

# MORE EFFICIENT DISHONEST MAJORITY SECURE COMPUTATION OVER $\mathbb{Z}_{2^k}$ VIA GALOIS RINGS

Read at [ia.cr/2022/815](https://ia.cr/2022/815)

---

Daniel Escudero<sup>1</sup>, Chaoping Xing<sup>2</sup> and Chen Yuan<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>J.P. Morgan AI Research, New York, USA.

<sup>2</sup>Shanghai Jiao Tong University, Shanghai, China

# Introduction

# Secure Multiparty Computation (MPC)

- Consider  $n$  parties  $P_1, \dots, P_n$  with **private inputs**  $x_1, \dots, x_n$
- They wish to **compute** a function  $z = f(x_1, \dots, x_n)$  **without** a trusted third party.
- Even if an adversary **actively corrupts**  $n - 1$  out of the  $n$  parties (**dishonest majority**), the input of the remaining **honest party** is kept private.

The function  $f$  is usually described as an **arithmetic circuit** over some **finite ring**.

Typical choice of ring:  $\mathbb{Z}_M$ , the ring of integers modulo  $M$ .

- If  $M$  is large enough, arithmetic over the **integers**  $\mathbb{Z}$  can be “emulated”
- **Binary computation** is achieved by taking  $M = 2$ .

**Finite fields** (*i.e.* obtained when  $M$  is a **prime**) is good for protocol design

- Every **non-zero** element is **invertible**

Taking  $M = 2^k$  has **advantages** (some of which have been verified experimentally in (Damgård *et al.*, S&P'19)):

- Reducing modulo  $2^k$ —for certain values of  $k$  like 32 or 64—comes **for free** in modern **computer architectures**.
- $\mathbb{Z}_{2^k}$  is “more **compatible**” with **binary computation**.

But  $\mathbb{Z}_{2^k}$  has **disadvantages** with respect to **finite fields**:

- **Non-invertible** elements
- **Zero divisors** (e.g.  $2^{k-1} \cdot 2 = 0$  in this ring)

## Previous Protocols for Finite Fields (Dish. Majority)

- BeDOZa (Bendlin *et al.*, EC'11)
- SPDZ (Damgård *et al.*, CRYPTO'12 and ESORICS'13)
- MASCOT (Keller *et al.*, CCS'16)
- Overdrive (Keller *et al.*, EC'18)
- TopGear (Baum *et al.*, SAC'19)
- LeMans (Rachuri and Scholl, CRYPTO'22)

They all use **additive secret-sharing** with **MACs** with preprocessed **multiplication triples**.

## Previous Protocols for $\mathbb{Z}_{2^k}$ (Dish. Majority)

For  $k \geq 1$ :

- SPD $\mathbb{Z}_{2^k}$  (Cramer *et al.*, CRYPTO'18)
- Improved Multiplication Triple Generation (Rathee *et al.*, CANS'19)
- Mon $\mathbb{Z}_a$  (Catalano *et al.*, PKC'20)
- Overdrive2k (Orsini *et al.*, RSA'22)
- MH2k (Cheon *et al.*, CRYPTO'21)

They all use the “SPDZ2k trick”: work over a larger ring  $\mathbb{Z}_{2^{k+s}}$

For  $k = 1$  (i.e. **binary computation**):

- TinyOT (Nielsen *et al.*, CRYPTO'12)
- MiniMAC (Damgård and Zakarias, TCC'13)
- Committed MPC (Frederiksen *et al.*, PKC'18)
- Secret-Sharing Based MPC Protocol (Cascudo and Gundersen, TCC'20)

**Note:** Most of the finite-field-based protocols work for  $\mathbb{Z}_2 = \mathbb{F}_2$ .



Our Work

We present a **dishonest majority** MPC protocol over the **ring**  $\mathbb{Z}_{2^k}$  with good **communication trade-offs** with respect to previous works.

Main technical insights:

- Novel use of **Galois rings** in the dishonest majority setting
- Novel use of **RMFEs** that does not require re-encoding rounds
- Novel use of **MFES** to achieve OLE over ring extensions.

Our protocol, unlike  $\text{SPD}\mathbb{Z}_{2^k}$ , also works for  $k = 1$  (*i.e.* **binary computation**)

## Communication: Offline Phase

Total **offline communication** divided by  $n(n - 1)$

Protocol	Offline phase	$s = 64$
<b>This work</b>	$8161.6 \cdot k$	$5142.5 \cdot k$
SPD $\mathbb{Z}_2^k$	$2(k + 2s)(4k + 9s)$	$2(k + 128)(4k + 576)$
Cascudo <i>et al.</i> (for $k = 1$ )	$462.21 \cdot \ell$	9706.41

For example, for  $k = 32$  and  $s = 64$ , our protocol uses  $\approx 73\%$  the communication of SPD $\mathbb{Z}_2^k$ .

## Communication: Online Phase

Total **online communication** divided by  $(n - 1)$

	Online phase	$s = 64$	$s = 128$
<b>This work</b>	$19.68 \cdot k$	$12.4 \cdot k$	$12.84 \cdot k$
SPD $\mathbb{Z}_{2^k}$	$4(k + s)$	$4(k + 64)$	$4(k + 128)$
Cascudo <i>et al.</i> (for $k = 1$ )	—	10.2	10.42

For example, for  $s = 64$  and  $k = 32$  our protocol has around the same complexity as SPD $\mathbb{Z}_{2^k}$ , but for  $k = 16$  our protocol uses  $\approx 62\%$  the communication of SPD $\mathbb{Z}_{2^k}$ .

## Technical Details

A **Galois ring** is a degree- $d$  extension of the ring  $\mathbb{Z}_{2^k}$ , namely  $R = \mathbb{Z}_{2^k}[x]/(f(x))$ , where  $f(x)$  is a degree- $d$  irreducible polynomial over  $\mathbb{Z}_{2^k}$ .

Previously used in **honest majority** protocols to achieve Shamir secret-sharing over  $\mathbb{Z}_{2^k}$ .

Ours is the **first use** of **Galois rings** in the **dishonest majority** setting.

## Important property of Galois rings

Given uniformly random  $\alpha \in R$  and  $\delta, \epsilon \in R$  where  $\delta \neq 0$ , the probability of  $\delta \cdot \alpha = \epsilon$  is  $\leq 2^{-d}$ .

This property enables **MPC over the extension ring**  $R$  following templates from previous works:

- **Secret-share** an element  $x \in R$  as  $\langle x \rangle = (\llbracket x \rrbracket, \llbracket \alpha \rrbracket, \llbracket x \cdot \alpha \rrbracket)$ .
  - $\llbracket \cdot \rrbracket$  denotes **additive secret-sharing** over  $R$ .
- **Additions** are local.
- For **multiplications**, preprocess **Beaver triples**  $(\langle a \rangle, \langle b \rangle, \langle c \rangle)$ .
- Use the **AMD code** to verify reconstructions are **correct**.

## From MPC over $R$ to MPC over $\mathbb{Z}_{2^k}$

**Elements** in  $R$  can be seen as **polynomials** of degree  $\leq d - 1$  over  $\mathbb{Z}_{2^k}$

We can obtain **MPC over the base ring**  $\mathbb{Z}_{2^k}$  by first instantiating MPC over  $R$  and then **encoding**  $x \in \mathbb{Z}_{2^k}$  as a **constant polynomial** in  $R$ .

- **Wasteful** in terms of **communication!**



## Reverse Multiplication-Friendly Embeddings (RMFEs)

An **RMFE** is a pair  $(\phi, \psi)$  where  $\phi : \mathbb{Z}_{2^k}^\ell \rightarrow R$  and  $\psi : R \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_{2^k}^\ell$  are  $\mathbb{Z}_{2^k}$ -linear maps, such that for every  $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{Z}_{2^k}^\ell$ :

$$\mathbf{x} \star \mathbf{y} = \psi(\phi(\mathbf{x}) \cdot_R \phi(\mathbf{y})).$$

**Main idea:** Multiplication over  $R$  can be used to instantiate  $\ell$  **simultaneous** computations over  $\mathbb{Z}_{2^k}$ .

- We can take  $d \approx 4.92 \cdot \ell$  (Cramer *et al.*, CRYPTO'21), so **no communication overhead** (asymptotically)!

## Encoding vectors

Secret-share a vector  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{Z}_{2^k}^\ell$  by secret-sharing  $\langle \mathbf{x} \rangle$ , where  $x \in R$  is **any** element such that  $\psi(x) = \mathbf{x}$ .

Proposed in (Abspoel *et al.*, ASIACRYPT'21) in the **honest majority** setting, used in **our work** in the **dishonest majority** scenario.

**Better** than the approach in (Cascardo and Gundersen, TCC'20)

## Fact

**Secure multiplication** is possible by preprocessing **quintuples**

$$(\langle a \rangle, \langle b \rangle, \langle \phi \circ \psi(a) \rangle, \langle \phi \circ \psi(b) \rangle, \langle \phi \circ \psi(a) \cdot \phi \circ \psi(b) \rangle).$$

OLE over the Galois Ring  $R$

# OLE Functionality

(Important **building block** for our preprocessing)

Given **two parties**  $P$  and  $Q$ :

- $P$  **inputs**  $a, b \in R$ ,  $Q$  **inputs**  $x \in R$
- $Q$  **receives**  $y = a \cdot x + b$ .

## Example: Finite Field Extensions

Consider the case  $k = 1$ , so  $R$  is a **field extension** of degree  $d$  of  $\mathbb{F}_2$ .

- **Write**  $x = \sum_{i=1}^d x_i \cdot \beta_i$  and  $a = \sum_{i=1}^d a_i \cdot \beta_i$ , where  $x_i, a_i \in \mathbb{F}_2$  and  $\{\beta_i\}_i$  is a  $\mathbb{F}_2$ -basis.
- **Write**  $a \cdot x = \sum_{i,j} (a_i \cdot x_j) \cdot (\beta_i \cdot \beta_j)$ .
- Use **Oblivious Transfer (OT)** for every term  $a_i \cdot x_j$ .

Requires  $d^2$  calls to OT!

Can be brought down to  $d$  calls using the **OT extension** protocol from (Keller *et al.*, CRYPTO'15)

## Question: What about the case $k > 1$ ?

The  $d^2$  approach still works, but it is not clear how to get **OLE** over the **extension ring**  $R$  while only using  $d$  calls to an **OLE functionality** over the **base ring**  $\mathbb{Z}_{2^k}$ .

- OT extension does not help

# Multiplication Friendly-Embeddings

An **MFE** is a pair  $(\rho, \mu)$  where  $\rho : \mathbb{Z}_{2^k}^t \rightarrow R$  and  $\mu : R \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_{2^k}^t$  are  $\mathbb{Z}_{2^k}$ -linear maps, such that for every  $x, y \in R$ :

$$x \cdot y = \rho(\mu(x) \star \mu(y)).$$

We can take  $t \approx 5.12 \cdot d$  (Cramer *et al.*, CRYPTO'21).

## OLE over $R$ from OLE over $\mathbb{Z}_{2^k}$ using MFEs

Recall goal. Given two parties  $P$  and  $Q$ :

- $P$  inputs  $a, b \in R$ ,  $Q$  inputs  $x \in R$
- $Q$  receives  $y = a \cdot x + b$ .

### Protocol with MFEs

- $P$  maps  $\mu(a)$  and  $\mu(b)$ , and  $Q$  maps  $\mu(x)$ .
- Run  $t$  OLE instances over the base ring  $\mathbb{Z}_{2^k}$  so that  $Q$  obtains  $\mu(a) \star \mu(x) + \mu(b)$
- $Q$  applies  $\rho$  to get  $\rho(\mu(a) \star \mu(x)) + \rho(\mu(b)) = a \cdot x + b$ .



Our **OLE protocol** for **extension rings** generalizes approaches that use **OT extension**.

Instead of requiring **quadratic** number of calls  $d^2$  to an **OLE** over the **base ring**  $\mathbb{Z}_{2^k}$ , a **linear**  $t = \Theta(d)$  numbers of calls is needed.

Possible **applications** whenever **OLE** over **ring extensions** is needed.

Offline Phase

# Authenticating values

We design a method to **promote** an **unauthenticated** value  $\llbracket x \rrbracket$  to **authenticated**  $\langle x \rangle$  (possibly adding errors).

- Requires **OLE** over the **Galois ring**  $R$
- The **adversary** can **introduce** certain **errors** that may **not** be **detected**
- We show that, even in that case, inputs can be **“extracted”** (which ensures correct **simulation**)

See **full paper** for details.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>We also address a bug found in a similar proof in MASCOT and (Casudo and Gundersen, TCC'20)

## Generating $(\langle a \rangle, \langle b \rangle, \langle \tau(a) \rangle, \langle \tau(b) \rangle, \langle \tau(a)\tau(b) \rangle)$

### 1. Obtain pairs $(\langle a \rangle, \langle \tau(a) \rangle)$ and $(\langle b \rangle, \langle \tau(b) \rangle)$

1. Obtain  $(\llbracket a \rrbracket, \llbracket \tau(a) \rrbracket)$  and  $(\llbracket b \rrbracket, \llbracket \tau(b) \rrbracket)$  **locally**
2. **Promote** them to  $(\langle a \rangle, \langle \tau(a) \rangle)$  and  $(\langle b \rangle, \langle \tau(b) \rangle)$
3. **Check for errors**

Generating  $(\langle a \rangle, \langle b \rangle, \langle \tau(a) \rangle, \langle \tau(b) \rangle, \langle \tau(a)\tau(b) \rangle)$

2. Use OLE to compute  $\llbracket \tau(a) \cdot \tau(b) \rrbracket$  from  $\llbracket \tau(a) \rrbracket$  and  $\llbracket \tau(b) \rrbracket$

Use OLE for the **cross-terms**

Generating  $(\langle a \rangle, \langle b \rangle, \langle \tau(a) \rangle, \langle \tau(b) \rangle, \langle \tau(a)\tau(b) \rangle)$

3. Authenticate  $[\tau(a) \cdot \tau(b)] \rightarrow \langle \tau(a) \cdot \tau(b) \rangle$

And then look for **errors** using a **cut-and-choose**-based check.

Efficient computations over **Galois ring** extensions

Better permutation techniques for **non-amortized computation**

Evaluate practicality of computing **RMFEs** and **MFEs**

Dishonest majority MPC over  $\mathbb{Z}_{2^k}$  with good communication trade-offs with respect to previous works.

Novel use of Galois rings

Novel use of RMFEs

Novel use of MFEs for OLE over ring extensions.

Also works for binary computation

THANK YOU!