Computing secure key rates for quantum key distribution with untrusted devices
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Device-independent quantum key distribution (DIQKD) provides the strongest form of secure key exchange, using only the input-output statistics of the devices to achieve information-theoretic security. Although the security principles of DIQKD are now well-understood, it remains a technical challenge to derive reliable security bounds for generic DIQKD protocols beyond the standard ones. In this Letter, we present a numerical framework based on semi-definite programming that gives reliable lower bounds on the asymptotic secret key rate of any QKD protocol using untrusted devices. In particular, our method can in principle be utilized to find achievable secret key rates for any DIQKD protocol, based on the full input-output probability distribution instead of specialized Bell inequalities.

INTRODUCTION

Device-independent quantum key distribution (DIQKD) considers the problem of secure key exchange using devices which are untrusted or uncharacterized [1–3]. In this setting, security is based entirely on the observation of non-local correlations, which are typically measured by a Bell inequality [4, 5]. In particular, if the correlations violate the inequality, then we say that they are non-local. This is necessary for secure key distribution, for it certifies that the key must come from measurements on an entangled state [6–8]. While the security of DIQKD is well understood from the monogamy property of non-local correlations [9], a formal security analysis is rather involved and tricky. This is because the dimension of the underlying shared quantum state is unknown, and most security proof techniques only apply to quantum systems with bounded dimension.

Recently, security proof techniques based on semi-definite programming (SDP) have been proposed for standard QKD [10–14]. In this so-called device-dependent (DD) setting, the underlying QKD devices are assumed to be suitably characterized. Our main result extends this approach to a wider range of settings, adapting to different levels of device characterization (see Fig. 1). At present, to prove the security of DIQKD, the current approaches are to either prove a reduction to qubit-level systems [2], or to use a family of semi-definite programs (SDPs) known as the Navascués-Pironio-Acin (NPA) hierarchy [15] to bound the adversary’s guessing probability [16–18]. However, neither of these approaches are general enough for most purposes. The former is restricted to protocols based on Bell inequalities with binary inputs and outputs, while the latter only bounds the min-entropy, which often leads to sub-optimal bounds on the von Neumann entropy (the relevant quantity for computing secret key rates against general attacks [3]). Here, we develop a generic computational toolbox that directly bounds the von Neumann entropy using the complete probability distribution of any DIQKD protocol.

The main mechanism of our toolbox is a technique for estimating the entropy production of a quantum channel acting on an unknown state under algebraic constraints. The simplest way to understand entropy production is to view it as the amount of entropy introduced to a system after performing some action on it. For instance, in the case of projective measurement, the entropy production is the entropy difference between the final post-measurement system and the initial system. We refer the interested reader to the Supplement [21] for more details. Here, we focus on its application to DIQKD.
Our toolbox bounds this entropy production via a (non-commutative) polynomial optimization performed over the measurement operators in the protocol. This can be evaluated using the SDPs in the NPA hierarchy [15]. In this sense, switching from DI to sDI or DD scenarios translates to adding more constraints on the SDPs and hence stricter bounds on the eventual secret key rates.

**SETTING AND METHODS**
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**FIG. 2. Basic situation:** By measuring her share of the joint state \( \psi_{ABE} \) with measurement \( A_0 \), Alice is (virtually) sending a raw key to Bob who (virtually) receives it by measuring \( B_0 \). Bob’s uncertainty is quantified by the classical entropy \( H(A_0|B_0) \). We assume that Eve has access to all classical communication and her share of the joint quantum state, which gives her some partial information on \( A_0 \) as well. This is quantified by the classical-quantum entropy \( H(A_0|E) \).

To assess the security performance of QKD, one can start by finding the asymptotic key rate under the assumption of independent and identically distributed (IID) states. In this setting, we consider protocols that are modelled as follows: in each round, Alice and Bob share a quantum state \( \rho_{AB} \), and Eve’s side-information \( E \) is described by the purification \( \psi_{ABE} \) of \( \rho_{AB} \) (see Fig. 2). Qualitatively, this means Eve controls all systems that are not in the labs of Alice and Bob. In each round, Alice (resp. Bob) performs one measurement from a set \( \{A_0, A_1, \ldots A_{X-1}\} \) (resp. \( \{B_0, B_1, \ldots , B_{Y-1}\} \)) on their local system. The raw key will be produced from the measurements \( \langle A_0, B_0 \rangle \). This model describes entanglement-based protocols, but can be as well converted to security proofs for prepare-and-measure protocols [13, 22, 23]. In this work, we fix our attention on protocols that use one-way error correction. Given the above, the asymptotic key rate \( r_\infty \) is then given by the Devetak-Winter formula [24], which reads

\[
r_\infty = \max \{H(A_0|E) - H(A_0|B_0), 0\},
\]

where \( H \) is the von Neumann entropy. This can be intuitively interpreted as the difference between Eve’s and Bob’s uncertainty about Alice’s measurement \( A_0 \).

The \( H(A_0|B_0) \) term in Eq. (1) can be computed based on the expected behaviour of the devices (see [3] for details), so the main challenge here is to reliably bound \( H(A_0|E) \) using the expected statistics. More specifically, suppose the protocol involves estimating parameters of the form \( l_j = \sum_{abxy} c_{abxy}^{(j)} \Pr(ab|xy) \) for some coefficients \( c_{abxy}^{(j)} \), where \( \Pr(ab|xy) \) is the probability of outcome \( (a, b) \) from measurements \( (A_x, B_y) \) (e.g., these parameters could be Bell inequalities in a DI scenario.) Let \( P_{ab|x, y} \) denote the projector [25] corresponding to outcome \( a \) of Alice’s measurement \( A_x \), and analogously, let \( P_{bx|y} \) denote Bob’s measurement projectors. The task is then to find lower bounds on

\[
\inf H(A_0|E)
\]

s.th. \( \langle L_j \rangle_{\psi_{ABE}} = l_j \),

where \( L_j = \sum_{abxy} c_{abxy}^{(j)} P_{a|x} \otimes P_{b|y} \), and the infimum takes place over \( \psi_{ABE} \) and any uncharacterized measurements (which may be some or all of the measurements, for sDI and DI scenarios respectively). For the uncharacterized measurements, even their dimensions may not be known [26].

To instead prove the security of finite-length protocols against non-IID attacks, one could use the recently developed entropy accumulation theorem [3, 27]. This theorem is applicable to DD, sDI and DI scenarios, and shows that the key rate against general attacks is still of a form essentially similar to Eq. (1). It inherently accounts for finite-size and non-IID effects, and reduces the main challenge in a security proof to a task similar to the IID case, namely, finding lower bounds on the optimization problem in Eq. (2) (see [3, 27, 28] for more details). Hence, in principle, our approach could also be used to compute finite key lengths against general attacks, by applying the entropy accumulation theorem.

**Eve’s side-information as entropy production on \( \rho_{AB} \)**
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**FIG. 3. Connection to entropy production:** The key-generating measurement is regarded as an isometry to a larger Hilbert space, by expanding the classical memory \( A_0 \) with an ancilla \( A' \). From this perspective the initial and final states are pure, and thus the entropy change \( \Delta H \) on the memory-Eve subsystem equals the entropy change on the Alice-Bob subsystem.
The advantage of quantum over classical cryptography stems from the fact that for the former, it is possible to bound Eve’s knowledge using only Alice’s and Bob’s systems (essentially, using the monogamy property of entanglement). To make this precise for \( H(A_0|E) \), one can regard the key-generating measurement as a quantum-to-classical channel that maps Alice’s (quantum) system \( A \) to a memory register \( A_0 \) that stores the (classical) measurement outcomes. By Stinepring’s theorem [29], this channel can be described via an isometry \( V \) to an extended system \( A_0A' \). This isometry maps the pure initial state \( \Psi_{ABE} \) to a pure final state \( \Psi_{A'B'E'A_0} \) (see Fig. 3).

Since the entropies of the two sides of a bipartite pure state are equal, this gives

\[
H(A_0|E) = H(A_0E) - H(E) = H(A') - H(AB) = H(T[\rho_{AB}]) - H(\rho_{AB}) =: \Delta H, \tag{3}
\]

where \( T[\rho_{AB}] = \text{tr}_{A_0}((V \otimes I_B)\rho_{AB}(V \otimes I_B)^\dagger) \). We remark that this approach has been introduced in Ref. [30]. The last line can be interpreted as entropy production, \( \Delta H \), resulting from the transformation \( AB \to A' \). Since it only depends on the reduced states of Alice and Bob, they can be used to bound Eve’s knowledge using only their own systems. For projective measurements, \( V \) can be chosen such that [30] \( T \) is the pinching channel

\[
T[\rho_{AB}] = \sum_a (P_{a|0} \otimes I_B)\rho_{AB}(P_{a|0} \otimes I_B). \tag{4}
\]

**Bounding the entropy production**

Besides its application to QKD, the amount of entropy that is produced or consumed by a quantum operation \( T \) is one of the central quantities of a physical system. However, finding this value in practice is not straightforward, since the entropy of a quantum state is not directly accessible. Instead, the quantities that are directly accessible are typically the expectation values of certain observables, i.e., expressions of the form \( \langle L_j \rangle_{\rho} = \text{tr}(\rho L_j) \) for operators \( L_j \) (which in QKD scenarios have the form described earlier). Following this perspective, we have to study the following problem [21]: find bounds on \( \Delta H \) that hold for all states consistent with observed constraints \( \langle L_j \rangle_{\rho} = l_j \). For QKD, these bounds have to be lower bounds, since we consider a “worst-case scenario” for the honest parties.

To tackle this task, we propose the following ansatz: for coefficients \( \lambda_j \in \mathbb{R} \), we define \( L = \sum_j \lambda_j L_j \) and aim to find an operator \( K \) such that [31]

\[
H(T[\rho]) - H(\rho) \geq \langle L \rangle_{\rho} - \ln(\langle K \rangle_{\rho}), \tag{5}
\]

holds for all states. Such an expression stems from the Lagrange dual of the constrained optimisation we have just described, and also bears some similarities to the approach used in Ref. [32] to derive entropic uncertainty relations.

To find such a \( K \), we note that Jensen’s operator inequality and the Gibbs variational principle imply [21]

\[
H(T[\rho]) - H(\rho) \geq -\langle \ln(T^*T[\rho]) \rangle_\rho - H(\rho) \tag{6}
\]

\[
\geq \langle L \rangle_{\rho} - \ln(\text{tr}(e^{\ln(T^*T[\rho]) + L})), \tag{7}
\]

where \( T^* \) is the adjoint channel of \( T \). Applying a recently discovered generalisation of the Golden–Thompson inequality [33], it follows that for any self-adjoint \( X_k \) such that \( L = \sum_k X_k \) [21], we can choose

\[
K = T^*T\left[ \int_{\mathbb{R}} dt \beta_0(t) \prod_k e^{\frac{\beta_0(t)}{2}X_k^2} \right], \tag{8}
\]

where \( \beta_0(t) = (\pi/2)(\cosh(\pi t) + 1)^{-1} \). This approach hence yields a family of lower bounds on \( H(T[\rho]) - H(\rho) \), characterized by \( \lambda_j \) and \( X_k \).

Now, our task is reduced to finding upper bounds on \( \langle K \rangle_{\rho} \). This can be done by measuring \( \langle K \rangle_{\rho} \) directly, if possible, or by bounding the maximum value of \( \langle K \rangle_{\rho} \) subject to the constraints \( \langle L_j \rangle_{\rho} = l_j \). If specific representations of \( K \) and \( L_j \) as matrices are known, as is the case in a DD scenario, the latter is simply an SDP in standard form. The resulting bound is very similar to that derived in Ref. [10], except that we have used the generalized Golden–Thompson inequality instead.

For sDI and DI scenarios, one does not have the explicit form of \( K \). To handle this, we choose \( X_{xy} = \sum_{ab} \lambda_j c^{(j)}_{abxy} P_{a|x} \otimes P_{b|y} \) and obtain our main result for DIQKD [21]:

**Theorem 1.** For a DI scenario as described, the minimum value of \( H(A_0|E) \) (in base \( e \)), subject to constraints \( \langle L_j \rangle_{\rho_{AB}} = l_j \) with \( L_j = \sum_{abxy} c^{(j)}_{abxy} P_{a|x} \otimes P_{b|y} \), is lower-bounded by

\[
\sup_x \left( \sum_j \lambda_j l_j - \ln \left( \sup_{\rho_{AB}:P_{a|x}P_{b|y}} \langle K \rangle_{\rho_{AB}} \right) \right), \tag{9}
\]

where

\[
K = T\left[ \int_{\mathbb{R}} dt \beta_0(t) \prod_{xy} \sum_{ab} e^{\kappa_{abxy} P_{a|x} \otimes P_{b|y}} \right]^2, \tag{10}
\]

with \( T[\sigma_{AB}] = \sum_a (P_{a|0} \otimes \mathbb{I}_B)\sigma_{AB}(P_{a|0} \otimes \mathbb{I}_B) \), \( \beta_0(t) = (\pi/2)(\cosh(\pi t) + 1)^{-1} \), and \( \kappa_{abxy} = (1 + it) \sum_j \lambda_j c^{(j)}_{abxy} / 2 \).

Eq. (10) is a non-commutative polynomial in the measurement operators, and the integrals can be evaluated in...
closed form [21]. Therefore, the task of maximizing $\langle K \rangle_\rho$ can now be tackled using the well-established NPA hierarchy [15]. For sDI scenarios, we can impose additional algebraic constraints corresponding to those satisfied by the characterized measurements. Since the optimization over $\lambda$ is a supremum, any value of $\lambda$ yields a secure lower bound, without needing to identify the optimal $\lambda$.

**APPLICATIONS**

We apply our method to two commonly studied DI scenarios, in which Alice and Bob each perform parameter estimation on two binary-outcome measurements [35]. (See [21] for our results in some other scenarios, including distributions optimized for tilted CHSH inequalities [36].) The first scenario is parametrized by a depolarizing-noise value $q \in [0, 1/2]$, and corresponds to performing the ideal CHSH measurements on the Werner state $(1 - 2q)|\Phi^+\rangle + (q/2)I$, where $|\Phi^+\rangle$ is the Bell state $|(00) + |(11)\rangle)/\sqrt{2}$. The second scenario is a limited-detection-efficiency model parametrized by $\eta \in [0, 1]$, where for every measurement the outcome 1 is flipped to 0 with probability $1 - \eta$. This is a simplistic model for a photonic setup where all nondetection events are mapped to the outcome 0 [34]. For this scenario, we use different states and measurements for each value of $\eta$, to maximize the CHSH value.

The best known bound on $H(A_0|E)$ in these two scenarios [37] is that derived in Ref. [2], which uses only the CHSH value instead of the full probability distribution. To make use of the latter, the only known approach is to first bound the guessing probability $P_g(A_0|E)$ and then apply the inequality $H(A_0|E) \geq -\ln P_g(A_0|E)$ [17, 18].

We note that if the marginal distribution of $A_0$ is uniform and binary-valued, then in fact the tighter inequality [38] $H(A_0|E) \geq (2 \ln 2)(1 - P_g(A_0|E))$ holds [31], and we plot this bound in Fig. 4. (See [21] for details on how it applies in the limited-detection-efficiency model.) However, approaches based on guessing probability do not outperform the bound in [2] for the two scenarios considered here.

Our method uses the full output distribution to bound $H(A_0|E)$ directly. As shown in Fig. 4, we find that it gives results that are close to or slightly outperform the bound from Ref. [2]. Roughly speaking, our approach tends to perform well for moderate noise values, which is useful since many Bell-test implementations are currently in such noise regimes [39–43]. Our results confirm that for the limited-detection-efficiency scenario, better bounds on $H(A_0|E)$ can be obtained by considering the full distribution rather than just the CHSH value. This suggests it may not be optimal to simply choose experimental parameters that maximize the CHSH value—maximizing a different Bell value may yield further improvement over the results in Fig. 4.

We also analyze an sDI version of the six-state protocol [44], where Bob’s measurement device is uncharacterized. As mentioned earlier, the characterization of Alice’s device translates to algebraic relations between the operators $P_{a|x}$, which we impose as additional constraints on top of the NPA hierarchy. As shown in Fig. 5, the resulting bound coincides with the bound for the BB84 protocol. This supports a conjecture [45] that when Bob’s measurements are uncharacterized, performing three measurements does not offer any advantage over performing only two measurements.

**SUMMARY AND OUTLOOK**

In summary, we have developed a method to obtain reliable secret key rates for QKD with untrusted devices. The advantage of our method, as compared to
the approach in Ref. [2], is that in principle it can be applied to arbitrary DIQKD scenarios, not only those based on specialized Bell inequalities. The only existing approach that can be applied to DIQKD with such generality is based on bounding the guessing probability $P_g(A_0|E)$ instead [17, 18], which is generally not optimal. Our method outperforms both of these approaches in some cases, as shown in Fig. 4. Importantly, it gives good results in regimes with substantial noise, which are likely to be experimentally relevant. With this approach, one could now explore DIQKD implementations aimed at maximizing a different Bell expression (or maximizing the key rate directly) instead of CHSH.

Currently, our method scales rapidly in computational difficulty as the number of inputs or outputs for the protocol increases—the polynomial in Eq. (10) is generally of high order, hence a high NPA hierarchy level [15] is needed to bound $\langle K \rangle_\rho$. Because of this, we currently do not have good bounds for DI scenarios with large numbers of inputs or outputs (though we find suboptimal bounds for some such cases in [21]). An important goal now would be to find ways to improve the tractability of our approach, perhaps by following reductions along the lines of those described in Ref. [46]. This would enable the computation of key rates for DIQKD protocols with more measurement settings and/or outcomes, and at the same time, yield good bounds on the secret key rate in the noise regime that is representative of present experimental conditions.

We thank Otfried Gühne, Miriam Huang, Mathias Kleinmann, Jie Lin, Norbert Lütkenhaus, Tobias Osborne, Gláucia Murta, Miguel Navascués, Renato Renner, Valerio Scarani, Marco Tomamichel, Reinhard F. Werner, and Ramona Wolf for useful discussions. E. Y.-Z. Tan was funded by the Swiss National Science Foundation via the National Center for Competence in Research for Quantum Science and Technology (QSWIT), and by the Air Force Office of Scientific Research (AFOSR) via grant FA9550-19-1-0202. C. C.-W. Lim acknowledges support from the National Research Foundation (Singapore) Fellowship and Quantum Engineering Programme grants, the Ministry of Education (Singapore), the National University of Singapore, and the Asian Office of Aerospace Research and Development.

Computations were performed using the MATLAB package YALMIP [47] with solver MOSEK [48]. Some of the calculations reported here were performed using the Euler cluster at ETH Zürich.

\[ H(A_0|E) \]


[25] Without loss of generality, we assume [21] all measurements are projective by using an appropriate Naimark dilation.

[26] In our proofs, we will assume that all systems have finite dimension, but we do not require any explicit bounds on these dimensions.


[31] All entropies are in base e unless otherwise specified.


[35] For QKD purposes, Bob will need to perform a third measurement for key generation, corresponding to $B_0$ in Eq. (1), but we do not use this when bounding $H(A_0|E)$.


[37] In [21], we describe some situations in which better bounds than [2] are known.


