

# Formal Analysis of an E-Health Protocol

Naipeng Dong <sup>a,\*</sup>, Hugo Jonker <sup>b</sup>, and Jun Pang <sup>c</sup>,

<sup>a</sup> School of Computing, National University of Singapore, Singapore

<sup>b</sup> Department of Computer Science, Open University, The Netherlands

<sup>c</sup> Faculty of Science, Technology and Communication  
Interdisciplinary Centre for Security, Reliability and Trust,  
University of Luxembourg, Luxembourg

## Abstract

Given the sensitive nature of health data, security and privacy in e-health systems is of prime importance. It is crucial that an e-health system must ensure that users remain private – even if they are bribed or coerced to reveal themselves, or others: a pharmaceutical company could, for example, bribe a pharmacist to reveal information which breaks a doctor’s privacy. In this paper, we first identify and formalise several new but important privacy properties on enforcing doctor privacy. Then we analyse the security and privacy of a complicated and practical e-health protocol (DLV08). Our analysis uncovers ambiguities in the protocol, and shows to what extent these new privacy properties as well as other security properties (such as secrecy and authentication) and privacy properties (such as anonymity and untraceability) are satisfied by the protocol. Finally, we address the found ambiguities which result in both security and privacy flaws, and propose suggestions for fixing them.

**Keyword:** E-health systems, formal verification, applied pi, secrecy, authentication, anonymity, privacy, enforced privacy, untraceability

## 1 Introduction

The inefficiency of traditional paper-based health care and advances in information and communication technologies, in particular cloud computing, mobile, and satellite communications, constitute the ideal environment to facilitate the development of widespread electronic health care (e-health for short) systems. E-health systems are distributed health care systems using devices and computers which communicate with each other, typically via the Internet. E-health systems aim to support secure sharing of information and resources across different health care settings and workflows among different health care providers. The services of such systems are intended to be more secure, effective, efficient and timely than the currently existing health care systems.

Given the sensitive nature of health data, handling this data must meet strict security and privacy requirements. In traditional health care systems, this is normally implemented by controlling access to the physical documents that contain the health care data. Security and privacy are then satisfied, assuming only legitimate access is possible and assuming that those with access do not violate security or privacy.

However, the introduction of e-health systems upends this approach. The main benefit of e-health systems is that they facilitate digital exchange of information amongst the various parties involved. This has two major consequences: first, the original health care data is shared digitally with more parties, such as pharmacists and insurance companies; and second, this data can be easily shared by any of those parties with an outsider. Clearly, the assumption of a trusted network can no longer hold in such a setting. Given that it is trivial for a malicious entity to

---

\*Supported by a grant from the Fonds National de la Recherche (Luxembourg).

intercept or even alter digital data in transit, access control approaches to security and privacy are no longer sufficient. Therefore, we must consider security and privacy of the involved parties with respect to an outsider, the Dolev-Yao adversary [DY83], who controls the communication network (i.e., the adversary can observe, block, create and alter information). Communication security against such an adversary is mainly achieved by employing cryptographic communication protocols. Cryptography is also employed to preserve and enforce privacy, which prevents problems such as prescription bribery.

It is well known that designing such protocols is error-prone: time and again, flaws have been found in protocols that claimed to be secure (e.g., electronic voting systems [BT94, LK00] have been broken [HS00, LK02]). Therefore, we must require that security and privacy claims of an e-health protocol are verified before the protocol is used in practice. Without verifying that a protocol satisfies its security and privacy claims, subtle flaws may go undiscovered.

In order to objectively verify whether a protocol satisfies its claimed security and privacy requirements, each requirement must be formally defined as a property. Various security and privacy properties have already been defined in the literature, such as secrecy, authentication, anonymity and untraceability. We refer to these properties as *regular* security and privacy properties. While they are necessary to ensure security and privacy, by themselves these regular properties are not sufficient. Benaloh and Tuinstra pointed out the risk of subverting a voter [BT94] to sell her vote. The idea of coercing or bribing a party into nullifying their privacy is hardly considered in the literature of e-health systems (notable exceptions include [Mat98, dDLVV08]). However, this concept impacts e-health privacy: for example, a pharmaceutical company could bribe doctors to prescribe only their medicine. Therefore, we cannot only consider privacy with respect to the Dolev-Yao adversary. To fully evaluate privacy of e-health systems, we must also consider this new aspect of privacy in the presence of an active coercer – someone who is bribing or threatening parties to reveal private information. We refer to this new class of privacy properties as *enforced* privacy properties. In particular, we identify the following regular and enforced privacy properties [DJP12b] to counter doctor bribery: *prescription privacy*: a doctor cannot be linked to his prescriptions; *receipt-freeness*: a doctor cannot prove his prescriptions to the adversary for preventing doctor bribes; *independency of prescription privacy*: third parties cannot help the adversary to link a doctor to the doctor’s prescriptions for preventing others to reduce a doctor’s prescription privacy; and *independency of receipt-freeness*: a doctor and third parties cannot prove the doctor’s prescriptions to the adversary for preventing anyone from affecting a doctor’s receipt-freeness.

**Contributions.** We identify three enforced privacy properties in e-health systems and are the first to provide formal definitions for them. In addition, we develop an in-depth applied pi model of the DLV08 e-health protocol [dDLVV08]. As this protocol was designed for practical use in Belgium, it needed to integrate with the existing health care system. As such, it has become a complicated system with many involved parties, that relies on complex cryptographic primitives to achieve a multitude of goals. We formally analyse privacy and enforced privacy properties of the protocol, as well as regular security properties. We identify ambiguities in the protocol description that cause both security and privacy flaws, and propose suggestions for fixing them. The ProVerif code of modelling and full analysis of the DLV08 protocol can be found in [DJP12a].

**Remark.** This article is a revised and extended version of [DJP12b] that appears in the proceedings of the 17th European Symposium on Research in Computer Security (ESORICS’12). In this version we have added (1) the full formal modelling of the DLV08 protocol in the applied pi calculus (see Section 5); (2) the detailed analysis of secrecy and authentication properties of the protocol (see Section 6); and (3) details of the analysis of privacy properties of the protocol which are not described in the conference paper [DJP12b] (see Section 6). In addition, it contains an overview on privacy and enforced privacy in e-health systems (see Section 2) and a brief but complete description of the applied pi calculus (see Section 3.1).

## 2 Privacy and enforced privacy in e-health

Ensuring privacy in e-health systems has been recognised as a necessary prerequisite for adoption such systems by the general public [MRS06, KAB09]. However, due to the complexity of e-health settings, existing privacy control techniques, e.g., formal privacy methods, from domains such as e-voting (e.g., [DKR09, JPM09]) and e-auctions (e.g., [DJP11]) do not carry over directly. In e-voting and e-auctions, there is a natural division into two types of roles: participants (voters, bidders) and authorities (who run the election/auction). In contrast, e-health systems have to deal with a far more complex constellation of roles, including doctors, patients, pharmacists, insurance agencies, oversight bodies, etc. These roles interact in various ways with each other, requiring private data of one another, which makes privacy even more complex.

Depending on the level of digitalisation, health care systems have different security requirements. If electronic devices are only used to store patient records, then ensuring privacy mainly requires local access control. On the other hand, if data is communicated over a network, then communication privacy becomes paramount. Below, we sketch a typical situation of using a health care system, indicating what information is necessary where. This will help to gain an understanding for the interactions and interdependencies between the various roles.

Typically, a patient is examined by a doctor, who then prescribes medicine. The patient goes to a pharmacist to get the medicine. The medicine is reimbursed by the patient's health insurance, and the symptoms and prescription of the patient may be logged with a medical research facility to help future research.

This overview hides many details. The patient may possess medical devices enabling her to undergo the examination at home, after which the devices digitally communicate their findings to a remote doctor. The findings of any examination (by doctor visit or by digital devices) need to be stored in the patients health record, either electronic or on paper, which may be stored at the doctor's office, on a server in the network, on a device carried by the patient, or any combination of these. Next, the doctor returns a prescription, which also needs to be stored. The pharmacist needs to know what medicine is required, which is privacy-sensitive information. Moreover, to prevent abuse of medicine, the pharmacist must verify that the prescription came from an authorised doctor, is intended for this patient, and was not fulfilled before. On top of that, the pharmacist may be allowed (or even required) to substitute medicine of one type for another (e.g., brand medicine for generic equivalents), which again must be recorded in the patient's health record. For reimbursement, the pharmacist or the patient registers the transaction with the patient's health insurer. In addition, regulations may require that such information is stored (in aggregated form or directly) for future research or logged with government agencies. Some health care systems allow emergency access to health data, which complicates privacy matters even further. Finally, although a role may need to have access to privacy-sensitive data of other roles, this does not mean that he is trusted to ensure the privacy of those other roles. For instance, a pharmacist may sell his knowledge about prescription behaviour to a pharmaceutical company.

From the above overview on e-health systems, we can conclude that existing approaches to ensuring privacy from other domains deal with far simpler division of roles, and they are not properly equipped to handle the role diversity present in e-health systems. Moreover, they do not address the influence of other roles on an individual's privacy. Therefore, current privacy approaches cannot be lifted directly, but must be redesigned specifically for the e-health domain.

In the following discussions, we focus on the privacy of the main actors in health care: patient privacy and doctor privacy. Privacy of roles such as pharmacists does not impact on the core process in health care, and is therefore relegated to future work. We do not consider privacy of roles performed by public entities such as insurance companies, medical administrations, etc.

### 2.1 Related work

The importance of patient privacy in e-health is traditionally seen as vital to establishing a good doctor-patient relationship. This is even more pertinent with the emergence of the Electronic Patient Record [And96]. A necessary early stage of e-health is to transform the paper-based

health care process into a digital process. The most important changes in this stage are made to patient information processing, mainly health care records. Privacy policies are the de facto standard to properly express privacy requirements for such patient records. There are three main approaches to implement these requirements: access control, architectural design, and the use of cryptography.

**Patient privacy by access control.** The most obvious way to preserve privacy of electronic health care records is to limit access to these records. The need for access control is supported by several privacy threats to personal health information listed by Anderson [And96]. Controlling access is not as straightforward as it sounds though: the need for access changes dynamically (e.g., a doctor only needs access to records of patients that he is currently treating). Consequently, there exists a wide variety of access control approaches designed for patient privacy in the literature, from simple access rules (e.g., [And96]), to consent-based access rules (e.g., [Lou98]), role-based access control (RBAC) (e.g., [RCHS03]), organisation based access control (e.g., [KBM<sup>+</sup>03]), etc.

**Patient privacy by architectural design.** E-health systems cater to a number of different roles, including doctors, patients, pharmacists, insurers, etc. Each such role has its own sub-systems or components. As such, e-health systems can be considered as a large network of systems, including administrative system components, laboratory information systems, radiology information systems, pharmacy information systems, and financial management systems. Diligent architectural design is an essential step to make such a complex system function correctly. Since privacy is important in e-health systems, keeping privacy in mind when designing the architecture of such systems is a promising path towards ensuring privacy [SV09]. Examples of how to embed privacy constraints in the architecture are given by the architecture of wireless sensor networks in e-health [KLS<sup>+</sup>10], proxies that may learn location but not patient ID [MKDH09], an architecture for cross-institution image sharing in e-health [CHCK07], etc.

**Cryptographic approaches to patient privacy.** Cryptography is necessary to ensure private communication between system components over public channels (e.g., [BB96]). For example, Van der Haak et al. [vWB<sup>+</sup>03] use digital signatures and public-key authentication (for access control) to satisfy legal requirements for cross-institutional exchange of electronic patient records. Ateniese et al. [ACdD03] use pseudonyms to preserve patient anonymity, and enable a user to transform statements concerning one of his pseudonyms into statements concerning one of his other pseudonyms (e.g., transforming a prescription for the pseudonym used with his doctor to a prescription for the pseudonym used with the pharmacist). Layouni et al. [LVS<sup>+</sup>09] consider communication between health monitoring equipment at a patient's home and the health care centre. They propose a protocol using wallet-based credentials (a cryptographic primitive) to let patients control when and how much identifying information is revealed by the monitoring equipment. More recently, De Decker et al. [dDLVV08] propose a health care system for communication between insurance companies and administrative bodies as well as patients, doctors and pharmacists. Their system relies on various cryptographic primitives to ensure privacy, including zero-knowledge proofs, signed proofs of knowledge, and bit-commitments. We will explain this system in more detail in Section 4.

**Doctor privacy.** A relatively understudied aspect is that of doctor privacy. Matyáš [Mat98] investigates the problem of enabling analysis of prescription information while ensuring doctor privacy. His approach is to group doctors, and release the data per group, hiding who is in the group. He does not motivate a need for doctor privacy, however. Two primary reasons for doctor privacy have been identified in the literature: (1) (Ateniese et al. [ACdD03]) to safeguard doctors against administrators setting specific efficiency metrics on their performance (e.g., requiring the cheapest medicine be used, irrespective of the patient's needs). To address this, Ateniese et al. [Ad02, ACdD03] propose an anonymous prescription system that uses group signatures to achieve privacy for doctors; (2) (De Decker et al. [dDLVV08]) to prevent a pharmaceutical company

from bribing a doctor to prescribe their medicine. A typical scenario can be described as follows. A pharmaceutical company seeks to persuade a doctor to favour a certain kind of medicine by bribing or coercing. To prevent this, a doctor should not be able to prove which medicine he is prescribing to this company (in general, to the adversary). This implies that doctor privacy must be enforced by e-health systems. De Decker et al. also note that preserving doctor privacy is not sufficient to prevent bribery: pharmacists could act as intermediaries, revealing the doctor's identity to the briber, as pharmacists often have access to prescriptions, and thus know something about the prescription behaviour of a doctor. This observation leads us to formulate a new but important requirement of *independency of prescription privacy* in this paper: no third party should be able to help the adversary link a doctor to his prescription.

## 2.2 Observations

Current approaches to privacy in e-health, as witnessed from the literature study in Section 2.1, mostly focus on patient privacy as an access control or authentication problem. Even though doctor privacy is also a necessity, research into ensuring doctor privacy is still in its infancy. We believe that doctor privacy is as important as patient privacy and needs to be studied in more depth. It is also clear from the analysis that privacy in e-health systems needs to be addressed at different layers: access control ensures privacy at the service layer; privacy by architecture design addresses privacy concerns at the system/architecture layer; use of cryptography guarantees privacy at the communication layer. Since e-health systems are complex [TGC09] and rely on correct communications between many sub-systems, we study privacy in e-health as a communication problem. In fact, message exchanges in communication protocols may leak information which leads to a privacy breach [Low96, CKS04, DKR09].

Classical privacy properties, which are well-studied in the literature, attempt to ensure that privacy can be *enabled*. However, merely enabling privacy is insufficient in many cases: for such cases, a system must *enforce* user privacy instead of allowing the user to pursue it. One example is doctor bribery. To avoid doctor bribery, we take into account enforced privacy for doctors. In addition, we consider that one party's privacy may depend on another party (e.g., in the case of a pharmacist revealing prescription behaviour of a doctor). In these cases, others can cause (some) loss of privacy. Obviously, ensuring privacy in such a case requires more from the system than merely enabling privacy. Consequently, we propose and study the following privacy properties for doctors in communication protocols in the e-health domain, in addition to regular security and privacy properties as we mentioned before in Section 1.

**prescription privacy:** A protocol preserves prescription privacy if the adversary cannot link a doctor to his prescriptions.

**receipt-freeness:** A protocol satisfies receipt-freeness if a doctor cannot prove his prescriptions to the adversary.

**independency of prescription privacy:** A protocol ensures independency of prescription privacy if third parties cannot help the adversary to link a doctor to the doctor's prescriptions.

**independency of receipt-freeness:** A protocol ensures independency of receipt-freeness if a doctor cannot prove his prescriptions to the adversary given that third parties sharing information with the adversary.

## 3 Formalisation of privacy properties

In order to formally verify properties of a protocol, the protocol itself as well as the properties need to be formalised. In this section, we focus on the formalisation of key privacy properties, while the formalisation of secrecy and authentication properties can be considered standard as studied in the literature [Low96, Bla01]. Thus secrecy and authentication properties are introduced later in the case study (Section 6.1) and are omitted in this section.

We choose the formalism of the applied pi calculus, due to its capability in expressing equivalence based properties which is essential for privacy, and automatic verification supported by the tool ProVerif [Bla01]. The applied pi calculus is introduced in Section 3.1. Next, in Section 3.2, we show how to model e-health protocols in the applied pi calculus. Then, from Section 3.4 to Section 3.7, we formalise each of the privacy properties described in the end of Section 2.2. Finally, in Sections 3.8 and 3.9, we consider (strong) anonymity and (strong) untraceability in e-health, respectively. These concepts have been formally studied in other domains (e.g., [SS96, vMR08, BHM08, KT09, ACRR10, KTV10]), and thus are only briefly introduced in this section.

### 3.1 The applied pi calculus

The applied pi calculus is a language for modelling and analysing concurrent systems, in particular cryptographic protocols. The following (mainly based on [AF01, RS10]) briefly introduces its syntax, semantics and equivalence relations.

#### 3.1.1 Syntax

The calculus assumes an infinite set of *names*, which are used to model communication channels and other atomic data, an infinite set of *variables*, which are used to model received messages, and a signature  $\Sigma$  consisting of a finite set of *function symbols*, which are used to model cryptographic primitives. Each function symbol has an arity. A function symbol with arity zero is a constant. *Terms* (which are used to model messages) are defined as names, variables, or function symbols applied to terms (see Figure 1).

$M, N, T ::=$	terms
$a, b, c, m, n, \dots$	names
$x, y, z$	variables
$f(M_1, \dots, M_\ell)$	function application

Figure 1: Terms in the applied pi calculus.

**Example 1** (function symbols and terms). *Typical function symbols are  $\text{enc}$  with arity 2 for encryption,  $\text{dec}$  with arity 2 for decryption. The term for encrypting  $x$  with a key  $k$  is  $\text{enc}(x, k)$ .*

The applied pi calculus assumes a sort system for terms. Terms can be of a base type (e.g., Key or a universal base type Data) or type  $\text{Channel}\langle\omega\rangle$  where  $\omega$  is a type. A variable and a name can have any type. A function symbol can only be applied to, and return, terms of base type. Terms are assumed to be well-sorted and substitutions preserve types.

Terms are often equipped with an equational theory  $E$  – a set of equations on terms. The equational theory is normally used to capture features of cryptographic primitives. The equivalence relation induced by  $E$  is denoted as  $=_E$ .

**Example 2** (equational theory). *The behaviour of symmetric encryption and decryption can be captured by the following equation:*

$$\text{dec}(\text{enc}(x, k), k) =_E x,$$

where  $x$  and  $k$  are variables.

Systems are described as processes: plain processes and extended processes (see Figure 2). In Figure 2,  $M, N$  are terms,  $n$  is a name,  $x$  is a variable and  $v$  is a metavariable, standing either for a name or a variable. The null process  $0$  does nothing. The parallel composition  $P \mid Q$  represents the sub-process  $P$  and the sub-process  $Q$  running in parallel. The replication  $!P$  represents an infinite number of process  $P$  running in parallel. The name restriction  $\nu n.P$  binds the name  $n$

$P, Q, R ::=$	plain processes
$0$	null process
$P \mid Q$	parallel composition
$!P$	replication
$\nu n.P$	name restriction
if $M =_E N$ then $P$ else $Q$	conditional
$\text{in}(v, x).P$	message input
$\text{out}(v, M).P$	message output
$A, B, C ::=$	extended processes
$P$	plain process
$A \mid B$	parallel composition
$\nu n.A$	name restriction
$\nu x.A$	variable restriction
$\{M/x\}$	active substitution

Figure 2: Processes in the applied pi calculus.

in the process  $P$ , which means the name  $n$  is secret to the adversary. The conditional evaluation  $M =_E N$  represents equality over the equational theory rather than strict syntactic identity. The message input  $\text{in}(v, x).P$  reads a message from channel  $v$ , and binds the message to the variable  $x$  in the following process  $P$ . The message output  $\text{out}(v, M).P$  sends the message  $M$  on the channel  $v$ , and then runs the process  $P$ . In both of these cases we may omit  $P$  when it is 0. Extended processes add variable restrictions and active substitutions. The variable restriction  $\nu x.A$  binds the variable  $x$  in the process  $A$ . The active substitution  $\{M/x\}$  replaces variable  $x$  with term  $M$  in any process that it contacts with. We say a process is sequential if it does not involve using the parallel composition  $P \mid Q$ , replication  $!P$ , conditional, or active substitution. That is, a sequential process is either null or constructed using name/variable restriction, message input/output. In addition, applying syntactical substitution (i.e., “let  $x = N$  in” in ProVerif input language) to a sequential process still results in a sequential process. For simplicity of presentation, we use  $\nu \tilde{a}$  as an abbreviation for  $\nu a_1. \nu a_2. \dots \nu a_n$ , where  $\tilde{a}$  is the sequence of names  $a_1, a_2, \dots, a_n$ . We also use the abbreviation  $P.Q$  to represent the process  $\text{action}_1. \dots \text{action}_n.Q$ , where  $P := \text{action}_1. \dots \text{action}_n$ ; and an  $\text{action}_i$  is of the form  $\nu n$ ,  $\nu x$ ,  $\text{in}(v, x)$ ,  $\text{out}(v, M)$  or let  $x = N$  in  $\text{action}_j$ . The intuition of  $P.Q$  is that when a process consists of a sequential sub-process  $P$  followed by a sub-process  $Q$ , we write the process in an abbreviated manner as  $P.Q$ . In addition, we use the abbreviation  $\{M_1/x_1, \dots, M_n/x_n\}$  to represent  $\{M_1/x_1\} \dots \{M_n/x_n\}$ .

Names and variables have scopes. A name is *bound* if it is under restriction. A variable is *bound* by restrictions or inputs. Names and variables are *free* if they are not delimited by restrictions or by inputs. The sets of free names, free variables, bound names and bound variables of a process  $A$  are denoted as  $\text{fn}(A)$ ,  $\text{fv}(A)$ ,  $\text{bn}(A)$  and  $\text{bv}(A)$ , respectively. A term is *ground* when it does not contain variables. A process is *closed* if it does not contain free variables.

**Example 3** (processes). *Consider a protocol in which  $A$  generates a nonce  $m$ , encrypts the nonce with a secret key  $k$ , then sends the encrypted message to  $B$ . Denote with  $Q_A$  the process modelling the behaviour of  $A$ , with  $Q_B$  the process modelling the behaviour of  $B$ , and the whole protocol by  $Q$ :*

$$\begin{aligned}
 Q_A &:= \nu m. \text{out}(\text{ch}, \text{enc}(m, k)) \\
 Q_B &:= \text{in}(\text{ch}, x) \\
 Q &:= \nu k. (Q_A \mid Q_B)
 \end{aligned}$$

Here,  $\text{ch}$  is a free name representing a public channel. Name  $k$  is bound in process  $Q$ ; name  $m$  is bound in process  $Q_A$ . Variable  $x$  is bound in process  $Q_B$ .

A *frame* is defined as an extended process built up from 0 and active substitutions by parallel composition and restrictions. The active substitutions in extended processes allow us to map an

extended process  $A$  to its frame  $\text{frame}(A)$  by replacing every plain process in  $A$  with  $0$ . The *domain* of a frame  $B$ , denoted as  $\text{domain}(B)$ , is the set of variables for which the frame defines a substitution and which are not under a restriction.

**Example 4** (frames). *The frame of the process  $\nu m.(\text{out}(\text{ch}, x) \mid \{m/x\})$ , denoted as  $\text{frame}(\nu m.(\text{out}(\text{ch}, x) \mid \{m/x\}))$  is  $\nu m.(0 \mid \{m/x\})$ . The domain of this frame, denoted as  $\text{domain}(\nu m.(0 \mid \{m/x\}))$  is  $\{x\}$ .*

A *context*  $\mathcal{C}[\_]$  is defined as a process with a hole, which may be filled with any process. An evaluation context is a context whose hole is not under a replication, a condition, an input or an output.

**Example 5** (context). *Process  $\nu k.(Q_A \mid \_)$  is an evaluation context. When we fill the hole with process  $Q_B$ , we obtain the process  $\nu k.(Q_A \mid Q_B)$ , which is the process  $Q$ .*

### 3.1.2 Operational semantics

The operational semantics of the applied pi calculus is defined by: 1) structural equivalence ( $\equiv$ ), 2) internal reduction ( $\rightarrow$ ), and 3) labelled reduction ( $\xrightarrow{\alpha}$ ) of processes.

1) Intuitively, two processes are structurally equivalent if they model the same thing but differ in structure. Formally, structural equivalence of processes is the smallest equivalence relation on extended process that is closed by  $\alpha$ -conversion on names and variables, by application of evaluation contexts as shown in Figure 3.

PAR – 0	$A \mid 0 \equiv A$	
PAR – A	$A \mid (B \mid C) \equiv (A \mid B) \mid C$	
PAR – C	$A \mid B \equiv B \mid A$	
REPL	$!P \equiv P \mid !P$	
SUBST	$\{M/x\} \mid A \equiv \{M/x\} \mid A\{M/x\}$	
NEW – 0	$\nu u.0 \equiv 0$	
NEW – C	$\nu u.\nu v.A \equiv \nu v.\nu u.A$	
NEW – PAR	$A \mid \nu v.B \equiv \nu v.(A \mid B)$	if $v \notin \text{fn}(A) \cup \text{fv}(A)$
ALIAS	$\nu x.\{M/x\} \equiv 0$	
REWRITE	$\{M/x\} \equiv \{N/x\}$	if $M =_E N$

Figure 3: Structural equivalence in the applied pi calculus.

2) Internal reduction is the smallest relation on extended processes closed under structural equivalence, application of evaluation of contexts as shown in Figure 4.

COMM	$\text{out}(c, x).P \mid \text{in}(c, x).Q \rightarrow P \mid Q$
THEN	$\text{if } N =_E N \text{ then } P \text{ else } Q \rightarrow P$
ELSE	$\text{if } M =_E N \text{ then } P \text{ else } Q \rightarrow Q$
	for ground terms $M, N$ where $M \neq_E N$

Figure 4: Internal reduction in the applied pi calculus.

3) The labelled reduction models the environment interacting with the processes. It defines a relation  $A \xrightarrow{\alpha} A'$  as in Figure 5. The label  $\alpha$  is either reading a term from the process's environment, or sending a name or a variable of base type to the environment.

### 3.1.3 Equivalences

The applied pi calculus defines *observational equivalence* and *labelled bisimilarity* to model the indistinguishability of two processes by the adversary. It is proved that the two relations coincide,

IN	$\text{in}(c, x).P \xrightarrow{\text{in}(c, M)} P\{M/x\}$
OUT – ATOM	$\text{out}(c, v).P \xrightarrow{\text{out}(c, v)} P$
OPEN – ATOM	$\frac{A \xrightarrow{\text{out}(c, v)} A' \quad v \neq c}{\nu v.A \xrightarrow{\nu v.\text{out}(c, v)} A'}$
SCOPE	$\frac{A \xrightarrow{\alpha} A' \quad v \text{ does not occur in } \alpha}{\nu v.A \xrightarrow{\alpha} \nu v.A'}$
PAR	$\frac{A \xrightarrow{\alpha} A' \quad \text{bv}(\alpha) \cap \text{fv}(B) = \text{bn}(\alpha) \cap \text{fn}(B) = \emptyset}{A \mid B \xrightarrow{\alpha} A' \mid B}$
STRUCT	$\frac{A \equiv B \quad B \xrightarrow{\alpha} B' \quad A' \equiv B'}{A \xrightarrow{\alpha} A'}$

Figure 5: Labelled reduction in the applied pi calculus.

when active substitutions are of base type [AF01, Liu11]. We mainly use the labelled bisimilarity for the convenience of proofs. Labelled bisimilarity is based on *static equivalence*: labelled bisimilarity compares the dynamic behaviour of processes, while static equivalence compares their static states (as represented by their frames).

**Definition 1** (static equivalence). *Two terms  $M$  and  $N$  are equal in the frame  $B$ , written as  $(M =_E N)B$ , iff there exists a set of restricted names  $\tilde{n}$  and a substitution  $\sigma$  such that  $B \equiv \nu \tilde{n}.\sigma$ ,  $M\sigma =_E N\sigma$  and  $\tilde{n} \cap (\text{fn}(M) \cup \text{fn}(N)) = \emptyset$ .*

*Closed frames  $B$  and  $B'$  are statically equivalent, denoted as  $B \approx_s B'$ , if*

- (1)  $\text{domain}(B) = \text{domain}(B')$ ;
- (2)  $\forall$  terms  $M, N$ :  $(M =_E N)B$  iff  $(M =_E N)B'$ .

*Extended processes  $A, A'$  are statically equivalent, denoted as  $A \approx_s A'$ , if their frames are statically equivalent:  $\text{frame}(A) \approx_s \text{frame}(A')$ .*

**Example 6** (equivalence of frames [AF01]). *The frame  $B$  and the frame  $B'$ , are equivalent. However, the two frames are not equivalent to frame  $B''$ , because the adversary can discriminate  $B''$  by testing  $y =_E f(x)$ .*

$$\begin{aligned} B &:= \nu M.\{M/x\} \mid \nu N.\{N/y\} \\ B' &:= \nu M.\{\{f(M)/x\} \mid \{g(M)/y\}\} \\ B'' &:= \nu M.\{\{M/x\} \mid \{f(M)/y\}\} \end{aligned}$$

where  $f$  and  $g$  are two function symbols without equations.

**Example 7** (static equivalence). *Process  $\{M/x\} \mid Q_1$  is statically equivalent to process  $\{M/x\} \mid Q_2$  where  $Q_1$  and  $Q_2$  are two closed plain process, because the frame of the two processes are statically equivalent, i.e.,  $\{M/x\} \approx_s \{M/x\}$ .*

**Definition 2** (labelled bisimilarity). *Labelled bisimilarity ( $\approx_\ell$ ) is the largest symmetric relation  $\mathcal{R}$  on closed extended processes, such that  $A \mathcal{R} B$  implies:*

- (1)  $A \approx_s B$ ;
- (2) if  $A \rightarrow A'$  then  $B \rightarrow^* B'$  and  $A' \mathcal{R} B'$  for some  $B'$ ;
- (3) if  $A \xrightarrow{\alpha} A'$  and  $\text{fv}(\alpha) \subseteq \text{domain}(A)$  and  $\text{bn}(\alpha) \cap \text{fn}(B) = \emptyset$ ; then  $B \rightarrow^* \xrightarrow{\alpha} \rightarrow^* B'$  and  $A' \mathcal{R} B'$  for some  $B'$ , where  $*$  denotes zero or more.

### 3.2 E-health protocols

In the existing e-voting and (sealed bid) e-auction protocols, where bribery and coercion have been formally analysed using the applied pi calculus (see e.g., [DKR09, DJP11]), the number of

participants is determined *a priori*. In contrast with these protocols, e-health systems should be able to handle newly introduced participants (e.g., patients). To this end, we model user-types and each user-type can be instantiated infinite times.

**Roles.** An e-health protocol can be specified by a set of roles, each of which is modelled as a process,  $P_1, \dots, P_n$ . Each role specifies the behaviour of the user taking this role in an execution of the protocol. By instantiating the free variables in a role process, we obtain the process of a specific user taking the role.

**Users.** Users taking a role can be modelled by adding settings (identity, pseudonym, encryption key, etc.) to the process representing the role, that is  $init_i.P_i$ , where  $init_i$  is a sequential process which generates names/terms modelling the data of the user (e.g.,  $\nu sk_{ph}.let\ pk_{ph} = pk(sk_{ph})$  in Figure 26), reads in setting data from channels (e.g.,  $in(ch_{hp}, Hi\ i)$  in Figure 25), or reveals data to the adversary (e.g.,  $out(ch, pk_{ph})$  in Figure 26). A user taking a role multiple times is captured by add replication to the role process, i.e.,  $init_i.!P_i$ . A user may also take multiple roles. When the user uses two different settings in different roles, the user is treated as two separate users. If the user uses shared setting in multiple roles, the user process is modelled as the user setting sub-process followed by the multiple role processes in parallel, e.g.,  $init_k.!(P_i \mid P_j)$  when the user takes two roles  $P_i$  and  $P_j$ .

**User-types.** Users taking a specific role, potentially multiple times, belong to a user-type. Hence, a user-type is modelled as  $R_i := init_i.!P_i$ . The set of users of a type is captured by adding replication to the user-type process, i.e.,  $!R_i$ . A protocol with  $n$  roles naturally forms  $n$  user-types. In protocols where users are allowed to take multiple roles with one setting, we consider these users form a new type. For example, a challenge-response protocol, which specifies two roles – a role *Initiator* and a role *Responder*, has three user-types - the *Initiator*, the *Responder* and users taking both *Initiator* and *Responder*, assuming that a user taking both roles with the same setting is allowed. A user-type with multiple roles is modelled as  $init_k.!(P_i \mid \dots \mid P_j)$ , where  $P_i, \dots, P_j$  are the roles that a user of this type takes at the same time. Since each user is an instance of a user-type, the formalisation of user-types allows us to model an unbounded number of users, by simply adding replication to the user-types. In fact, in most cases, roles and user-types are identical, and the user-types that allow a user to take multiple roles can be considered as a new role as well. Hence, we use roles and user-types interchangeably.

**Protocol instances.** Instances of an e-health protocol  $P_{eh}$  with  $n$  roles/user-types are modelled in the following form:

$$P_{eh} := \nu \widetilde{mc}.init.(!R_1 \mid \dots \mid !R_n),$$

where process  $\nu \widetilde{mc}$ , which is the abbreviation for process  $\nu a_1 \dots \nu a_n. \nu c_1 \dots \nu c_n$  ( $a_i$  stands for private names, and  $c_i$  stands for private channels), models the private names and channels in the protocol;  $init$  is a sequential process, representing settings of the protocol, such as generating/computing data and revealing information to the adversary (see Figure 23 for example). Essentially,  $\nu \widetilde{mc}.init$  models the global settings of an instance and auxiliary channels in the modelling of the protocol.

**Doctor role/user-type.** More specifically, we have a doctor role/user-type  $R_{dr}$  of the form:

$$\begin{aligned} R_{dr} &:= \begin{cases} \nu Id_{dr}.init_{dr}.!P_{dr}, & \text{if doctor identity is not revealed by setting} \\ \nu Id_{dr}.out(ch, Id_{dr}).init_{dr}.!P_{dr}, & \text{if doctor identity is revealed by setting} \end{cases} \\ P_{dr} &:= \nu presc.main_{dr}. \end{aligned}$$

In the following, we focus on the behaviour of a doctor, since our goal is to formalise privacy properties for doctors. Each doctor is associated with an identity ( $\nu Id_{dr}$ ) and can execute an infinite number of sessions (modelled by the exclamation mark ‘!’ in front of  $P_{dr}$ ). In case the

doctor identity is revealed in the initialisation phase, we require that this unveiling does not appear in process  $init_{dr}$ , for the sake of uniformed formalisations of the later defined privacy properties. Instead, we model this case as identity generation ( $\nu Id_{dr}$ ) immediately followed by unveiling the identity ( $out(\mathbf{ch}, Id_{dr})$ ) on the public channel  $\mathbf{ch}$ . Note that we reserve the name  $\mathbf{ch}$  for the adversary’s public channel. We require  $\mathbf{ch}$  to be free to model the public channel that is controlled by the adversary. The adversary uses this channel by sending and receiving messages over  $\mathbf{ch}$ . In fact, since the doctor identity  $Id_{dr}$  is defined outside of the process  $init_{dr}!P_{dr}$ , the doctor identity appearing in the process is a free variable of the process. Hence, in the case that the doctor identity is revealed, the doctor process can be simply modelled as  $R_{dr} := init_{dr}!P_{dr}$ , where doctor identity is a free variable. To distinguish the free variable in process  $init_{dr}!P_{dr}$  from the name  $Id_{dr}$ , we use the italic font to represent the free variable, i.e.,  $Id_{dr}$ .

Within each session, the doctor creates a prescription. Since a prescription normally contains not only prescribed medicines but also the time/date that the prescription is generated as well as other identification information, we consider the prescriptions differ in sessions. In the case that a prescription can be prescribed multiple times, one can add the replication mark  $!$  in front of  $main_{dr}$  to model that the prescription  $\mathbf{presc}$  can be prescribed in infinite sessions, i.e.,  $P_{dr} := \nu \mathbf{presc}.!main_{dr}$ . Similarly, we use the italic font of the prescription,  $\mathbf{presc}$ , to represent the free variable referring to the prescription in the process  $main_{dr}$ .

**Well-formed.** We require that  $P_{eh}$  is well-formed, i.e., the process  $P_{eh}$  satisfies the following properties:

1.  $P_{eh}$  is canonical: names and variables in the process never appear both bound and free, and each name and variable is bound at most once;
2. data is typed, channels are ground, private channels are never sent on any channel;
3.  $\nu \widetilde{m}c$  may be null;
4.  $init$  and  $init_{dr}$  are sequential processes;
5.  $init$ ,  $init_{dr}$  and  $main_{dr}$  can be any process (possibly 0) such that  $P_{eh}$  is a closed plain process.

Furthermore, we use  $\mathcal{C}_{eh}[\_]$  to denote a context (a process with a hole) consisting of honest users,

$$\mathcal{C}_{eh}[\_] := \nu \widetilde{m}c. init. (!R_1 \mid \dots \mid !R_n \mid \_).$$

Dishonest agents are captured by the adversary (Section 3.3) with certain initial knowledge.

### 3.3 The adversary

We consider security and privacy properties of e-health protocols with respect to the presence of active attackers – the Dolev-Yao adversary. The adversary

- controls the network – the adversary can block, read and insert messages over the network;
- has computational power – the adversary can record messages and apply cryptographic functions to messages to obtain new messages;
- has a set of initial knowledge – the adversary knows the participants and public information of all participants, as well as a set of his own data;
- has the ability to initiate conversations – the adversary can take part in executions of protocols.
- The adversary’s behaviour models that of every dishonest agent (cf. Section 6.9), which is achieved by including the initial knowledge of each dishonest agent in the adversary’s initial knowledge.

The behaviour of the adversary is modelled as a process running in parallel with the honest agents. The adversary does whatever he can to break the security and privacy requirements. We do not need to model the adversary explicitly, since he is embedded in the applied pi calculus as well as in the verification tool. Modelling the honest users' behaviour is sufficient to verify whether the requirements hold.

**Limitations.** Note that the Dolev-Yao adversary model we use includes the “perfect cryptography” assumption. This means that the adversary cannot infer any information from cryptographic messages for which he does not possess a key. For instance, the attacker cannot decrypt a ciphertext without the correct key. Moreover, the adversary does not have the ability to perform side-channel attacks. For instance, fingerprinting a doctor based on his prescriptions is beyond the scope of this attacker model.

### 3.4 Prescription privacy

Prescription privacy ensures unlinkability of a doctor and his prescriptions, i.e., the adversary cannot tell whether a prescription is prescribed by a doctor. This requirement helps to prevent doctors from being influenced in the prescriptions they issue.

Normally, prescriptions are eventually revealed to the general public, for example, for research purposes. In the DLV08 e-health protocol, prescriptions are revealed to the adversary observing the network. Therefore, in the extreme situation where there is only one doctor, the doctor's prescriptions are obviously revealed to the adversary - all the observed prescriptions belong to the doctor. To avoid such a case, prescription privacy requires at least one other doctor (referred to as the counter-balancing doctor). This ensures that the adversary cannot tell whether the observed prescriptions belong to the targetted doctor or the counter-balancing doctor. With this in mind, unlinkability of a doctor to a prescription is modelled as indistinguishability between two honest users that swap their prescriptions, analogously to the formalisation of vote-privacy [DKR09]. By adopting the vote-privacy formalisation, prescription privacy is thus modelled as the equivalence of two doctor processes: in the first process, an honest doctor  $\mathbf{d}_A$  prescribes  $\mathbf{p}_A$  in one of his sessions and another honest doctor  $\mathbf{d}_B$  prescribes  $\mathbf{p}_B$  in one of his sessions; in the second one,  $\mathbf{d}_A$  prescribes  $\mathbf{p}_B$  and  $\mathbf{d}_B$  prescribes  $\mathbf{p}_A$ .

**Definition 3** (prescription privacy). *A well-formed e-health protocol  $P_{eh}$  with a doctor role  $R_{dr}$ , satisfies prescription privacy if for all possible doctors  $\mathbf{d}_A$  and  $\mathbf{d}_B$  ( $\mathbf{d}_A \neq \mathbf{d}_B$ ) we have*

$$\begin{aligned} & C_{eh}[(init_{dr}\{\mathbf{d}_A/Id_{dr}\}.(!P_{dr}\{\mathbf{d}_A/Id_{dr}\} \mid main_{dr}\{\mathbf{d}_A/Id_{dr}, \mathbf{p}_A/presc\})) \mid \\ & \quad (init_{dr}\{\mathbf{d}_B/Id_{dr}\}.(!P_{dr}\{\mathbf{d}_B/Id_{dr}\} \mid main_{dr}\{\mathbf{d}_B/Id_{dr}, \mathbf{p}_B/presc\})))] \\ \approx_\ell & C_{eh}[(init_{dr}\{\mathbf{d}_A/Id_{dr}\}.(!P_{dr}\{\mathbf{d}_A/Id_{dr}\} \mid main_{dr}\{\mathbf{d}_A/Id_{dr}, \mathbf{p}_B/presc\})) \mid \\ & \quad (init_{dr}\{\mathbf{d}_B/Id_{dr}\}.(!P_{dr}\{\mathbf{d}_B/Id_{dr}\} \mid main_{dr}\{\mathbf{d}_B/Id_{dr}, \mathbf{p}_A/presc\})))] \end{aligned}$$

where  $\mathbf{p}_A$  and  $\mathbf{p}_B$  ( $\mathbf{p}_A \neq \mathbf{p}_B$ ) are any two possible prescriptions, process  $!P_{dr}\{\mathbf{d}_A/Id_{dr}\}$  and process  $!P_{dr}\{\mathbf{d}_B/Id_{dr}\}$  can be 0.

Process  $init_{dr}\{\mathbf{d}_A/Id_{dr}\}.(!P_{dr}\{\mathbf{d}_A/Id_{dr}\} \mid main_{dr}\{\mathbf{d}_A/Id_{dr}, \mathbf{p}_A/presc\})$  models an instance of a doctor, with identity  $\mathbf{d}_A$ . The sub-process  $main_{dr}\{\mathbf{d}_A/Id_{dr}, \mathbf{p}_A/presc\}$  models a prescribing session in which  $\mathbf{d}_A$  prescribes  $\mathbf{p}_A$  for a patient. The sub-process  $!P_{dr}\{\mathbf{d}_A/Id_{dr}\}$  models other prescribing sessions of  $\mathbf{d}_A$ . Similarly, process  $init_{dr}\{\mathbf{d}_B/Id_{dr}\}.(!P_{dr}\{\mathbf{d}_B/Id_{dr}\} \mid main_{dr}\{\mathbf{d}_B/Id_{dr}, \mathbf{p}_B/presc\})$  models another doctor  $\mathbf{d}_B$ . On the right-hand side of the equivalence, the two doctors,  $\mathbf{d}_A$  and  $\mathbf{d}_B$ , swap their prescriptions,  $\mathbf{p}_A$  and  $\mathbf{p}_B$ . The labelled bisimilarity ( $\approx_\ell$ ) captures that any dishonest third party (the adversary) cannot distinguish the two sides. Doctor  $\mathbf{d}_B$ 's process is called the counter-balancing process. We require the existence of the counter-balancing doctor  $\mathbf{d}_B$  and  $\mathbf{p}_A \neq \mathbf{p}_B$  to avoid the situation in which all patients prescribe the same prescription, and thus the prescription of all patients are simply revealed.

Note that  $Id_{dr}$  and  $presc$  are free names in the processes in the definition.  $\mathbf{d}_A$  and  $\mathbf{d}_B$  are free names in the processes, when the doctor identities are initially public, and are private names in

the processes, when the doctor identities are initially private. Similarly,  $p_A$  and  $p_B$  are free names in the processes, when the prescriptions are revealed, and are private names in the processes, when the prescriptions are kept secret. This holds for the following definitions as well.

### 3.5 Receipt-freeness

Enforced privacy properties have been formally defined in e-voting and e-auctions. Examples include receipt-freeness and coercion-resistance in e-voting [DKR09, JPM09], and receipt-freeness for non-winning bidders in e-auctions [DJP11]. De Decker et al. [dDLVV08] identify the need to prevent a pharmaceutical company from bribing a doctor to favour their medicine. Hence, a doctor's prescription privacy must be enforced by the e-health system to prevent doctor bribery. This means that intuitively, even if a doctor collaborates, the adversary cannot be certain that the doctor has followed his instructions. Bribed users are not modelled as part of the adversary, as they may lie and are thus not trusted by the adversary. Due to the domain differences – in e-voting and sealed-bid e-auctions, participants are fixed before the execution, whereas in e-health, participants may be infinitely involving; in e-voting and sealed-bid e-auctions, each participant executes the protocol exactly once, whereas in e-health, a participant may involve multiple/infinite times. Thus, the formalisation in e-voting and sealed-bid e-auctions cannot be adopted. Inspired by formalisations of receipt-freeness in e-voting [DKR09] and e-auction [DJP11], we define receipt-freeness to be satisfied if there exists a process where the bribed doctor does not follow the adversary's instruction (e.g., prescribing a particular medicine), which is indistinguishable from a process where she does.

Modelling this property necessitates modelling a doctor who genuinely reveals all her private information to the adversary. This is achieved by the process transformation  $P^{\text{chc}}$  by Delaune et al. [DKR09]. This operation transforms a plain process  $P$  into one which shares all private information over the channel  $\text{chc}$  with the adversary. The transformation  $P^{\text{chc}}$  is defined as follows: Let  $P$  be a plain process and  $\text{chc}$  a fresh channel name.  $P^{\text{chc}}$ , the process that shares all of  $P$ 's secrets, is defined as:

- $0^{\text{chc}} \quad \hat{=} 0,$
- $(P \mid Q)^{\text{chc}} \quad \hat{=} P^{\text{chc}} \mid Q^{\text{chc}},$
- $(\nu n.P)^{\text{chc}} \quad \hat{=} \begin{cases} \nu n.\text{out}(\text{chc}, n).P^{\text{chc}} & \text{when } n \text{ is a name of base type,} \\ \nu n.P^{\text{chc}} & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$
- $(\text{in}(v, x).P)^{\text{chc}} \quad \hat{=} \begin{cases} \text{in}(v, x).\text{out}(\text{chc}, x).P^{\text{chc}} & \text{when } x \text{ is a variable of base type,} \\ \text{in}(v, x).P^{\text{chc}} & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$
- $(\text{out}(v, M).P)^{\text{chc}} \quad \hat{=} \text{out}(v, M).P^{\text{chc}},$
- $(!P)^{\text{chc}} \quad \hat{=} !P^{\text{chc}},$
- $(\text{if } M =_E N \text{ then } P \text{ else } Q)^{\text{chc}} \quad \hat{=} \text{if } M =_E N \text{ then } P^{\text{chc}} \text{ else } Q^{\text{chc}}.$

In addition, we also use the transformation  $P^{\setminus \text{out}(\text{chc}, \cdot)}$  [DKR09]. This models a process  $P$  which hides all outputs on channel  $\text{chc}$ . Formally,  $P^{\setminus \text{out}(\text{chc}, \cdot)} := \nu \text{chc}.(P \mid !\text{in}(\text{chc}, x)).$

**Definition 4** (receipt-freeness). *A well-formed e-health protocol  $P_{eh}$  with a doctor role  $R_{dr}$ , satisfies receipt-freeness if for any two doctors  $d_A$  and  $d_B$  ( $d_A \neq d_B$ ) and any two possible prescriptions*

$\mathfrak{p}_A$  and  $\mathfrak{p}_B$  ( $\mathfrak{p}_A \neq \mathfrak{p}_B$ ), there exist processes  $init'_{dr}$  and  $P'_{dr}$ , such that:

$$\begin{aligned}
1. \quad & \mathcal{C}_{eh}[(init'_{dr}.(!P_{dr}\{\mathfrak{d}_A/Id_{dr}\} | P'_{dr})) | \\
& \quad (init_{dr}\{\mathfrak{d}_B/Id_{dr}\}.(!P_{dr}\{\mathfrak{d}_B/Id_{dr}\} | main_{dr}\{\mathfrak{d}_B/Id_{dr}, \mathfrak{p}_A/presc\})))] \\
\approx_\ell & \mathcal{C}_{eh}[(init_{dr}\{\mathfrak{d}_A/Id_{dr}\})^{chc}.(!P_{dr}\{\mathfrak{d}_A/Id_{dr}\} | (main_{dr}\{\mathfrak{d}_A/Id_{dr}, \mathfrak{p}_A/presc\})^{chc}) | \\
& \quad (init_{dr}\{\mathfrak{d}_B/Id_{dr}\}.(!P_{dr}\{\mathfrak{d}_B/Id_{dr}\} | main_{dr}\{\mathfrak{d}_B/Id_{dr}, \mathfrak{p}_B/presc\})))]; \\
2. \quad & \mathcal{C}_{eh}[(init'_{dr}.(!P_{dr}\{\mathfrak{d}_A/Id_{dr}\} | P'_{dr}))^{\text{out}(chc, \cdot)} | \\
& \quad (init_{dr}\{\mathfrak{d}_B/Id_{dr}\}.(!P_{dr}\{\mathfrak{d}_B/Id_{dr}\} | main_{dr}\{\mathfrak{d}_B/Id_{dr}, \mathfrak{p}_A/presc\})))] \\
\approx_\ell & \mathcal{C}_{eh}[(init_{dr}\{\mathfrak{d}_A/Id_{dr}\}.(!P_{dr}\{\mathfrak{d}_A/Id_{dr}\} | main_{dr}\{\mathfrak{d}_A/Id_{dr}, \mathfrak{p}_B/presc\})) | \\
& \quad (init_{dr}\{\mathfrak{d}_B/Id_{dr}\}.(!P_{dr}\{\mathfrak{d}_B/Id_{dr}\} | main_{dr}\{\mathfrak{d}_B/Id_{dr}, \mathfrak{p}_A/presc\})))]
\end{aligned}$$

where  $init'_{dr}.(!P_{dr}\{\mathfrak{d}_A/Id_{dr}\} | P'_{dr})$  is a closed plain process,  $chc$  is a free fresh channel name, process  $!P_{dr}\{\mathfrak{d}_A/Id_{dr}\}$  and  $!P_{dr}\{\mathfrak{d}_B/Id_{dr}\}$  can be 0.

In the definition, the sub-process  $!P_{dr}\{\mathfrak{d}_A/Id_{dr}\}$  models the sessions of  $\mathfrak{d}_A$  that are not bribed, and the sub-processes  $init'_{dr}$  and  $P'_{dr}$  model the process in which the doctor  $\mathfrak{d}_A$  lies to the adversary about one of his prescriptions. The real prescription behaviour of  $\mathfrak{d}_A$  is modelled by the second equivalence. The first equivalence shows that the adversary cannot distinguish whether  $\mathfrak{d}_A$  lied, given a counter-balancing doctor  $\mathfrak{d}_B$ .

**Remark** Receipt-freeness is stronger than prescription privacy (cf. Figure 6). Intuitively, this is true since receipt-freeness is like prescription privacy except that the adversary may gain more knowledge. Thus, if a protocol satisfies receipt-freeness (the adversary cannot break privacy with more knowledge), prescription privacy must also be satisfied (the adversary cannot break privacy with less knowledge). We prove this formally, following the proof that receipt-freeness is stronger than vote-privacy in [ACRR10]. We prove that by applying an evaluation context that hides the channel  $chc$  on both sides of the first equivalence in Definition 4, we can obtain Definition 3.

*Proof.* If a protocol satisfies receipt-freeness, there exists a closed plain process  $init'_{dr}.(!P_{dr}\{\mathfrak{d}_A/Id_{dr}\} | P'_{dr})$  such that the two equations in Definition 4 are satisfied. By applying the evaluation context  $\nu chc.(- | \text{in}(chc, x))$  (defined as  $P^{\text{out}(chc, \cdot)}$  in Section 3.5) on both sides of the first equation, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathcal{C}_{eh}[(init'_{dr}.(!P_{dr}\{\mathfrak{d}_A/Id_{dr}\} | P'_{dr})) | \\
& \quad (init_{dr}\{\mathfrak{d}_B/Id_{dr}\}.(!P_{dr}\{\mathfrak{d}_B/Id_{dr}\} | main_{dr}\{\mathfrak{d}_B/Id_{dr}, \mathfrak{p}_A/presc\}))]^{\text{out}(chc, \cdot)} \\
\approx_\ell & \mathcal{C}_{eh}[(init_{dr}\{\mathfrak{d}_A/Id_{dr}\})^{chc}.(!P_{dr}\{\mathfrak{d}_A/Id_{dr}\} | (main_{dr}\{\mathfrak{d}_A/Id_{dr}, \mathfrak{p}_A/presc\})^{chc}) | \\
& \quad (init_{dr}\{\mathfrak{d}_B/Id_{dr}\}.(!P_{dr}\{\mathfrak{d}_B/Id_{dr}\} | main_{dr}\{\mathfrak{d}_B/Id_{dr}, \mathfrak{p}_B/presc\}))]^{\text{out}(chc, \cdot)}
\end{aligned}$$

Lemma 1 [ACRR10]: Let  $\mathcal{C}_1 = \nu \tilde{a}_1.(- | B_1)$  and  $\mathcal{C}_2 = \nu \tilde{a}_2.(- | B_2)$  be two evaluation contexts such that  $\tilde{a}_1 \cap (\text{fv}(B_2) \cup \text{fn}(B_2)) = \emptyset$  and  $\tilde{a}_2 \cap (\text{fv}(B_1) \cup \text{fn}(B_1)) = \emptyset$ . We have that  $\mathcal{C}_1[\mathcal{C}_2[A]] \equiv \mathcal{C}_2[\mathcal{C}_1[A]]$  for any extended process  $A$ .

Using Lemma 1, we can rewrite the left-hand side (1) and the right-hand side (2) of the equivalence as follows.

$$\begin{aligned}
(1) \quad & \mathcal{C}_{eh}[(init'_{dr}.(!P_{dr}\{\mathfrak{d}_A/Id_{dr}\} | P'_{dr})) | \\
& \quad (init_{dr}\{\mathfrak{d}_B/Id_{dr}\}.(!P_{dr}\{\mathfrak{d}_B/Id_{dr}\} | main_{dr}\{\mathfrak{d}_B/Id_{dr}, \mathfrak{p}_A/presc\}))]^{\text{out}(chc, \cdot)} \\
\equiv & \mathcal{C}_{eh}[(init'_{dr}.(!P_{dr}\{\mathfrak{d}_A/Id_{dr}\} | P'_{dr}))^{\text{out}(chc, \cdot)} | \\
& \quad (init_{dr}\{\mathfrak{d}_B/Id_{dr}\}.(!P_{dr}\{\mathfrak{d}_B/Id_{dr}\} | main_{dr}\{\mathfrak{d}_B/Id_{dr}, \mathfrak{p}_A/presc\})))] \\
(2) \quad & \mathcal{C}_{eh}[(init_{dr}\{\mathfrak{d}_A/Id_{dr}\})^{chc}.(!P_{dr}\{\mathfrak{d}_A/Id_{dr}\} | (main_{dr}\{\mathfrak{d}_A/Id_{dr}, \mathfrak{p}_A/presc\})^{chc}) | \\
& \quad (init_{dr}\{\mathfrak{d}_B/Id_{dr}\}.(!P_{dr}\{\mathfrak{d}_B/Id_{dr}\} | main_{dr}\{\mathfrak{d}_B/Id_{dr}, \mathfrak{p}_B/presc\}))]^{\text{out}(chc, \cdot)} \\
\equiv & \mathcal{C}_{eh}[(init_{dr}\{\mathfrak{d}_A/Id_{dr}\})^{chc}.(!P_{dr}\{\mathfrak{d}_A/Id_{dr}\} | (main_{dr}\{\mathfrak{d}_A/Id_{dr}, \mathfrak{p}_A/presc\})^{chc})]^{\text{out}(chc, \cdot)} | \\
& \quad (init_{dr}\{\mathfrak{d}_B/Id_{dr}\}.(!P_{dr}\{\mathfrak{d}_B/Id_{dr}\} | main_{dr}\{\mathfrak{d}_B/Id_{dr}, \mathfrak{p}_B/presc\})))]
\end{aligned}$$

For equation (1), by the second equation in Definition 4, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathcal{C}_{eh}[(init'_{dr} \cdot (!P_{dr}\{\mathbf{d}_A/Id_{dr}\} | P'_{dr})) | \\ & \quad (init_{dr}\{\mathbf{d}_B/Id_{dr}\} \cdot (!P_{dr}\{\mathbf{d}_B/Id_{dr}\} | main_{dr}\{\mathbf{d}_B/Id_{dr}, \mathbf{p}_A/presc\}))] \setminus^{\text{out}(\text{chc}, \cdot)} \\ \approx_\ell & \mathcal{C}_{eh}[(init_{dr}\{\mathbf{d}_A/Id_{dr}\} \cdot (!P_{dr}\{\mathbf{d}_A/Id_{dr}\} | main_{dr}\{\mathbf{d}_A/Id_{dr}, \mathbf{p}_B/presc\})) | \\ & \quad (init_{dr}\{\mathbf{d}_B/Id_{dr}\} \cdot (!P_{dr}\{\mathbf{d}_B/Id_{dr}\} | main_{dr}\{\mathbf{d}_B/Id_{dr}, \mathbf{p}_A/presc\}))] \end{aligned}$$

Lemma 2 [ACRR10]: let  $P$  be a closed plain process and  $\text{chc}$  a channel name such that  $\text{chc} \notin \text{fn}(P) \cup \text{bn}(P)$ . We have  $(P^{\text{chc}}) \setminus^{\text{out}(\text{chc}, \cdot)} \approx_\ell P$ .

For equation (2), using Lemma 2, we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathcal{C}_{eh}[(init_{dr}\{\mathbf{d}_A/Id_{dr}\}^{\text{chc}} \cdot (!P_{dr}\{\mathbf{d}_A/Id_{dr}\} | (main_{dr}\{\mathbf{d}_A/Id_{dr}, \mathbf{p}_A/presc\})^{\text{chc}})) \setminus^{\text{out}(\text{chc}, \cdot)} | \\ & \quad (init_{dr}\{\mathbf{d}_B/Id_{dr}\} \cdot (!P_{dr}\{\mathbf{d}_B/Id_{dr}\} | main_{dr}\{\mathbf{d}_B/Id_{dr}, \mathbf{p}_B/presc\}))] \\ \approx_\ell & \mathcal{C}_{eh}[(init_{dr}\{\mathbf{d}_A/Id_{dr}\} \cdot (!P_{dr}\{\mathbf{d}_A/Id_{dr}\} | (main_{dr}\{\mathbf{d}_A/Id_{dr}, \mathbf{p}_A/presc\})) | \\ & \quad (init_{dr}\{\mathbf{d}_B/Id_{dr}\} \cdot (!P_{dr}\{\mathbf{d}_B/Id_{dr}\} | main_{dr}\{\mathbf{d}_B/Id_{dr}, \mathbf{p}_B/presc\}))] \end{aligned}$$

By transitivity, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathcal{C}_{eh}[(init_{dr}\{\mathbf{d}_A/Id_{dr}\} \cdot (!P_{dr}\{\mathbf{d}_A/Id_{dr}\} | main_{dr}\{\mathbf{d}_A/Id_{dr}, \mathbf{p}_B/presc\})) | \\ & \quad (init_{dr}\{\mathbf{d}_B/Id_{dr}\} \cdot (!P_{dr}\{\mathbf{d}_B/Id_{dr}\} | main_{dr}\{\mathbf{d}_B/Id_{dr}, \mathbf{p}_A/presc\}))] \\ \approx_\ell & \mathcal{C}_{eh}[(init_{dr}\{\mathbf{d}_A/Id_{dr}\} \cdot (!P_{dr}\{\mathbf{d}_A/Id_{dr}\} | (main_{dr}\{\mathbf{d}_A/Id_{dr}, \mathbf{p}_A/presc\})) | \\ & \quad (init_{dr}\{\mathbf{d}_B/Id_{dr}\} \cdot (!P_{dr}\{\mathbf{d}_B/Id_{dr}\} | main_{dr}\{\mathbf{d}_B/Id_{dr}, \mathbf{p}_B/presc\}))], \end{aligned}$$

which is exactly Definition 3.  $\square$

The difference between this formalisation and receipt-freeness in e-voting [DKR09] and in e-auctions [DJP11] is that in this definition only a part of the doctor process (the initiation sub-process and a prescribing session) shares information with the adversary. In e-voting, each voter only votes once. In the contrast, a doctor prescribes multiple times for various patients. As patients and situations of patients vary, a doctor cannot prescribe medicine from the bribing pharmaceutical company all the time. Therefore, only part of the doctor process shares information with the adversary. Note that we model only one bribed prescribing session, as it is the simplest scenario. This definition can be extended to model multiple prescribing sessions being bribed, by replacing sub-process  $(init_{dr}\{\mathbf{d}_A/Id_{dr}\})$  with the sub-process modelling multiple doctor sessions. Note that the extended definition requires multiple sessions of the counter-balancing doctor or multiple counter-balancing doctors.

Assume  $h$  sessions of  $\mathbf{d}_A$  are bribed, denoted as  $main_{dr}^b := main_{dr}^1 | \dots | main_{dr}^h$ , where  $main_{dr}^i := (main_{dr}\{\mathbf{d}_A/Id_{dr}\})^{\text{chc}}$ . An arbitrary instance of the bribed sessions is denoted as  $main_{dr}^b\{\mathbf{p}_A^1, \dots, \mathbf{p}_A^h/presc\} := main_{dr}^1\{\mathbf{p}_A^1/presc\} | \dots | main_{dr}^h\{\mathbf{p}_A^h/presc\}$ . Assume there is a counter-balancing process  $P_{dr}^c$  of the bribed sessions. The process  $P_{dr}^c$  has  $h$  corresponding sessions from one or more honest doctors. We use  $P_{dr}^c\{\mathbf{p}_A^1, \dots, \mathbf{p}_A^h/presc\}$  to denote the counter-balancing process where the prescriptions of the  $h$  sessions are  $\mathbf{p}_A^1, \dots, \mathbf{p}_A^h$ , respectively. Following definition 4, the multi-session receipt-freeness can be defined as follows.

**Definition 5** (multi-session receipt-freeness). *A well-formed e-health protocol  $P_{eh}$  with a doctor role  $R_{dr}$ , satisfies multi-session receipt-freeness, if for any doctor  $\mathbf{d}_A$  with  $h$  bribed sessions, denoted as  $main_{dr}^b := main_{dr}^1 | \dots | main_{dr}^h$ , where  $main_{dr}^i := (main_{dr}\{\mathbf{d}_A/Id_{dr}\})^{\text{chc}}$ , for any instantiation of the prescriptions in the bribed sessions  $main_{dr}^b\{\mathbf{p}_A^1, \dots, \mathbf{p}_A^h/presc\}$ , there exist processes  $init'_{dr}$  and  $P'_{dr}$ , such that*

1.  $\mathcal{C}_{eh}[(init'_{dr} \cdot (!P_{dr}\{\mathbf{d}_A/Id_{dr}\} | P'_{dr})) | P_{dr}^c\{\mathbf{p}_A^1, \dots, \mathbf{p}_A^h/presc\}]$   
 $\approx_\ell \mathcal{C}_{eh}[(init_{dr}\{\mathbf{d}_A/Id_{dr}\} \cdot (!P_{dr}\{\mathbf{d}_A/Id_{dr}\} | main_{dr}^b\{\mathbf{p}_A^1, \dots, \mathbf{p}_A^h/presc\})) | P_{dr}^c\{\mathbf{p}_B^1, \dots, \mathbf{p}_B^h/presc\}];$
2.  $\mathcal{C}_{eh}[(init'_{dr} \cdot (!P_{dr}\{\mathbf{d}_A/Id_{dr}\} | P'_{dr})) \setminus^{\text{out}(\text{chc}, \cdot)} | P_{dr}^c\{\mathbf{p}_A^1, \dots, \mathbf{p}_A^h/presc\}]$   
 $\approx_\ell \mathcal{C}_{eh}[(init_{dr}\{\mathbf{d}_A/Id_{dr}\} \cdot (!P_{dr}\{\mathbf{d}_A/Id_{dr}\} | main_{dr}\{\mathbf{d}_A/Id_{dr}, \mathbf{p}_B^1/presc\} | \dots | main_{dr}\{\mathbf{d}_A/Id_{dr}, \mathbf{p}_B^h/presc\})) | P_{dr}^c\{\mathbf{p}_A^1, \dots, \mathbf{p}_A^h/presc\}],$

where  $\text{init}'_{dr}.(!P_{dr}\{\mathbf{d}_A/Id_{dr}\} \mid P'_{dr})$  is a closed plain process,  $\mathbf{chc}$  is a free fresh channel name, process  $!P_{dr}\{\mathbf{d}_A/Id_{dr}\}$  and  $!P_{dr}\{\mathbf{d}_B/Id_{dr}\}$  can be 0,  $P_{dr}^c$  is less than  $h$  doctor processes running in parallel and  $P_{dr}^c\{(\mathbf{p}_A^1, \dots, \mathbf{p}_A^h)/presc\}$  denotes that in some sessions of the doctor processes, the prescriptions are instantiated with  $\mathbf{p}_A^1, \dots, \mathbf{p}_A^h$ .

Definition 4 (receipt-freeness) is a specific instance of this definition where only one session of the targeted doctor is bribed. When multiple sessions are bribed, to ensure multi-session receipt-freeness, it requires the existence of more than one counter-balancing doctor sessions, and thus this extended definition is stronger than receipt-freeness (Definition 4), meaning that if a protocol satisfied the multi-session receipt-freeness where multiple sessions are bribed, then the protocol satisfies receipt-freeness where only one session is bribed. The intuition is that if there exists a lying process for multiple bribed sessions such that multi-session receipt-freeness is satisfied, by hiding the communications to the adversary in the lying process except one session, we can obtain the lying process such that receipt-freeness is satisfied. More concretely, when receipt-freeness is satisfied, multi-session receipt-freeness may not be satisfied. For example, when there are exactly two users and two nonces generated by each user, if the revealed information is only the two nonces, a bribed user can lie to the adversary about his nonce, since the link between the user and the nonce is private. However, if the user is bribed on two sessions, i.e., the link between him and his two nonces, then at least one nonce has to be generated by the user, hence, multi-session receipt-freeness (two sessions in particular) is not satisfied.

Remark that we restrict the way a bribed user collaborates with the adversary: we only model forwarding information to the adversary. The scenario that the adversary provides prescriptions for a bribed doctor, similar to in coercion in e-voting [DKR09], is not modelled. Although providing ready-made prescriptions is theoretically possible, we consider this to not be a practical attack: correctly prescribing requires professional (sometimes empirical) medical expertise and heavily depends on examination of the patient. As such, no adversary can prepare an appropriate prescription without additional information. Moreover, forwarding a non-appropriate description carries serious legal consequences for the forwarding doctor. Therefore, we omit the case where the doctor merely forwards an adversary-prepared prescription. The adversary could still prepare other information for the bribed doctor, for example, the randomness of a bit-commitment. Such adversary-prepared information may lead to a stronger adversary than we are considering. To model such a scenario, the verifier needs to specify exactly which information is prepared by the adversary. Formalisation of such scenarios can follow the formal framework proposed in [DKR09, DJP13].

### 3.6 Independency of prescription privacy

Usually, e-health systems have to deal with a complex constellation of roles: doctors, patients, pharmacists, insurance companies, medical administration, etc. Each of these roles has access to different private information and has different privacy concerns. An untrusted role may be bribed to reveal private information to the adversary such that the adversary can break the privacy of another role. De Decker et al. [dDLVV08] note that pharmacists may have sensitive data which can be revealed to the adversary to break a doctor's prescription privacy. To prevent a party from revealing sensitive data that affects a doctor's privacy, e-health protocols are required to satisfy *independency of prescription privacy*. The DLV08 protocol, for example, requires prescription privacy independent of pharmacists [dDLVV08]. Intuitively, independency of prescription privacy means that even if another party  $R_i$  reveals their information (i.e.,  $R_i^{\mathbf{chc}}$ ), the adversary is not able to break a doctor's prescription privacy.

**Definition 6** (independency of prescription privacy). *A well-formed e-health protocol  $P_{eh}$  with a doctor role  $R_{dr}$ , satisfies prescription privacy independent of role  $R_i$ , if for all possible doctors  $\mathbf{d}_A$*

and  $\mathbf{d}_B$  ( $\mathbf{d}_A \neq \mathbf{d}_B$ ) we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathcal{C}_{eh}[\!|R_i^{\text{chc}} \mid \left( \begin{array}{l} \text{init}_{dr}\{\mathbf{d}_A/Id_{dr}\}.(!P_{dr}\{\mathbf{d}_A/Id_{dr}\} \mid \text{main}_{dr}\{\mathbf{d}_A/Id_{dr}, \mathbf{p}_A/\text{presc}\}) \\ \text{init}_{dr}\{\mathbf{d}_B/Id_{dr}\}.(!P_{dr}\{\mathbf{d}_B/Id_{dr}\} \mid \text{main}_{dr}\{\mathbf{d}_B/Id_{dr}, \mathbf{p}_B/\text{presc}\}) \end{array} \right) \mid \\ \approx_{\ell} & \mathcal{C}_{eh}[\!|R_i^{\text{chc}} \mid \left( \begin{array}{l} \text{init}_{dr}\{\mathbf{d}_A/Id_{dr}\}.(!P_{dr}\{\mathbf{d}_A/Id_{dr}\} \mid \text{main}_{dr}\{\mathbf{d}_A/Id_{dr}, \mathbf{p}_B/\text{presc}\}) \\ \text{init}_{dr}\{\mathbf{d}_B/Id_{dr}\}.(!P_{dr}\{\mathbf{d}_B/Id_{dr}\} \mid \text{main}_{dr}\{\mathbf{d}_B/Id_{dr}, \mathbf{p}_A/\text{presc}\}) \end{array} \right) \mid \end{aligned}$$

where  $\mathbf{p}_A$  and  $\mathbf{p}_B$  ( $\mathbf{p}_A \neq \mathbf{p}_B$ ) are any two possible prescriptions,  $R_i$  is a non-doctor role, process  $!P_{dr}\{\mathbf{d}_A/Id_{dr}\}$  and  $!P_{dr}\{\mathbf{d}_B/Id_{dr}\}$  can be 0.

Note that we assume a worst-case situation in which role  $R_i$  genuinely cooperates with the adversary. For example, the pharmacist forwards all information obtained from channels hidden from the adversary. The equivalence requires that no matter how role  $R_i$  cooperates with the adversary, the adversary cannot link a doctor to the doctor's prescriptions. The cooperation between pharmacists and the adversary is modelled in the same way as the cooperation between bribed doctors and the adversary, i.e.,  $!R_i^{\text{chc}}$ . We do not model the situation where the adversary prepares information for the pharmacists, as we focus on doctor privacy – information sent out by the pharmacist does not affect doctor privacy, so there is no reason to control this information. Instead of modelling the pharmacists as compromised users, our modelling allows the definition to be easily extended to model new properties which capture situations where pharmacists lie to the adversary due to, for example, coalition between pharmacists and bribed doctors. In addition, although we do not model delivery of medicine, pharmacists do need to adhere to regulations in providing medicine. Thus, an adversary who only controls the network cannot impersonate a pharmacist.

Just as receipt-freeness is stronger than prescription privacy, independency of prescription privacy is stronger than prescription privacy (cf. Figure 6). Intuitively, this holds since the adversary obtains at least as much information in independency of prescription privacy as in prescription privacy. Formally, one can derive Definition 3 from Definition 6 by hiding channel  $\text{chc}$  on the left-hand side as well as the right-hand side of the equivalence in Definition 6.

*Proof.* Consider a protocol that satisfies independency of prescription privacy. This protocol thus satisfies definition 6. By applying the evaluation context  $\nu\text{chc}.\text{(-} \mid \text{in}(\text{chc}, x))$  to both the left-hand side and the right-hand side of Definition 6, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathcal{C}_{eh}[\!|R_i^{\text{chc}} \mid \left( \begin{array}{l} \text{init}_{dr}\{\mathbf{d}_A/Id_{dr}\}.(!P_{dr}\{\mathbf{d}_A/Id_{dr}\} \mid \text{main}_{dr}\{\mathbf{d}_A/Id_{dr}, \mathbf{p}_A/\text{presc}\}) \\ \text{init}_{dr}\{\mathbf{d}_B/Id_{dr}\}.(!P_{dr}\{\mathbf{d}_B/Id_{dr}\} \mid \text{main}_{dr}\{\mathbf{d}_B/Id_{dr}, \mathbf{p}_B/\text{presc}\}) \end{array} \right) \mid \\ \approx_{\ell} & \mathcal{C}_{eh}[\!|R_i^{\text{chc}} \mid \left( \begin{array}{l} \text{init}_{dr}\{\mathbf{d}_A/Id_{dr}\}.(!P_{dr}\{\mathbf{d}_A/Id_{dr}\} \mid \text{main}_{dr}\{\mathbf{d}_A/Id_{dr}, \mathbf{p}_B/\text{presc}\}) \\ \text{init}_{dr}\{\mathbf{d}_B/Id_{dr}\}.(!P_{dr}\{\mathbf{d}_B/Id_{dr}\} \mid \text{main}_{dr}\{\mathbf{d}_B/Id_{dr}, \mathbf{p}_A/\text{presc}\}) \end{array} \right) \mid \end{aligned}$$

According to Lemma 1, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathcal{C}_{eh}[\!|R_i^{\text{chc}} \mid \left( \begin{array}{l} \text{init}_{dr}\{\mathbf{d}_A/Id_{dr}\}.(!P_{dr}\{\mathbf{d}_A/Id_{dr}\} \mid \text{main}_{dr}\{\mathbf{d}_A/Id_{dr}, \mathbf{p}_A/\text{presc}\}) \\ \text{init}_{dr}\{\mathbf{d}_B/Id_{dr}\}.(!P_{dr}\{\mathbf{d}_B/Id_{dr}\} \mid \text{main}_{dr}\{\mathbf{d}_B/Id_{dr}, \mathbf{p}_B/\text{presc}\}) \end{array} \right) \mid \\ \equiv & \mathcal{C}_{eh}[\!|R_i^{\text{chc}} \setminus \text{out}(\text{chc}, \cdot) \mid \left( \begin{array}{l} \text{init}_{dr}\{\mathbf{d}_A/Id_{dr}\}.(!P_{dr}\{\mathbf{d}_A/Id_{dr}\} \mid \text{main}_{dr}\{\mathbf{d}_A/Id_{dr}, \mathbf{p}_A/\text{presc}\}) \\ \text{init}_{dr}\{\mathbf{d}_B/Id_{dr}\}.(!P_{dr}\{\mathbf{d}_B/Id_{dr}\} \mid \text{main}_{dr}\{\mathbf{d}_B/Id_{dr}, \mathbf{p}_B/\text{presc}\}) \end{array} \right) \mid \\ & \mathcal{C}_{eh}[\!|R_i^{\text{chc}} \mid \left( \begin{array}{l} \text{init}_{dr}\{\mathbf{d}_A/Id_{dr}\}.(!P_{dr}\{\mathbf{d}_A/Id_{dr}\} \mid \text{main}_{dr}\{\mathbf{d}_A/Id_{dr}, \mathbf{p}_B/\text{presc}\}) \\ \text{init}_{dr}\{\mathbf{d}_B/Id_{dr}\}.(!P_{dr}\{\mathbf{d}_B/Id_{dr}\} \mid \text{main}_{dr}\{\mathbf{d}_B/Id_{dr}, \mathbf{p}_A/\text{presc}\}) \end{array} \right) \mid \\ \equiv & \mathcal{C}_{eh}[\!|R_i^{\text{chc}} \setminus \text{out}(\text{chc}, \cdot) \mid \left( \begin{array}{l} \text{init}_{dr}\{\mathbf{d}_A/Id_{dr}\}.(!P_{dr}\{\mathbf{d}_A/Id_{dr}\} \mid \text{main}_{dr}\{\mathbf{d}_A/Id_{dr}, \mathbf{p}_B/\text{presc}\}) \\ \text{init}_{dr}\{\mathbf{d}_B/Id_{dr}\}.(!P_{dr}\{\mathbf{d}_B/Id_{dr}\} \mid \text{main}_{dr}\{\mathbf{d}_B/Id_{dr}, \mathbf{p}_A/\text{presc}\}) \end{array} \right) \mid \end{aligned}$$

According to Lemma 2, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathcal{C}_{eh}[\!|R_i^{\text{chc}} \setminus \text{out}(\text{chc}, \cdot) \mid \left( \begin{array}{l} \text{init}_{dr}\{\mathbf{d}_A/Id_{dr}\}.(!P_{dr}\{\mathbf{d}_A/Id_{dr}\} \mid \text{main}_{dr}\{\mathbf{d}_A/Id_{dr}, \mathbf{p}_A/\text{presc}\}) \\ \text{init}_{dr}\{\mathbf{d}_B/Id_{dr}\}.(!P_{dr}\{\mathbf{d}_B/Id_{dr}\} \mid \text{main}_{dr}\{\mathbf{d}_B/Id_{dr}, \mathbf{p}_B/\text{presc}\}) \end{array} \right) \mid \\ \approx_{\ell} & \mathcal{C}_{eh}[\!|R_i \mid \left( \begin{array}{l} \text{init}_{dr}\{\mathbf{d}_A/Id_{dr}\}.(!P_{dr}\{\mathbf{d}_A/Id_{dr}\} \mid \text{main}_{dr}\{\mathbf{d}_A/Id_{dr}, \mathbf{p}_A/\text{presc}\}) \\ \text{init}_{dr}\{\mathbf{d}_B/Id_{dr}\}.(!P_{dr}\{\mathbf{d}_B/Id_{dr}\} \mid \text{main}_{dr}\{\mathbf{d}_B/Id_{dr}, \mathbf{p}_B/\text{presc}\}) \end{array} \right) \mid \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathcal{C}_{eh}[\!R_i^{\text{chc}} \setminus \text{out}(\text{chc}, \cdot) \mid \left( \begin{array}{l} \text{init}_{dr}\{\mathbf{d}_A/Id_{dr}\}.(!P_{dr}\{\mathbf{d}_A/Id_{dr}\} \mid \text{main}_{dr}\{\mathbf{d}_A/Id_{dr}, \mathbf{p}_B/\text{presc}\}) \\ \text{init}_{dr}\{\mathbf{d}_B/Id_{dr}\}.(!P_{dr}\{\mathbf{d}_B/Id_{dr}\} \mid \text{main}_{dr}\{\mathbf{d}_B/Id_{dr}, \mathbf{p}_A/\text{presc}\}) \end{array} \right) \mid \\
\approx_\ell & \mathcal{C}_{eh}[\!R_i \mid \left( \begin{array}{l} \text{init}_{dr}\{\mathbf{d}_A/Id_{dr}\}.(!P_{dr}\{\mathbf{d}_A/Id_{dr}\} \mid \text{main}_{dr}\{\mathbf{d}_A/Id_{dr}, \mathbf{p}_B/\text{presc}\}) \\ \text{init}_{dr}\{\mathbf{d}_B/Id_{dr}\}.(!P_{dr}\{\mathbf{d}_B/Id_{dr}\} \mid \text{main}_{dr}\{\mathbf{d}_B/Id_{dr}, \mathbf{p}_A/\text{presc}\}) \end{array} \right) \mid
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, by transitivity, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathcal{C}_{eh}[\!R_i \mid \left( \begin{array}{l} \text{init}_{dr}\{\mathbf{d}_A/Id_{dr}\}.(!P_{dr}\{\mathbf{d}_A/Id_{dr}\} \mid \text{main}_{dr}\{\mathbf{d}_A/Id_{dr}, \mathbf{p}_A/\text{presc}\}) \\ \text{init}_{dr}\{\mathbf{d}_B/Id_{dr}\}.(!P_{dr}\{\mathbf{d}_B/Id_{dr}\} \mid \text{main}_{dr}\{\mathbf{d}_B/Id_{dr}, \mathbf{p}_B/\text{presc}\}) \end{array} \right) \mid \\
\approx_\ell & \mathcal{C}_{eh}[\!R_i \mid \left( \begin{array}{l} \text{init}_{dr}\{\mathbf{d}_A/Id_{dr}\}.(!P_{dr}\{\mathbf{d}_A/Id_{dr}\} \mid \text{main}_{dr}\{\mathbf{d}_A/Id_{dr}, \mathbf{p}_B/\text{presc}\}) \\ \text{init}_{dr}\{\mathbf{d}_B/Id_{dr}\}.(!P_{dr}\{\mathbf{d}_B/Id_{dr}\} \mid \text{main}_{dr}\{\mathbf{d}_B/Id_{dr}, \mathbf{p}_A/\text{presc}\}) \end{array} \right) \mid
\end{aligned}$$

which is exactly Definition 3.  $\square$

Note that the first step in the proof (application of an evaluation context) cannot be reversed. Therefore, prescription privacy is weaker than independency of prescription privacy.

### 3.7 Independency of receipt-freeness

We have discussed two situations where a doctor's prescription behaviour can be revealed when either the doctor or another different party cooperates with the adversary. It is natural to consider the conjunction of these two, i.e., a situation in which the adversary coerces both a doctor and another party (not a doctor). Since the adversary obtains more information, this constitutes a stronger attack on doctor's prescription privacy. To address this problem, we define *independency of receipt-freeness*, which is satisfied when a doctor's prescription privacy is preserved even if both the doctor and another party reveal their private information to the adversary.

**Definition 7** (independency of receipt-freeness). *A well-formed e-health protocol  $P_{eh}$  with a doctor role  $R_{dr}$ , satisfies receipt-freeness independent of role  $R_i$  if for any two doctors  $\mathbf{d}_A$  and  $\mathbf{d}_B$  ( $\mathbf{d}_A \neq \mathbf{d}_B$ ) and any two possible prescriptions  $\mathbf{p}_A$  and  $\mathbf{p}_B$  ( $\mathbf{p}_A \neq \mathbf{p}_B$ ), there exist processes  $\text{init}'_{dr}$  and  $P'_{dr}$ , such that:*

1. 
$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathcal{C}_{eh}[\!R_i^{\text{chc}} \mid \left( \begin{array}{l} \text{init}'_{dr}.(!P_{dr}\{\mathbf{d}_A/Id_{dr}\} \mid P'_{dr}) \\ \text{init}_{dr}\{\mathbf{d}_B/Id_{dr}\}.(!P_{dr}\{\mathbf{d}_B/Id_{dr}\} \mid \text{main}_{dr}\{\mathbf{d}_B/Id_{dr}, \mathbf{p}_A/\text{presc}\}) \end{array} \right) \mid \\
\approx_\ell & \mathcal{C}_{eh}[\!R_i^{\text{chc}} \mid \left( \begin{array}{l} (\text{init}_{dr}\{\mathbf{d}_A/Id_{dr}\})^{\text{chc}}.(!P_{dr}\{\mathbf{d}_A/Id_{dr}\} \mid (\text{main}_{dr}\{\mathbf{d}_A/Id_{dr}, \mathbf{p}_A/\text{presc}\})^{\text{chc}}) \\ \text{init}_{dr}\{\mathbf{d}_B/Id_{dr}\}.(!P_{dr}\{\mathbf{d}_B/Id_{dr}\} \mid \text{main}_{dr}\{\mathbf{d}_B/Id_{dr}, \mathbf{p}_B/\text{presc}\}) \end{array} \right) \mid
\end{aligned}$$
2. 
$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathcal{C}_{eh}[\!R_i^{\text{chc}} \mid \left( (\text{init}'_{dr}.(!P_{dr}\{\mathbf{d}_A/Id_{dr}\} \mid P'_{dr})) \setminus \text{out}(\text{chc}, \cdot) \mid \right. \\
& \quad \left. \text{init}_{dr}\{\mathbf{d}_B/Id_{dr}\}.(!P_{dr}\{\mathbf{d}_B/Id_{dr}\} \mid \text{main}_{dr}\{\mathbf{d}_B/Id_{dr}, \mathbf{p}_A/\text{presc}\}) \right) \mid \\
\approx_\ell & \mathcal{C}_{eh}[\!R_i^{\text{chc}} \mid \left( \begin{array}{l} \text{init}_{dr}\{\mathbf{d}_A/Id_{dr}\}.(!P_{dr}\{\mathbf{d}_A/Id_{dr}\} \mid \text{main}_{dr}\{\mathbf{d}_A/Id_{dr}, \mathbf{p}_B/\text{presc}\}) \\ \text{init}_{dr}\{\mathbf{d}_B/Id_{dr}\}.(!P_{dr}\{\mathbf{d}_B/Id_{dr}\} \mid \text{main}_{dr}\{\mathbf{d}_B/Id_{dr}, \mathbf{p}_A/\text{presc}\}) \end{array} \right) \mid
\end{aligned}$$

where  $\text{init}'_{dr}.(!P_{dr}\{\mathbf{d}_A/Id_{dr}\} \mid P'_{dr})$  is a closed plain process,  $R_i$  is a non-doctor role,  $\text{chc}$  is a free fresh channel name, process  $!P_{dr}\{\mathbf{d}_A/Id_{dr}\}$  and  $!P_{dr}\{\mathbf{d}_B/Id_{dr}\}$  can be 0.

Independency of receipt-freeness implies receipt-freeness and independency of prescription privacy, each of which also implies prescription privacy (cf. Figure 6). The proof follows the same reasoning as the proofs in [DJP13]. Intuitively, the adversary obtains more information with independency of receipt-freeness (namely, from both doctor and pharmacist) than with either independency of prescription privacy (from pharmacist only) or receipt-freeness (from doctor only). If the adversary is unable to break a doctor's privacy using this much information, the adversary will not be able to break doctor privacy using less information. Therefore, if a protocol satisfies independency of receipt-freeness, then it must also satisfies independency of prescription privacy and receipt-freeness. Similarly, since the adversary obtains more information in both independency of prescription privacy and in receipt-freeness than in prescription privacy, if a protocol satisfies either independency of prescription privacy or receipt-freeness, it must also satisfies prescription privacy.

### 3.8 Anonymity and strong anonymity

Anonymity is a privacy property that protects users' identities. We model anonymity as indistinguishability of processes initiated by two different users.

**Definition 8** (doctor anonymity). *A well-formed e-health protocol  $P_{eh}$  with a doctor role  $R_{dr}$  satisfies doctor anonymity if for any doctor  $\mathbf{d}_A$ , there exists another doctor  $\mathbf{d}_B$  ( $\mathbf{d}_B \neq \mathbf{d}_A$ ), such that*

$$\mathcal{C}_{eh}[init_{dr}\{\mathbf{d}_A/Id_{dr}\}!\!P_{dr}\{\mathbf{d}_A/Id_{dr}\}] \approx_\ell \mathcal{C}_{eh}[init_{dr}\{\mathbf{d}_B/Id_{dr}\}!\!P_{dr}\{\mathbf{d}_B/Id_{dr}\}].$$

A stronger property of anonymity is defined in [ACRR10], capturing the situation that the adversary cannot even find out whether a user (with identity  $\mathbf{d}_A$ ) has participated in a session of the protocol or not.

**Definition 9** (strong doctor anonymity [ACRR10]). *A well-formed e-health protocol  $P_{eh}$  with a doctor role  $R_{dr}$  satisfies strong doctor anonymity, if*

$$P_{eh} \approx_\ell \nu \widetilde{mc}.init.(!R_1 \mid \dots \mid !R_n \mid (init_{dr}\{\mathbf{d}_A/Id_{dr}\}!\!P_{dr}\{\mathbf{d}_A/Id_{dr}\})).$$

Recall that the unveiling of a doctor's identity (when used) is performed outside the process  $init_{dr}$  (see Section 3.2). Therefore, the above two definitions do not include generation nor unveiling of doctor identities in the initialization phase.

Obviously, the concept of strong doctor anonymity is intended to be stronger than the concept of doctor anonymity. We show that it is impossible to satisfy strong doctor anonymity without satisfying doctor anonymity (arrow  $R_5$  in Figure 6).

*Proof.* Assume that a protocol  $P_{eh}$  satisfies strong doctor anonymity but not doctor anonymity. That is,  $P_{eh}$  satisfies Definition 9, i.e.,

$$P_{eh} \approx_\ell \nu \widetilde{mc}.init.(!R_1 \mid \dots \mid !R_n \mid (init_{dr}\{\mathbf{d}_A/Id_{dr}\}!\!P_{dr}\{\mathbf{d}_A/Id_{dr}\})), \quad (1)$$

but there exists no  $\mathbf{d}_B$  such that the equation in Definition 8 is satisfied. That is,  $\nexists \mathbf{d}_B$  s.t.

$$\mathcal{C}_{eh}[init_{dr}\{\mathbf{d}_A/Id_{dr}\}!\!P_{dr}\{\mathbf{d}_A/Id_{dr}\}] \approx_\ell \mathcal{C}_{eh}[init_{dr}\{\mathbf{d}_B/Id_{dr}\}!\!P_{dr}\{\mathbf{d}_B/Id_{dr}\}]. \quad (2)$$

Since

$$\mathcal{C}_{eh}[-] := \nu \widetilde{mc}.init.(!R_1 \mid \dots \mid !R_n \mid \_),$$

we have

$$\mathcal{C}_{eh}[init_{dr}\{\mathbf{d}_A/Id_{dr}\}!\!P_{dr}\{\mathbf{d}_A/Id_{dr}\}] := \nu \widetilde{mc}.init.(!R_1 \mid \dots \mid !R_n \mid (init_{dr}\{\mathbf{d}_A/Id_{dr}\}!\!P_{dr}\{\mathbf{d}_A/Id_{dr}\})).$$

That is, the right-hand side of the equation (1) is exactly the left-hand side of the equation (2). Therefore, there exists no  $\mathbf{d}_B$  such that the following equation holds,

$$P_{eh} \approx_\ell \mathcal{C}_{eh}[init_{dr}\{\mathbf{d}_B/Id_{dr}\}!\!P_{dr}\{\mathbf{d}_B/Id_{dr}\}]. \quad (3)$$

Since  $P_{eh} := \nu \widetilde{mc}.init.(!R_1 \mid \dots \mid !R_n)$ , by letting  $\mathbf{d}_B$  be an identity of a doctor process in  $P_{eh}$ , the equation (3) holds. There obviously exists a  $\mathbf{d}_B$  such that the equation (3) holds. This contradicts the assumption.  $\square$

Anonymity and strong anonymity may be similarly defined for other roles. We provide definitions for patient anonymity, anonymity for other roles is defined analogously.

**Definition 10** (patient anonymity). *A well-formed e-health protocol  $P_{eh}$  with a patient role  $R_{pt}$  satisfies patient anonymity if for any patient  $\mathbf{t}_A$ , there exists another patient  $\mathbf{t}_B$  ( $\mathbf{t}_B \neq \mathbf{t}_A$ ), such that*

$$\mathcal{C}_{eh}[init_{pt}\{\mathbf{t}_A/Id_{pt}\}!\!P_{pt}\{\mathbf{t}_A/Id_{pt}\}] \approx_\ell \mathcal{C}_{eh}[init_{pt}\{\mathbf{t}_B/Id_{pt}\}!\!P_{pt}\{\mathbf{t}_B/Id_{pt}\}].$$

**Definition 11** (strong patient anonymity [ACRR10]). *A well-formed e-health protocol  $P_{eh}$  with a patient role  $R_{pt}$  satisfies strong doctor anonymity, if*

$$P_{eh} \approx_{\ell} \nu \widetilde{mc}.init.(!R_1 \mid \dots \mid !R_n \mid (init_{pt}\{\mathbf{t}_A/Id_{pt}\} \cdot !P_{pt}\{\mathbf{t}_A/Id_{pt}\})).$$

As with the case for doctor anonymity, strong patient anonymity is stronger than patient anonymity ( $R_7$  in Figure 6). The proof is analogous to the proof above.

### 3.9 Untraceability and strong untraceability

Untraceability is a property preventing the adversary from tracing a user, meaning that he cannot tell whether two executions are initiated by the same user.

**Definition 12** (doctor untraceability). *A well-formed e-health protocol  $P_{eh}$  with a doctor role  $R_{dr}$  satisfies doctor untraceability if, for any two doctors  $\mathbf{d}_A$  and  $\mathbf{d}_B \neq \mathbf{d}_A$ ,*

$$\begin{aligned} & C_{eh}[init_{dr}\{\mathbf{d}_A/Id_{dr}\} \cdot (P_{dr}\{\mathbf{d}_A/Id_{dr}\} \mid P_{dr}\{\mathbf{d}_A/Id_{dr}\})] \\ \approx_{\ell} & C_{eh}[(init_{dr}\{\mathbf{d}_A/Id_{dr}\} \cdot P_{dr}\{\mathbf{d}_A/Id_{dr}\}) \mid (init_{dr}\{\mathbf{d}_B/Id_{dr}\} \cdot P_{dr}\{\mathbf{d}_B/Id_{dr}\})]. \end{aligned}$$

A stronger version of untraceability, proposed in [ACRR10], captures the adversary's inability to distinguish the situation where one user executes the protocol multiple times from each user executing the protocol at most once.

**Definition 13** (strong doctor untraceability [ACRR10]). *A well-formed e-health protocol  $P_{eh}$  with a doctor role  $R_{dr}$  being the  $j^{\text{th}}$  role, satisfies strong doctor untraceability, if*

$$P_{eh} \approx_{\ell} \nu \widetilde{mc}.init.(!R_1 \mid \dots \mid !R_{j-1} \mid !R_{j+1} \mid !R_n \mid (\nu Id_{dr}.init_{dr}.P_{dr})).$$

Similarly, we can define untraceability and strong untraceability for patient and other roles in a protocol, by replacing the doctor role with a different role.

**Definition 14** (patient untraceability). *A well-formed e-health protocol  $P_{eh}$  with a patient role  $R_{pt}$  satisfies patient untraceability if, for any two patients  $\mathbf{t}_A$  and  $\mathbf{t}_B \neq \mathbf{t}_A$ ,*

$$\begin{aligned} & C_{eh}[init_{pt}\{\mathbf{t}_A/Id_{pt}\} \cdot (P_{pt}\{\mathbf{t}_A/Id_{pt}\} \mid P_{pt}\{\mathbf{t}_A/Id_{pt}\})] \\ \approx_{\ell} & C_{eh}[(init_{pt}\{\mathbf{t}_A/Id_{pt}\} \cdot P_{pt}\{\mathbf{t}_A/Id_{pt}\}) \mid (init_{pt}\{\mathbf{t}_B/Id_{pt}\} \cdot P_{pt}\{\mathbf{t}_B/Id_{pt}\})]. \end{aligned}$$

**Definition 15** (strong patient untraceability [ACRR10]). *A well-formed e-health protocol  $P_{eh}$  with a patient role  $R_{pt}$  being the  $j^{\text{th}}$  role, satisfies strong doctor untraceability, if*

$$P_{eh} \approx_{\ell} \nu \widetilde{mc}.init.(!R_1 \mid \dots \mid !R_{j-1} \mid !R_{j+1} \mid !R_n \mid (\nu Id_{pt}.init_{pt}.P_{pt})).$$

Strong (doctor/patient) anonymity is stronger than (doctor/patient) anonymity, as the two processes (left-hand side and right hand side of the equivalence) in (doctor/patient) anonymity are instances of the two processes in strong (doctor/patient) anonymity respectively. Hence, if a protocol satisfies strong (doctor/patient) anonymity, it also satisfies (doctor/patient) anonymity. It is evidenced by that the DLV08 protocol (see Section 4) satisfies doctor anonymity (without doctor ID revealed), but does not satisfy strong doctor anonymity.

Once again, the strong notions of doctor/patient untraceability are stronger than the standard doctor/patient untraceability (see  $R_6$  and  $R_7$ , respectively, in Figure 6). The proof is again analogous to the proof showing strong doctor anonymity is stronger than doctor anonymity.

Finally, note that the strong versions of anonymity are not comparable to the strong versions of untraceability (e.g. strong patient anonymity is not comparable to strong patient untraceability). Strong anonymity and strong untraceability capture different aspects of privacy – anonymity focuses on the link between participants and their identities, whereas untraceability focuses on the link between sessions of a participant. This is supported by the case study in Section 4 where the strong doctor anonymity and strong doctor untraceability fail due to different reasons – the model




Figure 6: Relations between privacy properties

where strong doctor anonymity is satisfied, does not satisfy strong doctor untraceability, and vice versa.

Similarly, prescription privacy and doctor anonymity are not comparable either. Doctor anonymity aims to protect the doctor identity whereas prescription privacy aims to protect the link between a doctor’s identity and his prescriptions. For instance, a system in which there is one doctor may satisfy doctor anonymity, if that the doctor’s identity is perfectly protected. However, the system would not satisfy prescription privacy, since there is no counter-balancing doctor.

Conversely, consider a system where two doctors send out their public keys over public channels and afterwards each doctor sends one prescription via a private channel to the trusted authority, who finally outputs both prescriptions. Such a system may satisfy prescription privacy, due to the assumptions of private channel and trusted authority. That is: on the left hand side of the equation in Definition 3, the adversary observes two public keys followed by two prescriptions; on the right hand side, the adversary observes exactly the same. But this system does not satisfy anonymity since the adversary can block communication of participants in  $C_{eh}$  and observe the public channel – on the left hand side of the equation in Definition 8, the adversary observes the public key of  $d_A$ , while on the right hand side, the adversary observes the public key of  $d_B$ .

## 4 Case study: the DLV08 protocol

In this section, we apply the above formal definitions for doctor privacy in a case study as a validation of the definitions. We choose to analyse the DLV08 e-health protocol proposed by De Decker et al. [dDLVV08], as it claims enforced privacy for doctors. However, our analysis is not restricted to doctor privacy. We provide a rather complete analysis of the protocol including patient anonymity, patient untraceability, patient/doctor information secrecy and patient/doctor authentication as well. The ProVerif code used to perform this analysis is available from [DJP12a].

The DLV08 protocol is a complex health care protocol for the Belgium situation. It captures most aspects of the current Belgian health care practice and aims to provide a strong guarantee of privacy for patients and doctors. Our analysis of this protocol focuses on the below properties. For those that are explicitly claimed by DLV08, the corresponding claim identifier in that paper is given. In addition to those, we analyse secrecy, prescription privacy, receipt-freeness, and independency of receipt-freeness, which are implicitly mentioned.

- Secrecy of patient and doctor information: no other party should be able to know a patient or a doctor’s information, unless the information is intended to be revealed in the protocol (for formal definitions, see Section 6.1 and Section 6.2).

- Authentication ([dDLVV08]: S1): all parties should properly authenticate each other (for formal definitions, see Section 6.1 and Section 6.3).
- Patient anonymity ([dDLVV08]: P3): no party should be able to determine a patient’s identity.
- Patient untraceability ([dDLVV08]: P2): prescriptions issued to the same patient should not be linkable to each other.
- Prescription privacy: the protocol protects a doctor’s prescription behaviour.
- Receipt-freeness: the protocol prevents bribery between doctors and pharmaceutical companies.
- Independency of prescription privacy ([dDLVV08]: P4): pharmacists should not be able to provide evidence to pharmaceutical companies about doctors’ prescription.
- Independency of receipt-freeness: pharmacists should not be able to provide evidence to pharmaceutical companies about doctors’ prescription even if the doctor is bribed.

The rest of this section describes the DLV08 protocol in more detail.

## 4.1 Roles

The protocol involves seven roles. We focus on the five roles involved in the core process: doctor, patient, pharmacist, medicine prescription administrator (MPA) and health insurance institute (HII). The other two roles, public safety organisation (PSO) and social security organisation (SSO), provide properties such as revocability and reimbursement. As we do not focus on these properties, and as these roles are only tangentially involved in the core process, we omit these roles from our model.

The roles interact as follows: a doctor prescribes medicine to a patient; next the patient obtains medicine from a pharmacist according to the prescription; following that, the pharmacist forwards the prescription to his MPA, the MPA checks the prescription and refunds the pharmacist; finally, the MPA sends invoices to the patient’s HII and is refunded.

## 4.2 Cryptographic primitives

To ensure security and privacy properties, the DLV08 protocol employs several specific cryptographic primitives, besides the classical ones, like encryption. We briefly introduce these cryptographic primitives.

**Bit-commitments.** The bit-commitments scheme consists of two phases, committing phase and opening phase. On the committing phase, a message sender commits to a message. This can be considered as putting the message into a box, and sending the box to the receiver. Later in the opening phase, the sender sends the key of the box to the receiver. The receiver opens the box and obtains the message.

**Zero-knowledge proofs.** A zero-knowledge proof is a cryptographic scheme which is used by one party (prover) to prove to another party (verifier) that a statement is true, without leaking secret information of the prover. A zero-knowledge proof scheme may be either interactive or non-interactive. We consider non-interactive zero-knowledge proofs in this protocol.

**Digital credentials.** A digital credential is a certificate, proving that the holder satisfies certain requirements. Unlike paper certificates (such as passports) which give out the owner’s identity, a digital credential can be used to authenticate the owner anonymously. For example, a digital credential can be used to prove that a driver is old enough to drive without revealing the actual age of the driver.

**Anonymous authentication.** Anonymous authentication is a scheme for authenticating a user anonymously, e.g., [BCKL08]. The procedure of anonymous authentication is actually a zero-knowledge proof, with the digital credential being the public information of the prover. In the scheme, a user’s digital credential is used as the public key in a public key authentication structure. Using this, a verifier can check whether a message is signed correctly by the prover (the person authenticating himself), while the verifier cannot identify the prover. Thus, this ensures anonymous authentication.

**Verifiable encryptions.** Verifiable encryption is based on zero-knowledge proofs as well. A prover encrypts a message, and uses zero-knowledge proofs to prove that the encrypted message satisfies specific properties without revealing the original message.

**Signed proofs of knowledge.** Signed proofs of knowledge provide a way of using proofs of knowledge as a digital signature scheme (cf. [Bra00]). Intuitively, a prover signs a message using secret information, which can be considered as a secret signing key. The prover can convince the verifier using proofs of knowledge only if the prover has the right secret key. Thus it proves the origination of the message.

### 4.3 Setting

The initial information available to a participant is as follows.

- A doctor has an identity ( $\text{Id}_{dr}$ ), a pseudonym ( $\text{Pnym}_{dr}$ ), and an anonymous doctor credential ( $\text{Cred}_{dr}$ ) issued by trusted authorities.
- A patient has an identity ( $\text{Id}_{pt}$ ), a pseudonym ( $\text{Pnym}_{pt}$ ), an HII ( $\text{Hii}$ ), a social security status ( $\text{Sss}$ ), a health expense account ( $\text{Acc}$ ) and an anonymous patient credential ( $\text{Cred}_{pt}$ ) issued by trusted authorities.
- Pharmacists, MPA, and HII are public entities, each of which has an identity ( $\text{Id}_{ph}$ ,  $\text{Id}_{mpa}$ ,  $\text{Id}_{hii}$ ), a secret key ( $\text{sk}_{ph}$ ,  $\text{sk}_{mpa}$ ,  $\text{sk}_{hii}$ ) and an authorised public key certificate ( $\text{pk}_{ph}$ ,  $\text{pk}_{mpa}$ ,  $\text{pk}_{hii}$ ) issued by trusted authorities.

We assume that a user does not take two roles with the same identity. Hence, one user taking two roles are considered as two individual users.

### 4.4 Description of the protocol

The DLV08 protocol consists of four sub-protocols: doctor-patient sub-protocol, patient-pharmacist sub-protocol, pharmacist-MPA sub-protocol, and MPA-HII sub-protocol. We describe the sub-protocols one by one.

#### 4.4.1 Doctor-patient sub-protocol

The doctor authenticates himself to a patient by anonymous authentication with the authorised doctor credential as public information. The patient verifies the doctor credential. If the verification passes, the patient anonymously authenticates himself to the doctor using the patient credential, sends the bit-commitments on his identity to the doctor, and proves to the doctor that the identity used in the credential is the same as in the bit-commitments. After verifying the patient credential, the doctor generates a prescription, computes a prescription identity, computes the doctor bit-commitments. Then the doctor combines these computed messages with the received patient bit-commitments; signs these messages using a signed proof of knowledge, which proves that the doctor’s pseudonym used in the doctor credential is the same as in the doctor bit-commitments. Together with the proof, the doctor sends the opening information, which is used to open the doctor bit-commitments. The communication in the doctor-patient sub-protocol is shown as a message sequence chart (MSC, [MB01]) in Figure 7.




Figure 7: Doctor-Patient sub-protocol.

#### 4.4.2 Patient-Pharmacist sub-protocol

The pharmacist authenticates himself to the patient using public key authentication. The patient verifies the authentication and obtains, from the authentication, the pharmacist's identity and the pharmacist's MPA. Then the patient anonymously authenticates himself to the pharmacist, and proves his social security status. Next, the patient computes verifiable encryptions  $vc_1, vc_2, vc_3, vc'_3, vc_4, vc_5$ , where

- $vc_1$  encrypts the patient's HII using the MPA's public key and proves that the HII encrypted in  $vc_1$  is the same as the one in the patient's credential.
- $vc_2$  encrypts the doctor's pseudonym using the MPA's public key and proves that the doctor's pseudonym encrypted in  $vc_2$  is the same as the one in the doctor commitment embedded in the prescription.
- $vc_3$  encrypts the patient's pseudonym using the public safety organisation's public key and proves that the pseudonym encrypted in  $vc_3$  is the same as the one in the patient's commitment.
- $vc'_3$  encrypts the patient's HII using the social security organisation's public key and proves that the content encrypted in  $vc'_3$  is the same as the HII in the patient's credential.
- $vc_4$  encrypts the patient's pseudonym using the MPA's public key and proves that the patient's pseudonym encrypted in  $vc_4$  is the same as the one in the patient's credential.




Figure 8: Patient-Pharmacist sub-protocol.

- $vc_5$  encrypts the patient's pseudonym using his HII's public key and proves that the patient's pseudonym encrypted in  $vc_5$  is the same as the one in the patient's credential.
- $c_5$  encrypts  $vc_5$  using the MPA's public key.

The patient sends the received prescription to the pharmacist and proves to the pharmacist that the patient's identity in the prescription is the same as in the patient credential. The patient sends  $vc_1, vc_2, vc_3, vc'_3, vc_4, c_5$  as well. The pharmacist verifies the correctness of all the received messages. If every message is correctly formatted, the pharmacist charges the patient, and delivers the medicine. Then the pharmacist generates an invoice and sends it to the patient. The patient computes a receipt *ReceiptAck*: signing a message (consists of the prescription identity, the pharmacist's identity,  $vc_1, vc_2, vc_3, vc'_3, vc_4, vc_5$ ) using a signed proof of knowledge and proving that he knows the patient credential. This receipt proves that the patient has received his medicine. The pharmacist verifies the correctness of the receipt. The communication in the patient-Pharmacist sub-protocol is shown in Figure 8. Since the payment and medicine delivery procedures are out of the protocol scope, they are interpreted as dashed arrows in the figure.




Figure 9: Pharmacist-MPA sub-protocol.

#### 4.4.3 Pharmacist-MPA sub-protocol

The pharmacist and the MPA first authenticate each other using public key authentication. Next, the pharmacist sends the received prescription and the receipt *ReceiptAck*, together with  $vc_1$ ,  $vc_2$ ,  $vc_3$ ,  $vc_3'$ ,  $vc_4$ ,  $c_5$ , to the MPA. The MPA verifies correctness of the received information. Then the MPA decrypts  $vc_1$ ,  $vc_2$ ,  $vc_4$  and  $c_5$ , which provide the patient's HII, the doctor's pseudonym, the patient's pseudonym, and  $vc_5$ . The communication in the pharmacist-MPA sub-protocol is shown in Figure 9. Note that after authentication, two parties often establish a secure communication channel. However, it is not mentioned in [dDLVV08] that the pharmacist and the MPA agree on anything. Nevertheless, this does not affect the properties that we verified, except authentication between pharmacist and MPA.

#### 4.4.4 MPA-HII sub-protocol

The MPA and the patient's HII first authenticate each other using public key authentication. Then the MPA sends the receipt *ReceiptAck* to the patient's HII as well as the verifiable encryption  $vc_5$  which encrypts the patient's pseudonym with the patient's HII's public key. The patient's HII checks the correctness of *ReceiptAck*, decrypts  $vc_5$  and obtains the patient's pseudonym. From the patient pseudonym, the HII obtains the identity of the patient; then updates the patient's account and pays the MPA. The MPA pays the pharmacist when he receives the payment. The communication in the MPA-HII sub-protocol is shown in Figure 10. Similar to the previous sub-protocol, there is nothing established during the authentication which can be used in the later message exchanges. Note that in addition to authentications between MPA and HII, this affects the secrecy of a patient's pseudonym when the adversary controls dishonest patients (see Section 6.9.1).




Figure 10: MPA-HII sub-protocol.

## 5 Modelling DLV08

We model the DLV08 protocol in the applied pi calculus as introduced in Section 3.1. For clarity, we also borrow some syntactic expressions from ProVerif, such as key words ‘*fun*’, ‘*private fun*’, ‘*reduc*’ and ‘*equation*’, and expression ‘let  $x = N$  in  $P$ ’. Particularly, ‘(*private*) *fun*’ denotes a constructor which uses terms to form a more complex term (‘*private*’ means the adversary cannot use it). ‘*reduc*’ and ‘*equation*’ are key words used to construct the equational theory  $E$ . ‘*reduc*’ denotes a destructor which retrieves sub-terms of a constructed term. For the cryptographic primitives that cannot be captured by destructors, ProVerif provides ‘*equation*’ to capture the relationship between constructors. The expression ‘let  $x = N$  in  $P$ ’ is used as syntactical substitutions, i.e.,  $P\{N/x\}$  in the applied pi calculus. It is an abbreviation of ‘let  $x = N$  in  $P$  else  $Q$ ’ when  $Q$  is the null process. When  $N$  is a destructor, there are two possible outcomes. If the term  $N$  does not fail, then  $x$  is bound to  $N$  and process  $P$  is taken, otherwise  $Q$  (in this case, the null process) is taken.

Since the description of the protocol in its original paper is not clear in some details, before modelling the protocol, several ambiguities need to be settled (Section 5.1). Next we explain the modelling of the cryptographic primitives (Section 5.2), since security and privacy rely heavily on these cryptographic primitives in the protocol. Then, we illustrate the modelling of the protocol (Section 5.3).

### 5.1 Underspecification of the DLV08 protocol

The DLV08 protocol leaves the following issues unspecified:

- a1:** whether a zero-knowledge proof is transferable;
- a2:** whether an encryption is probabilistic;
- a3:** whether a patient/doctor uses a fresh identity and/or pseudonym for each session;
- a4:** whether credentials are freshly generated in each session;
- a5:** what a patient's social security status is and how it can be modified;
- a6:** how many HIIs exist and whether a patient can change his HII;
- a7:** whether a patient/doctor can obtain a credential by requesting one;
- a8:** what type of communication channels are used (public or untappable).

To be able to discover potential flaws on privacy, we make the following (weakest) assumptions in our modelling of the DLV08 protocol:

- s1:** the zero-knowledge proofs used are non-interactive and transferable;
- s2:** encryptions are not probabilistic;
- s3:** a patient/doctor uses the same identity and pseudonym in every session;
- s4:** a patient/doctor has the same credential in every session;
- s5:** a patient's social security status is the same in every session;
- s6:** there are many HIIs, different patients may have different HIIs, and a patient's HII is fixed and cannot be changed;
- s7:** a patient/doctor's credential can be obtained by requesting one;
- s8:** the communication channels are public.

Note that some assumptions may look weak to security experts, for example the assumption of deterministic encryption. However, without explicit warning, deterministic encryption algorithms may be used, which will lead to security flaws. With this in mind, we assume the weakest assumption when there is ambiguity. By assuming weak assumptions and showing the security flaws with the assumptions, we provide security warnings for the implementation of the protocol.

## 5.2 Modelling cryptographic primitives

The cryptographic primitives are modelled in the applied pi calculus using function symbols and equations. All functions and equational theory are summarised in Figures 11, 12 and 13.

<i>fun</i> true/0.	<i>fun</i> hash/3.	<i>fun</i> pk/1.	<i>fun</i> enc/2.
<i>fun</i> commit/2.	<i>fun</i> sign/2.	<i>fun</i> zk/2.	<i>fun</i> spk/3.
<i>fun</i> invoice/1.	<i>fun</i> key/1.	<i>fun</i> host/1.	
	<i>private fun</i> dcred/2.	<i>private fun</i> pcred/5.	

Figure 11: Functions.

<i>reduc</i> dec(enc( $m$ , pk( $sk$ )), $sk$ ) = $m$ .	(*asymmetric encryption*)
<i>reduc</i> open(commit( $x$ , $y$ ), $y$ ) = $x$ .	(*bit commitments*)
<i>reduc</i> Vfy-sign(sign( $x$ , $y$ ), pk( $y$ )) = true.	(*signature verification*)
<i>reduc</i> getsignmsg(sign( $x$ , $y$ ), pk( $y$ )) = $x$ .	(*message from signature*)
<i>reduc</i> getpublic(zk( $x$ , $y$ )) = $y$ .	(*public part of ZK*)
<i>reduc</i> getmsg(spk( $x$ , $y$ , $z$ )) = $z$ .	(*message of SPK*)
<i>reduc</i> getSpkVinfo(spk( $x$ , $y$ , $z$ )) = $y$ .	(*public part of SPK*)
<i>equation</i> key(host( $x$ )) = $x$ .	(*an identity has a unique public key*)
<i>equation</i> host(key( $x$ )) = $x$ .	(*a public key belongs to a unique identity*)

Figure 12: Equational theory part I: non-zero-knowledge part.

<i>reduc</i>	$\text{Vfy-zk}_{\text{Auth}_{dr}}(\text{zk}((\text{Pnym}_{dr}, \text{Id}_{dr}), \text{drcred}(\text{Pnym}_{dr}, \text{Id}_{dr})), \text{drcred}(\text{Pnym}_{dr}, \text{Id}_{dr})) = \text{true}.$
<i>reduc</i>	$\text{Vfy-zk}_{\text{Auth}_{pt}}(\text{zk}((\text{Id}_{pt}, \text{Pnym}_{pt}, \text{Hii}, \text{Sss}, \text{Acc}), \text{ptcred}(\text{Id}_{pt}, \text{Pnym}_{pt}, \text{Hii}, \text{Sss}, \text{Acc})), \text{ptcred}(\text{Id}_{pt}, \text{Pnym}_{pt}, \text{Hii}, \text{Sss}, \text{Acc})) = \text{true}.$
<i>reduc</i>	$\text{Vfy-zk}_{\text{PtProof}}(\text{zk}((\text{Id}_{pt}, \text{Pnym}_{pt}, \text{Hii}, \text{Sss}, \text{Acc}), (\text{commit}(\text{Id}_{pt}, \mathbf{r}_{pt}), \text{ptcred}(\text{Id}_{pt}, \text{Pnym}_{pt}, \text{Hii}, \text{Sss}, \text{Acc}))), \text{commit}(\text{Id}_{pt}, \mathbf{r}_{pt}), \text{ptcred}(\text{Id}_{pt}, \text{Pnym}_{pt}, \text{Hii}, \text{Sss}, \text{Acc})) = \text{true}.$
<i>reduc</i>	$\text{Vfy-spK}_{\text{PrescProof}}(\text{spk}((\text{Pnym}_{dr}, \mathbf{r}_{dr}, \text{Id}_{dr}), (\text{commit}(\text{Pnym}_{dr}, \mathbf{r}_{dr}), \text{drcred}(\text{Pnym}_{dr}, \text{Id}_{dr})), (\text{presc}, \text{PrescriptID}, \text{commit}(\text{Pnym}_{dr}, \mathbf{r}_{dr}), \text{commit}(\text{Id}_{pt}, \mathbf{r}_{pt}))), \text{drcred}(\text{Pnym}_{dr}, \text{Id}_{dr}), \text{presc}, \text{PrescriptID}, \text{commit}(\text{Pnym}_{dr}, \mathbf{r}_{dr}), \text{commit}(\text{Id}_{pt}, \mathbf{r}_{pt})) = \text{true}.$
<i>reduc</i>	$\text{Vfy-zk}_{\text{PtAuthSss}}(\text{zk}((\text{Id}_{pt}, \text{Pnym}_{pt}, \text{Hii}, \text{Sss}, \text{Acc}), (\text{ptcred}(\text{Id}_{pt}, \text{Pnym}_{pt}, \text{Hii}, \text{Sss}, \text{Acc}), \text{Sss}), \text{ptcred}(\text{Id}_{pt}, \text{Pnym}_{pt}, \text{Hii}, \text{Sss}, \text{Acc}), \text{Sss})) = \text{true}.$
<i>reduc</i>	$\text{Vfy-spK}_{\text{PtSpk}}(\text{spk}((\text{Id}_{pt}, \text{Pnym}_{pt}, \text{Hii}, \text{Sss}, \text{Acc}, \mathbf{r}_{pt}), (\text{ptcred}(\text{Id}_{pt}, \text{Pnym}_{pt}, \text{Hii}, \text{Sss}, \text{Acc}), \text{commit}(\text{Id}_{pt}, \mathbf{r}_{pt})), \text{nonce}), \text{ptcred}(\text{Id}_{pt}, \text{Pnym}_{pt}, \text{Hii}, \text{Sss}, \text{Acc}), \text{commit}(\text{Id}_{pt}, \mathbf{r}_{pt}), \text{nonce}) = \text{true}.$
<i>reduc</i>	$\text{Vfy-enc}_{\text{Hii}}(\text{zk}((\text{Id}_{pt}, \text{Pnym}_{pt}, \text{Hii}, \text{Sss}, \text{Acc}), (\text{ptcred}(\text{Id}_{pt}, \text{Pnym}_{pt}, \text{Hii}, \text{Sss}, \text{Acc}), \text{enc}(\text{Hii}, \mathbf{pk}_x))), \text{ptcred}(\text{Id}_{pt}, \text{Pnym}_{pt}, \text{Hii}, \text{Sss}, \text{Acc}), \text{enc}(\text{Hii}, \mathbf{pk}_x), \mathbf{pk}_x) = \text{true}.$
<i>reduc</i>	$\text{Vfy-enc}_{\text{DrnymMpa}}(\text{zk}((\text{Pnym}_{dr}, \mathbf{r}_{dr}), (\text{spk}((\text{Pnym}_{dr}, \mathbf{r}_{dr}, \text{Id}_{dr}), (\text{commit}(\text{Pnym}_{dr}, \mathbf{r}_{dr}), \text{drcred}(\text{Pnym}_{dr}, \text{Id}_{dr})), (\text{presc}, \text{PrescriptID}, \text{commit}(\text{Pnym}_{dr}, \mathbf{r}_{dr}), \text{c}_{ph-Comt_{pt}})), \text{enc}(\text{Pnym}_{dr}, \mathbf{pk}_x))), \text{spk}((\text{Pnym}_{dr}, \mathbf{r}_{dr}, \text{Id}_{dr}), (\text{commit}(\text{Pnym}_{dr}, \mathbf{r}_{dr}), \text{drcred}(\text{Pnym}_{dr}, \text{Id}_{dr})), (\text{presc}, \text{PrescriptID}, \text{commit}(\text{Pnym}_{dr}, \mathbf{r}_{dr}), \text{c}_{ph-Comt_{pt}})), \text{enc}(\text{Pnym}_{dr}, \mathbf{pk}_x), \mathbf{pk}_x) = \text{true}.$
<i>reduc</i>	$\text{Vfy-enc}_{\text{Ptnym}}(\text{zk}((\text{Id}_{pt}, \text{Pnym}_{pt}, \text{Hii}, \text{Sss}, \text{Acc}), (\text{ptcred}(\text{Id}_{pt}, \text{Pnym}_{pt}, \text{Hii}, \text{Sss}, \text{Acc}), \text{enc}(\text{Pnym}_{pt}, \mathbf{pk}_x))), \text{ptcred}(\text{Id}_{pt}, \text{Pnym}_{pt}, \text{Hii}, \text{Sss}, \text{Acc}), \text{enc}(\text{Pnym}_{pt}, \mathbf{pk}_x), \mathbf{pk}_x) = \text{true}.$
<i>reduc</i>	$\text{Vfy-spK}_{\text{ReceiptAck}}(\text{spk}((\text{Id}_{pt}, \text{Pnym}_{pt}, \text{Hii}, \text{Sss}, \text{Acc}), \text{ptcred}(\text{Id}_{pt}, \text{Pnym}_{pt}, \text{Hii}, \text{Sss}, \text{Acc}), (\text{c-} \text{PrescriptID}, \text{c}_{pt-Id_{ph}}, \text{vc}_1, \text{vc}_2, \text{vc}_3, \text{vc}'_3, \text{vc}_4, \text{c}_5)), \text{ptcred}(\text{Id}_{pt}, \text{Pnym}_{pt}, \text{Hii}, \text{Sss}, \text{Acc}), \text{c-} \text{PrescriptID}, \text{c}_{pt-Id_{ph}}, \text{vc}_1, \text{vc}_2, \text{vc}_3, \text{vc}'_3, \text{vc}_4, \text{c}_5) = \text{true}.$

Figure 13: Equational theory part II: zero-knowledge part.

**Bit-commitments.** The bit-commitments scheme is modelled as two functions: `commit`, modelling the committing phase, and `open`, modelling the opening phase. The function `commit` creates a commitment with two parameters: a message  $m$  and a random number  $r$ . A commitment can only be opened with the correct opening information  $r$ , in which case the message  $m$  is revealed.

```

fun    commit/2.
reduc  open(commit(m, r), r) = m.

```

**Zero-knowledge proofs.** Non-interactive zero-knowledge proofs can be modelled as function `zk`( $secrets, pub\_info$ ) inspired by [BMU08]. The public verification information  $pub\_info$  and the secret information  $secrets$  satisfy a pre-specified relation. Since the secret information is only known by the prover, only the prover can construct the zero-knowledge proof. To verify a zero-knowledge proof is to check whether the relation between the secret information and the verification information is satisfied. Verification of a zero-knowledge proof is modelled as function `Vfy-zk`(`zk`( $secrets, pub\_info$ ),  $verif\_info$ ), with a zero-knowledge proof to be verified `zk`( $secrets, pub\_info$ ) and the verification information  $verif\_info$ . Compared to the more generic definitions in [BMU08], we define each zero-knowledge proof specifically, as only a limited number of zero-knowledge proofs are used in the protocol. We specify each verification rule in Figure 13. Since the  $pub\_info$  and  $verif\_info$  happen to be the same in all the zero-knowledge proofs verifications in this protocol, the generic structure of verification rule is given as

$$\text{Vfy-zk}(\text{zk}(secrets, pub\_info), pub\_info) = \text{true},$$

where `true` is a constant. The specific function to check a zero-knowledge proof of type  $z$  is denoted as `Vfy-zkz`, e.g., verification of a patient’s anonymous authentication modelled by function `Vfy-zkAuthpt`.

**Digital credentials.** A digital credential is issued by trusted authorities. We assume the procedure of issuing a credential is perfect, which means that the adversary cannot forge a credential nor obtain one by impersonation. We model digital credentials as a private function (declared by key word *private fun* in ProVerif) which is only usable by honest users. In the DLV08 protocol, a credential can have several attributes; we model these as parameters of the credential function.

```

private fun drcred/2.    private fun ptcred/5.

```

There are two credentials in the DLV08 protocol: a doctor credential which is modelled as  $Cred_{dr} := \text{drcred}(\text{Pnym}_{dr}, \text{Id}_{dr})$ , and a patient credential which is modelled as  $Cred_{pt} := \text{ptcred}(\text{Id}_{pt}, \text{Pnym}_{pt}, \text{Hii}, \text{Sss}, \text{Acc})$ . Unlike private data, the two private functions cannot be coerced, meaning that even by coercing, the adversary cannot apply the private functions. Because a doctor having an anonymous credentials is a basic setting of the protocol, and thus the procedure of obtaining a credential is not assumed to be bribed or coerced. However, the adversary can coerce patients or doctors for the credentials and parameters of the private functions.

**Anonymous authentication.** The procedure of anonymous authentication is a zero-knowledge proof using the digital credential as public information. The anonymous authentication of a doctor is modelled as

$$\text{Auth}_{dr} := \text{zk}((\text{Pnym}_{dr}, \text{Id}_{dr}), \text{drcred}(\text{Pnym}_{dr}, \text{Id}_{dr})),$$

and the verification of the authentication is modelled as

$$\text{Vfy-zk}_{\text{Auth}_{dr}}(\text{Auth}_{dr}, \text{drcred}(\text{Pnym}_{dr}, \text{Id}_{dr})).$$

The equational theory for the verification is

$$\text{reduc } \text{Vfy-zk}_{\text{Auth}_{dr}}(\text{zk}((\text{Pnym}_{dr}, \text{Id}_{dr}), \text{drcred}(\text{Pnym}_{dr}, \text{Id}_{dr})), \text{drcred}(\text{Pnym}_{dr}, \text{Id}_{dr})) = \text{true}.$$

The verification implies that the creator of the authentication is a doctor who has the credential  $\text{drcred}(\text{Pnym}_{dr}, \text{Id}_{dr})$ . Because only legitimate doctors can obtain a credential from authorities, i.e., use the function  $\text{drcred}$  to create a credential; and the correspondence between the parameters of the anonymous authentication (the first parameter  $(\text{Pnym}_{dr}, \text{Id}_{dr})$  in  $\text{Auth}_{dr}$ ) and the parameters of the credential (parameters  $\text{Pnym}_{dr}$  and  $\text{Id}_{dr}$  in  $\text{drcred}(\text{Pnym}_{dr}, \text{Id}_{dr})$ ) ensures that the prover can only be the owner of the credential. Other doctors may be able to use function  $\text{drcred}$  but do not know  $\text{Pnym}_{dr}$  and  $\text{Id}_{dr}$ , and thus cannot create a valid proof. The adversary can observe a credential  $\text{drcred}(\text{Pnym}_{dr}, \text{Id}_{dr})$ , but does not know secrets  $\text{Pnym}_{dr}, \text{Id}_{dr}$ , and thus cannot forge a valid zero-knowledge proof. If the adversary forges a zero-knowledge proof with fake secret information  $\text{Pnym}_{dr}'$  and  $\text{Id}_{dr}'$ , the fake zero-knowledge proof will not pass verification. For the same reason, a validated proof proves that the credential belongs to the creator of the zero-knowledge proof. Similarly, an anonymous authentication of a patient is modelled as

$$\text{Auth}_{pt} := \text{zk}((\text{Id}_{pt}, \text{Pnym}_{pt}, \text{Hii}, \text{Sss}, \text{Acc}), \text{ptcred}(\text{Id}_{pt}, \text{Pnym}_{pt}, \text{Hii}, \text{Sss}, \text{Acc})),$$

and the verification rule is modelled as

$$\begin{aligned} \text{reduc } \text{Vfy-zk}_{\text{Auth}_{pt}} & (\text{zk}((\text{Id}_{pt}, \text{Pnym}_{pt}, \text{Hii}, \text{Sss}, \text{Acc}), \\ & \text{ptcred}(\text{Id}_{pt}, \text{Pnym}_{pt}, \text{Hii}, \text{Sss}, \text{Acc})), \\ & \text{ptcred}(\text{Id}_{pt}, \text{Pnym}_{pt}, \text{Hii}, \text{Sss}, \text{Acc})) = \text{true}. \end{aligned}$$

**Verifiable encryptions.** A verifiable encryption is modelled as a zero-knowledge proof. The encryption is embedded in the zero-knowledge proof as public information. The receiver can obtain the cipher text from the proof. For example, assume a patient wants to prove that he has encrypted a secret  $s$  using a public key  $k$  to a pharmacist, while the pharmacist does not know the corresponding secret key for  $k$ . The pharmacist cannot open the cipher text to test whether it uses the public key  $k$  for encryption. However, the zero-knowledge proof can prove that the cipher text is encrypted using  $k$ , while not revealing the secret  $s$ . The general structure of the verification of a verifiable encryption is

$$\text{Vfy-venc}(\text{zk}(\text{secrets}, (\text{pub\_info}, \text{cipher})), \text{verif\_info}) = \text{true},$$

where  $\text{secrets}$  is private information,  $\text{pub\_info}$  and  $\text{cipher}$  consist public information,  $\text{verif\_info}$  is the verification information.

**Signed proofs of knowledge.** A signed proof of knowledge is a scheme which signs a message, and proves a property of the signer. For the DLV08 protocol, this proof only concerns equality of attributes of credentials and commitments (e.g., the identity of this credential is the same as the identity of that commitment). To verify a signed proof of knowledge, the verifier must know which credentials/commitments are considered. Hence, this information must be obtainable from the proof, and thus is included in the model. In general, a signed proof of knowledge is modelled as function

$$\text{spk}(\text{secrets}, \text{pub\_info}, \text{msg}),$$

which models a signature using private value(s)  $\text{secrets}$  on the message  $\text{msg}$ , with public information  $\text{pub\_info}$  as settings. Similar to zero-knowledge proofs,  $\text{secrets}$  and  $\text{pub\_info}$  satisfy a pre-specified relation.  $\text{msg}$  can be any message. What knowledge is proven, depends on the specific instance of the proof and is captured by the verification functions for the specific proofs. For example, to prove that a user knows (a) all fields of a (simplified) credential, (b) all fields of a commitment to an identity, and (c) that the credential concerns the same identity as the commitment, he generates the following proof:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{spk}((\text{Id}_{pt}, \text{Pnym}_{pt}, \mathbf{r}_{pt}), & \quad (*\text{secrets}*) \\ (\text{ptcred}(\text{Id}_{pt}, \text{Pnym}_{pt}), \text{commit}(\text{Id}_{pt}, \mathbf{r}_{pt})), & \quad (*\text{public\_info}*) \\ \text{msg}). & \quad (*\text{message}*) \end{aligned}$$

These proofs are verified by checking that the signature is correct, given the signed message and the verification information. E.g., the above example proof can be verified as follows:

```

reduc Vfy-spk(spk((Idpt, Pnympt, rpt),
                  (ptcred(Idpt, Pnympt), commit(Idpt, rpt))),
              msg ), (*signed_message*)
  ( ptcred(Idpt, Pnympt), commit(Idpt, rpt) ), (*verify_info*)
  msg (*message*)
) = true.

```

**Other cryptographic primitives.** Hash functions, encryptions and signing messages are modelled by functions `hash`, `enc`, and `sign`, respectively (see Figure 11). Correspondingly, decryption, verifying a signature and retrieving the message from a signature are modelled as functions `dec`, `Vfy-sign` and `getsignmsg` (see Figure 12). Function `pk` models the corresponding public key of a secret key, and function `invoice` is used for a pharmacist to generate an invoice for a patient (see Figure 11). Functions `getpublic`, `getSpkVinfo` and `getmsg` model retrieving public information from a zero-knowledge proof, from a signed proof of knowledge, and obtaining the message from a signed proof of knowledge, respectively (see Figure 12). Function `key` models the public key of a user's identity and function `host` retrieves the owner's identity from a public key (see Figure 12).

### 5.3 Modelling the DLV08 protocol

We first show how to model each of the sub-protocols and then how to compose them to form the full DLV08 protocol.

**Modelling the doctor-patient sub-protocol.** This sub-protocol is used for a doctor, whose steps are labelled **di** in Figure 14, to prescribe medicine for a patient, whose steps are labelled **ti** in Figure 15.

```

Pdr :=
d1. out(ch, zk((Pnymdr, Iddr), drcred(Pnymdr, Iddr))).
d2. in(ch, (rcvAuthpt, rcvPtProof)).
d3. let cCredpt = getpublic(rcvAuthpt) in
d4. let (cComtpt, = cCredpt) = getpublic(rcvPtProof) in
d5. if Vfy-zkAuthpt(rcvAuthpt, cCredpt) = true then
d6. if Vfy-zkPtProof(rcvPtProof, (cComtpt, cCredpt)) = true then
d7. vpresc.
d8. v rdr.
d9. let PrescriptID = hash(presc, cComtpt, commit(Pnymdr, rdr)) in
d10. out(ch, (spk((Pnymdr, rdr, Iddr),
                (commit(Pnymdr, rdr), drcred(Pnymdr, Iddr)),
                (presc, PrescriptID, commit(Pnymdr, rdr), cComtpt)),
                rdr))

```

Figure 14: The doctor process  $P_{dr}$ .

First, the doctor anonymously authenticates to the patient using credential  $Cred_{dr}$  (**d1**). The patient reads in the doctor authentication (**t1**), obtains the doctor credential (**t2**), and verifies the authentication (**t3**). If the verification in step (**t3**) succeeds, the patient anonymously authenticates himself to the doctor using his credential (**t5**, the first `zk` function), generates a nonce  $r_{pt}$  (**t4**), computes a commitment with the nonce as opening information, and proves that the patient identity used in the patient credential is the same as in the commitment, thus linking the patient commitment and the patient credential (**t5**, the second `zk`).

```

 $P'_{pt} :=$ 
t1.   in(ch,  $rcv\_Auth_{dr}$ ).
t2.   let  $c\_Cred_{dr} = \text{getpublic}(rcv\_Auth_{dr})$  in
t3.   if  $\text{Vfy-zk}_{Auth_{dr}}(rcv\_Auth_{dr}, c\_Cred_{dr}) = \text{true}$  then
t4.    $\nu r_{pt}$ .
t5.   out(ch, (zk(( $\text{Id}_{pt}, \text{Pnym}_{pt}, \text{Hii}, \text{Sss}, \text{Acc}$ ),
                pcred( $\text{Id}_{pt}, \text{Pnym}_{pt}, \text{Hii}, \text{Sss}, \text{Acc}$ )),
                zk(( $\text{Id}_{pt}, \text{Pnym}_{pt}, \text{Hii}, \text{Sss}, \text{Acc}$ ),
                  (commit( $\text{Id}_{pt}, r_{pt}$ ),
                    pcred( $\text{Id}_{pt}, \text{Pnym}_{pt}, \text{Hii}, \text{Sss}, \text{Acc}$ )))))).
t6.   in(ch, ( $rcv\_PrescProof, rcv\_r_{dr}$ )).
t7.   let ( $c\_presc, c\_PrescriptID, c\_Comt_{dr}, = \text{commit}(\text{Id}_{pt}, r_{pt})$ )
        = getmsg( $rcv\_PrescProof$ ) in
t8.   if  $\text{Vfy-spK}_{PrescProof}(rcv\_PrescProof, (c\_Cred_{dr}, c\_presc,$ 
         $c\_PrescriptID, c\_Comt_{dr}, \text{commit}(\text{Id}_{pt}, r_{pt}))) = \text{true}$  then
t9.   let  $c\_Pnym_{dr} = \text{open}(c\_Comt_{dr}, rcv\_r_{dr})$  in  $P''_{pt}$ 

```

Figure 15: The patient process in the doctor-patient sub-protocol  $P'_{pt}$ .

The doctor reads in the patient authentication as  $rcv\_Auth_{pt}$  and the patient proof as  $rcv\_PtProof$  (**d2**), obtains the patient credential from the patient authentication (**d3**), obtains the patient commitment  $c\_Comt_{pt}$  and the patient credential from the patient proof, tests whether the credential matches the one embedded in the patient authentication (**d4**), then verifies the authentication (**d5**) and the patient proof (**d6**). If the verification in the previous item succeeds, the doctor generates a prescription  $presc^1$  (**d7**), generates a nonce  $r_{dr}$  (**d8**), computes a prescription identity  $PrescriptID$  (**d9**), and computes a commitment  $Comt_{dr}$  using the nonce as opening information (**d10**). Next, the doctor signs the message ( $presc, PrescriptID, Comt_{dr}, c\_Comt_{pt}$ ) using a signed proof of knowledge. This proves the pseudonym used in the credential  $Cred_{dr}$  is the same as in the commitment  $Comt_{dr}$ , thus linking the prescription to the credential. The doctor sends the signed proof of knowledge together with the open information of the doctor commitment  $r_{dr}$  (**d10**).

The patient reads in the prescription as  $rcv\_PrescProof$  and the opening information of the doctor commitment (**t6**), obtains the prescription  $c\_presc$ , prescription identity  $c\_PrescriptID$ , doctor commitment  $c\_Comt_{dr}$ , and tests the patient commitment signed in the receiving message (**t7**). Then the patient verifies the signed proof of prescription (**t8**). If the verification succeeds, the patient obtains the doctor's pseudonym  $c\_Pnym_{dr}$  by opening the doctor commitment (**t9**) and continues the next sub-protocol behaving as in process  $P''_{pt}$ .

**Rationale for modelling of prescriptions.** In the description of DLV08 protocol [dDLVV08], it is unclear precisely what information is included in a prescription. Depending on the implementation, a prescription may contain various information, such as name of medicines prescribed, amount of medicine prescribed, the timestamp and organization that wrote the prescription, etc. Some information in the prescription may reveal privacy of patients and doctors. For instance, if the identities of patients and doctors are included in the prescription, then doctor and patient prescription privacy is trivially broken. In addition, both (doctor/patient) anonymity and untraceability would also be trivially broken, if the prescriptions were revealed to the adversary. In order to focus only on the logical flaws of the DLV08 protocol and exclude such dependencies, we assume that the prescriptions in the protocol are de-identified. However, this may not be sufficient. Doctors may e.g. be identifiable by the way they prescribe, the order in which medicine appear on prescriptions, etc. Such “fingerprinting” attacks would also trivially break prescription privacy. For our analysis, we assume that a prescription cannot be linked to its doctor or patient by its content. That is, the prescription shall not be modelled as a function of doctor or patient

<sup>1</sup>Note that a medical examination of the patient is not part of the DLV08 protocol.

information. To avoid any of the above concerns, we model prescriptions as abstract pieces of data: each prescription is represented by a single, unique name. First, this modelling captures the assumption that prescriptions from different doctors are often different even for the same diagnose, due to different prescription styles. Second, this allows us to capture an infinite number of prescriptions in infinite sessions, without introducing false attacks to the DLV08 protocol that are caused by the modelling of the prescriptions.

**Modelling the patient-pharmacist sub-protocol.** This sub-protocol is used for a patient, whose steps are labelled  $t_i$  in Figure 16, to obtain medicine from a pharmacist, whose steps are labelled  $h_i$  in Figure 17.

```

 $P''_{pt} :=$ 
t10.   in(ch,  $rcv\_Auth_{ph}$ ).
t11.   if  $\text{Vfy-sign}(rcv\_Auth_{ph}, rcv_{pt}\text{-}pk_{ph}) = \text{true}$  then
t12.   let  $(= c_{pt}\text{-}Id_{ph}, c_{pt}\text{-}Id_{mpa})$ 
           =  $\text{getsignmsg}(rcv\_Auth_{ph}, rcv_{pt}\text{-}pk_{ph})$  in
t13.   let  $c_{pt}\text{-}pk_{mpa} = \text{key}(c_{pt}\text{-}Id_{mpa})$  in
t14.   out(ch,  $\text{zk}((Id_{pt}, Pnym_{pt}, Hii, Sss, Acc),$ 
            $(\text{ptcred}(Id_{pt}, Pnym_{pt}, Hii, Sss, Acc), Sss)))$ ).
t15.    $\nu\text{nonce}$ .
t16.   let  $vc_1 = \text{zk}((Id_{pt}, Pnym_{pt}, Hii, Sss, Acc),$ 
            $(\text{ptcred}(Id_{pt}, Pnym_{pt}, Hii, Sss, Acc),$ 
            $\text{enc}(Hii, c_{pt}\text{-}pk_{mpa})))$  in
t17.   let  $vc_2 = \text{zk}((c\_Pnym_{dr}, rcv\_r_{dr}),$ 
            $(rcv\_PrescProof, \text{enc}(c\_Pnym_{dr}, c_{pt}\text{-}pk_{mpa})))$  in
t18.   let  $vc_3 = \text{zk}((Id_{pt}, Pnym_{pt}, Hii, Sss, Acc),$ 
            $(\text{ptcred}(Id_{pt}, Pnym_{pt}, Hii, Sss, Acc),$ 
            $\text{enc}(Pnym_{pt}, pk_{sso})))$  in
t19.   let  $vc'_3 = \text{zk}((Id_{pt}, Pnym_{pt}, Hii, Sss, Acc),$ 
            $(\text{ptcred}(Id_{pt}, Pnym_{pt}, Hii, Sss, Acc),$ 
            $\text{enc}(Hii, pk_{sso})))$  in
t20.   let  $vc_4 = \text{zk}((Id_{pt}, Pnym_{pt}, Hii, Sss, Acc),$ 
            $(\text{ptcred}(Id_{pt}, Pnym_{pt}, Hii, Sss, Acc),$ 
            $\text{enc}(Pnym_{pt}, c_{pt}\text{-}pk_{mpa})))$  in
t21.   let  $vc_5 = \text{zk}((Id_{pt}, Pnym_{pt}, Hii, Sss, Acc),$ 
            $(\text{ptcred}(Id_{pt}, Pnym_{pt}, Hii, Sss, Acc),$ 
            $\text{enc}(Pnym_{pt}, c_{pt}\text{-}pk_{hii})))$  in
t22.   let  $c_5 = \text{enc}(vc_5, c_{pt}\text{-}pk_{mpa})$  in
t23.   out(ch,  $(rcv\_PrescProof, \text{spk}((Id_{pt}, Pnym_{pt}, Hii, Sss, Acc),$ 
            $(\text{ptcred}(Id_{pt}, Pnym_{pt}, Hii, Sss, Acc), \text{commit}(Id_{pt}, r_{pt})), \text{nonce}),$ 
            $vc_1, vc_2, vc_3, vc'_3, vc_4, c_5))$ .
t24.   in(ch,  $rcv\_Invoice$ ).
t25.   let  $ReceiptAck = \text{spk}((Id_{pt}, Pnym_{pt}, Hii, Sss, Acc),$ 
            $\text{ptcred}(Id_{pt}, Pnym_{pt}, Hii, Sss, Acc),$ 
            $(c\_PrescriptID, c_{pt}\text{-}Id_{ph}, vc_1, vc_2, vc_3, vc'_3, vc_4, c_5))$  in
t26.   out(ch,  $ReceiptAck$ )

```

Figure 16: The patient process in the patient-pharmacist sub-protocol  $P''_{pt}$ .

First, the pharmacist authenticates to the patient using a public key authentication (**h1**). Note that the pharmacist does not authenticate anonymously, and that the pharmacist's MPA identity is embedded. The patient reads in the pharmacist authentication  $rcv\_Auth_{ph}$  (**t10**) and verifies

```

P'_{ph} :=
h1.   out(ch, sign((Id_{ph}, c_{ph}-Id_{mpa}), sk_{ph})).
h2.   in(ch, rcv_PtAuthSss).
h3.   let (c_{ph}-Cred_{pt}, c_{ph}-Sss) = getpublic(rcv_PtAuthSss) in
h4.   if Vfy-zk_{PtAuthSss}(rcv_PtAuthSss, (c_{ph}-Cred_{pt}, c_{ph}-Sss))
                                           = true then
h5.   in(ch, (rcv_{ph}-PrescProof, rcv_{ph}-PtSpk,
              rcv_{vc1}, rcv_{vc2}, rcv_{vc3}, rcv_{vc'3}, rcv_{vc4}, rcv_{c5})).
h6.   let (c_{ph}-Comt_{dr}, c_{ph}-Cred_{dr})
                                           = getSpkVinfo(rcv_{ph}-PrescProof) in
h7.   let (c_{ph}-presc, c_{ph}-PrescriptID, = c_{ph}-Comt_{dr}, c_{ph}-Comt_{pt})
                                           = getmsg(rcv_{ph}-PrescProof) in
h8.   if Vfy-spk_{PrescProof}(rcv_{ph}-PrescProof, (c_{ph}-Cred_{dr}, c_{ph}-presc,
              c_{ph}-PrescriptID, c_{ph}-Comt_{dr}, c_{ph}-Comt_{pt})) = true then
h9.   let c_{msg} = getmsg(rcv_{ph}-PtSpk) in
h10.  if Vfy-spk_{PtSpk}(rcv_{ph}-PtSpk,
              (c_{ph}-Cred_{pt}, c_{ph}-Comt_{pt}, c_{msg})) = true then
h11.  let (= c_{ph}-Cred_{pt}, c_{Enc1}) = getpublic(rcv_{vc1}) in
h12.  if Vfy-ven_{Hii}(rcv_{vc1}, (c_{ph}-Cred_{pt}, c_{Enc1}, rcv_{ph}-pk_{mpa}))
                                           = true then
h13.  let (= rcv_{ph}-PrescProof, c_{Enc2}) = getpublic(rcv_{vc2}) in
h14.  if Vfy-ven_{DnymMpa}(rcv_{vc2}, (rcv_{ph}-PrescProof,
              c_{Enc2}, rcv_{ph}-pk_{mpa})) = true then
h15.  let (= c_{ph}-Cred_{pt}, c_{Enc3}) = getpublic(rcv_{vc3}) in
h16.  if Vfy-ven_{Ptnym}(rcv_{vc3}, (c_{ph}-Cred_{pt}, c_{Enc3}, pk_{sso}))
                                           = true then
h17.  let (= c_{ph}-Cred_{pt}, c_{Enc'3}) = getpublic(rcv_{vc'3}) in
h18.  if Vfy-ven_{Hii}(rcv_{vc'3}, (c_{ph}-Cred_{pt}, c_{Enc'3}, pk_{sso})) = true then
h19.  let (= c_{ph}-Cred_{pt}, c_{Enc4}) = getpublic(rcv_{vc4}) in
h20.  if Vfy-ven_{Ptnym}(rcv_{vc4},
              (c_{ph}-Cred_{pt}, c_{Enc4}, rcv_{ph}-pk_{mpa})) = true then
h21.  out(ch, inv(c_{ph}-PrescriptID)).
h22.  in(ch, rcv_ReceiptAck).
h23.  if Vfy-spk_{ReceiptAck}(rcv_ReceiptAck, (c_{ph}-Cred_{pt}, c_{ph}-PrescriptID,
              Id_{ph}, rcv_{vc1}, rcv_{vc2}, rcv_{vc3}, rcv_{vc'3}, rcv_{vc4}, rcv_{c5})) = true
      then P''_{ph}

```

Figure 17: The pharmacist process in the patient-pharmacist sub-protocol  $P'_{ph}$ .

the authentication (**t11**). If the verification succeeds, the pharmacist obtains the pharmacist's MPA identity from the authentication (**t12**), thus obtains the public key of MPA (**t13**). Then the patient anonymously authenticates himself to the pharmacist, and proves his social security status using the proof  $PtAuthSss$  (**t14**). The patient generates a nonce which will be used as a message in a signed proof of knowledge (**t15**), and computes verifiable encryptions  $vc_1$ ,  $vc_2$ ,  $vc_3$ ,  $vc'_3$ ,  $vc_4$  and  $vc_5$  (**t16-t21**). These divulge the patient's HII, the doctor's pseudonym, and the patient's pseudonym to the MPA, the patient's pseudonym to the HII, and the patient pseudonym and HII to the social safety organisation, respectively. The patient encrypts  $vc_5$  with MPA's public key as  $c_5$  (**t22**). The patient computes a signed proof of knowledge

$$\begin{aligned}
PtSpk = & \text{spk}((Id_{pt}, Pnym_{pt}, Hii, Sss, Acc), \\
& (\text{ptcred}(Id_{pt}, Pnym_{pt}, Hii, Sss, Acc), \text{commit}(Id_{pt}, r_{pt})), \\
& \text{nonce})
\end{aligned}$$

which proves that the patient identity embedded in the prescription is the same as in his credential. In the prescription, this identity is contained in a commitment. For simplicity, we model the proof using the commitment instead of the prescription. The link between commitment and prescription is ensured when the proof is verified (**h10**).

The patient sends the prescription  $rcv\_PrescProof$ , the signed proof  $PtSpk$ , and  $vc_1, vc_2, vc_3, vc'_3, vc_4, c_5$  to the pharmacist (**t23**). The pharmacist reads in the authentication  $rcv\_PtAuthSss$  (**h2**), obtains the patient credential and his social security status (**h3**), verifies the authentication (**h4**). If the verification succeeds, the pharmacist reads in the patient's prescription  $rcv_{ph}\_PrescProof$ , the signed proof of knowledge  $rcv_{ph}\_PtSpk$ , the verifiable encryptions  $rcv\_vc_1, rcv\_vc_2, rcv\_vc_3, rcv\_vc'_3, rcv\_vc_4$ , and cipher text  $rcv\_c_5$  (**h5**); and verifies  $rcv_{ph}\_PrescProof$  (**h6-h8**),  $rcv_{ph}\_PtSpk$  (**h9-h10**), and  $rcv\_vc_1, rcv\_vc_2, rcv\_vc_3, rcv\_vc'_3, rcv\_vc_4$  (**h11-h20**). If all the verifications succeed, the pharmacist charges the patient, and delivers the medicine (neither are modelled as they are out of DLV08's scope). Then the pharmacist generates an invoice with the prescription identity embedded in it and sends the invoice to the patient (**h21**).

The patient reads in the invoice (**t24**), computes a receipt: a signed proof of knowledge  $ReceiptAck$  which proves that he receives the medicine (**t25**); and sends the signed proof of knowledge to the pharmacist (**t26**). The pharmacist reads in the receipt  $rcv\_ReceiptAck$  (**h22**), verifies its correctness (**h23**) and continues the next sub-protocol behaving as in  $P''_{ph}$ .

**Modelling the pharmacist-MPA sub-protocol.** The pharmacist-MPA sub-protocol is used for the pharmacist, whose steps are labelled **hi** in Figure 18 to report the received prescriptions to the MPA, whose steps are labelled **mi** in Figure 19.

	$P''_{ph} :=$
<b>h24.</b>	$\text{out}(\text{ch}, (\text{sign}((\text{Id}_{ph}, c_{ph}\_Id_{mpa}), \text{sk}_{ph}), \text{Id}_{ph}))$ .
<b>h25.</b>	$\text{in}(\text{ch}, rcv\_Auth_{mpa})$ .
<b>h26.</b>	$\text{if } \forall \text{fy-sign}(rcv\_Auth_{mpa}, rcv_{ph}\_pk_{mpa}) = \text{true then}$
<b>h27.</b>	$\text{out}(\text{ch}, (rcv_{ph}\_PrescProof,$ $rcv\_vc_1, rcv\_vc_2, rcv\_vc_3, rcv\_vc'_3, rcv\_vc_4, rcv\_c_5,$ $rcv\_ReceiptAck))$

Figure 18: The pharmacist process in the pharmacist-MPA sub-protocol  $P''_{ph}$ .

As the pharmacist mostly forwards the information supplied by the patient, this protocol greatly resembles the patient-pharmacist protocol described above. Each step is modelled in details as follows: The pharmacist authenticates himself to his MPA by sending his identity and the signed identities of the pharmacist and the MPA (**h24**). The MPA stores this authentication in  $rcv_{mpa}\_Auth_{ph}$ , and stores the pharmacist's identity in  $c_{mpa}\_Id_{ph}$  (**m1**). From the pharmacist's identity, the MPA obtains the pharmacist's public key (**m2**). Then the MPA verifies the pharmacist's authentication against the pharmacist's public key (**m3**). If the verification succeeds, according to the corresponding rule in the equational theory, and the MPA verifies that he is indeed the pharmacist's MPA (**m4**), the MPA then authenticates itself to the pharmacist by sending the signature of his identity (**m5**). The pharmacist reads in the MPA's authentication in  $rcv\_Auth_{mpa}$  (**h25**), and verifies the authentication (**h26**). If the verification succeeds, the pharmacist sends the following to the MPA: prescription  $rcv_{ph}\_PrescProof$ , received receipt  $rcv\_ReceiptAck$ , and verifiable encryptions  $rcv\_vc_1, rcv\_vc_2, rcv\_vc_3, rcv\_vc'_3, rcv\_vc_4, rcv\_c_5$  (**h27**). The MPA reads in the information (**m6**) and verifies their correctness (**m7-m24**). If the verifications succeed, the MPA decrypts the corresponding encryptions ( $c_{mpa}\_Enc_1, c_{mpa}\_Enc_2$ , and  $c_{mpa}\_Enc_4$ ) embedded in  $rcv_{mpa}\_vc_1, rcv_{mpa}\_vc_2, rcv_{mpa}\_vc_4$ , and obtains the patient's HII (**m12**), the doctor pseudonym (**m15**), the patient pseudonym (**m23**). Then the MPA continues the next sub-protocol behaving as in process  $P'_{mpa}$ . The storing information to database by the MPA is beyond our concern.

```

Pmpa :=
m1. in(ch, (rcvmpa-Authph, cmpa-Idph)).
m2. let rcvmpa-pkph = key(cmpa-Idph) in
m3. if Vfy-sign(rcvmpa-Authph, rcvmpa-pkph) = true then
m4. let (= cmpa-Idph, = Idmpa)
      = getmsg(rcvmpa-Authph, rcvmpa-pkph) in
m5. out(ch, sign(Idmpa, skmpa)).
m6. in(ch, (rcvmpa-PrescProof, rcvmpa-vc1, rcvmpa-vc2, rcvmpa-vc3,
      rcvmpa-vc3', rcvmpa-vc4, rcvmpa-c5, rcvmpa-ReceiptAck)).
m7. let (cmpa-Comtdr, cmpa-Creddr)
      = getSpkVinfo(rcvmpa-PrescProof) in
m8. let (cmpa-presc, cmpa-PrescriptID, = cmpa-Comtdr, cmpa-Comtpt)
      = getmsg(rcvmpa-PrescProof) in
m9. if Vfy-spkPrescProof(rcvmpa-PrescProof, (cmpa-Creddr, cmpa-presc,
      cmpa-PrescriptID, cmpa-Comtdr, cmpa-Comtpt)) = true then
m10. let (= cmpa-Credpt, cmpa-Enc1) = getpublic(rcvmpa-vc1) in
m11. if Vfy-vencHii(rcvmpa-vc1,
      (cmpa-Credpt, cmpa-Enc1, pkmpa)) = true then
m12. let cmpa-Hii = dec(cmpa-Enc1, skmpa) in
m13. let (= rcvmpa-PrescProof, cmpa-Enc2)
      = getpublic(rcvmpa-vc2) in
m14. if Vfy-vencDrnymMpa(rcvmpa-vc2,
      (rcvmpa-PrescProof, cmpa-Enc2, pkmpa)) = true then
m15. let cmpa-Pnymdr = dec(cmpa-Enc2, skmpa) in
m16. let (= cmpa-Credpt, cmpa-Enc3) = getpublic(rcvmpa-vc3) in
m17. if Vfy-vencPtnym(rcvmpa-vc3,
      (cmpa-Credpt, cmpa-Enc3, pksso)) = true then
m19. let (= cmpa-Credpt, cmpa-Enc3') = getpublic(rcvmpa-vc3') in
m20. if Vfy-vencHii(rcvmpa-vc3',
      (cmpa-Credpt, cmpa-Enc3', pksso)) = true then
m21. let (= cmpa-Credpt, cmpa-Enc4) = getpublic(rcvmpa-vc4) in
m22. if Vfy-vencPtnym(rcvmpa-vc4,
      (cmpa-Credpt, cmpa-Enc4, pkmpa)) = true then
m23. let cmpa-Pnympt = dec(cmpa-Enc4, skmpa) in
m24. if Vfy-spkReceiptAck(rcvmpa-ReceiptAck, (cmpa-Credpt,
      cmpa-PrescriptID, cmpa-Idph, rcvmpa-vc1, rcvmpa-vc2,
      rcvmpa-vc3, rcvmpa-vc3', rcvmpa-vc4, rcvmpa-c5)) = true then Pmpa'

```

Figure 19: The MPA process in the pharmacist-MPA sub-protocol  $P_{mpa}$ .

**Modelling the MPA-HII sub-protocol.** This protocol covers the exchange of information between the pharmacist's MPA, whose steps are labelled **m***i* in Figure 20 and the patient's HII, whose steps are labelled **i***i* in Figure 21.

The MPA sends his identity to the HII and authenticates to the HII using public key authentication (**m25**). The HII stores the MPA's identity in *rcv*<sub>hii</sub>-*Id*<sub>mpa</sub> and stores the authentication in *rcv*<sub>hii</sub>-*Auth*<sub>mpa</sub> (**i1**). From the MPA's identity, the HII obtains the MPA's public key (**i2**). Then the HII verifies the MPA's authentication (**i3**). If the verification succeeds, the HII authenticates to the MPA using public key authentication (**i4**). The MPA stores the authentication in *rcv*<sub>mpa</sub>-*Auth*<sub>hii</sub> (**m26**). Then the MPA obtains the HII's public key from the HII's identity (**m27**) and verifies the HII's authentication (**m28**). If the verification succeeds, and the MPA verifies that the authentication is from the intended HII (**m29**), the MPA sends the receipt *rcv*<sub>mpa</sub>-*PrescProof* and the patient pseudonym encrypted for the HII – verifiable encryption

```

P'mpa :=
m25. out(ch, (sign(Idmpa, skmpa), Idmpa)).
m26. in(ch, rcvmpa-Authhii).
m27. let cmpa-pkhii = key(cmpa-Hii) in
m28. if Vfy-sign(rcvmpa-Authhii, cmpa-pkhii) = true then
m29. if getsignmsg(rcvmpa-Authhii, cmpa-pkhii) = cmpa-Hii then
m30. out(ch, (rcvmpa-ReceiptAck, dec(rcvmpa-c5, skmpa))).
m31. in(ch, rcvmpa-Invoice)

```

Figure 20: The MPA process in the MPA-HII sub-protocol  $P'_{mpa}$ .

```

Phii :=
i1. in(ch, (rcvhii-Authmpa, rcvhii-Idmpa)).
i2. let chii-pkmpa = key(rcvhii-Idmpa) in
i3. if Vfy-sign(rcvhii-Authmpa, chii-pkmpa) = true then
i4. out(ch, sign(Idhii, skhii)).
i5. in(ch, (rcvhii-ReceiptAck, chii-vc5)).
i6. let chii-Credpt = getSpkVinfo(rcvhii-ReceiptAck) in
i7. let (chii-PrescriptID, chii-Idph, chii-vc1, chii-vc2, chii-vc3, chii-vc'3,
      chii-vc4, chii-c5) = getmsg(rcvhii-ReceiptAck) in
i8. if Vfy-spkReceiptAck(rcvhii-ReceiptAck, (chii-Credpt,
      chii-PrescriptID, chii-Idph, chii-vc1, chii-vc2, chii-vc3, chii-vc'3,
      chii-vc4, chii-c5)) = true then
i9. let (= chii-Credpt, chii-Enc5) = getpublic(chii-vc5) in
i10. if Vfy-vcncPtNym(chii-vc5, (chii-Credpt, chii-Enc5, pkhii)) = true then
i11. let chii-Pnympt = dec(chii-Enc5, skhii) in
i12. out(ch, invoice(chii-PrescriptID))

```

Figure 21: The HII process  $P_{hii}$ .

$rcv_{mpa}\text{-}vc_5 = \text{dec}(rcv_{mpa}\text{-}c_5, \text{sk}_{mpa})$  (**m30**). The HII receives the receipt as  $rcv_{hii}\text{-}ReceiptAck$  and the encrypted patient pseudonym for the HII as  $c_{hii}\text{-}vc_5$  (**i5**). The HII verifies the above two pieces of information (**i6-i10**). If the verifications succeed, the HII decrypts the encryption  $c_{hii}\text{-}Enc_5$  and obtains the patient's pseudonym (**i11**). Finally, the HII sends an invoice of the prescription identity to the MPA (**i12**). The MPA stores the invoice in  $rcv_{mpa}\text{-}Invoice$  (**m31**). Afterwards, the HII pays the MPA and updates the patient account. As before, handling payment and storing information are beyond the scope of the DLV08 protocol and therefore, we do not model this stage.

**The full protocol.** In summary, the DLV08 protocol is composed as shown in Figure 22. The DLV08 protocol is modelled as the five roles  $R_{dr}$ ,  $R_{pt}$ ,  $R_{ph}$ ,  $R_{mpa}$ , and  $R_{hii}$  running in parallel (Figure 23).

$$\begin{aligned}
P_{DLV08} &:= \nu \tilde{m}c. \text{init}. (!R_{pt} \mid !R_{dr} \mid !R_{ph} \mid !R_{mpa} \mid !R_{hii}) \\
\text{init} &:= \text{let } \text{pk}_{sso} = \text{pk}(\text{sk}_{sso}) \text{ in } \text{out}(\text{ch}, \text{pk}_{sso})
\end{aligned}$$

where  $\nu \tilde{m}c$  represents global secrets  $\text{sk}_{sso}$  and private channels  $\text{ch}_{hp}$ ,  $\text{ch}_{mp}$ ,  $\text{ch}_{phpt}$ ; process  $\text{init}$  initialises the settings of the protocol – publishing the public key  $\text{pk}_{sso}$ , so that the adversary knows it. The roles  $R_{dr}$ ,  $R_{pt}$ ,  $R_{ph}$ ,  $R_{mpa}$  and  $R_{hii}$  are obtained by adding the settings of each role (see Section 4.3) to the previously modelled corresponding process of the role as shown in Figure 24, Figure 25, Figure 26, Figure 27 and Figure 28, respectively.

Each doctor has an identity  $\text{Id}_{dr}$  (**rd1**), a pseudonym  $\text{Pnym}_{dr}$  (**rd2**) and behaves like  $P_{dr}$  (**rd3**) as shown in Figure 24. The anonymous doctor credential is modelled by applying function  $\text{dcred}$  on  $\text{Id}_{dr}$  and  $\text{Pnym}_{dr}$ .




Figure 22: Overview of DLV08 protocol.

$$\begin{array}{l}
 P_{DLV08} := \nu \mathbf{sk}_{sso} . \nu \mathbf{ch}_{hp} . \nu \mathbf{ch}_{mp} . \nu \mathbf{ch}_{phpt} . \\
 \quad \text{let } \mathbf{pk}_{sso} = \mathbf{pk}(\mathbf{sk}_{sso}) \text{ in} \\
 \quad \text{out}(\mathbf{ch}, \mathbf{pk}_{sso}) . \\
 \quad (! (R_{dr}) \mid ! (R_{pt}) \mid ! (R_{ph}) \mid ! (R_{mpa}) \mid ! (R_{hii}))
 \end{array}
 \left. \begin{array}{l}
 \\ \\ \\ \\
 \end{array} \right\} \nu \widetilde{m}c$$

$\left. \begin{array}{l} \\ \\ \\ \\ \end{array} \right\} \mathit{init}$

Figure 23: The process for the DLV08 protocol.

$$\begin{array}{l}
 R_{dr} := \\
 \mathbf{rd1.} \quad \nu \mathbf{Id}_{dr} . \\
 \mathbf{rd2.} \quad \nu \mathbf{Pn}_{ym}_{dr} . \\
 \mathbf{rd3.} \quad ! (P_{dr})
 \end{array}
 \left. \begin{array}{l}
 \\ \\ \\
 \end{array} \right\} \mathit{init}_{dr}$$

Figure 24: The process for role doctor  $R_{dr}$ .

Each patient (as shown in Figure 25) has an identity  $\text{Id}_{pt}$  (**rt1**), a pseudonym  $\text{Pnym}_{pt}$ , a social security status  $\text{Sss}$ , a health expense account  $\text{Acc}$  (**rt2**). Unlike the identity and the pseudonym, which are attributes of a doctor, a doctor's  $\text{Hii}$  is an association relation, and thus is modelled by reading in an HII identity to establish the relation (**rt3**). In addition, a patient communicates with a pharmacist in each session. Which pharmacist the patient communicates with is decided by reading in a pharmacist's public key (**rt4**). From the pharmacist's public key, the patient can obtain the pharmacist's identity (**rt5**). Finally the patient behaves as  $P'_{pt}$  (**rt6**).

$R_{pt} :=$ <p><b>rt1.</b>            <math>\nu \text{Id}_{pt}.</math></p> <p><b>rt2.</b>            <math>\nu \text{Pnym}_{pt}.\nu \text{Sss}.\nu \text{Acc}.</math></p> <p><b>rt3.</b>            <math>\text{in}(\text{ch}_{hp}, \text{Hii}).\text{let } c_{pt-pk_{hii}} = \text{key}(\text{Hii}) \text{ in}</math></p> <p><b>rt4.</b>            <math>!(\text{in}(\text{ch}_{phpt}, \text{rcv}_{pk_{ph}}).</math></p> <p><b>rt5.</b>            <math>\text{let } \text{rcv}_{pt-pk_{ph}} = \text{rcv}_{pk_{ph}} \text{ in let } \text{Id}_{ph} = \text{host}(\text{rcv}_{pk_{ph}}) \text{ in}</math></p> <p><b>rt6.</b>            <math>P'_{pt})</math></p>	$\left. \vphantom{\begin{array}{l} \text{rt1.} \\ \text{rt2.} \\ \text{rt3.} \\ \text{rt4.} \\ \text{rt5.} \\ \text{rt6.} \end{array}} \right\} \begin{array}{l} \text{init}_{pt} \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \end{array}$
--	---

Figure 25: The process for role patient  $R_{pt}$ .

Each pharmacist has a secret key  $\text{sk}_{ph}$  (**rh1**), a public key  $\text{pk}_{ph}$  (**rh2**) and an identity  $\text{Id}_{ph}$  (**rh3**) as shown in Figure 26. The public key of a pharmacist is published over channel  $\text{ch}$ , so that the adversary knows it (**rh4**). In addition, the public key is sent to the patients via private channel  $\text{ch}_{phpt}$  (**rh4**), so that the patients can choose one to communicate with. In each session, the pharmacist communicates with an MPA. Which MPA the pharmacist communicates with is decided by reading in a public key of MPA (**rh5**). From the public key, the pharmacist can obtain the identity of the MPA (**rh6**). Finally, the pharmacist behave as  $P'_{ph}$ .

$R_{ph} :=$ <p><b>rh1.</b>            <math>\nu \text{sk}_{ph}.</math></p> <p><b>rh2.</b>            <math>\text{let } \text{pk}_{ph} = \text{pk}(\text{sk}_{ph}) \text{ in}</math></p> <p><b>rh3.</b>            <math>\text{let } \text{Id}_{ph} = \text{host}(\text{pk}_{ph}) \text{ in}</math></p> <p><b>rh4.</b>            <math>\text{out}(\text{ch}, \text{pk}_{ph}).\text{out}(\text{ch}_{phpt}, \text{pk}_{ph}).</math></p> <p><b>rh5.</b>            <math>!(\text{in}(\text{ch}_{mp}, \text{rcv}_{ph-pk_{mpa}}).</math></p> <p><b>rh6.</b>            <math>\text{let } c_{ph-Id_{mpa}} = \text{host}(\text{rcv}_{ph-pk_{mpa}}) \text{ in } P'_{ph})</math></p>	$\left. \vphantom{\begin{array}{l} \text{rh1.} \\ \text{rh2.} \\ \text{rh3.} \\ \text{rh4.} \\ \text{rh5.} \\ \text{rh6.} \end{array}} \right\} \begin{array}{l} \text{init}_{ph} \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \end{array}$
---	---

Figure 26: The process for role pharmacist  $R_{ph}$ .

Each MPA has a secret key  $\text{sk}_{mpa}$  (**rm1**), a public key  $\text{pk}_{mpa}$  (**rm2**) and an identity  $\text{Id}_{mpa}$  (**rm3**). The MPA publishes his public key as well as sends his public key to pharmacists (**rm4**), and behaves as  $P_{mpa}$  (**rm5**) as shown in Figure 27.

$R_{mpa} :=$ <p><b>rm1.</b>            <math>\nu \text{sk}_{mpa}.</math></p> <p><b>rm2.</b>            <math>\text{let } \text{pk}_{mpa} = \text{pk}(\text{sk}_{mpa}) \text{ in}</math></p> <p><b>rm3.</b>            <math>\text{let } \text{Id}_{mpa} = \text{host}(\text{pk}_{mpa}) \text{ in}</math></p> <p><b>rm4.</b>            <math>\text{out}(\text{ch}, \text{pk}_{mpa}).\text{out}(\text{ch}_{mp}, \text{pk}_{mpa}).</math></p> <p><b>rm5.</b>            <math>!(P_{mpa})</math></p>	$\left. \vphantom{\begin{array}{l} \text{rm1.} \\ \text{rm2.} \\ \text{rm3.} \\ \text{rm4.} \\ \text{rm5.} \end{array}} \right\} \text{init}_{mpa}$
---	---

Figure 27: The process for role MPA  $R_{mpa}$ .

Similar to MPA, each HII (Figure 28) has a secret key  $\text{sk}_{hii}$  (**ri1**), a public key  $\text{pk}_{hii}$  (**ri2**) and an identity  $\text{Id}_{hii}$  (**ri3**). The public key is revealed to the adversary via channel  $\text{ch}$  and sent to the patients via channel  $\text{ch}_{hp}$  (**ri4**). Then the HII behaves as  $P_{hii}$  (**ri5**).

$$\begin{array}{l}
R_{hii} := \\
\text{ri1.} \quad \nu \text{sk}_{hii}. \\
\text{ri2.} \quad \text{let } \text{pk}_{hii} = \text{pk}(\text{sk}_{hii}) \text{ in} \\
\text{ri3.} \quad \text{let } \text{Id}_{hii} = \text{host}(\text{pk}_{hii}) \text{ in} \\
\text{ri4.} \quad \text{out}(\text{ch}, \text{pk}_{hii}).\text{out}(\text{ch}_{hp}, \text{Id}_{hii}). \\
\text{ri5.} \quad !(P_{hii})
\end{array}
\left. \vphantom{\begin{array}{l} \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \end{array}} \right\} \text{init}_{hii}$$

Figure 28: The process for role HII  $R_{hii}$ .

## 6 Analysis of DLV08

In this section, we analyse whether DLV08 satisfies the following properties:

- *secrecy of patient and doctor information,*
- *authentication,*
- *(strong) patient and doctor anonymity,*
- *(strong) patient and doctor untraceability,*
- *(enforced) prescription privacy,* and
- *independence of (enforced) prescription privacy.*

The properties *doctor anonymity* and *untraceability* are not required by the protocol but are still interesting to analyse. The verification is supported by the automatic verification tool *ProVerif* [Bla01, Bla02, Bla04]. The tool has been used to verify many secrecy, authentication and privacy properties, e.g., see [AB05, ABF07, LCPD07, BC08, DJP11]. The verification results for secrecy are summarised in Table 1, and those for authentication in Table 2. As we are foremost interested in privacy properties, the verification results for privacy properties, and suggestions for improvements are discussed in Section 7. Table 5 summarises those results, causes of privacy weaknesses, suggested improvements, and the effect of the improvements. In this section, we show the verification results of properties from basic to more complicated. A flaw which fails a basic property is likely to fail a more complicated property as well. Thus we first show flaws of basic properties and how to fix them, then we show new flaws of complicated properties based on the fixed model.

### 6.1 ProVerif

ProVerif takes a protocol and a property modelled in the applied pi calculus as input (the input language (untyped version) differs slightly from applied pi, see [Bla]), and returns either a proof of correctness or potential attacks. A protocol modelled in the applied pi calculus is translated to Horn clauses [Hor51]. The adversary’s capabilities are added as Horn clauses as well. Using these clauses, verification of secrecy and authentication is equivalent to determining whether a certain clause is derivable from the set of initial clauses.

Secrecy of a term is defined as the adversary cannot obtain the term by communicating with the protocol and/or applying cryptography on the output of the protocol [AB05]. The secrecy property is modelled as a predicate in ProVerif: the query of secrecy of term  $M$  is “*attacker : M*” [Bla01]. ProVerif determines whether the term  $M$  can be inferred from the Horn clauses representing the adversary knowledge.

Authentication is captured by correspondence properties of events in processes: if one event happens the other event must have happened before [ABF07, Bla09]. Events are tags which mark important stages reached by the protocol. Events have arguments, which allow us to express relationships between the arguments of events. A correspondence property is a formula of the form:

$ev : \bar{f}(M) \implies ev : \bar{g}(N)$ . That is, in any process, if event  $\bar{f}(M)$  has been executed, then the event  $\bar{g}(N)$  must have been previously executed, and any relationship between  $M$  and  $N$  must be satisfied. To capture stronger authentication, where an injective relationship between executions of participants is required, an injective correspondence property  $evinj : \bar{f}(M) \implies evinj : \bar{g}(N)$  is defined: in any process, for each execution of event  $\bar{f}(M)$ , there is a distinct earlier execution of the event  $\bar{g}(N)$ , and the relationship between  $M$  and  $N$  is satisfied.

In addition, ProVerif provides automatic verification of labelled bisimilarity of two processes which differ only in the choice of some terms [BAF08]. An operation “*choice*[ $a, b$ ]” is introduced to model the different choices of a term in the two processes. Using this operation, the two processes can be written as one process – a *bi-process*.

**Example 8.** *To verify the equivalence*

$$\nu a. \nu b. \text{out}(\text{ch}, a). \text{out}(\text{ch}, e) \approx_{\ell} \nu a. \nu b. \text{out}(\text{ch}, b). \text{out}(\text{ch}, d)$$

where  $\text{ch}$  is a public channel,  $e$  and  $d$  are two free names, we can query the following bi-process in ProVerif:

$$P := \nu a. \nu b. \text{out}(\text{ch}, \text{choice}[a, b]). \text{out}(\text{ch}, \text{choice}[e, d]).$$

Using the first parameter of all “*choice*” operations in a bi-process  $P$ , we obtain one side of the equivalence (denoted as  $\text{fst}(P)$ ); using the second parameters, we obtain the other side (denoted as  $\text{snd}(P)$ ).

**Example 9.** *For the bi-process in Example 8, using the first parameter to replace each “choice” operation, we obtain*

$$\nu a. \nu b. \text{out}(\text{ch}, a). \text{out}(\text{ch}, e),$$

which is the left-hand side of the equivalence in Example 8; using the second parameter to replace each “choice” operation, we obtain

$$\nu a. \nu b. \text{out}(\text{ch}, b). \text{out}(\text{ch}, d),$$

which is the right-hand side of the equivalence.

Given a bi-process  $P$ , ProVerif tries to prove that  $\text{fst}(P)$  is labelled bisimilar to  $\text{snd}(P)$ . The fundamental idea is that ProVerif reasons on traces of the bi-process  $P$ : the bi-process  $P$  reduces when  $\text{fst}(P)$  and  $\text{snd}(P)$  reduce in the same way; when  $\text{fst}(P)$  and  $\text{snd}(P)$  do something that may differentiate them, the bi-process is stuck. Formally, ProVerif shows that the bi-process  $P$  is uniform, that is, if  $\text{fst}(P)$  can do a reduction to some  $Q_1$ , then the bi-process can do a reduction to some bi-process  $Q$ , such that  $\text{fst}(Q) \equiv Q_1$  and symmetrically for  $\text{snd}(P)$  taking a reduction to  $Q_2$ . When the bi-process  $P$  always remains uniform after reduction and addition of an adversary,  $\text{fst}(P)$  is labelled bisimilar to  $\text{snd}(P)$ .

## 6.2 Secrecy of patient and doctor information

The DLV08 protocol claims to satisfy the following requirement: any party involved in the prescription processing workflow should not know the information of a patient and a doctor unless the information is intended to be revealed in the protocol. In [dDLVV08], this requirement is considered as an access control requirement. We argue that ensuring the requirement with access control is not sufficient when considering a communication network. A dishonest party could potentially act as an attacker from the network (observing the network and manipulating the protocol) and obtain information which he should not access. It is not clearly stated which (if any) of the involved parties are honest. We find that in such a way, some patient and doctor information may be revealed to parties who should not know the information.

We formalise the requirement as standard secrecy of patient and doctor information with respect to the Dolev-Yao adversary. Standard secrecy of a term captures the idea that the adversary cannot access to that term (see Section 6.1). If a piece of information is known to the adversary,

checked Security property	initial model	cause(s)	improvement
Secrecy of $\text{Id}_{pt}$	✓		
Secrecy of $\text{Pnym}_{pt}$	✓		
Secrecy of $\text{Sss}$	×	revealed	session key
Secrecy of $\text{Hii}$	✓		
Secrecy of $\text{Acc}$	✓		
Secrecy of $\text{Id}_{dr}$	✓		
Secrecy of $\text{Pnym}_{dr}$	×	revealed	session key

Table 1: Verification results of secrecy for patients and doctors.

a dishonest party acting like the adversary can access to the information. We do not consider strong secrecy, as it is unclear whether the information is guessable. Recall that standard secrecy of a term  $M$  is formally defined as a predicate “ $attacker : M$ ” (see Section 6.1). By replacing  $M$  with the listed private information, we obtain the formal definition of the secrecy of patient and doctor information. The list of private information of patients and doctors that needs to be protected is: patient identity ( $\text{Id}_{pt}$ ), doctor identity ( $\text{Id}_{dr}$ ), patient pseudonym ( $\text{Pnym}_{pt}$ ), doctor pseudonym ( $\text{Pnym}_{dr}$ ), a patient’s social security status ( $\text{Sss}$ ), and a patient’s health insurance institute ( $\text{Hii}$ ). Although DLV08 does not explicitly require it, we additionally analyse secrecy of the health expense account  $\text{Acc}$  of a patient.

$query\ attacker : \text{Id}_{pt}$      $query\ attacker : \text{Id}_{dr}$      $query\ attacker : \text{Pnym}_{pt}$   
 $query\ attacker : \text{Pnym}_{dr}$      $query\ attacker : \text{Sss}$      $query\ attacker : \text{Hii}$   
 $query\ attacker : \text{Acc}$

**Verification result.** We query the standard secrecy of the set of private information using ProVerif [Bla01]. The verification results (see Table 1) show that a patient’s identity, pseudonym, health expense account, health insurance institute and identity of a doctor ( $\text{Id}_{pt}$ ,  $\text{Pnym}_{pt}$ ,  $\text{Hii}$ ,  $\text{Acc}$ ,  $\text{Id}_{dr}$ ) satisfy standard secrecy; a patient’s social security status  $\text{Sss}$  and a doctor’s pseudonym  $\text{Pnym}_{dr}$  do not satisfy standard secrecy. The  $\text{Sss}$  is revealed by the proof of social security status from the patient to the pharmacist. The  $\text{Pnym}_{dr}$  is revealed by the revealing of both the commitment of the patient’s pseudonym and the open key to the commitment during the communication between the patient and the doctor.

Fixing secrecy of a patient’s social security status requires that the proof of social security status only reveals the status to the pharmacist. Since how a social security status is represented and what the pharmacist needs to verify are not clear, we cannot give explicit suggestions. However, if the social security status is a number, and the pharmacist only needs to verify that the number is higher than a certain threshold, the patient can prove it using zero-knowledge proof without revealing the number; if the pharmacist needs to verify the exact value of the status, one way to fix its secrecy is that the pharmacist and the patient agree on a session key and the status is encrypted using the key. Similarly, a way to fix the secrecy of  $\text{Pnym}_{dr}$  is to encrypt the opening information using the agreed session key.

### 6.3 Patient and doctor authentication

The protocol claims that all parties should be able to properly authenticate each other. Compared to authentications between public entities, pharmacists, MPA and HII, we focus on authentications between patients and doctors, as patients and doctors use anonymous authentication. Authentications between patients and pharmacists are sketched as well.

The DLV08 claims that no party should be able to succeed in claiming a false identity, or false information about his identity. That is the adversary cannot pretend to be a patient or a doctor.

**Authentication from a patient to a doctor.** The authentication from a patient to a doctor is defined as when the doctor finishes his process and believes that he prescribed medicine for a pa-

tient, then the patient did ask the doctor for prescription. To verify the authentication of a patient, we add an event  $\text{EndDr}(c\_Cred_{pt}, c\_Comt_{pt})$  at the end of the doctor process (after line **d10**), meaning the doctor believes that he prescribed medicine for a patient who has a credential  $c\_Cred_{pt}$  and committed  $c\_Comt_{pt}$ ; and add an event  $\text{StartPt}(\text{ptcred}(\text{Id}_{pt}, \text{Pnym}_{pt}, \text{Hi i}, \text{Sss}, \text{Acc}), \text{commit}(\text{Id}_{pt}, \mathbf{r}_{pt}))$  in the patient process (between line **t4** and line **t5**), meaning that the patient did ask for a prescription. The definition is captured by the following correspondence property:  $ev(inj) : \text{EndDr}(x, y) \implies ev(inj) : \text{StartPt}(x, y)$ , meaning that when the event  $\text{EndDr}$  is executed, there is a (unique) event  $\text{StartPt}$  has been executed before.

**Authentication from a doctor to a patient.** Similarly, the authentication from a doctor to a patient is defined as when the patient believes that he visited a doctor, the doctor did prescribe medicine for the patient. To authenticate a doctor, we add to the patient process an event  $\text{EndPt}(c\_Cred_{dr}, c\_Comt_{dr}, c\_presc, c\_PrescriptID)$  (after line **t9**), and add an event  $\text{StartDr}(\text{dcred}(\text{Pnym}_{dr}, \text{Id}_{dr}), \text{commit}(\text{Pnym}_{dr}, \mathbf{r}_{dr}), \text{presc}, \text{PrescriptID})$  in the doctor process (between line **d9** and line **d10**), then query  $ev(inj) : \text{EndPt}(x, y, z, t) \implies ev(inj) : \text{StartDr}(x, y, z, t)$ .

**Authentication from a patient to a pharmacist.** The authentication from a patient to a doctor is defined as when the pharmacist finishes a session and believes that he communicates with a patient, who is identified with the credential  $c_{ph}\_Cred_{pt}$ , then the patient with the credential did communicate with the pharmacist. To verify the authentication of a patient, we add to the pharmacist process the event  $\text{EndPh}(c_{ph}\_Cred_{pt})$  (after line **h23**), add to the patient process  $\text{StartPtph}(\text{ptcred}(\text{Id}_{pt}, \text{Pnym}_{pt}, \text{Hi i}, \text{Sss}, \text{Acc}))$  (between line **t13** and line **t14**), and query  $ev(inj) : \text{EndPh}(x) \implies ev(inj) : \text{StartPtph}(x)$ .

**Authentication from a pharmacist to a patient.** The authentication from a pharmacist to a patient is defined as when the patient finishes a session and believes that he communicates with a pharmacist with the identity  $c_{pt}\_Id_{ph}$ , then the pharmacist is indeed the one who communicated with the patient. To verify this authentication, we add the event  $\text{EndPtph}(c_{pt}\_Id_{ph})$  into the patient process (after line **t26**), add the event  $\text{StartPh}(\text{Id}_{ph})$  into the pharmacist process (between line **h1** and line **h2**), and query  $ev(inj) : \text{EndPtph}(x) \implies ev(inj) : \text{StartPh}(x)$ . In addition, we add the conditional evaluation if  $rcv\_Invoice = \text{inv}(c\_PrescriptID)$  then before the end  $\text{EndPtph}(c_{pt}\_Id_{ph})$  in the patient process to capture that the patient checks the correctness of the invoice.

**Verification results.** The queries are verified using ProVerif. The verification results show that doctor authentication, both injective and non-injective, succeed; non-injective patient authentication succeeds and injective patient authentication fails. The failure is caused by a replay attack from the adversary. That is, the adversary can impersonate a patient by replaying old messages from the patient. This authentication flaw leads to termination of the successive procedure, the patient-pharmacist sub-process. We verified authentication between patients and pharmacists as well. Non-injective patient authentication succeeds, whereas injective patient authentication fails. This means that the messages received by a pharmacist are from the correct patient, but not necessarily from this communication session. Neither non-injective nor injective pharmacist authentication succeeds: the adversary can record and replay the first message which is sent from a pharmacist to a patient, and pass the authentication by pretending to be that pharmacist. In addition, the adversary can prepare the second message sending from a pharmacist to a patient, and thus does not need to replay the second message. Since the adversary alters messages, non-injective pharmacist authentication fails. The verification results are summarised in Table 2.

The reason that injective patient authentication fails for both doctors and pharmacists is that they suffer from replay attacks. One possible solution approach is to add a challenge sent from the doctor (respectively, the pharmacist) to the patient. Then, when the patient authenticates to the doctor or pharmacist, the patient includes this challenge in the proofs. This approach assures that the proof is freshly generated. Therefore, this prevents the adversary replaying old messages.

checked Auth	initial model	cause(s)	improvement
dr to pt (inject)	✓		
dr to pt (non-inject)	✓		
pt to dr (inject)	×	replay attack	add challenge
pt to dr (non-inject)	✓		
ph to pt (inject)	×	adv. can replay 1st message, compute 2nd message	sign the invoice
ph to pt (non-inject)	×	adv. can replay 1st message, compute 2nd message	sign the invoice
pt to ph (inject)	×	replay attack	add challenge
pt to ph (non-inject)	✓		

Table 2: Verification results of authentication of patients and doctors.

The reason that (injective and non-injective) authentication from a pharmacist to a patient fails is that the adversary can generate an invoice to replace the one from the real pharmacist. One solution is for the pharmacist to sign the invoice.

**Authentications between public entities.** The public entities – pharmacists, MPAs, HIIs, authenticate each other using public key authentication. The authentication is often used to agree on a way for the later communication. Since it is not mentioned in the original protocol that a key or a communication channel is established during authentication, we assume that the later message exchanges are over public channels, to model the worst case. In this model, the authentications between public entities are obviously flawed, since the adversary can reuse messages from other sessions. The flaws are confirmed by the verification results using ProVerif.

## 6.4 (Strong) patient and doctor anonymity

The DLV08 protocol claims that no party should be able to determine the identity of a patient. We define (strong) patient anonymity to capture the requirement. Note that in the original paper of the DLV08 protocol, the terminology of the privacy property for capturing this requirement is patient untraceability. Our definition of untraceability (Definition 12) has different meaning from theirs (for details, see Section 6.5). Also note that the satisfaction of standard secrecy of patient identity does not fully capture this requirement, as the adversary can still guess about it.

**Patient and doctor anonymity.** Doctor anonymity is defined as in Definition 8. Patient anonymity can be defined in a similar way by replacing the role of doctor with the role of patient.

$$\mathcal{C}_{eh}[init_{pt}\{\mathbf{t}_A/Id_{pt}\}!\!P_{pt}\{\mathbf{t}_A/Id_{pt}\}] \approx_{\ell} \mathcal{C}_{eh}[init_{pt}\{\mathbf{t}_B/Id_{pt}\}!\!P_{pt}\{\mathbf{t}_B/Id_{pt}\}].$$

To verify doctor/patient anonymity, is to check the satisfiability of the corresponding equivalence between processes in the definition. This is done by modelling the two processes on two sides of the equivalence as a bi-process, and verify the bi-process using ProVerif. Recall that a bi-process models two processes sharing the same structure and differing only in terms or destructors. The two processes are written as one process with choice-constructors which tells ProVerif the spots where the two processes differ. The bi-process for verifying doctor anonymity is

$$\nu\tilde{m}c.init.(!\!R_{pt} \mid \!\!R_{dr} \mid \!\!R_{ph} \mid \!\!R_{mpa} \mid \!\!R_{hii} \mid (\nu Pnym_{dr}.let Id_{dr} = choice[\mathbf{d}_A, \mathbf{d}_B] in \!\!P_{dr})),$$

and the bi-process for verifying patient anonymity is

$$\nu\tilde{m}c.init.(!\!R_{pt} \mid \!\!R_{dr} \mid \!\!R_{ph} \mid \!\!R_{mpa} \mid \!\!R_{hii} \mid (let Id_{pt} = choice[\mathbf{t}_A, \mathbf{t}_B] in \nu Pnym_{pt}.\nu Sss.\nu Acc.in(ch_{hp}, Hi i).let c_{pt-pk_{hii}} = key(Hi i) in \!\!P_{pt})).$$

Since the doctor identity is a secret information, we define  $\mathbf{d}_A$  and  $\mathbf{d}_B$  as private names *private free*  $\mathbf{d}_A$ . *private free*  $\mathbf{d}_B$ . In addition, we consider a stronger version, in which the adversary knows the two doctor identities a priori, i.e., we verify whether the adversary can distinguish two known doctors as well. This is modelled by defining the two doctor identities as free names, *free*  $\mathbf{d}_A$ .*free*  $\mathbf{d}_B$ . Similarly, we verified two versions of patient anonymity - in one version, the adversary does not know the two patient identities, and in the other version, the adversary initially knows the two patient identities.

**Strong patient and doctor anonymity.** Strong doctor anonymity is defined as in Definition 9. By replacing the role of doctor with the role of patient, we obtain the definition of strong patient anonymity. The bi-process for verifying strong doctor anonymity is

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{free } \mathbf{d}_A; \\ & \nu \tilde{m}c. \text{init}. (!R_{pt} \mid !R_{dr} \mid !R_{ph} \mid !R_{mpa} \mid !R_{hii} \mid \\ & \quad (\nu \mathbf{d}_B. \nu \mathbf{nPnym}_{dr}. \text{let } \mathbf{Pnym}_{dr} = \mathbf{nPnym}_{dr} \text{ in } !(\text{let } \text{Id}_{dr} = \text{choice}[\mathbf{d}_B, \mathbf{d}_A] \text{ in } P_{dr}))), \end{aligned}$$

and the bi-process for verifying strong patient anonymity is

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{free } \mathbf{t}_A; \\ & \nu \tilde{m}c. \text{init}. (!R_{pt} \mid !R_{dr} \mid !R_{ph} \mid !R_{mpa} \mid !R_{hii} \mid (\nu \mathbf{t}_B. \nu \mathbf{Pnym}_{pt}. \nu \text{Sss}. \nu \text{Acc}. \\ & \quad \text{in } (\text{ch}_{hp}, \text{Hii}). \text{let } c_{pt-pk_{hii}} = \text{key}(\text{Hii}) \text{ in } !(\text{let } \text{Id}_{pt} = \text{choice}[\mathbf{t}_B, \mathbf{t}_A] \text{ in } P_{pt}))). \end{aligned}$$

Note that by definition, the identities  $\mathbf{d}_A$  and  $\mathbf{t}_B$  is known by the adversary.

In the first bi-process, by choosing  $\mathbf{d}_B$ , we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{free } \mathbf{d}_A; \\ & \nu \tilde{m}c. \text{init}. (!R_{pt} \mid !R_{dr} \mid !R_{ph} \mid !R_{mpa} \mid !R_{hii} \mid \\ & \quad (\nu \mathbf{d}_B. \nu \mathbf{nPnym}_{dr}. \text{let } \mathbf{Pnym}_{dr} = \mathbf{nPnym}_{dr} \text{ in } !(\text{let } \text{Id}_{dr} = \mathbf{d}_B \text{ in } P_{dr}))). \end{aligned}$$

Since  $\mathbf{d}_A$  never appears in the remaining process, removing the declaration “*free*  $\mathbf{d}_A$ ,” does not affect the process. Since process “ $\nu \mathbf{d}_B. \nu \mathbf{nPnym}_{dr}. \text{let } \mathbf{Pnym}_{dr} = \mathbf{nPnym}_{dr} \text{ in } !(\text{let } \text{Id}_{dr} = \mathbf{d}_B \text{ in } P_{dr})$ ” essentially renames the doctor role process “ $R_{dr}$ ” (Figure 24) - renaming  $\text{Id}_{dr}$  as  $\mathbf{d}_B$  and renaming  $\mathbf{Pnym}_{dr}$  as  $\mathbf{nPnym}_{dr}$ , we have that the above process is structurally equivalent to (using rule REPL)

$$\nu \tilde{m}c. \text{init}. (!R_{pt} \mid !R_{dr} \mid !R_{ph} \mid !R_{mpa} \mid !R_{hii}),$$

which is the left-hand side of Definition 9 - the  $P_{DLV08}$  in the case study.

On the other hand, by choosing  $\mathbf{d}_A$ , we obtain process

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{free } \mathbf{d}_A; \\ & \nu \tilde{m}c. \text{init}. (!R_{pt} \mid !R_{dr} \mid !R_{ph} \mid !R_{mpa} \mid !R_{hii} \mid \\ & \quad (\nu \mathbf{d}_B. \nu \mathbf{nPnym}_{dr}. \text{let } \mathbf{Pnym}_{dr} = \mathbf{nPnym}_{dr} \text{ in } !(\text{let } \text{Id}_{dr} = \mathbf{d}_A \text{ in } P_{dr}))). \end{aligned}$$

Since  $\mathbf{d}_B$  only appears in the sub-process “ $\nu \mathbf{d}_B.$ ” which generates  $\mathbf{d}_B$  and never appears in the remaining process, the process is structurally equivalent to (applying rule NEW – PAR)

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{free } \mathbf{d}_A; \\ & \nu \mathbf{d}_B. \nu \tilde{m}c. \text{init}. (!R_{pt} \mid !R_{dr} \mid !R_{ph} \mid !R_{mpa} \mid !R_{hii} \mid \\ & \quad (\nu \mathbf{nPnym}_{dr}. \text{let } \mathbf{Pnym}_{dr} = \mathbf{nPnym}_{dr} \text{ in } !(\text{let } \text{Id}_{dr} = \mathbf{d}_A \text{ in } P_{dr}))). \end{aligned}$$

The above process is structurally equivalent to (proved later)

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{free } \mathbf{d}_A; \\ & \nu \tilde{m}c. \text{init}. (!R_{pt} \mid !R_{dr} \mid !R_{ph} \mid !R_{mpa} \mid !R_{hii} \mid \\ & \quad (\nu \mathbf{nPnym}_{dr}. \text{let } \mathbf{Pnym}_{dr} = \mathbf{nPnym}_{dr} \text{ in } !(\text{let } \text{Id}_{dr} = \mathbf{d}_A \text{ in } P_{dr}))), \end{aligned}$$

which is the right-hand side of Definition 9, where  $\mathbf{d}_A$  is a free name. This structural equivalent relation is proved as follows.

*Proof.* Assuming the above process is  $P$  (i.e.,  $P = \nu\tilde{m}c.init.(!R_{pt} \mid !R_{dr} \mid !R_{ph} \mid !R_{mpa} \mid !R_{hii} \mid (\nu nPnym_{dr}.let Pnym_{dr} = nPnym_{dr} in !(let Id_{dr} = d_A in P_{dr}))))$ ), by applying rule PAR – 0, we have  $P \equiv P \mid 0$ . By rule NEW – 0,  $\nu d_B.0 \equiv 0$ . Thus,  $P \equiv P \mid \nu d_B.0$ . Since  $d_B$  never appears in the process  $P$ , i.e.,  $d_B \notin fn(P) \cup fv(P)$ , by applying rule NEW – PAR, we have  $P \mid \nu d_B.0 \equiv \nu d_B.(P \mid 0) \equiv \nu d_B.P$ . Therefore,  $P \equiv \nu d_B.P$ .

**Verification result.** The bi-processes are verified using ProVerif. The verification results show that patient anonymity (with and without revealed patient identities a priori) and strong patient anonymity are satisfied; doctor anonymity is satisfied; neither doctor anonymity with revealed doctor identities nor strong doctor anonymity is satisfied.

For strong doctor anonymity, the adversary can distinguish a process initiated by an unknown doctor and a known doctor. Given a doctor process, where the doctor has identity  $d_A$ , pseudonym  $Pnym_{dr}$ , and credential  $drcred(Pnym_{dr}, d_A)$ , the terms  $Pnym_{dr}$  and  $drcred(Pnym_{dr}, d_A)$  are revealed. We assume that the adversary knows another doctor identity  $d_B$ . The adversary can fake an anonymous authentication by faking the zero-knowledge proof as  $zk((Pnym_{dr}, d_B), drcred(Pnym_{dr}, d_A))$ . If the zero-knowledge proof passes the corresponding verification  $Vfy-zk_{Auth_{dr}}$  by the patient, then the adversary knows that the doctor process is executed by the doctor  $d_B$ . Otherwise, not.

For the same reason, doctor anonymity fails the verification. Both flaws can be fixed by requiring a doctor to generate a new credential in each session (**s4'**).

## 6.5 (Strong) patient and doctor untraceability

Even if a user’s identity is not revealed, the adversary may be able to trace a user by telling whether two executions are done by the same user. The DLV08 protocol claims that prescriptions issued to the same patient should not be linkable to each other. In other words, the situation in which a patient executes the protocol twice should be indistinguishable from the situation in which two different patients execute the protocol individually. To satisfy this requirement, patient untraceability is required. (Remark that the original DLV08 paper calls this untraceability “patient unlinkability”).

**Patient and doctor untraceability.** Doctor untraceability has been defined in Definition 12, and patient untraceability can be defined in a similar style. The bi-process for verifying doctor untraceability is

$$\begin{aligned} & \nu\tilde{m}c.init.(!R_{pt} \mid !R_{dr} \mid !R_{ph} \mid !R_{mpa} \mid !R_{hii} \mid (\nu nPnym_{dr}.\nu wPnym_{dr}. \\ & ((let Id_{dr} = d_A in let Pnym_{dr} = nPnym_{dr} in P_{dr}) \mid \\ & (let Id_{dr} = choice[d_A, d_B] in let Pnym_{dr} = choice[nPnym_{dr}, wPnym_{dr}] in P_{dr}))))), \end{aligned}$$

and the bi-process for verifying patient untraceability is

$$\begin{aligned} & \nu\tilde{m}c.init.(!R_{pt} \mid !R_{dr} \mid !R_{ph} \mid !R_{mpa} \mid !R_{hii} \mid \\ & (\nu nPnym_{pt}.\nu nSss.\nu nAcc.\nu wPnym_{pt}.\nu wSss.\nu wAcc. \\ & in(ch_{hp}, nHii).in(ch_{hp}, wHii). \\ & let c_{pt-ntpkhii} = key(nHii) in let c_{pt-wpkhii} = key(wHii) in \\ & (let Hii = nHii in let c_{pt-pkhii} = c_{pt-ntpkhii} in let Id_{pt} = t_A in \\ & let Pnym_{pt} = nPnym_{pt} in let Sss = nSss in let Acc = nAcc in P_{pt}) \mid \\ & (let Hii = choice[nHii, wHii] in let c_{pt-pkhii} = choice[c_{pt-ntpkhii}, c_{pt-wpkhii}] in \\ & let Id_{pt} = choice[t_A, t_B] in let Pnym_{pt} = choice[nPnym_{pt}, wPnym_{pt}] in \\ & let Sss = choice[nSss, wSss] in let Acc = choice[nAcc, wAcc] in P_{pt}))). \end{aligned}$$

We verified two versions of doctor and patient untraceability, - in one version, the adversary does not know the two doctor/patient identities, and in the other version, the adversary initially knows the two doctor/patient identities.

**Strong patient and doctor untraceability.** Strong untraceability is modelled as a patient executing the protocol repeatedly is indistinguishable from different patients executing the protocol each once. Strong doctor untraceability is defined as in Definition 13 and strong patient untraceability can be defined in the same manner. The bi-process for verifying strong doctor untraceability is

$$\nu\tilde{m}c.init.(!R_{pt} \mid !R_{ph} \mid !R_{mpa} \mid !R_{hii} \mid !(\nu nId_{dr}.\nu nPnym_{dr}!(\nu wId_{dr}.\nu wPnym_{dr}.\text{let } Id_{dr} = \text{choice}[nId_{dr}, wId_{dr}] \text{ in let } Pnym_{dr} = \text{choice}[nPnym_{dr}, wPnym_{dr}] \text{ in } P_{dr}))),$$

and the bi-process for verifying strong patient untraceability is

$$\nu\tilde{m}c.init.(!R_{dr} \mid !R_{ph} \mid !R_{mpa} \mid !R_{hii} \mid !(\nu nId_{pt}.\nu nPnym_{pt}.\nu nSss.\nu nAcc.in(\text{ch}_{hp}, nHii).!(\nu wId_{pt}.\nu wPnym_{pt}.\nu wSss.\nu wAcc.\text{let } Id_{pt} = \text{choice}[nId_{pt}, wId_{pt}] \text{ in let } Pnym_{pt} = \text{choice}[nPnym_{pt}, wPnym_{pt}] \text{ in let } Sss = \text{choice}[nSss, wSss] \text{ in let } Acc = \text{choice}[nAcc, wSss] \text{ in in}(\text{ch}_{hp}, wHii).\text{let } Hii = \text{choice}[nHii, wHii] \text{ in let } c_{pt-pk_{hii}} = \text{key}(Hii) \text{ in } P_{pt}))).$$

This definition does not involve a specific doctor/patient, and thus needs not to distinguish whether the adversary knows the identities a priori.

**Verification result.** The bi-processes are verified using ProVerif. The verification results show that the DLV08 protocol does not satisfy patient/doctor untraceability (with/without revealed identities), nor strong untraceability.

The strong doctor untraceability fail, because the adversary can distinguish sessions initiated by one doctor and by different doctors. The doctor's pseudonym is revealed and a doctor uses the same pseudonym in all sessions. Sessions with the same doctor pseudonyms are initiated by the same doctor. For the same reasons, doctor untraceability without revealing doctor identities also fails. Both of them can be fixed by requiring the representation of a doctor's pseudonym (**Sss**) differ in each session (**s3'**).

However, assuming **s3'** (doctor pseudonym is fresh in every sessions) is not sufficient for satisfying doctor anonymity with doctor identities revealed. The adversary can still distinguish two sessions initiated by one doctor or by two different doctors, by comparing the anonymous authentications of the two sessions. From the communication in the two sessions, the adversary is able to learn two doctor pseudonyms  $Pnym_{dr}'$  and  $Pnym_{dr}''$ , two doctor credentials  $Cred_{dr}'$  and  $Cred_{dr}''$  and two anonymous authentications  $Auth_{dr}'$  and  $Auth_{dr}''$ . Since the adversary knows  $\mathbf{d}_A$  and  $\mathbf{d}_B$  in advance, he could construct the eight anonymous authentications by applying the zero-knowledge proof function, i.e.,  $zk((Pnym_{dr}, Id_{dr}), Cred_{dr})$ , where  $Pnym_{dr} = Pnym_{dr}'$  or  $Pnym_{dr} = Pnym_{dr}''$ ,  $Id_{dr} = \mathbf{d}_A$  or  $Id_{dr} = \mathbf{d}_B$ ,  $Cred_{dr} = Cred_{dr}'$  or  $Cred_{dr} = Cred_{dr}''$ . By comparing the constructed anonymous authentications with the observed ones, the adversary is able to tell who generated which anonymous authentication, and thus is able to tell whether the two sessions are initiated by the same doctor or different doctors. This can be fixed by additionally requiring that the doctor anonymous authentication differs in every session (**s4'**).

For strong patient untraceability, the adversary can distinguish sessions initiated by one patient (with identical social security statuses) and initiated by different patients (with different social security statuses). Second, the adversary can distinguish sessions initiated by one patient (with identical cipher texts  $\text{enc}(Pnym_{pt}, \mathbf{pk}_{ss0})$  and identical cipher texts  $\text{enc}(Hii, \mathbf{pk}_{ss0})$ ) and initiated by different patients (with different cipher texts  $\text{enc}(Pnym_{pt}, \mathbf{pk}_{ss0})$  and different cipher texts  $\text{enc}(Hii, \mathbf{pk}_{ss0})$ ). Third, since the patient credential is the same in all sessions and is revealed, the adversary can also trace a patient by the patient's credential. Fourth, the adversary can distinguish sessions using the same HII and sessions using different HIIs. For the same reasons, patient untraceability fails. Both flaws can be fixed by requiring that the representation of a patient's social security status to be different in each session (**s5'**), the encryptions are probabilistic (**s2'**), a patient freshly generates a credential in each session (**s4''**), and patients who shall not be distinguishable share the same HII (**s6'**).

## 6.6 Prescription privacy

Prescription privacy has been defined in Definition 3. To verify the prescription privacy is to check the satisfaction of the equivalence in the definition. The bi-process for verifying the equivalence is

$$\begin{aligned}
& (\text{private})\text{free } \mathbf{d}_A. (\text{private})\text{free } \mathbf{d}_B. \text{free } \mathbf{p}_A. \text{free } \mathbf{p}_B. \\
& \nu \tilde{m}. \text{init}. (!R_{pt} \mid !R_{dr} \mid !R_{ph} \mid (\nu \mathbf{nPnym}_{dr}. \nu \mathbf{wPnym}_{dr}. \\
& \quad \text{let } \text{Id}_{dr} = \text{choice}[\mathbf{d}_A, \mathbf{d}_B] \text{ in} \\
& \quad \text{let } \text{Pnym}_{dr} = \text{choice}[\mathbf{nPnym}_{dr}, \mathbf{wPnym}_{dr}] \text{ in} \\
& \quad \text{let } \text{presc} = \mathbf{p}_A \text{ in } \text{main}_{dr}) \mid \\
& (\nu \mathbf{nPnym}_{dr}. \nu \mathbf{wPnym}_{dr}. \\
& \quad \text{let } \text{Id}_{dr} = \text{choice}[\mathbf{d}_B, \mathbf{d}_A] \text{ in} \\
& \quad \text{let } \text{Pnym}_{dr} = \text{choice}[\mathbf{nPnym}_{dr}, \mathbf{wPnym}_{dr}] \text{ in} \\
& \quad \text{let } \text{presc} = \mathbf{p}_B \text{ in } \text{main}_{dr})).
\end{aligned}$$

Similarly, we verified two versions - in one version, the adversary does not know  $\mathbf{d}_A$  and  $\mathbf{d}_B$ , and in the other, the adversary knows  $\mathbf{d}_A$  and  $\mathbf{d}_B$ .

**Verification result.** The verification, using ProVerif, shows that the DLV08 protocol satisfies prescription privacy when the adversary does not know the doctor identities a priori, and does not satisfy prescription privacy when the adversary knows the doctor identities a priori, i.e., the adversary can distinguish whether a prescription is prescribed by doctor  $\mathbf{d}_A$  or doctor  $\mathbf{d}_B$ , given the adversary knows  $\mathbf{d}_A$  and  $\mathbf{d}_B$ . In the prescription proof, a prescription is linked to a doctor credential. And a doctor credential is linked to a doctor identity. Thus, the adversary can link a doctor to his prescription. To break the link, one way is to make sure that the adversary cannot link a doctor credential to a doctor identity. This can be achieved by adding randomness to the credential ( $\mathbf{s4}'$ ).

## 6.7 Receipt-freeness

The definition of receipt-freeness is modelled as the existence of a process  $P'_{dr}$ , such that the two equivalences in Definition 4 are satisfied. Due to the existential quantification, we cannot verify the property directly using ProVerif.

Examining the DLV08 protocol, we find an attack on receipt-freeness, even with assumption  $\mathbf{s4}'$  (after fixing prescription privacy with doctor ID revealed). A bribed doctor is able to prove to the adversary of his prescription as follows:

1. A doctor communicates with the adversary to agree on a bit-commitment that he will use, which links the doctor to the commitment.
2. The doctor uses the agreed bit-commitment in the communication with his patient. This links the bit-commitment to a prescription.
3. Later, when the patient uses this prescription to get medicine from a pharmacist, the adversary can observe the prescription being used. This proves that the doctor has really prescribed the medicine.

We formally confirm the attack using ProVerif, i.e., we show that in the protocol model, if a doctor reveals all his information to the adversary, the doctor's prescription privacy is broken. The same attack exists for multi-session receipt-freeness as well – a bribed doctor is able to prove his prescriptions by agreeing with the adversary on the bit-commitments in each session.

**Theorem 1** (receipt-freeness). *The DLV08 protocol fails to satisfy receipt-freeness under both the standard assumption  $\mathbf{s4}$  (a doctor has the same credential in every session), and also under assumption  $\mathbf{s4}'$  (a doctor generates a new credential for each session).*

Formal proof of the theorem can be found in Appendix A.

## 6.8 Independency of (enforced) prescription privacy

To determine whether the doctor’s prescription privacy is independent of the pharmacist, we replace regular pharmacist role  $R_i$  with collaborating role  $R_{ph}$  in Definition 6. The bi-process for verifying the property is:

$$\begin{aligned}
 & (\textit{private})\textit{free } \mathbf{d}_A. (\textit{private})\textit{free } \mathbf{d}_B. \textit{free } \mathbf{p}_A. \textit{free } \mathbf{p}_B. \\
 & \nu \tilde{m}c. \textit{init}. (!R_{pt} \mid !R_{dr} \mid !(R_{ph})^{\text{chc}} \mid (\nu n\text{Pnym}_{dr}. \nu w\text{Pnym}_{dr}. \\
 & \quad \text{let } \text{Id}_{dr} = \text{choice}[\mathbf{d}_A, \mathbf{d}_B] \text{ in} \\
 & \quad \text{let } \text{Pnym}_{dr} = \text{choice}[\text{nPnym}_{dr}, \text{wPnym}_{dr}] \text{ in} \\
 & \quad \text{let } \text{presc} = \mathbf{p}_A \text{ in } \textit{main}_{dr}) \mid \\
 & (\nu n\text{Pnym}_{dr}. \nu w\text{Pnym}_{dr}. \\
 & \quad \text{let } \text{Id}_{dr} = \text{choice}[\mathbf{d}_B, \mathbf{d}_A] \text{ in} \\
 & \quad \text{let } \text{Pnym}_{dr} = \text{choice}[\text{nPnym}_{dr}, \text{wPnym}_{dr}] \text{ in} \\
 & \quad \text{let } \text{presc} = \mathbf{p}_B \text{ in } \textit{main}_{dr}).
 \end{aligned}$$

Verification using ProVerif shows that the protocol (the original version where the adversary does not know  $\mathbf{d}_A$  and  $\mathbf{d}_B$ , and the version after fixing the flaw on prescription privacy with assumption  $\mathbf{s4}'$  where the adversary knows  $\mathbf{d}_A$  and  $\mathbf{d}_B$ ) satisfies this property.

The case of pharmacist-independent receipt-freeness is treated analogously. We replace regular pharmacist  $R_i$  with  $R_{ph}$  in Definition 7. The flaw described in Section 6.7 also surfaces here. This was expected: when a doctor can prove his prescription without the pharmacist sharing information with the adversary, the doctor can also prove this when the pharmacist genuinely cooperates with the adversary.

## 6.9 Dishonest users

So far, we have considered security and privacy with respect to a Dolev-Yao style adversary (see Section 3.3). The initial knowledge of the adversary was modelled such, that the adversary could not take an active part in the execution of the protocol. This constitutes the basic DY adversary, as shown in Table 3. In more detail, for secrecy of private doctor and patient information (see Table 1), [dDLVV08] claims that no third party (including the basic DY adversary) shall be able to know a patient’s or doctor’s private information (refer to the beginning of Section 4). Similarly, the verification of authentication properties in Table 2 is also with respect to the basic DY adversary. This captures that no third party that does not participate in the execution shall be able to impersonate any party (involved in the execution). The same basic DY adversary model is used to verify anonymity, untraceability and prescription privacy. The exceptions are (1) for verifying receipt-freeness and independency of enforced prescription privacy, the basic DY adversary is extended with information from the targeted doctor; (2) for verifying independency of prescription privacy and independency of enforced prescription privacy, the basic DY adversary is extended with information from pharmacists.

Properties	Adversary
Secrecy, Authentication, Anonymity, Untraceability, Prescription privacy	basic DY
Receipt-freeness	basic DY + info. from doctor
Independency of prescription privacy	basic DY + info. from pharmacy
Independency of enforced prescription privacy	basic DY + info. from doctor and pharmacy

Table 3: Summary of the respected adversary

In this section, we consider dishonest users, that is, malicious users that collaborate with the adversary and are part of the execution, into consideration. For each property previously verified, we analyse the result once again with respect to each dishonest role.

Dishonest users are modelled by providing the adversary certain initial knowledge such that the adversary can take part in the protocol. To execute the protocol as a doctor, i.e., to instantiate the doctor process  $P_{dr}$ , the adversary only needs to have an identity and a pseudonym. Since the adversary is able to generate data, the adversary can create his own identity  $\text{Id}_{dr}^a$  and pseudonym  $\text{Id}_{dr}^a$ . However, this is not sufficient, because an legitimate doctor has a credential issued by authorities. The credential is captured by the private function  $\text{drcred}$ . The adversary cannot obtain this credential, since he cannot apply the function  $\text{drcred}$ . When the function  $\text{drcred}$  is modelled as public, the adversary is able to obtain his credential  $\text{drcred}(\text{Id}_{dr}^a, \text{Id}_{dr}^a)$ , and thus has the ability to behave like a doctor. Hence, by modelling the function  $\text{drcred}$  as public, we allow the adversary to have the ability of dishonest doctors. Note that an honest doctor’s identity is secret (see Table 1). The attacker thus cannot forge credentials of honest doctors, as the doctor’s identity must be known for this. Thus, making the function  $\text{drcred}$  public does not bestow extra power on the attacker.

Similarly, by allowing the adversary to have patient credentials, we strengthen the adversary with the ability to control dishonest patients. This is modelled by changing the private functions  $\text{ptcred}$  to be public.

Each public entity (pharmacist, MPA or HII) has a secret key as distinct identifier, i.e., its public key and identity can be derived from the secret key. The adversary can create such a secret key by himself. However, only the legitimate entities can participate in the protocol. This is modelled using private channels – only the honest entities are allowed to publish their information to the channels, and participants only read in entities, which they are going to communicate with, from the private channels. By changing the private channels to be public, the adversary is able to behave as dishonest public entities. Note that when considering the adversary only controlling dishonest pharmacists among the public entities, for the sake of simplicity of modelling, a dishonest pharmacist is modelled as  $R_{ph}^{\text{chc}}$  (same as in independency of prescription privacy) in which the pharmacist shares all his information with the adversary.

The above modelling of dishonest users captures the following scenarios. For verifying secrecy of doctor/patient information,

- the dishonest doctor/patient models other doctors/patients that may break secrecy of the target doctor/patient;
- the dishonest patient/doctor models the patients/doctors that may communicate with the target doctor/patient;
- the dishonest pharmacist, MPA and HII may participate in the same execution as the target doctor/patient.

Since secrecy is defined as no other party (including dishonest users) should be able to know a doctor’s/patient’s information, unless the information is intended to be revealed, we would not consider it as an attack if the dishonest user intends to receive the private information, for details, see Section 6.9.1.

For verifying authentication properties, for example, a doctor authenticates a patient, a dishonest doctor is not the doctor directly communicating with the patient, and a dishonest patient is not the one who directly communicates with the doctor, because it does not make sense to analyse a dishonest user authenticates or authenticates to another user. Instead, the dishonest doctors and patients are observers who may participate in other execution sessions.

- In general, if user  $A$  authenticates to user  $B$ , the dishonest users taking the same role of  $A$  or  $B$  are observers participating in different sessions, i.e., cannot be  $A$  or  $B$ .
- For the dishonest pharmacists, MPAs and HIIs, since they are not the authentication parties, they can be users participating in the same session.

For verifying prescription privacy and receipt-freeness,

- the dishonest doctors are other doctors that aim to break the target doctor’s privacy;

- the dishonest patients can be patients communicating with the target doctor;
- dishonest pharmacists, MPAs and HIIs can be users participating in the same session.

Note that the dishonest doctor differs from the bribed doctor, as the bribed doctor tries to break his own privacy, while dishonest doctor tries to break others' privacy.

For verifying independency of prescription privacy and independency of enforced prescription privacy,

- the dishonest doctors (not the target doctor) try to break the target doctor's privacy;
- the dishonest patients may directly communicate with the target doctor;
- the dishonest pharmacists are the same as the bribed pharmacists, since 1) the bribed pharmacists genuinely forward information to the adversary and 2) all the actions that a dishonest pharmacists can do can be simulated by the basic DY with the received information from the bribed pharmacists, i.e., there is no private functions or private channels that the dishonest pharmacists can use but the adversary with bribed pharmacists information cannot;
- the dishonest MPAs and HIIs can participate in the same session as the target doctor.

The verification with dishonest users shows similar results as the verification without dishonest users. The reason is that if there is an attack with respect to the basic DY attacker when verifying a property, then the property is also broken when additionally considering dishonest users. The exceptions (i.e., the additional identified attacks) are shown in Table 4, and the details of the additional attacks are shown in the remaining part of this section.

Additional attacks	Dishonest users
secrecy of patient $\mathbf{t}_B$ 's pseudonym	basic DY + dishonest patient $\mathbf{t}_A$
secrecy of a patient's pseudonym	basic DY + dishonest pharmacists
(strong) patient anonymity when using different HIIs	basic DY + dishonest HIIs
(strong) patient anonymity when using different HIIs	basic DY + dishonest MPAs

Table 4: Additional attacks when considering dishonest users

### 6.9.1 Secrecy

When considering dishonest doctors and pharmacists, secrecy results in Table 1 do not change, since doctors do not receive any information that the adversary does not know (see Figure 7).

When considering dishonest patients, an additional attack is found. When a patient  $\mathbf{t}_A$  is dishonest, he can obtain another patient  $\mathbf{t}_B$ 's pseudonym by doing the following:

1.  $\mathbf{t}_A$  observes  $\mathbf{t}_B$ 's communication and reads in  $vc_4$  (the verifiable encryption which encrypts  $\mathbf{t}_B$ 's pseudonym with the public key of an MPA).
2. Hence, from  $vc_4$ ,  $\mathbf{t}_A$  can obtain the cipher-text  $\text{enc}(\text{Pnym}_{pt}^B, c_{pt-pk_{mpa}})$ , where  $\text{Pnym}_{pt}^B$  is  $\mathbf{t}_B$ 's pseudonym and  $c_{pt-pk_{mpa}}$  is the public key of the MPA.
3.  $\mathbf{t}_A$  initiates the protocol with his own data.
4. In the communication with a pharmacist,  $\mathbf{t}_A$  replaces his  $c_5$  (which should be a verifiable encryption, containing a cipher-text from  $\mathbf{t}_A$  encrypted with the public key of the MPA) with  $vc_4$ .
5. On receiving  $vc_4$  (the fake  $c_5$ ), the pharmacist sends it to the MPA, and the MPA decrypts the cipher-text  $\text{enc}(\text{Pnym}_{pt}^B, c_{pt-pk_{mpa}})$ , embedded in  $vc_4$  and sends the decryption result to HII.

6.  $\tau_A$  observes the communication between the MPA and HII, and reads the decrypted text of the fake  $c_5$  (i.e.,  $\text{Pnym}_{pt}^B$ ), which is  $\tau_B$ 's pseudonym.

This attack does not exist when the attacker cannot participate as a patient. Because the dishonest patient has to replace  $c_5$  in his own communication. If an honest patient's  $c_5$  is replaced by the adversary, the pharmacist would detect it by verifying the receipt *ReceiptAck*, which should contain the correct  $c_5$ . This attack can be addressed by explicitly asking the MPA to verify the decrypted message of  $c_5$  to be a verifiable encryption before sending it out. Alternatively, if the communication between MPA and the HII is secured after authentication, the adversary would not be able to observe  $\tau_B$ 's pseudonym, and thus the attack would not happen.

When considering dishonest pharmacists, an additional attack may exist on a patient's pseudonym. The dishonest pharmacist has/creates a secret key  $y$  and obtains its corresponding public key  $\text{pk}(y)$ . The pharmacist creates a fake MPA identity using the secret key and public key, i.e.,  $\text{host}(\text{pk}(y))$ . The dishonest pharmacist provides the patient a fake MPA identity, from which the patient obtains the MPA public key  $\text{pk}(y)$ . Later, the patient encrypts his pseudonym using the fake MPA's public key  $\text{enc}(\text{Pnym}_{pt}, \text{pk}(y))$ , and provides a verifiable encryption,  $vc_4$  in particular. The verifiable encryption is sent to the pharmacist, from which the pharmacist can read the cipher-text  $\text{enc}(\text{Pnym}_{pt}, \text{pk}(y))$ . Since the pharmacist knows the secret key  $y$ , he can decrypt the cipher-text and obtain the patient's pseudonym  $\text{Pnym}_{pt}$ . Note that we model that the patient obtains the MPA of the pharmacist and the MPA's public key from the pharmacist, thus the attack may not happen if the patient initially knows the MPA of any pharmacist, or the patient has the ability to immediately check whether the MPA provided by a pharmacist is indeed a legitimate MPA.

When considering dishonest MPAs, the adversary additionally knows a patient's pseudonym. However, this can hardly be an attack, as the patient pseudonym is intended to be known by the MPA. Similarly, the HII is the intended receiver of a patient's pseudonym. Other than a patient's pseudonym, the dishonest MPA and HII do not know any information that the adversary does not know without controlling dishonest agents. Note that in reality, the MPA and HII may know more sensitive information, for example, from the pseudonym, the HII is able to obtain the patient's identity, and a dishonest MPA can claim that a prescription has medical issues and obtain the doctor identity in a procedure, which is beyond the scope of this protocol.

### 6.9.2 Authentication

When considering dishonest users, the verification results of the authentication remain the same, except the authentication from the dishonest user to other parties. For example, when doctors are dishonest, we do not need to consider the authentication from doctors to a patient, since the dishonest users are part of the adversary. Similarly, when a patient is dishonest, the authentication from a patient to a doctor or a pharmacist is obviously unsatisfied, other authentication verification results remain the same. When pharmacists, MPAs or HIIs are dishonest, the verification results remain unchanged.

### 6.9.3 Privacy properties

For those privacy properties which are not satisfied with respect to the adversary controlling no dishonest agents, the properties are not satisfied when considering the adversary who controls dishonest users. Thus, we only need to analyse the property that are satisfied with respect to the adversary controlling no dishonest agents, i.e. (Strong) patient anonymity. Obviously, two patients can be distinguished by the adversary who controls dishonest HIIs, when the two patients use different HIIs, because the patients use different HII public keys to encrypt his pseudonym. When the two patients use different HIIs, and the HIIs are honest, the adversary, who controls dishonest MPAs, can still distinguish them, because a patient's HII is intended to be known by the MPA. Finally, (strong) patient anonymity is satisfied with respect to the adversary controlling dishonest doctors and dishonest pharmacists.

## 7 Addressing the flaws of the DLV08 protocol

To summarise, we present updates to the assumptions of Section 5.1 to fix the flaws found in our analysis of the privacy properties.

- **s2'** The encryptions are probabilistic.
- **s3'** The value of  $\text{Pnym}_{dr}$  is freshly generated in every session.
- **s4'** A doctor freshly generates an unpredictable credential in each session. We model this with another parameter (a random number) of the credential. Following this, anonymous authentication using these credentials proves knowledge of the used randomness.
- **s4''** A patient freshly generates an unpredictable credential in each session. Similar to **s4'**, this can be achieved by add randomness in the credential. The anonymous authentication using the credentials proves the knowledge of the used randomness.
- **s5'** The values of  $\text{Sss}$  differ in sessions.
- **s6'** The value of  $\text{Hii}$  shall be the same for all patients.

The proposed assumptions are provided on the model level. Due to the ambiguities in the original protocol (e.g., it is not clear how a social security status is represented), it is difficult to propose detailed solutions. To implement a proposed assumption, one only needs to capture its properties.

To capture **s2'**, the encryption scheme can be ElGamal cryptosystem, or RSA cryptosystem with encryption padding, which are probabilistic. In some systems, deterministic encryption, e.g., RSA without encryption padding, may be more useful than probabilistic encryption, for example for database searching of encrypted data. In such systems, designers need to carefully distinguish which encryption scheme is used in which part of the system.

**s3'** can be achieved by directly requiring a doctor's pseudonym to be fresh in every session, for example, a doctor generates different pseudonyms in sessions and keeps the authorities, who maintain the relation between the doctor identity and pseudonyms, updated in a secure way; or before every session the doctor requests a pseudonym from the authorities. Alternatively, it can be achieved by changing the value of  $\text{Pnym}_{dr}$ . Assuming the authorities share a key with each doctor; instead of directly using pseudonym in a session, the doctor encrypts his pseudonym with the key using probabilistic encryption. That is, the value of  $\text{Pnym}_{dr}$  is a cipher-text which differs in sessions. When an MPA wants to find out the doctor of a prescription, he can contact the authorities to decrypt the  $\text{Pnym}_{dr}$  and finds out the pseudonym of the doctor or the identity of the doctor directly.

**s4'** and **s4''** together form the updates to **s4**. We separate the update to the doctor credential in **s4'** and the update to the patient credential in **s4''** for the convenience of referring to them individually in other places.

Similar to **s3'**, **s5'** can be achieved by directly requiring that a patient's social security status is different in each session, e.g., by embedding a timestamp in the status. Alternatively, the value of  $\text{Sss}$  can be a cipher-text which is a probabilistic encryption of a patient's social security status with the pharmacist's public key, since the social security status is used for the pharmacist to check the status of the patient.

**s6'** can be achieved by directly requiring that all patients share the same HII. In the case of multiple HIIs, different HIIs should not be distinguishable, for example, HIIs may cooperate together and provide a uniformed reference (name and key). In fact, if patients are satisfied with untraceability within a group of a certain amount of patients, patient untraceability can be satisfied as long as each HII has more patients than the expected size of the group. If only untraceability is required (instead of strong untraceability), the use of a group key of all HIIs is sufficient. The common key among HIIs can be established by using asymmetric group key agreement. In this way, the HIIs cannot be distinguished by their keys. In addition, the identities of HIIs are not revealed, and thus cannot be used to distinguish HIIs. Hence, the common key

checked privacy property	initial model	cause(s)	improvement	revised model
prescription privacy	✓			✓
prescription privacy w. ID reveal	×	<b>s4</b>	<b>s4'</b>	✓
receipt-freeness	×		<b>s8'</b>	✓
ind. of presc. priv.	✓ (with <b>s4'</b> )			✓
ind. of enf. presc. priv.	×		<b>s8'</b>	×
pt. anonym. (w. ID reveal)	✓			✓
strong pt. anonym.	✓			✓
dr. anonym.	✓			✓
dr. anonym. w. ID reveal	×	<b>s4</b>	<b>s4'</b>	✓
strong dr. anonymity	×	<b>s4</b>	<b>s4'</b>	✓
pt. untrace. (w. ID reveal)	×	<b>s2, s4, s5, s6</b>	<b>s2', s4'', s5', s6'</b>	✓
strong pt. untrace.	×	<b>s2, s4, s5, s6</b>	<b>s2', s4'', s5', s6'</b>	✓
dr. untrace.	×	<b>s3</b>	<b>s3'</b>	✓
dr. untrace. w. ID reveal	×	<b>s3,s4</b>	<b>s3',s4'</b>	✓
strong dr. untrace.	×	<b>s3</b>	<b>s3'</b>	✓

Table 5: Verification results of privacy properties and revised assumptions.

ensures that two patients executing the protocol once and one patient executing the protocol twice cannot be distinguished by their HIIs.

The modified protocol was verified again using ProVerif. The verification results show that the protocol with revised assumptions satisfies doctor anonymity, strong doctor anonymity, and prescription privacy, as well as untraceability and strong untraceability for both patient and doctor.

However, the modified protocol model does not satisfy receipt-freeness, to make the protocol satisfy receipt-freeness, we apply the following assumption on communication channels.

- **s8'** Communication channels are untappable (i.e., the adversary does not observe anything from the channel), except those used for authentication, which remain public.

Our model of the protocol is accordingly modified as follows: replacing channel **ch** in lines **d10, t6** with an untappable channel **ch<sub>dp</sub>**, replacing channel **ch** in lines **t23, t26, h5, h22** with an untappable channel **ch<sub>ptph</sub>**, and replacing channel **ch** in lines **t24, h21** with an untappable channel **ch<sub>phpt</sub>**. The untappable channels are modelled as global private channels. We prove that the protocol (with **s4'** and **s8'**) satisfies receipt-freeness by showing the existence of a process  $P'_{dr}$  (as shown in Figure 29) such that the equivalences in Definition 4 are satisfied. This was verified using ProVerif (for verification code, see [DJP12a]).

Messages over untappable channels are assumed to be perfectly secret to the adversary (for example, the channels assumed in [DKR09, HNB11]). Thus, the security and classical privacy properties, which are satisfied in the model with public channels only, are also satisfied when replacing some public channels with untappable channels. Similar to other proposed assumptions, the assumption of untappable channels is at the model level. This is a strong assumption, as the implementation of an untappable channel is difficult [HNB11]. However, as this assumption is often used in literature to achieve privacy in the face of bribery and coercion (e.g. [Oka96, AS02, HNB11]), we feel that its use here is justifiable.

However, even with the above assumptions the DLV08 protocol does not satisfy independency of receipt-freeness. The proof first shows that  $P'_{dr}$  is not sufficient for proving this with ProVerif. Then we prove (analogous to the proof in Section 6.7) that there is no alternative process  $P'_{dr}$  which satisfies Definition 7. Intuitively, all information sent over untappable channels is received by pharmacists and can be genuinely revealed to the adversary (no lying assumption). Hence, the links between a doctor, his nonces, his commitment, his credential and his prescription can still be revealed when the doctor is bribed/coerced to reveal those nonces.

```

initdr{dA/Iddr}.(!Pdr{dA/Iddr} | P'dr{dA/Iddr}) :=
let Iddr = dA in νPnymdr.
  (!Pdr (*the Pdr has assumptions s4' and s8'*)
    | (out(chc, Iddr).
      out(chc, Pnymdr).
      νndr.out(chc, ndr).
      (*s4': creating a nonce and adding it in zk and spk*)
      out(ch, zk((Pnymdr, Iddr, ndr), drcrd(Pnymdr, Iddr, ndr))).
      in(ch, (rcv_Authpt, rcv_PtProof)).
      out(chc, (rcv_Authpt, rcv_PtProof)).
      let c_Credpt = getpublic(rcv_Authpt) in
      let (c_Comtpt, = c_Credpt) = getpublic(rcv_PtProof) in
      if Vfy-zkAuthpt(rcv_Authpt, c_Credpt) = true then
      if Vfy-zkPtProof(rcv_PtProof, (c_Comtpt, c_Credpt)) = true then
      out(chc, pA).
      νrdr.
      out(chc, rdr).
      let PrescriptID = hash(pB, c_Comtpt, commit(Pnymdr, rdr)) in
      out(chdp, (spk((Pnymdr, rdr, Iddr, ndr),
        (commit(Pnymdr, rdr), drcrd(Pnymdr, Iddr, ndr)),
        (pB, PrescriptID, commit(Pnymdr, rdr), c_Comtpt)),
        rdr)).
      out(chc, (spk((Pnymdr, rdr, Iddr, ndr),
        (commit(Pnymdr, rdr), drcrd(Pnymdr, Iddr, ndr)),
        (pA, hash(pA, c_Comtpt, commit(Pnymdr, rdr)),
        commit(Pnymdr, rdr), c_Comtpt)),
        rdr))))))

```

Figure 29: The doctor process  $P'_{dr}$  (using untappable channels).

**Theorem 2** (independency of receipt-freeness). *The DLV08 protocol fails to satisfy independency of receipt-freeness.*

Formal proof the theorem can be found in Appendix B.

Intuitively, a bribed doctor is linked to the nonces he sent to the adversary. The nonces are linked to the doctor's prescription in a prescription proof. A doctor's prescription proof is sent over untappable channels first to a patient and later from the patient to a pharmacist. Malicious pharmacists reveal the prescription proof to the adversary. If a bribed doctor lied about his prescription, the adversary can detect it by checking the doctor's corresponding prescription proof revealed by the pharmacist. The untappable channel assumption enables the protocol to satisfy receipt-freeness but not independency of receipt-freeness because untappable channels enable a bribed doctor to hide his prescription proof and thus allow the doctor to lie about his prescription, however the pharmacist gives the prescription proof away, from which the adversary can detect whether the doctor lied about the prescription.

## 8 Conclusions

In this paper, we have studied security and privacy properties, particular enforced privacy, in the e-health domain. We identified the requirement that doctor privacy should be enforced to prevent doctor bribery by, for example, the pharmaceutical industry. To capture this requirement, we first formalised the classical privacy property, i.e., prescription privacy, and its enforced privacy counterpart, i.e., receipt-freeness. The cooperation between the bribed doctor and the adversary

is formalised in the same way as in receipt-freeness in e-voting. However, the formalisation of receipt-freeness differs from receipt-freeness, due to the domain requirement that only part of the doctor's process needs to share information with the adversary.

Next, we noted that e-health systems involve not necessarily trusted third parties, such as pharmacists. Such parties should not be able to assist an adversary in breaking doctor privacy. To capture this requirement, we formally defined independency of prescription privacy. Moreover, this new requirement must hold, even if the doctor is forced to help the adversary. To capture that, we formally defined independency of receipt-freeness.

These formalisations were validated in a case study of the DLV08 protocol. The protocol was modelled in the applied pi calculus and verified with the help of the ProVerif tool. In addition to the (enforced) doctor privacy properties, we also analysed secrecy, authentication, anonymity and untraceability for both patients and doctors. Ambiguities in the original description of the protocol which may lead to flaws were found and addressed.

We notice that the property independency of receipt-freeness is not satisfied in the case study protocol, and we were not able to propose a reasonable fix for it. Thus, it is interesting for us to design a new protocol to satisfy such strong property in the future. Furthermore, when considering dishonest users, we did not consider one dishonest user taking multiple roles. Thus, it would be interesting to analyse the security and privacy properties with respect to dishonest users taking various combination of roles.

## References

- [AB05] M. Abadi and B. Blanchet. Computer-assisted verification of a protocol for certified Email. *Science of Computer Programming*, 58(1–2):3–27, 2005.
- [ABF07] M. Abadi, B. Blanchet, and C. Fournet. Just fast keying in the pi calculus. *ACM Transactions on Information and System Security*, 10(3):1–59, 2007.
- [ACdD03] G. Ateniese, R. Curtmola, B. de Medeiros, and D. Davis. Medical information privacy assurance: cryptographic and system aspects. In *Proc. 3rd Conference on Security in Communication Networks*, volume 2576 of *LNCS*, pages 199–218. Springer, 2003.
- [ACRR10] M. Arapinis, T. Chothia, E. Ritter, and M. D. Ryan. Analysing unlinkability and anonymity using the applied pi calculus. In *Proc. 23rd IEEE Computer Security Foundations Symposium*, pages 107–121. IEEE CS, 2010.
- [Ad02] G. Ateniese and B. de Medeiros. Anonymous e-prescriptions. In *Proc. ACM Workshop on Privacy in the Electronic Society*, pages 19–31. ACM Press, 2002.
- [AF01] M. Abadi and C. Fournet. Mobile values, new names, and secure communication. In *Proc. 28th Symposium on Principles of Programming Languages*, pages 104–115. ACM Press, 2001.
- [And96] R. Anderson. A security policy model for clinical information systems. In *Proc. 17th IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy*, pages 30–43. IEEE CS, 1996.
- [AS02] M. Abe and K. Suzuki. Receipt-free sealed-bid auction. In *Proc. 5th Conference on Information Security*, volume 2433 of *LNCS*, pages 191–199. Springer, 2002.
- [BAF08] B. Blanchet, M. Abadi, and C. Fournet. Automated verification of selected equivalences for security protocols. *Journal of Logic and Algebraic Programming*, 75(1):3–51, 2008.
- [BB96] Joachim Biskup and Gerrit Bleumer. Cryptographic protection of health information: cost and benefit. *International Journal of Bio-Medical Computing*, 43(1):61–67, 1996.

- [BC08] B. Blanchet and A. Chaudhuri. Automated formal analysis of a protocol for secure file sharing on untrusted storage. In *Proc. IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy*, pages 417–431. IEEE CS, 2008.
- [BCKL08] M. Belenkiy, M. Chase, M. Kohlweiss, and A. Lysyanskaya. P-signatures and non-interactive anonymous credentials. In *Proc. 5th Theory of Cryptography Conference*, volume 4948 of *LNCS*, pages 356–374. Springer, 2008.
- [BHM08] M. Backes, C. Hrițcu, and M. Maffei. Automated verification of remote electronic voting protocols in the applied pi-calculus. In *Proc. 21st IEEE Computer Security Foundations Symposium*, pages 195–209. IEEE CS, 2008.
- [Bla] B. Blanchet. Proverif automatic cryptographic protocol verifier user manual for untyped inputs. October 1, 2012.
- [Bla01] B. Blanchet. An efficient cryptographic protocol verifier based on prolog rules. In *Proc. 14th IEEE Computer Security Foundations Workshop*, pages 82–96. IEEE CS, 2001.
- [Bla02] B. Blanchet. From secrecy to authenticity in security protocols. In *Proc. 9th International Symposium on Static Analysis*, volume 2477 of *LNCS*, pages 342–359. Springer, 2002.
- [Bla04] B. Blanchet. Automatic proof of strong secrecy for security protocols. In *Proc. 25th IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy*, pages 86–100. IEEE CS, 2004.
- [Bla09] B. Blanchet. Automatic verification of correspondences for security protocols. *Journal of Computer Security*, 17(4):363–434, 2009.
- [BMU08] M. Backes, M. Maffei, and D. Unruh. Zero-knowledge in the applied pi-calculus and automated verification of the direct anonymous attestation protocol. In *Proc. IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy*, pages 202–215. IEEE CS, 2008.
- [Bra00] S. A. Brands. *Rethinking public key infrastructures and digital certificates: building in privacy*. MIT Press, 2000.
- [BT94] J. Benaloh and D. Tuinstra. Receipt-free secret-ballot elections (extended abstract). In *Proc. 26th ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing*, pages 544–553. ACM Press, 1994.
- [CHCK07] D. K. W. Chiu, P. C. K. Hung, V. S. Y. Cheng, and E. Kafeza. Protecting the exchange of medical images in healthcare process integration with web services. In *Proc. 40th Hawaii Conference on Systems Science*, pages 131–140. IEEE CS, 2007.
- [CKS04] R. Chadha, S. Kremer, and A. Scedrov. Formal analysis of multi-party contract signing. In *Proc. 17th IEEE Computer Security Foundations Workshop*, pages 266–279. IEEE CS, 2004.
- [dDLVV08] B. de Decker, M. Layouni, H. Vangheluwe, and K. Verslype. A privacy-preserving eHealth protocol compliant with the Belgian healthcare system. In *Proc. 5th European Workshop on Public Key Infrastructures, Services and Application*, volume 5057 of *LNCS*, pages 118–133. Springer, 2008.
- [DJP11] N. Dong, H. L. Jonker, and J. Pang. Analysis of a receipt-free auction protocol in the applied pi calculus. In *Proc. 7th Workshop on Formal Aspects in Security and Trust*, volume 6561 of *LNCS*, pages 223–238. Springer, 2011.

- [DJP12a] N. Dong, H. L. Jonker, and J. Pang. Formal analysis of an eHealth protocol [proverif codes]. Technical report, University of Luxembourg, 2012. ProVerif codes are available at <http://satoss.uni.lu/naipeng/publication.php> or <http://satoss.uni.lu/members/naipeng/thesis.php>.
- [DJP12b] N. Dong, H. L. Jonker, and J. Pang. Formal analysis of privacy in an eHealth protocol. In *Proc. 17th European Symposium on Research in Computer Security*, volume 7459 of *LNCS*, pages 325–342. Springer, 2012.
- [DJP13] N. Dong, H. L. Jonker, and J. Pang. Enforcing privacy in the presence of others: Notions, formalisations and relations. In *Proc. 18th European Symposium on Research in Computer Security*, volume 8134 of *LNCS*, pages 499–516. Springer, 2013.
- [DKR09] S. Delaune, S. Kremer, and M. D. Ryan. Verifying privacy-type properties of electronic voting protocols. *Journal of Computer Security*, 17(4):435–487, 2009.
- [DY83] D. Dolev and A. C.-C. Yao. On the security of public key protocols. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 29(2):198–207, 1983.
- [HNB11] J. Howlader, V. Nair, and S. Basu. Deniable encryption in replacement of untappable channel to prevent coercion. In *Advances in Networks and Communications*, volume 132 of *Communications in Computer and Information Science*, pages 491–501. Springer, 2011.
- [Hor51] A. Horn. On sentences which are true of direct unions of algebras. *Journal of Symbolic Logic*, 16(1):14–21, 1951.
- [HS00] M. Hirt and K. Sako. Efficient receipt-free voting based on homomorphic encryption. In *Proc. 19th Conference on the Theory and Application of Cryptographic Techniques*, volume 1807 of *LNCS*, pages 539–556. Springer, 2000.
- [JPM09] H. L. Jonker, J. Pang, and S. Mauw. A formal framework for quantifying voter-controlled privacy. *Journal of Algorithms in Cognition, Informatics and Logic*, 64(2-3):89–105, 2009.
- [KAB09] D. Kotz, S. Avancha, and A. Baxi. A privacy framework for mobile health and home-care systems. In *Proc. Workshop on Security and Privacy in Medical and Home-Care Systems*, pages 1–12. ACM Press, 2009.
- [KBM<sup>+</sup>03] A. Kalam, S. Benferhat, A. Miège, R. Baida, F. Cuppens, C. Saurel, P. Balbiani, Y. Deswarte, and G. Trouessin. Organization based access control. In *Proc. 4th IEEE Workshop on Policies for Distributed Systems and Networks*, pages 120–131. IEEE CS, 2003.
- [KLS<sup>+</sup>10] J. Ko, C. Lu, M. B. Srivastava, J. A. Stankovic, A. Terzis, and M. Welsh. Wireless sensor networks for healthcare. *Proceedings of IEEE*, 98(11):1947–1960, 2010.
- [KT09] R. Küsters and T. Truderung. An epistemic approach to coercion-resistance for electronic voting protocols. In *Proc. 30th IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy*, pages 251–266. IEEE CS, 2009.
- [KTV10] R. Küsters, T. Truderung, and A. Vogt. A game-based definition of coercion-resistance and its applications. In *Proc. 23rd IEEE Computer Security Foundations Symposium*, pages 122–136. IEEE CS, 2010.
- [LCPD07] L. Luo, X. Cai, J. Pang, and Y. Deng. Analyzing an electronic cash protocol using applied pi-calculus. In *Proc. 5th Conference on Applied Cryptography and Network Security*, volume 4521 of *LNCS*, pages 87–103. Springer, 2007.

- [Liu11] J. Liu. A proof of coincidence of labeled bisimilarity and observational equivalence in applied pi calculus, 2011. Available at <http://lcs.ios.ac.cn/~jliu/>.
- [LK00] B. Lee and K. Kim. Receipt-free electronic voting through collaboration of voter and honest verifier, 2000.
- [LK02] B. Lee and K. Kim. Receipt-free electronic voting with a tamper-resistant randomizer. In *Proc. 4th Conference on Information and Communications Security*, volume 2513 of *LNCS*, pages 389–406. Springer, 2002.
- [Lou98] K. Louwerse. The electronic patient record; the management of access – case study: Leiden university hospital. *International Journal of Medical Informatics*, 49(1):39–44, 1998.
- [Low96] G. Lowe. Breaking and fixing the Needham-Schroeder public-key protocol using FDR. In *Proc. 2nd Workshop on Tools and Algorithms for the Construction and Analysis of Systems*, volume 1055 of *LNCS*, pages 147–166. Springer, 1996.
- [LVS<sup>+</sup>09] M. Layouni, K. Verslype, M. T. Sandikkaya, B. de Decker, and H. Vangheluwe. Privacy-preserving telemonitoring for eHealth. In *Proc. 23rd Annual IFIP Working Conference on Data and Applications Security*, volume 5645 of *LNCS*, pages 95–110. Springer, 2009.
- [Mat98] V. Matyáš. Protecting doctors’ identity in drug prescription analysis, 1998.
- [MB01] Sjouke Mauw and Victor Bos. Drawing Message Sequence Charts with  $\text{\LaTeX}$ . *TUG-Boat*, 22(1-2):87–92, March/June 2001.
- [MKDH09] I. Maglogiannis, L. Kazatzopoulos, C. Delakouridis, and S. Hadjiefthymiades. Enabling location privacy and medical data encryption in patient telemonitoring systems. *IEEE Transactions on Information Technology in Biomedicine*, 13(6):946–954, 2009.
- [MRS06] M. Meingast, T. Roosta, and S. S. Sastry. Security and privacy issues with health care information technology. In *Proc. 28th Annual Conference of the IEEE Engineering in Medicine and Biology Society*, pages 5453–5458. IEEE CS, 2006.
- [Oka96] T. Okamoto. An electronic voting scheme. In *Proc. IFIP World Conference on IT Tools*, pages 21–30, 1996.
- [RCHS03] J. Reid, I. Cheong, M. Henricksen, and J. Smith. A novel use of rBAC to protect privacy in distributed health care information systems. In *Proc. 8th Australian Conference on Information Security and Privacy*, volume 2727 of *LNCS*, pages 403–415. Springer, 2003.
- [RS10] M. D. Ryan and B. Smyth. Applied pi calculus. Technical report, School of Computer Science, University of Birmingham, 2010. <http://www.cs.bham.ac.uk/~mdr/research/papers/pdf/11-applied-pi.extended.pdf>.
- [SS96] S. Schneider and A. Sidiropoulos. CSP and anonymity. In *Proc. 4th European Symposium on Research in Computer Security*, volume 1146 of *LNCS*, pages 198–218. Springer, 1996.
- [SV09] S. Sneha and U. Varshney. Enabling ubiquitous patient monitoring: Model, decision protocols, opportunities and challenges. *Decision Support Systems*, 46(3):606–619, 2009.
- [TGC09] J. M. Tien and P. Goldschmidt-Clermont. Healthcare: A complex service system. *Journal of Systems Science and Systems Engineering*, 18(3):257–282, 2009.

- [vMR08] T. van Deursen, S. Mauw, and S. Radomirović. Untraceability of RFID protocols. In *Proc. 2nd Workshop on Information Security Theory and Practices. Smart Devices, Convergence and Next Generation*, volume 5019 of *LNCS*, pages 1–15. Springer, 2008.
- [vWB<sup>+</sup>03] M. van der Haak, A. C. Wolff, R. Brandner, P. Drings, M. Wannemacher, and T. Wetter. Data security and protection in cross-institutional electronic patient records. *International Journal of Medical Informatics*, 70(2-3):117–130, 2003.

# Appendices

## A Proof of Theorem 1

**Theorem 1** (receipt-freeness). *The DLV08 protocol fails to satisfy receipt-freeness under both the standard assumption  $\mathbf{s4}$  (a doctor has the same credential in every session), and also under assumption  $\mathbf{s4}'$  (a doctor generates a new credential for each session).*

It is obvious that the DLV08 protocol fails to satisfy receipt-freeness under assumption  $\mathbf{s4}$  (a doctor has the same credential in every session), since DLV08 does not even satisfy prescription privacy with assumption  $\mathbf{s4}$ . The reasoning is as follows: since the adversary can link a prescription to a doctor without additional information from the bribed doctor, he can also link a prescription to a doctor when he has additional information from the bribed doctor. Therefore, the adversary can always tell whether a bribed doctor lied.

Next we prove that the DLV08 protocol fails to satisfy receipt-freeness under assumption  $\mathbf{s4}'$  (a doctor generates a new credential for each session). That is to prove that there exists no indistinguishable process in which the doctor lies to the adversary. To do so, we assume that there exists such a process  $P'_{dr}$  which satisfies the definition of receipt-freeness, and then derive some contradiction. In generic terms, the proof runs as follows: a bribed doctor reveals the nonces used in the commitment and the credential to the adversary. This allows the adversary to link a bribed doctor to his commitment and credential. In the prescription proof, a prescription is linked to a doctor's commitment and credential. Suppose there exists a process  $P'_{dr}$  in which the doctor lies to the adversary that he prescribed  $\mathbf{p}_A$ , while the adversary observes that the commitment or the credential is linked to  $\mathbf{p}_B$ . The adversary can detect that the doctor has lied.

*Proof.* Assume there exist process  $init'_{dr}$  and  $P'_{dr}$ , so that the two equivalences in the definition of receipt-freeness are satisfied, i.e.,  $\exists init'_{dr}$  and  $P'_{dr}$  satisfying

1. 
$$\begin{aligned} & \mathcal{C}_{eh}[(init'_{dr}.(!P_{dr}\{\mathbf{d}_A/Id_{dr}\} | P'_{dr})) | \\ & \quad (init_{dr}\{\mathbf{d}_B/Id_{dr}\}.(!P_{dr}\{\mathbf{d}_B/Id_{dr}\} | main_{dr}\{\mathbf{d}_B/Id_{dr}, \mathbf{p}_A/presc})))] \\ \approx_\ell & \mathcal{C}_{eh}[(init_{dr}\{\mathbf{d}_A/Id_{dr}\}^{\text{chc}}.(!P_{dr}\{\mathbf{d}_A/Id_{dr}\} | (main_{dr}\{\mathbf{d}_A/Id_{dr}, \mathbf{p}_A/presc\})^{\text{chc}}) | \\ & \quad (init_{dr}\{\mathbf{d}_B/Id_{dr}\}.(!P_{dr}\{\mathbf{d}_B/Id_{dr}\} | main_{dr}\{\mathbf{d}_B/Id_{dr}, \mathbf{p}_B/presc}))]; \text{ and} \end{aligned}$$
2. 
$$\begin{aligned} & \mathcal{C}_{eh}[(init'_{dr}.(!P_{dr}\{\mathbf{d}_A/Id_{dr}\} | P'_{dr})) \setminus^{\text{out}(\text{chc}, \cdot)} | \\ & \quad (init_{dr}\{\mathbf{d}_B/Id_{dr}\}.(!P_{dr}\{\mathbf{d}_B/Id_{dr}\} | main_{dr}\{\mathbf{d}_B/Id_{dr}, \mathbf{p}_A/presc})))] \\ \approx_\ell & \mathcal{C}_{eh}[(init_{dr}\{\mathbf{d}_A/Id_{dr}\}.(!P_{dr}\{\mathbf{d}_A/Id_{dr}\} | main_{dr}\{\mathbf{d}_A/Id_{dr}, \mathbf{p}_B/presc})) | \\ & \quad (init_{dr}\{\mathbf{d}_B/Id_{dr}\}.(!P_{dr}\{\mathbf{d}_B/Id_{dr}\} | main_{dr}\{\mathbf{d}_B/Id_{dr}, \mathbf{p}_A/presc}))]. \end{aligned}$$

According to the definition of labelled bisimilarity (Definition 2), if process  $A$  can reach  $A'$  ( $A \xrightarrow{\alpha^*} A'$ ) and  $A \approx_\ell B$ , then  $B$  can reach  $B'$  ( $B \xrightarrow{\alpha^*} B'$ ) and  $A' \approx_\ell B'$ . Vice versa. Note that we use  $\xrightarrow{\alpha^*}$  to denote one or more internal and/or labelled reductions.

According to Definition 2, if  $A' \approx_\ell B'$  then  $A' \approx_s B'$ .

According to the definition of static equivalence (Definition 1), if two processes are static equivalent  $A' \approx_s B'$ , then  $\text{frame}(A') \approx_s \text{frame}(B')$ . Thus we have that  $\forall M, N, (M =_E N) \text{frame}(A') \text{ iff } (M =_E N) \text{frame}(B')$ .

Let  $A$  be the right-hand side of the first equivalence and  $B$  be the left-hand side, i.e.,

$$\begin{aligned} A &= C_{eh}[(init_{dr}\{\mathbf{d}_A/Id_{dr}\})^{chc}.(!P_{dr}\{\mathbf{d}_A/Id_{dr}\} | (main_{dr}\{\mathbf{d}_A/Id_{dr}, \mathbf{p}_A/presc\})^{chc}) | \\ &\quad (init_{dr}\{\mathbf{d}_B/Id_{dr}\}.(!P_{dr}\{\mathbf{d}_B/Id_{dr}\} | main_{dr}\{\mathbf{d}_B/Id_{dr}, \mathbf{p}_B/presc\})))] \\ B &= C_{eh}[(init'_{dr}.(!P_{dr}\{\mathbf{d}_A/Id_{dr}\} | P'_{dr})) | \\ &\quad (init_{dr}\{\mathbf{d}_B/Id_{dr}\}.(!P_{dr}\{\mathbf{d}_B/Id_{dr}\} | main_{dr}\{\mathbf{d}_B/Id_{dr}, \mathbf{p}_A/presc\}))]. \end{aligned}$$

On the right-hand side of the first equivalence (process  $A$ ), there exists an output of a prescription proof  $PrescProof^r$  (together with the open information of the doctor commitment  $\mathbf{r}_{dr}^r$ ), over public channels, from the process  $(main_{dr}\{\mathbf{d}_A/Id_{dr}, \mathbf{p}_A/presc\})^{chc}$  initiated by doctor  $\mathbf{d}_A$ . Formally,  $A \xrightarrow{\alpha^*} A_i = C_i[out(ch, (PrescProof^r, \mathbf{r}_{dr}^r))] \equiv \nu x.(C_i[out(ch, x)] | \{(PrescProof^r, \mathbf{r}_{dr}^r)/x\}) \xrightarrow{\nu x.out(ch, x)} C_i[0] | \{(PrescProof^r, \mathbf{r}_{dr}^r)/x\}$ . Let  $A'' = C_i[0]$ , we have  $A \xrightarrow{\alpha^*} \xrightarrow{\nu x.out(ch, x)} A'' | \{(PrescProof^r, \mathbf{r}_{dr}^r)/x\}$ . Let  $A' = A'' | \{(PrescProof^r, \mathbf{r}_{dr}^r)/x\}$ , we have  $A \xrightarrow{\alpha^*} \xrightarrow{\nu x.out(ch, x)} A'$ .

Since  $A \approx_\ell B$ , we have that  $B \xrightarrow{\alpha^*} \xrightarrow{\nu x.out(ch, x)} B'$  and  $A' \approx_\ell B'$ . Hence,  $A' \approx_s B'$  and thus  $frame(A') \approx_s frame(B')$ . Since  $frame(A') = frame(A'') | \{(PrescProof^r, \mathbf{r}_{dr}^r)/x\}$ , the adversary can obtain the prescription  $\mathbf{p}_A$ :  $\mathbf{p}_A = first(getmsg(first(x)))$ , where function  $first$  returns the first element of a tuple or a pair. Since  $frame(A') \approx_s frame(B')$ , we should have the same relation  $\mathbf{p}_A = first(getmsg(first(x)))$  in  $frame(B')$ .

Intuitively, since on the right-hand side, the adversary can obtain the prescription  $\mathbf{p}_A$  from  $PrescProof^r$ , due to  $(\mathbf{p}_A, PrescriptID^r, Comt_{dr}^r, c\_Comt_{pt}^r) = getmsg(PrescProof^r)$ , on the left-hand side of the first equivalence, there should also exist an output of a prescription proof  $PrescProof^l$  over public channels, from which the adversary can obtain a prescription  $\mathbf{p}_A$ , following the same relation:

$$(\mathbf{p}_A, PrescriptID^l, Comt_{dr}^l, c\_Comt_{pt}^l) = getmsg(PrescProof^l).$$

Next, we prove that the corresponding prescription proof  $PrescProof^l$  is indeed the prescription proof in the doctor sub-process  $init'_{dr}$  or  $P'_{dr}$  in process  $B$ , rather than other sub-processes. Formally, the action  $\xrightarrow{\nu x.out(ch, x)}$  in process  $B$  happens in sub-process  $init'_{dr}$  or  $P'_{dr}$ .

On the right-hand side (process  $A$ ), the doctor pseudonym  $\mathbf{Pnym}_{dr}^r$  and the nonce for doctor commitment  $\mathbf{r}_{dr}^r$  and the nonce for doctor credential  $\mathbf{n}_{dr}^r$  (used for assumption  $\mathbf{s4}'$ ) are revealed to the adversary on  $chc$  channel. Formally,

$$\begin{aligned} A &\xrightarrow{\alpha^*} \xrightarrow{\nu x_1.out(chc, x_1)} A_1 | \{\mathbf{Pnym}_{dr}^r/x_1\} \\ &\xrightarrow{\alpha^*} \xrightarrow{\nu x_2.out(chc, x_2)} A_2 | \{\mathbf{Pnym}_{dr}^r/x_1\} | \{\mathbf{r}_{dr}^r/x_2\} \\ &\xrightarrow{\alpha^*} \xrightarrow{\nu x_3.out(chc, x_3)} A_3 | \{\mathbf{Pnym}_{dr}^r/x_1\} | \{\mathbf{r}_{dr}^r/x_2\} | \{\mathbf{n}_{dr}^r/x_3\} \\ &\xrightarrow{\alpha^*} \xrightarrow{\nu x.out(ch, x)} A_4 | \{\mathbf{Pnym}_{dr}^r/x_1\} | \{\mathbf{r}_{dr}^r/x_2\} | \{\mathbf{n}_{dr}^r/x_3\} | \{(PrescProof^r, \mathbf{r}_{dr}^r)/x\} \equiv A'. \end{aligned}$$

Since  $A \approx_\ell B$ , we have that

$$\begin{aligned} B &\xrightarrow{\alpha^*} \xrightarrow{\nu x_1.out(chc, x_1)} B_1 | \{\mathbf{Pnym}_{dr}^l/x_1\} \\ &\xrightarrow{\alpha^*} \xrightarrow{\nu x_2.out(chc, x_2)} B_2 | \{\mathbf{Pnym}_{dr}^l/x_1\} | \{\mathbf{r}_{dr}^l/x_2\} \\ &\xrightarrow{\alpha^*} \xrightarrow{\nu x_3.out(chc, x_3)} B_3 | \{\mathbf{Pnym}_{dr}^l/x_1\} | \{\mathbf{r}_{dr}^l/x_2\} | \{\mathbf{n}_{dr}^l/x_3\} \\ &\xrightarrow{\alpha^*} \xrightarrow{\nu x.out(ch, x)} B_4 | \{\mathbf{Pnym}_{dr}^l/x_1\} | \{\mathbf{r}_{dr}^l/x_2\} | \{\mathbf{n}_{dr}^l/x_3\} | \{(PrescProof^l, \mathbf{r}_{dr}^l)/x\} \equiv B'. \end{aligned}$$

That is, on the left-hand side of the first equivalence, to be equivalent to the right-hand side, there also exist sub-processes which output messages on  $chc$  channel. Such sub-processes can only be  $init'_{dr}$  and  $P'_{dr}$ , because there is no output on  $chc$  in other sub-processes in the left-hand side process (process  $B$ ).

In  $\text{frame}(A') = \text{frame}(A_4) \mid \{\text{Pnym}_{dr}^r/x_1\} \mid \{\mathbf{r}_{dr}^r/x_2\} \mid \{\mathbf{n}_{dr}^r/x_3\} \mid \{(PrescProof^r, \mathbf{r}_{dr}^r)/x\}$ , we have the following relation between two terms,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{first}(x) = & \text{spk}((x_1, x_2, \mathbf{d}_A, x_3), \\ & (\text{commit}(x_1, x_2), \text{drcred}(x_1, \mathbf{d}_A, x_3)), \\ & (\mathbf{p}_A, PrescriptID^r, \text{commit}(x_1, x_2), c\_Comt_{pt}^r)). \end{aligned}$$

Since  $A' \approx_s B'$ , we should have the same relation in  $\text{frame}(B')$ .

$$\begin{aligned} \text{first}(x) = & \text{spk}((x_1, x_2, \mathbf{d}_A, x_3), \\ & (\text{commit}(x_1, x_2), \text{drcred}(x_1, \mathbf{d}_A, x_3)), \\ & (\mathbf{p}_A, PrescriptID^l, \text{commit}(x_1, x_2), c\_Comt_{pt}^l)). \end{aligned}$$

On the left-hand side (process  $B$ ), the terms sent by process  $init'_{dr}$  and/or  $P'_{dr}$  over  $\text{chc}$  – the doctor pseudonym and the nonces  $\text{Pnym}_{dr}^l$ ,  $\mathbf{r}_{dr}^l$  and  $\mathbf{n}_{dr}^l$  (corresponding to  $\text{Pnym}_{dr}^r$ ,  $\mathbf{r}_{dr}^r$  and  $\mathbf{n}_{dr}^r$  on the right-hand side), are essential to compute  $PrescProof^l$ . Thus, process  $init'_{dr}$  and/or  $P'_{dr}$  is able to compute and thus output the prescription proof  $PrescProof^l$ , given that the coerced doctor  $\mathbf{d}_A$  has the knowledge of  $\mathbf{p}_A$ , by applying the following function:

$$\begin{aligned} PrescProof^l = & \text{spk}((\text{Pnym}_{dr}^l, \mathbf{r}_{dr}^l, \mathbf{d}_A, \mathbf{n}_{dr}^l), \\ & (\text{commit}(\text{Pnym}_{dr}^l, \mathbf{r}_{dr}^l), \text{drcred}(\text{Pnym}_{dr}^l, \mathbf{d}_A, \mathbf{n}_{dr}^l)), \\ & (\mathbf{p}_A, PrescriptID^l, \text{commit}(\text{Pnym}_{dr}^l, \mathbf{r}_{dr}^l), c\_Comt_{pt}^l)). \end{aligned}$$

Now we have proved that the action of revealing  $(PrescProof^l, \mathbf{r}_{dr}^l)$  ( $\xrightarrow{\nu x.\text{out}(\text{ch}, x)}$ ) can be taken in process  $init'_{dr}$  and/or  $P'_{dr}$  in process  $B$ . Next we show that sub-processes except  $init'_{dr}$  and  $P'_{dr}$  in  $B$ , cannot take the action of revealing  $(PrescProof^l, \mathbf{r}_{dr}^l)$ , given the process  $init'_{dr}$  and  $P'_{dr}$  does not replay the message  $(PrescProof^l, \mathbf{r}_{dr}^l)$  in an honest doctor process.

By examining process  $B$ , the sub-processes which send out a pair, the first element of which is a signed proof of knowledge, can only be doctor processes and the MPA processes, i.e., sub-processes that may send out a message  $x$  potentially satisfying  $\mathbf{p}_A = \text{first}(\text{getmsg}(\text{first}(x)))$  can only be doctor processes (at **d10**) or MPA processes (at **m30**).

- Case 1: considering that message  $x$  should also satisfy  $\text{open}(\text{third}(\text{getmsg}(\text{first}(x))), \text{snd}(x)) = \text{Pnym}_{dr}^l$ , the processes revealing  $x$  can only be doctor processes, because the second element in the message sent out at line **m30** of an MPA process is a zero-knowledge proof, and thus cannot be used as a nonce to open a commitment  $\text{third}(\text{getmsg}(\text{first}(x)))$ .
- Case 2: considering that the message  $x$  should satisfy  $\text{first}(x) = \text{spk}((x_1, x_2, \mathbf{d}_A, x_3), (\text{commit}(x_1, x_2), \text{drcred}(x_1, \mathbf{d}_A, x_3)), (\mathbf{p}_A, PrescriptID^l, \text{commit}(x_1, x_2), c\_Comt_{pt}^l))$ , where  $x_1$  is the doctor pseudonym,  $x_2$  and  $x_3$  are nonces, and the adversary receive  $x_1, x_2, x_3$  from  $\text{chc}$  channel, doctor sub-processes (except  $init'_{dr}$  and  $P'_{dr}$ ) cannot reveal the message  $x$ . Because these doctor sub-processes model honest doctor sessions, and thus use their own generated nonces to compute the signed proofs of knowledge (at line **t23**). Such nonces are not sent to the adversary over  $\text{chc}$  channel, since these doctor processes are not bribed or coerced. Thus, the signed proofs of knowledge generated by these honest doctor prepossess cannot be the first element of the message  $x$ , unless the process  $init'_{dr}$  and/or  $P'_{dr}$  reuses one of the signed proofs of knowledge.

In the case that the process  $init'_{dr}$  and/or  $P'_{dr}$  replay the message  $(PrescProof^l, \mathbf{r}_{dr}^l)$  of an honest doctor process,  $x_1$  needs to be the corresponding doctor pseudonym, and  $x_2$  and  $x_3$  need to be the corresponding nonces for the reused signed proof of knowledge the message. Otherwise,  $(PrescProof^l, \mathbf{r}_{dr}^l)$  will be detected as a fake message. Thus, the message indeed represents the actual prescription in process  $init'_{dr}$  and/or  $P'_{dr}$ . Although the action of revealing message  $(PrescProof^l, \mathbf{r}_{dr}^l)$  may be taken in an honest doctor process, the same action will be eventually taken in process  $init'_{dr}$  or  $P'_{dr}$ .

Therefore, the process  $init'_{dr}$  and/or  $P'_{dr}$  indeed outputs the prescription proof  $PrescProof^l$  on the left-hand side of the first equivalence, i.e.,  $init'_{dr}/P'_{dr} \xrightarrow{\alpha^*} \nu x.out(ch,x) \rightarrow P \mid \{(PrescProof^l, \mathbf{r}^l_{dr})/x\}$ . Let  $C$  be the left-hand side of the second equivalence, and  $D$  be the right-hand side.

$$\begin{aligned} C &= C_{eh}[\left( (init'_{dr}.(!P_{dr}\{\mathbf{d}_A/Id_{dr}\} \mid P'_{dr})) \setminus^{out(chc,\cdot)} \mid \right. \\ &\quad \left. (init_{dr}\{\mathbf{d}_B/Id_{dr}\}.(!P_{dr}\{\mathbf{d}_B/Id_{dr}\} \mid main_{dr}\{\mathbf{d}_B/Id_{dr}, \mathbf{p}_A/presc\})) \right) \mid \\ D &= C_{eh}[\left( (init_{dr}\{\mathbf{d}_A/Id_{dr}\}.(!P_{dr}\{\mathbf{d}_A/Id_{dr}\} \mid main_{dr}\{\mathbf{d}_A/Id_{dr}, \mathbf{p}_B/presc\})) \mid \right. \\ &\quad \left. (init_{dr}\{\mathbf{d}_B/Id_{dr}\}.(!P_{dr}\{\mathbf{d}_B/Id_{dr}\} \mid main_{dr}\{\mathbf{d}_B/Id_{dr}, \mathbf{p}_A/presc\})) \right) \mid \end{aligned}$$

In process  $C$ , the sub-process  $init_{dr}.(!P_{dr}\{\mathbf{d}_A/Id_{dr}\} \mid P'_{dr}) \setminus^{out(chc,\cdot)} := \nu chc.(init'_{dr}.(!P_{dr}\{\mathbf{d}_A/Id_{dr}\} \mid P'_{dr}) \mid \text{lin}(chc, y))$ , according to the definition of  $P \setminus^{out(chc,\cdot)}$ . Since  $init'_{dr}/P'_{dr}$  may take the action  $\nu x.out(ch,x) \rightarrow$  where  $\{(PrescProof^l, \mathbf{r}^l_{dr})/x\}$ , we have  $init'_{dr}.(!P_{dr}\{\mathbf{d}_A/Id_{dr}\} \mid P'_{dr}) \xrightarrow{\alpha^*} \nu x.out(ch,x) \rightarrow P' \mid \{(PrescProof^l, \mathbf{r}^l_{dr})/x\}$ . By filling it in the context  $\nu chc.(- \mid \text{lin}(chc, y))$ , we have  $\nu chc.((init'_{dr}.(!P_{dr}\{\mathbf{d}_A/Id_{dr}\} \mid P'_{dr}) \mid \text{lin}(chc, y)) \xrightarrow{\alpha^*} \nu x.out(ch,x) \rightarrow \nu chc.((P' \mid \{(PrescProof^l, \mathbf{r}^l_{dr})/x\}) \mid \text{lin}(chc, y))$ , and thus  $(init'_{dr}.(!P_{dr}\{\mathbf{d}_A/Id_{dr}\} \mid P'_{dr}) \setminus^{out(chc,\cdot)}) \xrightarrow{\alpha^*} \nu x.out(ch,x) \rightarrow \nu chc.(P' \mid \{(PrescProof^l, \mathbf{r}^l_{dr})/x\} \mid \text{lin}(chc, y))$ . The sub-process  $main_{dr}\{\mathbf{d}_B/Id_{dr}, \mathbf{p}_A/presc\}$  also outputs a signed proof of knowledge from which the adversary obtains  $\mathbf{p}_A$ , i.e.,  $main_{dr}\{\mathbf{d}_B/Id_{dr}, \mathbf{p}_A/presc\} \xrightarrow{\alpha^*} \nu x.out(ch,x) \rightarrow C_1 \mid \{(PrescProof, \mathbf{r}_{dr})/x_1\}$  and  $\mathbf{p}_A = \text{first}(\text{getmsg}(\text{first}(x_1)))$ . Thus, in process  $C$ , there are two outputs of a signed proof of knowledge, from which the adversary obtains  $\mathbf{p}_A$ . Other signed proofs of knowledge will not lead to  $\mathbf{p}_A$  or  $\mathbf{p}_B$ , as the prescription in process  $!P_{dr}\{\mathbf{d}_A/Id_{dr}\}$  and  $!P_{dr}\{\mathbf{d}_B/Id_{dr}\}$  are freshly generated.

In process  $D$ , the sub-process  $main_{dr}\{\mathbf{d}_A/Id_{dr}, \mathbf{p}_B/presc\}$  outputs a prescription proof from which the adversary knows  $\mathbf{p}_B$ , sub-process  $main_{dr}\{\mathbf{d}_B/Id_{dr}, \mathbf{p}_A/presc\}$  outputs a prescription proof from which the adversary knows  $\mathbf{p}_A$ , the prescriptions from the sub-process  $!P_{dr}\{\mathbf{d}_A/Id_{dr}\}$  and  $!P_{dr}\{\mathbf{d}_B/Id_{dr}\}$  are fresh names and thus cannot be  $\mathbf{p}_A$  or  $\mathbf{p}_B$ . The adversary can detect that the process  $C$  and  $D$  are not equivalent: in process  $C$ , the adversary obtains two  $\mathbf{p}_A$ , and in process  $D$ , the adversary obtains one  $\mathbf{p}_A$  and one  $\mathbf{p}_B$ . This contradicts the assumption that  $C \approx_\ell D$ .  $\square$

## B Proof of Theorem 2

**Theorem 2** (independency of receipt-freeness). *The DLV08 protocol fails to satisfy independency of receipt-freeness.*

*Proof.* Assume the DLV08 protocol satisfies independency of receipt-freeness. That is,  $\exists init'_{dr}$  and  $P'_{dr}$  satisfying the following two equivalences in the definition of independency of receipt-freeness (Definition 7).

$$\begin{aligned} 1. \quad & C_{eh} [!R_{ph}^{chc} \mid (init'_{dr}.(!P_{dr}\{\mathbf{d}_A/Id_{dr}\} \mid P'_{dr})) \mid \\ & \quad (init_{dr}\{\mathbf{d}_B/Id_{dr}\}.(!P_{dr}\{\mathbf{d}_B/Id_{dr}\} \mid main_{dr}\{\mathbf{d}_B/Id_{dr}, \mathbf{p}_A/presc\})) \mid \\ \approx_\ell & C_{eh} [!R_{ph}^{chc} \mid ((init_{dr}\{\mathbf{d}_A/Id_{dr}\})^{chc} \cdot \\ & \quad (!P_{dr}\{\mathbf{d}_A/Id_{dr}\} \mid (main_{dr}\{\mathbf{d}_A/Id_{dr}, \mathbf{p}_A/presc\})^{chc})) \mid \\ & \quad (init_{dr}\{\mathbf{d}_B/Id_{dr}\}.(!P_{dr}\{\mathbf{d}_B/Id_{dr}\} \mid main_{dr}\{\mathbf{d}_B/Id_{dr}, \mathbf{p}_B/presc\})) \mid]; \text{ and} \\ 2. \quad & C_{eh} [!R_i^{chc} \mid ((init'_{dr}.(!P_{dr}\{\mathbf{d}_A/Id_{dr}\} \mid P'_{dr})) \setminus^{out(chc,\cdot)} \mid \\ & \quad (init_{dr}\{\mathbf{d}_B/Id_{dr}\}.(!P_{dr}\{\mathbf{d}_B/Id_{dr}\} \mid main_{dr}\{\mathbf{d}_B/Id_{dr}, \mathbf{p}_A/presc\})) \mid \\ \approx_\ell & C_{eh} [!R_i^{chc} \mid (init_{dr}\{\mathbf{d}_A/Id_{dr}\}.(!P_{dr}\{\mathbf{d}_A/Id_{dr}\} \mid main_{dr}\{\mathbf{d}_A/Id_{dr}, \mathbf{p}_B/presc\})) \mid \\ & \quad (init_{dr}\{\mathbf{d}_B/Id_{dr}\}.(!P_{dr}\{\mathbf{d}_B/Id_{dr}\} \mid main_{dr}\{\mathbf{d}_B/Id_{dr}, \mathbf{p}_A/presc\})) \mid]. \end{aligned}$$

We prove that this assumption leads to contradictions.

Similar to the proof of Theorem 1, according to the definition of labelled bisimilarity (Definition 2) and static equivalence (Definition 1), Given  $A \approx_\ell B$ , if  $A \xrightarrow{\alpha^*} A'$  and  $M =_E Nframe(A')$ , then  $B \xrightarrow{\alpha^*} B'$  and  $M =_E Nframe(B')$ . Vice versa.

Let  $A$  be the right-hand side of the first equivalence,  $B$  be the left-hand side.

$$\begin{aligned}
A &= \mathcal{C}_{eh}[!R_{ph}^{\text{chc}} \mid ((\text{init}_{dr}\{\mathbf{d}_A/Id_{dr}\})^{\text{chc}} \mid \\
&\quad (!P_{dr}\{\mathbf{d}_A/Id_{dr}\} \mid (\text{main}_{dr}\{\mathbf{d}_A/Id_{dr}, \mathbf{p}_A/presc\})^{\text{chc}})) \mid \\
&\quad (\text{init}_{dr}\{\mathbf{d}_B/Id_{dr}\}.(!P_{dr}\{\mathbf{d}_B/Id_{dr}\} \mid \text{main}_{dr}\{\mathbf{d}_B/Id_{dr}, \mathbf{p}_B/presc\})))] \\
B &= \mathcal{C}_{eh}[!R_{ph}^{\text{chc}} \mid (\text{init}'_{dr}.(!P_{dr}\{\mathbf{d}_A/Id_{dr}\} \mid P'_{dr})) \mid \\
&\quad (\text{init}_{dr}\{\mathbf{d}_B/Id_{dr}\}.(!P_{dr}\{\mathbf{d}_B/Id_{dr}\} \mid \text{main}_{dr}\{\mathbf{d}_B/Id_{dr}, \mathbf{p}_A/presc\})))]
\end{aligned}$$

In process  $A$ , the doctor  $\mathbf{d}_A$  computed a signed proof of knowledge  $PrescProof^r$  in the sub-process  $(\text{main}_{dr}\{\mathbf{d}_A/Id_{dr}, \mathbf{p}_A/presc\})^{\text{chc}}$ . The signed proof of knowledge is sent to a patient over private channel. In addition, the signed proof of knowledge is also sent to the adversary over  $\text{chc}$  together with a nonce (the message sent over  $\text{chc}$  is  $(PrescProof^r, \mathbf{r}_{dr}^r)$ ). On receiving the signed proof of knowledge, the patient sends it together with other information to a pharmacist over a private channel. On receiving the message from the patient over private channel, the pharmacist forwards the message to the adversary over  $\text{chc}$  (the message sent over  $\text{chc}$  is  $(PrescProof^r, PtSpk^r, vc_1^r, vc_2^r, vc_3^r, vc_3^r, vc_4^r, c_5^r)$ ). Another sub-process  $\text{main}_{dr}\{\mathbf{d}_B/Id_{dr}, \mathbf{p}_B/presc\}$  also generates a signed proof of knowledge  $PrescProof^{zr}$ . This signed proof of knowledge is sent to a patient in a message over private channel (but it is not sent to the adversary over  $\text{chc}$ , as this sub-process is not bribed or coerced), and then sent to a pharmacist in another message via private channel. Finally, the pharmacist, who receives the message containing  $PrescProof^{zr}$ , sends the message to the adversary over channel  $\text{chc}$  (the message sent to  $\text{chc}$  is  $(PrescProof^{zr}, PtSpk^{zr}, vc_1^{zr}, vc_2^{zr}, vc_3^{zr}, vc_3^{zr}, vc_4^{zr}, c_5^{zr})$ ). Formally, there is a trace in process  $A$  as follows.

$$\begin{aligned}
A &\xrightarrow{\alpha^* \nu x.\text{out}(\text{chc}, x)} A_1 \mid \{(PrescProof^r, \mathbf{r}_{dr}^r)/x\} \\
&\xrightarrow{\alpha^* \nu y.\text{out}(\text{chc}, y)} A_2 \mid \{(PrescProof^r, \mathbf{r}_{dr}^r)/x\} \mid \\
&\quad \{(PrescProof^r, PtSpk^r, vc_1^r, vc_2^r, vc_3^r, vc_3^r, vc_4^r, c_5^r)/y\} \\
&\xrightarrow{\alpha^* \nu z.\text{out}(\text{chc}, z)} A_3 \mid \{(PrescProof^r, \mathbf{r}_{dr}^r)/x\} \mid \\
&\quad \{(PrescProof^r, PtSpk^r, vc_1^r, vc_2^r, vc_3^r, vc_3^r, vc_4^r, c_5^r)/y\} \mid \\
&\quad \{(PrescProof^{zr}, PtSpk^{zr}, vc_1^{zr}, vc_2^{zr}, vc_3^{zr}, vc_3^{zr}, vc_4^{zr}, c_5^{zr})/z\}
\end{aligned}$$

Let  $A' = A_3 \mid \{(PrescProof^r, \mathbf{r}_{dr}^r)/x\} \mid \{(PrescProof^r, PtSpk^r, vc_1^r, vc_2^r, vc_3^r, vc_3^r, vc_4^r, c_5^r)/y\} \mid \{(PrescProof^{zr}, PtSpk^{zr}, vc_1^{zr}, vc_2^{zr}, vc_3^{zr}, vc_3^{zr}, vc_4^{zr}, c_5^{zr})/z\}$ . We have  $\mathbf{p}_A = \text{first}(\text{getmsg}(\text{first}(x))) = \text{first}(\text{getmsg}(\text{first}(y)))$  and  $\mathbf{p}_B = \text{first}(\text{getmsg}(\text{first}(z)))$  at frame  $\text{frame}(A')$ .

Since  $A \approx_\ell B$ , we should have that

$$\begin{aligned}
B &\xrightarrow{\alpha^* \nu x.\text{out}(\text{chc}, x)} B_1 \mid \{(PrescProof^l, \mathbf{r}_{dr}^l)/x\} \\
&\xrightarrow{\alpha^* \nu y.\text{out}(\text{chc}, y)} B_2 \mid \{(PrescProof^l, \mathbf{r}_{dr}^l)/x\} \mid \\
&\quad \{(PrescProof^l, PtSpk^l, vc_1^l, vc_2^l, vc_3^l, vc_3^l, vc_4^l, c_5^l)/y\} \mid \\
&\xrightarrow{\alpha^* \nu z.\text{out}(\text{chc}, z)} B_3 \mid \{(PrescProof^l, \mathbf{r}_{dr}^l)/x\} \mid \\
&\quad \{(PrescProof^l, PtSpk^l, vc_1^l, vc_2^l, vc_3^l, vc_3^l, vc_4^l, c_5^l)/y\} \mid \\
&\quad \{(PrescProof^{zl}, PtSpk^{zl}, vc_1^{zl}, vc_2^{zl}, vc_3^{zl}, vc_3^{zl}, vc_4^{zl}, c_5^{zl})/z\}.
\end{aligned}$$

Let  $B' = B_3 \mid \{(PrescProof^l, \mathbf{r}_{dr}^l)/x\} \mid \{(PrescProof^l, PtSpk^l, vc_1^l, vc_2^l, vc_3^l, vc_3^l, vc_4^l, c_5^l)/y\} \mid \{(PrescProof^{zl}, PtSpk^{zl}, vc_1^{zl}, vc_2^{zl}, vc_3^{zl}, vc_3^{zl}, vc_4^{zl}, c_5^{zl})/z\}$ . We should have  $A' \approx_\ell B'$ , and thus,  $\mathbf{p}_A = \text{first}(\text{getmsg}(\text{first}(x))) = \text{first}(\text{getmsg}(\text{first}(y)))$  and  $\mathbf{p}_B = \text{first}(\text{getmsg}(\text{first}(z)))$  at frame  $\text{frame}(B')$ .

In process  $B$ , the sub-process  $\text{main}_{dr}\{\mathbf{d}_B/Id_{dr}, \mathbf{p}_A/presc\}$  generates a signed proof of knowledge  $f$  and  $\mathbf{p}_A = \text{first}(\text{getmsg}(f))$ . This signed proof of knowledge will be eventually revealed by a pharmacist,  $B \xrightarrow{\alpha^* \nu h.\text{out}(\text{chc}, h)} B_4 \mid \{(f, PtSpk^f, vc_1^f, vc_2^f, vc_3^f, vc_3^f, vc_4^f, c_5^f)/h\}$  and  $\mathbf{p}_A = \text{first}(\text{getmsg}(\text{first}(h))) = \text{first}(\text{getmsg}(f))$ .

By examining process  $B$ , we observe that  $y = h$ . The reason is as follows: since  $\mathbf{p}_A = \text{first}(\text{getmsg}(\text{first}(y)))$ , sub-process  $!P_{dr}\{\mathbf{d}_B/Id_{dr}\}$  generate fresh prescriptions and thus cannot be

$\mathbf{p}_A$ , therefore,  $!P_{dr}\{\mathbf{d}_B/Id_{dr}\}$  does not generate a prescription which eventually leads to the action of sending  $y$ . Thus the possible sub-process which generates the prescription  $\mathbf{p}_A$  and potentially leads to sending  $y$  can only be  $init'_{dr}$ ,  $P'_{dr}$  or  $main_{dr}\{\mathbf{d}_B/Id_{dr}, \mathbf{p}_A/presc\}$ . Assume  $init'_{dr}$  or  $P'_{dr}$  generates prescription  $\mathbf{p}_A$  which leads to the action of sending  $y$  and  $y \neq h$ , then, the adversary obtains three  $\mathbf{p}_A$  in process  $B$ : one from  $\mathbf{p}_A = \text{first}(\text{getmsg}(\text{first}(h)))$ , one from  $\mathbf{p}_A = \text{first}(\text{getmsg}(\text{first}(y)))$ , and one from  $\mathbf{p}_A = \text{first}(\text{getmsg}(\text{first}(x)))$ . However, in process  $A$ , the adversary can only observe two  $\mathbf{p}_A$ : one from  $\mathbf{p}_A = \text{first}(\text{getmsg}(\text{first}(x)))$  and one from  $\mathbf{p}_A = \text{first}(\text{getmsg}(\text{first}(y)))$ . This contradicts the assumption that  $A \approx_\ell B$ . Therefore, the prescription  $\mathbf{p}_A$  which leads to the action of revealing  $y$  is generated in sub-process  $main_{dr}\{\mathbf{d}_B/Id_{dr}, \mathbf{p}_A/presc\}$ , and thus  $y = h$ .

In addition, in process  $B$ , we observe that the prescription  $\mathbf{p}_B$  is generated in process  $init'_{dr}$  or  $P'_{dr}$ . As sub-process  $!P_{dr}\{\mathbf{d}_B/Id_{dr}\}$  generates fresh prescriptions and thus cannot be  $\mathbf{p}_B$ , and sub-process  $main_{dr}\{\mathbf{d}_B/Id_{dr}, \mathbf{p}_A/presc\}$  generates  $\mathbf{p}_A$  ( $\mathbf{p}_A \neq \mathbf{p}_B$ ), the only sub-process can generate  $\mathbf{p}_B$  is  $init'_{dr}$  or  $P'_{dr}$ . The second equivalence also confirms this observation. Let  $C$  be the left-hand side of the second equivalence, and  $D$  be the right-hand side.

$$\begin{aligned} C &= \mathcal{C}_{eh} [ !R_i^{\text{chc}} \mid ((init'_{dr}.(!P_{dr}\{\mathbf{d}_A/Id_{dr}\} \mid P'_{dr})) \setminus \text{out}(\text{chc}, \cdot)) \mid \\ &\quad (init_{dr}\{\mathbf{d}_B/Id_{dr}\}.(!P_{dr}\{\mathbf{d}_B/Id_{dr}\} \mid main_{dr}\{\mathbf{d}_B/Id_{dr}, \mathbf{p}_A/presc\})) ] \\ D &= \mathcal{C}_{eh} [ !R_i^{\text{chc}} \mid (init_{dr}\{\mathbf{d}_A/Id_{dr}\}.(!P_{dr}\{\mathbf{d}_A/Id_{dr}\} \mid main_{dr}\{\mathbf{d}_A/Id_{dr}, \mathbf{p}_B/presc\})) \mid \\ &\quad (init_{dr}\{\mathbf{d}_B/Id_{dr}\}.(!P_{dr}\{\mathbf{d}_B/Id_{dr}\} \mid main_{dr}\{\mathbf{d}_B/Id_{dr}, \mathbf{p}_A/presc\})) ]. \end{aligned}$$

In process  $D$ , the adversary can obtain one  $\mathbf{p}_A$  and one  $\mathbf{p}_B$ . Since  $C \approx_\ell D$ , in process  $D$ , the adversary should also obtain one  $\mathbf{p}_A$  and one  $\mathbf{p}_B$ . Since sub-process  $main_{dr}\{\mathbf{d}_B/Id_{dr}, \mathbf{p}_A/presc\}$  generates  $\mathbf{p}_A$  and sub-process  $!P_{dr}\{\mathbf{d}_A/Id_{dr}\}$  and  $!P_{dr}\{\mathbf{d}_B/Id_{dr}\}$  cannot generate  $\mathbf{p}_B$ , it must be process  $init'_{dr}$  or  $P'_{dr}$  who generates  $\mathbf{p}_B$ .

As the generated  $\mathbf{p}_B$  in process  $init'_{dr}$  or  $P'_{dr}$  is first sent to patient, then sent to a pharmacist and thus leads to a message sending over  $\text{chc}$ . The message revealed by the pharmacist is  $z$ , because  $\mathbf{p}_B = \text{first}(\text{getmsg}(\text{first}(z)))$ , and on other process can generate  $\mathbf{p}_B$  in process  $B$ .

By examining process  $B$ , the only sub-process which can take the action of sending  $x$  is process  $init'_{dr}$  or  $P'_{dr}$ , as process  $!R_{ph}^{\text{chc}}$  does not send a message  $x$  which is a pair and thus satisfies  $x = \text{pair}(\text{first}(x), \text{snd}(x))$ , and other processes does not involving using channel  $\text{chc}$ .

Intuitively, in process  $B$ , sub-process  $init'_{dr}$  and/or  $P'_{dr}$  sends  $\mathbf{p}_B$  to the patient which leads to the action of sending  $z$ ; meanwhile, the sub-process  $init'_{dr}$  and/or  $P'_{dr}$  lies to the adversary that the signed proof of knowledge for prescription is  $PrescProof^l$  by sending  $x$ .

In process  $A$ , in addition to  $PrescProof^r$ , process  $(main_{dr}\{\mathbf{d}_A/Id_{dr}, \mathbf{p}_A/presc\})^{\text{chc}}$  also sends other information over channel  $\text{chc}$ . Formally,

$$\begin{aligned} A &\xrightarrow{\alpha*} \xrightarrow{\nu x_1.\text{out}(\text{chc}, x_1)} A^1 \mid \{\text{Pnym}_{dr}^r/x_1\} \\ &\xrightarrow{\alpha*} \xrightarrow{\nu x_2.\text{out}(\text{chc}, x_2)} A^2 \mid \{\text{Pnym}_{dr}^r/x_1\} \mid \{\mathbf{r}_{dr}^r/x_2\} \\ &\xrightarrow{\alpha*} \xrightarrow{\nu x_3.\text{out}(\text{chc}, x_3)} A^3 \mid \{\text{Pnym}_{dr}^r/x_1\} \mid \{\mathbf{r}_{dr}^r/x_2\} \mid \{\mathbf{n}_{dr}^r/x_3\} \\ &\xrightarrow{\alpha*} \xrightarrow{\nu x.\text{out}(\text{ch}, x)} A_1 \mid \{\text{Pnym}_{dr}^r/x_1\} \mid \{\mathbf{r}_{dr}^r/x_2\} \mid \{\mathbf{n}_{dr}^r/x_3\} \mid \{(PrescProof^r, \mathbf{r}_{dr}^r)/x\}, \end{aligned}$$

and  $x_1, x_2, x_3$  and  $x$  satisfy

$$\begin{aligned} \text{first}(x) &= \text{spk}((x_1, x_2, \mathbf{d}_A, x_3), \\ &\quad (\text{commit}(x_1, x_2), \text{drcred}(x_1, \mathbf{d}_A, x_3)), \\ &\quad (\mathbf{p}_A, \text{snd}(\text{getmsg}(\text{first}(x))), \text{commit}(x_1, x_2), \text{fourth}(\text{getmsg}(\text{first}(x))))). \end{aligned}$$

Since  $A \approx_\ell B$ , we should have that

$$\begin{aligned} B &\xrightarrow{\alpha*} \xrightarrow{\nu x_1.\text{out}(\text{chc}, x_1)} B^1 \mid \{\text{Pnym}_{dr}^l/x_1\} \\ &\xrightarrow{\alpha*} \xrightarrow{\nu x_2.\text{out}(\text{chc}, x_2)} B^2 \mid \{\text{Pnym}_{dr}^l/x_1\} \mid \{\mathbf{r}_{dr}^l/x_2\} \\ &\xrightarrow{\alpha*} \xrightarrow{\nu x_3.\text{out}(\text{chc}, x_3)} B^3 \mid \{\text{Pnym}_{dr}^l/x_1\} \mid \{\mathbf{r}_{dr}^l/x_2\} \mid \{\mathbf{n}_{dr}^l/x_3\} \\ &\xrightarrow{\alpha*} \xrightarrow{\nu x.\text{out}(\text{ch}, x)} B_1 \mid \{\text{Pnym}_{dr}^l/x_1\} \mid \{\mathbf{r}_{dr}^l/x_2\} \mid \{\mathbf{n}_{dr}^l/x_3\} \mid \{(PrescProof^l, \mathbf{r}_{dr}^l)/x\}, \end{aligned}$$

and the same relation holds between  $x_1, x_2, x_3$  and  $x$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{first}(x) = \text{spk}((x_1, x_2, \mathbf{d}_A, x_3), \\ (\text{commit}(x_1, x_2), \text{drcred}(x_1, \mathbf{d}_A, x_3)), \\ (\mathbf{p}_A, \text{snd}(\text{getmsg}(\text{first}(x))), \text{commit}(x_1, x_2), \text{fourth}(\text{getmsg}(\text{first}(x)))). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{eq1})$$

The sub-process  $\text{init}'_{dr}$  and  $P'_{dr}$  do not know  $\text{Pnym}^l_{dr}, \mathbf{n}^l_{dr}$  since the two information satisfies secrecy. Thus sub-process  $\text{init}'_{dr}$  and/or  $P'_{dr}$  cannot send  $x_1$  and  $x_3$  over  $\text{chc}$  channel. Even assume the process  $\text{init}'_{dr}$  and  $P'_{dr}$  know the private information  $\text{Pnym}^l_{dr}, \mathbf{r}^l_{dr}, \mathbf{n}^l_{dr}$  for constructing  $\text{PrescProof}^l$ , since  $\text{PrescProof}^l$  is actually generated by  $\text{main}_{dr}\{\mathbf{d}_B/Id_{dr}, \mathbf{p}_A/\text{presc}\}$ , we have the following relation:

$$\begin{aligned} f = \text{PrescProof}^l = \text{spk}((\text{Pnym}^l_{dr}, \mathbf{r}^l_{dr}, \mathbf{d}_B, \mathbf{n}^l_{dr}), \\ (\text{commit}(\text{Pnym}^l_{dr}, \mathbf{r}^l_{dr}), \text{drcred}(\text{Pnym}^l_{dr}, \mathbf{d}_B, \mathbf{n}^l_{dr})), \\ (\mathbf{p}_A, \text{PrescriptID}^l, \text{commit}(\text{Pnym}^l_{dr}, \mathbf{r}^l_{dr}), c\_Comt^l_{pt})). \end{aligned}$$

that is,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{first}(x) = \text{spk}((x_1, x_2, \mathbf{d}_B, x_3), \\ (\text{commit}(x_1, x_2), \text{drcred}(x_1, \mathbf{d}_B, x_3)), \\ (\mathbf{p}_A, \text{snd}(\text{getmsg}(\text{first}(x))), \text{commit}(x_1, x_2), \text{fourth}(\text{getmsg}(\text{first}(x)))). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{eq2})$$

and thus, the adversary can detect that  $\text{PrescProof}^l$  is generated by  $\mathbf{d}_B$  by telling the difference between (eq1) and (eq2). This contradicts the assumption that  $A \approx_\ell B$ .  $\square$