

Postselection technique for optical Quantum Key Distribution with improved de Finetti reductions

Shlok Nahar¹, Devashish Tupkary¹, Yuming Zhao², Norbert Lütkenhaus¹, Ernest Y.-Z. Tan¹

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

²*Institute for Quantum Computing and Department of Pure Mathematics,
University of Waterloo, Waterloo, Ontario, Canada, N2L 3G1*

The postselection technique is an important proof technique for proving the security of quantum key distribution protocols against coherent attacks via the uplift of any security proof against collective attacks. In this work, we go through multiple steps to rigorously apply the postselection technique to optical quantum key distribution protocols. First, we place the postselection technique on a rigorous mathematical foundation by fixing a technical flaw in the original postselection paper. Second, we extend the applicability of the postselection technique to prepare-and-measure protocols by using a de Finetti reduction with a fixed marginal. Third, we show how the postselection technique can be used for decoy-state protocols by tagging the source. Finally, we extend the applicability of the postselection technique to realistic optical setups by developing a new variant of the flag-state squasher. We also improve existing de Finetti reductions, which reduce the effect of using the postselection technique on the key rate. These improvements can be more generally applied to other quantum information processing tasks. As an example to demonstrate the applicability of our work, we apply our results to the time-bin encoded three-state protocol. We observe that the postselection technique performs better than all other known proof techniques against coherent attacks.

I. INTRODUCTION

Proving the security of quantum key distribution (QKD) protocols against coherent attacks is a challenging task since the security proof must consider any arbitrary attack implemented by the adversary. Despite this challenge, there has been tremendous progress [1–4]. However, all known proof techniques have some drawbacks.

In particular, the phase-error rate [1] and entropic uncertainty relation (EUR) [5] based approaches cannot be used for practical detection setups with basis-dependent losses, and the entropy accumulation theorem [3] and existing postselection techniques [6] are not directly applicable to prepare-and-measure (PM) protocols. Moreover, the postselection technique also gives pessimistic bounds on the key rate. More recently, a generalised entropy accumulation theorem (GEAT) [4] was developed that applies to PM protocols and has been shown to perform well for qubit protocols. However, it currently requires a condition that Eve’s optimal attack satisfies a particular sequential property, and if that condition is enforced via limiting the repetition rate of the protocol [7, 8], the resulting key rates for fiber-based protocols are low.

In this work, we improve upon the postselection technique in several ways. First, we extend the applicability of the postselection technique to PM protocols, through the use of a de Finetti reduction with fixed marginal on Alice’s subsystem [9, Corollary 3.2]. Second, we improve on this de Finetti reduction both generically, and in the presence of block-diagonal structure and other symmetries. This in turn leads to improvements in the key rates obtained via the postselection technique. Third, we put the use of the postselection technique on a rigorous mathematical footing, by fixing a technical flaw in Ref. [6]. We also explain its application to variable-length protocols. Fourth, we develop new proof techniques to use the postselection technique for practical optical protocols. Lastly, we describe the application of the postselection technique to decoy-state QKD protocols. Thus, this work makes several important steps towards the application of the postselection technique to practical QKD protocols.

This paper is organized as follows. In Section II we state the improvements to the de Finetti reduction with fixed marginal. In Section III we rigorously apply the de Finetti reductions to lift the security of QKD protocols against IID attacks to that against arbitrary attacks through Corollary 3.1 and Corollary 3.2. In Section IV, we explain the usage of the postselection technique for optical protocols by constructing a new version of the flag-state squasher, and discussing the usage of the postselection technique with decoy-state analysis. Many proofs are delegated to the appendices. Finally, in Section V we apply our results to the time-bin encoded three-state protocol.

Symbol	What it represents
$[k]$	The set $\{1, 2, \dots, k\}$
A, B, \dots	Registers as well as Hilbert spaces (depending on context)
d_A, d_B, \dots	dimensions of spaces A, B, \dots
$L(A)$	Set of linear operators acting on A
$\text{Pos}(A)$	Set of positive operators acting on A
$S_o(A)$	Subset of positive operators acting on A with trace 1
$T(A, B)$	Set of linear maps from $L(A)$ to $L(B)$
$\mathcal{C}(A, B)$	Set of completely positive trace-preserving maps from $L(A)$ to $L(B)$
$\mathcal{B}(A)$	Set of bounded operators on A
$ \rho\rangle$	Purification of a positive semidefinite matrix ρ
$\text{Sym}^n(\mathbb{C}^x)$	Symmetric subspace of $(\mathbb{C}^x)^n$
$g_{n,x}$	$\dim(\text{Sym}^n(\mathbb{C}^x))$
$\lambda_{\min}(H)$	Minimum eigenvalue of H

TABLE I. Common symbols used in this work

II. IMPROVING THE DE FINETTI REDUCTION

Quantum de Finetti theorems [6, 9–11] are useful in reducing the analysis of various quantum information processing tasks to the IID case. In this work, we focus on quantum de Finetti reductions of following form used in Refs. [6, 9, 11]:

$$\rho_{A^n B^n} \leq g_{n,x} \tau_{A^n B^n}, \quad (1)$$

where $\tau_{A^n B^n} = \int \sigma_{AB}^{\otimes n} d\sigma_{AB}$ is a normalised density matrix, and $g_{n,x} = \dim(\text{Sym}^n(\mathbb{C}^x)) = \binom{n+x-1}{n}$. (Refer to Section VD for an easily computable upper bound on the dimension of the symmetric subspace.) We refer to a state

of the form $\tau_{A^n B^n} = \int \sigma_{AB}^{\otimes n} d\sigma_{AB}$ as a “de Finetti state”. Typically, in reducing the analysis of quantum information processing tasks to the IID case, the following factors come into play:

1. The value of $g_{n,x}$: This should be as small as possible, as it appears as a penalty in the reduction to IID states.
2. The integral over IID states in $\tau_{A^n B^n}$: This should be such that the integral is only over states for which the task has been “analyzed”, e.g. in the sense that some security property has been proven for all such IID states.

In this section we make several improvements to the value of $g_{n,x}$. These improvements are of two types. We first improve the dimensional scaling ($g_{n,x}$) in Lemma 3.1 of Ref. [9] for generic states. Second, we also show that the dimensions can be reduced for states that are invariant under certain symmetries, as an extension of Ref. [11] to the quantum case. Proofs of most statements in this section are deferred to Appendix A.

A. Generic improvement

Theorem 1 (de Finetti reduction with fixed marginal). Let $\hat{\sigma}_A \in \text{Pos}(\mathbb{C}^{d_A})$ and let $\rho_{A^n R^n}$ be any purification of $(\hat{\sigma}_A)^{\otimes n}$ supported on the symmetric subspace $\text{Sym}^n(\mathbb{C}^{d_A d_R})$. Then there exists a probability measure $d\phi$ on the set of purifications $|\phi\rangle\langle\phi|_{AR}$ of $\hat{\sigma}_A$, such that

$$\rho_{A^n R^n} \leq g_{n,d_A d_R} \int |\phi\rangle\langle\phi|_{AR}^{\otimes n} d\phi. \quad (2)$$

The proof is given in Appendix A.

Note that crucially, Theorem 1 differs from Lemma 3.1 in Ref. [9] in the prefactor $g_{n,x}$, where they had $x = \max[d_A^2, d_R^2]$ instead of $x = d_A d_R$. This leads to a corresponding improvement in the resulting corollary for mixed states. Before stating this corollary, we need to define permutation-invariance of matrices.

Definition 1 (Permutation-invariance of matrices). Given a matrix $\rho_{A^n B^n} \in \text{L}((\mathbb{C}^{d_A d_B})^{\otimes n})$ and a permutation $\pi \in S_n$ of its subsystems, we denote the action of π on $\rho_{A^n B^n}$ as $P_\pi^{d_A d_B, n} \rho_{A^n B^n} P_\pi^{d_A d_B, n \dagger}$ where $P_\pi^{d_A d_B, n}$ is the standard representation of π on $(\mathbb{C}^{d_A d_B})^{\otimes n}$. We say that a matrix is *permutation-invariant* if it is invariant under the action of all permutations $\pi \in S_n$.

Corollary 1.1. Let $\hat{\sigma}_A \in \text{Pos}(\mathbb{C}^{d_A})$ and $\rho_{A^n B^n}$ be any permutation-invariant extension of $(\hat{\sigma}_A)^{\otimes n}$. Then there exists a probability measure $d\sigma_{AB}$ on the set of non-negative extensions σ_{AB} of $\hat{\sigma}_A$, such that

$$\rho_{A^n B^n} \leq g_{n,x} \int \sigma_{AB}^{\otimes n} d\sigma_{AB} \quad (3)$$

holds for $x = d_A^2 d_B^2$.

Proof. We can use Lemma 4.2.2 from Ref. [10] to construct a purification $\rho_{A^n B^n E^n} \in \text{Sym}^n(\mathbb{C}^{d_A d_B} \otimes \mathbb{C}^{d_A d_B})$ of $\rho_{A^n B^n}$. From Theorem 1, it follows that

$$\rho_{A^n B^n E^n} \leq g_{n,d_A^2 d_B^2} \int |\phi\rangle\langle\phi|_{ABE}^{\otimes n} d\phi,$$

where $d\phi$ is a probability measure over purifications of $\hat{\sigma}_A$. Taking the partial trace over E^n on both sides completes the proof. \square

Note that the dramatic improvement over Corollary 3.2 from Ref. [9] ($x = d_A^2 d_B^4$ to $x = d_A^2 d_B^2$) is a direct result of Theorem 1. Additionally, with this improvement we obtain the earlier de Finetti reduction without a fixed marginal [6, Lemma 2] by considering A to be a trivial system, thus unifying both results. For pedagogical reasons, while applying de Finetti reductions to QKD in Section III we will primarily be using the de Finetti reduction with fixed marginal (Corollary 1.1), and not the improvements presented in Section II B. Thus, the remainder of this section can be skipped without affecting the understanding of Section III, though the following results we present are useful for improving finite-size bounds for practical key rate computations.

B. Improvements with symmetries

In this work, we will use the term ‘‘symmetries’’ as a broad term to refer to both block-diagonal structure and invariance under some groups. This is due to the following connection between block-diagonal structure and group invariance. Consider the group $\bigoplus_{i=1}^k \mathcal{U}(1)$ and the representation $\phi : \bigoplus_{i=1}^k \mathcal{U}(1) \rightarrow \mathcal{U}(\bigoplus_{i=1}^k \mathbb{C}^{d_i})$ defined as $\phi(u_1, \dots, u_k) \mapsto \bigoplus_{i=1}^k \bigoplus_{j=1}^{d_i} u_i$. Note that this representation has k irreps of dimensions $\{d_i\}_{i=1}^k$ each. A state being invariant under the action of this representation is equivalent to saying that the state is block-diagonal with k blocks of dimensions $\{d_i\}_{i=1}^k$ each. Hence, we can view block-diagonal structure as essentially corresponding to invariance with respect to some group representation.

The use of de Finetti-like reductions for symmetries was previously mentioned in [6, footnote 17], and with more details given in Refs. [12, 13]. We extend this analysis to the de Finetti reduction with fixed marginal, and also show that the reduction in the case of ‘‘IID-symmetries’’ can be combined with the reduction in the case of permutational symmetry. A similar analysis to combine permutational symmetry with ‘‘IID-symmetries’’ for the de Finetti reduction without a fixed marginal was recently performed by Ref. [14] independently of our work. Importantly, they also obtain a better cost $g_{n,x}$.

Our improvements to Corollary 1.1 in the presence of symmetries are based on observing that the proof in Section II A had the following structure:

1. Given a permutation-invariant state with a fixed marginal $\hat{\sigma}_A^{\otimes n}$, Lemma 4.2.2 from Ref. [10] is used to obtain a purification in the corresponding symmetric subspace.
2. This purification can then be related to a convex mixture of IID states with the same marginal $\hat{\sigma}_A$, via Theorem 1.
3. Tracing out the purifying system gives the de Finetti reduction for mixed states as shown in Corollary 1.1.

We show that in the presence of symmetries, steps 1 and 2 can be improved. With this, we prove a generalised version of Theorem 1 that results in better bounds in the presence of symmetries.

Theorem 2 (de Finetti reduction with symmetries and fixed marginal). Let $\hat{\sigma}_A \in \text{Pos}(\mathbb{C}^{d_A})$, and let $\rho_{A^n R^n}$ be any purification of $(\hat{\sigma}_A)^{\otimes n}$ supported on the symmetric subspace $\text{Sym}^n\left(\bigoplus_{i=1}^k \mathbb{C}^{d_i^A} \otimes \mathbb{C}^{d_i^R}\right)$ where $\bigoplus_{i=1}^k \mathbb{C}^{d_i^A} \subseteq \mathbb{C}^{d_A}$ and $\bigoplus_{i=1}^k \mathbb{C}^{d_i^R} \subseteq \mathbb{C}^{d_R}$. Then there exists a probability measure $d\phi$ on the set of purifications $|\phi\rangle_{AR} \in \bigoplus_{i=1}^k \mathbb{C}^{d_i^A} \otimes \mathbb{C}^{d_i^R}$ of $\hat{\sigma}_A$ such that

$$\rho_{A^n R^n} \leq g_{n,x} \int |\phi\rangle\langle\phi|_{AR}^{\otimes n} d\phi, \quad (4)$$

where $x = \sum_{i=1}^k d_i^A d_i^R$.

The proof is given in Appendix A.

We note that in the case where $k = 1$, $d_1^A = d_A$ and $d_1^R = d_R$ we recover Theorem 1. More generally, $\sum_{i=1}^k d_i^A d_i^R \leq d_A d_R$ leading to a reduced cost $g_{n,x}$. Block-diagonal symmetries are an important special case of generic symmetries that are often seen in optical implementations of quantum information protocols. Thus, we next describe the usage of Theorem 2 for the case where the state has some block-diagonal symmetry before considering more general symmetries.

1. Improvement for IID-block-diagonal states

Definition 2 (IID-block-diagonal states). Given a matrix $\rho_{A^n B^n} \in \text{L}((\mathbb{C}^{d_A d_B})^{\otimes n})$, and a set of orthogonal projections $\{\Pi_i\}_{i=1}^k \subset \text{L}(\mathbb{C}^{d_A d_B})$, we say that the matrix is *IID-block-diagonal* if

$$\rho_{A^n B^n} = \sum_{\vec{j} \in [k]^n} \Pi_{\vec{j}} \rho_{A^n B^n} \Pi_{\vec{j}}$$

where $\Pi_{\vec{j}} := \Pi_{j_1} \otimes \dots \otimes \Pi_{j_n}$. We denote the rank of projector Π_i as d_i ; it corresponds to the dimension of the i^{th} block.

Just as Lemma 4.2.2 from Ref. [10] was crucial in the proof of Corollary 1.1, the heart of the improvement that uses block-diagonal structure is the following lemma.

Lemma 1. Let $\rho_{A^n B^n} \in \text{Pos} \left((\mathbb{C}^{d_A d_B})^{\otimes n} \right)$ be a permutation-invariant and IID-block-diagonal matrix with respect to projections $\{\Pi_i\}_{i=1}^k$ of dimension $\{d_i\}_{i=1}^k$. Then there exists a purification of $\rho_{A^n B^n}$ supported on $\text{Sym}^n \left(\bigoplus_{i=1}^k \mathbb{C}^{d_i} \otimes \mathbb{C}^{d_i} \right)$.

The proof is given in Appendix A.

Remark 1. An important special case of Lemma 1 is when $\rho_{A^n B^n}$ is IID-block-diagonal with respect to projections $\{\Pi_i^A \otimes \Pi_j^B\}_{i,j=1}^{k_A, k_B}$ of dimension $\{d_i^A d_j^B\}_{i,j=1}^{k_A, k_B}$ where d_i^A and d_j^B are the ranks of $\Pi_i^A \in L(\mathbb{C}^{d_A})$ and $\Pi_j^B \in L(\mathbb{C}^{d_B})$ respectively. In that case, there exists a purification of $\rho_{A^n B^n}$ on $\text{Sym}^n \left(\bigoplus_{i,j=1}^{k_A, k_B} \mathbb{C}^{d_i^A} \otimes \mathbb{C}^{d_j^B} \otimes \mathbb{C}^{d_i^A} \otimes \mathbb{C}^{d_j^B} \right) = \text{Sym}^n \left(\bigoplus_{i=1}^{k_A} \mathbb{C}^{d_i^A} \otimes \mathbb{C}^{d_i^A} \sum_{j=1}^{k_B} d_j^{B^2} \right)$.

Note that this purification of $\rho_{A^n B^n}$ now belongs to $\text{Sym}^n \left(\bigoplus_{i=1}^{k_A} \mathbb{C}^{d_i^A} \otimes \mathbb{C}^{d_i^A} \sum_{j=1}^{k_B} d_j^{B^2} \right)$ instead of $\text{Sym}^n(\mathbb{C}^{d_A d_B})$ in Theorem 1. We thus obtain an improved version of Corollary 1.1.

Corollary 2.1. Let $\hat{\sigma}_A \in \text{Pos}(\mathbb{C}^{d_A})$ and $\rho_{A^n B^n}$ be any permutation-invariant and IID-block-diagonal extension of $(\hat{\sigma}_A)^{\otimes n}$ with respect to projections $\{\Pi_i^A \otimes \Pi_j^B\}_{i,j=1}^{k_A, k_B}$ of dimension $\{d_i^A d_j^B\}_{i,j=1}^{k_A, k_B}$, where d_i^A and d_j^B are the ranks of $\Pi_i^A \in L(\mathbb{C}^{d_A})$ and $\Pi_j^B \in L(\mathbb{C}^{d_B})$ respectively. Then there exists some probability measure $d\sigma_{AB}$ over the set of block-diagonal extensions σ_{AB} of $\hat{\sigma}_A$ such that

$$\rho_{A^n B^n} \leq g_{n,x} \int \sigma_{AB}^{\otimes n} d\sigma_{AB}, \quad (5)$$

where $x = \sum_{i,j=1}^{k_A, k_B} d_i^{A^2} d_j^{B^2}$.

Proof. The proof of this theorem is similar to the proof of Corollary 1.1, replacing the use of Lemma 4.2.2 from Ref. [10] with Lemma 1 and Theorem 1 with Theorem 2. \square

Although the IID-block-diagonal condition might seem restrictive, we show in Section IV that optical implementations often naturally result in such IID-block-diagonal structure. Thus, this would greatly tighten the analysis of optical implementations of quantum information protocols.

2. Improvement for IID symmetries

Definition 3 (IID-group-invariant). Let G be a group, and let $\{U_g\}_{g \in G}$ be a unitary representations of G on $\mathbb{C}^{d_A} \otimes \mathbb{C}^{d_B}$. We say a matrix $\rho_{A^n B^n} \in L((\mathbb{C}^{d_A} \otimes \mathbb{C}^{d_B})^{\otimes n})$ is *IID-G-invariant* if

$$U_{\vec{g}} \rho U_{\vec{g}}^\dagger = \rho$$

for all $\vec{g} \in G^n$, where $U_{\vec{g}} := \bigotimes_{i=1}^n U_{g_i}$ for $\vec{g} = (g_1, \dots, g_n) \in G^n$.

Similar to the block-diagonal case, the following lemma gives the improvement in the presence of symmetries.

Lemma 2. Let G be a compact group and let $\{U_g\}_{g \in G}$ be a unitary representation of G on $\mathbb{C}^{d_A d_B}$ with k irreducible representations with multiplicity $\{m_i\}_{i=1}^k$. If $\rho_{A^n B^n} \in \text{Pos}((\mathbb{C}^{d_A d_B})^{\otimes n})$ is permutation invariant and IID-G-invariant, then there exists a purification of $\rho_{A^n B^n}$ on $\text{Sym}^n \left(\bigoplus_{i=1}^k \mathbb{C}^{m_i} \otimes \mathbb{C}^{m_i} \right)$.

The proof is given in Appendix A.

Remark 2. An important special case of Lemma 2 is when the group $G = G_A \times G_B$ is a product of compact groups. Let the unitary representations $\{U_{g_A}\}_{g_A \in G_A} \subset L(\mathbb{C}^{d_A})$ and $\{U_{g_B}\}_{g_B \in G_B} \subset L(\mathbb{C}^{d_B})$ with k_A, k_B irreducible representations with multiplicity $\{m_i^A\}_{i=1}^{k_A}$ and $\{m_i^B\}_{i=1}^{k_B}$ respectively. Then there exists a purification of $\rho_{A^n B^n}$ on $\text{Sym}^n \left(\bigoplus_{i,j=1}^{k_A, k_B} \mathbb{C}^{m_i^A} \otimes \mathbb{C}^{m_j^B} \otimes \mathbb{C}^{m_i^A} \otimes \mathbb{C}^{m_j^B} \right) = \text{Sym}^n \left(\bigoplus_i^{k_A} \mathbb{C}^{m_i^A} \otimes \mathbb{C}^{m_i^A} \sum_{j=1}^{k_B} m_j^{B^2} \right)$.

This can now be directly used to prove the de Finetti reduction for mixed states in the presence of symmetries.

Corollary 2.2. Let $\{U_{g_A}^A\}_{g_A \in G_A}$ ($\{U_{g_B}^B\}_{g_B \in G_B}$) be a unitary representation of G_A (G_B) on \mathbb{C}^{d_A} (\mathbb{C}^{d_B}) with k_A (k_B) irreducible representations with multiplicity $\{m_i^A\}_{i=1}^{k_A}$ ($\{m_j^B\}_{j=1}^{k_B}$). Let $G = G_A \times G_B$, $\hat{\sigma}_A \in \text{Pos}(\mathbb{C}^{d_A})$ and $\rho_{A^n B^n}$ be any permutation-invariant extension of $(\hat{\sigma}_A)^{\otimes n}$ that is IID- G -invariant. Then there exists some probability measure $d\sigma_{AB}$ over the set of G -invariant extensions σ_{AB} of $\hat{\sigma}_A$ such that

$$\rho_{A^n B^n} \leq g_{n,x} \int \sigma_{AB}^{\otimes n} d\sigma_{AB}, \quad (6)$$

where $x = \sum_{i,j=1}^{k_A, k_B} m_i^{A^2} m_j^{B^2}$.

Proof. The proof of this theorem is similar to the proof of Corollary 2.1, replacing the use of Lemma 1 with Lemma 2. \square

Of course, these improvements would also apply to the de Finetti reduction without the fixed marginal [6, Lemma 2] in the case when A is a trivial register. Moreover, these improvements drastically improve upon the previous de Finetti reduction with fixed marginal [9, Corollary 3.2], thereby increasing the key rates obtained via the postselection technique, as we show later in Section V. We now turn to the rigorous application of the de Finetti reduction with fixed marginal to QKD via the postselection technique.

III. CORRECT APPLICATION OF DE FINETTI REDUCTIONS TO QKD

In this section, we fill in a missing gap in Ref. [6], in the reduction of QKD security proofs from arbitrary attacks to IID collective attacks, first noticed in [12]. We also explain how the postselection technique can be applied to prepare-and-measure protocols. For pedagogical reasons, we will present our results for protocols satisfying a permutation-invariance property. For such protocols, we will use the generic de Finetti reduction mentioned in Corollary 1.1, without the additional improvements from IID-block-diagonal structure Corollary 2.1 and IID symmetries Corollary 2.2. Proofs of most statements in this section are deferred to Appendix B.

Given a de Finetti reduction $\rho_{A^n B^n} \leq g_{n,x} \tau_{A^n B^n}$, Ref. [6] reduced the security proof of QKD protocols for arbitrary states to that of IID states. This followed in two steps. The first step is a reduction from the security of arbitrary states to the security of the state $\tau_{A^n B^n}$. The second is a reduction from the security for $\tau_{A^n B^n}$ to that of IID states. The second step in their analysis is argued intuitively and is not on sound mathematical grounds. Here, we present a rigorous proof of this step. For the sake of completeness, we explain the first step as well.

Moreover, to use the results of Ref. [6] one requires an IID security proof against *arbitrary* IID states. This is typically not available for prepare-and-measure (PM) protocols, where the IID security proof considers Alice having a fixed marginal state. We address this issue by using the de Finetti reductions with fixed marginal [9] proved in Sec. II instead of the de Finetti reduction in Ref. [6].

A. Using de Finetti reductions for QKD

We first establish some notation for QKD protocols that produce a key of fixed length upon acceptance. Let $\mathcal{M}_{\text{QKD}}^{(l)} \in \mathcal{C}(A^n B^n, K_A K_B \tilde{C})$ be a QKD protocol map, that maps the input state $\rho_{A^n B^n}$ to the output state $\rho_{K_A K_B \tilde{C}}^{(l)}$. Here l denotes the length of the key produced in the key registers K_A, K_B if the protocol accepts, and \tilde{C} denotes the register storing all classical announcements. If the protocol aborts, the key registers K_A, K_B contain the special symbol \perp . Let $\mathcal{E}_{\text{QKD}}^{(l)} = \text{Tr}_{K_B} \circ \mathcal{M}_{\text{QKD}}^{(l)}$ denote the same map but with Bob's key omitted from the output.

The ideal QKD protocol $\mathcal{M}_{\text{QKD}}^{(l), \text{ideal}} \in \mathcal{C}(A^n B^n, K_A K_B \tilde{C})$ is one which implements the actual QKD protocol $\mathcal{M}_{\text{QKD}}^{(l)}$, and then replaces Alice and Bob's key registers with the perfect key of length of l if the protocol accepts (and aborts if the protocol aborts). Similarly, let $\mathcal{E}_{\text{QKD}}^{(l), \text{ideal}} = \text{Tr}_{K_B} \circ \mathcal{M}_{\text{QKD}}^{(l), \text{ideal}}$ denote the same map but with Bob's key omitted from the output. The overall security of a QKD protocol can be described in terms of the maps $\mathcal{M}_{\text{QKD}}^{(l)}$ and $\mathcal{M}_{\text{QKD}}^{(l), \text{ideal}}$, as discussed in Ref. [15]; however, as shown in that work, one can break down the security definition into simpler conditions referred to as correctness and secrecy. Correctness is fairly straightforward to prove even in the non-IID case, hence in this work we focus only on secrecy, which can be defined using only the maps $\mathcal{E}_{\text{QKD}}^{(l)}$ and $\mathcal{E}_{\text{QKD}}^{(l), \text{ideal}}$, as follows:

Definition 4 (ε_{sec} -secret PMQKD protocol with fixed marginal $\hat{\sigma}_A$). A PMQKD protocol $\mathcal{E}_{\text{QKD}}^{(l)} \in \mathcal{C}(A^n B^n, K_A \tilde{C})$ is ε_{sec} -secret with fixed marginal $\hat{\sigma}_A$ if

$$\frac{1}{2} \left\| \left(\left(\mathcal{E}_{\text{QKD}}^{(l)} - \mathcal{E}_{\text{QKD}}^{(l), \text{ideal}} \right) \otimes \text{id}_{E^n} \right) \rho_{A^n B^n E^n} \right\|_1 \leq \varepsilon_{\text{sec}}, \quad (7)$$

$$\forall \rho_{A^n B^n E^n} \text{ such that } \text{Tr}_{B^n E^n} (\rho_{A^n B^n E^n}) = (\hat{\sigma}_A)^{\otimes n},$$

Since the fixed marginal $\hat{\sigma}_A$ can be constructed from the description of a PMQKD protocol (see Section IV A), we will refer to the above definition as ε_{sec} -secrecy of a PMQKD protocol. Having defined what we mean by secrecy of a QKD protocol, following Ref. [6] we justify the use of de Finetti reductions for QKD protocols through the following general statements.

We now define what it means for a map to be permutation-invariant. Note that in this definition we also correct a technical error in Ref. [6] regarding the order in which the maps are applied.

Definition 5 (Permutation-invariance of maps). A linear map $\Delta \in \mathcal{T}(A^n, B)$ is *permutation-invariant*, if for every $\pi \in S_n$, there exists a $G_\pi \in \mathcal{C}(B, B)$ such that

$$G_\pi \circ \Delta \circ \mathcal{W}_\pi = \Delta \quad (8)$$

where $\mathcal{W}_\pi(\cdot) = P_\pi^{d_A, n}(\cdot) P_\pi^{d_A, n \dagger}$.

Arguably, the above property might be better described as ‘‘covariance’’ rather than ‘‘invariance’’, since for instance it does not require that the map is literally ‘‘invariant’’ in the sense $\Delta \circ \mathcal{W}_\pi = \Delta$. However, for this work we shall follow the existing terminology in the field. Note that if some channel $\mathcal{F} \in \mathcal{C}(A^n, B)$ begins by first applying a uniformly random permutation to its input registers, and its output registers include some classical register storing the choice of permutation, then it is a permutation-invariant map according to the above definition, despite not necessarily satisfying $\mathcal{F} \circ \mathcal{W}_\pi = \mathcal{F}$. Furthermore, there exists a relatively simple procedure to implement such a random permutation using approximately $n \log(n)$ uniform random bits. (To clarify further: in the context of QKD, this choice of random permutation can be publicly announced and hence these $n \log(n)$ bits can be generated locally by one party and publicly announced; they do not involve a consumption of pre-shared key.) We discuss the details in Appendix B.

We proceed in a manner similar to Ref. [6], and prove the following lemma that can be used to relate ε_{sec} -secrecy of arbitrary states to the ε_{sec} -secrecy of a state that is a purification of a de Finetti state.

Lemma 3. Let $\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{F}' \in \mathcal{T}(A^n B^n, K)$ be such that $\mathcal{F} - \mathcal{F}'$ is a permutation-invariant map. Let $\rho_{A^n B^n R''} \in \text{Pos}(A^n B^n R'')$ with $\text{Tr}_{B^n R''}(\rho_{A^n B^n R''}) = (\hat{\sigma}_A)^{\otimes n}$. Then there exists a probability measure $d\sigma_{AB}$ on the set of extensions σ_{AB} of $\hat{\sigma}_A$ such that

$$\|((\mathcal{F} - \mathcal{F}') \otimes \text{id}_{R''})(\rho_{A^n B^n R''})\|_1 \leq g_{n,x} \|((\mathcal{F} - \mathcal{F}') \otimes \text{id}_R)(\tau_{A^n B^n R})\|_1, \quad (9)$$

where $\tau_{A^n B^n R}$ is any purification of $\tau_{A^n B^n} = \int d\sigma_{AB} \sigma_{AB}^{\otimes n}$, and $x = d_A^2 d_B^2$.

The proof is given in Appendix B.

The next step is to relate the security of $\tau_{A^n B^n R}$ to the IID security statements, which we do in the next section.

B. Reducing Security of QKD protocols to the IID case

Lemma 3 allows us to reduce the ε_{sec} -secrecy with fixed marginal of a QKD protocol for any arbitrary input state, to the ε_{sec} -secrecy of the protocol when the input state is a purification $\tau_{A^n B^n R}$ of a mixture of IID states $\tau_{A^n B^n}$ with the same fixed marginal. In this subsection, we will rigorously reduce the ε_{sec} -secrecy of a QKD protocol acting on $\tau_{A^n B^n R}$ to that of a QKD protocol against IID attacks. Note that several techniques for proving the ε_{sec} -secrecy of QKD protocols against IID attacks are known [10, 16]. We will now reduce the ε_{sec} -secrecy of a QKD protocol to one such widely-used IID security proof technique [16]. We first present the structure of such an IID security proof technique below.

1. Structure of IID security proof

First to set up some notation, let $S_{\hat{\sigma}} = \{\sigma_{ABE} \in \mathcal{S}_o(ABE) : \text{Tr}_{BE}(\sigma_{ABE}) = \hat{\sigma}_A\}$ be the set of all states that have a fixed marginal on Alice’s subsystem. These are the states for which security must hold. Suppose the protocol

is run with the input state $\sigma_{ABE}^{\otimes n}$. We use $\sigma_{Z^n C^n C_E E^n}$ to denote the state of Alice's raw key Z^n , round-by-round announcements C^n , error-correction and error-verification announcements C_E and Eve's quantum system E^n , just before the privacy amplification step. Moreover, we use $\sigma_{K_A \tilde{C} E^n}^{(l)}$ be the output of the protocol, where K_A is Alice's l -bit key register [17] and $\tilde{C} = C^n C_E C_P$ where C_P is the classical announcement of the two-universal hash function during privacy amplification.

The ε_{sec} -secrecy of QKD protocols against IID attacks is typically proven by showing that the following statements hold:

1. Choose $\varepsilon_{\text{AT}} \in [0, 1]$, and construct a set $S \subset S_{\hat{\sigma}}$ such that the set of states not in S but still in $S_{\hat{\sigma}}$ abort with probability at least $1 - \varepsilon_{\text{AT}}$, that is,

$$\sigma_{ABE} \in S_{\hat{\sigma}} \setminus S \implies \Pr(\Omega_{\text{acc}}) \leq \varepsilon_{\text{AT}}, \quad (10)$$

where Ω_{acc} denotes the event that the protocol does not abort.

2. The hash length l , $\varepsilon_{\text{PA}} \in [0, 1]$ and $\bar{\varepsilon} \in [0, 1]$ are chosen to be secure for all states in S [5], that is,

$$\frac{1}{2} \Pr(\Omega_{\text{acc}}) \left\| \sigma_{K_A \tilde{C} E^n | \Omega_{\text{acc}}}^{(l)} - \sigma_{K_A \tilde{C} E^n | \Omega_{\text{acc}}}^{(l), \text{ideal}} \right\|_1 \leq \frac{1}{2} 2^{-\frac{1}{2}} (H_{\min}^{\bar{\varepsilon}}(Z^n | C^n C_E E^n)_{\sigma \wedge \Omega_{\text{acc}}} - l) + 2\bar{\varepsilon} \leq \varepsilon_{\text{PA}} + 2\bar{\varepsilon}, \quad (11)$$

$$\forall \sigma \in S,$$

Note that Eqs. (10) and (11) together imply the ε_{sec} -secrecy statement with $\varepsilon_{\text{sec}} = \max\{\varepsilon_{\text{AT}}, \varepsilon_{\text{PA}} + 2\bar{\varepsilon}\}$

$$\frac{1}{2} \Pr(\Omega_{\text{acc}}) \left\| \sigma_{K_A \tilde{C} E^n | \Omega_{\text{acc}}}^{(l)} - \sigma_{K_A \tilde{C} E^n | \Omega_{\text{acc}}}^{(l), \text{ideal}} \right\|_1 \leq \varepsilon_{\text{sec}}, \quad \forall \sigma \in S_{\hat{\sigma}} \quad (12)$$

2. Final reduction

We can now state the final reduction to IID security proofs in the following theorem.

Theorem 3 (Postselection Theorem). Suppose $\mathcal{E}_{\text{QKD}}^{(l)} \in \mathcal{C}(A^n B^n, K_A \tilde{C})$ is such that Eqs. (10) and (11) are satisfied. Let the state $\tau_{A^n B^n}$ be given by

$$\tau_{A^n B^n} = \int \sigma_{AB}^{\otimes n} d\sigma_{AB}, \quad (13)$$

where $d\sigma_{AB}$ is some probability measure on the set of non-negative extensions σ_{AB} of $\hat{\sigma}_A$ and $\tau_{A^n B^n R}$ be a purification of $\tau_{A^n B^n}$. Let $\mathcal{E}_{\text{QKD}}^{(l')}$ be a QKD protocol map identical to $\mathcal{E}_{\text{QKD}}^{(l)}$, except that it hashes to a length $l' = l - 2 \log(g_{n,x})$ instead of l upon acceptance, and $x = d_A^2 d_B^2$. Then,

$$\frac{1}{2} \left\| \left(\left(\mathcal{E}_{\text{QKD}}^{(l')} - \mathcal{E}_{\text{QKD}}^{(l'), \text{ideal}} \right) \otimes \text{id}_R \right) (\tau_{A^n B^n R}) \right\|_1 \leq \varepsilon_{\text{PA}} + 2\bar{\varepsilon} + 2\sqrt{2\varepsilon_{\text{AT}}}. \quad (14)$$

The proof is given in Appendix B.

Through a series of lemmas and theorems, we have reduced the security proof of a QKD protocol against arbitrary attacks to the security proof of a similar QKD protocol against IID attacks. There are two costs to be paid for this lift. One is a cost paid to the ε_{sec} as stated in Lemma 3. The other is a cost paid to the hash length that can be chosen as stated in Theorem 3. We bring together the entire reduction formally in the following corollary.

Corollary 3.1. Suppose $\mathcal{E}_{\text{QKD}}^{(l)} \in \mathcal{C}(A^n B^n, K_A \tilde{C})$ is a QKD protocol map satisfying Eqs. (10) and (11), which produces a key of length l upon acceptance. Let $\mathcal{E}_{\text{QKD}}^{(l')}$ be a QKD protocol map identical to $\mathcal{E}_{\text{QKD}}^{(l)}$ except that it hashes to a length l' instead of l upon acceptance. Suppose $\mathcal{E}_{\text{QKD}}^{(l')} - \mathcal{E}_{\text{QKD}}^{(l'), \text{ideal}}$ is a permutation-invariant map for all l' . Then, $\mathcal{E}_{\text{QKD}}^{(l')}$ is $g_{n,x}(\varepsilon_{\text{PA}} + 2\bar{\varepsilon} + 2\sqrt{2\varepsilon_{\text{AT}}})$ -secret with fixed marginal $\hat{\sigma}_A$, for $l' = l - 2 \log(g_{n,x})$.

Proof. Since $\mathcal{E}_{\text{QKD}}^{(l')} - \mathcal{E}_{\text{QKD}}^{(l'),\text{ideal}}$ is permutation-invariant, Lemma 3 states that there exists a probability measure $d\sigma_{AB}$ on the set of extensions σ_{AB} of $\hat{\sigma}_A$ such that

$$\frac{1}{2} \left\| \left(\left(\mathcal{E}_{\text{QKD}}^{(l')} - \mathcal{E}_{\text{QKD}}^{(l'),\text{ideal}} \right) \otimes \text{id}_{E^n} \right) (\rho_{A^n B^n E^n}) \right\|_1 \leq \frac{1}{2} g_{n,x} \left\| \left(\left(\mathcal{E}_{\text{QKD}}^{(l')} - \mathcal{E}_{\text{QKD}}^{(l'),\text{ideal}} \right) \otimes \text{id}_R \right) (\tau_{A^n B^n R}) \right\|_1, \quad (15)$$

where $\tau_{A^n B^n R}$ is any purification of $\tau_{A^n B^n} = \int d\sigma_{AB} \sigma_{AB}^{\otimes n}$, and $x = d_A^2 d_B^2$. The claim then follows from Theorem 3. \square

Note that although all our proofs were stated for PMQKD protocols, they are also applicable to entanglement-based QKD protocols by choosing the fixed marginal to be trivial. This is an improvement on Ref. [6], whose results are only applicable for entanglement-based QKD protocols. Furthermore, we make rigorous a verbal argument made in Ref. [6] in Theorem 3. In doing so, we notice that the key secrecy parameter is worse than predicted by Ref. [6]. In particular, Ref. [6] obtains a secrecy parameter of $g_{n,x} \max\{\varepsilon_{\text{PA}} + 2\bar{\varepsilon}, \varepsilon_{\text{AT}}\}$ against arbitrary attacks, as compared to $g_{n,x} (\varepsilon_{\text{PA}} + 2\bar{\varepsilon} + 2\sqrt{2\varepsilon_{\text{AT}}})$ which we obtain. Finally, we highlight that our proof also covers protocols using two-way communication in error correction, as long as the C_E register includes all public communication that takes place in this process, and Z^n is replaced with a register \check{Z} that represents the string Alice uses as the input to the privacy amplification procedure.

In situations where the QKD protocol satisfies additional symmetries, one can repeat the previous analysis as shown below to obtain the corresponding statement in Corollary 3.2. We first define the notion of IID-group-invariance of maps, analogous to our definition of permutation-invariance of maps.

Definition 6 (IID-group-invariance of maps). Let H be a compact group with unitary representation W_h on A . A linear map $\Delta \in \mathcal{T}(A^n, B)$ is *IID- H -invariant*, if for every $\vec{h} \in H^n$, there exists a $G_{\vec{h}} \in \mathcal{C}(B, B)$ such that

$$G_{\vec{h}} \circ \Delta \circ \mathcal{W}_{\vec{h}} = \Delta \quad (16)$$

where $\mathcal{W}_{\vec{h}}(\cdot) = \bigotimes_{i=1}^n W_{h_i}(\cdot) \bigotimes_{i=1}^n W_{h_i}^\dagger$ for $\vec{h} \in (h_1, \dots, h_n) \in H^n$.

Corollary 3.2. Suppose $\mathcal{E}_{\text{QKD}}^{(l)} \in \mathcal{C}(A^n B^n, K_A \tilde{C})$ is a QKD protocol map satisfying Eqs. (10) and (11), which produces a key of length l upon acceptance. Let $\mathcal{E}_{\text{QKD}}^{(l')}$ be a QKD protocol map identical to $\mathcal{E}_{\text{QKD}}^{(l)}$ except that it hashes to a length l' instead of l upon acceptance. Suppose for all values of l' , $\mathcal{E}_{\text{QKD}}^{(l')} - \mathcal{E}_{\text{QKD}}^{(l'),\text{ideal}}$ is a permutation-invariant and IID- G -invariant map for a compact group $G = G_A \times G_B$, where the unitary representation $G_A(G_B)$ has $k_A(k_B)$ irreducible representations with multiplicities $\{m_i^A\}_{i=1}^{k_A}$ ($\{m_i^B\}_{i=1}^{k_B}$). Then $\mathcal{E}_{\text{QKD}}^{(l')}$ is $g_{n,x} (\varepsilon_{\text{PA}} + 2\bar{\varepsilon} + 2\sqrt{2\varepsilon_{\text{AT}}})$ -secret with fixed marginal $\hat{\sigma}_A$, for $l' = l - 2 \log(g_{n,x})$, where $x = \sum_{i,j=1}^{k_A, k_B} (m_i^A)^2 (m_j^B)^2$.

For brevity, we do not formally prove Corollary 3.2. The proof is a simple modification of the steps presented in this work. We use Lemma 12 with permutation-invariance and IID- G -invariance of the maps $\mathcal{E}_{\text{QKD}}^{(l)}$ to restrict our analysis to states which are permutation-invariant and IID- G -invariant. For such states, we use the de Finetti reduction from Corollary 2.2 and restate Theorem 3 with the improved de Finetti reduction. This gives the corresponding improvement in Corollary 3.2.

A special case of Corollary 3.2, is when the QKD protocol is IID-block-diagonal.

Definition 7 (IID-block-diagonal maps). Let $\{\Pi_i\}_{i=1}^k$ be a set of orthogonal projectors on A . A linear map $\Delta \in \mathcal{T}(A^n, B)$ is *IID-block-diagonal*, if

$$\sum_{\vec{i} \in [k]^n} \Delta \circ \mathcal{P}_{\vec{i}} = \Delta \quad (17)$$

where $\mathcal{P}_{\vec{i}}(\cdot) = \bigotimes_{j=1}^n \Pi_{i_j}(\cdot) \bigotimes_{j=1}^n \Pi_{i_j}$.

Corollary 3.3. Suppose $\mathcal{E}_{\text{QKD}}^{(l)} \in \mathcal{C}(A^n B^n, K_A \tilde{C})$ is a QKD protocol map satisfying Eqs. (10) and (11), which produces a key of length l upon acceptance. Let $\mathcal{E}_{\text{QKD}}^{(l')}$ be a QKD protocol map identical to $\mathcal{E}_{\text{QKD}}^{(l)}$ except that it hashes to a length l' instead of l upon acceptance. Suppose for all values of l' , $\mathcal{E}_{\text{QKD}}^{(l')} - \mathcal{E}_{\text{QKD}}^{(l'),\text{ideal}}$ is a permutation-invariant and IID-block-diagonal map with respect to projections $\{\Pi_i^A \otimes \Pi_j^B\}_{i,j=1}^{k_A, k_B}$ of dimension $\{d_i^A d_j^B\}_{i,j=1}^{k_A, k_B}$. Then $\mathcal{E}_{\text{QKD}}^{(l')}$ is $g_{n,x} (\varepsilon_{\text{PA}} + 2\bar{\varepsilon} + 2\sqrt{2\varepsilon_{\text{AT}}})$ -secret with fixed marginal $\hat{\sigma}_A$, for $l' = l - 2 \log(g_{n,x})$, where $x = \sum_{i,j=1}^{k_A, k_B} (d_i^A)^2 (d_j^B)^2$.

The proof is given in Appendix B.

In the next section, we briefly explain the application of the postselection technique to variable-length QKD protocols.

C. Using Postselection technique for variable-length protocols

So far we have dealt with “fixed-length” protocols, which either abort (Ω_{acc}^c occurs) or produce a key of fixed-length l (Ω_{acc} occurs). In practice, one may wish to implement a variable-length protocol [15, 18, 19], where the length of the final key is not fixed and depends on events taking place during the run of the protocol. Such protocols are more practical, since they do not require prior characterization of the honest behavior of the channel, and can adapt the length of the final key produced based on observations made during the protocol. A new security proof of variable-length protocols against IID-collective attacks was recently shown in Ref. [19]. In this section, we will apply the postselection technique to lift the security of variable-length protocols of this form to arbitrary attacks.

We first set up some notation. We let M denote the number of possible lengths of the output key. Thus K_A, K_B is now a classical register that stores bit strings up to some maximum length l_{max} . Analogous to the notation for fixed-length protocols, we use $\mathcal{E}_{\text{var-QKD}}^{(l_1, \dots, l_M)} \in \mathcal{C}(A^n B^n, K_A \tilde{C})$ to denote the protocol map (excluding Bob’s key) for variable-length protocols, which produces a key of length l_i in the register K_A upon the event Ω_i , and makes classical announcements in the register \tilde{C} . Aborting is modelled as the key registers K_A, K_B containing the special symbol \perp . The ideal protocol map $\mathcal{E}_{\text{var-QKD}}^{(l_1, \dots, l_M), \text{ideal}} \in \mathcal{C}(A^n B^n, K_A \tilde{C})$ first implements the real QKD protocol using $\mathcal{E}_{\text{var-QKD}}^{(l_1, \dots, l_M)}$, computes the length of the key produced (i.e. which event Ω_i occurred), and then replaces the key registers with the perfect keys of the same length (or aborts if the real QKD protocol aborts).

The ε_{sec} -secrecy definition for variable-length protocols is then given by

Definition 8 (ε_{sec} -secret variable-length PMQKD protocol with fixed marginal $\hat{\sigma}_A$). A variable-length PMQKD protocol $\mathcal{E}_{\text{var-QKD}}^{(l_1, \dots, l_M)} \in \mathcal{C}(A^n B^n, K_A \tilde{C})$ is ε_{sec} -secret with fixed marginal $\hat{\sigma}_A$ if

$$\frac{1}{2} \left\| \left(\left(\mathcal{E}_{\text{var-QKD}}^{(l_1, \dots, l_M)} - \mathcal{E}_{\text{var-QKD}}^{(l_1, \dots, l_M), \text{ideal}} \right) \otimes \text{id}_{E^n} \right) (\rho_{A^n B^n E^n}) \right\|_1 \leq \varepsilon_{\text{sec}}, \quad (18)$$

for all $\rho_{A^n B^n E^n}$ such that $\text{Tr}_{B^n E^n}(\rho_{A^n B^n E^n}) = (\hat{\sigma}_A)^{\otimes n}$.

The final reductions to IID security proofs for variable-length protocols is stated below as an analogous theorem to Theorem 3.

Theorem 4 (Postselection Theorem for Variable-length). Suppose $\mathcal{E}_{\text{var-QKD}}^{(l_1, \dots, l_M)} \in \mathcal{C}(A^n B^n, K_A \tilde{C})$ is such that the ε_{sec} -secrecy condition (Eq. (18)) holds for all IID states $\rho_{A^n B^n E^n} = \sigma_{ABE}^{\otimes n}$ satisfying $\text{Tr}_{BE}(\sigma_{ABE}) = \hat{\sigma}_A$. Let the state $\tau_{A^n B^n}$ be given by

$$\tau_{A^n B^n} = \int \sigma_{AB}^{\otimes n} d\sigma_{AB}, \quad (19)$$

where $d\sigma_{AB}$ is some probability measure on the set of non-negative extensions σ_{AB} of $\hat{\sigma}_A$ and $\tau_{A^n B^n R}$ be a purification of $\tau_{A^n B^n}$. Let $\mathcal{E}_{\text{var-QKD}}^{(l'_1, \dots, l'_M)}$ be a variable-length QKD protocol map identical to $\mathcal{E}_{\text{var-QKD}}^{(l_1, \dots, l_M)}$, except that it hashes to a length $l'_i = l_i - 2 \log(g_{n,x}) - 2 \log(1/\tilde{\varepsilon})$ instead of length l_i , upon the event Ω_i , where $x = d_A^2 d_B^2$. Then,

$$\frac{1}{2} \left\| \left(\left(\mathcal{E}_{\text{var-QKD}}^{(l'_1, \dots, l'_M)} - \mathcal{E}_{\text{var-QKD}}^{(l'_1, \dots, l'_M), \text{ideal}} \right) \otimes \text{id}_R \right) (\tau_{A^n B^n R}) \right\|_1 \leq \sqrt{8\varepsilon_{\text{sec}}} + \frac{\tilde{\varepsilon}}{2} \quad (20)$$

The proof is given in Appendix B.

Similar to Corollary 3.1, we then have the following corollary concerning the lift to coherent attacks for variable-length protocols.

Corollary 4.1. Suppose $\mathcal{E}_{\text{var-QKD}}^{(l_1, \dots, l_M)} \in \mathcal{C}(A^n B^n, K_A \tilde{C})$ is a map such that the ε_{sec} -secrecy condition (Eq. (18)) holds for all IID states $\rho_{A^n B^n E^n} = \sigma_{ABE}^{\otimes n}$ satisfying $\text{Tr}_{BE}(\sigma_{ABE}) = \hat{\sigma}_A$. Let $\mathcal{E}_{\text{var-QKD}}^{(l'_1, \dots, l'_M)}$ be a variable-length QKD protocol map identical to $\mathcal{E}_{\text{var-QKD}}^{(l_1, \dots, l_M)}$, except that it hashes to a length l'_i instead of l_i upon the event Ω_i . Suppose $\mathcal{E}_{\text{var-QKD}}^{(l'_1, \dots, l'_M)} - \mathcal{E}_{\text{var-QKD}}^{(l'_1, \dots, l'_M), \text{ideal}}$ is a permutation-invariant map for all l'_i . Then $\mathcal{E}_{\text{var-QKD}}^{(l'_1, \dots, l'_M)}$ is $g_{n,x}(\sqrt{8\varepsilon_{\text{sec}}} + \frac{\tilde{\varepsilon}}{2})$ -secret with fixed marginal $\hat{\sigma}_A$, for $l'_i = l_i - 2 \log(g_{n,x}) - 2 \log(1/\tilde{\varepsilon})$ and $x = d_A^2 d_B^2$.

Proof. Since $\mathcal{E}_{\text{var-QKD}}^{(l'_1, \dots, l'_M)} - \mathcal{E}_{\text{var-QKD}}^{(l'_1, \dots, l'_M), \text{ideal}}$ is permutation-invariant, Lemma 3 states that there exists a probability measure $d\sigma_{AB}$ on the set of extensions σ_{AB} of $\hat{\sigma}_A$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\| \left(\left(\mathcal{E}_{\text{var-QKD}}^{(l'_1, \dots, l'_M)} - \mathcal{E}_{\text{var-QKD}}^{(l'_1, \dots, l'_M), \text{ideal}} \right) \otimes \text{id}_{E^n} \right) (\rho_{A^n B^n E^n}) \right\|_1 \\ & \leq g_{n,x} \left\| \left(\left(\mathcal{E}_{\text{var-QKD}}^{(l'_1, \dots, l'_M)} - \mathcal{E}_{\text{var-QKD}}^{(l'_1, \dots, l'_M), \text{ideal}} \right) \otimes \text{id}_R \right) (\tau_{A^n B^n R}) \right\|_1, \end{aligned} \quad (21)$$

where $\tau_{A^n B^n R}$ is any purification of $\tau_{A^n B^n} = \int d\sigma_{AB} \sigma_{AB}^{\otimes n}$ and $x = d_A^2 d_B^2$. The claim then follows from Theorem 4. \square

Just as Corollary 3.1 could be modified to yield an improved Corollary 3.2 in presence of symmetries, one obtains the following Corollary 4.2

Corollary 4.2. Suppose $\mathcal{E}_{\text{var-QKD}}^{(l_1, \dots, l_M)} \in \mathcal{C}(A^n B^n, K_A \tilde{C})$ is a map such that the ε_{sec} -secrecy condition (Eq. (18)) holds for all IID states $\rho_{A^n B^n E^n} = \sigma_{ABE}^{\otimes n}$ satisfying $\text{Tr}_{BE}(\sigma_{ABE}) = \hat{\sigma}_A$. Let $\mathcal{E}_{\text{var-QKD}}^{(l'_1, \dots, l'_M)}$ be a variable-length QKD protocol map identical to $\mathcal{E}_{\text{var-QKD}}^{(l_1, \dots, l_M)}$, except that it hashes to a length l'_i instead of l_i upon the event Ω_i . Suppose $\mathcal{E}_{\text{var-QKD}}^{(l'_1, \dots, l'_M)} - \mathcal{E}_{\text{var-QKD}}^{(l'_1, \dots, l'_M), \text{ideal}}$ is a permutation-invariant map, and an IID- G -invariant for a compact group $G = G_A \times G_B$, where the unitary representation $G_A(G_B)$ has $k_A(k_B)$ irreducible representations with multiplicities $\{m_i^A\}_{i=1}^{k_A}$ ($\{m_i^B\}_{i=1}^{k_B}$). Then $\mathcal{E}_{\text{var-QKD}}^{(l'_1, \dots, l'_M)}$ is $g_{n,x}(\sqrt{8\varepsilon_{\text{sec}}} + \frac{\varepsilon}{2})$ -secret with fixed marginal $\hat{\sigma}_A$, with $l'_i = l_i - 2 \log(g_{n,x})$ and $x = \sum_{i,j=1}^{k_A, k_B} (m_i^A)^2 (m_j^B)^2$.

The proof of this corollary is similar to that of Corollary 3.2, replacing the use of Theorem 3 with Theorem 4. We also state a special case of Corollary 4.2.

Corollary 4.3. Suppose $\mathcal{E}_{\text{var-QKD}}^{(l_1, \dots, l_M)} \in \mathcal{C}(A^n B^n, K_A \tilde{C})$ is a map such that the ε_{sec} -secrecy condition (Eq. (18)) holds for all IID states $\rho_{A^n B^n E^n} = \sigma_{ABE}^{\otimes n}$ satisfying $\text{Tr}_{BE}(\sigma_{ABE}) = \hat{\sigma}_A$. Let $\mathcal{E}_{\text{var-QKD}}^{(l'_1, \dots, l'_M)}$ be a variable-length QKD protocol map identical to $\mathcal{E}_{\text{var-QKD}}^{(l_1, \dots, l_M)}$, except that it hashes to a length l'_i instead of l_i upon the event Ω_i . Suppose $\mathcal{E}_{\text{var-QKD}}^{(l'_1, \dots, l'_M)} - \mathcal{E}_{\text{var-QKD}}^{(l'_1, \dots, l'_M), \text{ideal}}$ is a permutation-invariant map, and an IID-block-diagonal map with respect to projections $\{\Pi_i^A \otimes \Pi_j^B\}_{i,j=1}^{k_A, k_B}$ of dimension $\{d_i^A d_j^B\}_{i,j=1}^{k_A, k_B}$. Then $\mathcal{E}_{\text{var-QKD}}^{(l'_1, \dots, l'_M)}$ is $g_{n,x}(\sqrt{8\varepsilon_{\text{sec}}} + \frac{\varepsilon}{2})$ -secret with fixed marginal $\hat{\sigma}_A$, with $l'_i = l_i - 2 \log(g_{n,x})$ and $x = \sum_{i,j=1}^{k_A, k_B} (d_i^A)^2 (d_j^B)^2$.

Note that unlike Corollaries 3.1 to 3.3, the above Corollaries 4.1 to 4.3 do not have any restrictions on the IID security proofs they lift to coherent attacks. Therefore, they are applicable more generally. Furthermore, a fixed-length protocol is a special case of a variable-length protocols where the number of possible output key lengths (M) is 1. Thus, Corollaries 4.1 to 4.3 can be applied to arbitrary *fixed-length* IID proofs as well. However, the performance of the specialized Corollaries 3.1 to 3.3 is superior.

Having explained rigorously the application of the postselection technique to QKD protocols we now move on to consider its application to optical protocols.

IV. POSTSELECTION TECHNIQUE FOR OPTICAL PROTOCOLS

Decoy-state methods [20–22] are essential to perform QKD at large distances in the absence of single photon sources. However, the analysis is performed on infinite-dimensional optical states on both Alice and Bob's spaces. Thus, the postselection technique cannot be directly applied to it as the dimension enters the correction factor $g_{n,x}$. Here, we rigorously show the reductions necessary to apply the postselection technique to decoy-state protocols to finite dimensions through source maps [23, 24] and squashing maps [25, 26]. In doing so we also develop a new flag-state squasher [26], an essential tool to prove security for optical protocols that use realistic detector setups. We also describe the effect that this reduction plays on the IID decoy-state analysis. Proofs of most statements in this section are deferred to Appendix C.

A. Construction of fixed marginal for PMQKD

In Definition 4, we defined the ε_{sec} -secrecy of a QKD protocol with fixed marginal $\hat{\sigma}_A$. In this subsection, we describe the explicit construction of such a fixed marginal for any PMQKD protocol.

A PMQKD protocol where Alice prepares states ρ_i with probability $p(i)$ can be equivalently described by the state preparation

$$\rho_{AA'}^{\text{prep}} = \sum_{i=1}^{d_A} p(i) |i\rangle\langle i|_A \otimes \rho_i \quad (22)$$

where the A register represents the classical register where Alice notes the states ρ_i prepared and sent to Bob. Thus, the security definition for such a protocol can be given by the following.

Definition 9 (ε_{sec} -secret PMQKD protocol). A PMQKD protocol $\mathcal{E}_{\text{QKD}}^{(l)} \in \mathcal{C}(A^n B^n, K_A \tilde{C})$ is ε_{sec} -secret if

$$\frac{1}{2} \left\| \left(\left(\mathcal{E}_{\text{QKD}}^{(l)} - \mathcal{E}_{\text{QKD}}^{(l), \text{ideal}} \right) \otimes \text{id}_{E^n} \right) \left[\left(\text{id}_{A^n} \otimes \Phi \right) \left[\left(\rho_{AA'}^{\text{prep}} \right)^{\otimes n} \right] \right] \right\|_1 \leq \varepsilon_{\text{sec}} \quad (23)$$

for all channels $\Phi \in \mathcal{C}(A^n, B^n E^n)$.

Here, Φ can be understood to be Eve's attack on the states Alice sends to Bob. The IID security proof techniques described in subsection III B 1 often give non-trivial key lengths only when Alice prepares pure states. Thus, we use the source-replacement scheme [27–29] and a shield system [30] to construct a fixed marginal involving pure states.

Lemma 4 (Shield system). Let $\mathcal{E}_{\text{QKD}}^{(l)}$ be a PMQKD protocol with Alice's state preparation described by $\rho_{AA'}^{\text{prep}} = \sum_{i=1}^{d_A} p(i) |i\rangle\langle i|_A \otimes \rho_i$. Let $\mathcal{E}_{\text{QKD-shield}}^{(l)}$ be another PMQKD protocol identical to $\mathcal{E}_{\text{QKD}}^{(l)}$ except that Alice's state preparation is given by

$$\rho_{AA_S A'}^{\text{prep}} = \sum_{i=1}^{d_A} p(i) |i\rangle\langle i|_A \otimes |\rho_i\rangle\langle \rho_i|_{A_S A'}, \quad (24)$$

where A_S (termed the *shield system*) is not sent to Bob and is acted on trivially by Alice. Here, $|\rho_i\rangle$ is related to the signal states Alice prepares $\rho_i = \text{Tr}_{A_S} [|\rho_i\rangle\langle \rho_i|]$. If the PMQKD protocol $\mathcal{E}_{\text{QKD-shield}}^{(l)}$ is ε_{sec} -secret, then the PMQKD protocol $\mathcal{E}_{\text{QKD}}^{(l)}$ is ε_{sec} -secret.

The proof is given in Appendix C.

Note that the purified states $|\rho_i\rangle$ can be chosen to be *any* purification of the signal states ρ_i . Thus, the dimension of the shield system d_{A_S} is the largest rank of the signal states.

Lemma 5 (Source-replacement scheme). Let $\mathcal{E}_{\text{QKD}}^{(l)}$ be a PMQKD protocol where Alice's state preparation is given by $\rho_{AA_S A'}^{\text{prep}} = \sum_{i=1}^{d_A} p(i) |i\rangle\langle i|_A \otimes |\rho_i\rangle\langle \rho_i|_{A_S A'}$. Let $\mathcal{E}_{\text{QKD-S}}^{(l)}$ be another PMQKD protocol identical to $\mathcal{E}_{\text{QKD}}^{(l)}$ except Alice's state preparation is given by

$$\rho_{AA_S A'} = \sum_{i,j=1}^{d_A} \sqrt{p(i)p(j)} |i\rangle\langle j|_A \otimes |\rho_i\rangle\langle \rho_j|_{A_S A'}, \quad (25)$$

and Alice's register A is measured in the computational basis at the start of the protocol. If the PMQKD protocol $\mathcal{E}_{\text{QKD-S}}^{(l)}$ is ε_{sec} -secret, then $\mathcal{E}_{\text{QKD}}^{(l)}$ is an ε_{sec} -secret PMQKD protocol.

The proof is given in Appendix C.

The fixed marginal used in Definition 4 can thus be constructed as $\hat{\sigma}_{AA_S} = \text{Tr}_{A'} [\rho_{AA_S A'}]$ where $\rho_{AA_S A'}$ is obtained from the source-replacement scheme. This represents the fact that Eve's channel acts only on the A' register sent to Bob leaving A and A_S unchanged. Thus, with this fixed marginal, the output of Eve's channel can be replaced with an arbitrary state $\rho_{A^n A_S^n B^n E^n}$ shared by Alice, Bob and Eve with marginal $\hat{\sigma}_{AA_S}^{\otimes n}$ on Alice's marginal state.

The usage of Corollary 3.1 to lift a security proof that assumes that Eve's attack Φ is IID to a security proof against general attacks requires the Hilbert spaces A_S and B to be finite-dimensional. However, for typical optical systems, Bob's detectors are typically infinite-dimensional. Additionally, for many protocols (such as decoy-state QKD protocols), the shield system A_S is not finite-dimensional. We describe tools to address this in Section IV B and Section IV C respectively.

B. Squashing maps

A squashing model is a framework that allows a description of measurements in Hilbert spaces that is smaller than their natural representation. The original propositions [25, 26, 31, 32] prove the applicability of squashing models by showing that their usage lower bounds the key rate under the assumption of IID attacks. However, this alone is insufficient to apply the squashing model to make Bob's system finite-dimensional and apply the postselection technique. Thus, the following lemma describes a sufficient condition for the usage of the squashing map for the postselection technique.

Lemma 6 (Squashing). Let $\mathcal{E}_{\text{QKD}}^{(l)}$ be a QKD protocol where Bob's measurement is described by POVM $\{\Gamma_i\}_{i=1}^{n_{\text{meas}}} \subset \mathcal{B}(B)$. Let $\mathcal{E}_{\text{QKD-Sq}}^{(l)}$ be another QKD protocol identical to $\mathcal{E}_{\text{QKD}}^{(l)}$ except Bob's measurement is described by POVM $\{F_i\}_{i=1}^{n_{\text{meas}}} \subset \mathcal{B}(Q)$. If there exists a channel $\Lambda \in \mathcal{C}(B, Q)$ such that $\Lambda^\dagger[F_i] = \Gamma_i$ for all i , then the ε_{sec} -secrecy of the PMQKD protocol $\mathcal{E}_{\text{QKD-Sq}}^{(l)}$ implies the ε_{sec} -secrecy of the PMQKD protocol $\mathcal{E}_{\text{QKD}}^{(l)}$.

The proof is given in Appendix C.

Note that not all squashing models use such a squashing map Λ . In particular, the universal squashing model [31] and the dimension reduction method [32] do not proceed through proving the existence of such a map, and thus they cannot be used with the postselection technique via Lemma 6 [33].

The various multiphoton-to-qubit squashing maps described in Ref. [25] only exist under a very restrictive set of parameter regimes for the QKD protocols which are not robust to device imperfections. Thus, for the remainder of this manuscript, we turn our attention to the flag-state squasher [26] which exists for every QKD protocol that uses threshold detectors.

1. Flag-state squasher

The flag-state squasher exists whenever the POVM elements have a block-diagonal structure

$$\Gamma_i = \Gamma_{i,m \leq N} \oplus \Gamma_{i,m > N}.$$

For threshold detectors, $m > N$ corresponds to the set of photon-numbers m greater than the cutoff N . The target measurements are given by

$$F_i = \Gamma_{i,m \leq N} \oplus |i\rangle\langle i|, \quad (26)$$

where $\{|i\rangle\}_{i=1}^{n_{\text{meas}}}$ forms an orthonormal set of vectors termed 'flags'. Theorem 1 from Ref. [26] guarantees the existence of a squashing map Λ for this case.

However, due to the existence of the flags, there exist classical states that live entirely in this subspace that cannot be excluded by acceptance testing on this finite-dimensional space. In other words, by itself, the flag-state squasher would result in a key length of 0. Thus, the usage of the flag-state squasher requires an additional constraint bounding the weight W in the flag space to be useful.

The canonical method of bounding the weight outside the preserved subspace can be found in Ref. [34, Section 3.4.2] and proceeds as follows. For any event e , and all input states it can be shown that

$$W \leq 1 - p(m \leq N) \leq \frac{p(e) - \lambda_{\min}(\Pi_N \Gamma_e \Pi_N)}{\lambda_{\min}(\overline{\Pi}_N \Gamma_e \overline{\Pi}_N) - \lambda_{\min}(\Pi_N \Gamma_e \Pi_N)}, \quad (27)$$

where Π_N ($\overline{\Pi}_N$) is the projection on (outside) the space corresponding to $\Gamma_{i,m \leq N}$. When working with the infinite-dimensional POVM, some protocol-dependent choices [24, 35] for the event lead to good bounds on the weight W . This bound can then be added in as an additional constraint to the finite-dimensional key rate optimisation.

Although this method works well when assuming that Eve performs an IID attack, the use of the postselection technique on the finite-dimensional protocol with the addition of a constraint is not straightforward. Note that attempting to use Eq. (27) directly with the finite-dimensional target POVM gives only trivial bounds as every event e has $\lambda_{\min}(\overline{\Pi}_N F_e \overline{\Pi}_N) = 0$. This motivates the construction of a modified version of the flag-state squasher - the "weight-preserving flag-state squasher" (WPFSS).

Lemma 7 (Weight-preserving flag-state squasher). Let $\{\Gamma_i\}_{i=1}^{n_{\text{meas}}}$ be a POVM where each element is block-diagonal, i.e. $\Gamma_i = \Gamma_{i,m \leq N} \oplus \Gamma_{i,m > N}$. Further, let $\{|i\rangle\}_{i=1}^{n_{\text{meas}}}$ be an orthonormal set of vectors for the flag space, and let

$0 \leq f_N \leq \lambda_{\min}(\overline{\Pi}_N \Gamma_1 \overline{\Pi}_N)$, where $\overline{\Pi}_N$ is the projection outside the space corresponding to $\Gamma_{i,m \leq N}$. Then, for the following choice of target measurements

$$F_i = \Gamma_{i,m \leq N} \oplus (1 - f_N) |i\rangle\langle i| \quad \forall 1 < i \leq n_{\text{meas}} \quad (28)$$

$$F_1 = \Gamma_{1,m \leq N} \oplus \left(|1\rangle\langle 1| + f_N \sum_{j=2}^{n_{\text{meas}}} |j\rangle\langle j| \right), \quad (29)$$

there exists a channel Λ such that $\Lambda^\dagger[F_i] = \Gamma_i$ for all i .

The proof is given in Appendix C.

The WPFSS is constructed so that the bounds obtained on the infinite-dimensional states from Eq. (27) can be directly added to the target POVM elements instead of adding it as an additional constraint. This is because the construction, which is independent of any observed quantity, ensures that $\lambda_{\min}(\overline{\Pi}_N F_1 \overline{\Pi}_N) = f_N$ is non-zero in contrast to the standard flag-state squasher. Thus, with this modification, the flag-state squasher can be used with Lemma 6 to squash Bob's system to finite dimensions.

Note that there is some choice in constructing the WPFSS.

1. The POVM element used to estimate the weight W in the flag-space (which we have denoted by Γ_1 in Lemma 7) can be freely chosen.
2. f_N can be chosen to be any lower bound on the minimum eigenvalue of the component of the POVM element in the flag-space $\lambda_{\min}(\overline{\Pi}_N F_1 \overline{\Pi}_N)$.

Thus, it is important to optimise the key length over these choices. The POVM element Γ_1 is typically [24, 26, 35] chosen based on the specificities of the protocol. We would generically expect the key rates from the WPFSS to improve as we get closer to a tight bound where f_N approaches $\lambda_{\min}(\overline{\Pi}_N F_1 \overline{\Pi}_N)$. This can be seen by using Eq. (27) to estimate the weight in the flag-space when using the WPFSS POVM element F_1 - the bound is a monotonically decreasing function of $\lambda_{\min}(\overline{\Pi}_N F_1 \overline{\Pi}_N) = f_N$.

We also show below that the WPFSS cannot give worse key rates against IID attacks than the standard flag-state squasher. As seen in Eqs. (28) and (29), the target POVM elements $\{F_i\}_{i=1}^{n_{\text{meas}}}$ for the WPFSS are block-diagonal. Thus, [26, Theorem 1] can be directly used on this setup to construct a squashing map with target POVM elements described in Eq. (26). Additionally, Eq. (27) can also be used to bound the weight inside the flag subspace. Thus, the above observation allows us to use the postselection technique to prove the security against coherent attacks for prior works [24, 26, 35] that use the standard flag-state squasher [36].

Next, we discuss the reduction of A_S to finite-dimensions.

C. Decoy-state lift

Decoy-state protocols [20–22] are often implemented with phase-randomised laser pulses ρ^μ with varying intensity μ ,

$$\rho^\mu = \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} p(m|\mu) |m\rangle\langle m|, \quad (30)$$

where $p(m|\mu)$ is a Poisson distribution with mean μ . Here, the signal information i is typically encoded in an orthogonal mode (for e.g.- polarisation, time-bin, etc.). For simplicity, we assume that this encoding is isometrically implemented resulting in states $\rho_i^\mu = V_i \rho^\mu V_i^\dagger$, where V_i is the encoding isometry.

As this state is full rank and lives in an infinite-dimensional Hilbert space, it would require an infinite-dimensional purifying system A_S . Thus, we aim to use source maps [24] to construct a convenient virtual protocol with finite-dimensional signal states which can be used with the postselection technique. Although this is a widely used technique, we present a proof here for completeness.

Lemma 8 (Source maps). Let $\{\rho_i^\mu\} \subset S_o(A'')$ be the set of states prepared by Alice in a PMQKD protocol. Suppose that there exists a *source map* $\Psi \in \mathcal{C}(A'', A')$ relating the real states $\{\rho_i^\mu\}$ to a set of virtual states $\{\xi_i^\mu\} \subset S_o(A')$ such that $\rho_i^\mu = \Psi[\xi_i^\mu]$ for all i, μ . Then ε_{sec} -secrecy for the virtual protocol with $\{\xi_i^\mu\}$ implies ε_{sec} -secrecy for the real protocol with $\{\rho_i^\mu\}$ instead.

The proof is given in Appendix C.

We can construct a virtual source, which emits tagged states [23] where the space with photon number greater than N_{ph} is tagged as follows,

$$\xi_i^\mu = \sum_{m=0}^{N_{\text{ph}}} p(m|\mu) V_i |m\rangle\langle m| V_i^\dagger + \left(1 - \sum_{m=0}^{N_{\text{ph}}} p(m|\mu)\right) |i, \mu\rangle\langle i, \mu|, \quad (31)$$

where $\{|i, \mu\rangle\}_{i, \mu}$ form an orthonormal basis for a space orthogonal to the span of $\{|m\rangle\}_{m=0}^{N_{\text{ph}}}$. If we define Ψ as a map that measures $|i, \mu\rangle\langle i, \mu|$ and prepares $\sum_{m=N_{\text{ph}}+1}^{\infty} p(m|\mu) V_i |m\rangle\langle m| V_i^\dagger$, Ψ is a source map relating the virtual states $\{\xi_i^\mu\}$ to the real states

$$\rho_i^\mu = \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} p(m|\mu) V_i |m\rangle\langle m| V_i^\dagger. \quad (32)$$

Thus, as shown in Lemma 8 it is sufficient to show that the virtual protocol where Alice prepares the states $\{\xi_i^\mu\}$ is an ε_{sec} -secret PMQKD protocol. For such states, the dimension of the shield system d_{A_S} can be obtained from the rank of the tagged states $d_{A_S} = N_{\text{ph}} + 2$. Further, as shown in Appendix D, for encoding isometries V_i that preserve the number of photons, the shield system is block-diagonal with all blocks of dimension 1. Any IID security proof for this can be lifted to a security proof for general attacks as described in Corollary 3.1.

D. IID decoy-state analysis for tagged sources

If using the postselection technique, the decoy-state analysis must be performed with the tagged states and not with the infinite-dimensional optical states. Thus, in this subsection, we describe the IID decoy-state analysis for the tagged source. As is typically the case a single intensity μ_S is chosen for key generation. Due to the block diagonal structure of the signal states given in Eq. (31), the key rate can be broken up [35] as

$$R = \sum_{m=0}^N p(m|\mu_S) R_m + (1 - \sum_{m=0}^N p(m|\mu_S)) R_{\text{tag}} \leq \sum_{m=0}^N p(m|\mu_S) R_m \quad (33)$$

where each R_m is the key rate of the blocks with m photons, and R_{tag} is the key rate of the tagged block.

To calculate R_m , we compute upper and lower bounds on the m -photon statistics using [24]

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{opt.}_{\Phi} \text{Tr} \left[\Phi \left[V_i |m\rangle\langle m| V_i^\dagger \right] \Gamma_j \right] \\ & \text{s.t. } \text{Tr} \left[\Phi \left[\xi_k^\mu \right] \Gamma_l \right] = \gamma_{l|k, \mu} \quad \forall l, k, \mu \\ & \Phi \in \mathcal{C}(A', B), \end{aligned} \quad (34)$$

where $\{\Gamma_i\}$ is Bob's squashed POVM. Here, opt. implies that we perform separate optimisations to find the minimum and maximum value.

While this is the generalised decoy-state optimisation used in Ref. [24], this can be reduced to the standard decoy-state analysis as follows. We can simplify the constraints as

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma_{l|k, \mu} &= \text{Tr} \left[\Phi \left[\xi_k^\mu \right] \Gamma_l \right] \\ &= \sum_{m'=0}^N p(m'|\mu) \text{Tr} \left[\Phi \left[V_k |m'\rangle\langle m'| V_k^\dagger \right] \Gamma_l \right] + (1 - \sum_{m'=0}^N p(m'|\mu)) \text{Tr} \left[\Phi \left[|k, \mu\rangle\langle k, \mu| \right] \Gamma_l \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (35)$$

Next, defining $p(\text{det}_l|k, m') = \text{Tr} \left[\Phi \left[V_k |m'\rangle\langle m'| V_k^\dagger \right] \Gamma_l \right]$, and $p(\text{det}_l|k, \mu, \text{tag}) = \text{Tr} \left[\Phi \left[|k, \mu\rangle\langle k, \mu| \right] \Gamma_l \right]$ allows us to recast the generalised decoy-state SDPs described in Eq. (34) into linear programs as

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{opt. } p(\text{det}_j|i, m) \\ & \text{s.t. } \sum_{m'=0}^N p(m'|\mu) p(\text{det}_l|k, m') + (1 - \sum_{m'=0}^N p(m'|\mu)) p(\text{det}_l|k, \mu, \text{tag}) = \gamma_{l|k, \mu} \quad \forall l, k, \mu \\ & 0 \leq p(\text{det}_l|k, m') \leq 1 \\ & 0 \leq p(\text{det}_l|k, \mu, \text{tag}) \leq 1. \end{aligned} \quad (36)$$




FIG. 1. Schematics of the implementation of the three-state protocol as in [37]. The numbers below the beam-splitters reflect their transmissivity. IM and VA refer to intensity modulator and variable attenuator respectively.

Finally, this can be recast into the standard form [21, 22] by using 0 and 1 as the lower and upper limits of $p(\text{det}_i|k, \mu, \text{tag})$ in the linear program constraints. Note that although a higher photon-number cut-off would lead to better IID key rates due to better decoy-state analysis, it increases the dimension of the shield system leading to worse finite-size performance after the use of the postselection technique.

V. APPLICATION TO THE THREE STATE PROTOCOL

In this section, we illustrate the various results in this manuscript by applying them to compute the key length of the time-bin encoded three-state protocol against coherent attacks. We use the new variable-length security proof [19] whose lift was described in Section III C. We begin by explaining the optical setup.

A. Optical setup

Alice uses a spontaneous parametric down-conversion (SPDC) or quantum dot source to prepare a single-photon in two time-bin modes as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} 0: & |0\rangle \otimes |1\rangle \\ 1: & |1\rangle \otimes |0\rangle \\ +: & \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} (|0\rangle \otimes |1\rangle + |1\rangle \otimes |0\rangle). \end{aligned}$$

Since the signal states span a two-dimensional vector space, Alice's dimension is 2.

Bob's measurement setup is identical to that considered in [24, 37] as depicted in Fig. 1. Both detectors here are threshold detectors, with 2 and 3 time-bins respectively. So there are 2^5 possible click patterns. We define the cross-click event cc to be any click pattern that records a click in both detectors while ignoring all clicks in the middle time slot of the Mach-Zehnder interferometer. As shown in Appendix C of Ref. [24], we can then find

$$\lambda_{\min}(\overline{\Pi}_N \Gamma_{cc} \overline{\Pi}_N) \geq 1 - t^{N+1} - \left(1 - \frac{t}{4}\right)^{N+1} + \left(\frac{3t}{4}\right)^{N+1}, \quad (37)$$

where t is Bob's basis-choice beam-splitting ratio. This now lets us use the flag-state squasher described in Lemma 7.

We have some choice of coarse-graining the events when using the flag-state squasher. However, having fewer events leads to a smaller flag space which in turn decreases the dimension of the problem improving the usage of the postselection technique. Thus, we coarse-grain the events to only consider the event in which no detector clicks, the events in which a single detector in a single time-bin clicks, the cross-click event, and all other events. This coarse-graining results in 8 flag states. For the simulations here, we choose the photon-number cutoff to be 1. Thus, Bob's system consists of 1 block of dimension 2 (qubit space), and 9 blocks of dimension 1 (vacuum and flags). Corollary 4.3 can thus be used with $x = 4^2 + 9 \cdot 2^2 = 52$. We let $\sigma_{ABE}^{\otimes n}$ be the state on which the protocol is run.

B. Classical part

After the signal transmission and detection, Alice and Bob store their measurement data in their local registers X^n and Y^n . They then choose a random subset of m signals, and announce their measurement outcomes for those rounds in the register C_{AT}^m , to obtain \mathbf{F}^{obs} , the observed frequency of different outcomes. This is then used for the “variable-length decision”, by computing the length of the key to be produced ($l(\mathbf{F}^{\text{obs}})$) and the number of bits to be used for error-correction information ($\lambda^{\text{EC}}(\mathbf{F}^{\text{obs}})$), as specified below in Section V C. The state of the protocol at this stage is given by $\sigma_{X^n Y^n E^n C_{AT}^m}$.

For the remaining $n_K = n - m$ signals, Alice and Bob implement round-by-round announcements C^{n_K} . For this protocol, Bob announces all events without any detections and whether the first (Z-basis) or second (X-basis) detector clicked when he observes a single-click event. Alice announces the bits in which she encoded the photon in the Z-basis. All events where Alice prepared the state in the Z-basis, and Bob’s first detector clicked are kept and the rest are discarded. Thus, Alice maps her local data X^{n_K} to the raw key Z^{n_K} , where discarding is modelled as setting $Z = 0$. Note that this procedure is equivalent to *physically* discarding rounds [19, Lemma 4].

Alice and Bob then implement error-correction using $\lambda^{\text{EC}}(\mathbf{F}^{\text{obs}})$ bits of data, and error-verification by comparing hash values of length $\log(1/\varepsilon_{\text{EV}})$, using the register C_E . The final step is privacy amplification, where Alice and Bob apply a common two-universal hash function, announced in the register C_P , to produce a key of $l(\mathbf{F}^{\text{obs}})$ bits. The state of the protocol at this stage is given by $\sigma_{K_A K_B \tilde{C} E^n}$, where we write $\tilde{C} = C^{n_K} C_{AT}^m C_E C_P$.

C. Key Length Computations

Recall that in a QKD protocol, when considering IID attacks, one has a fixed but unknown state $\sigma_{AB}^{\otimes n}$, which then gives rise to the random variable \mathbf{F}^{obs} . For a given \mathbf{F}^{obs} , the variable-length protocol must determine $l(\mathbf{F}^{\text{obs}})$ (length of key to be produced) and $\lambda^{\text{EC}}(\mathbf{F}^{\text{obs}})$ (number of bits to be used for error-correction). In this section, we briefly explain how this computation is implemented, using the variable-length framework of Ref. [19]. Note that multiple values of \mathbf{F}^{obs} will lead to the same value of the final key length $l(\mathbf{F}^{\text{obs}})$, and therefore constitute the same event Ω_i .

In order to compute the values of $l(\mathbf{F}^{\text{obs}})$ and $\lambda^{\text{EC}}(\mathbf{F}^{\text{obs}})$, the idea is to first construct $b_{\text{stat}}(\mathbf{F}^{\text{obs}})$, a high-probability lower bound on the Rényi entropy of the underlying state in the QKD protocol. In order to do so, one first needs to construct a set $V(\mathbf{F}^{\text{obs}})$ such that it contains the underlying state ρ_{AB} with high probability. That is,

$$\Pr_{\mathbf{F}^{\text{obs}}}(\sigma_{AB} \in V(\mathbf{F}^{\text{obs}})) \geq 1 - \varepsilon_{\text{AT}}. \quad (38)$$

Given such a $V(\mathbf{F}^{\text{obs}})$, Section V from [19] then specifies $b_{\text{stat}}(\mathbf{F}^{\text{obs}})$, $l(\mathbf{F}^{\text{obs}})$ and $\lambda^{\text{EC}}(\mathbf{F}^{\text{obs}})$ as follows

$$\begin{aligned} b_{\text{stat}}(\mathbf{F}^{\text{obs}}) &:= \min_{\substack{\sigma \in V(\mathbf{F}^{\text{obs}}) \\ \text{Tr}_B(\sigma_{AB}) = \hat{\sigma}_A}} n_K H(Z|CE)_\sigma - n_K(\alpha - 1) \log^2(d_Z + 1) \\ \lambda^{\text{EC}}(\mathbf{F}^{\text{obs}}) &:= n_K f H(Z|YC)_{\mathbf{F}^{\text{obs}}} \\ l(\mathbf{F}^{\text{obs}}) &:= \max(b_{\text{stat}}(\mathbf{F}^{\text{obs}}) - \lambda^{\text{EC}}(\mathbf{F}^{\text{obs}}) - \theta(\varepsilon_{\text{PA}}, \varepsilon_{\text{EV}}), 0) \\ \theta(\varepsilon_{\text{PA}}, \varepsilon_{\text{EV}}) &:= \frac{\alpha}{\alpha - 1} \left(\log\left(\frac{1}{4\varepsilon_{\text{PA}}}\right) + \frac{2}{\alpha} \right) + \lceil \log(1/\varepsilon_{\text{EV}}) \rceil, \end{aligned} \quad (39)$$

where H denotes the conditional von-Neumann entropy, d_Z is the dimension of the Z register, and $1 < \alpha < 1/\log(d_Z + 1)$ is the Rényi parameter. The resulting variable-length protocol is shown to be an ε_{EV} -correct [19, Theorem 2] and $(\varepsilon_{\text{PA}} + \varepsilon_{\text{AT}})$ -secret PMQKD protocol. In this work, we choose the optimal $\alpha = 1 + \kappa/\sqrt{n_K}$, where $\kappa = \sqrt{\log(1/\varepsilon_{\text{PA}})}/\log(d_Z + 1)$. Moreover, we compute $\lambda^{\text{EC}}(\mathbf{F}^{\text{obs}})$ from the observed distribution \mathbf{F}^{obs} , where $f = 1.16$ is the efficiency factor.

One can then use a variety of concentration inequalities to construct $V(\mathbf{F}^{\text{obs}})$ satisfying Eq. (38) [19, Lemma 1]. In this work, we construct $V(\mathbf{F}^{\text{obs}})$ in the following lemma using Hoeffding’s inequality. We refer the reader to Appendix E for the proof.

Lemma 9 (Constructing $V(\mathbf{F}^{\text{obs}})$). For any state σ , let $\mathbf{F}^{\text{obs}} \in \mathcal{P}(\Sigma)$ be the frequency vector obtained from measuring the state m times, where Σ is the set of possible outcomes. Let Γ_j be the POVM element corresponding to outcome j . Define

$$\mu := \sqrt{\frac{\log(2|\Sigma|/\varepsilon_{\text{AT}})}{2m}}, \quad (40)$$




FIG. 2. Plots demonstrating the performance of the postselection technique for the three-state protocol.

and the set

$$V(\mathbf{F}^{\text{obs}}) := \{\sigma \in S_o(AB) \mid |\text{Tr}(\Gamma_j \sigma) - \mathbf{F}_j^{\text{obs}}| \leq \mu, \forall j \in \Sigma\}. \quad (41)$$

Then, $V(\mathbf{F}^{\text{obs}})$ contains ρ with probability greater than $1 - \varepsilon_{\text{AT}}$. That is,

$$\Pr_{\mathbf{F}^{\text{obs}}} (\sigma \in V(\mathbf{F}^{\text{obs}})) \geq 1 - \varepsilon_{\text{AT}}. \quad (42)$$

D. Parameter choices

For simplicity in our key rate plots, we assume a loss-only channel through an ultralow-loss fiber with an attenuation of 0.16 dB/km. We also assume that Bob's detection setup consists of ideal threshold detectors. Note that this is a simplifying assumption made for the simulation. This can be easily adapted to more realistic scenarios by using the corresponding realistic POVM in our numerics [26]. We fix Bob's basis-choice beam-splitting ratio to be $t = 0.2$, and Alice's probability of preparing a state in the Z-basis to be 0.8. Further m (number of signals used for testing) is taken to be a fixed fraction $m = 0.05n$ of the total number of signals. In our simulation, we assume that the protocol runs for 3600s using a 3 GHz source. Thus, for the postselection technique plots, the number of signals sent during a run of the protocol is $n = 1.08 \times 10^{13}$.

We plot the secret key rate per second when the observed frequency of events in the acceptance test (\mathbf{F}^{obs}) is equal to the frequency expected from honest behavior. We choose the target security parameter to be $\varepsilon_{\text{sec}}^{\text{target}} = \varepsilon_{\text{cor}}^{\text{target}} = 10^{-12}$. Thus, the resulting protocol is $(\varepsilon_{\text{sec}}^{\text{target}} + \varepsilon_{\text{cor}}^{\text{target}})$ -secure. We use $g_{n,x} = \binom{n+x-1}{x-1} \leq \left(\frac{e(n+x-1)}{x-1}\right)^{x-1}$ to bound the dimension of the symmetric subspace. This gives better bounds than the often used $g_{n,x} \leq (n+1)^{x-1}$. Furthermore, when seeking to compute key rates for a target secrecy parameter $\varepsilon_{\text{sec}}^{\text{target}}$, for IID key rates we assume that $\varepsilon_{\text{PA}} = \varepsilon_{\text{AT}} = \varepsilon_{\text{sec}}^{\text{target}}/2$. When using the postselection technique (Corollary 4.3), we assume that $\sqrt{8\varepsilon_{\text{sec}}} = \tilde{\varepsilon}/2 = \varepsilon_{\text{sec}}^{\text{target}}/2g_{n,x}$.

Using these parameters, we plot various key lengths against distance in Fig. 2 as follows:

1. IID: We plot the key lengths as a function of distance under the assumption that Eve's attack is always IID. This serves as an upper bound for the key length plots.

2. Sequential IID: We plot the key length as a function of distance where the repetition rate of the protocol is limited in order to enforce a sequential condition. Here, Alice sends states at long enough intervals that ensure that Eve’s attack on a pulse cannot be influenced by pulses that come after. As shown in Eq. (41) of Ref. [7], the sequential condition limits the repetition rate R_s to $\frac{1.5 \times 10^5}{d}$, where d is the distance between Alice and Bob in km , and we have assumed the refractive of the fiber to be 1.5.

Thus, given the protocol duration $T = 3600s$, the maximum number of signals sent with this condition is $n = R_s T = \frac{5.4 \times 10^8}{d}$. We then perform a security analysis assuming that Eve’s attack is IID with this value of n . This serves as an upper bound on the GEAT key lengths under the sequential attack condition.

3. Postselection with block-diagonal improvement: We plot the key lengths obtained from applying Corollary 4.3. Here, $d_A = 2$, and Bob consists of a block of dimension 2, and nine blocks of dimension 1 resulting in $x = 52$ as detailed in Section V A. This gives the full secure key length through the use of the postselection technique.
4. Postselection with generic improvement: We plot the key lengths obtained from applying Corollary 4.1. Here, $d_A = 2$, and $d_B = 11$ resulting in $x = 484$ as detailed in Section V A. When compared to Item 3, this demonstrates the improvements we have made to the postselection technique by taking into account the block-diagonal structure. Note that even without the block-diagonal structure, this plot already consists of a significant improvement over past work [9] arising from Corollary 1.1.
5. Postselection with decoy-state lift: A more practical alternative to single-photon sources is decoy-state QKD. However, the value of $g_{n,x}$ is higher for decoy-state protocols. Thus, we compute key lengths with a larger dimension (x).

This dimension can be computed as follows. Alice’s signal state dimension $d_A = 3$ as Alice sends 3 linearly independent states. As shown in Appendix D, Alice’s total dimension consists of $n_{\text{int}}(N_{\text{ph}} + 2)$ blocks of dimension d_A , where N_{ph} is the photon-number cut-off used for the decoy-state analysis and n_{int} is the number of intensities used. For the simulation, we assume a cut-off of 2 and that 3 intensities were used. Bob’s dimensions are the same as in Item 3: 1 block of dimension 2 and 9 blocks of dimension 1. Thus, Corollary 4.3 can be used with

$$\begin{aligned} x &= n_{\text{int}}(N_{\text{ph}} + 2)(4d_A^2 + 9d_A^2) \\ &= 12(4 \times 9 + 9 \times 9) = 3510. \end{aligned} \tag{43}$$

Note that our IID key rate analysis assumes that Alice sends single photons, but we use a higher dimension (x) for the postselection lift. We do this, since we expect the key length obtained from IID decoy analysis along with the postselection lift to be similar.

Note that due to Bob’s unbalanced basis-choice and the large basis-dependent detection efficiencies, phase-error rate [1] and EUR [5] *cannot* be used. As shown in Fig. 2, imposing the sequential condition results in the protocol not producing any key for over 20 km, and thus the GEAT [4] would not be useful in this parameter regime. Thus, for realistic QKD protocols, the postselection technique outperforms all other current proof techniques.

VI. CONCLUSION AND FUTURE WORK

In this work, we presented the rigorous and improved application of the postselection technique to practical QKD protocols. In particular, we extended the applicability of the postselection technique to prepare-and-measure protocols and decoy-state protocols. We also develop a new variant of the flag-state squasher which enables the postselection technique to be used with realistic detector setups. Additionally, we fixed a gap in the original paper [6] to place the postselection technique on rigorous mathematical footing. We have also made several improvements to de Finetti reductions which significantly reduce the penalty imposed on the key rate when using the postselection technique. These improved statements can also be used to improve the performance of other quantum information processing tasks, such as those studied in [9].

To illustrate our results, we considered a simple implementation [37] of the time-bin encoded three-state protocol over a fiber-optic cable. For this implementation, phase-error rate and EUR-based proof techniques cannot be used. We find that accounting for the sequential assumption in the GEAT approach by limiting the repetition rate of the protocol leads to significantly worse key rates than our improved postselection technique. Thus, our results show that the postselection technique currently outperforms all other known security proof techniques for realistic PMQKD protocols.

We believe that many of our results can be improved further. For example, Corollary 1.1 and Corollary 2.2 can be improved. Since the proof consists of using Theorem 1 and Theorem 2 respectively, and tracing out the purifying

system, any choice of purifying system supported on the symmetric subspace would suffice. Moreover, a mixture of *all* such purifying system would also lead to no change in the proof. However, noting that the infinity norm of this mixture is less than 1 leads to a corresponding improvement to the prefactor in the corollaries. Another place for improvement is Theorem 2. The statement requires any symmetries to act separately on Alice and Bob's spaces. However, it may be possible to remove this requirement, thereby allowing the use of joint symmetries in both Alice and Bob's systems. Finally Theorems 3 and 4, which are utilized in applying the postselection technique to QKD protocols, currently impose a square root penalty on the security parameter. There may be a way to improve this penalty.

VII. AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS

S.N. and Y.Z. developed the proofs in Section II. D.T. and E.T. developed the proofs in Section III. S.N. developed the proofs in Section IV. S.N. and D.T. prepared the plots and code in Section V. S.N. contributed the ideas for Sections II and IV. N.L. and E.T. contributed to supervision and general directions for the project.

VIII. ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We thank Arsalan Motamedi for fruitful discussions involving the de Finetti reductions that contributed to our intuition. We thank Shihong Pan for providing some of the code used in the plots, as well as for some code review. This work was funded by the NSERC Discovery Grant, and was conducted at the Institute for Quantum Computing, University of Waterloo, which is funded by the Government of Canada through ISED. DT was partially funded by the Mike and Ophelia Laziridis Fellowship.

Appendix A: Proof of statements in Sec. II

In this appendix, we complete the proofs of the theorems and lemmas in Section II. To prove Theorem 1 and Theorem 2, we first need to establish the following lemma.

Lemma 10. Suppose d_A and d_R are two positive integers with $d_A \leq d_R$. Let $|\theta\rangle := \sum_{i=1}^{d_A} |i\rangle \otimes |i\rangle \in \mathbb{C}^{d_A} \otimes \mathbb{C}^{d_R}$, and let dU be the Haar measure on $\mathcal{U}(\mathbb{C}^{d_R})$. For every $n \geq 1$, let

$$T_n := \int_{\mathcal{U}(\mathbb{C}^{d_R})} (\text{id}_{A^n} \otimes U^{\otimes n}) |\theta\rangle\langle\theta|^{\otimes n} (\text{id}_{A^n} \otimes U^{\otimes n})^\dagger dU.$$

Then there is an invertible operator $\kappa_n \in \mathcal{L}((\mathbb{C}^{d_A})^{\otimes n})$ such that

$$(\kappa_n \otimes \text{id}_{R^n})^{-1/2} T_n (\kappa_n \otimes \text{id}_{R^n})^{-1/2} = \text{id}_{\text{Sym}^n(\mathbb{C}^{d_A} \otimes \mathbb{C}^{d_R})}. \quad (\text{A1})$$

The construction of κ_n is similar to the construction of κ_{D_n} in the proof of Lemma 3.1 in [9] which uses Schul-Weyl duality. In this regard, we provide a brief explanation of the Schul-Weyl duality that will be used in the proof. For a more comprehensive treatment, we refer the readers to [38].

Consider a tensor space $(\mathbb{C}^d)^{\otimes n}$, where d and n are positive integers. The unitary group \mathcal{U}_d of $d \times d$ unitaries acts on $(\mathbb{C}^d)^{\otimes n}$ by sending $|\psi_1\rangle \otimes \cdots \otimes |\psi_n\rangle \mapsto U |\psi_1\rangle \otimes \cdots \otimes U |\psi_n\rangle$ for $U \in \mathcal{U}_d$. The symmetric group S_n of permutations on n letters acts on $(\mathbb{C}^d)^{\otimes n}$ by sending $|\psi_1\rangle \otimes \cdots \otimes |\psi_n\rangle \mapsto |\psi_{\pi^{-1}(1)}\rangle \otimes \cdots \otimes |\psi_{\pi^{-1}(n)}\rangle$ for $\pi \in S_n$. Note that these two actions commute and they define representations of \mathcal{U}_d and S_n on $(\mathbb{C}^d)^{\otimes n}$. The Schul-Weyl duality can be viewed as a ‘‘quantitative version’’ of the double commutant theorem from representation theory. It states that as a $\mathcal{U}_d \times S_n$ -module,

$$(\mathbb{C}^d)^{\otimes n} \cong \bigoplus_{\lambda \in \Lambda_{n,d}} W_d^\lambda \otimes [\lambda], \quad (\text{A2})$$

where \mathcal{U}_d acts trivially on $[\lambda]$'s and S_n acts trivially on W_d^λ 's. So in particular, any $U \in \mathcal{U}_d$ acting on $(\mathbb{C}^d)^{\otimes n}$ decomposes as $\bigoplus_{\lambda \in \Lambda_{n,d}} W_d^\lambda(U) \otimes \text{id}_{[\lambda]}$, where each $W_d^\lambda(U)$ is a unitary acting on the space W_d^λ . Here $\Lambda_{n,d} := \{\lambda = (\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_d) : \lambda_1 \geq \lambda_2 \geq \cdots \geq \lambda_d \geq 0, \sum_{i=1}^d \lambda_i = n\}$ consists of partitions of n into d parts (which are commonly referred to as Young diagrams). We identify a partition $(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_d, 0, \dots, 0)$ with $(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_d)$, so $\Lambda_{n,d}$ is a subset of $\Lambda_{n,d'}$ for $d \leq d'$. In the decomposition (A2), the space $[\lambda]$ is determined by λ , while the space W_d^λ is dependent on both λ and d .

Now given two spaces $(\mathbb{C}^{d_A})^{\otimes n}$ and $(\mathbb{C}^{d_R})^{\otimes n}$ with $d_A \leq d_R$. The Schul-Weyl duality implies the decompositions

$$(\mathbb{C}^{d_A})^{\otimes n} \cong \bigoplus_{\lambda \in \Lambda_{n,d_A}} W_A^\lambda \otimes [\lambda]_A, \text{ and } (\mathbb{C}^{d_R})^{\otimes n} \cong \bigoplus_{\lambda \in \Lambda_{n,d_R}} W_R^\lambda \otimes [\lambda]_R.$$

For every $\lambda \in \Lambda_{n,d_A} \subset \Lambda_{n,d_R}$, we have $[\lambda]_A \cong [\lambda]_R$. The n -th symmetric power $\text{Sym}^n(\mathbb{C}^{d_A} \otimes \mathbb{C}^{d_R})$ is isomorphic to $\bigoplus_{\lambda \in \Lambda_{n,d_A}} W_A^\lambda \otimes W_R^\lambda$ as a $\mathcal{U}_{d_A} \times \mathcal{U}_{d_R}$ -module (see for instance Eq. (5.27) in Ref. [39]). Indeed, for each $\lambda \in \Lambda_{n,d_A}$ there is a maximally entangled state $|\psi_\lambda\rangle$ such that any vector $|v\rangle$ in $\text{Sym}^n(\mathbb{C}^{d_A} \otimes \mathbb{C}^{d_R})$ can be written as $\bigoplus_{\lambda \in \Lambda_{n,d_A}} |\phi_\lambda\rangle \otimes |\psi_\lambda\rangle$ for some $|\phi_\lambda\rangle \in W_A^\lambda \otimes W_R^\lambda$. It follows that $\text{id}_{\text{Sym}^n(\mathbb{C}^{d_A} \otimes \mathbb{C}^{d_R})} = \bigoplus_{\lambda \in \Lambda_{n,d_A}} \text{id}_{W_A^\lambda} \otimes \text{id}_{W_R^\lambda} \otimes |\psi^\lambda\rangle\langle\psi^\lambda|$.

Proof of Lemma 10. We keep using the notation above. Let $|\Psi_\lambda\rangle := \text{dim}([\lambda]) |\psi_\lambda\rangle$ for all $\lambda \in \Lambda_{n,d_A}$. Then

$$|\theta\rangle^{\otimes n} = \bigoplus_{\lambda \in \Lambda_{n,d_A}} |\Phi^\lambda\rangle \otimes |\Psi^\lambda\rangle$$

where $|\Phi^\lambda\rangle = \sum_{j=1}^{\text{dim}(W_A^\lambda)} |w_j^{\lambda,A}\rangle \otimes |w_j^{\lambda,R}\rangle$ for some orthonormal basis $\{|w_j^{\lambda,A}\rangle\}$ of W_A^λ and orthonormal set $\{|w_j^{\lambda,R}\rangle\}$ in W_R^λ . For every $\lambda, \lambda' \in \Lambda_{n,d_A}$, $1 \leq j, j' \leq \text{dim}(W_A^\lambda)$, and $U \in \mathcal{U}(\mathbb{C}^{d_R})$, by Schur's lemma, we obtain

$$\int_{\mathcal{U}(\mathbb{C}^{d_R})} W_R^\lambda(U) |w_j^{\lambda,R}\rangle\langle w_{j'}^{\lambda',R}| W_R^{\lambda'}(U)^\dagger dU = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{\text{dim}(W_R^\lambda)} \text{id}_{W_R^\lambda} & \text{if } \lambda = \lambda' \text{ and } j = j' \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} T_n &= \bigoplus_{\lambda, \lambda' \in \Lambda_{n,d_A}} \sum_{\substack{1 \leq j \leq \text{dim}(W_A^\lambda) \\ 1 \leq j' \leq \text{dim}(W_A^{\lambda'})}} |w_j^{\lambda,A}\rangle\langle w_{j'}^{\lambda',A}| \otimes \left(\int W_R^\lambda(U) |w_j^{\lambda,R}\rangle\langle w_{j'}^{\lambda',R}| W_R^{\lambda'}(U)^\dagger dU \right) \otimes |\Psi^\lambda\rangle\langle\Psi^{\lambda'}| \\ &= \bigoplus_{\lambda \in \Lambda_{n,d_A}} \frac{1}{\text{dim}(W_R^\lambda)} \text{id}_{W_A^\lambda} \otimes \text{id}_{W_R^\lambda} \otimes |\Psi^\lambda\rangle\langle\Psi^\lambda| = \bigoplus_{\lambda \in \Lambda_{n,d_A}} \frac{\text{dim}([\lambda])}{\text{dim}(W_R^\lambda)} \text{id}_{W_A^\lambda} \otimes \text{id}_{W_R^\lambda} \otimes |\psi^\lambda\rangle\langle\psi^\lambda|. \end{aligned}$$

Equation (A1) follows by taking $\kappa_n := \bigoplus_{\lambda \in \Lambda_{n,d_A}} \frac{\text{dim}([\lambda])}{\text{dim}(W_R^\lambda)} \text{id}_{W_A^\lambda} \otimes \text{id}_{[\lambda]_A}$. \square

Theorem 1 (de Finetti reduction with fixed marginal). Let $\hat{\sigma}_A \in \text{Pos}(\mathbb{C}^{d_A})$ and let $\rho_{A^n R^n}$ be any purification of $(\hat{\sigma}_A)^{\otimes n}$ supported on the symmetric subspace $\text{Sym}^n(\mathbb{C}^{d_A d_R})$. Then there exists a probability measure $d\phi$ on the set of purifications $|\phi\rangle\langle\phi|_{AR}$ of $\hat{\sigma}_A$, such that

$$\rho_{A^n R^n} \leq g_{n,d_A d_R} \int |\phi\rangle\langle\phi|_{AR}^{\otimes n} d\phi. \quad (2)$$

Proof. Assume without loss of generality that $d_A \leq d_R$ and $\hat{\sigma}_A$ has full rank. We first observe that

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Puri}_R(\hat{\sigma}_A) &:= \{|\phi\rangle\langle\phi| \in \text{Pos}(\mathbb{C}^{d_A} \otimes \mathbb{C}^{d_R}) : \text{Tr}_R[|\phi\rangle\langle\phi|] = \hat{\sigma}_A\} \\ &= \{(\hat{\sigma}_A^{1/2} \otimes U) |\theta\rangle\langle\theta| (\hat{\sigma}_A^{1/2} \otimes U^\dagger) : U \in \mathcal{U}(\mathbb{C}^{d_R})\}, \end{aligned}$$

so the Haar measure dU on $\mathcal{U}(\mathbb{C}^{d_R})$ induces a measure $d\phi$ on the set of purifications $\text{Puri}_R(\hat{\sigma}_A)$. Let $T_n := \int_{\mathcal{U}(\mathbb{C}^{d_R})} (\text{id}_{A^n} \otimes U^{\otimes n}) |\theta\rangle\langle\theta|^{\otimes n} (\text{id}_{A^n} \otimes U^{\otimes n})^\dagger dU$ be as in Lemma 10. Then

$$\tau_n := \int_{\text{Puri}_R(\hat{\sigma}_A)} |\phi\rangle\langle\phi|^{\otimes n} d\phi = (\hat{\sigma}_A^{\otimes n} \otimes \text{id}_{R^n})^{1/2} T_n (\hat{\sigma}_A^{\otimes n} \otimes \text{id}_{R^n})^{1/2},$$

so we only need to prove that

$$(\hat{\sigma}_A^{\otimes n} \otimes \text{id}_{R^n})^{-1/2} \rho_{A^n R^n} (\hat{\sigma}_A^{\otimes n} \otimes \text{id}_{R^n})^{-1/2} \leq g_{n,d_A d_R} T_n. \quad (\text{A3})$$

By Lemma 10, there is an invertible operator $\kappa_n \in \text{L}((\mathbb{C}^{d_A})^{\otimes n})$ such that

$$(\kappa_n \otimes \text{id}_{R^n})^{-1/2} T_n (\kappa_n \otimes \text{id}_{R^n})^{-1/2} = \text{id}_{\text{Sym}^n(\mathbb{C}^{d_A} \otimes \mathbb{C}^{d_R})}.$$

Let $\tilde{\rho} := (\kappa_n \otimes \text{id}_{R^n})^{-1/2} (\hat{\sigma}_A^{\otimes n} \otimes \text{id}_{R^n})^{-1/2} \rho_{A^n R^n} (\hat{\sigma}_A^{\otimes n} \otimes \text{id}_{R^n})^{-1/2} (\kappa_n \otimes \text{id}_{R^n})^{-1/2}$. To prove Equation (A3), we only need to show that

$$\tilde{\rho} \leq g_{n,d_A d_R} \text{id}_{\text{Sym}^n(\mathbb{C}^{d_A d_R})}. \quad (\text{A4})$$

Indeed, since $\rho_{A^n R^n}$ and τ_n have the same marginal $\hat{\sigma}_A^{\otimes n}$ on A^n , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\tilde{\rho}\|_\infty &\leq \text{Tr}(\tilde{\rho}) \\ &= \text{Tr} \left((\kappa_n \otimes \text{id}_{R^n})^{-1/2} (\hat{\sigma}_A^{\otimes n} \otimes \text{id}_{R^n})^{-1/2} \tau_n (\hat{\sigma}_A^{\otimes n} \otimes \text{id}_{R^n})^{-1/2} (\kappa_n \otimes \text{id}_{R^n})^{-1/2} \right) \\ &= \text{Tr} \left((\kappa_n \otimes \text{id}_{R^n})^{-1/2} T_n (\kappa_n \otimes \text{id}_{R^n})^{-1/2} \right) = \text{Tr} \left(\text{id}_{\text{Sym}^n(\mathbb{C}^{d_A d_R})} \right) \\ &= \dim(\text{Sym}^n(\mathbb{C}^{d_A d_R})) = g_{n,d_A d_R}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A5})$$

It is clear that the operator $\tilde{\rho}$ is supported on $\text{Sym}^n(\mathbb{C}^{d_A d_R})$, so Eq.(A4) follows. \square

Theorem 2 (de Finetti reduction with symmetries and fixed marginal). Let $\hat{\sigma}_A \in \text{Pos}(\mathbb{C}^{d_A})$, and let $\rho_{A^n R^n}$ be any purification of $(\hat{\sigma}_A)^{\otimes n}$ supported on the symmetric subspace $\text{Sym}^n \left(\bigoplus_{i=1}^k \mathbb{C}^{d_i^A} \otimes \mathbb{C}^{d_i^R} \right)$ where $\bigoplus_{i=1}^k \mathbb{C}^{d_i^A} \subseteq \mathbb{C}^{d_A}$ and $\bigoplus_{i=1}^k \mathbb{C}^{d_i^R} \subseteq \mathbb{C}^{d_R}$. Then there exists a probability measure $d\phi$ on the set of purifications $|\phi\rangle_{AR} \in \bigoplus_{i=1}^k \mathbb{C}^{d_i^A} \otimes \mathbb{C}^{d_i^R}$ of $\hat{\sigma}_A$ such that

$$\rho_{A^n R^n} \leq g_{n,x} \int |\phi\rangle\langle\phi|_{AR}^{\otimes n} d\phi, \quad (4)$$

where $x = \sum_{i=1}^k d_i^A d_i^R$.

Proof. For convenience, we use A_i and R_i to denote $\mathbb{C}^{d_i^A}$ and $\mathbb{C}^{d_i^R}$. From [38, Eq. (6.7.1)] we know that

$$\text{Sym}^n \left(\bigoplus_{i=1}^k A_i \otimes R_i \right) = \bigoplus_{n_1 + \dots + n_k = n} \bigotimes_{i=1}^k \text{Sym}^{n_i}(A_i \otimes R_i).$$

For every $1 \leq i \leq k$, let $|\theta_i\rangle := \sum_{j=1}^{d_A} |j\rangle \otimes |j\rangle \in A_i \otimes R_i$. Then for every purification $|\phi\rangle \in \bigoplus_{i=1}^k A_i \otimes R_i$ of $\hat{\sigma}_A$, there are unitaries $U_1 \in \mathcal{U}(R_1), \dots, U_k \in \mathcal{U}(R_k)$ such that $|\phi\rangle = \bigoplus_{i=1}^k \text{id}_{A_i} \otimes U_i |\theta_i\rangle$. So the Haar measure dU on $\mathcal{U}(R_1) \times \dots \times \mathcal{U}(R_k)$ induces a measure $d\phi$ on the set of purifications $|\phi\rangle_{AR} \in \bigoplus_{i=1}^k A_i \otimes R_i$ of $\hat{\sigma}_A$. It follows that

$$\tau := \int |\phi\rangle\langle\phi|_{AR}^{\otimes n} d\phi = (\hat{\sigma}_A^{\otimes n} \otimes \text{id}_{R^n})^{1/2} T (\hat{\sigma}_A^{\otimes n} \otimes \text{id}_{R^n})^{1/2},$$

where

$$T := \int \left(\left(\bigoplus_{i=1}^k \text{id}_{A_i} \otimes U_i |\theta_i\rangle \right) \left(\bigoplus_{j=1}^k \langle\theta_j| \text{id}_{A_j} \otimes U_j^\dagger \right) \right)^{\otimes n} dU_1 \dots dU_k.$$

Since $\int_{\mathcal{U}} U dU = 0$ for any compact unitary group \mathcal{U} and Haar measure dU on \mathcal{U} , we have

$$T = \bigoplus_{n_1 + \dots + n_k = n} \bigotimes_{i=1}^k T_{n_i}^{(i)}, \text{ where } T_{n_i}^{(i)} = \int (\text{id}_{A_i}^{n_i} \otimes U_i^{\otimes n_i}) |\theta_i\rangle\langle\theta_i|^{\otimes n_i} (\text{id}_{A_i}^{n_i} \otimes U_i^{\dagger \otimes n_i})^\dagger dU_i.$$

By Lemma 10, for every $1 \leq i \leq k$ and $1 \leq m \leq n$, there is an invertible operator $\kappa_m^{(i)} \in \text{L}((\mathbb{C}^{A_i})^{\otimes m})$ such that

$$(\kappa_m^{(i)} \otimes \text{id}_{R_i^m})^{-1/2} T_m^{(i)} (\kappa_m^{(i)} \otimes \text{id}_{R_i^m})^{-1/2} = \text{id}_{\text{Sym}^m(A_i \otimes R_i)}.$$

Let $\kappa := \bigoplus_{n_1 + \dots + n_k = n} \bigotimes_{i=1}^k \kappa_{n_i}^{(i)}$. Then

$$(\kappa \otimes \text{id}_{R^n})^{-1/2} T (\kappa \otimes \text{id}_{R^n})^{-1/2} = \bigoplus_{n_1 + \dots + n_k = n} \bigotimes_{i=1}^k \text{id}_{\text{Sym}^{n_i}(A_i \otimes R_i)} = \text{id}_{\text{Sym}^n(\bigoplus_{i=1}^k A_i \otimes R_i)}.$$

The rest of the proof follows similarly as in the proof of Theorem 1. \square

Lemma 1. Let $\rho_{A^n B^n} \in \text{Pos}\left((\mathbb{C}^{d_A d_B})^{\otimes n}\right)$ be a permutation-invariant and IID-block-diagonal matrix with respect to projections $\{\Pi_i\}_{i=1}^k$ of dimension $\{d_i\}_{i=1}^k$. Then there exists a purification of $\rho_{A^n B^n}$ supported on $\text{Sym}^n\left(\bigoplus_{i=1}^k \mathbb{C}^{d_i} \otimes \mathbb{C}^{d_i}\right)$.

Proof. Since $\rho_{A^n B^n}$ is block-diagonal, its eigenvectors $\{|x\rangle\}_{x \in \mathcal{X}}$ can be picked such that each eigenvector lies in the support of some projection $\Pi_{\vec{i}}$. For any eigenvalue λ , define

$$|\Psi^\lambda\rangle := \sum_{x \in \mathcal{X}_\lambda} |x\rangle \otimes \overline{|x\rangle}$$

where $\mathcal{X}_\lambda := \{x \in \mathcal{X} \mid \rho_{A^n B^n} |x\rangle = \lambda |x\rangle\}$ and the complex conjugation is taken with respect to a tensor product basis on $(\mathbb{C}^{d_A d_B})^{\otimes n}$. Since each eigenvector lies in the support of one projection, we have that $|\Psi^\lambda\rangle = \sum_{\vec{i} \in [k]^n} \Pi_{\vec{i}} \otimes \overline{\Pi_{\vec{i}}} |\Psi^\lambda\rangle$. Thus, $|\Psi^\lambda\rangle$ lies in a subspace of $(\mathbb{C}^{d_A d_B} \otimes \mathbb{C}^{d_A d_B})^{\otimes n}$. In particular,

$$\begin{aligned} |\Psi^\lambda\rangle &\in \bigoplus_{\vec{i} \in [k]^n} \left(\bigotimes_{j=1}^n (\mathbb{C}^{d_{i_j}} \otimes \mathbb{C}^{d_{i_j}}) \right) \\ \implies |\Psi^\lambda\rangle &\in \left(\bigoplus_{i=1}^k \mathbb{C}^{d_i} \otimes \mathbb{C}^{d_i} \right)^{\otimes n}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A6})$$

Moreover, as shown in the proof of Lemma 4.2.2 from [10]

$$P_\pi^{d_A^2 d_B^2, n} |\Psi^\lambda\rangle = |\Psi^\lambda\rangle, \quad (\text{A7})$$

for all $\pi \in S_n$. Combining Eq.(A6) with Eq. (A7), we see that

$$P_\pi^{\sum_{i=1}^k d_i^2, n} |\Psi^\lambda\rangle = |\Psi^\lambda\rangle, \quad (\text{A8})$$

for all $\pi \in S_n$ implying that $|\Psi^\lambda\rangle \in \text{Sym}^n\left(\bigoplus_{i=1}^k \mathbb{C}^{d_i} \otimes \mathbb{C}^{d_i}\right)$.

Finally, it can be straightforwardly verified that

$$|\Psi\rangle := \sum_{\lambda} \sqrt{\lambda} |\Psi^\lambda\rangle$$

is a purification of $\rho_{A^n B^n}$. Since $|\Psi\rangle$ is a linear combination of states in $\text{Sym}\left(\bigoplus_{i=1}^k \mathbb{C}^{d_i} \otimes \mathbb{C}^{d_i}\right)$, we get the required result. \square

Lemma 2. Let G be a compact group and let $\{U_g\}_{g \in G}$ be a unitary representation of G on $\mathbb{C}^{d_A d_B}$ with k irreducible representations with multiplicity $\{m_i\}_{i=1}^k$. If $\rho_{A^n B^n} \in \text{Pos}\left((\mathbb{C}^{d_A d_B})^{\otimes n}\right)$ is permutation invariant and IID- G -invariant, then there exists a purification of $\rho_{A^n B^n}$ on $\text{Sym}^n\left(\bigoplus_{i=1}^k \mathbb{C}^{m_i} \otimes \mathbb{C}^{m_i}\right)$.

To prove this, we first need to establish the following lemma:

Lemma 11. Suppose $\pi_1 : G \rightarrow \mathcal{U}(\mathbb{C}^d)$ and $\pi_2 : G \rightarrow \mathcal{U}(\mathbb{C}^d)$ are two irreducible representations of a compact group G . Let $\Pi := \int_G \pi_1(g) \otimes \overline{\pi_2(g)} d\mu(g)$ where μ is the Haar measure on G . Then Π is an orthogonal projection and $\text{Tr}(\Pi) := \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } \pi_1 \cong \pi_2 \\ 0 & \text{if } \pi_1 \not\cong \pi_2 \end{cases}$.

Proof. Observe that

$$\pi_1(g) \otimes \overline{\pi_2(g)} \Pi = \int_G \pi_1(gh) \otimes \overline{\pi_2(gh)} d\mu(g) = \int_G \pi_1(gh) \otimes \overline{\pi_2(gh)} d\mu(gh) = \Pi \quad (\text{A9})$$

for every $g \in G$. So $\Pi^2 = \int_G \pi_1(g) \otimes \overline{\pi_2(g)} \Pi d\mu(g) = \Pi$, and hence Π is an orthogonal projection. Let $|v\rangle \in \mathbb{C}^d \otimes \mathbb{C}^{d'}$ be a vector such that $\Pi |\psi\rangle = |v\rangle$. Without loss of generality, we may assume $d \leq d'$. Then there exists a linear map $\Lambda : \mathbb{C}^{d'} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^d$ such that $\Lambda \otimes \text{id} |\tau_{d'}\rangle = |v\rangle$ where $|\tau_{d'}\rangle := \frac{1}{\sqrt{d'}} \sum_{\ell=1}^{d'} |\ell\rangle \otimes |\ell\rangle$. Then Eq.(A9) implies

$$\begin{aligned} \pi_1(g) \Lambda \pi_2(g)^\dagger \otimes \text{id} |\tau_{d'}\rangle &= \pi_1(g) \Lambda \otimes \overline{\pi_2(g)} |\tau_{d'}\rangle = \pi_1(g) \otimes \overline{\pi_2(g)} |v\rangle \\ &= \pi_1(g) \otimes \overline{\pi_2(g)} \Pi |v\rangle = \Pi |v\rangle = |v\rangle = \Lambda \otimes \text{id} |\tau_{d'}\rangle \end{aligned}$$

for all $g \in G$. It follows that $\pi_1(g) \Lambda \pi_2(g)^\dagger = \Lambda$ for all $g \in G$. If $\pi_1 \not\cong \pi_2$, then Schur's lemma implies $\Lambda = 0$, so we must have $|v\rangle = 0$, and hence $\Pi = 0$. If $\pi_1 \cong \pi_2$, let U be the unitary such that $\pi_1(g) = U \pi_2(g) U^\dagger$, then by Schur's lemma again, $\Lambda = \lambda U$ for some $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$, and hence Π must be the rank-one projection onto the span of $U \otimes \text{id} |\tau_{d'}\rangle$. \square

Proof of Lemma 2. For notational convenience, we use $\pi : G \rightarrow \mathcal{U}(\mathbb{C}^d)$ to denote the representation that sends $g \mapsto U_g$ for all $g \in G$ where $d = d_A d_B$. Without loss of generality, we may assume $\pi = \bigoplus_{i=1}^k \bigoplus_{j=1}^{m_i} \pi_i^{(j)}$ where each $\pi_i^{(j)}$ is an irreducible representations of G on \mathbb{C}^{d_i} such that $\pi_i^{(j)} \cong \pi_i^{(j')}$ for all $i \in [k]$ and $j, j' \in [m_i]$, and $\pi_i^{(j)} \not\cong \pi_{i'}^{(j')}$ for all $i \neq i'$ in $[k]$. Let $\Pi := \int_G \pi(g) \otimes \overline{\pi(g)} d\mu(g)$. Lemma 11 implies

$$\Pi = \bigoplus_{i,i'=1}^k \bigoplus_{j=1}^{m_i} \bigoplus_{j'=1}^{m_{i'}} \int_G \pi_i^{(j)}(g) \otimes \overline{\pi_{i'}^{(j')}}(g) d\mu(g) = \bigoplus_{i=1}^k \bigoplus_{j,j'=1}^{m_i} \int_G \pi_i^{(j)}(g) \otimes \overline{\pi_i^{(j')}}(g) d\mu(g)$$

is an orthogonal projection of rank $\sum_{i=1}^k m_i^2$, because every $\int_G \pi_i^{(j)}(g) \otimes \overline{\pi_i^{(j')}}(g) d\mu(g)$ is a rank-one projection. Here the conjugation is taken with respect to the standard basis of $\mathbb{C}^d = \bigoplus_{i=1}^k (\mathbb{C}^{d_i})^{\oplus m_i}$. Now we only need to show that there is purification of ρ on $\text{Sym}^n(\text{supp}(\Pi))$. For every eigenvalue λ of ρ and $\vec{g} \in G^n$, since ρ commutes with $\pi(\vec{g})$, the eigenspace \mathcal{H}_λ of λ is invariant under $\pi(\vec{g})$. So \mathcal{H}_λ must be a direct sum of spaces of the form $\mathbb{C}^{d_{i_1}} \otimes \dots \otimes \mathbb{C}^{d_{i_n}}$. This implies that every \mathcal{H}_λ has a basis $\{\mathcal{X}_\lambda\}$ that is a subset of the standard basis \mathcal{X} for $(\mathbb{C}^d)^{\otimes n}$. Let $|\tau\rangle := \sum_{|v\rangle \in \mathcal{X}} |v\rangle \otimes |v\rangle$, and let $|\Psi^\lambda\rangle := \sum_{|v\rangle \in \mathcal{X}_\lambda} |v\rangle \otimes |v\rangle$ for every eigenvalue λ . For every $\vec{g} \in G^n$, since \mathcal{H}_λ is invariant under $\pi(\vec{g})$, the orthogonal projection $\Pi_\lambda := \sum_{|v\rangle \in \mathcal{X}_\lambda} |v\rangle \langle v|$ onto \mathcal{H}_λ commutes with $\pi(\vec{g})$ and $\overline{\pi(\vec{g})}$. It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \pi(\vec{g}) \otimes \overline{\pi(\vec{g})} |\Psi^\lambda\rangle &= (\pi(\vec{g}) \otimes \overline{\pi(\vec{g})}) (\Pi_\lambda \otimes \Pi_\lambda) |\tau\rangle = (\Pi_\lambda \otimes \Pi_\lambda) (\pi(\vec{g}) \otimes \overline{\pi(\vec{g})}) |\tau\rangle \\ &= (\Pi_\lambda \otimes \Pi_\lambda) (\pi(\vec{g}) \pi(\vec{g})^\dagger \otimes \text{id}) |\tau\rangle = \Pi_\lambda \otimes \Pi_\lambda |\tau\rangle = |\Psi^\lambda\rangle \end{aligned}$$

for all λ and \vec{g} . Then $|\Psi\rangle := \sum_\lambda \sqrt{\lambda} |\Psi^\lambda\rangle$ is a purification of ρ satisfying

$$\begin{aligned} \Pi^{\otimes n} |\Psi\rangle &= \left(\int_G \pi(g) \otimes \overline{\pi(g)} d\mu(g) \right)^{\otimes n} |\Psi\rangle = \sum_\lambda \sqrt{\lambda} \left(\int_{G^n} \pi(\vec{g}) \otimes \overline{\pi(\vec{g})} |\Psi^\lambda\rangle d\mu(\vec{g}) \right) \\ &= \sum_\lambda \sqrt{\lambda} |\Psi^\lambda\rangle = |\Psi\rangle. \end{aligned}$$

It is clear that $|\Psi\rangle$ must be permutation invariant, so we conclude that $|\Psi\rangle$ is a purification of ρ on $\text{Sym}^n(\text{supp}(\Pi)) \cong \text{Sym}^n(\mathbb{C}^{\sum_{i=1}^k m_i^2})$. \square

Appendix B: Proof of statements in Sec. III

We begin by reproducing some fairly standard arguments (some of which have been discussed to some extent in Refs. [6, 40]) to prove the starting claims in Sec. III, with small modifications in some cases to adapt them to this work. First, we verify the claim that a channel \mathcal{F} which applies a uniformly random permutation and outputs the permutation choice in a classical register C indeed satisfies Definition 5. To do so, observe that the action of such a channel can be written in the form

$$\mathcal{F}(\rho) = \frac{1}{n!} \sum_{\pi'} \mathcal{E} \circ \mathcal{W}_{\pi'}(\rho) \otimes |\pi'\rangle \langle \pi'|_C, \quad (\text{B1})$$

for some channel \mathcal{E} . Then for any permutation π , if we define G_π to be a channel that changes the value on C by replacing $|\pi'\rangle\langle\pi'|$ with $|\pi' \circ \pi\rangle\langle\pi' \circ \pi|$, we have the claimed property:

$$\begin{aligned}
G_\pi \circ \mathcal{F} \circ \mathcal{W}_\pi(\rho) &= G_\pi \left(\frac{1}{n!} \sum_{\pi'} \mathcal{E} \circ \mathcal{W}_{\pi' \circ \pi}(\rho) \otimes |\pi'\rangle\langle\pi'|_C \right) \\
&= G_\pi \left(\frac{1}{n!} \sum_{\pi''} \mathcal{E} \circ \mathcal{W}_{\pi''}(\rho) \otimes |\pi'' \circ \pi^{-1}\rangle\langle\pi'' \circ \pi^{-1}|_C \right) \\
&= \frac{1}{n!} \sum_{\pi''} \mathcal{E} \circ \mathcal{W}_{\pi''}(\rho) \otimes |\pi''\rangle\langle\pi''|_C \\
&= \mathcal{F}(\rho),
\end{aligned} \tag{B2}$$

where the second line is just a summation relabelling via $\pi'' := \pi' \circ \pi$ (which is a valid bijection on the summation indices) and the third line is by definition of G_π .

To apply a uniformly random permutation on a string of length n in practice, one can apply the Fisher-Yates shuffle, which is a simple algorithm that can permute the string in-place using approximately $n \log(n)$ random bits. Alternatively, there is a minor variation of that algorithm that can be implemented in a “streaming” fashion with respect to the input string, at the cost of requiring enough memory to store the input and output strings simultaneously, as follows. First prepare a “blank” output string. Then take the first value in the input string, select a uniformly random position $j \in [n]$ (which uses approximately $\log(n)$ bits), and fill that value in the j^{th} position in the output string. Repeat this procedure for each subsequent value in the input string, though in each subsequent step, one should only choose a uniformly random position out of the remaining “blank” spaces. This yields a uniformly random permutation of the input string, and uses only about $n \log(n)$ random bits (in fact fewer than that, since later steps require less randomness as the number of blank spaces decreases).

Technically, the above procedure describes permutations on classical strings rather than quantum registers. However, if one were to apply random permutations in QKD protocols in practice, it would indeed usually be performed on the classical output strings rather than the quantum states. This discrepancy can be resolved by noting that if the initial measurement steps in the protocol are described by a channel with an “IID form” $\mathcal{M}^{\otimes n}$, then the permutation of the output strings commutes with these measurements, and hence we can view it as effectively implementing the permutation directly on the quantum registers, as desired.

We now prove Lemma 3, by first showing the following lemmas Lemmas 12 and 13. Note that Lemma 12 is also proved in the proof of [6, Theorem 2].

Lemma 12. Let $\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{F}' \in \mathbb{T}(A^n B^n, K)$ be linear maps such that $\mathcal{F} - \mathcal{F}'$ is a permutation-invariant linear map. Let $\rho_{A^n B^n R'} \in \text{Pos}(A^n B^n R')$ be any extension of $\rho_{A^n B^n}$. Then the state $\bar{\rho}_{A^n B^n} = \frac{1}{n!} \sum_{\pi \in S_n} \mathcal{W}_\pi(\rho_{A^n B^n})$ is permutation-invariant, and for any purification $\bar{\rho}_{A^n B^n R'}$ of that state, we have

$$\|((\mathcal{F} - \mathcal{F}') \otimes \text{id}_{R''})(\rho_{A^n B^n R''})\|_1 \leq \|((\mathcal{F} - \mathcal{F}') \otimes \text{id}_{R'}) (\bar{\rho}_{A^n B^n R'})\|_1. \tag{B3}$$

Proof. Construct

$$\bar{\rho}_{A^n B^n R'' \tilde{R}} = \frac{1}{n!} \sum_{\pi \in S_n} (\mathcal{W}_\pi \otimes I_{R''})(\rho_{A^n B^n R''}) \otimes |\pi\rangle\langle\pi|_{\tilde{R}} \tag{B4}$$

as an extension of $\bar{\rho}_{A^n B^n}$. Therefore, there exists $\Phi \in \mathcal{C}(R', R'' \tilde{R})$ such that $(\text{id}_{A^n B^n} \otimes \Phi)(\bar{\rho}_{A^n B^n R'}) = \bar{\rho}_{A^n B^n R'' \tilde{R}}$. Since trace norm cannot increase under CPTNI maps, we have

$$\|((\mathcal{F} - \mathcal{F}') \otimes \text{id}_{R'' \tilde{R}})(\bar{\rho}_{A^n B^n R'' \tilde{R}})\|_1 \leq \|((\mathcal{F} - \mathcal{F}') \otimes \text{id}_{R'}) (\bar{\rho}_{A^n B^n R'})\|_1. \tag{B5}$$

Next, making use of the permutation-invariance of $\mathcal{F} - \mathcal{F}'$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\|((\mathcal{F} - \mathcal{F}') \otimes \text{id}_{R''})(\rho_{A^n B^n R''})\|_1 &= \frac{1}{n!} \sum_{\pi \in S_n} \| (G_\pi \circ (\mathcal{F} - \mathcal{F}') \circ \mathcal{W}_\pi \otimes \text{id}_{R''})(\rho_{A^n B^n R''}) \|_1 \\
&\leq \frac{1}{n!} \sum_{\pi \in S_n} \| ((\mathcal{F} - \mathcal{F}') \circ \mathcal{W}_\pi \otimes \text{id}_{R''})(\rho_{A^n B^n R''}) \|_1 \\
&= \|((\mathcal{F} - \mathcal{F}') \otimes \text{id}_{R'' \tilde{R}})(\bar{\rho}_{A^n B^n R'' \tilde{R}})\|_1,
\end{aligned} \tag{B6}$$

where the inequality again follows from the fact that CPTNI maps cannot increase trace norm, and the final inequality follows from the fact that the states $((\mathcal{F} - \mathcal{F}') \circ \mathcal{W}_\pi \otimes \text{id}_{R''}) (\rho_{A^n B^n R''})$ are orthogonal for different π . Putting Eqs. (B5) and (B6) together, we get the desired result. \square

Lemma 13. Let $\rho_{A^n B^n} \in \text{Pos}(A^n B^n)$ and $\tau_{A^n B^n} \in \text{Pos}(A^n B^n)$ be such that $\rho_{A^n B^n} \leq g_{n,x} \tau_{A^n B^n}$ for some $g_{n,x} \in \mathbb{R}_+$. Let $\rho_{A^n B^n R'}$ be any extension of $\rho_{A^n B^n}$, and let $\tau_{A^n B^n R}$ be any purification of $\tau_{A^n B^n}$. Then for any two maps $\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{F}' \in \mathcal{T}(A^n B^n, K)$,

$$\|((\mathcal{F} - \mathcal{F}') \otimes \text{id}_{R'}) (\rho_{A^n B^n R'})\|_1 \leq g_{n,x} \|((\mathcal{F} - \mathcal{F}') \otimes \text{id}_R) (\tau_{A^n B^n R})\|_1 \quad (\text{B7})$$

Proof. Since $\rho_{A^n B^n} \leq g_{n,x} \tau_{A^n B^n}$, there exists a $\omega_{A^n B^n} \in \text{S}_o(A^n B^n)$ such that $\rho_{A^n B^n} + (g_{n,x} - 1)\omega_{A^n B^n} = g_{n,x} \tau_{A^n B^n}$. One can then construct an extension of $\tau_{A^n B^n}$ as,

$$\tau_{A^n B^n R'M} = \frac{1}{g_{n,x}} \rho_{A^n B^n R'} \otimes |0\rangle\langle 0|_M + \left(1 - \frac{1}{g_{n,x}}\right) \omega_{A^n B^n R'} \otimes |1\rangle\langle 1|_M. \quad (\text{B8})$$

Since the map $(\mathcal{F} - \mathcal{F}') \otimes \text{id}_{R'M}$ acts identically on M , the two terms above are orthogonal before and after the action of the map. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \|((\mathcal{F} - \mathcal{F}') \otimes \text{id}_{R'M}) (\tau_{A^n B^n R'M})\|_1 &= \frac{1}{g_{n,x}} \|((\mathcal{F} - \mathcal{F}') \otimes \text{id}_{R'M}) (\rho_{A^n B^n R'} \otimes |0\rangle\langle 0|)\|_1 \\ &\quad + \left(1 - \frac{1}{g_{n,x}}\right) \|((\mathcal{F} - \mathcal{F}') \otimes \text{id}_{R'M}) (\omega_{A^n B^n R'} \otimes |1\rangle\langle 1|)\|_1 \\ &\geq \frac{1}{g_{n,x}} \|((\mathcal{F} - \mathcal{F}') \otimes \text{id}_{R'}) (\rho_{A^n B^n R'})\|_1 \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B9})$$

Finally, for any purification $\tau_{A^n B^n R}$ of $\tau_{A^n B^n}$, and extension $\tau_{A^n B^n R'M}$ of $\tau_{A^n B^n}$, there exists a CPTP map $\Phi \in \mathcal{C}(R, R'M)$ such that $(\text{id}_{A^n B^n} \otimes \Phi) (\tau_{A^n B^n R}) = \tau_{A^n B^n R'M}$. Therefore,

$$\|((F - F') \otimes \text{id}_R) (\tau_{A^n B^n R})\|_1 \geq \|((F - F') \otimes \text{id}_{R'M}) (\tau_{A^n B^n R'M})\|_1 \quad (\text{B10})$$

follows from the fact that CPTP maps cannot increase trace norm. Putting Eq. (B9) and (B10) together, the desired result is obtained. \square

Lemma 12 lets us assume without loss of generality that the input state to a permutation-invariant QKD protocol is permutation-invariant on $A^n B^n$. Thus, the input states to such protocols satisfy the de Finetti reductions (Corollary 1.1) described in Section II. Using Lemma 13 on this de Finetti reduction allows us to prove the following lemma after combining Lemmas 12 and 13 and Corollary 1.1.

Lemma 3. Let $\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{F}' \in \mathcal{T}(A^n B^n, K)$ be such that $\mathcal{F} - \mathcal{F}'$ is a permutation-invariant map. Let $\rho_{A^n B^n R''} \in \text{Pos}(A^n B^n R'')$ with $\text{Tr}_{B^n R''} (\rho_{A^n B^n R''}) = (\hat{\sigma}_A)^{\otimes n}$. Then there exists a probability measure $d\sigma_{AB}$ on the set of extensions σ_{AB} of $\hat{\sigma}_A$ such that

$$\|((\mathcal{F} - \mathcal{F}') \otimes \text{id}_{R''}) (\rho_{A^n B^n R''})\|_1 \leq g_{n,x} \|((\mathcal{F} - \mathcal{F}') \otimes \text{id}_R) (\tau_{A^n B^n R})\|_1, \quad (9)$$

where $\tau_{A^n B^n R}$ is any purification of $\tau_{A^n B^n} = \int d\sigma_{AB} \sigma_{AB}^{\otimes n}$, and $x = d_A^2 d_B^2$.

We now turn to the main technical proof for this section, which addresses the flaw in Ref. [6]. Essentially, the gap in the argument was the claim that one can compensate for the purifying register V in the state $\tau_{Z^n C^n C_E E^n V}$ (defined below) by simply subtracting $\log \dim(V)$ from the key length. That claim would have been true if we had a bound on the smooth min-entropy for *every* IID state contributing to the mixture $\tau_{Z^n C^n C_E E^n}$ and chose the hash length accordingly. However, the structure of typical IID security proofs (as we described in Section III B 1) does not straightforwardly yield such a bound, as it does not consider the smooth min-entropy of states outside the set S . We fix this by applying a different argument to lower bound the smooth min-entropy of $\tau_{Z^n C^n C_E E^n \wedge \Omega_{\text{acc}}}$, at the cost of a worse smoothing parameter, though we leave for future work the question of whether an alternative argument might prove the original claim in Ref. [6].

Theorem 3 (Postselection Theorem). Suppose $\mathcal{E}_{\text{QKD}}^{(l)} \in \mathcal{C}(A^n B^n, K_A \tilde{C})$ is such that Eqs. (10) and (11) are satisfied. Let the state $\tau_{A^n B^n}$ be given by

$$\tau_{A^n B^n} = \int \sigma_{AB}^{\otimes n} d\sigma_{AB}, \quad (13)$$

where $d\sigma_{AB}$ is some probability measure on the set of non-negative extensions σ_{AB} of $\hat{\sigma}_A$ and $\tau_{A^n B^n R}$ be a purification of $\tau_{A^n B^n}$. Let $\mathcal{E}_{\text{QKD}}^{(l')}$ be a QKD protocol map identical to $\mathcal{E}_{\text{QKD}}^{(l)}$, except that it hashes to a length $l' = l - 2\log(g_{n,x})$ instead of l upon acceptance, and $x = d_A^2 d_B^2$. Then,

$$\frac{1}{2} \left\| \left(\left(\mathcal{E}_{\text{QKD}}^{(l')} - \mathcal{E}_{\text{QKD}}^{(l'), \text{ideal}} \right) \otimes \text{id}_R \right) (\tau_{A^n B^n R}) \right\|_1 \leq \varepsilon_{\text{PA}} + 2\bar{\varepsilon} + 2\sqrt{2\varepsilon_{\text{AT}}}. \quad (14)$$

Proof. Suppose the protocol is run with the input state $\tau_{A^n B^n R}$. Then, the output states of the real and ideal protocols can be written as

$$\begin{aligned} \left(\mathcal{E}_{\text{QKD}}^{(l')} \otimes \text{id}_R \right) (\tau_{A^n B^n R}) &= \Pr(\Omega_{\text{acc}}) \tau_{K_A \tilde{C} R | \Omega_{\text{acc}}}^{(l')} + (1 - \Pr(\Omega_{\text{acc}})) \tau_{K_A \tilde{C} R | \Omega_{\text{acc}}}^{(\perp)} \\ \left(\mathcal{E}_{\text{QKD}}^{(l'), \text{ideal}} \otimes \text{id}_R \right) (\tau_{A^n B^n R}) &= \Pr(\Omega_{\text{acc}}) \tau_{K_A \tilde{C} R | \Omega_{\text{acc}}}^{(l', \text{ideal})} + (1 - \Pr(\Omega_{\text{acc}})) \tau_{K_A \tilde{C} R | \Omega_{\text{acc}}}^{(\perp, \text{ideal})} \end{aligned} \quad (B11)$$

where we separate the output states conditioned on the event Ω_{acc} (protocol accepts) and its complement Ω_{acc}^c . Since the output states of the real and ideal protocol are the same when the protocol aborts, we have

$$\left\| \left(\left(\mathcal{E}_{\text{QKD}}^{(l')} - \mathcal{E}_{\text{QKD}}^{(l'), \text{ideal}} \right) \otimes \text{id}_R \right) (\tau_{A^n B^n R}) \right\|_1 = \Pr(\Omega_{\text{acc}}) \left\| \tau_{K_A \tilde{C} R | \Omega_{\text{acc}}}^{(l')} - \tau_{K_A \tilde{C} R | \Omega_{\text{acc}}}^{(l', \text{ideal})} \right\|_1. \quad (B12)$$

Let the state of the protocol just before privacy amplification be given by $\tau_{Z^n C^n C_E R}$, where Z^n denotes Alice's raw key register, C^n denotes round-by-round announcements, C_E denotes error-correction and error-verification announcements.

We will first obtain a lower bound on the smooth min-entropy of the state $\tau_{Z^n C^n C_E E^n \wedge \Omega_{\text{acc}}}$, where $\tau_{A^n B^n E^n}$ is an IID extension of $\tau_{A^n B^n}$. We will then obtain a lower bound on the smooth min-entropy of $\tau_{Z^n C^n C_E R \wedge \Omega_{\text{acc}}}$. We will then show that the choice of l' is such that an ε_{sec} -secret key of l' bits can be safely extracted from the state $\tau_{Z^n C^n C_E R \wedge \Omega_{\text{acc}}}$.

Obtaining a lower bound $H_{\min}^{\varepsilon}(Z^n | C^n C_E E^n)_{\tau \wedge \Omega_{\text{acc}}}$: We will utilize the IID security proof statements Eqs. (10) and (11) for this part of the argument. First, we set up some notation to split the set of IID states into two convenient parts. Let $T' = \{\sigma_{AB} : \text{Tr}_B(\sigma_{AB}) = \hat{\sigma}_A, \Pr(\Omega_{\text{acc}})_{\sigma} \leq \varepsilon_{\text{AT}}\}$ be the set of states that the protocol accepts with probability less than ε_{AT} . Let $T = \{\sigma_{AB} : \text{Tr}_B(\sigma_{AB}) = \hat{\sigma}_A, \Pr(\Omega_{\text{acc}})_{\sigma} > \varepsilon_{\text{AT}}\}$. Recall from Eq. (10) of the IID security proof statement, that S is the set of states such that $\sigma \notin S \implies \Pr(\Omega_{\text{acc}})_{\sigma} \leq \varepsilon_{\text{AT}}$. Clearly, $T \subseteq S$. We can then write $\tau_{A^n B^n}$ and its extension $\tau_{A^n B^n E^n}$ as

$$\begin{aligned} \tau_{A^n B^n} &= \int_{\sigma \in T} d\sigma \sigma_{AB}^{\otimes n} + \int_{\sigma \in T'} d\sigma \sigma_{AB}^{\otimes n} = \tau_{A^n B^n}^{(1)} + \tau_{A^n B^n}^{(2)} \\ \tau_{A^n B^n E^n} &= \int_{\sigma \in T} d\sigma \sigma_{ABE}^{\otimes n} + \int_{\sigma \in T'} d\sigma \sigma_{ABE}^{\otimes n} = \tau_{A^n B^n E^n}^{(1)} + \tau_{A^n B^n E^n}^{(2)} \end{aligned} \quad (B13)$$

where σ_{ABE} is a purification of σ_{AB} , and where we used the fact that $\tau_{A^n B^n}$ is a mixture of IID states which are extensions of $\hat{\sigma}_A$, so we can split the mixture into two components $\tau^{(1)}, \tau^{(2)}$ defined by integrals over T and T' respectively.

We also have $\tau_{Z^n C^n C_E E^n \wedge \Omega_{\text{acc}}} = \tau_{Z^n C^n C_E E^n \wedge \Omega_{\text{acc}}}^{(1)} + \tau_{Z^n C^n C_E E^n \wedge \Omega_{\text{acc}}}^{(2)}$ by linearity. Since the IID states in $\tau_{A^n B^n}^{(2)}$ abort with high probability, we expect $\tau_{Z^n C^n C_E E^n \wedge \Omega_{\text{acc}}}$ to be "close" to $\tau_{Z^n C^n C_E E^n \wedge \Omega_{\text{acc}}}^{(1)}$. To bound the distance between these states, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \tau_{Z^n C^n C_E E^n \wedge \Omega_{\text{acc}}} - \tau_{Z^n C^n C_E E^n \wedge \Omega_{\text{acc}}}^{(1)} \right\|_1 &= \left\| \tau_{Z^n C^n C_E E^n \wedge \Omega_{\text{acc}}}^{(2)} \right\|_1 \\ &= \left\| \int_{\sigma \in T'} d\sigma \Pr(\Omega_{\text{acc}})_{\sigma} \sigma_{Z^n C^n C_E E^n | \Omega_{\text{acc}}} \right\|_1 \\ &\leq \int_{\sigma \in T'} d\sigma \Pr(\Omega_{\text{acc}})_{\sigma} \leq \varepsilon_{\text{AT}}. \end{aligned} \quad (B14)$$

Thus, the generalized trace distance [41] between the two states satisfies $\Delta(\tau_{Z^n C^n E^n \wedge \Omega_{\text{acc}}}, \tau_{Z^n C^n C_E E^n \wedge \Omega_{\text{acc}}}^{(1)}) = \frac{1}{2} \left\| \tau_{Z^n C^n C_E E^n \wedge \Omega_{\text{acc}}}^{(2)} \right\|_1 + \frac{1}{2} |\text{Tr}(\tau_{Z^n C^n C_E E^n \wedge \Omega_{\text{acc}}}^{(2)})| \leq \varepsilon_{\text{AT}}$. Therefore, the purified distance can be bounded as

$$P(\tau_{Z^n C^n C_E E^n \wedge \Omega_{\text{acc}}}, \tau_{Z^n C^n C_E E^n \wedge \Omega_{\text{acc}}}^{(1)}) \leq \sqrt{2\Delta(\tau_{Z^n C^n E^n \wedge \Omega_{\text{acc}}}, \tau_{Z^n C^n C_E E^n \wedge \Omega_{\text{acc}}}^{(1)})} = \sqrt{2\varepsilon_{\text{AT}}} \quad (B15)$$

using [41, Lemma 3.5]. This allows us to relate the smooth min entropies of the two states as follows.

Let $H_{\min}^{\bar{\varepsilon}}(Z^n|C^n C_E E^n)_{\tau \wedge \Omega_{\text{acc}}} = H_{\min}(Z^n|C^n C_E E^n)_{\rho^{(1)}}$ with $P(\rho_{Z^n C^n C_E E^n}^{(1)}, \tau_{Z^n C^n C_E E^n \wedge \Omega_{\text{acc}}}^{(1)}) \leq \bar{\varepsilon}$. By the triangle inequality for purified distance, we have $P(\rho_{Z^n C^n C_E E^n}^{(1)}, \tau_{Z^n C^n C_E E^n \wedge \Omega_{\text{acc}}}) \leq \bar{\varepsilon} + \sqrt{2\varepsilon_{\text{AT}}}$. Therefore, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} H_{\min}^{\bar{\varepsilon} + \sqrt{2\varepsilon_{\text{AT}}}}(Z^n|C^n C_E E^n)_{\tau \wedge \Omega_{\text{acc}}} &\geq H_{\min}(Z^n|C^n C_E E^n)_{\rho^{(1)}} \\ &= H_{\min}^{\bar{\varepsilon}}(Z^n|C^n C_E E^n)_{\tau^{(1)} \wedge \Omega_{\text{acc}}} \\ &\geq \min_{\sigma \in T} H_{\min}^{\bar{\varepsilon}}(Z^n|C^n C_E E^n)_{\sigma \wedge \Omega_{\text{acc}}} \\ &\geq \min_{\sigma \in S} H_{\min}^{\bar{\varepsilon}}(Z^n|C^n C_E E^n)_{\sigma \wedge \Omega_{\text{acc}}} \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B16})$$

where we used $P(\tau_{X_A C E^n \wedge \Omega}, \tau_{X_A C E^n \wedge \Omega}^{(1)}) \leq \sqrt{2\Delta} = \sqrt{2\varepsilon_{\text{AT}}}$ to obtain the first inequality, Lemma 14 to obtain the second inequality, and $T \subset S$ to get the third. Notice that $\min_{\sigma \in S} H_{\min}^{\bar{\varepsilon}}(Z^n|C^n C_E E^n)_{\sigma \wedge \Omega_{\text{acc}}}$ is the same expression that appears in the IID key length expression Eq. (11).

Obtaining a lower bound on $H_{\min}^{\bar{\varepsilon}}(Z^n|C^n C_E E^n)_{\tau \wedge \Omega_{\text{acc}}}$: Since we require $\tau_{A^n B^n R}$ to be a purification, we can purify $\tau_{A^n B^n E^n}$ to $\tau_{A^n B^n E^n V}$. Note that since each $\sigma_{ABE}^{\otimes n}$ in Eq. B13 is supported on $\text{Sym}^n(\mathbb{C}^{d_A^2 d_B^2})$, $\tau_{A^n B^n E^n}$ is supported on $\text{Sym}^n(\mathbb{C}^{d_A^2 d_B^2})$. Thus, the dimension of the purifying register V is bounded by $\dim(V) \leq \dim(\text{Sym}^n(\mathbb{C}^{d_A^2 d_B^2})) = g_{n,x}$ with $x = d_A^2 d_B^2$. Then, using [42, Eq. (8)], we have

$$H_{\min}^{\bar{\varepsilon} + \sqrt{2\varepsilon_{\text{AT}}}}(Z^n|C^n C_E E^n V)_{\tau \wedge \Omega_{\text{acc}}} \geq H_{\min}^{\bar{\varepsilon} + \sqrt{2\varepsilon_{\text{AT}}}}(Z^n|C^n C_E E^n)_{\tau \wedge \Omega_{\text{acc}}} - 2 \log(g_{n,x}) \quad (\text{B17})$$

Reducing the hash length: Let $l' = l - 2 \log g_{n,x}$. Applying the leftover hashing lemma [41] to $\tau_{Z^n C^n C_E E^n V}$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2} \Pr(\Omega_{\text{acc}})_{\tau} \left\| \tau_{K_A C^n C_E E^n V | \Omega_{\text{acc}}}^{(l')} - \tau_{K_A C^n C_E E^n V | \Omega_{\text{acc}}}^{(l'), \text{ideal}} \right\|_1 &\leq \frac{1}{2} 2^{-\frac{1}{2}} \left(H_{\min}^{\bar{\varepsilon} + \sqrt{2\varepsilon_{\text{AT}}}}(Z^n|C^n C_E E^n V)_{\tau \wedge \Omega_{\text{acc}}} - (l - 2 \log(g_{n,x})) \right) \\ &\quad + 2(\bar{\varepsilon} + \sqrt{2\varepsilon_{\text{AT}}}) \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2} 2^{-\frac{1}{2}} \left(H_{\min}^{\bar{\varepsilon} + \sqrt{2\varepsilon_{\text{AT}}}}(Z^n|C^n C_E E^n)_{\tau \wedge \Omega}^{-l} \right) + 2(\bar{\varepsilon} + \sqrt{2\varepsilon_{\text{AT}}}) \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2} 2^{-\frac{1}{2}} (\min_{\sigma \in S} H_{\min}^{\bar{\varepsilon}}(Z^n|C^n C_E E^n)_{\sigma \wedge \Omega_{\text{acc}}} - l) + 2(\bar{\varepsilon} + \sqrt{2\varepsilon_{\text{AT}}}) \\ &\leq \varepsilon_{\text{PA}} + 2\bar{\varepsilon} + 2\sqrt{2\varepsilon_{\text{AT}}} \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B18})$$

where we used Eq. (B17) for the second inequality, and Eq. (B16) for the third inequality, and Eq. (11) for the final inequality.

Identifying $E^n V$ with R , we obtain the required statement

$$\left\| \left((\mathcal{E}_{\text{QKD}}^{(l')} - \mathcal{E}_{\text{QKD}}^{(l'), \text{ideal}}) \otimes \text{id}_R \right) (\tau_{A^n B^n R}) \right\|_1 \leq (\varepsilon_{\text{PA}} + \bar{\varepsilon} + 2\sqrt{2\varepsilon_{\text{AT}}}) \quad (\text{B19})$$

□

The following lemma was used in the proof above.

Lemma 14. Let $\rho_{AB} = \int_{\sigma \in S} d\sigma \sigma_{AB}$ for some set of states S . Then,

$$H_{\min}^{\bar{\varepsilon}}(A|B)_{\rho} \geq \inf_{\sigma \in S} H_{\min}^{\bar{\varepsilon}}(A|B)_{\sigma} \quad (\text{B20})$$

Proof. From [43], ρ_{AB} can always be written as a finite sum of states in S , i.e. $\rho_{AB} = \sum_z \Pr(z) \sigma_{AB}^{(z)}$, where $\sigma_{AB}^{(z)} \in S$. Next, we define $\rho_{ABZ} := \sum_z \Pr(z) \sigma_{AB}^{(z)} \otimes |z\rangle\langle z|$, and let $H_{\min}(A|B)_{\tilde{\sigma}^{(z)}} = H_{\min}^{\bar{\varepsilon}}(A|B)_{\sigma^{(z)}}$, with $P(\tilde{\sigma}^{(z)}, \sigma^{(z)}) \leq \bar{\varepsilon}$. Define $\tilde{\sigma}_{ABZ} := \sum_z \Pr(z) \tilde{\sigma}_{AB}^{(z)} \otimes |z\rangle\langle z|$. Then, from [41, Eq. 3.59], we obtain

$$P\left(\sum_z \Pr(z) \sigma_{AB}^{(z)} \otimes |z\rangle\langle z|, \sum_z \Pr(z) \tilde{\sigma}_{AB}^{(z)} \otimes |z\rangle\langle z|\right) \leq \max_z P\left(\sigma_{AB}^{(z)}, \tilde{\sigma}_{AB}^{(z)}\right) \leq \bar{\varepsilon} \quad (\text{B21})$$

Therefore,

$$H_{\min}^{\tilde{\varepsilon}}(A|BZ)_\rho \geq H_{\min}(A|BZ)_{\hat{\sigma}} \geq \inf_z H_{\min}(A|B)_{\hat{\sigma}(z)} = \inf_z H_{\min}^{\tilde{\varepsilon}}(A|B)_{\rho(z)} \quad (\text{B22})$$

where we used [41, Eq. 6.25] for the second inequality. The required claim then follows from the fact that $H_{\min}^{\tilde{\varepsilon}}(A|B) \geq H_{\min}^{\tilde{\varepsilon}}(A|BY)$. \square

We next prove the result for variable-length protocols. Our proof is based on an argument that was used in [40] to remove the random permutation at the start of the protocol (we highlight however that in order for the argument in that work to be valid, the error-correction code must satisfy a permutation-invariance property that does not necessarily hold for error-correction procedures used in practice). In principle we could have applied a similar argument in our analysis of fixed-length protocols above; however, the approach we used there results in a somewhat better secrecy parameter.

Theorem 4 (Postselection Theorem for Variable-length). Suppose $\mathcal{E}_{\text{var-QKD}}^{(l_1, \dots, l_M)} \in \mathcal{C}(A^n B^n, K_A \tilde{C})$ is such that the ε_{sec} -secrecy condition (Eq. (18)) holds for all IID states $\rho_{A^n B^n E^n} = \sigma_{ABE}^{\otimes n}$ satisfying $\text{Tr}_{BE}(\sigma_{ABE}) = \hat{\sigma}_A$. Let the state $\tau_{A^n B^n}$ be given by

$$\tau_{A^n B^n} = \int \sigma_{AB}^{\otimes n} d\sigma_{AB}, \quad (\text{19})$$

where $d\sigma_{AB}$ is some probability measure on the set of non-negative extensions σ_{AB} of $\hat{\sigma}_A$ and $\tau_{A^n B^n R}$ be a purification of $\tau_{A^n B^n}$. Let $\mathcal{E}_{\text{var-QKD}}^{(l'_1, \dots, l'_M)}$ be a variable-length QKD protocol map identical to $\mathcal{E}_{\text{var-QKD}}^{(l_1, \dots, l_M)}$, except that it hashes to a length $l'_i = l_i - 2 \log(g_{n,x}) - 2 \log(1/\tilde{\varepsilon})$ instead of length l_i , upon the event Ω_i , where $x = d_A^2 d_B^2$. Then,

$$\frac{1}{2} \left\| \left(\left(\mathcal{E}_{\text{var-QKD}}^{(l'_1, \dots, l'_M)} - \mathcal{E}_{\text{var-QKD}}^{(l'_1, \dots, l'_M), \text{ideal}} \right) \otimes \text{id}_R \right) (\tau_{A^n B^n R}) \right\|_1 \leq \sqrt{8\varepsilon_{\text{sec}}} + \frac{\tilde{\varepsilon}}{2} \quad (\text{20})$$

Proof. Recall that in the variable-length protocol, multiple events may occur. Either the protocol aborts and does not produce any key (Ω_{acc}^c), or it accepts and produces a key of length l_i (when event Ω_i occurs). Thus, we write the output states for $\mathcal{E}_{\text{var-QKD}}^{(l'_1, \dots, l'_M)}$, $\mathcal{E}_{\text{var-QKD}}^{(l'_1, \dots, l'_M), \text{ideal}}$, for the input state $\tau_{A^n B^n R}$, as

$$\begin{aligned} \left(\mathcal{E}_{\text{var-QKD}}^{(l'_1, \dots, l'_M)} \otimes \text{id}_R \right) (\tau_{A^n B^n R}) &= \sum_{i=1}^M \Pr(\Omega_i) \tau_{K_A \tilde{C} R | \Omega_i}^{(l'_i)} + \Pr(\Omega_{\text{acc}}^c) \tau_{K_A \tilde{C} R | \Omega_{\text{acc}}^c}^{(\perp)} \\ \left(\mathcal{E}_{\text{var-QKD}}^{(l'_1, \dots, l'_M), \text{ideal}} \otimes \text{id}_R \right) (\tau_{A^n B^n R}) &= \sum_{i=1}^M \Pr(\Omega_i) \tau_{K_A \tilde{C} R | \Omega_i}^{(l'_i, \text{ideal})} + \Pr(\Omega_{\text{acc}}^c) \tau_{K_A \tilde{C} R | \Omega_{\text{acc}}^c}^{(\perp, \text{ideal})} \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B23})$$

where recall that the protocol produces a key of length l'_i when the event Ω_i occurs. Similarly, we write the output states for $\mathcal{E}_{\text{var-QKD}}^{(l_1, \dots, l_M)}$, $\mathcal{E}_{\text{var-QKD}}^{(l_1, \dots, l_M), \text{ideal}}$, for the input state $\tau_{A^n B^n E^n}$ as

$$\begin{aligned} \left(\mathcal{E}_{\text{var-QKD}}^{(l_1, \dots, l_M)} \otimes \text{id}_{E^n} \right) (\tau_{A^n B^n E^n}) &= \sum_{i=1}^M \Pr(\Omega_i) \tau_{K_A \tilde{C} E^n | \Omega_i}^{(l_i)} + \Pr(\Omega_{\text{acc}}^c) \tau_{K_A \tilde{C} E^n | \Omega_{\text{acc}}^c}^{(\perp)} \\ \left(\mathcal{E}_{\text{var-QKD}}^{(l_1, \dots, l_M), \text{ideal}} \otimes \text{id}_{E^n} \right) (\tau_{A^n B^n E^n}) &= \sum_{i=1}^M \Pr(\Omega_i) \tau_{K_A \tilde{C} E^n | \Omega_i}^{(l_i, \text{ideal})} + \Pr(\Omega_{\text{acc}}^c) \tau_{K_A \tilde{C} E^n | \Omega_{\text{acc}}^c}^{(\perp, \text{ideal})} \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B24})$$

where

$$\tau_{A^n B^n E^n} = \int \sigma_{ABE}^{\otimes n} d\sigma. \quad (\text{B25})$$

Recall that since each event Ω_i leads to a different length of the final key, the states $\tau_{K_A \tilde{C} E^n | \Omega_i}^{(l_i)}$ have orthogonal supports. Moreover, the output state conditioned on abort is identical for the real and ideal protocols. Therefore, from the ε_{sec} -secrecy statement (Eq. (18)) for IID states, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{1}{2} \left\| \left(\left(\mathcal{E}_{\text{var-QKD}}^{(l_1, \dots, l_M)} - \mathcal{E}_{\text{var-QKD}}^{(l_1, \dots, l_M), \text{ideal}} \right) \otimes \text{id}_{E^n} \right) (\tau_{A^n B^n E^n}) \right\|_1 &= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^M \Pr(\Omega_i) \left\| \tau_{K_A \tilde{C} E^n | \Omega_i}^{(l_i)} - \tau_{K_A \tilde{C} E^n | \Omega_i}^{(l_i, \text{ideal})} \right\|_1 \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^M \lambda_i \leq \varepsilon_{\text{sec}},
\end{aligned} \tag{B26}$$

where we define

$$\lambda_i := \frac{1}{2} \Pr(\Omega_i) \left\| \tau_{K_A \tilde{C} E^n | \Omega_i}^{(l_i)} - \tau_{K_A \tilde{C} E^n | \Omega_i}^{(l_i, \text{ideal})} \right\|_1. \tag{B27}$$

Without loss of generality, we can assume $\Pr(\Omega_i) > \lambda_i$ (if equality occurs, then the required bound in Eq. (B31) for the proof follows trivially). The converse bound for privacy amplification [41, Theorem 7.7] allows us to bound the smooth min-entropy of the state prior to privacy amplification, as follows :

$$H_{\min}^{\sqrt{2\lambda'_i - \lambda_i^2}}(Z^n | E^n C^n C_E)_{\tau | \Omega_i} \geq l_i, \quad \lambda'_i = \frac{\lambda_i}{\Pr(\Omega_i)} \tag{B28}$$

Since we require $\tau_{A^n B^n R}$ to be a purification, we purify $\tau_{A^n B^n E^n}$ in the same manner as in the proof of Theorem 3. Since each $\sigma_{ABE}^{\otimes n}$ in Eq. B25 belongs to $\text{Sym}^n(\mathbb{C}^{d_A^2 d_B^2})$, $\tau_{A^n B^n E^n}$ is supported on $\text{Sym}^n(\mathbb{C}^{d_A^2 d_B^2})$. Thus, the dimension of the purifying register V is bounded by $\dim(V) \leq \dim(\text{Sym}^n(\mathbb{C}^{d_A^2 d_B^2})) \leq g_{n,x}$ with $x = d_A^2 d_B^2$. Then, using [42, Eq. (8)], we have

$$\begin{aligned}
H_{\min}^{\sqrt{2\lambda'_i - \lambda_i^2}}(Z^n | E^n V C^n C_E)_{\tau | \Omega_i} &\geq H_{\min}^{\sqrt{2\lambda'_i - \lambda_i^2}}(Z^n | E^n C^n C_E)_{\tau | \Omega_i} - 2 \log(\dim(V)) \\
&\geq l_i - 2 \log(g_{n,x})
\end{aligned} \tag{B29}$$

Therefore, consider the modified protocol $\mathcal{E}_{\text{var-QKD}}^{(l'_1, \dots, l'_M)}$ that hashes to $l'_i = l_i - 2 \log(g_{n,x}) - 2 \log(1/\tilde{\varepsilon})$ instead of l_i , upon the event Ω_i , where $x = d_A^2 d_B^2$. In this case, using the leftover hashing lemma [5, Proposition 9] for smooth min-entropy, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\left\| \tau_{K_A \tilde{C} E^n V | \Omega_i}^{(l'_i)} - \tau_{K_A \tilde{C} E^n V | \Omega_i}^{(l'_i, \text{ideal})} \right\|_1 &\leq 2^{-\frac{1}{2}} \left(H_{\min}^{\sqrt{2\lambda'_i - \lambda_i^2}}(Z^n | E^n V C^n C_E)_{\tau | \Omega_i} - l'_i \right) + 4 \sqrt{2\lambda'_i - \lambda_i^2} \\
&\leq 2^{\log(\tilde{\varepsilon})} + 4 \sqrt{2\lambda'_i - \lambda_i^2} \\
&= \tilde{\varepsilon} + 4 \sqrt{2\lambda'_i - \lambda_i^2}
\end{aligned} \tag{B30}$$

Therefore, bringing all the terms together, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{1}{2} \left\| \left(\left(\mathcal{E}_{\text{var-QKD}}^{(l'_1, \dots, l'_M)} - \mathcal{E}_{\text{var-QKD}}^{(l'_1, \dots, l'_M), \text{ideal}} \right) \otimes \text{id}_{E^n V} \right) (\tau_{A^n B^n E^n V}) \right\|_1 \\
&= \sum_i \frac{1}{2} \Pr(\Omega_i) \left\| \tau_{K_A \tilde{C} E^n V | \Omega_i}^{(l'_i)} - \tau_{K_A \tilde{C} E^n V | \Omega_i}^{(l'_i, \text{ideal})} \right\|_1 \\
&\leq \sum_i \frac{1}{2} \Pr(\Omega_i) \left(\tilde{\varepsilon} + 4 \sqrt{2\lambda'_i - \lambda_i^2} \right) \\
&\leq \sum_i \frac{1}{2} \Pr(\Omega_i) \left(\tilde{\varepsilon} + 4 \sqrt{2\lambda'_i} \right) \\
&= \sum_i \frac{1}{2} \Pr(\Omega_i) \tilde{\varepsilon} + \sqrt{8} \sum_i \Pr(\Omega_i) \sqrt{\lambda'_i} \\
&\leq \frac{\tilde{\varepsilon}}{2} + \sqrt{8} \sqrt{\sum_i \Pr(\Omega_i) \lambda'_i} \\
&\leq \frac{\tilde{\varepsilon}}{2} + \sqrt{8} \sqrt{\varepsilon_{\text{sec}}}
\end{aligned} \tag{B31}$$

where we used concavity of the square root function in the penultimate inequality. \square

Appendix C: Proof of statements in Section IV

Lemma 4 (Shield system). Let $\mathcal{E}_{\text{QKD}}^{(l)}$ be a PMQKD protocol with Alice's state preparation described by $\rho_{AA'}^{\text{prep}} = \sum_{i=1}^{d_A} p(i) |i\rangle\langle i|_A \otimes \rho_i$. Let $\mathcal{E}_{\text{QKD-shield}}^{(l)}$ be another PMQKD protocol identical to $\mathcal{E}_{\text{QKD}}^{(l)}$ except that Alice's state preparation is given by

$$\rho_{AA_S A'}^{\text{prep}} = \sum_{i=1}^{d_A} p(i) |i\rangle\langle i|_A \otimes |\rho_i\rangle\langle \rho_i|_{A_S A'}, \quad (24)$$

where A_S (termed the *shield system*) is not sent to Bob and is acted on trivially by Alice. Here, $|\rho_i\rangle$ is related to the signal states Alice prepares $\rho_i = \text{Tr}_{A_S} [|\rho_i\rangle\langle \rho_i|]$. If the PMQKD protocol $\mathcal{E}_{\text{QKD-shield}}^{(l)}$ is ε_{sec} -secret, then the PMQKD protocol $\mathcal{E}_{\text{QKD}}^{(l)}$ is ε_{sec} -secret.

Proof. As Eve's channel does not act on the shield system, ε_{sec} -secrecy of the protocol with the shield system is given by

$$\frac{1}{2} \left\| \left(\mathcal{E}_{\text{QKD-shield}}^{(l)} - \mathcal{E}_{\text{QKD-shield}}^{(l), \text{ideal}} \right) \otimes \text{id}_{E^n} \right\| \left[\left(\text{id}_{A^n A_S^n} \otimes \Phi \right) \left[\rho_{A^n A_S^n A'^n}^{\text{prep}} \right] \right] \leq \varepsilon_{\text{sec}} \quad (C1)$$

for all channels Φ . Further, since the QKD protocol acts trivially on the shield system, $\mathcal{E}_{\text{QKD}}^{(l)} = \mathcal{E}_{\text{QKD-shield}}^{(l)} \circ \text{Tr}_{A_S^n}$, and $\mathcal{E}_{\text{QKD-shield}}^{(l), \text{ideal}} = \mathcal{E}_{\text{QKD}}^{(l), \text{ideal}} \circ \text{Tr}_{A_S^n}$. Combining these equations gives us the required result. \square

Lemma 5 (Source-replacement scheme). Let $\mathcal{E}_{\text{QKD}}^{(l)}$ be a PMQKD protocol where Alice's state preparation is given by $\rho_{AA_S A'}^{\text{prep}} = \sum_{i=1}^{d_A} p(i) |i\rangle\langle i|_A \otimes |\rho_i\rangle\langle \rho_i|_{A_S A'}$. Let $\mathcal{E}_{\text{QKD-S}}^{(l)}$ be another PMQKD protocol identical to $\mathcal{E}_{\text{QKD}}^{(l)}$ except Alice's state preparation is given by

$$\rho_{AA_S A'} = \sum_{i,j=1}^{d_A} \sqrt{p(i)p(j)} |i\rangle\langle j|_A \otimes |\rho_i\rangle\langle \rho_j|_{A_S A'}, \quad (25)$$

and Alice's register A is measured in the computational basis at the start of the protocol. If the PMQKD protocol $\mathcal{E}_{\text{QKD-S}}^{(l)}$ is ε_{sec} -secret, then $\mathcal{E}_{\text{QKD}}^{(l)}$ is an ε_{sec} -secret PMQKD protocol.

Proof. Let Ψ_{meas} be the channel that measures Alice's systems A^n in the computational basis. Since the first step of the QKD protocol is measuring Alice and Bob's system, $\mathcal{E}_{\text{QKD}}^{(l)} = \mathcal{E}_{\text{QKD-S}}^{(l)} \circ \Psi_{\text{meas}}$ and $\mathcal{E}_{\text{QKD}}^{(l), \text{ideal}} = \mathcal{E}_{\text{QKD-S}}^{(l), \text{ideal}} \circ \Psi_{\text{meas}}$. Finally, noting that $\Psi_{\text{meas}}[\rho_{AA_S A'}] = \rho_{A^n A_S^n A'^n}^{\text{prep}}$ gives us the required result. \square

Lemma 6 (Squashing). Let $\mathcal{E}_{\text{QKD}}^{(l)}$ be a QKD protocol where Bob's measurement is described by POVM $\{\Gamma_i\}_{i=1}^{n_{\text{meas}}} \subset \mathcal{B}(B)$. Let $\mathcal{E}_{\text{QKD-Sq}}^{(l)}$ be another QKD protocol identical to $\mathcal{E}_{\text{QKD}}^{(l)}$ except Bob's measurement is described by POVM $\{F_i\}_{i=1}^{n_{\text{meas}}} \subset \mathcal{B}(Q)$. If there exists a channel $\Lambda \in \mathcal{C}(B, Q)$ such that $\Lambda^\dagger[F_i] = \Gamma_i$ for all i , then the ε_{sec} -secrecy of the PMQKD protocol $\mathcal{E}_{\text{QKD-Sq}}^{(l)}$ implies the ε_{sec} -secrecy of the PMQKD protocol $\mathcal{E}_{\text{QKD}}^{(l)}$.

Proof. The first step of the QKD protocol is to measure Bob's received state, i.e. a quantum to classical channel

$$\rho_{A^n B^n} \rightarrow \sum_{\vec{i} \in [n_{\text{meas}}]^n} \text{Tr}_{B^n} \left[\mathbb{I}_{A^n} \otimes \Gamma_{\vec{i}} \rho_{A^n B^n} \right] \otimes \left| \vec{i} \right\rangle\langle \vec{i} |,$$

where $\Gamma_{\vec{i}} = \bigotimes_{j=1}^n \Gamma_{i_j}$. Since $\Gamma_i = \Lambda^\dagger[F_i]$, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Tr}_{B^n} \left[\mathbb{I}_{A^n} \otimes \Gamma_{\vec{i}} \rho_{A^n B^n} \right] &= \text{Tr}_{B^n} \left[\mathbb{I}_{A^n} \otimes \Lambda^{\dagger \otimes n} [F_{\vec{i}}] \rho_{A^n B^n} \right] \\ &= \text{Tr}_{B^n} \left[\left(\mathbb{I}_{A^n} \otimes F_{\vec{i}} \right) \text{id}_{A^n} \otimes \Lambda^{\otimes n} [\rho_{A^n B^n}] \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, $\mathcal{E}_{\text{QKD}}^{(l)} = \mathcal{E}_{\text{QKD-Sq}}^{(l)} \circ \Lambda^{\otimes n}$ and the security condition can be reduced to

$$\left\| \left(\left(\mathcal{E}_{\text{QKD}}^{(l)} - \mathcal{E}_{\text{QKD}}^{(l), \text{ideal}} \right) \otimes \text{id}_{E^n} \right) [\rho_{A^n B^n}] \right\|_1 \quad \forall \rho_{A^n B^n} \in \text{S}_o(A^n B^n) \quad (\text{C2})$$

$$= \left\| \left(\left(\mathcal{E}_{\text{QKD-Sq}}^{(l)} - \mathcal{E}_{\text{QKD-Sq}}^{(l), \text{ideal}} \right) \otimes \text{id}_{E^n} \right) [(\text{id}_{A^n} \otimes \Lambda^{\otimes n}) [\rho_{A^n B^n}]] \right\|_1 \quad \forall \rho_{A^n B^n} \in \text{S}_o(A^n B^n) \quad (\text{C3})$$

$$\leq \left\| \left(\left(\mathcal{E}_{\text{QKD-Sq}}^{(l)} - \mathcal{E}_{\text{QKD-Sq}}^{(l), \text{ideal}} \right) \otimes \text{id}_{E^n} \right) [\rho_{A^n Q^n}] \right\|_1 \quad \forall \rho_{A^n Q^n} \in \text{S}_o(A^n Q^n) \quad (\text{C4})$$

$$\leq \varepsilon_{\text{sec}}, \quad (\text{C5})$$

where Eq. (C4) holds as $(\text{id}_{A^n} \otimes \Lambda^{\otimes n}) [\rho_{A^n B^n}] \in \text{S}_o(A^n Q^n)$ for all $\rho_{A^n B^n} \in \text{S}_o(A^n B^n)$. This completes the proof. \square

Lemma 7 (Weight-preserving flag-state squasher). Let $\{\Gamma_i\}_{i=1}^{n_{\text{meas}}}$ be a POVM where each element is block-diagonal, i.e. $\Gamma_i = \Gamma_{i, m \leq N} \oplus \Gamma_{i, m > N}$. Further, let $\{|i\rangle\}_{i=1}^{n_{\text{meas}}}$ be an orthonormal set of vectors for the flag space, and let $0 \leq f_N \leq \lambda_{\min}(\overline{\Pi}_N \Gamma_1 \overline{\Pi}_N)$, where $\overline{\Pi}_N$ is the projection outside the space corresponding to $\Gamma_{i, m \leq N}$. Then, for the following choice of target measurements

$$F_i = \Gamma_{i, m \leq N} \oplus (1 - f_N) |i\rangle\langle i| \quad \forall 1 < i \leq n_{\text{meas}} \quad (\text{28})$$

$$F_1 = \Gamma_{1, m \leq N} \oplus \left(|1\rangle\langle 1| + f_N \sum_{j=2}^{n_{\text{meas}}} |j\rangle\langle j| \right), \quad (\text{29})$$

there exists a channel Λ such that $\Lambda^\dagger[F_i] = \Gamma_i$ for all i .

Proof. First, note that $f_N \leq \lambda_{\min}(\overline{\Pi}_N \Gamma_1 \overline{\Pi}_N)$ implies that $f_N \leq 1$. Thus, $\{F_i\}_{i=1}^{n_{\text{meas}}}$ is a POVM. We denote the Hilbert space on which the original measurements Γ_i act to be B , and the Hilbert space where the target measurements F_i act to be Q . Now define the map

$$\begin{aligned} \Lambda[\rho] = & \Pi_N \rho \Pi_N + \left(1 - \frac{1 - \text{Tr}[\Gamma_1 \overline{\Pi}_N \rho \overline{\Pi}_N]}{1 - f_N} \right) |1\rangle\langle 1| \\ & + \sum_{i=2}^{n_{\text{meas}}} \frac{1}{1 - f_N} \text{Tr}[\Gamma_i \overline{\Pi}_N \rho \overline{\Pi}_N] |i\rangle\langle i|, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C6})$$

for all $\rho \in \text{S}_o(B)$. It is easy to verify that this map is trace-preserving through explicit computation. Further, $f_N \leq \lambda_{\min}(\overline{\Pi}_N \Gamma_1 \overline{\Pi}_N)$ implies that $\text{Tr}[\Gamma_1 \overline{\Pi}_N \rho \overline{\Pi}_N] \geq f_N$. Thus, it can be easily verified that the map is positive.

For complete positivity, we show that it can be constructed by the composition of channels. The first channel is a measurement with Krauss operators Π_N and $\overline{\Pi}_N$. The next channel leaves the outcome corresponding to Π_N as is, and is a prepare-and-measure channel on the outcome corresponding to $\overline{\Pi}_N$. The measurements are given by the POVM $\{\frac{1}{1-f_N} \Gamma_i\}_{i=2}^{n_{\text{meas}}} \cup \{\frac{\Gamma_1 - \overline{\Pi}_N}{1-f_N}\}$, and the state prepared is the classical state corresponding to each measurement result.

Finally, through explicit computation, we can verify that $\text{Tr}[\Gamma_i \rho] = \text{Tr}[F_i \Lambda[\rho]]$ for all i , and $\rho \in \text{S}_o(B)$. Thus, $\Lambda^\dagger[F_i] = \Gamma_i$ for all i . \square

Lemma 8 (Source maps). Let $\{\rho_i^\mu\} \subset \text{S}_o(A'')$ be the set of states prepared by Alice in a PMQKD protocol. Suppose that there exists a *source map* $\Psi \in \mathcal{C}(A'', A')$ relating the real states $\{\rho_i^\mu\}$ to a set of virtual states $\{\xi_i^\mu\} \subset \text{S}_o(A')$ such that $\rho_i^\mu = \Psi[\xi_i^\mu]$ for all i, μ . Then ε_{sec} -secrecy for the virtual protocol with $\{\xi_i^\mu\}$ implies ε_{sec} -secrecy for the real protocol with $\{\rho_i^\mu\}$ instead.

Proof. The existence of the source map implies that $\rho_{AA'}^{\text{prep}} = (\text{id}_{A''} \otimes \Psi) [\xi_{AA'}^{\text{prep}}]$ where $\rho_{AA'}^{\text{prep}}$ and $\xi_{AA'}^{\text{prep}}$ are Alice's state preparations as described in Eq. (22). Thus, the secrecy condition

$$\left\| \left(\left(\mathcal{E}_{\text{QKD}}^{(l)} - \mathcal{E}_{\text{QKD}}^{(l), \text{ideal}} \right) \otimes \text{id}_{E^n} \right) [(\text{id}_{A^n A''} \otimes \Phi') [(\xi_{AA'}^{\text{prep}})^{\otimes n}]] \right\|_1 \leq \varepsilon_{\text{sec}} \quad \forall \Phi' \in \mathcal{C}(A''^n, B^n E^n) \quad (\text{C7})$$

trivially implies that $\left\| \left(\left(\mathcal{E}_{\text{QKD}}^{(l)} - \mathcal{E}_{\text{QKD}}^{(l), \text{ideal}} \right) \otimes \text{id}_{E^n} \right) [(\text{id}_{A^n A''} \otimes \Phi') [(\xi_{AA'}^{\text{prep}})^{\otimes n}]] \right\|_1 \leq \varepsilon_{\text{sec}}$ for any subset of channels. In particular, consider the subset

$$\mathcal{C}_\Psi := \{\Phi' | \Phi' = \Phi \circ \Psi^{\otimes N}, \Phi \in \mathcal{C}(A''^n, B^n E^n)\}. \quad (\text{C8})$$

Thus, it follows that

$$\varepsilon_{\text{sec}} \geq \left\| \left((\mathcal{E}_{\text{QKD}}^{(l)} - \mathcal{E}_{\text{QKD}}^{(l), \text{ideal}}) \otimes \text{id}_{E^n} \right) \left[(\text{id}_{A^n} \otimes (\Phi \circ \Psi^{\otimes N})) [(\xi_{AA''}^{\text{prep}})^{\otimes n}] \right] \right\|_1 \quad \forall \Phi \in \mathcal{C}(A^n, B^n E^n) \quad (\text{C9})$$

$$= \left\| \left((\mathcal{E}_{\text{QKD}}^{(l)} - \mathcal{E}_{\text{QKD}}^{(l), \text{ideal}}) \otimes \text{id}_{E^n} \right) \left[(\text{id}_{A^n} \otimes \Phi) [(\rho_{AA'}^{\text{prep}})^{\otimes n}] \right] \right\|_1 \quad \forall \Phi \in \mathcal{C}(A^n, B^n E^n). \quad (\text{C10})$$

□

Appendix D: Construction of shield system for decoy-state protocol

In this appendix, we will construct the shield system for a decoy-state protocol. This will enable us to calculate the dimensions of Alice's systems AA_S to use with Corollary 4.3.

In a decoy-state protocol, the tagged source described by Eq. (31) can be purified as

$$|\xi_i^\mu\rangle_{AA_S A'} = \sum_{m=0}^{N_{\text{ph}}} \sqrt{p(m|\mu)} |m\rangle \otimes V_i |m\rangle + \sqrt{1 - \sum_{m=0}^{N_{\text{ph}}} p(m|\mu)} |\text{tag}\rangle \otimes |i, \mu\rangle, \quad (\text{D1})$$

where $|\text{tag}\rangle$ is a state orthogonal to $\{|m\rangle\}_{m=0}^{N_{\text{ph}}}$. Let there be n_{int} intensities used in the decoy-state analysis. Then in the source replacement scheme described in Eq. (25), we can obtain the fixed marginal

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\sigma}_{AA_S} &= \text{Tr}_{A'} [\rho_{AA_S A'}] \\ &= \sum_{\substack{i,j=1 \\ \mu,\nu}}^{d_A, n_{\text{int}}} \sqrt{p(i, \mu)p(j, \nu)} |i, \mu\rangle\langle j, \nu|_A \otimes \text{Tr}_{A'} [|\xi_i^\mu\rangle\langle \xi_j^\nu|_{AA_S A'}] \\ &= \sum_{\substack{i,j=1 \\ \mu,\nu}}^{d_A, n_{\text{int}}} \sqrt{p(i, \mu)p(j, \nu)} |i, \mu\rangle\langle j, \nu|_A \otimes \\ &\quad \left(\sum_{m=0}^{N_{\text{ph}}} \sqrt{p(m|\mu)p(m|\nu)} \langle m| V_j^\dagger V_i |m\rangle |m\rangle\langle m| + \left(1 - \sum_{m=0}^{N_{\text{ph}}} p(m|\mu) \right) |\text{tag}\rangle\langle \text{tag}| \right), \end{aligned}$$

where the last equality used the fact that the encoding isometries V_i preserve the photon number i.e. $\langle m| V_j^\dagger V_i |m'\rangle = 0$ if $m \neq m'$. Thus, the fixed marginal is block-diagonal in the photon number.

Finally, in the IID decoy-state analysis described in Section IV D, the decoy-state analysis does not make use of the off-diagonal terms with different intensities $|i, \mu\rangle\langle j, \nu|$. Thus, using a promise

$$\hat{\sigma}_{AA_S} = \sum_{\substack{i,j=1 \\ \mu}}^{d_A, n_{\text{int}}} p(i, \mu) |i, \mu\rangle\langle j, \mu|_A \otimes \left(\sum_{m=0}^{N_{\text{ph}}} p(m|\mu) \langle m| V_j^\dagger V_i |m\rangle |m\rangle\langle m| + \left(1 - \sum_{m=0}^{N_{\text{ph}}} p(m|\mu) \right) |\text{tag}\rangle\langle \text{tag}| \right), \quad (\text{D2})$$

is sufficient for decoy-state security proofs. This has $n_{\text{int}}(N_{\text{ph}} + 2)$ diagonal blocks, each of dimension d_A .

Appendix E: Proof of statements in Section V

Lemma 9 (Constructing $V(\mathbf{F}^{\text{obs}})$). For any state σ , let $\mathbf{F}^{\text{obs}} \in \mathcal{P}(\Sigma)$ be the frequency vector obtained from measuring the state m times, where Σ is the set of possible outcomes. Let Γ_j be the POVM element corresponding to outcome j . Define

$$\mu := \sqrt{\frac{\log(2|\Sigma|/\varepsilon_{\text{AT}})}{2m}}, \quad (\text{40})$$

and the set

$$V(\mathbf{F}^{\text{obs}}) := \{\sigma \in S_o(AB) \mid |\text{Tr}(\Gamma_j \sigma) - \mathbf{F}_j^{\text{obs}}| \leq \mu, \forall j \in \Sigma\}. \quad (\text{41})$$

Then, $V(\mathbf{F}^{\text{obs}})$ contains ρ with probability greater than $1 - \varepsilon_{\text{AT}}$. That is,

$$\Pr_{\mathbf{F}^{\text{obs}}} (\sigma \in V(\mathbf{F}^{\text{obs}})) \geq 1 - \varepsilon_{\text{AT}}. \quad (\text{E2})$$

Proof. Consider the observed frequency of the j th outcome, which happens in each round with probability $\text{Tr}(\Gamma_j \rho) = p_j$, where Γ_j is the POVM element associated with outcome j . Given that one observed $\mathbf{F}_j^{\text{obs}}$ m events after sampling m times, Hoeffdings inequality for p_j gives us

$$\Pr_{\mathbf{F}^{\text{obs}}} (p_j \in [\mathbf{F}_j^{\text{obs}} - \mu, \mathbf{F}_j^{\text{obs}} + \mu]) \geq 1 - \frac{\varepsilon_{\text{AT}}}{|\Sigma'|} \quad \forall j \in \Sigma \quad (\text{E1})$$

Combining these expressions for all $j \in \Sigma'$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr_{\mathbf{F}^{\text{obs}}} (p_j \notin [\mathbf{F}_j^{\text{obs}} - \mu, \mathbf{F}_j^{\text{obs}} + \mu]) &\leq \frac{\varepsilon_{\text{AT}}}{|\Sigma'|}, \\ \Pr_{\mathbf{F}^{\text{obs}}} \left(\bigcup_{j \in \Sigma} p_j \notin [\mathbf{F}_j^{\text{obs}} - \mu, \mathbf{F}_j^{\text{obs}} + \mu] \right) &\leq \sum_{j \in \Sigma} \frac{\varepsilon_{\text{AT}}}{|\Sigma'|} = \varepsilon_{\text{AT}}, \\ \Pr_{\mathbf{F}^{\text{obs}}} \left(\bigcap_{j \in \Sigma} p_j \in [\mathbf{F}_j^{\text{obs}} - \mu, \mathbf{F}_j^{\text{obs}} + \mu] \right) &\geq 1 - \varepsilon_{\text{AT}}, \\ \Pr_{\mathbf{F}^{\text{obs}}} (\rho \in V(\mathbf{F}^{\text{obs}})) &\geq 1 - \varepsilon_{\text{AT}}, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{E2})$$

where we used the union bound for probabilities to obtain the second inequality. □

-
- [1] M. Koashi, *New Journal of Physics* **11**, 045018 (2009).
[2] M. Tomamichel, C. C. W. Lim, N. Gisin, and R. Renner, *Nature communications* **3**, 634 (2012).
[3] F. Dupuis, O. Fawzi, and R. Renner, *Communications in Mathematical Physics* **379**, 867 (2020).
[4] T. Metger, O. Fawzi, D. Sutter, and R. Renner, “Generalised entropy accumulation,” (2022), arXiv:2203.04989 [quant-ph].
[5] M. Tomamichel and A. Leverrier, *Quantum* **1**, 1 (2017), arXiv: 1506.08458.
[6] M. Christandl, R. König, and R. Renner, *Physical Review Letters* **102**, 1 (2009), arXiv: 0809.3019.
[7] M. Sandfuchs, M. Haberland, V. Vilasini, and R. Wolf, “Security of differential phase shift QKD from relativistic principles,” (2023), arXiv:2301.11340 [quant-ph].
[8] G. Currás-Lorenzo, M. Pereira, G. Kato, M. Curty, and K. Tamaki, “A security framework for quantum key distribution implementations,” (2023), arXiv:2305.05930 [quant-ph].
[9] O. Fawzi and R. Renner, *Communications in Mathematical Physics* **340**, 575 (2015).
[10] R. Renner, “Security of Quantum Key Distribution,” (2005), arXiv: quant-ph/0512258.
[11] R. Arnon-Friedman and R. Renner, *Journal of Mathematical Physics* **56**, 052203 (2015), arXiv:1308.0312 [quant-ph].
[12] P. Belzig, “Studying stabilizer de finetti theorems and possible applications in quantum information processing,” (2024), arXiv:2403.10592 [quant-ph].
[13] D. Gross, S. Nezami, and M. Walter, *Communications in Mathematical Physics* **385**, 1325 (2021).
[14] T. Matsuura, S. Yamano, Y. Kuramochi, T. Sasaki, and M. Koashi, “Tight concentration inequalities for quantum adversarial setups exploiting permutation symmetry,” (2024), arXiv:2403.11719 [quant-ph].
[15] C. Portmann and R. Renner, “Cryptographic security of quantum key distribution,” (2014), arXiv:1409.3525 [quant-ph].
[16] I. George, J. Lin, and N. Lütkenhaus, *Physical Review Research* **3** (2021), 10.1103/PhysRevResearch.3.013274, arXiv: 2004.11865 Publisher: American Physical Society.
[17] K_A technically also contains the special \perp symbol if the protocol aborts.
[18] M. Hayashi and R. Nakayama, *New Journal of Physics* **16**, 063009 (2014), arXiv:1302.4139 [quant-ph].
[19] D. Tupkary, E. Y.-Z. Tan, and N. Lütkenhaus, *Physical Review Research* **6**, 023002 (2024).
[20] W.-Y. Hwang, *Physical Review Letters* **91**, 057901 (2003), publisher: American Physical Society.
[21] H.-K. Lo, X. Ma, and K. Chen, *Physical Review Letters* **94**, 230504 (2005), publisher: American Physical Society.
[22] X.-B. Wang, *Physical Review Letters* **94**, 230503 (2005), arXiv:quant-ph/04110075.
[23] D. Gottesman, H.-K. Lo, N. Lütkenhaus, and J. Preskill, in *International Symposium on Information Theory, 2004. ISIT 2004* (arXiv, 2004) arXiv:quant-ph/0212066.
[24] S. Nahar, T. Upadhyaya, and N. Lütkenhaus, *Physical Review Applied* **20**, 064031 (2023).

- [25] O. Gittsovich, N. J. Beaudry, V. Narasimhachar, R. R. Alvarez, and T. Moroder, *Physical Review A* **012325**, 1 (2014).
- [26] Y. Zhang, P. J. Coles, A. Winick, J. Lin, and N. Lütkenhaus, *Physical Review Research* **3**, 013076 (2021).
- [27] C. H. Bennett, G. Brassard, and N. D. Mermin, *Physical Review Letters* **68**, 557 (1992).
- [28] M. Curty, M. Lewenstein, and N. Lütkenhaus, *Physical Review Letters* **92**, 217903 (2004).
- [29] A. Ferenczi and N. Lütkenhaus, *Physical Review A* , 1 (2011), arXiv: 1112.3396.
- [30] K. Horodecki, M. Horodecki, P. Horodecki, and J. Oppenheim, *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory* **55**, 1898 (2009), arXiv:quant-ph/0506189.
- [31] C.-H. F. Fung, H. F. Chau, and H.-K. Lo, *Physical Review A* **84**, 020303 (2011).
- [32] T. Upadhyaya, T. Van Himbeeck, J. Lin, and N. Lütkenhaus, *PRX Quantum* **2**, 020325 (2021).
- [33] Since the dimension reduction method is the only reduction to finite dimensions for CVQKD that is currently known, the use of the postselection technique in CVQKD is an open problem.
- [34] N. K. H. Li, “Application of the Flag-State Squashing Model to Numerical Quantum Key Distribution Security Analysis,” (2020).
- [35] N. K. H. Li and N. Lütkenhaus, *Physical Review Research* **2**, 043172 (2020).
- [36] Note that these works find key rates in the asymptotic regime and thus the technical flaw from Ref. [6] does not pose a problem.
- [37] A. Boaron, G. Boso, D. Rusca, C. Vulliez, C. Autebert, M. Caloz, M. Perrenoud, G. Gras, F. Bussi eres, M.-J. Li, D. Nolan, A. Martin, and H. Zbinden, *Physical Review Letters* **121**, 190502 (2018), publisher: American Physical Society.
- [38] J. M. Landsberg, *Tensors: geometry and applications: geometry and applications*, Vol. 128 (American Mathematical Soc., 2011).
- [39] A. W. Harrow, “Applications of coherent classical communication and the Schur transform to quantum information theory,” (2005), arXiv:quant-ph/0512255.
- [40] N. J. Beaudry, “Assumptions in Quantum Cryptography,” (2015), arXiv:1505.02792 [quant-ph] version: 1.
- [41] M. Tomamichel, **2021** (2015), 10.1007/978-3-319-21891-5, arXiv: 1504.00233.
- [42] S. Winkler, M. Tomamichel, S. Hengl, and R. Renner, *Physical Review Letters* **107**, 090502 (2011).
- [43] Vesely, Libor, “Integral jensen inequality,” www.mat.unimi.it/users/libor/AnConvessa/Jensen.pdf.