

The Trivial Bound of Entropic Uncertainty Relations and an Alternative Approach

Minu J. Bae*

Computer Science Department
University of Connecticut
Storrs CT, USA

(Dated: August 2, 2022)

Entropic uncertainty relations are bedrocks to compute the quantitative security bound in quantum cryptographic applications, such as quantum random number generation (QRNG) and quantum key distribution (QKD). This paper shows the case of the *standard entropic uncertainty relation* yielding the trivial bound in the source-independent quantum walk-based random number generation (SI-QW-QRNG) with a specific set of positive-operator valued measures (POVMs) and its *overlap*. Moreover, we introduce a simulation result: the *generalized entropic uncertainty relation* with the *effective overlap* also produces the trivial bound with the same setting. So, this paper posits there exists a case such that the *effective overlap* equals the *overlap*, which conflicts with the conjecture that the *effective overlap* is constantly less than equal to the *overlap*. Moreover, we introduce an alternative approach when the *standard* and *generalized entropic uncertainty relations* fail to operate in the quantum cryptographic application. We briefly discuss the backup method, a *sampling-based entropic uncertainty relation*, and shows the success of generating random bit rates in the SI-QW-QRNG based on the substitute.

I. INTRODUCTION

In quantum cryptography, an *entropic uncertainty relation* is a backbone in a security analysis of its application. In 1927, Heisenberg first introduced his notable uncertainty principle [1]. In 1929, Robertson re-composed the principle: the product of the standard deviations of the outcomes through two incompatible orthogonal measurements on a pure quantum state is lower bounded [2]. *Entropic uncertainty relations* were introduced for a finite output alphabet in [3, 4]. Maassen and Uffink showed in [5] extended *entropic uncertainty relations*, which reveals that Shannon's entropy of two incompatible measurements is lower bounded by a maximum *overlap* of these measurements, which projective measurements decide the *overlap* value. *Entropic uncertainty relations* have developed to describe what an adversarial party with a quantum memory can entangle with a quantum system and measure the entangled system to foreknow the outcome of measurements in [10–12]. Conditional von Neumann entropies craft the *entropic uncertainty relations* for the presence of quantum memory. *Entropic uncertainty relations* have extended to the case of general quantum measurement by a positive operator-valued measure (POVM) in [6]. The *standard entropic uncertainty relations* with POVMs and smooth min- and max-entropies were introduced in [12]. While the *standard entropic uncertainty relation* has been done for the security analysis of quantum cryptography, the method is challenging to be applied to an experiment. We need a better theoretical embodiment that the measurement devices are used to decide the particular uncertainty quantity through the experiment. In practice, any deviation from the physical execution may lead to

overestimating the uncertainty, which directly leads to a security loophole in quantum cryptography [13, 14]. To amend this empirical gap, the *generalized entropic uncertainty relation* with POVMs is introduced in [13, 14]. For further information regarding *entropic uncertainty relations*, we guide the reader to consider a survey of *entropic uncertainty relations and their applications* in [17].

Moreover, *quantum algorithms* can be utilized for cryptography, search and optimization, simulation of quantum systems, and solving large systems of linear equations [22–25]. Especially, the *quantum walk* (QW) algorithm, a quantum analogy of the classical random walk, is one of the fundamental methods in quantum computation [26–31]. QW-algorithm can be employed not only for searching and sampling problems but also recently, in quantum cryptography [43–45]. Lately, quantum walk-based random number generation (QW-QRNG) protocols are introduced in [46–49].

QRNG is to produce a string of true random bits by using the inherent randomness in a quantum state [38–42]. The first quantum walk-based QRNG (QW-QRNG) is introduced in [46], which can generate multiple bits by only one quantum walk state. The first security analysis of the semi-source independent QW-QRNG (SI-QW-QRNG) protocol based on its original model is established in the following papers [48, 49]. Note that the source independent (SI) model assumes measurement devices are characterized, but the source is under the control of an adversarial party [39–41]. In the SI model, a user desires to generate true random bits without trusting the randomness source that is possibly under the adversary's control. The SI-QW-QRNG protocol's security analysis employs the *sampling-based entropic uncertainty relation* because the *standard* and *generalized entropic uncertainty relations* do not work with the designated POVMs in the protocol; the *overlaps* generate the trivial value, one, so these relations produce only trivial bounds

* minwoo.bae@uconn.edu

in the security analysis [48, 49]. This paper discusses the trivial bounds of these *entropic uncertainty relations* and an alternative approach: the *sampling-based entropic uncertainty relation* with the POVMs.

We make three primary contributions in this paper. First, we introduce the case of a quantum cryptographic application, the SI-QW-QRNG, that can not operate with the POVM-versions of the *standard* and *generalized entropic uncertainty relations*. This case shows a trivial value, one, in computing the *overlaps* of the POVMs; the result brings about the trivial bound of these *entropic relations*. Second, we analyze the trivial value of the *overlap* of the set of POVMs in the *standard entropic uncertainty*. Also, we simulate the *overlap* in the *standard entropic uncertainty relation* and the *effective overlap* in the *generalized entropic uncertainty relation* to see if they yield the trivial value, one. These analytical and experimental results postulate that there exists a case in quantum cryptographic applications such that the *effective overlap* equals the *overlap*. This byproduct is against the results in [13, 16, 17]. Thirdly, we briefly introduce an alternative approach we can regard when the *standard* and *generalized entropic uncertainty relations* fail to function in the security analysis of the quantum cryptographic application. The alternative method is a *sampling-based entropic uncertainty relation*, which successfully shows the secure random bit rates of the SI-QW-QRNG protocols in [48, 49].

II. PRELIMINARIES

A. The Operator Norm

Let A be any linear operator in $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{H}')$, where \mathcal{H} and \mathcal{H}' are Hilbert spaces. Then the *operator norm* of the operator $A : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}'$ is the largest value by which A can stretch an element in \mathcal{H} via the linear transformation. The formal definition in [21] is as follows:

Definition II.1. Let \mathcal{H} and \mathcal{H}' be Hilbert spaces, and a linear operator $A \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{H}')$. Then the matrix norm induced by the norm of the Hilbert space is called the *operator norm*, namely:

$$\|A\|_{op} = \sup \left\{ \frac{\|A|v\rangle\|}{\|v\rangle\|} : |v\rangle \in \mathcal{H} \text{ and } \|v\rangle\| \neq 0 \right\}, \quad (1)$$

where $\|\cdot\|$ is a matrix norm and $\|\cdot\|$ is a vector norm.

Also, the *operator norm*, $\|A\|_{op}$, is the largest *singular value* of A , that is, the largest *eigenvalue* of $\sqrt{A^*A}$, where A^* is the conjugate transpose of A . Note that since A^*A is square, symmetric, and diagonalizable, the *spectral theorem* implies that $(A^*A)^{1/2} = U\Lambda^{1/2}U^*$, where U is a unitary *eigenvectors matrix* and Λ is an *eigenvalues matrix* [21]. Thus, we have that:

$$\|A\|_{op} = \sigma_{\max}(A) = \lambda_{\max}(\sqrt{A^*A}) = \sqrt{\lambda_{\max}(A^*A)}, \quad (2)$$

where $\lambda_{\max}(\cdot)$ is the *maximum eigenvalue* of a matrix. The *operator norm* satisfies the following properties [21]:

$$\|A\|_{op} \geq 0 \text{ and } \|A\|_{op} = 0 \text{ iff } A = 0, \quad (3)$$

$$\|\lambda A\|_{op} = |\lambda| \|A\|_{op} \text{ for any scalar } \lambda, \quad (4)$$

$$\|A + B\|_{op} \leq \|A\|_{op} + \|B\|_{op}, \quad (5)$$

$$\|AB\|_{op} \leq \|A\|_{op} \|B\|_{op}. \quad (6)$$

Moreover, in [21], it says that unitary invariance in the *singular value decomposition* allows: for any unitary U and V ,

$$\|UAV\|_{op} = \|A\|_{op}. \quad (7)$$

Note that when the context is clear, we forgo the subscription in the *operational norm* notation, namely $\|\cdot\|_{op} = \|\cdot\|$.

B. Quantum Walks on a Cycle

A *quantum walk* is one of the fundamental algorithms in quantum computation [29–31]. The *quantum walk* can be utilized to gain a substantial speedup over classical algorithms based on Markov chains [34–37]. In [27, 28], it says that the *quantum walk* propagates over the walker's Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}_W = \mathcal{H}_C \otimes \mathcal{H}_P$ over time $T \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$, where \mathcal{H}_C is the two-dimensional Hilbert coin space, \mathcal{H}_P is the P -dimensional Hilbert position space, and the dimension of the walk state is $|\mathcal{H}_W| = 2P$. Note that P is the walker's positional dimension. The walker starts at any initial position state $|c, x\rangle$ on a cycle at time $t = 0$, where $c \in \{0, 1\}$ and $x \in \{0, \dots, P - 1\}$. For each time $t \in T$ in walking propagation, the walker employs a unitary walk operator $W = S \cdot (H \otimes I_P)$, where the shift operator S on a cycle is defined in [27, 28] as follows:

$$S = \sum_c \sum_x |c, x + (-1)^c \pmod{P}\rangle \langle c, x|, \quad (8)$$

H is the Hadamard operator, and I_P is an identity operator on the position space. The shift operator S maps $|0, x\rangle \rightarrow |0, x + 1 \pmod{P}\rangle$ and $|1, x\rangle \rightarrow |1, x - 1 \pmod{P}\rangle$. Thus, the state of the quantum walk on a cycle over time t is obtained in [27, 28] as follows: for any $c \in \{0, 1\}$ and $x \in \{0, \dots, P - 1\}$,

$$|w_{c,x}\rangle = \sum_k \alpha_k^{(c,x)} |0, k \pmod{P}\rangle + \sum_r \beta_r^{(c,x)} |0, r \pmod{P}\rangle, \quad (9)$$

where $|w_{c,x}\rangle = W^T |c, x\rangle$ and $k \in \{0, \dots, P - 1\}$ and $r \in \{P, \dots, 2P - 1\}$. Note that when the context is clear, we forgo the superscription in the amplitudes, namely $\alpha_k^{(c,x)} = \alpha_k$ and $\beta_r^{(c,x)} = \beta_r$.

C. Quantum Walk based Random Number Generation

A quantum random number generation (QRNG) is to produce a string of true random numbers by using a quantum state that carries the inherent randomness throughout quantum processes [38–42]. Recently, a quantum walk based random number generation (QW-QRNG) is first introduced in [46]. The first rigorous security analysis of the semi-source-independent QW-QRNG (SI-QW-QRNG) is presented in [48, 49]. The protocol of SI-QW-QRNG works as follows:

Public Parameters: The quantum walk setting includes the dimension of the position space P , the walker's unitary operator W , and the number of steps to evolve by time T .

Source: An untrusted source produces a quantum state $|\varphi_i\rangle \in \mathcal{H}_A \otimes \mathcal{H}_E$, where $\mathcal{H}_A \cong \mathcal{H}_W^{\otimes N}$. If the source is honest, the state prepared should be of the form $|\varphi_0\rangle = |w_0\rangle^{\otimes N} \otimes |0\rangle_E$, namely, N -copies of the walker state $|w_0\rangle = W^T |0, 0\rangle$ unentangled with Eve E . Note that Alice can define which walker's state is a honest state $|w_0\rangle$.

User: Alice chooses a random subset $t \subset [N]$ of size m and measures the systems indexed by this subset using POVM $\mathcal{W} = \{|w_0\rangle\langle w_0|, I - |w_0\rangle\langle w_0|\} = \{W_0, W_1\}$ resulting in outcomes $q \in \{0, 1\}^m$. She measures the remaining n -walker systems by POVM $\mathcal{Z} = \{I_c \otimes |j\rangle\langle j|\}_{j=0}^{P-1}$, where $n = N - m$. The first m -outcome is used to test the fidelity of the received state while the second is used as a raw-random string $r \in \mathcal{A}_P^n$.

Postprocessing: Alice applies privacy amplification to r , producing a final random string of size ℓ . As proven in [38], the hash function used for privacy amplification need only be chosen randomly once and then reused for each run of the protocol.

The goal of the QW-QRNG protocol is to provide that, for a given ε_{PA} set by the user, after privacy amplification, the secure and random string, that is, ε_{PA} close to an ideal random string, uniformly generated and independent of any adversary system.

D. Entropic Uncertainty Relations

After Heisenberg introduced his notable *uncertainty principle* in [1], Robertson reformulated the principle as the product of the standard deviations of the outcomes via two incompatible measurements on a pure quantum state $|\varphi\rangle$ is lower bounded [2], namely:

$$\sigma_X \sigma_Z \geq \frac{1}{2} |\langle \varphi | [\hat{X}, \hat{Z}] | \varphi \rangle|, \quad (10)$$

where \hat{X} and \hat{Z} are the observable of the two measurements, and its commutator is defined as $[\hat{X}, \hat{Z}] = \hat{X}\hat{Z} - \hat{Z}\hat{X}$. After the stunning discoveries, *entropic uncertainty relations* for a finite output symbols were introduced by Hirschman and Deutsch, respectively in [3, 4].

A matured *entropic uncertainty relations* were shown by Maassen and Uffink [5], which reveals that the Shannon entropy of two incompatible measurements \mathcal{X} and \mathcal{Z} is lower bounded by a *maximum overlap* of them, called c , namely: for any quantum state ρ_A before measurement,

$$H(X) + H(Z) \geq -\log_2 c, \quad \text{where } c = \max_{x,z} |\langle x|z\rangle|^2, \quad (11)$$

where $|x\rangle\langle x| \in \mathcal{X}$ and $|z\rangle\langle z| \in \mathcal{Z}$. The value c is the *overlap* determined by these projective measurements. Note that the outcome of two projective measurements \mathcal{X} and \mathcal{Z} are stored in two classic registers X and Z . Moreover, *entropic uncertainty relations* have developed to determine what adversarial observer with a quantum memory can entangle with a quantum system and measure the entangled system to predict the outcome of measurements in [10–12]. The *entropic uncertainty relations* in the presence of quantum memory are formulated by conditional von Neumann entropies as follows: given a tripartite quantum system ρ_{ABC} and orthogonal measurements \mathcal{X} and \mathcal{Z} ,

$$H(X|B)_\rho + H(Z|C)_\rho \geq -\log_2 c. \quad (12)$$

These *entropic uncertainty relations* dispense lower bounds on the uncertainty of the outcomes of two incompatible measurements given side information [13].

1. Standard Entropic Uncertainty Relations with POVMs

In [6], *Entropic uncertainty relations* have expanded to the case of general quantum measurement, called a *positive operator-valued measure* (POVM). The *overlap* of two POVMs is defined in [6, 13] as follows:

Definition II.2. Let $\mathcal{X} = \{X_a\}$ and $\mathcal{Z} = \{Z_b\}$ be two POVMs. The *overlap* of these measurements is defined as follows:

$$c(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Z}) := \max_{a,b} \left\| \sqrt{X_a} \sqrt{Z_b} \right\|_{op}^2, \quad (13)$$

where $\|\cdot\|_{op}$ is the *operator norm*, which is the *largest singular value*.

Note that if \mathcal{X} and \mathcal{Z} are projective measurements, then the *overlap* in Eq. (13) reduces to another *overlap* in Eq. (11), namely $c = \max_{x,z} |\langle x|z\rangle|^2$. The *standard entropic uncertainty relation* with two POVMs and smooth min-and max-entropies is introduced in [12, 13], namely:

Theorem 1. Let ρ_{ABC} be any tripartite quantum state, and $\mathcal{X} = \{X_a\}$ and $\mathcal{Z} = \{Z_b\}$ be two POVMs on the quantum register A . For $\varepsilon \geq 0$, we have that:

$$H_\infty^\varepsilon(X|B)_\rho + H_{max}^\varepsilon(Z|C)_\rho \geq -\log_2 c(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Z}). \quad (14)$$

The operational meaning of the smooth min- and max-entropies in [7–9] is as follows: first, the smooth min-entropy $H_\infty^\varepsilon(X|B)_\rho$ estimates the maximal number of uniformly random bits that can be extracted from X , but it is independent of quantum side information B . This quantity is significant in quantum cryptography, where the job often takes to extract unassailable randomness from a quantum adversary; next, the smooth max-entropy, $H_{max}^\varepsilon(Z|C)_\rho$, evaluates the minimum number of extra bits of information about Z required to reconstruct it from a quantum memory C .

2. Generalized Entropic Uncertainty Relations with POVMs

The *standard entropic uncertainty relation* in Eq. (14) has been employed for the security analysis of quantum cryptography. However, it is challenging to be sampled experimentally. So, to decide the precise uncertainty quantity through the experiment, we need a careful theoretical benchmark of the measurement devices used. In practice, any deviation from the physical implementation may lead to overvaluing the uncertainty, which directly leads to a security loophole in quantum cryptography [13, 14]. Thus, the *effective overlap* of POVMs is introduced in [13, 14] as follows:

Definition II.3. Let ρ_{ABC} be arbitrary and tripartite quantum state, and $\mathcal{X} = \{X_a\}$ and $\mathcal{Z} = \{Z_b\}$ be two POVMs on \mathcal{H}_A . The triple $\{\rho_A, \mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Z}\}$ is called a measurement setup. Then the *effective overlap*, $c^*(\rho_A, \mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Z}) = c^*$, of the measurement setup is defined as follows:

$$c^* := \min_{\mathcal{P}} \left\{ \sum_y P_\rho(y) \max_a \left\| \left\| P^y \sum_b Z_b X_a Z_b \right\| \right\| \right\}, \quad (15)$$

where $P_\rho(y) = \text{tr}(P^y \cdot \rho_A)$ and $\mathcal{P} = \{P^y\}$ is a set of projective measurements on \mathcal{H}_A .

Note that the set of projective measurement \mathcal{P} commutes with both \mathcal{X} and \mathcal{Z} . By following a set of projective measurements $\mathcal{P} = \{\mathbb{I}_A\}$, the *effective overlap* in Eq. (15) can be simplified. Accordingly, the modified *effective overlap*, $c^*(\mathcal{W}, \mathcal{Z}) = c^*$, is defined in [17] as follows:

$$c^* := \min \left\{ \max_a \left\| \left\| \sum_b Z_b X_a Z_b \right\| \right\|, \max_b \left\| \left\| \sum_a X_a Z_b X_a \right\| \right\| \right\}. \quad (16)$$

In [13, 17], the conjecture of the relation between these *overlaps* is following: the *effective overlap* c^* always yields a stronger bound than the *overlap* c in Eq. (13), namely $c^* \leq c$. The conjecture is proved in [16].

With the *effective overlap*, the *generalized entropic uncertainty relation* with POVMs is presented in [13, 14] as follows:

Theorem 2. Let ρ_{ABC} be any arbitrary and tripartite quantum state, $\varepsilon \geq 0$, $\bar{\varepsilon} \geq 0$ and let $\mathcal{X} = \{X_a\}$ and $\mathcal{Z} = \{Z_b\}$ be two POVMs on \mathcal{H}_A . After each measurement, the post-measurement state is either $\rho_{XB} = \mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{X}}[\rho_{AB}]$ or $\rho_{ZC} = \mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{Z}}[\rho_{AC}]$. Then in terms of the smooth min- and max-entropies as defined in [12], the *generalized uncertainty relation* shows that:

$$H_\infty^{\varepsilon+2\bar{\varepsilon}}(X|KB)_\rho + H_{max}^\varepsilon(Z|KC)_\rho \geq -\log c^* - \log(2/\bar{\varepsilon}^2). \quad (17)$$

This *uncertainty relation* in smooth entropies gives a lower bound on the uncertainty about the outcome of two incompatible measurements, \mathcal{X} and \mathcal{Z} , conditioned on quantum side information and the result of project measurement, K , before obtaining X and Z [13, 14].

III. MAIN RESULTS

The SI-QW-QRNG with the POVMs, \mathcal{W} and \mathcal{Z} , runs into the problem of estimating a true random bit rate via the *standard entropic uncertainty relation* in Eq. (14) because its *maximum overlap* in the POVMs yields the trivial value, one [48]. Here, we formally discuss this problem. Suppose the randomness source in the SI-QW-QRNG protocol produces the honest *quantum walk* state, $|w_{0,0}\rangle = W^T |0,0\rangle$, where W is a unitary walk operator and T is time. But, we assume that the randomness source may be under the adversary's control, or the state's transmission is noisy. Once the *quantum walk* state is created and delivered, the protocol measures the state by two POVMs, \mathcal{W} and \mathcal{Z} , to generate a true random bit. The POVMs are defined in [48] as follows:

$$\mathcal{W} = \{|w_0\rangle\langle w_0|, I - |w_0\rangle\langle w_0|\} = \{W_0, W_1\} \quad (18)$$

and

$$\mathcal{Z} = \{I_C \otimes |j\rangle\langle j|\}_{j=0}^{P-1} = \{Z_j\}_{j=0}^{P-1}. \quad (19)$$

Note that the notation $|w_{0,0}\rangle$ can be simplified as $|w_0\rangle$. When the protocol computes the random bit rate through finding the *overlap* in Eq. (13), it produces the trivial value, one. So, the *standard entropic uncertainty relation* in Eq. (14) induces the trivial bound. We can go into the problem further in the following section.

A. Trivial Value of Overlaps

First of all, we have the analytical analysis of the trivial bound of the *overlap* in Eq. (13) in the SI-QW-QRNG protocol, which shows analytically why it produces such trivial value. We define formally our main result as follows:

Theorem 3. Let $|w_0\rangle$ be an honest *quantum walk* state on a cycle and let $\mathcal{W} = \{|w_0\rangle\langle w_0|, I - |w_0\rangle\langle w_0|\} = \{W_0, W_1\}$ and $\mathcal{Z} = \{I_C \otimes |j\rangle\langle j|\}_{j=0}^{P-1} = \{Z_0, \dots, Z_{P-1}\}$

be two POVMs, where $P \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$ is the positional dimension of the quantum walker. Then the *overlap* defined in Eq. (13) produces the trivial value, namely:

$$c(\mathcal{W}, \mathcal{Z}) = \max_{a,b} \left\| \sqrt{W_a} \sqrt{Z_b} \right\|_{op}^2 = 1, \quad (20)$$

where $\|\cdot\|_{op}$ is the *operator norm*, that is, the *largest singular value* of the given matrix.

Proof Suppose an honest *quantum walk* state is defined as $|w_0\rangle = \sum_k \alpha_k |0, k\rangle + \sum_r \beta_r |1, r\rangle$ and $\langle w_0| = \sum_{k'} \alpha_{k'} \langle 0, k'| + \sum_{r'} \beta_{r'} \langle 1, r'|$ via Eq. (9). Then we have a measurement operator $W_0 = |w_0\rangle\langle w_0|$ in POVM \mathcal{W} , namely: for any $c, c' \in \{0, 1\}$,

$$W_0 = \sum_{c,c'} f_0(c, c'), \quad (21)$$

where the function $f_0(c, c')$ is:

$$f_0(c, c') = \begin{cases} \sum_{k,k'} \alpha_k \alpha_{k'}^* |c, k\rangle\langle c', k'| & \text{if } c, c' = 0, \\ \sum_{r,k'} \beta_r \alpha_{k'}^* |c, r\rangle\langle c', k'| & \text{if } c = 1, c' = 0, \\ \sum_{k,r'} \alpha_k \beta_{r'}^* |c, k\rangle\langle c', r'| & \text{if } c = 0, c' = 1, \\ \sum_{k,k'} \beta_k \beta_{k'}^* |c, k\rangle\langle c', k'| & \text{if } c, c' = 1. \end{cases} \quad (22)$$

Since W_a and Z_b are self-adjoint operators, that is, $W_a^2 = W_a$ and $Z_b^2 = Z_b$, we have that $\sqrt{W_a} \sqrt{Z_b} = W_a \cdot Z_b$. Then we compute the following: $W_0 \cdot Z_b = |w_0\rangle\langle w_0| (I_c \otimes |j\rangle\langle j|)$, namely: for any $b \in \{0, \dots, n-1\}$,

$$W_0 \cdot Z_b = \sum_{c,c'} f_0^{(b)}(c, c'), \quad (23)$$

where the function is updated as follows:

$$f_0^{(b)}(c, c') = \begin{cases} \sum_k \alpha_k \alpha_b^* |c, k\rangle\langle c', b| & \text{if } c, c' = 0, \\ \sum_r \beta_r \alpha_b^* |c, r\rangle\langle c', b| & \text{if } c = 1, c' = 0, \\ \sum_k \alpha_k \beta_b^* |c, k\rangle\langle c', b| & \text{if } c = 0, c' = 1, \\ \sum_r \beta_k \beta_b^* |c, k\rangle\langle c', b| & \text{if } c, c' = 1. \end{cases} \quad (24)$$

Let $A_b = W_0 \cdot Z_b$. Then we compute $A_b^* A_b$ as follows:

$$A_b^* A_b = \sum_{c,c'} \tilde{f}_0^{(b)}(c, c'), \quad (25)$$

where

$$\tilde{f}_0^{(b)}(c, c') = \begin{cases} \alpha_b \alpha_b^* |c, b\rangle\langle c', b| & \text{if } c, c' = 0, \\ \beta_b \alpha_b^* |c, b\rangle\langle c', b| & \text{if } c = 1, c' = 0, \\ \alpha_b \beta_b^* |c, b\rangle\langle c', b| & \text{if } c = 0, c' = 1, \\ \beta_b \beta_b^* |c, b\rangle\langle c', b| & \text{if } c, c' = 1. \end{cases} \quad (26)$$

By the Spectral theorem, it is not difficult to find that $A_b^* A_b$ has only one *eigenvalue*, $\lambda_0^{(b)}$, where $\lambda_0^{(b)} = \alpha_b \alpha_b^* + \beta_b \beta_b^*$. Thus, we have that:

$$\max_b \|A_b\|_{op}^2 = \max_b \Lambda(A_b^* A_b) = \max_b \lambda_0^{(b)}, \quad (27)$$

where $0 \leq \lambda_0^{(b)} \leq 1$ since $\sum_b \alpha_b \alpha_b^* + \beta_b \beta_b^* = 1$. Note that as the walker's positional space becomes larger, then $\lambda_0^{(b)}$ becomes smaller. Now, we consider the second measurement operator in POVM \mathcal{W} as follows: $W_1 = I - W_0$, where $I = \sum_i W_i$ and $i = 0, \dots, 2P-1$. Then we compute the POVM W_1 as follows:

$$W_1 = I - \sum_{c,c'} f_0(c, c') = f_1(c, c'). \quad (28)$$

Let $B_b = W_1 \cdot Z_b$ as follows:

$$f_1^{(b)}(c, c') = \begin{cases} \sum_k (1 - \alpha_k \alpha_b^*) |c, k\rangle\langle c', b| & \text{if } c, c' = 0, \\ \sum_r -\beta_r \alpha_b^* |c, r\rangle\langle c', b| & \text{if } c = 1, c' = 0, \\ \sum_k -\alpha_k \beta_b^* |c, k\rangle\langle c', b| & \text{if } c = 0, c' = 1, \\ \sum_r (1 - \beta_r \beta_b^*) |c, k\rangle\langle c', b| & \text{if } c, c' = 1. \end{cases} \quad (29)$$

Then we compute $B_b^* B_b$ as follows:

$$B_b^* B_b = \sum_{c,c'} f_1^{(b)}(c, c'), \quad (30)$$

where $c, c' \in \{0, 1\}$ and

$$\tilde{f}_1^{(b)}(c, c') = \begin{cases} (1 - \alpha_b \alpha_b^*) |c, b\rangle\langle c', b| & \text{if } c, c' = 0, \\ -\beta_b \alpha_b^* |c, b\rangle\langle c', b| & \text{if } c = 1, c' = 0, \\ -\alpha_b \beta_b^* |c, b\rangle\langle c', b| & \text{if } c = 0, c' = 1, \\ (1 - \beta_b \beta_b^*) |c, b\rangle\langle c', b| & \text{if } c, c' = 1. \end{cases} \quad (31)$$

Since $B_b^* B_b$ is square and symmetric, we can have the decomposition as follows:

$$B_b^* B_b = Q_b \Lambda(B_b^* B_b) Q_b^*, \quad (32)$$

where

$$Q_b = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\lambda_0^{(b)}}} \sum_{c,c'} g_1^{(b)}(c, c'), \quad (33)$$

where $\lambda_0^{(b)}$ is as same as the *maximum eigenvalue* of $A_b^* A_b$ in Eq. (27),

$$g_1^{(b)}(c, c') = \begin{cases} -\beta_b |c, b\rangle\langle c', b| & \text{if } c, c' = 0, \\ \alpha_b^* |c, b\rangle\langle c', b| & \text{if } c = 1, c' = 0, \\ \alpha_b |c, b\rangle\langle c', b| & \text{if } c = 0, c' = 1, \\ -\beta_b^* |c, b\rangle\langle c', b| & \text{if } c, c' = 1, \end{cases} \quad (34)$$

and the *eigenvalue matrix* is formed as follows:

$$\Lambda(B_b^* B_b) = 1 \cdot |0, b\rangle\langle 0, b| + (1 - \lambda_0^{(b)}) |1, b\rangle\langle 1, b|. \quad (35)$$

So, we have the following result: an *eigenvalue* of the symmetric matrix, $B_b^* B_b$, is $\lambda_1^{(b)} \in \{1, 1 - \lambda_0^{(b)}\}$. Since the *eigenvalue* $\lambda_0^{(b)}$ is always less than equal to one, we have that:

$$\max_b \|W_1 \cdot Z_b\|_{op}^2 = \max_b \lambda_1^{(b)} = 1. \quad (36)$$

Therefore, the maximum of the *operator norm* over all measurements in two POVMs \mathcal{W} and \mathcal{Z} produces always the trivial value, one, as claimed. \square

Corollary III.1. Let ρ_{AE} be an arbitrary *quantum walk* state acting on $\mathcal{H}_A \otimes \mathcal{H}_E$. And let $\mathcal{W} = \{W_0, W_1\}$ and $\mathcal{Z} = \{Z_j\}_{j=0}^{P-1}$ be two POVMs on the quantum register A . Then the *standard entropic uncertainty relation* in Eq. (14) induces the trivial bound.

We have this following consequence because its *overlap* in Eq. (13) shows the trivial value by Theorem 3.

B. Simulations of Overlaps

From Theorem 3, we show that the *overlap* $c(\mathcal{W}, \mathcal{Z})$ in Eq. (13) with the POVMs \mathcal{W} and \mathcal{Z} in Eq. (18) and Eq. (19) always outputs the trivial value, one. We simulate this result to validate it in this section. Moreover, because of the trivial value of the *overlap*, the *standard entropic uncertainty relation* produces the trivial bound. So, we can not employ the standard relation in the security analysis of the SI-QW-QRNG with the POVMs \mathcal{W} and \mathcal{Z} . Also, we test the modified *effective overlap* $c^*(\mathcal{W}, \mathcal{Z})$ in Eq. (16) to navigate whether it is valid for the *entropic uncertainty relation* in Eq. (17).

We have the following simulation results of the *overlaps* for the *standard* and *generalized entropic uncertainty relations*. To have the experimental results, we define functions as follows:

$$\delta_0(\mathcal{W}, \mathcal{Z}) = \max_b \left\| \left\| \sqrt{W_0} \sqrt{Z_b} \right\| \right\|_{op}^2 \quad (37)$$

and

$$\delta_1(\mathcal{W}, \mathcal{Z}) = \max_b \left\| \left\| \sqrt{W_1} \sqrt{Z_b} \right\| \right\|_{op}^2, \quad (38)$$

which computes the *overlap* $c(\mathcal{W}, \mathcal{Z}) = \max\{\delta_0, \delta_1\}$. Now, we define the following functions:

$$\eta_0(\mathcal{W}, \mathcal{Z}) = \max_b \left\| \left\| \sum_a W_a Z_b W_a \right\| \right\|_{op} \quad (39)$$

and

$$\eta_1(\mathcal{W}, \mathcal{Z}) = \max_a \left\| \left\| \sum_b Z_b W_a Z_b \right\| \right\|_{op}, \quad (40)$$

which simulates the modified *effective overlap* $c^*(\mathcal{W}, \mathcal{Z}) = \min\{\eta_0, \eta_1\}$ in Eq. (16). Through the comparison of the simulations, we have the following result:

$$c^*(\mathcal{W}, \mathcal{Z}) = c(\mathcal{W}, \mathcal{Z}), \quad (41)$$

which contradicts to the conjecture, $c^*(\mathcal{W}, \mathcal{Z}) \leq c(\mathcal{W}, \mathcal{Z})$, in [13, 16, 17]. Fig.1 and Fig.2 show that $c(\mathcal{W}, \mathcal{Z})$ and $c^*(\mathcal{W}, \mathcal{Z})$ always produce the value one, which implies that both *standard* and *generalized entropic uncertainty relations* yield the trivial bound with these *overlaps*.




FIG. 1. The *quantum walk* state evolves over dimensions $P = 1, \dots, 101$ and time $T = P$. The left graph is to show δ_0 and δ_1 to find the *overlap* in the *standard entropic uncertainty relation*; The right graph is to show η_0 and η_1 to compute the modified *effective overlap* in the *generalized entropic uncertainty relation*; Both $c = \max\{\delta_0, \delta_1\}$ and $c^* = \min\{\eta_0, \eta_1\}$ show the trivial value, one.




FIG. 2. The *quantum walk* state evolves over time $T = 1, \dots, 100$ for fixed dimension P ; the first row is with the dimension $P = 51$; the second row is with the dimension $P = 101$. The first column is to show δ_0 and δ_1 to find the *overlap* in the *standard entropic uncertainty relation*; The second column is to show η_0 and η_1 to compute the modified *effective overlap* in the *generalized entropic uncertainty relation*; All $c = \max\{\delta_0, \delta_1\}$ and $c^* = \min\{\eta_0, \eta_1\}$ show the trivial value, one.

C. An Alternative Approach

We show the *overlap* in (13) of the *standard entropic uncertainty relation* generates the trivial value, one. Also, we present the simulation results: the modified *effective overlap* in (16) of the *generalized entropic uncertainty relation* produces the same trivial value. Consequently, the *standard* and *generalized entropic uncertainty relations* with the POVMs \mathcal{W} and \mathcal{Z} produce the trivial bound. Thus, we need an alternative solution for the quantum walk-based quantum cryptographic application using these POVMs. The new alternative approach for the SI-QW-QRNG is first introduced in [48] to remedy

the trivial bound matter. Here, we briefly discuss this quantum sampling-based approach and its results in this section.

The *sampling-based entropic uncertainty relations* with sets of orthogonal measurements, \mathcal{X} and \mathcal{Z} , are first introduced in [18, 19], which relations are accomplished by the quantum sampling technique [20]. This quantum *sampling-based entropic uncertainty* approach is applied not only to compute a true random bit rate of quantum walk-based QRNG but also to amend the problem of the trivial bound with the POVMs \mathcal{W} and \mathcal{Z} . The alternative *sampling-based entropic uncertainty relation* with these POVMs is defined in [48, 49] as follows:

Theorem 4. Let $\varepsilon > 0$, $0 < \beta < 1/2$, and ρ_{AE} an arbitrary quantum state acting on $\mathcal{H}_A \otimes \mathcal{H}_E$, where $\mathcal{H}_A \cong \mathcal{H}_{2P}^{\otimes(n+m)}$ and $m < n$. Let $\mathcal{W} = \{[w_0], I - [w_0]\} = \{W_0, W_1\}$ and $\mathcal{Z} = \{I_C \otimes [j]\}_{j=0}^{P-1} = \{Z_j\}_{j=0}^{P-1}$. If a subset t of size m of ρ_A is measured using POVM \mathcal{W} resulting in outcome q we denote by $\rho(t, q)$ to be the post-measurement state. Then the post-state is measured using POVM \mathcal{Z} resulting in outcome $r \in \mathcal{A}_P^n$, where $n = N - m$. It holds that: except with probability at most $\varepsilon^{1/3}$,

$$H_{\infty}^{\tilde{\varepsilon}}(Z|E)_{\rho} + n \cdot \frac{\bar{H}_{2P}(w(q) + \delta)}{\log_{2P}(2)} \geq -\eta_q \log \gamma - 2 \log \frac{1}{\varepsilon}, \quad (42)$$

where $\tilde{\varepsilon} = 2\varepsilon + 2\varepsilon^{1/3}$ and

$$\gamma = \max_z \mathbb{P}_W(|w_0\rangle \rightarrow z). \quad (43)$$

The true random bit rates of the SI-QW-QRNG using the alternative *sampling-based entropic uncertainty relation* shows in Fig.3. The brief concept of the *quantum sampling* and the sketchy proof of Theorem 4 are introduced in Appendix A.




FIG. 3. By using the *sampling-based uncertainty relation*, a quantum walk based QRNG produces true random bits over noisy settings; The left graph shows the random bit rate over noise $Q = 0$; The middle graph shows the random bit rate over noise $Q = 0.15$; The last graph shows the random bit rate over noise $Q = 0.2$; x-axis: number of signals sent N ; y-axis: random bit rates; green solid is $|W| = 2 \cdot 51$; magenta solid is $|W| = 2 \cdot 21$; orange dash is $|W| = 2 \cdot 11$; blue-dotted is $|W| = 2 \cdot 5$; cyan-dot-dashed is $|W| = 2 \cdot 3$.

IV. CLOSING REMARKS

In this paper, we present the case of the quantum cryptographic application, the SI-QW-QRNG, which shows the trivial bound of the *standard* and *generalized entropic uncertainty relations* in its security analysis. We show the analytical evaluation of the trivial value of the *overlap* in the *standard entropic uncertainty relation* and the simulation results of the *overlap* $c(\mathcal{W}, \mathcal{Z})$ in Eq. (13) and the modified *effective overlap* $c^*(\mathcal{W}, \mathcal{Z})$ in Eq. (16). These analytical and experimental results propose that there exists a case such that the modified *effective overlap* equals the *overlap*, namely, $c^*(\mathcal{W}, \mathcal{Z}) = c(\mathcal{W}, \mathcal{Z})$, which contracts the results in [13, 16, 17]. Also, many exciting open problems dwell. First, simulating the *overlap* and the modified *effective overlap* with a generalized coin operator in [44, 45] and a memory-based quantum walk state in [50–54] would be an exciting project. Second, analyzing the trivial value of the modified *effective overlap* $c^*(\mathcal{W}, \mathcal{Z})$ of the POVMs \mathcal{W} and \mathcal{Z} and the proof of the equality of $c(\mathcal{W}, \mathcal{Z})$ and $c^*(\mathcal{W}, \mathcal{Z})$ would be fascinating. Thirdly, analyzing and computing the general *effective overlap* $c^*(\rho_A, \mathcal{W}, \mathcal{Z})$ of the POVMs \mathcal{W} and \mathcal{Z} via finding a set of projective measurement \mathcal{P} in Eq. (15) is a compelling problem. Finally, analyzing the general *effective overlap* $c^*(\rho_A, \mathcal{W}, \mathcal{Z})$ to see whether the conjecture $c^*(\rho_A, \mathcal{W}, \mathcal{Z}) \leq c(\mathcal{W}, \mathcal{Z})$ is valid or not would be an imperative project.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The author appreciates noteworthy comments from the anonymous reviewers, which significantly ripens the paper's quality.

Appendix A: Quantum Sampling-Based Entropic Uncertainty Relation

In Appendixes A1 and A2, the following notation is considered: a Hermitian positive semi-definite operator of unit trace that acts on a Hilbert space \mathcal{H} is a *density operator*. Suppose a pure quantum state $|\psi\rangle \in \mathcal{H}$ is given. Then the *density operator* of the pure state is denoted $|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|$. We simplify it as the symbol $[\psi]$ to mean $|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|$.

1. Quantum Sampling

The first *quantum sampling* technique is introduced in [20]. They discovered a fascinating link between classical sampling strategies and quantum ones, even if a quantum state is entangled with an adversarial system. Based on the *quantum sampling*, the *sampling-based entropic uncertainty relations* are introduced in [18, 19, 48, 49]. We briefly review its concepts in this section.

Let a basis be $\{|0\rangle, \dots, |d-1\rangle\}$. Consider the quantum analogue of the good collection of classical words as follows:

$$\text{span}(\mathcal{B}_{t,\delta}) = \text{span}\{|w_{i_1}, \dots, w_{i_N}\rangle : |w(i_t) - w(i_{\bar{t}})| \leq \delta\},$$

where the set $\mathcal{B}_{t,\delta}$ is the group of all good words such that the classic sampling strategy is to almost likely produce a δ -close estimate of the Hamming weight of the unobserved portion.

Suppose that given a state $|\psi\rangle_{AE} \in \text{span}(\mathcal{B}_{t,\delta}) \otimes \mathcal{H}_E$, a measurement in the basis performing on those qudits indexed by t leads to outcome $q \in \mathcal{L}_d^m = \{0, \dots, d-1\}^m$. It must uphold that the remaining state is a superposition of the form: $|\psi_{t,q}\rangle = \sum_{i \in J} \alpha_i |w_i, E_i\rangle$, where $J \subset \{i \in \mathcal{L}_d^{N-m} : |w(i) - w(q)| \leq \delta\}$. Also, they introduce the superposition Lemma in [20]. It allows computing the lower bound of entropy of Z given E by using a mixed quantum state, that is, quantifying how much information an adversary E , prepares an entangled quantum state $|\varphi\rangle_{AE}$ and sends A portion to Alice, has on measuring the state by Alice. The superposition Lemma is as follows:

Lemma 1. Let $|\varphi\rangle_{AE}$ and ρ_{AE}^{mix} be of the form:

$$|\varphi\rangle_{AE} = \sum_{i \in J} \alpha_i |i\rangle_W \otimes |E_i\rangle \quad \text{and} \quad \rho_{AE}^{\text{mix}} = \sum_{i \in J} |\alpha_i|^2 |i\rangle_W \otimes |E_i\rangle,$$

where $|i\rangle = |i_1, \dots, i_n\rangle_W$ is the n -tensors of quantum states, $J = \{i \in \mathcal{L}_{2^n}^n : |w(i) - w(q)| \leq \delta\}$ and $n = N - m$ with $m = |q|$, $q \in \{0, 1\}^m$ and N is the total number of signals from the adversarial source E to Alice A . Let ρ_{ZE} and $\rho_{ZE}^{\text{mix}} = \chi_{ZE}$ describe the hybrid systems obtained by measuring subsystem A of $|\varphi\rangle_{AE}$ and ρ_{AE}^{mix} , respectively in basis $\{|z\rangle\}_z$ and tracing out a coin subspace out of all coin spaces, respectively. Then we have that:

$$H_\infty(Z|E)_\rho \geq H_\infty(Z|E)_\chi - \log_2 |J|. \quad (\text{A1})$$

With Lemma 1, the main result in [20] as follows:

Theorem 5. Let $\delta > 0$. Given the classical sampling strategy and an arbitrary quantum state $|\varphi\rangle_{AE}$, there exists a collection of ideal state $\{|\psi_t\rangle\}_t$, indexed over all possible subsets the sampling strategy may choose, such that each $|\psi_t\rangle \in \text{span}(\mathcal{B}_{t,q}) \otimes \mathcal{H}_E$ and:

$$\left\| \frac{1}{2} \left[\frac{1}{T} \sum_t [t] \otimes |\varphi\rangle - \frac{1}{T} \sum_t [t] \otimes |\psi_t\rangle \right] \right\| \leq \sqrt{\varepsilon_\delta^{cl}}, \quad (\text{A2})$$

where $T = \binom{N}{m}$ and the sum is over all subsets of size m .

The upshot is to show the failure probabilities of the *quantum sampling* strategy are functions of the classical error probability. We guide those interested in looking through [20] to have the detailed information.

2. Brief Proof of Theorem 4.

Theorem 4 is one of the alternative approaches based on the *quantum sampling* that we can employ when the *standard entropic uncertainty relations* do not work out [48, 49]. The sketch of the proof in [48, 49] is as follows: **Proof** Let $|\varphi_i\rangle_{AE}$ be the quantum state that the dishonest source E creates and sends the A portion to Alice N -times with the fixed error $\varepsilon > 0$. If the source is honest, Alice receives the state $|\varphi_0\rangle_{AE} = |w_0\rangle^{\otimes N} \otimes |E_0\rangle$, where $|w_i\rangle \in \mathcal{H}_W = \mathcal{H}_C \otimes \mathcal{H}_P$ and $i \in \{0, \dots, 2P-1\}$. Note that P is the walker's positional dimension. By Theorem 5, there exists ideal states, indexed over all subsets $t \subset [N]$ of size m such that $|\psi_t\rangle \in \text{span}(|w_{i_1}, \dots, w_{i_N}\rangle : |w(i_t) - w(i_{\bar{t}})| \leq \delta) \otimes \mathcal{H}_E$. Note that we define $|w_0\rangle = W^T |0, 0\rangle$. We utilize a similar approach, a two-step proof method, in [18, 19] to show the security. Analyzing the security of the ideal state $\sigma_{TAE} = 1/T \sum_t [t] \otimes |\psi_t\rangle$, where $T = \binom{N}{m}$ and $p(t) = 1/T$ is the first footstep. We measure the T register in σ_{TAE} , which leads the state to collapse to the superposition of ideal states $|\psi_t\rangle$ that is a quantum analogy of a classical random sampling. After the *quantum sampling*, we measure the ideal states $|\psi_t\rangle$ in a set of measurement POVM \mathcal{W} to have $q \in \{0, 1\}^m$. It tests whether a sample of quantum states $|w_i\rangle$ is honest or not. If the outcome is $q = 0$, i.e., $|w_0\rangle$, Alice considers the state from the source is honest so that she can extract true randomness. Then the experiment traces out the measured portion of size m resulting in the post-measurement state $\sigma(t, q)$ acting on $\mathcal{H}_{2P}^{\otimes n} \otimes \mathcal{H}_E$. Since $|\psi_t\rangle \in \text{span}(\mathcal{B}_{t,2P}^\delta) \otimes \mathcal{H}_E$, we claim that the post-measurement state is of the form:

$$\sigma(t, q) = \sum_{e \in \mathcal{A}_{2P-1}^{wt(q)}} p_e \cdot \sigma_{AE}^{(e)}, \quad (\text{A3})$$

where $P(Z) = ZZ^*$, $wt(q)$ is the (non-relative) Hamming weight of q , $\sigma_{AE}^{(e)} = P(\sum_{i \in J_q^{(e)}} \alpha_i^{(e)} |w_i\rangle \otimes |E_i\rangle)$, and $J_q^{(e)} \subset \{i \in \mathcal{A}_{2P}^n : |w(i) - w(q)| \leq \delta\}$. Recall $n = N - m$. This is the form of the post-measurement state after the experiment is done. Indeed, note that $|\psi_t\rangle$ is a superposition of vectors of the form $\{|w_i\rangle : |w(i) - w(q)| \leq \delta\}$. Thus, on observing q using POVM \mathcal{W} on subspace indexed by t , but before tracing out the measured portion, the state is of the form:

$$\sum_{e \in \Omega_q} \sqrt{p_e} |x_e\rangle_Q \otimes \sum_{i \in J_q^{(e)}} \alpha_i^{(e)} |w_i\rangle \otimes |E_i\rangle, \quad (\text{A4})$$

where $\Omega_q = \{e \in \mathcal{A}_{2P}^m : e_i = 0 \text{ iff } q_i = 0\}$. As the final step of the experiment, tracing out the Q register brings Eq. (A4). Let us consider one of the $\sigma_{AE}^{(e)}$ states. And Alice performs a measurement using POVM \mathcal{Z} in Eq. (19), on the remaining A portion to extract true randomness based on the multi-dimensional space. To compute this state $\sigma(t, q)$, we write a single quantum walker $|w_i\rangle \in \mathcal{H}_W$ as $|w_i\rangle = \sum_c |c\rangle \otimes |\varphi(c, i)\rangle$, where

$c \in \{0, 1\}$. With this notation, we can compute a post-measurement state, with Alice storing the outcome $z \in \mathcal{A}_P^n$ in a classical register Z and also tracing out the coin register. The post-measurement state is as follows:

$$\sigma_{ZE}^{(e)} = \sum_z [z]_Z \sum_{i,j \in J_q^{(e)}} \alpha_i \alpha_j^* \sum_{c \in \{0,1\}^n} \beta_{z,c,i} \beta_{z,c,i}^* \otimes [E_{ij}],$$

where $z \in \mathcal{A}_P^n$ and $\beta_{z,c,i} = \prod_{\ell=0}^{n-1} \langle z_\ell | \varphi(c_\ell, i_\ell) \rangle$. To compute the min-entropy of the post-measurement state, we will consider the following density operator:

$$\chi_{ZE} = \sum_z [z] \sum_i |\alpha_i|^2 \sum_c |\beta_{z,c,i}|^2 \otimes [E_i].$$

Due to the superposition Lemma 1, it bounds the min-entropy of a superposition based on the min-entropy of both suitable mixed states, we find that:

$$H_\infty(Z|E)_{\sigma^{(e)}} \geq H_\infty(Z|E)_\chi - \log_2 |J_q^{(e)}|. \quad (\text{A5})$$

Consider the state χ_{ZEI} where we append an auxiliary system spanned by orthonormal basis $|i\rangle$ as follows:

$$\chi_{ZEI} = \sum_i |\alpha_i|^2 \cdot \chi^{(i)} \otimes [E_i] \otimes |i\rangle, \quad (\text{A6})$$

where $\chi^{(i)} = \sum_z [z] \sum_c |\beta_{z,c,i}|^2$. For strings $z \in \mathcal{A}_P^n$, let $p(z|w_i)$ be the probability that outcomes z is observed if measuring the pure, and unentangled state, state $|w_{i_1}, \dots, w_{i_n}\rangle$ using POVM \mathcal{Z} . Simple algebra shows that this is in fact $p(z|w_i) = \sum_c |\beta_{z,c,i}|^2$. So $\chi^{(i)} = \sum_z p(z|w_i)[z]$. From the strong subadditivity of the min-entropy in [7] and treating the joint EI registers as a single classical register, we have:

$$H_\infty(Z|E)_\chi \geq H_\infty(Z|EI)_\chi \geq \min_i H_\infty(Z)_{\chi^{(i)}}. \quad (\text{A7})$$

Fix a particular $i \in J_q^{(e)}$ and $\eta = n - wt(i)$ (namely, η is the number of zeros in the string i .) Then, it is clear that $p(z|w_i) \leq \max_{x,c} \mathbb{P}_W(|w_0\rangle \rightarrow (x,c))^\eta = \xi^\eta$. Indeed, any other $\mathbb{P}_W(|w_0\rangle \rightarrow (x,c)) \leq 1$. We may consider only the $|w_0\rangle$ term as contributing to this upper-bound. From this it follows that $H_\infty(Z)_{\chi^{(i)}} = -\log \max_z p(z|w_i) \geq -\log \xi^{n-wt(i)}$. By considering the noise in the source via the sampling, we have that for $i \in J_q^{(e)}$ and $w(i) \leq n(w(q) + \delta)$, $\min_i H_\infty(Z)_{\chi^{(i)}} \geq -\log \xi^{n(1-w(q)\delta)} \geq \eta_q \gamma$, where $\eta_q = n(1 - (w(q) + \delta))$, the gamma γ is defined in Eq. (43). Finally, by the well known bound on the volume of a Hamming ball $|J_q^{(e)}| \leq d^{n\tilde{H}_d(w(q)+\delta)}$, the superposition Lemma 1, and the inequality in Eq. (A7), we have the bound of the min-entropy:

$$H_\infty(Z|E)_{\sigma^{(e)}} \geq \eta_q \gamma - \frac{n\tilde{H}_{2P}(w(q) + \delta)}{\log_{2P}(2)}. \quad (\text{A8})$$

The above analysis is for the ideal state. Since we use a similar technique for translating this ideal analysis to the real case, we refer the details to [18, 19]. \square

-
- [1] W. Heisenberg, "Über den anschaulichen inhalt der quantentheoretischen kinematik und mechanik," Z. Physik 43, 172 (1927).
- [2] Robertson, Howard Percy. "The uncertainty principle." Physical Review 34.1 (1929): 163.
- [3] I. I. Hirschman. "A Note on Entropy." Am. J. Math., 79(1): 152–156, 1957.
- [4] D. Deutsch. "Uncertainty in Quantum Measurements." Physical review letters 50(9): 631–633, 1983.
- [5] Maassen, Hans, and Jos BM Uffink. "Generalized entropic uncertainty relations." Physical review letters 60.12 (1988): 1103.
- [6] Krishna, M., and K. R. Parthasarathy. "An entropic uncertainty principle for quantum measurements." Sankhyā: The Indian Journal of Statistics, Series A (2002): 842-851.
- [7] Renner, Renato. "Security of quantum key distribution." International Journal of Quantum Information 6.01 (2008): 1-127.
- [8] Tomamichel, Marco, et al. "Leftover hashing against quantum side information." IEEE Transactions on Information Theory 57.8 (2011): 5524-5535.
- [9] Renes, Joseph M., and Renato Renner. "One-shot classical data compression with quantum side information and the distillation of common randomness or secret keys." IEEE Transactions on Information Theory 58.3 (2012): 1985-1991.
- [10] Berta, Mario, et al. "The uncertainty principle in the presence of quantum memory." Nature Physics 6.9 (2010): 659-662.
- [11] Coles, Patrick J., Li Yu, and Michael Zwoleak. "Relative entropy derivation of the uncertainty principle with quantum side information." arXiv preprint arXiv:1105.4865 (2011).
- [12] Tomamichel, Marco, and Renato Renner. "Uncertainty relation for smooth entropies." Physical review letters 106.11 (2011): 110506.
- [13] Tomamichel, Marco. "A framework for non-asymptotic quantum information theory." arXiv preprint arXiv:1203.2142 (2012).
- [14] Tomamichel, Marco, and Esther Hänggi. "The link between entropic uncertainty and nonlocality." Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and Theoretical 46.5 (2013): 055301.
- [15] Coles, Patrick J., et al. "Uncertainty relations from simple entropic properties." Physical review letters 108.21 (2012): 210405.

- [16] Coles, Patrick J., and Marco Piani. "Improved entropic uncertainty relations and information exclusion relations." *Physical Review A* 89.2 (2014): 022112.
- [17] Coles, Patrick J., et al. "Entropic uncertainty relations and their applications." *Reviews of Modern Physics* 89.1 (2017): 015002.
- [18] Krawec, Walter O. "Quantum sampling and entropic uncertainty." *Quantum Information Processing* 18.12 (2019): 1-18.
- [19] Krawec, Walter O. "A new high-dimensional quantum entropic uncertainty relation with applications." 2020 IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory (ISIT). IEEE, 2020.
- [20] Bouman, Niek J., and Serge Fehr. "Sampling in a quantum population, and applications." *Annual Cryptology Conference*. Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2010.
- [21] Horn, Roger A., and Charles R. Johnson. *Matrix analysis*. Cambridge university press, 2012.
- [22] Mosca, Michele. "Quantum algorithms." arXiv preprint arXiv:0808.0369 (2008).
- [23] Montanaro, Ashley. "Quantum algorithms: an overview." *npj Quantum Information* 2.1 (2016): 1-8.
- [24] Cerezo, Marco, et al. "Variational quantum algorithms." *Nature Reviews Physics* 3.9 (2021): 625-644.
- [25] Bharti, Kishor, et al. "Noisy intermediate-scale quantum algorithms." *Reviews of Modern Physics* 94.1 (2022): 015004.
- [26] E. Farhi and S. Gutmann, "Quantum computation and decision trees," *Physical Review A*, vol. 58, no. 2, p. 915, 1998.
- [27] Aharonov, Dorit, et al. "Quantum walks on graphs." *Proceedings of the thirty-third annual ACM symposium on Theory of computing*. 2001.
- [28] Bednarska, Małgorzata, et al. "Quantum walks on cycles." *Physics Letters A* 317.1-2 (2003): 21-25.
- [29] Childs, Andrew M., et al. "Exponential algorithmic speedup by a quantum walk." *Proceedings of the thirty-fifth annual ACM symposium on Theory of computing*. 2003.
- [30] Childs, Andrew M. "Universal computation by quantum walk." *Physical review letters* 102.18 (2009): 180501.
- [31] Lovett, Neil B., et al. "Universal quantum computation using the discrete-time quantum walk." *Physical Review A* 81.4 (2010): 042330.
- [32] Portugal, Renato. "Quantum walks and search algorithms". Vol. 19. New York: Springer, 2013.
- [33] Proctor, T. J., et al. "Nonreversal and nonrepeating quantum walks." *Physical Review A* 89.4 (2014): 042332.
- [34] Montanaro, Ashley. "Quantum algorithms: an overview." *npj Quantum Information* 2.1 (2016): 1-8.
- [35] Santha, Miklos. "Quantum walk based search algorithms." *International Conference on Theory and Applications of Models of Computation*. Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2008.
- [36] Magniez, Frédéric, et al. "Search via quantum walk." *SIAM journal on computing* 40.1 (2011): 142-164.
- [37] Balu, Radhakrishnan, Chaobin Liu, and Salvador E. Venegas-Andraca. "Probability distributions for Markov chain based quantum walks." *Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and Theoretical* 51.3 (2017): 035301.
- [38] Frauchiger, Daniela, Renato Renner, and Matthias Troyer. "True randomness from realistic quantum devices." arXiv preprint arXiv:1311.4547 (2013).
- [39] Vallone, Giuseppe, et al. "Quantum randomness certified by the uncertainty principle." *Physical Review A* 90.5 (2014): 052327.
- [40] Avesani, M., et al. "Secure heterodyne-based quantum random number generator at 17 Gbps (2018)." arXiv preprint arXiv:1801.04139.
- [41] Li, Yu-Huai, et al. "Quantum random number generation with uncharacterized laser and sunlight." *npj Quantum Information* 5.1 (2019): 1-5.
- [42] Herrero-Collantes, Miguel, and Juan Carlos Garcia-Escartin. "Quantum random number generators." *Reviews of Modern Physics* 89.1 (2017): 015004.
- [43] Rohde, Peter P., Joseph F. Fitzsimons, and Alexei Gilchrist. "Quantum walks with encrypted data." *Physical review letters* 109.15 (2012): 150501.
- [44] Vlachou, Chrysoula, et al. "Quantum walk public-key cryptographic system." *International Journal of Quantum Information* 13.07 (2015): 1550050.
- [45] Vlachou, Chrysoula, et al. "Quantum key distribution with quantum walks." *Quantum Information Processing* 17.11 (2018): 1-37.
- [46] Sarkar, Anupam, and C. M. Chandrashekar. "Multi-bit quantum random number generation from a single qubit quantum walk." *Scientific reports* 9.1 (2019): 1-11.
- [47] Srikara, S., and C. M. Chandrashekar. "Quantum direct communication protocols using discrete-time quantum walk." *Quantum Information Processing* 19.9 (2020): 1-15.
- [48] Bae, Minwoo, and Walter O. Krawec. "Semi-source independent quantum walk random number generation." 2021 IEEE Information Theory Workshop (ITW). IEEE, 2021.
- [49] Bae, Minu J. "Quantum Walk Random Number Generation: Memory-based Models." arXiv preprint arXiv:2207.08973 (2022).
- [50] Brun, Todd A., Hilary A. Carteret, and Andris Ambainis. "Quantum walks driven by many coins." *Physical Review A* 67.5 (2003): 052317.
- [51] Flitney, Adrian P., Derek Abbott, and Neil F. Johnson. "Quantum walks with history dependence." *Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and General* 37.30 (2004): 7581.
- [52] McGettrick, Michael. "One dimensional quantum walks with memory." arXiv preprint arXiv:0911.1653 (2009).
- [53] Rohde, Peter P., Gavin K. Brennen, and Alexei Gilchrist. "Quantum walks with memory provided by recycled coins and a memory of the coin-flip history." *Physical Review A* 87.5 (2013): 052302.
- [54] Mc Gettrick, Michael, and Jarosław Adam Miszczyk. "Quantum walks with memory on cycles." *Physica A: Statistical Mechanics and its Applications* 399 (2014): 163-170.