Abstract—Randomness extraction against side information is
the art of distilling from a given source a key which is almost
uniform conditioned on the side information. This paper provides
randomness extraction against quantum side information whose
extractable key length is given by a quantum generalization
of the conditional collision entropy defined without the conven-
tional smoothing. Based on the fact that the collision entropy is not sub-
additive, the generalized conditional collision entropy maximized
with respect to additional side information is introduced, and is
shown to be asymptotically optimal.
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I. INTRODUCTION

Consider a random variable $X$ and a quantum state $\rho$
related to $X$. The task of randomness extraction from
source $X$ against side information $\rho$ is to distill an almost
random key $S$ from $X$. Here the randomness of $S$ is measured
by the trace distance between the composite systems $(S, \rho)$ and
$(U, \rho)$, where $U$ is a random variable uniformly distributed
and independent of $\rho$. A major application of randomness
extraction is privacy amplification [1], [2], whose task is to
transform a partially secure key into a highly secure key in
the presence of an adversary with side information.

It has been shown that a two-universal hash function [3]
can be used to provide randomness extraction against quantum
side information, in which the extractable key length is lower-
bounded by a quantum generalization of the conditional min-
entropy [11]. The extractable key length can also be given by
a quantum generalization of the conditional collision entropy
(conditional Rényi entropy of order 2) [11], [12]. It should
be stated that the collision entropy is lower-bounded by the
min-entropy and so gives a better extractable key length than
the min-entropy, while the min-entropy has several useful
properties such as the monotonicity under quantum operations.

The conventional way to consider a tighter bound on the
length of an extractable almost random key is to generalize
entropies by the smoothing. In fact, the existing extractable
key lengths have been described by smooth entropies, which
are defined as the maximization of entropies with respect to
quantum states within a small ball (see e.g. [9], [11]–[13],
[15]). More precisely, let $\mathcal{H}_A$ and $\mathcal{H}_B$ be finite-dimensional
Hilbert spaces, and $\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H})$ and $\mathcal{S}_\leq(\mathcal{H})$ denote the sets
of normalized and sub-normalized quantum states on a Hilbert
space $\mathcal{H}$, respectively; then, for example, the smooth mini-
entropy $H^\epsilon_{\min}(A|B)_\rho$ of system $A$ conditioned on system $B$
of a state $\rho \in \mathcal{S}_\leq(\mathcal{H}_A \otimes \mathcal{H}_B)$ is defined by

$$H^\epsilon_{\min}(A|B)_\rho = \max_{\rho' \in B^\epsilon(\rho)} H_{\min}(A|B)_{\rho'},$$

$$H_{\min}(A|B)_\rho = \max_{\sigma \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H}_B)} \sup \{ \lambda | 2^{-\lambda} I_A \otimes \sigma \geq \rho \},$$

where $I_A$ denotes the identity operator on $\mathcal{H}_A$, and $B^\epsilon(\rho) = \{ \rho' \in \mathcal{S}_\leq(\mathcal{H}) | C(\rho, \rho') \leq \epsilon \}$ for $\epsilon > 0$ and $\rho \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H})$ with
$C(\rho, \rho') = \sqrt{1 - F^2(\rho, \rho')}$ and $F(\rho, \rho') = \text{Tr}[\sqrt{\rho \rho'}]$. This paper introduces a quantum generalization of the conditional
collision entropy defined without this conventional smoothing,
and provides randomness extraction against quantum side
information whose extractable key length is given by the
generalized collision entropy.

II. PRELIMINARIES

Let $\mathcal{H}$ be a Hilbert space. For an Hermitian operator $X$ on
$\mathcal{H}$ with spectral decomposition $X = \sum_i \lambda_i E_i$, let $\{ X \geq 0 \}$
denote the projection on $\mathcal{H}$ given by

$$\{ X \geq 0 \} = \sum_{i: \lambda_i \geq 0} E_i.$$ 

The projections $\{ X > 0 \}$, $\{ X \leq 0 \}$ and $\{ X < 0 \}$ are
defined analogously. Let $A$ and $B$ be positive operators on $\mathcal{H}$.
The trace distance $d_1(A, B)$ and the relative entropy $D(A||B)$
between $A$ and $B$ are defined as

$$d_1(A, B) = \text{Tr}[\sqrt{(A - B)(A - B)^*}],$$

$$D(A||B) = \text{Tr}[A \log_2 A - \log_2 B],$$

respectively, where $\log_2$ denotes the logarithm to base 2. The
von Neumann entropy of $A$ is defined as

$$S(A) = -\text{Tr} A \log_2 A.$$ 

For an operator $X > 0$, let $X'$ denote the normalization of
$X$; that is, $X' = X/\text{Tr}[X]$.

It then follows from $S(A') \leq \text{rank} A' = \text{rank} A$ and $D(A'||B') \geq 0$ that

$$S(A) \leq \text{Tr}[A(\log_2 A - \log_2 A)],$$

$$D(A||B) \geq \text{Tr}[A(\log_2 A - \log_2 B)].$$

More generally, it can be shown that inequality (1) holds for
$A \geq 0$ and inequality (2) holds for $A, B \geq 0$ such that
$\text{supp} A \subset \text{supp} B$, by using the convention $\log_2 0 = 0$, which
can be justified by taking the limit, $\lim_{\epsilon \to +0} \epsilon \log_2 \epsilon = 0$.

Let $f$ be an operator convex function on an interval $J \subset \mathbb{R}$.
Let $\{ X_i \}$ be a set of operators on $\mathcal{H}$ with their spectrum in $J$, and
$\{ C_i \}$ be a set of operators on $\mathcal{H}$ such that $\sum_i C_i' C_i = I$,
where $I$ is the identity operator on $\mathcal{H}$. Then Jensen’s operator inequality for $f$, $\{X_i\}_i$ and $\{C_i\}_i$ is given by

$$f\left(\sum_i C_i^\dagger X_i C_i\right) \leq \sum_i C_i^\dagger f(X_i) C_i$$

(3)

(see e.g. [2], [7]).

Let $\mathcal{X}$ and $\mathcal{S}$ be finite sets and $\mathcal{G}$ be a family of functions from $\mathcal{X}$ to $\mathcal{S}$. Let $G$ be a random variable uniformly distributed over $\mathcal{G}$. Then $\mathcal{G}$ is called two-universal, and $G$ is called a two-universal hash function [3], if

$$\Pr[G(x_0) = G(x_1)] \leq \frac{1}{|\mathcal{S}|}$$

(4)

for every distinct $x_0, x_1 \in \mathcal{X}$. For example, the family of all functions from $\mathcal{X}$ to $\mathcal{S}$ is two-universal. A more useful two-universal family is that of all linear functions from $\{0,1\}^n$ to $\{0,1\}^m$. More efficient families, which can be described using $O(n + m)$ bits and have a polynomial-time evaluating algorithms, are discussed in [3], [17].

Let $X$ be a random variable on a finite set $\mathcal{X}$ and $\rho$ be a quantum state on $\mathcal{H}_X$. In considering the composite system $(X, \rho)$, it may help to introduce a Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}_B$. Let $G$ be a quantum state on a Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}_B$. Then $G$ is the identity operator on $\mathcal{H}_B$.

$$\rho_{XB} = \frac{1}{|\mathcal{X}|} \sum_x |x\rangle\langle x| \otimes \rho_x,$$

where $\rho_x = \Pr[X = x]$ for $x \in \mathcal{X}$, and $\rho_x$ denotes the quantum state $\rho$ conditioned on $X = x$.

Let $X$ and $V$ be random variables on finite sets $\mathcal{X}$ and $\mathcal{V}$, respectively, and $\rho$ be a quantum state on $\mathcal{H}_B$. Then the distance $d(X|V)\rho$ from uniform of system $X$ given system $V$ and $B$ can be defined as

$$d(X|V)\rho = d_1(\rho_{XVB}, \rho_{UVB}),$$

where $U$ is a random variable which is uniformly distributed over $\mathcal{X}$ and independent of $V$ and $\rho$; namely,

$$\rho_{UVB} = \left(\frac{1}{|\mathcal{X}|} \sum_x |x\rangle\langle x| \right) \otimes \rho_{VB}.$$
side of (7) by applying Jensen’s operator inequality as follows. Let $f = -\log_2$ and introduce the operators $X_{sg}$ and $C_{sg}$ by writing

$$X_{sg} = \rho_{sg} + \gamma I \quad \text{and} \quad C_{sg} = (p_g \rho_{sg})^{1/2} P \rho_{sg}^{-1/2}$$

for $\gamma > 0$, where we have defined

$$\rho_s = P \rho_s P \quad \text{and} \quad P = \{ A - 2^{-r} \rho_s^2 \leq 0 \}$$

for $r < R_e(X|Y)_p$. It readily follows that $X_{sg} > 0$ and $\sum_{s,g} C_{sg}^* C_{sg} = P \rho_s$, where $P \rho_s$ denotes the projection onto the range of $\rho_s$. Furthermore, let us define the operators $X_+$ and $C_+$ by

$$X_+ = I \quad \text{and} \quad C_+ = I - P \rho_s,$$

so that

$$f(X_+) = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \sum_{s,g} C_{sg}^* C_{sg} + C_+^* C_+ = I.$$

Then by Jensen’s operator inequality (3),

$$f \left( \sum_{s,g} C_{sg}^* X_{sg} C_{sg} + C_+^* X_+ C_+ \right) \leq \sum_{s,g} C_{sg}^* f(X_{sg}) C_{sg}.$$

Here, $\sum_{s,g} C_{sg}^* X_{sg} C_{sg}$ is an operator on the range $\mathcal{R}(\rho_s)$ of $\rho_s$, while $C_+^* X_+ C_+$ is an operator on its orthogonal complement $\mathcal{R}(\rho_s)^\perp$. It thus follows that

$$\rho_s^{1/2} f \left( \sum_{s,g} C_{sg}^* X_{sg} C_{sg} \right) \rho_s^{1/2} \leq \rho_s^{1/2} \sum_{s,g} C_{sg}^* f(X_{sg}) C_{sg} \rho_s^{1/2},$$

which, in the limit $\gamma \to +0$, leads to

$$\sum_{s,g} p_g P \rho_{sg}^2 \left( \log_2 \rho_{sg} \right) \rho_{sg}^{1/2} P \leq \rho_s^{1/2} \left( \log_2 \sum_{s,g} p_g \rho_{sg}^{1/2} P \rho_{sg}^{1/2} \rho_s^{-1/2} \right) \rho_s^{1/2}. \quad (9)$$

To estimate the right-hand side of (9), let us estimate the sum $\sum_{s,g} p_g P \rho_{sg}^2 P$. Substitution of (8) into this sum gives

$$\sum_{s,g} p_g P \rho_{sg}^2 P = \sum_{g,x,x'} p_{g,x,x'} p(g(x) = g(x')) P \rho_x P \rho_x^*.$$

Here, we divide the sum of the right-hand side into two parts so that one part consists of the terms with $x = x'$ and the other part consists of the remaining terms. It follows from the definition of $P$ that the former part can be bounded as

$$\sum_{g,x,x': x = x'} p_{g,x,x'} p(g(x) = g(x')) P \rho_x P \rho_x^* \leq 2^{-r} P \rho_s^2 P.$$

By using (4), the latter part can also be bounded as

$$\sum_{g,x,x': x \neq x'} p_{g,x,x'} p(g(x) = g(x')) P \rho_x P \rho_x^* \rho_s \leq \frac{1}{|S|} \sum_{g,x,x': x \neq x'} p_{g,x,x'} P \rho_x P \rho_x^* \rho_s \leq \frac{1}{|S|} P \rho_s^2 P.$$

The above two inequalities at once give

$$\sum_{s,g} p_g P \rho_{sg}^2 P \leq \frac{1}{|S|} \left( 1 + \delta_r \right) P \rho_s^2 P \quad (10)$$

with $\delta_r = |S|^{-2}$. Note here that $\log_2 \rho_{sg} \leq 0$ and $\rho_{sg} \geq 1/2 P \rho_{sg}^2 P$, and so

$$\sum_{g,s} p_g \text{Tr} \left[ \rho_{sg} \log_2 \rho_{sg} \right] \leq \sum_{s,g} p_g \text{Tr} \left[ \rho_{sg}/2 P \rho_{sg}^2 \log_2 \rho_{sg} \right].$$

Therefore, by taking the trace of both sides of (9) and then using (10), we obtain

$$D(S|GY)_p \leq (1 - \text{Tr}[\rho_s]) \log_2 |S| + \log_2 (1 + \delta_r) + \Delta,$$

where we have introduced

$$\Delta = \text{Tr} \left[ \rho_s \log_2 (\rho_s^{-1/2} P \rho_s^2 P \rho_s^{-1/2}) \right] - \text{Tr} \left[ \rho_s \log_2 \rho_s \right].$$

Furthermore, by using $\text{Tr}[\rho_s] \geq 1 - \epsilon$ and $\log_2 (1 + x) \leq x/\ln2$ for $x \geq 0$, this inequality can be simplified to

$$D(S|GY)_p \leq \epsilon \log_2 |S| + \delta_r/\ln2 + \Delta. \quad (11)$$

It remains to estimate $\Delta$. Let us write $\Delta$ in the form $\Delta = \Delta_1 + \Delta_2$, where

$$\Delta_1 = \text{Tr} \left[ \rho_s \log_2 (\rho_s^{-1/2} P \rho_s^2 P \rho_s^{-1/2}) \right] - \text{Tr} \left[ \rho_s \log_2 \rho_s \right],$$

$$\Delta_2 = \text{Tr} \left[ \rho_s \log_2 \rho_s \right] - \text{Tr} \left[ \rho_s \log_2 \rho_s \right].$$

First, we estimate the first part $\Delta_1$. Let $A = \rho_s$ and $B = \rho_s^{-1/2} P \rho_s^2 P \rho_s^{-1/2}$. Since

$$B - A = \rho_s^{-1/2} P \rho_s (I - P) \rho_s \rho_s^{-1/2} \geq 0,$$

and hence $\text{supp} A \subset \text{supp} B$, inequality (2) can be applied to yield

$$\Delta_1 = -D(A||B) \leq \text{Tr} [A] \log_2 \frac{\text{Tr}[B]}{\text{Tr}[A]}.$$

It is now convenient to define $\phi = \text{Tr}[B - A]$, which can be written as

$$\phi = \text{Tr} \left[ \rho_s^{-1/2} P \rho_s (I - P) \rho_s \rho_s^{-1/2} \right] = \text{Tr} \left[ (I - P) \rho_s^{-1/2} P \rho_s^{-1/2} \rho_s \right].$$

Hence by Schwarz’s inequality,

$$\phi \leq \left( \text{Tr} \left[ (I - P) \rho_s \right] \right) \frac{\text{Tr} \left[ \rho_s \rho_s^{-1/2} P \rho_s^{-1/2} \right]}{2}^{1/2}.$$

By use of $\text{Tr}[(I - P) \rho_s] \leq \epsilon$ and $\text{Tr}[\rho_s \rho_s^{-1/2} P \rho_s^{-1/2}] = \text{Tr}[B] = \text{Tr}[A] + \phi$, this inequality can be simplified to $\phi \leq \epsilon^{1/2} (\text{Tr}[A] + \phi)^{1/2}$, which, together with $\text{Tr}[A] = \text{Tr}[\rho_s] \leq 1$, gives

$$\phi \leq \epsilon + \left( \epsilon^2 + 4\epsilon \text{Tr}[A] \right)^{1/2} \leq \epsilon + \epsilon \epsilon^{1/2} = \epsilon + \epsilon^{1/2}.$$

Therefore

$$\Delta_1 \leq \text{Tr}[A] \phi \leq \frac{\epsilon + \epsilon^{1/2}}{\ln2}. \quad (12)$$
Next, we estimate the second part $\Delta_2$. Let $\kappa_P(\rho_x) = P\rho_x P + (I - P)\rho_x (I - P)$. Since $\rho_x$ and $\kappa_P(\rho_x)$ are density operators, $D(\rho_x || \kappa_P(\rho_x)) \geq 0$, and hence

$$-S(\rho_x) + S(\hat{\rho}_x) + S((I - P)\rho_x (I - P)) \geq 0.$$  

From this and (11),

$$\Delta_2 = -S(\hat{\rho}_x) + S(\rho_x) \leq S((I - P)\rho_x (I - P)) \leq \epsilon \log_2 d + \eta_0(\epsilon),$$

where $d = \text{rank} \rho_x$ and $\eta_0$ is a monotone increasing function on $[0, \infty)$ defined by (6). Now, the required inequality (13) follows from (11), (12) and (13) with taking the limit $r \to R_r (X|Y) - 0$. This completes the proof. □

In randomness extraction against classical side information $Y$, the distance from uniform can be upper-bounded as $D(S|GY)_{\rho} \leq \epsilon \log_2 |S| + \delta/\ln 2$ if $G$ and $Y$ are independent (11), and as

$$D(S|GY)_{\rho} \leq \epsilon \log_2 |S| + \frac{\delta + \epsilon \epsilon}{\ln 2}$$

if $Y$ may depend on $G$ (16). (It should be stated that, in quantum key distribution, adversary’s measurement can wait until the choice of hash function is announced, and so adversary’s information $Y$ may depend on the choice $G$). As stated before, if $\rho_{XY}$ is purely classical, then the extractable key length $R_r (X|Y)$ coincides with those given by (11), (16): hence it may be of interest to compare the results of these works. It can be seen that the upper bound given in this work (see (5) is larger than that given in (16) (see above) by $\epsilon \log_2 (d/\epsilon) + \epsilon^{1/2}/\ln 2$, which is sufficiently small for sufficiently small $\epsilon$.

IV. ASYMPTOTIC OPTIMALITY

In contrast to the conditional von Neumann entropy $S(X|Y)_{\rho} = S(\rho_{XY}) - S(\rho_Y)$, the information spectrum collision entropy $R_r (X|Y)_{\rho}$ can increase when additional side information is provided; that is,

$$R_r (X|Y Z)_{\rho} > R_r (X|Y)_{\rho}$$

is possible (such side information for the classical collision entropy is called spoiling knowledge (11)). Therefore, we can improve the definition of $R_r (X|Y)_{\rho}$ as follows. Let $\mathcal{H}_X$ and $\mathcal{H}_Y$ be Hilbert spaces, and $\rho_{XY}$ be a quantum state on $\mathcal{H}_X \otimes \mathcal{H}_Y$. Then, the information spectrum collision entropy $\tilde{R}_r (X|Y)_{\rho}$ of system $X$ conditioned on system $Y$ of a state $\rho$ with optimal side information is defined by

$$\tilde{R}_r (X|Y)_{\rho} = \sup_{\mathcal{H}_Z: \rho_{XZ} \geq \rho_{XY} \otimes \mathcal{H}_Z} R_r (X|Y Z)_{\rho},$$

where the supremum ranges over all Hilbert spaces $\mathcal{H}_Z$ and quantum states $\rho_{XZ}$ on $\mathcal{H}_X \otimes \mathcal{H}_Y \otimes \mathcal{H}_Z$ such that $\text{Tr}_Z[\rho_{XZ}] = \rho_{XY}$. Note that the monotonicity of the relative entropy enables to replace $R_r (X|Y)_{\rho}$ in Theorem [11 by $\tilde{R}_r (X|Y)_{\rho}$.

We now show that $\tilde{R}_r (X|Y)_{\rho}$ is asymptotically optimal. Let $\mathcal{H}_X$ and $\mathcal{H}_Y$ be Hilbert spaces of finite dimensions $d_X$ and $d_Y$, respectively, and $\rho_{XY}$ be a quantum state on $\mathcal{H}_X \otimes \mathcal{H}_Y$.

Moreover, let $\mathcal{H}_Z$ be a two-dimensional Hilbert space with an orthonormal basis $\{|0\rangle, |1\rangle\}$, and for $\Delta_{xy} > 0$, define a quantum state $\rho_{XY^n Z}^{\Delta}$ on $\mathcal{H}_X \otimes \mathcal{H}_Y \otimes \mathcal{H}_Z$ by

$$\rho_{XY^n Z} = \tilde{\rho}_{XY^n} \otimes |1\rangle\langle 1| + (\rho_{XY} - \tilde{\rho}_{XY^n}) \otimes |0\rangle\langle 0|,$$

where we have introduced

$$\tilde{\rho}_{XY^n} = \rho_{XY^n} \mathcal{P}_{\rho_{XY}} \leq \mu \rho_{XY^n}$$

with $\mu = 2^{-n(S(\rho_{XY}) - \Delta_{xy})}$. It is clear from this definition that

$$\text{Tr}_Z[\rho_{XY^n Z}] = \rho_{XY^n}^{\mathcal{P}_{\rho_{XY}}}$$

and

$$\rho_{XY^n Z}^{\Delta} \leq \mu \rho_{XY^n}.$$

Also, it follows from Sanov’s theorem (see e.g. (4)) that

$$\text{Tr}[\tilde{\rho}_{XY^n}] \geq 1 - \epsilon_{xy}$$

with $\epsilon_{xy} = (1 + n)^{d_X d_Y} 2^{-nD_{\rho}(\rho_{XY})}$, where we have introduced

$$\tilde{D}_{\rho}(\rho, \Delta) = \inf_{\sigma \in S(\mathcal{H}); \rho = \rho_{XY} \otimes \mathcal{H}_Z} D(\sigma || \rho)$$

for $\rho \in S(\mathcal{H})$ and $\Delta > 0$. Here, we note that $\rho_{XY}$ and $\sigma$ above are simultaneously diagonalizable and so $\tilde{D}_{\rho}(\rho, \Delta)$ can be described classically (i.e. in terms of probability distributions induced by the eigenvalues of quantum states). Now, for $\Delta_{y} > 0$, define $\tilde{\rho}_{Y^n}$ by

$$\tilde{\rho}_{Y^n} = (\rho_{Y^n}^{\mathcal{P}_{\rho_{XY}}} \geq \lambda),$$

$$\tilde{\rho}_{Y^n} = \left\{ \begin{array}{ll} \rho_{Y^n}^{\mathcal{P}_{\rho_{XY}}} \geq \lambda \right\} \tilde{\rho}_{Y^n} \left\{ \rho_{Y^n}^{\mathcal{P}_{\rho_{XY}}} \geq \lambda \right\},$$

with $\lambda = 2^{-n(S(\rho_{Y^n}) + \Delta_{y})}$ and $\tilde{\rho}_{Y^n} = \text{Tr}_X[\tilde{\rho}_{XY^n}]$. Then,

$$\tilde{\rho}_{Y^n} \leq \tilde{\rho}_{Y^n}$$

and

$$\text{Tr}[\tilde{\rho}_{Y^n} - \tilde{\rho}_{Y^n}] \leq \epsilon_{xy},$$

and so for $\epsilon = 1 - \epsilon_{xy}^{1/2}$,

$$\text{Tr}[\tilde{\rho}_{Y^n} \{ \tilde{\rho}_{Y^n} < \tilde{\epsilon}_y \}] \leq \text{Tr}[\tilde{\rho}_{Y^n} \{ \tilde{\rho}_{Y^n} < \epsilon\tilde{\rho}_{Y^n} \}]$$

$$= \text{Tr}[\tilde{\rho}_{Y^n} \{ \epsilon^{1/2}_{xy} \tilde{\rho}_{Y^n} < \epsilon\tilde{\rho}_{Y^n} \}]$$

$$< \text{Tr}[\epsilon^{1/2}_{xy} (\tilde{\rho}_{Y^n} - \tilde{\rho}_{Y^n})] \leq \epsilon^{1/2}_{xy}.$$

Hence,

$$\text{Tr}[\tilde{\rho}_{Y^n} \{ \tilde{\rho}_{Y^n} \geq \tilde{\epsilon}_y \}] > \text{Tr}[\tilde{\rho}_{Y^n}] - \epsilon^{1/2}_{xy}.$$

Here, on noting that $\tilde{\rho}_{Y^n}$ commutes with $\{ \rho_{Y^n}^{\mathcal{P}_{\rho_{XY}}} \geq \lambda \}$, let us introduce the projection $P$ on $\mathcal{H}_X \otimes \mathcal{H}_Z$ defined by

$$P = \left\{ \begin{array}{ll} \rho_{Y^n}^{\mathcal{P}_{\rho_{XY}}} \geq \lambda \right\} \rho_{Y^n} \geq \lambda \otimes |1\rangle\langle 1|.$$

It can be seen from this definition that

$$\text{Tr}[\rho_{Y^n} P] > \text{Tr}[\rho_{Y^n}] - \epsilon^{1/2}_{xy} - \text{Tr}[\rho_{Y^n}^{\mathcal{P}_{\rho_{XY}}} - \tilde{\rho}_{Y^n}]$$

$$\geq 1 - \epsilon_{xy} - \epsilon^{1/2}_{xy}$$

with $\epsilon = (1 + n)^{d_X d_Y} 2^{-nD_{\rho}(\rho_{XY})}$, where we have introduced

$$D_{\rho}(\rho, \Delta) = \inf_{\sigma \in S(\mathcal{H}); \rho = \rho_{XY} \otimes \mathcal{H}_Z} D(\sigma || \rho)$$

for $\rho \in S(\mathcal{H})$ and $\Delta > 0$. Moreover, since

$$P \rho_{XY} P \preceq P \rho_{XY} P = P (\rho_{XY}^{\mathcal{P}_{\rho_{XY}}} \otimes |1\rangle\langle 1|) P \geq \epsilon \lambda P \rho_{XY} P,$$
it follows that
\[ P(\Lambda - 2^{-r} \rho^2) \leq 0 \]
for \( r \leq n(S(X|Y)_\rho - \Delta_{xy} - \Delta_y) + \log_2 c \), and hence
\[ \hat{R}_c(X^n|Y^n)_\rho \geq R_c(X^n|Y^n)^{NZ}_\rho \]
\[ \geq n(S(X|Y)_\rho - \Delta_{xy} - \Delta_y) + \log_2 (1 - \epsilon_{xy}^{1/2}) \]
for
\[ \epsilon = \epsilon_{xy}^{1/2} + \epsilon_{xy} + \epsilon_y. \]

Next, to consider an upper bound, suppose that \( \rho_{XY} \) is a classical-quantum state on \( \mathcal{H}_X \otimes \mathcal{H}_Y \) of the form
\[ \rho_{XY} = \sum_x |x⟩⟨x| \otimes \rho_x. \]

Then,
\[ S(\rho_{XY}) = -\sum_x \text{Tr}[\rho_y \rho_x^{-1/2} \rho_y^{1/2} (\log_2 \rho_x)^{1/2} \rho_y^{-1/2}] \]
\[ \geq -\text{Tr}[\rho_y \log_2 (\rho_y^{-1/2} A \rho_y^{-1/2})] \]
\[ = -\text{Tr}[\rho_y \log_2 (2 - R_0(X|Y)_\rho)] \]
\[ = R_0(X|Y)_\rho + S(\rho_y). \]

That is, \( S(X|Y)_\rho \geq R_0(X|Y)_\rho \). Therefore, on noting that
\[ S(X|Y)_\rho \geq S(X|YZ)_\rho \geq R_0(X|YZ)_\rho \]
and letting \( \Delta_{xy} = \Delta_y = n^{-\gamma} \) with \( 0 < \gamma < 1/2 \), we have
\[ \lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{1}{n} \hat{R}_c(X^n|Y^n)_\rho = S(X|Y)_\rho \]
with \( \lim_{n \to \infty} \epsilon = 0 \). Here, we have used
\[ \Delta < |S(\rho) - S(\sigma)| + D(\sigma||\rho) \]
\[ \leq d_1(\rho, \sigma) \dim \mathcal{H} - d_1(\rho, \sigma) \log_2 d_1(\rho, \sigma) + D(\sigma||\rho) \]
\[ \leq D(\sigma||\rho) \frac{1-\epsilon}{\log n} \]
with \( 0 < \gamma' < 1 - 2\gamma \), for sufficiently small \( D(\sigma||\rho) \), where
the second inequality follows from Fannes inequality \([5]\) (see the definitions of \( D_\sigma^c \) and \( D_\sigma^s \) above for the notation and the first inequality). This shows that \( \hat{R}_c(X|Y)_\rho \) is asymptotically optimal (in the first order).

V. CONCLUDING REMARKS

It follows from Theorem[1] and the monotonicity of the relative entropy that \( \hat{R}_c \) gives the length of extractable randomness with distance \( \epsilon \) from uniform. For fixed \( \epsilon \), the maximal length \( l^c \) of extractable randomness has an asymptotic expansion with an optimal second-order term,

\[ \frac{1}{n} l^c(X^n|Y^n) = S(X|Y)_\rho + \sqrt{\frac{V(X|Y)_\rho}{n}} \Phi^{-1}(\epsilon^2) + O\left(\frac{\log n}{n}\right), \]

where \( V(X|Y)_\rho = \text{Tr}[\rho_{XY} (\log_2 \rho_{XY} - \log_2 I_X \otimes I_Y)^2] \) and \( \Phi \) denotes the cumulative distribution function of the standard normal distribution (see \([14]\)). Hence, it is of interest to examine how close \( \frac{1}{n} \hat{R}_c \) is to the above optimum, in particular when the classical large deviation theory giving an optimal second-order asymptotics \([8]\) is applied instead of Sanov’s theorem.

Moreover, it should be stated that in many applications such as those in cryptography, \( \epsilon \) should converge to 0 faster than any polynomial \( n^{-\gamma} \) for sufficiently large \( n > n_c \). However, the optimality of the above expansion, which is shown by use of Berry-Essen theorem (see e.g. \([6]\)), is lost for such \( \epsilon \); in fact, the lower bound on \( l^c \) diverges to \(-\infty\) for \( \epsilon \) converging faster than \( 1/\sqrt{n} \). Therefore, it is also of interest to examine the possibility of further improvement in the second-order asymptotics for \( \epsilon \) converging sufficiently fast.
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