Upper bounds on secure key against non-signaling adversary via non-signaling squashed secrecy monotones
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We provide upper bounds on device independent key secure against a non-signaling adversary (NSDI) achieved by a class of operations, currently used in both quantum and non-signaling device independent protocols. As the main tool, we introduce a family of measures of non-locality by “squashing” secrecy monotones known to upper bound secret key in the secret key agreement scenario. In particular a squashed secret key rate can be considered itself as an upper bound on the key in NSDI, however we construct a much more computable example: - the non-signaling squashed intrinsic information of a conditional distribution (called squashed non-locality). We prove that the squashed non-locality exhibits several useful properties such as convexity, monotonicity, additivity on tensor product of conditional distributions, and asymptotic continuity. Hence, as a measure of non-locality, is interesting on its own. We demonstrate this approach by numerical upper bounds on this measure, that suggests, in particular, that the non-locality and secrecy in NSDI are not equivalent. We construct explicit examples of a conditional distribution violating CHSH inequality, from which no key in NSDI can be obtained with direct measurements and public communication followed by classical post-processing. We define the secret key rate in terms of the complete extension, a counterpart of quantum purification in non-signaling scenario, recently introduced in Winczewski et al. [1]. We show that the presented approach is equivalent to the already existing ones, including the one by Hänggi Renner and Wolf [2]. Finally, we simplify the class of operations attaining maximal distinguishability of two devices with several unary inputs, and one input of arbitrary cardinality, which is of independent interest on its own in context of Generalized Probabilty Theories.

I. INTRODUCTION

For a few decades the topic of quantum cryptography, a branch of science based on the synthesis of classical cryptography and quantum mechanics, was thoroughly investigated [3, 4]. There are four major security paradigms (scenarios) related structurally to quantum security: secret key agreement scenario (SK) [3, 5–7], device dependent security against quantum adversary (QDD) [3, 4, 8, 9], device independent security against quantum adversary (QDI) [4, 10–13] and device independent security against non-signaling adversary (NSDI) [2, 14–16], see [7] for a review.

In this manuscript we make a link between SK and (restricted) NSDI paradigms of security that allows us to provide an upper bound on the secret key rate in the latter paradigm by employing the results already known for the former one in a manner known from the QDD scenario [17].

To see the formal link, it is instructive to briefly focus on the basics of the above mentioned cryptographic scenarios. Although closely related on the conceptual level, they differ fundamentally by the class of considered states shared by the honest parties and the eavesdropper, as well as the class of operations that these parties can perform.

In the SK scenario, the parties share marginals of a classical distribution $P(ABE)$ respectively, and the honest parties (usually Alice and Bob) can process their data by the so called Local Operations and Public Communication (LOPC), while the eavesdropper Eve listens to the public communication and can apply any stochastic map on her data [5, 6].

The QDD scenario, originating conceptually from the SK, was introduced at the early stage of quantum cryptography [3, 4]. In this paradigm, the three parties share (in the worst case) a subsystem of a joined pure quantum state $|\Psi_{ABE}\rangle$. Alice and Bob can process this state by Local quantum Operations and Classical Communication (LOCC), while Eve obtains any system which is discused by Alice and Bob (which is equivalent to listening) and can perform any quantum operation on her share [18–20]. This scenario has a drawback, that Alice and Bob has to trust that the inner working of their device: the dimensionality of the state and operations of measurement performed by the device. This problem is resolved by much more restrictive, (QDI) quantum device independent scenario. There the object shared by the honest parties is a conditional distribution, which describes statistics of output of the device, given the parties...
press the buttons on them (i.e. set the inputs). Eavesdropper holds purification of a state, which, via the inner working of the device (which is of her choice), generates these statistics for Alice and Bob. The honest parties can process information by pressing buttons, generating data from the device, and further performing the LOPC operations.

A more general scenario, NSDI, assumes only that Eve does not signal (send information faster than light) to Alice and Bob and vice versa. Such a type of security relies only on statistics of inputs and outputs of the honest parties and the no-faster-than-light communication assumption, and as such can hold even in some future post-quantum physics. The shared object is then a tripartite joined distribution $P(ABE|XYZ)$. On this object the parties can perform certain wirings i.e. can feed outputs of one input to the other input, as well as perform LOPC operations on any obtained in such a way classical distribution. Eve can listen, and also perform certain device-to-device or device-to-distribution operations. This non-signaling paradigm, allowing to define the NSDI scenario, became an active field of research since the seminal papers of Rastall [21], Khalilin and Tsirelson [22] and finally by Popescu and Rohrlich [23], also within the subject of cryptography [2, 4, 14, 16, 24–26].

The theory of no-signaling boxes is a single instance of a much broader field of research related to generalized probabilistic theories (GPTs), which includes both fundamental topics [27, 28] and technical results [29–31].

As we have mentioned, our aim is to provide upper bounds on the key obtained in restricted NSDI, that is a variant of NSDI where we restrict the honest parties from performing certain operations. Namely, for simplicity, we assume that the honest parties do not perform wirings, but in the first step measure the device $P(ABE|XYZ)$ in some predefined way, by setting $X = x$ (Alice) and $Y = y$ (Bob) at their choice, known in advance to Eve. Then they can apply any LOPC operation to process the output distribution $P(AB|xy)$, while Eve is listening their communication $Q$, and can post-process her data, represented by $P(E|Z,Q)$, in any way that maps it to another distribution. We call these operations the restricted box operations followed by Local Operation and Public Communication (RBLOPC). It is important to note that all protocols of key generation in QDI and NSDI, to our best knowledge, use operations only from the RBLOPC class. Therefore, our bounds on the amount of key bounds from above the key rate achieved by a wide class of practical protocols.

Having described the background, we can discuss the formal link between NSDI and SK in a manner of QDD, which we provide. In the QDD scenario, the parties process $n$ copies of the pure state $|\psi_{ABE}\rangle^{\otimes n}$. The protocol should output the state $\rho_{ABE}^{real}$, which satisfies the security condition:

$$||\rho_{ABE}^{real} - \left(\sum_{i=0}^{K-1} \frac{1}{|K|} |ii\rangle\langle ii| \right) \otimes \rho_E|| \leq \varepsilon_{N \to \infty} 0. \quad (1)$$

where $\rho_E$ is any state of the eavesdropper that she can have after the protocol is done.

To provide similar formula as the above, we will use the recently introduced notion of a complete extension $E(P(AB|XY))$, which in cryptographic sense is a counterpart of the quantum purification [1]. It is proven there that the complete extension gives the maximal possible access to ensembles of the box shared by the honest parties. Their property was used before to express the power of the eavesdropper constrained only by the non-signaling condition [14–16]. Using this notion, we are able to formally define the maximal key rate, which can be obtained under attack by a complete extension of $N$ copies of identical conditional distribution $P(ABE|XYZ) \equiv E(P(AB|XY)^{\otimes N})$ by RBLOPC operations $\Lambda_N$, that satisfy security condition which is analogous to (1)

$$||\Lambda_N (E(P^{\otimes N})) - P_{ideal}^{(dn)}||_{\text{BOX}} \leq \varepsilon_{N \to \infty} 0. \quad (2)$$

In the Eq. (2) above $P_{ideal}^{(dn)}$ is a unary-unary-general-input device representing an ideal key, of the form:

$$\left(\sum_{s=0}^{d_n-1} |ss\rangle\langle ss|_{S_1S_2} \right) \otimes P'(E|Z), \quad (3)$$

with $P'(E|Z)$ denoting any box at Eve’s side after the protocol is done\(^1\). We refer to this scenario as to the iid non-signaling scenario. Here $||·||_{\text{BOX}}$ is the analogue of the trace norm for boxes, which equals to supremum over general operations which can be applied to conditional distributions, mapping the latter into distributions (for analogous approach, see [32]). Properties of this norm, shown here are of independent interest in context of the problem of distinguishability in GPTs [27, 33].

Thanks to the security condition described above, we have defined the key rate in the restricted iid non-signaling scenario, denoted as $K^{(iid)}_{RD1}$. It is easy to see, that any upper bound on this quantity yields an upper bound on the key rate in NSDI scenario, where the parties are attacked by a conditional distribution $P(ABE|XYZ)$ with a non tensor product structure.

What is important, we show that this approach (using the notion of a complete extension) is equivalent to the approach to the security in NSDI that is already presented in the literature [2, 34]. This enables us to compare our upper bound with some of the previously known lower bound [2, 24].

As the main result of this paper, we demonstrate how to construct a non-locality measure, called non-signaling squashed secrecy monotone (or quantifier), using the secrecy monotone (respectively secrecy quantifier). Such constructed measure serves as an upper bound on $K^{(iid)}_{RD1}$

\(^1\) Dirac notation in Equation 2 informally denotes a diagonal distribution.
if only the original secrecy monotone in SK is an upper bound on the secret key rate \( S(A : B \mid E) \) in the latter scenario (see in this context [35] and [36]). The squashing procedure is inspired by the definition of the squashed entanglement [35, 37–41], which satisfies a lot of important properties, as an entanglement monotone. We focus on the non-signaling squashed intrinsic information, which originates from the secrecy monotone called intrinsic information,

\[
N_{sq}(P) = \max_{x,y,z} \min_{E} I(A : B \mid E)(\mathcal{M}_{x,y}^E \otimes \mathcal{M}_{z}^E)E(P).
\]

What is equal to

\[
N_{sq}(P) = \max_{x,y,z} \min_{E} I(A : B \mid E')(\mathcal{M}_{x,y}^F \otimes \mathcal{M}_{z}^F)E'(P),
\]

and for the sake of simplicity, will be further called the squashed non-locality. We show that it can be used as an upper bound on the secret key rate of the iid non-signaling scenario, i.e., \( N_{sq}(P) \geq K_{RDI}^{(iid)}(P) \).

We present the usefulness of these objects by providing numerical upper bounds on \( K_{RDI}^{(iid)}(P) \) for the non-signaling bipartite binary input-output boxes. We choose four different combinations of the parameters, such that the box remains non-local, and compare the upper bound with the non-winning probability in the CHSH game [42]. We also compare our bound with the key rate given by Hänggi et al., where their protocol obtains a positive key rate in quantum region [2, 24]. We calculate our bound by numerically calculating the complete extension for the required conditional distribution. Noticeably, from these results it follows that from (many copies of) the isotropic distributions in two binary inputs and two binary outputs scenario no key can be distilled by the RBLOPC operations. This partially answers the open problem of [15].

We also study the properties of the squashed non-locality which are analogous to those of a squashed entanglement [43–46]. We first show that the squashed non-locality does not increase under the RBLOPC operations. Next, we show that it is a convex function of the input conditional distribution. Although it is hard to compute in general, its convexity can help with finding other upper bounds [47]. We notice that an easily computable lower convex hull of plots of upper bounds on the squashed non-locality is also an upper bound on it, and therefore on the \( R_{RDI}^{(iid)} \). We will show that the squashed non-locality is asymptotically continuous [48, 49], superadditive and additive under the tensor products of conditional distributions [36].

Finally, we stress that the presented procedure of squashing goes far beyond the secrecy paradigm. In fact, any measure of a bipartite box can be squashed to yield a non-locality measure. Although we focus on a bipartite case, the above results can be naturally extended to a multiparty scenario.

The paper is organized as follows. In Sec. II we introduce the reader with the considered cryptographic scenario, for which we later construct upper bounds on the key rate. In the next section, Sec. III, we discuss the security of protocols in the device independent key distribution paradigm in the presence of a non-signaling eavesdropper. We have also discussed the fact that in terms of the proximity in box norm that we define, the secrecy and correctness of a cryptographic protocol is equivalent to the security. This implies that the definition of security is analogous to that of device dependent scenario. In Sec. IV, we provide an equivalent form of the SK key rate, and the upper bounds in terms of non-signaling squashed secrecy quantifiers. We also identify a secrecy quantifier (the squashed non-locality), which satisfies all the required properties of being a measure of non-locality. Its properties are derived in Sec. IV C. One of them is convexity, which helps us to find upper bounds in terms of the convexification procedure, (Sec. V A). In Sec. V B, we provide a numerical upper bound on the NSDI key, for a bipartite binary input output box, in a region where the box exhibits non-local correlation. The last Section VI is devoted to conclusions and open problems.

II. SCENARIO

In the considered cryptographic scenario, the honest parties, Alice and Bob share \( N \) cryptographic devices of an unknown internal structure. In the device independent approach the honest parties base only on statistics of inputs and outputs of the device\(^2\). We model these devices with bipartite normalized conditional probability distributions. By a non-signaling box \( P(AB|XY) \equiv P_{A,B|X,Y} \), we denote a normalized conditional distribution satisfying the no-signaling constraints [31].

\[
\forall_{x,y,x',y'} \sum_{a} P(ab|xy) = \sum_{b} P(ab|xy'),
\]

\[
\forall_{x,x',y} \sum_{a} P(ab|xy) = \sum_{a} P(ab|x'y).
\]

We refer to random variables \( A, B, \) as to those representing outcomes of Alice and Bob respectively, whereas \( X, Y \) represent possible states of the inputs of the device for each party. The set of such distributions for a fixed number of inputs and outputs is denoted as \( \mathcal{B}_{NS} \). In quantum mechanical case inputs would correspond to different settings of measurement apparatus, similarly values of outcomes resemble values of observables. With full analogy to quantum theory we combine states of single systems into joint distribution of many devices with a tensor product formula i.e. \( P_1(AB|XY) \otimes P_2(AB|XY) \). Additionally the no-signaling constraints ensure us that the tensor product within the state space of non-signaling boxes \( \mathcal{B}_{NS} \) is well defined [50].

---

2 With ambiguity we will refer to device as to the whole cryptographic setup as well as to single box.
The task of the honest parties is to perform a cryptographic protocol in order to distill cryptographic key within a presence of a third eavesdropping party named Eve. The eavesdropper we consider is limited only with the constraints of the no-signaling theory, what means she can not instantaneously change the states of the devices of Alice and Bob, and vice versa: they can not influence device of Eve. Initially Eve may posses arbitrary correlations with the devices shared by Alice and Bob provided that shared tripartite extension satisfied the no-signaling constraints between each two subsystems. This is why we equip the eavesdropper with specific kind of extension introduced in Winczewski et. al [1] called the complete extension. The complete extension $\mathcal{E}(P)(ABE|XYZ)$ is designed to be a counterpart of quantum mechanical purification, which in the case of quantum cryptography is the worse case extension for the honest Alice and Bob that eavesdropping Eve may share with them. It was demonstrated in [1], that upon access to arbitrary local randomness and post-processing channel, the complete extension provides access for the extending system (Eve) to all statistical ensembles. The complete extension allows also for generation of any other extension of Alice’s and Bob’s device. This provides Eve with ultimate eavesdropping possibilities. We discuss features of the complete extension in more detail in Appendix A.

Since the main goal of this paper is to provide upper bounds on secret key rate in NSDI paradigm, we consider a particular attack strategy of the eavesdropper, so that at the beginning of the protocol the honest parties share $N$ identically independently distributed (iid) (possibly prepared by her).

It is usual in any NSDI cryptographic protocol that the raw data of the honest parties, obtained after a measurement stage of a protocol is typically not perfectly correlated. In order to agree on a shared secret key Alice and Bob employ public communication and post-processing. We make a restriction within the class of possible operations of the honest parties to the case in that they perform:

1. Full fiducial measurement followed by any composition of 2 and 3:

2. Classical post processing of the distribution.

3. Public communication.

We call this class Restricted Box Local Operations and Public Communication (RBLOPC), since it does not allow any wirings between copies of the device or general measurement which employs external randomness. The actions of Eve are not restricted with these criteria.

The cryptographic scenario and the complete extension of the non-signaling boxes are discussed in more details in Appendix A.

III. SECURITY OF NSDI PROTOCOL

According to the paradigm of device independent security, the inner working of a device can be designed by the eavesdropper. Since in this paper we focus on various upper bounds on the key rate we chose a particular eavesdropping strategy, where Eve produces many copies of the same device that are in use of the honest parties. It therefore upper bounds key obtained in other scenarios, in which more sophisticated attacks are allowed. We briefly discuss here the latter scenarios.

In every practical device independent (DI) cryptographic protocol, the honest parties perform a number of test runs and a (larger) number of key generation runs. The operations of Alice and Bob for each of these two types of runs are quite different. Specifically the choices of the inputs and the public communication in test rounds amount to check the level of violation of a Bell inequality. In the key generation rounds they perform (in most of the used protocols) some fixed measurement whose outcomes form the raw key. The raw key is further processed to yield the final key only if device has passed the test run i.e. the data are compatible with a sufficiently non-local box.

Aiming at upper bounds, we study only the performance of the key generation round. This corresponds to the phase of the practical protocol in which the device has passed the test, and additionally we assume that the box representing the attack is known. Such a knowledge would correspond to a test which performs a full tomography rather than measuring the value of the Bell inequality. Clearly the key obtained in the latter scenario can be only larger than the one obtained in the above described practical protocol.

As it was mentioned in previous section, the considered protocol (of the key generation round) consists of a full measurement on the AB subsystem and a classical post-processing stage, hence the output of it is a classical-classical-box (cc-box) state. The security of cryptographic scenarios can be formulated both in terms of the so called distinguisher\(^3\) and also in terms of the norms [24, 51, 52]. Equivalence of these approaches in quantum mechanical case was shown by Portmann and Renner [53] (see also by Beaudry [54]). We show, that fully analogous equivalence holds in the realm of non-signaling security. In order to do so, we show a straightforward analogy with the non-signaling case, we first introduce the box norm - counterpart of the trace norm $||·||_1$ in case of quantum security.

\(^3\) With reference to E. Hänggi et al [2], the distinguisher is an agent that has the maximal guessing advantage in the task of discriminating between two devices in a single round. Where she is given full specifications and has access to all interfaces of the devices.
Definition 1. For any two non-signaling boxes $P$, $Q \in \mathcal{B}_\text{NS}$, we define the box norm.

$$\|P - Q\|_{\text{BOX}} = \sup_{\mathcal{O}} \frac{1}{2} \|\mathcal{O}(P) - \mathcal{O}(Q)\|_1,$$

where supremum is taken over all linear operations that map boxes into probability distributions \cite{32}.

An instance of the box norm has been used previously by Hänggi \cite{24}, however not explicitly. As in approach of E. Hänggi we will use the box norm only for a special type of boxes - that of classical-classical-box form. For these boxes the above Definition 1 simplifies as we show in Corollary 1. In our scenario we consider only the case of E. Hänggi’s boxes the above Definition 1 simplifies as we show in Corollary 1.

Definition 2. A box protocol of key distillation is a sequence of (R)BLOPC operations $\Lambda = \{\Lambda_N\}$, performed by the honest parties, each element of which consists of measurement stage followed by post-processing. Moreover for each consecutive complete extension of $N$ copies $\mathcal{E}(P^{\otimes N})(ABE|XYZ)$, it outputs a cc-box state and

$$\|\Lambda_N (\mathcal{E}(P^{\otimes N})) - P^{(dN)}\|_{\text{BOX}} \leq \varepsilon_N \xrightarrow{N \to \infty} 0,$$

where $P^{(dN)}$ is the ideal cc-box\footnote{The factor of $\frac{1}{2}$ is introduced for a convenience.}, which contains the perfect correlation between the honest parties that are completely uncorrelated with Eve.

The tensor product in the Definition (2) above should be understood as a “max” tensor product in $\mathbb{R}^N$ space \cite{50}. After the (R)BLOPC protocol, the output state of the honest parties reduces to a cc-box state of the form $\Lambda_N (\mathcal{E}(P^{\otimes N}))_{S_A,S_B,Q,E|Z} (s_A, s_B, q, e|z)$, where $s_A$ and $s_B$ are the instances of the key shared between Alice and Bob. From now on we will denote random variables occurring in the protocol as: $S_A$, $S_B$ for the secret keys of Alice and Bob, respectively: $Q$ for the classical communication; $E$, $Z$ for Eve’s output and input (and lower case letters for their values). The ideal cc-box state is defined as $P^{(dN)}_{\text{ideal}} := \delta_{s_A, s_B} \otimes \sum_{s_A, s_B} \Lambda_N (\mathcal{E}(P^{\otimes N}))(s_A, s_B, Q, E|Z)$. The post-processing stage which is a part of a post-processing stage of the protocol as well as her local operations. We define a box protocol both with respect to BLOPC and RBLOPC operations. Moreover, the eavesdropper can perform general measurement, and pre and post-processing channel (a dice) on her part of the complete extension to enhance the distinguishing probabilities.

Definition 3. Given a bipartite box $P \equiv P(AB|XY)$ the secret key rate of the box protocol $\Lambda$ denoted $\mathcal{R}(\Lambda|_P)$ is a number $\lim_{N \to \infty} \log \frac{d_N}{N}$, where $d_N$ is the length of a secret key shared between Alice and Bob, with $d_N = \text{dim}_{\mathbb{A}} (\Lambda_N (\mathcal{E}(P^{\otimes N}))) = |S_A|$. The (restricted) device independent key rate of the iid scenario is given by

$$K^{(\text{iid})}_{(R)\text{DI}}(P) = \sup_{\Lambda} \mathcal{R}(\Lambda|_P),$$

where the supremum is taken with respect to (R)BLOPC box protocols.

As stated in Section (II), in this manuscript we restrict ourselves to the RBLOPC operations. We focus now mostly on the box norm computed for cc-box states shared after RBLOPC protocol and $K^{(\text{iid})}_{(R)\text{DI}}$. In Appendix B we show that in the considered scenario the box norm of Definition (1) can be much simplified, as the supremum over operations of the eavesdropper is satisfied for an adaptive fiducial measurement. (see appendix B). As a consequence of Proposition 3, we can write the closed form expression for the box norm computed for cc-box states.

Corollary 1. For the cc-box states shared at the end of the RBLOPC protocol $\Lambda$, the box norm can be rephrased with a simplified expression:

$$\|P_{S_A, S_B, Q, E|Z} - Q_{S_A, S_B, Q, E|Z}\|_{\text{BOX}}$$

$$= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{s_A, s_B, q} \max_e |P_{S_A, S_B, Q, E|Z}(s_A, s_B, q, e|z)$$

$$- Q_{S_A, S_B, Q, E|Z}(s_A, s_B, q, e|z)|.$$

From the heuristic point of view, this box norm is a maximal guessing advantage for a distinguisher to tell apart two boxes, and plays a role of a distance \cite{24, 53}.

Hänggi and Renner \cite{2} have provided a protocol which yields positive key rate for boxes exhibiting quantum correlations. Later it was shown by Portmann and Renner \cite{53} that in the quantum case a definition of security employing the notion of distinguisher is equivalent to the one involving a condition of proximity in norm to an ideal state (see also \cite{55} in regards to composability. In order to show that the security criterion employed by us is equivalent to the criteria used by Renner, Hänggi and Wolf \cite{2} we develop an analogy to the results of Refs. \cite{53, 54}, however in case of non-signaling boxes.

Theorem 1 (About the NSDI security criteria). For an RBLOPC protocol $\Lambda$, the proximity in the RBLOPC box norm security criterion is equivalent to the heuristic criterion employing the notion of distinguisher. That is for
any $\varepsilon_{sec} + \varepsilon_{cor} \equiv \varepsilon \geq \varepsilon_{sec}, \varepsilon_{cor} \geq 0$ the following equivalence relation holds:

$$\left\| S_{ABE}^{real} - S_{ABE}^{ideal} \right\|_{BOX} \leq O(\varepsilon) \iff P[S_A \neq S_B, \text{pass}] \leq O(\varepsilon_{cor}) \land (1 - p_{\text{abort}}) D(S_{ABE}^{\text{real, pass}}, S_{ABE}^{\text{ideal, pass}}) \leq O(\varepsilon_{sec}),$$

where $p_{\text{abort}}$ is the probability for the protocol to abort and the constant $O(\varepsilon)$ does not depend on any parameter of the protocol.

**Proof.** For the proof see Appendix C.

From now on we consider the protocol after an acceptance phase that is we set $p_{\text{abort}} = 0$. The equivalence relation given in (12) in Theorem 1 states that proximity in box norm is equivalent to both $\varepsilon_{sec}$-secrecy and $\varepsilon_{cor}$-correctness of the protocol (up to a multiplicative constant), what implies security. As an opposite implication is also true, we conclude that definitions of security are equivalent. Details of the equivalence relation can be found in Appendix C.

Theorem 1 is essential in order to compare the secret key of our scenario to those of other cryptographic schemes or even certain protocols, in particular to the results of Hänggi, Renner and Wolf [2], with the upper bounds that will be presented in this paper.

Composability concept in security is an area of research concerned with composing cryptographic primitives into more complex ones while keeping high security level. In the universal composability approach, a cryptographic primitive is said to be universally composable if any functionality using this primitive is as secure as an ideal one [51, 56]. The composable security is considered as the strongest notion of security [51, 56]. However in the device independent scenario, so far it was not rigorously proven that this scheme is ultimately secure. Furthermore, the results of [57] strongly suggest that it is not the case, so the problem arises when one wants to reuse the device. In particular, if the device used for composition has some memory, then it can leak the key of the previous use. This implies that in general the protocol is compositely secure as long as the same device is not reused in the protocol.

The iid scenario, considered by us is simple and not general. However, in terms of an upper bound on a distillable key, it is relevant to discuss the most general case, when the parties share only several devices, each used for a large number of runs of the protocol. We refer to it as a fully device independent scenario. In the latter case, the underlying box describing the attack might be signaling forward between the runs. Let us denote the rate of distillable key in such a scheme as $K_{DI}$. Attack by Eve is to prepare a tensor power of boxes, which can be considered then a special attack in the general scenario, such that the mentioned causal dependence does not hold and each run looks the same to the honest parties. It is then clear that we have

$$K_{DI} \leq K_{DI}^{(iid)}.\quad (13)$$

The above quantities refer to operations from the LOPC class. However none of the protocols of quantum key distribution known so far [13, 58] uses it in full extent. For a given protocol $\Lambda$, whose operations are RBLOPC, the following holds:

$$K_{DI}(\Lambda) \leq K_{RDI}^{(iid)},\quad (14)$$

that is, one can not achieve higher rate of the protocol $\Lambda$ in fully device independent scenario than $K_{RDI}^{(iid)}$ since the latter quantity is optimised over all RBLOPC protocol including $\Lambda$, and again the iid case is a possible attack in general case.

Due to successful attacks on a wide class of protocols [59, 60], it is believed that the rate $K_{DI}$ obtained from a single device is zero, as there is no good privacy amplification function which can decouple the honest parties from Eve. However, as we have mentioned, there are known protocols working with asymptotically unlimited number of devices which satisfy the property that they do not signal to each other [2, 4, 14, 16, 24–26]. That is, the total box shared by the honest parties in case of $N$ runs of the protocol is the so called $(2N + 1)$-non signaling device: the devices do not signal between each other means there exists no subset of $k$ devices which can signals to the remaining $2N + 1 - k$ ones for $1 \leq k \leq 2N$.

The last device belongs to Eve. Let us denote a quantity of a device independent distillable key, that can be obtained from those devices as $K_{NSDI}$. Via analogous considerations as above it is clear that we have:

$$K_{DI} \leq K_{NSDI} \leq K_{DI}^{(iid)},\quad (15)$$

$$K_{RDI} \leq K_{RDI}^{(iid)}.$$

**IV. NON-SIGNALING SQUASHED SECRECY MONOTONES AND QUANTIFIERS.**

In this section, we provide our main result, introduce the non-signaling squashed secrecy monotones and show that they are the upper bounds on $K_{RDI}^{(iid)}$. The procedure of squashing, inspired by squashed entanglement measure [35], constitutes a direct connection between the schemes of SK and NSDI, as it utilizes secrecy monotones used in the former model to constitute the upper bounds on the secret key rate in the latter scenario. Before we proceed with the definition of squashing, we will first rephrase the upper bound on the SK scenario, established in [5, 6].

---

6 This corresponds to the fact, that both parties correctly identify the shared device as $N$ copies of a device $P(AB|XY)$ e.g. by measuring a Bell inequality.

7 This condition can be enforced by parallel measurement of all the devices [25, 59]. This enforces naturally the use of the class of operations considered here - that of the RBLOPC operations.
A. Rephrasing the key rate in the secure key agreement scenario

The secret key agreement scenario (SK), is a cryptographic scheme in which (before the protocol) the honest parties and the eavesdropper share a classical joint probability distribution $P(ABE)$. The task of the honest parties is to agree on the secret key, by employing local operations and public communication (LOPC), in such a manner that the eavesdropper’s knowledge about the key is negligible. In the following lines we propose an alternative definition of the key rate in the aforementioned scenario and prove that it is equivalent to the definition of the secret key rate introduced in the literature \cite{5,6,17}. The aim of this rephrasing is to show and utilize a connection between the definition of secret key rate in SK and NSDI scenarios, as it was done for the quantum case \cite{17}.

\textbf{Theorem 2.} The secret key rate $S(A : B || E)$ of SK cryptographic model can be expressed via the following asymptotic formula:

$$S(A : B || E) = \sup_{P} \lim_{N \to \infty} \sup N \log \dim_{A} \left( P_{N} \left( P^{\otimes N} (ABE) \right) \right),$$

where $P$ are cryptographic protocols satisfying security conditions of Maurer \cite{6}.

\textit{Proof.} For the proof see Appendix D.

In the theorem above, we handle tensor product of probability distributions as the tensor product of non-signaling boxes having unary inputs. The link we have made is a crucial point in the procedure of squashing secrecy monotones of SK model, which is a subject of the next Section, as we rely on it when showing that a non-signaling squashed secrecy monotone upper bounds $K^{(\text{sid})}_{\text{RDI}}$.

B. Linking SK and NSDI cryptographic paradigms

In this section, we show that the non-signaling squashed secrecy measures (monotones under RBLOPC) can be used as non-locality measures and quantifiers, independently on cryptography. We also make use of the simplest secret correlations quantifier, the mutual information. We define squashed non-locality and prove its useful properties. Before we proceed with describing results, we recall the definitions of involved object.

- The Shannon entropy of a random variable is defined as

$$H(A) = - \sum_{a} p(a) \log_{2} p(a),$$

$$H(AB) = - \sum_{ab} p(ab) \log_{2} p(ab),$$

$$H(ABE) = - \sum_{abc} p(abe) \log_{2} p(abe),$$

where, $p(ab) = \sum_{c} p(abc)$ and $p(a) = \sum_{b} p(ab)$ are the marginals of the joint probability distribution $p(abe)$.

- The conditional Shannon entropy of any random variable say $A$, with respect to the random variable $B$, quantifies the uncertainty remaining in $A$, when one already know about $B$, and it is given by

$$H(A|B) = \sum_{b} p(b) H(A|B = b) = H(AB) - H(B|A).$$

- Mutual information $I(A : B)$, the correlation between $A$ and $B$ is defined as

$$I(A : B) = H(A) + H(B) - H(AB),$$

- The conditional mutual information $I(A : B | E)$, quantifies the correlation remaining between variables $A$ and $B$ conditioned upon the knowledge about value of third variable $E$, which is given by

$$I(A : B | E) = \sum_{e} I(A : B | E = e)$$

$$= H(A|E) - H(B|E) - H(AB|E).$$

- The intrinsic conditional mutual information $I(A : B \downarrow E)$ is

$$I(A : B \downarrow E) = \inf_{\Theta_{E|E'}} I(A : B | E'),$$

where $I(A : B | E')$, is the conditional mutual information of the probability distribution $P(ABE') = \sum_{e} \Theta_{E|E'}(E' = e) P(AB, E = e)$, where the infimum is taken over all possible conditional channels $\Theta_{E|E'}$.

- The reduced intrinsic conditional mutual information \cite{73} of random variables $A$ and $B$ given $E$, denoted by $I(A : B \downarrow E)$ is defined as

$$I(A : B \downarrow E) = \inf_{\Theta_{U|ABE}} (I(A : B \downarrow EU) + H(U)),$$

where the infimum is taken over all possible conditional channels $\Theta_{U|ABE}$.

1. Squashing procedure

Let us suppose that $M(A : B || E)$ is a real-valued and non-negative function, with domain in tripartite probability distributions, which is an upper bound on secret key rate $S(A : B || E)$ in SK cryptographic paradigm, i.e. $\forall P(ABE) \quad M(A : B || E) \geq S(A : B || E)$. Additionally if $M(A : B || E)$ is monotonic with respect to LOPC and zero
for product distributions we call it a secrecy monotone. At this point we should note that in general squashing a secrecy monotone will not yield an RBLOPC monotonic quantifier. The upper bounds on the SK key rate that are not monotonic under LOPC, e.g., a mutual information, can still be subjected to squashing procedure although we expect the result to be non-monotonic with respect to RBLOPC.

To construct quantifiers of secret correlations in NSDI model, we make use of functions already known from SK paradigm. In the first scenario the states of the system are non-signaling boxes i.e. conditional probability distributions, while in the second setting the states are unconditioned tripartite probability distributions, so we have to map the former into the latter. To make our functions being able to quantify correlations in a fixed scenario, this mapping should also be compatible with operations allowed within scenario.

**Definition 4.** With any function quantifying secret correlations between the honest parties in SK model \( M(A : B || E) \), we associate a non-signaling secrecy quantifier \( \bar{M}(A : B || E) \) acting on the tripartite non-signaling boxes:

\[
\bar{M}(A : B || E) = \max_{x,y,z} M(A : B || E)_{Q(ABE|XYZ)}^{F_x,y \otimes G_z} \tag{27}
\]

If \( Q(ABE|XYZ) \) is the complete extension \( E(P)(ABE|XYZ) \) of a bipartite box \( P(AB|XY) \), we call \( \bar{M}(A : B || E)_{E(P)(ABE|XYZ)} \) the non-signaling squashed secrecy quantifier. If \( M(A : B || E) \) is a secrecy monotone, we call \( \bar{M}(A : B || E) \) a non-signaling (squashed) secrecy monotone.

The motivation to use the term “squashed” comes from the choice of the extension of the of honest parties, that is shared by the honest parties and Eve. As in the case of the squashed entanglement in which the optimization over the extensions would be satisfied by the purification of the quantum state \( [35] \), we use the complete extension as a counterpart \([1]\) of such a state.

After the squashing procedure, each mutual information function, that is the mutual information (MI), the conditional mutual information (CMI)\(^8\), the intrinsic information (II) and the reduced intrinsic information (RII) (defined in the beginning of this Section) yields a non-signaling squashed secrecy quantifier. However only CMI, II and RMI are non-signaling squashed secrecy monotones (NSSM). \( S(A : B || E) \) itself can be subjected to squashing resulting in another NSSM. Those from aforementioned squashed functions which are additionally monotonic with respect to RBLOPC operations, additive over a tensor product of boxes, and zero for local boxes will be called non-signaling squashed secrecy measures. In Appendix \( F \) we elaborate on properties of non-signaling squashed intrinsic information evaluated for the complete extension, called also the squashed non-locality.

The tripartite boxes are mapped in Eq. (27), into probability distributions via measurement compatible with the paradigm. This means that the honest parties perform a fiducial measurement \( M_{x,y}^F \), however the unrestricted eavesdropper performs the general measurement \( M_{z}^G \), what results in a probability distribution. The general measurement is equivalent to probabilistic choice of inputs on Eve’s side of the box, or in other words to local wirings between the local box of Eve (dice) and her input. The example of general measurement provided by

\[
(M_{x,y}^F \otimes M_{z}^G)Q(ABE|XYZ) = \sum_{z} p(z|z’)Q(ABE|X=x, Y=y, Z=z), \tag{28}
\]

reveals equivalence. When Eve has access to the complete extension of honest parties’ system, then by employing the general measurement (if she employs also post-processing), she also has access to all possible extensions of the honest parties’ system \([1]\), what gives her the ultimate eavesdropping power. This is exactly the essence of squashing.

At this point we are ready to present the main result.

**Theorem 3.** The secret key rate in the non-signaling device independent iid scenario achieved with RBLOPC operations \( K^{(iid)}_{RD1} \) from a box \( P \) is upper bounded by any

---

\(^8\) Not to be mistaken with CMI entanglement.
Proposition 1. The squashed non-locality satisfies the tension of the box \( P \) where
\[
E(P) \coloneqq \mathcal{E}(P)(AB|E|XYZ) \text{ is its complete extension to the eavesdropper’s system.}
\]

Proof. For the proof see Appendix E.

Theorem 3 together with Definition 4 establish a connection between secret key rate in SK and NSDI scenario. An upper bound on the secret key rate in NSDI might seem to be easily determinable providing the secrecy quantifier is easily computable. However, computation of the complete extension generally requires some effort. It is also possible to consider simplified versions of the above functions, yielding weaker but computable upper bounds. This can be done, by changing from general to fiducial measurement on Eve’s subsystem. One can consider this either as a choice of scenario with less powerful eavesdropper or dually as an optimization over the operational power of eavesdropper is heavily limited, hence we would not refer to upper bounds obtained with this method as squashed ones. From Theorem 3 we obtain also an immediate corollary.

Corollary 2. The secret key of SK scenario can be squashed to yield a non-signaling squashed secrecy monotonon which is an upper bound for \( K_{\text{RDI}}^{(\text{id})} \).

\[
\tilde{S}(A : B|E)_{\mathcal{E}(P)(ABE|XYZ)} \geq \tilde{K}_{\text{RDI}}^{(\text{id})}(P). \tag{30}
\]

C. The squashed non-locality

Now we will consider the non-signaling squashed intrinsic information and its properties. Because of its power as an upper bound and general importance for this paper we shorten its name to the “squashed non-locality”.

Definition 5. The squashed non-locality \( N_{\text{sq}}(P) \), of a bipartite non-signaling box \( P \coloneqq P(AB|XY) \) is

\[
N_{\text{sq}}(P) \coloneqq \tilde{I}(A : B|E)_{\mathcal{E}(P)}, \tag{31}
\]

where \( \mathcal{E}(P) \coloneqq \mathcal{E}(P)(ABE|XYZ) \) is the complete extension of the box \( P \) [1].

Proposition 1. The squashed non-locality satisfies the following properties:

1. Positivity: It is non-negative real function of bipartite non-signaling boxes, and equal to zero for local boxes\(^9\).

2. Monotonicity: It is monotonic with respect to RBLOPC class of operations.

3. Convexity: It is a convex function over a mixture of boxes i.e.

\[
N_{\text{sq}}(\sum_{i} p_{i} P_{i}) \leq \sum_{i} p_{i} N_{\text{sq}}(P_{i}). \tag{32}
\]

4. Superadditivity and additivity: It is superadptive over joint non-signaling boxes and additive over tensor product of boxes.

5. Asymptotic continuity: \( ||P - Q||_{\text{BOX}} = \epsilon \) implies \( |N_{\text{sq}}(P) - N_{\text{sq}}(Q)| \leq O(\epsilon \log d_{AB}) + O(\epsilon) \), where \( d_{AB} \) is the dimension (statistical) of the support of the output distribution \( d_{AB} = \max_{XY} \text{supp} \mathcal{M}_{\epsilon,x,y}(P(AB|XY)) \).

6. Subextensivity: \( N_{\text{sq}}(P) \leq \log (\min \{d_{A}, d_{B}\}) \).

Proof. For the proof see Appendix F.

the convexity of the squashed non-locality, has a powerful implication which we will discuss in Sec. V. In particular, calculating \( N_{\text{sq}} \) for an arbitrary bipartite box \( P \) is a nontrivial task, but we can use its convexity to simplify finding an upper bound of it. The Property 4, can be used to give alternative proof of Theorem 3, in a similar manner as it was performed in [36]. Property 5, is very much important in the experimental realization of that measure. In particular, producing the exact box is a very hard experimental task. Essentially, easier realizable is a close approximation of a box. In such situation the asymptotic continuity certifies that the value of that measure is a close approximation of the value for required box.

Properties 1, 2 and 4, taken together, directly imply the following corollary.

Corollary 3. The squashed non-locality is a measure of non-local correlations contained in a bipartite box \( P \).

In fact any “squashed” function that satisfies Properties 1, 2 and 4 is a measure of non-local correlations. All previously listed functions (except the non-signaling squashed reduced intrinsic information, which is an upper bound on the squashed non-locality) can be regarded as non-locality quantifiers, since they bound non-local correlations from above. It is now very intuitive to provide a natural extension of the above to multipartite systems. This can be done via the multivariate conditional mutual information, which is a function well known from the classical theory.

We finish this subsection by providing one more quantifier of non-locality: the non-locality cost of the non-signaling box, which we prove to be an upper bound on \( K_{\text{RDI}}^{(\text{id})} \).

Definition 6. The non-locality cost of bipartite non-signaling box is

\[
N_{C}(P) \coloneqq C(P) \log (\min \{d_{A}, d_{B}\}), \tag{33}
\]
where \( d_A = \max_x \text{supp} M^x_P(A|X) \) and \( d_B = \max_y (\text{supp} M^y_P(P(B|Y))) \) are dimensions of the outputs, and \( C(P) \) is the non-locality fraction of \( P \) \cite{61, 62}.

**Proposition 2.** The secret key rate \( K_{RDI}^{\text{iid}}(P) \) of a box is upper bounded by

\[
\mathcal{N}_C(P) \geq K_{RDI}^{\text{iid}}(P), \tag{34}
\]

**Proof.** For the proof see Appendix G.

**V. UPPER BOUNDS ON NSDI KEY**

**A. Convexification procedure**

The squashed non-locality introduced in Sec. IV lacks a closed form expression, as it involves optimization over general measurement of the eavesdropper and optimization over post-processing channels (due to its origin in intrinsic information). This makes it hard to compute in generic case. Although the intrinsic information function is not convex, the squashed non-locality is convex. This may be due to the fact that it was constructed in the same way as the squashed entanglement, and the latter is a convex function of quantum states \cite{35}. In this Section we will show how convexity of squashed non-locality can be used not only to calculate non-trivial upper bounds on \( K_{RDI}^{\text{iid}} \), but also how it can be used to define new non-signaling squashed secrecy quantifiers. The squashed non-locality is upper bounded with non-signaling squashed conditional mutual information and also with non-signaling squashed mutual information. Hence,

**Fact 1.** Squashed non-locality is upper-bounded by the following expression.

\[
\mathcal{N}_\text{sq}(P) \leq \min \left\{ \hat{I}(A : B)_{\mathcal{E}(P)(ABE|XYZ)}, \hat{I}(A : B|E)_{\mathcal{E}(P)(ABE|XYZ)} \right\}. \tag{35}
\]

Fact 1, although very simple, brings an idea how to make use of the convexity of squashed non-locality. Since the squashed non-locality is an upper bound on it itself, the right hand side of Eq. (35) must also be an upper bound on \( K_{RDI}^{\text{iid}} \). Together with Property 3 it implies that a lower convex hull of plots of \( \hat{I}(A : B|E) \) and \( \hat{I}(A : B) \) also bounds \( K_{RDI}^{\text{iid}} \) from above.

**Theorem 4.** Within a family of functions \( \{F_i\} \), which are convex with respect to mixtures of boxes, and

\[
F_i(P) \leq \hat{I}(A : B)_{\mathcal{E}(P)(ABE|XYZ)}, \tag{36}
\]

\[
F_i(P) \leq \hat{I}(A : B|E)_{\mathcal{E}(P)(ABE|XYZ)}, \tag{37}
\]

there exists a function \( F \) that upper bounds any function in \( \{F_i\} \) and for which the following relation holds

\[
F(P) \geq K_{RDI}^{\text{iid}}(P). \tag{38}
\]

**Remark 1.** Lower convex hull of plots of arbitrary number of functions, each being an upper bound on a convex function which upper bounds \( K_{RDI}^{\text{iid}} \), is an upper bound on the key rate itself.

This automatically yields a recipe how to construct nontrivial upper bounds on \( K_{RDI}^{\text{iid}} \). We come up with the following corollary, being a direct consequence of Theorem 4 and Remark 1.

**Corollary 4.** A non-trivial upper bound is given by the lower convex hull (LCH) of plots of non-signaling squashed secrecy quantifiers.

\[
\mathcal{N}_{\text{sq}}(P) \leq \mathcal{F}(P) := \text{LCH} \left\{ \hat{I}(A : B)_{\mathcal{E}(P)(ABE|XYZ)}, \hat{I}(A : B|E)_{\mathcal{E}(P)(ABE|XYZ)} \right\}. \tag{39}
\]

The upper bound on \( K_{RDI}^{\text{iid}} \) introduced in Corollary 4 can be computed much more easily than the squashed non-locality. We will refer to the procedure of calculating upper bounds via this technique as convexification.

**B. Numerical upper bounds**

In the procedure of convexification described in Section V A, we focused on upper bounds obtained by employing lower convex hull of non-signaling squashed secrecy quantifiers being upper bounds on the squashed non-locality at the same time. The reason to proceed this way was that we aimed to simplify calculations. In this Section we present more sophisticated strategy to generate upper bounds on the squashed non-locality and hence also on the \( K_{RDI}^{\text{iid}} \). To explain what we mean in detail, we recall here full expression for calculating the squashed non-locality already exposed in Eq. (5):

\[
\mathcal{N}_{\text{sq}}(P) = \max_{x,y,z} \inf_{E'|E} I(A : B|E')_{\mathcal{M}^x_E \otimes \mathcal{M}^y_E}\mathcal{E}(P). \tag{40}
\]

The core of this strategy is based on observation that the definition of the squashed non-locality involves two minimizations as the actions of the eavesdropper. We notice that one can obtain an upper bounds also in the case in which used measurement and channels are not optimal. This follows from the property of infimum. Knowing this, we can run a three-steps strategy to obtain an upper bound on \( K_{RDI}^{\text{iid}} \) for the desired set of boxes.

1. Choose a (arbitrary, possibly continuous) set of boxes, for which an upper bound is to be calculated.
FIG. 2. Plot of several secrecy quantifiers $\hat{M}(A:B|E)$, as an upper bound on secure key rate $K_{RDI}^{iid}$, has been drawn for the bipartite binary input output box $P_{HRW}$ given in Eq. (41) (also in Ref. [2]). The dashed red line corresponds to the squashed mutual information $\hat{I}(A:B)_{P_{HRW}}$. The blue straight line represents the non-locality cost, as well as the squashed conditional mutual entropy $\hat{I}(A:B|E)_{E(P_{HRW})}$ over the complete extension $E(P_{HRW})$ of the given box $P$. The solid orange line represents the upper bound on the squashed non-locality $N_{sq}$ (which in fact is equal to the squashed intrinsic mutual information $\hat{I}(A:B\downarrow E)_{P_{HRW}}$), which is the LCH of the squashed function as given in Eq. (35). Eve uses the adaptive fiducial measurement on her part of the complete extension, followed by a channel, so she can adaptively choose her input depending on the inputs chosen by Alice and Bob. The parameters chosen for drawing these figures are provided in Table I.

2. Calculate the values of upper bounds on squashed non-locality employing different boxes, different measurement choices and different post-processing channels.

3. Construct lower convex hull of all previously generated plots, and the result is the convex hull of the chosen set of points.

We will now employ the above technique to bound the $K_{RDI}^{ iid}$ in the case of two binary inputs and two binary outputs boxes. As we showed in Section III, the notion of security employed by us is equivalent to this used by Renner, Hänggi and Wolf [2]. Since they have positive key rate of their protocol for boxes exhibiting quantum correlations, we compare our upper bounds with the lower bound presented in [2, 24], in Fig. 2. The non-signaling box we have consider, as in Ref. [34], is given by

$$P_{HRW}(ab|xy) = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & \frac{1}{2} - \delta & \frac{3}{8} - \frac{1}{2} - \frac{\delta}{2} - \frac{\epsilon}{2} \frac{1}{2} + \frac{\epsilon}{2} + \frac{\delta}{2} \\ 0 & 1 & \frac{1}{2} - \delta & \frac{3}{8} - \frac{1}{2} - \frac{\delta}{2} - \frac{\epsilon}{2} \frac{1}{2} + \frac{\epsilon}{2} + \frac{\delta}{2} \\ 0 & 1 & \frac{3}{8} - \frac{1}{2} + \frac{\epsilon}{2} + \frac{\delta}{2} \frac{3}{8} - \frac{1}{2} + \frac{\epsilon}{2} - \frac{\delta}{2} \\ 1 & 0 & \frac{1}{8} + \frac{\epsilon}{2} + \frac{\delta}{2} \frac{1}{8} + \frac{\epsilon}{2} - \frac{\delta}{2} \frac{1}{8} + \frac{\epsilon}{2} + \frac{\delta}{2} \\ 1 & 0 & \frac{3}{8} - \frac{1}{2} + \frac{\epsilon}{2} + \frac{\delta}{2} \frac{3}{8} - \frac{1}{2} + \frac{\epsilon}{2} - \frac{\delta}{2} \\ 1 & 0 & \frac{1}{8} + \frac{\epsilon}{2} + \frac{\delta}{2} \frac{1}{8} + \frac{\epsilon}{2} - \frac{\delta}{2} \frac{1}{8} + \frac{\epsilon}{2} + \frac{\delta}{2} \end{bmatrix}. \tag{41}$$

This box exhibits non-local correlation in the parameter range $0 \leq \delta \leq 1$ and $-\frac{1}{4} \leq \epsilon \leq \frac{1}{12} - \frac{\delta}{4}$. The error in winning the CHSH game [42] is

$$\varepsilon = \text{Pr}(a \oplus b \neq x \cdot y) = \frac{1}{4} \left( \frac{3}{4} + \delta + 3\epsilon \right). \tag{42}$$

In Fig. 2 we plot the upper bound on $K_{RDI}^{ iid}$ with respect to the error in the probability of winning the CHSH game.
for the box given in Eq. (41). Different plots correspond to different choices of the parameters \( \epsilon \) and \( \delta \), as given in Table I. In each of considered case, the set of boxes for which we calculate an upper bound is a line. In Appendix I we elaborate on the numerical methods used to obtain this result.

![Table I](image)

**TABLE I.** Table of the different values of the parameters \( \delta \) and \( \epsilon \), for the sub-figures as given in Fig. 2. \( \delta \) and \( \epsilon \) are the parameters of bipartite non-signaling box \( P_{\text{HRW}} \) given in Eq. (41).

In this paper we have initiated a systematic study of the upper bounds on the device independent secret key rate secure against a non-signaling adversary (NSDI). This is the scenario in which a non-signaling device of an unknown internal structure is shared by the honest parties, while the adversary Eve is assumed only to satisfy the no-faster-than-light-communication condition. We do so by providing explicit upper bounds on the key obtained under attack by independent identical copies of conditional distributions (an iid attack) in the case when the honest parties are performing a wide class of operations called RBLOPC [63, 64], which were used in all NSDI protocols considered so far [4, 14, 16, 24–26, 34]. These operations consist of choosing and measuring some input of the device and then post-processing of the output via Local Operations and Public Communication operations.

As a technical tool, we consider the “box” norm, which is the supremum of the variational distance over linear operations mapping conditional distributions to other distributions [32]. We then show, that this norm can be simplified for conditional distributions with two unary inputs and one input of arbitrary cardinality which are the output of the RBLOPC protocol. Next, we provide a definition of the secret key rate \( K_{\text{RDI}}^{(\text{iid})} \), in which the security of the key is expressed via the box norm and the complete extension [1] to eavesdropper’s system in full analogy to the definition of secure key in quantum device dependent scenario [65, 66]. We show that our definition of security is equivalent to the notion of security employed by Renner, Hänggi and Wolf in their protocol [2].

We prove that the secret key rate in the SK scenario can be, alike \( K_{\text{RDI}}^{(\text{iid})} \), expressed in an asymptotic manner, helping us to show how the secrecy monotones from the former scenario can be used to construct an upper bound on the key rate in the latter. We then exhibit a natural connection between the upper bounds on the secret key rates in both scenarios. This allows us to state our main result, which is a procedure of squashing functions of secret correlations (in particular, secrecy monotones) from the SK scenario, along with the proof that the non-signaling squashed secrecy monotones constitute upper bounds on the secret key rate \( K_{\text{RDI}}^{(\text{iid})} \) in the NSDI scenario. The squashing method amounts to a particular mapping via the RBLOPC operation acting on the complete extension, which is a counterpart of the quantum purification, followed by computing a chosen secrecy monotone (or quantifier) on such obtained distribution. We then focus on one of such measures, which originates from the intrinsic information [43–45] via squashing, called further squashed non-locality. We also prove that this function, is asymptotically continuous and convex on mixtures of states shared by the honest parties. We study its other properties, proving superadditivity, additivity over tensor product of boxes, positivity and subextensivity (these three results are motivated by [36]). We conclude that the squashed non-locality is a measure of non-signaling correlations. Its convexity allows us to provide a simple strategy for generating non-trivial upper bounds on \( K_{\text{RDI}}^{(\text{iid})} \), a method which we call a convexification. Namely, a lower convex hull of arbitrary number of upper bounds on squashed non-locality is still an upper bound on \( K_{\text{RDI}}^{(\text{iid})} \). We then calculate the upper bounds in three specific cases using lower convex hull of non-signaling squashed secrecy monotones an by providing the numerical upper bounds on the squashed non-locality. We compare our upper bound with a lower bound obtained by Hänggi et al. [2], where their protocol obtains a positive key rate in quantum region. We also bound \( K_{\text{RDI}}^{(\text{iid})} \) for boxes on the non-local region of isotropic line. In the latter case, we show that a family of non-local conditional distributions has zero key rate distillable by the RBLOPC operations. This means, that the only way of distilling key from them (if possible) is to use wirings (which allow for feeding output of one conditional distribution as an input of the other) by at least one of the parties.

**VI. CONCLUSIONS**
However the use of wirings implies the change of model, allowing attacks by forward signaling within the sites of the honest parties. In the latter scenario the usually applied privacy amplification functions can be attacked [59]. This strongly suggests that there are boxes which although non-local, have zero secret key in the NSDI scenario.

Apart from the above, we show that the non-signaling squashed secrecy quantifiers can be regarded as non-locality quantifiers since they upper bound the non-local correlations as well. Finally, we notice that the squashing procedure can be naturally extended to an arbitrary number of parties hence its usefulness goes far beyond the secrecy paradigm.

These results contribute to the research based on the phenomenon of non-locality by introduction and study of a new measure of non-locality, and also develop its use as a tool for finding the upper bounds on the distillable secret key in scenario described only by causality. We have also phrased the NSDI scenario in a manner similar to that of quantum key distribution and exposed its connection to the well studied in the SK scenario. These results lead to important open problems. First is the optimality of the presented bounds. Second is their use beyond the secure key: extending the presented paradigm to upper bound the rate of randomness in the process of its amplification should be possible. The case of more than two honest parties seems also to follow in a straightforward way. Last but not least, the presented methods shed a new light on the related problem of distinguishability of two conditional distributions by the class of operations from a particular Generalized Probability Theory. It is interesting to check if the class of two unary inputs and one input of arbitrary cardinality is the only case for which the “box” norm can be simplified as we have shown.

VII. NOTE ADDED

On the completion of the main results of this article contained in Sections III, and V, we have noticed the paper E. Kaur, M. Wilde and A. Winter [36] also related to upper bounds on device independent key. The proofs of monotonicity, subadditivity and additivity over tensor product boxes (see Appendix F 3 and F 4), where inspired by the analogous result for the squashed intrinsic nonlocality presented there. It also encouraged us to prove the following additional properties: subextensivity and asymptotic continuity.
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Appendix A: The world of non-signaling boxes and the cryptographic scenario

In the proposed cryptographic scenario, we have considered that the honest parties Alice and Bob share a cryptographic device of unknown internal structure, a non-signaling box $P(AB|XY) \equiv P_{AB|XY}$. A box $P(AB|XY)$, is a normalized conditional probability distribution, where $A, B, X$ and $Y$ are random variables and $a \in A, b \in B, x \in X$ and $y \in Y$ are the values of those random variables. The index $x$ and $y$ are considered to be the choice of inputs (or a set of measurements) by the honest parties, the outcomes of those measurements are denoted by $a$ and $b$ respectively. Hence, $P_{AB|XY}(ab|xy)$ represents the probability of occurring certain outcomes $a \in A$ and $b \in B$ when the inputs are set to be in $x \in X$ and $y \in Y$ [33]. We focus on non-signaling boxes, where the marginals $P_{A|X}(a|x)$ and $P_{B|Y}(b|y)$ are well defined, i.e.,

$$P_{A|X}(a|x) = \sum_b P_{AB|XY}(ab|xy) = \sum_b P_{AB|XY}(ab|y'), \; \forall \; a, x, y, y' \tag{A1}$$

$$P_{B|Y}(b|y) = \sum_a P_{AB|XY}(ab|xy) = \sum_a P_{AB|XY}(ab|x'), \; \forall \; b, x, x', y \tag{A2}$$

In order to take into account an eavesdropper (Eve) in our scenario we employ a concept of the complete extension [1], in which we extend bipartite box $P_{AB|XY}(ab|xy)$ to a tripartite one $E(P)_{ABE|XYZ}(abc|xyz)$, in such a way that additional interfaces, the choice of inputs $z \in Z$ and the corresponding output $e \in E$, are fully controlled by Eve. Additionally, Eve is also in charge of arbitrary local randomness, which can be used for both generating mixed measurements as well as for post-processing the output of her part of the box. In this framework Eve gets maximal accessible knowledge about the subsystem shared by the honest parties, i.e. she has an access to all possible ensembles of their box, as the complete extension can give her the power. Giving Eve the power of holding only the interfaces of the complete extension makes this cryptographic paradigm a completely device independent secure key distribution protocol in presence of a non-signaling adversary (NSDI).

The notion of the complete extension

There are many non-signaling extension of any arbitrary non-signaling boxes, but the complete extension defined in Ref. [1] is of lowest finite dimensional extension, which possess all the basic properties of quantum purification, except extremality. The set of all boxes with a fixed set of parties and fixed input and output choices, constitutes a convex polytope. The elements of that polytope which form the vertices, i.e., can not be expanded in terms of the convex combination of other boxes, we denote them as $\{P_E\}$. Any arbitrary box $P$, in that polytope can be written down as a convex combination of those vertices, i.e., $P = \sum_i p_i P_E$, and the ensemble $\{p_i, P_E\}$ will be called a pure members ensemble (PME). Clearly the decomposition $\{p_i\}$ are not unique, until we have encountered the minimal ensemble [1]. Now we state the definition of minimal ensemble which is a preamble of the concept of complete extension.

Definition 7 (Minimal ensemble). The ensemble $\{p_i, P'_E\}$ of a box $P = \sum_i p_i P_E$, and the ensemble $\{p_i, P'_E\}$ will be called a minimal ensemble of a box $P$, if all the members are pure and if any proper subset of the family $\{P_E\}$ for any new choices of the probabilities $\{p'_i\}$ is not an ensemble of the box $P$.

We can now invoke the definition of complete extension. Qualitatively speaking it is such an extension to Eves system that each input generates a unique minimal ensemble of boxes in subsystems of the honest parties. The complete extension is by definition a no-signaling extension of the shared boxes between any two subsystem what makes it perfect for NSDI cryptography.

Definition 8 (Complete extension [1]). Given box $P_A(A|X)$, we say that a box $E(P)_{AX}(AE)XZ$ is its complete extension to system $X$ if for any $z \in Z$ and $e \in E$ there holds

$$E(P)_{AX}(A, E = e|X, Z = z) = p(e|z)P^z_A(A|X) \tag{A3}$$

such that the ensemble $\{p(e|z)P^z_A(A|X)\}$ is a minimal ensemble of the box $P_A(A|X)$, and corresponding to each minimal ensemble with the property that it is an ensemble of box $P_A(A|X)$, there is exactly one $z \in Z$ which generates it.

Here we slightly abuse the notation, by $P_A(A|X)$, we mean the box $P_{A|X}(a|x)$, with random variables $A$ and $X$, corresponds to in the input $x$ and output $a$. The subscript $A$, denotes that the box is in possession of party $A$. Similarly for its complete extension $E(P)_{AX}(AE)XZ$, we mean the subscript $X$ stands for the extending party $X$, which control the additional interfaces $Z$ and $E$.

The complete extension has a number of interesting properties which were described in [1]. The most important among them are:
1. Access to all ensembles of extended system.
2. Generate any arbitrary extension of extended system.
3. In the generic case it is not a pure state (i.e., not a vertex in the extended state space or in the extended polytope).

**Possible Eavesdropping actions**

The task of the honest parties is to share a cryptographically secure key (correct and secret) [54], by iterative use of the device $P(AB|XY)$ whose internal structure is unknown to them. As we have discussed that one of the possible attack by the eavesdropper is to prepare $N$ iid device i.e., preparing $(P(AB|XY))^\otimes N \equiv P^\otimes N(AB|XY)$, and holds the additional interfaces of the complete extension $\mathcal{E}(P^\otimes N)(ABE|XYZ)$. Where $A = A_1A_2 \cdots A_N$, and similarly for $B, X$ and $Y$. Now Eve can do the possible actions on her input and output of the extending system

1. Fiducial measurement, $\{M^F_z\}$ i.e., choosing only one input $Z = z$ at a time. The inputs correspond to the choices of different minimal ensembles. In cryptographic sense some inputs are in favor of Eve and some are not.
2. External randomness, called a dice, which can be used to generate any pure member ensemble, by feeding its output to the input of the shared box. This can be considered as a general measurement $M^G_z = \sum_{z'} p(z|z')M^F_z$, for some choices $z'$, and $\{p(z|z')\}$ can be consider as the dice.
3. Classical post-processing channel $\Theta_{E'|E}$ on the output of the complete extension of extending party. That along with dice yields access of Eve to all ensembles (possibly mixed) in part of the honest parties.
4. Eve can just listen, i.e., collecting only classical information.

The most general strategy of the eavesdropper is to utilize both the external randomness and the post-processing channel. Then any other strategy is a specific case of the general one. For example the fiducial measurement strategy can be realized by a deterministic dice and a post-processing channel which is nothing but identity. One of the most important assumption we have used in our consideration is that the iid devices can not signal between each other.

**Cryptographic protocol**

The tasks of the honest parties is to transform a state shared amongst the devices, which do not signal between each other, into a distribution which is secure with respect to eavesdropper who can listen to the discussion (public communication) between them and also perform measurements in her part of the complete extension of the boxes. We note here, that the class of allowed operations on boxes are limited, as the parties can locally perform only one of the following operations:

1. Wiring, that is feeding some of the inputs of the boxes with some of the outputs of the others.
2. Measurement, that is setting some of the inputs $X, Y$ to certain values $x, y$ (possibly in a probabilistic manner).
3. Classical post-processing.
4. Public communication (Eve gets a copy of each message send from one honest party to the other).

Any combination of the above four types of operations will be called local operations and public communication operations (LOPC). In what follows we however notice, that the existing protocols of quantum as well as non-signaling device independent key do not use these operations in full extent. First of all they do not use wirings, and more importantly, in the first step they map (on the side of the honest parties) the boxes into probability distribution. We call this map the full measurement. The restricted set of operations, which includes only:

1. Full fiducial measurement followed by any composition of:
2. Classical post processing of the distribution.
3. Public communication.
will be called restricted local operations and public communications (RBLOPC) [63]. The reason for a limitations in wirings are due to the fact that the forward signaling between devices is believed to be insecure procedure. Limitation from general measurement to the fiducial one is due to the fact that in the case of the former Eve does not have access to correlation with the whole system of Alice and Bob, only a subsystem of it. We should note here that we do not restrict Eve from performing any wirings, in fact she does it any time she adaptively chooses her input after listening to the public communication or when she employs her local randomness in order to perform a general measurement.

**Notation 1.** For convenience we will denote a distribution \( P(A, B, E) := P(ABE) \). We will refer to \( P_{AB|XY}(ab|xy) \) also as to: \( P_{AB|XY} \) or \( P(AB|XY) \). Usually one denotes \( P(ab|xy) \) are short form of \( P_{AB|XY}(ab|xy) \). Throughout the paper, we use the notation of \( P_{AB|XY}(ab|xy) \), to imply that \( A \) and \( X \) are in the possession of Alice where the variables \( B \) and \( Y \) are with Bob.

**Remark 2.** The inability of the honest parties to proceed with general measurement is a consequence of the scenario in which, we give total eavesdropping power to Eve, through the CE. Notice that if we allow any local randomness on honest parties side, i.e., the honest parties can chooses measurements (inputs of the box) probabilistically, then Eve would not possess the complete extension any longer. If we now allow for complete extension together with new randomness, we are back to the problem presented here.

In quantum cryptographic protocol, the local randomness was shown to be useful [67] in tightening the lower bound on the secure key rate, where it was used as a part of classical post-processing. But in our protocol, we want to introduce the local randomness (public as well as private) in choosing the inputs of the shared box appropriately, where the eavesdropper holds the CE of the initial box will leads to a paradigm shift. Although the upper bound on the secret key rate in case of any local public randomness in part of the honest parties will be an interesting problem in its own. One can investigate the bound by considering that Eve holds the CE of the initial box probabilistically.

We prove security in a case when the state of the total system, i.e. shared by the honest parties and an eavesdropper before the secret key distillation protocol is the complete extension of tensor product of boxes shared by the honest parties. In general the complete extension of a tensor product of boxes is not a tensor product of complete extensions of the same boxes. This is the most general eavesdropping strategy (in iid case) since it gives Eve access to all statistical ensembles of the AB-subsystem.

**Remark 3.** Tensor product to which we refer in the present paper should be understand as a max tensor product [50]. As there is no natural definition of tensor product between probability distributions we should treat them as boxes with unary input [33]. There arises natural definition of a partial trace as a linear map, such that for \( A \in \Omega_A \) and \( B \in \Omega_B \), we have \( \text{Tr}_B[A \otimes B] = A \).

Let us finally remark, that the complete extension encompasses in a structural way the idea given by Hänggi, Renner and Wolf [2] that Eve has access to all statistical ensembles of the extended box.

### Appendix B: Features of the box norm

The box norm introduced in the Definition 1, strongly bases on the notion of distinguishing system [2, 24]. Aforementioned system acts as an agent which, when given a specification of two systems and connected to the inputs and outputs of the examined systems, has a maximal guessing advantage of indicating to which one it was connected. Although it seems highly abstract and uncomputable in the box norm that we consider we take a supremum over all possible operations of such an agent. Since, the class of possible operations on the boxes is quite limited we identify operations of the distinguisher to be a superposition of WIPCCs wirings described in [29], fiducial and general measurements described below, use of external randomness and classical post-processing. The results of this section although stated abstractly, are designed to be useful for the cc-box states shared after \( \Lambda_{RBLOPC} \) protocol.

The measurement \( \mathcal{M}_E \), can be any measurement choice by the eavesdropper, the general as well as fiducial measurement. By fiducial we mean to say a deterministic choices of the input of the shared box, and by general it is a probabilistic choice of the fiducial one. Suppose one has a single party box \( P_{E|Z}(e|z) \), where the indices have there usual meanings. Now

**Fiducial measurement** \( \mathcal{M}_z^F \): Fiducial measurement acting on a box \( P(E|Z) \equiv P_{E|Z} \), initiate the following conditional probability distribution

\[
\mathcal{M}_z^F(P(E|Z)) = P(E|Z = z),
\]

i.e., a specific choice of the input \( z \). Different \( z \) corresponds to different measurement. On the other hand

**General measurement** \( \mathcal{M}_z^G \): A general measurement is a mixture of fiducial measurement \( \mathcal{M}_z^G = \sum_z p(z|z') \mathcal{M}_z^F \),
which is followed by the very last operation of classical post-processing of all outcomes upon the knowledge of the
class of operations is that of the general measurements (see beginning of this section) performed on the wired system,
adjusted to inputs and outputs sizes. As we consider deterministic wiring the sets of
\{f, g\}, which determine the wiring, are always finite. Next class of operations is that of the general measurements (see beginning of this section) performed on the wired system, which is followed by the very last operation of classical post-processing of all outcomes upon the knowledge of the

\[ \mathcal{M}_E^C(P(E|Z)) = \sum_z p(z|z') \mathcal{M}_E^C(P(E|Z)) = \sum_z p(z|z') P(E|Z = z), \]  

(02)

with \( p(z|z') \), a conditional probability distribution and \( \sum_z p(z|z') = 1 \forall z' \). Here different \( z' \) indicates different choices of general measurement.

**Proposition 3.** For the c-c-.-c-box states (alike those shared at the end of the RBLOPC-protocol \( \Lambda_{RBLOPC} \)) i.e. many parties non-signaling box for which only single party has not unary input, the box norm takes the form:

\[ \left\| P_{B,A|X}^1 - P_{B,A|X}^2 \right\|_{BOX} = \frac{1}{2} \sum_b \sup_{\mathcal{M}_E^F} \left| \mathcal{M}_E^F \left( P_{B,A|X}^1 \right)(b,a) - \mathcal{M}_E^F \left( P_{B,A|X}^2 \right)(b,a) \right|, \]  

(03)

where \( b \in B \) is a multi-variable corresponding to outputs co c-c-.-c part of the c-c-.-c-box distribution.

**Proof.** For the simplicity of the proof we consider c-box states \( P_{B,A|X,1} \) (see Fig. 3), but our results are valid for c-c-.-c-box states of arbitrary (finite) dimension. To attain the supremum over all operations in Definition 1 we have to consider all possible actions of the distinguisher. These can be always decomposed into superposition of several operations belonging to disjoint sub-classes of different operational meaning. Firstly the distinguisher can make use of external randomness which in general may depend on output of the classical part of the system \( B \). We introduce this randomness by combining systems to be distinguished with external system called a dice \( D_{A_2|X_2,B} \). Next operations which we incorporate are wirings which can be splitted into i) those which incorporate deterministic wirings from cc-box system to dice, and ii) those which incorporate deterministic wirings from dice into input of cc-box system. We notice here that the wiring can depend on \( B \) as well. What is more the possible action of the distinguisher upon knowing the value of \( B \) is to design wirings of both classes and then preparing a mixture (with probability depending on the value of classical output as well), by discarding the knowledge upon which type of wiring was implemented. As in our proof we consider supremum over external systems \( D_{A_2|X_2,B} \) without loss of generality we consider only wirings employing deterministic functions. The notation for wirings is taken form Ref. [68], and we also use similar idea as depicted in Fig. 3. The domains and co domains of functions \( f, g \), which determine the wiring, are always adjusted to inputs and outputs sizes. As we consider deterministic wiring the sets of \( \{f\}, \{g\} \), are always finite. Next class of operations is that of the general measurements (see beginning of this section) performed on the wired system, which is followed by the very last operation of classical post-processing of all outcomes upon the knowledge of the

FIG. 3. Schematic diagram of deterministic wiring between the cc-box \( P_{A_1|X_1,B} \) and an arbitrary external box \( D_{A_2|X_2} \). Fig. (a) represents the wiring from the cc-box to the arbitrary one whereas Fig. (b) represents the converse one i.e., a wiring from the external box \( D_{A_2|X_2,B} \) to \( P_{A_1|X_1,B} \). The diagram is motivated from Ref. [68].
types of wiring can be different, so that we considering common supremums for the wiring design and measurement, following lines we show, that the strategy of mixing is not optimal. In general the cardinalities of the input in different

\[ W \]

The first step to simplify the expression above is to notice that \( |\cdot| \) is contractive under classical post-processing on probability distributions. Since the trivial post-processing is always accessible, we obtain the equality.

\[ \| P_{B,A_1|X_1} - P_{B,A_1|X_1} \| \text{BOX} \]

As it was stated informally above the general wiring \( W \) can be constructed adaptively upon the knowledge of the value of the output \( B \), as a probabilistic combination of two types of wirings (see Fig. 3) conv\{\( W^\to, W^\leftarrow \)\}. In the following lines we show, that the strategy of mixing is not optimal. In general the cardinalities of the input in different types of wiring can be different, so that we considering common supremums for the wiring design and measurement, meaning that the knowledge about the preparation was discarded after the optimal measurement for each type of wiring was already chosen.

\[ \| P_{B,A_1|X_1} - P_{B,A_1|X_1} \| \text{BOX} \]

\[ \text{where the suprema are taken over operations being adaptive with respect to the output } B. \text{ This can be rephrased with using the same symbols although for not adaptive operations, however acting on systems with fixed value of classical output } B. \]

\[ \| P_{B,A_1|X_1} - P_{B,A_1|X_1} \| \text{BOX} \]

\[ \text{As it was stated informally above the general wiring } W \text{ can be constructed adaptively upon the knowledge of the value of the output } B, \text{ as a probabilistic combination of two types of wirings (see Fig. 3) conv\{\( W^\to, W^\leftarrow \)\}. In the following lines we show, that the strategy of mixing is not optimal. In general the cardinalities of the input in different types of wiring can be different, so that we considering common supremums for the wiring design and measurement, meaning that the knowledge about the preparation was discarded after the optimal measurement for each type of wiring was already chosen.} \]

\[ \| P_{B,A_1|X_1} - P_{B,A_1|X_1} \| \text{BOX} \]

\[ \text{As it was stated informally above the general wiring } W \text{ can be constructed adaptively upon the knowledge of the value of the output } B, \text{ as a probabilistic combination of two types of wirings (see Fig. 3) conv\{\( W^\to, W^\leftarrow \)\}. In the following lines we show, that the strategy of mixing is not optimal. In general the cardinalities of the input in different types of wiring can be different, so that we considering common supremums for the wiring design and measurement, meaning that the knowledge about the preparation was discarded after the optimal measurement for each type of wiring was already chosen.} \]
which can now depend on outcome \( b \). This is actually how communication can help the Eavesdropper. The probability distribution after the wiring \( W^\rightarrow \) is given by the following formula

\[
W^\rightarrow \left( P_{A_1|X_1,B} \otimes D_{A_2|X_2,B} \right)_{A_1',X_1,B} \left( a_1'|x_1', b \right)
\]

\[
= \sum_{a_1,a_2: \: g_a(a_1,a_2,x_1')=a_1'} P_{A_1|X_1,B}(a_1|x_1', b) D_{A_2|X_2,B}(a_2|f_b(a_1, x_1'), b)
\]

The wiring can be chosen adaptively to the outcome of the variable \( = 1 \), \( 2 \), \( 2 \). The probability distribution for the box after a wiring is given by:

\[
\mathbb{P}_{B,a_1,x_1'}(b, a_1'|x_1') := P_{B|X_1}(b|x_1') \sum_{a_1,a_2: \: g_a(a_1,a_2,x_1')=a_1'} P_{A_1|X_1,B}(a_1|x_1', b) D_{A_2|X_2,B}(a_2|f_b(a_1, x_1'), b)
\]

\[
= \sum_{a_1,a_2: \: g_a(a_1,a_2,x_1')=a_1'} P_{B,A_1,X_1}(b, a_1|x_1') D_{A_2|X_2,B}(a_2|f_b(a_1, x_1'), b)
\]

\( W^\rightarrow \). Again the first thing to do is to identify probability distribution after a wiring. However we are now in a comfortable situation, as it is enough to interchange inputs of \( P_{A_1|X_1,B} \) and \( D_{A_2|X_2,B} \) systems, see Fig. 3(b).

\[
\mathbb{P}_{B,a_1,x_1'}(b, a_1'|x_1') := \sum_{a_1,a_2: \: g_a(a_1,a_2,x_1')=a_1'} P_{B,A_1,X_1}(b, a_1|f_b(a_2, x_1')) D_{A_2|X_2,B}(a_2|f_b(a_1, x_1'), b).
\]

At this point we are ready to calculate both terms in Equation (B15) separately.

\[
\frac{1}{2} \sum_{b} \sup_{D} \sup_{\mathcal{M}^G} \left\| (\mathcal{M}^G \circ W^\rightarrow) \left( P_{B=b,A_1|X_1}^{1} \otimes D_{A_2|X_2,B=b}^{1} \right) - \left( \mathcal{M}^G \circ W^\rightarrow \right) \left( P_{B=b,A_1|X_1}^{2} \otimes D_{A_2|X_2,B=b}^{2} \right) \right\|_1
\]

\[
= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{b} \sup_{D} \sup_{\mathcal{M}^G} \sum_{a_1'} \left( \mathcal{M}^G \left( P_{B=b,A_1|X_1}^{1} \mathcal{M}^F \left( P_{B=b,A_1|X_1}^{1} \right) \right) \left( b, a_1' \right) \right) - \left( \mathcal{M}^G \left( P_{B=b,A_1|X_1}^{2} \mathcal{M}^F \left( P_{B=b,A_1|X_1}^{2} \right) \right) \left( b, a_1' \right) \right)
\]

\[
= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{b} \sup_{D} \sup_{\mathcal{M}^G} \sum_{a_1'} \sum_{i} \omega_i \mathcal{M}^F \left( P_{B=b,A_1|X_1}^{1} \mathcal{M}^F \left( P_{B=b,A_1|X_1}^{1} \right) \right) \left( b, a_1' \right) - \sum_{i} \omega_i \mathcal{M}^F \left( P_{B=b,A_1|X_1}^{2} \mathcal{M}^F \left( P_{B=b,A_1|X_1}^{2} \right) \right) \left( b, a_1' \right)
\]

\[
\leq \frac{1}{2} \sum_{b} \sup_{D} \sup_{\mathcal{M}^G} \sum_{a_1'} \sum_{i} \omega_i \left| \mathcal{M}^F \left( P_{B=b,A_1|X_1}^{1} \mathcal{M}^F \left( P_{B=b,A_1|X_1}^{1} \right) \right) \left( b, a_1' \right) - \mathcal{M}^F \left( P_{B=b,A_1|X_1}^{2} \mathcal{M}^F \left( P_{B=b,A_1|X_1}^{2} \right) \right) \left( b, a_1' \right) \right|
\]

\[
= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{b} \sup_{D} \sup_{\mathcal{M}^G} \sum_{a_1'} \sum_{a_1,a_2: \: g_a(a_1,a_2,x_1')=a_1'} P_{B,A_1,X_1}(b, a_1|x_1') D_{A_2|X_2,B}(a_2|f_b(a_1, x_1'), b)
\]

\[
- \sum_{a_1,a_2: \: g_a(a_1,a_2,x_1')=a_1'} P_{B,A_1,X_1}(b, a_1|x_1') D_{A_2|X_2,B}(a_2|f_b(a_1, x_1'), b)
\]

\[
= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{b} \sup_{D} \sup_{\mathcal{M}^G} \sum_{a_1'} \sum_{a_1,a_2: \: g_a(a_1,a_2,x_1')=a_1'} D_{A_2|X_2,B}(a_2|f_b(a_1, x_1'), b) \left( P_{B,A_1,X_1}^{1}(b, a_1|x_1') - P_{B,A_1,X_1}^{2}(b, a_1|x_1') \right)
\]

\[
\leq \frac{1}{2} \sum_{b} \sup_{D} \sup_{\mathcal{M}^G} \sum_{a_1'} \sum_{a_1,a_2: \: g_a(a_1,a_2,x_1')=a_1'} D_{A_2|X_2,B}(a_2|f_b(a_1, x_1'), b) \left( P_{B,A_1,X_1}^{1}(b, a_1|x_1') - P_{B,A_1,X_1}^{2}(b, a_1|x_1') \right)
\]

\[
= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{b} \sup_{D} \sup_{\mathcal{M}^G} \sum_{a_1'} \sum_{a_1,a_2: \: g_a(a_1,a_2,x_1')=a_1'} D_{A_2|X_2,B}(a_2|f_b(a_1, x_1'), b) \left( P_{B,A_1,X_1}^{1}(b, a_1|x_1') - P_{B,A_1,X_1}^{2}(b, a_1|x_1') \right)
\]

\[
= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{b} \sup_{\mathcal{M}^F} \sum_{a_1} \left| \mathcal{M}^F \left( P_{B,A_1,X_1}^{1} \right) \left( b, a_1 \right) - \mathcal{M}^F \left( P_{B,A_1,X_1}^{2} \right) \left( b, a_1 \right) \right|
\]

\[
\leq \frac{1}{2} \sum_{b} \sup_{\mathcal{M}^F} \sum_{a_1} \left| \mathcal{M}^F \left( P_{B,A_1,X_1}^{1} \right) \left( b, a_1 \right) - \mathcal{M}^F \left( P_{B,A_1,X_1}^{2} \right) \left( b, a_1 \right) \right|.
The important point was to notice that \( \sum_{a_i'} \sum_{a_1, a_2: \text{g}_b(a_1, a_2, x_i') = a_i'} h(a_1, a_2) = \sum_{a_1, a_2} h(a_1, a_2). \)

b)

\[
\frac{1}{2} \sup_b \sup_{D\text{, }W'} \sup_{M^G} \left| \left( M^G \circ W' \right) (P^2_{b, b, A_1|x_1} \otimes D_{A_2|x_2, B=b}) - (M^G \circ W') (P^2_{b, b, A_1|x_1} \otimes D_{A_2|x_2, B=b}) \right|_1 \tag{B33}
\]

\[
= \frac{1}{2} \sup_b \sup_{D\text{, }W'} \sup_{M^G} \sum_{a_i'} \left| \left( M^G \left( \mathbb{P}^{1}_{b, g_b, B, A'_1|x'_1} \right) (b, a_i') - M^G \left( \mathbb{P}^{2}_{b, g_b, B, A'_1|x'_1} \right) (b, a_i') \right) \right| \tag{B34}
\]

\[
\leq \frac{1}{2} \sup_b \sup_{D\text{, }W'} \sum_{a_i'} \sum_i \left| \left( \mathbb{M}_i^F \left( \mathbb{P}^{1}_{b, g_b, B, A'_1|x'_1} \right) (b, a_i') - \mathbb{M}_i^F \left( \mathbb{P}^{2}_{b, g_b, B, A'_1|x'_1} \right) (b, a_i') \right) \right| \tag{B35}
\]

\[
\leq \frac{1}{2} \sup_b \sup_{D\text{, }W'} \sup_{x_i'} \max_{a_i'} \sum_{a_i'} \left| \left( \mathbb{P}^{1}_{b, g_b, B, A'_1|x'_1} (b, a_i' | x_i') - \mathbb{P}^{2}_{b, g_b, B, A'_1|x'_1} (b, a_i' | x_i') \right) \right| \tag{B36}
\]

\[
= \frac{1}{2} \sup_b \sup_{D\text{, }W'} \sup_{x_i'} \max_{a_i'} \sum_{a_i', a_1, a_2: \text{g}_b(a_1, a_2, x_i') = a_i'} \left| \sum_{a_1, a_2: \text{g}_b(a_1, a_2, x_i') = a_i'} P^1_{B, A_1|x_1} (b, a_1 | f_b(a_2, x_i')) D_{A_2|x_2, B}(a_2 | x_i', b) \right| \tag{B37}
\]

\[
\leq \frac{1}{2} \sup_{D\text{, }W'} \sup_{x_i'} \max_{a_i'} \sum_{a_i', a_1, a_2: \text{g}_b(a_1, a_2, x_i') = a_i'} \left| \sum_{a_1, a_2: \text{g}_b(a_1, a_2, x_i') = a_i'} P^1_{B, A_1|x_1} (b, a_1 | f_b(a_2, x_i')) D_{A_2|x_2, B}(a_2 | x_i', b) \right| \tag{B38}
\]

\[
= \frac{1}{2} \sup_b \sup_{D\text{, }W'} \sup_{x_i'} \max_{a_i'} \sum_{a_i', a_1, a_2: \text{g}_b(a_1, a_2, x_i') = a_i'} \left| \sum_{a_1, a_2: \text{g}_b(a_1, a_2, x_i') = a_i'} D_{A_2|x_2, B}(a_2 | x_i', b) \left( P^1_{B, A_1|x_1} (b, a_1 | f_b(a_2, x_i')) - P^2_{B, A_1|x_1} (b, a_1 | f_b(a_2, x_i')) \right) \right| \tag{B39}
\]

\[
\leq \frac{1}{2} \sup_b \sup_{D\text{, }W'} \sup_{x_i'} \max_{a_i'} \sum_{a_i', a_1, a_2: \text{g}_b(a_1, a_2, x_i') = a_i'} \left| \sum_{a_1, a_2: \text{g}_b(a_1, a_2, x_i') = a_i'} D_{A_2|x_2, B}(a_2 | x_i', b) \left( P^1_{B, A_1|x_1} (b, a_1 | f_b(a_2, x_i')) - P^2_{B, A_1|x_1} (b, a_1 | f_b(a_2, x_i')) \right) \right| \tag{B40}
\]

From a), b) and Equation (B15) we conclude that:

\[
\left\| P^1_{B, A_1|x_1} - P^2_{B, A_1|x_1} \right\|_{\text{BOX}} \leq \frac{1}{2} \sup_{b} \sup_{M^F} \sum_{a_1} \left| \mathbb{M}^F \left( P^1_{B, A_1|x_1} \right) (b, a_1) - \mathbb{M}^F \left( P^2_{B, A_1|x_1} \right) (b, a_1) \right|. \tag{B50}
\]

As the R.H.S. of the expression above realized a possible distinguisher strategy within considered BOX norm, the
inequality can be always saturated.

\[
\|P_{B,A_1|X_1}^2 - P_{B,A_1|X_1}^2\|_{\text{BOX}} = \frac{1}{2} \sum_b \sup_{M_F} \sum_{a_1} |M_F^1(P_{B,A_1|X_1}^1(b,a_1)) - M_F^2(P_{B,A_1|X_1}^2(b,a_1))|.
\]

(B51)

Note that if we impose \( B \equiv (S_A, S_B, Q) \), \( A_1 \equiv E \) and \( X_1 \equiv Z \), we see the results hold for the cc-box states shared at the end of the RBLOPC protocol.

\[
||P - Q||_{\text{BOX}} = D(P, Q)
\]

(B52)

**Remark 4.** In heuristic approach, introduced box norm is a maximal guessing advantage for a distinguisher to distinguish between two boxes and plays a role of composable distance [24, 53].

**Remark 5.** Boxes with unary inputs are isomorphic to probability distributions, for them box norm is proportional to the variational distance.

**Notation 2.** For the sake of simplicity we will sometimes omit the unary input.

---

**Appendix C: Equivalence between correctness, secrecy and overall security criteria for NSDI**

In Definition 3, of the key rate \( K_{RDI}^{(tid)} \), of restricted device independent key distribution protocol, we describe the key rate in terms of the proximity of box norm, given in Definition 1 from the ideal box distribution, which has the perfect correlation between the honest parties and no correlation with the eavesdropper. In the quantum case it was shown in Refs. [53, 54], that proximity in norm (of a state to the ideal one) is equivalent to (i) correctness and (ii) secrecy of a protocol. These two notions are employed in protocol independent definition of security [51]. We now show that the same holds for the box norm.

In the following lines, we employ notions of real, ideal and intermediate systems. The real system is a box shared by parties in a real protocol. An ideal box is the one which posses the same distribution on Eve’s side as a real box, however perfect (uniform) correlations between Alice and Bob (what makes honest parties uncorrelated with Eve). An intermediate system is a box for which Alice and Bob always share correct keys however distribution of the keys is not uniform (Eve’s part stays unchanged). The usual part of any protocol employing nonlocal correlations is an acceptance phase in which honest parties decide (upon some test) whether to abort or proceed. In the rest of this article we assume that the protocol is after the acceptance phase, although for the full generality we take a step back and consider also a possibility of aborting. We will later set the probability of aborting to zero. The superscripts pass is used to remind that states of systems are considered in the phase of a protocol when test is already done, and the lower subscript denotes who is in charge of the system. Let us begin with a few definitions.

**Definition 9** (State of system at the end of protocol). From now onward the state after the RBLOPC protocol will be called the state of real system and denoted by \( P_{S_A, S_B, Q, E|Z}^{\text{real}} \). Above feature will be true for all systems we decide now.

\[
S_{ABE} = P_{S_A, S_B, Q, E|Z}^{\text{real}} = P_{S_A, S_B, Q, E|Z}^{\text{pass}} + (1 - P_{\text{abort}}) P_{S_A, S_B, Q, E|Z}^{\text{pass}},
\]

(C1)

here we make a slight abuse of notation, the \( S_{ABE} \) in the L.H.S of the above equation represent the system of the three parties, whereas in the R.H.S \( P \) represent the box corresponds to the variables \( S_A, S_B \) and others.

**Definition 10** (State of ideal system conditioned on not aborting). The ideal system is one which possess perfect correlations between honest parties and is completely uncorrelated with eavesdropper. Local outcomes of eavesdropper and communications additionally mimics an imperfect system.

\[
P_{S_A, S_B, Q, E|Z}^{\text{ideal-pass}}(s_A, s_B, q, e|z) = \frac{\delta_{s_A, s_B}}{|S_A|} \sum_{s_A', s_B'} P_{S_A, S_B, Q, E|Z}^{\text{real}}(s_A', s_B', q, e|z),
\]

(C2)

\[
P_{S_A, S_B, Q, E|Z}^{\text{ideal-pass}} = P_{S_A, S_B, Q, E|Z}^{\text{ideal-pass}} \otimes P_{Q, E|Z}^{\text{ideal-pass}},
\]

(C3)

where \( P_{S_A, S_B} = \delta_{s_A, s_B} / |S_A| \) and \( P_{Q, E|Z}^{\text{ideal-pass}} = \sum_{s_A', s_B'} P_{S_A, S_B, Q, E|Z}^{\text{real}}(s_A', s_B', q, e|z) \).
Definition 11 (State of intermediate system conditioned on not aborting). An intermediate system is the one which bears such correlations between honest parties that they are always correct, but distribution they possess is not uniform hence correlations are not perfect in cryptographic sense. Eavesdropper still have some correlations with honest parties subsystems.

\[
P_{\text{int,pass}}^{\text{A},\text{S},\text{Q},\text{E}|\text{Z}}(s_A, s_B, q, e|z) = \frac{\delta_{s_A,s_B}}{|S_A|} p_{\text{real,pass}}^{\text{A},\text{S},\text{Q},\text{E}|\text{Z}}(s_A, q, e|z)
\]

(C4)

\[
P_{\text{int,pass}}^{\text{A},\text{S},\text{Q},\text{E}|\text{Z}}(s_A, s_B, q, e|z) = \frac{\delta_{s_A,s_B}}{|S_A|} \sum_{s_B} p_{\text{real,pass}}^{\text{A},\text{S},\text{Q},\text{E}|\text{Z}}(s_A, s_B, q, e|z)
\]

(C5)

As states of intermediate and ideal systems are adjusted to real system, the \( p_{\text{abort}} \) is the same in all cases (in fact we will consider the protocol after acceptance phase \( p_{\text{pass}} = 1 \), hence it will not lead to any ambiguities).

Now we are giving the definition of secrecy, correctness and security of the cryptographic protocol in case of non-signaling boxes.

Definition 12 (\( \varepsilon \)-secrecy of a protocol). A protocol is \( \varepsilon \)-secret if for any state \( S_{\text{AE}}^{\text{pass}} \in B_{\text{NS}} \), the state of the shared system between Alice (Bob) and Eve after a box protocol (conditioned on not aborting) satisfies

\[
(1 - p_{\text{abort}}) D(S_{\text{AE}}^{\text{real,pass}}, S_{\text{AE}}^{\text{ideal,pass}}) \leq \varepsilon,
\]

where:

\[
S_{\text{AE}}(s_A, q, e|z) := \sum_{s_B} S_{\text{ABE}}(s_A, s_B, q, e|z).
\]

(C7)

Definition 13 (\( \varepsilon \)-correctness). Let \( S_A \) and \( S_B \) be the random variables for the strings that Alice and Bob have at the end of the box protocol respectively. Then the protocol is \( \varepsilon \)-correct if:

\[
P[S_A \neq S_B, \text{pass}] \leq \varepsilon.
\]

(C8)

Definition 14 (\( \varepsilon \)-security of a protocol). Let \( S_{\text{ABE}}^{\text{real,pass}} \) be the state of the shared system between Alice, Bob, and Eve after a QKD protocol, conditioned on not aborting. Then the protocol is \( \varepsilon \)-secure if under any attack strategy by Eve:

\[
(1 - p_{\text{abort}}) D(S_{\text{ABE}}^{\text{real,pass}}, S_{\text{ABE}}^{\text{ideal,pass}}) \leq \varepsilon,
\]

where \( p_{\text{abort}} \) is the probability of aborting (which is the same for the real and ideal protocols).

To prove the equivalence between secrecy + correctness and security, we now provide the technical lemmas in which we show firstly that proximity in norm implies security and in the second that security implies proximity in the box norm.

Lemma 1 (\( \varepsilon \)-security 1). If a protocol is \( \varepsilon_{\text{sec,correct}} \) and \( \varepsilon_{\text{correct}} \) then the protocol is \( \varepsilon \)-secure, where \( \varepsilon = \varepsilon_{\text{sec}} + \varepsilon_{\text{correct}} \).

\[
(1 - p_{\text{abort}}) D(S_{\text{ABE}}^{\text{real,pass}}, S_{\text{ABE}}^{\text{ideal,pass}}) \leq \varepsilon_{\text{sec}} \land P[S_A \neq S_B, \text{pass}] \leq \varepsilon_{\text{correct}} \implies (1 - p_{\text{abort}}) D(S_{\text{ABE}}^{\text{real,pass}}, S_{\text{ABE}}^{\text{ideal,pass}}) \leq \varepsilon_{\text{sec}} + \varepsilon_{\text{correct}} = \varepsilon.
\]

(C10)

(C11)

Proof. Before we begin the proof we have the following observation and another lemma.

Observation 1. The following observation will be useful in incoming proofs.

\[
\| S_{\text{ABE}}^{\text{real,pass}} - S_{\text{ABE}}^{\text{ideal,pass}} \|_{\text{BOX}} = \| P_{\text{abort}} (P_{\text{real,pass}} - P_{\text{ideal,pass}}) (1 - p_{\text{abort}}) D_{\text{ideal,pass}} \|_{\text{BOX}}
\]

(C12)

\[
= \| P_{\text{abort}} (P_{\text{real,pass}} - P_{\text{ideal,pass}}) (1 - p_{\text{abort}}) (P_{\text{real,pass}} - P_{\text{ideal,pass}}) \|_{\text{BOX}}
\]

(C13)

\[
\overset{(I)}{=} P_{\text{abort}} \| P_{\text{real,pass}} - P_{\text{ideal,pass}} \|_{\text{BOX}} + (1 - p_{\text{abort}}) \| P_{\text{real,pass}} - P_{\text{ideal,pass}} \|_{\text{BOX}}
\]

(C14)

\[
\overset{(II)}{=} (1 - p_{\text{abort}}) \| P_{\text{real,pass}} - P_{\text{ideal,pass}} \|_{\text{BOX}}
\]

(I) - because of disjoint supports and
(II) - we assume that the \( P_{\text{real,pass}} \) and \( P_{\text{ideal,pass}} \) are trivially same when the protocol is aborted [54].
Lemma 2. The Box norm of the real and intermediate states, quantify the probability in which the keys between Alice and Bob differ. In particular

\[
D(S_{\text{real}}^{\text{ABE}}, S_{\text{int}}^{\text{ABE}}) \overset{(I)}{=} (1 - P_{\text{abort}}) D(S_{\text{real}}^{\text{ABE}}, S_{\text{int}}^{\text{ABE}}) = (1 - P_{\text{abort}}) P[S_A \neq S_B] = P[S_A \neq S_B, \text{pass}] = P[S_A \neq S_B]
\]  

(I) is due to observation (1), and the last equality comes from the fact that the keys are trivially same when they abort the protocol [54].

Proof. The distinguishing advantage between two boxes, is given in Eq. (B52), and we have

\[
D(S_{\text{real}}^{\text{ABE}}, S_{\text{int}}^{\text{ABE}}) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{s_A, s_B, q} \max_z \sum_e P_{\text{real}}(s_A, s_B, q, e | z) - P_{\text{int}}(s_A, s_B, q, e | z)
\]

\[
= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{s_A, s_B, q} \max_z \sum_e P_{\text{real}}(s_A, s_B, q, e | z) - \delta_{s_A, s_B} \sum_{s_B} P_{\text{real}}(s_A, s_B, q, e | z)
\]

\[
= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{s_A, q, s_B \neq s_A} \max_z \sum_e P_{\text{real}}(s_A, s_B, q, e | z) - \delta_{s_A, s_B} \sum_{s_B} P_{\text{real}}(s_A, s_B, q, e | z)
\]

\[
= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{s_A, q} \max_z \sum_{e, s_B} P_{\text{real}}(s_A, s_B, q, e | z) - \delta_{s_A, s_B} \sum_{s_B} P_{\text{real}}(s_A, s_B, q, e | z)
\]

\[
= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{s_A, q} \max_z \sum_{e, s_B} P_{\text{real}}(s_A, s_B, q, e | z)
\]

(I),(II) is due to no -signaling condition on the Eves's input z. 

Proof of Lemma 1. To prove the security of the protocol, we can write the L.H.S of Eq. (C9), as

\[
D(S_{\text{real}}^{\text{ABE}}, S_{\text{ideal}}^{\text{pass}}) = D(S_{\text{real}}^{\text{ABE}}, S_{\text{ideal}}^{\text{pass}} \otimes S_{\text{E}}^{\text{ideal}}) \leq D(S_{\text{real}}^{\text{ABE}}, S_{\text{ideal}}^{\text{pass}}) + D(S_{\text{ideal}}^{\text{pass}}, S_{\text{ABE}}^{\text{ideal}})
\]
where we use the triangular inequality in Box norm. Now,
\[
D \left( S_{\text{int,pass}}^{\text{ideal,pass}}, S_{\text{ideal,pass}}^{\text{ideal,pass}} \right) = \left\| P_{\text{int,pass}} - P_{\text{ideal,pass}} \right\|_{\text{BOX}} 
\]
\[
= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{s_A,s_B} \max_z \sum_e \delta_{s_A,s_B} \left| \sum_{s_B} P_{\text{real,pass}}^{s_A,s_B} S_{s_B,Q,E \mid Z}(s_A,s_B,q,e;|z) - \delta_{s_A,s_B} \sum_{s_B} P_{\text{real}}^{s_A,s_B} S_{s_B,Q,E \mid Z}(s_A,s_B,q,e;|z) \right| 
\]
\[
= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{s_A} \max_z \sum_e \left| \sum_{s_B} P_{\text{real,pass}}^{s_A,s_B} S_{s_B,Q,E \mid Z}(s_A,s_B,q,e;|z) - \sum_{s_B} \delta_{s_A,s_B} \sum_{s_B} P_{\text{real}}^{s_A,s_B} S_{s_B,Q,E \mid Z}(s_A,s_B,q,e;|z) \right| 
\]
\[
= \left\| S_{\text{real,pass}}^{\text{ideal,pass}} - S_{\text{ideal,pass}}^{\text{ideal,pass}} \right\|_{\text{BOX}} = D(S_{\text{real,pass}}^{\text{ideal,pass}}, S_{\text{ideal,pass}}^{\text{ideal,pass}}) 
\]

Finally we obtain:
\[
D \left( S_{\text{real,pass}}^{\text{ideal,pass}}, S_{\text{ideal,pass}}^{\text{ideal,pass}} \right) \leq D \left( S_{\text{real,pass}}^{\text{ideal,pass}}, S_{\text{int,pass}}^{\text{ideal,pass}} \right) + D \left( S_{\text{int,pass}}^{\text{ideal,pass}}, S_{\text{ideal,pass}}^{\text{ideal,pass}} \right) 
\]
\[
= (1 - p_{\text{abort}}) \mathbb{P} [S_A \neq S_B \mid \text{pass}] + D \left( S_{\text{real,pass}}^{\text{ideal,pass}}, S_{\text{ideal,pass}}^{\text{ideal,pass}} \right) 
\]

(1) We employ lemma (2). Hence,
\[
(1 - p_{\text{abort}}) D \left( S_{\text{real,pass}}^{\text{ideal,pass}}, S_{\text{ideal,pass}}^{\text{ideal,pass}} \right) \leq (1 - p_{\text{abort}}) \mathbb{P} [S_A \neq S_B \mid \text{pass}] + (1 - p_{\text{abort}}) D \left( S_{\text{real,pass}}^{\text{ideal,pass}}, S_{\text{ideal,pass}}^{\text{ideal,pass}} \right) 
\]

If a protocol is $\varepsilon_{\text{sec}}$-secret and $\varepsilon_{\text{cor}}$-correct:
\[
(1 - p_{\text{abort}}) D \left( S_{\text{real,pass}}^{\text{ideal,pass}}, S_{\text{ideal,pass}}^{\text{ideal,pass}} \right) \leq \varepsilon_{\text{sec}} + \varepsilon_{\text{cor}} 
\]

what means it is also at least $\varepsilon_{\text{sec}} + \varepsilon_{\text{cor}}$ secure.
\[
\mathbb{P} [S_A \neq S_B \mid \text{pass}] \leq \varepsilon_{\text{cor}} \land (1 - p_{\text{abort}}) D \left( S_{\text{real,pass}}^{\text{ideal,pass}}, S_{\text{ideal,pass}}^{\text{ideal,pass}} \right) \leq \varepsilon_{\text{sec}} 
\]

\[
\Rightarrow \left\| S_{\text{real,pass}}^{\text{ideal,pass}} - S_{\text{ideal,pass}}^{\text{ideal,pass}} \right\|_{\text{BOX}} \leq \varepsilon_{\text{sec}} + \varepsilon_{\text{cor}} 
\]

\[
\square 
\]

**Lemma 3 (Many-security 2). If a protocol is $\varepsilon$-secure it is at least $\varepsilon$-secret and $\varepsilon$-correct.**
\[
\left\| S_{\text{real,pass}}^{\text{ideal,pass}} - S_{\text{ideal,pass}}^{\text{ideal,pass}} \right\| = (1 - p_{\text{abort}}) D \left( S_{\text{real,pass}}^{\text{ideal,pass}}, S_{\text{ideal,pass}}^{\text{ideal,pass}} \right) \leq \varepsilon 
\]
\[
\Rightarrow \mathbb{P} [S_A \neq S_B \mid \text{pass}] \leq \varepsilon \land (1 - p_{\text{abort}}) D \left( S_{\text{real,pass}}^{\text{ideal,pass}}, S_{\text{ideal,pass}}^{\text{ideal,pass}} \right) \leq \varepsilon 
\]

**Proof of Lemma 3.** Let us prove the following first.
\[
D \left( S_{\text{real,pass}}^{\text{ideal,pass}}, S_{\text{ideal,pass}}^{\text{ideal,pass}} \right) \geq \mathbb{P} [S_A \neq S_B \mid \text{pass}] 
\]

\[
\square 
\]
In next step we prove:

\[ D \left( S_{\text{real, pass}}^{\text{ABE}}, S_{\text{ideal}}^{\text{ABE}} \right) \geq (1 - p_{\text{abort}}) D \left( S_{\text{real, pass}}^{\text{ABE}}, S_{\text{ideal, pass}}^{\text{ABE}} \right) \]  

\[ = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{s_A,s_B,q} \max_z \sum_e \left| P_{\text{real, pass}}^{S_{\text{ABE}}} \left( s_A, s_B, q, e \right) - \frac{1}{|S_A|} \sum_{s'_A,s'_B} P_{\text{real, pass}}^{S_{\text{ABE}}} \left( s'_A, s'_B, q, e \right) \right| \]  

\[ = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{s_A,s_B,q} \max_z \sum_e \left| P_{\text{real, pass}}^{S_{\text{ABE}}} \left( s_A, s_B, q, e \right) - \frac{1}{|S_A|} \sum_{s'_A,s'_B} P_{\text{real, pass}}^{S_{\text{ABE}}} \left( s'_A, s'_B, q, e \right) \right| + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{s_A,s_B \neq S_A} \max_z \sum_e \left| P_{\text{real, pass}}^{S_{\text{ABE}}} \left( s_A, s_B, q, e \right) \right| \]  

(I) - We use the triangular inequality.

(II) - Using the no-signaling condition in the Eve's subsystems.

(III) - Using the triangular inequality.

Therefore:

\[ (1 - p_{\text{abort}}) D \left( S_{\text{ABE}}^{\text{ABE}}, S_{\text{ideal}}^{\text{ABE}} \right) \geq (1 - p_{\text{abort}}) \mathbb{P} |S_A \neq S_B| \text{pass} = \mathbb{P} |S_A \neq S_B| \text{pass} \]  

In next step we prove:

\[ (1 - p_{\text{abort}}) D \left( S_{\text{real, pass}}^{\text{ABE}}, S_{\text{ideal, pass}}^{\text{ABE}} \right) \]  

\[ \geq (1 - p_{\text{abort}}) D \left( S_{\text{real, pass}}^{\text{ABE}}, S_{\text{ideal, pass}}^{\text{ABE}} \right) \]
\[
D(\mathcal{S}_{\text{real,pass}}^{A}, \mathcal{S}_{\text{ideal}}^{B})
\]

\[
= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{s_A, s_B, q} \sum_e \max_z \left| P_{\text{real,pass}}^{\mathcal{S}_{A, s_B, q, e}^A, e} (s_A, s_B, q) - \delta_{s_A, s_B} \sum_{s_A', s_B'} P_{\text{real,pass}}^{\mathcal{S}_{A, s_B, q, e}^A, e} (s_A', s_B', q) \right|
\]

\[
= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{s_A, q} \sum_e \max_z \left| P_{\text{real,pass}}^{\mathcal{S}_{A, s_B, q, e}^A, e} (s_A, s_B, q) - \frac{1}{|s_A|} \sum_{s_A'} P_{\text{real,pass}}^{\mathcal{S}_{A, s_B, q, e}^A, e} (s_A', s_B, q) \right|
\]

\[
+ \frac{1}{2} \sum_{s_A, s_B} \sum_{s_A' \neq s_A} \max_z \left| P_{\text{real,pass}}^{\mathcal{S}_{A, s_B, q, e}^A, e} (s_A, s_B, q) \right|
\]

(I) - Second component treated like in previous proof.

(II) - We use inverse triangle inequality.

(III) - We use the triangular inequality.

(IV) - We use the results in Eqs. (C26) and (C32).

We have:

\[
(1 - p_{\text{abort}}) D\left(\mathcal{S}_{\text{real,pass}}^{A}, \mathcal{S}_{\text{real,pass}}^{B} \otimes \mathcal{S}_{\text{ideal,pass}}^{E}\right) \geq \left| \frac{1}{2} P[S_A \neq S_B, \text{pass}] - (1 - p_{\text{abort}}) D\left(\mathcal{S}_{\text{real,pass}}^{A}, \mathcal{S}_{\text{ideal,pass}}^{E}\right) \right|
\]

One should go now through two different cases:

Case 1: \( \frac{1}{2} P[S_A \neq S_B, \text{pass}] \geq (1 - p_{\text{abort}}) D\left(\mathcal{S}_{\text{real,pass}}^{A}, \mathcal{S}_{\text{ideal,pass}}^{E}\right) \):
\[(1 - p_{\text{abort}}) D \left( S_{\text{real}, \text{pass}}^{\text{ABE}} \otimes S_{\text{ideal}, \text{pass}}^{\text{ideal}} \right) \geq \frac{1}{2} P [S_A \neq S_B, \text{pass}] - (1 - p_{\text{abort}}) D \left( S_{\text{real}, \text{pass}}^{\text{ABE}} \otimes S_{\text{ideal}, \text{pass}}^{\text{ideal}} \right) \quad (C67)\]

\[\geq 2 (1 - p_{\text{abort}}) D \left( S_{\text{real}, \text{pass}}^{\text{ABE}} \otimes S_{\text{ideal}, \text{pass}}^{\text{ideal}} \right) \geq 2 (1 - p_{\text{abort}}) D \left( S_{\text{real}, \text{pass}}^{\text{ABE}} \otimes S_{\text{ideal}, \text{pass}}^{\text{ideal}} \right) \quad (C69)\]

\[\geq (1 - p_{\text{abort}}) D \left( S_{\text{real}, \text{pass}}^{\text{ABE}} \otimes S_{\text{ideal}, \text{pass}}^{\text{ideal}} \right) \quad (C70)\]

Case 2: \( \frac{1}{2} P [S_A \neq S_B, \text{pass}] < (1 - p_{\text{abort}}) D \left( S_{\text{real}, \text{pass}}^{\text{ABE}} \otimes S_{\text{ideal}, \text{pass}}^{\text{ideal}} \right) \):

\[(1 - p_{\text{abort}}) D \left( S_{\text{real}, \text{pass}}^{\text{ABE}} \otimes S_{\text{ideal}, \text{pass}}^{\text{ideal}} \otimes S_E^{\text{ideal}} \right) \geq (1 - p_{\text{abort}}) D \left( S_{\text{real}, \text{pass}}^{\text{ABE}} \otimes S_{\text{ideal}, \text{pass}}^{\text{ideal}} \right) - \frac{1}{2} P [S_A \neq S_B, \text{pass}] \quad (C72)\]

\[\geq (1 - p_{\text{abort}}) D \left( S_{\text{real}, \text{pass}}^{\text{ABE}} \otimes S_{\text{ideal}, \text{pass}}^{\text{ideal}} \right) \quad (C74)\]

Finally:

\[(1 - p_{\text{abort}}) D \left( S_{\text{real}, \text{pass}}^{\text{ABE}} \otimes S_{\text{ideal}, \text{pass}}^{\text{ideal}} \otimes S_E^{\text{ideal}} \right) \geq (1 - p_{\text{abort}}) D \left( S_{\text{real}, \text{pass}}^{\text{ABE}} \otimes S_{\text{ideal}, \text{pass}}^{\text{ideal}} \right) \quad (C75)\]

If \((1 - p_{\text{abort}}) D \left( S_{\text{real}, \text{pass}}^{\text{ABE}} \otimes S_{\text{ideal}, \text{pass}}^{\text{ideal}} \otimes S_E^{\text{ideal}} \right) \leq \varepsilon\), we see from \((C44)\) and \((C55)\) that:

\[\|S_{\text{real}} - S_{\text{ideal}}\|_{\text{BOX}} = (1 - p_{\text{abort}}) D \left( S_{\text{real}, \text{pass}}^{\text{ABE}} \otimes S_{\text{ideal}, \text{pass}}^{\text{ideal}} \otimes S_E^{\text{ideal}} \right) \leq \varepsilon \quad (C76)\]

\[\implies P [S_A \neq S_B, \text{pass}] \leq \varepsilon \quad (C77)\]

\[\square\]

The above lemmas allow us to provide the proof the main theorem regarding the equivalence between security and correctness and secrecy.

**Proof of Theorem 1.** First we see from Observation 1:

\[\|S_{\text{real}} - S_{\text{ideal}}\|_{\text{BOX}} = (1 - p_{\text{abort}}) D \left( S_{\text{real}, \text{pass}}^{\text{ABE}} \otimes S_{\text{ideal}, \text{pass}}^{\text{ideal}} \right) \quad (C78)\]

From Lemma 1 we obtained:

\[P [S_A \neq S_B, \text{pass}] \leq \varepsilon_{\text{cor}} \land (1 - p_{\text{abort}}) D \left( S_{\text{real}, \text{pass}}^{\text{ABE}} \otimes S_{\text{ideal}, \text{pass}}^{\text{ideal}} \right) \leq \varepsilon_{\text{sec}} \quad (C79)\]

\[\implies \|S_{\text{real}, \text{pass}}^{\text{ABE}} - S_{\text{ideal}, \text{pass}}^{\text{ideal}}\|_{\text{BOX}} \leq \varepsilon_{\text{sec}} + \varepsilon_{\text{cor}} \quad (C80)\]

and from Lemma 3:

\[\|S_{\text{real}, \text{pass}}^{\text{ABE}} - S_{\text{ideal}, \text{pass}}^{\text{ideal}}\|_{\text{BOX}} \leq \varepsilon \quad (C81)\]

\[\implies P [S_A \neq S_B, \text{pass}] \leq \varepsilon \land (1 - p_{\text{abort}}) D \left( S_{\text{real}, \text{pass}}^{\text{ABE}} \otimes S_{\text{ideal}, \text{pass}}^{\text{ideal}} \right) \leq \varepsilon \quad (C82)\]

Together we can write,

\[\|S_{\text{real}, \text{pass}}^{\text{ABE}} - S_{\text{ideal}, \text{pass}}^{\text{ideal}}\|_{\text{BOX}} \leq O(\varepsilon) \quad (C83)\]

\[\iff P [S_A \neq S_B, \text{pass}] \leq O(\varepsilon_{\text{cor}}) \land (1 - p_{\text{abort}}) D \left( S_{\text{real}, \text{pass}}^{\text{ABE}} \otimes S_{\text{ideal}, \text{pass}}^{\text{ideal}} \right) \leq O(\varepsilon_{\text{sec}}) \quad (C84)\]

Hence the definition’s are cryptographically equivalent. \(\square\)
Appendix D: Connection between SK and NSDI scenario

Before we begin with the proof of the Theorem 2, let’s remind the definition of secret key rate, already presented by Maurer [6].

**Definition 15** (Of the secret key rate by Maurer ’93). The secret key rate of A and B with respect to E, denoted $S(A : B || E)$, is the maximum rate at which Alice and Bob can agree on a secret key S while keeping the rate at which Eve obtains information arbitrarily small, i.e., it is the maximal $R$ such that for every $\epsilon > 0$ there exists a protocol for sufficiently large $N$ satisfying (D3)-(D6) with $A$ and $B$ replaced by $A^N$ and $B^N$, respectively, satisfying

$$\frac{1}{N} I(S : C^t E^N) \leq \epsilon,$$

and achieving

$$\frac{1}{N} H(S) \geq R - \epsilon$$

and,

$$H(C_i | C^{i-1} A) = 0, \text{ for odd } i$$

(D3)

$$H(C_i | C^{i-1} B) = 0, \text{ for even } i$$

(D4)

and,

$$H(S' | C^t E) = 0,$$

(D6)

where $C^t$ is a sequence of public communication variables.

We have to notice the fact that

**Fact 2.** From the RBLOPC box norm given in Eq. (1):

$$\|P - Q\|_\text{BOX} \leq \epsilon \Leftrightarrow \forall \mathcal{M} \frac{1}{N} \|\mathcal{M}(P) - \mathcal{M}(Q)\|_1 \leq \epsilon,$$

(D7)

where $\mathcal{M}$ is a choice of input (or measurement on the box), such that it does not incorporate wirings (RBLOPC).

Now we have the following lemmas,

**Lemma 4.** The secret key rate in SK model has a lower bound.

$$\sup_{\mathcal{P}} \limsup_{N \to \infty} \frac{\log \dim_A (P_N (P^{\otimes N}_\mathcal{M} (ABE)))}{N} \leq S(A : B || E).$$

(D8)

Proof. Let us consider two tripartite non-signaling boxes $P(ABE|XYZ)$ and $P(ABE|XYZ)$, and $\mathcal{M}$ is some choice of measurements on the three parties which give rise to the probability distribution $\mathcal{M}(P) \equiv P(ABE) \equiv P_M$ and $\mathcal{M}(Q) \equiv Q(ABE) \equiv Q_M$. Now we are going to use asymptotic continuity of functions [69, 70].

$$|H(A)_{P_M} - H(A)_{Q_M}| \leq \epsilon \log (\dim_A (P_M) - 1) + h_2(\epsilon),$$

(D9)

$$|I(A : E)_{P_M} - I(A : E)_{Q_M}| \leq 2\epsilon \log d + 2g(\epsilon),$$

(D10)

(D11)

where $H(\cdot)$ is the Shannon entropy, defined in Sec. 1, $\epsilon = \frac{1}{2} ||P_M - Q_M||_1$, $\forall \in [0, 1]$ $h_2(\epsilon) = -\epsilon \log \epsilon - (1 - \epsilon) \log (1 - \epsilon)$, is the binary Shannon entropy, and $\forall \epsilon \in [0, 1]$ $g(\epsilon) = -\epsilon \log \epsilon + (1 + \epsilon) \log (1 + \epsilon)$, where $d = \min\{\dim_A (P_M), \dim_B (P_M)\}$.

For the key distribution, Alice and Bob apply $P_N$ protocol on their shared box, which is internally $N$ iid copies of the same box, i.e., $P^{\otimes N}_\mathcal{M} := \mathcal{M} (P^{\otimes N})$, in such a manner that:

$$\frac{1}{2} ||P_N (P^{\otimes N}_\mathcal{M}) - P^{\text{ideal}}_\mathcal{M}||_1 \leq \epsilon,$$

(D12)

$$P^{\text{ideal}}_\mathcal{M} := \frac{\delta_{S_A S_B}}{|S_A|} \otimes \sum_{S_A, S_B} P_N (P^{\otimes N}_\mathcal{M}),$$

(D13)
i.e., the output distribution of keys $(S_A, S_B)$ after protocol $P_N$, is arbitrarily close to the ideal distribution, where perfect correlations are imposed. We assume the tensor of probability distribution to be isomorphic to the tensor product of boxes with unary inputs [50].

Here one thing to notice is that the variable $S$ of Maurer’s model, (see Ref. [6]) is the key agreement $S_A$ by Alice and $S'$ is $S_B$ for Bob, whereas the $C^l Z$ is $E$ after the protocol. From the definition of the ideal system we obtain:

$$H(S_A)_{P_M} = \log \dim_A (P_M^\otimes N) \geq H(S_A)_{P_M^\otimes N}$$

(D14)

Since dimension of ideal system is exactly matches with the dimension of the real one, then

$$H(S_A)_{P_M} = \log \dim_A (P_N (P_M^\otimes N))$$

(D15)

Let’s set $\delta = \varepsilon \omega$, for any fixed $\omega \in (0, 1)$ and $R = \limsup_{N \to \infty} \frac{\log \dim_A (P_N (P_M^\otimes N))}{N}$. Where we consider all protocols which satisfy security condition given in Definition (2). From the asymptotic continuity of mutual information one has that $\forall \delta, \exists N_0 : \forall N \geq N_0$:

$$\frac{1}{N} I(S_A : E)_{P_N} \leq \frac{2 \varepsilon d_N + 2 g(\varepsilon)}{\varepsilon} \leq \delta,$$

(D16)

where $d_N = \min \{ \dim_A (P_N (P_M^\otimes N)), \dim_E (P_N (P_M^\otimes N)) \}$. Reconstructing second inequality of Maurer, $\forall \delta, \exists N_0 : \forall N \geq N_0$:

$$\frac{1}{N} H(S_A) \geq \frac{\log \dim_A (P_N (P_M^\otimes N))}{N} - \delta,$$

(D17)

$$\delta \geq \frac{1}{N} H(S_{\text{ideal}}) - \frac{1}{N} H(S_A).$$

(D18)

The last inequality we got from the asymptotic continuity of the entropy of $S_A$.

$$\forall N \geq N_0 \frac{1}{N} H(S_{\text{ideal}}) - \frac{1}{N} H(S_A) \leq \frac{\varepsilon \log (\dim_A (P_N (P_M^\otimes N)) - 1) + h_2(\varepsilon)}{N}$$

(D20)

$$\leq \frac{\varepsilon \log (\dim_A (P_M)^N - 1) + h_2(\varepsilon)}{N} \leq \delta,$$

(D21)

The same derivations can be made for $S_B$ variable, as required. This is because we only show that the rate of Maurer can be rephrased, when their protocol $P$, is a part of a $\varepsilon$-secure A protocol for boxes.

As the secret key rate $S(A : B || E)$ is maximal $R$ for which the above is satisfied:

$$\forall_{P=(P_N)} S(A : B || E)_{P_M} \geq \limsup_{N \to \infty} \frac{\log \dim_A (P_N (P_M^\otimes N))}{N}$$

(D22)

In particular:

$$S(A : B || E)_{P_M} \geq \sup_P \limsup_{N \to \infty} \frac{\log \dim_A (P_N (P_M^\otimes N))}{N}$$

(D23)

The result is slightly more general then lemma (4), to obtain what is desired product measurement has to be imposed $P_M^\otimes N := M^\otimes N (P^\otimes N)$.

\[ \square \]

**Lemma 5.** The secret key rate in SK-model has an upper bound.

$$S(A : B || E) \leq \sup_P \limsup_{N \to \infty} \frac{\log \dim_A (P_N (P_M^\otimes N (ABE)))}{N}.$$  

(D24)

**Proof of Lemma 5.** Let us suppose that there exist a protocol $P$ that is it optimal for some probability distribution $P_M$, and satisfies proximity in norm security condition. According to Maurer’s definition, secret key rate $S(A : B || E)$ is a maximal $R$, such that, for every $\epsilon > 0$ the following relation is true

$$\forall N \geq N_0 \frac{1}{N} H(S) \geq R - \delta.$$  

(D25)
where again, like in the proof of Lemma 4, we \( \delta = \varepsilon^\omega, \) \( \omega \in (0, 1) \). From the relation above, it instantly follows that

\[
\forall N \geq N_0 \quad S(A : B | E)_{P_M} \leq \frac{1}{N} H(S) \quad \text{(D26)}
\]

From the proximity in norm criteria, using inequalities of [69, 70] alike in proof of Lemma 4, it follows that

\[
\forall N \geq N_0 \quad \frac{1}{N} I(S : E)|_{P_M (p_{AB}^N)} \leq \delta
\]

(D27)

Properties of Shannon entropy allow us to write

\[
\forall N \geq N_0 \quad S(A : B | E)_{P_M} \leq \frac{1}{N} \log |S| = \frac{\log \dim_A (P_N (p_{AB}^N))}{N} \leq \limsup_{N \to \infty} \frac{\log \dim_A (P_N (p_{AB}^N))}{N}
\]

\[
\text{(D28)}
\]

However from the very beginning an optimal protocol was considered.

\[
S(A : B | E)_{P_M} \leq \sup_{P} \limsup_{N \to \infty} \frac{\log \dim_A (P_N (p_{AB}^N))}{N}
\]

\[
\text{(D29)}
\]

\( \Box \)

**Proof of Theorem 2.** From the Lemmas 4 and 5, it follows directly, that the secret key rate in SK scheme can be equivalently expressed as given in Eq. (17).

\( \Box \)

### Appendix E: Upper bound on device independent (iid) key

**Proof of Theorem 3.** Let \( \Lambda^\eta := \{\Lambda_N^\eta\} \) be a box protocol (incorporating optimal fiducial measurements in RBLOPC class and classical post-processing) such that, for any fixed distribution \( P_{AB|XY} \equiv P_{AB|XY}^{ideal}, \eta > 0 \) and any \( N > N_0 \)

\[
||\Lambda_N^\eta (E (P^{\otimes N})) - P^{\text{ideal}}||_\text{BOX} \leq \varepsilon_N(\eta) \to 0, \quad \text{(E1)}
\]

\[
\mathcal{R} (\Lambda^\eta_N | \rho) \geq K^{\text{ideal}}_D (P) - \eta, \quad \text{(E2)}
\]

where \( P \equiv P_{AB|XY} \) is the initial box before the protocol (honest parties share \( N \) copies of it), \( E(P^{\otimes N}) \equiv E(P^{\otimes N})(ABE|XYZ) \) is their complete extension to eavesdropper system. The ideal box is that which hold the perfect correlations after the protocol, introduced in the security proofs section is \( P^{\text{ideal}} := \frac{\delta_{\delta A-S_B}}{|S_A|} \otimes \sum_{s_A,s_B} \Lambda_N^\eta (E (P^{\otimes N}))|_{s_A=s_B,s_B=s_B} \). And \( \varepsilon_N(\eta) := \eta^{\frac{1}{2}}, \) for any fixed \( \omega \in (0, 1) \) (for reference see prove of Lemma 4).

**Notation 3.** In the rest of the proof we use a notation in which \( P_{ABE|XYZ} \equiv P(ABE|XYZ) \).

From the Lemma (4) we conclude that, for a fixed distribution \( P(ABE) \)

\[
\forall \eta > 0 \forall N > N_0 \forall P, S(A : B | E) \geq \frac{\log \dim_A (P_N (p_{AB}^{\otimes N}(ABE)))}{N}.
\]

\[
\text{(E3)}
\]

Let us now consider a family of distributions indexed with \( x, y, z, \) i.e. \( E(P)(ABE|X = x, Y = y, Z = z) \). This is a family originating from fiducial measurements performed by the honest parties, given any measurement by eavesdropper also fiducial.

\[
(M_{x,y}^F \otimes M_z^F)E(P)(ABE|XYZ) := E(P)(ABE|X = x, Y = y, Z = z).
\]

\[
\text{(E4)}
\]

Another class of distribution arises when the eavesdropper chooses to perform any general measurement, i.e, \( E(P)(ABE|XYZ) = \sum_z p(z|z') (M_{x,y}^F \otimes M_z^F)E(P)(ABE|XYZ) \)

\[
\text{(E5)}
\]

\[
= \sum_z p(z|z') E(P)(ABE|X = x, Y = y, Z = z), \quad \text{(E6)}
\]

\[
= \tilde{E}(P)(ABE|X = x, Y = y, Z = z') \quad \text{(E7)}
\]
where we use the fact that general measurement $\mathcal{M}_E^G = \sum_z p(z) \mathcal{M}_z^E$, is the probabilistic choices of fiducial measurements and the indices $z'$ denotes the different choices of general measurement. $\mathcal{E}(P)$ is the overcomplete extension (OCE) of the bipartite box $P$, see Definition 1 of Ref. [1]. One thing to notice is that the general measurement $\mathcal{M}_E^G = \sum_z p(z) \mathcal{M}_z^E$ also contain the fiducial measurement, so we consider the general measurement in the next section.

**Remark 6.** We restrict ourselves to the case in which the honest parties have access only to the fiducial measurements. In the general case when Alice and Bob have access also to the mixed measurements, which incorporate additional randomness, Eve should have access to complete extension of total system. If we restrict the power of Eve, to the correlations only with a part of honest parties, rather than the system with post-processing channel followed by the input randomness, we switch to another cryptographic paradigm.

With these distributions we can associate a family of $\eta$-optimal SK protocols $x,y P^\eta := \{x,y P^\eta_N\}$, we can write the following.

$$\forall N > 0 \forall x, y, z \forall_{x,y,p} \log \dim_A \left( (\mathcal{M}_y^{F_N} \otimes \mathcal{M}_z^{G_N}) \mathcal{E}(P)(ABE|XYZ) \right) \leq S(A : B||E)(\mathcal{M}_y^{F_N} \otimes \mathcal{M}_z^{G_N}) \mathcal{E}(P)(ABE|XYZ). \quad (E8)$$

Due to the non-signaling principle (from E to AB systems), and proximity in Box norm definition of security, given in Definition 2, the value of LHS of (E8) doesn’t depend on the choice of $z$. Since eavesdropper can choose its input adaptively we can assume $z$ is a function of $x$ and $y$, as a best choice of eavesdropper.

$$\forall N > 0 \forall x, y, z \forall_{x,y,p} \log \dim_A \left( (\mathcal{M}_y^{F_N} \otimes \mathcal{M}_z^{G_N}) \mathcal{E}(P)(ABE|XYZ) \right) \leq S(A : B||E)(\mathcal{M}_y^{F_N} \otimes \mathcal{M}_z^{G_N}) \mathcal{E}(P)(ABE|XYZ). \quad (E9)$$

**Remark 7.** For simplicity of the proof we restrict to the case in which each copy is subjected to the same measurement, as this is the case in all known protocols. Generalization in this case is trivial.

Let us chose $\bar{x}_N$, $\bar{y}_N$ so that maximize LHS of (E9) for any fixed $N > N_0$ i.e.

$$\forall N > N_0 \log \dim_A \left( (\mathcal{M}_{\bar{x}_N, \bar{y}_N}^{F_N} \otimes \mathcal{M}_{\bar{z}_{q(x,y)}}^{G_N}) \mathcal{E}(P)(ABE|XYZ) \right) \leq S(A : B||E)(\mathcal{M}_y^{F_N} \otimes \mathcal{M}_z^{G_N}) \mathcal{E}(P)(ABE|XYZ). \quad (E10)$$

But $\bar{x}_N$, $\bar{y}_N$ might not be an optimal choice for $S(A : B||E)$.

$$\forall N > N_0 \forall x, y, z \forall_{x,y,p} \log \dim_A \left( (\mathcal{M}_y^{F_N} \otimes \mathcal{M}_z^{G_N}) \mathcal{E}(P)(ABE|XYZ) \right) \leq S(A : B||E)(\mathcal{M}_y^{F_N} \otimes \mathcal{M}_z^{G_N}) \mathcal{E}(P)(ABE|XYZ). \quad (E12)$$

In the lines above we used $\mathcal{E}(P)^{\otimes N}$ which is not the complete extension of the $N$ iid copies box the box P, used in the norm. But due to non-signaling condition, both $\mathcal{E}(P)^{\otimes N}$ and $\mathcal{E}(P^{\otimes N})$ possess the same marginal distribution $P^{\otimes N}_{AB|XYZ}$, hence by change from $\mathcal{E}(P)^{\otimes N}$ to $\mathcal{E}(P^{\otimes N})$ on LHS of (E12) doesn’t change the value of the expression of L.H.S. From the Theorem 4 in Ref. [1] we know that such an extension exists upon appropriate allowed operation on complete extension on Eve’s side, i.e.,

$$(\mathbb{I}_{AB} \otimes \Omega_E) \mathcal{E}(P^{\otimes N}) = \mathcal{E}(P)^{\otimes N} \quad (E13)$$
Again, immediately last lines yield

Without loss of generality we fix the distribution $P(ABE)$ choice of $\{\text{monotones}\}$ can be squashed according to the following procedure. For any fixed one among them the following inequality holds,

$$P(\eta > 0) \sum_{x,y:} \log \dim_{\text{A}}(\Lambda_{\text{N}}(P(ABE|XYZ)))$$

From the very definition of $\Lambda_{\text{N}}$ protocol consisted of optimal RBLOPC measurement and $\eta$-optimal post-processing $P(\eta)$ adjusted to the measurement choice, also recalling that $\eta$ was and arbitrary function describing Eve's action.

$$\forall_{\eta > 0} \exists_{N > N_0} \sum_{x,y:} \log \dim_{\text{A}}(\Lambda_{\text{N}}(P(ABE|XYZ)))$$

In asymptotic limit

$$\forall_{\eta > 0} \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{x,y:} \log \dim_{\text{A}}(\Lambda_{\text{N}}(P(ABE|XYZ)))$$

Therefore

$$\forall_{\eta > 0} \max_{x,y:} \min_{z} \sum_{x,y:} \log \dim_{\text{A}}(\Lambda_{\text{N}}(P(ABE|XYZ)))$$

By taking a limit for optimal protocol $\eta \rightarrow 0$, one obtain

$$\max_{x,y:} \min_{z} \sum_{x,y:} \log \dim_{\text{A}}(\Lambda_{\text{N}}(P(ABE|XYZ)))$$

For the second part of the proof we need to recall some properties of certain family of functions, so called secrecy monotones $\{M(A:\|E)\}$ for SK model [71]. In fact each function that upper bounds secret key rate in SK paradigm can be squashed according to the following procedure. For any fixed one among them the following inequality holds,

$$\forall_{P(ABE)} \exists_{M(A:\|E)P(ABE)} \geq S(A:B:\|E)_{P(ABE)}$$

Extending the above inequality to any tripartite non-signaling box $P(ABE|XYZ)$, one can rewrite

$$\forall_{P(ABE|XYZ)} \exists_{M(x,y,z)} \exists_{M(A:B:\|E)_{P(ABE|XYZ)} \geq S(A:B:\|E)_{P(ABE|XYZ)}}$$

Without loss of generality we fix the distribution $P(ABE|XYZ)$ from now. Let us denote $\tilde{z}(x, y)$ as such an adaptive choice of $z$ that

$$\forall_{x,y} \exists_{M(A:B:\|E)_{P(ABE|XYZ)}} := \min_{\tilde{z}} \sum_{x,y:} \log \dim_{\text{A}}(\Lambda_{\text{N}}(P(ABE|XYZ)))$$

The immediate consequence is

$$\forall_{x,y} \min_{\tilde{z}} \sum_{x,y:} \log \dim_{\text{A}}(\Lambda_{\text{N}}(P(ABE|XYZ)))$$

Again, immediately last lines yield

$$\forall_{x,y} \min_{\tilde{z}} \sum_{x,y:} \log \dim_{\text{A}}(\Lambda_{\text{N}}(P(ABE|XYZ)))$$

Again, immediately last lines yield

$$\forall_{x,y} \min_{\tilde{z}} \sum_{x,y:} \log \dim_{\text{A}}(\Lambda_{\text{N}}(P(ABE|XYZ)))$$

Again, immediately last lines yield

$$\forall_{x,y} \min_{\tilde{z}} \sum_{x,y:} \log \dim_{\text{A}}(\Lambda_{\text{N}}(P(ABE|XYZ)))$$

Again, immediately last lines yield

$$\forall_{x,y} \min_{\tilde{z}} \sum_{x,y:} \log \dim_{\text{A}}(\Lambda_{\text{N}}(P(ABE|XYZ)))$$
On the RHS we recognize \( \tilde{M} (A : B || E)_{P_{\text{ABE}|XYZ}} \) from Definition 4. Using the result from the first part of the proof in (E18) with CE as a tripartite box, we obtain:

\[
\forall_{P_{\text{ABE}|XY}} \quad \tilde{M} (A : B || E)_{E(P)_{\text{ABE}|XYZ}} \geq K_{\text{RDI}}^{(ii,d)} (P(AB|XY)).
\] (E27)

**Remark 8.** Notice that, for the measure \( \tilde{M} (A : B || E) \), the subsystem hold by the eavesdropper can be a trivial one, and for that scenario, we can use the mutual information function, for constructing the upper bound.

\[
\square
\]

**Appendix F: Proof of the properties of squashed non-locality**

In this section, we will give the proofs of the stated properties of the squashed non-locality given in Sec. IV.C. But before we start with the proof, let’s recall the definition of intrinsic conditional mutual information \( I(A : B \downarrow E) \), given in Sec. J of the supplementary material. The function involve an optimization over all possible conditional probability distribution \( P_{E|X} \), in part of the random variable \( E \). Moreover, from the tripartite non-signaling box \( E(P)_{\text{ABE}|XYZ} \), a probability distribution emerges when its inputs are set or measured, hence from the definition of the squashed measure

\[
\hat{I} (A : B \downarrow E)_{E(P)_{\text{ABE}|XYZ}} = \max_{x,y} \min_z I(A : B \downarrow E)_{(\mathcal{M}_{x,y}^E \otimes \mathcal{M}_{z}^E)E(P)_{\text{ABE}|XYZ}} \tag{F1}
\]

\[
= \max_{x,y} \min_z \inf_{\tilde{E}} I(A : B|E')_{(\tilde{E}_{E'|E})_{(\mathcal{M}_{x,y}^E \otimes \mathcal{M}_{z}^E)E(P)_{\text{ABE}|XYZ}}}, \tag{F2}
\]

where \( \mathcal{M}_{x,y}^E \) is the fiducial choices of the measurements on the inputs \( X \) and \( Y \), and \( \mathcal{M}_{z}^E \) is a general measurement on \( Z \). According to Theorem 4 of Ref. [1], \( (\tilde{E}_{E'|E})(I \otimes \mathcal{M}_{z}^E)E(P)_{\text{ABE}|XYZ} = \sum_{e} \tilde{E}_{E'|E} = e \sum_{z} p(z) \mathcal{E}(P)_{\text{ABE} = e|XYZ = z} = \tilde{P}(\text{ABE}'|XY Z' = z') \), the general measurement, in the extending part, generates all pure members ensemble of the extended system and \( \tilde{E}_{E'|E} \) generates from this an arbitrary ensemble which can be consider any unary extension i.e., with some fixed \( z' \). Hence, for a fix input randomizer (dice \( p(z') \)) and for a fixed channel, one can have a arbitrary extension \( \tilde{P}(\text{ABE}'|XY) \), with unary input. All possible choices of input randomizer and post-processing channel leads to all possible extension. So we have, \( \min_{z} \inf_{\tilde{E}_{E'|E}} \equiv \inf_{\tilde{P}(\text{ABE}'|XY)} \). Here \( I \) is the identity operator in part of the extending system.

From Eq. (31), we can rewrite the definition of squashed non-locality as

\[
N_{sq}(P(AB|XY)) = \max_{x,y} \inf_{\tilde{P}(\text{ABE}|XY)} I(A : B|E)_{(\mathcal{M}_{x,y}^E \otimes \mathcal{M}_{z}^E)E(P)_{\text{ABE}|XY}} \tag{F3}
\]

Now an arbitrary extension \( \tilde{P}(\text{ABE}|XY) \), gives rise to an ensemble of the \( \text{ABE} \) box \( P(AB|XY) = \sum_{e} \tilde{P}(\text{ABE} = e|XY) = \sum_{e} p(e)P_{e}(AB|XY) \), where \( P_{e}(AB|XY) \) can be an arbitrary box corresponding to each output \( E = e \), lies in the same polytope where \( P \) lies, (need not be all extremal boxes) i.e., it creates any arbitrary ensemble \( \{p(e), P_{e}(AB|XY)\} \). Moreover, all possible choices of the extension of type \( \tilde{P}(\text{ABE}|XY) \), results all possible choices of ensembles of \( P(AB|XY) \). Now the set of all ensembles of a given box \( P \), defined as

\[
S^{all} = \left\{ \{p_i, P^i(AB|XY)\} : \sum_{i} p_i P^i(AB|XY) = P \right\}. \tag{F4}
\]

Hence \( \inf_{\tilde{P}(\text{ABE}'|XY)} \equiv \inf_{\{p_i, P^i(AB|XY)\}} \in S^{all} \), and from Eq. (F3), we can rewrite the definition of squashed non-locality as

\[
N_{sq}(P(AB|XY)) = \max_{x,y} \inf_{\{p_i, P^i(AB|XY)\} \in S^{all}} \sum_{i} p_i I(A : B)_{(\mathcal{M}_{x,y}^E \otimes \mathcal{M}_{z}^E)P^i(AB|XY)} \tag{F5}
\]

In Eq. (F5), the squashed non-locality reduces to the convex roof extension of the mutual information function, like the entanglement measure for a mixed state [72], the only difference is that here we are not only decomposing the box in terms of the pure (extremal) boxes but also allow the mixed box decomposition.
1. Positivity of the measure

**Corollary 5.** The squashed non-locality is positive semidefinite function of bipartite non-signaling boxes $P(AB|XY)$, i.e.,

$$\mathcal{N}_{sq}(P(AB|XY)) \geq 0,$$

(F6)

and the equality holds iff the box $P$ admits a local hidden variable model [10].

**Proof.** The intrinsic conditional mutual information $I(A : B \downarrow E) \geq 0$ for all distribution $P(ABE)$, hence the positive semi-definiteness directly follows from Eq. (F1).

$$\mathcal{N}_{sq}(P(AB|XY)) = \max_{x,y} \min_{z} I(A : B \downarrow E)_{(M_{E,F} \otimes M_{E,F})E}(P(AB|XYz)) \geq \max_{x,y} \min_{z} 0 = 0.$$  

(F7)

Now we have to show that for local boxes it is zero. Let us assume $P_L(AB|XY)$ is a local box i.e.  $\exists \lambda$, a hidden variable model, such that $P_L(AB|XY) = \sum_\lambda P(A|X,\lambda) \otimes P(B|Y,\lambda) P(\lambda)$. Which leads to an ensemble \{\(\rho(\lambda), P(A|X,\lambda) \otimes P(B|Y,\lambda)\}\} whose members are tensor product of local boxes, hence from Eq. (F5), we can directly write

$$\mathcal{N}_{sq}(P_L(AB|XY)) = \max_{x,y} \sum_{\lambda} \rho(\lambda) I(A : B)_{M_{E,F}^\lambda}(P(A|X,\lambda) \otimes P(B|Y,\lambda)) = 0.$$  

(F8)

□

2. Convexity

**Proposition 4.** $\mathcal{N}_{sq}(P)$ is a convex function, i.e., if $P(AB|XY)$ and $Q(AB|XY)$ are two bipartite non-signaling boxes lying in the same polytope, then the mixture

$$\mathcal{N}_{sq}(\lambda P(AB|XY) + (1 - \lambda) Q(AB|XY)) \leq \lambda \mathcal{N}_{sq}(P(AB|XY)) + (1 - \lambda) N_{sq}(Q(AB|XY)),$$

where $\lambda \in [0,1]$.

**Proof.** Consider the convex combination of the boxes

$$\mathcal{P}(AB|XY) = \lambda P(AB|XY) + (1 - \lambda) Q(AB|XY).$$  

(F10)

Assume an extension $\tilde{P}(ABE|A)$, of $\mathcal{P}(AB|XY)$, such that

$$\tilde{P}(ABE = 0|XY) = p(\Lambda = 0) \tilde{P}(ABE|XY)$$  

(F11)

$$\tilde{P}(ABE = 1|XY) = p(\Lambda = 1) \tilde{Q}(ABE|XY)$$  

(F12)

with $p(\Lambda = 0) = \lambda$ and $p(\Lambda = 1) = 1 - \lambda$. And we consider that the boxes $\tilde{P}(ABE|XY)$ and $\tilde{Q}(ABE|XY)$ are an arbitrary extension of the box $P(AB|XY)$ and $Q(AB|XY)$ respectively as discussed above.

Hence, from Eq. (F3), $\forall x,y$

$$\inf_{\mathcal{P}(AB|XY)} I(A : B|E)_{M_{E,F}^\lambda} \tilde{P}(ABE|XY) \leq I(A : B|E)_{M_{E,F}^\lambda} \tilde{P}(ABE|XY)$$

(F13)

$$= \lambda I(A : B|E)_{M_{E,F}^\lambda} \tilde{P}(ABE|XY) + (1 - \lambda) I(A : B|E)_{M_{E,F}^\lambda} \tilde{Q}(ABE|XY).$$  

(F14)

The above relation holds for an arbitrary extensions of $P$ and $Q$, i.e., for $\tilde{P}(AB|XY)$ and $\tilde{Q}(AB|XY)$, so it must also holds for the optimal extension of unary input in Eves side. Hence,

$$\inf_{\mathcal{P}(AB|XY)} I(A : B|E)_{M_{E,F}^\lambda} \tilde{P}(ABE|XY)$$

$$\leq \lambda \inf_{\tilde{P}(ABE|XY)} I(A : B|E)_{M_{E,F}^\lambda} \tilde{P}(ABE|XY) + (1 - \lambda) \inf_{\tilde{Q}(ABE|XY)} I(A : B|E)_{M_{E,F}^\lambda} \tilde{Q}(ABE|XY)$$  

(F15)
Consider the optimal fiducial measurements for $N_{sq}(P(AB|XY))$, as given in Eq. (F3), to be $x = \bar{x}$ and $y = \bar{y}$, hence
\[
N_{sq}(P(AB|XY)) = \max_{x,y} \inf_{P_{ABE|XY}} I(A:B|E)_{M_{x,y}^F,\tilde{P}(ABE|XY)}
\]
\[
= \inf_{P_{ABE|XY}} I(A:B|E)_{M_{x,y}^F,\tilde{P}(ABE|XY)}
\]
\[
(\text{I}) \leq \lambda \inf_{P_{ABE|XY}} I(A:B|E)_{M_{x,y}^F,\tilde{P}(ABE|XY)} + (1 - \lambda) \inf_{Q_{ABE|XY}} I(A:B|E)_{M_{x,y}^F,\tilde{Q}(ABE|XY)}.
\]
\[
(\text{II}) \leq \lambda N_{sq}(P(AB|XY)) + (1 - \lambda) N_{sq}(Q(AB|XY))
\]

(I) - We use (F15), with the optimal fiducial measurement for the L.H.S.
(II) - Here we use the fact that fiducial measurements $\bar{x}$ and $\bar{y}$, may not be the optimal for $N_{sq}(P(AB|XY))$ and $N_{sq}(Q(AB|XY))$.

\begin{figure}
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{fig4.png}
\caption{Schematic diagram of the LOPC operation, where the input of the boxes shared by the honest parties are chosen by a local randomizer $D^L(xy|x'y')$ as given in Eq. (F22). Similarly the outputs are also connected through a post processing channel $PC^L(a'b'|abxy)$ which also depends on the inputs $x,y$ and has a local hidden variable model as given in Eq. (F23).}
\end{figure}

3. Monotonic under RBLOPC class of operation\(^\text{10}\)

**Proposition 5.** The squashed non-locality of any non-signaling bipartite box $P$, follows the monotonicity properties.

\[
\forall \Omega_{LOPC}^x \quad N_{sq}(\Omega_{BLOPC}^x(P)) \leq N_{sq}(P)
\]

\[
(\text{F20})
\]

\[
\forall \Lambda_{RLOPC} \quad N_{sq}(\Lambda_{BLOPC}(P)) \leq N_{sq}(P)
\]

\[
(\text{F21})
\]

where $\Omega_{LOPC}^x$ is the local operation and public communication by the honest parties where $\Lambda_{BLOPC} \in \Omega_{LOPC}^x$ is an arbitrary RBLOPC operation, with adequate domain.

**Proof.** In this section, we are going prove that the squashed non-locality $N_{sq}(P)$, defined in Eq. (F5), of any bipartite non-signaling box $P \equiv P(AB|XY)$, shared between the honest parties Alice and Bob, where the random variables $X$ and $Y$ corresponds to the set of inputs and random variables $A$ and $B$ for the set of outputs for Alice and Bob respectively, is monotonic under the LOPC operation. The set of operations which comprises the LOPC operations, as discussed in Appendix A, can be summarized by a local random choices of the inputs followed by the classical post-processing of the output variables.

---

\(^{10}\) The result of this section is partially based on the analogous, but different result (see Section ??) for comparison of the models given in Ref. [36].
Suppose, the non-signaling box $P(AB|XY)$, shared by Alice and Bob and the eavesdropper holds the additional interfaces of the CE of $P(AB|XY) \rightarrow \mathcal{E}(P)(ABE|XYZ)$, and by using local randomness in her part (the input and output) she is able to access all possible ensembles $\{p_i, P_i(AB|XY)\} \in S^{all}(P)$, $\sum_i p_i P_i = P$.

In the LOPC operation the honest parties can choose their inputs $x$ and $y$ according to some conditional probability distribution, which can be the output of some local conditional boxes, say $\sum_{\lambda}^L \mathcal{E}(P)_{\lambda}(\cdot)$ (as depicted in Fig. 4). Obviously the cardinality of outputs of this box $|x|$ and $|y|$ are the same with the inputs of $P(AB|XY)$. Moreover,

$$D_{XY}^L(\cdot) = \sum_\lambda \mu(\lambda_1)D^1(x|x';\lambda_1)D^2(y|y';\lambda_1), \quad \text{(F22)}$$

where $\lambda_1 \in \Lambda_1$, is the local hidden variable and $\sum_\lambda \mu(\lambda) = 1$. This means that they have access to shared randomness $\mu(\lambda_1)$, depending on which each of them can roll some individual dice to choose the input. Similarly, the output is passed through a local postprocessing channel $PC_{A'B'|ABXY}(a'b'|abxy)$, which also depends on the inputs of the initial box as shown in Fig. 4. Additionally,

$$PC_{A'B'|ABXY}^L(a'b'|abxy) = \sum_\lambda \nu(\lambda_2)PC^1(a'|ax;\lambda_2)PC^2(b'|by;\lambda_2), \quad \text{(F23)}$$

with $\lambda_2 \in \Lambda_2$ and $\sum_\lambda \nu(\lambda) = 1$. Hence, the initial box $P(AB|XY)$ transform to $P'(A'B'|XY') = \Omega_{\text{LOPC}}^{xy}(P(AB|XY))$, with

$$P'(A'B'|XY', (a'b'|x'y') = \sum_{x'y'} D_{XY}^{L'}(x'y')(abxy) \sum_{\lambda} P_{AB}(ab|xy)PC_{A'B'|ABXY}^L(a'b'|abxy) \quad \text{(F24)}$$

$$= \sum_{x'y'} \sum_\lambda \mu(\lambda_1)D^1(x'|x_1)D^2(y'|y_1) \sum_{\lambda} P(ab|xy) \times \sum_\lambda \nu(\lambda_2)PC^1(a'|ax_2)PC^2(b'|by_2). \quad \text{(F25)}$$

Now the squashed non-locality, $\mathcal{N}_{sq}$ of the output box $P'$, is

$$\mathcal{N}_{sq}(P') = \bar{I}(A': B' \downarrow E)_{\mathcal{E}(P')}_{(A'B'E|X'Y'Z)}, \quad \text{(F26)}$$

$$= \max_{x'y'} \left\{ \inf_{p_i(\cdot), p_i(\cdot') \in S^{all}(P')} \sum_{i} p_i(I(A': B')_{p_i}) \right\} \quad \text{(F27)}$$

where $\mathcal{E}(P')(A'B'E|X'Y'Z)$, is the CE of the output box $P'(A'B'|XY') = \Omega_{\text{LOPC}}^{xy}(P_{AB|XY})$, and $S^{all}(P')$ is the all possible ensembles of $P'$.

Now consider the following tripartite box

$$\Omega_{\text{LOPC}}^{xy} \otimes I_E(E(P)(ABE|XYZ)) = \sum_{x'y'} D_{XY}^{L'}(x'y')(abxy) \sum_{\lambda} E(P)(abc|xyz)PC_{A'B'|ABXY}^{L'}(a'b'|abxy) \quad \text{(F28)}$$

$$= \sum_{x'y'} \sum_\lambda \mu(\lambda_1)D^1(x'|x_1)D^2(y'|y_1) \sum_{\lambda} E(P)(abc|xyz) \times \sum_\lambda \nu(\lambda_2)PC^1(a'|ax_2)PC^2(b'|by_2). \quad \text{(F29)}$$

Here $I_E$ means the identity operator in the Eve's subsystem. Recall that $E(P)$ is the CE of the initial box $P$.

Consider an ensemble $\{p(e|z)\mu(\lambda_1)\nu(\lambda_2), P_{e}\lambda_1\lambda_2(a'b'|x'y') \}$, where

$$P_{e}\lambda_1\lambda_2(a'b'|x'y') = \sum_{x'y'} D^1(x|x_1)D^2(y|y_1) \sum_{\lambda} P_{e}(ab|xy)PC^1(a'|ax_2)PC^2(b'|by_2). \quad \text{(F30)}$$

Now the above ensemble, will be an ensemble of $P'(A'B'|XY')$, if $\{p(e|z), P_{e}\lambda_1\lambda_2_{AB|XY} \}$ is an ensemble of $P(AB|XY)$, which we check below. Now $\{p(e|z), P_{e}\lambda_1\lambda_2_{AB|XY} \}$ can be an arbitrary ensemble, which is realized by Eve by performing
any general measurement and post-processing channel on the CE $\mathcal{E}(P)(ABE|XYZ)$. Indeed we have

$$\sum_{e \lambda_1 \lambda_2} p(e|z)\mu(\lambda_1)\nu(\lambda_2)P^{e \lambda_1 \lambda_2}(a'b'|x'y')$$

(F31)

$$= \sum_{e \lambda_1 \lambda_2} p(e|z)\mu(\lambda_1)\nu(\lambda_2) \sum_{xy} D^1(x|x'\lambda_1) D^2(y|y'\lambda_1) \sum_{ab} P^{e z}(ab|xy) PC^1(a'|ax\lambda_2) PC^2(b'|by\lambda_2)$$

(F32)

$$= \sum_{xy} \sum_{\lambda_1 \lambda_2} \mu(\lambda_1) D^1(x|x'\lambda_1) D^2(y|y'\lambda_1) \left( \sum_{e} p(e|z)P^{e z}(ab|xy) \right) \sum_{\lambda_2} \nu(\lambda_2) PC^1(a'|ax\lambda_2) PC^2(b'|by\lambda_2)$$

(F33)

$$= \sum_{xy} \sum_{\lambda_1} \mu(\lambda_1) D^1(x|x'\lambda_1) D^2(y|y'\lambda_1) \sum_{ab} P(ab|xy) \sum_{\lambda_2} \nu(\lambda_2) PC^1(a'|ax\lambda_2) PC^2(b'|by\lambda_2)$$

(F34)

$$= P_{A'B'|X'Y'}(a'b'|x'y'),$$

(F35)

by using Eq. (F25). As $\{p(e|z)\mu(\lambda_1)\nu(\lambda_2), P^{e \lambda_1 \lambda_2}(a'b'|x'y')\}$ is an ensemble of $P'$, hence

$$\forall x',y' \inf_{\{p_i,P_i\} \in S^{\text{all}}(P')} \sum_i p_i I(A':B')_{P_i} \leq \sum_{e \lambda_1 \lambda_2} p(e|z)\mu(\lambda_1)\nu(\lambda_2)I(A':B')_{P^{e \lambda_1 \lambda_2}(A'B'|X'=x',Y'=y')}(F36)$$

$$\leq \sum_{e \lambda_1 \lambda_2} p(e|z)\mu(\lambda_1)\nu(\lambda_2)I(AX:BY)_{P^{e \lambda_1 \lambda_2}(AXBY|X'=x',Y'=y')}(F37)$$

$$= \sum_{e \lambda_1} p(e|z)\mu(\lambda_1)\left( I(A:B|XY) + I(X:B|Y) + I(A:Y|X) + I(X:Y) \right)_{P^{e \lambda_1}(AXBY|X'=x',Y'=y')} (F38)$$

$$= \sum_{e \lambda_1} p(e|z)\mu(\lambda_1)I(A:B|XY)_{P^{e \lambda_1}(AXBY|X'=x',Y'=y')} (F39)$$

$$\leq \sum_{e \lambda_1 \lambda_2} p(e|z)\mu(\lambda_1)D^1(x|x'\lambda_1) D^2(y|y'\lambda_1)I(A:B)_{P^{e \lambda_1}(AB|X=x,Y=y,X'=x',Y'=y')} (F40)$$

(I) - In the second inequality we use the data processing inequality and the distribution $P^{e \lambda_1 \lambda_2}_{AXBY|X'=x',Y'=y'} = D^1(x|x'\lambda_1) D^2(y|y'\lambda_1) P^{e \lambda_1 \lambda_2}_{AB|XY}(ab|xy) \sum_{a'b'} PC^1(a'|ax\lambda_2) PC^2(b'|by\lambda_2)$ is independent of $\lambda_2$.

(II) - We use the chain rule of mutual information.

(III) - We use the fact that given $x'y'$ and $\lambda_1$, the random variables $X$ and $Y$ are independent, and $I(X:B|Y) = I(A:Y|X) = 0$, from the non-signaling condition.

(IV) - Where we use the fact that $P^{e \lambda_1}(AB|X=x,Y=y,X'=x',Y'=y') = P^{e \lambda_1}(AB|X=x,Y=y)$.

Now the R.H.S of the above inequality (F41) is true for an arbitrary ensemble $\{p(e|z), P^{e z}\} \in S^{\text{all}}(P)$, so it will still be true for taking infimum over all ensembles, hence we have

$$\max_{x'y'} \inf_{\{p_i,P_i\} \in S^{\text{all}}(P')} \sum_i p_i I(A':B')_{P_i(A'B'|X'=x',Y')} \leq \max_{x'y'} \inf_{\{p_i,P_i\} \in S^{\text{all}}(P')} \sum_i p_i I(A:B)_{P_i(AB|XY)}$$

(F42)

$$\Rightarrow \mathcal{N}_{sq}(\Omega_{\text{LOPC}}^{xy}(P)) \leq \mathcal{N}_{sq}(P).$$

(F43)

The restricted local operation and public communication $\Lambda_{\text{BLOPC}} \subset \Omega_{\text{BLOPC}}^{xy}$, hence

$$\mathcal{N}_{sq}(\Lambda_{\text{BLOPC}}(P)) \leq \mathcal{N}_{sq}(P)$$

(F44)

The above monotonicity property also holds for the squashed conditional mutual information $\hat{I}(A:B|E)_{\mathcal{E}(P)(ABE|XYZ)}$. \qed
4. Superadditivity and additivity\(^\text{11}\)

**Proposition 6.** If two bipartite non-signaling boxes \(P(A_1 B_1 | X_1 Y_1)\) and \(Q(A_2 B_2 | X_2 Y_2)\), are the marginals of a four partite non-signaling box \(P(A_1 A_2 B_1 B_2 | X_1 X_2 Y_1 Y_2)\), then the squashed non-locality \(N_{sq}\) is superadditive, i.e.,

\[
N_{sq}(\tilde{P}(A_1 A_2 B_1 B_2 | X_1 X_2 Y_1 Y_2)) \geq N_{sq}(P(A_1 B_1 | X_1 Y_1)) + N_{sq}(Q(A_2 B_2 | X_2 Y_2)),
\]

and additive for tensor product of boxes \(P(A_1 B_1 | X_1 Y_1) \otimes Q(A_2 B_2 | X_2 Y_2)\),

\[
N_{sq}(P(A_1 B_1 | X_1 Y_1) \otimes Q(A_2 B_2 | X_2 Y_2)) = N_{sq}(P(A_1 B_1 | X_1 Y_1)) + N_{sq}(Q(A_2 B_2 | X_2 Y_2)).
\]

**Proof.** **Superadditivity of joint box:** Let's consider two boxes \(P(A_1 B_1 | X_1 Y_1)\) and \(Q(A_2 B_2 | X_2 Y_2)\), which are the marginals of a big four party non-signaling box \(P(A_1 A_2 B_1 B_2 | X_1 X_2 Y_1 Y_2)\), i.e.,

\[
\sum_{a_1 b_1} \tilde{P}(a_1, a_2, b_1, b_2 | x_1, x_2, y_1, y_2) = \tilde{P}(a_1, b_1 | x_1, y_1) \quad \forall a_1, b_1, x_1, x_2, y_1, y_2 \quad (F47)
\]

\[
\sum_{a_1 b_1} \tilde{P}(a_1, a_2, b_1, b_2 | x_1, x_2, y_1, y_2) = Q(a_2, b_2 | x_2, y_2) \quad \forall a_2, b_2, x_2, y_2, \quad (F48)
\]

where \(\tilde{P}(A_1 = a_1, A_2 = a_2, B_1 = b_1, B_2 = b_2 | X_1 = x_1, X_2 = x_2, Y_1 = y_1, Y_2 = y_2) = \tilde{P}(a_1, a_2, b_1, b_2 | x_1, x_2, y_1, y_2) = \tilde{P}(a_1, b_1 | x_1, y_1)\) and \(Q(a_2, b_2 | x_2, y_2) = Q(a_2 | x_2, y_2)\). Moreover, \(\tilde{P}(A_1 A_2 B_1 B_2 | X_1 X_2 Y_1 Y_2)\) is also non-signaling among all of its parties. And the box \(P(A_1 A_2 B_1 B_2 | X_1 X_2 Y_1 Y_2)\) is non-signaling in all of its part as defined in Eqs. (A1) and (A2).

Now consider an arbitrary non-signaling extension of \(P(A_1 A_2 B_1 B_2 | X_1 X_2 Y_1 Y_2) \rightarrow \tilde{P}(A_1 A_2 B_1 B_2 | X_1 X_2 Y_1 Y_2 Z)\), with unary input \(Z\) in the extended part. As the input is unary so the non-signaling condition is automatic, and we can omit the \(Z\). The conditional mutual information, of the distribution after performing any arbitrary fiducial measurements \(M_{x_1, y_1}^F \otimes M_{x_2, y_2}^F\) on the inputs \(X_1, X_2, Y_1, Y_2\),

\[
\forall x_1, x_2, y_1, y_2, \\
I(A_1 A_2 : B_1 B_2 | E)(M_{x_1, y_1}^F \otimes M_{x_2, y_2}^F) \tilde{P}(A_1 A_2 B_1 B_2 | E | X_1 X_2 Y_1 Y_2) \quad (F49)
\]

\[
(I) \quad (I(A_1 : B_1 | E) + I(A_2 : B_1 | EA_1) + I(A_1 : B_2 | EB_1) + I(A_2 : B_2 | EA_1 B_1))(M_{x_1, y_1}^F \otimes M_{x_2, y_2}^F) \tilde{P}(A_1 A_2 B_1 B_2 | E | X_1 X_2 Y_1 Y_2) \quad (F50)
\]

\[
(Ii) \quad \geq I(A_1 : B_1 | E)M_{x_1, y_1}^F \tilde{P}(A_1 B_1 | E | X_1 Y_1) + I(A_2 : B_2 | EA_1 B_1)(M_{x_1, y_1}^F \otimes M_{x_2, y_2}^F) \tilde{P}(A_1 A_2 B_1 B_2 | E | X_1 X_2 Y_1 Y_2) \quad (F51)
\]

(I) - We use the chain rule of mutual information.

(II) - Positivity condition of mutual information, and \(M_{x_1, y_1}^F, M_{x_2, y_2}^F\) \(\tilde{P}(A_1 B_1 | E | X_1 Y_1)\) is the marginals of the box \((M_{x_1, y_1}^F \otimes M_{x_2, y_2}^F) \tilde{P}(A_1 A_2 B_1 B_2 | E | X_1 X_2 Y_1 Y_2)\) after the fiducial measurements on the inputs. And recall that

\[
(M_{x_1, y_1}^F \otimes M_{x_2, y_2}^F) \tilde{P}(A_1 A_2 B_1 B_2 | E | X_1 X_2 Y_1 Y_2) = \tilde{P}(A_1 A_2 B_1 B_2 | E | X_1, X_2 = x_2, Y_1 = y_1, Y_2 = y_2) \quad (F50)
\]

Notice that \(\tilde{P}(A_1 B_1 | E | X_1 Y_1)\) is an arbitrary extension of \(P(A_1 B_1 | X_1 Y_1)\) and similarly \(\tilde{P}(A_1 A_2 B_1 B_2 | E | X_1 X_2 Y_1 Y_2)\) is for the box \(Q(A_1 B_1 | E | X_1 Y_1)\), hence we can write

\[
\forall x_1, x_2, y_1, y_2, \\
I(A_1 : B_1 | E)M_{x_1, y_1}^F \tilde{P}(A_1 B_1 | E | X_1 Y_1) \geq \inf \tilde{P}(A_1 B_1 | E | X_1 Y_1) I(A_1 : B_1 | E)M_{x_1, y_1}^F \tilde{P}(A_1 B_1 | E | X_1 Y_1), \quad (F52)
\]

\[
I(A_2 : B_2 | EA_1 B_1)(M_{x_1, y_1}^F \otimes M_{x_2, y_2}^F) \tilde{P}(A_1 A_2 B_1 B_2 | E | X_1 X_2 Y_1 Y_2) \geq \inf Q(A_2 B_2 | E | X_2 Y_2) I(A_2 : B_2 | E)M_{x_2, y_2}^F \tilde{Q}(A_2 B_2 | E | X_2 Y_2). \quad (F53)
\]

From relations (F50), (F52) and (F53), we have

\[
\forall x_1, x_2, y_1, y_2, \\
I(A_1 A_2 : B_1 B_2 | E)(M_{x_1, y_1}^F \otimes M_{x_2, y_2}^F) \tilde{P}(A_1 A_2 B_1 B_2 | E | X_1 X_2 Y_1 Y_2) \geq \inf \tilde{P}(A_1 B_1 | E | X_1 Y_1) I(A_1 : B_1 | E)M_{x_1, y_1}^F \tilde{P}(A_1 B_1 | E | X_1 Y_1) + \inf Q(A_2 B_2 | E | X_2 Y_2) I(A_2 : B_2 | E)M_{x_2, y_2}^F \tilde{Q}(A_2 B_2 | E | X_2 Y_2). \quad (F54)
\]

\(^{11}\) The result of this section is partially based on the analogous, but different result (see Section ?? for comparison of the models) given in Ref. [36].
The above relation holds for all extension of $\bar{P}(A_1A_2B_1B_2|X_1X_2Y_1Y_2)$, hence for optimal extension on the L.H.S, so one can have

$$\forall x_1, x_2, y_1, y_2, \quad \inf_{\bar{P}(A_1B_1A_2B_2E|X_1X_2Y_1Y_2)} I(A_1A_2 : B_1B_2|E)_{(\mathcal{M}_{x_1,y_1}^F \otimes \mathcal{M}_{x_2,y_2}^F)} \bar{P}(A_1A_2B_1B_2E|X_1X_2Y_1Y_2)$$

$$\geq \inf_{\bar{P}(A_1B_1E|X_1Y_1)} I(A_1 : B_1|E)_{\mathcal{M}_{x_1}^F} \bar{P}(A_1B_1E|X_1Y_1) + \inf_{Q(A_2B_2E|X_2Y_2)} I(A_2 : B_2|E)_{\mathcal{M}_{x_2}^F} Q(A_2B_2E|X_2Y_2).$$

(F55)

Suppose, $\bar{x}_1, \bar{y}_1$ are the optimal fiducial measurement choice for $\mathcal{N}_{sq}(P)$ and $\bar{x}_2, \bar{y}_2$ is for $\mathcal{N}_{sq}(Q)$, i.e.,

$$\mathcal{N}_{sq}(P(A_1B_1|X_1Y_1)) = \max_{x_1,y_1} \inf_{\bar{P}(A_1B_1E|X_1Y_1)} I(A_1 : B_1|E)_{\mathcal{M}_{x_1,y_1}^F} \bar{P}(A_1B_1E|X_1Y_1)$$

$$= \inf_{\bar{P}(A_1B_1E|X_1Y_1)} I(A_1 : B_1|E)_{\mathcal{M}_{x_1,y_1}^F} \bar{P}(A_1B_1E|X_1Y_1).$$

(F56)

and

$$\mathcal{N}_{sq}(Q(A_2B_2|X_2Y_2)) = \max_{x_2,y_2} \inf_{\bar{P}(A_2B_2E|X_2Y_2)} I(A_2 : B_2|E)_{\mathcal{M}_{x_2,y_2}^F} \bar{Q}(A_2B_2E|X_2Y_2)$$

$$= \inf_{\bar{Q}(A_2B_2E|X_2Y_2)} I(A_2 : B_2|E)_{\mathcal{M}_{x_2,y_2}^F} \bar{Q}(A_2B_2E|X_2Y_2).$$

(F57)

Finally,

$$\mathcal{N}_{sq}(\bar{P}(A_1B_1A_2B_2|X_1X_2Y_1Y_2))$$

$$= \max_{x_1,y_1,x_2,y_2} \inf_{\bar{P}(A_1B_1A_2B_2E|X_1X_2Y_1Y_2)} I(A_1A_2 : B_1B_2|E)_{(\mathcal{M}_{x_1,y_1}^F \otimes \mathcal{M}_{x_2,y_2}^F)} \bar{P}(A_1A_2B_1B_2E|X_1X_2Y_1Y_2)$$

(F58)

$$\geq \inf_{\bar{P}(A_1B_1A_2B_2E|X_1X_2Y_1Y_2)} I(A_1A_2 : B_1B_2|E)_{(\mathcal{M}_{x_1,y_1}^F \otimes \mathcal{M}_{x_2,y_2}^F)} \bar{P}(A_1A_2B_1B_2E|X_1X_2Y_1Y_2)$$

(F59)

$$\geq \inf_{\bar{P}(A_1B_1E|X_1Y_1)} I(A_1 : B_1|E)_{\mathcal{M}_{x_1,y_1}^F} \bar{P}(A_1B_1E|X_1Y_1) + \inf_{\bar{Q}(A_2B_2E|X_2Y_2)} I(A_2 : B_2|E)_{\mathcal{M}_{x_2,y_2}^F} \bar{Q}(A_2B_2E|X_2Y_2),$$

(F60)

$$\geq \mathcal{N}_{sq}(P(A_1B_1|X_1Y_1)) + \mathcal{N}_{sq}(Q(A_2B_2|X_2Y_2)).$$

(F61)

(1) - We use an specific choice of fiducial measurement, $\mathcal{M}_{x_1,y_1}^F \otimes \mathcal{M}_{x_2,y_2}^F$, which may not be optimal for box $\bar{P}(A_1B_1A_2B_2|X_1X_2Y_1Y_2)$.

(II) - Using Eq. (F55) for the fiducial measurements $\mathcal{M}_{x_1,y_1}^F \otimes \mathcal{M}_{x_2,y_2}^F$.

(III) - Using Eqs. (F56) and (F57).

Additivity for Tensor product of boxes: Let consider that the joint non-signaling four party box (two random variables for input and output in part of the honest parties) is the tensor product [50], of two bipartite boxes i.e.,

$$\bar{P}(A_1B_1A_2B_2|X_1X_2Y_1Y_2) = \bar{P}(A_1B_1|X_1Y_1) \otimes \bar{Q}(A_2B_2|X_2Y_2)$$

(F62)

Now consider the (non-signaling) extensions with unary inputs of both the boxes, $P(A_1B_1|X_1Y_1) \rightarrow \bar{P}(A_1B_1E_1|X_1Y_1)$ and $Q(A_2B_2E_2|X_2Y_2) \rightarrow \bar{Q}(A_2B_2E_2|X_2Y_2)$, which are the optimal extension for calculating $\mathcal{N}_{sq}$ for both the boxes, as given in Eq. (F3), $\forall x, y$. Hence, their tensor product $\bar{P}(A_1B_1E_1|X_1Y_1) \otimes \bar{Q}(A_2B_2E_2|X_2Y_2)$ is an extension of $\bar{P}(A_1B_1A_2B_2|X_1X_2Y_1Y_2)$, which may not be optimal one, resulting

$$\forall x_1, x_2, y_1, y_2,$$

$$\inf_{\bar{P}(A_1B_1A_2B_2E|X_1X_2Y_1Y_2)} I(A_1A_2 : B_1B_2|E)_{(\mathcal{M}_{x_1,y_1}^F \otimes \mathcal{M}_{x_2,y_2}^F)} \bar{P}(A_1A_2B_1B_2E|X_1X_2Y_1Y_2)$$

$$\leq I(A_1A_2 : B_1B_2|E_1E_2)_{(\mathcal{M}_{x_1,y_1}^F \otimes \mathcal{M}_{x_2,y_2}^F)} \bar{P}(A_1B_1E_1|X_1Y_1) \otimes \bar{Q}(A_2B_2E_2|X_2Y_2)$$

$$= I(A_1 : B_1|E_1)_{\mathcal{M}_{x_1,y_1}^F} \bar{P}(A_1B_1E_1|X_1Y_1) + I(A_2 : B_2|E_2)_{\mathcal{M}_{x_2,y_2}^F} \bar{Q}(A_2B_2E_2|X_2Y_2)$$

$$= \inf_{\bar{P}(A_1B_1E_1|X_1Y_1)} I(A_1 : B_1|E_1)_{\mathcal{M}_{x_1,y_1}^F} \bar{P}(A_1B_1E_1|X_1Y_1) + \inf_{\bar{Q}(A_2B_2E_2|X_2Y_2)} I(A_2 : B_2|E_2)_{\mathcal{M}_{x_2,y_2}^F} \bar{Q}(A_2B_2E_2|X_2Y_2).$$

(F63)
Let us now consider the optimal fiducial measurements, \( M_{\xi_1, \tilde{g}_1} \otimes M_{\xi_2, \tilde{g}_2} \), in the L.H.S of the above relation, hence

\[
\mathcal{N}_{sq}(P(A_1 B_1 | X_1 Y_1) \otimes Q(A_2 B_2 | X_2 Y_2)) = \max_{x_1, x_2, y_1, y_2} \inf \rho(A_1 B_1 A_2 B_2 E | X_1 X_2 Y_1 Y_2) \leq I(A_1 A_2 : B_1 B_2 | E)_{(M_{\xi_1, \tilde{g}_1} \otimes M_{\xi_2, \tilde{g}_2})} \rho(A_1 A_2 B_1 B_2 E | X_1 X_2 Y_1 Y_2) (F66)
\]

\[
= \inf_{P(A_1 B_1 A_2 B_2 E | X_1 X_2 Y_1 Y_2)} I(A_1 A_2 : B_1 B_2 | E)_{(M_{\xi_1, \tilde{g}_1} \otimes M_{\xi_2, \tilde{g}_2})} \rho(A_1 A_2 B_1 B_2 E | X_1 X_2 Y_1 Y_2) (F67)
\]

\[
\leq \inf_{P(A_1 B_1 E_1 | X_1 Y_1)} I(A_1 : B_1 | E_1)_{M_{\xi_1, \tilde{g}_1}} P(A_1 B_1 E_1 | X_1 Y_1) + \inf_{Q(A_2 B_2 E_2 | X_2 Y_2)} I(A_2 : B_2 | E_2)_{M_{\xi_2, \tilde{g}_2}} Q(A_2 B_2 E_2 | X_2 Y_2) (F68)
\]

\[
= \max_{x_1, y_1} \inf_{P(A_1 B_1 E_1 | X_1 Y_1)} I(A_1 : B_1 | E_1)_{M_{\xi_1, \tilde{g}_1}} P(A_1 B_1 E_1 | X_1 Y_1) + \max_{x_2, y_2} \inf_{Q(A_2 B_2 E_2 | X_2 Y_2)} I(A_2 : B_2 | E_2)_{M_{\xi_2, \tilde{g}_2}} Q(A_2 B_2 E_2 | X_2 Y_2) (F69)
\]

\[
= \mathcal{N}_{sq}(P(A_1 B_1 | X_1 Y_1)) + \mathcal{N}_{sq}(Q(A_2 B_2 | X_2 Y_2)). (F70)
\]

Using relation (F61), we finish the proof with equality,

\[
\mathcal{N}_{sq}(P(A_1 B_1 | X_1 Y_1) \otimes Q(A_2 B_2 | X_2 Y_2)) = \mathcal{N}_{sq}(P(A_1 B_1 | X_1 Y_1)) + \mathcal{N}_{sq}(Q(A_2 B_2 | X_2 Y_2)). (F71)
\]

\[
\square
\]

5. Asymptotic continuity of the squashed non-locality

**Proposition 7.** If two non-signaling boxes \( P \) and \( Q \) are \( \epsilon \) close to each other, according to the box norm, where \( \epsilon > 0 \), arbitrarily small, then their squashed non-locality, \( \mathcal{N}_{sq} \) are nearby

\[
| \mathcal{N}_{sq}(P(AB|XY)) - \mathcal{N}_{sq}(Q(AB|XY)) | \leq K_1 \epsilon \log d_{AB} + O(\epsilon) (F72)
\]

where \( d_{AB} \) is the dimension of the variables \( AB \), in particular the cardinality of the random variable \( A \) and \( B \). \( K_1 \) is a constant and \( O(\epsilon) \) is a function of \( \epsilon \) independent of dimension \( d_{AB} \) which converges to 0 when \( \epsilon \to 0 \).

**Proof.** The box norm given in Definition 1, is

\[
\| P'(ABE|XYZ) - Q'(ABE|XYZ) \|_{BOX} = \sup_{O} \frac{1}{2} \| O(P')(ABE) - O(Q')(ABE) \|_1, (F73)
\]

where \( O \) is the class of operations including general measurements, wiring, input-randomness and post-processing. In the following proof, we only consider the restricted norm, which optimize over only the measurements \( \mathcal{M} \).

\[
\| P'(ABE|XYZ) - Q'(ABE|XYZ) \|_{res}^{BOX} = \sup_{\mathcal{M}} \frac{1}{2} \| M(P')(ABE) - M(Q')(ABE) \|_1, (F74)
\]

By \( \mathcal{M} \), we mean those set of measurements which map a tripartite box to a tripartite probability distribution. And this restricted norm, which consider only the measurement \( \mathcal{M} \equiv \hat{O} \subset O \) is a lower bound of the one above i.e,

\[
\| P'(ABE|XYZ) - Q'(ABE|XYZ) \|_{res}^{BOX} = \sup_{\hat{O} \subset O} \frac{1}{2} \| \hat{O}(P')(ABE) - \hat{O}(Q')(ABE) \|_1 (F75)
\]

\[
\| P'(ABE|XYZ) - Q'(ABE|XYZ) \|_{BOX} = \sup_{O \subset O} \frac{1}{2} \| O(P')(ABE) - O(Q')(ABE) \|_1 = \| P'(ABE|XYZ) - Q'(ABE|XYZ) \|_{BOX} (F76)
\]

With respect to this restricted box norm we have the following lemmas.

**Lemma 6** (Proximity in squashed intrinsic mutual information). The squashed intrinsic mutual information \( \hat{I}(A : B \downarrow E) \), of two tripartite non-signaling boxes \( P'(ABE|XYZ) \) and \( Q'(ABE|XYZ) \) are nearby

\[
\| \hat{I}(A : B \downarrow E)_{P'(ABE|XYZ)} - \hat{I}(A : B \downarrow E)_{Q'(ABE|XYZ)} \| \leq K_1 \epsilon \log d_{AB} + O(\epsilon), (F77)
\]

provided \( \| P'(ABE|XYZ) - Q'(ABE|XYZ) \|_{res}^{BOX} = \hat{\epsilon} \), where \( K_1 \) is a constant and \( O(\epsilon) \) is a function of \( \epsilon \) which converges to 0 as \( \epsilon \to 0 \), and independent of the dimension \( d_{AB} \).
Now as \( ||P'(ABE|XYZ)-Q'(ABE|XYZ)||^\text{res}_\text{box} = \tilde{\epsilon} \), implies that

\[
\forall \mathcal{M} \quad \frac{1}{2} ||\mathcal{M}(P')(ABE) - \mathcal{M}(Q')(ABE)||_1 \leq \tilde{\epsilon}.
\]  

(F79)

From the definition of squashing, given in Eq. (27), to calculate \( \hat{I}(A:B \downarrow E) \) of any tripartite box we need to consider only the following class of measurements \( \mathcal{M} \equiv \mathcal{M}^F_{x,y} \otimes \mathcal{M}^G_{z} \), i.e., fiducial measurements in part of first two parties and general for the third one. Which directly leads us to write

\[
\forall \mathcal{M} \quad ||I(A:B \downarrow E)_{\mathcal{M}(P')(ABE)} - I(A:B \downarrow E)_{\mathcal{M}(Q')(ABE)}|| \leq K_1 \tilde{\epsilon} \log d_{AB} + O(\epsilon).
\]  

(F80)

Here we absorb the factor 2, in the constant \( K_1 \).

Now define the squashed intrinsic mutual information, as given in Definition 4,

\[
\hat{I}(A:B \downarrow E)_{P'(ABE|XYZ)} = \max_{x,y} \min_z I(A:B \downarrow E)_{(\mathcal{M}^F_{x,y} \otimes \mathcal{M}^G_{z})P(ABE|XYZ)}.
\]  

(F81)

where the action of measurement \( (\mathcal{M}^F_{x,y} \otimes \mathcal{M}^G_{z}) \) on any tripartite box is given in Eq. (28). Moreover, in our cryptographic scenario Eve chooses her input \( z \) after getting the information of the measurement choices \( x \) and \( y \) of the honest parties, hence expressing optimum \( z \) as a function of \( x, y \) is consistent, i.e., for some functions \( f, g : (x, y) \rightarrow z \), one has

\[
\forall x, y \quad \min_z \max_{x,y} I(A:B \downarrow E)_{(\mathcal{M}^F_{x,y} \otimes \mathcal{M}^G_{z})P(ABE|XYZ)} := I(A:B \downarrow E)_{(\mathcal{M}^F_{x,y} \otimes \mathcal{M}^G_{z})P(ABE|XYZ)},
\]  

(F82)

\[
\forall x, y \quad \min_z \max_{x,y} I(A:B \downarrow E)_{(\mathcal{M}^F_{x,y} \otimes \mathcal{M}^G_{z})Q(ABE|XYZ)} := I(A:B \downarrow E)_{(\mathcal{M}^F_{x,y} \otimes \mathcal{M}^G_{z})Q(ABE|XYZ)}.
\]  

(F83)

Suppose \( \hat{I}(A:B \downarrow E)_{P'(ABE|XYZ)} \leq \hat{I}(A:B \downarrow E)_{Q'(ABE|XYZ)} \), hence for all \( x, y \) and \( z = f(x, y) \), we have

\[
||I(A:B \downarrow E)_{(\mathcal{M}^F_{x,y} \otimes \mathcal{M}^G_{z=f(x,y)})P'(ABE|XYZ)} - I(A:B \downarrow E)_{(\mathcal{M}^F_{x,y} \otimes \mathcal{M}^G_{z=f(x,y)})Q'(ABE|XYZ)}|| \leq K_1 \tilde{\epsilon} \log d_{AB} + O(\epsilon)\]  

(F84)

\[
\Rightarrow \max_{x,y} ||I(A:B \downarrow E)_{(\mathcal{M}^F_{x,y} \otimes \mathcal{M}^G_{z=f(x,y)})P'(ABE|XYZ)} - I(A:B \downarrow E)_{(\mathcal{M}^F_{x,y} \otimes \mathcal{M}^G_{z=f(x,y)})Q'(ABE|XYZ)}|| \leq K_1 \tilde{\epsilon} \log d_{AB} + O(\epsilon)\]  

(F85)

Now

\[
\max_{x,y} ||I(A:B \downarrow E)_{(\mathcal{M}^F_{x,y} \otimes \mathcal{M}^G_{z=f(x,y)})P'(ABE|XYZ)} - I(A:B \downarrow E)_{(\mathcal{M}^F_{x,y} \otimes \mathcal{M}^G_{z=f(x,y)})Q'(ABE|XYZ)}|| \geq \max_{x,y} ||I(A:B \downarrow E)_{(\mathcal{M}^F_{x,y} \otimes \mathcal{M}^G_{z=f(x,y)})P'(ABE|XYZ)} - I(A:B \downarrow E)_{(\mathcal{M}^F_{x,y} \otimes \mathcal{M}^G_{z=f(x,y)})Q'(ABE|XYZ)}||
\]  

(F86)

\[
\max_{x,y} ||I(A:B \downarrow E)_{(\mathcal{M}^F_{x,y} \otimes \mathcal{M}^G_{z=f(x,y)})P'(ABE|XYZ)} - I(A:B \downarrow E)_{(\mathcal{M}^F_{x,y} \otimes \mathcal{M}^G_{z=f(x,y)})Q'(ABE|XYZ)}|| \leq \max_x \Theta(x) - \max_x \Phi(x)
\]  

(F87)

\[
\hat{I}(A:B \downarrow E)_{P'(ABE|XYZ)} - \max_{x,y} I(A:B \downarrow E)_{(\mathcal{M}^F_{x,y} \otimes \mathcal{M}^G_{z=f(x,y)})Q'(ABE|XYZ)}.
\]  

(F88)

(I) - We use the fact that for two functions \( \Theta(x) \) and \( \Phi(x) \),

\[
\Theta(x) \leq |\Theta(x) - \Phi(x)| + \Phi(x),
\]  

(F89)

\[
\max_x \Theta(x) \leq \max_x (|\Theta(x) - \Phi(x)| + \Phi(x)),
\]  

(F90)

\[
\leq \max_x (\Theta(x) - \Phi(x)) \leq \max_x (\Phi(x)
\]  

(F91)

\[
\max \Theta(x) - \max \Phi(x) \leq \max_x (\Theta(x) - \Phi(x)),
\]  

(F92)

similarly

\[
\max \Phi(x) - \max \Theta(x) \leq \max_x (\Theta(x) - \Phi(x)),
\]  

(F93)

\[
\Rightarrow \max_x (\Theta(x) - \max \Phi(x)) \leq \max_x (\Theta(x) - \Phi(x)).
\]  

(F94)
On the other hand
\[
\max_{x,y} I(A : B \downarrow E)(\mathcal{M}_{x,y} \otimes \mathcal{M}'_{x,y})p'(ABE|XYZ) \geq \max_{x,y} \min_{z} I(A : B \downarrow E)(\mathcal{M}_{x,y} \otimes \mathcal{M}'_{z,y})p'(ABE|XYZ) \quad \text{(F95)}
\]
\[
\hat{I}(A : B \downarrow E)_{\mathcal{E}}(ABE|XYZ) = \hat{I}(A : B \downarrow E)_{Q'}(ABE|XYZ) \quad \text{(F96)}
\]

Note that, if one consider the covers scenario i.e., \(\hat{I}(A : B \downarrow E)p'(ABE|XYZ) \geq \hat{I}(A : B \downarrow E)q'(ABE|XYZ)\), then the proof is identical with \(f\) replaced by \(g\). Combining Eqs. (F85), (F88) and (F96) we got the desired result.

\[
\square
\]

**Corollary 6** (About overcomplete extension). Squashed intrinsic mutual information \(\hat{I}(A : B \downarrow E)\) is invariant under the use of complete extension \(\mathcal{E}(P)(ABE|XYZ)\) to overcomplete extension \(\hat{\mathcal{E}}(P)(ABE|XYZ)\) of any bipartite non-signaling box \(P(AB|XY)\).

**Proof.** Before we start the proof, we should recall the idea of the complete extension (CE) and overcomplete extension (OCE) of any bipartite box as given in Ref. [1]. An extension \(P(AB|XY) \rightarrow \mathcal{E}(P)(ABE|XYZ)\), will be called CE, if corresponds to each input \(Z = z\), of the extending party, the box \(P(AB|XY)\) partitioned to a pure members ensemble \(\{p(e|z), p^e(z)(AB|XY)\}\), which is minimal according to the Definition 7. On the other hand the extension \(P(AB|XY) \rightarrow \hat{\mathcal{E}}(P)(ABE|XYZ)\) will be called OCE if the pure members ensembles (PME) corresponds to each inputs are not minimal. And from Theorem 3 of Ref. [1], any pure members ensembles can be created by applying input randomizer (local randomness) on the input \(Z\) of the extended system. In particular we want to consider in this scenario those OCE, which can be transformed to any arbitrary extension, those OCE which can not possess this property, we just call them some general extension. Hence, there exists an operation \(\hat{\Omega}\), on the OCE of the bipartite box, which comprises the input randomizer followed by classical post-processing channel, such that
\[
\hat{I}(\hat{\mathcal{E}}(P)(ABE|XYZ)) = \mathcal{E}(P)(ABE|XYZ) \quad \text{(F97)}
\]
From Eq. (F5) it is clear that
\[
\hat{I}(A : B \downarrow E)_{\mathcal{E}}(ABE|XYZ) = \max_{x,y} \inf_{\{p_i, p^i\} \in S^{alt}} \sum_i p_i I(A : B)_{p^i} \quad \text{(F98)}
\]
where \(S^{alt}\) is the all possible ensembles of the non-signaling box \(P(AB|XY)\). Which is obtained by performing all possible kind of measurements, fiducial (deterministic choices of input) and general (probabilistic choices of fiducial measurements) on the extending part of the CE of the given box, followed by a post processing channel.

Now the general measurement on the CE of the extending party probabilistically creates all possible minimal ensemble of \(P(AB|XY)\). Resulting all possible mixture of minimal ensembles or all possible set of PME which can be consider as the fiducial measurements on some OCE \(P \rightarrow \hat{\mathcal{E}}(P)\). Hence, using the post-processing channel \(P_{E'|E}\) on the output \(E\), and general measurements on the inputs once again generates all possible ensembles \(S^{alt}\), (as another choice of general measurement on OCE basically made all possible PME from all PME), which leads us to write
\[
\hat{I}(A : B \downarrow E)_{\hat{\mathcal{E}}(P)}(ABE|XYZ) = \hat{I}(A : B \downarrow E)_{\mathcal{E}}(P)(ABE|XYZ) \quad \text{(F99)}
\]

\[
\square
\]

**Generation of overcomplete extension**

In the earlier section we discuss about the OCE of some bipartite box \(P\), which produces all possible pure members ensembles, for fiducial choices of inputs. But for a given box there are infinitely many pure members ensembles which can only be produces by a OCE which contains continuous choices of input randomizer (all possible dices). But that go beyond our investigation of box. Here we will generates only some class of OCE of boxes which satisfies Eq. (F99).

Suppose we have two non-signaling box \(P(AB|XY)\) and \(Q(AB|XY)\), which are \(\epsilon\) close to each other according to the restricted norm defined in Eq. (F74), i.e., \(||P - Q||_{BOX}^{\epsilon} = \epsilon\). We want to construct the OCE of both the boxes, such that there dimension matches.

It is very clear that for two boxes \(P(AB|XY)\) and \(Q(AB|XY)\), belong to the same polytope, however their CE’s, \(\mathcal{E}(P)(ABE|XYZ)\) and \(\mathcal{E}(Q)(ABE|XYZ)\) may not lie in the same polytope (see Sec. IV of Ref. [1]). The complete extension is such that, corresponding to each input \(z \in Z\), of the extending party, the box \(P(AB|XY)\) decomposes to the minimal ensemble \(\{p(e|z), V^e_P(AB|XY)\}\) for \(\mathcal{E}(P)(ABE|XYZ)\) and \(\{q(e|z), V^e_Q(AB|XY)\}\) for \(\mathcal{E}(Q)(ABE|XYZ)\). Here \(V^e_P\) is the vertex corresponds to each output \(e \in E\) for \(P\), when \(z\) is pressed. \(|Z|_{\mathcal{E}(P)},|Z|_{\mathcal{E}(Q)}\)
is the cardinality of inputs of the extending party of the CE of box $P$, and $|E|_{\mathcal{E}(P)}(z)$, is the cardinality of outputs corresponding to each input $z \in Z$. Similarly, the notations, $V^{e(z)}_Q$, $|Z|_{\mathcal{E}(Q)}$, $|E|_{\mathcal{E}(Q)}(z)$ bears the same meaning for box $Q$.

Here one thing to notice that $|Z|_{\mathcal{E}(P)}$ and $|Z|_{\mathcal{E}(Q)}$ depend on the number of minimal ensembles the box $P$ and $Q$ have, and in general $|Z|_{\mathcal{E}(P)} \neq |Z|_{\mathcal{E}(Q)}$. Similarly, $|E|_{\mathcal{E}(P)}(z) \neq |E|_{\mathcal{E}(Q)}(z)$, for a generic $z$, for any particular choice of the inputs. But to construct the RBLOPC box norm between the extensions of the given boxes, we need both of them to be in the same polytope with same cardinality of input and output. To construct these we follow the following prescription:

- **For $|E|_{\mathcal{E}(P)} = |E|_{\mathcal{E}(Q)}$:** If one consider labeling the output of the extending system to the vertices by a bijective mapping, i.e., $e \rightarrow V^e(AB|XY)$ irrespective of the input $z \in Z$, then we have $|E|_{\mathcal{E}(P)} = |E|_{\mathcal{E}(Q)} = D$, with $D$ being the total number of vertices.

- **For $|Z|_{\mathcal{E}(P)} = |Z|_{\mathcal{E}(Q)}$:** Construct an OCE of the box $P$ and $Q$ to $\tilde{\mathcal{E}}(P)$ and $\tilde{\mathcal{E}}(Q)$ respectively, with the help of their CE, such that the cardinality of the input, satisfies $|Z|_{\tilde{\mathcal{E}}(P)} = |Z|_{\mathcal{E}(P)} + |Z|_{\mathcal{E}(Q)} = |Z|_{\tilde{\mathcal{E}}(Q)}$.

Corresponding to each $z = z_i \in Z$ of the $\mathcal{E}(P)$, with $1 \leq i \leq |Z|_{\mathcal{E}(P)}$, choose a probability distribution $\{\lambda_{z_i}(\omega)\}$, $\sum_{\omega} \lambda_{z_i}(\omega) = 1$, to mix all the minimal ensembles of $Q$, generated from $\mathcal{E}(Q)$, and create a pure
Lemma 7. The restricted box norm of the OCE’s of the two bipartite boxes, generated by the above mentioned way, can be made as close as they are in terms of the same restricted box norm, i.e.,

$$\forall P,Q \exists \tilde{E}(P), \tilde{E}(Q) : ||\tilde{E}(P) - \tilde{E}(Q)||_{\Box}^{\text{res}} = ||P - Q||_{\Box}^{\text{res}}$$ (F100)

Proof. The restricted class box norm of the OCE of the two boxes is given by

$$||\tilde{E}(P) - \tilde{E}(Q)||_{\Box}^{\text{res}} = \max_{Q} \frac{1}{M} \left| \mathcal{M}(\tilde{E}(P))(ABE) - \mathcal{M}(\tilde{E}(Q))(ABE) \right|_1$$ (F101)

$$= \max_{x,y,z} \frac{1}{2} \left| \tilde{E}(P)(ABE|X = x, Y = y, Z = z) - \tilde{E}(Q)(ABE|X = x, Y = y, Z = z) \right|_1$$ (F102)

where we use partial results from Proposition 3, and the fiducial measurement $$(\mathcal{M}_{x,y}^F \otimes \mathcal{M}_{z}^F)(\tilde{E}(P))(ABE|XYZ) = \tilde{E}(P)(ABE|X = x, Y = y, Z = z)$$.

Now, for all $$x, y$$ and $$z = z_i, 1 \leq i \leq |Z|_{\tilde{E}(P)}$$, we have

$$||\tilde{E}(P)(ABE|X = x, Y = y, Z = z_i) - \tilde{E}(Q)(ABE|X = x, Y = y, Z = z_i)||_1$$

$$= \sum_{a,b,e} \left| \tilde{E}(P)(A = a, B = b, E = e|X = x, Y = y, Z = z_i) - \tilde{E}(Q)(A = a, B = b, E = e|X = x, Y = y, Z = z_i) \right|$$ (F103)

$$= \sum_{a,b,e} \left| p(e|z) V^c(A = a, B = b|X = x, Y = y) - \sum_{\omega} \lambda_z(\omega)q(e|\omega) V^c(A = a, B = b|X = x, Y = y) \right|$$ (F104)

$$= \sum_{a,b,e} \left| p(e|z) - \sum_{\omega} \lambda_z(\omega)q(e|\omega) \right| V^c(A = a, B = b|X = x, Y = y)$$ (F105)

$$= \sum_{e} \left| p(e|z) - \sum_{\omega} \lambda_z(\omega)q(e|\omega) \right|$$ (F106)

In the procedure of generating the OCE $$\tilde{E}(P)$$ and $$\tilde{E}(Q)$$, stated above, the probability distributions $$\{\lambda_z(\omega)\}$$, for each $$z$$, are the only parameters which can give rise to different OCE, but being in the same family. As each of them are functions of $$z$$, so we can first perform the optimization for each $$\{\lambda_z(\omega)\}$$ and then maximize over $$z$$ for the RBLOPC box norm. For any $$z = z_i, 1 \leq i \leq |Z|_{\tilde{E}(P)}$$, we want to find

$$\min_{\{\lambda_z(\omega)\}} \frac{1}{2} \sum_{e} \left| p(e|z) - \sum_{\omega} \lambda_z(\omega)q(e|\omega) \right|$$ (F107)

Observation 2. For all $$z_i, 1 \leq i \leq |Z|_{\tilde{E}(P)}$$, the function $$\sum_{e} \left| p(e|z) - \sum_{\omega} \lambda_z(\omega)q(e|\omega) \right| > 0$$ for all $$\{\lambda_z(\omega)\}$$.

Proof. This is due to the fact that we have assume that the two bipartite box $$P$$ and $$Q$$, which satisfies $$||P - Q||_{\Box} = \epsilon$$. 

the $\epsilon > 0$. If it is not the case, i.e., for some choices of $\{\lambda_\omega(\omega)\}$, $\sum_\omega |p(e|z) - \sum_\omega \lambda_\omega(\omega)q(e|\omega)| = 0$, then

$$
\|P - Q\|_{B_{\Box}}^{E_{\Box}} = \max_{x,y} \frac{1}{2} \left| P(A = a, B = b|X = x, Y = y) - Q(A = a, B = b|X = x, Y = y) \right| \\
= \max_{x,y} \frac{1}{2} \left| \sum_e \left( p(e|z) - \sum_\omega \lambda_\omega(\omega)q(e|\omega) \right) V^\epsilon(A = a, B = b|X = x, Y = y) \right|,
$$

(F108)

$$
\leq \max_{x,y} \frac{1}{2} \left| \sum_e \left( p(e|z) - \sum_\omega \lambda_\omega(\omega)q(e|\omega) \right) V^\epsilon(A = a, B = b|X = x, Y = y) \right|,
$$

(F109)

$$
= \frac{1}{2} \left| \sum_e \left( p(e|z) - \sum_\omega \lambda_\omega(\omega)q(e|\omega) \right) \right|.
$$

(F110)

Hence, $\|P - Q\|_{B_{\Box}}^{E_{\Box}} = 0$, which is a contradiction of our assumption of $\epsilon > 0$.

□

Inequality (F111), holds for all $z$ and $\{\lambda_\omega(\omega)\}$, hence it is clear that $\|\hat{E}(P) - \hat{E}(Q)\|_{B_{\Box}}^{E_{\Box}} \geq \|P - Q\|_{B_{\Box}}^{E_{\Box}}$, now we will show that some OCE exists for which the equality holds.

For a minimum to exists, of the function $\sum_e |p(e|z) - \sum_\omega \lambda_\omega(\omega)q(e|\omega)|$, in terms of $\lambda_\omega(\omega)$, under the following constraints

$$
\|P - Q\|_{B_{\Box}}^{E_{\Box}} = \hat{\epsilon} \sum_\omega \lambda_\omega(\omega) = 1.
$$

(F112)

(F113)

By using Lagrange's undetermined multipliers, we need the auxiliary function,

$$
F(\{\lambda_\omega(\omega)\}) = \sum_e \left| p(e|z) - \sum_\omega \lambda_\omega(\omega)q(e|\omega) \right| + \eta(\sum_\omega \lambda_\omega(\omega) - 1) + \xi(\|P - Q\|_{Box} - \epsilon).
$$

(F114)

The optimal choice of $\{\lambda_\omega(\omega)\}$, will be such, which satisfies the following condition

$$
\delta F(\{\lambda_\omega(\omega)\}) = 0 \Rightarrow \sum_\omega \frac{\partial F}{\partial \lambda_\omega(\omega)} \delta \lambda_\omega(\omega) = 0
$$

(F115)

$$
\frac{\partial F}{\partial \lambda_\omega(\omega)} = 0, \quad \forall \lambda_\omega(\omega)
$$

(F116)

Now,

$$
\frac{\partial}{\partial \lambda_\omega(\omega)} \left( \sum_e \left| p(e|z) - \sum_\omega \lambda_\omega(\omega)q(e|\omega) \right| \right) = \sum_e \operatorname{sgn}(\sum_\omega \lambda_\omega(\omega')q(e|\omega') - p(e|z)) q(e|\omega) = \sum_e \operatorname{sgn}(\sum_\omega \lambda_\omega(\omega')q(e|\omega') - p(e|z)) q(e|\omega)
$$

(F117)

(F118)

where we use the fact that

$$
\frac{d|x|}{dx} = \sgn(x) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } x \geq 0, \\ -1 & \text{if } x < 0. \end{cases}
$$

(F119)

On the other hand, for calculating $\|P - Q\|_{B_{\Box}}^{E_{\Box}}$, we assume that the optimal (for maximization) choices of inputs are $x = \bar{x}$ and $y = \bar{y}$ and consider the form of Eq. (F109), and write $V^\epsilon(A = a, B = b|X = \bar{x}, Y = \bar{y}) = V^\epsilon(ab|\bar{x}\bar{y})$ we obtain

$$
\frac{\partial}{\partial \lambda_\omega(\omega)} \|P - Q\|_{B_{\Box}}^{E_{\Box}} = \frac{\partial}{\partial \lambda_\omega(\omega)} \frac{1}{2} \left| \sum_{e,\omega} \left( p(e|z) - \sum_\omega \lambda_\omega(\omega)q(e|\omega) \right) V^\epsilon(ab|\bar{x}\bar{y}) \right| = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{e,\omega} \operatorname{sgn}(\sum_{\omega'} V^\epsilon(ab|\bar{x}\bar{y}) (\sum_\omega \lambda_\omega(\omega')q(e'|\omega') - p(e'|z))) \sum_e q(e|\omega) V^\epsilon(ab|\bar{x}\bar{y})
$$

(F120)

(F121)

$$
= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{e,\omega} \left[ \sum_{\omega'} V^\epsilon(ab|\bar{x}\bar{y}) (\sum_\omega \lambda_\omega(\omega')q(e'|\omega') - p(e'|z)) \right] V^\epsilon(ab|\bar{x}\bar{y}) q(e|\omega)
$$

(F122)
Hence the optimal $\lambda_\omega(\omega)$, should satisfy

$$
\sum_e \text{sgn}\left(\sum_{\omega'} \lambda_\omega(\omega')q(e|\omega') - p(e|z)\right)q(e|\omega) + \eta \\
+ \frac{\xi}{2} \sum_{ab} \left[ \sum_e \text{sgn}\left(\sum_{\omega'} V^{e'}(ab|x\tilde{y})(\sum_{\omega'} \lambda_\omega(\omega')q(e'|\omega') - p(e'|z))\right)V^{e}(ab|x\tilde{y})\right]q(e|\omega) = 0 \quad (F123)
$$

$$
\Rightarrow \sum_e \left[ \sum_{\omega} \lambda_\omega(\omega')q(e|\omega') - p(e|z)\right] + \eta \\
+ \frac{\xi}{2} \sum_{ab} \left[ \sum_{e'} V^{e'}(ab|x\tilde{y})(\sum_{\omega} \lambda_\omega(\omega')q(e'|\omega') - p(e'|z))\right]V^{e}(ab|x\tilde{y})\right]q(e|\omega) = 0 \quad (F124)
$$

Assume that for each $e$, the $\{\lambda_\omega(\omega)\}$ satisfies

$$
\text{sgn}\left(\sum_{\omega} \lambda_\omega(\omega)q(e|\omega) - p(e|z)\right) = -\eta - \frac{\xi}{2} \sum_{ab} \left[ \sum_{\omega} \lambda_\omega(\omega')q(e|\omega') - p(e|z)\right] \sum_{\omega} \lambda_\omega(\omega)q(e|\omega) - p(e|z) \quad (F125)
$$

The above equation does not provide the explicit solution of optimal $\{\lambda_\omega(\omega)\}$, but the characteristic form is sufficient for obtaining the optimal value of Eq. (F107).

Now, Eq. (F107) can be written as

$$
\frac{1}{2} \sum_e \left[ p(e|z) - \sum_\omega \lambda_\omega(q(e|\omega)) \right] = \frac{1}{2} \sum_e \left[ \sum_\omega \lambda_\omega(q(e|\omega)) - p(e|z) \right] \sum_\omega \lambda_\omega(q(e|\omega)) - p(e|z) \quad (F126)
$$

$$
= \frac{1}{2} \sum_e \left[ -\eta - \frac{\xi}{2} \sum_{ab} \left[ \sum_{\omega} \lambda_\omega(q(e|\omega)) - p(e|z)\right] \sum_{\omega} \lambda_\omega(q(e|\omega)) - p(e|z) \right] \quad (F127)
$$

$$
= -\frac{\xi}{4} \sum_{ab} \left[ Q(ab|x\tilde{y}) - P(ab|x\tilde{y}) \right] - \frac{\eta}{2} \sum_e \left[ \sum_{\omega} \lambda_\omega(q(e|\omega)) - p(e|z) \right] \quad (F128)
$$

$$
= -\frac{\xi}{4} \sum_{ab} \left[ Q(ab|x\tilde{y}) - P(ab|x\tilde{y}) \right] = -\frac{\xi}{2} ||P - Q||_{B_{O_{X}}} \quad (F129)
$$

where we use the fact that $Q(ab|x\tilde{y}) = \sum_{e} \sum_\omega q(e|\omega)\lambda_\omega V^{e}(ab|x\tilde{y})$, $P(ab|x\tilde{y}) = \sum_{e} p(e|z)\lambda_\omega V^{e}(ab|x\tilde{y})$ and $\sum_e \left[ \sum_\omega \lambda_\omega(q(e|\omega)) - p(e|z) \right] = 1$, sum of two probability distributions. Moreover, $||\hat{E}(P) - \hat{E}(Q)||_{B_{O_{X}}} = ||P - Q||_{B_{O_{X}}}$, the infimum value obtain for $\xi = -2$.

The right hand side of Eq. (F129) is independent of $z$, and due to reverse generation of PME, for any $z_j$, $|Z|_{E(P)} \leq j \leq |Z|_{E(Q)}$, as depicted in Fig. 5, we can say that the above relation also holds for all $z$ in the OCEs $\hat{E}(P)$ and $\hat{E}(Q)$. Hence, we can conclude that, corresponding to each $P$ and $Q$, there exists OCE $\hat{E}(P)$ and $\hat{E}(Q)$, such that

$$
||\hat{E}(P) - \hat{E}(Q)||_{res,B_{O_{X}}} = ||P - Q||_{B_{O_{X}}} \quad (F130)
$$

By using Lemmas 6 and 7 and Corollary 6 we have

$$
[N_{sq}(P|AB|XY) - N_{sq}(Q|AB|XY)] = \left[ \hat{H}(A : B \downarrow E)_{E(P)|(ABE|XYZ)} - \hat{H}(A : B \downarrow E)_{E(Q)|(ABE|XYZ)} \right] \quad (F131)
$$

$$
= \left[ \hat{H}(A : B \downarrow E)_{E(P)|(ABE|XYZ)} - \hat{H}(A : B \downarrow E)_{E(Q)|(ABE|XYZ)} \right] \quad (F132)
$$

$$
\leq K_1 ||\hat{E}(P)|(ABE|XYZ) - \hat{E}(Q)|(ABE|XYZ)||_{res,B_{O_{X}}} \log_{d_{AB}} \quad (F133)
$$

$$
= K_1 \hat{\epsilon} \log_{d_{AB}} + O(\hat{\epsilon}) \quad (F134)
$$

Corollary 6 connects the definition of $N_{sq}(P)$, from CE of $P$, $E(P)$ to OCE of $P$, $\hat{E}(P)$ of a particular kind depicted in Fig. 5. The construction of OCE $\hat{E}(P)$ is such that $N_{sq}(P)$, will not change when $\lambda_\omega(\omega)$ are changed. In Lemma
we connect the closeness of intrinsic mutual information for two probability distribution to two tripartite boxes, in terms of its RBLOPC box norm. Finally by Lemma 7, we connect the RBLOPC box norm of two over-complete extension to the RBLOPC norm of bipartite boxes.

6. Subextensivity

Proposition 8. Squashed non-locality is bounded by $\log (\min \{d_A, d_B\})$.

Proof. From the definition of squashed non-locality given in Eq. (F5) we have

$$N_{sq}(P(AB|XY)) = \max_{x,y} \inf_{\{p_i, p_i^{(AB|XY)}\} \in S^{al}} \sum_i p_i I(A : B)_{M_{x,y}(P(AB|XY))}$$

(F136)

$$\leq \max_{x,y} \inf_{\{p_i, p_i^{(AB|XY)}\} \in S^{al}} \sum_i p_i \log (\min \{d_A^x, d_B^y\})$$

(F137)

$$\leq \log (\min \{d_A, d_B\}).$$

(F138)

where $d_A^x = \text{supp} P(A|X = x)$ and $d_B^y = \text{supp} P(B|Y = y)$ and $d_A = \max_x \text{supp} P(A|X = x)$ and $d_B = \max_y \text{supp} P(B|Y = y)$.

□

Appendix G: Non-locality cost proof

In this section we will deliver the proof of Proposition 2.

Proof. Suppose Alice and Bob share a non-signaling box $P \equiv P(AB|XY)$, and Eve has access to its complete extension [1]. The box $P$ can be decomposed into a non-local vertex and a local box.

$$P = \alpha P_{NL}^V + (1 - \alpha) P_L,$$

(G1)

where $P_{NL}^V$ is the non-local vertex and $P_L$ is any local box. Let’s denote the non-locality fraction

$$C(P) = \min_{\text{All decompositions}} \alpha$$

(G2)

Now Eve can always get access to this ensemble, $\{(C(P), P_{NL}^V), (1 - C(P), P_L)\}$ in part of the honest parties.

If we assume that Eve works in favor of Alice and Bob, and inform them about her output, when she got the above ensemble. The Key rate $\tilde{K}$, in this scenario must be greater then in DI-iid scenario, since on that case there Eve doesn’t work on their account

$$K_{RDI}^{(iid)}(P) \leq \tilde{K}(P).$$

(G3)

With a probability of $C(P)$ they share the non-local correlations, useful for secret key agreement and with probability $1 - C(P)$ a local box with zero key rate. Since the key, satisfying Maurer’s security definition is upper bounded by mutual information function, and both of them are non-increasing under LOPC operations, we obtain

$$\tilde{K}(P) \leq C(P) \left( \sup_{M_{x,y}} I(A : B)_{M_{x,y}(P(AB|XY))} \right).$$

(G4)

Now

$$I(A : B)_{M_{x,y}(P(AB|XY))} \leq \log (\min \{d_A^x, d_B^y\}),$$

(G5)

where $d_A^x = \text{supp} P(A|X = x)$ and $d_B^y = \text{supp} P(B|Y = y)$. When employing well known inequality, and Eq. (G3), we finally obtain

$$K_{RDI}^{(iid)}(P) \leq C(P) \left( \sup_{M_{x,y}} \log (\min \{d_A^x, d_B^y\}) \right)$$

(G6)

$$= C(P) \log (\min \{d_A, d_B\}) = N_C(P),$$

(G7)

by Definition 6, with $d_A = \max_x \text{supp} P(A|X = x)$ and $d_B = \max_y \text{supp} P(B|Y = y)$.

□
Appendix H: Examples of secrecy monotones and Convexification of $\hat{I}(A : B \downarrow E)$ and a non-trivial bound

Monotones based on mutual information functions, are used to upper bound the secret key rate on the SK scenario. However, amongst them only one which is easily computable is mutual information itself. What is crucial in our approach is that all of them can be "squashed" and used to generate the upper bounds for $K_{\text{RD}}^{(\text{iid})}$.

Fact 3. The secrecy quantifiers and monotones [17] (and the mutual information function) are the upper bounds on $S(A : B || E)$:

$$I(A : B)_{P(ABE)} \geq S(A : B || E)_{P(ABE)},$$  \hspace{1cm} (H1)

$$I(A : B|E)_{P(ABE)} \geq S(A : B || E)_{P(ABE)},$$  \hspace{1cm} (H2)

$$\min \left\{ I(A : B)_{P(ABE)}, I(A : B|E)_{P(ABE)} \right\} \geq S(A : B || E)_{P(ABE)},$$  \hspace{1cm} (H3)

$$I(A : B \downarrow E)_{P(ABE)} \geq I(A : B \downarrow| E)_{P(ABE)} \geq S(A : B || E)_{P(ABE)}. \hspace{1cm} (H4)$$

We can use all of the functions displayed in the Fact 3 to construct the squashed secrecy quantifiers and monotones for the boxes. For the proper definition of the above functions see Appendix J.

Corollary 7. The following upper bounds on $K_{\text{DI}}^{(\text{iid})}(P)$ hold

$$\hat{I}(A : B)_{E(P)(ABE|XYZ)} \geq K_{\text{RD}}^{(\text{iid})}(P),$$  \hspace{1cm} (H5)

$$\hat{I}(A : B|E)_{E(P)(ABE|XYZ)} \geq K_{\text{RD}}^{(\text{iid})}(P),$$  \hspace{1cm} (H6)

$$\min \left\{ \hat{I}(A : B)_{E(P)(ABE|XYZ)}, \hat{I}(A : B|E)_{E(P)(ABE|XYZ)} \right\} \geq K_{\text{RD}}^{(\text{iid})}(P),$$  \hspace{1cm} (H7)

$$\hat{I}(A : B \downarrow E)_{E(P)(ABE|XYZ)} \geq \hat{I}(A : B \downarrow| E)_{E(P)(ABE|XYZ)} \geq K_{\text{RD}}^{(\text{iid})}(P).$$  \hspace{1cm} (H8)

The proof of the Corollary 7 is straightforward form Theorem 3. Again by $E(P)(ABE|XYZ)$ we denoted the complete extension to Eve’s system of the singly copy of a box $P(AB|XY)$ shared by Alice and Bob.

The intrinsic information $\hat{I}(A : B \downarrow E)$ and the reduced intrinsic information $\hat{I}(A : B \downarrow| E)$ are functions without closed-form expression, and hence they can not be computed straightforwardly. We present a technique for finding non-trivial bound using properties one of them. First we notice, that for any fixed bipartite box and its complete extension the following is true.

Fact 4 (Hierarchy between different mutual information functions).

$$\mathcal{N}_{\text{sq}}(P) = \hat{I}(A : B \downarrow E)_{E(P)(ABE|XYZ)} \leq \hat{I}(A : B)_{E(P)(ABE|XYZ)},$$  \hspace{1cm} (H9)

$$\mathcal{N}_{\text{sq}}(P) = \hat{I}(A : B \downarrow E)_{E(P)(ABE|XYZ)} \leq \hat{I}(A : B|E)_{E(P)(ABE|XYZ)},$$  \hspace{1cm} (H10)

$$\mathcal{N}_{\text{sq}}(P) = \hat{I}(A : B \downarrow E)_{E(P)(ABE|XYZ)} \leq \min \{ \hat{I}(A : B)_{E(P)(ABE|XYZ)}, \hat{I}(A : B|E)_{E(P)(ABE|XYZ)} \}. \hspace{1cm} (H11)$$

In general the intrinsic mutual information is not a convex function of a probability distribution. However the squashed entanglement function exhibits such a property [35]. Interestingly our squashed non-locality $\mathcal{N}_{\text{sq}}$ (see Eq. (31)) which is generated from intrinsic mutual information after squashing (see Eq. (27)), is a convex function of its argument. What we notice here is that we are equipped with a bunch of functions (see Fact 4, Lemma 2) which are upper bounds for $\mathcal{N}_{\text{sq}}$, which is convex. Hence there exists a convex (in the same sense) function which is an upper bound on the squashed intrinsic mutual information, but at the same time it is a lower bound on any function in this group. This leads us to the following proof of the Theorem 4.

Proof of Theorem (4). Since $\hat{I}(A : B \downarrow E) \in \{ F_i \}$ because of Lemma (4) and $\hat{I}(A : B \downarrow E)_{E(P)} \geq K_{\text{DI}}^{(\text{iid})}(P)$, then for a function which lies above the plot of intrinsic mutual information $F(P) \geq K_{\text{DI}}^{(\text{iid})}(P).$ 

Proof of Corollary (4). We prove by contradiction. If there would be a function which at any point is greater than lower convex hull of $\hat{I}(A : B)$ and $\hat{I}(A : B|E)$, either it would not be convex or it would be greater (at least at single point) then at least one from aforementioned non-signaling squashed non-locality quantifiers, and hence it is not in the set $\{ F_i \}.$
Appendix I: Numerical upper bounds

In this section, we are going to describe the numerical procedure, we have applied to calculate the upper bound on the squashed non-locality of a bipartite non-signaling binary input output box, given in Eq. (41), (the box has been taken from Ref. [2]) of the main text. Here, the honest parties Alice and Bob share $N$ copies of the given box, used for cryptographic key distributions.

The box is a non-signaling conditional probability distribution in the range of the parameters $0 \leq \delta \leq 1$ and $-\frac{1}{4} \leq \epsilon \leq \frac{1}{4}$. But it exhibits non-local correlation for a very small range of parameters, which one can quantify by the parameter $\epsilon$, the probability of not winning the CHSH game [23], and for the box in Eq. (41), it is

$$
\epsilon = \Pr(a \oplus b \neq x \cdot y) = \frac{1}{4}\left(\frac{3}{4} + \delta + 3\epsilon\right).
$$

So it remain in non-local domain for the error $\epsilon \in [0, \frac{1}{4})$, and it happens for many choices of parameters $\delta$ and $\epsilon$, without loss of generality we can fix one such choice $0 \leq \delta \leq 1$ and $-\frac{1}{4} \leq \epsilon \leq \frac{1}{12} - \frac{\delta}{3}$. Moreover, the non-locality fraction of these box, in the above range of parameters is $C(P) = \frac{1}{6} - \frac{\delta}{3} - 3\epsilon$.

Let us recall that the bipartite binary input and output box $P_{\text{HRW}}$, lies in a non-signaling polytope having 24 vertices [31]. Among which 16 are local and deterministic

$$
L_{\alpha\beta\gamma\sigma}(ab|xy) = \begin{cases} 
1 & \text{if } a = \alpha x \oplus b, \\
& b = \gamma y \oplus \sigma \\
0 & \text{otherwise.}
\end{cases}
$$

where $\alpha, \beta, \gamma, \sigma \in \{0, 1\}$ and 8 non-local box

$$
B_{rst}(ab|xy) = \begin{cases} 
1/2 & \text{if } a \oplus b = xy \oplus rx \oplus sy \oplus t \\
0 & \text{otherwise.}
\end{cases}
$$

where $r, s, t \in \{0, 1\}$.

In Fig. 2, we plot several non-signaling squashed secrecy quantifiers and monotone $\tilde{\mathcal{M}}(A : B\|E)$ for different choices of the parameters $\delta$ and $\epsilon$, with respect to the non-wining probability of the CHSH game, $\epsilon$. In Fig. 2(a) and (b), we fix the $\delta$ to 0.01 and 0.03 respectively, where the $\epsilon = f(\epsilon)$ according to the Eq. (I1), (see also Table I) whereas in Fig. 2(c) we choose $\epsilon = 3\delta - \frac{1}{4}$, and $\delta = \frac{1}{2}\epsilon$ and in Fig. 2(d) we took $\epsilon = \delta - \frac{1}{4}$, and $\delta$ turns out to be equal to $\epsilon$.

In all the four figures the red dashed line represents the squashed mutual information $\tilde{I}(A : B)_P$ between Alice and Bob. In the squashing process, the optimal choices of the measurements by Alice and Bob varies with $\delta$ and $\epsilon$. For Figs. 2(a) and 2(b), the optimum fiducial measurement choice is $(x = 0, y = 0)$, for $\delta < \epsilon$, and any one of the other three input choices, for $\delta \geq \epsilon$. Whereas measurement choice $(x = 0, y = 0)$, is optimal in the entire range of $\epsilon$ for Fig. 2(c) and all measurements choices give same mutual information for the choice of $\delta$ and $\epsilon$ in Fig. 2(d).

The non-locality cost $\mathcal{N}_C(P_{\text{HRW}})$ is plotted with the dashed dot blue line in all the figures.

The squashed conditional mutual information, $\tilde{I}(A : B|E)_{\mathcal{E}(P)}$, between Alice and Bob, when Eve holds the complete extension of the box $P_{\text{HRW}}$, depends on the possible Eve’s dropping actions described in Sec. A. We have found that the $\tilde{I}(A : B|E)_{\mathcal{E}(P)}$ is exactly same for the first two possible eavesdropping action, namely the fiducial and general choices of measurements. In order to calculate it, we find numerically the CE [1] in the range of $\delta$ and $\epsilon$, where the box is non-local. As the Eve chooses her fiducial measurement after getting full information about the input choices of Alice and Bob, so $z = f(x, y)$, intend to reduce the correlation of key strings of Alice and Bob as much as possible. Among all possible input choices of Eve, over her part of the CE, we have numerically found that (upto our numerical search) the optimal choice give rise to the following minimal ensemble, for all possible fiducial measurements of the honest parties.

$$
v = \left[\frac{1}{4} - \delta - 3\epsilon, \frac{1 + 4\epsilon}{8}, \frac{1 + 4\epsilon}{8}, \frac{1 + 4\epsilon}{8}, \frac{1 + 4\epsilon}{8}, \frac{1 + 4\epsilon}{8}, \frac{1 + 4\epsilon}{8}, \frac{1 + 4\epsilon}{8}, \frac{\delta}{2}, \frac{\delta}{2}\right].
$$

Let us say that the above minimal ensemble appeared when Eve chooses the input $z = z_0$. The squashed conditional mutual information $\tilde{I}(A : B|E)_{\mathcal{E}(P)} = \mathcal{N}_C(P_{\text{HRW}})$, is exactly equal to the non-locality cost of the shared box.

For the third eavesdropping action, if Eve uses a classical discrete post-processing channel $\Theta_E|E'$, then the corresponding $\tilde{I}(A : B|E)_{\mathcal{E}(P)}$ is nothing but the squashed non-locality $\mathcal{N}_{sq}$. Computing the optimal measurement and the
post-processing channel is very hard to get. But we are able to find one such channel and the optimal measurement according to our numerical search. Which we will say the upper bound on $N_{sq}$ as well as the $K_{RDI}^{iid}$.

The best measurement turns out to be a fiducial one with $z = z_0$, which leads to the minimal ensemble given in Eqs. (I4) and (I5), and the post-processing channels, which is also the best one according to our numerics, are given by

$$\Theta_{E|E}^{0.0} = \begin{cases} \text{Box} & L_{0000} & L_{0010} & L_{0101} & L_{0111} & L_{1000} & L_{1011} & L_{1101} & L_{1110} \\ e,e & 0 & 1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 5 & 6 & 7 & 8 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 2 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 3 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 4 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 5 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 6 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ \end{cases}$$  \tag{I6}

$$\Theta_{E|E}^{0.1} = \begin{cases} \text{Box} & L_{0000} & L_{0010} & L_{0101} & L_{0111} & L_{1000} & L_{1011} & L_{1101} & L_{1110} \\ e,e & 0 & 1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 5 & 6 & 7 & 8 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 2 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 3 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 4 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 5 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 6 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{cases}$$  \tag{I7}

$$\Theta_{E|E}^{1.0} = \begin{cases} \text{Box} & L_{0000} & L_{0010} & L_{0101} & L_{0111} & L_{1000} & L_{1011} & L_{1101} & L_{1110} \\ e,e & 0 & 1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 5 & 6 & 7 & 8 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 2 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 3 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 4 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 5 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 6 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \end{cases}$$  \tag{I8}

$$\Theta_{E|E}^{1.1} = \begin{cases} \text{Box} & L_{0000} & L_{0010} & L_{0101} & L_{0111} & L_{1000} & L_{1011} & L_{1101} & L_{1110} \\ e,e & 0 & 1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 5 & 6 & 7 & 8 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 2 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 3 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 4 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 5 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 6 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{cases}$$  \tag{I9}

Hence, the upper bound on the key, according to our numerical findings is

$$K_{RDI}^{iid} \leq \text{LCH} \left\{ \tilde{I}(A:B|E)_{\mathcal{E}(P_{HRW})(ABE|XYZ)} , \tilde{I}(A:B|E)_{Q(ABE|XYZ)} \right\},$$  \tag{I10}

where $Q(ABE|XYZ) = \Theta_{E|E}^{X,Y} (E(P_{HRW})(ABE'|XY'Z))$, i.e., the complete extension of the box passing through a post-processing channel, which depends on the outcome of the variables $X$ and $Y$, i.e., $x$ and $y$, the optimal fiducial measurements $M_{x,y}^F$ by the honest parties.)
The plot of the r.h.s of Eq. (110) is given by the solid orange line in Fig. 2. The color shade is given to separate the two regions where the optimal measurement choices of the honest parties are coming from two different inputs. The light blue shade in Fig. 2(a) and (b) represents the choices of optimal inputs to be \((x = 0, y = 0)\), whereas the dark blue shade is for the other input choices (all of them give rise to same value). In Fig. 2(c) the optimal input by the honest parties is \((x = 0, y = 0)\), and in Fig. 2(d) all the choices of inputs give the same mutual information so we choose the color shade to be light blue.

We compare our upper bound with the key rate \(R(\mathcal{P}_{HRW}|p)\), generated by Hänggi, Renner and Wolf [2], which is the magenta dotted line in all the figures in Fig. 2. It lies below the solid orange line, as it represents the NSDI key rate for a particular protocol, and we provide the upper bound over all possible protocol.

Moreover, if we compare the bounds of the different figures of Fig. 2, we observe that, for a fixed value of the error \(\varepsilon\), of the CHSH game, the bound is almost decreasing if one move from Fig. 2(a) to 2(d). This is due to the fact that, in Fig. 2(a), the choices of the parameters \(\delta\) and \(\epsilon\) are such that the error in winning probability for the CHSH game is less for one choice of input by the honest parties than the other and they can choose those by fiducial measurement. In Fig. 2(d) all the distribution has the same error \(\varepsilon\), depicts the lowest bound, i.e., all the inputs give rise to same error, leads to no specific choice of inputs.

**Appendix J: Definition of Entropic functions**

Suppose \(A, B\) and \(E\) are discrete random variables, with outcomes \(a \in A, b \in B\) and \(e \in E\). If \(P(ABE) \equiv p(abe)\) is the joint probability distribution of getting the values \(a, b\) and \(e\).

- The **Shannon entropy** of a random variable is defined as
  \[
  H(A) = -\sum_a p(a) \log_2 p(a), \tag{J1}
  \]
  \[
  H(AB) = -\sum_{ab} p(ab) \log_2 p(ab), \tag{J2}
  \]
  \[
  H(ABE) = -\sum_{abc} p(abe) \log_2 p(abe), \tag{J3}
  \]
  where, \(p(ab) = \sum_e p(abe)\) and \(p(a) = \sum_b p(ab)\) are the marginals of the joint probability distribution \(p(abe)\).

- The **conditional Shannon entropy** of any random variable say \(A\), with respect to the random variable \(B\), quantifies the uncertainty remaining in \(A\), when one already know about \(B\), and it is given by
  \[
  H(A|B) = \sum_b p(b) H(A|B = b) = H(AB) - H(B). \tag{J4}
  \]

- The **mutual information** \(I(A : B)\), the correlation between \(A\) and \(B\) is defined as
  \[
  I(A : B) = H(A) + H(B) - H(AB), \tag{J5}
  \]

- The **conditional mutual information** \(I(A : B|E)\), quantifies the correlation remaining between variables \(A\) and \(B\) conditioned upon the knowledge about value of third variable \(E\), which is given by
  \[
  I(A : B|E) = \sum_e I(A : B|E = e) \tag{J6}
  \]
  \[
  = H(A|E) - H(B|E) - H(AB|E). \tag{J7}
  \]

- The **intrinsic conditional mutual information** \(I(A : B \downarrow E)\) is
  \[
  I(A : B \downarrow E) = \inf_{\Theta_{E'|E}} I(A : B|E'), \tag{J8}
  \]
  where \(I(A : B|E')\), is the conditional mutual information of the probability distribution \(P(ABE') = \sum_e \Theta_{E'|E}(E'|E = e) P(AB, E = e)\), where the infimum is taken over all possible conditional channels \(\Theta_{E'|E}\).
The reduced intrinsic conditional mutual information [73] of random variables $A$ and $B$ given $E$, denoted by $I(A : B \downarrow\downarrow E)$, is defined as

$$I(A : B \downarrow\downarrow E) = \inf_{P_{\Theta | ABE}} (I(A : B \downarrow E) + H(U)),$$

where the infimum is taken over all possible conditional channels $\Theta_{U | ABE}$.

---