

Heal the Privacy: Functional Encryption and Privacy-Preserving Analytics

Alexandros Bakas, Antonis Michalas
Tampere University
{alexandros.bakas, antonios.michalas}@tuni.fi

Abstract—Secure cloud storage is an issue of paramount importance that both businesses and end-users should take into consideration before moving their data to, potentially, untrusted clouds. Migrating data to the cloud raises multiple privacy issues, as they are completely controlled by a cloud provider. Hence, an untrusted cloud provider can potentially breach users’ privacy and gain access to sensitive information. The problem becomes even more pronounced when the cloud provider is required to store a statistical database and periodically publish analytics. In this work, we first present a detailed example showing that the use of cryptography is not enough to ensure the privacy of individuals. Then, we design a hybrid protocol based on Functional Encryption and Differential Privacy that allows the computations of statistics in a privacy-preserving way.

Index Terms—Cloud Security, Differential Privacy, Functional Encryption

I. INTRODUCTION

Statistics, and data analytics in general, are very important tools for a variety of predictions. From real-time traffic analysis to disease outbreaks discovery, statistics allow societies to predict critical situations and prepare accordingly. However, along with the growth of cloud computing, such prediction services are moving to the cloud, where untrusted third parties may host and control statistical databases. Naturally, this raises several security concerns as the privacy of individuals can often be breached. These concerns become even greater when the analytics in question refer to extra sensitive data, such as medical records. A first response to these problems was presented in [1] with the formalization of differential privacy.

Differential Privacy allows sharing information about a dataset while withholding information about the individuals. In a differential private scheme, a curator (data owner) generates a dataset and, upon request of an analysts, releases statistics. To ensure the individuals’ privacy the statistics are filtered through a privacy mechanism and finally the analyst receives a noisy result. However, the results must be published in a way that will allow any analyst to deduce accurate enough results without breaching the privacy of any given individual. Although the problem of privatizing datasets has been thoroughly studied by both researchers and big industrial players like Apple and Google, the problem of further securing datasets with encryption has not drawn much attention so far. In this work, we aim to combine differential privacy with the promising concept of Functional Encryption (FE) in an attempt to design a protocol for privacy-preserving release of statistics.

FE is an emerging cryptographic technique which allows computations over encrypted data. More precisely, FE schemes provide key generation algorithms that output decryption keys with remarkable capabilities. In contrast to traditional cryptography, each functional decryption key sk_f is associated with a function f . Decrypting a ciphertext $Enc(x)$ using sk_f , yields $f(x)$ and thus keeps the x private. More recent works [2] generalized the concept of FE by presenting Multi-Input Functional Encryption (MIFE). In a MIFE scheme, given encryptions $Enc(x_1), \dots, Enc(x_n)$, a user can use sk_f to recover $f(x_1, \dots, x_n)$. In our work, we combine MIFE with differential privacy to design a scheme that allows the periodical release of statistics in a privacy-preserving way.

Contribution: To the best of our knowledge this is amongst the first works that combine differential privacy with cryptography to ensure the security of datasets, and the first one that does so using FE. More specifically:

- C1.** By combining FE with differential privacy, we propose a hybrid protocol as solution to the problem of designing encrypted private databases. Our work draws inspiration from both the fields of FE and Symmetric Searchable Encryption [3], [4]
- C2.** We provide a detailed security analysis of our protocol by demonstrating that it remains secure in the presence of a malicious adversary. Furthermore, we formally prove that our protocol satisfies the notion of differential privacy.
- C3.** Our solution is considered as efficient since it relies only on symmetric cryptographic primitives.

Organization: The rest of the paper is organised as follows: In section II, we present a concrete example that proves that cryptography is not enough to secure statistical databases. In section III, we discuss important published works in the fields of functional encryption and differential privacy. section IV contains all the necessary notations, cryptographic primitives and security notions used throughout the paper, and is followed by section V, where we present the detail of our system model. Section VI demonstrates the core contribution of the work as we present a scheme for publishing statistics in a privacy-preserving way. The security of our construction is proved in section VII and finally, section VIII concludes the paper.

Dataset					
Patients	Diagnosis	Condition	Age	sbp	dbp
$H(\text{Dennis})$	$H(\text{covid19})$	$H(\text{mild})$	c_{27}	c_{110}	c_{75}
$H(\text{Shawn})$	$H(\text{flu})$	$H(\text{severe})$	c_{58}	c_{123}	c_{60}
$H(\text{Dirk})$	$H(\text{flu})$	$H(\text{mild})$	c_{41}	c_{120}	c_{80}
$H(\text{Scottie})$	$H(\text{pneumonia})$	$H(\text{critical})$	c_{65}	c_{149}	c_{58}

TABLE I

STRUCTURED DATASET WITH FOUR CASES AND FIVE VARIABLES. SBP: SYSTOLIC BLOOD PRESSURE, DBP: DIASTOLIC BLOOD PRESSURE.

II. MOTIVATION AND APPLICATION DOMAIN

The ultimate goal of this work is to enable authorized users (analysts) to perform statistical analyses over medical datasets in a privacy-preserving way. In order to make this possible, we needed to ensure that our construction would be resistant against both internal (e.g. malicious servers) as well as external (e.g. malicious analysts) attacks.

For our solution, we used structured datasets composed of three different kinds of variables: *categorical*, *ordinal* and *numerical*:

- Categorical variables** do not have a natural ordering. For example, the medical diagnosis of a patient is a categorical variable.
- Ordinal variables** are categorical variables for which possible values can be ordered. For example, the condition of a patient, for which we can arbitrarily assume to be $\text{mild} < \text{severe} < \text{critical}$ is considered an ordinal variable.
- Numerical variables** are expressed using numbers e.g. the age of a patient or systolic and diastolic blood pressures.

To make things clearer, let us consider a scenario in which four patients sought medical care. Following the examination, the hospital stores their medical records to a structured dataset. As a next step, the hospital (who in this case acts as the curator of the dataset) masks all the ordinal and categorical variables in the dataset using a cryptographic hash function, and encrypts the numerical variables with a MIFE scheme. Without loss of generality, we can assume that our dataset looks like the one in Table I, where each $H(\cdot)$ denotes the hash of a variable and each c_x denotes the ciphertext corresponding to a plaintext x . Finally, the dataset is outsourced to a cloud service provider (CSP), where it will be stored.

For our work, we want to enable analysts to query the CSP in a privacy-preserving manner with queries in the form of “What is the average age of all patients that have been diagnosed with covid19?” or “What is the blood pressure of the patients whose condition is severe?”. In other words, we want to be able to compute a function on the values of the numerical variables that correspond to a specific categorical or ordinal variable.

It should be noted that although cryptography ensures the data confidentiality, it does not ensure the individuals’ privacy. For example, if an analyst were to initially requests the average age for the first three cases in the dataset and subsequently

request the average age of all patients, it would become obvious how Scottie’s age influences the average and hence, its value could be deduced. To protect the individuals’ privacy, we rely on the notion of differential privacy. By embedding well-calibrated error in the decryption algorithm, we ensure that the analyst has access to accurate enough results in order to perform any kind of analytics, without breaching the individual’s privacy.

III. RELATED WORK

Functional Encryption: While numerous studies with general definitions and generic constructions of FE have been proposed [5]–[10] there is a clear lack of works proposing FE schemes supporting specific functions. To the best of our knowledge, currently the number of supported functionalities is limited to inner products [11]–[13], quadratic polynomials [14] and the ℓ_1 norm of a vector [15]. In this work, we use the symmetric construction for the ℓ_1 norm presented in [15] to design a functionally encrypted private scheme.

Differential Privacy: Differential privacy is a notion first formalized in [1], where authors focused on ensuring the individuals’ privacy. More precisely, they proved that by adding well-calibrated noise to the data, the presence or absence of an individual’s information is *irrelevant* to the output of a database query. Since then, differential privacy has drawn the attention of both researchers [16]–[19] and key industry players such as Google [20] and Uber [21]. Nonetheless, to the best of our knowledge the only work that combines differential privacy with cryptography is the one presented in [22], where authors designed a scheme for private histogram queries. However, the solution presented in [22] relied on homomorphic encryption and hence, queries were restricted to only asking for the value of a counter. In our work, by using FE we allow users to perform any kind of query that is supported by the functionality of the FE scheme.

IV. BACKGROUND

Notation: If $\mathcal{Y}$ is a set, we use $y \xleftarrow{\$} \mathcal{Y}$ if y is chosen uniformly at random from $\mathcal{Y}$. The cardinality of a set $\mathcal{Y}$ is denoted by $|\mathcal{Y}|$. Vectors are denoted in bold as $\mathbf{x} = [x_1, \dots, x_n]$. A probabilistic polynomial time (PPT) adversary $\mathcal{ADV}$ is a randomized algorithm for which there exists a polynomial $p(z)$ such that for all input z , the running time of $\mathcal{ADV}(z)$ is bounded by $p(|z|)$.

A. Functional Encryption

Definition 1 (Multi-Input Functional Encryption in the Symmetric Key Setting). *Let $\mathcal{F} = \{f_1, \dots, f_n\}$ be a family of n -ary functions where each f_i is defined as follows: $f_i : \mathbb{Z}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$. A multi-input functional encryption scheme for $\mathcal{F}$ consists of the following algorithms:*

- $\text{Setup}(1^\lambda)$: Takes as input a security parameter λ and outputs a secret key $\mathbf{K} = [k_1, \dots, k_n] \in \mathbb{Z}^n$.
- $\text{Enc}(\mathbf{K}, i, x_i)$: Takes as input $\mathbf{K}$, an index $i \in [n]$ and a message $x_i \in \mathbb{Z}$ and outputs a ciphertext ct_i .

- $\text{KeyGen}(\mathbf{K}, f)$: Takes as input $\mathbf{K}$ and a description of a function f_i and outputs a functional decryption key sk_{f_i} .
- $\text{Dec}(\text{sk}_{f_i}, ct_1, \dots, ct_n)$: Takes as input a decryption key sk_{f_i} for a function f_i and n ciphertexts and outputs a value $y \in \mathbb{Z}$.

For the needs of our work, we rely on the one-AD-IND-secure symmetric MIFE scheme for the ℓ_1 norm, presented in [15]. Informally, one-AD-IND security ensures that given the encryption of two messages x_1 and x_2 , and a functional key sk_f for a function f such that $f(x_1) = f(x_2)$, no PPT adversary should be able to distinguish between them. With the aim of completeness and improved readability, the MIFE scheme for the ℓ_1 norm is illustrated in Figure 1.

<u>Setup(1^λ) :</u>	<u>KeyGen($\mathbf{K}$) :</u>
$\forall i \in [n], k_i \xleftarrow{\$} \mathbb{Z}$	<u>Return</u> $\text{sk}_f = \ \mathbf{K}\ _1 =$
<u>Return</u> $\mathbf{K} = [k_1, \dots, k_n] \in \mathbb{Z}^n$	$\sum_{i=1}^n k_i$
<u>Enc($\mathbf{K}, i, x_i$) :</u>	<u>Dec($\text{sk}_f, ct_1, \dots, ct_n$) :</u>
<u>Return</u> $ct_i = x_i + k_i$	<u>Return</u> $\sum_{i=1}^n ct_i - \text{sk}_f$

Fig. 1. one-AD-IND-secure MIFE for the ℓ_1 norm (MIFE $_{\ell_1}$).

B. Differential Privacy

We proceed by providing the main definitions of ϵ -differential privacy (ϵ -DP) and the main properties of the Laplace mechanism.

Definition 2. Two datasets DS and DS' are neighbouring if:

$$\|DS - DS'\|_1 \leq 1 \quad (1)$$

Definition 3 (ϵ -DP). A privacy mechanism $\mathcal{M} : \mathbb{N}^{|DS|} \rightarrow \text{Im}(\mathcal{M})$ is ϵ -DP if $\forall \mathcal{S} \subset \text{Im}(\mathcal{M})$ and $\forall$ neighboring datasets $DS, DS' \in \mathbb{N}^{|DS|}$:

$$\Pr[\mathcal{M}(DS) \in \mathcal{S}] \leq e^\epsilon \Pr[\mathcal{M}(DS') \in \mathcal{S}]$$

Definition 4 (Laplace distribution). The Laplace distribution centered at 0 and with scale parameter b is given by:

$$\text{Lap}(z) = \frac{1}{2b} e^{-\frac{|z|}{b}}$$

where the mean is 0 and the variance is $2b^2$.

We are now ready to proceed with the definition of the Laplace Mechanism [1].

Definition 5 (Laplace Mechanism). Given a query $q : \mathbb{N}^{|D|} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, the Laplace Mechanism is:

$$M_L(DS, q, \epsilon) = q(DS) + Y_i,$$

where $Y_i \sim \text{Lap}(b)$

A proof showing that the Laplace Mechanism is ϵ -differentially private can be found in [1].

V. ARCHITECTURE

In this section, we introduce the system model by explicitly describing the main entities participating in our protocol along with their capabilities.

We assume the existence of the following four entities:

1. **Curator (C):** **C** is responsible for generating an encrypted dataset and outsourcing to the CSP. **C** also generates a list L_{MA} containing mappings between encryption keys and their unique identifiers. This list is outsourced to MA.
2. **Analyst (A):** **A** is an analyst that can perform statistics on the data stored in the CSP.
3. **Cloud Service Provider (CSP):** We consider a cloud computing environment based on a trusted IaaS provider similar to the one described in [23]. The CSP is responsible for storing an encrypted dataset. Apart from that, upon **A**'s request the CSP is required to perform a search operation on the encrypted dataset and further communicate with the Master Authority for the generation of secret functional keys.
4. **Master Authority (MA):** **MA** is a trusted authority that is responsible for issuing secret functional keys. To do so, MA is required to maintain a list containing mappings between encryption keys and their unique identifiers.

VI. FORMAL CONSTRUCTION

This Section presents the core contribution of this work as we formally present Private Searchable Functional Encryption (PSFE). We assume the existence of an IND-CCA2 secure public key cryptosystem and a EUF-CMA secure signature scheme. Finally, we also utilize a first and second preimage resistant hash function H . PSFE consists of three algorithms Gen, Setup and Read such that:

PSFE.Gen: Each entity from the described architecture receives a public/private key pair (pk, sk) for an IND-CCA2 secure public cryptosystem, and publishes its public key while keeping the private key secret. Apart from that, all entities generate a signing and a verification key. Below we provide a list of all the generated keys:

- $(pk_C, sk_C), (sig_C, ver_C)$ - public/private, signing/verification and MIFE secret key for the Curator;
- $(pk_A, sk_A), (sig_A, ver_A)$ - public/private and signing/verification key pairs for the Analyst;
- $(pk_{CSP}, sk_{CSP}), (sig_{CSP}, ver_{CSP})$ - public/private and signing/verification key pairs for the cloud service provider;
- $(pk_{MA}, sk_{MA}), (sig_{MA}, ver_{MA})$ - public/private, signing/verification key pairs for the master authority.

PSFE.Setup: Represents a three party protocol between **C**, the CSP and MA. PSFE.Setup is initiated by **C** who wants to outsource an encrypted dataset (EDS) to the CSP. To encrypt the dataset, **C** hashes all the categorical and the ordinal entries concatenated with a salt s to prevent dictionary attacks. Apart from that, **C** also hashes the entries without the salt and stores each pair (salted and unsalted hashed entry) in a list L_{MA_s} . For the numerical ones, **C** generates a symmetric key k and

uses it to encrypt the corresponding entry. Apart from that, for each generated k , C generates a unique index. The keys, along with their indexes are stored in a list L_{MA_k} . Finally, C sends $m_1 = \langle t_1, \text{pk}_{CSP}(\text{EDS}), \sigma_C(H(t_1||\text{EDS})) \rangle$ to the CSP and $m_2 = \langle t_2, \text{pk}_{MA}(L_{MA_k}, L_{MA_s}), \sigma_C H(t_2||L_{MA}) \rangle$ to MA. Upon receiving these messages, both the CSP and MA verify their freshness (by looking at the timestamps t_1 and t_2) and the identity of the sender (by verifying the signature). If the verifications are successful, the CSP stores EDS and MA stores both L_{MA_s} and L_{MA_k} . In addition to that, both the CSP and MA send an acknowledgment to C that they have successfully stored EDS and the two lists via $m_3 = \langle t_3, \sigma_{CSP}(H(t_3||\text{EDS})) \rangle$ and $m_4 = \langle t_4, \sigma_{MA}(t_4||L_{MA_s}||L_{MA_k}) \rangle$ respectively. The encryption of the dataset is presented in detail in algorithm 1 and the flow of PSFE.Setup is illustrated in Figure 2.

Algorithm 1 Dataset Encryption

```

1: Input: A plaintext Dataset DS
2: Output: An encrypted Dataset EDS
3:  $K = \{\}$ 
4:  $L_{MA} = \{\}$ 
5:  $[r, c] = \text{size}(\text{DS})$  ▷ Number of rows and columns
6: for  $i = 1$  to  $r$  do ▷ All the cases
7:   for  $j = 1$  to  $c$  do ▷ All the variable
8:     if  $\text{DS}(i, j) == \text{categorical OR ordinal}$  then
9:        $s_{i,j} \leftarrow \mathbb{Z}$ 
10:       $L_{MA_s} = L_{MA_s} \cup H(\text{DS}(i, j)) || (H(\text{DS}(i, j)) || s_{i,j})$ 
11:       $\text{DS}(i, j) = H(\text{DS}(i, j) || s_{i,j})$ 
12:     else
13:       Generate  $k_{i,j} \in \mathbb{Z}$ 
14:        $\text{index}_{k_{i,j}} = H(k_{i,j})$ 
15:        $\text{DS}(i, j) = (\text{DS}(i, j) + k_{i,j}) || \text{index}_{k_{i,j}}$ 
16:        $L_{MA} = L_{MA} \cup (k_{i,j} || \text{index}_{k_{i,j}})$ 
17: Outsource  $L_{MA_s}$  and  $L_{MA_k}$  to MA
18:  $\text{EDS} = \text{DS}$ 

```




Fig. 2. Flow of PSFE.Setup

PSFE.Read: Represents a tree party protocol between A , the CSP and MA. PSFE.Read is initiated by the analyst A wishing to perform statistical analysis on the encrypted dataset. To do so, A first generates a search token τ_s as $\tau_s = \langle H(w_i), H(w_j), f \rangle$, where $H(w_i)$ refers to a categorical or ordinal value, $H(w_j)$ refers to a variable, and f is

the description of a function that will be applied to the ciphertexts. Then, A sends $m_5 = \langle t_5, \tau_s, \sigma_A(H(t_5||\tau_s)) \rangle$ to the MA. Upon reception, MA verifies the freshness and the signature of m_5 . If the verification is successful, MA retrieves the list L_{MA_s} , containing the salted hashes, finds which salted values correspond to $H(w_i)$ and $H(w_j)$ and sends them to the CSP via $m_6 = \langle t_6, H(w_i||s_i), H(w_j||s_j), \sigma_{MA}(t_6||H(w_i||s_i)||H(w_j||s_j)) \rangle$. Upon reception, the CSP verifies the freshness and the signature of m_6 . If the verification is successful, the CSP finds the ciphertexts that correspond to $H(w_i||s_i)$ with attribute $H(w_j||s_j)$ and sends the result R back to A via $m_7 = \langle t_7, R, \sigma_{CSP}(H(t_7||R)) \rangle$. At the same time CSP retrieves the unique index for each ciphertext $c_i \in R$, and stores them in a list L_{index} before outsourcing them to MA via $m_8 = \langle t_8, L_{index}, f, \sigma_{CSP}(H(t_8||L_{index}||f)) \rangle$. Upon reception of m_8 (and if the verifications are successful), MA can construct the functional key sk_f as a linear combination of all the keys k_i such that $H(k_i) \in L_{index}$. Apart from that, MA samples an error $e \approx \text{Lap}(1/\epsilon)$ and computes a noisy key $sk'_f = sk_f + e$. Finally, sk'_f is send back to A via $m_9 = \langle t_9, \text{pk}_A(sk'_f), \sigma_{MA}(H(t_9||sk'_f)) \rangle$. Upon receiving sk'_f , A computes the result as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
 \sum_{i=1}^n c_i - sk_f &= \sum_{i=1}^n (k_i + x_i) - \sum_{i=1}^n k_i + e \\
 &= \sum_{i=1}^n x_i + e
 \end{aligned}$$

PSFE.Read is illustrated in Figure 3.




Fig. 3. A complete run of PSFE.Read (The description of m_6 and m_7 is omitted from the diagram due to space constraints – $m_6 = \langle t_6, H(w_i||s_i), H(w_j||s_j), \sigma_{MA}(t_6||H(w_i||s_i)||H(w_j||s_j)) \rangle$ and $m_7 = \langle t_7, R, \sigma_{CSP}(H(t_7||R)) \rangle$).

VII. SECURITY ANALYSIS

In this Section we prove the security of our protocol, and show that the PSFE.Read protocol is ϵ -differential private one. Before proceeding to do so, we formally define our threat model.

A. Threat Model

Threat Model: Our threat model is similar to the one described in [23], based on the Dolev-Yao adversarial model [24]. We additionally extend it by defining a set of new attacks.

Attack 1 (Result Substitution Attack). *Let $\mathcal{ADV}$ be an adversary that observes the communication channels between $\mathbf{A}$ and the CSP. $\mathcal{ADV}$ successfully launches a Result Substitution Attack, if she manages to replace the result list R , sent from the CSP to $\mathbf{A}$, with another one R' .*

Attack 2 (Key Substitution Attack). *Let $\mathcal{ADV}$ be an adversary that observes the communication channels between $\mathbf{A}$, the CSP and MA. $\mathcal{ADV}$ successfully launches a Key Substitution Attack, if $\mathbf{A}$ receives a wrong sk'_f in a way that is indistinguishable to her.*

B. Protocol Security

We will proceed to prove PSFE's soundness against the attacks defined in Section VII-A.

Proposition 1 (Result Substitution Attack Soundness). *Let $\mathcal{ADV}$ be an adversary that overhears the communication between $\mathbf{A}$ and the CSP. Then $\mathcal{ADV}$ cannot successfully launch a Result Substitution Attack.*

Proof. For $\mathcal{ADV}$ to successfully launch a Result Substitution Attack, she needs to tamper with the result list R that is sent from the CSP to $\mathbf{A}$ via $m_6 = \langle t_6, R, \sigma_{CSP}(H(t_6 \| R)) \rangle$. To do, $\mathcal{ADV}$ has two choices:

- Reply an old m_6 message
- Replace R with another result list R_{mal}

In the instance where $\mathcal{ADV}$ overhears the communication between $\mathbf{A}$ and the CSP, we can assume that $\mathcal{ADV}$ possesses an old m_6 message $m_{6_{old}} = \langle t_{6_{old}}, R_{old}, \sigma_{CSP}(H(t_{6_{old}} \| R_{old})) \rangle$. Thus, when the CSP sends m_6 to $\mathbf{A}$, $\mathcal{ADV}$ intercepts the communication and replaces m_6 with $m_{6_{old}}$. Upon receiving $m_{6_{old}}$, $\mathbf{A}$ verifies the signature, and since $m_{6_{old}}$ contains a valid CSP's signature, the verification is successful. However, when $\mathbf{A}$ tries to verify the freshness of the message, she notices that the timestamp is old and thus drops the communication. As a result, the only way for $\mathcal{ADV}$ to successfully launch the attack, is to use another result list R_{mal} .

Just like before, when the CSP sends m_6 to $\mathbf{A}$, $\mathcal{ADV}$ intercepts the communication and replaces R with R_{mal} . However, the result list R is also included in the CSP's signature. Thus, replacing R with R_{mal} in an indistinguishable way, is equivalent to forging the CSP's signature. Nonetheless, given the signature scheme's EUF-CMA security, there is only

a negligible probability for this to happen and hence, the attack fails. $\square$

Proposition 2 (Key Substitution Attack Soundness). *Let $\mathcal{ADV}$ be an adversary that overhears the communication channels between $\mathbf{A}$, the CSP and MA. Then $\mathbf{A}$ cannot successfully launch a Key Substitution Attack.*

Proof. Since the encryption keys are elements in $\mathbb{Z}$, and the secret functional key is a linear combination of the encryption keys, it follows that the functional key lives in $\mathbb{Z}$ as well. This means that $\mathbf{A}$ is expecting to receive an integer and hence $\mathcal{ADV}$ could easily replace the real integer number in a way that is indistinguishable for $\mathbf{A}$. As a result, we need to make sure that even the slightest modification in the structure of the messages will have a big impact on what $\mathbf{A}$ receives. For $\mathcal{ADV}$ to successfully launch a Key Substitution Attack, she needs to replace the key sk'_f with one of her choice in a way that is indistinguishable for $\mathbf{A}$. To do so, $\mathcal{ADV}$ can follow the following two approaches:

- Replace the functional key sent from MA to $\mathbf{A}$, as part of m_8 , with a key of her choice.
- Force MA to compute a functional key for a function g such that $g \neq f$.

Tampering with the m_8 message sent from MA to $\mathbf{A}$ requires $\mathcal{ADV}$ to either use an old m_8 message or forge the signature of MA. As we saw in the proof for proposition 1, the use of timestamps and the EUF-CMA security of the signature scheme, ensure that $\mathcal{ADV}$ can only achieve this with negligible probability. Hence, we conclude that the only way for $\mathcal{ADV}$ to successfully launch a Key Substitution Attack is to force MA to compute a functional key for a function $g \neq f$.

Fooling MA into computing a wrong functional key, requires $\mathcal{ADV}$ to tamper with the m_7 message sent from the CSP to MA. Recall that $\langle t_7, L_{index}, f, \sigma_{CSP}(H(t_7 \| L_{index} \| f)) \rangle$. By observing the structure of m_7 , we see that $\mathcal{ADV}$ can either target L_{index} , the description of the function f , or both. However, similarly to the proof for proposition 1, as L_{index} and the function f 's description are also included in the CSP's signature, tampering with them is equivalent to forging the CSP's signature, which can only happen with negligible probability due to the signature scheme's EUF-CMA security. Moreover, the timestamp, ensures that $\mathcal{ADV}$ cannot replace an older message. We thus prove that in both cases, $\mathcal{ADV}$ can successfully launch a Key Substitution Attack with negligible probability. $\square$

C. Differential Privacy

In this section, we prove that the PSFE.Read protocol is ϵ -differential private one.

Theorem 1. *Let $EDS, EDS' \in \mathbb{N}^{|DS|}$ be arbitrary neighbouring datasets, let $q : \mathbb{N}^{|DS|} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be an arbitrary query and let $r, r' \in \mathbb{R}$. Moreover, let M_L be the Laplace Mechanism. Then, the PSFE.Read protocol is ϵ -differentially private as per Definition 3.*

Proof. Our goal is to prove that issuing a private query q to EDS reveals no more information than what is allowed by the privacy factor ϵ . In our construction, when $\mathbf{A}$ uses sk'_f to decrypt the result list R , she gets a result r' . In other words, $q(EDS) = r'$. However, the query contains the secret functional key $sk'_f = sk_f + e$, where $e \leftarrow \text{Lap}(\frac{\Delta q}{\epsilon})$, and when the Laplace Mechanism is applied to the query we get:

$$\begin{aligned} M_L(q, EDS, \epsilon) &= r = r' + e \Rightarrow \\ e &= r - r' \Rightarrow \\ e &= r - q(EDS). \end{aligned}$$

However, since e is arbitrarily chosen from the Laplace distribution ($e \leftarrow \text{Lap}(\frac{\Delta q}{\epsilon})$), then, without loss of generality, we can replace e with $\text{Lap}(\frac{\Delta q}{\epsilon})$. Hence, we get:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\Pr[M_L(EDS, q, \epsilon) = r]}{\Pr[M_L(EDS', q, \epsilon) = r]} &= \frac{\Pr[\text{Lap}(\frac{\Delta q}{\epsilon}) = r - q(EDS)]}{\Pr[\text{Lap}(\frac{\Delta q}{\epsilon}) = r - q(EDB')]} \\ &= \frac{\frac{\epsilon}{2\Delta q} \exp(-\frac{|r - q(EDS)|}{\Delta q})}{\frac{\epsilon}{2\Delta q} \exp(-\frac{|r - q(EDS')|}{\Delta q})} \\ &= \exp\left(-\frac{\epsilon|r - q(EDS')| - |r - q(EDS)|}{\Delta q}\right) \\ &= \exp\left(\frac{\epsilon|q(EDS') - q(EDS)|}{\Delta q}\right) \leq e^\epsilon \end{aligned}$$

□

VIII. CONCLUSIONS

We strongly believe that in the future cloud-based services will rely less on traditional decryption of information and more on computations over encrypted data. With this in mind, we proposed PSFE; a hybrid protocol based on Functional Encryption and differential privacy. Our protocol allows an analyst to periodically query a CSP for the release of statistics, without breaching the individuals' privacy. We hope that this work will inspire researchers and open new questions in the fascinating field of privacy-preserving computations in untrusted clouds, thus allowing us to create a bridge between the theoretical concepts of FE and real life applications.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The research leading to these results has received support from the Innovative Medicines Initiative Joint Undertaking under grant agreement n° 101034366, resources of which are composed of financial contributions from the European Union's Framework Programme Horizon 2020 and EFPIA companies' in kind contribution.

REFERENCES

- [1] C. Dwork, F. McSherry, K. Nissim, and A. Smith, "Calibrating noise to sensitivity in private data analysis," in *Theory of cryptography conference*, pp. 265–284, Springer, 2006.
- [2] S. Goldwasser, S. D. Gordon, V. Goyal, A. Jain, J. Katz, F.-H. Liu, A. Sahai, E. Shi, and H.-S. Zhou, "Multi-input functional encryption," in *Annual International Conference on the Theory and Applications of Cryptographic Techniques*, pp. 578–602, Springer, 2014.
- [3] A. Bakas and A. Michalas, "Nowhere to leak: A multi-client forward and backward private symmetric searchable encryption scheme," in *Data and Applications Security and Privacy XXXV* (K. Barker and K. Ghazinour, eds.), (Cham), pp. 84–95, Springer International Publishing, 2021.
- [4] A. Bakas and A. Michalas, "Power range: Forward private multi-client symmetric searchable encryption with range queries support," in *2020 IEEE Symposium on Computers and Communications (ISCC)*, pp. 1–7, 2020.
- [5] D. Boneh, A. Sahai, and B. Waters, "Functional encryption: a new vision for public-key cryptography," *Communications of the ACM*, vol. 55, no. 11, pp. 56–64, 2012.
- [6] B. Fisch, D. Vinayagamurthy, D. Boneh, and S. Gorbunov, "Iron: Functional encryption using intel sgx," in *Proceedings of the 2017 ACM SIGSAC Conference on Computer and Communications Security, CCS '17*, (New York, NY, USA), p. 765–782, Association for Computing Machinery, 2017.
- [7] A. Bakas, A. Michalas, and T. Dimitriou, "Private lives matter: A differential private functional encryption scheme (extended version)," *Cryptology ePrint Archive*, Report 2021/1692, 2021. <https://ia.cr/2021/1692>.
- [8] A. Bakas, A. Michalas, and T. Dimitriou, "Private lives matter: A differential private functional encryption scheme," in *Proceedings of the Twelfth ACM Conference on Data and Application Security and Privacy, CODASPY '22*, (New York, NY, USA), p. 300–311, Association for Computing Machinery, 2022.
- [9] A. Bakas, A. Michalas, and A. Ullah, "(f)unctional sifting: A privacy-preserving reputation system through multi-input functional encryption," in *Secure IT Systems* (M. Asplund and S. Nadim-Tehrani, eds.), (Cham), pp. 111–126, Springer International Publishing, 2021.
- [10] B. Waters, "A punctured programming approach to adaptively secure functional encryption," in *Annual Cryptology Conference*, pp. 678–697, Springer, 2015.
- [11] M. Abdalla, D. Catalano, D. Fiore, R. Gay, and B. Ursu, "Multi-input functional encryption for inner products: Function-hiding realizations and constructions without pairings," in *Advances in Cryptology – CRYPTO 2018* (H. Shacham and A. Boldyreva, eds.), (Cham), pp. 597–627, Springer International Publishing, 2018.
- [12] M. Abdalla, R. Gay, M. Raykova, and H. Wee, "Multi-input inner-product functional encryption from pairings," in *Annual International Conference on the Theory and Applications of Cryptographic Techniques*, pp. 601–626, Springer, 2017.
- [13] M. Abdalla, F. Bourse, A. De Caro, and D. Pointcheval, "Simple functional encryption schemes for inner products," in *IACR International Workshop on Public Key Cryptography*, pp. 733–751, Springer, 2015.
- [14] E. D. Sans, R. Gay, and D. Pointcheval, "Reading in the dark: Classifying encrypted digits with functional encryption," *IACR Cryptology ePrint Archive*, vol. 2018, p. 206, 2018.
- [15] A. Bakas and A. Michalas, "Multi-input functional encryption: Efficient applications from symmetric primitives," in *2020 IEEE 19th International Conference on Trust, Security and Privacy in Computing and Communications (TrustCom)*, pp. 1105–1112, 2020.
- [16] M. E. Andrés, N. E. Bordenabe, K. Chatzikokolakis, and C. Palamidessi, "Geo-indistinguishability: Differential privacy for location-based systems," in *Proceedings of the 2013 ACM SIGSAC conference on Computer & communications security*, pp. 901–914, 2013.
- [17] B. Barak, K. Chaudhuri, C. Dwork, S. Kale, F. McSherry, and K. Talwar, "Privacy, accuracy, and consistency too: A holistic solution to contingency table release," in *Proceedings of the twenty-sixth ACM SIGMOD-SIGACT-SIGART symposium on Principles of database systems*, pp. 273–282, 2007.
- [18] A. Blum, K. Ligett, and A. Roth, "A learning theory approach to noninteractive database privacy," *Journal of the ACM (JACM)*, vol. 60, no. 2, pp. 1–25, 2013.
- [19] S. P. Kasiviswanathan, H. K. Lee, K. Nissim, S. Raskhodnikova, and A. Smith, "What can we learn privately?," *SIAM Journal on Computing*, vol. 40, no. 3, pp. 793–826, 2011.
- [20] G. Fanti, V. Pihur, and Ú. Erlingsson, "Building a rapport with the unknown: Privacy-preserving learning of associations and data dictionaries," *Proceedings on Privacy Enhancing Technologies*, vol. 2016, no. 3, pp. 41–61, 2016.
- [21] N. Johnson, J. P. Near, and D. Song, "Towards practical differential privacy for sql queries," *Proceedings of the VLDB Endowment*, vol. 11, no. 5, pp. 526–539, 2018.
- [22] A. Agarwal, M. Herlihy, S. Kamara, and T. Moataz, "Encrypted databases for differential privacy," *Proceedings on Privacy Enhancing Technologies*, vol. 2019, no. 3, pp. 170–190, 2019.

- [23] N. Paladi, C. Gehrmann, and A. Michalas, "Providing user security guarantees in public infrastructure clouds," *IEEE Transactions on Cloud Computing*, vol. 5, pp. 405–419, July 2017.
- [24] D. Dolev and A. C. Yao, "On the security of public key protocols," *Information Theory, IEEE Transactions on*, vol. 29, no. 2, 1983.