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Abstract—We pose and investigate the distributed secure source coding problem based on the common key cryptosystem. This cypressystem includes the secrecy amplification problem for distributed encrypted sources with correlated keys using post-encryption-compression, which was posed investigated by Santos and Oohama. In this paper we propose another new security criterion which is generally more strict compared to the commonly used security criterion which is based on the upper-bound of mutual information between the plaintext and the ciphertext. Under this criterion, we establish the necessary and sufficient condition for the secure transmission of correlated sources.

I. INTRODUCTION

In this paper we pose and investigate the distributed secure source coding problem based on the common key cryptosystem. This cypressystem includes the secrecy amplification problem for distributed encrypted sources with correlated keys using post-encryption-compression (PEC), which was posed investigated by Santos and Oohama in [1], [2]. In this paper we propose another new security criterion which is generally more strict compared with the commonly used security criterion which is based on the upper-bound of mutual information between the plaintext and the ciphertext. Under this criterion, we establish the necessary and sufficient condition for the secure transmission of correlated sources.

Our results yields that the sufficient condition for the secure transmission derived by Santos and Oohama [1], [2] is tight. Our study in this paper has a closely related to several previous works on the PEC, e.g., Johnson et al. [3], Klinic et al. [4]. Our study also has a close connection with several previous works on the Shannon cipher system, e.g. [5], [6], [7].

II. SECURE SOURCE CODING PROBLEM

A. Preliminaries

In this subsection, we show the basic notations and related consensus used in this paper.

Random Sources of Information and Keys: Let $(X_1, X_2)$ be a pair of random variables from a finite set $X_1 \times X_2$. Let $\{(X_{1,t}, X_{2,t})\}_{t=1}^{\infty}$ be a stationary discrete memoryless source (DMS) such that for each $t = 1, 2, \ldots$, the pair $(X_{1,t}, X_{2,t})$ takes values in finite set $X_1 \times X_2$ and obeys the same distribution as that of $(X_1, X_2)$ denoted by $p_{X_1,X_2} = \{p_{X_1,X_2}(x_1, x_2)\}_{(x_1,x_2) \in X_1 \times X_2}$. The stationary DMS $\{(X_{1,t}, X_{2,t})\}_{t=1}^{\infty}$ is specified with $p_{X_1,X_2}$. Also, let $(K_1, K_2)$ be a pair of random variables taken from the same finite set $X_1 \times X_2$ representing the pair of keys used for encryption at two separate terminals, of which the detailed description will be presented later. Similarly, let $\{(K_{1,t}, K_{2,t})\}_{t=1}^{\infty}$ be a stationary discrete memoryless source such that each $t = 1, 2, \ldots$, the pair $(K_{1,t}, K_{2,t})$ takes values in finite set $X_1 \times X_2$ and obeys the same distribution as that of $(K_1, K_2)$ denoted by $p_{K_1,K_2} = \{p_{K_1,K_2}(k_1, k_2)\}_{(k_1,k_2) \in X_1 \times X_2}$. The stationary DMS $\{(K_{1,t}, K_{2,t})\}_{t=1}^{\infty}$ is specified with $p_{K_1,K_2}$.

Random Variables and Sequences: We write the sequence of random variables with length $n$ from the information source as follows: $X_1 := X_{1,1}X_{1,2} \cdots X_{1,n}$, $X_2 := X_{2,1}X_{2,2} \cdots X_{2,n}$. Similarly, the strings with length $n$ of $X_1^n$ and $X_2^n$ are written as $x_1 := x_{1,1}x_{1,2} \cdots x_{1,n} \in X_1^n$ and $x_2 := x_{2,1}x_{2,2} \cdots x_{2,n} \in X_2^n$ respectively. For $(x_1, x_2) \in X_1^n \times X_2^n$, $p_{X_1,X_2}(x_1, x_2)$ stands for the probability of the occurrence of $(x_1, x_2)$. When the information source is memoryless specified with $p_{X_1,X_2}$, we have the following equation holds: $p_{X_1,X_2}(x_1, x_2) = \prod_{t=1}^{\infty} p_{X_1,X_2}(x_{1,t}, x_{2,t})$. In this case we write $p_{X_1,X_2}(x_1, x_2)$ as $p_{X_1,X_2}^{\infty}(x_1, x_2)$. Similar notations are used for other random variables and sequences.

Consensus and Notations: Without loss of generality, throughout this paper, we assume that $X_1$ and $X_2$ are finite fields. The notation $\oplus$ is used to denote the field addition operation, while the notation $\ominus$ is used to denote the field subtraction operation, i.e., $a \oplus b = a \oplus (-b)$ for any elements $a, b$ of a same finite field. For the sake of simplicity, we use the same notation for field addition and subtraction for both $X_1$ and $X_2$. Throughout this paper all logarithms are taken to the base 2.

B. Basic System Description

First, let the information sources and keys be generated independently by different parties $S_{\text{gen}}$ and $K_{\text{gen}}$ respectively. In our setting, we assume the followings.

- The random keys $K_1$ and $K_2$ are generated by $K_{\text{gen}}$.
- The key $K_1$ is correlated to $K_2$.
- The sources $X_1$ and $X_2$ are generated by $S_{\text{gen}}$ and are correlated to each other.
- The sources are independent to the keys.

Source coding without encryption: The two correlated random sources $X_1$ and $X_2$ from $S_{\text{gen}}$ be sent to two separated nodes $E_1$ and $E_2$ respectively. Further settings of the system are described as follows. Those are also shown in Fig. [1].
The two correlated random sources $X_1$ and $X_2$ from $S_{gen}$ are sent to two separated nodes $L_1$ and $L_2$, respectively. The two random keys $K_1$ and $K_2$ from $S_{gen}$, are also sent to $L_1$ and and $L_2$, respectively. Further settings of our system are described as follows. Those are also shown in Fig. 1.

1) **Source Processing:** For each $i = 1, 2$, at the node $i$, $X_i$ is encrypted with the key $K_i$ using the encryption function $\Phi_i^{(n)} : \mathcal{X}_i^n \rightarrow \mathcal{X}_{\text{mi}}$. For each $i = 1, 2$, the ciphertext $C_{\text{mi}}$ of $X_i$ is given by $C_{\text{mi}} = \Phi_i^{(n)} (K_i, X_i)$. On the encryption function $\Phi_i^{(n)}$, $i = 1, 2$, we use the following notation:

$$ \Phi_i^{(n)} (K_i, X_i) = \Phi_i^{(n)} (K_i, C_{\text{mi}}) = \Phi_i^{(n)} (X_i, K_i). $$

2) **Transmission:** Next, the ciphertext $C_{\text{mi}}, i = 1, 2$ are sent to the information processing center $D$ through two public communication channels. Meanwhile, the key $K_i$, $i = 1, 2$, are sent to $D$ through two private communication channels.

3) **Sink Node Processing:** In $D$, we decrypt the ciphertext $(\tilde{X}_1, \tilde{X}_2)$ from $C_{\text{mi}}, i = 1, 2$, using the key $K_i, i = 1, 2$, through the corresponding decryption procedure $\Psi^{(n)}$ defined by $\Psi^{(n)} : \mathcal{X}_{\text{mi}} \times \mathcal{X}_{\text{mi}} \rightarrow \mathcal{X}_{\text{mi}}$. Here we set

$$ (\tilde{X}_1, \tilde{X}_2) := \Psi^{(n)} (K_1, K_2, C_{\text{mi}}, C_{\text{mi}}). $$

More concretely, the decoder outputs the unique pair $(\tilde{X}_1, \tilde{X}_2)$ from $(\Phi_1^{(n)} (K_1, C_{\text{mi}}))^{-1}(\tilde{X}_1)$ and $(\Phi_2^{(n)} (K_2, C_{\text{mi}}))^{-1}(\tilde{X}_2)$ in a proper manner.

For the above $(\Phi_1^{(n)}, \Phi_2^{(n)}, \Psi^{(n)})$, we define the set $D_{m_1}$ of correct decoding by

$$ D_{m_1} := \{ (x_1, x_2) \in \mathcal{X}_{\text{mi}} \times \mathcal{X}_{\text{mi}} : \\
\psi^{(n)} (\phi_1^{(n)} (x_1), \phi_2^{(n)} (x_2)) = (x_1, x_2) \}. $$

On $|D_{m_1}|$, we have the following property.

**Property 1:** We have the following.

$$ |D_{m_1}| = |\mathcal{X}_{\text{mi}}| \times |\mathcal{X}_{\text{mi}}|. \tag{1} $$

Proof of Property 1 is given in Appendix A.
We first provide several definitions.

**A. Proposed Security Criterion**

\[ \Delta = \sum_{(x_1, x_2) \in \mathcal{D}(n)} \mathcal{P}(c_1^{m_1}, c_2^{m_2} | x_1, x_2) \]

\[ \forall \theta, \kappa \]

\[ \mathcal{D}(n) \]

\[ \mathcal{P}(c_1^{m_1}, c_2^{m_2} | x_1, x_2) = \mathcal{P}(c_1^{m_1}, c_2^{m_2} | x_1, x_2) \]

\[ \mathcal{P}(c_1^{m_1}, c_2^{m_2} | x_1, x_2) = \mathcal{P}(c_1^{m_1}, c_2^{m_2} | x_1, x_2) \]

**Proof of Lemma 1** is given in Appendix B. Let \( \mathcal{P}(c_1^{m_1}, c_2^{m_2} | x_1, x_2) = \mathcal{P}(c_1^{m_1}, c_2^{m_2} | x_1, x_2) \). We further assume that \( p_{X_1, X_2} \) is the uniform distribution over \( \mathcal{D}(n) \). Then by Lemma B we have that

\[ \sum_{(x_1, x_2) \in \mathcal{D}(n)} \mathcal{P}(c_1^{m_1}, c_2^{m_2} | x_1, x_2) = 1 \]

Hence \( p_{c_1^{m_1}, c_2^{m_2}} \) is the uniform distribution over \( \mathcal{X}_1^{m_1} \times \mathcal{X}_2^{m_2} \).

**III. MAIN RESULTS**

**A. Proposed Security Criterion**

In this section, we introduce our proposed security criterion. We first provide several definitions.

**Definitions of Random Variables:** For each \( i = 1, 2 \), let \( \mathcal{C}_i \) be a random variable with a distribution \( p_{c_i}^{m_i} | \mathcal{X}_i \). We assume that for \( (x_1, x_2) \in \mathcal{X}_1 \times \mathcal{X}_2 \), the pair \((c_i^{m_i}, c_2^{m_2}, x_1, x_2)\) has a joint distribution \( p_{c_1^{m_1}, c_2^{m_2}} | x_1, x_2 \).

**Definition 1:** For any \( (x_1, x_2) \in \mathcal{X}_1 \times \mathcal{X}_2 \), we define the following:

\[ \Delta^{(n)}(x_1, x_2) := \sum_{(c_1^{m_1}, c_2^{m_2}) \in \mathcal{X}_1^{m_1} \times \mathcal{X}_2^{m_2}} \mathcal{P}(c_1^{m_1}, c_2^{m_2} | x_1, x_2) \times \log \frac{\mathcal{P}(c_1^{m_1}, c_2^{m_2} | x_1, x_2)}{\mathcal{P}(c_1^{m_1}, c_2^{m_2} | x_1, x_2)} \]

\[ = D(p_{c_1^{m_1}, \mathcal{X}_2}^{m_2} | x_1, x_2) \]

Furthermore define:

\[ \Delta^{(n)} := \sum_{(x_1, x_2) \in \mathcal{X}_1 \times \mathcal{X}_2} \mathcal{P}(x_1, x_2) \Delta^{(n)}(x_1, x_2) \]

\[ = D(p_{X_1, X_2} | p_{c_1^{m_1}, c_2^{m_2}} | X_1, X_2) \]

We have the following property on \( \Delta^{(n)} \).

**Property 3:**

a) If \( I(C_1^{m_1}, C_2^{m_2} ; X_1, X_2) = 0 \), then, we have \( \Delta^{(n)} = 0 \). This implies that the quantity \( \Delta^{(n)} \) is valid as a measure of information leakage.

b) By the definition of \( \Delta^{(n)} \), we have

\[ \Delta^{(n)} = I(C_1^{m_1}, C_2^{m_2} ; X_1, X_2) + D(p_{C_1^{m_1}, C_2^{m_2}} | P(c_1^{m_1}, c_2^{m_2} ) \geq I(C_1^{m_1}, C_2^{m_2} ; X_1, X_2) \]

This implies that the security measure \( \Delta^{(n)} \) is stronger than the mutual information security measure \( \Delta_{MI}^{(n)} := I(C_1^{m_1}, C_2^{m_2} ; X_1, X_2) \).

**Defining Reliability and Security:**

The decoding process is successful if \( (\hat{X}_1, \hat{X}_2) = (X_1, X_2) \) holds. Hence the decoding error probability is given by

\[ p_0 = p_{0, \phi_1, \phi_2, \psi} \]

\[ = p_{0, \phi_1, \phi_2, \psi} \]

\[ \Delta^{(n)} \]

Therefore, the security measure \( \Delta^{(n)} \) depends on \( (\phi_1, \phi_2, \psi) \).
Santoso and Oohama [1, 2] proved that the bound $R_{\text{key}}(p_{K_1,K_2}) \cap R_{\text{sw}}(p_{X_1,X_2})$ serves as an inner bound of $R(p_{X_1,X_2}, p_{K_1,K_2})$ in the case where the security criterion is measured by the mutual information $\Delta_M^{(n)}$. By a simple observation we can see that their post encryption compression scheme yields the same bound in the present case of security criterion measured by $\Delta^{(n)}$. Hence we have the following theorem:

**Theorem 1:** For each $(\varepsilon, \delta) \in (0, \varepsilon_0] \times (0, 1)$, we have

$$R_{\text{key}}(p_{K_1,K_2}) \cap R_{\text{sw}}(p_{X_1,X_2}) \subseteq R(p_{X_1,X_2}, p_{K_1,K_2}) \subseteq R(\varepsilon, \delta, p_{X_1,X_2}, p_{K_1,K_2}).$$

Outline of the proof of this theorem will be given in the next section. We next derive one outer bound by a simple observation based on previous works on the distributed source coding for correlated sources. From the communication scheme we can see that the common key cryptosystem can be regarded as the data compression system, where for each $i = 1, 2$, the encoder $\Phi_i$ and the decoder $\Psi_i$ can use the common side information $K_i$. By the strong converse coding theorem for this data compression system [3], we have that if

$$R_1 = H(X_1|X_2,K_1,K_2) = H(X_1|X_2) \text{ or }$$

$$R_2 = H(X_2|X_1,K_1,K_2) = H(X_2|X_1) \text{ or }$$

$$R_1 + R_2 = H(X_1,X_2|K_1,K_2) = H(X_1,X_2),$$

then $\forall \tau \in (0, 1), \forall \gamma > 0$, and $\forall \{(\phi_1, \phi_2, \psi)\}_{n \geq 1}$, $\exists n_0 = n_0(\tau, \gamma) \in N, \forall n \geq n_0$, we have:

$$\frac{m}{n} \log |X_i| \leq R_i + \gamma, i = 1, 2,$$

$$p_e(\phi_1, \phi_2, \psi)^n(p_{X_1,X_2}, p_{K_1,K_2}) \geq 1 - \tau.$$

Hence we have the following theorem.

**Theorem 2:** For each $(\varepsilon, \delta) \in (0, \varepsilon_0] \times (0, 1)$, we have

$$R(\varepsilon, \delta|p_{X_1,X_2}, p_{K_1,K_2}) \subseteq R_{\text{sw}}(p_{X_1,X_2}).$$

In this paper we prove that for some $\varepsilon > 0$, the set $R_{\text{key}}(p_{K_1,K_2})$ serves as an outer bound of $R(\varepsilon, \delta|p_{X_1,X_2}, p_{K_1,K_2})$ for $(\varepsilon, \delta) \in (0, \varepsilon_0] \times (0, 1)$. The following is the key lemma to derive the above result.

**Lemma 2:**

$$\max\{m_1 \log |X_1| - nH(K_1), m_2 \log |X_2| - nH(K_2),$$

$$m_1 \log |X_1| + m_2 \log |X_2| - nH(K_1,K_2)\} \leq \Delta^{(n)}.$$  \hspace{1cm} (2)

Proof of this lemma is given in Appendix [1] As an immediate consequence of the above lemma, we have the following proposition.

**Proposition 1:** If $(R_1, R_2) \in R(\varepsilon, \delta|p_{X_1,X_2}, p_{K_1,K_2})$, then we have that $\forall \gamma > 0, \exists n_0(\gamma), \forall n \geq n_0(\gamma)$, we have

$$R_i \leq H(K_i) + \gamma + \frac{\varepsilon}{n}, i = 1, 2,$$

$$R_1 + R_2 \leq H(K_1 + K_2) + \gamma + \frac{\varepsilon}{n}.$$ 

From this proposition we have the following theorem.

**Theorem 3:** For each $(\varepsilon, \delta) \in (0, \varepsilon_0] \times (0, 1)$, we have

$$R(\varepsilon, \delta|p_{X_1,X_2}, p_{K_1,K_2}) \subseteq R_{\text{key}}(p_{K_1,K_2}).$$

Combining Theorems [1, 2] and [3] we establish the following:

**Theorem 4:** For each $(\varepsilon, \delta) \in (0, \varepsilon_0] \times (0, 1)$, we have

$$R_{\text{key}}(p_{K_1,K_2}) \cap R_{\text{sw}}(p_{X_1,X_2}) = R(\varepsilon, \delta|p_{X_1,X_2}, p_{K_1,K_2}).$$

**IV. OUTLINE OF THE PROOF OF THEOREM 1**

In this section we outline the proof of Theorem 1. Our construction of $(\Phi_1^{(n)}, \Phi_2^{(n)}, \Psi^{(n)})$ is the same as that of Santoso and Oohama [1, 2] for the post encryption compression scheme.

Let $\phi^{(n)} := (\phi_1^{(n)}, \phi_2^{(n)})$ be a pair of linear mappings $\phi_1^{(n)}: \mathcal{X}_1^n \rightarrow \mathcal{X}_1^{m_1}$ and $\phi_2^{(n)}: \mathcal{X}_2^n \rightarrow \mathcal{X}_2^{m_2}$. For each $i = 1, 2$, we define the mapping $\phi_i^{(n)}: \mathcal{X}_i^n \rightarrow \mathcal{X}_i^{m_i}$ by

$$\phi_i^{(n)}(x_i) := \phi_i^{(n)}(k_i) \oplus b_i^{(n)} = k_iA_i \oplus b_i^{(n)},$$

where $A_i$ is a matrix with $n$ rows and $m_i$ columns. For each $i = 1, 2$, entries of $A_i$ are from $\mathcal{X}_i$. We fix $b_i^{(n)} \in \mathcal{X}_i^{m_i}, i = 1, 2$. For each $i = 1, 2$, define the mapping $\varphi_i^{(n)}: \mathcal{X}_i^n \rightarrow \mathcal{X}_i^{m_i}$ by

$$\varphi_i^{(n)}(k_i, x_i) = \phi_i^{(n)}(k_i \oplus x_i).$$

By the definition (4) of $\varphi_i^{(n)}$, $i = 1, 2$, we have

$$\varphi_i^{(n)}(k_i, x_i) = \varphi_i^{(n)}(x_i \oplus k_i),$$

where $\varphi_i^{(n)} := (\varphi_1^{(n)}, \varphi_2^{(n)})$. Next, let $\psi_i^{(n)}$ be the corresponding joint decoder for $\psi^{(n)}$ such that $\psi_i^{(n)}: \mathcal{X}_1^{m_1} \times \mathcal{X}_2^{m_2} \rightarrow \mathcal{X}_1 \times \mathcal{X}_2$. Note that $\psi_i^{(n)}$ does not have a linear structure in general.

**Description of Proposed Procedure:** We describe the procedure of our privacy amplified system as follows.

1) **Encoding of Ciphertexts:** First, we use $\varphi_1^{(n)}$ and $\varphi_2^{(n)}$ to encode the ciphertexts $X_1 \oplus K_1$ and $X_2 \oplus K_2$. Let $C_i^{m_i} = \varphi_i^{(n)}(X_i \oplus K_i)$ for $i = 1, 2$. By the affine structure (5) of encoders we have that for each $i = 1, 2$,

$$\phi_i^{(n)}(K_i, X_i) = C_i^{m_i} = \varphi_i^{(n)}(X_i \oplus K_i),$$

where $\tilde{X}_i^{m_i} := \phi_i^{(n)}(X_i), \tilde{K}_i^{m_i} := \varphi_i^{(n)}(K_i)$.

2) **Decoding at Joint Sink Node D:** First, using the pair of linear encoders $(\varphi_1^{(n)}, \varphi_2^{(n)})$, D encodes the keys $(K_1, K_2)$ which are received through private channel into $(\tilde{K}_1^{m_1}, \tilde{K}_2^{m_2}) = (\varphi_1^{(n)}(K_1), \varphi_2^{(n)}(K_2))$. Receiving
(\(C_{1}^{m_1}, C_{2}^{m_2}\)) from public communication channel, D computes \(\tilde{X}_i^{m_1}, i = 1, 2\) in the following way. From (6), we have that for each \(i = 1, 2\), the decoder D can obtain \(\tilde{X}_i^{m_1} = \phi_i^{(n)}(X_i)\) by subtracting \(\tilde{K}_i^{m_1} = \varphi_i^{(n)}(K_i)\) from \(C_i^{m_1}\). Finally, D outputs \((\tilde{X}_1, \tilde{X}_2)\) by applying the joint decoder \(\psi^{(n)}\) to \((\tilde{X}_1^{m_1}, \tilde{X}_2^{m_2})\) as follows:

\[
(\tilde{X}_1, \tilde{X}_2) = (\psi^{(n)}(\tilde{X}_1^{m_1}, \tilde{X}_2^{m_2})) = (\psi^{(n)}(\phi_1^{(n)}(X_1), \phi_2^{(n)}(X_2))).
\] (7)

We summarize the above argument. For \((K_1, K_2)\) and \((C_{1}^{m_1}, C_{2}^{m_2})\), define \(\psi^{(n)}\) by

\[
\psi^{(n)}(K_1, K_2, C_{1}^{m_1}, C_{2}^{m_2}) = \psi^{(n)}(K_1, K_2, \psi^{(n)}(C_{1}^{m_1} \oplus \tilde{K}_1^{m_1}, C_{2}^{m_2} \oplus \tilde{K}_2^{m_2})) = \psi^{(n)}(X_1^{m_1}, X_2^{m_2}).
\]

By the above definition and \(C_i^{m_1} = \Phi_i^{(n)}(X_i), i = 1, 2\), we have

\[
\psi^{(n)}(\Phi_1^{(n)}(X_1), \Phi_2^{(n)}(X_2)) = \psi^{(n)}(X_1^{m_1}, X_2^{m_2}) = \psi^{(n)}(\phi_1^{(n)}(X_1), \phi_2^{(n)}(X_2)).
\]

Hence we have the condition which \((\Phi_1^{(n)}, \Phi_2^{(n)}, \psi^{(n)})\) must satisfy.

In this paper, we use the minimum entropy decoder for our joint decoder \(\psi^{(n)}\).

**Minimum Entropy Decoder:** For \(\phi_i^{(n)}(x_i) = \tilde{x}_i^{m_1}, i = 1, 2\), \(\psi^{(n)} : \chi_1^{m_1} \times \chi_2^{m_2} \rightarrow \chi_1^{m_1} \times \chi_2^{m_2}\) is defined as follows:

\[
\psi^{(n)}(\tilde{x}_1^{m_1}, \tilde{x}_2^{m_2})
\]

\[
(\tilde{x}_1, \tilde{x}_2)\) if \(\phi_i^{(n)}(x_i) = \tilde{x}_i^{m_1}, i = 1, 2\), and \(H(\tilde{x}_1, \tilde{x}_2) < H(\tilde{x}_1, \tilde{x}_2)\)

for all \((\tilde{x}_1, \tilde{x}_2)\) such that

\[
\phi_i^{(n)}(x_i) = \tilde{x}_i^{m_1}, i = 1, 2,
\]

and \((\tilde{x}_1, \tilde{x}_2) \neq (\tilde{x}_1, \tilde{x}_2)\),

arbitrary if there is no such \((\tilde{x}_1, \tilde{x}_2) \in \chi_1^{m_1} \times \chi_2^{m_2}\).

Our privacy amplified system described above is illustrated in Fig. 3.

**Evaluations of the reliability and security:** On the error probability \(p_e\) of decoding we have

\[
p_e = \Pr[\psi^{(n)}(K_1, K_2, \phi_1^{(n)}(X_1), \phi_2^{(n)}(X_2)) \neq (X_1, X_2)]
\]

\[
= \Pr[\psi^{(n)}(\Phi_1^{(n)}(X_1), \Phi_2^{(n)}(X_2)) \neq (X_1, X_2)]
\]

Computing \(\Delta^{(n)}\), we have

\[
\Delta^{(n)} = D(p_{C_{1}^{m_1}C_{2}^{m_2}}X_1X_2 || p_{\tilde{C}_{1}^{m_1} \tilde{C}_{2}^{m_2}}p_{X_1X_2})
\]

\[
= m_1 \log |X_1| + m_2 \log |X_2| - H(C_{1}^{m_1}, C_{2}^{m_2}|X_1X_2)
\]

\[
= m_1 \log |X_1| + m_2 \log |X_2|
\]

\[- H(\tilde{K}_{1}^{m_1} \oplus \tilde{x}_1^{m_1}, \tilde{K}_{2}^{m_2} \oplus \tilde{x}_2^{m_2}|X_1X_2)
\]

\[
= m_1 \log |X_1| + m_2 \log |X_2| - H(\tilde{K}_{1}^{m_1}, \tilde{K}_{2}^{m_2})
\]

\[
= D(p_{\tilde{K}_{1}^{m_1} \tilde{K}_{2}^{m_2}}||p_{\tilde{X}_{1}^{m_1} \tilde{X}_{2}^{m_2}}).
\]

Here \(p_{\tilde{X}_{1}^{m_1} \tilde{X}_{2}^{m_2}}\) is the uniform distribution over \(\chi_1^{m_1} \times \chi_2^{m_2}\). According to Santoso and Oohama [2], \(\exists(\Phi_1^{(n)}, \Phi_2^{(n)}, \psi^{(n)})\).
\[ \{ \psi^{(n)} \}_{n \geq 1} \text{ such that for any } \{ p_{x_1, x_2}, p_{K_1, K_2} \} \text{ satisfying} \]
\[
\frac{m_1}{n}\log |x_1|, \frac{m_2}{n}\log |x_2| \in \mathcal{R}_{key}(p_{K_1, K_2}) \cap \mathcal{R}_{sw}(p_{x_1, x_2}),
\]
the two quantities
\[
Pr[\phi^{(n)}(X_1), \phi^{(n)}(X_2)] \neq (X_1, X_2) \text{ and} \]
\[
D(p^{(n)}) \leq |D(X_1, X_2)|
\]
decay exponentially as \( n \) tends to infinity. Hence we have [Theorem].

**APPENDIX**

A. Proof of Property [7]

**Proof of Property [7]** We have the following:
\[
\begin{align*}
D^{(n)} &= \{(x_1, x_2) = \psi^{(n)}(x_1^m, x_2^m) : (x_1^m, x_2^m) \in \phi^{(n)}_1(X_1^n) \times \phi^{(n)}_2(X_2^n) \} \\
&= \{(x_1, x_2) = \psi^{(n)}(x_1^m, x_2^m) : (x_1^m, x_2^m) \in \phi^{(n)}_1(X_1^n) \times \phi^{(n)}_2(X_2^n) \}. \quad (8)
\end{align*}
\]
Step (a) follows from that every pair \((x_1^m, x_2^m) \in \phi^{(n)}_1(X_1^n) \times \phi^{(n)}_2(X_2^n)\) uniquely determines \((x_1, x_2) \in D^{(n)}\). Step (b) follows from that \(x_1, x_2\) are surjective. Since \(\psi^{(n)}_1: X_1^n \times X_2^n \rightarrow X_1^n \times X_2^n\) is a one-to-one mapping and [8], we have \(|D^{(n)}| = |X_1^n| \times |X_2^n|\).

B. Proof of Property [3]

We first prove the part a) and next prove the part b).

**Proof of Property [3] part a):** Under \((x_1, x_2), (x'_1, x'_2) \in D^{(n)}\) and \((x_1, x_2) \neq (x'_1, x'_2)\), we assume that
\[
\{(\psi^{(n)}_1, \psi^{(n)}_2)(x_1), \psi^{(n)}_2(x_2)\} = \{(\psi^{(n)}_1(x'_1), \psi^{(n)}_2(x'_2))\}. \quad (9)
\]
Then we have the following
\[
\begin{align*}
(x_1, x_2) &\overset{(a)}{=} \psi^{(n)}(\phi^{(n)}_1(k_1), \phi^{(n)}_2(k_2)) \\
&\overset{(b)}{=} \psi^{(n)}_1(k_1, \phi^{(n)}_2(k_2)) \\
&\overset{(c)}{=} \psi^{(n)}_1(k_1, \phi^{(n)}_2(x_2)) \\
&\overset{(d)}{=} \psi^{(n)}_1(x'_1, \phi^{(n)}_2(x'_2)) \\
&\overset{(e)}{=} (x'_1, x'_2). \quad (10)
\end{align*}
\]
Steps (a) and (e) follow from the definition of \(D^{(n)}\). Step (c) follows from [9]. Steps (b) and (d) follow from the relationship between \((\phi^{(n)}_1, \phi^{(n)}_2, \psi^{(n)}_1, \psi^{(n)}_2)\) and \((\psi^{(n)}_1(k_1), \phi^{(n)}_2(k_2)), \psi^{(n)}_2(k_2))\). The equality [10] contradicts the first assumption. Hence we must have Property [2] part a).

**Proof of Property [2] part b):** We assume that \(\exists (k_1, k_2)\) and \(\exists (c_1^m, c_2^m)\) such that \(\forall (x_1, x_2) \in D^{(n)}, \{(\psi^{(n)}_1, \phi^{(n)}_2)(x_1), \phi^{(n)}_2(x_2)\} \neq (c_1^m, c_2^m)\). Set
\[
B := \{(\psi^{(n)}_1(x_1), \phi^{(n)}_2(x_2)) : (x_1, x_2) \in D^{(n)}\}.
\]
Then by the above assumption we have
\[
B \subseteq X_1^n \times X_2^n \setminus \{(c_1^m, c_2^m)\}. \quad (11)
\]
On the other hand we have
\[
\begin{align*}
\psi^{(n)}_{k_1, k_2}(B) &= \{(\psi^{(n)}(\phi^{(n)}_1(x_1), \phi^{(n)}_2(x_2)) : (x_1, x_2) \in D^{(n)}\} \\
&= \{(\psi^{(n)}_1(x_1), \psi^{(n)}_2(x_2)) : (x_1, x_2) \in D^{(n)}\} = D^{(n)}.
\end{align*}
\]
which together with that \(\psi^{(n)}_{k_1, k_2}: X_1^m \times X_2^m \rightarrow X_1^n \times X_2^n\) is a one-to-one mapping yields that
\[
|B| = |\psi^{(n)}_{k_1, k_2}(B)| = |D^{(n)}| = |X_1^m| \times |X_2^m|.
\]
The above equality contradicts [11]. Hence we must have that \(\forall (k_1, k_2), \forall (c_1^m, c_2^m), \exists (x_1, x_2) \in D^{(n)}\) such that \(\psi^{(n)}_{k_1, k_2}(x_1, x_2) = c_1^m, i = 1, 2\).

C. Proof of Lemma [7]

We first define a set necessary for the proof. For \((x_1, x_2) \in X_1^n \times X_2^n\), we set
\[
A_{x_1, x_2}(c_1^m, c_2^m) := \{(k_1, k_2) : \psi^{(n)}_i(x_i) = c_i^m, i = 1, 2\}.
\]

**Proof of Lemma [7]** By definition we have
\[
\begin{align*}
&\Pr \left( \{K_1, K_2\} \in A_{x_1, x_2}(c_1^m, c_2^m) \right) = \Pr \left( \{K_1, K_2\} \in A_{x_1, x_2}(c_1^m, c_2^m) \right) \\
&\subseteq \Pr (\{K_1, K_2\} \in A_{x_1, x_2}(c_1^m, c_2^m)) \quad (12)
\end{align*}
\]
Step (a) follows from \(\{K_1, K_2\} \subseteq (X_1, X_2)\). On the other hand, Property [2] part a) implies that
\[
A_{x_1, x_2}(c_1^m, c_2^m) \cap A_{x_1, x_2}(c_1^m, c_2^m) = \emptyset
\]
for \((x_1, x_2) \neq (x'_1, x'_2) \in D^{(n)}\). (13)

Furthermore, Property [2] part b) implies that
\[
\bigcup_{(x_1, x_2) \in D^{(n)}} A_{x_1, x_2}(c_1^m, c_2^m) = X_1^n \times X_2^n. \quad (14)
\]
From [12], we have the following chain of equalities:
\[
\sum_{(x_1, x_2) \in D^{(n)}} \Pr \left( \{K_1, K_2\} \in \bigcup_{(x_1, x_2) \in D^{(n)}} A_{x_1, x_2}(c_1^m, c_2^m) \right) = 1.
\]
Step (a) follows from [13]. Step (b) follows from [14].

D. Proof of Lemma [2]

In this appendix we prove Lemma [2] We first define quantities necessary for the proof. For each \(i = 1, 2\) and \(x_i \in X_1^n\), we define the following:
\[
\Delta_i^{(n)}(x_i) := \sum_{c_i^m \in X_i^n} \log \frac{p_{c_i^m|x_i}(c_i^m|x_i)}{p_{c_i^m}(c_i^m)}
\]
\[
= D(c_i^m||X_i^n) = D(p_{c_i^m|x_i}(c_i^m||p_{c_i^m}(c_i^m)).
\]
Furthermore for each $i = 1, 2$, define
\[
\Delta_i^{(n)} := \sum_{x_i \in \mathcal{X}_i^n} p(x_i) \Delta_i^{(n)}(x_i) = D(p_{C_i^{m_1}}(x_i) \| p_{C_i^{m_2}}(x_i)).
\]

It is obvious that $\Delta_i^{(n)} \geq \Delta_i^{(1)}, i = 1, 2$.

**Proof of Lemma 2** By the definition of $C_{x_i}^n$, $i = 1, 2$, we have for $i = 1, 2$,
\[
\Pr \{ C_{x_i}^n = c_{i1}^{m_1}, C_{x_2}^n = c_{i2}^{m_2} \} = \Pr \{ C_{x_i}^n = c_{i1}^{m_1}, C_{x_2}^n = c_{i2}^{m_2} \mid X_i = x_i, X_2 = x_2 \}
\]
\[
= \Pr \{ \Phi_{1,x_i}(K_1) = c_{i1}^{m_1}, \Phi_{2,x_2}(K_2) = c_{i2}^{m_2} \mid X_i = x_i, X_2 = x_2 \}
\]
\[
= \Pr \{ \Phi_{1,x_i}(K_1) = c_{i1}^{m_1}, \Phi_{2,x_2}(K_2) = c_{i2}^{m_2} \}.
\]  
(15)

Step (a) follows from that $K_1 \perp X_i, i = 1, 2$. Then for $i = 1, 2$, we have the following:
\[
\Delta_i^{(n)}(x_i) = m_i \log |\mathcal{X}_i| - H(C_{x_i}^n)
\]
\[
\geq m_i \log |\mathcal{X}_i| - H(\Phi_{1,x_i}(K_1))
\]
\[
\geq m_i \log |\mathcal{X}_i| - H(K_i) = m_i \log |\mathcal{X}_i| - nH(K_i).
\]  
(16)

Step (a) follows from (15). Step (b) follows from the data processing inequality. Hence from (16), we have
\[
\Delta_i^{(n)} \geq m_i \log |\mathcal{X}_i| - nH(K_i) \text{ for } i = 1, 2.
\]  
(17)

Furthermore, we have
\[
\Pr \{ C_{x_1}^n = c_1^{m_1}, C_{x_2}^n = c_2^{m_2} \mid X_1 = x_1, X_2 = x_2 \}
\]
\[
= \Pr \{ \Phi_{1,x_1}(K_1) = c_1^{m_1}, \Phi_{2,x_2}(K_2) = c_2^{m_2} \mid X_1 = x_1, X_2 = x_2 \}
\]
\[
= \Pr \{ \Phi_{1,x_1}(K_1) = c_1^{m_1}, \Phi_{2,x_2}(K_2) = c_2^{m_2} \}. \]
(18)

Step (a) follows from that $(K_1, K_2) \perp (X_1, X_2)$. Then, we have the following:
\[
\Delta^{(n)}(x_1, x_2) = m_1 \log |\mathcal{X}_1| + m_2 \log |\mathcal{X}_2| - H(C_{x_1}^n, C_{x_2}^n)
\]
\[
= m_1 \log |\mathcal{X}_1| + m_2 \log |\mathcal{X}_2| - H(\Phi_{1,x_1}(K_1)\Phi_{2,x_2}(K_2))
\]
\[
\geq m_1 \log |\mathcal{X}_1| + m_2 \log |\mathcal{X}_2| - H(K_1K_2)
\]
\[
= m_1 \log |\mathcal{X}_1| + m_2 \log |\mathcal{X}_2| - nH(K_1K_2).
\]  
(19)

Step (a) follows from (18). Step (b) follows from the data processing inequality. Hence from (19), we have
\[
\Delta^{(n)} \geq m_1 \log |\mathcal{X}_1| + m_2 \log |\mathcal{X}_2| - nH(K_1K_2).
\]  
(20)

From (17) and (20), we have the bound in Lemma 2.
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