

Two-Server Private Information Retrieval with Optimized Download Rate and Result Verification

Stanislav Kruglik*, Son Hoang Dau†, Han Mao Kiah*, Huaxiong Wang*

* School of Physical and Mathematical Sciences, Nanyang Technological University, Singapore

† School of Computing Technologies, STEM College, RMIT University, Melbourne, Australia

stanislav.kruglik@ntu.edu.sg, sonhoang.dau@rmit.edu.au, hmkiah@ntu.edu.sg, hxwang@ntu.edu.sg

Abstract—Private Information Retrieval (PIR) schemes allow a client to retrieve any file of interest, while hiding the file identity from the database servers. In contrast to most existing PIR schemes that assume honest-but-curious servers, we study the case of dishonest servers. The latter provide incorrect answers and try to persuade the client to output the wrong result. We introduce several PIR schemes with information-theoretic privacy and result verification for the case of two servers. Security guarantees can be information-theoretical or computational, and the verification keys can be public or private. In this work, our main performance metric is the download rate.

I. INTRODUCTION

A private information retrieval (PIR) scheme allows a user to retrieve a given file x_i from a database $\mathbf{x}^T = x_1 \cdots x_m$, while keeping its identity or index $i \in [m]$ private from the database servers [1]. The problem is motivated by the necessity to preserve the privacy of not only the sensitive content downloaded from public databases, but also the identity of the queried record [2], [3]. Examples include the price of a specific stock or a specific blockchain transaction. A trivial solution is to simply download the entire database and this clearly incurs tremendous communication costs. Unfortunately, in the case of a single server, Chor *et al.* [1] showed that this was the best information-theoretically secure solution. Nevertheless, in the same seminal paper, Chor *et al.* [1] showed that when the content are replicated among several servers, the communication cost can be significantly reduced. Following [1], several authors have introduced PIR schemes that progressively reduced the communications cost [4]–[6]. Formally, in this model, the client queries each of the k servers (each stores $x_1 \cdots x_m$) once and retrieves x_i , while keeping the index i private from up to t honest-but-curious servers. In PIR literature, such a scheme is called t -private k -server PIR scheme and such a property is known as t -privacy. Motivated by the large size of stored files, we ignore the upload cost. In other words, we assume queries are small compared to the downloaded file. Hence, our main performance metric is the *download rate*, defined as the ratio of the retrieved file size to the amount of information downloaded by the user [7]–[9]. The *PIR capacity* is defined as the maximum achievable download rate and the capacity is shown in [10] to be equal to

$$C_m(t, k) = \frac{1 - t/k}{1 - (t/k)^m}. \quad (1)$$

Since the number of files is also large, we are interested in asymptotic capacity values. So, we let $m \rightarrow \infty$, and we have that

$$C(t, k) \triangleq \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} C_m(t, k) = 1 - \frac{t}{k}. \quad (2)$$

Most of the current schemes assume that servers are honest-but-curious and that they provide correct responses. However,

such an assumption cannot be guaranteed within a cloud environment. This poses an interesting question: what can the user do if servers provide wrong responses? Here, we provide three different interpretations of this question and their formal definitions.

- *s-verifiability* [referred as *s-security* in [11]]. The client can detect the presence of up to s servers that persuade the client to output a wrong result.
- *a-accountability*. The client can identify each of up to a servers that persuade the client to output a wrong result.
- *b-byzantine resistance/b-byzantine robustness*. The client can retrieve the correct result in presence of up to b servers that persuade the client to output a wrong result.

It is clear that *a-accountability* implies *a-verifiability*, while *b-byzantine resistance* implies both *b-accountability* and *b-verifiability*. We also note that existing verifiable PIR schemes [12], [13] provide accountability - but rely on computational assumptions and require a trusted setup. Other previously studied schemes are *b-byzantine-resistant* PIR schemes [14]–[17]. Typically, they rely on error-correcting techniques and require at least three servers, while protocols considered in this paper are deployed in the two-server scenario.

Both verifiable *a-accountable* and *b-byzantine* PIR schemes identify malicious servers. However, in certain low-latency applications, such as private media browsing, this may be excessive [18]. By simply requiring *s-verifiability*, we can then have some savings of communication cost. *s-verifiable* PIR schemes was considered in papers [11], [19]. In these papers, authors measure the communication cost as the sum of upload and download costs, while in our case, we ignore the upload cost.

In this paper, we consider the notion of *s-verifiability* and propose a two-server verifiable PIR scheme with an optimized download rate by modifying a linear secret-sharing-based PIR scheme that achieves PIR asymptotic capacity (2) from [20]. We also propose a generalization that allows the PIR scheme to be publicly verifiable. After which, to reduce the communication cost, we introduce the use of homomorphic hashing in the verification step [21].

II. PRELIMINARIES

A. Notation

For any integer $n > 0$ we denote $[n] = \{1, \dots, n\}$. For any prime number p , we denote an extended finite field with p^t elements as \mathbb{F}_{p^t} . The base field with p elements is denoted as \mathbb{F}_p . By superscript T , we denote the transpose of a vector.

B. PIR Based Secret-Sharing Schemes

In what follows, we focus on the two-server scenario and add a result verification to the linear secret-sharing-based PIR scheme that achieves PIR capacity [20, Proposition 2]. Let us formally define it and denote as Π_0 . Each server S_1 and S_2 stores m files $x_1, \dots, x_m \in \mathbb{F}_{p^t}$ that form the data vector $\mathbf{x}^T = (x_1, \dots, x_m)$. Queries from client to servers to retrieve the file i are formed by Shamir secret sharing scheme as $\mathbf{f}(u_1)$ and $\mathbf{f}(u_2)$, where $\mathbf{f}(u) = \mathbf{e}_i + \mathbf{r}u \in \mathbb{F}_p^m$, \mathbf{e}_i is all zero vector of length m with a '1' in the position i , \mathbf{r} is a random vector over \mathbb{F}_p^m , u_1 and u_2 are pre-selected points over \mathbb{F}_p that correspond to servers one and two. As a response, server S_j computes the scalar product of data vector \mathbf{x} and query $\mathbf{f}(u_j)$ that can be written as $\mathbf{f}(u)\mathbf{x}^T = \mathbf{e}_i^T \mathbf{x} + \mathbf{r}^T \mathbf{x}u = x_i + \mathbf{r}^T \mathbf{x}u$. By collecting responses from two servers, the client can retrieve x_i from

$$\begin{bmatrix} x_i \\ \mathbf{r}^T \mathbf{x} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & u_1 \\ 1 & u_2 \end{bmatrix}^{-1} \cdot \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{f}(u_1)^T \mathbf{x} \\ \mathbf{f}(u_2)^T \mathbf{x} \end{bmatrix} \quad (3)$$

We do note that such a scheme has the download rate $\frac{1}{2}$ and its 1-privacy is ensured by the properties of underlined Shamir's secret sharing scheme.

C. PIR Model

Before we proceed further, let us formally define two server verifiable PIR. Our model consist of two servers S_1 and S_2 . Each server stores m files $x_1, \dots, x_m \in \mathbb{F}_{p^t}$ that form the data vector $\mathbf{x}^T = (x_1, \dots, x_m)$. The client wants to privately retrieve the correct value of x_i , while one server can be malicious and provide a wrong response.

Definition 1 (PIR with results verification). A two-server PIR scheme Π with *results verification* consists of three algorithms that can be described as follows:

- $(\text{vk}, \sigma_1, \sigma_2, \text{aux}_A, \text{aux}_V) \leftarrow \text{QueriesGen}(m, i)$ is a randomized query-generating algorithm for the client. As input, it takes the database size m and retrieval index i and outputs two queries σ_1 and σ_2 that will be given to servers S_1 and S_2 , value vk further employed by the client for verification purposes and, if necessary, auxiliary information aux_A used in answer-generation and aux_V used in verification.
- $\pi_j \leftarrow \text{AnswerGen}(j, \sigma_j, \mathbf{x}, \text{aux}_A)$ is a deterministic answer-generation algorithm for server S_j . As input it takes server number j , query σ_j , database \mathbf{x} , and, if necessary, auxiliary information aux_A , and outputs the query response π_j .
- $\{x_i, \perp\} \leftarrow \text{Verify}(i, \text{vk}, \pi_1, \pi_2, \text{aux}_V)$ is a deterministic verification algorithm for the client. As input, it takes the retrieval index i , verification key vk , servers answers π_1 , π_2 , if necessary, auxiliary information aux_V , and uses them to determine if it can reconstruct the correct value of x_i . If it cannot do so, it outputs the special symbol \perp indicating that at least one of the answers is incorrect, otherwise, it reconstructs x_i and outputs it.

A scheme is called *publicly verifiable* if vk is public. Otherwise, the scheme is *privately verifiable*. Public verification is generally preferred, but usually relies on computational assumptions, while privately verifiable schemes can be information-theoretically secure. Considered PIR scheme should satisfy correctness, privacy, and security properties. Let us formally define them.

Definition 2 (Correctness). The scheme Π is *correct* if for any $m, i \in [m]$ and $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{F}_{p^t}^m$ and any $(\text{vk}, \sigma_1, \sigma_2, \text{aux}_A, \text{aux}_V) \leftarrow \text{QueriesGen}(m, i)$ it holds that $\text{Verify}(i, \text{vk}, \text{AnswerGen}(1, \sigma_1, \mathbf{x}, \text{aux}_A), \text{AnswerGen}(2, \sigma_2, \mathbf{x}, \text{aux}_V)) = x_i$.

Definition 3 (Privacy). The scheme Π is *private* if for any m , any $i, i' \in [m]$ and $(\text{vk}, \sigma_1, \sigma_2, \text{aux}_A, \text{aux}_V) \leftarrow \text{QueriesGen}(m, i)$, $(\text{vk}', \sigma'_1, \sigma'_2, \text{aux}_A, \text{aux}_V) \leftarrow \text{QueriesGen}(m, i')$ and any $j \in [2]$, queries σ_j and σ'_j are identically distributed. The latter means that a given server j cannot distinguish between them.

Following [22] and recent papers on multi-server verifiable computations [11], [19], the verifiability property can be defined through the notion of security experiment: an adversary \mathcal{A} controls the dishonest server S_j , knows the database \mathbf{x} , retrieval index i , and, if necessary, the auxiliary information aux_A and crafts an answer $\hat{\pi}_j$ after receiving the query σ_j . We consider this setup for the privately verifiable case and we denote the corresponding experiment as $\text{EXP}_{\mathcal{A}, \Pi}^{\text{PriV}}(m, \mathbf{x}, i, j)$. For the publicly verifiable case, we borrow the same ideas from [11] and generalize the security experiment of [23] in a single-server setting to our two-server setup. The resulting security experiment $\text{EXP}_{\mathcal{A}, \Pi}^{\text{PubV}}(m, \mathbf{x}, i, j)$ is identical to $\text{EXP}_{\mathcal{A}, \Pi}^{\text{PriV}}(m, \mathbf{x}, i, j)$ except that adversary also knows verification key vk . Let us formally define them.

Definition 4 (Security experiment). An *interactive security experiment* $\text{EXP}_{\mathcal{A}, \Pi}^{\text{PriV}}(m, \mathbf{x}, i, j)/\text{EXP}_{\mathcal{A}, \Pi}^{\text{PubV}}(m, \mathbf{x}, i, j)$ between adversary \mathcal{A} that controls dishonest server $j \in [2]$ and its challenger in privately/publicly verifiable case can be described as follows:

- Challenger generates $(\text{vk}, \sigma_1, \sigma_2, \text{aux}_A, \text{aux}_V) \leftarrow \text{QueriesGen}(m, i)$ and sends σ_j to the adversary \mathcal{A} .
- The adversary \mathcal{A} generates a crafted answer $\hat{\pi}_i \leftarrow \mathcal{A}(j, \sigma_j, \mathbf{x}, i, \text{aux}_A)/\hat{\pi}_i \leftarrow \mathcal{A}(j, \sigma_j, \mathbf{x}, i, \text{vk}, \text{aux}_A)$ and sends it to the challenger.
- The challenger computes $\pi_{3-j} \leftarrow \text{AnswerGen}(3 - j, \sigma_{3-j}, \mathbf{x}, \text{aux}_A)$
- The challenger runs the verification algorithm Verify with inputs $i, \text{vk}, \hat{\pi}_j$ and π_{3-j} , if necessary, aux_V and computes an output y .
- If $y \notin \{x_i, \perp\}$ set the outcome $\text{EXP}_{\mathcal{A}, \Pi}^{\text{PriV}}(m, \mathbf{x}, i, j)/\text{EXP}_{\mathcal{A}, \Pi}^{\text{PubV}}(m, \mathbf{x}, i, j)$ of the experiment to be 1, otherwise set it to be 0.

In what follows, we define the following two notions of verifiability – information-theoretical and computational.

Definition 5 (Negligible function). A function from \mathbb{N} to \mathbb{R}^+ is *negligible* and denoted as $\text{negl}(\cdot)$ if for all $c > 0$ there exists a natural number λ_0 such that $\text{negl}(\lambda) < \frac{1}{\lambda^c}$ for all $\lambda > \lambda_0$.

Definition 6 (Information-theoretical verifiability). The protocol Π is $(1, \epsilon)$ -*verifiable* if for any adversary \mathcal{A} , any $j \in [2]$, $m, \mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{F}_{p^t}^m$ and any $i \in [m]$, we have $\Pr[\text{EXP}_{\mathcal{A}, \Pi}^{\text{PriV}}(m, \mathbf{x}, i, j) = 1] \leq \epsilon$. Here, the probability is taken over the randomness of \mathcal{A} and the experiment.

Definition 7 (Computational verifiability). The scheme Π is 1 -*verifiable* if for any probabilistic poly-time (PPT) adversary \mathcal{A} , any $j \in [2]$, $m, \mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{F}_{p^t}^m$ and any $i \in$

$[m]$, $\Pr[\text{EXP}_{\mathcal{A},\Pi}^{\text{PriV}}(m, \mathbf{x}, i, j)/\text{EXP}_{\mathcal{A},\Pi}^{\text{PubV}}(m, \mathbf{x}, i, j) = 1] \leq \text{negl}(\lambda)$, where the probability is taken over the randomness of \mathcal{A} and the experiment.

The notion of computational verifiability relies on certain cryptographic assumptions. Schemes proposed in this paper rely on the following Discrete logarithm (DLog) assumption.

Definition 8 (DLog assumption). Let \mathbb{G} be a cyclic group of order $p > 2^\lambda$. For generator g and $\alpha \in \mathbb{F}_p \setminus \{0\}$ we define the advantage $\text{Adv}_{\mathcal{A}}^{\text{DLog}}$ of adversary \mathcal{A} in solving discrete logarithm problem in group \mathbb{G} as the probability that he can find α from values of g and g^α . We say that discrete logarithm assumption holds if for any PPT adversary \mathcal{A} , $\text{Adv}_{\mathcal{A}}^{\text{DLog}}(\lambda) \leq \text{negl}(\lambda)$.

III. OUR CONSTRUCTIONS

In this section, we introduce two-server PIR schemes in which the client can verify the result in the presence of one dishonest server. The basic idea is to provide one more independent set of queries to the servers, so that the user can compute two versions of x_i or x_i and vx_i for some secret parameter v and verify that both servers are truthful. If we keep the verification key in secret and download whole responses to queries, we obtain an information-theoretical $(1, \epsilon)$ -verifiable scheme with private verification, or shortly $(1, \epsilon)$ privately verifiable scheme (see section III-A). Later on, we generalize this scheme to a publicly verifiable setup (see section III-B) and reduce the communication cost by introducing homomorphic hashes (see section III-C).

A. Information-Theoretical Privately Verifiable Scheme

Let us modify the linear secret-sharing-based PIR scheme Π_0 to the case of results verification by creating one more set of independent queries. The resulting two server verifiable PIR scheme Π_1 can be described as follows.

- **QueriesGen**(m, i): Choose $\mathbf{v} \leftarrow \mathbb{F}_p \setminus \{0\}$, $\mathbf{r} \leftarrow \mathbb{F}_p^m$, $\mathbf{r}_v \leftarrow \mathbb{F}_p^m$. Let $\mathbf{f}(u) = \mathbf{e}_i + \mathbf{r}u \in \mathbb{F}_p^m$ and $\mathbf{f}_v(u) = \mathbf{v}\mathbf{e}_i + \mathbf{r}_v u \in \mathbb{F}_p^m$, \mathbf{e}_i is all zero vector of length m with a '1' in the position i . Compute $\sigma_j = (\mathbf{f}(u_j), \mathbf{f}_v(u_j))$ for all $j \in [2]$. Output $\text{vk} = \mathbf{v}$, σ_1 , σ_2 , and $\text{aux}_V = \{u_1, u_2\}$.
- **AnswerGen**(j, σ_j, \mathbf{x}): Parse σ_j as $(\mathbf{f}(u_j), \mathbf{f}_v(u_j))$, compute $z_j = \mathbf{f}(u_j)^T \mathbf{x}$, $w_j = \mathbf{f}_v(u_j)^T \mathbf{x}$, output $\pi_j = (z_j, w_j)$.
- **Verify**($i, \text{vk}, \pi_1, \pi_2, \text{aux}_V$): Parse aux_V as $\{u_1, u_2\}$. Retrieve x_i and vx_i as

$$\begin{bmatrix} x_i \\ \mathbf{r}^T \mathbf{x} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & u_1 \\ 1 & u_2 \end{bmatrix}^{-1} \cdot \begin{bmatrix} z_1 \\ z_2 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} a & b \\ c & d \end{bmatrix} \cdot \begin{bmatrix} z_1 \\ z_2 \end{bmatrix} \quad (4)$$

and

$$\begin{bmatrix} vx_i \\ \mathbf{r}_v^T \mathbf{x} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & u_1 \\ 1 & u_2 \end{bmatrix}^{-1} \cdot \begin{bmatrix} w_1 \\ w_2 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} a & b \\ c & d \end{bmatrix} \cdot \begin{bmatrix} w_1 \\ w_2 \end{bmatrix} \quad (5)$$

If the equation below holds, output x_i ; otherwise, output \perp .

$$\mathbf{v}(az_1 + bz_2) = aw_1 + bw_2 \quad (6)$$

The proofs of correctness of our scheme and proof of privacy are almost identical to that of [20] and omitted here. The download rate is equal to $\frac{1}{4}$ and below we show that Π_1 is $(1, \epsilon)$ -verifiable.

Theorem 1. *The scheme Π_1 is $(1, \epsilon)$ -verifiable where $\epsilon = \frac{1}{p-1}$.*

Proof. Without loss of generality, assume that Adversary \mathcal{A} controls the server S_1 and set $j = 1$. Let $\pi_1 = (z_1, w_1)$ and $\pi_2 = (z_2, w_2)$ be the answers obtained by correctly executing

algorithm **AnswerGen** by each server. Let $\hat{\pi}_1 = (\hat{z}_1, \hat{w}_1)$ be the answer chosen by \mathcal{A} for S_1 .

From the description of Π_1 it is clear that

$$x_i = A = az_1 + bz_2$$

and

$$vx_i = V = aw_1 + bw_2$$

while

$$\hat{x}_i = \hat{A} = a\hat{z}_1 + b\hat{z}_2$$

and

$$\hat{v}\hat{x}_i = \hat{V} = a\hat{w}_1 + b\hat{w}_2.$$

\mathcal{A} wins the security experiment $\text{EXP}_{\mathcal{A},\Pi_1}^{\text{PriV}}(m, \mathbf{x}, i, j)$ if the $\hat{A} \neq A$ and $\hat{V} = v\hat{A}$. It is clear that $V = vA$. Hence, in this case,

$$\hat{V} - V = v(\hat{A} - A).$$

From equations (4), (5) and the fact that server S_2 is honest, it is clear that

$$\hat{A} - A = a(\hat{z}_1 - z_1) = a\Delta_0 \neq 0 \quad (7)$$

$$\hat{V} - V = a(\hat{w}_1 - w_1) = a\Delta_1 \quad (8)$$

Hence \mathcal{A} wins the security experiment $\text{EXP}_{\mathcal{A},\Pi_1}^{\text{PriV}}(m, \mathbf{x}, i, j)$ iff it finds the solution for the equation

$$G(\mathbf{v}) = a\Delta_1 - av\Delta_0 = a(\Delta_1 - v\Delta_0) = 0. \quad (9)$$

From the description of the security experiment, it follows that Δ_0, Δ_1 are known to \mathcal{A} and independent from \mathbf{v} . Hence

$$\Pr[\text{EXP}_{\mathcal{A},\Pi_1}^{\text{PriV}}(m, \mathbf{x}, i, j) = 1] \leq \Pr[G(\mathbf{v}) = 0], \quad (10)$$

for \mathbf{v} chosen independently and uniformly at random from $\mathbb{F}_p \setminus \{0\}$. By Schwartz-Zippel Lemma [24], [25] this value can be estimated from above as $\frac{1}{p-1}$, and the theorem statement follows. \square

B. Computational Publicly Verifiable Scheme

Next, we modify information-theoretical privately verifiable scheme Π_1 to a publicly verifiable setup. To do so, we choose a cyclic group \mathbb{G} with generator g of prime order $p \geq 2^\lambda$ and made $\text{vk} = g^v$ public. The resulting PIR scheme Π_2 can be described as follows.

- **QueriesGen**(m, i): Choose $\mathbf{x} \leftarrow \mathbb{F}_p \setminus \{0\}$, $\mathbf{r} \leftarrow \mathbb{F}_p^m$, $\mathbf{r}_v \leftarrow \mathbb{F}_p^m$. Let $\mathbf{f}(u) = \mathbf{e}_i + \mathbf{r}u \in \mathbb{F}_p^m$ and $\mathbf{f}_v(u) = \mathbf{v}\mathbf{e}_i + \mathbf{r}_v u \in \mathbb{F}_p^m$. Compute $\sigma_j = (\mathbf{f}(u_j), \mathbf{f}_v(u_j))$ for all $j \in [2]$. Choose a cyclic group \mathbb{G} of prime order p with generator g . Output $\text{vk} = g^v$, σ_1 , σ_2 and $\text{aux}_V = \{u_1, u_2\}$.
- **AnswerGen**(j, σ_j, \mathbf{x}): Parse σ_j as $(\mathbf{f}(u_j), \mathbf{f}_v(u_j))$, compute $z_j = \mathbf{f}(u_j)^T \mathbf{x}$, $w_j = \mathbf{f}_v(u_j)^T \mathbf{x}$, output $\pi_j = (z_j, w_j)$.
- **Verify**($i, \text{vk}, \pi_1, \pi_2, \text{aux}_V$): Parse aux_V as $\{u_1, u_2\}$. Retrieve x_i and vx_i as

$$\begin{bmatrix} x_i \\ \mathbf{r}^T \mathbf{x} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & u_1 \\ 1 & u_2 \end{bmatrix}^{-1} \cdot \begin{bmatrix} z_1 \\ z_2 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} a & b \\ c & d \end{bmatrix} \cdot \begin{bmatrix} z_1 \\ z_2 \end{bmatrix} \quad (11)$$

and

$$\begin{bmatrix} vx_i \\ \mathbf{r}_v^T \mathbf{x} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & u_1 \\ 1 & u_2 \end{bmatrix}^{-1} \cdot \begin{bmatrix} w_1 \\ w_2 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} a & b \\ c & d \end{bmatrix} \cdot \begin{bmatrix} w_1 \\ w_2 \end{bmatrix} \quad (12)$$

If the equation below holds, output x_i ; otherwise, output \perp :

$$(g^v)^{(az_1 + bz_2)} = g^{aw_1 + bw_2}. \quad (13)$$

The proofs of correctness of our scheme and proof of privacy are almost identical to that of [20] and omitted here. The download rate is equal to $\frac{1}{4}$.

Theorem 2. *The scheme Π_2 is 1-verifiable under DLog assumption in \mathbb{G} .*

Proof. Without loss of generality, assume that Adversary \mathcal{A} controls the server S_1 and set $j = 1$. Let $\pi_1 = (\mathbf{f}(u_1)^T \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{f}_v(u_1)^T \mathbf{x}) = (z_1, w_1)$ and $\pi_2 = (\mathbf{f}(u_2)^T \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{f}_v(u_2)^T \mathbf{x}) = (z_2, w_2)$ be the answers obtained by correctly executing algorithm `AnswerGen` by each server. Let $\hat{\pi}_1 = (\hat{z}_1, \hat{w}_1)$ is answers chosen by \mathcal{A} for S_1 .

From the description of Π_1 it is clear that

$$x_i = A = az_1 + bz_2$$

and

$$vx_i = V = aw_1 + bw_2$$

while

$$\hat{x}_i = \hat{A} = a\hat{z}_1 + b\hat{z}_2$$

and

$$\hat{v}\hat{x}_i = \hat{V} = a\hat{w}_1 + b\hat{w}_2.$$

\mathcal{A} wins the security experiment $\text{EXP}_{\mathcal{A}, \Pi_2}^{\text{PubV}}(m, \mathbf{x}, i, j)$ if the $\hat{A} \neq A$ and $g^{\hat{V}} = g^{v\hat{A}}$. From equations (11),(12) and the fact that server 2 is honest it is clear that

$$\hat{A} - A = a(\hat{z}_1 - z_1) = a\Delta_0 \neq 0 \quad (14)$$

$$\hat{V} - V = a(\hat{w}_1 - w_1) = a\Delta_1. \quad (15)$$

As $g^V = (g^v)^A$, \mathcal{A} wins the security experiment $\text{EXP}_{\mathcal{A}, \Pi_2}^{\text{PubV}}(m, \mathbf{x}, i, j)$ iff

$$g^{a\Delta_0} = (g^v)^{a\Delta_1}. \quad (16)$$

From the description of security experiment it follows that Δ_0, Δ_1 are known to \mathcal{A} and independent from v and g^v . Hence $\Pr[\text{EXP}_{\mathcal{A}, \Pi_2}^{\text{PubV}}(m, \mathbf{x}, i, j) = 1]$ can be estimated from above as probability of learning the value $v = \frac{a\Delta_0}{a\Delta_1} = \frac{\Delta_0}{\Delta_1}$ where $\Delta_0 \neq 0$ from the discrete-logarithm relationship in the group \mathbb{G} . As a result, the theorem statement follows. \square

C. Computational Privately Verifiable Scheme

The main drawback of scheme Π_1 is that it doubles the download cost in comparison to capacity-achieving scheme Π_0 . The possible solution to a problem of this kind is to apply homomorphic hashes to the second part of responses π_1 and π_2 . The construction of homomorphic hashes is based on DLog assumption in the multiplicative group of order $p \geq 2^\lambda$ in the finite field and was introduced for the first time for verification of digital content distributed by rateless erasure codes in [26] and further applied for network coding in [21]. Resulted PIR scheme Π_3 can be described as follows.

- `QueriesGen`(m, i): Choose $\mathbf{x} \leftarrow \mathbb{F}_p \setminus \{0\}$, $\mathbf{r} \leftarrow \mathbb{F}_p^m$, $\mathbf{r}_v \leftarrow \mathbb{F}_p^m$. Let $\mathbf{f}(u) = \mathbf{e}_i + \mathbf{r}u \in \mathbb{F}_p^m$ and $\mathbf{f}_v(u) = \mathbf{v}_i + \mathbf{r}_v u \in \mathbb{F}_p^m$. Compute $\sigma_j = (\mathbf{f}(u_j), \mathbf{f}_v(u_j))$ for all $j \in [2]$. Choose a prime number r so that $r - 1$ is divisible by p and random elements g_1, \dots, g_t of \mathbb{Z}_r of order p . Choose a basis \mathcal{B} of \mathbb{F}_{p^t} over \mathbb{F}_p . Output $\text{vk} = v, \sigma_1, \sigma_2, \text{aux}_A = \{g_1, \dots, g_t, \mathcal{B}\}$ and $\text{aux}_V = \{g_1, \dots, g_t, \mathcal{B}, u_1, u_2\}$.
- `AnswerGen`($j, \sigma_j, \mathbf{x}, \text{aux}_A$): Parse σ_j as $(\mathbf{f}(u_j), \mathbf{f}_v(u_j))$, aux_A as $\{g_1, \dots, g_t, \mathcal{B}\}$, compute $z_j = \mathbf{f}(u_j)^T \mathbf{x}$, $w_j = \mathbf{f}_v(u_j)^T \mathbf{x}$. Represent w_j in basis \mathcal{B} of \mathbb{F}_{p^t}

over \mathbb{F}_p as $(w_{j,1}, \dots, w_{j,t})^T$ and compute $h(w_j) = \prod_{l=1}^t g_l^{w_{j,l}} \bmod r$. Output $\pi_j = (z_j, h(w_j))$.

- `Verify`($i, \text{vk}, \pi_1, \pi_2, \text{aux}_V$): Parse aux_V as $\{g_1, \dots, g_t, \mathcal{B}, u_1, u_2\}$. Retrieve x_i as

$$\begin{bmatrix} x_i \\ \mathbf{r}^T \mathbf{x} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & u_1 \\ 1 & u_2 \end{bmatrix}^{-1} \cdot \begin{bmatrix} z_1 \\ z_2 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} a & b \\ c & d \end{bmatrix} \cdot \begin{bmatrix} z_1 \\ z_2 \end{bmatrix} \quad (17)$$

Represent x_i in basis \mathcal{B} of \mathbb{F}_{p^t} over \mathbb{F}_p as $(x_{i,1}, \dots, x_{i,t})^T$ and compute $h(x_i) = \prod_{l=1}^t g_l^{x_{i,l}} \bmod r$.

If the equation below holds, output x_i ; otherwise, output \perp .

$$h(x_i)^v = h(w_1)^a h(w_2)^b \bmod r. \quad (18)$$

The proofs of correctness of our scheme and proof of privacy are almost identical to that of [20] and omitted here. The download rate is equal to $\frac{t \log p}{2(t \log p + \log r)}$ that can be arbitrarily close to $\frac{1}{2}$.

Theorem 3. *The scheme Π_3 is 1-verifiable under DLog assumption in a multiplicative group of order p in a finite field.*

Proof. Without loss of generality, assume that Adversary \mathcal{A} controls the server S_1 and set $j = 1$. Let $\pi_1 = (\mathbf{f}(u_1)^T \mathbf{x}, h(\mathbf{f}_v(u_1)^T \mathbf{x})) = (z_1, h(w_1))$ and $\pi_2 = (z_2, h(w_2))$ be the answers obtained by correctly executing algorithm `AnswerGen` by each server. Let $\hat{\pi}_1 = (\hat{z}_1, h(\hat{w}_1))$ be the answer chosen by \mathcal{A} for S_1 .

Let HC and HC^c denote the event of hash collision and its complement, respectively. From the description of Π_3 and the law of total probability, it is clear that

$$\begin{aligned} & \Pr[\text{EXP}_{\mathcal{A}, \Pi_3}^{\text{PriV}}(m, \mathbf{x}, i, j) = 1] \\ &= \Pr[\text{EXP}_{\mathcal{A}, \Pi_3}^{\text{PriV}}(m, \mathbf{x}, i, j) = 1 | HC] \Pr[HC] \\ &+ \Pr[\text{EXP}_{\mathcal{A}, \Pi_3}^{\text{PriV}}(m, \mathbf{x}, i, j) = 1 | HC^c] \Pr[HC^c] \\ &\leq \Pr[HC] + \Pr[\text{EXP}_{\mathcal{A}, \Pi_3}^{\text{PriV}}(m, \mathbf{x}, i, j) = 1 | HC^c] \Pr[HC^c] \\ &\leq \Pr[HC] + \Pr[\text{EXP}_{\mathcal{A}, \Pi_3}^{\text{PriV}}(m, \mathbf{x}, i, j) = 1] \leq \text{negl}(\lambda). \end{aligned} \quad (19)$$

The final inequality (19) follows from the collision resistance of homomorphic hash functions under the DLog assumption in a multiplicative group of order $p \geq 2^\lambda$. \square

Remark 9. We can replace homomorphic hashes construction based on DLog assumption with homomorphic hashes construction based on t-poly DH assumption in the group of points of an elliptic curve [27], [28]. Despite the latter requiring a smaller field size to deploy, it requires the existence of a trusted setup that can be impossible in some scenarios.

IV. COMPARISONS

Let us consider setup when we have m files over a finite field \mathbb{F}_{p^t} and possible solutions to the problem of verifiable PIR with optimized download cost. By Pr we denote the probability that an adversary with access to one server wins in the security experiment. We measure the file size, upload cost (UP), and download cost (DC) in bits. Also, we differentiate schemes by the notion of 1-verifiability (1-verif.), 1-privacy (1-priv.), and presence of verifiability (verif.). The comparison is presented in Table 1. For comparison we take schemes Π_0, Π_1, Π_2 and Π_3 described in this paper. Also, we apply a two-server verifiable computation scheme of low-degree polynomials from [11, Scheme 3] at the top of scheme Π_0 to construct the two-server verifiable scheme. We note that this is the only scheme from [11] that can be deployed in two server scenarios.

	Π_0	[11, Scheme 3]	\mathbb{A}	Π_1	Π_2	Π_3
File size	$t \cdot \log(p)$	$t \cdot \log(p)$	$t \cdot \log(p)$	$t \cdot \log(p)$	$t \cdot \log(p)$	$t \cdot \log(p)$
UC	$2m \cdot \log(p)$	$4m \cdot \log(p)$	$4m \cdot \log(p)$	$4m \cdot \log(p)$	$4m \cdot \log(p)$	$4m \cdot \log(p)$
DC	$2t \cdot \log(p)$	$4t \cdot \log(p)$	$4t \cdot \log(p)$	$4t \cdot \log(p)$	$4t \cdot \log(p)$	$2t \cdot \log(p) + 2 \cdot \log(r)$
Pr	1	$\frac{p-1}{p^2-3}$	$\frac{2(p-1)}{(p-2)^2}$	$\frac{1}{p-1}$	$\text{negl}(\lambda)$	$\text{negl}(\lambda)$
1-verif.	no	IT	IT	IT	DLog	DLog
1-priv.	IT	IT	IT	IT	IT	IT
verif.	no	private	private	private	public	private

Table 1: Comparison of two-server PIR schemes that optimize the download rate

It cannot be generalized to publicly verifiable cases, and we cannot apply homomorphic hashing schemes to it as we cannot separate server responses into two parts (one is responsible for the retrieval, and one is for the verification). The parameters of the resulting scheme are presented in column 3.

Two server-verifiable schemes can also be created from scheme Π_0 by forming two independent queries for each server. The important thing here is that in comparison to previously described schemes, points of evaluation must be kept secret. Such an approach offers a higher probability that an adversary with access to one server wins in the security experiment. Let us formally describe it below and prove its $(1, \epsilon)$ -verifiability. In that follows, we denote this scheme as \mathbb{A} .

- $\text{QueriesGen}(m, i)$: Choose $u_1, u_2 \leftarrow \mathbb{F}_p$, $u_1 \neq u_2$, $\tilde{u}_1, \tilde{u}_2 \leftarrow \mathbb{F}_p$, $\tilde{u}_1 \neq \tilde{u}_2$, $\mathbf{r} \leftarrow \mathbb{F}_p^m$, $\mathbf{r}_v \leftarrow \mathbb{F}_p^m$. Let $\mathbf{f}(u) = \mathbf{e}_i + \mathbf{r}u \in \mathbb{F}_p^m$ and $\mathbf{f}_v(u) = \mathbf{e}_i + \mathbf{r}_v u \in \mathbb{F}_p^m$. Compute $\sigma_j = (\mathbf{f}(u_j), \mathbf{f}_v(\tilde{u}_j))$ for all $j \in [2]$. Output $\text{vk} = \text{aux}_V = \{u_1, u_2, \tilde{u}_1, \tilde{u}_2\}$, σ_1 and σ_2 .
- $\text{AnswerGen}(j, \sigma_j, \mathbf{x})$: Parse σ_j as $(\mathbf{f}(u_j), \mathbf{f}_v(u_j))$, compute $z_j = \mathbf{f}(u_j)^T \mathbf{x}$, $w_j = \mathbf{f}_v(u_j)^T \mathbf{x}$, output $\pi_j = (z_j, w_j)$.
- $\text{Verify}(i, \text{vk}, \pi_1, \pi_2, \text{aux}_V)$: Parse $\text{vk} = \text{aux}_V = \{u_1, u_2, \tilde{u}_1, \tilde{u}_2\}$. Retrieve x_i as

$$\begin{bmatrix} x_i \\ \mathbf{r}^T \mathbf{x} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & u_1 \\ 1 & u_2 \end{bmatrix}^{-1} \cdot \begin{bmatrix} z_1 \\ z_2 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} a & b \\ c & d \end{bmatrix} \cdot \begin{bmatrix} z_1 \\ z_2 \end{bmatrix} \quad (20)$$

and

$$\begin{bmatrix} x_i \\ \mathbf{r}_v^T \mathbf{x} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & \tilde{u}_1 \\ 1 & \tilde{u}_2 \end{bmatrix}^{-1} \cdot \begin{bmatrix} w_1 \\ w_2 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \tilde{a} & \tilde{b} \\ \tilde{c} & \tilde{d} \end{bmatrix} \cdot \begin{bmatrix} w_1 \\ w_2 \end{bmatrix} \quad (21)$$

If the equation below holds, output x_i ; otherwise, output \perp .

$$az_1 + bz_2 = \tilde{a}w_1 + \tilde{b}w_2 \quad (22)$$

The proofs of correctness of this scheme and proof of privacy are almost identical to that of [20] and omitted here. The download rate is equal to $\frac{1}{4}$.

Theorem 4. *The scheme \mathbb{A} is $(1, \epsilon)$ -verifiable where $\epsilon = \frac{2(p-1)}{(p-2)^2}$.*

Proof. Without loss of generality, assume that Adversary \mathcal{A} controls the server S_1 and set $j = 1$. Let $\pi_1 = (z_1, w_1)$ and $\pi_2 = (z_2, w_2)$ be the answers obtained by correctly executing algorithm AnswerGen by each server. Let $\hat{\pi}_1 = (\hat{z}_1, \hat{w}_1)$ be the answer chosen by \mathcal{A} for S_1 .

From the description of \mathbb{A} it is clear that

$$x_i = A = az_1 + bz_2$$

and

$$x_i = V = \tilde{a}w_1 + \tilde{b}w_2$$

while

$$\hat{x}_i = \hat{A} = a \cdot \hat{z}_1 + b\hat{z}_2$$

and

$$\tilde{x}_i = \hat{V} = \tilde{a}\hat{w}_1 + \tilde{b}\hat{w}_2.$$

\mathcal{A} wins the security experiment $\text{EXP}_{\mathcal{A}, \mathbb{A}}^{\text{PriV}}(m, \mathbf{x}, i, j)$ if the $\hat{A} \neq A$ and $\hat{V} = A$. It is clear that $A = V$. Hence,

$$\hat{V} - V = \hat{A} - A.$$

From equations (20), (21) and the fact that server 2 is honest it is clear that

$$\hat{A} - A = a(\hat{z}_1 - z_2) = a\Delta_0 \neq 0 \quad (23)$$

$$\hat{V} - V = \tilde{a}(\hat{w}_1 - w_2) = \tilde{a}\Delta_1, \quad (24)$$

where $a = \frac{u_2}{u_2 - u_1}$ and $\tilde{a} = \frac{\tilde{u}_2}{\tilde{u}_2 - \tilde{u}_1}$. Hence \mathcal{A} wins the security experiment $\text{EXP}_{\mathcal{A}, \Pi_1}^{\text{PriV}}(m, \mathbf{x}, i, j)$ iff it finds the solution for the equation

$$\begin{aligned} G(u_1, u_2, \tilde{u}_1, \tilde{u}_2) &= \frac{\tilde{u}_2}{\tilde{u}_2 - \tilde{u}_1} \Delta_1 - \frac{u_2}{u_2 - u_1} \Delta_0 \\ &= \frac{\tilde{u}_2(u_2 - u_1)\Delta_1 - u_2(\tilde{u}_2 - \tilde{u}_1)\Delta_0}{(\tilde{u}_2 - \tilde{u}_1)(u_2 - u_1)} = 0. \end{aligned} \quad (25)$$

From the description of security experiment, it follows that Δ_0, Δ_1 are known to \mathcal{A} and independent from $u_1, u_2, \tilde{u}_1, \tilde{u}_2$. Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} &\Pr[\text{EXP}_{\mathcal{A}, \mathbb{A}}^{\text{PriV}}(m, \mathbf{x}, i, j) = 1] \\ &\leq \Pr(G(u_1, u_2, \tilde{u}_1, \tilde{u}_2) = 0 | \Delta_1 \neq \Delta_0 \neq 0) \\ &= \sum_{(c_1, c_2, c_3, c_4) \in L} \Pr(G(c_1, c_2, c_3, c_4) = 0 | \Delta_1 \neq \Delta_0 \neq 0) \\ &\cdot \Pr[(u_1, u_2, \tilde{u}_1, \tilde{u}_2) = (c_1, c_2, c_3, c_4)] = \frac{g}{(q-1)^2(q-2)^2}, \end{aligned} \quad (26)$$

where $L = \{(c_1, c_2, c_3, c_4) | c_1, c_2, c_3, c_4 \in \mathbb{F}_q \setminus \{0\}, c_1 \neq c_2, c_3 \neq c_4\}$ and g is the number of $(c_1, c_2, c_3, c_4) \in L$ so that $G(c_1, c_2, c_3, c_4) = 0$. Since the denominator of G is non-zero, we can estimate g as number of zeros of $H(u_1, u_2, \tilde{u}_1, \tilde{u}_2) = \tilde{u}_2(u_2 - u_1)\Delta_1 - u_2(\tilde{u}_2 - \tilde{u}_1)\Delta_0$. Let $L' = \{(c_1, c_2, c_3, c_4) | c_1, c_2, c_3, c_4 \in \mathbb{F}_q \setminus \{0\}\}$. It is clear that $L \subseteq L'$ and we can estimate g from above as number of zeros of $H(\tau_1, \tau_2, \tau_3, \tau_4)$ where $\tau_1, \tau_2, \tau_3, \tau_4$ are chosen uniformly from L' . By Schwartz-Zippel Lemma [24], [25] this value can be estimated from above as $\frac{2}{q-1}$. As a result, we have that $g \leq 2(q-1)^3$, and the theorem statement follows. \square

V. CONCLUSION

We considered the problem of reflecting malicious server behavior in private information retrieval schemes with optimized download rates. We focused on the extreme two-server case

and propose generalizations of linear secret-sharing-based PIR schemes to verifiable setups. Considered schemes can detect the presence of one cheating server and offers information-theoretical private verifiability, computational public verifiability, and computational private verifiability with download rate close to those of non-verifiable scheme.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

Authors thank L. F. Zhang from ShanghaiTech University for numerous fruitful discussions during the preparation of this paper.

REFERENCES

- [1] B. Chor, O. Goldreich, E. Kushilevitz, and M. Sudan, "Private information retrieval," in *Proceedings of IEEE 36th Annual Foundations of Computer Science*, 1995, pp. 41–50.
- [2] S. Ulukus, S. Avestimehr, M. Gastpar, S. A. Jafar, R. Tandon, and C. Tian, "Private retrieval, computing, and learning: Recent progress and future challenges," *IEEE Journal on Selected Areas in Communications*, vol. 40, no. 3, pp. 729–748, 2022.
- [3] R. Ostrovsky and W. E. Skeith, "A survey of single-database private information retrieval: Techniques and applications," 2007, pp. 393–411.
- [4] D. Woodruff and S. Yekhanin, "A geometric approach to information-theoretic private information retrieval," *SIAM Journal on Computing*, vol. 37, no. 4, pp. 1046–1056, 2007.
- [5] S. Yekhanin, "Towards 3-query locally decodable codes of subexponential length," *J. ACM*, vol. 55, no. 1, Feb. 2008.
- [6] Z. Dvir and S. Gopi, "2-server pir with subpolynomial communication," *J. ACM*, vol. 63, no. 4, Sep. 2016.
- [7] N. B. Shah, K. V. Rashmi, and K. Ramchandran, "One extra bit of download ensures perfectly private information retrieval," in *2014 IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory*, 2014, pp. 856–860.
- [8] T. H. Chan, S.-W. Ho, and H. Yamamoto, "Private information retrieval for coded storage," in *2015 IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory (ISIT)*, 2015, pp. 2842–2846.
- [9] R. Tajeddine, O. W. Gnille, and S. El Rouayheb, "Private information retrieval from mds coded data in distributed storage systems," *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 64, no. 11, pp. 7081–7093, 2018.
- [10] H. Sun and S. A. Jafar, "The capacity of robust private information retrieval with colluding databases," *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 64, no. 4, pp. 2361–2370, 2018.
- [11] L. F. Zhang and H. Wang, "Multi-server verifiable computation of low-degree polynomials," in *2022 IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy (SP)*, 2022, pp. 596–613.
- [12] L. F. Zhang and R. Safavi-Naini, "Verifiable multi-server private information retrieval," in *Applied Cryptography and Network Security*, 2014.
- [13] L. Zhao, X. Wang, and X. Huang, "Verifiable single-server private information retrieval from lwe with binary errors," *Information Sciences*, vol. 546, pp. 897–923, 2021.
- [14] K. Banawan and S. Ulukus, "The capacity of private information retrieval from byzantine and colluding databases," *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 65, no. 2, pp. 1206–1219, 2019.
- [15] K. Kurosawa, "How to correct errors in multi-server pir," in *Advances in Cryptology – ASIACRYPT 2019*, 2019, pp. 564–574.
- [16] K. Devet, I. Goldberg, and N. Heninger, "Optimally robust private information retrieval," in *21st USENIX Security Symposium (USENIX Security 12)*, 2012, pp. 269–283.
- [17] A. Beimel, "Robust private information retrieval," in *Encyclopedia of Cryptography, Security and Privacy*, S. Jajodia, P. Samarati, and M. Yung, Eds. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2019, pp. 1–3.
- [18] T. Gupta, N. Crooks, W. Mulhern, S. Setty, L. Alvisi, and M. Walfish, "Scalable and private media consumption with popcorn," in *13th USENIX Symposium on Networked Systems Design and Implementation (NSDI 16)*, 2016.
- [19] P. Ke and L. F. Zhang, "Two-server private information retrieval with result verification," in *2022 IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory (ISIT)*, 2022, pp. 408–413.
- [20] R. Bitar and S. E. Rouayheb, "Staircase-pir: Universally robust private information retrieval," in *2018 IEEE Information Theory Workshop (ITW)*, 2018, pp. 1–5.
- [21] C. Gkantsidis and P. Rodriguez Rodriguez, "Cooperative security for network coding file distribution," in *Proceedings of 25th IEEE International Conference on Computer Communications*, 2006, pp. 1–13.
- [22] M. Belenkiy, M. Chase, C. C. Erway, J. Jannotti, A. Küpçü, and A. Lysyanskaya, "Incentivizing outsourced computation," in *Proceedings of the 3rd International Workshop on Economics of Networked Systems*, 2008, pp. 85–90.
- [23] B. Parno, M. Raykova, and V. Vaikuntanathan, "How to delegate and verify in public: Verifiable computation from attribute-based encryption," in *Theory of Cryptography*, 2012, pp. 422–439.
- [24] J. T. Schwartz, "Fast probabilistic algorithms for verification of polynomial identities," *J. ACM*, vol. 27, no. 4, pp. 701–717, Oct. 1980.
- [25] R. Zippel, "Probabilistic algorithms for sparse polynomials," in *Symbolic and Algebraic Computation*, 1979, pp. 216–226.
- [26] M. Krohn, M. Freedman, and D. Mazieres, "On-the-fly verification of rateless erasure codes for efficient content distribution," in *IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy*, 2004, pp. 226–240.
- [27] M. H. Au, Q. Wu, W. Susilo, and Y. Mu, "Compact e-cash from bounded accumulator," in *Topics in Cryptology*, 2006, pp. 178–195.
- [28] M. H. Au, W. Susilo, and Y. Mu, "Practical anonymous divisible e-cash from bounded accumulators," in *Financial Cryptography and Data Security*, 2008, pp. 287–301.