

Multi-Access Coded Caching with Demand Privacy

K. K. Krishnan Namboodiri and B. Sundar Rajan *

*Department of Electrical Communication Engineering, Indian Institute of Science, Bengaluru
E-mail: {krishnank, bsrajan}@iisc.ac.in

Abstract—The demand private coded caching problem in a multi-access network with K users and K caches, where each user has access to L neighbouring caches in a cyclic wrap-around manner, is studied. The additional constraint imposed is that one user should not get any information regarding the demands of the remaining users. A lifting construction of demand private multi-access coded caching scheme from conventional, non-private multi-access scheme is introduced. The demand-privacy for a user is ensured by placing some additional keys in a set of caches called the *private set* of that user. For a given K and L , a technique is also devised to find the private sets of the users.

Index Terms—Coded Caching, Multi-Access Network, Demand Privacy.

I. INTRODUCTION

Broadband data consumption has witnessed revolutionary growth over the past few years. The growing number of users and their increasing appetite for high data rate content leads to network traffic congestion, particularly during peak traffic periods. At the same time, the resources are often underutilized during off-peak periods. The idea of coded caching came to light after the seminal work of Maddah Ali and Niesen [1], in which it was shown that by utilizing multicast opportunities, coded caching could achieve significant gain over the conventional uncoded caching. The proposed set-up consists of a central server, having a library of N files, connected to K users through an error-free broadcast link. Each user is equipped with a dedicated cache, which can store M out of the N files in the placement phase. Each user reveals their demand during the delivery phase. Then, the server broadcasts coded symbols to all the users over the shared link. The objective is to design the placement and the delivery phases jointly such that the load of the shared link in the delivery phase is minimized.

However, in practical scenarios such as in cellular networks, the users can have access to multiple caches when their coverage areas overlap. Incorporating this possibility, coded caching problem has been extended to multi-access set-up recently [2]–[8], with K users and K caches, where each user can access L neighbouring caches in a cyclic wrap-around fashion.

One of the drawbacks of the aforementioned coded caching schemes is that the demand of every user will be revealed to the other users connected to the server in the delivery phase. The issue of demand-privacy has been studied in the dedicated cache networks in [9]–[14]. Recently, the multi-access coded caching problem was studied incorporating demand privacy constraint in [15]. In the multi-access coded caching scheme in [15], the server stores some additional keys in the caches to ensure privacy for the user demands. The general scheme given in Theorem 1 in [15] ensures demand privacy when $L \leq \lceil \frac{K}{2} \rceil$, and fails to satisfy the demand-privacy condition when $L > \lceil \frac{K}{2} \rceil$.

In this work, we focus on multi-access coded caching schemes ensuring privacy for the user demands. The main contributions of this paper can be summarized as follows,

- A sufficient condition for the existence of multi-access coded caching schemes with demand privacy is presented. Using the idea of the private sets of the users, a lifting construction of the multi-access coded caching schemes ensuring demand privacy is introduced (Section III, Theorem 2).
- The notion of the private set of a user in a multi-access network is introduced. An algorithm to find private sets of the users is presented, and thereby, an upper bound on the size of the smallest private set is derived (Section III, Lemma 1).

A. Notations

For a positive integer n , $[n]$ denotes the set $\{1, 2, \dots, n\}$. For any two integers, i and K ,

$$\langle i \rangle_K = \begin{cases} i \pmod{K} & \text{if } i \pmod{K} \neq 0. \\ K & \text{if } i \pmod{K} = 0. \end{cases}$$

For integers a, b and K such that $a, b \leq K$,

$$[a : b]_K = \begin{cases} \{a, a+1, \dots, b\} & \text{if } a \leq b \\ \{a, a+1, \dots, K, 1, 2, \dots, b\} & \text{if } a > b \end{cases}$$

For a set \mathcal{S} , $|\mathcal{S}|$ denotes the cardinality of set \mathcal{S} . The notation \oplus represents the Exclusive OR (XOR) operation between two bits. It denotes the element-wise XOR operation if the operands are binary vectors.

II. SYSTEM MODEL

The system model consists of a central server with a library of N independent files, $\mathbf{W} = \{W_1, W_2, \dots, W_N\}$ each of size F bits, connected to K users $\{U_1, U_2, \dots, U_K\}$ through an error-free broadcast link. There are K caches $\{\mathcal{Z}_1, \mathcal{Z}_2, \dots, \mathcal{Z}_K\}$ in the system, each of capacity MF bits, where $0 \leq M \leq N$. Each user has access to $L < K$ caches in a cyclic wrap-around manner. \mathcal{L}_k denotes the caches accessible for user U_k , and $\mathcal{L}_k = \{\mathcal{Z}_k, \mathcal{Z}_{\langle k+1 \rangle_K}, \dots, \mathcal{Z}_{\langle k+L-1 \rangle_K}\}$. Note that, $|\mathcal{L}_k| = L, \forall k \in [K]$. A system under the aforementioned setting is called a (K, L, N) multi-access network (Figure 1). The coded caching schemes under this model have been discussed in [2]–[8]. When $L = 1$, this setting reduces to the problem setting in [1].

A (K, L, N) multi-access coded caching scheme works in two phases. In the *placement phase*, the server fills the caches with the file contents without knowing the user demands. Z_k denotes the content stored in the cache \mathcal{Z}_k . In the *delivery phase*, each user requests a single file from the server through a private link between the user to the server without revealing to the peer users. Let \mathcal{D}_k be the random variable denoting the demand of user U_k , and $\mathcal{D} = \{\mathcal{D}_1, \mathcal{D}_2, \dots, \mathcal{D}_K\}$ are all uniformly and independently distributed over the set $[N]$. Let $\mathcal{D}_{\bar{k}}$ denote all the demands but \mathcal{D}_k . That is, $\mathcal{D}_{\bar{k}} = \mathcal{D} \setminus \{\mathcal{D}_k\}$. After knowing the demands of all the users, the server makes a transmission X of size RF bits. The non-negative real number




Figure 1: (K, L, N) Multi-access Coded Caching Network.

R is said to be the rate of the transmission. Each user U_k , $k \in [K]$ should be able to decode the demanded file from the transmission X and the contents in the caches in \mathcal{L}_k . That is,

$$[\text{Decodability}] H(W_{\mathcal{D}_k} | Z_{\mathcal{L}_k}, \mathcal{D}_k, X) = 0, \forall k \in [K], \quad (1)$$

where, $Z_{\mathcal{L}_k}$ denotes the contents stored in the caches in \mathcal{L}_k .

Definition 1: For a (K, L, N) multi-access coded caching scheme, a memory-rate pair (M, R) is said to be achievable if the scheme for cache memory M satisfies the decodability condition in (1) with a rate less than or equal to R for every possible realization of \mathcal{D} .

The optimal rate-memory trade-off is defined as,

$$R^*(M) = \inf \{R : (M, R) \text{ is achievable}\}. \quad (2)$$

In addition to the decodability condition in (1), the demand-privacy condition is imposed on the (K, L, N) multi-access coded caching scheme, as follows,

$$[\text{Demand privacy}] I(\mathcal{D}_{\bar{k}}; Z_{\mathcal{L}_k}, \mathcal{D}_k, X | \mathbf{W}) = 0, \forall k \in [K]. \quad (3)$$

We assume that the random variables \mathcal{D} and \mathbf{W} are all independent of each other. Thus, we can rewrite the demand privacy condition in (3) as,

$$I(\mathcal{D}_{\bar{k}}; Z_{\mathcal{L}_k}, \mathcal{D}_k, X, \mathbf{W}) = 0, \forall k \in [K]. \quad (4)$$

That is, user U_k should be completely uncertain about the demanded file indices of the remaining users, given all the information U_k has. The condition should hold even if U_k has access to all the files \mathbf{W} . Note that, we are not considering the possibility of user collusion in the demand privacy condition.

Definition 2: For a (K, L, N) multi-access coded caching scheme, a memory-rate pair (M, R) is said to be achievable with demand privacy, if the scheme for cache memory M satisfies the decodability condition in (1) and the demand-privacy condition in (3) with a rate less than or equal to R for every possible realization of \mathcal{D} .

The multi-access coded caching schemes satisfying the demand-privacy condition in addition to the decodability condition are called demand-private schemes, and the schemes that do not satisfy the demand-privacy condition are called non-private schemes.

III. MAIN RESULTS

In this section, we construct the demand-private coded caching schemes for (K, L, N) multi-access networks.

Theorem 1: (Baseline Theorem) For a (K, L, N) multi-access coded caching scheme, for $0 \leq M \leq \frac{N}{L}$, the rate $R(M) = N - LM$ is achievable with demand privacy.

Proof: We consider the memory regime $0 \leq M \leq \frac{N}{L}$. In the placement phase, the server divides the file W_n ,

$n \in [N]$ into two non-overlapping subfiles $W_n^{(1)}$ and $W_n^{(2)}$ with $|W_n^{(1)}| = \frac{LMF}{N}$ bits and $|W_n^{(2)}| = (1 - \frac{LM}{N})F$ bits. The subfile $W_n^{(1)}$ is further divided into L non-overlapping subfiles of equal size, $\frac{MF}{N}$ bits. So, $W_n^{(1)} = \{W_{n,1}^{(1)}, W_{n,2}^{(1)}, \dots, W_{n,L}^{(1)}\}$ for all $n \in [N]$. Now, consider an adjacent independent row (AIR) matrix $A_{K \times L}$. An AIR matrix of size $m \times n$ ($m \geq n$) is a zero-one matrix with the property that any n adjacent rows (with cyclic wrap-around) of A are linearly independent over \mathbb{F}_q (irrespective of the field size q) [16]. Using the AIR matrix $A_{K \times L}$, encode the subfiles $[W_{n,1}^{(1)}, W_{n,2}^{(1)}, \dots, W_{n,L}^{(1)}]$. That is,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{C} &:= [C_{n,1}, C_{n,2}, \dots, C_{n,K}] \\ &= [W_{n,1}^{(1)}, W_{n,2}^{(1)}, \dots, W_{n,L}^{(1)}] A^T. \end{aligned}$$

The server fills the cache Z_k , $k \in [K]$ with the coded subfile $C_{n,k}$ of all the files $n \in [N]$. The size of a coded subfile is the same as the size of a subfile of $W_n^{(1)}$. Which means, $|C_{n,k}| = \frac{MF}{N}$ for all $k \in [K]$ and $n \in [N]$. So, the memory constraint of all the caches is met by the given placement strategy.

In the delivery phase, irrespective of the demand vector, the server broadcasts $W_n^{(2)}$ for all $n \in [N]$. Therefore, the rate of the transmission is $N - LM$.

The claim is that each user can decode the demanded file using the transmission and the accessible cache contents. User U_k directly receives $W_{d_k}^{(2)}$ from the broadcast transmission. User U_k has access to L adjacent caches (with a possible cyclic wrap-around), and U_k possesses the coded subfiles $C_{n,j}$ for $j \in [k :< k + L - 1 >_K]_K$ and for all $n \in [N]$. Since, every consecutive L columns of A^T are linearly independent, user U_k can get all the L subfiles of $W_n^{(1)}$ for all $n \in [N]$. In short, U_k can decode $W_n^{(1)}$ for every $n \in [N]$. That is, all the users can decode all the files from the transmissions and the cache contents. In addition to that, the placement and delivery are independent of the demand vector. Hence the demand privacy for the users is also guaranteed.

This completes the proof of Theorem 1. \blacksquare

Now, we present a lifting construction of the multi-access coded caching with demand privacy. Before dealing with the general construction, we give an example for the multi-access scheme with $K = 3, L = 2$ and $\frac{M}{N} = \frac{1}{3}$.

Example 1: Consider a $(K = 3, L = 2, \frac{M}{N} = \frac{1}{3})$ multi-access coded caching scheme. We assume that N files ($N \geq 3$) are available with the server. First we will illustrate the case without demand privacy. In the placement phase, the server divides each file into 3 equal sized subfiles with size $F/3$ bits. That is, $W_n = \{W_{n,1}, W_{n,2}, W_{n,3}\}$ for all $n \in [N]$. Cache Z_j , $j \in \{1, 2, 3\}$ is filled with $W_{n,j}$ for all $n \in [N]$. By the placement, user U_1 gets the subfiles $W_{n,1}$ and $W_{n,2}$ of all the files. Similarly, user U_2 has $W_{n,2}, W_{n,3}$ and U_3 has $W_{n,3}$ and $W_{n,1}$ for all $n \in [N]$. Let $[d_1, d_2, d_3]$ be the demand vector. Then the server transmits the coded subfile, $W_{d_1,3} \oplus W_{d_2,1} \oplus W_{d_3,2}$.

Now, we construct a demand private multi-access coded caching scheme with $K = 3, L = 2$ and $M = \frac{N+2}{3}$. In the placement phase, the server generates vectors $\mathbf{p}_k^{(\alpha)}$ for every $k \in \{1, 2, 3\}$ and $\alpha \in \{1, 2\}$, which are all uniformly and independently drawn from the set of binary vectors of length N . Let $\mathbf{p}_k^{(\alpha)} := [p_{k,1}^{(\alpha)}, p_{k,2}^{(\alpha)}, \dots, p_{k,N}^{(\alpha)}]$. Then the server creates 6 coded subfiles as follows,

$$S_1^{(\alpha)} = \bigoplus_{n \in [N]} p_{1,n}^{(\alpha)} W_{n,3}, \quad \alpha \in \{1, 2\}.$$

$$S_2^{(\alpha)} = \bigoplus_{n \in [N]} p_{2,n}^{(\alpha)} W_{n,1}, \quad \alpha \in \{1, 2\}.$$

$$S_3^{(\alpha)} = \bigoplus_{n \in [N]} p_{3,n}^{(\alpha)} W_{n,2}, \quad \alpha \in \{1, 2\}.$$

$S_1^{(1)}$ and $S_1^{(2)}$ are linear combinations of the subfiles $W_{n,3}, \forall n \in [N]$, the subfiles that user U_1 has no access to in the uncoded form. Similarly, U_2 does not have access to the subfiles $W_{n,2}$ in the uncoded form, and $S_2^{(1)}$ and $S_2^{(2)}$ are precisely the linear combinations of those subfiles. The same is the case with user U_3 . The cache placement in the demand-private scheme is as follows,

$$Z_1 = \{W_{n,1}, \forall n \in [N], S_1^{(1)}, S_3^{(2)}\},$$

$$Z_2 = \{W_{n,2}, \forall n \in [N], S_2^{(1)}, S_1^{(2)}\},$$

$$Z_3 = \{W_{n,3}, \forall n \in [N], S_3^{(1)}, S_2^{(2)}\}.$$

We define a key for a user as follows,

$$\mathbb{K}_k := S_k^{(1)} \oplus S_k^{(2)}, \quad k \in \{1, 2, 3\}. \quad (5)$$

Notice that only U_1 can calculate \mathbb{K}_1 since no other user has access to both Z_1 and Z_2 . Similarly, only U_2 can calculate \mathbb{K}_2 and only U_3 can calculate \mathbb{K}_3 . Note that the possibility of the user collusion is not considered here.

Let the demand vector be $[d_1, d_2, d_3]$. In the delivery phase, the server makes the transmission,

$$X = (Q, \tilde{X}),$$

$$\text{where, } Q = [\mathbf{q}_1, \mathbf{q}_2, \mathbf{q}_3],$$

$$\text{and } \tilde{X} = (W_{d_1,3} \oplus \mathbb{K}_1) \oplus (W_{d_2,1} \oplus \mathbb{K}_2) \oplus (W_{d_3,2} \oplus \mathbb{K}_3),$$

where, $\mathbf{q}_k = \mathbf{p}_k^{(1)} \oplus \mathbf{p}_k^{(2)} \oplus \mathbf{e}_{d_k}$ for $k \in \{1, 2, 3\}$, and $\mathbf{e}_n \in \mathbb{F}_2^N$ is the standard unit vector with a one in the n -th position and zero elsewhere. Notice that,

$$W_{d_1,3} \oplus \mathbb{K}_1 = \bigoplus_{n \in [N]} q_{1,n} W_{n,3},$$

$$W_{d_2,1} \oplus \mathbb{K}_2 = \bigoplus_{n \in [N]} q_{2,n} W_{n,1},$$

$$W_{d_3,2} \oplus \mathbb{K}_3 = \bigoplus_{n \in [N]} q_{3,n} W_{n,2}.$$

User U_1 can compute $W_{d_2,1} \oplus \mathbb{K}_2$ and $W_{d_3,2} \oplus \mathbb{K}_3$ by using the subfiles $W_{n,1}, W_{n,2}, n \in [N]$, and the second and the third columns of Q . Also, U_1 can calculate \mathbb{K}_1 . So U_1 can decode $W_{d_1,3}$. Similarly, the users U_2 and U_3 can also decode the subfiles they need. The demand privacy is guaranteed since a user does not know the key of the remaining two users, and all the three columns of Q are uniformly and independently distributed over \mathbb{F}_2^N . U_2 knows $S_1^{(2)}$ and can find out $\mathbf{p}_1^{(2)}$, but it does not know $\mathbf{p}_1^{(1)}$. Similarly, U_3 can find $\mathbf{p}_1^{(1)}$ from $S_1^{(1)}$ but it does not know $\mathbf{p}_1^{(2)}$. So, in the second and third users' point of view, $d_1 \sim \text{unif}[N]$. But notice that, if U_2 and U_3 collude, they can know d_1 without any ambiguity. But, in the demand privacy condition (3), we are not incorporating the possibility of user collusion.

The server stores $N+2$ subfiles in all the caches, each of size $F/3$ bits. Therefore, the cache memory M is $\frac{N+2}{3}$. Note that, irrespective of N , the number of additional subfiles stored in a cache is two, compared to the non-private scheme. Therefore, the file-normalized memory $\frac{M}{N}$ reduces and tends to $\frac{1}{3}$ as the number of files increases. Or in other words, the fraction of

the additional memory used for ensuring demand-privacy is very less when $N \gg L$.

In the delivery phase, the main payload is \tilde{X} which is of the size $F/3$ bits. The matrix Q can be transmitted using $3N$ bits, that does not scale with F . Thus, the scheme achieves the memory-rate pair $(\frac{N+2}{3}, \frac{1}{3})$.

A. Lifting construction of Demand private schemes

To ensure privacy for the user demands, it is required to store some keys in the caches. The keys for user U_k are the linear combinations of the subfiles that are not placed in the uncoded form in the caches in \mathcal{L}_k . In Example 1, the key for user U_1 is \mathbb{K}_1 , which is the sum of $S_1^{(1)}$ and $S_1^{(2)}$. The only user who can access both $S_1^{(1)}$ and $S_1^{(2)}$ is U_1 since no other user has access to both Z_1 and Z_2 . In general, the keys for user U_k should remain private between U_k and the server. So, one naive approach is to place the keys in a distributed manner in all the L caches in \mathcal{L}_k , since no other user has access to all of those caches. But, for most of the values of K and L , we can do significantly better than that. This means that, during the placement phase, the keys for U_k will be stored only in a subset of the set of caches \mathcal{L}_k .

Definition 3 (Private Set): For user $U_k, k \in [K]$, a private set \mathcal{L}_k^p is a subset of \mathcal{L}_k such that $\mathcal{L}_k^p \not\subseteq \mathcal{L}_{k'}$ for every $k' \neq k$.

For example, if $K = 4$ and $L = 3$, the private set of U_1 is $\mathcal{L}_1^p = \{Z_1, Z_2, Z_3\} = \mathcal{L}_1$. In this case, it can be verified that $\mathcal{L}_k^p = \mathcal{L}_k$ for all $k \in [4]$. Now, consider the case $K = 5$ and $L = 3$. Note that for user $U_1, \mathcal{L}_1^p = \{Z_1, Z_3\} \subset \mathcal{L}_1$ is a private set of U_1 , since $\mathcal{L}_1^p \not\subseteq \mathcal{L}_k$ for any $k \in \{2, 3, 4, 5\}$.

For any K and L, \mathcal{L}_k is a private set of user U_k with cardinality L . In general, private set of a user is not unique. If $\mathcal{L}_1^p = \{Z_{\ell_1}, Z_{\ell_2}, \dots, Z_{\ell_t}\}$ is a private set of U_1 with cardinality t such that $\ell_1 < \ell_2 < \dots < \ell_t \leq L$, then $\mathcal{L}_k^p = \{Z_{\langle \ell_1+k-1 \rangle_K}, Z_{\langle \ell_2+k-1 \rangle_K}, \dots, Z_{\langle \ell_t+k-1 \rangle_K}\}$ is a private set of U_k , because of the circular symmetry of the network model. Let t^* be the size of the smallest private set of U_1 . Then, it can be seen that the same t^* is the size of the smallest private set of all the users. In other words, t^* is fixed for a given K and L .

In further discussions, while referring to non-private multi-access schemes, we assume that the placement is uncoded and file symmetric. By file symmetric placement, we mean that, if a subfile $W_{n,j}$ of a file W_n is kept in cache Z_k , then the subfiles $W_{n,j}$ for all $n \in [N]$ is kept in Z_k .

In the following theorem, we give a sufficient condition for the existence of a (K, L, N) demand-private multi-access coded caching scheme.

Theorem 2: If a memory-rate pair (M, R) is achievable for a (K, L, N) non-private multi-access coded caching scheme satisfying the condition C1, then the memory rate pair $(\tilde{M}, \tilde{R}) := (M + t(1 - \frac{LM}{N}), R)$ is achievable for (K, L, N) demand private multi-access coded caching scheme, where t is the size of the private set.

- C1: The effective memory accessible for every user is LM . That is, for a user $U_k, k \in [K], Z_j \cap Z_{j'} = \{\}$ for all $Z_j, Z_{j'} \in \mathcal{L}_k$ and $j \neq j'$.

Proof: Assume that we have a (K, L, N) non-private multi-access coded caching scheme that satisfies the condition C1, and achieves the rate R at cache memory M . Let $\mathcal{L}_k^p = \{Z_{\langle \ell_1+k-1 \rangle_K}, Z_{\langle \ell_2+k-1 \rangle_K}, \dots, Z_{\langle \ell_t+k-1 \rangle_K}\}$ be a private set of $U_k, k \in [K]$ of size t . Now, we construct a (K, L, N) multi-access coded caching scheme with demand

privacy, and achieves the same rate R at cache memory $M = M + t(1 - \frac{LM}{N})$.

Placement Phase: The subpacketization of the files will remain the same as that of the non-private scheme. In the demand-private scheme, the cache placement is divided into two rounds.

- Round 1: The server follows the same cache placement in the non-private scheme.
- Round 2: The server uniformly and independently generates Kt vectors from \mathbb{F}_2^N , $\mathbf{p}_k^{(\alpha)}, k \in [K], \alpha \in [t]$. Let $\mathbf{p}_k^{(\alpha)} := [p_{k,1}^{(\alpha)}, p_{k,2}^{(\alpha)}, \dots, p_{k,N}^{(\alpha)}]$. For user $U_k, k \in [K]$, if a subfile $W_{n,j}$ is not available in the caches in \mathcal{L}_k from Round 1, then store $\bigoplus_{n \in [N]} p_{k,n}^{(\alpha)} W_{n,j}$ in $\mathcal{Z}_{\langle \ell_\alpha + k - 1 \rangle_K}$ for all $\alpha \in [t]$.

In Round 1, the server stores M/N fraction of all the files in all the caches. By the condition C1, each user will be accessing $\frac{LM}{N}$ fraction of all the files. But, a cache will be in the private set of t users. Therefore, all the caches need an additional memory of $t(1 - \frac{LM}{N})$ in Round 2. Hence the total cache memory is $M + t(1 - \frac{LM}{N})$.

Delivery Phase: The transmission X has two components, $X = (Q, \tilde{X})$. The server broadcasts the matrix $Q = [\mathbf{q}_1, \mathbf{q}_2, \dots, \mathbf{q}_K]_{K \times N}$ to all the users, where

$$\mathbf{q}_k = \mathbf{e}_{d_k} \bigoplus \left(\bigoplus_{\alpha \in [t]} \mathbf{p}_k^{(\alpha)} \right), \quad \forall k \in [K].$$

Let $\mathbf{q}_k = [q_{k,1}, q_{k,2}, \dots, q_{k,n}]$. Define,

$$\widehat{W}_{d_k} \triangleq \bigoplus_{n \in [N]} q_{k,n} W_n, \quad \forall k \in [K].$$

The server treats the linear combination of the subfiles \widehat{W}_{d_k} as a new file and makes the broadcast transmission according to the non-private scheme by assuming that user U_k is requesting for file \widehat{W}_{d_k} for all $k \in [K]$. This broadcast transmission is denoted as \tilde{X} .

Decodability: From the contents stored in Round 1 of the placement phase and from the transmission \tilde{X} , user U_k can decode \widehat{W}_{d_k} since the coefficients $q_{k,n}$ are available from the transmitted matrix Q . But user U_k wants the file W_{d_k} . Some subfiles of all the files are available to U_k from Round 1 of the placement phase. Now, user $U_k, k \in [K]$ can find every missing subfile $W_{d_k,j}$ as,

$$W_{d_k,j} = \underbrace{\bigoplus_{n \in [N]} q_{k,n} W_{n,j}}_{\widehat{W}_{d_k,j}} \bigoplus \left(\bigoplus_{\alpha \in [t]} \underbrace{\left(\bigoplus_{n \in [N]} p_{k,n}^{(\alpha)} W_{n,j} \right)}_{\text{Accessible for user } U_k} \right).$$

The coded subfile $\bigoplus_{n \in [N]} p_{k,n}^{(\alpha)} W_{n,j}$ is available for user U_k in the cache $\mathcal{Z}_{\langle \ell_\alpha + k - 1 \rangle_K}$.

Now, the only thing left to prove is that the achievable scheme presented satisfies the demand-privacy condition. The keys to ensure the privacy for a user's demand is distributed across the private set of caches of that user. For user U_k , and for an index j of a missing subfile, the key is defined as,

$$\mathbb{K}_k^{(j)} = \bigoplus_{\alpha \in [t]} \bigoplus_{n \in [N]} p_{k,n}^{(\alpha)} W_{n,j}. \quad (6)$$

Notice that, from the point of view of user $U_{k'}, k' \neq k$, the k^{th} column of the matrix Q will be uniformly distributed over

\mathbb{F}_2^N . Because, user $U_{k'}$ does not have access to all the caches in \mathcal{L}_k^p and thus no other user can know the demand of U_k .

For user $U_k, k \in [K]$ with a private set of caches $\mathcal{L}_k^p = \{\mathcal{Z}_{\langle \ell_1 + k - 1 \rangle_K}, \mathcal{Z}_{\langle \ell_2 + k - 1 \rangle_K}, \dots, \mathcal{Z}_{\langle \ell_t + k - 1 \rangle_K}\}$, define the set of vectors, $\mathcal{P}_k := \left\{ \mathbf{p}_i^{(\alpha)} \mid \mathcal{Z}_{\langle \ell_\alpha + i - 1 \rangle_K} \in \mathcal{L}_k \right\}$. The vectors in \mathcal{P}_k contain the coefficients of all the linear combinations of the subfiles stored in the caches in \mathcal{L}_k (in Round 2 of the placement phase). Define the matrix, $R := [\mathbf{r}_1, \mathbf{r}_2, \dots, \mathbf{r}_K]_{N \times K}$, where $\mathbf{r}_k = \bigoplus_{\alpha \in [t]} \mathbf{p}_k^{(\alpha)}$ for every $k \in [K]$. Note that, $\mathbf{q}_k = \mathbf{r}_k \oplus \mathbf{e}_{d_k}$. Also, $Q_{\tilde{k}}$ and $R_{\tilde{k}}$ denote the matrices Q and R with the k^{th} column removed. Then,

$$I(\mathcal{D}_{\tilde{k}}; \mathcal{D}_k, X, \mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{L}_k}, \mathbf{W}) = I(\mathcal{D}_{\tilde{k}}; \mathcal{D}_k, Q, \tilde{X}, \mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{L}_k}, \mathbf{W}) \quad (7a)$$

$$= I(\mathcal{D}_{\tilde{k}}; \mathcal{D}_k, Q, \mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{L}_k}, \mathbf{W}) \quad (7b)$$

$$\leq I(\mathcal{D}_{\tilde{k}}; \mathcal{D}_k, Q, \mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{L}_k}, \mathcal{P}_k, \mathbf{W}) \quad (7c)$$

$$= I(\mathcal{D}_{\tilde{k}}; \mathcal{D}_k, Q, \mathcal{P}_k, \mathbf{W}) \quad (7d)$$

$$= I(\mathcal{D}_{\tilde{k}}; \mathcal{D}_k, \mathcal{P}_k, \mathbf{W})$$

$$+ I(\mathcal{D}_{\tilde{k}}; Q | \mathcal{D}_k, \mathcal{P}_k, \mathbf{W}) \quad (7e)$$

$$= I(\mathcal{D}_{\tilde{k}}; Q | \mathcal{D}_k, \mathcal{P}_k, \mathbf{W}) \quad (7f)$$

$$= I(\mathcal{D}_{\tilde{k}}; Q_{\tilde{k}}, \mathbf{q}_k | \mathcal{D}_k, \mathcal{P}_k, \mathbf{W}) \quad (7g)$$

$$= I(\mathcal{D}_{\tilde{k}}; Q_{\tilde{k}} | \mathcal{D}_k, \mathcal{P}_k, \mathbf{W}) \quad (7h)$$

$$= H(Q_{\tilde{k}} | \mathcal{D}_k, \mathcal{P}_k, \mathbf{W})$$

$$- H(Q_{\tilde{k}} | \mathcal{D}, \mathcal{P}_k, \mathbf{W}) \quad (7i)$$

$$= H(Q_{\tilde{k}} | \mathcal{P}_k) - H(R_{\tilde{k}} | \mathcal{D}, \mathcal{P}_k, \mathbf{W}) \quad (7j)$$

$$= H(Q_{\tilde{k}} | \mathcal{P}_k) - H(R_{\tilde{k}} | \mathcal{P}_k) \quad (7k)$$

$$= 0. \quad (7l)$$

(7a) follows since $X = (Q, \tilde{X})$. \tilde{X} is completely determined by matrix Q and \mathbf{W} , (7b) holds. $\mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{L}_k}$ is a function of \mathbf{W} and the vectors in \mathcal{P}_k . Therefore, (7d) follows. (7f) holds because $\mathcal{D}_{\tilde{k}}$ is independent of $\mathcal{D}_k, \mathcal{P}_k$ and \mathbf{W} . By the definition of private set, \mathcal{P}_k contains $\mathbf{p}_k^{(\alpha)}$ for all $\alpha \in [t]$, but does not contain $\mathbf{p}_{k'}^{(\alpha)}$ for all $\alpha \in [t]$ for any $k' \neq k$. Hence $H(Q_{\tilde{k}} | \mathcal{P}_k) = H(R_{\tilde{k}} | \mathcal{P}_k) = N(K-1)$ bits.

This completes the proof of Theorem 2. \blacksquare

Remark 1: In the demand-private multi-access coded caching scheme given in [15], irrespective of K and L , the keys for user U_k are always stored in the caches \mathcal{Z}_k and $\mathcal{Z}_{\langle k+L-1 \rangle_K}$, and it is claimed that no user, except U_k , will have access to both these caches simultaneously. But, when $L > \lceil \frac{K}{2} \rceil$, the claim is not true. In that case, the user $U_{\langle k+L-1 \rangle_K}$ will also be accessing \mathcal{Z}_k and $\mathcal{Z}_{\langle k+L-1 \rangle_K}$. For example, when $K = 4$ and $L = 3$, according to [15], the keys for user U_1 will be stored in \mathcal{Z}_1 and \mathcal{Z}_3 . At the same time, user U_3 is also accessing both \mathcal{Z}_1 and \mathcal{Z}_3 . As a result, U_3 will get to know the demand of U_1 .

Remark 2: The non-private multi-access coded caching schemes in [2]–[8] satisfy the condition C1. So, it is possible to derive demand-private schemes from those non-private schemes using the construction in the proof of Theorem 2.

By identifying the private set with the smallest size, we can reduce the additional memory used for ensuring the demand privacy. In the following lemma, we give an upper bound on the size of the smallest private set by presenting a construction of the private sets of the users.

Lemma 1: For a given K and L , the size of the smallest private set $t^* \leq \lceil \frac{K-1}{K-L} \rceil$.




Figure 2: Non-private multi-access coded caching schemes in [3], [6], [7] and the corresponding demand-private schemes constructed using Theorem 2 and Lemma 1 ($K = 24$, $N = 48$ and $L = 3$).

Proof: We identify a set $\mathcal{L}_1^p \subseteq \mathcal{L}_1$ of size $\lceil \frac{K-1}{K-L} \rceil$ such that $\mathcal{L}_1^p \not\subseteq \mathcal{L}_k$ for all $k \neq 1$. From \mathcal{L}_1^p , we can find \mathcal{L}_k^p for all $k \in [K]$. The construction of \mathcal{L}_1^p is given in Algorithm 1.

Algorithm 1 Private set construction for user U_1

Input: K, L

Output: \mathcal{L}_1^p

Initialize: $i \leftarrow 1, \mathcal{L}_1^p \leftarrow \{\}$

while $i < L$ **do**

$\mathcal{L}_1^p \leftarrow \mathcal{L}_1^p \cup \{\mathcal{Z}_i\}$

$i \leftarrow K - L + i$

end while

$\mathcal{L}_1^p \leftarrow \mathcal{L}_1^p \cup \{\mathcal{Z}_L\}$

First of all, \mathcal{L}_1^p should contain \mathcal{Z}_1 , since user U_2 has access to all the caches in \mathcal{L}_1 except \mathcal{Z}_1 . Then, add the caches $\mathcal{Z}_{n(K-L)+1}$ to \mathcal{L}_1^p for integer values of n such that $n(K-L)+1 < L$. Now, the set $\mathcal{L}_1^p = \{\mathcal{Z}_{n(K-L)+1}\}_{n=0}^{\lceil \frac{L-1}{K-L} \rceil - 1}$. Note that, $\lceil \frac{L-1}{K-L} \rceil (K-L) + 1 \geq L$. The cache $\mathcal{Z}_{n(K-L)+1}$ is not accessible for the users $U_{n(K-L)+2}$ to $U_{(n+1)(K-L)+1}$. Therefore, \mathcal{L}_1^p contains at least one cache that is not accessible for the users U_2 to $U_{\lceil \frac{L-1}{K-L} \rceil (K-L)+1}$. Finally, we add cache \mathcal{Z}_L to \mathcal{L}_1^p , since the users U_{L+1} to U_K do not have access to \mathcal{Z}_L . By Algorithm 1, we make sure that there is at least one cache in \mathcal{L}_1^p that is not accessible to the remaining users. Therefore, \mathcal{L}_1^p is a private set of user U_1 with size $\lceil \frac{K-1}{K-L} \rceil$. For user $U_k, k \in [K]$ the private set is thus $\mathcal{L}_k^p = \{\mathcal{Z}_{<n(K-L)+k>_K}\}_{n=0}^{\lceil \frac{L-1}{K-L} \rceil - 1} \cup \{\mathcal{Z}_{<L+k-1>_K}\}$.

This completes the proof of Lemma 1. \blacksquare

Remark 3: For $2 \leq L \leq \lceil \frac{K}{2} \rceil$, the size of the smallest private set is $t^* = 2$, and $\mathcal{L}_k^p = \{\mathcal{Z}_k, \mathcal{Z}_{<k+L-1>_K}\}$. Similarly, when $L = K - 1$, $t^* = K - 1$ itself, ie; $\mathcal{L}_k^p = \mathcal{L}_k$ for all $k \in [K]$.

Example 2: Consider the multi-access coded caching scheme with $K = 7$ and $L = 5$. For user $U_k, k \in [7]$, $\mathcal{L}_k^p = \{\mathcal{Z}_k, \mathcal{Z}_{<k+2>_7}, \mathcal{Z}_{<k+4>_7}\}$. Consider user U_1 with private set $\mathcal{L}_1^p = \{\mathcal{Z}_1, \mathcal{Z}_3, \mathcal{Z}_5\}$. The users U_2 and U_3 do not have access to \mathcal{Z}_1 , and the users U_4 and U_5 do not have access to \mathcal{Z}_3 . Similarly, the users U_6 and U_7 do not have access to \mathcal{Z}_5 . In this case, we can manually verify that, $t^* = 3$.

Corollary 1: If a memory-rate pair (M, R) is achievable for a (K, L, N) non-private multi-access coded caching scheme satisfying the condition C1, then the memory rate

pair $(\tilde{M}, \tilde{R}) := (M + \lceil \frac{K-1}{K-L} \rceil (1 - \frac{LM}{N}), R)$ is achievable for (K, L, N) demand private multi-access coded caching scheme.

Remark 4: For $L \leq \lceil \frac{K}{2} \rceil$, the achievability result in Corollary 1 coincides with the achievability result in [15].

The rate-memory trade-off of the non-private schemes in [3], [6], [7] and the corresponding demand-private schemes for $(K = 24, L = 3, N = 48)$ multi-access network is given in Figure 2. For $M \geq \lceil \frac{K-1}{K-L} \rceil$, the additional cache memory used to ensure demand privacy is upper bounded by $\lceil \frac{K-1}{K-L} \rceil$, i.e., compared to a non-private multi-access scheme achieving the rate R , the corresponding demand private scheme needs an additional cache memory, not more than $\lceil \frac{K-1}{K-L} \rceil$, to achieve the same rate R .

IV. CONCLUSION

In this work, we addressed the problem of demand-privacy in the multi-access coded caching system. We put forward the idea of the private set of the users in a multi-access network and presented an algorithm to find the private sets of the users. The demand privacy of the users is ensured by placing the keys in those private sets. The main discussion in this paper was restricted to the uncoded placement of the file contents. Investigating the possibility of coded placement is an interesting problem to work on in the future.

V. ACKNOWLEDGMENT

This work was supported partly by the Science and Engineering Research Board (SERB) of Department of Science and Technology (DST), Government of India, through J.C. Bose National Fellowship to B. Sundar Rajan.

REFERENCES

- [1] M. A. Maddah-Ali and U. Niesen, "Fundamental limits of caching," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 60, no. 5, pp. 2856–2867, May 2014.
- [2] B. Serbetci, E. Parrinello and P. Elia, "Multi-access coded caching: gains beyond cache-redundancy," in *IEEE Information Theory Workshop (ITW)*, Visby, Sweden, 2019, pp. 1-5.
- [3] K. S. Reddy and N. Karamchandani, "Rate-Memory Trade-off for Multi-Access Coded Caching With Uncoded Placement," in *IEEE Transactions on Communications*, vol. 68, no. 6, pp. 3261-3274, June 2020.
- [4] A. A. Mahesh, B. S. Rajan, "A Coded Caching Scheme with Linear Sub-packetization and its Application to Multi-Access Coded Caching," arXiv:2009.05377 [cs.IT], Sept 2020.
- [5] S. Sasi, B. S. Rajan, "An Improved Multi-access Coded Caching with Uncoded Placement," arXiv:2009.05377 [cs.IT], Sept 2020.
- [6] K.S. Reddy, N. Karamchandani, "Structured Index Coding Problem and Multi-access Coded Caching," arXiv:2012.04705 [cs.IT], Dec 2020.
- [7] M. Cheng, D. Liang, K. Wan, M. Zhang, G. Caire, "A Novel Transformation Approach of Shared-link Coded Caching Schemes for Multiaccess Networks," arXiv:2012.04483 [cs.IT], Dec 2020.
- [8] S. Sasi, B. S. Rajan, "Multi-access Coded Caching Scheme with Linear Sub-packetization using PDAs," arXiv:2102.06616 [cs.IT], Feb 2021.
- [9] K. Wan and G. Caire, "On Coded Caching With Private Demands," in *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 67, no. 1, pp. 358-372, Jan 2021.
- [10] S. Kamath, "Demand Private Coded Caching," arXiv:1909.03324 [cs.IT], Sep 2019.
- [11] V. R. Aravind, P. K. Sarvepalli, A. Thangaraj, "Coded Caching with Demand Privacy: Constructions for Lower Subpacketization and Generalizations," arXiv:2007.07475 [cs.IT], Jul 2020.
- [12] C. Gurjarpadhye, J. Ravi, S. Kamath, B. K. Dey, N. Karamchandani, "Fundamental Limits of Demand-Private Coded Caching," arXiv:2101.07127 [cs.IT], Jan 2021.
- [13] K. K. K. Nambodiri, B. S. Rajan, "Optimal Demand Private Coded Caching for Users with Small Buffers," arXiv:2101.08745v2 [cs.IT], Feb 2021 (Accepted for presentation in *International Symposium on Information Theory (ISIT)*, July 2021).
- [14] Q. Yan, D. Tuninetti, "Fundamental Limits of Caching for Demand Privacy against Colluding Users," arXiv:2008.03642v1 [cs.IT], Aug 2020.
- [15] D. Liang, K. Wan, M. Cheng, G. Caire, "Multiaccess Coded Caching with Private Demands," arXiv:2105.06282v1 [cs.IT], May 2021.
- [16] M. B. Vaddi and B. S. Rajan, "Optimal Scalar Linear Index Codes for One-Sided Neighboring Side-Information Problems," in *IEEE Globecom Workshops (GC Wkshps)*, Washington, DC, USA, 2016, pp. 1-6.