

One-Shot Min-Entropy Calculation And Its Application To Quantum Cryptography

Rong Wang* and H. F. Chau†

Department of Physics, University of Hong Kong, Hong Kong SAR, China

(Dated: June 24, 2024)

In quantum Shannon theory, various kinds of quantum entropies are used to characterize the capacities of noisy physical systems. Among them, min-entropy and its smooth version attract wide interest especially in the field of quantum cryptography as they can be used to bound the information obtained by an adversary. However, calculating the exact value or non-trivial bounds of min-entropy are extremely difficult because the composite system dimension may scale exponentially with the dimension of its subsystem. Here, we develop a one-shot lower bound calculation technique for the min-entropy of a classical-quantum state that is applicable to both finite and infinite dimensional reduced quantum states. Moreover, we show our technique is of practical interest in at least two situations. First, it gives an alternative tight finite-data analysis for the well-known BB84 quantum key distribution protocol. More importantly, it provides a security proof for a novel source-independent continuous-variable quantum random number generation protocol. These show the effectiveness and wide applicability of our approach.

I. INTRODUCTION

Quantum Shannon theory [1] is an active subfield of quantum information processing whose aim is to quantitatively characterize the ultimate capacity of noisy physical systems. Under the independent and identically distributed (i.i.d.) assumption and in the asymptotic limit (that is, when there are infinitely many identical copies of the state), the relevant entropy measures are the von Neumann entropy and its variations. The situation is different in the non-asymptotic or non-i.i.d. setting. Here, more general entropy measures have to be used [2]. One of them is the quantum conditional min-entropy, which we shall simply call min-entropy throughout this paper, together with its smooth version. For example, if an adversary tries to guess a string of random variable conditioned on some accessible quantum states, then the maximum possible correctly guessing probability is the min-entropy of the random variable conditioned on the quantum states [2]. Clearly, this adversarial setting is important as it includes important primitives such as quantum key distribution (QKD) [3] and quantum random number generation (QRNG)[4].

The min-entropy of raw data conditioned on adversary's state plays an important role in the information security analysis of quantum cryptography. In fact, by the quantum leftover hashing lemma [5, 6], the smooth min-entropy [5] determines the length of distillable key. To calculate the lower bound of smooth min-entropy of the large composite system shared by the users and Eve, the usual way is to reduce it to i.i.d. states and then sum up their von Neumann entropies via de Finetti representation theorem [7], post-selection technique [8], quantum asymptotic equipartition property [9] or entropy accumulation theorem [10, 11]. However, these approaches cannot provide a tight length of final key when comparing to one-shot calculations using uncertainty relations for smooth entropies [12–15]. Since these entropic uncertainty relations stem from the fact that the result of incompatible measurements are impossible to predict [16], their applications in quantum cryptography are limited as they require characterized measurements [12–14]. Therefore, it is instructive to find other one-shot approaches that are irrelevant to incompatible measurements.

In this work, we propose an alternative one-shot approach to min-entropy lower bound calculation, which can be extended naturally to the case of smooth min-entropy. Concretely, given a classical-quantum (CQ) state whose quantum subsystem may be finite- or infinite-dimensional, we develop a technique to calculate the lower bound of min-entropy of its classical random variable conditioned on its quantum subsystem. Unlike the entropic uncertainty relation mentioned above, our approach can directly calculate the lower bound of min-entropy once the density matrix of a CQ state is given. Concretely, we can always assume that the classical variable of a CQ state is uniformly distributed in an adversarial setting. If not, we apply Weyl operators to transform the distribution to a uniform one. Clearly, this transformation does not decrease the adversary's information gain. By working on the CQ state whose classical random variable is uniformly distributed, the min-entropy can be written in terms of the eigenvalues of adversary's state. In this way, we reduce the complicated problem of min-entropy calculation to a simple problem of solving eigenvalues.

* rwangphy@hku.hk

† hfchau@hku.hk

We take the entanglement-based (EB) version of BB84 QKD protocol as our first example application. Assuming that Alice and Bob hold a n -partite composite system before measurements (with n being finite), we can express the min-entropy by the parameters of n -partite density matrix. Furthermore, we connect these parameters to the observable statistics of the actual BB84 protocol. In this way, we can write the min-entropy in terms of observable statistics. Within the framework of universal composable security [5, 17, 18], this gives a way to prove the unconditional security against general attack for the BB84 protocol. More importantly, the final provably secure key length resulted from our approach is equal to the best one obtained in the literature [13, 14].

To further demonstrate the power of our approach, we report a novel source-independent continuous-variable (SI-CV) QRNG protocol [19–23] and apply our approach to prove its security against general attacks. In our SI-CV QRNG protocol, we assume that the optical source is untrusted, but the measurement devices are trusted and perfect. Inspired by the number–phase uncertainty relation [24] of electromagnetic field, the randomness stems from the fact that the more certain the photon number is, the more uncertain the phase will be. Concretely, a threshold detection is designed to test how close the untrusted optical source is to the vacuum state; and an heterodyne detection is designed to generate randomness if the source is sufficiently close enough to the vacuum state. Our one-shot min-entropy calculation enable us to prove the security of this SI-CV QRNG protocol. The above two applications show the wide applicability of our approach to quantum information security analysis.

II. DEFINITIONS AND MAIN RESULTS

Here we describe the task of min-entropy calculation in a quantum cryptographic setting. Alice holds a classical random variable X that may take on values in the set $\{0, 1, \dots, d-1\}$, while Eve holds her system E . Given a CQ state as

$$\tau_{XE} = \sum_{x=0}^{d-1} p_x |x\rangle \langle x| \otimes \tau_x \quad (1)$$

where p_x is its probability distribution of X , τ_x is Eve's state when X takes the value x , Eve wants to maximize her chance of correctly guessing X with the help of the quantum state in her system E . This optimized guessing probability is given by

$$p_{\text{guess}}(X|E)_{\tau_{XE}} := \sup_{\{M_x\}} \sum_{x=0}^{d-1} p_x \text{Tr}[M_x \tau_x] \quad (2)$$

where the supremum is over all possible positive operator-valued measures (POVMs) $\{M_x\}$ on Eve's system.

The optimized guessing probability is related to the min-entropy of τ_{XE} . Given ρ_{AB} , recall that the min-entropy is defined by [2, 5, 25–27]

$$H_{\min}(A|B)_{\rho_{AB}} := \sup_{\sigma_B} \{\lambda \in \mathbb{R} : 2^{-\lambda} I_A \otimes \sigma_B \geq \rho_{AB}\}, \quad (3)$$

where the supremum is over all normalized states σ_B within subsystem B , and I_A is the identity matrix of subsystem A . (Throughout this paper, identity matrix of any subsystem is similarly defined.) The max-entropy of any bipartite density matrix ρ_{AB} is defined by [2, 25–27]

$$H_{\max}(A|B)_{\rho_{AB}} := \sup_{\sigma_B} 2 \log F(\rho_{AB}, I_A \otimes \sigma_B), \quad (4)$$

where $F(\cdot, \cdot)$ is the fidelity between two density matrices. Moreover, the base of all logarithms in this paper is 2. The min- and max-entropies can be smoothed by introducing a family of sub-normalized state $\bar{\rho}_{AB}$ that are ε -close to ρ_{AB} [25]. Precisely,

$$B_\varepsilon(\rho_{AB}) := \left\{ \bar{\rho}_{AB} : \sqrt{1 - F(\rho_{AB}, \bar{\rho}_{AB})^2} \leq \varepsilon \right\} \quad (5)$$

is the set of all states that are ε -close to ρ_{AB} and the smooth min- and max-entropies are given by

$$H_{\min}^\varepsilon(A|B)_{\rho_{AB}} := \sup_{\bar{\rho}_{AB} \in B_\varepsilon(\rho_{AB})} H_{\min}(A|B)_{\bar{\rho}_{AB}}, \quad (6a)$$

$$H_{\max}^\varepsilon(A|B)_{\rho_{AB}} := \inf_{\bar{\rho}_{AB} \in B_\varepsilon(\rho_{AB})} H_{\max}(A|B)_{\bar{\rho}_{AB}}. \quad (6b)$$

From the operational meaning of min-entropy [2], the guessing probability is determined by the min-entropy of X conditioned on E , that is

$$p_{\text{guess}}(X|E)_{\tau_{XE}} = 2^{-H_{\min}(X|E)_{\tau_{XE}}}. \quad (7)$$

Therefore, in the cryptographic setting, the task is to bound $p_{\text{guess}}(X|E)$ or equivalently $H_{\min}(X|E)_{\tau_{XE}}$.

Lemma 1. *For any state τ_{XE} shared between Alice and Eve, there exists a corresponding*

$$\rho_{XE} = \frac{1}{d} \sum_{x=0}^{d-1} |x\rangle \langle x| \otimes |\Psi_x\rangle \langle \Psi_x| \quad (8)$$

with

$$H_{\min}(X|E)_{\rho_{XE}} \leq H_{\min}(X|E)_{\tau_{XE}}. \quad (9)$$

Here, $|\Psi_x\rangle$ is Eve's pure state when X takes the value x . Moreover, we can write $|\Psi_x\rangle$ as

$$|\Psi_x\rangle = \sum_{y=0}^{d-1} \omega^{xy} \sqrt{\lambda_y} |e_y\rangle, \quad (10)$$

where ω is a primitive d -th root of unity, λ_y 's are the eigenvalues of Eve's state. In other words,

$$\rho_E = \text{Tr}_X[\rho_{XE}] = \frac{1}{d} \sum_{x=0}^{d-1} |\Psi_x\rangle \langle \Psi_x| = \sum_{y=0}^{d-1} \lambda_y |e_y\rangle \langle e_y|, \quad (11)$$

with $\sum_{y=0}^{d-1} \lambda_y = 1$, and $\{|e_y\rangle\}$ is an eigenbasis of subsystem E .

Proof. By purifying each τ_x in Eve's system E as $|\psi_x\rangle$ in the composed system EF , we obtain the state

$$\tau_{XEF} = \sum_{x=0}^{d-1} p_x |x\rangle \langle x| \otimes |\psi_x\rangle \langle \psi_x|, \quad (12)$$

on the enlarged system XEF . From the data-processing inequality for min-entropy [25], we have

$$H_{\min}(X|EF)_{\tau_{XEF}} \leq H_{\min}(X|E)_{\tau_{XE}}. \quad (13)$$

In the case of quantum cryptography, we usually assume that Eve can access to infinite computational resources. Therefore we have the liberty to assume that Eve holds the purification of τ_x for each x . Next, we introduce a symmetrical operation using the Weyl operators. Let $\{|x\rangle\}$ be a computational basis of system A , then the Weyl operators are defined by

$$U_{yz} := \sum_{x=0}^{d-1} \omega^{xz} |x+y\rangle \langle x|, \quad (14)$$

where $y, z \in \{0, 1, \dots, d-1\}$ and summation inside the state ket is performed modulo d . (From now on, all arithmetical operations inside state kets and related indices are performed modulo d .) Further define

$$\tau_{XCFG} := \frac{1}{d} \sum_{y=0}^{d-1} (U_{y0} \otimes I_{EF}) \tau_{XEF} (U_{y0}^\dagger \otimes I_{EF}) \otimes |g_y\rangle \langle g_y|, \quad (15)$$

where $\{|g_y\rangle\}$ is a set of eigenbasis within Eve's subsystem G whose aim is to record the information of y . This symmetrical operation can be understood as follows. Alice uniformly and randomly chooses a value y , applies U_{y0} to her classical system. She then publicly announces y so that Eve can record this information using the register G . From Appendix A.3 in Ref. [25], this operation does not change the min-entropy. Using this trick, we obtain in a

uniformly distributed random variable X . This makes our later calculation easier. The closure property of modulo d allows us to write $\tau_{X EFG}$ as

$$\tau_{X EFG} = \frac{1}{d} \sum_{x=0}^{d-1} |x\rangle \langle x| \otimes \left(\sum_{y=0}^{d-1} p_y |\psi_y\rangle \langle \psi_y| \otimes |g_{x-y}\rangle \langle g_{x-y}| \right). \quad (16)$$

Given the state

$$\rho_{X EFG} = \frac{1}{d} \sum_{x=0}^{d-1} |x\rangle \langle x| \otimes P \left\{ \sum_{y=0}^{d-1} \sqrt{p_y} |\psi_y\rangle \otimes |g_{x-y}\rangle \right\}, \quad (17)$$

where $P\{|x\rangle\} := |x\rangle \langle x|$, it is straightforward to see that

$$\tau_{X EFG} = \sum_{y=0}^{d-1} |g_y\rangle \langle g_y| \rho_{X EFG} |g_y\rangle \langle g_y|, \quad (18)$$

where the set of projectors $\{|g_y\rangle \langle g_y|\}$ determines a projective measurement. Using the data-processing inequality for min-entropy in Sec. V of Ref. [25]), we have

$$H_{\min}(X|EFG)_{\rho_{X EFG}} \leq H_{\min}(X|EFG)_{\tau_{X EFG}}. \quad (19)$$

We now pick a mutually unbiased basis $\{|h_y\rangle\}_{y=0}^{d-1}$ where

$$|h_y\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{d}} \sum_{z=0}^{d-1} \omega^{-yz} |g_z\rangle. \quad (20)$$

Then $\rho_{X EFG}$ can be rewritten as

$$\rho_{X EFG} = \frac{1}{d} \sum_{x=0}^{d-1} |x\rangle \langle x| \otimes P \left\{ \sum_{y=0}^{d-1} \omega^{xy} \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{d}} \sum_{z=0}^{d-1} \omega^{-yz} \sqrt{p_z} |\psi_z\rangle \right) \otimes |h_y\rangle \right\}, \quad (21)$$

where we also make use of the closure property of modulo d . Note that

$$0 \leq \left| \frac{1}{\sqrt{d}} \sum_{z=0}^{d-1} \omega^{-yz} \sqrt{p_z} |\psi_z\rangle \right|^2 \leq \frac{1}{d} \left(\sum_{z=0}^{d-1} \sqrt{p_z} \right)^2 \leq 1, \quad (22)$$

where we have used the Cauchy–Schwarz inequality to arrive at the last inequality. Finally, we set

$$\lambda_y = \left| \frac{1}{\sqrt{d}} \sum_{z=0}^{d-1} \omega^{-yz} \sqrt{p_z} |\psi_z\rangle \right|^2 \quad (23a)$$

$$\sqrt{\lambda_y} |e_y\rangle = \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{d}} \sum_{z=0}^{d-1} \omega^{-yz} \sqrt{p_z} |\psi_z\rangle \right) \otimes |h_y\rangle \quad (23b)$$

$$|\Psi_x\rangle = \sum_{y=0}^{d-1} \omega^{xy} \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{d}} \sum_{z=0}^{d-1} \omega^{-yz} \sqrt{p_z} |\psi_z\rangle \right) \otimes |h_y\rangle \quad (23c)$$

and rephrase Eve's systems EFG using one system E . By combining Eqs. (13), (16) and the setting above, we obtain $H_{\min}(X|E)_{\rho_{XE}} \leq H_{\min}(X|E)_{\tau_{XE}}$. This completes our proof. \square

Theorem 1. *The min-entropy of the state ρ_{XE} given by Eq. (8) in Lemma 1 equals*

$$H_{\min}(X|E)_{\rho_{XE}} = \log d - \log \left(\sum_{y=0}^{d-1} \sqrt{\lambda_y} \right)^2. \quad (24)$$

Hence,

$$H_{\min}(X|E)_{\tau_{XE}} \geq \log d - \log \left(\sum_{y=0}^{d-1} \sqrt{\lambda_y} \right)^2. \quad (25)$$

Proof. From Lemma 1, it suffices to prove the validity of Eq. (24). By purifying ρ_{XE} with another system X' , an alternative purification is given by

$$|\Phi\rangle_{XX'E} = \sum_{y=0}^{d-1} \sqrt{\lambda_y} \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{d}} \sum_{x=0}^{d-1} \omega^{xy} |xx\rangle \right) |e_y\rangle, \quad (26)$$

where we extend the definition of X from a classical random variable to a quantum system and define the state $|xx\rangle$ within composite system XX' . Owing to the duality between min-entropy and max-entropy [25], we have

$$H_{\min}(X|E)_{\rho_{XE}} + H_{\max}(X|X')_{\rho_{XX'}} = 0, \quad (27)$$

where

$$\rho_{XX'} = \text{Tr}_E[|\Phi\rangle_{XX'E}\langle\Phi|] = \sum_{y=0}^{d-1} \lambda_y P \left\{ \frac{1}{\sqrt{d}} \sum_{x=0}^{d-1} \omega^{xy} |xx\rangle \right\} \quad (28)$$

is the state after partially tracing system E out. Note that $\sum_{x=0}^{d-1} \omega^{xy} |xx\rangle / \sqrt{d}$ is the generalized Bell state for each $y \in \{0, 1, \dots, d-1\}$, and therefore $\rho_{XX'}$ is Bell-diagonal. In what follows, we are going to prove that

$$H_{\max}(X|X')_{\rho_{XX'}} = \sup_{\sigma_{X'}} 2 \log F(\rho_{XX'}, I_X \otimes \sigma_{X'}) = \log \left[\frac{1}{d} \left(\sum_{y=0}^{d-1} \sqrt{\lambda_y} \right)^2 \right], \quad (29)$$

where $\sigma_{X'}$ would be optimized over all states within the system X' . Let $\sigma_{X'} = I_{X'}/d$, then

$$H_{\max}(X|X')_{\rho_{XX'}} \geq 2 \log F(\rho_{XX'}, I_X \otimes \frac{I_{X'}}{d}) = \log \left[\frac{1}{d} \left(\sum_{y=0}^{d-1} \sqrt{\lambda_y} \right)^2 \right]. \quad (30)$$

Let σ be the state that

$$H_{\max}(X|X')_{\rho_{XX'}} = 2 \log F(\rho_{XX'}, I_X \otimes \sigma), \quad (31)$$

we can complete the proof by showing

$$F(\rho_{XX'}, I_X \otimes \sigma) \leq F(\rho_{XX'}, I_X \otimes \frac{I_{X'}}{d}). \quad (32)$$

With the Weyl operators defined in Eq. (14), we apply $U_{yz}^* \otimes U_{yz}$ to the states in system XX' to get

$$F(\rho_{XX'}, I_X \otimes \sigma) = F((U_{yz}^* \otimes U_{yz}) \rho_{XX'} (U_{yz}^* \otimes U_{yz})^\dagger, (U_{yz}^* \otimes U_{yz}) I_X \otimes \sigma (U_{yz}^* \otimes U_{yz})^\dagger) = F(\rho_{XX'}, I_X \otimes U_{yz} \sigma U_{yz}^\dagger). \quad (33)$$

Here, we make use of the properties that fidelity is invariant under unitary transformations and that the generalized Bell states are the eigenstates of all the $U_{yz}^* \otimes U_{yz}$. As fidelity is concave, we have

$$F(\rho_{XX'}, I_X \otimes \sigma) = \frac{1}{d^2} \sum_{y,z=0}^{d-1} F(\rho_{XX'}, I_X \otimes U_{yz} \sigma U_{yz}^\dagger) \leq F(\rho_{XX'}, I_X \otimes \frac{1}{d^2} \sum_{y,z=0}^{d-1} U_{yz} \sigma U_{yz}^\dagger) = F(\rho_{XX'}, I_X \otimes \frac{I_{X'}}{d}). \quad (34)$$

Here we make use of the fact that applying $\{U_{yz}\}$ uniformly on any state will result in the unique maximally mixed state. This proves our theorem. \square

Corollary 1. For the state ρ_{XE} given by Eq. (8) in Lemma 1 and its min-entropy expressed in Eq. (24) in Theorem 1, the guessing probability $p_{\text{guess}}(X|E)_{\rho_{XE}}$ can be attained by the POVM $\{M_x\}_{x=0}^{d-1}$ where

$$M_x = P \left\{ \frac{1}{\sqrt{d}} \sum_{y=0}^{d-1} \omega^{xy} |e_y\rangle \right\}. \quad (35)$$

Proof. According to the definition in Eq. (7), we have

$$p_{\text{guess}}(X|E)_{\rho_{XE}} = \frac{1}{d} \left(\sum_{y=0}^{d-1} \sqrt{\lambda_y} \right)^2 = \frac{1}{d} \sum_{x=0}^{d-1} \left| \sum_{y=0}^{d-1} \omega^{-xy} \langle e_y | \Psi_x \rangle \right|^2. \quad (36)$$

This proves the corollary. \square

III. APPLICATION TO QUANTUM CRYPTOGRAPHY

A. Application To Discrete Variable Quantum Key Distribution

We now demonstrate how to apply our approach to the finite-data security analysis in discrete-variable (DV) QKD protocol, using BB84 protocol as an example. For completeness, we briefly describe the EB version of BB84 protocol below.

The Entanglement-Based BB84 Protocol.

1. **State preparation:** In each round, Alice prepares a pair of maximally entangled qubit $(|00\rangle + |11\rangle)/\sqrt{2}$.
2. **Distribution:** In each round, Alice sends the second qubit of state $(|00\rangle + |11\rangle)/\sqrt{2}$ to Bob through an insecure channel.
3. **Measurement:** In each round, Bob publicly announces whether he detects the qubit or not. Alice keeps her qubit only if Bob successfully detects the qubit. After sufficiently many rounds of state preparation, distribution and measurement, Alice (Bob) randomly and independently chooses a basis \mathbb{Z} or \mathbb{X} to measure her (his) each of their qubit in hand.
4. **Sifting:** Alice (Bob) publicly announces her (his) basis information. They keep only the basis-matched data. Denote the number of qubits that they both measured in \mathbb{X} and \mathbb{Z} bases by $(n+k)$ and k , respectively.
5. **Parameter estimation:** Alice and Bob randomly disclose k of the $(n+k)$ bits of data from their \mathbb{X} measurement results to compute the bit error frequency e_x . They also announce all the k bits of data from their \mathbb{Z} measurement to compute the bit error frequency e_z . If the secret key rate calculated from these bit error frequency distributions is positive, then continue the protocol. Otherwise, they abort the protocol.
6. **Error correction:** For the remaining n bits of data from their \mathbb{X} basis measurement, Alice and Bob execute an information reconciliation scheme which leaks at most $\text{leak}_{\text{EC}} + \left\lceil \log_2 \frac{1}{\varepsilon_{\text{cor}}} \right\rceil$ bits if the protocol is ε_{cor} -correct.
7. **Privacy amplification:** They apply a random two-universal hash function to the key generation data to extract ℓ bits of secret key.

According to the quantum leftover hashing lemma [6], the extracted secure key length is determined by the smooth min-entropy of raw key conditioned on Eve's quantum side information. Therefore, the core issue is to express this smooth min-entropy in terms of the observable statistics.

Suppose we were to measure the n -round's key generation data resulted from performing \mathbb{X} measurement on n -pair qubit in the \mathbb{Z} basis. We may estimate the upper bound of frequency of bit error denoted as \hat{e}_z from e_z as follows. Picking any concentration inequality without replacement, such as the Serfling inequality [13], the upper bound \hat{e}_z can be written as a function of parameters e_z , m , k and the small failure probability ε , namely,

$$\hat{e}_z = e_z + \sqrt{\frac{(n+k)(k+1)}{nk^2} \ln \frac{1}{\varepsilon}}. \quad (37)$$

In what follows, we express smooth min-entropy in terms of \hat{e}_z , with ε taken as the smooth parameter.

Following the reduction idea in Lo-Chau proof [28] and similar techniques [5, 29, 30], we reduce this n -pair of qubit to the generalized Bell-diagonal one. To express this, we define two n -bit strings $\mathbf{i}, \mathbf{j} \in \{0, 1\}^n$, and denote the k -th bits of the bit strings of \mathbf{i} and \mathbf{j} by $i_k, j_k \in \{0, 1\}$, respectively. Let $\sigma_{0,0} := I$ be the two-dimensional identity matrix, and $\sigma_{1,0} := \sigma_z$, $\sigma_{0,1} := \sigma_x$, $\sigma_{1,1} := \sigma_y$ to be the three Pauli matrices. Further define

$$U_{\mathbf{i}, \mathbf{j}} := \bigotimes_{k=1}^n \sigma_{i_k, j_k}. \quad (38)$$

Then, the n -pair Bell state is thus given by

$$|\Phi_{\mathbf{i}, \mathbf{j}}\rangle := U_{\mathbf{i}, \mathbf{j}} \left(\frac{|00\rangle + |11\rangle}{\sqrt{2}} \right)^{\otimes n}. \quad (39)$$

As a consequence, this n -pair Bell-diagonal state shared by Alice and Bob is given by

$$\rho_{AB}^n := \sum_{i,j} \lambda_{i,j} |\Phi_{i,j}\rangle \langle \Phi_{i,j}|, \quad (40)$$

where $\{\lambda_{i,j}\}$ are some real-valued and non-negative coefficients satisfying $\sum_{i,j} \lambda_{i,j} = 1$.

Theorem 2. *Let Eve holds the purification of ρ_{AB}^n defined in Eq. (40), then the states shared by Alice, Bob and Eve is given by*

$$|\Psi\rangle_{ABE}^n := \sum_{i,j} \sqrt{\lambda_{i,j}} |\Phi_{i,j}\rangle \otimes |e_{i,j}\rangle. \quad (41)$$

Here, $|e_{i,j}\rangle$'s are mutually orthogonal within Eve's system E . Let $\rho_{\mathbf{X}E}^n$ be the state after Alice measures all her qubits in the \mathbb{X} basis and then traces out Bob's system. Then, the min-entropy of $\rho_{\mathbf{X}E}^n$ equals

$$H_{\min}(\mathbf{X}|E)_{\rho_{\mathbf{X}E}^n} = n - \log \left[\sum_j \left(\sum_i \sqrt{\lambda_{i,j}} \right)^2 \right]. \quad (42)$$

Proof. Clearly, the CQ state $\rho_{\mathbf{X}E}^n$ is in the form

$$\rho_{\mathbf{X}E}^n = \frac{1}{2^n} \sum_{\mathbf{x}} |\mathbf{x}\rangle \langle \mathbf{x}| \otimes \sum_j P \left\{ \sum_i (-1)^{i \cdot \mathbf{x}} \sqrt{\lambda_{i,j}} |e_{i,j}\rangle \right\}, \quad (43)$$

where $\mathbf{x} \in \{0, 1\}^n$ is Alice's classical bit string. The sub-normalized state conditioned on \mathbf{j} is

$$\rho_{\mathbf{X}E|\mathbf{j}}^n = \frac{1}{2^n} \sum_{\mathbf{x}} |\mathbf{x}\rangle \langle \mathbf{x}| \otimes P \left\{ \sum_i (-1)^{i \cdot \mathbf{x}} \sqrt{\lambda_{i,j}} |e_{i,j}\rangle \right\}, \quad (44)$$

where $\rho_{\mathbf{X}E}^n = \sum_j \rho_{\mathbf{X}E|\mathbf{j}}^n$. Because of the mutually orthogonality of $\rho_{\mathbf{X}E|\mathbf{j}}^n$, Appendix A.3 in Ref. [25] implies that

$$2^{-H_{\min}(\mathbf{X}|E)_{\rho_{\mathbf{X}E}^n}} = \sum_j 2^{-H_{\min}(\mathbf{X}|E)_{\rho_{\mathbf{X}E|\mathbf{j}}^n}}. \quad (45)$$

Applying Theorem 1 to $\rho_{\mathbf{X}E|\mathbf{j}}^n$ and by setting $d = 2^n$, we get

$$H_{\min}(\mathbf{X}|E)_{\rho_{\mathbf{X}E|\mathbf{j}}^n} = n - \log \left(\sum_i \sqrt{\lambda_{i,j}} \right)^2. \quad (46)$$

Combining with Eq. (45), we obtain Eq. (42). \square

We further simplify the form of $H_{\min}(\mathbf{X}|E)_{\rho_{\mathbf{X}E}^n}$ using the following corollary.

Corollary 2. *Let $\lambda_i := \sum_j \lambda_{i,j}$, then*

$$H_{\min}(\mathbf{X}|E)_{\rho_{\mathbf{X}E}^n} \geq n - \log \left(\sum_i \sqrt{\lambda_i} \right)^2. \quad (47)$$

Proof. From Eq. (45), it suffices to prove

$$\sum_j \left(\sum_i \sqrt{\lambda_{i,j}} \right)^2 \leq \left(\sum_i \sqrt{\lambda_i} \right)^2, \quad (48)$$

or equivalently

$$\sum_j \left(\sum_i \lambda_{i,j} + 2 \sum_{i \neq i'} \sqrt{\lambda_{i,j} \lambda_{i',j}} \right) \leq \sum_i \lambda_i + 2 \sum_{i \neq i'} \sqrt{\lambda_i \lambda_{i'}}. \quad (49)$$

Therefore, it is sufficient to show that

$$\sum_j \sqrt{\lambda_{i,j} \lambda_{i',j}} \leq \sqrt{\lambda_i \lambda_{i'}}, \quad (50)$$

for any pair of $i \neq i'$. And this inequality follows directly from the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality. \square

In the following lemma, we connect $\{\lambda_i\}$ with \hat{e}_z , and thus express the smoothed version of $H_{\min}(\mathbf{X}|E)_{\rho_{\mathbf{X}E}^n}$ in terms of \hat{e}_z .

Lemma 2. *Let $\varepsilon \geq 0$. Define the set*

$$\mathcal{S}_{\hat{e}_z} := \left\{ \mathbf{i} : \frac{\sum_k i_k}{n} \leq \hat{e}_z \right\}, \quad (51)$$

and suppose $\sum_{\mathbf{i} \in \mathcal{S}_{\hat{e}_z}} \lambda_{\mathbf{i}} = 1 - \varepsilon$. Then

$$H_{\min}^\varepsilon(\mathbf{X}|E)_{\rho_{\mathbf{X}E}^n} \geq n[1 - h(\hat{e}_z)], \quad (52)$$

where $h(x) := -x \log x - (1-x) \log(1-x)$ is the binary entropy function.

Proof. We claim that the state

$$|\Psi_\varepsilon\rangle_{ABE}^n = \frac{1}{\sum_{\mathbf{i} \in \mathcal{S}_{\hat{e}_z}} \lambda_{\mathbf{i}}} \sum_{\mathbf{i} \in \mathcal{S}_{\hat{e}_z}} \sum_j \sqrt{\lambda_{\mathbf{i},j}} |\Phi_{\mathbf{i},j}\rangle \otimes |e_{\mathbf{i},j}\rangle. \quad (53)$$

is ε -close to $|\Psi\rangle_{ABE}^n$ in the terms of the purified distance [25]. To see this, we calculate the fidelity between the two states, namely,

$$F(|\Psi_\varepsilon\rangle_{ABE}^n, |\Psi\rangle_{ABE}^n) = |\langle \Psi_\varepsilon | \Psi \rangle_{ABE}^n| = \sqrt{\sum_{\mathbf{i} \in \mathcal{S}_{\hat{e}_z}} \lambda_{\mathbf{i}}} = \sqrt{1 - \varepsilon}, \quad (54)$$

so that the purified distance between the two states is then given by

$$P(|\Psi_\varepsilon\rangle_{ABE}^n, |\Psi\rangle_{ABE}^n) = \sqrt{1 - F^2(|\Psi_\varepsilon\rangle_{ABE}^n, |\Psi\rangle_{ABE}^n)} = \varepsilon. \quad (55)$$

Assuming that $\sigma_{\mathbf{X}E}^n$ is the state resulted from $|\Psi_\varepsilon\rangle_{ABE}^n$ after Alice measures all her qubits in \mathbb{X} basis and then traces out Bob's system. From the monotonicity of the fidelity, we have

$$P(\rho_{\mathbf{X}E}^n, \sigma_{\mathbf{X}E}^n) \leq \varepsilon. \quad (56)$$

Therefore, using Corollary 2 and the definition of smooth min-entropy [25], we obtain

$$H_{\min}^\varepsilon(\mathbf{X}|E)_{\rho_{\mathbf{X}E}^n} \geq H_{\min}(\mathbf{X}|E)_{\sigma_{\mathbf{X}E}^n} \geq n - \log \frac{(\sum_{\mathbf{i} \in \mathcal{S}_{\hat{e}_z}} \sqrt{\lambda_{\mathbf{i}}})^2}{\sum_{\mathbf{i} \in \mathcal{S}_{\hat{e}_z}} \lambda_{\mathbf{i}}}. \quad (57)$$

Since the cardinality of $\mathcal{S}_{\hat{e}_z}$ is at most $\sum_{\omega=0}^{\lfloor n\hat{e}_z \rfloor} \binom{n}{\omega}$, using the technique of Lemma 3 in the Supplementary Information of Ref. [13], we arrive at

$$\log \frac{(\sum_{\mathbf{i} \in \mathcal{S}_{\hat{e}_z}} \sqrt{\lambda_{\mathbf{i}}})^2}{\sum_{\mathbf{i} \in \mathcal{S}_{\hat{e}_z}} \lambda_{\mathbf{i}}} \leq \log \sum_{\omega=0}^{\lfloor n\hat{e}_z \rfloor} \binom{n}{\omega} \leq nh(\hat{e}_z). \quad (58)$$

This completes the proof. \square

Finally, applying the quantum leftover hashing lemma [5, 6], we obtain a lower bound for the secret key length ℓ and prove that the protocol is ε_{sec} -secret with $\varepsilon_{\text{sec}} = 4\varepsilon$. Remarkably, this bound is the same as those reported in Ref. [13].

Theorem 3. *If the final key length ℓ obeys*

$$\ell \leq n[1 - h(\hat{\epsilon}_z)] - \text{leak}_{\text{EC}} - \log_2 \frac{2}{\epsilon_{\text{sec}}^2 \epsilon_{\text{cor}}}, \quad (59)$$

where the classical information of the error correction leaked to Eve is at most $\text{leak}_{\text{EC}} + \log_2 \frac{1}{\epsilon_{\text{cor}}}$, then this protocol is ϵ_{sec} -secret.

Proof. According to quantum leftover hashing lemma [5, 6], users can extract a Δ -secret key of length ℓ from string \mathbf{X} where

$$\Delta = 2\epsilon + \frac{1}{2} \sqrt{2^{\ell - H_{\min}^{\epsilon}(\mathbf{X}|E')}}. \quad (60)$$

Here the term E' represents all information Eve obtained, including the classical information of the error correction step and Eve's quantum side information. Since at most $\text{leak}_{\text{EC}} + \log_2 \frac{1}{\epsilon_{\text{cor}}}$ bits leaked to Eve in the error correction, by the chain rule for smooth min-entropy [31] plus Eq. (52) in Lemma 2, we get

$$H_{\min}^{\epsilon}(\mathbf{X}|E') \geq H_{\min}^{\epsilon}(\mathbf{X}|E)_{\rho_{\mathbf{X}E}^{\epsilon}} - \text{leak}_{\text{EC}} - \log_2 \frac{2}{\epsilon_{\text{cor}}} \geq n[1 - h(\hat{\epsilon}_z)] - \text{leak}_{\text{EC}} - \log_2 \frac{2}{\epsilon_{\text{cor}}}. \quad (61)$$

By putting $\epsilon_{\text{sec}} = 4\epsilon$, we obtain

$$\Delta \leq 2\epsilon + \frac{1}{2} \sqrt{2^{\ell - H_{\min}^{\epsilon}(\mathbf{X}|E')}} \leq \frac{\epsilon_{\text{sec}}}{2} + \frac{\epsilon_{\text{sec}}}{2} = \epsilon_{\text{sec}}. \quad (62)$$

Thus, this protocol is ϵ_{sec} -secret. \square

We remark that by universal composable security [5, 17, 18], this protocol is $\epsilon_{\text{tot}} = \epsilon_{\text{sec}} + \epsilon_{\text{cor}}$ -secure. Comparing our key length in Eq. (59) with that of Ref. [13], the only difference is the estimation of $\hat{\epsilon}_z$, which depends on the actual concentration inequality used. If we use the same concentration inequality, our key length expression would be the same as theirs. In conclusion, our one-shot smooth min-entropy bound calculation is powerful enough to reproduce the best provably secure key rate of the standard BB84 scheme in the finite-data setting.

B. Application To Continuous Variable Quantum Random Number Generation

We now report a new SI-CV QRNG protocol and prove its security using our one-shot min-entropy calculation approach. The idea of this protocol is inspired by the number–phase uncertainty relation [24] of electromagnetic field. Concretely, the randomness stems from the fact that the more certain the photon number is, the more uncertain the phase will be. Therefore, if we ensure that the standard deviation of the photon number of an incoming light is sufficiently small, then the phase of this light must be close to a uniform i.i.d. distribution. In this way, we do not need to trust the incoming light as long as we could test both of phase and photon number. The problem of this approach is that it is not clear how to define a general quantum phase operator (see Section 2.7 in Ref. [24] for discussion). Fortunately, we may substitute the quantum phase operator by heterodyne detection. More precisely, the “phase” can be determined by the ratio of the two quadratures of an heterodyne detection. As for photon number testing, the most direct way is to use a photon number resolving detector. Nonetheless, this kind of detector is impractical due to low count rate and high cost. Here, we use a more common setup by using a threshold detector to test how close the incoming light is to the vacuum state. We write down the procedure of our SI-CV QRNG protocol below.

Source-Independent Quantum Random Number Generation Protocol.

1. **Sending untrusted states:** Eve prepares an N -partite optical quantum state and sends them to Alice one by one.
2. **Measurement:** For each photon send by Eve, Alice randomly chooses either the randomness generation mode or the testing mode. Denote the number of photons used in the randomness generation mode and testing mode by n and k , respectively. Clearly, $n + k = N$. We fix k so that $N \gg k$. If randomness generation mode chosen, Alice performs an heterodyne measurement on the received optical pulse to obtain the phase $\theta \in [0, 2\pi)$ and amplitude $\mu \in [0, +\infty)$. If testing mode chosen, Alice performs a single photon measurement on the received optical pulse. She records the frequency of detection Q , namely, the number of detection events divided by k .

3. **Parameter estimation:** Alice continues the protocol if Q is small enough. She aborts the protocol otherwise.
4. **Discretization:** Alice maps the continuous number $\theta \in [0, 2\pi)$ to a discrete number $x \in \{0, 1, 2, 3\}$. Specifically, $x = 0$ when $\theta \in [0, \pi/2)$, $x = 1$ when $\theta \in [\pi/2, \pi)$, $x = 2$ when $\theta \in [\pi, 3\pi/2)$, and $x = 3$ when $\theta \in [3\pi/2, 2\pi)$. In this way, the sequence of continuously distributed θ 's is mapped to the raw sequence of discrete random variables.
5. **Randomness extraction:** Alice applies a random two-universal hash function to the raw sequence of x to extract final secret ℓ -bit random numbers.

Two remarks are in order. First, we discretize the phase into four regions in the above protocol for illustrative purpose. It is perfectly fine to sub-divide the phase into any equally spaced regions. The security analysis is essentially unchanged. Second, the energy test can be accomplished by heterodyne detection [32–34]. Thus, it seems possible to execute a similar protocol without threshold detector. However, we do not pursue this investigation here as it is beyond the main goal of this paper.

We begin our security analysis by applying our one-shot approach to compute the min-entropy of a single round of randomness generation mode. An heterodyne measurement corresponds to the following POVM

$$\Pi_{\mu,\theta} := \frac{1}{\pi} |\sqrt{\mu}e^{i\theta}\rangle \langle \sqrt{\mu}e^{i\theta}|, \quad (63)$$

where $\mu \in [0, \infty)$ and $\theta \in [0, 2\pi)$. The outputs of an heterodyne measurement are two quadratures denoted by $\{q, p\}$. They are related to μ and θ by $\mu = q^2 + p^2$ and $\theta = \arctan(q/p)$. A threshold measurement corresponds to the POVM with two elements $\{|0\rangle\langle 0|, I - |0\rangle\langle 0|\}$, where $|0\rangle\langle 0|$ and $I - |0\rangle\langle 0|$ correspond to “no click event” (that is, non-detection) and “click event” (that is, detection), respectively. The untrusted light sent to Alice can be described by an arbitrary energy-bounded optical quantum state ϱ_A . However, we can reduce it to a diagonalized one in the Fock state basis. This is because Eve may apply a phase-randomized operation to ϱ_A and record the corresponding phase information. This phase-randomized operation would not change the detection frequency Q . Therefore, we write ϱ_A as

$$\varrho_A = \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} p_m |m\rangle \langle m| \quad (64)$$

with constraints of normalized condition

$$\sum_{m=0}^{\infty} p_m = 1 \quad (65a)$$

and energy-bounded condition

$$L := \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} m p_m < \infty. \quad (65b)$$

Since Eve holds the purification of ϱ_A , the composite state can be written as $|\Phi\rangle_{AE} = \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} \sqrt{p_m} |m\rangle |e_m\rangle$, where $\{|e_m\rangle\}$ are held by Eve. For an implementation in practice, any heterodyne measurement is discretized. As showed in discretization step of our SI-CV QRNG protocol, we use x instead of θ to generate the final random number sequence. The corresponding POVM elements for x are given by

$$\Pi_x := \frac{1}{\pi} \int_{\frac{x\pi}{2}}^{\frac{(x+1)\pi}{2}} d\theta \int_0^{\infty} \sqrt{\mu} d\sqrt{\mu} \Pi_{\mu,\theta} = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{\frac{x\pi}{2}}^{\frac{(x+1)\pi}{2}} d\theta \int_0^{\infty} d\mu \Pi_{\mu,\theta}. \quad (66)$$

Therefore, the CQ state after applying POVM $\{\Pi_x\}$ to $|\Phi\rangle_{AE}$ is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \varrho_{XE} &:= \sum_{x=0}^3 |x\rangle \langle x| \otimes \text{Tr}[\Pi_x |\Phi\rangle_{AE} \langle \Phi|] \\ &= \sum_{x=0}^3 |x\rangle \langle x| \otimes \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{\frac{x\pi}{2}}^{\frac{(x+1)\pi}{2}} d\theta \int_0^{\infty} d\mu P\{\langle \sqrt{\mu}e^{i\theta} | \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} \sqrt{p_m} |m\rangle |e_m\rangle\} \\ &= \sum_{x=0}^3 |x\rangle \langle x| \otimes \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{\frac{x\pi}{2}}^{\frac{(x+1)\pi}{2}} d\theta \int_0^{\infty} d\mu P\{\sum_{m=0}^{\infty} \sqrt{\frac{e^{-\mu}\mu^m p_m}{m!}} e^{-im\theta} |e_m\rangle\}, \end{aligned} \quad (67)$$

where we make use of the fact that

$$|\sqrt{\mu}e^{i\theta}\rangle = \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} \sqrt{\frac{e^{-\mu}\mu^m p_m}{m!}} e^{im\theta} |m\rangle. \quad (68)$$

With the replacement of variables, $\theta \rightarrow x\pi/2 + \theta$ and $m \rightarrow 4m + y$ where $y \in \{0, 1, 2, 3\}$, we rewrite ϱ_{XE} in Eq. (67) as

$$\begin{aligned} \varrho_{XE} &= \sum_{x=0}^3 |x\rangle \langle x| \otimes \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_0^{\frac{\pi}{2}} d\theta \int_0^{\infty} d\mu P\left\{\sum_{y=0}^3 \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} \sqrt{\frac{e^{-\mu}\mu^{4m+y} p_{4m+y}}{(4m+y)!}} e^{-i(4m+y)(\frac{x\pi}{2}+\theta)} |e_{4m+y}\rangle\right\} \\ &= \frac{1}{4} \sum_{x=0}^3 |x\rangle \langle x| \otimes \frac{2}{\pi} \int_0^{\frac{\pi}{2}} d\theta \int_0^{\infty} d\mu P\left\{\sum_{y=0}^3 e^{-i\frac{\pi}{2}xy} \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} \sqrt{\frac{e^{-\mu}\mu^{4m+y} p_{4m+y}}{(4m+y)!}} e^{-i(4m+y)\theta} |e_{4m+y}\rangle\right\} \\ &= \frac{2}{\pi} \int_0^{\frac{\pi}{2}} d\theta \int_0^{\infty} d\mu \frac{1}{4} \sum_{x=0}^3 |x\rangle \langle x| \otimes P\left\{\sum_{y=0}^3 e^{-i\frac{\pi}{2}xy} |\bar{e}_y^{\theta,\mu}\rangle\right\}, \end{aligned} \quad (69)$$

where we define the sub-normalized states $\{|\bar{e}_y^{\theta,\mu}\rangle\}$ as

$$|\bar{e}_y^{\theta,\mu}\rangle := \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} \sqrt{\frac{e^{-\mu}\mu^{4m+y} p_{4m+y}}{(4m+y)!}} e^{-i(4m+y)\theta} |e_{4m+y}\rangle. \quad (70)$$

Note that $|\bar{e}_y^{\theta,\mu}\rangle$ is a normalizable state owing to the energy-bounded condition in Eq. (65b). Let us define the ‘‘joint probability density’’ of variables $\{\theta, \mu\}$ by

$$\varrho_{XE}^{\theta,\mu} := \frac{1}{4} \sum_{x=0}^3 |x\rangle \langle x| \otimes P\left\{\sum_{y=0}^3 e^{-i\frac{\pi}{2}xy} |\bar{e}_y^{\theta,\mu}\rangle\right\}, \quad (71)$$

whose form matches that of Eq. (8). Clearly,

$$\varrho_{XE} = \frac{2}{\pi} \int_0^{\frac{\pi}{2}} d\theta \int_0^{\infty} d\mu \varrho_{XE}^{\theta,\mu}. \quad (72)$$

Now, we are ready to calculate the min-entropy lower bound of ϱ_{XE} in Eq. (67). For the sub-normalized state $\varrho_{XE}(\theta, \mu)$, we define the function as

$$p_{\text{guess}}(\varrho_{XE}^{\theta,\mu}) := p_{\text{guess}}(X|E)_{\varrho_{XE}^{\theta,\mu}} = 2^{-H_{\min}(X|E)_{\varrho_{XE}^{\theta,\mu}}}. \quad (73)$$

Physically, this is the guessing probability of sub-normalized state $\varrho_{XE}^{\theta,\mu}$.

Lemma 3. *The guessing probability $p_{\text{guess}}(X|E)_{\varrho_{XE}}$ obeys*

$$p_{\text{guess}}(X|E)_{\varrho_{XE}} \leq \frac{2}{\pi} \int_0^{\frac{\pi}{2}} d\theta \int_0^{\infty} d\mu p_{\text{guess}}(\varrho_{XE}^{\theta,\mu}), \quad (74)$$

with this improper double integral being well-defined.

Proof. We define the ‘‘marginal probability density’’ of the variable θ by

$$\varrho_{XE}^{\theta} := \int_0^{\infty} d\mu \varrho_{XE}^{\theta,\mu} \quad (75)$$

so that

$$\varrho_{XE} = \frac{2}{\pi} \int_0^{\frac{\pi}{2}} d\theta \varrho_{XE}^{\theta}. \quad (76)$$

Similarly, we define

$$p_{\text{guess}}(\varrho_{XE}^\theta) := p_{\text{guess}}(X|E)_{\varrho_{XE}^\theta} = 2^{-H_{\min}(X|E)_{\varrho_{XE}^\theta}}. \quad (77)$$

From Eq. (2), we know that

$$\left| p_{\text{guess}}\left(\int_0^{\theta+\delta} d\theta \varrho_{XE}^\theta\right) - p_{\text{guess}}\left(\int_0^\theta d\theta \varrho_{XE}^\theta\right) \right| \leq \int_\theta^{\theta+\delta} d\theta \|\varrho_{XE}^\theta\|_1 \leq |\delta| \quad (78)$$

for all $\theta, \theta + \delta \in [0, 2\pi]$. In other words, $p_{\text{guess}}\left(\int_0^\theta d\theta \varrho_{XE}^\theta\right)$ is continuous and hence Riemann integrable in $[0, 2\pi]$. The sub-additivity of guessing probability in Appendix. A. 3 in Ref. [25] implies that

$$p_{\text{guess}}(X|E)_{\varrho_{XE}} \leq \frac{2s}{\pi} \sum_{j=0}^{s-1} p_{\text{guess}}\left(\int_{\theta_j}^{\theta_{j+1}} d\theta \varrho_{XE}^\theta\right). \quad (79)$$

Here we evenly divide the interval $[0, \pi/2]$ into $s \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ sub-intervals of equal width. By taking the limit $s \rightarrow \infty$, we conclude that

$$p_{\text{guess}}(X|E)_{\varrho_{XE}} \leq \frac{2}{\pi} \int_0^{\frac{\pi}{2}} d\theta p_{\text{guess}}(\varrho_{XE}^\theta). \quad (80)$$

Next, we need to prove that

$$p_{\text{guess}}(\varrho_{XE}^\theta) \leq \int_0^\infty d\mu p_{\text{guess}}(\varrho_{XE}^{\theta, \mu}), \quad (81)$$

for each θ . Observe that

$$\begin{aligned} p_{\text{guess}}(\varrho_{XE}^\theta) &\leq p_{\text{guess}}\left(\int_0^t d\mu \varrho_{XE}^{\theta, \mu}\right) + p_{\text{guess}}\left(\int_t^\infty d\mu \varrho_{XE}^{\theta, \mu}\right) \\ &\leq \int_0^t d\mu p_{\text{guess}}(\varrho_{XE}^{\theta, \mu}) + p_{\text{guess}}\left(\int_t^\infty d\mu \varrho_{XE}^{\theta, \mu}\right) \end{aligned} \quad (82)$$

for any $t > 0$. From Eq. (2), the guessing probability of any state will not be greater than its trace norm. Combined with Eqs. (70) and (71), we obtain

$$p_{\text{guess}}\left(\int_t^\infty d\mu \varrho_{XE}^{\theta, \mu}\right) \leq \int_t^\infty d\mu \text{Tr}\left[\varrho_{XE}^{\theta, \mu}\right] = \sum_{m=0}^\infty p_m \int_t^\infty d\mu \frac{e^{-\mu} \mu^m}{m!}. \quad (83)$$

Since $e^{-\mu} \mu^m / m!$ is the Gamma distribution of variable μ , we have

$$\int_t^\infty d\mu \frac{e^{-\mu} \mu^m}{m!} = \Pr[\mu \geq t] \leq \frac{\mathbb{E}[\mu]}{t} = \frac{m+1}{t}. \quad (84)$$

where we make use of the Markov's inequality and the fact that the mean of this Gamma distribution is $m+1$. Consequently,

$$\delta(t) := \sum_{m=0}^\infty p_m \int_t^\infty d\mu \frac{e^{-\mu} \mu^m}{m!} \leq \sum_{m=0}^\infty p_m \frac{m+1}{t} = \frac{L+1}{t} \quad (85)$$

where we make use of the normalized condition in Eq. (65a) and energy-bounded condition in Eq.(65b). On the other hand, we get

$$\int_0^t d\mu p_{\text{guess}}(\varrho_{XE}^{\theta, \mu}) \leq \int_0^\infty d\mu p_{\text{guess}}(\varrho_{XE}^{\theta, \mu}) \leq \int_0^\infty d\mu \text{Tr}\left[\varrho_{XE}^{\theta, \mu}\right] = \sum_{m=0}^\infty p_m \int_0^\infty d\mu \frac{e^{-\mu} \mu^m}{m!} = 1. \quad (86)$$

Thus, $\int_0^t d\mu p_{\text{guess}}(\varrho_{XE}^{\theta, \mu})$ is bounded for every t . As a consequence,

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \int_0^t d\mu p_{\text{guess}}(\varrho_{XE}^{\theta, \mu}) + p_{\text{guess}}\left(\int_t^\infty d\mu \varrho_{XE}^{\theta, \mu}\right) \leq \int_0^\infty d\mu p_{\text{guess}}(\varrho_{XE}^{\theta, \mu}) + \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \delta(t) = \int_0^\infty d\mu p_{\text{guess}}(\varrho_{XE}^{\theta, \mu}). \quad (87)$$

This completes our proof. \square

Corollary 3. For the $\varrho_{XE}^{\theta, \mu}$ defined in Eqs. (70) and (71),

$$p_{\text{guess}}(X|E)_{\varrho_{XE}} \leq \frac{1}{4} \left(\sum_{y=0}^3 \sqrt{\sum_{m=0}^{\infty} p_{4m+y}} \right)^2, \quad (88)$$

and thus

$$H_{\min}(X|E)_{\varrho_{XE}} \geq 2 - \log \left(\sum_{y=0}^3 \sqrt{\sum_{m=0}^{\infty} p_{4m+y}} \right)^2. \quad (89)$$

Proof. From Eqs. (70), (71) and Theorem 1, we obtain

$$p_{\text{guess}}(\varrho_{XE}^{\theta, \mu}) = \frac{1}{4} \left(\sum_{y=0}^3 \sqrt{\sum_{m=0}^{\infty} \frac{e^{-\mu} \mu^{4m+y} p_{4m+y}}{(4m+y)!}} \right)^2 \quad (90)$$

for each θ . By Lemma 3, we arrive at

$$\begin{aligned} p_{\text{guess}}(X|E)_{\varrho_{XE}} &\leq \frac{2}{\pi} \int_0^{\frac{\pi}{2}} d\theta \int_0^{\infty} d\mu \frac{1}{4} \left(\sum_{y=0}^3 \sqrt{\sum_{m=0}^{\infty} \frac{e^{-\mu} \mu^{4m+y} p_{4m+y}}{(4m+y)!}} \right)^2 \\ &= \frac{1}{4} \int_0^{\infty} d\mu \left(\sum_{y=0}^3 \sqrt{\sum_{m=0}^{\infty} \frac{e^{-\mu} \mu^{4m+y} p_{4m+y}}{(4m+y)!}} \right)^2. \end{aligned} \quad (91)$$

By writing

$$\beta_y := \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} \frac{e^{-\mu} \mu^{4m+y} p_{4m+y}}{(4m+y)!}, \quad (92)$$

we have

$$\begin{aligned} p_{\text{guess}}(X|E)_{\varrho_{XE}} &\leq \frac{1}{4} \int_0^{\infty} d\mu \left(\sum_{y=0}^3 \sqrt{\beta_y} \right)^2 \\ &= \frac{1}{4} \int_0^{\infty} d\mu \left(\sum_{y=0}^3 \beta_y + \sum_{y \neq y'} 2\sqrt{\beta_y \beta_{y'}} \right) \\ &\leq \frac{1}{4} \sum_{y=0}^3 \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} p_{4m+y} + \frac{1}{4} \sum_{y \neq y'} 2 \left(\int_0^{\infty} d\mu \beta_y \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\int_0^{\infty} d\mu \beta_{y'} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &= \frac{1}{4} \sum_{y=0}^3 \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} p_{4m+y} + \frac{1}{4} \sum_{y \neq y'} 2\sqrt{p_{4m+y} p_{4m+y'}} \\ &= \frac{1}{4} \left(\sum_{y=0}^3 \sqrt{\sum_{m=0}^{\infty} p_{4m+y}} \right)^2. \end{aligned} \quad (93)$$

Here we make use of the Cauchy–Schwarz inequality to obtain the second inequality. Eq. (89) follows directly from Theorem 1 and this completes our proof. \square

We now come to the generalization of min-entropy calculation for the multi-round case. Following the idea of analysis of single-round case, we reduce the incoming n -partite state denoted by ϱ_A^n to a diagonalized one in the Fock state basis so that ϱ_A^n is written as

$$\varrho_A^n = \sum_{\mathbf{m}} p_{\mathbf{m}} |\mathbf{m}\rangle \langle \mathbf{m}|, \quad (94)$$

where $\mathbf{m} \in \mathbb{R}^n$, the sum is over all possible \mathbf{m} and

$$|\mathbf{m}\rangle := \bigotimes_{k=1}^n |m_k\rangle, \quad (95)$$

m_k is the k -th dit of string \mathbf{m} , and $\{|m_k\rangle\}$ are the Fock states for the k -th sub-system. Since Eve holds the purification of ρ_A^n , the composite state is written by

$$|\Phi\rangle_{AE}^n = \sum_{\mathbf{m}} \sqrt{p_{\mathbf{m}}} |\mathbf{m}\rangle |e_{\mathbf{m}}\rangle, \quad (96)$$

where $\{|e_{\mathbf{m}}\rangle\}$ are held by Eve. Then, the CQ state, after applying POVM $\{\Pi_x\}$ to each sub-system of $|\Phi\rangle_{AE}^n$, is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \varrho_{\mathbf{X}E} := & \sum_{\mathbf{x}} |\mathbf{x}\rangle \langle \mathbf{x}| \otimes \frac{1}{(2\pi)^n} \int_{\frac{x_1\pi}{2}}^{\frac{(x_1+1)\pi}{2}} d\theta_1 \cdots \int_{\frac{x_n\pi}{2}}^{\frac{(x_n+1)\pi}{2}} d\theta_n \int_0^\infty d\mu_1 \cdots \int_0^\infty d\mu_n \times \\ & P\left\{ \sum_{\mathbf{m}} \sqrt{p_{\mathbf{m}}} \prod_{k=1}^n \frac{e^{-\mu_k} \mu_k^{m_k}}{m_k!} e^{-i\mathbf{m}\cdot\boldsymbol{\theta}} |e_{\mathbf{m}}\rangle \right\}, \end{aligned} \quad (97)$$

where $\mathbf{x} \in \{0, 1, 2, 3\}^n$ and $\mathbf{m}\cdot\boldsymbol{\theta} = \sum_{k=1}^n m_k \theta_k$. Similarly, we replace the variables as $\theta_k \rightarrow x_k\pi/2 + \theta_k$, $m_k \rightarrow 4m_k + y_k$ where $x_k, y_k \in \{0, 1, 2, 3\}$ and m_k are respectively their k -th dit to obtain

$$\varrho_{\mathbf{X}E} = \left(\frac{2}{\pi}\right)^n \int_0^{\frac{\pi}{2}} d\theta_1 \cdots \int_0^{\frac{\pi}{2}} d\theta_n \int_0^\infty d\mu_1 \cdots \int_0^\infty d\mu_n \varrho_{\mathbf{X}E}^{\boldsymbol{\theta}, \boldsymbol{\mu}} \quad (98)$$

where

$$\varrho_{\mathbf{X}E}^{\boldsymbol{\theta}, \boldsymbol{\mu}} := \frac{1}{4^n} \sum_{\mathbf{x}} |\mathbf{x}\rangle \langle \mathbf{x}| \otimes P\left\{ \sum_{\mathbf{y}} e^{-i\frac{\pi}{2}\mathbf{x}\cdot\mathbf{y}} \sum_{\mathbf{m}} \sqrt{p_{\mathbf{m}}} \prod_{k=1}^n \frac{e^{-\mu_k} \mu_k^{4m_k + y_k}}{(4m_k + y_k)!} e^{-i(4\mathbf{m} + \mathbf{y})\cdot\boldsymbol{\theta}} |e_{4\mathbf{m} + \mathbf{y}}\rangle \right\}, \quad (99)$$

whose form also matches that of Eq. (8) if setting $d = 4^n$. By repetitively applying Lemma 3, we arrive at

$$p_{\text{guess}}(\mathbf{X}|E)_{\varrho_{\mathbf{X}E}} \leq \left(\frac{2}{\pi}\right)^n \int_0^{\frac{\pi}{2}} d\theta_1 \cdots \int_0^{\frac{\pi}{2}} d\theta_n \int_0^\infty d\mu_1 \cdots \int_0^\infty d\mu_n p_{\text{guess}}(\mathbf{X}|E)_{\varrho_{\mathbf{X}E}^{\boldsymbol{\theta}, \boldsymbol{\mu}}}. \quad (100)$$

Corollary 4. *The $p_{\text{guess}}(\mathbf{X}|E)_{\varrho_{\mathbf{X}E}}$ in Eq. (100) obeys*

$$p_{\text{guess}}(\mathbf{X}|E)_{\varrho_{\mathbf{X}E}} \leq \frac{1}{4^n} \left(\sum_{\mathbf{y}} \sqrt{q_{\mathbf{y}}} \right)^2 \quad (101)$$

where

$$q_{\mathbf{y}} := \sum_{\mathbf{m}} p_{4\mathbf{m} + \mathbf{y}}. \quad (102)$$

Moreover,

$$H_{\min}(\mathbf{X}|E)_{\varrho_{\mathbf{X}E}} \geq 2n - \log \left(\sum_{\mathbf{y}} \sqrt{q_{\mathbf{y}}} \right)^2. \quad (103)$$

Proof. This can be proven using the same logical argument in the proof of Corollary 3. \square

We now connect the parameters $\{q_{\mathbf{y}}\}$ in Corollary 4 to the observable Q in this SI-CV QRNG protocol and express the smoothed version in terms of Q .

Lemma 4. Let $\varepsilon \geq 0$. Define the set

$$\mathcal{S}_{\hat{Q}} := \left\{ \mathbf{y} : \frac{\sum_k \mathbf{y}_k}{n} \leq \hat{Q} \right\}, \quad (104)$$

where $\mathbf{y}_k = 0$ if $y_k = 0$, $\mathbf{y}_k = 1$ if $y_k \geq 1$, and

$$\hat{Q} \leq Q + \sqrt{\frac{(n+k)(k+1)}{nk^2} \ln \frac{1}{\varepsilon}}. \quad (105)$$

Suppose $\sum_{\mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{S}_{\hat{Q}}} q_{\mathbf{y}} = 1 - \varepsilon$. Then

$$H_{\min}^{\varepsilon}(\mathbf{X}|E)_{\varrho_{\mathbf{X}E}} \geq n[2 - H(\hat{Q})], \quad (106)$$

where $H(\hat{Q}) := -\hat{Q} \log \hat{Q} - (1 - \hat{Q}) \log[(1 - \hat{Q})/3]$ is the Shannon entropy of a random variable with four possible states following the probability distribution $\{\hat{Q}, (1 - \hat{Q})/3, (1 - \hat{Q})/3, (1 - \hat{Q})/3\}$.

Proof. The logical flow of this proof is the same as that of Lemma 2. We claim that the state

$$|\Phi_{\varepsilon}\rangle_{AE}^n = \frac{1}{\sum_{\mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{S}_{\hat{Q}}} \sum_{\mathbf{m}} p_{4\mathbf{m}+\mathbf{y}}} \sum_{\mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{S}_{\hat{Q}}} \sum_{\mathbf{m}} \sqrt{p_{4\mathbf{m}+\mathbf{y}}} |4\mathbf{m} + \mathbf{y}\rangle \otimes |e_{4\mathbf{m}+\mathbf{y}}\rangle. \quad (107)$$

is ε -close to $|\Phi\rangle_{AE}^n$ in Eq. (96). To see this, we calculate the fidelity between the two state, that is,

$$F(|\Phi_{\varepsilon}\rangle_{AE}^n, |\Phi\rangle_{AE}^n) = |\langle \Phi_{\varepsilon} | \Phi \rangle_{AE}^n| = \sqrt{\sum_{\mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{S}_{\hat{Q}}} q_{\mathbf{y}}} = \sqrt{1 - \varepsilon}, \quad (108)$$

so that the purified distance between the two states is then given by ε . Suppose $\varsigma_{\mathbf{X}E}$ is the state resulted from $|\Phi_{\varepsilon}\rangle_{AE}^n$ by Alice performing POVM $\{\Pi_x\}$. The monotonicity of the fidelity implies that

$$P(\varrho_{\mathbf{X}E}, \varsigma_{\mathbf{X}E}) \leq \varepsilon. \quad (109)$$

Therefore, according to Corollary 4, we have

$$H_{\min}^{\varepsilon}(\mathbf{X}|E)_{\varrho_{\mathbf{X}E}} \geq H_{\min}(\mathbf{X}|E)_{\varsigma_{\mathbf{X}E}} \geq 2n - \log \frac{\left(\sum_{\mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{S}_{\hat{Q}}} \sqrt{q_{\mathbf{y}}}\right)^2}{\sum_{\mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{S}_{\hat{Q}}} q_{\mathbf{y}}}. \quad (110)$$

By the technique of Lemma 4 in Appendix B in Ref. [15], we have

$$\log \frac{\left(\sum_{\mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{S}_{\hat{Q}}} \sqrt{q_{\mathbf{y}}}\right)^2}{\sum_{\mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{S}_{\hat{Q}}} q_{\mathbf{y}}} \leq H(\hat{Q}). \quad (111)$$

This completes the proof. \square

Since the probability of finding a non-vacuum state is Q in the testing rounds, the chance of getting a Fock state whose number of particles does not equal $4m$ for some $m \in \mathbb{N}$ is at most Q . By the Serfling inequality, we see that the probability of such Fock state occurring is bounded by \hat{Q} in the randomness generation rounds, except a small failure probability ε .

Finally, we show the length of secret random numbers, and prove that this SI-CV QRNG protocol is ε_{sec} -secret with $\varepsilon_{\text{sec}} = 4\varepsilon$

Theorem 4. If the final key length is given by

$$\ell \leq n[2 - H(\hat{Q})] - \log \frac{2}{\varepsilon_{\text{sec}}^2}, \quad (112)$$

then this protocol is ε_{sec} -secret.

Proof. According to quantum leftover hashing lemma [5, 6], the users can extract a Δ -secret key of length ℓ from string \mathbf{X} , where

$$\Delta = 2\varepsilon + \frac{1}{2}\sqrt{2^{\ell-H_{\min}^{\varepsilon}(\mathbf{X}|E)_{\rho_{\mathbf{X}E}}}}. \quad (113)$$

Then choosing $\varepsilon_{\text{sec}} = 4\varepsilon$, we have

$$\Delta \leq 2\varepsilon + \frac{1}{2}\sqrt{2^{\ell-H_{\min}^{\varepsilon}(\mathbf{X}|E)_{\rho_{\mathbf{X}E}}}} \leq \frac{\varepsilon_{\text{sec}}}{2} + \frac{\varepsilon_{\text{sec}}}{2} = \varepsilon_{\text{sec}}, \quad (114)$$

where we use Eq. (106). Thus, this protocol is ε_{sec} -secret. \square

IV. SUMMARY

In summary, we develop a powerful technique to calculate non-trivial lower bound on min-entropy as well as its smoothed version for a given classical-quantum state by reducing the computation to a problem of eigenvalues of the adversary state. This eases the lower bound computation. We apply this technique in quantum cryptography to give security proofs and secure key/random bit rates of the BB84 protocol as well as a novel SI-CV QRNG protocol. These demonstrate the usefulness of our one-shot min-entropy calculation technique and its wide applicability in quantum cryptography.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We thank Chao Wang for the discussion of experimental feasibility of our proposed SI-CV QRNG protocol. This work is supported by the RGC Grant No. 17303323 of the HKSAR Government.

-
- [1] M. M. Wilde, *Quantum information theory* (Cambridge university press, 2013).
 - [2] R. König, R. Renner, and C. Schaffner, The operational meaning of min-and max-entropy, *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory* **55**, 4337 (2009).
 - [3] C. H. Bennett and G. Brassard, Quantum cryptography: Public key distribution and coin tossing, in *Proceedings of IEEE International Conference on Computers, Systems and Signal Processing* (IEEE, 1984) pp. 175–179.
 - [4] M. Herrero-Collantes and J. C. Garcia-Escartin, Quantum random number generators, *Reviews of Modern Physics* **89**, 015004 (2017).
 - [5] R. Renner, Security of quantum key distribution, *International Journal of Quantum Information* **6**, 1 (2008).
 - [6] M. Tomamichel, C. Schaffner, A. Smith, and R. Renner, Leftover hashing against quantum side information, *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory* **57**, 5524 (2011).
 - [7] R. Renner, Symmetry of large physical systems implies independence of subsystems, *Nature Physics* **3**, 645 (2007).
 - [8] M. Christandl, R. König, and R. Renner, Postselection technique for quantum channels with applications to quantum cryptography, *Physical Review Letters* **102**, 020504 (2009).
 - [9] M. Tomamichel, R. Colbeck, and R. Renner, A fully quantum asymptotic equipartition property, *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory* **55**, 5840 (2009).
 - [10] F. Dupuis, O. Fawzi, and R. Renner, Entropy accumulation, *Communications in Mathematical Physics* **379**, 867 (2020).
 - [11] R. Arnon-Friedman, F. Dupuis, O. Fawzi, R. Renner, and T. Vidick, Practical device-independent quantum cryptography via entropy accumulation, *Nature Communications* **9**, 1 (2018).
 - [12] M. Tomamichel and R. Renner, Uncertainty relation for smooth entropies, *Physical Review Letters* **106**, 110506 (2011).
 - [13] M. Tomamichel, C. C. W. Lim, N. Gisin, and R. Renner, Tight finite-key analysis for quantum cryptography, *Nature Communications* **3**, 1 (2012).
 - [14] M. Tomamichel and A. Leverrier, A largely self-contained and complete security proof for quantum key distribution, *Quantum* **1**, 14 (2017).
 - [15] R. Wang, Z.-Q. Yin, H. Liu, S. Wang, W. Chen, G.-C. Guo, and Z.-F. Han, Tight finite-key analysis for generalized high-dimensional quantum key distribution, *Physical Review Research* **3**, 023019 (2021).
 - [16] P. J. Coles, M. Berta, M. Tomamichel, and S. Wehner, Entropic uncertainty relations and their applications, *Reviews of Modern Physics* **89**, 015002 (2017).
 - [17] J. Müller-Quade and R. Renner, Composability in quantum cryptography, *New Journal of Physics* **11**, 085006 (2009).
 - [18] C. Portmann and R. Renner, Security in quantum cryptography, *Reviews of Modern Physics* **94**, 025008 (2022).
 - [19] G. Vallone, D. G. Marangon, M. Tomasin, and P. Villoresi, Quantum randomness certified by the uncertainty principle, *Physical Review A* **90**, 052327 (2014).

- [20] Z. Cao, H. Zhou, X. Yuan, and X. Ma, Source-independent quantum random number generation, *Physical Review X* **6**, 011020 (2016).
- [21] X. Ma, X. Yuan, Z. Cao, B. Qi, and Z. Zhang, Quantum random number generation, *npj Quantum Information* **2**, 1 (2016).
- [22] D. G. Marangon, G. Vallone, and P. Villoresi, Source-device-independent ultrafast quantum random number generation, *Physical Review Letters* **118**, 060503 (2017).
- [23] M. Avesani, D. G. Marangon, G. Vallone, and P. Villoresi, Source-device-independent heterodyne-based quantum random number generator at 17 gbps, *Nature Communications* **9**, 5365 (2018).
- [24] C. C. Gerry and P. L. Knight, *Introductory quantum optics* (Cambridge university press, 2023).
- [25] M. Tomamichel, R. Colbeck, and R. Renner, Duality between smooth min-and max-entropies, *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory* **56**, 4674 (2010).
- [26] F. Furrer, J. Åberg, and R. Renner, Min-and max-entropy in infinite dimensions, *Communications in Mathematical Physics* **306**, 165 (2011).
- [27] M. Müller-Lennert, F. Dupuis, O. Szehr, S. Fehr, and M. Tomamichel, On quantum rényi entropies: A new generalization and some properties, *Journal of Mathematical Physics* **54**, 122203 (2013).
- [28] H.-K. Lo and H. F. Chau, Unconditional security of quantum key distribution over arbitrarily long distances, *Science* **283**, 2050 (1999).
- [29] B. Kraus, N. Gisin, and R. Renner, Lower and upper bounds on the secret-key rate for quantum key distribution protocols using one-way classical communication, *Physical Review Letters* **95**, 080501 (2005).
- [30] R. Renner, N. Gisin, and B. Kraus, Information-theoretic security proof for quantum-key-distribution protocols, *Physical Review A* **72**, 012332 (2005).
- [31] A. Vitanov, F. Dupuis, M. Tomamichel, and R. Renner, Chain rules for smooth min-and max-entropies, *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory* **59**, 2603 (2013).
- [32] R. Renner and J. I. Cirac, de finetti representation theorem for infinite-dimensional quantum systems and applications to quantum cryptography, *Physical Review Letters* **102**, 110504 (2009).
- [33] T. Upadhyaya, T. van Himbeek, J. Lin, and N. Lütkenhaus, Dimension reduction in quantum key distribution for continuous-and discrete-variable protocols, *PRX Quantum* **2**, 020325 (2021).
- [34] F. Kanitschar, I. George, J. Lin, T. Upadhyaya, and N. Lütkenhaus, Finite-size security for discrete-modulated continuous-variable quantum key distribution protocols, *PRX Quantum* **4**, 040306 (2023).