Leftover Hashing Against Quantum Side Information

Marco Tomamichel,[1, *] Christian Schaffner,[2, †] Adam Smith,[3, ‡] and Renato Renner[1, §]

[1]*Institute for Theoretical Physics, ETH Zurich, 8093 Zurich, Switzerland.*
[2]*Centrum Wiskunde & Informatica (CWI), Amsterdam, The Netherlands.*
[3]*Pennsylvania State University, University Park, PA 16802, USA.*
(Dated: October 29, 2018)

The Leftover Hash Lemma states that the output of a two-universal hash function applied to an input with sufficiently high entropy is almost uniformly random. In its standard formulation, the lemma refers to a notion of randomness that is (usually implicitly) defined with respect to classical side information. Here, we prove a (strictly) more general version of the Leftover Hash Lemma that is valid even if side information is represented by the state of a quantum system. Furthermore, our result applies to arbitrary δ-almost two-universal families of hash functions. The generalized Leftover Hash Lemma has applications in cryptography, e.g., for key agreement in the presence of an adversary who is not restricted to classical information processing.

I. INTRODUCTION

We will first consider the task of extracting uniform randomness from a random variable and introduce the Leftover Hash Lemma. Following its discussion, we extend the scenario to include side information that is potentially stored in a quantum state.

A. Randomness Extraction

Consider a random variable X that is partially known to an agent, i.e., the agent possesses side information E correlated to X. One may ask whether it is possible to extract from X a part Z that is completely unknown to the agent, i.e., uniform conditioned on E. If yes, what is the maximum size of Z? And how is Z computed?

The *Leftover Hash Lemma* answers these questions. It states that extraction of uniform randomness Z is possible whenever the agent's uncertainty about X is sufficiently large. More precisely, the number ℓ of extractable bits is approximately equal to the *min-entropy of X conditioned on E*, denoted $H_{\min}(X|E)$ (see Section I B for a definition and properties). Furthermore, Z can be computed as the output of a function f selected at random from a suitably chosen family of functions $\mathcal{F}$, called *two-universal family of hash functions* (see Section I C for a definition). Remarkably, the family $\mathcal{F}$ can be chosen without knowing the actual probability distribution of X and only depends on the alphabet $\mathcal{X}$ of X and the number of bits ℓ to be extracted.

Lemma 1 (Classical Leftover Hash Lemma). *Let X and E be random variables and let $\mathcal{F}$ be a two-universal family of hash functions with domain $\mathcal{X}$ and range $\{0,1\}^\ell$.*

Then, on average over the choices of f from $\mathcal{F}$, the distribution of the output $Z := f(X)$ is Δ-close from uniform conditioned on E[1], where

$$\Delta = \frac{1}{2}\sqrt{2^{\ell - H_{\min}(X|E)}} \ .$$

The lemma immediately implies that for a *fixed* joint distribution of X and E, there is a *fixed* function f that extracts almost uniform randomness. More precisely, given any $\Delta > 0$, there exists a function f that produces

$$\ell = \left\lfloor H_{\min}(X|E) - 2\log\frac{1}{2\Delta} \right\rfloor \tag{1}$$

bits that are Δ-close to uniform and independent of E.[2]

The Leftover Hash Lemma plays an important role in a variety of applications in computer science and cryptography (see, e.g., [1] for an overview). A prominent example is *privacy amplification*, i.e., the task of transforming a weakly secret key (over which an adversary may have partial knowledge E), into a highly secret key (that is uniform and independent of the adversary's information E). It was in this context that the use of two-universal hashing for randomness distillation has first been proposed [2]. Originally, the analysis was however restricted to situations where X is uniform and E is bounded in size. Later, versions of the Leftover Hash Lemma similar to Lemma 1 above have been proved independently in [3] and [4]. The term *leftover hashing* was coined in [5], where its use for recycling the randomness in randomized algorithms and for the construction of pseudo-random number generators is discussed (see also [3, 6]).

---

*marcoto@phys.ethz.ch
†c.schaffner@cwi.nl
‡asmith@cse.psu.edu
§renner@phys.ethz.ch

---

[1] The distance from uniform Δ measures the statistical distance of the probability distribution of X given E to a uniform distribution. See Section III for a formal definition.
[2] We use log to denote the binary logarithm.

B. Quantum Side Information

A majority of the original work on universal hashing is based entirely on probability theory and side information is therefore (often implicitly) assumed to be represented by a *classical* system E (modeled as a random variable).[3] In fact, since hashing is an entirely "classical" process (a simple mapping from a random variable X to another random variable Z), one may expect that the physical nature of the side information is irrelevant and that a purely classical treatment is sufficient. This is, however, not necessarily the case. It has been shown, for instance, that the output of certain extractor functions may be partially known if side information about their input is stored in a *quantum* device of a certain size, while the same output is almost uniform conditioned on any side information stored in a *classical* system of the same size (see [7] for a concrete example and [8] for a more general discussion).[4]

Here, we follow a line of research started in [9–11] and study randomness extraction in the presence of quantum side information E (which, of course, includes situations where E is partially or fully classical.) More specifically, our goal is to establish a generalized version of Lemma 1 which holds if the system E is quantum-mechanical. For this, we first need to quickly review the notion of *min-entropy* as well as of the notion of *uniformity*, which need to be extended accordingly.

The definition of *uniformity* in the context of quantum side information E is rather straightforward. Let Z be a classical random variable which takes any value $z \in \mathcal{Z}$ with probability p_z and let E be a quantum system whose state conditioned on $Z = z$ is given by a density operator $\rho_E^{[z]}$ on $\mathcal{H}_E$. This situation is compactly described by the *classical-quantum* (CQ) state

$$\rho_{\mathrm{ZE}} := \sum_{z \in \mathcal{Z}} p_z \, |z\rangle\langle z|_{\mathrm{z}} \otimes \rho_{\mathrm{E}}^{[z]} \,, \qquad (2)$$

defined on the product space $\mathcal{H}_{\mathrm{z}} \otimes \mathcal{H}_{\mathrm{E}}$, where $\mathcal{H}_{\mathrm{z}}$ is a Hilbert space with orthonormal basis $\{|z\rangle_{\mathrm{z}}\}_{z \in \mathcal{Z}}$. We say that Z *is uniform conditioned on* E if ρ_{ZE} has product form $\omega_{\mathrm{ZE}} \otimes \rho_{\mathrm{E}}$, where $\omega_{\mathrm{z}} := \mathbb{1}_{\mathrm{z}}/|\mathcal{Z}|$ is the maximally mixed state on $\mathcal{H}_Z$. More generally, we say that Z is Δ-*close to uniform conditioned on* E if there exists a state σ_{E} on E for which the trace distance between ρ_{ZE} and $\omega_{\mathrm{z}} \otimes \sigma_{\mathrm{E}}$ is

at most Δ (see Section III for a formal definition). The trace distance is a natural choice of metric because it corresponds to the *distinguishing advantage*.[5] Furthermore, in the purely classical case, the trace distance reduces to the statistical distance.

Next, we generalize the notion of min-entropy to situations involving quantum side information. Before we do this, note that the classical min-entropy $H_{\min}(\mathrm{X|E})$ has an operational interpretation as the guessing probability of X given E, namely

$$H_{\min}(\mathrm{X|E}) = -\log p_{\mathrm{guess}}(\mathrm{X|E}) \,. \qquad (3)$$

Here, $p_{\mathrm{guess}}(X|E)$ denotes the probability of correctly guessing the value of X using the optimal strategy with access to E. The optimal strategy in the classical case is to guess, for each value of e of E, the X with the highest conditional probability $P_{X|E=e}$. The guessing probability is thus

$$p_{\mathrm{guess}}(\mathrm{X|E}) = \sum_e P_E(e) \, \max_x P_{X|E=e}(x) \,.$$

A generalization of the min-entropy to situations where E may be a quantum system has first been proposed in [10] (see Section II for a formal definition). As shown in [13], the operational interpretation (3) naturally extends to this more general case. In other words, the min-entropy, $H_{\min}(\mathrm{X|E})$, is a measure for the probability of guessing X using an optimal strategy with access to the quantum system E.

However, the actual requirement on the entropy measure used in Lemma 1 is that it accurately characterizes the total amount of randomness contained in X, i.e. the number of uniformly random bits that can be extracted using an optimal extraction strategy. As we will show below, $H_{\min}(\mathrm{X|E})$ (or, more precisely, a smooth version of it) meets this requirement.

For this purpose, let ρ_{XE} be fixed and assume that f is a function that maps X to a string $Z = f(X) \in \{0,1\}^\ell$ of length ℓ that is uniform conditioned on the side information E. Then, obviously, the probability of guessing Z correctly given E is equal to $2^{-\ell}$ and, by virtue of (3), we find that

$$H_{\min}(\mathrm{Z|E}) = \ell \,. \qquad (4)$$

Furthermore, the probability of guessing $Z = f(X)$ correctly cannot be smaller than the probability of guessing X, correctly. This fact can again be expressed in terms of min-entropies,

$$H_{\min}(\mathrm{Z|E}) \le H_{\min}(\mathrm{X|E}) \,, \qquad (5)$$

---

[3] If the side information E is classical, the Leftover Hash Lemma can be formulated without the need to introduce E explicitly (see, e.g., [3]). Instead, one may simply interpret all probability distributions as being conditioned on a fixed value of the side information.

[4] Note that there is no sensible notion of a conditional probability distribution where the conditioning is on the state of a *quantum* (as opposed to a *classical*) system. An implicit treatment of side information E, where one considers all probability distributions to be conditioned on a specific value of E, as explained in the previous footnote, is therefore not possible in the general case.

[5] Let p_{succ} be the maximum probability that a distinguisher, presented with a random choice of either the state ρ or the state σ, can correctly guess which of the two he has seen. The *distinguishing advantage* is then defined as the advantage compared to a random guess, which is given by $p_{\mathrm{succ}} - \frac{1}{2} = \frac{1}{4}\|\rho - \sigma\|_1$ (see e.g. [12])

i.e., the min-entropy can only decrease under the action of a function. Combining (4) and (5) immediately yields

$$\ell \leq H_{\min}(X|E) . \tag{6}$$

We conclude that the number ℓ of uniform bits (relative to E) that can be extracted from data X is upper bounded by the min-entropy of X conditioned on E. This result may be seen as a converse of (1).

So far, the claim (6) is restricted to the extraction of *perfectly uniform* randomness. In order to extend this concept to the more general case of approximately uniform randomness, we need to introduce the notion of *smooth* min-entropy. Roughly speaking, for any $\varepsilon \geq 0$, the ε-*smooth min-entropy of X given E*, denoted $H_{\min}^{\varepsilon}(X|E)$, is defined as the maximum value of $H_{\min}(X|E)$ evaluated for all density operators $\tilde{\rho}$ that are ε-close to ρ (see Section II for a formal definition).

The above argument leading to (6) can be generalized in a straightforward manner to smooth min-entropy, and results in the bound

$$\ell \leq H_{\min}^{2\sqrt{\Delta}}(X|E)$$

for the maximum number ℓ of extractable bits that are Δ-close to uniform conditioned on E. Crucially, our extended version of the Leftover Hash Lemma implies that this bound can be reached, up to additive terms of order $\log(1/\Delta)$ (see Theorem 6 and Theorem 7). We thus conclude that the min-entropy of X conditioned on E, in particular its "smoothed" version, is an accurate measure for the amount of uniform randomness (conditioned on E) that can be extracted from X.

C. Almost Two-Universal Hashing

The notion of two-universal hashing has been introduced by Carter and Wegman [14]. A family $\mathcal{F}$ of functions from $\mathcal{X}$ to $\mathcal{Z}$ is said to be *two-universal* if, for any pair of distinct inputs x and x', and for f chosen at random from $\mathcal{F}$, the probability of a *collision* $f(x) = f(x')$ is not larger than $\delta := 1/|\mathcal{Z}|$. Note that this value for the collision probability corresponds to the one obtained by choosing $\mathcal{F}$ as the family of *all* functions with domain $\mathcal{X}$ and range $\mathcal{Z}$.

Later, the concept of two-universal hashing has been generalized to arbitrary collision probabilities δ [15]. Namely, a family of functions $\mathcal{F}$ from $\mathcal{X}$ to $\mathcal{Z}$ is called δ-*almost two-universal* if

$$\Pr_{f \in \mathcal{F}} [f(x) = f(x')] \leq \delta \tag{7}$$

for any $x \neq x'$. A two-universal family as above simply corresponds to the special case $\delta = 1/|\mathcal{Z}|$.

The classical Leftover Hash Lemma (Lemma 1) can be generalized to δ-almost two-universal hash functions [1]. More precisely, when extracting an ℓ-bit string from data X, its distance from uniform conditioned on E is bounded by $\Delta = \frac{1}{2}\sqrt{(2^{\ell}\delta - 1) + 2^{\ell - H_{\min}(X|E)}}$.

D. Main result

Our main result is a generalization of the Leftover Hash Lemma for δ-almost two-universal families of hash functions which is valid in the presence of quantum side information. While the statement is new for general δ-almost two-universal hash functions, the special case where $\delta = 2^{-\ell}$ has been proved previously by one of us [10].

Lemma 2 (General Leftover Hash Lemma). *Let X be a random variable, let E be a quantum system, and let $\mathcal{F}$ be a δ-almost two-universal family of hash functions from $\mathcal{X}$ to $\{0,1\}^{\ell}$. Then, on average over the choices of f from $\mathcal{F}$, the output $Z := f(X)$ is Δ-close to uniform conditioned on E, where*

$$\Delta = \inf_{\varepsilon > 0} \frac{1}{2}\sqrt{(2^{\ell}\delta - 1) + 2^{\ell - H_{\min}(X|E) + \log(2/\varepsilon^2 + 1)}} + \varepsilon .$$

Furthermore, if $\delta \leq 2^{-\ell}$, i.e., if $\mathcal{F}$ is two-universal, then

$$\Delta = \frac{1}{2}\sqrt{2^{\ell - H_{\min}(X|E)}} . \tag{8}$$

Note that inserting $\delta = 2^{-\ell}$ into the first expression for Δ yields a formula which is less tight than (8). The latter, therefore, requires a separate proof. In the technical part below, the two claims are formulated more generally for the *smooth* min-entropy (Theorem 6 and Theorem 7).

E. Applications and Related Work

Quantum versions of the Leftover Hash Lemma [10] for two-universal families of hash functions have been used in the context of privacy amplification against a quantum adversary [8, 11]. This application has gained prominence with the rise of quantum cryptography and quantum key distribution in particular. There, the side information E is gathered during a key agreement process between two parties by an eavesdropper who is not necessarily limited to classical information processing. The quantum generalization of the Leftover Hash Lemma is then used to bound the amount of secret key that can be distilled by the two parties.

The restriction to two-universal families of hash functions leads to the need for a random seed of length $\Theta(n)$, where n is the length in bits of the original partially secret string. This seed is used to choose f from a two-universal family $\mathcal{F}$. The main result of this paper, Lemma 2, and a suitable construction of a δ-almost two-universal family of hash functions (see Section IV) allow for a shorter seed of length proportional to ℓ, $\log \frac{n}{\ell}$ and $\log \frac{1}{\Delta}$. The length of secret key that can be extracted with this method is only reduced by a term proportional to $\log \frac{1}{\Delta}$ compared to the extractor using two-universal hashing. Furthermore, the generalized Leftover Hashing Lemma allows for an extension of existing cryptographic security proofs

to δ-almost two-universal families of hash functions and may lead to a speed-up in practical implementations.[6]

Recently, the problem of randomness extraction with quantum side information has generated renewed interest. It has been shown that the classical technique [18] of XORing a classical source about which an adversary holds quantum information with a δ-biased mask results in a uniformly distributed string [19][7].

However, to achieve even shorter seed lengths, more advanced techniques such as Trevisan's [21] extractor have been studied in [22–24]. In [23], it is shown that a seed of length $O(\text{polylog}\,n)$ is sufficient to generate a key of length $\ell \approx H_{\min}(\text{X}) - \log \dim \mathcal{H}_{\text{E}}$, where $\dim \mathcal{H}_{\text{E}}$ is a measure of the size of the adversary's quantum memory. In [24], the result was extended to the formalism of conditional min-entropies. They attain a key length of $\ell \approx H_{\min}^{\varepsilon}(\text{X}|\text{E})$, which can be arbitrarily larger than $H_{\min}(\text{X}) - \log \dim \mathcal{H}_{\text{E}}$. Furthermore, as we show in (6), this key length is almost optimal. Our result may be useful to further improve the performance of these extractors (see discussion in [24]).

Furthermore, our result should be used instead of the classical Leftover Hashing Lemma whenever randomness is extracted in a context governed by the laws of quantum physics. For example, consider a device that needs a seed that is random conditioned on its internal state. In this case the use of the *classical* Leftover Hashing Lemma instead of its quantum version, Lemma 2, corresponds to the implicit and potentially unjustified assumption that the device does not make use of quantum mechanics.

F.   Organization of the paper

In Section II, we discuss various aspects of the smooth entropy framework, which will be needed for our proof. We then give the proof of our generalized Leftover Hash Lemma (Lemma 2) in Section III. More precisely, we provide statements of the Leftover Hashing Lemma for two-universal and δ-almost two-universal hashing in terms of the smooth min-entropy (Theorems 9 and 10). Finally, in Section IV, we combine known constructions of δ-almost two-universal hash functions and discuss their use for randomness extraction with shorter random seeds. Appendix B may be of independent interest because it establishes a relation between the smooth min- and max-entropies (as defined above and used in [13, 25, 26]) and certain related entropic quantities used in earlier work (e.g., in [10])

---

[6] See, e.g. [16] and [17], where a practical implementation of privacy amplification is discussed in Section V.
[7] See also [20] for a generalization of this work to the fully quantum setting.

II.   SMOOTH ENTROPIES

Let $\mathcal{H}$ be a finite-dimensional Hilbert space. We use $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H})$, $\mathcal{L}^{\dagger}(\mathcal{H})$ and $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{H})$ to denote the set of linear, Hermitian and positive semi-definite operators on $\mathcal{H}$, respectively. We define the set of normalized quantum states by $\mathcal{S}_{=}(\mathcal{H}) := \{\rho \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{H}) : \text{tr}\,\rho = 1\}$ and the set of subnormalized states by $\mathcal{S}_{\leq}(\mathcal{H}) := \{\rho \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{H}) : 0 < \text{tr}\,\rho \leq 1\}$. Given a pure state $|\phi\rangle \in \mathcal{H}$, we use $\phi = |\phi\rangle\langle\phi|$ to denote the corresponding projector in $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{H})$. The inverse of a Hermitian operator is meant to be taken on its support only (generalized inverse). Given a bipartite Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}_{\text{AB}} := \mathcal{H}_{\text{A}} \otimes \mathcal{H}_{\text{B}}$ and a state $\rho_{\text{AB}} \in \mathcal{S}_{\leq}(\mathcal{H}_{\text{AB}})$, we denote by ρ_{A} and ρ_{B} its marginals $\rho_{\text{A}} = \text{tr}_{\text{B}}\,\rho_{\text{AB}}$ and $\rho_{\text{B}} = \text{tr}_{\text{A}}\,\rho_{\text{AB}}$.

The *trace distance* between states ρ and τ is given by $\frac{1}{2}\|\rho - \tau\|_1 = \frac{1}{2}\text{tr}\,|\rho - \tau|$. We also employ the *purified distance* P as a metric on $\mathcal{S}_{\leq}(\mathcal{H})$ [26]. It is an upper bound on the trace distance and defined in terms of the *generalized fidelity* $\bar{F}$ as

$$P(\rho,\tau) := \sqrt{1 - \bar{F}(\rho,\tau)^2}\,, \quad \text{where}$$
$$\bar{F}(\rho,\tau) := \text{tr}|\sqrt{\rho}\sqrt{\tau}| + \sqrt{(1 - \text{tr}\,\rho)(1 - \text{tr}\,\tau)}\,.$$

We will need that the purified distance is a monotone under trace non-increasing completely positive maps (CPMs). Let $\mathcal{E}$ be a trace non-increasing CPM, then [26]

$$P(\rho,\tau) \geq P\left(\mathcal{E}(\rho), \mathcal{E}(\tau)\right)\,. \tag{9}$$

Note that the projections $\rho \mapsto \Pi\rho\Pi$ for any projector Π is a trace non-increasing CPM. We define the ε-*ball* of states close to $\rho \in \mathcal{S}_{\leq}(\mathcal{H})$ as

$$\mathcal{B}^{\varepsilon}(\rho) := \{\tilde{\rho} \in \mathcal{S}_{\leq}(\mathcal{H}) : P(\rho,\tilde{\rho}) \leq \varepsilon\}\,.$$

We will now define the smooth min-entropy [10].

Definition 1. Let $\varepsilon \geq 0$ and $\rho_{\text{AB}} \in \mathcal{S}_{\leq}(\mathcal{H}_{\text{AB}})$. The *min-entropy of A conditioned on B* is given by

$$H_{\min}(\text{A}|\text{B})_{\rho} := \max_{\sigma_{\text{B}} \in \mathcal{S}_{=}(\mathcal{H}_{\text{B}})} \sup\left\{\lambda \in \mathbb{R} : \rho_{\text{AB}} \leq 2^{-\lambda} \mathbb{1}_{\text{A}} \otimes \sigma_{\text{B}}\right\}.$$

Furthermore, the *smooth min-entropy of A conditioned on B* is defined as

$$H_{\min}^{\varepsilon}(\text{A}|\text{B})_{\rho} := \max_{\tilde{\rho}_{\text{AB}} \in \mathcal{B}^{\varepsilon}(\rho_{\text{AB}})} H_{\min}(\text{A}|\text{B})_{\tilde{\rho}}\,.$$

The conditional min-entropy is a measure of the uncertainty about the state of a system A given quantum side information B. In particular, if the system A describes a classical random variable (i.e. if the state is CQ), the min-entropy can be interpreted as a guessing probability.[8] For

---

[8] See discussion in Section I and [13] for details.

general quantum states, the smooth min-entropy satisfies data-processing inequalities. For example, if a CPM is applied to the B system or if a measurement is conducted on the A system, the smooth min-entropy of A given B is guaranteed not to decrease.[9]

Finally, we will need a fully quantum generalization of the collision entropy (Rényi-entropy of order 2).

Definition 2. Let $\rho_{\mathrm{AB}} \in \mathcal{S}_\le(\mathcal{H}_{\mathrm{AB}})$ and $\sigma_{\mathrm{B}} \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{H}_{\mathrm{B}})$, then the *collision entropy of A conditioned on B* of a state ρ_{AB} given σ_{B} is $-\log \Gamma_{\mathrm{C}}(\rho_{\mathrm{AB}}|\sigma_{\mathrm{B}})$, where

$$\Gamma_{\mathrm{C}}(\rho_{\mathrm{AB}}|\sigma_{\mathrm{B}}) := \mathrm{tr}\left(\rho_{\mathrm{AB}}(\mathbb{1}_{\mathrm{A}} \otimes \sigma_{\mathrm{B}}^{-1/2})\right)^2 .$$

We will use the fact that the collision entropy provides an upper bound on the min-entropy. The proof of the following statement can be found in Appendix C and constitutes one of the main technical contributions of this work.

Lemma 3. Let $\rho_{\mathrm{XB}} \in \mathcal{S}_\le(\mathcal{H}_{\mathrm{XB}})$ be a CQ-state and $\bar\varepsilon > 0$. Then, there exists a state $\sigma_{\mathrm{B}} \in \mathcal{S}_=(\mathcal{H}_{\mathrm{B}})$ such that

$$\Gamma_{\mathrm{C}}(\rho_{\mathrm{XB}}|\sigma_{\mathrm{B}}) \le 2^{-H_{\min}(\mathrm{X}|\mathrm{B})_\rho} . \tag{10}$$

Moreover, there exists a normalized CQ-state $\bar\rho_{\mathrm{XB}} \in \mathcal{B}^{\bar\varepsilon}(\rho_{\mathrm{XB}})$ such that

$$\Gamma_{\mathrm{C}}(\bar\rho_{\mathrm{XB}}|\bar\rho_{\mathrm{B}}) \le 2^{-H_{\min}(\mathrm{X}|\mathrm{B})_\rho + \log(\frac{2}{\bar\varepsilon^2}+1)} . \tag{11}$$

III. PROOF OF THE LEFTOVER HASH LEMMA

In this section we give bounds on the distance from uniform of the quantum state after privacy amplification with two-universal and δ-almost two-universal hashing (Theorems 6 and 7). The proof of Lemma 2 then follows.

First, we extend the definition of the distance from uniform to sub-normalized states for technical reasons.[10]

Definition 3. Let $\rho_{\mathrm{AB}} \in \mathcal{S}_\le(\mathcal{H}_{\mathrm{AE}})$, then we define the *distance from uniform of A conditioned on B* as

$$\Delta(A|B)_\rho := \min_{\sigma_{\mathrm{B}}} \frac{1}{2}\|\rho_{\mathrm{AB}} - \omega_{\mathrm{A}} \otimes \sigma_{\mathrm{B}}\|_1 , \tag{12}$$

where $\omega_{\mathrm{A}} := \mathbb{1}_{\mathrm{A}}/\dim \mathcal{H}_{\mathrm{A}}$ and the minimum is taken over all $\sigma_{\mathrm{B}} \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{H}_{\mathrm{B}})$ satisfying $\mathrm{tr}\,\sigma_{\mathrm{B}} = \mathrm{tr}\,\rho_{\mathrm{B}}$.

As a first step, we bound the distance from uniform in terms of the collision entropy.

Lemma 4. Let $\rho_{\mathrm{AB}} \in \mathcal{S}_\le(\mathcal{H}_{\mathrm{AB}})$ and $\tau_{\mathrm{B}} \in \mathcal{S}_\le(\mathcal{H}_{\mathrm{B}})$ with $\mathrm{supp}\,\{\tau_{\mathrm{B}}\} \supseteq \mathrm{supp}\,\{\rho_{\mathrm{B}}\}$, then

$$\Delta(A|B)_\rho \le \frac{1}{2}\sqrt{d_{\mathrm{A}}\Gamma_{\mathrm{C}}(\rho_{\mathrm{AB}}|\tau_{\mathrm{B}}) - \mathrm{tr}\left(\rho_{\mathrm{B}}\tau_{\mathrm{B}}^{-1/2}\rho_{\mathrm{B}}\tau_{\mathrm{B}}^{-1/2}\right)} .$$

---

[9] See [26] for precise statements and proofs.
[10] Note that sub-normalized states have to be considered due to our definition of the smoothing of the min-entropy.

Proof. We apply the Hölder inequality (Lemma 18 in Appendix A) with parameters $r = t = 4$, $s = 2$, $A = C = \mathbb{1}_{\mathrm{A}} \otimes \tau_{\mathrm{B}}^{1/4}$ and $B = (\mathbb{1}_{\mathrm{A}} \otimes \tau_{\mathrm{B}}^{-1/4})(\rho_{\mathrm{AB}} - \omega_{\mathrm{A}} \otimes \rho_{\mathrm{B}})(\mathbb{1}_{\mathrm{A}} \otimes \tau_{\mathrm{B}}^{-1/4})$. This leads to

$$\begin{aligned}
2\,\Delta(A|B)_\rho &\le \|\rho_{\mathrm{AB}} - \omega_{\mathrm{A}} \otimes \rho_{\mathrm{B}}\|_1 \\
&= \|ABC\|_1 \le \|A^4\|_1^{1/4}\|B^2\|_1^{1/2}\|C^4\|_1^{1/4} \\
&\le \sqrt{d_A\,\mathrm{tr}\left((\rho_{\mathrm{AB}} - \omega_{\mathrm{A}} \otimes \rho_{\mathrm{B}})(\mathbb{1}_{\mathrm{A}} \otimes \tau_{\mathrm{B}}^{-1/2})\right)^2} .
\end{aligned}$$

We simplify the expression on the r.h.s. further using

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathrm{tr}\left((\rho_{\mathrm{AB}} - \omega_{\mathrm{A}} \otimes \rho_{\mathrm{B}})(\mathbb{1}_{\mathrm{A}} \otimes \tau_{\mathrm{B}}^{-1/2})\right)^2 \\
&= \mathrm{tr}\left(\rho_{\mathrm{AB}}(\mathbb{1}_{\mathrm{A}} \otimes \tau_{\mathrm{B}}^{-1/2})\right)^2 + \mathrm{tr}\left((\omega_{\mathrm{A}} \otimes \rho_{\mathrm{B}})(\mathbb{1}_{\mathrm{A}} \otimes \tau_{\mathrm{B}}^{-1/2})\right)^2 \\
&\quad - 2\mathrm{tr}\left(\rho_{\mathrm{AB}}(\mathbb{1}_{\mathrm{A}} \otimes \tau_{\mathrm{E}}^{-1/2})(\omega_{\mathrm{A}} \otimes \rho_{\mathrm{B}})(\mathbb{1}_{\mathrm{A}} \otimes \tau_{\mathrm{E}}^{-1/2})\right) \\
&= \Gamma_{\mathrm{C}}(\rho_{\mathrm{AB}}|\tau_{\mathrm{B}}) - \frac{1}{d_{\mathrm{A}}}\mathrm{tr}\left(\rho_{\mathrm{B}}\tau_{\mathrm{B}}^{-1/2}\rho_{\mathrm{B}}\tau_{\mathrm{B}}^{-1/2}\right) ,
\end{aligned}$$

which concludes the proof. $\square$

The above bound can be simplified by setting $\tau_{\mathrm{B}} = \rho_{\mathrm{B}}$:

$$\Delta(A|B)_\rho \le \frac{1}{2}\sqrt{d_{\mathrm{A}}\Gamma_{\mathrm{C}}(\rho_{\mathrm{AB}}|\rho_{\mathrm{B}}) - \mathrm{tr}\,\rho_{\mathrm{B}}} . \tag{13}$$

We now consider a scenario where X is picked from a set $\mathcal{X}$ and E is a quantum system whose state may depend on X. The situation is described by a CQ-state of the form

$$\rho_{\mathrm{XE}} = \sum_x |x\rangle\langle x|_{\mathrm{X}} \otimes \rho_{\mathrm{E}}^{[x]} , \tag{14}$$

where the probability of x occurring is the trace of the sub-normalized state $\rho_{\mathrm{E}}^{[x]}$ and $\rho_{\mathrm{E}} = \sum_x \rho_{\mathrm{E}}^{[x]}$. After applying a function $f : \mathcal{X} \to \{0,1\}^{\times \ell}$ chosen at random from a family of hash functions $\mathcal{F}$, the resulting CQ-state is given by

$$\rho_{\mathrm{FZE}} = \sum_f \sum_z p_f |f\rangle\langle f|_{\mathrm{F}} \otimes |z\rangle\langle z|_{\mathrm{Z}} \otimes \rho_{\mathrm{E}}^{[f,z]} , \tag{15}$$

where $z \in \{0,1\}^{\times \ell}$, $p_f = 1/|\mathcal{F}|$ and

$$\rho_{\mathrm{E}}^{[f,z]} := \sum_{x, f(x)=z} \rho_{\mathrm{E}}^{[x]} . \tag{16}$$

Formally, randomness extraction can be modelled as a trace-preserving CPM, $\mathcal{A}$, from $\mathcal{H}_{\mathrm{FX}} \to \mathcal{H}_{\mathrm{FZ}}$ that maps $\rho_{\mathrm{F}} \otimes \rho_{\mathrm{XE}} \mapsto (\mathcal{A} \otimes \mathcal{I}_{\mathrm{E}})(\rho_{\mathrm{F}} \otimes \rho_{\mathrm{XE}}) = \rho_{\mathrm{FZE}}$.

The followoing lemma yields a bound on the collision entropy of the output of the hash function in terms of the collision entropy of the input.

Lemma 5. Let $\mathcal{F}$ be δ-almost two-universal, let ρ_{XE} and ρ_{FZE} be defined as in (14) and (15), respectively, and let $\tau_{\mathrm{E}} \in \mathcal{S}_=(\mathcal{H}_{\mathrm{E}})$. Then,

$$\Gamma_{\mathrm{C}}(\rho_{\mathrm{FZE}}|\rho_{\mathrm{F}} \otimes \tau_{\mathrm{E}}) \le \Gamma_{\mathrm{C}}(\rho_{\mathrm{XE}}|\tau_{\mathrm{E}}) + \delta\,\mathrm{tr}\left(\rho_{\mathrm{E}}\tau_{\mathrm{E}}^{-1/2}\rho_{\mathrm{E}}\tau_{\mathrm{E}}^{-1/2}\right) .$$

Proof. The collision entropy on the l.h.s. can be rewritten as an expectation value over F, that is

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\Gamma_{\mathrm{C}}(\rho_{\mathrm{FZE}}|\rho_{\mathrm{F}} \otimes \tau_{\mathrm{E}}) \\
&= \mathrm{tr}\Big(\rho_{\mathrm{FZE}}(p_f \mathbb{1}_{\mathrm{FZ}} \otimes \tau_{\mathrm{E}})^{-1/2}\rho_{\mathrm{ZEF}}(p_f \mathbb{1}_{\mathrm{FZ}} \otimes \tau_{\mathrm{E}})^{-1/2}\Big) \\
&= \sum_f p_f \sum_z \mathrm{tr}\big(|f\rangle\langle f|_{\mathrm{F}} \otimes |z\rangle\langle z|_{\mathrm{Z}} \otimes \rho_{\mathrm{E}}^{[f,z]}\tau_{\mathrm{E}}^{-1/2}\rho_{\mathrm{E}}^{[f,z]}\tau_{\mathrm{E}}^{-1/2}\big) \\
&= \mathop{\mathbb{E}}_{F \in \mathcal{F}}\Big[\sum_z \mathrm{tr}\,(\rho_{\mathrm{E}}^{[F,z]}\tau_{\mathrm{E}}^{-1/2}\rho_{\mathrm{E}}^{[F,z]}\tau_{\mathrm{E}}^{-1/2})\Big] \\
&= \sum_{x,x'}\mathop{\mathbb{E}}_{F \in \mathcal{F}}\Big[\sum_z \delta_{F(x)=z}\delta_{F(x')=z}\Big]\mathrm{tr}\,(\rho_{\mathrm{E}}^{[x]}\tau_{\mathrm{E}}^{-1/2}\rho_{\mathrm{E}}^{[x']}\tau_{\mathrm{E}}^{-1/2})\,.
\end{aligned}
$$

We have used (16) to substitute for $\rho_{\mathrm{E}}^{[F,z]}$ in the last step. The expectation value can be evaluated using the defining property (7) of δ-almost two-universal families. We get

$$
\mathop{\mathbb{E}}_{F \in \mathcal{F}}\Big[\sum_z \delta_{F(x)=z}\delta_{F(x')=z}\Big] \leq \delta
$$

if $x \neq x'$ and 1 otherwise. We use this relation and the fact that the trace terms are positive to bound

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\Gamma_{\mathrm{C}}(\rho_{\mathrm{FZE}}|\rho_{\mathrm{F}} \otimes \tau_{\mathrm{E}}) \\
&\leq \sum_x \mathrm{tr}(\rho_{\mathrm{E}}^{[x]}\tau_{\mathrm{E}}^{-1/2}\rho_{\mathrm{E}}^{[x]}\tau_{\mathrm{E}}^{-1/2}) + \delta\sum_{x \neq x'}\mathrm{tr}(\rho_{\mathrm{E}}^{[x]}\tau_{\mathrm{E}}^{-1/2}\rho_{\mathrm{E}}^{[x']}\tau_{\mathrm{E}}^{-1/2})\,.
\end{aligned}
$$

We now complete the second sum with the terms where $x = x'$ to get the statement of the lemma. □

If we set $\tau_{\mathrm{E}} = \rho_{\mathrm{E}}$, the result can be simplified further:

$$
\Gamma_{\mathrm{C}}(\rho_{\mathrm{FZE}}|\rho_{\mathrm{F}} \otimes \rho_{\mathrm{E}}) \leq \Gamma_{\mathrm{C}}(\rho_{\mathrm{XE}}|\rho_{\mathrm{E}}) + \delta\,\mathrm{tr}\,\rho_{\mathrm{E}}\,. \tag{17}
$$

We are now ready to give a bound on the distance from uniform $\Delta(Z|FE)$ after privacy amplification with two-universal and δ-almost two-universal families of hash functions. Note that we consider the distance from uniform conditioned on F as well as E. This describes the situation where the chosen hash function (the value f) is published after its use (strong extractor regime).

The distance from uniform conditioned on E averaged over the choice of f is given by

$$
\sum_f p_f \Delta(Z|E)_{\rho^{[f]}}\,, \quad \text{where }\ \rho_{\mathrm{ZE}}^{[f]} := \sum_z |z\rangle\langle z|_{\mathrm{Z}} \otimes \rho_{\mathrm{E}}^{[f,z]}
$$

and it can be bounded in terms of $\Delta(Z|FE)$ as

$$
\begin{aligned}
\sum_f p_f\, \Delta(Z|E)_{\rho^{[f]}} &\leq \frac{1}{2}\sum_f p_f\,\big\|\rho_{\mathrm{ZE}}^{[f]} - \omega_{\mathrm{Z}} \otimes \sigma_{\mathrm{E}}\big\|_1 \\
&= \Delta(Z|EF)_\rho\,, \tag{18}
\end{aligned}
$$

where σ_{E} optimizes (12) for $\Delta(Z|EF)_\rho$. Hence, an upper bound on $\Delta(Z|FE)$ implies an upper bound on the average distance to uniform conditioned on E as well.

For two-universal hashing, we get the following bound (see also [10]).

Theorem 6. *Let $\mathcal{F}$ be two-universal and let ρ_{XE} and ρ_{ZEF} be defined as in (14) and (15), respectively. Then, for any $\varepsilon \geq 0$,*

$$
\Delta(Z|FE)_\rho \leq \varepsilon + \frac{1}{2}\sqrt{2^{\ell - H_{\min}^\varepsilon(\mathrm{X}|\mathrm{E})_\rho}}\,.
$$

Proof. We use Lemma 4 to bound $\Delta(Z|FE)_\rho$. In particular, we set $\tau_{\mathrm{FE}} := \rho_{\mathrm{F}} \otimes \tau_{\mathrm{E}}$ to get

$$
\begin{aligned}
2\Delta(Z|FE)_\rho &\leq \sqrt{2^\ell\Gamma_{\mathrm{C}}(\rho_{\mathrm{ZFE}}|\tau_{\mathrm{FE}}) - \mathrm{tr}\,(\rho_{\mathrm{E}}\tau_{\mathrm{E}}^{-1/2}\rho_{\mathrm{E}}\tau_{\mathrm{E}}^{-1/2})} \\
&\leq \sqrt{2^\ell\Gamma_{\mathrm{C}}(\rho_{\mathrm{XE}}|\tau_{\mathrm{E}})}\,,
\end{aligned}
$$

where we have used Lemma 5 and that $\mathcal{F}$ is two-universal ($\delta \leq 2^{-\ell}$) in the last step. The r.h.s. can be expressed in terms of a min-entropy using (10). With an appropriate choice of τ_{E}, we have

$$
2\Delta(Z|FE)_\rho \leq \sqrt{2^{\ell - H_{\min}(\mathrm{X}|\mathrm{E})_\rho}}\,. \tag{19}
$$

We have now shown the statement of the theorem for the case $\varepsilon = 0$.

Finally, the bound can be expressed in terms of a smooth min-entropy. Let $\tilde{\rho}_{\mathrm{XE}} \in \mathcal{B}^\varepsilon(\rho_{\mathrm{XE}})$ be the CQ-state (cf. Lemma 19) that optimizes the smooth min-entropy $H_{\min}^\varepsilon(\mathrm{X}|\mathrm{E})_\rho = H_{\min}(\mathrm{X}|\mathrm{E})_{\tilde{\rho}}$. We define $\tilde{\rho}_{\mathrm{FZE}} := (\mathcal{A} \otimes \mathcal{I}_{\mathrm{E}})(\rho_{\mathrm{F}} \otimes \tilde{\rho}_{\mathrm{XE}})$ and note that privacy amplification can only decrease the purified distance (9), i.e.

$$
\frac{1}{2}\|\rho_{\mathrm{FZE}} - \tilde{\rho}_{\mathrm{FZE}}\|_1 \leq P(\rho_{\mathrm{FZE}}, \tilde{\rho}_{\mathrm{FZE}}) \leq P(\rho_{\mathrm{XE}}, \tilde{\rho}_{\mathrm{XE}}) \leq \varepsilon\,.
$$

Moreover, let $\tilde{\sigma}_{\mathrm{FE}}$ be the state that minimizes the distance from uniform $d_u(Z|FE)_{\tilde{\rho}}$. Then,

$$
\begin{aligned}
2\Delta(Z|FE)_\rho &\leq \|\rho_{\mathrm{FZE}} - \omega_{\mathrm{Z}} \otimes \tilde{\sigma}_{\mathrm{FE}}\|_1 \\
&\leq \|\rho_{\mathrm{FZE}} - \tilde{\rho}_{\mathrm{FZE}}\|_1 + \|\tilde{\rho}_{\mathrm{FZE}} - \omega_{\mathrm{Z}} \otimes \tilde{\sigma}_{\mathrm{FE}}\|_1 \\
&\leq 2\varepsilon + 2\Delta(Z|FE)_{\tilde{\rho}}\,.
\end{aligned}
$$

We now apply (19) for $\tilde{\rho}_{\mathrm{FZE}}$ (instead of ρ_{FZE}) to get

$$
\begin{aligned}
\Delta(Z|FE)_\rho &\leq \varepsilon + \frac{1}{2}\sqrt{2^{\ell - H_{\min}(\mathrm{X}|\mathrm{E})_{\tilde{\rho}}}} \\
&= \varepsilon + \frac{1}{2}\sqrt{2^{\ell - H_{\min}^\varepsilon(\mathrm{X}|\mathrm{E})_\rho}}\,,
\end{aligned}
$$

which concludes the proof. □

Next, we consider the case of δ-almost two-universal hashing.

Theorem 7. *Let $\mathcal{F}$ be δ-almost two-universal and let ρ_{XE} and ρ_{ZEF} be defined as in (14) and (15), respectively. Then, for any $\varepsilon \geq 0$ and $\bar{\varepsilon} > 0$,*

$$
\Delta(Z|FE)_\rho \leq \varepsilon + \bar{\varepsilon} + \frac{1}{2}\sqrt{(2^\ell\delta - 1) + 2^{\ell - H_{\min}^\varepsilon(\mathrm{X}|\mathrm{B})_\rho + \log(\frac{2}{\bar{\varepsilon}^2} + 1)}}\,.
$$

Proof. We use Lemma 4 as in (13) to bound $\Delta(Z|FE)_\rho$. For normalized ρ_{zFE}, we find

$$2\Delta(Z|FE)_\rho \leq \sqrt{2^\ell \Gamma_{\mathrm{C}}(\rho_{\mathrm{FzE}}|\rho_{\mathrm{F}} \otimes \rho_{\mathrm{E}}) - 1}$$
$$\leq \sqrt{2^\ell \Gamma_{\mathrm{C}}(\rho_{\mathrm{xE}}|\rho_{\mathrm{E}}) + (2^\ell \delta - 1)},$$

where we used Lemma 5 as stated in (17).

The smoothing of the above equation is achieved using the same arguments as in the proof of Theorem 9. However, this time we need to include an additional smoothing parameter $\bar{\varepsilon} > 0$ in order to be able to apply (11).

Let $\tilde{\rho}_{\mathrm{xE}} \in \mathcal{B}^\varepsilon(\rho_{\mathrm{xE}})$ be the CQ-state (cf. Lemma 19) that optimizes the smooth min-entropy $H^\varepsilon_{\min}(\mathrm{X}|\mathrm{E})_\rho = H_{\min}(\mathrm{X}|\mathrm{E})_{\tilde{\rho}}$ and let $\bar{\rho}_{\mathrm{xE}} \in \mathcal{B}^{\bar{\varepsilon}}(\tilde{\rho}_{\mathrm{xE}})$ be the CQ-state (cf. Lemma 3) that satisfies

$$\Gamma_{\mathrm{C}}(\bar{\rho}_{\mathrm{xE}}|\bar{\rho}_{\mathrm{E}}) \leq 2^{-H_{\min}(\mathrm{X}|\mathrm{E})_{\tilde{\rho}} + \log(\frac{2}{\bar{\varepsilon}^2} + 1)}$$
$$= 2^{-H^\varepsilon_{\min}(\mathrm{X}|\mathrm{E})_\rho + \log(\frac{2}{\bar{\varepsilon}^2} + 1)}. \qquad (20)$$

Then, $\bar{\rho}_{\mathrm{xE}} \in \mathcal{B}^{\varepsilon + \bar{\varepsilon}}(\rho_{\mathrm{xE}})$ holds due to the triangle inequality of the purified distance. Moreover, we define the state after randomness extraction, $\bar{\rho}_{\mathrm{FzE}} := (\mathcal{A} \otimes \mathcal{I}_{\mathrm{E}})(\rho_{\mathrm{F}} \otimes \bar{\rho}_{\mathrm{xE}})$. Following the arguments laid out in the proof of Theorem 6, we have

$$\Delta(Z|FE)_\rho \leq \varepsilon + \bar{\varepsilon} + \Delta(Z|FE)_{\bar{\rho}}$$
$$\leq \varepsilon + \bar{\varepsilon} + \frac{1}{2}\sqrt{2^\ell \Gamma_{\mathrm{C}}(\bar{\rho}_{\mathrm{xE}}|\bar{\rho}_{\mathrm{E}}) + (2^\ell \delta - 1)}.$$

This can be bounded using (20), which concludes the proof. $\qquad\square$

The proof of the Leftover Hash Lemma stated in the introduction (Lemma 2) follows when we set $\varepsilon = 0$ in Theorem 9 and Theorem 10. To see this, note that the statements of two theorems can be expressed in terms of the distance from uniform averaged over the choice of f using (18).

IV. EXPLICIT CONSTRUCTIONS WITH SHORTER SEEDS

Here, we combine known constructions of two-universal and δ-almost two-universal hash functions and discuss their use for randomness extraction with shorter random seeds. We consider a scenario where X is an n-bit string $x \in \{0,1\}^{\times n}$ and E is a quantum system. The challenge is typically to optimize the following parameters:

a) the error described by the distance from uniform, $e := \Delta(Z|FE)$, which should be small,

b) the length of the extracted key, ℓ, which one wants to make as large as possible (close to $H^\varepsilon_{\min}(\mathrm{X}|\mathrm{E})$) and

c) the length of the random seed, $s := \log|\mathcal{F}|$, needed to choose f, which one wants to keep small.

The latter point is important in practical implementations of privacy amplification, for example in quantum key distribution (QKD), where the choice of f has to be communicated between two parties.

We will first review the explicit constructions of (δ-almost) two-universal hash functions used in this section. In [14], Carter and Wegman proposed several constructions of two-universal function families, trying to minimize the size of $\mathcal{F}$. An example of a two-universal set of hash functions with $|\mathcal{F}| = 2^n$ is the set $\mathcal{F} = \{f_\alpha\}_{\alpha \in \{0,1\}^n}$ consisting of elements

$$f_\alpha \; : \; \begin{array}{ccc} \{0,1\}^n & \longrightarrow & \{0,1\}^\ell \\ x & \longmapsto & x \cdot \alpha \mod 2^\ell \end{array} \qquad (21)$$

where $x \cdot \alpha$ denotes the multiplication in the field $\mathrm{GF}(2^n)$. The fact that $\mathcal{F}$ is two-universal can be readily verified by considering the difference $f_\alpha(x) - f_\alpha(x') = (x - x') \cdot \alpha \mod 2^\ell$ and noting that the mapping $\alpha \mapsto (x - x') \cdot \alpha$ is a bijection if $x - x' \neq 0$.

With δ-almost two-universal families, a larger value of δ typically allows for a smaller set $\mathcal{F}$. This is nicely illustrated by the following well-known construction based on polynomials. Let $\mathbb{F}$ be an arbitrary field and let r be a positive integer. We define the family $\mathcal{F} = \{f_\alpha\}_{\alpha \in \mathbb{F}}$ of functions

$$f_\alpha \; : \; \begin{array}{ccc} \mathbb{F}^r & \longrightarrow & \mathbb{F} \\ (x_1, \ldots, x_r) & \longmapsto & \sum_{i=1}^r x_i \alpha^{r-i} \end{array}. \qquad (22)$$

Using the fact that a polynomial of degree $r - 1$ can only have $r - 1$ zeros, it is easy to verify that $\mathcal{F}$ is δ-almost two-universal, for $\delta = (r-1)/|\mathbb{F}|$.

Another method to construct δ-almost two-universal families of hash functions is to concatenate two such families. We will use the following lemma by Stinson (see Theorem 5.4 in [15]).

Lemma 8. *Let $\mathcal{F}_1$ be δ_1-almost two-universal from $\{0,1\}^{\times n}$ to $\{0,1\}^{\times k}$ and let $\mathcal{F}_2$ be δ_2-almost two-universal from $\{0,1\}^{\times k}$ to $\{0,1\}^{\times \ell}$. Then, the family $\mathcal{G} := \{f_2 \circ f_1 : f_1 \in \mathcal{F}_1, f_2 \in \mathcal{F}_2\}$ consisting of all concatenated hash functions is $(\delta_1 + \delta_2)$-almost two-universal.*

Combining the general results on δ-almost two-universal hashing of Section III with the explicit constructions described above, we obtain the following statements.

If we do not care about s, we may choose a two-universal family of hash functions and recover a result by Renner [10]:

Theorem 9. *There exists a family of hash functions from $\{0,1\}^{\times n}$ to $\{0,1\}^{\times \ell}$ satisfying*

$$s = n \;\; and \;\; e \leq \varepsilon + \frac{1}{2}\sqrt{2^{\ell - H^\varepsilon_{\min}(\mathrm{X}|\mathrm{E})_\rho}} \;\; for\; any\; \varepsilon \geq 0.$$

Proof. We apply Theorem 6 using the two-universal family constructed in (21), which yields $s = \log|\mathcal{F}| = n$. □

We now show that we can choose a family of hash functions such that s is proportional to the key length ℓ instead of the input string length n.

Theorem 10. *There exists a family of hash functions from $\{0,1\}^{\times n}$ to $\{0,1\}^{\times \ell}$ satisfying*

$$s = 2\lfloor \ell + \log(n/\ell) + \log(1/\varepsilon^2) - 1\rfloor \quad and$$

$$e \leq 3\varepsilon + \frac{1}{2}\sqrt{2^{\ell - H_{\min}^\varepsilon(X|E)_\rho + \log(\frac{2}{\varepsilon^2}+1)}} \quad for\ any\ \varepsilon > 0.$$

Proof. We use the standard classical way of concatenating two hash functions to obtain the required parameters [27]. For the first function, we set $k = \lfloor \ell + \log(n/\ell) + \log(1/\varepsilon^2)\rfloor$ and use the field $\mathbb{F} = \mathrm{GF}(2^k)$ in the polynomial-based hash construction from (22). Interpreting the n-bit strings as $r = \lceil n/k\rceil$ blocks of k bits, the first hash function maps from $\{0,1\}^{\times n}$ to $\{0,1\}^{\times k}$ and requires a k-bit seed. Then, regular two-universal hashing from (21) with a seed length of again k bits is used to map from $\{0,1\}^{\times k}$ to $\{0,1\}^{\times \ell}$. The two seed lengths add up to $s = 2k = 2\lfloor \ell + \log(n/\ell) + \log(1/\varepsilon^2)\rfloor$.

Polynomial-based hashing achieves a δ_1 of at most

$$\frac{r-1}{2^k} \leq \frac{n}{k\,2^k} \leq \frac{4\,\ell\,\varepsilon^2}{k\,2^\ell} \leq \frac{4\varepsilon^2}{2^\ell}$$

by the choice of r and the fact that $k \geq \ell + \log(n/\ell) + \log(1/\varepsilon^2) - 2$. Together with the $\delta_2 \leq 2^{-\ell}$ from the two-universal hashing, we get from Lemma 8 that this construction yields a $\delta_1 + \delta_2 \leq \frac{1+4\varepsilon^2}{2^\ell}$-almost two-universal family of hash functions. Inserting this expression for δ into Theorem 7 and setting $\bar\varepsilon = \varepsilon$ yields

$$e \leq 2\varepsilon + \frac{1}{2}\sqrt{2^{\ell - H_{\min}^\varepsilon(X|E)_\rho + \log(\frac{2}{\varepsilon^2}+1)} + 4\varepsilon^2}.$$

The theorem then follows as an upper bound to this expression. □

Acknowledgment

Appendix A: Technical Results

The first lemma is an application of Uhlmann's theorem [28] to the purified distance[11] (see [26] for a proof).

---

[11] The main advantage of the purified distance over the trace distance is that we can always find extensions and purifications

Lemma 11. *Let $\rho, \tau \in \mathcal{S}_{\leq}(\mathcal{H})$, $\mathcal{H}' \cong \mathcal{H}$ and $\varphi \in \mathcal{H}\otimes\mathcal{H}'$ be a purification of ρ. Then, there exists a purification $\vartheta \in \mathcal{H}\otimes\mathcal{H}'$ of τ with $P(\rho,\tau) = P(\varphi,\vartheta)$.*

Corollary 12. *Let $\rho,\tau \in \mathcal{S}_{\leq}(\mathcal{H})$ and $\bar\rho \in \mathcal{S}_{\leq}(\mathcal{H}\otimes\mathcal{H}')$ be an extension of ρ. Then, there exists an extension $\bar\tau \in \mathcal{S}_{\leq}(\mathcal{H}\otimes\mathcal{H}')$ of τ with $P(\rho,\tau) = P(\bar\rho,\bar\tau)$.*

In the following, we apply this result to an ε-ball of pure states, $\mathcal{B}_{\mathrm{p}}^\varepsilon(\rho) := \{\tilde\rho \in \mathcal{B}^\varepsilon(\rho) : \mathrm{rank}\,\tilde\rho = 1\}$.

Corollary 13. *Let $\rho \in \mathcal{S}_{\leq}(\mathcal{H})$ and $\varphi \in \mathcal{H}\otimes\mathcal{H}'$ be a purification of ρ. Then,*

$$\mathcal{B}^\varepsilon(\rho) \supseteq \{\tilde\rho \in \mathcal{S}_{\leq}(\mathcal{H}) : \exists\,\tilde\phi \in \mathcal{B}_{\mathrm{p}}^\varepsilon(\varphi)\ s.t.\ \tilde\rho = \mathrm{tr}_{\mathcal{H}'}\tilde\phi\}$$

and equality holds if the Hilbert space dimensions satisfy $\dim\mathcal{H}' \geq \dim\mathcal{H}$.

The following lemma establishes a fundamental property of pure bipartite states, namely that every linear operator applied to one subsystem has a dual on the other subsystem, such that the resulting pure state is the same.

Lemma 14. *Let $\phi_{\mathrm{AB}} \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{H}_{\mathrm{AB}})$ be pure, $\rho_{\mathrm{A}} = \mathrm{tr}_{\mathrm{B}}\phi_{\mathrm{AB}}$, $\rho_{\mathrm{B}} = \mathrm{tr}_{\mathrm{A}}\phi_{\mathrm{AB}}$ and let $X \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}_{\mathrm{A}})$ be an operator with support and image in $\mathrm{supp}\{\rho_{\mathrm{A}}\}$. Then,*

$$\left(X \otimes \mathbb{1}_{\mathrm{B}}\right)|\phi\rangle_{\mathrm{AB}} = \left(\mathbb{1}_{\mathrm{A}} \otimes (\rho_{\mathrm{B}}^{1/2} X^T \rho_{\mathrm{B}}^{-1/2})\right)|\phi\rangle_{\mathrm{AB}},$$

where the transpose is taken with regard to the Schmidt basis of ϕ_{AB}.

Proof. We introduce the Schmidt decomposition $|\phi\rangle_{\mathrm{AB}} = \sum_i \sqrt{\lambda_i}\,|i\rangle_{\mathrm{A}}\otimes|i\rangle_{\mathrm{B}}$. Clearly, $(\mathbb{1}_{\mathrm{A}}\otimes\rho_{\mathrm{B}}^{-1/2})|\phi\rangle_{\mathrm{AB}} = \sum_i |i\rangle_{\mathrm{A}}\otimes|i\rangle_{\mathrm{B}} =: |\gamma\rangle_{\mathrm{AB}}$ is the (unnormalized) fully entangled state on the support of ρ_{A} and ρ_{B}. It is easy to verify that $(X\otimes\mathbb{1}_{\mathrm{B}})|\gamma\rangle_{\mathrm{AB}} = (\mathbb{1}_{\mathrm{A}}\otimes X^T)|\gamma\rangle_{\mathrm{AB}}$, where the transposed matrix is given by $X^T = \sum_{i,j}\langle i|X|j\rangle_{\mathrm{A}}\,|j\rangle\langle i|_{\mathrm{B}}$. □

Corollary 15. *Let $\phi_{\mathrm{AB}} \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{H}_{\mathrm{AB}})$ be pure, $\rho_{\mathrm{A}} = \mathrm{tr}_{\mathrm{B}}\phi_{\mathrm{AB}}$, $\rho_{\mathrm{B}} = \mathrm{tr}_{\mathrm{A}}\phi_{\mathrm{AB}}$ and $f : \mathbb{R}^+ \to \mathbb{R}$ a real-valued function, then*

$$\left(f(\rho_{\mathrm{A}}) \otimes \mathbb{1}_{\mathrm{B}}\right)|\phi\rangle_{\mathrm{AB}} = \left(\mathbb{1}_{\mathrm{A}} \otimes f(\rho_{\mathrm{B}})\right)|\phi\rangle_{\mathrm{AB}}.$$

We define the notion of a *dual projector* with regard to a pure state using the following corollary:

Corollary 16. *Let $|\phi\rangle_{\mathrm{AB}} \in \mathcal{H}_{\mathrm{AB}}$ be pure, $\rho_{\mathrm{A}} = \mathrm{tr}_{\mathrm{B}}\phi_{\mathrm{AB}}$, $\rho_{\mathrm{B}} = \mathrm{tr}_{\mathrm{A}}\phi_{\mathrm{AB}}$ and let $\Pi_{\mathrm{A}} \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{H}_{\mathrm{A}})$ be a projector in $\mathrm{supp}\{\rho_{\mathrm{A}}\}$. Then, there exists a dual projector Π_{B} on $\mathcal{H}_{\mathrm{B}}$ such that*

$$\left(\Pi_{\mathrm{A}} \otimes \rho_{\mathrm{B}}^{-1/2}\right)|\phi\rangle_{\mathrm{AB}} = \left(\rho_{\mathrm{A}}^{-1/2} \otimes \Pi_{\mathrm{B}}\right)|\phi\rangle_{\mathrm{AB}}.$$

The next Lemma gives a bound on the purified distance of a state ρ and a projected state $\Pi\rho\Pi$.

---

without increasing the distance.

Lemma 17. *Let $\rho \in \mathcal{S}_{\leq}(\mathcal{H})$ and Π a projector on $\mathcal{H}$, then*

$$P(\rho, \Pi\rho\Pi) \leq \sqrt{2\operatorname{tr}(\Pi^{\perp}\rho) - \operatorname{tr}(\Pi^{\perp}\rho)^2}\,,$$

where $\Pi^{\perp} = \mathbb{1} - \Pi$ is the complement of Π on $\mathcal{H}$.

Proof. The generalized fidelity between the two states can be bounded using $\operatorname{tr}(\Pi\rho) \leq \operatorname{tr}(\rho)$. We have

$$\bar{F}(\rho, \Pi\rho\Pi) \geq \operatorname{tr}(\Pi\rho) + 1 - \operatorname{tr}\rho = 1 - \operatorname{tr}(\Pi^{\perp}\rho)\,.$$

The desired bound on the purified distance follows from its definition. □

We also need a Hölder inequality for linear operators and unitarily invariant norms (see [29] for a proof). Here, we state a version for three operators and the trace norm:

Lemma 18. *Let A, B and C be linear operators and $r, s, t > 0$ such that $\frac{1}{r} + \frac{1}{s} + \frac{1}{t} = 1$, then*

$$\|ABC\|_1 \leq \||A|^r\|_1^{\frac{1}{r}} \||B|^s\|_1^{\frac{1}{s}} \||C|^t\|_1^{\frac{1}{t}}.$$

The following lemma makes clear that the min-entropy smoothing of a state will not destroy its CQ structure.

Lemma 19. *Let ρ_{XB} be a CQ-state of the form $\rho_{\mathrm{XB}} = \sum_x |x\rangle\langle x| \otimes \rho_{\mathrm{B}}^{[x]}$. Then, the state $\tilde{\rho}_{\mathrm{XB}} \in \mathcal{B}^{\varepsilon}(\rho_{\mathrm{XB}})$ that optimizes $H_{\min}^{\varepsilon}(\mathrm{X}|\mathrm{B})_{\rho} = H_{\min}(\mathrm{X}|\mathrm{B})_{\tilde{\rho}}$ is of the same form.*

Proof. Let $\tilde{\rho}_{\mathrm{AB}}$ be any state in $\mathcal{B}^{\varepsilon}(\rho_{\mathrm{XB}})$. We can establish a CQ-state $\tilde{\rho}_{\mathrm{XB}}$ by measuring A in the basis determined by X. This operation will not increase the distance $P(\tilde{\rho}_{\mathrm{AB}}, \rho_{\mathrm{XB}})$ (cf. [26], Lemma 7) and not decrease the min-entropy (cf. [26], Theorem 19). Thus, we can conclude that the optimal state is CQ. □

Appendix B: Alternative Entropic Quantities

Here, we discuss two alternative entropic quantities, $\widehat{H}_{\min}^{\varepsilon}(\mathrm{A}|\mathrm{B})$ and $\widehat{H}_{\max}^{\varepsilon}(\mathrm{A}|\mathrm{B})$ and show that they are equivalent (up to terms in $\log\varepsilon$) to the smooth min-entropy and smooth max-entropy, respectively. Some of the technical results of this appendix will be used to give a bound on the collision entropy in terms of the smooth min-entropy (cf. Appendix C and Lemma 3).

First, note that conditional entropies can be defined in terms of relative entropies, as is well-known for the case of the von Neumann entropy. Let ρ_{AB} be a bipartite quantum state. Then, the condtional von Neumann entropy of A given B is defined as

$$
\begin{aligned}
H(\mathrm{A}|\mathrm{B})_{\rho} &:= H(\rho_{\mathrm{AB}}) - H(\rho_{\mathrm{B}}) \\
&= -D(\rho_{\mathrm{AB}} \| \mathbb{1}_{\mathrm{A}} \otimes \rho_{\mathrm{B}}) \quad\quad\quad\text{(B1)} \\
&= -\min_{\sigma_{\mathrm{B}} \in \mathcal{S}_{=}(\mathcal{H}_{\mathrm{B}})} D(\rho_{\mathrm{AB}} \| \mathbb{1}_{\mathrm{A}} \otimes \sigma_{\mathrm{B}})\,, \quad\text{(B2)}
\end{aligned}
$$

where we used Klein's inequality [12, 30] in the last step. The relative entropy is defined as $D(\rho \| \tau) := \operatorname{tr}(\rho(\log\rho - \log\tau))$ and $H(\rho) := -\operatorname{tr}(\rho\log\rho)$.

We will now define the smooth min-entropy and an alternative to the smooth entropy as first introduced in [10]. The definition of two versions of the min-entropy is parallel to the case of the von Neumann entropy above; however, the two identities (B1) and (B2) now lead to different definitions. We follow [31] and first introduce the *max relative entropy*. For two positive operators $\rho \in \mathcal{S}_{\leq}(\mathcal{H})$ and $\tau \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{H})$ we define

$$D_{\max}(\rho \| \tau) := \inf\{\lambda \in \mathbb{R} : \rho \leq 2^{\lambda}\tau\}\,.$$

Definition 4. *Let $\varepsilon \geq 0$ and $\rho_{\mathrm{AB}} \in \mathcal{S}_{\leq}(\mathcal{H}_{\mathrm{AB}})$. The min-entropy and the alternative min-entropy of A conditioned on B are given by*

$$H_{\min}(\mathrm{A}|\mathrm{B})_{\rho} = \max_{\sigma_{\mathrm{B}} \in \mathcal{S}_{=}(\mathcal{H}_{\mathrm{B}})} -D_{\max}(\rho_{\mathrm{AB}} \| \mathbb{1}_{\mathrm{A}} \otimes \sigma_{\mathrm{B}}) \quad \text{and}$$

$$\widehat{H}_{\min}(\mathrm{A}|\mathrm{B})_{\rho} := -D_{\max}(\rho_{\mathrm{AB}} \| \mathbb{1}_{\mathrm{A}} \otimes \rho_{\mathrm{B}})\,,$$

respectively. Furthermore, the smooth min-entropy and the alternative smooth min-entropy of A conditioned on B are defined as

$$H_{\min}^{\varepsilon}(\mathrm{A}|\mathrm{B})_{\rho} = \max_{\tilde{\rho}_{\mathrm{AB}} \in \mathcal{B}^{\varepsilon}(\rho_{\mathrm{AB}})} H_{\min}(\mathrm{A}|\mathrm{B})_{\tilde{\rho}} \quad \text{and}$$

$$\widehat{H}_{\min}^{\varepsilon}(\mathrm{A}|\mathrm{B})_{\rho} := \max_{\tilde{\rho}_{\mathrm{AB}} \in \mathcal{B}^{\varepsilon}(\rho_{\mathrm{AB}})} \widehat{H}_{\min}(\mathrm{A}|\mathrm{B})_{\tilde{\rho}}\,.$$

The *smooth max-entropies* can be defined as duals of the smooth min-entropies.

Definition 5. *Let $\varepsilon \geq 0$ and $\rho_{\mathrm{AB}} \in \mathcal{S}_{\leq}(\mathcal{H}_{\mathrm{AB}})$, then we define the smooth max-entropy and the alternative smooth max-entropy of A conditioned on B as*

$$H_{\max}^{\varepsilon}(\mathrm{A}|\mathrm{B})_{\rho} := -H_{\min}^{\varepsilon}(\mathrm{A}|\mathrm{C})_{\rho} \quad \text{and}$$

$$\widehat{H}_{\max}^{\varepsilon}(\mathrm{A}|\mathrm{B})_{\rho} := -\widehat{H}_{\min}^{\varepsilon}(\mathrm{A}|\mathrm{C})_{\rho}\,,$$

where $\rho_{\mathrm{ABC}} \in \mathcal{S}_{\leq}(\mathcal{H}_{\mathrm{ABC}})$ is any purification of ρ_{AB}.

The max-entropies are well-defined since the min-entropies are invariant under local isometries on the C system (cf. [26] and Lemma 24) and, thus, independent of the chosen purification. The non-smooth max-entropies $H_{\max}(\mathrm{A}|\mathrm{B})_{\rho}$ and $\widehat{H}_{\max}(\mathrm{A}|\mathrm{B})_{\rho}$ are defined as the limit $\varepsilon \to 0$ of the corresponding smooth quantities. The alternative max-entropy is discussed in Appendix D, where it is shown that (cf. also [32])

$$\widehat{H}_{\max}(\mathrm{A}|\mathrm{B})_{\rho} = \max_{\sigma_{\mathrm{B}} \in \mathcal{S}_{=}(\mathcal{H}_{\mathrm{B}})} \log\operatorname{tr}\left(\Pi_{\rho_{\mathrm{AB}}}(\mathbb{1}_{\mathrm{A}} \otimes \sigma_{\mathrm{B}})\right)\,, \quad\text{(B3)}$$

where $\Pi_{\rho_{\mathrm{AB}}}$ is the projector onto the support of ρ_{AB}. Furthermore, we find that

$$\widehat{H}_{\max}^{\varepsilon}(\mathrm{A}|\mathrm{B})_{\rho} = \inf_{\mathcal{H}_{\mathrm{B}'} \supseteq \mathcal{H}_{\mathrm{B}}} \min_{\tilde{\rho}_{\mathrm{AB}'} \in \mathcal{B}^{\varepsilon}(\rho_{\mathrm{AB}'})} \widehat{H}_{\max}(\mathrm{A}|\mathrm{B}')_{\tilde{\rho}}\,, \quad\text{(B4)}$$

where the infimum is taken over all embeddings $\rho_{AB'}$ of ρ_{AB} into $\mathcal{H}_A \otimes \mathcal{H}_{B'}$. In fact, it is sufficient to consider an embedding into a space of size $\dim \mathcal{H}_{B'} = \operatorname{rank}\{\rho_{AB}\} \cdot \dim \mathcal{H}_A$.

The first definition of the smooth max-entropy, $H_{\max}^\varepsilon(A|B)$, is used in [13, 25] and is found to have many interesting properties, e.g. it satisfies a data-processing inequality [26]. The alternative definition, $\widehat{H}_{\max}^\varepsilon(A|B)$, was first introduced in [10] and is used to quantitatively characterize various information theoretic tasks (cf. e.g. [31, 33, 34]). Here, we find that the two smooth min-entropies and the two smooth max-entropies are pairwise equivalent up to terms in $\log \varepsilon$. Namely, the following lemma holds:

Lemma 20. *Let $\varepsilon > 0$, $\varepsilon' \geq 0$ and $\rho_{AB} \in \mathcal{S}_=(\mathcal{H}_{AB})$, then*

$$H_{\min}^{\varepsilon'}(A|B)_\rho - \log c \leq \widehat{H}_{\min}^{\varepsilon+\varepsilon'}(A|B)_\rho \leq H_{\min}^{\varepsilon+\varepsilon'}(A|B)_\rho\,,$$

where $c = 2/\varepsilon^2 + 1/(1-\varepsilon')$.

The equivalence of the max-entropies follows by their definition as duals, i.e. we have

$$H_{\max}^{\varepsilon'}(A|B)_\rho + \log c \geq \widehat{H}_{\max}^{\varepsilon+\varepsilon'}(A|B)_\rho \geq H_{\max}^{\varepsilon+\varepsilon'}(A|B)_\rho\,.$$

For convenience of exposition, we introduce the generalized conditional min-entropy

$$h_{\min}(A|B)_{\rho|\sigma} := -D_{\max}(\rho_{AB} \,\|\, \mathbb{1}_A \otimes \sigma_B)\,.$$

The proof of Lemma 20 is based on the following result.

Lemma 21. *Let $\varepsilon > 0$ and $\rho_{ABC} \in \mathcal{S}_\leq(\mathcal{H}_{ABC})$ be pure. Then, there exists a projector Π_{AC} on $\mathcal{H}_{AC}$ and a state $\tilde{\rho}_{ABC} = \Pi_{AC}\,\rho_{ABC}\,\Pi_{AC}$ such that $\tilde{\rho}_{ABC} \in \mathcal{B}_p^\varepsilon(\rho_{ABC})$ and*

$$h_{\min}(A|B)_{\tilde{\rho}|\rho} \geq H_{\min}(A|B)_\rho - \log \frac{2}{\varepsilon^2}\,.$$

Furthermore, there exists a state $\bar{\rho}_{AB} \in \mathcal{S}_\leq(\mathcal{H}_{AB})$ that satisfies $\bar{\rho}_{AB} \in \mathcal{B}^\varepsilon(\rho_{AB})$ and

$$\widehat{H}_{\min}(A|B)_{\bar{\rho}} \geq H_{\min}(A|B)_\rho - \log\left(\frac{2}{\varepsilon^2} + \frac{1}{\operatorname{tr}\rho_{AB}}\right)\,.$$

Proof. The proof is structured as follows: First, we give a lower bound on the entropy $h_{\min}(A|B)_{\tilde{\rho}|\rho}$ in terms of $H_{\min}(A|B)_\rho$ and a projector Π_B that is the dual projector (cf. Corollay 16) of Π_{AC} with regard to ρ_{ABC}. We then find a lower bound on the purified distance between ρ_{ABC} and $\tilde{\rho}_{ABC}$ in terms of Π_B and define Π_B (and, thus, Π_{AC}) such that this distance does not exceed ε.

Let λ and σ_B be the pair that optimizes the min-entropy $H_{\min}(A|B)_\rho$, i.e. $H_{\min}(A|B)_\rho = h_{\min}(A|B)_{\rho|\sigma} = -\log \lambda$. We have $\tilde{\rho}_B \leq \rho_B$ by definition of $\tilde{\rho}_{ABC}$. Hence, $h_{\min}(A|B)_{\tilde{\rho}|\rho}$ is finite and can be written as

$$2^{-h_{\min}(A|B)_{\tilde{\rho}|\rho}} = \left\|\rho_B^{-1/2}\tilde{\rho}_{AB}\rho_B^{-1/2}\right\|_\infty\,,$$

where $\|X\|_\infty$ denotes the maximum eigenvalue of X. We bound this expression using the dual projector Π_B of Π_{AC}

with regard to ρ_{ABC} and the fact that $\rho_{AB} \leq \lambda \mathbb{1}_A \otimes \sigma_B$ by definition of λ and σ_B:

$$\begin{aligned}\text{rhs.} &= \left\|\operatorname{tr}_C\left((\Pi_{AC} \otimes \rho_B^{-1/2})\,\rho_{ABC}\,(\Pi_{AC} \otimes \rho_B^{-1/2})\right)\right\|_\infty \\ &= \left\|\Pi_B\,\rho_B^{-1/2}\rho_{AB}\,\rho_B^{-1/2}\Pi_B\right\|_\infty \\ &\leq \lambda \left\|\mathbb{1}_A \otimes \Pi_B\,\rho_B^{-1/2}\sigma_B\,\rho_B^{-1/2}\Pi_B\right\|_\infty \\ &= \lambda \left\|\Pi_B\Gamma_B\Pi_B\right\|_\infty\,,\end{aligned}$$

where, in the last step, we introduced the Hermitian operator $\Gamma_B := \rho_B^{-1/2}\sigma_B\,\rho_B^{-1/2}$. Taking the logarithm on both sides leads to

$$h_{\min}(A|B)_{\tilde{\rho}|\rho} \geq H_{\min}(A|B)_\rho - \log \|\Pi_B\Gamma_B\Pi_B\|_\infty\,. \quad \text{(B5)}$$

We use Lemma 17 to bound the distance between ρ_{ABC} and $\tilde{\rho}_{ABC}$, namely

$$P(\rho_{ABC}, \tilde{\rho}_{ABC}) \leq \sqrt{2\operatorname{tr}(\Pi_{AC}^\perp\rho_{ABC})} = \sqrt{2\operatorname{tr}(\Pi_B^\perp\rho_B)}\,,$$

where the last equality can be verified using Corollary 16. Clearly, the optimal choice of Π_B will cut off the largest eigenvalues of Γ_B in (B5) while keeping the states ρ_{ABC} and $\tilde{\rho}_{ABC}$ close. We thus define P_B to be the minimum rank projector onto the smallest eigenvalues of Γ_B such that $\operatorname{tr}(\Pi_B\rho_B) \geq \operatorname{tr}\rho_B - \varepsilon^2/2$ or, equivalently, $\operatorname{tr}(\Pi_B^\perp\rho_B) \leq \varepsilon^2/2$. This definition immediately implies that ρ_{ABC} and $\tilde{\rho}_{ABC}$ are ε-close and it remains to find an upper bound on $\|\Pi_B\Gamma_B\Pi_B\|_\infty$.

Let Π_B' be the projector onto the largest remaining eigenvalue in $\Pi_B\Gamma_B\Pi_B$ and note that Π_B' and $\Pi_B^\perp$ commute with Γ_B. Then,

$$\|\Pi_B\Gamma_B\Pi_B\|_\infty = \operatorname{tr}(\Pi_B'\Gamma_B) = \min_{\mu_B} \frac{\operatorname{tr}(\mu_B(\Pi_B^\perp + \Pi_B)\Gamma_B)}{\operatorname{tr}(\mu_B)}\,,$$

where μ_B is minimized over all positive operators in the support of $\Pi_B^\perp + \Pi_B'$. Fixing instead $\mu_B = (\Pi_B^\perp + \Pi_B')\rho_B(\Pi_B^\perp + \Pi_B')$, we find

$$\begin{aligned}\|\Pi_B\Gamma_B\Pi_B\|_\infty &\leq \frac{\operatorname{tr}(\Gamma_B^{1/2}\rho_B\Gamma_B^{1/2}(\Pi_B^\perp + \Pi_B'))}{\operatorname{tr}((\Pi_B^\perp + \Pi_B')\rho_B)} \\ &\leq \frac{\operatorname{tr}(\Gamma_B^{1/2}\rho_B\Gamma_B^{1/2})}{\operatorname{tr}((\Pi_B^\perp + \Pi_B')\rho_B)} \leq \frac{2}{\varepsilon^2}\,.\end{aligned}$$

In the last step we used that $\operatorname{tr}(\rho_B^{1/2}\Gamma_B\rho_B^{1/2}) = \operatorname{tr}(\sigma_B) = 1$ and that $\operatorname{tr}((\Pi_B^\perp + \Pi_B')\rho_B) \geq \frac{\varepsilon^2}{2}$ by definition of $\Pi_B^\perp$. We have now established the first statement.

To prove the second statement, we introduce an operator $\Delta_B := \rho_B - \tilde{\rho}_B \geq 0$. The state $\bar{\rho}_{AB} = \tilde{\rho}_{AB} + \mathbb{1}_A/d_A \otimes \Delta_B$, where $d_A = \dim \mathcal{H}_A$, satisfies $\bar{\rho}_B = \rho_B$. We now show that the state $\bar{\rho}_{AB}$ is ε-close to ρ_{AB}. The inequality $\tilde{\rho}_{AB} \leq \bar{\rho}_{AB}$ implies $\|\sqrt{\tilde{\rho}_{AB}}\sqrt{\rho_{AB}}\|_1 \leq \|\sqrt{\bar{\rho}_{AB}}\sqrt{\rho_{AB}}\|_1$ and, thus,

$$\begin{aligned}\bar{F}(\rho_{AB}, \bar{\rho}_{AB}) &\geq F(\tilde{\rho}_{AB}, \rho_{AB}) + 1 - \operatorname{tr}\rho_{AB} \\ &\geq F(\tilde{\rho}_{ABC}, \rho_{ABC}) + 1 - \operatorname{tr}\rho_{AB} \\ &= 1 - \operatorname{tr}(\Pi_{AC}^\perp\rho_{AC}) \geq 1 - \varepsilon^2/2\,,\end{aligned}$$

where we used the monotonicity of the fidelity $F(\rho,\tau) := \|\sqrt{\rho}\sqrt{\tau}\|_1$ under the partial trace. Thus, $P(\bar{\rho}_{AB},\rho_{AB}) \leq \varepsilon$.

We use that $\bar{\rho}_B = \rho_B$ and $\bar{\rho}_{AB} \leq \tilde{\rho}_{AB} + \mathbb{1}_A/d_A \otimes \rho_B$ to find a lower bound on $\widehat{H}_{\min}(A|B)_{\bar{\rho}} = h_{\min}(A|B)_{\bar{\rho}|\rho}$:

$$2^{-\widehat{H}_{\min}(A|B)_{\bar{\rho}}} = \left\| \rho_B^{-1/2} \bar{\rho}_{AB} \rho_B^{-1/2} \right\|_\infty$$
$$\leq \left\| \rho_B^{-1/2} \tilde{\rho}_{AB} \rho_B^{-1/2} + \frac{1}{d_A}\mathbb{1}_{AB} \right\|_\infty$$
$$\leq \lambda \frac{2}{\varepsilon^2} + \frac{1}{d_A}.$$

We have $\lambda \geq \operatorname{tr} \rho_{AB}/d_A$ (Lemma 20 in [26]) and, thus,

$$\widehat{H}_{\min}(A|B)_{\bar{\rho}} \geq H_{\min}(A|B)_\rho - \log\left(\frac{2}{\varepsilon^2} + \frac{1}{\operatorname{tr}\rho_{AB}} \right).$$

This concludes the proof of the second statement. $\square$

Furthermore, the alternative smooth min-entropy is a lower bound on the smooth min-entropy by definition.

Lemma 22. *Let $\rho_{AB} \in \mathcal{S}_{\leq}(\mathcal{H}_{AB})$, then*

$$\widehat{H}_{\min}(A|B)_\rho \leq H_{\min}(A|B)_\rho - \log\frac{1}{\operatorname{tr}\rho_{AB}}.$$

We are now ready to prove Lemma 20. Namely, we show that, for $\varepsilon > 0$, $\varepsilon' \geq 0$ and $\rho_{AB} \in \mathcal{S}_{\leq}(\mathcal{H}_{AB})$, it holds that

$$H_{\min}^{\varepsilon'}(A|B)_\rho - \log c \leq \widehat{H}_{\min}^{\varepsilon+\varepsilon'}(A|B)_\rho \leq H_{\min}^{\varepsilon+\varepsilon'}(A|B)_\rho,$$

where $c = 2/\varepsilon^2 + 1/(\operatorname{tr}\rho_{AB} - \varepsilon')$.

Proof of Lemma 20. Let $\tilde{\rho}_{AB} \in \mathcal{B}^{\varepsilon'}(\rho_{AB})$ be the state that maximizes $H_{\min}^{\varepsilon'}(A|B)_\rho$. Clearly, $\operatorname{tr}\tilde{\rho}_{AB} \geq \operatorname{tr}\rho_{AB} - \varepsilon'$. Moreover, Lemma 21 and the triangle inequality of the purified distance imply that there exists a state $\bar{\rho}_{AB} \in \mathcal{B}^{\varepsilon+\varepsilon'}(\rho_{AB})$ that satisfies

$$\widehat{H}_{\min}^{\varepsilon+\varepsilon'}(A|B)_\rho \geq \widehat{H}_{\min}(A|B)_{\bar{\rho}} \geq H_{\min}^{\varepsilon'}(A|B)_\rho - \log c,$$

which concludes the proof of the first inequality. The second inequality follows by applying Lemma 22 to the state that maximizes $\widehat{H}_{\min}^{\varepsilon+\varepsilon'}(A|B)_\rho$. $\square$

Appendix C: Collision Entropy

In this section, we prove Lemma 3, which gives a relation between the collision entropy and the min-entropy. First, we provide an inequality in terms of relative entropies.

Lemma 23. *Let $\rho_{AB} \in \mathcal{S}_{\leq}(\mathcal{H}_{AB})$ and $\sigma_B \in \mathcal{S}_=(\mathcal{H}_B)$, then*

$$D_{\max}(\rho_{AB} \| \mathbb{1}_A \otimes \sigma_B) \geq \log\Gamma_C(\rho_{AB}|\sigma_B) - \log\operatorname{tr}\rho_{AB}.$$

Proof. By definition of the max relative entropy, we have $\rho_{AB} \leq 2^{D_{\max}(\rho_{AB}\|\mathbb{1}_A\otimes\sigma_B)}\mathbb{1}_A \otimes \sigma_B$ and, thus,

$$(\mathbb{1}_A \otimes \sigma_B^{-1/2})\rho_{AB}(\mathbb{1}_A \otimes \sigma_B^{-1/2}) \leq 2^{D_{\max}(\rho_{AB}\|\mathbb{1}_A\otimes\sigma_B)}\mathbb{1}_{AB}.$$

We use this and the fact that $\operatorname{tr}(\rho_{AB}X) \leq \operatorname{tr}(\rho_{AB}Y)$ if $X \leq Y$ to get

$$\Gamma_C(A|B)_{\rho|\sigma} \leq 2^{D_{\max}(\rho_{AB}\|\mathbb{1}_A\otimes\sigma_B)}\operatorname{tr}\rho_{AB},$$

which concludes the proof. $\square$

Using the above result and Lemma 21 of Appendix B, we are ready to prove Lemma 3 of Section II.

Proof of Lemma 3. To prove the first statement, we apply Lemma 23 to the state ρ_{XB}. The inequality holds in particular for the state σ_B that optimizes $H_{\min}(X|B)_\rho$ (cf. Definition 4), establishing (10).

Next, we use Lemma 21 to define $\bar{\rho}_{XB} \in \mathcal{B}^{\bar{\varepsilon}}(\rho_{XB})$. Thus,

$$\widehat{H}_{\min}(X|B)_{\bar{\rho}} \geq H_{\min}(X|B)_\rho - \log\left(\frac{2}{\bar{\varepsilon}^2} + \frac{1}{\operatorname{tr}\rho_{XB}} \right).$$

In particular, we can choose $\bar{\rho}_{XB}$ normalized and CQ.[12] We apply Lemma 23 to this state to get

$$\Gamma_C(\bar{\rho}_{XB}|\bar{\rho}_B) \leq 2^{-\widehat{H}_{\min}(X|B)_{\bar{\rho}}} \leq 2^{-H_{\min}(X|B)_\rho + \log(\frac{2}{\bar{\varepsilon}^2}+1)},$$

which concludes the proof of (11). $\square$

Appendix D: Duality Relation for Alternative Smooth Entropies

Here, we find that the alternative smooth min-entropy of A conditioned on B is invariant under local isometries on the B system. Since all purifications are equivalent up to isometries on the purifying system, this allows the definition of the alternative max-entropy as its dual (see Definition 5). Furthermore, the max-entropy of A conditioned on B is invariant under local isometries on the B system as a direct consequence. Note that the alternative smooth min- and max-entropies are in general not invariant under isometries on the A system, i.e. they depend on the dimension of the Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}_A$.

Lemma 24. *Let $\varepsilon \geq 0$ and $\rho_{AB} \in \mathcal{S}_{\leq}(\mathcal{H}_{AB})$. Moreover, let $U : \mathcal{H}_B \to \mathcal{H}_D$ be an isometry with $\tau_{AD} := (\mathbb{1}_A \otimes U)\rho_{AB}(\mathbb{1}_A \otimes U^\dagger)$. Then,*

$$\widehat{H}_{\min}^\varepsilon(A|B)_\rho = \widehat{H}_{\min}^\varepsilon(A|D)_\tau \quad and$$
$$\widehat{H}_{\max}^\varepsilon(A|B)_\rho = \widehat{H}_{\max}^\varepsilon(A|D)_\tau.$$

---

[12] To see this, first note that the alternative min-entropy, $\widehat{H}_{\min}(X|B)_{\bar{\rho}}$, is independent of $\operatorname{tr}\bar{\rho}_{XB}$. Moreover, measuring $\bar{\rho}_{XB}$ on the X system will increase the alternative min-entropy while the distance to ρ_{XB} can only decrease.

Proof. Let $\tilde{\rho}_{\mathrm{AB}} \in \mathcal{B}^{\varepsilon}(\rho_{\mathrm{AB}})$ be the state that maximizes the alternative min-entropy of A conditioned on B and let λ be defined with $\widehat{H}^{\varepsilon}_{\min}(\mathrm{A|B})_{\rho} = -\log \lambda$. Then $\tilde{\rho}_{\mathrm{AB}} \leq \lambda \mathbb{1}_{\mathrm{A}} \otimes \tilde{\rho}_{\mathrm{B}}$, which implies

$$\underbrace{(\mathbb{1}_{\mathrm{A}} \otimes U)\tilde{\rho}_{\mathrm{AB}}(\mathbb{1}_{\mathrm{A}} \otimes U^{\dagger})}_{=: \tilde{\tau}_{\mathrm{AD}}} \leq \lambda \mathbb{1}_{\mathrm{A}} \otimes (U\tilde{\rho}_{\mathrm{B}}U^{\dagger}) .$$

Hence, $\tilde{\tau}_{\mathrm{AD}} \leq \lambda \mathbb{1}_{\mathrm{A}} \otimes \tilde{\tau}_{\mathrm{D}}$. Moreover, $\tilde{\tau}_{\mathrm{AD}} \in \mathcal{B}^{\varepsilon}(\tau_{\mathrm{AD}})$ due to (9), which implies $\widehat{H}^{\varepsilon}_{\min}(\mathrm{A|D})_{\rho} \geq \widehat{H}^{\varepsilon}_{\min}(\mathrm{A|B})_{\rho}$. The same argument in reverse can be applied to get $\widehat{H}^{\varepsilon}_{\min}(\mathrm{A|B})_{\rho} \geq \widehat{H}^{\varepsilon}_{\min}(\mathrm{A|D})_{\tau}$.

The invariance under isometry of the dual quantity follows by definition. Namely, let ρ_{ABE} be any purification of ρ_{AB}, then

$$\begin{aligned}
\widehat{H}^{\varepsilon}_{\max}(\mathrm{A|B})_{\rho} &= -\widehat{H}^{\varepsilon}_{\min}(\mathrm{A|E})_{\rho} \\
&= -\widehat{H}^{\varepsilon}_{\min}(\mathrm{A|E})_{\tau} = \widehat{H}^{\varepsilon}_{\max}(\mathrm{A|D})_{\tau} ,
\end{aligned}$$

where $\tau_{\mathrm{ADE}} := (\mathbb{1}_{\mathrm{A}} \otimes U \otimes \mathbb{1}_{\mathrm{E}})\rho_{\mathrm{ABE}}(\mathbb{1}_{\mathrm{A}} \otimes U^{\dagger} \otimes \mathbb{1}_{\mathrm{E}})$ is a purification of τ_{AD}. $\square$

Next, we derive expression (B3) for the alternative non-smooth and smooth max-entropies. The result for the non-smooth entropy was first shown in [32] and an alternative proof is provided here for completeness.

Lemma 25. *Let* $\rho_{\mathrm{AB}} \in \mathcal{S}_{\leq}(\mathcal{H}_{\mathrm{AB}})$, *then*

$$\widehat{H}_{\max}(\mathrm{A|B})_{\rho} = \max_{\sigma_{\mathrm{B}} \in \mathcal{S}_{=}(\mathcal{H}_{\mathrm{B}})} \log \mathrm{tr}\left(\Pi_{\rho_{\mathrm{AB}}}(\mathbb{1}_{\mathrm{A}} \otimes \sigma_{\mathrm{B}})\right)$$

Proof. Let ρ_{ABC} be a purification of ρ_{AB}. Then, $\tau_{\mathrm{ABC}} := \left(\mathbb{1}_{\mathrm{AB}} \otimes \rho_{\mathrm{C}}^{-1/2}\right) \rho_{\mathrm{ABC}} \left(\mathbb{1}_{\mathrm{AB}} \otimes \rho_{\mathrm{C}}^{-1/2}\right)$ has marginal $\tau_{\mathrm{AB}} = \Pi_{\rho_{\mathrm{AB}}}$ due to Lemma 14. This allows us to write

$$\begin{aligned}
2^{\widehat{H}_{\max}(\mathrm{A|B})_{\rho}} &= 2^{-\widehat{H}_{\min}(\mathrm{A|C})_{\rho}} = \|\tau_{\mathrm{AC}}\|_{\infty} = \|\tau_{\mathrm{B}}\|_{\infty} \\
&= \max_{\sigma_{\mathrm{B}}} \mathrm{tr}(\sigma_{\mathrm{B}}\tau_{\mathrm{B}}) = \max_{\sigma_{\mathrm{B}}} \mathrm{tr}\left(\Pi_{\rho_{\mathrm{AB}}}(\mathbb{1}_{\mathrm{A}} \otimes \sigma_{\mathrm{B}})\right) ,
\end{aligned}$$

where the maximization is over all $\sigma_{\mathrm{B}} \in \mathcal{S}_{=}(\mathcal{H}_{\mathrm{B}})$. $\square$

The alternative smooth max-entropy can be seen as an optimization of the non-smooth quantity over an ε-ball of states, where the ball is embedded in a sufficiently large Hilbert space. We show that (B4) holds.

Lemma 26. *Let* $\varepsilon \geq 0$ *and* $\rho_{\mathrm{AB}} \in \mathcal{S}_{\leq}(\mathcal{H}_{\mathrm{AB}})$, *then*

$$\widehat{H}^{\varepsilon}_{\max}(\mathrm{A|B})_{\rho} = \inf_{\mathcal{H}_{\mathrm{B'}} \supseteq \mathcal{H}_{\mathrm{B}}} \min_{\tilde{\rho}_{\mathrm{AB'}} \in \mathcal{B}^{\varepsilon}(\rho_{\mathrm{AB'}})} \widehat{H}_{\max}(\mathrm{A|B'})_{\tilde{\rho}} ,$$

where $\rho_{\mathrm{AB'}}$ *is the embedding of* ρ_{AB} *into* $\mathcal{H}_{\mathrm{AB'}}$. *Furthermore, the infimum is attained for embeddings with* $\dim \mathcal{H}_{\mathrm{B'}} \geq \dim \mathrm{supp}\{\rho_{\mathrm{AB}}\} \cdot \dim \mathcal{H}_{\mathrm{A}}$.

Proof. Let ρ_{ABC} be a purification of ρ_{AB} on a Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}_{\mathrm{C}}$ with $\dim \mathcal{H}_{\mathrm{C}} = \mathrm{rank}\{\rho_{\mathrm{AB}}\}$. Furthermore, for any $\mathcal{H}_{\mathrm{B'}} \supseteq \mathcal{H}_{\mathrm{B}}$, let $\rho_{\mathrm{AB'C'}}$ be the embedding of ρ_{ABC} into $\mathcal{H}_{\mathrm{AB'C'}}$ with $\dim \mathcal{H}_{\mathrm{C'}} = \dim \mathcal{H}_{\mathrm{AB'}}$. We use Corollary 13 twice to upper bound

$$\begin{aligned}
\widehat{H}^{\varepsilon}_{\max}(\mathrm{A|B})_{\rho} &= -\widehat{H}^{\varepsilon}_{\min}(\mathrm{A|C'})_{\rho} \\
&= \min_{\tilde{\rho}_{\mathrm{AC'}} \in \mathcal{B}^{\varepsilon}(\rho_{\mathrm{AC'}})} -\widehat{H}_{\min}(\mathrm{A|C'})_{\tilde{\rho}} \\
&\leq \min_{\tilde{\rho}_{\mathrm{AB'C'}} \in \mathcal{B}^{\varepsilon}_{\mathrm{p}}(\rho_{\mathrm{AB'C'}})} \widehat{H}_{\max}(\mathrm{A|B'})_{\tilde{\rho}} \\
&= \min_{\tilde{\rho}_{\mathrm{AB'}} \in \mathcal{B}^{\varepsilon}(\rho_{\mathrm{AB'}})} \widehat{H}_{\max}(\mathrm{A|B'})_{\tilde{\rho}} .
\end{aligned}$$

A lower bound on $\widehat{H}^{\varepsilon}_{\max}(\mathrm{A|B})_{\rho}$ follows when we require that $\dim \mathcal{H}_{\mathrm{B'}} \geq \mathrm{rank}\{\rho_{\mathrm{AB}}\} \cdot \dim \mathcal{H}_{\mathrm{A}} = \dim \mathcal{H}_{\mathrm{AC}}$. Then, $\mathcal{H}_{\mathrm{B'}}$ is large enough to accomodate all purifications of states in $\mathcal{H}_{\mathrm{AC}}$. Using Corollay 13 twice, we find

$$\begin{aligned}
\widehat{H}^{\varepsilon}_{\max}(\mathrm{A|B})_{\rho} &= \min_{\tilde{\rho}_{\mathrm{AC}} \in \mathcal{B}^{\varepsilon}(\varepsilon)\rho_{\mathrm{AC}}} -\widehat{H}_{\min}(\mathrm{A|C})_{\tilde{\rho}} \\
&= \min_{\tilde{\rho}_{\mathrm{AB'C}} \in \mathcal{B}^{\varepsilon}_{\mathrm{p}}(\rho_{\mathrm{AB'C}})} \widehat{H}_{\max}(\mathrm{A|B'})_{\tilde{\rho}} \\
&\geq \min_{\tilde{\rho}_{\mathrm{AB'}} \in \mathcal{B}^{\varepsilon}(\rho_{\mathrm{AB'}})} \widehat{H}_{\max}(\mathrm{A|B'})_{\tilde{\rho}} .
\end{aligned}$$

The infimum is therefore attained and it is sufficient to consider embeddings with $\dim \mathcal{H}_{\mathrm{B'}} = \dim \mathrm{supp}\{\rho_{\mathrm{AB}}\} \cdot \dim \mathcal{H}_{\mathrm{A}}$. $\square$

---

[1] D. R. Stinson, "Universal Hash Families and the Left-over Hash Lemma, and Applications to Cryptography and Computing," *Journal of Combinatorial Mathematics and Combinatorial Computing*, vol. 42, pp. 3–31, 2002.

[2] C. H. Bennett, G. Brassard, and J.-M. Robert, "Privacy Amplification by Public Discussion," *SIAM J. Comput.*, vol. 17, no. 2, p. 210, 1988.

[3] R. Impagliazzo, L. A. Levin, and M. Luby, "Pseudo-Random Generation from one-way Functions," in *Proc. 21st Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing*, 1989, pp. 12–24.

[4] C. H. Bennett, G. Brassard, C. Crepeau, and U. M. Maurer, "Generalized Privacy Amplification," *IEEE Trans. on Inf. Theory*, vol. 41, no. 6, pp. 1915–1923, 1995.

[5] R. Impagliazzo and D. Zuckerman, "How to Recycle Random Bits," in *Proc. 30th Annual IEEE Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science*, 1989, pp. 248–253.

[6] J. Hå stad, R. Impagliazzo, L. A. Levin, and M. Luby, "A Pseudorandom Generator from any one-way Function," *SIAM J. Comput.*, vol. 28, no. 4, pp. 1364–1396, 1999.

[7] D. Gavinsky, J. Kempe, W. J. Kempe, I. Kerenidis, C. W. I. Amsterdam, R. Raz, R. de Wolf, and O. R. Raz, "Exponential Separation for one-way Quantum Communication Complexity, with Applications to Cryptography," in *Proc. 39th Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing*. San Diego: ACM, 2007, pp. 516–525.

[8] R. König and R. Renner, "Sampling of min-entropy Relative to Quantum Knowledge," p. 48, December 2007. [Online]. Available: http://arxiv.org/abs/0712.4291

[9] R. König, U. M. Maurer, and R. Renner, "On the Power of Quantum Memory," *IEEE Trans. on Inf. Theory*, vol. 51, no. 7, pp. 2391–2401, 2005.

[10] R. Renner, "Security of Quantum Key Distribution," PhD Thesis, ETH Zürich, 2005. [Online]. Available: http://arxiv.org/abs/quant-ph/0512258

[11] R. Renner and R. König, "Universally Composable Privacy Amplification Against Quantum Adversaries," in *Second Theory of Cryptography Conference, TCC 2005*, ser. LNCS, vol. 3378. Springer, 2005, pp. 407–425.

[12] M. A. Nielsen, I. Chuang, and L. Grover, *Quantum Computation and Quantum Information*. Cambridge University Press, 2000.

[13] R. König, R. Renner, and C. Schaffner, "The Operational Meaning of min- and max-Entropy," *IEEE Trans. on Inf. Theory*, vol. 55, no. 9, pp. 4337–4347, 2009. [Online]. Available: http://arxiv.org/abs/0807.1338

[14] J. L. Carter and M. N. Wegman, "Universal Classes of Hash Functions," *Journal of Computer and System Sciences*, vol. 18, no. 2, pp. 143–154, 1979.

[15] D. R. Stinson, "Universal Hashing and Authentication Codes," *Designs, Codes and Cryptography*, vol. 4, no. 3, pp. 369–380, July 1994.

[16] G. Van Assche, *Quantum Cryptography and Secret-Key Distillation*. Cambridge University Press, 2006.

[17] J. Lodewyck, M. Bloch, R. García-Patrón, S. Fossier, E. Karpov, E. Diamanti, T. Debuisschert, N. Cerf, R. Tualle-Brouri, S. McLaughlin, and P. Grangier, "Quantum Key Distribution over 25km with an All-Fiber Continuous-Variable System," *Phys. Rev. A*, vol. 76, no. 4, 2007.

[18] Y. Dodis and A. Smith, "Correcting Errors without Leaking Partial Information," in *37th Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing (STOC)*, 2005, pp. 654–663.

[19] S. Fehr and C. Schaffner, "Randomness Extraction Via Delta-Biased Masking in the Presence of a Quantum Attacker," in *Theory of Cryptography Conference '08*. Springer, 2008, pp. 465–481.

[20] S. P. Desrosiers and F. Dupuis, "Quantum entropic security and approximate quantum encryption," 2007. [Online]. Available: http://arxiv.org/abs/0707.0691

[21] L. Trevisan, "Extractors and Pseudorandom Generators," *Journal of the ACM*, vol. 48, no. 4, pp. 860–879, July 2001.

[22] A. Ta-Shma, "Short Seed Extractors Against Quantum Storage," 2008. [Online]. Available: http://arxiv.org/abs/0808.1994

[23] A. De and T. Vidick, "Near-Optimal Extractors Against Quantum Storage," November 2009. [Online]. Available: http://arxiv.org/abs/0911.4680

[24] A. De, C. Portmann, T. Vidick, and R. Renner, "Trevisan's Extractor in the Presence of Quantum Side Information," December 2009. [Online]. Available: http://arxiv.org/abs/0912.5514

[25] M. Tomamichel, R. Colbeck, and R. Renner, "A Fully Quantum Asymptotic Equipartition Property," *IEEE Trans. on Inf. Theory*, vol. 55, no. 12, pp. 5840–5847, 2009.

[26] M. Tomamichel, R. Colbeck, and R. Renner, "Duality Between Smooth Min- and Max-Entropies," 2009. [Online]. Available: http://arxiv.org/abs/0907.5238v1

[27] A. Srinivasan and D. Zuckerman, "Computing with Very Weak Random Sources," *SIAM J. Comput.*, vol. 28, no. 4, pp. 1433–1459, 1999.

[28] A. Uhlmann, "The Transition Probability for States of Star-Algebras," *Annalen der Physik*, vol. 497, no. 4, pp. 524–532, 1985.

[29] R. Bhatia, *Matrix Analysis*, ser. Graduate Texts in Mathematics. Springer, 1997.

[30] O. Klein, "Zur quantenmechanischen Begründung des zweiten Hauptsatzes der Wärmelehre," *Z. Phys*, vol. 72, no. 11-12, pp. 767–775, November 1931.

[31] N. Datta, "Min- and Max- Relative Entropies and a New Entanglement Monotone," *IEEE Trans. on Inf. Theory*, vol. 55, no. 6, pp. 2816–2826, 2009.

[32] M. Berta, "Single-Shot Quantum State Merging," Master's Thesis, ETH Zürich, 2008.

[33] M. Mosony and N. Datta, "Generalized Relative Entropies and the Capacity of Classical-Quantum Channels," *J. Math. Phys.*, vol. 50, no. 7, 2009.

[34] F. Buscemi and N. Datta, "The Quantum Capacity of Channels with Arbitrarily Correlated Noise," 2009. [Online]. Available: http://arxiv.org/abs/0902.0158v5