

Quantum secure non-malleable codes in the split-state model

Divesh Aggarwal * Naresh Goud Boddu † Rahul Jain ‡

Abstract

Non-malleable codes introduced by Dziembowski, Pietrzak and Wichs [DPW18] encode a classical message S in a manner such that the tampered codeword either decodes to the original message S or a message that is unrelated/independent of S . Constructing non-malleable codes for various tampering function families has received significant attention in the recent years. We consider the well studied (2-part) *split-state* model, in which the message S is encoded into two parts X and Y , and the adversary is allowed to arbitrarily tamper with each X and Y individually. Non-malleable codes in the split-state model have found applications in other important security notions like *non-malleable commitments* and *non-malleable secret sharing*. Thus, it is vital to understand if such non-malleable codes are secure against quantum adversaries.

We consider the security of non-malleable codes in the split-state model when the adversary is allowed to make use of arbitrary entanglement to tamper the parts X and Y . We construct explicit quantum secure non-malleable codes in the split-state model. Our construction of quantum secure non-malleable codes is based on the recent construction of quantum secure *2-source non-malleable extractors* by Boddu, Jain and Kapshikar [BJK21].

- We extend the connection of Cheraghchi and Guruswami [CG16] between 2-source non-malleable extractors and non-malleable codes in the split-state model in the classical setting to the quantum setting, i.e. we show that explicit quantum secure 2-source non-malleable extractors in (k_1, k_2) -qma-state framework of [BJK21] give rise to explicit quantum secure non-malleable codes in the split-state model.
- We construct the first quantum secure non-malleable code with efficient encoding and decoding procedures for message length $m = n^{\Omega(1)}$, error $\varepsilon = 2^{-n^{\Omega(1)}}$ and codeword of size $2n$. Prior to this work, it remained open to provide such quantum secure non-malleable code even for a single bit message in the split-state model.
- We also study its natural extension when the tampering of the codeword is performed t -times. We construct quantum secure one-many non-malleable code with efficient encoding and decoding procedures for $t = n^{\Omega(1)}$, message length $m = n^{\Omega(1)}$, error $\varepsilon = 2^{-n^{\Omega(1)}}$ and codeword of size $2n$.
- As an application, we also construct the first quantum secure 2-out-of-2 non-malleable secret sharing scheme for message/secret length $m = n^{\Omega(1)}$, error $\varepsilon = 2^{-n^{\Omega(1)}}$ and share of size n .

*Center for Quantum Technologies, National University of Singapore, dcsdiva@nus.edu.sg

†Center for Quantum Technologies, National University of Singapore, e0169905@u.nus.edu

‡Centre for Quantum Technologies and Department of Computer Science, National University of Singapore and MajuLab, UMI 3654, Singapore, rahul@comp.nus.edu.sg

1 Introduction

In a seminal work, Dziembowski, Pietrzak and Wichs [DPW18] introduced non-malleable codes to provide a meaningful guarantee for the encoded message S in situations where traditional error-correction or even error-detection is impossible. Informally, non-malleable codes encode a classical message S in a manner such that tampering the codeword results in decoder either outputting the original message S or a message that is unrelated/independent of S . Using probabilistic arguments, [DPW18] showed the existence of such non-malleable codes against any family \mathcal{F} of tampering functions of size as large as $2^{2^{\alpha n}}$ for any fixed constant $\alpha < 1$, where n is the length of codeword for messages of length $\Omega(n)$.

Subsequent works continued to study non-malleable codes in various tampering models. Perhaps the most well known of these tampering function families is the so called split-state model introduced by Liu and Lysyanskaya [LL12], who constructed efficient constant rate non-malleable codes against computationally bounded adversaries under strong cryptographic assumptions. We refer to the (2-part) split-state model as the split-state model in this paper. In the split-state model, the message S is encoded into two parts, X and Y , after which the adversary is allowed to arbitrarily tamper $(X, Y) \rightarrow (X', Y')$ such that $(X', Y') = (f(X), g(Y))$ for any functions (f, g) such that $f, g : \{0, 1\}^n \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^n$. Dziembowski, Kazana and Obremski [DKO13] proposed a construction that provides non-malleable codes for a single bit message based on strong extractors. Subsequently, multiple works considered non-malleable codes for multi-bit messages leading to constant rate non-malleable codes in the split-state model [LL12, CG16, CGL20, CG14, ADL18, Agg15, Li15, AB16, Li17, Li19, AO20, AKO⁺22]. Non-malleable codes in the split-state model have found applications to numerous other important security notions such as non-malleable commitments and non-malleable secret sharing [GPR16, GK18a, GK18b, ADN⁺19, SV19].

More formally, a non-malleable code in the split-state model in the classical setting can be defined as follows. Let n, m represent positive integers and $k, \varepsilon, \varepsilon' > 0$ represent reals. Let \mathcal{F} denote the set of all functions $f : \{0, 1\}^n \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^n$. We consider an encoding and decoding scheme (Enc, Dec) in the split-state model where $\text{Enc}(S) = (X, Y)$. Here $S \sim U_m$ (U_m is uniform distribution on m bits) represents the plaintext/message and $X, Y \in \{0, 1\}^n$ are the two parts of the codeword. Enc is a randomized function and $\text{Dec}(X, Y)$ is a deterministic function, such that $\Pr(\text{Dec}(\text{Enc}(S)) = S) = 1$.

We define the function $\text{copy} : \{0, 1\}^* \cup \{\text{same}\} \times \{0, 1\}^* \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^*$. $\text{copy}(x, s) = s$ if $x = \text{same}$, otherwise $\text{copy}(x, s) = x$.

Definition 1 (Non-malleable codes in the split-state model [LL12, DPW18]). *(Enc, Dec) is an (m, n, ε) -non-malleable code with respect to a family of tampering functions $\mathcal{F} \times \mathcal{F}$, if for every $f = (g_1, g_2) \in \mathcal{F} \times \mathcal{F}$, there exists a random variable $\mathcal{D}_f = \mathcal{D}_{(g_1, g_2)}$ on $\{0, 1\}^m \cup \{\text{same}\}$ which is independent of the randomness in Enc such that for all messages $s \in \{0, 1\}^m$, it holds that*

$$\|\text{Dec}(f(\text{Enc}(s))) - \text{copy}(\mathcal{D}_f, s)\|_1 \leq \varepsilon.$$

Intuitively, if the adversary doesn't tamper the codeword (in which case $(X, Y) = (X', Y')$), the decoded message is same (captured by the variable **same**) as original message S . If the adversary does tamper the codeword (in which case either $X \neq X'$ or $Y \neq Y'$), the decoded message is (approximately) distributed according to a distribution (\mathcal{D}_f minus **same** normalized) that only depends on f and is independent of the original message S .

Previous classical results in the split-state model

[DKO13] constructed the first non-malleable code for a 1-bit message. Following that Aggarwal, Dodis and Lovett [ADL18] gave the first information-theoretic construction for m -bit messages, but the length of codeword being $2n = m^{\mathcal{O}(1)}$. Chattopadhyay, Goyal and Li [CGL20] gave a non-malleable code for message length $m = n^{\Omega(1)}$, error $\varepsilon = 2^{-n^{\Omega(1)}}$ and codeword of size $2n$. Improving upon the work of [CGL20], Li [Li19] gave a non-malleable code for message length $m = \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{n \log \log n}{\log n}\right)$, error $\varepsilon = 2^{-n^{\Omega(1)}}$ and codeword of size $2n$. Only recently Aggarwal and Obrem-ski [AO20] gave the first constant rate non-malleable code for message length $m = \Omega(n)$, error $\varepsilon = 2^{-n^{\Omega(1)}}$ and codeword of size $2n$. This construction was improved to a rate $1/3$ construction in [AKO⁺22].

Motivation to consider the quantum setting

With the rise of quantum computers, it becomes vital to understand if non-malleable codes are secure against quantum adversaries. Quantum entanglement between various parties, used to generate classical information introduces *non-local correlations* [Bel64]. For example in the CHSH game, one can use local measurements on both the halves of a EPR state to generate a probability distribution which contains correlations stronger than those possible classically. Entanglement is of course known to yield several such unexpected effects with no classical counterparts, e.g., *super-dense coding* [BW92]. Thus, it motivates us to consider if one can provide non-malleable codes when adversary in the split-state model is allowed to make use of an arbitrary entanglement (between the two parts) to tamper the two parts X and Y (both classical) of an encoded message S . We note to the reader that the (Enc, Dec) schemes considered in this paper are classical, and we provide quantum security in the sense that the adversary is allowed to do quantum operations to tamper $(X, Y) \rightarrow (X', Y')$ using pre-shared unbounded entanglement.

Our results

Our first contribution is setting up the required analogue/framework to define non-malleable codes in the quantum setting.

Quantum split-state adversary

To tamper $(X, Y) \rightarrow (X', Y')$, we let the adversary share an arbitrary entanglement ψ_{NM} ¹ between the two different locations where split codewords are stored. The adversary then applies isometries $U : \mathcal{H}_X \otimes \mathcal{H}_N \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_{X'} \otimes \mathcal{H}_{N'}$ and $V : \mathcal{H}_Y \otimes \mathcal{H}_M \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_{Y'} \otimes \mathcal{H}_{M'}$ to tamper² $(X, Y) \rightarrow (X', Y')$. The decoding process begins by first measuring (X', Y') and then outputting the decoded message S' from (X', Y') (post measurement in the computational basis). To show that non-malleable codes are secure against such an adversary, it is sufficient to show that if the adversary doesn't tamper the codeword, the decoded message S' is same as the original message S . If the adversary does tamper the codeword, the decoded message S' is (approximately) distributed according to a distribution $(\mathcal{D}_{(U, V, \psi)})$ that only depends on (U, V, ψ) that is independent of the original message S . For simplicity, we denote quantum split-state adversary as $\mathcal{A} = (U, V, \psi)$ in this paper.

¹Without any loss of generality, one can consider ψ as a pure state.

²This is without any loss of generality since one can consider Strinspring isometry extension (see Definition 3) of a CPTP map Φ as isometry if the tampering is given by a CPTP map Φ .




Figure 1: Quantum split-state adversary along with the process.

We now formally define a quantum split-state adversary in the split-state model.

Definition 2 (Quantum split-state adversary (see Figure 1)). *Let σ_{SXY} be the state after encoding the message S . The quantum split-state adversary (denoted $\mathcal{A} = (U, V, \psi)$) will act via two isometries, (U, V) using an additional shared entangled state $|\psi\rangle_{NM}$ as specified by $U : \mathcal{H}_X \otimes \mathcal{H}_N \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_{X'} \otimes \mathcal{H}_{N'}$ and $V : \mathcal{H}_Y \otimes \mathcal{H}_M \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_{Y'} \otimes \mathcal{H}_{M'}$. Let $\hat{\rho} = (U \otimes V)(\sigma \otimes |\psi\rangle\langle\psi|)(U \otimes V)^\dagger$ and ρ be the final state after measuring the registers $(X'Y')$ in computational basis³.*

Our work provides the first quantum secure non-malleable code with efficient encoding and decoding procedures for message length $m = n^{\Omega(1)}$, error $\varepsilon = 2^{-n^{\Omega(1)}}$ and codeword of size $2n$. When the tampering of the codeword is performed t -times, we also provide the first quantum secure one-many non-malleable code with efficient encoding and decoding procedures for $t = n^{\Omega(1)}$, message length $m = n^{\Omega(1)}$, error $\varepsilon = 2^{-n^{\Omega(1)}}$ and codeword of size $2n$. Prior to our work, it remained open to provide such quantum secure non-malleable codes even for a single bit message in the split-state model. We next formally define the quantum secure non-malleable codes in the split-state model.

Definition 3 (Quantum secure non-malleable codes in the split-state model). *(Enc, Dec) is an (m, n, ε) -quantum secure non-malleable code in the split-state model with error ε , if for state ρ and adversary $\mathcal{A} = (U, V, \psi)$ (as defined in Definition 2), there exists a random variable $\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{A}}$ ⁴ on $\{0, 1\}^m \cup \{\text{same}\}$ such that*

$$\forall s \in \{0, 1\}^m : \quad \|S'_s - \text{copy}(\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{A}}, s)\|_1 \leq \varepsilon.$$

³We enforce the quantum split-state adversary to return classical registers X', Y' by doing the measurement in computational basis. This is without any loss of generality since the decoding process can start by doing the measurement (this will not affect anything in the absence of quantum split-state adversary) and then decode using Dec.

⁴Distribution depends only on \mathcal{A} and is independent of the original message S .

Above $S' = \text{Dec}(X', Y')$, $S'_s = (S'|S = s)$ and the function $\text{copy}(x, s)$ is such that $\text{copy}(x, s) = s$ if $x = \text{same}$, otherwise $\text{copy}(x, s) = x$.

Our first result is to show that a quantum secure non-malleable code in the split-state model can be constructed using a quantum secure 2-source non-malleable extractor. We use the 2-source non-malleable extractor of Boddu, Jain and Kapshikar [BJK21]. This is analogous to the classical result by Cheraghchi and Guruswami [CG14], however additional novelty over classical arguments is needed. This is to take care of the specific adversary model in which the security of 2-source non-malleable extractor is shown by [BJK21] and other additional issues involving quantum information (example purifications of states).

Theorem 1 (Quantum secure non-malleable codes in the split-state model). *Let $2\text{nmExt} : \{0, 1\}^n \times \{0, 1\}^n \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^m$ be an $(n - k, n - k, \varepsilon)$ -quantum secure 2-source non-malleable extractor. There exists an (m, n, ε') -quantum secure non-malleable code in the split-state model with parameter $\varepsilon' = 2^m(4(2^{-k} + \varepsilon) + \varepsilon)$ ⁵.*

Above, Enc, Dec for quantum secure non-malleable code in the split-state model are 2nmExt^{-1} , 2nmExt respectively. It can be noted that computation of $Z = 2\text{nmExt}(X, Y)$ (starting from (X, Y)) is efficient (in n). This ensures that Dec is efficient. However Enc involves given Z , sampling uniformly from the pre-image of Z (under the function 2nmExt) and it is not apriori clear that this is possible. In the next result, we show that this is indeed possible. This result is analogous to a result due to [CGL20], however in our case additional novelty is needed which we explain in the proof overview below.

Theorem 2. *There exists an (m, n, ε) -quantum secure non-malleable code in the split-state model with efficient encoding and decoding procedures for message length $m = n^{\Omega(1)}$, error $\varepsilon = 2^{-n^{\Omega(1)}}$ and codeword of size $2n$.*

Prior to this work, it remained open to provide such construction for quantum secure non-malleable codes, even for a single bit message in the split-state model.

As an application, we construct the first quantum secure 2-out-of-2 non-malleable secret sharing scheme for message/secret length $m = n^{\Omega(1)}$, error $\varepsilon = 2^{-n^{\Omega(1)}}$ and share of size n (see Appendix B).

We also study the natural extension when the tampering of the codeword is performed t -times (see Appendix A). Here, the adversary is allowed to tamper

$$(X, Y) \rightarrow (X^1 X^2 \dots X^t, Y^1 Y^2 \dots Y^t)$$

making use of an arbitrary entanglement between two parts X and Y . We require, in case of tampering, the original message S to be independent of $S^1 \dots S^t = \text{Dec}(X^1, Y^1) \dots \text{Dec}(X^t, Y^t)$.

Theorem 3 (Quantum secure one-many non-malleable codes in the split-state model). *Let $t\text{-}2\text{nmExt} : \{0, 1\}^n \times \{0, 1\}^n \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^m$ be a $(t; n - k, n - k, \varepsilon)$ -quantum secure 2-source t -non-malleable extractor. There exists a $(t; m, n, \varepsilon')$ -quantum secure one-many non-malleable code with parameter $\varepsilon' = 2^m(2^{2t}(2^{-k} + \varepsilon) + \varepsilon)$.*

Theorem 4. *There exists a $(t; m, n, \varepsilon)$ -quantum secure one-many non-malleable code in the split-state model with efficient encoding and decoding procedures for parameters $t = n^{\Omega(1)}$, $m = n^{\Omega(1)}$, error $\varepsilon = 2^{-n^{\Omega(1)}}$ and codeword of size $2n$.*

⁵All the quantum secure non-malleable codes in the split-state model we construct are qualitatively same as the non-malleable codes in the split-state model constructed in [CGL20].

Proof overview

Let 2nmext-c refer to the 2-source non-malleable extractor from [CGL20]. Let $XY = U_n \otimes U_n$ (\otimes represents independence). Let $Z = 2\text{nmext-c}(X, Y)$. According to the scheme by [CG14], efficient construction of non-malleable codes requires us to, given any z , sample efficiently from the distribution $(XY|Z = z)$. It is not apriori clear that such efficient (reverse) sampling for 2nmext-c is possible. [CGL20] modified 2nmext-c to come up with a new 2-source non-malleable extractor (say $\text{new-}2\text{nmext-c}$) and exhibited efficient reverse sampling for $\text{new-}2\text{nmext-c}$. A key difference between the constructions of 2nmext-c and $\text{new-}2\text{nmext-c}$ is the seeded extractor that is used in the alternating extraction argument (for both the constructions). 2nmext-c uses the seeded extractor from [GUV09] while $\text{new-}2\text{nmext-c}$ uses a seeded extractor IExt constructed by [CGL20]. Two key properties of IExt that are crucially used are:

1. Let W be the source, S be the seed and $O = \text{IExt}(W, S)$ be the output. For $WS = U_n \otimes U_d$, we have $OS = U_m \otimes U_d$.
2. IExt is a bi-linear function. This implies that for every (o, s) , one can sample (exactly) from $(W|OS = (o, s))$.

This allows [CGL20] exact reverse sampling. That is for any z , they are able to efficiently sample from the distribution $(XY|Z = z)$ exactly.

There are a few other modifications required to finally make $\text{new-}2\text{nmext-c}$ suitable for efficient reverse sampling. For example, the input sources X and Y are divided into $n^{\Omega(1)}$ different blocks (since there are $n^{\Omega(1)}$ rounds of alternating extraction in the construction of 2nmext-c). This enables to use different blocks (each with almost full min-entropy) as sources to seeded extractors in each round of alternating extraction. This further ensures the linear constraints that are imposed in the alternating extraction are on different variables of input sources, X, Y in each round which is crucial for the exact reverse sampling argument of [CGL20].

Let us now consider the quantum setting. Let 2nmext-q refer to the 2-source non-malleable extractor from [BJK21]. Again it is not apriori clear that efficient reverse sampling for 2nmext-q is possible. Hence we modify the 2nmext-q from [BJK21] to construct (say $\text{new-}2\text{nmext-q}$) in the full version. We follow the argument of dividing the input sources X and Y into different blocks (as stated in previous paragraph) and make necessary modifications to 2nmext-q . Next, we note the seeded extractor used in alternating extraction of both 2nmext-q , $\text{new-}2\text{nmext-q}$ is the Trevison extractor (say Trev) which is quantum secure [DPVR12]. One can modify 2nmext-q using a similar modification as that of [CGL20], by considering IExt instead of Trev . However then one would need to first show the quantum security of IExt . This is not known as of now and we leave it for future work. For now we choose to make the arguments work with Trev . We note the two key properties for Trev :

1. For $WS = U_n \otimes U_d$, we have $OS \approx U_m \otimes U_d$, where $O = \text{Trev}(W, S)$ (\approx represent close in ℓ_1 norm).
2. For every s , Trev is a linear function of W . Hence for every (o, s) , we can sample efficiently (exactly) from $(W|(OS) = (o, s))$.

Point 1. above is the differentiating property between IExt and Trev . Hence, unlike [CGL20], we cannot do exact reverse sampling and can only do approximate reverse sampling. We therefore have to carefully keep the overall error introduced under control.

While generating $Z = \text{new-2nmext-q}(X, Y)$, starting from (X, Y) , several intermediate random variables (say (R_1, R_2, \dots, R_k) in this order) are generated. During the reverse sampling, starting from Z , they need to be generated in the reverse order. We call this process *backtracking*. Since we have to keep the overall error under control, we need to note and use important Markov-chain structures between the intermediate random variables (see Claim 2 and Claim 3). This is additional technical novelty over [CGL20].

Organization

In Section 2, we describe useful quantum information facts and other preliminaries. It also contains useful lemmas and claims. We describe the existential proof of quantum secure non-malleable codes, i.e. Theorem 1 in Section 3. Section 4 contains the construction of modified 2-source non-malleable extractor along with proof of Theorem 2. The t -tampered version of non-malleable codes can be found in the Appendix A. Appendix B contains a quantum secure 2-out-of-2 non-malleable secret sharing scheme.

2 Preliminaries

Let n, m, d, t represent positive integers and $l, k, k_1, k_2, \delta, \gamma, \varepsilon \geq 0$ represent reals.

Quantum information theory

All the logarithms are evaluated to the base 2. Let $\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{Z}$ be finite sets (we only consider finite sets in this paper). For a *random variable* $X \in \mathcal{X}$, we use X to denote both the random variable and its distribution, whenever it is clear from the context. We use $x \leftarrow X$ to denote x drawn according to X . We also use $x \leftarrow \mathcal{X}$ to denote x drawn uniformly from \mathcal{X} . For two random variables X, Y we use $X \otimes Y$ to denote independent random variables.

We call random variables X, Y , *copies* of each other iff $\Pr[X = Y] = 1$. Let Y^1, Y^2, \dots, Y^t be random variables. We denote the joint random variable $Y^1 Y^2 \dots Y^t$ by $Y^{[t]}$. Similarly for any subset $\mathcal{S} \subseteq [t]$, we use $Y^{\mathcal{S}}$ to denote the joint random variable comprised of all the Y^s such that $s \in \mathcal{S}$. For a random variable $X \in \{0, 1\}^n$ and $0 < d_1 \leq d_2 \leq n$, let $\text{Crop}(X, d_1, d_2)$ represent the bits from d_1 to d_2 of X , i.e. $X^{[d_1, d_2]}$. Let U_d represent the uniform distribution over $\{0, 1\}^d$. For a random variable $X \in \mathbb{F}_q^n$ for a prime power q , we view X as a row vector (X^1, X^2, \dots, X^n) where each $X^i \in \mathbb{F}_q$.

Consider a finite-dimensional Hilbert space \mathcal{H} endowed with an inner-product $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ (we only consider finite-dimensional Hilbert-spaces). A quantum state (or a density matrix or a state) is a positive semi-definite operator on \mathcal{H} with trace value equal to 1. It is called *pure* iff its rank is 1. Let $|\psi\rangle$ be a unit vector on \mathcal{H} , that is $\langle \psi, \psi \rangle = 1$. With some abuse of notation, we use ψ to represent the state and also the density matrix $|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|$, associated with $|\psi\rangle$. Given a quantum state ρ on \mathcal{H} , *support of ρ* , called $\text{supp}(\rho)$ is the subspace of \mathcal{H} spanned by all eigenvectors of ρ with non-zero eigenvalues.

A *quantum register* A is associated with some Hilbert space \mathcal{H}_A . Define $|A| := \log(\dim(\mathcal{H}_A))$. Let $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}_A)$ represent the set of all linear operators on the Hilbert space \mathcal{H}_A . For operators $O, O' \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}_A)$, the notation $O \leq O'$ represents the Löwner order, that is, $O' - O$ is a positive semi-definite operator. We denote by $\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{H}_A)$, the set of all quantum states on the Hilbert space \mathcal{H}_A . State ρ with subscript A indicates $\rho_A \in \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{H}_A)$. If two registers A, B are associated with the same Hilbert

space, we shall represent the relation by $A \equiv B$. For two states ρ, σ , we let $\rho \equiv \sigma$ represent that they are identical as states (potentially in different registers). Composition of two registers A and B , denoted AB , is associated with the Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}_A \otimes \mathcal{H}_B$. For two quantum states $\rho \in \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{H}_A)$ and $\sigma \in \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{H}_B)$, $\rho \otimes \sigma \in \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{H}_{AB})$ represents the tensor product (*Kronecker product*) of ρ and σ . The identity operator on \mathcal{H}_A is denoted \mathbb{I}_A . Let U_A denote maximally mixed state in \mathcal{H}_A . Let $\rho_{AB} \in \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{H}_{AB})$. Define

$$\rho_B \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \text{Tr}_A \rho_{AB} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sum_i (\langle i| \otimes \mathbb{I}_B) \rho_{AB} (|i\rangle \otimes \mathbb{I}_B),$$

where $\{|i\rangle\}_i$ is an orthonormal basis for the Hilbert space \mathcal{H}_A . The state $\rho_B \in \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{H}_B)$ is referred to as the marginal state of ρ_{AB} on the register B . Unless otherwise stated, a missing register from subscript in a state represents partial trace over that register. Given $\rho_A \in \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{H}_A)$, a *purification* of ρ_A is a pure state $\rho_{AB} \in \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{H}_{AB})$ such that $\text{Tr}_B \rho_{AB} = \rho_A$. Purification of a quantum state is not unique. Suppose $A \equiv B$. Given $\{|i\rangle_A\}$ and $\{|i\rangle_B\}$ as orthonormal bases over \mathcal{H}_A and \mathcal{H}_B respectively, the *canonical purification* of a quantum state ρ_A is $|\rho_A\rangle \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (\rho_A^{\frac{1}{2}} \otimes \mathbb{I}_B) (\sum_i |i\rangle_A |i\rangle_B)$. A quantum map $\mathcal{E} : \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}_A) \rightarrow \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}_B)$ is a completely positive and trace preserving (CPTP) linear map. A *Hermitian* operator $H : \mathcal{H}_A \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_A$ is such that $H = H^\dagger$. A projector $\Pi \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}_A)$ is a Hermitian operator such that $\Pi^2 = \Pi$. A *unitary* operator $V_A : \mathcal{H}_A \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_A$ is such that $V_A^\dagger V_A = V_A V_A^\dagger = \mathbb{I}_A$. The set of all unitary operators on \mathcal{H}_A is denoted by $\mathcal{U}(\mathcal{H}_A)$. An *isometry* $V : \mathcal{H}_A \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_B$ is such that $V^\dagger V = \mathbb{I}_A$ and $V V^\dagger = \mathbb{I}_B$. A *POVM* element is an operator $0 \leq M \leq \mathbb{I}$. We use the shorthand $\overline{M} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathbb{I} - M$, where \mathbb{I} is clear from the context. We use shorthand M to represent $M \otimes \mathbb{I}$, where \mathbb{I} is clear from the context.

A *classical-quantum* (c-q) state ρ_{XE} is of the form

$$\rho_{XE} = \sum_{x \in \mathcal{X}} p(x) |x\rangle\langle x| \otimes \rho_E^x,$$

where ρ_E^x are states. In a pure state ρ_{XEA} in which ρ_{XE} is c-q, we call X a classical register and identify random variable X with it with $\Pr(X = x) = p(x)$. For an event $\mathcal{S} \subseteq \mathcal{X}$, define

$$\Pr(\mathcal{S})_\rho \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sum_{x \in \mathcal{S}} p(x) \quad ; \quad (\rho|\mathcal{S}) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \frac{1}{\Pr(\mathcal{S})_\rho} \sum_{x \in \mathcal{S}} p(x) |x\rangle\langle x| \otimes \rho_E^x.$$

For a function $Z : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{Z}$, define the following extension of ρ_{XE}

$$\rho_{ZXE} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sum_{x \in \mathcal{X}} p(x) |Z(x)\rangle\langle Z(x)| \otimes |x\rangle\langle x| \otimes \rho_E^x.$$

We call an isometry $V : \mathcal{H}_X \otimes \mathcal{H}_A \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_X \otimes \mathcal{H}_B$, *safe* on X iff there is a collection of isometries $V_x : \mathcal{H}_A \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_B$ such that the following holds. For all states $|\psi\rangle_{XA} = \sum_x \alpha_x |x\rangle_X |\psi^x\rangle_A$,

$$V|\psi\rangle_{XA} = \sum_x \alpha_x |x\rangle_X V_x |\psi^x\rangle_A.$$

All the isometries considered in this paper are safe on classical registers they act upon. For a function $Z : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{Z}$, define $\rho_{Z\hat{Z}XE}$ to be a pure state extension of ρ_{XEA} generated via a safe isometry $V : \mathcal{H}_X \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_X \otimes \mathcal{H}_Z \otimes \mathcal{H}_{\hat{Z}}$ (Z classical with copy \hat{Z}). For a pure state ρ_{XE} and measurement \mathcal{M} in

the computational basis on register X , define $\rho_{\hat{X}XE}$ a pure state extension post the measurement \mathcal{M} of state ρ_{XE} generated via a safe isometry $V : \mathcal{H}_X \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_X \otimes \mathcal{H}_{\hat{X}}$ such that $\rho_{\hat{X}XE} = V\rho V^\dagger$ and \hat{X} a copy of X .

Definition 4. 1. For $p \geq 1$ and matrix A , let $\|A\|_p$ denote the Schatten p -norm defined as

$$\|A\|_p \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (\text{Tr}(A^\dagger A)^{\frac{p}{2}})^{\frac{1}{p}}.$$

2. For states $\rho, \sigma : \Delta(\rho, \sigma) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \frac{1}{2} \|\rho - \sigma\|_1$. We write $\rho \approx_\varepsilon \sigma$ to denote $\Delta(\rho, \sigma) \leq \varepsilon$.

3. **Fidelity:** For states $\rho, \sigma : \mathbb{F}(\rho, \sigma) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \|\sqrt{\rho}\sqrt{\sigma}\|_1$.

4. **Bures metric:** For states $\rho, \sigma : \Delta_B(\rho, \sigma) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sqrt{1 - \mathbb{F}(\rho, \sigma)}$.

5. **Max-divergence** ([Dat09], see also [JRS02]): For states ρ, σ such that $\text{supp}(\rho) \subset \text{supp}(\sigma)$,

$$D_{\max}(\rho\|\sigma) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \min\{\lambda \in \mathbb{R} : \rho \leq 2^\lambda \sigma\}.$$

6. **Min-entropy and conditional-min-entropy:** For a state ρ_{XE} , the min-entropy of X is defined as,

$$H_{\min}(X)_\rho \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} -D_{\max}(\rho_X\|\mathbb{I}_X).$$

The conditional-min-entropy of X , conditioned on E , is defined as,

$$H_{\min}(X|E)_\rho \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} - \inf_{\sigma_E \in \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{H}_E)} D_{\max}(\rho_{XE}\|\mathbb{I}_X \otimes \sigma_E).$$

7. **Markov-chain:** A state ρ_{XEY} forms a Markov-chain (denoted $(X-E-Y)_\rho$) iff $\mathbb{I}(X : Y|E)_\rho = 0$ ⁶.

For the facts stated below without citation, we refer the reader to standard text books [NC00, Wat11].

Fact 1 (Uhlmann's Theorem [Uhl76]). Let $\rho_A, \sigma_A \in \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{H}_A)$. Let $\rho_{AB} \in \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{H}_{AB})$ be a purification of ρ_A and $\sigma_{AC} \in \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{H}_{AC})$ be a purification of σ_A . There exists an isometry V (from a subspace of \mathcal{H}_C to a subspace of \mathcal{H}_B) such that,

$$\Delta_B(|\theta\rangle\langle\theta|_{AB}, |\rho\rangle\langle\rho|_{AB}) = \Delta_B(\rho_A, \sigma_A),$$

where $|\theta\rangle_{AB} = (\mathbb{I}_A \otimes V)|\sigma\rangle_{AC}$.

Fact 2 ([CLW14]). Let $\mathcal{E} : \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}_M) \rightarrow \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}_{M'})$ be a CPTP map and let $\sigma_{XM'} = (\mathbb{I} \otimes \mathcal{E})(\rho_{XM})$. Then,

$$H_{\min}(X|M')_\sigma \geq H_{\min}(X|M)_\rho.$$

Above is equality iff \mathcal{E} is a CPTP map corresponding to an isometry.

Fact 3 (Stinespring isometry extension [Wat11]). Let $\Phi : \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}_X) \rightarrow \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}_Y)$ be a CPTP map. Then there exists an isometry $V : \mathcal{H}_X \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_Y \otimes \mathcal{H}_Z$ (Stinespring isometry extension of Φ) such that $\Phi(\rho_X) = \text{Tr}_Z(V\rho_X V^\dagger)$ for every state ρ_X .

⁶ $\mathbb{I}(A : B|C)_\rho$ represents conditional mutual information between registers A, B given register C in state ρ .

Fact 4 ([FvdG06]). *Let ρ, σ be states. Then,*

$$1 - \mathbb{F}(\rho, \sigma) \leq \Delta(\rho, \sigma) \leq \sqrt{1 - \mathbb{F}^2(\rho, \sigma)} \quad ; \quad \Delta_B^2(\rho, \sigma) \leq \Delta(\rho, \sigma) \leq \sqrt{2} \Delta_B(\rho, \sigma).$$

Fact 5 (Data-processing). *Let ρ, σ be states and \mathcal{E} be a CPTP map. Then*

- $\Delta(\mathcal{E}(\rho), \mathcal{E}(\sigma)) \leq \Delta(\rho, \sigma)$.
- $\Delta_B(\mathcal{E}(\rho), \mathcal{E}(\sigma)) \leq \Delta_B(\rho, \sigma)$.
- $D_{\max}(\mathcal{E}(\rho) \parallel \mathcal{E}(\sigma)) \leq D_{\max}(\rho \parallel \sigma)$.

The inequalities above are equalities in case Φ is a CPTP map corresponding to an isometry.

Fact 6. *Let ρ_{XE}, σ_{XE} be c-q states. Then,*

- $\|\rho_{XE} - \sigma_{XE}\|_1 \geq \mathbb{E}_{x \leftarrow \rho_X} \|\rho_E^x - \sigma_E^x\|_1$.
- $\Delta_B(\rho_{XE}, \sigma_{XE}) \geq \mathbb{E}_{x \leftarrow \rho_X} \Delta_B(\rho_E^x, \sigma_E^x)$.

The above inequalities are equalities iff $\rho_X = \sigma_X$.

Fact 7. *Let ρ, σ be states such that $\rho = \sum_x p_x \rho^x$, $\sigma = \sum_x p_x \sigma^x$, $\{\rho^x, \sigma^x\}_x$ are states and $\sum_x p_x = 1$. Then, $\Delta(\rho, \sigma) \leq \sum_x p_x \Delta(\rho^x, \sigma^x)$.*

Fact 8. *Let $\rho_{AB} \in \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{H}_A \otimes \mathcal{H}_B)$ be a state and $M \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}_B)$ such that $M^\dagger M \leq \mathbb{I}_B$. Let $\hat{\rho}_{AB} = \frac{M \rho_{AB} M^\dagger}{\text{Tr} M \rho_{AB} M^\dagger}$. Then,*

$$D_{\max}(\hat{\rho}_A \parallel \rho_A) \leq \log \left(\frac{1}{\text{Tr} M \rho_{AB} M^\dagger} \right).$$

Fact 9. *For random variables A, B such that $A = A_1 \otimes A_2$, $B = B_1 \otimes B_2$, we have*

$$\|A - B\|_1 = \|A_1 - B_1\|_1 + \|A_2 - B_2\|_1.$$

Fact 10. *For random variables $AB, \tilde{A}\tilde{B}$, we have*

$$\|\tilde{A}\tilde{B} - AB\|_1 \leq \|\tilde{B} - B\|_1 + \mathbb{E}_{b \leftarrow \tilde{B}} \|\tilde{A}|(\tilde{B} = b) - A|(B = b)\|_1.$$

Fact 11 (Folklore). *Let m, n be positive integers such that $m \leq n$. Let A be any $m \times n$ matrix over the Field \mathbb{F} . For any string $o \in \mathbb{F}^m$, let $S_o \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{x \in \mathbb{F}^n : Ax^\dagger = o^\dagger\}$. There exists an efficient algorithm that runs in time polynomial in $(m, n, |\mathbb{F}|)$ and outputs sample $x \leftarrow S_o$.*

Fact 12 (Corollary 5.2 in [CGL20]). *For any constant $\delta \in (0, 1)$, there exist constants α, β such that $3\beta \leq \alpha \leq 1/14$ and for all positive integers ν, r, t , with $r \geq \nu^\alpha$ and $t = \mathcal{O}(\nu^\beta)$ the following holds.*

There exists a polynomial time computable function $\text{Samp} : \{0, 1\}^r \rightarrow [\nu]^t$, such that for any set $\mathcal{S} \subset [\nu]$ of size $\delta\nu$,

$$\Pr(|\text{Samp}(U_r) \cap \mathcal{S}| \geq 1) \geq 1 - 2^{-\Omega(\nu^\alpha)}.$$

Definition 5. *Let $M = 2^m$. The inner-product function, $\text{IP}_M^n : \mathbb{F}_M^n \times \mathbb{F}_M^n \rightarrow \mathbb{F}_M$ is defined as follows:*

$$\text{IP}_M^n(x, y) = \sum_{i=1}^n x_i y_i,$$

where the operations are over the Field \mathbb{F}_M .

Extractors and non-malleable codes

Throughout the paper we use extractor to mean seeded extractor unless stated otherwise.

Definition 6 (Quantum secure extractor). *An (n, d, m) -extractor $\text{Ext} : \{0, 1\}^n \times \{0, 1\}^d \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^m$ is said to be (k, ε) -quantum secure if for every state ρ_{XES} , such that $H_{\min}(X|E)_\rho \geq k$ and $\rho_{XES} = \rho_{XE} \otimes U_d$, we have*

$$\|\rho_{\text{Ext}(X,S)E} - U_m \otimes \rho_E\|_1 \leq \varepsilon.$$

In addition, the extractor is called strong if

$$\|\rho_{\text{Ext}(X,S)SE} - U_m \otimes U_d \otimes \rho_E\|_1 \leq \varepsilon.$$

S is referred to as the seed for the extractor.

Fact 13 ([DPVR12, CV17]). *There exists an explicit $(2m, \varepsilon)$ -quantum secure strong (n, d, m) -extractor $\text{Ext} : \{0, 1\}^n \times \{0, 1\}^d \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^m$ for parameters $d = \mathcal{O}(\log^2(n/\varepsilon) \log m)$. Moreover the extractor Ext is linear extractor, i.e. for every fixed seed, the output of the extractor is a linear function of the input source.*

Definition 7 (l -qma-state [ABJO21]). *Let $\tau_{X\hat{X}}, \tau_{Y\hat{Y}}$ be the canonical purifications of independent and uniform sources X, Y respectively. Let τ_{NM} be a pure state. Let*

$$\theta_{X\hat{X}NM\hat{Y}} = \tau_{X\hat{X}} \otimes \tau_{NM} \otimes \tau_{Y\hat{Y}}.$$

Let $U : \mathcal{H}_X \otimes \mathcal{H}_N \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_X \otimes \mathcal{H}_{N'} \otimes \mathcal{H}_A$ and $V : \mathcal{H}_Y \otimes \mathcal{H}_M \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_Y \otimes \mathcal{H}_{M'} \otimes \mathcal{H}_B$ be isometries such that registers A, B are single qubit registers. Let

$$\rho_{X\hat{X}AN'M'BY\hat{Y}} = (U \otimes V)\theta_{X\hat{X}NM\hat{Y}}(U \otimes V)^\dagger,$$

and

$$l = \log \left(\frac{1}{\Pr(A=1, B=1)_\rho} \right) \quad ; \quad \sigma_{X\hat{X}N'M'Y\hat{Y}} = (\rho_{X\hat{X}AN'M'BY\hat{Y}}|_{A=1, B=1}).$$

We call $\sigma_{X\hat{X}N'M'Y\hat{Y}}$ an l -qma-state .

Fact 14 (IP security against l -qma-state [ABJO21]). *Let $n = \frac{n_1}{m}$ and $n_1 - l \geq 2 \log(\frac{1}{\varepsilon}) + m$. Let $\sigma_{X\hat{X}N'M'Y\hat{Y}}$ be an l -qma-state with $|X| = |Y| = n_1$. Then*

$$\|\sigma_{\text{IP}_{2^m}^n(X,Y)XN'} - U_m \otimes \sigma_{XN'}\|_1 \leq \varepsilon \quad ; \quad \|\sigma_{\text{IP}_{2^m}^n(X,Y)YM'} - U_m \otimes \sigma_{YM'}\|_1 \leq \varepsilon.$$

Fact 15 (Theorem 8 in [CGL20]). *Let X, Y be independent sources on $\mathbb{F}_{2^m}^n$ with min-entropy k_1, k_2 respectively. Then*

$$\|\text{IP}_{2^m}^n(X, Y)Y - U_m \otimes Y\|_1 \leq \varepsilon \quad ; \quad \|\text{IP}_{2^m}^n(X, Y)X - U_m \otimes X\|_1 \leq \varepsilon,$$

where $\varepsilon = 2^{-\frac{(k_1+k_2-m)(n+1)}{2}}$.

Definition 8 ((k_1, k_2) -qma-state [BJK21]). *We call a pure state $\sigma_{X\hat{X}NM\hat{Y}}$, with (XY) classical and $(\hat{X}\hat{Y})$ copy of (XY) , a (k_1, k_2) -qma-state iff*

$$H_{\min}(X|MY\hat{Y})_\sigma \geq k_1 \quad ; \quad H_{\min}(Y|NX\hat{X})_\sigma \geq k_2.$$

Definition 9 ((k_1, k_2) -qnm-state [BJK21]). Let $\sigma_{X\hat{X}NM\hat{Y}Y}$ be a (k_1, k_2) -qma-state. Let $U : \mathcal{H}_X \otimes \mathcal{H}_N \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_X \otimes \mathcal{H}_{X'} \otimes \mathcal{H}_{\hat{X}'} \otimes \mathcal{H}_{N'}$ and $V : \mathcal{H}_Y \otimes \mathcal{H}_M \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_Y \otimes \mathcal{H}_{Y'} \otimes \mathcal{H}_{\hat{Y}'} \otimes \mathcal{H}_{M'}$ be isometries such that for $\rho = (U \otimes V)\sigma(U \otimes V)^\dagger$, we have $(X'Y')$ classical (with copy $\hat{X}'\hat{Y}'$) and,

$$\Pr(Y \neq Y')_\rho = 1 \quad \text{or} \quad \Pr(X \neq X')_\rho = 1.$$

We call state ρ a (k_1, k_2) -qnm-state.

Definition 10 (Quantum secure 2-source non-malleable extractor [BJK21]). An (n, n, m) -non-malleable extractor $2\text{nmExt} : \{0, 1\}^n \times \{0, 1\}^n \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^m$ is (k_1, k_2, ε) -secure against qnm-adv if for every (k_1, k_2) -qnm-state ρ (chosen by the adversary qnm-adv),

$$\|\rho_{2\text{nmExt}(X,Y)2\text{nmExt}(X',Y')YY'M'} - U_m \otimes \rho_{2\text{nmExt}(X',Y')YY'M'}\|_1 \leq \varepsilon,$$

and

$$\|\rho_{2\text{nmExt}(X,Y)2\text{nmExt}(X',Y')XX'N'} - U_m \otimes \rho_{2\text{nmExt}(X',Y')XX'N'}\|_1 \leq \varepsilon.$$

Error correcting codes

Definition 11. Let Σ be a finite set. A mapping $\text{ECC} : \Sigma^k \rightarrow \Sigma^n$ is called an error correcting code with relative distance γ if for any $x, y \in \Sigma^k$ such that $x \neq y$, the Hamming distance between $\text{ECC}(x)$ and $\text{ECC}(y)$ is at least γn . The rate of the code denoted by δ , is defined as $\delta \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \frac{k}{n}$. The alphabet size of the code is the number of elements in Σ .

Fact 16 (MDS Codes). Let q be a prime power. For every positive integer k , there exists a large enough n such that there exists an efficiently computable linear error correcting code $\text{ECC} : \mathbb{F}_q^k \rightarrow \mathbb{F}_q^n$ with rate $\frac{k}{n}$ and relative distance $\frac{n-k+1}{n}$. Such codes are known as maximum distance separable (MDS) codes. Reed-Solomon codes is a typical example of an MDS code family.

Other useful facts, claims and lemmas

Fact 17 ([BJK21]). Let $\rho_{ABC} \in \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{H}_A \otimes \mathcal{H}_B \otimes \mathcal{H}_C)$ be a state and $M \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}_C)$ such that $M^\dagger M \leq \mathbb{I}_C$. Let $\hat{\rho}_{ABC} = \frac{M\rho_{ABC}M^\dagger}{\text{Tr}M\rho_{ABC}M^\dagger}$. Then,

$$\text{H}_{\min}(A|B)_{\hat{\rho}} \geq \text{H}_{\min}(A|B)_\rho - \log \left(\frac{1}{\text{Tr}M\rho_{ABC}M^\dagger} \right).$$

Fact 18 ([BJK21]). Let $\rho_{XE} \in \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{H}_X \otimes \mathcal{H}_E)$ be a c - q state such that $|X| = n$ and $\text{H}_{\min}(X|E)_\rho \geq n - k$. Let $\tilde{X} = \text{Crop}(X, d_1, d_2)$ for some positive integer $k \leq d_2 - d_1$ and $1 \leq d_1 < d_2 \leq n$. Then,

$$\text{H}_{\min}(\tilde{X}|E)_\rho \geq d_2 - d_1 + 1 - k.$$

Fact 19 ([BJK21]). Let $\rho_{X\hat{X}NY\hat{Y}M}$ be a (k_1, k_2) -qma-state such that $|X| = |\hat{X}| = |Y| = |\hat{Y}| = n$. There exists an l -qma-state, $\rho^{(1)}$ such that,

$$\Delta_B(\rho^{(1)}, \rho) \leq 3\varepsilon \quad \text{and} \quad l \leq 2n - k_1 - k_2 + 4 + 4 \log \left(\frac{1}{\varepsilon} \right).$$

Fact 20 (Quantum secure 2-source non-malleable extractor [BJK21]). Let $k = \mathcal{O}(n^{1/4})$ and $\varepsilon = 2^{-n^{\Omega(1)}}$. There exists an efficient 2-source non-malleable extractor $2\text{nmExt} : \{0, 1\}^n \times \{0, 1\}^n \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^{n/4}$ that is $(n - k, n - k, \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon))$ -quantum secure.

Fact 21 (Alternating extraction [BJK21]). Let θ_{XASB} be a pure state with (XS) classical, $|X| = n, |S| = d$ and

$$\mathbb{H}_{\min}(X|SB)_\theta \geq k \quad ; \quad \Delta_B(\theta_{XAS}, \theta_{XA} \otimes U_d) \leq \varepsilon'.$$

Let $T \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \text{Ext}(X, S)$ where Ext is a (k, ε) -quantum secure strong (n, d, m) -extractor. Then,

$$\Delta_B(\theta_{TB}, U_m \otimes \theta_B) \leq 2\varepsilon' + \sqrt{\varepsilon}.$$

Fact 22 (Min-entropy loss under classical interactive communication [BJK21]). Let ρ_{XNM} be a pure state where Alice holds registers (XN) and Bob holds register M , such that register X is classical and

$$\mathbb{H}_{\min}(X|M)_\rho \geq k.$$

Let Alice and Bob proceed for t -rounds, where in each round Alice generates a classical register R_i and sends it to Bob, followed by Bob generating a classical register S_i and sending it to Alice. Alice applies an isometry $V^i : \mathcal{H}_X \otimes \mathcal{H}_{N_{i-1}} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_X \otimes \mathcal{H}_{N'_i} \otimes \mathcal{H}_{R_i}$ (in round i) to generate R_i . Let $\theta_{XN_i M_i}^i$ be the state at the end of round- i , where Alice holds registers XN_i and Bob holds register M_i . Then,

$$\mathbb{H}_{\min}(X|M_t)_{\theta^t} \geq k - \sum_{j=1}^t |R_j|.$$

Claim 1. Let $\sigma_{X\hat{X}NY\hat{Y}M}$ be a (k_1, k_2) -qma-state with $|X| = n$ and $|Y| = n$. Let $2\text{nmExt} : \{0, 1\}^n \times \{0, 1\}^n \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^m$ be an efficient (k_1, k_2, ε) -quantum secure 2-source non-malleable extractor. Let $S = 2\text{nmExt}(X, Y)$. Then,

$$\|\sigma_{SYM} - U_m \otimes \sigma_{YM}\|_1 \leq \varepsilon.$$

Proof. Let $U : \mathcal{H}_X \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_X \otimes \mathcal{H}_{X'}$, $V : \mathcal{H}_Y \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_Y \otimes \mathcal{H}_{Y'}$ be (safe) isometries such that for $\rho = (U \otimes V)\sigma(U \otimes V)^\dagger$, we have $X'Y'$ classical (with copies $\hat{X}'\hat{Y}'$ respectively) and either $\Pr(X \neq X')_\rho = 1$ or $\Pr(Y \neq Y')_\rho = 1$.⁷ Notice the state ρ is a (k_1, k_2) -qnm-state. Since 2nmExt is a (k_1, k_2, ε) -quantum secure 2-source non-malleable extractor (see Definition 10), we have

$$\|\rho_{SS'Y'Y'M} - U_m \otimes \rho_{S'Y'Y'M}\|_1 \leq \varepsilon.$$

Using Fact 5, we further get

$$\|\rho_{SYM} - U_m \otimes \rho_{YM}\|_1 \leq \varepsilon.$$

The desired now follows by noting $\sigma_{XNMY} = \rho_{XNMY}$. □

Claim 2. Let random variables $ABC, \tilde{A}\tilde{B}\tilde{C}$ be such that

$$A \leftrightarrow B \leftrightarrow C \quad ; \quad \tilde{A} \leftrightarrow \tilde{B} \leftrightarrow \tilde{C} \quad ; \quad \|AB - \tilde{A}\tilde{B}\|_1 \leq \varepsilon_1 \quad ; \quad \|BC - \tilde{B}\tilde{C}\|_1 \leq \varepsilon_2.$$

Then,

$$\|ABC - \tilde{A}\tilde{B}\tilde{C}\| \leq 2\varepsilon_1 + \varepsilon_2.$$

⁷It is easily seen that such isometries exists.

Proof. Since $\|AB - \tilde{A}\tilde{B}\|_1 \leq \varepsilon_1$, using Fact 5, we have

$$\|B - \tilde{B}\|_1 \leq \varepsilon_1. \quad (1)$$

Since $A \leftrightarrow B \leftrightarrow C$, $\tilde{A} \leftrightarrow \tilde{B} \leftrightarrow \tilde{C}$, we have

$$(AC)|(B=b) = A|(B=b) \otimes C|(B=b) \quad ; \quad (\tilde{A}\tilde{C})|(\tilde{B}=b) = \tilde{A}|(\tilde{B}=b) \otimes \tilde{C}|(\tilde{B}=b). \quad (2)$$

Consider,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\tilde{A}\tilde{B}\tilde{C} - ABC\|_1 &\leq \|\tilde{B} - B\|_1 + \mathbb{E}_{b \leftarrow \tilde{B}} \|(\tilde{A}\tilde{C})|(\tilde{B}=b) - (AC)|(B=b)\|_1 && \text{(Fact 10)} \\ &= \|\tilde{B} - B\|_1 + \mathbb{E}_{b \leftarrow \tilde{B}} \|\tilde{A}|(\tilde{B}=b) \otimes \tilde{C}|(\tilde{B}=b) - A|(B=b) \otimes C|(B=b)\|_1 && \text{(Eq. (2))} \\ &= \|\tilde{B} - B\|_1 + \mathbb{E}_{b \leftarrow \tilde{B}} \left(\|\tilde{A}|(\tilde{B}=b) - A|(B=b)\|_1 + \|\tilde{C}|(\tilde{B}=b) - C|(B=b)\|_1 \right) && \text{(Fact 9)} \\ &= \|\tilde{B} - B\|_1 + \mathbb{E}_{b \leftarrow \tilde{B}} \left(\|\tilde{A}|(\tilde{B}=b) - A|(B=b)\|_1 \right) + \mathbb{E}_{b \leftarrow \tilde{B}} \left(\|\tilde{C}|(\tilde{B}=b) - C|(B=b)\|_1 \right) \\ &\leq \|\tilde{B} - B\|_1 + \|\tilde{A}\tilde{B} - AB\|_1 + \|\tilde{B}\tilde{C} - BC\|_1 && \text{(Fact 6)} \\ &\leq \varepsilon_1 + \|\tilde{A}\tilde{B} - AB\|_1 + \|\tilde{B}\tilde{C} - BC\|_1 && \text{(Eq. (1))} \\ &\leq 2\varepsilon_1 + \varepsilon_2. \end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof. \square

Since the construction of the quantum secure non-malleable extractor is composed of alternating extraction using Ext from Fact 13, we first state a claim about the invertibility of the Ext given the output (close to the desired).

Claim 3. Let $\text{Ext} : \{0, 1\}^n \times \{0, 1\}^d \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^m$ be an explicit $(2m, \varepsilon)$ -quantum secure strong extractor from Fact 13 or IP from Fact 15⁸ with error ε ⁹. Let X, H, O, \tilde{O} be random variables such that,

$$\|XH - U_n \otimes U_d\|_1 \leq \varepsilon' \quad ; \quad O = \text{Ext}(X, H) \quad ; \quad \|\tilde{O} - U_m\|_1 \leq \varepsilon''.$$

Given samples from $(\tilde{o}, \tilde{h}) \leftarrow \tilde{O}\tilde{H} = \tilde{O} \otimes U_d$, we can sample from $\tilde{X}|(\tilde{O}\tilde{H} = \tilde{o}\tilde{h})$ (which is same as sampling $\tilde{x} \leftarrow \{x : \text{Ext}(x, \tilde{h}) = \tilde{o}\}$) in time polynomial in (m, n) such that

$$\|\tilde{O}\tilde{H}\tilde{X} - OHX\|_1 \leq \varepsilon + \varepsilon' + \varepsilon'' \quad ; \quad \tilde{O} = \text{Ext}(\tilde{X}, \tilde{H}).$$

Proof. Let $\hat{X}\hat{H} = U_n \otimes U_d$ and $\hat{O} = \text{Ext}(\hat{X}, \hat{H})$ be the output of the extractor. Since $\|XH - \hat{X}\hat{H}\|_1 \leq \varepsilon'$, using Fact 5 we have

$$\|OXH - \hat{O}\hat{X}\hat{H}\|_1 \leq \varepsilon'. \quad (3)$$

Also, since $\hat{O} = \text{Ext}(\hat{X}, \hat{H})$ is the output of the strong extractor, we have

$$\|\hat{O}\hat{H} - U_m \otimes U_d\|_1 \leq \varepsilon.$$

Since $\tilde{O}\tilde{H} = \tilde{O} \otimes U_d$ and $\|\tilde{O} - U_m\|_1 \leq \varepsilon''$, we have $\|\tilde{O}\tilde{H} - U_m \otimes U_d\|_1 \leq \varepsilon''$. Using triangle inequality, we have

$$\|\hat{O}\hat{H} - \tilde{O}\tilde{H}\|_1 \leq \varepsilon + \varepsilon''. \quad (4)$$

⁸Inputs are of same size in this case, i.e. $d = n$.

⁹We assume there is enough min-entropy in the sources for the extractors to work.

We now proceed by noting that the extractor is linear. In other words, for every seed $H = h$, the output of the extractor $O = o$ is a linear function of the input $X = x$. For a fixed output o of the extractor and seed h , we have a matrix A_h of size $m \times n$ such that $A_h x^\dagger = o^\dagger$. Note for any fixing of the seed h and output o , the size of the set $\{x : \text{Ext}(x, h) = o\}$ is $2^{n - \text{rank}(A_h)}$ and sampling x uniformly from the set can be done efficiently from Fact 11.

Given samples $(\tilde{o}, \tilde{h}) \leftarrow \tilde{O}\tilde{H} = \tilde{O} \otimes U_d$, we use the following sampling strategy:

- Sample $\tilde{x} \leftarrow \tilde{X} | (\tilde{O}\tilde{H} = \tilde{o}\tilde{h})$ which is same as sampling $\tilde{x} \leftarrow \{x : \text{Ext}(x, \tilde{h}) = \tilde{o}\}$.

Note for any fixing of the seed \tilde{h} and output \tilde{o} of the extractor, $\tilde{X} | (\tilde{O}\tilde{H} = \tilde{o}\tilde{h}) = \tilde{X} | (\tilde{O}\tilde{H} = \tilde{o}\tilde{h})$ since $\tilde{X}\tilde{H} = U_n \otimes U_d$. Thus, from Fact 5 and Eq. (4), we have

$$\|\hat{O}\hat{X}\hat{H} - \tilde{O}\tilde{X}\tilde{H}\|_1 \leq \varepsilon + \varepsilon''. \quad (5)$$

Using Eqs. (3), (5) along with triangle inequality, we have the desired. \square

Corollary 1. *Let $\text{Ext} : \{0, 1\}^n \times \{0, 1\}^d \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^m$ be an explicit $(2m, \varepsilon)$ -quantum secure strong extractor from Fact 13 or IP from Fact 15¹⁰ with error ε . Let*

$$\|XH - U_n \otimes U_d\|_1 \leq \varepsilon' \quad ; \quad O = \text{Ext}(X, H).$$

Then, $\|O - U_m\|_1 \leq \varepsilon + \varepsilon'$.

Proof. Let $\hat{X}\hat{H} = U_n \otimes U_d$ and $\hat{O} = \text{Ext}(\hat{X}, \hat{H})$ be the output of the extractor. Since $\|XH - \hat{X}\hat{H}\|_1 \leq \varepsilon'$, using Fact 5 we have

$$\|OXH - \hat{O}\hat{X}\hat{H}\|_1 \leq \varepsilon'.$$

Using Fact 5 again, we further have

$$\|O - \hat{O}\|_1 \leq \varepsilon'. \quad (6)$$

Also, since $\hat{O} = \text{Ext}(\hat{X}, \hat{H})$ is the output of the extractor, we have

$$\|\hat{O} - U_m\|_1 \leq \varepsilon.$$

Using Eq. (6) along with triangle inequality, we have the desired. \square

Lemma 1. *Let $\text{ECC} : \mathbb{F}_q^k \rightarrow \mathbb{F}_q^n$ be an $(n, k, n - k + 1)$ Reed-Solomon code from Fact 16 for $q \geq n + 1$. Let random variable $M \in \mathbb{F}_q^k$ be uniformly distributed over \mathbb{F}_q^k . Let $C = \text{ECC}(M)$ and t be any positive integer such that $t < k$. Let \mathcal{S} be a subset of $[n]$ such that $|\mathcal{S}| = t$ and \mathcal{Q} be a subset of $[k]$ such that $|\mathcal{Q}| = j \leq k - t$. Then, for every fixed string c in \mathbb{F}_q^t and $C^{\mathcal{S}} = c$ ¹¹, the distribution $M^c \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} M | (C^{\mathcal{S}} = c)$ is such that $(M^c)^{\mathcal{Q}} = U_{j \log q}$. Further more, for any fixed string l in \mathbb{F}_q^j , we can efficiently (in time polynomial in (k, q)) sample from the distribution $(M^c)^{[k] \setminus \mathcal{Q}} | ((M^c)^{\mathcal{Q}} = l)$.*

Proof. The generator matrix for ECC is given by

$$G = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & \alpha_1 & \dots & \alpha_1^{k-1} \\ 1 & \alpha_2 & \dots & \alpha_2^{k-1} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 1 & \alpha_n & \dots & \alpha_n^{k-1} \end{pmatrix},$$

¹⁰Inputs are of same size in this case, i.e. $d = n$.

¹¹ $C^{\mathcal{S}}$ corresponds to codeword corresponding to columns \mathcal{S} of codeword C .

where $\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \dots, \alpha_n$ are distinct non-zero elements of \mathbb{F}_q (this is possible since $q \geq n + 1$). Let $\mathcal{S} = \{s_1, s_2, \dots, s_t\}$ and

$$G_{\mathcal{S}} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & \alpha_{s_1} & \dots & \alpha_{s_1}^{k-1} \\ 1 & \alpha_{s_2} & \dots & \alpha_{s_2}^{k-1} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 1 & \alpha_{s_t} & \dots & \alpha_{s_t}^{k-1} \end{pmatrix}.$$

Note we have $G_{\mathcal{S}}M^\dagger = (C^{\mathcal{S}})^\dagger$. By fixing $C^{\mathcal{S}} = c$, we have imposed the following linear constraints as given by $G_{\mathcal{S}}M^{c^\dagger} = c^\dagger$. Note $G_{\mathcal{S}}$ is a Vandermonde matrix for any fixed subset $\mathcal{S} \subset [n]$, $|\mathcal{S}| = t$ and $t < k$. Thus, any $t \times t$ submatrix of $G_{\mathcal{S}}$ has full rank. Note $k - j \geq t$. Note M^c is exactly the distribution, $m \leftarrow \{m \in \mathbb{F}_q^k : G_{\mathcal{S}}m^\dagger = c^\dagger\}$. Let $\mathcal{P} = [k] \setminus \mathcal{Q}$ and $\mathcal{P} = \{p_1, p_2, \dots, p_{k-j}\}$ with elements in the set \mathcal{P} in any fixed order. Equivalent way to define M^c is the distribution, $m \leftarrow \{m \in \mathbb{F}_q^k : \tilde{G}m^\dagger = \tilde{c}^\dagger\}$, such that \tilde{G} is $t \times k$ matrix, the submatrix of \tilde{G} corresponding to columns given by $\mathcal{P}' = \{p_1, p_2, \dots, p_t\}$ is exactly $\mathbb{I}_{t \times t}$ (since any $t \times t$ submatrix of $G_{\mathcal{S}}$ has full rank). Note one can get (\tilde{G}, \tilde{c}) from $(G_{\mathcal{S}}, c)$ using standard Gaussian elimination procedure (in time polynomial in (k, q)). Thus, sampling $m = (m_1, m_2, \dots, m_t)$ from the distribution M^c can be achieved as follows:

- Sample for every $i \in \mathcal{Q}$, m_i uniformly and independently from \mathbb{F}_q .
- Sample for every $i \in \mathcal{P} \setminus \mathcal{P}'$, m_i uniformly and independently from \mathbb{F}_q .
- For every $i \in \mathcal{P}'$, set $m_i \in \mathbb{F}_q$ such that it satisfies the linear constraints $\tilde{G}_i m^\dagger = \tilde{c}^\dagger$.¹²

Thus, $(M^c)^\mathcal{Q} = U_{j \log q}$. Further more, for any fixed string l in \mathbb{F}_q^j , we can efficiently (in time polynomial in (k, q)) sample from the distribution $(M^c)^{[k] \setminus \mathcal{Q}} | ((M^c)^\mathcal{Q} = l)$. \square

3 A quantum secure non-malleable code in the split-state model

Theorem 5 (Quantum secure non-malleable code in the split-state model). *Let $2\text{nmExt} : \{0, 1\}^n \times \{0, 1\}^n \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^m$ be an $(n - k, n - k, \varepsilon)$ -quantum secure 2-source non-malleable extractor. There exists an (m, n, ε') -quantum secure non-malleable code with parameter $\varepsilon' = 2^m(4(2^{-k} + \varepsilon) + \varepsilon)$.*

Proof. Let $\sigma_S = U_m$. Given a $2\text{nmExt} : \{0, 1\}^n \times \{0, 1\}^n \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^m$, let (Enc, Dec) be defined as follows:

- For any fixed message $S = s \in \{0, 1\}^m$, the encoder, Enc outputs a uniformly random string from the set $2\text{nmExt}^{-1}(s) \subset \{0, 1\}^{2n}$.
- $\text{Dec}(x, y) = 2\text{nmExt}(x, y)$ for every $(x, y) \in \{0, 1\}^{2n}$.

Note for every $s \in \{0, 1\}^m$, $\Pr(\text{Dec}(\text{Enc}(s))) = 1$.

We first show that (Enc, Dec) is a quantum secure non-malleable code in the split-state model (see Definition 3 and Figure 1). Note

$$\sigma_{S\text{Enc}(S)} = \sigma_{SXY} = \sum_{s \in \{0, 1\}^m} \left(\frac{1}{2^m} |s\rangle\langle s| \otimes \left(\frac{1}{|2\text{nmExt}^{-1}(s)|} \sum_{(x, y) : 2\text{nmExt}(x, y) = s} |xy\rangle\langle xy| \right) \right)$$

¹²Note the variables in \mathcal{Q} that appear in this linear constraint are already sampled before.

after encoding a uniform message S . Note $(X, Y) = \text{Enc}(S)$.

Let $\theta_{X\hat{X}X_1Y\hat{Y}Y_1} = \theta_{X\hat{X}X_1} \otimes \theta_{Y\hat{Y}Y_1}$ be a pure state such that $\theta_X = \theta_Y = U_n$, (X_1, \hat{X}) are copies of X , (Y_1, \hat{Y}) are copies of Y respectively. Note $\theta_{XY} = U_n \otimes U_n$. Let $S_1 = 2\text{nmExt}(X_1, Y_1)$, $S = 2\text{nmExt}(X, Y)$. For the state θ with the following assignment (terms on the left are from Definition 8 and on the right are from here),

$$(X, \hat{X}, N, M, Y, \hat{Y}) \leftarrow (X_1, \hat{X}, X, Y, Y_1, \hat{Y}),$$

one can note θ is an (n, n) -qma-state. Using Claim 1¹³ along with Fact 5, we have

$$\|\theta_{2\text{nmExt}(X_1, Y_1)} - U_m\|_1 \leq \varepsilon.$$

Thus,

$$\|\theta_{S_1XY} - \sigma_{SXY}\|_1 \leq \|\theta_{S_1} - U_m\|_1 \leq \varepsilon. \quad (7)$$

First inequality follows from Fact 5 and noting

$$\theta_{XY}|(S_1 = s) = \sigma_{XY}|(S = s) = \left(\frac{1}{|2\text{nmExt}^{-1}(s)|} \sum_{(x,y):2\text{nmExt}(x,y)=s} |xy\rangle\langle xy| \right).$$

Let $\mathcal{A} = (U, V, \psi)$ be the quantum split-state adversary from Definition 2. Note ψ_{NM} is an entangled pure state, $U : \mathcal{H}_X \otimes \mathcal{H}_N \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_{X'} \otimes \mathcal{H}_{N'}$ and $V : \mathcal{H}_Y \otimes \mathcal{H}_M \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_{Y'} \otimes \mathcal{H}_{M'}$ are isometries without any loss of generality.

In the analysis, we consider a pure state ρ' which is generated from $\theta_{X\hat{X}X_1Y\hat{Y}Y_1} = \theta_{X\hat{X}X_1} \otimes \theta_{Y\hat{Y}Y_1}$, in the following way (see Figure 2):

- Let $\hat{\rho}' = (U \otimes V)(\theta \otimes |\psi\rangle\langle\psi|)(U \otimes V)^\dagger$ be the state after the action of quantum split-state adversary.
- Let ρ' be the pure state extension after measuring the registers $(X'Y')$ in the computational basis in $\hat{\rho}'$. Note the measurement in the computational basis of registers (X', Y') corresponds to applying CNOT¹⁴ to modify $(X', Y') \rightarrow (X'\hat{X}', Y'\hat{Y}')$ such that \hat{X}', \hat{Y}' are copies of X', Y' respectively.

Let binary variables C, D (with copies \hat{C}, \hat{D}) be such that $C = 1$ indicates $X_1 \neq X'$ and $D = 1$ indicates $Y_1 \neq Y'$ (in state ρ').

Let $S' = 2\text{nmExt}(X', Y')$. Since $\|\theta_{S_1XY} - \sigma_{SXY}\|_1 \leq \varepsilon$ from Eq. (7), using Fact 5 we have $\|\rho'_{S_1S'} - \rho_{SS'}\|_1 \leq \varepsilon$. We will show

$$\|\rho'_{S_1S'} - \text{Zcopy}(\mathcal{D}_A, Z)\|_1 \leq 4(2^{-k} + \varepsilon), \quad (8)$$

for $Z = U_m$ and distribution \mathcal{D}_A that depends only on \mathcal{A} . We get that

$$\|\rho_{SS'} - \text{Zcopy}(\mathcal{D}_A, Z)\|_1 \leq 4(2^{-k} + \varepsilon) + \varepsilon,$$

¹³ (n, n) -qma-state is also an $(n - k, n - k)$ -qma-state.

¹⁴By CNOT on n qubit register, we mean applying NOT gate on different ancilla each time conditioned on each qubit independently. This operation amounts to performing measurement in the computational basis.




Figure 2: Analysis of a quantum secure non-malleable code in the split-state model

from $\|\rho'_{S_1 S'} - \rho_{SS'}\|_1 \leq \varepsilon$ and the triangle inequality, which implies the desired (using Fact 6),

$$\forall s \in \{0, 1\}^m : \quad \|S'_s - \text{copy}(\mathcal{D}_A, s)\|_1 \leq 2^m(4(2^{-k} + \varepsilon) + \varepsilon).$$

We now proceed to prove Eq. (8). For $C = c \in \{0, 1\}, D = d \in \{0, 1\}$, denote $\rho'^{c,d} = \rho' | ((C, D) = (c, d))$.

Claim 4. *For every $c, d \in \{0, 1\}$ except $(c, d) = (0, 0)$, we have*

$$\Pr((C, D) = (c, d))_{\rho'} \|\rho'^{c,d}_{S_1 S'} - Z \otimes \rho'^{c,d}_{S'}\|_1 \leq 2^{-k} + \varepsilon.$$

For $(c, d) = (0, 0)$, we have

$$\Pr((C, D) = (c, d))_{\rho'} \|\rho'^{c,d}_{S_1 S'} - ZZ\|_1 \leq 2^{-k} + \varepsilon,$$

where $Z = U_m$.

Proof. Fix $c, d \in \{0, 1\}$. Suppose $\Pr((C, D) = (c, d))_{\rho'} \leq 2^{-k}$, then we are done. Thus we assume otherwise. Note in state ρ' , we have

$$\rho'_{X_1 Y_1 \hat{Y}' \hat{Y} M' D \hat{D}} = U_n \otimes \rho'_{Y_1 Y' \hat{Y}' \hat{Y} M' D \hat{D}} \quad ; \quad \rho'_{Y_1 X_1 X' \hat{X}' \hat{X} N' C \hat{C}} = U_n \otimes \rho'_{X_1 X' \hat{X}' \hat{X} N' C \hat{C}}.$$

Thus,

$$\mathbb{H}_{\min}(X_1 | Y_1 Y' \hat{Y}' \hat{Y} M' D \hat{D})_{\rho'} = n \quad ; \quad \mathbb{H}_{\min}(Y_1 | X_1 X' \hat{X}' \hat{X} N' C \hat{C})_{\rho'} = n.$$

Using Fact 2, we have

$$\mathsf{H}_{\min}\left(X_1 \left| Y_1 Y' \hat{Y}' \hat{Y} M' \right.\right)_{\rho'} = n \quad ; \quad \mathsf{H}_{\min}\left(Y_1 \left| X_1 X' \hat{X}' \hat{X} N' \right.\right)_{\rho'} = n.$$

We use Fact 17, with the following assignment of registers (below the registers on the left are from Fact 17 and the registers on the right are the registers in this proof),

$$(\rho_A, \rho_B, \rho_C) \leftarrow (\rho'_{X_1}, \rho'_{Y_1 Y' \hat{Y}' \hat{Y} M'}, \rho'_{CD}).$$

From Fact 17, we get that

$$\mathsf{H}_{\min}\left(X_1 \left| Y_1 Y' \hat{Y}' \hat{Y} M' \right.\right)_{\rho'^{c,d}} \geq n - k.$$

Similarly $\mathsf{H}_{\min}\left(Y_1 \left| X_1 X' \hat{X}' \hat{X} N' \right.\right)_{\rho'^{c,d}} \geq n - k.$

Let $(c, d) = (0, 0)$. Note $\rho'^{0,0}$ is an $(n - k, n - k)$ -qma-state. Using Claim 1 along with Fact 5, we have $\|\rho'_{2\text{nmExt}(X_1, Y_1)}'^{0,0} - Z\|_1 \leq \varepsilon$. We also have $X_1 = X'$ and $Y_1 = Y'$ in $\rho'^{0,0}$. Thus Fact 5 will imply

$$\|\rho'_{S_1 S'}'^{0,0} - ZZ\|_1 \leq \varepsilon.$$

Let $(c, d) \neq (0, 0)$. Note $\rho'^{c,d}$ is an $(n - k, n - k)$ -qnm-state since either $\Pr(X_1 \neq X') = 1$ or $\Pr(Y_1 \neq Y') = 1$ in $\rho'^{c,d}$. Since, $2\text{nmExt} : \{0, 1\}^n \times \{0, 1\}^n \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^m$ is an $(n - k, n - k, \varepsilon)$ -quantum secure 2-source non-malleable extractor (see Definition 10), using Fact 5 we have

$$\|\rho'_{S_1 S'}'^{c,d} - Z \otimes \rho'_{S'}'^{c,d}\|_1 \leq \varepsilon.$$

This completes the proof. \square

For every $c, d \in \{0, 1\}$ except $(c, d) = (0, 0)$, let $\mathcal{D}_A^{c,d} = \rho'_{S'}'^{c,d}$ and for $(c, d) = (0, 0)$, let $\mathcal{D}_A^{0,0}$ be the distribution that is deterministically equal to same. Let $\mathcal{D}_A = \sum_{c,d \in \{0,1\}} \Pr((C, D) = (c, d))_{\rho'} \mathcal{D}_A^{c,d}$. Note for every $c, d \in \{0, 1\}$, the value $\Pr((C, D) = (c, d))_{\rho'}$ depends only on \mathcal{A} . We have,

$$\rho'_{S_1 S'}' = \sum_{c,d \in \{0,1\}} \Pr((C, D) = (c, d))_{\rho'} \rho'_{S_1 S'}'^{c,d}, \quad (9)$$

and

$$\mathsf{Zcopy}(\mathcal{D}_A, Z) = \sum_{c,d \in \{0,1\}} \Pr((C, D) = (c, d))_{\rho'} \mathsf{Zcopy}(\mathcal{D}_A^{c,d}, Z). \quad (10)$$

Consider,

$$\begin{aligned} & \|\rho'_{S_1 S'}' - \mathsf{Zcopy}(\mathcal{D}_A, Z)\|_1 \\ &= \left\| \sum_{c,d \in \{0,1\}} \Pr((C, D) = (c, d))_{\rho'} \rho'_{S_1 S'}'^{c,d} - \mathsf{Zcopy}(\mathcal{D}_A, Z) \right\|_1 \quad (\text{Eq. (9)}) \\ &\leq \sum_{c,d \in \{0,1\}} \Pr((C, D) = (c, d))_{\rho'} \|\rho'_{S_1 S'}'^{c,d} - \mathsf{Zcopy}(\mathcal{D}_A^{c,d}, Z)\|_1 \quad (\text{Eq. (10) and Fact 7}) \\ &\leq (2^{-k} + \varepsilon)4. \quad (\text{Claim 4}) \end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof. \square

4 Efficient quantum secure non-malleable codes

4.1 Modified non-malleable extractor

These parameters hold throughout this section.

Parameters

Let $\delta, \delta_1, \delta_2 > 0$ be small enough constants such that $\delta_1 < \delta_2$. Let $n, n_1, n_2, n_3, n_4, n_5, n_6, n_7, n_x, n_y, a, s, b, h$ be positive integers and $\varepsilon', \varepsilon > 0$ such that:

$$n_1 = n^{\delta_2} \quad ; \quad n_2 = n - 3n_1 \quad ; \quad q = 2^{\log(n+1)} \quad ; \quad \varepsilon = 2^{-\mathcal{O}(n^{\delta_1})} \quad ;$$

$$n_3 = \frac{n_1}{10} \quad ; \quad n_4 = \frac{n_2}{\log(n+1)} \quad ; \quad n_5 = n^{\delta_2/3} \quad ; \quad a = 6n_1 + 2\mathcal{O}(n_5) \log(n+1) = \mathcal{O}(n_1) \quad ;$$

$$n_6 = 3n_1^3 \quad ; \quad n_7 = n - 3n_1 - n_6 \quad ; \quad n_x = \frac{n_7}{12a} \quad ; \quad n_y = \frac{n_7}{12a} \quad ; \quad 2^{\mathcal{O}(a)} \sqrt{\varepsilon'} = \varepsilon \quad ;$$

$$s = \mathcal{O}\left(\log^2\left(\frac{n}{\varepsilon'}\right) \log n\right) \quad ; \quad b = \mathcal{O}\left(\log^2\left(\frac{n}{\varepsilon'}\right) \log n\right) \quad ; \quad h = 10s$$

- IP_1 be $\text{IP}_{2^{n_3}}^{3n_1/n_3}$,
- Ext_1 be $(2b, \varepsilon')$ -quantum secure (n_y, s, b) -extractor,
- Ext_2 be $(2s, \varepsilon')$ -quantum secure (h, b, s) -extractor,
- Ext_3 be $(4h, \varepsilon')$ -quantum secure $(n_x, b, 2h)$ -extractor,
- Ext_4 be $(n_y/4, \varepsilon^2)$ -quantum secure $(4n_y, 2h, n_y/8)$ -extractor,
- IP_2 be $\text{IP}_{2^{2h}}^{3n_1^3/2h}$,
- Ext_6 be $(\frac{n_x}{2}, \varepsilon^2)$ -quantum secure $(4n_x, n_y/8, n_x/4)$ -extractor.

We first describe a short overview of the modifications required in the construction of non-malleable extractor for the efficient encoding of quantum secure non-malleable code in the split-state model. We modify the construction of 2nmExt from [BJK21], using ideas from [CGL20] to construct a $\text{new-}2\text{nmExt} : \{0, 1\}^n \times \{0, 1\}^n \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^m$ that is $(n - n_1, n - n_1, \varepsilon)$ -secure against qnm-adv for parameters $n_1 = n^{\Omega(1)}$, $m = n^{1-\Omega(1)}$ and $\varepsilon = 2^{-n^{\Omega(1)}}$. We divide the sources X and Y into $n^{\Omega(1)}$ blocks each of size $n^{1-\Omega(1)}$. The idea now is to use new blocks of X and Y for each round of alternating extraction in the construction of non-malleable extractor. This enables the linear constraints that are imposed in the alternating extraction are on different variables of input sources, X, Y . Also, since X and Y each have almost full min-entropy, we have block sources, where each block has almost full min-entropy using Fact 18. This allows us to generate appropriate intermediate seed random variables (approximately uniform) using alternating extraction.

Definition of modified non-malleable extractor

Let $\text{ECC} : \mathbb{F}_q^{n_4} \rightarrow \mathbb{F}_q^n$ be an $(n, n_4, n - n_4 + 1)$ Reed-Solomon code from Fact 16. Let $\text{Samp} : \{0, 1\}^r \rightarrow [n]^{t_1}$ be the sampler function from Fact 12 where $t_1 = \mathcal{O}(n_5)$ and $r \geq n_3$. We identify the output of Samp as t_1 samples from the set $[n]$. By $\text{ECC}(Y)_{\text{Samp}(I)}$, we mean the $\text{Samp}(I)$ entries of codeword $\text{ECC}(Y)$.

Algorithm 1 : $\text{new-2nmExt} : \{0, 1\}^n \times \{0, 1\}^n \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^{n_x/4}$

Input: X, Y

1. Advice generator:

$$X_1 = \text{Crop}(X, 1, 3n_1) \quad ; \quad Y_1 = \text{Crop}(Y, 1, 3n_1) \quad ; \quad R = \text{IP}_1(X_1, Y_1) \quad ;$$

$$X_2 = \text{Crop}(X, 3n_1 + 1, n) \quad ; \quad Y_2 = \text{Crop}(Y, 3n_1 + 1, n) \quad ;$$

$$G = X_1 \circ \bar{X}_2 \circ Y_1 \circ \bar{Y}_2 = X_1 \circ \text{ECC}(X_2)_{\text{Samp}(R)} \circ Y_1 \circ \text{ECC}(Y_2)_{\text{Samp}(R)}$$

2. $X_3 = \text{Crop}(X, 3n_1 + 1, 3n_1 + n_6) \quad ; \quad Y_3 = \text{Crop}(Y, 3n_1 + 1, 3n_1 + n_6) \quad ; \quad Z^1 = \text{IP}_2(X_3, Y_3)$
3. $X_4 = \text{Crop}(X, 3n_1 + n_6 + 1, n) \quad ; \quad Y_4 = \text{Crop}(Y, 3n_1 + n_6 + 1, n)$
4. Correlation breaker with advice: $F = 2\text{AdvCB}(Y_4, X_4, Z^1, G)$
5. $X^{a+1} = \text{Crop}(X_4, 4n_x a + 1, 4n_x a + 4n_x)$
6. $S = \text{Ext}_6(X^{a+1}, F)$

Output: S

Algorithm 2 : $2\text{AdvCB} : \{0, 1\}^{n_7} \times \{0, 1\}^{n_7} \times \{0, 1\}^{2h} \times \{0, 1\}^a \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^{\frac{n_y}{8}}$

Input: Y_4, X_4, Z^1, G

1. For $i = 1, 2, \dots, a$:
 2. $Y^i = \text{Crop}(Y_4, 4n_y(i - 1) + 1, 4n_y(i))$
 3. $X^i = \text{Crop}(X_4, 4n_x(i - 1) + 1, 4n_x(i))$
 4. Flip-flop: $Z^{i+1} = 2\text{FF}(Y^i, X^i, Z^i, G_i)$
5. For $i = a + 1, a + 2, \dots, 3a$:
 6. $Y^i = \text{Crop}(Y_4, 4n_y(i - 1) + 1, 4n_y(i))$
 7. $X^i = \text{Crop}(X_4, 4n_x(i - 1) + 1, 4n_x(i))$
8. $F = \text{Ext}_4(Y^{a+1}, Z^{a+1})$

Output: F

Algorithm 3 : $2\text{FF} : \{0, 1\}^{4n_y} \times \{0, 1\}^{4n_x} \times \{0, 1\}^{2h} \times \{0, 1\} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^{2h}$

Input: Y^i, X^i, Z^i, G_i

$X_j^i = \text{Crop}(X^i, n_x(j-1) + 1, n_x(j))$ for every $j \in \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$

$Y_j^i = \text{Crop}(Y^i, n_y(j-1) + 1, n_y(j))$ for every $j \in \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$

$Z_1^i = \text{Crop}(Z^i, 1, h)$ and $Z_2^i = \text{Crop}(Z^i, h+1, 2h)$

1. $Z_s^i = \text{Prefix}(Z_1^i, s)$, $A^i = \text{Ext}_1(Y_1^i, Z_s^i)$, $C^i = \text{Ext}_2(Z_2^i, A^i)$, $B^i = \text{Ext}_1(Y_2^i, C^i)$
2. If $G_i = 0$ then $\bar{Z}^i = \text{Ext}_3(X_1^i, A^i)$ and if $G_i = 1$ then $\bar{Z}^i = \text{Ext}_3(X_2^i, B^i)$
3. $\bar{Z}_1^i = \text{Crop}(\bar{Z}^i, 1, h)$ and $\bar{Z}_2^i = \text{Crop}(\bar{Z}^i, h+1, 2h)$.
4. $\bar{Z}_s^i = \text{Prefix}(\bar{Z}_1^i, s)$, $\bar{A}^i = \text{Ext}_1(Y_3^i, \bar{Z}_s^i)$, $\bar{C}^i = \text{Ext}_2(\bar{Z}_2^i, \bar{A}^i)$, $\bar{B}^i = \text{Ext}_1(Y_4^i, \bar{C}^i)$
5. If $G_i = 0$, then $O = \text{Ext}_3(X_3^i, \bar{B}^i)$ and if $G_i = 1$, then $O = \text{Ext}_3(X_4^i, \bar{A}^i)$

Output: O

Theorem 6 (Security of new-2nmExt). *Let $\rho_{X\hat{X}X'\hat{X}'NY\hat{Y}'Y'M}$ be an $(n - n_1, n - n_1)$ -qnm-state with $|X| = |Y| = n$. Then,*

$$\|\rho_{SS'YY'M} - U_{n_x/4} \otimes \rho_{S'YY'M}\|_1 \leq \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon),$$

where $S = \text{new-2nmExt}(X, Y)$ and $S' = \text{new-2nmExt}(X', Y')$.

Proof. The proof proceeds in similar lines to the proof of Theorem 6 in [BJK21] using Fact 21 for alternating extraction argument, Fact 22 for bounding the min-entropy required in alternating extraction, Facts 14, 19 for the security of inner-product function in (k_1, k_2) -qma-state framework, Fact 4 for relation between Δ_B, Δ and we do not repeat it. \square

4.2 Efficiently sampling from the preimage of new-2nmExt

Recall that we showed existence of a quantum secure non-malleable code where encoding scheme was based on inverting 2nmExt, a quantum secure 2-source non-malleable extractor. In particular, for any fixed message $S = s$, the encoder, Enc outputs a uniformly random string from the set $2\text{nmExt}^{-1}(s)$. The decoder is the function 2nmExt itself. We call this as the *encoding and decoding* based on 2nmExt. We now state the main result of this paper.

Theorem 7 (Main Theorem). *Let $\text{new-2nmExt} : \{0, 1\}^n \times \{0, 1\}^n \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^m$ be the quantum secure 2-source non-malleable extractor from Algorithm 1, where $m = n_x/4$. Let (Enc, Dec) be the encoding and decoding based on new-2nmExt. Let $\hat{S}\text{Enc}(\hat{S}) = \hat{S}\hat{X}\hat{Y}$ for a uniform message $\hat{S} = U_m$. There exists an efficient algorithm that can sample from a distribution $\tilde{S}\tilde{X}\tilde{Y}$ such that $\|\tilde{S}\tilde{X}\tilde{Y} - \hat{S}\hat{X}\hat{Y}\|_1 \leq \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon)$ and $\tilde{S} = U_m$.*

Proof. Consider $XY = U_n \otimes U_n$. Let $S = \text{new-2nmExt}(X, Y)$. From Eq. (7) in the proof of Theorem 5 (after noting $\hat{S}\hat{X}\hat{Y} \equiv (SXY)_\sigma$ in Eq. (7) and $SXY \equiv (SXY)_\theta$ in Eq. (7)), we have

$$\|SXY - \hat{S}\hat{X}\hat{Y}\|_1 \leq \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon). \quad (11)$$

From Claim 5, we have an efficient algorithm that can sample from a distribution $\tilde{S}\tilde{X}\tilde{Y}$ such that

$$\|SXY - \tilde{S}\tilde{X}\tilde{Y}\|_1 \leq \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon) \quad ; \quad \tilde{S} = U_m.$$

From Eq. (11) and using triangle inequality, we have

$$\|\hat{S}\hat{X}\hat{Y} - \tilde{S}\tilde{X}\tilde{Y}\|_1 \leq \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon) \quad ; \quad \tilde{S} = U_m,$$

which completes the proof. \square

We have the following corollary.

Corollary 2. *Let $0 < \delta_3 < \delta_1$ and $m' = n^{\delta_3}$ be an integer. Let $\text{new-2nmExt} : \{0, 1\}^n \times \{0, 1\}^n \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^m$ be the quantum secure 2-source non-malleable extractor from Algorithm 1, where $m = n_x/4$. Let $\text{2nmExt} : \{0, 1\}^n \times \{0, 1\}^n \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^{m'}$ be such that $\text{2nmExt}(X, Y)$ is same as $\text{new-2nmExt}(X, Y)$ truncated to first m' bits. Let (Enc, Dec) be the encoding and decoding based on 2nmExt . Let $\hat{S}\text{Enc}(\hat{S}) = \hat{S}\hat{X}\hat{Y}$ for a uniform message $\hat{S} = U_{m'}$. There exists an efficient algorithm that can sample from a distribution $\tilde{S}\tilde{X}\tilde{Y}$ such that $\tilde{S} = U_{m'}$ and for every $s \in \{0, 1\}^{m'}$, we have $\|(\tilde{X}\tilde{Y})|(\tilde{S} = s) - (\hat{X}\hat{Y})|(\hat{S} = s)\|_1 \leq \mathcal{O}(2^{m'}\varepsilon) \leq 2^{-n^{\Omega(1)}}$.*

Claim 5. *Let $\text{2nmExt} : \{0, 1\}^n \times \{0, 1\}^n \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^{n_x/4}$ be the new-2nmExt from Algorithm 1. Let $XY = U_n \otimes U_{n_x}$, $S = \text{2nmExt}(X, Y)$. We can sample efficiently (in time polynomial in n) from a distribution $(\tilde{X}\tilde{Y}\tilde{S})$ such that*

$$\|XYS - \tilde{X}\tilde{Y}\tilde{S}\|_1 \leq \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon) \quad ; \quad \tilde{S} = U_{n_x/4}.$$

Proof. We consider the intermediate random variables while generating $S = \text{new-2nmExt}(X, Y)$ from X, Y . We use the same intermediate random variables but with tilde notation to denote the random variables we sample (in the reverse order). We note that the argument in this proof is entirely classical. Let

$$X_1, Y_1, R, G, X_3, Y_3, X^{[a+1]}, Y^{[a+1]}, X^{[a+2,3a]}, Y^{[a+2,3a]}, S$$

be as defined in Algorithms 1, 2, 3. We use the following sampling strategy:

1. Sample $g = (x_1, \bar{x}_2, y_1, \bar{y}_2) \leftarrow \tilde{G} = G = X_1 \circ \text{ECC}(U_{n_2})_{\text{Samp}(\text{IP}(X_1, Y_1))} \circ Y_1 \circ \text{ECC}(U_{n_2})_{\text{Samp}(\text{IP}(X_1, Y_1))}$,
2. Sample $(x_3, x^{[a+1]}, y_3, y^{[a+1]}, s) \leftarrow \tilde{X}_3 \tilde{X}^{[a+1]} \tilde{Y}_3 \tilde{Y}^{[a+1]} \tilde{S} | (\tilde{G} = g)$ from Claim 7, where $\tilde{S} | (\tilde{G} = g) = U_{n_x/4}$.
3. Sample $(x^{[a+2,3a]}, y^{[a+2,3a]}) \leftarrow \tilde{X}^{[a+2,3a]} \tilde{Y}^{[a+2,3a]} | (\tilde{G} = g, \tilde{X}_3 \tilde{X}^{[a+1]} \tilde{Y}_3 \tilde{Y}^{[a+1]} = x_3 x^{[a+1]} y_3 y^{[a+1]}) = X^{[a+2,3a]} Y^{[a+2,3a]} | (G = g, X_3 X^{[a+1]} Y_3 Y^{[a+1]} = x_3 x^{[a+1]} y_3 y^{[a+1]})$ from Claim 6.

Consider,

$$\begin{aligned} & \|XYS - \tilde{X}\tilde{Y}\tilde{S}\|_1 \\ & \leq \|GXYS - \tilde{G}\tilde{X}\tilde{Y}\tilde{S}\|_1 && \text{(Fact 5)} \\ & \leq \|GX_1 X_3 X^{[a+1]} Y_1 Y_3 Y^{[a+1]} S - \tilde{G} \tilde{X}_1 \tilde{X}_3 \tilde{X}^{[a+1]} \tilde{Y}_1 \tilde{Y}_3 \tilde{Y}^{[a+1]} \tilde{S}\|_1 && \text{(Fact 5, Step (3) and Claim 6)} \\ & \leq \|GX_3 X^{[a+1]} Y_3 Y^{[a+1]} S - \tilde{G} \tilde{X}_3 \tilde{X}^{[a+1]} \tilde{Y}_3 \tilde{Y}^{[a+1]} \tilde{S}\|_1 && \text{(Fact 5)} \\ & = \mathbb{E}_{g \leftarrow G} \|X_3 X^{[a+1]} Y_3 Y^{[a+1]} S | (G = g) - \tilde{X}_3 \tilde{X}^{[a+1]} \tilde{Y}_3 \tilde{Y}^{[a+1]} \tilde{S} | (\tilde{G} = g)\|_1 && \text{(Fact 6 and } \tilde{G} = G) \\ & \leq \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon) && \text{(Claim 7).} \end{aligned}$$

\square

Claim 6. Let $2\text{nmExt} : \{0, 1\}^n \times \{0, 1\}^n \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^{n_x/4}$ be the new-2nmExt from Algorithm 1. Let $XY = U_n \otimes U_n$, $S = 2\text{nmExt}(X, Y)$ and intermediate random variables

$$X_1, Y_1, G, X_3, Y_3, X^{[a]}, Y^{[a]}, X^{[a+1, 3a]}, Y^{[a+1, 3a]}$$

be as defined in Algorithms 1, 2, 3. Then, we have

$$GX_3Y_3X^{[a+1]}Y^{[a+1]} = G \otimes X_3Y_3X^{[a+1]}Y^{[a+1]}.$$

Furthermore, given $g \in \text{supp}(G)$ and $x_3y_3x^{[a+1]}y^{[a+1]}$, we can efficiently (in time polynomial in n) sample from the distribution $X^{[a+2, 3a]}Y^{[a+2, 3a]}|(G = g, X_3Y_3X^{[a+1]}Y^{[a+1]} = x_3y_3x^{[a+1]}y^{[a+1]})$.

Proof. Note $X = X_1 \circ X_2$, $Y = Y_1 \circ Y_2$ and $G = X_1 \circ \text{ECC}(X_2)_{\text{Samp}(\text{IP}(X_1, Y_1))} \circ Y_1 \circ \text{ECC}(Y_2)_{\text{Samp}(\text{IP}(X_1, Y_1))}$ from the construction of 2nmExt. Note $X_2Y_2 = U_{n_2} \otimes U_{n_2}$ and for fixed $G = g$, the distribution $X_2Y_2|(G = g) = X_2|(G = g) \otimes Y_2|(G = g)$.

Let $j \in [n_4]$ be such that $\text{Crop}(X_2, 1, j \log(n+1))$ has the string $(X_3, X^{[a+1]})$ as prefix. Thus, $(n_4 - j) \log(n+1) \geq (2a-1)4n_x$. For our choice of parameters, $j < n_4 - n_5$. We now fix $G = g = x_1 \circ \bar{x}_2 \circ y_1 \circ \bar{y}_2$ and let $\mathcal{T}_g = \text{Samp}(\text{IP}(x_1, y_1)) = \{t_1, t_2, \dots, t_{n_5}\}$.

Using Lemma 1, with the following assignment of terms (terms on left are from Lemma 1 and terms on right are from here)

$$(k, q, n, t, \mathcal{S}, \mathcal{Q}, M) \leftarrow (n_4, n+1, n, n_5, \mathcal{T}_g, [j], X_2),$$

we get that $X_2|(G = g)$ restricted to first $j \log(n+1)$ bits is uniform. Thus, $\text{Crop}(X_2|(G = g), 1, j \log(n+1))$ is uniform. This further implies $(X_3, X^{[a+1]}|(G = g)$ is uniform since $(X_3, X^{[a+1]})$ is a prefix of $\text{Crop}(X_2|(G = g), 1, j \log(n+1))$. Also, sampling from $X^{[a+2, 3a]}|(G = g, X_3X^{[a+1]} = x_3x^{[a+1]})$ in time polynomial in $(n_4, n+1)$ follows from Lemma 1. Using similar argument one can also note $(Y_3, Y^{[a+1]}|(G = g)$ is uniform and sampling from $Y^{[a+2, 3a]}|(G = g, Y_3Y^{[a+1]} = y_3y^{[a+1]})$ can be done in time polynomial in $(n_4, n+1)$. Thus, $GX_3Y_3X^{[a+1]}Y^{[a+1]} = G \otimes X_3Y_3X^{[a+1]}Y^{[a+1]}$ follows since $X_3Y_3X^{[a+1]}Y^{[a+1]}|(G = g) = X_3Y_3X^{[a+1]}Y^{[a+1]} = U_{n_6} \otimes U_{n_6} \otimes U_{(a+1)4n_x} \otimes U_{(a+1)4n_x}$. \square

Claim 7. Let $2\text{nmExt} : \{0, 1\}^n \times \{0, 1\}^n \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^{n_x/4}$ be the new-2nmExt from Algorithm 1. Let $XY = U_n \otimes U_n$, $S = 2\text{nmExt}(X, Y)$ and

$$X_1, Y_1, R, G, X_3, Y_3, X^{[a]}, Y^{[a]}, Z^{[a]}, A^{[a]}, B^{[a]}, C^{[a]}, \bar{Z}^{[a]}, \bar{A}^{[a]}, \bar{B}^{[a]}, \bar{C}^{[a]}, Z^{a+1}, X^{[a+1, 3a]}, Y^{[a+1, 3a]}, F, S$$

be as defined in Algorithms 1, 2, 3. For any $g \in \text{supp}(G)$, we can sample efficiently from a distribution $(\tilde{X}_3\tilde{Y}_3\tilde{X}^{[a+1]}\tilde{Y}^{[a+1]}\tilde{S})|G = g$ such that

$$\|(X_3Y_3X^{[a+1]}Y^{[a+1]}S)|(G = g) - (\tilde{X}_3\tilde{Y}_3\tilde{X}^{[a+1]}\tilde{Y}^{[a+1]}\tilde{S})|(G = g)\|_1 \leq \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon) \quad ; \quad \tilde{S}|(G = g) = U_{n_x/4}.$$

Proof. Let $g = g_1g_2 \dots g_a$. Note from Claim 6, we have $GX_3Y_3X^{[a+1]}Y^{[a+1]} = G \otimes X_3Y_3X^{[a+1]}Y^{[a+1]}$. Thus, fixing $G = g$, distribution of sources in the alternating extraction remains the same as before, i.e. exactly uniform.

Suppose $g_a = 1$, we show how to efficiently sample from distribution $(Z^a X^a Y^a X^{a+1} Y^{a+1} S)|(G = g)$ approximately¹⁵. We remove conditioning of $G = g$ for the rest of the proof. From Algorithms 1, 2 and 3, we have

$$Y^a = Y_1^a \circ Y_2^a \circ Y_3^a \circ Y_4^a, \quad X^a = X_1^a \circ X_2^a \circ X_3^a \circ X_4^a \quad \text{and} \quad \{A^a, B^a, C^a, \bar{Z}^a, \bar{A}^a, Z^{a+1}, F, S\}$$

¹⁵Similar argument holds when $g_a = 0$.

as intermediate random variables for $g_a = 1$. From Claim 8, we have $\|\tilde{Z}^a - U_{2h}\|_1 \leq \mathcal{O}(a\varepsilon')$. From construction of $2nm\text{Ext}$, we have $\tilde{Z}^a Y_3^a Y_4^a X_3^a X_4^a Y^{a+1} X^{a+1} = \tilde{Z}^a \otimes Y_3^a \otimes Y_4^a \otimes X_3^a \otimes X_4^a \otimes Y^{a+1} \otimes X^{a+1}$. Thus, we have

$$\|\tilde{Z}^a Y_3^a Y_4^a X_3^a X_4^a Y^{a+1} X^{a+1} - U_{2h} \otimes U_{n_y} \otimes U_{n_y} \otimes U_{n_x} \otimes U_{n_x} \otimes U_{4n_y} \otimes U_{4n_x}\|_1 \leq \mathcal{O}(a\varepsilon'). \quad (12)$$

Let us proceed flip-flop procedure (Algorithm 3) with $\hat{Z}^a \hat{Y}_3^a \hat{Y}_4^a \hat{X}_3^a \hat{X}_4^a \hat{Y}^{a+1} \hat{X}^{a+1} = U_{2h} \otimes U_{n_y} \otimes U_{n_y} \otimes U_{n_x} \otimes U_{n_x} \otimes U_{4n_y} \otimes U_{4n_x}$ and denote intermediate random variables as hat variables. Using Fact 5 and Eq. (12), we have

$$\|\tilde{Z}^a Y_3^a Y_4^a X_3^a X_4^a Y^{a+1} X^{a+1} \tilde{A}^a Z^{a+1} F \tilde{S} - \hat{Z}^a \hat{Y}_3^a \hat{Y}_4^a \hat{X}_3^a \hat{X}_4^a \hat{Y}^{a+1} \hat{X}^{a+1} \hat{A}^a \hat{Z}^{a+1} \hat{F} \hat{S}\|_1 \leq \mathcal{O}(a\varepsilon'). \quad (13)$$

From Algorithms 1, 2, 3, we have

$$(\hat{Z}_s^a \otimes \hat{Y}_3^a) \leftrightarrow (\hat{A}^a \otimes \hat{X}_4^a) \leftrightarrow (\hat{Z}^{a+1} \otimes \hat{Y}^{a+1}) \leftrightarrow (\hat{F} \otimes \hat{X}^{a+1}) \leftrightarrow \hat{S}. \quad (14)$$

Using Corollary 1 and noting $\hat{Z}_s^a \hat{Y}_3^a = U_s \otimes U_{n_y}$, we have, $\|\hat{A}^a - U_b\|_1 \leq \varepsilon'$. Noting $\hat{A}^a \hat{X}_4^a = \hat{A}^a \otimes U_{n_x}$, we further have

$$\|\hat{A}^a \hat{X}_4^a - U_b \otimes U_{n_x}\|_1 \leq \varepsilon'.$$

Using similar arguments, we also get

$$\|\hat{Z}^{a+1} \hat{Y}^{a+1} - U_{2h} \otimes U_{4n_y}\|_1 \leq 2\varepsilon' \quad ; \quad \|\hat{F} \hat{X}^{a+1} - U_{n_y/8} \otimes U_{4n_x}\|_1 \leq 2\varepsilon' + \varepsilon^2.$$

We use the following sampling strategy to sample from a distribution $\tilde{Z}^a \tilde{Y}_3^a \tilde{Y}_4^a \tilde{A}^a \tilde{X}_3^a \tilde{X}_4^a \tilde{Z}^{a+1} \tilde{Y}^{a+1} \tilde{F} \tilde{X}^{a+1} \tilde{S}$:

1. Sample $(\tilde{z}^a, \tilde{a}^a, \tilde{z}^{a+1}, \tilde{f}, \tilde{s}) \leftarrow \tilde{Z}^a \tilde{A}^a \tilde{Z}^{a+1} \tilde{F} \tilde{S} = U_{2h} \otimes U_b \otimes U_{2h} \otimes U_{n_y/8} \otimes U_{n_x/4}$,
2. Sample $\tilde{x}^{a+1} \leftarrow \tilde{X}^{a+1} | (\tilde{F} \tilde{S} = \tilde{f} \tilde{s})$ which is same as $\tilde{x}^{a+1} \leftarrow \{x^{a+1} : \tilde{s} = \text{Ext}_6(x^{a+1}, \tilde{f})\}$,
3. Sample $\tilde{y}^{a+1} \leftarrow \tilde{Y}^{a+1} | (\tilde{Z}^{a+1} \tilde{F} = \tilde{z}^{a+1} \tilde{f})$ which is same as $\tilde{y}^{a+1} \leftarrow \{y^{a+1} : \tilde{f} = \text{Ext}_4(y^{a+1}, \tilde{z}^{a+1})\}$,
4. Sample $\tilde{x}_4^a \leftarrow \tilde{X}_4^a | (\tilde{A}^a \tilde{Z}^{a+1} = \tilde{a}^a \tilde{z}^{a+1})$ which is same as $\tilde{x}_4^a \leftarrow \{x_4^a : \tilde{z}^{a+1} = \text{Ext}_3(x_4^a, \tilde{a}^a)\}$,
5. Sample $\tilde{y}_3^a \leftarrow \tilde{Y}_3^a | (\tilde{Z}_s^a \tilde{A}^a = \tilde{z}_s^a \tilde{a}^a)$ which is same as $\tilde{y}_3^a \leftarrow \{y_3^a : \tilde{a}^a = \text{Ext}_1(y_3^a, \tilde{z}_s^a)\}$,
6. Sample $\tilde{y}_4^a \leftarrow \tilde{Y}_4^a = U_{n_y}$ and independently of $\tilde{Z}^a \tilde{Y}_3^a \tilde{Y}_4^a \tilde{A}^a \tilde{X}_4^a \tilde{Z}^{a+1} \tilde{Y}^{a+1} \tilde{F} \tilde{X}^{a+1} \tilde{S}$,
7. Sample $\tilde{x}_3^a \leftarrow \tilde{X}_3^a = U_{n_x}$ and independently of $\tilde{Z}^a \tilde{Y}_3^a \tilde{Y}_4^a \tilde{A}^a \tilde{X}_4^a \tilde{Z}^{a+1} \tilde{Y}^{a+1} \tilde{F} \tilde{X}^{a+1} \tilde{S}$.

Noting,

$$\|\hat{F} \hat{X}^{a+1} - U_{n_y/8} \otimes U_{4n_x}\|_1 \leq 2\varepsilon' + \varepsilon^2 \quad ; \quad \hat{S} = \text{Ext}_6(\hat{X}^{a+1}, \hat{F})$$

and using Claim 3, with the below assignment of terms (terms on the left are from Claim 3 and on the right are from here),

$$(X, H, O, \tilde{X}, \tilde{H}, \tilde{O}, \varepsilon'') \leftarrow (\hat{X}^{a+1}, \hat{F}, \hat{S}, \tilde{X}^{a+1}, \tilde{F}, \tilde{S}, 0),$$

we get that the sampled distribution $\tilde{F} \tilde{X}^{a+1} \tilde{S}$ satisfies

$$\|\hat{F} \hat{X}^{a+1} \hat{S} - \tilde{F} \tilde{X}^{a+1} \tilde{S}\|_1 \leq 2\varepsilon' + 2\varepsilon^2. \quad (15)$$

Noting,

$$\|\hat{Z}^{a+1}\hat{Y}^{a+1} - U_{2h} \otimes U_{4n_y}\|_1 \leq 2\varepsilon' \quad ; \quad \hat{F} = \text{Ext}_4(\hat{Y}^{a+1}, \hat{Z}^{a+1})$$

and using Claim 3 again, with the below assignment of terms (terms on the left are from Claim 3 and on the right are from here),

$$(X, H, O, \tilde{X}, \tilde{H}, \tilde{O}, \varepsilon'') \leftarrow (\hat{Y}^{a+1}, \hat{Z}^{a+1}, \hat{F}, \tilde{Y}^{a+1}, \tilde{Z}^{a+1}, \tilde{F}, 0),$$

we get that the sampled distribution $\tilde{Z}^{a+1}\tilde{Y}^{a+1}\tilde{F}$ satisfies

$$\|\hat{Z}^{a+1}\hat{Y}^{a+1}\hat{F} - \tilde{Z}^{a+1}\tilde{Y}^{a+1}\tilde{F}\|_1 \leq 2\varepsilon' + \varepsilon^2. \quad (16)$$

Note $\hat{Z}^{a+1}\hat{Y}^{a+1} \leftrightarrow \hat{F} \leftrightarrow \hat{X}^{a+1}\hat{S}$ (from Eq. (14)), $\tilde{Z}^{a+1}\tilde{Y}^{a+1} \leftrightarrow \tilde{F} \leftrightarrow \tilde{X}^{a+1}\tilde{S}$ (from the sampling procedure). Thus, from Eqs. (15), (16) and using Claim 2 with the below assignment of terms (terms on the left are from Claim 2 and on the right are from here),

$$(A, B, C, \tilde{A}, \tilde{B}, \tilde{C}) \leftarrow (\hat{Z}^{a+1}\hat{Y}^{a+1}, \hat{F}, \hat{X}^{a+1}\hat{S}, \tilde{Z}^{a+1}\tilde{Y}^{a+1}, \tilde{F}, \tilde{X}^{a+1}\tilde{S}),$$

we get that the sampled distribution $\tilde{Z}^{a+1}\tilde{Y}^{a+1}\tilde{F}\tilde{X}^{a+1}\tilde{S}$ satisfies

$$\|\hat{Z}^{a+1}\hat{Y}^{a+1}\hat{F}\hat{X}^{a+1}\hat{S} - \tilde{Z}^{a+1}\tilde{Y}^{a+1}\tilde{F}\tilde{X}^{a+1}\tilde{S}\|_1 \leq 6\varepsilon' + 4\varepsilon^2 \leq 6\varepsilon' + 4\varepsilon. \quad (17)$$

Noting,

$$\|\hat{A}^a\hat{X}_4^a - U_b \otimes U_{n_x}\|_1 \leq \varepsilon' \quad ; \quad \hat{Z}^{a+1} = \text{Ext}_3(\hat{X}_4^a, \hat{A}^a)$$

and using Claim 3 again, with the below assignment of terms

$$(X, H, O, \tilde{X}, \tilde{H}, \tilde{O}, \varepsilon'') \leftarrow (\hat{X}_4^a, \hat{A}^a, \hat{Z}^{a+1}, \tilde{X}_4^a, \tilde{A}^a, \tilde{Z}^{a+1}, 0),$$

we get that the sampled distribution $\tilde{A}^a\tilde{X}_4^a\tilde{Z}^{a+1}$ satisfies

$$\|\hat{A}^a\hat{X}_4^a\hat{Z}^{a+1} - \tilde{A}^a\tilde{X}_4^a\tilde{Z}^{a+1}\|_1 \leq 2\varepsilon'. \quad (18)$$

Note $\hat{A}^a\hat{X}_4^a \leftrightarrow \hat{Z}^{a+1} \leftrightarrow \hat{Y}^{a+1}\hat{F}\hat{X}^{a+1}\hat{S}$ (from Eq. (14)) and $\tilde{A}^a\tilde{X}_4^a \leftrightarrow \tilde{Z}^{a+1} \leftrightarrow \tilde{Y}^{a+1}\tilde{F}\tilde{X}^{a+1}\tilde{S}$ (from sampling procedure). Thus, from Eqs. (17), (18) and using Claim 2 with the below assignment of registers

$$(A, B, C, \tilde{A}, \tilde{B}, \tilde{C}) \leftarrow (\hat{A}^a\hat{X}_4^a, \hat{Z}^{a+1}, \hat{Y}^{a+1}\hat{F}\hat{X}^{a+1}\hat{S}, \tilde{A}^a\tilde{X}_4^a, \tilde{Z}^{a+1}, \tilde{Y}^{a+1}\tilde{F}\tilde{X}^{a+1}\tilde{S}),$$

we get that the sampled distribution $\tilde{A}^a\tilde{X}_4^a\tilde{Z}^{a+1}\tilde{Y}^{a+1}\tilde{F}\tilde{X}^{a+1}\tilde{S}$ satisfies

$$\|\hat{A}^a\hat{X}_4^a\hat{Z}^{a+1}\hat{Y}^{a+1}\hat{F}\hat{X}^{a+1}\hat{S} - \tilde{A}^a\tilde{X}_4^a\tilde{Z}^{a+1}\tilde{Y}^{a+1}\tilde{F}\tilde{X}^{a+1}\tilde{S}\|_1 \leq 10\varepsilon' + 4\varepsilon. \quad (19)$$

Proceeding similarly using arguments involving Claim 3, Claim 2 appropriately, the sampled distribution $\tilde{Z}_s^a\tilde{Y}_3^a\tilde{A}^a\tilde{X}_4^a\tilde{Z}^{a+1}\tilde{Y}^{a+1}\tilde{F}\tilde{X}^{a+1}\tilde{S}$ satisfies,

$$\|\hat{Z}_s^a\hat{Y}_3^a\hat{A}^a\hat{X}_4^a\hat{Z}^{a+1}\hat{Y}^{a+1}\hat{F}\hat{X}^{a+1}\hat{S} - \tilde{Z}_s^a\tilde{Y}_3^a\tilde{A}^a\tilde{X}_4^a\tilde{Z}^{a+1}\tilde{Y}^{a+1}\tilde{F}\tilde{X}^{a+1}\tilde{S}\|_1 \leq 12\varepsilon' + 4\varepsilon. \quad (20)$$

Also note registers $\text{Cryp}(\hat{Z}^a, s+1, 2h)\hat{X}_3^a\hat{Y}_4^a = U_{2h-s} \otimes U_{n_x} \otimes U_{n_y}$ and independent of registers $\hat{Z}_s^a\hat{Y}_3^a\hat{A}^a\hat{X}_4^a\hat{Z}^{a+1}\hat{Y}^{a+1}\hat{F}\hat{X}^{a+1}\hat{S}$ (similarly for tilde variables). Thus,

$$\|\hat{Z}_s^a\hat{Y}_3^a\hat{Y}_4^a\hat{A}^a\hat{X}_3^a\hat{X}_4^a\hat{Z}^{a+1}\hat{Y}^{a+1}\hat{F}\hat{X}^{a+1}\hat{S} - \tilde{Z}_s^a\tilde{Y}_3^a\tilde{Y}_4^a\tilde{A}^a\tilde{X}_3^a\tilde{X}_4^a\tilde{Z}^{a+1}\tilde{Y}^{a+1}\tilde{F}\tilde{X}^{a+1}\tilde{S}\|_1 \leq 12\varepsilon' + 4\varepsilon. \quad (21)$$

Using Eqs. (13), (21) and triangle inequality, we get

$$\|\bar{Z}^a Y_3^a Y_4^a \bar{A}^a X_3^a X_4^a Z^{a+1} Y^{a+1} F X^{a+1} S - \tilde{\bar{Z}}^a \tilde{Y}_3^a \tilde{Y}_4^a \tilde{A}^a \tilde{X}_3^a \tilde{X}_4^a \tilde{Z}^{a+1} \tilde{Y}^{a+1} \tilde{F} \tilde{X}^{a+1} \tilde{S}\|_1 \leq \mathcal{O}((a+1)\varepsilon') + 4\varepsilon.$$

Using Fact 5, we further have that the sampled distribution $\tilde{\bar{Z}}^a \tilde{X}_3^a \tilde{X}_4^a \tilde{Y}_3^a \tilde{Y}_4^a \tilde{X}^{a+1} \tilde{Y}^{a+1} \tilde{S}$ satisfies

$$\|\bar{Z}^a X_3^a X_4^a Y_3^a Y_4^a X^{a+1} Y^{a+1} S - \tilde{\bar{Z}}^a \tilde{X}_3^a \tilde{X}_4^a \tilde{Y}_3^a \tilde{Y}_4^a \tilde{X}^{a+1} \tilde{Y}^{a+1} \tilde{S}\|_1 \leq \mathcal{O}((a+1)\varepsilon') + 4\varepsilon. \quad (22)$$

From Claim 8, we have $\|Z^a - U_{2h}\|_1 \leq \mathcal{O}(a\varepsilon')$. From construction of $2nmExt$, we have $Z^a Y_1^a Y_2^a X_1^a X_2^a = Z^a \otimes Y_1^a \otimes Y_2^a \otimes X_1^a \otimes X_2^a$. Thus, we have

$$\|Z^a Y_1^a Y_2^a X_1^a X_2^a - U_{2h} \otimes U_{n_y} \otimes U_{n_y} \otimes U_{n_x} \otimes U_{n_x}\|_1 \leq \mathcal{O}(a\varepsilon'). \quad (23)$$

Proceed flip-flop procedure with $\hat{Z}^a \hat{X}_1^a \hat{X}_2^a \hat{Y}_1^a \hat{Y}_2^a = U_{2h} \otimes U_{n_x} \otimes U_{n_x} \otimes U_{n_y} \otimes U_{n_y}$ and denote intermediate random variables as hat variables. Using Fact 5 and Eq. (23), we have

$$\|Z^a Y_1^a Y_2^a X_1^a X_2^a A^a C^a B^a \bar{Z}^a - \hat{Z}^a \hat{Y}_1^a \hat{Y}_2^a \hat{X}_1^a \hat{X}_2^a \hat{A}^a \hat{C}^a \hat{B}^a \hat{\bar{Z}}^a\|_1 \leq \mathcal{O}(a\varepsilon'). \quad (24)$$

From Algorithms 1, 2, 3, we have

$$(\hat{Z}_s^a \otimes \hat{Y}_1^a) \leftrightarrow (\hat{A}^a \otimes \hat{Z}_2^a) \leftrightarrow (\hat{C}^a \otimes \hat{Y}_2^a) \leftrightarrow (\hat{B}^a \otimes \hat{X}_2^a) \leftrightarrow \hat{Z}^a. \quad (25)$$

We extend the sampling procedure in the following way: consider sampled $\tilde{\bar{z}}^a \leftarrow \tilde{\bar{Z}}^a = U_{2h}$ (from before), next sample $\tilde{b}^a \leftarrow \tilde{B}^a = U_b$ and independently and proceed to sample from $\tilde{X}_2^a | (\tilde{\bar{Z}}^a \tilde{B}^a = \tilde{\bar{z}}^a \tilde{b}^a)$. Using similar arguments involving Corollary 1, Claim 3, Claim 2 like before (in this proof), we can sample from a distribution $\tilde{Z}^a \tilde{Y}_1^a \tilde{Y}_2^a \tilde{X}_1^a \tilde{X}_2^a \tilde{A}^a \tilde{C}^a \tilde{B}^a \tilde{\bar{Z}}^a$ such that

$$\|\hat{Z}^a \hat{Y}_1^a \hat{Y}_2^a \hat{X}_1^a \hat{X}_2^a \hat{A}^a \hat{C}^a \hat{B}^a \hat{\bar{Z}}^a - \tilde{Z}^a \tilde{Y}_1^a \tilde{Y}_2^a \tilde{X}_1^a \tilde{X}_2^a \tilde{A}^a \tilde{C}^a \tilde{B}^a \tilde{\bar{Z}}^a\|_1 \leq \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon'). \quad (26)$$

Using Eq. (26) along with Fact 5 we have,

$$\|\tilde{\bar{Z}}^a - U_{2h}\|_1 \leq \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon'). \quad (27)$$

From Eqs. (24), (26) and triangle inequality, we have

$$\|Z^a Y_1^a Y_2^a X_1^a X_2^a A^a C^a B^a \bar{Z}^a - \tilde{Z}^a \tilde{Y}_1^a \tilde{Y}_2^a \tilde{X}_1^a \tilde{X}_2^a \tilde{A}^a \tilde{C}^a \tilde{B}^a \tilde{\bar{Z}}^a\|_1 \leq \mathcal{O}((a+1)\varepsilon'). \quad (28)$$

Using Fact 5, we further can sample from a distribution $\tilde{Z}^a \tilde{Y}_1^a \tilde{Y}_2^a \tilde{X}_1^a \tilde{X}_2^a \tilde{\bar{Z}}^a$ such that

$$\|Z^a Y_1^a Y_2^a X_1^a X_2^a \bar{Z}^a - \tilde{Z}^a \tilde{Y}_1^a \tilde{Y}_2^a \tilde{X}_1^a \tilde{X}_2^a \tilde{\bar{Z}}^a\|_1 \leq \mathcal{O}((a+1)\varepsilon'). \quad (29)$$

Note that $Z^a Y_1^a Y_2^a X_1^a X_2^a \leftrightarrow \bar{Z}^a \leftrightarrow X_3^a X_4^a Y_3^a Y_4^a X^{a+1} Y^{a+1} S$ (from construction of $2nmExt$) and $\tilde{Z}^a \tilde{Y}_1^a \tilde{Y}_2^a \tilde{X}_1^a \tilde{X}_2^a \leftrightarrow \tilde{\bar{Z}}^a \leftrightarrow \tilde{X}_3^a \tilde{X}_4^a \tilde{Y}_3^a \tilde{Y}_4^a \tilde{X}^{a+1} \tilde{Y}^{a+1} \tilde{S}$ (from sampling procedure). From Eqs. (22), (29) and using Claim 2 along with Fact 5, we have

$$\|Z^a Y^{[a,a+1]} X^{[a,a+1]} S - \tilde{Z}^a \tilde{Y}^{[a,a+1]} \tilde{X}^{[a,a+1]} \tilde{S}\|_1 \leq \mathcal{O}((a+1)\varepsilon') + 4\varepsilon.$$

We extend the sampling procedure now considering sampled $\tilde{z}^a \leftarrow \tilde{\bar{Z}}^a$ (from before) such that $\|\tilde{\bar{Z}}^a - U_{2h}\|_1 \leq \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon')$ (from Eq. (27)) and proceed depending on bit g_{a-1} . Proceeding likewise

depending on $g = g_1 g_2 \dots g_a$ and inductively using similar arguments involving Corollary 1, Claim 3, Claim 2 along with Fact 5, we can sample from $\tilde{X}_3 \tilde{Y}_3 \tilde{X}^{[a+1]} \tilde{Y}^{[a+1]} \tilde{S}$ such that

$$\|X_3 Y_3 X^{[a+1]} Y^{[a+1]} S - \tilde{X}_3 \tilde{Y}_3 \tilde{X}^{[a+1]} \tilde{Y}^{[a+1]} \tilde{S}\|_1 \leq \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon') + \left(\sum_{i=1}^a \mathcal{O}((a+1)\varepsilon') \right) + 4\varepsilon = \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon).$$

□

We show a claim that states that intermediate random variables in the alternating extraction are approximately uniform even conditioned on every $G = g$.

Claim 8. *Let $2\text{nmExt} : \{0, 1\}^n \times \{0, 1\}^n \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^{n_x/4}$ be the new- 2nmExt from Algorithm 1. Let $XY = U_n \otimes U_n$, $S = 2\text{nmExt}(X, Y)$ and set*

$$\mathbb{P} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{G, Z^{[a]}, A^{[a]}, B^{[a]}, C^{[a]}, \bar{Z}^{[a]}, \bar{A}^{[a]}, \bar{B}^{[a]}, \bar{C}^{[a]}, Z^{a+1}\}$$

be the intermediate random variables as defined in Algorithms 1, 2, 3. Then, we have for any random variable $Q \in \mathbb{P} \setminus \{G\}$ and any fixing $G = g$,

$$\|Q|(G = g) - U_{|Q|}\|_1 \leq \mathcal{O}(a\varepsilon').$$

Proof. From Claim 6, we have

$$GX_3 Y_3 X^{[a+1]} Y^{[a+1]} = G \otimes X_3 Y_3 X^{[a+1]} Y^{[a+1]},$$

where $X = X_1 \circ X_3 \circ X^{[a+1]} \circ X^{[a+2, 3a]}$ and $Y = Y_1 \circ Y_3 \circ Y^{[a+1]} \circ Y^{[a+2, 3a]}$. Also, note from Algorithms 1, 2, 3, any random variable $Q \in \mathbb{P} \setminus \{G\}$ is extracted from sources $X_3 Y_3 X^{[a+1]} Y^{[a+1]}$. Note for any $i \in [a]$ and i -th flip-flop procedure (Algorithm 3), intermediate random variables $\{A^i, B^i, C^i, \bar{Z}^i, \bar{A}^i, \bar{B}^i, \bar{C}^i, Z^{i+1}\}$ are extracted from $X^i Y^i Z^i = X^i \otimes Y^i \otimes Z^i$. We remove conditioning on $G = g$ for the random variables for the rest of the proof.

Since $Z^1 = \text{IP}(X_3, Y_3)$, using Fact 15 we have $\|Z^1 - U_{2h}\|_1 \leq 2^{-\Omega(n)} \leq \varepsilon'$. We show if for any round i , $\|Z^i - U_{2h}\|_1 \leq \mathcal{O}(i\varepsilon')$, then for any $Q \in \{A^i, B^i, C^i, \bar{Z}^i, \bar{A}^i, \bar{B}^i, \bar{C}^i, Z^{i+1}\}$ we have $\|Q - U_{|Q|}\|_1 \leq \mathcal{O}((i+2)\varepsilon')$.

We denote generated intermediate random variables A^i, B^i, C^i, \bar{Z}^i from $\hat{Z}^i = \hat{Z}_1^i \hat{Z}_2^i = U_{2h}$ instead of Z^i as hat random variables. Using Fact 5 repeatedly, we have

$$\|X_1^i X_2^i Y_1^i Y_2^i Z^i A^i B^i C^i \bar{Z}^i - X_1^i X_2^i Y_1^i Y_2^i \hat{Z}^i \hat{A}^i \hat{B}^i \hat{C}^i \hat{Z}^i\|_1 \leq \mathcal{O}(i\varepsilon'). \quad (30)$$

Since $\hat{A}^i = \text{Ext}_1(Y_1^i, \hat{Z}_s^i)$, $Y_1^i \hat{Z}_s^i = U_{n_y} \otimes U_s$, using Corollary 1 we have

$$\|\hat{A}^i - U_b\|_1 \leq \varepsilon'. \quad (31)$$

Since $\hat{C}^i = \text{Ext}_2(\hat{Z}_2^i, \hat{A}^i)$, $\hat{Z}_2^i \hat{A}^i = U_h \otimes \hat{A}^i$ and $\|\hat{A}^i - U_b\|_1 \leq \varepsilon'$, using Corollary 1 we have

$$\|\hat{C}^i - U_s\|_1 \leq 2\varepsilon'. \quad (32)$$

Since $\hat{B}^i = \text{Ext}_1(Y_2^i, \hat{C}^i)$, $Y_2^i \hat{C}^i = U_{n_y} \otimes \hat{C}^i$ and $\|\hat{C}^i - U_s\|_1 \leq 2\varepsilon'$, using Corollary 1 we have

$$\|\hat{B}^i - U_b\|_1 \leq 3\varepsilon'. \quad (33)$$

If $g_i = 1$, we have $\hat{Z}^i = \text{Ext}_1(X_2^i, \hat{B}^i)$, $X_2^i \hat{B}^i = U_{n_x} \otimes \hat{B}^i$ and $\|\hat{B}^i - U_b\|_1 \leq 3\varepsilon'$. Using Corollary 1, we further have

$$\|\hat{Z}^i - U_{2h}\|_1 \leq 4\varepsilon'. \quad (34)$$

Similarly, if $g_i = 0$, we will have

$$\|\hat{Z}^i - U_{2h}\|_1 \leq 2\varepsilon'. \quad (35)$$

Using Fact 5, Eqs. (30), (31), (32), (33), (34) and (35) along with appropriate triangle inequalities, for any $Q \in \{A^i, B^i, C^i, Z^i\}$ we have $\|Q - U_{|Q|}\|_1 \leq \mathcal{O}((i+1)\varepsilon')$. Using similar arguments and noting $X_3^i X_4^i Y_3^i Y_4^i Z^i = X_3^i \otimes X_4^i \otimes Y_3^i \otimes Y_4^i \otimes Z^i$, one can note for any $Q \in \{\bar{A}^i, \bar{B}^i, \bar{C}^i, Z^{i+1}\}$ we have $\|Q - U_{|Q|}\|_1 \leq \mathcal{O}((i+2)\varepsilon')$. Thus, since we have a rounds of flip-flop procedure, the desired follows from induction argument. \square

Acknowledgment

We thank Divesh Aggarwal and Maciej Obremski for introducing us to the problem, sharing their insights on the classical constructions and several other helpful discussions. We also thank Upendra Kapshikar for the helpful discussions.

This work is supported by the National Research Foundation, including under NRF RF Award No. NRF-NRFF2013-13, the Prime Minister's Office, Singapore and the Ministry of Education, Singapore, under the Research Centres of Excellence program and by Grant No. MOE2012-T3-1-009 and in part by the NRF2017-NRF-ANR004 VanQuTe Grant. This work is also partially supported by the Singapore Ministry of Education under grant MOE2019-T2-1-145.

References

- [AB16] Divesh Aggarwal and Jop Briët. Revisiting the sanders-bogolyubov-ruzsa theorem in p n and its application to non-malleable codes. In *2016 IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory (ISIT)*, pages 1322–1326. Ieee, 2016.
- [ABJO21] Divesh Aggarwal, Naresh Goud Boddu, Rahul Jain, and Maciej Obremski. Quantum measurement adversary, 2021. ArXiv:2106.02766.
- [ADKO15] Divesh Aggarwal, Stefan Dziembowski, Tomasz Kazana, and Maciej Obremski. Leakage-resilient non-malleable codes. In Yevgeniy Dodis and Jesper Buus Nielsen, editors, *Theory of Cryptography*, pages 398–426, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2015. Springer Berlin Heidelberg.
- [ADL18] Divesh Aggarwal, Yevgeniy Dodis, and Shachar Lovett. Non-malleable codes from additive combinatorics. *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 47(2):524–546, 2018.
- [ADN⁺19] Divesh Aggarwal, Ivan Damgård, Jesper Buus Nielsen, Maciej Obremski, Erick Purwanto, João Ribeiro, and Mark Simkin. Stronger leakage-resilient and non-malleable secret sharing schemes for general access structures. In Alexandra Boldyreva and Daniele Micciancio, editors, *Advances in Cryptology – CRYPTO 2019*, pages 510–539, Cham, 2019. Springer International Publishing.

- [Agg15] Divesh Aggarwal. Affine-evasive sets modulo a prime. *Inf. Process. Lett.*, 115(2):382–385, February 2015.
- [AKO⁺22] Divesh Aggarwal, Bhavana Kanukurthi, Sai Lakshmi Bhavana Obbattu, Maciej Obremski, and Sruthi Sekar. Rate one-third non-malleable codes. In *Proceedings of the 54th Annual ACM SIGACT Symposium on Theory of Computing*, pages 1364–1377, 2022.
- [AO20] D. Aggarwal and M. Obremski. A constant rate non-malleable code in the split-state model. In *2020 IEEE 61st Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS)*, pages 1285–1294, Los Alamitos, CA, USA, nov 2020. IEEE Computer Society.
- [Bel64] J. S. Bell. On the einstein podolsky rosen paradox. *Physics Physique Fizika*, 1:195–200, Nov 1964.
- [BJK21] Naresh Goud Boddu, Rahul Jain, and Upendra Kapshikar. Quantum secure non-malleable-extractors, 2021.
- [Bla79] G. R. Blakley. Safeguarding cryptographic keys. In *1979 International Workshop on Managing Requirements Knowledge (MARK)*, pages 313–318, 1979.
- [BW92] Charles H. Bennett and Stephen J. Wiesner. Communication via one- and two-particle operators on einstein-podolsky-rosen states. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 69:2881–2884, Nov 1992.
- [CG14] Mahdi Cheraghchi and Venkatesan Guruswami. Non-malleable coding against bit-wise and split-state tampering. In *Proceedings of Theory of Cryptography Conference (TCC)*, pages 440–464, 2014. Extended version in *Journal of Cryptology*.
- [CG16] Mahdi Cheraghchi and Venkatesan Guruswami. Capacity of non-malleable codes. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 62(3):1097–1118, 2016.
- [CGL20] Eshan Chattopadhyay, Vipul Goyal, and Xin Li. Nonmalleable extractors and codes, with their many tampered extensions. *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 49(5):999–1040, 2020.
- [CLW14] Kai-Min Chung, Xin Li, and Xiaodi Wu. Multi-source randomness extractors against quantum side information, and their applications. *CoRR*, abs/1411.2315, 2014.
- [CV17] Gil Cohen and Thomas Vidick. Privacy amplification against active quantum adversaries. ArXiv:1608.06318, 2017.
- [Dat09] Nilanjana Datta. Min- and max- relative entropies and a new entanglement monotone. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 55:2816–2826, 2009.
- [DKO13] Stefan Dziembowski, Tomasz Kazana, and Maciej Obremski. Non-malleable codes from two-source extractors. In Ran Canetti and Juan A. Garay, editors, *Advances in Cryptology – CRYPTO 2013*, pages 239–257, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2013. Springer Berlin Heidelberg.
- [DPVR12] Anindya De, Christopher Portmann, Thomas Vidick, and Renato Renner. Trevisan’s extractor in the presence of quantum side information. *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 41(4):915–940, 2012.

- [DPW18] Stefan Dziembowski, Krzysztof Pietrzak, and Daniel Wichs. Non-malleable codes. *J. ACM*, 65(4), April 2018.
- [FvdG06] C. A. Fuchs and J. van de Graaf. Cryptographic distinguishability measures for quantum-mechanical states. *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theor.*, 45(4):1216–1227, September 2006.
- [GK18a] Vipul Goyal and Ashutosh Kumar. Non-malleable secret sharing. Cryptology ePrint Archive, Report 2018/316, 2018. <https://ia.cr/2018/316>.
- [GK18b] Vipul Goyal and Ashutosh Kumar. Non-malleable secret sharing for general access structures. Cryptology ePrint Archive, Report 2018/750, 2018. <https://ia.cr/2018/750>.
- [GPR16] Vipul Goyal, Omkant Pandey, and Silas Richelson. Textbook non-malleable commitments. In *Proceedings of the Forty-Eighth Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing*, STOC '16, page 1128–1141, New York, NY, USA, 2016. Association for Computing Machinery.
- [JRS02] R. Jain, J. Radhakrishnan, and P. Sen. Privacy and interaction in quantum communication complexity and a theorem about the relative entropy of quantum states. In *The 43rd Annual IEEE Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science, 2002. Proceedings.*, pages 429–438, 2002.
- [Li15] X. Li. Three-source extractors for polylogarithmic min-entropy. In *2015 IEEE 56th Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science*, pages 863–882, 2015.
- [Li17] Xin Li. Improved non-malleable extractors, non-malleable codes and independent source extractors. In *Proceedings of the 49th Annual ACM SIGACT Symposium on Theory of Computing*, STOC 2017, page 1144–1156, New York, NY, USA, 2017. Association for Computing Machinery.
- [Li19] Xin Li. Non-malleable extractors and non-malleable codes: Partially optimal constructions. In *Proceedings of the 34th Computational Complexity Conference, CCC '19*, Dagstuhl, DEU, 2019. Schloss Dagstuhl–Leibniz-Zentrum fuer Informatik.
- [LL12] Feng-Hao Liu and Anna Lysyanskaya. Tamper and leakage resilience in the split-state model. In Reihaneh Safavi-Naini and Ran Canetti, editors, *Advances in Cryptology – CRYPTO 2012*, pages 517–532, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2012. Springer Berlin Heidelberg.
- [NC00] Michael A. Nielsen and Isaac L. Chuang. *Quantum computation and quantum information*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK, 2000.
- [Sha79] Adi Shamir. How to share a secret. *Commun. ACM*, 22(11):612–613, nov 1979.
- [SV19] Akshayaram Srinivasan and Prashant Nalini Vasudevan. Leakage resilient secret sharing and applications. In Alexandra Boldyreva and Daniele Micciancio, editors, *Advances in Cryptology – CRYPTO 2019*, pages 480–509, Cham, 2019. Springer International Publishing.
- [Uhl76] A. Uhlmann. The "transition probability" in the state space of a *-algebra. *Rep. Math. Phys.*, 9:273–279, 1976.
- [Wat11] John Watrous. Chapter 5, naimark's theorem; characterizations of channels. Lecture notes on Theory of Quantum Information, 2011.

A A quantum secure one-many non-malleable code in the split-state model

A.1 Preliminaries for quantum secure one-many non-malleable code in the split-state model

Let m, n, k, t be positive integers and $\varepsilon, \varepsilon' > 0$. Let \mathcal{F} denote the set of all the functions from $\{0, 1\}^n \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^n$. We next define $\text{copy}^{(t)} : (\{0, 1\}^* \cup \{\text{same}\})^t \times \{0, 1\}^* \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^*$ when the first input is a t -tuple as follows: $\text{copy}^{(t)}((x_1, x_2, \dots, x_t), s) = (\text{copy}(x_1, s), \text{copy}(x_2, s), \dots, \text{copy}(x_t, s))$. Recall the function $\text{copy} : \{0, 1\}^* \cup \{\text{same}\} \times \{0, 1\}^* \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^*$ is such that $\text{copy}(x, s) = s$ if $x = \text{same}$, otherwise $\text{copy}(x, s) = x$.

Definition 12 (One-many non-malleable codes in the split-state model [CGL20]). *An encoding and decoding scheme (Enc, Dec) is a $(t; m, n, \varepsilon)$ -non-malleable code with respect to a family of tampering functions $(\mathcal{F} \times \mathcal{F})^t$, if for every*

$$f = ((g_1, h_1), (g_2, h_2), \dots, (g_t, h_t)) \in (\mathcal{F} \times \mathcal{F})^t,$$

there exists a random variable $\mathcal{D}_f = \mathcal{D}_{((g_1, h_1), (g_2, h_2), \dots, (g_t, h_t))}$ on $(\{0, 1\}^m \cup \{\text{same}\})^t$ which is independent of the randomness in Enc such that for all messages $s \in \{0, 1\}^m$, it holds that

$$\|\text{Dec}((g_1, h_1)(\text{Enc}(s))) \dots \text{Dec}((g_t, h_t)(\text{Enc}(s))) - \text{copy}^{(t)}(\mathcal{D}_f, s)\|_1 \leq \varepsilon.$$

Definition 13 ($(t; k_1, k_2)$ -qnm-state [BJK21]). *Let $\sigma_{X\hat{X}NMY\hat{Y}}$ be a (k_1, k_2) -qma-state. Let $U : \mathcal{H}_X \otimes \mathcal{H}_N \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_X \otimes \mathcal{H}_{X^{[t]}} \otimes \mathcal{H}_{\hat{X}^{[t]}} \otimes \mathcal{H}_{N'}$ and $V : \mathcal{H}_Y \otimes \mathcal{H}_M \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_Y \otimes \mathcal{H}_{Y^{[t]}} \otimes \mathcal{H}_{\hat{Y}^{[t]}} \otimes \mathcal{H}_{M'}$ be isometries such that for $\rho = (U \otimes V)\sigma(U \otimes V)^\dagger$, we have $X^{[t]}Y^{[t]}$ classical (with copy $\hat{X}^{[t]}\hat{Y}^{[t]}$) and*

$$\forall i \in [t], \Pr(Y \neq Y^i)_\rho = 1 \quad \text{or} \quad \Pr(X \neq X^i)_\rho = 1.$$

We call ρ a $(t; k_1, k_2)$ -qnm-state.

Definition 14 (Quantum secure 2-source one-many non-malleable extractor [BJK21]). *An (n, n, m) -non-malleable extractor $t\text{-}2\text{nmExt} : \{0, 1\}^n \times \{0, 1\}^n \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^m$ is $(t; k_1, k_2, \varepsilon)$ -secure against qnm-adv if for every $(t; k_1, k_2)$ -qnm-state ρ (chosen by the adversary qnm-adv),*

$$\|\rho_{t\text{-}2\text{nmExt}(X, Y)t\text{-}2\text{nmExt}(X^1, Y^1) \dots t\text{-}2\text{nmExt}(X^t, Y^t)X X^{[t]}N' - U_m \otimes \rho_{t\text{-}2\text{nmExt}(X^1, Y^1) \dots t\text{-}2\text{nmExt}(X^t, Y^t)X X^{[t]}N'}\|_1 \leq \varepsilon,$$

and

$$\|\rho_{t\text{-}2\text{nmExt}(X, Y)t\text{-}2\text{nmExt}(X^1, Y^1) \dots t\text{-}2\text{nmExt}(X^t, Y^t)Y Y^{[t]}M' - U_m \otimes \rho_{t\text{-}2\text{nmExt}(X^1, Y^1) \dots t\text{-}2\text{nmExt}(X^t, Y^t)Y Y^{[t]}M'}\|_1 \leq \varepsilon.$$

Definition 15 (Quantum one-many split-state adversary). *Let σ_{SXY} be the state after encoding message S . The quantum one-many split-state adversary (denoted $\mathcal{A} = (U, V, \psi)$) will act via two isometries, (U, V) using an additional shared entangled state $|\psi\rangle_{NM}$ as specified by $U : \mathcal{H}_X \otimes \mathcal{H}_N \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_{X^{[t]}} \otimes \mathcal{H}_{N'}$ and $V : \mathcal{H}_Y \otimes \mathcal{H}_M \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_{Y^{[t]}} \otimes \mathcal{H}_{M'}$. Let $\hat{\rho} = (U \otimes V)(\sigma \otimes |\psi\rangle\langle\psi|)(U \otimes V)^\dagger$ and ρ be the final state after measuring the registers $(X^{[t]}Y^{[t]})$ in the computational basis ¹⁶.*

¹⁶We enforce the quantum split-state adversary to return classical registers $X^{[t]}, Y^{[t]}$ by doing the measurement in the computational basis. This is without any loss of generality since the decoding process can start by doing the measurement (this will not affect anything in the absence of quantum one-many split-state adversary) and then decode using Dec .

Definition 16 (Quantum secure one-many non-malleable codes in the split-state model). *An encoding and decoding scheme (Enc, Dec) is a $(t; m, n, \varepsilon)$ -quantum secure one-many non-malleable code in the split-state model with error ε , if for state ρ and adversary $\mathcal{A} = (U, V, \psi)$ (as defined in Definition 15), there exists a random variable $\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{A}}$ on $(\{0, 1\}^m \cup \{\text{same}\})^t$ such that*

$$\forall s \in \{0, 1\}^m : \quad \|S_s^{[t]} - \text{copy}^{(t)}(\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{A}}, s)\|_1 \leq \varepsilon.$$

Above $\forall i \in [t]$, $S^i = \text{Dec}(X^i, Y^i)$ and $S_s^{[t]} = (S^{[t]} | S = s)$.

Claim 9. *Let $\sigma_{X\hat{X}NY\hat{Y}M}$ be a (k_1, k_2) -qma-state with $|X| = n$ and $|Y| = n$. Let $t\text{-}2\text{nmExt} : \{0, 1\}^n \times \{0, 1\}^n \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^m$ be a $(t; k_1, k_2, \varepsilon)$ -quantum secure 2-source t -non-malleable extractor. Let $S = t\text{-}2\text{nmExt}(X, Y)$. Then,*

$$\|\sigma_{SYM} - U_m \otimes \sigma_{YM}\|_1 \leq \varepsilon.$$

Proof. Let $U : \mathcal{H}_X \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_X \otimes \mathcal{H}_{X^{[t]}} \otimes \mathcal{H}_{\hat{X}^{[t]}}$, $V : \mathcal{H}_Y \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_Y \otimes \mathcal{H}_{Y^{[t]}} \otimes \mathcal{H}_{\hat{Y}^{[t]}}$ be isometries such that for $\rho = (U \otimes V)\sigma(U \otimes V)^\dagger$, we have $X^{[t]}Y^{[t]}$ classical (with copies $\hat{X}^{[t]}\hat{Y}^{[t]}$ respectively) and for every $i \in [t]$ either $\Pr(X \neq X^i)_\rho = 1$ or $\Pr(Y \neq Y^i)_\rho = 1$.¹⁷ Notice the state ρ is a $(t; k_1, k_2)$ -qnm-state. Since $t\text{-}2\text{nmExt}$ is a $(t; k_1, k_2, \varepsilon)$ -quantum secure (see Definition 14), we have

$$\|\rho_{SS^{[t]}Y^{[t]}M} - U_m \otimes \rho_{S^{[t]}Y^{[t]}M}\|_1 \leq \varepsilon,$$

where $S^i = t\text{-}2\text{nmExt}(X^i, Y^i)$. Using Fact 5, we get

$$\|\rho_{SYM} - U_m \otimes \rho_{YM}\|_1 \leq \varepsilon.$$

The desired now follows by noting $\sigma_{XNMY} = \rho_{XNMY}$. \square

Claim 10. *Let $t\text{-}2\text{nmExt} : \{0, 1\}^n \times \{0, 1\}^n \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^m$ be a $(t; k_1, k_2, \varepsilon)$ -quantum secure 2-source t -non-malleable extractor. Then, $t\text{-}2\text{nmExt}$ is also a $(j; k_1, k_2, \varepsilon)$ -quantum secure 2-source j -non-malleable extractor for any positive integer $j \leq t$.*

Proof. Let $\sigma_{X\hat{X}NY\hat{Y}M}$ be a (k_1, k_2) -qma-state with $|X| = n$ and $|Y| = n$. Let $U : \mathcal{H}_X \otimes \mathcal{H}_N \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_X \otimes \mathcal{H}_{X^{[j]}} \otimes \mathcal{H}_{\hat{X}^{[j]}} \otimes \mathcal{H}_{N'}$, $V : \mathcal{H}_Y \otimes \mathcal{H}_M \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_Y \otimes \mathcal{H}_{Y^{[j]}} \otimes \mathcal{H}_{\hat{Y}^{[j]}} \otimes \mathcal{H}_{M'}$ be isometries such that for $\rho = (U \otimes V)\sigma(U \otimes V)^\dagger$, we have $X^{[j]}Y^{[j]}$ classical (with copies $\hat{X}^{[j]}\hat{Y}^{[j]}$ respectively) and for every $i \in [j]$ either $\Pr(X \neq X^i)_\rho = 1$ or $\Pr(Y \neq Y^i)_\rho = 1$. Notice the state ρ is a $(j; k_1, k_2)$ -qnm-state.

Let $U' : \mathcal{H}_X \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_X \otimes \mathcal{H}_{X^{[t]\setminus[j]}} \otimes \mathcal{H}_{\hat{X}^{[t]\setminus[j]}}$, $V' : \mathcal{H}_Y \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_Y \otimes \mathcal{H}_{Y^{[t]\setminus[j]}} \otimes \mathcal{H}_{\hat{Y}^{[t]\setminus[j]}}$ be isometries¹⁸ such that for $\rho' = (U' \otimes V')\rho(U' \otimes V')^\dagger$, we have $X^{[t]\setminus[j]}Y^{[t]\setminus[j]}$ classical (with copies $\hat{X}^{[t]\setminus[j]}\hat{Y}^{[t]\setminus[j]}$ respectively) and for every $i \in [t]$ either $\Pr(X \neq X^i)_{\rho'} = 1$ or $\Pr(Y \neq Y^i)_{\rho'} = 1$. Notice the state ρ' is a $(t; k_1, k_2)$ -qnm-state. Since $t\text{-}2\text{nmExt}$ is a $(t; k_1, k_2, \varepsilon)$ -quantum secure (see Definition 14), we have

$$\|\rho'_{SS^{[t]}XX^{[t]}M'} - U_m \otimes \rho'_{S^{[t]}XX^{[t]}M'}\|_1 \leq \varepsilon \quad ; \quad \|\rho'_{SS^{[t]}YY^{[t]}M'} - U_m \otimes \rho'_{S^{[t]}YY^{[t]}M'}\|_1 \leq \varepsilon,$$

where $S^i = t\text{-}2\text{nmExt}(X^i, Y^i)$. Using Fact 5, we get

$$\|\rho'_{SS^{[j]}XX^{[j]}M'} - U_m \otimes \rho'_{S^{[j]}XX^{[j]}M'}\|_1 \leq \varepsilon \quad ; \quad \|\rho'_{SS^{[j]}YY^{[j]}M'} - U_m \otimes \rho'_{S^{[j]}YY^{[j]}M'}\|_1 \leq \varepsilon.$$

¹⁷It is easily seen that such isometries exists.

¹⁸It is easily seen that such isometries exists.




Figure 3: Analysis of a quantum secure one-many non-malleable code in the split-state model

Noting $\rho'_{XX^{[t]}N'M'YY^{[t]}} = \rho_{XX^{[t]}N'M'YY^{[t]}}$, we finally get

$$\|\rho_{SS^{[t]}XX^{[t]}M'} - U_m \otimes \rho_{S^{[t]}XX^{[t]}M'}\|_1 \leq \varepsilon \quad ; \quad \|\rho_{SS^{[t]}YY^{[t]}M'} - U_m \otimes \rho_{S^{[t]}YY^{[t]}M'}\|_1 \leq \varepsilon.$$

□

Theorem 8 (Quantum secure one-many non-malleable code in the split-state model). *Let $t\text{-}2\text{nmExt} : \{0, 1\}^n \times \{0, 1\}^n \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^m$ be a $(t; n - k, n - k, \varepsilon)$ -quantum secure 2-source t -non-malleable extractor. There exists a $(t; m, n, \varepsilon')$ -quantum secure one-many non-malleable code with parameter $\varepsilon' = 2^m((2^{-k} + \varepsilon)2^{2t} + \varepsilon)$.*

Proof. The proof proceeds in similar lines of Theorem 5. We do not repeat the entire argument but provide the necessary details required to complete the proof.

Let $\mathcal{A} = (U, V, \psi)$ be the quantum split-state adversary from Definition 15. We show that the encoding based on $t\text{-}2\text{nmExt}$ is a $(t; m, n, \varepsilon')$ -quantum secure one-many non-malleable code. Using arguments similar to Theorem 5, it suffices to prove

$$\|\rho'_{S_1S^{[t]}} - U_m \text{copy}^{(t)}(\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{A}}, U_m)\|_1 \leq (2^{-k} + \varepsilon)2^{2t},$$

where ρ' is the pure state as in Figure 3 after the action of adversary \mathcal{A} on state θ . Note $S^i = t\text{-}2\text{nmExt}(X^i, Y^i)$ and state $\theta_{X\hat{X}X_1Y\hat{Y}Y_1} = \theta_{X\hat{X}X_1} \otimes \theta_{Y\hat{Y}Y_1}$ is a pure state such that $\theta_X = \theta_Y = U_n$, (X_1, \hat{X}) are copies of X , (Y_1, \hat{Y}) are copies of Y respectively.¹⁹ In the Figure 3, with some abuse of notation, we used $\text{Dec}^{[t]}$ to denote $\text{Dec}(X^i, Y^i) = S^i$ performed for every $i \in [t]$.

¹⁹It is easily seen such state exists.

Let ρ' be the final pure state after we generate t -bit classical registers C, D (with copies \hat{C}, \hat{D} respectively) such that $C_i = 1$ indicates $X_1 \neq X^i$ in state ρ' and $D_i = 1$ indicates $Y_1 \neq Y^i$ in state ρ' for every $i \in [t]$.

Using similar arguments as in Theorem 5, one can note that the state ρ' is an (n, n) -qma-state. For $C = c \in \{0, 1\}^t, D = d \in \{0, 1\}^t$, denote $\mathcal{S}^{c,d} = \{i \in [t] : (c_i = 1) \vee (d_i = 1)\}$ and $\rho'^{c,d} = \rho' | ((C, D) = (c, d))$.

For every $c, d \in \{0, 1\}^t$, let $\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{A}}^{c,d} = \mathcal{D}_{(U,V,\psi)}^{c,d} = (\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{A},1}^{c,d}, \dots, \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{A},t}^{c,d})$, where $\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{A},j}^{c,d} = \rho'_{t-2\text{nmExt}(X^j, Y^j)}'^{c,d}$ for $j \in \mathcal{S}^{c,d}$ and $\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{A},j}^{c,d}$ be the distribution that is deterministically equal to same otherwise. Let $\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{A}} = \sum_{c,d \in \{0,1\}^t} \Pr((C, D) = (c, d))_{\rho'} \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{A}}^{c,d}$. Note for every $c, d \in \{0, 1\}^t$, the value $\Pr((C, D) = (c, d))_{\rho'}$ depends only on (U, V, ψ) . Note

$$\rho'_{S_1 S^{[t]}} = \sum_{c,d \in \{0,1\}^t} \Pr((C, D) = (c, d))_{\rho'} \rho'_{S_1 S^{[t]}}'^{c,d}, \quad (36)$$

and

$$Z\text{copy}^{(t)}(\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{A}}, Z) = \sum_{c,d \in \{0,1\}^t} \Pr((C, D) = (c, d))_{\rho'} Z\text{copy}^{(t)}(\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{A}}^{c,d}, Z), \quad (37)$$

where $Z = U_m$.

Claim 11. For every $c, d \in \{0, 1\}^t$, we have

$$\Pr((C, D) = (c, d))_{\rho'} \|\rho'_{S_1 S^{[t]}}'^{c,d} - Z\text{copy}^{(t)}(\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{A}}^{c,d}, Z)\|_1 \leq 2^{-k} + \varepsilon,$$

where $Z = U_m$.

Proof. Fix $c, d \in \{0, 1\}^t$. Suppose $\Pr((C, D) = (c, d))_{\rho'} \leq 2^{-k}$, then we are done. Thus we assume otherwise. Note $\mathcal{S}^{c,d}$ is empty only when $(c, d) = (0^t, 0^t)$.

First let $\mathcal{S}^{c,d} = \{i_1, \dots, i_j\}$ be non-empty. Using arguments similar to Claim 4 involving Fact 17 and noting that state ρ' is an (n, n) -qma-state, we get that $\rho'^{c,d}$ is a $(j; n-k, n-k)$ -qnm-state. Using Claim 10 to note $t-2\text{nmExt}$ is also $(j; n-k, n-k, \varepsilon)$ -quantum secure for any positive integer $j \leq t$ and using Fact 5, we have

$$\|\rho'_{S_1 S^{i_1} \dots S^{i_j}}'^{c,d} - U_m \otimes \rho'_{S_1 S^{i_1} \dots S^{i_j}}'^{c,d}\|_1 \leq \varepsilon. \quad (38)$$

For any $p \in [t] \setminus \mathcal{S}^{c,d}$, we have $\rho'_{S_1^p}'^{c,d} = \rho'_{S^p}'^{c,d}$. Thus from Eq. (38) and using Fact 5, we have

$$\|\rho'_{S_1 S^{[t]}}'^{c,d} - Z\text{copy}^{(t)}(\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{A}}^{c,d}, Z)\|_1 \leq \varepsilon.$$

For $(c, d) = (0^t, 0^t)$, the proof follows noting $\rho'^{c,d}$ is an $(n-k, n-k)$ -qma-state and using Claim 9 along with Fact 5. \square

Consider,

$$\begin{aligned} & \|\rho'_{S_1 S^{[t]}} - Z\text{copy}^{(t)}(\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{A}}, Z)\|_1 \\ &= \left\| \sum_{c,d \in \{0,1\}^t} \Pr((C, D) = (c, d))_{\rho'} \rho'_{S_1 S^{[t]}}'^{c,d} - Z\text{copy}^{(t)}(\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{A}}, Z) \right\|_1 \quad (\text{Eq. (36)}) \\ &\leq \sum_{c,d \in \{0,1\}^t} \Pr((C, D) = (c, d))_{\rho'} \|\rho'_{S_1 S^{[t]}}'^{c,d} - Z\text{copy}^{(t)}(\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{A}}^{c,d}, Z)\|_1 \quad (\text{Eq. (37) and Fact 7}) \\ &\leq (2^{-k} + \varepsilon) 2^{2t} \quad (\text{Claim 11}). \end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof. \square

A.2 A quantum secure modified 2-source t -non-malleable extractor

We modify the construction of t -2nmExt from [BJK21], using ideas from [CGL20] to construct a new- t -2nmExt : $\{0, 1\}^n \times \{0, 1\}^n \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^m$ that is $(n - n_1, n - n_1, \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon))$ -secure against qnm-adv for parameters $n_1 = n^{\Omega(1)}$, $m = n^{1-\Omega(1)}$, $t = n^{\Omega(1)}$ and $\varepsilon = 2^{-n^{\Omega(1)}}$.

Parameters

Let $\delta, \delta_1, \delta_2, \delta_3 > 0$ be small enough constants such that $\delta_1 < \delta_2$. Let $n, n_1, n_2, n_3, n_4, n_5, n_6, n_7, n_x, n_y, a, s, b, h, t$ be positive integers and $\varepsilon', \varepsilon > 0$ such that:

$$n_1 = n^{\delta_2} \quad ; \quad n_2 = n - 3n_1 \quad ; \quad q = 2^{\log(n+1)} \quad ; \quad \varepsilon = 2^{-\mathcal{O}(n^{\delta_1})} \quad ;$$

$$n_3 = \frac{n_1}{10} \quad ; \quad n_4 = \frac{n_2}{\log(n+1)} \quad ; \quad n_5 = n^{\delta_2/3} \quad ; \quad a = 6n_1 + 2n_5 \log(n+1) = \mathcal{O}(n_1) \quad ;$$

$$n_6 = 3n_1^3 \quad ; \quad n_7 = n - 3n_1 - n_6 \quad ; \quad n_x = \frac{n_7}{12a} \quad ; \quad n_y = \frac{n_7}{12a} \quad ; \quad 2^{\mathcal{O}(a)} \sqrt{\varepsilon'} = \varepsilon \quad ;$$

$$s = \mathcal{O}\left(\log^2\left(\frac{n}{\varepsilon'}\right) \log n\right) \quad ; \quad b = \mathcal{O}\left(\log^2\left(\frac{n}{\varepsilon'}\right) \log n\right) \quad ; \quad t \leq n^{\delta_3} \quad ; \quad h = 10ts$$

- IP_1 be $\text{IP}_{2^{n_3}}^{3n_1/n_3}$,
- Ext_1 be $(2b, \varepsilon')$ -quantum secure (n_y, s, b) -extractor,
- Ext_2 be $(2s, \varepsilon')$ -quantum secure (h, b, s) -extractor,
- Ext_3 be $(4h, \varepsilon')$ -quantum secure $(n_x, b, 2h)$ -extractor,
- Ext_4 be $(n_y/4t, \varepsilon^2)$ -quantum secure $(4n_y, 2h, n_y/8t)$ -extractor,
- IP_2 be $\text{IP}_{2^{2h}}^{3n_1^3/2h}$,
- Ext_6 be $(\frac{n_x}{2t}, \varepsilon^2)$ -quantum secure $(4n_x, n_y/8t, n_x/4t)$ -extractor.

Definition of 2-source t -non-malleable extractor

The following theorem shows that the function new- t -2nmExt as defined in Algorithm 4 is $(t; n - n_1, n - n_1, \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon))$ -secure against qnm-adv by noting that $S = \text{new-}t\text{-2nmExt}(X, Y)$ and $S^i = \text{new-}t\text{-2nmExt}(X^i, Y^i)$ for every $i \in [t]$. Note that 2AdvCB in Algorithm 4 is same as the one in Algorithm 2 except for parameters and extractors which are to be used as mentioned in this section.

Algorithm 4 : $\text{new-}t\text{-}2\text{nmExt} : \{0, 1\}^n \times \{0, 1\}^n \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^{n_x/4t}$

Input: X, Y

1. Advice generator:

$$X_1 = \text{Crop}(X, 1, 3n_1) \quad ; \quad Y_1 = \text{Crop}(Y, 1, 3n_1) \quad ; \quad R = \text{IP}_1(X_1, Y_1) \quad ;$$

$$X_2 = \text{Crop}(X, 3n_1 + 1, n) \quad ; \quad Y_2 = \text{Crop}(Y, 3n_1 + 1, n) \quad ;$$

$$G = X_1 \circ \bar{X}_2 \circ Y_1 \circ \bar{Y}_2 = X_1 \circ \text{ECC}(X_2)_{\text{Samp}(R)} \circ Y_1 \circ \text{ECC}(Y_2)_{\text{Samp}(R)}$$

2. $X_3 = \text{Crop}(X, 3n_1 + 1, 3n_1 + n_6) \quad ; \quad Y_3 = \text{Crop}(Y, 3n_1 + 1, 3n_1 + n_6) \quad ; \quad Z^1 = \text{IP}_2(X_3, Y_3)$

3. $X_4 = \text{Crop}(X, 3n_1 + n_6 + 1, n) \quad ; \quad Y_4 = \text{Crop}(Y, 3n_1 + n_6 + 1, n)$

4. Correlation breaker with advice: $F = 2\text{AdvCB}(Y_4, X_4, Z^1, G)$

5. $X^{a+1} = \text{Crop}(X_4, 4n_x a + 1, 4n_x a + 4n_x)$

6. $S = \text{Ext}_6(X^{a+1}, F)$

Output: S

Theorem 9 (Security of $\text{new-}t\text{-}2\text{nmExt}$). *Let $\rho_{XX^{[t]}\hat{X}\hat{X}^{[t]}YY^{[t]}\hat{Y}\hat{Y}^{[t]}M}$ be a $(t; n-n_1, n-n_1)$ -qnm-state. Then,*

$$\|\rho_{SS^{[t]}YY^{[t]}M} - U_{n_x/4t} \otimes \rho_{S^{[t]}YY^{[t]}M}\|_1 \leq \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon).$$

Proof. The proof proceeds in similar lines to the proof of Theorem 9 in [BJK21] using Fact 21 for alternating extraction argument, Fact 22 for bounding the min-entropy required in alternating extraction and Facts 14, 19 for the security of inner-product function in (k_1, k_2) -qma-state framework, Fact 4 for relation between Δ_B, Δ and we do not repeat it. \square

Efficiently sampling from the preimage of $\text{new-}t\text{-}2\text{nmExt}$

Theorem 10. *Let $\text{new-}t\text{-}2\text{nmExt} : \{0, 1\}^n \times \{0, 1\}^n \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^{n_x/4t}$ be the 2-source t -non-malleable extractor from Algorithm 4. Let (Enc, Dec) be the encoding and decoding based on $\text{new-}t\text{-}2\text{nmExt}$. Let $\hat{S}\text{Enc}(\hat{S}) = \hat{S}\hat{X}\hat{Y}$ for a uniform message $\hat{S} = U_{n_x/4t}$. There exists an efficient algorithm that can sample from a distribution $\tilde{S}\tilde{X}\tilde{Y}$ such that $\|\tilde{S}\tilde{X}\tilde{Y} - \hat{S}\hat{X}\hat{Y}\|_1 \leq \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon)$ and $\tilde{S} = U_{n_x/4t}$.*

Proof. The proof follows similarly to that of Theorem 7 and we do not repeat it. \square

We have the following corollary.

Corollary 3. *Let $0 < \delta_4 + \delta_3 < \delta_1$ and $m' = n^{\delta_4}$ be an integer. Let $\text{new-}t\text{-}2\text{nmExt} : \{0, 1\}^n \times \{0, 1\}^n \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^m$ be the quantum secure 2-source t -non-malleable extractor from Algorithm 4, where $m = n_x/4t$. Let $2\text{nmExt} : \{0, 1\}^n \times \{0, 1\}^n \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^{m'}$ be such that $2\text{nmExt}(X, Y)$ is same as $\text{new-}t\text{-}2\text{nmExt}(X, Y)$ truncated to first m' bits. Let (Enc, Dec) be the encoding and decoding based on 2nmExt . Let $\hat{S}\text{Enc}(\hat{S}) = \hat{S}\hat{X}\hat{Y}$ for a uniform message $\hat{S} = U_{m'}$. There exists an efficient algorithm that can sample from a distribution $\tilde{S}\tilde{X}\tilde{Y}$ such that $\tilde{S} = U_{m'}$ and for every $s \in \{0, 1\}^{m'}$, we have $\|(\tilde{X}\tilde{Y})|(\tilde{S} = s) - (\hat{X}\hat{Y})|(\hat{S} = s)\|_1 \leq \mathcal{O}(2^{m'}\varepsilon) \leq 2^{-n^{\Omega(1)}}$.*

B A quantum secure non-malleable secret sharing scheme

Secret sharing is a fundamental primitive in cryptography where a dealer encodes a secret/message into shares and distributes among many parties. Only the authorized subsets of parties should be able to recover the initial secret. Most well known secret sharing schemes are the so called t -out-of- n secret sharing schemes where at least t -parties are required to decode the secret [Sha79, Bla79]. In this paper, we focus only on 2-out-of-2 secret sharing schemes.

Recently non-malleable secret sharing schemes are introduced by Goyal and Kumar [GK18a] with the additional guarantee that when the adversary tampers with possibly all the shares of the secret independently, then the reconstruction procedure outputs original secret or something that is unrelated to the original secret.

In this paper, in addition, we allow the adversary to make use of arbitrary entanglement to tamper the shares. We then require the reconstruction procedure to output original secret or something that is unrelated to the original secret. We call such secret sharing schemes as quantum secure non-malleable secret sharing schemes. We show that quantum secure non-malleable codes in the split-state model gives rise to quantum secure 2-out-of-2 non-malleable secret sharing schemes.

We consider an encoding and decoding scheme (Enc, Dec) where $\text{Enc}(S) = (X, Y)$. Here $S \sim U_m$ (U_m is uniform distribution on m bits) represents the secret/message and $X, Y \in \{0, 1\}^n$ are the two shares/parts of the codeword. Enc is a randomized function and $\text{Dec}(X, Y)$ is a deterministic function, such that $\Pr(\text{Dec}(\text{Enc}(S)) = S) = 1$. Let \mathcal{F} denote the set of all functions $f : \{0, 1\}^n \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^n$.

Definition 17 (2-out-of-2 non-malleable secret sharing scheme [GK18a]). (Enc, Dec) is an $(m, n, \varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2)$ -2-out-of-2 non-malleable secret sharing scheme, if

- **statistical privacy:** for any two secrets $s_1, s_2 \in \{0, 1\}^m$, it holds that

$$\|X_{s_1} - X_{s_2}\|_1 \leq \varepsilon_1 \quad ; \quad \|Y_{s_1} - Y_{s_2}\|_1 \leq \varepsilon_1,$$

where $(X_{s_1}, Y_{s_1}) = \text{Enc}(s_1)$ and $(X_{s_2}, Y_{s_2}) = \text{Enc}(s_2)$

- **non-malleability:** for every $f = (g_1, g_2) \in \mathcal{F} \times \mathcal{F}$, there exists a random variable $\mathcal{D}_f = \mathcal{D}_{(g_1, g_2)}$ on $\{0, 1\}^m \cup \{\text{same}\}$ which is independent of the randomness in Enc such that for all secrets $s \in \{0, 1\}^m$, it holds that

$$\|\text{Dec}(f(\text{Enc}(s))) - \text{copy}(\mathcal{D}_f, s)\|_1 \leq \varepsilon_2,$$

where the function $\text{copy}(x, s)$ is such that $\text{copy}(x, s) = s$ if $x = \text{same}$, otherwise $\text{copy}(x, s) = x$.

Definition 18 (Quantum secure 2-out-of-2 non-malleable secret sharing scheme). (Enc, Dec) is an $(m, n, \varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2)$ -quantum secure 2-out-of-2 non-malleable secret sharing scheme, if

- **statistical privacy:** is as defined in Definition 17
- **non-malleability:** for state ρ and adversary $\mathcal{A} = (U, V, \psi)$ (as defined in Definition 2), there exists a random variable $\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{A}}$ ²⁰ on $\{0, 1\}^m \cup \{\text{same}\}$ such that

$$\forall s \in \{0, 1\}^m : \quad \|S'_s - \text{copy}(\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{A}}, s)\|_1 \leq \varepsilon_2.$$

Above $S' = \text{Dec}(X', Y')$, $S'_s = (S' | S = s)$ and the function copy is as defined in Definition 17.

²⁰Distribution depends only on \mathcal{A} and is independent of the original secret S .

Fact 23 (Lemma 6.1 in [ADKO15]). *Let (Enc, Dec) be an (m, n, ε) -non-malleable code in the split-state model. Then, for any two messages $u, v \in \{0, 1\}^m$, it holds that*

$$\|X_u - X_v\|_1 \leq 2\varepsilon \quad ; \quad \|Y_u - Y_v\|_1 \leq 2\varepsilon,$$

where $(X_u, Y_u) = \text{Enc}(u)$ and $(X_v, Y_v) = \text{Enc}(v)$.

Remark. *Since a quantum secure non-malleable code is also a classical non-malleable code in the split-state model, the above fact also applies for quantum secure non-malleable code in the split-state model.*

Corollary 4. *Let (Enc, Dec) be an (m, n, ε) -quantum secure non-malleable code in the split-state model. Then, (Enc, Dec) is also an $(m, n, 2\varepsilon, \varepsilon)$ -quantum secure 2-out-of-2 non-malleable secret sharing scheme.*

Proof. Statistical privacy follows from the Fact 23. Non-malleability property follows from the Definition 3 of quantum secure non-malleable code in the split-state model. \square