

PAPER

Secret Key Agreement by Soft-decision of Signals in Gaussian Maurer's Model*

Masashi NAITO^{†a)}, *Nonmember*, Shun WATANABE^{††b)}, Ryutaroh MATSUMOTO^{††c)},
and Tomohiko UYEMATSU^{††d)}, *Members*

SUMMARY We consider the problem of secret key agreement in Gaussian Maurer's Model. In Gaussian Maurer's model, legitimate receivers, Alice and Bob, and a wire-tapper, Eve, receive signals randomly generated by a satellite through three independent memoryless Gaussian channels respectively. Then Alice and Bob generate a common secret key from their received signals. In this model, we propose a protocol for generating a common secret key by using the result of soft-decision of Alice and Bob's received signals. Then, we calculate a lower bound on the secret key rate in our proposed protocol. As a result of comparison with the protocol that only uses hard-decision, we found that the higher rate is obtained by using our protocol.

key words: *advantage distillation, AWGN, information theoretic security, key agreement, privacy amplification, public discussion*

1. Introduction

As one of fundamental problems in cryptography, we will consider the problem of secret key agreement in this paper. That is to say, we will consider how to generate a common secret key by two parties not sharing such a key initially in the situation that a wire-tapper has access to the communication channel between two parties. Many models of this problem were presented and analyzed in the literatures [1]–[4]. Recently, key agreement over wireless channel is experimentally studied [6].

Maurer [5] and Ahlswede and Csiszar [7] considered the interactive model of secret key agreement from an initially shared partially secret string by communication over a public channel.

Maurer [5] considered the following model. Two parties, Alice and Bob, who want to share a secret key, and the wire-tapper, Eve, receive the bits randomly

generated by a satellite over independent binary symmetric channels (BSC) respectively. We call this model Maurer's model. Maurer [5] proposed an interactive protocol in his model, and he showed a lower bound on key rates at which Alice and Bob can agree a secret key. Note that the key rate is defined as length of the secret key generated by Alice and Bob per channel use by the satellite.

In Maurer's original model and protocol, channels are assumed to be BSC, and received signals are assumed to be digital signals. However, signals in practical channels are analogue. Recently, key agreement over wireless channel is experimentally studied by Aono et al. [6]. However, information theoretic analysis of the key agreement over analogue channels has not sufficiently conducted. In order to close the gap between Maurer's results and the experimental study, we will modify Maurer's model to use Gaussian channels instead of BSC, which we call Gaussian Maurer's model.

In Gaussian Maurer's model, Alice and Bob can use the results of soft-decision of analogue received signals. They can determine the reliability information from this results and use it for generating a common secret key. In this paper, we will propose a protocol for secret key agreement using the reliability information. Then, we calculate key rates at which Alice and Bob can agree a secret key in our proposed protocol.

Considering the situation that Alice, Bob, and Eve hard-detect the signals that are sent out by the satellite, Maurer's original model can be seen as the special case of Gaussian Maurer's model. Thus, we can compare the protocol in Gaussian Maurer's model and one in BSC Maurer's model. In order to show advantage to use reliability information, we will compare the key rate in our proposed protocol and the key rate in Maurer's protocol in which Alice and Bob use only hard-decision. that uses only hard-decision. From the result of this comparison, we will show that the higher key rate is obtained by using our proposed protocol than the protocol that only uses hard-decision.

Rest of this paper is organized as follows. In section 2, we will introduce Maurer's model modified to use Gaussian channels instead of BSC. In section 3, we will show our proposed protocol using reliability information. In section 4, we will compare our proposed protocol and Maurer's protocol with hard-decision. In

Manuscript received April 1, 2008.

Manuscript revised January 1, 2003.

Final manuscript received January 1, 2003.

[†]The author is with the Department of Media Science Graduate School of Information Science, Nagoya University

^{††}The authors are with the Department of Communications and Integrated Systems, Tokyo Institute of Technology

a) E-mail: m-naito@sp.m.is.nagoya-u.ac.jp

b) E-mail: shun-wata@it.ss.titech.ac.jp

c) E-mail: ryutaroh@rmatsumoto.org

d) E-mail: uyematsu@ieee.org

*A part of this paper will be presented at 2008 IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory in Toronto, Canada.

appendices, we will prove the lemmas that is needed for the proof of theorem that derives a lower bound on key rates at which Alice and Bob can agree a secret key.

2. Secret Key Rate in Gaussian Maurer's Model

Consider the following key agreement problem, which we call Gaussian Maurer's model. Assume that a satellite randomly generates signals and sends it to two parties Alice and Bob who want to share secret key and the wire-tapper Eve over three independent memoryless Gaussian channels. Their noises at time i , denoted $N_A^{(i)}$, $N_B^{(i)}$, and $N_E^{(i)}$, are drawn from independently identically distributed (i.i.d.) Gaussian distributions with mean 0 and variances V_A , V_B , and V_E respectively. A sequence of signals that the satellite generates at time 1 to n , denoted $U^n = [U^{(1)}, \dots, U^{(n)}]$, is drawn from a distribution P_{U^n} on a signal set in \mathbb{R}^n and this sequence of signals satisfies power constraint $\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (u^{(i)})^2 \leq 1$ for all sequences u^n . Alice, Bob, and Eve receive $X^n = [X^{(1)}, \dots, X^{(n)}]$, $Y^n = [Y^{(1)}, \dots, Y^{(n)}]$, and $Z^n = [Z^{(1)}, \dots, Z^{(n)}]$, as outputs of these three channels at time 1 to n respectively. They are assumed to know the distribution P_{U^n} and noise variances V_A , V_B , and V_E . Note that capital letters denote random variables and corresponding small letters denote realizations in this paper.

After Alice, Bob, and Eve receive signals, Alice and Bob communicate over a public channel. This channel is assumed to be noiseless and discrete, and its capacity is finite. Every messages communicated between Alice and Bob can be intercepted by Eve, but it is assumed that Eve cannot fraudulent messages nor modify messages on this public channel without being detected. Let C be the entire communication held over this public channel. After enough communication over the public channel, Alice computes a secret key S on a key alphabet \mathcal{S} as a function of her received signals X^n and all information C over the public channel. In a similar way, Bob computes a secret key S' on \mathcal{S} as a function of Y^n and C . The secret key rate in this model is defined as follows. Note that we will take all logarithms to be base 2, and hence all the entropies will be measured in bits.

Definition 1 For given noise variances V_A , V_B , and V_E , a rate R is said to be *achievable* if for every $\epsilon > 0$ there exists a protocol for sufficiently large n satisfying

$$\Pr[S \neq S'] \leq \epsilon, \quad (1)$$

$$H(S|CZ^n) \geq \log |\mathcal{S}| - \epsilon \quad (2)$$

and

$$\frac{1}{n} \log |\mathcal{S}| \geq R - \epsilon, \quad (3)$$

where $|\mathcal{S}|$ denotes the number of the elements in \mathcal{S} .

Definition 2 The *secret key rate* for given noise variances V_A , V_B , and V_E , denoted $R_S(V_A, V_B, V_E)$, is the supremum of all achievable rate.

3. Secret Key Agreement by Soft-Decision of Signals

In this section, we will propose a protocol that uses reliability information of signals and calculate a lower bound on the secret key rate in this protocol.

In our proposed protocol, the satellite selects input signal $U^{(i)}$ i.i.d. according to a distribution $P_U(1) = P_U(-1) = \frac{1}{2}$. Thus, the received signals $X^{(i)}$, $Y^{(i)}$, $Z^{(i)}$ are also i.i.d. respectively.

Let a_1, \dots, a_K be a positive monotonically increasing sequence, and let E_1, \dots, E_K be sets, where j th level set is defined as $E_j = [-a_j, a_j]$ ($j = 1, \dots, K$).

The procedures of our proposed protocol is as follows.

1. From the received signal $X^{(i)}$ at time i , Alice determines reliability information $W_A^{(i)}$ as

$$W_A^{(i)} = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } X^{(i)} \in E_1 \\ j & \text{if } X^{(i)} \in E_j^c \setminus E_{j+1}^c \quad (j = 1, \dots, K), \\ K & \text{if } X^{(i)} \in E_K^c \end{cases}$$

where the set E_j^c is the complementary set of the set E_j in the set of real numbers \mathbb{R} , and $E_j^c \setminus E_{j+1}^c = E_j^c \cap E_{j+1}$ is the difference set. Similarly, from the received signal $Y^{(i)}$ at time i , Bob determine reliability information $W_B^{(i)}$ as

$$W_B^{(i)} = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } Y^{(i)} \in E_1 \\ j & \text{if } Y^{(i)} \in E_j^c \setminus E_{j+1}^c \quad (j = 1, \dots, K). \\ K & \text{if } Y^{(i)} \in E_K^c \end{cases}$$

2. Alice and Bob send sequences $W_A^n = [W_A^{(1)}, \dots, W_A^{(n)}]$ and $W_B^n = [W_B^{(1)}, \dots, W_B^{(n)}]$ over the public channel. From these messages, they can know the sets containing their received signals.
3. Alice and Bob quantize X^n and Y^n into discrete random variables \tilde{X}_Δ^n and \tilde{Y}_Δ^n , where $\tilde{X}_\Delta^{(i)}$ is defined as

$$\tilde{X}_\Delta^{(i)} = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } X^{(i)} \geq 0, \\ 0 & \text{if } X^{(i)} < 0, \end{cases} \quad (4)$$

and $\tilde{Y}_\Delta^{(i)}$ is similarly defined as

$$\tilde{Y}_\Delta^{(i)} = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } Y^{(i)} \geq 0, \\ 0 & \text{if } Y^{(i)} < 0. \end{cases} \quad (5)$$

For given $(W_A^{(i)}, W_B^{(i)}) = (w_A, w_B)$, if Eve's ambiguity $H(\tilde{X}_\Delta|Z, W_A = w_A, W_B = w_B)$ about $\tilde{X}_\Delta^{(i)}$ is smaller than Bob's ambiguity $H(\tilde{X}_\Delta|Y, W_A =$

$w_A, W_B = w_B$) about $\tilde{X}_\Delta^{(i)}$, then we should discard $\tilde{X}_\Delta^{(i)}$ in our protocol. Indeed, if we keep $\tilde{X}_\Delta^{(i)}$ for such $(W_A^{(i)}, W_B^{(i)}) = (w_A, w_B)$, then a negative term is added to the lower bound on a secret key rate shown in Eq. (12). Furthermore, if the difference between Eve and Bob's ambiguity about $\tilde{X}_\Delta^{(i)}$ is smaller than the difference between Eve's ambiguity $H(\tilde{Y}_\Delta|Z, W_A = w_A, W_B = w_B)$ about $\tilde{Y}_\Delta^{(i)}$ and Alice's ambiguity $H(\tilde{Y}_\Delta|X, W_A = w_A, W_B = w_B)$ about $\tilde{Y}_\Delta^{(i)}$, we should generate a secret key from $\tilde{Y}_\Delta^{(i)}$ instead of $\tilde{X}_\Delta^{(i)}$. For this purpose, we consider the sets $A, B \subset \{1, \dots, K\} \times \{1, \dots, K\}$, which are defined as

$$\begin{aligned}
 A &= \{(w_A, w_B) | \\
 &\quad H(\tilde{X}_\Delta|Z, W_A = w_A, W_B = w_B) \\
 &\quad - H(\tilde{X}_\Delta|Y, W_A = w_A, W_B = w_B) \\
 &\quad \geq \max\{0, H(\tilde{Y}_\Delta|Z, W_A = w_A, W_B = w_B) \\
 &\quad \quad - H(\tilde{Y}_\Delta|X, W_A = w_A, W_B = w_B)\}\}, \\
 B &= \{(w_A, w_B) | \\
 &\quad H(\tilde{Y}_\Delta|Z, W_A = w_A, W_B = w_B) \\
 &\quad - H(\tilde{Y}_\Delta|X, W_A = w_A, W_B = w_B) \\
 &\quad > \max\{0, H(\tilde{X}_\Delta|Z, W_A = w_A, W_B = w_B) \\
 &\quad \quad - H(\tilde{X}_\Delta|Y, W_A = w_A, W_B = w_B)\}\}.
 \end{aligned}$$

If given $(W_A^{(i)}, W_B^{(i)})$ is in the set A , we use $\tilde{X}_\Delta^{(i)}$ for generating a secret key, otherwise we discard $\tilde{X}_\Delta^{(i)}$. Similarly, if given $(W_A^{(i)}, W_B^{(i)})$ is in the set B , we use $\tilde{Y}_\Delta^{(i)}$ for generating a secret key, otherwise we discard $\tilde{Y}_\Delta^{(i)}$. Thus, we determine discrete random variables

$$X_\Delta^{(i)} = \begin{cases} \tilde{X}_\Delta^{(i)} & \text{if } (W_A^{(i)}, W_B^{(i)}) \in A, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \quad (6)$$

and

$$Y_\Delta^{(i)} = \begin{cases} \tilde{Y}_\Delta^{(i)} & \text{if } (W_A^{(i)}, W_B^{(i)}) \in B, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \quad (7)$$

and we use them for generating a secret key instead of $\tilde{X}_\Delta^{(i)}$ and $\tilde{Y}_\Delta^{(i)}$.

4. According to the rule in Eq. (6), Alice determines X_Δ^n from W_A^n, W_B^n , and \tilde{X}_Δ^n . Similarly, Bob determines Y_Δ^n from W_A^n, W_B^n , and \tilde{Y}_Δ^n .
5. Alice sends partial information of X_Δ^n as a public message M_A on \mathcal{M}_A in order to share X_Δ^n with Bob. Similarly, Bob sends partial information of Y_Δ^n as a public message M_B on \mathcal{M}_B .
6. Alice decodes M_B, X^n , and the reliability information (W_A, W_B) into the estimation \hat{Y}_Δ^n . Similarly, Bob decodes M_A, Y^n , and the reliability information (W_A, W_B) , into the estimation \hat{X}_Δ^n .
7. Let \mathcal{F} be a set of two-universal hash function [8]

(see also Appendix B.1) from $\{0, 1\}^n \times \{0, 1\}^n$ to \mathcal{S} . Alice randomly choose a hash function $f \in \mathcal{F}$, and publicly tells the choice to Bob. Then, Alice and Bob's final keys are $S = f(X_\Delta^n, \hat{Y}_\Delta^n)$ and $S' = f(\hat{X}_\Delta^n, Y_\Delta^n)$ respectively.

In order to guarantee that Alice and Bob can compute the same key in step 6, we set the rate $\frac{1}{n} \log |\mathcal{M}_A|$ and $\frac{1}{n} \log |\mathcal{M}_B|$ of public messages according to the following lemma, which is derived by modifying ‘‘Slepian-Wolf Coding’’ [9] for continuous random variables.

Lemma 1 Suppose that we set

$$\frac{1}{n} \log |\mathcal{M}_A| > H(X_\Delta|Y W_A W_B) \quad (8)$$

and

$$\frac{1}{n} \log |\mathcal{M}_B| > H(Y_\Delta|X W_A W_B), \quad (9)$$

then there exist encoders and decoders such that the decoding error probabilities $\Pr\{\hat{X}_\Delta^n \neq X_\Delta^n\}$ and $\Pr\{\hat{Y}_\Delta^n \neq Y_\Delta^n\}$ tend to 0 as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

Thus, Eq. (1) is satisfied for sufficiently large n .

In order to guarantee the security of the protocol, we set the key rate $\frac{1}{n} \log |S|$ according to the following lemma, which is derived by modifying the so-called ‘‘left over hash lemma’’ [10]–[12] for continuous random variables.

Lemma 2 Suppose that we set

$$\frac{1}{n} \log |S| < H(X_\Delta Y_\Delta|Z W_A W_B) - \frac{1}{n} \log |\mathcal{M}_A| |\mathcal{M}_B|, \quad (10)$$

then

$$H(S|Z^n W_A^n W_B^n M_A M_B F) \geq \log |S| - \epsilon \quad (11)$$

is satisfied for sufficiently large n .

Note that F is a random variable on \mathcal{F} , and all information C over the public channel correspond to $(W_A^n, W_B^n, M_A, M_B, F)$ in this case.

From Eqs. (8)–(10), we obtain the following theorem that gives a lower bound on secret key rate $R_S(V_A, V_B, V_E)$ in this protocol.

Theorem 1 By using our proposed protocol, we achieve the lower bound on the secret key rate $R_S(V_A, V_B, V_E)$ as

$$\begin{aligned}
 R_S(V_A, V_B, V_E) &\geq H(X_\Delta Y_\Delta|Z W_A W_B) - H(X_\Delta|Y W_A W_B) \\
 &\quad - H(Y_\Delta|X W_A W_B). \quad (12)
 \end{aligned}$$

Note that from the rule in Eqs. (6)–(7), we can rewrite the Eq. (12) as




Fig. 1 The relation between SNR and the key rate in our proposed protocol for several NNR.

$$\begin{aligned}
 & H(X_{\Delta}Y_{\Delta}|ZW_AW_B) - H(X_{\Delta}|YW_AW_B) \\
 & \quad - H(Y_{\Delta}|XW_AW_B) \\
 & = \sum_{w_A, w_B} P_{W_AW_B}(w_A, w_B) \\
 & \quad \times \max\{0, H(\tilde{X}_{\Delta}|Z, W_A = w_A, W_B = w_B) \\
 & \quad \quad - H(\tilde{X}_{\Delta}|Y, W_A = w_A, W_B = w_B), \\
 & \quad H(\tilde{Y}_{\Delta}|Z, W_A = w_A, W_B = w_B) \\
 & \quad \quad - H(\tilde{Y}_{\Delta}|X, W_A = w_A, W_B = w_B)\}.
 \end{aligned}$$

For fixed $(W_A, W_B) = (w_A, w_B)$, $H(\tilde{X}_{\Delta}|Z, W_A = w_A, W_B = w_B) - H(\tilde{X}_{\Delta}|Y, W_A = w_A, W_B = w_B)$ is lower bound on the secret key rate when we use only \tilde{X}_{Δ}^n for generating a secret key, $H(\tilde{Y}_{\Delta}|Z, W_A = w_A, W_B = w_B) - H(\tilde{Y}_{\Delta}|X, W_A = w_A, W_B = w_B)$ is lower bound on the secret key rate when we use only \tilde{Y}_{Δ}^n for generating a secret key, and 0 is trivial lower bound on the secret key. By the rule in Eqs. (6)–(7), we choose the maximum among these lower bounds on secret key rate for each (w_A, w_B) in order to make the lower bound on the secret key rate as high as possible.

Note that encoding in step 5 and decoding in step 6 are implementable by using low-density parity check codes [13], [14].

4. Comparison to a Protocol with Hard-Decision

In this section, we will show the relation between signal-to-noise ratio (SNR) and the key rate achieved by our proposed protocol for several noise-to-noise ratio (NNR). We will also show the comparisons between the key rate achieved by our proposed protocol and the key rate achieved by the protocol that Alice and Bob use only hard-decision for generating a secret key.

The relation between (SNR) and the key rate achieved by our proposed protocol for several NNR is presented in Fig. 1, where sets E_1 , E_2 , and E_3 are de-




Fig. 2 The key rates achieved by our proposed protocol and Maurer's protocol.

termined from fixed $a_1 = \frac{1}{3}, a_2 = \frac{2}{3}, a_3 = 1$ in our proposed protocol. Note that SNR is defined as $\frac{1}{V_A}$ and NNR is defined as $\frac{V_E}{V_B}$, and we assume $V_A = V_B$. From this figure, we observe that we do not obtain a high key rate when SNR is too high or too low.

In order to show advantage to use soft-decision, we compare the key rate achieved by our proposed protocol and the key rate achieved by Maurer's protocol in which Alice and Bob use only hard-decision for generating a secret key. The result of this comparison is presented in Figs. 2(a)–2(c). In this comparison sets E_1 , E_2 , and E_3 are determined from fixed $a_1 = \frac{1}{3}$, $a_2 = \frac{2}{3}$, $a_3 = 1$ in our proposed protocol, and the block length of repetition code used in Maurer's protocol is optimally selected from 1 to 10 for each NNR. From these figures, we observe that we obtain a larger key rate by our proposed protocol than by Maurer's protocol with all value of NNR. Note that in Gaussian Maurer's model, we should calculate the key rate by Maurer's protocol for Eve who can use continuous random variables Z^n to guess the secret key. However, the numerical calculation of the key rate by Maurer's protocol in Gaussian Maurer's model is difficult when the block length of repetition code used in his protocol is 2 or larger. Thus, we calculate the key rate in BSC Maurer's model instead of Gaussian Maurer's model when the block length of repetition code used in his protocol is 2 or larger. In the calculation of the key rate in BSC Maurer's model, we consider the situation that Alice, Bob, and Eve hard-detect received signals according to the similar rule as in Eqs. (4) and (5). In this situation, we can convert three Gaussian channels into independent binary symmetric channels with error probabilities $\epsilon_A, \epsilon_B, \epsilon_E$ given by

$$\begin{aligned} \epsilon_A &= \frac{1}{2} \operatorname{erfc}\left(\sqrt{\frac{1}{V_A}}\right), & \epsilon_B &= \frac{1}{2} \operatorname{erfc}\left(\sqrt{\frac{1}{V_B}}\right), \\ \epsilon_E &= \frac{1}{2} \operatorname{erfc}\left(\sqrt{\frac{1}{V_E}}\right), \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

where the complementary error function $\operatorname{erfc}(z)$ is defined as

$$\operatorname{erfc}(z) = \frac{2}{\sqrt{\pi}} \int_z^\infty e^{-t^2} dt. \quad (14)$$

Note that this way of the comparison gives Maurer's protocol advantage because a wire-tapper in Gaussian Maurer's model is more powerful than in BSC Maurer's model.[†] Hence, the key rate achieved by Maurer's protocol in Gaussian Maurer's model is lower than that presented in Figs. 2(a)–2(c).

5. Conclusion

In this paper, we have proposed Gaussian Maurer's model and the protocol with reliability information based on the result of the soft-decision in this model. As a result, we have obtained a higher key rate than Maurer's protocol. This is because that the correlation

[†]The wire-tapper in BSC Maurer's model can use continuous random variables Z^n to guess the secret key, but one in BSC Maurer's model can only use quantized versions of them.

between X_Δ in Eq. (6) and Y and between Y_Δ in Eq. (7) and X obtained by using the reliability information is stronger than the correlation between \hat{X}_Δ in Eq. (4) and \hat{Y}_Δ in Eq. (5) obtained by using the hard-decision.

However, we do not know the optimal way to determine sets E_1, \dots, E_K and its number K . Intuitively, one may think that the more sets we use, the higher rate we obtain. However, this intuition does not seem to be always true. Actually, there exists the case that we cannot obtain higher key rate though we use many sets. Furthermore, we have to find the optimal signal constellation used by the satellite. These problems are future research agenda.

Acknowledgments

We would like to thank Dr. Jun Muramatsu for valuable discussions. This research also partly supported by the Japan Society for the Promotion of Science under Grants-in-Aid No. 00197137.

Appendix A: Proof of lemma 1

We only prove that if we set the rate $\frac{1}{n} \log |\mathcal{M}_A|$ of public message according to Eq. (8), then there exist encoders and decoders such that the decoding error probabilities $\Pr\{\hat{X}_\Delta^n \neq X_\Delta^n\}$ tends to 0 as $n \rightarrow \infty$. The proof for the rate $\frac{1}{n} \log |\mathcal{M}_B|$ of public message follows by symmetry.

We use the so-called ‘‘bin coding’’ proposed by Cover [15] in this proof. The procedures of bin coding is as follows.

Assign every $x_\Delta^n \in \mathcal{X}_\Delta^n$ to one of $|\mathcal{M}_A|$ bins independently according to the uniform distribution on \mathcal{M}_A .

Alice sends the index i of the bin to which x_Δ^n belongs. Then let $\bar{\varphi}_n(x_\Delta^n) = i$.

For each (y^n, \mathbf{w}^n) , we define the set $S_n(y^n, \mathbf{w}^n) \subset \mathcal{X}_\Delta^n$ as

$$\begin{aligned} S_n(y^n, \mathbf{w}^n) &:= \left\{ x_\Delta^n : \frac{1}{n} \log \frac{1}{P_{X_\Delta^n | Y^n, \mathbf{W}^n}(x_\Delta^n | y^n, \mathbf{w}^n)} \right. \\ &\quad \left. \leq H(X_\Delta | Y \mathbf{W}) + \gamma \right\}, \end{aligned}$$

where $\gamma > 0$ is an arbitrary fixed small constant, and we denote the pair (W_A^n, W_B^n) as \mathbf{W}^n . Then, for given y^n, \mathbf{w}^n , and the received index i , declare $\bar{\psi}_n(i, y^n, \mathbf{w}^n) = x_\Delta^n$ if there is one and only one pair $(x_\Delta^n, y^n, \mathbf{w}^n)$ such that $\bar{\varphi}_n(x_\Delta^n) = i$ and $x_\Delta^n \in S_n(y^n, \mathbf{w}^n)$. Otherwise, declare an error.

We will evaluate the decoding error probability averaged over randomly chosen encoders as follows. We have an error if X_Δ^n is not in $S_n(Y^n, \mathbf{W}^n)$ or if there is another symbol $\hat{x}_\Delta^n \in \mathcal{X}_\Delta^n$ in the same bin. Thus, we can define the events of error

$$\begin{aligned}
E_n^{(0)} &:= \{X_\Delta^n \notin S_n(Y^n, \mathbf{W}^n)\}, \\
E_n^{(1)} &:= \{\exists \hat{x}_\Delta^n \neq X_\Delta^n : \bar{\varphi}_n(\hat{x}_\Delta^n) = \bar{\varphi}_n(X_\Delta^n) \\
&\quad \text{and } \hat{x}_\Delta^n \in S_n(Y^n, \mathbf{W}^n)\},
\end{aligned}$$

Then the decoding error probability averaged over randomly chosen encoders $\Pr\{X_\Delta^n \neq \bar{\psi}_n(\bar{\varphi}_n(X_\Delta^n), Y^n, \mathbf{W}^n)\}$ is upper bounded as

$$\begin{aligned}
&\Pr\{X_\Delta^n \neq \bar{\psi}_n(\bar{\varphi}_n(X_\Delta^n), Y^n, \mathbf{W}^n)\} \\
&= \Pr\{E_n^{(0)} \cup E_n^{(1)}\} \\
&\leq \Pr\{E_n^{(0)}\} + \Pr\{E_n^{(1)}\}. \tag{A.1}
\end{aligned}$$

$\Pr\{E_n^{(0)}\}$ is evaluated as

$$\begin{aligned}
\Pr\{E_n^{(0)}\} &= \Pr\{X_\Delta^n \notin S_n(Y^n, \mathbf{W}^n)\} \\
&= \Pr\left\{\frac{1}{n} \log \frac{1}{P_{X_\Delta^n | Y^n \mathbf{W}^n}(X_\Delta^n | Y^n \mathbf{W}^n)} \right. \\
&\quad \left. > H(X_\Delta | Y \mathbf{W}) + \gamma \right\} \\
&= \Pr\left\{\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \log \frac{1}{P_{X_\Delta | Y \mathbf{W}}(X_\Delta^{(i)} | Y^{(i)} \mathbf{W}^{(i)})} \right. \\
&\quad \left. > H(X_\Delta | Y \mathbf{W}) + \gamma \right\}, \tag{A.2}
\end{aligned}$$

which tends to 0 as $n \rightarrow \infty$ by the weak law of large numbers. To bound $\Pr\{E_n^{(1)}\}$, we rewrite it as

$$\begin{aligned}
&\Pr\{E_n^{(1)}\} \\
&= \Pr\{\exists \hat{x}_\Delta^n \neq X_\Delta^n : \bar{\varphi}_n(\hat{x}_\Delta^n) = \bar{\varphi}_n(X_\Delta^n) \\
&\quad \text{and } \hat{x}_\Delta^n \in S_n(Y^n, \mathbf{W}^n)\} \\
&= \int_{\mathcal{Y}^n} p_{Y^n}(y^n) \sum_{(x_\Delta^n, \mathbf{w}^n) \in \mathcal{X}_\Delta^n \times \mathcal{W}_A^n \times \mathcal{W}_B^n} \\
&\quad P_{X_\Delta^n \mathbf{W}^n | y^n}(x_\Delta^n, \mathbf{w}^n) g_n(x_\Delta^n, y^n, \mathbf{w}^n) dy^n, \tag{A.3}
\end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
&g_n(x_\Delta^n, y^n, \mathbf{w}^n) \\
&= \Pr\{\exists \hat{x}_\Delta^n \neq x_\Delta^n : \bar{\varphi}_n(\hat{x}_\Delta^n) = \bar{\varphi}_n(x_\Delta^n) \\
&\quad \text{and } (\hat{x}_\Delta^n) \in S_n(y^n, \mathbf{w}^n)\}. \tag{A.4}
\end{aligned}$$

Furthermore, we can rewrite (A.4) as

$$\begin{aligned}
g_n(x_\Delta^n, y^n, \mathbf{w}^n) &= \sum_{\substack{\hat{x}_\Delta^n \neq x_\Delta^n \\ \hat{x}_\Delta^n \in S_n(y^n, \mathbf{w}^n)}} \Pr\{\bar{\varphi}_n(\hat{x}_\Delta^n) = \bar{\varphi}_n(x_\Delta^n)\} \\
&= \sum_{\substack{\hat{x}_\Delta^n \neq x_\Delta^n \\ \hat{x}_\Delta^n \in S_n(y^n, \mathbf{w}^n)}} \frac{1}{|\mathcal{M}_A|} \\
&\leq \sum_{\hat{x}_\Delta^n \in S_n(y^n, \mathbf{w}^n)} \frac{1}{|\mathcal{M}_A|} \\
&= \frac{|S_n(y^n, \mathbf{w}^n)|}{|\mathcal{M}_A|} \tag{A.5}
\end{aligned}$$

If $\hat{x}_\Delta^n \in S_n(y^n, \mathbf{w}^n)$, then from the definition of $S_n(y^n, \mathbf{w}^n)$, we have

$$P_{X_\Delta^n | y^n, \mathbf{w}^n}(\hat{x}_\Delta^n) \geq 2^{-n(H(X_\Delta | Y \mathbf{W}) + \gamma)}.$$

Thus, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
1 &\geq \sum_{\hat{x}_\Delta^n \in S_n(y^n, \mathbf{w}^n)} P_{X_\Delta^n | Y^n \mathbf{W}^n}(x_\Delta^n | y^n, \mathbf{w}^n) \\
&\geq |S_n(y^n, \mathbf{w}^n)| 2^{-n(H(X_\Delta | Y \mathbf{W}) + \gamma)}.
\end{aligned}$$

Hence, we have

$$|S_n(y^n, \mathbf{w}^n)| \leq 2^{n(H(X_\Delta | Y \mathbf{W}) + \gamma)}. \tag{A.6}$$

From Eqs.(A.3)–(A.6), we upper bound $\Pr\{E_n^{(1)}\}$ as

$$\begin{aligned}
\Pr\{E_n^{(1)}\} &\leq \int_{\mathcal{Y}^n} p_{Y^n}(y^n) \sum_{(x_\Delta^n, \mathbf{w}^n) \in \mathcal{X}_\Delta^n \times \mathcal{W}_A^n \times \mathcal{W}_B^n} \\
&\quad P_{X_\Delta^n \mathbf{W}^n | y^n}(x_\Delta^n, \mathbf{w}^n) \frac{2^{n(H(X_\Delta | Y \mathbf{W}) + \gamma)}}{|\mathcal{M}_A|} dy^n \\
&\leq \frac{2^{n(H(X_\Delta | Y \mathbf{W}) + \gamma)}}{|\mathcal{M}_A|} \\
&= 2^{-\log |\mathcal{M}_A|} 2^{n(H(X_\Delta | Y \mathbf{W}) + \gamma)}, \tag{A.7}
\end{aligned}$$

which exponentially tends to 0 as $n \rightarrow \infty$ if $\frac{1}{n} \log |\mathcal{M}_A| > H(X_\Delta | Y \mathbf{W}) + \gamma$.

Since the decoding error probability $\Pr\{X_\Delta^n \neq \bar{\psi}_n(\bar{\varphi}_n(X_\Delta^n), Y^n, \mathbf{W}^n)\}$ of randomly chosen code tends to 0 as $n \rightarrow \infty$, there exist at least one pair of an encoder and a decoder such that the decoding error probability $\Pr\{\hat{X}_\Delta^n \neq X_\Delta^n\}$ tends to 0 as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

Appendix B: Proof of lemma 2

In this Appendix, we will show the proof of lemma 2. In section B.1, we introduce a two-universal hash family, which is used for computation of a secret key. In section B.2, we define the security of the protocol in the sense of the variational distance, and we show the relation between the security of the protocol in the sense of the variational distance and the condition Eq. (2). This relation implies that if the security of the protocol in the sense of the variational distance is satisfied, then the condition Eq. (2) is satisfied. In section B.3, we relate the size $|\mathcal{S}|$ of a secret key S and the size $|\mathcal{M}_A \times \mathcal{M}_B|$ of public messages $\mathbf{M} = (M_A, M_B)$ to the security of the protocol, and we show that if we set $\frac{1}{n} \ln |\mathcal{S}| < H(X_\Delta Y_\Delta | Z W_A W_B) - \frac{1}{n} \ln |\mathcal{M}_A \times \mathcal{M}_B|$, then there exists at least one hash function f that satisfy Eq. (2) for sufficiently large n .

For the simplicity of notation, we denote the integral over \mathbb{R}^n as \int unless otherwise specified, and we abbreviate $P_{\mathbf{R}^n \mathbf{M}^n | Z^n \mathbf{W}^n}(\cdot, \cdot | z^n, \mathbf{w}^n)$ as $P_{\mathbf{R}^n \mathbf{M}^n | z^n, \mathbf{w}^n}(\cdot, \cdot)$. The variational distance $\|P_1 - P_2\|$ between the probability distribution P_1 and P_2 on \mathcal{V} is defined as

$$\|P_1 - P_2\| := \sum_{v \in \mathcal{V}} |P_1(v) - P_2(v)|. \quad (\text{A}\cdot 8)$$

B.1 two-universal hash family

In order to extract an almost secret string (secret key S) from a partially secret strings (a pair \mathbf{R}^n of random variables X_Δ^n and Y_Δ^n), we use a two-universal hash family \mathcal{F} . A set \mathcal{F} of functions $f : \mathcal{X}_\Delta^n \times \mathcal{Y}_\Delta^n \rightarrow \mathcal{S}$ is said to be a *two-universal hash family* if we have

$$P_F(\{f \in \mathcal{F} \mid f(\mathbf{r}^n) = f(\mathbf{r}'^n)\}) \leq \frac{1}{|\mathcal{S}|} \quad (\text{A}\cdot 9)$$

for any $\mathbf{r}^n \neq \mathbf{r}'^n \in \mathcal{X}_\Delta^n \times \mathcal{Y}_\Delta^n$, where F denotes a random variable on \mathcal{F} and P_F denotes the uniform distribution on \mathcal{F} . For given Eve's received signals $z^n \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and reliability information $\mathbf{w}^n \in \mathcal{W}_A \times \mathcal{W}_B$, the jointly conditional distribution $P_{SM|z^n, \mathbf{w}^n}(s, \mathbf{m})$ of a secret key $S = f(\mathbf{R}^n)$ and public message \mathbf{M} is given by

$$\begin{aligned} P_{SM|z^n, \mathbf{w}^n}(s, \mathbf{m}) &:= \sum_{\mathbf{r}^n \in f^{-1}(s)} P_{\mathbf{R}^n \mathbf{M}|z^n, \mathbf{w}^n}(\mathbf{r}^n, \mathbf{m}) \\ &= P_{\mathbf{R}^n \mathbf{M}|z^n, \mathbf{w}^n}(f^{-1}(s), \mathbf{m}), \end{aligned}$$

where $f^{-1}(s) := \{\mathbf{r}^n \in \mathcal{X}_\Delta^n \times \mathcal{Y}_\Delta^n \mid f(\mathbf{r}^n) = s\}$ is the subset of a set $\mathcal{X}_\Delta^n \times \mathcal{Y}_\Delta^n$ such that $f(\mathbf{r}^n) = s$. Note that since S depends on a hash function f , it should be referred as S_f . But, we use the above notation for convenience in this paper.

B.2 The security of the protocol in the sense of the variational distance

In order to prove lemma 2, we define the security of the protocol in the sense of the variational distance in this section. If a secret key S is independent of Eve's information and its distribution P_S is close to the uniform distribution $P_{\mathcal{S}}$ on \mathcal{S} , we decide that the secret key S is secure in the sense of the variational distance. In the other words, we define the security of the protocol as

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta_f &:= \int p_{Z^n}(z^n) \sum_{\mathbf{w}^n \in \mathcal{W}_A^n \times \mathcal{W}_B^n} P_{\mathbf{W}^n|z^n}(\mathbf{w}^n) \\ &\quad \|P_{SM|z^n, \mathbf{w}^n} - P_{\mathcal{S}} \times P_{\mathbf{M}|z^n, \mathbf{w}^n}\| dz^n, \quad (\text{A}\cdot 10) \end{aligned}$$

where $P_{\mathbf{M}|z^n, \mathbf{w}^n}$ is the marginal distribution of $P_{SM|z^n, \mathbf{w}^n}$, and $P_{\mathcal{S}} \times P_{\mathbf{M}|z^n, \mathbf{w}^n}$ is the product distribution of $P_{\mathcal{S}}$ and $P_{\mathbf{M}|z^n, \mathbf{w}^n}$.

As an extension of [16, Lemma 1] to continuous random variable, the following lemma relates the security of the protocol in the sense of the variational distance to the security of the protocol in the sense of the entropy shown in Eq. (2).

Lemma 3 The conditional entropy $H(S|Z^n \mathbf{W}^n \mathbf{M} F)$ is lower bounded by

$$\begin{aligned} H(S|Z^n \mathbf{W}^n \mathbf{M} F) &\geq (1 - \mathbb{E}_f[\Delta_f]) \ln |\mathcal{S}| \\ &\quad - \mathbb{E}_f[\Delta_f] \log \frac{1}{\mathbb{E}_f[\Delta_f]}. \quad (\text{A}\cdot 11) \end{aligned}$$

Note that since $\mathbf{W}^n = (W_A^n, W_B^n)$ and $\mathbf{M} = (M_A, M_B)$, the conditional entropy $H(S|Z^n \mathbf{W}^n \mathbf{M} F)$ equivalent to $H(S|Z^n W_A^n W_B^n M_A, M_B F)$ in Eq. (11). From this lemma, if $\mathbb{E}_f[\Delta_f]$ is sufficiently small, a secret key S is secure in the sense of the entropy.

Proof. Let

$$\Delta_{f, \mathbf{m}, z^n, \mathbf{w}^n} := \|P_{S|\mathbf{m}, z^n, \mathbf{w}^n} - P_{\mathcal{S}}\|. \quad (\text{A}\cdot 12)$$

Then, we can rewrite Δ_f as

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta_f &= \int p_{Z^n}(z^n) \sum_{\mathbf{m}, \mathbf{w}^n} \\ &\quad P_{\mathbf{M} \mathbf{W}^n|z^n}(\mathbf{m}, \mathbf{w}^n) \Delta_{f, \mathbf{m}, z^n, \mathbf{w}^n} dz^n \quad (\text{A}\cdot 13) \end{aligned}$$

For given $z^n \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $\mathbf{w}^n \in \mathcal{W}_A^n \times \mathcal{W}_B^n$, and $\mathbf{m} \in \mathcal{M}_A \times \mathcal{M}_B$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} H(S|\mathbf{M} = \mathbf{m}, Z^n = z^n, \mathbf{W}^n = \mathbf{w}^n, F = f) \\ &\geq \log |\mathcal{S}| - \Delta_{f, \mathbf{m}, z^n, \mathbf{w}^n} \log \frac{|\mathcal{S}|}{\Delta_{f, \mathbf{m}, z^n, \mathbf{w}^n}}, \quad (\text{A}\cdot 14) \end{aligned}$$

which follows from the continuity of entropy [15] in the similar way as [16, Lemma 1].

The second term of Eq. (A·14) is upper bonded as follow. Since $t \log \frac{1}{t}$ is a concave function, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{\mathbf{m}, \mathbf{w}^n} P_{\mathbf{M} \mathbf{W}^n|z^n}(\mathbf{m}, \mathbf{w}^n) \Delta_{f, \mathbf{m}, z^n, \mathbf{w}^n} \log \frac{|\mathcal{S}|}{\Delta_{f, \mathbf{m}, z^n, \mathbf{w}^n}} \\ \leq \Delta_{f, z} \log \frac{|\mathcal{S}|}{\Delta_{f, z}} \quad (\text{A}\cdot 15) \end{aligned}$$

from Jensen's inequality for \mathbf{w}^n, \mathbf{m} , where we let $\Delta_{f, z^n} := \sum_{\mathbf{m}, \mathbf{w}^n} P_{\mathbf{M} \mathbf{W}^n|z^n}(\mathbf{m}, \mathbf{w}^n) \Delta_{f, \mathbf{m}, z^n, \mathbf{w}^n}$. Averaging Eq. (A·15) over z^n , we obtain

$$\int p_{Z^n}(z^n) \Delta_{f, z^n} \log \frac{|\mathcal{S}|}{\Delta_{f, z^n}} dz^n \leq \Delta_f \log \frac{|\mathcal{S}|}{\Delta_f} \quad (\text{A}\cdot 16)$$

from Jensen's inequality for z^n . Moreover, averaging Eq. (A·16) over f , we obtain

$$\mathbb{E}_f \left[\Delta_f \log \frac{|\mathcal{S}|}{\Delta_f} \right] \leq \mathbb{E}_f[\Delta_f] \log \frac{|\mathcal{S}|}{\mathbb{E}_f[\Delta_f]} \quad (\text{A}\cdot 17)$$

from Jensen's inequality for f . \square

Note that when we use Jensen's inequality for a continuous random variable, the condition of absolutely integrable

$$\int p_{Z^n}(z^n) |\Delta_{f, z^n}| dz^n < \infty \quad (\text{A}\cdot 18)$$

must be satisfied [17]. In this case, from the fact that $0 \leq \Delta_{f, z^n} \leq 2$, this condition is satisfied.

B.3 The relation between the size of a secret key and the security of the protocol

The following lemma relates the size $|\mathcal{S}|$ of a secret key S and the size $|\mathcal{M}_A \times \mathcal{M}_B|$ of public messages \mathbf{M} to the security of the protocol.

Lemma 4 For the size $|\mathcal{S}|$ of a secret key S , the size $|\mathcal{M}_A \times \mathcal{M}_B|$ of public messages \mathbf{M} , and the security of the protocol Δ_f , we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}_f[\Delta_f] \\ & \leq \sqrt{\frac{|\mathcal{S}||\mathcal{M}_A \times \mathcal{M}_B|}{2\alpha n}} \\ & \quad + 2 \int p_Z^n(z^n) \sum_{\mathbf{w}^n} P_{\mathbf{W}^n|z^n}(\mathbf{w}^n) \\ & \quad \times P_{\mathbf{R}^n|z^n \mathbf{w}^n}(\{\mathbf{r}^n \in \mathcal{X}_\Delta^n \times \mathcal{Y}_\Delta^n \mid \\ & \quad -\frac{1}{n} \log P_{\mathbf{R}^n|z^n \mathbf{w}^n}(\mathbf{r}^n) < \alpha\}) dz^n, \quad (\text{A} \cdot 19) \end{aligned}$$

where \mathbb{E}_f denotes expectation for a uniform distribution on \mathcal{F} .

Proof. This proof is based on the techniques in [18, Chapter 5]. In the following, we will prove

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}_f[\Delta_{f,z^n, \mathbf{w}^n}] \\ & \leq \sqrt{\frac{|\mathcal{S}||\mathcal{M}_A \times \mathcal{M}_B|}{2\alpha n}} \\ & \quad + 2P_{\mathbf{R}^n|z^n \mathbf{w}^n}(\{\mathbf{r}^n \in \mathcal{X}_\Delta^n \times \mathcal{Y}_\Delta^n \mid \\ & \quad -\frac{1}{n} \log P_{\mathbf{R}^n|z^n \mathbf{w}^n}(\mathbf{r}^n) < \alpha\}), \quad (\text{A} \cdot 20) \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\Delta_{f,z^n, \mathbf{w}^n} = \|P_{\mathbf{S}\mathbf{M}|z^n \mathbf{w}^n} - P_{\bar{\mathcal{S}}} \times P_{\mathbf{M}|z^n \mathbf{w}^n}\|, \quad (\text{A} \cdot 21)$$

Averaging Eq. (A·20) over z^n and \mathbf{w}^n , we obtain Eq. (A·19).

For given $z^n \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $\mathbf{w}^n \in \mathcal{W}_A^n \times \mathcal{W}_B^n$, we define the set $A_n \subset \mathcal{X}_\Delta^n \times \mathcal{Y}_\Delta^n$ as

$$A_n := \left\{ \mathbf{r}^n \in \mathcal{X}_\Delta^n \times \mathcal{Y}_\Delta^n \mid -\frac{1}{n} \log P_{\mathbf{R}^n|z^n \mathbf{w}^n}(\mathbf{r}^n) \geq \alpha \right\},$$

and we define the set A_n^c as the complement of A_n on $\mathcal{X}_\Delta^n \times \mathcal{Y}_\Delta^n$. Then, $\Delta_{f,z^n, \mathbf{w}^n}$ for given $f \in \mathcal{F}$ is upper bounded by

$$\begin{aligned} & \|P_{\mathbf{S}\mathbf{M}|z^n \mathbf{w}^n} - P_{\bar{\mathcal{S}}} \times P_{\mathbf{M}|z^n \mathbf{w}^n}\| \\ & = \sum_{s, \mathbf{m}} |P_{\mathbf{R}^n \mathbf{M}|z^n \mathbf{w}^n}(f^{-1}(s), \mathbf{m}) \\ & \quad - P_{\bar{\mathcal{S}}}(s) P_{\mathbf{M}|z^n \mathbf{w}^n}(\mathbf{m})| \quad (\text{A} \cdot 22) \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} & = \sum_{s, \mathbf{m}} |P_{\mathbf{R}^n \mathbf{M}|z^n \mathbf{w}^n}(f^{-1}(s) \cap A_n, \mathbf{m}) \\ & \quad - P_{\bar{\mathcal{S}}}(s) P_{\mathbf{M}|z^n \mathbf{w}^n}(A_n, \mathbf{m}) \\ & \quad + P_{\mathbf{R}^n \mathbf{M}|z^n \mathbf{w}^n}(f^{-1}(s) \cap A_n^c, \mathbf{m}) \\ & \quad - P_{\bar{\mathcal{S}}}(s) P_{\mathbf{M}|z^n \mathbf{w}^n}(A_n^c, \mathbf{m})| \quad (\text{A} \cdot 23) \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} & \leq \sum_{s, \mathbf{m}} h_n(s, \mathbf{m}) + \sum_{s, \mathbf{m}} P_{\mathbf{R}^n \mathbf{M}|z^n \mathbf{w}^n}(f^{-1}(s) \cap A_n^c, \mathbf{m}) \\ & \quad + \sum_{s, \mathbf{m}} P_{\bar{\mathcal{S}}}(s) P_{\mathbf{R}^n \mathbf{M}|z^n \mathbf{w}^n}(A_n^c, \mathbf{m}) \quad (\text{A} \cdot 24) \end{aligned}$$

$$= \sum_{s, \mathbf{m}} h_n(s, \mathbf{m}) + 2P_{\mathbf{R}^n|z^n \mathbf{w}^n}(A_n^c). \quad (\text{A} \cdot 25)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} h_n(s, \mathbf{m}) & = |P_{\mathbf{R}^n \mathbf{M}|z^n \mathbf{w}^n}(f^{-1}(s) \cap A_n, \mathbf{m}) \\ & \quad - P_{\bar{\mathcal{S}}}(s) P_{\mathbf{R}^n \mathbf{M}|z^n \mathbf{w}^n}(A_n, \mathbf{m})|. \quad (\text{A} \cdot 26) \end{aligned}$$

Eq. (A·22) follows from the definition of the variational distance and $f^{-1}(s)$. Eq. (A·23) follows from the fact that $(f^{-1}(s) \cap A_n) \cap (f^{-1}(s) \cap A_n^c) = \emptyset$, $f^{-1}(s) = (f^{-1}(s) \cap A_n) \cup (f^{-1}(s) \cap A_n^c)$, and $P_{\mathbf{M}|z^n \mathbf{w}^n}(\mathbf{m}) = P_{\mathbf{R}^n \mathbf{M}|z^n \mathbf{w}^n}(A_n, \mathbf{m}) + P_{\mathbf{R}^n \mathbf{M}|z^n \mathbf{w}^n}(A_n^c, \mathbf{m})$. Eq. (A·24) follows from the triangle inequality. Eq. (A·25) follows from the fact that $\cup_{s \in \mathcal{S}} f^{-1}(s) = \mathcal{X}_\Delta^n \times \mathcal{Y}_\Delta^n$. By regarding the first term in Eq. (A·25) as an inner product, and by using the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, we can upper bound the first term in Eq. (A·25) by

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{s, \mathbf{m}} h_n(s, \mathbf{m}) \\ & \leq \sqrt{|\mathcal{S}||\mathcal{M}_A \times \mathcal{M}_B| \sum_{s, \mathbf{m}} h_n(s, \mathbf{m})^2} \quad (\text{A} \cdot 27) \end{aligned}$$

Furthermore, we can rewrite the inside of the root of Eq. (A·27) as

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{s, \mathbf{m}} h_n(s, \mathbf{m})^2 \\ & = \sum_{s, \mathbf{m}} \{P_{\mathbf{R}^n \mathbf{M}|z^n \mathbf{w}^n}(f^{-1}(s) \cap A_n, \mathbf{m})^2 \\ & \quad - 2P_{\mathbf{R}^n \mathbf{M}|z^n \mathbf{w}^n}(f^{-1}(s) \cap A_n, \mathbf{m}) \\ & \quad P_{\bar{\mathcal{S}}}(s) P_{\mathbf{R}^n \mathbf{M}|z^n \mathbf{w}^n}(A_n, \mathbf{m}) \\ & \quad + P_{\bar{\mathcal{S}}}(s)^2 P_{\mathbf{R}^n \mathbf{M}|z^n \mathbf{w}^n}(A_n, \mathbf{m})^2\} \\ & = \sum_{s, \mathbf{m}} P_{\mathbf{R}^n \mathbf{M}|z^n \mathbf{w}^n}(f^{-1}(s) \cap A_n, \mathbf{m})^2 \\ & \quad - \sum_{\mathbf{m}} \frac{1}{|\mathcal{S}|} P_{\mathbf{R}^n \mathbf{M}|z^n \mathbf{w}^n}(A_n, \mathbf{m})^2, \quad (\text{A} \cdot 28) \end{aligned}$$

where Eq. (A·28) follows from the fact that

$P_S(s) = \frac{1}{|\mathcal{S}|}$ and $\sum_s P_{\mathbf{R}^n \mathbf{M} | z^n \mathbf{w}^n}(f^{-1}(s) \cap A_n, \mathbf{m}) = P_{\mathbf{R}^n \mathbf{M} | z^n \mathbf{w}^n}(A_n, \mathbf{m})$. Then, we can rewrite the first term of Eq. (A.28) as

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{s, \mathbf{m}} P_{\mathbf{R}^n \mathbf{M} | z^n \mathbf{w}^n}(f^{-1}(s) \cap A_n, \mathbf{m})^2 \\ &= \sum_{s, \mathbf{m}} \sum_{\mathbf{r}^n, \mathbf{r}'^n \in f^{-1}(s) \cap A_n} P_{\mathbf{R}^n \mathbf{M} | z^n \mathbf{w}^n}(\mathbf{r}^n, \mathbf{m}) \\ & \quad P_{\mathbf{R}^n \mathbf{M} | z^n \mathbf{w}^n}(\mathbf{r}'^n, \mathbf{m}) \\ &= \sum_{\mathbf{m}} \sum_{\mathbf{r}^n, \mathbf{r}'^n \in A_n} \delta_{f(\mathbf{r}^n), f(\mathbf{r}'^n)} P_{\mathbf{R}^n \mathbf{M} | z^n \mathbf{w}^n}(\mathbf{r}^n, \mathbf{m}) \\ & \quad P_{\mathbf{R}^n \mathbf{M} | z^n \mathbf{w}^n}(\mathbf{r}'^n, \mathbf{m}), \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.29})$$

where $\delta_{f(\mathbf{r}^n), f(\mathbf{r}'^n)}$ is Kronecker's delta. On the other hand, we can rewrite the second term of Eq. (A.28) as

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{\mathbf{m}} \frac{1}{|\mathcal{S}|} P_{\mathbf{R}^n \mathbf{M} | z^n \mathbf{w}^n}(A_n, \mathbf{m})^2 \\ &= \sum_{\mathbf{m}} \sum_{\mathbf{r}^n, \mathbf{r}'^n \in A_n} \frac{1}{|\mathcal{S}|} P_{\mathbf{R}^n \mathbf{M} | z^n \mathbf{w}^n}(\mathbf{r}^n, \mathbf{m}) \\ & \quad P_{\mathbf{R}^n \mathbf{M} | z^n \mathbf{w}^n}(\mathbf{r}'^n, \mathbf{m}). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.30})$$

Thus, averaging Eq. (A.28) over f , we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{\mathbf{m}} \sum_{\mathbf{r}^n, \mathbf{r}'^n \in A_n} \mathbb{E}_f \left[\delta_{f(\mathbf{r}^n), f(\mathbf{r}'^n)} - \frac{1}{|\mathcal{S}|} \right] \\ & P_{\mathbf{R}^n \mathbf{M} | z^n \mathbf{w}^n}(\mathbf{r}^n, \mathbf{m}) P_{\mathbf{R}^n \mathbf{M} | z^n \mathbf{w}^n}(\mathbf{r}'^n, \mathbf{m}). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.31})$$

Since f is chosen from a universal-hash-family, we obtain

$$\mathbb{E}_f \left[\delta_{f(\mathbf{r}^n), f(\mathbf{r}'^n)} - \frac{1}{|\mathcal{S}|} \right] \leq \begin{cases} 1 & \text{for } \mathbf{r}^n = \mathbf{r}'^n \\ 0 & \text{for } \mathbf{r}^n \neq \mathbf{r}'^n \end{cases}$$

from its definition (shown in Eq. (A.9)). Thus, Eq. (A.31) is upper bounded by

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{\mathbf{m}} \sum_{\mathbf{r}^n \in A_n} P_{\mathbf{R}^n \mathbf{M} | z^n \mathbf{w}^n}(\mathbf{r}^n, \mathbf{m}) P_{\mathbf{R}^n \mathbf{M} | z^n \mathbf{w}^n}(\mathbf{r}^n, \mathbf{m}) \\ & \leq \sum_{\mathbf{m}} \sum_{\mathbf{r}^n \in A_n} P_{\mathbf{R}^n \mathbf{M} | z^n \mathbf{w}^n}(\mathbf{r}^n, \mathbf{m}) \frac{1}{2^{\alpha n}} \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.32})$$

$$\leq \sum_{\mathbf{r}^n, \mathbf{m}} P_{\mathbf{R}^n \mathbf{M} | z^n \mathbf{w}^n}(\mathbf{r}^n, \mathbf{m}) \frac{1}{2^{\alpha n}} \quad (\text{A.33})$$

$$= \frac{1}{2^{\alpha n}}, \quad (\text{A.34})$$

where Eq. (A.32) follows from the fact that $P_{\mathbf{R}^n \mathbf{M} | z^n \mathbf{w}^n}(\mathbf{r}^n, \mathbf{m}) \leq P_{\mathbf{R}^n | z^n \mathbf{w}^n}(\mathbf{r}^n) \leq \frac{1}{2^{\alpha n}}$ for any $\mathbf{r}^n \in A_n$. Since the root function $\sqrt{\cdot}$ is concave function, by combining Eqs.(A.22)–(A.32) and averaging over f , we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}_f[\Delta_{f, z^n, \mathbf{w}^n}] \\ & \leq \sqrt{|\mathcal{S}| |\mathcal{M}_A \times \mathcal{M}_B| \sum_{s, \mathbf{m}} h_n(s, \mathbf{m})^2} \\ & \quad + 2P_{\mathbf{R}^n | z^n \mathbf{w}^n}(\{\mathbf{r}^n \in \mathcal{X}_\Delta^n \times \mathcal{Y}_\Delta^n \mid \\ & \quad - \frac{1}{n} \log P_{\mathbf{R}^n | z^n \mathbf{w}^n}(\mathbf{r}^n) < \alpha\}) \\ & \leq \sqrt{\frac{|\mathcal{S}| |\mathcal{M}_A \times \mathcal{M}_B|}{2^{\alpha n}}} \\ & \quad + 2P_{\mathbf{R}^n | z^n \mathbf{w}^n}(\{\mathbf{r}^n \in \mathcal{X}_\Delta^n \times \mathcal{Y}_\Delta^n \mid \\ & \quad - \frac{1}{n} \log P_{\mathbf{R}^n | z^n \mathbf{w}^n}(\mathbf{r}^n) < \alpha\}). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.35})$$

□

Corollary 1 Suppose that we set $\frac{1}{n} \log |\mathcal{S}| = H(\mathbf{R} | Z\mathbf{W}) - \frac{1}{n} \log |\mathcal{M}_A \times \mathcal{M}_B| - 2\delta$, $\mathbb{E}_f[\Delta_f]$ is exponentially small for sufficiently large n .

Proof. Suppose that we set $\alpha = H(\mathbf{R} | Z\mathbf{W}) - \delta$ for $\delta > 0$, the second term of Eq. (A.19) exponentially tends to 0 as $n \rightarrow \infty$ by using the Chernoff bound [15]. On the other hand, suppose that we set $\frac{1}{n} \log |\mathcal{S}| = H(\mathbf{R} | Z\mathbf{W}) - \frac{1}{n} \log |\mathcal{M}_A \times \mathcal{M}_B| - 2\delta$, the first term of Eq. (A.19) is $e^{-\delta n}$ and tends to 0 as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Thus, suppose that we set $\frac{1}{n} \log |\mathcal{S}| = H(\mathbf{R} | Z\mathbf{W}) - \frac{1}{n} \log |\mathcal{M}_A \times \mathcal{M}_B| - 2\delta$, $\mathbb{E}_f[\Delta_f]$ exponentially tends to 0 as $n \rightarrow \infty$. □

If $\mathbb{E}_f[\Delta_f]$ is exponentially small, then the security of

the protocol in the sense of entropy is guaranteed by lemma 3. From this fact and corollary 5, suppose that we set $\frac{1}{n} \log |\mathcal{S}| < H(X_\Delta Y_\Delta | ZW_A W_B) - \frac{1}{n} \log |\mathcal{M}_A \times \mathcal{M}_B|$, Eq. (2) is satisfied for sufficiently large n .

References

- [1] A. D. Wyner, "The wire-tap channel," *Bell Syst. Tech. J.*, vol. 54, no. 8, pp. 1355–1387, 1975.
- [2] S. K. Leung-Yan-Cheong, "Multi-user and wire-tap channels including feedback," Ph.D. dissertation, Stanford University, 1976.
- [3] S. K. Leung-Yan-Cheong and M. E. Hellman, "The Gaussian wire-tap channel," *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, vol. 24, no. 4, pp. 451–456, July 1978.
- [4] I. Csiszár and J. Körner, "Broadcast channels with confidential messages," *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, vol. 24, no. 3, pp. 339–348, May 1979.
- [5] U. Maurer, "Secret key agreement by public discussion from common information," *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, vol. 39, no. 3, pp. 733–742, May 1993.
- [6] T. Aono, K. Higuchi, T. Ohira, B. Komiyama, and H. Sasaoka, "Wireless Secret Key Generation Exploiting Reactance-Domain Scalar Response of Multipath Fading Channel," *IEEE Trans. Antennas and Propagation*, vol. 53, no. 11, pp. 3776–3784, 2005.
- [7] R. Ahlswede and I. Csiszár, "Common randomness in information theory and cryptography—part 1: Secret sharing,"

- IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, vol. 39, no. 4, pp. 1121–1132, 1993.
- [8] J. L. Carter and M. N. Wegman, “Universal classes of hash functions,” *Journal of Computer and System Sciences*, vol. 18, pp. 143–154, 1979.
 - [9] D. Slepian and J. K. Wolf, “Noiseless coding of correlated information sources,” *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, vol. 19, no. 4, pp. 471–480, July 1973.
 - [10] C. H. Bennett, G. Brassard, and J. M. Robert, “Privacy amplification by public discussion,” *SIAM Journal on Computing*, vol. 17, no. 2, pp. 210–229, Apr. 1988.
 - [11] R. Impagliazzo, L. A. Levin, and M. Luby, “Pseudo-random generation from one-way function,” in *Proceedings of the 21st Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing (STOC ’89)*. ACM press, 1989, pp. 12–24.
 - [12] C. H. Bennett, G. Brassard, C. Crepeau, and U. Maurer, “Generalized privacy amplification,” *IEEE Trans. on Inform. Theory*, vol. 41, no. 6, pp. 1915–1923, Nov. 1995.
 - [13] J. Muramatsu, T. Uyematsu, and T. Wadayama, “Low-density parity-check matrices for coding of correlated sources,” *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, vol. 51, no. 10, pp. 3645–3654, 2005.
 - [14] T. P. Coleman, A. H. Lee, M. Médard, and M. Effros, “Low-complexity approaches to Slepian-Wolf near-lossless distributed data compression,” *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, vol. 52, no. 8, pp. 3546–3561, 2006.
 - [15] T. M. Cover and J. A. Thomas, *Elements of Information Theory*, 2nd ed. John Wiley & Sons, 2006.
 - [16] I. Csiszár and P. Narayan, “Secrecy capacities for multiple terminals,” *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, vol. 50, no. 12, pp. 3047–3061, December 2004.
 - [17] K. Ito, *Introduction to probability theory*. Cambridge University Press, 1984.
 - [18] R. Renner, “Security of quantum key distribution,” *Ph.D thesis, Dipl. Phys. ETH, Switzerland*, 2005, arXiv:quant-ph/0512258.