

The Trivial Bound of Entropic Uncertainty Relations and an Alternative Approach

Minu J. Bae*

Computer Science Department
University of Connecticut
Storrs CT, USA

(Dated: November 1, 2022)

Entropic uncertainty relations are underpinning to compute the quantitative security bound in quantum cryptographic applications, such as quantum random number generation (QRNG) and quantum key distribution (QKD). All security proofs derive a relation between the information accessible to the legitimate group and the maximum knowledge that an adversary may have gained, Eve, which exploits *entropic uncertainty relations* to lower bound Eve's uncertainty about the raw key generated by one party, Alice. The conditional uncertainty relation uses smooth min- and max-entropies to show the security of these cryptographic applications through computing the overlap of two incompatible measurements or positive-operator valued measures (POVMs), known as the *standard entropic uncertainty relations*. This paper shows the case of the POVM-versioned *standard entropic uncertainty relation* yielding the trivial bound since the maximum overlap in POVMs always produces the trivial value. So, it fails to bound the smooth min-entropy to show the security of the quantum cryptographic application, e.g., the semi-source independent quantum walk-based random number generation (SI-QW-QRNG). Moreover, we introduce an alternative and new approach called a *sampling-based entropic uncertainty relation* for generalized measurement operators (POVMs), which we can use it when the *standard entropic uncertainty relation* induces the trivial bound in the security analysis of the quantum cryptographic application. Finally, we show the success of generating true random bit rates in the SI-QW-QRNG based on the new instrument.

I. INTRODUCTION

In 1927, Heisenberg first introduced his notable uncertainty principle [1]. In 1929, Robertson recomposed 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 [10–13]. 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 relation* with POVMs was introduced in [13], namely:

$$H_{\infty}^{\epsilon}(Z|E) + H_{\max}^{\epsilon}(X|B) \geq -\log_2 c, \quad (1)$$

where the overlap is defined:

$$c = \max_{a,b} \left\| \left\| \sqrt{M_a} \sqrt{N_b} \right\| \right\|_{op}^2 \quad (2)$$

with $\|\cdot\|_{op}$ is the *operator norm* of any matrix, and $\{M_a\}$ and $\{N_b\}$ are two sets of POVMs. The inequality in Eq. (1) can be interpreted as follows: if Bob, B, undoubtedly has certainty on the X measurement, then Eve, E, has uncertainty to predict the outcome of the Z measurement. For further information regarding *entropic uncertainty relations*, we guide the reader to consider the following survey in [18].

In quantum cryptography, the *standard entropic uncertainty relations* have been supported in a security analysis of quantum cryptographic applications, such as quantum random number generation (QRNG) and quantum key distribution (QKD). Security proof emanates from finding a relation between the information accessible to the authorized players and the full knowledge that may have been gained by an adversary, Eve. It exploits *entropic uncertainty relations* to lower bound Eve's uncertainty about the raw key or random bits generated by one party, Alice. For example, the source-independent QRNG (SI-QRNG) makes use of the *standard entropic uncertainty relation* with two POVMs to prove the security of the protocol in [41]. The source-independent means QRNG does not trust the randomness source. The brief protocol of the SI-QRNG is as follows: the adversarial source prepares the $N = m + n$ number of quantum states, ρ_S , where $\rho_S = \text{tr}_E(\rho_{SE})$. Then it sends the quantum system ρ_S to Alice who generates a string of true random bits. Alice randomly selects between two POVMs to measure the quantum system ρ_S , e.g, she measures the m -number of quantum states in the POVM measurement $\mathcal{X} = \{M_x\}$ and measures the n -number of states in the POVM measurement $\mathcal{Z} = \{N_z\}$. The \mathcal{X} measurement is to compute a fraction of disagreement from an honest quantum state $|\psi_0\rangle$. And the \mathcal{Z} measure-

* minwoo.bae@uconn.edu

ment is to have a raw string of random bits. After these measurement processes, the entire quantum system will have a classical-quantum state ρ_{ZE} , then consider σ_{YE} is the result of a privacy amplification process on the Z register of the state. By randomly choosing a two universal hash function, the process maps the Z register on the Y register, namely:

$$\sigma_{YE} = \sum_y |y\rangle\langle y|_Y \otimes \rho_E^{(y)}. \quad (3)$$

When the output from Y is ℓ -bit long, the real and ideal relation was shown in Eq. (10). Also, the length of true random bits can be approximated as follows [12]:

$$\ell \approx H_\infty^\epsilon(Z|E) - H_{max}^\epsilon(X). \quad (4)$$

We can compute the length of the true bits ℓ by finding a bound of the smooth-min entropy $H_\infty^\epsilon(Z|E)$. In [13], the smooth-min entropy $H_\infty^\epsilon(Z|E)$ is bounded as follows:

$$H_\infty^\epsilon(Z|E) \geq n(-\log c) - H_{max}^\epsilon(X), \quad (5)$$

where $c = \max_{x,z} \left\| \left\| \sqrt{M_x} \sqrt{N_z} \right\|_{op} \right\|^2$. Also, the fraction δ of disagreement from an honest quantum state is estimated as follows:

$$H_{max}^\epsilon(X) \leq n \cdot h(\delta), \quad (6)$$

where $h(\cdot) \in [0, 1]$ denotes the binary entropy and n is the number of random bits by a random variable Z . So, the length of true random bits is evaluated as follows:

$$\ell \approx n[\vartheta - 2h(\delta)], \quad (7)$$

where $\vartheta = -\log c$. Note that when the maximum measurement overlaps c is always ‘‘one,’’ a true random bit rate, ℓ/N , can not be positive. So, computing the overlap value of POVMs is critical for security analysis in the quantum cryptographical application. We guide the reader to consider survey paper [19] for more information about security in quantum cryptography.

Moreover, *quantum algorithms* can be utilized for cryptography, search and optimization, simulation of quantum systems, and solving large systems of linear equations [24–27]. Especially, the *quantum walk* (QW), a quantum analogy of the classical random walk, is one of the fundamental methods in quantum computation [28–33]. The QW-algorithm or state can be employed not only for searching and sampling problems but also recently, in quantum cryptography, e.g., QRNG, QKD, and Quantum Secure Direct Communication (QSDC) protocols [45–51]. Particularly, quantum walk-based random number generation (QW-QRNG) protocols are introduced in [49–51]. The first quantum walk-based QRNG (QW-QRNG) is introduced in [49], 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) protocols based on its original




FIG. 1. The sampling-based scheme of the QW-QRNG with the POVMs: the randomness source is the state ρ_S is possibly correlated with an adversarial system E . The source sends the $N = m + n$ number of quantum walk states to the QW-QRNG protocol. The protocol picks a random subset t of them of size $|t| = m$ and measures the samples in the POVM W to estimate noise in the source. The quantum sampling outputs the fraction of noise q and the sampling error δ , which sends to the post-processing. The QW-QRNG measures the remaining quantum walk states in the POVM Z to produce the n -number of raw random bits. The n -number of raw bits goes to the post-processing, which outputs the ℓ -number of true random bits, so Y represents the final true random string.

model is established in the following papers [50, 51], see Fig.1. Note that the semi-source independent (SI) model assumes measurement devices are characterized and the dimension of the system is known, but the source is under the control of an adversarial party [41–43]. 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 entropic uncertainty relation* does not work with the specific sets of POVMs in the protocol; the *overlap* generates the trivial value, one, so its *entropic uncertainty relation* produces only trivial bounds in the security analysis, and the true random bit rate is always non-positive, namely:

$$\ell \approx n \cdot (-\log c) - 2n \cdot h(\delta) \leq 0, \quad (8)$$

where the maximum overlap is always ‘‘one,’’ i.e., $c = 1$. So, The SI-QW-QRNG protocol could not show the positive true random bit rate throughout the *standard entropic uncertainty relation* with the POVMs [50, 51]. This paper discusses the trivial bound of the *standard entropic uncertainty relation* and an alternative and new 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 exploit the POVM-versions of the *standard entropic uncertainty relation* for its security analysis. This case shows a trivial value, one, in computing the *overlap* of the POVMs in Eq. (21); the result brings about the trivial bound of the *standard entropic uncertainty relation* in Eq. (22), which can not output the positive true random bits rate

of the protocol. Second, we analyze the result regarding the trivial value of the *overlap* of the set of POVMs in the *standard entropic uncertainty relation* to show it always outputs the one which induces the corollary, that is, the *standard entropic uncertainty relation* with the POVMs is bounded by the trivial bound. Thirdly, we introduce the alternative and new approach we can regard when the *standard entropic uncertainty relation* for the generalized measurement operators fail to function in the security analysis of the quantum cryptographic application. The new method is a *sampling-based entropic uncertainty relation* for the POVMs, which successfully shows the secure random bit rates of the SI-QW-QRNG protocols in [50, 51].

II. PRELIMINARIES

A. Notation and Definitions

In this section, we introduce underlying definitions and notations that will be used all over this paper. A notation \mathcal{A}_d means a d -dimensional alphabet, that is, $\mathcal{A}_d = \{0, \dots, d-1\}$. So, consider a word $q \in \mathcal{A}_d^N$ and a random subset $t \subseteq [N]$, where $[N] = \{1, 2, \dots, N\}$. Then a new word q_t represents the substring of q indexed by t , namely a letter in q indexed by $i \in t$. A string $q_{\bar{t}}$ implies the complement of q_t in q . The *Hamming Weight* of q is a function $wt(q) = |\{i : q_i \neq 0\}|$. And the *relative Hamming weight* is $w(q) = wt(q)/|q|$.

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 $|\varphi\rangle \in \mathcal{H}$ is given. Then the *density operator* of the pure state is denoted $|\varphi\rangle\langle\varphi|$. We simplify it as the symbol $[\varphi]$ to mean $|\varphi\rangle\langle\varphi|$.

A notation $H(X)$ means the Shannon entropy of a random variable X . And $h_d(x)$ represents the d -ary entropy function, which is defined as: $h_d(x) = x \log_d(d-1) - x \log_d(x) - (1-x) \log_d(1-x)$. Also, a definition $\bar{H}_d(x)$ is the *extended d -ary entropy function* which is identical to $h_d(x)$ for all $x \in [0, 1-1/d]$, is 0 for all $x < 0$, otherwise 1 for all $x > 1-1/d$.

Suppose ρ_{BE} be a quantum state that acts on an arbitrary Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}_B \otimes \mathcal{H}_E$. The *conditional quantum min entropy* [7] is defined as follows: $H_\infty(B|E)_\rho = \sup_{\sigma_E} \max\{\lambda \in \mathbb{R} : 2^{-\lambda} I_B \otimes \sigma_E - \rho_{BE} \geq 0\}$, where I_B is the identity operator on \mathcal{H}_B . Consider that $\rho_B = \sum_b p_b [b]$ means the E system is trivial and the B portion is classical. So, its min entropy is $H_\infty(B) = -\log \max_b p_b$. The *smooth conditional min entropy* [7] is defined as follows: $H_\infty^\varepsilon(B|E)_\rho = \sup_{\sigma \in \Gamma_\varepsilon(\rho)} H_\infty(B|E)_\sigma$, where $\Gamma_\varepsilon(\rho) = \{\sigma : \|\sigma - \rho\| \leq \varepsilon\}$. Note that $\|X\|$ is the trace distance of operator X .

If the E portion is classical, namely the quantum-classical state $\rho_{BE} = \sum_e p_e \rho_B^e \otimes [e]$, then it can be shown that: $H_\infty(B|E)_\rho \geq \min_e H_\infty(B)_{\rho^e}$. Moreover, the quantum-quantum-classical state ρ_{BER} has the following inequality. Let the quantum-quantum-classical state

ρ_{BER} be of the form $\rho_{BER} = \sum_r p_r \cdot \rho_{BE}^r \otimes [r]$, where the R portion is classical. Then we have the following inequality:

$$H_\infty(B|ER)_\rho \geq \min_r H_\infty(B|E)_{\rho^r}, \quad (9)$$

which proof is not difficult to show by using the above definitions regarding the conditional quantum min entropy.

Suppose a classic-quantum state ρ_{BE} is given. Then consider σ_{YE} is the result of a privacy amplification process on the B register of the state. Through a randomly chosen two-universal hash function, the process maps the B register on the Y register. If the output ℓ bits is long, then the following relation was shown in [7] that:

$$\|\sigma_{YE} - I_Y/2^\ell \otimes \sigma_E\| \leq 2^{-\frac{1}{2}(H_\infty^\varepsilon(B|E)_{\rho^r} - \ell) + 2\varepsilon}. \quad (10)$$

B. 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 [23] 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:

$$\|A\|_{op} = \sup \left\{ \frac{\|A|v\rangle\|}{\|v\rangle\|} : |v\rangle \in \mathcal{H} \text{ and } \|v\rangle\| \neq 0 \right\}, \quad (11)$$

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* [23]. Thus, we have that:

$$\|A\|_{op} = \sigma_{\max}(A) = \lambda_{\max}(\sqrt{A^*A}) = \sqrt{\lambda_{\max}(A^*A)}, \quad (12)$$

where $\lambda_{\max}(\cdot)$ is the *maximum eigenvalue* of a matrix. The *operator norm* satisfies the following properties [23]:

$$\|A\|_{op} \geq 0 \text{ and } \|A\|_{op} = 0 \text{ iff } A = 0, \quad (13)$$

$$\|\lambda A\|_{op} = |\lambda| \|A\|_{op} \text{ for any scalar } \lambda, \quad (14)$$

$$\|A + B\|_{op} \leq \|A\|_{op} + \|B\|_{op}, \quad (15)$$

$$\|AB\|_{op} \leq \|A\|_{op} \|B\|_{op}. \quad (16)$$

Moreover, in [23], it says that unitary invariance in the *singular value decomposition* allows: for any unitary U and V ,

$$\|UAV\|_{op} = \|A\|_{op}. \quad (17)$$

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

C. 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:

$$\sigma_X \sigma_Z \geq \frac{1}{2} |\langle \varphi | [\hat{X}, \hat{Z}] | \varphi \rangle|, \quad (18)$$

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,

$$H(X) + H(Z) \geq -\log_2 c, \text{ where } c = \max_{x,z} |\langle x|z\rangle|^2, \quad (19)$$

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, 11, 13]. 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} ,

$$H(X|B)_\rho + H(Z|C)_\rho \geq -\log_2 c. \quad (20)$$

These *entropic uncertainty relations* dispense lower bounds on the uncertainty of the outcomes of two incompatible measurements given side information [14].

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, 14] 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:

$$c(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Z}) := \max_{a,b} \left\| \sqrt{X_a} \sqrt{Z_b} \right\|_{op}^2, \quad (21)$$

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. (21) reduces to another *overlap* in Eq. (19), 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 [13, 14], 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:

$$H_\infty^\varepsilon(X|B)_\rho + H_{max}^\varepsilon(Z|C)_\rho \geq -\log_2 c(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Z}). \quad (22)$$

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 .

D. Quantum Walk based Random Number Generation with POVMs

A *quantum walk* is one of the fundamental algorithms in quantum computation [31–33]. The *quantum walk* can be utilized to gain a substantial speedup over classical algorithms based on Markov chains [36–39]. In [29, 30], 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 [29, 30] as follows:

$$S = \sum_c \sum_x |c, x + (-1)^c \pmod{P}\rangle\langle c, x|, \quad (23)$$

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 [29, 30] as follows: for any $c \in \{0, 1\}$ and $x \in \{0, \dots, P-1\}$,

$$|w_{c,x}\rangle = \sum_k \alpha_k^{(c,x)} |0, k(\bmod P)\rangle + \sum_r \beta_r^{(c,x)} |0, r(\bmod P)\rangle, \quad (24)$$

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 $\beta_r^{(c,x)} = \beta_r$.

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 [40–44]. Recently, a quantum walk based random number generation (QW-QRNG) is first introduced in [49]. The first rigorous security analysis of the semi-source-independent QW-QRNG (SI-QW-QRNG) is presented in [50, 51].

1. The Protocol

In [50], the protocol of the SI-QW-QRNG with the POVMs 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, Eve, prepares an arbitrary quantum system $|\varphi_i\rangle \in \mathcal{H}_S \otimes \mathcal{H}_E$, where $\mathcal{H}_S \cong \mathcal{H}_W^{\otimes N}$. Then Eve sends the S -portion to Alice who measures them and produces a string of true random bits. 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, the N -number of independent and identical walker state $|w_0\rangle = W^T |0, 0\rangle$ unentangled with Eve. 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 [40], 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.

E. 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* with two orthonormal bases and two POVMs are introduced in [21, 22] and [50, 51], respectively. We briefly review its concepts in this section, but we guide a reader to scan through [20] for more details.

Suppose a string $q \in \mathcal{A}_d^N$. A classic sampling technique is a procedure of randomly picking a subset $t \subset [N]$ to discover q_t , which is the subset of the string q indexed by the subset t . Then the characteristic of the sample can estimate the undiscovered part, in which a user can define a target function, e.g., the Hamming weight, to compute the characteristic of the quantum population. In the sampling strategy, it utilizes sets of randomly choosing a subset t of size $m \leq N/2$ to have a random subset q_t and an output $w(q_t)$ as an estimate of the Hamming weight in the sample. The result presented in [20]: for $\delta > 0$,

$$\varepsilon_\delta^{cl} := \max_{q \in \mathcal{A}_d^N} \mathbb{P}(q \notin \mathcal{B}_{t,\delta}) \leq 2 \exp\left(\frac{-\delta^2 m(m+n)}{m+n+2}\right), \quad (25)$$

where the probability is over all possible random selections of subsets t and $\mathcal{B}_{t,\delta}$ is the group of all “good” words such that this sampling strategy is to almost likely produce a δ -close estimate of the Hamming weight of the unobserved portion, namely:

$$\mathcal{B}_{t,\delta} = \{q \in \mathcal{A}_d^N : |w(q_t) - w(q_{\bar{t}})| \leq \delta\}.$$

The error probability of the classical sampling strategy is the value ε_δ^{cl} , where the “cl” superscript means a classical sampling strategy. Bouman and Fehr show the failure probabilities of the quantum sampling are functions of the classical error probability [20]. 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 $|\varphi\rangle_{SE}$ and sends S portion to Alice, has on

measuring the state by Alice. The superposition Lemma is as follows:

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

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

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

$$H_\infty(Z|E)_\rho \geq H_\infty(Z|E)_\chi - \log_2 |J|. \quad (26)$$

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

Theorem 2. Let $\delta > 0$. Given the classical sampling strategy and an arbitrary quantum state $|\varphi\rangle_{SE}$, 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:

$$\frac{1}{2} \left\| \frac{1}{T} \sum_t [t] \otimes [\varphi] - \frac{1}{T} \sum_t [t] \otimes [\psi_t] \right\| \leq \sqrt{\varepsilon_\delta^{cl}}, \quad (27)$$

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.

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. (22) because its *maximum overlap* in the POVMs always yields the trivial value, one [50]. 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 [50] as follows:

$$\mathcal{W} = \{|w_0\rangle\langle w_0|, I - |w_0\rangle\langle w_0|\} = \{W_0, W_1\} \quad (28)$$

and

$$\mathcal{Z} = \{I_C \otimes |j\rangle\langle j|\}_{j=0}^{P-1} = \{Z_j\}_{j=0}^{P-1}. \quad (29)$$

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. (21), it produces the trivial value, one. So, the *standard entropic uncertainty relation* in Eq. (22) 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. (21) 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. (21) always produces the trivial value, namely:

$$c(\mathcal{W}, \mathcal{Z}) = \max_{a,b} \left\| \sqrt{W_a} \sqrt{Z_b} \right\|_{op}^2 = 1, \quad (30)$$

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. (24). Then we have a measurement operator $W_0 = |w_0\rangle\langle w_0|$ in POVM \mathcal{W} , namely: for any $c, c' \in \{0, 1\}$,

$$W_0 = \sum_{c,c'} f_0(c, c'), \quad (31)$$

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

$$f_0(c, c') = \begin{cases} \sum_{k,k'} \alpha_k \alpha_{k'}^* |c, k\rangle\langle c', k'| & \text{if } c, c' = 0, \\ \sum_{r,k'} \beta_r \alpha_{k'}^* |c, r\rangle\langle c', k'| & \text{if } c = 1, c' = 0, \\ \sum_{k,r'} \alpha_k \beta_{r'}^* |c, k\rangle\langle c', r'| & \text{if } c = 0, c' = 1, \\ \sum_{k,k'} \beta_k \beta_{k'}^* |c, k\rangle\langle c', k'| & \text{if } c, c' = 1. \end{cases} \quad (32)$$

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 $b \in \{0, \dots, n-1\}$,

$$W_0 \cdot Z_b = \sum_{c,c'} f_0^{(b)}(c, c'), \quad (33)$$

where the function is updated as follows:

$$f_0^{(b)}(c, c') = \begin{cases} \sum_k \alpha_k \alpha_b^* |c, k\rangle\langle c', b| & \text{if } c, c' = 0, \\ \sum_r \beta_r \alpha_b^* |c, r\rangle\langle c', b| & \text{if } c = 1, c' = 0, \\ \sum_k \alpha_k \beta_b^* |c, k\rangle\langle c', b| & \text{if } c = 0, c' = 1, \\ \sum_r \beta_k \beta_b^* |c, k\rangle\langle c', b| & \text{if } c, c' = 1. \end{cases} \quad (34)$$

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

$$A_b^* A_b = \sum_{c, c'} \tilde{f}_0^{(b)}(c, c'), \quad (35)$$

where

$$\tilde{f}_0^{(b)}(c, c') = \begin{cases} \alpha_b \alpha_b^* |c, b\rangle\langle c', b| & \text{if } c, c' = 0, \\ \beta_b \alpha_b^* |c, b\rangle\langle c', b| & \text{if } c = 1, c' = 0, \\ \alpha_b \beta_b^* |c, b\rangle\langle c', b| & \text{if } c = 0, c' = 1, \\ \beta_b \beta_b^* |c, b\rangle\langle c', b| & \text{if } c, c' = 1. \end{cases} \quad (36)$$

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:

$$\max_b \|A_b\|_{op}^2 = \max_b \Lambda(A_b^* A_b) = \max_b \lambda_0^{(b)}, \quad (37)$$

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:

$$W_1 = I - \sum_{c, c'} f_0(c, c') = f_1(c, c'). \quad (38)$$

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

$$f_1^{(b)}(c, c') = \begin{cases} \sum_k (1 - \alpha_k \alpha_k^*) |c, k\rangle\langle c', b| & \text{if } c, c' = 0, \\ \sum_r -\beta_r \alpha_b^* |c, r\rangle\langle c', b| & \text{if } c = 1, c' = 0, \\ \sum_k -\alpha_k \beta_b^* |c, k\rangle\langle c', b| & \text{if } c = 0, c' = 1, \\ \sum_r (1 - \beta_r \beta_b^*) |c, k\rangle\langle c', b| & \text{if } c, c' = 1. \end{cases} \quad (39)$$

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

$$B_b^* B_b = \sum_{c, c'} f_1^{(b)}(c, c'), \quad (40)$$

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

$$\tilde{f}_1^{(b)}(c, c') = \begin{cases} (1 - \alpha_b \alpha_b^*) |c, b\rangle\langle c', b| & \text{if } c, c' = 0, \\ -\beta_b \alpha_b^* |c, b\rangle\langle c', b| & \text{if } c = 1, c' = 0, \\ -\alpha_b \beta_b^* |c, b\rangle\langle c', b| & \text{if } c = 0, c' = 1, \\ (1 - \beta_b \beta_b^*) |c, b\rangle\langle c', b| & \text{if } c, c' = 1. \end{cases} \quad (41)$$

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

$$B_b^* B_b = Q_b \Lambda(B_b^* B_b) Q_b^*, \quad (42)$$

where

$$Q_b = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\lambda_0^{(b)}}} \sum_{c, c'} g_1^{(b)}(c, c'), \quad (43)$$

where $\lambda_0^{(b)}$ is as same as the *maximum eigenvalue* of $A_b^* A_b$ in Eq. (37),

$$g_1^{(b)}(c, c') = \begin{cases} -\beta_b |c, b\rangle\langle c', b| & \text{if } c, c' = 0, \\ \alpha_b^* |c, b\rangle\langle c', b| & \text{if } c = 1, c' = 0, \\ \alpha_b |c, b\rangle\langle c', b| & \text{if } c = 0, c' = 1, \\ -\beta_b^* |c, b\rangle\langle c', b| & \text{if } c, c' = 1, \end{cases} \quad (44)$$

and the *eigenvalue matrix* is formed as follows:

$$\Lambda(B_b^* B_b) = 1 \cdot |0, b\rangle\langle 0, b| + (1 - \lambda_0^{(b)}) |1, b\rangle\langle 1, b|. \quad (45)$$

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:

$$\max_b \|W_1 \cdot Z_b\|_{op}^2 = \max_b \lambda_1^{(b)} = 1. \quad (46)$$

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_{SE} be an arbitrary *quantum walk* state acting on $\mathcal{H}_S \otimes \mathcal{H}_E$. And let $\mathcal{W} = \{W_0, W_1\}$ and $\mathcal{Z} = \{Z_j\}_{j=0}^{P-1}$ be two POVMs on the quantum register S . Then the *standard entropic uncertainty relation* in Eq. (22) induces the trivial bound.

We have this following consequence because its *overlap* in Eq. (21) shows the trivial value by Theorem 3. Namely, the *standard entropic uncertainty relation* in Eq. (22) with the POVMs \mathcal{W} in (28) and \mathcal{Z} in (29) shows:

$$H_\infty^\epsilon(Z|E) + H_{max}^\epsilon(W) \geq -\log_2 1 = 0, \quad (47)$$

which is lower-bounded by the trivial hurdle, “zero.” Moreover, the length of the true random bits estimated by the *standard entropic uncertainty relation* with the POVMs is as follows:

$$\ell \approx n \cdot 0 - 2n \cdot h(\delta) \leq 0, \quad (48)$$

which always outputs the non-positive length of true random bits. Thus, we need an alternative and new entropic uncertainty relation with the POVMs \mathcal{W} in (28) and \mathcal{Z} in (29) to show the security of the SI-QW-QRNG.

B. An Alternative Approach

We show the *overlap* in Eq. (21) of the POVM \mathcal{W} in (28) and the POVM \mathcal{Z} in (29) always generates the trivial value, “one,” in the SI-QW-QRNG so that the *standard entropic uncertainty relation* with the POVMs is determined by the trivial bound. Consequently, it fails to show the protocol's security and compute the positive true random bit rate. Thus, we need an alternative and new technique for the SI-QW-QRNG with the POVMs.

First, we investigated the *sampling-based entropic uncertainty relations* with sets of orthogonal measurements, \mathcal{X} and \mathcal{Z} , to compute the overlap and one POVM Λ to measure the noise on the source, which are first introduced in [21, 22] and are accomplished by the quantum sampling technique [20]. Then we recast it for the POVM-version entropic uncertainty relation to remedy the trivial matter of the overlap in the security analysis of the SI-QW-QRNG [50, 51]. Here, we rephrase Theorem 2 to find the length of true random bits in the Si-QW-QRNG in [50] as the sampling-based entropic uncertainty relation with the POVMs and show the brief proof again. The *sampling-based entropic uncertainty relation* with the POVMs is defined as follows:

Theorem 4. Let $\varepsilon > 0$, $0 < \beta < 1/2$, and ρ_{SE} an arbitrary quantum system acting on $\mathcal{H}_S \otimes \mathcal{H}_E$, where $\mathcal{H}_S \cong \mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{D}}^{\otimes(n+m)}$ and $m < n$. Let $\mathcal{W} = \{[\mathbf{w}_0], I - [\mathbf{w}_0]\} = \{W_0, W_1\}$ and $\mathcal{Z} = \{I_C \otimes [\mathbf{j}]\}_{j=0}^{P-1} = \{Z_j\}_{j=0}^{P-1}$, where P is the dimension of the walker's positional space. If a subset t of size m of ρ_S is measured using POVM \mathcal{W} resulting in outcome $q \in \mathcal{A}_2^m$ 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 $r \in \mathcal{A}_d^n$, where $n = N - m$. It holds that: except with probability at most $\varepsilon^{1/3}$,

$$H_{\infty}^{\tilde{\varepsilon}}(Z|E)_{\rho} + n \cdot \frac{\bar{H}_{\mathcal{D}}(w(q) + \delta)}{\log_{\mathcal{D}}(2)} \geq -\eta_q \log \gamma - 2 \log \frac{1}{\varepsilon}, \quad (49)$$

where $\mathcal{D} = 2P$, $\tilde{\varepsilon} = 2\varepsilon + 2\varepsilon^{1/3}$,

$$\gamma = \max_z \mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{W}}(|w_0\rangle \rightarrow z), \quad (50)$$

and $\eta_q = (N - m)(1 - w(q) - \delta)$, where δ is the sampling error:

$$\delta = \sqrt{\frac{(N + 2) \ln(2/\varepsilon^2)}{m \cdot N}}. \quad (51)$$

Proof Let $|\varphi_i\rangle_{SE}$ be the quantum state that the dishonest source E creates and sends the S portion to Alice N -times with the fixed error $\varepsilon > 0$. If the source is honest, Alice receives the state $|\varphi_0\rangle_{SE} = |w_0\rangle^{\otimes N} \otimes |E_0\rangle$, where $|w_i\rangle \in \mathcal{H}_W = \mathcal{H}_C \otimes \mathcal{H}_P$ and $i \in \{0, \dots, \mathcal{D} - 1\}$. By Theorem 2, 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 [21, 22] to show the security. Analyzing the security of the ideal state $\sigma_{TSE} = 1/T \sum_t [t] \otimes |\psi_t\rangle$, where $T = \binom{N}{m}$ and $p(t) = 1/T$ is the first footstep. We measure the T register in σ_{TSE} , 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 $\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{D}}^{\otimes n} \otimes \mathcal{H}_E$. Since $|\psi_t\rangle \in \text{span}(\mathcal{B}_{t, \delta}) \otimes \mathcal{H}_E$, we claim that the post-measurement state is of the form:

$$\sigma(t, q) = \sum_{e \in \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{D}-1}^{wt(q)}} p_e \cdot \sigma_{AE}^{(e)}, \quad (52)$$

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 $J_q^{(e)} \subset \{i \in \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{D}}^n : |w(i) - w(q)| \leq \delta\}$. 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:

$$\sum_{e \in \Omega_q} \sqrt{p_e} |x_e\rangle_Q \otimes \sum_{i \in J_q^{(e)}} \alpha_i^{(e)} |w_i\rangle \otimes |E_i\rangle, \quad (53)$$

where $\Omega_q = \{e \in \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{D}}^m : e_i = 0 \text{ iff } q_i = 0\}$. As the final step of the experiment, tracing out the Q register brings Eq. (53). Let us consider one of the $\sigma_{AE}^{(e)}$ states. And Alice performs a measurement using POVM \mathcal{Z} in Eq. (29), 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:

$$H_{\infty}(Z|E)_{\sigma^{(e)}} \geq H_{\infty}(Z|E)_{\chi} - \log_2 |J_q^{(e)}|. \quad (54)$$

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

$$\chi_{ZEI} = \sum_i |\alpha_i|^2 \cdot \chi^{(i)} \otimes [E_i] \otimes |i\rangle, \quad (55)$$

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:

$$H_\infty(Z|E)_\chi \geq H_\infty(Z|EI)_\chi \geq \min_i H_\infty(Z)_{\chi^{(i)}}. \quad (56)$$

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. (50). Finally, by the well known bound on the volume of a Hamming ball $|J_q^{(e)}| \leq d^{nH_d(w(q)+\delta)}$, the superposition Lemma 1, and the inequality in Eq. (56), we have the bound of the min-entropy:

$$H_\infty(Z|E)_{\sigma^{(e)}} \geq -\eta_q \log \gamma - \frac{n\bar{H}_D(w(q) + \delta)}{\log_D(2)}. \quad (57)$$

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 [50]. \square

1. Evaluations

In the SI-QW-QRNG [50], the dimension of the quantum walk state is defined as follows $\mathcal{D} = 2P$, where P is the positional dimension of the walker's state. The protocol using the new *sampling-based entropic uncertainty relation* with the POVMs can output the length of true random bits as follows: except with probability at most $\varepsilon^{1/3}$, the final secret string of size is

$$\ell_{new} = -\eta_q \log_2 \gamma - n \cdot \frac{\bar{H}_{2P}(w(q) + \delta)}{\log_{2P}(2)} - 2 \log_2 \frac{1}{\varepsilon}, \quad (58)$$

which is $(5\varepsilon + 4\varepsilon^{1/3})$ -close to an ideal random string, that is, one that is uniformly generated and independent of any adversarial system. The true random bit rates of the SI-QW-QRNG shows in Fig.2.

IV. CLOSING REMARKS

In this paper, we present the case that the *standard entropic uncertainty relation* with the POVMs fails to




FIG. 2. By using the *sampling-based uncertainty relation* with the POVMs, 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; solid line represents $\mathcal{D} = 2 \cdot 51$; loosely dashed line is $\mathcal{D} = 2 \cdot 21$; dashed line is $\mathcal{D} = 2 \cdot 11$; dotted line is $\mathcal{D} = 2 \cdot 5$; dot-dashed line is $\mathcal{D} = 2 \cdot 3$.

use in security proof in the quantum cryptographic application, the SI-QW-QRNG. In this case, the *standard entropic uncertainty relation* with the POVMs produces the trivial bound since its *overlap* in Eq. (21) always outputs the value, one. We show the analytical proof of always producing the trivial value of the *overlap* in the sets of POVMs. Also, we introduce a new approach called the *sampling-based entropic uncertainty relation* with the POVMs to resolve the problem when the *standard entropic uncertainty relation* with the POVMs fails to function in a security analysis of a quantum cryptographic application. Finally, we show that the SI-QW-QRNG outputs the positive true random bit rate with the alternative approach with the POVMs. There are many exciting open problems: first of all, the *generalized entropic uncertainty relation* with the effective overlap c^* for generalized measurement operators, POVMs, was introduced in [14, 18]. It is essential to check whether the effective overlap c^* outputs the trivial value, one with our POVMs setup. Secondly, we can investigate when the *standard entropic uncertainty relation* does not work with which sets of POVMs.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The author would like to thank Walter O. Krawec for valuable feedback and helpful discussions and appreciates noteworthy comments from the anonymous reviewers, which significantly ripens the paper's quality.

-
- [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 Zwoiak. “Relative entropy derivation of the uncertainty principle with quantum side information.” *arXiv preprint arXiv:1105.4865* (2011).
- [12] 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.
- [13] Tomamichel, Marco, and Renato Renner. “Uncertainty relation for smooth entropies.” *Physical review letters* 106.11 (2011): 110506.
- [14] Tomamichel, Marco. “A framework for non-asymptotic quantum information theory.” *arXiv preprint arXiv:1203.2142* (2012).
- [15] Tomamichel, Marco, and Esther Hänggi. “The link between entropic uncertainty and nonlocality.” *Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and Theoretical* 46.5 (2013): 055301.
- [16] Coles, Patrick J., et al. “Uncertainty relations from simple entropic properties.” *Physical review letters* 108.21 (2012): 210405.
- [17] Coles, Patrick J., and Marco Piani. “Improved entropic uncertainty relations and information exclusion relations.” *Physical Review A* 89.2 (2014): 022112.
- [18] Coles, Patrick J., et al. “Entropic uncertainty relations and their applications.” *Reviews of Modern Physics* 89.1 (2017): 015002.
- [19] Portmann, Christopher, and Renato Renner. “Security in quantum cryptography.” *Reviews of Modern Physics* 94.2 (2022): 025008.
- [20] Bouman, Niek J., and Serge Fehr. “Sampling in a quantum population, and applications.” *Annual Cryptology Conference*. Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2010.
- [21] Krawec, Walter O. “Quantum sampling and entropic uncertainty.” *Quantum Information Processing* 18.12 (2019): 1-18.
- [22] Krawec, Walter O. “A new high-dimensional quantum entropic uncertainty relation with applications.” *2020 IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory (ISIT)*. IEEE, 2020.
- [23] Horn, Roger A., and Charles R. Johnson. *Matrix analysis*. Cambridge university press, 2012.
- [24] Mosca, Michele. “Quantum algorithms.” *arXiv preprint arXiv:0808.0369* (2008).
- [25] Montanaro, Ashley. “Quantum algorithms: an overview.” *npj Quantum Information* 2.1 (2016): 1-8.
- [26] Cerezo, Marco, et al. “Variational quantum algorithms.” *Nature Reviews Physics* 3.9 (2021): 625-644.
- [27] Bharti, Kishor, et al. “Noisy intermediate-scale quantum algorithms.” *Reviews of Modern Physics* 94.1 (2022): 015004.
- [28] E. Farhi and S. Gutmann, “Quantum computation and decision trees,” *Physical Review A*, vol. 58, no. 2, p. 915, 1998.
- [29] Aharonov, Dorit, et al. “Quantum walks on graphs.” *Proceedings of the thirty-third annual ACM symposium on Theory of computing*. 2001.
- [30] Bednarska, Małgorzata, et al. “Quantum walks on cycles.” *Physics Letters A* 317.1-2 (2003): 21-25.
- [31] 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.
- [32] Childs, Andrew M. “Universal computation by quantum walk.” *Physical review letters* 102.18 (2009): 180501.
- [33] Lovett, Neil B., et al. “Universal quantum computation using the discrete-time quantum walk.” *Physical Review A* 81.4 (2010): 042330.
- [34] Portugal, Renato. “Quantum walks and search algorithms”. Vol. 19. New York: Springer, 2013.
- [35] Proctor, T. J., et al. “Nonreversal and nonrepeating quantum walks.” *Physical Review A* 89.4 (2014): 042332.
- [36] Montanaro, Ashley. “Quantum algorithms: an overview.” *npj Quantum Information* 2.1 (2016): 1-8.
- [37] Santha, Miklos. “Quantum walk based search algorithms.” *International Conference on Theory and Applications of Models of Computation*. Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2008.
- [38] Magniez, Frédéric, et al. “Search via quantum walk.” *SIAM journal on computing* 40.1 (2011): 142-164.
- [39] 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.
- [40] Frauchiger, Daniela, Renato Renner, and Matthias Troyer. “True randomness from realistic quantum devices.” *arXiv preprint arXiv:1311.4547* (2013).
- [41] Vallone, Giuseppe, et al. “Quantum randomness certified by the uncertainty principle.” *Physical Review A* 90.5

- (2014): 052327.
- [42] Avesani, M., et al. “Secure heterodyne-based quantum random number generator at 17 Gbps (2018).” arXiv preprint arXiv:1801.04139.
- [43] Li, Yu-Huai, et al. “Quantum random number generation with uncharacterized laser and sunlight.” *npj Quantum Information* 5.1 (2019): 1-5.
- [44] Herrero-Collantes, Miguel, and Juan Carlos Garcia-Escartin. “Quantum random number generators.” *Reviews of Modern Physics* 89.1 (2017): 015004.
- [45] Rohde, Peter P., Joseph F. Fitzsimons, and Alexei Gilchrist. “Quantum walks with encrypted data.” *Physical review letters* 109.15 (2012): 150501.
- [46] Vlachou, Chrysoula, et al. “Quantum walk public-key cryptographic system.” *International Journal of Quantum Information* 13.07 (2015): 1550050.
- [47] Vlachou, Chrysoula, et al. “Quantum key distribution with quantum walks.” *Quantum Information Processing* 17.11 (2018): 1-37.
- [48] Srikara, S., and C. M. Chandrashekar. “Quantum direct communication protocols using discrete-time quantum walk.” *Quantum Information Processing* 19.9 (2020): 1-15.
- [49] 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.
- [50] Bae, Minwoo, and Walter O. Krawec. “Semi-source independent quantum walk random number generation.” 2021 IEEE Information Theory Workshop (ITW). IEEE, 2021.
- [51] Bae, Minu J. “Quantum Walk Random Number Generation: Memory-based Models.” arXiv preprint arXiv:2207.08973 (2022).
- [52] Brun, Todd A., Hilary A. Carteret, and Andris Ambainis. “Quantum walks driven by many coins.” *Physical Review A* 67.5 (2003): 052317.
- [53] 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.
- [54] McGettrick, Michael. “One dimensional quantum walks with memory.” arXiv preprint arXiv:0911.1653 (2009).
- [55] 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.
- [56] Mc Gettrick, Michael, and Jarosław Adam Miszczak. “Quantum walks with memory on cycles.” *Physica A: Statistical Mechanics and its Applications* 399 (2014): 163-170.