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Abstract

The two-party key agreement problem with public discussion, known as the source model problem, is considered. By relating the key agreement problem to hypothesis testing, a new coding scheme is developed that yields a sufficient condition to achieve a positive secret-key (SK) rate in terms of Chernoff information. The merits of this coding scheme are illustrated by applying it to an erasure model for Eve’s side information, for which the Chernoff information gives an upper bound on the maximum erasure probability for which the SK capacity is zero. The bound is shown to be tight when Alice’s or Bob’s source is binary, and this shows that the new code achieves larger SK rates than the best known coding scheme. The results motivate a new measure for the correlation between two random variables, which is of independent interest.

1 Introduction

The source model problem for key agreement considers two legitimate parties, Alice and Bob, and an eavesdropper, Eve [1,2]. Alice, Bob, and Eve, respectively, observe $n$ independent and identically distributed (i.i.d.) repetitions of random variables $X$, $Y$, and $Z$ that are distributed according to the probability mass function (pmf) $p_{XYZ}(x, y, z)$ for $x \in \mathcal{X}$, $y \in \mathcal{Y}$, $z \in \mathcal{Z}$, where $\mathcal{X}$, $\mathcal{Y}$, and $\mathcal{Z}$ are finite sets. The pmf $p_{XYZ}$ is called the source pmf, or simply the source. Alice and Bob engage in an authenticated and public discussion to agree on a key secret from Eve as follows (see [3, Section 22.3] for a review of the problem). Alice first creates a public message $F_1$ using some $p_{F_1|X^n}(f_1|x^n)$ and sends it to Bob. Bob generates a public message $F_2$ using some $p_{F_2|Y^n F_1}(f_2|y^n, f_1)$ and sends it to Alice, then Alice generates $F_3$ according to some $p_{F_3|X^n F_1:2}(f_3|x^n, f_1:2)$, etc. After $k$ rounds of communications, Alice creates a key $K_A$ according to some $p_{K_A|X^n F_{1:k}}(k_A|x^n, f_{1:k})$ and Bob creates a key $K_B$ according to some $p_{K_B|Y^n F_{1:k}}(k_B|y^n, f_{1:k})$. In an $(n, \delta)$ code, we require the keys to be equal with high probability such that

$$\mathbb{P}(K_A = K_B) \geq 1 - \delta.$$  

We require the keys to be almost uniform

$$\frac{1}{n} H(K_A) \geq \frac{1}{n} \log |\mathcal{K}_A| - \delta$$  

where $H(\cdot)$ is the entropy function. We also require the keys to be almost independent of Eve’s information

$$\frac{1}{n} I(K_A; Z^n F_{1:k}) \leq \delta$$

where $I(\cdot; \cdot)$ is the mutual information.
The key rate is $\frac{1}{n} \log(K_A)$. A key rate $R_s$ is said to be achievable if, given any $\delta > 0$, there is an $(n,\delta)$ code with a key rate of at least $R_s - \delta$. The supremum of all achievable key rates is called the source model secret-key (SK) capacity and denoted by $S(X;Y\|Z)$. Extensions to multiple parties and continuous random variables can be found in [10].

In this paper we are interested in the feasibility of key generation at a positive rate, i.e., when we have $S(X;Y\|Z) > 0$. Note that if key generation is feasible, it should be feasible also when Alice and Bob do not have access to private randomness. Thus, we may assume that the interactive communication $F$ satisfies

$$H(F_1|X^n) = H(F_2|F_1Y^n) = H(F_3|F_2X^n) = \cdots = 0.$$  

(4)

The reason is that Alice and Bob can use an initial part of their observations to distill private randomness and the remaining parts to extract a key.

### 1.1 Overview of the Main Results

We provide a condition for the feasibility of SK generation at a positive rate for a general probability distribution on $X, Y, Z$ in terms of the Chernoff information. The condition is based on a new constructive approach for achieving a positive SK rate that extends ideas in [2] and [9]. The extension is motivated by using hypothesis testing for SK agreement. Hypothesis testing was previously used for infeasibility results in network information theory, e.g., meta converses [10], and for the SK agreement problem in [11].

We use hypothesis testing to achieve a positive SK rate as follows. After initial interactive public discussion, Alice sets up a hypothesis testing problem that Bob solves to find an estimate of Alice’s secret key. More specifically, suppose that Alice produces a binary random variable $X$ that is binary.

We have

$$H(F_1|X^n) = H(F_2|F_1Y^n) = H(F_3|F_2X^n) = \cdots = 0.$$  

The reason is that Alice and Bob can use an initial part of their observations to distill private randomness and the remaining parts to extract a key.
Furthermore, we present a simple example where our code outperforms the best known code given in [12] that uses random binning and multiple auxiliary random variables to capture multiple rounds of communications. Our example is the doubly symmetric binary-erasure (DSBE) source, where \((X, Y)\) is a doubly symmetric binary source (DSBS) with parameter \(p\), i.e., we have \(p_{XY}(0,0) = p_{XY}(1,1) = p/2\) and \(p_{XY}(0,1) = p_{XY}(1,0) = (1-p)/2\). Our achievability result shows that the SK capacity vanishes if and only if

\[
e \leq \min\{p, 1 - p\} / \max\{p, 1 - p\}. \tag{5}
\]

On the other hand, the lower bound of [12] vanishes if and only if

\[
e \leq 4p(1 - p). \tag{6}
\]

Since \(4p(1 - p) > \min\{p, 1 - p\} / \max\{p, 1 - p\}\) when \(p \neq 1/2\), the lower bound is loose for a DSBE source for any \(p \neq 1/2\).

The rest of this paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we set up our notation and give definitions. We also review the best known lower and upper bounds for the SK agreement problem, and a noncomputable characterization of when the SK capacity is positive. Our main results are given in Section 3 and proved in the subsequent sections.

2 Preliminaries

2.1 Notation and Definitions

All logarithms in this paper are natural logarithms. Random variables are shown in capital letters while their realizations are shown in lower case letters. Caligraphic letters denote alphabet sets of random variables. We write \(U_{1:i-1}\) for \((U_1, U_2, \ldots, U_{i-1})\). The function \(h(p) = -p \log p - (1 - p) \log(1 - p)\) is the binary entropy function. We use \(F\) to denote the public discussion \((F_1, F_2, \ldots, F_k)\) of the source model problem.

**Definition 1.** The Renyi divergence of order \(\alpha\) between two pmfs \(p_X(x)\) and \(q_X(x)\) is

\[
D_{\alpha}(p_X(x)\|q_X(x)) = \frac{1}{\alpha - 1} \log \left( \sum_x p_X(x)^\alpha q_X(x)^{1-\alpha} \right).
\]

The Chernoff information between two pmfs \(p_X(x)\) and \(q_X(x)\) is

\[
C(p_X(x)\|q_X(x)) = \max_{\alpha \in [0,1]} (1 - \alpha)D_{\alpha}(p_X(x)\|q_X(x)).
\]

Observe that

\[
C(p_X(x)\|q_X(x)) = -\log \left( \min_{\alpha \in [0,1]} \sum_x p_X(x)^\alpha q_X(x)^{1-\alpha} \right)
\]

\[
\leq -\log \left( \sum_x \min(p_X(x), q_X(x)) \right)
\]

\[
= -\log \left( 1 - \|p_X(x) - q_X(x)\|_{TV} \right) \tag{7}
\]
where \( \| p_X(x) - q_X(x) \|_{TV} = \frac{1}{2} \sum_x |p_X(x) - q_X(x)| \) is the total variation (TV) distance between \( p_X \) and \( q_X \).

**Definition 2.** [13] Given a joint pmf \( p_{XY}(x, y) \), the strong data processing constant is

\[
s^*(X; Y) = \sup_{U \mid X} \frac{I(U; Y)}{I(U; X)}
\]

where \( U \) is an auxiliary random variable such that \( U \to X \to Y \) forms a Markov chain. The maximal correlation coefficient \( \rho_m(p_{XY}(x, y)) \) is defined as the maximum of Pearson’s correlation coefficients over all non-constant functions \( f(\cdot) \) and \( g(\cdot) \), respectively, of \( X \) and \( Y \), i.e.,

\[
\rho_m(p_{XY}(x, y)) = \max_{f(\cdot), g(\cdot)} \frac{\mathbb{E}[(f(X) - \mathbb{E}[f(X)])(g(Y) - \mathbb{E}[g(Y)])]}{\sqrt{\text{Var}[f(X)] \text{Var}[g(Y)]}}
\]

where \( \mathbb{E}[\cdot] \) and \( \text{Var}[\cdot] \) denote the expectation and variance operations, respectively. Finally, given a channel \( p(y|x) \), define

\[
\eta(p_{Y|X}(y|x)) = \max_{p_X(x)} s^*(X; Y) \overset{(a)}{=} \max_{p_X(x)} \rho_m^2(p_{XY}(x, y))
\]

where \( (a) \) follows from [13, Theorem 8].

**Definition 3.** [14] [15] Given two pmfs \( p_{XY}(x, y) \) and \( q_{XY}(x, y) \) on the alphabets \( \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y} \), the relation \( q_{XY}(x, y) \preceq p_{XY}(x, y) \) represents existence of some functions \( a : \mathcal{X} \to \mathbb{R}_+ \cup \{0\} \) and \( b : \mathcal{Y} \to \mathbb{R}_+ \cup \{0\} \) such that

\[
q_{XY}(x, y) = a(x)b(y)p_{XY}(x, y) \quad \text{for } \forall(x, y) \in \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}.
\]

**Example 1.** Let \( \mathcal{X}_1 = \{x \in \mathcal{X} : p_X(x) > 0\} \) and \( \mathcal{X}_2 = \{x \in \mathcal{X} : q_X(x) > 0\} \). If \( \mathcal{X}_2 \subseteq \mathcal{X}_1 \) and \( q_{Y|X}(y|x) = p_{Y|X}(y|x) \), then \( q_{XY}(x, y) \preceq p_{XY}(x, y) \). To show this result, choose \( a(x) = q_X(x)/p_X(x) \) for \( x \in \mathcal{X}_1 \) and \( a(x) = 0 \) for \( x \notin \mathcal{X}_1 \). Also, let \( b(y) = 1 \) for all \( y \in \mathcal{Y} \).

### 2.2 SK Capacity Lower Bound

The authors of [1] compute the SK capacity when messages are allowed to be transmitted in only one direction over the public channel. The one-way communication capacity from \( X \) to \( Y \), denoted by \( S_{ow}(X; Y||Z) \), is given by

\[
S_{ow}(X; Y||Z) = \max_{V \to U \to X \to YZ} I(U; Y|V) - I(U; Z|V).
\]

Clearly, \( S_{ow}(X; Y||Z) \) is a lower bound on the SK capacity \( S(X; Y||Z) \).

The best known lower bound on the SK capacity \( S(X; Y||Z) \) uses interactive communication [12]. Given random variables \( U_1, U_2, \ldots, U_k \) satisfying the Markov chain conditions

\[
U_i \rightarrow XU_{1:i-1} \rightarrow YZ \quad \text{for odd } i
\]

\[
U_i \rightarrow YU_{1:i-1} \rightarrow XZ \quad \text{for even } i
\]
and for any integer $\zeta$ such that $1 \leq \zeta \leq k$, we have $S(X; Y \| Z) \geq L(X; Y \| Z)$ where

$$L(X; Y \| Z) = \sum_{i \geq \zeta \atop \text{odd } i} I(U_i; Y|U_{1:i-1}) - I(U_i; Z|U_{1:i-1}) + \sum_{i \geq \zeta \atop \text{even } i} I(U_i; X|U_{1:i-1}) - I(U_i; Z|U_{1:i-1}).$$ (14)

Using standard reduction techniques, we can restrict the cardinality $|\mathcal{U}_i|$ of $U_i$ to

$$|\mathcal{U}_i| \leq \begin{cases} |X| \prod_{l=1}^{i-1} |\mathcal{U}_l| & \text{for } i \text{ odd}, \\ |Y| \prod_{l=1}^{i} |\mathcal{U}_l| & \text{for } i \text{ even}. \end{cases}$$ (15)

Let $\tilde{L}(X; Y \| Z)$ be the best possible lower bound obtained from (14). This bound is difficult to evaluate since $\zeta$ and $k$ are arbitrary and the cardinality bounds on the sizes of $U_1, U_2, \ldots, U_k$ grow exponentially. However, one can simplify the calculations by using the ideas from [14–16], where auxiliary random variables are represented by upper concave envelopes.

### 2.3 SK Capacity Upper Bounds

An early upper bound on $S(X; Y \| Z)$ is $\min\{I(X; Y), I(X; Y \| Z)\}$ [2]. This was later improved with the intrinsic mutual information upper bound [17]:

$$S(X; Y \| Z) \leq B_0(X; Y \| Z) \triangleq \min_{p_{J|Z}(j|z)} I(X; Y \| J).$$ (16)

The idea here is that if we make Eve weaker by passing $Z$ through a channel $p_{J|Z}(j|z)$, the SK capacity cannot decrease. Thus, we have

$$S(X; Y \| Z) \leq S(X; Y \| J) \leq I(X; Y \| J)$$

where $XY \rightarrow Z \rightarrow J$ forms a Markov chain. Considering $J = \emptyset$ and $J = Z$, we recover the earlier upper bound $\min\{I(X; Y), I(X; Y \| Z)\}$ on $S(X; Y \| Z)$. In evaluating $B_0(X; Y \| Z)$, it suffices to restrict $J$ to have cardinality size of at most $|Z|$ [18].

Other upper bounds are given in [12][19][21]. The best known upper bound is [12]

$$B_1(X; Y \| Z) = \inf_{p_{J|XYZ}} \max_{V \rightarrow U \rightarrow XY \rightarrow ZJ} I(X; Y | J) + I(U; J | V) - I(U; Z | V).$$ (17)

See [22] for a discussion on the computability of the above bound. The original interpretation of $B_1(X; Y \| Z)$ given in [12] is based on the idea of splitting the secret key into two parts so that only one part is independent of $J$. We give a new interpretation of $B_1(X; Y \| Z)$ in Appendix [A].

### 2.4 Conditions for a Positive SK Capacity

In an early work, Maurer gives an example in which multiple rounds of communications are necessary to achieve a positive SK capacity [2, Section V]. Orlitsky and Wigderson show in [9] that if the SK capacity
is positive, only two rounds of communication suffice to realize a positive key rate. In fact, they give a necessary and sufficient condition for the SK capacity to be positive. We review their results here.

Consider some natural number $n$, and some sets $A \subset X^n$ and $B \subset Y^n$. Denote the probability distribution of $(X^n, Y^n, Z^n)$ conditioned on the events $X^n \in A$ and $Y^n \in B$ by $p_r(x^n, y^n, z^n)$ so that $p_r(x^n, y^n, z^n) = 0$ if $(x^n, y^n) \notin A \times B$; otherwise, we have

$$p_r(x^n, y^n, z^n) = \frac{p_{X^NY^NZ^n}(x^n, y^n, z^n)}{P(X^n \in A, Y^n \in B)} \quad (18)$$

where $p_{X^NY^NZ^n}(x^n, y^n, z^n) = \prod_{i=1}^n p_{XYZ}(x_i, y_i, z_i)$ is a product distribution, whereas $p_r(x^n, y^n, z^n)$ is not necessarily a product distribution.

**Definition 4** (Orlitsky-Wigderson [9]). Given sets $A \subset X^n$ and $B \subset Y^n$, the legitimate users have a simple entropic advantage over the eavesdropper in $A \times B$ if for some (binary) function $f(X^n)$ we have

$$I_{p_r}(f(X^n); Y^n) > I_{p_r}(f(X^n); Z^n) \quad (19)$$

where the mutual information expressions are calculated according to $p_r(x^n, y^n, z^n)$.

**Theorem 1** (Orlitsky-Wigderson [9]). The following three claims are equivalent.

1. $S(X; Y \| Z) > 0$.

2. There exists some natural number $n$, and sets $A \subset X^n$ and $B \subset Y^n$, such that the legitimate users have a simple entropic advantage over the eavesdropper in $A \times B$.

3. The SK capacity is positive with only two rounds of communication.

**Proof.** The work [9] does not include proofs. We therefore give a sketch of their proof based on personal communication with the authors.

We first prove that 1) implies 2). As mentioned in the introduction, an interactive communication $F$ without private randomization suffices for achieving positive key rates, i.e., without loss of generality we may assume $H(F_1|X^n) = H(F_2|F_1Y^n) = H(F_3|F_1;2X^n) = ... = 0$. Orlitsky and Wigderson observe that for any interactive communication $F$ without private randomization, the conditional probability distribution of $(X^n, Y^n, Z^n)$ given $F = f$ is of the form $p_r(x^n, y^n, z^n)$ for some sets $A$ and $B$ that depend on $f$. Given $S(X; Y | Z) > 0$ from 1), there is an $(n, \delta)$ code with a positive rate $R > 0$ and a sufficiently small $\delta$. Observing that $\frac{1}{n} I(K_A; Y^n|F) \geq \frac{1}{n} I(K_A; K_B|F) \approx R$ and $\frac{1}{n} I(K_A; Z^n|F) \approx 0$, we have

$$I(K_A; Y^n|F) - I(K_A; Z^n|F) > 0 \quad (20)$$

so there exists an $F = f$ such that

$$I(K_A; Y^n|f) - I(K_A; Z^n|f) > 0. \quad (21)$$

Note that given a $F = f$, $K_A$ is a function of $X^n$.

We next prove that 2) implies 3). Suppose that Alice and Bob observe $N$ independent blocks, each of which consists of $n$ i.i.d. realizations of $(X, Y)$. Consider one of the blocks. Suppose that Alice observes $X^n$ and Bob observes $Y^n$ in that block. Alice declares on the public channel whether or not $X^n \in A$, and Bob
declares whether or not \( Y^n \in B \). If \( X^n \notin A \) or \( Y^n \notin B \), they discard the block. Otherwise, they use the block for key agreement. The fraction of the used blocks is asymptotically equal to \( \Pr(X^n \in A, Y^n \in B) \).

In the used blocks, the conditional pmf of the source is \( p_r(x^n, y^n, z^n) \), and Alice has an entropic advantage over Eve, so she can apply a one-way SK generation scheme to produce a shared key with Bob. Alice’s and Bob’s declarations count as two rounds of communications. However, if Alice declares that \( X^n \in A \) and if \( Y^n \in B \), Bob hears Alice’s response and attaches the necessary public information for SK generation to his declaration so that no more than two rounds of communication are required.

Since 1) implies 2) and 2) implies 3), we have that 1) also implies 3). Finally, going from 3) to 1) is immediate, and going from 3) to 2) is possible by going from 3) to 1) and then 1) to 2) as shown above.

\( \square \)

## 3 Main Results

We first give generic results about the positivity of the SK capacity for an arbitrary source \( p_{XYZ}(x, y, z) \) in Section 3.1. We then restrict our attention to erasure sources in Section 3.2.

### 3.1 General Sources

**Theorem 2.** Let \( p_{XY}(x, y) \) and \( q_{XY}(x, y) \) be two pmfs satisfying \( q_{XY}(x, y) \leq p_{XY}(x, y) \) (as defined in Definition 2). Consider a channel \( p_{z|XY}(z|x, y) \) and let

\[
p_{XYZ}(x, y, z) = p_{XY}(x, y) p_{Z|XY}(z|x, y), \quad q_{XYZ}(x, y, z) = q_{XY}(x, y) p_{Z|XY}(z|x, y).
\]

If the SK capacity \( S(q_{XYZ}(x, y, z)) \) is positive, then the SK capacity \( S(p_{XYZ}(x, y, z)) \) is also positive.

Theorem 2 is proved in Section 4.1. The following theorem gives a condition to achieve a positive SK rate in terms of the Chernoff information.

**Theorem 3.** Consider the source \( p_{XY}(x, y) p_{Z|XY}(z|x, y) \). The key capacity \( S(X; Y \| Z) \) is positive if one can find disjoint non-empty sets \( A_1, A_2 \subset \mathcal{X} \) and disjoint non-empty sets \( B_1, B_2 \subset \mathcal{Y} \) such that

\[
C(p(z|X \in A_1, Y \in B_1)||p(z|X \in A_2, Y \in B_2)) < \frac{1}{2} \log \left( \frac{\Pr(X \in A_1, Y \in B_1) \Pr(X \in A_2, Y \in B_2)}{\Pr(X \in A_1, Y \in B_2) \Pr(X \in A_2, Y \in B_1)} \right).
\]

In particular, \( S(X; Y \| Z) > 0 \) if one can find distinct symbols \( x_1, x_2 \in \mathcal{X} \) and distinct symbols \( y_1, y_2 \in \mathcal{Y} \) such that

\[
C(p_{Z|XY}(z|x_1, y_1)||p_{Z|XY}(z|x_2, y_2)) < \frac{1}{2} \log \left( \frac{p_{XY}(x_1, y_1)p_{XY}(x_2, y_2)}{p_{XY}(x_1, y_2)p_{XY}(x_2, y_1)} \right).
\]

Theorem 3 is proved in Section 4.2. The proof is based on a hypothesis testing approach. The left hand side of (23) is the error exponent of the adversary in a hypothesis testing problem while the right hand side is the error exponent of the legitimate parties. The theorem shows that key agreement is feasible when the legitimate parties have a better exponent than the adversary.

The following theorem provides a multi-letter converse to the result of Theorem 3.
Theorem 4. Given an arbitrary source \( p_{XY}(x, y)p_{Z|XY}(z|x, y) \), we have \( S(X; Y \| Z) > 0 \) if and only if there is an integer \( n \), disjoint non-empty sets \( A_1, A_2 \subseteq X^n \), and disjoint non-empty sets \( B_1, B_2 \subseteq Y^n \) such that

\[
C(p(z^n|X^n \in A_1, Y^n \in B_1) || p(z^n|X^n \in A_2, Y^n \in B_2)) < 1 - \frac{1}{2} \log \left( \frac{\mathbb{P}(X^n \in A_1, Y^n \in B_1) \mathbb{P}(X^n \in A_2, Y^n \in B_2)}{\mathbb{P}(X^n \in A_1, Y^n \in B_2) \mathbb{P}(X^n \in A_2, Y^n \in B_1)} \right)
\]

(25)

where \((X^n, Y^n, Z^n)\) are distributed according to \( \prod_{i=1}^{n} p_{XYZ}(x, y, z) \).

Theorem 4 is proved in Section 4.3.

Remark 1. In contrast to the characterization given in item 2 of Theorem 7, the characterization in Theorem 4 computes all probabilities with respect to the unconditional product distribution \( \prod_{i=1}^{n} p_{XYZ}(x, y, z) \). Furthermore, (25) can be expressed as

\[
\sum_{z^n} p(z^n|X^n \in A_1, Y^n \in B_1)p(z^n|X^n \in A_2, Y^n \in B_2)^{1-\alpha}
\]

(26)

for all \( \alpha \in [0, 1] \). Equation (26) only involves product of probability terms, while the characterization given in item 2 of Theorem 7 is based on mutual information expressions.

Next, we give yet another characterization of positivity of \( S(X; Y \| Z) \). When \( S(X; Y \| Z) = 0 \), it is not possible for Alice and Bob to agree on a shared key. However, it may be still possible for Alice and Bob to agree on a key that is approximately secret. Let us assume that Alice and Bob aim to exploit public interactive discussion to agree on a single secret bit. That is, instead of achieving a key rate, they produce bits \( K_A \in \{1, 2\} \) and \( K_B \in \{1, 2\} \) respectively. Alice and Bob wish to maximize agreement probability \( \mathbb{P}[K_A = K_B] \) while minimizing leakage to Eve who has \( Z^n \) and the public discussion transcript \( F \). We can measure the quality of the keys \( K_A \) and \( K_B \) via the total variation distance

\[
\|p_{K_A, K_B | Z^n, F} - q_{K_A, K_B} \cdot p_{Z^n | F}\|_{TV}
\]

(27)

where

\[
q_{K_A, K_B}(k_A, k_B) = \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{1}[k_A = k_B]
\]

(28)

is the ideal distribution on \( K_A \times K_B = \{1, 2\}^2 \). If the total variation distance given in (27) vanishes, Alice and Bob have perfect secret bits. We are interested in the minimum of (27) over all public discussion protocols and as we let the number of source observations \( n \) tend to infinity.

Definition 5. Given a source \( p_{XYZ}(x, y, z) \), let \( \Delta(X; Y \| Z) \) be the infimum of

\[
\|p_{K_A, K_B, Z^n, F} - q_{K_A, K_B} \cdot p_{Z^n | F}\|_{TV}
\]

over all interactive public discussion schemes \( F \) (of arbitrary length) that produce single bits \( K_A \) and \( K_B \) by Alice and Bob. The ideal distribution \( q_{K_A, K_B} \) is given in (28). In defining \( \Delta(X; Y \| Z) \), we let the number of source observations \( n \) tend to infinity.
The following theorem relates \( S(X; Y \| Z) \) to \( \Delta(X; Y \| Z) \).

**Theorem 5.** If \( S(X; Y \| Z) > 0 \), then \( \Delta(X; Y \| Z) = 0 \). If \( S(X; Y \| Z) = 0 \), then \( \Delta(X; Y \| Z) \geq \frac{3 - \sqrt{5}}{8} \approx 0.095 \ldots \)

Theorem 5 is proved in Section 4.4.

**Remark 2.** The constant \( \frac{3 - \sqrt{5}}{8} \) in Theorem 5 is not necessarily optimal. It is an interesting question to find the best possible constant, i.e., the minimum value of \( \Delta(X; Y \| Z) \) over all sources that satisfy \( S(X; Y \| Z) = 0 \).

### 3.2 Erasure Sources

We illustrate the condition given in Theorem 5 and relate it to previously known bounds by evaluating it for erasure sources. Suppose we are given a joint probability distribution \( p_{XY}(x, y) \). Without loss of generality, we assume that \( p_X(x) > 0 \) and \( p_Y(y) > 0 \) for all \((x, y) \in X \times Y\). We define a path, which is used in the proofs of the theorems given below.

**Definition 6.** A sequence \((x_1, y_1, x_2, y_2, \ldots, x_k, y_k)\) forms a path if all \(x_i\)’s with \(x_i \in X\) are distinct and also all \(y_i\)’s with \(y_i \in Y\) are distinct. We say the length of the path is 2\(k\) and assign the following value to the path

\[
\left( \frac{\prod_{i=1}^{k} p_{XY}(x_i, y_i)}{p_{XY}(x_1, y_k) \prod_{i=2}^{k} p_{XY}(x_i, y_{i-1})} \right)^{1/k}.
\]

Let \( \epsilon_1 \) be the minimum value of all possible paths and \( \epsilon_2 \) be the minimum value of all possible paths of length at most four. In particular, we have

\[
\epsilon_2 = \min_{x_1 \neq x_2, y_1 \neq y_2} \left( \frac{p_{XY}(x_1, y_1)p_{XY}(x_2, y_2)}{p_{XY}(x_1, y_2)p_{XY}(x_2, y_1)} \right)^{1/2}.
\]

**Example 2.** Assume that \( X \) and \( Y \) are binary with a joint probability distribution \( p_{XY}(x, y) \). Then paths of length two are assigned the value 1. Because \(x_i\)’s and \(y_i\)’s are distinct in a path, paths of size more than four do not exist. There are multiple paths of length four. For instance, \((x_1 = 0, y_1 = 1, x_2 = 1, y_2 = 0)\) is assigned the value

\[
\frac{\sqrt{p_{XY}(0, 1)p_{XY}(1, 0)}}{\sqrt{p_{XY}(0, 0)p_{XY}(1, 1)}}
\]

and the path \((x_1 = 0, y_1 = 0, x_2 = 1, y_2 = 1)\) is assigned the value

\[
\frac{\sqrt{p_{XY}(0, 0)p_{XY}(1, 1)}}{\sqrt{p_{XY}(0, 1)p_{XY}(1, 0)}}.
\]

All other paths have one of the above two values and

\[
\epsilon_1 = \epsilon_2 = \min \left\{ \frac{\sqrt{p_{XY}(0, 1)p_{XY}(1, 0)}}{\sqrt{p_{XY}(0, 0)p_{XY}(1, 1)}}, \frac{\sqrt{p_{XY}(0, 0)p_{XY}(1, 1)}}{\sqrt{p_{XY}(0, 1)p_{XY}(1, 0)}} \right\}.
\]

Note that one of the terms inside the minimum is less than or equal to one. We therefore do not need to consider paths of length two whose values are one.
We now give lower and upper bounds on the maximum erasure probability for which the SK capacity is zero for an erasure source.

**Theorem 6.** For the erasure source \( p_{XY}(x, y) p_{Z|XY}(z|x, y) \) with erasure probability \( \epsilon \), we have \( S(X; Y \parallel Z) = 0 \) if \( \epsilon \leq \epsilon_1 \), and \( S(X; Y \parallel Z) > 0 \) if \( \epsilon > \epsilon_2 \), where \( \epsilon_1 \) and \( \epsilon_2 \) are as in Definition 6.

Theorem 6 is proved in Section 4.5. Positivity of \( S(X; Y \parallel Z) \) for \( \epsilon > \epsilon_2 \) is derived by using the result of Theorem 3.

**Corollary 1.** Because the \( x_i \)'s and \( y_i \)'s are distinct in a path, the number of \( (x_i, y_i) \) pairs must satisfy \( k \leq \min\{|X|, |Y|\} \). Thus, \( \epsilon_1 = \epsilon_2 \) if \( X \) or \( Y \) is binary. For this special case, the above theorem gives a tight bound on the maximum erasure probability. We also have \( \epsilon_1 = \epsilon_2 = 0 \) when \( p_{XY}(x^*, y^*) = 0 \) for some \( (x^*, y^*) \in X \times Y \). This can be seen by starting the path with \( x_1 = x^*, y_1 = y^* \).

**Remark 3.** The mutual information \( I(X; Y) \) is a measure of the correlation of \( X \) and \( Y \). For example, we have \( S(X; Y \parallel Z) = I(X; Y) \) when \( Z \) is independent of \( (X, Y) \). In a similar manner, the quantities \( \epsilon_1 \) and \( \epsilon_2 \) motivate new measures of correlation. We give such a measure in Appendix B.

The following theorem gives an alternative characterization of \( \epsilon_1 \) that we use in the proof of Theorem 6.

**Theorem 7.** Define a matrix \( [p_{XY}(x, y) \delta_{x,y}] \) of size \(|X| \times |Y|\) whose rows and columns are indexed by the realizations of \( X \) and \( Y \), respectively, and whose \((x, y)\) entry is \( p_{XY}(x, y) \delta_{x,y} \) for all \((x, y) \in X \times Y\). We have

\[
\epsilon_1 = \max \min_{x,y} \delta_{x,y} \tag{32}
\]

where the maximum is over all \( \delta_{x,y} \in [0, 1] \) tuples such that the matrix \([p_{XY}(x, y) \delta_{x,y}]\) has rank one.

We prove Theorem 7 in Section 4.6.

We now study the one-way SK rate and the best lower bound \( \bar{L}(X; Y \parallel Z) \) obtained from (14) for an erasure source.

**Theorem 8.** For an erasure source \( p_{XY}(x, y) p_{Z|XY}(z|x, y) \) with erasure probability \( \epsilon \) such that \( p_X(x) > 0, p_Y(y) > 0 \) for all \((x, y) \in X \times Y\), the following statements hold.

1. The one-way SK rate from Alice to Bob vanishes if and only if

\[
\epsilon \leq 1 - \eta(p_{Y|X}(y|x)) \tag{33}
\]

where \( \eta(\cdot) \) is as defined in (4). A similar statement holds for the one-way SK rate from Bob to Alice.

2. We have \( \bar{L}(X; Y \parallel Z) = 0 \) if and only if

\[
\epsilon \leq 1 - \max_{q_{XY}(x,y): \rho_m^2(q_{XY}(x,y)) \leq p_{XY}(x,y)} \rho_m(q_{XY}(x,y)) \tag{34}
\]

where \( \rho_m(\cdot) \) is as defined in (8).
3. The upper bound $B_0(X;Y\|Z)$ in (16) is zero if and only if $\epsilon \leq \epsilon_3$ where

$$\epsilon_3 = \max \sum_{t=1}^{|Z|} \min_{x,y:p_{XY}(x,y)>0} \delta_{x,y,t}$$

where the maximum is over all $\delta_{x,y,t}$ tuples such that $\delta_{x,y,t} \geq 0$, the matrix $[p_{XY}(x,y)\delta_{x,y,t}]$ has rank 1 for all $x,y$. Here, for every $t$, $[p_{XY}(x,y)\delta_{x,y,t}]$ is a matrix of size $|X| \times |Y|$ and is defined as in the statement of Theorem 7.

4. The upper bound $B_1(X;Y\|Z)$ in (17) is zero if and only if

$$1 - \epsilon \geq \inf \eta(p(\bar{z}|x,y))$$

where the infimum is taken over channels $p(\bar{z}|x,y)$ for which $I(X;Y|\bar{Z}) = 0$ for $p(x,y,\bar{z}) = p(x,y)p(\bar{z}|x,y)$.

The proof of Theorem 8 is given in Section 4.7.

Remark 4. The value of $\epsilon_3$ given in part 3 of Theorem 8 is greater than or equal to $\epsilon_1$, given in Definition 6. To see this, observe that from Theorem 7 one can find some $\tilde{\delta}_{x,y} \in [0,1]$ such that

$$\epsilon_1 = \min_{x,y} \tilde{\delta}_{x,y}$$

and the matrix $[p_{XY}(x,y)\tilde{\delta}_{x,y}]$ has rank one. To prove that $\epsilon_1 \leq \epsilon_3$, we need to find appropriate $\delta_{x,y,t}$ for $t = 1, 2, \cdots, |Z|$ such that

$$\min_{x,y} \tilde{\delta}_{x,y} \leq \sum_{t=1}^{|Z|} \min_{x,y:p_{XY}(x,y)>0} \delta_{x,y,t}. \quad (38)$$

As shown in the proof of part 3 of Theorem 8, the quantity $\epsilon_3$ would remain the same if we allow $t$ to take values in a larger set $\{1, 2, \cdots, M\}$ for some $M > |Z|$. We define $\delta_{x,y,t}$ for $t \in \{0\} \cup X \times Y$ as follows: $\delta_{x,y,0} = \tilde{\delta}_{x,y}$ and for any $(x',y') \in X \times Y$, we have

$$\delta_{x,y,t=(x',y')} = \mathbb{1}[x' = x, y' = y](1 - \tilde{\delta}_{x,y}). \quad (39)$$

We have $\sum_t \delta_{x,y,t} = 1$ and $[p_{XY}(x,y)\delta_{x,y,t}]$ has rank 1 for all $t \in \{0\} \cup X \times Y$. Furthermore, we have

$$\min_{x,y:p_{XY}(x,y)>0} \delta_{x,y,t=(x',y')} = 0 \quad \forall x', y'. \quad (40)$$

Therefore, we compute

$$\sum_t \min_{x,y:p_{XY}(x,y)>0} \delta_{x,y,t} = \min_{x,y:p_{XY}(x,y)>0} \delta_{x,y,0} = \min_{x,y:p_{XY}(x,y)>0} \tilde{\delta}_{x,y} \geq \min_{x,y} \tilde{\delta}_{x,y}. \quad (41)$$

Computing the bounds on $\epsilon$ given in Theorem 8 is cumbersome for general distributions. Thus, we next focus on the DSBE source and illustrate the suboptimality of the best known lower bound with a DSBE source example.
3.3 The DSBE Source Example

Using (31) and Theorem 6, the SK capacity \( S(X; Y\|Z) \) is zero if and only if

\[
\epsilon \leq \min \{p, 1 - p\} \frac{1}{\max \{p, 1 - p\}}. \tag{42}
\]

We now study the lower bound \( \bar{L}(X; Y\|Z) \) obtained from (14) for a DSBE source. The main result of this subsection is to show that \( S(X; Y\|Z) \neq \bar{L}(X; Y\|Z) \) for a DSBE \((p, \epsilon)\) source if

\[
\min \{p, 1 - p\} \frac{1}{\max \{p, 1 - p\}} < \epsilon \leq 4p(1 - p). \tag{43}
\]

In fact, we show that \( \bar{L}(X; Y\|Z) = 0 \) for erasure probabilities \( \epsilon \) in the above interval since we know from (42) that \( S(X; Y\|Z) > 0 \) in this interval. This result illustrates that the best known lower bound is loose.

We remark that the lower bound is tight, i.e., \( S(X; Y\|Z) = \bar{L}(X; Y\|Z) \), for all previously considered joint probability distributions \( p_{X,Y,Z}(x, y, z) \) for which the SK capacity \( S(X; Y\|Z) \) is known. For instance, if \( X \rightarrow Y \rightarrow Z \) forms a Markov chain, then assigning \( U_1 = X \) and \( k = 1 \) in (14) recovers the known SK capacity \( S(X; Y\|Z) = I(X; Y\|Z) \) achieved by a one-way communication from \( X \) to \( Y \). Similarly, consider the reversely degraded example from [1]. Let \( X = (X_1, X_2), Y = (Y_1, Y_2), \) and \( Z = (Z_1, Z_2), \) where all \( (X_i, Y_i, Z_i) \) tuples for \( i = 1, 2 \) are mutually independent. If \( X_1 \rightarrow Y_1 \rightarrow Z_1 \) and \( Y_2 \rightarrow X_2 \rightarrow Z_2 \) form Markov chains, assigning \( U_1 = X_1 \) and \( U_2 = Y_2 \) in (14) recovers the known SK capacity result \( S(X; Y\|Z) = I(X; Y\|Z) \).

We give the condition for \( \bar{L}(X; Y\|Z) = 0 \) for a DSBE source in the following theorem and prove it in Section 3.3.

**Theorem 9.** Let \((X, Y, Z)\) be a DSBE source with parameters \((p, \epsilon)\). Then \( \bar{L}(X; Y\|Z) = 0 \) if and only if the one-way SK rate from Alice to Bob (or Bob to Alice) vanishes, i.e., if and only if

\[
\epsilon \leq 4p(1 - p). \tag{44}
\]

In Fig. 1, we plot some of the known lower and upper bounds on \( S(X; Y\|Z) \) to illustrate the gaps between them. Consider a DSBE source \((X, Y, Z)\) with parameters \((p = 0.6, \epsilon)\). This source has

\[
I(X; Y) = \frac{1}{1 - \epsilon} I(X; Y\|Z).
\]

Therefore, we plot only \( I(X; Y\|Z) \) and do not consider the upper bound \( I(X; Y) \). In Fig. 1, \( S_{ow}(X; Y\|Z) \) denotes the one-way communication capacity. This curve attains non-zero values for \( \epsilon > 4p(1 - p) \). We also plot an upper bound

\[
B_{0}^{sub}(X; Y\|Z) = I(X; Y\|J) \geq B_{0}(X; Y\|Z) \tag{45}
\]

where

\[
J = \begin{cases} 
0 & \text{if } Z = (0, 0), \\
1 & \text{if } Z = (1, 1), \\
\epsilon & \text{otherwise.}
\end{cases} \tag{46}
\]

Fig. 1 illustrates that the upper bound \( I(X; Y\|Z) \) is not tight for \( \epsilon \in (0, 1) \), and there is a gap between \( S_{ow}(X; Y\|Z) \) and \( B_{0}^{sub}(X; Y\|Z) \) for \( \frac{1-p}{p} \leq \epsilon < 1. \)
Figure 1: SK capacity bounds for a DSBE(0.6, ε) source. The curve labeled $S_{ow}(X; Y || Z)$ is zero if and only if $\epsilon \leq 4p(1 - p)$.

4 Proofs

4.1 Proof of Theorem 2

Without loss of generality, assume that the symbol 0 is included in both alphabets $X$ and $Y$. Assume that $q_{X'Y'Z}(x', y', z) = a(x)b(y)p_{X'Y'Z}(x', y', z)$. Let $\bar{a} = \max_x a(x) > 0$ and $\bar{b} = \max_y b(y) > 0$.

We define $X'$ and $Y'$ on $X$ and $Y$, respectively, as follows.

$$p_{XX''Y'Y'}(x', x', y', y', z) = p_{X'|X}(x'|x)p_{Y'|Y}(y'|y)p_{XYZ}(x, y, z)$$  \hspace{1cm} (47)

where $p_{X'|X}(x'|x)$ and $p_{Y'|Y}(y'|y)$ satisfy

$$p_{X'|X}(x'|x) = \frac{a(x)}{a}, \quad p_{Y'|Y}(y'|y) = \frac{b(y)}{b}.$$  \hspace{1cm} (48)

The values of $p_{X'|X}(x'|x)$ and $p_{Y'|Y}(y'|y)$ for $x', y' \neq 0$ are not important for the proof and can be chosen arbitrarily. Observe that (48) implies

$$p_{XY}(0, 0) = \sum_{x, y, z} \frac{a(x)b(y)}{ab} p_{XYZ}(x, y, z) = \frac{1}{ab} \sum_{x, y, z} q_{XYZ}(x, y, z) = \frac{1}{ab} > 0$$  \hspace{1cm} (49)

and

$$p_{XYZ|X'Y'}(x, y, z| x' = 0, y' = 0) = a(x)b(y)p_{XYZ}(x, y, z) = q_{XYZ}(x, y, z).$$  \hspace{1cm} (50)
Suppose that Alice, Bob and Eve observe i.i.d. repetitions of $X, Y, Z$ according to $p_{XYZ}(x, y, z)$. We now show that they can simulate i.i.d. repetitions according to $q_{XYZ}(x, y, z)$. Alice has access to $X^n$. She passes $X^n$ through $\prod_{i=1}^{n} p_{X_i|X_i}(x'_i|x_i)$ to produce a sequence $X'^n$. Alice then puts into the public channel the list of indices $i$ such that $X_i = 0$. Similarly, Bob passes $Y^n$ through $\prod_{i=1}^{n} p_{Y_i|Y_i}(y'_i|y_i)$ to produce $Y'^n$ and puts into the public channel the list of indices $i$ such that $Y_i = 0$. Alice and Bob then consider the observations $(X_i, Y_i)$ for indices $i$ where $(X_i', Y_i') = (0, 0)$, and discard their observations for other indices. The induced probability distribution on $(X_i, Y_i, Z_i)$ given the event $(X_i', Y_i') = (0, 0)$ is $q_{XYZ}(x, y, z)$. Alice and Bob can now proceed with any key agreement protocol for $q_{XYZ}(x, y, z)$ that achieves a positive key rate.

4.2 Proof of Theorem 3

It suffices to prove the claim that $S(X; Y||Z) > 0$ if (24) holds. To see why proving (24) establishes the claim for (23), let $X' \in \{1, 2, 3\}$ be a function of $X$ defined as follows: $X' = 1$ if $X \in A_1$, $X' = 2$ if $X \in A_2$ and $X' = 3$ otherwise. We defined $Y'$ as a function of $Y$ in a similar manner using $B_1$ and $B_2$. Then, $S(X; Y||Z) > 0$ if $S(X'; Y'||Z) > 0$. Equation (24) for $(X', Y', Z)$ with the choice of $x_1' = 1, x_2' = 2, y_1' = 1, y_2' = 2$ is equivalent to (23) for the triple $(X, Y, Z)$ with the sets $A_1, A_2, B_1$ and $B_2$.

It remains to prove that $S(X; Y||Z) > 0$ if (24) holds. Let $p_{ij} = p_{XY}(x_i, y_j)$ for $i, j = 1, 2$. By (24), we have

$$\frac{1}{2} \log \left( \frac{p_{11}p_{22}}{p_{12}p_{21}} \right) > 0$$

or equivalently,

$$p_{11}p_{22} > p_{12}p_{21}. \tag{51}$$

Consider some even natural number $n$ and the sets

$$A = \{x_1, x_2\}, \quad B = \{y_1, y_2\} \tag{52}$$

where

$$x_1 = (x_1, x_1, \cdots, x_1, x_2, x_2, \cdots, x_2),$$

$$x_2 = (x_2, x_2, \cdots, x_2, x_1, x_1, \cdots, x_1),$$

$$y_1 = (y_1, y_1, \cdots, y_1, y_2, y_2, \cdots, y_2),$$

$$y_2 = (y_2, y_2, \cdots, y_2, y_1, y_1, \cdots, y_1). \tag{53}$$

As in the proof of Theorem 1 and Maurer’s example in [2] p. 740, suppose that Alice and Bob observe $N$ independent blocks, each having i.i.d. realizations of $(X, Y)$. For each block, Alice declares whether $X^n \in A$ and Bob declares whether $Y^n \in B$. If $X^n \notin A$ or $Y^n \notin B$, they discard the block. Otherwise, they keep the block and use it for SK agreement. To prove that key generation is feasible, it suffices to show that

$$I(X^n; Y^n|X^n \in A, Y^n \in B) - I(X^n; Z^n|X^n \in A, Y^n \in B) > 0 \tag{54}$$
for large $n$. Equation (52) implies that the legitimate users have a simple entropic advantage over the eavesdropper (see Definition 4) and hence a positive key rate can be achieved. We now show that (54) is satisfied. Since for any three random variables $X, Y, Z$ we have

$$I(X; Y) - I(X; Z) = H(X, Y | Z) - H(Y | Z) - H(X | Z) = H(X, Y | Z) - H(Y | X) - H(X | Y)$$

it suffices to show that for large $n$ we have

$$H(X^n, Y^n | Z^n, X^n \in \mathcal{A}, Y^n \in \mathcal{B}) > H(Y^n | X^n, X^n \in \mathcal{A}, Y^n \in \mathcal{B}) + H(X^n | Y^n, X^n \in \mathcal{A}, Y^n \in \mathcal{B}).$$

We compute

$$\mathbb{P}(X^n = x_1, Y^n = y_1 | X^n \in \mathcal{A}, Y^n \in \mathcal{B}) = \mathbb{P}(X^n = x_2, Y^n = y_2 | X^n \in \mathcal{A}, Y^n \in \mathcal{B}) = \frac{p_{11}^{n/2} p_{22}^{n/2}}{2(p_{11}^{n/2} p_{22}^{n/2} + p_{12}^{n/2} p_{21}^{n/2})},$$

$$\mathbb{P}(X^n = x_2, Y^n = y_1 | X^n \in \mathcal{A}, Y^n \in \mathcal{B}) = \mathbb{P}(X^n = x_1, Y^n = y_2 | X^n \in \mathcal{A}, Y^n \in \mathcal{B}) = \frac{p_{12}^{n/2} p_{21}^{n/2}}{2(p_{11}^{n/2} p_{22}^{n/2} + p_{12}^{n/2} p_{21}^{n/2})}.\tag{56}$$

The conditional probability distribution of $(X^n, Y^n)$ given that $X^n \in \mathcal{A}$ and $Y^n \in \mathcal{B}$ is

$$\mathbb{P}(X^n = x_1, Y^n = y_1 | X^n \in \mathcal{A}, Y^n \in \mathcal{B}) = \mathbb{P}(X^n = x_2, Y^n = y_2 | X^n \in \mathcal{A}, Y^n \in \mathcal{B}) = \frac{p_{11}^{n/2} p_{22}^{n/2}}{2(p_{11}^{n/2} p_{22}^{n/2} + p_{12}^{n/2} p_{21}^{n/2})},$$

$$\mathbb{P}(X^n = x_2, Y^n = y_1 | X^n \in \mathcal{A}, Y^n \in \mathcal{B}) = \mathbb{P}(X^n = x_1, Y^n = y_2 | X^n \in \mathcal{A}, Y^n \in \mathcal{B}) = \frac{p_{12}^{n/2} p_{21}^{n/2}}{2(p_{11}^{n/2} p_{22}^{n/2} + p_{12}^{n/2} p_{21}^{n/2})}.\tag{57}$$

If $X^n \in \mathcal{A}$ and $Y^n \in \mathcal{B}$, then we can model the conditional joint probability distribution of $(X^n, Y^n)$ as a DSBS with parameter

$$\tilde{p}_n = \frac{p_{12}^{n/2} p_{21}^{n/2}}{p_{11}^{n/2} p_{22}^{n/2} + p_{12}^{n/2} p_{21}^{n/2}},$$

due to symmetry in (56) and (57). Thus, we obtain

$$H(X^n | Y^n, X^n \in \mathcal{A}, Y^n \in \mathcal{B}) = H(Y^n | X^n, X^n \in \mathcal{A}, Y^n \in \mathcal{B}) = h(\tilde{p}_n)\tag{58}$$

where $h(\cdot)$ is the binary entropy function. We have $h(p) \leq -2(1 - p) \log(1 - p)$ for any $p \in [0.5, 1]$. Using (51), we have $\tilde{p}_n \in [0.5, 1]$ and

$$\lim_{n \to \infty} (1 - \tilde{p}_n)^n = \left(\frac{p_{12} p_{21}}{p_{11} p_{22}}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}.\tag{59}$$

Hence, we have

$$\lim_{n \to \infty} h(\tilde{p}_n)^n \leq \lim_{n \to \infty} (-2(1 - \tilde{p}_n) \log(1 - \tilde{p}_n))^n = \left(\frac{p_{12} p_{21}}{p_{11} p_{22}}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$
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Thus, we obtain

\[
\lim_{n \to \infty} H(X^n|Y^n, X^n \in \mathcal{A}, Y^n \in \mathcal{B})^{\frac{1}{n}} = \lim_{n \to \infty} H(Y^n|X^n, X^n \in \mathcal{A}, Y^n \in \mathcal{B})^{\frac{1}{n}} \leq \left(\frac{p_{12}p_{21}}{p_{11}p_{22}}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}. \tag{60}
\]

This equation implies that

\[
\lim_{n \to \infty} \left[H(X^n|Y^n, X^n \in \mathcal{A}, Y^n \in \mathcal{B}) + H(Y^n|X^n, X^n \in \mathcal{A}, Y^n \in \mathcal{B})\right]^{\frac{1}{n}} \leq \left(\frac{p_{12}p_{21}}{p_{11}p_{22}}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \tag{61}
\]

which gives a bound on the asymptotics of the right hand side in (55). We now consider the term on the left hand side in (55). Our aim is to show that

\[
\liminf_{n \to \infty} H(X^n, Y^n|Z^n, X^n \in \mathcal{A}, Y^n \in \mathcal{B})^{\frac{1}{n}} \geq \exp(-C(p_{Z|XY}(z|x_1, y_1)||p_{Z|XY}(z|x_2, y_2))). \tag{62}
\]

This equation together with (61) shows that (55) holds for large values of \(n\) if

\[
\left(\frac{p_{12}p_{21}}{p_{11}p_{22}}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} < \exp(-C(p_{Z|XY}(z|x_1, y_1)||p_{Z|XY}(z|x_2, y_2))) \tag{63}
\]

which is equivalent to the condition

\[
C(p_{Z|XY}(z|x_1, y_1)||p_{Z|XY}(z|x_2, y_2)) < \frac{1}{2} \log \left(\frac{p_{11}p_{22}}{p_{12}p_{21}}\right). \tag{64}
\]

It remains to prove (62). From the perspective of Eve who observes \(Z^n\), there are four possibilities of \((X^n, Y^n) = (x_i, y_j)\) for \(i, j \in \{1, 2\}\). Eve can view this as a hypothesis testing problem. For example, given \((X^n, Y^n) = (x_1, y_1)\), the conditional probability distribution of \((Z_i, Z_{2+i})\) is

\[
p_{Z|XY}(z_i|x_1, y_1) \times p_{Z|XY}(z_{2+i}|x_2, y_2)
\]

for all \(1 \leq i \leq \frac{n}{2} - 1\). Furthermore, \(Z_i\) and \(Z_{2+i}\) are conditionally independent given \((X^n, Y^n) = (x_1, y_1)\) for all \(1 \leq i \leq \frac{n}{2} - 1\). Therefore, given the hypothesis \((X^n, Y^n) = (x_1, y_1)\), Eve observes \(n/2\) i.i.d. repetitions

\[
q_{Z_{a}Z_{b}}^{(1)}(z_a, z_b) \triangleq p_{Z|XY}(z_a|x_1, y_1)p_{Z|XY}(z_b|x_2, y_2).
\]

More generally, given the hypothesis \((X^n, Y^n) = (x_i, y_j)\), Eve observes \(n/2\) i.i.d. repetitions

\[
q_{Z_{a}Z_{b}}^{(ij)}(z_a, z_b) = p_{Z|XY}(z_a|x_i, y_j)p_{Z|XY}(z_b|x_{3-i}, y_{3-j})
\]

for \(i, j \in \{1, 2\}\).

We remark that the prior probability of the hypothesis \((X^n, Y^n) = (x_i, y_j)\) depends on \(n\); see (56) and (57). Therefore, we cannot directly apply results from the hypothesis testing literature, where fixed prior hypothesis probabilities are assumed. We use the following lemma.
Lemma 1. [23, Eq. (10)] For any arbitrary \( p_{UV}(u, v) \) and any two distinct symbols \( u_1, u_2 \), we have

\[
H(U|V) \geq \log(2) \left( \frac{p_{U}(u_1) \sum_{v \in \mathcal{D}} p_{V|U}(v|u_1) + p_{U}(u_2) \sum_{v \in \mathcal{D}^c} p_{V|U}(v|u_2)}{2} \right)
\]

where \( \mathcal{D} = \{ v : p_{UV}(u_1, v) < p_{UV}(u_2, v) \} \).

We apply Lemma 1 with \( U = (X^n, Y^n) \), \( V = Z^n \), and

\[
p_{UV}((x^n, y^n), z^n) = p_{X^n,Y^n,Z^n}(x^n, y^n, z^n | X^n \in \mathcal{A}, Y^n \in \mathcal{B}),
\]

\[ u_1 = (x_1, y_1), \]

\[ u_2 = (x_2, y_2). \]

Using (65), we have

\[
p_{U}(u_1) = p_{U}(u_2) = \frac{n/2}{2(n/2 n/2)}.
\]

Therefore, we obtain

\[
H(X^n, Y^n|Z^n, X^n \in \mathcal{A}, Y^n \in \mathcal{B}) \rightleftharpoons \frac{1}{n} \geq \left( \log(2) \frac{p_{11} n/2}{p_{11} p_{22} + p_{12} p_{21}} \right)^{1/n} \times \left\{ \frac{1}{2} \sum_{z^n \in \mathcal{D}} p_{Z^n|X^n,Y^n}(z^n | x_1, y_1, X^n \in \mathcal{A}, Y^n \in \mathcal{B}) + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{z^n \in \mathcal{D}^c} p_{Z^n|X^n,Y^n}(z^n | x_2, y_2, X^n \in \mathcal{A}, Y^n \in \mathcal{B}) \right\}.
\]

Using (61), we have

\[
\lim_{n \to \infty} \left( \log(2) \frac{p_{11} n/2}{p_{11} p_{22} + p_{12} p_{21}} \right)^{1/n} = 1.
\]

Next, observe that

\[
\mathcal{D} = \{ z^n : p_{Z^n|X^n,Y^n}(z^n | x_1, y_1) < p_{Z^n|X^n,Y^n}(z^n | x_2, y_2) \}
\]

is the maximum a-posteriori probability (MAP) decision region for a new binary hypothesis testing problem with two equiprobable hypotheses, i.e., \( (X^n, Y^n) = (x_1, y_1) \) and \( (X^n, Y^n) = (x_2, y_2) \). In this problem, Eve observes \( n/2 \) i.i.d. repetitions of \( q_{Z^n|X^n,Y^n}(z_a, z_b) \) under the first hypothesis, and \( n/2 \) i.i.d. repetitions of \( q_{Z^n|X^n,Y^n}(z_a, z_b) \) under the second hypothesis. The expression

\[
\frac{1}{2} \sum_{z^n \in \mathcal{D}} p_{Z^n|X^n,Y^n}(z^n | x_1, y_1, X^n \in \mathcal{A}, Y^n \in \mathcal{B}) + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{z^n \in \mathcal{D}^c} p_{Z^n|X^n,Y^n}(z^n | x_2, y_2, X^n \in \mathcal{A}, Y^n \in \mathcal{B})
\]
is the error probability, which is asymptotically equal to \( \exp(-\frac{1}{4}E) \) where

\[
E = C(q_{Z_{a}Z_{b}}^{(11)}, q_{Z_{a}Z_{b}}^{(22)}) = 2C(p_{Z|XY}(z|x_1, y_1)\|p_{Z|XY}(z|x_2, y_2)).
\]

Therefore, we obtain

\[
\lim_{n \to \infty} \left\{ \frac{1}{2} \sum_{z^n \in D} p_{Z^n|X^n,Y^n}(z^n|x_1, y_1, X^n \in \mathcal{A}, Y^n \in \mathcal{B}) + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{z^n \in D} p_{Z^n|X^n,Y^n}(z^n|x_2, y_2, X^n \in \mathcal{A}, Y^n \in \mathcal{B}) \right\}^{\frac{1}{n}}
= \exp(-C(p_{Z|XY}(z|x_1, y_1)\|p_{Z|XY}(z|x_2, y_2))).
\]

(72)

Combining (69), (70), and (72) establishes (62).

### 4.3 Proof of Theorem 4

Theorem 3 shows that \( S(X^n; Y^n\|Z^n) > 0 \) if there is an integer \( n \) and sets \( \mathcal{A}_i, \mathcal{B}_i \) that satisfy (25). Since \( S(X^n; Y^n\|Z^n) = nS(X; Y\|Z) \), if \( S(X^n; Y^n\|Z^n) > 0 \) then \( S(X; Y\|Z) > 0 \). It remains to prove the converse direction. Suppose that \( S(X; Y\|Z) > 0 \). Then from Theorem 5, one can find a natural number \( n \), interactive communication \( F = (F_1, F_2, \ldots) \), and secret keys \( K_A \in \{1, 2\} \) and \( K_B \in \{1, 2\} \), created by Alice and Bob after public discussion, such that

\[
\delta = \|p_{K_A, K_B, Z^n, F} - q_{K_A, K_B} \cdot p_{Z^n, F}\|_{TV} < \frac{3 - \sqrt{5}}{8}.
\]

(73)

The construction given in Lemma 2 identifies sets \( \mathcal{A}_i \) and \( \mathcal{B}_i \) such that (25) holds if

\[
-\log (1 - 4\delta) < \log \frac{\frac{1}{2} - 2\delta}{2\delta}.
\]

(74)

Equation (74) holds for \( \delta < \frac{3 - \sqrt{5}}{8} \). This completes the proof.

### 4.4 Proof of Theorem 5

First part of the proof: Suppose that \( S(X; Y\|Z) > 0 \). Because Alice and Bob can produce a key at a positive rate, they can also produce a key of length one bit. The authors of [24] show the equivalence of the strong and weak notions of security for the source model problem. More specifically, from [24] and using \( S(X; Y\|Z) > 0 \), we conclude that, given any \( \delta > 0 \), there is an interactive communication protocol yielding bits \( K_A \) and \( K_B \) for Alice and Bob such that \( \mathbb{P}[K = K_A = K_B] \geq 1 - \delta \) for some uniform bit \( K \in \{1, 2\} \). Furthermore, we have

\[
I(K; Z^n\|F) \leq \delta.
\]

The triangle inequality gives

\[
\|p_{K_A, K_B, Z^n, F} - q_{K_A, K_B} \cdot p_{Z^n, F}\|_{TV} \leq \|p_{K_A, K_B, Z^n, F} - p_{K_A, K_B} \cdot p_{Z^n, F}\|_{TV} + \|p_{K_A, K_B} \cdot p_{Z^n, F} - q_{K_A, K_B} \cdot p_{Z^n, F}\|_{TV}
= \|p_{K_A, K_B, Z^n, F} - p_{K_A, K_B} \cdot p_{Z^n, F}\|_{TV} + \|p_{K_A, K_B} - q_{K_A, K_B}\|_{TV}
\]

(75)
By Fano’s inequality we have
\[ I(KK_AK_B; Z^n) \leq I(K; Z^n) + H(K_AK_B|K) \leq \delta + h(\delta) + 3\delta. \] (76)
Therefore, we have the bound
\[ D(p_{K_AK_B}Z^nF || p_{K_AK_B}pZ^nF) = I(K_AK_B; Z^nF) \leq 4\delta + h(\delta). \] (77)
By Pinsker’s inequality, we have
\[ \|p_{K_AK_B}Z^nF - p_{K_AK_B}pZ^nF\|_{TV} \leq \sqrt{2\delta + \frac{1}{2}h(\delta)} \] (78)
Next, from uniformity of \( K \) and \( \mathbb{P}[K = K_A = K_B] \geq 1 - \delta \), we have
\[ \left| p_{K_AK_B}(i,i) - \frac{1}{2} \right| \leq \delta \text{ for } i = 1, 2. \] (79)
and
\[ p_{K_AK_B}(i,j) \leq \delta \text{ for } i \neq j. \] (80)
Therefore, we can write
\[ \|p_{K_AK_B} - q_{K_AK_B}\|_{TV} \leq 2\delta. \] (81)
From (73), (78) and (81), we obtain
\[ \|p_{K_AK_B}Z^nF - q_{K_AK_B}pZ^nF\|_{TV} \leq \sqrt{2\delta + \frac{1}{2}h(\delta) + 2\delta}. \] (82)
The right hand side of the above equation tends to zero as \( \delta \) tends to zero.

**Second part of the proof:** Suppose that \( S(X; Y\|Z) = 0 \). Consider an arbitrary code with observation size \( n \), interactive communication \( \text{F} = (F_1, F_2, ...) \) and secret key bits \( K_A \in \{1, 2\} \) and \( K_B \in \{1, 2\} \), created by Alice and Bob after the public discussion. Let
\[ \delta = \|p_{K_AK_B}Z^nF - q_{K_AK_B}pZ^nF\|_{TV}. \] (83)
Without loss of generality, we may assume that the interactive communication \( \text{F} = (F_1, F_2, ...) \) satisfies (4). This is because if we increase the observation length from \( n \) to \( n + n_1 + n_2 \), then Alice can use the initial \( n_1 \) observations and Bob can use the next initial \( n_2 \) observations to distill private randomness; the remaining \( n \) observations can be used to run the key generation code.

From Lemma 2 below, one can find disjoint non-empty subsets \( \mathcal{A}_1, \mathcal{A}_2 \subset \mathcal{X}^n \) and disjoint non-empty subsets \( \mathcal{B}_1, \mathcal{B}_2 \subset \mathcal{Y}^n \) such that
\[ \frac{1}{2} \log \left( \frac{\mathbb{P}(X^n \in \mathcal{A}_1, Y^n \in \mathcal{B}_1)\mathbb{P}(X^n \in \mathcal{A}_2, Y^n \in \mathcal{B}_2)}{\mathbb{P}(X^n \in \mathcal{A}_1, Y^n \in \mathcal{B}_2)\mathbb{P}(X^n \in \mathcal{A}_2, Y^n \in \mathcal{B}_1)} \right) > C(p(z^n|X^n \in \mathcal{A}_1, Y^n \in \mathcal{B}_1)\|p(z^n|X^n \in \mathcal{A}_2, Y^n \in \mathcal{B}_2)) \] (84)
if

\[- \log (1 - 4\delta) < \log \frac{\frac{1}{2} - 2\delta}{2\delta}. \quad (85)\]

By Theorem 3, (84) implies that \( S(X^n; Y^n \| Z^n) > 0 \), or equivalently \( S(X; Y \| Z) > 0 \). This contradicts our assumption that \( S(X; Y \| Z) = 0 \). In other words, we must have

\[- \log (1 - 4\delta) \geq \log \frac{\frac{1}{2} - 2\delta}{2\delta}. \quad (86)\]

Equivalently, \( \delta \) must be greater than or equal to \( \frac{3 - \sqrt{5}}{8} \).

**Lemma 2.** Consider a code with observation size \( n \), interactive communication \( \mathbf{F} = (F_1, F_2, ...) \) satisfying (4), and secret key bits \( K_A \in \{1, 2\} \) and \( K_B \in \{1, 2\} \), created by Alice and Bob after public discussion. We define

\[\delta = \| p_{K_A K_B Z^n | \mathbf{F}} - q_{K_A K_B} \cdot p_{Z^n | \mathbf{F}} \|_{TV}. \quad (87)\]

One can find disjoint non-empty subsets \( \mathcal{A}_1, \mathcal{A}_2 \subset X^n \) and disjoint non-empty subsets \( \mathcal{B}_1, \mathcal{B}_2 \subset Y^n \) such that

\[C(p(z^n | X^n \in \mathcal{A}_1, Y^n \in \mathcal{B}_1) || p(z^n | X^n \in \mathcal{A}_2, Y^n \in \mathcal{B}_2)) \leq - \log (1 - 4\delta) \quad (88)\]

and

\[\frac{1}{2} \log \left( \frac{\mathbb{P}(X^n \in \mathcal{A}_1, Y^n \in \mathcal{B}_1) \mathbb{P}(X^n \in \mathcal{A}_2, Y^n \in \mathcal{B}_2)}{\mathbb{P}(X^n \in \mathcal{A}_1, Y^n \in \mathcal{B}_2) \mathbb{P}(X^n \in \mathcal{A}_2, Y^n \in \mathcal{B}_1)} \right) \geq \log \frac{\frac{1}{2} - 2\delta}{2\delta}. \quad (89)\]

**Proof of Lemma 2.** There is a realization \( \mathbf{F} = \mathbf{f} \) such that \( \mathbb{P}[\mathbf{F} = \mathbf{f}] > 0 \) and

\[\| p_{K_A K_B Z^n | \mathbf{F}}(k_A, k_B, z^n | \mathbf{f}) - q_{K_A K_B}(k_A, k_B) \cdot p_{Z^n | \mathbf{F}}(z^n | \mathbf{f}) \|_{TV} \leq \delta. \quad (90)\]

From the data processing property of the total variation distance, we have

\[\| p_{K_A K_B | \mathbf{F}}(k_A, k_B | \mathbf{f}) - q_{K_A K_B}(k_A, k_B) \|_{TV} \leq \delta \quad (91)\]

and therefore

\[\mathbb{P}(K_A = 1, K_B = 1 | \mathbf{F} = \mathbf{f}) \geq \frac{1}{2} - 2\delta \quad (92)\]

\[\mathbb{P}(K_A = 2, K_B = 2 | \mathbf{F} = \mathbf{f}) \geq \frac{1}{2} - 2\delta \quad (93)\]

\[\mathbb{P}(K_A = 1, K_B = 2 | \mathbf{F} = \mathbf{f}) \leq 2\delta \quad (94)\]

\[\mathbb{P}(K_A = 2, K_B = 1 | \mathbf{F} = \mathbf{f}) \leq 2\delta. \quad (95)\]

As in the proof of Theorem 1, the conditional probability distributions of \( (X^n, Y^n, Z^n) \) given \( \mathbf{F} = \mathbf{f} \) has the form \( p_r(x^n, y^n, z^n) \) given in (18) for some sets \( \mathcal{A} \) and \( \mathcal{B} \) that depend on \( \mathbf{f} \). Furthermore, given
\( F = f, K_A \) is a function of \( X^n \). We partition \( A \) into \( A_1 \cup A_2 \) as follows: \( A_i = \{ x^n : K_A(x^n, f) = i \} \) for \( i = 1, 2 \). We define \( B_i \) similarly using \( K_B \).

Observe that
\[
P(K_A = i, K_B = j | F = f) = \frac{P(X^n \in A_i, Y^n \in B_j)}{P(X^n \in A, Y^n \in B)} \quad \text{for } i, j \in \{1, 2\}. \tag{96}
\]

From (92)-(96), we obtain
\[
\frac{1}{2} \log \left( \frac{P(X^n \in A_1, Y^n \in B_1)P(X^n \in A_2, Y^n \in B_2)}{P(X^n \in A_1, Y^n \in B_2)P(X^n \in A_2, Y^n \in B_1)} \right) \\
= \frac{1}{2} \log \left( \frac{P(K_A = 1, K_B = 1 | F = f)P(K_A = 2, K_B = 2 | F = f)}{P(K_A = 1, K_B = 2 | F = f)P(K_A = 2, K_B = 1 | F = f)} \right) \\
\geq \frac{1}{2} \log \left( \frac{1}{2} - 2\delta \right)^2 \\
= \log \frac{1}{2} - 2\delta \cdot \frac{2}{2\delta}. \tag{97}
\]

Next, from (90) we have
\[
\sum_{z^n} \left| P(K_A = 1, K_B = 1 | F = f)p_{Z^n|K_A,K_BF}(z^n | k_A = 1, k_B = 1, f) - \frac{1}{2}p_{Z^n|F}(z^n | f) \right| \leq 2\delta \tag{98}
\]
\[
+ \sum_{z^n} \left| P(K_A = 2, K_B = 2 | F = f)p_{Z^n|K_A,K_BF}(z^n | k_A = 2, k_B = 2, f) - \frac{1}{2}p_{Z^n|F}(z^n | f) \right| \leq 2\delta \tag{99}
\]
and the triangle inequality gives
\[
\sum_{z^n} \left| P(K_A = 1, K_B = 1 | F = f)p_{Z^n|K_A,K_BF}(z^n | k_A = 1, k_B = 1, f) \\
- P(K_A = 2, K_B = 2 | F = f)p_{Z^n|K_A,K_BF}(z^n | k_A = 2, k_B = 2, f) \right| \leq 2\delta. \tag{100}
\]
The triangle inequality further implies
\[
\sum_{z^n} \left( \frac{1}{2} P_{Z^n|K_A,K_B} F(z^n|k_A = 1, k_B = 1, f) - \frac{1}{2} P_{Z^n|K_A,K_B} F(z^n|k_A = 2, k_B = 2, f) \right) \\
\leq \sum_{z^n} |P(K_A = 1, K_B = 1|F = f) P_{Z^n|K_A,K_B} F(z^n|k_A = 1, k_B = 1, f) \\
- \mathbb{P}(K_A = 2, K_B = 2|F = f) P_{Z^n|K_A,K_B} F(z^n|k_A = 2, k_B = 2, f)| \\
+ \sum_{z^n} |P(K_A = 1, K_B = 1|F = f) P_{Z^n|K_A,K_B} F(z^n|k_A = 1, k_B = 1, f) \\
- \frac{1}{2} P_{Z^n|K_A,K_B} F(z^n|k_A = 1, k_B = 1, f)| \\
+ \sum_{z^n} |P(K_A = 2, K_B = 2|F = f) P_{Z^n|K_A,K_B} F(z^n|k_A = 2, k_B = 2, f) \\
- \frac{1}{2} P_{Z^n|K_A,K_B} F(z^n|k_A = 2, k_B = 2, f)| \\
\leq \sum_{z^n} |P(K_A = 1, K_B = 1|F = f) P_{Z^n|K_A,K_B} F(z^n|k_A = 1, k_B = 1, f) \\
- \mathbb{P}(K_A = 2, K_B = 2|F = f) P_{Z^n|K_A,K_B} F(z^n|k_A = 2, k_B = 2, f)| \\
+ 2\|p_{K_A|K_B}(k_A,k_B|f) - q_{K_A|K_B}(k_A,k_B)\|_{TV} \\
\leq 2\delta + 2\delta,
\]
where we use (91) and (100) in the last step. Observe that
\[
p_{Z^n|K_A,K_B} F(z^n|k_A = i, k_B = i, f) = p_{Z^n}(z^n|X^n \in A_i, Y^n \in B_i), \quad i \in \{1, 2\}.
\]
Therefore, (101) shows that
\[
\|p_{Z^n}(z^n|X^n \in A_1, Y^n \in B_1) - p_{Z^n}(z^n|X^n \in A_2, Y^n \in B_2)\|_{TV} \leq 4\delta
\]
and by (7) we have
\[
C(p(z^n|X^n \in A_1, Y^n \in B_1)p(z^n|X^n \in A_2, Y^n \in B_2)) \leq -\log (1 - 4\delta).
\]
\[
\square
\]
\[4.5 \quad \text{Proof of Theorem 6}\]
\[4.5.1 \quad \text{Proof for } S(X;Y\|Z) = 0 \text{ if } \epsilon \leq \epsilon_1\]

For the first part of the theorem, we need to show that \(S(X;Y\|Z) = 0\) when \(\epsilon = \epsilon_1\). Consider the characterization of \(\epsilon_1\) given in (32) and a \(\delta_{x,y}\) tuple such that \(\epsilon_1 = \min_{x,y} \delta_{x,y}\) and a \([p_{X|Y}(x,y)\delta_{x,y}]\) that has rank one. Since \(1 \geq \delta_{x,y} \geq \epsilon = \epsilon_1\) for all \(x, y\), we can find \(\mu_{x,y} \in [0, 1]\) such that
\[
\delta_{x,y} = \epsilon + (1 - \epsilon)\mu_{x,y}.
\]
Let $J = Z$ and define a channel $p_{J|Z}$. If $Z = e$, then $J = e$. If $Z = (x, y)$, then with probability $\mu_{x,y}$ we have $J = e$ and with probability $1 - \mu_{x,y}$ we have $J = Z = (x, y)$. Let $p_{X|Z,J} = p_{X|Z}p_{J|Z}$. We thus have that $XY \rightarrow Z \rightarrow J$ forms a Markov chain. We now prove that $I(X; Y| J) = 0$, which establishes that $B_0(X; Y\| Z) = 0$, so the SK capacity $S(X; Y\| Z)$ is zero.

The event $J = (x, y)$ implies that $Z = (x, y)$ for all $(x, y) \in \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}$. Therefore, we have $I(X; Y| J = (x, y)) = 0$. We have also

$$
p_{XY,J}(x, y, e) = p_{XY}(x, y)\epsilon + p_{XY}(x, y)(1 - \epsilon)\mu_{x,y}$$

$$= p_{XY}(x, y)(\epsilon + (1 - \epsilon)\mu_{x,y}) = p_{XY}(x, y)\delta_{x,y}
$$

(106)

which follows from (105). Therefore, we obtain

$$
p_{XY|J}(x, y|e) = \frac{p_{XY}(x, y)\delta_{x,y}}{\mathbb{P}(J = e)}.
$$

(107)

The matrix $[p_{XY|J}(x, y|e)]$ is a rank-one joint probability distribution matrix. This proves that $X$ and $Y$ are independent given $J = e$ so that $I(X; Y| J = e) = 0$. These results prove that $S(X; Y\| Z) = 0$ for any $\epsilon \leq \epsilon_1$.

### 4.5.2 Proof for $S(X; Y\| Z) > 0$ if $\epsilon > \epsilon_2$

Suppose that $\epsilon_2$ is obtained with the minimizer path $(x_1, y_1, x_2, y_2)$ so that

$$
\epsilon_2 = \left(\frac{p_{XY}(x_1, y_1)p_{XY}(x_2, y_2)}{p_{XY}(x_1, y_2)p_{XY}(x_2, y_1)}\right)^{1/2}.
$$

(108)

We prove that $S(X; Y\| Z) > 0$ for $\epsilon > \epsilon_2$. Since the value of the path $(x_1, y_1, x_2, y_2)$ is less than or equal to the value of the path $(x_1, y_2, x_2, y_1)$, we have

$$\epsilon_2 = \left(\frac{\min\{p_{11}p_{22}, p_{12}p_{21}\}}{\max\{p_{11}p_{22}, p_{12}p_{21}\}}\right)^{1/2}
$$

where $p_{ij} = p_{XY}(x_i, y_j)$ for $i, j = 1, 2$. From Theorem 8 we have $S(X; Y\| Z) > 0$ if

$$C(p_{Z|XY}(z|x_1, y_1)|| p_{Z|XY}(z|x_2, y_2)) < -\log \epsilon_2.
$$

But observe that

$$C(p_{Z|XY}(z|x_1, y_1)|| p_{Z|XY}(z|x_2, y_2)) = \max_{\alpha \in [0, 1]} -\log \left(\sum_z p_{Z|XY}(z|x_1, y_1)^\alpha p_{Z|XY}(z|x_2, y_2)^{1-\alpha}\right)
$$

$$\leq \max_{\alpha \in [0, 1]} -\log \left(p_{Z|XY}(z = e|x_1, y_1)^\alpha p_{Z|XY}(z = e|x_2, y_2)^{1-\alpha}\right)
$$

$$= \max_{\alpha \in [0, 1]} -\log (\epsilon^\alpha \epsilon^{1-\alpha})
$$

$$= -\log(\epsilon)
$$

(109)

which proves that $S(X; Y\| Z) > 0$ if $\epsilon > \epsilon_2$. 
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4.6 Proof of Theorem \[7\]

Let

\[ \tilde{\epsilon}_1 = \max_{x,y} \min \delta_{x,y} \]

(110)

where the maximization is over all \( \delta_{x,y} \in [0,1] \) tuples such that the matrix \([p_{XY}(x,y)\delta_{x,y}]\) has rank one. We prove that \( \tilde{\epsilon}_1 = \epsilon_1 \).

Observe that if \( p_{XY}(x^*,y^*) = 0 \) for some \( x^*,y^* \in \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y} \), then \( \epsilon_1 = 0 \), which follows from Definition \[6\]. We now prove that \( \tilde{\epsilon}_1 \) is also zero. Consider some arbitrary \( \delta_{x,y} \) such that \([p_{XY}(x,y)\delta_{x,y}]\) has rank one. Since \( p_{XY}(x^*,y^*)\delta_{x^*,y^*} = 0 \), we must have either \( p_{XY}(x^*,y)\delta_{x^*,y} = 0 \) for all \( y \in \mathcal{Y} \) or \( p_{XY}(x,y^*)\delta_{x,y^*} = 0 \) for all \( x \in \mathcal{X} \). Assume that \( \gamma_{XY}(x^*,y)\delta_{x^*,y} = 0 \) for all \( y \in \mathcal{Y} \). Since there exists a \( y \) such that \( p_{XY}(x^*,y) > 0 \), we obtain \( \delta_{x^*,y} = 0 \) for some \( y \in \mathcal{Y} \). Hence, \( \min_{x,y} \delta_{x,y} = 0 \) and \( \tilde{\epsilon}_1 = 0 \).

Based on the discussions above, we may assume that \( p_{XY}(x,y) > 0 \) for all \((x,y) \in \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y} \). In this case, it follows that \( \epsilon_1 > 0 \). We also have \( \tilde{\epsilon}_1 > 0 \) since one valid choice for \( \delta_{x,y} \) is \( \delta_{x,y} = \frac{k}{p_{XY}(x,y)} \), where \( k = \min_{x,y} p_{XY}(x,y) \). Since \( \tilde{\epsilon}_1 > 0 \), we take the maximum in (110) only over positive \( \delta_{x,y} \).

Consider some \( \delta_{x,y} \in (0,1) \) such that \([p_{XY}(x,y)\delta_{x,y}]\) has rank one. In other words, \( p_{XY}(x,y)\delta_{x,y} = e^{m(x)}e^{n(y)} \) has a product form for some \( m(x) \) and \( n(y) \). Taking logarithms, we obtain

\[
\log p_{XY}(x,y) + \log \delta_{x,y} = m(x) + n(y).
\]

(111)

We can express the problem as finding the maximum value of \( \tilde{\epsilon}_1 \in (0,1] \) such that for some \( m(x) \) and \( n(y) \), we have for \( \forall x,y \)

\[
m(x)+n(y) \leq \log p_{XY}(x,y) \leq m(x)+n(y) - \log \tilde{\epsilon}_1.
\]

(112)

We can view this as a linear programming problem to minimize \( A \triangleq -\log \tilde{\epsilon}_1 \) subject to

\[
m(x) + n(y) \leq \log p_{XY}(x,y),
\]

(113)

\[
\log p_{XY}(x,y) \leq m(x) + n(y) + A.
\]

(114)

We consider the dual of this linear programming problem. Multiplying (113) by some \( \gamma(x,y) \geq 0 \) and (114) by some \( \mu(x,y) \geq 0 \), we obtain

\[
\sum_{x,y} \gamma(x,y) (m(x) + n(y)) + \sum_{x,y} \mu(x,y) \log p_{XY}(x,y) \leq 0
\]

\[
\sum_{x,y} \gamma(x,y) \log p_{XY}(x,y) + \sum_{x,y} \mu(x,y) (m(x) + n(y) + A).
\]

Since we are interested in the best lower bound on \( A \), we should choose \( \gamma \) and \( \mu \) such that the coefficient of \( A \) is equal to one and the coefficients of free variables \( m(x) \) and \( n(y) \) vanish. The coefficient of \( A \) is one only if \( \sum_{x,y} \mu(x,y) = 1 \). Furthermore, to cancel out the auxiliary variables \( m(x) \) and \( n(y) \) from both sides, we must have \( \sum_x \gamma(x,y) = \sum_x \mu(x,y) \) for all \( y \in \mathcal{Y} \), and \( \sum_y \gamma(x,y) = \sum_y \mu(x,y) \) for all \( x \in \mathcal{X} \). This implies that \( \gamma(x,y) \) and \( \mu(x,y) \) are probability distributions with the same marginals. We denote their marginal probabilities by \( \mu(x) = \gamma(x) \) and \( \mu(y) = \gamma(y) \).
The dual of the linear programming problem is

\[ A = \max \sum_{x,y} (\mu(x,y) - \gamma(x,y)) \log p_{XY}(x,y) \]  \hspace{1cm} (115) \]

where the maximization is over all pmfs \( \mu(x,y), \gamma(x,y) \) with the same marginals. Since \( A = -\log \tilde{\epsilon}_1 \), we have

\[ \tilde{\epsilon}_1 = \min \prod_{x,y} p_{XY}(x,y)^{-\mu(x,y) + \gamma(x,y)} \]  \hspace{1cm} (116) \]

where the minimization is over all pmfs \( \mu(x,y), \gamma(x,y) \) with the same marginals.

The requirement that the pmfs \( \mu(x,y), \gamma(x,y) \) should have the same marginals imposes a number of linear constraints on \( \mu(x,y) \) and \( \gamma(x,y) \). This indicates that the set of all pmfs \( \mu(x,y), \gamma(x,y) \) with the same marginals is a polytope. We maximize a linear equation over this polytope in (115).

We first list three claims. These are proved below and used to show that \( \tilde{\epsilon}_1 = \epsilon_1 \).

**Claim 1:** If \( (\mu, \gamma) \) is a minimizer for (116) and

\[ \mu(x,y) = \lambda \mu_1(x,y) + (1 - \lambda) \mu_2(x,y) \]  \hspace{1cm} (117) \]

\[ \gamma(x,y) = \lambda \gamma_1(x,y) + (1 - \lambda) \gamma_2(x,y) \]  \hspace{1cm} (118) \]

where \( \mu_i(x,y), \gamma_i(x,y) \) are pmfs with the same marginals for \( i = 1, 2 \) and \( 0 < \lambda < 1 \), then \( (\mu_i(x,y), \gamma_i(x,y)) \) are also minimizers for \( i = 1, 2 \).

Given any probability distribution \( \mu \), we define \( \text{Support}(\mu) \) as the set of realizations with positive occurrence probability.

**Claim 2:** Given pmfs \( (\mu, \gamma) \) with the same marginals, if one can find pmfs \( \mu_1(x,y), \gamma_1(x,y) \) with the same marginals such that \( \text{Support}(\mu_1) \subseteq \text{Support}(\mu) \) and \( \text{Support}(\gamma_1) \subseteq \text{Support}(\gamma) \), then there is a \( \lambda \) with \( 0 < \lambda < 1 \) and a \( (\mu_2(x,y), \gamma_2(x,y)) \) with the same marginals such that

\[ \mu(x,y) = \lambda \mu_1(x,y) + (1 - \lambda) \mu_2(x,y), \]  \hspace{1cm} (119) \]

\[ \gamma(x,y) = \lambda \gamma_1(x,y) + (1 - \lambda) \gamma_2(x,y). \]  \hspace{1cm} (120) \]

**Claim 3:** Given pmfs \( (\mu, \gamma) \) with the same marginals, one can find a path \( (x_1, y_1, x_2, y_2, \cdots, x_k, y_k) \) (as defined in Definition [8]) such that \( \gamma(x_i, y_i) > 0 \) for \( 1 \leq i \leq k \), and \( \mu(x_1, y_k) > 0 \) and \( \mu(x_i, y_{i-1}) > 0 \) for \( 2 \leq i \leq k \).

Consider a minimizer \( (\mu, \gamma) \) and the path given in Claim 3 for \( (\mu, \gamma) \). Define \( \mu_1(x,y) \) and \( \gamma_1(x,y) \) as follows:

\[ \gamma_1(x,y) = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{k} & \text{if } (x,y) = (x_i, y_i) \text{ for } 1 \leq i \leq k, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \]  \hspace{1cm} (121) \]

\[ \mu_1(x,y) = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{k} & \text{if } (x,y) = (x_1, y_k), \\ \frac{1}{k} & \text{if } (x,y) = (x_i, y_{i-1}) \text{ for } 2 \leq i \leq k, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \]  \hspace{1cm} (122) \]
Observe that $\gamma_1$ and $\mu_1$ have the same marginals and satisfy the conditions $\text{Support}(\mu_1) \subseteq \text{Support}(\mu)$ and $\text{Support}(\gamma_1) \subseteq \text{Support}(\gamma)$. Using Claim 1 and 2, we conclude that $(\gamma_1, \mu_1)$ must also be a minimizer. Using (116), we therefore obtain

$$\tilde{\epsilon} = \prod_{x,y} p_{XY}(x,y)^{-\mu_1(x,y)+\gamma_1(x,y)}$$

which evaluates to the value assigned to the path $(x_1, y_1, x_2, y_2, \ldots, x_k, y_k)$ according to (29). Since $\epsilon_1$ is the minimum assigned value of all possible paths, we obtain $\epsilon_1 \leq \tilde{\epsilon}_1$.

To show that $\tilde{\epsilon}_1 \leq \epsilon_1$, suppose that $\epsilon_1$ is obtained for the minimizer path $(x'_1, y'_1, x'_2, y'_2, \ldots, x'_k, y'_k)$. We construct $\mu'_1$ and $\gamma'_1$ for this path, similar to (121) and (122), and the value of this path is

$$\epsilon_1 = \prod_{x,y} p_{XY}(x,y)^{-\mu'_1(x,y)+\gamma'_1(x,y)}.$$  

Using (116), we obtain $\tilde{\epsilon}_1 \leq \epsilon_1$. This proves $\tilde{\epsilon}_1 = \epsilon_1$.

It remains to prove the claims given above.

**Proof of Claim 1:** The value of $\sum_{x,y} (\mu_i(x,y) - \gamma_i(x,y)) \log p_{XY}(x,y)$ must be less than or equal to $\sum_{x,y} (\mu(x,y) - \gamma(x,y)) \log p_{XY}(x,y)$ for $i = 1, 2$ since $(\mu, \gamma)$ is a maximizer for (115). On the other hand, by the linearity of (115), we have

$$\sum_{x,y} (\mu(x,y) - \gamma(x,y)) \log p_{XY}(x,y) = \lambda \sum_{x,y} (\mu_1(x,y) - \gamma_1(x,y)) \log p_{XY}(x,y) + (1 - \lambda) \sum_{x,y} (\mu_2(x,y) - \gamma_2(x,y)) \log p_{XY}(x,y).$$

We thus have, for $i = 1, 2$,

$$\sum_{x,y} (\mu_i(x,y) - \gamma_i(x,y)) \log p_{XY}(x,y) = \sum_{x,y} (\mu(x,y) - \gamma(x,y)) \log p_{XY}(x,y).$$

**Proof of Claim 2:** Assign

$$\lambda = \min \left\{ 1, \min_{x,y} \frac{\gamma(x,y)}{\gamma_1(x,y)}, \min_{x,y} \frac{\mu(x,y)}{\mu_1(x,y)}, \right\}.$$  

Observe that $\lambda > 0$ since $\gamma_1(x,y) > 0$ implies that $\gamma(x,y) > 0$, and $\mu_1(x,y) > 0$ implies that $\mu(x,y) > 0$. Assigning the values

$$\gamma_2(x,y) = \frac{\gamma(x,y) - \lambda \gamma_1(x,y)}{1 - \lambda}$$

$$\mu_2(x,y) = \frac{\mu(x,y) - \lambda \mu_1(x,y)}{1 - \lambda}$$

proves the claim.

**Proof of Claim 3:** Consider some $x_1 \in X$ such that $\gamma(x_1) > 0$. Then there is some $y_1 \in Y$ such that $\gamma(x_1, y_1) > 0$. Hence $\gamma(y_1) > 0$, which implies that $\mu(y_1) > 0$. This also implies that there is some $x_2 \in X$
such that \( \mu(x_2, y_1) > 0 \). Hence, \( \mu(x_2) > 0 \) implies \( \gamma(x_2) > 0 \) and that there is some \( y_2 \) such that \( \gamma(x_2, y_2) > 0 \). We continue this process and obtain a sequence \( (x_1, y_1, x_2, y_2, \ldots) \). While applying the process, we must observe at some point for the first time a previously occurred symbol. Suppose that this happens at time \( m \). If \( x_m = x_i \) for some \( i < m \), then we consider the sequence \( (x_i, y_i, x_{i+1}, y_{i+1}, \ldots, x_{m-1}, y_{m-1}) \) as our path. This is a desirable path since \( \mu(x_i, y_{m-1}) = \mu(x_m, y_{m-1}) > 0 \). Similarly, if \( y_m = y_i \) for some \( i < m \), we consider the sequence \( (x_{i+1}, y_i, \ldots, x_{m}, y_m) \) as our path. This is a desirable path since \( \mu(x_{i+1}, y_m) = \mu(x_{i+1}, y_i) > 0 \). This proves the existence of such a path.

### 4.7 Proof of Theorem 8

**Part 1:** We first show that the one-way SK rate from Alice to Bob is positive if and only if

\[
\epsilon > 1 - \eta(p_{Y|X}(y|x))
\]

(130)

where \( \eta(\cdot) \) is as defined in (9).

The one-way SK rate is positive if and only if one can find auxiliary random variables \( U \) and \( V \) that satisfy the Markov chain \( VU \rightarrow X \rightarrow YZ \) such that

\[
I(U; Y|V) > I(U; Z|V) = (1 - \epsilon)I(U; XY|V) = (1 - \epsilon)I(U; X|V).
\]

(131)

Thus, the one-way SK rate is positive if and only if

\[
\epsilon > 1 - \sup_{VU \rightarrow X \rightarrow Y} \frac{I(U; Y|V)}{I(U; X|V)} = 1 - \eta(p_{Y|X}(y|x))
\]

(132)

where \( (a) \) follows by Lemma [8] proved in Appendix [C].

**Part 2:** We next prove that \( \tilde{L}(X; Y||Z) = 0 \) if and only if

\[
\epsilon \leq 1 - \max_{q_{XY}(x,y): \rho_m^2(q_{XY}(x,y))} \rho_m^2(q_{XY}(x,y)).
\]

(133)

From the definition of \( \tilde{L}(X; Y||Z) = 0 \), one can deduce that \( \tilde{L}(X; Y||Z) = 0 \) if and only if, for any \( U_1, U_2, \ldots, U_k \) satisfying (12) and (13), any \( i \) with \( 1 \leq i \leq k \), and any \( u_{1:i-1} \) such that \( \mathbb{P}(U_{1:i-1} = u_{1:i-1}) > 0 \), we have for odd and even \( i \), respectively,

\[
I(U_i; Y|U_{1:i-1} = u_{1:i-1} - I(U_i; Z|U_{1:i-1} = u_{1:i-1}) \leq 0
\]

(134)

\[
I(U_i; X|U_{1:i-1} = u_{1:i-1}) - I(U_i; Z|U_{1:i-1} = u_{1:i-1}) \leq 0
\]

(135)

The reason is that if either (134) or (135) fails, we can construct a valid \( U_i \) by setting it to be a constant conditioned on \( U_{1:i-1} \neq u_{1:i-1} \) so that

\[
I(U_i; Y|U_{1:i-1}) = \mathbb{P}(U_{1:i-1} = u_{1:i-1})I(U_i; Y|U_{1:i-1} = u_{1:i-1}).
\]

We can then compute a non-zero lower bound \( \tilde{L}(X; Y||Z) \) by considering \( k = \zeta = i \) in (14).

Equivalently, one can show that \( \tilde{L}(X; Y||Z) = 0 \) if and only if for any \( U_1, U_2, \ldots, U_k \) satisfying (12) and (13), any \( i \) with \( 1 \leq i \leq k \), and any \( u_{1:i-1} \) such that \( \mathbb{P}(U_{1:i-1} = u_{1:i-1}) > 0 \), the one-way SK rates for the distribution \( r_{XY}(x,y) = p_{XY|U_{1:i-1}}(x,y|u_{1:i-1}) \) are zero. This is because for any \( r_{UV,XY}(u,v,x,y) = \)
For even $i$, we can set $U_i = \text{constant}$, $U_{i+1} = V$, and $U_{i+2} = U$, and proceed similarly.

To complete the proof, we need to characterize the class of distributions $r_{XY}(x, y)$ that arises when we condition the joint distribution of $(X, Y)$ on $U_{i:i-1} = u_{i:i-1}$. The authors of [14, 15] consider this problem, where they search for the set of conditional pmfs $p_{XY|U_{1:k}}(x, y|u_{1:k})$ that one can obtain with some auxiliary random variables $U_1, U_2, \cdots, U_k$ satisfying

$$U_i \rightarrow XU_{1:i-1} \rightarrow Y \quad \text{for odd } i,$$

$$U_i \rightarrow YU_{1:i-1} \rightarrow X \quad \text{for even } i$$

for some arbitrary $k$ and arbitrary realization $u_{1:k}$ of $U_{1:k}$ satisfying $P(U_{1:k} = u_{1:k}) > 0$. This set of pmfs can be expressed as $q_{XY}(x, y) = a(x)b(y)p_{XY}(x, y)$ for some functions $a : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and $b : \mathcal{Y} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ [14, 15], i.e., $q_{XY}(x, y) \leq p_{XY}(x, y)$. Combining this observation with (33) proves that $\hat{L}(X; Y|Z) = 0$ if and only if

$$\epsilon \leq 1 - \max_{q_{XY}(x, y) \leq p_{XY}(x, y)} \eta(q_{XY}(x|y))$$

(136)

$$\overset{(a)}{=} 1 - \max_{q_{XY}(x, y) \leq p_{XY}(x, y)} \rho_m^2(q_{XY}(x, y))$$

(137)

where $(a)$ follows by [9] and because if $q_{XY}(x, y) \leq p_{XY}(x, y)$, then for any $r_{XY}(x, y) = r_X(x)q_{Y|X}(y|x)$ we also have $r_{XY}(x, y) \leq p_{XY}(x, y)$. A similar argument is used in [15, Eq. (80)].

**Part 3:** Since $p_{Z|XY}(\bar{z}|x,y)$ is an erasure channel with probability $\epsilon$, Lemma 4 in Appendix C shows that a given conditional distribution $p_{Z|X,Y}(\bar{z}|x,y)$ can be produced with a degradation $p_{Z|Z}(\bar{z}|\bar{z})$ on random variable $Z$, if and only if

$$\epsilon \leq \sum_{\bar{z}} \min_{x,y:p_{X,Y}(x,y)>0} p_{Z|X,Y}(\bar{z}|x,y).$$

(138)

As a result, the intrinsic mutual information $B_0(X; Y|Z)$ in (16) is zero if and only if

$$\epsilon \leq \sup_{p_{Z|X,Y}(\bar{z}|x,y):I(X;Y|Z) = 0} \sum_{\bar{z}} \min_{x,y:p_{X,Y}(x,y)>0} p_{Z|X,Y}(\bar{z}|x,y).$$

(139)

In computing $B_0(X; Y|Z)$, it suffices to restrict to random variables $\bar{Z}$ with cardinality at most $|Z|$. Therefore, we assume that $\bar{z} \in \{1, 2, \ldots, |Z|\}$. Finally, observe that the condition $I(X; Y|\bar{Z}) = 0$ is equivalent to the condition that the matrix

$$[p_{XY}(x, y)p_{Z|X,Y}(\bar{z}|x,y)]_{x,y}$$

has rank one for all $\bar{z}$. 28
Part 4: Consider a $p(\tilde{z}|x, y)$ such that $X \rightarrow \tilde{Z} \rightarrow Y$ forms a Markov chain. Since $Z$ is the result of $XY$ passing through an erasure channel, for any $q(u, x, y)p(\tilde{z}|x, y)$ we have

$$I(U; Z) = (1 - \epsilon)I(U; XY).$$

Thus, $B_1(X; Y\|Z)$ in (17) is zero if and only if for any $q(u, x, y)p(\tilde{z}|x, y)$ we have

$$(1 - \epsilon)I(U; XY) \geq I(U; \tilde{Z}).$$

This can be expressed in terms the strong data processing constant and Renyi’s maximal correlation as

$$1 - \epsilon \geq \max_{q(x,y)p(\tilde{z}|x,y)} s^2(q(xy, \tilde{z})) = \eta(p(\tilde{z}|x, y)). \quad (140)$$

4.8 Proof of Theorem 9

Using Theorem 8 the one-way SK rate for a DSBE source is positive if

$$\epsilon > 1 - \max_{q_{XY}(x,y)} \rho^2_m(q_{XY}(x,y)).$$

In particular, the one-way SK rate for a DSBE source is positive if

$$\epsilon > 1 - \rho^2_m(p_{XY}(x, y)) = 1 - (1 - 2p)^2 = 4p(1 - p).$$

We next prove that $L(X; Y\|Z) = 0$ if $\epsilon \leq 4p(1 - p)$, which completes the proof of Theorem 9. Note that the lower bound $L(X; Y\|Z)$ obtained from (14) includes the one-way SK rate. Using [15, Theorem 6], we obtain

$$\max_{q_{XY}(x,y): q_{XY}(x,y) \leq p_{XY}(x,y)} \rho^2_m(q_{XY}(x,y)) = (1 - 2p)^2. \quad (141)$$

Combining (34) with (141) gives the desired result.

References


A New Interpretation of the Upper Bound $B_1(X; Y\|Z)$

In this section, we give a new interpretation of the upper bound $B_1(X; Y\|Z)$. In [12], the bound $S(X; Y\|Z) \leq B_1(X; Y\|Z)$ follows by showing that

$$S(X; Y\|Z) \leq S(X; Y\|J) + S_{ow}(XY; J\|Z)$$

$$= S(X; Y\|J) + \max_{V \rightarrow U \rightarrow XY \rightarrow ZJ} I(U; J|V) - I(U; Z|V)$$  \hfill (142)

where $S_{ow}(XY; J\|Z)$ is the one-way SK rate from $XY$ to $J$. The interpretation of (142) given in [12] is to split the key shared between $X$ and $Y$ (and hidden from $Z$) into two parts: a part independent of $J$ (i.e., the term $S(X; Y\|J)$) and another part shared with $J$ (i.e., the term $S_{ow}(XY; J\|Z)$).

We now give a new interpretation for (142). To do this, we begin by revisiting the intrinsic mutual information upper bound $B_0(X; Y\|Z)$ from [17]. The authors in [17] use the fact that making Eve weaker by passing $Z$ through a channel $p_{J|Z}(j|z)$ does not decrease the SK capacity. Thus, $S(X; Y\|Z) \leq S(X; Y\|J)$ if $J \rightarrow Z \rightarrow XY$ forms a Markov chain. We now replace the degradation of $Z$ to $J$ with the less noisy condition. Consider a broadcast channel with input $(X, Y)$ and two outputs $Z$ and $J$. We have the following proposition:

**Proposition 1.** If the channel $p_{Z|XY}(z|x, y)$ is less noisy than the channel $p_{J|XY}(j|x, y)$, then

$$S(X; Y\|Z) \leq S(X; Y\|J).$$  \hfill (143)

**Proof 1.** The proposition follows from (142) since if $Z$ is less noisy than $J$, then $I(U; J|V) - I(U; Z|V)$ vanishes in (142). We give a direct proof of Proposition 1 below. \hfill \square
Thus, we have the bound (145),

\[
\frac{1}{n} I(K_A; Z^n F_{1:k}) \leq \epsilon.
\]

We now show that

\[
I(K_A; J^n F_{1:k}) \leq I(K_A; Z^n F_{1:k})
\]

(144)

which shows that the code is secure also for an eavesdropper that has i.i.d. repetitions of \( X \) instead of \( Z \). To prove (144), we need to show that

\[
I(K_A; J^n | F_{1:k}) \leq I(K_A; Z^n | F_{1:k}).
\]

It therefore suffices to show for all \( f_{1:k} \) that

\[
I(K_A; J^n | F_{1:k} = f_{1:k}) \leq I(K_A; Z^n | F_{1:k} = f_{1:k}).
\]

(145)

Since we have the Markov chain \( F_{1:k} K_A \rightarrow X^n Y^n \rightarrow Z^n J^n \), when we condition on \( F_{1:k} = f_{1:k} \), we have also the Markov chain \( K_A \rightarrow X^n Y^n \rightarrow Z^n J^n \) and

\[
p_{Z^n J^n | X^n Y^n} (z^n, j^n | x^n, y^n, f_{1:k}) = p_{Z^n J^n | X^n Y^n} (z^n, j^n | x^n, y^n)
\]

for all \( x^n, y^n, z^n, j^n, f_{1:k} \in X^n \times Y^n \times Z^n \times J^n \times F_{1:k} \). Since \( p_{Z|X Y} (z | x, y) \) is less noisy than \( p_{J|X Y} (j | x, y) \), the \( n \)-letter product channel \( p_{Z^n | X^n Y^n} (z^n | x^n, y^n) \) is also less noisy than the channel \( p_{J^n | X^n Y^n} (j^n | x^n, y^n) \). Thus, we have the bound (145).

Proposition 1 gives the following interpretation of (142): the term \( S_{ow}(XY; J \| Z) \) is the penalty of deviating from the less-noisy condition when we replace \( Z \) with \( J \) in \( S(X; Y \| Z) \) and \( S(X; Y \| J) \).

### B A New Measure of Correlation

The quantities \( \epsilon_1 \) and \( \epsilon_2 \) given in Definition 6 motivate new measures of correlation. Suppose we are given a joint probability distribution \( p_{XY}(x, y) \). Let

\[
q_{X_1 Y_1 X_2 Y_2}(x_1, y_1, x_2, y_2) = p_{XY}(x_1, y_1) p_{XY}(x_2, y_2),
\]

\[
r_{X_1 Y_1 X_2 Y_2}(x_1, y_1, x_2, y_2) = p_{XY}(x_1, y_2) p_{XY}(x_2, y_1)
\]

and define the new correlation measure

\[
J_\alpha(X; Y) = D_\alpha (q_{X_1 Y_1 X_2 Y_2}(x_1, y_1, x_2, y_2) || r_{X_1 Y_1 X_2 Y_2}(x_1, y_1, x_2, y_2))
\]

(146)

where \( D_\alpha \) is the Renyi divergence of order \( \alpha \). We have

\[
J_\infty(X; Y) = \log \max_{x_1, x_2, y_1, y_2: p_X(x_1), p_X(x_2), p_Y(y_1), p_Y(y_2) > 0} \left( \frac{p_{XY}(x_1, y_1) p_{XY}(x_2, y_2)}{p_{XY}(x_1, y_2) p_{XY}(x_2, y_1)} \right) = \log \max_{x_1 \neq x_2, y_1 \neq y_2: p_X(x_1), p_X(x_2), p_Y(y_1), p_Y(y_2) > 0} \left( \frac{p_{XY}(x_1, y_1) p_{XY}(x_2, y_2)}{p_{XY}(x_1, y_2) p_{XY}(x_2, y_1)} \right)
\]

\[
= 2 \log \frac{1}{\epsilon_2}.
\]

(147)

Some properties of \( J_\alpha \) are as follows.
• **Faithfulness:** \( J_\alpha(X;Y) \geq 0 \) with equality \( J_\alpha(X;Y) = 0 \) if and only if \( X \) and \( Y \) are independent. Equality follows from the equality \( q_{X_1,Y_1,X_2,Y_2}(x_1,y_1,x_2,y_2) = r_{X_1,Y_1,X_2,Y_2}(x_1,y_1,x_2,y_2) \) for all \( x_1,x_2,y_1,y_2 \).

• **Data Processing:** If \( A \rightarrow X \rightarrow Y \rightarrow B \), then we have \( J_\alpha(X;Y) \geq J_\alpha(A;B) \). In particular, we have

\[
J_\alpha(X_1;X_2;Y_1Y_2) \geq J_\alpha(X_1;Y_1).
\]

To show that \( A \rightarrow X \rightarrow Y \rightarrow B \) implies \( J_\alpha(X;Y) \geq J_\alpha(A;B) \), consider some \( p(a|x) \) and \( p(b|y) \). Let

\[
V(a_1a_2b_1b_2|x_1x_2y_1y_2) = p(a_1|x_1)p(a_2|x_2)p(b_1|y_1)p(b_2|y_2)
\]

and define

\[
q_{A_1,B_1,A_2,B_2}(a_1,b_1,a_2,b_2) = \sum_{x_1x_2y_1y_2} q_{X_1,Y_1,X_2,Y_2}(x_1,y_1,x_2,y_2)V(a_1a_2b_1b_2|x_1x_2y_1y_2)
= p_{AB}(a_1,b_1)p_{AB}(a_2,b_2)
\]

and

\[
r_{A_1,B_1,A_2,B_2}(a_1,b_1,a_2,b_2) = \sum_{x_1x_2y_1y_2} r_{X_1,Y_1,X_2,Y_2}(x_1,y_1,x_2,y_2)V(a_1a_2b_1b_2|x_1x_2y_1y_2)
= p_{AB}(a_1,b_2)p_{AB}(a_2,b_1).
\]

The bound \( J_\alpha(X;Y) \geq J_\alpha(A;B) \) follows from the data processing property of \( D_\alpha \).

• **Symmetry:** It is immediate from the definition that

\[
J_\alpha(X;Y) = J_\alpha(Y;X).
\]

• **Additivity:** If \((X_1,Y_1)\) and \((X_2,Y_2)\) are independent, then

\[
J_\alpha(X_1X_2;Y_1Y_2) = J_\alpha(X_1;Y_1) + J_\alpha(X_2;Y_2)
\]

which follows from the definition.

Furthermore, by \([147]\) we see that \( J_\infty(X;Y) \) depends only on \( p_{Y|X} \) and the support set of the distribution on \( X \). Thus, we have

\[
J_\infty(X;Y) = J_\infty(p_{Y|X}(y|x), \mathcal{X}')
\]

where \( \mathcal{X}' = \{x : p_X(x) > 0\} \).
B.1 An “Uncertainty Principle” for Channel Coding

Consider a point to point communication to send a message \( M \) over a channel \( p_{Y|X}(y|x) \) with \( n \) channel uses. Then, the chain \( M \rightarrow X^n \rightarrow Y^n \rightarrow \hat{M} \) is Markov so that due to the data-processing property of the new correlation measure, we have

\[
J_\infty(M; \hat{M}) \leq J_\infty(X^n; Y^n).
\]

However, \( J_\infty(X^n; Y^n) \) depends only on the channel \( p(y^n|x^n) \) and the support set of \( X^n \), that is \( \{x^n : p(x^n) > 0\} \). Because increasing the support set can only increase \( J_\infty \), we conclude that

\[
J_\infty(X^n; Y^n) \leq J_\infty(p(y^n|x^n), \mathcal{X}^n) = n \times J_\infty(p(y|x), \mathcal{X})
\]

Thus, we have

\[
J_\infty(M; \hat{M}) \leq n \times J_\infty(p(y|x), \mathcal{X})
\]

which implies that for any \( m_1 \neq m_2 \) we have

\[
\log \left( \frac{p_{\hat{M}|M}(m_1|m_1)}{p_{\hat{M}|M}(m_2|m_1)} \times \frac{p_{\hat{M}|M}(m_2|m_2)}{p_{\hat{M}|M}(m_1|m_2)} \right) \leq n \times J_\infty(p(y|x), \mathcal{X}). \tag{151}
\]

Equivalently, we have the following inequality

\[
\frac{p_{\hat{M}|M}(m_2|m_1)}{p_{\hat{M}|M}(m_1|m_1)} \times \frac{p_{\hat{M}|M}(m_1|m_2)}{p_{\hat{M}|M}(m_2|m_2)} \geq \exp \left( -n \times J_\infty(p(y|x), \mathcal{X}) \right). \tag{152}
\]

Define

\[
\frac{P_{\hat{M}|M}(m_2|m_1)}{P_{\hat{M}|M}(m_1|m_1)} \tag{153}
\]

as the “uncertainty of \( M = m_1 \)” against \( M = m_2 \) if the true value of \( M \) is \( m_1 \). Similarly, define the “uncertainty of \( M = m_2 \)” against \( M = m_1 \) if the true value of \( M \) is \( m_2 \) as

\[
\frac{P_{\hat{M}|M}(m_1|m_2)}{P_{\hat{M}|M}(m_2|m_2)} \tag{154}
\]

Then (152) gives a lower bound on the product of the uncertainty of \( M = m_1 \) and the uncertainty of \( M = m_2 \). (152) states that “if the uncertainty when the true value of \( M \) is \( m_1 \) is very small, then the uncertainty when the true value of \( M \) is \( m_2 \) cannot be small.” This may be considered as an uncertainty principle.

C Lemmas Used in the Proof of Theorem 8

Lemma 3. For any \( p_X(x) \) such that \( p_X(x) > 0 \) for all \( x \), and any \( p_{Y|X}(y|x) \), we have

\[
\eta(p_{Y|X}(y|x)) = \sup_{VU \rightarrow X \rightarrow Y} \frac{I(U; Y|V)}{I(U; X|V)}.
\]
Proof. For any \((U,V)\) satisfying the Markov chain \(VU \rightarrow X \rightarrow Y\), we have
\[
\frac{I(U;Y|V)}{I(U;X|V)} \leq \max_v \frac{I(U;Y|V = v)}{I(U;X|V = v)} \\
\leq s^*_e(X;Y) \\
\leq \max_{q_{XY}(x,y)} s^*_Q(X;Y) \\
= \eta(p_{Y|X}(y|x)) \quad (155)
\]
where \((a)\) follows because \(s^*_Q(X;Y)\) is the strong data processing constant evaluated according to
\[
r_{XY}(x,y) = p_{XY|V}(x,y|v) = p_X(x|v)p_{Y|X}(y|x).
\]
Therefore, we have
\[
\eta(p_{Y|X}(y|x)) \geq \sup_{VU \rightarrow X \rightarrow Y} \frac{I(U;Y|V)}{I(U;X|V)}.
\]
On the other hand, consider an arbitrary \(p_{V|X}(v|x)\). Fix some \(v^*\) such that \(P_{V}(v^*) > 0\) and let \(U\) to be a constant when \(V \neq v^*\). Then, we have
\[
\frac{I(U;Y|V)}{I(U;X|V)} = \frac{I(U;Y|V = v^*)}{I(U;X|V = v^*)}.
\]
Thus, we obtain
\[
\sup_{VU \rightarrow X \rightarrow Y} \frac{I(U;Y|V)}{I(U;X|V)} \geq s^*(X;Y|V = v^*).
\]
Since \(p_X(x) > 0\) for all \(x \in X\), for any pmf \(q_X(x)\) on \(X\) one can find a channel \(p_{V|X}(v|x)\) and a value \(v^*\) such that \(p_{X,Y|V}(x,y|v^*) = q_X(x)p_{Y|X}(y|x)\). Thus, we obtain
\[
\sup_{VU \rightarrow X \rightarrow Y} \frac{I(U;Y|V)}{I(U;X|V)} \geq \max_{q_X(x)} s^*(q_X(x)p_{Y|X}(y|x)) = \eta(p_{Y|X}(y|x)). \quad (156)
\]
\[
\square
\]

**Lemma 4.** Let \(A\) and \(R\) be arbitrary discrete sets. Let \(p_A(a)\) be a probability distribution on \(A\) such that \(p_A(a) > 0\) for all \(a \in A\). Let \(B = A \cup \{e\}\) and assume that \(p_{B|A}(b|a)\) is an erasure channel with probability \(\epsilon\) (here \(e\) is the erasure symbol). Consider an arbitrary \(q_{R|A}(r|a)\). There exists a conditional distribution \(p_{R|B}(r|b)\) such that
\[
\sum_b p_{A,B}(a,b)p_{R|B}(r|b) = p_A(a)q_{R|A}(r|a) \quad (157)
\]
if and only if
\[
\sum_r \min_a q_{R|A}(r|a) \geq \epsilon. \quad (158)
\]
Remark 5. The term $\sum_r \min_a q_{R|A}(r|a)$ is known as Doeblin’s coefficient of ergodicity of the channel $q_{R|A}(r|a)$ \cite[Section 5]{25}. One direction of Lemma 4 is mentioned in \cite{26} and \cite[Remark 3.2]{27}; the other direction seems to be new.

Proof. Suppose that we have a conditional distribution $p_{R|B}(r|b)$ such that (157) holds. Since $p_{B|A}(b|a)$ is an erasure channel, given an input $A = a$, $B$ has two possibilities $B \in \{a, e\}$. We have

$$p_A(a)q_{R|A}(r|a) = \sum_b p_{A,B}(a,b)p_{R|B}(r|b)$$

(159)

$$= \varepsilon p_A(a)p_{R|B}(r|e) + (1 - \varepsilon)p_A(a)p_{R|B}(r|a)$$

(160)

$$\geq \varepsilon p_A(a)p_{R|B}(r|e).$$

(161)

Thus, from $p_A(a) > 0$ for all $a \in A$ we have $q_{R|A}(r|a) \geq \varepsilon p_{R|B}(r|e)$. We obtain

$$\min_a q_{R|A}(r|a) \geq \varepsilon p_{R|B}(r|e).$$

(162)

Therefore, we observe that

$$\sum_r \min_a q_{R|A}(r|a) \geq \varepsilon \sum_r p_{R|B}(r|e) = \varepsilon$$

(163)

which proves the correctness of (158).

Conversely, take some arbitrary $q_{R|A}(r|a)$ satisfying (158) and let $q_{AR}(a,r) = p_A(a)q_{R|A}(r|a)$. Then for all $r$ we have

$$q_R(r) = \sum_a p_A(a)q_{R|A}(r|a) > 0$$

and

$$\sum_a p_A(a)\frac{q_{R|A}(r|a)}{q_R(r)} = 1.$$}

Thus, we conclude that for any $r$ we have

$$\min_a \frac{q_{R|A}(r|a)}{q_R(r)} \leq 1.$$}

Furthermore, using (158), we have

$$\sum_r q_R(r)\min_a \frac{q_{R|A}(r|a)}{q_R(r)} \geq \varepsilon.$$}

(164)

Thus, one can find $\lambda(r) \in [0, 1]$ such that

$$\lambda(r) \leq \min_a \frac{q_{R|A}(r|a)}{q_R(r)}$$

(165)

and

$$\varepsilon = \sum_r q_R(r)\lambda(r).$$}

(166)
Define $p_{RB}(r|b)$ as follows:

\begin{align}
    p_{RB}(r|e) &= \frac{q_R(r)\lambda(r)}{\epsilon} \\
    p_{RB}(r|a) &= \frac{q_{R|A}(r|a) - q_R(r)\lambda(r)}{1 - \epsilon} \quad \forall a \in A.
\end{align}

The conditional probability in (167) is well defined by (166). The conditional probability in (168) is non-negative and well-defined by (165). Finally, observe that with the choice of $p_{RB}(r|b)$ given in (167) and (168), the marginal probability distribution of $A, R$ is

\begin{align}
    p_{AR}(a, r) &= \sum_b p_{A,B}(a, b)p_{RB}(r|b) \\
    &= \epsilon p_A(a)p_{RB}(r|e) + (1 - \epsilon)p_A(a)p_{RB}(r|a) \\
    &= p_A(a)q_R(r)\lambda(r) + p_A(a)(q_{R|A}(r|a) - q_R(r)\lambda(r)) \\
    &= p_A(a)q_{R|A}(r|a) \quad \text{(169)}
\end{align}

which proves the converse part. \qed