

Characterizing the set of quantum correlations in prepare-and-measure quantum chain-shaped networks

Yanning Jia,^{1,2} Fenzhuo Guo,^{1,2,*} YuKun Wang,³ Haifeng Dong,⁴ and Fei Gao²

¹*School of Science, Beijing University of Posts and Telecommunications, Beijing 100876, China*

²*State Key Laboratory of Networking and Switching Technology,
Beijing University of Posts and Telecommunications, Beijing, 100876, China*

³*Beijing Key Laboratory of Petroleum Data Mining,
China University of Petroleum-Beijing, Beijing, 102249, China.*

⁴*School of Instrumentation Science and Opto-Electronics Engineering, Beihang University, Beijing, 100191, China*

We introduce a hierarchy of tests satisfied by any probability distribution P that represents the quantum correlations generated in prepare-and-measure (P&M) quantum chain-shaped networks, assuming only the inner-product information of the non-orthogonal quantum states. The P&M quantum chain-shaped networks involve multiple measurement parties, each measurement party potentially having multiple sequential receivers. Specifically, we adapt the original NPA-hierarchy by incorporating a finite number of linear and positive semi-definite constraints to characterize the quantum correlations in P&M quantum chain-shaped networks. These constraints in each hierarchy are derived from sequential measurement operators and the inner-product matrix of the non-orthogonal quantum states. We apply the adapted NPA-hierarchy to tackle some quantum information tasks, including sequential quantum random access codes (QRACs) and randomness certification. First, we derive the optimal trade-off between the two sequential receivers in the $2 \rightarrow 1$ sequential QRACs. Furthermore, we have investigated semi-device-independent randomness certification in the double violation region of $2 \rightarrow 1$ sequential QRACs. Second, considering the presence of eavesdropper (Eve) in actual communication, we show how much global and local randomness can be certified using the optimal trade-off of $2 \rightarrow 1$ sequential QRACs. Additionally, we quantify the amount of local and global randomness that can be certified from the complete probabilities generated by the two sequential receivers. We conclude that utilizing the complete set of probabilities certifies more local and global randomness than relying solely on the optimal trade-off relationship.

I. INTRODUCTION

The correlations generated in quantum systems exhibit nonclassical behavior, offering unique advantages over data obtained from classical sources. Over the past decades, physicists have devoted their efforts to studying quantum correlations generated by various quantum resources, such as entanglement [1], steering [2], nonlocality [3, 4], and contextuality [5]. These distinct quantum correlations constitute the fundamental building blocks of quantum theory. Additionally, optimizing over the entire set of quantum correlations has revealed some intriguing applications, such as quantum randomness certification [6, 7] and quantum random access codes (QRACs) [8]. Quantum correlations are at the core of quantum information science. Consequently, characterizing the set of correlations that arise from the quantum systems is an important problem in quantum information theory.

The direct strategy to characterize quantum correlations is searching over all quantum states and measurements, which is clearly infeasible. Currently, the best-known method to tackle this problem is the NPA-hierarchy, which characterizes the set of quantum correlations in the standard Bell scenario through a sequence of increasingly tighter outer approximations, each for-

mulated as a semi-definite program (SDP) [9, 10]. With the advancement of quantum technology, causal quantum networks [11] going beyond the standard Bell scenario have been developed. Subsequently, more complex quantum communication networks have attracted much attention, such as star-shaped quantum networks [12–15], tree-shaped quantum networks [16, 17] and chain-shaped quantum networks [18, 19]. The research in Ref. [20] adapted the NPA-hierarchy to bound the set of quantum correlations in causal quantum networks by imposing relaxations of factorization constraints in a form compatible with semi-definite programming. Besides the Bell scenario, prepare-and-measure (P&M) is another common scenario in quantum information processing. The study in Ref. [21] generalized the original NPA-hierarchy proposed in Refs. [9, 10] to the P&M quantum network scenario involving multiple measurement parties. The adaptation of original NPA-hierarchy has taken into account that the prepared state is not fixed.

Sequential measurement [22] have advantages in some quantum information tasks. For example, using sequences of measurements can overcome the limitation on the amount of randomness in the standard Bell scenario [23, 24]. A number of works have indicated that sequential scenarios allow more receivers to simultaneously exhibit distinct quantum correlations [25–29], thereby implying potential applications in quantum networks. Bowles et al. effectively adapted the original NPA-

* gfenzhuo@bupt.edu.cn

hierarchy by incorporating finite linear constraints to characterize the quantum correlations generated in the sequential Bell scenario [30]. These constraints are derived from the properties of sequential measurements. Sequential measurements also can be applied in prepare-and-measure (P&M) quantum scenarios [31]. In practical communication, quantum devices face challenges such as noise and potential third-party interference, which can be attributed to an eavesdropper, Eve [32–34]. In sequential P&M quantum scenarios, if there is an eavesdropper Eve, the prepared quantum states can be seen as transmitted to two measurement parties through a quantum broadcast channel. We extend our consideration to more general scenarios, namely P&M quantum chain-shaped networks. These networks consist of an arbitrary number of measurement parties, each of which may have multiple sequential receivers.

In this paper, we concrete on characterizing the quantum correlations in P&M quantum chain-shaped networks. The sequential measurements in this scenario are conducted on a varying prepared state $|\psi_z\rangle$ determined by the classical input z rather than a fixed state $|\psi\rangle$. The states in $\{|\psi_z\rangle\}_{z=1}^n$ are non-orthogonal. These varying and non-orthogonal quantum states are indistinguishable. The inner-product information of these non-orthogonal states plays a crucial role in certifying the security of quantum protocols and quantum key distribution [35–37]. To characterize the quantum correlations in P&M quantum chain-shaped networks, we adapt the original NPA-hierarchy by augmenting it with a finite number of linear constraints. Specifically, we introduce a sequence of necessary conditions for the quantum correlations set, assuming only the inner-product information of the non-orthogonal quantum states. Each of our conditions amounts to verifying the existence of a positive semi-definite matrix that must satisfy certain linear constraints arising from the inner-products of quantum states and the properties of sequential measurement operators. If one of our conditions is not satisfied, we can immediately conclude that the given correlation is not quantum.

To demonstrate the feasibility and efficacy of our method, We then apply our hierarchy to several problems in quantum information. First, we apply our method to derive the optimal trade-off of the two sequential receivers in $2 \rightarrow 1$ sequential QRACs, replicating the results from Ref. [31]. Furthermore, we investigate randomness certification based on the double violation region of $2 \rightarrow 1$ sequential QRACs. Our approach relaxes the dimension assumptions compared to the standard semi-device-independent (SDI) randomness certification using $2 \rightarrow 1$ QRACs [38], requiring only knowledge of the states' inner-product information. Second, in the presence of an eavesdropper (Eve), we consider how much global and local randomness can be certified using the optimal trade-off of $2 \rightarrow 1$ QRACs. If Eve knows the complete observed probability distribution P_{obs} , we also establish the relationship between the amount of certified




FIG. 1. (a). The P&M quantum chain-shaped scenario involves one measurement party with sequential receivers. A classical random source z is encoded into a quantum system $|\psi_z\rangle$ and distributed to Bob₁. After Bob₁ have performed his randomly selected measurement, he pass the post-measurement state to subsequent receivers who repeat this process. (b). The P&M quantum chain-shaped network scenario involves two measurement parties with sequential receivers. The prepared state $|\psi_z\rangle$ is converted into $|\phi_z\rangle$ through the quantum broadcast channel. The dimension of $|\psi_z\rangle$ may vary, but the inner-product information of all prepared states remains unchanged. Then, Alice₁ and Bob₁ receive the state $|\phi_z\rangle$ for measurement. They respectively pass the post-measurement state to Alice₂ and Bob₂ who repeat this process.

randomness and the measurement sharpness parameter η of the first sequential receiver. We conclude that the full set of probabilities certifies more randomness than relying solely on the optimal trade-off relationship.

II. THE P&M QUANTUM CHAIN-SHAPED NETWORKS

The sequential P&M quantum scenario can be viewed as a simple P&M quantum chain-shaped network with only one measurement party with sequential receivers, as illustrated in Fig. 1(a). A classical random source z is encoded into a quantum system $|\psi_z\rangle$ and distributed to Bob₁ for measurement via a quantum channel. The encoding states in $\{|\psi_z\rangle\}_{z=1}^n$ are non-orthogonal. Then, Bob₁ passes the post-measurement state to subsequent sequential receivers. If there are multiple measurement parties in the P&M quantum chain-shaped network, the prepared quantum states will be transmitted to them through a quantum broadcast channel. We will focus our discussion on a quantum chain-shaped network limited to two measurement parties with sequential receivers, as illustrated in Fig. 1(b). Our analysis can be straightforwardly

wardly extended to more general networks involving an arbitrary number of measurement parties with sequential receivers.

A classical random source $z \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ is encoded into a quantum state $|\psi_z\rangle$. The encoding states in $\{|\psi_z\rangle\}_{z=1}^n$ are non-orthogonal. Subsequently, one of the n predefined states $|\psi_z\rangle_{z=1}^n$, denoted as $|\psi_z\rangle$, is converted into $|\phi_z\rangle$ after being transmitted through the quantum broadcast channel, and then $|\phi_z\rangle$ is distributed to Alice₁ and Bob₁. For this type of transmission, adopting the purification picture as described in Ref. [39], we may see the state transformation is described by unitary evolution. Specifically, by working in a higher-dimensional Hilbert space, the isometric evolution takes $|\psi_z\rangle$ to some pure output state $|\phi_z\rangle$. After the transmission, the dimension and other properties of $|\psi_z\rangle$ may change. However, the initial information about the inner-product $\langle\psi_z|\psi_{z'}\rangle = \lambda_{zz'}$ is preserved in the transformed states $|\phi_z\rangle$. After Alice₁ and Bob₁ have performed their randomly selected measurements and recorded the outcomes, they respectively pass the post-measurement state to Alice₂ and Bob₂ who repeat this process.

Suppose there are m sequential receivers at Alice's party, a quantum state $|\phi_z\rangle$ of arbitrary dimension undergoes a sequence of m measurements with inputs x_i and outcomes a_i . The first measurement outcome and its corresponding post-measurement state are characterized by sets of Kraus operators $\{K_{x_1}^{a_1, \mu_1}\}$. Here, the index μ_1 indicates that there may be multiple Kraus operators associated with a single measurement outcome a_1 . For infinite dimensional systems, the (sub-normalized) post-measurement state obtained after obtaining outcome a_1 takes the form:

$$|\phi_z\rangle_{a_1|x_1} = \int_{\mu_1} d\mu_1 K_{x_1}^{a_1, \mu_1} |\phi_z\rangle, \quad (1)$$

where $\sum_{a_1} \int d\mu_1 K_{x_1}^{a_1, \mu_1 \dagger} K_{x_1}^{a_1, \mu_1} = I$. Continuing this process for the entire sequence with inputs $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_m)$ and outputs $\mathbf{a} = (a_1, a_2, \dots, a_m)$, we denote the sequential measurements:

$$\begin{aligned} A_{\mathbf{x}}^{\mathbf{a}} &= \int \dots \int d\mu_1 \dots d\mu_m K_{x_1}^{a_1, \mu_1 \dagger} K_{x_2}^{a_2, \mu_2 \dagger} \\ &\quad \dots K_{x_m}^{a_m, \mu_m \dagger} K_{x_m}^{a_m, \mu_m} \dots K_{x_2}^{a_2, \mu_2} K_{x_1}^{a_1, \mu_1}, \quad (2) \\ &\sum_{a_i} \int d\mu_i K_{x_i}^{a_i, \mu_i \dagger} K_{x_i}^{a_i, \mu_i} = I_A, \forall i. \end{aligned}$$

For the sake of description, we also assume that there are m sequential receivers at Bob's side. We denote the sequential inputs and outputs by $\mathbf{y} = (y_1, y_2, \dots, y_m)$ and $\mathbf{b} = (b_1, b_2, \dots, b_m)$, respectively. The sequential measurement $B_{\mathbf{y}}^{\mathbf{b}}$ has a similar structure to $A_{\mathbf{x}}^{\mathbf{a}}$. Then, using the quantum Born rule, we have that the probability of observing outcomes \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b} given sequential measurements \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} and $\{|\phi_z\rangle\}_{z=1}^n$ is

$$p(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b} | \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}, z) = \langle\phi_z | A_{\mathbf{x}}^{\mathbf{a}} B_{\mathbf{y}}^{\mathbf{b}} | \phi_z\rangle, \quad (3)$$

where $A_{\mathbf{x}}^{\mathbf{a}}$ and $B_{\mathbf{y}}^{\mathbf{b}}$ follow the sequential structure in Eq. (2). We define a set of quantum correlations that generated by the P&M chain-shaped networks assuming the inner-product matrix λ is $Q(\lambda)^{SEQ}$. A given set of correlations $p(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b} | \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}, z)$ belongs to $Q(\lambda)^{SEQ}$ if and only if it can be realised as Eq. (3), with the measurement operators satisfying the following properties [30]:

- (i) $A_{\mathbf{x}}^{\mathbf{a}} A_{\mathbf{x}'}^{\mathbf{a}'} = \delta_{\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{a}'} A_{\mathbf{x}}^{\mathbf{a}}, \quad \forall \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{a}'$,
- (ii) $\sum_{a_{k+1}, \dots, a_m} A_{\mathbf{x}}^{\mathbf{a}} - A_{\mathbf{x}'}^{\mathbf{a}} = 0, \quad \forall a_1, a_2, \dots, a_k, \forall \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}'$,
s.t. $x_i = x'_i, (i \leq k)$,
 $1 \leq k \leq m-1$,
- (iii) $A_{\mathbf{x}}^{\mathbf{a}} A_{\mathbf{x}'}^{\mathbf{a}'} = 0, \quad \forall \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}', \forall \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{a}'$,
s.t. $x_i = x'_i, (i \leq k)$,
 $(a_1, \dots, a_k) \neq (a'_1, \dots, a'_k)$,
 $1 \leq k \leq m$,
- (iv) $[A_{\mathbf{x}}^{\mathbf{a}}, B_{\mathbf{y}}^{\mathbf{b}}] = 0,$ (4)

and similarly (i)-(iii) for $B_{\mathbf{y}}^{\mathbf{b}}$. Properties (i) and (iii) can be deduced from the construction of the sequential measurements. Property (ii) represents the one-way no-signaling conditions because the measurement operators that define the first k measurements must be independent of the last $m-k$ inputs, as these occur later in the sequence. Property (iv) implies that the sequential measurements on Alice and Bob's side commute with each other since the measurement parties are independent of each other.

III. THE NPA-HIERACHY FOR P&M CHAIN-SHAPED NETWORKS

The problem that we aim to tackle is the following: Given an arbitrary probability distribution P and an $n \times n$ matrix λ , do there exist some quantum states $\{|\phi_z\rangle\}_{z=1}^n$ and measurements $A_{\mathbf{x}}^{\mathbf{a}}, B_{\mathbf{y}}^{\mathbf{b}}$, such that $p(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b} | \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}, z) = \langle\phi_z | A_{\mathbf{x}}^{\mathbf{a}} B_{\mathbf{y}}^{\mathbf{b}} | \phi_z\rangle$? The inner-product of the states satisfies $\langle\phi_z | \phi_{z'}\rangle = \lambda_{zz'}, z, z' \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$. The measurements $A_{\mathbf{x}}^{\mathbf{a}}$ and $B_{\mathbf{y}}^{\mathbf{b}}$ satisfy the properties in Eq. (4).

The NPA-hierarchy can efficiently characterize the set of quantum correlations for any P&M quantum chain-shaped network, assuming only the inner-product matrix λ . Let $S_k = \{S_k^1, S_k^2, \dots, S_k^l\}$ be a set of l operators in level k , where each element S_k^i is the identity operator or a linear combination of products of $A_{\mathbf{x}}^{\mathbf{a}}$ and $B_{\mathbf{y}}^{\mathbf{b}}$. More precisely, we define a sequence of hierarchical sets:

$$\begin{aligned} S_1 &= \{I\} \cup_{\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{x}} \{A_{\mathbf{x}}^{\mathbf{a}}\} \cup_{\mathbf{b}, \mathbf{y}} \{B_{\mathbf{y}}^{\mathbf{b}}\}, \\ S_{k+1} &= S_k \cup_{i, j} \{S_k^i S_k^j\}. \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

Then define G to be an $nl \times nl$ block matrix

$$G = \sum_{z, z'=1}^n G^{zz'} \otimes |e_z\rangle\langle e_{z'}|, \quad (6)$$

where $G_{(i,j)}^{zz'} = \langle \phi_z | S_k^i \dagger S_k^j | \phi_{z'} \rangle, \forall i, j \in \{1, 2, \dots, l\}, \forall z, z' \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$. By construction, the matrix G is Hermitian and positive semi-definite. Furthermore, the properties of sequential measurement operators and the inner-product constraints $\langle \phi_z | \phi_{z'} \rangle = \lambda_{zz'}$ translate to linear conditions on the entries of G :

(i) G satisfies a lot of linear constraints that arise from measurements properties. For instance, the orthogonality and the normalization of sequential measurement operators lead to $\langle \phi_z | A_{\mathbf{x}}^{\mathbf{a}} A_{\mathbf{x}}^{\mathbf{a}'} | \phi_{z'} \rangle = 0$, for $\mathbf{a} \neq \mathbf{a}', \forall \mathbf{x}$, and the commutativity of Alice's and Bob's operators implies $\langle \phi_z | [A_{\mathbf{x}}^{\mathbf{a}}, B_{\mathbf{y}}^{\mathbf{b}}] | \phi_{z'} \rangle = 0$. These constraints can be represented as $\text{tr}[G^{zz'} M_k] = 0$ and $\text{tr}[G^{zz'} M_k^{SEQ}] = 0$ with appropriately chosen fixed matrices M_k and M_k^{SEQ} .

(ii) G includes elements that directly correspond to the joint probabilities. Specifically, $p(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b} | \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}, z) = \langle \phi_z | A_{\mathbf{x}}^{\mathbf{a}} B_{\mathbf{y}}^{\mathbf{b}} | \phi_z \rangle$. We write these constraints as $\text{tr}[G^{zz} F_k] = P^{zz}$, where F_k are fixed matrices and P^{zz} denotes the corresponding joint probabilities.

(iii) By setting $S_k^{(1)} = I, \forall k$, we have $G_{(1,1)}^{zz'} = \lambda_{zz'}$.

If the given correlations $P \in Q(\lambda)^{SEQ}$, there exist some quantum states and sequential measurements leading to P , along with a corresponding matrix G that satisfies the above conditions. We outline a crucial necessary condition for membership of $P \in Q(\lambda)^{SEQ}$ as follows. If we define the operator sets as S_k , then the set of correlations that satisfy the positive solution in the NPA-hierarchy (level k) are denoted as $Q_k(\lambda)^{SEQ}$.

NPA-hierarchy (level k):

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{Find } G \\ \text{subject to: } & G \geq 0, G^+ = G, G_{(1,1)}^{zz'} = \lambda_{zz'}, \\ & \text{tr}[G^{zz'} M_k] = 0, \\ & \text{tr}[G^{zz'} M_k^{SEQ}] = 0, \\ & \text{tr}[G^{zz} F_k] = P^{zz}. \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

The problem is characterized by linear and positive semi-definite constraints, making it suitable for formulation as a SDP feasibility problem. The computational complexity of the solution depends on the size of the matrix G . Since this test represents a necessary condition for membership in $Q(\lambda)^{SEQ}$, it implies that $Q(\lambda)^{SEQ}$ is a subset of $Q_k(\lambda)^{SEQ}$. Consequently, we derive a sequence of SDPs, each providing a relaxation towards determining membership in $Q(\lambda)^{SEQ}$.

Given that the properties in Eq. (4) characterize precisely the set of sequential measurement operators and establish linear constraints, methods similar to those in Ref. [?] can be employed to demonstrate convergence of the hierarchy. As the sets S_k satisfying $S_k \subseteq S_{k+1}$, this corresponds to a sequence of block matrix, G_1, G_2, \dots , with increasing size and constraints. The




FIG. 2. The P&M quantum chain-shaped network involves one measurement party with two sequential receivers. The state $|\phi_z\rangle$ is distributed to Bob₁. He has performed his randomly selected measurement y_1 and recorded the outcome b_1 . The post-measurement state is relayed to Bob₂, who has the input y_2 and the output b_2 .

growing hierarchy offers a progressively tighter approximation of the quantum set: $Q(\lambda)^{SEQ} \subseteq Q_k(\lambda)^{SEQ} \subseteq Q_{k-1}(\lambda)^{SEQ} \dots$. It converges to the quantum correlation sets, i.e. $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} Q_k(\lambda)^{SEQ} = Q(\lambda)^{SEQ}$. One can extract some quantum states and sequential measurement operators from the moment matrix G_∞ corresponding to the asymptotic level of the hierarchy.

IV. THE APPLICATIONS

The method described above can effectively quantify the performance of information processing tasks in P&M quantum chain-shaped networks. For illustration, we provide four concrete applications in two simple P&M quantum chain-shaped networks.

A. one measurement party P&M quantum chain-shaped network

1. The optimal trade-off of 2 \rightarrow 1 sequential QRACs

In the first, our method is employed to derive the optimal trade-off of 2 \rightarrow 1 sequential QRACs in numerical results. QRACs are the key tools in quantum information theory, particularly in studying information capacity and the encoding efficiency of quantum states. QRACs are used to encode classical bit strings into quantum states, enabling the recovery of the original bit strings with a certain probability in subsequent processes [8, 40]. The Ref. [31] introduced sequential QRACs beyond standard P&M scenarios, thereby enhancing access to quantum system information for a larger number of receivers. We will introduce the scenario that refers to the 2 \rightarrow 1 sequential QRACs (see Fig. 2). The P&M quantum chain-shaped network involves one measurement party with two sequential receivers. According the uniformly random four-valued input $z = (z_0, z_1) \in \{0, 1\}^2$, the two random bits $z_0 z_1$ are encoded into a quantum state $|\phi_z\rangle$. We assume nothing about these states, except that the inner-product matrix λ of the code states $\{|\phi_{00}\rangle, |\phi_{01}\rangle, |\phi_{10}\rangle, |\phi_{11}\rangle\}$ is fixed to

that of $\{|0\rangle, |+\rangle, |-\rangle, |1\rangle\}$.

$$\lambda = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} & \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} & 0 \\ \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} & 1 & 0 & -\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \\ \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} & 0 & 1 & \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \\ 0 & -\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} & \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} & 1 \end{bmatrix}. \quad (8)$$

Then one of the code states is sent to two sequential Bob for selective decoding. Bob₁ and Bob₂ have the inputs $y_1, y_2 \in \{0, 1\}$ and the outputs $b_1, b_2 \in \{0, 1\}$ respectively. The sequential measurement operators are labeled by $B_{y_1 y_2}^{b_1 b_2}$. Their goal is to guess the input bit that is associated with the position bit. For example, if Bob₁ receives the input $y_1 = 0$, he has to guess the value of z_0 . The winning probabilities are defined as in Ref. [31]:

$$P(b_1 = z_{y_1}) = \frac{1}{8} \sum_{b_1 = z_{y_1}} p(b_1 | y_1, z_0 z_1),$$

$$P(b_2 = z_{y_2}) = \frac{1}{16} \sum_{b_2 = z_{y_2}} p(b_2 | y_2, z_0 z_1). \quad (9)$$

In the classical sequential random access codes, a large value of $P(b_1 = z_{y_1})$ constitutes no obstacle for also finding a large value of $P(b_2 = z_{y_2})$. There is no trade-off between $P(b_1 = z_{y_1})$ and $P(b_2 = z_{y_2})$. The set of classically attainable correlations is $0.5 \leq (P(b_1 = z_{y_1}), P(b_2 = z_{y_2})) \leq 0.75$. It was shown that an optimal QRAC for qubits exceeds the classical bound, which is 0.8536 [41]. In a quantum model, Bob₁'s measurement disturbs the initial state, and therefore Bob₂'s ability to access the desired information depends on Bob₁'s preceding measurement. We consider what is Bob₂'s optimal guessing probability given that Bob₁'s guessing probability is set to some fixed value $\tau \in [0.5, 0.8536]$. More specifically, we consider the following optimization problem:

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{maximize:} && P(b_2 = z_{y_2}), \\ & \text{subject to:} && P(b_1 = z_{y_1}) = \tau, \\ & && \langle \phi_z | \phi_{z'} \rangle = \lambda_{zz'}, \forall z, z', \\ & && P(b_1 b_2 | y_1 y_2, z) \in Q(\lambda)^{SEQ}. \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

Using the above NPA-hierarchy, we firstly take the set of operators S_1 , which contains all operators of the sequential receivers. In practice, we will use another set of operators S'_1 with fewer elements. Every operator in the set S_1 can be written as a linear combination of operators in another set S'_1 . Therefore, the constraints derived from S'_1 are at least as restrictive as those derived from S_1 . According to the fact of the four vary source $|\phi_z\rangle$, we can partition any feasible solution G to the SDP into 4×4 blocks $\{G_{zz'}\}$, each having size 11×11 .

$$\begin{aligned} S_1 &= \{I, B_{00}^{00}, B_{00}^{01}, B_{00}^{10}, B_{00}^{11}, B_{01}^{00}, B_{01}^{01}, B_{01}^{10}, B_{01}^{11}, \\ & B_{10}^{00}, B_{10}^{01}, B_{10}^{10}, B_{10}^{11}, B_{11}^{00}, B_{11}^{01}, B_{11}^{10}, B_{11}^{11}\}, \\ S'_1 &= \{I, B_{00}^{00}, B_{00}^{10}, B_{01}^{00}, B_{01}^{01}, B_{01}^{10}, B_{10}^{00}, B_{10}^{10}, B_{11}^{00}, \\ & B_{11}^{01}, B_{11}^{10}\}. \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$




FIG. 3. The optimal trade-off of QRACs(Bob₁, Bob₂) is generated using the NPA-hierarchy for the P&M chain-shaped networks.


The optimal trade-off between the pair of QRACs(Bob₁, Bob₂) corresponds to $P(b_2 = z_{y_2}) = \frac{1}{8}(4 + \sqrt{2} + \sqrt{16P(b_1 = z_{y_1}) - 16P(b_1 = z_{y_1})^2 - 2})$ [31]. Using the modified NPA-hierarchy, we are able to reproduce the result (see Fig. 3). The optimal trade-off is represented by the solid black line. The red region enclosed by the black dashed line represents the area where both guessing probabilities are within the classical bound. The light blue region indicates the area where quantum implementation is possible, while the dark blue region shows where the success guessing probabilities of Bob₁ and Bob₂ simultaneously violate the classical bound of 0.75.

2. The semi-device-independent randomness certification in the double violation region of the $2 \rightarrow 1$ sequential QRACs


Random numbers are crucial in information technology, particularly in information security. Many cryptographic protocols rely on random numbers to prevent attackers from predicting outcomes. According the uncertainty principle of quantum mechanics, the quantum mechanics can be used to generated the true random numbers. Certifying that a given set of random numbers is genuinely random is not a trivial task. We must certify that the quantum device really performs the way it is supposed to. The NPA-hierarchy serves as a critical tool for determining whether correlated probabilities originate from the quantum device, thus playing a crucial role in certifying genuine randomness.

The SDI randomness certification in the P&M scenario has been studied in many previous researches [38, 42–46]. Our approach relaxes the assumptions in the standard SDI randomness certification using the $2 \rightarrow 1$ QRACs approach [38], which fixes the system dimensions. In the

above-mentioned $2 \rightarrow 1$ sequential QRACs, we can observe a jpg blue shaded region (see Fig. 4(a)), which represents the area where both Bob₁'s and Bob₂'s guessing probabilities exceed the classical bound 0.75. We can speculate that in this region, both sequential receivers will be able to certify randomness. We formulate an optimization problem to determine the amount of randomness, relying solely on the inner product information of the states.



(a) The double-violation region.



(b) The min-entropy bounds.

FIG. 4. (a). The double-violation region (b). The min-entropy bounds $H_\infty(b_1|y_1)$, $H_\infty(b_2|y_2)$ and $H_\infty(b_1, b_2|y_1, y_2)$ in SDI randomness certification using $2 \rightarrow 1$ sequential QRACs using the $1+AB$ level of the NPA-hierarchy.

The winning probability of the first participant serve as the determinant for certifying the randomness of the two sequential participants. We quantify the randomness of the measurement outcomes b_1 and b_2 conditioned on the input values y_1 , y_2 , and z by the following min-entropy

function:

$$\begin{aligned} H_\infty(b_1|y_1) &= -\log_2 \max_{z, y_1, b_1} p(b_1|y_1, z), \\ H_\infty(b_2|y_2) &= -\log_2 \max_{z, y_2, b_2} p(b_2|y_2, z), \\ H_\infty(b_1 b_2|y_1 y_2) &= -\log_2 \max_{z, y_1, y_2, b_1, b_2} p(b_1 b_2|y_1 y_2, z). \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

More precisely, for a fixed success probability of Bob₁, the min-entropy function $H_\infty(b_1|y_1)$ is obtained by solving the following optimization problem:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{minimize:} \quad & H_\infty(b_1|y_1), \\ \text{subject to:} \quad & P(b_1 = z_{y_1}) = \tau, \tau \in [0.75, 0.8218], \\ & \langle \phi_z | \phi_{z'} \rangle = \lambda_{zz'}, \forall z, z', \\ & P(b_2|y_2, z) > 0.75. \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

To quantify the local randomness generated by Bob₂, we simply convert the objective function in the optimization problem into the min-entropy $H_\infty(b_2|y_2)$. Similarly, by modifying the objective function to $H_\infty(b_1 b_2|y_1 y_2)$, we can quantify the global randomness of the two sequential receivers. The relationship among $H_\infty(b_1|y_1)$, $H_\infty(b_2|y_2)$, $H_\infty(b_1 b_2|y_1 y_2)$ and $P(b_1 = z_{y_1})$ in SDI randomness certification using $2 \rightarrow 1$ sequential QRACs is illustrated in Fig. 4(b). The amounts of local and global randomness remain zero until Bob₁'s guessing probability exceeds 0.79, after which they begin to increase gradually. Our objective is to establish the lower bound of randomness across the entire double violation region. Consequently, the guessing probabilities of the two sequential receivers may not conform to the optimal trade-off relationship.

B. two measurement party P&M quantum chain-shaped network

In practice, quantum devices encounter challenges such as the potential eavesdropper (Eve), necessitating the authentication of the generated random numbers. Eve, who has knowledge of the devices, may know the choice of state and measurements. We use the two measurement party P&M quantum chain-shaped network as an example (see Fig. 5). Here, one of the parties is the eavesdropper Eve, whose goal is to guess the outcomes generated by the two sequential receivers in another measurement party. The randomness is quantified by the min-entropy of Eve's guessing probabilities, and upper bounds on the guessing probabilities can be computed using the NPA-hierarchy for the P&M chain-shaped networks.

The global guessing probability for the sequential Bob's input \mathbf{y} given a probability $P(\mathbf{b}|\mathbf{y}, z)$ is the best probability that Eve could guess \mathbf{b} given $\mathbf{y} = \mathbf{y}^*$ and $z = z^*$ while simultaneously reproducing $P(\mathbf{b}|\mathbf{y}, z)$ when




FIG. 5. The P&M quantum chain-shaped network involves two measurement parties. One of the parties is the eavesdropper Eve and her goal is to predict the outcomes $b_1 b_2$ generated by the two sequential receivers in another measurement party.

marginalizing over her output e .

$$\begin{aligned}
 G(\mathbf{y}, z) &= \max_{p_{BE}} \sum_{e=\mathbf{b}}^{|\mathbf{b}|} p_{BE}(\mathbf{b}, e | \mathbf{y}, x, z), \\
 \text{subject to : } & P(\mathbf{b} | \mathbf{y}, z) = \sum_e p_{BE}(\mathbf{b}, e | \mathbf{y}, x, z), \\
 & p_{BE}(\mathbf{b}, e | \mathbf{y}, x, z) \in Q(\lambda)^{SEQ}. \quad (14)
 \end{aligned}$$

Eve has the input x and the output $e \in [1, \dots, |\mathbf{b}|]$, where $|\mathbf{b}|$ represents the size of sequential Bob's outcomes. The second constraint represents that p_{BE} has a P&M chain-shaped network quantum realization satisfying the gram matrix λ of the states. That is,

$$p_{BE} = \langle \phi_z | B_{\mathbf{y}}^{\mathbf{b}} \otimes E_x^e | \phi_z \rangle, \langle \phi_z | \phi_{z'} \rangle = \lambda_{zz'}. \quad (15)$$

The global randomness for the two sequential receivers can be quantified by the min-entropy $-\log_2 G(\mathbf{y}, z)$. Similarly, we can change the objective function to calculate the local randomness of Bob₁ and Bob₂. Likewise, the constraints in the optimization problem need to be revised to address individual Bob rather than sequential Bobs.

1. Randomness Certification Based on the Optimal Trade-off of 2→1 Sequential QRACs

In the context of randomness certification based on 2→1 sequential random access codes, we did not factor in the presence of Eve. If there is an adversary Eve as shown in Fig. 5, what amount of local and global randomness can be certified? To better capture the quantum characteristics, we can constrain the guessing probabilities of Bob₁ and Bob₂ to satisfy the optimal trade-off relationship, rather than solving across the double viola-




FIG. 6. The P&M quantum chain-shaped network involves two measurement parties. One of the parties is the eavesdropper Eve and her goal is to predict the outcomes $b_1 b_2$ generated by the two sequential receivers in another measurement party.

tion quantum region. That is:

$$\begin{aligned}
 G(\mathbf{y}, z) &= \max_{p_{BE}} \sum_{e=\mathbf{b}}^{|\mathbf{b}|} p_{BE}(\mathbf{b}, e | \mathbf{y}, x, z), \\
 \text{subject to : } & P(b_1 = z_{y_1}) = \tau, \tau \in [0.5, 0.8536], \\
 & P(b_2 = z_{y_2}) = \frac{1}{8}(4 + \sqrt{2} + \\
 & \sqrt{16P(b_1 = z_{y_1}) - 16P(b_1 = z_{y_1})^2} - 2, \\
 & \sum_e p_{BE}(\mathbf{b}, e | \mathbf{y}, x, z) = p(\mathbf{b}, | \mathbf{y}, z), \forall y, z. \quad (16)
 \end{aligned}$$

Since we are based on the optimal trade-off of 2→1 sequential QRACs, each measurement choice for Bob₁ and Bob₂ results in two outcomes, thus there are four possible joint outcomes $b_1 b_2$. Eve's goal is to guess the joint outcome $b_1 b_2$. We assume that Eve has a single input and four outputs. We use Bob₁'s guessing probability as the variable, and Bob₂'s guessing probability is optimized. The last constraint represents the sum of Eve's outcomes is equal to the joint probability in the scenario without Eve. To obtain the local randomness that can be certified by Bob₁ and Bob₂, we can assume that Eve produces two outcomes. In the optimization problem Eq. (16), the objective function also needs to be changed to the local guessing probability. The local and global randomness obtained using the NPA method are shown in the Fig. 6.

2. Randomness Certification Based on Complete Probability

In the previous section, we certified randomness based on the optimal trade-off of 2→1 sequential QRACs, where the guessing probabilities align with dimension witness inequality [38]. However, researches have shown that full probability values contain more information than a single inequality. The Ref. [47] utilized complete measurement statistics for optimal device-independent randomness evaluation. Our goal is to bound the amount of randomness that can be certified from an observed complete probability distribution P_{obs} in the presence of an eavesdropper. The probability distribution P_{obs} generated by two sequential receivers Bob₁ and Bob₂ in Fig. 5.

To generate the full observed correlations P_{obs} , we have provided the specific quantum states and sequential measurements in the following. One of the four states $\{|0\rangle, |+\rangle, |-\rangle, |1\rangle\}$ is randomly distributed to Bob₁ via an untrusted quantum network. Bob₁ performs one of two unsharp measurements, corresponding to $\eta\sigma_x$ and $\eta\sigma_z$ for some sharpness parameter $\eta \in [0, 1]$. Then, Bob₁ sends his post measurement state to Bob₂. For $y_2 = 0, 1$, Bob₂ performs a projective measurement of σ_x or σ_z . The eavesdropper Eve performs measurement x to guess the global output b_1b_2 or the local outcome b_1, b_2 . The optimization problem for global randomness certification is as follows:

$$G(\mathbf{y}, z) = \max_{p_{BE}} \sum_{e=\mathbf{b}}^{|\mathbf{b}|} p_{BE}(\mathbf{b}, e|\mathbf{y}, x, z),$$

subject to :

$$P_{obs}(\mathbf{b}|\mathbf{y}, z) = \sum_e p_{BE}(\mathbf{b}, e|\mathbf{y}, x, z),$$

$$p_{BE}(\mathbf{b}, e|\mathbf{y}, x, z) \in Q(\lambda)^{SEQ}. \quad (17)$$

The first constraint requires that the sum of Eve's outcomes matches the observed probability values. The second constraint ensures that the probability distribution produced by Eve and the sequential Bobs lies within the quantum set. To determine the amount of local randomness that can be certified, we simply need to revise the objective function and the number of outcomes produced by Eve. Since Bob₁'s sharpness measurement parameter influence the amount of information obtained by both Bob₁ and Bob₂, we provide the relationship between the sharpness parameter η and the certifiable random bits. In Fig. 7 we present the min-entropy $-\log_2(G(y_1y_2^* = 00, z^* = 1))$, $-\log_2(G(y_1^* = 0, z^* = 1))$ and $-\log_2(G(y_2^* = 0, z^* = 1))$ obtained as functions of the sharpness parameter η , using level 1 + AB of the hierarchy.

From the Fig. 7, we can observe that the trend of global or local randomness as a function of the weak measurement parameters is consistent with that in Fig. 6. However, we can see that the randomness certified under full probabilities is greater than that certified under only




FIG. 7. The relationships between randomness of the two sequential receivers and the sharpness parameter η . The state $|0\rangle$ is sent to Bob₁ to perform his unsharp measurement $y_1 = 0$. Then, Bob₂ performs his measurement $y_2 = 0$ on the post measurement state. Eve performs her measurement x and guesses the outcome b_1b_2 or the single outcome b_1, b_2 .

sequential receivers' guessing probabilities. This conclusion is also consistent with the claim in Ref. [48] that more randomness can be certified from complete measurement statistics.

V. CONCLUSION

The approach introduced in this work provides a comprehensive toolbox for studying correlations generated in P&M quantum chain-shaped networks, featuring sequential receivers at each measurement party. Assuming only on the inner product information of the initial states, we can derive a hierarchy of necessary conditions for the correlations arising from P&M quantum chain-shaped networks. Each necessary condition amounts to verify the existence of a positive semi-definite matrix G who satisfies the linear and positive semi-definite constraints depends on the inner-product of quantum states and sequential measurement operators. Optimizing the entire quantum correlation set has many practical applications, one of which is the sequential QRACs. Using our approach, we derived the optimal trade-off between the success probabilities of two sequential receivers in the 2 → 1 sequential QRACs. In principle, the optimal trade-off attained by the NPA-hierarchy in low-level is not tight because the method only provides the necessary conditions for determining whether given correlations are generated in the P&M quantum chain-shaped networks. In the application, we show that low-level approximations are already enough to achieve tight bounds. Furthermore, we study the semi-device-independent randomness certifica-

tion based on the $2 \rightarrow 1$ sequential QRACs. Finally, in a two-party P&M chain-shaped network, one measurement party is an eavesdropper Eve, and the other party has two sequential receivers. Using the optimal trade-off of $2 \rightarrow 1$ sequential QRACs, we demonstrate the local and global randomness that can be certified using the NPA-hierarchy. Given the complete set of probability values generated by the two sequential receivers, we provide the relationship between the amount of randomness and the unsharp measurement parameter η of the first sequential receiver. We found that the complete set of probability values allows for the certification of greater local and global randomness compared to relying only on the optimal trade-off relation.

Considering the advantages of quantum correlation sets, it would be interesting to explore whether our toolbox can be applied in contexts beyond those specifically discussed above in quantum information tasks. Additionally, the time and memory requirements of the

NPA-hierarchy become prohibitive as the P&M quantum chain-shaped network scales up. Machine learning methods can not only effectively characterize the quantum correlations in quantum systems but also reduce resource consumption [49, 50]. The method in Ref.[51] proves to be more efficient than NPA-hierarchy methods, as it exploits a feedforward artificial neural network to optimize the correlations compatible with arbitrary quantum networks. We could consider applying this method to the P&M quantum chain-shaped network.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

This work is supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China (Grants No.62171056, No.61973021, and No.62220106012).

-
- [1] R. Horodecki, P. Horodecki, M. Horodecki, and K. Horodecki, Quantum entanglement, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **81**, 865 (2009).
- [2] H. M. Wiseman, S. J. Jones, and A. C. Doherty, Steering, entanglement, nonlocality, and the einstein-podolsky-rosen paradox, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **98**, 140402 (2007).
- [3] N. Brunner, D. Cavalcanti, S. Pironio, V. Scarani, and S. Wehner, Bell nonlocality, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **86**, 419 (2014).
- [4] D. Cavalcanti, M. L. Almeida, V. Scarani, and A. Acín, Quantum networks reveal quantum nonlocality, *Nature Communications* **2**, 10.1038/ncomms1193 (2011).
- [5] R. W. Spekkens, Contextuality for preparations, transformations, and unsharp measurements, *Phys. Rev. A* **71**, 052108 (2005).
- [6] A. Acín, S. Massar, and S. Pironio, Randomness versus nonlocality and entanglement, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **108**, 100402 (2012).
- [7] C. Dhara, G. Pretico, and A. Acín, Maximal quantum randomness in bell tests, *Phys. Rev. A* **88**, 052116 (2013).
- [8] R. R. Harumichi NISHIMURA, Quantum random access coding, *IEICE TRANSACTIONS on Fundamentals* **E92-A**, 1268 (2009).
- [9] M. Navascués, S. Pironio, and A. Acín, Bounding the set of quantum correlations, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **98**, 010401 (2007).
- [10] M. Navascués, S. Pironio, and A. Acín, A convergent hierarchy of semidefinite programs characterizing the set of quantum correlations, *New J. Phys.* **10**, 073013 (2008).
- [11] T. Fritz, Beyond bell's theorem: correlation scenarios, *New Journal of Physics* **14**, 103001 (2012).
- [12] D. Poderini, I. Agresti, G. Marchese, E. Polino, T. Giordani, A. Suprano, M. Valeri, G. Milani, N. Spagnolo, G. Carvacho, R. Chaves, and F. Sciarrino, Experimental violation of n-locality in a star quantum network[1], in *2021 Conference on Lasers and Electro-Optics (CLEO)* (2021) pp. 1–3.
- [13] F. Andreoli, G. Carvacho, L. Santodonato, R. Chaves, and F. Sciarrino, Maximal qubit violation of n-locality inequalities in a star-shaped quantum network, *New J. Phys.* **19**, 113020 (2017).
- [14] S. Munshi, R. Kumar, and A. K. Pan, Generalized n -locality inequalities in a star-network configuration and their optimal quantum violations, *Phys. Rev. A* **104**, 042217 (2021).
- [15] A. Tavakoli, P. Skrzypczyk, D. Cavalcanti, and A. Acín, Nonlocal correlations in the star-network configuration, *Phys. Rev. A* **90**, 062109 (2014).
- [16] S. Yang, K. He, X. Qi, and J. Hou, Quantum steering in two-forked tree-shaped networks, *Phys. Scripta* **98**, 125102 (2023).
- [17] H. Sun, F. Guo, H. Dong, and F. Gao, Network nonlocality sharing in a two-forked tree-shaped network, *Phys. Rev. A* **110**, 012401 (2024).
- [18] R. Gallego, L. E. Würflinger, R. Chaves, A. Acín, and M. Navascués, Nonlocality in sequential correlation scenarios, *New J. Phys.* **16**, 033037 (2014).
- [19] B. Doolittle and E. Chitambar, Maximal qubit violations of n -locality in star and chain networks, *Phys. Rev. A* **108**, 042409 (2023).
- [20] A. Pozas-Kerstjens, R. Rabelo, L. Rudnicki, R. Chaves, D. Cavalcanti, M. Navascués, and A. Acín, Bounding the sets of classical and quantum correlations in networks, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **123**, 140503 (2019).
- [21] Y. Wang, I. W. Primaatmaja, E. Lavie, A. Varvitsiotis, and C. C. W. Lim, Characterising the correlations of prepare-and-measure quantum networks, *npj Quantum Information* **5**, 17 (2019).
- [22] R. Silva, N. Gisin, Y. Guryanova, and S. Popescu, Multiple observers can share the nonlocality of half of an entangled pair by using optimal weak measurements, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **114**, 250401 (2015).
- [23] F. J. Curchod, M. Johansson, R. Augusiak, M. J. Hoban, P. Wittek, and A. Acín, Unbounded randomness certification using sequences of measurements, *Phys. Rev. A* **95**, 020102 (2017).
- [24] X. Liu, Y. Wang, Y. Han, and X. Wu, Quantifying the intrinsic randomness in sequential measurements, *New*

- Journal of Physics* **26**, 013026 (2024).
- [25] P. J. Brown and R. Colbeck, Arbitrarily many independent observers can share the nonlocality of a single maximally entangled qubit pair, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **125**, 090401 (2020).
- [26] M.-J. Hu, Z.-Y. Zhou, X.-M. Hu, C.-F. Li, G.-C. Guo, and Y.-S. Zhang, Observation of non-locality sharing among three observers with one entangled pair via optimal weak measurement, *npj Quantum Information* **4**, 63 (2018).
- [27] S. Sasmal, D. Das, S. Mal, and A. S. Majumdar, Steering a single system sequentially by multiple observers, *Phys. Rev. A* **98**, 012305 (2018).
- [28] A. Bera, S. Mal, A. Sen(De), and U. Sen, Witnessing bipartite entanglement sequentially by multiple observers, *Phys. Rev. A* **98**, 062304 (2018).
- [29] S. Datta and A. S. Majumdar, Sharing of nonlocal advantage of quantum coherence by sequential observers, *Phys. Rev. A* **98**, 042311 (2018).
- [30] J. Bowles, F. Baccari, and A. Salavrakos, Bounding sets of sequential quantum correlations and device-independent randomness certification, *Quantum* **4**, 344 (2020).
- [31] K. Mohan, A. Tavakoli, and N. Brunner, Sequential random access codes and self-testing of quantum measurement instruments, *New J. Phys.* **21**, 083034 (2019).
- [32] I. Gerhardt, Q. Liu, A. Lamas-Linares, J. Skaar, C. Kurtsiefer, and V. Makarov, Full-field implementation of a perfect eavesdropper on a quantum cryptography system, *Nature Communications* **2**, 349 (2011).
- [33] W. Li, V. Zapatero, H. Tan, K. Wei, H. Min, W.-Y. Liu, X. Jiang, S.-K. Liao, C.-Z. Peng, M. Curty, F. Xu, and J.-W. Pan, Experimental quantum key distribution secure against malicious devices, *Phys. Rev. Appl.* **15**, 034081 (2021).
- [34] Y. Wath, M. Hariprasad, F. Shah, and S. Gupta, Eavesdropping a quantum key distribution network using sequential quantum unsharp measurement attacks, *The European Physical Journal Plus* **138**, 54 (2023).
- [35] I. W. Primaatmaja, E. Lavie, K. T. Goh, C. Wang, and C. C. W. Lim, Versatile security analysis of measurement-device-independent quantum key distribution, *Phys. Rev. A* **99**, 062332 (2019).
- [36] M. Pereira, M. Curty, and K. Tamaki, Quantum key distribution with flawed and leaky sources, *npj Quantum Information* **5**, 62 (2019).
- [37] L. Liu, Y. Wang, E. Lavie, C. Wang, A. Ricou, F. Z. Guo, and C. C. W. Lim, Practical quantum key distribution with non-phase-randomized coherent states, *Phys. Rev. Appl.* **12**, 024048 (2019).
- [38] H.-W. Li, M. Pawłowski, Z.-Q. Yin, G.-C. Guo, and Z.-F. Han, Semi-device-independent randomness certification using $n \rightarrow 1$ quantum random access codes, *Phys. Rev. A* **85**, 052308 (2012).
- [39] M. M. Wilde, *Quantum Information Theory*, 2nd ed. (Cambridge University Press, 2017).
- [40] A. Tavakoli, A. Hameedi, B. Marques, and M. Bourenane, Quantum random access codes using single d -level systems, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **114**, 170502 (2015).
- [41] A. Tavakoli, J. m. k. Kaniewski, T. Vértesi, D. Rosset, and N. Brunner, Self-testing quantum states and measurements in the prepare-and-measure scenario, *Phys. Rev. A* **98**, 062307 (2018).
- [42] H.-W. Li, Z.-Q. Yin, Y.-C. Wu, X.-B. Zou, S. Wang, W. Chen, G.-C. Guo, and Z.-F. Han, Semi-device-independent random-number expansion without entanglement, *Phys. Rev. A* **84**, 034301 (2011).
- [43] Y.-Q. Zhou, H.-W. Li, Y.-K. Wang, D.-D. Li, F. Gao, and Q.-Y. Wen, Semi-device-independent randomness expansion with partially free random sources, *Phys. Rev. A* **92**, 022331 (2015).
- [44] E. Passaro, D. Cavalcanti, P. Skrzypczyk, and A. Acín, Optimal randomness certification in the quantum steering and prepare-and-measure scenarios, *New J. Phys.* **17**, 113010 (2015).
- [45] J. B. Brask, A. Martin, W. Esposito, R. Houlmann, J. Bowles, H. Zbinden, and N. Brunner, Megahertz-rate semi-device-independent quantum random number generators based on unambiguous state discrimination, *Phys. Rev. Appl.* **7**, 054018 (2017).
- [46] Y. Xiao, F. Guo, H. Dong, and F. Gao, Expanding the sharpness parameter area based on sequential $3 \rightarrow 1$ parity-oblivious quantum random access code, *Quantum Information Processing* **22**, 195 (2023).
- [47] O. Nieto-Silleras, S. Pironio, and J. Silman, Using complete measurement statistics for optimal device-independent randomness evaluation, *New Journal of Physics* **16**, 013035 (2014).
- [48] J.-D. Bancal, L. Sheridan, and V. Scarani, More randomness from the same data, *New Journal of Physics* **16**, 033011 (2014).
- [49] A. Canabarro, S. Brito, and R. Chaves, Machine learning nonlocal correlations, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **122**, 200401 (2019).
- [50] Y. Song, Y. Wu, S. Wu, D. Li, Q. Wen, S. Qin, and F. Gao, A quantum federated learning framework for classical clients, *Science China Physics, Mechanics & Astronomy* **67**, 250311 (2024).
- [51] N. D'Alessandro, B. Polacchi, G. Moreno, E. Polino, R. Chaves, I. Agresti, and F. Sciarrino, Machine-learning-based device-independent certification of quantum networks, *Phys. Rev. Res.* **5**, 023016 (2023).