

AUTOMORPHISM SHUFFLES FOR GRAPHS AND HYPERGRAPHS AND ITS APPLICATIONS

KAZUMASA SHINAGAWA AND KENGO MIYAMOTO

ABSTRACT. In card-based cryptography, a deck of physical cards is used to achieve secure computation. A shuffle, which randomly permutes a card-sequence along with some probability distribution, ensures the security of a card-based protocol. The authors proposed a new class of shuffles called graph shuffles, which randomly permutes a card-sequence by an automorphism of a directed graph (New Generation Computing 2022). For a directed graph G with n vertices and m edges, such a shuffle could be implemented with pile-scramble shuffles with $2(n + m)$ cards. In this paper, we study graph shuffles and give an implementation, an application, and a slight generalization of them. First, we propose a new protocol for graph shuffles with $2n + m$ cards. Second, as a new application of graph shuffles, we show that any cyclic group shuffle, which is a shuffle over a cyclic group, is a graph shuffle associated with some graph. Third, we define a hypergraph shuffle, which is a shuffle by an automorphism of a hypergraph, and show that any hypergraph shuffle can also be implemented with pile-scramble shuffles.

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. Background. *Card-based cryptography* is one of active research areas in cryptography. It enables secure computation by using a deck of physical cards. In card-based protocols, a deck of physical cards is used to achieve secure computation by hands. Thus, it is easy to understand the correctness and the security of protocols, even for non-experts who are unfamiliar with cryptography. In fact, there are some reports on an educational application of card-based cryptography for teaching cryptography (e.g., Cornell University [7], University of Waterloo [2], Tohoku University [9], and a Japanese elementary school [13]).

In 2014, Mizuki and Shizuya [10] defined a mathematical model of card-based cryptography. On the one hand, Mizuki–Shizuya model helps to find some new protocols and to prove some impossibility results (e.g., [6]). On the other hand, it allows some operations which are not clear how to implement physically. In particular, the Mizuki–Shizuya model allows the use of shuffles where it is non-trivial to implement physically. It is undesirable since card-based cryptography is easy to perform and easy to understand visually.

Let \mathfrak{S}_n be the symmetric group of degree n , $\Pi \subset \mathfrak{S}_n$ a set of permutations, and \mathcal{F} a probability distribution on Π . A *shuffle* $(\text{shuffle}, \Pi, \mathcal{F})$ for a card-sequence of n cards is an operation to obtain a permuted card-sequence by some $\pi \in \Pi$, where π is chosen according to \mathcal{F} . When we consider $(\text{shuffle}, \Pi, \mathcal{F})$, we may assume that no player knows which π is chosen. It is said to be *uniform closed* if Π is a group and \mathcal{F} is the uniform distribution. *The uniform closed shuffle over Π* denoted by $(\text{shuffle}, \Pi)$ is a shuffle $(\text{shuffle}, \Pi, \mathcal{F})$ for the uniform distribution \mathcal{F} .

Given a shuffle $(\text{shuffle}, \Pi, \mathcal{F})$, it is unclear how to implement it even for uniform closed shuffles. In this paper, we study the class of *graph shuffles* (see Subsection 2.3), which is a subclass of uniform closed shuffles including various well-known classes of shuffles such as random cuts [3], random bisection cuts [11], pile-shifting shuffles [14], and pile-scramble shuffles [4] and so on.

1.2. Related Work. Koch and Walzer [5] showed that any uniform closed shuffle $(\text{shuffle}, \Pi)$ for any group Π can be implemented by *random cuts*. Although it is worthwhile to show how to implement an arbitrary uniform closed shuffle, it requires many operations (at least the size of the group Π). On the other hand, our protocol requires a small number of operations.

Saito, Miyahara, Abe, Mizuki, and Shizuya [12] showed that every shuffle $(\text{shuffle}, \Pi, \mathcal{F})$ can be implemented by pile-shifting shuffles. Although it is worthwhile to show that every shuffle can be implemented theoretically, it requires many cards (at least $n \cdot |\Pi|$ cards). On the other hand, our protocol requires a relatively small number of cards.

TABLE 1. Summary of our results and the previous work

	# of cards	# of shuffles
◦ Graph shuffle protocol (directed, n vertices, and m edges)		
Miyamoto–Shinagawa [8]	$2(n + m)$	$d + 1$
Subsection 3.2	$2n + m$	$n + 2k$
◦ Graph shuffle protocol (undirected, n vertices, and m edges)		
Miyamoto–Shinagawa [8]	$2(n + 2m)$	$d + 1$
Subsection 3.2	$2(n + m)$	$n + 2d$
Subsection 5.2	$n + 2m$	$n + d + 1$
◦ Hypergraph shuffle protocol (n vertices and m hyperedges)		
Subsection 5.2	$n + \sum_{i=1}^m e_i $	$n + d' + \ell$

d is the number of distinct degrees, k is the number of distinct outdegrees, d' is the number of distinct degrees, and ℓ is the number of distinct sizes of hyperedges.

1.3. Contribution. In this paper, we focus on the class of graph shuffles introduced by Miyamoto and Shinagawa [8]. According to [8], a graph shuffle associated with a directed graph with n vertices and m edges can be implemented with pile-scramble shuffles and $2(n + m)$ cards. Our first main result is that we show that it can be implemented with pile-scramble shuffles and $2n + m$ cards. Thus, the number of cards is more efficient than that of [8]. We remark that the number of shuffles Second, as an application of graph shuffles, we show that every cyclic group shuffle, which is a uniform closed shuffle over a cyclic subgroup of \mathfrak{S}_n , is a graph shuffle. It yields that every cyclic group shuffle can be implemented with pile-scramble shuffles only. In the last, we consider hypergraphs. A hypergraph is a generalization of undirected graphs whose edge (called a hyperedge) is a subset of vertices rather than a pair of vertices. We introduce a *hypergraph shuffle*, which is a uniform closed shuffle over the automorphism group of a hypergraph, and design a hypergraph shuffle protocol for any hypergraph G . It requires $n + \sum_{i=1}^m |e_i|$ cards, where n is the number of vertices, and m is the number of hyperedges. Since an undirected graph is a hypergraph, our hypergraph shuffle protocol implies a graph shuffle protocol for undirected graphs. As a result, one can reduce the number of cards. Our results are summarized in Table 1.

2. PRELIMINARIES

2.1. Pile-scramble shuffles. A *pile-scramble shuffle* is a uniform closed shuffle that randomly permutes n piles of m cards. Suppose that we have the following card-sequence:

$$\underbrace{\boxed{?} \cdots \boxed{?}}_{\text{pile}[1]} \underbrace{\boxed{?} \cdots \boxed{?}}_{\text{pile}[2]} \cdots \underbrace{\boxed{?} \cdots \boxed{?}}_{\text{pile}[n]} .$$

$x_{1,1} \quad x_{1,m} \quad x_{2,1} \quad x_{2,m} \quad \dots \quad x_{n,1} \quad x_{n,m}$

An (n, m) -pile-scramble shuffle $\text{PSS}_{(n,m)}$ is a uniform closed shuffle that transforms the above card-sequence into the following card-sequence:


$$\underbrace{\boxed{?} \cdots \boxed{?}}_{\text{pile}[\alpha_1]} \underbrace{\boxed{?} \cdots \boxed{?}}_{\text{pile}[\alpha_2]} \cdots \underbrace{\boxed{?} \cdots \boxed{?}}_{\text{pile}[\alpha_n]} ,$$

$x_{\alpha_1,1} \quad x_{\alpha_1,m} \quad x_{\alpha_2,1} \quad x_{\alpha_2,m} \quad \dots \quad x_{\alpha_n,1} \quad x_{\alpha_n,m}$

where $(\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \dots, \alpha_n)$ is $\pi(1, 2, \dots, n)$ for some $\pi \in S_n$ chosen uniformly at random.

2.2. Generalized Pile-scramble Protocol. Suppose that we have n piles where the i -th pile consists of n_i cards. For a positive integer s , we put $A^{(s)} = \{i \mid n_i = s\}$. Suppose that $(A^{(s_1)}, A^{(s_2)}, \dots, A^{(s_t)})$ is a partition of $\{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ and $A^{(s_j)} = \{i_{j,1}, i_{j,2}, \dots, i_{j,k}\}$ for $k = |A^{(s_j)}|$. For each $1 \leq j \leq t$, we apply a pile-scramble shuffle $\text{PSS}_{(k,s_j)}$ to the card-sequence consisting of the $i_{j,1}, i_{j,2}, \dots, i_{j,k}$ -th piles. We define a *generalized pile-scramble protocol* by the above procedure.

Example 2.1. Suppose that we have the following card-sequence:



A generalized pile-scramble protocol for the above card-sequence is a sequence of pile-scramble shuffles: a pile-scramble shuffle to $(\text{pile}[1], \text{pile}[3], \text{pile}[5])$ and a pile-scramble shuffle to $(\text{pile}[2], \text{pile}[4])$. Applying it, we have one of the following 12 sequences:

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} (\text{pile}[1], \text{pile}[2], \text{pile}[3], \text{pile}[4], \text{pile}[5]), \\ (\text{pile}[1], \text{pile}[2], \text{pile}[5], \text{pile}[4], \text{pile}[3]), \\ (\text{pile}[3], \text{pile}[2], \text{pile}[5], \text{pile}[4], \text{pile}[1]), \\ (\text{pile}[3], \text{pile}[2], \text{pile}[1], \text{pile}[4], \text{pile}[5]), \\ (\text{pile}[5], \text{pile}[2], \text{pile}[1], \text{pile}[4], \text{pile}[3]), \\ (\text{pile}[5], \text{pile}[2], \text{pile}[3], \text{pile}[4], \text{pile}[1]), \\ (\text{pile}[1], \text{pile}[4], \text{pile}[3], \text{pile}[2], \text{pile}[5]), \\ (\text{pile}[1], \text{pile}[4], \text{pile}[5], \text{pile}[2], \text{pile}[3]), \\ (\text{pile}[3], \text{pile}[4], \text{pile}[5], \text{pile}[2], \text{pile}[1]), \\ (\text{pile}[3], \text{pile}[4], \text{pile}[1], \text{pile}[2], \text{pile}[5]), \\ (\text{pile}[5], \text{pile}[4], \text{pile}[1], \text{pile}[2], \text{pile}[3]), \\ (\text{pile}[5], \text{pile}[4], \text{pile}[3], \text{pile}[2], \text{pile}[1]). \end{array} \right.$$

2.3. Graph Shuffles. First, we recall some fundamentals from graph theory; for details, see [1].


A *directed graph* is a quadruple $G = (V_G, E_G, s_G, t_G)$ consisting of two sets: V_G (whose elements are called vertices) and E_G (whose elements are called directed edges), and two maps $s_G, t_G : E_G \rightarrow V_G$ which associates to its *source* $s_G(\alpha) \in V_G$ and its *target* $t_G(\alpha) \in V_G$ for $\alpha \in E_G$, respectively. A directed edge α with source a and target b is usually denoted by $a \xrightarrow{\alpha} b$. A directed graph $G = (V_G, E_G, s_G, t_G)$ is said to be *finite* if both V_G and E_G are finite sets. In this paper, we deal with finite directed graphs. For a vertex $v \in V_G$, we define two sets v^+ and v^- by $v^+ = \{\alpha \in E_G \mid s_G(\alpha) = v\}$ and $v^- = \{\alpha \in E_G \mid t_G(\alpha) = v\}$. The cardinality of v^+ and v^- , denoted by $\text{out}(v)$ and $\text{in}(v)$, are called *the outdegree* and *the indegree*, respectively. We remark that any undirected graph is regarded as a directed graph by changing each undirected edge to a 2-cycle $\bullet \rightleftarrows \bullet$.

Let G and G' be two directed graphs. A pair of maps $f = (f_0, f_1)$ consisting of $f_0 : V_G \rightarrow V_{G'}$ and $f_1 : E_G \rightarrow E_{G'}$ is a *morphism of directed graphs* if it satisfies the equation $(f_0 \times f_0) \circ (s_G \times t_G) = (s_{G'} \times t_{G'}) \circ f_1$. In addition, if f_0 and f_1 are bijective, f is called *an isomorphism* between G and G' . In particular, an isomorphism between G and itself is called *an automorphism* of G . We denote by $\text{Iso}(G, G')$ the set of all isomorphisms between G and G' , and we write $\text{Iso}_0(G, G')$ for all bijection f_0 such that $f = (f_0, f_1) \in \text{Iso}(G, G')$ for some f_1 . When $G = G'$, we set $\text{Aut}(G) = \text{Iso}(G, G)$, and $\text{Aut}_0(G) = \text{Iso}_0(G, G)$. The set $\text{Aut}(G)$ has the group structure by using the composition of maps as a product and is called *the automorphism group* of G . It is easy to check that the group structure of $\text{Aut}(G)$ induces a group structure of $\text{Aut}_0(G)$. Then, we regard $\text{Aut}_0(G)$ as a subgroup of $\mathfrak{S}_{|V_G|}$.

Now, we recall the definition of graph shuffles [8].

Definition 2.2. Let G be a directed graph. The *graph shuffle* associated with G is the uniform closed shuffle over $\text{Aut}_0(G)$.

2.4. Graph Shuffle Protocol. Let G be a directed graph with n vertices. A *graph shuffle protocol* for $(\text{shuffle}, \text{Aut}_0(G))$ is a card-based protocol that implements a graph shuffle associated with G . Given a card-sequence x of n cards as an input sequence, it outputs a card-sequence $y = \sigma(x)$ for $\sigma \in \text{Aut}_0(G)$ as follows:



where h is a card-sequence of helping cards. It is said to be *correct* if the chosen automorphism $\sigma \in \text{Aut}_0(G)$ is distributed uniformly at random. It is said to be *secure* if a probability distribution of the chosen automorphism $\sigma \in \text{Aut}_0(G)$ and a probability distribution of the visible sequence trace (see [10] for the definition) of the protocol are stochastically independent.

2.5. Miyamoto–Shinagawa’s Graph Shuffle Protocol. Let G be a directed graph with n vertices. Miyamoto–Shinagawa’s graph shuffle protocol [8] for $(\text{shuffle}, \text{Aut}_0(G))$ requires two kinds of cards, black-cards $\boxed{1} \boxed{2} \cdots \boxed{n}$ and red-cards $\boxed{\bar{1}} \boxed{\bar{2}} \cdots \boxed{\bar{n}}$. It proceeds as follows:

- (1) Let x be an input card-sequence. Place the cards as follows:

$$\underbrace{\boxed{?} \cdots \boxed{?}}_x \underbrace{\boxed{?} \cdots \boxed{?}}_{\text{pile}[1]} \underbrace{\boxed{?} \cdots \boxed{?}}_{\text{pile}[2]} \cdots \underbrace{\boxed{?} \cdots \boxed{?}}_{\text{pile}[n]},$$

where $\text{pile}[i]$ ($1 \leq i \leq n$) is defined by

$$\text{pile}[i] = \underbrace{\boxed{?}_i \quad \boxed{?}_i \boxed{?}_i \cdots \boxed{?}_i}_{\text{in}(i)+\text{out}(i) \text{ cards}}.$$

- (2) Apply a generalized pile-scramble protocol to n piles ($\text{pile}[1], \text{pile}[2], \dots, \text{pile}[n]$). Then we obtain a card-sequence:

$$\underbrace{\boxed{?} \cdots \boxed{?}}_x \underbrace{\boxed{?} \cdots \boxed{?}}_{\text{pile}[\alpha_1]} \underbrace{\boxed{?} \cdots \boxed{?}}_{\text{pile}[\alpha_2]} \cdots \underbrace{\boxed{?} \cdots \boxed{?}}_{\text{pile}[\alpha_n]}.$$

Here, $(\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \dots, \alpha_n)$ is a permutation of $(1, 2, \dots, n)$ given by the generalized pile-scramble protocol.

- (3) For each vertex $i \in V_G$, we define $\text{vertex}[i]$ by

$$\text{vertex}[i] = \underbrace{\boxed{?} \boxed{?}}_{\alpha_i \ x_i}.$$

For each edge $i \rightarrow j \in E_G$, we define $\text{edge}[i \rightarrow j]$ by

$$\text{edge}[i \rightarrow j] = \underbrace{\boxed{?} \boxed{?}}_{\alpha_i \ \alpha_j}.$$

Place $n + m$ piles as follows:

$$\underbrace{\boxed{?} \boxed{?}}_{\text{vertex}[1]} \cdots \underbrace{\boxed{?} \boxed{?}}_{\text{vertex}[n]} \underbrace{\boxed{?} \boxed{?}}_{\text{edge}[e_1]} \cdots \underbrace{\boxed{?} \boxed{?}}_{\text{edge}[e_m]},$$

where $E_G = \{e_1, e_2, \dots, e_m\}$.

- (4) Apply $\text{PSS}_{(m+n,2)}$ to the card-sequence.
(5) Open the left card of all piles. If it is a black-card, turn over the right card. Then sort $n + m$ piles so that the left card lied as $\boxed{\bar{1}} \cdots \boxed{\bar{n}} \boxed{1} \cdots \boxed{n}$. Suppose that we have a card-sequence as follows:

$$\boxed{\bar{1}} \boxed{?} \boxed{\bar{2}} \boxed{?} \cdots \boxed{\bar{n}} \boxed{?} \boxed{i_1} \boxed{j_1} \boxed{i_2} \boxed{j_2} \cdots \boxed{i_m} \boxed{j_m},$$

- (6) Define a graph G' by

$$\begin{aligned} V_{G'} &= V_G, \\ E_{G'} &= \{i_1 \rightarrow j_1, i_2 \rightarrow j_2, \dots, i_m \rightarrow j_m\}. \end{aligned}$$

- (7) Choose an isomorphism $\psi : G' \rightarrow G$. Set $\beta_i := \psi_0^{-1}(i)$. Output $y = (y_1, y_2, \dots, y_n)$, where y_i is the right next card of $\boxed{\beta_i}$.

3. OUR GRAPH SHUFFLE PROTOCOL

In this section, we propose a new graph shuffle protocol for an arbitrary directed graph, which is a more efficient protocol than that of [8] in terms of the number of cards.

3.1. Our Idea. The protocol in [8] needs $n + m$ piles of two cards: n piles for vertices and m piles for edges. Each pile $\text{vertex}[i]$ corresponding to a vertex i consists of a card representing a (randomized) vertex $\bar{\alpha}_i$ and the i -th input card x_i . Each pile $\text{edge}[i \rightarrow j]$ corresponding to an edge consists of cards representing a randomized edge $(\bar{\alpha}_i, \bar{\alpha}_j)$. Thus, the number of cards is $2(n + m)$.

Our idea to reduce the number of cards is that we make n piles only. For each vertex, we assign a pile as follows. A pile associated with the i -th vertex consists of the i -th input card x_i , a card representing a (randomized) vertex $\bar{\alpha}_i$, and $\text{out}(i)$ cards representing (randomized) outgoing edges from i . Thus, the number of cards is $2n + \sum_{i \in V_G} \text{out}(i) = 2n + m$.

3.2. Our Protocol. Let $G = (V_G, E_G, s_G, t_G)$ be an arbitrary directed graph with n vertices and m edges. We set $V_G = \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$. Let $x = (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n)$ be an input card-sequence for the shuffle. Our protocol proceeds as follows.

- (1) Place the cards as follows:

$$\underbrace{\boxed{?} \cdots \boxed{?}}_x \underbrace{\boxed{1} \cdots \boxed{1}}_{\text{pile}[1]} \underbrace{\boxed{2} \cdots \boxed{2}}_{\text{pile}[2]} \cdots \underbrace{\boxed{n} \cdots \boxed{n}}_{\text{pile}[n]},$$

where $\text{pile}[i]$ ($1 \leq i \leq n$) is a pile of cards consists of $\text{in}(i) + 1$ copies of \boxed{i} .

- (2) Apply a generalized pile-scramble protocol to n piles ($\text{pile}[1], \text{pile}[2], \dots, \text{pile}[n]$). Then we obtain a card-sequence:

$$\underbrace{\boxed{?} \cdots \boxed{?}}_x \underbrace{\boxed{?} \cdots \boxed{?}}_{\text{pile}[\alpha_1]} \underbrace{\boxed{?} \cdots \boxed{?}}_{\text{pile}[\alpha_2]} \cdots \underbrace{\boxed{?} \cdots \boxed{?}}_{\text{pile}[\alpha_n]}.$$

Here, $(\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \dots, \alpha_n)$ is a permutation of $(1, 2, \dots, n)$ given by the generalized pile-scramble protocol.

- (3) Suppose $\{t_G(\alpha) \mid \alpha \in i^+\} = \{w_{i,1}, w_{i,2}, \dots, w_{i,\text{out}(i)}\}$ as a multiset for each $i \in V_G$. Let $\text{vertex}[i]$ be a pile of cards defined as follows:

$$\text{vertex}[i] = \underbrace{\boxed{?} \boxed{?}}_{x_i} \underbrace{\boxed{?}}_{\alpha_i} \underbrace{\boxed{?}}_{\alpha_{w_{i,1}}} \underbrace{\boxed{?}}_{\alpha_{w_{i,2}}} \cdots \underbrace{\boxed{?}}_{\alpha_{w_{i,\text{out}(i)}}}$$

Place the card as follows:

$$\underbrace{\boxed{?} \boxed{?} \cdots \boxed{?}}_{\text{vertex}[1]} \underbrace{\boxed{?} \boxed{?} \cdots \boxed{?}}_{\text{vertex}[2]} \cdots \underbrace{\boxed{?} \boxed{?} \cdots \boxed{?}}_{\text{vertex}[n]}$$

- (4) For each $\text{vertex}[i]$, except the first and second cards, apply $\text{PSS}_{(\text{out}(i),1)}$ to the $\text{out}(i)$ cards. Let $\text{vertex}'[i]$ be the resultant pile. Then, the current card-sequence is

$$\underbrace{\boxed{?} \boxed{?} \cdots \boxed{?}}_{\text{vertex}'[1]} \underbrace{\boxed{?} \boxed{?} \cdots \boxed{?}}_{\text{vertex}'[2]} \cdots \underbrace{\boxed{?} \boxed{?} \cdots \boxed{?}}_{\text{vertex}'[n]}.$$

- (5) Apply a generalized pile-scramble protocol to n piles ($\text{vertex}'[1], \text{vertex}'[2], \dots, \text{vertex}'[n]$). Then we obtain the following card-sequence:

$$\underbrace{\boxed{?} \boxed{?} \cdots \boxed{?}}_{\text{vertex}'[\beta_1]} \underbrace{\boxed{?} \boxed{?} \cdots \boxed{?}}_{\text{vertex}'[\beta_2]} \cdots \underbrace{\boxed{?} \boxed{?} \cdots \boxed{?}}_{\text{vertex}'[\beta_n]}.$$

Here, $(\beta_1, \beta_2, \dots, \beta_n)$ is a permutation of $(1, 2, \dots, n)$ given by the generalized pile-scramble protocol.

- (6) For each pile, turn over all cards except the first card. Then sort n piles so that the second card is in ascending order as follows:

$$\underbrace{\boxed{?} \boxed{1} \cdots \cdots}_{\text{vertex}'[\gamma_1]} \underbrace{\boxed{?} \boxed{2} \cdots \cdots}_{\text{vertex}'[\gamma_2]} \cdots \underbrace{\boxed{?} \boxed{n} \cdots \cdots}_{\text{vertex}'[\gamma_n]}.$$

Here, $(\gamma_1, \gamma_2, \dots, \gamma_n)$ is a permutation of $(\beta_1, \beta_2, \dots, \beta_n)$. Let y_i be the first card of $\text{vertex}'[\gamma_i]$. For each i , we suppose that


$$\text{vertex}'[\gamma_i] = \underbrace{\boxed{?} \boxed{i} \boxed{j_1^i} \boxed{j_2^i} \cdots \boxed{j_{d_i}^i}}_{y_i}$$

- (7) We define a graph G' by

- $V_{G'} = V_G,$

$$\bullet E_{G'} = \bigcup_{i=1}^n \{i \rightarrow j_s^i \mid 1 \leq s \leq d_i\}.$$

(8) Take an isomorphism $\psi : G' \rightarrow G$. Set $\mathbf{z} = (z_1, z_2, \dots, z_n)$ with $z_i = y_{\psi_0^{-1}(i)}$. Arrange the card-sequence as follows:



The output card-sequence for the input \mathbf{x} is \mathbf{z} .

Remark 3.1. For the number of cards, the above protocol requires $2n + m$ cards. For the number of shuffles, it requires $2k + n$ PSSs, where $k = |\{\text{out}(i) \mid i \in V_G\}|$. Note that it is not necessary to apply the PSSs to a card-sequence in Step (4) if $\text{out}(i) = 1$. Thus, if we set $n' = |\{i \mid \text{out}(i) \geq 2\}|$, the protocol requires exactly $2k + n'$ PSSs.

3.3. Correctness and Security. For an arbitrary directed graph G with $V_G = \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$, we set

$$H_G^{\text{in}} = \{\pi \in \mathfrak{S}_n \mid \text{in}(i) = \text{in}(\pi(i)) \text{ for all } 1 \leq i \leq n\},$$

$$H_G^{\text{out}} = \{\pi \in \mathfrak{S}_n \mid \text{out}(i) = \text{out}(\pi(i)) \text{ for all } 1 \leq i \leq n\}.$$

Then H_G^{in} and H_G^{out} are subgroups of \mathfrak{S}_n , and $\text{Aut}_0(G)$ is a subgroup of H_G^{in} and H_G^{out} since every automorphism preserves the indegree and outdegree of each vertex.

Let $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n)$ be an input card-sequence, $\mathbf{y} = (y_1, y_2, \dots, y_n)$ the card-sequence described in Step (8), and $\mathbf{z} = (z_1, z_2, \dots, z_n)$ the corresponding output card-sequence. We take permutations $\sigma, \tau \in \mathfrak{S}_n$ such that $\sigma^{-1}(i) = \alpha_i$ in Step (2) and $\tau^{-1}(i) = \beta_i$ in Step (5), respectively. One can easily check that $\sigma \in H_G^{\text{in}}$ and $\tau \in H_G^{\text{out}}$. Let G' be the directed graph defined at Step (7). Let $\chi = (\chi_0, \chi_1) \in \text{Iso}(G, G')$ be an isomorphism such that $\chi_0 = \sigma^{-1}$ and $\psi = (\psi_0, \psi_1) \in \text{Iso}(G', G)$ an isomorphism chosen at Step (8).

Since $\text{Aut}_0(G)$ is a subgroup of $H_G^{\text{in}} \cap H_G^{\text{out}}$, we have $\sigma = \pi\sigma'$ and $\tau = \tau'\pi'$ for some $\sigma' \in H_G^{\text{in}}$, $\tau' \in H_G^{\text{out}}$, and $\pi, \pi' \in \text{Aut}_0(G)$. Then we have


$$\tau\sigma = \tau'\pi'\pi\sigma' = \tau'\pi''\sigma' \quad (1)$$

for $\pi'' = \pi'\pi \in \text{Aut}_0(G)$. It implies from $\psi_0 = \tilde{\pi}\sigma'$ for some $\tilde{\pi} \in \text{Aut}_0(G)$ that

$$\mathbf{z} = \psi_0\sigma^{-1}(\mathbf{x}) = \tilde{\pi}\sigma'(\pi\sigma')^{-1}(\mathbf{x}) = \tilde{\pi}\pi^{-1}(\mathbf{x}). \quad (2)$$

As the distribution of π' is uniform over $\text{Aut}_0(G)$, we conclude that the distributions of $\tilde{\pi}$ and π'' are independent by the above equations (1) and (2). It yields that $\tilde{\pi}\pi^{-1}$ is uniform over $\text{Aut}_0(G)$. Therefore, our protocol is secure and correct.

3.4. Example Execution of Our Protocol. We show an execution of our protocol for the following graph G :




Then, the automorphism group is


$$\text{Aut}_0(G) = \{\text{id}, (1\ 3), (4\ 5), (1\ 3)(4\ 5)\}.$$

Let $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4, x_5)$ be an input card-sequence.

(1) Place the cards as follows:



(2) Apply a generalized pile-scramble protocol to five piles ($\text{pile}[1], \text{pile}[2], \text{pile}[3], \text{pile}[4], \text{pile}[5]$). Then we obtain a card-sequence:



Here, $(\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \alpha_3, \alpha_4, \alpha_5)$ is a random permutation of $(1, 2, 3, 4, 5)$ with $\alpha_2 = 2$.

- (3) Arrange the piles of cards as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{vertex}[1] &= \begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|} \hline ? & ? & ? & ? \\ \hline x_1 & \alpha_1 & \alpha_2 & \alpha_3 \\ \hline \end{array}, & \text{vertex}[4] &= \begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline ? & ? \\ \hline x_4 & \alpha_4 \\ \hline \end{array}, \\ \text{vertex}[2] &= \begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|} \hline ? & ? & ? & ? \\ \hline x_2 & \alpha_2 & \alpha_4 & \alpha_5 \\ \hline \end{array}, & \text{vertex}[5] &= \begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline ? & ? \\ \hline x_5 & \alpha_5 \\ \hline \end{array}, \\ \text{vertex}[3] &= \begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|} \hline ? & ? & ? & ? \\ \hline x_3 & \alpha_3 & \alpha_1 & \alpha_2 \\ \hline \end{array}. \end{aligned}$$

- (4) Apply PSS to each $\text{vertex}[i]$ except the first and second cards.

$$\begin{aligned} \text{vertex}'[1] &= \begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|} \hline ? & ? & ? & ? \\ \hline x_1 & \alpha_1 & \alpha'_2 & \alpha'_3 \\ \hline \end{array}, & \alpha'_2, \alpha'_3 &\in \{\alpha_2, \alpha_3\}. \\ \text{vertex}'[2] &= \begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|} \hline ? & ? & ? & ? \\ \hline x_2 & \alpha_2 & \alpha'_4 & \alpha'_5 \\ \hline \end{array}, & \alpha'_4, \alpha'_5 &\in \{\alpha_4, \alpha_5\}. \\ \text{vertex}'[3] &= \begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|} \hline ? & ? & ? & ? \\ \hline x_3 & \alpha_3 & \alpha''_1 & \alpha''_2 \\ \hline \end{array}, & \alpha''_1, \alpha''_2 &\in \{\alpha_1, \alpha_2\}. \\ \text{vertex}'[4] &= \begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline ? & ? \\ \hline x_4 & \alpha_4 \\ \hline \end{array}, & \text{vertex}'[5] &= \begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline ? & ? \\ \hline x_5 & \alpha_5 \\ \hline \end{array}. \end{aligned}$$

- (5) Apply a generalized pile-scramble protocol to five piles ($\text{vertex}'[1], \text{vertex}'[2], \text{vertex}'[3], \text{vertex}'[4], \text{vertex}'[5]$). Then we obtain a card-sequence:

$$\underbrace{\begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|} \hline ? & ? & ? & ? \\ \hline \end{array}}_{\text{vertex}'[\beta_1]} \underbrace{\begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|} \hline ? & ? & ? & ? \\ \hline \end{array}}_{\text{vertex}'[\beta_2]} \underbrace{\begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|} \hline ? & ? & ? & ? \\ \hline \end{array}}_{\text{vertex}'[\beta_3]} \underbrace{\begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline ? & ? \\ \hline \end{array}}_{\text{vertex}'[\beta_4]} \underbrace{\begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline ? & ? \\ \hline \end{array}}_{\text{vertex}'[\beta_5]}.$$

Here, $(\beta_1, \beta_2, \beta_3)$ is a random permutation of $(1, 2, 3)$ and (β_4, β_5) is a random permutation of $(4, 5)$.

- (6) For each pile, turn over all cards except the first card. Suppose that we obtain a card-sequence as follows:


$$\underbrace{\begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|} \hline ? & 2 & 5 & 3 \\ \hline \end{array}}_{\text{vertex}'[\beta_1]} \underbrace{\begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|} \hline ? & 1 & 2 & 4 \\ \hline \end{array}}_{\text{vertex}'[\beta_2]} \underbrace{\begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|} \hline ? & 4 & 2 & 1 \\ \hline \end{array}}_{\text{vertex}'[\beta_3]} \underbrace{\begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline ? & 5 \\ \hline \end{array}}_{\text{vertex}'[\beta_4]} \underbrace{\begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline ? & 3 \\ \hline \end{array}}_{\text{vertex}'[\beta_5]}.$$

Then sort five piles so that the second card is in ascending order as follows:

$$\underbrace{\begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|} \hline ? & 1 & 2 & 4 \\ \hline \end{array}}_{\text{vertex}'[\beta_2]} \underbrace{\begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|} \hline ? & 2 & 5 & 3 \\ \hline \end{array}}_{\text{vertex}'[\beta_1]} \underbrace{\begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline ? & 3 \\ \hline \end{array}}_{\text{vertex}'[\beta_5]} \underbrace{\begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|} \hline ? & 4 & 2 & 1 \\ \hline \end{array}}_{\text{vertex}'[\beta_3]} \underbrace{\begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline ? & 5 \\ \hline \end{array}}_{\text{vertex}'[\beta_4]}.$$

Set $(\gamma_1, \gamma_2, \gamma_3, \gamma_4, \gamma_5) = (\beta_2, \beta_1, \beta_5, \beta_3, \beta_4)$. Let y_i be the first card in $\text{vertex}'[\gamma_i]$.

- (7) From the opened symbols, the graph G' is defined as follows:



- (8) Take an isomorphism $\psi : G' \rightarrow G$. For example, $\psi_0(1) = 3, \psi_0(2) = 2, \psi_0(3) = 4, \psi_0(4) = 1, \psi_0(5) = 5$. We have $(\psi_0^{-1}(1), \psi_0^{-1}(2), \psi_0^{-1}(3), \psi_0^{-1}(4), \psi_0^{-1}(5)) = (4, 2, 1, 3, 5)$. The output card-sequence is as follows:

$$\begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|c|} \hline ? & ? & ? & ? & ? \\ \hline y_4 & y_2 & y_1 & y_3 & y_5 \\ \hline \end{array}$$

4. CYCLIC GROUP SHUFFLES VIA GRAPH SHUFFLES

In this section, we state that every ‘‘cyclic group shuffle’’ is a graph shuffle associated with some graph.

Fix a positive integer n . Let C be an arbitrary cyclic subgroup of \mathfrak{S}_n . The uniform closed shuffle over C is called the C -cyclic group shuffle. For instance, the $\langle(1\ 2\ 3\ 4\ 5\ 6)\rangle$ -cyclic group shuffle is a random cut for

six cards. We note that every cyclic group shuffle is not only a random cut. For instance, the $\langle(1\ 2)(3\ 4\ 5\ 6)\rangle$ -cyclic group shuffle is different from a random cut. Indeed, if we apply the $\langle(1\ 2)(3\ 4\ 5\ 6)\rangle$ -cyclic group shuffle to $x = \boxed{1}\boxed{2}\boxed{3}\boxed{4}\boxed{5}\boxed{6}$ then we have the following card-sequence $\sigma(x)$ with probability $\frac{1}{4}$:

- $\begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|} \hline 1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 5 & 6 \\ \hline \end{array}$ $\sigma = \text{id}$,
- $\begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|} \hline 2 & 1 & 6 & 3 & 4 & 5 \\ \hline \end{array}$ $\sigma = (1\ 2)(3\ 4\ 5\ 6)$,
- $\begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|} \hline 1 & 2 & 5 & 6 & 3 & 4 \\ \hline \end{array}$ $\sigma = (3\ 4\ 5\ 6)^2$,
- $\begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|} \hline 2 & 1 & 4 & 5 & 6 & 3 \\ \hline \end{array}$ $\sigma = (1\ 2)(3\ 4\ 5\ 6)^3$.

Let C be a subgroup of \mathfrak{S}_n with a generator g . Assume that a cycle decomposition of g is given as $g = g_1 g_2 \cdots g_t$, where each g_i is of the form $g_i = (g_0^{(i)}, \dots, g_{\ell_i-1}^{(i)})$. Without loss of generality, we may assume that $\ell_i \leq \ell_j$ for any $1 \leq i < j \leq t$. For each cycle g_i , we denote by $C^{[i]}$ the following directed cycle:

$$C^{[i]} = \begin{array}{c} \xrightarrow{\hspace{10em}} \\ g_0^{(i)} \longrightarrow g_1^{(i)} \longrightarrow \cdots \longrightarrow g_{\ell_i-2}^{(i)} \longrightarrow g_{\ell_i-1}^{(i)} \end{array}$$

For distinguish two positive integers k and k' , we write $d(k, k')$ for the greatest common divisor of ℓ_k and $\ell_{k'}$. Now, we define a directed graph $Q(g)$ as follows.

- $V_{Q(g)} = \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$,
- $E_{Q(g)} = \bigcup_{k=0}^t E_{C^{[k]}} \cup \bigcup_{d(k, k') \neq 1, k < k'} \{g_u^{(k)} \rightarrow g_v^{(k')} \mid u \equiv v \pmod{d(k, k')}\}$.

Here, we sum over all pairs (k, k') such that $d(k, k') \neq 1$ and $k < k'$.

We call the directed graph $Q(g)$ *the gear graph of g* .


The following proposition holds from the construction of the gear graph $Q(g)$.

Proposition 4.1. Let $g \in \mathfrak{S}_n$. Then the graph shuffle associated with $Q(g)$ is the $\langle g \rangle$ -cyclic group shuffle.

Example 4.2. The gear graph of

$$g = (1\ 2\ 3)(4\ 5\ 6\ 7)(8\ 9\ 10\ 11\ 12\ 13) \in \mathfrak{S}_{13}$$

is given as follows.



Therefore, the $\langle g \rangle$ -cyclic group shuffle is the graph shuffle associated with $Q(g)$.

5. HYPERGRAPH SHUFFLE PROTOCOL

In this section, we define a “hypergraph shuffle”, which is a generalization of (undirected-)graph shuffles, and propose a hypergraph shuffle protocol for an arbitrary hypergraph.

5.1. Hypergraph Shuffles. A *hypergraph* is a pair $H = (V_H, \mathcal{E}_H)$ consisting of a set of *vertices* V_H and a family of subsets of V_H . Each element $e^H \in \mathcal{E}_H$ is called a *hyperedge*. Note that every undirected graph is a hypergraph such that any hyperedges has exactly two vertices. In this section, we deal with finite hypergraphs, i.e., the numbers of vertices and hyperedges are finite. For two hypergraphs $H = (V_H, \mathcal{E}_H)$ and $H' = (V_{H'}, \mathcal{E}_{H'})$, where $\mathcal{E}_H = \{e_1^H, \dots, e_n^H\}$ and $\mathcal{E}_{H'} = \{e_1^{H'}, \dots, e_n^{H'}\}$, we say that H and H' are *isomorphic* if there exist a bijective map $f : V_H \rightarrow V_{H'}$ and a permutation $\sigma \in \mathfrak{S}_{|E_H|}$ such that, for any $e_i^H \in \mathcal{E}_H$, $f(e_i^H) = e_{\sigma(i)}^{H'}$ holds. Such a map f is called *an isomorphism* of hypergraphs between H and H' . We denote by $\text{Iso}(H, H')$ the set of all isomorphisms of hypergraphs between H and H' . We set $\text{Aut}(H) = \text{Iso}(H, H')$ whose elements are called *automorphisms* of H . By the definition, $\text{Aut}(H)$ is a subgroup of $\mathfrak{S}_{|V_H|}$.

Now we define a class of hypergraph shuffles.

Definition 5.1. Let H be a hypergraph. The *hypergraph shuffle* associated with H is the uniform closed shuffle over $\text{Aut}(H)$.

5.2. Our Protocol. Let $H = (V_H, \mathcal{E}_H)$ be any hypergraph having n vertices and m hyperedges. We set $V_H = \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$, and $\mathcal{E}_H = \{e_1, e_2, \dots, e_m\}$. Besides n input cards, our protocol requires $\sum_{k=1}^m |e_k|$ helping cards as follows:

$$\underbrace{\boxed{1} \cdots \boxed{1}}_{|e_1|} \underbrace{\boxed{2} \cdots \boxed{2}}_{|e_2|} \cdots \underbrace{\boxed{m} \cdots \boxed{m}}_{|e_m|}.$$

Let $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n)$ be an input card-sequence for the shuffle. Our protocol proceeds as follows.

- (1) Place the cards as follows:

$$\underbrace{\boxed{?} \cdots \boxed{?}}_{\mathbf{x}} \underbrace{\boxed{1} \cdots \boxed{1}}_{\text{pile}[1]} \underbrace{\boxed{2} \cdots \boxed{2}}_{\text{pile}[2]} \cdots \underbrace{\boxed{m} \cdots \boxed{m}}_{\text{pile}[m]}.$$

Here, $\text{pile}[i]$ ($1 \leq i \leq m$) is a pile of cards consists of $|e_i|$ copies of \boxed{i} .

- (2) Apply a generalized pile-scramble protocol to m piles ($\text{pile}[1], \text{pile}[2], \dots, \text{pile}[m]$). Then we obtain a card-sequence:

$$\underbrace{\boxed{?} \cdots \boxed{?}}_{\mathbf{x}} \underbrace{\boxed{?} \cdots \boxed{?}}_{\text{pile}[\alpha_1]} \underbrace{\boxed{?} \cdots \boxed{?}}_{\text{pile}[\alpha_2]} \cdots \underbrace{\boxed{?} \cdots \boxed{?}}_{\text{pile}[\alpha_m]}.$$

Here, $(\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \dots, \alpha_m)$ is a permutation of $(1, 2, \dots, m)$ given by the generalized pile-scramble protocol.

- (3) For each $i \in V_H$, we set $E_H^{(i)} = \{j \mid i \in e_j\}$ as a multiset. We may suppose that $E_H^{(i)} = \{j_1, j_2, \dots, j_{s_i}\}$ and $j_k \leq j_\ell$ for $k < \ell$. We then define

$$\text{vertex}[i] = \underbrace{\boxed{?} \boxed{?} \boxed{?} \boxed{?}}_{\mathbf{x}_i \alpha_{j_1} \alpha_{j_2} \alpha_{j_3}} \cdots \underbrace{\boxed{?}}_{\alpha_{j_{s_i}}}.$$

After that, we arrange the cards as follows:

$$\underbrace{\boxed{?} \boxed{?} \cdots \boxed{?}}_{\text{vertex}[1]} \underbrace{\boxed{?} \boxed{?} \cdots \boxed{?}}_{\text{vertex}[2]} \cdots \underbrace{\boxed{?} \boxed{?} \cdots \boxed{?}}_{\text{vertex}[n]}$$

- (4) For each $i \in V_H$, apply $\text{PSS}_{(|E_H^{(i)}|, 1)}$ to the $|E_H^{(i)}|$ cards appearing in $\text{vertex}[i]$ except for the first card. Let $\text{vertex}'[i]$ be the resultant pile. We suppose that the current card-sequence is

$$\underbrace{\boxed{?} \boxed{?} \cdots \boxed{?}}_{\text{vertex}'[1]} \underbrace{\boxed{?} \boxed{?} \cdots \boxed{?}}_{\text{vertex}'[2]} \cdots \underbrace{\boxed{?} \boxed{?} \cdots \boxed{?}}_{\text{vertex}'[n]}.$$

- (5) Apply a generalized pile-scramble protocol to n piles ($\text{vertex}'[1], \text{vertex}'[2], \dots, \text{vertex}'[n]$). Then we obtain a card-sequence:

$$\underbrace{\boxed{?} \boxed{?} \cdots \boxed{?}}_{\text{vertex}'[\beta_1]} \underbrace{\boxed{?} \boxed{?} \cdots \boxed{?}}_{\text{vertex}'[\beta_2]} \cdots \underbrace{\boxed{?} \boxed{?} \cdots \boxed{?}}_{\text{vertex}'[\beta_n]}.$$

Here, $(\beta_1, \beta_2, \dots, \beta_n)$ is a permutation of $(1, 2, \dots, n)$ given by the generalized pile-scramble protocol.

(6) For each pile, turn over all cards except the first card. We suppose that

$$\text{vertex}'[\beta_k] = \underbrace{\boxed{?} \boxed{j_1} \cdots \boxed{j_{\ell_k}}}_{y_k} \quad (k = 1, 2, \dots, n).$$

(7) We define a hypergraph as follows:

- $V_{H'} = V_H$,
- the vertex k belongs to \tilde{e}_j if and only if \boxed{j} appears in $\text{vertex}'[\beta_k]$. We then set $\mathcal{E}_{H'} = \{\tilde{e}_1, \dots, \tilde{e}_m\}$.

(8) Take an isomorphism of hypergraphs $\psi : H \rightarrow H'$, and set $\mathbf{z} = (z_1, z_2, \dots, z_n)$ with $z_i = y_{\psi(i)}$. Arrange the card-sequence as follows:

$$\underbrace{\boxed{?} \cdots \boxed{?}}_z \underbrace{\boxed{1} \cdots \boxed{1}}_{\text{pile}[1]} \underbrace{\boxed{2} \cdots \boxed{2}}_{\text{pile}[2]} \cdots \underbrace{\boxed{m} \cdots \boxed{m}}_{\text{pile}[m]} .$$

The output card-sequence for the input \mathbf{x} is \mathbf{z} .

Remark 5.2. For the number of cards, the above protocol requires $n + \sum_{i=1}^m |e_i|$ cards. For the number of shuffles, it requires $n + \ell + d'$ PSSs, where $\ell = |\{|e| \mid e \in \mathcal{E}_H\}|$ and $d' = |\{ |E_H^{(i)}| \mid i \in V_H \}|$.

Remark 5.3. Consider an undirected graph G with n vertices and m undirected edges. Let \vec{G} be the corresponding directed graph of G (see Subsection 2.3). Since $\text{Aut}(G)$ (as a hypergraph) equals to $\text{Aut}(\vec{G})$ (as a directed graph), the hypergraph shuffle associated with G and the graph shuffle associated with \vec{G} implement the same shuffle. We observe that the hypergraph shuffle protocol requires $n + 2m$ cards while the graph shuffle protocol requires $2(n + m)$ cards. (Note that \vec{G} has $2m$ directed edges.) Thus, the hypergraph shuffle protocol is more efficient than the graph shuffle protocol for undirected graphs in terms of the number of cards.

5.3. Correctness and Security. For an arbitrary hypergraph $H = (V_H, \mathcal{E}_H)$ with $V_H = \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$, and $\mathcal{E}_H = \{e_1, e_2, \dots, e_m\}$, we set

$$S_H = \{ \pi \in \mathfrak{S}_n \mid |E_H^{(i)}| = |E_H^{(\pi(i))}| \text{ for all } 1 \leq i \leq n \}.$$

Then S_H is a subgroup of \mathfrak{S}_n , and $\text{Aut}(H)$ is a subgroup of P_H since every automorphism preserves the number of adjacent edges of each vertex.

Let $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n)$ be an input card-sequence, $\mathbf{y} = (y_1, y_2, \dots, y_n)$ the card-sequence described in Step (8), and $\mathbf{z} = (z_1, z_2, \dots, z_n)$ the corresponding output card-sequence. We take permutations $\sigma \in \mathfrak{S}_m$ and $\tau \in \mathfrak{S}_n$ such that $\sigma^{-1}(i) = \alpha_i$ in Step (2) and $\tau^{-1}(i) = \beta_i$ in Step (5), respectively. One can easily check that $\tau \in S_H$. Let H' be the hypergraph defined at Step (7). Let $\psi \in \text{Iso}(H, H')$ by an isomorphism chosen at Step (8).

Since $\text{Aut}(H)$ is a subgroup of P_H , we have $\tau = \tau' \pi$ for some $\tau' \in S_H$ and $\pi \in \text{Aut}(H)$. It implies from $\psi = \tau' \pi'$ for some $\pi' \in \text{Aut}(H)$ that

$$\mathbf{z} = \psi^{-1} \tau(\mathbf{x}) = (\tau' \pi')^{-1} \tau' \pi(\mathbf{x}) = (\pi')^{-1} \pi(\mathbf{x}). \quad (3)$$

Thanks to the randomization by σ , the opened symbols in Step (6) reveal nothing about the permutation π . Thus, the choice of π' is independent from π . Since the distribution of π is uniform over $\text{Aut}(H)$, it yields that $(\pi')^{-1} \pi$ is uniform over $\text{Aut}(H)$. Therefore, our protocol is secure and correct.

5.4. Example Execution of Our Protocol. We show an execution of our protocol for the following hypergraph H :

- $V_H = \{1, 2, 3, 4, 5\}$,
- $\mathcal{E}_H = \{e_1, e_2, e_3\}$, where $e_1 = \{1, 2, 3\}$, $e_2 = \{2, 4\}$, and $e_3 = \{2, 5\}$.

Let $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4, x_5)$ be an input card-sequence.

(1) Place the cards as follows:

$$\underbrace{\boxed{?} \boxed{?} \boxed{?} \boxed{?} \boxed{?}}_x \underbrace{\boxed{1} \boxed{1} \boxed{1}}_{\text{pile}[1]} \underbrace{\boxed{2} \boxed{2}}_{\text{pile}[2]} \underbrace{\boxed{3} \boxed{3}}_{\text{pile}[3]} .$$

- (2) Apply a generalized pile-scramble protocol to 3 piles (pile[1], pile[2], pile[3]). Then we obtain a card-sequence:

$$\underbrace{\boxed{?}\boxed{?}\boxed{?}\boxed{?}\boxed{?}}_x \underbrace{\boxed{?}\boxed{?}\boxed{?}}_{\text{pile}[\alpha_1]} \underbrace{\boxed{?}\boxed{?}}_{\text{pile}[\alpha_2]} \underbrace{\boxed{?}\boxed{?}}_{\text{pile}[\alpha_3]} .$$

Here, $(\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \alpha_3)$ is a permutation of $(1, 2, 3)$.

- (3) Arrange the piles of cards as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{vertex}[1] &= \underbrace{\boxed{?}\boxed{?}}_{x_1 \ \alpha_1}, & \text{vertex}[2] &= \underbrace{\boxed{?}\boxed{?}\boxed{?}\boxed{?}}_{x_2 \ \alpha_1 \ \alpha_2 \ \alpha_3}, \\ \text{vertex}[3] &= \underbrace{\boxed{?}\boxed{?}}_{x_3 \ \alpha_1}, & \text{vertex}[4] &= \underbrace{\boxed{?}\boxed{?}}_{x_4 \ \alpha_2}, \\ \text{vertex}[5] &= \underbrace{\boxed{?}\boxed{?}}_{x_5 \ \alpha_3}. \end{aligned}$$

- (4) Apply PSS to the second, third, and fourth cards in vertex[2]. Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} \text{vertex}'[i] &= \text{vertex}[i], \quad i \in \{1, 3, 4, 5\}, \\ \text{vertex}'[2] &= \underbrace{\boxed{?}\boxed{?}\boxed{?}\boxed{?}}_{x_2 \ \alpha'_1 \ \alpha'_2 \ \alpha'_3}, \quad \alpha'_1, \alpha'_2, \alpha'_3 \in \{\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \alpha_3\}. \end{aligned}$$

- (5) Apply a generalized pile-scramble protocol to 5 piles (vertex'[1], vertex'[2], vertex'[3], vertex'[4], vertex'[5]). Then we obtain a card-sequence:

$$\underbrace{\boxed{?}\boxed{?}}_{\text{vertex}'[\beta_1]} \underbrace{\boxed{?}\boxed{?}\boxed{?}\boxed{?}}_{\text{vertex}'[\beta_2]} \underbrace{\boxed{?}\boxed{?}}_{\text{vertex}'[\beta_3]} \underbrace{\boxed{?}\boxed{?}}_{\text{vertex}'[\beta_4]} \underbrace{\boxed{?}\boxed{?}}_{\text{vertex}'[\beta_5]} .$$

Here, $(\beta_1, \beta_2, \beta_3, \beta_4, \beta_5)$ is a permutation of $(1, 2, 3, 4, 5)$ with $\beta_2 = \alpha_2$.

- (6) For each pile, turn over all cards except the first card. Suppose that we obtain a card-sequence as follows:

$$\underbrace{\boxed{?}\boxed{2}}_{\text{vertex}'[\beta_1]} \underbrace{\boxed{?}\boxed{3}\boxed{2}\boxed{1}}_{\text{vertex}'[\beta_2]} \underbrace{\boxed{?}\boxed{1}}_{\text{vertex}'[\beta_3]} \underbrace{\boxed{?}\boxed{3}}_{\text{vertex}'[\beta_4]} \underbrace{\boxed{?}\boxed{2}}_{\text{vertex}'[\beta_5]} .$$

Let y_i be the first card in $\text{vertex}'[\beta_i]$.

- (7) From the opened symbols, the hypergraph H' is defined as follows:

- $V_{H'} = V_H$,
- $\mathcal{E}_{H'} = \{\tilde{e}_1, \tilde{e}_2, \tilde{e}_3\}$, where $\tilde{e}_1 = \{2, 3\}$, $\tilde{e}_2 = \{1, 2, 5\}$, and $\tilde{e}_3 = \{2, 4\}$.

- (8) Take an isomorphism $\psi : H \rightarrow H'$. For example, $\psi(1) = 1, \psi(2) = 2, \psi(3) = 5, \psi(4) = 3, \psi(5) = 4$. The output card-sequence is as follows:

$$\underbrace{\boxed{?}}_{y_1} \underbrace{\boxed{?}}_{y_2} \underbrace{\boxed{?}}_{y_5} \underbrace{\boxed{?}}_{y_3} \underbrace{\boxed{?}}_{y_4} .$$

Remark 5.4. We remark that $\text{Aut}(H)$ is just the automorphism group of G described in Subsection 3.4. Thus, the above hypergraph shuffle protocol and the graph shuffle protocol described in Subsection 3.4 implement the same shuffle. For the number of cards, the hypergraph shuffle protocol requires 12 cards and three PSSs, while the graph shuffle protocol requires 16 cards and six PSSs.

FUNDING

K. Shinagawa was partly supported by JSPS KAKENHI 21K17702. K. Miyamoto was partly supported by JSPS KAKENHI 20K14302.

REFERENCES

- [1] G. Chartrand, L. Lesniak, and P. Zhang. *Graphs & Digraphs*. Discrete Mathematics and Its Applications Series. CRC Press, Taylor & Francis Group, 2016.
- [2] E. Cheung, C. Hawthorne, and P. Lee. Cs 758 project: Secure computation with playing cards, 2013. https://cdhawthorne.com/writings/secure_playing_cards.pdf.

- [3] B. den Boer. More efficient match-making and satisfiability: *The Five Card Trick*. In J. Quisquater and J. Vandewalle, editors, *Advances in Cryptology - EUROCRYPT '89, Workshop on the Theory and Application of Cryptographic Techniques, Houthalen, Belgium, April 10-13, 1989, Proceedings*, volume 434 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 208–217. Springer, 1989.
- [4] R. Ishikawa, E. Chida, and T. Mizuki. Efficient card-based protocols for generating a hidden random permutation without fixed points. In C. S. Calude and M. J. Dinneen, editors, *Unconventional Computation and Natural Computation - 14th International Conference, UCNC 2015, Auckland, New Zealand, August 30 - September 3, 2015, Proceedings*, volume 9252 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 215–226. Springer, 2015.
- [5] A. Koch and S. Walzer. Foundations for actively secure card-based cryptography. In *FUN 2021*, volume 157 of *LIPICs*, pages 17:1–17:23. Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 2021.
- [6] A. Koch, S. Walzer, and K. Härtel. Card-based cryptographic protocols using a minimal number of cards. In T. Iwata and J. H. Cheon, editors, *Advances in Cryptology - ASIACRYPT 2015 - 21st International Conference on the Theory and Application of Cryptology and Information Security, Auckland, New Zealand, November 29 - December 3, 2015, Proceedings, Part I*, volume 9452 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 783–807. Springer, 2015.
- [7] A. Marcedone, Z. Wen, and E. Shi. Secure dating with four or fewer cards. *Cryptology ePrint Archive*, Report 2015/1031, 2015.
- [8] K. Miyamoto and K. Shinagawa. Graph automorphism shuffles from pile-scramble shuffles. *to appear in New Gener. Comput.*, 2022.
- [9] T. Mizuki. Applications of card-based cryptography to education. *IEICE Technical Report*, 116(289):13–17, 2016. (In Japanese).
- [10] T. Mizuki and H. Shizuya. A formalization of card-based cryptographic protocols via abstract machine. *Int. J. Inf. Sec.*, 13(1):15–23, 2014.
- [11] T. Mizuki and H. Sone. Six-card secure AND and four-card secure XOR. In X. Deng, J. E. Hopcroft, and J. Xue, editors, *Frontiers in Algorithmics, Third International Workshop, FAW 2009, Hefei, China, June 20-23, 2009. Proceedings*, volume 5598 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 358–369. Springer, 2009.
- [12] T. Saito, D. Miyahara, Y. Abe, T. Mizuki, and H. Shizuya. How to implement a non-uniform or non-closed shuffle. In C. Martín-Vide, M. A. Vega-Rodríguez, and M. Yang, editors, *Theory and Practice of Natural Computing - 9th International Conference, TPNC 2020, Taoyuan, Taiwan, December 7-9, 2020, Proceedings*, volume 12494 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 107–118. Springer, 2020.
- [13] K. Shinagawa. A report on a lecture for elementary and junior high school using card-based cryptography. *The Symposium on Cryptography and Information Security*, 2022. (In Japanese).
- [14] K. Shinagawa, T. Mizuki, J. C. N. Schuldt, K. Nuida, N. Kanayama, T. Nishide, G. Hanaoka, and E. Okamoto. Multi-party computation with small shuffle complexity using regular polygon cards. In M. H. Au and A. Miyaji, editors, *Provable Security - 9th International Conference, ProvSec 2015, Kanazawa, Japan, November 24-26, 2015, Proceedings*, volume 9451 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 127–146. Springer, 2015.

(K. Shinagawa) IBARAKI UNIVERSITY, 4-12-1 NAKANARUSAWA, HITACHI, IBARAKI, 316-8511, JAPAN; NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF ADVANCED INDUSTRIAL SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY (AIST), TOKYO WATERFRONT BIO-IT RESEARCH BUILDING 2-4-7 AOMI, KOTO-KU, TOKYO, 135-0064, JAPAN.

Email address: `kazumasa.shinagawa.np92@vc.ibaraki.ac.jp`

(K. Miyamoto) IBARAKI UNIVERSITY, 4-12-1 NAKANARUSAWA, HITACHI, IBARAKI, 316-8511, JAPAN.

Email address: `kengo.miyamoto.uz63@vc.ibaraki.ac.jp`