

Quantum secure non-malleable extractors

Naresh Goud Boddu* Rahul Jain † Upendra Kapshikar‡ §

September 17, 2024

Abstract

Non-malleable extractors, introduced by Dodis and Wichs [DW09], have found several applications in the study of tamper-resilient cryptography. For example, seeded non-malleable extractors are a key ingredient in the *privacy amplification* (PA) protocol with an active classical adversary. Similarly, 2-source non-malleable extractors provide a way to construct *non-malleable codes*, introduced by Dziembowski, Pietrzak, and Wichs [DPW18], with further applications to non-malleable secret sharing. Thus, understanding the security of such non-malleable extractors against quantum adversaries is vital.

We construct several efficient quantum secure non-malleable extractors. All our constructions are based on the works of Chattopadhyay, Goyal, and Li [CGL20], and Cohen [Coh15]

- We construct the first efficient quantum secure non-malleable extractor for source min-entropy $k \geq \text{poly}(\log(\frac{n}{\varepsilon}))$ and seed length $d = \text{poly}(\log(\frac{n}{\varepsilon}))$, where n is the length of the source and ε is the error parameter. Previously, Aggarwal, Chung, Lin, and Vidick [ACLV19] demonstrated that an inner-product based non-malleable extractor proposed by Li [Li12] is quantum secure, but it required linear (in n) min-entropy and seed length.
- By leveraging the connection between non-malleable extractors and PA (first established in the quantum setting by Cohen and Vidick [CV17]), we obtain a 2-round PA protocol that is secure against active quantum adversaries with communication $\text{poly}(\log(\frac{n}{\varepsilon}))$. This allows for a trade-off between communication and error in a PA protocol, improving on the results of [ACLV19], which required communication to be linear in n .
- We construct an efficient quantum secure 2-source non-malleable extractor for min-entropy $k \geq n - n^{\Omega(1)}$, with an output size of $n/4$ and error $2^{-n^{\Omega(1)}}$.
- Additionally, we explore the natural extensions of these extractors when the tampering of the inputs occurs t -times. We construct efficient quantum secure t -non-malleable extractors for both the seeded case ($t = d^{\Omega(1)}$) and the 2-source case ($t = n^{\Omega(1)}$). We construct efficient quantum secure t -non-malleable extractors for both seeded ($t = d^{\Omega(1)}$) as well as 2-source case ($t = n^{\Omega(1)}$).

*NTT Research, USA, naresh.boddu@ntt-research.com

†Centre for Quantum Technologies and Department of Computer Science, National University of Singapore and MajuLab, UMI 3654, Singapore, rahul@comp.nus.edu.sg

‡Center for Quantum Technologies, National University of Singapore, e0382999@u.nus.edu

§This paper was presented at 17th Conference on the Theory of Quantum Computation, Communication and Cryptography (TQC 2022) in workshop track.

1 Introduction

Extractors are functions that transform weak sources into uniform randomness. They are crucial because randomized algorithms are designed under the assumption that the randomness used is uniformly distributed. Extractors have numerous applications, including privacy amplification (PA), pseudo-randomness, derandomization, expanders, combinatorics, and cryptography. Some general models of weak sources are the so-called *min-entropy* sources and *conditional min-entropy* sources. Please refer to Section 2 for definitions of information-theoretic quantities, extractors, and various adversary models.

Let random variables $X \in \{0, 1\}^n, Y \in \{0, 1\}^n$ and $S \in \{0, 1\}^d$ (where U_d is the uniform distribution on d bits and $X \otimes S$ represents independent random variables X, S)

$$\mathcal{C}_1 = \{X : H_{\min}(X) \geq k\} \quad ; \quad \mathcal{C}_2 = \{X \otimes S : H_{\min}(X) \geq k \text{ and } S = U_d\} \quad ;$$

$$\mathcal{C}_3 = \{X \otimes Y : H_{\min}(X) \geq k_1 \text{ and } H_{\min}(Y) \geq k_2\}.$$

It can be argued that no deterministic function can extract even one uniform bit given an (arbitrary) source $X \in \mathcal{C}_1$, for $k \leq n - 1$ [CG85]. This led to designing extractors using sources from \mathcal{C}_2 . They use an additional uniform source (aka *seed* $S = U_d$) called *seeded extractors*. Subsequent works also considered extraction from class \mathcal{C}_3 , involving multiple independent weak sources [CG85, Bou05]. In the classical setting, extractors have been studied extensively both in the seeded and the multi-source settings [ILL89, GUV09, DW08, Bou05, CG85, KLRZ08, Rao06, Raz05, KLR09].

Consider a situation where the input of an extractor is tampered with. For example, for a source $(X, S) \in \mathcal{C}_2$, an adversary may tamper with the seed S to modify it to some other seed S' . In this case, a natural question arises: ‘*Does the output of tampered input (X, S') have any correlation with the output of the untampered input (X, S) ?*’. To be resilient against such adversarial tampering of the input, it is crucial that the original input produces an output that is (almost) independent of the one generated by the tampered input. Extractors with this property are called non-malleable extractors [DW09]. A non-malleable extractor, denoted by nmExt , produces an output that is nearly uniform and independent of tampering. Formally, this means that the outputs satisfy $(\text{nmExt}(X, S)\text{nmExt}(X, S')) \approx U_m \otimes \text{nmExt}(X, S')$.

Applications to cryptography motivate the study of extractors in the presence of an adversary holding some side information E about the source. For simplicity and brevity, we refer to the joint systems, including the adversary’s side information, as a source. These sources are considered to be of the form:

$$\mathcal{C}_4 = \{XE \otimes S : H_{\min}(X|E) \geq k \text{ and } S = U_d\}.$$

Here, we require the output of the extractor $\text{Ext}(X, S)$ to be uniform given the side information E , i.e., $(\text{Ext}(X, S)E \approx U_m \otimes E)$. Additionally, in the case of a non-malleable extractor, we require that it is (nearly) independent of any potential tampering of the seed:

$$\text{nmExt}(X, S)\text{nmExt}(X, S')E \approx U_m \otimes \text{nmExt}(X, S')E.$$

Similarly one can consider 2-sources with adversary side information (below $k_1, k_2 > 0$ and $|Y| = n$):

$$\mathcal{C} = \{X - E - Y : H_{\min}(X|E) \geq k_1 \text{ and } H_{\min}(Y|E) \geq k_2\},$$

where $X - E - Y$ represents a Markov-chain (see Definition 10). 2-source extractors have been extensively studied as well [Bou05, CG85, KLRZ08, Rao06, Raz05, KLR09, CGL20, Li15, CZ19].

Similar to seeded extractors, 2-source extractors also have a stronger variant in terms of non-malleability. For a 2-source non-malleable extractor, we allow tampering on both X and Y . An adversary can modify (X, Y) to some (X', Y') such that, either $\Pr[X \neq X'] = 1$ or $\Pr[Y \neq Y'] = 1$. A 2-source non-malleable extractor is a function $2\text{nmExt} : \{0, 1\}^n \times \{0, 1\}^n \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^m$ such that:

$$2\text{nmExt}(X, Y)2\text{nmExt}(X', Y')EYY' \approx_\varepsilon U_m \otimes 2\text{nmExt}(X', Y')EYY'.$$

2-source non-malleable extractors have been used in the construction of non-malleable codes in the well studied *split-state* model by Chattopadhyay, Goyal and Li [CGL20]. These non-malleable codes are known to have applications in various cryptographic tasks such as non-malleable secret-sharing and non-malleable commitment [GPR16, GK18a, GK18b, ADN⁺19, SV19]. Seeded non-malleable extractors were used, by Chattopadhyay and Zuckerman [CZ19], as a key ingredient in their breakthrough construction of 2-source extractors for $\text{polylog}(n)$ min-entropy sources. 2-source extractors also find applications in graph-theory and are related to Ramsey graphs, well studied combinatorial objects.

With the advent of quantum computers, it is natural to investigate the security of extractors against a quantum adversary with quantum side information on weak sources. Such sources are of the form:

$$\mathcal{Q}_1 = \{\sigma_{XES} = \sigma_{XE} \otimes \sigma_S : H_{\min}(X|E)_\sigma \geq k \text{ and } \sigma_S = U_d\},$$

where side information E is quantum and source as well as seed (XS) are classical. As expected, quantum side information presents many more challenges compared to classical side information. Gavinsky et al. [GKK⁺07] provided an example of a seeded extractor that is secure against a classical adversary but not secure against a quantum adversary, even with very small side information.

Very little is known about the security of non-malleable extractors against quantum side information. The initial challenge lies in defining a non-malleable extractor with quantum side information, as we need to provide security with updated quantum side information when the adversary modifies $(E, S) \rightarrow (E', S')$. Informally, we require (for formal definition see Definition 15)

$$\text{nmExt}(X, S)\text{nmExt}(X, S')E' \approx U_m \otimes \text{nmExt}(X, S')E'.$$

In the classical setting it can be argued that, conditioned on $E = e$, X and S' remain independent, since with this conditioning, S' is a deterministic function of S . However in the quantum setting, conditioning on quantum side information cannot be done in this manner, so this argument does not hold.

In this paper, we study seeded non-malleable extractors and extend the definition to 2-source non-malleable extractors (see Definition 18). We also explore their natural extensions where the tampering is performed t -times, allowing the adversary to tamper with $(E, S) \rightarrow (E', S^1, \dots, S^t)$.

In this scenario, we require that the output remains nearly independent given the quantum side information and any of the tampered outputs. For example, in the seeded case (see Definition 21):

$$\text{nmExt}(X, S)\text{nmExt}(X, S^1) \dots \text{nmExt}(X, S^t)E' \approx U_m \otimes \text{nmExt}(X, S^1) \dots \text{nmExt}(X, S^t)E'.$$

Before stating our results, we give a brief overview of some relevant previous works.

Previous works

Aggarwal et al. [ACLV19] have shown that an inner-product based non-malleable extractor proposed by Li [Li12] is quantum secure, however it requires linear min-entropy and seed length.

Recent work by Aggarwal et al. [ABJO24] has strengthened this result by showing that Li's extractor remains quantum secure even when the seed is not uniform, although it still requires linear min-entropy in the seed. They achieve this by introducing a notion of security against a quantum measurement adversary, to which the eventual quantum security of the inner-product is reduced.

To the best of our knowledge, the inner-product based non-malleable extractor proposed by Li [Li12] is the only non-malleable extractor for which quantum security is known.

Earlier works by Cohen and Vidick [CV17] and Bouman and Fehr [BF11] attempted to provide quantum security for non-malleable extractors based on the powerful technique of *alternating extraction* introduced by Dziembowski and Pietrzak [DP07]. Unfortunately, these results were later withdrawn due to subtle issues in the arguments.

Our results

Let σ_{XES} be a source from \mathcal{Q}_1 . We have $\sigma_{XES} = \sigma_{XE} \otimes \sigma_S$, $H_{\min}(X|E)_\sigma \geq k$ and $\sigma_S = U_d$. One may consider register S as uniform seed and register E as adversary quantum side information on source X . We consider the pure state extension of σ_{XES} denoted by $\sigma_{X\hat{X}\hat{E}ES\hat{S}} = \sigma_{X\hat{X}\hat{E}E} \otimes \sigma_{S\hat{S}}$, as it helps us in our analysis. Here $\sigma_{X\hat{X}\hat{E}E}$, $\sigma_{S\hat{S}}$ are *canonical purifications* of σ_{XE} and σ_S respectively. For simplicity we call the entire pure state as a source, even though the uniform randomness is extracted from classical registers of a pure state (see Definition 3). Note that \hat{X}, \hat{S} are copies of X, S respectively (see Definition 4). Consider,

$$\mathcal{Q}_2 = \{\sigma_{X\hat{X}\hat{E}ES\hat{S}} = \sigma_{X\hat{X}\hat{E}E} \otimes \sigma_{S\hat{S}} : H_{\min}(X|E)_\sigma \geq k \text{ and } \sigma_S = U_d\},$$

where $\sigma_{X\hat{X}\hat{E}ES\hat{S}}$ is a pure state. Note the sources in \mathcal{Q}_2 are purifications of sources in \mathcal{Q}_1 . The conditions in \mathcal{Q}_2 are equivalent to,

$$H_{\min}(X|ES\hat{S})_\sigma = H_{\min}(X|E)_\sigma \geq k \quad ; \quad H_{\min}(S|X\hat{X}\hat{E})_\sigma = H_{\min}(S)_\sigma = d.$$

More generally, this leads us to consider the following sources (see Definition 16):

$$\mathcal{Q} = \{\sigma_{X\hat{X}NMY\hat{Y}} : \sigma_{X\hat{X}NMY\hat{Y}} \text{ is a } (k_1, k_2)\text{-qpa-state}\}.$$

Here **qpa** stands for *quantum purified adversary*. To understand the advantage of considering the sources along with purification registers consider the following example. Consider the Markov-chain $\sigma_{XEY} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|00\rangle + |11\rangle)|0\rangle$. Note $I(X : Y|E)_\sigma = 0$. Let ρ_{XEY} be the state after applying CNOT gate on qubit Y conditioned on qubit E of σ . Note $\rho_{XEY} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|000\rangle + |111\rangle)$. We have $I(X : Y|E)_\rho \neq 0$. This points us to one of the key difficulty faced by earlier approach of Markov model. On the other hand, we note that sources in \mathcal{Q} remain in \mathcal{Q} after adversarial tampering. This can be seen as follows: Let $\sigma_{X\hat{X}NMY\hat{Y}}$ be a (k_1, k_2) -qpa-state and adversary tampers $(Y, M) \rightarrow (Y, Y', M')$. Let $\rho_{X\hat{X}NM'Y'Y\hat{Y}}$ be the state after adversary action. It is easy to note (using Fact 3) that $H_{\min}(X|M'Y'Y\hat{Y})_\rho \geq k_1$ and $H_{\min}(Y|NX\hat{X})_\rho \geq k_2$.

This enables us to analyse the constructions of non-malleable extractors step by step and ensuring the parameters (k_1, k_2) for the (k_1, k_2) -qpa-state at the end are still in control to extract randomness.

Also, note the sources $\mathcal{C}_2, \mathcal{C}_3, \mathcal{C}_4, \mathcal{Q}_1, \mathcal{Q}_2$ can all be seen as special cases of \mathcal{Q} (in the purification picture). This provides us a general framework to define extractors and non-malleable extractors, both in the seeded and the 2-source settings.

We now state our results. Let n, d, t be positive integers and $k, \varepsilon > 0$. The following result is about seeded non-malleable extractors.

Theorem 1 (quantum secure non-malleable extractor). *Let $d = \mathcal{O}(\log^7(n/\varepsilon))$ and $k = \Omega(d)$. There exists an efficient non-malleable extractor $\text{nmExt} : \{0, 1\}^n \times \{0, 1\}^d \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^{k/4}$ that is $(k, \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon))$ -quantum secure (see Definition 15).*

The adversary in the result above is the qnma (short for quantum non-malleable adversary). As a corollary, we get the following result for the standard model of sources considered in the literature (sources in \mathcal{Q}_1).

Corollary 1. *Let $d = \mathcal{O}(\log^7(n/\varepsilon))$ and $k = \Omega(d)$. Let ρ_{XEY} be a c -q state with registers (XY) classical such that*

$$H_{\min}(X|E)_\rho \geq k \quad ; \quad \rho_{XEY} = \rho_{XE} \otimes U_d \quad ; \quad |X| = n.$$

Let $\mathbb{T} : \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}_E \otimes \mathcal{H}_Y) \rightarrow \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}_{E'} \otimes \mathcal{H}_Y \otimes \mathcal{H}_{Y'})$ be a (safe) CPTP map such that for $\sigma_{XE'YY'} = \mathbb{T}(\rho_{XEY})$, we have registers $XY Y'$ classical and $\Pr(Y \neq Y')_\sigma = 1$. Let the function nmExt be from Theorem 1, $L = \text{nmExt}(X, Y)$ and $L' = \text{nmExt}(X, Y')$. Then,

$$\|\sigma_{LL'YY'E'} - U_{k/4} \otimes \sigma_{L'YY'E'}\|_1 \leq \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon).$$

Dodis and Wichs [DW09] gave a two-round protocol for privacy amplification (PA) against active adversaries with classical side information. The main ingredient in their protocol is a non-malleable extractor, which when combined with an information-theoretically secure message authentication code gives security in PA. As shown in [CV17], using quantum secure non-malleable extractor, one can extend the proof of security by Dodis and Wichs to the case of active quantum adversaries. Thus, our quantum secure non-malleable extractor, given by Theorem 1, enables us to obtain a PA protocol against active quantum adversaries (see Definition 26).

Theorem 2. *Let $d = \mathcal{O}(\log^7(n/\varepsilon))$, $k = \Omega(d)$ and $\delta > 0$ be a small enough constant. There exists an efficient two-round PA protocol against active quantum adversaries for min-entropy k sources that can extract $(\frac{1}{2} - \delta)k$ bits with communication $\mathcal{O}(d)$ and error $\mathcal{O}(\varepsilon)$.*

This result allows for a trade-off in communication and error in a PA protocol, improving on the result of [ACLV19], where the communication is required to be linear in n . We provide a proof of Theorem 2 in Appendix D. Similar proofs have appeared in [CV17, ABJO24, ACLV19].

We show the following result for 2-source non-malleable extractors.

Theorem 3 (quantum secure 2-source non-malleable extractor). *Let $k = \mathcal{O}(n^{1/4})$ and $\varepsilon = 2^{-n^{\Omega(1)}}$. There exists an efficient 2-source non-malleable extractor $2\text{nmExt} : \{0, 1\}^n \times \{0, 1\}^n \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^{n/4}$ that is $(n - k, n - k, \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon))$ -quantum secure (see Definition 18).*

The above result is stated for the adversary qnma (quantum non-malleable adversary). As a corollary, we obtain corresponding results for other models of 2-source adversaries studied in the literature.

Kasher and Kempe [KK10] introduced the quantum independent adversary (qia) model, where the adversary obtains independent side-information from both sources. Informally, qia gets the registers $\rho_{E_1 E_2}$ as quantum side information in $\rho_{X E_1 E_2 Y}$ such that

$$\rho_{X E_1 E_2 Y} = (\rho_{X E_1} \otimes \rho_{Y E_2}) \quad ; \quad \mathsf{H}_{\min}(X|E_1)_\rho \geq k_1 \quad ; \quad \mathsf{H}_{\min}(Y|E_2)_\rho \geq k_2.$$

We refer the reader to [KK10] for complete details. We propose to incorporate non-malleable extractor security against qia as follows.

Definition 1 (2-source non-malleable extractor against qia). *Let $\rho_{X E_1 E_2 Y}$ be a c -q state with registers (XY) classical such that $|X| = |Y| = n$,*

$$\rho_{X E_1 E_2 Y} = (\rho_{X E_1} \otimes \rho_{Y E_2}) \quad ; \quad \mathsf{H}_{\min}(X|E_1)_\rho \geq k_1 \quad ; \quad \mathsf{H}_{\min}(Y|E_2)_\rho \geq k_2.$$

Let $\mathsf{T}_1 : \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}_{E_2} \otimes \mathcal{H}_X) \rightarrow \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}_{E'_2} \otimes \mathcal{H}_X \otimes \mathcal{H}_{X'})$, $\mathsf{T}_2 : \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}_{E_1} \otimes \mathcal{H}_Y) \rightarrow \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}_{E'_1} \otimes \mathcal{H}_Y \otimes \mathcal{H}_{Y'})$ be (safe) CPTP maps such that for $\sigma_{X X' E'_1 E'_2 Y Y'} = (\mathsf{T}_1 \otimes \mathsf{T}_2)(\rho_{X E_1 E_2 Y})$, we have registers $(X X' Y Y')$ classical and either $\Pr(X \neq X')_\sigma = 1$ or $\Pr(Y \neq Y')_\sigma = 1$. We say a function $f : \{0, 1\}^n \times \{0, 1\}^n \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^m$ is a (k_1, k_2, ε) -quantum secure 2-source non-malleable extractor against qia iff for every σ as defined above, we have

$$\|\sigma_{f(X, Y) f(X', Y') Y Y' E'_1} - U_m \otimes \sigma_{f(X', Y') Y Y' E'_1}\|_1 \leq \varepsilon.$$

Remark 1. *In the Definition 1, one may ask if we can provide both the registers E'_1 and E'_2 as side-information to the adversary along with $Y Y'$. However this may allow adversary to gain complete knowledge of X, Y (since E'_2 may contain a copy of X and E'_1 may contain a copy of Y) making the model uninteresting. Thus we settle on the model as in Definition 1.*

We have the following corollary of Theorem 3.

Corollary 2 (2nmExt is a 2-source non-malleable extractor against qia). *Let the function 2nmExt be from Theorem 3. 2nmExt is an $(n - k, n - k, \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon))$ -quantum secure 2-source non-malleable extractor against qia.*

Arnon-Friedman, Portmann and Scholz [AFPS16] introduced the quantum Markov adversary (qMara). Informally, qMara gets the register ρ_E as quantum side information in a Markov-chain $\rho_{X E Y}$. We propose to incorporate 2-source non-malleable extractor security against qMara as follows.

Definition 2 (2-source non-malleable extractor against qMara). *Let $\rho_{X E Y}$ be a c -q state with registers (XY) classical such that*

$$\rho_{X E Y} = \sum_t \Pr(T = t) |t\rangle\langle t| \otimes (\rho_{X E_1}^t \otimes \rho_{Y E_2}^t)^1 \quad ; \quad \mathsf{H}_{\min}(X|E)_\rho \geq k_1 \quad ; \quad \mathsf{H}_{\min}(Y|E)_\rho \geq k_2,$$

where T is classical register over a finite alphabet. Let $\mathsf{T}_1 : \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}_{E_2} \otimes \mathcal{H}_X \otimes \mathcal{H}_T) \rightarrow \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}_{E'_2} \otimes \mathcal{H}_X \otimes \mathcal{H}_{X'} \otimes \mathcal{H}_T)$, $\mathsf{T}_2 : \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}_{E_1} \otimes \mathcal{H}_Y \otimes \mathcal{H}_T) \rightarrow \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}_{E'_1} \otimes \mathcal{H}_Y \otimes \mathcal{H}_{Y'} \otimes \mathcal{H}_T)$ be (safe) CPTP maps such that for $\sigma_{X X' E'_1 T E'_2 Y Y'} = (\mathsf{T}_1 \otimes \mathsf{T}_2)(\rho_{X E Y})$, we have registers $(X X' T Y Y')$ classical and either $\Pr(X \neq X')_\sigma = 1$ or $\Pr(Y \neq Y')_\sigma = 1$. We say a function $f : \{0, 1\}^n \times \{0, 1\}^n \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^m$ is a (k_1, k_2, ε) -quantum secure 2-source non-malleable extractor against qMara iff for every σ as defined above, we have

$$\|\sigma_{f(X, Y) f(X', Y') Y Y' E'_1 T} - U_m \otimes \sigma_{f(X', Y') Y Y' E'_1 T}\|_1 \leq \varepsilon.$$

¹This holds for a Markov-chain $(X - E - Y)_\rho$.

Remark 2. For reasons similar to that of Remark 1, in Definition 2 we do not allow the registers E'_1 and E'_2 as side-information to the adversary along with $YY'T$.

We have the following corollary of Theorem 3.

Corollary 3 (2nmExt is a 2-source non-malleable extractor against qMara). *Let the function 2nmExt be from Theorem 3. 2nmExt is an $(n - k, n - k, \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon))$ -quantum secure 2-source non-malleable extractor against qMara.*

The following are the t -tampering extensions of Theorem 1 and Theorem 3.

Theorem 4 (quantum secure t -non-malleable extractor). *Let $d = \mathcal{O}(\log^7(n/\varepsilon))$, $t = d^{\Omega(1)}$ and $k = \Omega(d)$. There exists an efficient non-malleable extractor $t\text{-nmExt} : \{0, 1\}^n \times \{0, 1\}^d \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^{k/4t}$ that is $(t; k, \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon))$ -quantum secure (see Definition 21).*

Theorem 5 (quantum secure 2-source t -non-malleable extractor). *Let $k = \mathcal{O}(n^{1/4})$, $\varepsilon = 2^{-n^{\Omega(1)}}$ and $t = n^{\Omega(1)}$. There exists an efficient 2-source non-malleable extractor $t\text{-2nmExt} : \{0, 1\}^n \times \{0, 1\}^n \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^{n/4t}$ that is $(t; n - k, n - k, \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon))$ -quantum secure (see Definition 23).*

Before going to details of our results, let us sketch of some key elements present in the construction of non-malleable extractors.

Some central ingredients

Similar to classical non-malleable extractors, our theorems regarding quantum-secure non-malleable extractors are also based on the powerful technique of alternating extraction along with *advice generators* and *correlation breakers with advice* [CGL20, Coh16] that use the clever *flip flop* primitive [Coh15]. Here, we provide a short overview of these primitives. See [CGL20, Coh16, Coh15] for more details.

- **Alternating extraction:** Alternating extraction is a powerful technique used in the construction of non-malleable extractors, particularly in scenarios involving multiple sources of weak randomness. Consider sources X, Y (with sufficient min-entropy). Consider a tampering given by $X \rightarrow X'$ and $Y \rightarrow Y'$. The procedure of alternating extraction involves iteratively applying (seeded) extractors to different sources to progressively refine and enhance the uniformity and independence of the extracted randomness. The process can be represented as $\text{Ext}_1 \rightarrow \text{Ext}_2 \rightarrow \text{Ext}_3 \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow \text{Ext}_t$, where each Ext_i is applied to a part of the source and possibly the output of the previous extractor. For odd i , Ext_i is applied on source X and the output of the previous extractor, and for even i , Ext_i is applied on source Y , (hence the name, alternating extraction) and the output of the previous extractor. By alternating between the sources and carefully managing the interplay between them, this method ensures that the final output is nearly uniform and retains minimal correlation with any tampered inputs. In the quantum setting, alternating extraction becomes even more intricate, as it must account for the complexities introduced by quantum side information and the non-commutative nature of quantum states.
- **Flip flop primitive $\text{FF}(X, Y, \text{Advice bit})$:** The flip-flop primitive uses alternating extraction to break correlations between random variables, leveraging weak sources of randomness and an advice bit. The flip-flop function ensures that $\text{FF}(X, Y, 0)$ is uniform even given $\text{FF}(X', Y', 1)$ (and vice-versa).

- Correlation breakers with advice: These are generalizations of the flip-flop primitive, using advice strings instead of advice bits. A correlation breaker $\text{AdvCB}(X, Y, \alpha)$ ensures uniformity of the output even given correlated inputs with different advice strings α' , i.e., $\text{AdvCB}(X', Y', \alpha')$.
- Advice generators: As stated above, correlation breakers need some advice string to work. Advice generators produce these strings.

With these main components in place, let us move to the proof overview.

Proof overview

As noted before, a key difficulty one faces in analyzing non-malleable extractors in the quantum setting is formulating and manipulating conditional independence relations between random variables since conditioning on quantum side information is tricky. Cohen and Vidick [CV17] attempted to deal with the difficulty by using the formalism of quantum Markov-chains. However, as noted by them, after the adversary tampers with the source, a quantum Markov-chain no longer necessarily remains a quantum Markov-chain. Hence it appeared that a generalization of the quantum Markov-chain model is needed.

We use **qpa-states** instead and consider sources in \mathcal{Q} . Additionally, we relate the sources produced by **qma** model, l -**qma-states** [ABJO24] (see Definition 12) and (k_1, k_2) -**qpa-states** (see Lemmas 4 and 5). We note that a source in \mathcal{Q} remains in \mathcal{Q} after adversary tampering, thereby getting over the key difficulty faced by earlier models, including quantum Markov-chains. Since **qma** can simulate other adversary models, we are able to derive as corollaries, the existence of seeded and 2-source non-malleable extractors in the more standard models of adversaries studied previously in the literature. Similarly, our application for privacy amplification against active quantum adversary is in the standard model of adversary considered in previous works e.g. [CV17, ACLV19].

Our proof follows on the lines of [CGL20, Coh16]. The key technical lemmas that we use repeatedly in the analysis are,

- a quantum analogue of alternating extraction in a (k_1, k_2) -**qpa-state** with approximately uniform seed (Lemma 1), and
- min-entropy loss under classical interactive communication to ensure enough conditional min-entropy is left for alternating extraction (Lemma 2).

Lemma 1 makes use of the powerful Uhlmann’s theorem. Lemma 2 follows using arguments similar to that of a result of Jain and Kundu [JK22] for quantum communication. In the technique of alternating extraction, we repeatedly extract and generate several approximately uniform random variables. In our analysis, the generation of random variables is viewed as communication protocols (see Protocols 1 to 9 for seeded non-malleable extractor analysis). We consider this approach more intuitive and makes the analysis more fine-grained.

As the analysis progresses, several additional classical random variables need to be generated and considered. We generate them in a manner such that the requirement of conditional-min-entropy is met for alternating extraction. It is a priori not clear what the sequence of generation of classical random variables should be (for original inputs and tampered inputs) because of the non-commutative nature of quantum side information. Careful analysis of the classical non-malleable extractor constructions leads us to show that such a sequence of generation of random variables

exists. The communication protocols (Protocols 1 to 9) specify the exact sequence in which the additional random variables are generated in various cases.

In the analysis of 2-source non-malleable extractors, we additionally need a 2-source extractor for sources in \mathcal{Q} . [ABJO24] provide security of an inner-product 2-source extractor for an l -qma-state (see Definition 12) as long as $l < n$. To use this result we need to relate a (k_1, k_2) -qpa-state (see Definition 16) with some l -qma-state. [ABJO24] show that a pure state $\sigma_{X\hat{X}NMY\hat{Y}}$ can be generated in the l -qma-state framework if

$$H_{\min}\left(X\left|MY\hat{Y}\right.\right)_{\sigma} \geq k_1 \quad ; \quad \tilde{H}_{\min}\left(Y\left|NX\hat{X}\right.\right)_{\sigma} \geq k_2.$$

Note that one of the min-entropy bounds is in terms of the modified-conditional-min-entropy $\tilde{H}_{\min}(\cdot|\cdot)$. Next we make use of a result that connects $H_{\min}(\cdot|\cdot)$ and $\tilde{H}_{\min}(\cdot|\cdot)$, i.e for any quantum state ρ_{XE} ,

$$\tilde{H}_{\min}(X|E)_{\rho} \leq H_{\min}(X|E)_{\rho} \leq \tilde{H}_{\min}(X|E)_{\rho'} + 2 \log(1/\varepsilon)$$

for some $\rho' \approx_{\varepsilon} \rho$ (see Lemma 3).

In the proof, while relating (k_1, k_2) -qpa-state with some l -qma-state, we face an additional technical difficulty of correcting a marginal state. For this we use the *substate perturbation lemma* due to [JK22] and circumvent the issue at the cost of minor loss in parameters (see Lemma 4). Thus, we are able to show that any (k_1, k_2) -qpa-state (say σ) can be approximated by an l -qma-state (say σ') for $l \approx 2n - k_1 - k_2$. We also show that l -qma-state, σ' also has the appropriate $\tilde{H}_{\min}(\cdot|\cdot)$ bounds, i.e.

$$\tilde{H}_{\min}\left(X\left|MY\hat{Y}\right.\right)_{\sigma'} \approx k_1 \quad ; \quad \tilde{H}_{\min}\left(Y\left|NX\hat{X}\right.\right)_{\sigma'} \approx k_2.$$

Now the security of inner-product in an l -qma-state (with appropriate $\tilde{H}_{\min}(\cdot|\cdot)$ bounds) from [ABJO24] for $l < n$ implies the security of inner-product in a (k_1, k_2) -qpa-state for $k_1 + k_2 > n$ which is then used in the 2-source non-malleable extractor construction. The analysis for 2-source non-malleable extractor then proceeds on similar lines of seeded non-malleable extractor.

Analysis of the t -tampered counterparts proceeds on similar lines by appropriate adjustment of parameters to account for increased communication in communication protocols.

Comparison with [ACLV19, ABJO24]

Both [ACLV19] and [ABJO24] have considered the inner-product based non-malleable extractor proposed by Li [Li12]. [ACLV19] extends the first step of classical proof, the reduction provided by the non-uniform XOR lemma, to the quantum case. This helps in reducing the task of showing non-malleable extractor property of inner-product to showing security of inner-product in a certain communication game. They then approach the problem of showing security of inner-product in a communication game by using the “reconstruction paradigm” of [DPVR12] to guess the entire input X from the modified side information.

On the other hand, the work of [ABJO24] reduces the security of inner-product in a communication game to the security of inner-product against the quantum measurement adversary. In the process, both [ACLV19] and [ABJO24] crucially use the combinatorial properties of inner-product. For example, [ABJO24] heavily uses the pair wise independence property of inner-product.

Note that the communication protocols we use in our analysis are not related to the earlier approach of reduction to a communication game, which is more specific to inner-product.

Comparison with classical constructions

To the best of our knowledge, [Li19] provides the construction of seeded non-malleable extractor that works for seed-length $d = \mathcal{O}\left(\log n + \log^{1+o(1)}\left(\frac{1}{\varepsilon}\right)\right)$, source min-entropy $k \geq \mathcal{O}\left(\log \log n + \log\left(\frac{1}{\varepsilon}\right)\right)$ and output length $m = \Omega(k)$. In the case of 2-source non-malleable extractor, [Li19] construction works for sources with min-entropy $k_1, k_2 \geq (1 - \delta)n$, output length $m = \Omega(n)$ and error $\varepsilon = 2^{-\Omega\left(\frac{n \log \log n}{\log n}\right)}$.

In the quantum setting, [ACLV19] provided the first construction of quantum secure seeded non-malleable extractor for seed-length $d = \frac{n}{2}$, source min-entropy $k \geq \left(\frac{1}{2} + \delta\right)n$, output length $m = \Omega(n)$ and error $\varepsilon = 2^{-\Omega(n)}$. Our work exponentially improves the parameters for source min-entropy $k \geq \text{poly}\left(\log\left(\frac{n}{\varepsilon}\right)\right)$, seed-length $d = \text{poly}\left(\log\left(\frac{n}{\varepsilon}\right)\right)$ and output length $m = \Omega(k)$. In the setting of quantum secure 2-source non-malleable extractors, we provide the first construction for sources with min-entropy $k_1, k_2 \geq (1 - o(1))n$, output length $m = n/4$ and error $\varepsilon = 2^{-n^{\Omega(1)}}$. We note though we are still far from achieving close to optimal constructions in the quantum-setting, we hope our techniques find new applications in proving quantum security of other classical non-malleable extractors.

Subsequent works

- [ABJ24] (IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory 2024) have extended the connection of [CG16] between 2-source non-malleable extractors and 2-split-state non-malleable codes (for classical messages) secure against quantum adversaries. They used our quantum secure 2-source non-malleable extractors to construct the first explicit quantum secure 2-split-state non-malleable codes (for classical messages) of length $m = n^{\Omega(1)}$, error $\varepsilon = 2^{-n^{\Omega(1)}}$ and codeword length $2n$.
- Using the techniques introduced in this work, [BBJ23] (QCrypt 2023) constructed a rate $1/2$ quantum secure non-malleable randomness encoder. They use this in a black-box manner, to construct the following:
 - rate $1/11$, 3-split-state non-malleable code for quantum messages
 - rate $1/3$, 3-split-state non-malleable code for classical messages against quantum adversaries
 - rate $1/5$, 2-split-state non-malleable code for (uniform) classical messages against quantum adversaries.
- Furthermore, [BGJR23] (QCrypt 2023 and TCC 2024) have constructed
 - rate $1/11$, 2-split-state non-malleable code for (uniform) quantum messages
 - 2-split-state non-malleable code for quantum messages of length $m = n^{\Omega(1)}$, error $\varepsilon = 2^{-n^{\Omega(1)}}$ and codeword length $\mathcal{O}(n)$.
 - They showed something stronger: the explicit 2-split-state non-malleable code for quantum messages is, in fact, a 2-out-of-2 non-malleable secret sharing scheme for quantum messages with share size n , any message of length at most $n^{\Omega(1)}$, and error $\varepsilon = 2^{-n^{\Omega(1)}}$.

Organization

In Section 2 we describe quantum information theoretic and other preliminaries. Section 3 contains useful lemmas and claims. We describe the construction and security analysis of seeded non-malleable extractor in Section 4, of 2-source non-malleable extractor in Section 5 and of t -tampered versions of these in Appendix A and B respectively. The communication protocols used in all the analysis appear in the Appendix C. We provide a proof of PA against active adversaries in Appendix D.

2 Preliminaries

Let n, m, d, t represent positive integers and $l, k, k_1, k_2, \delta, \gamma, \varepsilon \geq 0$ represent reals.

Quantum information theory

All the logarithms are evaluated to the base 2. Let $\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{Z}$ be finite sets (we only consider finite sets in this paper). Let $|\mathcal{X}|$ represent the size of \mathcal{X} , that is the number of elements in \mathcal{X} . For a *random variable* $X \in \mathcal{X}$, we use X to denote both the random variable and its distribution², whenever it is clear from the context. We use $x \leftarrow X$ to denote x drawn according to X . We call random variables X, Y , *copies* of each other if $\Pr[X = Y] = 1$. For a random variable $X \in \{0, 1\}^n$ and $d \leq n$, let $\text{Prefix}(X, d)$ represent the first d bits of X . Let U_d represent the uniform distribution over $\{0, 1\}^d$. Let Y^1, Y^2, \dots, Y^t be random variables. We denote the joint random variable $Y^1 Y^2 \dots Y^t$ by $Y^{[t]}$. Similarly for any subset $\mathcal{S} \subseteq [t]$, we use $Y^{\mathcal{S}}$ to denote the joint random variable comprised of all the Y^s such that $s \in \mathcal{S}$.

Consider a finite-dimensional Hilbert space \mathcal{H} endowed with an inner-product $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ (we only consider finite-dimensional Hilbert-spaces). A quantum state (or a density matrix or a state) is a positive semi-definite operator on \mathcal{H} with trace value equal to 1. It is called *pure* iff its rank is 1. Let $|\psi\rangle$ be a unit vector on \mathcal{H} , that is $\langle \psi, \psi \rangle = 1$. With some abuse of notation, we use ψ to represent the state and also the density matrix $|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|$, associated with $|\psi\rangle$. Given a quantum state ρ on \mathcal{H} , *support of ρ* , called $\text{supp}(\rho)$ is the subspace of \mathcal{H} spanned by all eigenvectors of ρ with non-zero eigenvalues.

A *quantum register* A is associated with some Hilbert space \mathcal{H}_A . Define $|A| := \log(\dim(\mathcal{H}_A))$. Let $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}_A)$ represent the set of all linear operators on the Hilbert space \mathcal{H}_A . For operators $O, O' \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}_A)$, the notation $O \leq O'$ represents the Löwner order, that is, $O' - O$ is a positive semi-definite operator. We denote by $\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{H}_A)$, the set of all quantum states on the Hilbert space \mathcal{H}_A . State ρ with subscript A indicates $\rho_A \in \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{H}_A)$. If two registers A, B are associated with the same Hilbert space, we shall represent the relation by $A \equiv B$. For two states ρ, σ , we let $\rho \equiv \sigma$ represent that they are identical as states (potentially in different registers). Composition of two registers A and B , denoted AB , is associated with the Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}_A \otimes \mathcal{H}_B$. For two quantum states $\rho \in \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{H}_A)$ and $\sigma \in \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{H}_B)$, $\rho \otimes \sigma \in \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{H}_{AB})$ represents the tensor product (*Kronecker product*) of ρ and σ . The identity operator on \mathcal{H}_A is denoted \mathbb{I}_A . Let U_A denote maximally mixed state in \mathcal{H}_A . Let $\rho_{AB} \in \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{H}_{AB})$. Define

$$\rho_B \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \text{Tr}_A \rho_{AB} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sum_i (\langle i| \otimes \mathbb{I}_B) \rho_{AB} (|i\rangle \otimes \mathbb{I}_B),$$

²Some works use P_X to denote distribution of X , however we use this non-standard notation for brevity.

where $\{|i\rangle\}_i$ is an orthonormal basis for the Hilbert space \mathcal{H}_A . The state $\rho_B \in \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{H}_B)$ is referred to as the marginal state of ρ_{AB} on the register B . Unless otherwise stated, a missing register from subscript in a state will represent partial trace over that register. Given $\rho_A \in \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{H}_A)$, a *purification* of ρ_A is a pure state $\rho_{AB} \in \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{H}_{AB})$ such that $\text{Tr}_B \rho_{AB} = \rho_A$. Purification of a quantum state is not unique. Suppose $A \equiv B$. Given $\{|i\rangle_A\}$ and $\{|i\rangle_B\}$ as orthonormal bases over \mathcal{H}_A and \mathcal{H}_B respectively, the *canonical purification* of a quantum state ρ_A is $|\rho_A\rangle \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (\rho_A^{\frac{1}{2}} \otimes \mathbb{I}_B) (\sum_i |i\rangle_A |i\rangle_B)$.

A quantum map $\mathcal{E} : \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}_A) \rightarrow \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}_B)$ is a completely positive and trace preserving (CPTP) linear map. A *Hermitian* operator $H : \mathcal{H}_A \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_A$ is such that $H = H^\dagger$. Let $\Lambda_+(H)$ denote the set of eigenvectors with positive eigenvalues, i.e. $\Lambda_+(H) = \{v \in \mathcal{H}_A : Hv = \lambda_v v, \lambda_v > 0\}$. Let H_+ be the vector space generated by $\Lambda_+(H)$. We say that H_+ is the positive part of H . A projector $\Pi \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}_A)$ is a Hermitian operator such that $\Pi^2 = \Pi$. A *unitary* operator $V_A : \mathcal{H}_A \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_A$ is such that $V_A^\dagger V_A = V_A V_A^\dagger = \mathbb{I}_A$. The set of all unitary operators on \mathcal{H}_A is denoted by $\mathcal{U}(\mathcal{H}_A)$. An *isometry* $V : \mathcal{H}_A \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_B$ is such that $V^\dagger V = \mathbb{I}_A$ and $VV^\dagger = \mathbb{I}_B$. A *POVM* element is an operator $0 \leq M \leq \mathbb{I}$. We use the shorthand $\overline{M} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathbb{I} - M$, where \mathbb{I} is clear from the context. We use shorthand M to represent $M \otimes \mathbb{I}$, where \mathbb{I} is clear from the context.

Definition 3 (Classical register in a pure state). *Let \mathcal{X} be a set. A classical-quantum (c-q) state ρ_{XE} is of the form*

$$\rho_{XE} = \sum_{x \in \mathcal{X}} p(x) |x\rangle\langle x| \otimes \rho_E^x,$$

where ρ_E^x are states.

Let ρ_{XEA} be a pure state. We call X a classical register in ρ_{XEA} , if ρ_{XE} (or ρ_{XA}) is a c-q state. We identify random variable X with the register X , with $\Pr(X = x) = p(x)$.

Definition 4 (Copy of a classical register). *Let $\rho_{X\hat{X}E}$ be a pure state with X being a classical register in $\rho_{X\hat{X}E}$ (see Definition 3) taking values in \mathcal{X} . Similarly, let \hat{X} be a classical register in $\rho_{X\hat{X}E}$ taking values in \mathcal{X} . Let $\Pi_{\text{Eq}} = \sum_{x \in \mathcal{X}} |x\rangle\langle x| \otimes |x\rangle\langle x|$ be the equality projector acting on the registers $X\hat{X}$. We call X and \hat{X} copies of each other (in the computational basis) if $\text{Tr}(\Pi_{\text{Eq}} \rho_{X\hat{X}}) = 1$.*

Definition 5 (Conditioning). *Let*

$$\rho_{XE} = \sum_{x \in \{0,1\}^n} p(x) |x\rangle\langle x| \otimes \rho_E^x,$$

be a c-q state. For an event $\mathcal{S} \subseteq \{0,1\}^n$, define

$$\Pr(\mathcal{S})_\rho \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sum_{x \in \mathcal{S}} p(x) \quad ; \quad (\rho|X \in \mathcal{S}) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \frac{1}{\Pr(\mathcal{S})_\rho} \sum_{x \in \mathcal{S}} p(x) |x\rangle\langle x| \otimes \rho_E^x.$$

We sometimes shorthand $(\rho|X \in \mathcal{S})$ as $(\rho|\mathcal{S})$ when the register X is clear from the context.

Let ρ_{AB} be a state with $|A| = n$. We define $(\rho|A \in \mathcal{S}) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (\sigma|\mathcal{S})$, where σ_{AB} is the c-q state obtained by measuring the register A in ρ_{AB} in the computational basis. In case $\mathcal{S} = \{s\}$ is a singleton set, we shorthand $(\rho|A = s) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \text{Tr}_A(\rho|A = s)$.

Definition 6 (Extension). *Let*

$$\rho_{XE} = \sum_{x \in \{0,1\}^n} p(x) |x\rangle\langle x| \otimes \rho_E^x,$$

be a c - q state. For a function $Z : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{Z}$, define the following extension of ρ_{XE} ,

$$\rho_{ZXE} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sum_{x \in \mathcal{X}} p(x) |Z(x)\rangle\langle Z(x)| \otimes |x\rangle\langle x| \otimes \rho_E^x.$$

Definition 7 (Safe maps). *We call an isometry $V : \mathcal{H}_X \otimes \mathcal{H}_A \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_X \otimes \mathcal{H}_B$, safe on X iff there is a collection of isometries $V_x : \mathcal{H}_A \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_B$ such that the following holds. For all states $|\psi\rangle_{XA} = \sum_x \alpha_x |x\rangle_X |\psi^x\rangle_A$,*

$$V|\psi\rangle_{XA} = \sum_x \alpha_x |x\rangle_X V_x |\psi^x\rangle_A.$$

We call a CPTP map $\Phi : \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}_X \otimes \mathcal{H}_A) \rightarrow \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}_X \otimes \mathcal{H}_B)$, safe on classical register X iff there is a collection of CPTP maps $\Phi_x : \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}_A) \rightarrow \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}_B)$ such that the following holds. For all c - q states $\rho_{XA} = \sum_x \Pr(X=x)_\rho |x\rangle\langle x| \otimes \rho_A^x$,

$$\Phi(\rho_{XA}) = \sum_x \Pr(X=x)_\rho |x\rangle\langle x| \otimes \Phi_x(\rho_A^x).$$

All isometries (or in general CPTP maps) considered in this paper are safe on classical registers that they act on. CPTP maps applied by adversaries can be assumed w.l.o.g as safe on classical registers, by the adversary first making a (safe) copy of classical registers and then proceeding as before. This does not reduce the power of the adversary.

For a pure state ρ_{XEA} (with X classical) and a function $Z : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{Z}$, define $\rho_{Z\hat{Z}XEA}$ to be a pure state extension of ρ_{XEA} generated via a safe isometry $V : \mathcal{H}_X \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_X \otimes \mathcal{H}_Z \otimes \mathcal{H}_{\hat{Z}}$ (Z classical with copy \hat{Z}).

Definition 8. 1. For $p \geq 1$ and matrix A , let $\|A\|_p$ denote the Schatten p -norm.

2. For $p \geq 1$: $\|A\|_p = (\text{Tr}(A^\dagger A)^{p/2})^{\frac{1}{p}}$.

3. For states ρ, σ : $\Delta(\rho, \sigma) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \frac{1}{2} \|\rho - \sigma\|_1$.

4. **Fidelity:** For states ρ, σ : $\mathbb{F}(\rho, \sigma) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \|\sqrt{\rho}\sqrt{\sigma}\|_1$.

5. **Bures metric:** For states ρ, σ : $\Delta_B(\rho, \sigma) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sqrt{1 - \mathbb{F}(\rho, \sigma)}$. We write $\rho \approx_\varepsilon \sigma$ to denote $\Delta_B(\rho, \sigma) \leq \varepsilon$. Being a metric, it satisfies the triangle inequality.

6. Define $d(X)_\rho \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \Delta_B(\rho_X, U_X)$ and $d(X|Y)_\rho \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \Delta_B(\rho_{XY}, U_X \otimes \rho_Y)$.

7. **Max-divergence** ([Dat09], see also [JRS02]): For states ρ, σ such that $\text{supp}(\rho) \subset \text{supp}(\sigma)$,

$$D_{\max}(\rho|\sigma) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \min\{\lambda \in \mathbb{R} : \rho \leq 2^\lambda \sigma\}.$$

8. **Min-entropy and conditional-min-entropy:** For a state ρ_{XE} , the min-entropy of X is defined as,

$$\mathbb{H}_{\min}(X)_\rho \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} -\mathbb{D}_{\max}(\rho_X \|\mathbb{I}_X).$$

The conditional-min-entropy of X , conditioned on E , is defined as,

$$\mathbb{H}_{\min}(X|E)_\rho \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} -\inf_{\sigma_E \in \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{H}_E)} \mathbb{D}_{\max}(\rho_{XE} \|\mathbb{I}_X \otimes \sigma_E).$$

The modified-conditional-min-entropy of X , conditioned on E , is defined as,

$$\tilde{\mathbb{H}}_{\min}(X|E)_\rho \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} -\mathbb{D}_{\max}(\rho_{XE} \|\mathbb{I}_X \otimes \rho_E).$$

For the facts stated below without citation, we refer the reader to standard text books [NC00, Wat11].

Fact 1 (Uhlmann's Theorem [Uhl76]). Let $\rho_A, \sigma_A \in \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{H}_A)$. Let $\rho_{AB} \in \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{H}_{AB})$ be a purification of ρ_A and $\sigma_{AC} \in \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{H}_{AC})$ be a purification of σ_A . There exists an isometry V (from a subspace of \mathcal{H}_C to a subspace of \mathcal{H}_B) such that,

$$\Delta_B(|\rho\rangle\langle\rho|_{AB}, |\theta\rangle\langle\theta|_{AB}) = \Delta_B(\rho_A, \sigma_A),$$

where $|\theta\rangle_{AB} = (\mathbb{I}_A \otimes V)|\sigma\rangle_{AC}$.

Fact 2 ([JRS02]). Let $\rho_{A'B}, \sigma_{AB}$ be pure states such that $\mathbb{D}_{\max}(\rho_B \|\sigma_B) \leq k$. Let Alice and Bob share σ_{AB} . There exists an isometry $V : \mathcal{H}_A \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_{A'} \otimes \mathcal{H}_C$ such that,

1. $(V \otimes \mathbb{I}_B)\sigma_{AB}(V \otimes \mathbb{I}_B)^\dagger = \phi_{A'BC}$, where C is a single qubit register.
2. Let C be the outcome of measuring ϕ_C in the standard basis. Then $\Pr(C = 1) \geq 2^{-k}$.
3. Conditioned on outcome $C = 1$, the state shared between Alice and Bob is $\rho_{A'B}$.

Fact 3 ([CLW14]). Let $\mathcal{E} : \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}_M) \rightarrow \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}_{M'})$ be a CPTP map and let $\sigma_{XM'} = (\mathbb{I} \otimes \mathcal{E})(\rho_{XM})$. Then,

$$\mathbb{H}_{\min}(X|M')_\sigma \geq \mathbb{H}_{\min}(X|M)_\rho.$$

Above is equality if \mathcal{E} is a map corresponding to an isometry.

Fact 4 (Lemma B.3. in [DPVR12]). For a c - q state ρ_{ABC} (with C classical),

$$\mathbb{H}_{\min}(A|BC)_\rho \geq \mathbb{H}_{\min}(A|B)_\rho - |C|.$$

Fact 5. Let ρ_{XE}, σ_{XE} be two c - q states. Then,

- $\|\rho_{XE} - \sigma_{XE}\|_1 \geq \mathbb{E}_{x \leftarrow \rho_X} \|\rho_E^x - \sigma_E^x\|_1$.
- $\Delta_B(\rho_{XE}, \sigma_{XE}) \geq \mathbb{E}_{x \leftarrow \rho_X} \Delta_B(\rho_E^x, \sigma_E^x)$.

The above inequalities are equalities iff $\rho_X = \sigma_X$.

Fact 6 ([FvdG06]). Let ρ, σ be two states. Then,

$$1 - \mathbb{F}(\rho, \sigma) \leq \Delta(\rho, \sigma) \leq \sqrt{1 - \mathbb{F}^2(\rho, \sigma)} \quad ; \quad \Delta_B^2(\rho, \sigma) \leq \Delta(\rho, \sigma) \leq \sqrt{2}\Delta_B(\rho, \sigma).$$

Fact 7 (Data-processing). *Let ρ, σ be two states and \mathcal{E} be a CPTP map. Then*

- $\Delta(\mathcal{E}(\rho), \mathcal{E}(\sigma)) \leq \Delta(\rho, \sigma)$.
- $\Delta_B(\mathcal{E}(\rho), \mathcal{E}(\sigma)) \leq \Delta_B(\rho, \sigma)$.
- $D_{\max}(\mathcal{E}(\rho) \parallel \mathcal{E}(\sigma)) \leq D_{\max}(\rho \parallel \sigma)$.

Above are equalities if \mathcal{E} is a map corresponding to an isometry.

Fact 8. *Let $M, A \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H})$. If $A \geq 0$ then $M^\dagger A M \geq 0$.*

Fact 9. *Let $\rho_{AB} \in \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{H}_A \otimes \mathcal{H}_B)$ be a state and $M \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}_B)$ such that $M^\dagger M \leq \mathbb{I}_B$. Let $\hat{\rho}_{AB} = \frac{M \rho_{AB} M^\dagger}{\text{Tr} M \rho_{AB} M^\dagger}$. Then,*

$$D_{\max}(\hat{\rho}_A \parallel \rho_A) \leq \log \left(\frac{1}{\text{Tr} M \rho_{AB} M^\dagger} \right).$$

Fact 10 (Substate Perturbation Lemma (Lemma 9 in [JK22])). *Let σ_{XB} , ψ_X and ρ_B be states such that,*

$$\sigma_{XB} \leq 2^c (\psi_X \otimes \sigma_B) \quad ; \quad \Delta_B(\sigma_B, \rho_B) \leq \delta_1.$$

For any $\delta_0 > 0$, there exists state ρ'_{XB} satisfying

$$\Delta_B(\rho'_{XB}, \sigma_{XB}) \leq \delta_0 + \delta_1 \quad ; \quad \rho'_{XB} \leq 2^{c+1} \left(1 + \frac{4}{\delta_0^2} \right) \psi_X \otimes \rho_B \quad ; \quad \rho'_B = \rho_B \quad ^3.$$

Fact 11. *Let $\rho, \sigma \in \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{H}_A)$ be two states and $M \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}_A)$ such that $M^\dagger M \leq \mathbb{I}_A$. Then,*

$$|\text{Tr} M \rho M^\dagger - \text{Tr} M \sigma M^\dagger| \leq \frac{\|\rho - \sigma\|_1}{2}.$$

Fact 12 (Gentle Measurement Lemma [Wil13]). *Let $\rho \in \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{H}_A)$ be a state and $M \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}_A)$ such that $M^\dagger M \leq \mathbb{I}_A$ and $\text{Tr}(M \rho M^\dagger) \geq 1 - \varepsilon$. Let $\hat{\rho} = \frac{M \rho M^\dagger}{\text{Tr} M \rho M^\dagger}$. Then, $\Delta_B(\rho, \hat{\rho}) \leq \sqrt{\varepsilon}$.*

Fact 13 (Corollary 5.2 in [CGL20]). *For any constant $\delta \in (0, 1)$, there exist constants $\alpha, \beta < 1/14$ such that for all positive integers ν, r, t , with $r \geq \nu^\alpha$ and $t = \mathcal{O}(\nu^\beta)$ the following holds.*

There exists a polynomial time computable function $\text{Samp} : \{0, 1\}^r \rightarrow [\nu]^t$, such that for any set $\mathcal{S} \subset [\nu]$ of size $\delta \nu$,

$$\Pr(|\text{Samp}(U_r) \cap \mathcal{S}| \geq 1) \geq 1 - 2^{-\Omega(\nu^\alpha)}.$$

Definition 9. *Let $M = 2^m$. The inner-product function, $\text{IP}_M^n : \mathbb{F}_M^n \times \mathbb{F}_M^n \rightarrow \mathbb{F}_M$ is defined as follows:*

$$\text{IP}_M^n(x, y) = \sum_{i=1}^n x_i y_i,$$

where the operations are over the field \mathbb{F}_M .

³[JK22] does not explicitly mention in the statement of the substate perturbation lemma that $\rho'_B = \rho_B$. But it can be easily verified from their proof that this holds. The statement in [JK22] is more general and is stated for *purified distance*, however it holds for any fidelity based distance including the Bures metric.

Definition 10 (Markov-chain). A state ρ_{XEY} forms a Markov-chain (denoted $(X - E - Y)_\rho$) iff $I(X : Y|E)_\rho = 0$.

Fact 14 ([HJPW04]). A Markov-chain $(X - E - Y)_\rho$ can be decomposed as follows:

$$\rho_{XEY} = \sum_t \Pr(T = t) |t\rangle\langle t| \otimes (\rho_{XE_1}^t \otimes \rho_{YE_2}^t),$$

where T is classical register over a finite alphabet.

Fact 15 ([AHJ⁺21]). For a Markov-chain $(X - E - Y)_\rho$, there exists a CPTP map $\Phi : \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}_E) \rightarrow \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}_E \otimes \mathcal{H}_Y)$ such that $\rho_{XEY} = (\mathbb{I}_X \otimes \Phi)\rho_{XE}$.

Fact 16 (Corollary 5.5 in [Wat11]). Let $\rho_{AB} \in \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{H}_A \otimes \mathcal{H}_B)$ be a state and $V_B : \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}_B) \rightarrow \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}_{B'} \otimes \mathcal{H}_C)$ be an isometry such that $|C| = 1$. Let $\sigma_{AB'C} = (\mathbb{I}_A \otimes V_B)\rho_{AB}(\mathbb{I}_A \otimes V_B)^\dagger$ and $\Phi_{AB'} = (\sigma_{AB'C}|C=1)$. There exists an operator M_B such that $0 \leq M_B^\dagger M_B \leq \mathbb{I}_B$ and

$$\Phi_{AB'} = \frac{(\mathbb{I}_A \otimes M_B)\rho_{AB}(\mathbb{I}_A \otimes M_B)^\dagger}{\text{Tr}(\mathbb{I}_A \otimes M_B)\rho_{AB}(\mathbb{I}_A \otimes M_B)^\dagger} \quad ; \quad \Pr[C = 1]_\sigma = \text{Tr}(M_B \rho_B M_B^\dagger).$$

Extractors

Throughout the paper we use extractor to mean seeded extractor unless stated otherwise.

Definition 11 (quantum secure extractor). An (n, d, m) -extractor $\text{Ext} : \{0, 1\}^n \times \{0, 1\}^d \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^m$ is said to be (k, ε) -quantum secure if for every state ρ_{XES} , such that $H_{\min}(X|E)_\rho \geq k$ and $\rho_{XES} = \rho_{XE} \otimes U_d$, we have

$$\|\rho_{\text{Ext}(X,S)E} - U_m \otimes \rho_E\|_1 \leq \varepsilon.$$

In addition, the extractor is called strong if

$$\|\rho_{\text{Ext}(X,S)SE} - U_m \otimes U_d \otimes \rho_E\|_1 \leq \varepsilon.$$

S is referred to as the seed for the extractor.

Fact 17 ([DPVR12] [CV17]). There exists an explicit $(2m, \varepsilon)$ -quantum secure strong (n, d, m) -extractor $\text{Ext} : \{0, 1\}^n \times \{0, 1\}^d \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^m$ for parameters $d = \mathcal{O}(\log^2(n/\varepsilon) \log m)$.

Definition 12 (l -qma-state [ABJO24]). Let $\tau_{X\hat{X}}, \tau_{Y\hat{Y}}$ be the canonical purifications of independent and uniform sources X, Y respectively. Let τ_{NM} be a pure state. Let

$$\theta_{X\hat{X}NM\hat{Y}\hat{Y}} = \tau_{X\hat{X}} \otimes \tau_{NM} \otimes \tau_{Y\hat{Y}}.$$

Let $U : \mathcal{H}_X \otimes \mathcal{H}_N \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_X \otimes \mathcal{H}_{N'} \otimes \mathcal{H}_A$ and $V : \mathcal{H}_Y \otimes \mathcal{H}_M \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_Y \otimes \mathcal{H}_{M'} \otimes \mathcal{H}_B$ be isometries such that registers A, B are single qubit registers. Let

$$\rho_{X\hat{X}AN'M'BY\hat{Y}} = (U \otimes V)\theta_{X\hat{X}NM\hat{Y}\hat{Y}}(U \otimes V)^\dagger,$$

and

$$l = \log \left(\frac{1}{\Pr(A = 1, B = 1)_\rho} \right) \quad ; \quad \sigma_{X\hat{X}N'M'Y\hat{Y}} = (\rho_{X\hat{X}AN'M'BY\hat{Y}}|_{A=1, B=1}).$$

We call $\sigma_{X\hat{X}N'M'Y\hat{Y}}$ an l -qma-state .

Definition 13 ((k) -qpa-state). We call a pure state $\sigma_{X\hat{X}NMY\hat{Y}}$, with (XY) classical and $(\hat{X}\hat{Y})$ copy of (XY) , a (k) -qpa-state if

$$H_{\min}\left(X\left|MY\hat{Y}\right.\right)_{\sigma} \geq k \quad ; \quad \sigma_{X\hat{X}NY} = \sigma_{X\hat{X}N} \otimes U_Y.$$

Definition 14 ((k) -qnm-state). Let $\sigma_{X\hat{X}NMY\hat{Y}}$ be a (k) -qpa-state. Let $V : \mathcal{H}_Y \otimes \mathcal{H}_M \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_Y \otimes \mathcal{H}_{Y'} \otimes \mathcal{H}_{\hat{Y}'} \otimes \mathcal{H}_{M'}$ be an isometry such that for $\rho = V\sigma V^\dagger$, we have Y' classical (with copy \hat{Y}') and $\Pr(Y \neq Y')_{\rho} = 1$. We call state ρ a (k) -qnm-state.

Remark 3. In Definition 14 (and in similar such definitions) previous works consider the notion of CPTP maps with no fixed points. However we replace it with the condition $\Pr(Y \neq Y')_{\rho} = 1$, which suffices for our purposes.

We require the non-malleable extractor to extract from every (k) -qnm-state, chosen by the adversary qnma (short for quantum non-malleable adversary). We follow similar convention for 2-source non-malleable extractors and their extensions to t -tampering setting.

Definition 15 (quantum secure non-malleable extractor). An (n, d, m) -non-malleable extractor $\text{nmExt} : \{0, 1\}^n \times \{0, 1\}^d \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^m$ is (k, ε) -secure against qnma if for every (k) -qnm-state ρ (chosen by the adversary qnma),

$$\|\rho_{\text{nmExt}(X,Y)\text{nmExt}(X,Y')YY'M'} - U_m \otimes \rho_{\text{nmExt}(X,Y')YY'M'}\|_1 \leq \varepsilon.$$

Definition 16 ((k_1, k_2) -qpa-state). We call a pure state $\sigma_{X\hat{X}NMY\hat{Y}}$, with (XY) classical and $(\hat{X}\hat{Y})$ copy of (XY) , a (k_1, k_2) -qpa-state if

$$H_{\min}\left(X\left|MY\hat{Y}\right.\right)_{\sigma} \geq k_1 \quad ; \quad H_{\min}\left(Y\left|NX\hat{X}\right.\right)_{\sigma} \geq k_2.$$

Definition 17 ((k_1, k_2) -qnm-state). Let $\sigma_{X\hat{X}NMY\hat{Y}}$ be a (k_1, k_2) -qpa-state. Let $U : \mathcal{H}_X \otimes \mathcal{H}_N \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_X \otimes \mathcal{H}_{X'} \otimes \mathcal{H}_{\hat{X}'} \otimes \mathcal{H}_{N'}$ and $V : \mathcal{H}_Y \otimes \mathcal{H}_M \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_Y \otimes \mathcal{H}_{Y'} \otimes \mathcal{H}_{\hat{Y}'} \otimes \mathcal{H}_{M'}$ be isometries such that for $\rho = (U \otimes V)\sigma(U \otimes V)^\dagger$, we have $(X'Y')$ classical (with copy $\hat{X}'\hat{Y}'$) and,

$$\Pr(Y \neq Y')_{\rho} = 1 \quad \text{or} \quad \Pr(X \neq X')_{\rho} = 1.$$

We call state ρ a (k_1, k_2) -qnm-state.

Definition 18 (quantum secure 2-source non-malleable extractor). An (n, n, m) -non-malleable extractor $2\text{nmExt} : \{0, 1\}^n \times \{0, 1\}^n \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^m$ is (k_1, k_2, ε) -secure against qnma if for every (k_1, k_2) -qnm-state ρ (chosen by the adversary qnma),

$$\|\rho_{2\text{nmExt}(X,Y)2\text{nmExt}(X',Y')YY'M'} - U_m \otimes \rho_{2\text{nmExt}(X',Y')YY'M'}\|_1 \leq \varepsilon.$$

Fact 18 (IP security against states with $\tilde{H}_{\min}(\cdot)$ bounds [ABJO24]). Let $n = \frac{n_1}{m}$ and $k_1 + k_2 - n_1 \geq 2\log\left(\frac{1}{\varepsilon}\right) + m$. Let $\sigma_{X\hat{X}N'Y\hat{Y}M'}$ be a state with $|X| = |Y| = n_1$, registers XY classical (with copies $\hat{X}\hat{Y}$) and

$$\tilde{H}_{\min}\left(X\left|Y\hat{Y}M\right.\right)_{\sigma} \geq k_1 \quad ; \quad \tilde{H}_{\min}\left(Y\left|X\hat{X}N\right.\right)_{\sigma} \geq k_2.$$

Then

$$\|\sigma_{\text{IP}_{2m}^n(X,Y)XN'} - U_m \otimes \sigma_{XN'}\|_1 \leq \varepsilon \quad ; \quad \|\sigma_{\text{IP}_{2m}^n(X,Y)YM'} - U_m \otimes \sigma_{YM'}\|_1 \leq \varepsilon.$$

Error correcting codes

Definition 19. Let Σ be a finite set. A mapping $\text{ECC} : \Sigma^k \rightarrow \Sigma^n$ is called an error correcting code with relative distance γ if for any $x, y \in \Sigma^k$ such that $x \neq y$, the Hamming distance between $\text{ECC}(x)$ and $\text{ECC}(y)$ is at least γn . The rate of the code denoted by δ , is defined as $\delta \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \frac{k}{n}$. The alphabet size of the code is the number of elements in Σ .

Fact 19 ([GS95]). Let p be a prime number and m be an even integer. Set $q = p^m$. For every $\delta \in (0, 1)$ and for any large enough integer n there exists an efficiently computable linear error correcting code $\text{ECC} : \mathbb{F}_q^{\delta n} \rightarrow \mathbb{F}_q^n$ with rate δ and relative distance $1 - \gamma$ such that

$$\delta + \frac{1}{\sqrt{q} - 1} \geq \gamma.$$

3 Useful claims and lemmas

In this section, we prove technical claims and lemmas which will be used throughout the paper.

Claim 1. Let ρ_{ZA}, ρ'_{ZA} be states such that $\Delta_B(\rho, \rho') \leq \varepsilon'$. If $d(Z|A)_{\rho'} \leq \varepsilon$ then $d(Z|A)_{\rho} \leq 2\varepsilon' + \varepsilon$.

Proof. Consider,

$$\begin{aligned} d(Z|A)_{\rho} &\leq \Delta_B(\rho_{ZA}, \rho'_{ZA}) + \Delta_B(\rho'_{ZA}, U_Z \otimes \rho_A) && \text{(Triangle inequality)} \\ &\leq \varepsilon' + \Delta_B(\rho'_{ZA}, U_Z \otimes \rho_A) \\ &\leq \varepsilon' + \Delta_B(\rho'_{ZA}, U_Z \otimes \rho'_A) + \Delta_B(U_Z \otimes \rho'_A, U_Z \otimes \rho_A) && \text{(Triangle inequality)} \\ &\leq \varepsilon' + \varepsilon + \varepsilon' = 2\varepsilon' + \varepsilon. \end{aligned}$$

□

The above claim holds even when $\Delta_B()$ is replaced with $\Delta()$.

Claim 2. Let $\rho_{XE} \in \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{H}_X \otimes \mathcal{H}_E)$ be a c - q state such that $|X| = n$ and $H_{\min}(X|E)_{\rho} \geq n - k$. Let $X_d = \text{Prefix}(X, d)$ for some integer $k \leq d \leq n$. Then $H_{\min}(X_d|E)_{\rho} \geq d - k$.

Proof. Since $H_{\min}(X|E)_{\rho} \geq n - k$, there exists a state σ_E such that

$$D_{\max}(\rho_{XE} \| U_X \otimes \sigma_E) \leq k.$$

Using Fact 7, we have

$$D_{\max}(\rho_{X_d E} \| U_{X_d} \otimes \sigma_E) \leq k \implies D_{\max}(\rho_{X_d E} \| \mathbb{I}_{X_d} \otimes \sigma_E) \leq k - d.$$

Thus,

$$H_{\min}(X_d|E)_{\rho} = -\inf_{\tau_E} D_{\max}(\rho_{X_d E} \| \mathbb{I}_{X_d} \otimes \tau_E) \geq d - k,$$

which completes the proof. □

Claim 3. Let $\rho_{AB} \in \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{H}_A \otimes \mathcal{H}_B)$ be a state and $V_B : \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}_B) \rightarrow \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}_{B'} \otimes \mathcal{H}_C)$ be an isometry such that $|C| = 1$. Let $\sigma_{AB'C} = (\mathbb{I}_A \otimes V_B)\rho_{AB}(\mathbb{I}_A \otimes V_B)^\dagger$ and $\Phi_{AB'} = (\sigma_{AB'C}|C=1)$. Then,

$$\tilde{H}_{\min}(A|B')_{\Phi} \geq \tilde{H}_{\min}(A|B)_{\rho}.$$

Proof. Since $\tilde{H}_{\min}(A|B)_\rho = -D_{\max}(\rho_{AB} \|\mathbb{I}_A \otimes \rho_B)$, we have

$$\rho_{AB} \leq 2^{-\tilde{H}_{\min}(A|B)_\rho} (\mathbb{I}_A \otimes \rho_B).$$

By Fact 16, there exists an operators M_B such that $0 \leq M_B^\dagger M_B \leq \mathbb{I}_B$ and

$$\Phi_{AB'} = \frac{(\mathbb{I}_A \otimes M_B)\rho_{AB}(\mathbb{I}_A \otimes M_B)^\dagger}{\text{Tr}(\mathbb{I}_A \otimes M_B)\rho_{AB}(\mathbb{I}_A \otimes M_B)^\dagger}.$$

This further implies,

$$\Phi_{AB'} \leq 2^{-\tilde{H}_{\min}(A|B)_\rho} \left(\mathbb{I}_A \otimes \frac{M_B \rho_B M_B^\dagger}{\text{Tr}(M_B \rho_B M_B^\dagger)} \right) = 2^{-\tilde{H}_{\min}(A|B)_\rho} (\mathbb{I}_A \otimes \Phi_{B'}).$$

Thus,

$$\tilde{H}_{\min}(A|B')_\Phi = -D_{\max}(\Phi_{AB'} \|\mathbb{I}_A \otimes \Phi_{B'}) \geq \tilde{H}_{\min}(A|B)_\rho.$$

□

Claim 4. Let $\rho_{ABC} \in \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{H}_A \otimes \mathcal{H}_B \otimes \mathcal{H}_C)$ be a state and $M \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}_C)$ such that $M^\dagger M \leq \mathbb{I}_C$. Let $\hat{\rho}_{ABC} = \frac{M \rho_{ABC} M^\dagger}{\text{Tr} M \rho_{ABC} M^\dagger}$. Then,

$$H_{\min}(A|B)_{\hat{\rho}} \geq H_{\min}(A|B)_\rho - \log \left(\frac{1}{\text{Tr} M \rho_{ABC} M^\dagger} \right).$$

Proof. Let $H_{\min}(A|B)_\rho = -D_{\max}(\rho_{AB} \|\mathbb{I}_A \otimes \sigma_B)$ for some state σ_B . Thus,

$$\rho_{AB} \leq 2^{-H_{\min}(A|B)_\rho} (\mathbb{I}_A \otimes \sigma_B).$$

Since from Fact 9, we have

$$\hat{\rho}_{AB} \leq \frac{1}{\text{Tr} M \rho_{ABC} M^\dagger} \rho_{AB},$$

we finally get $D_{\max}(\hat{\rho}_{AB} \|\mathbb{I}_A \otimes \sigma_B) \leq -H_{\min}(A|B)_\rho + \log \left(\frac{1}{\text{Tr} M \rho_{ABC} M^\dagger} \right)$. Thus,

$$H_{\min}(A|B)_{\hat{\rho}} = -\inf_{\theta_B} D_{\max}(\hat{\rho}_{AB} \|\mathbb{I}_A \otimes \theta_B) \geq H_{\min}(A|B)_\rho - \log \left(\frac{1}{\text{Tr} M \rho_{ABC} M^\dagger} \right).$$

□

Claim 5 (IP security against (k_1, k_2) -qpa-state). Let $n = \frac{n_1}{m}$ and $k_1 + k_2 \geq n_1 + m + 4 + 8 \log \left(\frac{1}{\varepsilon} \right)$. Let $\sigma_{X\hat{X}N'Y\hat{Y}M'}$ be a (k_1, k_2) -qpa-state with $|X| = |Y| = n_1$. Let $Z = \text{IP}_{2^m}^{n_1}(X, Y)$. Then

$$\|\sigma_{ZXN'} - U_m \otimes \sigma_{XN'}\|_1 \leq 35\varepsilon \quad ; \quad \|\sigma_{ZYM'} - U_m \otimes \sigma_{YM'}\|_1 \leq 35\varepsilon.$$

Proof. Let state $\rho^{(1)}$ be from Lemma 4 such that

$$\rho^{(1)} \approx_{6\varepsilon} \sigma \quad ; \quad \tilde{H}_{\min}(X|Y\hat{Y}M)_{\rho^{(1)}} \geq k_1 - 2 \log \left(\frac{1}{\varepsilon} \right) \quad ; \quad \tilde{H}_{\min}(Y|X\hat{X}N)_{\rho^{(1)}} \geq k_2 - 4 - 4 \log \left(\frac{1}{\varepsilon} \right).$$

Using Fact 18, we have

$$\|\rho_{\mathbb{P}_{2^m}^n(X,Y)XN'}^{(1)} - U_m \otimes \rho_{XN'}^{(1)}\|_1 \leq \varepsilon \quad ; \quad \|\rho_{\mathbb{P}_{2^m}^n(X,Y)YM'}^{(1)} - U_m \otimes \rho_{YM'}^{(1)}\|_1 \leq \varepsilon.$$

Since $\rho^{(1)} \approx_{6\varepsilon} \sigma$, using Fact 6, we have $\Delta(\rho^{(1)}, \sigma) \leq 6\sqrt{2}\varepsilon$. Using Claim 1 (for $\Delta(\cdot)$ instead of $\Delta_B(\cdot)$), we get

$$\Delta(\sigma_{ZXN'}, U_m \otimes \sigma_{XN'}) \leq 12\sqrt{2}\varepsilon + \varepsilon/2 \quad ; \quad \Delta(\sigma_{ZYM'}, U_m \otimes \sigma_{YM'}) \leq 12\sqrt{2}\varepsilon + \varepsilon/2.$$

We finally get,

$$\|\sigma_{ZXN'} - U_m \otimes \sigma_{XN'}\|_1 \leq 2(12\sqrt{2}\varepsilon + \varepsilon/2) \leq 35\varepsilon \quad ; \quad \|\sigma_{ZYM'} - U_m \otimes \sigma_{YM'}\|_1 \leq 35\varepsilon.$$

□

Claim 6. *Let ρ_{XAYB} be a pure state. Let $d = |X|$. There exists a pure state $\hat{\rho}_{XAYB}$ such that,*

$$\Delta_B(\hat{\rho}_{XAYB}, \rho_{XAYB}) = d(X|YB)_\rho \quad ; \quad H_{\min}(Y|XA)_{\hat{\rho}} = H_{\min}(Y|XA)_\rho \quad ; \quad \hat{\rho}_{XYB} = U_d \otimes \hat{\rho}_{YB}.$$

Proof. Let $\tau_{XX'}$ be the canonical purification of $\tau_X = U_d$. Let $\theta_{X_1AYBXX'} = \beta_{X_1AYB} \otimes \tau_{XX'}$ such that $\beta_{X_1AYB} \equiv \rho_{XAYB}$. We use Fact 1, with the following assignment of registers (below the registers on the left are from Fact 1 and the registers on the right are the registers in this proof),

$$(\sigma_A, \rho_A, \sigma_{AC}, \rho_{AB}) \leftarrow (\tau_X \otimes \rho_{YB}, \rho_{XYB}, \theta_{X_1AYBXX'}, \rho_{XAYB}).$$

From Fact 1 we get an isometry V such that

$$\Delta_B(\rho_{XAYB}, \hat{\rho}_{XAYB}) = \Delta_B(\rho_{XYB}, U_d \otimes \rho_{YB}),$$

where,

$$\hat{\rho}_{XAYB} = V(\theta_{X_1AYBXX'})V^\dagger.$$

From Fact 3,

$$H_{\min}(Y|XA)_{\hat{\rho}} = H_{\min}(Y|X_1AXX')_\theta = H_{\min}(Y|X_1A)_\beta = H_{\min}(Y|XA)_\rho.$$

Noting that isometry V acts trivially on θ_{XYB} , we have $\hat{\rho}_{XYB} = \theta_{XYB} = U_d \otimes \rho_{YB}$. Thus, $\hat{\rho}_{XYB} = U_d \otimes \hat{\rho}_{YB}$ which completes the proof. □

Lemma 1 (Alternating extraction). *Let θ_{XASB} be a pure state with (XS) classical, $|X| = n, |S| = d$ and*

$$H_{\min}(X|SB)_\theta \geq k \quad ; \quad \Delta_B(\theta_{XAS}, \theta_{XA} \otimes U_d) \leq \varepsilon'.$$

Let $T \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \text{Ext}(X, S)$ where Ext is a (k, ε) -quantum secure strong (n, d, m) -extractor. Then,

$$\Delta_B(\theta_{TB}, U_m \otimes \theta_B) \leq 2\varepsilon' + \sqrt{\varepsilon}.$$

Proof. We use Fact 1, with the following assignment of registers (below the registers on the left are from Fact 1 and the registers on the right are the registers in this proof)

$$(\sigma_A, \rho_A, \sigma_{AC}, \rho_{AB}) \leftarrow (\theta_{XAS}, \theta_{XA} \otimes U_d, \theta_{XASB}, \beta_{XAS_1B} \otimes \tau_{SS'}),$$

where $\tau_{SS'}$ is the canonical purification of $\tau_S \equiv U_d$ and $\beta_{XAS_1B} \equiv \theta_{XASB}$. From Fact 1 we get an isometry V (acts trivially on θ_{XAS}) such that,

$$\Delta_B \left(V\theta_{XASB}V^\dagger, \beta_{XAS_1B} \otimes \tau_{SS'} \right) = \Delta_B (\theta_{XAS}, \theta_{XA} \otimes U_d) \leq \varepsilon' . \quad (1)$$

Let $\gamma_{TXAS_1BSS'}$ be the state after $T = \text{Ext}(X, S)$ is generated using $\beta_{XAS_1B} \otimes \tau_{SS'}$. From Definition 11, Fact 6 and noting that,

$$\mathbb{H}_{\min}(X|S_1B)_\beta = \mathbb{H}_{\min}(X|SB)_\theta \geq k \quad ; \quad \gamma_{TSS_1B} \equiv \gamma_{TS'S_1B},$$

we get,

$$\Delta_B (\gamma_{TS'S_1B}, U_m \otimes U_d \otimes \beta_{S_1B}) \leq \sqrt{\varepsilon}. \quad (2)$$

Consider,

$$\begin{aligned} & \Delta_B (\theta_{TB}, U_m \otimes \theta_B) \\ &= \Delta_B \left(V\theta_{TB}V^\dagger, U_m \otimes V\theta_BV^\dagger \right) \quad (\text{Fact 7}) \\ &\leq \Delta_B \left(V\theta_{TB}V^\dagger, U_m \otimes U_d \otimes \beta_{S_1B} \right) + \Delta_B \left(U_m \otimes U_d \otimes \beta_{S_1B}, U_m \otimes V\theta_BV^\dagger \right) \quad (\text{Triangle inequality}) \\ &\leq \Delta_B \left(V\theta_{TB}V^\dagger, U_m \otimes U_d \otimes \beta_{S_1B} \right) + \varepsilon' \quad (\text{Eq. (1) and Fact 7}) \\ &\leq \Delta_B \left(V\theta_{TB}V^\dagger, \gamma_{TS'S_1B} \right) + \Delta_B (\gamma_{TS'S_1B}, U_m \otimes U_d \otimes \beta_{S_1B}) + \varepsilon' \quad (\text{Triangle inequality}) \\ &\leq \Delta_B \left(V\theta_{XASB}V^\dagger, \beta_{XAS_1B} \otimes \tau_{SS'} \right) + \Delta_B (\gamma_{TS'S_1B}, U_m \otimes U_d \otimes \beta_{S_1B}) + \varepsilon' \quad (\text{Fact 7}) \\ &\leq 2\varepsilon' + \sqrt{\varepsilon}. \quad (\text{Eq. (1) and (2)}) \end{aligned}$$

□

Lemma 2 (Min-entropy loss under classical interactive communication). *Let ρ_{XNM} be a pure state where Alice holds registers (XN) and Bob holds register M , such that register X is classical and*

$$\mathbb{H}_{\min}(X|M)_\rho \geq k.$$

Let Alice and Bob proceed for t -rounds, where in each round Alice generates a classical register R_i and sends it to Bob, followed by Bob generating a classical register S_i and sending it to Alice. Alice applies a (safe on X) isometry $V^i : \mathcal{H}_X \otimes \mathcal{H}_{N_{i-1}} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_X \otimes \mathcal{H}_{N'_{i-1}} \otimes \mathcal{H}_{R_i}$ (in round i) to generate ⁴ R_i . Let $\theta^i_{XN_iM_i}$ be the state at the end of round- i , where Alice holds registers XN_i and Bob holds register M_i . Then,

$$\mathbb{H}_{\min}(X|M_t)_{\theta^t} \geq k - \sum_{j=1}^t |R_j|.$$

⁴The isometries in the communication protocols in later sections act as $V^i : \mathcal{H}_X \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_X \otimes \mathcal{H}_{R_i} \otimes \mathcal{H}_{\hat{R}_i}$.

Proof. Proof proceeds by induction on i . For $i = 0$, the bound follows from initiation (we take $\theta^0 = \rho$). Let us assume the bound for round i

$$\mathbb{H}_{\min}(X|M_i)_{\theta^i} \geq k - \sum_{j=1}^i |R_j|,$$

and show the bound for round $i + 1$. Let $\tau_{XN'_i R_{i+1} M_i}$ be the state after Alice generates R_{i+1} . From Fact 4, we have

$$\mathbb{H}_{\min}(X|M_i R_{i+1})_{\tau} \geq \mathbb{H}_{\min}(X|M_i)_{\tau} - |R_{i+1}|.$$

Note that since Alice's operations are safe on X , $\tau_{XM_i} = \theta_{XM_i}^i$. Hence,

$$\mathbb{H}_{\min}(X|M_i)_{\tau} = \mathbb{H}_{\min}(X|M_i)_{\theta^i}.$$

From Fact 3, we have

$$\mathbb{H}_{\min}(X|M_{i+1})_{\theta^{i+1}} \geq \mathbb{H}_{\min}(X|M_i R_{i+1})_{\tau} \geq k - \sum_{j=1}^{i+1} |R_j|,$$

which shows the desired. \square

We now state a lemma which relates $\tilde{\mathbb{H}}_{\min}(\cdot)$ and $\mathbb{H}_{\min}(\cdot)$ for a state ρ and a nearby state ρ' . The below lemma is also proven in [TRSS10] (we thank the anonymous reviewer for pointing it out), however we include the proof here for completeness.

Lemma 3. *Let $\rho \in \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{H}_{AB})$. There exists $\rho' \in \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{H}_{AB})$ such that*

$$\Delta_B(\rho, \rho') \leq \varepsilon \quad ; \quad \tilde{\mathbb{H}}_{\min}(A|B)_{\rho} \leq \mathbb{H}_{\min}(A|B)_{\rho} \leq \tilde{\mathbb{H}}_{\min}(A|B)_{\rho'} + 2 \log \left(\frac{1}{\varepsilon} \right).$$

Proof. The inequality $\tilde{\mathbb{H}}_{\min}(A|B)_{\rho} \leq \mathbb{H}_{\min}(A|B)_{\rho}$ is clear from definitions.

Let $\mathbb{H}_{\min}(A|B)_{\rho} = u$ and $|A| = n$. Let $\sigma_B \in \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{H}_B)$ be a state such that $D_{\max}(\rho_{AB} \| U_A \otimes \sigma_B) = n - u$. Set $t = 2 \log \left(\frac{1}{\varepsilon} \right)$. Let Π denote the projector on $(\sigma_B - 2^t \rho_B)_+$. Hence, $\text{Tr}(\Pi(\sigma_B - 2^t \rho_B)) > 0$. This gives us,

$$2^t \text{Tr}(\Pi \rho_B) < \text{Tr}(\Pi \sigma_B) \leq 1,$$

and thus,

$$\text{Tr}(\Pi \rho_B) < 2^{-t} = \varepsilon^2 \quad ; \quad \text{Tr}(\bar{\Pi} \rho_B) > 1 - \varepsilon^2.$$

Also, since $\text{Tr}((\mathbb{I}_A \otimes \bar{\Pi}) \rho_{AB}) = \text{Tr}(\bar{\Pi} \rho_B)$, we have,

$$\text{Tr}((\mathbb{I}_A \otimes \bar{\Pi}) \rho_{AB}) > 1 - \varepsilon^2. \tag{3}$$

Note by construction, $\bar{\Pi}(\sigma_B - 2^t \rho_B)\bar{\Pi} \leq 0$, and hence,

$$\bar{\Pi} \sigma_B \bar{\Pi} \leq 2^t \bar{\Pi} \rho_B \bar{\Pi}. \tag{4}$$

Consider

$$\rho'_{AB} = \frac{(\mathbb{I}_A \otimes \bar{\Pi}) \rho_{AB} (\mathbb{I}_A \otimes \bar{\Pi})}{\text{Tr}((\mathbb{I}_A \otimes \bar{\Pi}) \rho_{AB})} \quad ; \quad \rho'_B = \frac{\bar{\Pi} \rho_B \bar{\Pi}}{\text{Tr}(\bar{\Pi} \rho_B)}.$$

Using Fact 12, Fact 7 and Eq. (3), we have

$$\Delta_B(\rho'_B, \rho_B) \leq \Delta_B(\rho'_{AB}, \rho_{AB}) \leq \varepsilon.$$

Since, $D_{\max}(\rho_{AB} \| U_A \otimes \sigma_B) = n - u$, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \overline{\Pi} \rho_{AB} \overline{\Pi} &\leq 2^{n-u} \cdot U_A \otimes \overline{\Pi} \sigma_B \overline{\Pi} && \text{(Fact 8)} \\ &\leq 2^{n-u+t} \cdot U_A \otimes \overline{\Pi} \rho_B \overline{\Pi} && \text{(Eq. (4))} \end{aligned}$$

Normalizing by the trace, we get, $\rho'_{AB} \leq 2^{n-u+t} (U_A \otimes \rho'_B) = 2^{t-u} (\mathbb{I}_A \otimes \rho'_B)$, which gives us

$$\tilde{H}_{\min}(A|B)_{\rho'} \geq H_{\min}(A|B)_{\rho} - 2 \log \left(\frac{1}{\varepsilon} \right). \quad \square$$

Lemma 4. *Let $\rho_{X\hat{X}NY\hat{Y}M}$ be a (k_1, k_2) -qpa-state such that $|X| = |\hat{X}| = |Y| = |\hat{Y}| = n$. There exists an l -qma-state $\rho_{X\hat{X}NY\hat{Y}M}^{(1)}$, such that,*

$$\Delta_B(\rho^{(1)}, \rho) \leq 6\varepsilon \quad \text{and} \quad l \leq 2n - k_1 - k_2 + 4 + 6 \log \left(\frac{1}{\varepsilon} \right).$$

Furthermore,

$$\tilde{H}_{\min}(X|Y\hat{Y}M)_{\rho^{(1)}} \geq k_1 - 2 \log \left(\frac{1}{\varepsilon} \right) \quad ; \quad \tilde{H}_{\min}(Y|X\hat{X}N)_{\rho^{(1)}} \geq k_2 - 4 - 4 \log \left(\frac{1}{\varepsilon} \right).$$

Proof. For the ease of notation, let us denote $\tilde{A} = X\hat{X}N$ and $\tilde{B} = Y\hat{Y}M$. Since, $H_{\min}(X|\tilde{B})_{\rho} \geq k_1$, using Lemma 3 (on state $\rho_{\tilde{B}X}$) with the assignment of registers $(A, B) \leftarrow (X, \tilde{B})$, we know that there exists a state $\rho'_{\tilde{B}X}$, such that

$$\Delta_B(\rho_{\tilde{B}X}, \rho'_{\tilde{B}X}) \leq \varepsilon \quad ; \quad D_{\max}(\rho'_{\tilde{B}X} \| U_X \otimes \rho'_{\tilde{B}}) \leq |X| - k_1 + 2 \log \left(\frac{1}{\varepsilon} \right) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} c_1. \quad (5)$$

Consider a purification of $\rho'_{\tilde{B}X}$ denoted as $\rho'_{\tilde{B}XE}$. Using Fact 1 with the following assignment of registers,

$$(\sigma_A, \rho_A, \sigma_{AC}, \rho_{AB}, \theta_{AB}) \leftarrow (\rho'_{\tilde{B}X}, \rho_{\tilde{B}X}, \rho'_{\tilde{B}XE}, \rho_{\tilde{A}\tilde{B}}, \rho'_{\tilde{A}\tilde{B}}),$$

there exists a pure state $\rho'_{\tilde{A}\tilde{B}}$ such that,

$$\Delta_B(\rho'_{\tilde{A}\tilde{B}}, \rho_{\tilde{A}\tilde{B}}) \leq \varepsilon \quad ; \quad D_{\max}(\rho'_{\tilde{A}\tilde{B}} \| U_X \otimes \rho'_{\tilde{B}}) \leq c_1, \quad (6)$$

where the inequalities follow from Eq. (5) and noting that isometry taking $\rho'_{\tilde{B}XE}$ to $\rho'_{\tilde{A}\tilde{B}}$ acts trivially on registers $\tilde{B}X$. Similarly, there exists a pure state $\rho''_{\tilde{A}\tilde{B}}$ such that,

$$\Delta_B(\rho''_{\tilde{A}\tilde{B}}, \rho_{\tilde{A}\tilde{B}}) \leq \varepsilon \quad ; \quad D_{\max}(\rho''_{\tilde{A}\tilde{B}} \| U_Y \otimes \rho''_{\tilde{A}}) \leq |Y| - k_2 + 2 \log \left(\frac{1}{\varepsilon} \right) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} c_2. \quad (7)$$

Consider the following state:

$$\theta = \tau_{X\hat{X}} \otimes \rho'_{\tilde{A}\tilde{B}} \otimes \tau_{Y_1\hat{Y}_1}$$

where $\tau_{X\hat{X}}, \tau_{Y_1\hat{Y}_1}$ are canonical purifications of $\tau_X \equiv U_X$, $\tau_{Y_1} \equiv U_Y$ respectively. Let Alice hold registers $\tilde{A}\hat{X}$, Bob hold registers $\tilde{B}\hat{Y}_1$ and Referee hold registers XY_1 . Now using Fact 2 with the following assignment of registers (below the registers on the left are from Fact 2 and the registers on the right are the registers in this proof)

$$(\rho_B, \sigma_B, \rho_{A'B}, \sigma_{AB}) \leftarrow (\rho'_{X\tilde{B}}, \tau_X \otimes \rho'_{\tilde{B}}, \rho'_{X\hat{X}N\tilde{B}}, \tau_{X\hat{X}} \otimes \rho'_{\tilde{A}\tilde{B}}),$$

it follows from Fact 2 that there exists an isometry $V_{\text{Alice}} : \mathcal{H}_{\tilde{A}\hat{X}} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_{\hat{X}N} \otimes \mathcal{H}_{C_A}$ such that the following hold:

$$\phi_{\tilde{B}X\hat{X}NC_A} = (V_{\text{Alice}} \otimes \mathbb{I}_{X\tilde{B}}) (\rho'_{\tilde{A}\tilde{B}} \otimes \tau_{X\hat{X}}) (V_{\text{Alice}} \otimes \mathbb{I}_{X\tilde{B}})^\dagger. \quad (8)$$

$$\Pr(C_A = 1)_\phi = p_1 \geq 2^{-c_1} \quad (9)$$

$$(\phi|_{C_A = 1}) = \rho'_{\tilde{A}\tilde{B}}. \quad (10)$$

Thus starting from state θ , there exists an isometry V_{Alice} (acting solely on Alice's registers) followed by measuring C_A , to get a state which we will denote as $\theta^{(1)}$. Hence, we get the following:

$$\phi_{\tilde{B}X\hat{X}NC_AY_1\hat{Y}_1}^{(1)} = (V_{\text{Alice}} \otimes \mathbb{I}_{X\tilde{B}Y_1\hat{Y}_1}) \theta (V_{\text{Alice}} \otimes \mathbb{I}_{X\tilde{B}Y_1\hat{Y}_1})^\dagger \quad (11)$$

$$\Pr(C_A = 1)_{\phi^{(1)}} = p_1 \geq 2^{-c_1} \quad (12)$$

$$\theta^{(1)} = (\phi^{(1)}|_{C_A = 1}) = \rho'_{\tilde{A}\tilde{B}} \otimes \tau_{Y_1\hat{Y}_1}. \quad (13)$$

Note that Eq. (11)-(13) additionally contain $\tau_{Y_1\hat{Y}_1}$ when compared to Eq. (8)-(10). But as the isometry acts trivially on $\tau_{Y_1\hat{Y}_1}$, they follow trivially from Eq. (8)-(10).

Using Eq. (6) and Eq. (7) along with triangle inequality, we have

$$\Delta_B(\rho''_{\tilde{A}\tilde{B}}, \rho'_{\tilde{A}\tilde{B}}) \leq 2\varepsilon. \quad (14)$$

Using Fact 7, we further have $\Delta_B(\rho''_{\tilde{A}}, \rho'_{\tilde{A}}) \leq 2\varepsilon$. Now, using Fact 10 with the following assignment,

$$(\sigma_{XB}, \psi_X, \rho_B, \rho'_{XB}, c, \delta_0, \delta_1) \leftarrow (\rho''_{Y\tilde{A}}, U_Y, \rho'_{\tilde{A}}, \rho_{Y\tilde{A}}^{(0)}, c_2, \varepsilon, 2\varepsilon)$$

there exists a state $\rho_{\tilde{A}Y}^{(0)}$ such that,

$$\Delta_B(\rho_{\tilde{A}Y}^{(0)}, \rho''_{\tilde{A}Y}) \leq 3\varepsilon \quad ; \quad \rho_{\tilde{A}Y}^{(0)} \leq 2^{c_2+1} \left(1 + \frac{4}{\varepsilon^2}\right) \cdot (U_Y \otimes \rho'_{\tilde{A}}) \leq 2^{c'} \cdot (U_Y \otimes \rho'_{\tilde{A}}) \quad ; \quad \rho_{\tilde{A}}^{(0)} = \rho'_{\tilde{A}},$$

where $c' \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} c_2 + 4 + 2 \log(\frac{1}{\varepsilon})$. Using Eq. (6), Eq. (7) and above, we get,

$$\Delta_B(\rho_{\tilde{A}Y}^{(0)}, \rho'_{\tilde{A}Y}) \leq 5\varepsilon \quad ; \quad \rho_{\tilde{A}Y}^{(0)} \leq 2^{c'} \cdot (U_Y \otimes \rho'_{\tilde{A}}) \quad ; \quad \rho_{\tilde{A}}^{(0)} = \rho'_{\tilde{A}}. \quad (15)$$

Consider a purification of $\rho_{\tilde{A}Y}^{(0)}$ denoted as $\rho_{\tilde{A}YE}^{(0)}$. Using Fact 1 with the following assignment of registers,

$$(\sigma_A, \rho_A, \sigma_{AC}, \rho_{AB}, \theta_{AB}) \leftarrow (\rho_{\tilde{A}Y}^{(0)}, \rho'_{\tilde{A}Y}, \rho_{\tilde{A}YE}^{(0)}, \rho'_{\tilde{A}\tilde{B}}, \rho_{\tilde{A}\tilde{B}}^{(1)}),$$

there exists a state $\rho_{\tilde{A}\tilde{B}}^{(1)}$ such that,

$$\Delta_B \left(\rho_{\tilde{A}\tilde{B}}^{(1)}, \rho'_{\tilde{A}\tilde{B}} \right) \leq 5\varepsilon \quad ; \quad D_{\max} \left(\rho_{\tilde{A}Y}^{(1)} \parallel U_Y \otimes \rho'_{\tilde{A}} \right) \leq c' \quad ; \quad \rho_{\tilde{A}}^{(1)} = \rho'_{\tilde{A}}, \quad (16)$$

where the inequalities follow from Eq. (15) and noting that isometry taking $\rho^{(0)}$ to $\rho^{(1)}$ acts trivially on registers $\tilde{A}Y$. Consider Fact 2 with the following assignment of registers,

$$(\rho_B, \sigma_B, \rho_{A'B}, \sigma_{AB}) \leftarrow \left(\rho_{\tilde{A}Y}^{(1)}, \rho'_{\tilde{A}} \otimes U_Y, \rho_{\tilde{A}\tilde{B}}^{(1)}, \rho'_{\tilde{A}\tilde{B}} \otimes \tau_{Y_1\hat{Y}_1} \right).$$

From Fact 2, there exists an isometry $V_{\text{Bob}} : \mathcal{H}_{\tilde{B}Y_1} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_{MY_1} \otimes \mathcal{H}_{C_B}$ such that the following hold:

$$\phi_{\tilde{A}M\hat{Y}_1Y_1C_B}^{(2)} = \left(V_{\text{Bob}} \otimes \mathbb{I}_{\tilde{A}\hat{Y}_1} \right) \theta^{(1)} \left(V_{\text{Bob}} \otimes \mathbb{I}_{\tilde{A}\hat{Y}_1} \right)^\dagger \quad (17)$$

$$\Pr(C_B = 1)_{\phi^{(2)}} = p_2 \geq 2^{-c'} \quad (18)$$

$$\rho_{\tilde{A}\tilde{B}}^{(1)} \equiv \left(\phi^{(2)} |_{C_B = 1} \right) \quad (19)$$

For the ease of notation, let us set $\zeta = (V_{\text{Alice}} \otimes V_{\text{Bob}}) \theta (V_{\text{Alice}} \otimes V_{\text{Bob}})^\dagger$. From Eq. (11)-(13) and Eq. (17)-(19), it follows that,

$$\rho_{\tilde{A}\tilde{B}}^{(1)} \equiv (\zeta |_{C_A = 1, C_B = 1}) \quad (\text{From Eq. (11),(13),(17) and (19)})$$

$$\Pr(C_A = 1, C_B = 1)_\zeta \geq 2^{-c_1} 2^{-c'} \quad (\text{From Eq. (9) and (18)}).$$

To summarize, the following properties hold in $\rho_{\tilde{A}\tilde{B}}^{(1)}$, which completes the proof.

- From construction, it follows that $\rho_{\tilde{A}\tilde{B}}^{(1)}$ is an l -qma-state with

$$l \leq c_1 + c' = 2n - k_1 - k_2 + 4 + 6 \log(1/\epsilon).$$

- $\rho_{\tilde{A}\tilde{B}}^{(1)} \approx_{6\epsilon} \rho_{\tilde{A}\tilde{B}}$ follows from Eq. (7), Eq. (16) and the triangle inequality.

- $\tilde{H}_{\min}(Y | \tilde{A})_{\rho^{(1)}} \geq k_2 - 4 - 4 \log(1/\epsilon)$ follows from Eq. (16).

- $\tilde{H}_{\min}(X | \tilde{B})_{\rho^{(1)}} \geq \tilde{H}_{\min}(X | \tilde{B}Y_1\hat{Y}_1)_{\theta^{(1)}} = \tilde{H}_{\min}(X | \tilde{B})_{\rho'}$ $\geq k_1 - 2 \log(1/\epsilon)$. Here, the first inequality follows from Claim 3 and the last inequality follows from Eq. (5).

□

Lemma 5. *Let $\sigma_{X\hat{X}N'M'Y\hat{Y}}$ be an l -qma-state such that $|X| = |\hat{X}| = |Y| = |\hat{Y}| = n$. There exists k_1, k_2 such that $k_1 \geq n - l$, $k_2 \geq n - l$ and σ is a (k_1, k_2) -qpa-state.*

Proof. Let $\theta_{X\hat{X}NMY\hat{Y}} = \tau_{X\hat{X}} \otimes \tau_{NM} \otimes \tau_{Y\hat{Y}}$ be the initial state as in Definition 12 (corresponding to an l -qma-state σ). Let $U : \mathcal{H}_X \otimes \mathcal{H}_N \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_X \otimes \mathcal{H}_{N'} \otimes \mathcal{H}_A$ and $V : \mathcal{H}_Y \otimes \mathcal{H}_M \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_Y \otimes \mathcal{H}_{M'} \otimes \mathcal{H}_B$ be isometries as in Definition 12. Let $\rho^{(1)} = U\theta U^\dagger$. Noting isometry U is safe on classical register X , we have

$$H_{\min}(X | MY\hat{Y})_{\rho^{(1)}} = H_{\min}(X | MY\hat{Y})_{\theta} = n.$$

Let $p_1 = \Pr(A = 1)_{\rho^{(1)}}$ and $\theta^{(1)} = (\rho^{(1)}|A = 1)$. Using Claim 4 with the following assignment (terms on the left are from Claim 4 and on the right are from here),

$$(A, B, C, \rho, \hat{\rho}) \leftarrow (X, MY\hat{Y}, A, \rho^{(1)}, \theta^{(1)})$$

we get,

$$\mathbb{H}_{\min}(X|MY\hat{Y})_{\theta^{(1)}} \geq \mathbb{H}_{\min}(X|MY\hat{Y})_{\rho^{(1)}} - \log\left(\frac{1}{p_1}\right) = n + \log(p_1). \quad (20)$$

Furthermore, let $\rho^{(2)} = V\theta^{(1)}V^\dagger$. Again using Fact 3 and noting V is an isometry, we have

$$\mathbb{H}_{\min}(X|M'Y\hat{Y})_{\rho^{(2)}} \geq \mathbb{H}_{\min}(X|M'Y\hat{Y}B)_{\rho^{(2)}} = \mathbb{H}_{\min}(X|MY\hat{Y})_{\theta^{(1)}}. \quad (21)$$

Let $p_2 = \Pr(B = 1)_{\rho^{(2)}}$. Note $\sigma = (\rho^{(2)}|B = 1)$ and $l = \log\left(\frac{1}{p_1 \cdot p_2}\right)$. Now we use Claim 4 with the following assignment (terms on the left are from Claim 4 and on the right are from here),

$$(A, B, C, \rho, \hat{\rho}) \leftarrow (X, M'Y\hat{Y}, B, \rho^{(2)}, \sigma)$$

we get $\mathbb{H}_{\min}(X|Y\hat{Y}M')_{\sigma} \geq \mathbb{H}_{\min}(X|Y\hat{Y}M')_{\rho^{(2)}} + \log(p_2)$. Using Eq. (20) and (21), we get

$$\mathbb{H}_{\min}(X|Y\hat{Y}M')_{\sigma} \geq n + \log(p_1 \cdot p_2) = n - l.$$

Using similar argument, we get

$$\mathbb{H}_{\min}(Y|X\hat{X}N')_{\sigma} \geq n - l.$$

Thus, σ is a (k_1, k_2) -qpa-state such that both $k_1, k_2 \geq (n - l)$. \square

4 A quantum secure non-malleable extractor

In this section, we define and prove the quantum security of the non-malleable extractor. Our non-malleable extractor is based on the constructions by Chattopadhyay, Goyal and Li [CGL20]. As stated before, these constructions use the alternating extraction, consisting of a sequence of random variables generated using strong seeded extractors. In [CGL20], seeded extractor from [GUV09] was used in alternating extraction. However, this extractor is not known to be quantum proof. In our construction, we use the quantum-proof Trevison extractor, and argue that the process of alternating extraction remains quantum-proof. After this change, we set our parameters in a very similar manner to that of [CGL20]. This gives us the following parameters, which hold throughout this section.

Parameters

Let $\delta > 0$ be a small enough constant and q be a prime power. Let $n, d, d_1, a, v, d_2, s, b, h$ be positive integers and $k, \varepsilon', \gamma, \varepsilon > 0$ such that:

$$d = \mathcal{O}\left(\log^7\left(\frac{n}{\varepsilon}\right)\right) \quad ; \quad v = \frac{d}{\varepsilon} \quad ; \quad d_1 = \mathcal{O}\left(\log^2\left(\frac{n}{\varepsilon}\right)\log(\log(v))\right) \quad ; \quad q = \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{\varepsilon^2}\right) \quad ;$$

$$a = d_1 + \log q \quad ; \quad \gamma = \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon) \quad ; \quad 2^{\mathcal{O}(a)} \sqrt{\varepsilon'} = \varepsilon \quad ; \quad d_2 = \mathcal{O}\left(\log^2\left(\frac{n}{\varepsilon'}\right) \log d\right) \quad ;$$

$$s = \mathcal{O}\left(\log^2\left(\frac{d}{\varepsilon'}\right) \log d\right) \quad ; \quad b = \mathcal{O}\left(\log^2\left(\frac{d}{\varepsilon'}\right) \log d\right) \quad ; \quad h = 10s \quad ; \quad k \geq 5d.$$

Let

- Ext₀ be $(2 \log v, \varepsilon^2)$ -quantum secure $(n, d_1, \log v)$ -extractor,
- Ext₁ be $(2b, \varepsilon')$ -quantum secure (d, s, b) -extractor,
- Ext₂ be $(2s, \varepsilon')$ -quantum secure (h, b, s) -extractor,
- Ext₃ be $(2h, \varepsilon')$ -quantum secure (d, b, h) -extractor,
- Ext₄ be $(d/4, \varepsilon^2)$ -quantum secure $(d, h, d/8)$ -extractor,
- Ext₅ be $(2d, \varepsilon')$ -quantum secure (n, d_2, d) -extractor,
- Ext₆ be $(\frac{k}{2}, \varepsilon^2)$ -quantum secure $(n, d/8, k/4)$ -extractor,

be the quantum secure extractors from Fact 17.

Let \mathbb{F}_q be the finite field of size q . Let $\text{ECC} : \mathbb{F}_q^d \rightarrow \mathbb{F}_q^v$ be an error correcting code with relative distance $1 - \gamma$ and rate ε (which exists from Fact 19 for our choice of parameters). We identify I as an element from $\{1, \dots, v\}$. By $\text{ECC}(Y)_I$, we mean the I -th entry of the code-word $\text{ECC}(Y)$, interpreted as a bit string of length $\log q$.

Description of the non-malleable extractor

At a high-level, our non-malleable extractor construction given by Algorithm 1 can be broken into three steps:

- Advice generation (Step 1 in Algorithm 1)
- Correlation breakers with advice (Step 3 in Algorithm 1)
- Improving the output length (Step 4 in Algorithm 1).

Correlation breakers (Algorithm 2) themselves use the flip-flop primitive, given by Algorithm 3. Now we expand on each of the above three steps and outline their motivation.

Correlation breakers with advice. A correlation breaker uses independent randomness to “remove correlation” that may exist between a sequence of random variables. Let YY' be correlated random variables such that $Y \neq Y'$ with Y having sufficient min-entropy. Let TT' be correlated random variables such that T is uniform and independent of YY' . Let α, α' be any two fixed strings of length a such that $\alpha \neq \alpha'$. Correlation breakers with advice is a function $\text{AdvCB} : \{0, 1\}^d \times \{0, 1\}^d \times \{0, 1\}^a \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^{\frac{d}{8}}$ such that $\text{AdvCB}(Y, T, \alpha)\text{AdvCB}(Y', T', \alpha') \approx U_{d/8} \otimes \text{AdvCB}(Y', T', \alpha')$. Note that since random variables YY' and TT' are arbitrarily correlated, it is not immediately clear why $\text{AdvCB}(Y, T, \alpha)\text{AdvCB}(Y', T', \alpha')$ should be independent.

Advice generation. As mentioned above, correlation breakers need two advice strings α, α' of length a such that $\alpha \neq \alpha'$. The job of the Advice generation step is to supply AdvCB with this

advice. Let X be a source and YY' be arbitrarily correlated random variables such that $Y \neq Y'$ with Y being uniform. The goal is to come up with a function f such that $G = f(X, Y) \neq f(X, Y') = G'$ (with high probability). This can be done as follows:

- Let ECC be an error correcting code of constant rate and sufficiently high relative distance (close to 1). Since $Y \neq Y'$, the encodings $\text{ECC}(Y)$ and $\text{ECC}(Y')$ differ at most coordinates.
- Now, take Y_1 (a prefix of Y) and generate $I = \text{Ext}(X, Y_1)$. Since X is independent of YY' , it follows that I is independent of YY' . Thus $\text{ECC}(Y)_I$ and $\text{ECC}(Y')_I$ are not equal with high probability.
- Define $G = Y_1 \circ \text{ECC}(Y)_I$ and $G' = Y'_1 \circ \text{ECC}(Y')_{I'}$. If $Y_1 \neq Y'_1$, then $G \neq G'$ trivially. Otherwise, $Y_1 = Y'_1$, and thus, $I = I'$ and $\text{ECC}(Y)_I \neq \text{ECC}(Y')_I$ with high probability.

Thus, we have achieved the task of obtaining $G \neq G'$.

Improving the output length. Advice generator along with correlation breakers already give a non-malleable property, but with logarithmic output length. Fortunately, one can show that most of the min-entropy is still intact in the source X . Thus, one can improve the output length of non-malleable extractor using one additional application of a seeded extractor, which is achieved in Step 4.

Algorithm 1 : $\text{nmExt} : \{0, 1\}^n \times \{0, 1\}^d \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^{k/4}$

Input: X, Y

1. Advice generator: $Y_1 = \text{Prefix}(Y, d_1)$; $I = \text{Ext}_0(X, Y_1)$; $G = Y_1 \circ \text{ECC}(Y)_I$
2. $Y_2 = \text{Prefix}(Y, d_2)$; $T = \text{Ext}_5(X, Y_2)$
3. Correlation breaker with advice: $S = \text{AdvCB}(Y, T, G)$
4. $L = \text{Ext}_6(X, S)$

Output: L

Algorithm 2 : $\text{AdvCB} : \{0, 1\}^d \times \{0, 1\}^d \times \{0, 1\}^a \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^{\frac{d}{8}}$

Input: Y, T, G

1. $Z_0 = \text{Prefix}(T, h)$
2. For $i = 1, 2, \dots, a$:
 Flip flop: $Z_i = \text{FF}(Y, T, Z_{i-1}, G_i)$
3. $S = \text{Ext}_4(Y, Z_a)$

Output: S

Result

To show the security of nmExt , we first explain the correspondence between Algorithm 1 and Protocol 1. Note that nmExt as defined in Algorithm 1 is a generation of sequence of random

Algorithm 3 : $\text{FF} : \{0, 1\}^d \times \{0, 1\}^d \times \{0, 1\}^h \times \{0, 1\} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^h$

Input: Y, T, Z, G

1. $Z_s = \text{Prefix}(Z, s)$, $A = \text{Ext}_1(Y, Z_s)$, $C = \text{Ext}_2(Z, A)$, $B = \text{Ext}_1(Y, C)$
2. If $G = 0$ then $\bar{Z} = \text{Ext}_3(T, A)$ and if $G = 1$ then $\bar{Z} = \text{Ext}_3(T, B)$
3. $\bar{Z}_s = \text{Prefix}(\bar{Z}, s)$, $\bar{A} = \text{Ext}_1(Y, \bar{Z}_s)$, $\bar{C} = \text{Ext}_2(\bar{Z}, \bar{A})$, $\bar{B} = \text{Ext}_1(Y, \bar{C})$
4. If $G = 0$, then $O = \text{Ext}_3(T, \bar{B})$ and if $G = 1$, then $O = \text{Ext}_3(T, \bar{A})$

Output: O

variables until we finally output $L = \text{nmExt}(X, Y)$. Our goal is to show that when $\text{nmExt}()$ executed on classical registers (X, Y) and (X, Y') in (k) -qnm-state $\rho_{X\hat{X}NY\hat{Y}'M}$, we have that

$$\|\rho_{LL'YY'M} - U_{k/4} \otimes \rho_{L'YY'M}\|_1 \leq \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon).$$

As stated before, the main conceptual hurdle in extending the analysis from [CGL20] to the quantum case, lies in finding the proper framework in which we can express the correlations that arise from quantum side information. This is necessary since the procedure of alternating extraction is based on repeated application of seeded extractors, which need some sufficient entropy in the source. In particular, an extraction at Alice's end using some source X would require that X has enough min-entropy given Bob's registers, and hence all the correlations including those that are quantum, need to be accounted for. We consider the (k_1, k_2) -qpa-state framework to express these quantum correlations. At each step in the analysis, we divide the entire state into two parts, one held by Alice and other held by Bob. This allows us to argue that a relevant register has certain min-entropy given the other party. We keep track of these registers, their min-entropy and closeness of states in Protocol 1. Note that Protocol 1 also contains variables such as Y' which are obtained after tampering by the adversary. Execution of nmExt on such tampered variables results in "primed" variables. As the purpose of Protocol 1 is to keep track of various quantities such as min-entropy and distance at various stages, the exact sequence in which we generate these "primed" and "unprimed" variables is highly critical. Protocol 1 gives this exact sequence (along with the analysis as one of the columns). Thus, these protocols given in the appendix serve as an aid to the security proof of nmExt , whose construction is given in Algorithm 1.

Note that Protocol 1 uses Protocol 2 as a subprotocol. Informally, Protocol 2 generates O and O' such that they are independent and are on different parts of the state. Protocol 2 is a *for loop*, which in each iteration, enters one of the six protocols given by Protocol 4-9; depending on bit values G and G' . The idea here is to output O (extractor output after many rounds of alternating extraction) on Alice's end while Bob already holds O' , so that O and all of Bob's registers (including O') are independent. This is exactly what is achieved by Protocol 4 and Protocol 5. Recall that the advice generation step produces $G \neq G'$ which ensures that at least one of Protocol 4 or Protocol 5 is run at some point in the loop, giving us the required independence. Protocol 6 and Protocol 8 depict the case until the point where bits of G and G' agree. At this stage no independence can be gained, which can be seen as these subprotocols output O and O' on the same side (Alice's). The rest of the Protocols (Protocol 7 and Protocol 9) ensure that once we gain the independence, it is retained throughout the n iterations of the *for loop*.

At this point, let us clarify some notation regarding Protocol 1. In Protocol 1, Alice and Bob generate new classical registers using safe isometries on old classical registers. At any stage of

Protocol 1, we use N to represent all the registers held by Alice other than the specified registers at that point. Similarly M represents all the registers held by Bob other than the specified registers. At any stage of the protocol, we use \tilde{A}, \tilde{B} to represent all the registers held by Alice and Bob respectively. We use the same convention for communication protocols in later sections as well.

The following theorem shows that the function nmExt as defined in Algorithm 1 is $(k, \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon))$ -secure against qnm by noting that $L = \text{nmExt}(X, Y)$ and $L' = \text{nmExt}(X, Y')$.

Theorem 6 (Security of nmExt). *Let $\rho_{X\tilde{X}NY'Y'\tilde{Y}'M}$ be a (k) - qnm -state with $|X| = n$ and $|Y| = d$. Let Protocol 1 start with ρ . Let Λ be the state at the end of the protocol. Then,*

$$\|\rho_{LL'YY'M} - U_{k/4} \otimes \rho_{L'YY'M}\|_1 \leq d(L|\tilde{B})_\Lambda \leq \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon).$$

Proof. The first inequality follows from Fact 7.

Since nmExt is comprised of a sequence of applications of seeded extractors, we need to argue that sufficient min-entropy is retained throughout Protocol 1 in the sources on which seeded extractors are applied. To do that, we first argue the total communication in Protocol 1 is bounded. For instance, the total communication from Alice to Bob in Protocol 1 is at most (from our choice of parameters)

$$2 \log \left(\frac{d}{\varepsilon} \right) + 6ah + h + \frac{k}{4} \leq (1/4 + \delta)k.$$

This implies, using Lemma 2, that throughout Protocol 1, $H_{\min}(X|\tilde{B}) \geq (3/4 - \delta)k > k/2$.

Similarly, total communication from Bob to Alice in Protocol 1 is at most

$$2d_1 + 2d_2 + 2a + 6ab + \frac{d}{4} \leq (1/4 + \delta)d.$$

Again using Lemma 2, throughout Protocol 1, $H_{\min}(Y|\tilde{A}) \geq (3/4 - \delta)d$.

Next we need to argue about the state just before invoking correlation breaker with advice (Step 3 in Algorithm 1). Let Φ be the joint state in Protocol 1 after registers Z_0, Z'_0 are generated by Alice. As stated before, we require that $G \neq G'$ with high probability in the state Φ . Furthermore we also need that register T is independent of Bob side registers for the correlation breaker with advice AdvCB to function. Formally, we prove the following two statements in Claim 7.

1. $\Pr(G = G')_\Phi = \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon)$.
2. $d(T|\tilde{B})_\Phi \leq \varepsilon$.

Let $\hat{\Phi}$ be the state obtained from Claim 6 (by letting ρ in Claim 6 as Φ here) such that,

$$H_{\min}(Y|\tilde{A})_{\hat{\Phi}} \geq (3/4 - \delta)d \quad ; \quad \hat{\Phi}_{T\tilde{B}} = U_d \otimes \hat{\Phi}_{\tilde{B}} \quad ; \quad \Delta_B(\hat{\Phi}, \Phi) \leq \varepsilon. \quad (22)$$

Let

$$\hat{\Phi}^{(\alpha, \alpha')} = \hat{\Phi}|_{((G, G') = (\alpha, \alpha'))}.$$

Let $\mathcal{S}_1 \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{(\alpha, \alpha') : \alpha = \alpha'\}$, $\mathcal{S}_2 \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{(\alpha, \alpha') : \Pr((G, G') = (\alpha, \alpha'))_{\hat{\Phi}} \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{2^{2|G|}}\}$ and $\mathcal{S} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathcal{S}_1 \cup \mathcal{S}_2$. Note $\Pr((\alpha, \alpha') \in \mathcal{S}_1)_{\hat{\Phi}} \leq \Pr((\alpha, \alpha') \in \mathcal{S}_1)_\Phi + \varepsilon = \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon)$ and $\Pr((\alpha, \alpha') \in \mathcal{S}_2)_{\hat{\Phi}} \leq \varepsilon$. From the union bound, $\Pr((\alpha, \alpha') \in \mathcal{S})_{\hat{\Phi}} \leq \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon)$.

For every $(\alpha, \alpha') \notin \mathcal{S}_2$, we have (using Fact 9 and noting that, in $\hat{\Phi}$, a copy of (G, G') is part of \tilde{B}),

$$\hat{\Phi}_{Y\tilde{A}}^{(\alpha, \alpha')} \leq \frac{\hat{\Phi}_{Y\tilde{A}}}{\Pr((G, G') = (\alpha, \alpha'))_{\hat{\Phi}}} \leq 2^{2|G| + \log(\frac{1}{\varepsilon})} \cdot \hat{\Phi}_{Y\tilde{A}}. \quad (23)$$

Eq. (22) and (23) imply that for every $(\alpha, \alpha') \notin \mathcal{S}_2$, we have

$$H_{\min}\left(Y|\tilde{A}\right)_{\hat{\Phi}(\alpha, \alpha')} \geq (3/4 - \delta)d - 2a - \log\left(\frac{1}{\varepsilon}\right) \geq (3/4 - 2\delta)d > d/4.$$

Let $\hat{\Gamma}^{(\alpha, \alpha')}$, $\hat{\Gamma}$, Γ be the joint states at the end of the Protocol 2 (for $i = a$) when starting with the states $\hat{\Phi}^{(\alpha, \alpha')}$, $\hat{\Phi}$, Φ respectively. From Claim 8, we have for every $(\alpha, \alpha') \notin \mathcal{S}$,

$$d(Z|\tilde{B})_{\hat{\Gamma}(\alpha, \alpha')} \leq \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon). \quad (24)$$

Consider (register Z is held by Alice and $\tilde{B} = GG'M$ in the state $\hat{\Gamma}$),

$$\begin{aligned} d(Z|\tilde{B})_{\hat{\Gamma}} &= \Delta_B(\hat{\Gamma}_{ZGG'M}, U_h \otimes \hat{\Gamma}_{GG'M}) = \mathbb{E}_{(\alpha, \alpha') \leftarrow (G, G')} \Delta_B(\hat{\Gamma}_{Z\tilde{B}}^{(\alpha, \alpha')}, U_h \otimes \hat{\Gamma}_{\tilde{B}}^{(\alpha, \alpha')}) \\ &\leq \Pr((\alpha, \alpha') \notin \mathcal{S})_{\hat{\Gamma}} \cdot \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon) + \Pr((\alpha, \alpha') \in \mathcal{S})_{\hat{\Gamma}} \\ &\leq \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon), \end{aligned}$$

where the first equality follows from Fact 5, the first inequality follows from Eq. (24) and the last inequality follows since $\Pr((\alpha, \alpha') \in \mathcal{S})_{\hat{\Gamma}} = \Pr((\alpha, \alpha') \in \mathcal{S})_{\hat{\Phi}} \leq \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon)$. Since (using Fact 7 and Eq. (22)) $\Delta_B(\hat{\Gamma}, \Gamma) \leq \Delta_B(\hat{\Phi}, \Phi) \leq \varepsilon$, we have,

$$d(Z|\tilde{B})_{\Gamma} = d(Z|\tilde{B})_{\hat{\Gamma}} + \varepsilon = \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon).$$

Using arguments as before (involving Lemma 1), we have $d(L|\tilde{B})_{\Lambda} \leq \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon)$. \square

Claim 7 (Advice generator). $\Pr(G = G')_{\Phi} = \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon)$ and $d(T|\tilde{B})_{\Phi} \leq \varepsilon$.

Proof. We first prove $\Pr(G = G')_{\Phi} = \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon)$. Let $\sigma_{XNIMYY'}$ be the state after Alice has generated register I (before sending to Bob). Let $\beta_{IYY'} = U_{\log v} \otimes \Phi_{YY'}$. We have,

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta(\Phi_{IYY'}, \beta_{IYY'}) &= \Delta(\sigma_{IYY'}, U_{\log v} \otimes \sigma_{YY'}) \\ &\leq \Delta(\sigma_{I\tilde{B}}, U_{\log v} \otimes \sigma_{\tilde{B}}) && \text{(Fact 7)} \\ &\leq \sqrt{2}\Delta_B(\sigma_{I\tilde{B}}, U_{\log v} \otimes \sigma_{\tilde{B}}) && \text{(Fact 6)} \\ &\leq \sqrt{2}\varepsilon. && \text{(Lemma 1)} \end{aligned} \quad (25)$$

Consider,

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr(G = G')_{\Phi} &\leq \Pr(G = G')_{\beta} + \sqrt{2}\varepsilon \\ &= \Pr(Y_1 = Y'_1)_{\beta} \Pr(G = G' | Y_1 = Y'_1)_{\beta} + \Pr(Y_1 \neq Y'_1)_{\beta} \Pr(G = G' | Y_1 \neq Y'_1)_{\beta} + \sqrt{2}\varepsilon \\ &= \Pr(Y_1 = Y'_1)_{\beta} \Pr(G = G' | Y_1 = Y'_1)_{\beta} + \sqrt{2}\varepsilon \\ &\leq \gamma + \sqrt{2}\varepsilon = \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon). \end{aligned}$$

Note that conditioned on $Y_1 = Y'_1$, we have $I = I'$. The first inequality above follows from Eq. (25) and noting that the predicate ($G = G'$) is determined from (I, Y, Y') . The second equality follows from definition of G . Second inequality follows since ECC has relative distance $1 - \gamma$.

We now prove $d(T|\tilde{B})_\Phi \leq \varepsilon$. Consider Protocol 3. Let $(E_A, E'_A) \longleftrightarrow (E_B, E'_B)$ represent $2d_1$ distinct EPR pairs each shared between Alice and Bob where $|E_A| = |E'_A| = |E_B| = |E'_B| = d_1$.

Let τ'' be the joint state just before Alice receives Y_2 and τ' be the joint state just after Alice generates T . Note, $\tau''_{AY_2} = \tau''_A \otimes U_{d_2}$. Hence from Lemma 1,

$$\Delta_B(\tau'_{T\tilde{B}}, U_d \otimes \tau'_{\tilde{B}}) \leq \sqrt{\varepsilon'}. \quad (26)$$

Let τ be the joint state just before Bob checks $(E_B, E'_B) = (Y_1, Y'_1)$. Let C be the predicate $((E_B, E'_B) = (Y_1, Y'_1))$. Note

$$\Pr(C = 1)_\tau = \Pr((E_B, E'_B) = (Y_1, Y'_1))_\tau \geq 2^{-2d_1}. \quad (27)$$

Let Φ' be the state Φ with two additional copies of $Y_1 Y'_1$. Note that the state at the end of Protocol 3, conditioned on Bob not aborting is Φ' . Consider,

$$\begin{aligned} & 2^{-2d_1} \Delta_B(\Phi_{T\tilde{B}}, U_d \otimes \Phi_{\tilde{B}}) \\ & \leq 2^{-2d_1} \Delta_B(\Phi'_{T\tilde{B}}, U_d \otimes \Phi'_{\tilde{B}}) && \text{(Fact 7)} \\ & \leq \Pr(C = 1)_\tau \Delta_B(\Phi'_{T\tilde{B}}, U_d \otimes \Phi'_{\tilde{B}}) && \text{(Eq. (27))} \\ & \leq \Delta_B(\tau_{T\tilde{B}}, U_d \otimes \tau_{\tilde{B}}) && \text{(Fact 5)} \\ & \leq \Delta_B(\tau'_{T\tilde{B}}, U_d \otimes \tau'_{\tilde{B}}) && \text{(Fact 7)} \\ & \leq \sqrt{\varepsilon'} && \text{(Eq. (26))} \end{aligned}$$

which shows the desired. \square

Claim 8 (Correlation breaker with advice). *Let Alice and Bob proceed as in Protocol 2 with the starting state as $\hat{\Phi}^{(\alpha, \alpha')}$, where $(\alpha, \alpha') \notin \mathcal{S}$. Let $\hat{\Gamma}^{(\alpha, \alpha')}$ be the joint state at the end of the Protocol 2 (at $i = a$). Then,*

$$d(Z|\tilde{B})_{\hat{\Gamma}^{(\alpha, \alpha')}} = \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon).$$

Proof. We have

$$\hat{\Phi}_{Z_0 \tilde{B}}^{(\alpha, \alpha')} = U_h \otimes \hat{\Phi}_{\tilde{B}}^{(\alpha, \alpha')} \quad ; \quad H_{\min}(Y|\tilde{A})_{\hat{\Phi}^{(\alpha, \alpha')}} \geq (3/4 - 2\delta)d \quad ; \quad H_{\min}(T|\tilde{B})_{\hat{\Phi}^{(\alpha, \alpha')}} = d.$$

The total communication from Alice to Bob in Protocol 2 is at most $6ah \leq \delta d$. From Lemma 2, throughout Protocol 2, we have $H_{\min}(T|\tilde{B}) \geq (1 - \delta)d > 2h$. From repeated applications of Claim 9 we have,

$$d(Z|\tilde{B})_{\hat{\Gamma}^{(\alpha, \alpha')}} \leq 2^{\mathcal{O}(a)} \sqrt{\varepsilon'} = \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon). \quad \square$$

Claim 9 (Flip flop). *Let \mathcal{P} be any of the Protocols 4, 5, 6, 7, 8 or 9 and $i \in [a]$. Let α be the initial joint state in \mathcal{P} such that $d(Z|\tilde{B})_\alpha \leq \eta$. Let θ be the final joint state at the end of \mathcal{P} . Then, $d(O|\tilde{B})_\theta \leq \mathcal{O}(\eta + \sqrt{\varepsilon'})$.*

Proof. We prove the claim when \mathcal{P} is Protocol 4 and $i = 1$ and the proof for other cases follows analogously. From Fact 7,

$$d(Z_s|\tilde{B})_\alpha \leq d(Z|\tilde{B})_\alpha \leq \eta.$$

Let γ be the joint state just after Bob generates register A . From Lemma 1, we have

$$d(A|\tilde{A})_\gamma \leq 2\eta + \sqrt{\varepsilon'}.$$

Let ζ be the joint state after Alice sends register Z' to Bob and Bob generates registers $(A'C'B')$. From Fact 7, we have

$$d(A|\tilde{A})_\zeta \leq d(A|\tilde{A})_\gamma \leq 2\eta + \sqrt{\varepsilon'}.$$

Let β be the joint state just after Alice generates register \bar{Z} . From Lemma 1,

$$d(\bar{Z}|\tilde{B})_\beta \leq 4\eta + 3\sqrt{\varepsilon'}.$$

Let $\hat{\beta}$ be the state obtained from Claim 6 (by letting ρ in Claim 6 as β here) such that

$$\mathsf{H}_{\min}(Y|\tilde{A})_{\hat{\beta}} = \mathsf{H}_{\min}(Y|\tilde{A})_\beta \geq d/4 \quad ; \quad \hat{\beta}_{\bar{Z}\tilde{B}} = U_h \otimes \hat{\beta}_{\tilde{B}} \quad ; \quad \Delta_B(\hat{\beta}, \beta) \leq 4\eta + 3\sqrt{\varepsilon'}. \quad (28)$$

Let $\theta', \hat{\theta}'$ be the joint states just after Alice generates register \bar{C} , proceeding from the states $\beta, \hat{\beta}$ respectively. Since communication between Alice and Bob after Alice generates register \bar{Z} and before generating \bar{C} is $2s + 2b$, from arguments as before involving Lemma 1 and Lemma 2,

$$d(\bar{C}|\tilde{B})_{\hat{\theta}'} \leq \mathcal{O}(\eta + \sqrt{\varepsilon'}).$$

From Eq. (28),

$$d(\bar{C}|\tilde{B})_{\theta'} \leq d(\bar{C}|\tilde{B})_{\hat{\theta}'} + \Delta_B(\hat{\beta}, \beta) = \mathcal{O}(\eta + \sqrt{\varepsilon'}).$$

Proceeding till the last round and using similar arguments involving Lemma 1, Lemma 2 and Claim 6, we get the desired. \square

We have the following corollary of Theorem 6.

Corollary 4. *Let ρ_{XEY} be a c - q state with registers (XY) classical such that*

$$\mathsf{H}_{\min}(X|E)_\rho \geq k \quad ; \quad \rho_{XEY} = \rho_{XE} \otimes U_d \quad ; \quad |X| = n.$$

Let $\mathsf{T} : \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}_E \otimes \mathcal{H}_Y) \rightarrow \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}_{E'} \otimes \mathcal{H}_Y \otimes \mathcal{H}_{Y'})$ be a (safe) CPTP map such that for $\sigma_{XE'YY'} = \mathsf{T}(\rho_{XEY})$, we have registers $XY Y'$ classical and $\Pr(Y \neq Y')_\sigma = 1$. Let the function nmExt be as defined in Algorithm 1, $L = \text{nmExt}(X, Y)$ and $L' = \text{nmExt}(X, Y')$. Then,

$$\|\sigma_{LL'YY'E'} - U_{k/4} \otimes \sigma_{L'YY'E'}\|_1 \leq \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon).$$

Proof. Let $\rho_{X\hat{X}E\hat{E}Y\hat{Y}}$ be a pure state extension of ρ_{XEY} such that,

$$\rho_{X\hat{X}E\hat{E}Y\hat{Y}} = \rho_{X\hat{X}\hat{E}E} \otimes \rho_{Y\hat{Y}} \quad ; \quad \mathsf{H}_{\min}(X|EY\hat{Y})_\rho = \mathsf{H}_{\min}(X|E)_\rho \geq k \quad ; \quad \rho_Y = U_d,$$

where registers (XY) classical (with copies $\hat{X}\hat{Y}$) and $\rho_{X\hat{X}\hat{E}E}$ is the canonical purification of ρ_{XE} .

For the state ρ with the following assignment (terms on the left are from Definition 16 and on the right are from here),

$$(X, \hat{X}, N, M, Y, \hat{Y}) \leftarrow (X, \hat{X}, \hat{E}, E, Y, \hat{Y}),$$

$H_{\min}\left(X \middle| EY\hat{Y}\right)_{\rho} = H_{\min}(X|E)_{\rho} \geq k$ and $\rho_{\hat{E}X\hat{X}Y} = \rho_{\hat{E}X\hat{X}} \otimes U_d$, we have ρ is a (k) -qpa-state. Let $V : \mathcal{H}_E \otimes \mathcal{H}_Y \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_{E'} \otimes \mathcal{H}_Z \otimes \mathcal{H}_Y \otimes \mathcal{H}_{Y'} \otimes \mathcal{H}_{\hat{Y}'}$ be the Stinespring isometry extension⁵ of CPTP map \mathbb{T} with additional copy \hat{Y}' of Y' , i.e. $\mathbb{T}(\theta) = \text{Tr}_{Z\hat{Y}'}(V\theta V^\dagger)$ for every c-q state θ_{YE} . Let $\sigma = V\rho V^\dagger$. Note $\sigma_{XE'YY'} = \text{Tr}_{Z\hat{Y}'}(V\rho_{XEY}V^\dagger) = \mathbb{T}(\rho_{XEY})$ and σ is a (k) -qnm-state. Using Theorem 6, we have

$$\|\sigma_{LL'YY'E'Z} - U_{k/4} \otimes \sigma_{L'YY'E'Z}\|_1 \leq \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon).$$

Using Fact 7, we further have

$$\|\sigma_{LL'YY'E'} - U_{k/4} \otimes \sigma_{L'YY'E'}\|_1 \leq \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon),$$

which completes the proof. \square

5 A quantum secure 2-source non-malleable extractor

In this section, we define and prove the quantum security of 2-source non-malleable extractor. As specified before, the parameters in our construction are set similarly in line with the construction of [CGL20] considering the use of quantum secure seeded extractors in the alternating extraction. The following parameters hold throughout this section.

Parameters

Let q be a prime power and $\delta, \delta_1 > 0$ be small enough constants. Let n, a, v, s, b, h be positive integers and $k, \varepsilon', \gamma, \varepsilon > 0$ such that:

$$v = \frac{n}{\varepsilon} \quad ; \quad q = \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{\varepsilon^2}\right) \quad ; \quad \varepsilon = 2^{-\mathcal{O}(n^{\delta_1})} \quad ;$$

$$a = 6k + 2 \log q = \mathcal{O}(k) \quad ; \quad \gamma = \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon) \quad ; \quad 2^{\mathcal{O}(a)} \sqrt{\varepsilon'} = \varepsilon \quad ;$$

$$s = \mathcal{O}\left(\log^2\left(\frac{n}{\varepsilon'}\right) \log n\right) \quad ; \quad b = \mathcal{O}\left(\log^2\left(\frac{n}{\varepsilon'}\right) \log n\right) \quad ; \quad h = 10s \quad ; \quad k = \mathcal{O}(n^{1/4})$$

- IP_1 be $\text{IP}_v^{3k/\log v}$,
- Ext_1 be $(2b, \varepsilon')$ -quantum secure (n, s, b) -extractor,
- Ext_2 be $(2s, \varepsilon')$ -quantum secure (h, b, s) -extractor,
- Ext_3 be $(2h, \varepsilon')$ -quantum secure (n, b, h) -extractor,

⁵Note the Stinespring isometry extension is safe on register Y .

- Ext_4 be $(n/4, \varepsilon^2)$ -quantum secure $(n, h, n/8)$ -extractor,
- IP_2 be $\text{IP}_{2^h}^{3k^3/h}$,
- Ext_6 be $(\frac{n}{2}, \varepsilon^2)$ -quantum secure $(n, n/8, n/4)$ -extractor.

Let $\text{ECC} : \mathbb{F}_q^d \rightarrow \mathbb{F}_q^v$ be an error correcting code with relative distance $1 - \gamma$ and rate ε (which exists from Fact 19 for our choice of parameters). We identify R as an element from $\{1, \dots, v\}$. By $\text{ECC}(Y)_R$, we mean the R -th entry of the code-word $\text{ECC}(Y)$, interpreted as a bit string of length $\log q$.

Description of 2-source non-malleable extractor

Similar to nmExt , the algorithm for 2-source non-malleable extractor can also be viewed in three steps:

- Advice generation (Step 1 in Algorithm 4)
- Correlation breakers with advice (Step 3 in Algorithm 4), that are built using the flip-flop primitive (Algorithm 6).
- Improving the output length (Step 4 in Algorithm 4).

The key difference in the constructions of 2-source non-malleable extractor and seeded non-malleable extractor is in the Advice generation step which we elaborate below. The main reason why advice generation needs to be modified is that none of the sources are uniform and Advice generation step from Step 1 in Algorithm 1 crucially uses the fact that the second source (seed) is uniform. One gets around this by using a quantum-secure 2-source extractor (for example, inner product extractor) in place of the Trevisan's extractor. The argument then follows in similar lines and we state it here briefly for completeness. Let XX' and YY' be arbitrarily correlated random variables such that $Y \neq Y'$ and $X \neq X'$. Also assume that X and Y both have sufficient min-entropy. Recall that the goal is to come up with a function such that, with high probability, $G = f(X, Y) \neq f(X', Y') = G'$.

- Let ECC be a error correcting code of constant rate and relative distance close to 1. Since $Y \neq Y'$, it is clear that $\text{ECC}(Y)$ and $\text{ECC}(Y')$ differ at most coordinates. Similarly, $\text{ECC}(X)$ and $\text{ECC}(X')$ differ at most coordinates.
- Take Y_1 (a prefix of Y) and X_1 (a prefix of X) to generate $I = \text{IP}(X_1, Y_1)$. Since XX' is independent of YY' , it follows from 2-source strong extractor properties of IP that I is independent of YY' (and analogously, independent of XX'). Thus $\text{ECC}(Y)_I$ and $\text{ECC}(Y')_I$ are not equal with high probability. Similarly, $\text{ECC}(X)_I$ and $\text{ECC}(X')_I$ are not equal with high probability.
- Define $G = X_1 \circ \text{ECC}(X)_I \circ Y_1 \circ \text{ECC}(Y)_I$ and $G' = X'_1 \circ \text{ECC}(X')_I \circ Y'_1 \circ \text{ECC}(Y')_I$. If $X_1 Y_1 \neq X'_1 Y'_1$, then $G \neq G'$ trivially. Otherwise, $X_1 Y_1 = X'_1 Y'_1$, then $I = I'$ and $\text{ECC}(Y)_I \neq \text{ECC}(Y')_I$, with high probability.

Algorithm 4 : $2nmExt : \{0, 1\}^n \times \{0, 1\}^n \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^{n/4}$

Input: X, Y

1. Advice generator:

$$X_1 = \text{Prefix}(X, 3k) \quad ; \quad Y_1 = \text{Prefix}(Y, 3k) \quad ; \quad R = \text{IP}_1(X_1, Y_1) \quad ;$$

$$G = X_1 \circ Y_1 \circ \text{ECC}(X)_R \circ \text{ECC}(Y)_R$$

2. $X_2 = \text{Prefix}(X, 3k^3) \quad ; \quad Y_2 = \text{Prefix}(Y, 3k^3) \quad ; \quad Z_0 = \text{IP}_2(X_2, Y_2)$

3. Correlation breaker with advice: $S = 2\text{AdvCB}(Y, X, Z_0, G)$

4. $L = \text{Ext}_6(X, S)$

Output: L

Algorithm 5 : $2\text{AdvCB} : \{0, 1\}^n \times \{0, 1\}^n \times \{0, 1\}^h \times \{0, 1\}^a \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^{\frac{n}{8}}$

Input: Y, X, Z_0, G

1. For $i = 1, 2, \dots, a$:

$$\text{Flip flop: } Z_i = 2\text{FF}(Y, X, Z_{i-1}, G_i)$$

2. $S = \text{Ext}_4(Y, Z_a)$

Output: S

Algorithm 6 : $2\text{FF} : \{0, 1\}^n \times \{0, 1\}^n \times \{0, 1\}^h \times \{0, 1\} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^h$

Input: Y, X, Z, G

1. $Z_s = \text{Prefix}(Z, s), A = \text{Ext}_1(Y, Z_s), C = \text{Ext}_2(Z, A), B = \text{Ext}_1(Y, C)$

2. If $G = 0$ then $\bar{Z} = \text{Ext}_3(X, A)$ and if $G = 1$ then $\bar{Z} = \text{Ext}_3(X, B)$

3. $\bar{Z}_s = \text{Prefix}(\bar{Z}, s), \bar{A} = \text{Ext}_1(Y, \bar{Z}_s), \bar{C} = \text{Ext}_2(\bar{Z}, \bar{A}), \bar{B} = \text{Ext}_1(Y, \bar{C})$

4. If $G = 0$, then $O = \text{Ext}_3(X, \bar{B})$ and if $G = 1$, then $O = \text{Ext}_3(X, \bar{A})$

Output: O

Result

The following theorem shows that the function 2nmExt as defined in Algorithm 4 is $(n - k, n - k, \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon))$ -secure against qnm by noting that $L = \text{nmExt}(X, Y)$ and $L' = \text{nmExt}(X', Y')$.

Theorem 7 (Security of 2nmExt). *Let $\rho_{X\hat{X}X'\hat{X}'NY'Y'\hat{Y}'\hat{Y}'M}$ be a $(n - k, n - k)$ -qnm-state with $|X| = |Y| = n$. Let Protocol 10 start with ρ . Let Λ be the state at the end of the protocol. Then,*

$$\|\rho_{LL'YY'M} - U_{n/4} \otimes \rho_{L'YY'M}\|_1 \leq d(L|\tilde{B})_\Lambda \leq \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon).$$

Proof. The first inequality follows from Fact 7. Most of our arguments here are similar to the case of seeded extractor; so we note the modifications that we need to take care of in case of 2nmExt .

First note that using Lemma 2, throughout Protocol 10, X and Y have enough conditional min-entropy left for necessary extractions since the total communication from Alice to Bob is at most (from our choice of parameters)

$$6k + 2 \log q + 6ah + h + \frac{n}{4} \leq (1/4 + \delta)n$$

and the total communication from Bob to Alice is at most

$$6k + 6k^3 + 2a + 6ab + \frac{n}{4} \leq (1/4 + \delta)n.$$

Thus, at any state ρ in Protocol 10, $H_{\min}(X|\tilde{B})_\rho \geq n - k - (1/4 + \delta)n \geq (3/4 - 2\delta)n \geq n/2$.

Similarly, $H_{\min}(Y|\tilde{A})_\rho \geq (3/4 - 2\delta)n \geq n/2$.

We start with a state $\rho_{XX'NY'Y'M}$ such that $H_{\min}(X|\tilde{B})_\rho \geq n - k$ and $H_{\min}(Y|\tilde{A})_\rho \geq n - k$. From Claim 2, we have,

$$H_{\min}(X_1|\tilde{B})_\rho \geq 3k - k = 2k \quad ; \quad H_{\min}(Y_1|\tilde{A})_\rho \geq 3k - k = 2k.$$

Now from Claim 5 with the below assignment of registers (and noting registers (XX', YY') are included in (\tilde{A}, \tilde{B}) respectively),

$$(Z, X, Y, \sigma) \leftarrow (R, X_1, Y_1, \rho) \quad ; \quad (k_1, k_2, m, n_1, \varepsilon) \leftarrow (2k, 2k, \log(n/\varepsilon), 3k, \varepsilon^2)$$

we have,

$$\Delta(\rho_{RY'Y'}, U_R \otimes \rho_{YY'}) \leq \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon^2) \quad ; \quad \Delta(\rho_{RX'X'}, U_R \otimes \rho_{XX'}) \leq \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon^2).$$

Using Fact 6, we get

$$\Delta_B(\rho_{RY'Y'}, U_R \otimes \rho_{YY'}) \leq \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon) \quad ; \quad \Delta_B(\rho_{RX'X'}, U_R \otimes \rho_{XX'}) \leq \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon).$$

Let κ be the state just before Bob sends Y_2 . Note that till then, communication from Alice to Bob and Bob to Alice is at most $7k$ each. Hence, by Lemma 2, $H_{\min}(X|\tilde{A})_\kappa \geq n - 8k$ and $H_{\min}(Y|\tilde{B})_\kappa \geq n - 8k$; which implies (from Claim 2), $H_{\min}(X_2|\tilde{A})_\kappa \geq 3k^3 - 8k \geq 2k^3$ and $H_{\min}(Y_2|\tilde{B})_\kappa \geq 2k^3$ respectively using Fact 2. Let η be the state just after Alice generates Z_0 . Using similar argument as before involving Claim 5, we have $d(Z_0|\tilde{B})_\eta \leq \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon)$.

Note that the state obtained in Protocol 10, just before Protocol 2 starts as a subroutine, is similar to the state obtained in Protocol 1 (just before Protocol 2 starts as a subroutine) with the below assignment of registers,

$$(Z_0, T, Y) \leftarrow (Z_0, X, Y).$$

Here the variables on the left are from Protocol 1 and variables on the right are from Protocol 10. The proof then proceeds using similar arguments as Theorem 6 involving Lemma 1, Lemma 2, Claim 6 after noting Claim 10.

We can verify the following claim regarding the state Φ (the state obtained in Protocol 10, just before Protocol 2 starts as a subroutine) using similar arguments as proof of Claim 7.

Claim 10. 1. $\Pr(G = G')_\Phi = \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon)$ and 2. $d(Z_0|\tilde{B})_\Phi \leq \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon)$.

Since we have either $\Pr(Y \neq Y') = 1$ or $\Pr(X \neq X') = 1$, we show it for the first case and second case will follow analogously. Now note that the event $G = G'$ is a sub-event of $G_1 = G'_1$ where $G_1 = Y_1 \circ \text{ECC}(Y)_R$ and $G'_1 = Y'_1 \circ \text{ECC}(Y')_R$. Thus we get, $\Pr(G = G')_\Phi \leq \Pr(G_1 = G'_1)_\Phi$. Rest of the argument follows similar lines to Claim 7.

This completes the proof. \square

We have the following corollary of Theorem 7.

Corollary 5. *Let the function 2nmExt be as defined in Algorithm 4. 2nmExt is an $(n - k, n - k, \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon))$ -quantum secure 2-source non-malleable extractor against qia.*

Proof. Let $\rho_{XE_1E_2Y}$ be a state (for $k_1 = k_2 = n - k$), T_1 and T_2 be CPTP maps as defined in Definition 1. Let $\rho_{X\hat{X}E_1\hat{E}_1E_2\hat{E}_2Y\hat{Y}}$ be a pure state extension of $\rho_{XE_1E_2Y}$ such that,

$$\rho_{X\hat{X}E_1\hat{E}_1E_2\hat{E}_2Y\hat{Y}} = \rho_{X\hat{X}\hat{E}_1E_1} \otimes \rho_{Y\hat{Y}\hat{E}_2E_2} \quad ; \quad \mathsf{H}_{\min}(X|E_1)_\rho \geq n - k \quad ; \quad \mathsf{H}_{\min}(Y|E_2)_\rho \geq n - k,$$

where registers (XY) are classical (with copies $\hat{X}\hat{Y}$), $\rho_{X\hat{X}\hat{E}_1E_1}$ is canonical purification of ρ_{XE_1} and $\rho_{Y\hat{Y}\hat{E}_2E_2}$ is canonical purification of ρ_{YE_2} .

Let $U : \mathcal{H}_{E_2} \otimes \mathcal{H}_X \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_{E'_2} \otimes \mathcal{H}_{Z_2} \otimes \mathcal{H}_X \otimes \mathcal{H}_{X'} \otimes \mathcal{H}_{\hat{X}}$, be the Stinespring isometry extension⁶ of CPTP map T_1 with additional copy \hat{X}' of X' , i.e. $\mathsf{T}_1(\theta) = \text{Tr}_{Z_2\hat{X}'}(U\theta U^\dagger)$ for every c-q state θ_{XE_2} . Similarly let $V : \mathcal{H}_{E_1} \otimes \mathcal{H}_Y \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_{E'_1} \otimes \mathcal{H}_{Z_1} \otimes \mathcal{H}_Y \otimes \mathcal{H}_{Y'} \otimes \mathcal{H}_{\hat{Y}}$, be the Stinespring isometry extension of CPTP map T_2 with additional copy \hat{Y}' of Y' . Since $\rho_{XE_1Y\hat{Y}\hat{E}_2} = \rho_{XE_1} \otimes \rho_{Y\hat{Y}\hat{E}_2}$, we have

$$\mathsf{H}_{\min}\left(X\left|Y\hat{Y}\hat{E}_2E_1\right.\right)_\rho = \mathsf{H}_{\min}(X|E_1)_\rho \geq n - k.$$

Similarly since $\rho_{YE_2X\hat{X}\hat{E}_1} = \rho_{YE_2} \otimes \rho_{X\hat{X}\hat{E}_1}$, we have

$$\mathsf{H}_{\min}\left(Y\left|X\hat{X}\hat{E}_1E_2\right.\right)_\rho = \mathsf{H}_{\min}(Y|E_2)_\rho \geq n - k.$$

Thus ρ is a $(n - k, n - k)$ -qpa-state, with the following assignment (terms on the left are from Definition 16 and on the right are from here),

$$(X, \hat{X}, N, M, Y, \hat{Y}) \leftarrow (X, \hat{X}, \hat{E}_1E_2, \hat{E}_2E_1, Y, \hat{Y}).$$

⁶Note the Stinespring isometry extension is safe on register X .

Let $\sigma = (U \otimes V)\rho(U \otimes V)^\dagger$. Note $\sigma_{XX'E'_1E'_2YY'} = (\mathbb{T}_1 \otimes \mathbb{T}_2)(\rho_{XE_1E_2Y})$ and σ is a $(n-k, n-k)$ -qnm-state. Using Theorem 7, we have

$$\|\sigma_{2\text{nmExt}(X,Y)2\text{nmExt}(X',Y')YY'E'_1\hat{E}_2Z_1} - U_{n/4} \otimes \sigma_{2\text{nmExt}(X',Y')YY'E'_1\hat{E}_2Z_1}\|_1 \leq \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon).$$

Using Fact 7, we further have

$$\|\sigma_{2\text{nmExt}(X,Y)2\text{nmExt}(X',Y')YY'E'_1} - U_{n/4} \otimes \sigma_{2\text{nmExt}(X',Y')YY'E'_1}\|_1 \leq \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon).$$

which completes the proof. \square

We have the following additional corollary of Theorem 7.

Corollary 6. *Let the function 2nmExt be as defined in Algorithm 4. 2nmExt is an $(n-k, n-k, \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon))$ -quantum secure 2-source non-malleable extractor against qMara .*

Proof. Let ρ_{XEY} be a state (for $k_1 = k_2 = n-k$), \mathbb{T}_1 and \mathbb{T}_2 be CPTP maps as defined in Definition 2. Let $\rho_{X\hat{X}T\hat{T}E_1\hat{E}_1E_2\hat{E}_2Y\hat{Y}}$ be a pure state extension of $\rho_{XEY} \equiv \rho_{XE_1TE_2Y}$ such that,

$$\rho_{X\hat{X}T\hat{T}E_1\hat{E}_1E_2\hat{E}_2Y\hat{Y}} = \sum_t \sqrt{\Pr(T=t)} |tt\rangle_{T\hat{T}} |\rho\rangle_{X\hat{X}E_1\hat{E}_1E_2\hat{E}_2Y\hat{Y}} \quad ;$$

$$\mathbb{H}_{\min}(X|E)_\rho \geq n-k \quad ; \quad \mathbb{H}_{\min}(Y|E)_\rho \geq n-k,$$

registers (XYT) are classical (with copies $\hat{X}\hat{Y}\hat{T}$), $|\rho\rangle_{X\hat{X}E_1\hat{E}_1E_2\hat{E}_2Y\hat{Y}} = |\rho\rangle_{X\hat{X}E_1\hat{E}_1} \otimes |\rho\rangle_{E_2\hat{E}_2Y\hat{Y}}$ is the pure state extension of $\rho_{XE_1}^t \otimes \rho_{YE_2}^t$ with $|\rho\rangle_{X\hat{X}E_1\hat{E}_1}^t, |\rho\rangle_{E_2\hat{E}_2Y\hat{Y}}^t$ canonical purifications of $\rho_{XE_1}^t, \rho_{YE_2}^t$ respectively. Since $E \equiv E_1TE_2$, using Fact 3, we have

$$\mathbb{H}_{\min}(X|E_1T)_\rho \geq \mathbb{H}_{\min}(X|E)_\rho \geq n-k. \quad (29)$$

Similarly, $\mathbb{H}_{\min}(Y|E_2T)_\rho \geq n-k$. Note,

$$\rho_{XY\hat{Y}\hat{E}_2E_1\hat{T}} \equiv \rho_{XY\hat{Y}E_2E_1T}. \quad (30)$$

The first equivalence follows since for every $T = \hat{T} = t$, $|\rho\rangle_{E_2\hat{E}_2Y\hat{Y}}^t$ is the canonical purification of $\rho_{YE_2}^t$ implying $\rho_{YE_2}^t = \rho_{Y\hat{E}_2}^t$. Consider,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{H}_{\min}\left(X\left|Y\hat{Y}\hat{E}_2E_1\hat{T}\right.\right)_\rho &= \mathbb{H}_{\min}\left(X\left|Y\hat{Y}E_1TE_2\right.\right)_\rho \\ &= \mathbb{H}_{\min}(X|TE_1)_\rho \\ &\geq n-k. \end{aligned}$$

First equality follows from Eq. (30), second equality follows from Fact 3, noting for every $T = t$, $\rho_{XY\hat{Y}E_1E_2}^t = \rho_{XE_1}^t \otimes \rho_{Y\hat{Y}E_2}^t$ and first inequality follows from Eq. (29). Similarly, $\mathbb{H}_{\min}\left(Y\left|X\hat{X}\hat{E}_1E_2T\right.\right)_\rho \geq n-k$. Thus, ρ is an $(n-k, n-k)$ -qpa-state, with the following assignment (terms on the left are from Definition 16 and on the right are from here),

$$(X, \hat{X}, N, M, Y, \hat{Y}) \leftarrow (X, \hat{X}, \hat{E}_1E_2T, \hat{E}_2E_1\hat{T}, Y, \hat{Y}).$$

Let $U : \mathcal{H}_{E_2} \otimes \mathcal{H}_X \otimes \mathcal{H}_T \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_{E'_2} \otimes \mathcal{H}_{Z_2} \otimes \mathcal{H}_X \otimes \mathcal{H}_{X'} \otimes \mathcal{H}_{\hat{X}'}, \otimes \mathcal{H}_T$ be the Stinespring isometry extension ⁷ of CPTP map \mathbb{T}_1 with additional copy \hat{X}' of X' , i.e. $\mathbb{T}_1(\theta) = \text{Tr}_{Z_2 \hat{X}'}(U\theta U^\dagger)$ for every state θ . Similarly let $V : \mathcal{H}_{E_1} \otimes \mathcal{H}_Y \otimes \mathcal{H}_{\hat{T}} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_{E'_1} \otimes \mathcal{H}_{Z_1} \otimes \mathcal{H}_Y \otimes \mathcal{H}_{Y'} \otimes \mathcal{H}_{\hat{Y}'}, \otimes \mathcal{H}_{\hat{T}}$ be the Stinespring isometry extension of CPTP map \mathbb{T}_2 with additional copy \hat{Y}' of Y' (and treating register T as \hat{T} since $\hat{T} \equiv T$). Let $\sigma = (U \otimes V)\rho(U \otimes V)^\dagger$. Note $\sigma_{XX'E'_1TE'_2YY'} = (\mathbb{T}_1 \otimes \mathbb{T}_2)(\rho_{XEY})$. Thus, σ is an $(n-k, n-k)$ -qnm-state. Thus, using Theorem 7, we have

$$\|\sigma_{2\text{nmExt}(X,Y)2\text{nmExt}(X',Y')YY'E'_1\hat{E}_2Z_1\hat{T}} - U_{n/4} \otimes \sigma_{2\text{nmExt}(X',Y')YY'E'_1\hat{E}_2Z_1\hat{T}}\|_1 \leq \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon).$$

Using Fact 7, we further have

$$\|\sigma_{2\text{nmExt}(X,Y)2\text{nmExt}(X',Y')YY'E'_1\hat{T}} - U_{n/4} \otimes \sigma_{2\text{nmExt}(X',Y')YY'E'_1\hat{T}}\|_1 \leq \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon).$$

The desired follows noting $T \equiv \hat{T}$ in σ which completes the proof. \square

Acknowledgment

We thank Divesh Aggarwal and Maciej Obremski for introducing us to the problem, sharing their insights on the classical constructions and several other helpful discussions.

The work of NGB was done while he was a graduate student at the Centre for Quantum Technologies.

This work is supported by the National Research Foundation, through Grants NRF-NRFF2013-13, NRF2021-QEP2-02-P05 and the VanQuTe Grant NRF2017-NRF-ANR004; the Prime Minister's Office and the Ministry of Education, Singapore, under the Research Centres of Excellence program and Grant MOE2012-T3-1-009.

A A quantum secure t -non-malleable extractor

Definition 20 ($(t; k)$ -qnm-state). *Let $\sigma_{X\hat{X}NM\hat{Y}\hat{Y}'}$ be a (k) -qpa-state. Let $V : \mathcal{H}_Y \otimes \mathcal{H}_M \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_Y \otimes \mathcal{H}_{Y^{[t]}} \otimes \mathcal{H}_{\hat{Y}^{[t]}} \otimes \mathcal{H}_{M'}$ be an isometry such that for $\rho = V\sigma V^\dagger$, we have $Y^{[t]}$ classical (with copy $\hat{Y}^{[t]}$) and $\forall i \in [t] : \Pr(Y \neq Y^i)_\rho = 1$. We call ρ a $(t; k)$ -qnm-state.*

Definition 21 (quantum secure t -non-malleable extractor). *An (n, d, m) -non-malleable extractor $t\text{-nmExt} : \{0, 1\}^n \times \{0, 1\}^d \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^m$ is $(t; k, \varepsilon)$ -secure against qnma if for every $(t; k)$ -qnm-state ρ (chosen by the adversary qnma),*

$$\|\rho_{t\text{-nmExt}(X,Y)t\text{-nmExt}(X,Y^1)\dots t\text{-nmExt}(X,Y^t)YY^{[t]}M'} - U_m \otimes \rho_{t\text{-nmExt}(X,Y^1)\dots t\text{-nmExt}(X,Y^t)YY^{[t]}M'}\|_1 \leq \varepsilon.$$

We define the parameters we use in the construction of quantum secure t -non-malleable extractor as follows. These parameters hold throughout this section.

⁷Note the Stinespring isometry extension is safe on classical registers.

Parameters

Let $\delta, \delta_3 > 0$ be small enough constants and $\delta_1, \delta_2 < \frac{1}{14}$ be constants chosen according to Fact 13. Let $n, n_1, d, d_1, d_2, a, v, s, b, h, t$ be positive integers and $k, \varepsilon, \varepsilon', \varepsilon'' > 0$ such that:

$$d = \mathcal{O}\left(\log^7\left(\frac{n}{\varepsilon}\right)\right) \quad ; \quad v = 5d \quad ; \quad n_1 \geq v^{\delta_1} \quad ; \quad d_1 = \mathcal{O}\left(\log^2\left(\frac{nt^2}{\varepsilon^2}\right)\log d\right) \quad ; \quad a = d_1 + \mathcal{O}(v^{\delta_2}) \quad ;$$

$$t = \min\{\mathcal{O}(d^{\delta_3}), 2^{\mathcal{O}(d^{\delta_1}) - \log(\frac{1}{\varepsilon})}\} \quad ; \quad 2^{\mathcal{O}(a)}\sqrt{\varepsilon'} = \varepsilon \quad ; \quad d_2 = \mathcal{O}\left(\log^2\left(\frac{n}{\varepsilon''}\right)\log d\right) \quad ; \quad \varepsilon'' = 2^{-2(t+1)d_1}\varepsilon^2 \quad ;$$

$$q = \mathcal{O}(1) \quad ; \quad s = \mathcal{O}\left(\log^2\left(\frac{d}{\varepsilon'}\right)\log d\right) \quad ; \quad b = \mathcal{O}\left(\log^2\left(\frac{d}{\varepsilon'}\right)\log d\right) \quad ; \quad h = 10ts \quad ; \quad k \geq 5d.$$

Let

- Ext₀ be $(2n_1, \varepsilon^2/t^2)$ -quantum secure (n, d_1, n_1) -extractor,
- Ext₁ be $(2b, \varepsilon')$ -quantum secure (d, s, b) -extractor,
- Ext₂ be $(2s, \varepsilon')$ -quantum secure (h, b, s) -extractor,
- Ext₃ be $(2h, \varepsilon')$ -quantum secure (d, b, h) -extractor,
- Ext₄ be $(d/4t, \varepsilon^2)$ -quantum secure $(d, h, d/8t)$ -extractor,
- Ext₅ be $(2d, \varepsilon'')$ -quantum secure (n, d_2, d) -extractor,
- Ext₆ be $(k/4t, \varepsilon^2)$ -quantum secure $(n, d/8t, k/8t)$ -extractor,

be the quantum secure extractors from Fact 17.

Definition of t -non-malleable extractor

Let \mathbb{F}_q be the finite field of size q . Let $\text{ECC} : \mathbb{F}_q^d \rightarrow \mathbb{F}_q^v$ be an error correcting code with relative distance $\frac{1}{10}$ and rate $\frac{1}{5}$ (which exists from Fact 19 for our choice of parameters) for this section. Let $\text{Samp} : \{0, 1\}^r \rightarrow [v]^{t_1}$ be the sampler function from Fact 13 where $t_1 = \mathcal{O}(v^{\delta_2})$ and $r \geq v^{\delta_1}$. We identify the output of Samp as t_1 samples from the set $[v]$. By $\text{ECC}(Y)_{\text{Samp}(I)}$, we mean the $\text{Samp}(I)$ entries of codeword $\text{ECC}(Y)$, interpreted as a bit string.

Result

The following theorem shows that the function t -nmExt as defined in Algorithm 7 is $(t; k, \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon))$ -secure against qnma by noting that $L = t\text{-nmExt}(X, Y)$ and $L^i = t\text{-nmExt}(X, Y^i)$ for every $i \in [t]$.

Theorem 8 (Security of t -nmExt). *Let $\rho_{X\hat{X}NY^iY^{[t]}\hat{Y}^iM}$ be a $(t; k)$ -qnm-state. Let Alice and Bob proceed with Protocol 11 starting with ρ . Let Λ be the state at the end of the protocol. Then,*

$$\|\|\rho_{LL^{[t]Y^iY^{[t]M}} - U_{k/8t} \otimes \rho_{L^{[t]Y^iY^{[t]M}}}\|_1 \leq d(L|\tilde{B})_\Lambda \leq \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon).$$

Algorithm 7 : $t\text{-nmExt} : \{0, 1\}^n \times \{0, 1\}^d \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^{k/8t}$

Input: X, Y

1. t -advice generator:

$$Y_1 = \text{Prefix}(Y, d_1) \quad ; \quad I = \text{Ext}_0(X, Y_1) \quad ; \quad G = Y_1 \circ \text{ECC}(Y)_{\text{Samp}(I)}$$

2. $Y_2 = \text{Prefix}(Y, d_2) \quad ; \quad T = \text{Ext}_5(X, Y_2)$

3. Correlation breaker with advice: $S = \text{AdvCB}(Y, T, G)$ ▷ Algorithm 2

4. $L = \text{Ext}_6(X, S)$

Output: L

Proof. The first inequality follows from Fact 7. Note that the total communication from Alice to Bob in Protocol 11 is at most (from our choice of parameters)

$$(t+1)n_1 + 6ah(t+1) + h + (t+1)\frac{k}{8t} \leq (1/4 + \delta)k.$$

This implies (using Lemma 2) that throughout Protocol 11, $H_{\min}(X|\tilde{B}) \geq (3/4 - \delta)k > \frac{k}{2}$.

The total communication from Bob to Alice in Protocol 11 is at most

$$(t+1)d_1 + (t+1)d_2 + (t+1)a + (t+1)6ab + (t+1)\frac{d}{8t} \leq (1/4 + \delta)d.$$

Again using Lemma 2, throughout Protocol 11, $H_{\min}(Y|\tilde{A}) \geq (3/4 - \delta)d$.

The proof then proceeds using similar arguments as Theorem 6 involving Lemma 1, Lemma 2, Claim 6 after noting Claim 11. □

Claim 11 (t -advice generator). *Let Φ be the joint state after registers $Z_0, Z_0^{[t]}$ are generated by Alice. Then,*

$$\Pr(\forall i \in [t] : (G \neq G^i))_{\Phi} \geq 1 - \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon) \quad \text{and} \quad d(T|\tilde{B})_{\Phi} \leq \varepsilon.$$

Proof. We first prove $\Pr(\forall i \in [t] : (G \neq G^i))_{\Phi} \geq 1 - \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon)$. Let $\sigma_{XNIMYY^{[t]}}$ be the state after Alice has generated register I . Let $\beta_{IYY^{[t]}} = U_{n_1} \otimes \Phi_{YY^{[t]}}$. We have,

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta(\Phi_{IYY^{[t]}}, \beta_{IYY^{[t]}}) &= \Delta(\sigma_{IYY^{[t]}}, U_{n_1} \otimes \sigma_{YY^{[t]}}) \\ &\leq \Delta(\sigma_{I\tilde{B}}, U_{n_1} \otimes \sigma_{\tilde{B}}) && \text{(Fact 7)} \\ &\leq \sqrt{2}\Delta_B(\sigma_{I\tilde{B}}, U_{n_1} \otimes \sigma_{\tilde{B}}) && \text{(Fact 6)} \\ &\leq \sqrt{2}\varepsilon/t. && \text{(Lemma 1)} \end{aligned} \tag{31}$$

Fix an integer $i \in [t]$ and consider,

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr(G = G^i)_{\Phi} &\leq \Pr(G = G^i)_{\beta} + \sqrt{2}\varepsilon/t \\ &= \Pr(Y_1 = Y_1^i)_{\beta} \Pr(G = G^i | Y_1 = Y_1^i)_{\beta} + \Pr(Y_1 \neq Y_1^i)_{\beta} \Pr(G = G^i | Y_1 \neq Y_1^i)_{\beta} + \sqrt{2}\varepsilon/t \\ &= \Pr(Y_1 = Y_1^i)_{\beta} \Pr(G = G^i | Y_1 = Y_1^i)_{\beta} + \sqrt{2}\varepsilon/t \\ &\leq 2^{-\Omega(n_1)} + \sqrt{2}\varepsilon/t \\ &\leq \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{\varepsilon}{t}\right). \end{aligned}$$

Note that conditioned on $Y_1 = Y_1^i$, we have $I = I^i$. The first inequality above follows from Eq. (31) and noting that the predicate ($G = G^i$) is determined from (I, Y, Y^i) . The second equality follows from definition of G . Let $\mathcal{S}_i \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{j \in [v] : \text{ECC}(Y)_j \neq \text{ECC}(Y^i)_j\}$. Second inequality follows since ECC has relative distance $\frac{1}{10}$ and considering Samp with $(r, \delta, \nu, \mathcal{S})$ in Fact 13 as $(v^{\delta_1}, \frac{1}{10}, v, \mathcal{S}_i)$ here. Third inequality follows by our choice of parameters. Now the desired follows from the union bound.

Using arguments similar to the proof of Point 2 of Claim 7, we get,

$$d(T|\tilde{B})_\Phi \leq 2^{(t+1)d_1} \sqrt{\varepsilon''} \leq \varepsilon.$$

□

B A quantum secure 2-source t -non-malleable extractor

Definition 22 ($(t; k_1, k_2)$ -qnm-state). Let $\sigma_{X\hat{X}NY\hat{Y}}$ be a (k_1, k_2) -qpa-state. Let $U : \mathcal{H}_X \otimes \mathcal{H}_N \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_X \otimes \mathcal{H}_{X^{[t]}} \otimes \mathcal{H}_{\hat{X}^{[t]}} \otimes \mathcal{H}_{N'}$ and $V : \mathcal{H}_Y \otimes \mathcal{H}_M \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_Y \otimes \mathcal{H}_{Y^{[t]}} \otimes \mathcal{H}_{\hat{Y}^{[t]}} \otimes \mathcal{H}_{M'}$ be isometries such that for $\rho = (U \otimes V)\sigma(U \otimes V)^\dagger$, we have $X^{[t]}Y^{[t]}$ classical (with copy $\hat{X}^{[t]}\hat{Y}^{[t]}$) and

$$\forall i \in [t], \Pr(Y \neq Y^i)_\rho = 1 \quad \text{or} \quad \Pr(X \neq X^i)_\rho = 1.$$

We call ρ a $(t; k_1, k_2)$ -qnm-state.

Definition 23 (quantum secure 2-source t -non-malleable extractor). An (n, n, m) -non-malleable extractor $t\text{-}2\text{nmExt} : \{0, 1\}^n \times \{0, 1\}^n \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^m$ is $(t; k_1, k_2, \varepsilon)$ -secure against qnma if for every $(t; k_1, k_2)$ -qnm-state ρ (chosen by the adversary qnma),

$$\|\rho_{t\text{-}2\text{nmExt}(X, Y) t\text{-}2\text{nmExt}(X^1, Y^1) \dots t\text{-}2\text{nmExt}(X^t, Y^t) Y Y^{[t]} M' - U_m \otimes \rho_{t\text{-}2\text{nmExt}(X^1, Y^1) \dots t\text{-}2\text{nmExt}(X^t, Y^t) Y Y^{[t]} M'}\|_1 \leq \varepsilon.$$

Parameters

Let $\delta, \delta_3 > 0$ be small enough constants. Let $\delta_1, \delta_2 < \frac{1}{14}$ be constants chosen according to Fact 13, $n, v, n_1, t, a, s, b, h > 0$ be positive integers and $k, \varepsilon, \varepsilon' > 0$ be such that,

$$v = 5n \quad ; \quad n_1 = v^{\delta_1} \quad ; \quad \varepsilon = 2^{-\mathcal{O}(n^{\delta_3})} \quad ; \quad t \leq n^{\delta_3} \quad ;$$

$$k = \mathcal{O}(n^{1/4}) \quad ; \quad a = 6k + 2\mathcal{O}(v^{\delta_2}) = \mathcal{O}(k) \quad ; \quad 2^{\mathcal{O}(a)} \sqrt{\varepsilon'} = \varepsilon \quad ;$$

$$s = \mathcal{O}\left(\log^2\left(\frac{n}{\varepsilon'}\right) \log n\right) \quad ; \quad b = \mathcal{O}\left(\log^2\left(\frac{n}{\varepsilon'}\right) \log n\right) \quad ; \quad h = 10ts \quad .$$

- IP_1 be $\text{IP}_{2^{n_1}}^{3k/n_1}$, ; IP_2 be $\text{IP}_{2^h}^{3k^3/h}$,
- Ext_1 be $(2b, \varepsilon')$ -quantum secure (n, s, b) -extractor,
- Ext_2 be $(2s, \varepsilon')$ -quantum secure (h, b, s) -extractor,
- Ext_3 be $(2h, \varepsilon')$ -quantum secure (n, b, h) -extractor,
- Ext_4 be $(\frac{n}{4t}, \varepsilon^2)$ -quantum secure $(n, h, \frac{n}{8t})$ -extractor,
- Ext_6 be $(\frac{n}{2t}, \varepsilon^2)$ -quantum secure $(n, \frac{n}{8t}, \frac{n}{4t})$ -extractor.

Definition of 2-source t -non-malleable extractor

Let \mathbb{F}_q be the finite field of size $q = \mathcal{O}(1)$. Let $\text{ECC} : \mathbb{F}_q^n \rightarrow \mathbb{F}_q^v$ be an error correcting code with relative distance $\frac{1}{10}$ and rate $\frac{1}{5}$ (which exists from Fact 19 for our choice of parameters) for this section. Let $\text{Samp} : \{0, 1\}^r \rightarrow [v]^{t_1}$ be the sampler function from Fact 13 where $t_1 = \mathcal{O}(v^{\delta_2})$ and $r \geq v^{\delta_1}$. We identify the output of Samp as t_1 samples from the set $[v]$. By $\text{ECC}(Y)_{\text{Samp}(I)}$, we mean the $\text{Samp}(I)$ entries of codeword $\text{ECC}(Y)$, interpreted as a bit string.

Algorithm 8 : $t\text{-2nmExt} : \{0, 1\}^n \times \{0, 1\}^n \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^{n/4t}$

Input: X, Y

1. Advice generator:

$$X_1 = \text{Prefix}(X, 3k) \quad ; \quad Y_1 = \text{Prefix}(Y, 3k) \quad ; \quad R = \text{IP}_1(X_1, Y_1) \quad ;$$

$$G = X_1 \circ Y_1 \circ \text{ECC}(X)_{\text{Samp}(R)} \circ \text{ECC}(Y)_{\text{Samp}(R)}$$

2. $X_2 = \text{Prefix}(X, 3k^3) \quad ; \quad Y_2 = \text{Prefix}(Y, 3k^3) \quad ; \quad Z_0 = \text{IP}_2(X_2, Y_2)$

3. Correlation breaker with advice: $S = 2\text{AdvCB}(Y, X, Z_0, G)$

4. $L = \text{Ext}_6(X, S)$

Output: L

Result

The following theorem shows that the function $t\text{-2nmExt}$ as defined in Algorithm 8 is $(t; k_1, k_2, \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon))$ -secure against qnm by noting that $L = t\text{-2nmExt}(X, Y)$ and $L^i = t\text{-2nmExt}(X^i, Y^i)$ for every $i \in [t]$. Note that 2AdvCB in Algorithm 8 is same as the one in Algorithm 5 except for parameters and extractors which are to be used as mentioned in this section.

Theorem 9. *Let $\rho_{X^t \hat{X}^t N Y^t \hat{Y}^t M}$ be a $(t; n-k, n-k)$ - qnm -state. Let Alice and Bob proceed with Protocol 16 starting with ρ . Let Λ be the state at the end of the protocol. Then,*

$$\|\rho_{LL^t Y Y^t M} - U_{n/4t} \otimes \rho_{L^t Y Y^t M}\|_1 \leq d(L|\tilde{B})_\Lambda \leq \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon).$$

Proof. First inequality follows from Fact 7.

Note that the total communication from Alice to Bob in Protocol 16 is at most

$$(t+1)(n_1 + 3k + 6ah) + h + \frac{n}{8t}(t+1) \leq \left(\frac{1}{4} + \delta\right)n.$$

Similarly, total communication from Bob to Alice is at most

$$(3k + a + 6ab)(t+1) + 3k^3(t+1) + \frac{n}{8t}(t+1) \leq \left(\frac{1}{4} + \delta\right)n.$$

Hence, using Lemma 2, at any stage ρ in Protocol 16, we have, $H_{\min}(X|\tilde{B})_\rho \geq n - k - (1/4 + \delta)n \geq n/2$ and similarly, $H_{\min}(Y|\tilde{A})_\rho \geq n/2$. Thus, both Alice and Bob have enough entropy throughout the protocol for necessary extractions.

We start with a state $\rho_{XX^{[t]}NY^{[t]}M}$ such that $H_{\min}(X|\tilde{B})_{\rho} \geq n - k$ and $H_{\min}(Y|\tilde{A})_{\rho} \geq n - k$. From Fact 2, we have,

$$H_{\min}(X_1|\tilde{B})_{\rho} \geq 3k - k = 2k \quad ; \quad H_{\min}(Y_1|\tilde{A})_{\rho} \geq 3k - k = 2k.$$

Now from Claim 5 with the below assignment of registers (and noting registers $(XX^{[t]}, YY^{[t]})$ are included in (\tilde{A}, \tilde{B}) respectively),

$$(Z, X, Y, \sigma) \leftarrow (R, X_1, Y_1, \rho) \quad ; \quad (k_1, k_2, m, n_1, \varepsilon) \leftarrow (2k, 2k, n_1, 3k, (\varepsilon/t)^2)$$

we have,

$$\Delta(\rho_{RY^{[t]}}, U_R \otimes \rho_{YY^{[t]}}) \leq \mathcal{O}((\varepsilon/t)^2) \quad ; \quad \Delta(\rho_{RX^{[t]}}, U_R \otimes \rho_{XX^{[t]}}) \leq \mathcal{O}((\varepsilon/t)^2).$$

Using Fact 6, we get

$$\Delta_B(\rho_{RY^{[t]}}, U_R \otimes \rho_{YY^{[t]}}) \leq \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon/t) \quad ; \quad \Delta_B(\rho_{RX^{[t]}}, U_R \otimes \rho_{XX^{[t]}}) \leq \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon/t).$$

Let κ be the state just before Bob sends Y_2 . Note that till then, communication from Alice to Bob and Bob to Alice is at most $\mathcal{O}(tk) \leq \mathcal{O}(k^2)$ each. Hence, by Lemma 2, $H_{\min}(X|\tilde{B})_{\kappa} \geq n - k - \mathcal{O}(k^2)$ and thus $H_{\min}(X_2|\tilde{B})_{\kappa} \geq 3k^3 - k - \mathcal{O}(k^2) \geq 2k^3$. Similarly, $H_{\min}(Y_2|\tilde{A})_{\kappa} \geq 3k^3 - k - \mathcal{O}(k^2) \geq 2k^3$. Let η be the state just after Alice generates Z_0 . Using similar argument as before involving Claim 5, we have $d(Z_0|\tilde{B})_{\eta} \leq \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon)$.

Rest of the proof follows similar lines to that of Theorem 7 with the following change in the Claim 10 as follows:

Claim 12. *Let Φ be the joint state after registers $Z_0, Z_0^{[t]}$ are generated by Alice. Then,*

$$\Pr(\forall i \in [t], G \neq G^i)_{\Phi} \geq 1 - \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon) \quad \text{and} \quad d(Z_0|\tilde{B})_{\Phi} \leq \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon).$$

The proof of the above claim follows from that of Claim 11, after noting that $G = G^i$ is a sub-event of both $G_a = G_a^i$ and $G_b = G_b^i$ where $G_a = X_1 \circ \text{ECC}(X)_{\text{Samp}(R)}$, $G_a^i = X_1^i \circ \text{ECC}(X^i)_{\text{Samp}(R^i)}$, $G_b = Y_1 \circ \text{ECC}(Y)_{\text{Samp}(R)}$ and $G_b^i = Y_1^i \circ \text{ECC}(Y^i)_{\text{Samp}(R^i)}$.

This completes our proof. \square

C Communication Protocols

Protocols for nmExt

Protocol 1 $(X, \hat{X}, N, Y, Y', \hat{Y}, \hat{Y}', M)$.

Alice: (X, \hat{X}, N)		Bob: $(Y, Y', \hat{Y}, \hat{Y}', M)$	Analysis
		$Y_1 = \text{Prefix}(Y, d_1)$	$d(Y_1 \tilde{A}) = 0$
$I = \text{Ext}_0(X, Y_1)$	$Y_1 \leftarrow Y_1$		$d(I \tilde{B}) \leq \varepsilon$
$I' = \text{Ext}_0(X, Y'_1)$	$Y'_1 \leftarrow Y'_1$	$Y'_1 = \text{Prefix}(Y', d_1)$	$d(I \tilde{B}) \leq \varepsilon$
	$I \longrightarrow I$	$G = Y_1 \circ \text{ECC}(Y)_I$	
	$I' \longrightarrow I'$	$G' = Y'_1 \circ \text{ECC}(Y')_{I'}$	
$T = \text{Ext}_5(X, Y_2)$	$Y_2 \leftarrow Y_2$	$Y_2 = \text{Prefix}(Y, d_2)$	$d(T \tilde{B}) \leq \varepsilon$
$T' = \text{Ext}_5(X, Y'_2)$	$Y'_2 \leftarrow Y'_2$	$Y'_2 = \text{Prefix}(Y', d_2)$	
$Z_0 = \text{Prefix}(T, h)$	$G \leftarrow G$		
$Z'_0 = \text{Prefix}(T', h)$	$G' \leftarrow G'$		$d(T \tilde{B}) \leq \varepsilon$

Alice: $(T, T', Z_0, Z'_0, G, G', N)$

Bob: (Y, Y', G, G', M)

Protocol 2 $(T, T', Z_0, Z'_0, G, G', N, Y, Y', G, G', M)$

Alice: (X, Z, N)		Bob: (Y, Y', Z', M)	
$L' = \text{Ext}_6(X, S')$	$S' \leftarrow S'$	$S' = \text{Ext}_4(Y', Z')$	$d(Z \tilde{B}) \leq \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon)$
	$Z \longrightarrow Z$	$S = \text{Ext}_4(Y, Z)$	$d(S \tilde{A}) \leq \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon)$
	$L' \longrightarrow L'$		$d(S \tilde{A}) \leq \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon)$
$L = \text{Ext}_6(X, S)$	$S \leftarrow S$		$d(L \tilde{B}) \leq \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon)$

Alice: (L, N)

Bob: (L', Y, Y', M)

Protocol 2 $(T, T', Z, Z', G, G', N, Y, Y', G, G', M)$.

For $i = 1, 2, \dots, a$:

- Protocol 4 $(T, T', Z, Z', G, G', N, Y, Y', G, G', M)$ for $(\alpha_i, \alpha'_i) = (0, 1)$.
- Protocol 5 $(T, T', Z, Z', G, G', N, Y, Y', G, G', M)$ for $(\alpha_i, \alpha'_i) = (1, 0)$.
- Protocol 6 $(T, T', Z, Z', G, G', N, Y, Y', G, G', M)$ for $(\alpha_i, \alpha'_i) = (0, 0)$ and $\alpha_j = \alpha'_j$ for $j < i$.
- Protocol 7 $(T, T', Z, Z', G, G', N, Y, Y', G, G', M)$ for $(\alpha_i, \alpha'_i) = (0, 0)$ and $\alpha_j \neq \alpha'_j$ for some $j < i$.
- Protocol 8 $(T, T', Z, Z', G, G', N, Y, Y', G, G', M)$ for $(\alpha_i, \alpha'_i) = (1, 1)$ and $\alpha_j = \alpha'_j$ for $j < i$.
- Protocol 9 $(T, T', Z, Z', G, G', N, Y, Y', G, G', M)$ for $(\alpha_i, \alpha'_i) = (1, 1)$ and $\alpha_j \neq \alpha'_j$ for some $j < i$.

$$(Z, Z') = (O, O').$$

Protocol 3 Modified advice generator.

Alice: (X, N)

Bob: (Y, Y', M) Analysis

	$(E_A, E'_A) \longleftrightarrow (E_B, E'_B)$		
		$Y_1 = \text{Prefix}(Y, d_1)$	
		$Y'_1 = \text{Prefix}(Y', d_1)$	
$I = \text{Ext}_0(X, E_A)$			$d(I \tilde{B}) \leq \varepsilon$
	$I \longrightarrow I$		
$I' = \text{Ext}_0(X, E'_A)$	$I' \longrightarrow I'$		
$T = \text{Ext}_5(X, Y_2)$	$Y_2 \longleftarrow Y_2$	$Y_2 = \text{Prefix}(Y, d_2)$	$d(T \tilde{B}) \leq \sqrt{\varepsilon'}$
$T' = \text{Ext}_5(X, Y'_2)$	$Y'_2 \longleftarrow Y'_2$	$Y'_2 = \text{Prefix}(Y', d_2)$	
$Z_0 = \text{Prefix}(T, h)$	$G \longleftarrow G$	$G = Y_1 \circ \text{ECC}(Y)_I$	
$Z'_0 = \text{Prefix}(T', h)$	$G' \longleftarrow G'$	$G' = Y'_1 \circ \text{ECC}(Y')_{I'}$	$d(T \tilde{B}) \leq \sqrt{\varepsilon'}$
		If: $(E_B, E'_B) \neq (Y_1, Y'_1)$	
		abort	
		else: continue	$d(T \tilde{B}) \leq 2^{2d_1} \sqrt{\varepsilon'} \leq \varepsilon$
<hr/>			
Alice: $(T, T', Z_0, Z'_0, G, G', N)$	Bob: (Y, Y', G, G', M)		
<hr/>			

Protocol 4 $(T, T', Z, Z', G, G', N, Y, Y', G, G', M)$.

Alice: (T, T', Z, Z', G, G', N)

Bob: (Y, Y', G, G', M)

Analysis

$$Z_s = \text{Prefix}(Z, s)$$

$$d(Z_s | \tilde{B}) \leq \eta$$

$$Z_s \longrightarrow Z_s$$

$$A = \text{Ext}_1(Y, Z_s) \quad d(A | \tilde{A}) \leq \mathcal{O}(\eta + \sqrt{\varepsilon'})$$

$$Z' \longrightarrow Z'$$

$$\begin{aligned} A' &= \text{Ext}_1(Y', Z'_s) \\ C' &= \text{Ext}_2(Z', A') \\ B' &= \text{Ext}_1(Y', C') \end{aligned} \quad d(A | \tilde{A}) \leq \mathcal{O}(\eta + \sqrt{\varepsilon'})$$

$$\bar{Z} = \text{Ext}_3(T, A)$$

$$A \longleftarrow A$$

$$\bar{Z}_s = \text{Prefix}(\bar{Z}, s)$$

$$d(\bar{Z}_s | \tilde{B}) \leq \mathcal{O}(\eta + \sqrt{\varepsilon'})$$

$$\bar{Z}' = \text{Ext}_3(T', B')$$

$$B' \longleftarrow B'$$

$$\bar{Z}'_s = \text{Prefix}(\bar{Z}', s)$$

$$d(\bar{Z}'_s | \tilde{B}) \leq \mathcal{O}(\eta + \sqrt{\varepsilon'})$$

$$\bar{Z}_s \longrightarrow \bar{Z}_s$$

$$\bar{A} = \text{Ext}_1(Y, \bar{Z}_s) \quad d(\bar{A} | \tilde{A}) \leq \mathcal{O}(\eta + \sqrt{\varepsilon'})$$

$$\bar{Z}'_s \longrightarrow \bar{Z}'_s$$

$$\bar{A}' = \text{Ext}_1(Y', \bar{Z}'_s) \quad d(\bar{A}' | \tilde{A}) \leq \mathcal{O}(\eta + \sqrt{\varepsilon'})$$

$$\bar{C} = \text{Ext}_2(\bar{Z}, \bar{A})$$

$$\bar{A} \longleftarrow \bar{A}$$

$$d(\bar{C} | \tilde{B}) \leq \mathcal{O}(\eta + \sqrt{\varepsilon'})$$

$$O' = \text{Ext}_3(T', \bar{A}')$$

$$\bar{A}' \longleftarrow \bar{A}'$$

$$d(\bar{C}' | \tilde{B}) \leq \mathcal{O}(\eta + \sqrt{\varepsilon'})$$

$$\bar{C} \longrightarrow \bar{C}$$

$$\bar{B} = \text{Ext}_1(Y, \bar{C}) \quad d(\bar{B} | \tilde{A}) \leq \mathcal{O}(\eta + \sqrt{\varepsilon'})$$

$$O' \longrightarrow O'$$

$$d(\bar{B}' | \tilde{A}) \leq \mathcal{O}(\eta + \sqrt{\varepsilon'})$$

$$O = \text{Ext}_3(T, \bar{B})$$

$$\bar{B} \longleftarrow \bar{B}$$

$$d(O | \tilde{B}) \leq \mathcal{O}(\eta + \sqrt{\varepsilon'})$$

Protocol 5 $(T, T', Z, Z', G, G', N, Y, Y', G, G', M)$.

Alice: (T, T', Z, Z', G, G', N)		Bob: (Y, Y', G, G', M)	Analysis
$Z_s = \text{Prefix}(Z, s)$			$d(Z_s \tilde{B}) \leq \eta$
	$Z_s \longrightarrow Z_s$	$A = \text{Ext}_1(Y, Z_s)$	$d(A \tilde{A}) \leq \mathcal{O}(\eta + \sqrt{\varepsilon'})$
$Z'_s = \text{Prefix}(Z', s)$	$Z'_s \longrightarrow Z'_s$	$A' = \text{Ext}_1(Y', Z'_s)$	$d(A' \tilde{A}) \leq \mathcal{O}(\eta + \sqrt{\varepsilon'})$
$C = \text{Ext}_2(Z, A)$	$A \longleftarrow A$		$d(C \tilde{B}) \leq \mathcal{O}(\eta + \sqrt{\varepsilon'})$
$\bar{Z}' = \text{Ext}_3(T', A')$	$A' \longleftarrow A'$		$d(C' \tilde{B}) \leq \mathcal{O}(\eta + \sqrt{\varepsilon'})$
	$C \longrightarrow C$	$B = \text{Ext}_1(Y, C)$	$d(B \tilde{A}) \leq \mathcal{O}(\eta + \sqrt{\varepsilon'})$
	$\bar{Z}' \longrightarrow \bar{Z}'$	$\bar{A}' = \text{Ext}_1(Y', \bar{Z}'_s)$ $\bar{C}' = \text{Ext}_2(\bar{Z}', \bar{A}')$ $\bar{B}' = \text{Ext}_1(Y', \bar{C}')$	$d(B' \tilde{A}) \leq \mathcal{O}(\eta + \sqrt{\varepsilon'})$
$\bar{Z} = \text{Ext}_3(T, B)$	$B \longleftarrow B$		$d(\bar{Z}_s \tilde{B}) \leq \mathcal{O}(\eta + \sqrt{\varepsilon'})$
$O' = \text{Ext}_3(T', \bar{B}')$	$\bar{B}' \longleftarrow \bar{B}'$		$d(\bar{Z}_s \tilde{B}) \leq \mathcal{O}(\eta + \sqrt{\varepsilon'})$
	$\bar{Z}_s \longrightarrow \bar{Z}_s$	$\bar{A} = \text{Ext}_1(Y, \bar{Z}_s)$	$d(\bar{A} \tilde{A}) \leq \mathcal{O}(\eta + \sqrt{\varepsilon'})$
	$O' \longrightarrow O'$		$d(\bar{A} \tilde{A}) \leq \mathcal{O}(\eta + \sqrt{\varepsilon'})$
$O = \text{Ext}_3(T, \bar{A})$	$\bar{A} \longleftarrow \bar{A}$		$d(O \tilde{B}) \leq \mathcal{O}(\eta + \sqrt{\varepsilon'})$

Protocol 6 ($T, T', Z, Z', G, G', N, Y, Y', G, G', M$).

Alice: (T, T', Z, Z', G, G', N)		Bob: (Y, Y', G, G', M)	Analysis
$Z_s = \text{Prefix}(Z, s)$			$d(Z_s \tilde{B}) \leq \eta$
	$Z_s \longrightarrow Z_s$	$A = \text{Ext}_1(Y, Z_s)$	$d(A \tilde{A}) \leq \eta$
$Z'_s = \text{Prefix}(Z', s)$	$Z'_s \longrightarrow Z'_s$	$A' = \text{Ext}_1(Y', Z'_s)$	$d(A' \tilde{A}) \leq \mathcal{O}(\eta + \sqrt{\varepsilon'})$
$\bar{Z} = \text{Ext}_3(T, A)$	$A \longleftarrow A$		
$\bar{Z}_s = \text{Prefix}(\bar{Z}, s)$			$d(\bar{Z}_s \tilde{B}) \leq \mathcal{O}(\eta + \sqrt{\varepsilon'})$
$\bar{Z}' = \text{Ext}_3(T', A')$	$A' \longleftarrow A'$		$d(\bar{Z}' \tilde{B}) \leq \mathcal{O}(\eta + \sqrt{\varepsilon'})$
	$\bar{Z}_s \longrightarrow \bar{Z}_s$	$\bar{A} = \text{Ext}_1(Y, \bar{Z}_s)$	$d(\bar{A} \tilde{A}) \leq \mathcal{O}(\eta + \sqrt{\varepsilon'})$
$\bar{Z}'_s = \text{Prefix}(\bar{Z}', s)$	$\bar{Z}'_s \longrightarrow \bar{Z}'_s$	$\bar{A}' = \text{Ext}_1(Y', \bar{Z}'_s)$	$d(\bar{A}' \tilde{A}) \leq \mathcal{O}(\eta + \sqrt{\varepsilon'})$
$\bar{C} = \text{Ext}_2(\bar{Z}, \bar{A})$	$\bar{A} \longleftarrow \bar{A}$		$d(\bar{C} \tilde{B}) \leq \mathcal{O}(\eta + \sqrt{\varepsilon'})$
$\bar{C}' = \text{Ext}_2(\bar{Z}', \bar{A}')$	$\bar{A}' \longleftarrow \bar{A}'$		$d(\bar{C}' \tilde{B}) \leq \mathcal{O}(\eta + \sqrt{\varepsilon'})$
	$\bar{C} \longrightarrow \bar{C}$	$\bar{B} = \text{Ext}_1(Y, \bar{C})$	$d(\bar{B} \tilde{A}) \leq \mathcal{O}(\eta + \sqrt{\varepsilon'})$
	$\bar{C}' \longrightarrow \bar{C}'$	$\bar{B}' = \text{Ext}_1(Y', \bar{C}')$	$d(\bar{B}' \tilde{A}) \leq \mathcal{O}(\eta + \sqrt{\varepsilon'})$
$O = \text{Ext}_3(T, \bar{B})$	$\bar{B} \longleftarrow \bar{B}$		$d(O \tilde{B}) \leq \mathcal{O}(\eta + \sqrt{\varepsilon'})$
$O' = \text{Ext}_3(T', \bar{B}')$	$\bar{B}' \longleftarrow \bar{B}'$		$d(O' \tilde{B}) \leq \mathcal{O}(\eta + \sqrt{\varepsilon'})$

Protocol 7 ($T, T', Z, Z', G, G', N, Y, Y', G, G', M$).

Alice: (T, T', Z, G, G', N)		Bob: (Y, Y', Z', G, G', M)	Analysis
$Z_s = \text{Prefix}(Z, s)$			$d(Z_s \tilde{B}) \leq \eta$
$\bar{Z}' = \text{Ext}_3(T', A')$	$A' \leftarrow A'$	$A' = \text{Ext}_1(Y', Z'_s)$	$d(Z_s \tilde{B}) \leq \eta$
	$Z_s \rightarrow Z_s$	$A = \text{Ext}_1(Y, Z_s)$	$d(A \tilde{A}) \leq \mathcal{O}(\eta + \sqrt{\varepsilon'})$
	$\bar{Z}' \rightarrow \bar{Z}'$	$\bar{A}' = \text{Ext}_1(Y', \bar{Z}'_s)$ $\bar{C}' = \text{Ext}_2(\bar{Z}', \bar{A}')$ $\bar{B}' = \text{Ext}_1(Y', \bar{C}')$	$d(A \tilde{A}) \leq \mathcal{O}(\eta + \sqrt{\varepsilon'})$
$\bar{Z} = \text{Ext}_3(T, A)$	$A \leftarrow A$		$d(\bar{Z}_s \tilde{B}) \leq \mathcal{O}(\eta + \sqrt{\varepsilon'})$
$\bar{Z}_s = \text{Prefix}(\bar{Z}, s)$			
$O' = \text{Ext}_3(T', \bar{B}')$	$\bar{B}' \leftarrow \bar{B}'$		$d(\bar{Z}_s \tilde{B}) \leq \mathcal{O}(\eta + \sqrt{\varepsilon'})$
	$\bar{Z}_s \rightarrow \bar{Z}_s$	$\bar{A} = \text{Ext}_1(Y, \bar{Z}_s)$	$d(\bar{A} \tilde{A}) \leq \mathcal{O}(\eta + \sqrt{\varepsilon'})$
$\bar{C} = \text{Ext}_2(\bar{Z}, \bar{A})$	$\bar{A} \leftarrow \bar{A}$		$d(\bar{C} \tilde{B}) \leq \mathcal{O}(\eta + \sqrt{\varepsilon'})$
	$\bar{C} \rightarrow \bar{C}$	$\bar{B} = \text{Ext}_1(Y, \bar{C})$	$d(\bar{B} \tilde{A}) \leq \mathcal{O}(\eta + \sqrt{\varepsilon'})$
	$O' \rightarrow O'$		$d(\bar{B} \tilde{A}) \leq \mathcal{O}(\eta + \sqrt{\varepsilon'})$
$O = \text{Ext}_3(T, \bar{B})$	$\bar{B} \leftarrow \bar{B}$		$d(O \tilde{B}) \leq \mathcal{O}(\eta + \sqrt{\varepsilon'})$

Protocol 8 $(T, T', Z, Z', G, G', N, Y, Y', G, G', M)$.

 Alice: (T, T', Z, Z', G, G', N)

 Bob: (Y, Y', G, G', M)

 Analysis

$$Z_s = \text{Prefix}(Z, s)$$

$$d(Z_s | \tilde{B}) \leq \eta$$

$$Z_s \longrightarrow Z_s$$

$$A = \text{Ext}_1(Y, Z_s)$$

$$d(A | \tilde{A}) \leq \mathcal{O}(\eta + \sqrt{\varepsilon'})$$

$$Z'_s = \text{Prefix}(Z', s)$$

$$Z'_s \longrightarrow Z'_s$$

$$A' = \text{Ext}_1(Y', Z'_s)$$

$$d(A' | \tilde{A}) \leq \mathcal{O}(\eta + \sqrt{\varepsilon'})$$

$$C = \text{Ext}_2(Z, A)$$

$$A \longleftarrow A$$

$$d(C | \tilde{B}) \leq \mathcal{O}(\eta + \sqrt{\varepsilon'})$$

$$C' = \text{Ext}_2(Z', A')$$

$$A' \longleftarrow A'$$

$$d(C' | \tilde{B}) \leq \mathcal{O}(\eta + \sqrt{\varepsilon'})$$

$$C \longrightarrow C$$

$$B = \text{Ext}_1(Y, C)$$

$$d(B | \tilde{A}) \leq \mathcal{O}(\eta + \sqrt{\varepsilon'})$$

$$C' \longrightarrow C'$$

$$B' = \text{Ext}_1(Y', C')$$

$$d(B' | \tilde{A}) \leq \mathcal{O}(\eta + \sqrt{\varepsilon'})$$

$$\bar{Z} = \text{Ext}_3(T, B)$$

$$B \longleftarrow B$$

$$\bar{Z}_s = \text{Prefix}(\bar{Z}, s)$$

$$d(\bar{Z}_s | \tilde{B}) \leq \mathcal{O}(\eta + \sqrt{\varepsilon'})$$

$$\bar{Z}' = \text{Ext}_3(T', B')$$

$$B' \longleftarrow B'$$

$$d(\bar{Z}'_s | \tilde{B}) \leq \mathcal{O}(\eta + \sqrt{\varepsilon'})$$

$$\bar{Z}_s \longrightarrow \bar{Z}_s$$

$$\bar{A} = \text{Ext}_1(Y, \bar{Z}_s)$$

$$d(\bar{A} | \tilde{A}) \leq \mathcal{O}(\eta + \sqrt{\varepsilon'})$$

$$\bar{Z}'_s = \text{Prefix}(\bar{Z}', s)$$

$$\bar{Z}'_s \longrightarrow \bar{Z}'_s$$

$$\bar{A}' = \text{Ext}_1(Y', \bar{Z}'_s)$$

$$d(\bar{A}' | \tilde{A}) \leq \mathcal{O}(\eta + \sqrt{\varepsilon'})$$

$$O = \text{Ext}_3(T, \bar{A})$$

$$\bar{A} \longleftarrow \bar{A}$$

$$d(O | \tilde{B}) \leq \mathcal{O}(\eta + \sqrt{\varepsilon'})$$

$$O' = \text{Ext}_3(T', \bar{A}')$$

$$\bar{A}' \longleftarrow \bar{A}'$$

$$d(O' | \tilde{B}) \leq \mathcal{O}(\eta + \sqrt{\varepsilon'})$$

Protocol 9 $(T, T', Z, Z', G, G', N, Y, Y', G, G', M)$.

 Alice: (T, T', Z, G, G', N)

 Bob: (Y, Y', Z', G, G', M)

 Analysis

$$Z_s = \text{Prefix}(Z, s)$$

$$d(Z_s | \tilde{B}) \leq \eta$$

$$\begin{aligned} Z'_s &= \text{Prefix}(Z', s) \\ A' &= \text{Ext}_1(Y', Z'_s) \\ C' &= \text{Ext}_2(Z', A') \\ B' &= \text{Ext}_1(Y', C') \end{aligned}$$

$$\bar{Z}' = \text{Ext}_3(T', B')$$

$$B' \leftarrow B'$$

$$d(Z_s | \tilde{B}) \leq \eta$$

$$Z_s \longrightarrow Z_s$$

$$A = \text{Ext}_1(Y, Z_s)$$

$$d(A | \tilde{A}) \leq \mathcal{O}(\eta + \sqrt{\varepsilon'})$$

$$\bar{Z}'_s = \text{Prefix}(\bar{Z}', s)$$

$$\bar{Z}'_s \longrightarrow \bar{Z}'_s$$

$$\bar{A}' = \text{Ext}_1(Y', \bar{Z}'_s)$$

$$d(\bar{A}' | \tilde{A}) \leq \mathcal{O}(\eta + \sqrt{\varepsilon'})$$

$$C = \text{Ext}_2(Z, A)$$

$$A \leftarrow A$$

$$d(C | \tilde{B}) \leq \mathcal{O}(\eta + \sqrt{\varepsilon'})$$

$$O' = \text{Ext}_3(T', \bar{A}')$$

$$\bar{A}' \leftarrow \bar{A}'$$

$$d(C | \tilde{B}) \leq \mathcal{O}(\eta + \sqrt{\varepsilon'})$$

$$C \longrightarrow C$$

$$B = \text{Ext}_1(Y, C)$$

$$d(B | \tilde{A}) \leq \mathcal{O}(\eta + \sqrt{\varepsilon'})$$

$$O' \longrightarrow O'$$

$$d(B | \tilde{A}) \leq \mathcal{O}(\eta + \sqrt{\varepsilon'})$$

$$\bar{Z} = \text{Ext}_3(T, B)$$

$$B \leftarrow B$$

$$\bar{Z}_s = \text{Prefix}(\bar{Z}, s)$$

$$d(\bar{Z}_s | \tilde{B}) \leq \mathcal{O}(\eta + \sqrt{\varepsilon'})$$

$$\bar{Z}_s \longrightarrow \bar{Z}_s$$

$$\bar{A} = \text{Ext}_1(Y, \bar{Z}_s)$$

$$d(\bar{A} | \tilde{A}) \leq \mathcal{O}(\eta + \sqrt{\varepsilon'})$$

$$O = \text{Ext}_3(T, \bar{A})$$

$$\bar{A} \leftarrow \bar{A}$$

$$d(O | \tilde{B}) \leq \mathcal{O}(\eta + \sqrt{\varepsilon'})$$

Protocols for 2nmExt

Protocol 2' is exactly same as Protocol 2 except replacing extractors and parameters as in Section 5.

Protocol 10 $(X, \hat{X}, X', \hat{X}', N, Y, \hat{Y}, Y', \hat{Y}', M)$.

Alice: $(X, \hat{X}, X', \hat{X}', N)$	Bob: $(Y, \hat{Y}, Y', \hat{Y}', M)$	Analysis
$X_1 = \text{Prefix}(X, 3k)$	$Y_1 = \text{Prefix}(Y, 3k)$	$H_{\min}(X_1 \tilde{B}) \geq 2k$ $H_{\min}(Y_1 \tilde{A}) \geq 2k$
$X_1 \longrightarrow X_1$	$R = \text{IP}_1(X_1, Y_1)$	$d(R XX') \leq \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon)$
$R = \text{IP}_1(X_1, Y_1)$ $V = \text{ECC}(X)_R$	$Y_1 \longleftarrow Y_1$ $V \longrightarrow V$	$d(R YY') \leq \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon)$
$X'_1 = \text{Prefix}(X', 3k)$	$Y'_1 = \text{Prefix}(Y', 3k)$ $R' = \text{IP}_1(X'_1, Y'_1)$ $W' = \text{ECC}(Y')_{R'}$	
$R' = \text{IP}_1(X'_1, Y'_1)$	$X'_1 \longrightarrow X'_1$ $Y'_1 \longleftarrow Y'_1$	
$V' = \text{ECC}(X')_{R'}$	$V' \longrightarrow V'$ $G' = X'_1 \circ Y'_1 \circ V' \circ W'$	
$X_2 = \text{Prefix}(X, 3k^3)$ $Z_0 = \text{IP}_2(X_2, Y_2)$	$Y_2 \longleftarrow Y_2$	$Y_2 = \text{Prefix}(Y, 3k^3)$ $H_{\min}(Y_2 \tilde{A}) \geq 2k^3$ $H_{\min}(X_2 \tilde{B}) \geq 2k^3$ $d(Z_0 \tilde{B}) \leq \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon)$
$X'_2 = \text{Prefix}(X', 3k^3)$ $Z'_0 = \text{IP}_2(X'_2, Y'_2)$	$Y'_2 \longleftarrow Y'_2$	$Y'_2 = \text{Prefix}(Y', 3k^3)$
	$(G, G') \longleftarrow (G, G')$	$d(Z_0 \tilde{B}) \leq \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon)$
Alice: $(X, X', Z_0, Z'_0, G, G', N)$	Bob: (Y, Y', G, G', M)	
Protocol 2' $(X, X', Z_0, Z'_0, G, G', N, Y, Y', G, G', M)$		
Alice: (X, X', Z, N)	Bob: (Y, Y', Z', M)	
$L' = \text{Ext}_6(X, S')$	$S' \longleftarrow S'$ $Z \longrightarrow Z$ $L' \longrightarrow L'$	$S' = \text{Ext}_4(Y', Z')$ $S = \text{Ext}_4(Y, Z)$
$L = \text{Ext}_6(X, S)$	$S \longleftarrow S$	$d(Z \tilde{B}) \leq \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon)$ $d(S \tilde{A}) \leq \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon)$ $d(S \tilde{A}) \leq \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon)$ $d(L \tilde{B}) \leq \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon)$
Alice (L, N)	Bob (L', Y, Y', M)	

Protocols for t -nmExt

Protocol 11 $(X, \hat{X}, N, M, Y, \hat{Y}, Y^{[t]}, \hat{Y}^{[t]})$.

Alice: (X, \hat{X}, N)		Bob: $(M, Y, \hat{Y}, Y^{[t]}, \hat{Y}^{[t]})$	Analysis
		$Y_1 = \text{Prefix}(Y, d_1)$	$d(Y_1 \tilde{A}) = 0$
$I = \text{Ext}_0(X, Y_1)$	$Y_1 \leftarrow Y_1$		$d(I \tilde{B}) \leq \varepsilon/t$
$I^1 = \text{Ext}_0(X, Y_1^1)$	$Y_1^1 \leftarrow Y_1^1$	$Y_1^1 = \text{Prefix}(Y^1, d_1)$	$d(I^1 \tilde{B}) \leq \varepsilon/t$
\vdots	\vdots	\vdots	\vdots
$I^t = \text{Ext}_0(X, Y_1^t)$	$Y_1^t \leftarrow Y_1^t$	$Y_1^t = \text{Prefix}(Y^t, d_1)$	$d(I^t \tilde{B}) \leq \varepsilon/t$
	$I \longrightarrow I$	$G = Y_1 \circ \text{ECC}(Y)_{\text{Samp}(I)}$	
	$I^1 \longrightarrow I^1$	$G^1 = Y_1^1 \circ \text{ECC}(Y^1)_{\text{Samp}(I^1)}$	
	\vdots	\vdots	
	$I^t \longrightarrow I^t$	$G^t = Y_1^t \circ \text{ECC}(Y^t)_{\text{Samp}(I^t)}$	
$T = \text{Ext}_5(X, Y_2)$	$Y_2 \leftarrow Y_2$	$Y_2 = \text{Prefix}(Y, d_2)$	$d(T \tilde{B}) \leq \varepsilon$
$T^1 = \text{Ext}_5(X, Y_2^1)$	$Y_2^1 \leftarrow Y_2^1$	$Y_2^1 = \text{Prefix}(Y^1, d_2)$	
\vdots	\vdots	\vdots	
$T^t = \text{Ext}_5(X, Y_2^t)$	$Y_2^t \leftarrow Y_2^t$	$Y_2^t = \text{Prefix}(Y^t, d_2)$	
$Z_0 = \text{Prefix}(T, h)$	$G \leftarrow G$		
$Z_0^1 = \text{Prefix}(T^1, h)$	$G^1 \leftarrow G^1$		
\vdots	\vdots		
$Z_0^t = \text{Prefix}(T^t, h)$	$G^t \leftarrow G^t$		$d(T \tilde{B}) \leq \varepsilon$

Alice: $(T, T^{[t]}, Z_0, Z_0^{[t]}, G, G^{[t]}, N)$

Bob: $(Y, Y^{[t]}, G, G^{[t]}, M)$

Protocol 12 $(T, T^{[t]}, Z_0, Z_0^{[t]}, G, G^{[t]}, N, Y, Y^{[t]}, G, G^{[t]}, M)$

Alice: (X, Z, N)		Bob: $(Y, Y^{[t]}, Z^{[t]}, M)$	
$L^1 = \text{Ext}_6(X, S^1)$	$S^1 \leftarrow S^1$	$S^1 = \text{Ext}_4(Y^1, Z^1)$	$d(Z \tilde{B}) \leq \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon)$
\vdots	\vdots	\vdots	\vdots
$L^t = \text{Ext}_6(X, S^t)$	$S^t \leftarrow S^t$	$S^t = \text{Ext}_4(Y^t, Z^t)$	$d(Z \tilde{B}) \leq \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon)$
	$Z \longrightarrow Z$	$S = \text{Ext}_4(Y, Z)$	$d(S \tilde{A}) \leq \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon)$
	$L^1 \longrightarrow L^1$		$d(S \tilde{A}) \leq \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon)$
	\vdots		\vdots
	$L^t \longrightarrow L^t$		$d(S \tilde{A}) \leq \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon)$
$L = \text{Ext}_6(X, S)$	$S \leftarrow S$		$d(L \tilde{B}) \leq \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon)$

Alice (L, N)

Bob $(L^{[t]}, Y, Y^{[t]}, M)$

Protocol 12 $(T, T^{[t]}, Z, Z^{[t]}, G, G^{[t]}, N, Y, Y^{[t]}, G, G^{[t]}, M)$.

For $i = 1, 2, \dots, a$:

Let $\mathcal{S}_i = \{j : G_i = G_i^j\}$ and $\bar{\mathcal{S}}_i = [t] \setminus \mathcal{S}_i$. Let $\mathcal{S}_i^0 = \{j : (G_i = G_i^j) \wedge (G_k = G_k^j \text{ for every } k < i)\}$ and $\mathcal{S}_i^1 = \{j : (G_i = G_i^j) \wedge (G_k \neq G_k^j \text{ for some } k < i)\}$.

- Protocol 13 $(T, T^{[t]}, Z, Z^{[t]}, G, G^{[t]}, N, Y, Y^{[t]}, G, G^{[t]}, M)$ for $(G_i = 0)$.
- Protocol 14 $(T, T^{[t]}, Z, Z^{[t]}, G, G^{[t]}, N, Y, Y^{[t]}, G, G^{[t]}, M)$ for $(G_i = 1)$.

$(Z, Z^1, \dots, Z^t) = (O, O^1, \dots, O^t)$.

Protocol 13 $(T, T^{[t]}, Z, Z^{[t]}, G, G^{[t]}, N, Y, Y^{[t]}, G, G^{[t]}, M)$.

Execute $\forall p \in \mathcal{S}_i^0, \forall q \in \mathcal{S}_i^1, \forall r \in \overline{\mathcal{S}}_i$.

Alice: $(T, T^{[t]}, Z, Z^{[t]}, G, G^{[t]}, M)$	Bob: $(Y, Y^{[t]}, Z^{\mathcal{S}_i^1}, G, G^{[t]}, M)$	Analysis
$Z_s = \text{Prefix}(Z, s)$		$d(Z_s \tilde{B}) \leq \eta$
$\overline{Z}^q = \text{Ext}_3(T^q, A^q)$	$A^q \leftarrow A^q \quad A^q = \text{Ext}_1(Y^q, Z_s^q)$	$d(Z_s \tilde{B}) \leq \eta$
	$Z_s \longrightarrow Z_s \quad A = \text{Ext}_1(Y, Z_s)$	$d(A \tilde{A}) \leq \mathcal{O}(\eta + \sqrt{\varepsilon'})$
	$Z_s^p \longrightarrow Z_s^p \quad A^p = \text{Ext}_1(Y^p, Z_s^p)$	$d(A \tilde{A}) \leq \mathcal{O}(\eta + \sqrt{\varepsilon'})$
	$\overline{Z}^q \longrightarrow \overline{Z}^q \quad \begin{aligned} \overline{A}^q &= \text{Ext}_1(Y^q, \overline{Z}_s^q) \\ \overline{C}^q &= \text{Ext}_1(\overline{Z}^q, \overline{A}^q) \\ \overline{B}^q &= \text{Ext}_1(Y^q, \overline{C}^q) \end{aligned}$	$d(A \tilde{A}) \leq \mathcal{O}(\eta + \sqrt{\varepsilon'})$
	$Z^r \longrightarrow Z^r \quad \begin{aligned} A^r &= \text{Ext}_1(Y^r, Z_s^r) \\ C^r &= \text{Ext}_2(Z^r, A^r) \\ B^r &= \text{Ext}_1(Y^r, C^r) \end{aligned}$	$d(A \tilde{A}) \leq \mathcal{O}(\eta + \sqrt{\varepsilon'})$
$\overline{Z} = \text{Ext}_3(T, A)$	$A \leftarrow A$	$d(\overline{Z}_s \tilde{B}) \leq \mathcal{O}(\eta + \sqrt{\varepsilon'})$
$\overline{Z}^p = \text{Ext}_3(T^p, A^p)$	$A^p \leftarrow A^p$	$d(\overline{Z}_s \tilde{B}) \leq \mathcal{O}(\eta + \sqrt{\varepsilon'})$
$O^q = \text{Ext}_3(T^q, \overline{B}^q)$	$\overline{B}^q \leftarrow \overline{B}^q$	$d(\overline{Z}_s \tilde{B}) \leq \mathcal{O}(\eta + \sqrt{\varepsilon'})$
$\overline{Z}^r = \text{Ext}_3(T^r, B^r)$	$B^r \leftarrow B^r$	$d(\overline{Z}_s \tilde{B}) \leq \mathcal{O}(\eta + \sqrt{\varepsilon'})$
	$\overline{Z}_s \longrightarrow \overline{Z}_s \quad \overline{A} = \text{Ext}_1(Y, \overline{Z}_s)$	$d(\overline{A} \tilde{A}) \leq \mathcal{O}(\eta + \sqrt{\varepsilon'})$
	$\overline{Z}_s^p \longrightarrow \overline{Z}_s^p \quad \overline{A}^p = \text{Ext}_1(Y^p, \overline{Z}_s^p)$	$d(\overline{A} \tilde{A}) \leq \mathcal{O}(\eta + \sqrt{\varepsilon'})$
	$\overline{Z}_s^r \longrightarrow \overline{Z}_s^r \quad \overline{A}^r = \text{Ext}_1(Y^r, \overline{Z}_s^r)$	$d(\overline{A} \tilde{A}) \leq \mathcal{O}(\eta + \sqrt{\varepsilon'})$
$\overline{C} = \text{Ext}_2(\overline{Z}, \overline{A})$	$\overline{A} \leftarrow \overline{A}$	$d(\overline{C} \tilde{B}) \leq \mathcal{O}(\eta + \sqrt{\varepsilon'})$
$\overline{C}^p = \text{Ext}_2(\overline{Z}^p, \overline{A}^p)$	$\overline{A}^p \leftarrow \overline{A}^p$	$d(\overline{C} \tilde{B}) \leq \mathcal{O}(\eta + \sqrt{\varepsilon'})$
$O^r = \text{Ext}_3(T^r, \overline{A}^r)$	$\overline{A}^r \leftarrow \overline{A}^r$	$d(\overline{C} \tilde{B}) \leq \mathcal{O}(\eta + \sqrt{\varepsilon'})$
	$\overline{C} \longrightarrow \overline{C} \quad \overline{B} = \text{Ext}_1(Y, \overline{C})$	$d(\overline{B} \tilde{A}) \leq \mathcal{O}(\eta + \sqrt{\varepsilon'})$
	$\overline{C}^p \longrightarrow \overline{C}^p \quad \overline{B}^p = \text{Ext}_1(Y^p, \overline{C}^p)$	$d(\overline{B} \tilde{A}) \leq \mathcal{O}(\eta + \sqrt{\varepsilon'})$
	$O^q \longrightarrow O^q$	$d(\overline{B} \tilde{A}) \leq \mathcal{O}(\eta + \sqrt{\varepsilon'})$
	$O^r \longrightarrow O^r$	$d(\overline{B} \tilde{A}) \leq \mathcal{O}(\eta + \sqrt{\varepsilon'})$
$O = \text{Ext}_3(T, \overline{B})$	$\overline{B} \leftarrow \overline{B}$	$d(O \tilde{B}) \leq \mathcal{O}(\eta + \sqrt{\varepsilon'})$
$O^p = \text{Ext}_3(T^p, \overline{B}^p)$	$\overline{B}^p \leftarrow \overline{B}^p$	$d(O \tilde{B}) \leq \mathcal{O}(\eta + \sqrt{\varepsilon'})$

Protocol 14 $(T, T^{[t]}, Z, Z^{[t]}, G, G^{[t]}, N, Y, Y^{[t]}, G, G^{[t]}, M)$.

Execute $\forall p \in \mathcal{S}_i^0, \forall q \in \mathcal{S}_i^1, \forall r \in \overline{\mathcal{S}}_i$.

Alice: $(T, T^{[t]}, Z, Z^{[t]}, G, G^{[t]}, N)$	Bob: $(Y, Y^{[t]}, Z^{\mathcal{S}_i^1}, G, G^{[t]}, M)$	Analysis
$Z_s = \text{Prefix}(Z, s)$		$d(Z_s \tilde{B}) \leq \eta$
	$A^q = \text{Ext}_1(Y^q, Z_s^q)$ $C^q = \text{Ext}_1(Z^q, A^q)$	
$\overline{Z}^q = \text{Ext}_3(T^q, B^q)$	$B^q \leftarrow B^q$ $B^q = \text{Ext}_1(Y^q, C^q)$	$d(Z_s \tilde{B}) \leq \eta$
	$Z_s \rightarrow Z_s$ $A = \text{Ext}_1(Y, Z_s)$	$d(A \tilde{A}) \leq \mathcal{O}(\eta + \sqrt{\varepsilon'})$
	$Z_s^p \rightarrow Z_s^p$ $A^p = \text{Ext}_1(Y^p, Z_s^p)$	$d(A \tilde{A}) \leq \mathcal{O}(\eta + \sqrt{\varepsilon'})$
$\overline{Z}_s^q = \text{Prefix}(\overline{Z}^q, s)$	$\overline{Z}_s^q \rightarrow \overline{Z}_s^q$ $\overline{A}^q = \text{Ext}_1(Y^q, \overline{Z}_s^q)$	$d(A \tilde{A}) \leq \mathcal{O}(\eta + \sqrt{\varepsilon'})$
	$Z_s^r \rightarrow Z_s^r$ $A^r = \text{Ext}_1(Y^r, Z_s^r)$	$d(A \tilde{A}) \leq \mathcal{O}(\eta + \sqrt{\varepsilon'})$
$C = \text{Ext}_2(Z, A)$	$A \leftarrow A$	$d(C \tilde{B}) \leq \mathcal{O}(\eta + \sqrt{\varepsilon'})$
$C^p = \text{Ext}_2(Z^p, A^p)$	$A^p \leftarrow A^p$	$d(C \tilde{B}) \leq \mathcal{O}(\eta + \sqrt{\varepsilon'})$
$O^q = \text{Ext}_3(T^q, \overline{A}^q)$	$\overline{A}^q \leftarrow \overline{A}^q$	$d(C \tilde{B}) \leq \mathcal{O}(\eta + \sqrt{\varepsilon'})$
$\overline{Z}^r = \text{Ext}_3(T^r, A^r)$	$A^r \leftarrow A^r$	$d(C \tilde{B}) \leq \mathcal{O}(\eta + \sqrt{\varepsilon'})$
	$C \rightarrow C$ $B = \text{Ext}_1(Y, C)$	$d(B \tilde{A}) \leq \mathcal{O}(\eta + \sqrt{\varepsilon'})$
	$C^p \rightarrow C^p$ $B^p = \text{Ext}_1(Y^p, C^p)$	$d(B \tilde{A}) \leq \mathcal{O}(\eta + \sqrt{\varepsilon'})$
	$O^q \rightarrow O^q$	$d(B \tilde{A}) \leq \mathcal{O}(\eta + \sqrt{\varepsilon'})$
	$\overline{Z}^r \rightarrow \overline{Z}^r$ $\overline{A}^r = \text{Ext}_1(Y^r, \overline{Z}_s^r)$ $\overline{C}^r = \text{Ext}_1(\overline{Z}^r, \overline{A}^r)$ $\overline{B}^r = \text{Ext}_1(Y^r, \overline{C}^r)$	$d(B \tilde{A}) \leq \mathcal{O}(\eta + \sqrt{\varepsilon'})$
$\overline{Z} = \text{Ext}_3(T, B)$	$B \leftarrow B$	$d(\overline{Z}_s \tilde{B}) \leq \mathcal{O}(\eta + \sqrt{\varepsilon'})$
$\overline{Z}^p = \text{Ext}_3(T^p, B^p)$	$B^p \leftarrow B^p$	$d(\overline{Z}_s \tilde{B}) \leq \mathcal{O}(\eta + \sqrt{\varepsilon'})$
$O^r = \text{Ext}_3(T^r, \overline{B}^r)$	$\overline{B}^r \leftarrow \overline{B}^r$	$d(\overline{Z}_s \tilde{B}) \leq \mathcal{O}(\eta + \sqrt{\varepsilon'})$
	$\overline{Z}_s \rightarrow \overline{Z}_s$ $\overline{A} = \text{Ext}_1(Y, \overline{Z}_s)$	$d(\overline{A} \tilde{A}) \leq \mathcal{O}(\eta + \sqrt{\varepsilon'})$
	$\overline{Z}_s^p \rightarrow \overline{Z}_s^p$ $\overline{A}^p = \text{Ext}_1(Y^p, \overline{Z}_s^p)$	$d(\overline{A} \tilde{A}) \leq \mathcal{O}(\eta + \sqrt{\varepsilon'})$
	$O^r \rightarrow O^r$	$d(\overline{A} \tilde{A}) \leq \mathcal{O}(\eta + \sqrt{\varepsilon'})$
$O = \text{Ext}_3(T, \overline{A})$	$\overline{A} \leftarrow \overline{A}$	$d(O \tilde{B}) \leq \mathcal{O}(\eta + \sqrt{\varepsilon'})$
$O^p = \text{Ext}_3(T^p, \overline{A}^p)$	$\overline{A}^p \leftarrow \overline{A}^p$	$d(O \tilde{B}) \leq \mathcal{O}(\eta + \sqrt{\varepsilon'})$

Protocols for t -2nmExt

Protocol 12' is same as Protocol 12 except replacing extractors and parameters as in Section B.

Protocol 15 $(X, \hat{X}, X^{[t]}, \hat{X}^{[t]}, N, Y, \hat{Y}, Y^{[t]}, \hat{Y}^{[t]}, M)$.

Alice: $(X, \hat{X}, X^{[t]}, \hat{X}^{[t]}, N)$	Bob: $(Y, \hat{Y}, Y^{[t]}, \hat{Y}^{[t]}, M)$	Analysis
$X_1 = \text{Prefix}(X, 3k)$		$\mathbf{H}_{\min}(X_1 \tilde{B}) \geq 2k$
	$Y_1 = \text{Prefix}(Y, 3k)$	$\mathbf{H}_{\min}(Y_1 \tilde{A}) \geq 2k$
	$R = \text{IP}_1(X_1, Y_1)$	$d(R X X^{[t]}) \leq \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon/t)$
		$d(R Y Y^{[t]}) \leq \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon/t)$
$R = \text{IP}_1(X_1, Y_1)$	$Y_1 \leftarrow Y_1$	
$V = \text{ECC}(X)_{\text{Samp}(R)}$	$V \rightarrow V$	
	$W = \text{ECC}(Y)_{\text{Samp}(R)}$	
	$G = X_1 \circ Y_1 \circ V \circ W$	
$X_1^1 = \text{Prefix}(X^1, 3k)$	$Y_1^1 = \text{Prefix}(Y^1, 3k)$	
\vdots	\vdots	
$X_1^t = \text{Prefix}(X^t, 3k)$	$Y_1^t = \text{Prefix}(Y^t, 3k)$	
	$(X_1^1, \dots, X_1^t) \rightarrow (X_1^1, \dots, X_1^t)$	
	$R^1 = \text{IP}_1(X_1^1, Y_1^1)$	
	\vdots	
	$R^t = \text{IP}_1(X_1^t, Y_1^t)$	
	$(Y_1^1, \dots, Y_1^t) \leftarrow (Y_1^1, \dots, Y_1^t)$	
$R^1 = \text{IP}_1(X_1^1, Y_1^1)$		
\vdots		
$R^t = \text{IP}_1(X_1^t, Y_1^t)$		
$V^1 = \text{ECC}(X^1)_{\text{Samp}(R^1)}$	$W^1 = \text{ECC}(Y^1)_{\text{Samp}(R^1)}$	
\vdots	\vdots	
$V^t = \text{ECC}(X^t)_{\text{Samp}(R^t)}$	$W^t = \text{ECC}(Y^t)_{\text{Samp}(R^t)}$	
	$(V^1, \dots, V^t) \rightarrow (V^1, \dots, V^t)$	
	$G^1 = X_1^1 \circ Y_1^1 \circ V^1 \circ W^1$	
	\vdots	
	$G^t = X_1^t \circ Y_1^t \circ V^t \circ W^t$	
	$Y_2 = \text{Prefix}(Y, 3k^3)$	
$X_2 = \text{Prefix}(X, 3k^3)$		$d(Z_0 \tilde{B}) \leq \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon)$
$Z_0 = \text{IP}_2(X_2, Y_2)$	$Y_2 \leftarrow Y_2$	
$X_2^1 = \text{Prefix}(X^1, 3k^3)$	$Y_2^1 = \text{Prefix}(Y^1, 3k^3)$	
\vdots	\vdots	
$X_2^t = \text{Prefix}(X^t, 3k^3)$	$Y_2^t = \text{Prefix}(Y^t, 3k^3)$	
	$(Y_2^1, \dots, Y_2^t) \leftarrow (Y_2^1, \dots, Y_2^t)$	
$Z_0^1 = \text{IP}_2(X_2^1, Y_2^1)$		
\vdots		
$Z_0^t = \text{IP}_2(X_2^t, Y_2^t)$		
	$G \leftarrow G$	
	$(G^1, \dots, G^t) \leftarrow (G^1, \dots, G^t)$	
Alice: $(X, X^{[t]}, Z_0, Z_0^{[t]}, G, G^{[t]}, N)$	Bob: $(Y, Y^{[t]}, G, G^{[t]}, M)$	

Protocol 16 $(X, \hat{X}, X^{[t]}, \hat{X}^{[t]}, N, Y, \hat{Y}, Y^{[t]}, \hat{Y}^{[t]}, M)$.

Alice: $(X, \hat{X}, X^{[t]}, \hat{X}^{[t]}, N)$

Bob: $(Y, \hat{Y}, Y^{[t]}, \hat{Y}^{[t]}, M)$

Analysis

Protocol 15 $(X, X^{[t]}, N,$
 $Y, Y^{[t]}, M)$

$d(Z_0|\tilde{B}) \leq \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon)$

Alice: $(X, X^{[t]}, Z_0,$
 $Z_0^{[t]}, G, G^{[t]}, N)$

Bob: $(Y, Y^{[t]},$
 $G, G^{[t]}, M)$

Protocol 12' $(X, X^{[t]}, Z_0, Z_0^{[t]},$
 $G, G^{[t]}, N, Y, Y^{[t]}, G, G^{[t]}, M)$

Alice: $(X, X^{[t]}, Z, N)$

Bob: $(Y, Y^{[t]}, Z^{[t]}, M)$

$L^1 = \text{Ext}_6(X, S^1)$

$S^1 \leftarrow S^1$

$S^1 = \text{Ext}_4(Y^1, Z^1)$

$d(Z|\tilde{B}) \leq \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon)$

\vdots

\vdots

\vdots

\vdots

$L^t = \text{Ext}_6(X, S^t)$

$S^t \leftarrow S^t$

$S^t = \text{Ext}_4(Y^t, Z^t)$

$d(Z|\tilde{B}) \leq \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon)$

$Z \rightarrow Z$

$S = \text{Ext}_4(Y, Z)$

$d(S|\tilde{A}) \leq \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon)$

$L^1 \rightarrow L^1$

$d(S|\tilde{A}) \leq \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon)$

\vdots

\vdots

$L^t \rightarrow L^t$

$d(S|\tilde{A}) \leq \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon)$

$L = \text{Ext}_6(X, S)$

$S \leftarrow S$

$d(L|\tilde{B}) \leq \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon)$

Alice (L, N)

Bob $(L^{[t]}, Y, Y^{[t]}, M)$

D Privacy amplification against an active adversary

Preliminaries

We begin with some useful definitions, facts and claims. Let n, m, d, z be positive integers and $k, \varepsilon > 0$.

Definition 24. A function $\text{MAC} : \{0, 1\}^{2m} \times \{0, 1\}^m \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^m$ is an ε -secure one-time message authentication code if for all $\mathcal{A} : \{0, 1\}^m \times \{0, 1\}^m \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^m \times \{0, 1\}^m$ and $b' \in \{0, 1\}^m$,

$$\Pr_{s \leftarrow U_{2m}} [\text{P}(s, \mathcal{A}(b', \text{MAC}(s, b')), b') = 1] \leq \varepsilon,$$

where predicate $\text{P} : \{0, 1\}^{2m} \times \{0, 1\}^m \times \{0, 1\}^m \times \{0, 1\}^m \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ is defined as

$$\text{P}(s, b, t, b') \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (\text{MAC}(s, b) = t) \wedge (b' \neq b).$$

Efficient constructions of MAC satisfying the conditions of Definition 24 are known.

Fact 20 (Proposition 1 in [KR09]). For any integer $m > 0$, there exists an efficient family of 2^{-m} -secure one-time message authentication code $\text{MAC} : \{0, 1\}^{2m} \times \{0, 1\}^m \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^m$.

Definition 25. We say joint random variables ABC , form a Markov-chain, denoted $A \leftrightarrow B \leftrightarrow C$, iff

$$\forall b \in \text{supp}(B) : (AC|B = b) = (A|B = b) \otimes (C|B = b).$$

We have the following corollaries of Theorem 1.

Corollary 7. Let $d = \mathcal{O}(\log^7(\frac{n}{\varepsilon}))$ and $k \geq 5d$. Let $\sigma_{X\hat{X}NY\hat{Y}M}$ be a (k) -qpa-state with $|X| = n$ and $|Y| = d$. Let $\text{nmExt} : \{0, 1\}^n \times \{0, 1\}^d \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^{k/4}$ be an efficient (k, ε) -quantum secure non-malleable extractor from Theorem 1. Let $S = \text{nmExt}(X, Y)$. Then,

$$\|\sigma_{SYM} - U_{k/4} \otimes \sigma_{YM}\|_1 \leq \varepsilon.$$

Proof. Let $V : \mathcal{H}_Y \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_Y \otimes \mathcal{H}_{Y'} \otimes \mathcal{H}_{\hat{Y}'}$ be a (safe) isometry such that for $\rho = V\sigma V^\dagger$, we have Y' classical (with copy \hat{Y}') and $\Pr(Y \neq Y')_\rho = 1$.⁸ Notice the state ρ is a (k) -qnm-state. Since nmExt is a (k, ε) -quantum secure non-malleable extractor (see Definition 15), we have

$$\|\rho_{SS'YY'M} - U_{k/4} \otimes \rho_{S'YY'M}\|_1 \leq \varepsilon.$$

Using Fact 7, we get

$$\|\rho_{SYM} - U_{k/4} \otimes \rho_{YM}\|_1 \leq \varepsilon.$$

The desired now follows by noting $\sigma_{XNMY} = \rho_{XNMY}$. \square

Corollary 8 (nmExt is a quantum secure extractor). Let $\text{nmExt} : \{0, 1\}^n \times \{0, 1\}^d \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^{k/4}$ be an efficient (k, ε) -quantum secure non-malleable extractor from Theorem 1. nmExt is a (k, ε) -quantum secure $(n, d, k/4)$ -extractor for parameters $d = \mathcal{O}(\log^7(n/\varepsilon))$ and $k \geq 5d$.

⁸It is easily seen that such an isometry exists.

Proof. Let $\rho_{XEY} = \rho_{XE} \otimes U_d$ be a c-q state (XY classical) such that $H_{\min}(X|E)_\rho \geq k$. Consider the following purification $\rho_{X\hat{X}\hat{E}EY\hat{Y}}$ of ρ_{XEY} ,

$$\rho_{X\hat{X}\hat{E}EY\hat{Y}} = \rho_{X\hat{X}\hat{E}E} \otimes \rho_{Y\hat{Y}},$$

where $\rho_{X\hat{X}\hat{E}E}$ is a purification of ρ_{XEY} (\hat{X} a copy of X) and $\rho_{Y\hat{Y}}$ is the canonical purification of ρ_Y . Note ρ is a (k) -qpa-state. Let $S = \text{nmExt}(X, Y)$. Using Corollary 7 (by setting $\sigma_{X\hat{X}NY\hat{Y}M} \leftarrow \rho_{X\hat{X}\hat{E}EY\hat{Y}}$), we get

$$\|\rho_{SYE} - U_{k/4} \otimes \rho_{YE}\|_1 \leq \varepsilon. \quad \square$$

Claim 13. Let MAC be an ε -secure one-time message authentication code from Definition 24. Let $SB'T'$ be such that $SB' = U_{2m} \otimes U_m$ and $T' = \text{MAC}(S, B')$. Let BT be such that $S \leftrightarrow B'T' \leftrightarrow BT$ and $|B| = |T| = m$. Then,

$$\Pr [\mathbf{P}(S, B, T, B') = 1] \leq \varepsilon.$$

Proof. For each (b', t') , define $g_{(b't')} : \{0, 1\}^m \times \{0, 1\}^m \rightarrow [0, 1]$ as

$$g_{(b't)}(b, t) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathbb{E}_{s \leftarrow S^{b't'}} [\mathbf{P}(s, b, t, b') = 1].$$

Define, $\mathcal{A} : \{0, 1\}^m \times \{0, 1\}^m \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^m \times \{0, 1\}^m$ as

$$\mathcal{A}(b', t') \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \arg \max \{g_{(b't)}(b, t)\}. \quad ^9$$

Consider,

$$\begin{aligned} & \Pr [\mathbf{P}(S, B, T, B') = 1] \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{(b't') \leftarrow B'T'} \left[\mathbb{E}_{(bt) \leftarrow BT^{b't'}} \left[\mathbb{E}_{s \leftarrow S^{b't'}} [\mathbf{P}(s, b, t, b') = 1] \right] \right] \quad (\text{since } S \leftrightarrow B'T' \leftrightarrow BT) \\ &\leq \mathbb{E}_{(b't') \leftarrow B'T'} \left[\mathbb{E}_{s \leftarrow S^{b't'}} [\mathbf{P}(s, \mathcal{A}(b', t'), b') = 1] \right] \quad (\text{Definition of } \mathcal{A}) \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{(sb') \leftarrow SB'} [\mathbf{P}(s, \mathcal{A}(b', \text{MAC}(s, b')), b') = 1] \quad (\text{Definition of } T') \\ &\leq \varepsilon. \quad (\text{Definition 24}) \quad \square \end{aligned}$$

Claim 14. Let MAC be an ε -secure one-time message authentication code from Definition 24. Let $\rho_{SB'T'E'}$ be a c-q state ($SB'T'$ classical) such that

$$\rho_{SB'T'E'} = \rho_{SB'T'} \otimes \rho_{E'} \quad ; \quad \rho_{SB'} = U_{2m} \otimes U_m \quad ; \quad T' = \text{MAC}(S, B').$$

Let classical registers BT be generated by a quantum adversary using (safe on classical registers) isometry $V : \mathcal{H}_{E'} \otimes \mathcal{H}_{B'} \otimes \mathcal{H}_{T'} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_{E''} \otimes \mathcal{H}_{B'} \otimes \mathcal{H}_{T'} \otimes \mathcal{H}_B \otimes \mathcal{H}_T$ ¹⁰. Let $\sigma_{SB'T'BE''} = V \rho_{SB'T'E'} V^\dagger$. Then,

$$\Pr [\mathbf{P}(S, B, T, B') = 1]_\sigma \leq \varepsilon.$$

Proof. Note in state ρ , for every $b't' \in \text{supp}(B'T')$, we have $\rho_{SE'}^{b't'} = \rho_S^{b't'} \otimes \rho_{E'}$. Since V is safe on registers $B'T'$, we have

$$\sigma_{SE''BT}^{b't'} = \sigma_S^{b't'} \otimes \sigma_{E''BT}^{b't'},$$

where $\sigma_S^{b't'} = \rho_S^{b't'}$. Using Fact 7, we get $\sigma_{SBT}^{b't'} = \sigma_S^{b't'} \otimes \sigma_{BT}^{b't'}$. Using Definition 25 we have (in state σ), $S \leftrightarrow B'T' \leftrightarrow BT$. Using Claim 13 (for state $\sigma_{SB'T'BT}$) while noting $\sigma_{SB'T'} = \rho_{SB'T'}$, we get the desired. \square

⁹If there are more than one achieving maximum, pick one of them arbitrarily.

¹⁰We included the copies of classical registers B, T in register E'' .

Claim 15. Let MAC be an ε -secure one-time message authentication code from Definition 24. Let $STBB'$ be random variables such that, $STBB' = U_{2m} \otimes TBB'$ and $B' = U_m$. Then,

$$\Pr[\mathbf{P}(S, B, T, B') = 1] \leq \varepsilon.$$

Proof. Note that $S \leftrightarrow B' \leftrightarrow BT$. This implies $S \leftrightarrow B'T' \leftrightarrow BT$, where $T' = \text{MAC}(S, B')$. Using Claim 13, the desired follows. \square

We start with the definition of a quantum secure privacy amplification (PA) protocol against active adversaries. The following description is from [ACLV19]. A PA protocol (P_A, P_B) is defined as follows. The protocol is executed by two parties (Alice and Bob) sharing a secret $X \in \{0, 1\}^n$. Their actions are described by P_A and P_B respectively. In addition there is an active, computationally unbounded adversary Eve, who might have some quantum side information E correlated with X , where ρ denotes the initial state of the protocol. Note that, for the definition, it is not necessary to specify exactly how the protocols are formulated; informally, each player's action is described by a sequence of efficient algorithms that compute the player's next message, given the past interaction.

The protocol should have the following property: in case protocol does not terminate with a rejection, output keys R_A, R_B should be random and statistically independent of Eve's view. Moreover, they must output the same keys $R_A = R_B$ with overwhelming probability. We assume that Eve is in full control of the communication channel between Alice and Bob, and can arbitrarily insert, delete, reorder or modify messages sent by Alice and Bob. At the end of protocol, Alice outputs $R_A \in \{0, 1\}^z \cup \{\perp\}$, where \perp is a special symbol indicating rejection. Similarly, Bob outputs $R_B \in \{0, 1\}^z \cup \{\perp\}$. For a random variable $R \in \{0, 1\}^z \cup \{\perp\}$, let $\text{purify}(R)$ be a random variable on z -bit strings that is deterministically equal to \perp if $R = \perp$, and is otherwise uniformly distributed over $\{0, 1\}^z$. The following definition generalizes the classical definition in [DLWZ14].

Definition 26 ([ACLV19]). Let Θ be the joint state of Alice, Bob and Eve at the end of the protocol given by (P_A, P_B) including $\text{purify}(R_A)$ and $\text{purify}(R_B)$. We say that a PA protocol (P_A, P_B) is (k, z, ε) -secure against quantum adversaries if for any initial state ρ_{XE} such that $H_{\min}(X|E)_\rho \geq k$ it satisfies the following three properties.

1. Correctness. If the adversary does not interfere with the protocol, then $\Pr(R_A = R_B \neq \perp)_\Theta = 1$.
2. Robustness. In the presence of an active adversary, $\Pr(Q(R_A, R_B) = 1)_\Theta \leq \varepsilon$, where $Q(R_A, R_B)$ is the predicate $(R_A \neq R_B \wedge R_A \neq \perp \wedge R_B \neq \perp)$.
3. Extraction. Let $\Theta_{\tilde{E}}$ be the final quantum state possessed by Eve (including the transcript of the protocol). The following should hold:

$$\|\Theta_{R_A \tilde{E}} - \Theta_{\text{purify}(R_A) \tilde{E}}\|_1 \leq \varepsilon \quad \text{and} \quad \|\Theta_{R_B \tilde{E}} - \Theta_{\text{purify}(R_B) \tilde{E}}\|_1 \leq \varepsilon.$$

In other words, whenever a party does not reject, the party's key is (approximately) indistinguishable from a fresh random string to the adversary.

PA Protocol

Let $\delta > 0$ be a small constant.

- Let $\text{nmExt} : \{0, 1\}^n \times \{0, 1\}^d \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^{2m}$ be a (k, ε) -quantum secure $(n, d, 2m)$ -non-malleable extractor from Theorem 1 with following choice of parameters,

$$d = \mathcal{O}\left(\log^7\left(\frac{n}{\varepsilon}\right)\right) \quad ; \quad k \geq 5d \quad ; \quad k \geq 8m.$$

- Let $\text{MAC} : \{0, 1\}^{2m} \times \{0, 1\}^m \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^m$ be an 2^{-m} -secure one-time message authentication code from Fact 20 for $m = \mathcal{O}\left(\log^3\left(\frac{n}{\varepsilon}\right)\right)$. Note $2^{-m} \leq \varepsilon$.
- Let $\text{Ext} : \{0, 1\}^n \times \{0, 1\}^m \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^z$ be a $(2z, \varepsilon)$ -quantum secure strong extractor from Fact 17. Taking $2z = (1 - 2\delta)k$ suffices for the PA application.

Protocol 17 PA protocol.

Alice: X	Eve: E	Bob: X
Generate $Y \leftarrow U_d$		
$S = \text{nmExt}(X, Y)$	$Y \xrightarrow{\mathbb{T}_1} Y'$	$S' = \text{nmExt}(X, Y')$
		Generate $B' \leftarrow U_m$
		$R_B = \text{Ext}(X, B')$
		$T' = \text{MAC}(S', B')$
	$B, T \xleftarrow{\mathbb{T}_2} B', T'$	
If $T \neq \text{MAC}(S, B)$: reject ($R_A = \perp$)		
Otherwise:		
$R_A = \text{Ext}(X, B)$		

Remark 4. In Protocol 17, registers Y, B' are generated uniformly and independently of the state of the protocol at that point.

Definition 27 (Active attack). An active attack against PA protocol is described by 3 parameters.

- A c -q state ρ_{XE} (of adversary choice) such that $\mathbb{H}_{\min}(X|E)_\rho \geq k$.
- A CPTP map $\mathbb{T}_1 : \mathcal{H}_E \otimes \mathcal{H}_Y \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_{E'} \otimes \mathcal{H}_Y \otimes \mathcal{H}_{Y'}$.
- A CPTP map $\mathbb{T}_2 : \mathcal{H}_{E'} \otimes \mathcal{H}_{B'} \otimes \mathcal{H}_{T'} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_{E''} \otimes \mathcal{H}_{B'} \otimes \mathcal{H}_{T'} \otimes \mathcal{H}_B \otimes \mathcal{H}_T$.

Result

Theorem 10. For any active attack $(\rho_{XE}, \mathbb{T}_1, \mathbb{T}_2)$, Protocol 17 is $(k, (\frac{1}{2} - \delta)k, \mathcal{O}(\sqrt{\varepsilon}))$ -secure as defined in Definition 26 with communication $\mathcal{O}(d)$.

Proof. For the purpose of this proof, without any loss of generality, we can consider T_1 and T_2 to be isometries because tracing out registers after applying an isometry (which amounts to applying a CPTP map) will only weaken the adversary holding the side information. We can assume isometries to be safe and registers $(YY'B'T'BT)$ to be classical, since both Alice and Bob when executing the protocol, keep a copy of the registers they send and also make a copy of the registers they receive¹¹. We keep the transcript of the protocol in adversary side information at different stages of the protocol.

Correctness of the protocol follows by observation. Let the adversary choose state ρ_{XE} . Let $\rho_{X\hat{X}E\hat{E}Y\hat{Y}} = \rho_{X\hat{X}E\hat{E}} \otimes \rho_{Y\hat{Y}}$ be a pure state such that,

$$\rho_{X\hat{X}E\hat{E}Y\hat{Y}} = \rho_{X\hat{X}E\hat{E}} \otimes \rho_{Y\hat{Y}} \quad ; \quad H_{\min}(X|E)_\rho \geq k \quad ; \quad \rho_Y = U_d,$$

where registers XY are classical with copies $\hat{X}\hat{Y}$. Note in Protocol 17, register X (is held by both Alice and Bob), register E is the quantum side information with Eve, register Y is generated by Alice in the first step and \hat{E} is the purification inaccessible to any of Alice, Bob or Eve throughout the protocol.

Let $\sigma = T_1(\rho)$. Note σ is (k) -qpa-state since $H_{\min}(X|E'YY'\hat{Y})_\sigma \geq k$ and $\sigma_Y = U_{|Y|}$. Using Corollary 7, we get

$$\|\sigma_{SY'Y'E'} - U_{2m} \otimes \sigma_{YY'E'}\|_1 \leq \varepsilon. \quad (32)$$

Let τ be a pure state after Alice generates S (with copy \hat{S}), Bob generates classical registers $S'B'R_B T'$ (with copies $\hat{S}'\hat{B}'\hat{R}_B\hat{T}'$). Note,

$$\tau_{XSS'YY'E'B'} = \sigma_{XSS'YY'E'} \otimes U_m. \quad (33)$$

Let Θ be the final pure state at the end of protocol including $\text{purify}(R_A)\text{purify}(R_B)$ along with their copies $\hat{\text{purify}}(R_A)\hat{\text{purify}}(R_B)$.

Robustness property: We now show the robustness property of Protocol 17. Let $p = \Pr(Y' \neq Y)_\sigma$. Based on the value of p , we divide our analysis into three parts.

Case 1 ($p = 0$): In this case we have $\Pr(S = S')_\tau = 1$. From Eq. (32) and (33) we have

$$\|\tau_{SB'YY'E'} - U_{2m} \otimes U_m \otimes \sigma_{YY'E'}\|_1 \leq \varepsilon.$$

Let $\hat{\tau}_{SB'YY'E'} = U_{2m} \otimes U_m \otimes \sigma_{YY'E'}$. Using Fact 7, we get

$$\|\tau_{SB'T'YY'E'} - \hat{\tau}_{SB'T'} \otimes \hat{\tau}_{YY'E'}\|_1 \leq \varepsilon. \quad (34)$$

Let $\hat{\Theta}$ be the final state if protocol is run on $\hat{\tau}$ instead of τ . Using Fact 7, we get

$$\|\Theta_{SBT'B'T'YY'E''} - \hat{\Theta}_{SBT'B'T'YY'E''}\|_1 \leq \varepsilon.$$

Using Fact 7 again, we get

$$\|\Theta_{SBB'T'} - \hat{\Theta}_{SBB'T'}\|_1 \leq \varepsilon. \quad (35)$$

¹¹We do not mention it in the protocol or in the analysis, instead we assume and proceed for simplifying the analysis.

From Claim 14, with the following assignment of registers and isometry,

$$(\rho_{SB'T'}, \rho_{E'}) \leftarrow (\hat{\tau}_{SB'T'}, \hat{\tau}_{YY'E'}), \quad V \leftarrow \mathbb{T}_2,$$

we get

$$\Pr(\mathsf{P}(S, B, T, B') = 1)_{\hat{\Theta}} \leq \varepsilon.$$

Using Eq. (35) and Fact 11 we get,

$$\Pr(\mathsf{P}(S, B, T, B') = 1)_{\Theta} \leq 2\varepsilon.$$

Noting,

$$\Pr(Q(R_A, R_B) = 1)_{\Theta} \leq \Pr(\mathsf{P}(S, B, T, B') = 1)_{\Theta}$$

we get

$$\Pr(Q(R_A, R_B) = 1)_{\Theta} \leq 2\varepsilon. \tag{36}$$

This establishes the robustness property in Case 1.

Case 2 ($p = 1$): In this case, σ is a (k) -qnm-state. Since nmExt is (k, ε) -quantum secure non-malleable extractor (Definition 15), we get

$$\|\sigma_{SS'YY'E'} - U_{2m} \otimes \sigma_{S'YY'E'}\|_1 \leq \varepsilon.$$

Since $\tau_{SS'YY'E'B'} = \sigma_{SS'YY'E'} \otimes U_m$, we have

$$\|\tau_{SB'S'YY'E'} - U_{2m} \otimes U_m \otimes \sigma_{S'YY'E'}\|_1 \leq \varepsilon.$$

Let $\hat{\tau}_{SB'S'YY'E'} = U_{2m} \otimes U_m \otimes \sigma_{S'YY'E'}$. Using Fact 7, we get

$$\|\tau_{SB'T'S'YY'E'} - U_{2m} \otimes \hat{\tau}_{B'T'S'YY'E'}\|_1 \leq \varepsilon.$$

Also note $\hat{\tau}_{B'} = U_m$. Let $\hat{\Theta}$ be the final state if protocol is run on $\hat{\tau}$ instead of τ . Using Fact 7, we get

$$\|\Theta_{SB'T'BTS'YY'E''} - U_{2m} \otimes \hat{\Theta}_{B'T'BTS'YY'E''}\|_1 \leq \varepsilon.$$

Using Fact 7 again, we get

$$\|\Theta_{SB'BT} - U_{2m} \otimes \hat{\Theta}_{B'BT}\|_1 \leq \varepsilon. \tag{37}$$

Since \mathbb{T}_2 is safe on register B' , we also have $\hat{\Theta}_{B'} = U_m$. From Claim 15, with the following assignment of registers (below the registers on the left are from Claim 15 and the registers on the right are the registers in this proof)

$$(SB'TB) \leftarrow (\hat{\Theta}_{SB'TB}),$$

we get

$$\Pr(\mathsf{P}(S, B, T, B') = 1)_{\hat{\Theta}} \leq \varepsilon.$$

Using Eq. (37) and Fact 11 we get,

$$\Pr(\mathsf{P}(S, B, T, B') = 1)_{\Theta} \leq 2\varepsilon.$$

Noting,

$$\Pr(Q(R_A, R_B) = 1)_\Theta \leq \Pr(\mathbf{P}(S, B, T, B') = 1)_\Theta$$

we get

$$\Pr(Q(R_A, R_B) = 1)_\Theta \leq 2\varepsilon. \quad (38)$$

This establishes the robustness property in Case 2.

Case 3: $0 < p < 1$. In the analysis, we consider a pure state $\tilde{\sigma}$ which is generated from ρ , in the following way:

- Generate $\sigma = \mathsf{T}_1(\rho)$.
- Generate one bit classical register C (with copy \hat{C}) such that $C = 1$ indicates $Y \neq Y'$ in state σ .
- Conditioned on $C = 0$, generate classical register Y'' (with copy \hat{Y}'') such that $Y'' \neq Y$.
- Conditioned on $C = 1$, generate classical register Y'' (with copy \hat{Y}'') such that $Y'' = Y'$.

Note $\Pr(Y \neq Y'')_{\tilde{\sigma}} = 1$ and $\tilde{\sigma}$ is a (k) -qnm-state (by Fact 3). Since nmExt is (k, ε) -quantum secure non-malleable extractor (Definition 15), we get

$$\|\tilde{\sigma}_{SS'YY'Y''CE'} - U_{2m} \otimes \tilde{\sigma}_{S'YY'Y''CE'}\|_1 \leq \varepsilon, \quad (39)$$

where $S = \text{nmExt}(X, Y)$ and $S' = \text{nmExt}(X, Y')$. Note by construction of state $\tilde{\sigma}$, we have $\Pr(C = 1)_{\tilde{\sigma}} = p$. Let $\tilde{\sigma}^1 = \tilde{\sigma}|(C = 1)$ and $\sigma^1 = \sigma|Y \neq Y'$. Thus, from Eq. (39) and Fact 5, we get

$$\Pr(C = 1)_{\tilde{\sigma}} \|\tilde{\sigma}_{SS'YY'Y''E'}^1 - U_{2m} \otimes \tilde{\sigma}_{S'YY'Y''E'}^1\|_1 \leq \varepsilon, \quad (40)$$

where $S = \text{nmExt}(X, Y)$, $S' = \text{nmExt}(X, Y')$ and Y'' is a copy of Y' in $\tilde{\sigma}^1$. Noting $\Pr(C = 1)_{\tilde{\sigma}} = p$ and $\tilde{\sigma}_{XY'Y''E'}^1$ is the same state as $\sigma_{XY'Y''E'}^1$ (with additional copy of Y' in Y''), from Eq. (40) and using Fact 7, we further get

$$\|\sigma_{SS'YY'E'}^1 - U_{2m} \otimes \sigma_{S'YY'E'}^1\|_1 \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{p}. \quad (41)$$

We further consider a pure state $\hat{\sigma}$ which is generated from ρ , in the following way:

- Generate $\sigma = \mathsf{T}_1(\rho)$.
- Generate one bit classical register C (with copy \hat{C}) such that $C = 1$ indicates $Y \neq Y'$ in state σ .

Note by construction of state $\hat{\sigma}$, we have $\Pr(C = 0)_{\hat{\sigma}} = 1 - p$ and $\hat{\sigma}$ is a (k) -qpa-state (by Fact 3). Let $\hat{\sigma}^0 = \hat{\sigma}|(C = 0)$ and $\sigma^0 = \sigma|Y = Y'$. Using Corollary 7, we get

$$\|\hat{\sigma}_{SY'CE'} - U_{2m} \otimes \hat{\sigma}_{Y'CE'}\|_1 \leq \varepsilon.$$

Using Fact 5, we get

$$\|\hat{\sigma}_{SY'E'}^0 - U_{2m} \otimes \hat{\sigma}_{Y'E'}^0\|_1 \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{1-p}.$$

Noting $\hat{\sigma}_{XY'Y'E'}^0$ is the same state as $\sigma_{XY'Y'E'}^0$, we get

$$\|\sigma_{SY'Y'E'}^0 - U_{2m} \otimes \sigma_{YY'E'}^0\|_1 \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{1-p}. \quad (42)$$

Note,

$$\sigma_{SS'YY'E'} = (1-p) \cdot \sigma_{SS'YY'E'}^0 + p \cdot \sigma_{SS'YY'E'}^1. \quad (43)$$

Let Θ^0 and Θ^1 be the final states if we proceed PA protocol with states σ^0 and σ^1 after the first round. Using using Eq. (42) and arguments similar to case 1, we get

$$\Pr(Q(R_A, R_B) = 1)_{\Theta^0} \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{1-p} + \varepsilon. \quad (44)$$

Similarly, using Eq. (41) and similar arguments of case 2, we get

$$\Pr(Q(R_A, R_B) = 1)_{\Theta^1} \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{p} + \varepsilon. \quad (45)$$

Thus, from Eq. (43), (44) and (45), we have

$$\Pr(Q(R_A, R_B) = 1)_{\Theta} \leq (1-p) \left(\frac{\varepsilon}{1-p} + \varepsilon \right) + p \left(\frac{\varepsilon}{p} + \varepsilon \right) = 3\varepsilon, \quad (46)$$

i.e. the robustness property in Case 3.

Extraction property: We now show the extraction property of PA protocol. From Eq. (33), we have $\tau_{XE'YY'SS'B'} = \sigma_{XE'YY'SS'} \otimes U_m$. Consider,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{H}_{\min}(X|E'YY'SS')_{\tau} &= \mathbb{H}_{\min}(X|E'YY'SS')_{\sigma} \\ &\geq \mathbb{H}_{\min}(X|E'YY')_{\sigma} - |SS'| && \text{(Fact 4)} \\ &\geq \mathbb{H}_{\min}(X|E)_{\rho} - |SS'| && \text{(Fact 3 and } \rho_{XEY} = \rho_{XE} \otimes U_d) \\ &\geq k - 2m \\ &\geq (1 - 2\delta)k. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, noting $2z = (1 - 2\delta)k$ and Ext is a quantum secure extractor (see Definition 11), we get

$$\|\tau_{R_B E'YY'SS'B'} - U_z \otimes \tau_{E'YY'SS'B'}\|_1 \leq \varepsilon.$$

Using Fact 7, we get

$$\|\tau_{R_B E'YY'T'SS'B'} - U_z \otimes \tau_{E'YY'T'SS'B'}\|_1 \leq \varepsilon,$$

and further,

$$\|\Theta_{R_B \tilde{E}SS'} - U_z \otimes \Theta_{\tilde{E}SS'}\|_1 \leq \varepsilon, \quad (47)$$

where \tilde{E} denotes the registers held by Eve and transcript of the protocol. Using Fact 7 again, we have

$$\|\Theta_{R_B \tilde{E}} - U_z \otimes \Theta_{\tilde{E}}\|_1 \leq \varepsilon, \quad (48)$$

the extraction property for Bob. From the robustness property of the protocol, i.e. Eq. (36), (38) and (46), we have

$$\Pr(Q(R_A, R_B) = 1)_{\Theta} \leq \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon).$$

Thus, $\Pr((R_A = R_B) \vee (R_A = \perp))_{\Theta} \geq 1 - \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon)$. Using Fact 12 and Fact 6,

$$\|\Theta - \tilde{\Theta}\|_1 \leq \mathcal{O}(\sqrt{\varepsilon}), \text{ where } \tilde{\Theta} = \Theta | ((R_A = R_B) \vee (R_A = \perp)). \quad (49)$$

Let C be the predicate to indicate $(\text{MAC}(S, B) = T)$. Let $\tilde{\Theta}^{\perp} = \tilde{\Theta} | (C = 0)$ and $\tilde{\Theta}^{\neq \perp} = \tilde{\Theta} | (C = 1)$. Note $\Pr(R_A = R_B)_{\tilde{\Theta}^{\neq \perp}} = 1$. Consider,

$$\begin{aligned} & \|\tilde{\Theta}_{R_A \tilde{E}} - \tilde{\Theta}_{\text{purify}(R_A) \tilde{E}}\|_1 \\ & \leq \|\tilde{\Theta}_{R_A \tilde{E} S S'} - \tilde{\Theta}_{\text{purify}(R_A) \tilde{E} S S'}\|_1 && \text{(Fact 7)} \\ & = (\Pr(C = 1)_{\tilde{\Theta}}) \|\tilde{\Theta}_{R_A \tilde{E} S S'}^{\neq \perp} - U_z \otimes \tilde{\Theta}_{\tilde{E} S S'}^{\neq \perp}\|_1 \\ & = (\Pr(C = 1)_{\tilde{\Theta}}) \|\tilde{\Theta}_{R_B \tilde{E} S S'}^{\neq \perp} - U_z \otimes \tilde{\Theta}_{\tilde{E} S S'}^{\neq \perp}\|_1 && (\Pr(R_A = R_B)_{\tilde{\Theta}^{\neq \perp}} = 1) \\ & \leq \|\tilde{\Theta}_{R_B \tilde{E} C S S'} - U_z \otimes \tilde{\Theta}_{\tilde{E} C S S'}\|_1 && \text{(Fact 5)} \\ & = \|\tilde{\Theta}_{R_B \tilde{E} S S'} - U_z \otimes \tilde{\Theta}_{\tilde{E} S S'}\|_1 && (C \text{ can be generated from } \tilde{E} S S') \\ & \leq \mathcal{O}(\sqrt{\varepsilon}). && \text{(Claim 1 and Eq. (47))} \end{aligned} \quad (50)$$

$$\begin{aligned} & \|\Theta_{R_A \tilde{E}} - \Theta_{\text{purify}(R_A) \tilde{E}}\|_1 \\ & \leq \|\Theta_{R_A \tilde{E}} - \tilde{\Theta}_{R_A \tilde{E}}\|_1 + \|\tilde{\Theta}_{R_A \tilde{E}} - \Theta_{\text{purify}(R_A) \tilde{E}}\|_1 && \text{(Triangle inequality)} \end{aligned} \quad (51)$$

$$\begin{aligned} & \leq \mathcal{O}(\sqrt{\varepsilon}) + \|\tilde{\Theta}_{R_A \tilde{E}} - \Theta_{\text{purify}(R_A) \tilde{E}}\|_1 && \text{(Eq. (49))} \\ & \leq \mathcal{O}(\sqrt{\varepsilon}) + \|\tilde{\Theta}_{R_A \tilde{E}} - \tilde{\Theta}_{\text{purify}(R_A) \tilde{E}}\|_1 + \|\tilde{\Theta}_{\text{purify}(R_A) \tilde{E}} - \Theta_{\text{purify}(R_A) \tilde{E}}\|_1 && \text{(Triangle inequality)} \\ & \leq \mathcal{O}(\sqrt{\varepsilon}) && \text{(Eq.(50) and Eq.(49)).} \end{aligned} \quad (52)$$

By our choice of parameters, using Eq. (36), (38), (46), (48) and (52), the theorem follows. \square

Corollary 9. *For any active attack (ρ_{XE}, T_1, T_2) , Protocol 17 is $\left(k, \left(\frac{1}{2} - \delta\right)k, \mathcal{O}(2^{-n^\delta/2})\right)$ -secure as defined in Definition 26 with communication $\mathcal{O}(n^{7\delta})$ as long as $k \geq \Omega(n^{7\delta})$.*

Proof. Choosing $\varepsilon = 2^{-n^\delta}$, the corollary follows from Theorem 10. \square

Corollary 10. *For any active attack (ρ_{XE}, T_1, T_2) , Protocol 17 is $\left(k, \left(\frac{1}{2} - \delta\right)k, \frac{1}{\text{poly}(n)}\right)$ -secure as defined in Definition 26 with communication $\mathcal{O}(\log^7(n))$ as long as $k \geq \Omega(\log^7(n))$.*

Proof. Choosing $\varepsilon = \frac{1}{\text{poly}(n)}$, the corollary follows from Theorem 10. \square

References

- [ABJ24] Divesh Aggarwal, Naresh Goud Boddu, and Rahul Jain. Quantum secure non-malleable codes in the split-state model. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 70(1):349–371, 2024.
- [ABJO24] Divesh Aggarwal, Naresh Goud Boddu, Rahul Jain, and Maciej Obremski. Quantum measurement adversary. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 70(1):318–335, 2024.
- [ACLV19] Divesh Aggarwal, Kai-Min Chung, Han-Hsuan Lin, and Thomas Vidick. A quantum-proof non-malleable extractor. In Yuval Ishai and Vincent Rijmen, editors, *Advances in Cryptology – EUROCRYPT 2019*, pages 442–469, Cham, 2019. Springer International Publishing.
- [ADN⁺19] Divesh Aggarwal, Ivan Damgård, Jesper Buus Nielsen, Maciej Obremski, Erick Purwanto, João Ribeiro, and Mark Simkin. Stronger leakage-resilient and non-malleable secret sharing schemes for general access structures. In Alexandra Boldyreva and Daniele Micciancio, editors, *Advances in Cryptology – CRYPTO 2019*, pages 510–539, Cham, 2019. Springer International Publishing.
- [AFPS16] Rotem Arnon-Friedman, Christopher Portmann, and Volkher B. Scholz. Quantum-Proof Multi-Source Randomness Extractors in the Markov Model. In Anne Broadbent, editor, *11th Conference on the Theory of Quantum Computation, Communication and Cryptography (TQC 2016)*, volume 61 of *Leibniz International Proceedings in Informatics (LIPIcs)*, pages 2:1–2:34, Dagstuhl, Germany, 2016. Schloss Dagstuhl–Leibniz-Zentrum fuer Informatik.
- [AHJ⁺21] Anurag Anshu, Shima Bab Hadiashar, Rahul Jain, Ashwin Nayak, and Dave Touchette. One-shot quantum state redistribution and quantum markov chains. In *2021 IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory (ISIT)*, pages 130–135, 2021.
- [BBJ23] Rishabh Batra, Naresh Goud Boddu, and Rahul Jain. Quantum secure non-malleable randomness encoder and its applications, 2023. Contributed talk at QCrypt 2023. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2308.07340>.
- [BF11] Niek J. Bouman and Serge Fehr. Secure authentication from a weak key, without leaking information. Cryptology ePrint Archive, Report 2011/034, 2011. <https://ia.cr/2011/034>.
- [BGJR23] Naresh Goud Boddu, Vipul Goyal, Rahul Jain, and Joao Ribeiro. Split-state non-malleable codes for quantum messages, 2023. Contributed talk at QCrypt 2023 and Accepted for publication at 22nd Theory of Cryptography Conference 2024. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2308.06466>.
- [Bou05] J. Bourgain. More on the sum-product phenomenon in prime fields and its applications. *International Journal of Number Theory*, 01:1–32, 2005.

- [CG85] B. Chor and O. Goldreich. Unbiased bits from sources of weak randomness and probabilistic communication complexity. In *26th Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (sfcs 1985)*, pages 429–442, 1985.
- [CG16] Mahdi Cheraghchi and Venkatesan Guruswami. Capacity of non-malleable codes. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 62(3):1097–1118, 2016.
- [CGL20] Eshan Chattopadhyay, Vipul Goyal, and Xin Li. Nonmalleable extractors and codes, with their many tampered extensions. *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 49(5):999–1040, 2020.
- [CLW14] Kai-Min Chung, Xin Li, and Xiaodi Wu. Multi-source randomness extractors against quantum side information, and their applications. *CoRR*, abs/1411.2315, 2014. <http://arxiv.org/abs/1411.2315>.
- [Coh15] Gil Cohen. Local correlation breakers and applications to three-source extractors and mergers. In *2015 IEEE 56th Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science*, pages 845–862, 2015.
- [Coh16] Gil Cohen. Non-Malleable Extractors - New Tools and Improved Constructions. In Ran Raz, editor, *31st Conference on Computational Complexity (CCC 2016)*, volume 50 of *Leibniz International Proceedings in Informatics (LIPIcs)*, pages 8:1–8:29, Dagstuhl, Germany, 2016. Schloss Dagstuhl–Leibniz-Zentrum fuer Informatik.
- [CV17] Gil Cohen and Thomas Vidick. Privacy amplification against active quantum adversaries. <http://arxiv.org/abs/1608.06318>, 2017.
- [CZ19] Eshan Chattopadhyay and David Zuckerman. Explicit two-source extractors and resilient functions. *Annals of Mathematics*, 189(3):653–705, 2019.
- [Dat09] Nilanjana Datta. Min- and max- relative entropies and a new entanglement monotone. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 55:2816–2826, 2009.
- [DLWZ14] Yevgeniy Dodis, Xin Li, Trevor D. Wooley, and David Zuckerman. Privacy amplification and nonmalleable extractors via character sums. *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 43(2):800–830, 2014.
- [DP07] Stefan Dziembowski and Krzysztof Pietrzak. Intrusion-resilient secret sharing. In *48th Annual IEEE Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS'07)*, pages 227–237, 2007.
- [DPVR12] Anindya De, Christopher Portmann, Thomas Vidick, and Renato Renner. Trevisan’s extractor in the presence of quantum side information. *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 41(4):915–940, 2012.
- [DPW18] Stefan Dziembowski, Krzysztof Pietrzak, and Daniel Wichs. Non-malleable codes. *J. ACM*, 65(4), April 2018.
- [DW08] Zeev Dvir and Avi Wigderson. Kakeya sets, new mergers and old extractors. In *2008 49th Annual IEEE Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science*, pages 625–633, 2008.

- [DW09] Yevgeniy Dodis and Daniel Wichs. Non-malleable extractors and symmetric key cryptography from weak secrets. New York, NY, USA, 2009. Association for Computing Machinery.
- [FvdG06] C. A. Fuchs and J. van de Graaf. Cryptographic distinguishability measures for quantum-mechanical states. *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theor.*, 45(4):1216–1227, September 2006.
- [GK18a] Vipul Goyal and Ashutosh Kumar. Non-malleable secret sharing. In *Proceedings of the 50th Annual ACM SIGACT Symposium on Theory of Computing*, STOC 2018, page 685–698, New York, NY, USA, 2018. Association for Computing Machinery.
- [GK18b] Vipul Goyal and Ashutosh Kumar. Non-malleable secret sharing for general access structures. In *Advances in Cryptology – CRYPTO 2018: 38th Annual International Cryptology Conference, Santa Barbara, CA, USA, August 19–23, 2018, Proceedings, Part I*, page 501–530, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2018. Springer-Verlag.
- [GKK⁺07] Dmitry Gavinsky, Julia Kempe, Iordanis Kerenidis, Ran Raz, and Ronald de Wolf. Exponential separations for one-way quantum communication complexity, with applications to cryptography. *Proceedings of the thirty-ninth annual ACM symposium on Theory of computing - STOC '07*, 2007.
- [GPR16] Vipul Goyal, Omkant Pandey, and Silas Richelson. Textbook non-malleable commitments. In *Proceedings of the Forty-Eighth Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing*, STOC '16, page 1128–1141, New York, NY, USA, 2016. Association for Computing Machinery.
- [GS95] Arnaldo Garcia and Henning Stichtenoth. A tower of artin-schreier extensions of function fields attaining the drinfeld-vladut bound. *Inventiones mathematicae*, 121(1):211–222, 1995.
- [GUV09] Venkatesan Guruswami, Christopher Umans, and Salil Vadhan. Unbalanced expanders and randomness extractors from parvaresh–vardy codes. *J. ACM*, 56(4), July 2009.
- [HJPW04] Patrick Hayden, Richard Jozsa, Dénes Petz, and Andreas Winter. Structure of States Which Satisfy Strong Subadditivity of Quantum Entropy with Equality. *Communications in Mathematical Physics*, 246(2):359–374, 2004.
- [ILL89] R. Impagliazzo, L. A. Levin, and M. Luby. Pseudo-random generation from one-way functions. In *Proceedings of the Twenty-First Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing*, STOC '89, page 12–24, New York, NY, USA, 1989. Association for Computing Machinery.
- [JK22] Rahul Jain and Srijita Kundu. A direct product theorem for quantum communication complexity with applications to device-independent qkd. In *2021 IEEE 62nd Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS)*, pages 1285–1295, 2022.
- [JRS02] R. Jain, J. Radhakrishnan, and P. Sen. Privacy and interaction in quantum communication complexity and a theorem about the relative entropy of quantum states. In

- The 43rd Annual IEEE Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science, 2002. Proceedings.*, pages 429–438, 2002.
- [KK10] Roy Kasher and Julia Kempe. Two-source extractors secure against quantum adversaries. In Maria Serna, Ronen Shaltiel, Klaus Jansen, and José Rolim, editors, *Approximation, Randomization, and Combinatorial Optimization. Algorithms and Techniques*, pages 656–669, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2010. Springer Berlin Heidelberg.
- [KLR09] Y. T. Kalai, X. Li, and A. Rao. 2-source extractors under computational assumptions and cryptography with defective randomness. In *2009 50th Annual IEEE Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science*, pages 617–626, 2009.
- [KLRZ08] Y. T. Kalai, X. Li, A. Rao, and D. Zuckerman. Network extractor protocols. In *2008 49th Annual IEEE Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science*, pages 654–663, 2008.
- [KR09] Bhavana Kanukurthi and Leonid Reyzin. Key agreement from close secrets over unsecured channels. In *Proceedings of the 28th Annual International Conference on Advances in Cryptology - EUROCRYPT 2009 - Volume 5479*, page 206–223, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2009. Springer-Verlag.
- [Li12] X. Li. Non-malleable extractors, two-source extractors and privacy amplification. In *2012 IEEE 53rd Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science*, pages 688–697, 2012.
- [Li15] X. Li. Three-source extractors for polylogarithmic min-entropy. In *2015 IEEE 56th Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science*, pages 863–882, 2015.
- [Li19] Xin Li. Non-malleable extractors and non-malleable codes: Partially optimal constructions. In *Proceedings of the 34th Computational Complexity Conference, CCC '19*, Dagstuhl, DEU, 2019. Schloss Dagstuhl–Leibniz-Zentrum fuer Informatik.
- [NC00] Michael A. Nielsen and Isaac L. Chuang. *Quantum computation and quantum information*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK, 2000.
- [Rao06] Anup Rao. Extractors for a constant number of polynomially small min-entropy independent sources. In *Proceedings of the Thirty-Eighth Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing, STOC '06*, page 497–506, New York, NY, USA, 2006. Association for Computing Machinery.
- [Raz05] Ran Raz. Extractors with weak random seeds. In *In Proceedings of the 37th Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing*, pages 11–20, 2005.
- [SV19] Akshayaram Srinivasan and Prashant Nalini Vasudevan. Leakage resilient secret sharing and applications. In Alexandra Boldyreva and Daniele Micciancio, editors, *Advances in Cryptology – CRYPTO 2019*, pages 480–509, Cham, 2019. Springer International Publishing.
- [TRSS10] M. Tomamichel, R. Renner, C. Schaffner, and A. Smith. Leftover hashing against quantum side information. In *2010 IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory*, pages 2703–2707, 2010.

- [Uhl76] A. Uhlmann. The “transition probability” in the state space of a $*$ -algebra. *Rep. Math. Phys.*, 9:273–279, 1976.
- [Wat11] John Watrous. Chapter 5, naimark’s theorem; characterizations of channels. Lecture notes on Theory of Quantum Information, 2011.
- [Wil13] Mark M Wilde. *Quantum information theory*. Cambridge University Press, 2013.