therefore those were valid lower bounds on the achievable keyrates.

³⁵Technically, the single-round terms resulting from Fact 3 would involve the H_α^\uparrow entropies, hence *a priori* differing from the computations in [DFR20, DF19, LLR+21, MFS+22b], which involved H_α or $H_{\hat{\alpha}}$. However, this is trivially resolved by relaxing the bound using $H_\alpha^\uparrow \geq H_\alpha \geq H_{\hat{\alpha}}$ and then proceeding with the computations in those works.

7 Tightness of bounds and numerical examples

In this section, we only used heuristic numerical methods when evaluating the various minimizations that appear in e.g. our lower bounds on $h_{\hat{\alpha}}$. This means that strictly speaking, our numerical results are not guaranteed to be certified lower bounds on the keyrates. However, in all examples in this section, the minimizations we evaluate can be written using at most 3 optimization variables, and are convex in all the individual variables, hence we believe that there should not be too much of a risk that we have significantly over-estimated the true keyrates.

7.1 Remaining steps for improvement

An interesting feature of our Theorem 2 proof is that for S_Ω satisfying the theorem conditions and α close to 1, it seems there are not many steps that could be improved — almost all the bounds are nearly saturated by IID states, except for the Lemma 8 bound and a “relaxation” from $\tilde{\Omega}$ to S_Ω . Explicitly listing them in order: first, Theorem 1 is basically tight for IID states up to the “higher-order” change $\alpha \rightarrow \hat{\alpha}$ (which for that matter is not present in the EAT or f -weighted Rényi entropy versions of our bounds), as discussed below the theorem statement. Next, to obtain Corollary 1 the only important bounds we applied were³⁶ $H_\alpha^\uparrow \geq H_\alpha$ and Lemma 8; however, by a converse bound $H_{2-1/\alpha} \geq H_\alpha^\uparrow$ ([TBH14] or [Tom16, Corollary 5.3]) we can conclude that the former is again basically tight up to a “higher-order” change in Rényi parameter (since $2 - 1/\alpha = 1 + \mu + O(\mu^2)$ if $\alpha = 1 + \mu$). We then simplified this to the Corollary 2 bound by focusing on the special case where all QES-s are the same in each round and relaxing the minimization over $\tilde{\Omega}$ to one over S_Ω ; there is perhaps some possibility that the former choice is not optimal, but there do not seem to be obviously better options for scenarios where all rounds are “basically the same”. Finally, recall that in proceeding from Corollary 2 (optimized over f) to Theorem 2, all the remaining steps held with *equality* by Lemma 13, so there was no loss of tightness there. (Though when applying our result in a security proof, perhaps there remains a question of how tight the Rényi privacy amplification theorem is. Still, this seems to be something of a distinct consideration, and we leave it for separate work.)

Hence it seems the largest potential source of suboptimality might be Lemma 8 and possibly the relaxation from $\tilde{\Omega}$ to S_Ω . This is consistent with some numerical observations we make in Remark 9 later, where it seems one obtains significantly better bounds when choosing the conditioning event to mostly only contain “typical sequences” produced in the IID case, rather than a more coarse-grained version that includes other sequences (and hence worsens the value of $\max_{c_1^n, \tilde{c}_1^n \in \tilde{\Omega}} H_\alpha(D)_{\rho_{|c_1^n, \tilde{c}_1^n}}$). However, we highlight that for such a choice of conditioning event, Lemma 8 would only be “loose up to typicality” (in that it takes the worst-case value over the typical set rather than some sort of average-case value), which is still a fairly sharp bound, and it seems hard to improve it much further in the presence of finite-size effects.

In light of this, we expect that Theorem 2 should yield strictly better bounds than previous GEAT or EAT results. This can be more rigorously formalized with the following argument. First note that if in Corollary 2 we extend \mathcal{M} with a read-and-prepare channel as described in Lemma 1

³⁶While we also applied [DFR20, Lemma B.5] to account for conditioning on Ω , note that when applying the Rényi privacy amplification theorem of [Dup21], the $\frac{\alpha}{\alpha-1} \log \frac{1}{P_{\tilde{\Omega}}}$ term essentially does not affect the final keyrates — see e.g. [Dup21, KAG+24] or Sec. 7.2–7.3 below.

(for Rényi parameter $\hat{\alpha}$), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
H_{\hat{\alpha}}^f(S\bar{C}|\widehat{C}E\widetilde{E})_{\nu} + \mathbf{f} \cdot \mathbf{q} &= H_{\hat{\alpha}}(DSC|\widehat{C}E\widetilde{E})_{\nu} - M + \mathbf{f} \cdot \mathbf{q} \\
&= H_{\hat{\alpha}}(DSC|\widehat{C}E\widetilde{E})_{\nu} - \sum_{\bar{c}\hat{c} \in \bar{C} \times \widehat{C}} H_{\hat{\alpha}}(D)_{\nu_{|\bar{c}\hat{c}}} q(\bar{c}\hat{c}) \\
&\geq H_{\hat{\alpha}}(DSC|\widehat{C}E\widetilde{E})_{\nu} - \sum_{\bar{c}\hat{c} \in \bar{C} \times \widehat{C}} H_{\alpha}(D)_{\nu_{|\bar{c}\hat{c}}} q(\bar{c}\hat{c}), \tag{147}
\end{aligned}$$

and so the bound in that corollary is at least as good as

$$H_{\alpha}^{\uparrow}(S_1^n \bar{C}_1^n | \widehat{C}_1^n E_n)_{\rho_{\Omega}} \geq \inf_{\mathbf{q} \in S_{\Omega}} \inf_{\nu \in \Sigma} \left(H_{\hat{\alpha}}(DSC|\widehat{C}E\widetilde{E})_{\nu} - \sum_{\bar{c}\hat{c} \in \bar{C} \times \widehat{C}} H_{\alpha}(D)_{\nu_{|\bar{c}\hat{c}}} q(\bar{c}\hat{c}) \right) n - \frac{\alpha}{\alpha - 1} \log \frac{1}{p_{\Omega}}. \tag{148}$$

This is the same as a bound that appears in the middle of the GEAT-with-testing proof of [MFS+22b] (specifically, Eq. (4.7) combined with the first two inequalities in step (iii) on that page; here we have presented the optimization domain with S_{Ω} instead of an event Ω on $\bar{C}_1^n \widehat{C}_1^n$ but this is just a slight generalization), apart from a technical issue that we have chosen the D register entropies in a slightly different fashion, but this should not make a significant difference. However, recall that in our proof of Theorem 2 we showed that the bound in that theorem is *exactly equal* to the Corollary 2 bound (which is slightly tighter than (148)) with the best choice of f . Therefore, the results in [MFS+22b], which were obtained by proceeding onwards from (148) but with some further relaxations, should not yield a better bound than Theorem 2. Analogous results hold for the EAT bounds derived in e.g. [DFR20, DF19, LLR+21].

7.2 BB84

As a preliminary example, we apply Theorem 2 to derive keyrates for an entanglement-based implementation of the BB84 protocol, as follows. In this protocol, the registers S_j store Alice’s “secret” data and the registers \widehat{C}_j store “public” data from test rounds, similar to our above formulations; we design the protocol such that the \bar{C}_j registers are trivial.

Protocol 1 EB-BB84 protocol outline

1. For each round $j \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$, perform the following steps:
 - 1.1. Alice and Bob each receive a qubit register. Then via public communication, with probability $1 - \gamma$ (independently in each round) they jointly declare the round is a generation round, and otherwise it is a test round. Alice also independently generates a uniformly random “symmetrization bit” $F_j \in \{0, 1\}$ and publicly announces it.
 - 1.2. If it is a generation round, they both measure in the Z basis, XOR their outcomes with F_j , and store the resulting values in registers S_j and \tilde{S}_j for Alice and Bob respectively. Also, they jointly set $\widehat{C}_j = \perp$.
 - 1.3. If it is a test round, they both measure in the X basis, XOR their outcomes with F_j and publicly announce the resulting values, then jointly set $\widehat{C}_j = 0$ if their outcomes matched and $\widehat{C}_j = 1$ otherwise. Also, Alice sets $S_j = 0$ and Bob sets $\tilde{S}_j = \text{test}$.
 2. Perform an **acceptance test**, in which Alice and Bob abort if $\text{freq}_{\widehat{C}_1^n}$ lies outside some predetermined set S_Ω .
 3. Perform one-way **error correction** in which Alice sends Bob a bitstring of length λ_{EC} , which he uses together with \tilde{S}_1^n to produce a guess $\mathbf{S}^{\text{guess}}$ for Alice’s string S_1^n . Then perform **error verification**, in which Alice sends Bob a 2-universal hash of S_1^n (together with the choice of hash function), who compares it with the hash of $\mathbf{S}^{\text{guess}}$ and aborts if they do not match.
 4. If neither of the above steps aborted, produce final keys of length ℓ_{key} by performing **privacy amplification**, in which Alice chooses a 2-universal function $\{0, 1\}^n \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^{\ell_{\text{key}}}$ and publicly announces it, then Alice and Bob apply it to S_1^n and $\mathbf{S}^{\text{guess}}$ respectively.
-

We defer to [TL17, MR23] for details on the error correction and privacy amplification steps. There are many modifications that can be made to the above outline (e.g. here we have followed [TL17, Sec. 3] and allowed Alice and Bob to jointly decide the basis to measure in, but for practical protocols the parties may need to *independently* choose measurement bases, so the test/generation labelling is different; see [GLH+22, KAG+24]), but we do not pursue these details further for this example.

As our goal in this example is to provide some comparison to the results in [TL17], we proceed in analogy to that work and choose some “QBER threshold” value Q_{thresh} , then define the set S_Ω to be³⁷

$$S_\Omega = \{\mathbf{q} \in \mathbb{P}_{\widehat{C}} \mid q_{\widehat{C}}(1) \leq \gamma Q_{\text{thresh}}\}. \quad (149)$$

Following that work, we do not include an analysis of the required honest QBER value such that the honest protocol accepts with high probability; we note however in Remark 9 below that a careful analysis of this aspect can improve the keyrates from our formulas. Furthermore, following [TL17] we note that (without affecting any security properties of the protocol, only the probability that it aborts in the honest case) in the error correction step we can plausibly use the choice

$$\lambda_{\text{EC}} \approx 1.1(1 - \gamma)h_{\text{bin}}(Q_{\text{thresh}})n, \quad (150)$$

where the factor of $1 - \gamma$ accounts for the generation-round probability. (Strictly speaking, one could in fact use the better value $\lambda_{\text{EC}} \approx 1.1H(S_j|\tilde{S}_j)_{\text{hon}}n = 1.1(1 - \gamma)h_{\text{bin}}(Q_{\text{hon}})n$, where $H(S_j|\tilde{S}_j)_{\text{hon}}$

³⁷Since the test rounds are only measured in the X basis, in this formula we could instead view Q_{thresh} as only being the “phase error rate”, rather than QBER with respect to multiple bases. However, since the error-correction term λ_{EC} instead depends on error rates in generation rounds (i.e. the Z -basis error rate), for simplicity in this analysis we shall view Q_{thresh} as a single QBER parameter that characterizes error rates in any basis, so we can use it in the formula (150) for λ_{EC} .

denotes the value in the *honest* implementation, rather than the threshold accept value; we avoid this for a fairer comparison to [TL17]. We also gloss over the subtlety that here \tilde{S}_j is not a binary random variable since it is set to `test` with probability γ , so existing results for LDPCs may not immediately apply; the above formula is an approximate heuristic anyway.)

Remark 9. *Some numerical experimenting indicates that if we consider that there should be some honest IID behaviour of the protocol and S_Ω must be chosen to accept it with high probability, then we find a rough trend that Theorem 2 seems to yield much tighter bounds if S_Ω is instead chosen to constrain all the entries of \mathbf{q} in a small neighbourhood of the honest behaviour, i.e.*

$$S_\Omega = \left\{ \mathbf{q} \in \mathbb{P}_{\widehat{\mathcal{C}}} \mid q_{\widehat{\mathcal{C}}}(\hat{c}) \in I_{\hat{c}} \forall \hat{c} \in \widehat{\mathcal{C}} \right\}, \quad (151)$$

for some small intervals $I_{\hat{c}}$ (even after accounting for the fact that the resulting upper bound on $q_{\widehat{\mathcal{C}}}(1)$ must be looser than the single-term version in (149), to achieve the same bound on honest abort probability). This seems related to the observation that Lemma 8 is potentially the loosest step in our proof, and choosing S_Ω such that it only “captures” the typical IID sequences helps to reduce the value of $\max_{\hat{c}_1^{\epsilon_1} \hat{c}_1^{\epsilon_1} \in \tilde{\Omega}} H_\alpha(D)_{\rho_{|\hat{c}_1^{\epsilon_1} \hat{c}_1^{\epsilon_1}}}$ there. Furthermore, in such cases we find that (denoting the desired bound on honest abort probability as ε^{com} , the **completeness parameter**) it seems better to choose the intervals $I_{\hat{c}}$ such that each term causes an abort with probability at most $\varepsilon^{\text{com}}/3$ (i.e. we distribute the “abort-probability contributions” evenly), rather than using the same interval width for all terms. Note also that while these intervals can be simply chosen using e.g. the Chernoff bound, better results can be obtained by instead using the binomial-distribution analysis described in [LLR+21, KAG+24] (either by using inbuilt software functions that can evaluate binomial-distribution tail bounds, or relaxing them to normal-distribution tail bounds as described in [LLR+21]).

For the above protocol, we can construct GEATT channels \mathcal{M}_j in the fashion described in [MR23], with the E_j register in each round storing all the side-information Eve collects and updates, including both her quantum side-information and the public announcements from each round. We then construct a single rate-bounding channel \mathcal{M} for all of them using Lemma 9, which is an infrequent-sampling channel as discussed below Definition 13. For this rate-bounding channel, we can apply an EUR for von Neumann entropy [BCC+10] to lower-bound $H(S|E\tilde{E})_{\nu_\perp}$ for any $\nu \in \Sigma$ (i.e. any state that could be produced by $\mathcal{M} \otimes \text{id}_{\tilde{E}}$). Specifically, if we let X, \tilde{X} denote registers that store Alice and Bob’s symmetrized³⁸ X -measurement outcomes conditioned on $\widehat{\mathcal{C}} \neq \perp$ (i.e. we are in the “test” component of the infrequent-sampling channel), then

$$H(S|E\tilde{E})_{\nu_\perp} \geq 1 - H(X|\tilde{X})_{\nu_{\widehat{\mathcal{C}} \neq \perp}} = 1 - h_{\text{bin}} \left(\Pr[X \neq \tilde{X} | \widehat{\mathcal{C}} \neq \perp] \right) = 1 - h_{\text{bin}} \left(\frac{\nu_{\widehat{\mathcal{C}}}(1)}{\gamma} \right), \quad (152)$$

where $H(X|\tilde{X})_{\nu_{\widehat{\mathcal{C}} \neq \perp}} = h_{\text{bin}} \left(\Pr[X \neq \tilde{X} | \widehat{\mathcal{C}} \neq \perp] \right)$ holds because the marginal distributions of X, \tilde{X} conditioned on $\widehat{\mathcal{C}} \neq \perp$ are uniform, and in the last step we recall that $\widehat{\mathcal{C}}$ is set to \perp with probability

³⁸As in, after they have XOR’d their outcomes with the symmetrization bit F . Note that strictly speaking, in order to apply EURs to the values S, X, \tilde{X} (which are produced after symmetrization, i.e. not the raw outcomes of X or Z measurements), we are implicitly applying a standard argument [RGK05] that the same overall state (including all side-information) could instead have been produced by just taking the raw outcomes of measurements on some other initial state, essentially by “commuting” the symmetrization with the measurements by re-expressing it as a rotation on the pre-measurement qubits. An alternative option could be to omit the symmetrization step and instead use e.g. Fano’s inequality to write $H(X|\tilde{X})_{\nu_{\widehat{\mathcal{C}} \neq \perp}} \leq h_{\text{bin}} \left(\Pr[X \neq \tilde{X} | \widehat{\mathcal{C}} \neq \perp] \right)$ for the purposes of the bound (152) below, but this would require more steps to extend to the Rényi EUR bound (159).

$1 - \gamma$ and otherwise is set to 1 if and only if $X \neq \widetilde{X}$. Combined with [DFR20, Lemma B.9], this gives (note that here we have $\dim(S) = 2$, because we designed the protocol such that S is still bit-valued even in a test round):

$$\forall \alpha \in \left(1, 1 + \frac{1}{\log(5)}\right), \quad H_{\widehat{\alpha}}(S|E\widetilde{E})_{\nu_{\perp}} \geq 1 - h_{\text{bin}}\left(\frac{\nu_{\widehat{C}}(1)}{\gamma}\right) - (\widehat{\alpha} - 1) \log^2(5). \quad (153)$$

Again, one could instead use [DF19, Corollary IV.2] here for tighter but slightly more elaborate bounds; we omit this for ease of presentation.

Without loss of generality, we can assume that once the n measurement steps have been completed, Eve no longer acts on her register E_n (by replacing any operation she does afterwards with its Stinespring isometry). Let ρ denote the state produced in the protocol just before privacy amplification, and let Ω denote the event that both³⁹ the acceptance test and error verification accepted. Then since S_{Ω} as defined in (149) is convex, we can apply Theorem 2 together with Lemma 10 and the bound (97) for infrequent-sampling channels (which is tight for this protocol, i.e. the equality (98) holds) to obtain

$$H_{\alpha}^{\uparrow}(S_1^n | \widehat{C}_1^n E_n)_{\rho|_{\Omega}} \geq \inf_{\mathbf{q} \in S_{\Omega}} \inf_{\nu_{\widehat{C}} \in \mathbb{P}_{\widehat{C}}} \left(q(\perp) \left(1 - h_{\text{bin}}\left(\frac{\nu_{\widehat{C}}(1)}{\gamma}\right) - (\widehat{\alpha} - 1) \log^2(5) \right) + \frac{1}{\widehat{\alpha} - 1} D(\mathbf{q} \| \nu_{\widehat{C}}) \right) n - \frac{\alpha}{\alpha - 1} \log \frac{1}{p_{\Omega}}, \quad (154)$$

where we have relaxed the optimization over $\nu \in \Sigma$ by noting that the bound (153) in fact only depends on the classical distribution $\nu_{\widehat{C}}$. Note that since the domains of $\mathbf{q}, \nu_{\widehat{C}}$ enforce that they are normalized, and also the value of $\nu_{\widehat{C}}(\perp)$ is fixed as $1 - \gamma$ by the infrequent-sampling structure, there are in fact only 3 independent variables in the above minimization.

Then by applying (92) to convert the above bound to smooth min-entropy and following the proof structure in [MR23] or [KAG+24], one can show that if we choose any values⁴⁰ $\varepsilon_s, \varepsilon_a, \varepsilon_{\text{EV}}, \varepsilon_{\text{PA}} \in (0, 1)$ and set

$$\ell_{\text{key}} = \left[\inf_{\mathbf{q} \in S_{\Omega}} \inf_{\nu_{\widehat{C}} \in \mathbb{P}_{\widehat{C}}} \left(q(\perp) \left(1 - h_{\text{bin}}\left(\frac{\nu_{\widehat{C}}(1)}{\gamma}\right) - (\widehat{\alpha} - 1) \log^2(5) \right) + \frac{1}{\widehat{\alpha} - 1} D(\mathbf{q} \| \nu_{\widehat{C}}) \right) n - \frac{\alpha}{\alpha - 1} \log \frac{1}{\varepsilon_a} - \frac{1}{\alpha - 1} \log \frac{2}{\varepsilon_s^2} - \lambda_{\text{EC}} - \left\lceil \log \frac{1}{\varepsilon_{\text{EV}}} \right\rceil - 2 \log \frac{1}{\varepsilon_{\text{PA}}} \right], \quad (155)$$

the protocol will be $\varepsilon^{\text{secure}}$ -**secure** (see [TL17, MR23] for full definitions, or [PR21] under the term **soundness** instead) with⁴¹

$$\varepsilon^{\text{secure}} = \max \left\{ \frac{\varepsilon_{\text{PA}}}{2} + 2\varepsilon_s, \varepsilon_a \right\} + \varepsilon_{\text{EV}}. \quad (156)$$

³⁹Note that this event is a stricter condition than just the acceptance test accepting (which would be the event $\text{freq}_{e_1^n} \in S_{\Omega}$), so it remains the case that every distribution \widehat{c}_1^n with nonzero probability in the conditional state $\rho|_{\Omega}$ satisfies $\text{freq}_{e_1^n} \in S_{\Omega}$, i.e. the first condition on S_{Ω} in Theorem 2 indeed holds. Also note that we are implicitly exploiting the fact that in Theorem 2, Ω does not have to be an event defined entirely on the \widehat{C}_1^n registers, as discussed in Corollary 1.

⁴⁰The parameter ε_{EV} here is denoted as ε_{KV} in [MR23]; we have used different notation simply because we refer to the relevant step as “error verification” instead of “key validation”.

⁴¹To obtain this result we have basically added the **correctness** and **secrecy** parameters from [MR23], except that the secrecy parameter in that work is rescaled by a factor of 2 as compared to [PR21, TL17], and so we have first adjusted it accordingly. We have also removed the dependence of the secrecy parameter in that work on ε_{EV} , because for our protocol we perform the acceptance test directly on the \widehat{C}_1^n registers rather than a guess for it; see [KAG+24].

Note that since the optimal choice of α in (155) is often close to 1, the effects of $\varepsilon_a, \varepsilon_s$ in that bound are significantly larger than those of $\varepsilon_{\text{PA}}, \varepsilon_{\text{EV}}$. Hence for our numerical calculations, given some desired value of $\varepsilon^{\text{secure}}$ we use the heuristic choice of setting

$$\varepsilon_{\text{PA}} = \varepsilon_{\text{EV}} = \varepsilon_{\text{small}}, \quad \varepsilon_a = \varepsilon^{\text{secure}} - \varepsilon_{\text{small}}, \quad \varepsilon_s = \frac{1}{2} \left(\varepsilon^{\text{secure}} - \frac{3}{2} \varepsilon_{\text{small}} \right), \quad (157)$$

where $\varepsilon_{\text{small}}$ is a parameter we choose to maximize ℓ_{key} . Specifically, substituting the above expressions into (155), given any fixed choice of α we can find the best $\varepsilon_{\text{small}}$ by differentiating with respect to $\varepsilon_{\text{small}}$ (note that the infimum term is independent of $\varepsilon_{\text{small}}$ and can be entirely ignored for this purpose), which yields the explicit solution

$$\varepsilon_{\text{small}} = \frac{8 + 17(\alpha - 1) - \sqrt{64 + 56(\alpha - 1) + (\alpha - 1)^2}}{2(9 + 12(\alpha - 1))} \varepsilon^{\text{secure}} \approx \frac{3}{4} (\alpha - 1) \varepsilon^{\text{secure}}. \quad (158)$$

On the other hand, a tighter bound can be obtained by directly using EURs for Rényi entropies to bound $h_{\hat{\alpha}}$. Specifically, by using the fact that $H_{\hat{\alpha}} \geq H_{\frac{1}{2-\hat{\alpha}}}^{\uparrow}$ ([TBH14] or [Tom16, Corollary 5.3]) and then applying the EUR from [MLDS+13, Theorem 11], we have

$$H_{\hat{\alpha}}(S|E\tilde{E})_{\nu_{\perp}} \geq H_{\frac{1}{2-\hat{\alpha}}}^{\uparrow}(S|E\tilde{E})_{\nu_{\perp}} \geq 1 - H_{\beta}^{\uparrow}(X|\tilde{X})_{\nu_{|\hat{C} \neq \perp}}, \quad \text{where } \beta = \frac{1}{\hat{\alpha}}. \quad (159)$$

Note that if we write $\hat{\alpha} = 1 + \hat{\mu}$, then $\beta = 1/(1 + \hat{\mu}) = 1 - \hat{\mu} + O(\hat{\mu}^2)$. The $H_{\beta}^{\uparrow}(X|\tilde{X})_{\nu_{|\hat{C} \neq \perp}}$ term is a purely classical Rényi entropy and hence coincides with the entropy from [Ari77]. Again using the fact that the symmetrized bits X, \tilde{X} have uniform marginal distributions, we can explicitly calculate

$$\begin{aligned} H_{\beta}^{\uparrow}(X|\tilde{X})_{\nu_{|\hat{C} \neq \perp}} &= \frac{\beta}{1-\beta} \log \left(\sum_{i=0}^1 \left(\sum_{j=0}^1 \left(\frac{\nu_{\hat{C}}(i \oplus j)}{2\gamma} \right)^{\beta} \right)^{1/\beta} \right) \\ &= \frac{1}{1-\beta} \log \left(\left(1 - \frac{\nu_{\hat{C}}(1)}{\gamma} \right)^{\beta} + \left(\frac{\nu_{\hat{C}}(1)}{\gamma} \right)^{\beta} \right). \end{aligned} \quad (160)$$

For α somewhat further away from 1, the above bound has an important advantage over the previous bound (153) in that as $\nu_{\hat{C}}(1) \rightarrow 0$, it converges towards the tight bound $H_{\hat{\alpha}}(S|E\tilde{E})_{\nu_{\perp}} \geq 1$, unlike (153) which yields a lower bound that remains of the form $1 - \Theta(\hat{\alpha} - 1)$. With this bound, we conclude that the same security levels as described above can be achieved by instead setting

$$\begin{aligned} \ell_{\text{key}} = & \left[\inf_{\mathbf{q} \in S_{\Omega}} \inf_{\nu_{\hat{C}} \in \mathbb{P}_{\hat{C}}} \left(q(\perp) \left(1 - \frac{1}{1-\beta} \log \left(\left(1 - \frac{\nu_{\hat{C}}(1)}{\gamma} \right)^{\beta} + \left(\frac{\nu_{\hat{C}}(1)}{\gamma} \right)^{\beta} \right) \right) + \frac{1}{\hat{\alpha}-1} D(\mathbf{q} \parallel \nu_{\hat{C}}) \right) n \\ & - \frac{\alpha}{\alpha-1} \log \frac{1}{\varepsilon_a} - \frac{1}{\alpha-1} \log \frac{2}{\varepsilon_s^2} - \lambda_{\text{EC}} - \left\lceil \log \frac{1}{\varepsilon_{\text{EV}}} \right\rceil - 2 \log \frac{1}{\varepsilon_{\text{PA}}} \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (161)$$

In the above bounds, we have converted to smooth min-entropy rather than directly using the Rényi privacy amplification theorem of [Dup21], in order to achieve a “fairer” comparison to [TL17]. However, our approach is certainly compatible with the latter since it proceeds by first bounding the Rényi entropy, and this typically yields better finite-size keyrates [GLH+22]. Furthermore, this gives us a “fully Rényi” security proof, maximally exploiting the results we have developed in this work. We hence also perform some calculations for this approach. Specifically, using the single-round




Figure 1: Keyrates for EB-BB84 from our approach, for an example with QBER threshold $Q_{\text{thresh}} = 0.025$ and security parameter $\varepsilon^{\text{secure}} = 10^{-10}$. The brown, blue, and purple curves correspond to the keyrates given by the formulas (155), (161) and (162), respectively, where we used heuristic numerical methods to evaluate the (fairly simple) minimizations in those formulas. For comparison, the dashed red curve is the corresponding result from [TL17, Fig. 7] (based on smooth-entropy EURs), and the black horizontal line is the asymptotic rate. It can be seen that our results are always an improvement over that work, except for the case of the suboptimal formula (155) at small n . (The choices of S_{Ω} , λ_{EC} and epsilon parameters we used in our formulas are described in the main text, and we roughly optimized the choices of γ and α by simply evaluating the formulas over a grid of values for those parameters and taking the best result; we leave a more refined approach for future applications.)

Rényi entropy bounds (159)–(160) together with the Rényi privacy amplification theorem, we can conclude that if we set [KAG+24]

$$\ell_{\text{key}} = \left[\inf_{\mathbf{q} \in S_{\Omega}} \inf_{\nu_{\widehat{C}} \in \mathbb{P}_{\widehat{C}}} \left(q(\perp) \left(1 - \frac{1}{1-\beta} \log \left(\left(1 - \frac{\nu_{\widehat{C}}(1)}{\gamma} \right)^{\beta} + \left(\frac{\nu_{\widehat{C}}(1)}{\gamma} \right)^{\beta} \right) \right) + \frac{1}{\widehat{\alpha}-1} D(\mathbf{q} \parallel \nu_{\widehat{C}}) \right) n - \lambda_{\text{EC}} - \left\lceil \log \frac{1}{\varepsilon_{\text{EV}}} \right\rceil - \frac{\alpha}{\alpha-1} \log \frac{1}{\varepsilon_{\text{PA}}} + 2 \right], \quad (162)$$

then the protocol will be $\varepsilon^{\text{secure}}$ -secure with the much simpler security parameter

$$\varepsilon^{\text{secure}} = \varepsilon_{\text{PA}} + \varepsilon_{\text{EV}}. \quad (163)$$

Optimizing the choice of ε_{PA} and ε_{EV} for a desired $\varepsilon^{\text{secure}}$ and fixed α yields the following explicit solution (in this case, it is ε_{PA} that contributes much more significantly to the key length than ε_{EV} , due to the behaviour of the Rényi privacy amplification theorem):

$$\varepsilon_{\text{EV}} = \frac{\alpha-1}{2\alpha-1} \varepsilon^{\text{secure}}, \quad \varepsilon_{\text{PA}} = \frac{\alpha}{2\alpha-1} \varepsilon^{\text{secure}}. \quad (164)$$

In Fig. 1, we plot the keyrates $\frac{\ell_{\text{key}}}{n}$ obtained from the formulas (155), (161) and (162) for a simple example with $Q_{\text{thresh}} = 0.025$. Comparing them to the corresponding curve in [TL17, Fig. 7], we find

that while (155) is slightly worse at small n , we have better keyrates everywhere else as compared to the results in that work. In particular, the formula (161) already performs better everywhere despite also proceeding via a smooth min-entropy bound (instead of Rényi privacy amplification), i.e. this means it genuinely certifies a better bound on smooth min-entropy as compared to the proof in that work. (It is true that technically our protocol implements infrequent-sampling rather than sampling-without-replacement as in their protocol; however, we believe that the comparison is still fairly reasonable.) An important question is whether this improvement still holds in the presence of photon loss; we leave this for future work.

We remark that in fact, using Theorem 2 for this proof was slightly suboptimal: our bound for the [HB24] model (Theorem 3) is slightly tighter, as previously discussed. However, we choose to present our results based on Theorem 2 to demonstrate that we can get keyrates comparable to the smooth-entropy EUR approach in [TL17] even with this slight suboptimality. Also note that here we considered an EB protocol, which does not require a “single-signal interaction” condition when applying the GEAT; when considering PM protocols instead, one should anyway use the [HB24] model to avoid requiring this condition.

7.3 DIRE from collision-entropy accumulation

In [LLR+21], an experiment was performed to demonstrate DIRE, with a security proof using the EAT (under the original Markov conditions as described in Sec. 6.1 here). To briefly summarize, each round consists of an infrequent-sampling channel (Definition 13) such that in test rounds, the CHSH game is played and the “secret test register” \overline{C}_j is set to 0 for a loss and 1 for a win; in generation rounds, fixed inputs are supplied to their devices and the outputs are recorded, with \overline{C}_j being set to \perp . The “public test registers” \widehat{C}_j are trivial in this analysis. The secret register S_j for the proof technically consists of outputs from both Alice and Bob’s devices; however, for the purposes of the single-round analysis we follow that work and simply lower-bound its entropy by only considering Alice’s output.

As the [LLR+21] analysis was based on the previous EAT, they considered only the von Neumann entropy in the single-round analysis. We could of course do the same with our results using the methods discussed above (and we again find improved finite-size performance compared to previous results, which we present in a companion work [HT24]). However, in this section we demonstrate an alternative perspective that given a bound on the single-round min-entropy or collision entropy, we can “accumulate” it to obtain a bound on the overall H_2^\uparrow entropy, on which we can directly apply a “traditional” privacy amplification result [Ren05, Theorem 5.5.1]. (A collision-entropy analysis was also used in [MDR+19], but it was under an IID assumption.)

Remark 10. *Readers interested in results more applicable to DIQKD may refer to the companion work [HT24]. For this example here, we have chosen randomness expansion rather than QKD because in the former, any $\Omega(n)$ lower bound on the overall $H_2^\uparrow(S_1^n \overline{C}_1^n | T_1^n \widehat{E})_{\rho_{|\Omega}}$ entropy is enough to eventually produce a nonzero key length. In contrast, for QKD there is an error-correction term λ_{EC} that remains significant at large n , so an $\Omega(n)$ lower bound on $H_2^\uparrow(S_1^n \overline{C}_1^n | T_1^n \widehat{E})_{\rho_{|\Omega}}$ would still need to have a sufficiently large implicit constant in order to produce a nonzero key length, even asymptotically.*

Specifically, in [PAM+10, MPA11] a bound was derived on $H_\infty^\uparrow(S\overline{C}|\widehat{C}T\widehat{E})_{\nu_\perp}$ as a function of CHSH winning probability. Noting that $H_2 \geq H_\infty^\uparrow$ ([TBH14] or [Tom16, Corollary 5.3]), we can

write⁴²

$$H_2(S\bar{C}|\widehat{C}T\widehat{E})_{\nu_{\perp}} \geq H_{\infty}^{\uparrow}(S\bar{C}|\widehat{C}T\widehat{E})_{\nu_{\perp}} \geq f_{\text{CHSH}}\left(\frac{\nu_{\bar{C}}(1)}{\gamma}\right), \quad (165)$$

where $f_{\text{CHSH}}(w) := 1 - \log\left(1 + \sqrt{2 - \frac{(8w - 4)^2}{4}}\right)$.

Applying the Lemma 14 version of Theorem 2 with the Lemma 10 bound (these choices are to ensure the Rényi parameter does not change further), we obtain a form of “collision entropy accumulation”, albeit with H_2^{\uparrow} of the final state rather than H_2 :

$$H_2^{\uparrow}(S_1^n \bar{C}_1^n | T_1^n \widehat{E})_{\rho_{|\Omega}} \geq nh_2 - \log \frac{1}{p_{\Omega}}, \quad (166)$$

where $h_2 = \inf_{\mathbf{q} \in S_{\Omega}} \inf_{\nu_{\bar{C}} \in \mathbb{P}_{\bar{C}}} \left(q(\perp) f_{\text{CHSH}}\left(\frac{\nu_{\bar{C}}(1)}{\gamma}\right) + D(\mathbf{q} \parallel \nu_{\bar{C}}) \right)$.

With this we can apply a “traditional” privacy amplification theorem for unsmoothed H_2^{\uparrow} [Ren05, Theorem 5.5.1], from which we conclude we can obtain an $\varepsilon^{\text{secret}}$ -secret key with length given by

$$\ell_{\text{key}} = \left\lfloor nh_2 - 2 \log \frac{1}{\varepsilon^{\text{secret}}} + 2 \right\rfloor. \quad (167)$$

(Technically, to obtain the above we have used the fact that for this protocol we have $H_2^{\uparrow}(S_1^n | T_1^n \widehat{E})_{\rho_{|\Omega}} = H_2^{\uparrow}(S_1^n \bar{C}_1^n | T_1^n \widehat{E})_{\rho_{|\Omega}}$ by [DFR20, Lemma B.7], because \bar{C}_1^n in this protocol can be “projectively reconstructed” from $S_1^n T_1^n$. Also, the log-probability term does not appear in the final key length formula because it simply becomes an appropriate prefactor in the secrecy definition; see [Dup21, KAG+24].)

The above formula for ℓ_{key} is a linear expression with only an $O(1)$ finite-size correction, so we might hope that it could perform better at small n , where the $O(\sqrt{n})$ finite-size corrections of the previous EAT have larger relative effects. Evaluating the value of h_2 in the above formula for the parameters used in the main experiment of [LLR+21], we find the result $h_2 = 4.47 \times 10^{-9}$, which appears fairly small. However, we note that to achieve the secrecy parameter of $\varepsilon^{\text{secret}} = 3.09 \times 10^{-12}$ that was chosen in that work, the minimum number of rounds required for nontrivial key length (i.e. $\ell_{\text{key}} \geq 1$) with this formula is then $n_{\min} = 1.685 \times 10^{10}$, which is indeed a slight improvement over the value $n_{\min} = 8.951 \times 10^{10}$ found in that work. (On the other hand, if we consider the larger value $n = 1.3824 \times 10^{11}$ used in the actual [LLR+21] experiment, the formula (167) yields a much smaller ℓ_{key} than the analysis in that work — this is somewhat expected since the rate asymptotically converges to h_2 rather than the single-round von Neumann entropy.)

As mentioned in previous sections, the above approach has the drawback that h_2 is a constant independent of n , because the “penalty term” in (166) does not change with n . This implies in particular that it does not converge to $\inf_{\nu_{\bar{C}} \in S_{\Omega}} \nu_{\bar{C}}(\perp) f_{\text{CHSH}}\left(\frac{\nu_{\bar{C}}(1)}{\gamma}\right)$ even at large n . To overcome

⁴²It would have been cleaner if we could directly “accumulate” H_{∞}^{\uparrow} ; however, it can be seen that our bounds for the EAT or GEAT scenarios involve H_{α} rather than H_{α}^{\uparrow} in the single-round terms, and therefore we cannot directly make use of a bound on single-round H_{α}^{\uparrow} without first converting it to H_2 . (For the [HB24] scenario though, the bounds we presented in Sec. 6.2 are indeed based on single-round H_{α}^{\uparrow} , which would indeed allow us to directly “accumulate” min-entropy.) Though in any case, for the CHSH game in particular, [MDR+19] showed that the bound (165) is in fact tight for both H_2 and H_{∞}^{\uparrow} , so there is no loss of tightness in considering the former instead for this particular protocol.

this issue, we can fine-tune further by noting that since the Rényi entropies are monotone in α , the lower bound in (165) also holds for any H_α with $\alpha \leq 2$, and therefore we could invoke our bounds with any such α instead. Together with the Rényi privacy amplification theorem [Dup21]⁴³, this means we could get an $\varepsilon^{\text{secret}}$ -secret key by picking

$$\ell_{\text{key}} = \left\lfloor \inf_{\mathbf{q} \in S_\Omega} \inf_{\nu_{\bar{c}} \in \mathbb{P}_{\bar{c}}} \left(q(\perp) f_{\text{CHSH}} \left(\frac{\nu_{\bar{c}}(1)}{\gamma} \right) + \frac{1}{\alpha - 1} D(\mathbf{q} \parallel \nu_{\bar{c}}) \right) n - \frac{\alpha}{\alpha - 1} \log \frac{1}{\varepsilon^{\text{secret}}} + 2 \right\rfloor. \quad (168)$$

where $\alpha \in (1, 2]$ can be optimized over. Note that in this approach, the final Rényi entropy $H_\alpha^\uparrow(S_1^n \bar{C}_1^n | T_1^n \bar{E})_{\rho_{1\Omega}}$ that we bounded may have a very different Rényi parameter from the single-round bound; however, it has the advantage that at large n , the “first-order constant” will indeed converge to $\inf_{\nu_{\bar{c}} \in S_\Omega} \nu_{\bar{c}}(\perp) f_{\text{CHSH}} \left(\frac{\nu_{\bar{c}}(1)}{\gamma} \right)$ (e.g. by taking $\alpha = 1 + \Theta(1/\sqrt{n})$). By optimizing α in this formula (168), we find that $\ell_{\text{key}} \geq 1$ can be achieved even at e.g. $n = 10^{10}$.

In fact, with this perspective we can also apply the Lemma 11 bound instead, by setting $\alpha' = 2$ and hence requiring $\frac{\alpha}{\alpha - 1} = 2 + \frac{\alpha''}{\alpha'' - 1}$ (if we write $\alpha = 1 + \mu$, this translates to $\alpha'' = 1 + \frac{\mu}{1 - 2\mu} = 1 + \mu + O(\mu^2)$; note that this means we have to restrict to $\mu < 1/2$ i.e. $\alpha < 3/2$). Due to symmetries of the protocol, the bound (165) also holds for the state ν without conditioning on $\bar{c} = \perp$ (this fact was implicitly used in [LLR+21]). With this we can pick

$$\ell_{\text{key}} = \left\lfloor \inf_{\mathbf{q} \in S_\Omega} \inf_{\nu_{\bar{c}} \in \mathbb{P}_{\bar{c}}} \left(f_{\text{CHSH}} \left(\frac{\nu_{\bar{c}}(1)}{\gamma} \right) + \frac{\alpha''}{\alpha'' - 1} D(\mathbf{q} \parallel \nu_{\bar{c}}) \right) n - \frac{\alpha}{\alpha - 1} \log \frac{1}{\varepsilon^{\text{secret}}} + 2 \right\rfloor. \quad (169)$$

We find that at $n \sim 10^{10}$, this bound is worse than (168). However, when n gets closer to the values used in the [LLR+21] experiment, it sometimes performs better than (168) (though still somewhat worse than the results in [LLR+21] based on single-round von Neumann entropy, but surprisingly, not by a large extent). This behaviour essentially seems to be because we have fixed the value of α' in this case, so the other Rényi parameter α'' remains equal to α up to order $O((\alpha - 1)^2)$, hence more or less avoiding the “loss” in Rényi parameter. Hence at large n (where the optimal α becomes close to 1), it can sometimes outperform (168) because it does not have the $q(\perp)$ prefactor. However, roughly speaking we do not expect this to be the case if we were to instead work with von Neumann entropy (via (91)) in this regime, since in that case the Rényi parameters would have the worse scaling $\alpha', \alpha'' = 1 + 2\mu + O(\mu^2)$ as discussed previously, assuming we choose $\alpha' = \alpha''$.⁴⁴

Finally, we highlight that numerical exploration again suggests that rather than using the accept condition in the [LLR+21] experiment (which only constrains the frequency of $\bar{c} = 0$), our bounds yield better results if we instead follow the approach in Remark 9 (while preserving the same bound on honest abort probability).

⁴³Again, we could instead convert to $H_{\min}^{\varepsilon_s}$ and apply the corresponding privacy amplification theorem (under the current state of results in privacy amplification, this may be necessary if the protocol uses Trevisan’s extractor instead of 2-universal hashing). However, in that case we find no improvement in n_{\min} over (167), though we can at least still get about $n_{\min} = 3 \times 10^{10}$, which is still better than [LLR+21]. The issue basically seems to be that for security proofs based on our $H_{\min}^{\varepsilon_s}$ bound rather than our H_α^\uparrow bound, one has to pick a “threshold” value ε_a and split the analysis into cases where ρ_Ω is above or below ε_a ; this introduces additional finite-size corrections, and the resulting ℓ_{key} formula then fails to reduce to (167) in the $\alpha \rightarrow 2$ limit.

⁴⁴In fact another potential question is whether we would actually get better n_{\min} values via this von Neumann entropy approach; we leave this question for future work. One point that may be worth highlighting is that similar to the advantage of (160) over (153) in the previous section, working with the collision-entropy bound (165) ensures that the optimization for the “first-order term” always returns a strictly positive value, unlike the relaxation to von Neumann entropy via the continuity bound (91), which may yield a negative value if α' is not sufficiently close to 1. Hence it seems likely that the collision-entropy approach will indeed be better for small n , where the optimal Rényi parameters are further from 1.

8 Conclusion and future work

In summary, in this work we have found a connection between entropy accumulation and QEFs, yielding families of Rényi entropy bounds that are suitable for use in both variable-length and fixed-length protocols. Our results for the latter case have the important advantage of not requiring affine min-tradeoff functions, and furthermore we find that they give a significant improvement in practice over previous EAT or GEAT bounds. Since our approach proceeds via Rényi entropies, it also unlocks a variety of options for security proofs based on any Rényi entropies, including “fully Rényi” security proofs (without an IID assumption) that approach the “correct” asymptotic behaviour by taking $\alpha \rightarrow 1$.

Certainly, one question for future consideration would be whether the bounds could be further tightened. As discussed in Sec. 7.1, it seems many steps in the proof are tight, apart from Lemma 8. It would be interesting to see if improvements could be found on that step. However, we highlight again that the current bound is already tight enough to outperform the smoothed-entropy EURs in at least some contexts.

Another consideration is the fact that in current DIQKD security proofs, the handling of the test-round registers is highly inconvenient — since they do not fulfil the NS condition, one has to include them in the \overline{C}_1^n registers on the “left side” of the conditioning, then shift them to the “right side” via chain rules [AFRV19, TSB+22, CMT23]. Ideally, to resolve this issue, one would like to have a version of entropy accumulation that does not require the test-round registers to explicitly appear in the entropy terms (or be “reconstructible” from the registers that appear, in the sense of [MFS+22b]). It does not seem straightforward how to do so with the proof approaches thus far, but this remains an interesting open question that should be further explored. Failing that, it may be interesting to consider the question of whether there is a more natural way to handle the \overline{C}_1^n registers for variable-length protocols rather than simply shifting them onto the “right side” of the conditioning (especially in the case of DIRE), perhaps by using some other structure in QES-entropies.

Remark 11. *For fixed-length protocols using infrequent-sampling channels (Definition 13) though, we can at least propose an improved method for handling the \overline{C}_1^n registers as compared to previous works such as [AFRV19, MDR+19, TSB+22, GLH+22]. Specifically, let us suppose the protocol (more precisely the GEATT model used to describe it) satisfies the following properties:*

- *The E_n register at the end of the protocol contains a copy of some classical registers T_1^n that record whether each round is a test or generation round.*
- *Conditioned on the event Ω , the fraction of test rounds is at most some fixed constant γ^{\max} .*

These properties are usually easy to satisfy when designing a protocol (the second one by choosing the accept condition appropriately; this usually only has a small effect on the completeness parameter since the honest behaviour is IID). The results in this work give bounds on $H_\alpha^\uparrow(S_1^n \overline{C}_1^n | \widehat{C}_1^n E_n)_{\rho|\Omega}$, but the main quantity of interest in e.g. DIQKD security proofs is often either $H_\alpha^\uparrow(S_1^n | \overline{C}_1^n \widehat{C}_1^n E_n)_{\rho|\Omega}$ or $H_\alpha^\uparrow(S_1^n | \widehat{C}_1^n E_n)_{\rho|\Omega}$ (the former for protocols that just directly announce the \overline{C}_1^n values, the latter for protocols that “compress” those values as in [AFRV19, TSB+22, NDN+22]). We now observe that given the above two properties, we can easily relate all these quantities as follows, for any

$\alpha \in [1/2, \infty]$:

$$\begin{aligned}
H_\alpha^\uparrow(S_1^n | \widehat{C}_1^n E_n)_{\rho_{|\Omega}} &\geq H_\alpha^\uparrow(S_1^n | \overline{C}_1^n \widehat{C}_1^n E_n)_{\rho_{|\Omega}} \\
&\geq H_\alpha^\uparrow(S_1^n \overline{C}_1^n | \widehat{C}_1^n E_n)_{\rho_{|\Omega}} - H_0^\uparrow(\overline{C}_1^n | T_1^n)_{\rho_{|\Omega}} \\
&\geq H_\alpha^\uparrow(S_1^n \overline{C}_1^n | \widehat{C}_1^n E_n)_{\rho_{|\Omega}} - \max_{t_1^n \text{ s.t. } \rho_{|\Omega}(t_1^n) > 0} H_0^\uparrow(\overline{C}_1^n)_{\rho_{|t_1^n}} \\
&\geq H_\alpha^\uparrow(S_1^n \overline{C}_1^n | \widehat{C}_1^n E_n)_{\rho_{|\Omega}} - \gamma^{\max} \dim(\overline{C}_j) n,
\end{aligned} \tag{170}$$

where in the last line we can replace $\dim(\overline{C}_j)$ with $\dim(\overline{C}_j) - 1$ if $\overline{C}_j = \perp$ never occurs in test rounds.⁴⁵ In the above, the second line is⁴⁶ proven in Appendix C (see (178), noting that E_n contains the register T_1^n), the third line follows from the fact that since $\overline{C}_1^n T_1^n$ are classical we can (see [Tom16, Eq. (5.27)]) write $H_0^\uparrow(\overline{C}_1^n | T_1^n)_{\rho_{|\Omega}}$ in the form given in [Ren05, Definition 3.1.2 and 3.1.4], and the fourth line follows from the imposed property that the event Ω implies there are at most $\gamma^{\max} n$ rounds in which \overline{C}_j was not deterministically set to \perp , and conditioned on t_1^n the positions of those rounds are fixed.

The above chain of computations serves to bound both $H_\alpha^\uparrow(S_1^n | \widehat{C}_1^n E_n)_{\rho_{|\Omega}}$ and $H_\alpha^\uparrow(S_1^n | \overline{C}_1^n \widehat{C}_1^n E_n)_{\rho_{|\Omega}}$, so one can use whichever is more convenient in a DIQKD security proof. Also, while we presented the above bound in terms of the \overline{C}_j registers, it is easily modified to slight variants where e.g. one only considers Bob’s registers; see [HT24]. We believe that this bound should be not only simpler but also tighter than the previous approaches in [AFRV19, MDR+19, TSB+22, GLH+22], which were based on chain rules that changed the smoothing parameter or Rényi parameter.⁴⁷

However, for variable-length protocols this technique does not work directly, because we do not condition on an “acceptance event” and so it seems less straightforward to constrain the state support in the subtracted entropic term. As discussed previously, one approach might be to use Lemma 5, and then apply the EAT to bound the resulting $H_{\alpha'}(\overline{C}_1^n | T_1^n)_\rho$ term on the unconditioned state (noting that for an infrequent-sampling channel, the single-round $H_{\alpha'}(\overline{C}_j | T_j)_\nu$ entropy is bounded even without “testing”), but the bound might be slightly worse.

We also note that in this work we have focused on presenting fairly simple example applications, such as fully qubit BB84 and a simple DIRE scenario. In upcoming works, we aim to apply these results to more sophisticated protocols such as decoy-state QKD and DIQKD.

⁴⁵This property follows automatically from the definition of infrequent-sampling channels whenever the \widehat{C}_j registers are trivial; the only issue if \widehat{C}_j are nontrivial is that our definition *technically* allows one to set $\overline{C}_j = \perp$ in test rounds if $\widehat{C}_j \neq \perp$, though we do not expect this will be a serious issue for actual protocols.

⁴⁶We could have obtained a similar result by instead using the chain rule from [Dup15] here to extract a $H_{1/2}^\uparrow(\overline{C}_1^n | T_1^n)_{\rho_{|\Omega}}$ term, but this would have a (fairly minor) disadvantage of causing a small “higher-order” change in Rényi parameter, comparable to (68). Note that even with this, our approach would still differ slightly from [GLH+22] due to how we bound the $H_{1/2}^\uparrow(\overline{C}_1^n | T_1^n)_{\rho_{|\Omega}}$ term in the subsequent steps.

⁴⁷Furthermore, in our bound the subtracted term simply has the form $\gamma^{\max} \dim(\overline{C}_j) n$ where γ^{\max} only needs to be chosen to be sufficiently large for the *honest* IID behavior to accept with high probability. In comparison, the subtracted terms in [AFRV19, MDR+19, TSB+22, GLH+22] were instead of roughly the form $\dim(\overline{C}_j) \gamma n + O(\sqrt{n})$ where the $O(\sqrt{n})$ term accommodated potential non-IID behavior. It seems likely that the former value is smaller, though we do not aim to prove this rigorously. (We briefly highlight however that [CMT23] introduced an approach in which the subtracted term was also roughly of the form $\gamma^{\max} \dim(\overline{C}_j) n$, though there was still a change of smoothing parameter.)

Acknowledgements

We are very grateful to Peter Brown and Thomas van Himbeek for discussions of their work on f -weighted Rényi entropies — our presentation in Sec. 4 in terms of QES-entropies was formulated based on their approach, though we developed the overall proof structure that led to Theorem 2 mostly independently. We also thank Ashutosh Marwah for providing us with the proof of Lemma 16, as well as Frédéric Dupuis, Tony Metger, Renato Renner, Martin Sandfuchs, and Ramona Wolf for helpful discussions. A.A. and E.T. conducted research at the Institute for Quantum Computing, at the University of Waterloo, which is supported by Innovation, Science, and Economic Development Canada. Support was also provided by NSERC under the Discovery Grants Program, Grant No. 341495. T.H. acknowledges support from the Marshall and Arlene Bennett Family Research Program, the Minerva foundation with funding from the Federal German Ministry for Education and Research and the Israel Science Foundation (ISF), and the Directorate for Defense Research and Development (DDR&D), grant No. 3426/21.

A Comparison to previous GEATT definition

Here we outline some differences between the conditions in [MFS+22b] and our approach. In that work, only a single “testing register” C_j was produced in each round, and the bounds they obtained were on entropies of the form $\mathbb{H}(S_1^n|E_n)$ (for various entropies \mathbb{H}) for the final state, under a condition that C_1^n can be “projectively reconstructed” from $S_1^n E_n$ in that state. In this work, we have two such registers \bar{C}_j and \widehat{C}_j in each round, and we instead take the approach of obtaining bounds on the entropies of the form $\mathbb{H}(S_1^n \bar{C}_1^n | \widehat{C}_1^n E_n)$, where $\bar{C}_1^n \widehat{C}_1^n$ are explicitly involved in the final bound but we do not impose the projective reconstruction condition. However, note that if \bar{C}_1^n and \widehat{C}_1^n can separately be projectively reconstructed from S_1^n and E_n respectively (which should be basically equivalent to the projective reconstruction property for C_1^n in that work, because it requires C_1^n to be a deterministic function of outcomes of separate projective measurements on S_1^n and E_n , which can therefore be viewed as \bar{C}_1^n and \widehat{C}_1^n), then $\mathbb{H}(S_1^n \bar{C}_1^n | \widehat{C}_1^n E_n) = \mathbb{H}(S_1^n | E_n)$ for any entropy with “reasonable” data-processing properties, and so our results should be basically equivalent in those aspects. Similar considerations hold when considering the single-round entropies $\mathbb{H}(S_j \bar{C}_j | \widehat{C}_j E_j)$ as well. (Strictly speaking, [MFS+22b] does not state that the projective reconstruction property is required for individual rounds. However, a close inspection of the proof shows that in fact it is implicitly required to obtain the bound just before Eq. (4.10) in their proof, because their argument is based on the argument in [DF19] which requires this property in single rounds as well.)

B Alternative proofs of strong duality

Here we provide an alternative proof of Lemma 13 that provides options for removing the finite-dimensionality assumption on \widehat{Q} (at least, for the purposes of proving this lemma in isolation — other steps such as the fundamental GEAT bound (57) still currently require that assumption, due to the use of a de Finetti argument in its proof), possibly by imposing extra conditions on S_Ω .

We begin by removing some “extraneous” degrees of freedom from the optimizations. Specifically, given the rate-bounding channel \mathcal{M} , let us introduce a notion of its “supporting alphabet”⁴⁸

⁴⁸An alternative approach for the purposes of our analysis would have been to simply restrict the alphabet of the

$\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{M}} \subseteq \bar{\mathcal{C}} \times \widehat{\mathcal{C}}$, which we define as the set of values $\bar{c}\hat{c}$ that can be produced with nonzero probability by some input state to \mathcal{M} :

$$\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{M}} := \left\{ (\bar{c}, \hat{c}) \in \bar{\mathcal{C}} \times \widehat{\mathcal{C}} \mid \nu^\omega(\bar{c}\hat{c}) > 0 \text{ for some } \omega \in S_{=}(\widetilde{Q}) \right\}. \quad (171)$$

We will write $\mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{M}}}$ to denote distributions on $\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{M}}$. Basically, our first goal is to “remove some dependencies” on terms corresponding to $\bar{c}\hat{c} \notin \mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{M}}$.

Observe that for any λ such that $\text{supp}(\lambda) \not\subseteq \mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{M}}$, by definition of $\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{M}}$ we have $\text{supp}(\lambda) \not\subseteq \text{supp}(\nu_{\bar{\mathcal{C}}\widehat{\mathcal{C}}}^\omega)$ for *every* ω . This means we can exclude any such λ from the infimum in the last line of (123) without changing its value, because for such λ we have $G_{\hat{\alpha}, \nu^\omega}^*(\lambda) = +\infty$ for all ω (due to the $D\left(\lambda \left\| \nu_{\bar{\mathcal{C}}\widehat{\mathcal{C}}}^\omega\right.\right)$ term). For convenience, let us introduce the notation $\mu_{\oplus \mathbf{0}}$ for any distribution $\mu \in \mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{M}}}$ to mean the corresponding distribution in $\mathbb{P}_{\bar{\mathcal{C}}\widehat{\mathcal{C}}}$ obtained by padding μ with zero entries. With this, we can carry on from the last line of (123) to obtain:

$$\begin{aligned} r_{\hat{\alpha}}(\mathbf{f}) &= \inf_{\mathbf{q} \in S_{\Omega}} \inf_{\mu \in \mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{M}}}} \inf_{\omega \in S_{=}(\widetilde{Q})} \left(G_{\hat{\alpha}, \nu^\omega}^*(\mu_{\oplus \mathbf{0}}) + (\mathbf{q} - \mu_{\oplus \mathbf{0}}) \cdot \mathbf{f} \right) \\ &= \inf_{\mathbf{q} \in S_{\Omega}} \inf_{\mu \in \mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{M}}}} \left(J_{\hat{\alpha}}(\mu) + (\mathbf{q} - \mu_{\oplus \mathbf{0}}) \cdot \mathbf{f} \right), \end{aligned} \quad (172)$$

where we introduce a new function $J_{\hat{\alpha}}$ that computes the infimum over the only term involving ω :

$$J_{\hat{\alpha}}(\mu) := \inf_{\omega \in S_{=}(\widetilde{Q})} G_{\hat{\alpha}, \nu^\omega}^*(\mu_{\oplus \mathbf{0}}). \quad (173)$$

With this, from the last line of (172) we see that $\sup_{\mathbf{f}} r_{\hat{\alpha}}(\mathbf{f})$ is the dual problem of

$$\begin{aligned} & \inf_{\mathbf{q} \in S_{\Omega}} \inf_{\mu \in \mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{M}}}} J_{\hat{\alpha}}(\mu) \\ & \text{s.t. } \mathbf{q} - \mu_{\oplus \mathbf{0}} = \mathbf{0} \end{aligned}, \quad (174)$$

and to obtain our desired result we shall show strong duality holds for this problem.

To do so, we first note that the objective $J_{\hat{\alpha}}(\mu)$ has the following critical properties with respect to μ :

- It is convex over $\mu \in \mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{M}}}$, because $G_{\hat{\alpha}, \nu^\omega}^*(\mu_{\oplus \mathbf{0}})$ is jointly convex in (μ, ω) , and for a jointly convex function of two variables, taking the infimum with respect to one variable over a convex set preserves convexity in the other variable [BV04, Chapter 3.2.5] (as long as the infimum is not $-\infty$ everywhere, which is easily seen to be true for $G_{\hat{\alpha}, \nu^\omega}^*$).
- It is finite over $\mu \in \mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{M}}}$, because we can construct a feasible point ω in (173) with finite objective value: by definition of $\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{M}}$, for each $\bar{c}\hat{c} \in \mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{M}}$ we can find some ω such that $\nu_{\bar{\mathcal{C}}\widehat{\mathcal{C}}}^\omega(\bar{c}\hat{c}) > 0$; by taking a mixture of such cases, we can obtain an ω such that $\nu_{\bar{\mathcal{C}}\widehat{\mathcal{C}}}^\omega$ has full support on $\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{M}}$ (by linearity of \mathcal{M}), which means $D\left(\mu_{\oplus \mathbf{0}} \left\| \nu_{\bar{\mathcal{C}}\widehat{\mathcal{C}}}^\omega\right.\right)$ and hence also $G_{\hat{\alpha}, \nu^\omega}^*(\mu_{\oplus \mathbf{0}})$ is finite for this ω .⁴⁹ (The $D_{\hat{\alpha}}\left(\nu_{SE\widetilde{E}\wedge\bar{c}\hat{c}}^\omega \left\| \mathbb{I}_S \otimes \nu_{E\widetilde{E}\wedge\hat{c}}^\omega\right.\right)$ terms in the sum are all finite as previously discussed, so they pose no issues.)

registers $\bar{\mathcal{C}}\widehat{\mathcal{C}}$ to $\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{M}}$ rather than $\bar{\mathcal{C}} \times \widehat{\mathcal{C}}$, since the values outside $\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{M}}$ will never occur and thus have no “physical relevance”. However, this would be the slightly unpleasant side-effect that the resulting alphabet is not guaranteed to have a Cartesian-product form.

⁴⁹Alternative option: since the mapping $\omega \rightarrow \nu_{\bar{\mathcal{C}}\widehat{\mathcal{C}}}^\omega$ is a quantum-to-classical channel, one can show it must be of the form $\omega \rightarrow \sum_{\bar{c}\hat{c}} \text{Tr}[\Gamma_{\bar{c}\hat{c}}\omega] |\bar{c}\hat{c}\rangle\langle\bar{c}\hat{c}|$ for some POVM elements $\Gamma_{\bar{c}\hat{c}}$; furthermore, we must have $\Gamma_{\bar{c}\hat{c}} \neq 0$ for all $\bar{c}\hat{c} \in \mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{M}}$. With this we can show that any full-support $\omega_{\widetilde{Q}}$ yields a distribution $\nu_{\bar{\mathcal{C}}\widehat{\mathcal{C}}}^\omega$ with full support on $\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{M}}$ (at least, assuming countable dimension; the argument should generalize further in some fashion but we do not consider this further here), giving the desired result.

- It is continuous over $\boldsymbol{\mu} \in \mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{C}_M}$ as long as we chose Pur to be a continuous function, because in that case $G_{\hat{\alpha}, \nu^\omega}^*(\boldsymbol{\mu}_{\oplus \mathbf{0}})$ is continuous in $(\boldsymbol{\mu}, \omega)$ (as discussed in the main text), and we are taking its infimum over a compact set $S_=(\tilde{Q})$. (Note that while $G_{\hat{\alpha}, \nu^\omega}^*(\boldsymbol{\mu}_{\oplus \mathbf{0}})$ was only continuous in an extended-real sense, $J_{\hat{\alpha}}(\boldsymbol{\mu})$ is finite everywhere by the preceding point, and hence continuous in the standard sense.)

Since $J_{\hat{\alpha}}(\boldsymbol{\mu})$ is entirely independent of \mathbf{q} , the above properties trivially give (joint) convexity, finiteness and continuity over $(\mathbf{q}, \boldsymbol{\mu}) \in \mathbb{P}_{\overline{\mathcal{C}}} \times \mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{C}_M}$ as well. With this we can again suppose S_Ω is closed without loss of generality, since the continuity property over $\mathbb{P}_{\overline{\mathcal{C}}} \times \mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{C}_M}$ allows us to switch between S_Ω and its closure. With these properties, we have strong duality by the Clark-Duffin condition (or Sion’s minimax theorem), after which we obtain the desired final result by “reversing” all the above transformations:

$$\begin{aligned}
\sup_{\mathbf{f}} r_{\hat{\alpha}}(\mathbf{f}) &= \inf_{\mathbf{q} \in S_\Omega} \inf_{\boldsymbol{\mu} \in \mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{C}_M}} J_{\hat{\alpha}}(\boldsymbol{\mu}) \\
&\quad \text{s.t. } \mathbf{q} - \boldsymbol{\mu}_{\oplus \mathbf{0}} = \mathbf{0} \\
&= \inf_{\mathbf{q} \in S_\Omega} \inf_{\boldsymbol{\mu} \in \mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{C}_M}} \inf_{\omega \in S_=(\tilde{Q})} G_{\hat{\alpha}, \nu^\omega}^*(\boldsymbol{\mu}_{\oplus \mathbf{0}}) \\
&\quad \text{s.t. } \mathbf{q} - \boldsymbol{\mu}_{\oplus \mathbf{0}} = \mathbf{0} \\
&= \inf_{\mathbf{q} \in S_\Omega} \inf_{\boldsymbol{\lambda} \in \mathbb{P}_{\overline{\mathcal{C}}}} \inf_{\omega \in S_=(\tilde{Q})} G_{\hat{\alpha}, \nu^\omega}^*(\boldsymbol{\lambda}) \\
&\quad \text{s.t. } \mathbf{q} - \boldsymbol{\lambda} = \mathbf{0},
\end{aligned} \tag{175}$$

where the last line holds because as discussed previously, any $\boldsymbol{\lambda}$ such that $\text{supp}(\boldsymbol{\lambda}) \not\subseteq \mathcal{C}_M$ yields $G_{\hat{\alpha}, \nu^\omega}^*(\boldsymbol{\lambda}) = +\infty$ for every ω .

Remark 12. *In this proof of Lemma 13, the only point we invoked the finite-dimensionality condition was in showing that $J_{\hat{\alpha}}$ is continuous (where we used compactness of $S_=(\tilde{Q})$) — all other properties, such as convexity and finiteness, were true even for infinite-dimensional \tilde{Q} . Hence this approach also provides an alternative method to obtain the desired result without requiring finite-dimensionality of \tilde{Q} , if we instead impose additional conditions on S_Ω in order to use Slater’s condition, which requires no continuity properties. Specifically, suppose we additionally require that the relative interior of S_Ω contains a distribution \mathbf{q}^* such that $q^*(\bar{c}\hat{c}) > 0$ if and only if $\bar{c}\hat{c} \in \mathcal{C}_M$ (i.e. $\text{supp}(\mathbf{q}^*) = \mathcal{C}_M$). In that case, if we let $\boldsymbol{\mu}^* \in \mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{C}_M}$ be the distribution \mathbf{q}^* with the terms in \mathcal{C}_M removed, we see that $(\mathbf{q}^*, \boldsymbol{\mu}^*)$ is a relative interior point of the domain in the constrained optimization (174) (in which the objective $J_{\hat{\alpha}}(\boldsymbol{\mu})$ is finite⁵⁰ everywhere), and it satisfies the equality constraint. This suffices to invoke Slater’s condition to claim that strong duality holds for that optimization, yielding the desired result without any finite-dimensionality conditions.⁵¹*

We also highlight that the interior-point requirement stated above should hold in any practical protocol, because S_Ω would need to contain a “tolerance interval” for each outcome value $\bar{c}\hat{c} \in \mathcal{C}_M$.

⁵⁰Here we did not simply try to apply Slater’s condition to the original constrained optimization (120), because it would require the existence of some ω in the relative interior of the **effective domain** of $G_{\hat{\alpha}, \nu^\omega}^*(\boldsymbol{\lambda})$ (i.e. the domain on which it takes finite values), which is more subtle in the infinite-dimensional case. Though for the finite-dimensional case, in our above proof of the finiteness of $J_{\hat{\alpha}}$, we did argue that $G_{\hat{\alpha}, \nu^\omega}^*(\boldsymbol{\lambda})$ is finite over all full-support ω , and hence any full-support ω yields such an interior point.

⁵¹However, this proof method also still does not immediately certify dual attainment, despite using Slater’s condition — this is because when transforming the optimizations we only focused on preserving the optimal value, rather than other properties such as dual attainment. We leave a more extensive analysis of such aspects for future work, if it should become important.

A rigorous formulation of this claim is as follows. Given that S_Ω is convex, the interior-point requirement holds whenever the following conditions are fulfilled:

1. For every distribution $\mathbf{q} \in S_\Omega$, we have $\text{supp}(\mathbf{q}) \subseteq \mathcal{C}_M$.
2. There exists some “reference” distribution \mathbf{q}^{ref} with $\text{supp}(\mathbf{q}^{\text{ref}}) \subseteq \mathcal{C}_M$, and some $\delta > 0$, such that S_Ω contains all distributions \mathbf{q} with $|q(\bar{c}\hat{c}) - q^{\text{ref}}(\bar{c}\hat{c})| \leq \delta$ for all $\bar{c}\hat{c} \in \mathcal{C}_M$.

To prove this suffices, simply construct the desired relative interior point by taking \mathbf{q}^{ref} and perturbing it if necessary to make it full-support on \mathcal{C}_M ; it is straightforward to show such a perturbation always exists while keeping it in the relative interior of S_Ω (under the first condition listed above, which ensures the $\bar{c}\hat{c} \notin \mathcal{C}_M$ terms do not “contribute” to the affine hull of S_Ω). Also, any practical protocol should satisfy these conditions, because it would need to accept with nontrivial probability on some honest behaviour — assuming for simplicity that this honest behaviour is IID (though various non-IID scenarios can also be considered), this necessarily implies S_Ω must contain all frequency distributions of the form just described, with \mathbf{q}^{ref} being the honest single-round distribution and δ a small but strictly positive value.⁵²

An alternative prospect would be to try proving that $J_{\hat{\alpha}}$ is continuous even for infinite-dimensional \widetilde{Q} . We believe this seems to be a plausible property, though proving this claim seems slightly subtle because in that case $S_=(\widetilde{Q})$ is not closed, and taking the infimum over such a set does not generically preserve continuity. A more detailed analysis of the continuity properties of $J_{\hat{\alpha}}$ may be able to resolve this point. In the process it might be able to remove the use of continuity of Pur (which is also slightly subtle in the infinite-dimensional case because the formula (24) does not directly generalize), because in fact we really only need continuity properties of the “subsequent” quantities $D(\boldsymbol{\mu}_{\oplus \mathbf{0}} \parallel \boldsymbol{\nu}_{\widehat{CC}}^\omega)$ and $D_{\hat{\alpha}}(\nu_{SE\widehat{E}\wedge\bar{c}\hat{c}} \parallel \mathbb{I}_S \otimes \nu_{E\widehat{E}\wedge\hat{c}})$.

C A one-shot chain rule

We thank Ashutosh Marwah for providing us with the proof of this claim. For our calculations here, we briefly make use of the Petz entropies:

Definition 17. (Petz entropies) For any bipartite state $\rho \in S_=(AB)$, and $\alpha \in [0, \infty]$, we define the following two Petz conditional entropies:

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{H}_\alpha(A|B)_\rho &= -\bar{D}_\alpha(\rho_{AB} \parallel \mathbb{I}_A \otimes \rho_B) \\ \bar{H}_\alpha^\uparrow(A|B)_\rho &= \sup_{\sigma_B \in S_=(B)} -\bar{D}_\alpha(\rho_{AB} \parallel \mathbb{I}_A \otimes \sigma_B), \end{aligned} \tag{176}$$

where \bar{D}_α denotes the Petz divergence [Pet86]; see e.g. [Tom16] for further details. For $\alpha = 1$, both the above values coincide and are equal to the von Neumann entropy.

For classical states, the Petz and sandwiched Rényi divergences coincide and are equal to the classical Rényi divergences; the same therefore also holds for the conditional entropies.

⁵²There is no need to include any “tolerance interval” for the $\bar{c}\hat{c} \notin \mathcal{C}_M$ terms, because zero-probability events (on a finite alphabet) would literally never occur. There is a technical issue that the supporting alphabets induced by \mathcal{M}_j versus \mathcal{M} might be different in principle, but we do not expect this situation to arise in practice.

Lemma 16. For any $\rho \in \mathcal{S}_=(A_1A_2B)$ and $\alpha \in [1/2, \infty]$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} H_\alpha^\uparrow(A_1|A_2B)_\rho &\geq H_\alpha^\uparrow(A_1A_2|B)_\rho - \bar{H}_0^\uparrow(A_2|B)_\rho \\ &\geq H_\alpha^\uparrow(A_1A_2|B)_\rho - H_0^\uparrow(A_2|B)_\rho. \end{aligned} \quad (177)$$

Consequently, for any $\rho \in \mathcal{S}_=(A_1A_2B_1B_2)$ and $\alpha \in [1/2, \infty]$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} H_\alpha^\uparrow(A_1|A_2B_1B_2)_\rho &\geq H_\alpha^\uparrow(A_1A_2|B_1B_2)_\rho - \bar{H}_0^\uparrow(A_2|B_2)_\rho \\ &\geq H_\alpha^\uparrow(A_1A_2|B_1B_2)_\rho - H_0^\uparrow(A_2|B_2)_\rho. \end{aligned} \quad (178)$$

If the registers in the \bar{H}_0^\uparrow and H_0^\uparrow terms are classical, then there is no difference between those versions of the bounds, since those values are then equal as mentioned above.

Proof. Let $\beta \in [1/2, \infty]$ be such that $1/\alpha + 1/\beta = 2$, and purify ρ onto some register C . For this analysis we suppose that ρ is such that $\rho_{A_1A_2C}$ can be chosen to be full-rank (our claimed result then holds for rank-deficient states as well, by continuity of Rényi entropies with respect to the state [MLDS+13] for $\alpha \neq 0$).

Focusing on the registers A_1A_2C , by [MD23, Corollary C.3] we have a chain rule⁵³ (also implicitly observed in [DFR20, Eq. (44)]):

$$H_\beta^\uparrow(A_1A_2|C)_\rho \geq H_\beta^\uparrow(A_1|C)_\rho + H_\beta(A_2|A_1C)_\nu, \quad (179)$$

where ν is a state of the following form (leaving tensor factors of identity implicit for brevity):

$$\nu_{A_2A_1C} = \nu_{A_1C}^{1/2} \rho_{A_1C}^{-1/2} \rho_{A_2A_1C} \rho_{A_1C}^{-1/2} \nu_{A_1C}^{1/2}, \quad (180)$$

for some $\nu_{A_1C} \in \mathcal{S}_=(A_1C)$ (which is full-rank whenever ρ_{A_1C} is full-rank). Importantly, note that this state satisfies

$$H_\beta(A_2|A_1C)_\nu \geq H_\infty(A_2|A_1C)_\nu = H_\infty(A_2|A_1C)_\rho, \quad (181)$$

where the inequality is simply by monotonicity in β , and the equality follows from the SDP characterization of D_∞ ([Dat09] and [Tom16, Proposition 4.3]):

$$\begin{aligned} D_\infty(\rho_{A_2A_1C} \| \mathbb{I}_{A_2} \otimes \rho_{A_1C}) &= \inf \left\{ \lambda \mid \rho_{A_2A_1C} \leq 2^\lambda \mathbb{I}_{A_2} \otimes \rho_{A_1C} \right\} \\ &= \inf \left\{ \lambda \mid \rho_{A_1C}^{-1/2} \rho_{A_2A_1C} \rho_{A_1C}^{-1/2} \leq 2^\lambda \mathbb{I}_{A_2} \otimes \mathbb{I}_{A_1C} \right\} \\ &= \inf \left\{ \lambda \mid \nu_{A_1C}^{1/2} \rho_{A_1C}^{-1/2} \rho_{A_2A_1C} \rho_{A_1C}^{-1/2} \nu_{A_1C}^{1/2} \leq 2^\lambda \mathbb{I}_{A_2} \otimes \nu_{A_1C} \right\} \\ &= \inf \left\{ \lambda \mid \nu_{A_2A_1C} \leq 2^\lambda \mathbb{I}_{A_2} \otimes \nu_{A_1C} \right\} \\ &= D_\infty(\nu_{A_2A_1C} \| \mathbb{I}_{A_2} \otimes \nu_{A_1C}), \end{aligned} \quad (182)$$

where the second and third lines are obtained by noting that the constraint in each infimum holds if and only if the constraint in the preceding infimum holds (because positive-semidefiniteness ordering is preserved by conjugation with positive semidefinite operators). Therefore we can conclude

$$H_\beta^\uparrow(A_1A_2|C)_\rho \geq H_\beta^\uparrow(A_1|C)_\rho + H_\infty(A_2|A_1C)_\rho, \quad (183)$$

⁵³Strictly speaking that chain rule is only stated for $\beta \in (0, \infty)$, but we can first suppose that $\alpha > 1/2$ so that $\beta < \infty$, then to obtain our desired result we can take the $\alpha \rightarrow 1/2$ limit at the end, exploiting continuity of the sandwiched Rényi divergences with respect to α ([Tom16, Corollary 4.2] together with the fact that convex functions are continuous on the interior of their domain).

and by applying the duality relations $H_\beta^\uparrow(A_1A_2|C)_\rho = -H_\alpha^\uparrow(A_1A_2|B)_\rho$, $H_\beta^\uparrow(A_1|C)_\rho = -H_\alpha^\uparrow(A_1|A_2B)_\rho$ for H_α^\uparrow [Bei13, MLDS+13] and $H_\infty(A_2|A_1C)_\rho = -\bar{H}_0^\uparrow(A_2|B)_\rho$ between sandwiched and Petz entropies [TBH14], the above is equivalent to

$$H_\alpha^\uparrow(A_1A_2|B)_\rho \leq H_\alpha^\uparrow(A_1|A_2B)_\rho + \bar{H}_0^\uparrow(A_2|B)_\rho. \quad (184)$$

This yields our claimed bounds in (177) (where the second line follows from the generic relation $H_\alpha^\uparrow \geq \bar{H}_\alpha^\uparrow$ between sandwiched and Petz entropies [Tom16, Eq. (4.88)]). To get our claimed bounds in (178), we simply set $B := B_1B_2$ in the first line of (177) and apply the data-processing inequality $\bar{H}_0^\uparrow(A_2|B_1B_2)_\rho \leq \bar{H}_0^\uparrow(A_2|B_2)_\rho$ for Petz entropies [Tom16] at $\alpha = 0$, then again apply $H_\alpha^\uparrow \geq \bar{H}_\alpha^\uparrow$. (We do not directly obtain the second line in (178) by data-processing on H_0^\uparrow because the sandwiched entropies do not satisfy data-processing for $\alpha < 1/2$ [BFT17].) \square

References

- [AFRV19] R. Arnon-Friedman, R. Renner, and T. Vidick. [Simple and Tight Device-Independent Security Proofs](#). *SIAM Journal on Computing* 48.1 (2019), pp. 181–225.
- [Ari77] S. Arimoto. Information measures and capacity of order alpha for discrete memoryless channels. *Topics in Information Theory* 17 (1977), pp. 41–52.
- [BBM92] C. H. Bennett, G. Brassard, and N. D. Mermin. [Quantum cryptography without Bell’s theorem](#). *Physical Review Letters* 68.5 (1992), 557–559. ISSN: 0031-9007.
- [BCC+10] M. Berta, M. Christandl, R. Colbeck, J. M. Renes, and R. Renner. [The uncertainty principle in the presence of quantum memory](#). *Nature Physics* 6.9 (2010), pp. 659–662. ISSN: 1745-2481.
- [Bei13] S. Beigi. [Sandwiched Rényi divergence satisfies data processing inequality](#). *Journal of Mathematical Physics* 54.12 (2013). ISSN: 1089-7658.
- [BFT17] M. Berta, O. Fawzi, and M. Tomamichel. [On variational expressions for quantum relative entropies](#). *Letters in Mathematical Physics* 107.12 (2017), 2239–2265. ISSN: 1573-0530.
- [BGW+23] S. Bäuml, C. P. García, V. Wright, O. Fawzi, and A. Acín. [Security of discrete-modulated continuous-variable quantum key distribution](#). *arXiv:2303.09255v3 [quant-ph]* (2023).
- [BV04] S. Boyd and L. Vandenberghe. *Convex Optimization*. Cambridge University Press, 2004.
- [CMT23] E. Cervero-Martín and M. Tomamichel. [Device independent security of quantum key distribution from monogamy-of-entanglement games](#). *arXiv:2312.04079v1 [quant-ph]* (2023).
- [Dat09] N. Datta. [Min- and Max-Relative Entropies and a New Entanglement Monotone](#). *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory* 55.6 (2009), pp. 2816–2826.
- [DF19] F. Dupuis and O. Fawzi. [Entropy accumulation with improved second-order term](#). *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory* (2019), pp. 1–1. ISSN: 0018-9448.
- [DFR20] F. Dupuis, O. Fawzi, and R. Renner. [Entropy Accumulation](#). *Communications in Mathematical Physics* 379.3 (2020), pp. 867–913.

- [Duf78] R. J. Duffin. [Clark’s Theorem on linear programs holds for convex programs](#). *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 75.4 (1978), 1624–1626. ISSN: 1091-6490.
- [Dup15] F. Dupuis. [Chain rules for quantum Rényi entropies](#). *Journal of Mathematical Physics* 56.2 (2015), p. 022203.
- [Dup21] F. Dupuis. [Privacy amplification and decoupling without smoothing](#). *arXiv:2105.05342v1 [quant-ph]* (2021).
- [FL12] A. Ferenczi and N. Lütkenhaus. [Symmetries in quantum key distribution and the connection between optimal attacks and optimal cloning](#). *Physical Review A* 85.5 (2012). ISSN: 1094-1622.
- [FL13] R. L. Frank and E. H. Lieb. [Monotonicity of a relative Rényi entropy](#). *Journal of Mathematical Physics* 54.12 (2013). ISSN: 1089-7658.
- [GLH+22] I. George, J. Lin, T. van Himbeek, K. Fang, and N. Lütkenhaus. [Finite-Key Analysis of Quantum Key Distribution with Characterized Devices Using Entropy Accumulation](#). *arXiv:2203.06554v1 [quant-ph]* (2022).
- [HB24] T. van Himbeek and P. Brown. *Tight and general finite-size security of quantum key distribution*. In preparation. 2024.
- [HT24] T. Hahn and E. Y.-Z. Tan. In preparation. 2024.
- [JK21] R. Jain and S. Kundu. [A direct product theorem for quantum communication complexity with applications to device-independent cryptography](#). *arXiv:2106.04299v3 [quant-ph]* (2021).
- [JK22] R. Jain and S. Kundu. [A direct product theorem for quantum communication complexity with applications to device-independent QKD](#). *2021 IEEE 62nd Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS)*. IEEE, 2022.
- [JMS20] R. Jain, C. A. Miller, and Y. Shi. [Parallel Device-Independent Quantum Key Distribution](#). *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory* 66.9 (2020), pp. 5567–5584. ISSN: 1557-9654.
- [KAG+24] L. Kamin, A. Arqand, I. George, N. Lütkenhaus, and E. Y.-Z. Tan. In preparation. 2024.
- [KW20] S. Khatri and M. M. Wilde. [Principles of Quantum Communication Theory: A Modern Approach](#). *arXiv:2011.04672 [quant-ph]* (2020).
- [LLR+21] W.-Z. Liu, M.-H. Li, S. Ragy, S.-R. Zhao, B. Bai, Y. Liu, P. J. Brown, J. Zhang, R. Colbeck, J. Fan, Q. Zhang, and J.-W. Pan. [Device-independent randomness expansion against quantum side information](#). *Nature Physics* 17.4 (2021), pp. 448–451.
- [MD23] A. Marwah and F. Dupuis. [Smooth min-entropy lower bounds for approximation chains](#). *arXiv:2308.11736v2 [quant-ph]* (2023).
- [MDR+19] G. Murta, S. B. van Dam, J. Ribeiro, R. Hanson, and S. Wehner. [Towards a realization of device-independent quantum key distribution](#). *Quantum Science and Technology* 4.3 (2019), p. 035011.
- [MFS+22a] T. Metger, O. Fawzi, D. Sutter, and R. Renner. [Generalised entropy accumulation](#). *2022 IEEE 63rd Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS)*. 2022, pp. 844–850.
- [MFS+22b] T. Metger, O. Fawzi, D. Sutter, and R. Renner. [Generalised entropy accumulation](#). *arXiv:2203.04989v2 [quant-ph]* (2022).

- [MLDS+13] M. Müller-Lennert, F. Dupuis, O. Szechr, S. Fehr, and M. Tomamichel. [On quantum Rényi entropies: A new generalization and some properties](#). *Journal of Mathematical Physics* 54.12 (2013). ISSN: 0022-2488.
- [MO14] M. Mosonyi and T. Ogawa. [Quantum Hypothesis Testing and the Operational Interpretation of the Quantum Rényi Relative Entropies](#). *Communications in Mathematical Physics* 334.3 (2014), 1617–1648. ISSN: 1432-0916.
- [MPA11] L. Masanes, S. Pironio, and A. Acín. [Secure device-independent quantum key distribution with causally independent measurement devices](#). *Nature Communications* 2.1 (2011). ISSN: 2041-1723.
- [MR23] T. Metger and R. Renner. [Security of quantum key distribution from generalised entropy accumulation](#). *Nat. Commun.* 14.5272 (2023), pp. 1–13. ISSN: 2041-1723.
- [NDN+22] D. P. Nadlinger, P. Drmota, B. C. Nichol, G. Araneda, D. Main, R. Srinivas, D. M. Lucas, C. J. Ballance, K. Ivanov, E. Y.-Z. Tan, P. Sekatski, R. L. Urbanke, R. Renner, N. Sangouard, and J.-D. Bancal. [Experimental quantum key distribution certified by Bell's theorem](#). *Nature* 607.7920 (2022), pp. 682–686.
- [PAM+10] S. Pironio, A. Acín, S. Massar, A. B. de la Giroday, D. N. Matsukevich, P. Maunz, S. Olmschenk, D. Hayes, L. Luo, T. A. Manning, and C. Monroe. [Random numbers certified by Bell's theorem](#). *Nature* 464.7291 (2010), pp. 1021–1024.
- [Pet86] D. Petz. [Quasi-entropies for finite quantum systems](#). *Reports on Mathematical Physics* 23.1 (1986), 57–65. ISSN: 0034-4877.
- [PM13] S. Pironio and S. Massar. [Security of practical private randomness generation](#). *Physical Review A* 87 (2013), p. 012336.
- [PR21] C. Portmann and R. Renner. [Security in Quantum Cryptography](#). *arXiv:2102.00021v2 [quant-ph]* (2021).
- [Ren05] R. Renner. [Security of Quantum Key Distribution](#). ETH Zürich, 2005.
- [RGK05] R. Renner, N. Gisin, and B. Kraus. [Information-theoretic security proof for quantum-key-distribution protocols](#). *Physical Review A* 72 (2005), p. 012332.
- [TBH14] M. Tomamichel, M. Berta, and M. Hayashi. [Relating different quantum generalizations of the conditional Rényi entropy](#). *Journal of Mathematical Physics* 55.8 (2014). ISSN: 1089-7658.
- [TL17] M. Tomamichel and A. Leverrier. [A largely self-contained and complete security proof for quantum key distribution](#). *Quantum* 1 (2017), p. 14. ISSN: 2521-327X.
- [Tom16] M. Tomamichel. [Quantum Information Processing with Finite Resources](#). Springer International Publishing, 2016.
- [TSB+22] E. Y.-Z. Tan, P. Sekatski, J.-D. Bancal, R. Schwonnek, R. Renner, N. Sangouard, and C. C.-W. Lim. [Improved DIQKD protocols with finite-size analysis](#). *Quantum* 6 (2022), p. 880. ISSN: 2521-327X.
- [Vid17] T. Vidick. [Parallel DIQKD from parallel repetition](#). *arXiv:1703.08508 [quant-ph]* (2017).
- [WLC18] A. Winick, N. Lütkenhaus, and P. J. Coles. [Reliable numerical key rates for quantum key distribution](#). *Quantum* 2 (2018), p. 77.
- [ZFK20] Y. Zhang, H. Fu, and E. Knill. [Efficient randomness certification by quantum probability estimation](#). *Physical Review Research* 2 (2020), p. 013016.