

# AnoFel: Supporting Anonymity for Privacy-Preserving Federated Learning

Ghada Almashaqbeh  
*University of Connecticut*  
 ghada@uconn.edu

Zahra Ghodsi  
*Purdue University*  
 zahra@purdue.edu

## Abstract

Federated learning enables users to collaboratively train a machine learning model over their private datasets. Secure aggregation protocols are employed to mitigate information leakage about the local datasets. This setup, however, still leaks the *participation* of a user in a training iteration, which can also be sensitive. Protecting user anonymity is even more challenging in dynamic environments where users may (re)join or leave the training process at any point of time.

In this paper, we introduce AnoFel, the first framework to support private and anonymous dynamic participation in federated learning. AnoFel leverages several cryptographic primitives, the concept of anonymity sets, differential privacy, and a public bulletin board to support anonymous user registration, as well as unlinkable and confidential model updates submission. Additionally, our system allows dynamic participation, where users can join or leave at any time, without needing any recovery protocol or interaction. To assess security, we formalize a notion for privacy and anonymity in federated learning, and formally prove that AnoFel satisfies this notion. To the best of our knowledge, our system is the first solution with provable anonymity guarantees. To assess efficiency, we provide a concrete implementation of AnoFel, and conduct experiments showing its ability to support learning applications scaling to a large number of clients. For an MNIST classification task with 512 clients, the client setup takes less than 3 sec, and a training iteration can be finished in 3.2 sec. We also compare our system with prior work and demonstrate its practicality for contemporary learning tasks.

## 1 Introduction

Privacy-preserving machine learning is a critical problem that has received huge interest from both academic and industrial communities. Many crucial applications involve training ML models over highly sensitive user data, such as medical screening [30], credit risk assessment [29], or autonomous vehicles [17]. Enabling such applications requires machine learning frameworks that preserve the privacy of users' datasets.

Federated learning (FL) aims to achieve this goal by offering a decentralized paradigm for model training. Participants, or clients, train the model locally over their datasets, and then share only the local gradients with the model owner, or the server. After aggregating updates from all clients, the server shares the updated model with these clients to start a new training iteration. This iterative process continues until the model converges.

However, individual model updates leak information about clients' private datasets [52, 55], and therefore aggregation should be done in a secure way: a server only sees the aggregated value rather than individual contributions from each client. A large body of work emerged to build cryptographic protocols for secure aggregation to support private federated learning, e.g., [9, 14, 60, 64, 66, 72]. Even with a provably secure aggregation protocol, the aggregated model updates still impose a leakage; it was shown that membership inference attacks can determine whether a data sample has been used in the training of a given ML model [55, 63]. Several defense techniques have been proposed that rely on, e.g., regularization techniques to reduce overfitting [42, 68], knowledge distillation [62], and differential privacy [74].

**Anonymous client participation.** A related question to protecting data privacy in federated learning is protecting client identity and breaking linkability with any information that could be deduced from training. Anonymity is critical for training models over sensitive data related to, e.g., rare diseases or sexual abuse incidents. The mere knowledge that a user has participated implies being ill or a victim. It may also allow collecting sensitive information, e.g., location in autonomous vehicles related applications, or financial standing in trading or loans related training tasks. Such leakage invades privacy, and may discourage participation.

Unfortunately, existing frameworks for private federated learning either don't support client anonymity, or suffer from security issues. Secure aggregation protocols [9, 14] require full identification of clients through a public key infrastructure (PKI) or a trusted client registration process to prevent Sybil attacks and impersonation. Even frameworks that deal

with honest-but-curious adversaries [14, 60, 64, 66, 72] assign clients logical identities, where the mapping between the logical and real identities is known to the server or a trusted third party. On the other hand, techniques that anonymize datasets [47, 50, 65, 74] do not support participation anonymity, but rather hide sensitive information in the dataset before being used in training. At the same time, existing solutions for anonymous client participation have several limitations [19, 24, 35, 48, 76]: they either rely on fixed pseudonyms that are susceptible to traffic analysis attacks [24], assume a trusted party to mediate communication [76], or are vulnerable to man-in-the-middle attacks [35, 48].

**Dynamic settings.** Allowing clients to (re)join or leave at any time is invaluable for training tasks targeting dynamic environments. A decentralized activity as federated learning may deal with heterogeneous settings involving weak clients who may use low-power devices or have unstable network connectivity. Even it could be the case that clients simply change their minds and abort the training protocol after it starts. The ability to support this dynamicity at low overhead promotes participation, but it is a more challenging setup for client anonymity.

Most privacy-preserving federated learning solutions do not support dynamic participation; usually clients must join at the onset of the training process during the setup phase. Several solutions support client dropouts (at a relatively high overhead by employing highly interactive recovery protocols that reveal dropout identities) [14, 64, 66, 72] but not addition, or support both but at the expense of a constrained setup that places a cap on the number of clients who can participate [71]. To the best of our knowledge, supporting anonymity in a dynamic environment has been absent from the current state-of-the-art.

**An open question.** Therefore, we ask the following question: *can we achieve private federated learning that supports users' anonymity in both static and dynamic settings?*

## 1.1 Our Contributions

In this paper, we answer this question in the affirmative and propose a system called AnoFel that fulfills the requirements above. In particular, we make the following contributions.

**System design.** AnoFel utilizes various cryptographic primitives and privacy techniques to achieve its goals. To address anonymity, our system combines a public bulletin board, cryptographic commitments, non-interactive zero-knowledge proofs, and differential privacy such that users can participate in training without revealing their identities. This involves (1) an anonymous registration process guaranteeing that only legitimate clients with honestly-generated datasets can participate, and (2) an unlinkable model updates submission that cannot be traced back to the client. We rely on anonymity sets and zero-knowledge proofs to achieve this, where a client proves owning a legitimate dataset (during registration), and being one of the registered clients (during model updates

submission), without revealing anything about their identity or registration information. Moreover, to address membership, inference, and model inversion attacks which could also compromise participation anonymity, we employ differential privacy. A client, after training the model locally and before encrypting the model updates, will sample a noise value and add it to the model updates before encrypting them. The value of this noise is adaptive; it decreases as the number of active clients (those who submitted updates so far in iteration) increases. This reduces the impact on training accuracy without violating the privacy leakage guarantees obtained by differential privacy as elaborated later.

To support dynamic user participation and secure aggregation of model updates, our system employs threshold homomorphic encryption. It splits the roles of a model owner from the aggregators (where we use a committee of aggregators to distribute trust). Aggregators receive encrypted model parameter updates (gradients) from users, and at the end of a training iteration, they operate on these ciphertexts by (homomorphically) adding them to produce a ciphertext of the aggregation. Afterwards, the aggregators decrypt the result and send the aggregated plaintext updates to the model owner so that a new training iteration can be started. Due to this configuration, the clients are not involved in the aggregation or decryption processes and can (re)join and leave training at any time without interrupting the system operation. Furthermore, the bulletin board provides a persistent log accessible to all parties, and facilitates indirect communication between them to reduce interaction.

**Formal security notions and analysis.** We define a notion for private and anonymous federated learning that encompasses three properties: correctness, anonymity, and dataset privacy. Then, we formally prove the security of AnoFel based on this notion. To the best of our knowledge, we are the first to provide such formal definition covering anonymity, and the first to build a provably secure client anonymity solution for private federated learning. Our notion could be of independent interest as it provides a rigorous foundation for other anonymity solutions to prove their security guarantees.

**Implementation and evaluation.** To show practicality, we implement AnoFel and empirically evaluate its performance covering different federated learning tasks. We demonstrate scalability of our system by testing scenarios that involve large numbers of clients and contemporary models—the benchmarked architectures are the largest studied in privacy-preserving federated learning literature. We also show that the augmented components to support privacy and anonymity add reasonable overhead to client runtime. For example, in a network of 512 clients, the client setup needed to join the training task takes less than 3 sec, and each training iteration for MNIST classification takes the client a total of 3.2 sec. We also compare our system to prior work on privacy-preserving federated learning. For our largest benchmark on SqueezeNet architecture trained over TinyImageNet dataset with a net-

work of 512 clients, AnoFel is only  $1.3\times$  slower to finish a training round (in 17.5 sec) compared to Truex et al. [66] and  $2.8\times$  slower than Bonawitz et al. [14] (the former is a non-interactive private scheme while the latter is interactive, and neither support anonymity). Additionally, we evaluate the accuracy of models trained with AnoFel and show that compared to a non-DP baseline, we obtain models with  $< 0.5\%$  accuracy loss in both independent and identically distributed (IID) datasets between clients and non-IID settings.

## 2 A Security Notion for Private and Anonymous Federated Learning

In this section, we define a formal security notion for a private and anonymous federated learning scheme (PAFL). This notion, and its correctness and security properties, are inspired by [16, 28, 40, 61].

**Notation.** We use  $\lambda$  to denote the security parameter,  $\alpha$  to denote correctness parameter,  $\gamma$  to denote the privacy advantage of the adversary ( $\alpha$  and  $\gamma$  are the parameters of the technique used to address membership attacks, if any)  $\text{negl}(\cdot)$  to denote negligible functions, and boldface letters to represent vectors. The variable state represents the system state, including the data recorded on the bulletin board (these posted by all parties, and the public parameters of the cryptographic building blocks). The notation  $\mathcal{A}^{\mathcal{O}}$  means that an entity, in this case the adversary  $\mathcal{A}$ , has an oracle access to  $\mathcal{O}$ . Lastly,  $\overset{\$}{\leftarrow}$  denotes drawn at random, and PPT is a shorthand for probabilistic polynomial time.

**Definition 1** ( $(\alpha, \gamma)$ -PAFL Scheme). *Let  $\Pi$  be a protocol between a server  $S$ , set of aggregators  $\mathcal{AG}$ , and a set of clients  $\mathcal{C}$  such that each client  $cl_i \in \mathcal{C}$  holds a dataset  $D_i$ . Let  $\mathbf{M}$  be the initial model that  $S$  wants to train,  $\mathbf{M}_{actual}$  be the model produced by training  $\mathbf{M}$  over  $D_i$  (in the clear) for  $i = 1, \dots, |\mathcal{C}|$ , and  $\mathbf{M}_{\Pi}$  be the trained model produced by the protocol  $\Pi$ .  $\Pi$  is a private and anonymous federated learning (PAFL) scheme, parameterized by bounds  $\alpha$  and  $\gamma$ , if it satisfies the following properties for every  $\mathbf{M}$ :*

- **$\alpha$ -Correctness:** *The model trained by  $\Pi$  achieves an error bound  $\alpha$  with high probability compared to the actual model. That is, for  $\alpha \geq 0$ , and an error function  $\text{Er}$ , with high probability, we have  $\text{Er}(\mathbf{M}_{actual}, \mathbf{M}_{\Pi}) \leq \alpha$ .*
- **Anonymity:** *Any PPT adversary  $\mathcal{A}$  has a negligible advantage in winning the anonymity game  $\text{AnonGame}$ . Formally, for a security parameter  $\lambda$ , there exists a negligible function  $\text{negl}$  such that  $\mathcal{A}$  wins  $\text{AnonGame}$  with probability at most  $\frac{1}{2} + \text{negl}(\lambda)$ , where the probability is taken over all the randomness used by  $\mathcal{A}$  and  $\Pi$ .*
- **$\gamma$ -Dataset Privacy:** *Any PPT adversary  $\mathcal{A}$  has a negligible additional advantage over  $\gamma$  in winning the dataset indistinguishability game  $\text{DINDGame}$ . Formally, for a security parameter  $\lambda$  and  $\gamma \geq 0$ , there exists a negligible*

*function  $\text{negl}$  such that  $\mathcal{A}$  wins  $\text{DINDGame}$  with probability at most  $\frac{1}{2} + \gamma + \text{negl}(\lambda)$ , where the probability is taken over all randomness used by  $\mathcal{A}$  and  $\Pi$ .*

Intuitively, a PAFL scheme is one that is correct and provides anonymity and dataset privacy for clients. Ideally, correctness guarantees that the outcome of a PAFL scheme (i.e., the final trained model) is identical to what will be produced by a training scheme that gets full access to the clients' datasets. Anonymity means that no one can tell whether a client has registered or participated in any training iteration. In other words, a submitted model updates, or any other information a client uses for registration, cannot be traced back to this client. Dataset privacy means that no additional information will be leaked about the private datasets of honest clients beyond any prior knowledge the adversary has.

To make our definition more general, we account for the use of non-cryptographic privacy techniques, such as DP, that may result in accuracy and privacy loss. We do that by parameterizing our definition with  $\alpha$  and  $\gamma$  standing for correctness (or accuracy loss) and indistinguishability (or privacy loss) parameters, respectively. Having  $\alpha = \gamma = 0$  reduces to the ideal case in which  $\mathbf{M}_{actual} = \mathbf{M}_{\Pi}$ , and an adversary has negligible advantage in breaking anonymity and data set privacy. The bounds for these parameters are derived based on the non-cryptographic privacy technique employed in the system.

We define two security games to capture anonymity and dataset privacy, denoted as  $\text{AnonGame}$  and  $\text{DINDGame}$ , respectively, and the interfaces offered by a PAFL scheme. All parties receive the security parameter  $\lambda$ , and are given an oracle access to  $\mathcal{O}_{\text{PAFL}}$ .  $\mathcal{O}_{\text{PAFL}}$  maintains the state of the system, including the set of registered clients and aggregators, and any additional information recorded on the board. Since the goal is to protect clients from the model owner  $S$ , we assume  $\mathcal{A}$  controls  $S$  and any subset of clients and aggregators. That is,  $\mathcal{A}$  can register any client or aggregator committee  $\mathcal{AG}$  in the system, and can corrupt any of the registered clients and aggregators.  $\mathcal{O}_{\text{PAFL}}$  supports the following query types:

- ( $\text{setup}, 1^{\lambda}$ ): takes the security parameter as input and sets up the system accordingly—creating the bulletin board, the public parameters needed by all parties/cryptographic building blocks, and the bounds/parameters needed by any additional non-cryptographic privacy technique employed in the system. This command can be invoked only once.
- ( $\text{register}, p, \text{aux}$ ): registers party  $p$  that could be a client or an aggregators committee. The field  $\text{aux}$  specifies the party type and its input: if  $p$  is a client, then  $\text{aux}$  will include its certified dataset and the certification information, while if  $p$  is an aggregator committee,  $\text{aux}$  will include the committee's public key. This command can be invoked anytime and as many times as desired.
- ( $\text{train}, cl, \text{aux}$ ): instructs a (registered) client  $cl$  to train the model using its dataset and submit the model updates.

The field  $\text{aux}$  defines the dataset that belongs to  $\text{cl}$  (the exact information is based on  $\Pi$ ). This command can be invoked anytime and as many times as desired.

- ( $\text{access}$ ): returns the updated model (after aggregating all submitted individual model updates received in an iteration). For any iteration, this command can be invoked only once and only at the end of that iteration.
- ( $\text{corrupt}, p, \text{aux}$ ): This allows  $\mathcal{A}$  to corrupt party  $p$ , which could be a client or an aggregator. If  $p$  is a client, then  $\text{aux}$  will be the registration information of this client (e.g., in  $\text{AnoFel}$ , it is the dataset commitment as we will see later), while if  $p$  is an aggregator,  $\text{aux}$  will be the public key of that party. This command can be invoked at anytime and as many times as  $\mathcal{A}$  wishes.

Note that the notion  $\text{cl}$  only represents the type of a party to be a client, it does not contain its real identity.

Accordingly, the  $\text{AnonGame}$  proceeds as follows:

1.  $b \xleftarrow{\$} \{0, 1\}$
2.  $\text{state} \leftarrow (\text{setup}, 1^\lambda)$
3.  $(\text{cl}_0, \text{aux}_0, \text{cl}_1, \text{aux}_1) \leftarrow \mathcal{A}^{\mathcal{O}_{\text{PAFL}}}(1^\lambda, \text{state})$
4.  $(\text{train}, \text{cl}_b, \text{aux}_b)$
5.  $\mathcal{A}$  continues to have access to  $\mathcal{O}_{\text{PAFL}}$
6. At the end,  $\mathcal{A}$  outputs  $b'$ , if  $b' = b$  and:
  - (a) both  $\text{cl}_0$  and  $\text{cl}_1$  are honest,
  - (b) and there is at least two honest clients participated in every training iteration, and that these clients remained to be honest until the end of the game,
 then return 1 (meaning that  $\mathcal{A}$  won the  $\text{AnonGame}$ ), otherwise, return 0.

Note that  $\mathcal{A}$  has access to the current state of the system at anytime, and can see the updated bulletin board after the execution of any command. Also,  $\mathcal{A}$  can see all messages sent in the system, and can access the updated model at the end of any iteration, before and after submitting the challenge. For the chosen clients,  $\text{aux}_i$  represents their registration information (which does not include the client identity or its actual dataset  $D_i$ ).<sup>1</sup> Since  $\mathcal{A}$  can choose any two clients for the challenge,  $\text{AnonGame}$  also captures anonymity of registration. That is, if the registration information can be linked to a model update submission, then  $\mathcal{A}$  can always win the game.

$\text{AnonGame}$  game includes several conditions to rule out trivial attacks. The two clients that  $\mathcal{A}$  selects must be honest, otherwise, if any is corrupt, it will be trivial to tell which client was chosen. Furthermore, since the aggregated model updates is simply the summation of these updates, if only  $\text{cl}_b$  participates in the iteration during which the challenge command is executed, it might be trivial for  $\mathcal{A}$  to win (same for any other iteration if only one honest client participates). This is

<sup>1</sup>If the adversary knows the dataset of a client, then it knows that this client is part of the population, i.e., this client suffers from illness, for example; there is no point of hiding whether that client participated in training or not.

because  $\mathcal{A}$  can access the updated model at the end of that iteration and can extract  $\text{cl}_b$ 's individual updates. Thus, we add the condition that there must be at least two honest clients have participated in any iteration, and these have to be honest until the end of the game. (Also, any  $\mathcal{AG}$  can have at most  $n - t$  corrupt parties, which is implicit in  $\mathcal{A}$ 's capabilities.)

The  $\text{DINDGame}$  proceeds as follows:

1.  $b \xleftarrow{\$} \{0, 1\}$
2.  $\text{state} \leftarrow (\text{setup}, 1^\lambda)$
3.  $(D_0, \text{aux}_0, D_1, \text{aux}_1) \leftarrow \mathcal{A}^{\mathcal{O}_{\text{PAFL}}}(1^\lambda, \text{state})$
4.  $(\text{register}, \text{cl}, (D_b, \text{aux})), (\text{train}, \text{cl}, \text{aux})$
5.  $\mathcal{A}$  continues to have access to  $\mathcal{O}_{\text{PAFL}}$
6.  $\mathcal{A}$  outputs  $b'$ , if  $b' = b$ , and:
  - (a)  $\text{cl}$  is honest,
  - (b) and there is at least two honest clients participated in every training iteration, and that these clients remained to be honest until the end of the game,
 then return 1 (meaning that  $\mathcal{A}$  won the  $\text{DINDGame}$ ), otherwise return 0.

This game follows the outline of  $\text{AnonGame}$ , but with a different construction of the challenge command to reflect dataset privacy. In particular,  $\mathcal{A}$  chooses two valid datasets (the field  $\text{aux}$  contains all information required to verify validity). The challenger chooses one of these datasets at random (based on the bit  $b$ ), queries  $\mathcal{O}_{\text{PAFL}}$  to register a client using this dataset, and then instructs this client to train the model using the dataset  $D_b$ . Note that  $\text{aux}$  in line 4 is the registration information of the client constructed based on the  $\Pi$  scheme.  $\mathcal{A}$  continues to interact with the system, and access the updated model at the end of any iteration. As before, conditions are added to rule out trivial attacks.  $\mathcal{A}$  wins the game if it guesses correctly which of the datasets was chosen in the challenge. Being unable to guess after seeing the outcome of the challenge train command, and even after accessing the aggregated model updates, means that a PAFL schemes does not reveal anything about the underlying datasets.

**Remark 1.** *Our PAFL notion can be further generalized to have only the model owner  $S$ , i.e., no aggregators, so this party is the one who aggregates the individual model updates as well. Moreover, if preserving the privacy of the model is required, then our notion can be extended with a model privacy property to reflect that. Since model privacy is outside the scope of this work, we did not include this property to keep the definition simple.*

**Remark 2.** *It should be noted that our definition of anonymity (and so our scheme that satisfies this notion) does not leak negative information (i.e., a client has not participated in training). Both participation and the absence of participation are protected, i.e., identities of those who participate or do not participate are not revealed.*

### 3 Building Blocks

In this section, we provide a brief background on the building blocks employed in AnoFel, covering all cryptographic primitives that we use and the technique of differential privacy.

**Commitments.** A cryptographic commitment scheme allows hiding some value that can be opened later. It consists of three PPT algorithms: Setup, Commit, and Open. On input the security parameter  $\lambda$ , Setup generates a set of public parameters  $pp$ . To commit to a value  $x$ , the committer invokes Commit with inputs  $pp, x$ , and randomness  $r$  to obtain a commitment  $c$ .  $\text{Open}(pp, c)$  opens a commitment by simply revealing  $x$  and  $r$ . Anyone can verify correctness of opening by computing  $c' = \text{Commit}(pp, x, r)$  and check if  $c = c'$ .

A secure commitment scheme must satisfy: *hiding*, meaning that commitment  $c$  does not reveal any information about  $x$  beyond any pre-knowledge the adversary has, and *binding*, so a commitment  $c$  to  $x$  cannot be opened to another value  $x' \neq x$  (formal definitions can be found in [32]). These security properties enable a party to commit to their inputs (i.e., private datasets in our case), and publish the commitment publicly without exposing the private data.

**Threshold homomorphic encryption.** Homomorphic encryption allows computing over encrypted inputs and producing encrypted outputs. Such operations include homomorphic addition and multiplication. That is, let  $ct_1$  be a ciphertext of  $x_1$ , and  $ct_2$  be a ciphertext of  $x_2$ , then  $ct_1 + ct_2$  produces a ciphertext of  $x_1 + x_2$ , and  $ct_1 \cdot ct_2$  produces a ciphertext of  $x_1 \cdot x_2$  (the exact implementation of the homomorphic '+' and '.' vary based on the encryption scheme). Some encryption schemes support only one of these operations, e.g., Paillier scheme [56] is only additively homomorphic. Supporting both addition and multiplication leads to fully homomorphic encryption [15, 54]. Since we focus on secure aggregation of model updates, we require only additive homomorphism.

A homomorphic encryption scheme is composed of three PPT algorithms: KeyGen that generates encryption/decryption keys (and any other public parameters), Encrypt which encrypts an input  $x$  to produce a ciphertext  $ct$ , and Decrypt which decrypts a ciphertext  $ct$  to get the plaintext input  $x$ . Correctness states that Decrypt produces the original plaintext for any valid ciphertext produced by Encrypt, and in case of homomorphic operations, the correct result (add and/or multiply) is produced. Security is based on the regular security notion for encryption (i.e., semantic security or indistinguishability-based). In this work, we require indistinguishability against CPA (chosen-plaintext attacker).

The threshold capability is related to who can decrypt the ciphertext. To distribute trust, instead of having the decryption key known to a single party, it is shared among  $n$  parties. Thus, each of these parties can produce a partially decrypted ciphertext upon calling Decrypt, and constructing the plaintext requires at least  $t$  parties to decrypt. In a threshold ho-

momorphic encryption scheme, KeyGen will be a distributed protocol run by the  $n$  parties to produce one public key and  $n$  shares of the secret key, such that each party will obtain only her share (and will not see any of the others' shares). In AnoFel, we use the threshold Paillier encryption scheme [23].

**Zero-knowledge proofs.** A (non-interactive) zero-knowledge proof (ZKP) system allows a prover, who owns a private witness  $\omega$  for a statement  $x$  in language  $\mathcal{L}$ , to convince a verifier that  $x$  is true without revealing anything about  $\omega$ . A ZKP is composed of three PPT algorithms: Setup, Prove, and Verify. On input a security parameter  $\lambda$  and a description of  $\mathcal{L}$ , Setup generates public parameters  $pp$ . To prove that  $x \in \mathcal{L}$ , the prover invokes Prove over  $pp, x$ , and a witness  $\omega$  for  $x$  to obtain a proof  $\pi$ . To verify this proof, the verifier invokes Verify over  $pp, x$ , and  $\pi$ , and accepts only if Verify outputs 1. In general, all conditions needed to satisfy the NP relation of  $\mathcal{L}$  are represented as a circuit. A valid proof will be generated upon providing valid inputs that satisfy this circuit. Some of these inputs could be public, which the verifier will use in the verification process, while others are private, which constitute the witness  $\omega$  that only the prover knows.

A secure ZKP system must satisfy completeness, soundness, and zero-knowledge. Completeness states that any proof generated in an honest way will be accepted by the verifier. Soundness ensures that if a verifier accepts a proof for a statement  $x$  then the prover knows a witness  $\omega$  for  $x$ . In other words, the prover cannot convince the verifier with false statements. Finally, zero-knowledge ensures that a proof  $\pi$  does not reveal anything about the witness  $\omega$ . Many ZKP systems added a succinctness property, so that proof size is constant and verification time is linear the input size and independent the NP relation circuit size. These are called zero-knowledge succinct non-interactive argument of knowledge (zk-SNARKs). Formal definitions of ZKP systems can be found in [13, 32]. In AnoFel, we use the proof system proposed in [33].

**Differential privacy.** Differential privacy (DP) is a technique usually used to address attacks such as membership and inference attacks. That is, knowing a data point and the trained model, an attacker can tell if this datapoint was used in training the model. DP provides the guarantee that inclusion of a single instance in the training datasets causes a statistically insignificant change to the training algorithm output, i.e., the trained model. Thus, it limits the success probability of the attacker in membership attacks. Formally, DP is defined as follows [26] (where  $\epsilon > 0$  and  $0 < \delta < 1$ ):

**Definition 2** (Differential Privacy). *A randomized mechanism  $\mathcal{K}$  provides  $(\epsilon, \delta)$ -differential privacy, if for any two datasets  $D_0$  and  $D_1$  that differ in only single entity, for all  $R \subseteq \text{Range}(\mathcal{K})$ :  $\Pr[\mathcal{K}(D_0) \in R] \leq e^\epsilon \Pr[\mathcal{K}(D_1) \in R] + \delta$*

We adopt the Gaussian DP mechanism as described in [69], and apply the optimization for the secure aggregation setting in [40, 66]. The clients sample a noise from a Gaussian

distribution  $\mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2)$  and add the noise to their model updates before encrypting and submitting them. Each client  $i$  clips their model gradients  $\mathbf{g}_i$  to ensure  $\|\mathbf{g}_i\| < C$  where  $C$  is a clipping threshold for bounding the norm of gradients. Client  $i$  then sets sensitivity  $S_f = 2C/|D_i|$  where  $D_i$  is the  $i$ -th client’s dataset, assuming gradients are shared after one epoch of local training. The noise scale is set as  $\sigma \geq cTS_f/\epsilon$  where  $c \geq \sqrt{2\ln(1.25/\delta)}$  and  $T$  indicates exposures of local parameters (number of epochs or iterations), and satisfies  $(\epsilon, \delta)$ -DP [7, 26, 69] for  $\epsilon < 1$ . We apply the optimization in [66] by dividing the noise scale by the number of participating clients. Since only the aggregation of the updates is revealed, the individual noise value added by a client can be reduced while guaranteeing that the aggregate value maintains the desired level of privacy, leading to better accuracy.

Using these parameters, the advantage  $\gamma$  of the attacker in membership attacks can be computed as [38]:

$$\gamma \leq (1 - e^{-\epsilon} + 2\delta)(e^\epsilon + 1)^{-1} \quad (1)$$

As for the error bound  $\alpha$ , the Gaussian mechanism satisfies an absolute error bound  $\alpha \leq O(R\sqrt{\log k})$ , where  $k$  is the number of queries and  $R := S_f\sqrt{k \log 1/\delta}/\epsilon$  [22, 25] (a query here indicates one training round, so  $k$  is the number of training iterations, and  $S_f$  is the query sensitivity, which is the sensitivity of the training function). We use these bounds in our security proofs in Appendix A.

In describing our design, we use DP as a blackbox. A client invokes function called DP.noise to sample the appropriate noise value. This makes our design modular as any secure DP-mechanism, other than the one we employ, can be used.

## 4 AnoFel Design

AnoFel relies on four core ideas to achieve its goals: certification of clients’ datasets to prevent impersonation, anonymity sets to support anonymous registration and model training, a designated aggregators committee to prevent accessing the individual model updates submitted by the clients, and a public bulletin board to facilitate indirect communication and logging. In this section, we present the design of AnoFel showing the concrete techniques behind each of these ideas and how they interact with each other.

### 4.1 System Model

As shown in Figure 1, for any learning task there is a model owner  $S$ , a model aggregator set (or committee)  $\mathcal{AG}$  of size  $n$  (we use a committee instead of a single aggregator to distribute trust), and a set of clients  $\mathcal{C}$  who wants to participate in this learning task. During a training iteration,  $\mathcal{C}$  will train the initial model locally over their private datasets and publish encrypted updates.  $S$  has to wait until the iteration is finished, after which  $\mathcal{AG}$  will aggregate the updates and grant  $S$  access




Figure 1: AnoFel system architecture. All these steps (except 1.a - 1.c, and 2) will be repeated for each training iteration.

to the aggregated value. AnoFel can support any aggregation method based on summation or averaging (e.g., FedSGD [18] and FedAVG [51]) given that the number of participants is public. All parties have access to a public bulletin board, allowing them to post and retrieve information about the training process. There could be several learning tasks going on in the system, each with its own  $S$ ,  $\mathcal{AG}$ , and  $\mathcal{C}$ , and all are using the same bulletin board.<sup>2</sup> In the rest of this section, we focus on one learning task to explain our protocol; several learning tasks will separately run the same protocol between the involved parties.

### 4.2 Threat Model

We assume a secure and immutable public bulletin board available to all parties, which accepts only authenticated information that complies with predefined correctness rules.<sup>3</sup>

We adopt the following adversary model (we deal with PPT adversaries). For clients, we assume them to be malicious during registration (a malicious party may behave arbitrarily), while we assume these clients to be semi-honest during training (a semi-honest party follows the protocol but may try to collect any additional information). Thus, during registration, a client with an invalid (or poisoned) dataset may try to register, while during training, registered clients will use their valid (registered) datasets in training and submit valid updates. We assume the server  $S$  to be always malicious, so it

<sup>2</sup>In fact, it could be the case that the same parties are involved in several learning tasks, but they track each of these separately.

<sup>3</sup>This can be instantiated in a decentralized way using a blockchain with miners, or validators, verifying correctness.

may try to impersonate clients in the registration phase, collude with aggregators during the training phase, or manipulate the model posted at the beginning of each iteration. For  $\mathcal{AG}$ , we assume that at maximum  $n - t$  parties can be malicious, where  $t$  is the threshold required for valid decryption.

Since our goal is supporting anonymity, we do not assume any authenticated communication channels. Lastly, we work in the random oracle model where hash functions are modeled as random oracles.

### 4.3 System Workflow

AnoFel achieves anonymity and privacy by combining a set of cryptographic primitives, such as threshold homomorphic encryption and zero-knowledge proofs, differential privacy, and a public bulletin board. The latter is used to facilitate indirect communication between the parties and to create anonymity sets to disguise the participants. Our techniques of combining zero-knowledge proofs and anonymity sets are inspired by recent advances in private and anonymous cryptocurrencies [16, 28, 61].

Each client must register before participation (step 1.b in Figure 1) by publishing on the board a commitment to the master public key and dataset this client owns (the commitments are never revealed and don't leak any information). Similarly, the aggregators  $\mathcal{AG}$  must register by posting their public key on the board (step 1.c in Figure 1), which will be used by the clients to encrypt their model updates. As we use DP to protect against membership and inference attacks, the client samples a noise and adds it to their updates before encrypting them. The encrypted updates will be accompanied with a zero-knowledge proof (ZKP) attesting that a client is a legitimate and registered data owner, but without revealing the public key or the dataset commitment of this client. Thus, anonymity is preserved against everyone (the server, aggregators, other clients, or any other party).

As shown in the figure (steps 1.d and 3), a server publishes the initial model updates on the bulletin board, which are retrieved by the clients to be used in the local training. The use of this immutable public bulletin board avoids direct communication between the server and clients, which would compromise anonymity. Moreover, it addresses privacy attacks resulting from distributing different initial model parameters to clients (this type of attacks has been recently demonstrated in [57]). In fact, AnoFel is the only private federated learning system that enjoys this advantage.

To prevent Sybil and data poisoning attacks, each dataset must be certified by its source, e.g., a hospital. Since exposing the certifier reveals the dataset type and impacts privacy, AnoFel creates an anonymity set for the certifiers by having all their public keys posted on the board (step 1.a in Figure 1). Thus, during the registration, a client will provide a ZKP that its hidden (committed) dataset is signed by one of the certifiers—without specifying which one.

Furthermore, to hide which training activity a client is participating in, which if revealed it will expose the dataset type, AnoFel creates an anonymity set for the aggregators. That is, the system will have several ongoing training activities, each of which with its own  $\mathcal{AG}$  committee. When submitting a model update, the client will choose a subset of these aggregators including the target  $\mathcal{AG}$  who is managing the training activity the client is interested in. The client then encrypts the updates under the public keys of this subset—encrypt the actual updates for the target  $\mathcal{AG}$  while encrypt 0 for the rest of the aggregators. Consequently, even if it is revealed that a client has submitted a model update, this will not expose which training activity this client is part of.

Accordingly, AnoFel proceeds in three phases: setup, model training, and model access, which we discuss below.

#### 4.3.1 Setup

The initial system setup includes creating the bulletin board, generating all public parameters needed by the cryptographic primitives used, and configuring the parameters for noise distribution and privacy/accuracy loss bounds of DP that all parties will use. Then, the certifiers, aggregators, and each client must run the setup process.<sup>4</sup>

**Certifiers.** Each certifier posts its public key on the board. Let  $\mathcal{PK}_C$  be the set of all certifiers' public keys.

**Aggregators.**  $\mathcal{AG}$  run the setup of a threshold homomorphic encryption to generate a public key and shares of the secret key. They post the public key on the board, while each party keeps its secret key share. To authenticate the public key, at least  $t$  of these aggregators must post it on the board (each posting is signed using the aggregator's own public key).<sup>5</sup>

**Clients.** The setup process for clients is more involved compared to the previous entities. This is a natural result of supporting anonymity. As shown in Figure 2, which is the detailed version of step 1.b in Figure 1, each client  $cl_i \in \mathcal{C}$ , with a dataset  $D_i$  and a master keypair  $(msk_i, mpk_i)$ ,<sup>6</sup> obtains a certificate  $\sigma_i$  from its certifier— $\sigma_i$  could be simply the certifier's signature over  $D_i \parallel mpk_i$ . Then,  $cl_i$  commits to its dataset  $D_i$  (without revealing anything about it) as follows:

- Compute a commitment to  $D_i$  and  $mpk_i$  as  $comm_i = H(D_i \parallel mpk_i \parallel salt)$ , where  $H$  is a collision resistant hash function and  $salt$  is a fresh random string in  $\{0, 1\}^\lambda$ .
- Generate a fresh digital signature keypair  $(pk_{sig}, sk_{sig})$ . Compute  $a = H(pk_{sig})$  and  $tag = PRF_{msk_i}(a)$ , where

<sup>4</sup>A PKI is needed to ensure the real identities of the certifiers, aggregators, and model owner. So, when any of these entities posts its public key on the board, this must be accompanied with a certificate (from a certificate authority) to prove that indeed the party owns this key.

<sup>5</sup>The individual public keys of  $\mathcal{AG}$  are managed by a PKI.

<sup>6</sup>Clients need a PKI for their master public keys, so a certifier can check that a client owns the presented master public key. However, to preserve anonymity, these are hidden in the training process, and a certifier cannot link an encrypted model update to the master public keys.




Figure 2: Client setup—anonymous registration process.

PRF is a pseudorandom function, and tag serves as an authentication tag over the fresh key to bind it to the master keypair of the client. Similar to [61], we instantiate the PRF as  $\text{PRF}_{\text{msk}_i}(a) = H(\text{msk}_i \| a)$ .

- Generate a ZKP  $\pi$  to prove that the dataset is legit and owned by  $cl_i$ . In particular, this ZKP attests to the following statement (again without revealing anything about any of the private data that the client knows): given a commitment  $\text{comm}_i$ , a signature verification key  $\text{pk}_{\text{sig}}$ , a tag tag, and a bulletin board state index sid, client  $cl_i$  knows a dataset  $D_i$ , randomness salt, master keypair  $(\text{mpk}_i, \text{msk}_i)$ , a certifier’s key  $\text{pk}_c$ , a certificate  $\sigma_i$ , and a signing key  $\text{sk}_{\text{sig}}$ , such that:
  1.  $D_i$ ,  $\text{mpk}_i$ , and salt are a valid opening for the commitment  $\text{comm}_i$ , i.e.,  $\text{comm}_i = H(D_i \| \text{mpk}_i \| \text{salt})$ .<sup>7</sup>
  2.  $\sigma_i$  has been generated using  $\text{pk}_c$  over  $D_i \| \text{mpk}_i$ , and that  $\text{pk}_c \in \mathcal{PK}_C$  with respect to the set  $\mathcal{PK}_C$  registered on the board at state with index sid.
  3. The client owns  $\text{mpk}_i$ , i.e., knows  $\text{msk}_i$  that corresponds to  $\text{mpk}_i$ .
  4. The tag over the fresh  $\text{pk}_{\text{sig}}$  is valid, i.e., compute  $a = H(\text{pk}_{\text{sig}})$  and check that  $\text{tag} = \text{PRF}_{\text{msk}_i}(a)$ .
- Sign the proof and the commitment: set  $m = (\text{comm}_i, \text{tag}, \text{pk}_{\text{sig}}, \pi, \text{sid})$ , use  $\text{sk}_{\text{sig}}$  to sign  $m$  and obtain a signature  $\sigma_{cl_i}$ .
- Post  $(m, \sigma_{cl_i})$  on the bulletin board.

As for verifying the third condition, i.e., the client knows  $\text{msk}_i$ , it is simply done by computing the public key based on the input  $\text{msk}_i$  and checking if it is equal to  $\text{mpk}_i$ . Although  $\text{mpk}_i$  is not recorded explicitly on the bulletin board, it is bound to the client since it is part of the dataset commitment  $\text{comm}_i$  certified by  $\sigma_i$ .

<sup>7</sup>Note that the opening of the commitment is a private input the client uses to generate the proof (and same applies to the training phase as we will see shortly). This opening is never revealed to the public—The board only has the commitment, and a ZKP on its well-formedness that does not leak any information about any private data used locally to generate the proof.

To allow efficient proof generation with respect to the anonymity set  $\mathcal{PK}_C$ , a Merkle tree is used to aggregate the key set  $\mathcal{PK}_C$  as shown in Figure 2. Proving that a key  $\text{pk}_c \in \mathcal{PK}_C$  is done by showing a proof of inclusion (PoI) of that key in the tree. In other words, the circuit underlying the ZKP generation takes a membership path of the key and the tree root and verifies the correctness of that path. Thus, the cost will be logarithmic in the set size. The tree can be computed by the entities maintaining the board, with the root published on the board to allow anyone to use it when verifying the ZKP.

Note that a ZKP is generated with respect to a specific state of the anonymity set  $\mathcal{PK}_C$ . This state is the root of the Merkle tree of this set, which changes when a new certifier joins the system. Such change will invalidate all pending ZKPs, and thus, invalidate all pending client registrations tied to the older state. To mitigate this, a client should specify the state index sid based on which the ZKP (and hence, the Merkle tree) was generated. So if the board is a series of blocks as in Figure 2, sid is the block index containing the root used in the proof.

All these conditions are modeled as an arithmetic circuit. The client has to present valid inputs that satisfy this circuit in order to generate a valid ZKP. Only registration with valid ZKPs will be accepted, where we let  $\mathcal{CM}_{CL}$  be the set of all valid clients’ commitments. Registration integrity is preserved by the security of the digital signature  $\sigma_{cl_i}$ : if an adversary tampers with any of the information that a client submits— $\text{comm}_i$ , tag,  $\text{pk}_{\text{sig}}$ ,  $\pi$ , or sid—this will invalidate  $\sigma_{cl_i}$  and will lead to rejecting the registration.

Note that clients can perform the setup at anytime, and once their registration information is posted on the board, they can participate in the model training immediately. Thus, AnoFel allows clients to join at anytime during the training process, and each client can perform the setup phase on its own.

### 4.3.2 Model Training

At the beginning of each training iteration,  $S$  posts the initial model parameters on the bulletin board (step 1.d in Figure 1).




Figure 3: Model training—anonymous model updates submission ( $0^{n-1}$  means  $n - 1$  zeros, and HE is homomorphic encryption).

Each client  $cl_i$  retrieves them and trains the model locally over its dataset (step 3 and 4 in Figure 1, respectively). Then  $cl_i$  shares the model updates privately and anonymously without revealing (1) which training activity it is participating in nor (2) the dataset commitment it owns (i.e., without revealing its identity). Client  $cl_i$  does that as follows (see Figure 3, which is the detailed version of step 5 in Figure 1):

- Choose a set of aggregators  $AG = \{AG_1, \dots, AG_u\}$  including the target  $AG$ , with  $AG_{pk}$  denoting the public keys of these aggregators. Shuffle  $AG$  to avoid any ordering attacks (e.g., if the target  $AG$  is always placed first, this reveals the target training activity).
- Invoke DP.noise to sample a noise value to be added to the model updates. As mentioned earlier, we apply the optimization in [66] by dividing the noise scale by the number of participating clients since the model updates will be decrypted after being aggregated.
- Encrypt the model updates under the target  $AG$  public key, while encrypt 0 under the public keys of the rest. This will produce  $\mathbf{c}$ ; a vector of  $u$  ciphertexts.<sup>8</sup>
- Generate a fresh digital signature keypair  $(pk_{sig}, sk_{sig})$ . Compute  $a = H(pk_{sig})$  and  $tag = PRF_{msk_i}(a)$ .
- Produce a ZKP  $\pi$  (with respect to the current state of the board at index  $sid$ ) attesting that:  $cl_i$  is a legitimate owner of a dataset, and that the fresh digital signature key was generated correctly. Thus, this ZKP proves the following statement: given a signature key  $pk_{sig}$ , and a tag  $tag$ ,  $cl_i$  knows the opening of some commitment  $comm \in \mathcal{CM}_{CL}$  (this proves legitimacy), and that  $tag$  was computed correctly over  $pk_{sig}$  as before. Since we adopt the semi-honest adversary model during the training phase, there is no need to prove that  $\mathbf{c}$  has only one non-zero update.<sup>9</sup>

<sup>8</sup>A client will have a fixed  $AG$  selected at the beginning. Changing  $AG$  between iterations must be done carefully; for a new  $AG'$ , if  $AG \cap AG' = AG$ , it would be trivial to tell which training activity a client is part of.

<sup>9</sup>Note that although we assume semi-honest clients during training, we

- To preserve integrity, sign the proof, the ciphertext, and the auxiliary information. That is, set  $m = (\mathbf{c}, AG_{pk}, tag, pk_{sig}, \pi, sid = 120)$  and sign  $m$  using  $sk_{sig}$  to produce a signature  $\sigma_{cl_i}$ .
- Post  $(m, \sigma_{cl_i})$  on the bulletin board.

We use the Merkle tree technique to aggregate the commitment anonymity set  $\mathcal{CM}_{CL}$ . A client provides a proof of inclusion of its commitment in the Merkle tree computed over  $\mathcal{CM}_{CL}$  with respect to a specific state indexed by  $sid$ . The latter is needed since we allow clients to join anytime, and thus,  $\mathcal{CM}_{CL}$ , and its Merkle tree, will change over time.

Based on the above, Anofel naturally supports dynamic client participation. As mentioned before, a client who wants to join can do that immediately after finishing the setup. While (registered) clients who do not wish to participate in a training iteration simply do not send any updates. Anofel does not need a recovery protocol to handle additions/dropouts since the setup of a client does not impact the setup of the system,  $AG$ , or other clients. Also, the model updates submitted by any client do not impact the updates submitted by others. Not to mention that any information needed to perform the setup is already on the bulletin board, so interaction between the parties is needed. Furthermore, submitting model updates is done in one shot; a client posts  $(m, \sigma_{cl_i})$  on the board. Since we use non-interactive ZKPs,  $AG$ , and any other party, can verify the proof on their own.

### 4.3.3 Model Access

At the end of each training iteration,  $AG$  members retrieve all client updates—those that are encrypted under her public key—from the board, and aggregate them using the additive homomorphism property of the encryption scheme (steps 6

still need the ZKP above to preserve integrity and make sure only registered clients participate. That is, a malicious adversary (who could be the server) may impersonate a client during training (without doing any registration), and it may alter the submitted updates (thus we need to prove that the signature is honestly generated by a registered client).

and 7 in Figure 1, respectively). Then, each member decrypts the ciphertext using its secret key share, producing a partial decryption that is sent to  $S$  (step 8 in Figure 1). Once  $S$  receives at least  $t$  responses, it will be able to construct the plaintext of the aggregated model updates and start a new iteration.

Signaling the end of a training iteration relies on the bulletin board. Adding a future block with a specific index will signal the end. Thus, the system setup will determine the block index of when training starts, and the duration of each iteration (in terms of number of blocks). Since all parties have access to the board, they will be able to know when each iteration is over. Another approach is to simply have  $S$  post a message on the board to signal the end of each iteration.

Although AnoFel is a system for federated learning that involves several parties, it is not considered an interactive protocol. These parties do not communicate directly with each other—the bulletin board mediates this communication. When sending any message, the sender will post it on the bulletin board, and the intended recipient(s) will retrieve the message content from the board.

**Remark 3.** *The concrete instantiation of the bulletin board impacts runtime. The board mediates communication between parties and must verify the validity of all information postings before accepting them. To speed up this process, the board be formed from a sequence of blocks of information maintained by a committee of registered validators (similar to a blockchain but without the full overhead a regular blockchain introduces). Alternatively, a regular blockchain that takes advantage of recent optimized designs and scalability techniques [8, 31, 67] can be adopted. We note that the concrete instantiation of the board is outside the scope of this work.*

## 4.4 Extensions

**Addressing a stronger adversary model.** AnoFel assumes semi-honest clients in the training phase. Therefore, mitigating threats of (1) using a legitimate (registered and certified) dataset in a training activity of totally different type—e.g., use medical data to train a model concerned with vehicles, and (2) encrypt non-zero values to other aggregators (other than the target  $\mathcal{AG}$ ) in  $\mathcal{AG}$  to corrupt their training activities, are out of scope. Nevertheless, we can make our adversary model stronger by considering a semi-malicious client who may attempt these attacks.

To mitigate the first attack, we require the certifier to add a dataset type  $dt$  to the dataset certificate, and hence, we require the client to prove that it has used a dataset with the correct type in training. That is, each training activity in the system will have a designated type  $dt$ , and a certifier will check that a dataset  $D_i$  is indeed of type  $dt$  (so it can be used to train any model of type  $dt$ ) before signing  $D_i \parallel \text{mpk}_i \parallel dt$ . Also, the ZKP circuit a client uses in training must check that the target  $\mathcal{AG}$  (that will receive a ciphertext of non-zero value) is managing a training activity with an identical  $dt$ . Otherwise, a valid proof

cannot be generated. To mitigate the second attack, we can add another condition to be satisfied in the ZKP circuit (again the one a client uses during training) to validate the ciphertext  $\mathbf{c}$ . That is, verify that only one ciphertext in  $\mathbf{c}$  is for a non-zero value while the rest are zeros. This requires providing the ZKP circuit with all plaintexts and the randomness used in encryption, so it can the ciphertexts based on these, denoted as  $\mathbf{c}'$ , and check if  $\mathbf{c}' = \mathbf{c}$ .

Addressing malicious clients during training, i.e., these who may deviate arbitrarily from the protocol, can be done in a generic way using ZKPs as in [49]. That is, a model update will be accompanied with ZKP proofs on well-formedness, meaning that the registered dataset and the actual initial model parameters were used and training was done correctly. Extending AnoFel to support that while preserving its efficiency level is part of our future work.

**Reducing storage costs of the bulletin board.** ML models may involve thousands of parameters. The server needs to post the initial values of these parameters on the board for each training iteration. Also, a client posts the updated version of all these parameters on the board. This is a large storage cost that may create a scalability problem, e.g., if the board is a blockchain this cost could be infeasible. To address this issue, we can employ any of the solutions currently used by the blockchain community, e.g., store the (ciphertext of) model parameters on a decentralized storage network, and post only the hash of them on the board (with a pointer to where the actual data is stored). Furthermore, once the data is used, i.e., a training iteration concluded, initial model parameters and all clients updates can be discarded, which reduces the storage cost significantly. Note that the initial model parameters are posted by the server, who is not anonymous, while the encrypted updates are posted by clients. Thus, an anonymous off-chain storage must be used (like an anonymous sidechain) to avoid compromising their anonymity.

## 4.5 Security of AnoFel

AnoFel realizes a correct and secure PAFL scheme based on the notion defined in Section 2. In Appendix A, we formally prove the following theorem:

**Theorem 1.** *The construction of AnoFel as described in Section 4 is a correct and secure PAFL scheme (cf. Definition 1).*

## 5 Performance Evaluation

In this section, we provide details on the implementation and performance evaluation of AnoFel, and benchmarks to measure its overhead compared to prior work.

### 5.1 Implementation

For hash functions, we use the Pedersen hash function [37], with an alternative implementation using Baby-Jubjub elliptic

Table 1: zk-SNARKs runtime for client setup and training.

# Clients	Setup		Training	
	Prove (s)	Verify (ms)	Prove (s)	Verify (ms)
16	1.97	4.65	0.79	4.67
32	2.04	4.74	0.85	4.55
64	2.09	4.61	0.96	4.57
128	2.16	4.62	1.04	4.53
256	2.22	4.64	1.14	4.54
512	2.28	4.65	1.25	4.56

curve [10] and 4-bit windows [1], which requires less constraints per bit than the original implementation. For threshold additive-homomorphic encryption, we use the threshold version of Paillier encryption scheme [23] based on [5]. For digital signatures, we use EdDSA [11] over Baby-Jubjub elliptic curve based on [2]. For zero-knowledge proofs, we use Groth16 zk-SNARKS [33] implemented in libsnark [4]. We use PyTorch [58] to incorporate differential privacy, and implement the FedSGD [18] algorithm for federated learning.

**Dataset and Models.** We evaluate the performance of AnoFel using three federated learning tasks. Our first benchmark is LeNet5 [46] architecture with 61.7K parameters trained on the MNIST [45] dataset. Our second benchmark is ResNet20 [36] architecture with 273K parameters trained over the CIFAR10 [44] dataset. Our third benchmark is SqueezeNet [34] with 832K parameters trained over TinyImageNet [73] dataset. This benchmark is the largest studied in private federated learning literature [21, 49, 66]. Since batch normalization is not compatible with DP [75], we replace all batch normalization layers with group normalization [70] in ResNet20 and SqueezeNet with negligible effect on accuracy.

**Configuration.** For our runtime experiments, we consider a network of  $N = \{16, 32, 64, 128, 256, 512\}$  clients. We also assume one committee consisting of 3 aggregators. Runtimes are benchmarked on an Intel i9-10900X CPU running at 3.70GHz with 64GB of memory assuming 8 threads, and the mean of 5 runs are reported for each experiment. We present micro-benchmarks of AnoFel components as well as end-to-end benchmarks for a training iteration. We also evaluate AnoFel accuracy under IID and non-IID dataset settings. The DP parameters are set as  $\epsilon = 0.9$ ,  $\delta = 10^{-5}$ , and norm clipping threshold  $C = 1$  for MNIST and  $C = 2$  for CIFAR10 and TinyImageNet benchmarks.

## 5.2 Results

**Runtime Overhead.** Table 1 shows the performance of zero-knowledge proof implementation of clients setup and training circuits. The prove and verify runtimes are reported for different numbers of clients participating in the learning task. The size of proof is a constant 1019 bits. The setup prove overhead is a one-time cost for clients, and the training prove overhead is incurred for each training iteration. As the results suggest, the prover runtime for both setup and training increase sub-




Figure 4: Aggregator computation time for a training iteration for MNIST on LeNet5, CIFAR10 on ResNet20, and TinyImageNet on SqueezeNet.




Figure 5: Breakdown of client runtime for each training iteration for MNIST on LeNet5, CIFAR10 on ResNet20, and TinyImageNet on SqueezeNet

linearly with the number of clients, remaining under 2.5 sec for all experiments. The verifier runtime remains constant under 5 msec. Later we will show that ZKP cost is a fraction of the total cost and add little overhead to the overall runtime.

Next, we show results for an end-to-end training iteration. Aggregators’ runtime during training is found in Figure 4 for different numbers of clients. Aggregators receive the ciphertexts from clients, perform aggregation using homomorphic addition over ciphertexts followed by a partial decryption after which the result is sent to the model owner. The decryption cost only depends on the size of the model, while the cost of aggregating ciphertexts increases with the number of clients. For our largest network of clients with 512 participants, the aggregator runtime is 13.3, 56.8, and 174.6 sec for MNIST, CIFAR10, and TinyImageNet benchmarks respectively.

Figure 5 presents the client runtime with detailed breakdown for a training iteration with 512 clients for our benchmarks. The breakdown includes the cost of client local model training, model update encryption for the target  $\mathcal{A}_G$  aggregator committee, and ZKP generation. The cost of noising updates, generating keypairs, signatures, and hash computations are negligible, thus omitted from the plot. Local model training cost is measured for training over a batch of 1024 images on a GeForce RTX 2080 Ti GPU, taking 0.616, 0.791, and 1.276 sec for MNIST, CIFAR10, and TinyImageNet benchmarks respectively. The remaining protocol costs (encryption and ZKP) are measured using the CPU described in config-




Figure 6: Comparing client computation time for one training round of AnoFel, Truex et al. [66], and Bonawitz et al. [14] for (a) MNIST on LeNet5, (b) CIFAR10 on ResNet20, and (c) TinyImageNet on SqueezeNet.

uration. For MNIST, the overhead of generating the ZKP is 39%, and for the larger CIFAR10 and TinyImageNet benchmarks the ZKP overhead constitutes 17% and 7% of the total runtime. For all benchmarks, the runtime cost is dominated by the model update encryption step.

**Communication Overhead.** The communication overhead of the parties during setup and training phases are as follows.

*Clients:* Client  $i$ 's setup involves the certifier's signature (96 B), and posting  $m = (\text{comm}_i, \text{tag}, \text{pk}_{\text{sig}}, \pi, \text{sid})$  and its signature (360 B). Each training iteration involves obtaining model parameters (121 KB, 527 KB, and 1.6 MB of 16-bit updates for LeNet5, ResNet20, and SqueezeNet respectively) and posting  $m = (\mathbf{c}, \text{AG}_{\text{pk}}, \text{tag}, \text{pk}_{\text{sig}}, \text{sid}, \pi)$  and its signature (9.2 MB, 41 MB, and 124 MB for LeNet5, ResNet20, and SqueezeNet respectively).

*Aggregators:* During setup, aggregators post their (signed) public key (160 B). In each training iteration, aggregators receive encrypted updates from clients and send partial decryptions to model owner (9.2 MB, 41 MB, and 124 MB for LeNet5, ResNet20, and SqueezeNet respectively).

*Model Owner:* During each training iteration, model owner posts the model updates (124 KB and 546 KB for Lenet5 and ResNet20, respectively), and obtains partial ciphertexts from aggregators (9.2 MB, 41 MB, and 124 MB for LeNet5, ResNet20, and SqueezeNet respectively).

**Comparison to Baseline.** To better understand the performance of AnoFel, we provide comparison to prior work on privacy-preserving federated learning. We don't know of any other framework that provides anonymity guarantees similar to AnoFel, and therefore we chose two recent systems for privacy-preserving federated learning, namely, Truex et al. [66] and Bonawitz et al. [14]. Truex et al. present a non-interactive protocol that deploys threshold homomorphic encryption for secure aggregation, and Bonawitz et al. develop an interactive protocol based on masking to protect the client updates during aggregation.

We benchmarked the client runtime for a training iteration in Bonawitz et al. protocol based on implementation found at [3] with fixes to allow more than 40 clients, and Truex et al. protocol using the implementation found at [6] for different

number of clients. The results are shown in Figure 6. When compared to Truex et al. protocol, AnoFel is at most  $2\times$ ,  $1.4\times$ , and  $1.3\times$  slower on MNIST, CIFAR10, and TinyImageNet respectively for different number of participants. Compared to Bonawitz et al. protocol, AnoFel is at most  $3.7\times$ ,  $7.7\times$ , and  $12.1\times$  slower on MNIST, CIFAR10, and TinyImageNet respectively. With larger number of clients, the runtime gap between Bonawitz et al. and AnoFel reduces. For 512 participating clients AnoFel is only slower by  $1.1\times$  on MNIST,  $2.1\times$  on CIFAR10, and  $2.8\times$  on TinyImageNet. Our results demonstrate the scalability of our framework; the cost of its additional anonymity guarantees, that are not supported by prior work, is relatively low especially in large scale scenarios.

**Model Accuracy.** We evaluate the model test accuracy in AnoFel incorporating DP and compare to a non-DP baseline in Figure 7. For these experiments we assume number of clients  $N = 16$ . Figure 7(a-c) presents the convergence characteristics of our benchmarks assuming IID datasets among clients. AnoFel achieves 99.27%, 90.60%, and 40.30% test accuracy on MNIST, CIFAR10, and TinyImageNet datasets respectively. We also present accuracy results for non-IID setting, following the distribution described in [41] on CIFAR10. As depicted in Figure 7(d), AnoFel achieves an accuracy of 76.61%. Across all benchmarks, AnoFel obtains models with less than 0.5% accuracy loss compared to non-DP models.

## 6 Related Work

**Private federated learning.** Bonawitz et al. [14] is among the earliest works on private federated learning. It handles client dropouts (but not addition) using an interactive protocol. The proposed scheme does not support anonymity; each client is known by a logical identity, which in the malicious setting must be tied to a public key (through a PKI) to prevent impersonation. A followup work [9] optimized the overhead of [14] and supported the semi-malicious model—the server is only trusted to handle client registration. This also violates anonymity since the server has full knowledge on the clients. The works [39, 64, 72] also targeted the efficiency of [14], and all inherit its lack of anonymity and interactivity issues.

Truex et al. [66] use homomorphic encryption and differ-




Figure 7: Accuracy of AnoFel per epoch for  $N = 16$  clients compared with a non-DP baseline with IID datasets for (a) MNIST on LeNet5, (b) CIFAR10 on ResNet20, (c) TinyImageNet on SqueezeNet, and (d) non-IID dataset for CIFAR10 on ResNet20.

ential privacy to achieve secure aggregation. This makes it easy to handle dropouts—since a user’s update is independent of others’—but not addition since all users must be known at the setup phase to get shares of the decryption key. The proposed scheme relies on clients to decrypt the aggregated updates—which introduces excessive delays, and requires the server to know all clients and communicate with them directly—thus violating anonymity. Xu et al. [71] avoid the distributed decryption process, and allows for user additions (up to a maximum cap per iteration). However, this comes at the expense of introducing a trusted party to run the system setup and help in decrypting the aggregated model after knowing who participated in each iteration. Ryffel et al. [60] employ function secret sharing and assumes a fixed client participation, with a (semi-honest) server knows all clients and will communicate with them directly. Thus, client anonymity is not supported. Mo et al. [53] use a trusted execution environment to achieve privacy. Beside not supporting anonymity, trusting a hardware is problematic due to the possibility of side channel and physical attacks.

AnoFel addresses the limitations of prior work: it supports client anonymity, and does not involve them in the aggregation process. Accordingly, AnoFel not only reduces overhead, but supports dynamic participation without any additional recovery protocol or any trusted party. This is in addition to addressing recent attacks resulting from disseminating different initial models to clients [57] as explained previously.

**Anonymity and Federated Learning.** Several techniques were proposed to anonymize the dataset itself before using it in training, such as differential privacy [74],  $k$ -anonymity [20, 65],  $l$ -diversity [50], and  $t$ -closeness [47] (a survey can be found in [27]). These techniques are considered complementary to AnoFel: they allow anonymizing a dataset, and our system guarantees client’s anonymity in the sense that no one will know if this client participated in training or which updates they have submitted.

The works [19, 24, 35, 48, 76] target the same anonymity notion as in AnoFel. Domingo et al. [24] utilize probabilistic multi-hop routes for model update submission, with the clients known by fixed pseudonyms instead of their real identities. However, such pseudonyms provide only pseudoanonymity; several studies showed how network and traffic analysis can link these pseudonyms back to their real identities [12, 43,

59]. Also, their anonymity guarantees is based on assuming that clients do not collude with the model owner, a strong assumption that AnoFel avoids. Li et al. [48] uses interactive zero-knowledge proofs to achieve client anonymity when submitting model updates. Their approach, however, suffers from several security and technical issues: First, any party can generate a secret key and pass the proof challenge, not necessarily the intended client. Second, in this protocol, some parameters must be made public, but no details on how to do this in an anonymous way. Third, no discussion on how to preserve message integrity, making the protocol vulnerable to man-in-the-middle attacks.

The scheme proposed in [35] works at the physical layer; it randomly samples a subset of clients’ updates and aggregates their signals before submitting them to the model owner. The proposed protocol assumes clients are trusted, and does not discuss how to preserve integrity of the communicated updates. Zhao et al. [76] introduces a trust assumption to achieve anonymity; a trusted proxy server mediates communication between clients and model owner. Lastly, Chen et al. [19] use a modified version of Tor to preserve anonymity; users authenticate each other and then negotiate symmetric keys to use for encryption. However, the negotiation and authentication processes are interactive, and the model owner records all clients’ (chosen) identities, putting anonymity at risk due to the use of fixed identities. Thus, none of these systems supports anonymity in a provably secure way as AnoFel does.

## 7 Conclusion

In this paper, we presented AnoFel, the first framework for private and anonymous user participation in federated learning. AnoFel utilizes a public bulletin board, various cryptographic building blocks, and differential privacy to support dynamic and anonymous user participation, and secure aggregation. We also introduced the first formal security notion for private federated learning covering client anonymity. We demonstrated the efficiency and viability of AnoFel through a concrete implementation and extensive benchmarking covering large scale scenarios and comparisons to prior work.

## Acknowledgment

The work of G.A. is supported by UConn’s OVPR Research Excellence Program Award.

## References

- [1] 4-bit window pedersen hash on the baby jubjub elliptic curve, 2022.
- [2] Edds for baby jubjub elliptic curve with mimc-7 hash, 2022.
- [3] Google protocol implementation, 2022.
- [4] libsnark library, 2022.
- [5] Paillier scheme implementation, 2022.
- [6] Truex et al. protocol implementation, 2022.
- [7] Martin Abadi, Andy Chu, Ian Goodfellow, H Brendan McMahan, Ilya Mironov, Kunal Talwar, and Li Zhang. Deep learning with differential privacy. In *Proceedings of the 2016 ACM SIGSAC conference on computer and communications security*, pages 308–318, 2016.
- [8] Vivek Bagaria, Sreeram Kannan, David Tse, Giulia Fanti, and Pramod Viswanath. Prism: Deconstructing the blockchain to approach physical limits. In *Proceedings of the 2019 ACM SIGSAC Conference on Computer and Communications Security*, pages 585–602, 2019.
- [9] James Henry Bell, Kallista A Bonawitz, Adrià Gascón, Tancrede Lepoint, and Mariana Raykova. Secure single-server aggregation with (poly) logarithmic overhead. In *Proceedings of the 2020 ACM SIGSAC Conference on Computer and Communications Security*, pages 1253–1269, 2020.
- [10] Marta Bellés-Muñoz, Barry Whitehat, Jordi Baylina, Vanesa Daza, and Jose Luis Muñoz-Tapia. Twisted edwards elliptic curves for zero-knowledge circuits. *Mathematics*, 9(23):3022, 2021.
- [11] Daniel J Bernstein, Niels Duif, Tanja Lange, Peter Schwabe, and Bo-Yin Yang. High-speed high-security signatures. *Journal of cryptographic engineering*, 2(2):77–89, 2012.
- [12] Alex Biryukov and Sergei Tikhomirov. Deanonimization and linkability of cryptocurrency transactions based on network analysis. In *2019 IEEE European Symposium on Security and Privacy (EuroS&P)*, pages 172–184. IEEE, 2019.
- [13] Nir Bitansky, Alessandro Chiesa, Yuval Ishai, Omer Paneth, and Rafail Ostrovsky. Succinct non-interactive arguments via linear interactive proofs. In *Theory of Cryptography Conference*, pages 315–333. Springer, 2013.
- [14] Keith Bonawitz, Vladimir Ivanov, Ben Kreuter, Antonio Marcedone, H Brendan McMahan, Sarvar Patel, Daniel Ramage, Aaron Segal, and Karn Seth. Practical secure aggregation for privacy-preserving machine learning. In *proceedings of the 2017 ACM SIGSAC Conference on Computer and Communications Security*, pages 1175–1191, 2017.
- [15] Zvika Brakerski, Craig Gentry, and Vinod Vaikuntanathan. (leveled) fully homomorphic encryption without bootstrapping. *ACM Transactions on Computation Theory (TOCT)*, 6(3):1–36, 2014.
- [16] Benedikt Bünz, Shashank Agrawal, Mahdi Zamani, and Dan Boneh. Zether: Towards privacy in a smart contract world. In *International Conference on Financial Cryptography and Data Security*, pages 423–443. Springer, 2020.
- [17] Chenyi Chen, Ari Seff, Alain Kornhauser, and Jianxiong Xiao. Deepdriving: Learning affordance for direct perception in autonomous driving. In *Proceedings of the IEEE international conference on computer vision*, pages 2722–2730, 2015.
- [18] Jianmin Chen, Xinghao Pan, Rajat Monga, Samy Bengio, and Rafal Jozefowicz. Revisiting distributed synchronous sgd. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1604.00981*, 2016.
- [19] Yijin Chen, Ye Su, Mingyue Zhang, Haoye Chai, Yunkai Wei, and Shui Yu. Fedtor: An anonymous framework of federated learning in internet of things. *IEEE Internet of Things Journal*, 2022.
- [20] Olivia Choudhury, Aris Gkoulalas-Divanis, Theodoros Salonidis, Issa Sylla, Yoonyoung Park, Grace Hsu, and Amar Das. Anonymizing data for privacy-preserving federated learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2002.09096*, 2020.
- [21] Amrita Roy Chowdhury, Chuan Guo, Somesh Jha, and Laurens van der Maaten. Eiffel: Ensuring integrity for federated learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2112.12727*, 2021.
- [22] Yuval Dagan and Gil Kur. A bounded-noise mechanism for differential privacy. In *Conference on Learning Theory*, pages 625–661. PMLR, 2022.
- [23] Ivan Damgård and Mads Jurik. A generalisation, a simplification and some applications of paillier’s probabilistic public-key system. In *International workshop*

- on public key cryptography, pages 119–136. Springer, 2001.
- [24] Josep Domingo-Ferrer, Alberto Blanco-Justicia, Jesús Manjón, and David Sánchez. Secure and privacy-preserving federated learning via co-utility. *IEEE Internet of Things Journal*, 2021.
- [25] Cynthia Dwork, Krishnaram Kenthapadi, Frank McSherry, Ilya Mironov, and Moni Naor. Our data, ourselves: Privacy via distributed noise generation. In *Advances in Cryptology-EUROCRYPT 2006: 24th Annual International Conference on the Theory and Applications of Cryptographic Techniques, St. Petersburg, Russia, May 28-June 1, 2006. Proceedings 25*, pages 486–503. Springer, 2006.
- [26] Cynthia Dwork, Aaron Roth, et al. The algorithmic foundations of differential privacy. *Foundations and Trends® in Theoretical Computer Science*, 9(3–4):211–407, 2014.
- [27] Ahmed El Ouadrhiri and Ahmed Abdelhadi. Differential privacy for deep and federated learning: A survey. *IEEE Access*, 10:22359–22380, 2022.
- [28] Prastudy Fauzi, Sarah Meiklejohn, Rebekah Mercer, and Claudio Orlandi. Quisquis: A new design for anonymous cryptocurrencies. In *International Conference on the Theory and Application of Cryptology and Information Security*, pages 649–678. Springer, 2019.
- [29] Jorge Galindo and Pablo Tamayo. Credit risk assessment using statistical and machine learning: basic methodology and risk modeling applications. *Computational Economics*, 15(1):107–143, 2000.
- [30] Maryellen L Giger. Machine learning in medical imaging. *Journal of the American College of Radiology*, 15(3):512–520, 2018.
- [31] Yossi Gilad, Rotem Hemo, Silvio Micali, Georgios Vlachos, and Nikolai Zeldovich. Algorand: Scaling byzantine agreements for cryptocurrencies. In *Proceedings of the 26th symposium on operating systems principles*, pages 51–68, 2017.
- [32] Oded Goldreich. *Foundations of cryptography: volume 1, basic tools*. Cambridge university press, 2007.
- [33] Jens Groth. On the size of pairing-based non-interactive arguments. In *Annual international conference on the theory and applications of cryptographic techniques*, pages 305–326. Springer, 2016.
- [34] Song Han, Jeff Pool, John Tran, and William Dally. Learning both weights and connections for efficient neural network. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 28, 2015.
- [35] Burak Hasircioğlu and Deniz Gündüz. Private wireless federated learning with anonymous over-the-air computation. In *ICASSP 2021-2021 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP)*, pages 5195–5199. IEEE, 2021.
- [36] Kaiming He, Xiangyu Zhang, Shaoqing Ren, and Jian Sun. Deep residual learning for image recognition. In *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 770–778, 2016.
- [37] Daira Hopwood, Sean Bowe, Taylor Hornby, and Nathan Wilcox. Zcash protocol specification. *GitHub: San Francisco, CA, USA*, 2020.
- [38] Thomas Humphries, Simon Oya, Lindsey Tulloch, Matthew Rafuse, Ian Goldberg, Urs Hengartner, and Florian Kerschbaum. Investigating membership inference attacks under data dependencies. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2010.12112*, page 2, 2020.
- [39] Swanand Kadhe, Nived Rajaraman, O Ozan Koyluoglu, and Kannan Ramchandran. Fastsecagg: Scalable secure aggregation for privacy-preserving federated learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2009.11248*, 2020.
- [40] Peter Kairouz, Ziyu Liu, and Thomas Steinke. The distributed discrete gaussian mechanism for federated learning with secure aggregation. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 5201–5212. PMLR, 2021.
- [41] Sai Praneeth Karimireddy, Lie He, and Martin Jaggi. Byzantine-robust learning on heterogeneous datasets via bucketing. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2006.09365*, 2020.
- [42] Yigitcan Kaya, Sanghyun Hong, and Tudor Dumitras. On the effectiveness of regularization against membership inference attacks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2006.05336*, 2020.
- [43] Philip Koshy, Diana Koshy, and Patrick McDaniel. An analysis of anonymity in bitcoin using p2p network traffic. In *International Conference on Financial Cryptography and Data Security*, pages 469–485. Springer, 2014.
- [44] Alex Krizhevsky, Vinod Nair, and Geoffrey Hinton. Cifar-10 (canadian institute for advanced research). [URL http://www.cs.toronto.edu/kriz/cifar.html](http://www.cs.toronto.edu/kriz/cifar.html), 5, 2010.
- [45] Yann LeCun. The mnist database of handwritten digits. <http://yann.lecun.com/exdb/mnist/>, 1998.
- [46] Yann LeCun, Léon Bottou, Yoshua Bengio, and Patrick Haffner. Gradient-based learning applied to document recognition. *Proceedings of the IEEE*, 86(11):2278–2324, 1998.

- [47] Ninghui Li, Tiancheng Li, and Suresh Venkatasubramanian. t-closeness: Privacy beyond k-anonymity and l-diversity. In *2007 IEEE 23rd international conference on data engineering*, pages 106–115. IEEE, 2007.
- [48] Yijing Li, Xiaofeng Tao, Xuefei Zhang, Junjie Liu, and Jin Xu. Privacy-preserved federated learning for autonomous driving. *IEEE Transactions on Intelligent Transportation Systems*, 2021.
- [49] Hidde Lycklama, Lukas Burkhalter, Alexander Viand, Nicolas Küchler, and Anwar Hithnawi. Rof: Robustness of secure federated learning. In *2023 IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy (SP)*, pages 453–476. IEEE Computer Society, 2023.
- [50] Ashwin Machanavajjhala, Daniel Kifer, Johannes Gehrke, and Muthuramakrishnan Venkitasubramaniam. l-diversity: Privacy beyond k-anonymity. *ACM Transactions on Knowledge Discovery from Data (TKDD)*, 1(1):3–es, 2007.
- [51] Brendan McMahan, Eider Moore, Daniel Ramage, Seth Hampson, and Blaise Aguera y Arcas. Communication-efficient learning of deep networks from decentralized data. In *Artificial intelligence and statistics*, pages 1273–1282. PMLR, 2017.
- [52] Luca Melis, Congzheng Song, Emiliano De Cristofaro, and Vitaly Shmatikov. Exploiting unintended feature leakage in collaborative learning. In *2019 IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy (SP)*, pages 691–706. IEEE, 2019.
- [53] Fan Mo, Hamed Haddadi, Kleomenis Katevas, Eduard Marin, Diego Perino, and Nicolas Kourtellis. Ppfl: privacy-preserving federated learning with trusted execution environments. In *Proceedings of the 19th Annual International Conference on Mobile Systems, Applications, and Services*, pages 94–108, 2021.
- [54] Pratyay Mukherjee and Daniel Wichs. Two round multiparty computation via multi-key fhe. In *Annual International Conference on the Theory and Applications of Cryptographic Techniques*, pages 735–763. Springer, 2016.
- [55] Milad Nasr, Reza Shokri, and Amir Houmansadr. Comprehensive privacy analysis of deep learning: Passive and active white-box inference attacks against centralized and federated learning. In *2019 IEEE symposium on security and privacy (SP)*, pages 739–753. IEEE, 2019.
- [56] Pascal Paillier. Public-key cryptosystems based on composite degree residuosity classes. In *International conference on the theory and applications of cryptographic techniques*, pages 223–238. Springer, 1999.
- [57] Dario Pasquini, Danilo Francati, and Giuseppe Ateniese. Eluding secure aggregation in federated learning via model inconsistency. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2111.07380*, 2021.
- [58] Adam Paszke, Sam Gross, Francisco Massa, Adam Lerer, James Bradbury, Gregory Chanan, Trevor Killeen, Zeming Lin, Natalia Gimelshein, Luca Antiga, et al. Pytorch: An imperative style, high-performance deep learning library. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 32:8026–8037, 2019.
- [59] Fergal Reid and Martin Harrigan. An analysis of anonymity in the bitcoin system. In *Security and privacy in social networks*, pages 197–223. Springer, 2013.
- [60] Théo Ryffel, Pierre Tholoniati, David Pointcheval, and Francis Bach. Ariann: Low-interaction privacy-preserving deep learning via function secret sharing. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2006.04593*, 2020.
- [61] Eli Ben Sasson, Alessandro Chiesa, Christina Garman, Matthew Green, Ian Miers, Eran Tromer, and Madars Virza. Zerocash: Decentralized anonymous payments from bitcoin. In *2014 IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy*, pages 459–474. IEEE, 2014.
- [62] Virat Shejwalkar and Amir Houmansadr. Membership privacy for machine learning models through knowledge transfer. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1906.06589*, 2019.
- [63] Reza Shokri, Marco Stronati, Congzheng Song, and Vitaly Shmatikov. Membership inference attacks against machine learning models. In *2017 IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy (SP)*, pages 3–18. IEEE, 2017.
- [64] Jinhyun So, Başak Güler, and A Salman Avestimehr. Turbo-aggregate: Breaking the quadratic aggregation barrier in secure federated learning. *IEEE Journal on Selected Areas in Information Theory*, 2(1):479–489, 2021.
- [65] Latanya Sweeney. k-anonymity: A model for protecting privacy. *International Journal of Uncertainty, Fuzziness and Knowledge-Based Systems*, 10(05):557–570, 2002.
- [66] Stacey Truex, Nathalie Baracaldo, Ali Anwar, Thomas Steinke, Heiko Ludwig, Rui Zhang, and Yi Zhou. A hybrid approach to privacy-preserving federated learning. In *Proceedings of the 12th ACM Workshop on Artificial Intelligence and Security*, pages 1–11, 2019.
- [67] Gang Wang, Zhijie Jerry Shi, Mark Nixon, and Song Han. Sok: Sharding on blockchain. In *Proceedings of the 1st ACM Conference on Advances in Financial Technologies*, pages 41–61, 2019.

- [68] Tianhao Wang, Yuheng Zhang, and Ruoxi Jia. Improving robustness to model inversion attacks via mutual information regularization. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, volume 35, pages 11666–11673, 2021.
- [69] Kang Wei, Jun Li, Ming Ding, Chuan Ma, Howard H Yang, Farhad Farokhi, Shi Jin, Tony QS Quek, and H Vincent Poor. Federated learning with differential privacy: Algorithms and performance analysis. *IEEE Transactions on Information Forensics and Security*, 15:3454–3469, 2020.
- [70] Yuxin Wu and Kaiming He. Group normalization. In *Proceedings of the European conference on computer vision (ECCV)*, pages 3–19, 2018.
- [71] Runhua Xu, Nathalie Baracaldo, Yi Zhou, Ali Anwar, and Heiko Ludwig. Hybridalpha: An efficient approach for privacy-preserving federated learning. In *Proceedings of the 12th ACM Workshop on Artificial Intelligence and Security*, pages 13–23, 2019.
- [72] Chien-Sheng Yang, Jinhyun So, Chaoyang He, Songze Li, Qian Yu, and Salman Avestimehr. Lightsecagg: Rethinking secure aggregation in federated learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2109.14236*, 2021.
- [73] Leon Yao and John Miller. Tiny imagenet classification with convolutional neural networks. *CS 231N*, 2(5):8, 2015.
- [74] Samuel Yeom, Irene Giacomelli, Matt Fredrikson, and Somesh Jha. Privacy risk in machine learning: Analyzing the connection to overfitting. In *2018 IEEE 31st Computer Security Foundations Symposium (CSF)*, pages 268–282. IEEE, 2018.
- [75] Da Yu, Huishuai Zhang, Wei Chen, and Tie-Yan Liu. Do not let privacy overbill utility: Gradient embedding perturbation for private learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2102.12677*, 2021.
- [76] Bin Zhao, Kai Fan, Kan Yang, Zilong Wang, Hui Li, and Yintang Yang. Anonymous and privacy-preserving federated learning with industrial big data. *IEEE Transactions on Industrial Informatics*, 17(9):6314–6323, 2021.

## Appendix A Proof of Theorem 1

To prove Theorem 1, we need to prove that AnoFel does not impact training correctness, and that no PPT adversary can win the security games defined in Section 2 for anonymity and dataset privacy with non-negligible probability.

Intuitively, AnoFel satisfies these properties by relying on the correctness and security of the underlying cryptographic

primitives, and the bounds on accuracy and privacy loss offered by DP as employed in our system. The use of a secure zero-knowledge proof guarantees: completeness (a valid honest proof generated by a client will be accepted by the bulletin board validators and the aggregators  $\mathcal{AG}$ ), soundness (a client that does not own a certified dataset cannot register, and a client that does not belong to the registered set cannot forge valid proofs during training), and zero-knowledge (so the proof does not reveal anything about the master public key of the client or its dataset).

Furthermore, the use of a semantically secure threshold homomorphic encryption scheme guarantees that the ciphertexts of the model updates do not reveal anything about the underlying (plaintext) updates, and adding them will produce a valid result of the sum of these updates. The use of a secure commitment scheme guarantees that a commitment posted by a client  $cl_i$  hides the dataset  $D_i$  and binds this client to  $D_i$ . The security of the digital signature scheme and the PKI guarantees that a malicious adversary cannot forge a certificate for a corrupted dataset, and that a man-in-the-middle attacker cannot manipulate any of the messages that a client, aggregator, or a server send. Also, under the assumption that at least  $t$  members of  $\mathcal{AG}$  are honest, this guarantees that  $S$  will not have access to the individual updates submitted by clients.

Moreover, the use of a  $(\epsilon, \delta)$ -differential privacy technique leads to small advantage for the attacker in membership attacks as given by equation 1, and a small error (or loss in accuracy) bound as detailed in Section 3. We use these parameters in our proofs below.

Formally, the proof of Theorem 1 requires proving three lemmas showing that AnoFel is correct, anonymous, and supports dataset privacy. For correctness, we remark that AnoFel does not impact training correctness and accuracy. So if a defense mechanism against inference attacks is employed, and this mechanism provides a trade-off with respect to accuracy (as in differential privacy), AnoFel will not impact that level.

**Lemma 1.** *AnoFel satisfies the correctness property as defined in Definition 1.*

*Proof.* Correctness follows by the correctness of the homomorphic encryption scheme and the security of the digital signature, as well as the accuracy level provided by DP. A semi-honest client in the training phase will perform training as required and encrypt the updates and post them on the board. Since AnoFel uses an existential unforgeable digital signature scheme, a malicious attacker  $\mathcal{A}$  cannot modify the ciphertext of the updates without invalidating the signature, and  $\mathcal{A}$  cannot forge a valid signature over a modified ciphertext. Thus, it is guaranteed that all accepted model updates ciphertexts are the ones produced by the client. Also, since AnoFel uses a correct (and secure) homomorphic encryption scheme, the homomorphic addition of the ciphertexts will produce a ciphertext of the sum of the actual updates (with their added noise level by DP). By the correctness of the decryption

algorithm, after decrypting the sum ciphertext, the server will obtain the correct value of the aggregated updates in each training iteration. This trained model differs from the actual one by the error bounds  $\alpha$  obtained from DP, thus satisfying  $\alpha$ -correctness. This completes the proof.  $\square$

For anonymity, as we mentioned previously, inference attacks will have no impact on anonymity unless the leaked datapoint contains sensitive data (like the identity of the client)—so this attack assumes that the adversary got a hold on the dataset or part of it. As an extra step, a technique can be used to pre-process the dataset to remove sensitive attributes from the dataset, satisfies that and renders membership attacks ineffective in compromising anonymity (note if the attacker gets a hold on a client dataset and he knows the client identity, then he already compromised privacy of that client). The definition of our anonymity property does not assume the adversary knows the dataset or identity of the clients involved in the challenge.<sup>10</sup>

**Lemma 2.** *AnoFel satisfies the anonymity property as defined in Definition 1.*

*Proof.* Under the assumption that at least one honest client (other than  $cl$ ) has submitted updates during the challenge training iteration (as described in the game definition earlier), accessing the aggregated model updates at the end of any iteration will not provide  $\mathcal{A}$  with any non-negligible advantage in winning the game. Thus, the proof is reduced to showing that all actions introduced by AnoFel preserve anonymity. We prove that using a similar proof technique to the one in [28], where we show a series of hybrids starting with an AnonGame with  $b = 0$  (Hybrid<sub>0</sub>), and finishing with an AnonGame game with  $b = 1$  (Hybrid<sub>7</sub>). By showing that all these hybrids are indistinguishable, this proves that  $\mathcal{A}$  cannot tell which client was chosen for the challenge train command in AnonGame. Now, we proceed with a sequence of hybrid games as follows:

Hybrid<sub>0</sub>: The game AnonGame with  $b = 0$ .

Hybrid<sub>1</sub>: Same as Hybrid<sub>0</sub>, but we replace the zero-knowledge proofs with simulated ones, i.e., we invoke the zero-knowledge property simulator for each of the register and train queries, and we replace the actual proofs in the output of these queries with simulated ones. The hybrids Hybrid<sub>0</sub> and Hybrid<sub>1</sub> are indistinguishable by the zero-knowledge property of the ZKP system that AnoFel uses. That is, if  $\mathcal{A}$  can distinguish them, then we can build another adversary  $\mathcal{A}'$  that can break the zero-knowledge property, which is a contradiction.

Hybrid<sub>2</sub>: Same as Hybrid<sub>1</sub>, but we replace  $(cl_0, aux_0, cl_1, aux_1)$  with fresh output  $(cl'_0, aux'_0, cl'_1, aux'_1)$ . That is, we choose fresh datasets and register two fresh

clients using them. So if setup created a state with  $n$  clients, any register query for any of the  $n$  clients other than  $cl_0$  and  $cl_1$  will proceed as in Hybrid<sub>1</sub>. However, if it is for  $cl_0$  or  $cl_1$ , we replace them with  $cl'_0$  or  $cl'_1$  and proceed.

The hybrids Hybrid<sub>1</sub> and Hybrid<sub>2</sub> are indistinguishable by the zero-knowledge property of the ZKP system and the hiding property of the commitment scheme that AnoFel uses (which implies that client registration is indistinguishable). That is, if  $\mathcal{A}$  can distinguish them, then we can build two adversaries:  $\mathcal{A}'$  that can break the zero-knowledge property of the ZKP system, and  $\mathcal{A}''$  that can break the hiding property of the commitment scheme, which is a contradiction.

Hybrid<sub>3</sub>: Same as Hybrid<sub>2</sub>, but we replace the output of training any of  $(cl_0, aux_0, cl_1, aux_1)$  with fresh output produced by training  $(cl'_0, aux'_0, cl'_1, aux'_1)$ . As above, if setup created a state with  $n$  client registrations, any train query for any of the  $n$  clients other than  $cl_0$  and  $cl_1$  will proceed as in Hybrid<sub>2</sub>. However, if the train query is for  $cl_0$  or  $cl_1$ , we replace them with training output based on the fresh datasets owned by  $cl'_0$  or  $cl'_1$  and proceed.

Hybrid<sub>2</sub> and Hybrid<sub>3</sub> are indistinguishable by the zero knowledge property of the ZKP system and the semantic security of the homomorphic encryption scheme used in AnoFel (which implies that training is indistinguishable). If  $\mathcal{A}$  can distinguish them, then we can build two adversaries:  $\mathcal{A}'$  that can break the zero-knowledge property of the ZKP system, and  $\mathcal{A}''$  that can break the semantic security of the encryption scheme, which is a contradiction.

Hybrid<sub>4</sub>: Same as Hybrid<sub>3</sub>, but with  $b = 1$ . The hybrids Hybrid<sub>3</sub> and Hybrid<sub>4</sub> are indistinguishable by the indistinguishability of model training as described above.

Hybrid<sub>5</sub>: Same as Hybrid<sub>4</sub>, but with  $(cl_0, aux_0, cl_1, aux_1)$  used in training as in the original game. So this is Hybrid<sub>3</sub> with  $b = 1$ . The hybrids Hybrid<sub>4</sub> and Hybrid<sub>5</sub> are indistinguishable by the indistinguishability argument of Hybrid<sub>3</sub> and Hybrid<sub>2</sub>.

Hybrid<sub>6</sub>: Same as Hybrid<sub>5</sub>, but with  $(cl_0, aux_0, cl_1, aux_1)$  used in registration as in the original game. So this is Hybrid<sub>2</sub> with  $b = 1$ . The hybrids Hybrid<sub>5</sub> and Hybrid<sub>6</sub> are indistinguishable by the indistinguishability argument of Hybrid<sub>2</sub> and Hybrid<sub>1</sub>.

Hybrid<sub>7</sub>: Same as Hybrid<sub>6</sub>, but with real ZKPs instead of the simulated ones. So this is the original AnonGame with  $b = 1$ . The hybrids Hybrid<sub>6</sub> and Hybrid<sub>7</sub> are indistinguishable by the indistinguishability argument of Hybrid<sub>1</sub> and Hybrid<sub>0</sub>.

This shows that AnonGame with  $b = 0$  is indistinguishable from AnonGame with  $b = 1$ , which completes the proof.  $\square$

As for dataset privacy, membership attacks will allow  $\mathcal{A}$  to win the dataset privacy game with advantage  $\gamma$  as he selects the datasets involved in the challenge. Thus, our proofs proceeds in two stages: first, we show that the cryptographic primitives used in AnoFel do not provide  $\mathcal{A}$  with any non-negligible advantage, and second, by the security guarantees of DP, this

<sup>10</sup>Even if we allow that, we can define  $\gamma$ -anonymity property where the attacker wins with probability bounded by  $\gamma$  inherited from DP.

attacker has an advantage bounded by  $\gamma$  due to membership attacks.

**Lemma 3.** *AnoFel satisfies the dataset privacy property as defined in Definition 1.*

*Proof.* As defined in the DINDGame, adversary  $\mathcal{A}$  chooses two datasets  $D_0$  and  $D_1$ . Then, the challenger picks one of these datasets at random, registers a client with that dataset, and invokes the train command for that client.  $\mathcal{A}$  gets to see the output of the registration and training commands, which are the messages and signatures that a client sends in the setup and training phases of AnoFel as described before.

In order to win the DINDGame,  $\mathcal{A}$  can attack the registration or the training process. That is, for the former  $\mathcal{A}$  tries to reveal which dataset is hidden in the posted commitment or obtain information about the witness underlying the submitted proof, which contains the dataset  $D_b$  in this case. While for the latter,  $\mathcal{A}$  may try to infer any information about the plaintext of the model updates ciphertext (recall that the model parameters in a training iteration are public, and thus,  $\mathcal{A}$  can produce the model updates resulted from the use of  $D_0$  and  $D_1$ ). Note that attacking the ZKP to reveal any information about the commitment that was used, and then attacking that commitment, reduces to the same case of attacking the registration process.

Attacking registration means attempting to break the hiding property of the commitment scheme and the zero-knowledge property of the ZKP system. Since AnoFel uses a secure commitment scheme, the former will succeed with negligible probability  $\text{negl}_1(\lambda)$ . Also, since AnoFel uses a secure ZKP system that satisfies the zero-knowledge property, the latter will succeed with negligible probability  $\text{negl}_2(\lambda)$ . Attacking the training process means attempting to break the semantic security of the encryption scheme. Since AnoFel uses a semantically secure encryption to encrypt the model updates, such an attack will succeed with negligible probability  $\text{negl}_3(\lambda)$ .

Accordingly,  $\mathcal{A}$ 's advantage by the cryptographic primitives that we use is  $\text{negl}_1(\lambda) + \text{negl}_2(\lambda) + \text{negl}_3(\lambda) = \text{negl}(\lambda)$ .

Now,  $\mathcal{A}$  can query the oracle  $\mathcal{O}_{\text{PAFL}}$  to access the updated model and perform a membership attack. That is,  $\mathcal{A}$  knows both datasets and query the model over various datapoints to see which dataset was used in training. The success of this strategy is bounded by the privacy loss  $\gamma$  given by equation 1.

Thus, the probability that  $\mathcal{A}$  wins in the DINDGame is  $\frac{1}{2} + \text{negl}(\lambda) + \gamma$ , which completes the proof.  $\square$

**Proof of Theorem 1.** Follows by Lemmas 1, 2, and 3.