

Physical Zero-Knowledge Proof for Connected Spanning Subgraph Problem and Bridges Puzzle

Suthee Ruangwises*¹ and Toshiya Itoh^{†1}

¹Department of Mathematical and Computing Science, Tokyo Institute of Technology, Tokyo, Japan

Abstract

An undirected graph G is known to both the prover P and the verifier V , but only P knows a subgraph H of G . P wants to convince V that H is a connected spanning subgraph of G , i.e. H is connected and contains all vertices of G , without revealing any information about H to V . In this paper, we propose a physical protocol of zero-knowledge proof for this problem using a deck of cards, which enables P to physically show that H satisfies the condition without revealing it. We also show one possible application of this protocol to verify a solution of a famous logic puzzle called Bridges.

Keywords: zero-knowledge proof, card-based cryptography, connected spanning subgraph, graph, Bridges, puzzle

1 Introduction

Suppose that an undirected graph G of railway tracks between cities is known to both a government agent Patricia and a company agent Victor. Victor wants to buy rights for his company to operate trains on a subset of these tracks. He wants the routes run by his company to be connected in a single component as well as having access to every city. Patricia has a subgraph H of G containing the tracks she wants to sell rights to Victor. While she does not want to reveal H to him before the purchase, she needs to convince him that H satisfies his condition. In this situation, Patricia needs a *zero-knowledge proof* to convince Victor that H is a connected spanning subgraph of G , i.e. H is connected and contains all vertices of G .

A zero-knowledge proof is an interactive protocol between a prover P and a verifier V , which enables P to convince V that a statement is correct without revealing any other information. A protocol of zero-knowledge proof must satisfy the following three properties.

1. **Completeness:** If the statement is correct, then V accepts with high probability. (Here we consider the *perfect completeness* property where the probability of acceptance is one.)

*ruangwises@gmail.com

†titoh@c.titech.ac.jp

2. **Soundness:** If the statement is incorrect, then V accepts with low probability. (Here we consider the *perfect soundness* property where the probability of acceptance is zero.)
3. **Zero-knowledge:** V gets no extra information during the verification other than the correctness of the statement. Formally, there exists a probabilistic polynomial time algorithm S , called a *simulator*, with no access to P but has a black-box access to V , and the outputs of S follow the same probability distribution as the outputs of the actual protocol.

Goldwasser et al. [7] was the first one to introduce a concept of zero-knowledge proof, and Goldreich et al. [6] later proved that a computational zero-knowledge proof exists for every NP problem. Since verifying a connected spanning subgraph can be easily done in polynomial time, we can construct a computational zero-knowledge proof for this problem. However, such construction requires cryptographic primitives and thus is not practical or intuitive.

Instead, a number of previous papers have focused on constructing a physical protocol of zero-knowledge proof using a deck of playing cards. These card-based protocols have benefit that they do not require computers and use only a small deck of cards that can be carried anywhere. These protocols also have a great didactic value since they are easy to understand and verify the correctness and security, even for non-experts in cryptography.

1.1 Related Work

Most of the card-based protocols of zero-knowledge proof developed in previous work were intended to solve well-known logic puzzles: Sudoku [8, 16], Nonogram [4], Akari [2], Takuzu [2, 12], Kakuro [2, 13], KenKen [2], Makaro [3], Norinori [5], Slitherlink [11], Numberlink [15], and Juosan [12].

The importance of these protocols is that many of them employ methods to physically verify specific functions. For example, a subprotocol in [3] verifies that two given numbers are different without revealing their values, another subprotocol in [3] verifies that a number in a list is the largest one in that list without revealing any value in the list, and a subprotocol in [8] verifies that a list is a permutation of all given numbers in some order without revealing their order.

Some of these protocols can also verify graph theoretic problems. For example, a protocol in [15] verifies a solution of the k vertex-disjoint paths problem, i.e. a set of vertex-disjoint paths joining each of the k given pairs of endpoints in an undirected graph.

1.2 Our Contribution

In this paper, we develop a card-based protocol of zero-knowledge proof with perfect completeness and perfect soundness properties to verify that a graph H is a connected spanning subgraph of a graph G without revealing H .

We also show one possible application of this protocol to verify a solution of a famous logic puzzle called Bridges.

2 Basic Subprotocols

We will introduce basic subprotocols involving *encoding cards*. Each encoding card has either \clubsuit or \heartsuit on the front side and has an identical back side.

For $0 \leq x < k$, define $E_k(x)$ to be a sequence of consecutive k cards, with all of them being \clubsuit except the $(x + 1)$ -th card from the left being \heartsuit , e.g. $E_3(0)$ is $\heartsuit\clubsuit\clubsuit$ and $E_4(2)$ is $\clubsuit\clubsuit\heartsuit\clubsuit$. We use $E_k(x)$ to encode an integer x in $\mathbb{Z}/k\mathbb{Z}$. This encoding rule was first considered by Shinagawa et al. [18] in the context of using regular k -gon cards to encode integers in $\mathbb{Z}/k\mathbb{Z}$.

Normally, the cards in $E_k(x)$ are arranged horizontally as defined above unless stated otherwise. In some situations, however, we may arrange the cards vertically, where the leftmost card will become the topmost card and the rightmost card will become the bottommost card.

We construct an $m \times k$ *matrix* of face-down cards. Let Row i denote the i -th topmost row, and Column j denote the j -th leftmost column.

		Column					
		1	2	3	4	5	6
Row	1	?	?	?	?	?	?
	2	?	?	?	?	?	?
	3	?	?	?	?	?	?
	4	?	?	?	?	?	?
	5	?	?	?	?	?	?

Figure 1: An example of a 5×6 matrix

2.1 Pile-Shifting Shuffle

A *pile-shifting shuffle* was introduced by Shinagawa et al. [18]. In the pile-shifting shuffle on an $m \times k$ matrix, we rearrange the columns of the matrix by a random cyclic permutation, i.e. move each Column ℓ to Column $\ell + r$ for a uniformly random $r \in \mathbb{Z}/k\mathbb{Z}$ (where Column ℓ' means Column $\ell' - k$ for $\ell' > k$).

In real world, one can perform the pile-shifting shuffle by putting the cards in each column into an envelope and applying a *Hindu cut*, a basic shuffling operation commonly used in card games [19], on the sequence of envelopes.

2.2 Matrix Rearrangement Protocol

The purpose of a *matrix rearrangement protocol* is to revert columns of a matrix (after we perform pile-shifting shuffles) back to their original positions so that we can reuse all cards in the matrix without revealing them. Different variants of this protocol were used in some previous work on card-based protocols [3, 9, 10, 15, 16]. Note that before performing pile-shifting shuffles that we want to revert later, we always put $E_k(0)$ in Row 1, hence we need to ensure that a \heartsuit in Row 1 moves back to Column 1.

We can apply the rearrangement protocol on an $m \times k$ matrix by publicly performing the following steps.

1. Apply the pile-shifting shuffle to the matrix.
2. Turn over all cards in Row 1. Locate the position of a \heartsuit . Suppose it is at Column j .
3. Shift the columns of the matrix to the left by $j - 1$ columns, i.e. move every Column ℓ to Column $\ell - (j - 1)$ (where Column ℓ' means Column $\ell' + k$ for $\ell' < 1$). Turn over all face-up cards.

2.3 Sequence Selection Protocol

Suppose we have a sequence B encoding an integer b in $\mathbb{Z}/k\mathbb{Z}$ and k sequences A_0, A_1, \dots, A_{k-1} , each encoding an integer in $\mathbb{Z}/m\mathbb{Z}$. We introduce the following *sequence selection protocol*, which allows us to select a sequence A_b without revealing b .

		Column				
		1	2	...	k	
1	?	?	?	...	?	$\rightarrow E_k(0)$
2	?	?	?	...	?	$\rightarrow B$
Row 3	?	?	?	...	?	
4	?	?	?	...	?	
\vdots	\vdots	\vdots	\vdots	\vdots	\vdots	
$m + 2$?	?	?	...	?	
		\downarrow	\downarrow	\downarrow		
		A_0	A_1	...	A_{k-1}	

Figure 2: An $(m + 2) \times k$ matrix M constructed in Step 1

1. Construct an $(m + 2) \times k$ matrix M by the following procedures (see Fig. 2).
 - (a) In Row 1, place a sequence $E_k(0)$.
 - (b) In Row 2, place the sequence B .
 - (c) In each column $j = 1, 2, \dots, k$, place the sequence A_{j-1} arranged vertically from Row 3 to Row $m + 2$.
2. Apply the pile-shifting shuffle to M .
3. Turn over all cards in Row 2. Locate the position of a \heartsuit . Suppose it is at Column j .
4. Select the sequence in Column j arranged vertically from Row 3 to Row $m + 2$. This is the sequence A_b as desired. Turn over all face-up cards.

After we are done using A_b in other protocols, we can put A_b back into M and apply the matrix rearrangement protocol to M if we want to reuse the sequences A_0, A_1, \dots, A_{k-1} , and B .

3 More Advanced Subprotocols

In addition to the encoding cards, we also use *marking cards* in some of our subprotocols. Each marking card has a positive integer on the front side and has an identical back side.

We construct an $m \times k$ *super-matrix* M as follows. First, construct an $m \times k$ matrix M of face-down encoding cards. Then, on top of Row 1 of M , place face-down marking cards $\boxed{1}$, $\boxed{2}$, ..., \boxed{k} from left to right in this order. We call this new row Row 0. Also, to the left of Column 1 of M , place face-down marking cards $\boxed{2}$, $\boxed{3}$, ..., \boxed{m} from top to bottom in this order (starting at Row 2). We call this new column Column 0. As a result, M becomes an incomplete $(m + 1) \times (k + 1)$ matrix with two cards at the top-left corner removed (see Fig. 1). We call M an $m \times k$ super-matrix.

		Column						
		0	1	2	3	4	5	6
	0		$\boxed{1}$	$\boxed{2}$	$\boxed{3}$	$\boxed{4}$	$\boxed{5}$	$\boxed{6}$ (actually face-down)
	1		$\boxed{?}$	$\boxed{?}$	$\boxed{?}$	$\boxed{?}$	$\boxed{?}$	$\boxed{?}$
Row	2	$\boxed{2}$	$\boxed{?}$	$\boxed{?}$	$\boxed{?}$	$\boxed{?}$	$\boxed{?}$	$\boxed{?}$
	3	$\boxed{3}$	$\boxed{?}$	$\boxed{?}$	$\boxed{?}$	$\boxed{?}$	$\boxed{?}$	$\boxed{?}$
	4	$\boxed{4}$	$\boxed{?}$	$\boxed{?}$	$\boxed{?}$	$\boxed{?}$	$\boxed{?}$	$\boxed{?}$
	5	$\boxed{5}$	$\boxed{?}$	$\boxed{?}$	$\boxed{?}$	$\boxed{?}$	$\boxed{?}$	$\boxed{?}$
			\uparrow (actually face-down)					

Figure 3: An example of a 5×6 super-matrix

3.1 Double-Scramble Shuffle

A *double-scramble shuffle* was developed by Ruangwises and Itoh [15]. In the double-scramble shuffle on an $m \times k$ super-matrix, we rearrange all columns and all rows except Row 1 of a matrix by random permutations unknown to all parties.

1. Rearrange Rows $2, 3, \dots, m$ by a uniformly random permutation (p_2, p_3, \dots, p_m) of $(2, 3, \dots, m)$, i.e. move Row i to Row p_i for every $i = 2, 3, \dots, m$.
2. Rearrange Columns $1, 2, \dots, k$ by a uniformly random permutation (q_1, q_2, \dots, q_k) of $(1, 2, \dots, k)$, i.e. move Column j to Column q_j for every $j = 1, 2, \dots, k$.

3.2 Super-Matrix Rearrangement Protocol

Like the matrix rearrangement protocol, a *super-matrix rearrangement protocol* is another variant of rearrangement protocols with a purpose to revert rows and columns of a super-matrix after we perform double scramble shuffles.

We can apply the rearrangement protocol on an $m \times k$ super-matrix by publicly performing the following steps.

1. Apply the double-scramble shuffle to the matrix.

2. Turn over all marking cards in Column 0. Suppose the opened cards are p_2, p_3, \dots, p_m from top to bottom in this order.
3. Rearrange Rows 2, 3, ..., m by a permutation (p_2, p_3, \dots, p_m) , i.e. move Row i to Row p_i for every $i = 2, 3, \dots, m$.
4. Turn over all marking cards in Row 0. Suppose the opened cards are q_1, q_2, \dots, q_k from left to right in this order.
5. Rearrange Columns 1, 2, ..., b by a permutation (q_1, q_2, \dots, q_k) , i.e. move Column j to Column q_j for every $j = 1, 2, \dots, k$. Turn over all face-up cards.

3.3 Path Verification Protocol

A *path verification protocol* verifies existence of an undirected path between vertices s and t in an undirected graph G . It is a special case $k = 1$ of the protocol for the k vertex-disjoint paths problem developed by Ruangwises and Itoh [15].

In this protocol, we call s and t *terminal vertices*, and other vertices *non-terminal vertices*. Also, we call a path (v_1, v_2, \dots, v_k) *simple* if there is no i, j such that $j > i + 1$ and v_j is a neighbor of v_i . Observe that if the solution is a non-simple path (v_1, v_2, \dots, v_k) with v_j being a neighbor of v_i where $j > i + 1$, then we can replace it with a shorter path $(v_1, v_2, \dots, v_i, v_j, v_{j+1}, \dots, v_k)$. We repeatedly perform this until the path becomes simple.

Suppose that the maximum degree of a vertex in G is d . We can inductively color the vertices of G with at most $d + 1$ colors in linear time such that there are no neighboring vertices with the same color. This $(d + 1)$ -coloring is known to all parties.

First, on each terminal vertex v , the prover P publicly places a sequence $A(v)$, defined to be $E_{d+2}(0)$. Then, on each non-terminal vertex v with the x -th color in the $(d + 1)$ -coloring of G , P secretly places a sequence $A(v)$, defined to be $E_{d+2}(0)$ if v is on the (simple) path between s and t , and to be $E_{d+2}(x)$ if v is not on the path.

The intuition of this protocol is that, for each vertex v with the x -th color, P will add two artificial neighbors of v , both having a sequence encoding x , and then convince the verifier V that

1. every non-terminal vertex v has exactly two neighbors with a sequence encoding the same number as $A(v)$.
2. every terminal vertex v has exactly one neighbor with a sequence encoding the same number as $A(v)$.

The formal steps of verifying a non-terminal vertex v with the x -th color and with degree d_v are as follows.

1. Construct a $(d_v + 3) \times (d + 2)$ super-matrix M in the following way.
 - (a) In Row 1 of M , place the sequence $A(v)$.
 - (b) In each of the next d_v rows of M , place the sequence $A(v')$ for each neighboring vertex v' of v .
 - (c) In each of the last two rows of M , place a sequence $E_{d+2}(x)$.
 - (d) Place marking cards to complete the super-matrix M .

2. Apply the double-scramble shuffle to M .
3. Turn over all encoding cards in Row 1. Locate the position of a \heartsuit . Suppose it is at Column j .
4. Turn over all other encoding cards in Column j . If there are exactly two \heartsuit s besides the one in Row 1, then the protocol continues; otherwise V rejects and the protocol terminates.
5. Turn over all face-up cards and apply the super-matrix rearrangement protocol to M to revert the cards to their original positions. Finally, put the sequences back to their corresponding vertices.

The verification phase for a terminal vertex works exactly the same as that for a non-terminal vertex, except that in Step 4, V verifies that there is exactly one (instead of two) \heartsuit in Column j besides the one in Row 1. (Also, Step 1(c) is not necessary when verifying a terminal vertex.)

If every vertex in G passes the verification, then V accepts.

4 Verifying Connected Spanning Subgraph

We get back to our main problem. Let v_1, v_2, \dots, v_n be the vertices in G . In order to prove that H is a connected spanning subgraph of G , it is sufficient to show that there is an undirected path between v_i and v_n in H for every $i = 1, 2, \dots, n - 1$. Therefore, P can perform a slightly modified version of the path verification protocol in Section 3.3 for $n - 1$ rounds, with $s = v_i$ and $t = v_n$ in the i -th round.

Let d be the maximum degree of a vertex in G . Like in the path verification protocol, we can color the vertices of G with at most $d + 1$ colors such that there are no neighboring vertices with the same color. This $(d + 1)$ -coloring is known to all parties.

At the beginning, on each vertex v in G with the x -th color in the $(d + 1)$ -coloring of G , P publicly places a sequence $A_0(v)$, defined to be $E_{d+3}(d + 2)$. On each edge e in G , P secretly places a sequence $B(e)$, defined to be $E_2(1)$ if e is in H and to be $E_2(0)$ if e is not in H . By placing $B(e)$ for every edge e , the graph H is committed and cannot be changed later.

Consider the i -th round when P wants to show that there is a path between $s = v_i$ and $t = v_n$ in H . First, P selects a simple path between s and t in H . On each terminal vertex v , P publicly places a sequence $A_1(v)$, defined to be $E_{d+3}(0)$. On each non-terminal vertex v with the x -th color in the $(d + 1)$ -coloring of G , P secretly places a sequence $A_1(v)$, defined to be $E_{d+3}(0)$ if v is on the path and to be $E_{d+3}(x)$ if v is not on the path.

The verification phase is very similar to the path verification protocol in Section 3.3, except that in Step 1(b), P first applies the sequence selection protocol in Section 2.3 to determine whether to choose $A_0(v')$ or $A_1(v')$ for each neighbor v' of v , depending on whether an edge e joining v and v' is in H or not. If e is in H ($B(e) = 1$), then v' is still v 's neighbor in H , so P chooses a sequence $A_1(v')$ as in the path verification protocol. If e is not in H ($B(e) = 0$), then v' is not v 's neighbor in v , so P chooses a sequence $A_0(v')$, which is $E_{d+3}(d + 2)$ and thus guaranteed to be different from $A_1(v)$.

The formal steps of verifying a non-terminal vertex v with the x -th color and with degree d_v are as follows.

1. Construct a $(d_v + 3) \times (d + 3)$ super-matrix M in the following way.
 - (a) In Row 1 of M , place the sequence $A_1(v)$.
 - (b) For each neighbor v' of v , let e be an edge joining v and v' , and let b be a bit encoded by the sequence $B(e)$. Apply the sequence selection protocol in Section 2.3 to choose a sequence $A_b(v')$ and place it in the next row of M . Repeatedly perform this for every neighbor of v to fill the next d_v rows of M .
 - (c) In each of the last two rows of M , place a sequence $E_{d+3}(x)$.
 - (d) Place marking cards to complete the super-matrix M .
2. Apply the double-scramble shuffle in Section 3.1 to M .
3. Turn over all encoding cards in Row 1. Locate the position of a \heartsuit . Suppose it is at Column j .
4. Turn over all other encoding cards in Column j . If there are exactly two \heartsuit s besides the one in Row 1, then the protocol continues; otherwise V rejects and the protocol terminates.
5. Turn over all face-up cards and apply the super-matrix rearrangement protocol in Section 3.2 to M to revert the cards to their original positions. Also, revert the sequence selection protocol in step 1(b) for every neighbor of v . Finally, put the sequences back to their corresponding vertices.

The verification phase for a terminal vertex works exactly the same as that for a non-terminal vertex, except that in Step 4, V verifies that there is exactly one (instead of two) \heartsuit in Column j besides the one in Row 1. (Also, Step 1(c) is not necessary when verifying a terminal vertex.)

If every vertex in G passes the verification, then V accepts.

This protocol uses $2(d+3)(2n+2) + 2d + 2m$ encoding cards and $2d + 5$ marking cards, where n and m are the numbers of vertices and edges of G , respectively. Therefore, the total number of required cards is $\Theta(dn)$.

5 Proof of Correctness and Security

We will prove the perfect completeness, perfect soundness, and zero-knowledge properties of our main protocol in Section 4.

Lemma 1 (Perfect completeness). If H is a connected spanning subgraph of G , then V always accepts.

Proof. Suppose that H is a connected spanning subgraph of G , then there exists a path between v_i and v_n in H for every $i = 1, 2, \dots, n - 1$.

First, we will prove the correctness of the sequence selection protocol in Section 2.3. Since the sequence B encodes the number b , when placing B in Row 2 of M , the \heartsuit will locate at Column $b+1$, the same column as the sequence A_b . After applying the pile-shifting shuffle, they will still be at the same column, so the sequence we get in Step 4 will be A_b .

Now consider the main protocol in each i -th round. In Step 1(b), P always pick a sequence $A_1(v')$ if e is in H and $A_0(v')$ if e is not in H . Since $A_0(v')$ is $E_{d+3}(d+2)$ and thus is different from $A_1(v)$, adding $A_0(v')$ to a new row of M does not increase the number of \heartsuit s found in Row j in Step 4. Therefore, the result will remain the same if in Step 1(b) P adds only the sequences on vertices such that e is in H , which is equivalent to solely applying the path verification protocol in Section 3.3 to verify a path between v_i and v_n on H .

The perfect completeness property of the path verification protocol has been proved in [15], so we can conclude that V always accepts. \square

Lemma 2 (Perfect soundness). If H is not a connected spanning subgraph of G , then V always rejects.

Proof. Suppose that H is not a connected spanning subgraph of G , then there exists an index $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, n-1\}$ such that there is no path between v_i and v_n in H . In Lemma 1, we have proved that the sequence selection protocol is correct, and the i -th round of the main protocol is equivalent to applying the path verification protocol to verify a path between v_i and v_n on H .

The perfect soundness property of the path verification protocol has been proved in [15], so we can conclude that V always rejects. \square

Lemma 3 (Zero-knowledge). During the verification phase, V learns nothing about H .

Proof. To prove the zero-knowledge property, it is sufficient to prove that all distributions of the values that appear when P turns over cards can be simulated by a simulator S without knowing H .

- In the sequence selection protocol:
 - Consider Step 3 where we turn over all cards in Row 2. This occurs right after we applied the pile-shifting shuffle to M . Therefore, a \heartsuit has an equal probability to appear at each of the k columns, hence this step can be simulated by S without knowing H .
- In each i -th round of the main protocol:
 - Consider Step 3 where P turns over all encoding cards in Row 1. The order of Columns 1, 2, ..., $d+3$ is uniformly distributed among all possible permutations due to the double-scramble shuffle, hence the \heartsuit has an equal probability to appear at each of the $d+3$ columns. Therefore, this step can be simulated by S without knowing H .
 - After that, in Step 4 P locates the position of the \heartsuit in Row 1 at Column j , and then turns over all other encoding cards in Column j . The order of Rows 2, 3, ..., d_v+3 is uniformly distributed among all possible permutations due to the double-scramble shuffle, hence all (one or two) \heartsuit s have an equal probability to appear at each of the d_v+2 rows. Therefore, this step can be simulated by S without knowing H .

Therefore, we can conclude that V learns nothing about H . \square

6 Verifying Bridges Puzzle

One of the possible applications of this protocol to verify a solution of a famous logic puzzle called *Bridges*, or the original Japanese name *Hashiwokakero*. The Bridges puzzle was introduced by a Japanese company Nikoli, which also developed many popular logic puzzles including Sudoku, Kakuro, Numberlink, and Nurikabe.

A Bridges puzzle consists of a rectangular grid of size $m \times n$, with some cells called *islands* containing an encircled positive number of at most 8. The objective of this puzzle is to connect some pairs of islands by straight lines called *bridges* that can only run horizontally or vertically. There can be at most two bridges between each pair of islands, and the bridges must satisfy the following conditions [14].

1. *Island condition*: The number of bridges connected to each island must equal to the number written on that island.
2. *Noncrossing condition*: Each bridge cannot cross islands or other bridges.
3. *Connecting condition*: The bridges must connect all islands into a single component.




Figure 4: An example of a Bridges puzzle (left) and its solution (right)

Determining whether a given Bridges puzzle has a solution has been proved to be NP-complete [1].

We will show an application of the protocol in Section 4 to verify the solution of the Bridges puzzle.

An *edge* is a line segment of a unit length on the Bridges grid that either separates two adjacent cells or lies on the outer boundary of the grid. For each edge e , let $b(e)$ be the number of bridges passing through e (including bridges coming out of e if e is an edge of an island cell). First, P secretly places a sequence encoding $b(e)$ in $\mathbb{Z}/3\mathbb{Z}$. Then, P publicly appends six ♣s to the end of the sequence to make it encode $b(e)$ in $\mathbb{Z}/9\mathbb{Z}$ (while ensuring V that $b(e)$ is at most 2). For each island cell c with a number $n(c)$, P also publicly places a sequence encoding $n(c)$ in $\mathbb{Z}/9\mathbb{Z}$ on c .

For each cell c , let $b(e_1), b(e_2), b(e_3), b(e_4)$ be the numbers encoded by sequences on the top edge e_1 , the right edge e_2 , the bottom edge e_3 , and the left edge e_4 of c , respectively (see Fig. 5). The steps of verifying a solution of the Bridges puzzle are as follows.




Figure 5: Positions of edges e_1, e_2, e_3, e_4 surrounding a cell c .

1. For each edge e located on the outer boundary of the Bridges grid, verify that $b(e) = 0$ (no bridge goes beyond the grid), which can be shown by simply revealing the sequence on e .
2. For each island cell c with a number $n(c)$, verify that $b(e_1) + b(e_2) + b(e_3) + b(e_4) \equiv n(c) \pmod{9}$ (the island condition).
3. For each non-island cell c , verify that $b(e_1) \equiv b(e_3) \pmod{9}$ and $b(e_2) \equiv b(e_4) \pmod{9}$ (the number of bridges passing through c is consistent), and also that $b(e_1) \cdot b(e_2) \equiv 0 \pmod{9}$ (the noncrossing condition).

Steps 2 and 3 can be performed by applying a combination of copy and arithmetic protocols, which are explained in Appendix A.

Finally, construct a graph G with all islands being vertices of G , and two islands having an edge in G if they are on the same row or column and there is no island between them (that is, one can construct a valid bridge between them). Let H be a subgraph of G such that two islands have an edge in H if there is at least one bridge between them in the solution. Verifying the connecting condition is equivalent to verifying that H is a spanning subgraph of G , which can be done by the protocol in Section 4.

7 Future Work

We developed a card-based protocol of zero-knowledge proof to verify that a graph H is a connected spanning subgraph of a graph G without revealing H . We also showed an application of this protocol to verify a solution of the Bridges puzzle.

A possible future work is to explore methods to physically verify other important graph theoretic problems as well as the solution of other popular logic puzzles.

References

- [1] D. Andersson. Hashiwokakero is NP-complete. *Information Processing Letters*, 109(9): 1145–1146 (2009).
- [2] X. Bultel, J. Dreier, J.-G. Dumas and P. Lafourcade. Physical Zero-Knowledge Proofs for Akari, Takuzu, Kakuro and KenKen. In *Proceedings of the 8th International Conference on Fun with Algorithms (FUN)*, pp. 8:1–8:20 (2016).
- [3] X. Bultel, J. Dreier, J.-G. Dumas, P. Lafourcade, D. Miyahara, T. Mizuki, A. Nagao, T. Sasaki, K. Shinagawa and H. Sone. Physical Zero-Knowledge Proof for Makaro. In *Proceedings of the 20th International Symposium on Stabilization, Safety, and Security of Distributed Systems (SSS)*, pp. 111–125 (2018).

- [4] Y.-F. Chien and W.-K. Hon. Cryptographic and Physical Zero-Knowledge Proof: From Sudoku to Nonogram. In *Proceedings of the 5th International Conference on Fun with Algorithms (FUN)*, pp. 102–112 (2010).
- [5] J.-G. Dumas, P. Lafourcade, D. Miyahara, T. Mizuki, T. Sasaki and H. Sone. Interactive Physical Zero-Knowledge Proof for Norinori. In *Proceedings of the 25th International Computing and Combinatorics Conference (COCOON)*, pp. 166–177 (2019).
- [6] O. Goldreich, S. Micali and A. Wigderson. Proofs that yield nothing but their validity and a methodology of cryptographic protocol design. *Journal of the ACM*, 38(3): 691–729 (1991).
- [7] S. Goldwasser, S. Micali and C. Rackoff. The knowledge complexity of interactive proof systems. *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 18(1): 186–208 (1989).
- [8] R. Gradwohl, M. Naor, B. Pinkas and G.N. Rothblum. Cryptographic and Physical Zero-Knowledge Proof Systems for Solutions of Sudoku Puzzles. In *Proceedings of the 4th International Conference on Fun with Algorithms (FUN)*, pp. 166–182 (2007).
- [9] Y. Hashimoto, K. Shinagawa, K. Nuida, M. Inamura and G. Hanaoka. Secure Grouping Protocol Using a Deck of Cards. In *Proceedings of the 10th International Conference on Information Theoretic Security (ICITS)*, pp. 135–152 (2017).
- [10] T. Ibaraki and Y. Manabe. A More Efficient Card-Based Protocol for Generating a Random Permutation without Fixed Points. In *Proceedings of the 3rd International Conference on Mathematics and Computers in Sciences and Industry (MCSI)*, pp. 252–257 (2016).
- [11] P. Lafourcade, D. Miyahara, T. Mizuki, T. Sasaki and H. Sone. A Physical ZKP for Slitherlink: How to Perform Physical Topology-Preserving Computation. In *Proceedings of the 15th International Conference on Information Security Practice and Experience (ISPEC)*, pp. 135–151 (2019).
- [12] D. Miyahara, L. Robert, P. Lafourcade, S. Takeshige, T. Mizuki, K. Shinagawa, A. Nagao and H. Sone. Card-Based ZKP Protocols for Takuzu and Juosan. In *Proceedings of the 10th International Conference on Fun with Algorithms (FUN)*, pp. 20:1–20:21 (2020).
- [13] D. Miyahara, T. Sasaki, T. Mizuki and H. Sone. Card-Based Physical Zero-Knowledge Proof for Kakuro. *IEICE Transactions on Fundamentals of Electronics, Communications and Computer Sciences*, E102.A(9): 1072–1078 (2019).
- [14] Nikoli: Hashiwokakero. <https://www.nikoli.co.jp/en/puzzles/hashiwokakero.html>
- [15] S. Ruangwises and T. Itoh. Physical Zero-Knowledge Proof for Numberlink Puzzle and k Vertex-Disjoint Paths Problem. *New Generation Computing* (2020).
- [16] T. Sasaki, T. Mizuki and H. Sone. Card-Based Zero-Knowledge Proof for Sudoku. In *Proceedings of the 9th International Conference on Fun with Algorithms (FUN)*, pp. 29:1–29:10 (2018).

- [17] K. Shinagawa and T. Mizuki. Card-based Protocols Using Triangle Cards. In *Proceedings of the 9th International Conference on Fun with Algorithms (FUN)*, pp. 31:1–31:13 (2018).
- [18] K. Shinagawa, T. Mizuki, J.C.N. Schuldt, K. Nuida, N. Kanayama, T. Nishide, G. Hanaoka and E. Okamoto. Multi-party Computation with Small Shuffle Complexity Using Regular Polygon Cards. In *Proceedings of the 9th International Conference on Provable Security (ProvSec)*, pp. 127–146 (2015).
- [19] I. Ueda, A. Nishimura, Y. Hayashi, T. Mizuki and H. Sone. How to Implement a Random Bisection Cut. In *Proceedings of the 5th International Conference on the Theory and Practice of Natural Computing (TPNC)*, pages 58-69 (2016).

A Copy and Arithmetic Protocols

In this appendix, we explain the copy and arithmetic protocols that can be used to verify a solution of the Bridges puzzle in Section 6.

A.1 Copy Protocol

Given a sequence A encoding an integer a in $\mathbb{Z}/k\mathbb{Z}$, this protocol creates m additional copies A_1, A_2, \dots, A_m of A without revealing a . It was introduced by Shinagawa et al. [18].

1. Construct a $2 \times k$ matrix M by placing a sequence $E_k(0)$ in Row 1 and the sequence A in Row 2.
2. Apply the pile-shifting shuffle to M .
3. Turn over all cards in Row 2 of M . Locate the position of a \heartsuit . Suppose it is at Column j .
4. Append m rows to the bottom of M , each row with a sequence $E_k(j - 1)$, making M become a $(m + 2) \times k$ matrix. Turn over all face-up cards.
5. Apply the matrix rearrangement protocol to M .
6. We have the sequences A_1, A_2, \dots, A_m in Rows 3, 4, ..., $m + 2$ of M as desired.

A.2 Addition Protocol

Given sequences A and B encoding integers a and b in $\mathbb{Z}/k\mathbb{Z}$, respectively. This protocol computes the sum $a + b \pmod{k}$ without revealing a or b . It was introduced by Shinagawa et al. [18].

1. Reverse the sequence B horizontally, i.e. move each i -th leftmost card of B to become the i -th rightmost card. We call this modified sequence B' .
2. Construct a $2 \times k$ matrix M by placing the sequence A in Row 1 and the sequence B' in Row 2.

3. Apply the pile-shifting shuffle to M . Note that Row 1 of M encodes $a + r \pmod{k}$ for a uniformly random $r \in \mathbb{Z}/k\mathbb{Z}$, while Row 2 of M is a reverse of a sequence encoding $b - r \pmod{k}$.
4. Turn over all cards in Row 2 of M . Locate the position of a \heartsuit . Suppose it is at Column j .
5. Shift the sequence in Row 1 of M to the left by j positions, i.e. move a card in each Column ℓ to Column $\ell - j$ (where Column ℓ' means Column $\ell' + k$ for $\ell' < 1$).
6. The sequence in Row 1 of M encodes $(a + r) + (b - r) \equiv a + b \pmod{k}$ as desired.

A.3 Multiplication Protocol

Given sequences A and B encoding integers a and b in $\mathbb{Z}/k\mathbb{Z}$, respectively, this protocol computes the product $a \cdot b \pmod{k}$ without revealing a or b . It is a generalization of a protocol of Shinagawa and Mizuki [17] to multiply two integers in $\mathbb{Z}/3\mathbb{Z}$.

1. Repeatedly apply the copy protocol and the addition protocol to produce sequences $A_0, A_1, A_2, \dots, A_{k-1}$ encoding $0, a, 2a, \dots, (k-1)a \pmod{k}$, respectively.
2. Apply the sequence selection protocol to select the sequence A_b encoding $a \cdot b \pmod{k}$.

A.4 Equality Verification Protocol

Given sequences A and B encoding integers a and b in $\mathbb{Z}/k\mathbb{Z}$, respectively, this protocol verifies that $a = b$ without revealing a or b . This protocol is a simplified version of the one used in the path verification protocol in Section 3.3.

1. Construct a $2 \times k$ matrix M by placing the sequence A in Row 1 and the sequence B in Row 2.
2. Apply the pile-shifting shuffle to M .
3. Turn over all cards in Row 1 of M . Locate the position of a \heartsuit . Suppose it is at Column j .
4. Turn over the card at Row 2 and Column j of M . If it is a \heartsuit , then the protocol continues. Otherwise, the verifier V rejects and the protocol terminates.