Faster Optimal-rate Many-server Private Information Retrieval (PIR)

Indiana University—Bloomington and University of Calgary

Optimal-rate Private Information Retrieval (PIR) Comparison in Query Construction • PIR enables client to fetch record(s) from remote and untrusted database with cryptographic Computationa 3.67 M rows / s privacy. $13.69 \mathrm{M} \mathrm{rows/s}$ 13.58M rows/s (ns)• Steps: query construction (Q) by the client, response generation (R) by the server, and record reconstruction (E) by the client. time .21Brows/s 2.31Brows/s • Cost-metrics: upload cost, download cost, computation cost at both client-side and server-side, 5.71Brows/s and number of interaction round Wall-clock • Optimal download cost achieved by Shah et al. (ISIT 2014). 4 • Optimal upload cost achieved by Boyle et al. (CCS 2016). 11.44T rows/s 16.09T rows/s • Optimal computation cost per server achieved by Chor et al. (FOCS 1995). 19.81 Trows / 9 • Our proposed protocols can **CAPTURE AND OUTPERFORM** any of them with favourable 460.64T rows/s 15.29T rows/s settings! ,060.92T rows / s 2^{16} 2^{18} 2^{20} 2^{22} 2^{24} 2^{26} 2^{28} 2^{30} 2^{14} Database height (# of blocks) $(1^{\lambda}, I) \longrightarrow$ Figure: Wall-clock time for (client-side) query construction in bit-more-than-a-bit protocols. Head-to-head comparison with Percy++ (2014) Figure: Information flow in single-round and ℓ -server PIR. (ms) "One-extra-word" Protocols time • Augment the database $\boldsymbol{D} \in \mathbb{F}^{r \times (s+1)}$ by the vector $\vec{v} \in \mathbb{F}^s$ as $\boldsymbol{D}^* \coloneqq \boldsymbol{D} || (\boldsymbol{D} \vec{v}^T) \in \mathbb{F}^{r \times (s+1)}$. Wall-clock • $M^{(r,s)} \subseteq \mathbb{F}^{r \times (s+1)}$ is the set of all height-*r* matrices, *A*, whose rows are vectors from the standard basis. 'all • Each of $\ell = (s+1)^r$ number of servers holds the *Frobenius inner product* $\langle \mathbf{D}^*, \mathbf{A} \rangle_F := tr(\mathbf{D}^* \mathbf{A}^T)$ in its $2^{10} \ 2^{12} \ 2^{14} \ 2^{16} \ 2^{18} \ 2^{20} \ 2^{22} \ 2^{24}$ 2^{22} 2^{24} 2^{26} bucket Database height (# of blocks) • To retrieve D_i , client selects $A \in_R M^{(r,s)}$, and fetches $\langle D^*, B_i \rangle_F$ from bucket $\varphi(B_i)$ for each (a) Query construction $\boldsymbol{B}_i \in Eq(i; \boldsymbol{A}).$ • Thus client downloads *s* + 1 number of words, hence just an extra word beyond the whole **record**, from the servers. ng costs for bit-more-than-a-bit protocol. • Finally, client solves a system of *s* linear equations to reconstruct the desired record. **Perfectly 1-private "Bit-more-than-a-bit" protocols** Head-to-head comparison with RAID-PIR (CCSW 2014) • Governed by $\ell \ge 2$, s, the binary field $\mathbb{F} = \mathbf{GF}(2^w)$ where $w = \lceil \frac{b}{s} \rceil$, the all-0s vector $\vec{v} = \vec{0}$, and a particular mapping φ . – A – libbitmore 📥 RAID-PIR – 🛛 – libbitmore ---- RAID-PIR • New φ reduces the requirement of super-exponential number of servers (ℓ) to an arbitrary $\ell \geq 2$ with the condition of $\ell = s + 1$. **Computationally 1-private "Bit-more-than-a-bit" protocols** • Our most efficient construction with $\ell = 2^L$ reduces per-server upload cost from *rL* bits to just 2^{22} 2^{18} 2^{22} 2^{14} 2^{26} 2^{10} 2^{14} 2^{18} 2^{26} $(\lambda + 2) \lceil \lg \frac{r}{\lambda} \rceil L$ bits. • Client samples independently and distributes *L*-tuple of (2, 2)-DPF key pairs to the servers. • Server performs a full-domain evaluation on the received keys and concatenates the resulting bit vectors component-wise to obtain a length-*r* vector. **2**22 **2**23 **2**22 **2**23 **2**21 **n**24 $(k_0^{(1)}, k_1^{(1)})$ $(k_0^{(0)}, k_1^{(0)})$ **2**3 **2**24 **(b)** $\ell = 2^3$ (a) $\ell = 2^2$ EvalFull $(k_0^{(1)})$ [] EvalFull $(k_0^{(0)})$ EvalFull $(k_0^{(1)})$ || EvalFull $(k_1^{(0)})$ EvalFull $(k_1^{(1)})$ [] EvalFull $(k_1^{(0)})$ EvalFull $(k_1^{(1)})$ || EvalFull $(k_0^{(0)})$ Figure: (2, 2)-DPF key distribution and query expansion procedure for $\ell = 2^2$ servers. This work is supported by the NSF Grant No. 1718475 and an NSERC Discovery Grant. E-mail: shafiz@iu.edu and ryan.henry@ucalgary.ca

Syed Mahbub Hafiz and Ryan Henry





Fig. 7. Head-to-head comparison with various 1-private, 2-server instances from Percy++ v1.0. The faint plots near the bottoms show correspond-



Fig. 8. Head-to-head comparison with computationally 1-private RAID-PIR v0.9.5 instances for ℓ ranging from 4 to 32. The scale of some experinents was limited because RAID-PIR v0.9.5 cannot handle databases that exceed physical memory.

Comparison in PIR Response Generation

Figure: Wall-clock time for (server-side) response generation for bit-more-than-a-bit protocols. DB size scales up to 256 GiB.