

# TrollThrottle — Raising the Cost of Astroturfing

Ilkan Esiyok<sup>1</sup>, Lucjan Hanzlik<sup>2</sup>, Robert Künnemann<sup>1</sup>, Lena Marie Budde<sup>3</sup>, and Michael Backes<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> CISA Helmholtz Center for Information Security

<sup>2</sup> CISA Helmholtz Center for Information Security, Stanford University

<sup>3</sup> Saarland University

**Abstract.** Astroturfing, i.e., the fabrication of public discourse by private or state-controlled sponsors via the creation of fake online accounts, has become incredibly widespread in recent years. It gives a disproportionately strong voice to wealthy and technology-savvy actors, permits targeted attacks on public forums and could in the long run harm the trust users have in the internet as a communication platform.

Countering these efforts without deanonymising the participants has not yet proven effective; however, we can raise the cost of astroturfing. Following the principle ‘one person, one voice’, we introduce TrollThrottle, a protocol that limits the number of comments a single person can post on participating websites. Using direct anonymous attestation and a public ledger, the user is free to choose any nickname, but the number of comments is aggregated over all posts on all websites, no matter which nickname was used. We demonstrate the deployability of TrollThrottle by retrofitting it to the popular news aggregator website Reddit and by evaluating the cost of deployment for the scenario of a national newspaper (168k comments per day), an international newspaper (268k c/d) and Reddit itself (4.9M c/d).

## 1 Introduction

Astroturfing describes the practice of masking the sponsor of a message in order to give it the credibility of a message that originates from ‘grassroots’ participants (hence the name). Classic astroturfing involves paid agents fabricating false public opinion surroundings, e.g., some product. The anonymity of the cyberspace makes astroturfing very inexpensive; now, it can even be mechanised [36]. This form of astroturfing, also called ‘cyberturfing’, is a Sybil attack that exploits a useful, but sometimes fallible heuristic strategy in human cognition: roughly speaking, the more people claim something, the improved judgement of credibility [53, 54]. In the wake of the 2016 US elections, Twitter identified, ‘3,814 [...] accounts’ that could be linked to the Internet Research Agency (IRA), a purported Russian ‘troll factory’. These accounts ‘posted 175,993 Tweets, approximately 8.4% of which were election-related’ [70], which is likely only a fraction of the overall activity. This influence comes at a modest price, as the IRA had a \$1.25M budget in the run-up to the 2016 presidential election [4] and only 90 members of staff producing comments [28].

The everyday political discourse has also suffered. Many newspapers have succumbed under the weight of moderation, e.g., the New York Times [35]. Some newspapers decided to move discussion to social media [74], where they only moderate a couple of stories each day and leave out sensitive topics such as migration altogether [63]. Kumar et. al. show that many popular news pages have hundreds of active sock puppets, i.e., accounts controlled by individuals with at least one other account [52]. The New York Times, one of the largest newspapers worldwide, has put serious effort and technological skills into moderating discussion, but ultimately, they had to give up. In mid-2017, they reported how they employ modern text analysis techniques to cluster similar comments and moderate them in one go. At that point in time, they had 12 members of staff dedicated to moderation, handling a daily average of 12,000 comments [56]. Despite the effort and expertise put into this, they had to give up three months later, deactivating the commenting function on controversial topics [35].

In this paper, we propose a cryptographic protocol that permits throttling the number of comments that a single user can post on all participating websites *in total*. The goal is raising the cost of astroturfing: if the threshold is  $\tau$ , the cost of posting  $n$  comments is the cost of acquiring  $\lceil \frac{n}{\tau} \rceil$  identities, be it by employing personnel, by bribery or by identity theft. Our proposal retains the anonymity of users and provides accountability for censorship, i.e., if a user believes her comment ought to appear on the website, she can provide evidence that can be evaluated by the public to confirm misbehaviour on the part of the website. We took care to explicitly devise a clear system of incentives for all participating parties. Part of this system is a pseudo-random audit process to ensure honest behaviour, which we have formally verified.

We show that this protocol, TrollThrottle, can be retrofitted to existing websites. We set up a forum<sup>4</sup> on Reddit that demonstrates our proposal. We also compute the additional cost of operation incurred by our protocol by simulating user interaction for three real-life scenarios: an international newspaper, a nationwide publication and all comments posted on Reddit in one day. In the newspaper case, the computational overhead incurs a cost of about \$1.20; for the whole of Reddit, \$3.60 is sufficient.

As a by-product and second contribution, we extend the notion of direct anonymous attestation (DAA) by proposing two features with applications outside our protocol. Both are already supported by an existing DAA scheme by Brickell and Li [24]. First, updatability, which means that the issuer can non-interactively update the users' credentials. This allows for easy key rollover in the mobile setting and for implicit revocation of credentials by not updating them (old credentials invalidated). Second, instant linkability, which means that each signature contains a message-independent pseudonym that determines whether two signatures can be linked. This allows to efficiently determine whether a signature can be linked to any existing signature within a given set.

---

<sup>4</sup> <https://old.reddit.com/r/trollthrottle/>

*Paper structure:* We first define the problem and outline the approach in Section 2. In Section 3, we define the protocol in terms of a set of cryptographic algorithms, which we analyse for security in Section B. In Section 4, we consider caveats of implementing this system that are not covered in the cryptographic model: the incentive structure for the participants, who performs verification, etc. We evaluate our proposal (Section 5) and consider its impact on society (Section D). We conclude after discussing limitations (Section 6) and the related work (Section 7).

## 2 TrollThrottle

Despite text analysis techniques that can facilitate moderation, e.g., clustering [56], many local and international newspaper websites gave up on moderating and disabled commenting sections [35, 74]. Even if troll detection could be automated, e.g., via machine learning, as soon as the detection algorithm becomes available to attackers, numerous techniques permit the creation of adversarial examples [55] to evade classifiers. Fundamentally, astroturfing does not even rely on automated content generation and can be conducted by paid authors in countries with low labour cost: e.g., the so-called 50-cent party, a group of propagandists sponsored by China, was named after the remuneration they receive per comment [58].

Our approach is orthogonal to detection by content. If we can limit the number of messages to a certain threshold  $\tau$  that each physical person can send per day, bots become largely useless, and troll farms need to pay, bribe or steal identities from sufficiently many actual people to send messages in their name. Besides raising the cost, this also raises the probability of detecting larger operations. This approach comes at a cost for honest users, as it imposes a bound on power users, too. We will discuss this issue in-depth in Section D.

**Problem statement:** We want to establish a system that serves a set of websites  $W_1$  to  $W_n$  and that, for each user  $U$ , provides the following guarantees:

- I If the number of messages a user posts to *any* of the websites exceeds  $\tau$ , all subsequent messages should be discarded.
- II A user is free to choose a virtual identity of her choice for any comment. Her comments are unlinkable, even if one or more websites conspire against her.
- III A website should be accountable for censorship: should it choose not to display a comment, the user is able to provide a piece of verifiable evidence for the public that this comment was withheld, without revealing her identity.
- IV The trust placed in the organisation running the system should be limited. For each party in the system, there should be a clear incentive to participate.

We built our approach on direct anonymous attestation (DAA [21]). In DAA, an issuing party distributes membership credentials to signers (in our case users) that it considers legitimate. Each signer can prove membership by signing data:




Fig. 1: Approach

a valid DAA signature guarantees that a valid signer signed this data, but does not reveal the signer’s identity. DAA schemes can also be seen as group signature schemes that prevent the issuing party to identify the signer of the message, a feature known as *opening*.

To avoid a single point of trust, the identification of the user is not only a matter of the issuer, who is likely to be the provider of this service. Instead, an agreed upon set of verifiers establishes the legitimacy of users, i.e., that they are real people and that they have not received a DAA key before. We will discuss how the issuer and the verifiers keep each other honest in Section E.1. To provide accountability, a public ledger keeps records about the comments that websites ought to publish.

Thus, the following parties cooperate in TrollThrottle: an issuer  $I$ , who issues DAA keys, a set of verifiers  $V$ , who verify the users’ identities, a set of users  $U$ , who create DAA signatures of their comments, a public append-only ledger  $L$ , who records these signatures, and a set of websites, who verify these signatures and are bound to publish comments whose signatures exist on the ledger.

In DAA, a signature can be created and verified with respect to a so-called *basename*. Signatures created by the same user with the same basename can be linked. This is the key feature to achieve throttling. Within a commenting period  $t$ , e.g., a day, only signatures with a basename of the form  $(t, seq)$  are accepted, where  $seq$  is a sequence number between 1 and the desired threshold  $\tau$ . If a user signs two messages with the same basename, they can be linked and discarded by the website. Hence a user can create at most  $\tau$  signatures that are unlinkable to each other. A valid DAA signature assures the website that a valid user signed this comment, but neither the website, nor the issuer or the verifier learns who created the comment, or which other comments they created.

By storing the signatures on the ledger  $L$ , the websites (a) can enforce a global bound, and (b) provide accountability for censorship by promising to represent all comments addressed to this website that appear in the ledger. If a website does not publish a user’s comment, it must have sufficient grounds for censorship.

We build on Brickell and Li’s DAA scheme [24] for its efficiency, but extend it with various features to make TrollThrottle more efficient (see Appendix A), more secure (Section 3), more practical (Section 4), and more resistant against compromise (Section 4).

We assume the issuer  $I$  is known to all users and websites; the verifiers  $V$  are known to the issuer and all websites; and the public ledger  $L$  is known to all participants in the protocol. The ledger can be implemented using a consensus mechanism between the websites and some trusted representatives of civil society (e.g., via Tendermint [42] or PBFT [29]) or open consensus mechanisms like blockchains. We will formalise our approach in terms of PPT algorithms and an interactive protocol.

**V Definition 1 (Accountable commenting scheme).** *An accountable commenting scheme consists of a tuple of algorithms (Setup, KeyGen, Comment, Verify, Claim, VerifyClaim) and an interactive protocol (Join – Issue). The algorithms and the protocol are specified as follows.*

**Setup**( $1^\lambda$ ) models the generation of a setup parameter  $\rho$  used by all participants from the security parameter  $1^\lambda$ . This parameter is an implicit argument for the other algorithms, but we omit it for brevity. The issuer  $I$  invokes **KeyGen**( $\rho$ ) to generate its secret key  $sk_I$  and public key  $pk_I$  from this parameter.

The issuing procedure  $\langle \text{Join}(pk_I, U) \leftrightarrow \text{Issue}(sk_I, \text{ver}, U) \rangle$  is an interactive protocol between  $I$  and a new user (identified with  $U$ ) that has not registered so far. At the end of the protocol, the user receives a credential  $cred_U$  and a secret key  $sk_U$ . For now, we abstract away from the verifiers by giving the issuer access to a read-only database  $\text{ver}$  such that  $\text{ver}[V, U] \in \{0, 1\}$  is 1 iff the verifier  $V$  confirms the identity of a user. In Section 4, we present and verify a protocol to implement and audit this verification step.

The commenting procedure is split into four PPT algorithms, **Comment** for  $U$  to generate comments that she sends to the ledger, **Verify** for  $W$  to verify that a comment on the ledger should be displayed, **Claim** for  $U$  to generate a claim that a valid comment on the ledger ought to be published, and **VerifyClaim** for the public to verify that said claim is valid.

**Comment**( $pk_I, sk_U, cred_U, dom, m$ ) is executed by  $U$ , who knows the issuer’s public key  $pk_I$ , its own secret key  $sk_U$  and credentials  $cred_U$ .  $U$  chooses a basename  $dom \in \{0, 1\}^*$  and a message  $m \in \{0, 1\}^*$  and obtains a signed comment  $\gamma$  and a pseudonym  $nym$ , both of which she stores on the ledger. The basename determines a user’s  $nym$ , so that anyone can check whether two comments were submitted with the same basename by checking their respective nyms for equality. This is a key feature: in TrollThrottle, all basenames have to be of the form  $\langle t, i \rangle$  for a commenting period  $t$  and an integer  $i \in \{1, \dots, \tau\}$ . Hence there are at most  $\tau$  unique basenames within  $t$ , and thus at most  $\tau$  nyms per  $sk_U$  and  $t$ .

**Verify**( $pk_I, nym, dom, m, \gamma$ ) can be computed by any website that has access to the issuer’s public key  $pk_I$ , the comment on the ledger  $\gamma$ , pseudonym  $nym$ , domain  $dom$  (which can be determined by trial and error) and a message  $m \in \{0, 1\}^*$  received from the user. If the output is 1 and  $\gamma$  is valid w.r.t.  $m$ , the website  $W$  must display  $m$ . If  $W$  fails to do that, the user computes **Claim**( $pk_I, sk_U, cred_U, dom, m, \gamma$ ) on the same data as before. The output *evidence* can be publicly verified using the **VerifyClaim**( $pk_I, dom, m, \gamma, evidence$ ) algorithm. It outputs 1 iff *evidence* and the ledger entry  $\gamma$  prove that  $m$  ought to be displayed during the commenting period indicated by  $dom$ .

### 3 Protocol definition

Before we present TrollThrottle as an instance of an accountable commenting scheme, we introduce the necessary cryptographic notions.

We follow the DAA definition proposed in [24]. A DAA scheme consists of four PPT algorithms ( $\text{Setup}_{\text{DAA}}$ ,  $\text{Sign}_{\text{DAA}}$ ,  $\text{Verify}_{\text{DAA}}$ ,  $\text{Link}_{\text{DAA}}$ ) and an interactive protocol ( $\text{Join} - \text{Issue}_{\text{DAA}}$ ), between parties: an issuer  $I$ , a verifier  $V$  and a signer  $S$ . In our case, the websites take the role of the verifiers, and the users the role of the signer.

$\text{Setup}_{\text{DAA}}(1^\lambda)$  is run by  $I$ ; based on the security parameter  $1^\lambda$ , it computes the issuer's secret key  $sk_I$  and public key  $pk_I$ , including global public parameters.  $\text{Join} - \text{Issue}_{\text{DAA}}$  is an interactive protocol between  $I$  and  $S$  to provide credentials issued by  $I$  to  $S$ . It consists of sub-algorithms  $\text{Join}_{\text{DAA}}$  and  $\text{Issue}_{\text{DAA}}$ .  $S$  executes  $\text{Join}_{\text{DAA}}(pk_I, sk_S)$  on input  $pk_I$  and  $sk_S$  to obtain the commitment  $\text{com}$ .<sup>5</sup>  $I$  executes  $\text{Issue}_{\text{DAA}}(sk_I, \text{com})$  to create a credential  $cred_S$  that is associated with  $sk_S$  and sent to  $S$ . Note the key of  $S$  remains hidden from  $I$ .

$\text{Sign}_{\text{DAA}}(sk_S, cred_S, dom, m)$  is executed by  $S$  to create a signature  $\sigma$  for a message  $m$  w.r.t. a basename  $dom$ ,<sup>6</sup> which is optionally provided by  $V$ . If  $dom \neq \perp$ , signatures created by the same signer can be linked.

$\text{Verify}_{\text{DAA}}(pk_I, m, dom, \sigma, RL)$  is a deterministic algorithm run by  $V$  on a message  $m$ , a basename  $dom$ , a signature  $\sigma$ , and a revocation list  $RL$  to determine if a signature  $\sigma$  is valid. In [24],  $I$  stores revoked secret keys in the revocation list  $RL$ ; signatures created with a revoked secret key are not valid.

$\text{Link}_{\text{DAA}}(\sigma_0, \sigma_1)$  is a deterministic algorithm that determines with overwhelming probability whether signatures  $\sigma_0$  and  $\sigma_1$  were created by the same signer with the same basename  $dom \neq \perp$ . It outputs 1 if the signatures are linked, 0 for unlinked and  $\perp$  for invalid ones.

**DAA features** Brickell and Li's DAA scheme [24] has the following security properties (formally stated in Appendix F).

*Correctness*: if an honest signer's secret key is not in the revocation list  $RL$ , then, with overwhelming probability, signatures created by the signer are accepted and correctly linked by an honest verifier.

*User-controlled-anonymity*: a PPT adversary has a negligible advantage over guessing in a game where she has to distinguish whether two given signatures associated with different basenames were created by the same signer or two different signers.

<sup>5</sup> We slightly alter the original definition and assume that instead of sampling this key inside the algorithm,  $S$  provides the key as an input.

<sup>6</sup> In the original definition,  $\text{Sign}_{\text{DAA}}$  also takes as input a nonce  $n_V$ , which the signature verifier provides to prove freshness of the message. Brickell and Li make this nonce explicit but it can be part of the signed message. What's more, we will not make use of such a nonce in our system and assume that if freshness of a signature is required then this nonce will be part of the signed message.

*User-controlled-traceability:* no PPT adversary can forge a non-traceable yet valid signature with  $dom \neq \perp^7$  without knowing the secret key that was used to create the signature, or if her key is in the revocation list  $RL$ .

We add the following property (formally stated in Appendix A):

*Instant-linkability* There is a deterministic poly-time algorithm  $\text{NymGen}$  s.t.  $\text{NymGen}(sk_S, dom)$  generates a nym that is otherwise contained in the signature, and two nyms are equal iff the corresponding signatures are linkable.

*Zero-knowledge* The user creates non-interactive proofs of knowledge to show that her key was honestly generated. We highlight the notation here and refer to Appendix C.1 for the full security definitions. Let  $\mathcal{R}$  be an efficiently computable binary relation. For  $(x, w) \in \mathcal{R}$ , we call  $x$  a *statement* and  $w$  a *witness*. Moreover,  $L_{\mathcal{R}}$  denotes the language consisting of statements in  $\mathcal{R}$ , i.e.,  $L_{\mathcal{R}} = \{x \mid \exists w : (x, w) \in \mathcal{R}\}$ .

**Definition 2.** A non-interactive proof of knowledge system  $\Pi$  consists of the following three algorithms (Setup, CreateProof, VerifyProof).

**Setup( $1^\lambda$ ):** on input security parameter  $1^\lambda$ , this algorithm outputs a common reference string  $\rho$ .

**CreateProof( $\rho, x, w$ ):** on input common reference string  $\rho$ , statement  $x$  and witness  $w$ ; this algorithm outputs a proof  $\pi$ .

**VerifyProof( $\rho, x, \pi$ ):** on input common reference string  $\rho$ , statement  $x$  and proof  $\pi$ ; this algorithm outputs either 1 or 0.

*TrollThrottle* We will now present TrollThrottle in terms of an accountable commenting scheme (see Def. 1). Besides an instantly linkable DAA scheme, we assume a collision-resistant hash function  $h$  and a non-interactive proof of knowledge system for the relation:

$$((\text{com}, pk_{I,\text{DAA}}), (sk_{S,\text{DAA}})) \in \mathcal{R}_{\text{Join}} \iff \text{com} \stackrel{s}{\leftarrow} \text{Join}_{\text{DAA}}(pk_{I,\text{DAA}}, sk_{S,\text{DAA}}).$$

We assume that the witness for the statement  $(\text{com}, pk_{I,\text{DAA}})$  contains the random coins used in  $\text{Join}_{\text{DAA}}$ .

**Definition 3.** *TrollThrottle Protocol*

**Setup( $1^\lambda$ )** - compute the parameters for the zero-knowledge proof of knowledge  $\rho_{\text{Join}} \stackrel{s}{\leftarrow} \text{Setup}_{\text{ZK}}(1^\lambda)$  and output  $\rho = (1^\lambda, \rho_{\text{Join}})$ .

**KeyGen( $\rho$ )** - execute  $(pk_{I,\text{DAA}}, sk_{I,\text{DAA}}) \stackrel{s}{\leftarrow} \text{Setup}_{\text{DAA}}(1^\lambda)$ , set and return  $pk_I = pk_{I,\text{DAA}}$  and  $sk_I = (pk_{I,\text{DAA}}, sk_{I,\text{DAA}})$ .

**Join( $pk_I, sk_U, U$ )** - let  $pk_I = pk_{I,\text{DAA}}$  and  $sk_U = sk_{S,\text{DAA}}$ . Run  $\text{com} \stackrel{s}{\leftarrow} \text{Join}_{\text{DAA}}(pk_{I,\text{DAA}}, sk_{S,\text{DAA}})$  and compute proof  $\Pi_{\text{Join}} = \text{CreateProof}(\rho_{\text{Join}}, (\text{com}, pk_{I,\text{DAA}}), sk_{S,\text{DAA}})$ . Send  $(\text{com}, \Pi_{\text{Join}})$  to the issuer and receive  $\text{cred}_U$ . Return  $(\text{cred}_U, sk_U)$ .

<sup>7</sup> Note that basenames in TrollThrottle are always different from  $\perp$ , see Section 3.

**Issue**( $sk_I, \text{ver}, U$ ) - parse  $sk_I = (pk_{I,DAA}, sk_{I,DAA})$ . Receive  $(\text{com}, \Pi_{\text{Join}})$  from the User. Abort if the proof is invalid, i.e.,  $\text{VerifyProof}(\rho_{\text{Join}}, (\text{com}, pk_{I,DAA}), \Pi_{\text{Join}}) = 0$ . Otherwise, execute the **Issue<sub>DAA</sub>** protocol with input  $(\text{com}, sk_{I,DAA})$ , receiving credentials  $\text{cred}_U$ . Send  $\text{cred}_U$  to the user.

**Comment**( $pk_I, sk_U, \text{cred}_U, \text{dom}, m$ ) - set and return  $\gamma = (\sigma, \text{nym}, \text{dom}, h(m))$  where  $\sigma \xleftarrow{\$} \text{Sign}_{DAA}(sk_U, \text{cred}_U, \text{dom}, h(m))$  and  $\text{nym} \xleftarrow{\$} \text{NymGen}(sk_U, \text{dom}) = \text{NymExtract}(\sigma)$ .

**Verify**( $pk_I, \text{nym}, \text{dom}, m, \gamma$ ) - Parse  $\gamma = (\sigma, \text{nym}, \text{dom}, h^*)$  and  $pk_I = pk_{I,DAA}$ .  
 Output 1 iff
 

- $\text{Verify}_{DAA}(pk_{I,DAA}, h^*, \text{dom}, \sigma, RL_\emptyset) = 1$  and  $h(m) = h^*$ ,
- $\text{NymExtract}(\sigma) = \text{nym}$ , and
- $\text{VerifyBsn}(\sigma, \text{dom}) = 1$ .

**Claim**( $pk_I, sk_U, \text{cred}_U, \text{dom}, m, \gamma$ ) - return evidence =  $\gamma$ .

**VerifyClaim**( $pk_I, \text{dom}, m, \gamma, \text{evidence}$ ) - Parse  $\gamma = (\sigma, \text{nym}, \text{dom}, h)$  and output 1 iff  $\text{Verify}(pk_I, \text{nym}, \text{dom}, m, \gamma) = 1$ .

The algorithms **Setup** and **KeyGen** generate the issuer's DAA keys and parameters for the non-interactive zero-knowledge proof of knowledge for the relation  $\mathcal{R}_{\text{Join}}$ . The **Join** – **Issue** protocol closely resembles the **Join** – **Issue<sub>DAA</sub>** protocol of the DAA scheme with two main differences. Firstly, the user provides her secret key as input to the **Join** algorithm. This is for practical reasons: in Section 4, we explain how this key can be recomputed from a pair of login and password using a key derivation function when a user switches machines. The second difference is the  $\Pi_{\text{Join}}$  proof created by the user to ensure honestly generated secret keys and allow the security reduction to extract secret keys generated by the adversary. We remark that during the **Join** – **Issue** protocol, the user communicates with a publicly known verifier who validates her identity and confirms it to  $I$ . In Section 4, we present a protocol for obtaining this confirmation and running a pseudo-probabilistic audit of  $V$  by  $I$ .

**Comment** creates the information that  $U$  stores on the ledger, consisting of the signed comment  $\gamma$  and pseudonym  $\text{nym}$ . To provide accountability for censorship,  $U$  sends the signature to the ledger, which notifies the website  $W$ . At this point,  $W$  must publish the comment  $\gamma = (\sigma, \text{nym}, \text{dom}, m)$  as long as the signature  $\sigma$ , message and  $\text{dom}$  are deemed valid, and  $\text{nym}$  appears exactly once on the ledger.

With the validity requirement on the basename  $\text{dom}$  and the ability to detect repeated basenames in the ledger, we can easily implement the desired throttling mechanism. Let  $\tau$  be a threshold for some time frame (e.g., a day) and let  $t$  mark the current period. Then, a valid  $\text{dom}$  is of the form  $(t, \text{seq})$  with  $\text{seq} \in \{1, \dots, t\}$ . The sequence number  $\text{seq}$  in  $\text{dom}$  is allowed to arrive out-of-order, but it cannot be larger than  $\tau$ . The throttling is ensured because there exist only  $\tau$  valid basenames per commenting period and thus only  $\tau$  valid  $\text{nym}$  per  $(sk_U, \text{dom})$ .

If  $W$  refuses to publish the comment, then  $U$  can use **Claim** to claim censorship and provide the entry on the ledger  $\gamma$  and  $m$  as evidence to the public

that  $m$  ought to be displayed. The public checks the same conditions that  $W$  should have applied. Part of this check is to interpret a common agreement for moderation, which we discuss in more detail in Section 4, but do not model explicitly. We show the security of this protocol in the cryptographic model, see Appendix B.

## 4 Practical implementation

A deployable system needs more than just a cryptographic specification, but a system of incentives and checks. First, we discuss what methods for identity verification are available. We detail how to identity verification can be deferred to the verifiers and misbehaviour can be detected using pseudo-probabilistic audits. A realistic system also has to deal with revocation, which we solve by exploiting a novel property called *updatability*. Finally, we discuss questions related to the end user: how moderation is handled and where to store credentials. Table 1 summarises the protocol components and their security analysis.

*Identity providers* The verifiers need to attest that only real people receive digital identities and each person obtains only one. We discuss multiple competing solutions to this problem, none perfect by itself. In combination, however, they cover a fair share of the users for our primary target, news websites.

**Identity verification services (IVS):** Banks, insurers and other online-only services already rely on so-called identity verification services, e.g., to comply with banking or anti-money laundering regulations. Usually, IVS providers verify the authenticity of claims using physical identity documents, authoritative sources, or by performing ID checks via video chat or post-ID. McKinsey anticipates the market for IVS to reach \$16B-20B by 2022 [72]. The business model of these companies revolves around their trustworthiness.

**Subscriber lists:** Newspaper websites are the main targets of our proposal, because of their political and societal relevance and the moderation cost they are currently facing. It is in their interest to provide easy access to their subscribers. Insofar as bills are being paid, they do have some assurance of the identity of their subscribers, so they can use their existing relationship to bootstrap the system by giving access to their customers right away.

components	security analysis
base protocol	cryptographic proof (Appendix B)
encrypted ledger	strictly weakens the attacker
identity verification	formally verified (Appendix 4)
revocation	simple hybrid argument using Appendix F
extended protocol	cryptographic proof (Appendix C)
storing credentials	trivial modification

Table 1: Overview: security analysis.

name	symbol	purpose	typical duration
epoch	$t_e$	implicit revocation	one week
billing period	$t_b$	billing	one month
commenting period	$t$	throttling	one day

Table 2: Time periods used in protocol.

**Biometric passports and identification documents:** Biometric passports are traditional passports that have an embedded electronic microprocessor chip containing information for authenticating the identity of the passport holder. The chip was introduced to enable additional protection against counterfeiting and identity theft. This authentication process can be performed locally (as part of e.g., border control) or against a remote server. Biometric passports are standardised by the International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO) [46] and issued by around 150 countries [37]. More importantly, even many electronic identification documents are supporting this standard, e.g., the German eID [25].

Our system can easily leverage this infrastructure to authenticate users. Of course, we need to assume that governments are issuing those documents honestly, however, large-scale fraud would have serious repercussions for the issuing government.

These methods can be combined: even if somebody is neither a subscriber of a newspaper nor the owner of a digital passport, they still have the option of identifying to the IVS. We note that a natural person could use two methods (e.g., IVS and subscriber list) to obtain two DAA credentials and thus effectively double her threshold. As we provide a method for revocation (see Section 4), the verifiers can run private set-intersection protocols (see [62] for an overview) and revoke parties in the intersection.

*Encrypting comments on the ledger* We distinguish a billing period  $t_b$  that is distinct from the commenting period  $t$  (see Table 2). Assume a CCA-secure public key encryption scheme  $(\text{KG}_{\text{enc}}, \text{enc}, \text{dec})$ , a collision-resistant hash function  $h$  and a standard existentially unforgeable digital signature scheme  $(\text{KG}_{\text{sig}}, \text{sig}, \text{ver})$ . We apply the accountable commenting scheme from Def. 3. The output of **Comment** is encrypted with a public key  $pk_{\mathbf{W}, t_b}$  distributed to all websites participating in the current billing period  $t_b$ . Claims need to include the randomness used to encrypt. See Fig. 2 for the complete message flow.

*Deferring identity verification with pseudo-probabilistic auditing* Our security model in Appendix B abstracts away from the communication between verifier and issuer. We propose a protocol to implement this step and formally verify it in the symbolic setting, which is better suited for reasoning about complex interactions. The protocol (Fig. 3) improves privacy by hiding the identity verification process from the issuer and improves accountability by providing a pseudo-random audit.

0.  $U$  can restore  $sk_U$  from  $login$  and  $pw$ ,  
and download  $h(login), cred_{t_e}$  from  $L$ :  
 $sk_U := kdf(login, pw)$   
 $L \rightarrow U : \{h(login), cred_{t_e}\}$
1.  $U$  computes the basename from date and sequence:  
 $dom := (t, seq)$
2.  $U$  computes the  $nym$  from  $sk_U$  and  $dom$ :  
 $nym := \text{NymGen}(sk_U, dom)$
3.  $U$  signs the hash of his comment:  
 $\sigma := \text{Sign}(sk_U, cred, dom, h(m), W)$
4.  $U$  encrypts  $\sigma$ , attaches metadata and sends it to  $L$ :  
 $\gamma := \{enc(pk_{W, t_b}, (\sigma, nym); r), h(m), W, dom\}$   
 $U \rightarrow L : \gamma$
5.  $L$  notifies  $W$  and  $U$  sends the raw comment to  $W$ :  
 $L \rightarrow W : \gamma$   
 $U \rightarrow W : m$
6.  $W$  decrypts  $\gamma$  and verifies the following:  
 $\sigma$  valid,  $\text{VerifyBsn}(\sigma, dom) = 1$ ,  $seq \leq \tau$ ,  $m$  acceptable.
7.  $W$  queries  $L$  with  $nym$ :  
 $nym := \text{NymExtract}(\sigma)$   
 $W \rightarrow L : nym$
8.  $W$  publishes  $m$  if  $nym$  fresh and  $m$  acceptable.
9.  $U$  claims censorship to public, if  $m$  not published:  
 $claim_U := \{\sigma, nym, r, m\}$   
 $U \rightarrow public : claim_U$

Fig. 2: Message flow for commenting. Note that in step 0, the user's secret DAA key is restored using a password, see Section 4, and that entries in the ledger are encrypted, see Section E.1. Furthermore, to save space on the ledger, we identify the comment  $m$  by its hash.

1.  $U$  creates a secure channel with  $I$ , with session id  $sid$ :  
 $I \rightarrow U : sid$
  2.  $U$  chooses  $login$ ,  $pw$  and random  $r_U$ , sends to  $I$ :  
 $r_U \leftarrow \{0, 1\}$   
 $U \rightarrow I : login, h(r_U, nbd, 1)$
  3.  $I$  chooses random nonce  $r_I$ , creates a commitment  $c_I$ , signs it and sends it to  $U$ :  
 $r_I \leftarrow \{0, 1\}$   
 $c_I := h(r_I, sid, h(r_U, nbd, 1))$   
 $I \rightarrow U : sig(sk_I, c_I)$
  4.  $U$  creates a secret key from his  $login$  and  $pw$ :  
 $sk_U := kdf(login, pw)$
  5.  $U$  creates a secure channel with  $V$  and sends:  
 $U \rightarrow V : \{nbd, c_I, r_U, sig(sk_U, c_I)\}$
  6.  $V$  verifies  $U$ 's identity with evidence  $E$ , signs the commitment and sends it to  $U$ :  
 $\psi := sig(sk_V, c_I)$   
 $V \rightarrow U : \psi$
  7.  $U$  recreates the secure session with the previous  $sid$ , and sends the commitment (signed by  $V$ ) to  $I$ :  
 $U \rightarrow I : \psi$
- \*\*  $U$  and  $I$  run **Join – Issue** protocol (Fig. 4)
- \*\*  $I$  use  $\psi$  to start auditing with  $V$  (Fig. 5)

Fig. 3: Identity verification protocol specification

We assume a collision-resistant one-way hash function  $h$  to instantiate a binding commitment scheme. When a user wants to register, the website directs her to the issuer. They run an authentication protocol akin to the ASW protocol for fair exchange [15] where, in the end,  $U$  gets  $V$ 's signature on a commitment  $c_I$  generated by  $I$ . Only with this signature, the issuer runs the **Join – Issue** procedure from Def. 3 (repeated in Fig. 4 for completeness). Note that the ledger distributes the issuer's public key and public parameters. In Section 4, we explain a revocation mechanism that is based on updating the issuer's public key every epoch and publishing the fresh key in the ledger.  $U$  also makes use of the ledger by storing its credentials in case it needs to recover its state (see Section 4).

1.  $U$  downloads  $pk_I$  from  $L$  :  
 $L \rightarrow U : pk_I$
2.  $U$  and  $I$  run **Join – Issue**<sub>DAA</sub> proto. using  $sk_U$  and  $pk_I$  for epoch  $t_e$ , and  $U$  gains  $cred_{t_e}$  and  $w_{t_e}$ .
3.  $U$  inserts  $h(login)$  and  $cred_{t_e}$  into  $L$  :  
 $U \rightarrow L : h(login), cred_{t_e}$
4.  $I$  inserts  $h(login)$  and  $w_{t_e}$  into  $L$  :  
 $I \rightarrow L : h(login), w_{t_e}$

Fig. 4: **Join – Issue** protocol specification

After verification,  $I$  may trigger a pseudo-random audit by sending the previously hidden values  $sid$ ,  $r_I$  in the commitment  $c_I$  of the identity verification protocol to  $V$  (see Fig. 5). If the hash of these values matches the hash of  $V$ 's signed commitments, an audit is triggered. If we consider a random oracle in place of the hash function, the probability of an audit is  $\Pr[\text{audit}] = 2^{-L}$ , where  $L$  is the number of bits both parties compare.  $L$  is agreed upon in advance, to define this probability. Since the nonce  $r_I$  has been revealed to  $V$  before,  $I$  cannot modify the second hash ( $s'$ ) to avoid audit. As the digital signature scheme is existentially unforgeable,  $I$  cannot fabricate a valid signature to raise the probability of an audit and to learn something about  $U$ . If the session is chosen for audit,  $V$  has to hand over the evidence  $\{E\}$  it collected for identification — this is a standard procedure for IVS. If  $V$  fails to comply, then  $I$  can publish a *claim* and the public can determine whether to audit  $V$ .

Presuming that  $I$  is honest, the probability that colluding  $U$  and  $V$  can create  $n$  usable fake identities is thus bound by  $(1 - \Pr[\text{audit}])^n + \text{negl}(\lambda)$  for some negligible function  $\text{negl}(\lambda)$ .

The auditing protocol is very simple cryptographically, but has many possible message interleaving. It is well known that pen-and-paper proofs for such protocols are not only tedious, but also prone to errors. We analyse the proto-

```

**  $I$  and  $V$  are principals.
1.  $I$  sends  $sid$  and  $r_I$  to  $V$ :
    $I \rightarrow V : \{sid, r_I\}$ 
2.  $I$  and  $V$  both calculate two hashes:
    $s := h(r_i, sid, 2)$ 
    $s' := h(\psi)$ 
3. Both compare the first  $L$  bits of these two hashes:
    $s|_L^0 = s'|_L^0$ 
4. If the session is chosen for audit,  $V$  sends  $E$  to  $I$ :
    $V \rightarrow I : E$ 
5. If  $V$  fails to comply,  $I$  can publish a claim:
    $claim_I := \{r_I, sid, h(r_U, nbd, 1), \psi\}$ 
    $I \rightarrow public : claim_I$ 
6. The public audits  $V$ ,  $V$  proves it acted in good faith:
    $V \rightarrow public : \{r_U, nbd, E\}$ 
7. The public gives the verdict.

```

Fig. 5: Auditing protocol specification

col in the symbolic model, using the SAPIC process calculus [51] and Tamarin protocol verifier [64]. We formally verify that:

1. Whenever  $I$  accepts to run the Join – Issue protocol with a user,  $V$  has validated her identity, unless  $I$  or  $V$  are dishonest.
2. When determining the need for an audit, neither a dishonest  $I$ , nor a dishonest  $V$  can predict the value of the other party, unless both are dishonest. Therefore, they cannot trigger or avoid the audit.
3. If the public accepts a claim, then  $V$  did indeed receive the values  $r_I$  and  $sid$  and send out  $\psi$  (unless  $V$  is dishonest and tricks itself into the obligation of an audit). As these values determine both hashes, the public can now decide if an audit was justified.

The verification takes about 10 sec on a 3.1 GHz Intel Core i7 and 16 GB RAM computer.<sup>8</sup>

*Revocation* In case  $U$  runs the identification protocol a second time with a different  $V$ , or simply forgets her password and needs to re-identify, her previous DAA key  $sk_{U,DAA}$  needs to be revoked. But how can  $U$  revoke her DAA key if she forgets her password? We circumvent this problem by *implicit revocation*: DAA keys are short-lived by default, but the system can issue new keys without interacting with the user. Keys that are not issued are thus implicitly revoked by the end of their lifetime, which we call the *epoch* (see Fig. 2).

<sup>8</sup> See Appendix E for the model code.

\*\*  $I$ ,  $V$  and  $L$  are principals.

1.  $I$  announces new epoch  $t'_e$  and updates her  $pk_{I,t'_e}$  :  
 $I \rightarrow L : t'_e$
2.  $I$  asks all  $V$ s, to report all valid *logins* to be updated :  
 $V \rightarrow I : \text{sig}(sk_V, ('update', c_I))$
3.  $I$  obtains *update message*  $u$  for all valid *logins* from  $L$  :  
 $L \rightarrow I : h(login, u)$
4.  $I$  creates new credentials for each *login* :  
 $cred_{t'_e} := \text{Issuer}_{\text{DAA}}(sk_I, pk_I, u)$
5.  $I$  stores new credentials for each *login* in  $L$  :  
 $I \rightarrow L : h(login, cred_{t'_e}, t'_e)$

Fig. 6: Certificate update protocol specification

At the start of each epoch  $t_e$ ,  $I$  defines a new public key  $pk_{I,t'_e}$  which is chosen so that  $I$  can recompute all credentials  $cred_{t'_e}$  for the new epoch by itself (see Fig. 6). At this point, only those DAA keys remain valid, for which such a *cred* is computed, all others are implicitly revoked. If a user forgets her password, she reports to the verifier, who confirms (by means of the commitment  $c_I$ ) that her old key is invalidated. Starting from the next epoch, she can use her new key. To allow for such mechanism, the DAA scheme has to be structured in a way that  $I$  can update her public key and all users' credentials without any interaction.

**Definition 4 (Updateable DAA scheme).**

A DAA scheme is updateable if:

1.  $\text{Setup}_{\text{DAA}}$  can be divided into  $\text{Setup}_1$  and  $\text{Setup}_2$ , s.t.:
  - $\text{Setup}_1(1^\lambda)$ , outputs a persistent group public key  $gpk_1$
  - $\text{Setup}_2(1^\lambda, gpk_1)$  outputs an ephemeral group public key  $gpk_2$  and a secret key  $sk_S$ , where  $pk_I = (gpk_1, gpk_2)$ .
2. The Join –  $\text{Issue}_{\text{DAA}}$  protocol consists of two steps  $\text{User}_{\text{DAA}}$  and  $\text{Issuer}_{\text{DAA}}$ , s.t.:
  - $\text{User}_{\text{DAA}}(gpk_1, sk_S)$  outputs an update  $u$ ,
  - $\text{Issuer}_{\text{DAA}}$  takes  $pk_I$ ,  $u$  and  $sk_I$  as inputs and outputs valid credentials  $cred_S$  for secret key  $sk_S$  w.r.t. the new  $pk_I$ .
3.  $\text{Setup}_1$  uses only public coins to generate  $gpk_1$ , i.e., there are no secrets required to generate  $gpk_1$  and giving those coins to the adversary only negligibly increases its advantage in the user-controlled anonymity and traceability experiments.

Brickell and Li's scheme with a minor modification possess these features (see Appendix F for a formal proof).

Updatability is interesting on its own: it allows for regular, non-interactive key rollovers in DAA.  $I$  can create each user's credential offline, so the user can fetch this credential (in encrypted form) at later point, even if  $I$  is offline.

*Holding the issuer accountable* In TrollThrottle, a corrupt issuer and verifier can collude to introduce arbitrarily many valid credentials into the system. This form of Sybil attack is difficult to counter while retaining the user’s privacy: Without trust in either the verifiers or the issuer, the only way of determining whether a user is legitimate is to have another entity (e.g., the websites, or the public) check this identity — otherwise, the adversary controls all parties involved. Even if done in a pseudo-random manner similar to the auditing procedure in Section 4, the loss of individual privacy would be considerable.

In Appendix C we present the extended TrollThrottle protocol to mitigate this issue to the extent possible. Here, for every user that joins, a *genesis block* is added to the ledger. This block is signed by the verifier, which allows the public to tell how many credentials were validated by each verifier. Large-scale fraud could thus be detected through an unusual number of participants coming from a single verifier. This information is public and can be computed by any participant at any time.

During the commenting phase,  $U$  downloads a subset of genesis tuples<sup>9</sup> and computes a zero-knowledge proof that her genesis tuple is part of this set. She includes this proof along with the time point at which she queried the list in her DAA signature. In Appendix C.5, we show that for Brickell and Li’s scheme [24], we can instantiate a non-interactive proof of knowledge system with proofs that are logarithmic in the number of genesis tuples in the ledger. We show that, in addition to the security properties in Appendix B, no adversary can create comments that cannot be attributed.

*Moderation* News websites need to moderate comments (see step 8 in Fig. 2). This decision is ultimately a human decision, but it should be based on a binding agreement between the participating websites, and in compliance with the laws that apply to them. When  $U$  claims censorship, the public has to judge based on the agreement and the content of  $m$ .

*Storing credentials* By default, a cookie or browser plugin may store the credentials, however, many users expect a system to work similarly to a third-party website, where they can log in from a computer of their choice. We, therefore, allow users to restore their identities, by making the users’ secret keys e.g.,  $sk_U$  derivable from their login and password chosen by themselves in the identification process. Hence, we assume there exists an efficiently computable key-derivation function  $kdf$  [49] that maps to the space of secret keys. Such a function exists for the scheme we use, where the secret key is just an element in  $\mathbb{Z}_q^*$ .

The secret key  $sk_U$  can be recomputed by applying the key-derivation function to login and password, while the DAA credentials  $cred$  can be recovered from the ledger by querying with the hash of her login. Note that the login should not identify the user on other platforms, otherwise an attacker can use it to check if the user is participating in TrollThrottle. The last value of  $seq$  can be

<sup>9</sup> To achieve, e.g., anonymity among 100 users, about 49 KB of data is downloaded once per commenting period.




Fig. 7: Screenshot of Reddit deployment, for identity creation and commenting scenarios, see Retrofitting subreddit

recovered by using bisection to discover the largest  $seq$  s.t.  $\text{NymGen}(sk_U, (t, seq))$  is on the ledger.

## 5 Evaluation

We evaluate TrollThrottle in terms of how easy it is to deploy, and how much performance overhead it incurs. To demonstrate the former, we retrofit it to an existing website, without any modification to the server-side code — in fact, without the website being aware of this. To demonstrate that it incurs only modest costs, we simulate realistic traffic patterns using a recorded message stream and measure computational overhead and latency.

*Deployability* We demonstrate that the protocol can be deployed easily by retrofitting it, without any server-side changes, to Reddit.com, the most visited news website in the world [12] and an alleged target for large-scale astroturfing and propaganda efforts [69].

On Reddit, we created a forum as a testing ground. We implemented signature creation and verification in a JavaScript library and used a simple browser extension [10] to load this library when entering the forum. In an actual deployment, this library would be loaded via JavaScript inclusions. We point out,

however, the known problem that there is no guarantee the website  $W$  is transmitting the correct script. This is a well-known issue for all web-based services that claim end-to-end security (e.g., ProtonMail [48]), and sometimes mitigated by offering optional plugins (e.g., mega.co.nz). Note, though, that there was an incident where the chrome extension itself was compromised via the Chrome web store, which highlights the need to trust both the software developer and the distribution mechanism [14]. We forked the Multiprecision Integer and Rational Arithmetic Cryptographic Library (MIRACL) [8] and modified it for portability. Then, using emscripten, we compiled this library to javascript. As this library is widely used to implement elliptic curve cryptography and large integers, this modified version could be of independent interest for front-end applications [7]. We use this library to implement Brickell and Li’s pairing based DAA scheme using Barreto-Naehrig (BN) [18] elliptic curve at the 128-bit security level. Furthermore, we use libsodium [6] for digital signatures used in the identity verification protocol (based on Ed25519 with 256 bit keys), hashing (BLAKE2B), authenticated public-key encryption (based on XSalsa20 stream cipher and X25519 key exchange with 256 bit keys) and randomness generation. For key derivation, we used PBKDF2 in Crypto-js [3] with 100 100 iterations.<sup>10</sup> The simulation is available in [11].

Any comment posted in this subreddit is transmitted according to the protocol (see Fig. 2). As the server side is not validating the comments in this instance, this task is performed by the JS library as well. It communicates with a simple HTTP server implementing the public ledger. Comments that do not pass are greyed out by using a subreddit-specific stylesheet (see Fig. 7).

*Performance* To evaluate TrollThrottle’s performance, we compiled three realistic datasets [2] to represent plausible scenarios. Our focus is on traditional news outlets that want to establish a close relation with their readership. We thus examine two scenarios in this domain, and a third, representing an extreme case: the entirety of Reddit, the largest website categorised as ‘News’ by Alexa [12].

*Scenario I: nationwide news source* Most news pages operate primarily on a national scale. Here, traffic patterns can have sharp peaks, e.g., is the vast majority of German speakers situated in the same time zone. Using Germany as an example, the most popular news page [13] reports a ‘clear five-figure number’ of comments per day [57], with other pages reporting between 12k and 80k [75]. As we have no access to comments *before* moderation, we simulate the traffic patterns. We do so by combining the traffic of the German-speaking r/de subreddit of sufficiently many days until we reach a volume of 168k comments.

*Scenario II: international newspaper* In mid-2017, just three months before they decided to stop accepting comments out of lack of resources, the New York Times reported 12K comments per day [56]. If we assume an exponential growth at a rate of about 140% per year<sup>11</sup>, we estimate 398k incoming comments in January

<sup>10</sup> Default for server-side storage of passwords in LastPass [5].

<sup>11</sup> Extrapolated from data points in 2016 [76] and 2018 [75].

2020. Again, we use Reddit data to retrieve realistic traffic patterns. In this case, we collected all comments on submitted links to nytimes.com from a 24h period. We aggregated the comments over a two-month period, from the beginning of May to the end of June 2019, to reach 268k comments.

*Scenario III: Number of comments per day on Reddit* From a 10-year dataset that includes all comments ever posted on Reddit, we pick the recent busiest day, which is 27 June 2019 with 4 913 934 comments. As for the other datasets, we did not filter out the comments that are marked as ‘[deleted]’, i.e., were removed by moderators or their respective authors. They do not contain information about their authors, but still show the request patterns that the website needs to handle. Hence, we regarded them as one regular user.

**Performance measures** We focus on the performance requirements from the perspective of the news outlet that has to serve users within a given latency and compute the additional cost due to the new computations. To get a precise measure of the overhead incurred, our experiment only simulates the cryptographic operations and does not display the comments or use network communication. The computation is performed separately for the server and the client. We assume the issuer is trusted and thus disregard the extension in Appendix C.

As for the other datasets, we collected the comments annotated with their author’s nickname and the time point they were posted. The dataset is thus a sequence of tuples  $(t, u, m)$  ordered by the time point  $t$  at which  $u$  posted comment  $m$ . We assume each nickname corresponds to a different actual person, thus over-approximating the effort for key generation. For each  $(t, u, m)$ , we

- (1) simulate the issuing protocol, if  $u$  comes out in the entire (10 years) dataset for the first time,
- (2) simulate the commenting protocol to produce a signature for the comment, and finally
- (3) simulate the server side signature verification.

Step (1) and (2) can be done in a pre-processing step, as they are computed by the user and issuer. We measure the time for commenting ( $\delta^{\text{Comment}}$ ) and issuing ( $\delta_I^{\text{Issue}}$  and  $\delta_U^{\text{Issue}}$ , for the issuer and the user, respectively). For step (3), we simulate the load of the server side on a Ruby-on-Rails application with Nginx load balancer.

Firstly, we estimated the number of cores needed to satisfy a latency requirement of  $l = 0.1$  seconds using a simple first-come-first-serve scheduler. To determine this value, we used the following algorithm. We sampled the server computation time  $\delta_s$  by measuring the verification time for a random comment. We start with one core. We compute a first-come-first-serve scheduling until we reach a point where a comment posted at  $t$  is scheduled at  $t'$  such that  $t' + t_s < t + l$ . If we never reach such a point, we are done and output the number of cores. Otherwise, we add a new core.

Secondly, we simulated the load on the server. For each point  $(t, u, m)$  in the database, we simulate the arrival of the encrypted signature  $(\gamma, nym)$  resulting

from pre-processing  $m$ , at time  $t + \delta^{\text{Comment}} + \delta_I^{\text{Issue}} + \delta_U^{\text{Issue}}$ . We run `Verify` on the signature and measure the finishing time  $t_f$ , as well as the actual processing time  $\delta^{\text{Verify}}$ . We report the results in seconds for the largest dataset in Table 3.

measure		mean	median	variance
issuing (on $U$ ) <sup>1</sup>	$\delta_U^{\text{Issue}}$	0.038	0.036	0.069
issuing (on $W$ ) <sup>1</sup>	$\delta_I^{\text{Issue}}$	0.010	0.009	0.0006
commenting <sup>2</sup>	$\delta^{\text{Comment}}$	0.036	0.032	0.0003
verification	$\delta^{\text{Verify}}$	0.021	0.018	0.0002
latency <sup>3</sup>	$t_f - t$	0.022	0.019	0.0002
commenting (on $U$ ) <sup>4</sup>	$\delta_U^{\text{Comment}}$	0.058	0.057	0.01

(1) over all new users.(2) computation overhead w/ pre-computed signatures.(3) shows server-side total processing time.(4) on 1000 samples, single-threaded.

Table 3: Evaluation for Reddit use case (3 cores).

In Table 4, we report the number of cores needed and the cost incurred by the computations just described, i.e., the overhead compared to normal website operations. The number of cores to meet the latency requirement was estimated as described above and used in the simulation. To account for the cost, we employ the core hours metric, which is the product of the number of cores and the total running time on the server. We take Amazon on Demand EC2 pricing [1] as an example and assume \$0.05 per core hour. We also report on the maximal latency encountered in the simulation and the percentage of comments that met the target latency of  $\leq 0.1s$ . Finally, we report the number of genesis tuples created in the ledger, i.e., the number of nicknames in the dataset, and the total size of the ledger, representing an over-approximation of the storage requirements of a single day of operation.

Since comments are hashed before signing, the communication overhead is approximately 2.4 KB, independent of the comment size. To evaluate the storage requirements on a consensus-based public ledger, we chose Tendermint [42] as an example. Tendermint employs a modified AVL tree to store key-value pairs. Values are kept in leaf nodes and keys in non-leaf nodes. The overhead is about 100 bytes per non-leaf node [9]. For the largest dataset, each participant in Tendermint would thus require approximately 12 GB of space. Once the current commenting period is over, the signed comments and hence most of the data can be purged. To allow accountability for censorship over the last month, the data of the last thirty commenting periods can be stored on less than 0.5 TB.

In summary, the additional cost on the websites is modest compared to the moderation effort saved.

scenario	#comments	#cores	daily cost	max. latency	latency < 0.1s	#genesis tuples	ledger size(MB)
Nationwide newspaper (r/de)	168k	1	\$ 1.20	0.166s	99.99%	13,975	204
International news. (url:nytimes)	268k	1	\$ 1.20	0.391s	99.99%	87,223	633
Reddit (r/all)	4.9M	3	\$ 3.60	1.011s	99.99%	1,217,761	10628

Table 4: Scenarios for performance evaluation, including the number of comments, source of the data stream, number of Intel E5 2.6 GHz cores, operating cost per day, maximum latency, percentage of queries answered within 0.1 secs, number of genesis tuples computed (i.e., number of distinct nicknames), and total ledger size.

## 6 Limitations

Despite the auditing by the issuer and the limited accountability for colluding issuer and verifiers in the extended protocol, we have centralised trusted authorities. One way to remove these is to introduce protocols that can recognise Sybils. This could relieve the issuer from the responsibility of auditing the verifiers and potentially allow for a protocol with accountability features to deter misbehaviour. As this topic is orthogonal to our protocol, we leave it for future work, but remark that, theoretically, Sybil-detection is possible without user identification. A potential approach is to combine biometric methods [16,67] with captchas. Uzun and Chung proposed such a protocol to show liveness. Here, the user’s response to a captcha involves physical actions (smiling, blinking) that she captures in a selfie video [71] within a 5s time limit. Their approach is based on the fact that automated captcha-solving takes considerable time, and face reenactment (e.g., [68]) is difficult to do at scale. Building on the same assumptions, a Sybil-detection scheme could be built by pseudo-randomly defining sets of users that need to show liveness *at the same time*.

TrollThrottle aims to provide a similar user experience to website logins. Hence, all client-side secrets are derived from the login and password of the user and thus vulnerable to password-guessing attacks. This can be mitigated by incorporating a two-factor authentication into the protocol, or by setting up the key generation to require a password of sufficient length and entropy, as to enforce the use of password managers.

Finally, the client-side code is loaded by the website, which could potentially include a different script albeit this behaviour would leave traces. As previously discussed (see Section 5), this is a well-known problem for web-based apps, and usually mitigated by offering optional plugins.

## 7 Related work

The detection of astroturfing has been tackled using reputation systems (e.g., [60]), crowdsourcing (e.g., [73]) and feature-based analysis (e.g., n-gram detection [61],

sentiment analysis [65], or by analysing responses [59]). Fundamentally, the posting profile of a politically motivated high-effort user is not very different from a state-sponsored propagandist [50], hence we focus on prevention instead of detection. The detection and prevention approaches could be combined, but detection approaches either come at a loss of accountability, or they need to explain their decisions, although many of them rely on the fact that the bot is not adapting to the mechanism (e.g., via adversarial machine learning [45]).

Our approach is similar to anonymity protocols in which we specify a way of exchanging messages without revealing identities. In contrast to anonymity protocols, TrollThrottle provides anonymity with respect to the ledger, but presumes the communication channels to provide sufficient anonymity. By itself, TrollThrottle is not resistant against traffic analysis — here anonymity protocols come into play. One might ask whether anonymity protocols already do what TrollThrottle proposes to do. To the best of our knowledge, Dissent [33] is the only anonymity protocol that provides explicit accountability guarantees, but these pertain to the type of communication, not to sending more messages than allowed. Furthermore, unlinkability is not achieved within the group, but towards outsiders. In each protocol phase, parties generate new secondary keys, which they broadcast signed and encrypted to all members of the group. This requires setting up a group in advance. This is unsuitable for our setting, where the group comprises all registered users of a web. TrollThrottle preserves unlinkability even within this group.

Pseudonymity systems like Nym [43] or Nymble [47] provide anonymous, yet authenticated access to services, but some allow resource owners to block access at their discretion. By using a ledger and a common set of rules, TrollThrottle users can claim and prove censorship, but have to trust the ledger. This is in contrast to p2p-protocols, where censors may be sidestepped, but cannot be forced to publish the content themselves. Dingledine et al. advocate for the transaction of reputation/credit between pseudonyms [34]. By contrast, the credit in our scheme is essentially the number of nyms. This simplifies the system and ensures unlinkability, at the cost of inherent limitations: the ‘credit’ is the same for every participant ( $\tau$  for each commenting period) and cannot be transferred.

One of the main cryptographic components of TrollThrottle is a specific DAA scheme with additional properties (instant-linkability and updatability). DAA was introduced as a way to address privacy issues of the remote attestation protocol proposed for TPMs [40]. There exists a number of schemes, e.g., based on the RSA assumption [21], on elliptic curve cryptography [22, 32], on the LRSW assumption [20, 23] and on the q-SDH assumption [24, 30, 31]. We focused on the scheme by Brickell and Li [24], because it supports these properties, produces short signatures and because a reference implementation was available.

There are building blocks besides DAA that are compatible with TrollThrottle. Anonymous Credentials (AC) allow users to prove (a set of) attributes about themselves to third parties, usually via an interactive protocol (but there are non-interactive schemes). An efficient scheme, by Baldimtsi and Lysyanskaya [17], supports only single-time use of a credential, which would require to store a

fresh credential for each comment that the user would like to post in the future (the shown attribute would also need to include the date and some unique value). Multi-show credentials, for instance the one by Camenisch et al. [26], would decrease the number of fresh credentials required, but would still depend on the user’s obtain an attribute for every possible day/comment number combinations. What’s more concerning is that the attribute value would have to be set by the issuer to a unique value (to prevent double spending/commenting), which would decrease the privacy of this approach and allow the Issuer to link certain comments. Therefore, it seems more efficient to use a system that supports domain-specific pseudonyms with a secret-key based attribute than lightweight credential systems. It worths noting that DAA can be viewed as such a credential system for just a single and secret attribute (the secret key).

The most similar credential system to the DAA scheme, that we used, was proposed by Camenisch et al. [27]. In this system, an issuer creates and distributes so-called dispensers. Dispensers are used to create a pre-defined number of one-time credentials valid for a given date. This system can be immediately used in TrollThrottle. As an implementation was not available, we perform a qualitative analysis. On the one hand, verification is faster in their scheme, they perform seven multi-exponentiations in a prime order group and one in an RSA group, while Brickell and Li’s scheme perform one multi-exponentiation in each group i.e.,  $\mathbb{G}_1, \mathbb{G}_2, \mathbb{G}_T$ , and one pairing computation. On the other hand, the signatures, which consists of a unique serial number (similar to a pseudonym) and a number of proofs of consistency are at least twice as much larger and their size depend on how the proofs are implemented. This produces considerable computation and communication overhead in the ledger. Moreover, the verification of comments is performed by the websites, making verification efficiency less important than the size of the data included in the ledger. Therefore, the DAA scheme represents a preferable tradeoff.

## 8 Conclusion

The prevalence of social bots and other forms of astroturfing in the web poses a danger to the political discourse. As many newspapers are closing down their commenting functionality despite the availability of sophisticated detection methods, we argue that they should be combined with a more preventive approach.

We presented TrollThrottle, a protocol that raises the cost of astroturfing by limiting the influence of users that emit a large amount of communication, even if using different pseudonyms. TrollThrottle preserves anonymity, provides accountability against censorship, it is easy to deploy and comes at a modest cost. We also discuss its social impact in Appendix D.

By how much do we raise the cost of astroturfing? We shall regard the last week before the 2016 US election for a rough calculation. The computational propaganda project considered around 3.4M election-related tweets to be originating from bots who emit more than 50 messages per day [44]. If we assume a threshold of 20 messages/day and perfect coordination between the bots, 24 178

identities need to be stolen to reach the same target. A lab study [19] finds that users are willing to sell their Facebook accounts for \$26 on average, which is only slightly above the black-market value for stolen verified Facebook accounts. Such operation would thus face a cost of \$634 501 and a risk of detection.

A remaining challenge for future work is to provide Sybil detection without identifying the users. The verification of user identities inherently relies on the party asserting them, but, theoretically, this step is not necessary to determine whether, at a given time, two virtual identities are controlled by independent parties.

*Acknowledgements:* This work has been partially funded by the German Research Foundation (DFG) via the collaborative research center “Methods and Tools for Understanding and Controlling Privacy” (SFB 1223), and via the ERC Synergy Grant IMPACT (Grant agreement 610150). The first author holds the Turkish Ministry of National Education Scholarship. The second author is supported by the German Federal Ministry of Education and Research (BMBF) through funding for the CISP-Stanford Center for Cybersecurity (FKZ: 16KIS0762).

## References

1. Amazon EC2 on-demand pricing, <https://aws.amazon.com/ec2/pricing/on-demand/>
2. Big query reddit dataset, [https://bigquery.cloud.google.com/dataset/fh-bigquery:reddit\\_comments](https://bigquery.cloud.google.com/dataset/fh-bigquery:reddit_comments)
3. Crypto-js documentation, <https://www.npmjs.com/package/crypto-js>
4. Department of justice : Charges in case 1:18-cr-00032-dlf, <https://www.justice.gov/file/1035477/download>
5. Lastpass: About password iterations, <https://support.logmeininc.com/lastpass/help/about-password-iterations-lp030027>
6. Libsodium documentation, <https://libsodium.gitbook.io/doc/>
7. MIRACL with DAA API for Javascript, <https://github.com/iesiyok/MIRACL>
8. Multiprecision Integer and Rational Arithmetic Cryptographic Library (MIRACL), <https://github.com/miracl/MIRACL>
9. Tendermint avl performance and benchmarks, <https://github.com/tendermint/iaavl/blob/master/PERFORMANCE.md>
10. Trollthrottle Browser Extension, [https://github.com/iesiyok/trollthrottle\\_chrome](https://github.com/iesiyok/trollthrottle_chrome)
11. Trollthrottle Simulation, <https://github.com/iesiyok/trollthrottle>
12. Alexa News (2019), <https://www.alexa.com/topsites/category/Top/News>
13. Alexa Internet, Inc.: Top sites in germany, <https://www.alexa.com/topsites/countries/DE>
14. Alexandre, A.: Mega chrome extension compromised to steal users’ monero. <https://cointelegraph.com/news/mega-chrome-extension-compromised-to-steal-users-monero> (Sep 2019)
15. Asokan, N., Shoup, V., Waidner, M.: Asynchronous protocols for optimistic fair exchange. In: S&P’98. pp. 86–99. IEEE Comp. Soc. (1998)
16. Azimpourkivi, M., Topkara, U., Carbutar, B.: A secure mobile authentication alternative to biometrics. In: Proc. of the 33rd ACSAC. pp. 28–41. ACSAC 2017, ACM, New York, NY, USA (2017). <https://doi.org/10.1145/3134600.3134619>, <http://doi.acm.org/10.1145/3134600.3134619>

17. Baldimtsi, F., Lysyanskaya, A.: Anonymous credentials light. In: (CCS'13). pp. 1087–1098. ACM (2013)
18. Barreto, P.S.L.M., Naehrig, M.: Pairing-friendly elliptic curves of prime order. In: Preneel, B., Tavares, S. (eds.) *Selected Areas in Cryptography*. pp. 319–331. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, Berlin, Heidelberg (2006)
19. Benndorf, V., Normann, H.T.: The willingness to sell personal data. *The Scandinavian Journal of Economics* **120**(4), 1260–1278 (2018)
20. Bernhard, D., Fuchsbauer, G., Ghadafi, E., Smart, N.P., Warinschi, B.: Anonymous attestation with user-controlled linkability. *Int. J. Inf. Secur.* **12**(3), 219–249 (2013)
21. Brickell, E.F., Camenisch, J., Chen, L.: Direct anonymous attestation. In: CCS'04. pp. 132–145. ACM (2004)
22. Brickell, E., Chen, L., Li, J.: A new direct anonymous attestation scheme from bilinear maps. In: *Trusted Computing-Challenges and Applications*, pp. 166–178. Springer (2008)
23. Brickell, E., Chen, L., Li, J.: Simplified security notions of direct anonymous attestation and a concrete scheme from pairings. *Int. J. Inf. Secur.* **8**(5), 315–330 (2009)
24. Brickell, E., Li, J.: A pairing-based daa scheme further reducing tpm resources. In: Acquisti, A., Smith, S.W., Sadeghi, A.R. (eds.) *Trust and Trustworthy Computing*. pp. 181–195. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, Berlin, Heidelberg (2010)
25. BSI: Technical guideline tr-03110 v2.21 – advanced security mechanisms for machine readable travel documents and eidas token (2016), <https://www.bsi.bund.de/EN/Publications/TechnicalGuidelines/TR03110/BSITR03110.html>
26. Camenisch, J., Drijvers, M., Dzurenda, P., Hajny, J.: Fast keyed-verification anonymous credentials on standard smart cards. In: *ICT Systems Security and Privacy Protection (SEC 2019)*. pp. 286–298. Springer (2019)
27. Camenisch, J., Hohenberger, S., Kohlweiss, M., Lysyanskaya, A., Meyerovich, M.: How to win the clonewars: efficient periodic n-times anonymous authentication. In: CCS'06. pp. 201–210. ACM (2006)
28. Carroll, O.: St.Petersburg troll farm to influence US election campaign, <https://www.independent.co.uk/news/world/europe/russia-us-election-donald-trump-st-petersburg-troll-farm-hillary-clinton-a8005276.html>
29. Castro, M., Liskov, B., et al.: Practical byzantine fault tolerance. In: *OSDI*. vol. 99, pp. 173–186 (1999)
30. Chen, L., Morrissey, P., Smart, N.: Daa: Fixing the pairing based protocols. *Cryptology ePrint Archive*, Report 2009/198, Withdrawn (2009)
31. Chen, L.: A daa scheme requiring less tpm resources. *Cryptology ePrint Archive*, Report 2010/008 (2010)
32. Chen, X., Feng, D.: A new direct anonymous attestation scheme from bilinear maps. In: *Young Computer Scientists, 2008. ICYCS 2008*. pp. 2308–2313. IEEE (2008)
33. Corrigan-Gibbs, H., Ford, B.: Dissent: accountable anonymous group messaging. In: CCS'10. pp. 340–350. ACM (2010)
34. Dingledine, R., Mathewson, N., Syverson, P.: Reputation in p2p anonymity systems. In: *Workshop on economics of peer-to-peer systems*. vol. 92 (2003)
35. Etim, B.: Why no comments? it's a matter of resources, <https://www.nytimes.com/2017/09/27/reader-center/comments-moderation.html>
36. Ferrara, E., Varol, O., Davis, C., Menczer, F., Flammini, A.: The rise of social bots. *Commun. ACM* **59**(7), 96–104 (Jun 2016). <https://doi.org/10.1145/2818717>, <http://doi.acm.org/10.1145/2818717>

37. Gemalto: The electronic passport in 2018 and beyond (Jun 2018), <https://www.gemalto.com/govt/travel/electronic-passport-trends>
38. Groth, J., Kohlweiss, M.: One-out-of-many proofs: Or how to leak a secret and spend a coin. In: EUROCRYPT 2015. pp. 253–280. Springer (2015)
39. Groth, J., Ostrovsky, R., Sahai, A.: Perfect non-interactive zero knowledge for NP. In: Vaudenay, S. (ed.) EUROCRYPT 2006. LNCS, vol. 4004, pp. 339–358. Springer, Heidelberg (2006)
40. Group, T.C.: Main specification version 1.1b (2001), <https://trustedcomputinggroup.org/tpm-main-specification/>
41. Hegelich, S., Janetzko, D.: Are social bots on twitter political actors? empirical evidence from a ukrainian social botnet. In: Tenth Int. AAAI (2016)
42. Herlihy, M., Moir, M.: Enhancing accountability and trust in distributed ledgers (06 2016)
43. Holt, J.E., Seamons, K.E.: Nym: Practical pseudonymity for anonymous networks. Internet Security Research Lab Technical Report 4, 1–12 (2006)
44. Howard, P., Kollanyi, B., Woolley, S.C.: Bots and automation over twitter during the second us presidential debate. Tech. rep., Political Bots (2016)
45. Huang, L., Joseph, A.D., Nelson, B., Rubinstein, B.I., Tygar, J.: Adversarial machine learning. In: Proc. of the 4th ACM workshop AISec. pp. 43–58. ACM (2011)
46. ICAO: Machine Readable Travel Documents - Part 11: Security Mechanism for MRTDs. Doc 9303 (2015)
47. Johnson, P.C., Kapadia, A., Tsang, P.P., Smith, S.W.: Nymble: Anonymous ip-address blocking. In: Intern. Workshop on PETS. pp. 113–133. Springer (2007)
48. Kobeissi, N.: An analysis of the protonmail cryptographic architecture (2018), <https://eprint.iacr.org/2018/1121>, cryptology ePrint Archive, Report 2018/1121
49. Krawczyk, H.: Cryptographic extraction and key derivation: The hkdf scheme. In: Rabin, T. (ed.) Advances in Cryptology – CRYPTO 2010. pp. 631–648. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, Berlin, Heidelberg (2010)
50. Kreil, M.: Social bots, fake news und filterblasen (2017), [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/List\\_of\\_newspapers\\_by\\_circulation](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/List_of_newspapers_by_circulation)
51. Kremer, S., Künnemann, R.: Automated analysis of security protocols with global state. In: S&P’14. pp. 163–178. IEEE Comp. Soc. (2014). <https://doi.org/10.1109/SP.2014.18>
52. Kumar, S., Cheng, J., Leskovec, J., Subrahmanian, V.: An army of me: Sockpuppets in online discussion communities. In: Proc. of the 26th Int. Conf. on WWW. pp. 857–866 (2017)
53. Kuran, T., Sunstein, C.R.: Availability cascades and risk regulation. *Stan. L. Rev.* **51**, 683 (1998)
54. Leiser, M.: Astroturfing, cyberturfing and other online persuasion campaigns. *EJLT* **7**(1) (2016), <http://ejlt.org/article/view/501>
55. Li, Y., Ye, J.: Learning adversarial networks for semi-supervised text classification via policy gradient. In: Proc. of the 24th ACM SIGKDD. pp. 1715–1723. KDD ’18, ACM, New York, NY, USA (2018). <https://doi.org/10.1145/3219819.3219956>
56. Long, K.: Keeping the times civil, 16 million comments and counting, <https://www.nytimes.com/2017/07/01/insider/times-comments.html>
57. Medien, H.: <https://www.heise.de/newsticker/meldung/Der-Hass-in-den-Kommentarspalten-macht-vielen-Medien-Sorgen-4140143.html>
58. Michael Bristow, BBC News, B.: China’s internet ‘spin doctors’ (2008), <http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/7783640.stm>
59. Mihaylov, T., Georgiev, G., Nakov, P.: Finding opinion manipulation trolls in news community forums. In: Proc. of the Nineteenth CoNLL. pp. 310–314 (2015)

60. Ortega, F.J., Troyano, J.A., Cruz, F.L., Vallejo, C.G., Enríquez, F.: Propagation of trust and distrust for the detection of trolls in a social network. *Computer Networks* **56**(12), 2884 – 2895 (2012). <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.comnet.2012.05.002>, <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S138912861200179X>
61. Peng, J., Choo, R.K., Ashman, H.: Astroturfing detection in social media: Using binary n-gram analysis for authorship attribution. In: 2016 IEEE Trustcom/BigDataSE/ISPA. pp. 121–128 (Aug 2016). <https://doi.org/10.1109/TrustCom.2016.0054>
62. Pinkas, B., Schneider, T., Zohner, M.: Scalable private set intersection based on ot extension. *ACM Trans. Priv. Secur.* **21**(2), 7:1–7:35 (Jan 2018). <https://doi.org/10.1145/3154794>, <http://doi.acm.org/10.1145/3154794>
63. Reuter, M., Dachwitz, I.: Moderation bleibt handarbeit: Wie große online-medien leserkommentare moderieren, <https://netzpolitik.org/2016/moderation-bleibt-handarbeit-wie-tageszeitungen-leserkommentare-moderieren>
64. Schmidt, B., Meier, S., Cremers, C., Basin, D.: The tamarin prover for the symbolic analysis of security protocols. In: CAV’13. LNCS, vol. 8044, pp. 696–701. Springer (2013)
65. Seah, C.W., Chieu, H.L., Chai, K.M.A., Teow, L., Yeong, L.W.: Troll detection by domain-adapting sentiment analysis. In: 2015 18th Int. Conf. on Inf. Fusion (Fusion). pp. 792–799 (Jul 2015)
66. Shearer, E., Matsa, K.E.: News user across social media platforms 2018 (2018)
67. Sluganovic, I., Roeschlin, M., Rasmussen, K.B., Martinovic, I.: Using reflexive eye movements for fast challenge-response authentication. In: Proc. of the 2016 ACM SIGSAC CCS. pp. 1056–1067. ACM (2016)
68. Thies, J., Zollhofer, M., Stamminger, M., Theobalt, C., Nießner, M.: Face2face: Real-time face capture and reenactment of rgb videos. In: Proc. of the IEEE CVPR. pp. 2387–2395 (2016)
69. Tony Romm, W.P.: Senate investigators want answers from reddit and tumblr on russia meddling (2018)
70. Twitter, I.: Update on twitter’s review of the 2016 US election, [https://blog.twitter.com/official/en\\_us/topics/company/2018/2016-election-update.html](https://blog.twitter.com/official/en_us/topics/company/2018/2016-election-update.html)
71. Uzun, E., Chung, S.P.H., Essa, I., Lee, W.: rtcaptcha: A real-time captcha based liveness detection system. In: NDSS. Georgia Institute of Technology (2018)
72. Vikram Iyer, M.C.: The next \$20 billion digital market — id verification as a service (2018), <https://fuelbymckinsey.com/article/the-next-20-billion-digital-market-id-verification-as-a-service>
73. Wang, G., Mohanlal, M., Wilson, C., Wang, X., Metzger, M., Zheng, H., Zhao, B.Y.: Social turing tests: Crowdsourcing sybil detection. arXiv preprint arXiv:1205.3856 (2012)
74. Wullner, D.: Lassen sie uns diskutieren, <https://www.sueddeutsche.de/kolumne/ihre-sz-lassen-sie-uns-diskutieren-1.2095271>
75. Zeit, D.: <https://blog.zeit.de/glashaus/2018/03/02/wie-wir-leserkommentare-moderieren/>
76. Zeit, D.: <https://www.zeit.de/zeit-magazin/2016/31/kommentare-internet-medien-community-redakteur>

## A Instant linkability

In Brickell and Li’s scheme [24], signatures are composed of the actual signature and the corresponding pseudonym. To check whether two valid signatures are

linked, i.e., were created by the same signer with the same  $dom \neq \perp$ , one merely compares the nym. We exploit this property to instantly check whether a new comment is linked to any of the previous comments and thus avoid ‘double spending’ of basenames. To generalise to other DAA schemes, we formalise this requirement as follows:

**Definition 5 (Instantly linkable DAA scheme).** *We call a DAA scheme instantly linkable if:*

1. *A nym can be generated without knowledge of the data  $m$ , i.e., there is a deterministic poly-time algorithm  $\text{NymGen}$  s.t.  $\text{NymGen}(sk_S, dom) =$*

$$\text{NymExtract}(\text{Sign}_{\text{DAA}}(sk_S, cred, dom, \cdot)).$$

2. *Signatures contain a nym that links them, i.e., there is a deterministic poly-time algorithm  $\text{NymExtract}$  s.t. for all signatures  $\sigma_1, \sigma_2$ ,  $\text{Link}(\sigma_1, \sigma_2) = 1$  iff  $\text{NymExtract}(\sigma_1) = \text{NymExtract}(\sigma_2)$ .*
3. *The basename used to create a signature can be checked without knowing the data  $m$  and is uniquely defined by the signature, i.e., there exists a poly-time algorithm  $\text{VerifyBsn}$  s.t. for all PPT adversary  $A$ , the following probability is negligible in  $\lambda$*

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr [ (dom, dom', \sigma, pk_I, m) \xleftarrow{\$} A(1^\lambda) : \\ \text{VerifyBsn}(\sigma, dom') = 1 = \text{VerifyBsn}(\sigma, dom) \wedge \\ \text{Verify}_{\text{DAA}}(pk_I, m, dom, \sigma, RL_\emptyset) = 1 ], \end{aligned}$$

where  $RL_\emptyset$  corresponds to an empty revocation list.

## B Security Analysis

Here we show the intuition that the protocol we propose here enforces the threshold  $\tau$ , valid comments cannot be forged, users remain anonymous and its accountability mechanism is sound and complete.

We define the security goals of TrollThrottle in terms of five properties within an experiment. The adversary has access to oracles for user creation, honest execution of the commenting procedure and the Join – Issue protocol, and she can corrupt both users and verifiers. The formal model and full proofs are available in Appendix G.

1. *Correctness*, intuitively: honest users should always be able to create and publish a comment (acceptable by the policy of the website) and the comment should appear on the website. Moreover, if a comment is not published, the user should be able to generate a claim that can be publicly verified.
2. *Protection against trolling*, intuitively: the number of valid comments that the adversary  $\mathcal{A}$  can produce *per basename* is at most the number of users that she corrupted plus the number of users maliciously verified by a corrupted verifier. Let  $n$  be the number of user identities under adversarial

control (either by bribing the user or by bribing the verifiers) this directly results in the bound  $\tau \cdot n$  for the number of comments the adversary can emit per epoch.

3. *Non-frameability*,  $\mathcal{A}$  cannot create comments that can be linked to a nym of an honest user.
4. *Anonymity*, intuitively: When challenged with distinguishing a comment produced by a user of her choice from a freshly created user, the adversary can do no better than a guess.
5. *Accountability*, intuitively: Whatever the adversary does, for any honestly generated comment one can produce a verifiable claim that this comment ought to be published. Furthermore, it is not possible to produce such a claim in the name of an honest user unless the comment has been produced by her.

**Theorem 1 (Protection against trolling).** *The TrollThrottle protocol satisfies protection against trolling if the DAA scheme is user-controlled traceable and instantly linkable,  $h$  is collision resistant and we have proofs of knowledge for the relation  $\mathcal{R}_{\text{Join}}$ .*

*Sketch.* An adversary can fake comments in three ways:

- by creating a fresh digital identity,
- using an existing signature under a different message, or
- forging valid pseudonyms with acceptable basenames for an existing signature (this would allow her to publish the same comment multiple times).

An adversary that uses the first strategy can be used to break the user-controlled traceability of the DAA scheme. The second attack would break collision resistance. Finally, due to instant linkability of the DAA scheme, we conclude that the adversary cannot find a second nym that is valid under the same basename.  $\square$

**Theorem 2 (Non-frameability).** *The TrollThrottle protocol satisfies non-frameability if the underlying DAA scheme is user-controlled traceable and instantly linkable, the function  $h$  is collision-resistant and the proof system for relation  $\mathcal{R}_{\text{Join}}$  is a proof of knowledge.*

*Sketch.* We use a similar observation. An adversary that can post in the name of an honest user generates a forgery for the DAA scheme and thus can be used to break user-controlled traceability or break the collision-resistance of the hash function.  $\square$

**Theorem 3 (Anonymity).** *The TrollThrottle protocol satisfies anonymity if the underlying DAA scheme provides user-controlled anonymity and the proof system for relation  $\mathcal{R}_{\text{Join}}$  is zero-knowledge.*

*Sketch.* Since user-controlled anonymity of the DAA scheme ensures that the adversary cannot tell which of two uncorrupted users signed a message it follows that this implies that an adversary cannot also tell which user commented (since comments are signed using DAA signatures). Note that because of the zero-knowledge property the proof for relation  $\mathcal{R}_{\text{Join}}$  can be simulated.  $\square$

**Theorem 4 (Accountability).** *The TrollThrottle protocol satisfies accountability if it is correct and  $h$  is collision-resistant.*

*Sketch.* Correctness of TrollThrottle ensures that honest users can always generate a valid claim even if an adversary tries to prevent this. The evidence produced can be compared with the ledger state, as the message is given. If the message claimed is accepted, but different from a valid entry in the ledger, it constitutes a collision.  $\square$

## C Holding the issuer accountable

In this section we consider an extended version of our protocol that copes with an untrusted issuer, i.e., how can we protect against trolling even if the Issuer is untrusted. The high-level idea is to use so-called genesis tuples for every new user, which are signed using a standard signature scheme by the verifier checking the personal data of the user. Then while commenting, the user proves that there exists one genesis tuple that corresponds to her identity. A malicious issuer can create an unlimited number of DAA credentials but cannot generate genesis tuples at will without colluding with a verifier. We cannot protect against such a collusion but our approach allows the public to track suspicious behaviour, i.e., one verifier is signing a high volume of genesis tuples.

We begin this section by recalling cryptographic primitives used in this version. We then show how to extend the existing notion of our accountable commenting scheme and define a property we call *credibility*, which will formally capture a dishonest issuer trying to selectively troll the system.

### C.1 Preliminaries

In addition to an instantly linkable DAA scheme, this scheme assumes a standard existentially unforgeable digital signature scheme  $(\text{KG}_{\text{sig}}, \text{sig}, \text{ver})$ . The user has access to signing oracle for a verifier with key pair  $(sk_V, pk_V)$ . Moreover, we recall the definitions given by Groth et al. [39].

**Definition 6 (Zero-Knowledge).** *A proof system  $\Pi$  is called zero-knowledge, if there exists a PPT simulator  $\text{Sim} = (S_1, S_2)$  such that for all PPT algorithms  $\mathcal{A}$  the following probability, denoted by  $\text{Adv}[\mathcal{A}_{\Pi}^{\text{ZK}}]$ , is negligible in the security parameter  $1^\lambda$ :*

$$\left| \Pr \left[ \rho \leftarrow \text{Setup}(1^\lambda) : \mathcal{A}^{\text{CreateProof}(\rho, \cdot, \cdot)}(\rho) = 1 \right] - \Pr \left[ (\rho, \tau) \leftarrow S_1(1^\lambda) : \mathcal{A}^{S(\rho, \tau, \cdot)}(\rho) = 1 \right] \right|,$$

where  $\tau$  is a trapdoor information,  $S(\rho, \tau, x, w) = S_2(\rho, \tau, x)$  for  $(x, w) \in \mathcal{R}$  and both oracles output  $\perp$  if  $(x, w) \notin \mathcal{R}$ .

**Definition 7 (Soundness).** A proof system  $\Pi$  is called *sound*, if for all PPT algorithms  $\mathcal{A}$  the following probability, denoted by  $\mathbf{Adv}[\mathcal{A}_\Pi^{\text{sound}}]$ , is negligible in the security parameter  $1^\lambda$ :

$$\Pr \left[ \begin{array}{c} \rho \leftarrow \text{Setup}(1^\lambda), \\ (x, \pi) \leftarrow \mathcal{A}(\rho) \end{array} : \begin{array}{c} \text{VerifyProof}(\rho, x, \pi) = \text{accept} \\ \wedge \quad x \notin L_{\mathcal{R}} \end{array} \right].$$

**Definition 8 (Knowledge Extraction).** A proof system  $\Pi$  is called a *proof of knowledge* for  $\mathcal{R}$ , if there exists a knowledge extractor  $\mathbf{Extr} = (E_1, E_2)$  as described below. For all algorithms  $\mathcal{A}$ :

$$\begin{aligned} & |\Pr[\rho \leftarrow \text{Setup}(1^\lambda) : \mathcal{A}(\rho) = 1] - \\ & \Pr[(\rho, \tau) \leftarrow E_1(1^\lambda) : \mathcal{A}(\rho) = 1]| \leq \mathbf{Adv}[\mathcal{A}_\Pi^{E_1}] \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} & \Pr[(\rho, \tau) \leftarrow E_1(1^\lambda), (x, \pi) \leftarrow \mathcal{A}(\rho), w \leftarrow E_2(\rho, \tau, x, \pi) : \\ & \text{VerifyProof}(\rho, x, \pi) = \text{reject} \quad \vee \quad (x, w) \in \mathcal{R}] = 1 \end{aligned}$$

$\mathbf{Adv}[\mathcal{A}_\Pi^{E_1}]$  is negligible in  $1^\lambda$ .

## C.2 Accountable Commenting Scheme with Credibility (ACSC)

We define an accountable commenting scheme with the additional property of credibility as follows:

**Definition 9 (ACSC).** An accountable commenting scheme with credibility consists of a tuple of algorithms ( $\text{Setup}$ ,  $\text{KeyGen}$ ,  $\text{Comment}$ ,  $\text{Verify}$ ,  $\text{Claim}$ ,  $\text{VerifyClaim}$ ,  $\text{Attribute}$ ) and an interactive protocol ( $\text{Join} - \text{Issue}$ ) with inputs and outputs specified as follows.

All algorithms are defined in a similar way to the ones for the standard scheme presented in Def. 1. The only differences are as follows:

1. the  $\text{Join}$  algorithm of the  $\text{Join} - \text{Issue}$  protocol additionally outputs a genesis tuple  $gb$ ,
2. the  $\text{Comment}$ ,  $\text{Verify}$  and  $\text{VerifyClaim}$  algorithms take as an additional list  $GB$  containing genesis tuples.

In addition, we define the PPT algorithm  $\text{Attribute}(gb)$  that allows the public to attribute a genesis tuple  $gb$  to a verifier  $V$  by outputting the verifier's public key, which uniquely identifies the verifier. Even if the issuer is colluding with selected verifiers, the public can attribute users to verifiers, and thus gather statistics on how many users were verified by which  $V$  that could expose cheaters.

### C.3 Instantiation

We will now define an efficient instantiation of an accountable commenting scheme with credibility. The scheme closely resembles the scheme presented in Def. 3 but includes the generation and verification of genesis tuples. In particular, let us define the following relation that users will use to prove knowledge of genesis tuples:

$$\begin{aligned} ((nym, dom, GB), (sk_S)) \in \mathcal{R}_{GB} &\iff \\ \exists(\cdot, nym_1, \cdot) \in GB \quad \wedge \quad nym_1 &= \text{NymGen}(sk_S, 1) \\ \wedge \quad nym &= \text{NymGen}(sk_S, dom). \end{aligned}$$

**Definition 10.** *Extended TrollThrottle Protocol*

**Setup**( $1^\lambda$ ) - compute  $\rho_{GB} \xleftarrow{\$} \text{Setup}_{ZK}(1^\lambda)$ ,  $\rho_{Join} \xleftarrow{\$} \text{Setup}_{ZK}(1^\lambda)$  and output  $\rho = (1^\lambda, \rho_{Join}, \rho_{GB})$ .

**KeyGen**( $\rho$ ) - equal to **KeyGen** in Def. 3.

**Join**( $pk_I, sk_U, U$ ) - parse  $pk_I = pk_{I,DAA}$  and  $sk_U = sk_{U,DAA}$ . Execute  $\text{com} \xleftarrow{\$} \text{Join}_{DAA}(pk_{I,DAA}, sk_{U,DAA})$  and compute proof  $\Pi_{Join} = \text{CreateProof}(\rho_{Join}, (\text{com}, pk_{I,DAA}), sk_{U,DAA})$ . Send  $(\text{com}, \Pi_{Join})$  to the issuer and receive  $cred_U$ . Compute the pseudonym  $nym_1 = \text{NymGen}(sk_U, 1)$ , and set  $gb_U = (pk_V, nym_1, \text{sig}(sk_V, nym_1))$ , where  $\text{sig}(sk_V, nym_1)$  was created by an identity verifier. Return  $(cred_U, sk_U, gb_U)$ .

**Issue**( $sk_I, ver, U$ ) - equal to **Issue** in Def. 3.

**Comment**( $pk_I, sk_U, cred_U, dom, m$ ) - set and return  $\gamma = (\sigma, nym, dom, h(m), \Pi)$  where  $\Pi = \text{CreateProof}(\rho_{GB}, (nym, dom, GB), sk_U)$ ,  $\sigma = \text{Sign}_{DAA}(sk_U, cred_U, dom, h(m))$  and  $nym \xleftarrow{\$} \text{NymGen}(sk_U, dom) = \text{NymExtract}(\sigma)$ .

**Verify**( $pk_I, nym, dom, GB, m, \gamma$ ) - Parse  $pk_I = pk_{I,DAA}$  and  $\gamma = (\sigma, nym, dom, h, \Pi)$ .

Output 1 iff

- $\text{Verify}_{DAA}(pk_{I,DAA}, h, dom, \sigma, RL_\emptyset) = 1$ ,
- if  $h(m) = h$ ,
- $\text{NymExtract}(\sigma) = nym$ ,
- $\text{VerifyBsn}(\sigma, dom) = 1$ .
- $\text{VerifyProof}(\rho_{GB}, (nym, dom, GB), \Pi) = 1$ .

**Claim**( $pk_I, sk_U, cred, dom, m, \gamma$ ) - Claim in Def. 3.

**VerifyClaim**( $pk_I, GB, dom, m, \gamma, evidence$ ) - return 1 iff  $\gamma$  is valid for  $m$ , i.e., that  $\text{Verify}(pk_I, nym, dom, GB, m, \gamma) = 1$ .

**Attribute**( $gb$ ) - parse  $gb = (pk_V, nym_1, \text{sig}(sk_V, nym_1))$  and return  $pk_V$ .

### C.4 Security Analysis

Here we will formally define what it means for an accountable commenting scheme to have the credibility property and proof that the scheme presented above fulfils it.

**Definition 11.** We say that the system is credible if for every adversary  $\mathcal{A}$ , every  $1^\lambda$ , the probability  $\Pr[\text{Exp}_{\mathcal{A}}^{\text{credibility}}(1^\lambda) = 1]$  is negligible  $1^\lambda$ .

**Experiment  $\text{Exp}_{\mathcal{A}}^{\text{credibility}}(1^\lambda)$ :**

```

CU  $\leftarrow \emptyset$ ;  $V \leftarrow \emptyset$ ;  $\text{ver} \leftarrow \emptyset$ ;
 $(sk_1, pk_1) \xleftarrow{\$} \text{Setup}(1^\lambda)$ 
 $\mathcal{O} = \{\text{CorruptVer}(\cdot, \text{ver}), \text{JoinSystem}(\cdot, \text{ver}, sk_1)\}$ 
 $\text{OUT} = \{(nym_i^*, dom_i^*, m_i^*, \gamma_i^*)\}_{i=1}^k \xleftarrow{\$} \mathcal{A}^{\mathcal{O}}(\rho, sk_1)$ 
Return 0 if  $\text{Verify}(pk_1, nym_i^*, dom_i^*, m_i^*, \gamma_i^*) = 0$  for any  $i \in \{1, \dots, k\}$ 
 $S = \{(nym, dom) : ((\cdot, nym, dom, \cdot) \in \text{OUT})\}$ 
 $t = \max_{(\cdot, dom) \in S} |\{(nym) : (nym, dom) \in S\}|$ 
Return 1 iff  $t > |\text{VM}|$ 

```

Fig. 8

**Theorem 5 (Credibility).** The Extended TrollThrottle protocol (see Def. 10) satisfies credibility (see Def. 11) if the underlying DAA scheme is instantly linkable (Def. 5) and the proof system for relation  $\mathcal{R}_{\text{GB}}$  is sound.

*Proof.* The idea behind the proof is as follows. Because we know that to win an adversary has to return  $t > |\text{VM}|$  valid signatures for one basename but at the same time there exist only  $|\text{VM}|$  genesis tuples. It is easy to see now that if the adversary wins, then there must exist at least proof  $\Pi_i^*$ , where  $\gamma_i^* = (\cdot, \cdot, \cdot, \cdot, \Pi_i^*)$  that is false and can be used to break the soundness property of the proof system. Note that this follows from the fact that because of instant linkability there can only exist  $|\text{VM}|$  secret keys that form the pseudonyms  $nym_1$  in a genesis tuple.  $\square$

### C.5 Efficient instantiation of the proof for relation $\mathcal{R}_{\text{GB}}$

Pseudonyms in the scheme by Brickel and Li are of the form  $h(dom)^{sk_S}$ , where  $h$  is a collision-resistant hash function that maps elements from  $\{0, 1\}$  to elements of a group  $\mathbb{G}$  of order  $q$  and the secret key  $sk_S$  is an element in  $\mathbb{Z}_q^*$ . It follows that in such a case we have  $nym_1 = h(1)^{sk_S}$  and  $nym = h(dom)^{sk_S}$ .

To generate  $\Pi$  we will make use of the proof system by Groth and Kohlweiss [38]. They showed an interactive  $\Sigma$ -protocol for the following statement. Given  $n$  commitments  $c_1, \dots, c_n$  at least one opens to 0. The communication size is logarithmic in  $n$ , which means that by applying the Fiat-Shamir transformation we receive a non-interactive zero-knowledge proof of the same size. Note that this proof system requires the commitment scheme to be homomorphic and the message space to be  $\mathbb{Z}_q$ . In particular, Groth and Kohlweiss show that their proof system works for Pedersen commitments where  $\text{com}(x, r) = g^x \cdot \hat{g}^r$  for some elements  $g, \hat{g} \in \mathbb{G}$ .

We will now show an efficient proof system for the following statement: Given  $dom$ ,  $nym$  and ledger  $L$  with genesis tuples  $gb_1, \dots, gb_b$  (where  $gb_i = (\cdot, nym_1^i, \cdot)$ ) there exists a secret key  $sk_S$  and an index  $j$  such that  $nym = \mathbf{NymGen}(sk_S, dom)$  and  $nym_1^j = \mathbf{NymGen}(sk_S, 1)$ . First we notice that by setting  $g = h(1)$  and  $\hat{g} = h(2)$  we can use  $g, \hat{g}$  as parameters for a Pedersen commitment scheme. What's more, for all  $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$  we have  $nym_1^i = com(sk_S^{(i)}, 0)$  where  $sk_S^{(i)}$  is the secret key of the user that generated tuple  $gb_i$ .

To create proof  $\Pi$  the Prover with secret witness  $sk_S, j$  proceeds as follows:

1. computes a commitment  $c = com(sk_S, r)$  using random coins  $r \in \mathbb{Z}_q$ ,
2. for all  $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$  computes  $c_i = c/nym_1^i = com(sk_S - sk_S^{(i)}, r)$ ,
3. computes proof  $\pi$  using the system by Groth and Kohlweiss that one of  $c_1, \dots, c_n$  is a commitment to 0,
4. returns proof  $\Pi = (c, \pi)$ .

To verify the proof a Verifier proceeds as follows:

1. for all  $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$  computes  $c_i = c/nym_1^{(i)}$ ,
2. verifies proof  $\pi$  using  $c_1, \dots, c_n$  as part of the statement and returns true if and only if this proof is valid.

## D Impact on society

We provide a solution for newspapers that want to interact with their readership, but cannot bear the cost of moderation. As of now, among the Top 10 websites in the Alexa ‘News’ section that belongs to a newspaper, three do not offer on-site commenting, two others disable commenting functionality for controversial topics and four require a Facebook signup with a real name. The last one apparently has this functionality, but did not display any comments or provide a link to leave one, presumably due to a glitch. Hence any technique making this interaction feasible again is an improvement to the political discourse. We shall nevertheless discuss some implications in case TrollThrottle, or a similar system, should be adopted in larger parts of the web.

**Setting the threshold** From a technical view point, setting the threshold is a matter of balancing the number of regular users that post beyond this threshold with some target cost that an astroturfing operation should incur. From this perspective, there should be a clear demarcation between bots and regular users, that is characterised among other features by the number of messages these users send. This is, however, not the case, as the journalist Michael Kreil argues in response to a scientific study that used text mining and other learning techniques to recognise social bots [41]. He contacted these purported bots and found out that many of them were, in fact, real people who post well over 150 politically divisive messages per day [50]. In our evaluation database, we found that around 2 % of users are above the threshold of 20 messages per day. Upon inspection,

some of those can be categorised as bots, but many are just very active users or cannot be clearly distinguished from those. One particular user posts a daily average of 96 messages on a cricket-related forum. He or she is just a big sports fan. If, in addition to the daily limit, we impose a limit of 100 comments a week and 300 comments per month, then only an additional 443 Reddit users will be affected, compared to 206 855 out of 6 619 612 users affected by the daily limit itself (in June 2019).

This shows that the system can be set up to avoid affecting intensive users, but, ultimately, *there is no threshold that distinguishes trolls from intensive users*. During the world cup match between India and Afghanistan in June, e.g., the aforementioned cricket fan posted 928 comments. The method we propose is thus affecting the political discourse. It discourages communication patterns employed by power users. This is not necessarily a bad thing, as collective belief formation is driven both by learning from the (stated) beliefs of others and by some interest in maintaining social acceptance [53]. Due to the difficulty of mapping virtual identities to real-world identities, one may argue that the discourse stands to benefit from a limit on the messages, which favours thought-out contributions. In summary, we propose a method for moderation instead of a clear-cut filtering mechanism. It can enable discussion where, currently, there is none. It can be adjusted to accommodate for fluctuations in use by evaluating current patterns, it will impose restrictions on a minority of users.

**Centralisation of discourse** The public ledger provides a centralised view of the discourse on participating websites, even if its implementation is decentralised. This offers several potential advantages: with a slight modification of the protocol, the user can optionally add a pseudonym  $nym_{rep} = \text{NymGen}(sk_U, x)$  for some arbitrary  $x$  (e.g., by signing the comment again under an additional basename  $x$ ), to make a set of messages — across websites — cryptographically linkable. Users can thus build a reputation across websites. Similarly, we may add yet another pseudonym  $nym_{thr} = \text{NymGen}(sk_U, tid)$ , with  $tid$  some global identifier for discussion threads, to ensure that authors have only one identity per thread and don't respond to themselves with a different account. Websites could, theoretically, stop providing their own infrastructure for user registration, and only permit signed posts to appear, providing essentially projections of the ledger's representation of the public discourse.

While these features seem appealing, the idea of a centralised political discourse beyond news websites has to be seen critically. Most importantly, it may undermine the incentives of the issuer described in Section E.1, so she might take the risk and collaborate with a malicious verifier. In our view, this scenario is unlikely. According to a 2018 study, about two thirds of U.S. adults obtain their news on social media sites, about 43% from Facebook [66]. The business model of most of these social media sites is based on exclusive access to their users' information; hence they have little interest to share it. Our focus is therefore on traditional news pages, who benefit from a healthy discourse.

## E Formal analysis of the deferred verification and auditing protocol

```

theory TrollThrottle
begin

builtins: hashing

functions:
  pk/1,sk/1[private],
  sign/3, verify/3,extrmsg/1,
  true/0

equations:
  verify(sign(m, r, sk(i)), m, pk(i)) = true,
  extrmsg(sign(m,r,x))=m

let Issuer =
  let
    skI = sk('I')
    skV = sk('V')
    pkV = pk('V')
    m1 = sid
    pat_m2 = <login,h(<rU,nbd,'1'>)>
    cI = h(rI,sid,h(<rU,nbd,'1'>))
    m3 = sign(cI,r3,skI)
    s1 = h(<rI,sid,'2'>)
    s2 = h(m5)
    claim = <rI,sid,pat_m2,m5>
  in
    out (m1);
  in (pat_m2);
  new rI;
  new r3;
  out (m3);
  in (m5);
  if verify(m5,cI,pkV)=true() then
    event Accepted(nbd);
    ( // case distinction: the attacker may decide to play a game
      ( in(xs1); // (a) the dishonest verifier tries to
        // predict s1 to avoid auditing
        if xs1 = s1 then
          event VerifierPredict()
        )
      )
  +

```

```

( // (b) only if the verifier does not want to play this game,
  // she learns rI
out(<sid,rI>); // we may use a public channel here,
               // because V considered dishonest anyway
out(claim)
)
)

let Verifier =
  let
    skI = sk('I')
    pkI = pk('I')
    skV = sk('V')
    cI = h(<rI,sid,h(<rU,nbd,'1'>)>)
    pat_m4 = <nbd,cI,rU,xm3>
    m5 = sign(cI,r5,skV)
    s1 = h(<rI,sid,'2'>)
    s2 = h(m5)
  in
    in(pat_m4);
    if verify(xm3,cI,pkI)=true() then
      lock cI; // make sure that for the same cI,
               // only one execution is started
    in(evidence);
    event Verified(nbd,evidence);
    new r5;
    event InResponse(rI,sid,m5);
    ( // As before, adversary can decide
      ( in(xs2); // (a) to let a dishonest issuer try to predict s2
        // as to chose m5 in a way that avoids auditing
        if xs2 = s2 then
          event IssuerPredict()
        )
      +
      ( // (b) continue the protocol, as usual
        out(m5);
        in(<sid,rI>);
        // starting from here, assume an audit takes place
        // (adversary can decide whether to run this step)
        out(<rU,nbd>)
      )
    )

let CheckClaim = let

```

```

// A dishonest issuer tries to claim that V needs to send
// evidence, although the values do not match.
// I controls s1 but honest V choses s2
// Hence the issuer wins if she can send s1 and s2 that pass
// checking, but s2 was not the answer of verifier to sid and
// rI used to computed it
skI = sk('I')
skV = sk('V')
pkV = pk('V')
m3 = sign(cI, r3, skI)
pat_claim = <rI, sid, xm2, xm5>
cI = h(rI, sid, xm2)
/* s1 = h(<rI, sid, '2'>) // not used, but this can be used to recompute the c
s2 = h(xm5) //
in
in(pat_claim);
if verify(xm5, cI, pkV) = true() then
    event ClaimAccept(rI, sid, xm5)

!(
  ( new sid; Issuer)
| Verifier)
| CheckClaim
| !(in(p:pub); event Corrupted(p); out(sk(p)))

lemma sanity : // considers dishonest user
  exists-trace
    "Ex nbd #i. Accepted(nbd) @ i
    &
    not (Ex #j p. Corrupted(p)@j)
    "

lemma authenticity_accept : // considers dishonest user
  "All nbd #i. Accepted(nbd) @ i ==>
    (Ex #j evidence. Verified(nbd, evidence) @ j)
  | (Ex #j. Corrupted('V')@j)
  | (Ex #j. Corrupted('I')@j)
  "

lemma unpred_issuer :
  " All #i. IssuerPredict()@i ==> Ex #j. Corrupted('V')@j"

lemma unpred_verified :
  " All #i. VerifierPredict()@i ==> Ex #j. Corrupted('I')@j"

```

```

lemma authenticity_claim : // if claim is accepted , then the
                           // verifier indeed responded to values
                           // that determine the decision
  " All ri sid m5 #i . ClaimAccept(ri ,sid ,m5) @ i
    ==> (Ex #j . InResponse(ri ,sid ,m5) @ j )
    | (Ex #j . Corrupted('V')@j)
  "

end

```

### E.1 Goals & Incentives

A system like TrollThrottle can only be deployed if all parties have incentives to run it and we build our design on the following incentives.

**Websites:** Websites have an incentive to get information about the trolls to lessen the burden on moderation and save on personnel. The system requires paying the issuer a fee for running the infrastructure; hence these costs must be covered by the websites' fee to the issuer. As they benefit from the system, they have an incentive to pay, as long as it is not possible to piggyback on the system. The information necessary to determine whether a user is a troll must hence only be available to paying websites. This can be achieved by using public-key encryption, see below.

**Issuer:** The issuer runs a service and collects a fee. She relies on the trust of the websites to maintain her business. The short-term gain of accepting bribery for issuing non-validated DAA certificates could, however, outweigh the loss of this trust and the potential failing of her business. First, the protocol only allows forging identities in collusion with a verifier. Second, it is possible to keep track of the number of identities in the system that each verifier attested to by modifying the protocol (see Section 4). If a verifier confirms an unusually large number of identities or it is inconsistent with public information (e.g., subscriber lists; the circulation of newspapers is independently audited in most countries, as it is used to set advertising rates), this will raise doubts. A fake identity can thus be linked to the verifier that colluded in creating it. Hence, both the issuer and the verifier carry the risk of exposure, which grows with the number of fake identities they produce.

**Verifiers:** The verifier's incentive to participate is that it is either being paid (IVS), run by one of the participating websites (subscriber list) or is a readily available governmental service (smart passports/identity cards). For an IVS, as well as the government issuing smart identification documents, trustworthiness is existential. By adding a pseudo-probabilistic procedure to the protocol (see Sec. 4), large-scale fraud can be detected with high probability, which would terminate the IVS's business. For newspapers, the participating websites need to carefully decide, which subscriber list they accept — the newspaper should have a reputation to lose. As discussed before, a dishonest issuer has to collude with a dishonest verifier. In this case, they can quietly skip the audit; however, the public can still determine the number of identities verified per verifier. This

allows at least some amount of public scrutiny, as, e.g., the approximate size of the subscriber list is publicly known. One could make the auditing publicly verifiable. This, however, comes the expense of some users' privacy.

## F Review and adoption of the security model taken from [24]

We review Brickell and Li's security model [24], including the user-controlled-anonymity and user-controlled-traceability experiment. Their DAA scheme satisfies both notions under the decisional/ strong Diffie-Hellmann assumption. We slightly simplify their model, as our protocol's computations are performed by a single host and not split between a TPM and an untrusted device.

**Definition 12 (User-controlled-anonymity).** *A DAA scheme is user-controlled-anonymous if no PPT adversary can win the following game between a challenger  $\mathcal{C}$  and an adversary  $\mathcal{A}$ , i.e., if  $\mathbf{Adv}[\mathcal{A}_{\text{DAA}}^{\text{anonymity}}] = \Pr[\mathcal{A} \text{ wins}]$  is negligible:*

- Initial:  $\mathcal{C}$  runs  $\text{Setup}_{\text{DAA}}(1^\lambda)$  and gives the resulting  $sk_I$  and  $pk_I$  to  $\mathcal{A}$ .
- Phase 1:  $\mathcal{C}$  is probed by  $\mathcal{A}$  who makes the following queries:
  - *Sign:*  $\mathcal{A}$  submits a signer's identity  $S$ , a basename  $dom$  (either  $\perp$  or a data string) and a message  $m$  of her choice to  $\mathcal{C}$ , who runs  $\text{Sign}_{\text{DAA}}$  to get a signature  $\sigma$  and responds with  $\sigma$ .
  - *Join:*  $\mathcal{A}$  submits a signer's identity  $S$  of her choice to  $\mathcal{C}$ , who runs  $\text{Join}_{\text{DAA}}$  with  $\mathcal{A}$  to create  $sk_S$  and to obtain a set of valid credentials  $cred_S$  from  $\mathcal{A}$ .  $\mathcal{C}$  verifies the validation of  $cred_S$  and keeps  $sk_S$  secret.
  - *Corrupt:*  $\mathcal{A}$  submits a signer's identity  $S$  of her choice to  $\mathcal{C}$ , who responds with the value  $sk_{\text{DAA}}$  of the signer.
- Challenge: At the end of phase 1,  $\mathcal{A}$  chooses two signers' identities  $S_0$  and  $S_1$ , a message  $m$  and a basename  $dom$  of her choice to  $\mathcal{C}$ .  $\mathcal{A}$  must not have made any Corrupt query on either  $S_0$  or  $S_1$ , and not have made the Sign query with the same  $dom$  if  $dom \neq \perp$  with either  $S_0$  or  $S_1$ . To make the challenge,  $\mathcal{C}$  chooses a bit  $b$  uniformly at random, signs  $m$  associated with  $dom$  under  $(sk_{S_b}, cred_{S_b})$  to get a signature  $\sigma$  and returns  $\sigma$  to  $\mathcal{A}$ .
- phase 2:  $\mathcal{A}$  continues to probe  $\mathcal{C}$  with the same type of queries that it made in phase 1. Again,  $\mathcal{A}$  is not allowed to corrupt any signer with the identity either  $S_0$  or  $S_1$ , and not allowed to make any Sign query with  $dom$  if  $dom \neq \perp$  with either  $S_0$  or  $S_1$ .
- Response:  $\mathcal{A}$  returns a bit  $b'$ . We say that the adversary wins the game if  $b = b'$

**Definition 13 (User-controlled-traceability).** *A DAA scheme is user-controlled-traceable if no probabilistic polynomial-time adversary can win the following game between a challenger  $\mathcal{C}$  and an adversary  $\mathcal{A}$ , i.e., if  $\mathbf{Adv}[\mathcal{A}_{\text{DAA}}^{\text{trace}}] = \Pr[\mathcal{A} \text{ wins}]$  is negligible:*

- Initial:  $\mathcal{C}$  runs  $\text{Setup}_{\text{DAA}}(1^\lambda)$ , gives the resulting  $pk_I$  to  $\mathcal{A}$  but keeps  $sk_I$ .

- Phase 1:  $\mathcal{C}$  is probed by  $\mathcal{A}$  who makes the following queries:
  - *Sign*: The same as in the game of user-controlled-anonymity.
  - *Join*: There are two cases of this query. Case 1:  $\mathcal{A}$  submits a signer's identity  $S$  of her choice to  $\mathcal{C}$ , who runs  $\text{Join} - \text{Issue}_{\text{DAA}}$  to create  $sk_{\text{DAA}}$  and  $cred$  for the signer. Case 2:  $\mathcal{A}$  submits a signer's identity  $S$  with a  $sk_{\text{DAA}}$  value of her choice to  $\mathcal{C}$ , who runs  $\text{Join} - \text{Issue}_{\text{DAA}}$  to create  $cred$  for the signer and puts the given  $sk_{\text{DAA}}$  into a revocation list  $RL$ .  $\mathcal{C}$  responds the query with  $cred$ .  
Suppose that  $\mathcal{A}$  does not use a single  $S$  for both of the cases.
  - *Corrupt*. This is the same as in the game of user-controlled-anonymity, except that at the end  $\mathcal{C}$  puts the revealed secret key into the list  $RL$ .
- *Forge*:  $\mathcal{A}$  returns a signer's identity  $S$ , a signature  $\sigma$ , it's signed message  $m$  and the associated basename  $dom$ .  
We say that the adversary wins the game if
  1.  $\text{Verify}_{\text{DAA}}(pk_I, m, dom, \sigma, RL) = 1$  (accepted), but  $\sigma$  is no response of the existing *Sign* queries, and/or
  2. In the case of  $dom \neq \perp$ , there exists another signature  $\sigma'$  associated with the same identity and  $dom$ , and the output of  $\text{Link}_{\text{DAA}}(\sigma, \sigma')$  is 0 (unlinked).

We will use the following notation to denote the queries made by the adversary:

- $\text{Sign}_{\text{DAA}}(S, dom, m)$  - On input of a signer's identity  $S$ , a basename  $dom$  (either  $\perp$  or a data string), a message  $m$  the oracle returns signature  $\sigma$ .
- $\text{HJoin}_{\text{DAA}}(S)$  - On input of a signer's identity  $S$  of her choice, the adversary obtains credentials  $cred_S$ . The secret key  $sk_S$  is kept secret by the oracle. This oracle corresponds to Case 1 joining.
- $\text{Join}_{\text{DAA}}(S, sk_S)$  - On input of a signer's identity  $S$  of her choice and a secret key  $sk_S$ , the adversary obtains credentials  $cred_S$ . This oracle corresponds to Case 2 joining.
- $\text{IHJoin}(S)$  - On input of a signer's identity  $S$  of her choice, this interactive honest user joining oracle allows the adversary to issue credentials for an honest user in the name of the issuer. This oracle represents the Join oracle defined in user-controlled-anonymity.
- $\text{CorruptUser}_{\text{DAA}}(S)$  - On input of a signer's identity  $S$ , the value  $sk$  is returned to the adversary

**Definition 14 (correctness).** *If both the signer and verifier are honest, then the signatures and their links generated by the signer will be accepted by the verifier with overwhelming probability, i.e., for any secret key  $sk_S$  in the user's*

secret key space if

$$\begin{aligned} (pk_I, sk_I) &\leftarrow \text{Setup}_{\text{DAA}}(1^\lambda), \\ (\text{com}) &\leftarrow \text{Join}_{\text{DAA}}(pk_I, sk_S), \\ (\text{cred}_S) &\leftarrow \text{Issue}_{\text{DAA}}(sk_I, \text{com}), \\ \sigma_0 &\leftarrow \text{Sign}_{\text{DAA}}(sk_S, \text{cred}, m_0, \text{dom}), \text{ and} \\ \sigma_1 &\leftarrow \text{Sign}_{\text{DAA}}(sk_S, \text{cred}, m_1, \text{dom}), \end{aligned}$$

then, with overwhelming probability,

$$1 \leftarrow \text{Verify}_{\text{DAA}}(pk_I, m, \text{dom}, \sigma_i), i \in \{0, 1\}$$

and

$$1 \leftarrow \text{Link}_{\text{DAA}}(\sigma_0, \sigma_1).$$

Brickell and Li's scheme is easily shown to fulfil our requirement that the Link function can also be represented using the pseudonym that is included in the signature. This pseudonym is fixed per identity and per basenamespace.

**Theorem 6.** *For any cryptographic collision resistant hash function  $h : \{0, 1\}^* \rightarrow \mathbb{G}$ , Brickell and Li's scheme [24] is an instantly linkable DAA scheme if we define:*

$$\begin{aligned} \text{NymExtract}(\sigma) &:= \sigma_2 \\ \text{NymGen}(sk_S, \text{dom}) &:= h(\text{dom})^{sk_S} \\ \text{VerifyBsn}(\sigma, \text{dom}) &:= \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } \sigma_1 = h(\text{dom}) \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

where  $\sigma = (\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_9)$ .

*Proof.* It is easy to see that pseudonyms of the form  $h(\text{dom})^{sk_S}$  are already used by the Brickell and Li scheme but are hidden as part of the signature (i.e., as  $\sigma_2$ ). Thus, **NymExtract** and **NymGen** work according to the definition of instant linkability. Lastly, we note that the first element of the signature  $\sigma_1$  is actually the base under which we compute the pseudonym, i.e.,  $h(\text{dom})$ . Note that in our system we always use domain-based DAA signatures and this element is in the range of the hash function and not a random element (as also allowed in the Brickell and Li scheme).  $\square$

**Theorem 7.** *Brickell and Li's scheme [24] with a minor modification is an updateable DAA scheme.*

*Proof.* The main observation is that in the **Join** – **Issue**<sub>DAA</sub> protocol the user computes a Diffie-Hellman public key  $F = h_1^f$  and computes a Schnorr like proof for  $f$ , i.e., it computes  $R = h_1^{r_f}$ , challenge  $c = h(pk_I || \text{nonce} || F || R)$  and proof  $s_f = r_f + c \cdot f$ . The generator  $h_1$  is part of the public key  $pk_I$ , nonce is some

nonce send by the issuer to prevent replay attacks and  $u = (F, c, s_f, \text{nonce})$ . What's more, the setup algorithm the generator  $h_1$  by directly sampling a group element, i.e., it is generated using public coins .

One can easily notice that we can set  $gpk_1 = (h_1)$  (including the group definition), where  $gpk_2$  contains the remaining parameters (see [24] for a full specification). The only problem we have to tackle with is that the challenge  $c$ , used to generate the proof  $s_f$ , contains the full public parameters  $pk_I$ . Indeed, there is no reason to include the full  $pk_I$  besides to protect against cross issuer attacks, i.e., a malicious man-in-the-middle could register a user into a different DAA system (with a different  $pk_I$ ). However, in our case we want this to be true. What's more important here is that changing the challenge does not break the soundness of the proof. Since, the used proof is a standard Fiat-Shamir instantiation of a sigma protocol, it is sufficient that challenge contains remaining values.

□

## G Proofs of security

We first define the adversarial model in terms of the oracles at the attacker's disposal. Then we treat introduce and prove each security property, one by one.

### G.1 Model Oracles

To model the security of the protocol, we first define the adversarial capabilities in terms of a set of oracles that will be used in the following security definitions. The challenger in all these definitions is defined in terms of these oracles and the winning condition of the adversary.

**Definition 15.** *We define the following oracles and global sets CU, HU, VM, USK, CH, COMM that are initially set empty:*

**CorruptUser**( $U$ ) - *on input of the user identifier this oracle, checks if there is a tuple  $(U, sk_U, cred_U) \in \text{USK}$  then output  $(sk_U, cred_U)$ . Otherwise it outputs  $\perp$ . Finally, it adds  $U$  to the set CU and sets  $\text{HU} = \text{HU} \cup \{U\}$ .*

**CorruptVer**( $U, \text{ver}, V$ ) - *on input of the user identifier and database ver, this oracle sets  $\text{ver}[V, U] = 1$  and adds  $(V, U)$  to the set VM.*

**CreateHonestUser**( $U, \text{ver}, sk_I, V$ ) - *this oracle first checks that  $U \notin \text{HU} \cup \text{CU}$  and returns  $\perp$  if not. Then it sets  $\text{ver}[V, U] = 1$  and runs the Join – Issue protocol, receiving  $(sk_U, cred_U)$ . Finally, it adds  $(U, sk_U, cred_U, V)$  into USK and  $U$  to HU.*

**JoinSystem**( $U, \text{ver}, sk_I, V$ ) - *this oracle first checks that  $U \notin \text{HU} \cup \text{CU}$ ,  $\text{ver}[V, U] = 1$  and that  $(\cdot, U) \notin \text{VM}$ . It returns  $\perp$ , if both checks fail. Then, it interactively executes **Issue**( $sk_I, \text{ver}, U$ ) by communicating with the adversary.*

**HJoinSystem**( $U, \text{ver}, pk_I, V$ ) - this oracle first checks that  $U \notin \text{HU} \cup \text{CU}$  and  $(\cdot, U) \notin \text{VM}$ . It returns  $\perp$  if both checks fails. Then it sets  $\text{ver}[V, U] = 1$ , samples a fresh secret key  $sk_U$  and interactively executes the **Join**( $pk_I, sk_U, U$ ) protocol with the adversary, receiving  $\text{cred}_U$ . It then adds  $(U, sk_U, \text{cred}_U, V)$  to **USK** and  $U$  into **HU**.

**CreateComment**( $U, \text{dom}, m, pk_I$ ) - this oracle first checks that  $U \in \text{HU}$  and then computes  $(nym, \gamma) \xleftarrow{\$} \text{Comment}(pk_I, sk_U, \text{cred}_U, \text{dom}, m)$ . Finally, it adds  $(U, nym, \text{dom}, m, \gamma)$  to **COMM** and outputs  $\gamma$  and the pseudonym  $nym$ .

**Chall<sub>b</sub>**( $U, \text{dom}, m, sk_I, pk_I$ ) - this oracle first checks that  $U \in \text{HU}$  and returns  $\perp$  if not. If  $(U, \text{dom}, sk_{U, \text{dom}}, \text{cred}_{U, \text{dom}}) \notin \text{CH}$  then the oracle executes the **Join** - Issue protocol to receive a new secret key  $sk_{U, \text{dom}}$  and credential  $\text{cred}_{U, \text{dom}}$ . Then it adds  $(U, \text{dom}, sk_{U, \text{dom}}, \text{cred}_{U, \text{dom}})$  to **CH** and computes: **if**  $b = 0$ :  $(nym, \gamma) \xleftarrow{\$} \text{Comment}(pk_I, sk_U, \text{cred}_U, \text{dom}, m)$ ,

**else if**  $b = 1$ :  $(nym, \gamma) \xleftarrow{\$} \text{Comment}(pk_I, sk_{U, \text{dom}}, \text{cred}_{U, \text{dom}}, \text{dom}, m)$   
Finally, it outputs  $\gamma$  and pseudonym  $nym$ .

## G.2 Protection against trolling

**Definition 16.** We say that the system protects against trolling if for every adversary  $\mathcal{A}$ , every  $1^\lambda$ , the probability  $\Pr[\text{Exp}_{\mathcal{A}}^{\text{troll}}(1^\lambda) = 1]$  is negligible  $1^\lambda$ .

### Experiment $\text{Exp}_{\mathcal{A}}^{\text{troll}}(1^\lambda)$ :

$\text{CU} \leftarrow \emptyset; \text{HU} \leftarrow \emptyset; V \leftarrow \emptyset;$   
 $\text{USK} \leftarrow \emptyset; \text{COMM} \leftarrow \emptyset; \text{ver} \leftarrow \emptyset;$   
 $(sk_I, pk_I) \xleftarrow{\$} \text{Setup}(1^\lambda)$   
 $\mathcal{O} = \{\text{CorruptUser}(\cdot), \text{CreateHonestUser}(\cdot, \text{ver}, sk_I),$   
 $\text{CorruptVer}(\cdot, \text{ver}), \text{JoinSystem}(\cdot, \text{ver}, sk_I), \text{CreateComment}(\cdot, \cdot, \cdot, pk_I)\}$   
 $\text{OUT} = \{(nym_i^*, \text{dom}_i^*, m_i^*, \gamma_i^*)\}_{i=1}^k \xleftarrow{\$} \mathcal{A}^{\mathcal{O}}(\rho, pk_I)$   
 $\text{OUT} = \text{OUT} \setminus \{(nym, \text{dom}, m, \gamma) : (\cdot, nym, \text{dom}, m, \gamma) \in \text{COMM}\}$   
 Return 0 if  $\text{Verify}(pk_I, nym_i^*, \text{dom}_i^*, m_i^*, \gamma_i^*) = 0$  for any  $i \in \{1, \dots, k\}$   
 $S = \{(nym, \text{dom}) : (nym, \text{dom}, \cdot, \cdot) \in \text{OUT}\}$   
 $t = \max_{(\cdot, \text{dom}) \in S} |\{(nym) : (nym, \text{dom}) \in S\}|$   
 Return 1 if  $t > |\text{CU}| + |\text{VM}|$

Fig. 9

**Theorem 8 (Protection against trolling).** The *TrollThrottle* protocol (see Def. 3) satisfies protection against trolling (see Def. 16) if the underlying DAA scheme provides user-controlled traceability (Def. 13) and is instantly linkable (Def. 5), the user hash function is collision-resistant and the proof system for relation  $\mathcal{R}_{\text{Join}}$  is a proof of knowledge.

*Proof.* We begin this proof by noting that the adversary can only win the trolling experiment in three ways.

1. by finding a comment with a DAA signature  $\sigma$  under basename  $dom_1$  and message  $m$  that is also valid for basename  $dom_2$  and message  $m$ , where  $dom_1 \neq dom_2$ .
2. forging a signature for an honest user for message  $m^*$  where there exists a tuple  $(\cdot, \cdot, \cdot, m, \cdot) \in \text{COMM}$  for which  $h(m^*) = h(m)$ .
3. by creating a “fake” new user without interacting with the issuer or forging a signature for an honest user for message  $m^*$  where there exists no tuple  $(\cdot, \cdot, \cdot, m, \cdot) \in \text{COMM}$  for which  $h(m^*) = h(m)$ .

We will now show that any adversary has only a negligible probability to actually perform any of the above attacks. To do so, we will create reductions that interact with the adversary and a DAA challenger for the user-controlled traceability. However, first we show how those reductions will answer the oracle queries of the adversary. In every case, the reduction will play the role of the adversary against the DAA scheme. Thus, it will receive the public key of the DAA issuer  $pk_I$ . Moreover, every reduction will keep its own local vector  $\text{ver}$  (initially zero) and initially empty lists  $\text{HU}_{\mathcal{R}}$ ,  $\text{CU}_{\mathcal{R}}$  (different than the ones used in the definitions) and  $\text{COMM}$ .

*Generic way of answering oracle queries by the reduction*

- CorruptVer**( $U, \text{ver}$ ) - on a corrupt verification query, the reduction just sets the local value  $\text{ver}[U]$  to 1.
- CreateHonestUser**( $U, \text{ver}, sk_I$ ) - on an honest user creation query, the reduction returns  $\text{cred}_U$  if  $(U, \text{cred}_U) \in \text{HU}_{\mathcal{R}}$ . If such a tuple does not exist, it queries the DAA  $\text{HJoin}_{\text{DAA}}(S)$  oracle, where  $S = U$ , receives a DAA credentials  $\text{cred}_S$  and adds  $(U, \text{cred}_U)$  into  $\text{HU}_{\mathcal{R}}$  and returns  $\text{cred}_U = \text{cred}_S$ .
- CorruptUser**( $U$ ) - on a corrupt honest user query, the reduction returns  $\perp$  if there exists no tuple  $(U, \text{cred}_U) \in \text{HU}_{\mathcal{R}}$ . Otherwise, it queries the DAA oracle **CorruptUser** $_{\text{DAA}}(S)$ , where  $S = U$  and receives the DAA secret key  $sk_U = sk_S$  and credentials  $\text{cred}_U = \text{cred}_S$ . The reduction updates  $\text{HU}_{\mathcal{R}} = \text{HU}_{\mathcal{R}} \setminus \{(U, \text{cred}_U)\}$ , add  $(U, sk_U, \text{cred}_U)$  to  $\text{CU}_{\mathcal{R}}$  and returns  $sk_U = sk_S$ .
- JoinSystem**( $U, \text{ver}, sk_I$ ) - on a corrupt user joining query, the reduction returns  $\perp$  if  $\text{ver}[U] = 0$  or  $(U, \cdot) \in \text{HU}_{\mathcal{R}}$ . The reduction then uses the extraction algorithm **Extr** to extract  $sk_S$  from  $\Pi_{\text{Join}}$ . It then uses its own **Join** $_{\text{DAA}}(U, sk_S)$  and obtains credentials  $\text{cred}_S$ . The reduction then adds  $(U, sk_S, \text{cred}_S)$  to  $\text{CU}_{\mathcal{R}}$  and returns  $\text{cred}_U = \text{cred}_S$  to the adversary.
- CreateComment**( $U, dom, m, pk_I$ ) - on a commenting query, the reduction first checks that the query is for an honest user, i.e., that  $(U, \cdot) \in \text{HU}_{\mathcal{R}}$  and returns  $\perp$  if this is not the case. It then uses its own signing oracle to query **Sign** $_{\text{DAA}}(U, dom, m)$  receiving signature  $\sigma$  and computes  $nym = \text{NymExtract}(\sigma)$ . Finally, it returns  $\gamma = (\sigma, nym, m, dom)$  and it adds  $(U, nym, dom, m, \gamma)$  into  $\text{COMM}$ .

If the **Extr** fail, then the reduction also fails. Thus, it is easy to see that the probability of any reduction in simulating the real experiment without error

depends heavily on this algorithm. Fortunately, we assumed that they fail only with negligible probability, so does our reduction.

*Case 1* We will now discuss that there cannot exist any adversary that can use the first attack strategy. This basically follows from the instant linkability of the DAA scheme, i.e., because of the `VerifyBsn`, we ensure that signatures are linked to basenames and the probability that any  $\mathcal{A}$  finds such a “collision” is negligible.

To show this more formally, let us assume that there exists an adversary  $\mathcal{A}$  that wins by returning a valid comment  $\gamma_1 = (\sigma^*, \cdot, dom^*, m^*)$  where  $(\cdot, nym^*, dom^*, m^*, \gamma_1) \notin \text{COMM}$  but there exists a tuple  $\gamma_2 = (\sigma^*, \cdot, dom, m^*)$  such that  $(\cdot, nym^*, dom, m^*, \gamma_2) \in \text{COMM}$ , which is what we assumed in this case. However, because both commitments are valid we know that  $\text{VerifyBsn}(\sigma^*, dom^*) = 1$  and  $\text{VerifyBsn}(\sigma^*, dom) = 1$ , and  $\text{Verify}_{\text{DAA}}(pk_I, m, dom^*, \sigma^*, RL_\emptyset) = 1$  and  $\text{Verify}_{\text{DAA}}(pk_I, m, dom, \sigma^*, RL_\emptyset) = 1$ . Thus, we found a “collision” and broke the instant linkability property of the DAA scheme for which we assumed that there exists no PPT adversary with non-negligible probability.

*Case 2* It is easy to see that by winning in this case the adversary  $\mathcal{A}$  can be used to break collision-resistance of the hash function  $h$ . The reduction just returns  $(m, m^*)$  as a collision for  $h$ .

*Case 3* We will now show that in case 2 if there exists an adversary  $\mathcal{A}$  against the trolling experiment, then we can use it to construct a reduction  $\mathcal{R}$  against the user-controlled-traceability experiment. In particular, we have shown above that how  $\mathcal{R}$  can answer all possible queries of  $\mathcal{A}$  using its own oracles for the user-controlled-traceability experiment. Thus, at some point  $\mathcal{A}$  will conclude and return a list OUT. We assume without loss of generality that this list does not contain any of the signatures returned as part of the `CreateComment` oracle queries. Note that the experiment explicitly disallows such tuples. Since we assumed that  $\mathcal{A}$  wins the experiment, thus there must exist a basename  $dom$  for which  $\max_{(\cdot, dom) \in S} = t > |\text{CU}| + |\text{VM}|$ , where  $S = \{(nym, dom) : (\cdot, nym, dom, \cdot) \in \text{OUT}\}$ . However, what this implies is that there must exist exactly  $t$  valid DAA signatures in OUT for the basename  $dom$ . Let us denote those signatures under respectively pseudonyms  $nym_1, \dots, nym_t$  and messages  $m_1, \dots, m_t$  as  $\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_t$ . We also know that all  $nym_1, \dots, nym_t$  are distinct. What’s more, because of instant linkability we know that there exist secret keys  $sk_1, \dots, sk_t$  for which  $nym_i = \text{NymGen}(sk_i, dom)$ , where there is at least one secret key  $sk_j$  which was not extracted by the reduction (and put in on the revocation list by the user-controlled-traceability experiment). It follows that for the revocation list  $RL = \{sk_1, \dots, sk_{j-1}, sk_{j+1}, \dots, sk_t\}$  we have that  $\text{Verify}_{\text{DAA}}(pk_I, m_j, dom, \sigma_j, RL) = 1$ . Thus, since we know that all signatures in OUT are not an output of the `CreateComment` oracle and there exists at least one valid signature despite using a revocation list with the secret keys of all corrupted users by returning  $(U, \sigma_j, m_j, dom)$  for some  $U$  of a signer, the reduction wins the user-controlled-traceability experiment. The  $U$  is chosen depending on

the type of forgery. If  $sk_j$  does not correspond to a secret key of any honest user (the reduction can check this asking its oracle for a signature under a dummy message for all honest users in basename  $dom$  and comparing the corresponding pseudonym with  $nym_j$ )  $U$  is chosen as an identifier of a corrupted user and otherwise as the identifier of the honest user with secret key  $sk_j$ .

Thus, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr[\text{Exp}_{\mathcal{A}}^{\text{troll}}(1^\lambda) = 1] &= 3 \cdot (\text{Adv}[\mathcal{R}_{\text{DAA}}^{\text{trace}}] + \text{Adv}[\mathcal{R}_h^{\text{collision}}] + \\ &\quad + \text{Adv}[\mathcal{R}_{\text{DAA}}^{\text{VerifyBsn}}]) + \text{Adv}[\mathcal{R}_H^{E_1}] \\ &\leq \text{negl}(\lambda). \end{aligned}$$

□

### G.3 Non-frameability

**Definition 17.** We say that the system is non-frameable if for every adversary  $\mathcal{A}$ , every  $1^\lambda$ , the probability  $\Pr[\text{Exp}_{\mathcal{A}}^{\text{noframe}}(1^\lambda) = 1]$  is negligible  $1^\lambda$ .

**Experiment  $\text{Exp}_{\mathcal{A}}^{\text{noframe}}(1^\lambda)$ :**

```

CU ← ∅; HU ← ∅; V ← ∅;
USK ← ∅; COMM ← ∅; ver ← ∅;
 $(sk_I, pk_I) \xleftarrow{\$} \text{Setup}(1^\lambda)$ 
 $\mathcal{O} = \{\text{CorruptUser}(\cdot), \text{CreateHonestUser}(\cdot, \text{ver}, sk_I),$ 
 $\text{CorruptVer}(\cdot, \text{ver}), \text{CreateComment}(\cdot, \cdot, \cdot, pk_I), \text{JoinSystem}(\cdot, \text{ver}, sk_I)\}$ 
 $(nym^*, dom^*, m^*, \gamma^*) \xleftarrow{\$} \mathcal{A}^{\mathcal{O}}(\rho, pk_I)$ 
Return 0 if  $\text{Verify}(pk_I, nym^*, dom^*, m^*, \gamma^*) = 0$ 
Return 1 if:
1) there exists no tuple  $(\cdot, nym^*, dom^*, m^*, \gamma^*)$  in COMM, and
2)  $\exists U^* \in \text{HU } nym^* = nym_{U^*}$ , where
 $(nym_{U^*}, \cdot) \xleftarrow{\$} \text{Comment}(pk_I, sk_{U^*}, cred_{U^*}, dom^*, m^*)$ , and
 $(U^*, sk_{U^*}, cred_{U^*}, \cdot) \in \text{USK}$ 

```

Fig. 10

**Theorem 9 (Non-frameability).** *The TrollThrottle protocol (see Def. 3) satisfies Non-frameability (see Def. 16) if the underlying DAA scheme provides user-controlled traceability (Def. 13) and is instantly linkable (Def. 5), the hash function  $h$  is collision-resistant and the proof system for relation  $\mathcal{R}_{\text{Join}}$  is a proof of knowledge.*

*Proof.* Assume there exists a PPT adversary  $\mathcal{A}$  that can win the non-frameability game with non-negligible probability. Then by instant linkability there  $\exists dom, U \in \text{HU}, nym = \text{NymGen}(sk_U, dom)$ , s.t.  $\text{Verify}(pk_I, nym, dom, m, \gamma) = 1$  and  $\neg \exists(\cdot, nym,$

$dom, m, \gamma) \in \text{COMM}$ . In other words, the adversary is able to create a valid  $\gamma = (\sigma, nym, dom, m)$  tuple that corresponds to an honest user  $U \in \text{HU}$ . We first exclude the case that the adversary wins by using a comment from COMM under a different message  $m'$ . It is easy to see that this basically corresponds to an attack against the collision-resistance of the hash function and we can use  $\mathcal{A}$  to break the security of the hash function  $h$ . We will show that in any adversary winning in any other can be used to create reduction  $\mathcal{R}$  that wins the user-controlled traceability experiment for the DAA scheme with non-negligible probability.

$\mathcal{R}$  simulates the non-frameability experiment for  $\mathcal{A}$  according to G.2. With non-negligible probability,  $\mathcal{R}$  obtains  $(nym^*, dom^*, m^*, \gamma^*) \xleftarrow{\$} \mathcal{A}^\mathcal{O}(\rho, pk_1)$ . Let  $out = (U^*, \sigma^*, m^*, dom^*)$ , where  $\gamma^* = (\sigma^*, nym^*, dom^*, m^*)$  and  $U^*$  corresponds to the honest user with  $nym^* = \text{NymGen}(sk_{U^*}, dom^*)$ . According to winning conditions of the non-frameability experiment we have that  $\text{Verify}_{\text{DAA}}(pk_{I, \text{DAA}}, m^*, dom^*, \sigma^*, RL_\emptyset)$  will return 1 and  $\sigma^*$  is not the result of any signing query made by the reduction  $\mathcal{R}$ . What's more, the winning conditions require that the signature corresponds to an honest user, which by instant linkability means that  $\sigma^*$  is also valid for the revocation list containing the secret keys of all corrupted users in CU. Thus, by returning  $out$ , the reduction wins the user-controlled-traceability experiment with a non-negligible probability. It follows that we have

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr[\text{Exp}_{\mathcal{A}}^{\text{noframe}}(1^\lambda) = 1] &= \text{Adv}[\mathcal{R}_{\text{DAA}}^{\text{trace}}] + \text{Adv}[\mathcal{R}_h^{\text{collision}}] + \\ &\quad \text{Adv}[\mathcal{R}_H^{E_1}] \leq \text{negl}(\lambda). \end{aligned}$$

□

#### G.4 Anonymity

**Definition 18.** We say that the system is anonymous if for every adversary  $\mathcal{A}$ , every  $1^\lambda$ , the probability  $\Pr[\text{Exp}_{\mathcal{A}}^{\text{anon}}(1^\lambda) = 1] = \frac{1}{2} + \text{negl}(\lambda)$ .

**Experiment  $\text{Exp}_{\mathcal{A}}^{\text{anon}}(1^\lambda)$ :**

$\text{CU} \leftarrow \emptyset; \text{HU} \leftarrow \emptyset; V \leftarrow \emptyset;$   
 $\text{USK} \leftarrow \emptyset; \text{COMM} \leftarrow \emptyset; \text{ver} \leftarrow \emptyset;$   
 $(sk_I, pk_I) \xleftarrow{\$} \text{Setup}(1^\lambda)$   
 $\mathcal{O} = \{\text{CorruptUser}(\cdot), \text{CreateHonestUser}(\cdot, \text{ver}, sk_I),$   
 $\text{HJoinSystem}(\cdot, \text{ver}, pk_I, V), \text{CreateComment}(\cdot, \cdot, \cdot, pk_I)\}$   
 $(U^*, dom^*, m^*) \xleftarrow{\$} \mathcal{A}^{\mathcal{O}}(\rho, sk_I)$   
 $b \xleftarrow{\$} \{0, 1\}$   
 $\text{chall} = \text{Chall}_b(U^*, dom^*, m^*, sk_I, pk_I)$   
 $\mathcal{O}_2 = \{\text{CorruptUser}(\cdot), \text{CreateHonestUser}(\cdot, \text{ver}, sk_I),$   
 $\text{HJoinSystem}(\cdot, \text{ver}, pk_I, V), \text{CreateComment}(\cdot, \cdot, \cdot, pk_I)\}$   
 $b^* \xleftarrow{\$} \mathcal{A}^{\mathcal{O}_2}(\rho, sk_I, \text{chall})$   
 Return 0 if  $(U^*, \cdot, dom^*, \cdot, \cdot) \in \text{COMM}$   
 Return 1 iff  $b = b^*$  and  $U^* \in \text{HU}$

Fig. 11

**Theorem 10 (Anonymity).** *The TrollThrottle protocol (see Def. 3) satisfies Anonymity (see Def. 18), if the underlying DAA scheme provides user-controlled anonymity (Def. 12) and the proof system for relation  $\mathcal{R}_{\text{Join}}$  is a proof of knowledge.*

*Proof.* Assume there exists a PPT adversary  $\mathcal{A}$  that can break the anonymity game with probability  $\frac{1}{2} + \epsilon(\lambda)$  where  $\epsilon$  is non-negligible in  $\lambda$ . We construct a PPT adversary  $\mathcal{R}$  against the user-controlled-anonymity game that wins with the same probability as  $\mathcal{A}$ . We construct  $\mathcal{R}$  as follows:

1. Experiment simulation for  $\mathcal{A}$ :
  - The oracles  $\text{CorruptUser}(\cdot)$ ,  $\text{CreateHonestUser}(\cdot, \text{ver}, sk_I)$ ,  $\text{CreateComment}(\cdot, \cdot, \cdot, pk_I)$  are simulated according to G.2.
  - To answer queries to the  $\text{HJoinSystem}$  oracle, the reduction uses its own  $\text{IHJoin}(S)$  oracle and the simulator  $\text{Sim}$  to generate the proof for relation  $\mathcal{R}_{\text{Join}}$  (here we require the zero-knowledge property).
  - The oracle  $\text{Chall}_b(U, dom, m, sk_I, pk_I)$  is simulated as follows:
    - $\mathcal{R}$  chooses some  $U' \neq U$  and  $(U', \cdot, \cdot, \cdot) \notin \text{USK}$  uniformly at random.
    - $\mathcal{R}$  queries its Join oracle on  $U'$  obtaining  $\text{cred}_{U'}$ .
    - $\mathcal{R}$  gives  $S_0 = U$  and  $S_1 = U'$ ,  $m$  and  $dom$  to its challenger and receives the challenge  $\sigma'_b = \text{Sign}_{\text{DAA}}(sk_{S_b}, \text{cred}_{S_b}, m, dom)$ .
    - $\mathcal{R}$  sends  $(\text{NymExtract}(\sigma'_b), (\sigma'_b, \text{NymExtract}(\sigma'_b), dom, m))$  to  $\mathcal{A}$ . If the challenged bit is 0, the simulation of  $\mathcal{R}$  is equivalent to  $\text{Chall}_0(\cdot)$ . Otherwise, if the challenged bit is 1, the simulation is equivalent to  $\text{Chall}_1(\cdot)$ .
  - With non-negligible probability,  $\mathcal{R}$  obtains  $b_A \xleftarrow{\$} \mathcal{A}^{\mathcal{O}}(\rho, sk_I)$ .
2.  $\mathcal{R}$  returns  $\text{out} = b_A$  and wins the user-controlled anonymity experiment if  $\mathcal{A}$  wins against its anonymity game.

Thus, by user-controlled anonymity of the DAA scheme and the zero-knowledge of the proof system we have  $\Pr[\text{Exp}_{\mathcal{A}}^{\text{anon}}(1^\lambda) = 1] = \frac{1}{2} + \mathbf{Adv}[\mathcal{R}_{\text{DAA}}^{\text{anon}}] + \mathbf{Adv}[\mathcal{R}_{\text{H}}^{\text{ZK}}]$ .  $\square$

## G.5 Accountability

The system shall provide accountability against censorship by allowing a participant to claim and prove that a website censored its comment. The party provides evidence that can be used to prove that an entry in the public ledger belongs to a certain message and basename. Deciding when a message is acceptable is a matter of public opinion and not modelled here.

### Soundness

**Definition 19.** *We say that the system's accountability mechanism is sound if for every adversary  $\mathcal{A}$  and  $1^\lambda$ , the probability  $\Pr[\text{Exp}_{\mathcal{A}}^{\text{accsound}}(1^\lambda) = 1]$  is negligible  $1^\lambda$ .*

**Experiment  $\text{Exp}_{\mathcal{A}}^{\text{accsound}}(1^\lambda)$ :**

CU  $\leftarrow \emptyset$ ; HU  $\leftarrow \emptyset$ ; VM  $\leftarrow \emptyset$ ;  
 USK  $\leftarrow \emptyset$ ; COMM  $\leftarrow \emptyset$ ; ver  $\leftarrow \emptyset$ ;  
 $(sk_I, pk_I) \xleftarrow{\$} \text{Setup}(1^\lambda)$   
 $\mathcal{O} = \{\text{CorruptUser}(\cdot), \text{CreateHonestUser}(\cdot, \text{ver}, sk_I),$   
 $\text{CorruptVer}(\cdot, \text{ver}), \text{CreateComment}(\cdot, \cdot, \cdot, pk_I), \text{JoinSystem}(\cdot, \text{ver}, sk_I)\}$   
 $(dom^*, m^*, \gamma^*, evidence^*) \xleftarrow{\$} \mathcal{A}^{\mathcal{O}}(\rho, pk_I)$   
 Return 1 if all of the following hold true

- COMM contains no tuple  $(\cdot, dom^*, m^*, \cdot)$
- COMM contains a tuple  $(\cdot, \cdot, \cdot, \gamma^*)$
- $\text{VerifyClaim}(pk_I, dom^*, m^*, \gamma^*, evidence^*) = 1$

Fig. 12

**Theorem 11 (Sound accountability).** *The TrollThrottle protocol (see Def. 3) has a sound accountability mechanism (see Def. 19) if  $h$  is collision resistant.*

*Proof.* Assume there exists a PPT adversary  $\mathcal{A}$  that can win the sound accountability game with non-negligible probability. For the case where the experiment returns 1, the adversary returns  $(dom^*, m^*, \gamma^*, evidence^*)$  such that,  $(\cdot, \cdot, dom^*, m^*, \cdot) \notin \text{COMM}$ , but, for some  $U'$ ,  $nym'$ ,  $dom'$  and  $m'$ ,  $(U', nym', dom', m', \gamma^*) \in \text{COMM}$ , and (by definition of  $\text{VerifyClaim}$ ),  $\gamma^* = (\sigma^*, nym^*, h(m^*), dom^*)$  for some  $\sigma^*$  and  $nym^*$ , as well as  $\text{Verify}(pk_I, nym^*, dom^*, m^*, \gamma^*) = 1$ . By definition of  $\text{CreateComment}$ ,  $(nym', \gamma^*) \xleftarrow{\$} \text{Comment}(pk_I, sk_{U'}, cred_{U'}, dom', m')$ , and thus by definition of  $\text{Comment}$ ,  $\gamma^* = (\sigma', nym', h(m'), dom') = (\sigma^*, nym^*, h(m^*), dom^*)$ .

Hence,  $(U', nym^*, dom^*, m', \gamma^*) \in \text{COMM}$ . As we assume  $h$  to be collision-resistant,  $m' \neq m$  while  $h(m') = h(m)$  would constitute an attack. Hence, if  $\mathcal{A}'$  does not find a collision this way, then  $(U', nym^*, dom^*, m^*, \gamma^*) \in \text{COMM}$ , contradicting the assumption that no such tuple is in  $\text{COMM}$ .  $\square$

### Completeness

**Definition 20.** *We say that the system's accountability mechanism is complete if for every adversary  $\mathcal{A}$ , every  $1^\lambda$ , the probability  $\Pr[\text{Exp}_{\mathcal{A}}^{\text{acccompl}}(1^\lambda) = 1]$  is negligible  $1^\lambda$ .*

#### Experiment $\text{Exp}_{\mathcal{A}}^{\text{acccompl}}(1^\lambda)$ :

$\text{CU} \leftarrow \emptyset; \text{HU} \leftarrow \emptyset; V \leftarrow \emptyset;$   
 $\text{USK} \leftarrow \emptyset; \text{COMM} \leftarrow \emptyset; \text{ver} \leftarrow \emptyset;$   
 $(sk_I, pk_I) \xleftarrow{\$} \text{Setup}(1^\lambda)$   
 $\mathcal{O} = \{\text{CorruptUser}(\cdot), \text{CreateHonestUser}(\cdot, \text{ver}, sk_I),$   
 $\text{CorruptVer}(\cdot, \text{ver}), \text{CreateComment}(\cdot, \cdot, \cdot, pk_I), \text{JoinSystem}(\cdot, \text{ver}, sk_I)\}$   
 $(U^*, nym^*, dom^*, m^*, \gamma^*, evidence^*) \xleftarrow{\$} \mathcal{A}^{\mathcal{O}}(\rho, pk_I)$   
 Return 1 if there exist tuples  $(U^*, nym^*, dom^*, m^*, \gamma^*) \in \text{COMM}$ ,  
 and  $(U^*, sk_U, cred_U, \cdot) \in \text{USK}$  such that  
 $\text{VerifyClaim}(nym^*, dom_i^*, m^*, \gamma^*, x) = 0$   
 for  $x = \text{Claim}(pk_I, sk_U, cred_U, dom^*, m^*, \gamma^*, nym^*)$ .

Fig. 13

**Theorem 12 (Completeness of accountability mechanism).** *The TrollThrottle protocol (see Def. 3) has a complete accountability mechanism (see Def. 18), if correctness holds.*

*Proof.* This follows immediately from the definition of  $\text{CreateComment}$  (Def. 15), and the correctness of the DAA scheme (Def. 14).  $\square$