Abstract—In physical-layer Group Secret-Key (GSK) generation, multiple nodes of a wireless network synthesize symmetric keys by observing a subset of their channels, referred as the common source of randomness (CSR). Unlike two-user key generation, in GSK generation, some nodes must act as facilitators by broadcasting quantized versions of the linear combinations of the channel realizations, which in turn reduces the overall key-rate, and also incurs non-zero leakage of the CSR to an eavesdropper. Identifying these issues, we propose a practical GSK generation protocol, referred to as Algebraic Symmetrically Quantized GSK (A-SQGSK) protocol, in a network of three nodes, wherein due to quantization of symbols at the facilitator, the other two nodes also quantize their channel realizations, and use them appropriately over algebraic rings to generate the keys. First, we prove that the A-SQGSK protocol incurs zero leakage. Subsequently, on the CSR provided by the A-SQGSK protocol, we propose a consensus algorithm among the three nodes, called the Entropy-Maximization Error-Minimization (EM-EM) algorithm, which maximizes the entropy of the secret-key subject to an upper-bound on the mismatch-rate. We use extensive analysis and simulation results to lay out guidelines to jointly choose the parameters of the A-SQGSK protocol and the EM-EM algorithm.

I. INTRODUCTION

Physical-layer key generation is an effective way of synthesizing symmetric keys for securing communication among wireless nodes in a network. In the simplest model of two-user key generation, radio devices witness correlated source of randomness by observing the temporal variation of the wireless channel between them and subsequently harvest a shared secret-key through consensus [1], [2]. A generalization of two-user physical-layer key generation is group secret-key (GSK) generation [16], [17], wherein more than two nodes in the network generate a shared secret-key by observing an appropriately chosen common source of randomness (CSR). Typical applications of GSK generation include broadcast, relaying and multi-cast communication in Device-to-Device communication in ad hoc networks, e.g., vehicular networks and mobile networks. Physical-layer GSK generation techniques can be broadly classified into two types: (i) pairwise key based generation, wherein pairs of users in the network synthesize secret-keys using their wireless links, and subsequently distribute a GSK by using their pair-wise keys at the digital level [16], [17], and (ii) GSK generation, wherein multiple nodes in the network first exchange a common source of randomness, and then generate a group secret-key after executing a group consensus algorithm [18], [19]. While the former class of methods piggyback on the simplicity of two-user key generation protocols, such schemes expose the generated digital key to threats to a possible insider attack in the wireless network. In contrast, using the latter class of methods, it has been shown that manipulating the common source of randomness by an insider is power-inefficient, and may also be detected by the neighboring nodes provided the detection algorithms are carefully designed [23]. Due to such advantages, in this paper, we are interested in the design and analysis of the latter class of GSK protocols. In the next section, we introduce the motivation behind this work using an illustrative example.

A. Motivation

One of the main questions in GSK generation strategies is “How to securely share a CSR among the nodes in the network?” To illustrate, in the case of the three-node network shown in Fig. 1, the total set of available channels is \( \{ h_{12}, h_{13}, h_{23} \} \), where \( h_{jk} \) denotes the complex baseband wireless channel between node-\( j \) and node-\( k \). With this setup, the CSR can be any non-empty subset of the available channels. Irrespective of the choice of the CSR, observe that some nodes in the network have to learn the channels of the adjacent pairs, and this cannot be achieved by exchanging pilot symbols among them. For instance, if the CSR is \( h_{12} \), then
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node-3 cannot learn this channel during the pilot transmission phase, and therefore either node-1 or node-2 has to help node-3 in learning $h_{12}$. This implies that node-1 (or node-2), henceforth referred to as the facilitator, needs to broadcast some function of $h_{12}$ and $h_{13}$ (or a function of $h_{12}$ and $h_{23}$), denoted by $f(h_{12}, h_{13}) \in \mathbb{C}$ (or $f(h_{12}, h_{23}) \in \mathbb{C}$), such that node-3 recovers $h_{12}$ after receiving the broadcast signal, and an eavesdropper in the vicinity must not recover $h_{12}$ from the broadcast signal. Furthermore, since $h_{12}$ and $h_{13}$ are Gaussian distributed complex numbers with infinite precision, the broadcast signal $f(h_{12}, h_{13})$ (or $f(h_{12}, h_{23}) \in \mathbb{C}$) must also be of infinite precision to assist accurate recovery of $h_{12}$. However, in practice, radio devices are designed to transmit baseband symbols from finite constellations, and as a result, quantized versions of $f(h_{12}, h_{13})$ have to be transmitted by the facilitator. Although quantizing $f(h_{12}, h_{13})$ to binary sequences of large block-lengths and subsequently mapping those bits to complex constellations is one solution to reduce the quantization error, such a strategy may not be applicable when the CSR has to be shared within a short coherence-block. To address this issue, we consider a new framework of practical GSK generation, wherein the facilitator is restricted to quantize $f(h_{12}, h_{13})$ directly to points in a complex constellation before broadcasting to the other nodes in the network. As a consequence, the noise levels of the CSR observed at various nodes in the network will be at different levels. For instance, in this example setting, the CSR at node-1 and node-2 are $h_{12}$, whereas the CSR at node-3 is a quantized version of $h_{12}$, which in turn is recovered from the quantized version of the broadcast signal by the facilitator. In this work, we address this disparity in the noise levels and discuss new methods to share the common source of randomness in the network model given in Fig. [1]

B. Contributions

We consider a wireless network, as shown in Fig. [1] wherein the three legitimate nodes are interested in sharing a common source of randomness (CSR) among them to harvest a group secret-key out of it. The CSR of interest in our model are the channel realizations of one of the links in the network. First, we identify that unlike the case of two-user key generation protocols, broadcasting pilot symbols one after the other within the coherence-time of the channels is not sufficient for the nodes to witness a CSR. As a result, one of the nodes, referred to as the facilitator, will have to transmit a function of the channel realizations observed by it in addition to broadcasting pilots. Assuming node-1 as the facilitator and $h_{12}$ as the chosen CSR, we make the following two crucial observations with respect to Fig. [1] (i) although node-1 can broadcast the sum $h_{12} + h_{13}$ to facilitate node-3 to witness $h_{12}$, this technique does not ensure zero leakage of the CSR to an external eavesdropper, and (ii) transmitting the complex number $h_{12} + h_{13}$ (with infinite precision values) within a short coherence-block is challenging, and as a result, the facilitator is constrained to directly quantize $h_{12} + h_{13}$ to points in a complex constellation before broadcasting them to the other nodes. Incorporating the above observations, in this paper, we make the following two-fold contributions:

C1: We propose a GSK protocol to exchange a CSR among the nodes in the network given in Fig. [1] such that (i) the channel realizations shared by the facilitator are quantized within the coherence-block thereby making the scheme amenable to implementation in practice, and importantly, (ii) the protocol incurs zero-leakage of the CSR to an external eavesdropper.

C2: On the CSR provided in C1, we propose a multi-level consensus algorithm, referred to as the EM-EM algorithm, among the three nodes to generate a group secret-key such that the entropy of the key is maximized subject to an upper bound on the mismatch rate. Given that the proposed multi-level consensus algorithm is closely coupled with the protocol used to exchange the CSR, we lay out design rules to jointly choose the parameters of the A-SQGSK protocol and the EM-EM algorithm as a function of underlying signal-to-noise-ratio and the required mismatch rate on the generated group secret-key.

Specific contributions of this work with respect to C1 and C2 are listed below:

Under C1, we propose a practical GSK protocol, referred to as Algebraic Symmetrically Quantized GSK (A-SQGSK), wherein due to the quantization of channel realizations at the facilitator, the other two nodes also quantize their channel realizations, and use them appropriately over algebraic rings to generate group secret-keys. Specifically, in this protocol, the facilitator, instead of quantizing the sum $h_{12} + h_{13}$ directly, quantizes the channel realizations $h_{12}$ and $h_{13}$ individually and then adds them over an algebraic ring before transmitting the result to the other nodes. Meanwhile, the other nodes, also quantize their channel realizations and subsequently recover the CSR using the symbols transmitted by the facilitator through successive interference cancellation. We show that the proposed protocol incurs zero leakage to an external eavesdropper, and this important property is attributed to the algebraic nature of operations at the facilitator (See Section III-C).

Under C2, we highlight that the CSR observed using the A-SQGSK protocol takes values from a discrete constellation. We show that the underlying discrete constellation must be carefully chosen so that the three nodes must be able to derive a group secret-key such that (i) the key rate (the number of bits per sample) is maximized, (ii) the entropy of the generated key is maximized, and (ii) the mismatch rate between the keys at the three nodes must be bounded within a negligible number.

C2.1 In order to meet the above design criteria, it is straightforward to note that a consensus algorithm must be designed using the knowledge of the joint probability distribution function (PDF) on the CSR observed at the three nodes. However, given that the three-dimensional joint PDF is intractable, we propose relaxed criteria to design a consensus algorithm by making use of the two-dimensional joint PDF on the CSR at node-2 and node-3, which captures the worst-case link for group-key generation when node-1 is the facilitator and $h_{12}$
is the channel realization for CSR (See Section IV).

**C2.2** Given the number of levels for quantization and the knowledge of the two-dimensional distribution, we formulate a constrained optimization problem to maximize the key rate with strict constraints on the entropy and the mismatch rate of the generated keys. Towards solving the optimization problem, we propose an iterative algorithm, referred to as the Entropy-Maximization Error-Minimization (EM-EM) algorithm, which carefully introduces guard bands in $\mathbb{R}^2$, as shown in Fig. 3 to satisfy the underlying constraints. In the EM-EM algorithm, iterations mainly involve two blocks, namely: (i) the entropy block, which shifts the guard bands to achieve the constraint on entropy, and (ii) the error block, which prudently increases the width of each guard band to satisfy the constraint on mismatch rate. Unlike existing approaches on multi-level quantization, we show that the EM-EM algorithm guarantees secret-keys with entropy of $b$-bits per sample in consensus when using a $2^b$-level quantizer. We show that the EM-EM algorithm outperforms multi-level quantization methods, which are optimized using the marginal distributions, and other traditional quantization methods, such as uniform quantization and Max-Lloyd quantization [24]. In summary, our algorithm can be applied on a wide range of joint distributions, and thus can serve as a software package to design multi-level quantizers for key generation (See Section V).

**C2.3** Using the proposed EM-EM algorithm on the CSR observed at node-2 and node-3, we show that the synthesized group secret-key exhibits maximum entropy of $b$ bits per sample, for $b \geq 1$, provided the size of the discrete constellation is sufficiently large. We show that this behaviour with respect to the size of the discrete constellation is attributed to limited degrees of freedom in enlarging the guard bands when the constellation size is small. Through extensive simulation results, we recommend the following guidelines when using the proposed GSK generation method: (i) The discrete constellation $\mathcal{A}$ chosen for quantization of the channel realizations in the A-SQGSK protocol must induce uniform distribution on the CSR at the individual nodes, (ii) After the algebraic operations during Phase 4, the facilitator must map the resultant symbols onto a regular QAM constellation before transmitting them to the other nodes, and (iii) the inputs to EM-EM algorithm must be the joint distribution of the CSR at node-2 and node-3, which constitute the worst-pair with reference to the CSR obtained from the channel realizations $h_{12}$ (See Section VI).

**C. Related Work**

In this section, we review the literature on group secret-key generation to highlight that none of the existing GSK generation protocols [16]-[22] has addressed the objectives of jointly achieving practicality, confidentiality, and maximum entropy in the GSK generation. Physical-layer key generation between two radio devices is well studied starting from theory that focuses on fundamental limits [2] to testbed developments that showcase proof-of-concepts [4]. A wide range of contributions exist in this topic, wherein the specific choice of common source of randomness [5], [7], [10], [11], [12], used to generate the keys depend on wireless platforms such as OFDM [13], multiple-input multiple-output (MIMO) systems [14], and fibre optical networks [15], to name a few. Under the class of two-user key generation algorithms, one of the early contributions on consensus algorithms was from [1], which proposed a two-level quantizer to derive secret bits in an unauthenticated channel. Subsequently, [2], [3] have proposed enhancements over the idea in [1] to maximize the entropy of the generated key with two-level quantizer. Further, [6], [7] have addressed scalar multi-level quantization schemes to generate more than one bit per sample, whereas [8] has proposed methods to reduce the mismatch rate between the generated keys. Recently, [9] has also explored vector quantization methods to achieve consensus on channels with correlated variations over time.

A generalization of relay-assisted secret-key generation is the concept of wireless physical-layer group secret-key (GSK) generation, wherein a group of nodes in a network generate a shared secret-key by observing a common source of randomness. For GSK generation using pair-wise channels, we refer the readers to [16], [17] for key generation using received signal strength indicator (RSSI) values, we refer the readers to [18], [19] for group keys using channel estimates, we refer to [20]. Unlike the case of two-user key generation, group secret-key generation methods involve two phases: In the first phase, nodes in the network need to securely exchange pilot symbols and their channel realizations such that all of them witness a common source of randomness. In the second phase, all the users need to apply a consensus algorithm to synthesize a group-secret key on the common source of randomness. With respect to the protocol phase, although there is literature on physical-layer GSK generation using RSSI values and channel estimates, questions on practicality and confidentiality of such protocols are not yet addressed. Similarly, a systematic approach to designing consensus algorithms in group secret-key generation that are matched to the common source of randomness derived in the protocol phase is missing. In this work, we have proposed solutions to fill the above pointed gaps in the literature.

**Notations:** We use $x \sim \mathcal{CN}(0, \sigma^2)$ to represent a circularly symmetric complex Gaussian random variable with mean 0 variance $\sigma^2$. The set of all integers, Gaussian integers, natural numbers and complex numbers are denoted by $\mathbb{Z}$, $\mathbb{Z}[i]$, $\mathbb{N}$ and $\mathbb{C}$, respectively, where $i = \sqrt{-1}$. The set $\mathbb{Z}_p$, for some integer $p > 1$, is given by $\{0, 1, 2, \ldots, p-1\}$. The mutual information between two random variables $x$ and $y$ is denoted by $I(x;y)$, and $H(x)$ denotes the entropy of a discrete random variable $x$. Given two sets $\mathcal{S}_1 \subset \mathbb{C}$ and $\mathcal{S}_2 \subset \mathbb{C}$, the direct sum $\mathcal{S}_1 \oplus \mathcal{S}_2$ is given by $\{s_1 + s_2 \mid s_1 \in \mathcal{S}_1, s_2 \in \mathcal{S}_2\}$. The acronym AWGN refers to additive white Gaussian noise. The number of elements in the set $\mathcal{S}$ is denoted by $|\mathcal{S}|$. We use $\text{Prob}(\cdot)$ to represent the regular probability operator. We use the notation $[n]$ to represent the set of integers $\{1, 2, \ldots, n\}$. Given a two-dimensional probability density function $P(x, y)$ of continuous random variables $X$ and $Y$, the probability that the pair lie in a given range is denoted by $\int_{a_1}^{a_2} \int_{b_1}^{b_2} P(x, y) dx dy$. In the special case of discrete random
variables $X$ and $Y$, the integral will collapse to summation of mass points in the given interval as $\sum_{a_j} a_j \sum_{a_k} P(x, y)$, where $P(x, y)$ denotes the joint probability mass function $P(X = x, Y = y)$.

II. System Model for GSK Generation

We consider a wireless network comprising three nodes, denoted by node-1, node-2 and node-3 as shown in Fig. II. In this network model, the channel between any two nodes is assumed to be frequency-flat and remain quasi-static for a block of four channel-uses. The wireless channel between node-$j$ and node-$k$, for $j \neq k$ is represented by a complex Gaussian random variable $h_{jk} \sim \mathcal{CN}(0, \sigma^2)$. The three nodes intend to generate a GSK by observing a subset of the channels $\{h_{12}, h_{13}, h_{23}\}$. This subset is referred to as the CSR in our model. To learn the CSR, the three nodes broadcast pilot symbols turn-by-turn within each coherence-block, using which the receiving nodes learn the corresponding channels. Subsequently, one of the nodes, referred to as the facilitator, broadcasts a combination of its observed channels to assist all the nodes in learning the CSR within the coherence-block. Consolidating the CSR observed over several coherence-blocks, the three nodes then apply a suitable key generation algorithm to synthesize a GSK. We denote the channels based on the coherence-block index $l$ as $\{h_{12}(l), h_{13}(l), h_{23}(l)\}$ for $l = 1, 2, \ldots, L$. In the next section, we present one such GSK protocol wherein the three nodes have to witness the CSR $\{h_{12}(l)\}$ for $1 \leq l \leq L$. Throughout the paper, we choose the CSR to be $\{h_{12}(l)\}$ as it suffices to study quantization effects at the facilitator.

A. Group Secret-key Generation with No Quantization at the Facilitator

We present a detailed description of a GSK protocol to exchange a common source of randomness among the three nodes in the network shown in Fig. II. We describe the four phases of the protocol for a given coherence-block $l \in \{1, 2, \ldots, L\}$:

**Phase 1**: node-1 transmits a pilot symbol $x = 1$, which is used by node-2 and node-3 to estimate the channels $h_{12}(l)$ and $h_{13}(l)$, respectively, as

$$\theta_2^{(1)}(l) = h_{12}(l) + e_2^{(1)}(l) \text{ and } \theta_3^{(1)}(l) = h_{13}(l) + e_3^{(1)}(l),$$

where $e_2^{(1)}(l) \sim \mathcal{CN}(0, \gamma)$ and $e_3^{(1)}(l) \sim \mathcal{CN}(0, \gamma)$ denote the channel estimation errors at node-2 and node-3, respectively. The superscripts denote the phase number in each coherence-block.

**Phase 2**: node-2 transmits a pilot symbol $x = 1$, which is used by node-1 and node-3 to estimate the channels $h_{12}(l)$ and $h_{23}(l)$, respectively, as

$$\theta_1^{(2)}(l) = h_{12}(l) + e_1^{(2)}(l) \text{ and } \theta_3^{(2)}(l) = h_{23}(l) + e_3^{(2)}(l),$$

where $e_1^{(2)}(l) \sim \mathcal{CN}(0, \gamma)$ and $e_3^{(2)}(l) \sim \mathcal{CN}(0, \gamma)$ are the corresponding estimation errors.

**Phase 3**: node-3 transmits a pilot symbol $x = 1$, which is used by node-1 and node-2 to estimate the channels $h_{13}(l)$ and $h_{23}(l)$, respectively, as

$$\theta_2^{(3)}(l) = h_{23}(l) + e_2^{(3)}(l) \text{ and } \theta_3^{(3)}(l) = h_{13}(l) + e_3^{(3)}(l),$$

where $e_2^{(3)}(l) \sim \mathcal{CN}(0, \gamma)$ and $e_3^{(3)}(l) \sim \mathcal{CN}(0, \gamma)$ are the corresponding estimation errors. We assume that all the nodes employ the same channel estimation algorithm, and as a result, we use $\gamma$ as the variance of the estimation error at all the nodes.

**Phase 4**: By the end of Phase 3, node-1 and node-2 have noisy versions of the CSR $\{h_{12}(l)\}$, but not node-3. Therefore, to fill the gap, in the last phase, node-1 (which acts as the facilitator) transmits the sum $\theta_2^{(4)}(l) + \theta_3^{(4)}(l)$, using which node-3 receives $\theta_3^{(4)}(l) = h_{13}(l) \left(\theta_2^{(3)}(l) + \theta_1^{(3)}(l)\right) + n_3^{(4)}(l)$, where $n_3^{(4)}(l)$ denotes the additive noise at node-3 distributed as $\mathcal{CN}(0, \sigma^2)$. Using $\theta_3^{(3)}(l)$ and $\theta_3^{(4)}(l)$, node-3 learns a noisy version of $h_{12}(l)$ as

$$\tilde{\theta}_3^{(4)}(l) = \left(\theta_3^{(3)}(l)\right)^{-1} \theta_3^{(4)}(l) - \theta_3^{(1)}(l).$$

Thus, by the end of Phase 4, the three nodes witness noisy versions of the CSR $\{h_{12}(l)\}$.

Observe that all the nodes witness noisy version of the CSR, wherein the noise levels depend on the node. Specifically, node-1 and node-2 observe $\{h_{12}(l)\}$, which are perturbed by estimation errors. However, node-3 observes a noisy version of $h_{12}(l)$, which is perturbed by both estimation error and the recovery noise during Phase 4.

In terms of leakage, an external eavesdropper receives the following symbols in the four phases: $y_E^{(1)}(l) = h_{1E}(l) + n_E^{(1)}(l)$, $y_E^{(2)}(l) = h_{2E}(l) + n_E^{(2)}(l)$, $y_E^{(3)}(l) = h_{3E}(l) + n_E^{(3)}(l)$, and $y_E^{(4)}(l) = h_{1E}(l)(\theta_2^{(3)}(l) + \theta_1^{(3)}(l)) + n_3^{(4)}(l)$, where $h_{1E}(l)$ is the complex channel between node-$j$ for $1 \leq j \leq 3$ and the eavesdropper, and $n_E^{(k)}(l)$ is the AWGN at the eavesdropper in Phase $k$ for $k = 1, 2, 3, 4$. Note that the eavesdropper cannot learn the channel realizations $\{h_{12}(l)\}$ during the first three phases by the virtue of its physical location (with the assumption that $h_{1E}(l), h_{2E}(l), h_{3E}(l)$ are statistically independent of $h_{12}(l)$). However, in Phase 4, it is straightforward to verify that the CSR is not confidential since the mutual information between the sum $\theta_2^{(2)}(l) + \theta_3^{(3)}(l)$ and $\theta_1^{(4)}(l)$ is not zero. Overall, in addition to the asymmetry in the noise levels of the CSR at different nodes, this protocol also leaks the CSR to an eavesdropper.

B. Group Secret-key Generation with Quantization at the Facilitator

In this section, we discuss some practical aspects of group secret-key generation protocols. In Section II, we present the first three phases involve broadcast of pilot symbols, wherein the receiver nodes estimate the corresponding channels using an appropriate channel estimation algorithm. However,
in Phase 4, the sum of the two channel realizations, i.e.,
\( \theta_1^{(2)}(l) + \theta_1^{(3)}(l) \), is transmitted by node-1. Observe that the
in-phase and the quadrature components of \( \theta_1^{(2)}(l) + \theta_1^{(3)}(l) \) can be irrational, and as a result, there will be loss of
precision when the radio devices are implemented with limited
hardware. Furthermore, most practical radios are designed to
transmit baseband signals from finite constellations such as
Phase Shift Keying (PSK), Quadrature Amplitude Modulation (QAM) etc. Due to constraints of short coherence-bloks, node-1 would need to transmit a quantized version of
the sum \( \theta_1^{(2)}(l) + \theta_1^{(3)}(l) \), given by \( \varphi(\theta_1^{(2)}(l) + \theta_1^{(3)}(l)) = \theta_1^{(2)}(l) + \theta_1^{(3)}(l) + z_{\text{sum}}(l) \), where \( \varphi(\cdot) \) is an appropriate
quantization algorithm that directly quantizes the channel
estimates to points in a complex constellation, denoted by
A, and \( z_{\text{sum}}(l) \) is the corresponding quantization noise. We
refer to this form of the GSK protocol as Asymmetrically
Quantized GSK (AQGSK) [24], [25]. After transmitting the
received symbols, the channel realizations
at node-3 are corrupted by the quantization noise
in addition to the recovery noise in Phase 4. Thus, with
quantization at node-1, the common randomness across the
three nodes are affected by different levels of noise. Although
more practical than the GSK protocol in Section II-A, this
method suffers from disparity in the effective noise levels at
the three nodes, and importantly, the transmitted symbol
from the faciliator \( \theta_1^{(2)}(l) + \theta_1^{(3)}(l) + z_{\text{sum}}(l) \) continues to
leak the CSR \( \theta_1^{(2)}(l) \) at an external eavesdropper. Identifying
these disadvantages of the AQGSK protocol, we propose a
new GSK protocol that enables the faciliator (node-1) to
transmit symbols from a finite constellation, and yet provide
zero-leakage to an external eavesdropper.

III. ALGEBRAIC SQGSK PROTOCOL

In this section, we propose a new practical GSK protocol
which reduces the asymmetry in the noise levels of the CSR at
different nodes, and also compensates the leakage drawbacks
of AQGSK. The central idea behind this method is to avoid
quantizing the sum \( \theta_1^{(2)}(l) + \theta_1^{(3)}(l) \) directly. Instead, we
propose to quantize the values \( \theta_1^{(2)}(l) \) and \( \theta_1^{(3)}(l) \) separately
at node-1, then appropriately transform them to points in an
algebraic ring before transmission. We refer to this method as
the Algebraic SQGSK (A-SQGSK) protocol. The ingredients
required to describe the A-SQGSK protocol are provided in the
following section.

A. Ingredients

The A-SQGSK protocol requires three complex constella-
tions for the following purposes: (i) to quantize the channel
realizations at all the three nodes, (ii) to execute the algebraic
operations at node-1, and (ii) to transmit a function of the
channel realizations at node-1 (the facilitator). In the proposed
A-SQGSK protocol, the facilitator quantizes the complex
channel realizations to points in a complex constellation \( \mathbb{C} \subset
\mathbb{C} \), of size \( 2^m \), given by \( \mathcal{A} = \mathcal{A}_I \bigoplus \mathcal{A}_Q \), where \( i = \sqrt{-1} \)
such that \( |\mathcal{A}_I| = |\mathcal{A}_Q| = 2^m \). Using \( \varphi : \mathbb{C} \to \mathcal{A} \) to
denote the quantization operator, we assume that \( \varphi(\cdot) \) works
independently on the in-phase and the quadrature components
of the input. For instance, with \( \beta \sim \mathcal{CN}(0, \Sigma) \), we have
\[
\varphi(\beta) = \arg \min_{a \in \mathcal{A}} |\beta - a|^2 \in \mathcal{A}.
\] (4)

We choose the constellation \( \mathcal{A} \) such that \( \varphi(\beta) \) is uniformly
distributed over the support \( \mathcal{A} \) when \( \beta \sim \mathcal{CN}(0, \Sigma) \). Given that
\( \mathcal{A}_I = \mathcal{A}_Q \), and the in-phase and the quadrature components
of \( \beta \) are independent and identically distributed, it suffices
to choose \( \mathcal{A}_I \subset \mathbb{R} \) such that \( \text{real}(\varphi(\beta)) \) and \( \text{imag}(\varphi(\beta)) \)
are uniformly distributed over the support \( \mathcal{A}_I \) and \( \mathcal{A}_Q \), respectively.
We also require a regular square quadrature amplitude
modulation (QAM) constellation \( \mathcal{A}_Q \subset \mathbb{C} \), of size
\( 2^m \), given by \( \mathcal{A}_Q = \mathcal{A}_I \bigoplus i\mathcal{A}_Q \), such that
\( \mathcal{A}_I = \mathcal{A}_Q = \{-2^{m-1} + 1, -2^{m-1} + 3, \ldots, 2^{m-1} - 3, 2^{m-1} - 1\} \)
where \( i = \sqrt{-1} \), and \( m \) is even. Assuming that the numbers of \( \mathcal{A}_I \) are
arranged in the ascending order, for \( \nu \in \mathcal{A}_I \), we define a one-to-one
mapping, denoted by \( \psi : \mathcal{A} \to \mathcal{A}_I \) as
\[
\psi(\nu) = \tilde{A}_I(\varphi(\text{real}(\nu))) + i\tilde{A}_Q(\varphi(\text{imag}(\nu))),
\] (5)
where \( \varphi(\cdot) \in [2^{m-1}] \) provides the position of the argument in
the ordered set \( \mathcal{A}_I \), and \( \tilde{A}_I(t) \), for \( t \in [2^{m-1}] \), provides the \( t \)-th
element in the ordered set \( \mathcal{A}_I \). We require a complex constellation
\( \mathcal{A}' = \{0, 1, \ldots, 2^m - 1\} \bigoplus \{0, i, i \cdot 2^m - 1\} \}
which forms an algebraic ring \( \mathbb{Z}_{2^m}[i] \), defined over regular addition
and multiplication, however, with modulo \( 2^m \) operation on
both the in-phase and the quadrature components. A regular
\( 2^m \)-QAM constellation \( \mathcal{A} \) can be written as a scaled and
shifted version of \( \mathcal{A}' \), given in Ingredient 3. In particular, for
\( \alpha \in \mathcal{A} \), the one-one transformation from \( \mathcal{A} \) to \( \mathcal{A}' \), represented
by \( \phi : \mathcal{A} \to \mathcal{A}' \), is
\[
\phi(\alpha) = \frac{\alpha + 2^m - 1 + i(2^m - 1)}{2}.
\] (6)

Using the mappings \( \phi(\cdot) \) and \( \psi(\cdot) \), it is straightforward
to note that there is a one-to-one correspondence between the
constellations \( \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{A}_I, \) and \( \mathcal{A}' \). Henceforth, throughout the paper,
the composite mapping \( \psi(\phi(\cdot)) \) from \( \mathcal{A} \) to \( \mathcal{A}' \) is denoted by
\( \Theta(\cdot) \), and its inverse from \( \mathcal{A}' \) to \( \mathcal{A} \) is denoted by \( \Theta^{-1}(\cdot) \).
B. A-SQGSK Protocol

The three nodes agree upon the discrete constellations \( A, \bar{A}, A' \subset \mathbb{C} \) of size \( 2^m \), for some integer \( m \), where \( m \) is even. Similar to the GSK protocol in Section II-A, the A-SQGSK protocol also comprises four phases, which are described below:

**Phase 1:** node-1 broadcasts a pilot symbol \( x = 1 \) using which node-2 and node-3 receive \( y_2^{(1)}(l) = h_{12}(l)x + n_2^{(1)}(l) \), and \( y_3^{(1)}(l) = h_{13}(l)x + n_3^{(1)}(l) \), respectively, where \( n_2^{(1)}(l) \) and \( n_3^{(1)}(l) \) are the AWGN distributed as \( \mathbb{C}N(0, \sigma^2) \). Using the received symbols, node-2 and node-3 estimate the channels \( h_{12}(l) \) and \( h_{13}(l) \), respectively, as \( h_{12}(l) + e_2^{(1)}(l) \) and \( h_{13}(l) + e_3^{(1)}(l) \), where \( e_2^{(1)}(l) \sim \mathbb{C}N(0, \gamma) \) and \( e_3^{(1)}(l) \sim \mathbb{C}N(0, \gamma) \) denote the channel estimation errors at node-2 and node-3, respectively. Further, these estimates are quantized to points in \( A \) as

\[
\begin{align*}
\theta_2^{(1)}(l) &= \varphi(h_{12}(l) + e_2^{(1)}(l)) \in \mathbb{A}, \\
\theta_3^{(1)}(l) &= \varphi(h_{13}(l) + e_3^{(1)}(l)) \in \mathbb{A},
\end{align*}
\]

where \( \varphi(\cdot) \) is as given in (4).

**Phase 2:** Similar to Phase 1, node-2 transmits a pilot symbol \( x = 1 \), which is used by node-1 and node-3 to estimate the channels \( h_{12}(l) \) and \( h_{23}(l) \), respectively, as \( h_{12}(l) + e_1^{(2)}(l) \) and \( h_{23}(l) + e_3^{(2)}(l) \). Subsequently, the estimates are quantized as

\[
\begin{align*}
\theta_1^{(2)}(l) &= \varphi(h_{12}(l) + e_1^{(2)}(l)) \in \mathbb{A}, \\
\theta_3^{(2)}(l) &= \varphi(h_{23}(l) + e_3^{(2)}(l)) \in \mathbb{A},
\end{align*}
\]

where \( e_1^{(2)}(l) \sim \mathbb{C}N(0, \gamma) \) and \( e_3^{(2)}(l) \sim \mathbb{C}N(0, \gamma) \) are the corresponding estimation errors.

**Phase 3:** Similar to Phase 1 and Phase 2, node-3 transmits a pilot symbol \( x = 1 \), which is used by node-1 and node-2 to obtain quantized version of estimates in \( \mathbb{A} \) as

\[
\begin{align*}
\theta_1^{(3)}(l) &= \varphi(h_{13}(l) + e_1^{(3)}(l)) \in \mathbb{A}, \\
\theta_2^{(3)}(l) &= \varphi(h_{23}(l) + e_3^{(3)}(l)) \in \mathbb{A},
\end{align*}
\]

where \( e_1^{(3)}(l) \sim \mathbb{C}N(0, \gamma) \) and \( e_3^{(3)}(l) \sim \mathbb{C}N(0, \gamma) \) are the corresponding estimation errors. All the three nodes employ the same channel estimation algorithm, and as a result, \( \gamma \) is identical at the three nodes.

**Phase 4:** By the end of Phase 3, node-1 and node-2 have quantized versions of the estimates of the channel \( h_{12}(l) \), whereas node-3 does not have access to \( h_{12}(l) \). Therefore, to fill the gap, in the last phase, node-1 applies the composite transformation \( \Theta(\cdot) \) on \( \theta_2^{(2)}(l) \) and \( \theta_3^{(3)}(l) \) to obtain \( \Theta(\theta_2^{(2)}(l)) \in \mathbb{A}' \) and \( \Theta(\theta_3^{(3)}(l)) \in \mathbb{A}' \), respectively. Subsequently, node-1 computes \( \theta_{\text{sum}}(l) = \Theta(h_{12}(l) + e_3^{(3)}(l)) \in \mathbb{A}', \) where \( \oplus \) denotes addition over the ring \( \mathbb{Z}_2^m[i] \), and then it broadcasts \( \theta(l) \triangleq \phi^{-1}(\theta_{\text{sum}}(l)) \in \bar{A} \) to node-2 and node-3. Here \( \phi^{-1}(\cdot) \) denotes the inverse of \( \phi \), defined in (6). With this, the received symbol at node-3 is given by \( \theta_3^{(4)}(l) = \sqrt{E_{\text{avg}}} h_{13}(l)(\theta(l) + n_{3}^{(4)}(l)) \), where \( \sqrt{E_{\text{avg}}} \) is the scalar used to normalize the transmit power in Phase 4 such that \( E[|\theta(l)|^2] = 1 \). Since node-3 has the knowledge of both \( h_{13}(l) + e_3^{(4)}(l) \), it obtains a maximum a posteriori probability (MAP) estimate \( \hat{\theta}_3(l) \in \bar{A} \) of \( \theta(l) \). Using the above estimate, node-3 obtains an estimate of the quantized version of \( h_{13}(l) \) as

\[
\hat{\theta}_3^{(4)}(l) = \Theta^{-1}(\phi(\hat{\theta}_3(l)) \oplus \Theta(h_{13}(l) + e_3^{(4)}(l))) \in \mathbb{A},
\]

where the subtraction operator \( \oplus \) is over the ring \( \mathbb{Z}_2^m[i] \). Thus, the CSR seen by node-1, node-2, node-3 are respectively given in (5). Unlike the protocol in Section II-A, the CSR witnessed at the three nodes belong to \( \bar{A} \).

C. Confidentiality of the CSR in Algebraic SQGSK

In this section, we prove that the A-SQGSK protocol does not leak the CSR to Eve. Since the channel realization \( h_{12}(l) \) is chosen as the CSR of interest, \( \theta_1^{(2)}(l) \), which is the quantized version of the CSR at node-1 qualifies as the quantity of interest to the external eavesdropper.

**Theorem 1:** With regular \( 2^m \)-QAM constellation, when \( \theta_1^{(2)}(l) \) and \( \theta_2^{(3)}(l) \) are identically distributed, we have \( I(\theta_1^{(2)}(l); \theta_1(l)) = 0 \), where \( \theta_1(l) \) is the symbol transmitted by node-1 in Phase 4 of the A-SQGSK protocol.

**Proof:** In Phase 4 of the coherence-block \( l \), the received symbol at the eavesdropper is given by \( y_E^{(l)}(l) = h_{1E}(l)\theta(l) + n_E^{(l)}(l) \), where \( h_{1E}(l) \) is the complex channel between node-1 and the eavesdropper, and \( n_E^{(l)}(l) \sim \mathbb{C}N(0, \Omega) \) is the AWGN noise at the eavesdropper. In this leakage analysis, we assume the worst-case scenario for the legitimate nodes that \( \Omega = 0 \), and also assume that the eavesdropper perfectly knows the channel \( h_{1E}(l) \) (using Phase 1 of the protocol). As a result, the eavesdropper can perfectly recover the transmitted point \( \theta(l) \in \bar{A} \) by node-1. We now analyze the conditional entropy \( H(\theta_2^{(2)}(l) \mid \theta(l)) \), which quantifies the residual entropy at the eavesdropper. The residual entropy \( H(\theta_2^{(2)}(l) \mid \theta(l)) \) at Eve is

\[
- \sum_{j=1}^{2^m} H(\theta_2^{(2)}(l) \mid \theta(l) = c_j) \text{Prob}(\theta(l) = c_j),
\]

where \( H(\theta_2^{(2)}(l) \mid \theta(l) = c_j) \) is given in (6), such that \( \text{Prob}(\theta_2^{(2)}(l) = b_k \mid \theta(l) = c_j) \) is the conditional probability on \( \theta_2^{(2)}(l) \). Furthermore, we have the relation in (10) where \( \oplus \) denotes subtraction over the ring \( \mathbb{Z}_2^m[i] \). Since \( c_j \) is fixed, the symbol \( \Theta^{-1}(\phi(c_j) \oplus \Theta(b_k)) \) results in a distinct value of \( A \) for each \( b_k \). Therefore, we have \( H(\theta_2^{(2)}(l) \mid \theta(l) = c_j) = H(\theta_2^{(3)}(l)) \), and thus \( H(\theta_2^{(2)}(l) \mid \theta(l)) = H(\theta_2^{(3)}(l)) \).

Since \( h_{12}(l) + e_2^{(2)}(l) \) and \( h_{13}(l) + e_3^{(3)}(l) \) are identically distributed, we have \( H(\theta_1^{(3)}(l)) = H(\theta_2^{(2)}(l)) \), and therefore, we have \( H(\theta_2^{(2)}(l) \mid \theta(l)) = H(\theta_1^{(3)}(l)) \). This completes the proof.

IV. GROUP CONSENSUS ALGORITHM FOR A-SQGSK PROTOCOL

By the end of the A-SQGSK protocol, the CSR at the three nodes, as given in (6), belong to the complex constellation \( A \), for some \( m > 1 \). Out of the three observations in (6), the first two are a result of direct quantization of channel
\[ \{ \phi \left( h_{12}(l) + e_1^{(2)}(l) \right) \}, \{ \phi \left( h_{12}(l) + e_2^{(1)}(l) \right) \}, \text{ and } \{ h_3^{(4)}(l) \} \]  
\[ H \left( \theta_1^{(2)}(l) \mid \theta(l) = c_j \right) = -\sum_{k=1}^{m} \text{Prob} \left( \theta_1^{(2)}(l) = b_k \mid \theta(l) = c_j \right) \log_2 \left( \text{Prob} \left( \theta_1^{(2)}(l) = b_k \mid \theta(l) = c_j \right) \right) \]  
\[ \text{Prob} \left( \theta_1^{(2)}(l) = b_k \mid \theta(l) = c_j \right) = \text{Prob} \left( \theta_1^{(3)}(l) = \Theta^{-1}(\phi(c_j) \oplus \Theta(b_k)) \right), \]  

realizations during the first three phases, whereas as the third one is a consequence of MAP decoding and successive cancellation at node-3 during Phase 4. We note that the in-phase and the quadrature components of a complex CSR sample in (8) are statistically independent at each node owing to circularly symmetric complex channel and also perfect knowledge of the channel during the phase of MAP decoding and successive interference cancellation at node-3. Since the in-phase and the quadrature components of the CSR belong to \( A_I \), the three nodes can agree upon a consensus algorithm to identify the location of the real samples that lie at the same level. A straightforward technique to harvest shared secret-keys is to apply two-level quantization on the in-phase and the quadrature components of the samples given in (8), as proposed in [2], [3]. Although this idea is effective, its limitation is its inability to generate more than one bit per sample when the CSR offers significant randomness. A natural way to increase the number of bits per sample is to apply multi-level quantization on each sample, where the number of levels must be chosen depending on the CSR at the end of the A-SQGSK protocol. In order to generate \( b \) bits per real sample, for \( b \in \mathbb{N} \), we formally define a \( 2^b \)-level quantizer as follows.

**Definition 1:** A \( 2^b \)-level quantizer, denoted by \( \Omega_b \subset \mathbb{R}^2 \), is defined by a set of \( 2^b \) pairs of real numbers, given by \( \Omega_b = \{ (a_j^-, a_j^+) \mid j = 1, 2, \ldots, 2^b \} \), satisfying the following constraints:

- \( a_j^- < a_j^+ \) for each \( 1 \leq j \leq 2^b \).
- \( a_j^+ \leq a_{j+1}^- \) for \( 1 \leq j \leq 2^b - 1 \), and
- \( a_1^- = -\infty \) and \( a_{2^b}^+ = \infty \).

Henceforth, we refer to the interval \( (a_j^-, a_j^+) \) by a fixed representative in that region, denoted by \( a_j \in (a_j^-, a_j^+) \). We call this set of representatives \( \{ a_j \mid 1 \leq j \leq 2^b \} \) as the finite constellation \( c \subset \mathbb{R} \) of size \( 2^b \). We use \( g_{j,j+1} \equiv (a_j^+, a_{j+1}^-) \) as the guard band separating the \( j \)-th and the \( (j+1) \)-th region, for \( 1 \leq j \leq 2^b - 1 \). We also use \( \Delta_j \equiv a_{j+1}^- - a_j^+ \) to represent the width of \( g_{j,j+1} \).

**Definition 2:** A real number \( y \in \mathbb{R} \) is quantized to \( 2^b + 1 \) discrete values, denoted by \( \hat{c} \equiv c \cup \{ X \} \), based on the following rule:

\[ \Omega_b(y) = \begin{cases} a_j, & \text{if } y \in (a_j^-, a_j^+) \text{ for } 1 \leq j \leq 2^b - 1, \\ X & \text{if } y \in (a_j^-, a_{j+1}^-) \end{cases} \]  

where \( a_j \) is the chosen representative of the region \( (a_j^-, a_{j+1}^-) \), and the symbol \( X \) is used to represent the samples lying in any of the guard bands.

Based on Definition 1 and Definition 2 the notation \( \Omega_b \) is used to represent a quantizer, whereas the notation \( \Omega_b(\cdot) \) is used to represent evaluation of the quantizer on a given real number. Although the quantizer is applicable on any real numbers, in this paper, we use this quantizer to apply on real samples in \( A_I \). In the next section, we discuss a group consensus algorithm among the three nodes using an appropriately designed quantizer \( \Omega_b \).

**A. Consensus Phase for Group-Key Generation**

To generate a group secret-key, node-1, node-2 and node-3 agree upon a quantizer \( \Omega_b \), as presented in Definition 2. Furthermore, they collect a sufficiently large number of CSR observations, denoted by

\[ y_A^l = \{ \phi \left( h_{12}(l) + e_1^{(2)}(l) \right) \mid l = 1, 2, \ldots, \ldots, L \}, \]
\[ y_B^l = \{ \phi \left( h_{12}(l) + e_1^{(1)}(l) \right) \mid l = 1, 2, \ldots, \ldots, L \}, \]

and

\[ y_C^l = \{ \theta_3^{(4)}(l) \mid l = 1, 2, \ldots, \ldots, L \}, \]  

over \( L \) coherence-blocks. After unfolding the in-phase and the quadrature components of the CSR, node-1, node-2 and node-3, respectively gather the sets of real samples \( y_A, y_B \) and \( y_C \), each of size \( 2L \). To achieve consensus, the three nodes execute the following protocol using the excursion length \( e \geq 1 \)[1]

- node-2 obtains the set \( \bar{Y}_B = \{ Q_b(y_B(r)) \mid y_B(r) \in y_B \} \), and then shares the index values \( \bar{J}_B = \{ r \mid y_B(r) = \bar{Q}_b(y_B(r + 1)) = \ldots = \bar{Q}_b(y_B(r + e - 1)) = a_j, \text{ for some } a_j \in \bar{c} \} \) to node-1.

- node-1 obtains the set \( \bar{Y}_A = \{ Q_b(y_A(r)) \mid y_A(r) \in y_A \} \), and then computes the corresponding set of index values \( \bar{J}_A = \{ r \mid y_A(r) = \bar{Q}_b(y_A(r + 1)) = \ldots = \bar{Q}_b(y_A(r + e - 1)) = a_j, \text{ for some } a_j \in \bar{c} \} \). Subsequently, node-1 shares \( \bar{J}_{3,BA} \equiv \bar{J}_B \cap \bar{J}_A \) with node-3, where \( \bar{J}_{3,BA} \) denotes the set of index values in consensus between node-2 and node-1.

- node-3 obtains the set \( \bar{Y}_C = \{ Q_c(y_C(r)) \mid y_C(r) \in y_C \} \), and then computes the corresponding set of index values \( \bar{J}_C = \{ r \mid y_C(r) = \bar{Q}_b(y_C(r + 1)) = \ldots = \bar{Q}_b(y_C(r + e - 1)) = a_j, \text{ for some } a_j \in \bar{c} \} \). Subsequently, node-3 shares \( \bar{J}_{3,ABA} \equiv \bar{J}_C \cap \bar{J}_{3,BA} \) with node-1 and node-2, where \( \bar{J}_{3,ABA} \) denotes the set of index values in consensus.

[1]This protocol for group consensus is a generalization of the protocol proposed for pair-wise key generation in [2].
between node-1, node-2 and node-3. We use \( N_{\text{group}} \) to denote the length of \( J_{CBA} \), i.e., \( N_{\text{group}} = |J_{CBA}| \).

Using \( J_{CBA} \), node-1, node-2 and node-3 generate the following sequences \( \mathcal{K}_A = \{Q_b(y_A(r)) \mid r \in J_{CBA}\} \), \( \mathcal{K}_B = \{Q_b(y_B(r)) \mid r \in J_{CBA}\} \), and \( \mathcal{K}_C = \{Q_b(y_C(r)) \mid r \in J_{CBA}\} \). Note that \( \mathcal{K}_A \), \( \mathcal{K}_B \), and \( \mathcal{K}_C \) are \( N_{\text{group}} \)-length sequences over the alphabet \( \mathcal{C} \).

B. Design Criteria on \( \Omega_b \)

Based on the above consensus algorithm, the following properties are desired on \( \mathcal{K}_A \), \( \mathcal{K}_B \), and \( \mathcal{K}_C \):

1) The symbol-rate, given by \( \frac{N_{\text{group}}}{2L} \), which captures the fraction of samples in consensus among the three nodes, is maximum.

2) The entropy of the three sequences must be maximum, i.e., \( H(\mathcal{K}_A) = N_{\text{group}}b \), \( H(\mathcal{K}_B) = N_{\text{group}}b \), and \( H(\mathcal{K}_C) = N_{\text{group}}b \) where \( H(\mathcal{K}_A) \), \( H(\mathcal{K}_B) \) and \( H(\mathcal{K}_C) \), respectively denote the joint entropy of \( N_{\text{group}} \) random variables over \( \mathcal{C} \).

3) The fraction of pair-wise disagreements between any two sequences must be negligible, i.e.,

\[
\frac{1}{N_{\text{group}}}d_H(\mathcal{K}_E, \mathcal{K}_F) \leq \beta,
\]

for \( E, F \in \{A, B, C\} \), where \( d_H(\cdot, \cdot) \) denotes the Hamming distance operator, and \( \beta \) is a negligible number of our choice.

In the rest of this paper, we drop the reference to the sample index \( r \), and refer to the real numbers at node-1, node-2 and node-3 as three correlated random variables \( y_A \), \( y_B \) and \( y_C \) with an underlying joint probability distribution function \( P(y_A, y_B, y_C) \). The above listed criteria can be met provided \( \Omega_b \) is based on \( P(y_A, y_B, y_C) \). However, given that this three-dimensional distribution is intractable to handle, we propose relaxed design criteria on \( \Omega_b \) which takes into account the two-dimensional joint distribution \( P(y_B, y_C) \) instead of \( P(y_A, y_B, y_C) \). We choose the pair-wise distribution \( P(y_B, y_C) \) over \( P(y_A, y_B) \) and \( P(y_A, y_C) \) since \( y_C \) is more distorted with respect to \( y_B \) than \( y_A \) because of the combination of quantization noise as well as the recovery noise. Note that while the quantizer design is based on the CSR between the worst-pair of nodes in the network, the same quantizer will be used by all the three nodes during the group consensus phase of Section IV-A.

C. Relaxed Design Criteria on \( \Omega_b \) based on Pair-wise Consensus

By focusing on the CSR available at node-2 and node-3, we design a quantizer \( \Omega_b \) assuming that only node-2 and node-3 are participating in the key-generation process using their CSR \( y_B \) and \( y_C \). The following protocol is assumed to take place between node-2 and node-3 with excursion length \( e \geq 1 \):

- node-2 obtains the set \( \tilde{Y}_B = \{Q_b(y_B(r)) \mid y_B(r) \in J_{CBA}\} \), and then shares the index values \( J_B = \{r \in [2L] \mid Q_b(y_A(r)) = \bar{Q}_b(y_A(r + 1)) = \ldots = Q_b(y_A(r + e - 1)) = a_j, \text{ for } a_j \in \mathcal{C}\} \) to node-3.

- node-3 obtains the set \( \tilde{Y}_C = \{Q_b(y_C(r)) \mid y_C(r) \in J_{CBA}\} \), and then computes the corresponding set of index values \( J_C = \{r \in [2L] \mid Q_b(y_C(r)) = Q_b(y_C(r + 1)) = \ldots = Q_b(y_C(r + e - 1)) = a_j, \text{ for } a_j \in \mathcal{C}\} \). Subsequently, node-3 shares \( J_{CB} = J_C \cap J_B \) with node-2, where \( J_{CB} \) denotes the set of index values in consensus between node-2 and node-3. We use \( N \) to denote the length of \( J_{CB} \), i.e., \( N = |J_{CB}| \).

Using \( J_{CB} \), node-2 and node-3 generate the following sequences \( \mathcal{K}_B = \{Q_b(y_B(r)) \mid r \in J_{CB}\} \), and \( \mathcal{K}_C = \{Q_b(y_C(r)) \mid r \in J_{CB}\} \).

Similar to the design criteria in Section IV-B, the following properties are desired on \( \mathcal{K}_B \) and \( \mathcal{K}_C \):

1) The symbol-rate, given by \( \frac{N}{2L} \), which captures the fraction of samples in consensus between node-2 and node-3, is maximum.

2) The entropy of the two sequences must be maximum, i.e., \( H(\mathcal{K}_B) = Nb \) and \( H(\mathcal{K}_C) = Nb \).

3) The fraction of pair-wise disagreements must be negligible, i.e., \( \frac{1}{N}d_H(\mathcal{K}_B, \mathcal{K}_C) \leq \beta \), where \( \beta \) is a small number of our choice.

We formally express the above criteria in terms of \( P(y_B, y_C) \), and subsequently formulate an optimization problem to design the quantizer \( \Omega_b \) when the consensus algorithm uses excursion length \( e = 1 \). Henceforth, throughout the paper, we formulate the problem statement with respect to a probability density function \( P(y_B, y_C) \). However, when the CSR samples are discrete, the same formulation continues to hold after replacing the integrals by summation operations.

To capture the criterion of symbol-rate, the consensus probability, denoted by \( p_e(\Omega_b) \), is given by,

\[
p_e(\Omega_b) = \text{Prob}(Q_b(y_B) \in \mathcal{C}, Q_b(y_C) \in \mathcal{C}) = \sum_{j=1}^{2^b} \sum_{k=1}^{2^b} \int_{a}^{a+k} P(y_B, y_C) dy_B dy_C. \tag{12}
\]

Out of the \( 2L \) real samples that undergo consensus, the average number of samples in agreement after the consensus phase is \( 2p_e L \). Therefore, the symbol-rate of the quantizer \( \Omega_b \) is

\[
N \frac{1}{2L} = p_e(\Omega_b). \tag{13}
\]

It is clear that \( Q_b(y_B) \in \mathcal{K}_B \) if and only if \( Q_b(y_B) \in \mathcal{C} \) and \( Q_b(y_C) \in \mathcal{C} \). As a result, the entropy of \( Q_b(y_B) \in \mathcal{K}_B \) is

\[
H(Q_b(y_B) \mid Q_b(y_C), Q_b(y_B) \in \mathcal{C}) = -\sum_{j=1}^{2^b} g_j \log_2 g_j. \tag{14}
\]

where \( g_j = \text{Prob}(Q_b(y_B) = a_j \mid Q_b(y_B), Q_b(y_C) \in \mathcal{C}) = \frac{\sum_{k=1}^{2^b} \int_{a}^{a+k} P(y_B, y_C) dy_B dy_C}{\sum_{j=1}^{2^b} \sum_{k=1}^{2^b} \int_{a}^{a+k} P(y_B, y_C) dy_B dy_C}. \tag{15}
\]

Since the samples after consensus are expected to be random, it is desired to achieve \( b \) bits on \( \mathcal{C} \) when \( \mathcal{C} \) comprises \( 2^b \) levels.
Two samples, $Q_b(y_B)$ and $Q_b(y_C)$ that are already in consensus, i.e., $Q_b(y_B), Q_b(y_C) \in \mathcal{C}$, are said to be in error if $Q_b(y_B) \neq Q_b(y_C)$. Formally, using the joint PDF, the symbol error rate (SER) among the samples in consensus is given by

\[
SER(Q_b) = \Pr(Q_b(y_B) \neq Q_b(y_C) | Q_b(y_B), Q_b(y_C) \in \mathcal{C}) = \frac{p_{c,m}(Q_b)}{p_c(Q_b)},
\]

where

\[
p_{c,m}(Q_b) = \sum_{j=1}^{2^b} \sum_{k \neq j} a_{j,k}^+ \int_{a_{j,k}^-}^{a_{j,k}^+} P(y_B, y_C) dy_B dy_C,
\]

and $p_c(Q_b)$ is given in (12). The quantizer $Q_b$ must be designed such that $SER(Q_b)$ is upper bounded by a negligible number, say $\beta > 0$. In practice, the choice of $\beta$ depends on the error-correction capability of the channel codes which are subsequently used to correct the residual errors in the secret-keys. Since $SER(Q_b)$ is inversely proportional to $p_c(Q_b)$, we take the approach of maximizing $p_c(Q_b)$ for a given upper bound on $p_{c,m}(Q_b)$.

Keeping in view of the expressions in (13), (14) and (16), the proposed objective function on the design of quantizer is formally given in Problem 1. The constrained optimization in Problem 1 must be solved for a given set of inputs $\{P(y_B, y_C), \eta, b\}$ with $p_c(Q_b)$ denoting the symbol-rate offered by the quantizer, the SER offered by it is upper bounded by $\frac{\eta}{p_c(Q_b)}$. Therefore, one way to obtain a quantizer satisfying the upper bound $SER(Q_b) \leq \beta$, for some $\beta > 0$, is to solve Problem 1 for various values of $\eta > 0$, and then choose the one which satisfies $\frac{\eta}{p_c(Q_b)} \leq \beta$.

In the next section, we provide an iterative algorithm to design a quantizer that satisfies the constraints in (18)-(19) for a given $\eta > 0$. 

Problem 1: Solve

\[
\arg \max_{Q_b} p_c(Q_b) \quad \text{such that} \quad H(Q_b(y_B) | Q_b(y_C), Q_b(y_B) \in \mathcal{C}) = b, \quad (18)
\]

\[
p_{c,m}(Q_b) \leq \eta, \quad (19)
\]

where $\eta > 0$ is a given negligible number.

V. EM-EM ALGORITHM

Towards solving Problem 1, we present an iterative algorithm, referred to as the Entropy-Maximization Error-Minimization (EM-EM) algorithm. As shown in Fig. 4, our algorithm comprises four blocks, namely: (i) the initialization block, which feeds an initial set of boundaries $\{(a_j, a_j^+) | \forall j\}$ for a given $b \in \mathbb{N}$, (ii) the entropy block, which handles the constraint in (18), (iii) the error block, which addresses the constraint in (19), and finally (iv) the refining block, which corrects the suboptimality of the entropy block in achieving equality constraint on conditional entropy.

Given the inputs $\{P(y_B, y_C), \eta, b\}$, our approach is to solve Problem 1 by assuming that $y_B$ and $y_C$ are identical, and then use the corresponding quantizer as the initial set of boundaries. With identical $y_B$ and $y_C$, the initial boundaries $\{a_j, a_j^+ \} | \forall j \}$ will be such that $\Delta_j = 0$ for each $j$. As a result, the constraint on $p_{c,m}(Q_b)$ will not be satisfied when the SNR is finite. To circumvent this problem, we feed these boundaries to the error block, which increases the width of the $j$-th guard band, for $1 \leq j \leq 2^b - 1$, as $(a_j, a_j^+) \leftarrow (a_j - \theta_j, a_j + 1 + \theta_j)$, for some $\theta_j \geq 0$, in order to satisfy the constraint $p_{c,m}(Q_b) \leq \eta$. Here, the notation $\leftarrow$ is used to represent the update operator on the guard bands. Subsequently, since the conditional entropy might have been disturbed, the updated boundaries from the error block are fed to the entropy block, which translates the $j$-th guard band, for $1 \leq j \leq 2^b - 1$, as $(a_j, a_j^+) \leftarrow (a_j + \phi_j, a_j + 1 + \phi_j)$, for some $\phi_j \in \mathbb{R}$, to satisfy the constraint on conditional entropy. This way, iterations between the error block and the entropy block continue until the constraints on the conditional entropy and $p_{c,m}(Q_b)$ are met. At the end of the algorithm, using the final set of boundaries $\{a_j, a_j^+ \} | \forall j \}$, we compute $p_c(Q_b)$ and $SER(Q_b)$ using $P(y_B, y_C)$.

In the rest of this section, we explain the functionality of each block by providing the rationale behind its design.

A. Initialization Block

For a given $b \in \mathbb{N}$, we obtain a quantizer $\{(a_j, a_j^+) | \forall j \}$, which is optimized to $\sigma^2 = 0$, i.e., when $y_B$ and $y_C$ are identical. For this extreme case, the boundaries are obtained by equating

\[
P_j = \int_{a_j}^{a_j^+} P(y_B) dy_B \quad (20)
\]

to $\frac{\Delta_j}{b}$, for $1 \leq j \leq 2^b$, where $a_j = -\infty$, $a_j^+ = +\infty$ and $P(y_B)$ is the PDF of $y_B$. A pseudocode description to solve (20) is given in Algorithm 1. It is straightforward to observe that $\Delta_j = 0$, for each $j$, since $\sigma^2 = 0$. 

![Fig. 3. Depiction of the proposed two-dimensional approach to solve multi-level quantization for key-generation. Unlike existing approaches, joint PDF is exploited to identify the placements and the widths of the guard bands.](image)
Fig. 4. Depiction of the proposed EM-EM algorithm to generate a multi-level quantizer. The inputs to the algorithm are \( \{P(y_B, y_C)\}, b, \eta \), where \( 2^b \) is the number of levels, and \( \eta \) is the upper bound on \( p_{c,m}(Q_b) \).

Algorithm 1: Initialization Block: The case when \( \sigma^2 = 0 \)

**Input:** \( P(y_B), b, \) and step-size \( \theta > 0 \)

**Output:** \( \{(a_j, a_j^+) \mid \forall j\} \)

1: Initialize \( a_1 = -\infty \) and \( a_{1+} = -\infty \)
2: for \( j = 1 \rightarrow 2^b - 1 \) do
3: \( a_j \) using (20)
4: \( \text{while } P_j < \frac{b}{2} \) do
5: \( a_j^+ \leftarrow a_j^+ + \theta \)
6: \( \text{update } P_j \) using (20)
7: \( \text{end while} \)
8: \( a_{j+} = a_j^+, a_{j+1} = a_j \)
9: \( \text{end for} \)
10: \( a_b^+ = +\infty \)

B. Error Block

The objective of this block is to increase the widths of guard bands to satisfy the constraint

\[
\int_{a_j}^{a_j^+} \int_{a_k}^{a_k^+} P(y_B, y_C) dy_B dy_C \leq \eta. \tag{21}
\]

Out of the \( 2^{2b} - 2^b \) terms in (21), the dominant terms are \( \int_{a_j}^{a_j^+} \int_{a_k}^{a_k^+} P(y_B, y_C) dy_B dy_C \) such that \( |k-j| = 1 \). Therefore, instead of addressing the constraint in (21), the error block satisfies the constraint on \( \delta_i \) given in (22), for each \( 1 \leq i \leq 2^b - 1 \). Using \( P(y_B, y_C) \), we compute the set \( \{\delta_i \mid i = 1, 2, \ldots, 2^b - 1\} \). Starting from \( i = 1 \) to \( 2^b - 1 \), the error block increases the width of \( G_{i+1} \) until the constraint on (22) is satisfied, as shown in Algorithm 2. Proposition 1 provides guarantee that increasing the width of \( G_{i+1} \) reduces \( \delta_i \). If \( \delta_i \), for some \( i \), already satisfies the constraint, then \( G_{i+1} \) remains unchanged. This way, the error block increases the width of each guard band prudently based on \( P(y_B, y_C) \).

**Proposition 1:** Increasing the width of \( G_{i+1} \) reduces \( \delta_i \).

**Proof:** This result follows from the definition of probability distribution function.

Algorithm 2: Error Block

**Input:** \( \{(a_j, a_j^+) \mid \forall j\}, P(y_B, y_C), b, \eta, \) and step-size \( \theta > 0 \)

**Output:** \( \{(a_j, a_j^+) \mid \forall j\} \)

1: for \( i = 1 \rightarrow 2^b - 1 \) do
2: \( \text{ Compute } \delta_i \) using (22)
3: \( \text{ while } \delta_i \leq \frac{b}{2^{i+1}} \) do
4: \( a_i^+ \leftarrow a_i^+ - \theta, a_{i+1}^+ \leftarrow a_{i+1}^+ + \theta \)
5: \( \text{ update } \delta_i \) using (22)
6: \( \text{ end while} \)
7: \( \text{end for} \)

C. Entropy Block

The role of the entropy block is to maximize the conditional entropy in (14). Based on the expressions of \( \{g_j \mid 1 \leq j \leq 2^b\} \) given in (15), the entropy block translates the guard bands locally such that \( g_j = \frac{1}{\alpha_j} \), for each \( j \). Unlike the error block, this block does not increase the widths of the guard bands; instead it translates them either to left or right to maximize the conditional entropy. Among the \( 2^b \) terms in the numerator of each \( g_j \), terms of the form \( \int_{a_j}^{a_j^+} \int_{a_k}^{a_k^+} P(y_B, y_C) dy_B dy_C \), for \( j \neq k \), are already driven to negligible values by the error block. As a result, the entropy block neglects such terms, and considers an approximation on \( g_j \), denoted by \( \tilde{g}_j \), as

\[
\tilde{g}_j = \frac{\alpha_j}{\alpha_1 + \alpha_2 + \ldots + \alpha_{2^b}}, \quad \tag{23}
\]

where

\[
\alpha_j = \int_{a_j}^{a_j^+} \int_{a_j^+}^{a_j^+} P(y_B, y_C) dy_B dy_C. \quad \tag{24}
\]

Using the boundaries received from the error block, \( \tilde{g}_j \) is computed as in (23) sequentially from \( j = 1 \) to \( 2^b \). For a given \( j \), if \( \tilde{g}_j \) is less than \( \frac{1}{2^b} \), then the corresponding guard band is translated to right until \( \tilde{g}_j = \frac{1}{2^b} \), as shown in Algorithm 3. On the other hand, if \( \tilde{g}_j \) is more than \( \frac{1}{2^b} \), then the corresponding guard band is translated to left by an appropriate amount until the equality \( \tilde{g}_j = \frac{1}{2^b} \) is met. The following proposition shows that the direction of translation depends on whether \( \tilde{g}_j \) is more or less than \( \frac{1}{2^b} \).

**Proposition 2:** If \( \tilde{g}_j \) is less than \( \frac{1}{2^b} \), then shifting the guard band to right increases \( \tilde{g}_j \). Similarly, if \( \tilde{g}_j \) is more than \( \frac{1}{2^b} \), then shifting the guard band to left decreases \( \tilde{g}_j \).

**Proof:** We provide a proof to show that translating the guard band to right increases the corresponding value of \( \tilde{g}_j \). The result for the other direction can be proved in a similar manner. Before translating the guard band \( \tilde{g}_{j+1} = (a_{j+1}^+, a_{j+1}^+) \), let \( \tilde{g}_j \) be computed as in (23) using the initial set of values given by \( \{a_j \mid \forall j\} \). If this guard band is translated as \( (a_j + \gamma, a_{j+1}^+ + \gamma) \), for some \( \gamma > 0 \), then based on the joint PDF, it is straightforward to observe that \( \alpha_j \) increases to \( \alpha_j + \gamma \alpha_j \), for some \( \gamma \alpha_j > 0 \), and \( \alpha_{j+1} \) decreases to \( \alpha_{j+1} - \gamma \alpha_{j+1} \), for some \( \gamma \alpha_{j+1} > 0 \), and the rest of the terms
\[
\delta_i = \int_{a_i^{-}}^{a_i^{+}} \int_{a_{i+1}^{-}}^{a_{i+1}^{+}} P(y_B, y_C) dy_B dy_C + \int_{a_{i+1}^{-}}^{a_{i+1}^{+}} \int_{a_i^{-}}^{a_i^{+}} P(y_B, y_C) dy_B dy_C \leq \frac{\eta}{2^b - 1} \tag{22}
\]

\{\alpha_k, \ | \ k \neq j, k \neq j + 1\} \text{ remain unchanged. As a result, the updated version of } \tilde{g}_j \text{ is of the form}
\[
\tilde{g}_j = \frac{\alpha_j + \gamma_{\alpha_j}}{\sum_{k=0}^{2^b-1} \alpha_k + \gamma_{\alpha_j} - \gamma_{\alpha_{j+1}}}.
\tag{25}
\]

Since \(\tilde{g}_j\) is always less than one, it is straightforward to prove that the updated value in (25) will be more than \(\tilde{g}_j\) for any \(\gamma_{\alpha_j} \geq 0, \gamma_{\alpha_{j+1}} \geq 0\). This completes the proof.

\[\square\]

**Algorithm 3: Entropy Block: Maximizing conditional entropy**

- **Input:** \(\{(a_j^-, a_j^+) \mid \forall j\}, P(y_B, y_C), b, \text{ and step-size } \theta > 0\)
- **Output:** \(\{(a_j^-, a_j^+) \mid \forall j\}\)

1. for \(j = 1 \rightarrow (2^b - 1)\)
2. Compute \(\tilde{g}_j\) using (23)
3. if \(\tilde{g}_j \leq \frac{1}{2^b}\) then
4. while \(\tilde{g}_j < \frac{1}{2^b}\) do
5. \(a_j^+ - a_j^- + \theta; a_{j+1}^- \leftarrow a_{j+1}^- + \theta\)
6. update \(\gamma_j\) using (23)
7. end while
8. else \(\tilde{g}_j > \frac{1}{2^b}\) do
9. while \(\tilde{g}_j > \frac{1}{2^b}\) do
10. \(a_j^+ - a_j^- - \theta; a_{j+1}^- \leftarrow a_{j+1}^- - \theta\)
11. update \(\tilde{g}_j\) using (23)
12. end while
13. end if
14. end for

**D. Refining Block**

Notice that the entropy block forces each \(\tilde{g}_j\) to take \(\frac{1}{2^b}\) from \(j = 1\) to \(2^b\) in a sequential manner, and as a result, the overall entropy \(-\sum_j \tilde{g}_j \log_2(\tilde{g}_j)\) may not be \(b\) after \(\tilde{g}_{2^b}\) is updated. This is because the process of forcing \(\tilde{g}_{j+1}\) to \(\frac{1}{2^b}\) disturbs \(\sum_j \alpha_j\), which in turn changes \(\tilde{g}_j\), which was optimized in the preceding step. To correct this suboptimal behavior of the entropy block, the refining block expands the guard bands to ensure \(\tilde{g}_j = \alpha_{\min}\), where \(\alpha_{\min} = \min\{\alpha_j \mid j = 1, 2, \ldots, 2^b\}\). This way, the equality constraint on entropy is met, and moreover the constraint on \(p_{c,m}(Q_b)\) is not violated. A pseudocode description of the refining block is given in Algorithm 4.

**Algorithm 4: Refining Block: Refining \(\tilde{g}_j = \frac{1}{2^b}\)**

- **Input:** \(\{(a_j^-, a_j^+) \mid \forall j\}, P(y_B, y_C), \text{ and step-size } \theta > 0\)
- **Output:** \(\{(a_j^-, a_j^+) \mid \forall j\}\)

1. Compute \(\{\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \ldots, \alpha_{2^b}\}\) using (24)
2. \(\alpha_{\min} = \min_{1 \leq k \leq 2^b} \alpha_k\)
3. for \(j = 1 \rightarrow 2^b\) do
4. while \(\alpha_j > \alpha_{\min}\) do
5. \(\alpha_j^- \leftarrow \alpha_j^+ + \theta; \alpha_j^+ \leftarrow \alpha_j^+ - \theta\)
6. update \(\alpha_j\) using (24)
7. end while
8. end for

**E. On Achieving the Desired SER using the EM-EM Algorithm**

After the refining block, the EM-EM algorithm guarantees that the entropy of the key is maximized for a given \(\eta > 0\). However, at this point, the desired SER may not be achieved, i.e., \(SER(Q_b) > \beta\). Further decreasing \(\eta\) decreases both the numerator and the denominator of (16), and as a result, lower values of \(SER(Q_b)\) may not be guaranteed by decreasing \(\eta\). In such cases, the pair \((b, \beta)\) is not feasible as defined below:

**Definition 3:** When using a quantizer \(Q_b\) with excursion length \(e = 1\), the pair \((b, \beta)\), for a given \(b \in \mathbb{N}\) and \(\beta > 0\), is said to be feasible if there exists an \(\eta \leq \beta\) such that \(SER(Q_b) \leq \beta\).

Based on Definition 3, when \((b, \beta)\) is not feasible, we propose to design \(Q_b\) using the EM-EM algorithm by feeding an \(\eta > 0\) such that \(SER(Q_b)\) is minimized, i.e.,
\[
\eta^* = \min_\eta SER(Q_b).
\tag{26}
\]

Subsequently, we use the corresponding quantizer \(Q_b\) (which is designed with \(\eta^*\)) in the consensus algorithm with excursion length \(e > 1\). The minimum value of \(e\) for which the mismatch rate of \(\beta\) is achieved will be used in the consensus phase. The following result proves that if the consensus algorithm is employed with \(Q_b\) (which is designed using the EM-EM algorithm) and excursion length \(e > 1\), then the entropy of the synthesized key continues to be maximum.

**Proposition 3:** When using the quantizer \(Q_b\) from the EM-EM algorithm along with excursion length \(e > 1\) in the consensus algorithm, the entropy of the synthesized key continues to be \(b\) bits per sample.

**Proof:** The EM-EM algorithm generates a quantizer \(Q_b\) that guarantees maximum entropy on the generated key when \(e = 1\), and this feature is contributed by the refining block of the algorithm. When using the consensus algorithm with \(Q_b\) and \(e > 1\), let \(\bar{Y}_B\) and \(\bar{Y}_C\) denote \(e\)-successive samples of \(Y_B\) and \(Y_C\), respectively, and let \(P(\bar{Y}_B, \bar{Y}_C)\) denote the corresponding joint probability mass function of \(\bar{Y}_B\) and \(\bar{Y}_C\). Note that the support of \(\bar{Y}_B\) and \(\bar{Y}_C\) are \(e\)-fold cross products of the set \(\bar{C}\) given by \(\bar{C}^e = \bar{C} \times \bar{C} \times \ldots \times \bar{C}\) with size \((2^b + 1)^e\), where \(\bar{C} = \bar{C} \cup X\). As per the consensus algorithm in Section IV-C, the consensus probability is given by \(\sum_j \sum_k \text{Prob}(\bar{Y}_B = a_j, \bar{Y}_C = a_k)\), where \(a_j = [a_j \ a_j \ldots \ a_j]\) and \(a_k = [a_k \ a_k \ldots \ a_k]\) such that \(a_j, a_k \in \bar{C}\). Let us define the set \(\hat{C}_X = \{v \in \bar{C}^e \mid v(t) = X \text{ for some } 1 \leq t \leq e\}\). With
that, the conditional entropy with excursion length $e > 1$ is given by $H(\hat{Y}_B | \hat{Y}_B \notin \mathcal{C}_X, \hat{Y}_C \notin \mathcal{C}_X) = - \sum_{j=1}^{2^e} t_j \log_2(t_j)$, where

$$t_j = \frac{\sum_k \text{Prob}(\hat{Y}_B = a_j, \hat{Y}_C = a_k)}{\sum_j \sum_k \text{Prob}(\hat{Y}_B = a_j, \hat{Y}_C = a_k)}$$

$$= \frac{\sum_k \left( \text{Prob}(\hat{Y}_B = a_j, \hat{Y}_C = a_k) \right)^e}{\sum_j \sum_k \left( \text{Prob}(\hat{Y}_B = a_j, \hat{Y}_C = a_k) \right)^e}$$

where the second equality is applicable because of statistical independence across the $e$ samples. If the parameter $\gamma$ of the EM-EM algorithm is appropriately chosen, then the cross-terms $\text{Prob}(\hat{Y}_B = a_j, \hat{Y}_C = a_k)$, for $j \neq k$, are negligible. As a result, we can approximate $t_j$ as

$$t_j \approx \frac{\left( \text{Prob}(\hat{Y}_B = a_j, \hat{Y}_C = a_j) \right)^e}{\sum_{k=1}^{2^e} \left( \text{Prob}(\hat{Y}_B = a_k, \hat{Y}_C = a_k) \right)^e}.$$

Since the refining block of the EM-EM algorithm ensures identical values of $\text{Prob}(\hat{Y}_B = a_j, \hat{Y}_C = a_j)$ for each $1 \leq j \leq 2^e$, we note that $t_j \approx \frac{1}{2^e}$, and therefore the conditional entropy of the symbols in consensus is maximum. This completes the proof.

\[F. \text{ Performance of the EM-EM Algorithm}\]

Before applying the EM-EM algorithm with A-SQGSK protocol, we showcase the performance of the EM-EM algorithm on the CSR $\{\theta_1(3)(l)\}$ and $\{\theta_2(3)(l)\}$ in (1) and (2), respectively. On the left-side of Fig. 5 we present the key rate of the EM-EM algorithm, defined as $b \ast p_r(Q_b)$, when $b = 1, 2$ and 3, against various values of $\text{SNR} = \frac{1}{\sigma^2}$. To generate the results, the constraint $\text{SER}(Q_b) \leq 10^{-3}$ is satisfied at each SNR by feeding an appropriate value of $\eta$ to the EM-EM algorithm. The left-side plots in Fig. 5 show that $b$ must be chosen based on SNR in order to fully exploit the shared randomness. We highlight that the secret-keys generated for the above constraints is that of EM-EM algorithm. However, at high SNR, the entropy achieved by optimizing the average quantization error using the marginal distribution, and (iii) Uniform quantizer, wherein the $2^e$ quantization levels are uniformly spread in $\mathbb{R}$, independent of the marginal distribution. With each baseline, the widths of the guards bands are increased until the constraint $\text{SER}(Q_b) \leq 10^{-3}$ is satisfied. The plots confirm that none of the baselines achieves entropy of $b$ bits. However, at high SNR, the entropy achieved by optimizing marginal distributions is close to that of EM-EM algorithm owing to high probability of consensus. Interestingly, the uniform quantizer achieves higher symbol-rate than the EM-EM algorithm because of significant mass points near the origin. However, the corresponding entropy is low, thereby resulting in lower key-rate.

VI. SIMULATION RESULTS USING EM-EM ALGORITHM ON THE A-SQGSK PROTOCOL

In this section, we present simulation results on the performance of the A-SQGSK protocol in conjunction with the proposed EM-EM algorithm. In the first three phases of the A-SQGSK protocol, all the nodes use the received symbols as the noisy estimates of the channels, i.e., $\gamma = \sigma^2$. For a given value of $m \in \{2, 4, 6, 8, 10, 12, 14\}$, and the underlying signal-to-noise-ratio, defined by $\text{SNR} = \frac{1}{\sigma^2}$, we choose the complex constellation $\mathcal{A}$ to ensure that the outputs of $\varphi(\cdot)$ are uniformly distributed. Accordingly, we use 4-, 16-, 64-, 256-, 1024-, 4096-, and 16384- QAM constellations as $\mathcal{A}$. We use $L = 10000$ coherence-blocks to generate the CSR samples, which correspond to the in-phase and the quadrature components of their CSR samples. Subsequently, we need the joint probability distribution of the real samples at node-2 and node-3 as the input to the EM-EM algorithm by specifying the value of $e = 1$. However, when applying the EM-EM algorithm to A-SQGSK protocol, we will show that $e = 1$ does not suffice due to discrete constellations.
b ≥ 1 (which is the number of bits generated per real sample) and the mismatch rate. As discussed in Section IV-E if the bound on mismatch rate is not achieved with excursion length e = 1, then we design the quantizer Q_b with η^* (as given in (26)) and then use it in the consensus algorithm with e > 1. Finally, we employ the designed quantizer Q_b to achieve consensus on a group secret-key as per the protocol in Section IV-A. Throughout this section, mismatch rate is referred to as bit-error-rate (BER) and symbol-error-rate (SER) when b = 1 and b > 1, respectively. Out of the 2L real samples available for consensus, we define the key rate as the average number of secret bits generated per real sample.

Using the EM-EM algorithm with b = 1, i.e., two-level quantization, the key rates of the A-SQGSK protocol are presented in Fig. 7 against SNR ∈ {10, 15, 20, 25, 30} dB so as to achieve an upper bound on the mismatch rate of 10^{-2}. In this context, a bit is said to be in error if any two nodes disagree with the value at that location after executing the protocol in Section IV-A. At each SNR value, we capture the impact of the A-SQGSK protocol by employing different sizes of the discrete constellation A. The plots in Fig. 7 show that for a given SNR value, the key rate does not increase by increasing m, the joint distribution of CSR at node-1 and node-2 must not be used to design the quantizer; this is because those CSR samples are only perturbed by the effect of additive noise in the quantization process. As a result, at high SNR values, the impact of recovery noise in Phase 4 of the A-SQGSK protocol is neglected. Thus, while the quantizer design is made on good pair of CSR samples, the subsequently designed quantizer is used to achieve e consensus on CSR samples that are poorer compared to that of node-1 and node-2. As a result, the overall mismatch rate achieved at the group secret-key level is more than the desired reliability level. The plots also show that instead of CSR samples at node-2 and node-3, we could also make use of the CSR samples at node-1 and node-3. This is because between the two sources of noise, the recovery noise in Phase 4 is more dominant, and therefore the resultant mismatch rate continues to lie below the desired reliability number. At lower SNR values, it is clear that the quantization

In Fig. 8 we capture the performance of group key generation when different pair-wise samples are considered to design Q_b. We plot the mismatch rate of the group key offered by feeding the joint distribution of several pairs, along with the threshold of 10^{-2}, which is the intended mismatch rate fed to the EM-EM algorithm. The plots show that for all values of m, the joint distribution of CSR at node-1 and node-2 must not be used to design the quantizer; this is because those CSR samples are only perturbed by the effect of additive noise in the quantization process. As a result, at high SNR values, the impact of recovery noise in Phase 4 of the A-SQGSK protocol is neglected. Thus, while the quantizer design is made on good pair of CSR samples, the subsequently designed quantizer is used to achieve e consensus on CSR samples that are poorer compared to that of node-1 and node-2. As a result, the overall mismatch rate achieved at the group secret-key level is more than the desired reliability level. The plots also show that instead of CSR samples at node-2 and node-3, we could also make use of the CSR samples at node-1 and node-3. This is because between the two sources of noise, the recovery noise in Phase 4 is more dominant, and therefore the resultant mismatch rate continues to lie below the desired reliability number. At lower SNR values, it is clear that the quantization
to maintain an upper bound on the mismatch rate of $10^{-2}$, we also present the key rate offered by the A-SQGSK protocol to synthesize a group secret-key with entropy of $10$ bits.

The plots show that if the CSR samples at node-1 and node-2 are used to design $Q_b$ in order to achieve entropy of $b = 1$ bit per sample and a mismatch rate (SER) of at most $10^{-2}$, then the resulting mismatch rate of the group secret-key does not satisfy $10^{-2}$ since the CSR samples between node-1 and node-2 do not capture the recovery noise at node-3 in Phase 4 of the protocol.

As a generalization of results presented in Fig. 7, in Fig. 11 we also present the key rate offered by the A-SQGSK protocol to synthesize a group secret-key with entropy of $b = 2$ bits per real sample. In this context, $b = 2$ implies that the quantizer $Q_b$, divides the CSR samples (which take $2^{2b}$ levels) at each user into $2^b$ zones in order to arrive at consensus. Similar to the case of $b = 1$, the quantizer design continues to maintain an upper bound on the mismatch rate of $10^{-2}$. However, the mismatch rate corresponds to symbol-error rate since the synthesized key is over the alphabet $\mathcal{C}$ containing 4 values. The plots presented in Fig. 10 show that inferences drawn by observing Fig. 7 continue to hold when $b = 2$. We have also verified that the entropy of the generated keys is 2 bits per real sample. At lower SNR values, the proposed EM-EM algorithm was unable to generate non-zero key rate satisfying entropy of 2 bits per sample and a mismatch rate of $10^{-2}$. One of the reasons for this behavior is the discrete nature of CSR.

Finally, we present a comparison between the key rate offered by the proposed combination of the A-SQGSK protocol and the EM-EM algorithm when the following two types of discrete constellations are considered for $\mathcal{A}$: (i)
The constellation $\mathcal{A}$ is chosen such that upon quantizing the channel realizations at each node, the resultant CSR samples exhibit uniform distribution, and (ii) the constellation $\mathcal{A}$ is a regular square QAM constellation. To generate the simulation results under (ii), we use a regular square QAM normalized to unit average energy to quantize the channel realizations in the first three phases of the A-SQGSK protocol. The corresponding plots are presented in Fig. 11 and Fig. 12 for $b = 1$ and $b = 2$, respectively. The plots show that forcing uniform distribution on the CSR samples after A-SQGSK protocol outperforms regular-QAM since the latter method accumulates large number of samples around the mean value, and as a result, increasing the guard band drops significant number of samples when compared to the former case. In summary, stitching together the advantages of the A-SQGSK protocol and the EM-EM algorithm, we recommend to choose $m$ and $b$ based on the underlying SNR values. From the viewpoint of designing the quantizer $Q_b$, we recommend the use of joint distribution of CSR samples at node-2 and node-3, which constitute the worst-pair of common randomness when using $h_{12}$ to harvest the group secret-key.

VII. Conclusion

We have proposed a practical GSK generation protocol for exchanging a common source of randomness among the nodes in a three-user wireless network, followed by a consensus algorithm that guarantees maximum entropy of the generated secret-keys subject to upper bounds on the mismatch rate. With respect to the protocol for exchanging CSR, we highlight that other than broadcasting pilot symbols, the facilitator must first quantize its channel realizations to node-2 and node-3 onto a complex constellation and subsequently transmit a linear combination of the result over an algebraic ring. We have shown that the quantization operation at the facilitator ensures practicality, whereas the algebraic operation ensures confidentiality of the CSR to an external eavesdropper. With respect to the consensus algorithm, we have proposed the EM-EM algorithm to synthesize a group secret-key by considering the discrete nature of the CSR samples provided in the protocol phase. Unlike the existing class of consensus algorithms, our algorithm guarantees maximum entropy to the generated keys. As future directions for research, we are interested in generalizing the proposed protocol to wireless networks with more than three nodes, and with varying topology. A straightforward extension of this work is to apply ideas similar to the A-SQGSK protocol to line-networks; in such cases, after the phase of exchanging common source of randomness, the EM-EM algorithm can be fed with the joint distribution of CSR samples at the first node and the last node in the chain to design the quantizer.
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